UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 91—PART 12

JUNE 11, 1945, TO OCTOBER 11, 1945

(PAGES A2767 TO A4294)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

COPY 3

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

For God and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, it is my privilege to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorial address delivered by my friend and former regimental commander of World War I, Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox, to Government Printing Office Post, No. 33, American Legion, National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C., on May 27, 1945:

We gather here to memorialize our deceased brothers and to renew our obligations to so conduct our daily lives as to be worthy of those who have gone to their reward. In this connection, it is well to recall the 25th and 26th verses of the 11th chapter of St. John, where it is written:

"I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die."

We then come not as mourners, but to glorify those who share the life eternal.

Love of God, which we are accustomed to call religion, and love of country, which we know as patriotism, are the constituent elements of a nation's safety. In the disturbed condition of world affairs, it behooves all of us to rededicate ourselves to a stronger defense of these fundamental principles.

The history of western civilization is essentially the history of the development of human freedom. With the renaissance came intellectual freedom; with the reformation came religious freedom; with the Declaration of Independence, our Federal Constitution and its Bill of Rights, came political freedom; with the industrial revolution and the development of natural science came a degree of freedom heretofore unknown from the forces of nature. Now we are in the midst of a world-wide struggle for economic freedom. In some countries the earlier forms of freedom, attained by much toil and bloodshed, are being sacrificed in the struggle for economic freedom, or rather the mirage of it. Intolerance stalks the globe. The entire world seems to be dividing into two classes; one believing that whatever is, is right; the other that whatever is, is wrong. Reason and common sense seem to be in danger of being crushed between the upper and nether millstones of conservatism, so-called, and of liberalism, so-called.

And what is the answer? The answer is found in the lesson of today, of yesterday, and of tomorrow—that man is his brother's keeper. Where there is no brotherhood, there can be no peace. The bleeding bodies of 10,000,000 men should be an ever-present reminder of the result of ill will between nations, brought about by lack of understanding through the failure of the human race to have learned that ages-old lesson "love thy neighbor."

And by "love thy neighbor" I do not mean that you should throw your arms around or otherwise physically embrace your neighbor, but I do mean you should exhibit toward your neighbor, personally known to you or not, a tolerant understanding—the good will which motivates the life of a Christian.

With the Psalmist can we of this much-blessed country say "the lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage." It is a legacy that our forebears bequeathed to us in sacred trust more than a century and a half ago. Are we taking care to preserve that priceless legacy? What are we doing to create such a result as the poet Browning had in mind when he sang, "How good is man's life, the mere living. How fit to employ all the heart and soul and the senses forever enjoy."

And so, on this beautiful day, surrounded as we are by evidence on every hand of God's goodness, I remind you that no undertaking of man can succeed unless the spirit of God is permitted to control. The universal craving is for peace. And that peace is a will to yield not to a temporal but to a higher power—to the greatest mediator of them all.

In this connection, I recall that many years ago the most contented Americans were those descendants of the black people of Africa, who a century ago had been enslaved that through their toil they might develop this then new country, and who lived largely in the rural districts of our Southern States. I base their happiness upon the expression that came from their throats at their frequent assemblies. Deeply religious by nature, deprived of the opportunities for entertainment vouchsafed to most others, when their weekly toil was done they gave expression to their ideals in singing the Old Time Religion Is Good Enough for Me. In the active lives we lead and the many interruptions that are daily ours, I can visualize a happier civilization and a more contented people if we, too, regarded more deeply the spiritual ideals of our old-time religion.

The present condition of world affairs has been brought about by a disposition to lose sight of the fact that our intangible liberties are far more precious than golden riches or industrial triumphs. The age is covered with a cloak of materialism which obscures the life and teachings that Christ gave to the people of this world nearly 2,000 years ago. His is the simple philosophy which makes real the meaning of value or of compensation in human life. He taught us the real compensation—that service to one's fellow man is service to God, and that love is the highest expression of the human soul. But what has the world done with Christ's teachings? Many of us brush aside as maudlin or sentimental the cry that religion must have a place in our daily lives. We refuse to recognize any force or will more powerful than our own. We avoid religion because it annoys us in that it interferes with our so-called pleasures or profits. Our fundamental principles, the form of government which we love, were formulated by men who sought God's guidance and who publicly recognized the value of the old-time religion to them and to their neighbors. They set up a standard and a mode of life which 130,000,000 Americans are enjoying today and which other nations of the world have emulated. They fought that religion might be preserved. The freemen of the world today find themselves again employed in armed conflict, that the life and liberty won for them by their forefathers through centuries of struggle may be preserved.

In central and eastern Europe during the last decade there has been built a philosophy of government based upon the denial of personal liberty and the inherent rights of man. A great war machine, geared to the limit of human capacity and endurance, set itself a goal of ruling the world. It rode roughshod over individual freedom. It scoffed at the idea that man has any God-given right to choose his own way of life as his conscience may indicate. Freedom of speech and of the press, the right of peaceable assembly, and religious liberty were ridiculed and denied to men under totalitarian jurisdiction. This philosophy has inflicted death wounds upon old, established social customs and has invaded even the home and family life, claiming the sole allegiance of the children and of the youth. It sought to regiment everything and everybody into absolute, unquestioned obedience to the dictates of a superstate. Truth was ruthlessly crushed to earth. A barrier was placed on human thought, and the soul of man as well as his body was enslaved. The money changers again occupied the temple.

In contrast to this bondage of body and soul, at the Worlds Fair in New York there stood four gigantic statues to the four American freedoms. Those statues have been demolished, but the freedoms to which they testified are enshrined in the hearts of our American people. But from the lives of the inhabitants of 17 nations from Esthonia and Lithuania to Abyssinia and Greece, beneath the thunder of dive bombers and tanks and the persecution of the Gestapo and Ogpu concentration camps, those freedoms were erased.

Freedom, both personal and collective, is as much our definite government program as the suppression of liberty is the studied program of dictator states. We enjoy liberty not by tolerance, but by legal right. These liberties have not always been ours. Only after centuries of conflict with entrenched autocracies did the masses gain from the privileged classes the freedom that is our cherished heritage today. Our forefathers threw off the feudal chains of slavery, of serfdom and of special privilege link by link, and religious, civil, and personal liberty became glorious reality. The two philosophies of government are in deadly conflict and there seems to be no common ground upon which they may meet and negotiate a peace.

There can be no peace upon earth except among men and women whose wills are for good, and not for evil. Selfishness is not good, nor is injustice, nor greed, nor envy, hatred or malice. It is idle to pray for peace unless we frankly recognize that these are th hideous motives that move individuals and nations to war. We need to pray that those who call themselves Christians may honestly keep their vows of discipleship and renounce the hidden works of darkness. True peace is rooted in righteousness. False prophets cry "Peace! Peace!" when there is no peace. We must not adopt the cowardly slogan "Anything for peace!" We must not compromise moral issues or evade clear moral responsibilities under the guise of being peace lovers. We believe in the dignity of the individual, in government by law, in respect for truth, and in a good God. These beliefs are worth our lives and men. As our late President Franklin Roosevelt said, "The moral consciousness of the world must be aroused to the cardinal necessity of honoring sanctity of treaties, respecting the rights and liberties of others, and of putting an end to acts of international aggression."

Liberty is not bought and sold at the market place. The history of civilization is the delineation of a bloody struggle. What we have, we have gained by sacrifice. The world issue today is plain. Shall freemen live under laws of their own making and under leadership of their own choosing, or shall human beings exist as slaves under the lash of the tyrants while all that makes life worth living, and even life itself, are subject to the whim of the oppressor? It seems but a short time ago that men and women of this Nation participated with those of other nations in another world-wide war. The war was thought to be a war to end wars—a war to preserve civilization—and victory having perched upon our banner, we gloried that a world peril had been averted. The years since have quickly passed and daily reports show clearly that World War I was humane in comparison with the conflict now raging, and that, as the grim-visaged Mars regards the triumph of his principles, we are forced to admit that from the standpoint of civilized people and of Christians the years in passing have brought to the inhabitants of this globe retrogression rather than progression. That war was waged, as wars to that time had been, by armed might against armed might. Cruel in the extreme did we then consider the use of poison gases. But never did we anticipate that the time would come when the purpose of armed men would be directed more at unarmed women and children than at those who with like arms oppose them in the field. It is a bitter cross we carry when we are forced to admit, as Christians, that wars are now being made against the defenseless as well as against those bearing arms.

There has never been a time as now when the responsibilities and the obligations of Christian citizenship have rested so heavily upon the individual citizen. While our inspiration may be in the struggles and in the sacrifices and in the victories of yesterday, it is our stamina and our Christianity that will be tested in the fires of today and tomorrow. This is no time for softness and for complacency.

There can be no lasting victory for any cause that is not righteous, and the cause of truth can triumph only through Christ. The truth taught by Christ is essentially the truth of freedom for the individual soul. He was the great Apostle of the dignity of the individual and the great Teacher of true democracy. This democracy of curs was raised upon the foundation of the teachings of Christ of Nazareth. We fight, with Great Britain and the other United Nations, not only to defend our land and our way of life but consciously are not we fighting the battle of Christianity against forces motivated by brute materialism ? Our enemies have openly declared that, if victorious, they will dethrone Christ and replace Him with the god of force.

Each right and privilege that we as American citizens enjoy carries with it equal responsibilities and duties. This Nation of ours was not founded by men who sat and waited for somebody else to do the job; by men so engrossed in their private affairs that they had no time for public questions. If we are to protect and preserve our system of representative democracy, free enterprise, and religious liberty, we must give of our time and thought to the public good. I sometimes wonder if the words of a poem written by Winona Montgomery Gilliland are not properly descriptive of our attitude today. It reads:

"Our vision is dimmed; we are tired
And long for ease.
We neglect our vital spark—
That burning love for freedom which once lit
Our blackest nights—and now we fumble,
Confused and fearful, hearing our
Foundations crumble.
Craven, we seek a leader who will raise
A torch and make our pathway smooth again,
Forgetting that within us sleeps a fire
Sufficient, in itself, to make us men."

As individuals thinking only of individual efforts we cannot achieve, but as men and women with due humility seeking divine guidance and obtaining God's assistance all can be accomplished.

We must defend the Christian principles which have been the mudsill of our civilization. We must recognize that a Nation and its people must have ideals and fight to keep them, or return to brute savagery. We must rekindle the concepts of life embraced in our old time religion. We must gird ourselves with an all-abiding faith, a confidence in ourselves, and in those around us, such a faith as had Bertha D. Martin when she penned those lines with which I shall conclude, and which delineate, in spoken words, the inmost thoughts of the spirit. She said:

"I must have faith, not that which stirs and moves
My hands and feet in well-accustomed grooves;
That turns the sod, and sows the proven seed,
And trusts my trade to fill my daily need;
But faith, a living flame, that gives to me
Meaning and reason for all things that be.
"A faith unmoved by all the fears and doubt
That haunt and devastate the world about;
That sees beyond life's parting, dark with gloom,
The shining portal of an empty tomb;
And knows that hate shall conquered be by love,
That all is well because God reigns above."

Ralph A. Bard, Under Secretary of the Navy

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker and Members, you have doubtless noticed in the press that Ralph A. Bard, Under Secretary of the Navy, is leaving his duties in the Navy Department on next July 1.

I wish to pay tribute to Under Secretary Bard, for I know from working closely with him what a splendid man he is and the fine service he has rendered to the Navy and to the Nation.

For the past 4½ years, during which time he served as Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of the Navy, our Navy has been built up to become the most powerful sea-air power in the world. A large measure of this achievement has been due to the energy and wisdom of Ralph Bard. I have never met a more conscientious public servant, or one more devoted to the cause he served. Throughout his term of office Mr. Bard was responsible for the supervision and direction of all matters of the Navy Department relating to civilian personnel and the general administration of the Department of the Navy, including the general administrative control of all of the naval shore establishments.

Ralph Bard will long be remembered for the tremendous improvement he made in the Navy's industrial relations. He instituted a sound program of personnel administration and did much to strengthen the Navy's supervisory organization, which has made possible the Navy's fine production record during its most critical period.

He was constantly looking after taxpayers' interests and much of his personal attention was devoted to the efficient utilization of manpower and the elimination of inefficiencies and wastes.

Seldom during his 4½ years' service in the Navy Department has Mr. Bard been away from his desk. He came to work early and he stayed late. By personal example, he gave the cue to his subordinates for industry, loyalty, and devotion to duty. His splendid record of service is one in which the Nation can take pride and we are ever grateful for his outstanding contribution to the successful winning of the war.

Mr. Bard has assured the Secretary of the Navy and the President that after a brief rest he will be available to serve for the balance of the war on any special assignments where his services are needed and I am glad to say that the Secretary of the Navy fully expects to use his advice and assistance on special problems at least until the end of the war.

Mr. Bard has performed this duty at great personal sacrifice and it is a pleas-

ure for me to pay tribute to such a fine American.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 9, 1945.

HON. RALPH A. BARD,
Under Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: I have your letter of resignation dated May 23 and have reluctantly come to the conclusion that you are entitled to have it accepted. As you request, it will be effective on July 1, 1945.

During your period of duty as Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of the Navy for the past 4½ years, our Navy has been built up to become the most powerful in the world. I know that a great part of that result has been due to your energy and wisdom. Yours has been a splendid record of service for which the Nation is grateful, and in which I am sure you can take great pride.

The Secretary of the Navy has informed me that he will require your services and advice on special assignments at least until the end of the war. I am very happy that you have expressed your willingness to continue to serve your country in that capacity, as soon as you have taken a much needed and deserved rest.

With all best wishes to you, and hoping that you will come in to see me from time to time when you are in Washington.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Succession to the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo (N. Y.) News of May 17, 1945:

SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

The proposal by James A. Farley that a commission be named to examine the question of succession to the Presidency is good. It has been incorporated into a bill by Representative MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma. But his bill goes beyond this, for it provides that the Speaker of the House be placed at the head of the present line of succession pending a final report by the commission.

Under the present system, the Secretary of State succeeds to the Chief Executive office should both the President and Vice President die or become incapacitated, with other Cabinet officers following in the order in which their Departments were created. This system has its flaws, but so do most of the suggested alternatives, including Mr. MONRONEY'S. An impartial study of the whole question would be a timely move to plug what Mr. MONRONEY terms "glaring loopholes" in the succession machinery. But in the meantime there is no good reason to tamper with the present plan.

This plan was enacted by Congress in 1886 as insurance against a complete change of parties during any elected administration. Until then, the President pro tempore of the Senate was next in line after the Vice President. But in 1885, just after Cleveland's inauguration, the Democratic Vice President died, and the Senate elected a Republican, John Sherman, as its President pro tempore. Thus, Cleveland's death in office would have meant a complete party change. As a result, Congress voted, in effect, to keep the same party in power throughout a whole 4-year term by limiting the succession to the President's Cabinet appointees in the order of their rank.

One objection raised against the present plan is that it gives a Vice President who succeeds to the Chief Executive office the power to name his own successor by appointing a Secretary of State who has never been passed upon by the electorate. But in practice it is not likely that a Secretary of State, who is subject to Senate confirmation, would be much more "hand picked" or lacking in executive qualifications than a Vice President.

A more valid complaint is that no fixed line of succession now is provided for, in event both a President-elect and Vice President-elect should die before inauguration day. This and other possible contingencies should be guarded against, so that the office of President would never be left to chance or to a last-minute political manipulation. The whole subject might well be given an exhaustive airing by a commission such as that proposed in the Monroney bill.

That $2,500 Expense Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, since President Truman assumed office, the heat formerly turned on Congress by the Executive and the administrative departments has not been so intense nor so constant. The President did tell Congress to adopt Bretton Woods and the House, by an overwhelming majority, did just that; swallowing it without knowing very much about it.

The President also attempted to put the heat on his own party and force the adoption of H. R. 2232, an FEPC bill. But the Democratic members of the Rules Committee balked, and if the House retains any of its good sense, it will not enact that particular bill. If it enacts legislation on that subject, it should take the bill introduced by me, H. R. 2495. No one approves of discrimination. To end any that may exist it is not necessary to establish a new executive agency; creating jobs for thousands of new Federal employees, opening the road to further persecution of businessmen, and bringing about a situation which will only create ill will because of differences in race and creed. A law giving a remedy for injury growing out of discrimination and using the established court procedure will be sufficient.

Congress as a whole believes the President to be honest and sincere, will give his requests respectful consideration, but it is doubtful if he even wants or tries to make Congress subservient to his wishes. It may be a long time before another Executive finds a Congress which will rubber-stamp the executive department as have those of the last 12 years.

SEVENTEEN MILLION DOLLARS

Yesterday the House, on a record vote by a combination of Democrats and Republicans cut $17,000,000 from the funds of the OWI, which it had intended to use in Europe and the United States. The agency still has $17,000,000 to use in the Pacific area.

THAT $2,500 EXPENSE ITEM

Earlier in the week the House voted to allow each Congressman $2,500 to, in part, repay him for money necessarily expended in connection with his official duties.

For personal reasons, I filed with the disbursing officer of the House a written assignment authorizing and directing him to pay back into the Treasury of the United States any and all portions of that fund which may be credited to my account prior to January 1, 1946. But I voted for the appropriation because there is no reason why a Congressman should not be allowed his legitimate expenses incurred in the performance of his official duties. Every other employer allows his employees such expenses while on the boss' business.

In recent years the duties of Congressmen transacting the business of their constituents have been trebled, as have their expenses, and there is no reason why repayment should not be made, nor is there any reason why Congressmen should be discriminated against by the Revenue Department as they have been over a period of years.

Every man in business, every earner of an income, except Congressmen, has been permitted to deduct from his income-tax payments necessary expenses incurred in connection therewith.

It is suggested that if Congressmen are not satisfied with their salaries and with their expenses, they can resign, that no one forces them to run for office. That is true. It is equally true that if the Congress votes to allow itself increased compensation for additional items of expense or an increase in salary for Congressmen elected to subsequent Congresses, the people, if they disapprove at the coming election, can defeat them and elect someone who they believe will be worth the money—earn it.

Not a few Congressmen before coming here earned net twice what they get here. Some may not be worth half what they get here. It is up to the people every 2 years to select their Representative, keeping in mind the duties to be done, the ability of the candidates to perform them. The people should know what the candidate is worth. They should be willing to pay what they think he is worth, and if they have in Congress a man who they believe is not worth what he is being paid as compensation and allowed as expense money, they should try and find one in the District who will meet that standard.

I voted for the expense allowance of $2,500 because I believed the Congressmen are entitled to it. The fact that for personal reasons the legal assignment

of expense money to the United States Treasury was made by me is no criticism of those who accept it. If because of my vote on this issue the people of my District want someone else to represent them, they will have opportunity to make that decision when the next election rolls around. It is my purpose to be fair to all while here.

Put Only Americans on Guard

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman should take a tip from George Washington and "put only Americans on guard."

He should not only clean out those traitors in the State Department who have been stealing secret documents for foreign governments and giving our Government secrets to Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell, but he should clean such elements out of all other branches of the Government and put a stop to the War Department's commissioning subversive individuals into the United States Army.

Every Communist in America is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, and yet they are being commissioned into our Army by the War Department and placed in positions where they can do the most harm if and when it becomes necessary to exercise their sabotage proclivities in order to serve their alien masters.

Last night both Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell went to bat for those saboteurs in the State Department, who were exposed by the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities months and months ago; and this morning PM, the up-town edition of the Communist Daily Worker, as well as the Daily Worker itself, comes out and defends those subversive individuals who have been betraying this country at home while American boys were dying by the tens of thousands to defend it abroad.

A high ranking general in the United States Army told me more than a year ago that if he were to give out the Government secrets that were being broadcast by Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell he would be court-martialed immediately, and ought to be.

Here is an example: On the night of April 6, just 2 days before the Germans capitulated, in the most critical hour of the war when every day it continued meant the death of thousands of American boys, Drew Pearson went on the radio and broadcast this statement to the world:

Washington: Gen. William J. Donovan, Office of Strategic Services, has just received from his overzealous aides a detailed plan for American war on Russia.

What could have been more dangerous to the Allied cause than for Drew Pearson to broadcast that statement to the world at that critical hour—one of the most critical hours in the world's history?

Somebody in the State Department, in the War Department, and even around the White House, has been giving out secret information to Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell to broadcast to the world regardless of its cost in the lives of American boys on the various fighting fronts.

It is time for the administration to clean house and put only Americans on guard.

Doctor of Laws Degree Conferred on Marcellus C. Sheild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of June 4 a great honor was conferred on Marcellus C. Sheild, former clerk of the Appropriations Committee, when American University conferred on him the degree of doctor of laws, in the presence of a large assemblage. By unanimous consent I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the commencement address delivered by Arthur S. Flemming, of the United States Civil Service Commission, on that occasion, as follows:

TOMORROW'S PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Arthur S. Flemming, member, United States Civil Service Commission)

This is an unusual commencement. At least half of the members of this graduating class are public servants. A large percentage of the members of this audience are public servants. And many who are here have come for the primary purpose of paying tribute to one of the outstanding public servants of our generation. Consequently, I know of no more appropriate place in which to discuss tomorrow's public service.

All branches of government have discharged tremendously important responsibilities throughout the war years. Mistakes have been made. But on the whole these responsibilities have been discharged in an unusually effective manner. The results speak for themselves.

We shouldn't, however, permit these results to becloud our vision as we look ahead to the future. There are weak spots in the public service. The unity and the drive which come in the midst of a war have made it possible for us to achieve results in spite of the weak spots. We would have done a better job if they hadn't been there. We won't be able to do tomorrow's job unless they are eliminated.

We know that tomorrow's job is to bring peace to this war-torn world. We know that it can't be done unless our Nation is willing to become an active and intelligent participant in the affairs of the world.

We know, of course, that such participation depends, first of all, on public opinion. But we also know that public opinion must depend on public servants for the carrying out of the programs which it backs. A public that has had a mountain-top experience and beheld a vision of what must be done if peace is to reign must express itself through public servants who have likewise had mountain-top experiences. If it doesn't tragedy is sure to follow.

There rests squarely, therefore, on the shoulders of tomorrow's—not the day after tomorrow's—public servants a large share of the responsibility for providing the answer to this question, "Have these dead died in vain?" No greater responsibility has ever rested on the shoulders of any group of men or women—in peace or in war.

And the public service is aware of the importance of tomorrow. Take, for example, our Federal Government. Never has there been as much soul searching as there is right now. The legislative branch, through the LaFollette-Monroney committee, is examining into its own procedure and into its own resources to determine whether they are adequate, and, if not, to ascertain what can be done about it. The executive branch, as indicated by developments of the past few weeks, in doing likewise.

And so, in the light of tomorrow's staggering responsibilities, let us consider a few "musts" for tomorrow's public service.

We have a civil-service system in the Federal Government. It is being applied today to approximately 95 percent of the positions in the Federal service. Those men who secured the passage of the basic Civil Service Act of 1883 would be proud of what they could observe today. Men who, like Theodore Roosevelt in the 6 years that he served as a member of the Civil Service Commission, fought and won many battles against a vicious spoils system, would recognize that those gains have been consolidated and extended. And we who occupy their positions today must make sure that none of those gains is lost. There cannot be and will not be any backward movement.

But those men of yesterday would be the first to recognize that we have a long way to go before we can be sure that tomorrow's public service can discharge the responsibilities which will be placed upon it.

WE MUST PUT THE PUBLIC SERVANT IN HIS PROPER NICHE IN OUR NATION'S HALL OF FAME

We have still to recognize that a public servant in fact, as well as in name, gives his life to the service of his fellow men just as surely as does, for example, a minister of the gospel, a teacher, or a physician.

We are always ready, and rightly so, to condemn a public servant for his mistakes. This right of condemnation is an essential part of democracy. It must be retained. In fact, as a nation we must be even more vigorous in discovering, condemning, and getting rid of our unfaithful public servants.

But, in exercising our right to condemn, let's be specific. And let's make sure that, directly or indirectly, we do not lead the public to believe that the unfaithful public servant is typical of all public servants. Every time we do so, we are deliberately sabotaging the public service of tomorrow because we are driving away from it men and women who would otherwise become a part of it.

In addition, however, we should be just as quick to commend as we are to condemn. We need more universities that, like the American University is doing tonight, will reach down into the heart of our public service and there find a man who, over a long period of years, day in and day out, has rendered the kind of outstanding service to the public that Marc Sheild has rendered; and then having found him, will honor him in the way in which this university proposes to honor Marc Sheild tonight. It is a great thing to do for Marc Sheild. It is likewise a great thing to do for tomorrow's public service. Such an action becomes an inspiration and a challenge to untold thousands of public servants.

Of course, not all public servants can be given honorary degrees. But, in various ways, we can commend those who deserves

commendation. Editorial writers can do it. Congress can do it. Administrators and supervisors can do far more of it than they have done. When we do it, we will inspire others to seek like commendation. And when we do it, we will lift the sights of the entire Nation insofar as its attitude toward public servants and the public service is concerned.

This isn't something that can wait until tomorrow. We need to start today. Millions of the best young men and women of this Nation will, in the months which lie ahead, be demobilized from service in the armed forces. They have learned what it means to serve their Nation on the battle fronts of the world. We need what they can bring to the public service. Let's make it possible for them to believe that one of the most effective avenues for continued service to their Nation is the public service.

We must put our public servants in their proper place in our Nation's hall of fame if tomorrow's public service is to discharge tomorrow's responsibilities as they should be discharged.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST BECOME KNOWN AS THE MOST PROGRESSIVE EMPLOYER IN THE NATION

This is true, for example, insofar as wages are concerned. For many types of positions, it is recognized that Government will never compete on an equal footing with private organizations. That doesn't mean, however, that persons should be deliberately penalized because they decide to serve their fellow citizens through the Government.

It has always been difficult to understand why, as a society, we assume that because a person seeks to serve, for example, in the ministry or the teaching profession he must, of necessity, be satisfied with compensation which, in many instances, makes it barely possible for him and the members of his family to live decently.

Time and again persons who have had invaluable experiences in Government leave to enter private employment. Their primary reason for leaving is a feeling that failure to accept the increased compensation offered to them would be unfair to their families. As a nation, we take such decisions as a matter of course. And yet, oftentimes when it happens, the Nation, as a whole, is deprived of the services of someone whose services are desperately needed.

In our lower brackets, Government salaries do and should compare favorably with those of private industry. The same should be true insofar as the middle brackets are concerned.

Ir the upper brackets, although salaries will not necessarily be equal to those paid by industry, there is no reason why they should not be large enough to make it possible for the persor who has a genuine desire to continue to serve his fellow citizens to do so without being unfair to himself and to his family. And this principle should apply to all three branches of the Government—judicial, executive, and legislative.

Then, take another example. Industry has discovered that adequate health and medical programs constitute one of the best investments that can possibly be made. Government hasn't discovered the same thing because, generally speaking, it hasn't any health and medical programs for employees. We are behind the procession when we should be leading it. The same statements can be made insofar as safety programs are concerned.

Without becoming paternalistic, government, huge as it is, should nevertheless take a personal interest in the welfare and working conditions of its employees. If it doesn't, we will lose highly competent people that we would otherwise hold, and we will fail to attract the type of persons we should attract.

Government must lead the procession and become known as the Nation's most progressive employer, if tomorrow's public service is to discharge tomorrow's responsibilities as they should be discharged.

WE MUST SELL THE PUBLIC SERVICE TO PROSPECTIVE PUBLIC SERVANTS

We can comply with all of the requirements of the Civil Service Act by simply posting announcements of civil-service examinations in the post offices of the country. But that isn't the way in which we will develop the kind of public service which the responsibilities of tomorrow demand.

With the crusading spirit of a missionary, we must spot well-qualified and well-balanced citizens, and then sell them on the opportunities for service which exist in government. It costs a little more to do it. But, in the long run, it saves money.

The best that can be found will be none too good for tomorrow's public service.

WE MUST KEEP OUR PUBLIC SERVANTS OUT OF MENTAL AND SPIRITUAL RUTS

Where there is no vision the people perish. And where there is no vision on the part of public servants, the public service ceases to serve.

Take for example, this question of rules and regulations. Some officials worship them as ends in themselves. And when they do, the public gets mad. And the public shou'd be mad.

Originally, the rule or regulation was drafted as one method of attaining a laudable objective. But the officials charged with the administration of the rule or regulation were never told by their administrator what the objective was. Consequently, they play safe and insist on enforcing it in a literal manner. They are in mental and spiritual ruts. The results are often ridiculous and tend to undermine confidence in the entire public service.

And, usually, it is the administrator who is to blame. He has been so busy doing nonessential things that he hasn't had time to do the one thing which would bring about a tremendous improvement in his operaiton.

If every employee in the Federal service could be shown how to relate his everyday activities to government's tremendously challenging objectives, 90 percent of those who are in mental and spiritual ruts would pull themselves out of those ruts.

There are still other things which can be done. Too many people, for example, come to work for the central offices of agencies here in Washington, and then stay here for the rest of their lives. This shouldn't be permitted. They become unrealistic. They should spend at least a portion of their working careers out at the grass roots where regulations touch the lives of human beings. Then and only then will they develop a true appreciation of both the opportunities and limitations of government.

Career employees who give promise of developing into outstanding public officials should have the opportunity of working in more than one agency. Right now the Civil Service Commission is providing approximately 30 young persons, selected first of all by their own departments, with a chance to do just that.

Career employees should have first-hand contact with business organizations. And, like business, government, as an employer, should keep its employees in close contact with the work of educational institutions as they constantly push back the frontiers of human knowledge.

Tomorrow's job can't be done by public servants who are in mental and spiritual ruts. It must be tackled by public servants whose sights are high. Where there is no vision the public service perishes.

WE MUST DEVELOP A PUBLIC SERVICE THAT IS RESPONSIVE TO CHANGES IN POLICY

A career public service can operate in such a manner as to sabotage our democratic form of government.

When the citizens of this country, or when their representatives in Congress, decide on a change in policy, career public servants should do one of two things: Either they should do everything they can to make the new policy work, or they should get out.

And, in any civil-service system, it should be possible to separate those who cannot adjust and who do not get out on their own motion.

WE MUST BE MORE VIGOROUS THAN EVER BEFORE IN WEEDING OUT UNSATISFACTORY PUBLIC SERVANTS

And it can be done under a civil-service system. There is no such thing, for example, as life tenure in the Federal civil service for the lazy, the inefficient, or the office politician. If such persons remain in the service, it is because some administrators are unwilling to display the courage which must be displayed in any organization, if such persons are to be removed from it.

The Federal civil service does protect the efficient from arbitrary action. It gives no protection to the lazy, the inefficient, and the office politician. The only protection they receive is that given by the spineless administrator.

And now, these final words:

To the members of this graduating class who are public servants: We join with you tonight in rededicating ourselves to the task at hand. We are thinking once again of the fact that we have all solemnly swor nto well and faithfully discharge the duties of our respective offices. And we are thinking once again of the fact that, as we took that oath, we recognized that by ourselves we could not reach the goals set forth therein. At the end there was that prayer, uttered by all public servants as they enter upon the duties of their offices, "So help me God." We repeat it tonight, knowing that, as public servants, we must have in our lives the strength which God alone can give, if we are to play our part in bringing peace to this war-torn world.

To the members of this graduating class who are not public servants: We hope that you will give serious thought to becoming public servants. But, if for one reason or another you do not, we sincerely hope that you, as citizens of this Nation, will insist upon having the highest type of public service, and will do everything within your power to uphold the hands of those who do serve you and your fellow citizens.

To Marc Sheild: We and this entire Nation will be eternally grateful to you for having, by your life of unselfish service to your Nation, provided us with an outstanding example of what tomorrow's public service can be like, if tomorrow's public servants will only follow in your footsteps. If they do, these dead will not have died in vain and we will achieve a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Line of Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Asbury Park (N. J.) Press of May 15, 1945:

LINE OF SUCCESSION

James A. Farley has scored in his campaign calling for revision of the Presidential

Succession Act of 1886. The former Postmaster General points out that under this statute a Vice President, upon assuming the Presidency, could appoint his successor in the event of death by naming him as Secretary of State. If the Senate were not in session the President's right to make ad interim appointments would permit him to choose a possible successor without Senate confirmation.

Under the act of 1886 the Presidency passes from the President to the Vice President and then, in order to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior. At 61 years of age President Truman is older than any other Vice President at the time he became President. Although the President is fortunately reported to be in the best of health, his age, plus the tremendous burdens he must assume, arouse interest in those who might succeed him. At present Secretary of State Stettinius would become President in the event that anything should happen to the Chief Executive.

Mr. Farley's address calling attention to the casual manner in which members of the Cabinet might enter the White House has created a demand for congressional action to establish a commission to study the succession problem. Many suggestions for revising it have been made and they indicate room for considerable improvement in the act of 1886. Certainly there can be no objection to a study that will be aimed at placing representative men in line to succeed a President should death strike him.

Hitler Condemned in Classic Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to place in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Dan T. Davis a very logical and versatile writer of my district. Mr. Davis in addition to his work as a writer edits two papers with wide circulation in my district:

THE BOOK OF HITLER

In those days when there was no king in Germany there arose one Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber, and saith unto the people, "Hearken ye unto me and I will make of ye a great nation, that shall rule the world." And the people shouted with a great shout and said "Long live Hitler, son of Shickelgruber." After a few days Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber, threw away his paint brushes and the pots and pans in which he mixed the paste, for he was also a hanger of wallpaper, and took his journey to Munich. And he saith to himself, being quite dizzy, "I will take two Z's and cross them and form a swastika, and say unto the people, ye who are for me wear this swastika on your arm as a symbol of supermen, for ye are supermen, and there are none other in the whole world like us."

And Hitler builded him a great castle in Berchtesgaden, with a porch high up in front. When the castle was finished he sent a decree to all the people to come on the second day of the second month, to his castle. He also commanded the people to wear the swastika, and whosoever did not wear the swastika should have no part in the government and the benefits that should come to the people.

And all the people came to Berchtesgaden on the second month and the second day of the month. Then Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber, came out on the high veranda of his palace, and he stretched forth his hand horizontally before him and shouted, "Heil Hitler." And he commanded all the people to do the same. And the people stretched forth their arms as he had done, and shouted with a great shout, "Heil Hitler," and the thing was established in the day and became a sign in Germany in honor of Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber.

Then Hitler the son of Shickelgruber, said unto the people, "I am the god that brought you out of the Versailles bondage. Have no other gods before me, thou, nor thy sons, thy daughters, mules or asses or the oxen that moo in your barns. And the people stretched forth their arms and shouted again with a great shout and said, "Long live Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber, he is god and him only will we serve."

And there were in that country at that time men of the sons of Abraham, and Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber, hated them. And he said unto the people, let us deal wisely with them. And they treated roughly the sons of Abraham, and the sons of Abraham came to Hitler the son of Shickelgruber and said, "Long live the king. But what have we done to bring on the wrath of the king? And Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber, answered and said, "All the wealth that ye have bring unto me else I shall not leave among you even one that standeth against a wall."

And the sons of Abraham brought all their wealth in order to appease the king. But he chastized them and sent them out of the country and they wandered thither and yon, but many perished in the concentration camps. There was a man of the tribe of Britain who feared Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber, his people also feared him and they said unto Chamberlain, take thou now thy umbrella and journey to Hitler and say unto him, "A oes heddwch?" (Is there peace?) If Hitler answers, "Peace," all is well and thou shalt return.

Then Chamberlain journeyed to Hitler and said "A oes heddwch" and Hitler answered and said, "Heddwch" (Peace). Then Chamberlain and his umbrella returned joyfully to Britain and said, "Hitler is a dependable man. Hitler loves Britain." "But," asked the Britons, "what means this cannonading we hear across the channel in Holland?" Then Chamberlain dropped his umbrella and he and all the people of Britain ran into bomb shelters and remained until the "all clear" signal was given.

There arose a man in Britain, by name, Winny, the Church-on-the-Hill, and he said, "Hearken unto me, we will deal wisely with Hitler, the son of Shickelgruber." And he called together all the men of valor, those who worked with jeeps and tanks and B-40's and B-50's and he said unto them, "Stand ye here, until I talk to Uncle Sam." And he said to Uncle Sam, "Shall I go over and fight the Hun?" And Uncle Sam answered, "Go ye up and I will give thee the victory."

Winny, the Church-on-the-Hill, also said to Uncle Joe, the Stalling, "Will ye be off or from?" And Joe the Stalling answered, "I shall be off." But Joe, the Stalling, was harassed toward the rising of the sun, even unto Stalingrad, by Hitler's mighty men of valor. But at Stalingrad, the Russian men of valor struck the Hitlerites with the edge of the sword. All those who perished not by the sword froze to death on the steppes before Stalingrad.

And there came from the west the wild men from the land of America, from Dan to Bersheba. Woozy faced were these men, with long whiskers and they landed on D-day and struck the men of Hitler with the edge of the sword, from the shores of the Atlantic to the line of the Siegfried and over the Rhine.

And all Germany fled that day and Hitler, the son, of Shickelgruber, said to his armorbearer Himmel, "What shall we do, and how shall we escape the wild men from the land of America?" And Himmel took from his jaw a little pill, and said, "O king, liver forever, take ye this little pill and ye shall escape the terror of the uncircumscribed and the uncircumsized." And Hitler and Himmel died and were gathered to their fathers.—

D. T. D.

Need Seen for Congress to Change Law Governing Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by David Lawrence:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—NEED SEEN FOR CONGRESS TO CHANGE LAW GOVERNING PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—Within a few weeks President Truman will leave the United States to meet Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin. Where they will meet has not been announced, but apparently it will be somewhere on the continent of Europe.

Although the armed services will take the best of care and will protect to their utmost the safety of the President, accidents can happen to ships and planes. The man who would in that event become President of the United States is Secretary of State Stettinius. There is today no Vice President. This is as well known to Members of Congress as to citizens generally. Yet not a single effort has been made in either the House or the Senate to amend the Presidential-succession law other than to introduce a few bills.

CONGRESS HAS POWER

There is no need to amend the Constitution. The power to act resides in Congress. A measure changing the Presidential-succession law could be passed without much difficulty, for almost all Members of Congress feel that some elective rather than appointive officer should be in line for the Presidency when there is no Vice President.

All that Congress needs to do is to provide that the Secretary of State act as an interim President until Congress selects a successor for the unexpired term of a President when there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President. The method that can be prescribed for the process of selection would, of course, have to be written into the new law.

The old statute which was in effect from the beginning of the Republic until 1886 provided that the presiding officer of the Senate and then the Speaker of the House should succeed. Recently Senator WILLIS, of Indiana, proposed that the House of Representatives should in these circumstances choose a President in the same way that it is required to do when no candidate receives a majority in the electoral college in a regular election.

There is no reason why Congress, if it desired, could not follow the practice which prevails when a vacancy occurs in the Senate. A temporary appointment usually is

made and the vacancy for the unexpired term is filled in either a special election or on the next regular election day

The subject is one that is getting widespread attention and no considerations of delicacy should prevent Congress from acting before President Truman leaves the United States. The speculation is that the Big Three may meet in Berlin. This means that the conference might be held somewhere near the capital of defeated Germany, perhaps under military auspices. This, however, hardly affords the facilities for the advisers who will have to go along.

It may be, of course, that Marshal Stalin will insist that the meeting be held on Russian territory once more. It is hoped here that some neutral place will be selected, which can be the meeting place also of Secretaries of State or other Allied representatives who must work out the peace settlements. Such a place might well be Stockholm, which has the facilities for a Big Three meeting and is accessible by ship direct from the United States. Communication between Stockholm and other capitals is excellent. Sweden is near enough for Marshal Stalin to visit without being away from Moscow too long.

JOURNEY REASONABLY SAFE

The American and British Navies could escort Prime Minister Churchill and President Truman in European waters and the journey would be reasonably safe, though the presence of floating mines constitutes a hazard in the waters too near Germany. A landing could better be made in Norway and the rest of the journey made by train.

Meanwhile Members of Congress are beginning to talk of the first absence of President Truman from the country and they hope that he will not be away for long journeys such as his predecessor felt it necessary to take because of military planning. With the war in Europe ended, it would seem that Mr. Truman could appoint a group of capable diplomatic representatives to carry on the business of the United States Government so that the need for first-hand Presidential diplomacy would be reduced to the minimum.

Carroll Binder, Jr.'s, Tribute to a Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from the diary of a young flier, Carroll Binder, Jr., of a distinguished family. He has been missing in action since May 1944:

There was an empty bed in our hut the other night. I hadn't known him very well, as he had moved in only a week before. It was hard for me to realize that he had done more than go on furlough, which is quite possible since nine chutes were seen to open as the plane went into a dive over France.

Mike was his name, and he was a copilot. He belonged to the race which Hitler has told us is inferior, which a Senator has discovered to be the cause of all our troubles, which Coughlin has told us it is the duty of Christians to stamp out, and which most of the people who "count" in America will tell you has evaded war responsibilities and dodged the draft en masse. All these charges are, of course, irrefutable, but particularly the one concerning draft dodging. The Jews have a genius for finding themselves safe and sheltered jobs, such as flying crew positions in the Eighth Air Force. I can verify that from what I know about our own squadron, in which 12 percent of the pilots, 6 percent of the copilots, 30 percent of the navigators, and 20 percent of the bombardiers belong to the tainted race (whose population is just over 4 percent of America's total).

So Mike went down, and no doubt at the very moment that his plane caught fire, some sturdy defender of the American way of life was urging that people of Mike's faith be "suppressed." If I had been Mike I would not have had the heart to go on fighting after reading some American newspapers or hearing of Jew-baiting by certain public officials. But he kept on going in the hope that decent Americans would win out in the end. I pray God his hopes will be fulfilled.

Reestablishment of Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have included in the RECORD a report which I recently received from Mr. Charles B. Floyd, chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Committee for Returning Veterans, Newtonville, Mass. The report outlines the organizational work being done by this committee in helping the veteran to reestablish himself in the community, and because of the very obvious competence with which the program is being carried out, I believe a description of it may be helpful to other communities in setting up similar programs:

The work of the committee has been twofold: Surveys and long-range planning; immediate service to veterans.

I. SURVEYS AND PLANNING

It is realized that in order to plan logically for after-the-war handling of veterans, it was necessary to learn something of the educational and employment background of those who would return as veterans; what their own plans were; what their service careers were doing to improve their status in the employment market; how war experiences were affecting their health.

Using the records of the honor-roll list, cards listing each serviceman and his next-of-kin were set up as a master file, which has been maintained by adding names as they entered the service and taking out deaths reported, whether battle casualties or natural deaths.

In January 1944 a questionnaire and a letter explaining its purpose was sent to the next of kin. This practice is being continued with those entering the service later, waiting 4 or 5 months after the name is received in order to let the man complete his boot training and receive definite military assignment. A shorter, somewhat different questionnaire was mailed in April direct to overseas addresses of approximately 1,200 men. The response from these mailings provided information, more or less in detail, on over 3,500 service men and women (45 percent of total).

From examination of the questionnaires, we are building up various broad classifications which can safely be assumed to give an accurate picture of several phases of the postwar situation. We have classified:

1. Those who will return to school or continue education.
2. Those who will need help for employment.
3. Hospitalization; cause and (sometimes) effect.
4. Occupational qualifications, preferences, and expectancies (in 28 categories).

We are in a position to make (and are planning to make) the following analyses:

1. Those who will return to their old job.
2. Those who plan to remain in military or naval service.
3. Those desiring civil-service employment (partial analysis shows heavy percentage).
4. Marital and dependent status.
5. Further break-down of 1, school; and 4, occupation above, whatever seems necessary.
6. Any classification useful to the city.

II. SERVICE TO DISCHARGED VETERANS

When notified by a draft board that a man is discharged, a fill-in letter is completed and mailed to him. The response to these letters has been running only about 20 percent, due, we believe, to the efficiency of the separation centers, which inform a man before discharge what his rights and benefits are and where he should go in connection with each, and to the fact that the employment situation hasn't yet presented any difficulties.

When a discharged man comes in, the interview card is filled out as far as possible without subjecting the man to too extended questioning.

Photostatic copies of discharge papers are made by the veterans' service department at the city hall; physical examinations are arranged by appointment with Dr. Allen R. Barrow at a fixed fee of $3, paid by the committee.

On matters of employment, the committee has a close relationship with the mayor's committee on employment, a group of 53 local business and professional men who have volunteered to counsel those who are uncertain what course their future is to take. It is not a job-finding approach, but an advisory one. The demands on the mayor's committee have not been at all heavy as yet, but the members of the committee are standing by, and in the few referrals made a telephone call while the veteran is still in the office has produced a definite appointment.

It was found that many cases required legal advice, and to lessen the calls made upon the lawyer members of the citizens' advisory committee a penal of 10 local lawyers has been organized to stand by like the mayor's committee and help when a man is referred to them.

Complete effective cooperation is being received from all agencies to which veterans have been referred by the citizens' advisory committee. Those used most frequently have been the Veterans' Administration, Red Cross home service, family welfare bureau, and the city welfare, soldiers' relief, and school departments. We have corresponded with all agencies represented in the Newton Community Council and have letters on file from most of them stating exactly what aid they can provide and the type of case which they are most likely to handle.

At the end of the year our discharged file contained 495 names, 52 of which did not return to Newton and are on record as residing elsewhere. We have had no contact except our form letter with 274; slight contact

with 55 others. Of the rest, 76 are considered closed cases, while there are 38 cases where we have not received the latest word or feel that the steps taken so far may not be the final solution—open cases.

The objective in handling veterans who have come in with a problem which could not be settled at the time of the interview has been to send the man to the agency which can immediately take action and eventually settle the problem, saving the veteran the run-around. This we feel has been attained.

Fight Inflation Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me, I desire to call attention to Fight Inflation Week which began yesterday and continues all this week. Throughout America, consumer groups, church groups and labor groups are calling the peoples' attention to the need for continued price control.

As I said once before upon the floor of the House, no one seems to favor price control except the average American consumer—the housewife, the worker, the man whose pocketbook is hit by every tiny price increase. We would be derelict in our duty as the people's representatives if we did not extend the Price Control Act beyond June 30. If we weaken that act in any fashion, in fact, unless we strengthen it by giving OPA power to control commercial rents, we are saying to every American, "We are more interested in the profits of a few than we are in the pocketbooks of the many."

Even with as good a job as OPA is doing under all its handicaps, American labor justly asks a 20-percent wage increase to bring wages up partially to the levels prices have risen to despite OPA. There are now pending two seriously supported amendments which together, if adopted, would rob the American consumer of half a billion dollars a year.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include as a part of these remarks, a statement on Fight Inflation Week published in Bread and Butter, official publication of the Consumers' Union of the United States. It reads:

FIGHT INFLATION WEEK—JUNE 10–17

The week of June 10–17 has been proclaimed Fight Inflation Week by a number of organizations, including Consumers Union, the American Association of University Women, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Consumers League, the Congregational and Christian Churches of America, and the National Council of Jewish Women.

Fight Inflation Week is to be used as the instrument for dramatizing the Nation's need for price control. All organizations are asked to participate in this important job and plan community and neighborhood meetings to discuss the need for renewing the Price Control Act without inflationary amendments, and for appropriating sufficient funds for effective enforcement by OPA.

ACTION NEEDED

Organizations and individual consumers should ask their mayors and governors to proclaim June 10–17 as Fight Inflation Week, and to give full official support to holding the line on inflation.

Consumers should start now to write their Congressmen and Senators, requesting them to work and vote for price control, including adequate appropriations, and to fight against any amendments proposed by special interests.

Organizations should circulate petitions addressed to Congressmen and Senators urging them to work and vote for price control. The more petitions and the more names on the petitions received by your Congressman and Senators, the more impressed they will be with the urgency of the appeal and the need to keep inflation in check.

There is no time to lose. Those who stand to profit from inflation are preparing to gang up on price-control legislation. They can and must be defeated. They will be if the voice of the people is heard in Congress.

Here is the appeal addressed to all consumers by the organizations sponsoring Fight Inflation Week. Get behind this program and do your part to hold the line.

THE PRICE CONTROL ACT EXPIRES JUNE 30—IT MUST BE RENEWED

The danger of inflation is greater than ever before.

There must be no negotiated peace with inflation through special-interest amendments.

There must be no compromise with black markets.

Rationing must continue to assure fair sharing, and to enable us to help prevent starvation of liberated peoples.

The production of OPA must not be destroyed by reckless and irresponsible attacks on this people's agency.

The OPA must not be crippled for lack of funds.

WE MUST CARRY THROUGH ON THE HOME FRONT WHILE OUR BOYS GO ON TO TOKYO

We ask all organized groups and individual citizens to make the week of June 10–17 Fight Inflation Week.

During this week—and until the Price Control Act is passed—let the people of every community tell their Congressman that they must renew the act without inflationary amendments and must appropriate enough funds to enable the OPA to fight the black market.

IN OUR FIGHT ON INFLATION WE SHALL KEEP FAITH WITH OUR BOYS

We shall make sure that their families are not victimized by black markets and soaring prices while they are gone.

We shall see to it that they will not be paid off in phony dollars depreciated by inflation and that the bonds in which their savings have been placed will be worth their face value.

We shall help to assure jobs for them when they return.

Trade Agreements Reduced Tariffs on California Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, California, and in fact the entire far Western States area, is separated from the rest of the United States by a thousand miles of difficult mountains and desert which constitute a natural barrier equivalent to many thousands of miles of ocean when one considers the relative transportation costs. Therefore, it is necessary if our far western producers are to compete in the Middle West and eastern markets on anywhere near an equal footing with foreign producers, that there be tariffs on the importation of such products that will at least offset our added costs of transportation.

Transportation is one great item of expense and labor costs are another. California and the far West pay the highest agricultural labor rates in the world and its industrial labor rates are comparable to those in the rest of the United States, which are likewise the highest in the world.

Under the Hull trade-treaty program, when a tariff is reduced through a trade treaty with one country, it is reduced at the same time to all other countries in the world that do not discriminate against our trade, and that means every country except Germany and, since December 7, 1941, Japan. Hence, when a tariff reduction is made by us in an agreement with a country such as Canada or Belgium, it applies equally to the imports of all of the other countries, except Germany and Japan, regardless of whether we have a trade treaty with them as individual countries.

If the reduction applied only to the country with whom the treaty reduction was made, perhaps we could not complain, but, as in the case of long-staple cotton, the 50-percent reduction was made in a treaty with Peru, which is a relatively small producer of that item, but that reduction applies equally to the long-staple cotton of Egypt, and Egypt is by far the principal producer in the world outside of the United States. In other words, the reduction was not made in the treaty with the principal-producer country, but it applies to the principal producer just the same as though it had been made in a treaty with that country.

The trade-agreements program as it has been carried out by this administration gives the benefit to all the world of a tariff reduction that is made in an agreement with one country, but the corresponding tariff reduction made by that country to us is, generally speaking, applicable only to us. Hence the agreements are described as broadly multilateral on our part and bilateral on the part of each country with whom we make an agreement. To restate a metaphor made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] "A good Yankee trader would trade horses with his neighbor across the way, but he would be silly indeed if every time he made such a trade he gave away a horse to everyone else in the neighborhood. He would soon run out of horses." And that is just what this administration has done in its trade-agreements program and that is why they now come in to ask for further authority for reduction of tariffs. They say that they have run out of tariff reductions to trade.

While the tariff schedules in the act of 1930 were higher than had theretofore

been in effect, there was included in the act a provision authorizing the President to either raise or lower any tariff by 50 percent. Likewise, under that act, three-fourths of all the items we import—by dollar volume—were placed on the "free list," meaning free of duty. Of the remaining one-fourth of our imports by dollar volume, tariffs covering 42 percent of such imports have been reduced 50 percent under the trade agreements program and on an additional 20 percent of such imports tariffs have been reduced from 1 to 49 percent. The bill which recently passed the House over my protest, intends to enable the President to reduce whatever tariff was in effect on January 1, 1945, by 50 percent, which means a 75 percent reduction on those items which have already been reduced 50 percent, and that includes a number of important California products.

Mr. Speaker, many of California's products which it sells to the rest of the United States and in some cases to the world at large, have suffered serious tariff reductions. I list below some of its products and the percent reduction of tariff made pursuant to trade agreements with the countries listed. These tariff reductions apply to all countries except Germany and Japan.

Items	Tariff Act of 1930	Modified tariff	Percent reduction	Treaty country
Tiles, floor and wall	8 cents per square foot, but not less than 40 nor more than 56 percent ad valorem.	4 cents per square foot, not less than 20 nor more than 28 percent ad valorem.	50	Mexico.
Portland cement	6 cents per 100 pounds	4½ cents per 100 pounds	25	Belgium.
Earthenware and crockery	10 cents per dozen pieces, plus 45 percent ad valorem.	5 cents per dozen pieces, plus 25 percent ad valorem.	50	Mexico.
Manganese ore	1 cent per pound on metallic manganese contained therein.	½ cent per pound on metallic manganese contained therein.	50	Brazil.
Steel ingots	3/10 cent per pound	¼ cent per pound	16⅔	Belgium.
Cattle, weight 700 pounds and over.	3 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound (with quota restrictions).	50	Canada, Mexico.
Birds, live: Chickens, ducks, geese, etc.	8 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	50	Canada.
Birds, dead, dressed, undressed, fresh, chilled, or frozen: Chickens, ducks, etc.	10 cents per pound	6 cents per pound	40	Do.
Eggs of chickens in the shell	10 cents per dozen	5 cents per dozen	50	Do.
Honey	3 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	50	Guatemala, Mexico.
Halibut	2 cents per pound	1 cent per pound	50	Canada.
Swordfish	do	do	50	Do.
Barley	20 cents per bushel	15 cents per bushel	25	Do.
Oats	16 cents per bushel	8 cents per bushel	50	Do.
Figs, fresh or dried	5 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	40	Turkey.
Raisins made from seedless grapes.	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	25	Do.
Candied or glaced fruits	40 percent ad valorem	25 percent ad valorem	37½	France.
Tomatoes, fresh	3 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	50	Mexico.
Tomatoes, prepared or preserved.	50 percent ad valorem	25 percent ad valorem	50	Argentina.
Cotton, long staple	7 cents per pound	3½ cents per pound	50	Peru.
Still wines, from grapes	$1.25 per gallon	75 cents per gallon	40	France.
Photographic-film negatives, exposed and developed.	3 cents per linear foot	1½ cents per linear foot	50	Mexico.

Three-Cent Increase Needed To Make Sheep Grower Break Even

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the first 4 months of 1945 show the greatest sheep liquidation and slaughter for a like period in the history of the industry. It exceeds 1943, in which for the whole year, slaughter of sheep was 326 percent above the average 20-year period.

There is a reason for this astounding situation. It is found in the hard, cold facts of a study by the United States Tariff Commission which shows a loss of $1.22 per head on representative ranches, in 1944.

Mr. Speaker, this bears out the predictions of sheep growers a year ago. They said then what would happen if the regulations applied to the marketing of lambs and wool were continued unchanged. Today's situation is set forth and a simple, direct remedy is suggested in a letter by Mr. J. M. Jones, secretary of the National Wool Growers Association, addressed to the Administrators of the Office of Price Administration and War Food Administration. Because of its clarity on this important matter, I am placing the letter in the RECORD by permission of the House. The letter follows:

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, May 15, 1945.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator, War Food Administration, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On March 28, 1944, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and again on April 28, 1944, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, members of the sheep industry presented the condition of this industry to Congress. Previous to that time we worked with the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration in an attempt to secure sufficient relief from governmental regulations to permit continued production of wool and lambs for the war effort.

We have not received the necessary relief. The economic condition of the industry was bad then, and it has grown steadily worse. Statistics published by Government agencies definitely establish this fact.

SLAUGHTER

The average federally inspected slaughter of sheep (principally breeding ewes) for the period 1923–42 averaged approximately 1,150,000 head, but in 1943 this figure rose to 4,897,000 head, or an increase of 326 percent over the average 20-year period, and in 1944 a 214 percent increase is shown. The primary reason for the lower slaughter in 1944, as compared with 1943 is the very low price paid for sheep on the markets in 1944.

The first 4 months of 1945 show the greatest sheep liquidation and slaughter for a like period in the history of the industry, exceeding the record year of 1943. Government reports show that 550,000 more sheep and lambs were marketed in the first 4 months of 1945 than for the like period in 1944.

In view of the shortage of meat and the tremendous liquidation of breeding stock, the answer is obvious. The industry is not meeting its cost of production.

COST OF PRODUCTION

To further substantiate this fact a summary of the study of the United States Tariff Commission, purely a fact-finding body, is given below. This study was released by the Commission in January 1945:

Sheep industry—income and expense

	Total ranch income per head inspected	Total expense, including interest, per head inspected	Profit per head (+), loss per head (−)
1940	$5.26	$5.32	−$0.06
1941	6.83	5.86	+.97
1942	7.57	6.43	+1.14
1943	6.96	7.08	−.12
1944	6.66	7.88	−1.22

This study shows that expenses per head increased from 1940 to 1944, 48.1 percent, while income increased only 26.6 percent during the same period. As stated above, these figures were not prepared by the sheep industry, but by the United States Tariff Commission.

INCREASE IN PRICE AND COSTS

Again, to further substantiate the Tariff Commission's report, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics' figures show that farm wages have increased 204 percent from 1940 to 1944. This item of cost represents between 20 and 30 percent of the total operating cost of the sheep industry.

It is often said by men in your agencies that inability to secure labor is the main reason for liquidation. I admit this is a factor, but only because the sheep industry cannot meet the competition of industrial wages and survive. An outstanding example of what is meant here is that the sheep industry has one labor operation for which it has been forced to meet industrial wages. This is the shearing of the sheep.

This spring it was not difficult to secure men from critical industries such as coal mining and steel production for the sheep-shearing operation. The going price for shearing is 30 cents per head. A skilled shearer will take the wool from 100 to 150 head of sheep per day or produce an income for himself of from $30 to $45 per day. Likewise, if it were possible to compete with industrial wages in the same manner for herders, camp tenders, and lambers, labor would be a small worry, but prices received for wool and lambs will not permit this condition. This lack of proper adjustment is forcing sheepmen out of business.

Feed prices have risen far out of the proper relationship with prices received by producers of wool and lambs. Hay prices, for example, have increased 126 percent since 1940; corn prices have increased 84 percent from 1940

to 1944. Feed represents between 12 and 15 percent of the total operating costs.

On the other side of the picture, wool prices have increased only 43 percent, lamb prices 57 percent, and sheep prices 56 percent during the period 1940 to 1944, inclusive.

Again, these figures are not ours, but come from official Government sources.

The question in the minds of the producers of wool and lambs is, Does our Government want a domestic sheep industry? And after its experience of having to spend $750,000,000 for the development of a synthetic rubber industry in this country the answer, in my opinion, must be in the affirmative. If the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration are of the same opinion, then immediate relief must be given this industry to stop further liquidation of breeding herds.

IMPORTANCE OF THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

In 1943 the cash income from the livestock industry in the 12 Western States and Texas amounted to $1,288,766,000 or over 36 percent of the total income from agriculture and over 21 percent of the total cash income of these States and the sheep industry represented over 22 percent of the income from livestock. It is readily seen, therefore, that this industry is very important to the economic stability of these States.

REMEDY

As pointed out before, the United States Tariff Commission shows that the industry lost $1.22 per head in 1944. Forty-two cents of this loss is charged to sheep and lambs and 80 cents is charged to the wool, or a loss of 10.8 cents per grease pound on wood produced.

This means, therefore, that in 1944 an increase of 1 cent a pound on live weight of lambs and 10.8 cents per grease pound of wool would have been necessary to meet the cost of production.

Under the present situation in which wool and lamb are placed, one of the logical remedies to the situation would be to permit the grower to receive the equivalent of from 2 to 3 cents per pound on live lamb. This is a conservative figure based on losses experienced in 1944.

The production of live lamb per head of sheep in an average herd amounts to approximately 40 pounds per year. If the return to the grower were increased by 3 cents, it would mean an additional return of $1.20 per head, or just under the per-head loss shown by the Tariff Commission for 1944.

Any relief from the present condition must accrue to the grower. Further relief in the form of increased subsidy to the packer will not, in my opinion, be reflected back sufficiently to the producers.

We urge serious consideration by the OPA and the WFA on this problem immediately, will appreciate your reaction to the above statements, and will await your decision.

Enclosed are charts bearing out the above statements.

Very truly yours,

J. M. JONES, *Secretary.*

Editorial by Walling Keith on Autobiography of the Late George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial under the caption "The fear of poverty," written by Mr. Walling Keith, editor of the Gadsden (Ala.) Times. The editorial refers to the autobiography of the late Senator George W. Norris.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEAR OF POVERTY

Senator George W. Norris was one of the gentlest men ever to trod the green-floored Chamber of the United States Senate. And he was as fearless as any man ever to hold an elective office. And because he did not know the meaning of fear, he was able to be as thoroughly honest as any man we have ever known, heard about, or read about in public life.

In his autobiography, finished only a few days before death saved him from the retirement he was forced into by the fortunes of politics, Senator Norris wrote of his poverty-bitten boyhood on his mother's farm.

"There on that farm," he said, "I lost all fear of poverty. I learned to live most simply, and I learned to get a great joy out of work. It never occurred to me in those years that a lack of money was of any consequence."

Could this have been the secret of George Norris' selfless devotion to integrity in public office, the reason he was able to shove aside expediency, to follow always the straight path of principle, sometimes against all the so-called rules of practical politics?

Could it be that George Norris learned a simple lesson from his boyhood poverty that most men have stumbled over in their awkward search for security?

"I lost all fear of poverty," Senator Norris said. We wonder if he did not lose most other fears that beset men when he learned that poverty need not be disastrous. We wonder if the fear of poverty is not the cause of many of the ills that haunt men.

Most men can look back with a mellow feeling on their boyhood and while basking in happy memories of youth even profess to see certain virtues in poverty itself, but they have not rid themselves of a lurking fear of poverty—a fear of the necessity for "beginning all over again."

George Norris, by his voice and by his vote in the United States Senate time after time, gave evidence that as much as he enjoyed the honor of high office, he was willing to risk it without the slightest hesitation every time his inner integrity was challenged.

As a freshman Congressman from the raw State of Nebraska he stood up against the powerful Joe Cannon, and he led the fight in the House to strip that canny Speaker of powers that were not right but which had been almost unquestioned before Norris appeared. The fact that Norris finally won is only incidental. It was not victory for Norris himself, it was victory for the democratic process. And such victories live long after the campaign has gone.

Norris led other fights, too, some which may have been too far ahead of his time—and some which have not yet been won.

But we are less concerned with what George Norris did than the kind of man he was, and how he happened to be thus.

When he put out of his heart for all time the fear of poverty he put out of his heart all fear of losing things—money, prestige, public office, the praise of the masses. He never grew too old to brave the risk of losing those things he cherished more than security. For to men of his breed the joy of public service means far more than riches—only some men so inclined do fear "starting all over again" just as those who place financial security at the top.

In recent years we have tried by legislation to rid this country of fear of poverty—by social security laws and other means of Government insurance, and these are worthy objects. Yet one must wonder if the fear of poverty can be abolished in the minds and hearts of men in this manner alone.

George Norris was unafraid of poverty, because he had decided for himself that no matter what happened, he was resolved to begin afresh, to brave the battle again.

Actually he learned early in life that the thing most men fear—failure—after all, is nothing more than being dropped back for a new start on the great adventure.

And in the end George Norris, himself, was a failure. His people of Nebraska in his own words, "didn't want me any more." And tears came into his eyes when he lost his last election—a far greater loss to George Norris than all of Rockefeller's millions would have meant to that rich man.

So he returned to Nebraska, a gentle-eyed little man in a black alpaca coat, a failure—but still without fear, having lost all except his integrity and a place of honor in his Nation's history that will make legends for school children in the years to come.

Ceremonies at Unveiling of German Surrender Documents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on June 6, 1945, the first anniversary of D-day, a very impressive ceremony was held in the exhibition hall of the National Archives Building, during which the German surrender documents signed at Luneburg, at Rheims, and at Berlin were placed on public display. On that occasion, Maj. Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, the hero of Bastogne, whose response to the German demand to surrender was "Nuts," represented the Secretary of War and unveiled the surrender documents. The documents were accepted for public display by Dr. Solon J. Buck, the Archivist of the United States. Rear Admirals J. L. McCrea and M. B. Gardner represented the Secretary of the Navy. It was my privilege to serve as master of ceremonies. The ceremony was broadcast by WOL, WINX, and WWDC. I ask unanimous consent to have the script of that broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, from the exhibition hall in the National Archives building in our Nation's Capital, is brought to you a special ceremony in celebration of the first anniversary of D-day, during which the original German surrender documents will be placed on public display.

This is indeed a beautiful setting. The hall is semicircular in shape and its ceiling is a half dome 75 feet above the floor. On the north side of the room facing the entrance is a marble shrine in which hangs the American flag that was raised above Rome on the day of its capture. In front of this is a large center case containing the German surrender documents which the combined Chiefs of Staff have turned over to the National Archives for public exhibition. Around

the walls on each side of this case are smaller display cases. Above them to the right and left are two large murals by Barry Faulkner, one depicting a scene in connection with the Declaration of Independence and the other showing the submission of the draft of the Constitution to the convention.

During the ceremony the German surrender documents signed at Luneburg, at Reims, and at Berlin will be made available for public inspection.

The case holding them will be unveiled by Maj. Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, a resident of Washington, and the documents will be accepted for public exhibition by Dr. Solon J. Buck, Archivist of the United States. Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado, the ranking Democratic member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, will be the master of ceremonies.

And now, the next voice you will hear will be that of Dr. Solon J. Buck, Archivist of the United States.

The ARCHIVIST. Ladies and gentlemen, it affords me genuine pleasure to welcome you to the National Archives on this significant occasion. I am happy to have the honor and the privilege of introducing to you Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado, acting chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, who will serve as master of ceremonies.

Senator JOHNSON. On June 6, 1944, one of the most difficult and amazing military feats in the history of warfare was successfully carried out. One year ago today our troops and those of our allies landed on the fire-raked beaches of Normandy. All of us are familiar with the story of that operation. None of us has forgotten, or is likely to forget, the thrill that came to all America with the news of that invasion. Eleven months thereafter those fighting men, under the inspired leadership of that American military genius, General Eisenhower, with the assistance of the valiant Red army, had beaten fortress Germany into unconditional surrender. It is extremely fitting, therefore, on this, the first anniversary of D-day, that the documentary evidence of that unconditional surrender that brought to a disastrous end Hitler's dream of world conquest and rid the world of the evils of nazism, should be placed on public display.

It is very appropriate, too, that they should be displayed in the exhibition hall of the National Archives to supplement the exhibit of material already on display relating to the efforts of our late beloved leader, President Roosevelt, to bring the war to a successful conclusion and to win lasting world peace. These surrender documents, signed at Luneburg, Reims, and Berlin, constitute tangible evidence of the consummation of one of President Roosevelt's primary objectives—the complete defeat of Germany—and it is altogether fitting that they should be made a part of this exhibit that reflects so vividly the high ideals and noble efforts of President Roosevelt to make the world a better place in which to live.

This is indeed a significant occasion, and I commend the Combined Chiefs of Staff for making these documents available and the National Archives for placing them on public display.

We are honored to have with us a number of distinguished rereresentatives of the War and Navy Departments. Rear Admiral J. L. McCrea, who served as naval aide to the late President Roosevelt, and Rear Admiral M. B. Gardner, who has just returned from the command of a submarine force in the Pacific, are present to represent the Navy Department. And now it is my privilege to present to you a distinguished military leader, just back from Europe, who will speak for the War Department and unveil the case in which are displayed the German surrender documents. All of you are familiar with the heroic saga of Bastogne and with the successful stand made there by a mere handful of brave fighting men. I am indeed honored to introduce to you the intrepid commander of our embattled garrison at Bastogne, who, in response to a German demand to surrender, sent the now famous reply, "Nuts!" Ladies and gentlemen, Maj. Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe.

Major General MCAULIFFE. Senator Johnson, Dr. Buck, I am indeed honored, as representative of the Secretary of War, to assist in officially unveiling the German ununconditional surrender documents. These documents are testimony, for now and forever, that the American soldier, bound to a just cause, and backed up by the labor and industry of America, can and will overcome any evil force on earth no matter how strong, or how long in power. A prologue from the past, these documents are an augury of the future, too—of the unhappy future that lies ahead for that bitter enemy, Japan. On this first anniversary of D-day, I know I speak from the heart of every American soldier when I say we are proud of the part we played to help bring these documents here. And I know, too, I speak for them when I say we cannot rest until we destroy the military might of the enemy in the Pacific, and peace is once more restored to this earth.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, General McAuliffe. The American people are indeed fortunate that our armed forces, of whom we are so proud, are under the command of men like you who have and are providing such undaunted leadership.

And now it is my privilege to present to you the Archivist of the United States who will accept these historic documents for public display and who will read a message from the President of the United States. Ladies and gentlemen, the Archivist of the United States, Dr. Solon J. Buck.

The ARCHIVIST. Senator Johnson, General McAuliffe, ladies and gentlemen, it is with deep gratitude, General McAuliffe, that the National Archives receives from you, as a representative of the American armed forces, these tokens of Germany's unconditional surrender. Here in a few sheets of paper is recorded history's greatest triumph over the forces of evil. Here is recorded the end, at last, of a tyranny that, having enslaved the peoples of Germany and of Europe, reached out to enslave the world.

We shall remember, as we read these documents, what was sacrificed to win the victory they symbolize. We shall remember the bloody roads that stretched from Stalingrad and Salerno and Normandy to Berlin. We shall remember what price our sons and allies paid in suffering and lives to wring this admission of utter defeat from the leaders of nazidom.

The exhibit to which these documents are added—"President Roosevelt and International Cooperation for War and Peace"—was planned while Franklin Roosevelt still lived to record the long steps that had been taken, from the earliest days of lend-lease through the Conference at Yalta, to organize a world freed from tyranny and the threat of tyranny—a world in which nations could live together in peace and in which each tomorrow would bring for all people, not fear but hope. Perhaps only in such a democracy as this could documents recording that hard-won progress be laid so promptly before the people who helped achieve it.

The surrender documents and President Truman's proclamation of victory in Europe complete one part of the story recorded in this room. But that story is not ended, nor will the task of any of us be done until the time when there can also be laid here before the people the tokens of the complete surrender of our enemies in the Pacific and the charter of a new union of the peace-loving nations of the world.

President Truman has asked me to express his regret that he could not be here today. He has sent a message, however, which he asked me to read in his behalf. This is his message:

"The placing on public view of the documents that mark the unconditional surrender of Germany is a significant occasion. It is fitting that it should take place on the first anniversary of D-day, the beginning of the end of the war in Europe. The people of the Nation—the peoples of the United Nations—are profoundly thankful that this anniversary sees the hostilities on that front at an end. These documents are a symbol of that victory, an eloquent tribute to the courageous men, living and dead, who made it possible.

"In our satisfaction over one goal won, however, we cannot forget that the world is not yet rid of the scourge of oppression and brutality. The triumph of Allied arms in Europe is being matched in the Pacific, but it is not for victory on the battlefields alone that we fight. Until liberty, justice, and an enduring peace are won, complete victory will not be ours."

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the American flag is the symbol of freedom to all the oppressed peoples throughout the world. Let us always keep it waving "o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave." Let us all join in celebrating Flag Day week, June 11 to 18.

I include herein a Flag Day statement by William T. Kerr, national founder of Flag Day.

EVERY AMERICAN FLAG YOU DISPLAY FLAG DAY WILL BE YOUR PLEA FOR TRUE AMERICANISM

(By William T. Kerr, founder and national president and director, General American Flag Day Association)

Flag Day emphasizes that our flag means more than a mere banner which claims power or a great history, though it has both. To every real American, our flag is the symbol of all that we are, and hope to be. It is an emblem of freedom in its truest sense. No stain has ever marred it, no clouds have dimmed its stars. Its mission has always been to champion the cause of the oppressed. Wherever Old Glory floats there is a shrine and it is the only flag in all the world's history which has never bowed in defeat.

Flag Day calls to all who enjoy the inheritances bequeathed to us by illustrious forefathers that they love our flag, honor and respect our laws and institutions, and help preserve these inheritances unimpaired so that they may be passed on to the generations to follow. Whoever does that, not alone on Flag Day, when bands play and orators inspire, but every day, these are true Americans, no matter where they were born nor what may be their race, color, or creed.

Important notice: The Robinson-Weiss bill, Pennsylvania H. R. 196, session of 1937, known as Act No. 155, made June 14 Flag Day a legal holiday in Pennsylvania. Don't fail to fly Old Glory on Flag Day.

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Attacking Price Control," published in the Washington Post of June 11, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACKING PRICE CONTROL

This week the Senate expects to act on two amendments to the resolution extending price control that would, in the opinion of Price Administrator Bowles, result in an inflationary advance in prices and a complete break-down of control. Senator ELMER THOMAS' amendment—the more drastic of the two—would make mandatory the establishment of ceiling prices high enough to cover all costs, overhead expenses, and reasonable profits for every processor of agricultural products on each major processed product or item. The Taft amendment would provide similar protection for manufacturers by requiring that ceiling prices cover costs of major items and allow the same dollar margins over costs as were received in 1941 by the industry in question.

Adoption of the Thomas amendment would, it is evident, necessitate setting an over-all ceiling price high enough to assure a profit to the least efficient, highest-cost producer of agricultural products. Or, as an alternative, OPA would have to compute costs and profit allowances for countless "major" products (whatever that may mean) of countless individual producers, and fix different ceiling prices for each one. Obviously the OPA would be swamped by such an accountancy undertaking, to say nothing of the disastrous consequences from the viewpoint of the consumer. The Taft amendment avoids this kind of individual pricing, but its insistence upon profits for an industry on the basis of a year of inflated peacetime earnings would certainly have a price-boosting effect. Indeed, that is its purpose.

This conclusion is borne out by an exchange between Senator ELLENDER, who led the fight against the amendment, and the senior Senator from Ohio. The former asked whether Senator TAFT believed ceiling prices for steel should be set high enough to take care of a marginal 4 percent of producers even if that entailed raising the swollen profits of the great majority. The answer was "Yes." And Mr. TAFT added that he favored giving low-cost producers the benefit of prices of high-cost producers "because that is the whole basis on which our economy operates." That, of course, is true in normal times when prices are not subjected to governmental controls. But it is also true that in normal times high-cost and inefficient producers are constantly being weeded out, because they are unable to meet the competition of the more efficient.

To fix ceiling prices in times of scarcity at levels that assure profits to the high-cost marginal units would certainly not bring about a return to the free-pricing system of which Mr. TAFT dreams. Quite the contrary—it would in effect guarantee profits to the least efficient and permit the most efficient to rake the excess return at consumer expense. The widespread price increases that would probably follow would entail advances in living costs and give impetus to the drive for wage increases. In short, we conclude it is not exaggerating to say that adoption of either of the two pricing formulas proposed would set in motion inflationary developments that would spell the end of effective price control.

In so concluding we do not mean to imply that the OPA is above criticism. For there is much force in Senator TAFT's argument that OPA has squeezed distributors in some instances unduly in its effort to keep living costs down in face of rising labor and raw material costs. There is also force in the contention that it is most important during the reconversion period to set ceiling prices sufficiently high to allow adequate profits to be obtained on specific items of output; otherwise productive activity would be stifled. For, barring subsidies, a manufacturer will not voluntarily produce goods to sell at a loss or at profits that do not satisfy him, even if his over-all business profits are entirely adequate.

The current criticism of OPA's pricing methods has, therefore, been worth while as a reminder of the problems that lie ahead of us. Indeed, the discussion of the controversial amendments now before the Senate has already borne fruit. For it has brought assurances from OPA that textile manufacturers will be allowed reasonable profit margins on each major item produced and that a separate profitable price basis will be set for each of the three major types of meat.

At this stage of the war, the only safe and sensible thing to do is to extend price-control legislation without attaching hampering amendments, thus leaving the OPA free to modify its policies as changing conditions require. It is much too late in the day to try to effect radical changes in pricing policies which are designed to maintain stable costs of living, despite increases in labor costs and in agricultural prices at the farm level. Extensive subsidization has been necessary to combine that objective with efforts to encourage production of essential commodities. No doubt Senator TAFT's hostility to the subsidy program accounts in part for his efforts to impose a price-boosting ceiling formula upon the OPA that would remove the need for subsidies.

For the long-range viewpoint his criticisms deserve careful consideration. But for the duration of the existing emergency the lid ought to be kept tight on retail prices if we are to escape the evils of postwar inflation. The OPA will then be in a position to make necessary adjustments gradually, keeping in mind that our ultimate goal is release from price control as soon as feasible after VJ-day.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Republican Suicide," published in the Washington Daily News of June 9, 1945, bearing upon the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements, including a 50-percent further reduction; also an editorial entitled "Trade and Peace," published in the New York Times of June 11, 1945, bespeaking the support of the Senate for the renewal reciprocal trade agreements, with the power to reduce duties an additional 50 percent.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 9, 1945]

REPUBLICAN SUICIDE

The Senate Finance Committee has voted, 10 to 9, to cut the heart out of the House-approved bill to extend the reciprocal trade agreements law for 3 years.

Seven Republican Senators and three Democrats made up the majority which struck from the bill, as it will go before the Senate next week, authority to reduce tariff rates 50 percent below present levels through negotiations with other nations.

Fortunately, the three Democrats will not find many Members of their party agreeing with them on the Senate floor. But with so large a number of Senators away from Washington, it is possible that Republicans can muster enough strength to beat the attempt that will be made to restore the bill to its original form. If they win such a victory, we predict that the Republican Party will long regret it.

For the people of this country are not for economic isolation. Governor Dewey is one of the many Republican leaders, outside of Congress, who see that clearly and proclaim it boldly. Making a fine speech in New York Thursday night, Mr. Dewey proposed a seven-point program for American leadership in promoting world trade and preventing postwar economic strife. In the seventh point, he called for reducing tariffs "as we have done in recent years, and as we shall continue to do under the renewed Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act when the Congress completes action upon it."

The people will not easily forgive Republicans in the Senate if they defeat that hope by keeping out of the bill adequate authority to further reduce tariffs.

[From the New York Times of June 11, 1945]

TRADE AND PEACE

The Senate is scheduled to begin debate this week on the extension and expansion of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In at least two respects it has got off to a disappointing start. It is late. The Trade Agreements Act, in fact, is due to expire tomorrow. The agreements made under the act will still be valid, of course, and the lapsing of the act itself may therefore be regarded as a technicality. But it is a technicality that could play, psychologically, into the hands of those who wish to defeat the new measure.

The Finance Committee, moreover, by an adverse vote of 10 to 9, has stricken from the bill the provision which would expand the act so that the maximum reduction of 50 percent permitted in any particular duty could be made from the existing level of duties rather than from that prevailing when the law was first enacted. This adverse vote is also an unpromising development. The majority decision of a Senate committee always carries a great deal of prestige with the whole body. In this particular case the solid Republican vote for removing the provision, plus the defections in the Democratic ranks, may prove to some extent symptomatic of the line-up in the Senate as a whole.

The renewal of the present act simply as it stands, without incorporating the expanded powers, would be tantamount to an an-

nouncement to the world that so far as the reduction of tariff barriers is concerned this country intends to do practically nothing. For the greater part of the reduction authority in the present act has already been used up. We would have few inducements left to offer to most countries in exchange for further reductions in their tariff duties on American goods.

The opponents of the present administration reciprocal trade program are afraid of the wrong thing. They fear a sudden introduction of free trade. No fear, in the present state of the world, could be further from reality. The record of the State Department in negotiating the reciprocal trade agreements already adopted has been one of meticulous care. The probable effect of each proposed change in tariff schedule on the particular American industry involved has received far more detailed and thorough study than it ever got in the days of congressional tariff making, when important changes in rates were often made in the rough and tumble of debate on the floor. Moreover, the world in which we shall try to negotiate the new trade treaties will have been made jittery by the war. Many nations will try to make themselves independent of outside supplies of all sorts of products which they will need or fancy they need in case they should become involved in a new conflict. Whenever there is anything less than full employment, spokesmen for many of the particular industries in which some measure of idleness exists will be certain to blame part of their troubles on foreign competition. This will increase any tendency to regard other nations as primarily competitors rather than as primarily customers.

In such an atmosphere the danger of any sudden disruptive reduction of tariff barriers will be extremely remote. The real danger will be an indefinite prolongation and even intensification of barriers to international trade. The real difficulty will be to negotiate meaningful treaties of tariff reduction. The least that the Senate can do now is to vote to make such treaties possible. A refusal by this country to allow meaningful reductions of tariff rates below existing levels would encourage everywhere policies of economic isolation and economic warfare; and the crying need of the postwar world will be economic cooperation and economic peace.

Statement by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, on Proposed Increase of Salaries of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in support of H. R. 3035, which would increase the salaries of postal employees.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to come before you in support of H. R. 3035, which would increase the salaries of postal employees, and to urge that you take immediate and favorable action towards enactment of this legislation.

To my mind, the measure now before your committee marks a great step forward in correcting, equitably and fairly, the wide discrepancy that exists between the salaries of postal employees, which have not been increased for 20 years, and the rise in the cost of living. In 1943, Congress recognized this gap and authorized an annual bonus of $300 for postal employees. But this was only a temporary measure and will expire June 30 of this year. Permanent legislation must be enacted immediately to insure that postal employees receive a decent living wage so that they can continue to perform the duties that are of immense importance to the welfare of our country.

There is no finer and more deserving group of people than postal employees. I know them personally and have had intimate association with them.

My father, who recently passed away, was a retired postal official, and I came in close contact with his fellow workers at an early age. While I was in my teens, I worked in the Philadelphia Post Office during the Christmas and summer holidays. I worked on the floor, sorting and casing mail; I substituted as a letter carrier; I rode in trucks and delivered parcel post mail. Working with this fine group of people is an experience I shall always cherish.

The qualities of steadfastness, reliability, and efficiency that the postal employee possesses has captured the imagination of the country. During the past week I received 1,942 communications from my constituents in Pennsylvania, each one requesting an early enactment of H. R. 3035. Not one opposed the salary increase. The support for this legislation has come from all groups in the State—from labor, from business, from educational and church groups, retailers, and private individuals.

I should like to read some of these letters to you. Mr. Mathewson, superintendent of schools in Canonsburg, Pa., writes:

"DEAR MR. MYERS: It has been called to my attention that a bill is before the United States Legislature to make provisions for increases in the pay of postal employees. In my humble estimation, there should be no delay in enacting this bill into law. One has only to note the increased load that city carriers are burdened with or to note the expense that rural carriers meet in keeping vehicles in repair, to realize that present salaries are very inadequate.

"The teaching force of Pennsylvania has just seen enacted a bill that will give to them a substantial increase in salary. It has boosted morale immensely. Can you not, as our Representative, use your influence in bringing about a much discussed morale lifter for our postal servants? We feel that an act such as H. R. 3035 will meet with the approval of every patron.

"Very sincerely yours,

"C. A. MATHEWSON."

Another letter from Mr. Robins, president of a butter, eggs, and cheese wholesale company, reads:

"DEAR SIR: I am writing at this time to ask that you use your influence in having H. R. 3035 reported out of the Senate Post Office Committee at the earliest possible moment, and to seek for its prompt enactment.

"Thanking you for your prompt attention to this matter, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"MORRIS A. ROBINS."

Mr. Nash, manager of erection, American Bridge Co., a United States Steel subsidiary, writes:

"SIR: I am writing you in the interest of the United States Postal employees, and requesting your early and favorable vote on H. R. 3035, which is intended to bring relief in the way of better wages for the forgotten man in the Government forces. It is my understanding if this bill is not passed by the Senate and signed by the President prior to June 30, there will be a reduction in the existing inadequate compensation of these faithful people, which should certainly not be allowed to come about.

"Very truly yours,

"J. M. NASH."

And typical of hundreds of letters that were sent me from housevives, Mrs. Helen C. Daily of Erie, Pa., writes:

"DEAR SIR: I am most anxious to have my postman get an increase in his salary. Therefore, I am giving my wholehearted support to the next bill H. R. 2071, providing an immediate increase of $400 per year for postal employees.

"Won't you do all in your power to help these forgotten men? Thank you.

"Very truly yours,

"HELEN C. DAILY."

The people of the country are behind this legislation, and they are consistent and unanimous in their endorsement of it. It is long overdue.

We have the best postal system in the world; we should do all in our power to keep it that way.

Address by Samuel D. Jackson at Roosevelt Memorial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Honorable Samuel D. Jackson, who is a former Senator. His address was delivered at a Roosevelt memorial dinner held at New Orleans on May 31.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a distinct honor as well as a personal privilege to have a part in this program. It was to have been a celebration of the birthday of the sage of Monticello.

But on the very day we were laying our plans to meet together to sing praises in celebration of the imperishable name of Thomas Jefferson, our harps were tuned to mourning. The dark Angel of Death touched down forever the eyelids of Franklin D. Roosevelt—now he, too, dwells with the immortals.

It is but a short step from a Jefferson Day celebration and a Roosevelt memorial. Jefferson was America's greatest champion of freedom—civil, intellectual, and religious. Roosevelt was the world's greatest champion of peace. Roosevelt was the world's Thomas Jefferson.

It is true "the spirits of Jefferson and Hamilton still stalk the ways of men—still fighting." Our party, after a century and a half, still moves with steady tread in the spirit of its founder—still fighting. The spirit of Roosevelt marches forward with strong and active faith toward peace. All America tonight follows with firm and even cadence beneath its sunlit banner.

My task is easier tonight when I recall that I am now in a State represented in the

Congress by eight Democratic Representatives and two Democratic Senators.

My two distinguished former colleagues in the Senate have at least one characteristic in common and in equal measure. On all occasions they seem to be bursting with pride that they are representing this pendent jewel of the Southland, the State of Louisiana. To hear them debate imparts to the student of government both wisdom and exultation. If I would applaud them to the very echo, that echo should applaud again. I see that Louisiana is also proud—proud of Senator JOHN H. OVERTON and Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

On the day following that fearful summons to our late President, that call to his long home, I stood on Pennsylvania Avenue. It was jammed as I never saw it jammed before. There were muffled drums, and a placid sea of grave and tear-bathed faces; half a million men and women and children, too full for sound, hushed like the birds in a nighttime of grief. The long cortege moved by.

I thought of the Jefferson Memorial there on the Potomac. The great bronzelike figure beneath the white marble dome became the man himself. His was a hallowed spot—a vantage point from which he watched and waited. Around him were his matchless words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident."

"Almighty God hath created the mind free."

"God who gave us life gave us liberty."

"I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. * * * With the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times."

In these words can be found the soul of Thomas Jefferson.

I knew then—I know now—now in the midst of this audience of patriotic American citizens, joined here by the ancient ties of the party of Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Wilson, and Roosevelt—if that silent figure could have spoken of this somber scene it would have said, "There goes one of the greatest of us all."

We have just completed a Presidential campaign year. The election of 1944 goes down in the history of America as one of the most important and significant ever held. In the history of the world, it may yet be set down as a turning point in civilization. Last year the people had three dominant hopes accompanied by three dominant fears. The first hope was to win the war as speedily and decisively as possible. The second was to write the structures of an enduring peace. The third was to restore to normal life this tired and weary, this beloved country of ours when the carnage of war shall be blanketed by the victories of peace. There was one man in these United States who was the answer to all three of these hopes—one man who allayed the three accompanying fears—that man was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We had waged the campaign in the fervent belief that a change in national administration in the midst of this most devastating of all wars was frightening to contemplate, for it might well prove to be disastrous.

What might have happened in the event of a change in political administration at Washington, no man can say he actually knows. But this we do know—the valor of our men at arms, with undreamed of speed, have conquered the unspeakable Nazi and have brought us within the reach of Tokyo. The American people now know they were right last November.

President Roosevelt is dead. At long last he can rest—rest from his labors, rest from his ambitions for his people, rest from the lance of his enemies, rest from all that burden which he carried. For 12 long years with a broken body he took upon himself the cares of the people of the United States of America.

He, like Jefferson, was the scion of a distinguished and wealthy family. He was a fine-grained patrician. He was indeed something of an aristocrat. He was born the aristocrat who lived to be the great democrat, or rather he was the great democrat.

He brought to his exalted place in this Nation a broken body which was at once his cross and, in a unique sense, our salvation. In 1928, when all was against us, when strong men weakened, and the fearful quailed, when many Democrats would have abandoned the old party, in him we found the faith that bred the hope that led to party triumph.

Roosevelt was our issue in 1932. He was our issue in 1936, in 1940, and in 1944. His faith in our party brought it to Government to lift our own people from the low days that were despair to the high days that now hold the torch of promise to all peoples.

All cannot agree with what he did or what he stood for, but all can recognize that at government he was the master of adversity.

He, like the expert chess player, didn't have one chess game to play, he was like an expert that plays 40 champions at once, and wins every game.

Men who criticize him undertake to set up their judgment against his—so often we've heard that. But he had not one chess game to play, not two, he had a hundred. He had the Japanese chess game, he had the European chess game, he had Hitler, he had Churchill, and Stalin, he had Congress, the Senate, he had all of his administrative bodies, he had all of his boards and bureaus.

He played every inspired move that went to make up the continuing chapters of his administration for 12 long years. Perhaps more will be written about him than of any other President who has ever served the United States of America. Such a long story of government. No wonder he grew so tired.

What kind of man could do all he did? Measure if you can, this "world's man, leader's man, people's man, history's man," and you will have struck the stature of a man of providential selection.

On that cloudy, windy inauguration day in March 1933, a philanthropic giant gripped the rostrum. His heart was indomitably confident—his face transfigured. He began the amelioration of humanity. "The Nation asks for action and action now." From the fireside he spoke to us with a voice that was resonant, far-reaching, modulated but compelling, a voice such as God gives to but one man in a million. Every hearth knew it. Perhaps that is why when he died every home seemed to have suffered its own separate loss.

There came PWA, WPA, NRA, HOLC, SEC, CCC, a peaceful revolution springing from the loins of Woodrow Wilson's "new freedom" and old Teddy's "square deal."

In 1937 at Chicago, he, first of all our statesmen, sounded the cry to "quarantine the aggressor." Then came the unspeakable paperhanger, then the crisis. Then followed acts "short of war," cash and carry, lend-lease battleships and rifles to save the world after Dunkerque, the draft, the declaration of war, war production, the stifling of runaway prices, the Big Three, and finally the assumption of the responsibility for the peace.

This man brought us triumphantly through and well on the way to a durable Christian peace.

If ever heaven designed the destiny of a man and the affairs of his people by inflicting for their own collective good a timely demise; if there is such a thing as an enviable death, these were wrapped up in the gentle dispensation of April 12, 1945. When his spirit was in fullest strength and power it fled the worn-out body. The body remained to enrich the soil, to call America to gratitude, to bring mind and brawn to rededication. The spirit soars out and on to show how to beat the weapons of war into the implements of peace.

Even now Dumbarton Oaks is with us; the San Francisco Conference is in progress. Ratifications in the United States Senate are yet to come. His spirit shines with an intensity and clarity no one can mistake. His spirit goes to work freed from the animosities that cluster around the man. Enemies of the man can never dare to strike his spirit when it is liberated. The man is imperfect—his spirit is righteous altogether. The spirit works all the time, everywhere, and is both infallible and imperishable. Roosevelt is stronger in death than in life.

Perhaps we have learned nothing from World War I. The investment we have in that war is lost unless the toll of that war, plus the toll of this war, may prevent a World War III. If with complete victory we desert plans for peace, our grandchildren 25 years from now will be taking the places of our children upon the same battlefields we, their fathers, saw 25 years ago.

One of the most tedious and annoying factors tending to obstruct the work of those who are striving to take material steps to plan a program and establish a structure for permanent peace is the attitude that future armed conflict cannot be avoided. We do not believe in the inevitableness of recurrent wars.

Soon in the arena of the Senate treaties will be approved or rejected. The spirit of Roosevelt is the steel core placed into the cable of high purpose which is to bind our collective wills into one adequate cohesion.

The most tragic betrayal of the century was the fact visited upon those who sacrificed to win World War I. What did the dead and wounded in 1917–18 get for their pitiful misery? Not a world safe for democracy—not a victory to end all wars. What are those who fell in Normandy and Iwo Jima and those who will fall at Okinawa to have for their precious lives? What happened in 1919 must not be permitted to occur in 1945.

Sitting in the Senate Chamber, I sometimes realized that I could look down upon the very spot where the best prospects for peace this old world ever had were killed. There are the blood stains from the sacrifice. It was a sacrifice to the gods of partisan greed; and that by unhallowed hands. One can feel the chill of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, riding out of nowhere, and dashing again back through the dark recesses of that same Chamber, screaming like frustrated vampires, in search of the hope of peace, which, recaptured, would give them liberation and rest.

Unprinted in the Senate RECORD, but nonetheless real, are the voices from Flanders Field, moaning that the torch they threw their statesmen was doused in the vats of party hate. Senators were not above striking down peace hopes to their partisan gain. Thank heaven, both Republicans and Democrats representing us at San Francisco give assurance of greater statesmanship. This spirit of Roosevelt calls upon the United States Senate for the redemption of 1919's assassination, and that right early. It calls Peace from that sepulchre, where she now lies slain, to rise, resurrected in the sunrise of man's new day. Let those who lingered longest in her defense, true to his spirit, be the first to greet her on the morn.

We must write a peace—at whatever lengths and by whatever honorable means—supported by whatever effective implementation or common international action may be necessary to guarantee to the 10,000,000 returning veterans that their sons and daughters will be spared a recurrent war. Let those who disagree with Russia and Russia's viewpoint hold their tongues while the nations confer.

In an address written the night before he died, to have been delivered so that we could

have heard it on our originally planned program in observance of Jefferson Day, Franklin D. Roosevelt pointed the way to peace in this language:

"We, as Americans, do not choose to deny our responsibility.

"Nor do we intend to abandon our determination that, within the lives of our children and our children's children, there will not be a third world war.

"We seek peace—enduring peace. More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginnings of all wars—yes, an end to this brutal, inhuman, and thoroughly impractical method of settling the differences between governments.

* * * * *

"And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say:

"The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

In these words can be found the soul of Franklin D. Roosevelt. But we do not hear those words from his lips.

But on that day all who doubted democracy learned a lesson.

Within a few minutes after the death of the President of a hundred and thirty million people, with 12,000,000 men and women under arms, a new President took his place. The war will proceed to victory, and peace will follow the footsteps of victory. The world will be well again.

Harry S. Truman is kind without being weak. He has courage without an overbearing disposition. He uses caution without showing fear. He possesses a humility and patience without any loss of inherent dignity and nobility. He knows he does not know everything, yet he will think and decide for himself. He will seek the aid of the Congress, and yet he will never forget the fact that he was placed in the Presidency to lead a faithful and responsive people.

In his first address to the Congress President Truman said:

"With great humility I call upon all Americans to help me keep our Nation united in defense of those ideals which have been so eloquently proclaimed by Franklin Roosevelt.

"I want, in turn, to assure my fellow Americans and all of those who love peace and liberty throughout the world that I support and defend those ideals with all my strength and all my heart."

The vision and power of President Truman is emblazoned in this immortal declaration, "I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and my people."

No man ever had so precipitously thrust upon his shoulders such tremendous burdens. Few have had greater strength than Truman. He is, he will be, a great and good President. To him in the name of Jefferson and Roosevelt we pledge allegiance. With the faith of our people of all classes, creeds, all sections, and parties, he will neither falter nor fail.

In that speech to Congress President Truman quoted the words of King Solomon:

"Give therefore Thy servant an understanding heart to judge Thy people, that I may discern between good and bad; for who is able to judge this Thy so great a people?"

When he took his first oath of office as President, Roosevelt placed his strong and sun-browned hand upon an ancient Dutch Bible of his forefathers, open at the thirteenth chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians:

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. * * * And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing."

So long as the breath of Heaven animates her furls, the flag of this country will never perish.

Let none despair, Heaven rescued this land. God will preserve it.

Shortage of Underwear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters, one from C. O. Follett, president of Smith, Follett & Crowl, wholesale dry goods and notions, of Fargo, N. Dak., addressed to me under date of June 8, 1945, and a copy of a letter which he addressed to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] under date of June 4, 1945, which he enclosed in his letter to me for reference and as a part of the information.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMITH, FOLLETT & CROWL,
Fargo, N. Dak., June 8, 1945.

Hon. BOURKE HICKENLOOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On June 4 I addressed a letter to our Senator from North Dakota, Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, relative to order recently issued by OPA known as MAP Order (SO–108) which became effective Friday, June 1. After writing Senator YOUNG, I discovered that he was away from Washington on a business trip to North Dakota, and yesterday I learned that he was in Fargo, and had an opportunity of contacting him on the matter that I had written him about. During my conversation with Senator YOUNG, he suggested that a copy of my letter to him be sent to you as you were more familiar with OPA activities. I have accordingly prepared a copy of my letter to Senator YOUNG, which I am enclosing to you herewith.

Since writing this letter to the Senator, I have noticed considerable reference to this OPA order in some of the magazines and just yesterday I read in the last issue of Newsweek that 5 underwear mills have already announced that under this MAP order they would discontinue making any shipments of underwear to the civilian trade. There is a very serious shortage of underwear throughout this northwest territory and you, of course, can realize what suffering there would be this winter in this cold country of ours if no deliveries of underwear were made up here.

I would very much appreciate any consideration you will give to this matter which to my mind seems a very serious one and needs immediate attention and investigation.

Thanking you for any interest you may take in this matter, I am

Very sincerely,

C. O. FOLLETT.

[Enclosure.]

SMITH, FOLLETT AND CROWL,
FARGO, N. DAK., *June 4, 1945.*

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to take up with you as best I can by correspondence a matter that is quite serious as affecting our business after June 1. I refer to order issued by OPA known as MAP Order (SO–108) which became effective Friday, June 1. Please understand that I have been very much in favor of the Price Control Act and believe that it was one of the best pieces of legislation that was put on our statute books at the beginning of this war. At the same time, I believe that the persons who have been responsible for enforcing the regulations under OPA and also the issuing of new regulations from time to time, have been very inefficient and practically every new order or regulation that they have issued has made it more impossible for the Price Control Act to function properly.

I want to explain to you as best I can, how this MAP order affects us and every other wholesaler of dry goods in the country. Without going too much into detail regarding the features of this regulation, wish to state that this order provides that manufacturers of certain items in our line must after June 1, 1945, sell to their customers, which would be ourselves and other jobbers throughout the country, at an average price not in excess of the price received by this manufacturer in 1943. The items that affect us in this order cover manufacturers of women's and children's outerwear, women's and children's underwear, women's and children's accessories, infants' wear, men's and boys' clothing and men's and boys' furnishings. You are well aware of the difficulty we have had in securing anywhere near the quantities of merchandise in our line to take care of our demand. You will remember that you made some investigation of the canvas-glove situation in this territory a short time ago and my letter to you explaining how short we were of canvas gloves to meet the demand. Now comes an order of this kind which will stop the manufacturers of certain types of merchandise badly needed of making any deliveries at all to us or other jobbers as long as this order is in effect. In order to show you what will be the situation of many manufacturers regarding this order, I am quoting here a portion of a letter received from the Standard Knitting Mills, of Knoxville, Tenn., under date of May 22, 1945. The paragraph in this letter is as follows:

"MAP order (SO–108) of OPA becomes effective Friday, June 1. The knit underwear industry is included under this MAP order. Any civilian underwear which we might ship, either in spring weight or fall weight, under this MAP order would show us a loss. We, therefore, plan no further shipments of civilian underwear after May 31, unless relief is granted by OPA. To date, OPA has declined to take our industry out from under this MAP order. Since you look upon our company as one of your dependable sources of supply of knit underwear, possibly you will want to contact promptly your Senators and Congressmen regarding this matter."

The Standard Knitting Mills are one of the principal manufacturers of men's and boys' underwear and represent one of our principal sources of supply. You probably know that we were very, very short of enough underwear last year to take care of our customers' demand. Now, under this order we will not be able to receive any underwear at all from our manufacturers. I think you can picture the suffering that would prevail in a cold country such as ours, if something was not done at once to change this situation.

We also have notice today from one of the very large hosiery manufacturers—namely, the Bear Brand Hosiery Co. of Chicago—in which they cancel orders that we had on file for several styles of hosiery which they were unable to get shipped to us before June 1. They state that any goods shipped to us under this average-price order which went into effect June 1, would show them a loss and they, therefore, have automatically canceled the order. This same condition will

no doubt be followed by similar announcements from other manufacturers from whom we receive merchandise in our line, and it is quite evident that if something is not done to change this order, that neither ourselves nor any of the other jobbers throughout the country will be receiving any merchandise at all in many of the principal lines that we handle.

I will appreciate it very much if you will give this matter your prompt attention. I am quite sure that if you will confer with Senators from other States where wholesale dry goods jobbers are located, you will find that they will have received similar complaints about this OPA order. Surely something should be done without delay to insure delivery of as much merchandise as is possibly available for civilians as even with the amount of merchandise in certain items that we are able to get after Army and Navy requirements are taken care of, still means a tremendous shortage in taking care of the civilian demand. If there is any further information I can give you on this subject, I will be only too glad to do so and will appreciate hearing from you after you have had time to make some investigation of this matter.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely.

Chester County Protests Saved Milk Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Edwin Kemp, Record farm editor, entitled "Chester County Protests Saved Milk Subsidy," published in the Philadelphia Record of May 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHESTER COUNTY PROTESTS SAVED MILK SUBSIDY—DAIRYMEN'S ACTION BRINGS $20,000,000 TO UNITED STATES FARMERS

(By Edwin Kemp)

WASHINGTON, May 4.—A handful of Chester County farmers who wouldn't take no for an answer have won $20,000,000 for America's dairymen. It is also a victory over the experts.

The tens of thousands of checks adding up to $20,000,000, will be ready in a few days. Every milk producer in the country will collect his share, as result of Chester County's fight.

FOR INCREASED COSTS

This jack pot is Federal subsidy, of which a half billion already has been paid to dairy farmers to help them meet increased wartime feed costs.

Had this increased return gone to dairymen through higher prices for their milk instead of through subsidy, it is estimated the resulting cycle of higher living costs and higher wages would have added about three billion of costs to the consumer.

Since last October 1, dairy farmers had been receiving from the Government the full winter rate subsidy. In the Northeastern States, this ranged from 70 cents per 100 pounds in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine to 80 cents in New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. In addition, some of these received an extra 10-cent rate because of serious drought conditions.

Came War Food Administration's announcement that in April the basic subsidy rate would be slashed nationally by 35 cents and the extra drought payment dropped entirely.

The 35-cent reduction meant a loss of $1,266,965 to Pennsylvania alone during April; $5,111,316 to those of the 11 Northeastern States and $20,199,175 for the United States.

MEET IN COATESVILLE

Dairymen everywhere got ready to take it on the nose—everywhere except in Chester County. It was a grass-roots meeting that filled Coatesville's YMCA the night of March 1. Every triple-A community committeeman attended—and brought a representative dairy farmer from his neighborhood.

Facts and figures they put together showed April normally was a high-feed-cost month on any well-managed dairy farm.

Another exhibit was Chester County newspapers, in which hundreds of dairy farms suddenly were advertised for sale as result of the impending cut in subsidy. Farmers brought their account books to prove the subsidy meant the difference between going out of business or staying in.

A few triple-A officials told them nothing could be done, that War Food Administrator Marvin Jones had ordered the cut. Chester's farmers refused to listen. By unanimous motion, they ordered their county committee to "do everything to continue the subsidy at winter rate, at least during April."

HEAD FOR WASHINGTON

Things began to happen. A committee of six headed for Washington on March 20. It included the three members of Chester County's triple-A committee—William G. Mendenhall, East Caln Township, chairman; Arthur Harvey, Penn Township; and Homer Stoltzfus, South Coventry Township—and three dairy farmers: George Anderson, Uwchlan Township; Gordon Jones, New Garden Township; and Warren Elston, Whitland Township.

They explained their case to United States Senators JOSEPH F. GUFFEY and FRANCIS J. MYERS. The Senators tried to reach Marvin Jones, but he was absent. GUFFEY then told the farmers if one of them would stay in Washington the rest could go home and he would try to obtain definite word from War Food headquarters by nightfall. The farmers designated Gordon Jones to stay. His cost exhibits and other data were presented to Marvin Jones late that afternoon.

"The Administrator said he appreciated the necessity of an adjustment," said Gordon Jones, "but could give no definite answer until he could find the funds. But he was keenly interested in our argument. I came home with Senator GUFFEY'S promise he would let us know the minute he got word from Marvin Jones.

SUBSIDY CONTINUED

"The following Saturday Senator GUFFEY wired me that the subsidy would be continued through April, but without the 10-cent drought payment.

"This meant 100 percent more, however, than we were slated to get under the reduction order."

Marvin Jones later confided to friends in Washington that this was the first effort by dairymen to convince him an extension of the winter subsidy was needed—that he had "got it" from experts and officials but when he got it from the farmers themselves the facts carried more weight with him than the advice of experts.

The Administrator also agreed that one of the most forceful exhibits was a Chester County paper with 10 big dairy farms for sale in the same issue.

The Dairymen's League has been claiming credit for having the April subsidy restored. So have other agricultural organizations. Headmen of triple A and War Food Administration say those farm lobby groups failed to make any real dent—have "yelled wolf" too many times—and what really won the fight for other dairymen was the businesslike appeal of the dairymen from Chester County.

The Need for National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful letter written to me by Alfred Stanley, under date line Okinawa, May 8.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKINAWA, *May 8, 1945.*

Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
United States Senator from California, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I respectfully suggest that the following item from the April 30 issue of Time magazine deserves to be perpetuated in the official papers of our Nation by inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is an excerpt from a sermon dedicating the military cemetery on Iwo Jima, and was authored by Chaplain Ronald B. Gittlesohn:

"Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie a man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses or beneath a Jewish star of David there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet. Now they lie here silently in this sacred soil, and we gather to consecrate this earth in their memory.

"Here lie officers and men, Negroes and white, rich men and poor; here are Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, here no man prefers another because of his faith, or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quota of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy.

"Any man among us living who lifts his hand in hate against a brother or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority, makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifice it commemorates an empty, hollow mockery."

Many publicists have bemoaned the fact that the American soldier does not understand what he is fighting for. This is a slander that should be answered.

It is true, that separated as we are from our homes, and occupied as we are with the responsibility of destroying our Nation's enemies by force of arms, very few of us have been able to project a complete policy for victory or for the peace.

These professional calamity howlers, however, are mistaking the shadow for the substance. We do know that we are fighting and dying in defense of our Nation and its democratic traditions that have earned us the justified respect of freedom-loving people of all the world. We passionately hope that

our sacrifices and the sacrifices of the patriotic and devoted people at home will bear fruit in an advancement of those great traditions designed to meet the needs of our people in the years of peace to follow.

A long period of peace and prosperity for our Nation call for a long period of national unity. Such unity can only be achieved if forward-looking people at home work to destroy those dangerous contradictions to our main democratic traditions, contradictions like racial and religious discrimination, just as our armed forces today are destroying or neutralizing their international counterparts in German and Japanese Fascist militarism.

May I respectfully add my voice to that of thousands of others of your constituents at home and in the armed forces, urging you to use your great influence to extend and expand such agencies as the Fair Employment Practice Committee, agencies designed by our late great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to win the war and secure a peace worthy of a great Nation.

Most sincerely,

ALBERT STANLEY.

Tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address in tribute to the late President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, delivered by the Reverend Allen Pendergraft.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Where there is no vision the people perish."—Proverbs 28:19.

Please excuse me for speaking from a personal point of view on this difficult occasion. I do not as a rule make personal remarks from the pulpit. But sometimes one speaks best from what he himself has seen and heard.

I shall not easily forget the first time I ever met Mr. Roosevelt. It was in the summer of 1932 before he had been elected President for the first time.

We were spending the summer on my father's ranch in the cool mountains of northern Arizona. Mr. Roosevelt and his party had stopped at a neighboring ranch to meet the Governor of the State of Arizona, George W. P. Hunt, who had been in office 16 years. I had known the governor since I was 7 years old when I had taken it upon myself to call on him. I have always been interested in all sorts and conditions of people.

So Governor Hunt invited me to meet another governor from New York State. I spent the afternoon listening, watching, and studying. One overwhelming impression stayed with me: Mr. Roosevelt, in spite of his many apparent weaknesses, had something we all needed, something I had detected in the history-book stories of the greatest leaders of our Nation, something hard to define, something which I can only suggest now by the word "faith," although I would not have used the word then. Mr. Roosevelt had faith: faith in himself, faith in his friends, faith in his country, faith in the future of the world, and, above all, faith in God.

You remember the year 1932, how black it was, how full of despair, how bereft of hope. Men of promise were closing up their life work and committing suicide.

But here was a leader who had confidence that life was worth living, even though he himself was tremendously handicapped. Few people realize how crippled he was, that customarily he moved only between two men or in a wheel chair.

"Where there is no vision the people perish." In 1932 we had lost our confidence and our vision of the future and we were perishing. Mr. Roosevelt recalled to our minds the American dream of a brave new world, and his vision held the country together. He was courageous, too, strong enough to overcome his own handicaps and discouragements and courageous enough to make experiments. He believed that only drastic measures would save the country. The old home remedies had been tried and had failed. He knew that experiment means risk and mistakes, but he was willing to chance making a mistake. He did make mistakes, costly errors, but he had the courage to take a risk and to try something else. And our economic structure survived.

The next time I met the President was in Washington in January of 1941 on the occasion of the third inauguration. It was a momentous and dangerous occasion. The Allies were being defeated in Europe. The Japanese were threatening us in the Pacific. The country took a desperate gamble, risked its democracy, shattered one of our most revered precedents, and elected Mr. Roosevelt for a third term. Again we were threatened by destruction, this time from abroad. One man stood out because of his faith and his confidence. He believed America should and could take a stand in the world struggle for freedom. And he had the courage to take a risk.

The risk was justified by the events of the next few months. In December our enemies stabbed us in the back at Pearl Harbor. That we were not completely unprepared and quickly overwhelmed was due largely to the vision of the President, who risked his political career and the Nation's affection, his greatest asset, to prepare us to defend ourselves and our liberty.

I shall never forget the third inauguration. I was the guest of the office of the Speaker of the House, Mr. SAMUEL RAYBURN. I made notes on Mr. Roosevelt's brief address when he spoke frankly of the need of faith in the future. He said, "Lives of nations are determined not by the count of years, but by the lifetime of the human spirit. The life of a man is three-score years and ten: a little more, a little less. The life of a nation is the fullness of its measure of the will to live. * * * To defeat the foes of our freedom we muster the faith of America. We do not retreat; we cannot stand still. We go forward, in the service of our country, by the will of God."

Later that year I sat in Arlington Amphitheatre in Virginia on Armistice Day, 1941, less than a month before the attack on Pearl Harbor. Again the President revealed his vision and made it emphatically clear that to preserve our freedom we must have faith. With typical simplicity and humility the President quoted Sergeant York, never hesitating to use the language of the common man. He said, "The thing we forget is that liberty is so very precious and we do not fight to win it once and then stop. Liberty is a prize awarded only to those people who fight to win and then keep fighting eternally to hold it. This duty we owe," he continued quoting, "not to ourselves alone, but to the many dead who died to gain our freedom for us—to make the world a place where freedom can live and grow into the ages."

At the conclusion of his address the President was carried away on the arms of two strong men, a remarkable invalid who could not support his own body, but who was willing to try to carry the burden of the world's struggle for freedom. Beside me the people were standing in silent tribute, the silence broken only by deep sobs, as the feeling of the weight of the inevitable tragedy of the coming struggle settled upon our minds. But the weight was sustained by faith; faith in the country and in the future of the world as mediated to us through a man with a powerful vision.

Within a month we had endured the blow at Pearl Harbor. Again the country was in deep trouble; again our confidence soared as the President swung into action. Once our man of vision had told the United States: "This generation has a rendezvous with destiny." After Pearl Harbor there could be no mistaking that fact. He is the man of this century, to date, because he stood for the highest hopes of the world. He believed in what we call the Kingdom of God—"on earth as it is in heaven."

In January of 1942 he came to Christ Church in Alexandria, Va., where I was a seminary student assistant to the rector, the Reverend Edward Randolph Wells, and there in the presence of the Prime Minister of Great Britain and of all the people Mr. Roosevelt reaffirmed his faith in us and in our future under God.

When a man dies, all bitterness and all party hatred should be put aside, and only the good he has done should be recalled. Those who really serve humanity so often leave us before their work is finished. Who is to say whether it is the will of God or whether it is the natural outcome of complete self-sacrifice, a sacrifice even unto the death. From the Unknown Soldier back to the Son of God Incarnate, we know that the great men of the race have given not only their voices but also their very lives for what they believed. They give their lives before their work is done; but whereas there was but one to carry the burden in the beginning, afterward many hands come forward to complete the task.

Leaders of the two prominent parties, including Mr. David Lawrence, of Buffalo, and many Republicans of the first rank, have expressed their utmost confidence in the new President. Mr. Truman, as those of us know who heard him speak in private last week when he visited the Church of the Good Shepherd, has in a large measure the same spirit which made Mr. Roosevelt great, and that is the spirit of faith. He, too, believes in himself, in you, in me, in the future of the world, and in Almighty God. He has the same vision of a better world.

Where there is no vision the people perish. But where the vision is and is heeded, you have the beginning of the life abundant.

Our Commander in Chief is dead. But the spirit which he revived in our hearts will live as long as the race holds to its faith.

Committee Reports on Bretton Woods Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Committee Reports," published in today's New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO COMMITTEE REPORTS

In discussing the sweeping vote of approval for the Bretton Woods agreements in the House last week this newspaper, while it had, itself, consistently criticized the machinery of the monetary fund, applauded the vote as logical and proper in the circumstances. "It is in the best tradition of the American legislative process," we observed, "that a committee decision on such a highly technical subject, rendered in such decisive terms, should be regarded as virtually final."

There could hardly be a more striking contrast between the situation which faced the House when it prepared to vote on the Bretton Woods program and that which will face the Senate when legislation for continuing the reciprocal tariff act comes before it in the form in which it issued from the Finance Committee.

Neither of the two considerations which more or less bound the House to put its stamp of approval on the committee's Bretton Woods recommendations is present in the case of the tariff measure. The Bretton Woods legislation came to the floor recommended by a 23 to 3 vote. The mutilated version of the tariff measure which has emerged from committee was approved by the bare majority of one vote. Moreover, the House has already expressed its approval of the tariff legislation with its important liberalizing provisions, by the decisive vote of 239 to 153.

As to the nature of the issues involved in the two cases, the contrast is equally striking. For the House to have overridden its committee on the monetary fund would have been little short of a travesty, for the controversy over that institution involved not merely technical questions understood by a comparatively small number of specialists but questions of basic economic theory which could be argued intelligently only by advanced students of that abstruse subject. In the case of the pending tariff legislation in the Senate, the issue, on the other hand, is simple to the point of absurdity.

To be able to enter into tariff bargains with other countries, the President must have something to bargain with. That, figuratively speaking, is his capital. The fund of bargaining power with which the Administration was provided originally has been seriously depleted. In the case of 42 percent of our dutiable imports, tariffs have already been cut the full 50 percent permitted in the 1934 legislation. With respect to another 20 percent, authority to cut has been reduced, and in some cases nearly exhausted. As Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton pointed out, "We have already used up about 90 percent of our bargaining power with our two best customers, the United Kingdom and Canada."

The Hull trade program, in our opinion, is the outstanding American symbol today of genuine economic liberalism in world relations. We believe the American people are overwhelmingly behind it. Moreover, we think the Senate Finance Committee has itself tacitly admitted this fact by employing the indirect method of attack which it has chosen. In these circumstances not only is the Senate under no compulsion to accept the committee's recommendations but it is under a very real obligation to override its ill-advised action.

The Export of American Jobs by the Internationalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the employees in the handmade glassware industries are alarmed and rightfully so at the prospect of having their jobs destroyed by the action of the internationalists in the State Department who are asking the power of life and death over American industry and American jobs. The ruthless and devastating trade agreement program of the internationalists will be brought to light in due time, but unless the proposal to lower the tariff duties by another 50 percent, and in some instances by 75 percent, is stopped now, irreparable harm will ensue to our whole economic structure. Labor will suffer the loss of jobs, the communities will lose the pay rolls which support them, and returning veterans will find their opportunities to work exported to foreign countries.

Under leave to extend, I insert an appeal made to the Congress by the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America:

AMERICAN FLINT GLASS WORKERS' UNION OF NORTH AMERICA,
Toledo, Ohio, June 6, 1945.

To the Members of United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: The workers employed in the production of handmade glassware articles, as highly efficient and as capable as any glassware workers in the world, appeal to you to vote against delegating to the State Department the authority to further reduce present tariff rates.

We base our protest on actual happenings. The tariff rates on imports of glassware articles were reduced up to 50 percent in our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia. These reduced rates became effective April 16, 1938, and were suspended as of April 22, 1939.

The tariff-rate concessions we granted were so harmful that our trade was demoralized. A year after the trade-agreements rates bebecame effective, on the pretext that Czechoslovakia having been occupied by the Nazis and could not carry out its obligations assumed under the trade agreement, the State Department suspended the trade agreement.

It is of interest to note that the State Department had also entered into trade agreements with France, with Belgium, with Holland, and with Finland, which countries had either been occupied or taken over by the Nazis, yet the State Department did not suspend or cancel the trade agreements we held with these countries. It would be quite interesting to ascertain why the State Department did not adhere to its alleged policy of suspending trade agreements with these countries as they had with Czechoslovakia.

We respectfully protest the acceptance by the Senate of assertions on the part of State Department officials as though such assertions were established facts.

The statement is repeatedly made that as a result of our entry into trade agreements, and the concessions we have made and secured, that "no single American industry can show that it has been seriously injured."

Such a statement is wholly unwarranted by the established facts. Evidence presented by representatives of several American industries, including the glassware industry, show that concessions made have injured several American industries.

Reference is continually made to the effect that imports of competitive articles are negligible. In the case of handmade glassware articles the Tariff Commission reports show that they had official notice that handmade glassware article imports supplied from 25 percent to 30 percent of the handmade glassware purchased yearly by American consumers.

Tariff Commission reports also show that with these inadequate tariff rates suspended, through the suspension of the trade agreement with Czechoslovakia, our production increased from $12,000,000 to $19,000,000 yearly. Such increases are of little consequence to international bankers, but an increase of from $7,000,000 to $12,000,000 yearly in wages to American handmade glassware workers is highly important to them, and to the communities dependent upon the pay rolls of these glassware plants.

Incidentally, the Tariff Commission also reports that the increase in American production was made possible by using productive capacity not previously in use, presumably because competitive imports made use of these productive capacities unprofitable.

It is possible and highly probable that State Department officials, coming into direct contact only with the affluent representatives of international bankers and the small fraction of 1 percent of our industrialists, many of whom have plants in foreign countries, really mean that none of the cartel-minded industrialists of America have been seriously injured by concessions made to foreign countries, which concessions they will share in through their production in those countries. One of the possible reasons why big business interests, many of them with plants in foreign countries, are so ardently supporting this further reduction in tariff rates is so that, following the close of the present war and in order to curry favor with foreign governments, they may sharply curtail or reduce the volume of their production in their American plants and supply their American trade with products of their plants in foreign countries.

Secretary Clayton has testified that he estimates that following the close of the war that American corporations—big business—will invest some fifteen or twenty billions of American dollars in foreign production plants.

Section 526 of the present Tariff Act provides that the holder of an American trade mark or patent registration can produce articles so protected and such registrant alone can ship such articles into the United States.

Stated simply, under the protection of section 526 of the Tariff Act, these American corporate interests, with their billions of American dollars invested in foreign production plants, can supply their American trade with such products, produced at a much lesser labor cost, deprive American workers of their jobs, possibly destroy the American wage and living standards, and, still have their investments intact in both places.

If, and when, as shown in my statement to the Finance Committee, the Senate authorizes the State Department to further reduce tariff rates, and the State Department reduces the present average tariff rates of 35 percent to say 25 percent, the Members of the Senate, so authorizing, cannot say that they did not expect such a drastic reduction. Secretary Clayton has placed the Congress and the American people on notice

that if granted the authority which the State Department seeks to further reduce tariff rates, he believes, as shown on page 341 of the Ways and Means Committee hearings, that "tariff rates of 27 or 28 or 30 percent are fairly high."

Throughout these hearings, both before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, there is no citation of the value of specific increases in exports which any American industry or industries have secured through the concessions which we have granted to producers in other countries.

No comparable lists have been made available in these hearings which will prove that there were less trade barriers in force in foreign countries in 1939, 5 years after the trade-agreement program was authorized, than there were in 1934.

Despite assertions that our export trade with trade-agreement countries increased some 62 percent, while our exports to nontrade agreement countries had increased but 33 percent, we find that the State Department placed in page 12 of the Finance Committee hearings a table showing that our total exports in 1939 were only eight-tenths of 1 percent greater than our exports for the year 1935.

The old adage of figures and those who figure is well illustrated by these assertions of State Department officials. Contrary to Secretary Clayton's assertions that exports had increased 62 percent in one case and 33 percent in the other, or a total increase of 95 percent, this State Department table shows that our total exports had increased in 1939 over 1935 only 10 percent of the 1935 figures.

It is also interesting to note that while there were 28 trade agreements in force in 1939 and only 5 trade agreements in force in 1937, the State Department table shows that our exports for 1939 were only equal to the same proportion as that of 1937. Especially is this significant when we consider that during the year 1939 the State Department permitted, if not promoted, directly and indirectly, the exportation of hundreds of millions of dollars of materials which landed in Axis countries and which materials were later used to destroy the lives of thousands of American soldiers, sailors, and marines.

On behalf of the officers and members of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union we appeal to you to use your vote and your influence with other Members of the Senate to reject the request of the State Department for authority to further reduce our present tariff rates. We make this appeal not for the purpose of enabling any American producer to secure additional profits, but for the sole purpose of protecting the job opportunities of the millions of American workers, those returning from the armed forces, and those now producing for the needs of the armed forces, who will soon be looking for jobs.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY H. COOK,
International President.

Communistic Penetration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three very timely and righteous resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Knights of Columbus, New York State Council, held in New York City on May 26, 1945, urging that a solemn warning be sounded to the United States and other lands against communistic penetration:

I

Whereas the Big Three at the Crimea Conference assumed without reference to the constitutional Polish Government, or to the wishes of the Polish people, the right to determine Poland's eastern boundaries, thereby excluding 6,000,000 Poles from the citizenship of their own country, while leaving Polish western frontiers undecided; and

Whereas this decision violates the principle of democratic self-determination of peoples, the chief basis of the future world security organization; and

Whereas the Big Three by their failure to establish a democratic government in Poland, the avowed purpose of the Crimean decisions, have caused to exist in Poland a situation characterized by the following facts:

1. Soviet Russia has insisted upon the right of the Warsaw Communist Government to veto any Polish democratic leader proposed by the Allies as a member of the new Government, this right having been used by the Warsaw Communist government in respect to each of the more than 30 democratic leaders proposed by the western allies.

2. Failure to establish a truly representative, democratic Polish Government has served Soviet Russia with an excuse for vetoing the invitation of Poland to the San Francisco Conference, unless Poland be represented by Soviet-appointed Communists of Russian origin.

The Warsaw Communist Government appointed by Soviet Russia and now acting in Poland has introduced a reign of terror:

(a) By continuing mass deportations of the Polish civil population to concentration camps and to Russia.

(b) By arresting and shooting members of the Polish underground army, recognized by the United States Army as "enjoying the status of an allied army," although the United States Government warned the Nazis that they would be held criminally responsible for inhuman treatment of members of the Polish underground army.

(c) Notorious German death camps, like Majdanek, are now being used by Soviet Russia for imprisonment of Poles who fought Nazis for 6 years; this in spite of the fact Russia has not only done nothing to indict the 240 German generals held in Russia but even permitted them to form, in Moscow, a puppet German government to propagandize the German people by Soviet-sponsored broadcasts.

(d) Repeated efforts made by the Polish Government in London to come to an agreement with Russia are being purposely frustrated, as shown by the recent arrest of 16 Polish democratic leaders who, in an endeavor at friendly collaboration and at the suggestion of the British Government, revealed themselves to Soviet Russian authorities when invited by Soviet military authority, under the guaranty of personal safety and upon the word of honor of Russian Army officers.

(e) Soviet Russia has confronted the Allies with one-sided decisions such as the conclusion of border treaties with its own Soviet-appointed Warsaw Communist Government.

(f) Poland is being sovietized against the will of 98 percent of its inhabitants. Communist administration is enforced by secret police terror and the complete isolation of Poland from American testimony of witnesses to the blood bath visited upon our oldest and most faithful ally.

(g) The occupying Soviet Russian military forces are exercising a reign of terror in the Soviet sphere of military occupation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, in annual meeting assembled, submits to the people of the United States that the American sense of justice under God, and the national honor, demand that we, as a people, at all times and everywhere, give testimony to the truth and that we break the conspiracy of silence shrouding international affairs.

2. That every effort be made to assure to Poland the same treatment as American forces have accorded to France, to Belgium, and to Holland, our allies of equal status to that of Poland.

3. That Soviet Russia be called upon to admit to Poland American Senators, American Representatives, American consular officers, the press, approved representatives of the American Red Cross, agents of UNRRA, and members of Christian and Jewish charitable organizations, whose purpose will be the alleviation of suffering of the people of Poland.

4. That the large Soviet-Russian standing armies in Poland be withdrawn from Poland, where they are causing increasing famine, be not used to force an unwilling Ally to accept a Communist totalitarian regime.

5. That strongest representations should be made to Soviet Russia to obtain the liberation of the 16 democratic leaders of the Polish masses arrested in violation of the Soviet Russia's pledge of personal safety.

6. That a solution of the problem of creating a truly democratic free Government in Poland, representing all the people, and not one forced upon Poland by a foreign power, be effected without delay, pursuant to the obligation assumed by Soviet Russia at the Crimean Conference and in accordance with promises made on numerous occasions by Marshal Stalin.

7. That as a preliminary condition of democratic free elections, political prisoners be freed and deported populations repatriated.

8. That for such time as unilateral pressure can prevent free election in Poland, incurring displeasure of the American people and strengthening throughout the world distrust of Soviet Russia, a joint administration of Poland by an equal number of American, British, and Russian representatives shall be insisted upon with no less determination than in the case of Trieste.

9. That the boundaries of Poland be settled at the Peace Conference in the same manner as originally intended for other European nations as well as those in the Far East.

10. That a firm pronouncement be formulated forcefully stating in the name of the American people that it will discountenance any further aid to Soviet Russia if she continues to commit acts contrary to the principles for which so many American lives have been sacrificed.

11. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives from the State of New York, the Delegates of the United States at the San Francisco Conference, the supreme officers and directors and the State deputies of the several jurisdictions of the Knights of Columbus.

II

Whereas it is becoming more evident day by day that the pressure exercised by Soviet Russia upon the independence and freedom of the Polish Nation is only a part of a much broader design constituting a bid for world domination as evidenced by the following facts:

1. Soviet Russia is forming a Balkan Communist federation under the guidance of its agent, the Moscow-trained Communist, Tito Broz. This federation claims Italian territory with the help of Italian Communists, thus extending Soviet-Russian penetration to the Adriatic.

2. Soviet Russia has formed a Macedonian Communist republic which has occupied Salonika, excluding the Greeks from that part of their territory and flanking Piraeus, thus extending Soviet Russia's penetration to the eastern Mediterranean.

3. Soviet Russia has occupied the island of Bornholm which nullifies the only Swedish naval base in the Baltic at Kalrscrona, insuring the domination of the Baltic Sea and its outlets into the Atlantic.

4. Soviet Russia has formed a Rumanian Communist government which is liquidating American-owned oil-plant equipment in Rumania and shipping it to Russia.

5. Soviet Russia has annexed part of Czechoslovakia and formed a Czech government under the Communist Prime Minister Firlinger, who at one time, when in Moscow, openly revolted against President Benes.

6. Soviet Russia has achieved the domination of northern Iran and has thus flanked Turkey, both in Asia Minor and in the Balkans, and is presently exerting pressure upon Turkey to obtain political control over that country, the Dardanelles Straits, and the Middle East.

7. Soviet Russia is infiltrating into many South and Central American nations thousands of Communist agitators, trained in Moscow, from among 14,000 Spanish children removed by Soviet Russia from Spain after the civil war.

8. Soviet Russia has obliquely made known her desire and is working for the domination of Manchuria, Korea, outer Mongolia, and Sinkiang, and is presently arming the Fourth Route Chinese Communist Army in northern China and keeping that army, together with the Communist regime based upon it, in constant opposition to national Chinese forces, thus weakening Chinese cooperation with America against Japan.

9. Soviet Russia covets Pacific bases as has been indicated by recent discussion in San Francisco, when she insisted upon the right to veto future decisions concerning disposal of security island bases in the Pacific, conquered by American forces from Japan, and showing interest in the disposal of Formosa which flanks the Philippine Islands.

10. Soviet Russia, by its occupation of Europe to the agreed Lubeck-Trieste line, will acquire power over 150,000,000 Europeans and subject them to Communist slavery; it will further gain domination over 20,000,000 people in the Middle East and 80,000,000 in the Far East. Thus Soviet Russia will command the activities of 400,000,000 people occupying one-fifth of the whole earth and will constitute an almost irresistible force in the communization of the world.

11. Soviet Russia has its own political force ruled from Moscow in every country, acting under the guise of Communist groups or associations and even more numerous fellow-traveler fronts, following the party-line of Soviet Russia. Their aim is to insure the domination of Russia over a sovietized world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

1. That New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, in annual meeting assembled urges that a solemn warning be sounded throughout the American Nation against Communist penetration into the United States and into other lands, which hold that their citizens possess rights even against the State.

2. That unless the representatives of the United States appreciate fully the danger that is threatening us and take immediate action to protect us therefrom, the dark forces which have brought unspeakable desolation to the Eastern Hemisphere will destroy our western civilization, which alone exalts the dignity of man.

3. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives from the State of New York, the delegates of the United States at the San Francisco Conference, the supreme officers and directors and the State deputies of the several jurisdictions of the Knights of Columbus.

III

Whereas Pope Pius XII has been subjected to vicious attacks by the official press of Soviet Russia, which insinuates that His Holiness has condoned the principles and practices of nazism and has been sympathetic to the Nazi and Fascist Governments; and

Whereas by assiduous propaganda these unfounded accusations have been given world-wide publicity; and

Whereas Pope Pius XII has on numerous occasions denounced the attitude of the totalitarian governments individually and collectively and has set forth in his Christmas message of 1944 the principles of true democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, in annual meeting assembled on behalf of its total membership—

1. Again expresses its filial devotion to His Holiness Pope Pius XII;

2. Deplores the mendacious and hypocritical attacks made upon His Holiness Pope Pius XII by the government-inspired Soviet Russian press;

3. Pledge to His Holiness Pope Pius XII, individual and collective support of the principles of justice and peace for which he is the world's outstanding champion;

4. That there be forwarded copies of the 1944 Christmas message of Pope Pius XII together with copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives from the State of New York, the Delegates of the United States at the San Francisco Conference, the supreme officers and directors and the State deputies of the several jurisdictions of the Knights of Columbus.

STEPHEN J CUSHING,
State Deputy.

Attest:

WILLIAM E. BURKE,
State Secretary.

We Don't See Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N. H., of June 8, 1945:

WE DON'T SEE WHY

Meat is scarce in Carroll County. Lucky is the housewife who can find some stew beef to take home to her family once a week. Tender steaks, rich prime roasts, savory sizzling hamburg, and pork steaks drenched in gravy are but memories of a fond and distant past.

The whys and wherefores of the Government fumbling and mistakes that have taken our meat away from us are beyond the ken of a simple country editor. Furthermore, space is lacking to detail all the pros and cons of the situation.

But we do know that we are all hungry for meat.

And we do know that we are not getting it.

Yet we folks who live in northern New Hampshire have a simple remedy for this situation.

But the Government will not allow us to use this remedy.

Evidently the Government does not want us to eat.

Up in the Province of Quebec there is plenty of beef and lamb and pork on the hoof. Steers, carrying the necessary health certification, can be purchased in Quebec for 8 to 9 cents per pound, live weight. They pay a duty, coming into the States, of 1½ cents per pound. They can be trucked down for 1 to 2 cents per pound.

That is, good Canadian beef can be trucked into Carroll County at a figure that will allow your market man to slaughter it and retail it to you at or below the ceiling price and still make a legitimate profit.

But the Government says "no" to such a simple solution of the problem.

To slaughter beef in Carroll County that is to be sold legally in retail stores, at or below ceiling prices, with due delivery of red points and money in exchange for the meat, it is necessary to kill the animals in a class 2 slaughterhouse.

Class 2 slaughter quotas are being cut 25 percent below last year's slaughtering.

No new class 2 permits are being issued.

The Government is attempting to drive all meat through the big packing companies in the big cities.

It is trying to keep the meat out of the hands of the small slaughterer.

Furthermore, if you are so lucky, or unlucky, as to live so near the Canadian border that you can go shopping in rationless Canada, you cannot bring in any meat unless you surrender your red points at the United States customs.

Boiled down to simplest terms: the Canadians have meat. They want to sell that meat. We have no meat but we have plenty of money to buy that meat with.

But our Government says, "No—you cannot have that meat."

Obviously, an expert on meat rationing can offer all kinds of plausible, sound reasons in rebuttal to this editorial as to just why meat is denied to us when it is available.

But the facts remain that we are meat hungry, meat is close at hand, and we are not allowed to lay hands on it.

Conditions in Veterans' Hospitals—Statement of Col. Roy D. Wolford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement made by Dr. Roy A. Wolford, colonel in the Army Medical Corps, and Assistant Medical Director, Tuberculosis Division of the Veterans' Administration,

presented before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on Friday, June 8, 1945.

His statement is in answer to attacks made upon the veterans' hospitals in certain newspaper and magazine articles.

I hope every Member of Congress, and everyone else who is interested in this proposition, will take time to read his entire statement.

The matter referred to follows:

As Assistant Medical Director in charge of Tuberculosis Hospitals, the Administrator and the Medical Director have placed upon me the responsibility of answering the many allegations of Mr. Albert Q. Maisel as contained in his first article entitled "Third-Rate Medicine for First-Rate Men," which appeared in the March issue of the Cosmopolitan. The editor of this periodical, commenting in his editorial column, stated: "There's a shocking article on page 35. The author has spent many months collecting the facts. Now he presents them, fully documented and with a sincerity learned on two battle fronts." It will be my purpose to refute by documentary evidence many of Maisel's statements bearing on veterans and I feel assured that I can also prove to your satisfaction the editor to be wrong on at least three counts: (1) That Mr. Maisel did not spend months collecting facts, or if he did, he did not use them in his articles; (2) that his presentation is not factually documented; and (3) that there is a distinct ring of sensationalism and a show of gross ignorance, but no sincerity of purpose in what he has written.

The editor failed to say that the article would have a far-reaching effect on the peace of mind of millions of veterans and their families; that it would shake the morale of the patients in every veterans' hospital in the country; that it would malign and be a source of discouragement to every nurse and every physician in the Veterans' Administration—the very individuals who have with true sincerity unselfishly dedicated their lives to serve those veterans for whom the editor glibly states, "It is therefore with a sense of public and humane obligation to the men in our armed forces, past and present, that we publish these damning facts"; nor did the editor tell the reader that it would be the seriously and critically ill veteran, whose life is almost despaired of and whose eternal hope for recovery is bulwarked by the faith and confidence that has been builded in his mind by the skill and training of the physicians, nurses, and other personnel in whose hands a grateful Government has placed him, who may in the end be the loser.

I hope I am not speaking with too much feeling; but if I am, I ask that you pardon me, for I am but voicing the righteous indignation of every loyal employee of the Veterans' Administration to whose attention this article has come.

Mr. Maisel implies that his statements are based on the published figures issued by the Veterans' Administration itself; that in many of the veterans' hospitals he has visited, the death rates are actually higher, the "cure" rates far lower and conditions, far, far worse than any cold statistics can ever indicate.

What are the actual facts?

Mr. Albert Q. Maisel did visit two tuberculosis hospitals of the Veterans' Administration and the tuberculosis department of one of our general hospitals. Let us see upon what his conclusions were based.

In the early fall Mr. Maisel did call at the Minneapolis hospital. He visited with the chief of the tuberculosis service in his office at that hospital for almost 1 hour. He did not see the wards or kitchens or interview any of the patients and according to the physician he contacted, he indicated the purpose of the jaunt from Massachusetts to Minnesota was to gather material which would be of interest to the public who knew little or nothing about "the greatest clinic in the world". It appears that it started out as a laudable enterprise but that subsequently somewhere along the road it degenerated into some rather lucrative journalistic trickery based on hasty generalizations.

Next we find Mr. Maisel visited the Castle Point, N. Y., tuberculosis hospital. He was interviewed by the manager and gave the impression that he was interested in the exserviceman; that he has been a war correspondent and that he was preparing a book. He asked if he could be permitted to visit the hospital and talk with a few of the patients. This seemed to be a natural request and no objection was interposed since many people who are interested in the Veterans' Administration and the work it is doing come out of interest to see for themselves what is actually going on inside the hospital buildings. Mr. Maisel talked to some of the patients as stated in his article. With relation to the statistics referred to throughout his report he was not given any statistical information concerning any of the administrative matters of the hospital other than he was told that the bed capacity was 625. At the time he visited Castle Point, N. Y., construction was in progress, increasing the bed capacity from 479 to 625. During the alteration program it was necessary to evacuate parts of wards. The patients evacuated had to be reabsorbed in certain other rooms. Also during the reconstruction program the rooms constructed for day rooms were necessarily used temporarily for housing the patients. This was essential due to the urgent demand for beds. However, at no time were any of the rooms overcrowded. The alterations and reallocation of space were made in accordance with standard plans allotting at least 70 square feet of space for each bed. Mr. Maisel was informed the additional beds were being obtained through reallocation of space. His statement that the patients were robbed of day rooms, diet kitchens, and toilet facilities is not borne out by the facts. The toilet facilities of all the wards were increased where rebuilding was involved.

There was provided a special day room on each ward which did not exist prior to the construction, and there is an adequate nourishment kitchen on each ward. During the alteration period at no time did the bed capacity of a five-bed room exceed six beds or did a two-bed room exceed three beds as a temporary expedient.

The menu served on the day of Mr. Maisel's visit there October 5, 1944, was:

Dinner: Soup, pot roast with gravy; buttered potatoes, buttered cabbage, fudge cake, bread and butter, milk, coffee, and tea.

Supper: Soup, hamburger, American fried potatoes, tomato-onion salad with mayonnaise, hot buns, chilled apricots, beverage.

That visit likewise was a rather fleeting one of several hours and as far as can be ascertained he talked to but four patients—one of whom was James Collier, concerning whom we will talk at greater length a little later, no physicians except the manager and the clinical director and no nurses whatsoever.

Mr. Maisel subsequently went to the Sunmount, N. Y., hospital on the morning of December 5, 1944, and departed at 11 p. m. on that date. While at Sunmount he interviewed the clinical director, a few medical officers, several patients, and accompanied the manager and the chief nurse for a short time while they were making rounds in the infirmary wards. In the afternoon he spent 2 hours at the surgical collapse board meeting. He ate two meals at the hospital. Mr. Maisel commended the manner in which the collapse board meeting was conducted by the clinical director and appeared when he departed to have gained a favorable impression of the Sunmount hospital.

I believe the committee will see that the time spent by Mr. Maisel in the tuberculosis hospitals of the Veterans' Administration and the superficial and inexperienced manner in which he conducted his investigations were surely insufficient to warrant any conclusions regarding the treatment being accorded our tuberculous beneficiaries.

Some days ago Dr. H. A. Pattison, director of the Potts Memorial Institute at Livingston, N. Y., made an unannounced visit to the Castle Point Hospital. Dr. Pattison has been a member of our medical council for many years. He is one of the most outstanding tuberculosis specialists in the United States and enjoys an international reputation as a tuberculosis hospital administrator.

Here is what he had to say about his visit, as taken from a copy of a letter which he addressed to Miss Evelyn P. Ellsworth, of 23 Waller Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.:

"MY DEAR MISS ELLSWORTH: I have received your letter of March 7 with the enclosure of a clipping from the Daily Mirror referring to an attack upon the Veterans' Administration and its hospitals in the March Cosmopolitan. I had seen neither the clipping nor the magazine.

"Only last Saturday, I had occasion to go to Castle Point concerning a patient who had been transferred there from this institution. After leaving Castle Point, I purchased the Cosmopolitan. My observations do not in any way support the writer of the attack. While I had no official status, and could not attempt any detailed survey, I made observations based upon the experience in visits to more than three hundred sanatoria in this country and in Europe, and written reports on 250.

"The chief medical officer accompanied me to the large, airy, well-ventilated kitchen, where the noon meal was being served. I asked the privilege of tasting some of the food. This was the menu: Soup, which I did not sample; bread and butter. I did not taste the bread, but the butter was fresh and of excellent flavor. The chicken fricassee could not be improved upon and there was just about as much chicken as gravy. It was well seasoned. The mashed potatoes were excellent, and the lima beans were small, tender and tasty. The date-custard pudding was delicious. There was a choice of milk, tea or coffee. I sampled the coffee, black. It was very satisfactory. The food was hot and the dishes were hot.

"It is served to bed patients from heated, electric carriers. It is very difficult to get food to the patients in bed as hot as one would like, even in a smaller institution. Had the food been of poor quality, I should not have been greatly surprised, because of the difficulties of preparing good food by mass cooking. The diets were in charge of two, alert, capable, young women.

"The dining room for ambulant patients was clean and the tables covered with clean, white tablecloths. If ever linen is dirty, it is on Saturday. The chairs had attractive covers for the backs. There were hangings at the windows.

"The nurses, in their particular dining room, were capable-looking, young women in fresh uniforms.

"The small lounging rooms on the various floors were attractively furnished.

"The X-ray and laboratory equipment were adequate.

"The institution is not badly overcrowded, although it has a few more patients than normal capacity due to the exigencies of war.

"Such attacks as you refer to serve no good purpose. They upset the morale and discipline of patients. They must distress the relatives who are likely to accept statements in a popular magazine as gospel truth. They must certainly be disheartening to an overworked staff, doing its best in a period of man shortage to give good service. There

are, of course, men grown old in the service, but there are also younger physicians, and all of the younger graduates have good, basic, scientific training. It is shameful that they should be vilified and traduced in a time like this. It is almost certain that someone will demand a congressional investigation. That means, that the staff in the central office at Washington, and the staffs in the various hospitals, will be further distracted from the important business at hand. When you read an attack such as that in the Cosmopolitan, you may always discount it by 80 to 90 percent. It is difficult to combat widely circulating stories such as this one, but each of us can do something to counteract such evil influences.

"Sincerely yours,

"H. A. PATTISON."

Before we launch into the general statements relative to the "cold statistics"—which is what Mr. Maisel calls them and thereafter either purposely or ignorantly proceeds to distort and misinterpret them to provide a sensational backdrop for his accusations—let us examine the facts regarding the two cases which he high lights by photographs of photostated letters of one and wash drawings of alleged experiences of the other, to illustrate his article.

HAROLD W. C. SCHWIEBERT, XC-3,255,845

You will remember Mr. Maisel stated:

"Last June Harold Schwiebert wrote a letter from the bed he had occupied for almost a year in the Veterans' Facility at Dayton, Ohio. An overseas veteran, Schwiebert had been treated for tuberculosis in Army hospitals in England and, later, in the States. Then, discharged, he was turned over to the Veterans' Administration for further treatment.

"For a year he endured that 'treatment.' Finally, in despair, he wrote to Dr. H. H. Brueckner, superintendent of the District Tuberculosis Hospital, of Lima, Ohio, begging to be admitted to the five-county institution. Here is his description of his treatment at the Veterans' Hospital:

" 'I have just lost all belief of ever recovering in this place. I was admitted to this hospital June 23, 1943. I was only aspirated twice, which was sometime in July, when there was 1,500 cubic centimeters of fluid removed and then again in August, when there was 1,000 cubic centimeters removed, and since that haven't been aspirated or anything done, but being fluoroscoped or X-rayed once in a while. The last X-ray was taken in March and May. Haven't been examined since February 1944. * * * I had a flare-up about 3 weeks ago and being sent up to be fluoroscoped by our ward surgeon, the pneumo doctor refused to do the fluoroscoping and sent back a sarcastic note to our ward surgeon. * * * I have found out all about this place I want to know. I have made up my mind to leave here and the sooner the better for my own good.' "

Reviewing the clinical folder of this patient we can place the date Mr. Schwiebert wrote Dr. Brueckner the quoted letter as not earlier than the latter part of May 1944. I ask you to remember this date, for it will have an important bearing on the facts which I will submit later. As a former patient, who was also a physician, wrote after reading the article:

"There is nothing in Schwiebert's own account of his condition and treatment to indicate anything except that he was dissatisfied with his treatment and results and that he was bewildered. Who would not be bewildered after nearly a year of invalidism. He was naturally discouraged, but this does not indicate that there was any improper treatment or neglect in his case."

As the committee has been furnished a complete brief of the facts on the Schwiebert case, I will only summarize the salient points which have a bearing on his treatment.

On admission to the Dayton facility at 8:15 a. m., June 23, 1943, Mr. Schwiebert was immediately seen by the ward physician, placed on regular tray and given 24-hour bedrest, with bathroom privileges. He received an X-ray of the chest on the same day and routine laboratory examinations, including a urinalysis, total red count, total white count, differential blood smear, Wassermann, and specimen of single sputum the following day. A series of 11 morning specimens of sputum followed. Subsequently two 24-hour specimens of sputum were obtained and examined by the concentrate method. All sputum examinations were found to be negative for tubercle bacilli. The patient was seen by the surgical collapse board, consisting of five physicians—the chief of the surgical service, the chief of the medical service, the chief of the tuberculosis service, the clinical director, and the roentgenologist—on June 30, 1943. Their report, and I will quote it in its entirety, follows:

"SURGICAL COLLAPSE BOARD

"This 27-year-old veteran was admitted June 23, 1943, by discharge from the United States Army with diagnosis of moderately advanced active pulmonary tuberculosis. About Christmas of 1942 he developed pleurisy while overseas and continued to have trouble until February 11, 1943, when he developed a high temperature and fluid in his left chest. He was moved to the general hospital and remained there until May 6, 1943, at which time he was evacuated to the United States, Fort Devens, Mass., and transferred here for discharge. Fluid was removed from his chest on five different occasions, the first aspiration yielding only 60 cc. of yellowish, slightly turbid fluid which gave a count of 600 WBC's per cm. specific gravity 1.019, sugar 10 mgs. percent and was positive for tubercle bacilli. Sedimentation rate 2 mm. per hour. Subsequent tappings yielded 1,250 cc. and on two occasions 2,400 cc. each. In all, fluid withdrawn on five occasions. Normal weight 186 pounds. Present weight 156.

"Since admission temperature has been elevated only slightly, ranging from 99 to 99.2. Pulse from 72 to 106. Respiration from 18 to 24. The physical examination was positive for involvement of the entire left lung. Sputum tests, however, have been negative.

"X-ray shows right lung clear and radiant throughout and in the left there is a dense homogeneous opacity which obliterates the entire lung with apparent deviation of the trachea to the left, also heart shadow is apparently deviated somewhat to the right.

"Diagnoses:

"1. Tuberculosis, pulmonary, chronic, far advanced, active III.

"2. Hydropneumothorax, left, serofibrinous, acute.

"Recommendations:

"Transfer to annex No. 4, ward 21 or 22. Bed rest, symptomatic treatment, and withdrawal of the fluid from the left chest, if and when he becomes uncomfortable. If fluid is withdrawn it should be replaced with air."

He was transferred from the reception service to the treatment ward on the same date and placed on 24-hour bed rest with regular tray. The patient rapidly gained weight, the graphic weight chart indicating on June 30, 1943, that he weighed 155 pounds and on the 5th of January 1944, 175 pounds. This weight was maintained until May 21, when a slight decrease in weight was noted. The patient remained on 24-hour bed rest, with bathroom privileges and regular tray until August 6, 1943, when he was permitted to go to the ward dining room. During this period he remained afebrile, observed the rest periods well, and was a most cooperative patient. On July 19, 1.500 cc. of fluid were aspirated from the left chest. The specimen was sent to the laboratory and was found positive for tubercle bacilli. Again on August 21, 1943, approximately 1,000 cc. of a turbid fluid were aspirated from the chest. He had developed an infection of the fourth finger of the left hand on August 1, 1943, which, according to the patient, was the result of an insect bite. This condition was properly treated and cleared up rapidly with no untoward symptoms.

Beginning November 3, 1943, he was permitted to be out of bed 4 hours daily. On April 18 he was given the privilege of 15 minutes walking exercise daily. On May 12, 1944, 4 weeks later, the patient developed pain in the chest with an elevation of temperature. He was kept in bed on a light tray for several days, when he was again placed on a regular tray. Beginning June 9, he was permitted out of bed 2 hours in a 24-hour period. He was progressing favorably until June 16, when he complained of a severe recurrent headache with nausea and vomiting. He was given symptomatic treatment for the headache. There was no cervical rigidity or cutaneous hyperaesthesia present. By June 24 the patient had developed symptoms which strongly pointed to a meningeal condition. The temperature became elevated to 100° and 101°, and the pulse rate was increased to approximately 100 per minute. A spinal puncture was made on June 28, and examination of the fluid withdrawn showed an occasional acid fast bacilli with a heavy increase of globulin and a cell count of 328 per c. mm. with 44 percent lymphocytes. On June 28, the left chest was again aspirated, and only 50 cc. of foul greenish yellow material was recovered, certainly insufficient to cause any respiratory or cardiac embarrassment. The patient's condition became progressively worse, he lapsed into coma June 30, 1944, and he expired at 12:40 a. m., July 2, 1944. The cause of death was tuberculous meningitis, secondary to a far advanced pulmonary tuberculosis.

A review of the reports of X-rays of the chest made of this patient indicates that on June 23, 1943, there was no evidence of infiltration or of consolidation of the right lung. However, the left lung showed a dense homogeneous opacity obliterating the entire left lung, with slight deviation of the trachea to the left and the heart shadow was apparently deviated to the right. The Bucky film of the chest made July 1, 1943, revealed the left side of the chest to be homogeneously cloudy, probably due to the presence of fluid. An elliptical area of clearing adjacent to the spine was interpreted as representing pulmonary tissue. The diaphragm on the left side appeared to be depressed. The roentgenogram of the chest taken on August 23, 1943, following the withdrawal of fluid from the left side of the thorax revealed a hydropneumothorax with a fluid level at about the ninth dorsal spine. A partial collapse of the left lung was noted. The upper left lobe was fixed by a vertical adhesion which extended to the thoracic inlet. The left lower lobe was concealed by the fluid. The right chest was negative throughout. The X-ray of the chest made March 30, 1944, demonstrated a complete homogeneous opacity over the entire left chest due to the presence of a large hydropneumothorax. The report indicated the fluid displaced the cardiac shadow slightly into the right chest and that the right lung remained negative. Comparative roentgenogram of the chest made May 22, 1944, contrasted with the prior one of March 30, 1944, revealed no significant change except for a small area of clearing in the region of the left hilus approximately 3 by 1 centimeters. The heart was reported as being still moderately displaced to the right and the right lung remained negative with the exception of congestive changes in the base. A roentgenogram of the chest taken June 26, 1944, compared with that of May 22, 1944, revealed no significant change in the left lung. The same dense homogeneous opacity occupied the entire left pleural space with the exception of an area in the hilus which was only fairly aerated. The trachea was deviated to

the left and the right lung showed a stippled, soft type of infiltration throughout all lobes and zones.

SUMMARIZATION

If one is to judge from both the ward surgeon's and nurse's notes, Mr. Schwiebert was a very cooperative patient during his hospitalization. He followed bedrest very satisfactorily and improved under the hospital regimen during the first 6 months of his hospitalization. At this period he had gained approximately 20 pounds in weight. His general physical condition was so satisfactory that he was granted a 7-day pass on April 6 through April 13, 1944. His treatment as outlined by the surgical collapse board was medically sound and in accordance with the best established medical practices in this type of case. This treatment was carefully followed and the unanimous admonition of the collapse board that the fluid only be withdrawn if and when he became uncomfortable was clearly understood by the physician under whose care this patient was placed. It appeared necessary to withdraw fluid on but two occasions in the early period of his hospitalization. Subsequent to August 21, 1943, there is no indication from the record that this patient manifested any cardiac embarrassment or was uncomfortable to any extent until his terminal illness.

I have personally reviewed the X-ray films taken of the patient while in the Dayton facility and there is, in my opinion, no material shift of the mediastinum shown in any of them (X-ray films of patient demonstrated to committee). The record conclusively shows that the patient died July 2, 1944, of a tuberculous meningitis which had its inception before June 15, 1944. When the diagnosis of tuberculous meningitis was clearly established on June 28, 1944, the prognosis was fatal, this being the usual termination in this complication.

Tuberculosis meningitis is fortunately a rare complication in adults. However, it does occasionally occur. The onset is usually gradual and characterized by headache which is persistent and does not yield to treatment. In addition the patient becomes irritable and fretful and there is frequently loss of memory. Later the clinical symptomatology develops so that there are definite signs of neck rigidity, nausea and vomiting. You will remember about the time Mr. Schwiebert forwarded his letter to Dr. Brueckner he had a slight elevation of temperature, with later signs developing of a tuberculous meningitis.

You will also recall in the article of Albert Q. Maisel in the March issue of the Cosmopolitan he quoted from a letter allegedly written Dr. H. H. Brueckner, superintendent of the District Tuberculosis Hospital of Lima, Ohio, by patient Schwiebert and a letter from Dr. Brueckner of July 6, 1944, to Louis I. Dublin, Ph. D., third vice president and statistician, New York Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y. The letter from patient Schwiebert to Dr. Brueckner, according to the photostatic copy printed in the Cosmopolitan, read as follows:

"DEAR SIR: I have been wanting to write to you for some time, but thought maybe I could write to my sister Helena there at the hospital and find out through her what I wanted to know, but she thought it would be best for me to write personally to you and tell you about my treatment here, if I can call it that.

"There has been so many things happening here lately that I have just lost all belief of ever recovering in this place. I had a flare-up about 3 weeks ago and being sent up for to be fluoroscoped by our ward surgeon, the pneumo doctor refused to do the fluoroscoping and sent back a sarcastic note to our ward surgeon, who is Captain Knot now. He has been here for nearly a month, but seems to get poor cooperation from some of the other doctors.

"I also got to speak to Colonel Schillinger, the chief medical officer, a week ago. I asked about my case of how I knew of them being treated at most general hospitals in the Army and other TB hospitals. Oh, he says, to me, 'We forgot that way of treating them since the Civil War.' So you see I have found out all about this place I want to know, so I have made up my mind to leave here and the sooner the better for my own good.

"So I have decided to come to that hospital, if possible, and get my treatment there and get my proper treatment, I'm sure. I want to also pay my own way, which I think will be possible, since I am service connected. So I want to know all about the monthly fee there and also about the papers to be made out. Also let me know how soon I can come there. I have also been wondering whether the papers couldn't be made out on arrival there, rather than to be doing this through the mail.

"I will tell you about my treatment that I have received here so far. I was admitted to this hospital June 23, 1943. I was only aspirated twice, which was some time in July, when there was 1,500 cc. of fluid removed, and then again in August, when there was 1,000 cc. removed, and since that haven't been aspirated or anything done but being fluoroscoped and X-rayed once in a while. The last X-ray was taken in March and May. Haven't been examined since February 1944. Since I had the flare-up I have been running a little temperature ever since. I believe I told you when I was there how much fluid that had been taken off altogether. Anyway I had 2,400 cc. taken off overseas and the total aspirated was 6,800 cc.

"Well, I must close for now, and if you wish to know more about me before I leave here, I would be pleased to answer everything in the next letter. So I'm hoping and trusting to hear from you very soon.

"Sincerely yours,

"HAROLD W. C. SCHWIEBERT."

The letter from Dr. Brueckner to Louis I. Dublin purports to read as follows:

"DEAR DR. DUBLIN: It might be of interest to you to know that Mr. Harold Schwiebert will not have a chance of coming to this hospital for removal of his pleural effusion.

"He died July 2 of apparently cardiac failure and cardiac embarrassment probably because of severe mediastinal shift caused by effusion.

"Sincerely yours,

"H. H. BRUECKNER, M. D.,

"Superintendent."

It is interesting to note how Dr. Brueckner's guess at the diagnoses in a patient he never saw became transformed through the skillful pen of Mr. Maisel into an indisputable fact. But we already know that the true cause of young Schwiebert's death was tuberculous meningitis and not cardiac failure as guessed by the good doctor in absentia.

Now, let us return to the statement in Schwiebert's letter to Dr. Brueckner: "I had a flareup about 3 weeks ago and being sent up for to be fluoroscoped by our ward surgeon, the pneumo doctor refused to do the fluoroscoping and sent back a sarcastic note to our ward surgeon, who is Captain Knot." Dr. W. L. Knott took over the care of patient Schwiebert May 2, 1944. On May 9, 1944, the patient had a slight elevation of temperature which continued to May 12. On May 10, 1944, Dr. Knott requested a fluoroscopic examination of Dr. Schiffer. Dr. Schiffer did not make the fluoroscopic examination and forwarded a note to Dr. Knott which reads as follows:

"DEAR BILL: I am not on the TB service, and do not do their consultations. I do not do the fluoroscopy in TB's in an official capacity. I believe the procedure commonly used is for X-rays to be taken."

On the basis of Dr. Schiffer's note, Dr. Knott ordered an X-ray of the chest for comparison purposes and requested that the fluid level be noted. The X-ray was taken and showed no significant change in the left lung as contrasted with the previous X-ray taken March 30, 1944. The note of Dr. Schiffer is in his own handwriting, is not sarcastic in nature and was only informative to Dr. Knott as to the established procedure. It may be well to state to the committee that Dr. Knott had but recently been assigned to the Dayton facility, and was not intimately familiar with the organization and procedures followed in that specific facility.

JAMES H. COLLIER, C-4187670

I will not go into the complete history of this veteran because the committee has already been furnished a brief outlining in chronological order all the pertinent facts from the time of enlistment in the Army until the present time. This is what Mr. Maisel stated regarding the Collier case, and opposite each allegation the irrefutable facts are given:

MAISEL	FACTS
1. "* * * Entered Castle Point on December 28, 1943. I was examined then, and they decided I was a bed-rest case. I shouldn't get off the bed for any reason."	1. Physical examination, also X-ray, December 29, 1943. Twenty - four - hour bed patient with bathroom privileges in wheel chair.
2. "The next time I was examined was 7 weeks later—February 17, 1944. Then a medical board decided that I would require a lobectomy (the cutting away of the infected lobe of a lung). They decided they couldn't do the operation for me. I would have to be sent to the facility in the Bronx, in New York."	2. Case considered by tuberculosis surgical collapse board, December 30, 1943—2 days after admission to the Castle Point facility. Dr. L. R. Davidson, consultant in thoracic surgery, being present at the time, it was decided a pneumonectomy on the left was the advised procedure. X-ray January 14, 1944—17 days after admission. Patient did not give consent for operation until January 15, 1944.
3. "So they handed me my valise and told me to get dressed. They didn't send anyone with me. No ambulance. I took a taxi to the Beacon station and the train to New York. Then I took streetcars to the Bronx and walked through the hospital grounds to the admitting office."	3. Patient taken from Castle Point facility to Beacon railway station in station car; taken from New York railway station to Bronx facility in station car. If he carried valise from hospital to car and from car to station it was because he elected to do so contrary to the usual procedure. Veterans' Administration chauffeurs are instructed to render this service to patients.
4. "When I got there they hadn't any knowledge of me. My papers hadn't been sent ahead. No one knew that I was on 'bed rest' or that I had a pneumothorax. It was 10 days after I got there that I finally yelled so much that they refilled my pneumothorax. They made me go to meals	4. Bronx facility fully advised of Patient Collier's scheduled arrival and condition before he left Castle Point facility. Seen promptly by physician upon arrival, X-ray ordered, given complete physical examination on the following day; transferred on second day to tuberculosis ward; placed on

MAISEL	FACTS
and wash up just like all the other walking cases."	tray service upon admission; given pneumothorax refill third day after admission; repeated 5 days later and repeated again within a week. On 24-hour bed rest from January 26, date of admission, until February 23, 1944, at which time he was placed on 20-hour bed rest due to improved condition, but continued on tray service until March 8, when he was permitted ward dining room privileges.
5. "Then, when the doctors finally got around to examining me, they decided that my 'good lung' had gone bad. Either I never should have been sent for the operation or all the traveling and exercise broke down the 'good lung.' They told me that they couldn't operate on me in that condition. So, on March 25, they sent me back to Castle Point—the same way I was sent down—alone and toting my own valise."	5. The X-ray of the chest taken on December 29, 1943, showed no tuberculous involvement of the right lung. One month later, however, on January 26, 1944, the X-ray indicated a small area of infiltration in the contra-lateral side, particularly in the third anterior intercostal space, which caused the consultant in thoracic surgery (Dr. L. R. Davidson), who had seen the patient at Castle Point prior to his transfer to the Bronx, to decide against the pneumonectomy which he recommended before the transfer of the patient to the Bronx facility. On transfer from the Bronx facility to the Castle Point facility, patient Collier was taken from Bronx facility to railroad station in car, met at railroad station in Beacon, N. Y., and taken to Castle Point facility in station car.
6. "Since then I've been examined only three times: The day I got back here, on June 27, and on October 1. The doctors won't tell me what my trip did to me, but some of the nurses say it set me back at least six months."	6. Patient Collier had a complete physical examination on March 15, 1944, an examination of the chest on May 31, August 1, and October 3, 1944. He was given a complete cardiac examination on October 23, November 11, December 28, 1944, and January 13, 1945. He was also seen by the eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist in consultation May 15, May 30, November 25, 1944, and January 22, 1945. The Surgical Collapse Board reviewed his case March 16 and June 27, 1944, and July 4, 1944, at which time Dr. Charles W. Lester, the consultant in thoracic surgery, also reviewed it. His case was again reviewed by the Surgical Collapse Board September 26, 1944, when left thorocoplasty was recommended. The Chief of the Surgical Service examined Collier October 14, 1944, and reviewed the case with the consultant in thoracic surgery on October 17, 1944, at which time he was scheduled for the first stage of thorocoplasty. X-rays were made June 20, September 21, October 23, November 6, December 27, 1944, January 9 and February 4, 1945, as well as numerous laboratory examinations. At the time Collier was transferred to the Bronx facility he was afebrile. The medical staff at the Castle Point facility does not consider that the train trip from Beacon to New York at an elapse of time of approximately 1 hour and 20 minutes could have injured his lung in any way or caused any extension of his tuberculous condition. The clinical file and the staff report indicate quite favorable progress in the tuberculous process since his return to Castle Point and the completion of the three stages of thorocoplasty. The ward surgeon's notes and nurse's notes reveal no complaints from patient Collier until after his marriage June 30, 1944, and only three or four minor complaints since that time. There is nothing to indicate any neglect of this patient at any time during his period of hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities. Every procedure in connection with his treatment and transfer to and from the Bronx facility was carried out.

I believe the committee is now in a position to judge the entire article by comparing the statements made by Mr. Maisel in the two above-mentioned cases with the facts as shown from the official records of the Veterans' Administration. However, for purposes of the record we shall now return to the general statements, some italicized, in the opening portion of Mr. Maisel's article:

2. "Yet only one patient in six ever leaves these beautiful buildings as 'cured.'"

3. "Only three out of five complete their hospitalization and win even the label of 'improved.' The rest die or are discharged as 'unimproved,' or run away to enter other hospitals or to suffer and die quietly at home."

The term "cured" is rather loosely used by certain uninformed laymen and I regret to say even by some hospitals and physicians. In Veterans' Administration hospitals a patient is discharged as cured only when the condition for which he had been treated has actually reached that stage. Acute diseases will frequently result in a cure after hospitalization but most chronic diseases will actually only be improved. This is especially true of tuberculosis and nervous and mental disabilities. In our tuberculosis hospitals, if we are to follow the National Tuberculosis Association classification, no patient can be discharged as even apparently cured for this requires the resumption of the normal activity of the patient for a 2-year period under the usual routine of life without any constitutional symptoms of the pulmonary disease developing. At this time I desire to introduce into the record a copy of the table Domiciliary and Hospital Discharges of United States Veterans Showing Results of Hospital Treatment and Type of Patient, Fiscal Year 1944.

You will note that among the general medical and surgical cases for that year 13.6 percent were discharged from the hospital as cured, 58.2 percent as improved, and but 6.2 percent were unimproved. The condition on discharge was not stated in 15.7 percent, and 7.3 percent died. Regarding the neuropsychiatric patients discharged, 5.3 percent were discharged as cured, 54.4 percent as improved, 20.8 percent as unimproved, and 6.8 percent died. The condition on discharge was not stated in 12.7 percent. Among the tuberculous patients discharged 2.9 percent were arrested, 1.1 apparently arrested, 1 percent quiescent, 28.7 percent showed improvement, and 28.5 percent were unimproved; 19.7 percent died, while the condition was not stated in 15.9 percent.

Among the younger veterans of World War II suffering with pulmonary tuberculosis discharged during the fiscal year 1944, of 4,075 patients discharged during that year 164, or 4 percent, were discharged as arrested; 88, or 2.2 percent, were discharged apparently arrested; 60, or 1.5 percent, were discharged as quiescent; and 1,360, or 33.4 percent, were discharged as improved.

While those discharged as improved from our hospitals were still active insofar as their clinical status in conformity with the National Tuberculosis Association classification was concerned, approximately 70 percent of them had a negative sputum at time of discharge and in the majority of instances these patients were also free of constitutional symptoms. In many State, county, and private tuberculosis institutions a patient free of constitutional symptoms and with sputum negative for tubercle bacilli is discharged as quiescent. Among the younger World War II veterans, whose average age is around 25 years, 12 percent were discharged as arrested, apparently arrested, and quiescent during the fiscal year 1944, while in the group of veterans of other wars and the Regular Establishment, whose average age was about 52 years, over 6 percent were discharged as arrested, apparently arrested, and quiescent. Therefore, actually for the fiscal year 1944, of the patients discharged alive, almost 65 percent were discharged with the pulmonary condition either arrested, apparently arrested, quiescent, or improved.

You will be interested in the mortality rate and the results of treatment of a number of representative State, county, and municipal tuberculosis hospitals, several of which were mentioned by Mr. Maisel in his article as practicing first-class medicine "on the other side of town" and to acquaint you with the comparative data, one with another and with our tuberculosis hospitals, I

desire to place in the RECORD a comparative analysis of miscellaneous data on non-Federal tuberculosis hospitals and tuberculosis facilities of the Veterans' Administration." When you have an opportunity, compare our mortality rate of 19.7 percent in 1944 with a number of the others. (Explain tuberculosis mortality rates for white male and female and nonwhite male and female by age groups through use of mortality chart.)

For the fiscal year 1944, of the veterans of World War I and World War II discharged from hospital or domiciliary care, 8 percent of the World War I patients left the hospital against medical advice or absent without official leave. For the World War II group, 18 percent of the cases left the hospital in this manner. A break-down of these percentages indicates among the general type of patients 6 percent of the World War I group and 14 percent of the World War II group had the hospitalization period terminated by irregular discharge. In the neuropsychiatric type of veteran, 9 percent of the World War I group left the hospital against medical advice or absent without official leave, while 20 percent of the World War II group were so discharged. In the tuberculosis type of patient, 35 percent of the World War I group and 52 percent of the World War II group terminated their hospitalization either against medical advice or absent without official leave. In this connection, attention is invited to the fact that except under unusual and exceptional circumstances patients from veterans' hospitals are not discharged while active cases of tuberculosis, except against medical advice. In most private and municipal hospitals, it is understood that discharges with advice are made in active cases when, in the judgment of discharging physicians, such type of discharge is indicated and is requested by the patient. It is also understood that in some State institutions the duration of hospitalization is limited, and it is necessary to discharge patients with advice on termination of the limited period of hospitalization to which they are entitled.

The Veterans' Administration, at the beginning of the present emergency, became cognizant (as was observed after World War I) of the reaction to freedom from restraint following release from the military and naval services, which was evidenced by the high percentage of irregular discharges among the younger veterans of World War II, particularly the tuberculosis beneficiaries when hospitalized in our facilities after discharge from the armed forces. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 1942, over 67 percent of the first 300 discharges of World War II tuberculous veterans were against medical advice, absent without official permission, or for disciplinary reasons. This was a matter of deep concern. An intensification of our intramural educational program was effected and a resurvey of our public-health and social-work procedures instituted. It has been our experience that, in those States where the local public-health and welfare agencies are more efficiently organized and the cooperation of the Veterans' Administration facilities and these agencies more effectively applied, the handling of patients who interrupt their treatment while still open and communicable cases does not constitute a problem. The Veterans' Administration facilities systematically and immediately report persons found in the course of out-patient or hospital examinations to have tuberculosis, and persons discharged with active tuberculosis in any form, to their own State health department for transmission to the appropriate county health department in the case of State residents and the appropriate State health department in the case of nonresidents.

Unfortunately, many States have indicated that not all of their county health departments are equipped to use these reports to advantage; that is, they do not have the personnel or funds to interpret to the members of the household their urgent need for physical examinations or to offer them such, nor can they maintain supervision of veterans discharged with active tuberculosis. Undoubtedly, in some areas the tuberculous veterans living at home are regarded as the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration solely. It should be remembered that veterans, whether their disabilities are service-connected or non-service-connected, are citizens of the community in which they are resident, and, as such, eligible and entitled to the same services from the public health department as other residents of the community. They should likewise be amenable to the same regulatory restrictions in communicable diseases as are applied to nonveterans by the local public health authorities. Similar measures to insure adherence to health regulations should be invoked with recalcitrant tuberculous veterans as with other citizens. Every effort should be expended to impress on the war disabled, suffering with active tuberculosis, the necessity of continuing indicated medical treatment until maximum benefit has been attained.

Those hospitals where social workers have been assigned have been directed to supplement official reports with requests directed to local social and health agencies for the prompt examination of persons who may have been exposed to the disease and prompt medical and social supervision of patients who have been discharged with active tuberculosis, with a view to encouraging rehospitalization of the latter at the first opportunity.

Adequacy of the private social case work and health agencies of the home community to which the Veterans' Administration social worker can turn, which are in a position to give prompt response and collaboration, also greatly facilitates the effective meeting of acute social problems when they threaten to force the patient to leave the hospital. Whatever can be done to strengthen such local agencies and whatever encouragement can be given those agencies to include veterans among the groups which they serve, will permit more effective service to hospitalized veterans by Veterans' Administration personnel.

The Army and the Navy are assisting materially and cooperating to the fullest extent with the Veterans' Administration in impressing the soldier or sailor with the seriousness of his tuberculous disease and the necessity for early definitive treatment. Medical officers of the military and naval services have been instructed by their respective Surgeons General to use the weeks pending separation from the service as a period of essential education to the soldier or sailor. The necessity for continued treatment in the Veterans' Administration facility on his transfer there after discharge from the service until a complete arrest of the disease is attained, is being impressed upon the discharged service man or woman.

The United States Public Health Service has rendered effective assistance and, at its recent conference of State health officers, presented the subject of the adequacy of reporting methods as it relates to tuberculous veterans as one of the major topics for discussion.

The American Legion has actively embarked upon an educational campaign among its own members and members of its auxiliary, to engender an intelligent and sympathetic understanding on the part of ex-service men and women in the problems of the tuberculous veteran. Service officers of the Legion and interested workers of the American Legion Auxiliary receive instruction on tuberculosis and its control. The American Legion, early in its campaign, solicited the expert advice of the National Tuberculosis Association in formulating its program and in securing closer cooperation with State and local health authorities.

Other ex-service organizations and individuals interested in tuberculosis control have contributed their share in the awakening of an awareness to the need for concerted action. It is believed some results are discernible. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 1943, 1,311 World War II tuberculous veterans were discharged from all hospitals, 61 percent without the consent of the physician. During the fiscal year 1944, this irregular discharge rate had dropped to 52 percent of all discharges of World War II veterans and it has further declined until by the end of the calendar year 1944 (December 31, 1944), the irregular discharges among these veterans of World War II had fallen to 41 percent of all discharges.

The educational program actively under way in our facilities includes individual instruction, group teaching, radio talks, motion-picture demonstrations, display of posters, distribution of books and other material dealing with tuberculosis, written for patients; a question box with periodic answers by radio, round-table discussions, and the encouragement of the reading of pamphlets and leaflets from the National Tuberculosis Association, the United States Public Health Service, and other organizations. The more popular methods are alternated with those less popular in a well-planned program so as to provide diversification and relieve the monotony of long-continued and sometimes stereotyped routine programs which often become ineffective, notwithstanding a popular introduction. Informal talks to small groups of patients by the physician, participated in by the social worker, with encouragement of questions about the disease, its nature, course, and treatment, the meaning of the symptoms, the prevention of its spread, and the bringing out of misconceptions about it harbored by the patients, have proven worth while. Visiting relatives have been invited to participate at some stations or separate talks are given them.

4. "Doctors, so overloaded that they could give the average patient only 7 minutes' attention a week. Not 7 minutes a day, mind you—7 minutes a week."

No two patients in a hospital require the same amount of daily attention by the physician attending his case. Many cases, particularly those who are seriously or critically ill, may occupy hours daily of the physician's time, while the chronic case who is convalescing satisfactorily may require less than a minute of a physician's time during the day. A patient undergoing operative procedure under general or spinal anesthesia requires in our hospitals the time of not less than three physicians for from an hour to several hours, depending on the nature and seriousness of the operation. Many hours a day are spent by physicians studying the X-ray and laboratory findings, reviewing temperature charts and the observation notations of nurses and auxiliary workers concerning the individual patient—time not spent in actual contact with the patient but decidedly in the interest of the patient and his condition in the clinics, laboratories, and wards of the hospital. Nor does Mr. Maisel seem to understand that a physician spends all of each 24 hours with or at the call of his patients. Or that even while shaving in the morning, sitting at meals, or attending church or the theater the symptomatology of his patients is constantly in his thoughts and he is subconsciously cataloging the diagnoses and outlining the treatment he proposes to follow. Contrary to the practice at some highly reputable civilian hospitals, the Veterans' Administration requires its physicians to see every patient at least once daily. There has been no change in this established practice and an analysis made at our tuberculosis hospitals

in the last few weeks demonstrates that the physicians are averaging from 30 minutes to 2 hours weekly with each patient assigned to their care.

5. "Found nurses so negligent that they did not even bother to wash their hands after examining one patient with a contagious disease and before turning to another."

Perhaps this allegation can best be answered in the words of the manager of one of our facilities:

"He (Maisel) speaks of negligent nurses. Now nurses being what they are—just human beings—I can conceive of some of them being as dumb as Mr. Maisel charges them with being, but I have never known such, nor do we have any of that kind at this facility. Of course, their efficiency varies, as does the efficiency in any other group of employees of a similar number. My observation, over a period of several years, convinces me that the Veterans' Administration has been particularly fortunate in obtaining the services of an unusually high type of nurses."

The allegation of Mr. Maisel is so fundamentally at variance with the training of a nurse and the necessity of these practices for her own protection that it warrants no serious consideration.

6. "A minority—devoted to their patients and doing their very best, but so overloaded with work and so hog-tied by administrative restrictions that they freely confessed their best could not possibly be good enough."

Concerning administrative restrictions, it is admitted that the Veterans' Administration physician has to do far more paper work than the average physician in civilian hospitals, but there is for consideration the fact that every Veterans' Administration patient is not only a medical problem but is potentially at least a prospective beneficiary of monetary consideration through pension, compensation, insurance, etc., offered by the Veterans' Administration. For this reason reports and records are of necessity more comprehensive and more complete than those usually kept in nonveterans hospitals. All of our hospitals are surveyed by the American College of Surgeons for recognition by that college. All are recognized. There has been no indication from the surveys conducted by the college that the records maintained by the Veterans' Administration are too voluminous.

7. "Found many doctors who could hold no position in any well-run hospital: Cynical men who joked to me about their patients' miseries; incompetent men who rejected, offhand, every modern advance in medicine."

Let us examine the qualifications of the staffs of one of each of the three classes of hospitals; and since one with the knowledge of hospitals attained by Mr. Maisel might suggest that the staffs by the smaller hospitals are less qualified than those in the larger hospitals, we will choose the smaller hospitals.

Fort Bayard, N. Mex., 305-bed tuberculosis hospital:

Lt. Col. A. G. Walker, M. C., manager: Graduate M. D. University of Colorado. Specialized in the treatment of tuberculosis in Government hospitals including United States Army hospitals, United States Public Health Service hospitals, and Veterans' Administration hospitals for the past 25 years, 20 of which have been as a hospital administrator.

Lt. Col. W. C. Nalty, M. C., clinical director: Is a graduate of Creighton University; is a fellow of the American College of Physicians. Has been a specialist in tuberculosis engaged in tuberculosis work exclusively for 16 years and has held the position of chief of medical service, and, or, clinical director for the past 6 years.

Maj. C. C. Keeler, M. C., chief of surgical service: Is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons (for the past 15 years), and has been a surgeon performing major surgical operations for the past 25 years, in United States Army, United States Public Health Service, and Veterans' Administration hospitals for the past 28 years. Frequent postgraduate work and visits to the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, Minn., have kept him abreast of all current surgical procedure.

Maj. Harry Lazar, M. C., chief, reception service: Is a graduate of Lewis Institute in Chicago, Ill., with a B. S. degree; University of Illinois School of Medicine. He held an internship in Cook County Hospital, Chicago, Ill., and since completion of his internship has been on duty as a medical officer in the United States Army assigned to duty in the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Veterans' Administration.

Maj. Joseph Zausner, M. C., pathologist: Is a graduate of the University of Vienna Medical School, 1936. Had a residency at New York City Cancer Institute and Hospital and Brooklyn Cancer Institute; 2 years internship in surgery, United States Public Health Service hospital; 2 years rotating internship at United States Penitentiary Hospital, Atlanta, Ga., and 2 years assistant surgeon in charge of general medicine at the United States Penitentiary Hospital, Atlanta, Ga.

Capt. William H. Crays, M. C., chief of tuberculosis service and roentgenologist: Is a graduate of the University of Indiana, 1936; internship Baltimore Marine Hospital (United States Public Health Service); resident physician Indiana State Sanatorium. Has done tuberculosis work as a specialist in tuberculosis since that time, except for 1 year at which time he had recognized residency in radiology under the auspices of the Veterans' Administration.

Capt. Henry L. Dorfmann, M. C.: Is a graduate of the University of Edinburgh, Scotland; served internships at Harlem and Broad Street Hospitals, New York City; resident pathologist at Sea View Hospital; also resident in chest diseases at that hospital, then did private practice until time of entry into the United States Army, during which time he was associate physician in charge of chest at Stuyvesant Polyclinic Hospital, New York City; chief of the tuberculosis clinic at Gouverneur Hospital; clinical assistant visiting in chest at Mount Sinai Hospital, New York City, and a member of the thoracic group at that hospital, as well as consultant physician in diseases of the chest at Manhattan General Hospital and also held the rank of attending physician at that hospital with his own service. Also, served on the staff of Sea View Hospital as associate attending physician and a member of the New York City Board of Health in charge of pneumothorax therapy. He is a fellow of the American College of Chest Physicians and a fellow of the Trudeau Society and was rated by the New York State Compensation Board as specialist in tuberculosis.

Capt. Harold Klein, M. C., neuropsychiatrist: He is a diplomate of National Board of Medical Examiners and a fellow of the Psychiatric Association. He is a graduate of the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, and prior to entry on duty in the Veterans' Administration, between the years of 1937 and 1941 had training in various internships and residencies in pediatrics and communicable diseases.

Capt. George L. Marbry, M. C., eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist: He is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, B. A. degree in 1937 and M. D. in 1939; had 1 year's internship at the University of Wisconsin. He is a member of the American Medical Association and Wisconsin Medical Association. He was engaged in general practice of medicine for 2 years and had special training in eye, ear, nose, and throat work—ophthalmology and otolaryngology, under the auspices of the Veterans' Administration.

First Lt. Gerhard S. Wickler, M. C.: He is a graduate of the Medical Faculty of the University of Berlin; served an internship of 1 year. After that held positions as a resident physician, senior resident and assistant director in various hospitals in Germany, devoted to specialized training in gynecology and obstetrics. For 4 years held a position as a resident of the Jewish Consumptives' Relief Society, during which time a thorough familiarization with the diseases of the chest, especially tuberculosis, was achieved; also, the technique of penumothorax treatment, aspirations, and so forth. After this and until induction into the Army Medical Corps, time was spent in practice of general medicine.

Capt. Albert Morene, D. C., chief dental officer: He is a graduate of the North Pacific Dental College with degree of D. M. D. 1923. Was in the private practice of dentistry from 1924 to 1934. Since 1935 he has been on duty in Veterans' Administration facilities.

White River Junction, Vt., 188-bed general medical and surgical hospital:

The chief medical officer was in the United States Public Health Service at the beginning of World War I and has been in the Veterans' Administration or some of its predecessors ever since. He was for many years chief of the medical service at the Bronx and, according to my information, is thoroughly qualified medically and from my own personal observation is a tireless worker and constantly interested in the welfare and treatment of the patients in this hospital. The chief of the surgical service, Maj. Philip Cooper, is a fellow in the American College of Surgeons. Maj. Harry Warshawsky, chief of the medical service, has a certificate from the American Board of Internal Medicine, is an associate in the American Medical Association. Maj. Leo Birnbaum, chief of the outpatient and reception service, is a diplomate in psychiatry of the American Board of Neurology and Psychiatry. Capt. Jonas Weissberg, who is in the medical service and also is the pathologist and roentgenologist, is a diplomate of the American Board of Internal Medicine and Cardio Vascular Disease. He is also a fellow in the American Medical Association.

Canandaigua, N. Y., 1,435-bed neuropsychiatric hospital:

Capt. A. P. Constantine, M. C.: Holds master of arts and doctor of medicine degrees; has a license to practice medicine and surgery in Texas and New York. Member of county and state medical societies as well as a member of the American Medical Association; is certified as a qualified psychiatrist and is a member of American Psychiatric Association. Held membership in the Colorado Neurological Society, the American Soviet Medical Society and the American Association for Advancement of Science. Has served over 3 years in large mental hospitals, 2 years of which in a New York State hospital, which is approved by the American Medical Association for training in psychiatry, in addition to a year of rotating internship; also served on the staff of Neurological Institute; Vanderbilt Clinic, Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center, New York. Was in charge of a large service of about 600 patients, administered electro-shock therapy and other forms of therapies, and served on a child-guidance clinic.

Donald F. Mueller, M. D.: B. A. degree, University of Iowa, 1932; M. D. degree, University of Iowa, 1936; licensed to practice medicine in State of Iowa, 1937; rotating internship for 12 months, 1936–37, St. Francis Hospital, Evanston, Ill.; house physician, St. Francis Hospital, Freeport, Ill., 1937–1938; resident physician, Decatur and Macon County Hospital, Decatur, Ill., mixed residency, 10 months; assistant to general practitioner in Iowa for 9 months; staff physician, Fort Wayne State school, Fort Wayne, Ind., November 1939–January 1941; commissioned in Indiana National Guard December 1940; postgraduate instruction in obstetrics, Chicago Maternity Center, Chicago, Ill., January–May 1942.

Capt. Frederick S. Panno, M. C.: Received moderate training in tuberculosis under the supervision of expert authorities, and received

the degree of doctor in medicine and surgery at the Royal University of Naples; interned at the International Medical Center, New York City; completed an 18 months rotating internship at the Columbus Hospital in New York City and following that became an assistant clinic physician; later resident at the New York City Farm Colony Hospital and later contract surgeon for the Civilian Conservation Corps, stationed in Louisiana; trained at Veterans' Administration, Aspinwall Pa., part of which time was spent on tuberculosis ward, at the end of the training period was sent to Veterans' Administration, Bedford, Mass., where he remained 9 months under the supervision of well-trained psychiatrists; transferred to Veterans' Administration, Canandaigua, N. Y., in 1942.

Capt. B. Bobowise, M. C.: Graduated from the Loyola University School of Medicine, Chicago, Ill., and then served a rotating internship at the Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington, D. C.; following this worked as a resident physician in a southern hospital for 2 years and then accepted a position as a physician in a State mental institution and in conjunction with this position gave time as clinical instructor in psychiatry and neurology at the Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, Va. In the summer of 1942 became associated with the Veterans' Administration.

First Lt. Julius Cinder, M. C.: Graduate of the University of Texas with a bachelor of arts, graduating summa cum laude; following this attended the Anderson College of Medicine, Glasgow, Scotland, and received the equivalent to the M. D. degree; passed the State Board Examinations of New York State and served a rotating general internship at the Morrisannia General Hospital of New York City for 15 months; thereafter entered private practice of medicine and attended a post-graduate course in allergy at Stuyvesant Polyclinic and Gouverneur Hospitals; was a member of the medical staff of Gouverneur Hospital in clinical allergy, also a member of the Associated Allergy Clinics of Greater New York; subsequently entered the Veterans' Administration and was given a course of training at the Facility in Pittsburgh.

First Lt. Samuel Wolfe Doskof, M. C.: University of Alabama, A. B.; University of Geneva, Switzerland, M. D., ranked second in class; received license to practice medicine and surgery in New York State in 1935; rotating general internship at Meadowbrook Hospital, Hempstead, L. I.; resident in pathology at Meadowbrook Hospital, Hempstead, L. I.; autopsy and cancer work stressed in association with members of staff of Memorial Hospital, New York City; private practice for 7 years; assistant physician in allergy at Queens General Hospital, Jamaica, L. I.; member of staff of Queens General Hospital, Parsons Hospital, and entered Army on December 26, 1944.

First Lt. M. Zelman, M. C.: Johns Hopkins University, College of Arts and Science, Baltimore, Md., A. B. degree; New York Medical College, Flower Fifth Avenue Hospital, New York, N. Y., M. D. degree; rotating internship, Harlem Hospital, New York, N. Y.; surgical residency, Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Ill.; surgical residency, Mount Sinai Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio; surgical residency, Beth El Hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y.

These staffs are representative of the physicians in the various Veterans' Administration hospitals. At a later date the qualifications of every physician assigned to the Medical and Hospital Service of the Veterans' Administration will be made available to the committee.

8. "Seen desperately sick veterans served food so cold that it would be indignantly rejected in the worst Bowery flophouse."

Mr. Maisel in his article made some comment about the food at the Castle Point facility, and it is assumed that he is basing his opinion principally on observations made on a visit to that station. I have previously brought to your attention the menu at the Castle Point facility on the date of Mr. Maisel's visit; also the report of Dr. Pattison, who visited the facility on March 9, 1945. The total patient census of the Castle Point facility on March 17, 1945, was 632. Every patient in the hospital on that date was contacted by the manager and requested to submit any complaints concerning the food or treatment being received. Of this number about 5 percent indicated that either the temperature of the food, character of the menu, or the method of preparation was not to their liking.

Continuous effort has been made over a period of months to overcome any possible complaint of lukewarm or cold food at Castle Point. At the time the subsistence supervisor from central office visited the station, when the centralized tray service was instituted, she made various suggestions that have been quite rigidly adhered to. The tray carts are heated for 45 minutes prior to the insertion of the set-up tray. At her suggestion small amounts of meat and vegetables are placed in the serving units at one time. The remainder of the meat and vegetables is kept hot on the ranges. As the meat and vegetables in the serving units are depleted by the setting up of the trays additional small amounts are placed in the serving units from the heated vegetables and meats on the ranges. The time consumed in setting up the trays and placing the heated aluminum covers over the plates is very small and the heated tray is placed in the heated conveyor. In timing the length of time consumed in the main kitchen in setting up all trays for delivery to all wards it is found that the time varies from 45 minutes to 1 hour depending on the type of meals served and the number of different articles that are placed on the tray. As of March 17, 1945, 414 patients are fed by tray service, which would mean that the rate of delivery of trays from the serving line to the tray carriers should vary from 6.7 to 9.4 per minute. The heated conveyors are immediately taken to the wards and the trays delivered to the patients.

At the time Mr. Maisel visited Castle Point conditions in the dietetic department were not satisfactory. However, the unsatisfactory conditions at Castle Point at that time did not obtain through Veterans' Administration facilities. This subject will be dealt with more fully later on.

9. "Seen those same veterans charged unconscionably high prices by racketeering concessionaires, permitted to operate within the hospitals by complacent superintendents."

At the majority of our hospitals there is a patient's supply store or canteen operated by a private concessionaire on contract for the space used. Prices for all articles are posted and approved by the manager of the individual facility. These concessions are subject to the price ceilings of the Office of Price Administration and none are in excess of these ceiling prices. There have been and still are some individuals who complain from time to time about the prices charged for certain articles and some patients have claimed that they are excessive. However, the concessionaire is not always able to compete with chain-store prices on certain articles at certain times, yet prices compare favorably with those charged in individually owned stores in the locality and in many instances the prices charged for articles are below those charged in local stores.

It is assumed Mr. Maisel's allegations concerning concessions are wholly founded upon conditions he found at Castle Point. At that time the Veterans' Administration had experienced difficulty with the operation of the station canteen and had been unable to negotiate a contract with a satisfactory person for operation of the canteen. The manager reported on May 8, 1944, that they had experienced considerable trouble in the operation of the canteen; that many complaints had been received from patients and organizations, and as a result of these complaints he appointed a board of investigation to make a thorough unbiased inquiry into conditions in the canteen; that the board appointed found that strict sanitation had not been maintained in the canteen and that a reasonable effort had not been made to protect food from contamination; that the place, particularly the kitchen and appurtenances, were in an unsatisfactory condition, and these conditions had been brought to the attention of the concessionaire on several occasions by the manager, and that in view of the findings of the board he recommended immediate cancellation of the contract. A central office investigation was conducted. It disclosed that the operation of the canteen had been very unsatisfactory and that the concessionaire was not a desirable person to operate it.

Following the investigation more trouble was experienced in finding persons interested in bidding for the contract and about this time it was decided to recondition the space used for the concession and this further delayed making a contract. However, on completion of the reconditioning of this space a satisfactory contract was made with Mr. George Alley and, according to the manager's reports, there have been no complaints concerning the operation of the canteen since the contract was awarded to Mr. Alley.

10. "Seen men denied surgery they needed, denied modern treatments that could have cured them—and even sneered at by officials for presuming to ask for these things."

The charge that patients are denied surgical and other treatments that they need is one which should be further explained by the author of the article. So far as is known no patient has been denied surgery or other treatment that, in the opinion of the medical staff, should be instituted. Occasionally a patient is desirous of obtaining surgical treatment which, in the opinion of the physicians and sugeon, is contraindicated in his case. This is especially true among general cases who are requesting surgical interference in gastrointestinal conditions of purely functional origin and in occasional nose and throat cases. It is certainly a function of the physicians and surgeons to decide on the necessity of operation and it is extremely injudicious to perform an operation simply because a patient thinks he would like to have one performed. No patient is qualified to make such a decision for himself. It is fully a matter for the decision of qualified medical personnel. It is our experience that instead of being denied surgical treatment many patients refuse to submit to surgical treatment which is recommended and definitely indicated.

At this time it might be well to point out to the committee that with the case of patient Collier at the Castle Point facility, where surgery was considered for unilateral far advanced pulmonary tuberculosis, in mind a pneumonectomy or lobectomy is a serious surgical operation requiring the skill of a thoracic surgeon of many years' experience. The indications for these operations in tuberculosis are specific and few, and for determination require a careful study of serial chest X-ray films. If there is any spread of the tuberculosis to the other side the operation is contraindicated for the essential purpose of the pneumonectomy or lobectomy is not met, i. e., removal of the infected lung before there is a spread to the contralateral side.

11. "Gone to the other side of a town and entered a State or county hospital just as tied down by Government restrictions, just as hard up under a labor shortage. Yet in these places, run at far lower cost, I have found real doctors practicing real medicine. I have found lower death rates, higher cure rate, and smiling, hopeful, happy patients."

I hope this committee will seek evidence beyond my testimony on this subject by

visiting as many Veterans' Administration hospitals and State, county, and municipal hospitals as necessary in order to compare the service of the latter with the former. I do not propose to criticize the excellent service being rendered in any State, county or municipal hospital. I merely want to point out to you that frequently they all do not have the facilities nor the funds to render the treatment that the Veterans' Administration can give. If you will again refer to the table on "Comparative Analysis of Miscellaneous Data of New Federal Tuberculosis Hospitals and Tuberculosis Hospitals of the Veterans' Administration" which I introduced into the record some minutes ago you will note that several county and State hospitals which Mr. Maisel stated were practicing first-class medicine appear on that chart. I refer particularly to the Worcester County, Mass., sanatorium; the Jefferson County sanatorium at Beaumont, Tex.; Glen Lake in Minnesota; and the New York group of hospitals. Compare if you will the death rates, the ratio of personnel to patients, the raw food and per diem costs and the ultimate treatment results of the tuberculosis hospitals listed, which are fairly representative of the entire country, with Veterans' Administration hospitals and I believe your critical analysis will show that our hospitals compare favorably with the county, State and municipal hospitals on "the other side of town."

14 to 20. "That the last published report of the Veterans' Administration showed over 10,000 men treated for tuberculosis and discharged from the hospitals during the fiscal year, but only 233 discharged as arrested cases, 2.3 percent—less than 1 arrest achieved out of every 43. That State hospitals achieved an arrested condition in 25.6 percent of all the patients they discharged—more than 11 times that of the Veterans' Administration.

"That of all veterans treated for tuberculosis by the Veterans' Administration, only 3.67 percent are discharged as 'quiescent.' 'apparently arrested,' or 'arrested,' but that New York State's hospitals discharged 48.1 in these classifications—14 times the record of the Veterans' Administration, and Worcester County Sanatorium, Massachusetts, brings 51.7 percent of its patients into the quiescent stage or better.

"That for the last recorded fiscal year 1943 a total of 1,117 patients completed treatment and were discharged alive; nearly 200 of these were discharged as unimproved and 1,922 died in these hospitals of TB.

"That in the event a man completes treatment the chances are nearly 2-to-1 that he will be carried out in a coffin.

"That the condition recited above is no war-created situation, actually the Veterans' Administration has been achieving this record year after year for two decades and the record is worse than the figures quoted.

"That of the total included more than 58 percent never complete treatment at all, they leave 'against medical advice' or 'a. w. o. l.'"

Here again Mr. Maisel either through ignorance of tuberculosis statistics or because of ill-advised coaching by an inept statistician, juggled Veterans' Administration data so as to make it read what he would have it prove. In citing data he failed to point out:

1. The relative importance and influence of certain variables should be borne in mind when one evaluates immediate sanatorium results and hospital mortality rates.

2. Numerous sanatoria admit only persons of certain ages, color, race, and economic status. Frequently they limit their admissions to individuals suffering with minimal lesions of the disease. A few retain patients for a specified and limited time only. Nor have uniform diagnostic standards and classification of the disease in various stages and clinical status been universally adopted by various sanatoria through the country. In those sanatoria that accept patients as they come—in which class the Veterans' Administration tuberculosis facilities unreservedly fall—it is a fact well recognized by most phthisiologists that approximately 25 percent of the cases admitted are so far advanced that they are beyond help and die while under treatment.

3. The comparison of immediate results of two institutions is hazardous. The comparative method is always liable to errors, because to obtain satisfactory results one should be able "to contrast," as in an experiment, two or more sets of figures which resemble each other in all or some of the essential points; and which only differ on that one point with which the formulation of the question has to deal. In the case of sanatorium treatment, the circumstances are particularly complicated because the patients in sanatoria are always a carefully selected group and it is practically impossible to make the same selection of patients for two comparative groups.

4. The psychology of the disabled exserviceman is so different from that of individuals, not so disabled, conclusions about the result of treatment in our tuberculosis hospitals are not believed to be comparable with the results of similar work with civilians.

5. The proportion of deaths occurring in sanatoria is closely tied up with the type of patients admitted and with the stage of disease of patients admitted with pulmonary tuberculosis.

6. For the 12-month period, October 1, 1941, to September 30, 1942, inclusive, which is the period Mr. Maisel is covering, there were 7,701 admissions of tuberculous patients to our 13 tuberculosis hospitals. Of this number, 5,477 or 71.1 percent were far advanced, 1,782 or 23.2 percent moderately advanced and but 442 or 5.7 percent were in the minimal stage of the disease, and that the average age of the almost exclusively male admissions was almost 50.

7. According to Bogen, the death risk for moderately advanced cases is about three times that of the minimal cases, while that for the far advanced cases is nearer 10 times that figure.

8. Deaths in our tuberculosis hospitals have been kept at a low rate of occurrence in spite of an increasing number of older patients under treatment, a rising number of patients admitted with far advanced tuberculosis and the introduction of surgical procedures involving operative risks.

9. The mortality rates are lower and the clinical results better in female patients in the later age groups than among male patients, after age 25.

10. The Veterans' Administration during the fiscal year 1942 and for sometime prior to that year were treating almost exclusively male patients in the age group over 40 years.

21. "In 1942—according to the written admission of Dr. Charles M. Griffith, Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration—1,120 World War I veterans died in veterans' hospitals and 1,203 died outside, 'while in receipt of compensation or pension on account of tuberculosis.'"

On December 31, 1944, 51,105 World War I veterans were receiving compensation for service-connected tuberculosis. Of these cases of service-connected tuberculosis, 85 percent were in the arrested stage of the disease. In addition, 9,868 World War I veterans were receiving total permanent pension for non-service-connected tuberculosis and 178 World War I veterans were drawing emergency officers' retirement pay for tuberculosis. The total of veterans of World War I on the pension, compensation, and retirement rolls for tuberculosis was 61,151. About 5 percent of these were hospitalized on December 31, 1944. It may be well to state that the medical director in the communication to which Mr. Maisel refers indicated that 1,203 veterans in receipt of compensation on account of tuberculosis died outside of veterans' hospitals. It was not stated in that communication nor was it the intention of the medical director to imply that these 1,203 veterans who died in 1942 while in receipt of compensation on account of tuberculosis died of tuberculosis. Certainly, 85 percent of these veterans who died outside of the hospital had arrested pulmonary tuberculosis and no active manifestation of the disease. Death in a vast majority of these 1,203 cases were due to accidents and natural causes other than tuberculosis, such as heart disease, malignancy, and certain degenerative diseases.

For the information of the committee, I desire to introduce into the record certain tables indicating the normal death rate for tuberculosis by age groups. Table No. 1 represents the number of tuberculosis patients remaining in the hospital on June 30, 1942 and 1943, with the admissions and deaths for those respective years. Table No. 2 represents the comparative expected tuberculosis deaths of World War I veterans for 1942 and 1943 and 1943–44. Table No. 3 gives the death rates per 100,000 estimated population by age for 1942 for all causes and pulmonary tuberculosis. Table No. 4 outlines the death rates for tuberculosis per 100,000 estimated population for all ages at 5-year periods from 1900 to 1940 and the years 1941 and 1942. Table No. 5 is a graphic representation of the mortality from tuberculosis rates per 1,000 in 1942 by age groups.

22. "The fact that nearly 60 percent of all the patients in the veterans' TB hospitals 'run away' has long been recognized as a sign that things are desperately wrong in these hospitals."

This allegation was discussed in answer to allegations 2 and 3.

23. "This first reason for the high rate of runaways is simple overcrowding."

Some months ago a consolidation of the salient data submitted by the individual tuberculosis hospitals covering a 30-day period, summarizing the causes for patients leaving the hospital against medical advice and absent without leave was made. They are listed below for ready reference:

Stated reasons for irregular discharges

1. Disliked restricted or hospital routine	7
2. Desired to go home and refused a pass on account of physical condition	7
3. Did not desire hospitalization—transferred to V. A. by Army	3
4. To evade disciplinary action (a. w. o. l)	9
5. Illness in family	6
6. Personal reasons, not divulged, or no apparent reason	6
7. Not contacted or unknown (a. w. o. l cases)	66
8. Preferred to be at home or believed they would do as well at home	28
9. Circumstances at home demanded their presence	7
10. Denied or restricted morphine	2
11. To get married or contemplating matrimony	2
12. Business reasons	2
13. Failed to return from leave (dropped a. w. o. l.)	6
14. Homesick	7
15. Believed they were able to return to work	5
16. Chronic alcoholism (a. w. o. l.)	7
17. Negative sputa, approaching arrest (a. w. o. l.)	4
18. Take treatment at home, consult private physician, or other hospital	10
19. Desired change in climate	7
20. Objected to reduction in pension while in hospital	1
21. Denied bed baths, ambulatory, ward dining room case	1
22. Denied pass to take treatment from chiropractor	1
23. Discharged for disciplinary reasons	3
24. Refused to accept thoracic surgery	1

Reasons stated by patients presently hospitalized for self-interruption of continuous treatment during previous hospitalization

1. Desired to be at home with their families or for summer months	37
2. Chronic alcoholism (a. w. o. l.)	8
3. Did not like hospital restrictions, discipline, or routine	51
4. Failed to return from leave	7
5. Dissatisfied with treatment received	6
6. Objected to cut in compensation to $8 or $20 while in hospital	21
7. Illness in family	15
8. Home conditions, business, domestic, financial	46
9. A. w. o. l., not contacted	8
10. Desired change of climate or environment	18
11. Nervousness, indefinite, homesick	12
12. Desired to try treatment at home after 1 to 5 years in hospital	29
13. Believed they were able to go to work	11
14 Stated they were encouraged to go a. w. o. l. instead of signing out A. M. A	5
15. Denied a pass	3
16. Refused special treatment—preferred treatment by private physician	5
17. Felt too well to remain in hospital	15
18. To avoid disciplinary board	8
19. Difficulty with another patient	1
20. Did not believe he had pulmonary tuberculosis	1
21. Denied M. H. B. discharge	1
22. Patient in same room snored	1
23. Disciplinary reasons	3

I might add that overcrowding is not one or has it ever been one of the conditions why patients leave the hospitals.

24. "That at the Castle Point, N. Y., facility there were 582 patients on October 3, 1944, yet Castle Point was built for 479 patients."

You will remember that Mr. Maisel visited Castle Point at the time the alteration project was under way and when it was necessary to assign more than the usual number of patients to a ward in order to progressively vacate certain areas to permit remodeling. This was merely a temporary expedient in order to minimize the interference to the patients by construction operations, and crowding was held to a minimum. This temporary condition existing at Castle Point during the construction operations would have been misleading to a visitor unless he familiarized himself with all conditions surrounding the crowding of the wards.

Comparison of the prints of the building as originally used and as now existing since completion of the alteration project shows that the building is better arranged for the comfort and treatment of the patients. Under the original plan the rooms in which the extremely ill patients were assigned were scattered throughout the entire floor, in many instances leaving the patients exposed to the heavy traffic, noise, and confusion in the corridors. Under the revised plan segregation of the patients has been arranged so that the most seriously ill or terminal patients are out of the line of traffic, being located on either end of the building, therefore being exposed to the minimum of noise and confusion. Also, the abolishing of the serving kitchen, together with its resultant noise and provision of a nourishment kitchen in another location made it possible to minimize noise on the ward. The nourishment kitchens are confined to the center of the building removed from the bed patients. Prior to alterations the bed capacity at Castle Point was 479 beds, and by the alterations it was possible to provide 625 beds, which is the established bed capacity for this station. Day rooms are provided on every floor similar to those now incorporated in new construction.

25. "That in county and State hospitals he visited he found physicians carrying nothing like the amazing burden of cases heaped upon some veterans' medical doctors; that at Minneapolis the county sanatorium, Glen Lake, had 451 patients, 11 physicians, 1 to 41 patients, but in the same county on the same day the veterans' facility could spare only 3 doctors for 179 patients in the tuberculosis pavilion."

A comparison of the TB service at Minneapolis facility with the Glen Lake Sanatorium in April 1945 indicates the bed capacity of the former to be 199 with 192 patients cared for by 3 full-time physicians, 15 graduate nurses, and 29 attendants; the bed capacity of the latter (Glen Lake Sanatorium) to be 634 with 497 patients cared for by 9 full-time physicians (excluding the director), 35 graduate nurses, and 52 practical nurses, nurses' aides, and attendants. On the basis of 9 full-time physicians the number of patients average 55 at Glen Lake as against an average of about 63 per physician in the Minneapolis facility. The services of the specialists in the general medical and surgical side of the Minneapolis facility care for the specialistic work, other than tuberculosis, required for the patients. The number of graduate nurses at Glen Lake averages 1 to 14 patients, while the graduate nurses assigned to the tuberculosis service at the Minneapolis facility averages 1 to 13.2 patients. Practical nurses, nurses' aids, and attendants at Glen Lake average 1 to 9.5 patients, and the ratio of attendants to patients at Minneapolis facility was 1 to 6.6.

26. "That the Minneapolis facility TB service was shockingly bad even by Veterans' Administration standards, and out of 125 discharges in the first 7 months of 1944, 28 left the hospital in coffins and only 27 achieved maximum hospital benefit; that 70 men went out against medical advice or AWOL and 78 percent of the men treated for tuberculosis achieved no benefit, but at Glen Lake Sanatorium three-quarters of all patients achieve a rating of 'improved' or better and discharge against medical advice accounted for less than 3 percent of all discharges."

During the year Glen Lake discharged 381 patients and 114 died. Of the 381 discharged, 70 were against medical advice, 3 disciplinary, and 27 absent without permission, totaling 100 such cases which represents 27 percent (not 3 as stated by Mr. Maisel). There were 538 patients on January 1, 1943, and 429 admissions, making a total of 967 patients treated through the year 1944. The 114 deaths represent about 12 percent of the patients treated. The tuberculosis deaths at the Minneapolis facility in 1944 represented about 11 percent of the total tuberculosis patients treated.

Of the 381 discharged alive at Glen Lake, 175 were recommended for discharge representing 33 inactive, 101 arrested, 3 apparently arrested, 12 quiescent, 1 improved, 1 unimproved, and 24 nontuberculous. Fifty-eight were discharged with the acquiescence of the hospital, representing 6 inactive, 13 arrested, 8 apparently arrested, 17 quiescent, 10 improved, 3 unimproved, and 1 nontuberculous. Combining the inactive, arrested, and apparently arrested cases recommended for discharge by the hospital, we find a total of 137 of the 381 patients discharged, or 27 percent thereof, which would be placed in the arrested classification according to our method of discharge. Fifty-seven of those whose discharge was acquiesced in by the hospital and 14 of those recommended for discharge as quiescent, improved and unimproved, would be added to the total of cases discharged against medical advice and thus bring the total patients at Glen Lake discharged against medical advice, absent without permission, etc., to 171, representing 44.9 percent of the total discharges, if their method of classification was the same as ours. In other words, we carry under disciplinary, all against-medical-advice, absent-without-permission, and misconduct, and under against-medical-advice all cases other than arrested. The Glen Lake Sanatorium discharges patients at their own request when not arrested, but does not put them under the against-medical-advice classification in all instances.

27. "That Col. Roy A. Wolford, Assistant Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration in charge of all tuberculosis hospitals, boasted to him that he had 'more tuberculosis specialists under a single control than any other outfit in the United States'; that these specialists come to them as general practitioners and are given a 4 months' orientation course at one of the facilities."

About 6 months ago Mr. Maisel interviewed me in my office in the Veterans' Administration Building. He indicated that he was interested in the tuberculosis problem and would appreciate some data on the tuberculosis hospitals. During the conversation he was informed of the approximate number of tuberculosis specialists assigned to the Veterans' Administration and in answering some of his questions regarding the procedure for obtaining new physicians for the Veterans' Administration, he was advised that young physicians who were graduates of "A" class schools and had 1 year's internship were selected from the Civil Service Register for appointment as associate physicians in the Veterans' Administration. On appointment, these associate physicians were given a 4 months' orientation course in one of our facilities before being permanently assigned to the Veterans' Administration. There was nothing in our conversation to indicate that these physicians were any more than associate physicians who work under the supervision of trained ward physicians and specialists in tuberculosis.

At least 5 years of specialistic training in tuberculosis is necessary before a physician in the Veterans' Administration can be considered for promotion to a specialist in tuberculosis. The table of organization for our tuberculosis hospitals provides for an appropriate number of the physicians as specialists in tuberculosis. Other specialists such as eye, ear, nose, and throat, roentgenology and neuropsychiatry are also assigned. In addition, there are a number of the younger physicians included on the staff of each hospital who are undergoing training in tuberculosis under these specialists.

28. "That the vast majority of the physicians he interviewed were tired or cynical men whose only goal seemed to be to finish the day's work and get home."

With approximately 2,000 physicians in the Veterans' Administration, it would be unusual if we did not have a few physicians such as described by Mr. Maisel. However, without more specific information identifying the physicians to which he refers, we can neither affirm nor deny that he would meet a few of this type. As assistant medical director in charge of the tuberculosis hospitals, I know from my own personal knowledge that the conditions spoken of by Mr. Maisel relative to the attitude of physicians do not generally prevail in tuberculosis hospitals.

At the Castle Point facility, which Mr. Maisel visited, there are on duty four physicians who have had over 10 years' experience in the treatment of tuberculosis; six physicians who have had from 5 to 10 years' experience; six physicians who have had from 1 to 5 years' experience; and two physicians who have had less than 1 year's experience in tuberculosis. The clinical director has had over 11 years' experience in treating tuberculosis and the manager has had 9 years.

29. "That Lt. Marie Stevens, a former Army nurse and a patient in the women veterans' ward at Castle Point said, 'How can I hope to be cured by a doctor who is so afraid of catching TB that he only stethoscopes the

backs of patients for fear that if he stethoscoped their chests, they might breathe on him?'"

It is true there are some physicians practicing medicine who are fearful of tuberculosis. This may be due to the fact that they are not interested in tuberculosis and, therefore, do not know the statistical incidence of new cases of tuberculosis among the personnel in tuberculosis sanatoriums. Actually, so far as physicians and nurses are concerned, the chances of contracting tuberculosis are less in tuberculosis hospitals than they are in general medical and surgical and particularly neuropsychiatric hospitals.

The allegation made by Miss Stevens is found to be true. It was discovered by the clinical director at Castle Point that Captain Frankenthaler was making bedside examinations and was confining his examination to the posterior chest. An order was immediately issued to all physicians under date of October 25, 1944, which read as follows:

"It has been called to my attention that some members of the medical staff have been conducting their bimonthly chest examinations and yearly physical examinations at the patients' bedside. This practice will be discontinued in the case of all patients who are capable of proceeding to the physician's office. All patients will be examined in the physician's office with the exception of such patients who may be seriously or critically ill. Another exception will be in the case of a patient who has had a recent hemorrhage. There may be patients who are not on the serious or critically ill list who nevertheless would be capable of proceeding to the physician's office in a wheel chair. These patients will also be examined in the physician's office.

"It has also been called to my attention that in some instances physicians are listening to the posterior chest only—in other words, conducting a physical examination of the posterior chest and then writing a complete chest examination. This practice will be discontinued and in the future the anterior and posterior chest will be examined thoroughly. As the time arises for the yearly complete physical, such an examination will also be conducted in the physician's office. In the future this examination will also include a rectal examination. Finger cots may be requisitioned from the supply department."

Captain Frankenthaler was recently transferred from the tuberculosis hospital at Castle Point to the Veterans' Administration Facility, Mountain Home, Tenn., a general medical and surgical hospital.

30. "That only 1,968 chest operations were performed in a year for 10,718 patients treated, only 18.4 percent of the patients received any chest surgery whatever; that of these operations 1,395 were the simplest operation of all—induced pneumothorax, which leaves only 573 patients treated by chest surgery other than pneumothorax; that New York State, with fewer than a quarter as many patients actually gave its patients 335 more operations than the entire Veterans' Tuberculosis Hospital System."

Mr. Maisel implies that all that is necessary to cure tuberculosis is to institute collapse therapy. If he believes that then he was not very observant when he attended the collapse-therapy conference at Sunmount. Before he voices his opinion so positively he should study the able statistical analysis made by Drolet, of the New York Tuberculosis and Health Association, on the results obtained in tuberculosis before the general application of surgical collapse therapy, and as recently as the 5-year period 1937 to 1941 inclusive, when collapse therapy had been extensively used by most tuberculosis hospitals. He should know, too, that many of the private, county, State, and municipal tuberculosis hospitals, particularly those in New York City, are becoming more conservative in the use of collapse therapy.

That the percentage of cases treated by collapse therapy in the Veterans' Administration facilities in 1942—the year which the figures he is quoting represents, and incidentally these figures cover the total individual patients treated and not the total of operations performed as he would have you believe—was not as high as in other institutions is attributable to the nature of the disease in the particular sex and age group, then under treatment in our hospitals. This is borne out by the fact that for 1944 after an appreciable number of the younger World War II veterans had been admitted to our hospitals, the percentage of all patients under treatment who were receiving collapse therapy had risen to 30 percent, with almost 40 percent of the World War II patients having surgical collapse therapy as a part of their treatment. As the case load of the younger World War II veterans increases and the older World War I group decreases the percent of patients treated by surgical collapse therapy will continue to rise. At one tuberculosis hospital this rate is now 43 percent and at three others it has reached 38 percent of the total cases treated.

All patients admitted to tuberculosis hospitals for treatment are considered by a board of surgical collapse therapy consisting of either the clinical director or chief of the medical service as chairman, the chief of the surgical service, the roentgenologist, the physician in charge of pneumothorax therapy, and the ward physician, immediately upon completion of initial examination. A determination is made at that time as to the advisability of instituting any form of chest surgery. Those not considered suitable at the time of the first consultation are reconsidered from time to time, usually at 3-month intervals or oftener if deemed advisable by either the ward physician, the chief of service or the clinical director.

Unfortunately, quite a number of patients who have been recommended for some type of chest surgery refuse to accept same. In all such cases every effort is made to persuade them to accept the treatment offered and believed definitely indicated. Of course if a patient persists in his refusal of the chest surgery recommended, he is given such other therapy as appears indicated and which he will accept. Data on collapse therapy from a few representative tuberculosis hospitals, which Mr. Maisel admits are practicing first-class medicine follow:

Hospital and percent of collapse therapy

	Percent
Worcester County Sanatorium, Massachusetts	30
Jefferson County Sanatorium, Beaumont, Tex.:	
White patients	18
Colored patients	18
Minnesota State Sanatorium, Minnesota:	
White patients	43
Indian patients	32

31. "That at some veterans' hospitals chest surgery is practically unobtainable. Even at Washington, D. C., 190 TB patients received a grand total of 8 operations, all induced pneumothoraxes and this veterans' hospital is listed as a chest-surgery center."

The hospital at Washington, D. C., is not a tuberculosis hospital. Tuberculosis cases needing thoracic surgery are transferred to a tuberculosis hospital.

A report of chest surgery in nontuberculous conditions, submitted by the Washington, D. C., facility under date of January 4, 1943, which is the period covered by Mr. Maisel's statistics, follows:

	Treated	Condition
(a) Thoracoplasty	2	Improved.
(b) Rib resections (rib tumors)	2	Do.
(c) Thoracentesis	12	Do.
(d) Pneumonectomy (multiple lung abscesses).	1	Died.
(e) Lung abscesses, surgical drainage, two stages.	3	Improved.
(f) Lobactomy (bronchiectasis)	1	Do.
(g) Thoracotomy: Removal of mediastinal tumor.	1	Died.
(h) Exploratory, cancer	2	No change.
(i) Rib resection with packing of empyema pocket.	1	Improved.
(j) Rib resection: Drainage of lung cyst, 1 stage.	1	Do.
(k) Drainage of lung cyst, 2 stage.	1	Do.
(l) Multiple sinus tract obliteration.	2	Do.
(m) Empyema drainage	7	Do.
(n) Subphrenic abscess	1	Do.
(o) Partial Schede thoracoplasty	1	Do.
(p) Pneumoperitoneum	1	Do.
(q) Bronchograms	24	Do.
(r) Bronchoscopy	52	Do.

32. "That at every hospital he visited a private concessionaire has been allowed to run a canteen, and invariably the patients have complained about these 'licensed profiteers'; that at Castle Point the complaints took the form of petitions signed by hundreds of patients, and Navy veteran Stanley Skigen told him of being charged 35 cents to cash a $20 Government check, and Elbert Horner said he had been charged 65 cents."

The facts concerning the concessionaire at Castle Point were presented under allegation number 9. It is probable that during the time Mr. Maisel visited at Castle Point excessive prices were charged for articles sold at the canteen. It is also true that patients and others complained of the operation of this concession. This condition has been remedied.

Relative to Stanley Skigen telling Mr. Maisel he had been charged 35 cents for cashing a $20 Government check, and Elbert Horner saying he had been charged 65 cents, the manager has furnished a signed statement dated March 15, 1945, as follows:

"The statement in Cosmopolitan about my being charged 35 cents to have a check cashed is not true. I was then and am still being charged 15 cents to have my $20 checks cashed and I feel that this is not right.

"STANLEY H. SKIGEN."

The manager reported that Elbert Horner when interviewed stated he was charged 65 cents to cash a $100 Government check by the former concessionaire. He was not charged 65 cents for the cashing of a $20 Government check. The Leon Neon Corp., of Newburgh, N. Y., now sends a representative the first of each month to the Castle Point facility in order that the patients' checks may be cashed. A charge of 10 cents is made on all checks of $8 or less and 15 cents for all checks above $8. These charges are less than the charges authorized by the State of New York for such services. At several facilities the concessionaire makes a nominal charge for cashing patients' checks. At the majority of the facilities, no charge is made.

Under existing procedure all patients have the privilege of depositing their funds with the agent cashier and withdrawing them as needed, except the patient is limited to a cash withdrawal of $5 per day. Any amount in excess of this is returned to him by check and it usually takes from 2 to 3 days to have this check issued because it is issued by the Treasury Department and not the Veterans' Administration. However, cash withdrawals in excess of $5 may be made for an urgent need, such as being discharged or

going home on furlough. The procedure for handling patients' funds has not been entirely satisfactory due to the fact that it takes 2 or 3 days to have a Treasury check issued when a patient desires to withdraw more than $5 at a time, except in emergency. In this connection, it might be stated that it is the ruling of the Comptroller General that all funds delivered to a facility for safe-keeping must be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, which makes it impossible for the Veterans' Administration to expeditiously return funds deposited for safekeeping. This matter is now receiving study and it is expected that a satisfactory arrangement will be worked out whereby patients may deposit their funds for safekeeping and receive them promptly when withdrawal is desired.

33. "That at Castle Point there was a universal complaint of the patients concerning the food and last September over 400 patients signed a petition begging for better food."

The food situation at Castle Point was discussed under allegation No. 8. However, at the time of Mr. Maisel's visit there were complaints from the patients concerning the food.

In a special-delivery letter of September 30, 1944, the manager at Castle Point advised the medical director of the urgent need for the immediate assignment of an experienced chief dietitian due to the highly nervous state of the head dietitian because of the strain under which she was working with only two dietitians on duty. The chief dietitian had entered upon sick leave on August 7, 1944, and was transferred to the field roll on November 2, 1944.

On October 6, the medical and hospital service received a letter from the manager dated September 28, 1944, with which he forwarded a newspaper article covering food complaints by patients at Castle Point. An experienced chief dietitian from Lyons, N. J., was detailed to Castle Point immediately for 30 days to meet the emergency until a permanent chief dietitian could be assigned. A subsistence supervisor was also sent to the facility to assist the manager in eliminating any cause for food complaints, and remained there from October 10 to 31, 1944.

The head dietitian reported off duty on extended sick leave October 13, 1944, and was transferred to the field roll on November 6, 1944. Replacement was made by promotion and transfer from the Bronx facility on November 6, 1944. A permanent chief dietitian was assigned by promotion and transfer from Hines, Ill., on November 16, 1944. An additional position of dietitian SP-5 was established on November 30, 1944. This brought the number of dietitian positions at Castle Point to four, including one chief, one head, and two dietitians. All of these positions except one are filled at the present time.

The subsistence supervisor reported confusion in the dietetic department at the time of her arrival on October 10, 1944, due partly to lack of proper adjustment to the central tray service that had been instituted at Castle Point some months before and to a delay in obtaining certain equipment for satisfactory food preparation.

In addition, the illness and prolonged absence of the chief and head dietitian that necessitated replacements for both individuals, and a change in the chief cook the 1st of September had a definite bearing upon the conditions found by the supervisor.

Both the chief dietitian on temporary detail from Lyons, N. J., and the subsistence supervisor rendered excellent assistance in the emergency so as to insure the food reaching the dining room and tray patients in appetizing condition and at proper temperature. The services concerned in central office took appropriate action to provide the needed equipment including adequate refrigeration.

The report states that at the time of the supervisor's departure the new chief cook was showing excellent ability in food preparation, the dietetic employees were better organized, most of the confusion in the department had been eliminated and the patients throughout the hospital appeared to be well satisfied with the food.

34. "That when he visited the Castle Point Facility he examined a dozen meal trays and found the day's main meal one small pot of cold tea, two thin slices of white bread, a tiny pat of butter, a few thin slices of broken-down stewed peaches and—the main course—a beef stew containing six or seven tiny chunks of greasy meat swimming in fast-congealing gravy; all cold as the grave."

Under allegation No. 8 I informed you of the regular menu served the patients the day Mr. Maisel visited the Castle Point Facility. The manager on March 9, 1945, reported that at the present time the centralized tray service is functioning without difficulty.

In addition to the allegations referred to above, Mr. Maisel also stated:

"The cost at Glen Lake Sanatorium, Minneapolis, is $3.85 a day. At the Minnesota State Sanatorium it is $2.71. But the cost of caring for a TB case in a veterans' facility is $5.20 per day—a first-class price for third-class medicine."

The average per diem cost of the 13 tuberculosis hospitals of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1943 was $5.04, and for the fiscal year 1944 it was $5.11. The January 1945 average per diem cost for this group of hospitals was $4.90. There are many diverse factors which enter into the per diem cost of an institution, especially as to whether all items such as the medical and nursing care, laboratory and X-ray services, operating room and anesthetic charges, etc., are included in the per diem cost as in our hospitals or whether the per diem cost is exclusive of physicians' fees and various other items which are paid for separately by the patient or supporting agencies or given gratis and therefore customarily do not enter into the operating cost of the individual sanatorium.

Not being in possession of the method used in arriving at the per diem cost, from the two hospitals which Mr. Maisel mentions, I am not in a position to compare our per diem costs with these institutions.

1. That the Veterans' Administration practices "third-rate medicine for first-rate men."

12. That Harold Schwiebert died of heart failure because the wall that separates the right and left lung was forced against his heart by the fluid that gathered in his lung cavities—the fluid Schwiebert begged to have removed.

13. That James Collier, who was admitted to the Castle Point Facility December 28, 1943, was not examined again after admission until February 17, 1944, was transferred from the Castle Point Facility to the Bronx Facility for a lobectomy and was compelled to carry his own valise and was not furnished transportation to and from the railroad station, and was transferred back to the Castle Point Facility without being furnished transportation to and from the railroad stations and had only been reexamined three times since his return to the Castle Point Facility.

The afore-mentioned allegations have not been presented in the chronological order in which they appear in the list of allegations. It is believed complete and full answers have been made to the allegations in the Schwiebert and Collier cases and that the statements made by Mr. Maisel in these two cases have been proven to be untrue.

In addition, it is felt from the foregoing presentation of my answers to the other allegations that the committee will see that the Veterans' Administration does not practice third-rate medicine for its veteran beneficiaries.

If there are any questions, I shall be pleased to answer them to the best of my ability.

Fiscal Policy for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an article entitled "Fiscal Policy for Full Employment" written by John H. G. Pierson. The excerpt is entitled "Summary and Recommendations."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has analyzed the reasons why a positive fiscal policy is essential for assuring full employment, and has drawn conclusions as to the kind of fiscal policy needed.

A review of the strategic factors governing the flow of income in our economy indicates that automatic forces cannot be counted upon to bring about a sufficient volume of effective demand after reconversion without the aid of conscious fiscal action. As a general rule, saving will tend to be too large and spending too small to make an automatic balance possible. It will therefore be necessary to raise consumption or match the surplus savings with additional investment.

We believe it is desirable to raise consumption as long as this does not deprive society of genuinely needed investment. We also believe that the individual is ordinarily the best judge of his own consumption requirements, and therefore we especially favor an expansion of purchasing power in the hands of individual consumers. Some public capital expenditures and some community consumption expenditures, however, are so important for the general welfare that they shold be given priority even over a rise in individual consumption. We have listed substantially increased public expenditures for health, education, housing, and conservation and development of resorces as clearly belonging in this preferred category, and we urge the initiation of these programs immediately after the war.

To raise the individual consumer demand to levels that will reestablish a full-employment balance in our economy, it is necessary to increase the incomes of the lower-income groups in our society. Sooner or later this reform must be put on a permanent basis, through adoption of fundamental improvements such as a more progressive system of taxes, expansion of social-security benefits, higher wages wherever possible, and elimination of unnecessary amounts of governmental or corporate saving. In this report we have recommended changes with respect to both the collection and the disbursement of social-security funds. We have also dealt at some length with taxation in general, paying particular attention to the question of securing enough tax revenue to cover desirable regular expenditures of Government, and to the question of distributing the burden in accordance with ability to pay and the need to maintain mass markets for goods and services.

If our program with respect to basic expenditure policies and basic tax policies were adopted in its entirety, oversaving would be strikingly reduced. Of course it would still be necessary to have additional fiscal measures ready in reserve, so that they could be applied in a flexible manner whenever required to compensate for either an underspending or an over-spending tendency. Meanwhile, until these long-run measures actually are adopted, the role of purely compensatory fiscal policy will be even more important.

To provide in a practical way for compensatory fiscal action capable of supplementing the results of all other private and public policies by holding total effective demand at the level required to sustain full employment, we have proposed an over-all insurance mechanism consisting of two parts. One part would be a system of national income insurance whereby the Federal Government would underwrite total consumer spending at a level calculated to buy all the consumer goods and services a normal labor force working normal hours can produce, after allowing for the expected volume of private capital formation and the regularly budgeted programs of all levels of government. This would make for a maximum of consumption by individual consumers, and would consequently assure private business as a whole against a shortage of markets and thereby give private business a real opportunity to provide the jobs required for full employment. Because it would take the size of our foreign market into account in the determination of the necessary size of our domestic consumer market, it would also weaken the pressure to obtain export surpluses larger than justified by the real needs of borrowing countries for foreign investments—pressure which may otherwise prove a barrier to liberal international economic relations on a two-way trading basis. The other part would be a reserve shelf of useful public works and work projects which would be drawn upon for additional jobs at regular rates of pay during such times as sufficient private jobs were not available in spite of the favorable conditions provided by national income insurance. This would serve as the final line of defense against unemployment, and would therefore also underpin consumers' income and hold consumer spending at the underwritten level except insofar as over-saving, or, in exceptional circumstances, over-spending would still need to be corrected.

The final adjustment of consumers' incomes, required to make good the total consumer spending guaranty, could be handled, according to our proposal, through consumer-tax adjustments. As long as consumer spending tended to fall short of the national quota, we have considered the possibility of compensating this through offsets to indirect taxes and reduction of income taxes. If, on the other hand, consumer spending tended to exceed the quota by more than a reasonable margin, to be specified in advance, this tendency would perhaps best be counteracted through application of a graduated spendings tax, with generous exemptions for subsistence spending. Thus compensatory fiscal policy would guard against deflation and at the same time would provide a necessary safeguard against inflation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of our analysis in this report, we make the following specific recommendations on and relating to fiscal policy:

Recommendation 1: That Congress and the President declare it to be national policy to maintain full employment.

Recommendation 2. That all necessary steps be taken to make the meaning of this commitment practical and definite; in particular, that steps be taken to (a) provide a suitable definition of full employment based on the number of men and women wanting to work; (b) provide current statistics of labor force, employment, and unemployment adequate for application of the definition of full employment; and (c) assign to the appropriate agency the responsibility for giving notice, (1) when supplementary public works or work projects are needed in order to avoid falling short of full employment, and (2) when public projects should be curtailed because additional private employment opportunities are in sight.

Recommendation 3: That all necessary legislative and administrative action be taken to develop and carry out a compensatory fiscal program capable of maintaining a full-employment volume of demand for goods and services; that, in particular:

(a) With a view to minimizing reliance on compensatory public works, Congress designate an official series of total private consumer expenditure; approve a general method for calculating the volume of consumer expenditure necessary to provide a reasonable market basis for full employment through expanded private production, having regard for foreign markets and all other relevant factors; through the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation or other joint budget committee calculate, or authorize the appropriate agency to calculate and report periodically, the volume of consumer expenditure necessary for the ensuing fiscal period; underwrite the volume of consumer expenditure as thus determined; define policies in accordance with which taxes would be refunded to consumers, or other distributions of income made, if necessary to keep total consumer expenditure from falling below the underwritten level; define policies in accordance with which additional taxes, or other restraints on spending, would be imposed if necessary to keep total consumer expenditure from rising more than a specified amount above the underwritten level; and provide for flexible application of these policies as necessary to realize the guaranties given.

(b) Congress provide for the planning and prepartion of an ample, diversified, and geographically distributed reserve shelf of useful Federal public works and work projects, nonconstruction as well as construction; assist in the creation of a non-Federal shelf by developing a clear policy with respect to the terms and conditions on which Federal aid will be extended to State and local jurisdictions for both the planning and execution of projects; establish project initiation and termination procedures, and authorize expenditure of funds for projects, in a manner consistent with giving priority to private employment whenever available, maintaining wage rates and other labor standards, utilizing Federal action so far as practicable only when other Government jurisdictions fail to act, and maintaining full employment as defined.

Recommendation 4: That, in order to promote equality of opportunity and provide for raising the general standard of living, while at the same time minimizing the necessity for compensatory fiscal action under paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b), Congress establish a joint Welfare Standards Committee, charged with (a) estimating and reporting on the character and financial costs of adequate programs of housing, health, education, conservation and development, and social security, and (b) recommending a suitable over-all program, with a suitable division of cost and operating responsibility as between the various private and public jurisdictions concerned. Associated with this congressional committee should be a welfare standards advisory committee, consisting of representatives of business, agriculture, labor, and the professions, and having access to all relevant data available in any of the executive agencies. Labor should also be represented, along with other groups, in the administration of these programs when adopted.

Recommendation 5: That, in order to provide for an equitable sharing of tax burdens, sustain purchasing power, stimulate enterprise, and minimize the necessity for compensatory fiscal action under paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b), Congress develop a postwar Federal tax program that will: (a) provide sufficient revenue to cover regular expenditures, including desirable welfare expenditures as may be recommended pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 4; (b) distribute the burden in accordance with ability to pay; (c) place main emphasis on the individual income tax, with suitably graduated rates, elimination of tax exemption for State and local government securities, closing of other loopholes, and allowance of adequate exemptions for subsistence incomes; (d) provide for proper integration and strengthening of estate and gift taxes, so that they will yield substantially increased revenues; (e) eliminate excise taxes, except for excises at moderate rates on liquor, tobacco, and gasoline; (f) modify corporate income taxation to end discrimination against equity capital, and allow suitable tax exemptions for new enterprises, but retain rates on established corporations sufficient to avoid undue impairment of revenue, enact provisions to stimulate distribution or use of corporate earnings, and develop as a substitute for wartime excess-profits taxation a selective tax on the excess profits of businesses that are substantially monopolistic; (g) meet a part of the cost of social insurance benefits from general tax revenues; and (h) include adequate provision for enforcement. In addition the Federal tax program should (i) provide for the flexible application of anti-deflationary tax refunds and anti-inflationary supplementary taxation as necessary to effectuate the provisions of paragraph 3 (a); and (j) be developed with a view to eliminating unnecessary conflicts and overlaps with State and local taxation.

Recommendation 6: That the Federal Government also (a) assist in securing provision of capital and credit to small businesses on reasonable terms; (b) assist in maintaining suitably low interest rates on borrowed capital generally; (c) in any international monetary agreements, cooperate fully in avoiding unilateral action that would be disruptive to foreign economies but at the same time adequately safeguard the integrity of domestic fiscal policy, especially through avoiding excessive rigidity of exchange rates; and (d) adopt all other practicable measures that are consistent with those herein specified and will further promote enterprise, investment, and competition.

Our American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Our American Economy," written by my distinguished colleague [Mr. WHERRY] and appearing in the June issue of Washington News Digest, an independent national monthly magazine published under the editorship of former Representative John J. O'Connor of New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR AMERICAN ECONOMY—PART II

(By KENNETH WHERRY, United States Senator from Nebraska)

Our debt has now reached about $300,000,000,000 and we are spending $260,555,000 daily. Farmers along with other citizens, will have to pay more taxes.

Every American child born today comes into the world owing approximately $2,000. Contrary to the doctrine of some, our public debt—principal as well as interest—will have to be paid.

It can be paid only by taxes and other Federal revenue. It cannot be paid by sale of bonds, or the printing of money. This does not reduce the debt, but creates ruinous inflation.

Our whole financial economy is, and must be, based on the fundamental principle that the public debt must be honored, just the same as private debt. And some day, somehow, the Budget will have to be balanced and payments will have to be made on the debt—if we are to have a sound, stabilized economy.

That economy governs the baby's bottle of milk and the casket in which the aged goes to his long last sleep—and all in between. If we are to stabilize our national economy and continue to pay high wages to organized labor, economic balance must be maintained for agriculture.

Lincoln said, "I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." Neither can it survive half broke and half prosperous.

This means full production and fair prices for that production. Anything which retards full production will retard prosperity.

It is assumed by the Government-controlled propagandists that at some time in our history we were isolationists. There are many who have been insolent and brazen enough to insist that our actions after the last war brought on the present one, the implication being, of course, that, since we brought on this war, there is no limit to the sacrifices we should make, not only in this war but thereafter.

I have a profound respect for the diplomatic dexterity of those great British nationalists who are able to convince at least a part of our people that whatever is best for Britain is also best for the United States. But I am completely lacking in respect for those American intellects which accept such rubbish and would found American policy upon foreign directives.

We are being told that, if we are to have a full prosperity in this country, we must have a vast export trade. Some of our Government statisticians have figured out that in building up an adequate national income we must have at least $8,000,000,000 of exports.

It is interesting and possibly signficant that the greatest boomer for a big export trade is Earl Browder. In his book Teheran, in which he says, in effect, that a new world order was decided on at the meeting in Persia, he wants an export trade of $40,000,000,000 a year.

The prospect of an immense foreign trade is alluring to those of our citizens who live on foreign trade. I would point out to you, however, that the chief advocates of foreign trade are those people who stand to make money out of it. They are so intent on pursuing their selfish interests that they do not see or care to what ends they will go in pretending that what they want for themselves is also in the national interest.

The single fact that we need to remember with respect to foreign trade is that exports must be paid for by imports, else we shall give our goods away and be that much poorer.

We cannot lend-lease forever. Even those bleeding hearts who would give the whole United States away in order to raise the standards of living all over the world must realize that, even if we did give the United States away, and all were to get on a basis of equality, our people would go very far down, but the rest of the world would not come far up.

As to the effect of imports on our economy, you will be interested in the statement made by Hon. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture of Georgia, before a subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee on December 5, 1944.

Mr. Linder, whose statement was concurred in by the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, declared that the $9,000,000,000 of agricultural imports in the 4 years 1925–29 reduced our national income by $63,000,000,000 during the same period.

"The stock-market crash of 1929," said Mr. Linder, "swept away $15,000,000,000, but during the 4 years prior to the stock-market crash we lost $63,000,000,000 by importing agricultural products."

And, turning to the Roosevelt administration, Mr. Linder said: "* * * when we imported $10,000,000,000 in agricultural products from 1934 to 1939, we sustained a loss in national income of $70,000,000,000.

"Only the passage of lend-lease and the spending of mammonth sums of Government money prevented a crash in 1940, equally as bad as the crash in 1930."

What Has Happened to the Meat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first article, which appears on pages 31, 32, and 33 of the June 4, 1945, issue of News Week, entitled "What Has Happened to the Meat?—The Story Behind the Shortages."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE MEAT?—THE STORY BEHIND THE SHORTAGES—THREE YEARS OF TAMPERING WITH DISTRIBUTION AND PRICES LED TO NATION-WIDE HAVOC

The Nation's supply of meat was so low last week that even the black market couldn't get it. Not since Pearl Harbor had the situation been so desperate. In most cities the shortage was near famine proportions. Ironically the number of livestock on farms and ranges was second only to last year's all-time high, yet empty meat counters testified that it was not finding its way to market.

To the average housewife, weary of ration squeezes and statistics and official explanations that explained little, it was evident that Washington's handling of the meat supply would go down as the No. 1 bungle of the war. To the average farmer, packer, and retailer it was clear that the whole maze of regulations thrown around meat in the last 3 years had not only hopelessly disrupted the highly intricate distribution system but had failed completely to achieve the announced objective of "holding the line" on civilian prices. To the flourishing black marketeer, now largely the fixer of prices, it was unmistakable that he owed to governmental fumbling the biggest vote of thanks since prohibition.

TALE OF THE CITIES

City by city, here was the picture:

Boston: Meat now actually scarcer than cigarettes. Five percent of normal is the estimate. Even the black market feeling the pinch. Typical 1-day fare: Breakfast, eggs; lunch, fried clams; dinner, fish.

New York: Black market estimated at 90 percent is in command. Restaurant steaks from $2.50 to $5 a la carte when obtainable. Steaks for homes virtually nonexistent. Pork vanished; lamb hard to find. Pressed meats and frankfurters very scarce. Delicatessens considering closing. Hundreds of butcher shops closed, scores open only 1 day a week.

Washington: Chain stores have some meat three or four times a week, but most of time counters bare. Lines now longer than for cigarettes. Black market thrives on hidden overcharges under the nose of the OPA.

Atlanta: Black market in control with "shade-tree" operators (farmers butchering carcasses hung to trees) supplying the illegitimate trade. All meats and poultry scarce.

Louisville: Meat available, but market tight. Black market estimated to control 15 percent. Legitimate outlets have supplies only 50 percent of normal.

Cleveland: Spot check of 10 leading retailers disclosed not one with any beef, veal, or pork, only one with frankfurters, a few with chicken livers and pressed meats. Chains have had only 30 percent supply for first five months this year compared with 1944.

Chicago: Black market has bulk of meat; poultry being sold at $1 to $1.50 a pound in Negro districts. Approximately half of Chicago's meat dealers closed two or more days a week.

Kansas City: Dealers reduced to sausage, fish, and frankfurters for most part. Pork offerings; tails, snouts, and pickled feet.

Des Moines: Meat supply 25 percent what it was last year. Typical butcher displays: Spareribs, tongue, sweetbreads, kidneys, pressed meats.

Denver: More meat than most cities, but becoming increasingly short. Black market gaining.

Dallas: Only 50 miles from ranges, but housewives find only frankfurters, fish, and liver. About two days a week some Grades B and C beef to early or preferred customers.

Salt Lake City: Meat situation, which throughout war has been good, has taken sudden nose dive. Some stores considering two-week closing.

Seattle: Heavy sale of horse meat. Some lamb, but all other meats disappearing. Black market controlling 50 to 60 percent of distribution. Poultry available but at roasting-chicken prices for stewing hens.

San Francisco: Lamb and sausage obtainable; all other meats short. Black market thriving, with almost a monopoly on poultry.

Los Angeles: Meat situation desperate. With 40-percent increase in population since 1940, southern California getting about 15 percent of normal supply.

HOW IT HAPPENS

Beyond question, small towns and rural communities have not felt the pinch as much. Last week, George Thiem, Chicago Daily News farm editor, traveling through Minnesota and Nebraska found "meat galore" in restaurants in smaller communities. Examples: At Austin, Minn., steaks, mutton chops, and bacon; at Columbus, Nebr., choice of tenderloin or sirloin steaks, or grade AA roast beef.

What Thiem discovered appeared to be the rule, not the exception, throughout the Nation save in New England. Uniformly last week, Newsweek correspondents noted that the closer the community to the farm, the more meat; inversely, the larger the city the less meat. Conclusion: With the bulk of the

population in the cities, the overwhelming majority of Americans were actually meat hungry in normally the best-fed Nation in the world.

Why?

To scores of growers, feeders, packers, distributors, retailers, and meat experts, Newsweek correspondents last week put that question. The reasons assigned varied widely, but the theme of the replies was overwhelmingly consistent—Government regulations complicated by 3 years of pyramiding on a false start.

Most of the answers presumed a knowledge of the complex meat-distribution system:

1. That beef cattle come off the western grass ranges weighing only 500 pounds or so—too lean for market.

2. That they are sold to feeders (Midwest grain farmers) who normally fatten them to twice that weight, taking 8 to 12 months to do it.

3. That feeders then sell them to slaughterers.

4. That packers (most big ones also slaughter) buy the slaughtered meat, dress it, and distribute it to wholesalers, who in turn sell it to the retailers, restaurants, and hotels.

5. That most meat for big cities comes from the Nation's 449 federally inspected packers who process 65 percent of all meat; that the bulk for smaller communities comes from 26,000 smaller (and non-Federal inspected) butchers and processors, who handle the remaining 35 percent.

6. That pork and lamb are produced on much the same pattern of growing, processing, and distribution.

THE PROFESSORS DANCE

Most meat men hold that the chaos in the industry began back in 1942 when the OPA was run by the economist, Leon Henderson, and 60 percent of the key jobs in the agency were held by economists, college instructors, and lawyers, mostly in their thirties. Initial price ceilings on beef and pork were set in the spring of that year. Whether there was a "well devised and planned scheme to control profits" as a House committee later charged, beef ceilings nevertheless were based on Lenten prices which are seasonally low. The price differentials allowed on various grades of beef were so narrowed that feeders claimed they could only fatten cattle at a loss. In the next few weeks the cattle market broke and animals that should have been held for further feeding were sold immediately, thereby greatly reducing the amount of beef to reach the market.

The picture was further complicated by the fact that although ceilings were imposed on packers, none was put on cattle or hogs on the hoof with the result that packers were caught in a squeeze between uncontrolled prices on their "raw material" and strict controls on the price of their processed products. For 7 months packers claimed that they were losing $2 to $4 on every hog they slaughtered, and losing approximately $1 on every hundredweight of beef. Scores went out of business while the OPA refused to alter a price structure that was based on hogs at $13.50 a hundredweight when hogs were actually selling for around $15.50.

The year 1943, with OPA's "roll-back" of prices and the payment of subsidies to packers to make up for the additional loss, was little different. With hog prices continuing to soar, grain producers fed hogs instead of marketing part of their grain as they normally would. As a result, the OPA's poultry and dairy price programs became unstuck because little grain was available to feed chickens and herds. At the same time, beef cattle were going to the market underfed because price regulations continued to squeeze the feeders.

By 1944, there was a glut in the hog market, but a growing scarcity of butter and poultry. The beef supply was tight. More cattle were being slaughtered than ever before, but they weighed less, hence less beef. Nevertheless, by summer, virtually all rationing controls were lifted. Republicans charged that it was an election year stunt to curry favor with the voters; the Government pointed to the hog glut. Actually the main reason was the "inside" belief that the war in Europe would end by fall, with the consequence that less meat was set aside for the use of the armed services and more was allocated to civilians.

Meanwhile, the Government officially urged farmers to produce 20 percent fewer hogs for the 1945 market, and then, in the midst of clearing the glutted 1944 market, pulled the support price (subsidy) down from $13.75 to $12.50, thereby depressing the market price.

WHO PAYS THE PIPER?

By the beginning of 1945 the dire shortages which meat experts had predicted as far back as 1942 were at hand. The reasons were accumulative:

With the war in Europe failing to end last fall as envisioned, the allocations of meat to the armed services were steeply increased in January to make up the deficit in their stock piles resulting from increased civilian apportionment last year. The proof is in the following figures (in millions of pounds) showing the Government requirements on meat for this year by quarters compared with last year:

	1945	*1944*
January–March	143	128
April–June	130	105
July–September	100	105
October–December	125	132

The sharp increase for the first two quarters is noteworthy. The projections for the last two quarters are actually less than purchases a year ago. Further, although the war in Europe is now over, total Government requirements this year are 498,000,000 pounds against 470,000,000 last year when Washington expected it to end.

With Government demand currently heavier than ever, the Government's planned 20-percent reduction in hogs has been complied with thumpingly. Actually, the reduction is 30 percent, an additional 10 percent having been gratuitously thrown in by farmers who last year were fearful that if a promised support price could be lowered from $13.75 to $12.50 by one swish of a bureaucratic pen, another swish might lower it from $12.50 to some still lesser figure.[1]

With the Government purchasing more meat, on one hand, and sponsoring a pork shortage, on the other, the black market really came into its own in 1945. Here are the civilian allocation figures (in millions of pounds) for this year compared with last:

	1945	*1944*
January–March	166	241
April–June	146	243
July–September	194	239
October–December	215	206

With demand unprecedented due to bulging home-front pocketbooks, allocations this year are the lowest of the war. Few expect any amount of OPA prosecutions to make serious inroads on the black market before next year. Further, black-market prices will probably continue to soar. In any case, black market or legitimate, only 721,000,000 pounds are available for civilians this year, compared with 929,000,000 in 1944.

[1] On April 11, 1945, in an effort to encourage heavier production for the 1946 market, Washington raised the support price to $13, pledging no reduction before November 1, 1946.

SIGNIFICANCE

There is small hope for either the patriotic dealer or housewife to obtain much meat in 1945 legitimately, particularly in large cities. The armed services buy only Federal-inspected meat. Big, Federal-inspected packers, principal suppliers for metropolitan areas (non-Federal-inspected meat cannot cross State lines), are having to meet the Government's increased demands. Further, the black marketeers are cutting sharply into their sources of supply by offering above-ceiling prices. Non-Federal-inspected packers are getting an increasingly larger share of cattle and hogs. Result: less meat, other than black market, for big cities.

Two weeks ago the Government at long last recognized the squeeze on feeders and its resultant paradox of less meat with more (but lighter) cattle slaughtered. War Mobilizer Fred M. Vinson announced a subsidy (Newsweek, May 28). Best estimates are that it will be at least September before results are obtained but many claim the subsidy is too small to solve the problem. And if farmers are lured by it, current shortages will become even more acute while feeders fatten cattle to weights demanded for the subsidy. Prospects: no immediate relief in sight.

Freedom's Greatest Foe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the Salesmanship Club of Dallas, Tex., April 12, 1945, by J. P. Seiberling, president, Seiberling Rubber Co.:

It would not be surprising, in view of the tire shortage, if many of you came here today expecting me to discuss the current rubber situation and express an opinion as to when you will get tires for your car. I intend, however, to talk to you about a subject of far greater importance to you and yours than the present tire shortage. The tire shortage is merely a passing problem that will be corrected in time, whereas the subject I have in mind involves the preservation of a priceless heritage.

I want to talk to you about freedom's greatest foe, for I am convinced that we are in grave danger of losing the most precious possession of each and every one of us in this Nation—namely, our personal freedom. Certainly such will be the case unless the American people become convinced of that fact and arouse themselves to preserve their liberty.

If there is one pronounced characteristic of the American people, it is the tendency to take things for granted and be nochalant about it. We are prone to assume that what we are, we will always be; and what we have, we will always enjoy; and then, having assumed that such is the case, we go on about our business of attending to our own personal affairs and interests.

It is unfortunate that this is so, for it makes us forgetful that our freedom is not something that has been handed to us on a silver platter, to use and enjoy or put upon the shelf, as we will, but is something that we must jealously guard and zealously nurture and all our waking hours be concerned

about, if we are to retain and possess it for ourselves and our posterity. As someone has truly said, "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance." For too long already we have permitted the greatest foe of freedom infiltrate among us without challenge or defense. The time to counterattack has come.

I am afraid that most Americans are inclined to forget, and that many of the young people in our schools today are not taught that freedom came to our shores only because a little over 300 years ago small groups of people risked a hazardous journey across the Atlantic in tiny sailing vessels, determined to rid themselves of the tyranny and despotism of Europe, and to found for themselves and their families a new life, the heart and core of which was freedom—religious freedom, personal freedom, political freedom, economic freedom—freedom to worship God as they pleased, freedom to do and say as they pleased, freedom to order and shape their own government, and freedom to build their own fortunes and use and enjoy them as they would.

I know that I need not recite here how precious that freedom was to them. Their actions over the years as recorded on the pages of history disclose how highly they prized it. The signers of the Declaration of Independence, who wrote in the closing sentence thereof, "And for the support of this Declaration * * * we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor," indicated clearly the high value that each of them placed upon this precious thing called freedom. Assuredly, each well knew his signature on that document was the equivalent of a death warrant if the war for independence was lost. "Give me liberty or give me death"—"Millions for defense but not a cent for tribute"—I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country"—were not uttered by persons who held freedom in slight esteem. They knew full well, as all before them and all since have known, who have engaged in the eternal struggle from freedom, that freedom is man's most precious possession, which has been bought and paid for in the blood, sweat, tears, and sacrifice of millions of human beings, even as today.

In these latter years the tendency of most of us has been to assume that this freedom is our birthright and, like many inheritances for which we ourselves have not struggled, to evaluate it perhaps less highly, and certainly to regard it with less concern than would be the case otherwise.

The time has come, however, to arouse ourselves from our complacency, for this inheritance of ours we are slowly but steadily losing—losing to a foe which most of the American people have not yet recognized as being such. This is because freedom's greatest foe is intangible—a foe that one cannot see or feel or stand up to, because it is an idea—a foreign, alien idea, but an idea, nonetheless, of such power that it already has destroyed freedom for tens of millions of persons on this earth. Never forget this: that history shows unmistakably that ideas are the most powerful force in the world and that, once firmly planted in the minds of millions, they are extremely difficult to uproot.

The name of the idea that is freedom's greatest foe is collectivism, and its progeny goes by many other names, such as nazism, fascism, communism, socialism, unionism, statelsm, and the like. All these isms have one thing in common—namely, that they make the interests of the mass, class or group superior to the interests of the individual, and compel the individual to subject himself and his interests to the dictates of the mass, class, or group. Opposed to this idea is the concept named individualism, which holds that the supreme factor of worth in this world is the individual—his rights, his interests, his freedom. Christianity contains this same basic conception of the supreme worth and superior importance of the individual. The founding fathers of our nation were so imbued with the principles of individualism that they undertook to protect the inalienable rights and superior interests of the individual in the supreme law of the land. Even so, collectivism persists in its influence upon mankind.

The appeals of collectivism to the individual are subtle, powerful, and strong, for the appeals are directed to natural human instincts and prevalent human weaknesses. There is the appeal of security, directed to the instinct of self-preservation, the appeal of security being phrased in those beguiling words known to all as freedom from fear. There is the appeal directed to that human longing inherent in all of us to have our personal needs and selfish desires satisfied, and this appeal is phrased in those equally beguiling words known to all of us as freedom from want. Security and abundance—those are the two appealing ideas—ideas that have been reiterated again only within the past 2 weeks as the declared aim of the postwar planners in Washington. There is still a third subtle appeal that comes quite by inference—namely, that this security and abundance can be had, not because of any effort on the part of the individual, but as the result of the work of a few men who plan it that way. This is the appeal to laziness, a strong human instinct that has come down through the centuries and, I regret to say, an all too human weakness in many of us today.

These appeals are then rationalized and made plausible by resorting to that age-old generalization of Aristotle that what is best for the greatest number is best for all, and that therefore any undertaking that has as its objective the greatest good for the greatest number is worthy of the support of each individual. This is a plausibility that is hard to defeat, because on the surface it makes sense to the average man, who fails to see that it begs the question in that it fails to define what is best and what is good. For example: Is it best that we should have no fears and just go bubbling along through life surcharged with faith that everything is going to be all right, because the planners who are looking out for us say so? Is it best that most of us should want for nothing, assuming that all human wants are capable of fulfillment, which they are not? Is it best that the majority should have security and abundance as the result of the planners' clever planning rather than as the result of their own planning and their own efforts? Is the greatest good for the greatest number served by a program of less work for more pay? Is the greatest good for the greatest number served by a program of confiscatory taxation to redistribute wealth? Is the greatest good for the greatest number served by a program of borrow and borrow, spend and spend, lend and lend, inflate and inflate, debase and debase? I am not attempting to answer these questions, though I believe them to be readily answerable. I am merely pointing out the fallaciousness of the plausible argument of the collectivists that programs designed to provide the greatest good for the greatest number are necessarily good. Who can insure that the program is good until it has been demonstrated that the alleged goodness is in fact good irrespective of the numbers involved?

Thus you see that collectivism has strong appeals to fundamental human instincts and to the weaknesses of human nature, and that it clothes its appeal in arguments of plausibility to snare the gullible. But the strongest appeal of all to the average person is the price of all this security and abundance—this freedom from fear and freedom from want—for the price is allegedly cheap and presumably constitutes a real bargain. What is the price? Merely that of joining up—signing up—becoming a part of some mass or group or class or movement—paying small dues or making small contributions, or in some cases paying or contributing nothing at all, just joining up. Ah, but in that joining up one must give up part of one's precious individual freedom of action through "cooperation" with the group, "cooperation" being the collectivists' soft and polite word for carrying out the orders of the group leader, whether he be known as fuehrer, commissar, duce, or what have you. The name is immaterial. The important thing is that orders are orders and that you do as you are told, or else. You're in and you can't escape. The penalties of those who think otherwise vary from death, sudden or slow, all the way to blacklisting and social isolation.

When we come to the appeals of individualism, we find entirely different appeals, for the appeals of individualism are not directed to the weakness in human nature but rather to its strength. The appeals of individualism are and always have been to the aspirations of humankind—the aspiration to be free, to say and do and be as one will, subject to the domination of no man or group of men; the aspiration to make the most of one's talents, powers, capacities and abilities—to grow, to achieve, to develop, deterred by no man or group of men, or even by the bludgeonings of fate or circumstance; the aspiration to live one's life to the full and to enjoy the fruits of that life as one will, without interference or restraint or despoilment; the aspiration to leave to the world and one's progeny a better place in which to live, because of the labors and achievements of one's life. These are the aspirations, the fulfillment of which only freedom makes possible.

And the price—what is the price that one must pay for these fruits of individual freedom—for the opportunity to satisfy these aspirations? Because the value is great, the price, unlike the price of collectivism, is not cheap but high. The price is hard work, thrift, courage, fortitude, determination, perseverance, anxiety, and sacrifice.

One would think that the appeal of individualism would be especially great to youth—youth with its boundless energy, enthusiasms, imagination; youth with its courage and daring, and such is the case for the most part. The collectivists, however, knowing this, have been hard at work endeavoring to defeat the appeals to youth of individualism by feeding cleverly and subtly the seductive ideas of collectivism into the unguarded, credulous minds of youth through so-called youth movements designed purportedly to enlarge the sphere of opportunity for youth in the "new world of tomorrow." Have you never heard of the Hitler Youth Movement, with its "Joy through strength" program; or, in this country, of the National Youth Movement, trading on the idealism of youth, with its program of security for youth through abundance of everything, and its plausible argument that such a program provides the greatest good for the greatest number of youth? Few people realize how far the ideas of collectivism have already permeated the minds of American youth, but inquiry will show that collectivism has done its work well while individualism for the most part has remained silent as regards American youth.

Recently I have been corresponding with a fine young American 22 years of age, who at present is a naval officer. I have known him for many years, known his family and his background. He is well bred, well educated and has had what you might call a good American bringing-up. He wrote me to ascertain my views regarding the course that he should take after the war is over. He knew that in my younger days I had gone through law school and engaged in the practice of law and he wanted to know what law

school I thought it best for him to attend, and whether upon the completion of his legal studies he should enter a large law office in a large city, dealing with large clients, or a small law office in a small city, dealing with small clients. Then he went on to inquire my opinion as to whether or not it might be wise for him to give up the idea of becoming a lawyer and instead devote his talents to the business world, and whether in such event he would be better off joining a large business organization or a small business organization. He said, "You see, what I am really seeking and thinking about is where, after I get out of the service, I can find the greatest security for the future."

I confess that when I read that word "security" and realized the true purpose of his queries, I was shocked, as it was inconceivable to me that a young man of his background, bringing-up, attainments, and capacities, possessing a high degree of intelligence, could already have become so saturated with that basic appeal of collectivism. So I sat down and wrote him a letter and let him have it straight from the shoulder. I told him that if he was really seeking so-called security, that about the best place he could find it on this earth was to take a civil-service examination and go to work for the Government, hoping that political intrigue would not unseat him or make his life miserable, and that the ability of the taxpayers would be equal to the task of providing him with his monthly stipend and pension upon retirement. I told him that I was shocked to think that one of his age and abilities, with most of life before him, had already begun to think in terms of security and freedom from want and fear; that when I was his age, the young men of my time were thinking not in terms of security, but opportunity—opportunity to make the most of their talents, abilities, and capacities—opportunity to achieve and develop their high aspirations and hopes—opportunity to grow and develop through struggle the strength to rise and climb. I told him that I was surprised that one of his intelligence had not long ago seen that the idea of personal security was for all practical purposes a fiction, nothing being sure in this uncertain world save death and taxes. I pointed out to him how the hallmarks and landmarks of a civilization in Europe over a thousand years old were today being destroyed and made a shambles. I showed him how the lives, homes, dreams, and hopes of millions of American young men like himself were today being wrecked and blasted by a war that few dreamed of 10 years ago.

I told him of some of the men of great wealth and power whom I as a young man his age had known and looked up to, and who from the standpoint of so-called security seemed to have security beyond all comprehension, yet who in subsequent years lost it all and died in meager or bankrupt circumstances; Charles Schwab, for example, who as president of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation when I graduated from college was one of the wealthiest and most powerful business leaders of that time, whose estate upon his death was insufficient to pay a small note for money borrowed from a church he had helped support in his days of affluence; the Van Swearingens, who began as orphan newsboys on the streets of Cleveland and gained control of the largest railroad system in the United States, who had once been worth over a hundred million dollars on paper and yet who died insolvent; the Armours, Durant, and many more of the great business leaders of that time, whose fortunes had all been swept away.

I told him of my own father, who shortly before the twenties was worth a considerable fortune, and who upon my return home from college after graduation, showed me his personal balance sheet that indicated that his worth was less than nothing. I showed to him that the idea of material security is an utterly fallacious idea in this world of trial and tribulation, death and destruction, change and uncertainty; that the only thing that approaches security that amounts to anything is that something within you that nothing can take from you save death itself—that strength of heart and mind and character that enables you to face the world with courage and faith and high resolution, undaunted and undismayed; that something within you that enabled a man like my father, at 65 years of age, to start over again, found a new business, and go to work paying up his obligations and providing for the latter years of his life, which he is still doing at 85 years of age and going strong. I told him that that's the kind of security that he should be seeking—that's the kind of security he should be striving for—that's the kind of security he should be aspiring to, for that was the only kind of security that was real. In closing I exhorted him to follow the tenets of that great American, Theodore Roosevelt, who preached the doctrine not of security, abundance, and ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life; who preached not that his burdens might be lightened, but that his strength might be made equal to the task of carrying the burdens that were his; who preached not the soft and debilitating doctrine of freedom from something, but the strong, vigorous doctrine of freedom for everybody, knowing that in this life we only grow strong as we struggle, and only reach the limit of our capacities as individual freedom provides us a limitless area of opportunity in which to expand them.

Some of you may think that this young man is an exaggerated case, but I tell you here and now that the pernicious doctrines of collectivism have already made deep inroads into the minds of American youth, and that as long as the doctrines of individualism and freedom for the individual are allowed to sleep in silence, that these pernicious doctrines of collectivism will continue to warp the thinking and sap the vitality of that portion of our population where the spirit of liberty and freedom should burn the fiercest and brightest.

One would also think that the appeal of individualism would be strong in the realm of business, because business by its very nature involves the elements of venture and enterprise. Generally speaking, the spirit of freedom and independence burns bright in the lives of most independent businessmen, but the doctrines of collectivism have already permeated to a large extent the thinking of many of the heads of big, integrated businesses, sometimes referred to as the mass producers and the mass distributors. At least many of these so-called big businessmen have shown unmistakable signs of being willing to play along and compromise with the doctrines of collectivism, on the theory that by so doing they can work both sides of the street, to the enrichment and advancement of their businesses, when in reality all they are doing is selling their birthright for a mess of pottage. The collectivists artfully encourage this practice of working both sides of the street and play up to big business whenever possible, because the collectivists know that big, integrated business can be a valuable ally in subjugating and destroying that citadel of freedom and independence and individualism, the independent businessman about whom they are outwardly so solicitous but with respect to whom they quietly but assiduously scheme and work to weaken and destroy. The collectivists fully appreciate that in all lands the independent businessmen, large or small, has always been the biggest bulwark of freedom, and hence have welcomed any and all assistance from whatever source to effect his destruction.

The appeals of individualism have been strong for centuries to farmers, doctors, nurses, lawyers, teachers, actors, and others who labor largely by themselves, but here also the appeals of collectivism have made substantial advances in changing basic attitudes toward freedom. The farmers are being lured by the idea of the ever-normal granary with its implied ever-normal profit, notwithstanding the loss of freedom involved in controlled planting, regimented husbandry, and hand-out subsidies. The doctors and nurses are being enticed with the security appeal of steady income through socialized medicine. Lawyers, teachers, and actors are being beguiled into guilds to effect standardization of income and job security. So through the whole fabric of our still individualistic free society, the ideas and appeals of collectivism are steadily moving with increasing power and momentum.

There are many well-meaning idealistic persons in high places of government, business, the professions, etc., who are actively sponsoring and promoting the doctrines of collectivism for many ill-conceived reasons. Some argue that since the horse and buggy days are gone and there are no longer new frontiers that individualism has served its purpose and that collectivism provides the best system for the new order-to-be of security and abundance. Others follow the defeatism line and contend that as nothing can be done to stop the growth of collectivism, the thing to do is to climb on the band wagon and go along with the procession, or, in other words, if you can't lick 'em—join em.

Few there are of these Quislings of individualism who will concede that the doctrines of collectivism are antagonistic to and destructive of the freedoms of individualism. On the contrary, they proclaim that the developments of civilization being what they are, that the freedom of the individual is protected and preserved by the so-called security of collectivism. They argue that collectivism and individualism can live in peace side by side and get along together in their respective spheres of influence, and be mutually complementary to each other, all of which is specious reasoning of the first order. They well know, or should know, that freedom has no frontiers or spheres and that freedom is never divisible. Just as you cannot eat your cake and have it too, you cannot give up part of your freedom and expect to long retain the rest. No less wise an observer than Benjamin Franklin remarked some years ago that "he who trades freedom for security assuredly will lose both."

The facts of history and experience show beyond a shadow of doubt that the doctrines of collectivism and individualism are utterly antagonistic to each other and that in the end one must triumph and one must fail. Just as you cannot serve God and mammon, you cannot make the interests of the group, mass, or class supreme and retain individual freedom. The history of the past 25 years in Germany, Italy, and Russia is proof positive of that.

Nor can you compromise with collectivism. Big, integrated business in Germany and Italy gave the nod to Hitler and Mussolini—helped put them in power and sustain them in power until the collectivistic socialist state which they had created was strong enough to engulf its big business supporters. No indeed—you cannot eat your cake and have it too. No nation or peoples can long remain half slave and half free.

If any of you here today have any other idea, I urge you—in fact, I urge all of you—to read The Road to Serfdom, by Friedrich A. Hayek, which was published last fall by the University of Chicago Press and is currently reviewed as the leading article in this month's (April) Reader's Digest. I believe that when you have finished reading this book or the review, you will recognize the utter impossibility of the ideas of collectivism living side by side in peace with the ideas of individualism.

The irreparable nature of the conflict in the two doctrines has been illustrated only recently in this country in several dramatic instances that have come to the public's attention. Mr. Sewell Avery, as head of Montgomery Ward & Co. has twice had the control of operation of the business wrested by force from him and his associates because he refused to obey the dictates of the collectivists ordering him to execute a contract with an employees' union requiring individual employees of the company who were members of the union to maintain the payment of dues to the union or be discharged by the company. He contended that there was no law that required him to sign such a contract and that if there was such a law, it violated the rights and freedom of individuals guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and that in any event he would not accede to the idea that in "the land of the free and home of the brave" any individual had to pay tribute to any organization in order to continue to work for Montgomery Ward & Co. Even though the Federal district court fully sustained his contention—pending appeal of the decision—the collectivists still enforce control of operation of the company's property.

Last fall, out in Los Angeles, Mr. Cecil B. DeMille as a member of a union was assessed $1 to finance a campaign in opposition to a proposed law banning the closed shop. He was not in favor of the campaign or the defeat of the proposed law, so he refused to pay the assessment. He received notice that the failure to pay the assessment would result in suspension from the union, and in this case suspension from the union would deprive him of the right to engage in his life's work—namely, the entertainment business. Nevertheless he stood his ground, and consequently was suspended from the union and forced to give up his employment. He is now engaged in a fight through the courts to establish his right to refuse to pay $1 in behalf of a cause that he was opposed to. It will cost him many hundred thousands of dollars in loss of income and expenses before his simple, individual right of freedom is established and the power of collectivism is defeated, but he feels the great cause of individual freedom and liberty for which he fights is worth it all. Speaking recently in Omaha, he said:

"This is an issue between all liberty-loving citizens and a few (?) unscrupulous men who are trying to gather into their own hands—for their own use—the power of the people, just as it was gathered in Germany and Italy and in other totalitariam countries. If it is not quickly stopped all individual rights and freedom will be gone, and only the right to obey left to us."

It is obvious that Mr. DeMille fails to appreciate the vast number of unscrupulous men in the forces of collectivism, even though he fully appreciates the life and death nature of the conflict. Incidentally, in the first court the collectivists won, the court holding that members of an organization are bound by the reasonable rules of the governing board, even though it would appear unreasonable to require one to be for something that he is against. Requiring one to be for something that he is against, however, is good collectivistic doctrine here as well as in Germany, Italy, Russia, or elsewhere. Never forget that in spite of the collectivist's deceitful claim that collectivism protects the freedom of the individual by enlarging his alleged security, the basic proposition of collectisvism is always "join up—cooperate or else." Ah, freedom—what crimes are committed in thy name.

Just one more illustration of the irreparable nature of the conflict and then I will conclude. In Canton, Ohio, there is a member of the Timken Roller Bearing Union who desires to withdraw from the union. The union contends that the member cannot withdraw from the union in good standing unless said member signs a withdrawal form. This form contains a blank for the social-security number and the name and address of the member, and carries this paragraph:

"I am withdrawing my membership with the understanding that my name will be forwarded to all local unions throughout the United States which are affiliated with the CIO and the A. F. of L., and that *I will never be accepted again as a member of any local union affiliated with the CIO.*"

The italics are mine—the edict is the ultimate consummation of collectivism—the blacklist—eventually the concentration camp—in any event the principle of rule or ruin—the supremacy of the group, mass, or class versus the freedom of the individual.[1]

No, gentlemen, in spite of the plausibilities, specious arguments, and promises of security and abundance by the collectivists, two and two still make four—we can't eat our cake and have it too—if we trade our freedom for security, we will assuredly lose both. Between collectivism and individualism there can be no compromise. It's a fight to the finish—one will triumph and one will fail. The stake is man's most precious possession in life—his freedom.

Time will not permit me to recite here what course I think should be followed if freedom's greatest foe is to be defeated and driven back across the seas from whence it came.[2] It will be sufficient today if I have caused you to clearly see the nature of the foe and the nature of the conflict. It will be a hard fight and a long one, but it can be won if all who love freedom, liberty, and independence are determined to have and to hold them, and are willing to pay the price in money and effort to preserve them.

It is inconceivable to me that once the American people fully appreciate the nature of the struggle, recognize the foe and understand what is at stake, that they will forsake the freedom of individualism for the alleged security of collectivism.

As far as so-called security and abundance go, no people on earth have enjoyed as much of both as the free people of the United States of America. Here we are—as a nation—only 156 years old—very young as nations go. Yet, under the doctrines of individualism, which regard the individual as the factor of supreme worth and give to him full freedom to make the most of his capacities and opportunities—the people of this Nation have built for themselves the richest, strongest, most powerful nation in the world—a nation with the highest standard of living in the world, with the happiest homes, securest homes, freest homes in the world. Can it be that we, who are the pride and envy of the peoples of the world, will knowingly abandon a proven way of life that has brought us such untold blessings, and knowingly pursue the seductive doctrines of collectivism that have brought only a lower standard of living, insecurity, and tragedy to all who have tried them overseas? Certainly not—if the American people are awakened to what is going on—before it is too late.

Five thousand miles across one ocean and ten thousand miles across the other, the youth of America today is fighting as vicious and stupendous a war as the history of mankind has ever recorded. Over a hundred thousand of them have already given their lives and nearly a million of them have been maimed and mangled and have known the frightful pain inflicted by the weapons of modern warfare. They are fighting, suffering and dying to preserve their homeland and their loved ones—to keep them safe and keep them free. What greater tragedy could there be, than that what they are fighting for and winning on the battle front, we should lose on the home front; that the vestiges of collectivism which they are now destroying in Europe and in the Far East, they should, upon returning here, find well entrenched and stronger than ever? This can be, but must not be. It shall not be, if you and I and millions like us play our full part to outsell the foreign, subversive doctrines of collectivism that have already furtively and silently crept into the minds of millions of our people, snuffing out and smothering the thoughts and ideas of freedom and liberty and the extreme importance of the individual in the scheme of things—much like crabgrass has made its way across the green lawns of this Nation, quitly but steadily penetrating and destroying them.

Recently a nephew of mine—just a lad 21 years of age—came back a casualty from the European war front, where he had been in fox holes filled with mud, snow, and water for 7 weeks without taking off his clothes. He told me that as the great ship bringing many more thousands like him, most of whom were in far worse shape than he, steamed into New York Harbor all those who could raise their heads to peer out the portholes did so, and that as they steamed past the "Old Lady" holding high in her hand the Torch of Liberty, the tears streamed down their faces unabashed and unashamed; for there she stood—the "Light of the World"—greeting them upon their return to "the land of the free and the home of the brave"—the Good Old U. S. A. He said that some of the fellows started to sing "God Bless America—Land That I Love," just as those internees did in Santa Tomas Prison in far-off Manila when Old Glory was unfurled. Others sang "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty * * * from every mountainside let freedom ring."

Tens of thousands of American soldiers like this, who have seen and experienced the hell of war and witnessed the untold suffering of those who have been made slaves and prisoners of foreign isms, know to the full the blessedness of freedom—the freedom that the founders of our Nation meant that we should have, provided that we are worthy, and determined to have and to hold it. That kind of freedom can be ours if we will exert ourselves to the utmost to keep it—if we and millions like us will "From every mountainside, let freedom ring."

---

[1] See addendum—Malcolm Bingay's report from Germany.

[2] See addendum—Outlining suggestions for defeating the ideas of collectivism.

ADDENDA

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE WRITTEN BY MALCOLM BINGAY, APPEARING IN AKRON BEACON JOURNAL, APRIL 29, 1945

(Mr. Bingay, editorial writer for Knight Newspapers, Inc., was one of the group of distinguished American newspapermen invited to Europe by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to see with their own eyes the horrors of nazism.)

I now write not as a member of the reporting committee, but give my own personal opinion.

If everybody in America could see what we have seen, there would sweep over the United States a complete understanding of what nazism means as a threat to the peace of the world and the hopes of mankind.

That threat will not end when the Nazi armies are crushed. The threat is not that of mere physical force. It is the power of an idea conceived in hell and gestated with fiendish genius.

I will not dwell long on the sights we saw at Buchenwald. They have been accurately reported.

I saw hundreds of creatures that were once human beings now reduced to mere skeletons covered with skin. The only happy ones were piled like cordwood in the yard waiting their turn at the vast crematory.

I saw the long rows of gallows at which many were hanged to die of slow strangulation.

I saw the clubs with which they had been beaten. These men were not prisoners of war. They were thrown into this hell on earth for just one reason—they refused to accept the political philosophy of the Nazi Party.

They were slave labor. First Jews and anti-Nazi Germans, then other brave souls who refused to conform.

It is no time for emotionalism. It is not a study of any one individual human or group of human beings. It is a national neurosis, the mass production of a world insanity generated by the power of an evil idea—the elimination of all individual rights, the rejection of the human soul, the denial of God Himself, the apotheosis of opposition to every clean and worthy thing for which America has ever stood.

REMARKS OMITTED FROM ADDRESS OF J. P. SEIBERLING TO SALESMANSHIP CLUB OF DALLAS, TEX., BECAUSE OF LACK OF TIME

How are we going to defeat collectivism and drive its destructive ideas from our midst? The answers to the question in themselves are many, and each constitutes a considerable subject, so I will only touch upon some of them here.

1. The liberty-loving, freedom-loving persons in our population must be aroused to the grave peril that exists with respect to their freedom, and must be made aware of the real nature of freedom's greatest foe, and the true nature of the conflict.

2. These persons must be inspired to band together to attack this foe in countless ways, and sustain the attack for one generation at least, and maybe two.

3. The attack must obviously be along educational and propaganda lines, for ideas—which are the most powerful force in the world—can only be encompassed and defeated with stronger and more compelling counter ideas, which for the most part must be positive rather than negative in character. It is not sufficient that the fallaciousness of opposing ideas be demonstrated. The false ideas must be supplanted with positive, true, and constructive ones. It must also be recognized that the ideas must be backed up with practical results, as man cannot live on ideas alone. Freedom without adequate food, shelter, clothing, and opportunity is only for the intrepid.

4. The educational and propaganda attack must be made on a broad front, consistently sustained, employing every known method of communication and using various and appropriate types of appeals. Certainly for the past dozen years or so, collectivism has done an excellent job of implanting its ideas. The collectivists have been aggressive and positive in their actions; they have been deceptive and subtle in their appeals; they have organized, planned, and executed well; they have consistently and persistently pushed their attack with dash, vigor, and daring. They have shouted their doctrines with confidence and cockiness from every forum to which they could shoulder their way—from the radio microphone to the Halls of Congress; from public meeting places to soap boxes; from books, pamphlets, newspapers, hand bills, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, franked speeches—to movies and the dramatic and fine arts. Over and over again they have pounded away at a few simple ideas and appeals in an endless variety of approaches and treatment. The propaganda tactics set forth in Mein Kampf were faithfully and successfully followed. Opposition was effectively silenced by smears, ridicule, gross and repeated half-truths and untruths and, when necessary, by intimidation and coercive action. Individualists for the most part have remained silent, said little, written little, or answered with amazing ineptitude. But there is nothing good that collectivists have done along educational and propaganda lines that individualists cannot do better.

5. A thorough job of organization must be done in every city, town, village, and hamlet in the land, so as to reach the youth in the homes, schools, and colleges; the farmers; the businessmen, and business people; the professional men and women; the politicians; the teachers and doctors; the veterans of this and the last war; the patriotic organizations; the preachers and religious bodies; the women of the Nation; and the wage earners in their homes. Again, and again, and again they must hear the positive ideas and rewards of the blessings of liberty and freedom, the glories of this Nation's past and the greatness of this Nation's future under the banner of freedom, until they are thoroughly trained to sell freedom in every township, ward, precinct, and block in the land.

6. Reestablish throughout the land through befitting ceremonies, rituals, and customs greater respect for the Nation's flag, National Anthem, and the high office of President of the United States by continuous and proper display of the flag, the singing or playing of the National Anthem at the opening of all public gatherings, and toasts to the President of the United States at all luncheon and dinner meetings of organizations, and the encouragement in every way of reverence and respect for our institutions and the Constitution of the United States.

7. The development of a sound legislative program to break the chains and shackles and controls that have been forged and fastened upon our economy, and the pushing through of that program with vigor and dispatch, so that a free economy may move forward once again, charged with confidence, enthusiasm, hope, and faith that "the best is yet to be," thus unleashing the vast power of American economic energy.

The task is a large one, but it can be accomplished by effective organization of freedom-loving individuals who are determined to see the cause of freedom maintained and strengthened in our land.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of June 5, 1945:

THIS IS A CALIFORNIA PROJECT

Should the people of California run the Central Valley project when it is completed? Or should the Interior Department in far-off Washington, D. C., conduct this California enterprise in the manner of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

If the wishes of the people of California are consulted, the irrigation and power features of the Central Valley project, which controls the waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, will be taken over by Californians, leaving to the Federal Government navigation and salt control.

If the wishes of Secretary of the Interior Ickes are consulted, the Central Valley will be run lock, stock, and barrel by the Reclamation Bureau in perpetuity in accord with what Mr. Ickes conceives to be the general good of everybody.

Tied in with Central Valley are flood-control projects on the Kings River, the Kaweah River, the Tule River, and the Kern River, already surveyed by the United States engineers. Mr. Ickes and the Reclamation Bureau seek to take over these local projects also and run them from Washington. Most of the people of Fresno, Tulare, and Kern Counties want the Army to construct these dams and leave the counties to run them, as is customary with other flood-control projects.

Now all these rivers rise in, flow through and empty from the soil of California and no other State. They are not interstate streams, as is the Tennessee, which required an administration transcending State lines since it traverses several States. The problems concerning them are State problems, except as navigation interests are concerned: navigation, everybody agrees is the business of the Federal Government.

They cannot efficiently be administered from Washington, in accordance with the set formulas devised by Harold Ickes, or any other national Secretary of the Interior who may succeed him.

The reasons which justify Federal control of projects on streams traversing or bordering several States do not exist in the case of the Central Valley Project or in the cases of the other local projects mentioned. These are all California streams and no other State is concerned with them.

We need an effective State water board, to be sure, to assume jurisdiction over these purely State projects. But the formation of such an organization is a California responsibility—a responsibility which will be executed quickly when the Federal Government steps out of the way. California, of course, will pay the bill for construction of such parts of the works as pertain to irrigation and power; and it should have the management of them.

Prior to 1942, no one ever supposed that the Federal Government proposed to move in on Central Valley. The general understanding from the project's inception was that a State water authority would control after completion. California should insist that this original understanding be carried out.

The State chamber of commerce properly supports this view. It points out that there are three serious objections to Federal control: First, that vested water rights set up by State law could be condemned and seized by the Federal authority at its option; second, that the Federal authority would subject California to a combination of economic and political control at the whim of Washington, and, last, that the proposed Federal authority is not answerable to Congress for the expenditure of its revenue and hence would be a law to itself.

These are cogent objections. But they can be summed up by saying that California knows its own business best and should be allowed to attend to it in its own fashion.

American Soil Preservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, important though unspectacular organizations interested in the preservation and improvement of the fertility of America's soil have been hard at work for many years. Our Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with the agricultural schools of many States, has been waging a great fight against misuse of our country's soil.

Now the Soil Conservation Service chief, Hugh H. Bennett, has announced that more than 200,000,000 acres of farm

and range land have been thoroughly mapped for agricultural capacity. More than 375,000 farmers are reportedly using these maps in planning their individual programs of soil and water utilization on some 75,000,000 acres. Forty-five States have organized soil-conservation districts conducted by farming men themselves. These are encouraging signs to a nation whose 600,000,000 acres of crop land have almost 100,000,000 out of productivity because of abuse of the soil.

America United

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the broadcast by the American Federation of the Farm Bureau over the NBC network, Sunday, June 10, 1945, as follows:

MR. EDWARD A. O'NEAL, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE FARM BUREAU

Mr. O'NEAL. The Farm Bureau is privileged today to act as host to a distinguished panel of leaders—Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; and Congressman Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, who speaks for Government.

The 1944 convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation adopted a resolution, which reads, in part, as follows:

"We appeal to the leaders in other groups of agriculture and the recognized leaders in labor and in industry to join in a series of conferences in 1945, to formulate a program necessary for the establishment and maintenance of policies designed to assure large-scale production of the products of both agriculture and other industry, and their interchange on a basis of true economic balance, and the establishment and maintenance of a standard of regular wages for workers on such a scale of economic balance."

That, gentlemen, is what the Farm Bureau is committed to. We all agree, I believe, that we face serious economic disturbances unless we manage to achieve maximum production and use of goods, maximum employment at adequate wages, and fair economic balance among the various groups. The hour is growing late. We must make definite plans to meet the crucial test of postwar adjustment.

We have an opportunity here today to advise the public, on behalf of our respective organizations, how we plan to achieve the universally desired goal of an economy of abundance and a national standard of living for all the people far beyond anything that has hitherto been dreamed of.

To achieve these goals we must wipe out artificial barriers to the free exchange of goods and services among our people and among the people of other countries, and we must learn to coordinate our policies to achieve the greatest good to the greatest number.

We may as well admit that the job is bigger than any one of our organizations, and that without teamwork we will all be lost. How much have you already done and what further are you prepared to do in your organizations? Mr. Green, may we hear from the American Federation of Labor?

MR. WILLIAM GREEN, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. GREEN. I want to emphasize at the outset, Mr. O'Neal, that an economy of plenty for all Americans is the No. 1 postwar objective on the home front of the American Federation of Labor.

We believe that the first step toward this goal is the establishment of lasting international peace, based upon justice and affording every nation full opportunity to work out its economic salvation.

In our own country, that salvation depends on maximum production in industry and in agriculture, accompanied by full employment at a high wage level.

America has learned from bitter experience that when millions of workers are unemployed and when wages are depressed, the farmers and businessmen are bound to suffer, too. Farm surpluses and overloaded inventories inevitably follow in the wake of reduced purchasing power of the Nation's workers.

At the same time, when the bottom falls out of the market on agricultural prices and the farmers are caught in an economic squeeze, labor and industry lose one of their best customers and are adversely affected.

Finally, unless free, competitive enterprise is given every opportunity to expand production and provide abundant jobs for workers and industrial products for farmers, the Nation's economic machinery will not function efficiently.

Thus, labor recognizes the close interdependence of its own welfare with that of industry and agriculture.

I am convinced that if these facts are taken to heart by all concerned, the way will be cleared for industry, agriculture and labor to work together as an economic team in the postwar period for the national well-being.

Already, a large section of industry and organized labor have adopted and ratified a code of principles in which each side agrees to respect the other's rights. This code seeks to establish harmony and cooperation in place of strife.

While no such formal charter has as yet been attempted between agriculture and labor, I want the farmers of America to know that the American Federation of Labor has always supported their cause and will back up their efforts to secure fair prices even more vigorously in the future.

ERIC JOHNSTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. O'Neal, the businessmen of America, whom I represent as president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, are acutely aware of the need for the closest unity among the groups in our national economy, as expressed in the title of these Sunday broadcasts, "America United."

You have expressed the desire of the American Farm Bureau Federation to join with other groups in seeking means, through cooperation, of assuring large-scale production of agricultural and industrial products and for their interchange on a basis of true economic balance. We have heard from Mr. Green, for labor.

I want to pledge the participation of business in any effort that promises to improve our national standards of living. Manifestly, we cannot in the period of reconversion which we are now entering and in the period that will follow the war's end have an expanding economy without the highest degree of unity and the fullest cooperation among our economic groups.

Mr. Green and I have recently had a hand in framing a labor-management charter designed to lessen industrial conflict. It still is only a piece of paper. But we and many others feel that it opens the road to future industrial peace.

We believe the charter gives a basis upon which both labor and industry can work toward, fuller cooperation in the interests of both and in the interest of the American people.

I cite the charter as an example of what can be accomplished when two groups earnestly seek agreement on principles for their common betterment.

To be prosperous, as you have indicated, America must produce. That applies to the farm and to industry. Industry needs a prosperous agricultural population to absorb its products; and the farmer wants a prosperous industry with high employment at good wages because the industrial worker buys the products of the farm abundantly or sparingly as his income goes up or down.

Without an economy of abundance, we cannot enjoy abundant living. We cannot have either unless we are united in a common purpose to aid each other in building a better America.

We will always have differences of opinion and we will always have a striving to obtain group advantage. But we must realize that there must be an equitable balance in our economy, and that if one end of the seesaw is always up the other is bound to be always down.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. CANNON. You have just heard the three great leaders in American industry, Mr. O'Neal, representing agriculture; Mr. Green, representing labor; and Mr. Johnston, representing business.

Their appearance here together, on this important forum of the air, at a time when throughout the Nation our economic engineers are busily plotting charts and blueprints to guide us through the hazardous period which will follow the close of the war, is most opportune and deeply significant.

The depression which followed the last war was largely the result of failure of the captains of industry of that day, to plan in advance for a situation which should have been clearly foreseen. Depressions and unemployment are not visitations of God. They flow directly and inevitably from faulty planning, or from no planning at all.

These distinguished leaders who appear here today, proposing the correlation and coordination of the great forces in their respective organizations, in the formulation of policies—which will maintain high production and full employment and an American standard of living following the war—are rendering an invaluable service to the working man, the farmer, the businessman, and the Nation at large.

As the modernization of transportation and communication has brought the nations of the world closer together—the modernization of production and distribution has brought all industries closer together. Throughout the Nation men are at last realizing that it is no longer possible to live alone and no longer possible to prosper alone. As each prospers the Nation prospers.

The broadcast today by those in a position to speak for the great forces which must work together for the common good, is a forecast of future prosperity—not only of America but of the world. America is assuming world leadership—leadership not only in political democracy but in industrial democracy, and through such men as these, will lead the way to a common prosperity, enduring peace, and to world welfare.

They operate through organization and through the medium of statutory law. They service and maintain the organization and in response to their needs Congress formulates the law.

For legislation is essentially the handmaiden of industry. No law can be enacted or successfully administered without the approval and support of the people. It follows then, that in the enactment of legislation which will make it possible for industry to function most effectively, we must necessarily take counsel with these men and the

forces and interests which they represent and which all three of them have represented so efficiently through the last decade. With their cooperation the future is bright with promise and with the assurance of industrial security, national prosperity, and international cooperation.

Will Our Constitution Remain the Same?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 last, it was my privilege to be present at the sixth district of New Jersey national high-school oratorical contest, held at the Freehold High School, with the subject The Constitution of the United States. There were four contestants whose names were James W. Moore, Trenton Central High School; Bernard Franckel, Lakewood High School; John Britton, Jr., Long Branch Senior High School; and Carol Markel, St. Peter's High School, New Brunswick; and every one of them made speeches which showed study and careful preparation. The winner was James W. Moore, who later competed at Trenton for the State prize.

The American Legion deserves a great deal of credit for sponsoring this program and in this way bringing to the high school students of the country the glory of Americanism and the responsibilities of citizenship. It is with much prid that I have these excellent speeches printed in the RECORD and I hope my colleagues will read them:

WILL OUR CONSTITUTION REMAIN THE SAME?

(By James W. Moore, Trenton Central High School, Trenton, N. J.)

(Prize-winning speech in Trenton Central High School, city, county, and Sixth District contests)

Mankind has developed an unusual standard of values. Many of us do not appreciate our mother and father until we no longer have them. We do not appreciate childhood until we are men and women. And, in a like manner, we will not appreciate our Constitution until we no longer have it. Hundreds upon hundreds of our valiant American soldiers thought little of their arms and legs until the dust of battle had cleared and the roar of guns had faded and they were left to live without one or more of these priceless possessions which you and I take for granted. The man without a country had to lose his citizenship before he could realize the true value of his native land. Does the common ownership by 130,000,000 people make Americanism cheap? The answer, apparently, is yes.

Suppose you were given a magnificent, rare jewel. You probably would guard it with your life, you would take every precaution for its safekeeping, and if someone tried to take it from you, you would put up a stiff fight. All for a small jewel, which, although rare, might be replaced. How many of you, on the other hand, take an equal precaution for the safe keeping of Americanism? And if a Communist or a Fascist should try to take it from you, how many of you would put up a stiff fight? Is it not worth the protection you gave the jewel or do you differentiate between a jewel and Americanism because one is rare and the other is common?

Our American way of life is outlined in the Constitution. By the principles of this document our country rose from a small fourth-rate power of rebels to the greatest Nation the world has ever known. You and I lived by the principles of this document before we ever knew what it meant. Today your friends and mine are risking their lives on the battlefields of the world in order that you and your children may continue to live your lives in peace under the principles of this same document. But does the winning of this war guarantee to us that our Constitution will remain the same?

On the surface it seems only natural to ask, "Why do we need a guarantee? Why should we be apprehensive of a change in Our Constitution? Why should we be so narrow-minded? Does our history warrant such confidence? Does our geographic location assure us of protection from our enemies? Have we committed ourselves to think that America can remain aloof from subversive isms? Yes; in this question of isms lies the answer to your "whys."

Deep down in our hearts we know that a democracy can be surpassed by no other form of government in the world, but our Communists and our Fascists friends have been taught the same faith in their forms of government. They are so sure that the universal solution of all social problems lies in their government systems that they are trying to establish them, often by underground methods, in every nation of the world.

These allegations are well founded. What is now happening to Poland, China, France, Greece, and the rest of the Balkans proves them beyond the shadow of a doubt. What guarantee have we that our Constitution will remain the same?

Today the United States is fighting an enemy not only abroad but also at home. The enemy we are fighting here in America does not attack with guns and tanks but with whispers and pamphlets. His secret agents are entrenched in our schools and in our Government and they are there for a purpose. A leader of one of these subversive isms tells us that he and his kind are here to incite a revolution and explains that a revolution does not simply happen, it must be made. He goes on to say that in the revolutionary situation his party first wins over some of our armed forces and then leads the effective majority of the population into the seizure of the State power. In this very day pamphlets like the Soldiers Voice, the Shipmates Voice, and the Navy Yard Worker are being circulated among our armed forces for the purpose of inciting a revolution. These pamphlets under apparently innocent pretenses have allured many Americans into sympathizing with if not believing in the ideas which they propagate. If such conditions continue to exist will our Constitution remain the same?

Why should we fear this enemy? Well, whom would you fear the most, the man who makes a frontal attack with a sword or the man who would run a knife into your back?

Despite the window dressing displayed by the propaganda agents of these uninvited guests we still find slum conditions existing in every country from which they come. Juvenile deliquency in Russia is so serious that children, 12 years of age, are brought under the penal codes, which includes capital punishment. Dictatorships, with one-party rule are not designed to represent the people. We have been told that a better form of government, that a democracy would be one in which the people owned and controlled all the wealth and everyone received the benefit of it. Such a plan has never succeeded; no, not even in Russia. There the people do not own and control the wealth. It is a scheme whereby the government controls everything and the people do not actually control the government. Government and business are lumped together in the hands of comparatively few men. Political power cannot be used to control money power, unions cannot fight managers, and customers cannot influence markets. Shall we change our Constitution so that our Government will be run in this same manner? If not, what can you do to stop it?

You, and your neighbors are the people who formulate American opinion. We are known for our freedom of speech, of the press, and of asemblage. These are the greatest forces we, as a people, have to control the policies of our Nation. And yet when they are most vitally needed and when they are most valuable, we hesitate to use them. With millions of American boys in uniform, with thousands of gold stars on service flags throughout the Nation, with ever mounting casualty lists, with the great roll we have played in supplying Allied Nations with materials, we are still too timid to express our sentiments on national and international policies.

I am not denouncing these isms in the hopes of causing a split with our allies, in my own elementary way I am simply trying to make you aware of the dangerous trend toward foreign isms in the United States If communism is a suitable plan for the people in Russia then let the Russians use that plan for themselves. But we here in America have a different plan, we have gone through wars and depressions, internal revolts and political strife, we have come a long way with our plan and we intend to keep it even if we must hurt the feelings of our allies!

Today, more than ever before, the fighting spirit of the Russian people has gained the admiration of the world. But the hardships of war which we are now sharing will be in vain if we do not let each other know what we are truthfully and sincerely thinking. Countless organizations are opposed to this foreign ism in America. Your have either read the opposition or you have heard it voiced by such organizations as the Jewish Zionists, the YMCA, the church, the American Federation of Labor, and the American Legion.

What have we to gain by following their lead and opposing these isms in the United States? First, we will be safe-guarding the American way of life by preventing any change in our Constitution; and, second, we will be laying a stronger foundation for mutual understanding and world peace by clearing away a hidden fear, for a lasting peace cannot be built on suspicion, envy, or distrust.

If you have grown tired of Americanism then say so. But if you are an American, if you cherish the American way of life, and if you want no other form of government than a democracy; then say that! For then, and only then, can we be sure that our Constitution will remain the same.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION AS SEEN BY A FRENCHMAN

(By Bernard Franckel, Lakewood High School)

The great French philosopher, Voltaire, once said: "A people has only the government it is worth having." Can't this be also said of the American people and of the American Constitution? For only a great people could have such a great Constitution. Its influence has been felt and still is felt in every country; it has been copied and modeled upon in many lands.

Everywhere, particularly in France, it reawakened the democratic feelings of the people already aroused by the philosophers like Rousseau and Montesquieu. And everywhere the new ideas spread like wildfire, from France up to Prussia, from one side of Europe to another. From hand to hand, copies of the American Constitution were being passed. On the threshold of their farms as well as in

the cities, the people were preparing to rise and follow the example of the new democracy, far beyond the seas. * * *

Only a few documents stand out today in world history, surviving the test of time, but certainly the most outstanding is the Constitution of the United States.

When we compare the American and French Constitutions we notice that while the American was not modified through the years, but for a very small number of amendments, the French did not enjoy the same stability. First voted on the third of September, 1791, it was successively modified until 1875, when it reached its final shape after the fall of Napoleon III, and even now, today, a possible revision of the French Constitution on the model of the American is being discussed.

The greatness of the Constitution of the United States comes primarily from its simplicity which makes it easy reading for the common man. This resulted in the forming of citizens conscious of their rights and duties, all united behind it. Its strength comes from the way power is balanced. France made the sad experience of having a weak executive branch, the President being a mere figurehead, doing almost nothing but naming prime ministers who could be removed from office by a cabinet crisis. By contrast with the President of the United States, a European prime minister is responsible to parliament to whom it gives a great power over the executive branch, a perpetual Sword of Damocles being suspended over the head of the prime-minister, who, it is true, being a member of parliament and usually a majority leader, has much influence over parliament.

The President of the United States is practically directly elected by the people. The French Constitution states that the President shall be chosen by an absolute majority of votes of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies united in National Assembly. Furthermore, the President of the United States is elected every 4 years which makes him more representative of the people than the President of the French Republic who holds office for 7 years.

We can find the reason of the weakness of the executive branch of the French Government in the fact that at the time of the framing of its constitution, France had just come through years of dictatorship under absolute monarchs and the French were afraid of investing too much power in one man.

The American Senate and House of Representatives are composed of only two parties, one of them having a majority which usually remains stable for at least 2 years; the majority in the French Parliament is composed of a coalition of some of the many parties represented. Of course, this results in instability.

James Bryce, a well-known author and member of the British Parliament, criticizing the legislative and executive branches of the American Government wrote in one of his books: (1) "The President and his ministers have no initiative in Congress, little influence over Congress, except what they can exert upon individual Members through the bestowal of patronage. (2) Congress has, together with unlimited powers of inquiry, imperfect powers of control upon the administrative departments. (3) There is a loss of time by friction between branches of the government * * * The more checks, the more friction."

Though these criticisms are correct, I cannot agree with the idea expressed by Mr. James Byrce, for the system of check and balance is the very foundation of democracy.

The third part of the check and balance system is the judiciary branch. Its importance can best be described in the words of the Supreme Court itself, "The perpetuity of our institutions and the liberty which is enjoyed under them depend in no small degree upon the power given the judiciary to declare null and void all legislation that is clearly repugnant to the supreme law of the land." Thus the Supreme Court is a check on the majority and guards the fundamental rights of the people.

A proof of the strength of the American Constitution can be found in the fact that its normal functioning has not been interrupted by the events of the war we are in. Indeed, alone from all democratic countries, the United States was able to hold wartime elections.

It is interesting to note that the Declaration of the Rights of Man, which is the French equivalent of the Bill of Rights, was adopted before the French Constitution itself and 2 years before the American Bill of Rights was ratified by the Congress of the United States. The first gesture of the liberated French people, in 1789, was to insure its freedom. The American people first sought a workable form of government before adding a Bill of Rights.

But though one people first thought of its rights and the other of its government, yet we can find no fundamental difference between the aims of the great statesmen of that period nor of the present. The aim of Jefferson and of Montesquieu was to liberate the common man. Woodrow Wilson and Aristide Briand both tried to build a peaceful world.

In one of the cemeteries of Paris, among the anonymous graves, lies an illustrious tomb. The name of the man who rests in his eternal sleep must be known to you. His name is Lafayette. Do you know that the earth which covers his remains is an American earth? Yes; the earth he took with him from the land he loved so much.

Do you not see anything symbolical in this mixture of earth on the grave of a man who had two countries for which he had a single and great love?

Could we not have created something truly great by this mixing of our two cultures and of the great principles enclosed in our constitutions, which are those of justice, of tolerance, and of liberty?

THE CONSTITUTION IN A CHANGING WORLD

(By John Britton, Jr., Long Branch Senior High School)

Our Constitution is a flexible document, which changes with the times and adapts itself to our economic, political, and social development. It is not rigid in the sense of a contract which must be interpreted exactly as the parties to the contract understood it when it was entered into. It can be, and has been, amended, expanded, and reinterpreted.

Otherwise it would not be a democratic instrument because democracy is not static. Democracy is a principle of living and life which conforms to the evolution of the needs, desires, and welfare of the people. Government of the people, by the people, and for the people is not the same each decade and each century because the people and the world in which they live are not the same. People are the life of a nation, and life is change, and provision for change must be a requisite of a constitutional government.

The method and character of change are important, however. World changes of recent years and the desire for freedom on the part of the people in other countries has brought about radical forms of government. The people's support for these governments was first secured by false promises of greater economic welfare and liberty. But the Fascist and Communist governments which arose got their power largely through violence and revolutions and the suppression of the rights of the people they had promised to help. Evolution, rather than revolution, has been our guiding principle in the expansion of democratic living, individual freedom, and the preservation of our precious national heritage. Our Constitution may be changed and changed back again, if the original change is found impractical. It can be revised at will to meet the needs of a society constantly in a state of flux provided the vital provisions preserving the checks and balances that make orderly change possible are not tampered with.

Amendment as a method of modifying our Constitution is provided for in four processes of change. This fact speaks well for the wisdom and foresight of the Founding Fathers. They made our Constitution more difficult to amend than those of some other countries and in a century and a half we have adopted only 21 amendments, practically all of them in response to public need or opinion. The first 10 amendments were adopted soon after the ratification of the Constitution, and are the keystone in our fundamental democracy and the rights of the people. Probably next in importance are the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments which were added after the Civil War and which gave promise at least of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness to a large section of our population, heretofore held in bondage, namely, the Negroes. The seventeenth amendment was a step toward a more truly representative democracy when it provided for the election of Senators by the people instead of by the State legislatures. Suffrage was extended to the women of our Nation by the nineteenth amendment which is another landmark in the establishment of justice and freedom for all. The twentieth amendment had as its purpose the abolition of the so-called "lame duck" sessions of Congress, that is, sessions which took place after some of the Members had been defeated at the polls and their successors elected. These sessions were not truly democratic because some of the Members had been defeated on current issues and did not really represent the views of the people.

We may well ask what will the twenty-second amendment to our Constitution be? What change will help to fill the gaps still evident in our democracy and bring us nearer to the fulfillment of the "Great American Dream," a dream which, according to James Truslow Adams, visualizes a greater and better America in a greater and better world in which to live. Will the twenty-second amendment establish equality for women? Will it lower the voting age to 18? Will it abolish child labor? Will it provide for uniform marriage and divorce laws throughout the United States? Or will it change the method of ratifying treaties and thus prevent a handful of willful men from defeating our cooperation in a changing and shrinking world?

An amendment of such nature would be, perhaps, the most desirable at this time. It should be apparent to everyone by now that permanent peace cannot be secured without international cooperation. This fact was not so obvious after the last war and the plan which might have prevented the present conflict was rejected by the Senate, determined to regain its powers relinquished during the war. A Third World War compared to previous international conflicts would be so much more terrible and so much more destructive to the whole world, our country included, as to conceivably paralyze civilization for a long, long time to come. After this war, if we decide to enter an organization for the preservation of world peace, many treaties will come for ratification. We must be sure of their intelligent consideration by the representatives of the people and their speediest possible adoption. Our allies cannot have faith in our participation in collective security under our present ratification set-up, and so we cannot blame them for trying to build their own national security in their own national way. Will a Dumbarton Oaks or any other plan for international organization get by the United States Senate? is a question that haunts them as they look to the postwar world. We must keep the faith with them

and with our men who have fought and bled and died to end wars and to create a world with freedom and justice for all.

Our court system as an instrument change has read new meaning into the words of our Constitution. The Supreme Court interpretations have tended more and more in the direction of the protection of life and liberty rather than the protection of property rights apart from human welfare. Our courts have held to the political philosophy of President Theodore Roosevelt, who said that the Constitution "Should be treated as the greatest document ever devised by the wit of man to aid people in exercising every power necessary for its own betterment, and not a straitjacket cunningly fashioned to strangle growth."

Proof of our congressional consciousness of the general welfare is the development in the type of legislation that has been passed in the last 50 or 60 years. The makers of the Constitution were familiar with an America that was devoted almost completely to farming. They could not foresee that in the short period of the next 100 years large factories would be built by great corporations which would exploit the workers and use their economic strength to influence both State and National Legislatures. The Constitution had no provisions with which to deal with big business. Besides, unlimited opportunity for American genius and inventiveness to make the most it could of itself and for itself, unhampered by the interference of the State, was a part of the American creed of liberty. So, while the Government had political supremacy, its economic supremacy as we know it today was then unknown.

Beginning with the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 which has put a stop to the unscrupulous practices of the railroads and coming down through the administrations of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson when laws curbing monopolies and trusts were passed, to the present day with its restrictions on the abuse of economic freedom, we discern a definite trend toward greater government responsibility for the social well-being of the people and positive effort made to remove the lag between industrial growth and political growth. All this has been done within the framework of the Constitution and with the stamp of approval of the Supreme Court.

As we review the ways by which our Constitution of the United States has been changed to comply with a changing world, and to achieve greater democratic freedom, we realize many things are still to be accomplished in furthering the great American dream. Despite the evolution and progress we have made there are many hurdles to be cleared in the future. Poll taxes interfere with the right of suffrage. Inequality of educational opportunity interferes with good citizenship. Business, labor, and Government must meet the challenge of economic insecurity. Racial and religious discriminations belie our democracy. Pressure groups with great economic power give us government without true representation. Political machines make a farce of elections in some sections of our country and undermine the foundations of self-determination.

Some of our problems cannot be solved by laws on constitutional change. They require a moral and spiritual change in the hearts of our people and an earnest application of the true meaning of democracy. To advance, as we will, to a still higher pinnacle of democratic freedom it will be necessary for the individual to assume responsibility as well as accept rights. He must study the problems of democracy, think them through, make decisions, and take action as an intelligent citizen. Only an enlightened and thoughtful people can safeguard freedom. Democracy is not the easy way of life but it is the best way. The Biblical admonition, "He who keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep," applies today to the citizen who would be alert and vigilant for the future of his America. The Constitution gives us opportunity. We can be masters of our fate. We can make the great American dream come true—we must make it come true.

OUR HERITAGE: THE BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Carol Markes, St. Peters High School, New Brunswick, N. J.)

Thomas James Norton, in his book The Constitution of the United States, says: "Menaced by dictators abroad and collectivist trends at home, we must seek revival of our strength in the spiritual foundations which are the bedrock of the Republic. Democracy is the outgrowth of the religious conviction of the sacredness of every human life. On the religious side, its highest embodiment is the Bible; on the political, the Constitution. The Constitution is the civil bible of all Americans."

The creed of the founding fathers of this country enunciates the truths that the individual has natural rights, that all men are created politically free and equal by divine and natural law. Let us look at the three great principles involving the individual's rights, which the Constitution has always preserved. These are: the right to law, the right to property, and the right to liberty.

Our Constitution is the law of our land. It is not the ready-made will of a sovereign, but the wants, needs, and desires of the people, expressed by them through their representatives. Does it not bind man to man, city to city, and State to State, by a common center of human action, by a common center of legal protection, and a common center of association?

How could our Nation be successful, how could it be just and righteous, how could it endure, if it were ignorant of the motives that govern people, both collectively and individually? Here, knowledge is power and greatness; ignorance is weakness and inefficiency. But, knowledge of the motives that govern human action or reaction to a government is not sufficient; it is necessary that the Government respect and protect them. Our Government is successful, is just, righteous, and enduring because it does respect, protect, and insure those rights.

Consider the citizen's right to law. It is difficult to make an American conscious of this right, a thing that he has breathed in all his life, a thing that he has always taken for granted. The right to law embodies the citizen's right to protection by the Government and its laws—his right regardless of his rank, position, or station to appeal to a court of law when in dispute with any person, group, or civil officer—his right to resist any unlawful action either by himself or with a court order, in any civil or criminal cases, whenever his rights as an individual are threatened.

Our right to law is protected in full against usurpation by the Federal Government in the fifth amendment, and against the State in the fourteenth; our right to fair and legal trial is guaranteed in criminal cases by he sixth amendment in criminal cases, and by the seventh in civil cases.

Under the right to law we enjoy the privilege of defending ourselves in court against any illegal interference by the Government; to question the action of any Government official, even the action of the President, himself.

Compare our right to trial to that of the German people. When Herr Hitler, dictator, felt it necessary to explain why in a single day, he had done to death, with the merest mockery of a trial, 200 human beings, he declared: "If someone should ask me why we did not invoke an ordinary court of law to deal with these men, I can only tell him: 'In this hour I was responsible for the fate of the nation,' therefore, the supreme court of the people, during those 24 hours consisted of myself.'" If that principle composed our American form of government, this land would be just another scene of mass massacre and unjust imprisonment.

Correlated with the right to law is the right to property. The right to property is very clearly explained by a Supreme Court justice who says, "in the concept, of property, there are its acquisition, disposition and enjoyment, in a word, dominion over it." It is to a man's happiness and well-being as a school is to education. It is not a detriment to the democratic form of government, but a necessary part of it. Was it not recognized as a fundamental part of all organized governments, centuries ago? Yet, we know that there are countries suppressing or attempting to suppress that right today.

The Constitution does not regulate "our acquisition, disposition, and enjoyment of property," but does recognize and protect our right to it. In the third, fourth, and fifth amendments, it guards our ownership of property. It recognizes the acquiring, disposing, and enjoining of property as the domestic affairs of the citizen to be regulated by the State.

Can anyone of us deny that the spirit of liberty is strong in us all? If we read the history of any world power, we will see beneath all its progress the struggle of the common people to attain the highest plane of human liberty. Consider the country in which the individual has no liberty and you will see countries which are continually embroiled in internal conflict and revolution. Full liberty of the individual was first protected by our Constitution. It is, in fact, the very foundation of this, our American republic.

The Constitution also extends to us religious and political liberty, freedom of speech and of the press.

The American conception of religious liberty is the right to worship God, but not the right to do away with religion. We may not agree with our neighbor's beliefs, but we must respect his convictions. We are not obliged to submit to sectarian education, to pay taxes for religious property, or take a religious examination for public office. We cannot be banished from the country or be removed from public office because of our particular religious beliefs.

Freedom of speech gives us the right to talk as we wish and to criticize public officials for their acts, but it does not give us the right to advocate destruction of life, property, or government. These two rights of speech and of the press have even been extended to those who are not in sympathy with our Amercan ideals.

Daniel Webster, in his immortal eulogy on General Washington, in 1832, closed with the words which I should like to quote for you; now, 110 years later, when we must defend our heritage against enemies, foreign and domestic, I bring them respectfully to your attention.

"Other misfortunes may be borne, and their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the oceans, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it lay waste our fields, still under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests.

"It were but a trifle if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of a demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with states' rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No, if these columns fall, they will be risen not again. For like the Colosseum and

the Parthenon, they will be doomed to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw—the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on universal military training for the House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, by Karl T. Compton, president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, June 8, 1945:

The people of the United States have been strongly idealistic ever since the Colonists first settled this country, seeking opportunity to live in accordance with their ideals of religious and political freedom. World War I and World War II were peak periods of the continued struggle to preserve these ideals.

Unfortunately people with the highest of ideals do not always follow the best procedures for bringing these ideals to reality and effectiveness. Most of us will now agree that this was true of the extreme pacifist groups during the 1920's and 1930's, both in this country and in Great Britain. Many of us believe that the sad lack of military preparedness and the very strong sentiment against any move even to prepare for war were simply invitations and incitements to Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, and their followers to let loose their mad avalanche of armed aggression for conquest.

As long as the world contains selfishly ambitious groups who are unscrupulous and ruthless enough to try to gain their ends by force if given a chance, it will be necessary for peace-loving countries like the United States to prevent the would-be aggressors from having this chance. This can be done by an expenditure of only a very small portion of the effort and money which go into a war.

There are a number of things which the United States must do if it is to guard against the danger of future war. To be prepared in a military sense is only one of these things. To be strong in science, technology, and production is another requirement. Even more important, the United States must be just, reasonable, and cooperative in its dealings with other countries. And in order that the burden of preventing wars may not fall too heavily on any one country, it is important that all countries which are determined to have peace in the future should combine to insure it. But, in any case, I believe that a reasonable degree of military strength is one of the realistic essentials to the future peace of our United States.

Just how much military strength a "reasonable degree" calls for and how this "reasonable degree" can be most advantageously secured are very important questions. As to the first, it would seem to me that "reasonable strength" would mean a rather strong military establishment for such a considerable period after the war as may be required to establish an international plan to maintain peace and to evaluate its effectiveness. If, after this international plan has been given a convincing trial, it proves to be effective, then I should think that all the participating nations would be justified in a gradual reduction of their armed strength. But right now we would be well advised to establish our reasonable military program, and to let the world know that we mean business when we talk of preserving peace, and that we are ready to adopt strong measures to insure our safety against attack.

Technological developments have greatly changed the conception of an effective citizens' army. For one thing, war on land, sea, and air has become so highly technical that a much longer period of training is necessary than was true 50 or 100 years ago. The training itself must be largely technical. More important still, the speed of transportation and the development of methods for making powerful attacks with great suddenness and at a great distance mean that it is no longer safe to wait until war breaks out to begin the intensive training of our armies. These factors, I take it, have all been influential in leading the military experts to the conclusion that a year of military training is needed to provide a continuously replenished reservoir of men who could be quickly called to arms for effective military service at threat of war.

Some of my colleagues, impressed as I have been with the great value of scientific and engineering skill in contributing effectiveness to our armed forces, have argued that scientists and engineers should be exempt from any universal military training. They back up their argument by pointing out the very critical shortage of such personnel to meet both the military and peacetime requirements which we can see ahead. I recognize a real force in this argument, which can also be made for young men going into the medical profession, for men in agriculture, industrial production, and all other essential activities. The difficulty with this argument, as I see it, is that once it is acceded to for any one group, the pressure cannot be resisted to grant similar exemption to many other groups, and the military training program hence breaks down. It seems to me best therefore to carry out the program without exemptions.

On the positive side, a strong argument can be made for giving military training to scientists and engineers, for many of these are needed among the officer personnel in these days of technological warfare.

Another argument against the plan, with which I have little sympathy, is that the year spent in military training would be a waste of time, particularly for any young man who is planning to go ahead with a professional or other education. This objection seems to me ill-founded on two counts.

In the first place, very many of the most successful and effective professional men—scientists, engineers, doctors, or what not—interrupted their educational careers for a year or more to work at some job to earn the money with which to proceed. On the whole I am convinced that they were strengthened by this work. I have often wished that far more of our young students in college could be induced or forced to put in an intervening year of serious nonacademic work. They would come out of it with greater maturity, more realistic social adjustment, and greater determination to make the best use of their future educational opportunities.

In the second place, the year of military training, as now outlined by the armed forces, incorporates a considerable amount of useful educational experience. To be sure, relatively little of it is of a classroom variety, but a large portion of it has to do with learning to understand technical equipment and how to use it, and how to work with precision in an organization, both of which are useful elements in any young man's education.

For these reasons I do not believe that a year's loss of time in getting through college or getting established in a job is a serious objection in comparison to the values of the year of military training from a national security standpoint plus the inherent educational values of the year of training as a partially compensating byproduct.

One further argument against universal military training is that the methods of warfare change so rapidly that the training given in any one year may be obsolete a few years hence. This argument I believe to be illogical. The same type of argument would say that we should not train an electrical engineer at M. I. T. today because some of the techniques of engineering practice may be different 5 or 10 years hence. Actually, details will change and new elements will be introduced into the picture, but the fundamentals do not change so much, and anyone with the fundamental training can pick up the developments of the next 5 years with relative ease and in a short time. In any case, an effective army could be mobilized and trained in far shorter time if it drew upon young men who had had the year of military training within the preceding 10 years than if the whole military strength had to be built up out of raw recruits after the emergency was upon us.

While I believe that the basic argument for universal military training must be founded upon military value and aimed at national security, there are several educational values which are incidental but which still seem to me to be of considerable importance. I think, for example, of the concern which has steadily grown over the last 20 years with respect to the undisciplined character of many of our young men, particularly in the big cities and under the influence of the inevitable gangs. Not all boys' gangs are vicious.

Among my prized recollections of boyhood are my adventures as a member of the North End gang of a small city, where I believe that the things which we learned about human nature and team play far overweighed our nuisance value. However, the problem of youth in cities and towns is a serious one, especially since our increased technical productive power has resulted in leaving more and more leisure time. By and large, I believe that a year of military training under good officers and with a sound program could have a very wholesome influence on the succeeding generations of our young men. Since this is an important educational matter, I should like to discuss it in a little more detail as to discipline and ideals.

Discipline: To be a stable and effective citizen requires a nice balance between freedom and initiative on the one hand and discipline on the other. In the modern age we scarcely need to make an argument for freedom and initiative because certainly the youth of our country, by and large, have a great deal of both. The serious question, in fact, is whether they do not have too much freedom and too little discipline to be the most effective possible members of society.

It is only the man who lives entirely alone who has complete personal freedom. Every social contact requires some adjustment, and every effective adjustment is a discipline. I believe that 1 year in the stage between youth and manhood spent in the universal military training program would develop fundamental habits of promptness and precision. It would develop the ability to work as part of an organization with an attitude of teamwork, which I believe is what is meant by real discipline. A football team, for example, is disciplined down almost to the last reaction and motion. It is trained so that the most fundamental actions are gone through automatically, smoothly, swiftly, and without thought. It is this very discipline and automatic character of action

which leaves the football player free to concentrate his attention on the new and unusual factors in the game where quick and intelligent handling determines the success of the play.

Discipline in the sense in which I am using it does not mean subjection of the individual. It means smooth and automatic action by the individual in his routine situation so that he can be free to give attention to the new and unusual problems which may face him. It is this type of discipline which is fundamental in an army and it is this element of training and character which I believe a year of universal military training would strengthen in our oncoming generations of citizens.

Character: If there is one feature which is important above all others in a soldier it is character. This word connotes many qualities, such as skill, accuracy, perseverance, promptness, efficiency, good sportsmanship, fair play, honesty, loyalty, and similar virtues. These are all important attributes of a good soldier. They are therefore, all of them, qualities which a competent program of universal military training would include as objectives in its training program.

Morale: Most important of all to a man, or to an army, or to a country, are the ideals which motivate them. It is these ideals, more than anything else, that determine what is commonly called morale. One of the most important aspects of successful military training, therefore, must be the inculcation of proper ideals. It is these ideals, for example, that a soldier means when he asks, "What am I fighting for?" or tells the world that he is fighting for such and such a cause. The most powerful military weapon ever devised in history has been the cause for which the army has faught. In America this cause would mean all of the things which we prize and cherish in American life and in the American ideal of a land of freedom and opportunity.

This subject of ideals and morale is so important to an army that it would have to be an important concern of those charged with planning and carrying out the program of universal military training. Of course, the background of morale is found in the home and in the public schools and in the church. These are essential and quite basic. Nevertheless, there is surely something which can be gained by a year of concentrated effort in which all the young men of a given age group in the country will be simultaneously working and training together for the basic purpose of defending something greatly important—their country.

Other educational byproducts of the universal military training program have to do with literacy, a problem of some magnitude in certain sections, and with physical fitness. These are so obvious that I merely mention them for the record.

Putting all of the above things together, it seems to me that out of a program of universal military training aimed primarily at national security would come secondarily as a byproduct an exceedingly valuable and wholesome development of attitude on the part of group after group of oncoming young citizens.

Implementation: Are these educational objectives practically capable of achievement, and if so, by what means? In my judgment all of these objectives are capable of achievement to a very worth-while degree. The procedures for doing this would have to start with the best ideas and experience which can be marshaled at the beginning, and would have to be improved with experience and further constructive study of the problem. The following thoughts are I think pertinent to these questions.

The Army has had, during the past 4 years, some very intensive experience in the art of training. The Nation can take justifiable pride in the results. I have personally had opportunity to observe some phases of this training in various Army and Navy radar schools and also as a member of an advisory committee on the Ordnance training program as carried out in various Ordnance training centers. I have here seen some very enthusiastic, skillful, and effective teaching. I do not mean to imply that these Army methods should revolutionize our general system of education, but I do mean that the Army tackled new and specialized educational problems and quickly demonstrated skill, imagination, and effectiveness in handling them. I have been struck with the morale and enthusiasm of both the teachers and the enlisted student personnel.

In my judgment there would be two elements essential to the success of the proposed military training program. The most important of these would be that it be put in the hands of absolutely top-notch officers, all the way from the top command down into the instructing ranks. If this training program were to be used to provide berths for ineffective officers it would be a colossal failure, but in the hands of able and inspiring men it could be an outstanding success. The other point is that the plan should draw upon the best educational talent in the country, both within and without military circles, for initial planning, continued evaluation, and advice.

Timing: I would say a word about the timing of the inauguration of universal military training. On this point I differ with certain of my very esteemed academic colleagues, for I do not believe that consideration of the subject should be postponed until we have settled down to peaceful pursuits after the war. I believe that the soundest decisions are likely to be made in times of stress when we are keyed up to the determination to deliver the best that is in us for a good cause. After every time of stress, whether in an individual or in a national group, there is a time of let down, and this in my judgment is the worst of all times in which to make an important decision, particularly if this decision should call for some exertion and perchance for some sacrifice. I believe, therefore, that the universal military training question should be faced now and not postponed until the time of let down after the war.

Whatever the decision on this question may be, there is one basic thing on which I hope we shall not fail. It is that we should have the courage to do whatever needs to be done after this war to insure, as far as possible and at almost any cost, that still another world war will be made impossible, and that we may strive for this objective with such determination that we shall not allow minor differences of opinion or complications to deter us from the main objective, which is a world with the greatest possible assurance of peace, opportunity, and freedom.

Gentlemen, I appreciate the privilege of presenting these views for your consideration.

America's Bargaining Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Washington is viewing the San Francisco Conference these days with a very analytical eye. Developments at the Conference and on foreign peace fronts make it appear that the language at the meeting is hardly being translated into action anywhere. Government officials are beginning to wonder over the wisdom of adopting a high-sounding, well-phrased program for concerted world action when simultaneously the prospective signers are going ahead with policies of their own which completely contradict the program.

If we are to develop a world order in which the rights of all nations are to be established and preserved, it is certainly a poor beginning which has been made in Poland, at Trieste, and in the closing of Berlin's doors to American troops and reporters. These attitudes reflect nothing but confusion, suspicion, and grave mistrust.

All of us understand the basis for these discords. Russia remembers the invasion of her soil by Allied forces after World War I. The Western Allies recall the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement still more recently. Yet all of us recognize the basic fact, that whether or not we like each other cordially, we are at present jointly responsible for the establishment of some world orderliness. That must be the fundamental cohesive fact.

Our own country is in an excellent bargaining position to enforce its desire for world peace. We have the lend-lease materials they have used and the machinery they must have for the rebuilding of their homelands. Let us establish decent standards of international conduct and insist that those standards be met before any nation is eligible for the aid we can give.

Salaries of Senators and Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a communication which I have received this morning from Mr. L. S. Chadwick, president of the Perfection Stove Co., Cleveland, Ohio:

PERFECTION STOVE CO., INC.,
Cleveland, Ohio, June 9, 1945.

Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KIRWAN: In yesterday morning's paper I noticed the announcement of President Truman's stand on the question of salaries of our Representatives and Senators. In connection with same, I want to say that I heartily approve of his suggestion, particularly as applied to the larger amount that our Representatives and Senators should receive, namely, $25,000 per year.

I honestly believe that it is a disgrace for a nation of the size of the United States of America to be paying the Members of its lawmaking bodies the trifling sum of $10,000 per year as a salary, for the purpose of living and maintaining their positions in Washington or elsewhere. Furthermore, it casts a slur upon those men, every one of whom are able and well worth the suggested salary.

To think that the greatest Nation in the world should select its lawmakers to run the management of the world's greatest business and should announce to the world that

that type of management only requires the services of $10,000-per-year men is, in my opinion, an absurdity. No man can live up to his responsibilities in Washington and meet his expenses on such a trifling sum, under present-day values.

I sincerely hope that you will vote and fight, for your own sake as well as for the future of America, for adequate salaries to be paid to our lawmakers, thereby aiding and insuring the Nation against ward heelers and grafters.

I believe every fair-minded man in this country who knows anything about business and living costs will join with me in urging you, regardless of small-minded talk, to demand that you be paid in proportion to your value to the Nation.

If you cannot find in your own mind a measure of doubt of this kind, then you are far too small a man to fill the job which you have been elected to fill.

Sincerely yours,

L. S. CHADWICK.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur V. Burrowes from the St. Joseph News-Press:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Diabolic possession. Have you ever heard of it? The Scriptures themselves are authority that there is such a thing as possession of a human body by the devil, as every Bible reader knows. When we read of some of the excesses committed by the Nazis against the Jews, not only of conquered countries, but of their own vaterland, we are inclined to the belief that there is such a thing as diabolic possession. You cannot explain how a people can have fallen so low in this so-called enlightened age without seriously considering the ancient, Bible-vouched curse—possession by the devil.

These observations are called to mind by a new book just received by Public Librarian I. R. Bundy, which he has graciously condescended to let us have for a day before cataloging it and putting it on the shelf for general circulation. It is No Traveler Returns, by Renry Shoskes, former lawyer of Warsaw, Poland. It is a book that will profoundly shock every American of Jewry, every American philo-Jew. It will make readers of other minorities—religious or racial—tremble with the thought, "It might have been us."

There is the avenging cataclysm about persecution. The wheels of time turn and the prosecutor of today may become the persecuted of tomorrow. The blood of untold Jews lies on the head of Nazi leaders, and this blood will be their mark when the masters of the Nazis strike with the whip. The sanest and most sober thought of the best brains in the world, whether President and Pope, Premier, and philosopher, student and scholar, must be spent in seeing that to the tyrants against Jewry in Germany, going back to 1934 and continuing until shortly before VE-day, there be not retaliation, but merciless justice.

That consignment to oblivion of the ancient Biblical line, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," will be hard at best. It will be harder after Messrs. Truman and Churchill and the leaders of the United Nations behind them have read the story of the Nazi persecution of Jews, authenticated in 267 all too fleeting pages of No Traveler Returns.

Yet the book should have been published. It was necessary at this time and in this country—it is a 1945 Doubleday, Doran release—to make the gentile who is indifferent or unfriendly to the Jew stop and pause. It was necessary at this time and in this country to make the obnoxious Jew stop and pause. A Jew, Shoskes in his classic tells of unworthy Jews, who sold out to the SS and Gestapo, who for filthy gold tattled on their brothers in Jewry who had managed to hide away their long-accumulated savings. No less a powerful sermon to us of gentile extraction is this book a thundering preachment to Jews who by their acts have made their fellow Jews ashamed of them and their non-Jew neighbors hate and envy them.

Author Shoskes estimates that 5,000,000 Jews were exterminated by the Germans in Europe between 1933 and 1945. The processes of extermination are almost unbelievably diabolical, occasioning the thought expressed at the beginning of these observations. The gas chambers and the electrical devices to bring death were the instruments, not of torture, but of mercy. The Nazi thought seemed to be not alone to kill but first to torture.

Never before have we read so clearly the nauseating details of the Warsaw ghetto where Jews were reduced by systematic sadistic torture and death from half a million to a mere 40,000. In our own reading of history nothing from Haman in the Old Testament to the ezarist pogroms could equal the story of the Warsaw ghetto.

It was not alone in Warsaw, but in all Poland, in Ukraine, in White Russia, in France, in Czechoslovakia, everywhere where the Nazi conquered. Remember to read the book and when you close the last page you will be tempted to whisper: For what they have done may God forgive the German nation, for man cannot.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial comment on FEPC, March 1944–February 1945:

1944

Washington, D. C., the Washington Post (March 7): "Working in an area of deeply entrenched prejudices, FEPC sought patiently to open job opportunities for Negroes. Our manpower shortage and the need for all-out production strengthened the clear logic of its efforts. It did not solve the problem of employment discrimination in the United States, but at least it satisfied Negroes that a solution was being sought.

"The FEPC is simply trying to bring about a fuller mobilization of the Nation's manpower for war and a fuller realization of the principle of human equality on which the Nation is founded.

"It would be genuinely tragic if race prejudice caused the liquidation of this agency. To American Negroes whose loyalty to the United States and devotion to democracy has remained steadfast in the face of bitter deprivations, the FEPC is a vital symbol. To renounce it would be to slam a door upon the legitimate hopes which our own American litany has engendered and encouraged."

Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer (March 7): "To deprive anyone of his livelihood or to bar him from job opportunities because of his race, his religious belief, his color, or his national origin is not only unfair, it is un-American."

Washington (D. C.) Evening Star (March 10): "For there should be such an agency created by act of Congress and charged with the mission of working toward the removal of race prejudice, especially those prejudices which bar the Negro from economic opportunity and advancement."

Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette (March 20): "Taking due note of the whole spirit of our democratic laws, it is hard to see how any Member of Congress can argue that fair employment practices are either unconstitutional or un-American. To say that our Government can draft Negroes to fight with white men for their common safety and security but cannot insist that Negroes as well as white men be used in maintaining maximum production on the home front is splitting hairs too thin for logic."

Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald (May 26): "As for the FEPC, this newspaper has never considered that agency the terrible menace some have represented it as being. There have been, and are, unquestionably problems of discrimination against minorities in this country. This discrimination obviously can make the Nation's acute wartime manpower problem more difficult. That the Federal Government should strive to mitigate such problems is an entirely understandable, if not imperative, undertaking. Not always has the FEPC acted wisely. But the general purpose underlying it is sound."

St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch (May 27): "FEPC has been the instrument in the Federal Government in seeking to eliminate unfair employment practices on the part of any contractors doing Government business.

"It is a problem of Nation-wide, not South-wide, interest and concern, because such practices encourage abuse of minorities everywhere.

"* * * The only political issue involved is whether a great democracy will blink at or try to stamp out discrimination, a crime for which we have indicted Nazi Germany."

St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch (May 27): "In saving the Fair Employment Practices Committee's appropriation, the House of Representatives has done the right thing but by a shamefully small margin of only four votes. * * * What the white supremacy people don't see is that if every Negro had a fair chance to make his way in the world for himself and to educate his children so that they could do the same, even better in their turn, the so-called Negro problem would be about nine-tenths solved with no harm to anyone except those who wish to exploit him as cheap labor."

Chicago (Ill.) Sun (May 28): "America owes a debt to its conscience to keep FEPC alive."

Wilmington (Del.) News (May 29): "* * * if the Senate approaches the question (continuance of FEPC) from the standpoint of the Nation's need to use the skills of all its citizens to best advantage it can decide it in only one way."

Washington (D. C.) The Evening Star (May 31): "On the record, and in good conscience, this is plainly a program which should be continued.

"* * * Nothing constructive could be accomplished, but serious harm would be done, by permitting the agency to die for lack of funds while legislation to give it whatever powers Congress thinks it should have is under consideration."

Detroit (Mich.) Free Press (May 31): "The FEPC deals with only one phase of the problem of securing economic equality for 13,000,000 Negroes, but in that field it has done excellent work."

Des Moines (Iowa) Register (June 1): "Frankly, we are scandalized that so many Republicans in the House of Representatives voted with the 'white supremacy' boys of the South to kill the appropriation for the battered Fair Employment Practices Committee. * * * The FEPC's only power is that of persuasion. Its only demands are that common human justice and sense be applied in hiring war industry and Federal workers—namely, that there be no discrimination for reasons of race, creed, color, or national origin as between loyal American citizens. * * *

"We are glad to note that the Iowa Congressmen present all voted for the FEPC appropriation."

Overseas News Agency (June 3): "While the FEPC does not deal with some of the main predisposing causes of racial strife, such as overcrowded housing, insufficient transportation facilities, fatigue due to long hours and pressure on war jobs, and discrimination against colored men in uniform, yet it operates on those tensions at the point where they become most heated: The quest and competition for jobs.

"The work of the FEPC has directly contributed to lessening strikes and consequent loss of time in war industries."

Boston, Mass., Christian Science Monitor, June 5: "The committee can stand on its own merits. Its officials have proceeded cautiously and conscientiously in a highly charged atmosphere, and have encountered remarkably little trouble. Usually it is only necessary for a committee examiner to remind an employer or labor organization of its responsibilities under the President's order. The bulk of 744 cases satisfactorily adjusted in the past half year were handled in this manner. Only five cases have reached the stage of public hearing under the present committee.

"An adequate appropriation for the FEPC should be passed."

Springfield, Mass., Springfield Daily News, June 5: "As a result of the committee's work, real progress has been made in bringing economic democracy to millions of Americans. * * * Its work will have a permanent effect on the future economic rights of Americans. And its work must be carried on."

Chicago, Ill., Chicago Sun, June 11: "Emergency operation of the FEPC for war purposes is so clearly justified that for the Senate to deny it funds would be a serious setback. The agency has proceeded sanely and carefully. It has handled the majority of its cases without fireworks or publicity and has helped ease tensions in a difficult field. * * * The appropriation and authorization are commanded by the needs of war and by the principles of democracy."

St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch (June 11, urging passage of the appropriation): "This is the best way of making the public aware of the need, as recognized by a bill now in the House committee, for extending FEPC into the postwar period."

Washington, D. C., the Washington Post (June 13): "FEPC's orderly, understanding approach to labor problems of this nature will be needed more than ever when we encounter the problems of demobilization and reconversion. For in this period discrimination can create chaos. If whole classes of men are denied an opportunity to earn a living because of the color of their skin, they will become desperate and dangerous."

Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette (June 21): "The best possible approach to our racial problems is on the economic level, where the FEPC has sought with a measurable degree of success to give members of our minority groups an equal opportunity to earn a living by serving their country in time of war."

Kansas City (Mo.) Times (June 22): "The principle on which the FEPC has operated is sound. As its name implies, the function of the committee is to see to it as nearly as may be humanly possible that unfair discrimination in wartime employment is not directed against workers because of race, color, or religion. That is both a fair and democratic principle."

Detroit, Mich., Detroit Free Press (June 22): "The Senate's 39 to 21 refusal to strike from an appropriation measure a $500,000 fund for the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee helps to insure continued life for an important agency. * * * The FEPC was set up to do what it could to reduce the discrimination in industrial employment and to promote better racial understanding. No one of intelligence expected it to usher in Utopia overnight."

Philadelphia (Pa.) Record (June 22): "It is vastly encouraging that the southern bloc in the United States Senate was soundly whipped in its effort to destroy the Fair Employment Practice Committee * * * FEPC, established * * * by Presidential order, has accomplished a great deal in promoting equal opportunity."

Miami (Fla.) Miami-Herald, June 26: "For Senator GEORGE to charge that approval of the FEPC fund would be 'a long step toward converting our economic system into a communistic or national socialistic system' is * * * only a measure of the Georgian's capacity for reckless statement. FEPC may have its faults, but what Senator GEORGE alleges so fiercely is not one of them."

Washington (D. C.) Post, June 26: "The FEPC can be counted on * * * to hew quietly yet persistently, as it has in the past at formal discriminations which all believers in democracy must regret."

Boston (Mass.) Herald, June 26: "The significance of the survival of the Fair Employment Practice Committee in its first congressional test is that a precedent has been established for a permanent agency to tackle this thorny problem of fairer treatment of Negroes by employers."

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat, July 1: "A nation founded on democratic consent and now at war for democracy ought to have no difficulty in providing for 'the full and equitable participation of all workers in defense industries, without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.' * * * (Yet) Discrimination in employment against Negroes, against Jews and other religious minorities, and against some foreign-born groups persists * * * Wisdom and justice cry out against discrimination. Fair play helps everyone and unfairness, in the long run, hurts everyone."

Washington (D. C.) Post, July 7: "The agency is doing a difficult job with skill and patience."

St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch, July 25: "Maintenance of fair practices in industrial employment ought to be one of those unarguable things, like goodness and love of family."

Salisbury (N. C.) Post, August 5: "No question of social mingling of the races is involved. The question is solely one of equal opportunity. We may hope that both employers and white workers will realize this simple truth, and that they will also realize that if opportunity can be denied to any group, for reasons of color, religion, or national origin, no minority group's rights are safe. The principle of equal opportunity is not divisible. It ceases to exist if all do not have it."

Kansas City (Mo.) Times, September 1: "Despite mistakes that no doubt have been made, it served a justified purpose in wartime and its work would be even more necessary in the postwar adjustment era. From the experience gained it ought to be the better prepared to deal with the many problems that will arise in that period."

Durham (N. C.) Herald, September 11: "In a democracy every one has a right to choose his friends and associates. If he likes to feel superior to those he doesn't associate with, that feeling, right or wrong, is his inalienable privilege. This is all there is to the question of 'social equality' which is always dragged in when the subject of equal opportunity for all racial groups is brought up.

"Equal opportunity has nothing whatever to do with 'social equality'—whatever those words mean. Equal opportunity means what it says—a chance for every one according to his character and abilities, plus equal pay for equal work. This, and no more, is what the Fair Employment Practices Committee has stood for and does stand for. Yet the FEPC barely squeezed through the House last spring when the war agencies bill came up and it had 21 votes against it in the Senate to 38 in favor.

"Now a strong fight is ahead if a permanent FEPC is not to be blocked. The need for it is desperate. Hearings in the House and Senate committee rooms show that the Negro is still being discriminated against. He still doesn't get the same pay the white man gets for the same work. He is still the first to go when there are cutbacks. And the Philadelphia transit strike showed that the blame isn't entirely management's. It goes deep into the ranks of union men and women who ought to know better.

"There are no new arguments against discrimination. There are just the old ones. It is unfair. It is undemocratic. It is un-American. Or, if such an appeal falls on deaf ears, we may add that it breaks down wage levels by creating a submarginal class. It creates racial strife in which the white man suffers just as much as the Negro—maybe more. It hurts us among our friends abroad. Wise, civilized, and patriotic Americans will take their stand against it."

New York (N. Y.) Evening Post (September 2): "But the day of reckoning when we shall need a permanent FEPC cannot be put off. The disgraceful race strike which tied up Philadelphia showed that. It was an omen of the future, especially of the postwar days, when the pressure for jobs will aggravate race tensions."

Washington (D. C.) Post (September 2): "When reconversion gets under way there is bound to be a profound upheaval in employment. If the hiring and firing of workers takes place on a discriminatory basis, gross injustice and hardship is certain to be visited upon minority elements in our population, Negroes in particular. 'The right to work,' the Reverend Francis W. McPeek told the Senate Committee on Labor and Education, 'is the least common denominator of democracy. To the extent that this elementary right is denied to men on grounds of race, religion, or national origin, democracy is debased and stultified.'"

Asheville (N. C.) Citizen, September 5: "Hitherto, the FEPC has shown little disposition to practice patience and to place its faith in education. For this reason, its agreements with the CIO union is all the more gratifying. Working together the union and the FEPC can do much to remedy conditions of discrimination within the particular industry for whose employees the union can speak. We are confident that once the union members are willing to see all unfair employment practices eliminated, the employers in that industry will withhold no cooperation."

Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune, September 16: "At present the Federal Fair Employment Practices Committee is charged with preventing job discrimination. This is set up as a wartime agency, however, and can give no one the sense of long-term security in this field which is essential if open conflicts are to be avoided. The FEPC should be made permanent. This would pay as well in the long run."

Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, September 16: "It is essential that labor unions recognize the common interest of white and Negro workers and that Negroes not be discrimi-

nated against became of their color. Some unions are making a good beginning. * * * There is nothing easy about this problem. It's a tough one, prejudice being what it is. But it won't cure itself. Unions and employers and the workers themselves must all help to solve it. And the committee on fair employment practices should be made permanent, as is proposed in Congress."

Chicago (Ill.) Sun, September 23; "Racial discrimination, like social security, fair labor standards, and minimum wages, is a national problem. It must be dealt with rationally. Shall America confess that fair employment practices are possible only in time of labor scarcity? Shall we give up the ground so far gained when the war ends? Congress can answer 'No' by establishing the FEPC on a permanent basis."

Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune (October 16): "No war agency is more American in the finest sense and more absolutely expressive of the ideals for which we are fighting in this war than the Fair Employment Practice Committee."

Eau Claire (Wis.) Leader (October 24: "This agency, in the words of the presidential proclamation which created it, is intended to 'encourage full participation in the war effort of the United States regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders.' That is the practical reason for its existence. . . . But practicality isn't everything. . . . They ought to have fair play because everyone ought to, because they are a part, and a valuable part, of the Nation—because, in short, they belong."

Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune (November 14): "It wouldn't be American in the grand old meaning of the word to give fair play to minority groups during a war merely in order to get work out of them. It would be a mean kind of exploitation. . . . Let's have fair play during the war. Let's continue it after the war. It is one of the brightest stars in the banner of victory."

New York (N. Y.) Post (November 18): "The siren that announces the end of the war may, in the same note, shrill the warning of a race conflict unless—

"Unless Congress sets up a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee to see to it that no worker is discriminated against because of race, color, or creed."

Kansas City (Mo.) Star (December 8): "Through tactful administration a permanent FEPC could remove many causes of strife and many injustices."

Dayton (Ohio) Herald (December 18): "The FEPC as an emergency group has had some ticklish situations to study and untangle in the interest of the war effort. As a permanent instrument of government its responsibilities would be no less onerous, perhaps even more so. Yet it will be better for our democracy if the problems of discrimination are faced courageously and yet tactfully by leaders carefully chosen for this special task instead of being swept under the rug of national indifference and complacency."

Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald (December 9) (summarizing its stand on Federal prohibition of discrimination in employment): "It will be generally agreed that voluntary progress against the results of discrimination is better than that brought about by compulsion. But it is also true that even under a democracy we must protect and enforce certain freedoms and rights by compulsory measure(s)."

1945

Washington (D. C.) Post (January 5): "There is no doubt that prejudice has inhibited the effectiveness of our manpower mobilization by keeping qualified workers out of essential jobs on account of race, creed, or color. If it is allowed to continue into the period of demobilization, it will seriously aggravate the difficulties of conversion from a war to a peacetime economy. * * * We are in full agreement, therefore, with Mr. LaFollette's belief that Congress should act to do away with discrimination in employment. It can best do so by giving statutory authority and permanent status to the Fair Employment Practice Committee which has been operating up to the present time by simple Executive order."

Durham (N. C.) Herald (January 11): "The President's Fair Employment Practice Committee, set up for the war period only, is the first official attempt to guarantee any measure of job equality. Because this agency will cease to exist when the war ends, it seems vitally essential to set up a permanent and broader FEPC immediately."

Terre Haute (Ind.) Star (January 18): "Either one is for democracy at any price, or one does not really believe in it at all. If one believes in it then one must fight for it. One way of fighting for it is to extend economic democracy. One way to extend economic democracy is to see that a permanent FEPC is set up without delay."

Paterson (N. J.) Call (January 20): "No one who believes in democracy would dare to interfere with the right of any citizen to vote, merely because of his race, creed, color, or national origin. But political rights can have little meaning if they are not backed up by economic rights. The right to a job must therefore be guaranteed by society on the same basis as the right to vote."

Kansas City (Mo.) Times (February 1): "Controversial as the question is, there are sound reasons for a permanent FEPC. This agency has made progress in breaking down discrimination in wartime employment on grounds of race, creed, and color. It has not attained perfection, but from its own experience a better record could be made in the postwar period, when competition for jobs will be much stronger than it is today."

Washington (D. C.) Post (February 11): "There is nothing more fundamental to a democratic society than equality of economic opportunity. If it cannot be absolutely guaranteed by law, it can certainly be significantly fostered. And insistence upon the observance of this equality through vigorous governmental enforcement, is at once an impetus to and an essential concommittant of education. * * * It is time for the Government of the United States to go unequivocally on record in support of the doctrine that all Americans have an equal right to jobs."

Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel (February 11): "At first blush this may seem to some readers one of those reforms that might be postponed until the war is won. But we think the ideal of equal economic opportunity is something more than an objective for a remote peace. It represents something even more than the kind of country which American fighting men—of varying race, color, and creed—want to come home to. It bespeaks the kind of country we need here and now to produce with maximum efficiency for war."

Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle (February 12): "Our judgment is that if it is the practice of most employers to discriminate on grounds of race or religion, there are few instances in which this practice ought not to be stopped, by law, if necessary."

New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune (February 16): "We agree that it is impossible to regulate purely social aspects of human relationships by law. But unjust restrictions on the opportunity to earn a living are a different matter. We believe that the barring of Negroes and other minorities fro many consideration whatsoever for jobs can be outlawed. The present wide public support for action stems from a recognition that members of a minority cannot be denied the basic mean for self-betterment. The paradox of a nation which finds Negroes sufficiently capable to be inducted for military service but which still refuses to test their capabilities in wide areas of industry is plain for all to see."

Chicago (Ill.) Sun (February 27): "The work of the President's wartime Fair Employment Practice Committee has directed attention to the evils of racial or religious discrimination in economic opportunity. This type of prejudice, more widespread than was generally understood, strikes minorities the deadliest kind of blow; it deprives individual members of a chance to rise according to individual merit."

No Military Conscription Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Josephus Daniels, editor of the News and Observer, before the Committee on Postwar Military Policy of the House of Representatives, June 11, 1945:

NO MILITARY CONSCRIPTION NEEDED

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the propaganda for compulsory military service for American youth is based upon three false premises:

1. Fear, and I hold with Franklin Roosevelt that "fear is the only thing to fear." As I read or listen to the pleas to Hitlerize America, and see how the advocates of compulsion tremble, I am reminded of the old nursery rhyme: "Run, little fear, or big fear will get you."

2. Cynicism, the disbelief in the ability of our civilization to rise out of savagery and so order the affairs of a civilized age as to make war an anachronism. This unbelief based on the silly credo: "There have always been wars and there always will be wars."

3. Imperialism, the desire that Uncle Sam shall abandon democracy, the right of all men to govern themselves, and follow the example of the Israelites of old who, tired of God's guidance, wished a king so they would be like neighbor nations that lived by the sword. It was this jealousy of John Bull's exploitation of weak peoples that caused us to go into the colonial business when we obtained rule of the Philippines by conquest and purchase, and held on to them under the pious profession of "benevolent assimilation." Happily, we have come to ourselves and given the solemn pledge to return sovereignty to the Filipinos as soon as this war is over.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let me hasten to avow that I belong to the school of thought which holds with Washington, "In time of peace prepare for war." I also am a Wilsonian who believes equally in the maxim. "In time of war prepare for peace." One is the corollary of the other. As long as there are men and nations that live by the sword there is the certainty that nations lacking the means of defense may die by the sword. As long as there are robbers and marauders, cities must maintain a vigilant and adequate police force to protect life and property, the size being regulated

by the danger of being despoiled. I believe everything in the Bible "from kivver to kivver" except "The meek shall inherit the earth." That makes me a heretic unless this prophecy was intended for some far-off century. Up to our day the meek have not only not inherited the earth but have been the victims of the strong and greedy whose creed is that the earth belongs to those who have the power and are able to go up and take it.

Our country for decades was so favorably situated between the two great oceans, it had little fear of invasion. That was in the days when communication and transportation were so slow that Andrew Jackson could be winning the Battle of New Orleans days after the treaty of peace had been signed between the two fighting nations at Ghent. That protection was lessened when submarines could stealthily enter our harbors before their presence was discovered and hurl deadly torpedoes to destroy our cities. It was lost when bombers in a few hours could fly from Tokyo and work havoc on the American fleet anchored in Pearl Harbor, or the "airy navies of the central blue" were capable of taking off before breakfast from Berlin and blasting Boston before the setting sun. Protected by the narrow channel separating it from the Continent, the tight little island of England was safe from invasion in all former wars, but was dangerously near destruction when flying robots wiped out thickly populated sections of London and made life a final nightmare to millions. Only the supremacy in air, aided by sea and land forces, prevented its annihilation.

The outstanding lesson taught by World War No. 2 is that the nation which commands the air is the nation that can rule the world. This is not to say that wars can be fought and enemy countries brought under subjection and punishment alone by this new weapon sending its bombs hurtling on crowded cities, industrial plants and railway stations. No complete victory can be won and garnered, as this war proves, except by aerial warfare with hand-to-hand fighting to follow the devastation from the air. It is too soon to assess the relative value of the forces of land, sea and air, or to plan for wise preparedness in a world that is still bleeding from the wounds of war. There must be time for the adoption of the best plan after all the lessons have been made known.

The first sound that fell upon my infant ears was from the shelling by Federal gunboats of a small southern town in which I was born. I have lived through three major wars, having been privileged to direct naval operations of the United States in World War No. 1. Study and experience have convinced me that until we can replace war with effective international agreement as a safe substitute, our country must be well prepared against attack. In 1914, when the European war broke out and there was danger the contagion might reach us, the Wilson administration made plans and in 1915 secured authorization for the creation of the most powerful navy in the world. I am testifying today from my experience of 8 years as Secretary of the Navy, covering the period of World War No. 1 and from my strong belief in efficient preparedness. No man believes more in having a gun well primed than I do. But I put emphasis on the sort of preparedness this war has taught will win victories, and not on the discredited broken stick of universal compulsory conscription.

Before we entered the war in 1917 naval statesmen did not foresee that the enemy would employ the U-boat as its chief offensive. We did not provide adequately for such warfare. We had placed chief emphasis on dreadnoughts, while the craft most needed were destroyers, submarines, chasers, and Eagle boats. There was better preparedness against the submarine in this war, but military experts here and abroad had not foreseen that Nazi victories over Europe and the expulsion of the British from the Continent would come from superiority in the air and mechanized weapons on the land. The tide of war did not turn until Allied air superiority blasted Nazi cities and fortresses and factories and railroads and war materials. The imperative preparedness of tomorrow is that which give conquest of the skies. Without that mastery all the mighty leviathans and the thundering artillery and the serried ranks of infantry will be compelled in any future war to say, "One thing thou lackest yet"—and the first and most potent offensive weapon.

We were forehanded in antiquated cavalry in 1940, we were strong in powerful dreadnoughts which may soon be outmoded, we had efficient drill masters and artillerymen, but in 1940 all our belated preparedness lacked the most important essential for modern warfare—modern aircraft carriers and ships in the upper air that could drop down their deadly missiles and destroy whatever they elected to annihilate.

When the time comes to prepare for preparedness, the first step will be to unlearn the methods of the past and discard the archaic drilling, put all cavalry horses to plowing, shut down munition plants making out-of-date weapons, discard the ancient tactics and strategy long taught in military schools, and look mainly toward the perfection of weapons of the skies. The airy navies of the central blue will win the first battles of the future. The chief ship of the surface navy will be the aircraft carriers, and the chief function of the land forces to give the knockout blow, follow up, mop up, and occupy. And Uncle Sam will be astounded at the number of young men who will volunteer—more than needed—to see the sky darkened by the dreadnought planes raining down their ghastly dew.

My first introduction to compulsory service, and my revulsion from it, came in 1914, a few months before the outbreak of World War I. A very good friend, General Estoppinall, Member of Congress from Louisiana and member of the Naval Affairs Committee, called to see me on his return from France, where he had been on a visit to his sister. "I am glad to get back," he said, "to a free country where youth are not conscripted for military service and where we do not live daily in fear of war. When I arrived in France I found my sister in deep distress because her sons must leave home and school and be called to military service (the law required service up to 45 years of age). She hated the separation—her boys being taken from her and from school to march and drill and drill and march and march, for which they had no taste." General Estoppinall said the French hated the system but tolerated it because of the fear that Germany would again try to possess their country. That fear was well founded, for in less than 6 months after that conversation German soldiers rushed through Belgium and threatened France. It was not till America threw its might into the struggle that the Germans were driven back. The French fought bravely against great odds, not because of the compulsory military service but in spite of it. By 1918 they were war weary and could not have carried on without the help of British and American soldiers, who, lacking the nightmare of compulsory service, fought with at least as high efficiency as their allies whose sons had been conscripted to serve in the army since 1872.

The draft under French law provided for a 27-year period of military service. The proportion of the youth drafted varied from 65 to 85 percent. In World War I and World War II our American soldiers, who had never in time of peace been conscripted, went overseas with only a few months wartime training and, fighting side by side with the French, demonstrated that long, compulsory training did not make better soldiers. This is particularly true in mechanized warfare, where familiarity with automobiles, tractors, and like machinery makes it comparatively easy to go from peacetime to war without a long period of goose-stepping.

The example of France, which in 1939 boasted the greatest and best trained regular army, with long training under a compulsory law, certainly offers no good argument to adopt a system which did not save that army from rout and defeat in this war. French soldiers, without the blight of compulsion, would have given a better account of themselves. The draft system was tried and found wanting.

The advocates of a compulsory law point to the early victories of the Nazis as an example America should follow. The first thing Hitler did when he became dictator of Germany was to tighten up and enforce military conscription. All German males between 18 and 45 were drafted and forced into active duty for a period of 10 years. The system called for the training of the entire youth of the Nation. There was basic preinduction service, discipline, and hardening of young boys in the schools. They were indoctrinated into the fake of being "the superior race." Germany was made one vast military camp and all life was based on preparedness for war. This by order of the Fuehrer. The Nazis became brutally efficient and for a time ran roughshod over most of Europe. They believed their military caste and universal military service would make Germany the master of the world. It would be futile to deny that the German military force won important victories and imposed their will from the Atlantic Ocean and the British Channel to the steppes of Russia. Their victories were made possible more by early supremacy in the air, and the utilization of mechanized implements of war more than by compulsory goose-stepping. And the time came when the drafted Nazi soldiers, with long years of compulsory military service, came up against mighty armies from countries which had practiced no peacetime compulsion. The result is history. The citizen soldiers, quickly mastering the lessons of war in combat, came off victors over those who believed no soldier could fight unless from boyhood he had been compelled to make militarism the grind of his daily life.

Certainly an examination of the results of compulsory service in France and Germany give no sufficient reason why the United States should abandon its century-old Americanism and adopt European imperialism, which now in its rout finds none so poor to render it obeisance. Weighed in the balance—in the acid test of war—that much-vaunted system was found wanting. Its epitaph—this is true of Italy, too, and will be of Japan; Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin.

Up to date nobody advocating spending billions and billions of dollars for compulsory military services has even guessed at how much money will be required to put that juggernaut in motion and keep it going, and in what sort of war these draftees will be trained to fight to get best results. The only suggestions have been land bases, barracks, and tents galore, and the sort of drilling that was in fashion a generation ago. Most of such training is as out of date as the triremes of Rome. It has not been suggested that there is need for drafting men for the Navy. It can obtain all it may need by volunteers who are ambitious to go down to the sea in ships. Aviation will attract more men of their own volition than there are planes in which they can try their wings. There remains, therefore, as the only possible argument for compulsory training, the draft-

ing of men to make up the land forces. At the most there will be need only for a small, compact land force. Every man that can be wisely placed can be obtained by volunteer enlistment if there is adequate pay with certain advancement from the ranks to those who show ability in actual service.

Let me illustrate: When I became Secretary of the Navy in March 1913, Congress had authorized an enlistment of 54,643 men. I found that the strenuous effort to attract enough youths to the number authorized lagged. This in the face of propaganda by Navy bands and solicitation to enlistment by the promise, "Joint the Navy and see the world." I resolved to find why the response to appeals to enlist did not secure enough seamen. I found it was due to 4 reasons: 1. The pay was inadequate. 2. The training, except in gunnery and engineering, was lacking. 3. A caste system denied the equality that is synonymous Americanism. 4. The door to promotion was barred.

A new policy was adopted of a school on every ship, better vocational and elementary instruction, opportunity for advancement and promotion to commissioned officer rank—not enough—and training in navigation by voyages that enabled all sailors to see the world, begining with a voyage to Rome. What was the result? In piping times of peace the full strength was enlisted and the next Congress authorized all the sailors needed to man the ships in commission and the new ships to be constructed and enough volunteered, and more for the need.

What does this history teach? Beyond dispute, that if the pay is adequate, the dignity of youth respected, education provided, and the door to promotion opened—if these American rights and opportunities are made a part of military life, there will be so many American youths volunteering that no branch of military service will need to conscript a single man.

The call is not compulsory service—as un-American as nazism or fascism—but the practice of that American democracy in the military branches which prevails in civilian life. The first step is promotion of the capable privates to officer rank, and the utter exclusion of that snobbery which sometimes creates a chasm between the officers and enlisten men.

We are told that the cure for democracy is more democracy. The cure for lack of full enlistments is to introduce democracy and more democracy.

A few weeks ago I chanced to be in a company of civilian officials and officers of the Navy and Army when the discussion turned on the subject of compulsory military service. One civilian, who had come to Washington from patriotic motives to serve in an important post, brought up the subject your committee is now considering, and expressed the strong belief that our country should at once enact the legislation which is now under consideration. He said it was the guarantee of protection. He advanced the view that every youth should be fitted for war by military training in peace. As he proceeded with the old familiar argument first advanced by Bismarck, and later be-praised by Hitler, a wise admiral who still has his feet on the ground, interrupted by asking: "How much would it cost to give this universal compulsory military training?" As the discussion proceeded, and the advocates brought forth argument after argument for compulsion, they were all confounded when the quiet admiral halted every argument brought forth with the disconcerting question: "How many billion dollars will it cost?" He has had no answer to his question yet because the advocates shy away from that phase of their proposal. One of those present did say: "No matter what the cost, it will be cheaper than the two wars in which we have been engaged. The admiral asked: "Did compulsory military service in France stop Hitler in 1940. And did it guarantee the peace you think that un-American system would insure for us when a war lord is bent on military domination?" That question remains unanswered.

This wise admiral, whose practical devotion to true preparedness is a matter of record, commented: "I have not forgotten the fundamentals of democracy I learned as a boy. Compulsory military service in peacetimes is contrary to those principles. Let us stick to our Americanism and we have nothing to fear."

After the discussion had proceeded for some time, the civilian who was most vocal for compulsion turned to the officers present and said: "Unless we get it now, we will never get it. The time to strike is when the iron is hot."

You may ask me, "If you do not believe in compulsory military service, what would you propose in lieu of it for preparedness against any possible foe?" That would be a proper question. No one ought to be against a proposed remedy unless prepared to offer a better one. If and until a league of nations, or a like international organization, has demonstrated its ability to prevent war, our country owes it to itself to be prepared against the possibility of attack.

What is the best protection? My answer is the same one I made to the Naval Affairs Committee while Wilson was in Paris negotiating for a world organization of a substitute for war. Unless and until such an agency could work satisfactorily, I urged the most powerful Navy in the world. The naval emphasis then was on surface ships. Today I would place the main emphasis on a navy that flies, with adequate military strength on land and sea. Aviation has passed its infancy but has not reached its stride. I would take leave to be strong in the air. If our country dominates the sky, no enemy can land on any part of our terrain.

We will never dominate in war by dependence upon the draft. All we need to do is to provide the craft and accessories and young Americans will hasten to enlist, and the number of voluntary aviators will exceed the ability to furnish them wings. Certainly, we ought not to put all our eggs in one basket. We now have land and sea and air forces larger than we will ever need. Enough should be retained of all to guarantee national defense until time has demonstrated the size of each force that is necessary for our own protection and thus to contribute our share to an international police force to use against any who would threaten the peace of the world.

It is too soon, it is far too soon to determine the character and size of the military strength in men and munitions. We should make a study of the lessons taught by war before determining the character or quantity of military strength or how our armed forces are to be recruited.

It would be the height of unwisdom to plunge into the expenditure of billions to set up a mighty system which would invade every home at the behest of militarist or cynic. I have heard no reason or excuse for compulsory military service except from those who doubt the effectiveness of any world peace or those who wish Uncle Sam to become a colonial Nation holding the weaker people in chains.

The apparent sentiment for departing from American preparedness does not exist in the hinterland of America, you do not find it among the men who reap and sow, of those who fashion implements and tools and machines in our factories, or in our schools and colleges. Most of it is pumped up. Outside of Washington and official and military circles there is little demand for this radical departure from a system of Government that has been our sound foundation in all our history.

Internationalists Hope to Give Foreign Countries Running Start in Capturing Our Domestic Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Great Britain is missing no time in seizing the opportunity to capture our domestic market. If and when the Trade Agreement Extension is passed by Congress authorizing the State Department to reduce tariffs on pottery, light automobiles, textiles, and other competitive products, the American industries and American labor may look to a WPA program for themselves and families. The internationalists who wish to barter away our markets will rejoice to learn that foreign competition is about to be resumed. It now becomes apparent why the pottery, the textile and the watch makers were so vigorous in their opposition to the internationalist's program to extend the Trade Agreement Act and its new provision by which tariff duties may be reduced by 50 percent.

Under leave to extend, I am including articles which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of June 11, 1945:

WHAT'S BUSINESS AND FINANCE

American industry was formally notified by the WPB yesterday it will have to depend largely on its own ingenuity in obtaining materials to resume civilian output. The agency announced it will not grant manufacturers allotments of controlled materials beyond the levels already scheduled for the third quarter of this year. A few exceptions might be made to assure additional production of essential items. WPB officials said the move was designed to "wean civilian industry away" from dependence on Government allocations now that cut-backs in war orders are freeing increasing amounts of scarce materials.

Britain's reconversion will be speeded with the lifting today of wartime restrictions on private manufacture of various products, mostly destined for export. The Government announced automobile companies will be permitted to turn out 200,000 passenger cars in the next 12 months, half for overseas trade. Other goods to be made for export are machinery, pottery, abrasives, and certain metal goods. Officials said British factories will not be able to swing into volume output immediately because of the necessity of allocating and distributing basic materials. Full operations are expected to be achieved in 6 months.

BRITAIN PERMITS INDUSTRY TO RESUME PRODUCTION OF GOODS FOR EXPORT—AUTOS, MACHINES, POTTERY ON LIST

LONDON.—Wartime restrictions on the export of certain goods and machinery will be lifted today when the government gives the green light to private industry to turn out peacetime products for foreign trade, a Board of Trade spokesman said.

Simultaneously the Board of Trade and the Supply Ministry announced that automobile manufacturers will be permitted to turn out 200,000 private cars in the next 12 months, half for overseas export.

The spokesman said the Government was releasing factory space to private industry to turn out peacetime products. Most of the space being allocated to the automobile industry for expansion of war-weakened foreign trade.

Other goods to be manufactured for export are machinery, pottery, abrasives, asbestos, and certain metal goods.

The Board of Trade spokesman emphasized that the factories will not be able to swing into full-time production immediately because of the necessity of allocating and distributing basic materials. Full-scale production will probably be achieved in 6 months.

Government control on export licenses will continue, he said, despite lifting of production clamps. Thus, overseas trade will remain under nominal Government supervision for several months to come.

Informed quarters said that although automobile builders are given preferential treatment in the new production program, they will not attempt to compete with United States manufacturers.

Lord Nuffield, British motor magnate, stated the British position recently when he said that his country could never hope to vie with America in production of big cars and that Britain would specialize in the manufacture of small and medium automobiles.

He said he believed there was a tremendous Empire market for lighter automobiles because they were cheap and easy to keep up.

Morris Motors and the Austin Motor Co. are two automobile makers that have been authorized to resume production immediately. Platt Bros. is scheduled to begin the manufacture of textile machinery and is said to have a backlog of several million dollars worth of orders.

One new industry which will undertake a mass-production program is watchmaking.

The Kayser Bondor Co. is authorized to go into big-scale production of silk stockings and underwear.

The go-ahead given by the Board of Trade and Supply Ministry was in response to a request by the auto manufacturers, who set a goal of 40,000 vehicles by the end of 1945. Substitute materials for scarce elements have already been evolved.

A Correction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A2629, under the heading "Not new but somewhat startling," I inserted a letter from the Macmillan Co., which published a book entitled "Lend-Lease: Weapon for Victory," the manuscript for which was written by Mr. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, and made a statement calling attention to the money-making proclivities of some of those who were or are connected with the Roosevelt administration, and named, among others, Henry Wallace and Harry Hopkins, and stated that few of us ever thought that Mr. Stettinius would follow in their footsteps.

That statement also contained this language:

The apparent greed of those who, especially in wartime, should set us an example of unselfish devotion and whole-hearted service in the interests of our country, again crops up in the administration's official family.

A letter on the stationery of the Macmillan Co. advises me that Mr. Stettinius, after completing the manuscript, donated it "to a large philanthropic organization, and all royalty payments are made by this company to that organization." I assume that this statement by the Macmillan Co. is true and I am happy to make the correction and to know that Mr. Stettinius has donated the royalties from the publication of the material, much of which he must have obtained by virtue of his official position, to a charitable organization.

It is to be hoped that some of those who have not thought of that procedure or who have not been inclined to follow it may do likewise. His example is a fine one and perhaps the Macmillan Co. will itself follow it and donate any profits which they may make out of the publication of this book, the sales of which naturally will be increased by the fact that is was written by the present Secretary of State and also by the fact that the proceeds are to go for charity.

I still believe, if the information contained in this book is of such inestimable value as indicated by the advertisements of the Macmillan Co., the Secretary of State should have incorporated it in an official document to be published and distributed by the Government itself. It would then have been available to hundreds of thousands of citizens who cannot afford to pay Macmillan Co. $3 for a copy. Nor would there have been room for any confusion as to whether Mr. Stettinius, Jr., was writing as an individual or as Secretary of State; whether he was an author for profit or a public officer making an official report.

Canada Makes Mouth Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Bill Cunningham in the Boston Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA MAKES MOUTH WATER—EVERYTHING TO EAT—POINTLESS, BECAUSE HEADS PLANNED RIGHT

(By Bill Cunningham)

TORONTO, CANADA, June 4.—Such things as 2-inch quadrangles of honey-colored butter, sweet and succulent pork chops pan fried to that lovely brunette shade, sirloin steaks you almost couldn't cover with a 10-gallon hat, hamburger that doesn't look as if they'd ground some old inner tube into it as stretcher, ham, any way you wish it, sir; bacon, six strips to the serving; sausage—can you hear me now, or don't the words mean anything any more?

Well, they've got 'em here in Canada, just as you've heard. They're ration free. You can buy them in the nude at any meat counter. At least, I moseyed through six different breeds of food emporiums that called themselves such as names as Loblaw Groceterias, Ltd.; Dominion Stores, Ltd.; A. & P. Food Stores; Curtis Markets, and some more; and there was the beef of steer and all the sundry cuts of swine reposing in all their pristine glory.

Women, instead of clawing at each other's wigs and jamming elbows in ribs in a wild Donnybrook to get up to the place, moved around calmly, even high-hatting the lonesome-looking displays in some of the places. There were no jams, no queues. In fact, I'd say business was pretty poor in some of the places.

THEN YOU GET BREAKFAST PROGRAM

Prices? Well, the hamburger was 40 cents per pound. It was all red and looked good. Rump roast was 44 cents. Sirloin steak was 49 cents. Mushrooms, and good looking ones, were 59 cents a pound. They are seventy-nine at home. Perfectly beautiful asparagus was 23 cents for a bunch that looked practically like a bundle of faggots. At home a bunch of little stinkers about the size of a half-dozen lead pencils would run you 59 cents.

The places were stocked with canned goods. Hundreds of bottles of point-free catsup, or ketchup, anyway that red stuff, gave an encarnadined motif to the chaste white shelves. There was cheese of all packaged varieties, whole cases of butter. There were oranges, plenty of them, in every place. These were California oranges. They ran from 37 cents a dozen to 41 cents, 52 cents, and the swellest department store in town, Eaton's, has an imperial brand of Valencias for a hefty 83 cents. Spuds will run you 5 pounds to the quarter; onions, 3 pounds for 17 cents.

There's no ration points on anything but sugar, butter, canned fruits, and preserves.

That's the stores, and the picture for the housewives. On the way to the train in Newtonville the other day, I cast a rheumy eye along the meat counter of the village's most popular, and generally best stored food store. Most of it was as bare as Mother Hubbard's cupboard. The parts that weren't, offered some discouraged looking live lobsters that looked as if they'd been snatched before their primes and some cottage cheese, rather than which I, for one, had as soon eat a pot of old library paste.

Here in Toronto, if you're only passing through, which chances to be my status, and you therefore take your sustenance in restaurants, the following is the practically unbelievable way it works out. If you've come up on the night train, you're practically as hungry as a horse, for the night train to Toronto doesn't run very pronto, and the immigration inspector gets you up at 6, the customs man at 7, and there isn't any diner. So you sit and get hungry until 8.

If there's any place to breakfast in the depot, I didn't see it, either, and the redcaps are slower than molasses in January, and what, with losing your baggage, and with one thing and another, you finally get to a hotel around 9, or thereafter. You're in an exceptionally feculent mood by the time you enter the dining room.

But then the man hands you the breakfast program, and here is what you can have for 85 cents. At least, it was this morning at the King Edward Hotel: Any sort of fruit, or fruit juice, the same including a baked

apple, or sliced pineapple; the choice of any cereal, hot or cold, including one called Good Humor, which is a new one on ye scribe; then, as a main course, eggs, any style, ham and eggs, bacon and eggs, or white fish, filet of fresh pickerel, or lake trout; lamb chops or pork chops, calves' liver and bacon, or country sausages and wheat cakes; bread, toast, muffins or rolls, and your choice of morning beverages, including choice English tea.

Luncheon at the magnificent Granite Club offered a menu that went straight on from here into soldier victuals. Roast beef, grilled pork chops, and so on, were main courses there, with fresh Canadian asparagus, potatoes cooked any way, blueberry pie, chocolate sundae, or rice pudding. The price for the complete luncheon—and I've frequently attended affairs advertised as banquets that saw less come to the table—but the price for most was 90 cents. One or two came to a dollar, but that meant the whole works.

None of this is of anything but credit to Canada. There's no monkey business, no black market, no cheating the starving. It's possible because Canada chanced to have some people with enough brains and occupational know-how to measure her food supply and her food potential and to fit it intelligently into her war picture. So far as I can discover here, a lot of lies have been told about Canada and a lot of them have come in my mail. I've had letters from outraged patriots who purported to know that Canada was taking our lend-lease food and having a regular civilian banquet off it, without rations and even without thanks. Some of these letters have even said that they knew somebody who had crossed into Canada and bought a pound of butter stamped United States lend-lease.

USED PLAIN COUNTRY-BOY SENSE

Well, I walked through typical food stores today unannounced and unnoticed, examining brands on practically everything in the place. They were all just as Canadian as the official maple leaf. This beef is Canadian grown and slaughtered. So is the pork. The butter's Canadian. There may be a little cheating somewhere in some border town. There usually is and our own are no better than anybody else when it comes to it.

But the difference is that whereas Canada brought some plain country boy sense into the handling of her victualing, our master minds in Washington, under the aegis of that distinguished public servant, Mr. Leon Henderson, flushed the academic rookeries of a covey of young slide rule operators, most of whom had never been bruised by life beyond their cloistered college halls and all of whom evidently thought steer was the way you drive an automobile. Their weird and wonderful directives, controls, and conflabustercated ceilings are now paying off. They're long since out and aren't around to blame anymore.

Sound food men in our country predicted that exactly what has happened would happen as certainly as we stood for their unfathomable shenanigans. Well, it's here, brother, gnaw your carrot and feel noble.

In the meanwhile Canadians are dining no better and even not as well as they did in former days, but compared with what we saviors of civilization are using for meals, it looks like Belshazzar's feast served three times a day I say hurrah for Canada and may its steaks grow even thicker. And I say it with complete detachment, for the irony of it is that this entire subject is strictly academic with me. All this cornucopia, to me, currently, is utterly meaningless as I am dieting in a desperate effort to become thin and beautiful and making no progress in either direction, just in case anybody was asking.

Commencement Address at University of Utah by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the seventy-sixth annual commencement of the University of Utah at Salt Lake City, Utah, June 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

History is being repeated in more ways than one this morning. Commencements have gone on for a number of years. The repetition of history that is on my mind this minute is the fact that in 1906 when I received my degree a Senator gave the commencement address. I do not want to talk to you as a Senator. I do not even want to give advice, not because I am a cynic and believe that graduates will not take advice, but because I merely want to talk about attitudes and trends: attitudes and trends in relation to you and the world. Both are important entities. I must, though, get in a little advice or this will not be a commencement address.

I have no advice for the people of Utah. I like the people of Utah. They have been good to me. I have no advice for the University. I love this institution as I love no other. It is my university in every sense of the word. And one of the things which I take greatest pride in is that I organized the Associated Students of the University of Utah. Some people did not like what I had done in that instance and those in authority did not accept all that was recommended. They did not approve of the separation of the preparatory students from the college students, nor did they like the idea of a required student-body fee. But they came around to see the light in time, so that you now have a splendid student-body organization.

Now for the advice—Every student who ever took an American government class under me was told to choose some American statesman and read everything he could find about that statesman; learn his life as he learns nothing else. It does not necessarily matter who the man is, but get deeply interested in him. If you will do that you will never want for something to do in any of your leisure hours and you will find that the twentieth or thirtieth book you read about your hero is more interesting than the first one you read. In this way you will find that you are building up your own soul. You do not have to confine your hero to America or to a statesman, but find someone who has lived a worthwhile life and learn all of the mistakes he has made. That will help you to avoid mistakes. Learn all of the good he has done, the discouragements he has overcome, and you will learn how to overcome discouragement and do some good.

I chose Thomas Jefferson for my own hero and the study of Jefferson has been fruitful to me beyond words. I am now chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission and a director of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association. The Commission has erected a $3,000,000 memorial to Jefferson and the Association has purchased Monticello and given it to the American people as a national monument. I have at times become so enthusiastic over the Jefferson Memorial that in my enthusiasm I think of it as something I have done. Of course I know I have contributed but little, but that contribution has become so much a part of my life that I glory in the whole. I remember when the Commission for the memorial in Washington was first established that at the very first meeting of the Commission I told those present that as far as I was concerned I was going to work with such enthusiasm that I was going to take credit for everything the Commission did. I was glad I said that because within a week the President of the United States called me with the then chairman of the Commission to give us his ideas. I needn't say more. But just between you and me the President did not have his way and the reason he did not have his way was that he had not said the memorial was going to be his and I had. Under those circumstances, you would not have budged for the President of the United States, would you?

The point I am trying to make is this: It took time to bring about the organization of the Associated Students and it took time to bring about the Jefferson Memorial, and the fine people who objected to each in the beginning all gave way in the end. If you make something your own, and keep at it long enough, you do win.

That brings me to another point. You only go forward with institutions. You cannot go forward alone. Identify yourselves, therefore, with causes that result in institutions, then when you are dead and gone you still live. You cannot take George Washington and Thomas Jefferson out of the Government of the United States. Their spirits are there. Both of them are dead, but the Government of the United States is not dead and in that they live. Let us take a simpler case. When I used to sit on the deans council, some bright instructor in the freshmen English class, and there were bright instructors in those days, even in English classes, asked the students to write a paragraph on why they came to the university. One girl, and I wish I had known her, merely wrote that she came to the university to get a decent husband (period) and handed in her paper (exclamation point). That was so out of the ordinary that one important dean thought it was disgusting and that such a person should be invited to leave the campus. I said it was great, that there was a girl who had a plan for life and she was just working her plan. She understood a plan about life. Probably without knowing it, she had accepted the Aristotelian theory that man is a social animal. Here is the way Aristotle put it ——— I could say more if I put it in English, but I won't. I have made my point: that girl gave evidence of having a philosophy of life. I wish someone had impressed upon me earlier in life, than when I got the idea, that life can only be lived properly when one has a philosophy of life. It was Mencius who brought me to my senses in regard to this fundamental idea. Mencius' dissertation about the earthworm could be summed up in these words: Both man and an earthworm are parts of life, but man should not live like an earthworm. He should have purpose, purpose in what he does, and should act in accordance with that purpose. Man should have reverence for the proper relationships between himself and other men. Man should live in accordance with that understanding of those relationships. I should like to go even further than Mencius and say that man should have not only a philosophy of life, but he should have a religion. By religion, I mean it in its simplest form. The

word "religion," as you know, comes from the Latin word, religio, which means a tie, or bond. Religion is merely that bond which connects you with that which has gone before and that which is to come. Thus, man may become part of the eternal scheme in his thinking as well as the social scheme that Mencius stressed.

Would you live like an earthworm? One very great philosopher said on this campus when President Thomas was inaugurated that the difference between a man and an earthworm was that when an earthworm digs in the ground he keeps on doing it, but when a man digs in the ground he finds an earthworm and that gives him an idea and he goes fishing. Do you see what I mean? Man does something about the ideas he gets.

Let me suggest that you be very selfish. Not that you break the tenth commandment, but that you realize within the bounds of the Aristotelian concept that man is a social animal and that selfishness must of necessity also be social. We would not have electric lights today if Edison had said to us: "This is the way to make an electric light. Now you go ahead and make it." He was selfish. He did it himself. You and I have both had more good from electric lights than Edison got out of them. I am sure that I got more pleasure out of reading Jefferson's letters than he got out of writing them. I have had inspiration, understanding, history, appreciation of my country, and I have learned the values of democracy. I know from a study of Jefferson, not only how democracy works but how it should work. Jefferson did not know that he was giving me any of those ideas when he wrote his letters. The good man does never stops. Jefferson never dreamed that nazism, fascism, and world conquest through horror would overrun the earth and that his defense of liberty, law, and justice would overcome them. But the leaders of the earth today know the strength of his great fundamentals and their power to withstand wickedness.

There is not one of you graduates who had anything to do with the moving of the university up here on the hill, or the planting of the first tree on the campus, or the building of the first athletic field, or in planning the first prom. You do not know the headaches other people had in going through those experiences, but you got more out of them than the very people who started them going. Is it right to be selfish and use benefits that someone else has provided? You cannot dodge those benefits. Who owns this university anyway? It is mine. It is yours. Both of us failed to attain the utmost potentiality the university offered. But that was not the university's fault. Both of us failed in getting in the fullness all that we might have. But the university did its part. We failed to do ours. When you sloughed your last class did you go to the trouble to figure out in dollars and cents who had been cheated? I never did. The class did not seem to cost anything until one day I figured out that the State of Utah paid me quite a sum of money for delivering the lectures I did. Perhaps no one is cheated when he sloughs a class. But if a professor has sense enough to say—I am delivering this lecture for the good it does me—and works so hard in preparation for that lecture with the idea that only he himself will get the profit from it, somebody is benefited, and, as far as the State is concerned, it is not cheated. That is my reason for selfishness. Whatever you do, do for your own upbuilding and others will be benefited.

No class in the history of commencements has looked upon a world so wrought in its own destruction as the world you face today. No class has started to tread the path of life with a choice between good and evil so easy to discern. In all of the world's history, civilization has never before presented so many excellent possibilities nor have the destroyers of civilization ever perpetrated so many ills. If, as some of the philosophers held, good and evil exist eternally, never have they dwelt side by side in such close proximity as they dwell today. Man can transport himself quicker, can make for himself greater happiness, can live life more abundantly than it has ever been lived before. He can commit more evil, bring about more destruction, destroy more happiness than he has been able to do before.

In many ways the world I have described here is like the world implied in Cicero's great orations against Cataline. My teacher of Cicero, the sainted Dean Cummings, always left us at the end of each class with the feeling that here was Cataline, a boy like ourselves, a choice one among the youths of Rome, with all of the opportunities that anyone had had opened to him, and he deliberately chose evil. Perhaps the world is not so different after all. At any rate, the good and the evil are side by side. You must make the choice.

I once talked to an enthusiastic Nazi who admitted that probably Hitler could not succeed ultimately in his objectives by destroying and killing, but that he could have 3 or 4 years of real pleasure out of the success of his endeavor and that if, after 3 or 4 years of destructive processes, he should ultimately come out the conqueror, then happiness for him and his associates would be assured; but if he failed and was crushed, as he admitted he probably would be, he still would have had the satisfaction of having ruled a while.

The Japanese, when they threw the best their Nation had to offer into destruction by their attack on Pearl Harbor, knew that it was a gamble for rule or ruin. They accepted the odds; the gambler's fling, with civilization as the stake. What cared they for civilization if they could but rule. There is hardly a boy or girl who has been exposed to the American public-school system who cannot appreciate the gambler's chance these destroying leaders took. It was Caesar who said, "I would rather be first in a little Iberian village than second in Rome." He achieved neither. The conflict in the world today is the eternal conflict. Shall I be free in a world of free men, or shall I be a passive follower of a single will? The weaknesses of democracy that Mussolini and Hitler used to point out are democracy's greatest strength. They failed to see the possibilities of any unity among free men. Their great mistake was merely that of assuming that unity can come only by the destruction of the individual in his service to a single will. "You will unite because you must," said Hitler. "We will unite because it is right to do so," say the American people.

Under the American system, every American soldier who takes part in a battle understands the general objectives. He is trusted to do his part. The old German system required that the individual soldier do what he was told without understanding the purpose of his doing. What football coach would try a play that every man on the team did not understand. Football is democracy in action. A player can run the wrong way with the ball and he sometimes does, but, generally, intelligent recognition of the facts of the game brings our team through. Thus, free men can work in unison. It is inspiring to hear our great generals talk about our team. It is fine to see them recognize each soldier as a member of that team. Never has an army in the history of the world been such an understanding one as has our Army become this time. Democracy is strength if it is intelligently directed. Make each individual in that democracy well trained and you may be assured of its intelligent direction. A trained citizenry is the greatest asset any nation can have. That is pure unadulterated Americanism as you have been taught it on this campus. It is that type of Americanism you are now seeing lived.

Back to my Jefferson to work my way out—the state is important and we should be ready to give our lives for it, but it is not all-important from the American standpoint. It is important only to the extent that it serves that which is of greater importance. It is men, women, and children that are important. The state was made for man just as the Sabbath, and man not either for the state or the Sabbath.

The American Government is still the only government on earth where the spokesman for that Government and the leaders in it carry on not for the benefit of the Government, but for the people for whom the Government functions. The Constitution may have been written by inspired men, but they did not create through their inspiration something that was to be worshiped. The Constitution is not a god. It is merely the companion of the American people in the accomplishment of the people's social, political, and economic objectives. It goes with the people. It does not lead and they do not follow. It is the people's way of life. It merely says to us: "You will act in order to accomplish our good ends." It says to our President: "You lead us in accomplishing our general welfare. You direct us when we are attacked; you command us when we are at war; but you direct, command, and lead us with righteousness or we shall cut you down." And with full faith in the goodness of man's nature, we today trust the welfare not of 130,000,000 people but the welfare of the people of the world to this man we call the President because we realize that with righteousness he will direct and lead because 130,000,000 people have imposed that task upon him. The American people say to their judges: "You administer justice in accordance with law and protect the individual in his rights and in his property, and all individuals in their relationship to their fellow men." The American people say to their legislative representatives: "You make the law but you do it in accordance with the standards laid down by us." That is what the Constitution means and that is the way it functions. And in the history of our country, the failures of these governmental trusts have been so few that you can still count on the fingers of your two hands the number of impeachment trials the Senate of the United States has had to hold. Is that Government weak because it protects the individual in his rights? Are our courts weak because they administer justice and law instead of political theory and expediency? Are our Army and our Navy weak because the leaders of that Army and that Navy take an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States, which in turn is merely a way of political life for the American people?

Democracy is not weak; freedom is not weak; liberty is not weak. These are strong, and you have seen that strength manifest and made certain at the same time that you have heard democracy's weaknesses proclaimed and its impending destruction assured to cheering mobs by men who now lie in the dust, destroyed ultimately by their own wickedness, their own ambitions, and their own lack of morals. What then in life constitutes strength? Did Jesus have it, Jesus the world's outstanding failure, killed in his early thirties? His plan for men has not yet been the crowning success which is to bring the world's redemption. But who today would call Him weak? Socrates failed. He, too, died because he thought that death was better than a submission to wrong. Why did these men fail? They decided that morals were important and that ideals were

worth while. It was these assertions that brought their destruction, but their way of life is prevailing today in high and low places and the strength which they showed is being displayed by thousands and thousands of our boys and girls who are fighting; and thousands and thousands more, who have died in concentration camps rather than surrender an ideal. Yes, giving their lives that right, decent living, honesty, and morality may have a meaning in this world. The acts of men are so great and the facts of history so stupendous that we who stand here uttering words must seem insignificant indeed.

"I saw the powers of darkness put to flight!
"I saw the morning break!"

The world's great task is the same as it was when the Constitution of the United States was written and ratified. How to bring one out of many—e pluribus unum—is the task that faces us today as it faced our fathers. It must be done as they did it. It is because of my firm belief in the great American experiment that I always advocate that world unity can only come through American leadership and under the auspices of the American theory. It is in America that the federal technique of government has been worked out. It is in America that the theory of dual and plural citizenship has been made practical. It is in America that we can unite for some purposes and be divided for others. It is in America that liberty is maintained by promoting voluntary cooperation instead of forced unity. It is in America that national and State sovereignty are permitted to exist side by side, not without conflict, to be sure, but with those conflicts adjusted by peaceful means. It is in America that the individual has the right to have and to hold, to go and to come, to live life in a greater sense than it has ever been lived before, with man "under his own vine and fig tree" as some prophet of old foretold man should live.

After 150 years of experience, if the world would but catch America's spirit, no one need feel that the efforts being made by our leaders today are in vain. Slowly but surely man is being made conscious of the fact that, no matter what nation he belongs to, that nation in turn is but one of a community of nations. That fact realized, that fact maintained, surely then the standard for nations can be as readily set up as the standards for individuals are set up within the community or the nation. Man lives in law and is not free from the restraints of his neighbors. A nation too lives in law and should not be free from restraints of its neighbors. If we fail to bring about a better world through the organization of the nations we will fail because we did not realize the fact that the earth is a unit and the nations of the earth are but individual entities within that unit and must adhere to the prevailing will of the community of nations. If we but do this, we shall have a sanction for international law as binding and as great as the fundamental sanction which we have in our own Constitution.

When we say—we the people in order to do certain things, do those things—there is no questioning in our Constitution of the right of the people to say—we the people. What State questions that right today among our 48? Can we not expand the idea as America has expanded from 13 small States to 48 mighty ones and say—we the people of the world in order to form, in order to do, in order to act, establish the following?—

Practically every pitfall that is pointed out by those without faith in the earth today was pointed out by those without faith in our American Constitution 150 years ago. If those theories which were dreamed of by the fathers, if that Constitution which we so glibly call inspired contain the elements of truth, why should anyone criticize me when I say that the American Revolution is still on, that it has not accomplished its ultimate objective, and that its full meaning in the earth will not be understood until the world unity is made manifest, that same type of unity which we have made manifest in our 150 years of history. A unity which has destroyed war among us can by expansion destroy war in the earth.

Thus, I have talked of you and the world. I might have talked of you and many worlds, but I have full faith that the great sacrifice of so many has brought home to all the need for thoughtful approach to bring about that condition among men that destruction by war shall cease. It was a heroine in one of the early Greek dramas, I believe it was one of Sophocles', that wailed, "Oh, why? Oh, why! do men unite so readily for war, but never unite for peace?" Is the task hopeless? Are nations so foolish that they will not give a little of that which they claim for themselves in order to gain much for all? There were those among our fathers who talked against our Constitution with that spirit, but they did not prevail. There are those in the world today who still have little faith. But for you, may I suggest this simple approach. Had you lived in Washington's time would you have been happy to have been one of those without faith in Washington's cause? Had you lived in Lincoln's time would you now be proud that you were one of those who were against what Lincoln was trying to do? You will have to make decisions. Make them so that your grandchildren will point with pride and be happy to be identified as sons and daughters of some great cause which is yours. Do not think it was easier for our fathers to decide than it is for you. It was not. And never forget that

"Mankind needs men, men that can stand alone
Their faith unsullied in a sordid world.
The age is growing, right comes to its own.
Prometheus loosed no more from gods is hurled.

"Mankind needs men, such as in days of old
Deemed that bright treasurer Honor more than gold.
Should courtesy and courage be upheld
Less nobly now than in the days of old?"

Germany's War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the motto of the Allies in dealing with Germany today must be, "Lest we forget." American civilians and even American soldiers are notoriously generous victors. The spirit we have absorbed on the playing fields of our country calls for the hearty handshake when the game is over, with a rousing cheer for the losers and winners alike. Inside the shower room, the game is ended.

We must not permit this sportsmanlike attitude to color our views toward Germany. This was not a game. It was a battle to the death with a military machine which bombed helpless cities into ruins at Warsaw, at Rotterdam, at Coventry, and would willingly have done the same to New York, Washington, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, and San Francisco if it had only found the means. This was a war in which American prisoners were massacred in cold blood when their rescue appeared imminent, in which our boys were systematically starved with a view toward permanent injury to their health if not death itself. This was a war in which millions of men and women and children were ruthlessly murdered by German militarists who issued orders for that destruction with the sole purpose of wiping out potential threats to future German domination of the European Continent.

Let there be no display of generous handshakes to the members of the German General Staff on the theory that they are gentlemen and fellow sportsmen. These men are criminals exactly as are all those who conspire to take the lives of their fellowmen. These men have committed murders exactly as do all those who purchase gunmen to do their bidding. Let them be confined and tried for their crimes against man and God. Let us not forget the million American casualties for which they are directly responsible in an outburst of magnanimity. A just peace means a hard peace.

Chicago Surface Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Chicago Sun:

[From the Chicago Sun of June 3, 1945]

IGOE RELATIVE HOLDS TRANSIT SYSTEM POST—BROTHER-IN-LAW HANDLES PART OF TRIAL BUSINESS

(By J. M. Klein)

Further inquiry by the Chicago Sun into judicial control of the Chicago Surface Lines under Judge Michael L. Igoe, of United States district court, has revealed that one of the many lawyers employed by the streetcar company is Fred J. O'Connor, brother-in-law of Judge Igoe.

This supplements previous disclosures in the Sun that friends and political associates of Judge Igoe have been placed in high-paying jobs in the management of the Surface Lines, either by court appointment or employment by the management.

FIVE YEARS IN CITY HALL

O'Connor, who has law offices at 111 West Washington Street, joined the array of the trolley company's legal talent a few months after Judge Igoe assumed jurisdiction of the traction litigation, which he inherited from Judge James H. Wilkerson, now retired, in March 1940.

Earlier O'Connor had been assistant corporation counsel in city hall for 5 years, leaving that post in October 1940 for private law practice.

According to the Surface Lines' management, headed by John E. Sullivan, an Igoe friend and appointee, Igoe's brother-in-law is not a full-time salaried employee but is paid on a per diem basis (a specified fee for each day's work) to handle part of the company's trial business.

PAYMENTS ARE CONCEALED

The streetcar management refused to disclose how much O'Connor gets and refused also to furnish any other information about his employment.

However, the general understanding among lawyers and court officials is that the usual per diem pay for the type of work that O'Connor does for the Surface Lines is $100 a day.

O'Connor handles trial of damage suit cases for the streetcar lines in circuit court and superior court, as do several other lawyers working on a per diem basis. He is regarded by court officials as one of the busiest of the Surface Lines lawyers engaged in such work.

UNDER IGOE'S EX-PARTNER

O'Connor works under Frank L. Kriete, head of the Surface Lines' personal injury law department, but the chief counsel of the Surface Lines is William J. Flaherty, Igoe's former law partner, who was hired in December 1941, by authorization of Judge Igoe.

The fees paid to O'Connor and other lawyers not directly appointed by the court do not show in court records of the traction case, although all operations of the transit lines are subject to supervision of Judge Igoe.

[From the Chicago Sun of June 7, 1945]

BROTHER OF SECRETARY TO JUDGE IGOE PASSES ON CARLINE JOB BIDS

(By J. M. Klein)

The superintendent of employment of the Chicago Surface Lines, the man who passes on applicants for jobs with the streetcar system, is Edward D. Ehrlich, brother of the secretary to Judge Michael L. Igoe, of United States District Court, who has had judicial control of Chicago's transit lines for the last 5 years.

Anybody who wants to work in any operating division of the trolley lines must apply to Ehrlich, who, according to his own estimate, has jurisdiction over more than 15,000 jobs.

NAME NOT IN COURT RECORDS

Ehrlich's name does not show on the court records of the costly traction litigation—he is the brother of Miss Miriam Ehrlich, longtime secretary of Judge Igoe—but for more than 2 years he has been a keyman in job disposals in the trolley system, the Chicago Sun has discovered in its investigation of Federal court control of the transit properties.

Earlier disclosures by the Sun have shown that friends and political associates of Judge Igoe have been put into Surface Lines jobs since Igoe took over judicial control of the traction litigation in March 1940 from Judge James H. Wilkerson, now retired.

CENSURE MOVE DEFEATED

Furthermore, the Sun has made public the fact that the transfer of the transit lawsuits and other big receiverships from Wilkerson to Igoe provoked a resolution of censure against them at a meeting of the Federal district judges here. The censure proposal was defeated by a vote of 4 to 2.

By reason of his judicial authority over the traction case, Judge Igoe has the power to delay if not upset the public ownership plan approved by Chicago voters Monday.

EMPLOYMENT JOB CREATED

The Sun's inquiry into court supervision of the traction lines disclosed that the management of the streetcar system under Judge Igoe created the job of "superintendent of employment" shortly before his secretary's brother, Ehrlich, was hired for the post.

In an interview with this writer, Ehrlich said he went to work for the Surface Lines May 1, 1943, in the newly established job.

He told the Sun's reporter—in response to questioning—that he does not know whether his sister or her boss, Judge Igoe, had anything to do with his getting the job.

HIRED BY FRIEND OF IGOE

But he does know, he said, that he was hired by Jon E. Sullivan, then treasurer of the Surface Lines, now president and chairman of the joint board of management and operation of the system.

The Sun already has revealed that Sullivan has been an intimate friend and political associate of Judge Igoe, and that he was first hired by the trolley lines as financial officer about a year after Igoe inherited the traction litigation from Wilkerson.

When Igoe threw the Surface Lines into bankruptcy last fall, after they had been in receivership for nearly 18 years, he put his friend Sullivan in charge of the trolley set-up as chairman of the management board.

SULLIVAN REFUSES FACTS

Sullivan has repeatedly refused to give the Sun any information from the pay-roll records of the streetcar lines, and has refused to tell anything about Ehrlich's employment.

However, Ehrlich disclosed to the Sun that he went to Sullivan when he wanted a job with the Surface Lines.

"Who directed you to go to Sullivan?" Ehrlich was asked.

"I don't remember that anyone did," was the reply. "I just heard it talked about that Sullivan was the man to see. He was treasurer of the Surface Lines at that time."

Ehrlich said he was unemployed at the time, having resigned from another job. He refused to say where he had worked before, but emphasized he had had extensive experience in employment work before joining the surface lines as employment superintendent.

Ehrlich said he passes on applications of all persons desiring jobs as conductors, motormen, maintenance men, and office employees in operation departments.

AIDS OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Furthermore, he said, "I do all I can to help heads of nonoperating departments, such as our general offices in the Continental Illinois Bank Building, to get stenographers, clerks, etc., through the United States Employment Service."

Ehrlich asserted that neither Judge Igoe nor his sister, Igoe's secretary, has anything to do with any of the job applications which come to him.

"Every application is handled on its own merit," he declared.

OTHER FACTS REVEALED

Further investigation by the Sun has brought to light these facts:

Harry Rosendal, friend of both Igoe's secretary, Miss Ehrlich, and her brother, Ed Ehrlich, surface lines employment superintendent, has obtained a job with the streetcar system as supervisor of war bond sales.

John Patrick Gibbons, political crony of Judge Igoe, has been given a job in the real-estate department of the surface lines.

Rosendal told the Sun he was hired by the surface lines about 3 years ago (about 2 years after Igoe became judicial overseer) after he had filed an application for the job of paymaster. Rosendal said he had been employed previously, for 8 years, as secretary to Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democratic Congressman from the Fifth District an old friend of Judge Igoe.

HOW HE OBTAINED JOB

Rosendal said he got his new job through the treasurer's office of the Surface Lines—the treasurer was John E. Sullivan, friend of Igoe—but doesn't recall meeting Sullivan at the time.

Igoe was an Illinois Congressman in 1934–35 during SABATH'S congressional service. Both are Democrats.

Rosendal said he does not know if Miss Ehrlich or Judge Igoe had any connection with his employment by the Surface Lines.

GIBBONS AVOIDS QUESTIONS

Gibbons, for many years a member of the Chicago Board of Trade, refused to discuss his employment by the trolley system.

He remarked, cryptically, "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. You have no business prying into my private affairs."

Formerly active in Democratic politics—he was a Democratic committeeman from the seventh ward for more than 20 years—Gibbons at one time claimed credit for putting Igoe into the State legislature. Igoe served in the State assembly for eight terms from the South Side before going to Congress.

Whom Shall We Forgive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, with the collapse of Germany and the hope for a similar collapse of Japan, which inevitably will come, we are naturally concerned about our attitudes and relationships with the peoples of these unfortunate countries.

From reliable reports received it is very evident that there is little or no feeling of regret in the minds and hearts of these conquered peoples. Unless and until there is a change of heart and a reversal of attitudes on the part of the peoples who have caused so much suffering and loss of life, there should be no forgiveness.

Dr. H. W. Provence, an eminent teacher and writer and one of my former professors at Furman University, Greenville, S. C., has summarized this extremely important problem in a very succinct and proper manner in the attached editorial which appeared in the current issue of the Baptist Courier. Believing that others will appreciate this very timely statement, I insert it herewith as a part of my remarks:

WHOM SHALL WE FORGIVE?

There is a great deal of superficial thinking about forgiveness. It is easy for many people to be misled by sentimentalism. Already we are hearing from various sources the propaganda against being too hard on the Germans and the Japanese. "Christianity teaches us to forgive our enemies," the sentimentalists declare; and on the basis of that assertion they argue that we ought to forgive the Germans and the Japanese.

But this fundamental assumption is false; Christianity does not teach that we should forgive our enemies. If anyone thinks it does, let him try to find a single passage in the New Testament that contains such teaching. He will search in vain.

Christ does command His followers, "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you;" but loving our enemies is one thing and forgiving our enemies is another. God loves all sinners, but He does not forgive all sinners.

The one indispensable condition of forgiveness is repentance. God never forgives an unrepentant sinner. He loves that sinner. He tries to bring him to repentance. But without repentance the sinner can never receive forgiveness. Christ himself declared, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." All the sentimental talk about God's being too loving to inflict eternal punishment on any soul is the result of ignoring His inexorable demand for repentance.

Neither does Christ command His followers to forgive those who are unrepentant. "If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him." Forgiveness is to be unlimited, but not unconditional.

When the sinner repents, he becomes the friend of God instead of His enemy, because repentance is more than merely saying, "I am sorry;" it is the complete reversal of one's attitude toward sin and toward God.

When the Germans and the Japanese give sufficient evidence that they have genuinely repented of their defiance of all the laws of civilization and morality, then, and not until then, we should forgive them. Thus far there have been no signs of such repentance. One of the striking evidences of the fundamental moral depravity of both the German and the Japanese leaders and their fanatical followers is the fact that they show no appreciation of the enormity of their crimes. Until they genuinely repent, God will not forgive them; why should we?

H. W. PROVENCE.

Another Oleo Claim Unfounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the high-priced magazines' articles and advertisements and on the radio we have heard that oleomargarine has as many international units of vitamin A as butter. In fact, I have heard many say that oleo has more vitamin A than did butter which was produced in the wintertime. Some oleo did not have any vitamin A added whatsoever. The oleo that did have vitamin A added had only 9,000 international units of vitamin A.

The following letter from Mr. Grover Hill, Acting Secretary of Agriculture shows that analyzed summer butter samples have twice as much vitamin A as does the oleo that had 9,000 international units of vitamin A added. The butter also shows that winter butter has more vitamin A than the oleo with the 9,000 international units of vitamin A added.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 26, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of May 18 regarding certain experiments that are being conducted for the determination of vitamin A in butter. We have had a project under way for some time in which the Bureau of Dairy Industry, in cooperation with many States (including Wisconsin) is analyzing representative samples of butter in the United States in order to determine the average vitamin A content. The data accruing from this project are now being compiled in their final form. Results of the Wisconsin work have been published and are as follows:

The vitamin A potency of creamery butter produced in Wisconsin

Number of samples and date analyzed or collected	Carotene per gram in butterfat (micrograms)	Vitamin A per gram in butterfat (micrograms)	Potency of butter per pound (international units)	
			Not corrected for loss in analysis	Corrected for loss of vitamin A in analysis
22 samples, March 1942	2.16	5.61	9,568	10,185
65 samples, January 1943	2.97	5.89	10,488	11,141
20 samples, July 1942	7.43	8.96	17,738	18,731
70 samples, September 1942	7.66	9.06	18,032	19,034
Average of winter samples [1]	2.56	5.75	10,028	10,663
Average of summer samples [2]	7.54	9.01	17,885	18,883
Mean for annual output	5.82	7.88	15,167	16,039

[1] Probably about the average potency for butter produced from December to April, inclusive; i. e., 34.6 percent of the State's annual output.

[2] Probably about the average potency for butter produced from May to November, inclusive; i. e., 65.4 percent of the State's annual output.

We shall be glad to send you a copy of the final results of the survey upon its completion.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Acting Secretary.

What is the relation of absorption of butter and oleo by the human body? This is an interesting study. The facts also are that butter is much more readily used by the human body than hydrogenized vegetable oils.

The War With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, rumors that the Japanese Government is making peace approaches to the Allies have already been heard in Washington. Much as all of us would like to believe these reports, it should not be overlooked that the Japanese are subtle students of American psychology. They are counting on a great war weariness to set in throughout our country, and they expect to be let off with peace terms far more generous than unconditional surrender. They are hoping to keep a good share of their hold on the Asiatic mainland even if they give up everything else.

There is grave danger in this approach. Japan's entire outlook upon world affairs is conditioned on a great disdain for human life. If the threat posed by the Japanese military class is not met and overcome in this generation, it is hardly possible that it will be permanently crushed. Some day it will rise again to menace our children and jeopardize the peace of the world once again. We owe it to those who have already died in the Pacific to end this challenge for the entire forseeable future. If it is done now, we may not be called upon to repeat in the east the war against Germany which was not completely won at the end of 1918.

Veterans' Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most revelatory article from today's Washington News, indicating that in their recent investigations the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have substantiated many of the charges, based upon widespread complaints, that I have previously urged as the basis for a complete revision and renovation of the entire hospital and rehabilitation programs:

VETS GET "COUNTY HOSPITAL" CARE

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars today demanded immediate and drastic reforms in the Veterans' Administration to avert an imminent break-down of veterans' hospitalization.

In separate reports to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee the two major veterans' organizations presented exhaustive documentary evidence of the steadily increasing handicaps under which veterans' hospitals have been operating.

It appeared that Gen. Omar N. Bradley, soon to become veterans' administrator, will have a front job just as difficult in its way as his battle assignment in Europe.

HOSPITALS CITED

"Hospital treatment and care should be at the same high level as that in the famous Mayo Clinic and Johns Hopkins Hospital," the Legion said. The VFW agreed and said 47 percent of the veterans' hospitals now give inadequate treatment.

Actually, the reports of both groups revealed, standards in veterans' hospitals can be compared favorably only with those in State, county, and municipal institutions in the same areas. A VFW investigator in Montana observed "that's nothing to brag about."

DEFICIENCIES FOUND

In individual reports on veterans' hospitals from coast to coast the Legion and VFW found service being impaired almost universally by overcrowding, staff shortages, low salaries, and red tape. These conditions were hindering claims and legal services as well as medical care.

They found, in addition, a wide range of complaints—from the type of pajamas issued to patients to building sanitation. "Disgraceful," "terrible," "deplorable" were frequent adjectives.

The Legion, on the basis of its investigation of 80 of the 97 veterans' hospitals proposed a 10-point reorganization plan which would establish a new post of Deputy Administrator. Also proposed was a realinement of authority under six Assistant

Administrators, instead of the three now functioning.

MEDICAL CHIEF URGED

The Legion called for a complete overhauling of the medical division under an outstanding medical man with the title of, or status equal to, assistant administrator. The other administrators would handle insurance; finance, loan guaranties, readjustment allowances; vocational training, rehabilitation, and education; adjudication of compensation, pension, and retirement claims; construction, supplies, and contracts.

INDEPENDENT SURVEYS

The reports of both veterans' organizations were based on independent surveys of hospitals throughout the country. The investigations were made at the suggestion of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, whose resignation as Administrator was accepted by President Truman last week.

Another organization, the Disabled American Veterans, made a similar study. Its report was submitted to Hines a few days ago. No major criticisms were noted and no specific information was furnished.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of both the Legion and VFW followed the same lines:

1. Expanded bed capacity for immediate and future needs and provisions for women patients which were now said to be highly inadequate. Total hospital capacity at present is 93,000 and is to be expanded to 123,000 by December 1947;
2. Higher wage scales, especially in the lower brackets.
3. More authority for hospital authorities to procure doctors, nurses, and other personnel; more authority for procuring supplies and equipment.
4. Provisions for developing research, for staff to attend medical meetings to broaden their knowledge of all kinds of problems.
5. Expansion and development of rehabilitation and recreation programs, especially for World War II men.
6. More intelligent segregation of veterans with different ailments and different problems to provide the atmosphere most conductive to recovery.
7. Larger and better canteens.
8. Relieve doctors of the administrative work that keeps them from patients.
9. Better counseling service to handle veterans' compensation claims and other personal problems to prevent their leaving hospitals against medical advice.
10. Better personnel training programs.
11. Swift and unprejudiced handling of complaints.
12. Replacement of Army personnel with civilians or putting Army personnel on civilian status.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the right of a free ballot is the basic right in a democracy. Unless all of us can vote, our Government cannot be truly representative. This is a fact, a blunt fact, and we must, in honesty, face it squarely.

Recognition of the right of every last citizen to have a voice in his Government, has been hard won. It was for this right, primarily, that the Thirteen Colonies fought so valiantly in the Revolutionary War. It is a right that our nation tradition has cherished, and a right that causes other nations to envy us.

Yet, despite our fair words and historic protestations, we all know that the right of a free ballot, and the ability to cast a vote, are not yet one. Abe Lincoln called this a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." The fourteenth amendment to our Constitution declares that the right of suffrage shall not be abridged for any reason. Yet we know, it cannot be denied, that more than 10,000,000 Americans, citizens like you and me, are not able to vote. Because of the poll tax, one-fifth of the Congress of the United States, the legislative body which passes legislation affecting the whole Nation, is actually elected by one-fifteenth of the voters in the country. This, clearly, is not representative government.

The poll tax was, when it was imposed, frankly and without subterfuge, a disfranchising measure designed to defeat the growing power of the Populists, the Free Silver Democrats, the Knights of Labor, and other organized farm and labor groups.

Its character and purpose are still the same. Though the nature of the disfranchised groups has changed, the nature of the poll tax as a bar to government of and by the people has not.

The issue of the poll tax has been called racial issue. Certainly it was intended to deprive, and certainly it has succeeded in depriving, the Negro of the political equality which the Constitution says he must have.

But, as all battles for freedom of any sort, the battle against the poll tax has no color line. The poll tax prevents 3,000,000 Negroes from voting; it prevents 7,000,000 whites from exercising their right to a free ballot.

Relative to general income, the amount of the poll tax is small. Relative to actual income of citizens, whites and Negroes, of voting age, living in the poll-tax States, the amount of the poll tax is absolutely prohibitive.

The poll tax, in a manner blunt and crude, sells the precious right of a free ballot for money. If you have enough money, in the poll-tax States, you can vote. If you have not enough money, you forfeit the most precious and most basic right of every last citizen of our democracy; the right of suffrage.

Let us face this fact, face it honestly. We have lied and evaded to ourselves too long. Our men, black and white, fight, and many of them die, today for the right of freemen to govern themselves. If not for our honor in the eyes of the world, then for our honor before our consciences and before God, let us give them, all, in actuality, this right.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of June 9, 1945]

IT'S NOT A THEORY—IT'S A FACT; BETTER GOVERNMENT IN FLORIDA

Seven States still require payment of a poll tax for voting. Next Monday Congress will take up a bill to abolish this tax so far as national elections are concerned. The object is to make it possible for more people to vote, thus opening the road to better Government.

Will repeal of the poll tax do it?

An answer can be found in the case of Florida, or Louisiana, or North Carolina, all of which abolished the tax themselves. Georgia also has voted out the tax, but it is too early to see the results in that State. Tennessee tried to vote it out but the courts held the bill to do so unconstitutional.

We'll take the case of Florida. Repeal of the tax has definitely increased the vote. In 1936, before repeal, 327,000 citizens voted in the Presidential election. In 1940, 3 years after repeal, 485,000 voted, an increase of 46 percent. The 1944 vote was about the same.

In Florida 41 out of every 100 potential voters vote. In Florida 26 out of every 100 population vote.

In the poll-tax States, on the average only 22 out of every 100 potential voters vote and only 12 out of every 100 population vote. This hits a low in South Carolina, where only 10 out of 100 potential voters vote, and where only 3 out of every 100 of population vote.

In 1936 only 20.3 percent of Florida's population voted for President. In 1940, after repeal, this jumped to 26 percent. Of the total vote cast in 1936, 23.9 percent was Republican In 1940, 26.3 percent was Republican. This is close enough to the national trend to prove that poll-tax elimination caused the increased voting.

ACCENTUATE THE POSITIVE

We can accentuate the analysis by considering the voting record of a group of seven reactionary north Florida counties, centering on Tallahassee, the capital, and covering the heart of the old cotton plantation-slavery belt which is so similar to Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, and Mississippi.

The seven counties are: Baker, Gadsden, Jackson, Jefferson, Madison, Leon, and Suwanee. The 1935 census showed that 48.5 percent of the people in these counties were Negroes, while the Negro population of the State as a whole was 28.8. In 1940, the seven counties' Negro population was 47 percent against 27.1 percent for the State as a whole. Here's how the vote went in 1936 and 1940:

Population voting

	7 counties (percent)	*State (percent)*
1936 (poll tax)	12.1	20.3
1940	17	26

This would indicate that the poll-tax requirement had deprived a number of citizens, both in the black belt and in the State as a whole, of voting. This includes poor whites as well as Negroes. In Georgia, Editor Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution estimated that poll taxes keep about five whites to one Negro from voting.

FLORIDA EXPLODES A MYTH

One of the bugaboos raised when you talk about abolishing the poll tax is that it would give the Negro the decisive vote in a close race. It did not work that way in Florida in 1944.

In the white primary, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida's outstanding liberal, had stiff opposition. Treatment of Negroes politically was the outstanding issue. His foes circulated pictures showing him speaking before a Negro church. Heat of the contest brought out 379,286 votes. The primary Governor's contest was a hot one, too, but lacked the Negro issue. It brought out 389,585 votes.

When the general election arrived and Negroes were allowed to vote, the Senate total was 470,943; the Governor's race total 357,328. There was a total vote difference of 113,615, but PEPPER, and Millard Caldwell, winner in the Governor's race, received almost identical votes percentagewise. There was not the slightest evidence that the Negroes favored PEPPER or penalized Caldwell, who, while not vehement on the question, is entirely typical of the deep South politico on the Negro question. The voters obviously voted their party convictions, Democratic or Republican.

FLORIDA'S REWARDS

Many observers believe that abolition of the poll tax is responsible for—

1. The heavier and more healthy vote in Florida.

2. The distinct improvement in caliber of candidates.

3. Widened interest in politics.

4. Cleaner elections. (Any practitioner of politics in Florida can tell you, if he will, that in the pre-poll-tax days one of the main expenses of a campaign was poll-tax money. Candidates could get the money from pressure groups.)

Thoughtful Floridians believe that the wider the franchise, the freer the elections of the State, the better government the people will get. They are proud that Florida was a leader among Southern States in getting rid of the tax. They are reaping their reward in more tangible good government.

Florida's stake in the national antipoll bill is not as direct as that of the States still retaining the tax, but in the over-all picture of good national government and of making democracy work it is important.

Because a majority of the people of our Nation are against the poll tax, it is doomed. The Congress may well take the step now that will abolish it quickly. The tides of democracy, progress, and time are running against it.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at an early date Congress will consider the extension of the Price Control Act. We must approach this important question in the spirit of what we believe to be in the best interest of our country. The motive which prompted the passage by this Congress of the Price Control Act was concern lest the country go into a spiral of inflation with respect to commodity prices. We cannot deny that in many respects the line has been held. In many cases, however, abuses and regimentation of society by the OPA can well be considered more damaging than inflation would have been. By and large the people of the Nation resent much of what is being done by OPA. And truly have they a right to resent the errors of judgment and lack of practical approach in many phases of this movement.

We must not overlook the fact that the War Department has made the problem extremely serious by having taken great quantities of the food supply and cotton goods, woolens, and other things for the armed forces, and apparently without consideration for the civilian population. The Administrator of OPA in his over-zealousness to hold the line against advancing prices has too often neglected to recognize that there are certain contributing factors for which there must be allowed some latitude, if goods are to be available in abundance. First, there are the armed forces, the civilian population, the lend-lease, and the other countries to whom we have given liberally of our production.

At the present time the Price Control bill is receiving attention in the other body of this Congress. Senator ELMER THOMAS has offered an amendment which would make mandatory ceiling prices to cover all cost, overhead expenses, and reasonable profits for every phase of agricultural production. Senator TAFT has offered an amendment which would provide similar protection for manufacturers, that is a ceiling price to cover cost of larger items and allow the same dollar prices over cost that were received in 1941 by a particular industry. These well-thought-out provisions are constructive suggestions for correction of some of the difficulties that are to be found in the Price Control Act. It is my firm belief that one or the other of these amendments should be added to this legislation, preferably both.

We can ask this question. If we do not have price control, what would the price of steak be today? And I use the item of steak as an illustration only. It probably would be higher than the prevailing price as listed today in legitimate markets, but I beg you to remember that the only place we find steaks is on the listing. For the most part there are no steaks to be purchased by consumers. So, it matters little what the price and the listing of a product may be if there is no product to buy.

It is my belief that due consideration should be given to this legislation by this Congress when dealing with the excessive penalties that are levied for slight violations. Willful and determined violators who persist in violations over and over again must be dealt with summarily. But first violations, especially in small businesses, result frequently because of lack of help to carry out the vast volume of orders put out by OPA. Violations with larger concerns occur in some instances because of long business practices, but in most cases without intent to do wrong. Then one of those bureaucrats located in Washington, with no knowledge of business practices whatsoever, steps forth and advises a particular business to get in step, or else. Some of the penalties reach a point of confiscation.

Truly as we approach this legislation these corrective measures should be given due consideration.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith the following telegrams which have come to my desk within the last few days from various sections of the State of North Dakota which I represent at large, all in disapproval of the Price Control Act:

GRAFTON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please do all possible to limit extension of Price Control Act to 3 months and recommend easing of regulations to encourage manufacture of needed merchandise. New maximum average-price order effective June 1 is unwise and unworkable unless modified at once.

W. W. REYLECK CO.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest extension OPA as now constituted.

L. R. BAIRD.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *June 7, 1945.*

Hon. C. R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives:

Note in papers that they are trying to give an extension to OPA for 1 year. I hope that you will do everything that you can to eliminate that office.

H. J. DUEMELAND.

DICKINSON, N. DAK.

Hon. CHAS. R. ROBERTSON and WM. LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully suggest your sincere efforts in preventing the extension of the OPA law in its present form and administration and to the end that hardships and inconveniences may not be suffered by our loyal and devoted citizens.

B. F. BAMBENEK.
T. A. TOLLEFSON.
F. L. REARDON.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 7, 1945.*

Hon. CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives
Office Building:

Would appreciate you voting against extension of OPA.

R. C. FENSTERMACHER.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 7, 1945.*

Hon. CHAS. A. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate you voting against extension of OPA.

JOSEPH P. ZIEGLER.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*

CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

OPA restrictions must be eliminated in order for the merchant to remain in business. Your vote against extension appreciated.

G. M. HEDDERICH CO.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*

Representatives ROBERTSON and LEMKE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Extending OPA regulations will drastically reduce progressive development in North Dakota. Your vote against extension will be appreciated.

CRIGHTON MOTOR CO.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*

Representative CHAS. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Advocate only short extension of Price Control Act for 3 months and easing of regulations to encourage manufacture of needed merchandise.

MANNS,
F. P. MANN, Jr.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*

Representative CHARLES E. ROBERTSON:

Request you oppose continuance of OPA.

W. K. JOHNSON.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*

Representative CHARLES R. ROBERTSON:

We ask that you vote against extension of OPA.

DICKINSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
C. E. SCOTT, *President.*

WAHPETON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Member of Congress, Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your vote against the extension of OPA will be appreciated.

WAHPETON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

MANDAN, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*
CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
The chamber of commerce urges you to vote against the extension of OPA.
J. I. ROVIG, *Secretary.*

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*
CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Extending OPA regulations will stop progressive postwar development. Your vote against same appreciated.
E. B. MERRIT.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*
CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
To support the extension of OPA will be a hardship on the people of North Dakota as well as the Nation. Your vote against the extension will be appreciated.
VOHS CITY MARKET.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*
CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Extending OPA regulations will drastically reduce progressive development of North Dakota. Your vote against extension appreciated.
OPPENS FOOD MARKET.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945*
CHARLES ROBERTSON,
Representative,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you to vote against continuation of OPA under present regulations.
PAUL SCHILLA.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 7, 1945.*
Please vote against OPA extension.
WALTON & DAVIS CO.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 7, 1945.*
CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Office, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
We wish you to vote against OPA in its present form and management.
M. A. KANE AND R. A. KANE,
St. Charles Cafe.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 7, 1945.*
Hon. CHAS. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We respectfully request that you vote against the continuation of the OPA as we believe it is being very badly administrated and is not following the purposes and intent for which it was created but has turned itself into an agency of persecution and not prosecution.
NORTH DAKOTA CREAM
SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
By F. M. FOSTER.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 7, 1945.*
Hon. CHAS. ROBERTSON,
Office of House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Will you please vote against OPA extension bill; they are trying to put the small businessman out of business.
GEORGE BERZEL.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1945.*
Representative CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.:
To keep small business operating it is urgent for you support to discontinue the OPA.
E. A. LUHMAN DICKINSON BOTTLING WORKS.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 7, 1945.*
Hon. CHAS. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I wish personally to let you know that I am against the OPA as now constituted and administered; it is not in my opinion acting in the spirit that Congress intended, instead is trying to make criminals out of honest men—head officials in North Dakota being particularly obnoxious.
Yours truly,
WM. H. WALTON.

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *June 8, 1945.*
Representative CHARLES ROBERTSON,
Washington, D. C.:
I do not favor the OPA as it is now constituted.
Dr. H. L. REICHERT.

United States as a Mediator for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have a copy of an excellent address delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, before the Manhattan (Kans.) Rotary Club, on the subject United States as a Mediator for Peace. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The greatest achievement of modern civilization was the development of objective thinking.

The processes of objective thinking include toleration, education, accurate information, and humanitarianism.

These highly important attributes of civilization reached their finest flowering in the world before the First World War, at least in the United States and Great Britain.

Since then, they have withered steadily under the attacks of a deadly parasite—the art of government-inspired mass propaganda and government censorship.

Of course, ever since we have had governments, we have had propaganda in favor of the government in power.

For many centuries objective thinking and government propaganda were handicapped by the lack of channels of communication. Both were more or less evenly balanced.

Today's increase in the channels of communications has given government propaganda a big edge over objective thinking because the peoples of the world are not able to digest all the mass information that floods them. Taking advantage of that situation, governments hold back certain vital information and parts of the news for political as well as military reasons, and in the torrent of world news these critical omissions are not noticed. In addition, we must realize that today there is a lot of lying going on. Anyone now who would think objectively must, as the first step, proceed with great caution in spite of the abundance of news. The mission of such organizations as Rotary, the schools, the press, the radio, and the church, is to hold aloft the art of objective thinking.

Without objective thinking, as I have described it, we have nothing left but the naked brute power of feudalism or the chaos of the Dark Ages.

It is to be expected that objective reporting—showing all sides of the story—is inevitably almost destroyed as the result of war.

Modern war is the complete and total mobilization of all the efforts of all the people of a country. The press becomes an arm of the Government and has quite properly performed vital services in the war effort. But the press itself admits that it is prevented from full and accurate reporting of important events and policies. It has the will but not the power to do the job so long as the war lasts.

Today we stand in need of a constant reexamination of our ideas in the light of swift moving events and the enormous problems that confront us. Today more than ever those qualities of objective thinking call for cautious, balanced judgment and keen examination of the facts.

Many in the United States are pursuing a "Hallelujah" policy with regard to Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco. The very Government agencies that ballyhooed their accomplishments a few short months ago are now attempting to warn the American people of expecting too much from the conference at San Francisco. What are the important facts of foreign affairs in the world we live in?

1. A large part of the world hates and is suspicious of the British.

2. A large part of the world fears Russia. I do not mean communism, but I mean an imperialistic, militaristic Russia—Adam Zad, the bear that walks like a man.

3. Russia fears the rest of the world.

4. Whatever their doubts about us, a large part of the world wants American investment and American business connections for political reasons as well as economic. They believe that American connections give them more security for themselves.

5. Europe, which for many centuries was the center of the world, is today the center of complete confusion, because of our military victories and the lack of agreed peace policies among the Allies. Russia seems to be setting up by ruthless force puppet states in this vacuum that was once Europe.

Britain is fighting for her Empire's lifeline through the Mediterranean; France is desperately trying to rebuild the empire that was hers. And we are still listening to the birdies sing as we have done from Moscow to San Francisco—under the assumption that there is accord on postwar policies among the Allies.

These are the plain facts of a situation that confronts us now and will confront us for many years, and it is the height of foolishness for us to continue to ignore it.

The job of statesmanship—and all the agencies of public opinion—is to build a bridge of cooperation for peace between a ruthless totalitarian dictatorship and other nations whom the Russians consider equally ruthless.

That is almost a superhuman job with America occupying a place of special responsibility. We are not fulfilling it by our emotional approach to the problem either of world peace or of Russia.

The illusion current among many people that all we have to do is to follow the course charted from Moscow to Yalta is a dangerous fallacy that contributes to the difficulties of a satisfactory solution.

Russophiles or Russophobes also contribute to the difficulty of the two people understanding each other.

Basically we have been trying to work with Russia, not only in war but for lasting peace. But Russia is making it exceedingly difficult, and there are those in the United States who are not making it easier by their loose talk that we must eventually fight Russia. There are still others who are not helping the situation by insisting that all Russian policies

are perfect, and that all criticisms are Fascist lies.

I must say that I am impressed with the good will and liking the returning American soldier has for the Russians he has met. Perhaps that may have a decisive influence on the future relations of the United States and Russia.

There must be a meeting of the minds when we hold our international conferences. As I have been saying, ever since the Moscow Conference, we have had one hallelujah interpretation for the American people which Russia has often and promptly contradicted either by word or deed. This is not the time nor the place to discuss whose fault that is. But at least the Russians have been frank in not permitting us to continue under our delusions. It is our fault that we have. I do say that the Pollyanna fiction of agreement planted in the American press from Moscow to Yalta has added to the difficulties of the two nations. The longer that situation continues, the greater the threat of disastrous consequences to both countries and to the world.

Again and again, I have protested the policy of dodging and covering up the lack of a community of purpose as very dangerous. I repeat that explosions can be generated by smothering as well as by friction.

Whether the fault is ours—or the Russians'—or both, our first problem is to establish the right kind of relations with Russia.

A just and lasting peace is the profound desire of the people of the United States. The mere contemplation of the deadly meaning of another world war is enough to call forth the highest statesmanship on our part to prevent another cycle of world-wide destruction which will destroy liberty and civilization and bring on a new Dark Age.

A fundamental of that statesmanship on our part is that the United States must be an honest broker for peace among the nations. Today we stand one of three nations holding the real power of the world—the United States, Russia, and Great Britain. If we in the United States make plain that we are not and will not be a party by action or inaction to any scheme or intrigue to gang up on Russia, or Great Britain, or China, or any other nation, then we have laid the cornerstone for lasting peace.

If we stand firmly upon the principle that the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness apply to nations as well as individuals, then it will be extremely difficult for any nation to remain immovably bullheaded in opposing progress toward the realization of that principle.

We must never forget that the peace of the world in the last analysis depends upon the recognition of those inalienable rights.

By force of circumstances the world looks to us as the natural mediator among the powers today. Even the official Russian newspaper Izvestia last Tuesday views with regret that our policy of mediation is changing to a policy of drifting. Whether or not we agree with that interpretation, our vital role among the powers as mediator is acknowledged.

Our role is the promotion of international cooperation, rather than the development of old-fashioned international alliances which, after all, usually turn out to be shotgun marriages. Thus we carry out the real meaning of General Washington's famous message about entangling alliances. We must make it plain that we will not join any power bloc but will use our balance of power for peace and stability in the world and are willing to assume the responsibilities that go with that. I am speaking for triple cooperation rather than a mere formal British-American or British-American-Russian alliance which inevitably gives rise to opposing blocs in the course of time and changing conditions.

As we go about this business of the honest broker for peace among the nations, we may find it too costly to continue our national habit of day-dreaming and talking in headlines. It has been well said that we in the United States talk too much and our Russian allies don't talk enough. Our British cousins, who have had more experience in these matters than we have, are neither maudlin about their role in international affairs, nor tongue-tied. They set us a good example in considered and careful public discussion. They require and get factual reports from their Prime Minister.

To President Truman comes the great opportunity and the heavy responsibility of effecting policies that will offer a sound base for peace, and at the same time continue a united front against Japan. It calls for a tremendous effort of statesmanship.

The prayers and the hopes of humanity go with him in his great work. But he is entitled to more than good wishes. He is entitled to the support of his constituents in certain fundamental decisions he must make that have the gravest consequences for the future of the people of the United States and the world.

We Americans have the custom of closing ranks in great national emergencies.

I believe that today the American people are facing as great an emergency in winning the peace as we have ever faced in our national history. It is time we unite behind our President, as he faces his crucial negotiations with Stalin and Churchill. He will need our united support in his endeavor to develop the beginning at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco into a world forum where nations large and small may be heard without fear or hindrance. This would be a great step forward for mankind. But it will never come out of mere wishful thinking or drifting on a sea of misunderstanding.

The nations today are in a state of great change in life and power.

Our leadership in this inevitable world evolution should be directed toward paths of development without world violence and with consent of the governed.

We cannot merely attempt with fine words to sit on the lid of the explosive forces now working in the world as did the Holy Alliance of Vienna.

Our leadership depends upon the vigor and soundness and unity with which we exercise it. The world is watching not only what our President does but how we support his foreign policies.

Don't Kill FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Detroit Free Press as an editorial in the Thursday, June 6, 1945, issue, entitled "Don't Kill FEPC":

DON'T KILL FEPC

The House Appropriations Committee's failure to recommend funds to enable the Fair Employment Practice Committee to carry on has brought a stinging rebuke from the White House.

The FEPC was created by President Roosevelt as a temporary instrument for removing job discrimination against Negroes. That it has been measurably successful will not be denied. A bill to set up a permanent FEPC is now in the House Rules Committee. The President urges Chairman SABATH to permit it to be voted upon by the House "as quickly as possible." That should be done.

The denial of economic equality to 13,000,000 American citizens because of their color violates every concept of justice and prevents a tenth of our population from carrying its full share of the national load.

Congress should put FEPC on a permanent basis and give it enough money effectively to discharge its duties.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, all through the ages man has fought for full suffrage, because it is only through full suffrage that he can hope to achieve that equality of opportunity which we in America consider the most fundamental of all our democratic ideals.

Until we have established universal suffrage, without qualifications of wealth or property, we cannot claim a true democracy.

Argue as we will on reasons for a poll tax, we cannot escape the fundamental point that such a tax places a qualification of wealth on the right of suffrage. And just so long as we maintain such qualifications, anywhere in the land, we are not a true democracy. We are observing a relic of feudalism, from the days when the feudal barons imposed a head tax on the serfs.

It is a testimonial to our progress that, although the poll tax was carried through all the colonial States and at one time was quite general throughout all the United States, it is now retained in only seven States.

We may say that it is not a wealth restriction on the right to vote, yet a citizen delinquent in his poll tax cannot vote whereas one delinquent in his property tax may.

On the one hand, we grant the franchise to any kind of tax dodger; on the other, we deny it to those who, through misfortune or other cause, cannot pay the infamous head tax of feudal origin.

We cannot escape the indisputable fact that the tax remains as a subterfuge for limiting the franchise to those whom the powers feel they can trust to vote in the way they want them to vote.

The recognized qualifications for suffrage in a democracy are simply stated. The voter must be a citizen. He must be of legal age. He must not have had his citizenship suspended or abrogated because of an offense against the State. These, I maintain, are the only points on which the right of franchise should be based.

I quote from the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State

shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2 of the same amendment further states, in defining the basis for representation of the States in the House of Representatives:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indiana, not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, of the members of the legislature thereof, is denied any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of citizens 21 years of age in such State.

Application of a poll-tax restriction for these offices is not permitted under this amendment to the Constitution, if the States that apply it seek representation in the Congress on the basis of their total population. When we allot representation in the Congress on the basis of total population, without deducting the number of voters otherwise eligible who are denied the rights of suffrage because of failure or inability to pay the poll tax, we violate the Constitution.

In strict interpretation of the Constitution, those States which invoke the poll tax are overrepresented in the Congress. I need only cite some figures comparing my own State, Minnesota, with another on near-parity in total population, Mississippi. Total population of Mississippi in 1940, according to the United States Statistical Abstract, was 2,832,961. For Minnesota it was 2,792,300.

Yet, the highest vote cast for a single office in the general election of 1942 in Mississippi was 51,602. Highest vote cast for a single office in the primary election that year was 133,449.

Contrast this with Minnesota, with a slightly lower total population. In the State primary election of 1942 there were 524,181 votes cast for Governor. In the general election there were 794,228 votes cast for Governor, more than 15 times as many votes as were cast in Mississippi for any office in the general election there.

In the Presidential election of 1940 Mississippi cast 175,824 votes, Minnesota 1,251,188, or about seven times as many as Mississippi.

Taking the comparison most favorable to Mississippi, the primary election of 1942, when Minnesota's vote was lightest and Mississippi's heaviest, Minnesota cast approximately four times as many votes as Mississippi.

But what is the difference in representation in the Congress? Minnesota has nine Members of this body, Mississippi seven. Casting 25 percent as many votes, using the most favorable figures, it has approximately 77 percent as much representation.

Nazi Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosures of Nazi murder camps which were found in the path of our armies, as well as the Russian armies, during the concluding phases of the war in Germany, remind me of the remarks which I made on the floor of the House on August 31 of last year, when I called attention to Nazi mass murders and asked that some steps be taken to stop this undisguised slaughter before it would be too late.

Unfortunately, my words at that time were not heeded.

In spite of my best efforts to bring about proper action by this body, or perhaps Congress as a whole, or even the executive departments of our Government, action which would have resulted in the saving of many human lives, my efforts at that time failed entirely.

I suppose the American public refused to believe in the possibility of such large-scale atrocities committed by a nation which claimed to be civilized.

In spite of the fact that Germany had been brutalized by and steeped into a philosophy of hatred and destruction since Hitler came to power in 1933, the world was not ready to believe that Germany lost the last vestige of humanity and that she was no longer to be classed among the civilized nations.

Things as brutal as those I described in my speech of August 31, 1944, many people believed possible only in the Dark Ages of human history. The worst cruelties of the Middle Ages and the most barbarian tortures ever perpetrated by backward peoples cannot possibly compare with this organized brutality which Germany exhibited to the world.

To tell you frankly, I myself hoped against hope that perhaps if the facts were rechecked or if the conditions were reexamined some of the reports which had reached us might be found exaggerated. I hoped that such might be the case, but unfortunately the tragic reality was even worse than my greatest fears.

Only a few days ago a legislative committee of the Senate presented a very restrained report of atrocities in the German concentration camps. No one can read this report without having chills running through his back and without thanking God that he is privileged to be a citizen of a country which would never tolerate such brutalities and barbarities. This is human ingenuity, used to its highest pitch, not for the purposes of creation, not for the purposes of building and making things, but for the purposes of destroying life and ruining everything we hold dear.

If there is any one crime that the German people stand convicted of for all time, it will be that of callous indifference which they exhibited toward all other nations and groups of people and the utter disregard of human life which they showed in their mass murders and killings.

Soon after Hitler came into power in 1933, I sensed the danger which his philosophy had for all democracies in the world and I felt that something should be done to eradicate the influence of that type of philosophy upon our people. I knew that the propaganda system which the Nazi regime instituted in Germany had for its purpose the "softening up" of our democratic way of life to make us an easy prey for nazism and its ideas and ideals. I was afraid of this type of philosophy, because our people were free and open-minded and so ready to listen to the strangest doctrines that ever came to be uttered by man.

Nazism particularly sought to bring about a cleavage in the happiness of our American people by splitting us up into small minority groups and having each group fight every other group. It was white against black, Jew against gentile, Nordic against Latin, Catholic against Protestant, and so forth.

The old Roman doctrine of conquest was "divide and rule" and the Nazi rulers felt that if they could but divide and split up the American people into segments, they could very easily destroy the effectiveness of American power, by making us into a group of discordant elements which would be very simple to break up and defeat in a very short time.

It was against this type of propaganda this psychological blitzkrieg that I, almost alone, raised my voice as a protagonist of the danger that was threatening us from Nazi sources.

It took a long time for Congress to see that my fears had some justification and it was only after a long delay that Congress saw fit to organize a committee to inquire into un-American activities.

The first Committee on Un-American Activities—and not to be confused with the later Dies committee, of which the less said the better—of which committee the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was chairman and I was vice chairman, was the committee which proposed remedial legislation, legislation which became so helpful later on in tracking down spies, saboteurs, and other enemies of America.

It seems to me that even now—in the face of military victory—we legislators must keep in mind the dangers of as cancerous a growth as nazism and fascism. We must think of the future and not take the Pollyanna attitude that everything is fine and there is no danger. We dare not lose the peace which our boys paid for with their blood. It was an expensive lesson and we would be unworthy of the sacrifice made by our gallant fighters and the faith they put in us to preserve the democratic way of life were we to disregard the trust put in us by permitting the dark forces of reaction and fascism to take root in our own country.

Federalism in the U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by John N. Hazard entitled "Federalism in the U. S. S. R.," which appeared in the Magazine of State Affairs, published monthly by the Council of State Governments:

FEDERALISM IN THE U. S. S. R.[1]

(By John N. Hazard, lecturer on international politics, Foreign Service Educative Foundation, Washington, D. C.)

The republics of the Soviet Union are appearing on the international scene for the first time in over 20 years. Some of them are seeking representation in international councils and at foreign capitals. They point to the 1944 amendments to the constitution of the U. S. S. R. and to the amendments of their own constitutions, which followed, to establish their authority. Their action dramatizes a change in the relationships between the republics of the Soviet Union and the Federal Government itself. This change has been abrupt, but not without precedent.

FEDERALISM AS INTERPRETED BY STALIN

Soviet policy toward the republics is based on Stalin's thesis of 1913. In his analysis entitled, "Marxism and the National Question," the man who was later to become the first Commissar of Nationalities in the Russian Soviet Republic and was to formulate Soviet policy on the position of nationalities within the union propounded two basic concepts. The first was a definition of a nation as an "historically evolved stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture." The second was that movements for national liberation have been inspired historically by the economic struggle of national minorities for a political status which will permit untrammeled economic competition with their more powerful overlords. Granted liberation from economic bondage and the bourgeois forms of economic competition, Stalin anticipated that a national minority would have no occasion for discontent if it were permitted to use its own language, to possess its own schools, and to enjoy "liberty of conscience, liberty of movement, etc."

Stalin summed up his proposals of 1913 as follows: "Thus, national equality in all forms (language, schools, etc.) is an essential element in the solution of the national problem. A state law based on complete democracy in the country is required, prohibiting all national privileges without exception and all kinds of disabilities and restrictions on the rights of national minorities. That, and that alone, is the real, not a paper guaranty, of the rights of a minority."

The study of federalism in the Soviet Union has been the study of means of integrating the economic life of the many nations within the Union's borders, while preserving those institutions which Stalin has believed essential to the preservation of the rights of a minority. The means used to balance the economic urge toward unity and the cultural urge toward autonomy have varied with the situation, both inside the Soviet Union and abroad. Preservation of the Union as essential to the well-being of a people developing a new system of economy in a hostile world has been uppermost in the minds of the leaders since the various republics joined in union. When the urge toward autonomy of a republic bore the marks of a desire for economic separation it was vigorously opposed by the leaders. They believed such a movement would mean retrogression to the economy of capitalism, which seemed to them as backward a form of economy as feudalism seems to those who espouse the capitalist system of free enterprise. When the urge toward autonomy of a national minority bore the marks of a desire for greater cultural development, while retaining the economic system and bonds established by the revolution, it was encouraged as a step toward a literate, enlightened population.

FORMATION OF THE SOVIET UNION

Federation was not immediate after the revolution. As each of the large national minorities of the Russian Empire freed itself from foreign armies and civil war, it created it own government and enacted its own constitution. As leaders in each republic were men and women who had been trained in the school of Marxism as members of the Communist Party, they followed closely the same pattern of development. In those republics which contained within their borders national minorities which were less articulate than the major nation, as in the case of the Russian republic, stretching from Leningrad to Vladivostok, features of cultural autonomy for these minorities were instituted immediately and the republic was called a federated one, although political aspects of autonomy among these nationalities were lacking.

Steps toward union of the republics were taken quickly after the various republics set up these governments. In the summer of 1922 the Communist Parties of the republics appointed committees to work out the form of union. Three of the republics south of the Caucasus Mountains decided to federate as the Transcaucasion Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and adopted a constitution on December 13, 1922, reserving to each republic its own governmental structure, but authorizing the new federation to join a Soviet Union when it should be formed.

A constitution for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was approved by delegates from four republics on December 30, 1922 and it was referred to each republic for review. It was finally adopted on January 31, 1924 and the four republics, known as the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the White Russian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Transcaucasian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic entered the new federation.

DIVISION OF POWERS UNDER THE FIRST CONSTITUTION

The first constitution of the U. S. S. R. reflected the national minority concepts set forth by Stalin 11 years earlier. In general lines, each republic transferred to the Federal Government the control, and in some instances the administration of economic activities, while retaining for its own control and administration its cultural activities and those economic activities which were of local interest. The Federal Government had the sole power to develop a general plan for the entire national economy; to establish general principles for the development and use of the soil, mineral deposits, forests, and bodies of water; to direct transport and telegraphic services and to direct foreign trade under the state monopoly. Economic control was further strengthened in the Federal Government by provision that budgets of the republics had to be incorporated in the federal budget, and local taxes had to be approved by the Federal Government.

Appreciation of the peril of disunity when dealing with the outside world had been developed during the period of intervention, and the desirability of unity on the diplomatic front had been learned at early international conferences. The constitution reflected this condition by providing that the conclusion of treaties, the conduct of diplomatic relations and the declaration of war were the sole province of the Federal Government.

The republics in addition to controlling their educational systems and having complete right to use their own language, even in relation with the Federal Government, kept the right to enact their own codes of law, subject only to the basic principles set by the Federal Government to assure the preservation of the Soviet state and the socialist system of economy. The franchise was a matter for each republic to decide, as was its bill of rights, for no provisions on either subject appeared in the Federal constitution. The right of secession was preserved to each republic, although no member of the Communist Party would have approved the exercise of this right. They would have to remember Stalin's admonition to the Social Democrats of 1913, "A nation has the right even to return to the old order of things; but this does not mean that Social Democrats will subscribe to such a decision if taken by any institution of the said nation."

Representation of the republics in the Federal Government was provided for in one chamber of a bicameral central executive committee. This committee served as the active legislative organ of the government during the 2-year intervals between meetings of the Congress of Soviets, in which lay supreme authority. The bicameral feature permitted identical representation in one chamber of each of the four republics, even though they differed greatly in size and population. This chamber had equal legislative authority with the other chamber, which was based upon population. There were provisions for submission of disagreements to the Congress of Soviets in special or regular session if the matter could not be settled by agreement in conference or in a joint session of both chambers.

Republics retained their own courts to administer their codes, although a supreme court of the Union was created by the constitution to interpret federal legislation and to review decisions of a supreme court of a republic if the public prosecutor believed that the decision contravened federal legislation or affected the interests of other republics. If the supreme court agreed with the public prosecutor, it referred the decision to the central executive committee of the Congress of Soviets with its recommendation. The court itself could not set aside legislation of a republic or a decision of the courts of a republic if it believed they contravened the federal constitution. The central executive committee alone had this power. A system of lower federal courts was later established to hear cases relating to military matters and transportation.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL AUTONOMY

In the years between 1924 and 1929 the development of national minority groups was rapid. The number of republics federated in the Union grew from four to seven, with the addition of the Uzbek and Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republics in 1925 and the Tadzhik Soviet Socialist Republic in 1929. No more additions to the Union occurred until the reorganization of the Union in connection with the promulgation of a second federal constitution in 1936.

While the major national minorities were becoming constituent republics the minor groups were also coming of age in a less prominent but clearly identifiable way. To

[1] Second of a series of articles on federalism abroad. For the first of this series see Harvey Walker, Federalism in Brazil, March issue, pp. 43–44, 52.

provide for cultural autonomy and some measure of political power, these lesser nations were given the status of "Autonomous Regions," while the most advanced were given the status of "Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics" within the Soviet Socialist Republic in which they lay. As a result of this process there had been developed 14 "Autonomous Regions" and 19 "Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics" by 1936. Each "Autonomous Region" was given 1 seat in the Council of Nationalities of the Central Executive Committee of the Union, while each "Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic" was given 5 seats, which put it on an equal basis with each of the 7 republics who made up the Union. No right to secede was granted these less developed forms.

When the progress of Soviet socialism made a new constitution imperative in the minds of the members of the Communist Party, its Central Committee in February 1935, directed the Central Executive Committee of the Union to name a Constitutional Commission to draft a new text. This text was finally adopted on December 5, 1936. It remains the basic law of the U. S. S. R., although it has been amended on several occasions.

THE CONSTITUTION OF 1936

From the point of view of a study of federalism, the new constitution is noteworthy because of the emphasis it placed on the Federal Government. Matters which had been left to the republics in the 1924 constitution, such as determination of electoral rights, the bill of rights, and promulgation of codes of law, were declared to be the province of the Federal Government. The republics retained, however, their control over education, local industry, municipal economy, social insurance and automobile transport, subject only to preservation of general principles established by the Federal Government. They also retained their right to their language as one of the official languages of the Federal Government. The republics at the top level, known as "Union Soviet Socialist Republics," retained their right to secede, and Stalin took pains to emphasize the importance of retaining a statement of this right in the constitution.

Representation of the republics was provided for in the top legislative organ of the Union, as it had been before. This body became under the new constitution a Supreme Soviet, which was itself bicameral in form. One chamber, called the Soviet of the Union was to be composed of delegates elected directly by the people in accordance with a rule of 1 delegate from every 300,000 inhabitants. The other chamber, called the Soviet of Nationalities was to be composed of delegates elected on the basis of 25 for each "Union Republic," 11 from each "Autonomous Republic," 5 from each "Autonomous Region," and 1 from each "national district." This latter form had appeared in the political life of the country with the cultural and political growth of the smallest, remotest tribes of the far north and the mountain regions. Eleven of them sent delegates to the Soviet of Nationalties, which had 574 deputies in all as compared with 569 deputies in the Soviet of the Union. As before, each Soviet had equal legislative authority.

In the reorganization prior to the promulgation of the new constitution, the three republics making up the Transcaucasian Federation were separated, and each entered the Union independently to make the Georgian, Armenian, and Azerbaidjan Soviet Socialist Republics. Two of the units, formerly "Autonomous Republics" within the R. S. F. S. R. were elevated to the status of "Union Republics" as the Kazakh and Kirgiz Soviet Socialist Republics. This brought the number of "Union Republics" to eleven. When Stalin was asked why other national minorities might not be advanced to top status, he replied that the status did not indicate a level of culture, but took into consideration size and location, for the nation must number more than a million, must represent a compact majority within the republic, and must have a frontier bordering on the outside world, so that it might be able to secede if it wished to. After 1940 with the incorporation of border areas and states as part of the Soviet Union, the total number of "Union Republics" was raised to sixteen.

INFLUENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The unifying influence of the Communist Party must not be overlooked in any study of federalism in the U. S. S. R. By the 1936 constitution the party was given constitutional status as the public organization "for the most active and conscientious citizens from the ranks of the working class and other strata of the toilers." Stalin has clearly indicated that Marxism admits parties only when they represent different economic classes in a community, and since these classes have been reduced to one in the Soviet state by virtue of the elimination of bourgeois elements who live by return on capital investment, there will be only one political party in the Soviet Union as a whole and in each republic. This situation means that formal rights granted a republic never would be exercised in opposition to the interests of the federal government.

NEW STATUS OF THE UNION REPUBLICS

Into this situation of growing emphasis upon the powers of the federal government there came the amendments to the constitution in 1944. It is these amendments which have brought the republics to a position on the international scene. In brief, the amendments gave to each "Union Republic" the right to create within its government two commissariats to administer the newly created power given each republic "to enter into direct relation with foreign states, to conclude agreements with them, and exchange diplomatic and consular representatives with them" and to establish "its republican military formations."

In these amendments the power of the Federal Government is defined by adding the following words to its other powers, "the establishment of the general character of the relations between the Union Republics and foreign states," and "the establishing of the directing principles of the organization of military formations of the Union Republics."

To permit the Federal Government to maintain its constitutional control, its Commissariats of Foreign Affairs and Defense are changed in structure from the previous form in which they exercised the monopoly of administration to a form long used for fields of administration which cut sharply across interests of the republics, such as the food industry, agriculture, finance, internal affairs, justice, public health, and several others. Under this form there is a Commissariat for the Union, responsible to the Federal Government, and a Commissariat of the same name in each republic, responsible at the same time to the Government of the Republic and to the Commissariat of the Union, insofar as the higher Commissariat issues directives as to policy.

CULTURAL AUTONOMY—ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL UNITY

For the republics of the Soviet Union federation now represents the unification of economic activities, but antonomy in the pursuit of cultural interests with an area in-between in which the Federal Government and the government of each republic share power. With the 1944 amendments to the constitution this latter area has been enlarged, although strong supervisory powers remain in the Federal Government. Unanimity of political thought is likewise assured by unanimity of political training of the leaders of each republic. The new republics step upon the international scene as unfamiliar types seeking recognition from the international community, but with something to say. Economic and political unity of thought and action can be expected of all Soviet Republics, but there can also be expected to appear an increasing manifestation of cultural independence, which Soviet leaders doubtless feel will prosper as it seeks its level on the international scene and which they believe will redound to the credit of the Soviet system and to its power and prestige abroad and at home.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Andrew T. Walker, president, Branch 1, New York Post Office Clerks Association, over radio station WINS:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, tonight I wish to speak to you of a matter concerning a group of faithful public servants that truly deserve your attention and support.

Postal employees, as a whole group have been doing a fine job. As we all know, one of the important factors in keeping the work of any department functioning with satisfactory relationship between employer and employee, is morale. Certainly we cannot expect to keep up the morale of our post-office employees while from year to year they have failed to receive any permanent wage adjustment.

Pending in the United States Senate is our reclassification of salary bill designated as S. 908. This bill provides for a $400 increase above the present basic pay of postal employees, effective July 1, 1945. The companion bill of S. 908 passed in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, May 15, 1945, with the overwhelming vote of 360 to 1.

This proposal would supersede the present temporary bonus of $300 annually which expires June 30, 1945. S. 908 is designed to correct the inequalities brought about by the adoption of piecemeal legislation. Is is the result of extensive conferences among the members of the Senate Post Office Committee.

Post office operation is now producing a surplus to the Government. The Treasury has received from this source $121,000,000 over the past decade despite the fact that one-eighth of the mail is carried free. This reflects the fact that the postal employees have been doing an increasing amount of work and there is about 50,000 postal employees now in the armed forces of our country.

In view of the fact that the temporary increase granted for postal employees will expire shortly, it is essential that action be taken now to continue readjustment of postal wages. The great majority of the employees of the postal service are in the low-income bracket. Their real earnings and standard of living have declined drastically in the past 3 years. This inequality must be eliminated in fairness to these employees in the public interest, and in the interest of the postal service itself.

There has been no basic pay raise or reclassification of their salaries for 20 long years. Since 1925 postal salaries have remained frozen except for an economy cut during the depression and an ill-fitting flat temporary raise after our entry into the present conflict.

S. 908 is tardy recognition of a well-merited claim. Unless the Senate passes this bill postal employees and their families will find themselves in a very precarious economic plight.

Under present salary schedules the young man who enters the postal service starts at a salary of $1,700 a year, after first serving as a substitute for several years at hourly pay. He receives an increase of $100 a year thereafter for 4 years. This is as far as he can go. Two thousand one hundred dollars is the maximum he can look forward to. This schedule was established back in 1925. As the years have passed it has been impossible for them to make ends meet.

The average salary for a postal clerk, of letter carrier is $2,000 a year, plus the temporary $300 bonus, which brings the average salary up to a maximum of $2,300 annually. Deduct his income tax, plus his pension contribution from this amount, and he is fortunate to have $1,900 a year or about $38 a week remaining to maintain himself and his dependents.

The United National Association of Post Office Clerks is advocating the passage of S. 908. There is urgent need for increased compensation on a permanent basis for postal employees because:

1. They need it to overcome the increased cost of living.

2. It's deserving because they have rendered efficient service over a period of years, and during the last 20 years they have not received any recognition by way of increased compensation.

3. Our retirement deductions have been increased from 3 to 5 percent without increasing our annuity.

4. We all know most employees, particularly those in private industry, receive time and a half for overtime, but postal employees receive 16 cents less per hour for overtime than they do for regular time.

Postal employees are loyal without question; they are thoroughly worthy. Their task is much greater during the impending emergency than it was before, including many inescapable burdens, and yet in the face of disheartening conditions they have served faithfully and efficiently. In peace or war, it is most essential for the success and hapiness of the people of this Nation that communication through the post office be carried on.

As far back as December 1, 1942, Hon. Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General, stated in his annual report that no readjustment of salaries has been made. "When I consider the very material rise in the cost of living, the increase in wages for industry, and the fact that the case pay of field postal employees has not been adjusted since 1925, I am compelled to conclude that a pay raise somewhat commensurate with the increased cost of living is not only equitable and fair but, in view of all the circumstances and conditions, it is well merited and urgently needed. The postal employees are confronted by critical living conditions, and the postal establishment is confronted by critical personnel problems. The matter of pay adjustment should be considered in the light of the need of this large group of employees in order that they may have an incentive to maintain peek efficiency and to remain in postal work during the emergency. Postal employees are anxious to do a full day's work, and they are doing it. The Post Office Department wants them to be contended and happy in their work. I have advocated strongly the readjustment of their salaries in the field and in the Department."

Throughout this broad land courteous men and women render an indispensable daily service to 130,000,000 people. We have seen this vast army operating during two wars, each time assuming burdens of increasing magnitude without complaint and with no diminution in the efficient postal service rendered.

Too long has proper action been delayed to grant a permanent salary increase to the postal workers.

Apparently only public support can help them secure what appears to be from all points of view a justifiable case pay increase.

They have truly been the forgotten people in this period of everrising living costs. We have looked to them for dependable, efficient, and essential service every day of the month and then forgotten them on pay day.

The United States Senate could not in good conscience do less than act favorably without delay to correct a long standing imposition on faithful service. I am appealing to you to aid the postal employees secure the successful enactment of S. 908 into law. Our request for an increase of pay is a simple one of obvious justice.

You can help the postal worker in this effort if you write to your United States Senators stating that you are in favor of this meritorious legislation.

Your interest and your assistance will be greatly appreciated by the United National Association of Post Office Clerks and all postal employees.

Such help from the public will cause the Senate to realize that others beside the postal employees think they are not properly paid.

Let us give heart and hope to the postal employee as he gives his life to the great services that touch every hand and home of the Nation.

Now that I have put our case in appeal for a just and fair consideration before you, I wish to express my thanks and the appreciation of postal employees the country over, to radio station WINS for its courtesy in inviting me here this evening. The station's fine action is in keeping with a laudible public-spirited policy of so many years' standing.

I thank you.

Multiple Taxation of Air Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to provide for the avoidance of multiple taxation of air commerce. It will be helpful to the Members of the House in considering this proposed legislation to relate some of the background of the bill.

You will remember that on May 15, 1944, the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Northwest Airlines, Inc.* v. *Minnesota* ((1944) 322 U. S. 292), upheld a property tax assessment by Ramsey County, Minn., on the entire fleet of aircraft owned by Northwest Airlines, despite the fact that portions of the fleet were taxed by other States in which Northwest operated, specifically Oregon, Washington, Montana, North Dakota, and Illinois. That decision foreshadowed possible chaos in the State taxation of air carriers. Destructive multiple taxation became a possibility, and inequity in the sharing of air carrier taxes among the States was virtually certain to follow.

Principally as a result of the Northwest decision, I introduced H. R. 4935, which was passed by the Congress on June 22, 1944. This law directed the Civil Aeronautics Board to consult with State and local tax authorities with a view to the development of means for avoiding multiple taxation of persons engaged in air commerce and their employees, by States, Territories, and possessions and subdivisions thereof, and other taxation by those jurisdictions which has the effect of unduly burdening or unduly impeding the development of air commerce. The Board was further directed to report to the Congress the results of its consultations and such recommendations as it might deem advisable, including recommendations for legislation.

The Board's report was transmitted to the Congress under date of April 3, 1945, and is now identified as House Document No. 141, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. The Board's report is a very thorough analysis of the multiple-taxation problem and contains well-considered recommendations bearing on a solution of that problem. It was prepared after consultation with many State tax administrators and other outstanding experts in the field of State and local taxation.

The Board concluded that only the Congress is properly equipped to solve the problem of multiple taxation of air commerce. State and local taxes measured by property, capital stock, net income, and gross receipts were regarded as presently productive of, or likely to produce, multiple taxation. This being the case, the Board recommended that a Federal statute be enacted which would provide for the allocation among the several States of the bases of those taxes in accordance with specifically prescribed formulae, thus preventing the taxation by one State of more than its share of air-line operations and property. To implement such an allocation the Board recommended that an administrative agency be given the power to interpret and administer the formulae with the assistance of an advisory committee of five members, composed of State and local tax officials and experts.

In addition, State pilot license fees were regarded by the Board as potential sources of multiple taxation and, in any event, as indefensible exactions. Accordingly, the Board recommended that if the States do not refrain from exacting such license fees, that Congress pass the necessary legislation prohibiting such action in regard to commercial air carriers.

The report indicates very clearly that aviation fuel taxes may give rise to a multiplicity of taxes and that they presently constitute unduly burdensome taxation. The Board concludes that "the case against the continuance of State taxes on aviation fuel used by interstate carriers is conclusive."

On this subject the report recommends that inasmuch as the gasoline tax problem is a very vital one, the solution of which involves consideration of the general fiscal relationships between the Federal Government and the States, a separate study be undertaken looking to the formulation of an equitable legislative solution.

The bill I have introduced is designed to carry into effect the Board's recommendations. It provides the allocation

formulae suggested and commits the administration and interpretation of these formulas to the Civil Aeronautics Board itself, thus avoiding the necessity of creating a new agency for this limited purpose. This bill is introduced for the purpose of study and criticism by all those concerned. It is anticipated that public hearings will be held on the bill shortly after the conclusion of the summer recess.

I feel that this proposed legislation represents a long stride in the solution of the problem of multiple taxation of air commerce. I am confident that a Federal statute can be written and enacted which, while requiring air carriers to pay their fair share of State and local taxes, will remove the danger of multiple taxation which might well cripple the development of the national air-transport system.

Report of Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy:

CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1945

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939 (Public, No. 183, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1945 Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy:

Senators: Hon. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, of Maryland, appointed by the Vice President; Hon. PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, and Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, of Wyoming, appointed by Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce. Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas, was appointed to serve in place of Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY, ex-officio Member, and Senator THOMAS C. HART, of Connecticut, was appointed to serve in place of Senator PAT MCCARRAN.

Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, and Hon. JOSEPH E. TALBOT, of Connecticut, were appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Hon. GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, Hon. RALPH DAUGHTON, of Virginia; and Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, were appointed by Hon. SCHUYLER O. BLAND, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ex-officio member of the Board of Visitors. Hon. CHASE G. WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut, was later appointed in place of Mr. FORAND and Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL, of Ohio, was appointed in place of Mr. BLAND who were unable to attend.

The Board left Washington on Friday, May 4, 1945, on the train Colonial at 10 a. m., accompanied by Rear Adm. Frank J. Gorman, United States Coast Guard; Read Adm. Joseph F. Farley, United States Coast Guard; Capt. (E) Ellis Reed-Hill, United States Coast Guard; and Ship's Clerk John S. Williams, United States Coast Gard Reserve. The party arrived in New London at 4:45 p. m., and was met by Rear Adm. James Pine, United States Coast Guard, Superintendent of the Academy, and other Coast Guard officers of his staff. At 8 p. m. the Superintendent entertained the Board at dinner in the officers' mess. Coast Guard films emphasizing the activities of the Academy and the participation of the Coast Guard in World War II, including amphibious landings, troop transport, rescue, and convoy duty, were shown after dinner in the reading room of the officer's club. The next morning the members met for a formal meeting of the board in Hamilton Hall. Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, was unanimously elected chairman of the Board.

After general discussion, three members of the advisory committee, Prof. H. L. Seward, of Yale University; Dean H. E. Clifford, of Harvard University; and Prof. G. E. Russell, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, were invited to appear before the Board. The advisory committee has played an important part in the development of the scholastic excellence of the Coast Guard Academy. It first functioned as a voluntary group in response to letters written to the presidents of Harvard, Yale, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Columbia, asking each of them to designate a member of their faculties to serve on a voluntary basis. The advisory committee received its initial authorization on April 16, 1937. Several members sought information from these men concerning the scholastic standing and attainment of the Academy. These professors highly praised the instructors and present faculty and administrative officers of the Academy for the results they have achieved during the past 8 years, with special emphasis on the able manner in which they had adapted the curriculum to wartime needs.

Rear Admiral Pine appeared and made a report which was discussed at length.

In accordance with practice all Coast Guard officers attending the meeting of the Board of Visitors absented themselves after the report of the Superintendent and that of the advisory committee had been discussed, in order that the cadet battalion commander, representing the members of the Cadet Corps, might have an opportunity to acquaint the Board with suggestions and recommendations emanating from the student body. His thoughts are incorporated in this report.

After the meeting of the members of the Board of Visitors were taken on an inspection tour of the Academy reservation. They were conducted through the numerous reserve buildings, including the barracks, auditorium, and indoor ground gymnasium. The permanent new infirmary, the docks, and water-front facilities, as well as the Coast Guard training ship *Danmark*, 83-foot cutters, and other Coast Guard craft were inspected. Heads of departments and assistants stood by to discuss scholastic problems with members of the Board. Following the inspection the Board of Visitors reviewed the cadet battalion, with Senator RADCLIFFE and Congressman CANFIELD officiating. Afterward Board members had luncheon in Chase Hall with the cadets.

The Board left New London for Washington at 2:30 p. m.

THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The immediate predecessor of the Coast Guard Academy was the school for prospective officers of the former Revenue Cutter Service founded in 1876. From its original location at New Bedford, Mass., the school was moved to Baltimore, Md., at the beginning of this century, and in 1910 was transferred to New London, Conn., where it has since been located. While the Coast Guard Academy has been in existence 69 years, the present physical plant was authorized by congressional appropriation in 1929 and many of the buildings were completed in 1932. Since 1940 the Academy has been accredited by the Association of American Universities so that in addition to being commissioned in the Coast Guard graduates of the Academy are now also awarded the degree of bachelor of science.

The Coast Guard is a military service, operating under the Treasury Department in time of peace and under the Navy Department during time of war or national emergency. The way of life at the Academy is, therefore, military in nature. At the basis of the curriculum are studies dealing with the marine and military phases of the Coast Guard's work and engineering subjects, but ample provision is made for such general college course as English, foreign languages, and history. Today the Academy is recognized as an engineering school of the highest standing, and its graduates are well trained in the various fields of engineering. The Engineering Council for Professional Development has rated this institution in the first 10 percent of the educational institutions of the country.

With the tremendous expansion in the size of the Coast Guard since the beginning of the war, there has been required a proportionate increase in the facilities of the Academy. The assignment to the Coast Guard of new activities related to the merchant marine have required that new courses in maritime law and economics be added to the Academy curriculum, while wartime demands upon the Coast Guard have required the introduction of new studies in the various fields of maritime warfare. As the Academy's function is to train officers to lead the Coast Guard in the performance of the functions delegated to it by law, the curriculum has been closely related to the work which the Coast Guard has been required to do. Accordingly changes in functions, brought about by the assignment to the Coast Guard of new and greater duties during wartime, have required changes both in the emphasis and in the actual courses of instruction which are given.

ACADEMY ACTIVITIES DURING THE PAST YEAR

Since the last visit of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy several changes have occurred in its activities. While regular cadet training remains at the same level, with 150 cadets entering each year, the curriculum has been returned to a 4-year basis with the class which entered the Academy in July of 1944. Although the classes of 1946 and 1947 are still taking the accelerated 3-year course because of wartime demands, it is believed that future classes will be benefited by the return to the 4-year curriculum. One of the Academy's major war activities—the training of Reserve officer candidates—has been resumed. SPAR cadet training was discontinued in November 1944, but an officers' training school giving advanced courses of instruction to commissioned officers was established last May and has operated with an average enrollment of about 100. A course for enlisted men in sound training was discontinued in March 1945, while a training course for stewards and steward's mates was begun in September 1944.

Since December 7, 1941, the Coast Guard Academy has trained and commissioned 279 Regular officers, 3,748 Reserve officers, and 830 SPAR officers, giving a total of 4,877 officers prepared for their duties. Within the past year 95 Regular cadets, 215 Reserve cadets, and 68 SPAR cadets have been commissioned. The following is a summary of the training courses given at the Academy last year:

(a) Regular cadets: At present there are 322 Regular cadets at the Academy, with 98 cadets in the first class, 110 in the second class, and 114 in the fourth class. The Regular cadets now studying at the Academy come from 42 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Hawaii. Over 2,500

applications from boys desiring to undertake the competitive examinations for admission to the Academy, to be held on May 10, 1945, have been approved by headquarters.

(b) Reserve cadets: In June 1944 the 4-months' course of line and engineering training for Reserve cadets was discontinued. Three months later, however, that course was resumed on a reduced basis in order to satisfy replacement needs of the service. Every 5 weeks 1 class is commissioned and a new class enters the Academy. During the past 12 months, 528 Reserve cadets have entered the school, and at the present time 248 of them are undergoing training.

(c) Officers' training school: In May 1944, an advanced course of instruction for commissioned officers was inaugurated. This course, which is on an elective basis, covers instructions in the latest technical developments in combat sea warfare. From the Academy, these officers are assigned to fill vacancies afloat for which they are deemed qualified as a result of their experience and training. Officers to the rank of commander have taken this course during the past year, and of the officers who have reported for this training, almost 50 have been assigned as commanding officers of units.

(d) Training courses for enlisted personnel: A sonar school for training soundmen was established in September 1943 and discontinued in March 1945 after 747 men had completed the 5-weeks' basic course and 216 men had finished the 2½ weeks' refresher course.

A school for stewards and steward's mates was started in September 1944 and, by the date of the visit of the Board, 566 men had been assigned to the steward's mate course and 87 had entered the steward's school, with 222 men already graduated from the first course and 25 from the second.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS

The Board was highly impressed by the excellent work which has been done at the Academy and the adjustments which it has made to comply with the greatly expanded needs brought forward by the war. The Cadet Corps is composed of a group of young Americans selected from every part of the country solely by competitive examination open to all and constitutes a student body of the highest grade. But while the Board finds the Academy in excellent condition and maintaining the highest scholastic and military standings, the Board feels that certain measures are desirable in order to insure the continued operation of the Academy at its maximum efficiency and service.

In establishing the curriculum for future Academy classes and in determining definite plans concerning the broad scheme of education and training for cadets and officers of the Coast Guard, the Academy has been handicapped by a lack of definite knowledge as to the postwar size of the Coast Guard, with particular reference to its officer personnel, and of the functions which the Coast Guard will be required to carry out after the war. As the basic job of the Coast Guard Academy is to train officers to perform the tasks assigned to the Coast Guard by law, the scope and requirements of that training cannot be determined until a more definite decision is made as to what functions are to be performed by that service. Accordingly, the Board believes that measures should be taken by the Congress as soon as possible to enact legislation specifying the scope of postwar operations of the Coast Guard.

The Board understands that Coast Guard headquarters has developed a postwar plan which has been approved by the Navy subject to such changes as subsequent events may dictate. It is recommended that legislation necessary to effectuate these postwar plans with respect to personnel and functions should be introduced and enacted at the earliest possible date. For, definite legislation setting forth the postwar functions of the Coast Guard and authorizing the personnel necessary to carry out these functions is required before the Academy can proceed with concrete plans for its curriculum and its postwar plans for the education and training of officers, which must be largely tentative and guesswork until the required legislation is enacted.

Tentative postwar personnel requirements for Coast Guard operations suggest a total of 3,500 officers. With a 4-year course, there will be an average of about 550 cadets in the corps each year. Present Academy facilities, exclusive of the temporary reserve school, were designed for 312 cadets. Accordingly, some increase in physical facilities is necessary, and the following additional facilities for the Coast Guard Academy are recommended by the Board:

(a) Two practice ships are required:

(1) A large modern steamer of the C–3 or C–4 type especially converted for its intended purpose, with instruction rooms and shops and living quarters for about 200 cadets and the necessary instruction staff. Operating on a year-round schedule this ship would provide practical training and familiarity with large ship types, as well as housing facilities needed for the cadet groups under instruction.

2. A square rigged sailing ship for local cruises is required. Use of the sailing vessel *Danmark* for initial training of cadets in seamanship has proved so valuable that a replacement for that vessel is considered essential. The Board is informed that the yacht *Intrepid*, which has been transferred to the Navy by the late Walter P. Murphy, may be available for this purpose after the war.

(b) Certain construction work on the Academy's water front seemed necessary. The bulkheading and filling of the property east of the railroad tracks should be continued, as this will provide additional recreational space which the Academy sorely requires. A new wharf extending from the bulkhead area is needed to accommodate Academy vessels and a new building on the water front is required to replace the old rigging loft, which was converted to other purposes at the beginning of the war. Work on the boathouse on Jacob's Rock, which was interrupted at the outbreak of the war, should be completed in accordance with the original plan as soon as material and labor are available.

(c) Increased facilities for studies in the sciences are required. A science wing containing a lecture hall to accommodate 200 cadets, additional lecture facilities for physics and chemistry courses, and a drafting room are needed.

(d) As recommended by the Board of Visitors on two previous occasions, a chapel and a memorial building should be constructed for the Academy. Also required are additional quarters for officers and the provision of extra athletic facilities. These projects are closely related, and it is believed advisable that they should be planned and considered as a unit. Some sketches and studies have been made, and it is recommended that land be acquired for these buildings and an architectural competition be held.

(e) It is recommended that the College Heights housing development built by the Federal Housing Administration as a local housing project be transferred to the Coast Guard for occupancy by enlisted personnel attached to the Academy and by Reserve officers who are stationed at the Academy for instruction. Of the 50 double houses in this development, 25 have been previously allocated to the Academy and have been fully occupied. In view of the probable lessened demand for civilian housing in this area, after the war and the location of these dwellings closely proximate to the Academy, it is recommended that the entire project be transferred to the Coast Guard for occupancy by its personnel. A memorandum regarding this matter is attached hereto as an appendix.

(f) Since the Academy was completed, Mohegan Avenue has become the main traffic artery between New London and Norwich. As a result the heavy traffic along this road now passes the Academy's main gate and causes a dangerous condition. The Board recommends that steps be taken to remedy this condition in order to eliminate the possibility of serious accidents.

(g) While 42 States, plus the District of Columbia and the Territory of Hawaii have representatives in the cadet corps of the Coast Guard Academy, the Board noticed a concentration of cadets came from particular geographical areas. In order that a more diversified proportionate representation may be had from all parts of the country, the Board suggests that greater efforts be made to disseminate information concerning the Academy throughout the United States, and that a greater effort be made to attract qualified candidates from those areas which now are not proportionately represented in the cadet corps.

In conducting its report, the Board desires to express its high opinion of the excellent work which has been done by the Coast Guard Academy in training the officers of one of our major fighting forces. The Academy and its personnel under the direction of Rear Adm. James Pine, Commandant of the Coast Guard Academy, are to be congratulated for the work which they have performed. The Board of Visitors is of the opinion that the standards of instruction and the quality of the student body of the Coast Guard Academy are outstanding and reflect credit in comparison with any other educational institution of its level.

GORDON CANFIELD, *Chairman.*
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE.
EDWARD V. ROBERTSON,
W. LEE O'DANIEL.
THOMAS C. HART.
JOSEPH E. TALBOT.
RALPH DAUGHTON.
EUGENE J. KEOGH.
CHASE G. WOODHOUSE.
ALVIN F. WEICHEL.
ELLIS REED-HILL, *Secretary.*

Certified to be a true copy:
ELLIS REED-HILL.

APPENDIX

THE COLLEGE HEIGHTS HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

The College Heights housing development consists of 37 two-family dwelling units of 2 bedrooms each, 13 two-family units of 3 bedrooms each, 1 administration building, and 1 small building intended as a garage for the administration building. Of these the Coast Guard has been assigned 10 three-bedroom units (5 houses) and 40 two-bedroom units (20 houses), now rented as follows:

	Number	Rental	Total
3-bedroom units:			
Commissioned and warrant officers	3	$40.00	$120.00
Petty officers and bandsmen	7	33.50	234.50
Other enlisted men	0	22.50	
2-bedroom units:			
Commissioned and warrant officers	15	36.50	547.50
Petty officers and bandsmen	19	30.00	570.00
Other enlisted men	6	19.50	117.00
Total	50		1,589.00

Enlisted men receiving money allowance for quarters, such as bandsmen, are charged same as are petty officers.

Each unit is furnished with gas stove and refrigerator. The combined kitchen and dining space is covered with inlaid linoleum.

Heating system is coal-fired hot air. Charges now made include a flat charge for cooking gas, but electricity, water, and coal for heating must be purchased by the occupant.

It is proposed that the College Heights Housing Development could be utilized to an advantage as a whole by the personnel assigned to permanent or temporary duty at the Coast Guard Academy on the following basis:

The housing development would be divided into two sections, one section to be used as housing for the families of enlisted personnel assigned to duty at the Academy, chiefly on a permanent basis. Another section would be assigned as temporary housing for officer personnel, most of whom would be on temporary duty at the Academy for a very limited period, but some of whom would probably use the housing temporarily while seeking permanent quarters. The relative number of units in each section would vary with the requirements.

The housing of all Academy personnel, except the few high-ranking officers assigned Government quarters, has presented many very difficult problems. Many officers have only found suitable quarters by going to outlying small towns and rural districts of East Lyme, Old Lyme, Niantic, Mystic, some situated at least 20 miles from the Academy with the attendant difficulties in transportation because of bad driving conditions in winter weather and restrictions on the use of gasoline.

Enlisted men have not usually obtained quarters as far away but have had to accept unsatisfactory quarters at high rentals. There are men who have been on the waiting list for housing at College Heights for about a year. With the present policy of rotation of enlisted personnel there are cases of men who have come from arduous sea duty for a tour of duty ashore at the Academy and have completed that tour of shore duty without obtaining satisfactory quarters for their families in New London. Many of them have left their families in Boston, New York, or have been forced to crowd into unsatisfactory apartments in or near New London. This condition will probably be somewhat relieved when the volume of war work in New London decreases. However, with the probable cadet enrollment of 500 there will always be required a working enlisted force at the Academy of several hundred men, most of whom will be married. It is believed that there will always be a demand for more than 100 units for enlisted men alone.

The officers at the Academy for temporary duty under instruction at the officers' training school spend periods of 2 weeks to several months in New London, almost always between assignments of duty at sea. Frequently, it is the only opportunity, aside from a short leave period, that they have to spend with their families. Housing for these officers has been particularly difficult, many of them spending from $5 to $10 a day for hotel rooms plus the other expenses incident to living under these conditions. Provision of suitable living accommodations for these officers and their families for short periods is very necessary. It is also extremely difficult for officers ordered to longer tours of duty at the Academy to find suitable accommodations. If temporary accommodations were available during the period when permanent quarters were being located, this situation would be eased.

It is planned that charges be based on existing regulations in accordance with the policy followed under similar conditions at the submarine base and probably other stations where temporary housing is needed. For an officer there would be an initial charge of $5 and an additional charge of $1.50 per day, which would be limited to a period of 60 days without loss of rental allowance. After 60 days the officer's rental allowance would be checked and the daily charge discontinued.

The rental allowances, of course, would vary from $60 in the case of ensigns under 5 years' service to $120 for senior officers. These quarters should be considered only as temparary quarters for commissioned officers and available to them on a strictly voluntary basis. It should be definitely understood that these are not Government quarters to be assigned, and occupancy will not be required with the required loss of rental allowance.

The charge for enlisted men would be a deduction of 90 cents a day from the family allowance in accordance with regulations. It is believed that this is not only a reasonable rate which will provide full occupancy for any of the units not required for the temporary housing of officers, but is also an adequate return to the Government on the capital investment.

There is submitted below an estimate of the cost of furnishing these quarters:

To complete the furnishing of these units for occupancy by personnel and their dependents as public quarters, it is estimated would cost approximately $625 for each two bedroom unit, and $750 for each three-bedroom unit, exclusive of chinaware, flat ware, and kitchenware and utensils. Total cost would therefore be as follows:

	Now assigned	Entire development
3-bedroom units	(10) $7,500	(26) $19,500
3-bedroom units	(40) 25,000	(74) 46,250

Vacuum cleaners, allowing one for each two units, would cost approximately $45 each, or $1,125 for those units now assigned, and $2,250 for the entire project. Construction items, such as fire extinguisher, ash and garbage cans, window shades, and cocoa mats, would be estimated to cost about $25 per unit.

Total estimated cost for completely equipping houses now assigned, $34,675; total cost for entire development, $70,500. No attempt has been made to estimate required cost of furnishing the administration building, as this would depend upon the use, if any, to which it is intended to put this building.

The gross return, without any allowance for vacancies, would vary depending upon the proportion occupied by enlisted men and by officers. With a 50 percent division, the gross return would be 50 times 45 or $2,250; 50 times 27 or $1,350, totaling $3,600. This, of course, would be decreased by loss of time due to vacancies and by increasing the proportion of enlisted men. A gross income in excess of $3,000 a month or $36,000 a year would probably result. Net, after expenses and charges, would probably be considerably less. However, it is believed that it will result in a greater monetary return on the Government investment in this project than disposing of the project in any other manner.

Brave Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in including the following poem by Mr. E. W. Collins, of Capitola, Calif. It is a fitting tribute to a great American.

BRAVE MAN

He lived our soldiers' varied life by land and air and sea,
He shared the hardships, danger, strife of front-line Infantry;
North Africa to far Japan, he followed fortune's fate,
He was a first-class writing man who knew how men are great.

On battlefield, by lonely bier, on fortress flight or crutch,
With general there or private here, he kept the common touch;
And when the final scroll is checked for all good men in file,
Few DSC's will rank respect ahead of Ernie Pyle.

This is no "in memoriam" nor "lycidas" in code,
But just a light-line diagram for elegy or ode
By some great soul who felt his loss or shared his faithful fight,
An epitaph for one white cross that fronts the heathen night.

Needed: A Levant Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Needed: A Levant Conference," which appeared in the New York Post on June 5.

I believe it is high time that we embark upon an independent American foreign policy in dealing with international problems, having in view the general interests of humanity at large and not those of one particular power alone. I am especially pleased with the fact that this editorial, in analyzing the situation of the Middle East, the interests of our valiant Hebrew ally are not ignored.

NEEDED: A LEVANT CONFERENCE

Though the French troops are being withdrawn from Syria amid shouts of "Down with France" and the British are marching in behind a marine band to the accompaniment of wild cheers, no one has won. Absolutely no one.

Obviously, the French have not won.

The Arabs of Syria and Lebanon have not won either. In place of French bayonets there are British bayonets. This does not make the fellahin—the vast mass of the Arab world's 40,000,000—any less exploited by foreign interest or any less the slave of the prince and the rich landholder. It gives them no more land, no more schools, hospitals, industries—all of which they need if they are to be truly free.

The British have not won. The Near East still invites the intervention of other major powers. Its oil is still there—two hundred to three hundred billion barrels—probably the most tempting yet poorly guarded prize in an oil-hungry world.

The Near East has become a cockpit for war. The clash of interests—of Britain, France, the United States, and Russia—in this area is dangerous.

AN END TO MAKE-BELIEVE

No cause, save that of war, is served by treating this clash (as it has been treated by almost all concerned) with the polite fiction that it concerns no more than lines of communication to the Jap war, by making believe that only Britain and France are involved.

For that reason no cause was served by Acting Secretary of State Grew's move in supporting the British threat to the French or by the action of State Department official William Phillips in bestowing United States approval on the Arab League which, as the Post pointed out editorially on May 28, is largely an instrument of British imperialism.

This Government, as the most disinterested observer, should, instead, have faced the facts of the tangled relations in the Near East and called for a five-power conference to straighten them out. Instead it took up the position of tail to the British Foreign Office kite and left it to Russia and France to make the sensible appeal for the five-power meeting.

But whoever called for the meeting, such a conference is the only solution for all concerned and the sooner they agree to it the sooner a cause for war will be laid to rest.

A five-power conference on the Near East, with the rival imperialisms canceling out each other, would probably set up a trusteeship with the aim of encouraging Arab political, economic, and cultural development to the point where the Arab states would not only be ready but able to become independent.

The trusteeship board would probably allocate Arab oil to those nations with the greatest need. This would have the effect of removing oil from the list of potential warmakers and would satisfy oil-hungry Britain and France and, to a lesser degree, the United States and Russia.

INDUSTRY, HEALTH SCHOOLS

It would also have the effect of developing Arab industry and would pay for the health measures and schools that the Arab world needs, especially as it strives to govern itself.

In such an atmosphere the Palestine issue could be settled more easily. Much of the truculence with which the Arabs have been viewing Palestine arises from the feeling that they are being robbed and cheated of their rights by everyone. Once the Arabs knew for certain that their 3,000,000 square miles of territory were to be free, they would be far more willing to turn over Palestine to their Semitic brothers and to those stateless Hebrews who desperately seek homes there.

As for the British—they would get the security that they have been blustering for. They would get it without antagonizing France; without pushing the world closer to war, without having to ride such a dangerous tiger as Arab nationalism.

And the world would get a needed lesson in how to decontaminate an area of its war germs, a lesson in how to give nations the security they seek through international action, instead of allowing them to take the unilteral steps that inevitably lead to the clash of interests that leads to war.

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on June 6 I stated on the floor of the House that lend-lease should be stopped forthwith all over the world except as to China.

Surely every Member of Congress can observe that the people generally are becoming extremely interested in this subject, and feel that millions are being wasted with no pretense of contributing to the war effort. Congress should immediately review this very important matter.

Today I submit for the benefit of my colleagues an able editorial from the Lincoln Republican, edited by A. W. Hoff and published in Hamlin, W. Va., which gives us some pertinent facts and sound opinions regarding lend-lease:

LEND-LEASE FAILS TO WIN FRIENDS

As many people have learned, both to their sorrow and disappointment, it is a difficult thing to buy friendship and affection with money.

This same rule applies equally to individuals and nations, and as to the latter it is well illustrated with our lend-lease aid to France where it is signally failing to win friendship.

Mr. Ralph M. Horton, an eminent newspaper correspondent who has recently returned from Algiers has this to say: "Despite the millions of dollars of lend-lease dumped into north Africa, in my estimation scarcely more than 20 percent of the French there were true friends of the United States or of the Allied cause."

In both Morocco and Algiers there are airports with fine runways, many hangars, repair shops, modern airway equipment, administration buildings, all built with American money, the money of American taxpayers. These were but two of scores of similar airports scattered all over Africa, most of which are now being operated by the British. The airports are supposedly American, but our Americans, even military officials, must obtain permission from the British to come and go. Our money made all these improvements, but their control is in the hands of foreigners. The French particularly had strong Laval sympathies, detested Americans, and yet were receiving and accepting all of the gratuities and comforts resulting from American moneys.

It was in July 1943, that the lend-lease mission was established in north Africa. Its activities were divided into two fields—civilian and military. The military lend-lease was properly being used to equip a French Army under "payment-after-the war" terms, but the civilian lend-lease was supposed to be on a strictly cash basis and the goods were to be paid for with a French fund of $350,000,000 frozen in the United States in 1940 when France collapsed. From the very outset great difficulty was experienced in collecting for civilian lend-lease goods, and up to the spring of 1944 less than one-half of the goods which the French had received had been paid for—thereafter payment virtually ceased. The French took on more the attitude that payments were an unimportant part of the transaction. In this they were encouraged to a large extent by the behavior of lend-lease officials.

The same situation has been and is being duplicated in many countries where we have been expending lend-lease funds in the hope of making friends. True, there are instances throughout the world where lend-lease has been helpful and appreciated, but it cannot be denied that there exists a real alarming laxity in the administration of this colossal fund.

Is it not high time that our administration, including both the executive and legislative departments, take appropriate action to supervise the lend-lease fund? Such action should be entirely divorced from political influence. The moneys appropriated under lend-lease belong to our Government which has collected them from all our taxpayers. They should be distributed by men of judgment whose primary interest should not be based on the assumption that money buys friends, but on the fact that sound business principles carefully adopted in the distribution of funds will more surely induce to wholesome respect which in turn can be translated into lasting gratitude.

Secretary of State Gave His Book on Lend-Lease to the Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to say that I noticed with some surprise the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] on June 1 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which he criticized Secretary of State Stettinius for publishing his book, Lend-Lease, Weapon for Victory. I think it only fair to point out these facts:

First. Implication that Mr. Stettinius has profited financially from sale of book is untrue. Mr. Stettinius has not profited financially in any way from the publication and sale of the lend-lease book. Prior to publication, Mr. Stettinius gave the manuscript to the American Red Cross. The American Red Cross then entered into a contract with the Macmillan Co. for publication of the book, and all royalties have been paid to the American Red Cross. Mr. Stettinius has at no time received any royalties or financial payments of any kind in connection with the sale of the book either in the United States or abroad, and will not.

Second. Charge that information contained in the book was not made available to the public free is contrary to the facts. Congressman HOFFMAN charges that inasmuch as the taxpayers "furnished the money for lend-lease, paid the expenses and the compensation not only of Mr. Stettinius, the Secretary of State, but of a multitude of employees in that Department, that if there was information worth while which the people should have, that the Department, under his direction, should have made it available to the public without charge and as an official publication."

The book contains information and views which for the most part were available to the public in the form of the regular official quarterly reports to Congress by the Lend-Lease Administration. Certain facts, however, were made available to the public for the first time in the lend-lease book, but such information was immediately at that time distributed to the public in the form of official press releases and documents.

Third. Implication that "official" photographs have been misused is not true. Congressman HOFFMAN points out that

the book contains "40 official photographs—note that word 'official.'" Such photographs were, prior to publication of Mr. Stettinius' book, or at that time, released to the public press. "Official" photographs are often released to the public press, and our daily newspapers and many magazines repeatedly carry "official" photographs. They are entirely different from secret pictures, and there is no impropriety in their reproduction once they have been released by the proper Government authority.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Post:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 11, 1945]

THE REPUBLICANS AND FEPC

The House Committee on Rules has not responded with any alacrity to President Truman's request that it bring to the floor of the House the bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. An already once-postponed meeting was adjourned on Thursday with no action taken. There are Republicans on this steering committee whose decisive alinement with Democrats favoring the bill should insure action. However, even if the bill has to be brought to the floor by means of a petition, the Republicans in Congress have ample opportunity to see that their party's pledge is fulfilled. The plank in the 1944 Republican platform condemning racial and religious intolerance is specific: "We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission."

The issue presented by this bill admits, in our judgment, neither of politics as usual nor prejudice as usual. In view of the platform pledge and of campaign pledges made by Republican candidates from Mr. Dewey on down, Republican opposition, even the "agin" the administration variety, can have no basis in legitimate political partisanship. One would certainly not expect Republican opposition stemming from prejudice such as is cherished by politicians of the deep South. And those Republicans whose opposition is based on real conviction having no connection either with politics or prejudice should welcome debate and the opportunity to present that conviction.

[From the Washington Post of June 12, 1945]

HEADLOCK

The House bill to establish a statutory Fair Employment Practice Commission was introduced by Representative MARY NORTON as a bipartisan proposal. It was an implementation of pledges made last fall in both major party platforms. It has been reported favorably by the House Labor Committee—the only committee authorized to advise the House concerning it. A vigorous plea for prompt action on the bill has come from President Truman. Yet the Members of the House of Representatives have been kept from voting on this issue. They have been kept from voting by the failure of the Rules Committee to grant a rule governing the manner in which the bill shall be debated and decided.

This is merely one more shocking example of the stranglehold which the Rules Committee has on the House as a whole. It is aggravated in this situation by the refusal of the committee to grant a rule governing the war agencies appropriation bill whereby the House could, if it wanted to, vote funds for continuation of the existing Fair Employment Practice Committee established by Executive order. The comimttee, in short, has taken the whole issue of Federal regulation of employment practices into its own hands and has forbidden the House to legislate on the subject. And this in the face of a specific request for action by the President of the United States.

The manner in which this tyranny was effected is no less shocking than the tyranny itself. The chairman of the Rules Committee, Representative SABATH, has done his best to meet the President's request. But he has been blocked at every turn by a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans The Republicans, in view of their party's platform pledge, are understandably ashamed of their part in the chicanery. With the exception of Representative HALLECK, they have simply stayed away from committee meetings and thus helped to prevent the assembly of a quorum. The Southern Democrats appear to be entirely without shame in the matter.

This impasse presents to the House a real and serious problem. The control of the Rules Committee over legislation, when exercised with such arrogant irresponsibility, constitutes a peril to the whole legislative process. What is at issue now is not the FEPC as such but the right of the House to function as a legislative body. Whether a majority of the House favors or opposes an FEPC, the bill to create that agency ought to be debated and decided in the House as a whole. And the American public ought to know how the Members of the House stand.

China and Britain Increase the Price of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will be interested in knowing that two of the major countries of the world have recently increased their price of gold.

On March 28, 1945, China increased the price of gold from $20,000 to $35,000 an ounce. Last week T. V. Soong, the Foreign Minister, announced another increase in the price of gold in China from $35,000 to $40,000 an ounce. This represents the second increase in 2 months and a doubling of the price of gold in China.

Britain just increased the price of gold from $33.60 to $34.46, an increase of 86 cents. The new price applies to the sterling area and will primarily benefit the gold producers in South and West Africa. The purpose of the increase is to lure the gold from South and West Africa to the British treasury, rather than let it come to the United States. Unless the increase had been made the difference in shipping costs to the United States would have made it preferable for the South and West African gold miners to send their production to the United States rather than to the British treasury. Lord Keynes, the British financial expert, has publicly stated that gold is a relic of barbarism. The actions of the British treasury seem to belie his words so far as the British desire for gold is concerned. It is not hard to imagine the position the American dollar would hold in the international money markets if not as solidly backed by gold is it is. Britain and China and every other country are getting every ounce of gold they can to stabilize their currencies.

The WPB has informed me that on Friday of this week an announcement will be made in regard to the opening of the gold mines. I am in hopes that our governmental officials will have in mind these recent actions by foreign countries bearing upon the value of gold and its position in the money markets of the world and will not hesitate to immediately authorize the reopening of our gold mines and the rebuilding of our dwindling supplies of this precious metal so necessary to a stable currency.

Keep OWI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that a serious mistake was made in the House last week when the appropriation for the Office of War Information was reduced 50 percent. I believe the need of this agency in Europe today is as great if not greater than during the actual fighting of the war.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an article written by Mr. William L. Shirer. This column was written before the action reducing the appropriation was taken by the House, but it states, in my opinion, a very clear case for OWI.

The article follows:

Ignominious defeat has at last silenced the poisonous voice of nazism in this world, but at the very moment of our great victory the voice of America may become silenced, too, if the Congress fails to grasp what is at stake.

Washington dispatches last week told of the possibility that the House might abolish the appropriations needed by the Office of War Information to stay in business for another year. This is hardly likely in view of the fact that the Japanese war has still to be won. But the Washington correspondents report strong sentiment in Congress to curtail greatly or even abolish the funds needed by the OWI to operate in Europe and other areas not directly connected with the Pacific war.

SILENCING VOICE OF AMERICA

This would be tantamount to silencing the voice of America over most of the globe. Maybe that is what the American people want, but I doubt it, for then the voices of

Russia, of Great Britain, and perhaps of France would become dominant in the world. That may be what the Congress wants, but I doubt that, too.

It will be argued, no doubt, that the voice of America was heard mainly and appropriately of late through the roar of her guns and her bombs, which spoke a language much more articulate than that of mere words. But the same could be said of our gallant allies. Now, with the guns silent, they are substituting words and pictures, for politics, which for the last 6 years has been conducted principally by the waging of war, will now be handled by other means.

The Russians understand this when they reopen movie houses throughout the vast part of Europe which their armies occupy and show, even in Berlin, such Soviet films as Lenin in 1918, Professor Mamlock, and Zoya. They understand it in their broadcasts, which are now going out over the Berlin radio and other captured stations. The British understand it by holding a great exhibition in France to show the glories of the British Army in this war. They show they know what is at stake when BBC programs suddenly come over the air from German radio stations controlled by the western Allies.

UNITED STATES MUST TELL OWN STORY

There is what we might call a Russian story and a British story to be told to the masses of this world, and, as is quite natural and, indeed, proper, they will be told from the respective viewpoints of the two nations and the two peoples.

I believe there is an American story to be told, too. I know it will not be told by our Russian or British or French friends. If it is told at all, it will have to be told by ourselves. That is what is at stake.

There are, of course, many ways to tell it. And there are undoubtedly many sincere men in Congress who believe that the OWI is not the one to tell it. In fact, they would like to take the state out of this business and hand the matter over entirely to private enterprise. And they can advance many good arguments for their stand.

But before we abolish the OWI, with all its faults, let us remember that our British, French, and Russian friends will be telling their story in the years to come almost exclusively through state agencies. We may not like it, but that's the way it will be done. And just as diplomacy, as one means of handling foreign affairs, is a prerogative of National Government, so to a considerable extent will be public relations, insofar as they have to do with furthering foreign policy and making the voices of nations heard around this world.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CAN HELP

There will be plenty of opportunities for our private enterprise to help, especially in the field of news agencies and radio, where American talent is especially great. Certainly no American wants the voice of his country to sound stereotyped or echo the dullness of Government bureaucracy. And obviously there are many voices in America, including that of the party out of power and those of capital and labor and agriculture, which are not always in harmony. But, above all this, there is a synthesis that stands for the American Nation and the American people, regardless of class, party, or creed. This is what we must give voice to. And it is the burden of a democratically elected government, it seems to me, to take a responsible part in propagating that voice.

The war taught us the potential power of the new technique of propaganda and of the special role of the radio and the motion picture. But the media are not the only things to be considered. Much will depend on the wisdom of our national policies and the expertness of our diplomacy.

At San Francisco we learned how inept diplomacy could weaken and confuse the voice of America in the world. This great Republic, which still holds to the ideals of Washington and Jefferson, was temporarily maneuvered diplomatically into the utterly false position of seeming to champion Argentine fascism and seeming to be against eventual independence for the dependent peoples and seeming to be against labor being heard in the councils of the new world security organization. Actually nothing was further from the thoughts of those who in the Government direct the present course of the Republic. But harm was done to our prestige and to the good will which we have built up in the world. And harm was done to the Allied coalition which won the war and must, in the beginning, at least, keep the peace.

The voice of America faltered not because America faltered but because of a surprising ineptness in our diplomacy and a corresponding failure to realize the consequences in terms of "public relations."

RADIO'S ROLE

At the moment radio seems destined to play an important role in peacetime politics. Unfortunately the end of the war did not bring the end of political censorship in Europe. But the radio will go over the heads of the censors. The crisis over Trieste provided an example. Allied-controlled radio stations in Italy gave Field Marshal Alexander's side of the controversy. Yugoslav stations broadcast Marshal Tito's position. There was censorship on both sides. But the radio seems to have overcome it to a considerable extent.

There are today certain countries where the facts about America, its immense contribution to the war, and its sacrifices for the peace are not very well known for reasons which we need not go into here. Some in those lands think that we ought to provide more food or fuel or transport, that we are waxing fat while they starve. Some think that we are too friendly to the Fascists, too kindly disposed toward the war criminals, or that we plan to turn on the Russians when the Japanese War is over, and so on ad absurdum.

Chiefly by radio, which will get over any local restrictions on the voice of America's being heard, we can, unless Congress decides otherwise, do a great deal to set these things and many others straight immediately. And through the turbulent years that lie just ahead we can, if we are not blind, do a great many other things to make the voice of this great land heard.

Sgt. John A. Dolnack Receives Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. John A. Dolnack, a neighbor of mine, is a graduate of Glassport High School and he is one of the most admired young men in my home community of Glassport, Pa. He entered the service on January 6, 1942, and was assigned to the Headquarters Battery, Twenty-second Armored Division, Field Artillery Battalion, and he went overseas with the Fourth Armored Division. For gallantry displayed against the enemy on July 28, 1944, near Coustances, France, he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. I am happy to include in my remarks the citation Sergeant Dolnack received:

HEADQUARTERS, FOURTH ARMORED DIVISION,
A. P. O. 254, United States Army.

The Bronze Star Medal is awarded to Sgt. John A. Dolnack, 33,038,549, Field Artillery, Twenty-second Armored Field Artillery Battalion, United States Army, for meritorious service in connection with military operations against an armed enemy of the United States, on July 28, 1944, near Coustances, France. Sergeant Dolnack, as a member of the liaison section between his organization and Combat Command "B," continually drove through heavy enemy artillery fire and mortar fire. When his vehicle was disabled by enemy artillery fire, Sergeant Dolnack, with complete disregard for his own personal safety, evacuated it to a place of comparative safety, and repaired the vehicle sufficiently to permit its use and successfully completed his mission. Sergeant Dolnack's actions, his courage, devotion to duty, reflect great credit upon himself and the armed forces of the United States.

LESLIE C. GEORGE,
WOJG, United States Army, Assistant Adjutant, Twenty-second Armored Field Artillery Battalion.

The Vote on the Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the vote in the House yesterday clearly shows that nearly two-thirds of the membership are in favor of near-related issues to this legislation.

I have observed that some of the gentlemen from the South strenuously opposed to the legislation are fearful as to what may happen if the legislation is enacted. I candidly believe that if the people in those States that have not as yet repealed the poll tax would treat the colored people as fairly as we do in the North, they would not need to fear the effect of the colored vote. In fact, I sincerely believe that the repeal of the poll tax will increase the Democratic vote in those States.

We in Chicago and most of the Northern States, due to the recognition that we have given to the colored people, have been obtaining their votes, and I feel that they are as appreciative and show the same degree of reciprocity as any other peoples. Therefore, I have signed the petition to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the consideration of the poll-tax bill and have voted for its passage, believing, taking everything into consideration, that its enactment is not only to the best interest of our colored citizenry but to the Nation.

Everyone who has read of the heroic efforts of the colored members of our armed forces cannot help but admire their patriotism, devotion, and the sacrifices they have made during the war. No one objected to their service or induction because of their color, and there is no real justification why they should be denied the right to vote and being taxed for the privilege which is theirs under the Constitution.

Yes, in years gone by I have observed some gentlemen opposing legislation on the theory that it might be detrimental to their respective States, but time has demonstrated that their fears were unwarranted and unjustified. The South, notwithstanding some legislation which was enacted under the late President Roosevelt, after strong opposition, and which has proven to be helpful and beneficial before and druing this war, has enjoyed and is at present enjoying its greatest prosperity in the history of our Nation.

Address of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey at the Commencement Exercises, Albright College, Reading, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, delivered at the commencement exercises at Albright College, Reading, Pa., on June 3, 1945:

Five years ago there was peace in America. A strange, unnatural peace it appears in retrospect. Then, to some, the road of peace we traveled seemed to lead along the brink over which we must inevitably tumble into war. There were others who took counsel of their hopes and believed that in some way we could be spared the fate of Europe. In those days there were divisions of opinion. Sharp and honest differences. There were those who insisted 5 years ago that our survival as a Nation might well depend upon our decision to arm immediately. There were others who held that peace for America could be maintained only by convincing the world that we had neither the desire nor the means of threatening anyone. Pearl Harbor suspended these arguments. The danger was greater during those summer days of 5 years ago, because after Pearl Harbor the giant America was awake and wholly alive to perils which had been confronting her for many many months.

Today there is war in America. A war going through its fourth year. A war global in extent. The greatest war of our time or any other time. One of our enemies has seen destruction, devastation, defeat, and now disintegration. The Germany that 5 years ago rolled through western Europe after crushing Poland, the Germany that pushed to the Mediterranean and then across into Africa, the Germany that pushed toward Asia for a rendezvous with the Japanese in India, has ceased to exist. There is no Germany. The Japan which 3 years ago occupied southeastern Asia and threatened a junction with Germany on the shores of the Indian Ocean is being driven back upon her island homeland and the China coast. American naval power dominates the waters Japan must control to live. The surface units of the Japanese Fleet live only by stealth—the tempo of the destruction of air power is increasing day by day. The might that blew the cities of Germany into formless rubble trained by this experience moves to attack the less substantial cities of Japan. Our land forces have driven the Japanese not without cost from island after island in the vast Pacific, the Philippines are well on the road toward complete liberation. The outcome of the struggle we know. The timetable of its progress we do not know nor can we count in lives the cost of victory when it finally comes.

What followed the peace we had 5 years ago? A year and more of time, precious time, in which we made some preparations for the experiences we have since undergone. A year and more in which we hesitated to put our house in order for the storms that even then banked up in both our eastern and western skies. We did in wisdom provide the machinery to mobilize our manpower for the armed forces. We did put in training a million men. We did begin to build some ships, tanks, and guns. We did send help to England. Help that we assembled with great difficulty. World War destroyers and obsolescent rifles were welcomed by a hard-pressed Britain. We did some—we delayed much. The automotive industry continued to turn out passenger cars. The Congress held men in service by a hairline vote. We still believed we could have both butter and guns. This was the first year and a half of the 5 years back over which we are now looking.

Then came Pearl Harbor to open the war through which we have traveled for 3½ years. That was the shock that fused America. The indecisions of 1940 and 1941 were behind. We moved in unity to build the munitions of war which when manned by men mobilized and trained would make the victory certain. There was so much undone when war came upon us. We were not prepared in a military sense, we were not prepared economically, and, most of all, we were not prepared psychologically. To many of our people war for us remained unthinkable even with three continents already ablaze. It just could not happen here. To this conclusion hopes and desires for peace had taken many of our people. Peace is a condition desired by the normal person at all times and in most places. Like all desirable things of this earth, it must be paid for. We wanted peace in 1940 and in 1941, but we were unable to bring convincing influences on the nations who threatened and finally destroyed the peace we then possessed. The technique of an aggressor nation is to bully the helpless, be they large or small.

The months that followed Pearl Harbor saw giant America prepare herself for the struggle after she found herself in it. Materials in the skilled hands of men and women guided by the minds of other men and women became munitions of war. Ships began to slide into the ocean with a speed unknown heretofore on this old planet. Airplanes grew in size and speed. Their numbers surpassed our wildest hopes. Food has been produced in quantities greater than at any other time. The seasons have been most favorable but determination drove men, women, and children to efforts that made possible new heights of accomplishment. Men were selected and inducted into our armed forces by thousands, and then by millions. The citizens of America proved the strength of free men when, through selective service local boards all over this country, they sent their sons to battle or left them to carry on those things that must be done to support a war. Forty-three millions registered, over 18,000,000 were selected, 14,000,000 entered the armed forces, nearly 5,000,000 were found unacceptable for military service. Those are some of the totals of American effort to date.

Five years ago we were at peace. Unprepared, we entered war. National survival was an issue recognized by all. The strength, the energies, and the capacities of America have been turned upon our enemies in this war, to the successes we all know. Shall we remobilize for peace with as much success as we have mobilized to meet the demands of war? Five years ago we hesitated to believe war inevitable and to take measures to meet it. Shall we now hesitate to believe peace inevitable and take no measures to meet the problem of peace? Before war came there were restrictions on what we could do prior to a declaration of war. Before peace comes again we must win the Japanese war, but are we prepared to meet the conditions inevitable in the postwar period? Shall we pass through a period when we hesitate on the threshold of peace as we did on the threshold of war before Pearl Harbor? Can we muster the same unity, display the same abilities, and work as hard to prepare for the problems of peace as we did to solve the problems of war after Pearl Harbor? Will there be a day, an incident, or a series of incidents which will high-light the change from war to peace as Pearl Harbor highlighted the change from peace to war?

We have changed 14,000,000 civilians into soldiers, sailors, or marines. Can we reconvert these men and women back into civilians? We have built an Army and a Navy from these civilians. We have supported the war through those civilians remaining outside the forces. Can we reconstruct our civilian life reweaving the veterans back into the fabric? These are problems not of tomorrow but of today, in many respects of yesterday. Have we solved these problems? Are we economically, socially, and psychologically prepared for the end of the Japanese war? The answer is obviously that we cannot be while we are still pointed toward the defeat of Japan. The extent to which we are preparing to reintegrate the veterans released by the defeat of Germany will become apparent in the months ahead.

It oversimplifies the problem to consider it as having two main factors—the veteran and the Nation—the rest of us symbolized politically by the Government. Oversimplification has the merit of recognizing a forest without spending time counting the trees.

Demobilization in ever-increasing numbers will return to civilian life thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and then millions of veterans. Who are these veterans? What will they want? What will they do to get it? With few exceptions all veterans 5 years ago were civilians. This they had in common with each other, this they had in common with all nonveterans—the rest of us—which we have symbolized as the Nation. It is inaccurate to say they are a true cross section. They are not. They are young in age, the great majority in their teens and in their twenties, even though 2,000,000 are over 30. They are well above the average in physical fitness, because selection included fitness and their life in the forces has increased their physical development. They were selected after elimination of those below certain standards mentally and emotionally. They were selected for service when others of their age group were deferred because of the importance of the work they were doing. The veteran has served under a variety of conditions. Some of his service has not been unpleasant or dangerous, much of it has been most unpleasant and extremely dangerous. The pay of the veteran while in service has been in cash, in food and clothing, in medical care, and in shelter. He will receive some of his pay during the rest of his life in certain benefits provided by law. All of these may add up to a relatively high rate of pay per hour, but the veteran will naturally think of his pay in terms of what he received in cash each month. As he compares this with what he has heard of wartime wages he feels he has been the object of discrimination. Wherever he has served he has been required to work without regard to hours when there was work to be done. He has heard that this condition did not prevail generally on the home front. Perhaps the information he has received has been exaggerated. Undoubtedly the exceptional came to be the usual, but that is the way he heard it.

He has not been accustomed to quit a job that he did not like or when he did not ap-

prove of the methods employed by those in charge. Of course, he was in the Army and this is war. As a matter of fact some of the veterans probably did fail to do what they were supposed to, but if found out punishment followed. The veteran probably would be the first to demand the right to strike, as a matter of principle in civilian life, that is one of the things he was fighting for. But he has great difficulty in understanding why other citizens should exercise that right when to do so deprived him of things he must have to prevent his death. Again he heard the unusual but all news is the unusual. Regardless of how it happened, these are factors in the veteran's attitude toward the rest of us.

The veteran has had many experiences which make him believe that he has contributed more to his country than the rest of us during the past 5 years. We have most properly concurred in this belief. We told him when he left that he was performing public service of the highest order. We assured him a grateful Nation would not forget. We have translated this thought into law in numerous acts of Congress. The press, the radio, and the public platform have been vehicles through which we have informed the serviceman that his return would be welcomed. These are factors which will affect the attitude of the veteran as we readjust him and his Nation.

The veteran comes home to a world that has changed in many respects since he went away. He has visualized and idealized a world that never did exist. It is small wonder that he, a changed person, finds when he comes home a changed world from the one he has built in his dreams.

What does the veteran want? The complete answer can be had only from each of the 14,000,000 who have gone. Of certain things we may be reasonably sure. If he has suffered wounds or illnesses that handicap, the veteran will want all measures taken to care for him until he has made maximum recovery together with training that will overcome so far as possible the unfavorable circumstances under which he must compete with his fellows in making a living.

If he has suffered no injuries of any kind, then the veteran will ask only a chance to make up for the years he has lost while away. He will ask the chance to resume his education. Here he will not be satisfied to be treated as a boy just graduated from high school He is an adult. He has learned many things in life's hard school. He is alive because he had the capacity to learn, and learn quickly. He will demand the right to continue his education from the point where his general all-around training places him. He will not be content to be restricted by formal prerequisites and other means taken in other times to insure orderly administration within colleges and other institutions of education. He will demand things to learn that he feels are worth learning.

The veteran wants a chance to earn a living so that he can support the family he has, or the reasonable hope that he shall be able to maintain the family he hopes to build. This chance may be in a business of his own, it may be a farm, it may be a job. The great majority of veterans will not expect these privileges to the exclusion of the rest of us. On the other hand, they will view with jaundiced eyes the perpetuation of rules made for normal times and normal circumstances, especially if this procedure sustains the nonveteran in war-gained advantages. The veteran wants the opportunity to be a participating stockholder in the American life which evolves after this war. He will not be content to take only the left-over jobs, or be eligible solely for the subordinate places, whether they be in college life, the church, political parties, or veterans' organizations. He wants to be a workman in building the tomorrow of America, but he believes he has taken a worthwhile role in the most significant events of the last 5 years and is qualified by this experience to be one of the architects of the future.

This generation of our youth has made a large payment to insure the survival of America. The victory over Germany a few weeks ago gave deep satisfaction and a measure of relief to us. Germany was a formidable enemy. What was Germany, has lost its power as an aggressor. The men who landed in Normandy, the men who crossed the Rhine, and the men now in Germany know how Germany was defeated. They know what it cost. They did their duty; some gave their lives, all offered them. Is it unreasonable for them to want the rest of us to keep America strong so that the younger brothers, the sons, or grandsons of these veterans will not be compelled to enter another war unprepared? Not only to enter it unprepared but to be compelled to overcome defeat and save the war even before they can hope to win it. Even now one hears voices abroad in the land crying that a year is too much to ask from a young man for national security, especially if it delays his college plans or, perchance, interferes with other plans. How will a veteran, who has given 2, 3, 4, or 5 years, with perhaps a leg, an arm, or an eye, feel toward those who are so careful of other boys' time? Was the Nation worth a veteran's life? Are the years of others in the future more valuable? The veteran invested much to save America. He has a right to want his investment protected.

The extent to which the veteran will secure his wants will depend on whether or not the wanted things exist, and, if so, how many of the rest of us are competitors for the same things. What do the rest of us want? We want our veterans home at the earliest time. You want your boys home; I want my boys home. We both want the boys of our friends home. We want all American boys home. The want is general, and it is specific in our family and among our friends. Is it a specific want if some veteran, any veteran outside our family and friend group, comes back to compete with us for our job? Perhaps to take our job? Yes; we want our sons to come home, to come into our business, to learn to run it as we believe it should be run, so our business can go on when we are dead or tired. Go on running it in the way we conceived it, and thus give us a claim to immortality. Perhaps others of us may have plans for our sons to go to college to be what we have hoped for years they would become—a lawyer, a teacher, a doctor, a preacher, or a college president? Are we prepared to change our wants when our sons have seen different visions of their life's work since they have been away? We want them back in our colleges. Is it to take our courses? Or will they have some voice, not only in what they take but what is taught and how it is taught? Do we want them back if we must teach other things and all things differently?

The war expanded industries, the war changed industries. Many new workers came into the field. Many new methods have come. Do the rest of us want the veteran to come back and join this competition for jobs at the point where he entered it 1 year, 2 years ago? Must he run all of the race he missed because he went to war? Do we want to pay him for his service to the Nation by graciously permitting him to take the jobs we do not want?

How can we make the America of tomorrow the product of the efforts of the veteran and the rest of us? It is clear that the veteran cannot have all that some of the veterans may expect. It is just as evident that the rest of us cannot hold in perpetuity the maximum gains we made while the veterans were gone. The solution of the problem lies as always in compromise. The basis of this compromise must rest in a realization that the social, political, and economic fabric we weave is not a direct continuation of our prewar experience or of our war experience. It will not be just a matter of a veteran coming back to what he was when he left. It will not be a situation where the rest of us carry on as we have, permitting the veteran to help as we need him. It will be another pattern woven from citizens who went to war and those who did not. In this pattern we must recognize the basic American right of equality of opportunity for all. Some way must be found which will permit the veteran to compete, with hope of success, for the places in the postwar world. If there are jobs for all, he should have one. If there are not enough jobs for everyone, he cannot be denied the opportunity to compete by rules made for normal peacetimes or by credits earned by others during the years he fought to protect all of the rest of us.

Equality of opportunity does not mean a guardianship of the veteran by national, State, or local agencies. It means that the veteran released from his service finds information when he seeks and advice when he asks. It means that he is treated as an adult. It means that he is not considered a problem or a case. Equality of opportunity will insure the veteran the right to graduate from college when he possesses the knowledge and reaches the stage of development normally associated with college graduation. He is the product of an unusual time. When he is eligible for graduation must be determined by other methods than the normal ones. Let no one fear that I assault the citadel of academic standards; far from it, but we deal with men who know more about many things than can be known in normal times. Look well that you equate all that he knows in your determinations. It will take more work, it will take thought, but colleges have a very grave responsibility in reweaving the pattern of the veteran and the rest of us. To use a catalog even of last year would not be unlike traveling on last year's timetable. Colleges are ideal places for readjustment, for orientation in the transition from military to civilian. Perhaps, it is better to say they should be. They will be if they have the flexibility to understand the veteran and to challenge him with the belief that here in college there is knowledge worth seeking.

To all veterans must go equality of opportunity. This means special treatment for those whose bodies and minds bear the scars of war. They are entitled to the best the Nation can give in treatment. They must be rehabilitated to the greatest possible degree. They must be trained if at all possible to regain economic independence. The right to be able to work for one's living is a precious possession. None of this we give to the handicapped veteran, we only repay in part what he has already given to us.

Our veterans have at times during the war felt misgivings about the unity of our home front. We owe it to them to maintain our Nation so that it shall be respected abroad and by the same token to set our house in order at home. We dare not see our land retarded by the pushings and pullings of groups within. Our dead, our wounded, our veterans deserve something better than that for the service they have given.

Each of us, the veteran, and all of the rest of us must dedicate ourselves to give in peace the same quality of service to the Nation as we have in war. The necessity for cooperation between groups will be as great in peace as in war. The urge to cooperate will be less, so the difficulties of accomplishment will be greater. No matter what the initial objective of management, of labor, of farmers, of veterans, or of nonveterans may be, the ultimate objectives of each and of all must be American objectives. When these objectives have been accepted as the policies of us all, then we must guide our Nation on its course with intelligence and skill that each veteran may be forever proud that he fought that this Nation might survive.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a colloquy between Bob Evans, distinguished CBS news analyst, and myself over Station WFBL, Syracuse, N. Y., Friday evening, June 9, 1945:

Mr. EVANS. Yes; Congressman HALL, who represents Broome, Chenango, and Madison Counties, is our guest again tonight, and he is going to talk about the Bretton Woods proposals.

Congressman HALL. I am, Bob. I know that Bretton Woods still remains an unknown quantity to many people. Talk about an international bank and stabilized money throughout the world may sound to some like higher mathematics, or a problem right out of the fourth dimension. It isn't as simple as A B C, and tonight I'm going to try to show how simple the Bretton Woods proposals are basically.

Mr. EVANS. All right, Ed.

Now here is Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL on Bretton Woods.

Congressman HALL. Bob, yesterday the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly to adopt the Bretton Woods proposals for an international bank and the set-up of a monetary system which will enable the nations of the world to exchange goods and services on an equal basis.

Mr. EVANS. An overwhelming vote was right, Ed. It was top-heavy, and it surprised me when it did carry by such a lop-sided margin. The score was 345 to 18.

Congressman HALL. It was, Bob. And it was my decision to vote for this bill. Twenty-five years ago the American people would never have accepted this point of view. At the close of the First World War the forces drawing this country into its shell were at work. We turned our backs on any kind of traffic with our neighbors, erected high trade barriers, isolated ourselves, and refused to have anything to do with anybody across the seas.

Mr. EVANS. The robot bomb wasn't invented then.

Congressman HALL. It wasn't, Bob. And as we were doing this, the other nations of the world tried a semblance of fraternization through the League of Nations and the World Court. They worked at a disadvantage, however, because the most powerful influence for good on earth was not present at the council table. The United States was busy promoting a high standard of living within her own borders, but she wouldn't let anybody else play.

Mr. EVANS. In short, we developed the highest standard of living in the world after the last war. Just about every family in the country, it seemed, could buy a car, build a home, live a bountiful life. And none of us could see the handwriting on the wall.

Congressman HALL. It was a wonderful situation for the United States. And it would have been even better had the boom lasted. But by the early 1930's the bottom had dropped out, the high standard of living took a nose-dive, and the country found itself in the midst of a depression.

Mr. EVANS. A depression that lasted pretty well into the late thirties.

Congressman HALL. Bob, I am not enough of an economics student to say that because of our lack of a fair exchange with other countries we failed to prosper ourselves. But I do feel that from now on we must recognize the fact we are living in a family of nations, and, as one of the largest members, with certain responsibilities toward the smaller members.

Mr. EVANS. We had some recognition of that fact last night in San Francisco, when one of the most difficult questions plaguing the United Nations Conference was settled. The voting question. The right to be heard, which had been demanded by the smaller nations, and against which Russia had been the major hold-out, has been granted.

Congressman HALL. Yes; that is an important instance of the big powers accepting responsibility. Now, Bob, the creation of a means of exchange of money and goods among people and nations both has the effect of increasing understanding between them. It gives them a common ground to work upon. Just as peoples speaking the same language are drawn together by better mutual conception of the others' views, so do those who are secured by fair barter and trade with similar currency regulation have reason to be peacefully associated.

Mr. EVANS. And with the great industrial capacity of this country, we are in the best position of any nation to take advantage of these barter and trade possibilities.

Congressman HALL. America will manufacture more peacetime goods than our people can possibly use after this war. I see the output of washing machines, refrigerators, radios, autos, electrical, and household appliances, and all kinds of farm machinery and equipment in quantities which will dwarf even the gigantic production we made before the present conflict. The American people will have these made available to them. The people of other nations should also have these made available to them.

Mr. EVANS. And the means to make them available to other peoples will come——

Congressman HALL. Through the trade agreements. The creation of an international bank is the step which will assure fair exchange and increased confidence among the many nations of the world. For the first time in history, we will be able to do business with countries we could never before approach on an equal basis. The setting up of an international monetary fund should guarantee the development of the most remote parts of this world. It should bring the backward countries up to date. Those nations which have been forced to the rear because of lack of wealth through industry will be given the chance to develop their own resources so they can also prosper.

Mr. EVANS. In other words, it might be said that the Bretton Woods proposals will promote peace in concrete form. Those decisions they are making out in San Francisco are, of necessity, only general. The decisions made by the International Bank in regard to loans and grants are specific and tangible, because they are bound to put good will to work for nations less fortunate and less powerful.

Congressman HALL. Bob, the promotion of peace in the world of tomorrow, is the most important step mankind can take. Unless we are able to attain peace we will degenerate. Human nature cannot stand another war. We will descend to the level of savages if a new war develops. Therefore, it is the duty of Congress as representatives of the American people, to use its great influence to bring about the passage of legislation designed to attain peace. I have tried to cast my votes with that lofty objective uppermost in my mind.

Mr. EVANS. Ed, it seems to be fundamental that there is just about one way in which peace, lasting peace, can be attained. That is, by enabling people over the world to make a living, get enough to eat, and make themselves secure.

Congressman HALL. Yes; and I believe the establishment of a world bank, operating in principle just as any American bank does, will pave the way to world economic security. I should like to see the people of India, of Brazil, of China, of Canada, or of any other nation, be able to buy American clothing, automobiles, radios, and food, if we ever get a surplus of that again. I believe they will welcome the chance. I think we will all be glad when they do so.

Mr. EVANS. And not only to buy autos and radios and clothing. But to buy the scores of new devices which have been invented as a result of this war. Devices which will raise our standard of living to heights never before attained.

Congressman HALL. That's right, Bob. When people are at work, they are at peace. What other nations have needed for years is the power of a fair rate of exchange so that they can provide the means to get to work. With the adoption of Bretton Woods policies, there will be no end to rehabilitation and reconstruction in the nations almost wholly destroyed by this terrible war.

Mr. EVANS. And the others which have not suffered by destruction, but which have fewer important industries and buildings will be afforded the chance for real development.

Congressman HALL. Bob, I confess I approached this question with fear and trembling because it is of such great magnitude. I am not too optimistic at this point about many phases of the fund. I believe there is possibility for exploitation and deception. Countless questions must be ironed out. It will be a long time before a smoothly working financial machinery is finally developed.

Mr. EVANS. But, on the other hand, our only alternative is a return to our isolationism which followed the last war, and in that way, when the world's economic system breaks down, as it did the last time, and as it will all over again, well, we can accept the fact that World War III is in the immediate offing.

Congressman HALL. And so it is our duty to press forward to peace. It is the greatest desire of mankind today. No other consideration will matter if we can be saved from another dreadful conflict such as the one we are now going through. If the Bretton Woods agreements constitute a step in the direction of permanent peace, as I feel they do, I am in favor of them. If they will bring about a common basis to cure financial ills, to assist development of all countries, to promote peace through sound, secure exchange, I am in favor of them. The Congress has been led to believe that this objective will be reached by the creation of this bank and the fund. I sincerely hope for the good of all the world, such a happy view will be realized.

Mr. EVANS. And we all can say, "Amen" to that. Thank you, Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Resolution Against Further Decreases in Existing Tariff Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts on May 28 and June 4, respectively. This resolution urges that no further decreases be made in existing tariff rates, and believes if H. R. 3240 is enacted into law it will adversely affect the textile industry in Massachusetts.

The resolution follows:

Resolution apprising the President of the United States that further decreases in existing tariff rates, if made by him under authority of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, may adversely affect the textile industry in Massachusetts

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill, printed as H. R. 3240, which in part extends the authority of the President of the United States in the making of proclamations by him increasing or decreasing existing tariff rates; and

Whereas while it is recognized and agreed that the basic principle involved in the proposed legislation is a necessary part in the work for the establishment and maintenance of world peace, yet any further decreasing of existing tariff rates by the President under such extended authority, if said bill is enacted into law, may result in conditions adversely affecting the textile industry in Massachusetts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully apprises the President of such result so that he may be guided thereby in acting under the authority aforesaid in the matter of tariff rates; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted May 28, 1945.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, June 4, 1945.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, due to my recent illness, I have necessarily delayed inserting in the RECORD an interesting radiocast made April 29, 1945, by one of the most independent, penetrating, and keen observers of world affairs and trends, Prof. Raymond Moley, first confidant and adviser of the late beloved President Roosevelt.

I take pleasure in inserting Mr. Moley's sagacious exposé of the fallacy of those who, unfortunately, continue to write unwarranted, irresponsible conclusions that would better be left unsaid, because they produce friction among Allied Nations, including France and Yugoslavia, all of which have suffered the loss of millions of lives in effecting a subjugation of the Fascist beast. These continual snipings and misrepresentations are seized by the Fascist-inspired press to make sensational headlines and by amateur radiocasters who have no factual recitals for their listeners, thus actually endangering friendly relations among the nations that are absolutely necessary for a plan to evolve and maintain world peace and tranquillity:

I should like to underline the fact that I am not making this broadcast from San Francisco. There are good reasons for commentators to be in San Francisco, and there are many excellent commentators there. But it seemed to me that something could be gained in perspective from New York—3,000 miles away.

The point I make is well illustrated by the excitement last night over the premature report of a German surrender, when thousands of people celebrated the supposed news. The hunt for news at a large conference is highly competitive. There is limited game and many hunters—a thousand reporters for every bit of news.

In San Francisco a Senator apparently talked too much last night, which is not unusual for a Senator. But it is also clear that there was hasty and clumsy handling of the Senator's comment by the press.

President Truman's handling of the report was superb. He didn't handle it through a press representative. He didn't laugh it off. He didn't blame the press. He was direct and to the point. Yes, he heard it. Yes, he called Eisenhower. It is not true. That is all. That is a magnificent example of prompt and clear dealing with the public. His stature as President continues to grow.

In the excited atmosphere of a conference, trifles light as air become confirmations strong as Holy Writ. A small argument in a little room sounds louder than a big battle in the open. When news is scarce, it must be multiplied like the loaves and fishes in the desert.

Let's keep this in mind when we hear things about differences between the United States and Russia in San Francisco.

Those reported disagreements, heard from this spot between the Golden Gate and the Elbe River in Germany, seemed pretty small this week. To the West in San Francisco excited over-aged men were quarreling about seats in an unborn League of Nations. But in the other direction, on the Elbe River, boys from Russia and America were finishing a job without which there could be no League of Nations.

Look once more, Americans, at the pictures of those boys in your Saturday and Sunday papers. There is the hope of the world. What do Tovarich Joe and his buddy Ivan care about who presides on Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday in San Francisco? They know that on last Wednesday they met some great guys on the Elbe—clean, strapping fellows who had licked the greatest army on earth all the way from Stalingrad and all the way from Normandy. In Heaven's name, Americans, let's listen to those boys, and meanwhile, take our diplomats with a grain of salt.

Now let's have a little quiet common sense about Russia. In some quarters in this country questions have been raised about the good faith of our ally. In turn, let us examine the reliability of some American Russian-haters who have been writing and talking about Russia over the past few years.

In 1939 I heard these gentlemen say that Russia would join Hitler in an attack upon western civilization. Instead of that, Russia and Germany went to war.

In 1940 I heard an otherwise important critic of Russia say that Germany could conquer Russia with 10 divisions. Russia has destroyed almost 200 German divisions.

In 1941, after Germany attacked Russia, we were told in print over and over that Russia could not last 2 months.

In 1942 our Russian-haters said Stalin would make a separate peace with Germany. Tell that to German fugitives.

In 1943 we were told that Russia would stop at the Russian borders. Tell that to the boys on the Elbe.

In 1944 we were told that Russia would stop at Warsaw. That's another one.

In 1945—3 weeks ago—we were told that Russia would stop at the Oder and make us shed our blood at Berlin.

A few days later we were told that Russia wouldn't let us take Berlin. She wanted that glory for herself.

Now these two stories are contradictory. But they both must sound strange to Americans whose sons might have died in Berlin, and to Russians, whose sons did die in Berlin.

We were also told that Russia would permit no fraternizing with Americans at the Elbe. Look at those pictures again.

They tell us now that Russia will not help us beat Japan. Wait a while and see.

All of these charges prove a case—not against Russia, but against the Russia-haters.

Now let's try and see Russia's position in this peace-making business.

Russian suspicion of the western powers is very real and very deep. She remembers that twice in 3 years, there was created in eastern Europe a series of small states whose bitter anti-Russian sentiments were counted on to shut Russia permanently out of European affairs. Germany did this in 1917 in the enforced Peace of Brest Litovsk. Germany, in that so-called peace severed from Russia, as Churchill said, "by a great saber stroke from the Baltic to the Caspian Sea" all that Russia had acquired in 300 years. A dozen German-controlled nations were set up to wall in forever the remains of the Russian Nation.

After Germany's defeat in 1918, the process of walling in Russia began again—this time by Clemenceau and Lloyd George with the tacit consent of the United States. We participated with our allies, including Japan, in an attempted invasion of Russia, hoping by intervention to change her form of government. Some of the new states that we set up celebrated their freedom by attacks on Russia, shearing off still more of her legitimate territory. And the United States capped it all by refusing to recognize Russia for more than 15 years. This is a record that we would all like to forget.

Russia is determined never again to have a cordon sanitaire of unfriendly nations on her western borders. In their simple, realistic way, Russians believe that the alternative to a cordon of unfriendly nations is a cordon of friendly nations. Would we enjoy a concerted move by foreign powers to set up governments unfriendly to us in Canada, Mexico, and Cuba? President Monroe answered that.

In Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary the alternative is not democratic versus undemocratic governments. Those countries have never had real democratic governments. For the time being, it is either governments that hate Russia or governments that do not hate Russia, and Russia is determined that her neighbors shall not hate her.

On the other hand, truly democratic Czechoslovakia has welcomed a treaty with Russia. This is a test by a highly civilized government on the spot. The Czechs were sold down the river at Munich. This time they voluntarily choose to trust Russia instead.

The test of Russia cannot and must not be on the special case of Poland alone. The test will be what Russia does with Germany and what Russia has already done in Austria.

We have the answer on Austria today, and it is a good answer. Moscow has announced that a new Austrian Government has been set up in Vienna. The head of that Government is Dr. Karl Renner, a former prime minister of the Republic of Austria, a leader of

the Social-Democratic Party and a man favorably known in all freedom-loving circles of Europe. He is positively not a Communist.

The second man in the new Austrian Government is a Christian Socialist, a fellow member of the Catholic Party with Dollfuss and Schuschnigg. Hitler killed Dollfuss and sent Schuschnigg to a concentration camp. His death was reported recently.

The third man in the new Austrian Government is a Communist.

This is a representative government. It is not Communist. And it is not a puppet government. Dr. Renner has never been a puppet for anyone.

This indication of Russian intentions is wholly reassuring. We could not have done better ourselves.

Now, in the name of common sense, is there any evidence that Russia wants to make trouble for us? In the first place, the Russian Bear needs time to lick her wounds which are deep and painful. In this most costly of all our wars, Russia a year ago admitted 4,500,000 military deaths. There must be hundreds of thousands more now. If we add to that, civilian casualties of all sorts, we see that her loss has been from ten to twelve million.

In the next place, Russia needs money and credit from us for years to come. Her problem of reconstruction is immense. It will take 10 years to complete that. Whatever we contribute will not only profit us but cement a lasting friendship. Russia likes our stuff, from our jeeps to our refrigerators. She admires our industry and those who direct it.

Finally, there is a basis of friendship between us and Russia, not only in history but in geography. Of all the nations in the world, Russia and the United States have the least reason to attack each other for reasons of national gain. We are a sea power. Russia is a land power. Our spheres of influence are nowhere in conflict. We both have oil, coal, iron, gold, and wheat.

These are the basic and material grounds of friendship. Our cultural and political bonds will grow with the years.

I certainly have never, in all my life, had any preference for communism. I have opposed even the slightest subversive Communist propaganda here with everything that I could muster. But as an American I believe that Russian preference for communism is her business. Constitutional democracy is our business. But world security is everybody's business. And that is the business at hand. Let's get on with it and stop looking under the bed.

Tonight Europe is face to face with the stupendous fact of German defeat. Legal surrender will merely signalize the practical fact. Our own reception of this fact is tempered by our awareness of our unfinished job in Japan. But to most of Europe this is the end. And Europe, like a man emerging from long darkness, is only slowly comprehending the light. Words fail them. Their emotions choke their speech. Their hearts outrun their minds.

Think and feel, Americans, what this means to Europe. Sixty-eight bitter months ago it heard the screaming voice of Hitler announce the entrance of the heathen gods of murder, terror, and slavery. The thunder of armies shook the continent. Small nations were trampled under foot. As months mounted into years, it seemed that no human life could endure. It seemed as if some voice from heaven had said that all truth was a myth, that all good was bad, that all the mind had learned must be forgotten, that God was not God but a magician's trick to serve the devil's purpose, and that fire, hunger, pestilence, and pain were truly the destiny of men.

It will take many years to understand that, somehow, terror has been blasted. Churchill told his people that without victory there could be no survival. But blood, toil, tears, and sweat have won at last.

We Americans still have dangers and labor ahead. We must finish Japan and, after that, prepare for our future and for that of our children.

The spectacle of a terribly beaten Germany must be clear, even to a Japanese mind. Let's tell Japan over and over what has happened in Europe. We can tell them more besides, and in the telling strengthen our own spirit. Japan is now alone.

Our job is not over, but we have labored to the eleventh hour. We rejoice for Europe, but—

"We have promises to keep
And miles to go before we sleep."

Racing and Retailers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from Mr. Joseph T. Meek, executive secretary of the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations, dated June 8, 1945:

ILLINOIS FEDERATION OF
RETAIL ASSOCIATIONS,
Chicago, June 8, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We would like to ask your assistance in straightening out the policy of the ODT in permitting racing—the assembling of thousands of people at such races and the transporting of horses, jockeys, and equipment all over the country—while refusing business the right of assemblage in the buying of merchandise congregated at hotel-room displays and market events.

It seems to us there is a strange discrepancy in Government philosophy in permitting racing and not market events. Possibly the best thing retailers and manufacturers could do would be to arrange market events in cities or towns near where racing events are held. In this way there would be no ban on attending the races and the hard-pressed merchant could, at the same time, enjoy the privilege of trying to find merchandise for the civilian economy.

If the situation were not so serious it would be silly. Retailers have nothing against horse racing, but they do know that horses do not walk from track to track. On the other hand, they know, and ODT ought to know, that the future of our country depends upon orderly distribution for sound reconversion—to avoid widespread unemployment through getting the goods and selling them to create jobs. Everyone knows that inventories are at the lowest point in years. It should be realized that to build up those markets during the reconversion period now beginning retailers must go to market.

Those same merchants have the alternatives of going to a market event to buy from from a wide group of suppliers; of making single trips to scores of suppliers to try to fill their wants, and more heavily taxing transportation, or of sitting idly by and having no merchandise to offer the public. It is not a case of feeling sorry for the merchant. It is a case of worrying about the entire reconversion program. It will not be too difficult to produce goods in America. It is not now. But goods produced must be given a time and a place utility by retailers. They do not create jobs unless the retailers can get the goods and sell them off of their shelves.

We have no protest against sports events. They are being intelligently handled and no one can blame sports leaders for operating when they are permitted to do so. But at the same time, it is nothing short of tragic to deny the right of assemblage to business bent on a gigantic reconstruction program.

Sincerely,

J. T. MEEK.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and petition from the Southern Conference for Human Welfare:

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR
HUMAN WELFARE
Nashville, Tenn., May 30, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: The people of Alabama are opposed to the poll-tax system and want it abolished. Certainly most of our southern leaders wanted to see the individual States take the initiative and abolish the undemocratic law. Now, due to the failure of the present Alabama Legislature to satisfy the will of the people, the South wholeheartedly supports Federal action.

The anti-poll-tax bill, H. R. 7, must be passed. It is a detriment, not only to the southern people, but to the welfare of the Nation; it is, indeed, a great liability to our principles of democratic government that as few as 14 percent of the voting-age population voted in the 1944 elections in South Carolina, and scarcely 18 percent in Alabama.

It is a notorious fact that barely 10 percent of the voting population elected the present members of the Alabama State Legislature.

A recent public-opinion poll conducted by this office indicates that just as many citizens of the Black Belt want the poll tax abolished as in the northern part of the State. It is safe to say that only those who hold public office at the expense of a small vote fear abolition.

Enclosed is a petition against the poll tax signed by 500 business and professional people of Alabama. Initiated by a retired official of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., this statement received wide response from important leaders of the business world. It is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,

PAULINE T. DOBBS,
Executive Secretary, Alabama Committee.
BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *June 1, 1945.*

In April over 500 prominent Alabama business and professional people requested the Governor of the State, Hon. Chauncey Sparks, to abolish the poll tax.

The action was initiated by a retired official of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., Leonard T. Beecher, a resident of Birmingham, who circulated a petition in his name.

The statement read:

"We, the undersigned business and professional people of Alabama, desire to make known our attitude toward the subject of the poll tax as a qualification for voting in the State of Alabama.

"We believe that the poll tax is undemocratic and that Alabama should be among the first of the southern poll-tax States to eliminate it and make voting a matter of citizenship and literacy without any financial requirement."

Signatures include those of bankers, industrialists, real-estate men, businessmen, lawyers, doctors, educators, ministers, and a few soldiers.

BIRMINGHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MEMBERS

J. A. Thornbury, Jr., Conners Steel Co., 2134 Twenty-first Avenue South.; Philip Jaffe, Jaffe-Wohl Iron & Metal Co.; Edwin Bishop, manager, Delta Air Corp.; Moseley Hugerman, Jefferson Brick Supply Co.; Wallace Falkner, Haverty Furniture Co.; C. B. Beasley, W. S. Dickey Clay Manufacturing Co.; E. P. Gillespie, Foremost Dairies, Inc.; W. S. Donovan, Donovan Coffee Co.; James J. Conan, Harris Transfer & Warehouse Co.; F. W. Anderson, Jobe Rose Jewlery Co.; P. L. T. Beavers, 3609 Mountain Lane; S. L. Peoples, Central of Georgia R. R. Co.; A. B. Weil, Burger-Phillips Co.; R. A. Miller, Gulf Refining Co.; L. A. Brooks, Cosby-Hodges Milling Co. (abolition of cumulative feature only); Donald Comer, Avondale Mills (textile); E. E. Forbes, E. E. Forbes & Co. (furniture and music company); Sam S. Romano, South Highlands station; J. W. Dobbs, Dobbs Truss Co.; J. R. Israel, Hawkins-Israel Co. (interior decorating); J. C. Inglis, manager, S. H. Kress & Co.; W. D. Philips, Birmingham Ornamental Iron Co.

C. B. Davis, C. B. Davis Engineering Co., 1000 Forty-third Street South; J. M. Smither, J. R. Burls, H. W. Ward, Noland Co.; Charles P. Marks, John B. Carr, Clarice K. Robertson, W. B. Leedy Real Estate & Insurance Co.; C. T. Blair, industrialist; Ellsworth Swift, Ruth Swift, Sam Land, 1410 Sutherland Drive; Tom Pankey, Austin B. Pankey, 1321 Fourteenth Avenue, South; J. M. Forbes, E. E. Forbes & Sons Co.; C. H. Dege (general manager, M. & O. R. R. Co), D F. T. M. G M. & O. R. R. Co., 603 Empire Building; Abe Fink, Chandler's Boot Shop; Homer C. Dobbs, Betty Dems, L. U. Busby, Frank A. Vines, O. C. Dobbs, Jr., H. L. Walton, The Dobbs-Truss Co.; M. C. Holcomb, 4419 Seventh Avenue, South; Theresa Corniglia, Murie Jones, Argie Lightsey, Gladys Lewis, Anne Lohner, Mrs. Bishop Smith, S. H. Kress & Co.; C. P. Schmiede, Mrs. George S. Study, Bankhead Hotel; B. D. Feld, Box 908; R. Goodwin, 1928 Second Avenue, North; Frank J. Stayton, 2401 First Avenue, North; S. E. Bradin, Jr., J. C. Zouldback, M. G. Harris, D. C. Dunlap, Jr., Batterton Coffee Co.; E. B. Rock, Jr., 609 Empire Building; H. Vernon Fitz, Alpha Portland Cement Co.; James B. Fletcher, Barber Pure Milk Co.; George C. Study, Bankhead Hotel; John W. Billings, Walter E. Jones, Birmingham Tank Co.; George H. Randall, Birmingham Fire Insurance Co.; J. C. Frirale, Birmingham Slag Co.; Horace Ware, Crane Co.; Russell E. Jones, Birmingham Tank Co.; Mrs. F. W. Anderson, Jobe-Rose Jewelry Co.

J. H. Oppenheimer, W. L. Hausman, O. William Spoor, Loveman, Joseph & Loeb; E. R. Rowe, Jr., 609 Empire Building; Alan T. Drennen, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., Watts Building; W. D. Thomason, Perfection Mattress Co., 1400 North Twenty-eighth Street; James Burns, Railway Express Agency, 1208 Princeton Avenue; J. Solomon, Liberty Trouser Co., 3612 Country Club Road; Louis Jacobson, Liberty Trouser Co., 1451 South Twenty-eighth Street; T. L. Crowder, commercial agent, Railway Express, 604 Fifth Avenue North; O. P. Northrup, manager, Parisian Department Store, 1609 Graymont Avenue; J. Carl Park; Odum, Bowers & White (merchandise), 1424 Sixteenth Avenue South; Mrs. Cornelia Klenck, manager, L. B. Price Mercantile Co., 728 South Forty-eighth Street; Sam Pollock, Julius Friedman, John W. Tipton, Pizits Department Store; Oliver Vaylor, manager, Lyric Theater; Frank J. Stayton, S. E. Braden, Jr., J. C. Zirkelbach, M. G. Harris, M. D., D. C. Dunlap, Jr., 2401 First Avenue North; O. W. Schanbacher, 3124 Pine Ridge Road; T. A. Ripley, 2816 Fairway Drive; W. E. Willett (banker), Bank for Savings & Trust; Walter H. Miller, Miller Foundry Co., 5343 Seventh Avenue South; C. P. Park, Miller Foundry Co.; A. C. Montgomery, Montgomery Real Estate & Insurance Co.; W. R. Knudsen, owner, Peck & Hill Furniture Store; H. A. Powell, Polk, Powell & Hendon, engineers; John T. Woodson, National Pipe (cast iron) Division; James B. Claw & Sons, National Cast Iron Pipe Divison; Mrs. Ozelia Woodson, National Pipe Division; A. G. O'Bryan, Railroad, L. & N. R. R., 1410 Sutherland Drive; Earl Beason, Rheems Manufacturing Co., 407 Meadowbrook Lane; C. R. Holliman, Montgomery Real Estate & Insurance Co.; L. B. Cooper, Montgomery Real Estate & Insurance Co.

Lee B. Weil, Evansville Packing Co.; C. H. Freeman, 2006 Second Avenue North; Arthur Reed, Darling Shop, Dress Shop; Forrest H. Holder, Margaret McMillan, Houire G. Montavo, Claudine M. Black, H. Wayne Young, Foremost Dairies Inc. of the South; Ralph Dewberry, Dewberry Engraving Co.; W. F. Bihr, Killgore Furniture Co.; George O. Wright, 1021 South Twentieth Street; Eddrelle T. Lawson, 2537 Montevallo Drive; E. D. Farmer, 912 Southwest Twenty-fifth Street; Fletcher Gray, 217 East Edgewood Drive; J. J. Duncan, 1644 South Fourteenth Street; C. D. Blair, Black Diamond Coal Mining Co.; F. E. McAtee, 3924 Montevallo Road; G. R. Mathews, 1715 Mayfair Drive; R. M. Reid, R. D. Burnett Cigar Co. Inc.; P. H. Taylor, the Baptist Hospital; John Hulme, 1914 Second Avenue North; H. E. Tischer, 1914 Second Avenue North; J. W. Heathcock, 404 Sixteenth Place Southwest; R. F. Lancaster, 1121 Sixteenth Street Southwest; Charles Wegelin, Post Office Box 1148; Herbert H. Farr, 1416 North Twenty-third Street; F. C. Grank, 4755 Seventh Court South; J. O. Williams, 2409 North Twentieth Avenue; J. W. Beach, 1584 Cotton Avenue; Leo Mendel, 1921 First Avenue North; Dr. W. Marvin Woodall, 702 First National Building; Mary M. Polny, Clara Everett, Flora E. Brooks, Bankhead Hotel; R. C. Palmer, Ingalls Iron Works Co.; H. B. Spivey, H. C. Schuelz, E. A. Holms, Jr., E. E. Forbes & Sons Co.

EDUCATORS AND TEACHERS

Dr. Halie Farmer, head of history department, Montevallo, Ala.; Dr. George Lang, Box 2021, University, Ala.; Mary M. McCoy, Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala.; William F. Maynor, superintendent, Blount County Board of Education, Oneonta, Ala.; R. E. Moore, Cullman, Ala.; Eugene Mims (from Alabama), Box 5226, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Dr. E. R. Naylor, president, Athens College, Athens, Ala.; Dr. Harold W. Hutson, Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Ala.; Josephine F. Eddy, Montevallo, Ala.; Anne L. Eastman, Montevallo, Ala.; Eva Caldwell Knight, 1061 South Thirty-first Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Henrietta Snead, 108 Edgeview Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; H. W. Collins, 703 Carr Avenue, Edgewood, Birmingham, Ala.; Sarah E. Collins, 703 Carr Avenue, Edgewood, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. W. A. Bell, Miles College, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. Charles Henry Haynes, Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Dr. F. D. Patterson, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.; J. B. Haskew, Jr. (Alabama student), Box 5496, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; J. R. Jolly (Alabama student), Box 51, Longhurst, N. C.; Robert C. Howard (Alabama student), Box 4224, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

Malcolm M. Anderson, Alabama, student, box 4162, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; F. A. Peters, Alabama, student, box 4164, Duke University, Durham, N. C.; Vernon M. Sims, Northport, Ala.; May Lanphier Sims, Northport, Ala.; Olivia Athey, Bursar, Athens College, Athens, Ala.; Ina B. Farris, nurse, Athens College, Athens, Ala.; Viva J. Ragsdale, instructor in history, Athens College, Athens, Ala.; J. R. Wingfield, State Reform School, Mount Meigs, Ala.

ATTORNEYS

J. H. Dunning, residence 2530 Tenth Avenue South, 201 Massey Building, Birmingham, Ala.; D. H. Griswold, 1827 North Seventeenth Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; Judge Louise O. Charlton, 1005 Irving Road, Birmingham 9, Ala.; Bryan A. Chancey, 309 Title Guarantee Building, Birmingham, Ala.; Harold Price, Massey Building, Birmingham, Ala.; W. L. Longshore, 510 Frank Nelson Building, residence 1400 Sutherland Place, Birmingham, Ala.; James G. Adams, Jr., 421 Massey Building, Birmingham, Ala.; Robert Gordon, Massey Building, Birmingham, Ala.; Henry L. Jennings, Title Guarantee Building, Birmingham, Ala.; H. F. Hillhouse, Title Guarantee Building, Birmingham, Ala.; Augustus Lindburgh, 4323 Avenue Northwest, Birmingham, Ala.; James B. Smiley, Title Guarantee Building, Birmingham, Ala.

PHYSICIANS

Gordon Goodall, 1022 Twenty-eighth Place South, Birmingham, Ala.; Wattern D. Dryer, 1605 Comer Building, Birmingham, Ala.; B. J. Dryer, 1605 Comer Building, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. H. A. Elkourie, 101 Bonita Drive, Birmingham, Ala.; A. B. McKenzie, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Bertram A. Fox, 1057 South Thirty-first Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. Bertram A. Fox, 1057 South Thirty-first Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Henrietta Fox, 1057 South Thirty-first Street, Birmingham, Ala.; E. R. Fox, 1057 South Thirty-first Street, Birmingham, Ala.; H. P. Hanna, 6 Pamona Avenue, Homewood, Ala.; E. W. Sollard, 1420 North Seventh Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. Hughes Kennedy, Jr., 3118 Carlisle Road, Birmingham, Ala.; H. P. Shugerman, 2121 Highland Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. J. W. Black, 2104 Avenue G, Ensley, Birmingham, Ala.; Carl A. Fox, 3101 Cliff Road, Birmingham, Ala.; W. Nicholson Jones, 901 Woodward Building, Birmingham, Ala.; William A. Cunningham, 103 North Fifty-fifth Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. E. H. Hargis, 1131 Twenty-eight Street, Birmingham, Ala.; D. T. Alford, 1131 North Twenty-eighth Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. E. W. Rucker, Jr., 2754 Hanover Circle, Birmingham, Ala.

MINISTERS

Rev. S. L. Slaton, 516 North Twenty-second Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. John L. Slaughter, 2928 Fairway Drive, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. Sheppard O. Smith, Route 1, Box 836–C, Mobile, Ala.; Rev. Peerce N. McDonald, 113 Gilmer Avenue, Montgomery 6, Ala.; Emmett J. Williams, 1801 Fulton Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. Tweedy Foster, Box 84, Cullman, Ala.; Rev. B. Scott Eppes, 3060 Avenue T Fairview, Birmingham 8, Ala.; Rev. J. A. Durick, 2313 Highland Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. Dubos Murphy, Christ Episcopal Church, Tuscalocsa, Ala.; Rev. J. T. Ellisor, Eutaw, Ala.; Rev. E. J. Lawlor, 1630 Sixth Avenue South, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. Francis W. Fallon, 1630 Sixth Avenue South, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. S. W. Brooke, Route 8, Birmingham 8, Ala.; Rev. J. C. Pritchard, Heflin Baptist Church, Heflin, Ala.

Rev. Roswell E. Owens, First Baptist Church, Clanton, Ala; M. P. Gilmer, D. D. S., Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Rev. W. A. Lipscomb, 2313 Highland Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. Guy F. Ponder, 401 Sherman Street, Decatur, Ala.; Mrs. Emmett J. Williams, 1801 Fulton Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. W. T. Pate, Winfield, Ala.; Mrs. W. T. Pate, Winfield, Ala.; E. W. Gamble, priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Selma, Ala.; Rev. W. C. Coware, Box 248, Panama City, Fla. (temporary), Auburn, Ala.; Mrs. Mabel W. Smith, Route 1, Box 836C, Mobile, Ala.; Rev. W. R. Beal, 4421 Fifth Avenue, Wylam Station, Birmingham 8, Ala.

BUSINESS MEN AND WOMEN

Gilbert A. Sanford, 711 High Street, Montgomery, Ala.; W. P. Kedsin, 2315 Highland Avenue, Apartment D–1, Birmingham, Ala; H. S. Pitzer, 4022 Clairmont Avenue, Birmingham, Ala.; W. R. Haynes, 563 Nineteenth Street SW., Birmingham 7, Ala.; Walter Puckett, P. O. Box 968, Birmingham, Ala.

MEMBERS OF THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Zoe LaForge, 3700 Old Leeds Road, Birmingham 9, Ala.; Helen I. Stockton, 1228 South Twenty-ninth Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Elizabeth LaForge, 3700 Old Leeds Road, Birmingham 9, Ala.; Margaret T. Jagger, 1127 South Twenty-third Street, Birmingham 5, Ala.; Thyrs C. Christensen, 2301 Fifteenth Avenue South, Birmingham, Ala.; Nettie Lee Ward, 1509 Grove Place, Birmingham 9, Ala.

MEMBERS OF THE WOMEN'S MISSIONARY UNION, BAPTIST

Juliette Mather, 1111 Comer Building, Birmingham 3, Ala.; Rachel J. Colvin, 1111 Comer Building, Birmingham 3, Ala.; Anne Crittenden, 922 Ninth, Birmingham 4, Ala.; Minnie Brooks, 6004 Georgia Road, Birmingham, Ala.; Mattie H. Anderson, 809 Thirty-ninth Place Street, Birmingham 6, Ala.; Mary Allen, 1409 Ardsley Place, Birmingham 9, Ala.; George Bridges, artist, 214 Edgewood Boulevard, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. George A. O'Connell, vice chairman, Democratic committee, Calhoun County, 1311 Glenwood Terrace, Anniston, Ala.; Alexander Nunn, editor, Progressive Farmer, Loachapoka, Ala.; Harry M. Ayers, editor, The Anniston Star, Anniston, Ala.

MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Pvt. Bethel Harris, Winfield, Ala.; Mrs. Ida Harris (wife), Winfield, Ala.; Pvt. O. A. Presley, Winfield, Ala.; Mrs. O. A. Presley (wife), Winfield, Ala.; Pvt. Edward McGraw, Birmingham, Ala., now overseas; Staff Sgt. James H. Thomas, Jr., Birmingham, Ala., now overseas in England; Lt. Malcolm Dobbs, Birmingham, Ala., now overseas in France; Sgt. Luther C. Owings, now in Burma; Pfc. Kenneth C. Charlton, Fort Knox, Ky.; Lt. Mason Dorrough, Pell City, Ala., now overseas in France.

PROFESSIONS NOT GIVEN

Mixon Tooson, Box 48, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Mrs. Jesse Smith, Route 2, Cullman, Ala.; Jesse M. Rogers, 2153 LaFayette Street, Decatur, Ala.; W. I. Dansby, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; James M. Evans, Route 1, Arab, Ala.; Sebostian Ditto, Elberta, Ala.; Frank F. Caymays, Elberta, Ala.; John A. Shank, Elberta, Ala.; Albert Schweizer, Elberta, Ala.; Edmond Edmann, Elberta, Ala.; Roberta G. Haley, 1423 North Twenty-fourth Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Susan B. Anthony, 2301 Fifteenth Avenue South, Birmingham, Ala.; Zella Tanner, 1219 South Nineteenth Street, Birmingham 5, Ala.; Margaret E. Harris, 1312 Quintard Avenue, Anniston, Ala.; J. O. Polley, 108 Jackson Avenue, Birmingham 9, Ala.; Paul N. Propst, Young Men's Christian Association, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. D. E. Sanderson, 415 Twelfth Street Southwest, Birmingham, Ala.; Eleanor Massey Bridges, 214 Edgewood Boulevard, Birmingham, Ala.; Mary Eleanor B. Weller, 218 Edgewood Boulevard, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. Jim C. Dorsey, 409 Hollywood Boulevard, Birmingham, Ala.; Lydia W. Chinery, 3525 Highland Avenue H–1, Birmingham, Ala.

ADDITIONAL SIGNATURES RECEIVED

Dr. Jerome Meyer, 1110 South Forty-first Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. Jerome Meyer, 1110 South Forty-first Street, Birmingham, Ala.; A. S. Mitchell, M. D., 1930 Twenty-sixth Avenue North, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. A. L. Stabler, 2308 Fourth Avenue North, Birmingham, Ala.; Dr. S. F. Harris, 400 North Seventeenth Street, Birmingham, Ala.; Rev. John P. West, route 1, Box 566, Bessemer, Ala.; Mrs. J. P. West, Route 1, Box 566, Bessemer, Ala.

Statesman-Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, at a banquet held in Oklahoma in honor of Senator ELMER THOMAS, Oklahoma's senior United States Senator, at which time a portrait of the Senator was unveiled and presented to the Historical Society for Oklahoma, Hon. Earl Pruet, brilliant and eloquent young attorney of Oklahoma City, delivered the presentation address.

Because of the information and history of events in Oklahoma associated with the life and character of our State's senior Senator, and because of my admiration for both the Senator and Mr. Pruet, both of whom I have known intimately for more than a quarter of a century, and for the further reason that I am sure it will be of special interest to many citizens of Oklahoma, I am pleased to include herewith for the RECORD the address in question. It follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Senator THOMAS, Mrs. Thomas, ladies and gentlemen, in the year 1900 the man, who is our guest of honor this evening, left his native State of Indiana and came to Oklahoma City, where for the space of a year he was engaged in teaching school. In 1901 he went to Lawton, Okla., where he has since resided.

At the erection of the State in 1907, he was elected to the State senate from the seventeenth senatorial district, composed of Comanche, Stephens, and Jefferson Counties. He served the State continuously in that capacity until his election to Congress in 1922. He was president pro tempore of the State senate during the session of 1910–11. As chairman of the appropriations committee of the State senate he was responsible for financing the construction of the State capitol without a bond issue.

In 1920 he won the Democratic nomination in the Sixth Congressional District but lost in the general election by a narrow margin, in the Harding landslide.

This is the only election, primary or general, which he has ever lost.

His last term in the State senate expired in 1922; in that year he again received the Democratic nomination to Congress in the Sixth Congressional District and was elected to Congress in the general election, serving in the Congress for two terms. In 1926 he was nominated and elected to the United States Senate and has since been relected to that position three times—in 1932, 1938, and 1944. He is now serving his fourth term in the Senate of the United States. He can be justly proud of the fact that he has never run against a Democratic incumbent in office and that he has never lost a primary election.

He is chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture; is the ranking member and former chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee; is the third ranking member on the all-important Appropriations Committee; is chairman of the War Department appropriations subcommittee; member of the Navy Department appropriations subcommittee; and chairman of the Senate appropriations subcommittee on flood control.

His career as a Congressman and Senator has been a continuous record of service to the ex-servicemen of the First World War. He led the fight for all legislation looking toward the hospitalization and rehabilitation of our heroes in World War I. He recently supported, voted for, and assisted in the passage of the bill which is known as the GI bill of rights. Its provisions will enable our boys and girls who return from the service in the present war to begin life anew.

Today our hearts are gladdened by the fact that the war in Europe has been won. This was possible because our men and the men of our allies who participated had been given the best training and had been equipped with the best ships, tanks, guns, planes, and other equipment which money can buy. The means for training and equipping those men were provided by the Congress of the United States. Because of his position as chairman of the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate and as a member of the Navy Department Appropriations Subcommittee, he has perhaps contributed more than any other one man in the Congress toward this victory.

His outstanding achievement in the Congress was accomplished when the Congress of the United States adopted his monetary amendment which gave to our late President Roosevelt control over the monetary affairs, as result of which the dollar was devaluated and a profit of $2,800,000,000 was realized by our Government. This sum is sufficient to pay his salary for the next 280,000 years.

He has had a major part in the enactment of all the progressive legislation of the present national administration. He is recognized as the greatest parliamentarian in the Congress; he is today, without question, the outstanding Member of the Senate.

I speak of our senior Senator and Oklahoma's greatest all-time legislator and statesman, ELMER THOMAS.

The Dangers of a Permanent FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Times-Dispatch, of Richmond, Va., dated June 11, 1945, entitled "The Dangers of a Permanent FEPC":

THE DANGERS OF A PERMANENT FEPC

There are many sincere and public-spirited advocates of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, and the philosophy behind the proposal to establish such an agency in Washington is precisely in the American tradition. But although these things are true, this bill which is designed to help minorities probably would have precisely the opposite result, at least insofar as the Negro minority in the South is concerned.

Legislation rests on public opinion. No law which is strongly opposed by the overwhelming majority will ever be effective, or will ever achieve the results which it seeks to achieve. This is especially true of legislation such as that which seeks to establish a permanent FEPC. Here is a bill which involves some of the most emotionally felt issues in our public life, but which ignores those emotions in providing for enforcement. Such a law is often worse than no law at all. After much study of the issues involved here, we are con-

vinced that if a permanent FEPC is established in Washington over the virtually unanimous, if not completely unanimous, opposition of the entire southern bloc in Congress, the consequences can only be harmful.

Representative MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, chief proponent of the bill in the House, has prepared a series of questions and answers about this piece of legislation. She says that the types of discrimination forbidden in the bill on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry are those "in employment or union membership, i. e., hiring, discharging, wages, seniority, transfers, demotions, upgrading, union auxiliaries, etc." Answering her own question, "Does the bill require an employer to hire Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, or other minorities?" she says: "No. An employer may hire or reject anyone he pleases, on any basis and for any reason, so long as a needed and qualified person is not rejected because of his race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry." This answer, when analyzed, is really meaningless, for the second half of the sentence partially nullifies the first half. The important fact is that this law would make possible the imposition of heavy penalties upon employers for failure to hire colored persons.

This is not the way to broaden opportunities for the colored people of the South. This is the road to a vast amount of bitterness and strife. The lessons of the past should teach Congress that the entry of the Federal authorities into this delicate relationship of employer and employee, and the emphasis which would be placed in the law upon the race issue, would simply fan the flames of interracial antagonism, instead of quenching them.

Such a lifelong friend of the Negro race as Oswald Garrison Villard, whose greatest pride is that he is the grandson of William Lloyd Garrison, the Abolitionist, is opposed to this type of legislation. He feels that it is more harmful than otherwise, and that it tends to accentuate race differences instead of eliminating them. He and half a dozen eminent New Yorkers of liberal inclinations signed a statement in opposition to the Ives bill, which is of a similar character, and which was passed in New York State a short time ago.

So liberal a man as Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, is against the establishment of a permanent FEPC, and so is the militantly liberal Louisville Courier-Journal. Both have fought many battles for the Negroes of the South, but they can see that the sort of statute which is being advocated would, in all likelihood, increase existing tensions instead of lessening them.

Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, one of the most enlightened and progressive Members of the House, always a friend of the disadvantaged, made a long address on the House floor recently in opposition to this bill. "It is unity of purpose we seek," he declared, "not enforced relationships." He pointed out that the bill would not only cover the hiring of workers but also their discharge, and he stated that where an employee was discharged, and he complained to the FEPC, that body could order the employer to reinstate the worker, and the employer would go to jail, if he declined. Similar penalties can be imposed for refusal to hire, if the law is violated.

It is only right, of course, that colored workmen, who have made good on merit during the war, should not be laid off when there is a slump, simply because they are colored. But, while this is true, it is also true that Federal decrees against individual employers, especially in the Southern States, are sure to be deeply resented. The desired results as to both hiring and firing should be sought by other means.

Some absurd and even hysterical things have been said by southerners against this FEPC bill, and we consider them so much rodomontade. On the other hand, there is no use blinking the facts concerning this legislation, and the real dangers which it contains.

It may be argued that while far-reaching powers are conferred by the bill, they would not be exercised. What guaranty is there of that? None whatever. On the contrary, given the zeal and unquestioned integrity of many of the bill's advocates, they might well consider that the South ought to be singled out first for attention, since it contains by far the bulk of the country's Negroes. Should that occur, the fat would be in the fire, and irreparable harm would be done.

The Times-Dispatch has frequently championed the cause of better employment opportunities for our Negro citizens. We shall continue to do so, especially in the years immediately ahead, when it is so important that returning Negro soldiers and sailors be made to feel that they are being fairly treated. But this newspaper cannot support legislation to that end which could arouse great interracial hostility, and create almost interminable friction. If such consequences flowed from the establishment of a permanent FEPC—and they probably would—the Negroes would be the chief sufferers, and interracial progress would be set back for decades.

OWI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months I have been in a position to observe first-hand the work of the Office of War Information overseas, both as an arm of our fighting forces in the conduct of psychological warfare and as an information service to Allied and neutral nations.

My most unforgettable experience abroad was my inspection of conditions within the former German concentration camp at Buchenwald. There, I saw evidence of systematic mass murder, of planned starvation, of torture and of exposure to the ravages of typhus, typhoid, and dysentery. This inspection revealed to me, beyond any possibility of contradiction, the bestial nature of our defeated enemy in Europe.

What I have told you, my colleagues, concerning this nightmare of inhumanity has been told to the people of Europe—who have not as yet had the facilities of commercial press and radio entirely restored to them—by the OWI. It was my privilege to tell the story of Buchenwald to the people of Europe by broadcasting from London. Every possible media has been employed to tell this story as it should be told. So effective has the work of the OWI been in this respect that our own Army has had OWI booklets describing the horrors of Buchenwald and Belsen distributed among the German prisoners of war in this country with the result that in one POW camp the prisoners took up a collection for the survivors of Buchenwald.

It is no mystery to me that OWI campaigns have succeeded. I have had the opportunity to see the operations of OWI's London office. I know the trials and the triumphs of OWI London employees.

When London was on the front lines during the flying-bomb blitz, OWI personnel shared the inconveniences and the risks of our British allies. One office had its windows blown in 3 times by the V-weapons. Only a year ago, in a street near another OWI office, 30 people were killed by a flying bomb. In crowded wartime London, OWI workers labored at their jobs in makeshift quarters—some in commercial buildings; others in rebuilt boarding houses; and still others in private homes.

In these trying times, OWI worked with British Government organizations and earned their lasting respect. SHAEF's Psychological Warfare Division brought OWI members in close touch with members of the British Foreign Office Political Intelligence Department. OWI's radio work brought like contacts between its representatives and those of BBC. OWI exchanged material and services with the British Ministry of Information. OWI in London was and is a composite cross-section of the United States, reflecting the attitudes of all sections of this country.

I tell you these facts about what has happened because they bear a direct relationship to what is now taking place.

A great task remains before us in the field of information. Real information; not propaganda. The people of the liberated lands of western Europe must find out what has been happening in the outside world since 1939. They must do this in order to take their places in the world community of free nations. The part of the United States in winning the war and in establishing the peace must be explained to this vast audience so that their future actions will not be based on distorted opinions. The story must be told over and over again of the cooperation of the United States with governments in exile and resistance forces within formerly German-occupied territory.

OWI services will continue to be needed in raising the curtain of ignorance from the eyes of the German people, under the leadership of General Eisenhower. No matter what the over-all information policy toward the German people will be, it will require experienced, trained personnel that will be able to work with our allies. Certainly, those OWI men and women who have made a record of successful cooperation with British governmental agencies over a period of years will add to the efficiency of this complex operation.

Nor can even a general discussion of OWI's value in the European area be complete without full recognition of its accomplishments and possibilities in connection with better relations between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain. In the years before VE-day, hundreds of thousands of Americans lived and worked in hundreds of British communities. They visited British homes, attended British churches, made British friends—and talked unceasingly about America. They aroused

still further the already intense British curiosity about things American. They stirred Britons to find out all they could about America. In my contacts with Britons I was surprised to learn that many of them knew a great deal about our country.

Wartime conditions made the methods of supplying this need by commercial means extremely limited. Newspapers, books, and magazines were restricted in size and quantity. The military demands on shipping prevented the importation of such material. OWI libraries and information centers helped to supply that lack. Speeches by leading Americans on subjects which projected the American way of life—some of them made on the floor of the House of Representatives—were sent in their entirety for distribution to the British press. The newsroom of London OWI, thus, supplemented but in no way competed with the commercial news agencies.

There are two chief reasons why I am interested in the continuance of the London operation of the OWI. I know what it has done under fire. I know also that there is a great deal remaining to be done and that OWI London has the facilities and the experienced personnel to meet present and future demands.

The people of the United States are still engaged in a war which demands their every sacrifice and every effort. OWI is needed to tell that war, not sell that war, to the established audiences in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe. We need to tell Europeans, and keep telling them, so that they will have a constant awareness that the completeness of their recovery from being victimized by the Nazi mentality which conceived of not one, but scores, of Buchenwalds, is dependent upon the completeness of our military victory over Japan. Europeans have confidence in the men and the methods employed by OWI to inform them in the past. Any relaxation in our vigilant information policy will have its effect upon our relations with other countries and upon our vigorous prosecution of the war against Japan.

There is a vital need for the OWI until the aggressor nations have been defeated everywhere in the world.

Glassport, Pa., Officer Awarded Silver Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I have known Lt. Anthony W. Borrelli, of Glassport, Pa., since infancy. He is one of four brothers in the service. He enlisted in June of 1941, and he received his training with the One Hundred and Seventy-sixth Infantry Regiment of the Twenty-ninth Division. He graduated from officers' candidate school as a second lieutenant. As a platoon leader, Lieutenant Borrelli played a vital role in the now famous One Hundred and First Air-Borne Division's all-important mission of seizing and securing a 20-mile corridor as far north as Vechel for the British Second Army advance to Nijmegen. For his gallantry in action during the German attack in Bastogne, Belgium, Lieutenant Borrelli was promoted from second lieutenant to first lieutenant, and he was also awarded the Silver Star. I include herein the citation received by Lieutenant Borrelli on the battle front:

GLASSPORT OFFICER AWARDED SILVER STAR

WITH THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIRST AIR-BORNE DIVISION ON THE WESTERN FRONT.—First Lt. Anthony Borrelli, a platoon leader of the Five Hundred and Sixth Parachute Infantry Regiment, One Hundred and First Air Borne Division, was recently awarded the Silver Star Medal for gallantry in action, during the German attack in Bastogne, Belgium.

Lieutenant Borrelli was with the Eagle Division in a rest camp after more than 70 days of on-the-line fighting in Holland when orders came suddenly for the One Hundred and First to move to Bastogne and hold that key road-junction town against the fury of the Nazi counteroffensive.

The Five Hundred and Sixth Regiment was defending positions near Foy, when it was learned that the enemy had infiltrated through the main defense line and had dug emplacements behind that line. When the company commander became a casualty, Lieutenant Borrelli took command. With complete disregard for his personal safety he moved to the front of his company; firing his submachine gun, he charged toward the Germans.

Inspired by his example the men joined in the assault. Lieutenant Borrelli's spirit and action were typical of the defense of Bastogne, where for a week the One Hundred and First Division, completely surrounded and attacked almost continuously by numerically superior German forces, stalled the Nazi counteroffensive.

Lieutenant Borrelli, son of Mr. and Mrs. N. A. Borrelli, 428 Iowa Avenue, Glassport, Pa., saw his first action during the air-borne invasion of Holland last September. He is a graduate of Glassport High School and before entering the Army was employed by the People's Natural Gas Co.

In addition to the Silver Star, he wears the Presidential Citation, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Purple Heart for wounds at Bastogne, and the European Theater of Operations ribbon.

Full Employment and the Wholesaler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me entitled "Full Employment and the Wholesaler," published in the March 1945 issue of the Hosiery Wholesaler.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND THE WHOLESALER

(By JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senator from Montana)

For several years we have been discussing postwar full employment. Businessmen, economists, workers, legislators, housewives, service men and women—all are on common ground in their concern over postwar jobs. This is partly because the war has demonstrated that full employment can be achieved. And it is partly because it has become clear that it will not be achieved without positive action by all groups in cooperation with the Government.

No group, however, has a larger stake in full employment than businessmen. Business needs a steady over-all demand large enough to keep at work the entire labor force. This means increased purchasing power and larger markets. Only if there is an assurance of full employment does the businessman dare embark upon the high wage and low-price policy basic to a high sales volume. Finally, full employment in this Nation is prerequisite to industrialization and expansion in other countries, thus automatically making them better customers for our goods, equipment, and services.

Larger markets mean larger profits. They mean steadier profits, too. The promise of a continuously adequate and expanding aggregate demand for goods and services would largely eliminate the element of risk and uncertainty which causes alternating waves of optimism and pessimism and accentuates business cycles. If businessmen have no reason to anticipate depression, they will cease to make depression inevitable through pre? cautionary protective measures. They cannot afford to take chances.

The pressure for radical economic and political changes stemming from unemployment and poverty would likewise be greatly reduced. The result would be a strengthening of free enterprise and a revival of faith in the existing economic system.

The economic interests of distributors bear a particularly close relationship to the maintenance of full employment. When national income dropped from the prewar high of $85,000,000,000 in 1929 to $42,000,000,000 in 1932, distributors' net income declined by more than 300 percent. The subsequent rise of national income to $153,000,000,000 in 1943 carried with it a nearly sixfold increase of net income for distributors. This is because prosperity buying increases profit in a number of ways. It expands purchases of higher quality goods which carry larger margins of profit. Credit risks and collection costs are minimized. Greater sales volume reduces the unit costs of selling, advertising, transportation, etc.

For wholesalers, a significant consequence of full employment would be its stimulus to small and new retail enterprises. When markets are expanding, credit facilities are more liberal and total demand is large enough to absorb the output of small as well as large producers. Expansion in the field of distribution has always provided the greatest opportunity for small businesses. A contraction of business activity, on the other hand, usually hits the little fellow, leaving larger firms more or less intact.

The first concrete step toward translating full employment discussion into action has been taken by the presentation to Congress of the full employment bill of 1945, sponsored in the Senate (S. 380) by Senators WAGNER, THOMAS of Utah, O'MAHONEY, and myself, and in the House (H. R. 2202) by Representative PATMAN.

The bill makes it a fundamental responsibility of the Federal Government to "assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment."

It provides that the Annual Budget message of the President should set forth estimates:

First. The total volume of expenditures by business consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government which may be necessary to assure full employment;

Second. The anticipated levels of expenditures by business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; and

Third. The gap between what is probable and what is necessary.

If the expenditures are likely to be too great, inflation controls are to be set into operation. In the event of a prospective deficiency in aggregate spending—that is, if anticipated expenditures are less than a full-employment volume—a twofold attack is proposed. First, the Government should take every possible measure to induce expansion in business and industry. This would involve policies in connection with banking and currency, taxation, wages and working conditions, social security, development of natural resources, etc., which might encourage businessmen and consumers to spend more. Then if there is still a gap, the Federal Government should itself undertake direct expenditures on useful public works and services to the extent necessary to provide jobs for those who would otherwise be unemployed, until such time as a balance is achieved.

Each year a joint House and Senate committee, made up from appropriate standing committees of both Houses, would make a detailed study of the Budget message, and by March 1, at the latest, introduce a joint resolution in both Houses embodying their recommendations. Thus, the responsibility for insuring that measures are taken to stimulate a full employment level of demand is placed squarely upon Congress.

The bill is designed to keep total spending in the economy at an adequate level. This is because spending creates demand—demand for the products of industry and, ultimately, demand for workers. And spending represents demand whether it is in the form of expenditures for consumer goods or expenditures for investment; that is, expansion of producers' facilities and equipment.

Thus the primary purpose of the bill is to stimulate expansion of private production—either directly by permitting a reduction of business costs, or indirectly by increasing consumer spending and thus expanding markets. There are any number of alternative methods for accomplishing both these purposes. Production costs can be lowered by legislation directed at easing the burden of business taxes, underwriting more liberal credit facilities, attacking monopolistic practices and prices, and by making technical research and assistance available to small business. Consumer buying can be stimulated by protection of minimum wages and collective bargaining rights, support of farm prices, encouragement of international trade, intelligent taxation policies, social security, inflation controls, and other similar measures.

What is not so commonly realized is that Government expenditures for public works and services are likewise directed toward reducing production costs and expanding markets in order to stimulate private enterprise. Regional development programs for river control (flood and soil erosion control, irrigation, navigation, and power projects), and conservation of natural resources enable businessmen to exploit the industrial potentialities of relatively backward areas of the country. They lower transportation and power costs, prevent soil erosion, one of the principal sources of waste in this country, and enhance the productivity of the land.

CREATE LOCAL MARKETS

Moreover, these projects connect the newly developed regions with the industrial markets of the north and east, and also create local markets for services and farm products as well as manufactured goods. Financial and planning assistance for States and localities in connection with housing and highway projects and urban redevelopment increases property values and makes possible the letting of innumerable and valuable contracts to the private construction industry. In this way, the tax resources of the Nation are increased and their burden more evenly distributed. And Government programs for health, education, slum clearance, sanitation, recreation, and so forth, greatly increase the productivity of industry's workers, and the general purchasing power of the country.

Clearly, then, there is a large number of different ways in which full employment might be stimulated through governmental action. But the most significant fact about the full employment bill is that it does not prescribe any particular method. No commitment is made as to what policies should be adopted to sustain demand.

PROVIDES FRAMEWORK

The bill does not itself provide a program; it is rather a framework within which our free enterprise system can develop a program. The aim is to coordinate the activities of various segments of the economy—industry, workers, consumers, and local and State governments. Only the Federal Government is in a position to see to it that all these activities are geared in the same direction, so that they do not counteract each other. The bill would enable Congress to act as an enlightened referee and guide in the democratic tussle between the pressures of competing groups in the economy.

In the past the Federal Budget has been concerned only with that part of national income which flows through governmental channels. The National Budget called for in the bill, however, would examine the effect of every Government action, i. e., every revenue measure and every public expenditure, upon total spending in the economy to see whether it was likely to reach a level high enough to utilize the full labor force, but not so high that it would cause inflation. A National Budget has been termed a "human budget," because it is concerned with jobs rather than purely fiscal issues. Under it every legislative proposal would be considered not only in terms of what it would cost, but also in terms of its effect on private industry's propensity to employ.

JOINT CONSIDERATION

It is in this sense that the bill would provide a coordinating framework—a perspective from which to view various measures and relate them to each other and to the full employment objective. That is why it is important at the same time to require that the various measures proposed in the annual budget message should be considered as a whole by a joint congressional body, rather than as separate unrelated bills by various committees interested only in isolated aspects of the general economic picture.

The final result of the legislation, if enacted, would be to place responsibility for the Federal Government's economic activities right where it belongs—not upon the administration, but upon the Members of Congress.

Under the bill, the responsibility of the businessman is exceedingly great. For the middleman this responsibility has a special significance and importance. The wholesaler straddles the market between the manufacturer and the retailer. Thus he is in a strategic position to influence price policies. Given a basic assurance of over-all demand, the wholesaler will almost invariably find it to his advantage to push for lower prices and the greater sales volume which follows. It is true, of course, that price determination depends upon the locus of economic power, and that the size of margins is not always subject to control by the wholesaler. But full employment will itself reduce the area of monopoly pressure upon wholesalers. And certainly there is already a wide field in which they can exert an expansionary influence.

TASK OF BUSINESSMAN

However, the expansionary responsibility of businessmen under the bill has a much broader scope than that of price alone. The legislation is intended to assure an adequate over-all market for goods and services in general. The task of the businessman would be to translate these market potentialities into specific goods of the right kind and amount at the right time and place. This is primarily a problem of market analysis, and it depends a great deal upon how effectively wholesalers function. For them the full employment bill represents an opportunity to make an important contribution to the goal of jobs for returning servicemen, a maximum level of national income, the preservation of free enterprise, and economic security for all the people of America.

Army Nurses

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, active and aggressive recruitment for the Army Nurse Corps ceased on May 30, 1945, although applications will be accepted in accordance with attrition from this point on.

Last week the office of the Surgeon General of the Army issued the following release:

The progress of the Army nurse recruitment program has reached such a favorable stage that intensive recruitment measures are no longer necessary. Applications of registered nurses, the only eligible class for commissions in the Army Nurse Corps, now pending, together with anticipated applications from graduating classes of registered nurses, are expected to bring the Army Nurse Corps to a near total of its required strength within the next few weeks.

While intensive recruiting measures for the Army Nurse Corps are being dropped, it is expected that the number of unsolicited applications received from eligible nurses will be sufficient to provide for normal replacements due to attrition and rotation. The attrition rate has averaged from 250 to 300 nurses per month. It is probable that at least an equal or perhaps a greater number of nurses will be required for rotation replacements and to compensate for other losses incurred through the Army readjustment plan.

Redeployment of the Army will result in a general shift of Army nurses to medical installations being established in the Asiatic-Pacific theater of war and will also provide for

the return of many nurses now in Europe to assignments with Army hospitals in the United States. Under current redeployment plans, the number of nurses required for the Army has been computed at slightly less than the number authorized prior to the surrender in Europe, but the progress of the war with Japan will determine the future strength of the Army Nurse Corps.

"The United States Army Medical Department is deeply gratified that the response of nurses has been adequate to fill its needs," said Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General, United States Army, in commenting on the success of the Army nurse recruitment campaign. "The American people have a right to be proud of their nursing profession whose members have responded so valiantly and adequately to our country's call."

This is exceedingly gratifying to those of us who, because of the strong statements of the War Department, voted for the draft legislation when it was before the House, to find that our contention that the nursing profession would furnish an adequate number of nurses by the volunteer method once they were adequately informed of the need, has proved itself true. Once again nurses have answered the call. In 1940 the Army Nurse Corps consisted of less than 1,000 nurses. In 1944 there were about 42,255. As of this date, June 1945, there are on duty 53,700. Applications being processed are about 2,000. (This last figure represents those that were firm at the time the recruitment of nurses was no longer a necessity.) Senior cadets serving with the Army number 2,139, a nurse total of 57,839. Anticipated graduations from the Cadet Nurse Corps in the next months: 3,000 in June; 550 in July; 3,000 in August; 11,000 in September.

It is a great joy to me, Mr. Speaker, to report to this House that once again the nurses have met the challenge magnificently.

Corn Not Available for Starch and Sirup But Is Available for Whisky

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Pekin, Ill., plant of the Corn Products Refining Co. closed down because its corn supply was exhausted. This is the second largest plant in the country with a daily capacity of 65,000 bushels. Other plants are unable to get sufficient stocks of corn and will have to curtail operations or perhaps close down entirely.

This means a shortage of starch and other products which are being used in the manufacture of war materials and in the production of vital civilian goods like corn sugar, corn sirup, and other scarce food products. I am advised that even in the great corn State of Iowa the supply of corn for poultry feed is practically cleaned up. It must be remembered that the amount of poultry, livestock, and dairy products which we are going to have during the next year depends upon our supply of corn and other grain products.

It seems almost unbelievable that in the face of this situation the WPB is authorizing a whiskey holiday for the month of July, which will result in the consumption of millions of bushels of corn and other feed grains, yet that is exactly what is happening. Instead of corn products for the war effort, instead of badly needed corn sugar and corn sirup, and instead of livestock feed we are going to have whiskey.

In substantiation of the above statements with reference to the rapidly developing shortage of corn, and under leave to extend my remarks I include the following telegram from Pendleton Dudley, executive secretary of the Corn Industries Research Foundation. Also, the following letter from the Penick & Ford, Ltd., a large manufacturer of corn and sugarcane products:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 11, 1945.*

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

For your information, we must advise that the Pekin, Ill., plant of Corn Products Refining Co. closed down on Saturday because its corn supply was exhausted. This is the industry's second largest plant, with daily capacity of 65,000 bushels. Other member plants, with corn stocks sufficient for only a few days ahead, and with daily receipts diminishing, are apprehensive of reduced grind.

This situation, developing despite this industry's unceasing efforts to obtain all possible corn for maximum operations, threatens seriously curtailed output of starch and other products essential to manufacture of war materials and vital civilian goods.

PENDLETON DUDLEY,
Executive Secretary,
Corn Industries Research Foundation.

PENICK & FORD, LTD., INC.,
New York, June 11, 1945.

The Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: I have been interested in reading your House Resolution No. 278. This corn situation is one which is giving us a good deal of worry, as I know it is others in our industry, and, as you perhaps know, it is an essential industry.

We have been finding great difficulty in buying the necessary corn, having purchased in all available markets without regard to freight rates as long as we did not exceed ceiling prices, and during the past week we have purchased less than 70 percent of our requirements, and stocks have become dangerously low.

I was advised this morning that one of the large plants of another company in the industry had been forced to close down for lack of corn, and that another large plant feared the same thing would happen, as they were unable to purchase more than 60 percent of their requirements.

I thought, in view of your representation, you might like to be advised of this position.

Sincerely,

F. T. BEDFORD,
President.

Milk Wasted

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, to me it was quite refreshing to learn from the morning newspapers that the Army is going to handle the food being supplied to the needy people in Europe rather than UNRRA. This is going to save a lot of people from starving to death. Apparently, the little confab between President Truman and Mr. Hoover in the White House is bearing fruit.

I notice by the newspaper that the War Food Administration's Food Distribution Order No. 79 is limiting the sale and delivery of milk to consumers. Consequently, in York, Pa., the dealers are now compelled to dump 7,500 quarts of milk daily down the sewer. With staple food becoming more scarce daily it seems to be too bad that this milk cannot find its way to the consumers, who not only sorely need it, but want it.

The food problem will not be solved for this country or for the world until the Government gets down to tending to its own business, that of operating the Government, and permits businessmen to operate business, and the farmers to farm their farms in the usual manner to raise food and get it into the market through the legitimate channels of trade.

This bureaucratic control is creating gigantic black markets as well as artificial scarcities.

The following news article to which I refer is from the York (Pa.) Dispatch:

SEVENTY-FIVE HUNDRED QUARTS OF MILK WASTED DAILY HERE—DEALERS PLACE BLAME ON WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION—WANT ORDER REPEALED

Immediate rescission by the War Food Administration of Food Distribution Order No. 79 was urged at the monthly meeting of the York County Milk Dealers' Association last night. It was brought out at the meeting, which was held at Bierman's Restaurant, that this order is contributing greatly to waste of good food.

Announcement was made that large quantities of milk are being wasted in York County as a result of this Government ruling. It was estimated that 7,500 quarts of skim milk are poured away daily in the York area.

The huge waste of milk is directly due to the order, which sets quotas for dealers, making it necessary to limit sales to consumers. The excess milk received by dealers from the farmers is separated and the cream stored for future sale. Sales to consumers are limited because each dairy is compelled by the War Food Administration to set aside a certain quantity each day for processing for the armed forces and lend-lease. The dealers' quotas for the manufacture of ice cream and other milk products also have been cut. It was brought out at the meeting that there is an excess over and above what the processing plants can handle for the Government, and dairymen should be allowed to sell this to civilian consumers.

Under present conditions, the producer is being penalized by receiving a lower price

for his product. The price to the producer is governed by what use is made of the milk. Because of limitation on sales of milk and cream to consumers, it was stated, a large percentage of the butterfat is classed in a lower-price bracket. The butterfat content of milk also partly governs the price to the producer.

The association stated that immediate relief from the order which governs the sale and distribution of milk and milk products to consumers in the York sales area is necessary. This food, which is now being wasted, should be saved for the consumer, the association urged. The York sales area takes in the city of York and all of York County except Spring Grove and Hanover districts.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on American foreign policy which I delivered last night, June 12 at 10:30 p. m. over the Columbia network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pessimism over our chances of preventing another major war is widespread in the United States today. The reasons for it are apparent. They include the inevitable compromises at San Francisco in drafting the charter of a world security organization, the fighting between French forces and Arabs in Syria and Lebanon, the lack of any understanding with Russia in regard to eastern Europe or Germay, and the jingoistic nationalism which is showing up everywhere, even here in the United States.

We have heard individuals argue recently that unless the charter of the international organization being drafted at San Francisco contains this or that provision it will not work, and we might as well give up any hope of lasting peace. Or we are told that unless Russia changes her policy overnight and adopts democratic principles, a war with this great ally is inevitable. That is a grim picture, because there just is not any chance that Russia's philosophy will change completely overnight. Or we hear that unless principles of justice and democracy are followed completely in the peace settlements, they will not endure and we will have another great war. A very good case can be made theoretically for any one of these pessimistic conclusions. But they are not true and it would be folly for us to base our foreign policy on such conclusions.

These grim and pessimistic conclusions are not true for two reasons. First of these is that the civilized world simply cannot permit them to come true. The weapons capable of destroying our civilization in another great war are not still awaiting future scientific development. They are here now. We and our allies are using them now, to win this war. Rocket projectiles, huge 6-ton earthquake bombs, the B-29's, our new incendiary bombs, and modern artillery and tanks are all that are necessary to destroy modern, industrial civilization.

If the Nazis had developed V-1 and V-2 bombs just a few years earlier, they might easily have won in Europe. I saw the terrible destruction which some of these weapons wrought in the great industrial Ruhr Valley of Germany, and ever since I have been thankful that our cities have been spared that horror. If Europe is restored to any kind of economic health in less than 5 or 10 years, it will be a miracle.

The weapons capable of destroying modern industrial civilization are here now, and it is only because we are winning and have the initiative and a great preponderance of power that we are spared that destruction. It would be suicide for any nation, great or small, to permit another great war to get started. It would be suicide for the Russians, the Poles, the Yugoslavs, the French, or the British as purely as it would be for us. That compulsion on the world's statesmen to find a peaceable way out somehow, regardless of differences in philosophy and language, will be tremendous, and it is a fact which our pessimistic prophets overlook.

The second reason why extreme pessimism is not justified is that permanent peace is possible in spite of defects in the World Security Organization and in spite of injustices in the peace settlements.

There has been a great deal of discussion of the veto power which the five permanent members of the Security Council will have on any action to stop future aggression. San Francisco was plunged in gloom for a week because of Russian insistence, now withdrawn, that the veto should extend even to discussion of a complaint by any aggrieved nation. Perhaps the Russians can veto discussion in Russia, but it is difficult to see how they could have stopped it in the international organization, no matter what language was written in the charter. I suspect that democracies like ours and Britain's would carry the right of free speech and discussion into any organization, regardless of Charter provisions.

But how about this veto on action, which any one of the major powers will have? Will it prohibit any effective action by the new organization? Theoretically, one could imagine many hypothetical cases in which a requirement would be fatal. Yet it is a fact that the League of Nations Covenant required a unanimous vote, not only of the great powers, but of all members, to declare a nation an aggressor. And the League did declare Japan an aggressor in 1931 and Italy an aggressor in 1936. The unanimity provision failed to stop action in the face of an aroused world public opinion.

Of course, if any one of the Big Three—the United States, Russia, or Britain—embarked on a course of aggression and conquest in the next few decades, we would have another world war. The security organization would have failed, but not because of the veto power. The possibility that one of these great nations may become an aggressor is one of the chances we run, and it is a hazard to peace whether the veto power exists or not. Personally, I have never favored the veto power, but neither do I go along with those who contend it is fatal to any chance of keeping the peace.

Likewise, injustices in the peace settlements appear to me to be inevitable, but I do not therefore believe that another war is a certainty, any more than I would admit that the injustices in the Versailles Treaty caused the present war. Hitler's desire to conquer the world led to war, and that desire had nothing to do with injustices in the Versailles Treaty, although Hitler did use them as a pretext. If the democracies, France and Britain particularly, had had enough vision and courage to stop Hitler's aggressions in time, they might have prevented this war.

Which leads me to the major point I wish to make tonight. The Charter drafted at San Francisco and even the establishment of the United Nations organization will be only the beginning, and not the end of the task of preventing another great war.

No organization for peace will be self-operating, and the chance of success for the United Nations organization will be in direct proportion to the support which the peoples and governments of its member nations give to it. The League of Nations, cumbersome as its machinery was, did not fail because the machinery did not function nor because of the injustices in the peace settlements. Those injustices were being corrected gradually and by peaceful means when Hitler came along and put an end to peaceful adjustment. And the League machinery did work to declare both Japan and Italy to be aggressors. But the peoples and governments of the member nations of the League failed in both instances to fulfill their obligations under the covenant and go to the assistance of China and Ethiopia.

Those aggressions seemed very remote. It was difficult for the people of League member nations to see how their security was threatened. Because there was no pressure from the people the governments did nothing to fulfill their obligations. Japan and Italy got away with their first little aggressions, and that paved the way for Hitler and his big aggressions.

And lest we in the United States become too complacent, it is well to remember that when the League imposed economic sanctions on Italy our exports to that aggressor increased considerably. We were as blind to consequences and as engrossed in our own affairs as the rest.

The United Nations Charter will have one great advantage over the League Covenant. Under the United Nations Charter, once the Security Council decides that force is required to stop an aggression, use of force will be automatic, requiring no further action by the governments of member states. Each member nation would have assigned agreed-upon quotas of military force—airplanes, warships, or divisions of troops—to the United Nations Organization, to be available on call of the Security Council. They would go into action against the aggressor as an international policing force. Under the League Covenant, once the League declared a nation to be an aggressor, it was up to each member nation to declare war on the aggressor to fulfill its obligation. That requirement stymied swift and decisive action, which is the only kind of argument that will stop a determined aggressor.

To me that provision, for joint use of force, is the heart of the Charter being drawn at San Francisco and gives us a far better chance than did the League to prevent another great war. What business has the United States individually interfering in a little war in Asia or Africa? That is a legitimate question and a tough one to answer. But few would argue that the United States does not have a definite and real stake in preserving peace and stability in the world and that our Nation should stand ready to do its share in preserving law and order among the nations.

I hope that the great influence of the United States will be exerted to the utmost in the interests of justice and freedom in the peace settlements. But I doubt whether we will have our way completely. That will not make war inevitable. We haven't yet achieved perfect democracy and equal rights for all here in the United States, but we're not going to war about it nor are we going to throw overboard our Constitution for that reason.

I have tried, in the brief time available tonight, to give you some of the reasons why I believe that extreme pessimism regarding our chances of preventing another war are not justified. If we begin the arduous and

never-ending task of building peace and justice into our world convinced that we are licked before we start, obviously we'll never succeed.

But let's not minimize the dangers either. We and our allies are late in establishing the machinery for joint international action to preserve peace and to adjust amicably international economic and political problems. It would have been far better had we gotten together 2 or 3 years ago, when some of us were pressing for speedy action. At that time, with German and Japanese aggression blotting out much of the world and threatening all nations, extreme nationalism, imperialism, and power politics did not look so attractive. All nations would have been more willing to sacrifice some national sovereignty in the interests of world peace and security. Now, with the threat receding, the task of achieving agreement is more difficult, national interests and imperialistic desires are more prominent.

Our international organization, as a result, will not be as strong, and there will be more compromises with principles in the peace settlements.

The only realistic answer to the situation for the United States is for us to remain strong and to use our strength to support justice and peace and democracy, both within the international organization and outside it. We'll just have to try harder.

We may have to fight little wars now and then to avoid big ones. We may have to accept temporarily settlements repugnant to us. We'll have to weigh and judge propaganda and counterpropaganda, and decide when compromise ends and fatal appeasement begins. It won't be easy, and it will be impossible unless all of us keep informed on the issues and insist that our Government make the right decisions.

In the United States it is the collective impact of the decisions which each of us reach individually about great issues which finally determines the course our Government follows. We each of us individually have the ultimate responsibility for the foreign policy of the United States. If we once again become so engrossed in our own domestic affairs, our individual jobs and concerns, that we overlook international issues, refuse to face unpleasant facts, and let our Nation and the world drift into another war, it will be our failure. The job will not be easy. The issues are complicated, and as soon as one problem is solved another arises.

There is always the chance that in spite of the best we can do, our efforts may fail and the world face another Great War. But it is only by trying, by making the tough decisions, by acting when necessary that we can justify in part, at least, the sacrifices of this war.

Tribute to the Late President Franklin D. Roosevelt by Miss June Thomson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, by Miss June Thomson, a student of the University of Pittsburgh.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Peace, his triumph will be sung
By some yet unmolded tongue
Far on in summers that we shall not see.
Peace, it is a day of pain
For one about whose patriarchal knee
Late the little children clung.
Oh, peace, it is a day of pain
For one upon whose hand and heart and brain.
Once the weight and fate of Europe hung.
Ours the pain, be his the gain!

* * * * *

On God and Godlike men we build our trust.
Hush, the Dead March wails in the people's ears;
The dark crowd moves, and there are sobs and tears;
The black earth yawns; the mortal disappears;
Ashes to ashes, dust to dust;
He is gone who seemed so great—
Gone, but nothing can bereave him
Of the force he made his own
Being here, and we believe him
Something far advanced in State,
And that he wears a truer crown
Than any wreath that man can weave him.
Speak no more of his renown,
Lay your earthly fancies down,
And in the vast cathedral leave him.
God accept him, Christ receive him.

—From "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington," by Alfred Lord Tennyson, 1852.

It was at that in-between hour of twilight when we first heard the news—that time of day when the shadowy finger of the chapel points across campus to the near-deserted cathedral. The word came first as a hush, a whisper. Our President is dead. We rejected belief. Then the rumor spread, was confirmed, gathered speed and noise till it boomed in our ears, and faded like the sound of a great amen. President Roosevelt is dead.

Inadequacy. Small, silent groups clustered in the tuckshops, needing the strength of companionship. Instinctively, voices lowered. The radio in the Owl office droned into the empty hall, "The little infantile victims at Warm Springs mourn." Inside, we were full, bursting to act, run, smash something with our fist, protest to the skies; we sat, dumb, staring, hands helpless in our laps. And when the first shock was over and the awful realization came, some of us cried openly and without shame. We were orphaned and alone. We had lost our leader. Who was to look after us now?

But more than that, we had lost a friend. In no other time has there been such a bond between the young and the Chief Executive. For most of us, Franklin Delano Roosevelt is the only President we remember. And he was with us through all those days of our childhood that will never be forgotten. We remember the worry lines, scars of the black depression, that traced our fathers' faces: erased by President Roosevelt. And the grim specter of leaner days that haunted our board; banished by our President. And then the renewed courage that came with him to look beyond tomorrow for a happy future. With a child's faith we depended on him. For he was more than a great man to be awed. He was a humanitarian, sprung from the people, feeling the pulse of the people. We cannot so quickly relegate the broad smile, the cigarette holder, and the old felt hat to history.

But after the first wave of grief is over, we shall not mourn him with tears and musty garlands. Retrospection was never his way when there were tasks to be done. So it will be with action and courage and strong words that we will honor him. It will be, not with tears but with plans for a lasting peace and the unconditional surrender of the enemy. We will honor him with the America and the bright new world that he lived for, fought for, and died for. We of the younger generation pledge him that.

Our compassion, rather, should go out to the peoples of the world at his demise. Theirs is the pain and loss. A man of action, he died in action. The tolling angelus, the flag, struck limp to half-mast, the very heavens wept at the bier of a great man.

The Negro and the Postwar Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Judge William E. Hastie, who is a member of the board of directors of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, and also on the staff or Howard University, delivered an able address before the House Committee on Postwar Military Policy on June 6 on the subject of military conscription. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been authorized by the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to express to this committee the opposition of the association to the pending bill to establish a system of compulsory and universal peacetime military service and training, and to state the reasons for that position. The formal resolution of our board expresses opposition to peacetime conscription "both because it is generally unsound in principle and because the present bill would permit the continuation of the present racial segregation and discrimination in the armed forces."

All of us should approach this grave issue with humility born of the tragic failure of this generation to prevent a World War, and our awareness that in supporting or opposing this measure we may be affecting, not just the course of American life, but the future of civilization. I say this because of my firm belief that civilization cannot survive another World War. If Rotterdam and Warsaw and Berlin and Tokyo cease to exist as cities as a result of this war, it is not fanciful to predict that another World War would destroy organized human society as we know it. I believe the British who have felt the weight of the V-2 bomb and with it the prediction of undreamed terrors to come realize that we cannot stand another war. The Russians with their tens of millions of casualties must be aware of it. We, the most fortunate great Nation with only a million casualties to date, must at least begin to know that the geometric progression of destruction from World War I to World War II cannot proceed to World War III without world chaos. Loss of life, destruction of property, disorganization of governments and economics cannot go much further than they already have gone in

this war without the total disintegration of modern civilization.

So as we consider the legislation now proposed, intended according to its own language to promote the peace and security of future generations, we must clearly understand and keep ever in the forefront of our thinking that our one common all overriding objective is the prevention of another world war. It is not the winning of another war but its prevention to which our energies must be devoted, because, if what I already have said is correct there can be no winner of such a war in the future—there can only be losers. If in fact another world war should come, our military preparedness would not save civilization. It would merely insure that we did our full share in destroying civilization. Therefore, if universal military training has any justification, that justification must be found in its effect as a deterrent of war. It is our belief that it would have no such effect.

If we launch a program of universal peacetime training and preparation for war, the only consequence reasonably to be anticipated is that all great nations will attempt to equal or surpass our military program. Their people will be told, even as we are now being told, that peace and security require that they prepare for war. A race for armaments is the one immediate consequence surely to be anticipated from the building of a vast peacetime military establishment in the United States. International competition to see what nations can be best prepared for war is the most certain path to war. The nations best prepared for war rattle the saber at the less prepared. If the less prepared nations sullenly bow to the threat of force it is only to gain time in which to make ready to match that force and ultimately to become strong enough for the rattling of their own sabers. The history of mankind is the story of the futility of this process as insurance against war. If temporary or immediate security is sometime won by vast military preparation, ultimate conflict is made only more certain and on a larger scale. Moreover, however pacific the mood in which universal peacetime military training and service may be conceived, there is the ever present danger that the nation with tremendous peacetime military strength will become antagonistic rather than persuasive in dealing with its neighbors. Its international diplomacy, impatient with those too stupid or too stubborn to be persuaded by reason, comes to rely upon the implicit threat of armed might as the ultimate persuader. Its military men, confident in their strength, become impatient to test the cutting edge of the weapon they have forged. Thus, those well prepared for war become war minded. Less prepared rivals hurry to become well prepared so that they can afford to be war minded too. In my judgment we must make up our minds that there is no tolerable future in an international jungle in which each lion calls himself the king of the beasts and keeps sharpening his claws to prove it. And it does not help for us to say we are a benevolent lion who sharpens his claws only for self-protection. Neither the other lions nor the less powerful beasts will be reassured.

In brief, if one nation plays the game of all-out peacetime military preparation, the likelihood is that all will play; and if all play, no one wins. It is psychologically impossible, even as it is a contradiction in words, for any nation long to preserve the peace by peacetime mobilization and training of men for war.

There is an additional unfortunate aspect of the proposal for peacetime conscription now. No thinking person can avoid grave concern as he observes signs of increasing distrust between the two nations with greatest resources and influence today, the United States and Russia. It is futile for us to say Russia is responsible or for Russia to say that we are responsible for the deterioration of our relations. Each has the task of convincing the other that they can exist and function in this contracting world in peace and mutual confidence, and no useful purpose is served by either saying the other must make the first move. By the same token, any action by either tending to increase the distrust of the other is a grave disservice to essential harmony, particularly in the present delicate state of international relationships. It is worse than useless to say in San Francisco that international organization in the interest of world security supported by military forces sufficient for joint international action against an aggressor is essential to world peace if at the same time we act in Washington on the premise of the pending bills that we must be a greater military power than our neighbors so that we can take independent military action.

We cannot build an effective organization founded on international confidence and at the same time take the most drastic peacetime military step in our national history as token of our lack of faith in international organization.

What I have said up to this point is but an outline of certain fundamental arguments against peacetime conscription. Other witnesses will, no doubt, elaborate and document these arguments. However, I wish to devote my remaining time to considerations of special importance in the mind of the Negro citizen.

The bill now proposed would be a signed but otherwise blank check to be filled in by the Army and Navy as they may desire from to time. Specifically, all details of the year of compulsory military training are left to regulations to be prescribed by the President, and, of course, the function of working out the plans of training and other details to be embodied in such regulations is the responsibility of the Army and Navy. Indeed, the military command has already indicated informally at some length its present thinking about details of training.

The Negro citizen, for reasons which I shall elaborate, is unalterably opposed to legislation giving the military such blanket authority, uncontrolled by legislative safeguards against abuse.

It is no secret that the Negro today is deeply resentful at much of the treatment he has received at the hands of the Army and Navy. For present purposes, it is material to cite only aspects of that treatment which would be expected to carry over into peacetime military training unless Congress shall impose appropriate legislative controls.

In peacetime, and even until this war was well advanced, the Navy excluded Negroes from naval service, except as messmen. In 1935, Rear Admiral Andrews frankly expounded this policy to the NAACP, saying that the restriction of colored men to the messmen branch "will best meet the needs and efficiency of the Navy" and that recruiting stations are instructed not to accept Negroes as apprentice seamen. Even the partial relaxation of this rule in the exigencies of this war leaves large number of technical specialties closed to the Negro seaman. Entire areas of naval service, for example naval aviation, are still completely closed to Negroes. We have no reason to believe that the Navy contemplates the use of Negroes in any capacity other than messmen when it returns to peacetime basis.

Before the present wartime expansion the Army restricted Negroes to very limited opportunities of service in the Infantry, Cavalry and Quartermaster Corps. And though the war has brought substantial relaxation of these strictures the types of training and service open to a Negro within a particular arm or service are still seriously restricted. For example, except for the so-called attached units Negro enlisted men in the Medical Corps have been restricted to sanitary companies. The work of these units is miscellaneous common labor in the field of health and sanitation. It may be common labor in and about hospitals; it may be drainage for mosquito control; it may be the digging of latrines in the theater of war or any other labor service required for sanitation. All of this is necessary work. Much of it is particularly unpleasant work. Certainly the Negro should do his share of it. But so far as I know, there is not a single white sanitary company in the Army. I can be positive that there were none in 1942, but there were numerous such Negro units. I also know that this particular discrimination was blocked for a time by a fair-minded and able staff officer. But when he went into the field, where incidentally he ultimately presided at the surrender of the German armies, someone else arranged to make the sanitary company the exclusive business of Negro soldiers. I mention this particularly because so long as Congress leaves the military with unfettered discretion to discriminate as it may please in training and service, the types and extent of discrimination will depend as a practical matter upon the will of the officers who are administering or supervising particular programs. This Congress should not permit.

But the sanitary company illustration is not unique. Early in the war the Air Forces organized certain special Negro battalions called aviation squadrons, separate. There were no equivalent white organizations. So goes the business of making particular labor services exclusively or very largely the function of Negroes. At the other end of the scale, we find Negroes excluded entirely from certain much sought after types of training and service. For example, even today the Air Forces will not accept a Negro pilot in the Air Transport Command. I know a Negro pilot who for a considerable time ferried bombers across the Atlantic for Canada. But being a citizen of the United States he preferred to render this essential service for his own country. But our Air Forces did not want and still do not want Negroes in this work. Again at a time when the Army was trying desperately to recruit 10,000 young men with mathematical and other scientific training to learn to be meteorologists and weather observers, all qualified Negroes were rejected. The Army took the position that it has seven Negroes in this field and that was enough.

To approach the matter somewhat differently, training opportunities are defined and limited by the number and types of combat and service organizations already organized or authorized. Negroes are segregated into separate units. If no Negro units of a certain type are authorized, no Negroes will be admitted to that type of training. Or if one or two Negro units are authorized, only enough Negroes will be accepted for training to fill those units. Thus able and qualified Negroes are repeatedly denied training for which they are qualified, because the Army insists on racially segregated units but has established no Negro units in that area. It is to be anticipated that this discrimination in training opportunities will persist or even be aggravated if the Congress gives the military the unlimited discretion which the proposed legislation would confer.

I think it must be clear that the basic cause of racial discrimination in training opportunities is the insistence of the Army that Negroes be restricted to racially segregated combat and service units. Not only

does this repeatedly deprive the Army of the services of the most able and best trained Negroes in the work for which they are best fitted, it also imposes a tremendous burden upon those who try to plan and organize the Army.

I believe any thorough inquiry will show that the over-all military policy of racial segregation is inefficient, uneconomical and injurious to morale.

Let us see how the segregated system works. It works badly from the very beginning. To maintain the segregated system the Army is forced to racial discrimination in induction. If you choose men by chance as their names come up or under the proposed legislation as they become eligible for training, you cannot get just enough Negroes for an arbitrary number of Negro units. Sometimes there will be more Negroes in a particular time and place than the Negro units will accommodate, sometimes there will be less. So to make the segregated system work, the military must instruct those in charge of selection to furnish a certain number of white men and a certain number of colored men at a given time. In Connecticut this almost caused the collapse of selective service when the local officials refused to call whites while Negroes were not being called. The racial quota system caused similar dissatisfaction in the South.

Once this first stage of calling men for training and service is passed, the proper placement of Negroes is handicapped by the scheme of segregated units. If we take the Army and Navy as a whole, there are almost always places where a man's special skills can be used. But when we consider the limited opportunities available at any one time in the limited number and types of Negro units, it will often happen that the available vacancies do not fit the capabilities of the available men. When one group of Negro selectees arrives at a reception center, there may be vacancies in Negro labor units only. Men far more useful for other service must go in those units along with the totally unskilled. At another time there are numbers of vacancies where the more capable men are needed. If the then available new recruits are principally unskilled, they must be sent to fill these units. Thus, the practical administration of the segregated system is incompatible with the effective placement of the individual where he will be most useful. It is no more possible to provide opportunities in the segregated 10 percent of the Army equal to those in the remaining 90 percent than it is possible to duplicate in a Jim Crow coach the many facilities of a deluxe passenger train.

I have already discussed in some detail the way in which the rule of segregation prevents the effective use of Negro specialists in the Air Forces and in the Medical Department. Such waste of special skills throughout the Army and Navy is the inevitable result of the policy which requires that Negroes serve with and for Negroes only.

From another approach, the time and effort wasted by high-ranking officers in Washington and in the field in a vain attempt to make the segregated system work well is tremendous. I observed this process in the War Department for more than 2 years. Again and again new types of military units have been organized for white personnel. There have also been large increases in the number of units of preexisting types. Whenever any substantial increase in white personnel occurs the proportion of Negroes in the Army is thrown out of balance. Then begins a great expenditure of time and effort to find some place in the Army where the command is willing to use additional Negro soldiers. The various arms and services are canvassed to find who will take some more Negro units and of what type. At times, no one wants any more Negro units. Then someone must be ordered to take so many thousand Negroes and to work out a plan for their utilization. Thus haphazardly Negro units are organized. The exigencies of the policy of racial segregation rather than considerations of military advantage come to be the controlling factor in building 10 percent of the Army. All of this is too high a price to pay for the maintenance of a segregated pattern which serves no useful purpose.

One of the most ridiculous and extreme manifestations of this practice is to be found in Puerto Rico, where the Army has introduced a system of separate colored and white Puerto Rican units. I do not know what test of racial identity is applied or can be applied, but the mere matter of practical difficulty does not deter those who make a fetish of racial segregation.

Racial discrimination is a matter of concern in still another connection. The proposed year of military training would not only provide a reserve, it would serve as a feeder for the Regular Army and Navy and National Guard. The pending bills so indicate by encouraging such active service as a substitute for the acceptance of reserve status. But the Negro, after finishing his year of training, faces serious and varied racial restrictions upon his opportunity for service in the Regular Military and Naval Establishments.

In only five States and the District of Columbia is the Negro admitted to the National Guard under any circumstances, and in each of those five States there is but one small segregated Negro unit authorized. Regular enlistments of Negroes in the Navy are still limited to the messman branch. The Regular Army in fact, if not in theory, discriminates against Negroes in the matter of qualifying for commissions. I have seen a Negro graduate of the Reserve Officer Training Corps denied a commission because the Army would not have Negro officers in the branch for which he had qualified. I have seen a distinguished Negro Reserve officer after the last war denied a Regular Army commission, not because of any personal or professional deficiency, but on the stated ground that Negroes are unfit to be officers of the Regular Army. Negro college students in the North and West are almost never admitted to advanced ROTC, where they can qualify for commissions. And in the few Negro colleges where there are ROTC units the ranking graduates are in fact not permitted to qualify for Regular Army commissions despite specific regulations giving them that privilege. All of these are indicia of the basic pattern of discrimination which should be corrected in any event, and particularly if Negroes are to go into the peacetime Army and Navy by compulsion rather than consent.

A final thought and I shall have finished. Whatever private individuals may do, or even the States within their exclusive sphere, it is a basic concept that our Federal Government shall not make racial distinctions in the administration of the national business. This should be especially true of the military establishment whose very mission is the safeguarding of the institutions of a democracy. Under the proposed legislation the Army and Navy can say to every American youth, "You shall live 1 year of your life under a system of racial segregation and discrimination imposed and administered by the Federal Government." We gain little if now and in the future the military protects us from Hitler's brand of racism, yet itself exemplifies and by its own organization impresses upon the minds of our young men a domestic brand of racism equally at variance with democratic ideals.

To many of us the entire plan of peacetime conscription seems unsound. But beyond that I can assure the committee that Negroes generally, and large numbers of white persons, believe it to be the responsibility of Congress to require in unequivocal language that in the Army and the Navy the selection of individuals for training, the determination of the type of training which an individual shall receive and the organization of units both for training and for service shall be accomplished without regard to or distinction on account of race.

Women's Rights and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter printed in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 12 on the subject of Women's Rights and the Constitution, which letter was addressed to the Bulletin by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, Democratic committeewoman from the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN'S RIGHTS AND THE CONSTITUTION

My attention has just been called to an article appearing in your paper last month concerning a Committee Against the Equal Rights Amendment. This committee is headed by a very charming lady, Miss Gertrude Ely, whom I have known for many years; but I fear, in this case at least, that Miss Ely is off on the wrong foot.

I wonder if she does not realize the Democratic platform contains a plank recommending the equal rights amendment. This plank was put in the platform by a large majority of votes of the platform committee at Chicago last summer, of which I was a member. With practically no exceptions, everyone who ran for a Federal office accepted that platform, and it may interest the opposition to know that both United States Senators from Pennsylvania support the equal rights amendment as well as the majority, if not all, of our Democratic Congressmen. Certainly these men would not support the amendment if they did not believe that women should have equality.

ONE THOUSAND DISCRIMINATIONS

There are at present on the statute books of all the States throughout the Nation more than a thousand unjust discriminations against women, particularly working and married women. I venture to say that most of the women who oppose the amendment would not for one moment accept the injustices that millions of other women are forced to endure because women are not yet persons under the Constitution of the United States.

We have advanced far in this country, but the discriminations against women are still founded on prejudice, ignorance, and fear. Prejudice against a movement to raise the

legal status of any group is always present no matter how worthy the cause. Ignorance, especially regarding the equal rights amendment, is explainable on the part of women of independent means like Miss Ely and her friends, who do not realize what millions of other women are up against.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

Her group states they want equal opportunities for women. I wonder if they realize how working and married women are denied equal opportunities. In a number of States married women cannot enter into business without the consent of their husbands before the courts. They are denied equal guardianship of their children; women in a third of our States are still denied jury service, although they may be tried by a jury of men for any crime on the calendar. All men, regardless of color, may now serve on juries, but not all women.

The opposition to the amendment agrees that there are numerous injustices against women which should be removed, but they insist this must be done by State action alone, ignoring the fact that what one legislature may do another may undo.

In the article above mentioned, stress is laid on the opposition of the Political Action Committee of the CIO. No wonder the officials of the CIO, as well as of the AFL, are against the equal-rights amendment, for they fear what is going to happen to some of the less-skilled men workers when the war is over.

Millions of women working in war jobs have proven that they can do just as good work as the men, so they are told by Miss Frieda Miller, of the Department of Labor, that they must go back to what are known as service trades. Why should not a skilled woman be permitted to choose her form of work the same as a man?

HOURS OF WORK

During the war no one has brought the boogy-boo of women's health to the fore, for women have been working just as long hours as men and taking it. The long workday has gone forever, so that after the war women will be able to work the same hours as men without any ill effects on their health. Secretary Perkins says women must not do any night work after the war, leaving out of consideration entirely the question of whether it suits a women better to work at night or whether she prefers it. The special laws that have been passed in various States forbidding night work for women have always been brought about by the insistence of either ladies of leisure, whose hearts beat for the poor working girl, or by labor leaders who fear the competition of women and who know that some forms of night work call for overtime pay, and they prefer to collect that themselves. Have you ever heard of labor leaders opposing night work for women who scrub office floors or for nurses, who take care of the sick all hours of the night?

EMMA GUFFEY MILLER,
Democratic National Committeewoman.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

No Discrimination!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Sara E. Southall, supervisor of employment since 1920 of the International Harvester Co. The article appears in a June issue of the Church Woman and is entitled "No Discrimination!" It follows:

NO DISCRIMINATION!

(By Sara E. Southall)

The current importance of full manpower utilization is being made clear to the American public by our entrance into the critical stages of the war. In the words of James F. Byrnes, until recently the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion: "We have committed our reserves. * * * We must * * * concentrate on getting the right workers into the right jobs and places at the right time." Beyond the military requirement is a moral duty, for if we are fighting a war to preserve ideals implicit in Christian democracy, it is imperative to allow a part in this war to all who desire it, regardless of their color, religion, or nationality.

Early in the defense program the Federal Government took steps to assure the participation of minority groups in the war effort. On June 25, 1941, President Roosevelt's Executive Order 8802 forbade discrimination in defense industry and Government because of race, creed, color, or national origin. Under the provisions of this order a Committee on Fair Employment Practice was established to administer the Government's nondiscrimination policy. The present FEPC operates within the more recent Executive Order 9346, which set up a new committee in May 1943 to function as an independent agency with wartime responsibilities. Congress, in passing the national war agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944–45, including an item of $500,000 for FEPC. Through 15 regional offices and suboffices, the Committee investigates complaints of discrimination forbidden by the order and takes appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

The problems faced by FEPC have been and are complex, requiring tact, ingenuity, and patience in those who work for their adjustment. After nearly 2 years of experience as a member of the Committee and after many additional years of work with minority groups on a local community basis, it is clear to me that we have shut our eyes in a laissez faire attitude that has extended to many of the issues. There are people who believe that these problems can be met only by long-term education and planning. Although both are certainly desirable, war needs could not wait for the testing of such methods. Personally, I am not disturbed at the amount of discussion and fearfulness among groups who want to use only the slow educational approach to race problems. As a prominent citizen said to me in a city where the Committee recently held hearings, "We realize that FEPC hearings only mirror ourselves to us, yet you are the yeast that starts the bread rising in our community and many others. You show us what it is our job to do." The churches, and especially the women of the church must assume leadership in local situations. The Committee counts on them.

FEPC examiners always attempt to establish good relationships with the personnel officers of firms under investigation. Such machinery is helpful in meeting new questions as they arise, and its general usefulness is illustrated by these two cases:

A large tractor company in Peoria had no colored employees in May 1942, but after a complaint was made to the President of the United States and later referred to FEPC, the firm put into effect a plan for integrating Negro workers. They were introduced into the factory in unskilled jobs and subsequently were upgraded in accordance with ability. The expanding concern also began to accept women employees, but at first did not take Negro women. Intervention by FEPC and WMC resulted in the hiring of 3 Negro women, and 50 more were employed after a visit to the plant by the Committee's regional director. In June 1944 an FEPC examiner again visited Peoria to discuss pending complaints and the success of the company's program. A subsequent letter to the Committee stated:

"The attitude of this company toward the group is this: They are not colored employees; they are ——— (name of firm) employees and are treated in exactly the same manner as other employees."

The outlook for postwar employment in this plant is favorable.

During the year following October 1943, nonwhite employment in a large Chicago plant rose from less than 300 to more than 3,000. The first complaints processed against this firm by FEPC involved refusal to hire Negros and the latter ones a failure to upgrade. Negro workers now are employed in 57 classifications throughout the plant. Complaints of discrimination are given prompt attention by officials of the company with whom the Committee's regional office has an especially cooperative relationship.

Occasionally individual employers are strongly adverse to hiring members of certain minority groups and are convinced that all members of such groups have special characteristics which make them undesirable employees. Cases of the sort mentioned below present a special challenge to FEPC examiners.

Officials of a New Jersey firm manufacturing explosives stated that they could not use Negroes in assembly operations because, he claimed, the skin of colored people made them highly susceptible to tetral poisoning. In this case FEPC pointed out that the problem really lay in the conditions of work which exposed all employees, white or colored, to poisoning of this type. The exposure was corrected, and within a short time Negroes were being hired for assembly work.

In another instance, a complainant told the Committee's Los Angeles office that the co-owner of a small west-coast manufacturing company had been about to hire her as a stenographer, but changed his mind when he discovered that she was Jewish. When the executive was interviewed he stated the incumbent workers, because of their prejudices, would disrupt the office should the complainant be hired. He then said that he had to dismiss two or three previous Jewish employees because they wanted to take over the place after a few days. During the long conference which ensued, the FEPC examiner stressed the responsibility of the employer regarding nondiscrimination under Executive Order 9346 and under the provisions of his war contracts. In addition to realizing this responsibility, the official finally conceded that it was unfair to generalize on the basis of experience with only two or three members of the minority group. The complainant was hired, with no repercussions.

There are cases in which management expresses a desire to hire qualified minority workers to meet manpower needs but is restrained by fear of work stoppage. For example:

A chemical company in Philadelphia reported that an effort to use Negroes in jobs above the level of laborer had resulted in a walkout. Conferences and a trip through the plant by a Committee examiner revealed that, in addition, the company was faced with complex problems in training inexperienced help for highly technical work. Many suggestions were made, and after several additional meetings the firm established a new industrial relations department, through which it now hires and trains white and nonwhite workers. Negroes have been upgraded to skilled

work and are being trained as chemical operators. One colored man now is a leader in charge of a mixed crew of riggers.

Discrimination may involve difficulties that require not only the attention of the regional offices of FEPC and the contracting agencies of the Government, but also continued efforts of their representatives at the national level.

One such case involved a shipbuilding company located in the deep South, on the Gulf coast. The problem here included charges of brutality toward Negroes, refusal to upgrade Negro workers, and refusal to hire Negro applicants for welders' jobs.

Until January 1943 the company employed Negroes only as laborers and janitors. One year later it was using colored workers as rough painters, but refused to upgrade them. At the same time the local USES reported to FEPC that although there were 100 openings for welder trainees, the firm had refused to hire a Negro applicant referred to it through union channels.

In February 1944 colored employees walked out in protest against several incidents of violence in which company guards with State trooper status severely beat Negro workers. Shortly after the disturbance, meetings between management and FEPC resulted in the setting up of remedial measures and the promise of the company to discipline the offending guards.

The case involving welders remained pending until January 1945. FEPC pointed out that painters and grinders had been upgraded successfully and that Negro welders were working harmoniously at plants nearby. After final negotiations in Washington, the contracting agency announced that the shipyard would hire colored welders laid off by a neighboring firm. On January 8, 15 Negroes went to work at the company as production welders. No trouble has been reported, and management has stated that 200 colored welders will be employed.

The necessity for full wartime employment has been stressed. Our postwar obligations are equally clear. We cannot hope to have full employment and a going economy if we exclude large segments of our people from job opportunities and thus deny them consumer strength. This fact has special significance for the South, whose 10,000,000 Negroes constitute almost 24 percent of the total population. Without equitable and elastic employment patterns, the Southern States will be without consumers and must forego regional prosperity.

Reductions in Tariff Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to Members of the Senate from the National Brotherhood of Operative Potters and also a statement submitted to the Senate Finance Committee:

NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF OPERATIVE POTTERS,
East Liverpool, Ohio.

DEAR SENATOR: In view of the fact that big business, closely allied with international bankers, in a desire, we believe, to bring about a drastic reduction in American wage scales—thus lowering America's workers standard of living—by successfully prevailing upon State Department officials to agree to 50-percent reductions in present tariff rates, have seemingly closed the pages of most American newspapers and all of the radio news casts to the views of those opposing a further reduction in tariff rates—through secret negotiations—our organization is appealing to you, honored with membership in the United States Senate, to work and to vote against authorizing the State Department, through our entry into grade treaties or trade agreements, to reduce present tariff rates a further 50 percent.

The hearings held by the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee show that small business unanimously opposed the Congress delegating its authority to reduce tariff rates. The reason for such is apparent in that small business does not engage in foreign trade, and the power sought by the State Department will place most of our employers, those employing 500 or less workers, at a greater disadvantage than now exists. The census of 1939 reports that 93 percent of the 184,230 manufacturing concerns employ less than 500 workers.

Such authorization to reduce tariff rates 50 percent will, if delegated, we believe, result in serious injury to many American industries, especially those smaller industries the products of which compete in America's markets with products of lower-paid workers in foreign countries, will jeopardize American wage and living standards, is contrary to the policy set forth and declared by the Congress in creating in 1936 and in revising in 1938 the merchant marine laws and will transfer the job opportunities of America's workers to the lower-paid workers in foreign countries.

The United States Tariff Commission, in a report on the competitive conditions in the pottery industry stated:

"The landed costs, duties paid, of Japanese articles in the United States had been much below domestic [American] costs of production." It can happen again.

The United States Tariff Commission, on its report to the Senate, April 1945, states pages 2–38:

"Pottery production is technically more efficient in the United States than in all other countries, although in all countries such efficiency has increased in recent years. So far as costs are concerned, however, the greater efficiency has continued to be more than offset by the lower wages in the pottery industries in other countries."

Within the next year or so, assuming that the present bickering, and, the playing of power politics at San Francisco—the policy of might alone makes right—will soon end in the creation of a world organization, founded on real justice for all peoples, our industrial tycoons will, we believe, start delivering our most modern mechanized automatic mass production machines to production plants in foreign countries.

About that time, or sooner, we all look forward (with the end of the war with Japan) to the return of millions of our loved ones who offered their lives, if necessary, to make the world a better place in which to live. These returning heroes will need and must have profitable jobs, in American production plants, in which they may earn their own living. In addition, most of the munition production plants will have closed down, and, additional millions, now employed, will seek and must find other jobs.

Where will either our returning heroes, or, those who labored as soldiers on war production lines find such jobs?

A careful analysis of the assertions of those demanding that the United States Congress authorize attachés of the State Department, only a few of whom ever had any experience, either in business or as productive workers, show:

(a) They expect that American capitalists and large industrialists will invest some fifteen or more billions of American dollars in production plants in foreign countries;

(b) That our tariff rates must be lowered—through secret negotiations, without knowledge of either the American Congress or the American people until after the deals have been consummated—to a point which will insure these American capitalists and large industrialists dividends on their investments;

(c) That despite the definite and official findings of the United States Maritime Commission of American production costs—principally due to higher wages—being 100 percent higher than comparable foreign costs those American workers who are dependent for their livelihood on the production of competitive articles must prduce under wages and working conditions which allow only a cost or wage differential of from 25 to 30 percent.

(d) Such a policy will nullify the wage standards set by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and will set aside the job and wage protection which Americ a's workers secure through the proper enforcement of the restrictive immigration laws.

Testimony presented to the Finance Committee, and to the Ways and Means Committee, not refuted by any facts—just a cold denial—by the State Department officials, show that numerous American industries have been seriously injured and that the job opportunities of America's workers have been transferred to lower paid workers in other countries.

With reference to the plea that trade treaties or trade agreements promote peace you will note on page 34 of the Ways and Means Committee that Secretary Clayton stated: "I do not think any responsible official of the State Department ever said that the adoption of the reciprocal trade agreement program would promote peace."

We appeal to your deep interest and your responsibility in the welfare and prosperity of the American people, and we sincerely suggest that present chaotic world conditions do not justify any authorization for further reductions in tariff rates nor an extension of the present legislation beyond the duration of the present war.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. DUFFY,
President.

P. S.—Attached hereto is a copy of the presentation, on behalf of the officers and members of our brotherhood, to the Senate Finance Committee, June 1, 1945.

STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Finance Committee, in the short time alloted to me, on behalf of the officers and members of the National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, I will try to present sufficient reasons, from America's industrial workers' viewpoint, why the pending legislation, especially that section authorizing further reductions in tariff rates, should be rejected.

I ask permission that I may file a brief setting forth additional reasons why this authorization should be rejected.

Great emphasis has been laid on the allegation that workers employed in export industries receive higher wages than those workers dependent for their livelihood on allegedly tariff protected industries.

WAGES HELD DOWN BY COMPETITIVE IMPORTS

Workers employed in mechanized and patent-protected industries, where labor costs are low, and where margins between costs and sales prices are ample, and which indus-

tries are not forced to compete with low wage products of foreign countries, have opportunities through collective bargaining for better wages than workers in industries such as pottery, where the products of our workers have to compete in the American market with products which are delivered into American markets at less than our costs of production.

We believe that an employer, if he is to continue to provide jobs for workers, must secure a reasonable profit on his investment.

SMALL BUSINESS PROFITS SMALL

The pottery industry has been thoroughly investigated by two Government agencies in the past 10 years. In both cases the reports of these agencies were made public. The Tariff Commission in 1936 issued a report showing that the employers, without any allowance for depreciation or obsolescence, retained some 7.1 percent. The Office of Price Administration in 1943 found that the industry had a margin of less than 5 percent.

The workers in the American pottery industry do not receive the wages they are entitled to. Our workers, through their economic strength, representing more than 90 percent of all the workers in the industry, would, I am sure, secure better wages if the products of their labor were not forced to compete in American markets with competitive products of workers in foreign countries which products are delivered into American markets at less than our costs of production.

We do not ask for high tariffs. We are not isolationists nor are we exclusionists.

We appeal to the Congress for tariff rates which will permit the products of our workers to have an equal opportunity of sale in American markets. In so doing are we un-American?

CONGRESS FAVORS MAINTAINING WAGE SCALES AND LIVING STANDARDS

Are we to understand that the Congress of the United States, in enacting legislation in 1936 and again in 1938, years after the first authorization for our entry into trades treaties or trade agreements, which legislation provided, I quote, "that American wage scales and standards of living be maintained," intended that such wage scales and living standards would be maintained only for a certain group of America's wage workers?

It is our understanding that tariff rates, in the past, were supposedly based on the differences in costs of production, American costs and foreign costs. It is our understanding that with the negotiation of trade treaties this principle has been eliminated on the assertion that differences in costs of production cannot be definitely ascertained.

AMERICAN PRODUCTION COSTS 100 PERCENT HIGHER THAN FOREIGN

However, one of our largest and most important Government agencies, entrusted with billions of dollars of Government moneys, has, apparently, found no difficulty in ascertaining the differences in the costs of production, American and foreign.

The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee disclose that the Maritime Commission, before the war definitely ascertained that American costs of construction or production was 100 percent higher than comparable costs in foreign countries.

In so finding the Maritime Commission, paying out hundreds of million of taxpayers' dollars, had to be certain its findings were correct. The law under which these findings were made, section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, revised in 1938, reads:

"The construction differential approved by the Commission shall not exceed 33⅓ percent (American costs) of the construction cost of the vessel paid by the Commission except that in cases where the Commission possesses convincing evidence that the actual differential is greater than that percentage, the Commission may approve an allowance not to exceed 50 percent of such cost, upon the affirmative vote of four members."

You will note that the law definitely requires that the Commission must "possess convincing evidence that the actual difference is greater than 33⅓ percent" of American costs. Further, that such difference in costs must be found affirmatively by four of the five members.

Emphasizing such findings Chairman Land, in testimony shown on page 198 of the Ways and Means Committee, cites cases as illustrative; one case where a foreign-built vessel which cost $982,000 would cost $2,002,000 if built in American shipyards, and another case where a vessel built in foreign shipyards at a cost of $600,000 would cost $1,000,000 when built in American shipyards.

Yet, despite these definite findings of the Maritime Commission we find Chairman Land, in an address at Mobile, Ala., May 22, 1945, which address was widely publicized, advocating the adoption of the pending legislation, including the presumed reduction of 50 percent in present tariff rates, and stating, "I am a 50-50 guy and certainly believe in reciprocity."

CONSISTENCY?

Are we to understand that Chairman Land, presumably one of the leading figures in foreign trade activities in the present administration, advocates that 50 percent of the American market shall be supplied with competitive products of foreign countries? If Chairman Land really believes in reciprocity does he believe that American shipyard workers should reciprocate their protective wage scales and living standards, secured through legislation, with America's industrial workers dependent for their livelihood on the production of articles which must compete with lower cost competitive products of other countries?

We do not believe that those Members of the Congress representing the great majority of States and congressional districts, where there are no shipbuilding yards, are justified in supporting legislation which, after an official and undisputed finding that American costs of production are 100 percent higher than foreign costs, require the products of their constituents to compete in American markets with products of other countries on a basis of 25 percent or 30 percent tariff rates or cost differentials.

The Congress has enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act. That legislation requires that in the production of articles which move across State lines that minimum wages of 40 cents per hour must be paid for not more than 40 hours and 60 cents for hours worked in excess of sixty hours.

FOREIGN PRODUCTIVITY REDUCED ONLY 20 PERCENT

We contend that inadequate tariff rates which permit the delivery into American markets of competitive products of workers of foreign countries at less than our costs of production will nullify such beneficial legislation.

Secretary Clayton told the Ways and Means Committee that the productive capacity of England, France, and Belgium, as I recall his testimony, had been reduced some 20 or 25 percent. We are also told that Japan and Germany will not be competitive factors in world markets for many years to come. Having been forced to accept lower wages than we believe we should have received due to the excessive competition, first of Germany, and, in later years of Japan, of course, that is music to our ears. Yet, such statements are not backed, and as yet, cannot be backed by any facts.

We do not know what the facts will be in 1947 or 1948. We do know that under what we believe to be an unwarranted delegation of the constitutional responsibilities accepted by those who sought election to the Congress of the United States that trade treaties or trade agreements entered into by the State Department in 1946 or 1947 will be binding on the United States for a period of 3 years thereafter, or into 1949 or 1950.

Surely, such a gamble is well worth looking into before we enter into it in view of the chaotic world conditions now existent.

Stress has been laid by advocates of the pending legislation on the assumption that our mechanized industries can compete with products of any foreign country, and, that low wages result in high labor costs.

EFFICIENCY OFFSET BY LOWER WAGES

We are concerned with the competition of pottery produced in foreign countries and sold in American markets in competition with the products of our workers.

The United States Tariff Commission, in its report to the Senate, 1945, on pages 2-38 states. "Pottery production is technically more efficient in the United States than in all other countries, although in all countries such efficiency has increased in recent years. So far as costs are concerned, however, the greater efficiency has continued to be more than offset by the lower wages in the pottery industries in foreign countries."

This report indicates that our industry has been found to be efficient, therefore, we presume, our jobs will not be transferred to workers in other countries as readily as the workers in other industries who are less fortunate in that such a finding has not been officially made.

We also note that this finding indicates that despite the inability, due to war conditions, of foreign countries to secure additional mechanical equipment they have increased their efficiency.

SMALL BUSINESS VERSUS BIG BUSINESS

In conclusion, I wish to remind the Congress that the Congress has for a period of years concerned itself with the purpose of helping the small business concerns of this country.

The 1939 census shows that out of 184,230 manufacturing concerns 181,925 employ less than 500. Of the balance 176 provided jobs for more than 2,500; 634 provided jobs for more than 1,000 and less than 2,500; 1,495 provided jobs for more than 500 and less than 1,000.

WAGE STANDARDS IMPERILED

It is the belief of many who have had to study this matter of international trade insofar as it concerned job opportunities for America's workers that the negotiation of trade agreements is now dominated by or influenced by international bankers and international industrialists. We believe that this request for a further reduction in tariff rates is solely for the purpose of transferring the job opportunities of America's workers to workers in other countries, where many of these international bankers and international industrialists either have or are planning to have production plants. Thus, through lack of job opportunities, to strike down our present wage standards.

An analysis of the list of those supporting this legislation will show, outside of the Government bureaucrat with a lust for additional power and authority, and, those who appeared in the belief that this program will lend to world peace, an idea which Secretary Clayton, in his presentation to the Ways and Means Committee refuted, consisted of:

(1) Those representing or influenced by international bankers and industrialists such as the London Chamber of Commerce, Overseas Clubs, Importers Association, and the CIO.

The record shows those in opposition, in addition to representatives of American Federation of Labor unions, and the recorded historic position of the American Federation of Labor conventions down to November 1944,

seeking not high tariffs but tariff rates which will permit the competitive products of America's workers to have an equal opportunity of sale in the American market, and, the representatives of free American farm organizations such as the National Grange, the National Milk Producers Association and other dairy interests, the National Live Stock Association, the National Association of Wool Growers, supported by a host of witnesses consisting of those who actually operate the small business concerns of our country.

The Congress could do nothing better to help the small-business concerns of this country as well as the skilled workers and farmers of our country than to reject this pending legislation.

Senate Amendments to Price Control Act

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in the debate in the Senate on the extension and amendments to the Price Control Act. Because of the extensive debate and the parliamentary situation attendant upon the amendments offered, it is rather difficult to get the essential facts without considerable effort. I have expended that considerable effort in connection with the matter and thought the membership might be saved some time and might be interested in a brief summation of the four principal amendments that were offered and in the amendments that were finally adopted.

The first amendment introduced was an amendment by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma. That amendment is as follows:

It shall be unlawful to establish or maintain against any processor a maximum price for any major product (applied separately to each major item in the case of products made in whole or major part from cotton or cotton yarn) resulting from the processing of any agricultural commodity, or maximum prices for the products of any species of livestock (such as cattle, hogs, or sheep) (the products of each species of livestock to be taken as a group in establishing or maintaining such maximum prices) which does or do not equal all costs and expenses (including all overhead, administrative, and selling expenses allowed as expense deductions in computing Federal income and excess-profits tax liability) incurred in the acquisition of the commodity or species of livestock and in the production and distribution of such product or products plus a reasonable profit thereon, not less than the profit earned thereon by such processor during a representative base period. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1945, p. 5871.

Senator BARKLEY introduced a substitute amendment to the Thomas amendment which is as follows:

Provided further, That on and after the date of the enactment of this proviso, no maximum prices shall be established or maintained on products resulting from the processing of cattle and calves, lambs and sheep, and hogs, the processing of each species being separately considered, which, taken together, do not allow for a reasonable margin of profit to the processing industry as a group on each such species. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1945, p. 5867.

The Barkley amendment was adopted by a vote of 36 to 31. Senator TAFT introduced an amendment somewhat similar to the Thomas amendment and which would have modified the Barkley amendment. Senator TAFT's amendment was as follows:

SEC. 3. No maximum price shall be established or maintained, over protest, for any commodity or for any major product of a processor, manufacturer, or minor (other than products resulting from the processing of cotton and products of any species of livestock), which does not return to the processors, manufacturers, and miners of such commodity or major product, not less than the same dollar margin over cost if any, which they received for such commodity or major items in the year 1939. For the purpose of determining such margin, "cost" shall include, both for 1939 and current year calculations, labor, materials, overhead, sales and advertising expenses, taxes other than Federal taxes, depletion, depreciation, and all other expenses allowed as deductions by the Federal income-tax laws. "Costs" and "margin" for any group of processors, manufacturers and miners shall be the average costs and margins of typical members of the industry to be determined by any reasonable method selected by the Administrator. Maximum prices fixed hereunder shall not be invalid because they fail to return his costs to particular members of such group. The word "miners" shall be defined as including all individuals, partnerships, and corporations engaged in the business of mining but shall not include employees.

Nothing in this section shall nullify the power of the Administrator to make adjustments and reasonable exceptions in individual cases under the provisions of section 2 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, but it is the intention of this section that an adequate general price level be established for all commodities and major products, and exceptions made only in special cases. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1945, p. 5885.)

The Taft amendment was defeated, the vote being 26 to 41.

Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, introduced the following amendment:

It shall be unlawful to establish or maintain against the producers of any livestock, grain, or any other agricultural commodity a maximum price for such commodity which does not equal all costs and expenses (including all overhead expenses and return on capital, and an allowance for the labor of the producer and his family) incurred in the production of such commodity plus a reasonable profit thereon. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1945, p. 5886.)

This amendment was carried by a vote of 37 to 29.

World Opium Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of June 9, 1945:

WORLD OPIUM CONTROL

The original charter placed before the United Nations Conference in San Francisco was weak and inadequate in many respects, as the many amendments offered by all of the participating nations attest.

But one of its greatest weaknesses, in the light of recent world experience, was its failure to include any provision for international opium control.

And among the hundreds of amendments offered, not one even mentions this vital subject.

The international control of opium was one of the very few activities of the old League of Nations which functioned efficiently throughout the life of the organization, and in fact it continued to function after the present war obliterated practically all other agencies of the League.

The international opium controls established by the League have been observed throughout the war, even in countries occupied by the enemy.

Surely the new world organization, which will probably emulate all too many of the mistakes of the old League, should at least salvage the only successful enterprise of its predecessor which is still living.

International opium control should have an important place in the new United Nations organization, providing for world agreements to supervise the use and suppress the abuse of narcotic drugs.

Millions of human lives all over the world, far more than the casualties of war, will be saved if the conferring nations merely adopt and perpetuate existing opium conventions in the new charter.

There is no form of slavery on earth more destructive of human life than slavery to drugs.

Unfortunately, it is also one of the most profitable of all forms of slavery—and many governments have not been above sharing and even monopolizing these iniquitous profits.

The Covenant of the League of Nations had little enough to commend it, but it did deal courageously, wisely, and beneficially with the age-old problem of dangerous drugs.

The new United Nations charter thus far does not have even this much to commend it.

If its failure to do so is only a matter of oversight, let the San Francisco Conference repair it with all speed.

If something more sinister is the root of the matter, let it be exposed to the light of world understanding—in the vital interest of gaining world recognition of the importance of international opium control in terms of human life and happiness.

Poem Written on the Death of an Aviator by His Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 13 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written by Mrs. Mabel Poe Blyth, of Slippery Rock, Pa., the night she was told her navigator son had died in action in Europe.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAVIGATOR IS YOUNG

Dear God, tonight we learned the truth.
You have a boy up there who's new in Heaven;
He's wearing navigator's wings which shine like new—
So lately were they given.
Be kind to him, Our Father, when he calls;
Forgive the rakish angle of his cap
For he is young, so very young You'll see,
He comes to you with man's estate untapped.
He loved this world You gave; loved living in it.
He loved your stars. He learned them all by name
For use in one last journey—our only son!
Can living on, without him, be the same?
His name is Don. Please write it deep and clear
Upon the Great White Ledger that You keep.
Watch over him; we trust him to Your care,
Then, with compassion, look upon us who weep.

—*Mabel Poe Blyth.*

Twenty-Million-Dollar Private Claim Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members have been advised that what is commonly called the private claim of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd will be called up Friday under a special rule. This is the second time that this bill has been considered under a special rule. I doubt if you can discover where the Rules Committee has heretofore voted two rules for the consideration of a private bill. Why this bill has been selected for special treatment I do not know.

This bill was defeated in 1940 on a division. The majority against the bill was such that the proponents did not even ask for a roll call. Now it is back again.

The only difference between the situation then and the situation now is that in 1940 it was estimated that the principal and interest asked by the claimants amounted to around $16,000,000. As 5 years have elapsed the interest naturally increased and there is now $20,000,000 involved.

The bill grows out of the purchase of seven ships at one time owned by residents of Austria flying the Austrian flag. This transaction occurred in 1917.

The ships had been tied up in American waters for 3 years and as the United States was going to enter the war the owners had agents in New York contact the claimants, Mr. Carden and Mr. Herd. They were not financially able to buy the ships so Mr. Herd contacted Mr. Percy R. Pine 2d, who resided at Princeton, N. J., and was also engaged in business in New York City. Mr. Pine was a capitalist. He contacted six of his friends and formed a syndicate to advance the money to buy the ships. The contract provided for a 10 percent payment.

Mr. August Huckscher, also a New York capitalist and a member of the syndicate, put up over $100,000 in cash, while the other members of the syndicate signed a note for the balance, turning it over to Mr. Herd who deposited it in the bank and gave his private check to close the deal.

At this time Mr. Herd insisted that the deal would have to be closed not later than April 7, 1917, which was the date we declared war on Germany.

Within 30 days the Government bought the ships, every member of the syndicate agreeing that they should be turned over to the Government and they asked for no profit. The Government paid the purchase price plus considerable money in the form of expenses to Carden and Herd and also interest on the money for the time that the syndicate held the ships. No member of the syndicate ever made a dollar on the ships. Carden and Herd themselves never advanced $1 toward the purchase price.

When the ships were taken over by Carden and Herd there was an agreement that they should only be operated between North and South America. In order to remove that restriction the Government gave Carden and Herd over $1,000,000. I have never been able to find anything in the testimony, in the hearings, or in the reports to show positively where that $1,000,000 went to. I do not know if it all went to the Austrian owners, or just part of it.

Sixty days after the ships were taken over from the Austrian owners Congress passed the Emergency Shipping Act but it was not retroactive and this deal was not subject to that act.

Congress also passed a law which was commonly called the Dent Act setting up a board in the War Department to consider war claims against the Government. Under the terms of that act the Secretary of War had the power to set aside the decision of the Board if he so desired.

Carden and Herd filed a claim before the Board which was denied. They then appealed to the Secretary of War, who granted them $550,000 on their claim and at the time they accepted the money, they signed a complete release. Not a dollar of that money went to any member of the syndicate who put up the money in order to make the deal possible, but went to Carden and Herd.

Some years after Congress passed a law directing the Court of Claims to consider the claim. The Court of Claims unanimously decided against the claimants.

You are going to be told that this bill does not carry an appropriation of one dollar. That is true, but it is also true that if this bill is passed and a favorable decision is rendered by the court, then Congress will be asked to appropriate $20,000,000 to meet the decision of the court.

Carden and Herd had their claim considered by the Board under the Dent Act. The claim was considered by the Secretary of War. The claim was considered by the Court of Claims, so they certainly have had their day in court.

In the report you will find nothing in favor of the Government. Everything in the report and in the hearings is favorable to the claimants.

Therefore, under the permission granted me, I quote from a letter written by the Comptroller General of the United States to a Senate committee:

The claim of Messrs. Carden and Herd for compensation for the ships to which these bills relate had their inception in the turbulent days immediately preceding and following the entry of the United States into the World War. The files pertaining thereto are voluminous, and, in addition to those of the General Accounting Office, include those of the Department of Justice, the War Department, possibly of the former War Industries Board and of the White House, and those of Carden and Herd. All of these files are interconnected, and the bringing together and correlating of the facts therein as a whole would appear helpful to your committee preparatory to its determination of the action it will take in this matter.

From the facts as before me it is concluded that the United States has already paid and furnished to Carden and Herd all to which entitled—legally, equitably, or otherwise—growing out of this sale by them of the seven Austrian ships to the United States. Accordingly, I am unable to recommend favorable action.

Accompanying this letter was a 47-page, closely typed memorandum on which the Comptroller General based his opinion.

The Attorney General likewise strongly opposes any additional relief, but I was unable to secure his statement in time to include it in my remarks.

Between War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article Between War and Peace, by David J. Dallin, which appeared in the June 9 issue of the New Leader:

BETWEEN WAR AND PEACE

The war with Germany has ended; the struggle for Germany is ahead.

Behind the scenes a heated debate is going on concerning the extent of the zones of military occupation inside Germany. Another debate deals with the adult male population, the prisoners of war: about what the reciprocal shares are of the individual victors. Silently the opposing forces are showing their skill (or lack of it) in organizing postwar Germany and in rehabilitating her life and economy. While the western Allies reluctantly arrive at the conclusion that Germany cannot be run by young men from Missouri or Devonshire, and joyfully discover survivors of Weimar, the Soviet ally, always three steps in advance, is arranging free ballots and meetings of anti-Fascists to elect mayors and other officials. The TASS agency repeats every day that rank-and-file members of Hitler's party have nothing to fear, and the alert Soviet photo agency distributes to

the world press pictures showing truckloads of sugar and flour arriving in Berlin from Russia But to Soviet ears Weimar sounds like western orientation which is permitted only in prisons.

In Russia, anti-German propaganda has been stopped altogether and a hard peace is no longer mentioned. Instead, the reports from Germany tell of Soviet achievements in restoring electricity and gas in German cities. Ilya Ehrenburg, the famous hater of Germans, has been rebuked for his Russian racism, just as Eearl Browder has been rebuked for his pro-Americanism, since there is no longer need for that sort of propaganda. Both are among postwar casualties. Instead, Stalin's words of 1942 are being reiterated again and again: "Hitlers come and go, but the German state will remain." It will not take very long before Stalin's other sentence will be recalled: "To deprive Germany of military force does not lie in the interests of the victor."

A few American newspaper reporters from Europe have finally arrived at the conclusion that the Soviet Government, not so modest as they had presumed during 3 years, wishes to establish the line from Stettin to Trieste as the border of the newly created Russian sphere Again they are behind time. The border line runs much further to the west, starting in the western Baltic somewhere around Luebeck and including in the Soviet sphere about half of Germany To digest this bit of Germany, with its twenty-nine or thirty million people, with its industry and agriculture, has become the greatest task for Soviet Russia. Moscow regards the Polish problem as settled, just as the Baltic problem was solved earlier.

With the nine nations in the Soviet sphere, this part of Europe, from Finland to Yugoslavia, includes a population of 140,000; if the Curzon line is regarded as the Russian border, the population of the zone amounts to about 128,000,000. If the reconstruction of Europe along these lines takes place, the population of Europe based on 1939 figures, will be divided approximately as follows:

Russia. 275,000,000 (135,000,000 in the European part of the Soviet Union and about 140,000,000 in her 9 dependencies).

Western and southern Europe, 140,000,000.

The German west, temporarily occupied by America, Britain, and France—about 39,000,000.

Still more striking will be the distribution of Europe's territory: Russia and her dependencies, 7,070,000 square kilometers; western and southern Europe, 2,815,000 square kilometers; balance of Germany and Austria, 310,000 square kilometers.

Collaboration, alliance, and a tight union with Germany has been the great goal of Moscow for 27 years, the quintessence of all of her far-reaching plans, the dream of all Soviet leaders. It was this goal that animated Lenin in the war with Poland in 1920—to win the bridge to Germany. It was this hope that impelled Zinovieff and Trotsky to foment revolutionary putsches in Germany during 1921 and 1923, and it was this prospect that earned for the German Communists seats in the first row in the Comintern. As late as 1933 an official Moscow publication declared that "Germany is the heart of Europe," and that "capitalist Europe cannot exist if it loses its heart." "He who does not understand the German question does not understand the path of revolution." "We will conclude a fraternal alliance with the Soviet Union," declared a prominent German Communist leader in 1933, "arm all the toilers, and create a mighty revolutionary army."

The great goal for Moscow was not a simple diplomatic combination with a German capitalist government, although this was often deemed necessary—for instance, the Rapallo treaty in 1922, the Stresemann treaty in 1926, and the Molotov-Ribbentrop treaty in 1939. These agreements were mere maneuvers; the main goal was a real union, a union of the peoples—liberated from capitalist governments.

Now the goal becomes reality. The paths of history are sinuous indeed to have made possible, as a start, a union of Russia with the northeastern part of Germany.

A permanent division of Germany into several states was never contemplitaed by any Moscow program, and such a division is not now endorsed by the Soviet Government. A reunification of German lands must take place in the future, and toward this end Moscow will readily assume the role of champion of a new all-German national movement.

If isolated from the rest of the world, western Europe will b no match for the new power. The only great nations of the west, France and Italy, are not strong military powers today. Even with Britain's aid they are not strong enough. America remains the decisive weight on the European scales. On American policy depends the settlement of European problems. There is not the slightest doubt that the Kremlin desires the removal of the bulk of the American military forces from Europe. Therefore, after the imminent change of line, Browder's party will start a campaign for "hands off Europe," and "bring the boys back."

No demobilization decree has been issued in Russia. On the contrary Izvestia writes that the Soviet Army must be strengthened and its fighting abilities augmented. In Poland, a new Soviet Army is growing by conscription. The army of Marshal Tito is also growing. And the pro-Soviet Czech General Bocek, while announcing the ties which will bind this army to the Soviet Union, says unequivocally: "The army is destined for battle, battle is her aim."

In Europe the war has ended, but peace has not started.

The policy of the western allies concerning postwar Germany has not taken shape so far, and it seems as if they were muddling along with no program and concept at all, inch by inch. It is neither hard nor soft. It is slow in punishment of war criminals; it is reluctant in purging Nazis from offices; it is reluctant in organizing civil life. There is more reluctance than policy. Moscow has, of course, an easier job, since no public opinion impedes a change of policy; "Public opinion—it's me," Stalin can correctly say. The western allies, on the other hand, are handicapped by the psychological inheritance of the war years. It will be too bad if they move forward only when pushed by new unilateral action by Russia.

The policy should be hard and swift as far as the remnants of Hitlerism are concerned. The punishment of war criminals must not be delayed; if agreements with the Allies are not easily reached, even unilateral action in this case is better than delay. Whether there are thousands, or tens of thousands, or even a hundred thousand war crimes—the great court and punishment machinery should be brought into motion immediately, and in the shortest possible time, the guilty leaders punished. There will be no excuse if action is postponed, diluted, and finally overshadowed by new events in our swiftly moving history.

The policy must be hard and clear in regard to Nazis in the German civil administration. It must be stated publicly that Nazis are excluded from any government job and that offices cannot be held even by rank-and-file Nazis. The removals must take place fast, and drastically, even if this creates local difficulties.

The policy must be human and "soft" regarding the rest of the German people. Local self-government can be restored swiftly, and elections can be free. Democratic political parties will emerge and thus regeneration shall be encouraged. Finally, a German government must emerge, the sooner the better, if only to alleviate the blame which will burden the Allies for the inevitable distress of the near future. If Moscow is not willing to participate, or claims key posts for its puppets in such a government, the latter must be formed independently.

Since Germany cannot be run by foreign officers, like a colony, there is every reason to encourage the emergence of her internal political life. Not all groups will be pro-British or pro-American, and it is inevitable that even a certain nationalist sentiment will come to the fore. But Hitlerism is dead, Germany is not now any danger, and you cannot expect millions of people in Europe to possess a mentality made in Washington. And we must not make the exploitation of natural sentiments a monopoly of the Soviet Government.

Germany by herself is no danger any longer. She could become a new danger only in case of a military conflict between the great powers. There is no sense in suppressing German self-government, or dismantling German industries. The key to safety from a new German menace lies in the hand of the Allies, and everything depends on their willingness and ability to open that door.

Karl E. Mundt, Crusader in Congress Against Stream Pollution, Never Quits

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, of interest to all friends of clear streams and good fishing will be the following article appearing in the Sunday issue of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, on June 10:

THE COURIER SPORTSMAN—KARL E. MUNDT, CRUSADER IN CONGRESS AGAINST STREAM POLLUTION, NEVER QUITS

(By Ken Taylor)

If the sportsmen of America ever had a champion in Congress, KARL E. MUNDT, Representative from South Dakota, is one. For years MUNDT has been fighting against stream pollution. He has introduced legislation which would have helped to clear up the Nation's streams and then to have kept them clear.

His bills have been beaten by the pollutionists. But he never has quit the fight. As recently as April 23 he made a ringing speech on his latest attempt to get Congress to do something.

HISTORY

I believe that conservationists in general and fishermen in particular would like to know what MUNDT has been saying.

"The measure of a Nation's greatness is determined in large part by the manner in which it utilizes and preserves its natural resources," MUNDT declared in the opening sentence of that April 23 speech, and then he pictured for the House of Representatives the condition of our waters and outlined the history of the battle against pollution.

Excerpts from the speech are well worth a fisherman's time to read:

THREE TYPES

"Water today suffers from the greatest amount of public neglect. In fact, water pollution is practically the last important uncontrolled, unregulated, and unchecked pagan practice continuing in the United States

insofar as our natural resources are concerned. * * * The time has now come when an enlightened American public insists that something be done to correct, curtail, and eventually stop the practices of polluting the public waters of America.

"There are three general types of such pollution, individual or incidental, sewage from municipalities, and industrial.

"The control and curtailment of water pollution is important for a number of specific reasons:

"The first is to save the Nation money, the second to protect the public health (there is much evidence to substantiate the belief that polio itself is in large part the result of stream pollution); third, to protect private and public property values; fourth, to protect fishing and recreational opportunities; fifth, to protect and provide commercial fish food, oyster beds, and fishing areas; sixth, to assure the axiom of 'the greatest good for the greatest number,' being applied to the great natural resources of the public waters and, seventh, as a national-defense measure."

NATIONAL LEVEL

"The only effective control of pollution must be at the national level because it is definitely an interstate problem of national consequence.

"It deals with interstate streams and interstate watersheds, over which State jurisdictions have no control; it involves industries doing interstate business and the only fair regulation of pollution is one which treats all competitive industries and businesses and communities alike; and bad pollution practices drive good pollution practices out of existence.

"Each State, each industry, each polluter, wants the other fellow to act first and the result is that nobody acts as long as we leave it up to local control.

"When State legislation is attempted to meet the pollution problem, the offenders cry out, 'Unfair, unfair; this is a national problem.' When national legislation, such as my bill (H. R. 519) is introduced, the same offenders, evidencing greater versatility than logic, protest, 'No, no; leave this to the States and to interstate compacts. You must protect States' rights and this is a local problem.' Thus the problem grows steadily worse and the correctives are repeatedly delayed."

MEETS TEST

"In brief, my bill meets the test which it seems to me any pollution legislation must meet if it is to be judged as adequate and as acceptable and as a workable piece of legislation.

"In the first place, it includes the philosophy that new sources of pollution must be stopped now, so that we can define the problem as we now have it, and go about the task of correcting it without constantly aggravating the question with new sources of pollution.

"In the second place, it provides a 2-year make-ready adjustment period, during which it permits polluters to continue their practices, because it gives them those 2 years of grace in which to adjust their manufacturing or mining techniques to meet the new set of controls.

"In the third place, it encourages interstate compacts and local acts. It establishes authority for Federal action in the background, where States, communities, and industries do not and will not act at the local level."

NO INTERFERENCE

"In the fourth place, it specifically exempts all pollution regulation which would interfere in any way with the war effort. Its control board is representative of both political parties. It represents both the legislative and executive branches of the Government and all interested Government departments.

"In the fifth place, while being far from drastic, it has teeth enough in it so that confirmed polluters are opposed to it and are seeking to defeat it by encouraging support for another 'study, diagnose, and delay' bill which is so palpably a polluters' pet that it does not even provide for stopping new sources of pollution.

"Let us be ready at the conclusion of this war to start a Nation-wide program of pollution regulation and control, with the establishment of modern disposal plants for the sewage of cities and industry."

A CHALLENGE

That graphically tells the story of the status of the crusade against water pollution and it throws a challenge.

Private citizens can be of real constructive assistance on this problem by writing to their Senators and Representatives expressing their support and approval of this effort to rid the public waters of America of the age-old and obnoxious problem of pollution.

Leaning Over Backward in Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, last week I addressed the attention of those Members of the House who are interested in foreign policy to the great care being taken by our Government to avoid giving any cause for friction to the Government of the Soviet Union and/or to its many good friends in this country and abroad.

Today there is further evidence of our desire "to lean over backwards," as Mr. Grew called it, in our relations with Stalin in Austria.

Austria has a very special place in the matter of our international relations during this war. She was, of course, the first completely independent nation to be absorbed into the greater Reich by Hitler's Nazi policy, and Austrian citizens have not been classed as enemy aliens in the United States. At the Moscow Conference of October 1943 Austria was promised reestablishment as a free and independent nation, "thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighboring states which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace."

At Yalta, it was agreed by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill and Marshal Stalin that the reconstruction of Austria would be undertaken during a joint occupation of the three leading powers; all alike guaranteeing the "four freedoms" to the Austrians during the period of reconstruction, and this plan was announced following the conference in the Crimea. Now let us look at the facts as they stand today.

The city of Vienna is occupied exclusively by Soviet forces. Vienna contains about 2,000,000 of the 7,000,000 inhabitants of the Austrian state, and with the other Austrian lands under Soviet occupancy at least half of all Austria is subject to Soviet control. This means that, in practice, the "workers"—as defined in the special language of communism—are invested with privileges, and all nonworkers are deprived of rights—property owners of any land over 100 acres are classed as nonworkers and their farms are taken away from them, although farmers of peasant origin may retain 200 acres.

This further complicates the already desperate economic situation of the Austrians who have been batted about ever since 1919 when the city of Vienna, highly industrialized capital of an empire of 50,000,000 people, was walled up behind high-tariff barriers which strangled its economic life blood.

Survival and recovery for the Austrians depend upon establishing a balance between agricultural and industrial production with the least possible further disturbance of an already tense situation. It requires uninterrupted communications between the city and the outlying rural areas. To ensure this the provisional government of Austria should draw at least half of its ministers from the rural areas.

However, that has not been done in the formation of the present Austrian regime. This regime, we must remember, has been recognized, indeed has been formed by the Kremlin authorities, but it has not yet been recognized by either the United States or Great Britain.

The significant characteristic of this regime is its exclusively Viennese character. Very probably this was unavoidable in order to secure an administration strongly anchored to the left. Any local, rural groups would have insisted upon sending Catholics and Monarchists to the government, as the rural population is overwhelmingly Catholic and Monarchist, as is whatever the Nazi and more recent purges have left of the former Austrian middle class.

The head of the provisional Austrian Government today is Dr. Karl Renner, now 75 years old. For at least 50 years Renner was a member of the Socialist Party. He is reputedly a well-meaning man who, under normal political conditions, might serve Austria well. For the present purpose, however, he is simply a presentable front, behind which the real business—the communization of Austria—is being carried on.

The actual leader of Dr. Renner's government is Ernst Fischer, who holds the post of Minister of Public Instruction and Religion. There is no analogous position in either the American or British Cabinets. In the late Nazi Cabinet, the equivalent was held by Dr. Josef Paul Goebbels of evil memory, and in Russia a similar post is occupied by Mr. Losofski.

Mr. Fischer, the Austrian Minister of Culture and Religion is an old-time Communist, a part of whose activities for many years past have been devoted to the propagation of atheism—what the Russians called the anti-God movement.

Extremely shrewd and able, Mr. Fischer is one of the most capable Communist organizers in Europe. He has connections in the Communist parties of every European country. From 1934 to 1945 Fischer had charge of the bureau in Moscow which directed Communist activity in all the Danubian States. Fischer invented the propaganda line which Austrian communism has followed since

1934, which opposed the anschluss and urged Austrian independence. His devotion to Stalin is demonstrated by the fact that he supported enthusiastically the Moscow trials despite the fact that one of his closest friends and associates was purged. In 1920, Fisher worked for the Austrian socialist paper, Wiener Arbeiterzeitung, and later became its editor.

Fischer's wife is the daughter of a Prussian junker, who became a fervent Communist. After he went to Moscow in 1934, he became the representative of Austria at the Comintern—of course not as an official but with official privileges from the Soviets. Later on, during the war, Fischer was the go-between for the German Officers' Committee in Moscow and the Russian Government. He is reported to be responsible for the formation of the Free German Committee in Moscow. Later on he was a liaison man between the German and the Austrian Committees in Moscow. He is listed as author and playwright. He composed a play called Lenin.

The other members of the Renner government are mainly colorless followers of the party line. All important cabinet posts are held by well-known Communists, or people who have recently been trained in Moscow. Armed forces, interior and police, and the ministry of education are in the hand of trusted pro-Communists. Control of the country is therefore assured. All Socialist elements come from the extreme left-wing branch of Socialists, the one identified as pro-Soviet. All of their tendencies are definitely pan-German. The Christian-Socials are represented by the weakest elements of that party, people known either for their political opportunism or their extremely advanced age. It is easy to see that there will be no friction between this regime and the Kremlin.

Lest it be doubted for a moment that we are "leaning over backward to give no offense" to the Soviet Union, it should be added that no member of the present provisional Austrian Government has ever had any contacts, or expressed any sympathies, for the western European allies or the United States.

The inclusion of pan-German elements in the Renner government may be very significant; particularly when it is coupled with the reports from Vienna that Russian NKVD units have made arrests of Austrian Socialists known to be opposed to the union of Austria with north German states. It tends to confirm belief that the Soviet plan is for inclusion into its Union of those parts of Germany now under Soviet control. One group of the high Communist command in Moscow has always urged a Russo-German union, along the military pattern cut by Bismarck, but with headquarters in Moscow instead of in Berlin.

Some confirmation of this idea may be found also in the personnel of two key Cabinet positions: the War Department and the Interior.

The Austrian War Department—called officially the Ministry of Armed Forces—is headed by Lt. Col. Franz Winterer, a former captain in the Army of the Austrian Republic. Winterer was the military organizer of the Schutzbund, the private army of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party. Clashes between the Schutzbund and the Government in 1934 forced Winterer to flee to Germany, where he became an officer in the German Army and served somewhere on the Russian front. This is indicated by the fact that he is now listed as a former prisoner of war, having been released from military imprisonment by the Soviet authorities and permitted to help organize the Free Austrian Committee in Moscow. His assistants in Moscow were Ernst Fischer, the present real leader of the Austrian Government; and Johann Koplenigg, who is now, also, in Vienna.

Winterer remained in Moscow until after Vienna was occupied by Red Army forces.

The Austrian Minister of the Interior, Franz Hohner, or Honner, is also interesting. He is an official member of the Communist Party, with a long residence and party education in Moscow, and his post as Minister of Interior gives him charge of all police forces and communications.

There is one other man worthy of note in Dr. Renner's cabinet. He is Johann Koplenigg, who holds no cabinet post but is a member of the advisory committee in which he represents the Communist Party. At one time Koplenigg was editor of the Communist newspaper Rote Fahne—the Red Flag. He is a survivor of the tiny Austrian Communist Party which never had a representative in Parliament. Koplenigg was considered as the brains of Austrian communism, and his escape was arranged to Moscow in 1934. Along with Fischer and Winterer he organized the Free Austrian Committee in Moscow and served as its head.

The United States so far has not seemed to question the formation in Moscow of an Austrian regime in which American representatives did not take part, although they had been scheduled to do so at the Yalta Conference. However, these few facts about the chief ministers of the provisional Austrian Government should serve to reassure once again all those who welcomed Mr. Grew's statement that the United States is "leaning over backward to avoid giving offense to Russia."

Chopin in April

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues the reading of the following poem on the death of President Roosevelt, Chopin in April, written by the Honorable Joseph T. Higgins, former collector of internal revenue in New York City:

CHOPIN IN APRIL

Down Dutchess Valley the Hudson sadly flows,
O'er the old manor the fresh forsythia blows;
On this April evening how the willows weep,
Stately old hemlocks the silent vigil keep;
Silent is the robin as the daffodil,
Muted in mourning the mansion on the hill.

Through pastel meadows the Nashua softly glides,
Hushed on its bosom the mallard lightly rides,
Foaming oars of contest shun the river's sheen,
No youthful voices awake the saddened green;
Whispered is the silence of those Groton halls
Somber and stunned is the shadow that enthralls.

Slowly the Charles slips majestically to sea,
Through Pilgrim towns sliding onward silently,
High above the sunset soar the sailing gulls,
Faintly the waves lap against the anchored hulls;
Sounding o'er the campus tolls the Harvard bell,
Far from the city returns the muffled knell.

Round Campobello, the isle of happy dreams,
Glistens the surf in the dying sunset beams,
Fickle was the welcome of your siren surge,
Dull is the pounding of your direful dirge;
Never shall the white sail luff against the strand,
Never the tiller shall feel the master hand.

Move on Potomac to the eternal main,
Are you insensate to all our mortal pain?
Mirrored in your waters shimmer stately towers,
Plashed on your green banks remain the April flowers;
Let the warming laughter in the world abide,
Bear off the grieving with your ebbing tide.

Now there abideth faith, hope, and charity—
How that sweet virtue was magnified in thee.
Monuments are builded to the hero dead,
Yours are the healing Georgia Springs instead.
At your humble cottage, whence your spirit rose,
Your lingering smile lulls the feeble to repose.

—*Joseph T. Higgins.*

Jefferson Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. Robert S. Kerr at the Jefferson Day dinner, Birmingham, Ala., May 17, 1945:

It is a genuine pleasure to break bread and to commune in spirit with Alabama democracy.

It is a joy to partake of your sunshine, your genial hospitality, your unexcelled southern food.

It is inspiring to associate with the citizenship of a State great enough to give to America so many outstanding statesmen including Speaker Will Bankhead, Gov. Bib Graves, and Senator Oscar Underwood. It is an honor to further extend my acquaintance with your distinguished Governor, Chauncey Sparks. He is known throughout the land wherever Democrats meet, and respected wherever real statesmen are held in high regard.

I understand and share your pride in Senators JOHN BANKHEAD and LISTER HILL.

I like Alabama—so symbolic of the Old South, yet demonstrating so clearly the in-

dustrial development and economic progress of the New South.

As we gather here tonight we realize that events so far-reaching and of such magnitude are taking place at such great speed they stagger the imagination. History in many places is being made more rapidly than ever before, and America and Americans are doing more in making that history than any other nation or any other people.

You and I are a part of this meteoric drama. We are a link between America's glorious past and her even more glorious future. We are the product of those who have gone before and share their responsibility for the future.

Looming large among the great men of that past is one who today is much in the minds not only of Democrats, but of all men everywhere who love freedom.

Thomas Jefferson was born more than 200 years ago, has been dead nearly 120 years but lives in the hearts of people now as a greater influence for good than when he was at the height of his living influence and power.

He advocated certain great principles for humanity's welfare. He planted the seed of those principles deep in the minds of the people of his generation. They grow and flower today in our hearts with as much vitality as they had then.

Said Jefferson: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Those beautiful and powerful words shook the world then. They are just being written today in fire and blood by the gallant sons of free peoples everywhere who are determined that not only Americans, but all men, may have these rights.

Jefferson was first to establish a political party dedicated to these principles and the party he established more nearly symbolizes them today than any other political organization on the earth. If Jefferson were alive now he would feel at home, either in the ranks, or in the most exalted place of leadership in his party—our party—the Democratic Party.

It has been my happy privilege to visit his beautiful home amid the pine-clad hills of Virginia. Many of us have stood at that great shrine and been inspired by its traditions and its memories.

We also glory in the fact that though faithful marble may preserve his image, the engraven brass proclaim his worth—the humblest sod of free America, with nothing but the dewdrop of the morning to guard it and with nothing but Nature's flowers to adorn it, is a prouder resting place for the Sage of Monticello than kings and emperors can boast.

If he were here today he would be the most emphatic among us that all men are created equal, and that the freedom, dignity, security, and happiness of man are the sole objects of legitimate government.

Likewise, he would be the first to proclaim that these principles represented the fondest hopes and most cherished dreams of mankind since the beginning of the world.

He, more than any other man of his day, visualized a nation built upon, and dedicated to those principles.

He, more than any other man of his day, was responsible for the development of that nation.

If he were here now he would see more clearly than most others the reality of what he dreamed. He would be the champion today, as he was then, not only for equal rights for all Americans, but for security, liberty, and justice for all men upon the earth.

As he recognized then the opportunity to build a great nation upon the foundation of these principles, he would recognize today the opportunity of building a sisterhood of sovereign nations upon the same foundation.

You and I are proud of and grateful for America.

We are likewise proud and grateful that in building America, so great a part has been played by the Democratic Party.

As we gather here in the dual capacity of Democrats and Americans, we recognize that while there are many good Americans who are not good Democrats, all good Democrats are good Americans.

Without speaking disparagingly of others, whose patriotism we recognize, we cannot but be aware of the fact that this Nation has been builded and those indescribable blessings which make up the American way of life have, in the main, been developed by Democratic administrations.

Practically all of the territorial domain over which the American flag flies today, except the area of the Thirteen Colonies, has become a part of our Nation under Democratic administrations.

The Louisiana Purchase was made by Thomas Jefferson. The Floridas were added under James Monroe. The vast Empire of Texas and the broad domain of the Northwest Territory and of the areas from the Rockies to the Pacific came into the Union under James K. Polk. Alaska was acquired during the administration of Andrew Johnson.

As Madison was the father of the Constitution, Jefferson was the father of the first ten amendments, revered as the Bill of Rights.

Down through the years the welfare of the common people has been developed under such stalwart democratic leadership as that of Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, that incomparable statesman, Woodrow Wilson, and the greatest of them all, Franklin Roosevelt.

We love the Democratic Party. We respect its traditions. We glory in its achievements. It is, and has always been, the party of the people, the advocate and guardian of the sacred rights of freemen in a free land.

More than any other political organization in history, it holds aloft the deathless, gleaming principles of justice and liberty that illumine man's pathway as he marches ever upward and onward.

By its record the Democratic Party has established clear title to the claim that it is the party of progress.

Woodrow Wilson said: "The immortality of Thomas Jefferson does not lie in any of his achievements, but in his attitude towards mankind."

Jefferson, at times alone, and at others supported only by a small group, looked upon the Revolution not only as a struggle against tyranny and misrule, but also as the labor pains incident to the birth of a new and different kind of government.

Alexander Hamilton represented the viewpoint of the majority whose primary aim was to set up in America an independent government fashioned entirely along the lines of the British Government. They did not seek to establish a nation of freemen who would be sovereign citizens in control of their own government, but rather a sovereign government that would be absolute master of all its citizens.

Jefferson worked in his day for human progress. "All men are created equal." These words presented an objective so vitally antagonistic, both to the conditions prevailing when they were uttered, and to the concept of government in the average mind, that realization of their meaning came slowly to the people like an awakening on a bright morning after a deep and heavy slumber.

If he were here now he would glory in the fact that throughout all our history his party has sought human progress. But he would be more interested in the progress of tomorrow, than in all the progress yet achieved.

It is just as necessary that Americans move forward from their position, today as it was in Jefferson's time, that education be made available to the masses, and that religious freedom be given the people.

Progress as an ideal of democracy demands that the lot of the common man today be improved tomorrow, just as much as progress demanded in 1863 the emancipation of millions of native-born Americans from slavery, just as much as progress demanded the enactment of the 8-hour labor law under Woodrow Wilson, and the elimination of child labor and human sweat shops in the early days of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The frontiers of human progress which lie ahead of us are just as attractive, just as adventuresome and romantic as those that Jefferson saw in 1800, that Jackson saw in 1832, and that Roosevelt saw in 1933.

If I may become partisan for a moment, and indulge a brief reference to the opposition party I would say that it forms such deep-rooted attachments and develops such lasting affection for things as they were that it refuses to move forward into broader uplands of human progress until compelled to do so by the demonstrated improvements inaugurated by the party of progress, the Democratic Party.

In fact, the Republican leadership reminds me of the ancient dodo bird, which was so constructed that he always flew backward. This made it impossible for him ever to look forward. He didn't know where he was going and didn't care; his interest and concern were only in where he had been.

In 1920 Harding promised to lead America back to normalcy. And what a trip it was.

Do you remember the Hoover promises of 1928? "Two cars in every garage. Two chickens in every pot." That slogan which was to have been our passport into economic paradise became the toboggan down which we slid to poverty, depression, and ruin.

First, we lost our homes through foreclosure, and we lost the garages when we lost our homes. Unable to meet the payments, we next lost our cars. The banks crashed and our savings were swept away. We didn't have one chicken, let alone two, and not even a pot to cook it in.

The Democratic Party has by its record established itself as the party of preparedness—preparedness against war—preparedness for peace.

It has been honored with the confidence of the people in this most difficult period in our Nation's history.

We are charged with the responsibility of working diligently to demonstrate worthiness of that confidence, to maintain the security and progress of today, and provide a greater security, and progress, tomorrow.

The German monster of ruthless aggression has been forced to unconditional surrender. America and her allies have achieved victory over the most diabolic fiend that ever sought to ravage and enslave the free peoples of the world. But the most difficult times of this war are ahead. The tempo of our fighting must be maintained.

We must work just as hard until Japan has unconditionally surrendered as we worked to build our fighting strength to the point necessary for Germany's defeat.

Likewise, we must apply to the fullest extent Jefferson's warning with reference to "eternal viligance" in achieving an abiding peace.

We must do more than defeat our enemies and compel their unconditional surrender.

The challenge of war has been terrific.

The challenge of peace is even greater.

We have been in this war 3½ years. We believe that 2 more years will see our war task accomplished. This means that the challenge of war will have taken at least 5½ years to meet.

But we will not have completely met the challenge of peace in a hundred years.

To meet the challenge of war we have mobilized all our manpower, in the fighting forces, and in the productive armies of civilian soldiers.

To meet the challenge of peace we must insure the opportunity for profitable employment to every American willing and able to work.

The Nation has been justified in drafting the services of its fighting men. Those fighting men as civilians will be entitled to receive at the hands of a grateful Nation the opportunity for profitable peacetime employment.

America at war has called upon her farmers to produce ever greater quantities of food and feed for victory. Those farmers are entitled to call upon America at peace for the assurance that they will have the opportunity for continued full production and a profitable market for their products.

In winning the war America and her Allies have hurled back the challenge of aggression by which Italy, and Germany, and Japan sought to conquer and enslave the world.

America and her Allies at peace must prevent for all time the creation and development of any aggressive power by any would-be world conqueror which could ever again threaten the peace and security of the world.

In winning this war our Air Force has driven the dreaded Luftwaffe from the skies, carried war with all its horror and terror back to the evil den of nazism in which it was born and from which it was spewed upon a peaceful and happy world. It has repaid in destruction of Japanese air power their treachery at Pearl Harbor a hundredfold.

And this is just a small part of what we are preparing to send them.

In winning this war our men who fight on the ground have slugged and slashed their way to Rome and to Berlin. They have killed nearly 500,000 Japs who have sought to impede their progress along the terrible road to Tokyo.

The German people have learned about other wars by listening to their fighting men tell of battles in foreign lands and by reading about them in history books.

They have learned about this one from their own cities that have been reduced to rubble before their eyes; from the destruction of their factories; from the screaming hell and holocaust produced about them by the explosion of millions of tons of bombs and bursting shells.

The Germans have learned about this war from the lips of millions of their own dying men and the spilling of untold quantities of German blood on Germany's own foul soil.

The Germans have learned about war this time by being stripped of every vestage of their military power—by seeing their military strength shrivel before their eyes; by seeing every acre of their homeland conquered and occupied; by being compelled to complete and unconditional surrender.

In winning this war our merchant marine and our fleets have performed military miracles never before dreamed of.

Germany's vaunted submarines running singly or in their dreaded wolf packs have been driven back into their pens, captured, or blasted to the bottom of the sea. The once mighty German Navy, including the *Von Tirpitz* and the *Bismarck* and their powerful auxiliaries, no longer exists.

The Japanese Navy has been blown out of or sunk beneath the waters of the blue Pacific whose broad expanse they sought to rule. The oceans of the world are now United Nations lakes. America and her Allies rule the waves.

In winning this war our fighting men and women, all of them, are making the world safe for peace. In keeping this peace all Americans will make our own blessed land safe from war. We cannot hope for more, we dare not tolerate less.

The United Nations have frustrated the purposes of the war lords and war criminals of Germany and Japan. We are defeating them and will destroy their power.

America and her Allies must not only disarm, disable, destroy, and incapacitate these war criminals, but they must be tracked down and captured like the wild beasts they are and then fully and completely punished for the horrible crimes they have committed against humanity.

Ah, surely they must have a fair and impartial trial—and then be just as fairly and impartially executed.

America and her Allies at war will soon have brought about the unconditional surrender of the last of those who have spurned the laws of the nations and wrecked the order of the world.

America and her Allies at peace must restore the dignity of law and the security of order not only within the nations of the world but as between those nations.

As the powers of darkness have sought to enslave the human race, as they have affronted the dignity and scorned the equality of man, so they and all others must be compelled to forever dissolve the bonds of slavery, completely restore the dignity of man, and recognize the equality of all mankind.

As we prepare to meet the challenge of peace in the future we are reminded of failures to meet it in the past. These failures have not demonstrated impossibility of attainment, but do serve as markers identifying the pitfalls into which we have stumbled. They must also serve as a warning and as reminders of the necessity for a greater effort in the future than we have ever made in the past.

As we settle our differences with our foes on the hard and stern fields of battle we must resolve our differences with our allies in a spirit of mutual trust and confidence. We are human enough that differences among the United Nations are inevitable. But the divine hand of Providence that is leading us to victory in this war will, if we permit it, provide the wisdom that will lead us in settling on the basis of justice any differences that may arise in peace.

Our positions will not always prevail with our allies, but if we are as willing to do justice by all as we are willing to receive it from others, we may be sure that through patience and understanding we cannot fail.

We know that national security is nonpartisan. We know that an abiding peace is nonpolitical, but we would be ineffective if we did not in the future, as we have in the past, demonstrate the ability of our party to lead the way.

In this noble effort we do not seek to embarrass any other party. We strive only to make our own effective. We do not seek to disserve the opposition. We strive only to serve our country.

We are proud of the progress we have brought about, but we are not content. As we ponder the obstacles we have successfully overcome, as we realize the hardships we have endured; as we contemplate the broad advance America has made on the front of human liberty, justice, and equality, we are grateful and we are proud.

As we look into the future and understand the tasks ahead we feel a deep humility, but no fear. We have the confidence which comes from the knowledge of the people's trust and the worthiness we have demonstrated.

We know that this cause is just.

We know that this purpose is right.

We have had the pattern in Jefferson's declaration of principles.

We have seen the demonstration through 12 glorious years of unparalleled accomplishment.

We have marched with democracy's greatest leader in a crusade for freedom and equality in our own land and around the world. We have seen that leader glorify that cause in life and ennoble it in death.

We have seen our new captain, though saddened with grief, take his place and humbly and courageously carry on.

We are inspired by his determination to lead us to early victory in war and into the security of an abiding peace.

We have felt the Nation and the world respond with renewed devotion and new determination to the challenge of his leadership.

We shall not stumble—we will not waver—we will march forward as Democrats and as Americans inspired by and supporting with all our strength our new beloved Commander in Chief and President Harry S. Truman.

The Future of Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert excerpts from the speech of Mr. C. Bedell Monro, president of Pennsylvania-Central Airlines, delivered to the Wings Club in New York on June 6, 1945.

It goes without saying that this is a clear presentation of the future of commercial and private flying.

One of the questions of paramount importance in the minds of practically all Americans is, of course, the ability of industry to reemploy more than 10,000,000 boys now in military service. Many spokesmen for aviation have predicted that commercial aviation will open a vast field of opportunity for many of these boys. By affirming and reaffirming this open-door policy of employment, I do not doubt but that men in uniform by the thousands will look to the air lines for their peacetime jobs and opportunities. They know and we know that our business is going to expand; it will expand many times over our prewar business peaks.

It would be deception, however, to imply to these thousands of boys whose lives have been disrupted in order that freedom may exist that aviation has no limitations. Aviation, like every other industry, is limited in the number of jobs it can offer returning GI's. Let us be frank in this matter. Let us be honest with ourselves, with the public, and, most of all, with the boys who are now clad in muddy khaki. You would not for a minute have us disillusion anyone, especially those fighting men to whom we all have an obligation that is sacred.

Before the war the domestic air lines of this Nation operated about 360 planes and employed about 17,300 people to keep these planes in the air. That means that 50 airline employees were required to keep each plane in service.

Now let us look at the postwar prospects. By a generous estimate we can visualize the domestic air lines using 1,000 air lines to ply the air ways. By assuming that larger planes plus the expected heavier traffic will raise the number of employees per plane to 100, the total number of all air-line employees estimated for 1948 will be only 100,000. That, you must agree, is a rather pitiful market for the countless thousands who are looking to aviation for future security.

To further shed accuracy to the picture, we must realize that most of the present

air-line employees will want to retain their jobs. You can scarcely ask that the loyalty and hard work of these people during the difficulties of wartime be ignored.

In addition to these loyal workers, there are in the armed forces, particularly in the Air Transport Command, the Troop Carrier Command, the Naval Air Transport Service, and similar units, hundreds and thousands of former air-line men and women who fully expect to resume their prewar air-line jobs. To reemploy them is not only our moral but our legal obligation.

We realize that there will be many fine opportunities, new jobs and new careers, in air transportation after the war, but compare this thin market to the tens of thousands who have never been in aviation, but who have been trained for aviation in the armed forces and who expect jobs in aviation when the war is over. I need not enlarge upon this extensively, because you are fully aware of the thousands of pilots, navigators, and ground crewmen who are fuly trained to take important places in air transportation, and who definitely want to continue with aviation as a peacetime career.

It appears to competent observers of present-day aviation trends that those in air transportation are relying entirely too much on our own broadened activities to discharge such a tremendous obligation. It also appears that many of us are failing to take the necessary steps to broaden our own markets except along narrow, specialized lines in what can be an expansive field.

It is our job in aviation to create jobs. It is our job to actively cooperate in the support of every phase of aviation that will mean more work for more people; it is our obligation to expand every potential development—to rush it through to completion—in the hope that in this way we can, first, make our industry larger and thus more capable of absorbing those who have earned access to it, and secondly to enlarge it for the sake of the industry.

Some of the phases of aviation that have not previously had the concentrated weight and support of today's leaders in air transportation are centered in the field of private flying, which has the broadest possible ramifications, the majority of which have been practically ignored up to the present.

With less theorizing and more action, the "roadways of the air," the airport of the average community, can be developed to pave the way for private flying to the extent that it can become a new major industry, employing new workers by the thousands in aviation. With an adequate airport or flight strip in sufficient towns and cities to make cross-country flying in planes of light horsepower feasible, a new and industrially important field can blossom. With the proper development of this field, the manufacturing opportunities, the wholesaling and retailing of aircraft, and many other aspects of private flying, offer countless career possibilities.

When the automobile was in the same relative period of its infancy as is the personal airplane, but few envisaged any great future for the horseless carriage. Travel was too precarious, too full of interruptions caused by undeveloped tires on undeveloped roads. But, as you well know, when both roads and tires were improved, the automobile came into its own. So it will be with personal airplanes. With the improvements that are assured by the attention of the world's greatest aeronautical engineers, and with the rapid increase of flight strips, air parks and airports, the future of private flying can be as boundless as was the future of the automobile.

The creation of the automobile industry made new jobs for millions, not only in manufacturing but in distribution and in the service industries. Is there anyone in this room who can guarantee that the future of personal flying does not hold fully as great possibilities as did the automobile in 1915?

Should such result, which I contend is possible by further improvement in aircraft design, aircraft power plants, air traffic control, and in increased landing facilities, does it not become apparent that there will be new career opportunities in aircraft engineering, manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, maintenance, and servicing?

The field of aviation instruction alone has but scratched the surface. Before the war our flying schools trained but an infinitesimal percentage of our population, because private or personal flying was solely a hobby with a few adventurists. If this mode of transportation can be made more practical, which I am sure it can, this minor percentage of amateur fliers can be boosted almost beyond the realm of imagination.

Maintenance bases for private flying, before the war, were haphazard affairs, generally born of the necessity of keeping a few planes in the air. The career opportunities for military ground crewmen in this field are apparent.

These bases will be at hundreds of additional airports not now even conceived. The operation of the airports or air parks themselves will offer new outlets for men of managerial ability, who have found other small business fields already overcrowded and unappealing. In addition to the air park managerships that will be made available, many other jobs will be offered, from sales through the service categories.

Not only does the stimulation and development of private flying offer wide employment opportunities, but the over-all education of the public to the use of scheduled air transportation will have an effect that dwarfs our industry's present and planned promotional activities. Unfortunately, too many air-transport people currently have the narrow viewpoint that private plane owners will result in less air-line passengers. On the contrary, an increase in private flying will give impetus and force to a widening circle of aircraft usage of all kinds.

You do not expect me to espouse the cause of private flying without admitting sufficient realism to acknowledge the many problems involved. Private flying is still confronted by the high initial cost of an airplane, and the continuing operating costs of aircraft. We can expect a gradual evolution, however, towards a cheaper airplane that is less expensive to operate. Maintenance, hangar and field rentals, and other expenses must come down—and I feel they will when the prospects of volume business are apparent. Insurance costs must be lowered, and they will be when statistics prove the private plane even safer. A new means of air-traffic control must be evolved that will be specially designed for private planes, safe, and yet easy to follow. There are, of course, many other problems, but in my opinion the airline industry should be just as active in working on those problems as it is on its own immediate development. There should be a cessation of the flagrantly short-sighted policy at times, and disinterested at all other times, of some air-line personnel toward private flying; a policy which has been obstructive

* * * * *

Any "restrictatory" program ignores the national defense. It has been well stated that in any future wars, American manufacturing centers will be subjected to the first surprise attack rather than another Pearl Harbor. American manufacturing centers most helpful to national defense would be aircraft manufacturing plants. It is imperative that our aircraft manufacturing industry be kept active, alert, and progressive if we are to maintain our place as a world power.

* * * * *

These are important aspects of the problems confronting our industry, even though in mentioning them I have barely touched one or two of our many perplexing and unsolved questions. Their solution, which is imperative for the ultimate success of those boys who are earning the right of Americans to live free and unrestricted lives, depend not only on intelligence, study and hard work, but on the elimination of internecine controversy, of the necessity to amalgamate all phases of aviation so that we can work toward the realization of a potential still too vast for the comprehension of any of us.

American Ownership of Property in Japan and Germany; German and Japanese Ownership of Property in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me the letter which I herewith include in the RECORD is a most interesting one. I trust the American people will interest themselves in the subject matter contained in the letter.

Is it to be concluded that our Government must be "mighty good and lenient" to the people who own property in Germany and Japan in order to obtain a full disclosure of this fact? Is it to be concluded that our Government must be "mighty good and lenient" to Germans and Japanese who own property in this country in order to obtain a full disclosure of this fact?

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 11, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letters of May 26 and 28, 1945, requesting a list of persons in this country owning property in foreign countries and a list of nationals of foreign countries owning property here. In subsequent conversations held with you by members of this Department, it was understood that the request should be taken as restricted to Germany and Japan.

To supply the information this Department would be obliged to refer to the reports filed with it on Forms TFR-300 and TFR-500, which relate respectively to foreign-owned assets in the United States and American-owned assets abroad.

Acting under the authority of section 161 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 22), this Department treats the reports as confidential. In many instances serious financial and even personal consequences might result to persons whose property was reported if information derived from the reports was revealed.

Aside from this consideration the Department views these reports as confidential for the same reasons that have motivated the Congress closely to restrict the use and availability of income-tax returns. Thus, both the Congress and the Department have recognized that the ordinary desire for privacy in both personal and business affairs may be a deterrent to full and complete disclosure to the Government unless adequate assurances of confidence are extended and fulfilled. In this respect the Department has had in mind not only the property owners themselves but also the numerous financial institutions in this country whose

cooperation was essential in carrying out the reporting projects.

Accordingly, I regret to state that this Department is not in a position to supply you with the requested information. However, on June 8, 1945, Presiden Truman signed Executive Order No. 9567 which confers on the Alien Property Custodian ultimate authority over all German and Japanese property in this country. You may, therefore, wish to discuss with the Office of the Custodian the question of obtaining information relating to such property.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Our Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Hon. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., delivered on May 21 an able address, entitled "The Foreign Economic Policy of the State Department," and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

THE FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The tragic drama now gripping the world is more than a world war, it is a world revolution.

There is at issue something far more elemental than any mere political, social, or economic problem could ever be.

That issue is simply this:

Nations must learn to live together cooperatively for their mutual security and prosperity; otherwise, civilization will be utterly destroyed and man will return to the dark ages.

This is the law of the machine.

Man created the machine to lessen his burden in supplying the necessities of life.

In doing this, the machine has enormously multiplied man's wants.

These ever-increasing wants make man more and more dependent upon other men, and nations more and more dependent upon all other nations.

One machine calls for another machine and another, and so it will be until the end of time.

Under the impact of the machine, the world continues to shrink rapidly; there is no such thing as isolation, and man now easily destroys in a few days what it took him centuries to build. What new hellish instrument of destruction tomorrow may bring forth no man knows.

The machine can set us free; or, uncontrolled, it can and will destroy us.

To control the machine, we must first learn to control ourselves.

Man lived in isolation and independence over such great reaches of time that it is with the greatest difficulty that his mental and spiritual concepts are adjusted to the condition of dependence which the machine and modern civilization impose.

Out in San Francisco we are trying to set up the framework of an organization within which rules may be written to guide men in their cooperative efforts to build a new world on the foundations of peace and prosperity.

The delegates there and the peoples for whom they speak know that victory in this war will not bring enduring peace but only the opportunity to work for enduring peace. They know, to, as their predecessors of 25 years ago failed to realize, that the most elaborate arrangements for the maintenance of political and military peace will soon disintegrate if the world again engages in the type of economic warfare it wages between the two World Wars.

Nations which act as enemies in the market place cannot long be friends at the council table.

The peace structure has to be seen as a great arch supported by two strong columns, one political and the other economic.

If either column gives way, the whole structure falls.

While the delegates of 49 countries at San Francisco work to set up this organization, a struggle is going on in Washington to prevent our own country from retracking the same tragic path of economic nationalism which we followed after the First World War with such disastrous results.

There are two, and only two, roads open to us in shaping our economic policies in the postwar world.

We can follow the path of economic liberalism, in keeping with our democratic principles and traditions, and without which no peace structure will long stand, or we can take that same road we followed in the 1920's—the road to economic nationalism, restrictionism, and regimentation, leading inevitably to international irritations and retaliation, and the creation of an atmosphere in which the seeds of conflict are sown.

It is impossible to stand still, even if we wished: the world is moving much too fast for that now.

In the State Department we have planted our feet firmly on the road of economic liberalism and that's the road we propose to follow.

Our foreign economic policy revolves around the conception of an expanded world economy—free and equal access for all nations to the trade and raw materials of the world, increased production, much greater exchange of goods and services between nations, increased consumption and higher levels of living for all peoples everywhere.

Now, there is not one single element of the Santa Claus philosophy in this policy.

On the contrary, quite aside from the question of future peace, the United States will be one of its principal beneficiaries.

Next to this problem of future peace and security, the postwar problem which concerns the greatest number of people in the United States is the problem of employment.

As you know so well here in this great industrial city of Detroit, we have enormously increased our productive capacity during the war, especially in capital and producers' goods—machinery, equipment, tools, and technical knowledge. This productive capacity is now far beyond our domestic requirements.

If we are to reach a satisfactory level of postwar employment, we must find markets abroad for this surplus production.

The markets are there all right in almost unlimited volume.

Many nations require enormous quantities of goods of this character in order to repair their war-devastated areas.

Other nations require the same type of goods in order to develop their resources.

It is definitely in our interest to assist these countries to reconstruct and develop because we cannot long expect to have a high level of employment and prosperity in our own country if the rest of the world is in the throes of unemployment and depression.

Moreover, we should not forget that our best markets are in the industrially developed countries of the world because it is in such countries that we find the highest standard of living and the greatest buying power.

To sum up, we have the goods for sale, and there are buyers who must have these goods. The problem is to find the dollars with which to make payment.

In the final analysis, our customers must pay in their own goods and services, but this will not be possible for several years, for the obvious reason that they will first have to restore and develop their productive facilities before they can produce a surplus over and beyond their own requirements.

One means of payment will be provided through the facilities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. I would like to tell you something about this institution and the International Monetary Fund.

A bill is now before the Congress to authorize our Government to join in the formation of these two institutions.

As you know, proposals for the bank and the fund were agreed upon at Bretton Woods last summer by delegates from all of the 44 United and Associated Nations.

The International Monetary Fund is designed to prevent a recurrence of one of the worst forms of international economic warfare so generally practiced in the period between the two World Wars.

I refer to the manipulation of currencies, exchange discriminations, and restrictions and competitive devaluation of exchanges in an effort to gain an unfair advantage in international trade.

The International Monetary Fund is designed to prevent this type of economic warfare.

Members of the fund agree to define their money in terms of gold, and to keep their money within 1 percent of its defined value. They also agree to avoid exchange restrictions and to consult with the fund whenever they consider a change in the value of their currency necessary.

This agreement forms the basic elements of stability and provides the rules of the game. Countries which join the fund agree that they will abide by the rules and will act together for the common good.

The agreement provides that each member shall pay into the fund a certain amount of its own currency and a smaller amount of gold. A member of the fund is enabled to purchase from the fund with its own currency the currency of another member.

In essence, the fund is a common effort by the nations which subscribe to it to put aside practices which are destructive of others and of the common good of all, and to provide the means which make that possible. No nation has more to gain from such a result than our own.

The International Monetary Fund promotes collective security because it seeks to establish order in the financial and economic fields, and order in those fields cannot be divorced from order elsewhere.

The second institution proposed at Bretton Woods is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The bank will facilitate investments and productive enterprises where they are need. This does not mean that the bank will supersede private lending.

In the normal case, a country will borrow from private bankers, but where private banks, because of the risk, cannot make the loan upon terms which are possible for the borrower, both borrower and lender may need the assistance of the International Bank.

The bank's function will be to investigate the soundness of the projects for which capital is desired and, provided they are sound, it will guarantee the loans made by private banks. It will also require the government of the country in which the money is to be used to guarantee the loan.

There are other means, such as the Export-Import Bank, of financing our excess of exports over imports which it is estimated may reach very large totals in the first 5 or 6 years after the war.

In all probability our total investments abroad, Government and private, may easily reach fifteen to twenty billion dollars in the first few years after the war, assuming

always that we are successful in building an organization for the preservation of peace which will give us reasonable hope to expect that the peace of the world will not again be broken, at least for many years to come.

In order to make it possible for the debtor countries to pay the interest and dividends on so large a sum, it is absolutely essential that trade discriminations be eliminated and excessive barriers to the international movement of goods such as tariffs, quotas, etc., be substantially lowered.

Indeed, the Bretton Woods proposals make no sense unless this necessary action is taken so that our foreign debtors will be allowed to service their obligations to us.

Surely, we do not wish to repeat the course we followed after the First World War. We had somewhat the same problem then that we have now. The way we met that problem was to provide lavishly the necessary credits which foreign countries needed for buying our goods, but we accompanied that with three separate advances in the tariff just to make sure that our foreign debtors would be unable to pay us no matter how much they wished to do so. Everybody remembers the tragic consequences of that policy. We not only lost our money but we created much international bad feeling as well. Thirty-two nations promptly retaliated by erecting all kinds of barriers against our trade, and from that time until the passage of the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934 there ensued a mad race between nations to see which could do the most to destroy international trade. The resulting damage was so great that it could not quickly be repaired.

Through the authority given in the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the Government is authorized to make agreements with foreign countries whereby concessions in our import duties on goods we purchase from them are traded for reductions in their duties on goods they buy from us.

This act has been in effect for 11 years with highly beneficial results, and there is now pending before the Congress a bill to extend the act for another 3 years and to give to the Government additional bargaining powers under the act.

As you know, this bill made its first hurdle a few days ago when the House Ways and Means Committee approved it by a vote of 14 to 11. But it is being bitterly fought and the battle is not yet won.

Governments are not alone in setting up barriers to an expanding world trade. Private cartels have developed enormously in the last 25 years, and through the control of production, prices, and markets also act to restrict the international exchange of goods. We in the State Department are opposed to such arrangements.

The whole basis of the Bretton Woods proposals and of the Trade Agreements Act and of our anticartels program is the promotion of an expanding economy and collective security through common action.

As has already been announced by the Secretary of State, an international conference to consider questions of trade and employment will probably be called in the next 9 or 10 months.

Unless we achieve a great expansion in world economy and an increase in the levels of living of all peoples, a solution of the vast problems before all the nations may well be rendered impossibe.

Most wars originate in economic causes.

The bounties of nature are distributed unequally over the earth.

Some countries are rich in one resource and some in another; still others possess almost no subsoil resources.

Hence, equality of opportunity for development in the modern world is only possible if all nations have free and equal access to the trade and raw materials of the world.

The belief entertained by many that our high wages and high standard of living are the product of a high tariff is, of course, an economic fallacy of the first order.

Wages and living standards are high in those countries where the proportion of land and productive facilities is high to that of the population and low in countries where the opposite is true.

Before the First World War the country in western Europe enjoying the highest standard of living had the lowest tariff and the country in western Europe with the lowest standard of living had the highest tariff.

A few years ago Mr. Hull had a survey made which showed that 34 tariff-protected industries in this country paid its workers an average wage of about $1,100 a year, whereas 34 industries having little or no tariff protection and requiring none paid its workers an average of about $1,800 a year.

The United States has the most efficient industrial plant in the world and there are very few industries in this country which cannot hold their own in the world market in competition with the industries of other countries.

We lead the world in the art of combining capital, management, and labor in the mass production of goods.

Lying about equally between Europe and Asia, with thousands of miles of seacoast on the Atlantic, the Gulf and the Pacific, with the best systems of transportation and communication in the world, with great natural resources and a great reservoir of capital, we are in an incomparable position to take advantage of the unprecedented opportunities which lie ahead of us.

What are we afraid of?

The only thing we should be afraid of is another world war.

Let us never forget that world peace will always be gravely jeopardized by the kind of international economic warfare which was so bitterly waged between the two world wars.

Democracy and free enterprise will not survive another world war.

For the second time in this generation, our country is faced with the responsibilities and opportunities of participation in world leadership.

At the end of the First World War, we stepped aside and the mantle fell to the ground. This time, the mantle is already around our shoulders, and a devastated and terrified world is hopefully looking to us to help them back to peace and life.

We can do this, but only if our wisdom and vision are equal to our power and influence.

Smoke Screens of Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to the House that failure to grant the Bureau of Reclamation the funds it has requested and which are necessary for planning of the Central Valley project transmission lines and Delta steam plant must inevitably result in continuing the grant to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. of a monopoly on the purchase of the vast blocks of low-cost public power which will be available from the power plants of the Central Valley project. I think the people of California and the people of the Nation have a right to expect and to demand that this House obey the 40-year-old mandate of the law that publicly generated power shall be made available to public purchasers, a mandate which this House itself reiterated when it passed the Flood Control Act of 1944 which became effective on December 22. I think the public has a right to expect and demand this rather than to have the cream from a vast public investment go to a monopolistic private power company.

The proponents of this monopoly have put forward many smoke screens in an attempt to confuse the issue. Mr. Speaker, let us examine briefly a few of these smoke screens.

The proponents of monopoly attempt to beguile us with the siren song that the private power company will bring the benefits of low-cost power to all users of electricity in the Central Valley area. They tell us further that there is no unserved market in the Central Valley area. These claims are neither new nor true. They are the same old claims that were put forward, and I regret to say put forward successfully, for a decade in the case of Wilson Dam, which is now a part of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

But the plain truth in the case of the Wilson Dam was that the low-cost Government power was not delivered cheaply to the consumers of electric energy in the areas served by the purchasing utility, even though that utility by reason of its monopolistic position purchased Government energy for a song. Nor was it true that there was no unserved market in the area of Wilson Dam. When the public began to sell the power of Wilson Dam at a fair rate the "fully developed market area" increased its use of power many fold. Unless the Government is free in its efforts to bring the power to the wholesale load centers, the history of Wilson Dam prior to TVA will repeat itself.

Another smoke screen put forward in an attempt to becloud the issue is the claim that by continuing the sale of Central Valley power exclusively to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. the Government will realize more money than it will realize if it builds these transmission lines to transmit the power itself to wholesale load centers. Mr. Speaker, that is entirely beside the point even if true, and we have only the unsupported testimony of the president of the P. G. & E that it is true. Mr. Speaker, the Government, if it is allowed to transmit this power to the wholesale load centers, will be able to derive in net revenues a sum sufficient, within the repayment period fixed by law, to amortize fully the cost of construction of the power facilities and, in addition, to pay that portion of the cost of the irrigation facilities of this project which is beyond the ability of the water users to repay.

Mr. Speaker, the law requires that the rates charged by the Government do this and the Government will be able to do this and still furnish power to public bodies, nonprofit cooperatives, and other purchasers, including the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. itself, at a cost to the purchaser substantially below the rate which the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is charging. In so doing the Government will be complying fully with another basic aim of governmental power policy, which has been written into the Flood Control Act

of 1944 by this very Congress, and that is that Government power shall be transmitted and disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles in order to encourage the most widespread use thereof.

One more smoke screen put forward by the monopolies deserves attention. That is the oft-repeated statement of Mr. Black, the president of the P. G. & E. Co., that if the Government will continue to give P. G. & E. a monopoly at the bus bar, the P. G. & E. will graciously consent to the Government's withdrawing such power as it may wish to sell to public bodies that wish to deal directly with the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing to this claim, because the Government will not be able, since it would have no transmission lines, to deliver power to public purchasers.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous other smoke screens that the P. G. & E. has thrown out. Upon analysis none of them stand up any better than those I have already brought to your attention. I think it incumbent upon this House to refuse any longer to be a party to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. monopoly.

Wildlife Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some ten to fifteen million sportsmen are interested in a national wildlife conservation program, I take the liberty of bringing to the attention of the House, the following bills I have today introduced on behalf of the House Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, and on which hearings will be had by our committee commencing on Tuesday, June 19:

First. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this bill is to give the Fish and Wildlife Service jurisdiction over the wildlife resources of water impounded areas.

Section 3 of the bill fully protects the rights of the States in their jurisdiction over fish and upland game.

Section 4 directs a full investigation of pollution and a report thereon to the Congress. The information likewise to be made available to Federal, State, municipal and private agencies.

Section 5 authorizes an appropriation to finance that investigation and for other purposes.

Second. A bill to preserve breeding stocks and prevent starvation and disease among waterfowl along their fly ways, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service to issue permits to feed migratory birds, for which a permit fee not in excess of $5 may be charged. The funds realized from such permits are to be used for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918, as amended.

Third. A bill to permit public shooting on national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the provisions of the Duck Stamp Act, which prohibits shooting on any refuges purchased with such funds. It has been found that some of those refuges are larger than required for refuge purposes. The bill authorizes the Fish and Wildlife Service in its discretion to open to public shooting not exceeding 25 percent of any refuge.

I have introduced no bill to permit the use of live decoys since that is a matter better handled by regulations to be promulgated by the President. Many communications from all sections of the country have been received by our committee in behalf of the proposal. I anticipate it will be the chief topic of discussion at the forthcoming hearings.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is highly probable that at an early date this Congress will consider the great question of peacetime conscription. Mr. Percy M. Hansen, editor of the Jamestown Sun, Jamestown, N. Dak., who for a period of 4 years has been a high-ranking officer in the service of his country, writes the following editorial entitled "Let's Go Slow on Peacetime Draft."

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial:

LET'S GO SLOW ON PEACETIME DRAFT

One of the first editorials appearing in the Sun, after it had come under the control of the present management nearly 20 years ago, advocated universal military training as the best method of keeping this Nation out of war and of regaining peace if we ever should be forced to fight. During the 16 years between the publication of that comment and the beginning of the so-called national defense period, which preceded the present conflict, this newspaper and its editor waged an unceasing campaign for national defense and military preparedness. So active did we become in this effort that we were charged many times with being a war monger, whatever that may be.

In view of this background, it may come as a surprise to many that we now caution against a hasty passage of the proposed measure which would call all youth of the land into the armed forces for a period of 1 year. There are several reasons for our opposition to the proposed bill, and these reasons are born of 4 years of active service with the Army in this country and in two of the three sectors outside of the continental limits of the United States.

Proponents of the measure now before Congress openly admit that they are trying to force the passage of the bill before the millions of men now in the service in foreign countries return. They admit that their chance of securing the approval of the bill has lessened with the ending of the fighting on the European front and their fear of defeat if action is delayed until after the surrender of Japan. Millions of words have been written of how the prohibition amendment to the Constitution was secured by the antiliquor forces while the men were overseas, and, it would appear that the present frenzy over passage of the universal military training bill may be caused, in part at least, by the fear that the veterans of the present conflict will be opposed to the measure.

Only yesterday, the Veterans of Foreign Wars proposed a substitute measure which would not take high-school boys away from home at the critical, formative period in their lives, but would give them the necessary military training under competent instruction near their homes and without interfering with their education. The internationally recognized record of the One Hundred Sixty-fourth Infantry and the less spectacular but equally as deserving record of the One Hundred Eighty-eighth Field Artillery in World War II lends strength to the stand of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Both of these regiments were graded as "ready for field service" as a result of their training in North Dakota and the neighboring State of Minnesota.

Opponents of national defense have, for many years, declared that universal military training would make us a militaristic Nation and would promote rather than avert war. We do not subscribe to this view, if that military training is given under democratic conditions. There is, however, a serious danger of the professional military men of the Nation becoming too powerful if the National Guard and the Officer's Reserve Corps is replaced with a purely professional Army. There is no question in the minds of any person who has been in the Army during the last 5 years but that the powerful, controlling clique in the regular Army has planned for many years to eliminate the National Guard at the first opportunity and that every effort was made to attain this objective during the present war. Several general officers openly boasted to the writer that "the National Guard is dead." One brigade commander issued formal orders that the National Guard origin of one of this State's regiments was not to be mentioned by the officers of that regiment in any talks to their men nor in any news stories which were sent home. "There is no such thing as the National Guard," he announced, "and there never will be again."

Perhaps, the most outstanding incident which shows the attitude of the professional officer toward the civilian components of the Army of the United States was revealed with the publication of the story that General Marshall told President Truman, then a member of the United States Senate and a colonel in the Officers' Reserve Corps, when he applied for active service that "We do not want any old goats like you in the Army."

Some of the most potent arguments against the measure now before Congress are that it will take the youth away from the influences of his home community and interrupt his education at a very critical period in his life. The high-school graduate, who is forced to delay going to college until after a full year in the armed services, is much less apt to continue on to college than one who is able to pursue his education uninterrupted. Thousands of men have been given commissions as officers after only 13 weeks of training and hundreds of thousands have been sent into battle with a similar or shorter period of training. The period of basic train-

ing in the present war was set at 17 weeks and thousands of marines and sailors went into action immediately upon completion of their 8 weeks' "boot" training. It should be remembered that this 17-week period was set by the War Department before Pearl Harbor and that, in many instances, it was materially shortened when the situation became more critical.

If it is possible to train men for battle in 13 or 17 weeks, why is it necessary to give them a full year of training? If they can be trained in 13 weeks or twice that time, why not induct them into service during the summer vacations of the sophomore and junior years in high school, leaving them free to prepare for college during the summer months immediately following their graduation from high school? After the completion of the two summer periods, their training could be continued in the National Guard or in a reserve component at such time as not to interfere with their education or civilian work.

When a great organization like the Veterans of Foreign Wars opposes a full year of military training, it would seem that it might be well to make haste slowly and wait until the present crop of veterans of foreign service have returned to their homes and can express their opinions. After all, they are the men who have, through hard experience, become experts on the matter of military training. Certainly, there will be no immediate danger of another world war after the defeat of Japan, and we can afford to study this matter carefully before taking final action.

A Big Job for a Competent Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a release from the Department of the Interior calls our attention to the promotion of Goodrich W. Lineweaver by his appointment as Director of the Branch of Operation and Maintenance of the Bureau of Reclamation, effective immediately. According to the announcement, Mr. Lineweaver has had a varied experience which is a part of his qualifications for the new responsibility. He is well known to all of us who have had contact with the Bureau of Reclamation, and we regard this appointment as an unusually good one.

When it is considered that the United States Government has nearly a billion dollars invested in reclamation projects in the West and that it contemplates investing a great deal more money in an extension of the reclamation program in the postwar period, it may be seen how great a task devolves upon Mr. Lineweaver. Believing that his past work is but an earnest of what may be expected of him in the new position, I hail this appointment in behalf of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. This committee has recently reported out two bills—H. R. 520 and H. R. 2742—both designed to aid servicemen, not only to find employment in constructive work on their return from the war but to furnish homes for many of them. This is a part of the work which Mr. Lineweaver will be called upon to extend with all of his ability and energy. The release is as follows:

The appointment of Goodrich W. Lineweaver as Director of the Branch of Operation and Maintenance of the Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C., was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. Mr. Lineweaver has been Acting Director of the Branch since February 5, 1945.

Commenting on the appointment which he had recommended to Secretary Ickes, Commissioner of Reclamation Harry W. Bashore said:

"Mr. Lineweaver's knowledge and experience in reclamation equip him to head the Operation and Maintenance Branch, which is responsible for the development and coordination of irrigation systems providing water to more than 4,000,000 acres of highly productive land in 15 Western States.

"A principal responsibility of the new Director of the Branch of Operation and Maintenance is to develop, for execution through the regional offices of the Bureau in the West, settlement programs for returning servicemen and others so as to bring about full and sustained use of the resources of Federal reclamation projects, expected to be extended in the postwar period to include several million additional acres in new irrigation farms."

Following the announcement by Secretary of the Interior Ickes, Commissioner Harry W. Bashore made a more complete statement regarding the significance of this appointment than was circulated in the general press release which was issued. The complete statement by Mr. Bashore follows:

"Mr. Lineweaver's knowledge and experience in reclamation equip him to head the Operation and Maintenance Branch. As Director of the Branch, he will coordinate these activities of the Bureau's seven regions in the West and function through the regional directors at Boise, Idaho; Sacramento, Calif.; Boulder City, Nev.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Amarillo, Tex.; Billings, Mont.; and Denver, Colo.

"The Branch is responsible, as well, for the development and coordination of programs in connection with the operation and maintenance of irrigation systems providing water to more than 4,000,000 acres of highly productive land in 15 Western States. It shares in the protection of the Federal investment of $920,000,000 in irrigation, power, and other facilities in that area. The director represents the Commissioner in outlining the economic bases for amendatory repayment contracts and for the initiation of new contracts under which the return of the Federal investment is obtained from irrigation water users.

"This Branch is also responsible for the programs of land use and other agricultural and economic aspects, including settlement, on 50 projects in operation and more than 100 others authorized for construction which will extend the Bureau's irrigation service to more than 15,000,000 acres in 17 Western States.

"A principal responsibility of the Branch of Operation and Maintenance is to develop, for execution through the regional offices of the Bureau in the West, settlement programs for returning servicemen and others so as to bring about full and sustained use of the resources of Federal Reclamation projects. The Bureau of Reclamation is now giving first priority, so far as funds and legislative authority permit, to speed the work necessary in opening up for settlement several million acres in new irrigation farms. The program includes plans to make irrigation homesteads available to veterans on public and other lands in the West.

"That settlement objective involves, among other things, working out ways for veterans and other new settlers to be able to get their homesteads into income-producing crops soon after entry," Mr. Bashore said. "The Operation and Maintenance Branch will coordinate the work with Federal and State agencies, with irrigation districts and other local organizations, and State colleges of agriculture in formulating programs for economical land clearing and leveling and for irrigated farm practices that will result in stable income to settlers on family-size farms. Sound irrigation farming leads to prosperous communities and contributes to national welfare through expanded purchasing power."

Reclamation Commissioner Bashore announced at the same time appointment of E. D. Eaton and Alfred R. Golze as assistant directors of the Operation and Maintenance Branch, on Mr. Lineweaver's staff.

John S. Moore, whom Mr. Lineweaver succeeds, headed the Branch at Denver, Colo., before its transfer last fall to Washington and is now assistant to the regional director at Boise, Idaho.

Mr. Lineweaver, before becoming Acting Director of Operation and Maintenance, was assistant to the Commissioner in charge of liaison with branches located in Denver, and with regional directors in coordinating the Bureau's war, food, and postwar programs. Previously he had been Chief of Information of the Bureau. In 1937–38, he was secretary of the Reclamation Repayment Commission which made an analysis of the economic conditions of reclamation projects then in operation in 15 Western States, after which he joined the Bureau's staff as a consultant on irrigation and related subjects. He has a wide acquaintance in the West.

Previous to his connection with the Bureau, Mr. Lineweaver had served as secretary of the Federal Power Commission and as a consultant with the Brookings Institution in its survey of Federal agencies. He is a native of Harrisonburg, Va., was an Army lieutenant in World War I, and had been associated with newspapers in Harrisonburg, Norfolk, and Richmond, Va., before entering the Federal service.

The New Deal Financial Cult

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the public should not be too severe on Brig. Gen. Elliott Roosevelt for his adventure into high finance. The public must not forget that this young man has been trained under an illustrious financier who, of course, proceeds on the theory that "we owe it to ourselves." I dare say that the settlement made by the Roosevelt family was not unlike the settlement which the New Deal hopes to make with the citizens of this country who have loaned their money and paid their taxes to carry out the superspending program inaugurated in 1933.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article by Westbrook Pegler which appeared in the Jamestown Post-Journal, Jamestown, N. Y., under date of June 12, 1945:

NEW YORK.—On March 31, 1939, Elliott Roosevelt, then 29 years old, called on John Hartford, president of the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co., the largest retail grocery chain-store system, to request a loan of $200,000. He had met Hartford only once

before and then only in a mere introduction, so there was no basis of old personal friendship between them. Elliott wanted the money to finance his radio interests in Texas.

Hartford had a profound respect for the office of the President of the United States and may have thought it was an honor to be asked to assist the son of a President. Other considerations suggest themselves which might have been influential in the decision of a man so placed. In the recent past, scrupulously honest men had been harassed and pilloried as tax evaders who had scrupulously complied with the law. The Department of Justice had given citizens reason to fear prosecution for political motives. Until Mr. Hartford decides to make a statement we cannot know what thoughts persuaded him to lend Elliott the money.

It can be stated, however, that Hartford did demur on the ground that such a transaction might be misunderstood if knowledge of it became public and might embarrass the President. Dispelling such misgivings, Elliott immediately telephoned to President Roosevelt at the Little White House at Warm Springs, Ga., and the President spoke cordially to Mr. Hartford, addressing him as "John" although they had never met, and thanked him for this favor to his son.

Hartford then loaned Elliott the $200,000, taking as collateral stocks in business interests in which Elliott was concerned. Hartford closed the transaction on March 17, 1942. He never dunned Elliott for the money, never demanded payment and only made inquiries regarding the stock. Finally he wrote off the $200,000 in his income-tax returns as an uncollectible debt, and the net result has been that Elliott Roosevelt got $200,000 for his business and the treasuries of the United States and the State of New York have lost the high-bracket taxes that Hartford otherwise would have had to pay on the money.

The question arises why Elliott selected an individual rich man instead of going to a bank if his security was appropriate to the loan.

John Hartford and his brother, George, and a group of other defendants are now on trial under criminal informations filed against them by the Department of Justice charging them with violation of the antitrust law. The trial is proceeding in the Federal court in Danville, Ill.

Hartford may be suspected of divulging the deal with Elliott at this time for an ulterior purpose in connection with the defense. In fairness to him, therefore, I will state that the original information came to me from a source which I believe to have no connection with the Hartfords or their company 4 months ago, and that the reason why it is presented at this time is that it has taken this long to confirm the tip. It is a mere coincidence that it is confirmed while the trial is on, and Mr. Hartford was plainly embarrassed when the facts were placed before him and would say nothing for publication.

There is no doubt that President Roosevelt knew of the loan and approved it.

Would Mr. Hartford have been willing to lend $200,000 to some other young man of 29, not the son of a President of the United States, with experience and qualifications equal or even superior to Elliott's on similar terms? Or would he advise the applicant to go to a bank for the money? As a director of the Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, would he have approved this loan as a sound investment?

Elliott Roosevelt, now a brigadier general, has been invited to make a statement of his position and the facts of the case. A telegram was addressed to him at the Waldorf-Astoria where he was a guest but he had checked out leaving no forwarding address. The message therefore was repeated to Hyde Park.

Poll-Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 13, 1945:

POLL-TAX ISSUE

(By Mark Sullivan)

HISTORY OF MOVEMENT

The essential question involved in the movement in Congress to abolish payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting may be understood by recalling the history of another movement analogous in kind and purpose.

Just as seven States now require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, so, preceding 1920, did many States have a different limitation—voters had to be of the male sex. This limitation on voting was thought by many persons to be undesirable. They set about ending it. They took the method prescribed by the Constitution, that is, by amendment of the Constitution.

Following the constitutional procedure, they introduced the proposed amendment in Congress. Passage by both branches was concluded June 4, 1919. Thereafter, continuing to follow the constitutional procedure, the amendment was laid before the States. By August 18, 1920, the amendment had been ratified by three-fourths of the States. Sex as a limitation on voting was ended.

The entire process of ending a limitation on voting by constitutional amendment, from introduction in Congress to final ratification by the States, consumed less than 20 months. The backers of the present movement to end the poll tax have followed a different method. They undertook to do it by a simple act of Congress, requiring a majority vote. The movement began in 1939, when the first bill was introduced. It has been under way ever since. Twice in the past—in 1942 and 1943—the bill passed the House; twice it died in the Senate. After 6 years of formidably organized agitation and drive, the backers of the movement are where they began. Had they followed the method of constitutional amendment, they might have ended the poll-tax limitation as quickly as the sex limitation was ended. This is on the assumption, of course, that there is—in Congress, in the States, and among the people—as much desire for ending the poll-tax limitation as there was for ending the sex limitation.

Without examining newspapers of the time carefully, it seems safe to say that in 1919 hardly any responsible person seriously supposed that the Federal Government could change voting requirements in States by any process other than constitutional amendment.

There is yet another way of ending the poll-tax limitation—by action of the States within which it exists. The process is under way. Georgia ended the poll tax this year. Florida ended it in 1937; Louisiana in 1934. Payment of a poll tax, or of ordinary taxes, as a requirement for voting, was ended in Pennsylvania in 1933. There remain but seven States in which the poll tax exists. In all seven sentiment against it is strong and increasing. In two, active anti-poll-tax movements likely to be successful, are under way.

The attempt to end the poll tax by simple act of Congress involves the question whether Congress, under the Constitution, has this power. The present bill recognizes that Congress, if it has the power at all, has it only as respects voting for Federal officials—President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives. No one contends that Congress has power to end the poll tax as respects voting for State and local officials. Whether Congress has even the limited power which the present bill undertakes to exercise is a disputed constitutional question.

But the deeper question is whether Congress, even if it has the power, ought to exercise it. At present, the fixing of requirements for voting is exclusively in the hands of the States. All of the States have requirements of their own. In varying forms they deal with length of residence in the State and in the voting district, ability to read and write, naturalization of alien-born voters, and the length of time since naturalized. As respects age, 47 of the States stipulate 21 years; 1 State, Georgia, has recently fixed 18 years.

If Congress can intrude in this exclusive function of the States as respects the poll tax, it can intrude as respects every other voting requirement. When a Congressman from Pennsylvania, for example, votes to end the poll tax as a requirement for voting in South Carolina, he by that act asserts that Congress can likewise end any voting requirement that Pennsylvania may have. And so as to every Congressman from every State.

The right of each State to fix its own voting requirements is a precious power; it goes to the heart of the very existence of a State as a unit of government. And the present proposal comes at a time when the States and their citizens are showing concern lest their rights and functions be reduced.

Work in a Congressional Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, many people do not have information about the nature of the work of a Member of Congress. They vote every 2 years for someone to represent them in the lawmaking body at Washington, D. C. An intimate knowledge of the duties and the work of a Member of Congress may be of interest at this time. I briefly call attention to some of our activities in the Nation's Capitol. Our scheme of government, of course, provides for a Congress to enact legislation, an executive branch of the Government to administer the laws, and a supreme court to decide whether or not those laws are constitutional.

A large part of the work of Congress is done through its committees. A bill is introduced, referred to a committee, hearings are held, and a bill reported by the committee to the House of Representatives for consideration. This all sounds rather simple, but sometimes hearings before a committee run for a period of several weeks and when bills reach the House of Representatives they

may be amended and changed, and roll calls are in order.

Entirely aside from the legislative program, every Member of Congress receives a large volume of correspondence, not only from people in his district, but elsewhere as well. Right now legislation relating to the Office of Price Administration is pending and several letters each day may be expected from various people interested in this subject. The volume of correspondence varies. If it is a highly controversial matter, letters and telegrams may number 50 or even 100 in a single day.

Then there is the matter of departmental contacts. With the enormous increase in the number of bureaus and agencies, requests have steadily increased. A typical example would have to do with the extension of a rural mail route. Another would have to do with getting a birth record from the Bureau of the Census. A request came to the office the other day from a housewife whose husband was ill, and had to have meat, and she was having trouble to get the proper food to comply with the diet requirements. She had to have information as to proper and correct procedure. These illustrations could be multiplied 100 times. Since World War II started the congressional work has increased in many ways. There was the matter of getting allotments straightened out for dependents of men in the armed forces. There was the question of war risk insurance, and numerous other matters relating directly or indirectly to the war effort. With VE-day, there has come the problem of demobilization. Every mail brings a request from someone who feels that a soldier ought to be discharged, and very often give good and compelling reasons. These are just typical of the subject matter of a large volume of correspondence which we handle every day in a congressional office.

In spite of all of this activity, there are still some folks who think that all a Member has to do is smoke a cigar and take life easy. They do not realize that when Congress is in session, the schedule is a heavy one. Most Members are at their office early in the morning, check over correspondence, dictate letters, and then at 10 o'clock in the morning attend committee meetings which last, as a rule, until 12 o'clock noon. The ordinary rule is for both the House and the Senate to go into session at noon and remain in session until the day's legislative program is completed. Members either must be in attendance, or be working in their office so that they can be present when votes are taken on legislative proposals.

From time to time we get some real critical letters. They are brick-bats in every sense of the word. You can always find someone who is right on every question, who never makes a mistake, and who never has a wrong opinion. They may not make a Congressman's life happy, but they do make it interesting, because, after all, you welcome the other fellow's viewpoint and then use your best judgment, having in mind the people of the district who elect you to Congress.

It is refreshing to have a line of appreciation once in a while, and I quote from a few of the many such letters which have come to my office.

A recent letter came from the American Legion post at Chisholm, Minn., dealing with problems concerning members of a family in the armed forces. Omitting the names, this letter reads as follows:

PRESS-LLOYD POST, No. 247,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Chisholm, Minn., June 6, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PITTENGER: This will acknowledge, with sincerest appreciation, your two very fine letters, and your very excellent attention to the matters concerning the ——— boys.

It is very gratifying to be able to refer such exceedingly important matters to one in your position and to be able to expect, and receive, the best possible results.

You may rest assured that your efforts in this case are fully appreciated by the ——— family, their friends, and many others, as well as by the writer and the organization he represents.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
O. F. WECKERLING,
Adjutant and Service Officer.

Another letter, typical of those which have to do with our legislative program, reads as follows:

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 39,
Eveleth, Minn., May 16, 1945.

Congressman WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I thank you for your letter in regard to the hot-lunch program for schools and I also wish to congratulate you on your postwar program. I hope we may persuade some other Congressmen to become as intelligent on this matter as you are.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours very truly,
A. D. GILLETT,
Superintendent.

In connection with the legislative program the postal employees have been interested, and a letter from Leo E. George, president, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, is typical of the correspondence dealing with problems of the group represented by Mr. George. The letter reads as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PITTENGER: You were one who personally appeared before the House Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on March 27, 1945, and expressed your favorable interest in legislation to provide for a much needed and long overdue adjustment of postal salaries to meet increased obligations and recompense these faithful public employees in some measure for their increased productivity and loyal service.

This is to convey to you the sincere appreciation of more than 55,000 members of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks for your friendly interest and for your taking the time from a busy schedule to be helpful in expediting this meritorious legislation.

Sincerely yours,
LEO E. GEORGE, *President.*

Another interesting letter from a constituent tells its own story, and reads as follows:

DULUTH, MINN., *April 21, 1945.*

WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTENGER: We received the agricultural bulletins today and wish to send our thanks. As we are folks that have just moved on our little farm in the past year they are really a big help.

Thanking you again, we remain,
Very sincerely yours,
MR. and MRS. ROBERT A. LAPIERRE.

You would be surprised at the variety of requests that come to us. One had to do with getting transportation for the wife of a man who is stationed in the Canal Zone in Panama. We received a letter of appreciation, reading as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 9, 1945.

WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to thank you for the excellent work that you have done in obtaining permission for Mrs. ——— to return to her husband in the Canal Zone. I am sure that you are making a young couple happy, and I feel very grateful to you for having made it possible for them to be in their home in the Canal Zone.

I trust, that sometime in the future, that I will have the opportunity of meeting you personally and thanking you in my plain way of talking. I have written your State representative, Dwight Swanstrom, and told him of the good work that you did in this case. Again thanking you and hoping that I will be able some time to return this favor and with fondest personal regards and the best of luck, I am,

Yours truly,
JAMES W. O'BRIEN.

We get many requests from people in the district for copies of laws or for information dealing with some one of the hundreds of bureaus down here. The following note of appreciation tells its own story:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF BOILERMAKERS, IRON SHIP
BUILDERS AND HELPERS OF AMERICA,
Duluth, Minn., May 3, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Just a note to tell you how much myself and my organization appreciate the work you have done in our behalf. The sincerity and promptness with which you have handled our requests more than justify our confidence in you.

Best wishes and kindest regards.
JOHN J. WEST,
Business Agent, Local No. 415.

Requests for assistance in expediting claims and other governmental matters come from every part of the district. I quote in part the following letter from Hibbing, Minn.:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Hibbing, Minn., April 24, 1945.

Mr. W. A. PITTENGER,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PITTENGER: May I take this occasion of expressing my sincere thanks and appreciation for the interest that you took in procuring the payment of death gratuity

in the above serviceman's case, and also for your wire and letter of April 16?

Cordially yours,

JOHN L. GOLOB,
Service Officer.

One of the important phases of work in a Congressman's office deals with compensation for veterans and their dependents. This will become more and more important following the termination of the present war. We treasure very highly a letter of appreciation—we omit name of the party—which was received from Mr. Johnston, and which reads as follows:

ST. LOUIS COUNTY WELFARE BOARD,
Duluth, Minn., May 31, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PITTENGER: I wish to thank you for your telegram of May 31 informing me that dependency compensation has been granted Mrs. ———. I know she will appreciate your efforts in her behalf.

We also appreciate the fine job you are doing for these dependents of deceased veterans. In most cases everything goes along fine, but once in a while I get into a little difficulty, and whenever I have called on you you have been able to straighten it out, so your cooperation along these lines is appreciated.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

DON J. JOHNSTON,
Veterans' Assistance Officer.

Without making this list of illustrations dealing with departmental activity too long I want to submit the following letter from Mr. Hicks, showing that in spite of the many prosaic matters handled in a Congressman's office, the subject of sugar and sweetness is not overlooked. In the processing of jellies and jams the sweetening up process is necessary, as the following letter will illustrate:

THE HICKS CO.,
Grand Rapids, Minn., March 29, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
Congressman, House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PITTENGER: We have your telegraphic and letter communications with reference to the adjustment of our sugar allotment by the OPA. We have also received confirmation from the Duluth OPA office and sugar-allotment certificates have already been issued to us.

We thank you most heartily for your efforts and the results obtained in prevailing upon the OPA for this adjustment. Their action proves justification for our application. Therefore I am sure you realize that we were not seeking something which we were not entitled to.

Again thanking you for your assistance in bringing about this favorable condition, I am,

Yours very truly,

ROLAND HICKS.

EIGHTH DISTRICT HAS MANY VARIED INTERESTS

Every section of the Eighth Congressional District has its problems which require attention at Washington. The people of Itasca County are interested in the flood problems of the reservoirs in the upper Mississippi, and we have just recently secured enactment of a resolution by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, of which committee I am a member, requesting the War Department engineers to make a survey of the upper Mississippi to determine the best way to avoid flooding of lands and consequent damage in Itasca County.

Then over at Lake Kabetogama they have conducted hearings to determine what improvements are needed in this lake. Some 3 or 4 years ago Tom Watson, of Ray, Minn., suggested that the lake needed some harbor improvements, and we were successful in having the War Department make a survey and conduct hearings in connection with this problem.

Of particular interest to our section of the State, so far as its recreational advantages are concerned, is the development of harbors of refuge along the north shore of Lake Superior. Surveys have already been made at Beaver Bay and Lutsen, and with proper help from the State of Minnesota, supplementing funds which will be spent by the War Department at Washington, we are going to have a couple of fine harbors at these two places, which will accommodate not only fishermen but those who want to spend their vacations on the shore of Lake Superior where they can have boating and other facilities.

We also plan to request the War Department engineers to consider further the development of the harbor at Grand Portage, Minn., and a harbor of refuge at Tofte, Minn. I just mention these different projects so those who are interested in activities at Washington will understand how the Federal Government is related to numerous conditions which mean much in the development of our section of the country.

Rehabilitation of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following valedictory address of John A. Farrell, Bayonne, N. J., a disabled veteran of World War II, at the graduation of the second class of trainees of the Disabled American Veterans at American University, Washington, D. C., May 20, 1945:

Soon the last shot will be fired and our demobilized veterans will return in ever increasing numbers, back to the farm, to the factory, and to the office. Each one must be enabled to take his place as a useful citizen. That is what he wants; that is what we want. For that, special measures must be taken now. A planned practical rehabilitation program for our disabled veterans, properly administered, and the planned reconversion of our industries from war to peace to insure full employment are all part of a whole which can bring this about.

The physically handicapped veteran needs special help. He must be discharged, thoroughly equipped to adjust himself to civilian life and well trained to do useful work. Many hospitals for the wounded have an excellent program for reconditioning, including aptitude testing, vocational guidance, vocational training and useful work which men can do while they are hospitalized. One of these programs is the Birmingham Plan for Occupational Therapy. In operation this plan provides an opportunity for men to participate in gainful employment while being hospitalized. It is available both to ambulatory and bed patients. With the cooperation of local industry, shops are set up for part-time employment with a scale of wages comparable to what they would make if employed at the plant proper. Endless hours of inactivity are hereby utilized in productive employment.

Many hospitals, however, have no such program. I was in one. I spent, and hundreds like me have spent, and are still spending months of endless days with nothing to do, and nights sleepless because of the day's inactivity. Life in such a vacuum breeds professional veterans; leads to hopelessness and cynicism. Many of our disabled veterans are discharged from these hospitals such as those suffering from severe cases of hospitalitis and pensionitis.

Let us advocate the installation of the Birmingham plan in every hospital for the wounded in the country. Let us see to it that each disabled man, whether he is blind, deaf, or otherwise mutilated, knows as soon as possible that he can do useful work. This is his birthright; this must be his to keep.

Not only is a rehabilitation program needed in hospitals, but so are trained counselors to render assistance and guidance to our handicapped. To illustrate this need, let me tell you just two experiences of mine.

While convalescing, I became asquainted with a boy who had lost a leg. His education was limited to grade school; he had formerly been a coal miner. One day he said, and I quote him, "Now that I have lost a leg I guess I can't get down on my knees in the mines any more." He had been hospitalized over 6 months. During all those precious months there was no personal contact made by any trained counselor to help him solve his problem and help him plan his future.

During a recent visit to the same hospital I made the acquaintance of another soldier who had lost his right hand. Jim was a professional saxophone player before he entered the Army. How he was vitally concerned with the future because he could not return to his former occupation. We cannot overstress the need of aptitude testing and vocational guidance for many of our disabled in service hospitals throughout the country. We merely have to show them the door of opportunity and they will open it. The future years will reveal the results of a halfway, inadequate rehabilitation program. Seeds now sown in fertile fields will yield an abundant harvest in the future.

Following discharge, many of our veterans will return to civilian life through the channel of education. For many veterans reintegration into civilian life can be accomplished only through education and retraining. This has been recognized in veterans' laws. Althought these laws provide that a veteran discharged other than dishonorably "shall be eligible for and entitled to such course of education or training as he may elect and at any approved educational or training institution at which he chooses to enroll," this is for one large group of veterans purely theoretical. Although the armed services are popularly supposed to be made up of boys out of high school and college, there is a large segment which has had only a grammar-school education. If such veterans are under 20 the trade school of high-school level is available for training. However, for such veterans over 20, and particularly for those over 26, such trade high schools, set up to meet the needs of adolescents are unsuitable. Can you visualize matured veterans returning to high schools mingling in the society of bobby-socked Sinatra fans? Veterans over 25 who have had only a grammar-school education are liable also to have been unskilled labor

before conscription and to have suffered personal defeat as depression casualties.

The group of adult males over 25 of low educational level who have been unskilled labor is particularly that group which feels that the GI bill offers them nothing. Such groups will be found in the areas where there are rural and urban slums; where the great depression was the deepest, forcing children out of school as soon as possible; where there are large aggregations of foreign born from southern and eastern Europe. Their entire lives have been a story of underprivilege both economic and social. To them the GI bill is one more manifestation. This situation against such individuals is aggravated when the veteran is disabled and is no longer able to perform unskilled labor which is usually heavy labor.

It would seem that New York City because of the facilities and skills available as well as its marked progressive attitude on education would at least have met this need. However, on investigation it was discovered that there were vocational trade schools for adolescents; night trade schools which adults attend; the vocational program in the city was being curtailed not expanded; there were no public vocational training facilities for adults other than night schools. There was no special attention being given by the city to the vocational training of adult veterans.

But industries are not going to cooperate in a Birmingham plan if they are shutting down their plants. What jobs can vocational schools train veterans to take if there are no jobs? This brings us to the most important part of planning for the returning veteran. The reconversion of this country's industry must be so planned that we maintain full employment so that there is a job for the veteran, his comrade-in-arms and his brother who stayed home.

There is no line of demarcation between planning for war and planning for peace. We have mobilized our resources in wartime; let us now mobilize for peace. Legislation for this purpose must be promptly adopted to provide for the problems of reconversion which are already arising. We need such measures now with unemployment growing around Detroit and the west coast. How hopeful does the soldier along the Elbe feel when he reads of this? We recognize that the task of providing full employment is primarily that of private industry. We believe that, given adequate planning, with the participation and assistance of Government, private industry can do the job. The full employment program must, however, be guaranteed by Government with a prepared program of jobs at useful work, with standard wages and working conditions, if and to the extent that private industry falls short of the goal.

Full employment is the achievement we are all striving for, but we as disabled veterans are especially concerned. With unemployment we may suffer the most. In the prewar world the physically handicapped belonged in a low employable category—"the last to be hired and the first to be fired." It is needless to say that this was unjustified because statistics have proven that the handicapped have equaled and not infrequently have surpassed their fellow worker. We are proud as a class of disabled veterans to be members of the Disabled American Veterans—an organization which has formulated and presented to Congress a bill to encourage the hiring of disabled veterans. Our neighbor to the north, Canada, has enacted into law such legislation since 1921. It is hoped that we shall soon follow them.

The bill H. R. 1533 is now before the World War Veterans Committee awaiting consideration. We trust that it will be considered soon; followed by its enactment into law.

We are at the moment victors. We are stating what we want and what we need. It is not military victory alone we seek but a better chance for every guy in a better world. Men who are conceived in war, born of a great depression and who are now engaged in war will not want to return to a world that will be visited with economic upheavals and recurring wars. Is the unemployment in Detroit and the acceptance of Argentina into the Security Conference an indication of what the future holds? Are we to have won the war and lost the peace abroad and here at home? "When we assumed the soldier, we did not lay aside the citizen." These are the words inscribed in marble on the amphitheater near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington Cemetery. In a sense it is a challenge to us all. We, as citizens and veterans, shall not shirk this challenge.

The veteran among us will be charged with the responsibility of securing the peace, ideals and economic welfare of America by those veterans who are not among us.

It is not a question whether these men shall have died in vain but whether we shall have lived in vain.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, recently much has been said in and out of Congress about proposed legislation setting up a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. As the matter stands now, the legislation will probably not be brought out. In my judgment, it should not be considered or passed. It is entirely the wrong approach, and would without a doubt cause a widening breach in race relationships. You cannot reach the situation by force of law. It must be by education—by tolerance—by reason, and by forbearance.

In my judgment great good could come of a sensible and reasonable racial relations division in the Department of Labor. A group dedicated to improving race relationships and understanding in the economic field by the application of the principles of reason and justice. I should certainly like to see it honestly tried.

The Richmond Times Dispatch, of Richmond, Va., whose editorial policy is liberal and progressive had an editorial in its column on June 12 which I think splendidly expresses the unemotional southern viewpoint. It is as follows:

THE DANGERS OF A PERMANENT FEPC

There are many sincere and public-spirited advocates of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee, and the philosophy behind the proposal to establish such agency in Washington is precisely in the American tradition. But although these things are true, this bill which is designed to help minorities probably would have precisely the opposite result, at least insofar as the Negro minority in the South is concerned.

Legislation rests on public opinion. No law which is strongly opposed by the overwhelming majority will ever be effective, or will ever achieve the results which it seeks to achieve. This is especially true of legislation such as that which seeks to esablish a permanent FEPC. Here is a bill which involves some of the most emotionally felt issues in our public life, but which ignores these emotions in providing for enforcement. Such a law is often worse than no law at all. After much study of the issues involved here, we are convinced that if a permanent FEPC is established in Washington over the virtually unanimous, if not completely unanimous, opposition of the entire Southern bloc in Congress, the consequences can only be harmful.

Representative MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, chief proponent of the bill in the House, has prepared a series of questions and answers about this piece of legislation. She says that the types of discrimination forbidden in the bill on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry are those "in employment or union membership, i. e., hiring, discharging, wages, seniority, transfers, demotions, upgrading, union auxiliaries, and so forth." Answering her own question, "Does the bill require an employer to hire Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, or other minorities?" she says, "No. An employer may hire or reject anyone he pleases, on any basis and for any reason, so long as a needed and qualified person is not rejected because of his race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry." This answer, when analyzed, is really meaningless, for the second half of the sentence paritally nullifies the first half. The important fact is that this law would make possible the imposition of heavy penalties upon employers for failure to hire colored persons.

This is not the way to broaden opportunities for the colored people of the South. This is the road to a vast amount of bitterness and strife. The lessons of the past should teach Congress that the entry of the Federal authorities into this delicate relationship of employer and employee, and the emphasis which would be placed in the law upon the race issue, would simply fan the flames of interracial antagonism, instead of quenching them.

Such a lifelong friend of the Negro race as Oswald Garrison Villard, whose greatest pride is that he is the grandson of William Lloyd Garrison, the abolitionist, is opposed to this type of legislation. He feels that it is more harmful than otherwise, and that it tends to accentuate race differences, instead of eliminating them. He and a half a dozen eminent New Yorkers of liberal inclinations signed a statement in opposition to the Ives bill, which is of a similar character, and which was passed in New York State a short time ago.

So liberal a man as Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, is against the establishment of a permanent FEPC, and so is the militantly liberal Louisville Courier-Journal. Both have fought many battles for the Negroes of the South, but they can see that the sort of statute which is being advocated would, in all likelihood, increase existing tensions, instead of lessening them.

Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, one of the most enlightened and progressive Members of the House, always a friend of the disadvantaged, made a long address on the House floor recently in opposition to this bill. "It is unity of purpose we seek," he declared, "not enforced relationships." He pointed out that the bill would not only cover the hiring of workers, but also their discharge, and he stated that where an employee was discharged, and he complained to the FEPC, that body could order the employer to reinstate the worker, and the employer would go to jail, if he declined. Similar penalties can be imposed for refusal to hire, if the law is violated.

It is only right, of course, that colored workmen who have made good on merit during the war should not be laid off when there is a slump, simply because they are colored. But while this is true, it is also true that Federal decrees against individual employers, especially in the Southern States, are sure to be deeply resented. The desired

results as to both hiring and firing should be sought by other means.

Some absurd and even hysterical things have been said by southerners against this FEPC bill, and we consider them so much rodomontade. On the other hand, there is no use blinking the facts concerning this legislation, and the real dangers which it contains.

It may be argued that while far-reaching powers are conferred by the bill, they would not be exercised. What guaranty is there of that? None whatever. On the contrary, given the zeal and unquestioned integrity of many of the bill's advocates, they might well consider that the South ought to be singled out first for attention, since it contains by far the bulk of the country's Negroes. Should that occur, the fat would be in the fire, and irreparable harm would be done.

The Times-Dispatch has frequently championed the cause of better employment opportunities for our Negro citizens. We shall continue to do so, especially in the years immediately ahead, when it is so important that returning Negro soldiers and sailors be made to feel that they are being fairly treated. But this newspaper cannot support legislation to that end which could arouse great interracial hostility, and create almost interminable friction. If such consequences flowed from the establishment of a permanent FEPC—and they probably would—the Negroes would be the chief sufferers, and interracial progress would be set back for decades.

Bombing the Sun God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, under date of June 6, 1945, entitled "Bombing the Sun God":

BOMBING THE SUN GOD

At last someone appears to have rescinded the order that the Japanese imperial palace and "sacred" hide of Emperor Hirohito must be spared inviolate by our bomber crews. For, according to best accounts, our airmen recently rained fire bombs upon the palace buildings, and there was at least partial destruction.

It seems that the principal excuse for avoiding danger to the Emperor was that we eventually would need him as a medium for negotiations when the time for unconditional surrender arrived. Another theory advanced was that if Hirohito should be killed that would make the Japanese mad and consequently they would be harder to whip.

It makes no difference who hatched these fool ideas in the first place. The facts remain that a great majority of the American people and practically all the armed forces were against them. Now it would seem that the orders have been rescinded and that our airmen are going to try to get the fellow and all he represents.

Perhaps it took the fall of Germany to demonstrate to the unrealistic thinkers the fact that when it comes to unconditional surrender there is no negotiating, consequently there is no need to have anyone with whom to negotiate. When Japan quits, if she does quit short of absolute destruction, the Japanese General Staff will notify us and at the same time will order all its forces to surrender. Hirohito will have nothing to say about it.

The Emperor is supposed to be a sort of holy personage in the minds of the Japanese. They have been propagandized into believing that he is a direct descendant of the sun god and that he is infallible—the same idea the Nazis broadcast about Hitler. Hirohito's body is supposed to be so sacred that no one may touch him, few may look upon him and only through extraordinary necessity may anyone address him. This conception makes of Hirohito a symbol, a myth, a remote sort of idol which only blind fools could seriously revere.

It is somewhat of a mystery how far Hirohito went with the Japanese General Staff in starting this war. In any circumstances he certainly bowed to the will of the Japanese military clique that seized the national power a number of years ago by suddenly murdering the high-up Japanese members of the Government who opposed them and then taking over the power themselves. There was no indication that the Emperor made any effort to oppose them or even to protest.

From the time we first began raiding Tokyo it was generally understood that our airmen were instructed to avoid hitting the imperial palace. Now it is apparent that at least less emphasis on this is being expressed, or even that the bombardiers have been instructed to go their length. We may be sure they get unqualified joy out of aiming at the palace buildings with the hope that Hirohito might get in the way of a bomb.

There is nothing that could make the Japanese fighters and ruling class any more fanatical than they are. No matter what indignities we heap upon their Emperor they are not going to be any more ruthlessly cruel or suicidally bent than they are. They are not fighting to the death because of devotion to Hirohito; they are being killed because they know there is no other alternative when they are overpowered. No American soldier is going to try to capture an enemy when he knows that enemy is more than likely to have high powered explosives about his person that he is prepared to touch off as soon as his captors get close enough.

By no means do we go along with those members of our State Department whose theory it is that the Japanese Emperor was opposed to this war and was overruled by the military. If he was, he certainly was a weakling; if not he certainly was in on the deal. If he is a weakling would the military fanatics pay any attention to him if he ordered unconditional surrender? If he was in on the deal what other way out has he but that taken by so many of the leading Nazis when they realized the fat was in the fire?

America was delighted to learn that the Imperial Palace had been bombed and at least partially burned. And America demands that we keep right on bombing until we blast Hirohito's "sacred" hide out of existence and thus put an all-time end to an evil dynasty.

Continue Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement of the attitude of the National Council of Jewish Women regarding extension of price controls, presented to me by Mrs. Gerson B. Levy, national chairman on social welfare and war activities. The statement follows:

The National Council of Jewish Women, an organization of 65,000 members, with 200 sections throughout the United States, are vitally interested in the continuation of the Price Control Act, without crippling amendments. They know that through this control inflation has been prevented. They remember the inflation that came at the close of World War I and they are concerned lest this happen again. With the coming of VE-day, pressure has been brought to relax controls. It is imperative that the Office of Price Administration be continued and with sufficient appropriations for enforcement. A weakened Price Control Act would mean disaster for millions of families, interfere with stabilization, and delay reconversion.

Alien Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, former Attorney General Biddle has made a report pointing out the amount of money spent by aliens to mold public opinion in this country to serve their respective purposes. The cost of this propaganda program of foreign nations carried on in the United States is not the important question. What ought to concern the American citizens is the cost of this alien propaganda to the taxpayers of this country. It is only a matter of millions of dollars spent by foreign nations, but the cost of it to American taxpayers will run into billions.

Under leave to extend, I insert an article by Walter Trohan in the Washington Times-Herald under date of June 12, 1945:

THIRTEEN MILLION PAID HERE BY ALIENS TO SWAY UNITED STATES—BRITISH PROPAGANDISTS HEAVIEST SPENDERS

(By Walter Trohan)

Foreign propaganda agents spent more than $13,000,000 in seeking to mold American opinion in the period from June 28, 1942, to December 31, 1944, Attorney General Biddle reported to Congress yesterday.

Almost half this sum was spent by Great Britain, which has the most effective propaganda machine operating in this country, according to accomplishments listed in the 560-page report.

INCREASED NEAR VE-DAY

Propaganda increased rather than decreased as victory neared in Europe and the foreign ballyhoo was concentrated on securing the greatest peacetime prize in the history of the world—$40,000,000,000 worth of credits the foreign powers are seeking from this country for postwar industrial and commercial rehabilitation.

The foreign propaganda units spent nearly $5,500,000 in 1944, and Britain spent almost half that sum, the Department of Justice revealed. The activities of the propagandists have been stepped up in recent months.

Poland was the second biggest spender among the nations propagandizing in this country, with a total of almost $1,500,000 in the period covered by the report. The Netherlands spent almost as much as Poland.

Other large spenders included Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and France.

SOLD PROPAGANDA ITEMS

Soviet Russia's expenditures were not revealed. The Soviet Union, the report explained, does not maintain an official information agency in this country. The Soviet embassy prints and circulates a bulletin and much Soviet propaganda is sent directly by mail or cable from Moscow.

Commercial agencies alone are listed by Russia under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. These sold various propaganda items and material totaling $254,000 in 1942, $316,000 in 1943, and $279,000 in 1944.

The Justice Department's estimates on propaganda expenditures in this country were considered very low in congressional circles. It had been estimated that the British Information Service alone was spending upward of $20,000,000 a year, more than the estimated total for the 30-month period of the report.

FIVE HUNDRED AND SIX REGISTRATIONS

The report listed 506 registrations in compliance with the law. Of these 227 were of organizations and 281 of individuals. The most important of the organizations are the 18 official information centers maintained by foreign governments in this country.

The registered agents and groups are only a fraction of the many who serve from conviction or principle, who are not registered. These were not covered in the report.

MAIL BOXES STUFFED

The report listed the activities of the propaganda agents and organizations as given in their registrations. The activities of the propagandists in molding American opinion include stuffing mail boxes with books, pamphlets, and circulars; providing speakers for various meetings; preparing radio programs, and providing data for radio broadcasters, newspapers, and lecturers.

The registration report of the British Information Service offers concrete evidence on the lengths to which propagandizers go to advance their country's cause in America and the success which they meet.

The New York division of BIS in a 12-month period released 250,000 copies of 1,113 press releases. The BIS has branches in Washington, Chicago, and San Francisco which pour out lesser, although impressive, floods of releases.

The New York magazine and editorial section placed 1,285 articles in American magazines including the Saturday Evening Post, the New York Times, Popular Science, Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, Shipyard Worker, Brewery Worker, Farmers Union Herald, Breeder's Gazette, Our Dumb Animals, and Heroic Comics.

GIVEN TO 188 COMMENTATORS

The military affairs section distributed to 188 commentators and Government officials a daily war review by Gen. H. S. Sewell. The photographic section loaned 6,000 British prints to newspapers and magazines and 1,000 to the Government.

The radio section of the New York office issued more than 35,000 copies of 241 press releases and 252 script releases. The New York film division reported 17 BIS feature films were run in an average of 3,100 theaters. The most popular film, Desert Victory, was shown in 9,552 theaters.

The New York speakers section reported securing 3,000 engagements in a 12-month period before Rotary clubs. American Legion units, war plant workers, war bond rallies, conventions, and the like.

The New York dispatch section distributed over 4,000,000 copies of British publications and pamphlets ranging from Catholics of Britain at War to His Majesty's Ships.

RELATIVELY SMALL

Besides the flow of British propaganda the Polish was small. In a 12-month period this unit published 3 periodicals—Polish Facts in 50,000 copies, The Polish Review in 5,000 copies, and Comments on Polish Affairs in 775 copies.

The Polish Information Bureau also supplies news releases to newspapers including those published in the Polish language.

It reported distributing 169 pamphlets numbering 475,000 copies in the 12-month period. Its radio section prepares 15-minute weekly recorded programs used by 300 radio stations. It also sends shortwave broadcasts to Poland.

Its film section distributed 22 different films. It also distributed 16,873 photographs, 590,000 poster stamps, 175 photographic enlargements, and 36 types of posters.

Succession to the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, commending the position taken by two outstanding Americans, the former Postmaster General James A. Farley, and our esteemed colleague, Representative MONRONEY, in calling for a commission to look into and more fully clarify the matter of succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency in the case of removal from office by death, resignation, and so forth:

WHITE HOUSE SUCCESSION

Succession to the Presidency has always been a weak spot in the American governmental system. For many years there was no other provision than that the Vice President should succeed the President in case of his removal from office by death, resignation, or "inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office." Congress enacted a succession statute in 1886, but it leaves unanswered many questions as to who should be President in various contingencies. We quite agree with James A. Farley and Representative MONRONEY that it is time to examine these possibilities for misunderstanding and confusion and to work out a more definite and clear-cut policy.

As the law now stands, Secretary of State Stettinius would succeed President Truman in case of his death or inability to continue acting as President. In case the Secretary of State should be ineligible or otherwise not available, the office would pass to the Secretary of the Treasury and so on down the line as far as the Secretary of the Interior. It is difficult to conceive, however, of this high office being occupied for any length of time by a man not elected by the people. On this point the Constitution merely authorizes Congress to provide for succession to the Presidency "until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected." It says nothing about a special election, but that language might be construed as not authorizing Congress to call a special election if the Presidency should be filled by a Cabinet officer.

We think this uncertainty ought to be removed. An appointed official could well serve for a brief interval. But the people ought to be consulted if several years of the Presidential term remain to be served. Nor can it be thought that the possibility of having a Cabinet member in the Presidency is remote. Mr. Farley points out that the Vice Presidency has been vacant 15 times in our brief history. Good fortune alone has saved us from the emergency that might arise with the advancement of a nonelected official to the White House.

Mr. Farley and Representative MONRONEY are well advised, therefore, in calling for a commission to look into this complicated subject. The Presidency has become too powerful an office to be subjected to any confusion whatever as to the succession to it. Provision should be made for every contingency. Only by a thorough study could all these contingencies be taken into account and guarded against. We hope that Congress will authorize such a study as a prelude to new legislation on the subject or a constitutional amendment, if necessary.

General Eisenhower's Toast to Marshal Zhukov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. O. BURGIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Text of General Eisenhower's Toast to Zhukov," which appeared in the Washington Post of June 11, 1945:

I rise primarily to read a word of admiration on behalf of the Allied forces for Marshal Zhukov, but I am going to wander a bit afield before I arrive at my final toast.

Marshal Zhukov has praised me in extravagant terms, my job and my performance of my job in the war. It seems a fitting occasion to me to point out that I have had the advice of the most skillful soldiers and diplomats that two great countries could produce, soldiers, sailors, airmen, and diplomats.

Realizing that only in unity is there strength, they have subordinated themselves to my commands with perfect loyalty regardless of the claims on them from within their own countries.

OWES DEBT OF GRATITUDE

To these men I owe an immeasurable debt of gratitude. Those people have worked at my side in adversity and in prosperity and have never once deviated one inch from the instructions laid down.

I cannot name names today for the simple reason there have been so many that have performed so loyally that it would be an injustice if I name a single soldier. But I know those men intimately and I know what they want.

They want peace.

They want an opportunity for our farmers to raise a little more corn next year. They want an opportunity for our miners to live a little better next year.

All of us who are right thinking want the common man of all nations to have opportunities that we fought to preserve for them.

ALL SUMMED UP IN PEACE

They want the opportunities that will let all nations that have been engaged in this war go forward together to greater prosperity—not for us sitting around this table—for the masses that we represent.

That means peace.

Speaking for the allied forces, I say, we are going to have peace even if we have to fight for it.

On two occasions now I have had the great honor of meeting high officials of the Soviet Government. It is my feeling that in the basic desires of all of us they are one with us.

Regardless of the methods by which we arrive at that goal, that is what we are struggling for.

I cannot speak for any other individual, in fact, while I am expressing what is in my heart and mind. I am speaking for no one except Ike Eisenhower.

But I believe that there is not any single man around this table that would not give back all the honors, all the publicity, everything else this war has brought to him, if he could have avoided the misery, the suffering and the debt that have been brought to the populations by reason of this war.

NO WAR MORE HOLY

Yet this was a holy war. More than any other war in history this war has been an array of the forces of evil against those of righteousness. It had to have its leaders and it had to be won—but no matter what the sacrifice, no matter what the suffering of populations, no matter what the cost, the war had to be won.

To no one man do the United Nations owe a greater debt than to Marshal Zhukov. As our honored guest today he has come down and very courteously conferred certain honors of the Soviet Union upon members of the Allied forces.

But Marshal Zhukov, being a modest man, probably underrates the standing that he holds in our hearts and minds.

One day, when all of us here at this board are gathered to our fathers, there is certain to be another order of the Soviet Union.

It will be the Order of Zhukov and that order will be prized by every man who admires courage, vision, foresight, and determination in a soldier.

Gentlemen, I deem it a very great honor to ask you to rise and drink to Marshal Zhukov.

Dumping Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 12, 1945:

DUMPING WHEAT

At a time when acute food shortages prevail in Europe and scarcities at home are becoming more important, it is reported that in Oklahoma wheat is being dumped in the fields because there are not enough freight cars available to ship it to terminal markets. Thus, while an appeal is made for people to help with the harvesting, we learn that some of the products harvested may not be transported to the market. Here is another illustration of the need for better coordination in our food program.

This situation has not developed suddenly. Grain men, farmers, and State officials have been warning Federal agencies for several months that transportation facilities would be inadequate. Why has it not been possible to have a sufficient number of freight cars to meet these needs when they were known so long in advance? Certainly, freight cars are being used to transport many items less essential than wheat. Moreover, it seems strange that enough freight cars have not been available, particularly inasmuch as the needs of a one-front war would appear to be smaller than those of a two-front war. Who is to blame for the reduction in food supplies which may take place because of the failure to act earlier? To what extent will available supplies of wheat fail to reach the market? How soon can we expect a correction of any mistakes that have developed? With large-scale harvesting soon to start in Kansas, the answers to these questions are of urgent national interest.

Letter From Soldier Constituent in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SOMEWHERE IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA,
May 20, 1945.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Before going into any details, may I introduce myself and the fellows I am to represent. My name is Pfc John C. Klangos, from Lynn, Mass. I am now in Czechoslovakia with the Y. D. and have been with the Twenty-sixth Division for 50 months. What I am about to say in this friendly letter may seem to you as a gripe but we have a right to gripe for what we think is wrong. The boys as a whole in the Twenty-sixth Division heartily approve and are all with me toward what I have to say. You may know a lot of us and maybe not, but we all know you. I know that you could help us if you tried. We don't ask for riches but ask for the right to live as human beings once again.

You are our Congressman and the only man we feel we could trust and look forward to. Now I will tell you our so-called gripe as others would call it, and that is the point system. We all heartily disagree to it. We think it is unfair to the men with longer length of service here. In other words, first in the Army and last to get out is just about the size of it. They even said that the point system was approved and agreed by the individual soldier. That, my dear friend, is a lie for we did not see, hear, or vote on anything till it came out on the radio, and that is unfair to us and many, many, others who have risked their lives in this great campaign. Who are the soldiers that voted for points? If any did vote did they pick soldiers with high points and at least three kids? Why at that rate soldiers back in the States who have never seen combat will be going home.

Why? Because they have three kids. I have two kids myself but still don't approve of the point system. I don't think I'll get the points for I married a widow with two children, but didn't take out adoption papers on the children. I do support them, even if I do get the points I'll, along with others, refuse to sign the point sheet, for it's really unfair to many. We are all hurt very badly on that decision for after what we've been through, nobody even thought of us to ask us what we thought about the points.

For example, we have many married men and are just as anxious to get home as the next fellow. Just because they have been in the Army so long and didn't get the chance to raise a family like others did, does it mean that they shouldn't get the chance? No; for all men are created equal. For example, I've been in so long it isn't funny any more. That goes for all of us, too. I've been in so long, 4 years to be exact. I've done my job as I saw it. All these years we suffered and waited for this day to come. For what? I ask you. An awful let-down, with a slap in the face and a broken heart.

Here's our suggestion of how the release of the Army should be, and maybe you could do something about it, for we won't forget. Men in the States, no matter how long they've been in service and all men overseas should be discharged according to the length of service. Points don't mean length of service. Don't you think we are right? Do you agree?

I know you will, for you know what's right. All we ask of you is to please fight for us on that deal.

Well, sir, I could go on and on and talk against us older men in service, but will quit, for this ought to give you an idea of what we mean and how we feel. We do hear lots about the Army say this or that, but who is the Army if it isn't us? We are a free Nation, free of speech, justice, and liberty for all. So let's be that way and live up to those few words with a big meaning. We feel as though Congress must, shall, and should help us in this battle of justice and freedom.

Mr. Congressman, below the undersigned are a few names, for example, who are heartily against this point system. But, of course, there are many, many more who disapprove of it, too, and I could get many more names and addresses of their home cities. We feel as though this small total should be sufficient for the purpose. If more names are needed, let me know right away, and I could get practically the whole Third Army. We will wait for your answer and hope it's what we are waiting to hear. We thank you kindly for your hearty cooperation, for we deeply trust in you in doing what's right for the GI's of Massachusetts.

Sincerely yours,

Pfc JOHN C. KLANGOS,
Service Battery, One Hundred and Second Field Artillery Battalion, APO 26, care Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

Pfc John C. Klangos, 87 Pleasant Street, Lynn, Mass.

T/5 Roland M. Curtis, 135 Pine Grove Avenue, Lynn, Mass.

Corp. Raymond J. Gallant, 164 Water Street, Lawrence, Mass.

Pfc Larry R. Estabrook, 518 Boston Street, Lynn, Mass.

T/5 Hyman Talkowsky, 18 Phillips, Salem, Mass.

Pfc Edward F. Warner, 28 Upland Road, Lynn, Mass.

Sgt. J. M. Wallace, 8 Washington Street, Lawrence, Mass.

Staff Sgt. F. E. Shaughnosy, 1400 Vernon Street, Bridgewater, Mass.

T/4 Frank A. Stanewies, 105 Middlesex Street, Lowell, Mass.

First Sgt. Henry O. Romanwitz, 105 Lynn Street, Peabody, Mass.

T/5 Alphonse Jackneauls, 149 West Eighth Street, South Boston, Mass.

Pvt. Walter N. J. Denault, 18 Union Street, Beverly, Mass. (52 months).

T/4 John Maleski, 27 Norfolk Avenue, Peabody, Mass.

Sgt. James F. Seale, 9 Mason Street, Beverly, Mass.

Staff Sgt. Stanley Fenara, 44–A Jay Street, Boston, Mass.

Sgt. Angelo J. Tocci, 127 Linwood Avenue, Newtonville, Mass.

Staff Sgt. Joseph Finkle, 25 Crosby Street, Lynn, Mass.

Pvt. Chester Kingsley, 8 Hawley Street, Peabody, Mass.

Corp. Arthur Gaudreau, 84 Jennings Street, Lawrence, Mass.

T/4 Leroy J. Allain, 4 Almeda Street, Salem, Mass.

Lt. John R. Jackle, 222 New Hampshire Avenue, Cumberland, Md.

Corp. C. E. Benway, 35 Mount Pleasant Street, East Lynn, Mass. (52 months).

P. S.—Sir, may I put down two suggestions that just came in to me? It may be of some help to you.

First, it's about the $21 per month. We went for about 2 years for $30 with that price and nothing was said. Sorry I had to do this. I meant Coastal Defense American Theater. Did we get credit for that? No. Why?

At one time, a very short while ago—don't know the exact date—it was said over the radio, "First in are to be the first out." After all, they were in first. But it turned out to be first in, last out. I love the Yankee Division myself and have great faith in our General Patton and General Paul, but I don't intend to die of old age in the Army. And neither do the rest of the fellows.

I thank you.

JOHN C. KLANGOS.

P. S.—Sir, I have also sent a copy to Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, for he was against the point system himself.

Prosecution of Axis War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the foundations for peace are being established today in San Francisco. Mr. Justice Jackson has made a very great contribution to that work. His report on war crimes, having been endorsed by President Truman, now becomes a statement of our national policy in relation to the handling of Axis war criminals.

This statement will be known in the future as one of the great state papers.

After the last war the handling by the Allies of war criminals was a farce. Finally, nothing was done. As a result, the ghosts of yesterday came back to haunt us in World War II.

There has been much concern that again, after this terrible war which will leave half the civilized world in ashes, we shall fail to prosecute for their lawlessness those who have caused the peoples of the world to suffer so terribly.

Now we have stated our policy. It is a clear, straightforward, able statement. If we act upon it promptly, thoroughly, and with vigor and honest determination to bring to account those who planned and prosecuted this war, we will have reinforced the structure for peace now being built at San Francisco.

Such action will serve as a future warning to all the world that hereafter those who make war will be treated as common criminals against the nations of the world.

The Jackson report makes it clear that the Germans committed an international crime when they plunged the world into war. It was a crime when they made their master plan to reduce the world to slavery.

Mr. Justice Jackson ably points out that Germany, Italy, and Japan were signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928 which renounced war as an instrument of international policy.

"Unless this pact," says the Jackson report, "altered the legal status of wars of aggression, it has no meaning at all and comes close to being an act of deception."

The Jackson report goes on to prove that the Briand-Kellogg Pact did not stand alone in international law. The Geneva Protocol of 1924, which was adopted by 48 governments, declared a war of aggression to be an international crime.

In 1927 the eighth assembly of the League of Nations by unanimous resolution, which included Germany, declared that aggressive war was an international crime.

The 21 American Republics at the Pan-American Conference of 1928 adopted unanimously a resolution stating that "war of aggression constitutes an international crime against the human species."

The Jackson report makes it clear that either these pacts were a part of international law making war itself a crime or that they were meaningless bits of paper in a lawless world.

Mr. Justice Jackson has built his statement on these international agreements. If we carry through under the policy which has been declared, the foundation will have been laid to secure for the world one of the "four freedoms"—freedom from fear.

The following is the report from Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, chief of counsel for the United States in the prosecution of Axis war criminals:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to report accomplishments during the month since you named me as chief of counsel for the United States in prosecuting the principal Axis war criminals. In brief, I have selected staffs from the several services, departments, and agencies concerned; worked out a plan for preparation, briefing, and trial of the cases; allocated the work among the several agencies; instructed those engaged in collecting or processing evidence; visited the European theater to expedite the examination of captured documents and the interrogation of witnesses and prisoners; coordinated our preparation of the main case with preparation by judge advocates of many cases not included in my responsibilities; and arranged cooperation and mutual assistance with the United Nations War Crimes Commission and with counsel appointed to represent the United Kingdom in the joint prosecution.

I

The responsibilities you have conferred on me extend only to "the case of major criminals whose offenses have no particular geographical localization and who will be punished by joint decision of the governments of the Allies," as provided in the Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943, by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin. It does not include localized cases of any kind. Accordingly, in visiting the European theater, I attempted to establish standards to segregate from our case against the principal offenders cases against many other offenders and to expedite their trial. These cases fall into three principal classes:

1. The first class comprises offenses against military personnel of the United States—such, for example, as the killing of American airmen who crash-landed and other Americans who became prisoners of war. In order to insure effective military operation, the field forces from time immerial have dealt with such offenses on the spot. Authorization of this prompt procedure, however, had been withdrawn because of the fear of stimulating retaliation through execution of captured Americans on trumped-up charges. The surrender of Germany and liberation of our prisoners has ended that danger. The morale and safety of our own troops and effective government of the control area seemed to require prompt resumption of summary dealing with this type of case. Such proceedings are likely to disclose evidence helpful to the case against the major criminals and will not prejudice it in view of the measures I have suggested to preserve evidence and to prevent premature execution of those who are potential defendant or witnesses in the major case.

I flew to Paris and Frankfort and conferred with Generals Eisenhower, Smith, Clay, and Botts, among others, and arranged to have a representative on hand to clear questions of conflict in any particular case. We also arranged an exchange of evidence between my staff and the theater judge advocate's staff. The officials of other countries were most anxious to help. For example, the French brought to General Donovan and me in Paris evidence that civilians in Germany had beaten to death with wrenches three American airmen. They had obtained from the German burgomeister identification of the killers, had taken them in custody, and offered to deliver them to our forces. Cases such as this are not infrequent. Under the arrangements perfected, the military authorities are enabled to move in cases of this class without delay. Some are already under way; some by now have been tried and verdicts rendered. Some concentration-camp cases are also soon to go on trial.

2. A second class of offenders, the prosecution of which will not interfere with the major case, consists of those who, under the Moscow declaration, are to be sent back to the scene of their crimes for trial by local authorities. Those comprise localized offenses or atrocities against persons or property, usually of civilians of countries formerly occupied by Germany. The part of the United States in these cases consists of the identification of offenders and the surrender on demand of those who are within our control.

The United Nations War Crimes Commission is especially concerned with cases of this kind. It represents many of the United Nations, with the exception of Russia. It has been usefully engaged as a body with which the aggrieved of all the United Nations have recorded their accusations and evidence. Lord Wright, representing Australia, is the Chairman of this Commission, and Lt. Col. Joseph V. Hodgson is the United States representative.

In London, I conferred with Lord Wright and Colonel Hodgson in an effort to coordinate our work with that of the Commission wherever there might be danger of conflict or duplication. There was no difficulty in arriving at an understanding for mutual exchange of information. We undertook to respond to requests for any evidence in our possession against those listed with the Commission as criminals and to cooperate with each of the United Nations in efforts to bring this class of offenders to justice.

Requests for the surrender of persons held by American forces may present diplomatic or political problems which are not my responsibility. But so far as my work is concerned, I advised the Commission, as well as the appropriate American authorities, that there is no objection to the surrender of any person except on grounds that we want him as a defendant or as a witness in the major case.

3. In a third class of cases, each country, of course, is free to prosecute treason charges in its own tribunals and under its own laws against its own traitorous nationals—Quislings, Lavals, Lord Haw-Haws, and the like.

The consequence of these arrangements is that preparations for the prosecution of major war criminals will not impede prosecution

of other offenders. In these latter cases, however, the number of known offenses is likely to exceed greatly the number of prosecutions, because witnesses are rarely able satisfactorily to identify particular soldiers in uniform whose acts they have witnessed. This difficulty of adequately identifying individual perpetrators of atrocities and crimes makes it the more important that we proceed against the top officials and organizations responsible for originating the criminal policies, for only by so doing can there be just retribution for many of the most brutal acts.

II

Over a month ago the United States proposed to the United Kingdom, Soviet Russia, and France a specific plan, in writing, that these four powers join in a protocol establishing an International Military Tribunal, defining the jurisdiction and powers of the tribunal, naming the categories of acts declared to be crimes, and describing those individuals and organizations to be placed on trial. Negotiation of such an agreement between the four powers is not yet completed.

In view of the immensity of our task, it did not seem wise to await consummation of international arrangements before proceeding with preparation of the American case. Accordingly, I went to Paris, to American Army Headquarters at Frankfort and Wiesbaden, and to London for the purpose of assembling, organizing, and instructing personnel from the existing services and agencies and getting the different organizations coordinated and at work on the evidence. I uniformly met with eager cooperation.

The custody and treatment of war criminals and suspects appeared to require immediate attention. I asked the War Department to deny those prisoners who are suspected war criminals the privileges which would appertain to their rank if they were merely prisoners of war; to assemble them at convenient and secure locations for interrogation by our staff; to deny them access to the press; and to hold them in the close confinement ordinarily given suspected criminals. The War Department has been subjected to some criticism from the press for these measures, for which it is fair that I should acknowledge responsibility. The most elementary considerations for insuring a fair trial and for the success of our case suggest the imprudence of permitting these prisoners to be interviewed indiscriminately or to use the facilities of the press to convey information to each other and to criminals yet uncaptured. Our choice is between treating them as honorable prisoners of war with the privileges of their ranks, or to classify them as war criminals, in which case they should be treated as such. I have assurances from the War Department that those likely to be accused as war criminals will be kept in close confinement and stern control.

Since a considerable part of our evidence has been assembled in London, I went there on May 28 with General Donovan to arrange for its examination, and to confer with the United Nations War Crimes Commission and with officials of the British Government responsible for the prosecution of war criminals. We had extended conferences with the newly appointed Attorney General, the Lord Chancellor, the Foreign Secretary, the Treasury Solicitor, and others. On May 29, Prime Minister Churchill announced in the House of Commons that Attorney General Sir David Maxwell Fyfe had been appointed to represent the United Kingdom in the prosecution. Following this announcement, members of my staff and I held extended conferences with the Attorney General and his staff. The sum of these conferences is that the British are taking steps parallel with our own to clear the military and localized cases for immediate trial, and to effect a complete interchange of evidence and a coordination of planning and preparation of the case by the British and American representatives. Despite the fact that the prosecution of the major war criminals involves problems of no mean dimensions, I am able to report that no substantial differences exist between the United Kingdom representatives and ourselves, and that minor differences have adjusted easily as one or the other of us advanced the better reasons for his view.

The provisional Government of the French Republic has advised that it accepts in principle the American proposals for trials before an international military tribunal. It is expected to designate its representative shortly. The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, while not yet committed, has been kept informed of our steps, and there is no reason to doubt that it will unite in the prosecution. We propose to make provision for others of the United Nations to become adherents to the agreement.

III

The time, I think, has come when it is appropriate to outline the basic features of the plan of prosecution on which we are tentatively proceeding in preparing the case of the United States.

1. The American case is being prepared on the assumption that inescapable responsibility rests upon this country to conduct an inquiry, preferably in association with others, but alone if necessary, into the culpability of those whom there is probably cause to accuse of atrocities and other crimes. We have many such men in our possession. What shall we do with them? We could, of course, set them at large without a hearing. But it has cost unmeasured thousands of American lives to beat and bind these men. To free them without a trial would mock the dead and make cynics of the living. On the other hand, we could execute or otherwise punish them without a hearing. But undiscriminating executions or punishments without definite findings of guilt, fairly arrived at, would violate pledges repeatedly given and would not set easily on the American conscience or be remembered by our children with pride. The only other course is to determine the innocence or guilt of the accused after a hearing as dispassionate as the times and horrors we deal with will permit and upon a record that will leave our reasons and motives clear.

2. These hearings, however, must not be regarded in the same light as a trial under our system, where defense is a matter of constitutional right. Fair hearings for the accused are, of course, required to make sure that we punish only the right men and for the right reasons. But the procedure of these hearings may properly bar obstructive and dilatory tactics resorted to by defendants in our ordinary criminal trials.

Nor should such a defense be recognized as the obsolete doctrine that a head of state is immune from legal liability. There is more than a suspicion that this idea is a relic of the doctrine of the divine right of kings. It is, in any avent, inconsistent with the position we take toward our own officials, who are frequently brought to court at the suit of citizens who allege their rights to have been invaded. We do not accept the paradox that legal responsibility should be the least where power is the greatest. We stand on the principle of responsible government declared some three centuries ago to King James by Lord Chief Justice Coke, who proclaimed that even a king is still "under God and the law."

With the doctrine of immunity of a head of state usually is coupled another, that orders from an official superior protect one who obeys them. It will be noticed that the combination of these two doctrines means that nobody is responsible. Society as modernly organized cannot tolerate so broad an area of official irresponsibility. There is doubtless a sphere in which the defense of obedience to superior orders should prevail. If a conscripted or enlisted soldier is put on a firing squad, he should not be held responsible for the validity of the sentence he carries out. But the case may be greatly altered where one has discretion because of rank or the latitude of his orders. And, of course, the defense of superior orders cannot apply in the case of voluntary participation in a criminal or conspiratorial organization, such as the Gestapo or the SS. An accused should be allowed to show the facts about superior orders. The tribunal can then determine whether they constitute a defense or merely extenuating circumstances, or perhaps carry no weight at all.

3. Whom will be accuse and put to their defense? We will accuse a large number of individuals and officials who were in authority in the Government, in the military establishment, including the General Staff, and in the financial, industrial, and economic life of Germany who by all civilized standards are provable to be common criminals. We also propose to establish the criminal character of several voluntary organizations which have played a cruel and controlling part in subjugating first the German people and then their neighbors. It is not, of course, suggested that a person should be judged a criminal merely because he voted for certain candidates or maintained political affiliations in the sense that we in America support political parties. The organizations which we will accuse have no resemblance to our political parties. Organizations such as the Gestapo and the SS were direct-action units, and were recruited from volunteers accepted only because of aptitude for, and fanatical devotion to, their violent purposes.

In examining the accused organizations in the trial, it is our proposal to demonstrate their declared and covert objectives, methods of recruitment, structure, lines of responsibility, and methods of effectuating their programs. In this trial, important representative members will be allowed to defend their organizations as well as themselves. The best practicable notice will be given, that named organizations stand accused and that any member is privileged to appear and join in their defense. If in the main trial an organization is found to be criminal, the second stage will be to identify and try before regular military tribunals individual members not already personally convicted in the principal case. Findings in the main trial that an organization is criminal in nature will be conclusive in any subsequent proceedings against individual members. The individual member will thereafter be allowed to plead only personal defenses or extenuating circumstances, such as that he joined under duress, and as to those defenses he should have the burden of proof. There is nothing novel in the idea that one may lose a part of or all his defense if he fails to assert it in an appointed forum at an earlier time. In United States wartime legislation, this principle has been utilized and sustained as consistent with our concept of due process of law.

4. Our case against the major defendants is concerned with the Nazi master plan, not with individual barbarities and perversions which occurred independently of any central plan. The groundwork of our case must be factually authentic and constitute a well-documented history of what we are convinced was a grand, concerted pattern to incite and commit the aggressions and barbarities which have shocked the world. We must not forget that when the Nazi plans were boldly proclaimed they were so extravagant that the world refused to take them seriously. Unless we write the record of this movement with clarity and precision, we cannot blame the future if in days of peace

it finds incredible the accusatory generalities uttered during the war. We must establish incredible events by credible evidence.

5. What specifically are the crimes with which these individuals and organizations should be charged, and what marks their conduct as criminal?

There is, of course, real danger that trials of this character will become enmeshed in voluminous particulars of wrongs committed by individual Germans throughout the course of the war, and in the multitude of doctrinal disputes which are part of a lawyer's paraphernalia. We can save ourselves from those pitfalls if our test of what legally is crime gives recognition to those things which fundamentally outraged the conscience of the American people and brought them finally to the conviction that their own liberty and civilization could not persist in the same world with the Nazi power.

Those acts which offended the conscience of our people were criminal by standards generally accepted in all civilized countries, and I believe that we may proceed to punish those responsible in full accord with both our own traditions of fairness and with standards of just conduct which have been internationally accepted. I think also that through these trials we should be able to establish that a process of retribution by law awaits those who in the future similarly attack civilization. Before stating these offenses in legal terms and concepts, let me recall what it was that affronted the sense of justice of our people.

Early in the Nazi regime, people of this country came to look upon the Nazi Government as not constituting a legitimate state pursuing the legitimate objectives of a member of the international community. They came to view the Nazis as a band of brigands, set on subverting within Germany every vestige of a rule of law which would entitle an aggregation of people to be looked upon collectively as a member of the family of nations. Our people were outraged by the oppressions, the cruelest forms of torture, the large-scale murder, and the wholesale confiscation of property which initiated the Nazi regime within Germany. They witnessed persecution of the greatest enormity on religious, political, and racial grounds, the breakdown of trade unions, and the liquidation of all religious and moral influences. This was not the legitimate activity of a state within its own boundaries, but was preparatory to the launching of an international course of aggression and was with the evil intention, openly expressed by the Nazis, of capturing the form of the German state as an instrumentality for spreading their rule to other countries. Our people felt that these were the deepest offenses against that international law described in the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 as including the "laws of humanity and the dictates of the public conscience."

Once these international brigands, the top leaders of the Nazi party, the SS, and the Gestapo, had firmly established themselves within Germany by terrorism and crime, they immediately set out on a course of international pillage. They bribed, debased, and incited to treason the citizens and subjects of other nations for the purpose of establishing their fifth columns of corruption and sabotage within those nations. They ignored the commonest obligations of one state respecting the internal affairs of another. They lightly made and promptly broke international engagements as a part of their settled policy to deceive, corrupt, and overwhelm. They made, and made only to violate, pledges respecting the demilitarized Rhineland, and Czechoslovakia and Poland and Russia. They did not hesitate to instigate the Japanese to treacherous attack on the United States. Our people saw in this succession of events the destruction of the minimum elements of trust which can hold the community of nations together in peace and progress. Then, in consummation of their plan, the Nazis swooped down upon the nations they had deceived and ruthlessly conquered them. They flagrantly violated the obligations which states, including their own, have undertaken by convention or tradition as a part of the rules of land warfare and of the law of the sea. They wantonly destroyed cities like Rotterdam for no military purpose. They wiped out whole populations, as at Lidice, where no military purposes were to be served. They confiscated property of the Poles and gave it to party members. They transported in labor battalions great sectors of the civilian populations of the conquered countries. They refused the ordinary protections of law to the populations which they enslaved. The feeling of outrage grew in this country, and it became more and more felt that these were crimes committed against us and against the whole society of civilized nations by a band of brigands who had seized the instrumentality of a state.

I believe that those instincts of our people were right and that they should guide us as the fundamental tests of criminality. We propose to punish acts which have been regarded as criminal since the time of Cain and have been so written in every civilized code.

In arranging these trials we must also bear in mind the aspirations with which our people have faced the sacrifices of war. After we entered the war, and as we expended our men and our wealth to stamp out these wrongs, it was the universal feeling of our people that out of this war should come unmistakable rules and workable machinery from which any who might contemplate another era of brigandage would know that they would be held personally responsible and would be personally punished. Our people have been waiting for these trials in the spirit of Woodrow Wilson, who hoped to "give to international law the kind of vitality which it can only have if it is a real expression of our moral judgment."

Against this background it may be useful to restate in more technical lawyer's terms the legal charges against the top Nazi leaders and those voluntary associations such as the S. S. and Gestapo which clustered about them and were ever the prime instrumentalities, first, in capturing the German state, and then, in directing the German state to its spoliations against the rest of the world.

(a) Atrocities and offenses against persons or property constituting violations of international law, including the laws, rules, and customs of land and naval warfare. The rules of warfare are well established and generally accepted by the nations. They make offenses of such conduct as killing of the wounded, refusal of quarter, ill treatment of prisoners of war, firing on undefended localities, poisoning of wells and streams, pillage and wanton destruction, and ill treatment of inhabitants in occupied territory.

(b) Atrocities and offenses, including atrocities and persecutions on racial or religious grounds, committed since 1933. This is only to recognize the principles of criminal law as they are generally observed in civilized states. These principles have been assimilated as a part of international law at least since 1907. The Fourth Hague Convention provided that inhabitants and belligerents shall remain under the protection and the rule of "the principles of the law of nations, as they result from the usage established among civilized peoples, from the laws of humanity and the dictates of the public conscience."

(c) Invasions of other countries and initiation of wars of aggression in violation of international law or treaties.

The persons to be reached by these charges will be determined by the rule of liability, common to all legal systems, that all who participate in the formulation or execution of a criminal plan involving multiple crimes are liable for each of the offenses committed and responsible for the acts of each other. All are liable who have incited, ordered, procured, or counselled the commission of such acts, or who have taken what the Moscow Declaration describes as "a consenting part" therein.

IV

The legal position which the United States will maintain, being thus based on the common sense of justice, is relatively simple and nontechnical. We must not permit it to be complicated or obscured by sterile legalisms developed in the age of imperialism to make war respectable.

Doubtless what appeals to men of good will and common sense as the crime which comprehends all lesser crimes is the crime of making unjustifiable war. War necessarily is a calculated series of killings, of destructions of property, of oppressions. Such acts unquestionaby would be criminal except that international law throws a mantle of protection around acts which otherwise would be crimes when committed in pursuit of legitimate warfare. In this they are distinguished from the same acts in the pursuit of piracy or brigandage which have been considered punishable wherever and by whomever the guilty are caught. But international law as taught in the nineteenth and the early part of the twentieth century generally declared that war making was not illegal and is no crime at law. Summarized by a standard authority, its attitude was that "both parties to every war are regarded as being in an identical legal position, and consequently as being possessed of equal rights." This, however, was a departure from the doctrine taught by Grotius, the father of international law, that there is a distinction between the just and the unjust—the war of defense and the war of aggression.

International law is more than a scholarly collection of abstract and immutable principles. It is an outgrowth of treaties or agreements between nations and of accepted customs. But every custom has its origin in some single act, and every agreement has to be initiated by the action of some state. Unless we are prepared to abandon every principle of growth for international law, we cannot deny that our own day has its right to institute customs and to conclude agreements that will themselves become sources of a newer and strengthened international law. International law is not capable of development by legislation, for there is no continuously sitting international legislature. Innovations and revisions in international law are brought about by the action of governments designed to meet a change in circumstances. It grows, as did the common law through decisions reached from time to time in adapting settled principles to new situations. Hence I am not disturbed by the lack of precedent for the inquiry we propose to conduct. After the shock to civilization of the First World War, however, a marked reversion to the earlier and sounder doctrines of international law took place. By the time the Nazis came to power it was thoroughly established that launching an aggressive war or the institution of war by treachery was illegal and that the defense of legitimate warfare was no longer available to those who engaged in such an enterprise. It is high time that we act on the juridical principle that aggressive war making is illegal and criminal.

The reestablishment of the principle of unjustifiable war is traceable in many steps. One of the most significant is the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928, by which Germany, Italy, and Japan, in common with ourselves and practically all the nations of the world, renounced war as an instrument of national

policy, bound themselves to seek the settlement of disputes only by pacific means, and condemned recourse to war for the solution of international controversies. Unless this pact altered the legal status of wars of aggression, it has no meaning at all and comes close to being an act of deception. In 1932, Mr. Stimson, as Secretary of State, gave voice to the American concept of its effect. He said, "War between nations was renounced by the signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. This means that it has become illegal throughout practically the entire world. It is no longer to be the source and subject of rights. It is no longer to be the principle around which the duties, the conduct, and the rights of nations revolve. It is an illegal thing. * * * By that very act, we have made obsolete many legal precedents and have given the legal profession the task of reexamining many of its codes and treaties."

This pact constitutes only one in a series of facts which have reversed the viewpoint that all war is legal and have brought international law into harmony with the common sense of mankind, that unjustifiable war is a crime. Without attempting an exhaustive catalog, we may mention the Geneva Protocol of 1924 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, signed by the representatives of 48 governments, which declared that "a war of aggression constitutes * * * an international crime." The Eighth Assembly of the League of Nations in 1927, on unanimous resolution of the representatives of 48 member nations, including Germany, declared that a war of aggression constitutes an international crime. At the Sixth Pan-American Conference of 1928, the 21 American republics unanimously adopted a resolution stating that "war of aggression constitutes an international crime against the human species."

The United States is vitally interested in recognizing the principle that treaties renouncing war have juridical as well as political meaning. We relied upon the Briand-Kellogg Pact and made it the cornerstone of our national policy. We neglected our armaments and our war machine in reliance upon it. All violations of it, wherever started, menace our peace as we now have good reason to know. An attack on the foundations of international relations cannot be regarded as anything less than a crime against the international community, which may properly vindicate the integrity of its fundamental compacts by punishing aggressors. We therefore propose to charge that a war of aggression is a crime, and that modern international law has abolished the defense that those who incite or wage it are engaged in legitimate business. Thus may the forces of the law be mobilized on the side of peace.

Any legal position asserted on behalf of the United States will have considerable significance in the future evolution of international law. In untroubled times, progress toward an effective rule of law in the international community is slow indeed. Inertia rests more heavily upon the society of nations than upon any other society. Now we stand at one of those rare moments when the thought and institutions and habits of the world have been shaken by the impact of world war on the lives of countless millions. Such occasions rarely come and quickly pass. We are put under a heavy responsibility to see that our behavior during this unsettled period will direct the world's thought toward a firmer enforcement of the laws of international conduct, so as to make war less attractive to those who have governments and the destinies of peoples in their power.

V

I have left until last the first question which you and the American people are asking—When can this trial start and how long will it take? I should be glad to answer if the answer were within my control. But it would be foolhardy to name dates which depend upon the action of other governments and of many agencies. Inability to fix definite dates, however, would not excuse failure to state my attitude toward the time and duration of trial.

I know that the public has a deep sense of urgency about these trials. Because I, too, feel a sense of urgency, I have proceeded with the preparations of the American case before completion of the diplomatic exchanges concerning the tribunal to hear it and the agreement under which we are to work. We must, however, recognize the existence of serious difficulties to be overcome in preparation of the case. It is no criticism to say that until the surrender of Germany the primary objective of the military intelligence services was naturally to gather military information rather than to prepare a legal case for trial. We must now sift and compress within a workable scope voluminous evidence relating to a multitude of crimes committed in several countries and participated in by thousands of actors over a decade of time. The preparation must cover military, naval, diplomatic, political, and commercial aggressions. The evidence is scattered among various agencies and in the hands of several armies. The captured documentary evidence—literally tons of orders, records, and reports—is largely in foreign languages. Every document and the trial itself must be rendered into several languages. An immense amount of work is necessary to bring this evidence together physically, to select what is useful, to integrate it into a case, to overlook no relevant detail, and at the same time and at all costs to avoid becoming lost in a wilderness of single instances. Some sacrifice of perfection to speed can wisely be made and, of course, urgency overrides every personal convenience and comfort for all of us who are engaged in this work.

Beyond this I will not go in prophecy. The task of making this record complete and accurate, while memories are fresh, while witnesses are living, and while a tribunal is available, is too important to the future opinion of the world to be undertaken before the case can be sufficiently prepared to make a creditable presentation. Intelligent, informed, and sober opinion will not be satisfied with less.

The trial must not be protracted in duration by anything that is obstructive or dilatory, but we must see that it is fair and deliberative and not discredited in times to come by any mob spirit. Those who have regard for the good name of the United States as a symbol of justice under law would not have me proceed otherwise.

May I add that your personal encouragement and support have been a source of strength and inspiration to every member of my staff, as well as to me, as we go forward with a task so immense that it can never be done completely or perfectly, but which we hope to do acceptably.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT H. JACKSON.

Succession to the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Rocky Mountain (N. C.) Telegram of May 17, 1945]

THE PRESIDENCY

A movement has been started in Washington for Congress to take action on the Presidential succession since, as is now the case, should the Vice President step into the White House then the next person in line, the Secretary of State, is an appointive and not an elective official. James A. Farley has suggested a special commission to study the question of the succession to the Presidency, and Capital reports say that Congress has been urged to pass a law making the Speaker of the House third man in the order of succession.

Oklahoma's Representative MONRONEY, a Democrat, has introduced legislation to create a 12-member commission to study all problems relating to the Presidential chair and to recommend a fixed order of succession. His bill provides that the Speaker resign from Congress and be sworn in as President in the event of the death or disability of both the President and the Vice President. MONRONEY has recommended that the study commission be composed of four Supreme Court Justices, four Presidential appointees, two Senators, and two Representatives. In addition the group also would clear up three questions: The definition of Presidential disability and decide who shall say whether a President is unable to serve; to consider changes in the methods of electing a President with the possible abolition of the electoral college; to decide who would be President should both the President and the Vice President be unable to take office on Inauguration Day.

Mr. Farley, whose suggestions run for the most part in line with those of the Oklahoma Solon, points out that in any ordinary course the chance of a Cabinet member becoming President is slight. It never has happened, but that does not mean that it is impossible. Back in 1844, in President Tyler's term, the Presidential party, including several of the Cabinet, boarded the war steamer, *Princeton*, and one of its guns was fired in salute. It exploded, killing the Secretaries of State and the Navy, and several other high officials. Had it happened that the others had included the President, since Tyler had succeeded President William Henry Harrison, there would have been no Vice President and no Secretary of State. The supply of successors would have been notably cut.

In a case such as we now have, when the Vice President has assumed the job early in the 4-year term, it is well to plan for any emergency. It has been Mr. Farley who has pointed out the dangers to the Nation if between election day and Inauguration Day both the top officials should be incapacitated. The matter would, as it now stands, be turned over to the House of Representatives, and a deadlock there might leave the Nation without a Chief Executive for many months.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Sunday Dispatch of May 20, 1945]

THE THIRD IN LINE—SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

In a world now in revolt against tyranny and dictatorship and bureaucracy and all that goes with them, the United States has turned its attention, naturally, to a subject long politically vital to its continued existence as a free nation.

This subject has to do with keeping the Government, in any eventuality, in the hands of those most nearly representing the popular will of the people as it is expressed at the ballot box.

Following the death of President Roosevelt, the question of the succession to the Presidency, sporadically discussed over the

years but never in all our history really settled, took on a new and significant meaning.

Former Postmaster General Farley pointed out something that was on many people's minds at the time; namely, that under the present loose laws governing such situations the next man in line for this most important political office in the Nation, should anything happen to President Truman, is not a man who has been elected to office but one who has been appointed—the Secretary of State.

There is no question of personalities in this subject. It is one of principle only, the principle at stake being the necessity of preserving the Presidency at all times and in all situations in the legitimate state of an elective office.

In accordance with this idea a bill has been introduced into Congress to alter the present line of succession and make the Speaker of the House of Representatives, rather than the Secretary of State, the third man in the line. This, it is argued, would insure the Nation that in the event of the deaths, or removal for any other cause, of the President and Vice President, a successor who would come practically as close as either to reflecting the political feeling of the country.

It is not the purpose here to argue whether the third person in succession should be the Speaker of the House or the majority leader of the Senate, or some other equally responsible political figure. But it is important that Congress take whatever steps are necessary to make certain that no matter what emergency may arise an elected official, rather than an appointive one who has no political obligation to the voters, be third in the line of succession.

This Nation today is at the very beginning of a Presidential term. It has no Vice President now to step into the breach, should fate remove Mr. Truman from office. The matter of the succession is imperative. Congress owes it to the Nation to act promptly in clearing up this situation.

Protection of Honorably Discharged Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the armed forces are coming home and asking for their jobs back. Congress gave them to understand that they would get those jobs back without having to pay tribute.

But unfortunately that promise is not being carried out. There is a tendency to try to squeeze these ex-servicemen out, in order to keep people on the various pay rolls who have been there during the war, and some of whom have been fomenting strikes all the while these boys were in the service, and many of them on the firing line.

I have introduced this bill to protect these honorably discharged veterans in their rights to join or refrain from joining labor unions or other organizations in order to secure employment. The bill has struck a responsive chord with the servicemen all over the country, and on every fighting front. I am going to insist on its passage before Congress adjourns in order that we may do justice to those men who have been fighting our battles in this war.

The bill referred to reads as follows:

H. R. 3384

A bill to protect honorably discharged veterans in their rights to join or refrain from joining labor and other organizations

Be it enacted, etc., That title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (relating to employment of veterans) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 608. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of any contract or agreement, no veteran (discharged or released from the armed forces under honorable conditions) shall be required, as a condition of employment, to be or become a member of, or to maintain membership in, any labor organization, club, association, or other organization, or, as a nonmember thereof, to make any payment thereto in the form of dues, assessments, charges, contributions, or other payments. The rights of any veteran under this section may be enforced, upon his petition, by mandatory injunction or other suitable process by the district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) for the district in which the alleged violation or threatened violation of such rights occurred, or in which the veteran resides, and for such purpose process of the court may be served at any place in the United States."

Statement of Eugene C. Pulliam on Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement made by Eugene C. Pulliam, of Indianapolis, Ind., before the House Committee on Postwar Military Policy on June 14, 1945, as follows:

As a matter of identification, my name is Eugene C. Pulliam. I am publisher of a group of Indiana newspapers including the Indianapolis Star, and owner of two radio stations in Indiana. I have been State chairman of the Indiana War Finance Committee since before Pearl Harbor. My son is a lieutenant serving in the Pacific; one son-in-law is in the Marines; my other son-in-law is in the United States Air Corps. For more than 4 years at least 70 percent of my time has been devoted to the war effort, without salary or expense money of any kind from the United States Government.

Compulsory military training can be considered only from the viewpoint of national defense. I doubt that any man in America is able to say with certainty, at this time, that compulsory military training in peacetime will ever be advisable for Americans. If it should be advisable, if it should be necessary in the national defense, then this assuredly is not the time to vote on it * * * for nothing would so definitely insure its repeal as voting it during wartime. I do not say that I would not, at some far future date and under some now unforseeable conditions, approve of compulsory military training. I do say I am thoroughly and wholeheartedly opposed to consideration of the measure to provide for it by the present session of Congress.

We have a Pearl Harbor complex. It is becoming a national phobia. We were caught so unprepared at Pearl Harbor that we shall never let it happen again. So here we are, in the midst of one war and preparing for the next.

And how are we preparing? In this instance by planning another Government enterprise on a grand scale, something like a military WPA, a cure-all by which we say we hope to settle all our difficulties so we can sit back and rest in peace during a time which undoubtedly will be one of the most chaotic periods in all history. We call this preparation universal military training. But it isn't going to be that easy.

Universal military training has the dangers inherent in most panaceas offered to a country which is grasping desperately for peace and security. It has an innocuous sound, not blunt and arresting like peacetime conscription, but that is what it really is. It sweetens its military nature with a large dose of the sociological program of the day. It has the endorsement of some popular military and financial leaders. On the surface it is fine. If it could do all its proponents say it will do, then naturally I would favor it. But the blunt truth is it won't.

Let us not deceive ourselves. Universal military training is not a panacea for peace. It is a panacea for war, and as far as the record goes, for defeat, too.

Germany, Italy, and Japan had it. We know what happened to them. The United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China did not have it—and we are winning.

Our problem now is not to repel some unknown enemy. It is to help bring order out of a devastated world; to do our best to remove the causes of war; to show that a democratic people know more about how to win a war than a people enslaved by dictators. We cannot do that by discarding the democratic principles which caused us to win and by taking up the formula of fascism and defeat.

Universal military training is advocated as a wartime measure, yet it is intended simply to set up a peacetime army. All the 18-year-old boys already are going into the Army or Navy under the Selective Service Act, and they will continue to do so until the war ends. Universal military training could not even be put into effect until after the end of the war, so why should we vote on the measure now?

It is idle to say that peacetime conscription will improve the Nation's physical and mental health and morality, develop character, spread education, and insure against postwar unemployment. Even if this were true—and there is much evidence to the contrary—those duties are not the job of the Army or Navy in a democracy. They are the responsibility of the civilian—the home, the school, the church, and the civil government.

Then, purely as a measure for peacetime defense, we are asked to install universal military training 1, 2, 3, or 4 more years before it possibly can be put into effect. There is no urgent need to vote on the measure at the present time. There is, in fact, no reason at all why this decision must be made now. Its advocates say that if it is not passed while the fever of war is upon us, later we may fail to do so. I know of no better reason why it should not be passed now.

After this war the American people are not going to become apathetic. The war, the peace, the threats to our security, our economic survival will keep the American people vitally concerned for years to come. We couldn't be apathetic if we wanted to be. We will be living in a world of social and political chaos, and apathy—as far as national defense is concerned—will be out the window.

Then, too, if we consider this measure at the present time, we will deny approximately 11,000,000 men and women now in the military service their right to express an opin-

ion on the measure. Certainly the men who have fought this war should have a chance to vote on universal military training.

Just as surely as we cram this measure down the throats of the servicemen at this time, they will see to it that it is repealed before it can accomplish any good. So even if the policy of military training should some day be found good for America, this is not the time to consider it.

Also, I want to call attention to the fact that 80 percent of organized labor already is opposed to peacetime conscrption. In the postwar world management will be beset by the serious problems of reconversion. Both labor and management have a hard row to hoe for the next 5 years, and if we drop into this postwar situation military peacetime conscription, we will have set up a new barrier against early settlement of labor-management controversies, because labor regards military peacetime conscription as a vehicle for use against labor and will charge it to management.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that if this measure is passed now it will become a political football in the election of 1946 and again, I repeat, if we pass it now it will most surely be repealed by the Congress elected in 1946.

In the meantime, we are not facing an unsettled, chaotic world unarmed and unprepared. We have the greatest Navy in the history of the world. We have one of the finest armies that has ever marched in any land, and we have our valiant fighting marines. We will be respected at the peace table. The annual conscription of 800,000 high-school boys is not our answer for national defense; and it is no answer at all to the militant-minded leaders of other nations.

Instead of peacetime conscription now, I propose that we maintain an army of at least 1,000,000 young men. Thousands upon thousands of the men now serving in the Army will remain voluntarily if given reasonable pay and opportunity for promotion.

We should maintain the United States Fleet at full strength under all circumstances and at all costs. It would be the most tragic mistake in American history to reduce our fleet below the strength of any possible combination of enemy nations.

We should maintain our air superiority at full strength and with every possible encouragement in the research division. We must encourage research and means of production. Our unpreparedness at the beginning of this war was not in the lack of men—it was in the lack of materials, and our enemies knew it. Remember how long we trained our boys with wooden guns because there was no equipment?

We should maintain a competent general staff, encouraged by generous Government appropriations and with informed public opinion, but always reminded of the words of General Marshall that "the Army is the instrument of democracy."

We must have the best intelligence service in the world; the most alert diplomatic corps to keep our Government and our people informed as to what other nations are doing. If we do this we will have the men ready, we will have guns and ships and planes, in time to meet any raid or any invasion.

And we must keep strong outposts. It is unthinkable that we should ever forsake the graves of our heroic dead on Iwo Jima, on Saipan, on Okinawa, or any of the other islands in the Pacific, the Atlantic, or the Caribbean in order to satisfy some other nation's ideas of trusteeship, mandate, or face. We must keep our naval and air bases, and keep them fortified and supplied, regardless of the protest of any nation or group of nations on earth. We are not an imperialistic people, but we must be realistic about war from now on.

We should encourage the Army to organize ROTC units in every high school and college where they can be set up on a voluntary basis. We should provide the finest technical and scientific training for commissioned and noncommissioned officers in the Reserve and the National Guard, as well as for those in the Regular Army. In short, we should undertake the eradication of pacifism through a program of education and social measures, but not by conscription—for that is compulsion.

This program I suggest is based on the incontrovertible, though lately unfashionable, fact that our country still is protected by its oceans. A strong Air Force and a strong Navy can keep the enemy from our shores until we are able to gear manpower and production to our needs. If we have a correct intelligence service and correct research laboratories, no enemy is going to arise in full bloom on some future Sunday morning, ready to attack us without our having known anything about it. That is unthinkable now. We should see to it that it is impossible every day of our history from now on.

It is only common sense to be ready if someone wants to fight us, but as things stand today we cannot place our trust in universal military training. It cuts across the grain of everything that won this war for us, and it isn't the answer to the problem of national defense. We have that answer now in our great fleet, in our magnificent Air Corps, in our unexcelled Army, and always the United States Marines. We must continue to be strong in the air, on the sea, and on the land. We have accepted the responsibility of serving as an international policeman against aggressors, and we simply can't expect 18-year-old boys, with a single year of training, to bring order out of the turmoil of international chaos that will exist in the world for the next 4 or 5 years.

Conceivably universal military training may become a necessary policy for national defense sometime in the future. It should not be considered now because it is no answer to our present-day problem, nor to any problem now foreseeable. Until peace becomes the accepted way of life in the world, the only way the United States can insure peace for herself is for her to remain strong. That means we must keep our bases, we must keep our fleet and our Air Corps at full strength, and we must have an Army and Marine Corps of sufficient size that no nation on earth, under any circumstances, will decide to attack us.

The Unfinished Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, at the annual show of the San Francisco Press Club, held in San Francisco recently, Helen Hayes, the distinguished American actress, read a beautiful tribute to our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in the form of a vignette which was written by Hon. George B. Harris, judge of the San Francisco municipal court. The stirring lines are as follows:

THE UNFINISHED MESSAGE

(By George B. Harris)

CHARACTERS IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE

Arthur Prettyman, Negro valet--Joe Foreman
Miss Delano----------Helen Hayes

The scene: The "Little White House," Warm Springs, Ga. A living room in the cottage, atop Pine Mountain.

The time: Late afternoon, April 12, 1945.

On a table there may be found documents, papers, etc., and long cigarette holder.

Arthur Prettyman, the valet, is found at the table packing papers and trinkets in a bag. He picks up the cigarette holder and then replaces it on the table with a great deal of reverence. As he glances over the papers he picks up the Unfinished Message and peruses it.

Enter Miss Delano. She approaches empty chair. A Navy cape hangs over the back of the chair. She holds it tenderly.

Miss DELANO. What have you there, Prettyman?

PRETTYMAN. I was glancing at the speech, Miss Delano. The President was working on this message when he——

Miss DELANO (interrupting). May I read it?

PRETTYMAN. By all means, Miss Delano.

(Miss Delano picks up the script and starts reading.)

I speak to you on every beachhead, in every fox hole, atop the mountains and in the valleys, in every hamlet, every city, along Main Street, and in the alleys.

To you crusading fighters in the skies, on the land and under the seas, I implore you to carry on with renewed fervor and vigor.

To you leaders on the field of battle and on the home front, let not the thought of victory within your grasp cause you to relent in driving from the face of the earth all those opponents of decent living who have sought to destroy every vestige of our democratic way of life. To you little people, the common man, the world over, crying out to Heaven for vengeance, whose souls, bodies and homes have been left bleeding in the pathways of a torn civilization; may there be another world, a happier world, rising from the ashes of bigotry and slavery and intolerance.

To the families, and the mothers and fathers of those heroes whose eternal remains rest on foreign shores; their spirit and yours will never die, for that is militant America carrying on and on—that is the undying fervor of the English, Russian, French, Chinese and our other Allied brothers who have paid so big a price for just a little freedom; for just a little bit of ground on which to maintain a home and raise a family, decently and peacefully.

To you gathered in that grand city of San Francisco—the representatives of the United Nations—may your efforts be blessed by the Almighty, in bringing about a lasting peace, happiness on earth and a fair share of the good things of life to all.

None of you should have any fear as to the eventual outcome—for the only thing we have to fear, is fear itself.

PRETTYMAN. Oh, Dear Lord! I'd like to have gone with him to the Golden Gate.

Flag Day, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on this Flag Day of 1945 there are legions of New Hampshire's sons who recall the many experiences when the American flag gave them inspiration to carry on through days of fatigue, of combat, of long marches, and nights of vigil. Among these sons is Lt. Col. Arthur M. Edwards, whose allegiance to the flag was expressed in an admirable address

on the pages of this RECORD in 1937. The passing of years only adds to the loyalty which he has to the flag of his country and which he has expressed in the verses which follow:

O FLAG OF STRENGTH AND BEAUTY

O flag of strength and beauty,
O flag of freedom's light,
Through thee we learn our duty,
To show that right makes might.
With thee our own dear country
Will strive her work to do;
O pure and sov'reign banner,
Our dear Red, White, and Blue.

Today on war-sick nations
Thy light of freedom falls;
To help all righteous nations
Thy trump of freedom calls;
Thy starry splendor glowing
Will pierce all dark clouds through;
Rich life the world is owing
To our Red, White, and Blue.

Thy stars were sent from heaven,
Thy rainbow from the sky;
That right in thunder-riven
Might cause all wrong to fly;
With all the world more glorious
In freedom's conscious right;
Our dear homeland victorious
In our thrice blessed light.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the United States Chamber of Commerce is on record with the Ways and Means Committee as speaking for the business interests of the United States in support of the bill, H. R. 3240, to further reduce our tariff duties. The chamber does not speak for all American businessmen, Mr. Speaker, on this question. Many instances have come to my attention of members of the Chamber of Commerce condemning the action of the chamber in supporting this measure. As an example of the opposition to the chamber's position, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks, the following letter from Mr. Herman F. Voss, president of the Victor Silk Hosiery Co., of New Britain, Pa., which I hope will be carefully read by every Member of the Congress and by those representatives of the Chamber of Commerce who purport to speak for American business interests in support of H. R. 3240, which is now before the Senate:

VICTOR SILK HOSIERY CO.,
New Britain, Pa., May 21, 1945.

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I saw in the papers this morning that the New Dealers succeeded in obtaining a majority vote on bill H. R. 2652, which extends for 3 years the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which expires June 12, 1945, and that the same will be referred to the House for debate and vote.

I, and all other members of our firm, together with most of our employees, are anxious that this law should be defeated, for we are concerned that on account of such laws the conditions in the United States will become such that many of our people will be out of work and those that still have work will have to work for a great deal less than they are earning under normal conditions.

We also notice that the United States Chamber of Commerce endorsed this program and I would like to make a statement here that our firm is associated with the chamber of commerce, but we certainly do condemn this action on their part from the bottom of our souls, and we therefore do not wish to continue our membership in the future. In fact, we have felt that way ever since Mr. Johnston, the president, returned from his excursion to Russia, where it seems he was favorably impressed with conditions that make him feel we should help them along and become Communists ourselves. However, we are absolutely against this, as well as any further help to other nations, to make them competitors of our own.

I have cited several instances in my former communications in which it was shown that it is impossible to have various articles manufactured in the United States on a competitive basis with other countries having a decidedly lower standard of living, and if we lower the tariff to such an extent that large numbers of products and materials can be brought into this country in the manufacture of which low wages were paid, no one will pay the prices here.

We fully understand that a certain class is favorable to this, which I would rather not call American, or a party with a soul, or with a country, but whose only ideal is money.

We believe thoroughly that we should absolutely protect the interest of America by having as many as possible of our people employed at reasonable wages.

I, therefore, ask that you yourself do your utmost to obtain this condition, and I believe if properly laid before the Members of the House we should be able to obtain a majority opposing this bill.

Again assuring you of our loyalty in support of your work, we remain,

Very truly yours,

HERMAN F. VOSS,
President.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on Education on June 13, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate this opportunity of speaking to the House Committee on Education, on a subject concerning which I have always felt strongly, and which I believe to be of utmost importance to our whole national future, the subject of Federal Aid to Education.

A democracy is a government not only for the people, but one, of necessity, of and by those same people. It is therefore apparent that if we are to govern ourselves in a manner which will insure our welfare and continuing freedom, we must permit no one to come to maturity unprepared for the duties of democratic citizenship. We must know our past, our mistakes and successes, in order to achieve a proper perspective in regard to our present position. We must be fully aware of the nature of our goal—a fuller and more inclusive democracy—so as to know, in relation to it, where we must constantly correct and improve ourselves. Most important, we must know those tools, those democratic rights and processes, whereby we can try to achieve that goal.

A people who know nothing of themselves, cannot govern themselves. The most important knowledge that the citizens of a democracy can have is the knowledge of what democracy means, in concrete every-day terms. We must have a Monday, not just a Sunday democracy, as we must have a Monday, not just a Sunday religion. If, for instance, we truly believe that all men are created equal, then there can be no reason for discrimination. If we recognize environment as the prime factor in shaping social attitudes and reactions, and if we recognize the brotherhood of man, in a real and practical sense, as desirable and necessary, then and then only can we seek to create an environment in which all men can learn to be brothers.

I honestly believe that all our social and economic ills can be laid, ultimately, at the door of ignorance. I honestly believe that if we know our goals and know the methods whereby we can reach them, we can actually achieve a fuller democracy, the brotherhood of man in a real and practical sense, in this Nation and eventually in the world. This is not a utopian dream. This is realism.

I think it is a firmly established fact in our minds that education is the basis of a free society. In view of this, it is alarming to know that according to a recent estimate (quoted by the National Education Association of the United States) more than 650,000 men have been rejected for military service in this country because of educational deficiencies only. Nearly 5,000,000 have been rejected for educational, physical, and mental reasons, many of which could have been avoided through a strengthened public-school system. According to 1940 census facts, more than 2,000,000 children, age 6 to 15, were not in school at that time, and 10,000,000 adults were unable to read and write. This is, to most of us, as frightening as it is amazing.

There are several reasons for these facts. All of them have to do, basically, with money.

In the first place, the teaching profession is notoriously underpaid. We have never had as many teachers as were needed. And in recent years the number of teachers in this country has dropped alarmingly, coupled with a steady increase in our population. Since Pearl Harbor, more than 280,000 teachers have left the profession.

In October 1944 there were an estimated 10,000 classrooms without teachers, which meant that 250,000 children were without teachers at that time. In the face of these facts, we must realize that the cost of living has risen about 30 percent above prewar levels, while teachers' salaries have, generally, risen less than 15 percent. This is a condition certainly not designed to attract capable people to the teaching profession.

Secondly, the amount of money spent, and available for spending, toward education, varies among the States so that the cost of operating classrooms in 1939–40 ranged from less than $100 per year in some localities, to more than $6,000 per year in others. While the median classroom unit cost $1,600 per year, over 6,380,000 children were in classrooms each costing less than $1,200 per year, and 1,720,000 in classrooms costing less than $600 per year. Thirty-eight thousand two hundred and fifty-three of our children attended classrooms on which were spent less than $100 per year. The inadequate education received by these children is not their fault, certainly. Yet they and we will suffer for it in a few short years, when the reins of government are in their hands.

Such poor educational facilities are not the fault, either, of any unwillingness on the part of these States to provide funds for education. The fact of the matter is that

they just haven't enough money. For, unfortunately, according to figures published by the National Education Association of the United States, the States that have the most children to be educated, in relation to the adult population, have, in most cases, the least money to spend. The States that have the fewest children have the most money to spend. Yet the States with the most children and the least money are spending the highest percentage of all State revenues for schools.

Obviously, then, it is only through Federal aid that educational opportunity can be equalized throughout the country, and made even barely adequate in some of our States. The bill, H. R. 1296, now before your committee, Mr. Chairman, proposes, as you know, to increase Federal aid to education by $300,000,000 annually. This is not an expenditure; rather, it is an investment, an investment that will pay enormous dividends to every person in this Nation * * * for it is an investment in democracy.

More than that, I think it is not extravagant to say that without such an investment our whole national future is in danger.

There was a time in our distant past when education was the possession of only a very few. It was those educated few in whose hands lay the Government of our Nation. Today we have extended suffrage, but the caliber and amount of our education has not kept pace with it. Certainly it is only a sensible safeguard to our own national future to make certain that those who vote, those who shape our national policies, know enough to do it intelligently. It is not only because of their lack of maturity that we do not permit children to vote. It is primarily because we think they have not yet learned enough. Yet, in effect, we give the right of suffrage to many adults whose education is equivalent to that of a fourth or eighth-grade child and to some who have had no education at all. This is not the eternal vigilance that will preserve our democracy and our freedom.

The primary argument that the opponents of Federal aid to education have advanced is that Federal control will follow Federal aid.

Such arguments crumble like straw men in the face of the facts of the case; we have always had Federal aid to education. The principle itself is older than the Constitution. It began, in this country, in the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787, was reaffirmed by Congress in our Constitution. It has taken many forms: that of land grants, of outright money grants, and of money grants that annually recur. It has been extended for many purposes: for support of land-grant colleges, for agricultural experiment stations, for vocational education and rehabilitation, as well as emergency war-training programs. Every State in the Union has at one time or another received such funds.

The legislation which is now before you, and which I so urgently recommend that you support, does not establish a new principle. Rather, it recognizes the worth of an old one, and asks that in view of many new developments and facts, the amount of aid for educational purposes extended by the Federal Government to States and localities be increased. This legislation specifically and forcefully reserves the control of education to the States and localities.

Education is a matter of national concern. This is one indivisible Nation, one toward whose welfare each of us bears a responsibility. These facts cannot be disputed: that we haven't enough teachers; that many of our schools do not have proper and sufficient equipment with which to properly educate those who will direct the course of the Nation in the next generation. To correct these weaknesses in our democracy is only common sense. It is an investment in security, defense, and prosperity. I cannot too strongly urge, Mr. Chairman, that you and your committee give this measure, H. R. 1296, your approval.

Rubber Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding Senate bill 713, known as the rubber-tire bill, delivered by George J. Burger, of New York City, before the Metropolitan Philadelphia Tire Trade Association in Philadelphia on June 7, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The legislation now pending before the Seventy-ninth Congress known as the rubber-tire bill (S. 713 in the Senate and H. R. 2617 in the House of Representatives) was not introduced as the result of some idle dream or as a result of a new theory in the thinking of the Congress—the introduction was the result of presentation to Members of Congress of the cold, hard facts concerning the problems confronting the independent interests in the rubber-tire industry. These facts had to be shown conclusively to interested Members before legislation of this nature would even be considered.

The bill was first introduced in the Seventy-seventh, then in the Seventy-eighth, and now in the Seventy-ninth Congress. The present sponsors in the Senate are Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee; Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, also a member of that committee; and Senator ROBERT WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; in the House it is sponsored by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee and also a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The bill has been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee in both Houses.

The purpose of the bill is to take the manufacturers out of the field of operating retail stores in competition with his own independent retail outlets. This will provide for and insure real free enterprise and fair competition in the rubber-tire industry. The Senate Small Business Committee, as a result of a fact-finding survey, was convinced that the rubber-tire industry was controlled by a monopoly and that something should be done about it.

I believe it would be well for the members of the industry here tonight to stop a moment and give some thought to the tremendous amount of work that has been done over a period of many years past by a few in that industry in an attempt to bring about a "live and let live" condition instead of the "big dog eat dog" with which we are at present confronted. They should not forget, too, the value of the sympathetic understanding of the independent's problem which is apparent by the actions in the independent's behalf by Senator MURRAY and Congressman PATMAN. The sympathetic understanding of these gentlemen is the result of confidence in a few men in our industry who have worked long and hard to present to them the seriousness of our problems.

Let us not forget for a moment that these two leaders in Congress—the champions of small-business interest in Congress—have been the keystones to whom the small businesses in our industry could look for assistance when they could show just reason for such assistance.

At the same time, the other members of these Small Business Committees have never permitted politics to interfere in or influence their opinion when they felt that relief was necessary for the independents in the rubber tire industry. This is most commendable and should be significant to all interests that oppose this legislation—it proves conclusively that this legislation is sound and that it warrants the support, and must receive the support, of the entire Congress.

The independents would very much have preferred to solve their problems without resorting to a request for legislation which would prevent the practices within our industry that have created those problems. It would have been much simpler to come to some cooperative, fair, and equitable agreement throughout the entire industry than to have to resort to asking Congress for legislative relief. As far back as 1920, at the first national convention of the dealers—25 years ago—the manufacturers were asked to withdraw from the retail field. Bear in mind that at that time the independent dealers were handling 98 percent of replacement sales.

Did the entry into the retail field by the manufacturers cease or decrease? On the contrary, the manufacturers increased their ownership of retail outlets by leaps and bounds. Not only did they take away the business of their own independent dealer outlets through this medium, but they also took it away through special deals with oil companies, mass-distributor contracts, special deals with automobile manufacturers, mileage and rental contracts with taxicab and bus companies, and direct selling to local and national truck fleets.

The strange part of it all is that during these 25 years the net profits of these manufacturers did not increase as a result of these grabbing tactics. In fact, their profits went down, the investors suffered, hundreds of tire manufacturers fell by the wayside, and thousands upon thousands of independent tire dealers throughout the Nation were destroyed. The entire financial structure of the rubber-tire industry suffered tremendously, affecting especially the independent interests of that industry. I would safely say that right up to Pearl Harbor it was almost impossible for the independent interests to finance their operations.

The only conclusion that can be reached when an attempt is made to analyze all of these actions is that the only aim was that of monopoly. It could be nothing but an attempt by the Big Four to create a monopoly—if not that, what line of reasoning could have prompted the course of action which they undertook? The public was not crying for lower prices—the public was not insisting upon better quality in tires.

Realizing the dangerous situation they were facing, the dealers themselves in 1936 called upon the Federal Trade Commission to assist them in holding an industry conference to adopt fair trade practice rules. An invitation was extended by the Federal Trade Commission to all members of the industry to attend such a conference. The conference was held in Chicago in June of 1936. Commissioner Freer, of the Federal Trade Commission, was surprised at the lack of attendance by the manufacturers and said he was at a loss to understand the complete lack of interest by the manufacturers. Dealers from all over the United States were present and this tremendous dealer attendance was indicative of their interest in establishing fair trade practice rules which would benefit everyone in the rubber-tire industry. Apparently it was the attitude of the manufacturers that if things did not go their way, they would go no way at all.

Shortly thereafter the Robinson-Patman Act became law. All independents were hopeful that this would be the means for relief against the unfair practices that were prevailing and which had prevailed for a con-

siderable time. They were doomed to be disillusioned, however, for the manufacturers soon found ways to circumvent the law, and we would not be mistaken in charging the big interests in our own industry with setting such circumventing examples for others to follow. The cease and desist orders of the Federal Trade Commission after that act became law will confirm this statement.

We all remember the Federal Trade Commission case against Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. prior to the Robinson-Patman Act. Years of study and research by the Commission resulted in the discovery that Goodyear had favored one of its accounts with preferentials of about $41,000,000. This case, of national importance, was lost by the Commission in the Federal courts by a two-to-one decision. From that moment the picture for the independents in the rubber-tire industry rapidly became darker and will continue to become darker unless a congressional committee steps in and reviews the entire situation.

In 1929 and 1930 the independent dealers tried to meet mass distributor competition that became increasingly serious as a result of contracts entered into between the major tire manufacturers and these mass distributors. Another large manufacturer took the dealers' contracts, but sooner or later managed to effect breaches of this contract.

In 1937 Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, introduced a bill in the Seventy-fifth Congress, H. R. 4722 (the same bill is now in the 79th Cong. as H. R. 135), to take all manufacturers out of the retail field under certain conditions. This bill would have increased the powers of the Federal Trade Commission to enable the Commission to take the manufacturers out of the retail field only after the Commission had found facts to warrant such action. The majors in the tire industry did everything within their power to defeat this bill.

In 1938, both in the House and Senate, resolutions were introduced to investigate the rubber-tire industry. Why? Only because of the unfair practices that were so evident within that industry. This led to the introduction in June of 1942 of the tire bill. It was introduced in both the House and the Senate with the unanimous approval of all members of the Small Business Committees of both bodies.

During hearings which have been held in the Senate on this bill during the past 3 years, every possible objection that could be raised against it has been heard. Opposition has come, for example, from governmental agencies, the National Manufacturers Association, chambers of commerce, oil companies, labor organizations, so-called small business organizations, and trucking associations. In fact, one Member of Congress remarked that never had he seen such well-organized opposition. Another Member threatened to call for an investigation of the opposition because it was so obviously built upon deception, misleading statements, and deliberate false statements, all with the thought of confusing the issue.

That "tire bill" is still in Congress, however, in spite of all that organized propaganda and resistance. That "tire bill" is not dead by any manner or means—in fact, it is farther from being dead now than it has ever been. It can be said in all seriousness that it is one of the biggest pieces of business legislation that has been before the Congress since the Civil War. Does anyone for a moment think that the Members of Congress who have sponsored it would have given it a second thought or have shown their interest by reintroducing it for the third consecutive time if this were not sound and legal legislation?

Surely what this bill would do by law is only what the meat packers' consent decree does and this consent decree has been sustained by the Supreme Court time and time again. The meat packers are not permitted to operate retail stores. How about the Court's decision in the Pullman case? The Pullman Co. had to divorce its manufacturing operation from the servicing or renting. It is also reported that the movie industry is facing the same court action. How about the recent action by the Department of Justice instituted to strip the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. of its 108 warehouses and retail stores? Bear in mind that this action was instituted only a few days back.

It is quite significant in view of the contention we hear every so often by so-called legal authorities that the tire bill is unconstitutional. That is just more smoke thrown out in an attempt to block or slow up action. You need have no fear about the legality or constitutionality of that bill. It is my firm conviction that when that bill becomes law, if it is ever brought up before the Supreme Court, that Court will uphold that law. It is also my firm conviction that once that bill becomes the law of the land, no attempt will ever be made by the rubber industry to question its legality or constitutionality.

What this Nation needs today more than ever is a greater number of independents in all lines of industry, be it manufacturing, jobbers or retailers. An increase in independents will result in the creation of better communities throughout the Nation.

Not one of the opposition has dared to say that the independents in our industry are inefficient. If such a statement had been made, it would definitely have been answered by the actions and experience and the part played by the independents in the rubber-tire industry in keeping the Nation's fleet of passenger cars, trucks, and busses operating during this war. Just stop a moment to think what would have happened if the independents had thrown in the towel and called it quits back in the thirties when the going got rough. Is there any doubt but that the civilian transportation system would have collapsed? There isn't any doubt as to that in my mind.

And while we are on that subject, let me remind you that it was the independent interests in our industry that proposed the tire-conservation and Nation-wide tire-service program that was later recommended by the Baruch committee and then adopted by the war agencies of our Government. This came from the thinking of the efficient independent factors of the tire industry and from no one else. The public gained by those recommendations. These are the same people who proposed the tire bill for the consideration of Congress.

I need not take the time to tell any of you here tonight who William Jeffers is. He had to be an efficient administrator to be the president of the Union Pacific Railroad and he proved to be one of the greatest administrators we have known in his capacity as Rubber Administrator during this war. Appearing before the Senate Small Business Committee in that capacity back in March of 1943, he recommended that the Senate and the Congress approve the tire bill. Here was one of the Nation's leading businessmen advocating its approval in full. He could plainly see that if conditions continued as they have been, the independents of the Nation could well be destroyed and he could all too plainly see what would happen if another crisis came along and there were no independents to play the part they did during this war. His endorsement alone should be enough to make everyone in the business world stop and think seriously of its implications.

It can be truthfully said that if the controlling interests in the rubber tire industry had instituted and followed a plan of live and let live, there would never have been the need for such legislation. Repeatedly, year after year, the tire dealers have requested the major manufacturers to sit down and talk things over as to practices within the law, but these meetings have never amounted to anything and after each one of these meetings, conditions have continued to become worse and worse.

Such flagrant violations of all ethics have continued into such a time as this present war. I am referring in particular at the moment to the case of a major tire manufacturing firm that took it upon itself to do some fancy interpreting of regulations—an interpretation, incidentally, which resulted in some very fancy business for itself. You are all familiar with that one, too. They knew what they were doing when they so conveniently twisted the interpretation to suit their needs—but they had gotten away with so much in prior years that they thought nothing of a little experimenting even during wartime.

I hope that you businessmen present here tonight will go out of your way to explain to your fellow merchants what this tire bill will do for the Nation's future prosperity. On all sides we hear "full employment": the enactment into law of this bill will certainly contribute its share toward a fulfillment of the Nation's hope for full employment. It will be the means of creating more of a home community, will insure a condition where the local merchant is really and truly a part of the community and not merely part of an organization with a local manager whose job it is to attend civic meetings to help the illusion of that organization being a part of the community. The maintenance of a healthy economy in which the independent plays a major part will be the means of giving more employment to our returning GI's, and also give them a square break in the establishment of their own business. Let us not become a Nation of clerks for manufacturers' retail outlets.

During a discussion of this problem about a year ago, Senator MEAD remarked that he could not understand why the management of these company-owned stores did not set up in business for themselves if it were a profitable operation, as it surely must be or the manufacturer would not be in it. He remarked that it was the natural ambition of every American to own his own business instead of working for someone else. Well, there are answers to that in the rubber-tire industry as many who have their own independent business have found out. It's a sad commentary when we must ask for legislation to curb the practices which destroy the opportunity of the American citizen to go into business for himself but such is the case and that is why we plead for the enactment of the tire bill into law. We are trying, through that bill, to aid those independents who are at present in business and to open the door for others to enter as independents. Our Nation's economy and our Nation's greatness were founded on that principle and only on that principle will it continue to be great.

The Congress will vote that bill into law but it will vote it into law that much quicker if all of you will do your share. Preach it—it is something that will help everyone and it is our salvation. We are not asking the Government for lower taxes—we are not asking for loans. All we are asking is to be permitted to get an even break in our industry. We do not need subsidy—we can take care of ourselves on the basis of an even break but heaven knows that any talk of an even break under existing practices in our industry would have to be accompanied with a hearty horselaugh.

Remember that the motor transportation system of this Nation depends on the independent tire sales and serving system. That is why Congress will vote for that bill.

During the past week I have been privileged to attend hearings in Washington held by the House Small Business Committee. Presenting testimony at sessions I attended were Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce; John Snyder, Federal Loan Administrator;

and Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

I was particularly impressed with the testimony of the last two gentlemen and the opinions they held as to the importance of maintaining a healthy small-business economy in our Nation. Their testimony was human, clear, and understandable. Shall we call this a change of heart or a change in the thinking of our Government officials? In my opinion, this change in thinking and the understanding of small-business problems can be traced to the doorstep of the Small Business Committees in our Congress. The result of their work over the past 4 years is becoming apparent as we see the problems of small business being given full recognition by the heads of our various Government agencies.

This is an encouraging sign to small business. Now, I wonder what small business is going to do for itself to back up and follow through with the work that these congressional Small Business Committees have been doing and are doing?

The Right To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the right to work is perhaps one of the most basic rights for which man strives. For the right to work means the right to live, the right to earn the money with which to buy food, shelter, clothing, medical attention. Without these basic bodily requirements you and I cannot live.

For some years now we have talked of other rights—the rights of free speech, free press, religion, assembly, a free ballot—but only recently have we begun to speak of our most basic right, and to strive to secure it. The Atlantic Charter called it freedom from want. Today we name it for what it is, bluntly, the right to work, the right to live.

With recognition of this basic right has come legislation in this Congress, to secure it. The measure to obtain approval of the Bretton Woods proposals, the bill to extend our reciprocal trade agreements, which have both just passed the House so successfully, are not concerned with obscure financial and trade arrangements with other nations, with no practical meaning to you in the factory, and you on the farm, and you in industry. They are primarily and directly concerned with increasing and assuring prosperity at home, here in America. They are meant to create those conditions under which the worker can find jobs, the farmer a market, and the businessman profits. They are meant to help secure and assure the right to work—the right to live. It was for this basic right to live that you and I fought so hard, and so successfully, for Bretton Woods and reciprocal trade, in the House of Representatives. This fight must be carried to and concluded successfully in the Senate.

The battle for a Fair Employment Practice Committee is only a battle for the right to work—the right to live. It means only that Americans—Negroes, Catholics, Jews, those of Japanese or German ancestry—shall be able to find work commensurate with their ability, and their ability alone; that they shall not be denied work because of the color of their skin, their ancestry, their religious beliefs, or those of their great-grandparents. It only means that all of us, regardless of our color, our religious beliefs and our religious or national ancestry, shall have the right to live.

Another measure now before us, with this same purpose, the right to work, the right to live, is the full employment bill, S. 380, and its companion measure, H. R. 2202. These measures seek to "establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government."

This war has proved to us the stuff of which we, as a Nation, are made, in regard to production and employment. We have reached levels of both previously undreamed of. This has been done with 20 percent of our prewar labor force in the armed services. Four-fifths of United States workers are, then, producing enough to successfully wage the most tremendous war of all time, and to meet most domestic needs as well.

Therefore, it is brought forcibly home to us that, because of our great technological progress and skill, full production does not necessarily mean full employment. For today we are achieving full production with one-fifth of our citizenry completely out of the production picture.

Obviously, then, the achievement of full employment, the right to work, the right to live, cannot be left to chance. We must plan for it; plan for peace as we planned for war. Plan for life for ourselves and our democracy as we planned for the defeat of our enemies and the death of fascism.

This cannot be done by one or two or three measures alone. S. 380 and H. R. 2202, the full-employment bills, are not the whole answer any more than are Bretton Woods or reciprocal trade. But each has a specific function to perform, in relation to the whole picture. Each is indispensable, in regard to our ultimate goal.

S. 380 and H. R. 2202 seek, primarily, to call up our national economy for a medical check-up about once a year. The metabolism of its intake and output is noted, anemia searched for. If presence or symptoms of economic ills of any sort are discovered, the Federal Government warns the patient, and, after agreement is reached by our legislators, a course of prevention and cure is set forth, in which all of us must cooperate. S. 380 and H. R. 2202 seek to discover and prevent disease in our body politic before it gets a foothold impossible to dislodge.

We have, as Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion Director Vinson stated so well, "unfulfilled needs in America so diverse and so great as to challenge the capacity of even the greatest producing Nation on earth—but needs are not demands, in the economic sense. People must have steady income before needs become demands and people become customers."

Not only must those incomes we receive be steady, but all of us must be assured the right and the opportunity to gain such steady incomes, through jobs. Toward this end, business, agriculture, labor, and local, State and Federal Governments must all cooperate, play full parts. We must view the national economy as a whole, and adopt national economic policies which will promote and encourage business expansion, maintenance and growth of markets, and consumer spending. S. 380 and H. R. 2202 seek to do this by recognition of governmental responsibility in measuring the size of the country's employment need, and providing specific programs to meet it.

In order to give employment to everyone, and reduce industrial strife, there must of course be shorter hours in order to spread work and stabilize wages in order to maintain purchasing power. In this direction I intend shortly to introduce a measure, as an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, calling for a 35-hour week and a 65-cent-an-hour minimum wage.

Further, there must be a program to stabilize employment with public works. If this is to be carried out planning must be begun immediately, and funds appropriated in sufficient amounts to finance engineering works, for instance, so that when the need arises, work can be gotten under way before a depression gets a real foothold. Together with such a program the Government must plan to subsidize public works, of cities and counties, to facilitate the speed with which such a plan can be gotten underway at the first sign of unemployment.

A flourishing foreign trade is, of course, an absolute necessity for our prosperity, as is the economic well-being and development of all other nations. Reciprocal trade and Bretton Woods stimulate these requirements. A large merchant marine is also indispensable in this regard, as a bridge of ships between our Nation and nations across the sea, and as an industry in itself capable of supplying one-half million jobs. Unemployment insurance, too, as President Truman emphasized, is another measure necessary to prevent reconversion from slipping into depression. To this list must be added, in addition, a wide range of social-security legislation, including sickness and disability compensation and old-age pensions.

This whole problem might be likened to a wheel. It might be said that the right to work is the hub; the spokes are the various measures necessary to insure it—Bretton Woods, reciprocal trade, FEPC, S. 380 and H. R. 2202, and others to come; and the rim is democracy and world peace. For only in a democracy surrounded by nations at peace can the hub and the spokes—the right to work and the measures that insure it—function effectively, not as regimentation, but as desired goals, freely sought and planned for. We have fought hard, and so far successfully, for Bretton Woods and reciprocal trade. Let us begin the fight for S. 380 and H. R. 2202, the full-employment bills.

We plan for everything else—the family budget, the children's education, our meals and our vacations, for national defense and for war. Surely it is neither strange nor wrong to plan for peace, for the right to work, for the right to live.

Veterans' Home-Loan Appraisals

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the membership of the House some facts with regard to the appraisal of property offered for home loans under section 501 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Recently the Society of Residential Appraisers, of 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., prepared an interpretation to guide appraisers doing such work.

For the study of the membership, I desire to insert in the RECORD the explanatory note and also the interpretation, as follows:

REASONABLE NORMAL VALUE FOR VETERANS' HOME-LOAN APPRAISALS UNDER SECTION 501 OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

(An interpretation prepared by the Society of Residential Appraisers, Chicago, Ill.)

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The Veterans' Administration uses independent appraisers for the valuation work on home loans under section 501 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Use of private appraisers on a fee basis in this program is evidence of the progress made by the organized appraisal profession through study and cooperative efforts in the Society of Residential Appraisers.

The fee system permits the maximum economy and flexibility in handling occasional peak periods in appraisal requests as well as periods of low volume. This would not be possible if a large staff of Government-employee appraisers were used. Government overhead expense on the appraisal phase of veteran-loan processing is thus kept at a minimum with resultant savings to veterans and taxpayers. More important, the services of the best appraisers in the country, being volunteered for part-time assignments, would not be available on any other basis.

This program offers appraisers an opportunity to help World War II veterans. The performance of private appraisers must be thoroughly satisfactory if their services are to be retained and their reputations upheld.

The meaning of "reasonable normal value" as stated in the act has not been clear. As a service to society members, to assist in the veterans' home-loan program, and to strengthen the independent appraisal program, this memorandum interpreting "reasonable normal value" has been prepared by the officers and governors of the Society of Residential Appraisers. In addition to consultation among society officers and governors, it reflects careful study of the congressional background of the appraisal provision of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, discussions with many recognized individual appraisal leaders and study and exchange of opinion by society members in local chapters in all parts of the country. Thus, this interpretation reflects the practical approach of appraisal leaders in their field work.

GEORGE T. WHELDEN,
President.
NORMAN STRUNK,
Secretary.

INTERPRETATION TO GUIDE THE APPRAISER

The basic objective of the veterans' home-loan guaranty is to provide veterans of World War II with ample opportunities to achieve a sound, long-term home-ownership program through the aid of liberal financing. The program adopted by Congress, however, is clearly designed to protect, as well as to liberalize financing for the veteran. Counsel is provided by appraisers, realtors, and lending institutions.

The appraiser has the responsibility of protecting the veteran as to the purchase price. Congress provided in the law that an otherwise eligible loan can be guaranteed only if "the purchase price paid * * * by the veteran for such property * * * (does) not exceed the reasonable normal value thereof as determined by proper appraisal."

In writing this section into the law, Congress apparently intended that the veteran should be protected against paying a price in excess of a competently made valuation, which recognizes that abnormal wartime conditions affecting construction cost and market price levels cannot be accepted as long-term factors. The word "normal" was probably used to emphasize that prices and costs produced by abnormal conditions of supply and demand should not be accepted as measures of long-term value.

Conditions which affect the price of houses today and which Congress apparently desired appraisers to recognize as abnormal in reporting the reasonable normal value of property include the following:

1. Undersupply of existing housing accommodations.

2. Shortage of construction labor and restrictions preventing or limiting the manufacture of building materials, as well as limitations on the construction of new homes and the repair or modernization of existing homes.

The act provides aid to veterans in financing a long-term home-ownership program. This aid will be available for years to come. The loan guaranty need not be used immediately by the veteran. The law now provides that the guaranty may be applied for at any time within 2 years after the veteran is discharged or 2 years after the end of the war, whichever is the later. Amendments now before Congress seek to extend these time limits. It was not intended that a veteran purchase his home immediately upon discharge if that would necessitate his paying a price in excess of the value of the property.

Study of the intent and language of Congress indicates that reasonable normal value is the same value that appraisers report in their usual appraisal work—that is, the present worth of all the rights to future benefits arising from ownership.

Reasonable normal value may or may not coincide with the all-cash price currently obtainable. It will not so coincide if demand factors far outweigh supply factors. Immediate supply and demand factors enter into market price. On the other hand, value has a longer term concept and gives expression to expected future price changes—whether they be upward or downward—which will accompany a restoration of an approximate balance between supply and demand factors.

Consistent with accepted valuation principles, reasonable normal value may be lower than, but never higher than, the estimated cost of reproducing the property new at the time of the appraisal. It will be lower than reproduction cost new if depreciation or obsolescence have occurred. Reasonable normal value contemplates no premium above the replacement cost of the property.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by me over a network of radio stations in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan:

Friends and neighbors in the Twelfth Congressional District, more than any Government agency in the whole experience of American democracy, the Office of Price Administration has become an intimate part of the everyday life of the people of the country. No single person, no family or business, has been unaffected by the operation of this wartime Federal department.

In proportion to the vast scope of the jurisdiction of the OPA has been the criticism leveled at it. Griping at price-control regulations or rationing has become a part of the wartime folklore of America.

I have been as expert as anyone in criticizing the OPA, but, in common with most Americans, I am profoundly grateful that we have had an OPA during the war years. The alternative to price control and rationing during these years was skyrocketing prices and shortages or disappearance of vital commodities. This is what we have avoided through price-control regulations.

Very often we have found price control a bitter pill to swallow, but it has done a job, and a good one, of checking the disease of wartime inflation.

Right now there is an intensive campaign to abolish OPA, or to so limit its powers that price control would be a farce. This must not happen. With one great military victory achieved, and with the battle for the final victory still hotly contested, we cannot let down our guard on the home front and succumb to the temptation of a return to so-called "normalcy."

A simple recital of what happened during and after the last war, when there was little or no price control, will give us a pretty good idea of what abandonment of price control now would mean.

A contrast of some of the statistics of World War I with World War II shows how much greater the postwar adjustment of our economic life must be, how much more danger there is of rapid, runaway inflation now than there was in 1918 and 1919 and in the years immediately after that.

World War I cost the taxpayers of the country $32,000,000,000, with just about 25 percent of the total national production of machines and materials going into that cost. This time, up until December 1944, the war had cost $245,000,000,000, with 44 percent of our total productive capacity being utilized for war purposes.

The people of the country, in 1918, had, after taxes were deducted, a buying power of $58,000,000,000. In 1944, the public buying power was approximately $135,000,000,000.

You can see what this means. The people of this country now have about eighty billion more dollars to spend than they had in 1918, and many fewer items on which to spend it. The demand for goods now is more than a hundredfold more pressing than it was in 1918.

Many of you will remember what happened in the years immediately following the armistice of November 1918. None of us want that to happen again, and yet, without price control, we have the stage

set for a much more severe inflation and a much more severe depression following it.

It is important to remember that the peak of the inflation growing out of World War I came, not during the war, but afterward—1920 was the year when the inflationary balloon was fully inflated and then it burst.

Many of you, out of your own personal experience, will claim that OPA has not held prices down, that your dollar is not worth as much today as it was before the war. I know this as well as anyone. Living costs have gone up.

Just how much they have gone up is a subject of dispute between the Government and various consumer groups. But, when we take the official Government estimates of the rise in living costs during this war and contrast it with the official estimate of the rise in costs during the last war, we can get a pretty fair appraisal of the job OPA has done.

From the outbreak of World War II to the end of 1944 wholesale prices rose 38.7 percent. In a like period after the outbreak of World War I wholesale prices rose 114.7 percent.

Living costs during this same period in World War II rose, according to Government estimate, 28.8 percent. In World War I, by the same estimate over the same period of time, they had gone up 84.4 percent. In World War I, living costs rose to just within 15 percent under 100 percent of what they were before the war started.

The ruinous effects of this inflationary spree were still being felt a decade after the close of World War I. Some of its immediate effects were these: An increase of over 5,000,000 unemployed persons before the end of 1921; a 44 percent drop in the weekly pay checks of those who kept their jobs; the foreclosure of more than 450,000 farm mortgages before 1926, and the failure of some 105,000 businesses in the 5 years after the price collapse.

The success of the OPA in stabilizing prices to the creditable extent it has so far does not mean that we can sit back now, in anticipation of an early close of the war, and relax our vigilance against inflation. We are more vulnerable now to inflationary pressures than we have been at any time during the war period. We will not be safe against inflation and runaway prices until a balance has been achieved between the demand for consumer goods and the supply of consumer goods.

Obviously that balance cannot be achieved until the great part of our production that is still going into war materials can be returned to its normal peacetime production of consumer goods.

It cannot be anticipated that the cutbacks in the war-production schedules following VE-day will permit sufficient conversion to consumer-goods production to justify any optimism about a greatly increased supply of consumer goods. At most, there will be a trickle of commodities to meet an overwhelming demand. To remove controls of prices over this trickle would be to jeopardize the whole program of orderly transition to normal civilian production and consumption.

It is estimated by the WPB that there still will be in the neighborhood of $73,000,000,000 spent by the Government next year for war purposes.

This will mean that the vast hoard of savings accumulated during the war period will continue to grow. We already have, in savings alone, more than $118,000,000,000 ready to bid for consumer products. In addition to this we have the unprecedented annual income of over $137,000,000,000.

In contrast with these astronomical figures, there is now available only about $98,000,000,000 worth of nonwar goods on the market.

Very largely it is business interests and the powerful farm groups—not necessarily the small dirt farmers—who are clamoring for relaxation of price controls. The billions of dollars waiting to be spent are very tempting, and the desire to be in on the ground floor of postwar business outweighs longer-range considerations.

Aside from the long-range disastrous effects of price-control relaxation now, let me point out who some of the immediate victims of any such action would be.

First of all there would be the millions of servicemen's families who depend entirely on allotment checks for their existence. While the American soldier is the best paid soldier in the world, and his family the best provided for, I don't think anyone could claim that the ordinary serviceman's allotment check does more than just keep his family going until he comes home. Any increase in prices, particularly food and essential clothing prices, would work a severe hardship on these millions of American families who live on the restricted and fixed monthly allotment check.

Another first victim of price increases would be the working man or woman. The VE-day cut-backs, while not sufficient to permit widespread conversion to production of civilian goods, have thrown thousands of war workers out of jobs and reduced the weekly pay checks of thousands more through cuts in overtime work. These people, those without jobs and those with reduced incomes, are demanding more, not less, price control.

They are the vanguard of millions of war workers who will be necessarily subjected to lowered incomes during the period of transition from war to peacetime production. Even if there were adequate unemployment-compensation schedules for these workers—which there are not—increased prices will mean to them a further reduction in already drastically reduced incomes, will force them to dip into their war bond and other savings, which many already have been forced to do. A serious dent in the reserve of savings needed to oil the production and consumption machinery of the country when the war is over will have been made.

By forcing people to draw on their savings now in order to meet increased living costs, while the country is not geared to production of durable consumer goods, we whittle away at the stock pile of consumer purchasing power which will be needed to achieve an economy of full production and full employment after the war. Of course, this will be a slow process; but once started, it will snowball into dangerous proportions.

All consumers will be victimized by relaxation of price controls, but those millions of Americans who live on fixed low incomes and those whose earnings have stopped or been decreased because of the partial cutback from war production will suffer most.

I support the extension of the Price Control Act for at least a year, without crippling amendments permitting some increases. In the atmosphere of inflationary pressures that exist today, permitting some increases is like throwing just one match in a haystack on the theory that just one little flame can't hurt much.

I support the continuation of the OPA not because I believe it is a superorganization with a perfect record. Far from it. I think OPA has done a good, in fact, in many respects, a remarkable, job in keeping prices down and in rationing scarce commodities. Sometimes I have felt that its methods have been devised by madmen or practical jokers. Many of you, my constituents, have referred some of your troubles with OPA to me, and I have spent many frustrating hours trying to unravel red tape.

Administratively, I believe OPA should be improved. I certainly hope that during this next crucial year it will be. But impatience with OPA's sometimes cumbersome and apparently nonsensical methods should not blind us to the fact of its vital importance to our national well-being. The job it has been doing and must continue to do will make the difference between prosperity and severe depression after the war.

The one thing that most people, including myself, hold against OPA right now is that we can't get meat. Obviously, somewhere in the Government's food program some bad mistakes have been made in calculating our meat supply and meat needs.

I don't think much purpose would be served now by trying to assess the blame for the present meat shortage. While OPA has borne the brunt of the criticism, I believe equal blame might be laid at the door of the military procurement services or the War Food Administration or even at the door of the great meat packers themselves.

Wherever the fault lies, I think we can find some assurance of more equitable distribution of meat in the new program announced recently by OPA Administrator Bowles, and in the fact that the War Food Administration is now to be in the Department of Agriculture under its able new Secretary, Representative CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

The meat shortage has been used by many of the enemies of the OPA as an occasion to attack the entire price-control and rationing program. This strategy, if successful, would result in making what meat there is a delicacy to be enjoyed only by the very rich, and creating a half-dozen shortages where one exists now. We would be cutting off our nose to spite our face. We must have effective price control.

Good night and good luck.

Bretton Woods Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NED R. HEALY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, I am moved to speak on the Bretton Woods agreements because of the compelling interest evidenced by the people in my district. The unanimity of opinion among my constituents requesting our participation in these agreements is completely understandable. During the course of the present war there has been a tremendous expansion of industry in California. Southern California is no longer mainly an agricultural area, but has become a center of manufacturing. There has been a tremendous in-migration of skilled workers who have determined that this area shall become their home. Their remaining is dependent on the continued operation of the industrial facilities which have been built. The continued operation of these plants is dependent not only on the pent-up demand for consumer goods in this country, but to an expanding foreign trade.

Time and again the tremendous potential markets of the East have been called to the attention of American manufacturers and yet these markets have never materialized. Before the war our exports to China, with a population of 460,000,000 people, were but 1.9 percent of the total; India, with a population of 34,000,000, bought only 1.9 percent. By comparison, Great Britain, with a population of 46,000,000, accounted for 25.1 percent. The conclusion to be drawn is obvious. Great populations do not necessarily represent great markets. The primitive methods of population obtain-

ing in the Orient must be replaced with modern manufacturing facilities and techniques if earning power of workers in these countries is to be raised sufficiently to transform this potential market into a real one. The immediate market for products of heavy industry and machine tools is almost beyond calculation, providing that long-term credits are made available to these countries.

While it is true that private capital will do much to extend necessary credits, the magnitude of this undertaking will demand greater resources than those which can be mustered from existing private financial groups. In addition, the chaotic condition existing in China and the uncertain status of India will give pause to private investors, and there will be disastrous delays. Premier Stalin has expressed a desire for $10,000,000,000 in long-term credits for the Soviet Union. Private financial sources can handle this only in part. The International Bank as set up in the Bretton Woods agreements would not only facilitate the extension of private loans but would be able to offer credits to the full extent of the Soviet Union's need commensurate with her ability to handle these obligations. A $10,000,000,000 loan to Russia constitutes $10,000,000,000 of direct business with American firms, as we are the only nation equipped to fill her needs. Here alone is a substantial contribution to full employment in the postwar period.

China in 1928 imported $859,000,000 worth of goods. Nine years later, in 1937, this figure had dropped to $167,000,000. According to Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Harry D. White, China, prior to the war, was unable to obtain foreign exchange with which to purchase goods in the United States. The stabilization of Chinese currency plus the extension of long-term loans, both of which can be accomplished through the Bretton Woods agreements, will transform China into one of the greatest markets in the world.

In Europe we have a slightly different corollary of the situation existing in the Orient. The devastation wrought by war both in Britain and on the Continent has severely dislocated and in some cases utterly destroyed the productive facilities of these nations. During my recent trip to Europe I had opportunity to see at first hand the desperate condition of the transportation system in France. It is my understanding that the situation in Italy and the Balkans is incomparably worse. Viewing matters from a purely American standpoint the rehabilitation of these nations is absolutely mandatory and it can be accomplished only through the facilities of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank. France today is flooded with money, both coin and currency, the value of which in international exchange is almost impossible of determining. Without the regulatory and supporting machinery of the International Monetary Fund the indeterminate status of the currency of many nations will make trade virtually impossible.

Disregarding the stimulus which the Bretton Woods agreements will bring to world trade and considering them only in the light of their bearing on world peace, the necessity of adoption cannot be denied. For the last 6 weeks deliberations have been under way by representatives of the United Nations. The machinery for maintaining peace has gradually taken shape and countless obstacles to international understanding have been overcome. If the economic aspects of world order as patterned in the Bretton Woods agreements are not provided for, the magnificent work at San Francisco will become a hollow mockery. Wars in this modern world have always grown from economic conflicts. We now have the means to prevent the manipulation of national and international economies for the benefit of select few and to the detriment of the peoples of the whole world.

It is a solemn obligation on the part of our great Nation to carry on the work so magnificently begun by our late great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. We are emerging from this war as the most powerful Nation on earth. Over a million American men and women have shed their blood so that fascism may be obliterated as a force against mankind. We would be derelict in our duty if we fail to accept the responsibility and leadership which rests upon us to create a workable structure for enduring peace. Adoption of the Bretton Woods agreements marks our acceptance of that responsibility and leadership.

Shipping Receipts Held Small Factor in Balance of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Frank J. Taylor, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, on the subject Shipping Receipts Held Small Factor in Balance of Trade, which appeared in the May 23, 1945, issue of the New York Journal of Commerce:

SHIPPING RECEIPTS HELD SMALL FACTOR IN BALANCE OF TRADE—THEIR EFFECT UPON THE BALANCE OF EXCHANGE AND UPON THE ABILITY OF OTHERS TO BUY FROM US IS NEGLIGIBLE, TAYLOR SAYS IN ATTACKING "MYTH"

(By Frank J. Taylor, president, American Merchant Marine Institute)

Of all the misconceptions that exist concerning the American merchant marine, none is more persistent than the specious theory that such a fleet is detrimental to our foreign trade as it prevents other maritime nations from earning transportation dollars for the purchase of American goods. Although repeatedly debunked, this myth recurrently arises.

Those who subscribe to this theory would have it believed that the shipping revenue of many nations is their prime source of funds for obtaining American exports. The theory, on the surface, is plausible and merits ready acceptance in some quarters. Naturally enough, foreign nations who stand to benefit by such an error do nothing to correct this theory when planted in the American mind.

"TREMENDOUSLY EXAGGERATED"

But close examination reveals that shipping earnings as an important factor in world trade have been tremendously exaggerated. Even in the peak year of 1929, net earnings for American shipping in foreign trade were only $117,000,000. If the American merchant marine withdrew completely from foreign sea lanes and allowed other nations to carry all our overseas trade, the small sum involved in transportation charges would not substantially increase purchases in the United States.

In fact, we can hardly be certain that this increased income from shipping would be used to buy goods in this country. There are some maritime nations which in the past have not used all their shipping revenue to buy from America if trade balances can be accepted as the measure, as supporters of this theory maintain.

Recently the hoary argument has again been refuted, this time authoritatively by the Maritime Commission in the form of a memorandum printed by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as Document No. 32. This 19-page pamphlet entitled "Memorandum on the Merchant Marine and Balance of Payments" should be read by everyone concerned in any way with the American Merchant Marine.

NEW HOUSE DOCUMENT

The document is the result of a thoughtful request by Representative S. O. BLAND, chairman of the House Committee, on Admiral E. S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, for data on this subject. It includes an exchange of correspondence between Judge BLAND and Admiral Land, a memorandum prepared by the Commission, and a pertinent address by R. Earle Anderson, Director of Finance, United States Maritime Commission. In all, the document represents, in handy form, valuable information on a phase of shipping and foreign trade about which too little is generally known.

Mr. Anderson's address will be remembered as that given before the Export Managers Club of New York on March 22, 1944. It pointed out to businessmen dealing with foreign trade the folly of placing an ocean transportation system in the hands of competitors and sets the stage for a proper understanding of the Maritime Commission's more formal memorandum which follows it in the document.

The memorandum is a careful study of world shipping earnings in international commerce, United States participation in world shipping income and the estimated effect of an expanded American merchant marine on the balance of international payments.

Those who do a great deal of unnecessary worrying about the effects of an expanded American merchant marine on international shipping and foreign trade should be put at ease by the Commission's memorandum. It goes into this phase of the problem rather thoroughly. It discovers that if Admiral Land's suggestion of a foreign-trade fleet of 7,500,000 deadweight tons carrying 50 percent of our trade is put into practice, America's share of world shipping revenue would be about the same as it was in 1929.

UNITED STATES SHARE 14 PERCENT

In cold figures, it is estimated that the United States share in world shipping earnings would be about $170,000,000, or 14 percent, while the other maritime nations of the world could carve up more than a billion dollars. Certainly, if we go back to the 1929 status so far as shares in world shipping are concerned, there should be no cry that the American merchant marine is wrecking international balance of payments and making it impossible for foreign nations to buy American goods.

Admiral Land's postwar foreign-trade fleet would consist of faster vessels than the slower prewar fleet. On this account, the memorandum assumes that such a fleet would be the equivalent of about a 75-percent increase in the fleet employed in our foreign commerce in 1929.

EIGHTY-TWO MILLION TON VOLUME

In 1929, American ships in foreign trade carried 21,500,000 long tons and with a 75-percent increase this total would be about 37,500,000 long tons. If this latter figure is to represent the 50-percent share to be carried by American vessels in the postwar period, it will mean that the total of America's foreign commerce would have to be 75,000,000 tons.

The Commission's memorandum asks, "Is this conceivable?" It answers, in a strong affirmative, by showing, from the Department of Commerce estimates of a postwar United States export-import trade of $13,000,000,000, that the total volume will be in excess of 75,000,000 tons and might reach 82,000,000 tons. On the basis of 1929 freight rates, the movement of this cargo would produce net shipping receipts of approximately $340,000,000 of which the American share would be the $170,000,000 previously mentioned.

It is logically pointed out that America's foreign trade would not develop without some substantial expansion in world trade as a whole. The memorandum holds that an in- not unreasonable. On this assumption and still using 1929 rates as an index, net world shipping receipts would increase from the 1929 mark of $900,000,000 to $1,200,000,000 in postwar.

DEPENDS ON WORLD VOLUME

The memorandum reaches the conclusion that the amount of shipping receipts which foreign maritime nations can expect to acquire to help balance international payments, depends not upon the share credited to the American merchant marine but rather upon the total volume of world trade and the level of rates at which it is carried.

The Commission's memorandum adds:

"Whether American shipping participates to the extent of 7 percent or 14 percent in the total net shipping receipts from the carriage of world trade, or to the extent of one-third or one-half in the carriage of the foreign commerce of the United States, makes a considerable difference to the operations of the American merchant marine, but it is a distinctly minor note in the over-all questions of world shipping receipts and of the balance of international payments."

In support of these conclusions the Maritime Commission presents some extremely interesting figures. The net total of earnings which entered into international shipping competition for the world as a whole never equaled $1,000,000,000 in any one of the 10 years beginning in 1929. In the peak years of 1929 and 1937, it was $900,000,000 and $935,000,000 respectively. The annual 10-year average was less than $700,000,000.

While the fluctuations in earnings were in part due to changes in the total cargoes carried, equally important as a factor were fluctuations in freight rates. The Commission took Lloyd's index of freight rates for the United Kingdom as a world criterion and showed that freight rates in 1932 were 55 percent of the 1929 level, while in 1937 the rates were about 130 percent of the 1929 level.

UNITED STATES RECEIPTS DWINDLED

The Commission estimates that the United States share of net receipts was about one hundred and seventeen millions out of the nine hundred millions in 1929, or about 13 percent, and about sixty-three millions out of the nine hundred and thirty-five millions in 1937, or 6½ percent of the total. It is also pointed out that by 1937 the American merchant fleet in foreign trade had reduced 35 percent in gross tonnage, a sizable reduction, but proportionately less than the 50 percent reduction in its share of net world shipping receipts. Again it was the high freight rate level of 1937 which prevented net receipts from being even smaller.

The memorandum observes: "It is evident that the mere size of the merchant fleet in foreign trade does not entirely determine the size of its share in total earnings, which on the contrary is also affected by the level of rates and fares, and the competitive efficiency of the operators in finding traffic for their vessels to carry."

In much the same line the Commission states: "In short, the pie that was baked for the shipping companies, to be divided among them, varied greatly from year to year; the size of the share was fully as dependent upon the size of the pie as on the proportions in which it was to be divided; and the size of the pie was determined as much or more by the level of rates as by the volume of traffic."

We have taken the liberty of leaning heavily on the congressional document in the hope that it will thus come to the attention of everyone to whom this question of shipping and international payments has been a bugbear.

American-Soviet Accord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me over Station WJZ and the American network, Wednesday, June 13, 1945:

AMERICAN-SOVIET ACCORD—REPLY TO THE LADY FROM CONNECTICUT, MRS. LUCE

A short while ago, the gentle lady from Connecticut, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, used the facilities of this network to warn us against Russia. If that were an isolated instance, there would be no cause for alarm. If one lady speaks her little piece on suspicion and fear and retires modestly to meditative silence, we agree or disagree and turn to other business at hand. But those of us who have watched these ill-advised talks multiply, have heard radio commentators like Fulton Lewis, Jr., and Upton Close and read some columnists repeat and repeat untempered accusations against Russia, crying out vociferously about the Russian menace, we are gravely troubled.

What is it they seek? Surely not collective security; surely, they have not troubled to ask themselves whether this is the path to international collaboration, to mutual understanding, so essential to international peace. Have they given any thought to what the actual differences are between Russia and ourselves, how they best can be resolved? Have they sought to find out wherein we have erred and wherein Russia has erred?

If this fear and distrust of Russia is permitted to gather strength, it will continue on its own momentum and no security council on earth will be of any avail.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. It is not my purpose to do any special pleading on behalf of Russia. I am not rushing to the defense of her political system. Most certainly I want no part of her brand of government in the United States. I want no part of communism. First and foremost, we are a democracy with the best kind of government suited to the needs of our country. Russia continues in her system which she deems best. That is not the issue here, not the issue at all. The issue is the direction so many of our opinion molders are taking, that of regarding Russia, if not as our present enemy, then as our potential one. Instead of bending our efforts tirelessly toward the creation of world peace, a peace durable and strong, we stand in danger of losing our perspective, our balance. We curb neither our tongues nor our tempers, and our patience, put to the test, has proven entirely too thin.

This is as true of Russia as it is of us.

I deplore the unilateral action of Russia in Vienna, setting up a provisional government, representative as it may be, the blackout of news from Russian-held territory, the whole troublesome question of Poland. Just as we would not tolerate an unfriendly Canada or unfriendly Mexico, so Russia feels for reasons of security a need for friendly states around her. She might well, though, take the historical perspective both backward and forward in time. I recall when President Wilson sent our soldiers into Vera Cruz and when Teddy Roosevelt seized Panama, as well as his "big stick" policy. It took us more than three decades to wipe out the hostility that followed. Russia might well learn the lesson that we learned, that animosity so created is not easily dissolved.

Our distrust is sharpened by the memory of the active subversive elements that Russia had once planted in this country and elsewhere, her past antireligion campaign, and the notorious Russian purges.

But on the other hand, Russia can recall without too much difficulty our armed intervention in Russia following the revolution, how we took part in building a cordon sanitaire around her, how we refused her recognition for those many years. Russia saw Japan walk into Manchuria and Mussolini into Ethiopia without vigorous protest. She saw Czechoslovakia offered up to Hitler without consulting her. She saw us maintain relations with Fascist Franco while his Blue Division fought her on the bloody eastern front. And, perhaps most important of all, she saw an influential group in western Europe willing and ready to make peace with Germany at her expense.

Much has been made of Russia's obstinacy in meeting successfully the crucial issues being ironed out at San Francisco. Those issues which made sensational headlines, ended for most part amicably. True, her tardiness at reaching an understanding has appeared to be almost hostile. But the patience of the working delegates on both sides reaped its reward in the settlement of such issues as the regional security dispute, the veto on discussion, and the compromise on the presiding chairman. Russia likewise yielded in the seating of Argentina. An explanation of her close bargaining may lie in the fact that the counts of votes most often add up to 44 to 5, Russia being among the 5. The Latin-American bloc of 20 votes follows solidly the United States. Russia can usually rely on only four in addition to her own—Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, the Ukraine, and White Russia.

Some of our public declaimers with verbal gymnastics leap around and neatly sidestep these facts.

Reports these past few days may dispel some of the gloom of our fearing public prophets. Paris reports the release of 15 of the 16 Poles held by Russia and the expansion of the Polish Provisional Government to include a truly representative group. A meeting of the Big Three will take place within a month. Add to these facts the additional fact that further accord is seen in the meeting of the military in the Reich to begin a clarification of all Allied control in Germany, and then, maybe, a bit of the poison injected into the air will evaporate.

The attitude of the gentle lady from Connecticut, Mrs. LUCE, and others is sharply demonstrated by an incident that took place before a GI forum at a Red Cross club in Rome. The discussion turned to our relations with Russia and one of the traveling Senators asked the soldiers present: "How do you men feel, the great majority of you soldiers who fought the war and have been here for a long time? How do you feel about finishing the job by fighting the Russians?" I ask my audience to imagine its own reaction if reports came through that a high-ranking member of the Soviet Politburo or a marshal had asked his soldiers how they felt about fighting Americans. I can well imagine the hue and cry that would follow in the United States—and justly so.

Men and women in public life cannot afford to disregard the responsibility of their positions. They cannot allow rancor and personal prejudice and sensationalism to stir up public fear and hate. They are not called upon to pay the consequences; the people are.

Mrs. LUCE, the lady from Connecticut, talks about Russian domination of Europe. Of course, she says nothing of British domination in Italy and Greece. She talks about communism in Mexico, but says nothing of the Sinarquist Fascist movement there. Nor does she show much concern over Fascist Spain and Argentina. Is communism to be flayed more than fascism? Most of the tone and temper of the lady's remarks are like those of the old Cliveden set again—the same intemperance, the same red herring drawn across the trail, the same dodging of the vital issues. Mrs. LUCE ends her colorful and colored talk by asking for friendship. She might better have said, in the words of Shakespeare, "I do desire we may be better strangers."

Assistant Secretary of State MacLeish, speaking on May 25, 1945, from San Francisco, put it well. He said, "Certain commentators have even spoken openly of an inevitable conflict of interest between the Russians and ourselves, and have debated the question whether Russia, our present ally, is our enemy or our friend—a serious debate, one would think, with our soldiers living side by side in conquered Germany and our common dead but freshly buried." He points out further, "The vital interests of the United States and the Soviet Union conflict at no point on the earth's surface. There is no necessary reason, in other words, in the logic of geography or in the logic of economics, or in the logic of national objective, why the United States and the Soviet Union should ever find themselves in conflict with each other, let alone in the kind of conflict reckless and irresponsible men have begun now to suggest." Acting Secretary of State Grew reemphasized these views of amity and accord, saying that there was no part of the world where the United States and Russian interests were in basic conflict.

Much of Europe is in chaos. The peoples of these countries need food, clothing, implements of manufacture, tractors, and trucks. They have carried guns far too long. Because of this chaos, it is feared that Russia will expand her influence throughout these countries and subject them to political domination. Let it be remembered that only two countries came out of the German war with apparent prestige and strength, the United States and Russia. If the United States withholds her help, if she prohibits the sale of trucks and tractors on credits or cash, if essential foodstuffs are not forthcoming, these war-torn countries will, of necessity, turn to Russia for her aid. Ranting against the expansion of Russian influence and yet refusing to help stabilize these stricken areas, we court the very dangers we seek to avoid. We must keep it clear in our own minds that whatever generosity we display will be in self-interest. Yet by some curious logic, those who cry out most strenuously against Russian influence cry out with equal strength against aid to Europe.

I'd like to turn to another thought. Russia presently pins down at least a half million crack Jap troops on the Manchurian border. She has disavowed her antiaggression pact with Hirohito. Experts tell us that we cannot beat Nippon by bombing the daylights out of the metropolitan island of Japan, nor can we beat Nippon with starvation by blockade. Bombing and blockade will, of course, help, but the Japs have huge stock piles of food and strategic materials, thanks to our shortsightedness. Japs can live on fish and a handful of rice.

The Japs have 4,000,000 fighting maniacs. They are well equipped and trained. Few prisoners are taken. They must be killed. We face the staggering job of killing nearly 4,000,000 armed Japs to put an end to the war. This extermination of Japs involves us in terrific losses of our men. At Tarawa, our casualties were 3,000 to 5,000 Japs, a proportion that has been fairly constant wherever the fighting is heavy. It is true that a large amount of our losses were in wounded men of whom three-fourths are, with proper care, restored to duty. But apply the 3-to-5 yardstick alongside of 4,000,000 Jap deaths, and you get an idea of how high our casualties can be. And the Jap boast is that they can make our high casualty rate stand up throughout the war, and that we can't take it. We can take it, but see how the war can be measurably shortened if Russia comes into the fray promptly.

Then, too, there is no Chinese Army in the sense that the Japs or British or Russians or we have armies. The Chinese are willing but badly equipped, and are caught in a tangle of factions. This is no reflection upon the Chinese nor a reflection upon their courage. It is just a statement of fact. The Chinese have two armies. One in the South under Chiang Kai-shek and avowedly anti-Communist, and the other in the North—Communist and anti-Kuomintang. Thus far, attempts both within and without China to cement these two Chinese armies have been futile, and therefore the telling blows that a united Chinese force could inflict upon the Japs are absent. Such lack of union makes our task all the more hazardous. I incline to the belief that Russia will enter the war on our side—but when? I believe Stalin agreed to fight at Yalta and gave his promise to Churchill and Roosevelt. He will not welsh. But again—when? He refused to set a date when. Each day's delay means more bloodshed. The far from gentle remarks of the gentle lady from Connecticut, Mrs. LUCE, and the harangues against Russia by certain commentators certainly will prolong and not hasten Stalin's making up his mind as to the time when he shall fling the might of his legions of men, planes, tanks, and ships against Hirohito.

I suggest that the lady from Connecticut heed President Truman's advice given to the press today. He said that if we keep our heads difficulties with the Russians will be worked out.

We face three major tasks: The winning of the war against Japan, the establishment of a durable and strong peace and reconversion to peacetime pursuits. The successful completion of these tasks is vastly impeded by the irresponsible talk of Russian enmity and the growing fear. If both sides will it, and the action cannot be unilateral, we can work together and aim at achieving understanding between the two countries. I am not wary of honest criticism on either or both sides, but let both sides make certain it is honest.

Russia and the United States both desire a peace that will endure; they both look forward to a period of internal well-being and prosperity. Russia will need all her strength to build up her ravaged territory; she will need the United States and the United States will need her in the era of postwar trade. It all adds up to concessions on both sides and goodwill on both sides, an erasing of the errors we both have made. It does not add up to war.

Tribute to the Twenty-seventh Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on June 12, 1945. This editorial pays fitting tribute to the gallant service rendered by New York's own Twenty-seventh Infantry Division. It is now almost 5 years ago that these fine boys, volunteers from the cities and towns of New York, left for Fort McClellan, Ala. What they have accomplished since is inscribed indelibly on the pages of history. All too many, including Col. James G. Conroy, the commanding officer of the old Fighting Sixty-ninth, have made the supreme sacrifice.

It is encouraging to know that these heroic boys, who have seen as much front-line action as any other American division in this war, were relieved from the front line on May 1. It is to be hoped that it will soon be possible to return them and their comrades in arms to the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALUTE TO A DIVISION

It was October 21, 1940, when the first troop train of the Twenty-seventh Infantry Division, the former New York National Guard, left this city for Fort McClellan, Ala. The attack on Pearl Harbor by Japan meant the division's eventual arrival in Hawaii. Australia, the Gilbert Islands, and Saipan were further Pacific steps of New York regiments. It was in the capture of Makin, in the Gilberts, that the Twenty-seventh Division went into battle for the first time since World War I. In that island landing of November 1943, Brooklyn-born Col. James G. Conroy, of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry, the old Fighting Sixty-ninth, was killed, as his famous regiment won new glory and victory.

Under command of Maj. Gen. George W. Griner and experienced in fighting a constantly more tricky and suicidal enemy, the Twenty-seventh Division completed at the end of April 15 days of desperate fighting and heavy casualty lists on Okinawa. The "Knickerbocker," the One Hundred and Sixth Regiment; the "Fighting Sixty-ninth," now this city's 165th; the upstate "Appleknockers," the One Hundred and Fifth—all suffered heavy losses in driving the Japanese back from their carefully chosen positions in a difficult terrain. These regiments fought along Kakazu Ridge in what Maj. Gen. John R. Hodge called the area of greatest enemy activity, and in an advance of 3,000 yards on April 19 won the elaborately defended and important Machinato airfield.

Relieved from front-line position on May 1, to be replaced by a fresh division, the

Twenty-seventh received high praise from Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., commanding the Tenth United States Army, and from Major General Hodge, commanding that Army's Twenty-fourth Corps. General Hodge said: "The conduct and spirit of the officers and men of the command in the face of bitter enemy resistance * * * measure up to the high standard of American arms and the splendid record of the Twenty-seventh Infantry Division." And, less formally, the general declared: "They have gone in and slugged it out. They have paid heavily and they have shown lots of guts."

Assigned by Lieutenant General Buckner to a "previously contemplated mission of island garrison," the Twenty-seventh Division already knows, as this city and New York State cannot fail to remember, islands in the Pacific garrisoned by its many gallant dead. Fallen in combat against a fanatical enemy are boys from up-State cities, from nearby suburbs and counties, and, for our town's pride, grief, and counting, from the sidewalks of New York. The Twenty-seventh has a brave record, earned and paid for. We salute its past, present, and future.

GI Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN-FIRST TRUST CO.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., June 7, 1945.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been interested in GI loans throughout the State, but at the present time the regulations are so restrictive that it is practically impossible for us or any other concern to do business outside of their own home town.

You will recall that the regulations provide for two types of loans. The so-called two-package loan in which the bulk of the money is furnished by the FHA under its own regulations and remaining balance corresponding to the down payment is made in a separate loan on appraisal made by the FHA. In this type, the FHA interpretation of the term "a reasonable, normal value" is such that it is exceedingly difficult for a loan of this type to be made. And institutions in Oklahoma making GI loans have quit trying this route and are concentrating their efforts on the one-package loan.

You will recall that in the one-package loan the security is all covered by one mortgage with interest limited to 4 percent on the entire amount, with the Veterans' Bureau insuring up to $2,000, the remainder being carried uninsured by the lending institution. The building and loan associations especially are making a small number of loans of this type in Oklahoma City and Tulsa. But you will recall, also, that the limitations on charges and expenses are so strict that it is impossible to recover any costs expended for inspections or investigations of loans outside the institution's own city.

Here is a concrete situation. Suppose a youngster in your own home town of Mangum has returned from war with the benefits accruing from his services. Suppose, also, that he has gone back to a good job and desires to buy a modest home for his family costing $4,000. Who in Mangum will lend $4,000 at 4 percent interest? It is extremely unlikely that he can obtain the money there. We would make that loan at 4 percent out of our own funds—$2,000 to be insured, $2,000 carried at our own risk. But we cannot afford to make the trip to Mangum for inspection and investigation of the property unless there is some way to recover the costs of the trip. Neither can we risk a $4,000 loan without somebody from our office seeing the property and knowing what it is all about. We have no desire to make any profit off the returning GI and desire no commission or bonus, but if we began to make unrestricted inspections over the entire State the cost would be prohibitive.

Further, somebody in Mangum who is acquainted with preparing applications and with real-estate and loan transactions must act for the GI in the preparation of the original papers. And that person must be remunerated for his services in some manner. And it seems to me that a young man in Mangum who is able to buy a home with interest at 4 percent with nothing down should not be averse to paying a small fee for the actual expenses to the people who help him obtain that happy end.

Mr. Pavesich, Chief of the Mortgage Loan Division of the Veterans' Bureau, says that the program is going better than they expected. However, most people disagree with him. A small number of loans are being made in the metropolitan centers and in Oklahoma City and Tulsa the GI who has a good job and is able to make monthly payments can get his loan. But I am not so sure about it in Mangum, Anadarko, Stigler, Antlers, Seminole, and similar places. I will appreciate hearing from you at your convenience. As previously stated, we do not want to make any profit off of the returned GI but with an interest rate of 4 percent we can't afford to go to heavy expense to carry the loan to him.

With best personal regards and good wishes,

ELLIS STEPHENSON,
Vice President,
Manager, Mortgage Department.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. ELSAESSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from the Buffalo Evening News of May 17, 1945:

SEAWAY PROJECT AN EXTRAVAGANZA

TORONTO, May 17.—Assailing the St. Lawrence project, W. T. Jackman, professor of transportation at the University of Toronto, asserted today that to divert men from the war effort and set them to work on a project "which is both unnecessary and imprudent, as well as prodigal, would be an extravaganza of the wildest nature."

"If the scheme were self-liquidating," he said, "the issue might be considered from a different viewpoint, but when it involves an excessive expenditure and taxpayers would have the additional burden superimposed upon that of our heavy war taxes, the course of sanity would be to pay our war obligations first and leave the St. Lawrence scheme to be determined later."

Professor Jackman quoted public sources in Canada and the findings of a disinterested engineering firm retained by the Montreal Board of Trade to show that Canada needs neither the power development nor the additional transportation facilities.

The Economic Lesson of 1920

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Strout, from the Christian Science Monitor:

THE ECONOMIC LESSON OF 1920

AN INTIMATE MESSAGE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The war ended November 11, and at first people wondered what prices would do. They went down. There was a cry of alarm. Stocks slumped. With war orders reduced and factories closing for reconversion, financial writers filled the newspapers with dire predictions. Now for the great slump! was the dolorous cry.

But it didn't come. Why? Primarily because the demand for goods was vastly greater than the supply. Compared to present restrictions, there were few controls in 1918. People bid against one another for the scarce goods, using war savings for their chips, and prices went up, as they always do in an auction. The sag lasted only 4 months.

The boom started in March 1920. The inflation that came then was not a tame affair; it was an explosion that whirled up faster and faster, industry scrambling for inventories, the public scrambling for goods, labor scrambling for higher wages that never quite caught up to higher prices, the salaried class, the bondholders, the quiet widow living on a fixed annuity taking the chief hardship and suffering in silence, as always.

What a gaudy boom it was. Millionaires were made in a few weeks. Prosperity had come for keeps, the financial writers reported. Free enterprise, untouched by controls, had shown what it could achieve; and butter sold for 70 cents a pound.

Well, the peak was reached in May 1920. Then the economic roller coaster dipped suddenly and all its shrieking occupants, who comprised the American Nation, went down in a giddy spin. Production caught up with consumption. Retailers stopped placing new orders, wholesalers suddenly realized warehouses were full and telegraphed contract cancellations, manufacturers slowed production, fired workers. Workers had less purchasing power and could buy fewer goods, so more people were thrown out of jobs. The great inflationary spiral began to unwind.

What was the cost of it all? The loss of business inventories was $11,000,000,000. A whole lot of small businesses—just started by homecoming soldiers, like a young Missouri major of artillery, Harry S. Truman—went bankrupt. The whole farm economy was shaken out brutally, like a rug in the hands of a boy: 430,000 farmers lost their farms. One of the queerest statistics was this: The whole of corporate business in America in 1921 was conducted at a loss.

Looking back at it now, was this self-made economic earthquake avoidable? It is hard not to reach the conclusion that it could have been prevented. We have restrictions and controls today which, if applied then, would

have bridged the country over to the prosperous good times that came later on, in the decade of the twenties.

The surprising thing is that with this experience fairly fresh in our recollection, there are people who are trying to beat down the present controls today. The loss of such controls would almost certainly open the way for another giddying zigzag of ups and downs after this war. The potentialities of an economic explosion are vastly greater now than in 1918. The war has lasted longer. Immensely greater disruption has occurred in normal affairs. Scarcity of consumer goods is greater; potential demand vastly larger. Liquid assets are now estimated as in excess of $300,000,000,000. Inflationary pressure is at an all-time high.

It seems fairly calm on the surface, partly because controls against inflation have worked so well. This very crust of security is dangerous, however, if it lulls the public into a feeling of false safety.

The question of controls is now before Congress. Nearly everyone wants to continue OPA, but qualifications are proposed which, Chester Bowles, OPA head, declares, would either be disastrous, or could not be administered in practice. With the example of 1920 in mind, most people will be prejudiced in favor of strong measures in holding the line against inflation.

Proposal as to Italy Presented by Generoso Pope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD proposals regarding the status of Italy presented to the President of the United States by Mr. Generoso Pope, of New York, publisher of El Progresso Italo-Americano.

There being no objection, the proposals were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr Generoso Pope, of New York, the publisher of Il Progresso Italo-Americano, on Tuesday, June 12, submitted to the President a memorandum regarding the critical situation in Italy.

The proprosals presented by Mr. Pope to the President are as follows:

"1. In view of their political and military role for the last 23 months, the harsh armistice imposed on the Italian people should be annulled as unsound and unjust.

"2. The San Francisco Conference should welcome Italy into the fold of the United Nations and invite her to participate in its final deliberations and decisions.

"3. As much as possible of Allied military equipment and food and medical supplies that might be useful for civilian purposes and economic reconstruction should be left in Italy.

"4. A substantial proportion of the 3,000,000 tons of Italian shipping taken over by the Allies in 1943 for military use against Germany should now be turned back to democratic Italy so as to enable her to have the shipping space necessary for transporting vitally needed supplies.

"5. Normal commercial relations with Italy should be speedily restored. Everything should be done to facilitate the sailing of merchant vessels and individual American businessmen to Italian ports as soon as they are physically restored.

"6. According to General Clark, many of Italy's splendid industrial plants in the north have escaped destruction—thanks, in no small measure, to the vigilance of the Italian people themselves. Coal and other raw materials are lacking. Credit should be extended to the Italian people so that they may procure these supplies, and thereby resume normal economic life and promote general social and political stability within their own country and in Europe as a whole.

"7. America should take the lead in having all the big powers prevent any further assaults against the national integrity of democratic Italy.

"8. As soon as the broadened cabinet now under consideration is organized, the Allied Military Government should enable fully liberated Italy to have its own Government exercise complete authority."

Flag Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address I made yesterday evening at the Flag Day ceremony of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Baltimore Lodge No. 7:

In celebrating the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the adoption by the Continental Congress of our Stars and Stripes, we have special cause for rejoicing this year.

In 1914 Congress passed a resolution calling on the President to declare June 14 a National Memorial Day. President Woodrow Wilson complied, and each year since then the President has proclaimed Flag Day.

Ever since Congress passed the original resolution providing for the creation of Flag Day, this emblem has never been more feared and more loved than it is today—at home and abroad men are working, fighting, and dying for what it represents. We celebrate Flag Day in 1945 with the full realization that the Stars and Stripes is the hope and the future of the civilized world.

Flag Day emphasizes that our flag means more than just a banner which claims power or a great history. To every real American, our flag is the symbol of all that we are and hope to be. It is an emblem in the truest sense.

No stain has ever marred it, nor have clouds dimmed its stars. Its mission has always been to champion the cause of the oppressed. There is a shrine wherever Old Glory waves. It is the only flag in the world's history that has never bowed in defeat, and it never will.

Never before in my lifetime have I ever been more grateful, nor have I appreciated more, my membership in this great order, than I have at the present time. When we stop to consider that we are fighting a war to preserve the ideals for which this organization was founded, membership in this great organization takes on a new meaning.

The Order of Elks is an organization of American citizens who love their country and desire to preserve its cherished institutions; who love their fellow man and seek to promote his well-being; and who love the joyousness of life and endeavor to contribute to it, as well as to share it.

The order questions no man's religion; nor bars him on account of his creed. It is not concerned with one's political affiliations. And it does not permit either religion or politics to be injected into, or to have any effect upon, its fraternal deliberations, national or local.

It lures no man to its doors by any promised material benefits which might appeal to his self interest. It pledges no support to the furtherance of personal ambitions. It has no insurance feature to appeal to one's sense of economy. It is beneficent, not merely benevolent, and believes that doing good is better than merely being good. It teaches that it is nobler to serve than to be served; that laughter is better than tears, a kind word more potent than a frown; and that life is all the sweeter for a song.

It therefore seeks to draw into its fraternal circle only those who delight in wholesome associations with congenial companions; who are deeply imbued with the spirit of patriotic loyalty and devotion; who recognize the obligations of human brotherhood; and who desire, without the fanfare of the trumpets of publicity, to share with their associates in the endeavor to feed the hungry, to shelter the homeless, to relieve those in distress, and to prove themselves true friends to all in need.

With such a membership, holding such ideals, the order has grown from a modest but purposeful group of organizers into a great and powerful fraternity, whose patriotic services have won for it a high place in national esteem and whose benefactions have smoothed the pathway of countless thousands.

This year the whole world might well join the people of the United States in celebration of Flag Day, because Old Glory holds forth a promise of liberation and an inspiration for a new day of freedom and liberty for all. This promise of liberation and inspiration for freedom has been associated with our flag since the days of George Washington.

As we look at the American flag as it waves so proudly, we think of what Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill meant. It was proud in those days, too, even when it accompanied our soldiers in their solitary pilgrimage after being driven from New York. It waved above the heads of suffering men at Valley Forge and Morristown. It crossed the waters rolling with ice at Trenton. It saw danger and suffering, but it also saw victory. Before it Burgoyne laid down his arms, and under its banner Yorktown surrendered its hosts.

Today our outlook is much brighter, and the horror of a national catastrophe has given way to a definite conviction that we are going to win the war. The collective fear of the future has changed to an intense individual sorrow, or to bitter grief for the ones who were, or of acute apprehension for those who are, defending us and their homes, their families, and their right and ours to live as we as a people choose. Today our thoughts are divided between pride in those who are fighting for us and the deepest sorrow for those who can never see again the land and the flag for which they have lived and loved and fought.

We are today demonstrating the same spirit of sacrifices and self-denial which was demonstrated by the people in 1776, and which laid the foundation for our great Republic.

The American flag means to us the symbol of everything that people of the world want, but few people of the world have the opportunity to enjoy in these days of persecution, tyranny, and disregard for human lives and human rights.

It means to us the greatest privilege and blessing that anyone can have. It makes us proud that we are a free people. It brings us a feeling of deep emotion and happiness as we realize that all the people of the world will some day cheer the American flag as it

is carried from one battle front to another, to drive out the tyrants and selfish invaders who seek to enforce a system of slavery upon a beaten and defeated world. But they will never succeed.

During periods of great emergencies and dangers—America has always survived. Our country has never found it's people wanting in patriotism, nor unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to preserve our Nation and its government, and as Americans we consider it a privilege to show our gratitude for the great opportunities our country has offered us.

Those of us who are not called upon to fight in the front lines of battle have the opportunity of using every ounce of our energy in making and sending to our fighting men, the weapons they need to fight for us. But in addition to supplying them with weapons of war, we have another grave responsibility toward them—for we have guaranteed the preservation of everything they hold worth while on earth—everything for which they are fighting. They not only look to us to furnish to them and to our allies every means required to defeat the enemy, but at the same time they rightfully expect those of us who are here at home to use sound judgment, sacrifice, and self-denial, and to exert every effort to preserve for them and their families the structure of our economic system, to enable us to give them the opportunity to work and to live with the greatest possible happiness in the future. That is what America should mean to every man and woman in or supporting our armed forces here and abroad.

They look, as we do, to our flag, as a symbol of the destiny of America—a destiny of high purpose, joined with lasting memories of those who will not come back to us. The flag of the United States is traveling around the globe, and wherever it goes, it brings a promise of liberty and freedom for the despondent and discouraged peoples who have been subjected to lives of slavery.

The flag of the United States is a symbol—just as the Statue of Liberty—standing in New York Harbor, is a symbol of liberty, casting its light to dispel the darkness of slavery and tyranny.

Our flag which glimmered as the symbol of our hopes in 1941 is today the symbol of our eternal debt to those who have given their lives, and of our profound admiration for those who are prepared to suffer and die if they must, to preserve our freedom.

But today we are creating something greater than a symbol of liberty or a statue. We are creating the means for bringing liberty and freedom to a despairing and oppressed world. We are doing this through toil and sacrifices on the battlefields of the world, on the farm, in business and industry, and in the home. Every American is participating in a greater or lesser degree in this noble and gigantic enterprise. Our flag makes this promise for the future because it represents a glorious past history—a history steeped in the tradition of democracy, liberty, justice, and religious tolerance. It is a history in which free men always considered themselves the equal of all mankind, and all mankind their equal. It is a history of struggles, sacrifices, dangers, and great losses, during which time the people sought always to preserve their liberty, their freedom, and their independence.

Many of our citizens have forgotten the band of patriots who suffered and died at Valley Forge, who trod through the snow and ice in their bare feet, half starved, half clothed; who suffered and sacrificed their lives for you and for me, and every person living within our shores, citizens, and yes, aliens. They fought, bled, and died for freedom, for the Constitution and the Bill of Rights that we enjoy.

We are prone to treat lightly the noble heritage that they won for us and therefore it is our solemn and sacred duty to remind our citizens, and, yes, aliens, within our borders, from time to time, and at frequent intervals, what we enjoy here in America that has been denied to the people of many of the European countries.

We have the right of trial by jury.

We are free to express our thoughts without fear.

We have a free press.

Freedom of speech and lawful assembly.

The right to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience.

The right of petition.

We participate in our Government through the ballot (not bullet).

We are secure in our homes from unlawful search and seizure.

We have the writ of habeas corpus.

We in this country enjoy the freedom of dissenting publicly, we have the privilege to present our views to Congress, the President, and the bar of public opinion. It is the spirit of Americanism which tolerates freedom of expression not only of applause, but of criticism, which only democracies, and especially our institutions, foster, and encourage.

In other countries, to question an official act is to ask for a one-way ticket to a concentration camp. Here our writers, authors, and our actors, without fear or danger, enjoy complete freedom of press and speech; all of us have our constitution and bill of rights and yet some people are poisoning the minds of our children and less fortunate adults with their alien and destructive doctrines. They would supplant our Americanism, our democracy, with communism, fascism, and nazism.

Thanks to the heroic dead who fought to preserve our Nation at various times in our history, we have a noble heritage. We have a stake in the world second to none. It includes the lives, families, and properties, and the rights of 130,000,000 people, occupying an area of 4,000,000 square miles and possessing one-half of the total wealth of the world.

Our country is young and vigorous, compared to the rest of the world. The men and women of our country are more secure in their property, more protected in their lives, and more happy in their outlook toward the future, than the inhabitants of any other nation in the world.

There is hardly a man living today anywhere in Europe, who, if given the opportunity and a free passport to America, would not drop his work and migrate to this country on the first available boat. There is hardly a man living today in this country who would give up his citizenship, or residence permanently, to leave this country to seek greater happiness abroad. American citizenship is priceless.

Despite the fact that we enjoy the highest rights and privileges, the highest standard of living in the world, there are within our borders undesirable aliens, who would tear down from our constitutional mast, these rights and privileges.

There is abundant evidence in the files of Congress that we have sinister and mischievous forces and influences within our borders seeking to inject into the minds of our children and less-educated adults destructive doctrines and to incite rabid, racial, social, and religious hatreds.

America has too long closed its eyes to those who, while enjoying the best that is in our land, have been secretly plotting its downfall. The Communist, the Fascist, and Nazi in our midst, bent on spreading discontent must be ferreted out and exposed.

Freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, we must preserve. But the abuse of these liberties by those who are boring from within, and who seek only the destruction of the American way of life, must be curbed by a firm Government hand and by a sound public opinion.

On this day Americans reiterate their allegiance to the United States and the democratic principles upon which it was founded. We know that there is no room in this country for any ism but Americanism and patriotism, and we want 100 percent of that.

And what is Americanism?

It is an unfailing and undying love for our country and our flag. Loyalty to its institutions and its ideals, eagerness to defend it against all enemies, and a burning desire to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our children.

And what is patriotism?

It is an intangible, invisible something that makes your heart beat faster when you hear the Star-Spangled Banner.

It is a spiritual, sacred attribute that makes the blood in your fingertips tingle when you hear the thrilling story of the young patriot, Capt. Nathan Hale, when you visualize him standing upon a scaffold with his hands tied behind him. "Have you anything more to say before you die?" And in your imagination you see young Hale straighten to his full height, every inch a soldier, and utter the words that will live as long as America lives, "Sir, I regret that I have but one life to give for my country." That was patriotism; that was an example of Americanism.

I do not believe that I could sum up my plea for Americanism any better than to recite from what I term a poem prayer, written by William A. Chappell, of Milwaukee, Wis., and I commend it to you as a daily prayer during the critical days that lie ahead for our country:

"Our Father, who art above,
Instill in our hearts a greater love
For the liberties we enjoy today,
Before it's too late and they're taken away.
Continue to give us our daily bread,
Grant us the power to keep our head
When radicals rave of the favorite 'ism'
With which they'd displace our Americanism.
Deliver us, our Father, who art above,
From the loss of these rights we cherish and love,
So that each night when we kneel and pray
We can say, 'Thank God for the U. S. A.'"

Compulsory Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Douglas Southall Freeman before the House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, June 14, 1945:

Prior to the 16th of September 1940, the Army of the United States five times had completed substantially the same cycle. After the difficult termination of a successful war, there was demobilization of volunteers or conscripted men and reliance for the national defense on a small force of regulars. This force was widely scattered. Generally, too, in periods of fiscal stringency, Army appropriations were scaled down to the extent, at least, that few units were kept at authorized strength. Just a century ago, for example, an army calculated at 8,616 men had 5,612. Regiments did not count more than 300 muskets.

When in such a situation the danger of war came near, the persistent optimism of Americans in all that relates to peace led them to disregard or discount the immediacy. As soon as it was manifest that hopes

and good intentions could not save the country, the first step was to authorize the expansion of the Regular Army. This usually was not done until too late to have the new recruits trained to the standard of the old cadres before the troops went into action, though the capacity of veteran American troops to digest recruits was notable. After the expansion of the Regular Army there came, on the outbreak of war or close to it, a call for the embodiment of the militia or the incorporation of the National Guard into the Federal service. These troops proved of varying quality, training, and command, but they never were able to go speedily into combat otherwise than with the immense losses unskilled soldiers usually sustain. Subsequently, in every war prior to that of 1861-65, the effort of government was to offset casualties and to undertake new enterprises with further calls for militia or volunteers on a quota basis. Often the Regular Army, which was expanded still more, was competing with the States for recruits.

This was the unbroken pattern of expansion for the Army of the United States from 1789 until March 3, 1863, when the first and worst conscription act of American military history was signed. This short-sighted law covered all able-bodied males from 20 to 35 years of age, and all unmarried men under 45, but in its original form it authorized exemption from the draft for all men who, when drawn for duty, would furnish a substitute or pay $300. Under this statute, 3,112,000 men were enrolled. Approximately 2,760,000 were considered available for duty. The number actually inducted was 170,000. Of these, 120,000 were hired substitutes. The system would have proved a hopeless failure had not the prospect of being drafted for service led approximately 1,000,000 to volunteer. Those who did so had the incentive also of bounties which finally reached $300 for 3-year volunteers and $400 for men who would enlist for 4 years. Localities had a feeling that the actual drafting of one of its citizens was a community humiliation. Volunteers, accordingly, were recruited to fill the quotas. Rich towns often raised sufficient money to pay a volunteer $1,000 cash for enlisting. This extraordinary system of bounties cost the United States Government $300,000. The States and lesser units of government paid at least an equal sum. It may be said that bounties to compensate for the manifest weakness of the conscription act cost the people of the United States, in 1861-65, not far below three-quarters of a billion dollars. This, of course, was in addition to regular army pay. In spite of these and other faults, the direct and indirect operation of the draft law of 1863 gave General Grant the continuous flow of replacements necessary to win the final campaign of attrition. Had the act been passed a year earlier, the war might have ended a year sooner. As soon as hostilities terminated, there was the greatest haste in reducing the Army. By the end of September 1866, an army of about 1,060,000 had declined to 38,000 regulars and 10,000 volunteers, most of whom were Negroes who had not then decided on a permanent vocation.

Appraisal of this cycle manifestly should be in terms of the designed function of the Army of a democratic people. If a military historian were asked what the American armed forces should be and do, he probably would say our Army and Navy, while available for the maintenance of order at home, should be so constituted that they can develop competent officers of every rank, test new weapons, explore new tactics, and maintain an organization capable of vast and rapid expansion and training to the end that decisive victory in war can be assured in minimum time with the lowest practicable loss of human life and the least practicable expenditure of the Nation's substance.

Regard for the time of this committee forbids the dissection, clause by clause, of this statement of the purpose of America's armed forces. If the statement is approximately correct, our military policy prior to the Second World War was a negation, in whole or in part, of every principle that should have been applied. The United States, prior to the outbreak of hostilities, never maintained an army of sufficient size to give our officers peacetime field training on a scale that equipped them to handle any large body of men confidently, on the basis of experience. In April 1861 the United States Army had the services of only one man under 65 years of age who previously had commanded in the field as many as 2,000 armed men. Because of this, Union commanders had to pay with the lives of men for the lessons they had to learn in the maneuver of troops. It probably is no exaggeration to say that half the casualties sustained by the Federal armies through the Seven Days' Campaign could have been avoided if, prior to war, the generals had been able to muster a sufficient number of men to learn at least the ABC's of logistics and of deployment and advance under fire.

The relative size of modern armies considered, the situation scarcely was better in 1915. A year after the Germans had shown that it was possible to employ simultaneously 4,000,000 combat troops on fronts separated by hundreds of miles, we had in the continental United States, outside essential garrisons, a mobile force estimated at a maximum of 24,600, or less than one division of the AEF of 1918. It is not believed that more than two men, if two, ever handled that force in field maneuvers.

The overrapid expansion of a small army or navy put too great a strain on our facilities for instruction. In 1917, for example, we had to place as many as 150 men under a single instructor who had not himself always been well schooled. The result was delay in training and, in some instances, that ancestral woe of American military history, the employment of troops in difficult action before they were fully trained. Nothing more appalls the student of our wars than the sickening picture, again and again, of magnificent first-line troops—as good military material as there was in the world—hurled into action before either they or their commanders had mastered that part of their essential lesson that could be learned prior to combat. What was true of the waste of life in the delayed, overhurried expansion of our personnel was obviously true, also, of the development of modern weapons. We nearly always waited too long in peace to provide for the adequate test of most of our new or improved weapons except, in general, our standard artillery.

It may be said that the review thus given summarily is an argument for the maintenance of large armed forces and for adequate appropriations to encourage research, to supply new weapons, to permit large-scale maneuvers, and to provide adequate instructors and reserve officers. That, it may be objected, is not an argument for compulsory military service in peacetime. Cannot the same results be attained from an enlargement of the Regular Army as from compulsory service? To this question, we can get no answer for the future elsewhere than from the past. We Americans never have been willing to support, either with funds or with personnel, an adequate Regular Army. That is one reason the opening sentence of this statement dated a new and more hopeful cycle from the Selective Service Act of September 16, 1940, and not from the similar statute of May 18, 1917, or from the draft law of March 3, 1863.

The contrasting story of America's participation in the two World Wars does not depreciate the leaders of 1917-18. They faced immense difficulties of training, procurement, and transport, and they deserve high place among American soldiers and military administrators. At the same time, the larger army of 1941-43 was prepared and trained with much greater speed and smoothness. An unappreciated measure of credit for this must go to the provisions of the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, and especially to the system of Reserve officers' training then established. The tremendous, decisive fact was that when the United States was compelled in 1941 to take up arms, the Nation had selective service in force and so far advanced that the first stage of training was past for sufficient men to constitute about 30 divisions. Further study of German records and equipment may show that the time thus saved in our preparation for the struggle in Europe enabled this Nation to throw its weight against Germany before the improvement of submarines, the development of jet-propulsion, and the perfection of rocket design prolonged the conflict at unthinkable cost and threatened to stalemate the Allies. It already appears plain that if the United States had followed the same course in the First World War, and had introduced compulsory service in 1916, the Germans would have been halted in the first stage of the offensive of March 21, 1918.

In such matters at this, where literally the life and liberty of America are at stake, anyone who dogmatizes is by that very fact discredited. The most that anyone can hope to do is to study the record, to integrate dispassionately the conclusions he draws from it, and, at the end, to voice an opinion. If, in this spirit, I were asked what lesson, above all others, the examination of American military history makes clear, I would say it is, in my opinion, this, the old cycle of disarmament, negligence, and frenzied preparation for war has cost our Nation unreckonable billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives; compulsory military service, properly administered, has been proved to be the surest, most democratic, and most economical system of essential national defense.

Congressmen's Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of June 11, 1945:

CONGRESSMEN'S PAY

Despite the fuss made by some papers over the $2,500 annual expense allowance for Congressmen, now that the bill has passed there is little or no objection to it. The reason is that the allowance is fair and necessary. Congressmen have so many expenses that men in other professions do not have that the people must see that they are properly paid. If they are not, the inevitable result will be that the country itself will suffer.

One Congressman has figured out that after he pays his income tax, hotel bills in Washington, railroad fare for several trips home every month to make speeches or attend conferences, and the cost of running his office over and above what the Government allows him, he has less than $150 a month left to keep up his home and support his family. Nowadays that is less than most of his constituents have, yet the business of shaping the Nation's policy is one of the hardest and most important of all occupations.

Early this year the National Planning Association—a group of the country's leading men

who are interested in government—met in Chicago to devise ways and means of strengthening Congress.

One of the recommendations they adopted was that Members of Congress should be paid salaries of $25,000 a year. "The job is worth it," their resolution said. "Service in Congress is the top legislative job in the country and should carry compensation in line with that of top jobs in other fields."

They recalled that congressional service is now generally a full-time job, instead of one taking only 3 or 4 months a year, as it did when the present salary of $10,000 a year was fixed in 1925. Too frequently, they said, Members leave Congress with less money than when they entered. "Members have about the same general expenses as a private citizen, plus large expenditures incident to congressional service. The latter include outlays for frequent and necessary entertainment, maintenance of two domiciles, contributions, campaigning, special trips to the constituency, maintenance of an office in the constituency, and living scale commensurate with the dignity of position."

So the National Planning Association concluded that higher pay for Congressmen would be a good investment for the country. The amount it recommended is twice what Congressmen will receive, even with their allowance for expenses. But the laborer is worthy of his hire, even when he serves the public, and if the public is to have the right kind of service, it must pay for it. In the end the right kind is always the cheapest.

Anti-Poll-Tax Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to give expression on the so-called anti-poll-tax measure, now before the House for determination. Those States which now have the requirement that the poll tax be first paid as a requisite to the right to vote have placed a barrier before the people of that particular State which in many instances prevents people from voting, and this very requirement prevents a full and free election in those several States. Under our Constitution, all elections shall be free and equal. While it has been argued that the requirement that a poll tax must be first paid before that person is entitled to vote means but a very small outlay of money on the part of the elector, yet in many instances a small sum of money is impossible to raise for such purpose, and that elector is thereby prevented from casting his or her ballot, and the provision of our Constitution that "all elections shall be free and equal" is thereby defeated.

It is my considered judgment in the face of the provisions of our Constitution, and in the face of the decided cases upon this question, the requirement of the payment of poll tax as a condition precedent to the right to vote, in any State in which that requirement still exists, constitutes a barrier against the clear language contained in our Constitution.

We are not unmindful, I am certain, that this is a Government by the people. The people speak, they are entitled to speak, and they speak with authority. While it may be argued that this poll tax payment is not a requirement which goes to the qualification of a voter, yet it is a regulation, in those few States, which carries the force and effect of an additional requirement with which the voter must comply in order to render himself or herself eligible to vote at the election. In many cases in which the voter is unable to pay the poll tax, and thereby cast a vote, that requirement has the same force and effect upon the ability of that elector to vote as if the question of age, or residence, was not fairly and clearly established. I do not believe that any such result should obtain with respect to any American citizen and his or her right to vote. Such a policy certainly places an added restriction upon certain voters, who are otherwise qualified to vote, which renders them incapable of voting. That program makes such an election, held under that policy in those States which require the payment of the poll tax before a voter may cast a vote, a restriction which prevents such an election from being free and equal, as was contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the members, article XV, section 1, of our Constitution, in which we find this language:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Thus we find ourselves, today, debating the old question of the poll-tax requirement as a condition precedent to voting in a number of the States. As I scan the authorities decided upon this very question, I find the Classic case to be of controlling influence. Our courts look upon this poll-tax requirement as an added burden upon the elector, which in many cases makes voting impossible, and which denies and abridges the right of the voter to take his or her place in the election booth and exercise the right of an American citizen. I will cast my vote to abolish the requirement of paying poll tax as a condition precedent to voting, and it is my fervent hope that elections in this country may be made forever free and equal to the people. Any other plan is certainly unthinkable under our form of government and under the sound provisions of our Constitution.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of resolution No. 14, adopted by the honorable Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis, State of Missouri, on June 1, 1945, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation setting up a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee:

Whereas S. 101, a bill forbidding discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry, and creating a permanent Fair Employment Commission to prevent such discrimination, has been introduced in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas this bill would provide an urgently needed job equality opportunity and improve relations between labor and industry; and

Whereas there is now a Fair Employment Practice Committee established by Presidential order that has been very effective in providing a much-needed source of manpower for our war emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis urges the enactment of S. 101 by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Representatives in Congress from St. Louis, the United States Senators from Missouri, and the President of the United States.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
City of St. Louis, ss:

This is to certify that the above and foregoing is a true copy of a resolution, No. 14, which was adopted by the board of aldermen on the 1st day of June 1945.

Given under my hand this 4th day of June 1945.

GEO. W. HARTMAN,
Clerk, Board of Aldermen, City of St. Louis, Mo.

Civilian Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks under the above caption, I wish to call the attention of the House Military Affairs Committee and the Members of Congress to a statement issued by Senator DOWNEY, Democrat, of California, which was published in the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., on June 13, 1945. The newspaper account is included herein as follows:

LET MEDICS GO, ARMY IS URGED

Senator DOWNEY, Democrat, of California, yesterday requested that the Senate Military Affairs Committee investigate alleged hoarding of doctors and dentists by the Army and Navy while civilians suffer unnecessarily from lack of medical care.

Meanwhile Maj. Gen. George F. Lull, Deputy Army Surgeon General, estimated that 2,000 to 3,000 doctors and up to 1,000 dentists would be available for discharge from the Army by the end of the year.

DOWNEY stated that there is one Army doctor for every 180 soldiers in the United States, but an average of only one civilian doctor for more than 1,500 civilians.

Mr. Speaker, every citizen of these United States, including myself, desires and demands that our men in the armed forces have the best medical care required, but, as Senator DOWNEY points out, when that necessity has been satisfied, the Army and Navy should not retain a surplus of doctors and dentists

in the services at the expense of the civilian population, and as my district is suffering, as are many other sections of the country for lack of doctors, I trust action will be taken when it is found that a doctor or dentist is not needed, that they be returned to the communities which are in such dire need of their services.

Many communities in this country have had the majority of their doctors called in the service, and, as a result, inadequate medical care of the civilian population has resulted, and now that the European phase of the war has been terminated and replacements have become available, doctors and dentists that have served for 2, 3, or more years who are officers, and who do not come under the point system of the Army, and are not permitted to apply for discharge for that reason, and in view of their long and patriotic service and the need of them in their local communities, should be given full consideration for discharge if the exigencies of the service permit.

Indian Trade Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JUNE 14, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLAYTON: Permit me to draw to your attention certain facts concerning international trade with India.

Herewith find a list of imports and exports passing between India and our own country between the years 1926 to 1940:

Years	Imports from the United States	Exports to the United States
	In millions of dollars	*In millions of dollars*
1926	50.0	150.9
1927	63.2	131.0
1928	53.6	148.9
1929	55.3	149.3
1930	45.1	104.1
1931	36.6	58.5
1932	24.9	33.2
1933	19.8	43.7
1934	27.4	54.8
1935	31.4	61.9
1936	26.8	70.7
1937	43.7	94.4
1938	35.7	58.1
1939	42.8	66.3
1940	68.4	101.1
Total	625.4	1,327.5

The trade balance in favor of India was $702,100,000 up to 1940. This is the dollar surplus on normal trading. India before the war had been earning as a result of trade with us roughly forty-six millions per annum. I am unable to cite figures for the years following 1940, because after that year England took the surplus dollars due India and placed them in the British imperial pool, or as it is sometimes called, the sterling bloc pool. In other words, the surplus was placed absolutely under British control. Britain then gave India credit in pounds and then froze such pounds. This will force India to buy exclusively—for practical purposes—only British goods.

I am reliably informed by those in a position to know that England has refused to give an accounting of the dollar surplus due India on her trade balances with us from 1940 to date.

India has been selling and shipping to us jute, mica, manganese, and other strategic war materials. These shipments to us may run up an additional surplus of over $250,000,000. The total credit balances due India, in all likelihood, have mounted up to $1,000,000,000 by this time. It is difficult for any country to support an international trade so slanted. The result has been to emphasize and underscore the inflationary movement rampant in India today due to shortage of goods of all kinds. India needs American products and needs them badly, but India has been deprived of the dollars with which to buy American productivity.

Furthermore Britain has not openly announced her trade policy not only for the present but for the postwar period, except that Prime Minister Churchill, in referring to British postwar trade, has said: "Everything will be done to promote international trade, but Britain will not give up its rights to safeguard our balance of payments by whatever means are necessary."

What is the policy of our State Department?

Information reaches me through the grapevine that England may continue this freezing of dollars due India for several years after the war. Lord Keynes, in a memorandum to Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau in October last, said that the sterling bloc pool should be maintained for 3 years after the war with Japan. That observation seems to be in line with Prime Minister Churchill's statement aforesaid. This means we would be deprived of a fertile Indian market for our goods and will mean the loss of good will for decades to come.

England, it can readily be seen, will be unable for a considerable period to supply India's demand for capital and consumer goods. I am sure the Indians do not ask for charity. They have the dollars but cannot buy. It is interesting to note that the India Supply Mission in this country had been buying in America until recently about $9,000,000 worth per month, but these purchases, with the exception of a mere trickle of goods, have been summarily stopped. I have before me a clipping from the Hindustan Times, which reads as follows: "Mr. K. O. Mahindra, head of the India Supply Mission, is en route to Washington to wind up his duties and await replacement before returning to India, but it is reported in Washington that the Viceroy is not in accord with his ideas of increased postwar Indo-American trade." That clipping is highly important for what it admits as well as for what it omits. Very likely Mr. Mahindra was forced to resign because he wanted to use India's surplus dollars to buy American goods.

Prior to the war, Japan was a big reservoir upon which India drew for goods and supplies. America might well be a splendid substitute after the war for that market. This is certain: England cannot supply goods to India for a number of years to come. Why should American traders in India be stymied?

What is the position of the State Department with reference to this so-called sterling-bloc pool?

In addition to all this, apparently grave restrictions still exist that throttle any possible trade between India and ourselves. The FEA, it would seem, follows the British point of view. It refuses to issue trade licenses unless with the consent of the British Ministry of Supply. Even if the FEA would grant licenses, our War Shipping Administration, due to the pressure, very likely, of the British Embassy, puts up other hurdles by refusing shipping space. I do not get these facts out of the thin air. I can prove them.

Something assuredly must be done, and done soon, to open trade channels with India. Otherwise we are missing a glorious trade opportunity.

The economic repercussions are very important and serious. Small business and big business are watching the situation most intently. Likewise, labor has a vital stake in this attempt to bottle up the free flow of our goods into India. Millions of jobs are at stake.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

The Vehement Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 15 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in the issue of Liberty of June 23, 1945, there appeared an article entitled "The Vehement Volunteer," by John Taylor and Lynne Brannen, which pays a splendid tribute to my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennesssee [Mr. MCKELLAR] as one of the most outstanding officers of our Government. I commend the article to my colleagues and to the American public as one well worth reading, and in order that it may be available I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VEHEMENT VOLUNTEER

(By Don Taylor and Lynne Brannen)

FATE HAS PLACED SENATE PRESIDENT KENNETH D. M'KELLAR IN A SPOT, OR A WHOLE SERIES OF SPOTS, UNIQUE IN AMERICAN HISTORY. MEET THE MAN WHO MAY MAKE OR BREAK THE ADMINISTRATION—IT'S IMPORTANT TO KNOW HIM

One of the dominant figures in Washington today—perhaps second only to President Truman himself—is the new president of the Senate, fiery, 75-year-old, KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, of Tennessee. Circumstance has given him unusual if not unique control over much that goes on in the Senate, at a time when Congress seems destined to regain some of its former power.

Consider MCKELLAR'S position. As president pro tempore of the Senate when President Truman took office, he automatically became its presiding officer, gaining also such perquisites as the Vice Presidential salary of $15,000 a year and the Vice Presidential limousine.

But his new power stems from a position probably never before attained in United States history: Parliamentary head of the Senate, he still retains his senatorial vote and the right to speak from the floor. Equally

important, he has been invited to sit in on all Cabinet meetings. Thus he cannot only absorb the sense of these historic sessions at first hand, but also transmit the wishes of his Chief directly to the Senate; then, having got them there, he can exert enormous power to implement them.

In addition, he continues as acting chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee, chairman of the Post Offices Committee, and member of the Rules, Civil Service, and Library Committees.

With such an interlocking grip on the strategy and finances of Government, he can do much to make or break the new President's policies. And what he does will be backed by 34 years' experience in congressional debate and cloakroom intrigue and his strong hold on the votes of southern Senators.

What sort of man is this Senator from Tennessee?

First of all, he is an internationalist. He was one of the leaders in the battle for President Wilson's Fourteen Points, the League of Nations, and the World Court. Today he says he is confident that a world organization can be made to work and to save the next generation from another bloody struggle. He has pledged himself to that cause, and certainly is in a position to gain Senate support for a peace treaty and a world organization to preserve the peace.

It appears certain that he can be relied on to help the President bridge the gap which recent years have interposed between the Senate and the White House.

After visiting the White House soon after Mr. Truman took office, MCKELLAR declared: "I think the new President is going to be a fine leader for our Nation. He is going to work with Congress, and he will have our support 100 percent. He knows the value of close cooperation with the legislative branch of the Government. * * * I am 100 percent behind the President."

The Senator also recalled their Senate days, when he and President Truman worked closely together and voted together in almost every instance.

MCKELLAR'S faith in the new President is founded on personal friendship, which guarantees that he will never desert Mr. Truman. The new President of the Senate lives by a simple creed: "That every man shall be his brother's keeper, pay his just debts, and cleave to his friends even unto death." To him, ingratitude and disloyalty are the greatest crimes of mankind.

As an indication of what MCKELLAR means by friendship is the following story which still goes the rounds in Washington:

As chairman of the Senate Post Offices Committee and senior Senator from Tennessee, MCKELLAR had the last word on the hotly contested candidacy for the job of postmaster at Knoxville. He awarded the job to one of his college classmates whose chief recommendation—so the legend goes—was that he had once lent the youthful MCKELLAR a tuxedo to wear to a college dance.

On domestic issues, the new presiding officer of the Senate is definitely a right-winger, a conservative whom some New Dealers have called a reactionary. Back in his early days in Congress, under President Wilson, he was labeled a liberal Democrat. Then he campaigned with fiery zeal for woman suffrage, popular election of United States Senators, and the Public Roads Act. Later he was leader in the battle for public power and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

But in the past 5 years he has frequently opposed the New Deal, for all that he was a personal follower of the late President Roosevelt. Four times he endorsed him for the Democratic Presidential nomination, four times he stumped Tennessee in the Presidential campaigns. He fought for his Chief in 1944 even though he disapproved of the fourth term in principle.

When he learned of the President's death, MCKELLAR said, "Mr. Roosevelt had the most remarkable and gracious personality of any man I've ever met. No man is perfect, and the President was not always the best judge of men. We had our governmental differences, but things never once disturbed our warm personal friendship."

It was over administration appointees that the Tennessean broke with the New Deal shortly after President Roosevelt began his third term. Quarreling with TVA Director David Lilienthal and Engineer (now WPB Chief) J. A. Krug over the site of new dams for the Tennessee Valley system, MCKELLAR demanded their resignations.

He failed to get them.

Recently President Truman renominated Lilienthal over MCKELLAR'S pointed protest. He still opposes Lilienthal and disapproves of his policies. But in the interest of harmony he made no serious attempt to block Senatorial approval. For a time it appeared that the controversy might become an issue in MCKELLAR'S bid for reelection next year.

Donald Nelson also felt the heat of the MCKELLAR ire. When Nelson was head of the WPB, a power-saving blackout order affecting Memphis, Tenn., earned him the wrath of the Memphis political boss who also rules the State of Tennessee—Edward Hull Crump, until recently a Democratic national committeeman. Crump complained to MCKELLAR. In the verbal fireworks that followed, the Senator denounced Donald Nelson and compared the blackout order with Sherman's invasion of the South.

But not until this year did the gentleman from Tennessee really unlimber his big guns against the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, aiming specifically at New Dealers Henry Wallace and Aubrey Williams. Even after Congress passed the George bill, divorcing the RFC from the Commerce Department, MCKELLAR was one of five Democratic Senators who voted against confirmation of Wallace as Secretary of Commerce. He lost that fight, but he won his battle to bar Aubrey Williams as Rural Electrification Administrator. The Tennessean charged that Williams had insufficient business experience for the position. He drove home his point with a typical McKellarism:

"I happen to be a Presbyterian. If the Catholic Church should elect me Pope of Rome I'd be as much out of place as Mr. Williams would be as REA Administrator."

In his jousting with the New Deal, the conservative from Tennessee undoubtedly has dramatized himself as a white knight of the Old South doing battle against a pinkish dragon of the North. His friends say MCKELLAR opposed Wallace and Williams in the belief that they are under Communist influence and are ambitious for radical social reform. To the average southern politician communism has nothing to do with Joe Stalin or Soviet Russia; in the South a Communist is a man who believes in granting the Negro the vote and social and economic equality. Aubrey Williams' admission that he was partly responsible for the Fair Employment Practices Committee, which insists on equal employment rights for Negroes, has earned him special bitterness in the South.

MCKELLAR has also been irked by the northern Democrats' insistence on antipoll tax and antilynching legislation. He has masterminded filibusters and other strategems which have blocked these proposals in the past. Though he has always prided himself on being a friend of labor, MCKELLAR has further tagged himself a conservative and earned a place in the black books of labor leaders by voting for the Smith-Connally antistrike bill.

Much of the MCKELLAR antipathy to the northern Democratic liberals can probably be traced to his vivid remembrances of his childhood in the impoverished post-Civil War South. His distrust of the industrial North seems to date back to the Yankee carpetbaggers who flocked into the South after the War Between the States.

MCKELLAR came from an educated and moderately well-to-do rural Alabama clan. His father was a country attorney and farmer, a Confederate Army veteran. Young KENNETH worked his way through the University of Alabama in 3 years, clerking, teaching school, and farming. He graduated (magna cum laude) at the head of his class, with two degrees—A. B. and M. A.

He then entered law school and completed the course in 1 year, teaching in the university at the same time.

In his college days he turned down a profitable mercantile career in favor of a legal education. His summertime employer, owner of a large store, offered him a half-interest to quit school and stay on the job there. That half-interest was then worth $3,000 a year, a tidy sum back in the nineties. But the education-thirsty KENNETH went back to school.

After graduation he set out for California to make his fortune. He got as far as Memphis, Tenn., liked the town, and has hung his hat there since. Legend says MCKELLAR arrived in Memphis with 15 cents in his pockets. He says he had nary a penny. Yet in 19 years of successful law practice, his friends say he had accumulated $300,000 when he abandoned law for politics 34 years ago.

Stepping directly upon the national political stage, MCKELLAR was first elected to Congress in 1911. About that time he formed an alliance with E. H. Crump, whose star was also in the ascendant, and with his aid was twice reelected to the House. In 1916 he decided to get into the race for the United States Senate in the first popular election of a Senator from Tennessee. Nobody gave him much of a chance against the incumbent, Senator Luke Lea, and former Tennessee Gov. Malcolm B. Patterson.

But after a campaign that consisted of trying to shake every hand in Tennessee, the whole State, including Boss Crump, was amazed when dark-horse MCKELLAR won the election and assumed the Senate seat for which he has never been seriously challenged since. The name "MCKELLAR" is a household word in Tennessee, and its owner enjoys the same independence of action in the Senate as the people of Idaho bestowed on the late Senator William Borah.

Many political observers contend that he is the tool of Tennessee's Boss Crump. This is probably not literally true, but the two are fast personal friends and their political alliance has endured 40 years of mutual trials. Tennesseans remember that one of MCKELLAR'S first successes in Congress was in obtaining a Federal grant for a new toll-free bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis. In 1939 he won approval for a better bridge to be built when materials are available. E. H. Crump is chairman of the commission that will supervise the bridge construction.

Andrew Jackson, hero of the Battle of New Orleans and twice President, is the most revered figure in the history of the Volunteer State. But not to Senator K. D. MCKELLAR. In two speeches on Jackson's traditional home grounds at Nashville last year, MCKELLAR told the world that Edward H. Crump was at least Jackson's equal and, in MCKELLAR'S own opinion, perhaps superior to Old Hickory.

Only once in the long history of their political partnership has the Senator crossed

swords with Crump. In 1936 McKELLAR give tentative backing in the Tennessee Democratic primary race for Governor to Burgin Dossett, now Tennessee State educational commissioner. Crump supported Gordon Browning, who won in a landslide. Dossett got exactly three votes in McKELLAR's home precinct.

The Senator from the Volunteer State is one of the most assiduous workers in Washington. He rises early, breakfasts by 7:30, and is nearly always in his office by 8. He labors there or in the Senate until 5 or 6 in the afternoon, seldom missing a session or a committee meeting. It is safe to assume that he will never be absent from his post as Presiding Officer unless he is seriously ill. Home with him at night goes a brief case jammed with bills for study and speeches for preparation.

The bachelor McKELLAR has faded almost completely from the Washington social whirl in the past 15 years. But he enjoys having people around him, and Capitol veterans remember him as something of a "gay young blade" during his early days in Congress. He is abstemious, and has been most of his life. He neither drinks nor smokes.

He boasts that he has never had time for a hobby. But he enjoys reading, especially history, Shakespeare, and the Bible. He has become something of an authority on history and Shakespeare. His favorite movie stars, incidentally, are Gary Cooper and Clara Bow. The latter choice would indicate that nowadays the Senator seldom goes to the movies.

Moderately tall, just an inch and a half under 6 feet, McKELLAR uses his hands freely to illustrate his points in speaking. He frequently twirls a heavy gold watch chain about his fingers. Once on his feet, he is one of the most colorful and, on occasion, vitriolic speakers in Congress.

The greatest achievement in the career of this senior Senator from Tennessee is the Tennessee Valley Authority in his own beloved South. In the early days of the Roosevelt administration, Senator McKELLAR joined Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, in epochal battles for the Tennessee Valley Authority. He still is a strong proponent of public power, and only last year helped defeat legislation that would have crippled the administration's power program.

He believes that getting $667,000,000 in appropriations to finance the TVA was his greatest accomplishment in Congress.

Perhaps he had a long-range objective in view. For the past 4 years the Senator from the Volunteer State has been fighting for legislation to give Congress control of TVA finances. He proposes that income from the Authority be turned in to the Federal Treasury, and that Congress appropriate the money needed for operation of the power project.

He points out that the Post Office Department operates successfully that way. Such a system, of course, would also give Congress control over TVA patronage.

McKELLAR once remarked that he had never gotten a job from TVA. And in a Senate address on March 14 he denied wanting any patronage from the power authority. He declared:

"Newspapers and commentators have insinuated that I individually wanted to take over the patronage of the TVA. The truth is that patronage is a great detriment to a Senator. He would be better off without it."

Despite that speech, some of his contemporaries in Washington say he rates as one of the most skillful manipulators of patronage in Congress.

His friends say that McKELLAR, though a member of the Senate Civil Service Committee, still considers the spoils system more efficient than civil service.

He contends that a public servant will do a better job when he knows that any incompetency may result in his party's defeat at the polls and the loss of his own job.

This, then, is the man McKELLAR, most powerful figure in the Congress that will help write the peace; an international liberal, a home-front conservative, and in all things champion of the old South.

New Land in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, to many of our returning soldiers seeking a home and a new start in life, the irrigated lands of the West will offer the best opportunity. The great State of Idaho has much to offer in the way of new land for reclamation and settlement, as presented in an article by our secretary of state, Mr. Ira H. Masters, submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of May 7, 1945]

IDAHO SEEKS PART IN PROGRAM FOR POSTWAR RECLAMATION—FIFTY THOUSAND SERVICEMEN, FIFTY THOUSAND WAR WORKERS MUST BE GIVEN EMPLOYMENT, FARM OPPORTUNITIES, MASTERS TELLS BOISE MEET

BOISE.—"Idaho is anxious to join the huge postwar reclamation program to provide employment for returning servicemen, to provide a supplemental water supply for 1,163,000 rich acres and to make possible irrigation for 320,000 acres of new land in the State," said Ira H. Masters, secretary of state, in an address Saturday.

He said in part:

"Our returning soldiers and war workers will be given an opportunity like our pioneer forefathers to carve for themselves a home out of the desert. No one other than a fool or a halfwit would oppose such an outstanding program of postwar development and a plan to provide employment for these returning servicemen."

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND IN WAR SERVICE

"It has been estimated we have about 50,000 men and women in war service. We have perhaps another 50,000 in our huge war plants and other defense industries. Some labor official has estimated we will need 210,000 jobs after the war or nearly 20,000 more than we had before this war. If we permit these rich acres to lie idle, we will break faith with these men and women so long as there remains potential land and water resources in the State.

"Nearly half of our irrigated land in Idaho lacks sufficient water for irrigation and maximum crop production cannot be harvested. One of the vast new projects which should be developed lies between Boise and Mountain Home.

"The Boise irrigation project was short 173,000 acre-feet of water in 1939, or about 19 percent. This shortage has varied from 18 percent to 44 percent during the last 15 years and the gross loss is over $12,000,000 to all concerned.

"The Bureau of Reclamation proposes 22 projects at a total cost of $190,000,000 for Idaho, but 6 of these projects are already authorized."

PROVIDE FLOOD CONTROL

"Irrigation projects would provide flood control and help save at least a part, if not most, of the $400,000 loss by floodwaters of the Snake River. Pallisades Dam in eastern Idaho is another of these 22 projects which will provide electric energy and flood control for Idaho.

"The population gain in the Western States from 1920 to 1940 has been 60 percent while the increase in irrigated land has only been 10 percent. New Idaho acres must be brought under irrigation to feed this growing population.

"Western irrigation projects have had a fine record of repaying the United States Reclamation Bureau these original costs. Idaho irrigationists led the field with 99½ percent.

"Fear and progress don't mix. May I close with the last words of our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt: 'Our only barriers of tomorrow will be the doubts and fears of today.'"

James A. Farley's Proposals for Limiting Succession to the Presidency—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 15 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Limiting the Presidency," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of May 13, 1945; also, an editorial entitled "Presidential Succession," published in the Hartford Daily Courant of May 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of May 13, 1945]

LIMITING THE PRESIDENCY

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley, now in private business, is still devoting himself to the public service, and his addresses in these days are attracting attention all over the country. Mr. Farley is not missing an opportunity to express his desire for the full restoration of the American way wherever he can, whether before a luncheon club in a small city or before a gathering of important business and financial leaders.

He is listened to closely because of his long experience in politics of the practical kind, and his service in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt. Now he is proposing the creation of a special commission of Members of the Senate and the House, amplified possibly by a Justice of the Supreme Court and other leading officials, to study the need of a constitutional amendment which would cover all possible exigencies in regard to the succession to the Presidency.

In the last 156 years, all seven of our Vice Presidents who have been elevated by the death of the President, have lived, fortunately, to complete their terms in the White House. Although this has consistently happened in the past, there is no guarantee that it will continue unbroken forever.

Section 3 of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution empowers the Congress to provide by law for successors to the President and Vice President, in case of their death or disqualification in the interim between their election and the date of their inauguration in January.

Congress, however, in Mr. Farley's view, could become involved in a long deadlock if such a situation developed, and this possibility certainly warrants attention. And if a Vice President should advance to the Presidency by death, his appointee as Secretary of State would take the place. In this matter the voters would have no direct choice.

It is a timely suggestion by Mr. Farley and one that should be studied.

[From the Hartford Daily Courant of May 18, 1945]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, proposes that a special commission be appointed to study the question of presidential succession when, as in the present instance, there is no Vice President. A similar suggestion was previously made by James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, who feels that the subject is of sufficient importance to demand consideration at this time.

The Constitution provides for the succession of the Vice President in case of the death, removal, resignation or disability of the President, and gives Congress power to provide what officer shall succeed in case of a vacancy existing in the office of Vice President. In 1793 Congress enacted a law specifying that in such case the President of the Senate should succeed and after him the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Doubt existed as to the constitutionality of this arrangement, and in 1886 Congress provided that after the Vice President, presidential succession should pass to the members of the Cabinet in the following order: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Interior. The Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor were created since the passage of the Succession Act and their Secretaries are not eligible for Presidential succession.

Those who hold that new legislation is now desirable point out that President Truman, who is 61, is older than any other person elected Vice President who became President as the result of the death of the incumbent President. Seven Vice Presidents have entered the White House as a result of the death of the incumbent President, and there have been six Vice Presidents who died in office. It was the death of Vice President Hendricks that led to the enactment of the Presidential Succession Act of 1886.

It is not a pleasant matter to discuss, but if President Truman should not live out his present term he would be succeeded by the Secretary of State, who happens to be the well-qualified Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. But report has it that Mr. Stettinius will quit the State Department before long, and whoever President Truman nominates to succeed him will, of course, have to be confirmed by the Senate. In the existing circumstances the Senate would naturally consider such a nomination not merely for the fitness of the nominee to be Secretary of State, but his fitness for the Presidency should he be called upon to serve in that capacity.

Should the Senate not be in session when a new Secretary of State is nominated, the President could make an interim appointment without Senate confirmation. As Mr. Farley has pointed out, this would virtually give the President the power to name his own successor without reference to the electorate. Therefore, he thinks the time opportune to set up a special commission to study and recommend a wholly new course of procedure with respect to the Presidential succession.

Some persons who have given the subject considerable study are of the opinion that in the event of something befalling a Vice President who had succeeded to the Presidency, the vacancy should be filled by Congress, whose selection ought to command a two-thirds vote in both Houses. The difficulty of obtaining such a vote seems obvious, but it might result in the choice of a man exceptionally well fitted to assume the burdens of the Presidency. The whole question is of more than academic interest and Representative MONRONEY's proposal fully deserves prompt consideration.

Editorial on Book Written by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, Entitled "The Four Fears"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 15 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on February 25, 1945, concerning the Four Fears, a book written by one of our colleagues, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR YEARS TO BE DISPELLED

Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah, has embarked on an interesting effort to help insure American participation in the peace. As he sees it, the chief danger ahead in this country is neither bad bargains by White House or State Department, nor intransigence from isolationist Senators and Congressmen. What he apprehends is that fears will sweep the people, as in the fall of 1919, and kindle a new isolationism, because of which peace will again be blocked in the Congress by a minority.

Four fears have seemed to him so dangerous that he has published a book to show the menace of these hobgoblins, and to get the true light on them before the people, that they might be overcome. These are:

1. Fear of idealism;
2. Fear of entangling alliances;
3. Fear of England and of Russia;
4. Fear of revolution.

No one of these, he says, is of such magnitude that it is likely to determine the attitude of a majority of the American people. But his experience in the world of education as well as in that of politics has given him a lively appreciation of the cumulative effect of interacting and mutually catalyzing unknowns. Therefore, his effort out of Congress as in it is to enlighten the public, that it may approach closer to the truth.

Surely this is time, and thought, and talent well spent. If more of this spade work had been done in 1919, it is possible that the tragedy of the rejection of the Versailles Treaty would have been avoided. For the irreconcilables could not have had their way without the backing of those liberals who didn't like Shantung, or the mandates in the Pacific, or Fiume, or the Saar. The perfectionists sustained the isolationists in the refusal to enter the League. Such folly should not be repeated this time, and education of the Thomas type may help forfend it.

Washington's Planning and Housing Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, one of the finest and most comprehensible addresses which I have seen treating the subject of housing for the capital of the Nation is an address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on June 15 in the city of Washington under the auspices of the Citizens' Council for Community Planning. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate this outstanding address by the Senator from Louisiana in the RECORD, and following it that there be printed in the RECORD a highly laudatory article on the editorial page of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS FOR WASHINGTON'S PLANNING AND HOUSING NEEDS

(By Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, United States Senator, Louisiana)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, all of you know that Members of the Congress have never been under a heavier pressure of work and responsibility than they have been burdened with during the last 2 years. I have come here, nonetheless, because I firmly believe that the people of the city of Washington in particular, and those of our Nation in general, must face and come to grips with a vitally important fact about our Capital City.

That fact is not a pleasant one.

The truth is this: Prior to the destruction caused by this war, Washington lagged far behind many of the capital cities of the world with respect to improving the physical environment in which its people lived.

A prewar visitor to Washington from London or any of the Scandinavian capitals, and even from Berlin, might well have been impressed by the fine buildings along Constitution Avenue and by our three great memorials. But the same visitor, driving through many of the streets of this sprawling city, would have felt proud indeed of his own capital's residential efforts, compared with the American record, despite our enormous wealth and superior power.

When the war is over, the scarred and blackened capitals of our allies across the seas are going to be rebuilt. If we do not redouble our efforts here—if we do not set higher goals and move toward them with a strong determination and will to performance—we shall be left even further behind in the future than we have been in the past.

That is why this meeting is so important. We face a challenge and we must accept it. In the quality of its physical plant, Wash-

ington should be the first city in America and the jewel city of all the world.

The planning and building of Washington up to the goal that we set will require concerted effort. Taxpayers, builders, financial institutions, workers, Government employees, and all those interested in every aspect of health and human welfare, will need to join forces. But the task is so huge that we must divide it into parts. We must analyze it, in order that we may do first things first.

Let us make a brief analysis and see where it leads us.

The surface of a city is covered with streets, parks, public buildings, houses, schools, churches, business districts, hospitals, and other community facilities.

The fundamental street and park pattern of Washington as laid out is satisfactory, except for the alleys, which are tied in with the question of housing redevelopment, to which I shall later refer.

Our public building program need give us no immediate concern. It does involve the relationship between where people work and where they live, and what recreational facilities they have near where they live. This again ties directly with housing.

Since Washington is not an industrial city, we certainly cannot place the treatment of its business districts first on the list of our pressing problems.

This leads us to consideration of hospitals, schools, community facilities, and housing.

I think these other items which I have just enumerated are, in large measure, a derivative of housing conditions. The slums of Washington, as elsewhere, contribute more than their share toward disease and delinquency. According to one survey, 13½ percent of the population here lived under housing conditions four times as crowded as the average for the District as a whole. In 1 year, this 13½ percent of the population supplies more than 36 percent of the persons arrested for other than traffic violations; more than 27 percent of those arrested under 17 years of age; more than 20 percent of the delinquent children committed to institutions or placed on probation; and more than 25 percent of the deaths from tuberculosis.

Studies like these have convinced me that the improvement of housing conditions is the foundation for the improvement of a city's social welfare, improvement of its physical planning, and improvement of its economic strength.

In short, I submit that we can get furthest toward solving Washington's planning and housing needs by beginning with housing.

When we have a plan for redeveloping all the residential areas of Washington into decent living accommodations, at costs which the people can afford to pay, and with adequate open spaces, we shall be well on our way to the kind of Washington which is now only a dream. Once we determine to do this housing job, the related problems of streets and community facilities will necessarily be attacked simultaneously. If we begin with housing, we cannot stop short of the whole job. That is why I favor beginning with housing.

To take housing as the starting point is so obvious that the natural question arises: "Why do we so frequently start with something else?"

The answer is simple. We are tempted not to begin with housing because it is such a big problem; because there is so much opposition to doing anything about it; and because we think it may cost too much. There are almost no selfish groups opposed to public buildings. Everybody feels warm and kindly toward the idea of hospitals and schools. But on the most vital item of all, the place in which a family lives, selfish and misguided opposition has always stopped us in our tracks.

I do not believe that the American people, after this war, are going to allow this obstruction to continue. They are going to want good housing; they are going to get good housing, and insofar as they cannot obtain it by themselves, their Government through their Congress is going to help them secure it.

Together with Senator WAGNER, I am now working on a postwar housing bill. This legislation will establish a consistent and comprehensive national housing policy. It will define the outlines of a housing goal for this Nation. It will provide tools for reaching this goal.

I want to summarize the guiding principles of this proposed legislation, and then apply these principles to the situation here in Washington.

Principle No. 1 is that we cannot do much about housing until we know all the facts relating to the housing need. These facts should be locally determined by the people concerned. No community should expect to receive aid from the Federal Government until it presents a full catalog of its needs, developed, advocated, and proposed through local initiative.

This means that all local groups interested in housing must find some way of cooperating with each other and with one or more local public bodies in order that the whole local need for adequate housing may be assembled and fitted into a complete picture.

Unfortunately, there are only a few communities where this is now taking place. Here in Washington the various local groups are spending too much of their energies in sniping at and contending with one another. With emotion rather than facts, they are arguing about what part of the job should be done by private enterprise and what part by public housing. They are even fiercely arguing about which particular public agency should be entrusted with the public part of the job.

I tell you very frankly that Congress cannot solve this problem. The communities must solve it for themselves. They must develop enough local leadership, abundant good will, and sufficient common understanding to take this first step themselves. When this first step is taken, a community will be in possession of a long-term housing plan—a 10-, 15-, or 20-year plan—to clear up all its slums and provide decent housing for all its people. This blueprint must be in accord with the best master plan that can be devised for the redevelopment of the city as a whole.

Now, after this plan is on paper, what should be done about it?

This brings us to principle No. 2. With regard to housing, private enterprise should be aided and encouraged to take on the whole job. It should be given a reasonable opportunity to carry out the master plan of housing. This, I believe, is clearly the predominant sentiment among the Members of the Congress. It is doubtless the prevailing view of the people throughout our country. I venture that it is the dominant feeling among those here today.

But there are certain obstacles which stand in the way of private enterprise. I have become absolutely convinced that the real enemies of private enterprise here in the District of Columbia are not those who believe in public housing, for some public housing is necessary. The real enemies of private enterprise here in the District are a small minority of the misinformed, selfish, self-appointed spokesmen for private enterprise. They muddy up the waters by making absurd claims as to what they can do—they assume a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward that part of the job that they have never done and cannot possibly do under present conditions. If we take their advice, Washington will have many more slums in 1955 than it has now. And that would discredit private enterprise in a way that I, as a true friend of private enterprise, do not want to see it discredited.

To illustrate, let us look squarely at the facts, here in Washington.

In 1940, almost 20 percent of the houses in the Washington metropolitan district were definitely substandard. Likewise, about the same percentage of all residential areas in this city was covered with substandard housing. That so high a proportion of the people in the Capital of the wealthiest Nation on earth should be living under these conditions is nothing less than a national disgrace.

In the final analysis, the only way to remedy this appalling situation is to make good housing available, at costs which those now suffering from bad housing can afford to pay. This is as elementary as saying that two and two make four.

Now, what can people afford to pay? Just before the war, here in Washington, about 40 percent of the families had incomes above $2,500 a year, and roughly speaking could afford to pay more than $40 a month for their housing—whether as owners or renters. Almost 30 percent of the families had incomes below $1,500 a year, which required that they obtain housing for less than $25 a month, or in any event less than $30 a month. More than 14 percent of the families, or about one-seventh of the total, had incomes of less than $1,000 a year, and only could afford to pay less than $20 a month for their housing.

These figures are truly shocking. But they are the facts. Looking forward to higher incomes and greater prosperity after the war, there would be some shift upward in all these figures. But these shifts, while affecting magnitudes, would not change the nature of the problem.

Now, let us contrast these income figures with the cost of new housing actually built in the Washington area during the 5 years preceding the war. About 62 percent of this new housing was made available at a cost or rental basis of more than $50 a month. About 31 percent of it was made available at costs between $30 and $50 a month. In contrast, only 6.6 percent of this new housing was made available for the 30 percent of the families who could afford to pay less than $30 per month. And only 3 percent of the new housing was made available for the more than 14 percent of the families that could afford to pay less than $20 per month.

We all know the stock theoretical answer to these alarming disparities. We are told that the families of middle-income and low-income groups can get plenty of satisfactory second-hand housing, handed down from the good housing built for higher income groups. The only trouble with this theory is that it was being tried even before the Washington Monument was built, and it has failed dismally. The measure of the failure can be obtained by taking a walk or driving a car from one end of the District to the other. If anyone is satisfied with the spectacle, that person, and that person alone, will be satisfied with the theory.

The facts simply do not square with the theory. The housing, in which tens of thousands of Washington families are living, is not good housing handed down. It is bad housing. And for that bad housing they are paying more rent than they can afford. The median rent in the substandard housing in the District of Columbia before the war was almost $25 a month. This rent was far above the rent-paying capacity of most of the families living in the bad housing. The obvious result has been terrific overcrowding. Another result has been inadequate diet and poor medical care, caused in part by too large

a share of the family budget going for housing purposes.

This situation is much worse in Washington than in other parts of the country. According to one estimate, less than one-fifth of the total supply of existing housing is available under $30 a month, contrasted with 79 percent in New Orleans and 54 percent in Baltimore. The median rents in Washington are much higher than in New York City and almost twice as high as in Richmond.

These economic realities of income and housing costs are at the heart of the problem. Neglect of this problem is indefensible. To expect to solve the problem without getting to its heart is sheer folly.

By all means, I repeat, we must encourage private enterprise to do as much of this job as it can. But what are the limits of reasonable expectation here in Washington? If private enterprise in the past has been building almost entirely for families who pay more than $40 a month, and mostly for those who pay more than $50, we may encourage and stimulate private enterprise in the future to build also for those who pay between $30 and $40, and even for some of those who pay between $20 and $30. But private enterprise cannot be expected, and should not be asked, to provide for those who need housing at less than $20 a month. There is no magic in the world that can accomplish this result, for $20 a month can just about pay interest and principal on the cost of a standard house in this area, without any allowance for taxes, operating costs, insurance, commissions, or profit.

This brings us to principle No. 3: That we must supplement private enterprise with some public housing if we are to be honest with ourselves in tackling the job.

The twofold purpose of a postwar housing program, therefore, must be to help private enterprise to expand its market and its volume, and also to resume and continue the public housing program for those who need it and who cannot otherwise obtain decent housing.

The legislation now in preparation would help private enterprise in two ways:

First. There are billions of dollars in financial institutions, such as insurance companies and savings banks, which would flow into housing projects if the safety of such investment could be assured. In return for this safety of investment these institutions would be willing to retire their principal over a period of 50 years rather than 25 years, and to accept an interest rate of about 3 percent rather than the rate of 4 to 5 percent now prevalent for home financing. This would reduce the monthly cost of the housing to the point where middle-income families could afford it. The necessary security of investment would be achieved through a system of yield insurance, established by the Government, as a logical extension of the FHA system of mutual mortgage insurance.

Housing of this investment type would in no sense be competitive with the housing now being supplied through current building and financing methods, because this investment housing would be limited to those income groups which cannot be served adequately under prevailing practices. It would enlarge the market rather than divide up the present market.

As a second aid to private enterprise, the legislation now under study contemplates a system of Federal and local aid for land assembly, clearance, and preparation for redevelopment. The blighted central areas of our cities are held at a cost too high to permit their purchase and clearance by private enterprise. To condemn these properties, and thus acquire them at their reuse value, would be unfair to their present owners, including institutions in which are invested the savings of the people. On the other hand, through the use of long-term public loans at low rates of interest, and some subsidies, the land can be acquired and cleared by local public bodies, and then made available at its reuse value for redevelopment by private enterprise combined with public improvements.

These forms of aid to private enterprise, plus the continuation of public housing, would provide a sound and workable machinery for building the kind of communities in which Americans should live.

There are some who say that such a program is hostile to the best interests of private enterprise. This is a complete distortion of the facts. Private enterprise would achieve a far higher and more stable level of house production, under this plan, than it has ever achieved in the past. The public housing program would be supplementary, and not competitive. I firmly believe that millions of people, continuing to live in slums, without hope of improvement, would be a threat to our whole system. I fear that more than the discontent of a few builders whose drum-beating alarm about public housing is entirely imaginary.

It is equally fallacious to worry about the cost of this rebuilding program. The only cost to the Government or to the taxpayer, despite the outlandish propaganda to the contrary, would be the annual subsidies required for public hearing, and also required for the land assembly and redevelopment program. It is impossible to make exact computations of cost, because of some unknown factors as to our future national income and its distribution. But of this much we can be absolutely certain: If we approved tomorrow a comprehensive program of housing and redevelopment, designed to remove all of our bad housing in the city and on the farm over a 10- to 20-year period, and to replace it with model communities serving the needs of every income group—even then, the total annual cost to the Federal Government, after all the rebuilding was done, would be less than a billion dollars a year for the life of the projects. This would be, on an annual basis, less than 1 cent for every dollar of the cost of fighting the war. And every bit of the money disbursed would be spent, not for destruction, but for the creation of permanent assets which would represent the wisest investment of our Nation's wealth and resources.

It is truly tragic that we should balk at undertaking this job, when we realize how low the cost would be in terms of the benefits. These benefits would include employment, demand for the products of industry, reduction in the cost of fires and disease and delinquency, improvement in public health, better planned and more beautiful cities, and decent housing for all the people in America.

I should like to see the whole job commenced now. But of course it will not be legislatively feasible to launch a program on so complete a scale. I want to stress that no legislative program now in contemplation would involve anywhere near the expenditure of $1,000,000,000 a year of public funds. The legislation now in preparation would involve maximum public expenditures of less than one-fifth of that amount. But this would be a beginning large enough to be significant. It would set before the country a demonstration and challenge of what needs to be done.

It is our hope that this legislation will be sponsored on a nonpartisan basis, with representation of all sections of the country in its sponsorship.

We must organize support for this type of legislation, in every community throughout the land. There will be powerful opposition, as powerful as it is misguided—misguided even as to its own best interests. Congress responds to the will of the people. The mobilization of support must come through meetings such as this one. It must come from an affiliation of all those interested in the preservation of a prosperous democracy in America.

You may count upon me to assert every effort in my power toward the enactment of legislation along these lines during the present Congress.

[From the Washington Post of June 18, 1945]

ADVICE ON HOUSING

For the cool wave of common sense that blew over Washington's heated housing controversy last week we have Senators ELLENDER and WAGNER to thank. Their appeal before the Citizens Council for Community Planning was simply for action by all groups in the spheres where they can be effective. The alternative to such a program, as Senator ELLENDER made unmistakably plain, is to suffer through the decades ahead with foul slums continuing to spread disease, crime, and general degradation through the city.

When the war is over, Mr. ELLENDER said, the scarred and blackened capitals of Europe will be rebuilt. We shall fall pitifully behind in the contest to improve living conditions if our own undamaged Capital is left to further deterioration and decay. At least 20 percent of its housing is substandard. Instead of shell pockets, we have filthy hovels overrun by vermin and grossly overcrowded by people. In the long run these are far more deadly than the bombs which the Nazis dropped over London.

Concrete facts offered by Senator ELLENDER show that 13½ percent of the population here lives in housing four times as crowded as the average for the District as a whole. This relatively small 13½ percent accounts for more than 36 percent of the arrests for offenses other than traffic violations, 20 percent of the delinquency, and 25 percent of the deaths from tuberculosis. It is impossible to avoid Senator ELLENDER's conclusion that these conditions in the Capital of a great and wealthy Nation constitute a national disgrace.

A recital of inescapable facts as to the incomes of families who live in these slums drove home one other point—the elimination of this worst housing cannot be left to private enterprise. There is an enormous task for private enterprise in supplying homes for the upper and middle income groups. Senators WAGNER and ELLENDER propose that the Government aid private enterprise in this task by guaranteeing long-term loans and by assembling land in blighted areas for redevelopment. "But private enterprise cannot be expected, and should not be asked," said Mr. ELLENDER, "to provide for those who need housing at less than $20 a month." Nor can all low-income families be accommodated in good second-hand houses. Reliance on that vague hope in the past has led to the wretched living conditions that may be found in many parts of Washington today.

We think the advice of both Senators that local factions forget petty rivalry and join hands in attacking this immense problem is eminently sound. The public housing program must be supplementary and not competitive. There is more than enough work for both groups to do. The Ellender-Wagner bill soon to be introduced will be national in its scope, but it seems to offer new hope for bridging of the gap between contending private and public housers here. Certainly the time has come to end the drum-beating, the statistics slinging and the name calling, and to settle down to a constructive program that will give us better postwar housing of all types.

The Soldier's Franc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. WILSON

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Soldier's Franc," which appears in the Stars and Stripes for June 10, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOLDIER'S FRANC

In an editorial yesterday this newspaper discussed the arbitrary contribution being made to the French economy by every soldier who has occasion to spend a dollar in France.

Because it is of personal interest to each officer and man in Europe, it is well to consider the circumstances which prompted the pegged, or 2-cent franc, and the changing conditions which suggest a reconsideration of our Government's pay-table agreement.

The problem is a confusing one, and even the conferences and decisions which led to the 2-cent figure have been variously reported. According to best available information, however, here is what happened:

The agreement to value the United States dollar in France at 49.5663 francs and the British pound sterling at an even 200 francs was a military-economic decision reached at Casablanca in 1943.

It was made against the advice of some financial experts and Treasury Department officials who thought the previous rate of 73 francs to the dollar more equitable.

One of the reasons for setting this rate of exchange was to limit the soldiers' purchasing power in order that their mass buying would not stimulate inflation, strip the country of consumer goods, and weaken its economy.

But there were, reportedly, other reasons which led to the tripartite agreement.

1. The Allies had adopted a policy of allowing the governments of liberated countries to make the final decision on their exchange rate.

The French themselves wanted a 2-cent franc for reasons of national prestige to help restore public confidence and as a basis for financial planning.

Economists, looking at the future of France from a perspective in north Africa, also thought the 2-cent franc would help build up France's dollar and sterling balances abroad and help finance the rebuilding of France after the war.

It appears that the franc rate was set by the French and agreed to by the Allies to achieve certain economic objectives. The rate had little relation to any market.

We are in sympathy with the original planning, but after 2 years and with concrete information finally available, it would seem a reconsideration of buying values in France is in order.

A dangerous inflation does exist but the effect upon it of soldier buying is believed to be negligible.

With a reported valuation of roughly 1 cent on the New York money market, responsible trading circles are apparently not accepting the arbitrary 2-cent franc.

No "outside" money will be coming in until trade is resumed and when it does start it is doubtful if businessmen will trade on the basis of "artificial" currency.

A downward revision of the franc, on a cold and practical basis, seems inevitable if France is to take its place in the world markets.

Meanwhile, soldiers in France are the only victims of an agreement originally based on expediency but whose reasons for existence should now be reexamined.

It seems unfair to continue to penalize the soldier by cutting his dollar in half at the pay table.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, Before Florida Legislature Memorial Exercises for the Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on April 25 before a joint session of the Florida Legislature as a part of the memorial service to the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Simpson, Governor Caldwell, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the senate, members of the house, my fellow citizens, you know with what deep satisfaction one who has ever been a member of this legislature returns to visit its chambers and to see again old friends. You could have done neither yourself nor me any greater honor than to make it possible this evening that we and all those who are assembled here pay in death as we endeavored to render in his life our humble tribute to President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I am sure that it will be the verdict of history that in all time there has been no greater and no better man than he. About 3 weeks before his sad demise it was my privilege to have a conversation with him in the White House, the last. In the antechamber of his office were gathered when I arrived some officers, some noncommissioned officers, and some enlisted men of the Army. I didn't know why they were there. After they came out of the President's office I entered. I shook hands with him but his mind seemed to be somewhere else, and he started to soliloquize. I didn't know about what he was speaking, but as he looked downward at his desk he said, "That was a very significant ceremony. To think that those soldiers over there in the Middle East would send $17,000 here to me on my birthday as their contribution to the fight against infantile paralysis." And he seemed lost in meditation and in gratitude at this thoughtful act of soldiery by soldiers fighting so gallantly another war so far away. That gave me an opportunity for which I shall ever be grateful. I said, "Mr. President, you have done so many things that not in all history has one left a monument greater than you will leave." I didn't know I was speaking his epitaph in his own presence.

Here is a comment that comes from the other side of the seas. In his eulogy in the House of Commons, Prime Minister Winston Churchill said of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, he was "The greatest American friend we have ever known, and the greatest champion of freedom who has ever brought help and comfort from the New World to the Old. I conceived an admiration for him as a statesman, a man of affairs, and as a war leader. I felt the utmost confidence in his upright, inspiring character and outlook, and a personal regard and affection beyond my power to express today. It is a loss, indeed a bitter loss, to humanity that these heartbeats are stilled forever."

I am sure that if in his lifetime there had been held an election in any part of the world as to what name was the greatest name to humanity, Franklin D. Roosevelt would have been the world's choice. In a little bit of travel and from what I have heard of those who have come from other countries to ours, many times have I heard it said by citizens of foreign countries, "We know what President Roosevelt stands for. Will the American Government carry on those policies after his departure?"

A little while ago dictators and totalitarian braggarts from Berlin and Rome were castigating the decadent democracies. They were speaking of their inevitable dissolution and their downfall. Now both of those dictators have been dethroned, their cities subjugated, and their people conquered by the militant and gallant democracies which they castigated as destined for collapse. And that is to the world the best evidence that God is in His Heaven and democracy still lives.

A bit ago we pledged allegiance to the flag, and we said, "One nation indivisible." So deeply had President Roosevelt become a part of our lives, so intimately had affection for him become entwined about our hearts, that we could not imagine the United States without him as our President. Yet yesterday it was my privilege to stand in the office of another President and to have him say to me, "Never has any Vice President assumed such fearful responsibility as fate has thrust upon my shoulders." And I was privileged to say, "Yes, Mr. President, but never have the people given their devotion and their loyal support so wholeheartedly to a Vice President who assumed the Presidency as the people of the Nation in this crisis have given their wholehearted affection and their loyalty to you." Then I ventured to say I was coming here for this occasion. He said, "Tell the people of Florida to give me their support and the succor of their prayers."

The world has waited for the day which today came, waited for us to enter the last portal in the making of a permanent peace. Today representatives of our great country have assembled with the representatives of other nations of the world who have joined in this crusade for freedom, in our own fair city on the west coast: a delegation from the Congress named by our departed leader, a city chosen by him.

All America is dedicated this time that we shall not fail those who have died that the curse of war should not come again to scourge mankind. And the least we can do to honor the memory not only of President Roosevelt but of all dead in this war, the physically and the mentally dead, is with our determination, our support, and our divine supplication to see to it that that San Francisco Conference does not fail.

There are many vicissitudes ahead. Yet anyone who was on the Senate floor the day the Senators of both parties arose to say farewell to their colleague, anyone who could have heard the voices of Senator CONNALLY and Senator VANDENBERG, laden with heartfelt emotion, anyone who was privileged to see Senators accustomed not to give expression to their sentiments rise in their seats

and in violation of the Senate rules pour out their hearts in applause as the Senators of our delegation concluded their farewell addresses before leaving for San Francisco can well believe that this time the people's Senate will not be the cross upon which shall be crucified all our honored dead.

I also said to President Roosevelt in that last conversation, "Mr. President, perhaps I shouldn't say it, but the versatility and the reach of your mind is such that you are the only worthy successor of whom I know to those of old giant-minded men said to possess infinite knowledge. You seem to know more about everything than almost any other person on earth." I am sure that not all history will be able to reveal and to disclose the reach of President Roosevelt's magnificent mind and heart.

I am sure that the military and the naval leaders who have been the instrumentalities through which were fashioned the strategy which is bringing us today to the doors of Berlin and to the outskirts of Tokyo would be the first to pay homage to the masterful sense of strategy even about military matters to which the mind of President Roosevelt contributed. I am sure that you have heard the President say in his speeches that someone had to make the decision as to where the attack should be brought and how the forces should be divided between the east and the west, what critical materials should go to the Army and to the Navy, to the air forces, and to the tanks. In the final analysis, not by dictation but by the disclosure of his own masterful powers of reasoning and his unparalleled sense of strategy, did he, with those military and naval leaders, make the final decisions.

I am sure that if they could speak to the people of America today, no two men on earth would render greater homage to the President than Prime Minister Churchill, who speaks of him not only as his comrade but as his friend, and of Premier Marshal Stalin who, perhaps more by the voice and the great heart of President Roosevelt than by any other force on earth, was brought into the great company which is winning so many battles upon so many fields in all the earth today. And I should not be surprised to see that what Russia did a little while ago in giving indication to the Japanese of the termination of the mutual nonaggression pact of the two countries is but the omen, as the dastardly Japanese suspect, that the full force and might of the Soviet power shall be beside our own country and England in bringing to heel our last enemy, the Japanese. When the truth shall be fully known, it will appear that no mind and no heart brought the Marshal to that decision more persuasively than President Roosevelt, whom he trusted perhaps as he trusted no other man on earth outside his own country. So, as a strategist, President Roosevelt will be long remembered and honored, for none has been the architect of our victory more than he.

The President was also the unchallenged leader of democracy in the world. President Roosevelt had but to speak to arouse the hopes of the oppressed everywhere on earth. Where people were still free they looked to him for leadership; where they were not free they looked to him for their emancipation. Upon his word more people hung with confidence and affection than upon the utterances of any other human being upon all this great globe.

In diplomacy the President was also great. He had the knack of making men wish to work with him. He had the engaging manner and personality which can be bestowed only by the smile of fate and fortune. May I say one thing which perhaps might seem a little strange to some? Out of many scores of conversations with the President, I have yet to hear one harsh word about any man or woman ever escape his lips. I have seen him in the midst of his great battles; I have seen him when the shadow and the burden of battle flitted across his brow and time after time he would put his fingers to his forehead, as he did in his last seconds, seeming to brush away, to drive out, something which was beclouding his clear vision, yet I have never heard him speak ill of an enemy. To hear him talk you wouldn't know that he had an enemy. He always fought on affirmatively for the cause which was the cause of his head and his heart. But I am sure that his magnetic personality, his powers of persuasion, his sense of strategy, his capacity to make men bend their minds to his, will make him for all time one of the great masters of diplomacy which the world has ever seen.

It was he who reconciled, I expect, the differences between the East and the West, the Occident and the Orient. It was his insistence which brought far-off and long-suffering China to the honored peace table as one of the responsible parties in the direction of human events. And it was he, too, who was the champion of the little nations as well as the friend of the large. And though there were times when the propagandists upon short-sighted instances persuaded the small nations that he was no longer their champion, they, too, like little men and women, never lost faith in him. They knew that he would always come back to the true line and be the friend of the little nation as he was ever the friend of the little man.

Perhaps the President's reputation could principally rest upon his part in world affairs, and yet we think of him primarily as our President—as the leader of our own country through the dangers of peace and of war. Anyone who has seen recent news reels remembers that figure—strong, brave, and bold—who addressed the Nation on that dark day, March 4, 1933, and how he put confidence in hearts that despaired and how he made men hope again for a future for America and for their families and for them. A taxi driver the other day, with tears in his eyes, told me about the time when he with his family lived in a piano box in Washington as a part of the bonus army, and he said, "I have got a son in this war. I know President Roosevelt will never let him and his wife and his little children go through that experience that was mine." Through these vicissitudes, through dangers that were perhaps more deadly than we knew, to the very brink and precipice of revolution had this Nation gone, and with his strong hand and arm he brought it back, and he set it upon the way to greatness, to a sound economy, which was the best preparation we could have had for the day when war attacked us. There were those even who had been the most bitter opponents of such things as the Tennessee Valley Authority—for example, Mr. Wendell Willkie, who himself was such a stalwart strength for the President in the crucial days of international crisis, who said that had it not been for the Tennessee Valley Authority, had it not been for the great dams erected in the West, we could not have waged war as we have waged it through these crucial days. So he builded better than people knew, the strength of a nation and the sinews of the people.

But it was he who saw the dangers lurking beyond the horizon of our country. In his address in Chicago in 1937 he spoke about the necessity of quarantining the dictators from abroad. He knew that aggression was like a disease—a contagious disease—if it spread, it would strike down all those whom it reached with its evils and he wanted to quarantine it. But there were many who were blind because they could not see and many who were blind because they would not see, and they did not understand what the President saw with the greater reach of his vision. He knew the rattlesnake fangs of Hitler which were about to be implanted in our own flesh. He knew the stiletto of the Italian dictator which was already raised to strike us. He knew the dagger of the dastardly Japanese which was already unsheathed for our back. But, like all others who have powers of observation and understanding which exceed those of their fellow men, he was doubted the way Thomas doubted his own Master and Saviour. But he never lost hope, he never lost faith in the people, he never swerved from his course, which determined him to defend America against dictatorship and keep democracy forever alive in the earth.

I shall never forget a scene in his office just after Dunkerque. I happened to be there upon another mission. He pulled open the drawer of his desk and handed me several sheets of paper. I looked over pages of machine guns, rifles, pages of mortars, and other weapons of war, and when I had had a little bit of time to gaze at them he said, "I have just today sent those to England." It was right after Dunkerque, remember. "I pray they get there in time."

At that time Great Britain had less than 15,000 armed men in the British Isles. Hitler had conquered Poland, Belgium, had been victorious over the Low Countries, and stood just 22 miles away over the Channel. The President had no act of Congress, he had no plebiscite from the people, but he knew that if the people understood, they would support him in what he did.

I remember the day in 1940 when he took a little pocket map of mine and drew a mark at the top of it and divided the Eastern and the Western Hemispheres in the Atlantic and even then he said Greenland and Iceland are essential to our security, and no enemy must be permitted to occupy them. "We cannot stand idly before any threat of occupancy of either by any militaristic power," he said.

It seems that fortune has always favored us. It favored us when our forefathers were led across the tumultuous seas to this wide and rich continent. It has favored us in every crisis in our long history. And I believe that we all think that it was a Divine Providence which lifted up President Roosevelt to be the leader of democracy in America and in the world. That is the reason the people so signally honored him and so unprecedentedly gave him their continued confidence. The other day the British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, was the guest of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Across the table from Mr. Eden sat Lord Halifax and around the table were gathered all of our delegates to the San Francisco Conference as well as all the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Mr. Eden was speaking to us after the luncheon. After speaking of San Francisco and what we hoped to achieve there, he said, "This morning Lord Halifax and I visited and spent an hour with General Marshall." He said, "We looked at the charts which General Marshall disclosed to us. We saw your far-flung battle line which reaches around the circumference of the globe, the advance of your Army, Navy, Air Force, and your Marines in every theater of war." He said, "Gentlemen, I thought I knew something about the power of nations, but I never gazed upon such magnificence of strength as General Marshall disclosed upon those charts to Lord Halifax and me—the might of America."

Then with one of those penetrating remarks which only a man of his intelligence and position could make, he said to Lord Halifax, "And may I say what I said to you as we departed from General Marshall's office," Lord Halifax indicated his assent. Eden continued, "I said, 'what a fortunate thing it was that General Marshall is such a nice man'."

There was a double meaning to that remark of Britain's Foreign Secretary. What he meant was that the United States of

America had become the greatest military power the world has ever seen, yet the Nation whose conscience more perfectly controls that vast power than has ever occurred in all history's long past.

And then I thought how truly that revealed the character of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was the President who asked for those appropriations. He was the President who asked for the legislation that made those mighty forces possible. He was the President who approved every one of those requests. He was the President who called the boys from every home and farm and fireside and sent them forth to battle and to death with his benediction. It was he whose vision saw all those fronts encompass the circumference of the globe. Yet it was the tender conscience, the true, genuine, humble democracy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt that made that mighty army the friend of every oppressed nation and person and the foe of no good man or woman in all the earth. So Roosevelt revealed and symbolized the character of America.

And I like to think of what the President meant to the South. Oh, there were some who said he wasn't the friend of the South. Yet his record speaks more eloquently than any witness who might testify in his behalf. I could show you and the other members of the Florida delegation could show you letters passing between him and us in 1938 about lowering freight rates for the South, so that the products of our farms and our factories and our fields could reach the great markets of the Nation without having to hurdle the barriers of discrimination. When he spoke of the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem, he spoke of it with kindliness and with an earnest desire to help and not to criticize, for every southerner who has battled for the South could tell you of something he has helped him to do to help the South. We have lost a great southern champion.

You may remember that he so often referred to Warm Springs as the Little White House and to Georgia as his "other home." Had it occurred to you that he didn't die in the White House, in the Nation's august and majestic Capital; he didn't die in the family mansion at Hyde Park amidst those towering trees, by those far-reaching lawns, by the silent, majestic roll of the mighty Hudson. He died in a little white cottage on top of a red Georgia hill. He not only loved the South, he gave generously of himself to it. He not only gained back the largest measure of his recovered strength in the healing waters of Warm Springs but, as he might have preferred, he last lived there.

One of the stories in the paper which you may have noticed, told by a minister in Atlanta, was of an incident which occurred 2 days before the President's death. In the afternoon as the sun broke over the Georgia hills and fell down into the green valleys, the President sent word to his Secret Service men that he wished to go for a drive. They got in the car with him and they drove down the clay road. Finally they came to a trail that turned off to a knoll called Dowell's Knob by the people who lived there and he drove his little car to the very crest of that towering point which surveyed the beautiful green valleys which stretched beyond from those peaceful hills and farms. Then he said, "Gentlemen, I hope you will be kind enough to leave me and not return until I blow my horn." Of course they went away and for 2 hours he sat there alone in the little car which he drove and looked from that point of prominence out across those inviting valleys to the hills beyond. The minister may have been right that the President was not only looking at those soothing valleys, not only letting his mellow gaze fall upon those hills he had come to love, but he may have been looking beyond those hills, even to the rim of the horizon and to the City of God which lay on beyond.

And so it was from this "other home" in our Southland, too, that his sad train wound its way back to the Nation's Capital. When it reached Washington, Mrs. Pepper and I were among those who saw the body lowered gently upon a caisson drawn by six white horses and set apart for its dreary journey. We saw that mournful caravan as it wound its way this time in the majestic silence of death for the last time to the White House. A little bit later it was my privilege to see the people along the streets, whites and black, old and young, men and women, to see the tears that unashamedly rolled down their cheeks as the President passed by to return no more. And then we know that he has left a legacy of a great affection for the South, his "other home" which he loved.

I hope, as I am speaking primarily to the members of the legislature, that you will not misunderstand me if I refer to the first contact which I personally ever had with President Roosevelt. I would like to read two or three paragraphs of a letter which I wrote on December 22, 1928, from Perry, just after I had been honored by the people of Taylor County by election to the House of Representatives in this great body and just after the President had been elected Governor of New York. The first paragraph will speak for itself.

"PERRY, FLA., *December 22, 1928.*

"Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
"Governor-elect, New York, N. Y.

"MY DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: It was a pleasure to have from you a inquiry as to my opinion of the conduct of the Democratic Party in the future. I may say, I hope, that the people have implicit confidence in your own judgment and rely upon you to furnish to our party its leadership in the coming years. Your public record and your personal characteristics, which are known to all, eminently qualify you for the position. I had the pleasure for a while of living with Mr. Ferdinand A. Hoyt, of your State, who, as he advises, enjoyed service with you in the New York Assembly, and he has been enthusiastic in your praise."

Then this paragraph:

"I am convinced, however, that we shall not have our greatest success until we make more perfect in the public mind the concept of what our party is and at what it aims. For one, I want the Democratic Party genuinely to become the liberal party of this Nation. I want it not to compromise upon that matter, because we cannot go to the people with conviction in our eyes unless we are sincere in our liberalism—in our belief that right in this respect is the conferring of the greatest good upon the greatest number. To do that we shall lose some of those who are now with us. They are appreciated; they are as noble as we, but they cannot go with us in straightforward policy of liberalism in politics. We must stand for principle and not election always. We must be so firm in our allegiance to a utilitarian political philosophy that the people of this Nation shall know upon whom to call when they are convinced that that philosophy is right. Straightforwardness, honesty and clearness of statement, sincerity of purpose must characterize our party's relation with the public."

And the last:

"We must show the people our own vision. They must come with us because they prefer us, and not because they hate those in the camp of the enemy.

"I fear I have been tedious. I hope you will forget it because I am tremendously interested in the future of our party.

"I again assure you of the high esteem in which you are held by our people.

"Very sincerely yours,

"CLAUDE PEPPER."

I offer that for whatever it may be worth, not so much for what it may bear upon my own thinking as upon that of the President. The President never asked me to vote for or against a bill. He never asked me to make a speech or not to make a speech. He never asked me, as some have professed to believe, to send up any trial balloon. I think I may say, as I indicated I was in that letter on December 22, 1928, I remained to the last time I saw him, and I am today, essentially of one faith and one mind with him upon domestic and foreign policy. And I am not ashamed of that course.

On the third day before the President's death I had a letter from him responding to a letter from me in which he was discussing the relationship of the President and the Senate in respect to our foreign policy. This letter has never been published anywhere and, if I may, I will read it to you:

"WARM SPRINGS, GA., *April 9, 1945.*

"DEAR CLAUDE: Yours of April 5 has been sent to me down here where I am getting a 10-day vacation—more for catching up with mail than for a rest.

"I like what you say and it is perfectly clear that fundamentally you and I mean exactly the same thing. As a matter of fact, while in questions of foreign policy the President ought to do the spade work of negotiations and the original nominating of certain officers, a long experience leads me to recognize that the Senate ought to be consulted both on the policy and some of the nominations. Both you and I know that as a matter of practice too much consultation would slow up both matters.

"What is needed is the removal of the political point of view on the part of some Presidents and many Senators. There are altogether too many instances throughout our history—some of them, even recent ones, completely unnecessary. I like to feel that we have really accomplished marvels in the matter of both our domestic and foreign policies in changing the point of view of a lot of people toward more liberal trends, not only here but throughout the world.

"On the consummation of a treaty, I hope that the next trend of public opinion will recognize that under our own theory nations are coequal and therefore any treaty must represent compromises. We cannot jump to what we consider perfection if the other fellow does not go the whole way. He might think that his point of view was just as good or better than ours.

"I do hope to see you one of these days soon. I will certainly do so as soon as I get back from the opening day of the San Francisco parley.

"Always sincerely,

"F. D. R."

How magnificently he epitomized in that letter the spirit of teamwork between the President and the Senate. By the way, for 3 years, nearly, a nonpartisan group of Senators from the Foreign Relations Committee have been weekly, and sometimes daily, meeting with the President and the Secretary of State discussing the future peace. You know, the President appointed not Democrats, but Democrats and Republicans to represent us at the San Francisco parley. The peace we shall gain—God helping us, we shall gain it—is due largely, in my humble opinion, to the Executive's ability to cooperate with the legislative which he exhibited in that last letter which I received from his hand.

The last time I saw him was in the hemlock-guarded garden at Hyde Park, amidst those who were permitted to assemble there. His body was lowered for the last time to sleep the eternal sleep of the dead.

What I should like to remember and to pass on to you are the words that were uttered by the President's own Hyde Park minister,

his last utterances over the grave of the President:

"Now the laborer's task is o'er;
Now the battle day is past;
Now upon the farther shore
Lands the voyager at last.
Father, in Thy gracious keeping
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping.

"There the tears of earth are dried;
There its hidden things are clear;
There the work of life is tried
By a juster Judge than here.
Father, in Thy gracious keeping
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping.

"There the penitents, that turn
To the cross their dying eyes,
All the love of Jesus learn
At His feet in Paradise.
Father, in Thy gracious keeping
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping.

"There no more the powers of hell
Can prevail to mar their peace;
Christ the Lord shall guard them well,
He who died for their release.
Father, in Thy gracious keeping
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping.

"'Earth to earth, and dust to dust,'
Calmly now the words we say,
Left behind, we wait in trust
For the resurrection day.
Father, in Thy gracious keeping
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping."

The Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] to Mrs. Thomas F. McAllister, chairman of the National Committee to Defeat the Un-Equal Rights Amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 13, 1945.

Mrs. THOMAS F. MCALLISTER,
Chairman, National Committee to Defeat the Un-Equal Rights Amendment, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. MCALLISTER: I am in receipt of a letter on your committee's stationery from a number of women, some signing as officers of organizations or boards, whether or not in a representative capacity is not clear, others signing as individuals. Therefore, I am addressing you as the chairman of the committee for which these women purport to speak.

That you should ask me to withdraw my name as a sponsor to the Equal Rights Amendment is an astounding request as I did not permit my name to be used without first being irrevocably convinced that this amendment would benefit all women, while you apparently think only of women for whom you would approve minimum wage and hour laws, etc., which you would not accept for yourselves. Your whole argument regarding working women sounds as if you had progressed no further than World War I when working restrictions on women seemed to be necessary but now that the long work day is gone forever and the FEPA has been declared constitutional, working women should certainly be permitted to choose not only their own type of job, but have the same rights as men to bargain for hours, pay, and time of employment, thereby advancing equally with men.

Your prophecy that under the amendment sweat shops would expand and that women's health would deteriorate is stated with apparent certitude but with complete lack of truth. It is evident also that you do not realize that motherhood is a condition, not a legal status, and mothers could still be protected by special legislation the same as men, such as veterans, etc. However, I think you may well leave it to the potential mothers to decide what legislation they need and desire. The same misunderstanding exists in your mind regarding old-age pensions, insurance, and the like.

It is to be hoped that your third point will come to be the law of the land so that women may be the guardians of their children, serve on juries and control their own property, enter businesses and professions, etc., the same as men and thus raise the legal status of women effectively to that of men. Perhaps some of the signers of this letter have forgotten what was said about "endless litigation" and "legal confusion" should the suffrage amendment be passed. I was not influenced by this argument then, nor am I now. Nor do I forget that it was seriously proclaimed from pulpit and press 100 years ago that the invention of the baby carriage would corrupt mothers and damage family relations; that the invention of the sewing machine would shatter the very foundations of the home and, therefore, no Christian woman should use such a devilish contraption. I regret to say it but it seems to me that many of your arguments stem from such antecedents as above.

In conclusion: You anticipate with unbecoming alarm, hardships to millions of American women by the adoption of the great principle of equal status for all citizens. It is difficult for me as a patriot to see what hardships would be comparable to the injustice of continuing to keep women in the status of subcitizens. You good women have lived long enough to see the chaos and destruction brought upon the world by nations which have extolled the doctrine of discriminatory laws, which have glorified the social system of an elite class with its consequent inferior status for other citizens—all done under the guise of "security." I deplore that you are unable to see that such doctrines must not be tolerated in our own great democracy. Sex is a crude and primitive way of trying to evaluate the rights and desires of citizens. Surely we are sufficiently enlightened in this country to write our laws on the basis of eternal liberty, justice, and equality for all.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH F. GUFFEY.

The Roosevelt Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the Roosevelt loan, which appeared in the State, of Columbia, S. C., of the issue of June 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROOSEVELT LOAN

The State does not know why Elliott Roosevelt was lent $200,000 by John Hartford.

From reports, the adventure proved to be a bad business proposition, and all Mr. Hartford got back was about $4,000. Therefore, he charged the loan off as a bad debt.

Reference is made to the fact that the late President knew the transaction was being made.

Our point is that we see no reason to drag Franklin D. Roosevelt's name into the deal. He is not here to present his side. We trust there will be no effort to smear his record. Let the matter be argued out among the living, if there is any need to argue it out at all, which we doubt.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today as General Eisenhower walked into the Capitol he was handed a letter by a man he did not know, and he was asked to deliver the letter to Congress. He did not have an opportunity to read it.

It turns out that the letter was addressed to him by the District of Columbia Department of the Disabled American Veterans. In the letter General Eisenhower is requested to include in his address today to the joint session of Congress a recommendation for compulsory military training in time of peace. Of course, General Eisenhower would not, under the circumstances, include that subject in his address, but at his request I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT,
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1945.

Gen. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: As commander of the District of Columbia Department of the Disabled American Veterans, I wish to bring to your attention the necessity for the Seventy-ninth Congress to pass the compulsory military training legislation and we of the Disabled American Veterans hereby ask that you use the power of your position to give this cause your support in your address before Congress today.

We of the Disabled American Veterans ask you to deliver this message to Congress for us today:

"Since its inception as a national organization in 1920, the Disabled American Veterans has urged upon the Congress, and the

people of the United States the necessity for an adequate national defense. Certainly, men who have continued to suffer from war disabilities for a quarter century can hardly be charged with being militarists. Military training, in our judgment, inculcates into the youth of America that great love of freedom which we all cherish and for which thousands of our comrades paid the supreme price. The members of the Disabled Amerecan Veterans feel privileged that they are continuing to pay the greatest price a human being can contribute for the preservation of freedom of thought and action, and continue to live."

At the last national convention of the Disabled American Veterans, which was held in Denver, Colo., a resolution was unanimously adopted, which in part is as follows:

"We commend to the American people, and to the Government of the United States which derives its power from the people—

"1. That we have at the conclusion of this war compulsory military training; that each of our young men be required to serve in one of the armed services for a period of 1 year.

"2. That in addition to the elementary military training, we also have Army training; that is, the concentrated training of our future soldiers, sailors, and marines in sufficiently large groups to give the officers more than paper experience in commanding armies and fleets.

"3. That we keep and maintain an adequate regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and sufficiently large enough to train the youth of America.

"4. That we maintain a two-ocean Navy.

"5. That we unalterably oppose the repetition of the sinking of our Navy for the purpose of example.

"In making the above recommendations we are conscious, as above indicated, of the fact that it may seem to those who ignore facts that we propose a change to the point where the military will be supreme over the civilian. We ask only that those who have such a conviction sincerely investigate and consider the question and that they reach their conclusions from facts disclosed by history. That conclusions reached by wishful thinking only, if not supported by realistic facts, will do nothing less than destroy our way of life in the end. * * *

"6. We recommend that the United States collaborate with the governments of our allies, and any government of a free people, to force and then preserve the peace of the world. We ask for the spirit of that great American statesman and patriot, Patrick Henry, who said: 'Give me liberty, or give me death.' * * * That this convention call to the attention of the American people the impossibility of training an American soldier to effectively use the modern implements of warfare in less than 1 year."

We submit that it isn't fair to the boys who have died and those who will yet die for this country, and that it isn't fair to those who are going to live a lifetime of suffering for this country, that, at the termination of this war, responsibilities of our young men to our Government should cease, except upon a voluntary basis. There are those who would have the Government delay action of this legislation. Respectfully, we submit that to delay is to defeat. The time for action is now and if at some future time we find such training unnecessary, the law can always be repealed.

Very cordially yours,

FOSCOLO HENDRICK,
Commander, District of Columbia Department, Disabled American Veterans.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Norman Thomas before the Woodrum committee on Friday, June 8, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, I appear today as a representative of the Postwar World Council, a national organization, nonpartisan in character, of which I am chairman. It happens that in the matter before you the position which I shall take is also the position of the Socialist Party, which, however, will set forth its case through another spokesman or in a brief or by both methods. I only am responsible for the particular form in which this case is presented.

As I understand it, you are considering the military policy of the United States rather than any particular bill, and these hearings are more narrowly devoted to the place of postwar military conscription for universal military training in that policy.

I begin by stressing what you gentlemen doubtless realize, but which is too often overlooked on both sides of this discussion. There is no such thing as shaping a military policy in a vacuum or as a thing in itself. Clausewitz and other theorists in the arts of war were entirely right in arguing that war is the extension of diplomacy or of the foreign policy of nations. No matter how sincere advocates of conscription or any other military policy for the United States may be in claiming that they are not thinking of particular potential enemies but are merely advocating a general policy of insurance against war, nothing of the sort is possible. No nation has even practiced conscription and competitive militarism except with a view to specific potential enemies. The expense of the process makes it necessary to win popular support for conscription by playing up rivalry, fear or suspicion of competitors. Other nations assume, as a matter of course, that a competitive military policy is an expression of a competitive imperialist policy and act accordingly. Never in history has it been otherwise. Never will it be otherwise.

It is, you will agree, completely impossible even for a nation as strong as the United States to gain absolute security by any kind or degree of military preparation. Always some conceivable coalition against us provoked by a wrong handling of our foreign policy would be stronger. Therefore, I repeat, you cannot shape a military policy except in the light of the general economic and political policies which the United States will support in the world.

Hence, the present War Department propaganda for postwar military conscription is consciously or unconsciously disingenuous. First it assumes incorrectly that conscription can provide protection, irrespective of national policies. Then it proceeds to add to that error by deliberately ignoring and obscuring in the high-powered propaganda the obvious fact that the potential mass armies provided imperfectly by 1 year's training will be useless against the first impact of a third world war begun by surprise attack from the air by rocket bombs and other new developments. Even in this war, if England had had great mass armies, they could not have done for her in 1940 what her air force did. At most, mass armies, unless the United States is to take the aggressive in actually occupying a large part of the world, will be useful only in a secondary stage of war, and they cannot adequately be prepared in advance. This is the position taken by such experts as the British General Fuller, father of the tank, and by Hanson Baldwin.

I cannot imagine that General Marshall himself, or any other official advocates of conscription, will seriously argue before your committee that the training of our able-bodied youth for 1 year is the vital and indispensable part of the defense system they will demand. Its heart will be highly mechanized forces, expertly trained. The emphasis will be on the development of aviation and electronics and the new weapons which the Germans produced late in this war. No competent American military leader would dare to repeat the mistakes of the French, who had the longest unbroken tradition and practice of military conscription, but had so neglected the proper use of modern aviation and armor that Hitler overran them with fewer men than they had under arms. Repeatedly we opponents of conscription have got certain of its advocates to admit, at least in private conversation, that what they really wanted was to keep in being an elaborate system of camps and supply agencies and, above all, to indoctrinate the Nation, not in love of war, but in the acceptance of executive authority which is at the heart of militarism.

Lieutenant Colonel Conkling, out of experience in two wars with the Selective Service System, goes further and argues that the War Department and the Army high command, which deny to military personnel the right to oppose the postwar conscription which it uses the taxpayers' money so freely to advance, is motivated in considerable part by the natural self-interest of a military hierarchy in perpetuating jobs, rank, and power. I should add that an even greater danger is the vested interests that makers of supplies, both capitalists and workers, acquire in competitive armaments and competitive imperialism which are always united like Siamese twins. You will have to take account of these self-interested motives in judging the case for conscription that some of the advocates present. And your committee and Congress itself should consider very seriously the effect upon democracy of War Department and Army propaganda in the policy-making field. For that is what is involved in the advocacy of conscription by official agencies backed by associations of men commanding great wealth.

In what I have been saying about the essential relation between a military policy for the United States and (a) our foreign policy in general and (b) the technological nature of modern war, I am not trespassing on the field of the military expert but arguing what is common sense. Repeatedly I have summed up these points by a statement that no one has challenged: if mass armies and peacetime conscription for them are essential to our defense against attack, or to the degree that they are essential, we shall be increasingly disadvantaged as the decades go on. In this respect we cannot possibly compete with the USSR or later with China. It is our business to do all in our power to make an end of military conscription throughout the world not merely for the glorious cause of universal peace but in our own selfish interest. If instead, without trying the obviously better way, you gentlemen now take a step

which will fasten conscription upon mankind, a new generation of Americans in a not distant future may curse you for helping to forge the weapon by which our enemies were aided and our defeat made sure. If military conscription is the secret of defense, Russia will win. She will have the greater population, the strategic position in which mass armies are most useful, and the kind of totalitarian government to which peacetime conscription is far more appropriate and effective than to our democracy.

To avoid war with Soviet Russia is a must for American statesmanship. This cannot be done by appeasement or a refusal to face facts, one of which is that in the long run Russia will win if, by playing the old militarist and imperialist game, we fasten it upon the world. Have you ever puzzled over the fact that at present American Communists whose slavish and exclusive loyalty is to Stalin should favor conscription, although with increasing frankness most of its advocates urge it as a necessary step in arming against Russia? May it not be that in the long run the Communists believe the U. S. S. R. can win if rivalry in conscription should determine the policies and the war techniques of Russia and the United States? Even more probably, may they not believe that conscription in America will help to produce the attitudes on which Communist agitation and later Communist totalitarianism can thrive?

This is, of course, speculative. What is not speculative is the fact that the greatest single help to peace would be a movement toward the total abolition of military conscription and a policy of progressive disarmament following the disarmament of Germany and Japan. A movement like this could not fail if the two most powerful nations, the Soviet Union and the United States, should institute it. No one has a right to say that such a movement is impossible until it has been tried. A little less than 20 years ago Stalin, through Litvinov, asked for this very thing at Geneva. In spite of what I have said to the effect that military conscription, if it is an advantage at all, would strengthen Russia more than the United States, Stalin might be wise enough to see that assured peace is even more to the interest of his own country. In time the Russian people might come to realize it in spite of the barriers Stalin puts up against communication. Perhaps a beginning could be made by proposing a 5- or 10-year arms holiday in which there should be no conscription. If that worked well, it would be very hard to reestablish the old military competition and to persuade people to turn over all their sons to the state for 1, 2, or 3 years. At any rate, it is a crime against the peace, which is our heart's desire, not to make this approach to the problem of security and lasting peace.

It would be easier to make it if the results at San Francisco should prove more encouraging than now appear likely. It is still possible to hope that those results will at least make further adjustments easier. At all events war weariness in all countries, including Russia, and our own certain superiority in effective strength give us 5 or 10 years of grace to work out our problem in better terms than adoption of the system which did so much to plunge Europe into ruin.

I have heard the argument, as ridiculous as it is dangerous, that under the provisions of this new world organization we may be constrained to resort to conscription to do our part in a police job. Unsatisfactory as are the San Francisco arrangements, they aren't that bad. At the worst, the policing of the world won't require general conscription or be aided by it. It's a job for specialized, carefully selected, and well paid forces. We shall not need conscription in order to play our part in a sheriff's posse of nations to be called out against an aggressor. No sheriff in his right mind, trying to bring some sort of order into a lawless county, would urge every man in it who had never carried a gun to arm himself, and every woman to become a pistol-packing mama. The competitive armament which our adoption of conscription would certainly fasten on the world would produce an analogous situation among nations. Any valid system of international force for security, Ely Culbertson's quota force system for instance, depends upon international control of offensive armaments and general disarmament.

Again I insist that the best key to any sound policy of security and peace would be agreement with the Soviet Union on disarmament. That will depend on many things which we cannot here discuss. One of them is so important in relation to our future security that I must mention it briefly. It is that we try to bring an end to the war against Japan by laying down terms which will deny her the possibility of aggression, but which will not destroy the only strong independent nation in Asia and turn her embittered people over to Communist machinations. Unless America appears as the author of terms which will make her the friend of all the peoples of Asia rather than the underwriter of white imperialism—British, Dutch, or even American—Stalin will win the war even if he does not enter it. He will certainly win it if we bribe him by helping him make China an Asiatic Poland. What Congress should be considering is not conscription for peacetime but terms which might shorten a war of annihilation We can win such a war with or without Russia's help but at such a cost in men, materials, our own ideals, and the friendship of Asiatic peoples that we should have lost in relative security what in peacetime conscription can restore.

So terrible would be a third world war that the victors, if any, would merely enjoy the advantage of the wounded in the kingdom of the dead. Your real concern is with the policies that will avert war. In a country definitely not persuaded of the power of nonviolent resistance it is inevitable that Congress, at any rate pending international agreements, will concern itself with providing an Army and a Navy. Such forces must be composed of carefully selected, well paid experts. They will be necessary even if you also impose conscription. But you do not have to aggravate suspicion by our policy. For the United States, with its long record of opposition to conscription in peacetime, to adopt it now, no matter how great our own consciousness of virtue, would invite an almost universal fear of us and confirm the rest of the world in the old military way.

Certain facts are inescapable. Conscription, which goes back to the French Revolution and the first Napoleon, never prevented any war or guaranteed victory to any nation in war. Indeed it made war more likely because it created great vested interests in the rivalries, fears, and hates that lead to war. The First World War, many historians believe, might have been avoided if there had been time for sober second thought. Conscription by its practical and psychological consequences prevented second thought. The Second World War did not come because only the Germans had conscription but because the more numerous non-Germans in Europe, all of whom had enjoyed the blessings of conscription, most of them longer than their German foes, were divided in political policy and out of date in their military strategy. So far was conscription from guaranteeing the life of nations or their soldiers that the two nations which best survived the shock of two world wars were the United States and Great Britain, neither of which had had conscription. Japan did not attack us until after we had had very extensive military conscription for more than a year and then she attacked us where we were strong. It was not our lack of peacetime conscription that explains our entry into the war.

Not only had conscription tended to make wars more likely in the world; it has contributed directly to the coming of the totalitarian state. In republican France military conscription was used against labor to break strikes, and thanks to it an army caste at the time of the Dreyfus case came perilously close to making the whole French Nation anti-Semitic.

Throughout Europe conscription and militarism were forms of boondoggling for unemployment which diverted attention from its cure and made it easier to accept even war itself. It will not be different in America.

I could continue to argue the incidental injuries rather than benefits of conscription for character, education, and health, but you are concerned with military policy, I content myself with filing a statement signed by 74 educators of standing in America opposing peacetime military conscription.

I rest my own case on the arguments I have presented that for Congress to adopt peacetime military conscription now would not only fail to guarantee military security but would actually jeopardize it and enormously increase our difficulties in preventing a Third World War.

STATEMENT OF EDUCATORS

As educators and as citizens we wish strongly to oppose the passage of postwar military conscription now. In an exhausted world in which our enemies are defeated and disarmed, it is not conceivably necessary for American defense. Surely no one would argue that the best educational use for a sum estimated as high as $3,000,000,000 is the regimentation of all our able-bodied youths in military camps.

The issue stands and falls, as most of the proponents of conscription admit, on the relation of this program to peace or war. We believe that were America now to reverse her historic policy before peace has been made, it would be a confession of defeat in the struggle for a lasting peace. Everywhere it will stimulate the forces of militarism. Conscription will be meaningless except as attended by great armament—and great armaments will not long be supported except by nationalistic suspicions and fears and rival imperialistic drives for profit and power which will nullify any international agreement and breed new war.

In America, as in Europe, militarism including conscription will be a form of patriotic boondoggling and divert attention from the constructive cure of unemployment. An officer caste and great armament will have a vested interest in militarism and the nationalist and imperialist passions which support it. For these reasons, we are unalterably opposed to the passage of conscription now.

ALONZO F. MYERS.
EDUARD C. LINDEMAN.
BROADUS MITCHELL.
RAY LYMAN WILBUR.
(And 70 others.)

Integrity: Man's Greatest Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by a distinguished American industrialist at the commencement exercises held at Ithaca College on June 1, 1945.

I refer to Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of the Thomas A. Edison Co. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in connection with the address the citation which was given at the time when Mr. Stringfellow was awarded an honorary degree by Ithaca College.

There being no objection, the address and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRITY: MAN'S GREATEST ASSET

(By George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc.)

Mr. President, honored guests, members of the faculty, friends of Ithaca College, fellow students, and classmates, I am deeply and reverently moved by receiving an honorary degree of Doctor of Fine Arts from this great college, and I shall cherish the honor with a lifelong memory. Then, too, I am complimented by the opportunity to address you on the subject Integrity: Man's Greatest Asset.

It is, in my opinion, the first requisite for good government, domestic tranquillity, and international peace

Integrity is soundness of character. Integrity is that quality of mind and spirit which we associate with honesty and good faith either in public or private life. Integrity is the foundation upon which virtue and morality rest. Integrity is the cornerstone of right relationship between individuals and groups. Integrity is the indispensable ingredient for sound business and the professions.

Abraham Lincoln offered this bit of homely counsel to a caller at the White House, "If you forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem."

Nothing more completely baffles one who is full of tricks and duplicity than simple integrity in another.

One of the blackest days in our national history was dramatized by the dishonest and tricky peace negotiations in Washington by the Japanese Ambassador, while his government was preparing to bomb Pearl Harbor. This breach of integrity, this treacherous assault, united our citizens overnight, for the very reason that it violated the one thing people possessing it, cherish; even those without it, respect it—integrity.

If civilization is to be saved, we must deal honestly and righteously with each other and with foreign nations.

"A human being," said Horace Mann, "is not, in any proper sense, a human being until he is educated."

In this country we spend less than $4,000,000,000 a year on all forms of education. On the other hand, the annual cost of crime in the United States varies from five to fifteen billions of dollars, depending upon what is included in the invoice. It is my belief that if we spend more for education, the cost of crime would be much less.

Our prison population, while astounding, represents but a small percentage of law breakers who have sinned against society. Actually the great masses of our people are dependable, hard working, home building, and liberty loving.

Our Nation's real wealth is not found in the coffers of her great financial institutions. It is not found in the vast assets of her industry. Nor is it in her almost unlimited natural resources.

The greatest asset of the United States of America is the character of its citizens. Let our people lose their fundamental honesty and business will collapse overnight. Let them lose their sense of decency and no one will be safe anywhere. Let them lose their sense of liberty and tyrants will spring into power immediately. Thinking people know that there is no substitute for integrity.

The history of human progress is the record of men who could be trusted and who could trust themselves; men who put righteousness, truth, justice, and freedom above personal gain, above personal power, yes; above life itself.

There is a false notion abroad today that men of sterling worth, men of complete honesty and noble character, are not successful in a monetary sense in this so-called hard, cold, practical world. Nothing is further from the truth. Successful men and women, over any appreciable period of time, in all walks of life, have been individuals of integrity. Is it not true that the crooked businessman, the unscrupulous lawyer, the quack doctor, and the insincere clergyman are still rare enough to be news? Most people drive on the right side of the street, stop for red lights, and pay their just debts.

Without integrity, our land would be a shambles; transportation facilities would be paralyzed; pure foods, reliable drugs, and even clean drinking water, would be stolen from us. Everything we are, everything we have, yes; everything we hope for, rests upon the integrity of mankind.

It has been proven time and time again that the world will offer many opportunities for advancement and service to civilization to anyone planning to enter society as a person of character.

Here, under the able and courageous leadership of Dr. Leonard Job, one of the outstanding educators of the Nation, you have made an investment in knowledge. The extent to which you realize upon that investment will depend to no small degree upon your integrity.

The noble traditions of this great college are in harmony with the highest American ideals. Here you have learned individual initiative. No one did your work for you; no one could pass your examinations but yourself. You, who are graduating today, have earned your degrees. Here you have learned that we must work for what we want and we must give a full day's work for a full day's pay. This is basic in all moral thinking, and I suggest that you never forget it if you expect to get where you want to go.

If you will give yourself in service to your community, and remain unyielding in your fidelity to your principles, the community will reward you with its esteem, its gratitude, and with material success. The idea that honesty does not pay is false. Only the honest physician is successful. Only the honest lawyer reaches the peak of his profession. Only those firms that turn out quality products and render good service stay in business and pay dividends.

May I issue this word of caution: As a nation, we are risking the loss of our heritage. I refer especially to the attitude of our citizens toward local, State, and national governments. Our forefathers laid the foundations of our Nation on the assumption that the citizens would participate in their Government, accepting the responsibility as well as the privilege of democracy. Gradually we have been drifting away from this concept. We have been wishing for good government without working for it; we have been expecting something for nothing. Too many of us have left the responsibilities of citizenship and the control of our public affairs to political machines, made up of men and women whom we would not employ in our own enterprises, whom we would not retain as lawyers, for whose knowledge, ability, and experience we have no respect, and in whose character we have no confidence.

By neglecting to vote in all elections, especially the primaries, a great body of otherwise responsible citizens has permitted a small, well-organized minority of negative politicians, without integrity, to take over our Government and, in many instances, rule us to suit their selfish desires. By discharging our civic responsibilities, we can easily exterminate selfish rule by the ruthless machines in the major political parties.

In East Orange, N. J., where I live, the citizens have for years taken an active interest in public affairs. Therefore, we have no political machines. The mayor is the choice of the people and is serving his fourteenth consecutive term which, when completed, will comprise 28 years of honest and efficient service to the community.

It should be clear to thinking citizens that our Government will never be any better or any more secure than you and I, and millions of others like us, determine to make it. It will be as bad and as corrupt as you and I, and others like us, permit it to be.

Alarming trends, including the acceptance of Government paternalism as a substitute for individual ambition and initiative, and the tendency to dodge immediate responsibility by borrowing against the future, in utter disregard of the day of settlement, have developed in recent years. These threats are real and must not be minimized. These, and other threats to our way of life must be vigorously opposed by a convincing demonstration of their fallacies and a better way to accomplish constructive results. Men and women of integrity are needed for this job.

Virginius Dabney, writing in the Saturday Review of Literature, calls attention to such great journalists as Horace Greeley, Charles Dana, and Joseph Pulitzer. He especially mentions Pulitzer, who made the New York World one of America's greatest newspapers:

"If there were more publishers today like Joseph Pulitzer, the newspapers of the United States would stand higher in public esteem. There were three major reasons for the superlative excellence of the World."

Mr. Dabney continues:

"1. Pulitzer was a journalistic genius who was more interested in the editorial stand taken by his papers than he was in their balance sheets.

"2. He required a promise from Frank Cobb, the World's editor, that if the paper's duty to its readers ever conflicted with Pulitzer's other extensive investments, the editor would disregard the publisher's investments. * * * This resulted in one of history's finest examples of journalism.

"Furthermore, and this is a fact which many publishers might well ponder," observed Mr. Dabney, "the World * * * was enormously profitable. Its progressive, enlightened and courageous policies," the writer concludes, "strengthened its hold on the people and made it an indispensable medium for advertising."

Let us turn now to the field of statesmanship. What has brought our Nation forward? What men and women stand out as truly great? Only those of integrity.

A wag once said: "Diplomacy is to do and say the nastiest thing in the nicest way." Compare that with Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in." Lincoln, as you know, was called "Honest Abe." The story of his walking 3 miles to return 6 cents to a woman he overcharged, is probably true.

Paralleling "Honest Abe" was that "prince of merchants," John Wanamaker, who was

affectionately known as "Honest John." The story of his personal life, how he built his business on integrity, how he maintained it through daylight and darkness, giving honest value for every dollar received, has been a challenge and an inspiration to merchants everywhere.

In the field of education, Horace Mann, A. Lawrence Lowell, and Charles Eliot stand out as leaders because they had intellectual integrity. No one did more than Horace Mann to establish the conception that education should be universal, nonsectarian, and that its object should be social efficiency, civic virtue, and character.

Both Lowell and Eliot, as presidents of Harvard University, played a vital part in guaranteeing intellectual freedom through the unhampered search for truth by institutions of higher learning. Their integrity has paid everyone higher dividends.

In the realm of science and invention, there is Thomas Alva Edison, who after conducting more than 50,000 experiments, developed and placed on the market a well and now favorably known product. Defects showed up in operation which were not apparent in the laboratory models. Edison, on learning of this, closed his factory, requested his customers to return their purchases and get their money. After 2 years of research, the great inventor discovered and eliminated the weaknesses. Many of Edison's customers were amazed at his request to "send back the product and get your money." Some protested that the defective product was better than others then on the market and refused to respond to the inventor's offer.

Edison felt that his integrity was involved, and this priceless ingredient was not for sale.

Lasting success, which we all seek, like integrity, is not to be had without effort and self-discipline. We are entitled to what we can earn. Wealth is a measure of effort intelligently applied, and no salary or wage is too high when it is earned. Pulitizer, Lincoln, Wanamaker, Mann, Baruch, Ford, and Edison started life with the same assets: imagination, industry, determination, and integrity.

These men did not drift from pillar to post, looking for soft jobs with a future. On this subject of drifting, Abraham Lincoln in a letter to John D. Johnson (brother-in-law), said:

"I have learned that you are anxious to sell your land, where you live, and move to Missouri: What can you do in Missouri better than here? Is the land any richer? Can you there, any more than here, raise corn without work? Will anybody there, any more than here, do your work for you? If you intend to go to work, there is no better place than right where you are. If you do not intend to work, you cannot get along anywhere."

For those who possess that priceless attribute—integrity—and willingness to work, the future was never brighter. You are about to be tested in a war-torn world; and a war-torn world is about to test your character. You may be facing the future with confidence and a feeling of security, born of the many accomplishments gained through your learning in this great college.

However, it is my opinion that your contribution to civilization will be vastly enlarged, and your reward multiplied many times, if you go forth from these halls armed with that matchless ingredient, the most important equipment man can possess—integrity, man's greatest asset.

God bless you.

CITATION

George Edward Stringfellow, successful industrial executive, director of industries and mining, active in transportation and advertising, outstanding civic leader, crusader for honesty in government, supporter of political virtue, religious leader, recipient of a citation by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, chairman of the committee on citizenship responsibility of New York district Kiwanis, and member of public affairs committee of International Kiwanis, we find in you an exemplification of those qualities and virtues that add immeasurably to the richness of living through the utilization of intelligence, skill, taste, and harmony in business, social, and professional life. Believing, as we do, that the finest of all arts is the art of fine living, in recognition of your sterling worth as an individual, in acknowledgment of your important contribution to the life of your State and to the Nation, and in endorsement of your advocacy of the finer arts, by and under the authority of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, and by direction of the board of trustees of Ithaca College, I confer upon you the doctor of fine arts honoris causa, with all the rights and privileges appertaining thereto.

As evidence of such degree and the right to such privileges, I hand to you this diploma and cause to be placed upon you the hood which shall be a token of our high esteem and the honor of our college.

LEONARD BLISS JOB,
President.
ROBT. K. DEVRICKS,
Secretary.

Allied Aid to Italian Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a soldier in Italy, together with a clipping which he attaches to his letter. The clipping is entitled "Italian Transport Aided by 1,700 Allied Vehicles."

There being no objection, the letter and clipping were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 11, 1945.

DEAR SIR: Please read the clipping enclosed.

Was the battle for Italy a political mistake or our American youth expected to lay down their lives so the Italians can have free transportation.

Most of us fellows here in Italy are damned puzzled, to say the least, about the American attitude to these people who so recently were shooting at Americans.

Please see what you can do about cutting off Italian aid.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. MUNSON,
Second Lieutenant, Air Corps.

ITALIAN TRANSPORT AIDED BY 1,700 ALLIED VEHICLES

ROME, June 10.—The Allies have handed over 1,700 American-made motor vehicles to Italian authorities to ease Italy's civilian transportation needs, the Rome radio said today, according to Reuter's. Another 2,000 vehicles are being brought to Italy for the same purpose, the radio said.

Policies in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very significant statement, in my opinion, issued by Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure in regard to Office of War Information policies in occupied Germany. I desire to have the release printed in the RECORD because later in the week I intend to speak about Office of War Information policies, and I think this statement is an excellent one and is good evidence why the Office of War Information appropriation should be continued in the new budget.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

The Psychological Warfare Division of SHAEF has already put into operation its program for total Allied control of German information services—a program whose end view is toward the gradual return of those services to German hands after all Nazi and militarist influences have been purged from them.

This program embraces all newspapers, radio transmitters, publishing and entertainment enterprises in those areas of Germany controled by the supreme Allied commander. It is designed to meet two requirements; namely, the immediate military one of maintaining order, and the much-longer-range objective of reorienting the German mind after 12 years of nazism.

Our policy behind all this was expressed by General Eisenhower, who stated that a free press and a free flow of information and ideas should prevail in Germany, in a manner consistent with military security.

He emphasized, however, that there can be no restoration of a free German press in Germany until the elimination of Nazis and militarist influence has been completed, and also that we are not going to lose the peace by giving license to racialists, pan-Germans, Nazis, and militarists so that they can misuse democratic rights in order to attack democracy as Hitler did.

That is the simple policy. Making it work is somewhat more ramified, and in order to serve both the short- and long-term aims, the PWD plan of control calls for a division of operations into three distinct phases:

1. The shutting down of all German information service.

2. The institution of Allied information services, utilizing German newspaper and publishing plants, radio transmitters, etc., but doing the writing and editing ourselves.

3. A gradual transition from Allied information services to German-managed services working under Allied supervision. This phase will come only after detailed reconnaissance and examination of prospective German operators have been made.

The first, or shut-down, phase went into effect in each German locality directly it was captured.

The second phase has begun with the reopening of several radio stations and the

publishing of Allied newspapers, which are now being published in about 10 plants in Germany. These newspapers are being published in such cities as Essen, Cologne, Frankfurt, Kassel, and Munich, and are being distributed throughout the surrounding areas of these main centers of population. As time goes on, PWD plans even wider decentralization of printing—to about 20 cities, in fact—and more thorough distribution in the rural districts.

In this second phase of the program for the control of German information, the emphasis is on publicizing military government rules and regulations, countering rumors by announcements, and supplying a selected news service. The part of this news service dealing with world news (everything, in fact, except local news) is produced in the United Kingdom by an organization known as the Allied Press Service, which is made up of personnel from the OWI and, on the British side, from the Political Intelligence Department of the Foreign Office (PID). The news file produced by the Allied Press Service is a synthesis of material available from the usual news and agency sources. It is beamed daily to the continent by radio and is the sole world news source for all newspapers published in the British and American zones.

The fact that the source of this news is not only non-Nazi, but non-German as well, is expected to act as a daily reminder to the German that the old order has completely disappeared. At the same time, daily contact with objective and truthful world news is expected to help him to draw his own conclusions about the Nazi propaganda to which he was subjected for 12 years. Manifestly, however, we do not expect a sudden change. We expect it will take time—maybe a very long time.

In the field of radio broadcasting we have found that many of the most important transmitters in Germany have been destroyed or damaged by military action or by Nazi sabotage. Where repairs are practicable, these are under way now, and beyond that Radio Hamburg and Radio Munich are already on the air again. Eventually, we plan to operate additional stations at Stuttgart, Cologne, and Frankfurt.

These stations will carry network programs of information and instructions fed from the key Allied station, which is Radio Luxemburg. At certain periods of the day, the network stations will broadcast news and instructions of a local nature. In the early period of this phase, there will be programs not only for German but also for the large numbers of United Nations displaced persons throughout the British and American zones of occupation as well.

When I spoke to you before, I told you that Manfred Zapp, the Nazi chief of Transocean News Agency, had stated to us that Radio Luxemburg had blanketed the Rhineland and the Ruhr during the final months of the war. Since then, we have conducted surveys of civilians in Germany to assure ourselves that we were right in placing so much faith in the transmitters of Radio Luxemburg for this network for occupied Germany. The result of these surveys is gratifying. Of the total populations of three selected towns, Hersfeld, Eschwege, and Marburg, 48 percent of the people who had listened to Allied stations before the end of the war stated that Luxemburg was the station they listened to most. Thus, we were certain that Luxemburg already enjoyed a very sizable audience.

Now that there are no Nazi stations, and it is no longer against the law to listen to us, we feel that Radio Luxemburg, with its network outlets, will reach the people in the SHAEF zone in Germany effectively.

As was true before the surrender, Luxemburg will not initiate all its programs, but will relay certain selected British and American programs originated in London and New York.

Incidentally, prisoner-of-war interrogation reports which are still coming in reaffirm the importance of Radio Luxemburg in the final phase of the battle of Germany. Toward the end, despite the Gestapo, it seems almost anyone with a radio in Germany, whether civilian or soldier, listened to Radio Luxemburg when he pleased, which was often.

Films will be shown to the German people. Obviously they will be carefully selected. The main items, perhaps, will be a weekly newsreel and selected documentary films produced by OWI and MOI. We shall also arrange for the importation and exhibition of certain Allied feature films, when it is felt that the time has come to give the German people full-scale cinema shows.

Beyond this, an hour-long film of German atrocity camps is being completed. This film will include material from most of the larger Nazi concentration camps and is being carefully and soberly documented. It will attempt to show Germans what was going on in those camps in the light of daily life in the villages nearby, and the theme is simply that the people of Germany must consider themselves responsible for the atrocities as does the rest of the world, because they and they alone are responsible for the creation and maintenance of the system of government which used these shocking methods as a means of control.

There will be music in Germany, but its character will be closely supervised. No music will be permitted which propagates militaristic ideas, or which is associated with the Nazi party, fascism, pan-Germanism, or the German Army, or, in the case of incidental vocal music, whose words imply any of the foregoing or constitute an incitement to riot or disorder or in any way interfere with the process of military government. (I have been roughly paraphrasing military government instructions on information control.)

As soon as transportation and other facilities permit, selected and specially prepared Allied publications will be imported into Germany, but manifestly they will not be of a light or entertaining nature. They will be the beginning of the long-term task of attempting to reorient the German mind. We have just completed an illustrated booklet on German concentration camp atrocities, which will be required reading for Germans. It will be distributed to German troops in our hands as well as to German civilians. Also, as soon as transportation and distribution facilities are adequate and the importation machinery is functioning, regular Allied and neutral publications can come into Germany. Thus the Germans will have one of the best examples of democracy at work.

The immediate objectives of our Allied information services are: (1) To maintain and deepen the mood of passive acquiescence and acceptance of orders to the German people, and so to facilitate the completion of the occupation of Germany; (2) to undertake special campaigns required by military government; and (3) to take the first steps toward arousing a sense of collective responsibility for Germany's crimes and to provide the facts which expose the fatal consequences of Nazi and militarist leadership, and German acquiescence in them.

As in the final phase of combat psychological warfare against the fighting enemy, about which I told you several weeks ago, our original output to the German people will be dominated by precise instructions. The information we give to the German people, whether about their own country or about the world outside, will be given coldly and objectively.

The tone of what we say will not be loud, but stern, aloof. There won't be any argumentative propaganda in it. There will be no slogans or similar devices; there will only be unemotional reporting and instructions.

During the earlier stages of our work we will not engage in speculation for the benefit of the Germans on the subject of the future of Germany as a nation, nor will we permit any such erroneous suggestion as that we have relaxed our position on the subject of the pre-Nazi Junkers or officers' corps. We regard the militarists as an enemy, at least as virulent and probably more dangerous today than the Nazis.

Preparations for the third and final phase of PWD's work, the gradual turning over of information services to Germans who will function under Allied supervision, are proceeding now. These preparations take the form of reconnaissance missions to discover those Germans who may be trusted to publish newspapers or books, to produce films, and so on.

Investigators have been instructed not only to test candidates for past affiliation with the party, but, further, to explore the backgrounds of professed non-Nazis for traces of militarist or German nationalist beliefs. A directive requires that Germans selected for executive positions in the third phase of information control be proved to have an active "devotion to democratic ideals."

There again you have the difference between the simplicity of a paper policy and the actual hard-rock problem of making it work. Obviously, after 12 years, we aren't going to find many people of high caliber sitting around on the bench, unscathed, who have an active "devotion to democratic ideals." We shall have to cut very deeply indeed into the German structure to find the people who will begin to met our requirements. And then we shall be faced with the problem of finding, among those still living, men who have this active devotion to democratic ideals and, at the same time, have the qualifications for management of newspapers, book publishing firms, etc. We shall often have to go far out of our way to help certain individuals who have not had an easy life these past 12 years and more, men whose broken spirits may well need our support and guidance to return to the ways of active personal democratic initiative.

In this third phase, operations in the various media will be governed by the techniques of registration and licensing. All Germans engaged in distribution or selling (i. e., newsdealers, booksellers, theater owners, concert managers, etc.) must first be registered with military government. All Germans engaged in actual creative production in any medium (i. e., radio broadcasters, newspaper and book publishers, theatrical producers, etc.) must receive a license from military government. When a man gets a license, he must accept responsibility for carrying out directives designed to prevent the circulation of Nazi or militarist doctrines. He will be subject to constant scrutiny to make sure that he does in fact conform to them.

But how to find the right people?

The problem, as we recognized a long time ago, is complex. And so, long before the real phasing of this information control program was put into effect, we tried an experiment. When Aachen fell, we decided to use that city, wrecked as it was, as a guinea pig. We sent a press control team there for the purpose of finding a man to license as publisher of a newspaper. It isn't necessary to recount here the manifold tiny problems that that first press control team encountered. Suffice it to say that after examining all possible candidates, they finally chose an elderly man, a trade unionist, who had been foreman of the composing room of the pre-Nazi paper in Aachen, and had resigned to live on a tiny pension in 1933. He seemed to be—and has

since shown himself—a man of active democratic ideals, but he didn't know much about the editorial side of making a newspaper.

However, our experimentation with personalities proved to us that as between an experienced publisher who is suspect, and a man whose technical knowledge may be faulty but whose political philosophy is right, the latter is our best bet. Under such conditions, to be sure, our press control officers must give him much aid and guidance. But such effort, we find, pays off. It pays off because the community as a whole comes to recognize that we mean what we say about purging the Nazis. The very public position of a newspaper publisher, or book publisher, or theatrical producer, makes him a bellwether whom townspeople can see at close range.

There can be no question that we have learned from the Aachen experiment much that will help us as we go on with registration and licensing on a broad scale. The board which will license individuals, incidentally, is composed of the SHAEF British and American political advisers, or their representatives, the deputy chief of PWD, and the heads of the various sections of PWD, such as directives, intelligence, press control, publications control, film-theater-music control, radio control.

The scrutiny of activities of Germans who have been licensed will vary with the type of license. A man who wants to publish books, for instance, after being found to be politically unobjectionable, might first be granted a conditional or temporary license. During the period of probation, information control officers would take the precaution of scrutinizing his manuscripts before production, then, after a period of time, during which the publisher had displayed his good faith, he would be granted a full or regular license. From this time on, the information control officers would regard him as on his own in matters of judgment, and would limit themselves to post-production scrutiny of his output, with severe penalties to be imposed if the publisher strayed from the path of rectitude.

Throughtout the period of its operations in Germany, PWD will have a staff and control organization—a headquarters which will bind the whole operation together, and make certain that the various directives and laws under which we function are observed. Beyond this, there are so-called district information control units which will serve as the field force for operations. Two United States units are now in the field in Munich and Wiesbaden, British units are operating in Hamburg, Hanover, and Oelde. These units have operating sections, namely, intelligence, publications, press, radio, and films-theater-music.

In view of some rather conflicting articles that have been published laterly, I think that it is wise at this stage to clarify the position of PWD-SHAEF relative to the British and American civilian agencies in the German operation. As you know, the PWD German operation is composed of military and civilian personnel, representing the British and American forces, the United States Office of War Information, PID, and the United States Office of Strategic Services. The civilian agencies also supply PWD with special equipment and special material such as publications and films.

The basic political policies of the two governments are, of course, developed by the State Department and the Foreign Office, with which PWD is in liaison and consultation through United States and British political advisers. The propaganda policies which stem from these political policies are developed by OWI and PID. Any policy guidance which comes to my division from OWI in Washington, for instance, does so through military channels and not directly to OWI personnel in my division. The military aspects of the propaganda policies of OWI and PID come to us through the Combined Chiefs of Staff.

Beyond this, the actual operations, the actual working out of the Government information policies in the field, are the responsibilities of PWD-SHAEF, and will continue to be our responsibility so long as SHAEF exists.

The persons from civilian agencies who work in PWD are an integral part of PWD while they are with us. They are not OWI, nor PID, nor OSS. This personnel in Germany is a part of my office and works directly under my instructions.

When SHAEF disappears, on the American side there will be a United States group-control council, which will deal with the other powers occupying Germany, and the United States theater staff, which will be responsible for occupation of the United States military zone in Germany. I have been named chief of the information control services for the United States Group Control Council and the chief of the information control division of the United States theater staff. Thus, as you can see, information control in Germany will continue to be military for some time. The British will have a similar set-up, the British Control Commission and a British theater staff. On the United States side, we will have the same relationship to OWI and OSS as existed between PWD-SHAEF and these agencies during the SHAEF period.

Incidentally, the personnel break-down on the United States side in Germany is approximately 1,600 military and 145 civilians.

With the PWD organization I have described, then, and through the three phases outlined, it is planned gradually and carefully to permit the development of new German initiative in these fields, once the Nazi and militarist forces that shaped Germans' past have been eliminated. It is recognized, however, that all media will not lend themselves to entry into the third and final phase of control at the same time. Controls over media whose purpose is primarily cultural or recreational probably will be relaxed a good deal sooner than controls over the vital daily informational media, such as radio, press and news.

PWD–SHAEF takes the view that there can be no relaxation of control until Allied authorities are convinced that Germans of unquestioned loyalty to democratic ideas have proved their technical, as well as political, fitness to manage opinion-forming instruments. When they are convinced that this condition exists, the really long-term work of German reeducation can begin. And PWD believes that the Germans must finally accomplish this themselves. But when that moment will arrive, no one now can begin to estimate.

Conferring of Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws on President Truman by Georgetown University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Evening Star of yesterday entitled "Georgetown Citation Extols Truman as a Chosen Son of Destiny." My colleague the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], received on behalf of President Truman, an honorary degree of doctor of laws at the Georgetown University exercises with which this article deals.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGETOWN CITATION EXTOLS TRUMAN AS A CHOSEN SON OF DESTINY

Georgetown University yesterday paid tribute to President Harry S. Truman as a "chosen son of destiny" under whose "providential leadership the American ship of state is advancing unimpaired toward the consummation of victory through justice and toward the haven of a long-desired peace."

More than 3,000 relatives and friends of the university's class of 234 graduates attended the colorful outdoor ceremony of the one hundred and forty-sixth annual commencement. Of the graduates, 128 from the medical and dental schools were awarded commissions in the Army and Naval Reserve.

The audience roundly applauded after the Very Reverend Lawrence C. Gorman, S. J., Georgetown president, read the citation in Latin, awarding an honorary doctor of laws degree to the Chief Executive.

President Truman's unavoidable absence made it necessary for him to designate Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico, a Georgetown law alumnus of 1920, to accept the degree in his behalf. Mr. Truman is the first President to receive a Georgetown degree, although former President Herbert Hoover was thus honored when he was Secretary of Commerce.

CHAPLAIN HERO ACCLAIMED

Center of attraction at the commencement was modest Lt. Comdr. Joseph T. O'Callahan, the heroic Jesuit chaplain of the aircraft carrier *Franklin*. The crowd gave him a tremendous ovation when Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of the university, conferred a doctor of laws degree upon him.

President Gorman also conferred LL. D. degrees upon Vice Admiral Ross T McIntire, Surgeon General of the Navy, whose medical skill, the citation said, has safeguarded the health of millions of our men. Similar honors were given two Georgetown men, John E. Laskey, who taught criminal law for 31 years, and John E. Colliflower, now chairman of the Georgetown University new hospital fund.

The citation for President Truman, for which English translations were provided, said:

"The Presidency of the United States by its very nature is at all times and under all circumstances a supreme trust and a measure of the confidence of our people. In time of war it becomes the central and focal point of national unity and the predestined bulwark of an embattled Nation where all minds and hearts converge as a symbol of security. Moreover, in the present unprecedented world tragedy, the Presidency has become, as it were, a sound rock of international stability in the tumultuous seas of unloosened passion and physical disaster."

INSTRUMENT FITS CHALLENGE

"By the inscrutable decrees of Providence, one war President fell at his post, stricken by premature death. Straightway another chosen son of destiny ascends the pilot's deck and without tremor or deviation from its plotted course, the American ship of state advances unimpaired toward the consummation of victory through justice and toward the haven of a long-desired peace. The instrument is fitted to the challenge of the times.

"In Harry S. Truman the people of the United States salute a worthy helmsman of their political course and a Commander in Chief of their armed forces who brings to his high responsibilities precious qualities of providential leadership. His steadiness of character, broad human sympathy, proven

wisdom in the administrative requirements, great love of his fellow man, and fortitude of soul in following his determined plans, have kindled new determination and unity in all the corners of our country."

Commander O'Callahan, who has been recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor, delivered the address to the graduating class. Twenty of their number, now in the armed services, were awarded degrees in absentia.

SHIPMATES ARE PRAISED

Digressing from the text of a prepared address which made no mention of war, he said he had been made by accident the symbol of the unheralded thousands of chaplains serving in the Army and Navy.

"In accepting this honor," he told the Georgetown president, "I realize you expect me to share it with the hundreds of my shipmates who faced death unafraid amid the explosions that rocked the *Franklin* on that date of March 19 when it was bombed off the coast of Japan. The whole world knows how completely they set about to accomplish what seemed then a hopeless task—to save that ship. And they did save the ship.

"Those men," said Commander O'Callahan, "are the real unsung heroes, the representatives of an epitome of heroism. By an accident of fate I have been made merely a symbol of their heroism."

To the Georgetown graduates, he urged that they take life seriously, but suggested that they do not take themselves too seriously. "Who takes himself seriously is overconscious of his rights; who takes life seriously is fully conscious of his obligations," he said.

Commander O'Callahan, a former Holy Cross teacher, took postgraduate mathematics at Georgetown in 1936–38. A brother, Neil O'Callahan, of New York City, attended the commencement. Also attending was a first cousin, Capt. Richard Casey, on duty here at the Air Transport Command.

Booth Tarkington on Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Booth Tarkington, a distinguished constituent of mine, in which he expresses grave concern over the possibility that Congress may enact peacetime conscription as a result of what he calls "this present fit of our volatile and emotional thinking." He poses this question: "If Congress votes for peacetime increase of armament, how could it vote to join a League of Nations whose basic requirement is the reduction of such armaments?"

I submit Mr. Tarkington's letter for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an interesting contribution to the current discussion of this important subject. It is as follows:

KENNEBUNKPORT, MAINE, *May 30, 1945.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I greatly fear present portents. To my mind, the situation would seem grotesque were it not that the consequences will certainly be back-breakingly burdensome and can be internationally tragic.

In order to have peace, we propose to make ourselves ready to kill any of our present friends whom we frighten into trying to carry as big a gun as ours. This we do, of course, as a measure of self-defense—and so does he. No wonder so many people now believe that another and worse war is inevitable.

You will have noticed, no doubt, that until about a year ago there was a very general opinion, editorially fostered and widely expressed, that our failure to enter Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations was the real cause of this war. Prevalent during 3 years, the theme seemed to culminate at about the time the "Wilson" film was produced. Then almost suddenly that line of talk faded out—became inaudible. There was an abrupt swing of popular thought and speech. Everywhere we heard voices saying that we'd never have been in this war and it wouldn't have happened at all if we'd had the forethought to make ourselves militarily powerful enough. The war came upon us because in peacetime we hadn't made ourselves strong. Therefore, in order to prevent future wars—which are, of course, inevitable—we must now stay strong.

Then lately, as Germany's defeat grew certain, there was a general swing back—temporarily—to faith in the former League of Nations direction. San Francisco began with a day of prayer all over the Nation, great popular interest, even enthusiasm. For a week or so people hung upon the words that came from California.

That phase has been steadily passing out of the popular mind. "They don't seem to be getting much of anywhere" is what one too usually hears. This seems to mean that although San Francisco is still trying, it's pretty much a failure—League of Nations can't be depended upon; they only talk and sign papers. "We've got to make ourselves strong."

This present fit of our volatile and emotional "thinking" can heave us into peacetime conscription, I fear. It might also bring about a paradox that would be the end of the world's second attempt to put law before anarchical war and maintain a League of Nations.

From San Francisco there has come a proposal for an arms conference, to put a ceiling upon peacetime armaments. Ostensibly this was to be for economy's sake; but it's obvious of course that there can't be an enduring peace without it. If Congress votes for peacetime increase of armament, how could it vote to join a League of Nations whose basic requirement is the reduction of such armaments?

In order sufficiently to punish Germany and Japan for their outlawry we intend to bestow upon them the blessings of complete disarmament, thus giving to every Jap and German a higher standard of living wrought by his purely productive industry and intelligence, while we put upon ourselves the ancient tribal load, devoting our time, our skill, and the lives of our young men to the potentialities of destruction.

If these horrible ironies become a part of our history you will have at least the consolation of knowing that you strove to avert them—and anyhow that's something.

Yours faithfully,

BOOTH TARKINGTON.

N. B.—I've just come upon an item: That Russia is now preparing peacetime compulsory military training for all Russian boys of 15 and 16. As these added millions will, of course, be given refresher courses, our proposed competition in the same field appears to be a gesture of feeble scope and suggests quite forcibly that we ought to try something else—something rather radically different.

For another of "life's little ironies," one meditates upon the fact that now, for the control and regulation of our country's policy in time of peace, we place the professional warrior in charge. For consistent pursuance of this philosophy we must see to it that the natural result, our next war, shall be conducted not by the War and Navy Departments but by the clergy, the society of friends, the presidents and faculties of our universities.

The Truth About Mount Alto and the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib, vice commander of Costello Post, the American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

On March 12, 1945, 6 months after serious charges had been leveled against the Veterans' Administration, General Hines suddenly called to Washington the representatives of the various veterans' organizations for a conference at which time he requested these leaders to institute an investigation of the Government facilities.

Then on June 11, 1945, 4 months later, these national commanders of the veterans' organizations appeared before the House World War Veterans' Committee to report their findings.

Mind you that the national veteran organizations did absolutely nothing until General Hines gave them the "go sign." From September 1944, when my criticism first appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to March 1945 the managers of the veterans' hospitals had ample time to clean up many unfortunate conditions in anticipation of the forthcoming probe. Of course, many unsatisfactory conditions were cleared up during this period as I will later show in the case of Mount Alto, but the stench was so bad that many of these facilities obviously could not be deodorized in time. That is why the Veterans of Foreign Wars found only half of the hospitals in a terrible state of affairs. It is of interest also to note that my series of criticisms of veterans' hospitals began appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD approximately 4½ months before the newspaper PM or the Cosmopolitan magazine decided to take up the cudgels in behalf of the veterans.

However, since Mount Alto hospital in Washington, D. C., has been given a so-called clean slate, I submit that the American people and the rank and file of the veterans have a perfect right to know the true facts concerning this institution and a few pertinent incidents that have occurred right here in the Nation's Capital. The following will give the citizens of this Republic an inside picture of what actually transpired during this great American tragedy.

On January 2, 1945, Costello Post of the American Legion, unanimously adopted a resolution to study conditions at Mount Alto. On January 25, this resolution was unanimously approved by the executive committee of the American Legion of the department of the District of Columbia.

March 6, 41 days later the District commander of the Legion finally decided to appoint an investigating committee. On April 13 this committee visited the Mount Alto

facility and later admitted that they merely made a sightseeing tour. For evidence this committee relied basically upon information from the Veterans' Administration. Solely upon such information this group made its report to Congress. And I might add here that if the other veteran organizations conducted their investigations in the same spirit as did the Legion department committee then all of their findings ought to be thrown into the ashcan. Under these circumstances is there any wonder that Mount Alto was given a clean slate?

NOW WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

On January 4, 1945, Costello Post directed a letter to General Hines requesting certain information as to whether or not a new medical center would be constructed in Washington, D. C. Eleven days later General Hines replied that no provisions had been made for a new hospital in this locality.

Following this on January 31, 1945, Representative DOYLE inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by this writer denouncing General Hines for his refusal to take a definite stand on this matter. Also, there was reproduced correspondence with the veterans chief and copy of our post resolution. This story was carried in all of the local papers.

To my surprise on February 3, I received this letter from the department commander:

"Last evening Tom Costello and other members of your post waited for you at the Legion clubhouse until quite late in order to discuss the matter you had introduced on the Hill. Inasmuch as this matter should be cleared up as soon as possible, I would very much appreciate it if you would come by my office at the Legion clubhouse Monday evening, February 5, 1945, in order to thoroughly discuss this matter.

When I found it impossible to keep this engagement on such short notice, the department commander came before my post and in open meeting bitterly denounced me because of my attack on General Hines. And it can be said here that he left that meeting with his tail under his legs.

This was followed by a story that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on February 12 under the caption: "Medical unit planned here for veterans," and emphasized that the project merely awaited the President's signature. Because this looked like an attempt to quiet the criticism I called this clipping to the attention of General Hines and respectfully asked him whether the story had any basis of fact.

Instead of acknowledging this letter, Hines forwarded my inquiry to the Legion department commander, who in turn tried to high-pressure my post commander by sending him the following letter dated February 27:

"For your information there is attached hereto a copy of a letter dated February 14, addressed by Joseph Leib to General Hines. I received a call from the Veterans' Administration on this and suggested that General Hines forward it to me. Inasmuch as we are already making an inquiry concerning this matter on the basis of a resolution by your post, I wish that you would please ask Joe to lay off the General until after the inquiry has been completed."

Soon after, I visited a friend in Mount Alto and noticed that the facility was undergoing a thorough house cleaning. So naturally I directed a letter to Colonel Beardsley, manager of the hospital, requesting an itemized list of the reconditioning, paint jobs, and renovations that occurred since our post criticized conditions at the institution.

Beardsley turned this letter over to the Legion department commander and on March 10 Costello Post received further pressure as recorded in the following letter:

"I am enclosing herewith a letter addressed to Colonel Beardsley by Joe Leib. This is the second communication addressed to the Veterans' Administration since the resolution passed by your post was subsequently acted upon by the department executive committee and a committee headed by Bill Hargrave, the other two members being J. Halper and N. Pagnotta, now have the matter in their hands for investigation.

"It was my understanding at the time I appeared before your meeting, which I thought Joe Leib concurred in, that the post and Leib would take no further action inasmuch as the investigation is in the hands of a department committee upon the specific request of your post.

"I would appreciate anything you and the post could do to cut out this sniping. For your information, I have telephonically discussed this situation with Veterans' Administration officials and hereafter when Joe directs any personal communications pertaining to the Veterans' Administration to Veterans' Administration officials they will just refer them to me so it is really a waste of Joe's time to write letters there."

This was too much. I could not understand why an official of the American Legion would be so determined to protect the Veterans' Administration in face of the facts. I soon learned the answer. The "dictator" of the Department American Legion is none other than General Hines' Assistant Chief Clerk. These men are willing to sell the veterans short merely to protect their own skins.

So I appealed to a Member of Congress to demand of General Hines the true picture at Mount Alto, including an itemized list of recent improvements—paint jobs and whatever renovations had been made since 1945.

On May 24, 1945, the answer came, and it was startling because General Hines had attempted to deceive a Member of Congress. In this letter he sent the following attachment:

"IMPROVEMENT AT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, MOUNT ALTO, WASHINGTON, D. C., DURING YEAR 1944

"Exteriors: Building No. 20, nurses' quarters. Building No. 22, administration building. Building No. 5, ward building, half completed. Scattered portions of buildings Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4.

"Interiors: Patients' rooms and corridors of wards E and F-2, buildings Nos. 22 and 5. Portion of the rooms and corridors on second and third floors of nurses' quarters, building No. 20. Connecting corridor between buildings Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Patients' and staff dining rooms, building No. 6. Connecting corridor between buildings Nos. 3 and 10. Scattered portions of interior, clinic and laboratory, building No. 19.

"Renovation: Rooms and corridors of administrative offices in building No. 22. Entire recreation building except basement. Entire attendants' quarters. Scattered portions of ward buildings Nos. 1, 3, and 4, and connecting corridor between ward building No. 4 and recreation building No. 19. Portions of out-patient section.

"Improvements: New asphalt tile floor laid on first and third floors of ward building No. 6. Installation of new refrigeration equipment in main kitchen, including ice field, unit coolers for food boxes, and condensing equipment."

Note that General Hines was asked for information as to what took place in 1945 and not in 1944. The above report was marked for 1944. Therefore, the Member of Congress sent General Hines another telegram requesting the exact dates and specific improvements made in 1945 and also whatever specific recommendations Colonel Beardsley may have made regarding conditions at Mount Alto. On May 26, this new data was received and it confirmed the fact that Hines tried to mislead the Congressman. Compare the following report with the one previously quoted. With the exception of five items the improvements listed for 1944 actually took place in 1945. By this kind of trickery Hines attempted to show that Mount Alto was being kept up before the criticism had gotten started. Now read the second report and notice the dates:

"IMPROVEMENTS AT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, MOUNT ALTO, WASHINGTON, D. C., DURING YEAR 1945

"Exteriors: Scattered portions of Buildings Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4. (April 11, 1945, through present time.)

"Interiors: Patients' rooms and corridor of Ward E and F-2, Buildings Nos. 22 and 5. (January 1 to February 10, 1945.)

"Connecting corridor between Buildings Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. (February 25 to April 11, 1945.)

"Patients' and staff dining rooms, Building No. 6. (February 10 to February 25, 1945.)

"Connecting corridor between Buildings Nos. 3 and 10. (February 25 to April 11, 1945.)

"Renovations: Rooms and corridors of administrative offices in building No. 22. Entire recreation building except basement. Entire attendant's quarters. Scattered portions of ward buildings Nos. 1, 3, and 4, and connecting corridor between ward building No. 4 and recreation building No. 19. Portions of out-patient section. (January 11, 1945, through present time.)

"Improvements: New asphalt tile floor laid on first and third floors of ward building No. 6. (January 20, to February 20, 1945.)

"Installation of new refrigeration equipment in main kitchen, including ice field, unit coolers for food boxes, and condensing equipment. (March 20, 1945, 95 percent complete.)"

To top this off here are three letters that Colonel Beardsley had addressed to General Hines pleading for a new hospital and warning the Veterans' Administrator of forthcoming criticism unless conditions were cleaned up promptly. Because these letters are quite long I shall only quote a few illuminating paragraphs from each one.

To my amazement I learned that Colonel Beardsley had begged for a new hospital as far back as 1939, but that General Hines had disregarded his pleadings. I call the following information to the attention of Congress and particularly to the American Legion investigating committee which done such a splendid job in whitewashing one of the worst hospitals in the whole veterans' group.

The first letter is dated January 26, 1943:

"Probably no organization has greater interest in planning for postwar problems than has the Veterans' Administration. This should be particularly true in respect to matters pertaining to medical work. As one interested in this particular facility, and in the administration as a whole, it is desired to submit the following suggestions with the hope that they be of value in connection with such planning:

"The Veterans' Administration will be compelled to expand its hospital facilities and a medical center located in Washington comparable to the medical centers of the Army and Navy should be of inestimable value. The Army and Navy have realized the value of such centers and acted accordingly. It is hoped that the Veterans' Administration will complete this group and place its medical service on a standing equal to that of the other major Federal medical services. I am as soundly convinced of the need and benefit of such an institution, and I am certain of the medical obligation this country will owe its ex-service men and women for many years.

"LEWIS G. BEARDSLEY, M. D.,
"Manager."

The second letter is dated March 30, 1944:

"It seems to me not only proper but my duty as manager to express views which appear indicated for the good of the service as well as informative and protective to the head of the organization in which I am employed.

"Many individuals representing various groups mentioned above have very emphati-

cally expressed the opinion that this station, because of its location and the demands made upon it, should be a model institution from the standpoint of construction, equipment, and staff.

"The manager has at all times endeavored to satisfy these groups even in face of extreme handicaps. It must be frankly admitted, however, that this hospital in no way represents modern hospital construction nor does it represent hospitals of the high standard set by the Veterans' Administration as a whole.

"We are expected to furnish accommodations comparable to those at Walter Reed Hospital and the Naval Hospital at Bethesda and are criticized because this is not possible. Many express the feeling that ex-servicemen and women deserve accommodations equal to those furnished individuals in active service. We are expected to furnish medical treatment comparable to or better then the average throughout the Veterans' Administration as a whole, but this is only too frequently impossible because of these extreme inappropriate constructions of buildings. Secondly, I have been impressed and disturbed because of apparent increasing unrest on the part of individuals and organizations relative to what they consider inadequate accommodations and impaired treatment as a result of such as this station. I cannot but fear possible undue publicity and criticism unless steps are taken toward satisfying those who are interested in seeing this station as representative of the best in the Veterans' Administration.

"LEWIS G. BEARDSLEY,
"Manager."

The third letter is dated March 30, 1945:

"In accordance with request contained in all station letters from your office, dated March 16, 1945, the following comments and suggestions are submitted in respect to steps which might be taken by central office to place this station in a better position to do what must be done. Suitable and sufficient personnel, construction, equipment, and supplies are absolutely essential in the effieient operation of a hospital.

"Physicians: The quality of physicans on duty at this time is far below the standard previously maintained at this station. As of this date we have practically our full quota. Our need is better qualified physicans.

"Construction: One of the most needed steps to be taken by central office to place this station in a better position to do what must be done is to construct and equip a suitable hospital. The manager emphasized this need in 1939 and has continued to do so on numerous occasions since. Central office is well aware of the limited and poor construction at this station without reiteration of our difficulties. The manager understands, through rumor, that central office is giving consideration to this matter. After years of recommending and urging there seems little to add in an attempt to further impress central office concerning this matter of construction which has been such a handicap and which has been so manifestly indicated.

"LEWIS G. BEARDSLEY,
"Manager."

Finally on May 29, 1945, as reported in the Washington Star, General Hines announced that he had submitted to the Federal Board of Hospitalization, of which he is chairman, a recommendation for the construction of a new veterans' hospital to be located near or in Washington, D. C. How long it will be until this new medical center is finally approved and constructed, God only knows. In the meantime whom are the veterans of this vicinity to turn to should they need medical care?

It was obvious from the very beginning that the district Legion committee was not interested in getting down to the facts; it was set up solely to whitewash the local hospital. In its ridiculous report no mention whatever was made as to what improvements, and so forth, had taken place during the very time that conditions at the institution were supposedly under study.

I wish space would permit reproduction of that report.

In conclusion, I want it clearly understood that this statement is not in any way a criticism of the American Legion or what it was orginally organized to stand for, but I do want my readers to know that these remarks are intended to denounce those few individuals who have risen to the top by finding it advantageous to work for their own selfish interest instead of trying to be helpful to the vast majority of Legion members.

I believe that the preamble, the bylaws, and the constitution of the American Legion bear me out in this stand, and I challenge anyone to refute this analysis of the principles or the intent and purpose of the American Legion.

Now that the cobwebs have been cleared away and the truth behind this scandal has finally come to light, I believe that it is the duty of every veteran and Legionnaire to see to it that the factors that caused this great catastrophe in our veterans' hospitals be eradicated immediately without fear or favor and that safeguards be established to prevent such a situation from ever occurring again. Those who betrayed their trust should be ousted from office at once.

Without the assistance of Congressman GILLIE and a number of other legislators this matter might never have been corrected. Every veteran should be deeply grateful to these lawmakers who had the courage to help us in this fight.

The Potato Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal propagandists appear to be more than anxious to try to make the American people believe many things that are not true. Every day we hear about 35 percent more this and 40 percent more of that food that has been produced. It is an easy procedure to estimate production of 30 years ago when the census was the only meager fact-finding organization, and it is an easy matter to compare drought years with normal and abnormally favorable crop years and conclude how great the Washington boys really are. Everyone knows that 1942 through 1944 were years for exceptional favorable food production. The farmers did a great job, but they did it with good weather to help them and they did it in spite of all the New Deal handicaps from Washington.

The following table shows the potato production for the years 1939 through 1944:

Potatoes

[Thousand bushels]

State	Production					
	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Alabama	4,800	4,350	5,616	3,996	5,264	3,364
Arizona	196	240	273	562	1,170	1,342
Arkansas	3,000	3,813	3,024	3,619	4,543	3,196
California	21,705	21,820	19,541	23,130	27,895	33,250
Colorado	11,858	13,065	12,529	17,020	18,531	18,779
Connecticut	2,918	3,034	2,772	3,016	3,190	3,408
Delaware	320	443	300	335	308	273
Florida	3,868	4,481	3,341	4,116	3,703	3,445
Georgia	1,541	1,728	1,300	1,782	2,170	1,363
Idaho	27,690	32,640	27,450	20,590	43,470	36,675
Illinois	3,330	3,471	3,240	3,528	2,170	1,800
Indiana	5,280	5,145	5,750	6,480	4,100	3,115
Iowa	5,152	5,880	5,508	6,600	5,238	2,470
Kansas	2,080	2,352	2,530	2,700	2,730	1,144
Kentucky	3,432	3,318	3,080	4,560	4,664	2,494
Louisiana	2,240	2,280	2,623	2,520	3,906	3,498
Maine	36,190	42,028	43,035	42,660	72,775	53,868
Maryland	2,100	2,320	1,920	2,019	1,980	1,824
Massachusetts	2,337	2,848	2,492	2,945	3,375	3,120
Michigan	20,962	17,548	20,020	16,562	22,365	18,360
Minnesota	19,024	22,227	16,068	18,050	23,571	15,334
Mississippi	1,386	1,188	1,380	1,917	1,904	2,210
Missouri	3,936	4,510	4,680	4,173	3,827	2,232
Montana	1,275	1,725	1,540	1,725	2,645	2,520
Nebraska	10,731	11,340	9,620	12,876	12,090	8,400
Nevada	339	391	432	483	680	544
New Hampshire	1,030	1,238	1,023	1,088	1,472	1,064
New Jersey	7,844	9,288	10,340	10,136	11,431	8,804
New Mexico	210	216	288	340	480	425
New York	26,069	28,457	27,676	27,676	29,645	26,445
North Carolina	8,200	8,532	6,640	9,434	12,100	6,970
North Dakota	12,410	17,710	15,015	17,955	22,100	20,875
Ohio	10,700	9,500	10,614	9,180	8,550	5,810
Oklahoma	1,944	2,310	1,982	2,244	2,501	2,015
Oregon	6,171	7,805	7,175	6,825	11,600	10,340
Pennsylvania	19,635	20,910	21,450	17,584	18,656	19,140
Rhode Island	838	916	920	975	1,085	1,235
South Carolina	2,712	3,048	2,548	3,108	3,193	1,464
South Dakota	2,106	1,800	1,740	2,816	3,680	2,550
Tennessee	3,268	3,476	2,604	3,564	4,380	2,464
Texas	2,806	3,536	6,039	4,675	6,375	5,016
Utah	2,099	2,193	1,904	2,312	3,430	2,765
Vermont	1,626	1,820	1,740	1,473	1,825	1,656
Virginia	7,980	10,804	6,808	7,242	9,594	5,976
Washington	7,067	8,610	8,820	7,800	13,200	10,340
West Virginia	2,816	3,465	3,584	3,808	2,775	2,040
Wisconsin	15,470	13,680	14,378	10,050	16,368	11,844
Wyoming	1,729	2,275	2,250	2,240	2,295	2,170
United States total	342,420	375,774	355,602	370,489	464,999	379,436

In 1934 there was a potato crop of over 400,000,000 bushels. In the 1930's we find, in 1931, 384,000,000 bushels produced; in 1932, 374,000,000 bushels produced. No marked increase in production has occurred except what was evidently the result of favorable weather conditions and an increased acreage. The 376,000,000 produced in 1940 and the 379,000,000 bushels produced in 1944 do not show any 10 percent increase in production we hear so much about in the press.

The acreage planted, harvested, and yield per acre for the years 1936 through 1944 is shown in the following table:

Potato acreage and yield

	Acres planted	Acres harvested	Yield per acre
1936	3,127	2,960	109
1937	3,119	3,055	123
1938	2,994	2,870	124
1939	2,867	2,813	121
1940	2,900	2,845	132
1941	2,768	2,711	131
1942	2,790	2,711	136
1943	3,440	3,331	139
1944	3,009	2,909	130

This table shows the increase in acreage in 1943 and 1944. You will note a gradual increase in acre yield. This was possibly due to favorable weather conditions, guaranteed floor prices, and to some increase in fertilizer application. Since the fertilizer has been allocated on a historical basis rather than on the basis of increased food production, the demand for fertilizers for potato production has not been filled. Due to many causes the increase in fertilizer production for domestic food use has not been very greatly increased.

THE POTATO PROGRAM

The potato program with its support price and its nonrecourse loans for some of the years no doubt increased production. In 1941 and 1942 the funds were used to curtail or control potato production, while in 1943 and 1944 the funds were used to stimulate production. The incentive for the 1944 production of $22,000,000 expended largely in 1944 represented less than a 5 cents per bushel for the 464,000,000 bushels produced in 1943. The inability of the housewife to procure potatoes in the market place in the winter of 1942 and 1943 and the prices that prevailed, should have justified the potato program of 1943 and 1944 without too much criticism. The official expenditures in the potato program are as follows:

Cost of potato program, by fiscal years, 1941–45

	White potatoes
1941	$5,687,078.09
1942	1,466,582.23
1943	139,754.70
1944	22,110,429.18
1945 [1]	22,096.10
Total	29,425,940.30

[1] To March 31, 1945.

THE TARIFF SITUATION

The facts regarding the duty on potatoes imported for seed and table use are given in the following letter from Mr. Oscar B. Ryder of the United States Tariff Commission:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, June 11, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: I have your two letters of June 5 and 6, respectively, asking for data on imports and exports of potatoes, cheese, and wheat, and also for the present duties on potatoes.

Under the trade agreement with Canada, effective January 1, 1939, the duty on seed potatoes was reduced to 37½ cents per hundred pounds on an annual quota of 1,500,000 bushels. Imports in excess of the quota are subject to the original duty of 75 cents per hundred pounds. Under this same agreement the duty on other potatoes that is, table stock, was reduced to 37½ cents per hundred pounds during the period March to November, and 60 cents per hundred pounds for the remainder of the year. These rates apply to a quota of a million bushels. However, if in any given year the United States crop of potatoes, as of September 1, is estimated by the Department of Agriculture to be less than 350,000,000 bushels, the quota for the following year beginning September 15 may be increased by an amount equal to that difference. In no year under the agreement has the September 1 crop estimate been less than 350,000,000 bushels, so that the tariff quota on table stock potatoes has remained at 1,000,000 bushels. Entries in excess of the quota are subject to the original duty of 75 cents per hundred pounds. The duty on potatoes imported from Cuba is 30 cents per hundred pounds. There is no tariff quota on Cuban potatoes, and imports from Cuba are not charged against the quota established under the agreement with Canada.

I am enclosing herewith tables showing the imports and exports of cheese, wheat, and potatoes.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

White or Irish potatoes: United States imports for consumption, by kinds, 1938–44 and January-March 1945

Year	White or Irish potatoes			
	Certified seed		Other than certified seed	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
	Bushel (60 lbs.)		*Bushel (60 lbs.)*	
1938	726,890	$529,149	36,782	$52,080
1939	1,301,529	1,293,070	262,791	233,588
1940	843,137	828,292	481,257	443,257
1941	744,882	549,262	188,902	141,179
1942	770,056	856,956	14,177	34,656
1943 [1]	[2] 1,056,478	[2] 1,433,980	[2] 71,602	[2] 99,212
1944 [1]	1,941,393	2,739,446	[2] 3,446,516	[2] 3,826,111
1945 (January–March [1])	983,367	1,394,645	2,311,344	3,061,528

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Includes imports entered free of duty under "Provisions, title 34, U. S. C., sec. 568," and Executive Order 9177—Emergency purchases of war materials abroad, by agencies of the U. S. Government as follows:

Duty free R. M.	1943		1944	
	Bushels (60 lbs.)	Value	Bushels (60 lbs.)	Value
Certified seed	12,265	$25,757	.....	.....
Other than certified seed	3,964	8,940	4,660	$2,796

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

White potatoes: United States exports of domestic merchandise, 1938–44 and January-March 1945

Year	Quantity	Value
	Bushel (60 lbs.)	
1938	2,082,554	$1,465,208
1939	2,686,604	2,252,068
1940	2,593,704	1,958,943
1941	2,655,620	2,293,418
1942	1,764,445	2,759,703
1943 [1]	2,363,584	4,431,121
1944 [1]	1,979,204	3,588,019
1945 (January–March) [1]	162,209	347,768

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. Ryder's letter shows that, first, the duty on certified seed potatoes was reduced to 37½ cents per hundredweight, or 22.55 cents per bushel on seed potatoes for the first 1,500,000 bushels imported; 75 cents per hundredweight or 45 cents per bushel is the duty for additional imports; second, the duty on table stock potato imports was reduced to 37½ cents per hundredweight or 22¼ cents per bushel up to 60 cents per hundredweight, or 36 cents per bushel for the first million bushels imported; third, there is no quota on Cuban imports and the duty is 30 cents per hundredweight or 18 cents per bushel.

A State such as Maine that has produced 15 percent of the Nation's potatoes, and where a specialized crop system of farming is followed, and where the normal market for the potatoes is also close to the source of imports has reason to watch this duty situation. This also particularly applied to Idaho as well as some other states. Will Idaho potatoes, requiring a long freight haul, be able to compete with Canadian potatoes if the duty is cut to 11⅛ cents per bushel?

Here, then, is the question: If trade treaties are to be the result of one man's opinion, exactly what is the situation going to be in the future? If this crop is attracted to the United States market to such an extent as to pay even the 75 cents per bushel duty, what will happen if the duties are reduced by 50 percent as provided in H. R. 3140, or to 11⅛ cents per bushel? States like Idaho will be the first to feel this reduction and duty juggling.

Certain people in the Agriculture Department now propound this question: How is the 90-percent floor on potatoes for 2 years after the war going to be provided? If we have unlimited domestic production which will depress the price below the 90-percent parity floor price guaranteed by law, the thinkers now suggest they could pay a subsidy to the farmer for the difference between the market price and the 90-percent parity guaranteed legal price. This method would discourage imports.

These are serious questions and are one more reason why the Congress should not pass H. R. 3240 or disturb the duty rates. The first obligation is to iron out the domestic economic difficulties that are to be faced in maintaining the 90-percent parity floor of the domestic agricultural set-up.

Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editor with his feet on the ground and a knowledge of what the homefolks are thinking gives his views of the drive for universal conscription. In the Cassopolis Vigilant, William H. Berkey writes as follows:

We note the propaganda for universal conscription of every boy in the United States for a year of military training in order that we may be prepared for the next war, or, by such manpower, to avoid war. We know there are some good arguments in favor of this program, but let us examine the subject a bit more closely, for there are certain facts that should be taken into consideration. France had a large standing army, prepared for war, and was licked in a few weeks. England had a large military and naval force, but suffered severe defeat in Europe. Germany had the largest and best equipped military machine in Europe, but what has Germany now? Italy also had a large war machine, but to no avail. The United States had only the skeleton of a military force when we entered the war, but United States raised and equipped its own Army, Navy and Air Force in addition to largely equipping the British, Russians and French, and the American forces played a major part in defeating Germany while at the same time conducting a mighty war against Japan. Could we have done any better if we had followed Hitler's plan and subjected all our boys to military training? We wonder. It certainly is an outstanding fact that American youth which had not been regimented by its Government took on military training rapidly and when in action exercised more initiative and individual responsibility than the Hitler youth trained in a military groove. It is said that we might be attacked suddenly when we were wholly unprepared; but wars do not come suddenly; there are always war clouds which warn of coming storm; there were plenty of indications of the coming war in Europe, and plenty of evidence of the coming trouble with Japan, and had our Government heeded those warnings we could have been better prepared than we were.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. Charles M. Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a Memorial day address by State Senator Charles M. Mills, of Jaffrey, N. H., delivered at Keene, N. H.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recently the legislature adopted a new State emblem and motto. The Old Man of the Mountains is encircled with the name of our State above while below is the great phrase "Live free or die." These immortal words were uttered by the first general from New Hampshire, John Stark, while rallying New Hampshire boys in the early struggles of the Revolution. Here were the lads from Keene, Rindge, Jaffrey, and the Connecticut River towns trying to repel the hated redcoats from old New England. Here were the men who refused to pay taxes to a foreign king without adequate representation. Here were brave pioneer women toiling to provide homespun clothing to keep their men warm even in the deep snows of the severe winter and humbly praying God to give courage and comfort to the men at the front. Here were tiny communities formed by people 3,000 miles from their homeland who knew that defeat meant disaster. They knew full well they must "Live free or die."

What more fitting words could be spoken on Memorial Day! We, too, know that America and her Allies must live free or die. For this day brings new meaning to our Nation. This is the most solemn Memorial Day in our history. During the past year 220,000 white crosses have been erected in the uttermost parts of the world. In the far reaches of the islands of the Pacific, in the lonely wastes of Alaska and Iceland, in the desert sands of Africa, in the mountain snows of Italy, on the beaches of Normandy, in the horror camps of Germany, lie those who have made the supreme sacrifice. For them there is no other day than Memorial Day. For them there is no joyous homecoming to hearthside and family, to baseball games on the corner lot, to movies with their best girl, to win a new job. For them there is no worship in the village church, no chance to love and marry and raise children for the peace that is to come. For us, they have lived and died to make us free.

URGES SELF-EXAMINATION

What have we done at home for such sacrifice? Have we made our homes better for the boys who shall return? Have we done our full share in factory and fireside to make our town a better place to live? Have we done our part in salvage, in giving blood to the wounded, in buying bonds, in abiding by the rules of rationing, or have we tried to cut corners through black markets, in beating the gun with our rationing boards, in lying down on the job and saying the war is over? For Memorial Day should remind us anew that we still have a long and tough struggle ahead. Every day on Okinawa 150 Americans die. We cannot and we must not rest in our efforts at home until the barbaric and uncivilized Japs are knocked clear out of the picture. If we malinger and stall, the very sacrifice that has been made will go for nothing. This Memorial Day, therefore, should be a day of self-examination, of searching of our conscience, of reverence rather than celebration.

Our legislature, which has just finished its tasks, has provided new laws for veterans in protecting them in their property right, in liberalizing the State Bonus Act, in guaranteeing reemployment for returning veterans in civil-service, county, municipal, and town jobs. Probably two-thirds of the veterans will want new jobs or more training. More than $600,000 was appropriated for the next 2 years for area training schools and a State trade school. The Veterans' Council, treating the individual cases of veterans and their families, has been vastly enlarged.

However, we must see that politically encrusted bureaucracy does not tie the veteran up with miles of red tape. The real job, in my opinion and through my experience in the last war, is not to coddle or overcomfort the returning GI, but to make him feel at home. Let him seek his own way, don't pester him with questions about his war experiences. If he wants to talk with you he will, but most veterans want to forget, if possible, what they have seen and experienced. Nine out of ten veterans want peace at home as well as abroad.

MUST GUARD FUTURE

Yet we cannot "Live Free or Die" without giving thought to our future as a nation. We all hope and pray for a quick understanding out of the international conferences leading to eventual world peace. We must guard, however, against being involved too quickly with intricate problems which men have struggled with for a thousand years, like the Polish question. Isolationism is a dead cat. Science and the airplane have made the world one community whether we like it or not. We must learn to live with our neighbors even though we don't like the way the English speak or the economic system of the Russian Government. We must come to realize that we have no other place to go. We cannot move away, as we can in civil life, because our neighbors make too much noise. We must make the best of the situation where God has placed us and strengthen all international efforts for better mutual understanding like Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and San Francisco.

At the same time, to live free in this modern world with flying bombs at 400 miles an hour and planes with rockets which may shortly do more than a thousand, we must maintain a mighty military establishment. The day when a million men could spring to arms overnight is gone forever. We only can remain strong in our freedom by reality and not by substance. We must remain true to the cause of freedom everywhere. We must never forget the white crosses throughout the world, not only on Memorial Day but night and day. We must keep the faith imposed upon us by the dead.

"God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far-flung battle line,
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine,
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet
Lest we forget, lest we forget.

"The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart;
Still stands our ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

A Meeting With President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, which very accurately appraises a meeting with President Truman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEETING WITH PRESIDENT TRUMAN

WASHINGTON, D. C.—(Editorial correspondence.)—The recent meeting of the Board of Directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors brought along with it an invitation from the White House for the 14 editors present to meet and converse with President Truman.

There was also the opportunity to discuss face to face with the top-ranking military authorities the war situation. Admiral King was a guest of the directors at a luncheon meeting and General Marshall at dinner.

What was told us can, of course, not be repeated but there is no censorship imposed upon statements of impressions obtained through these contacts. All of these consultations were off the record.

Leaving the White House after a somewhat prolonged chat with the President, one of the editors summed the case up in a capsule when he said that "it has been a long time since we have visited here in an atmosphere of complete ease."

Much could be written in elaboration of that statement, but little more needs to be added.

Many of these same editors, over a period of several years, had similarly visited President Roosevelt. Sometimes when they held their convention in Washington, the entire membership of the society attending went in a body to the White House. On other occasions President Roosevelt would come to their annual banquet as chief honor guest and speaker.

These contacts were always outwardly pleasant, jovial, and agreeable, but they were somewhat inwardly reserved, if not strained.

Mr. Roosevelt had often, and in many public statements, severely criticized American newspapers as being hostile to him and to his philosophy and program of government. It must be honestly confessed that not all of this feeling on his part was unjustified.

As a result of how he felt toward the press and of how he thought the press felt toward him, a sort of social and professional barrier became built up on the occasions of these mutual visits.

President Truman, however, indicates no preconceived judgments as to how he will be treated by the American newspapers. Time has not come for that.

During the short while he has been in the White House, national political questions have not been paramounted. People generally seem to feel kindly and sympathetic toward him. They realize that he has come into the kingdom in a day of continuingly grave crises. No deep-seated prejudices against him are felt. So far as his Presidential office and its duties are concerned, he is still in the honeymoon period.

The editors found him exceedingly charming and gracious.

In the President's circular office he met his guests with an air of complete informality. Shaking hands with each as the group came in the door, he finally seated himself upon his desk instead of his chair, crossed his legs and with a beaming smile welcomed them and began to talk freely and easily.

In answering the questions of his visitors he was direct and precise, clearcut, and unevasive. He spoke plainly in a quiet conversational tone of voice and usually with a broad and infectious smile.

Always he indicated complete self-confidence and certainty of his own position. There was never any hesitation or backing and filling. Quickly and spontaneously he expressed his opinions, stated his views and outlined his position on many vital national and international problems.

Not once did he excuse himself for not giving a reply to an inquiry. Not once did he resort to the strategy of remarking that "you have thrown me into water over my head on that one" or "I must speak now very much off the record."

One of the most vivid impressions one gains from such a visit is that of the President's vivacity and aggressiveness. Although 60 years of age, he looks much younger and his laughter is almost boyish in its robustness.

Mr. Truman is, of course, as yet unwearied by the pressures of his vast responsibilities, but he is not unmindful of their gravity. It is as if he had slung them all across his back and was on his way up hill with his heavy burden without having gone so far along the tedious climb as to be in the least fatigued or, for that matter, in any manifest sense overborne by their massive dimensions.

The President surely has full comprehension of what his leadership, both national and international, will impose upon his powers, both of body and mind, but he is clearly facing them with great courage, stout heart and obvious reassurance.

Early impressions of him may change later, but these editors, most of whom are politically of an opposite household, were tremendously pleased, and one has the feeling that the American people generally are having the same reaction.

Mr. Truman is dominantly of a practical mind and proposes to be the head of an administration whose feet are on the ground and whose policies will make sense insofar as it is humanly possible to adopt intelligent policies for an era as confused, complex and chaotic as this in which his leadership lot has been cast.

It may confidently be assumed by the American people that President Truman will more than hold his own in grappling with the international problems which are immediately ahead.

He will speak the American language when he meets with Churchill and Stalin in the coming conference. It will be the language of forthrightness, of directness, and of blunt plainness.

This is especially true of the manner in which he will approach the Russian political mind.

Mr. Truman is going to be patient and long-suffering with Russia because he quite well understands that language barriers have been largely contributory to many misunderstandings and frictions.

And he wants the American people to be that way too toward Russia. His major striving in the international field will be directed to the end of projecting the same spirit of unity established among the Allied Nations in the prosecution of the war into the tedious and laborious enterprises of perfecting a durable peace for all the world.

It is refreshing, of course, to feel that the President is such a devout believer himself in the achievement of world peace and that, so far as lies within his powers and backed by the resources of good will among his people, he will labor unremittingly toward that end.

This, he seems to realize, is largely his own responsibility.

No better proof of this assumption is to be found than in the circumstance that he looked beyond his own State Department and sent personal envoys both to London and Moscow in order to deal directly with the heads of those states in connection with current pressing problems among these major governments.

At the time of our visit he was eagerly awaiting the return of these errand runners, Davies to London and Harry Hopkins to Moscow, and was quite sure then in his own mind that they would achieve the mission on which they had been dispatched.

Concerning domestic issues and problems, President Truman seems to be bent on charting his own course rather than in following to pinpoint precision those which he inherited from the preceding President.

This is not to intimate that many of the advanced social and economic philosophies of the late President will not be retained, but it is to say that in those areas in which they are retained Mr. Truman will strive for sounder and more practical administration.

The feeling is somewhat general that in the working out of the guiding principles upon which his political leadership will be based he will endeavor to swing both the leftists and the rightists more nearly toward the dead center.

He is himself no rank reactionary nor fanatical liberal.

Of course, the new President has not waded far into these deep and turbulent waters, but one instinctively feel that his over-all determination is to see that justice is done to all and that no particular group is favored to the utter exclusion of the best interests of some other.

Hailing from the vast plains of the Middle West, Mr. Truman is as breezy as the winds that play their sprightly symphonies through their forests and as open-hearted as its vast plains are expansive.

He is giving the American people the idea that, above all things else, he is honest, simple, conscientious, and that he will do his best to lead the Nation out of its present travails and up to the high hills of a finer day for the future.

High-Stake Steaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes from the Washington Daily News of June 6, 1945; also an editorial from the Washington Post of June 11, 1945:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of June 6, 1945]

HIGH-STAKE STEAKS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Everybody has a complaint about OPA. Some of them are justified. It's not perfect. It could never be perfect. Its job is an almost impossible one in a complex economy in the midst of war.

Right now it's the scarcity of meat—good red meat—that we complain about most. There are folks in the big cities in the East, including this one, who have not seen the likes of a steak for weeks, and there are children, including my own 5-year-old son, who probably would not know what a steak was if it were brought, hot and sizzling and dripping with butter, to the table. (Where did I get that butter?)

This is annoying. Something's wrong and something ought to be done about it.

A steak sure would taste good. We know it and lots of other folks know it. Some of them are ready to use our longing for a steak and other things, our little grievances about OPA, to try to break down the price-control

machinery which, despite its faults, has kept living costs down and warded off inflation like that of the last war and afterward.

After all, it is human nature for businessmen and farmers to want to let off the brakes and have a killing, even though they've done very nicely. Corporation profits, even after taxes, were double last year what they were before the war. Small businessmen, too, have done well. So have farmers, with a net income 165 percent above 1939.

A steak would taste mighty good, but is this the time to sell ourselves out for one?

The war on OPA, which is just beginning in Congress, first in the Senate, is employing an insidious strategy. The slogan of OPA's enemies is "OPA is all right, but—" There are some who would vote an extension for only 3 or 6 months longer. When, they say, Congress could take another look.

That may sound persuasive. But don't be fooled.

OPA expires June 30, unless Congress extends it. The administration bill would continue it another year. This is regarded as essential to carry through the Jap war and the period of readjustment.

Others in Congress would amend the law in divers ways. Senator THOMAS, Democrat, of Oklahoma, would establish a price structure to guarantee a profit on single items, instead of on the over-all operation. Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, is proposing one of similar import.

Amendments of this character, according to OPA Administrator Chester Bowles, would start a vicious circle of price increases, which then would call for wage increases and lead, in the end, to inflation.

Congress already has gone over the Price Control Act, provision by provision, three times. It has made many changes. The OPA is trying to meet problems administratively, without further changes in law. Many leaders in Congress think this the proper procedure.

Mr. Bowles and administration leaders envisage a confusion should the law be extended for only 3 to 6 months.

The inflation pressure now is far heavier than during and just after the last war. The worst of that inflation came after the war. Anybody who lived through that era of high prices should not have to be warned, nor should he have to be reminded that it was followed by a collapse, the depression of 1920–21, with unemployment, foreclosure, and bankruptcy.

It looks like too high a stake for a steak.

[From the Washington Post of June 11, 1945]

ATTACKING PRICE CONTROL

This week the Senate expects to act on two amendments to the resolution extending price control that would, in the opinion of Price Administrator Bowles, result in an inflationary advance in prices and a complete breakdown of control, Senator ELMER THOMAS' amendment—the more drastic of the two—would make mandatory the establishment of ceiling prices high enough to cover all costs, overhead expenses, and reasonable profits for every processor of agricultural products on each major processed product or item. The Taft amendment would provide similar protection for manufacturers by requiring that ceiling prices cover costs of major items and allow the same dollar margins over costs as were received in 1941 by the industry in question.

Adoption of the Thomas amendment would, it is evident, necessitate setting an over-all ceiling price high enough to assure a profit to the least efficient, highest-cost producer of agricultural products. Or, as an alternative, OPA would have to compute costs and profit allowances for countless "major" products (whatever that may mean) of countless individual producers, and fix different ceiling prices for each one. Obviously the OPA would be swamped by such an accountancy undertaking, to say nothing of the disastrous consequences from the viewpoint of the consumer. The Taft amendment avoids this kind of individual pricing, but its insistence upon profits for an industry on the basis of a year of inflated peacetime earnings would certainly have a price boosting effect. Indeed, that is its purpose.

This conclusion is borne out by an exchange between Senator ELLENDER, who led the fight against the amendment, and the senior Senator from Ohio. The former asked whether Senator TAFT believed ceiling prices for steel should be set high enough to take care of a marginal 4 percent of producers even if that entailed raising the swollen profits of the great majority. The answer was "Yes." And Mr. TAFT added that he favored giving low-cost producers the benefit of prices of high-cost producers "because that is the whole basis on which our economy operates." That, of course, is true in normal times when prices are not subjected to governmental controls. But it is also true that in normal times high-cost and inefficient producers are constantly being weeded out, because they are unable to meet the competition of the more efficient.

To fix ceiling prices in times of scarcity at levels that assure profits to the high-cost marginal units would certainly not bring about a return to the free-pricing system of which Mr. TAFT dreams. Quite the contrary—it would in effect guarantee profits to the least efficient and permit the most efficient to rake in excess returns at consumer expense. The widespread price increases that would probably follow would entail advances in living costs and give impetus to the drive for wage increases. In short, we conclude it is not exaggerating to say that adoption of either of the two pricing formulas proposed would set in motion inflationary developments that would spell the end of effective price control.

In so concluding we do not mean to imply that the OPA is above criticism. For there is much force in Senator TAFT's argument that OPA has squeezed distributors in some instances unduly in its effort to keep living costs down in face of rising labor and raw materials costs. There is also force in the contention that it is most important during the reconversion period to set ceiling prices sufficiently high to allow adequate profits to be obtained on specific items of output; otherwise productive activity would be stifled. For, barring subsidies, a manufacturer will not voluntarily produce goods to sell at a loss or at profits that do not satisfy him, even if his over-all business profits are entirely adequate.

The current criticism of OPA's pricing methods has, therefore, been worthwhile as a reminder of the problems that lie ahead of us. Indeed, the discussion of the controversial amendments now before the Senate has already borne fruit. For it has brought assurances from OPA that textile manufacturers will be allowed reasonable profit margins on each major item produced and that a separate profitable price basis will be set for each of the three major types of meat.

At this stage of the war, the only safe and sensible thing to do is to extend price-control legislation without attaching hampering amendments, thus leaving the OPA free to modify its policies as changing conditions require. It is much too late in the day to try to effect radical changes in pricing policies which are designed to maintain stable costs of living, despite increases in labor costs and in agricultural prices at the farm level. Extensive subsidization has been necessary to combine that objective with efforts to encourage production of essential commodities. No doubt Senator TAFT's hostility to the subsidy program accounts in part for his efforts to impose a price-boosting ceiling formula upon the OPA that would remove the need for subsidies.

From the long-range viewpoint his criticisms deserve careful consideration. But for the duration of the existing emergency the lid ought to be kept tight on retail prices if we are to escape the evils of postwar inflation. The OPA will then be in a position to make necessary adjustments gradually, keeping in mind that our ultimate goal is release from price control as soon as feasible after VJ-day.

Government Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. WILSON

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 19 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Subsidy," which appeared in the Atlantic News-Telegraph, of Atlantic, Iowa, in June 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUBSIDY

Most dangerous of all the economic cure-alls advocated by the New Deal is the subsidy. It is like a habit forming drug which produces illusions of well being, lulling the recipients with a false feeling of security, but doing nothing to cure the economic ills with which the nation is afflicted. Once the subsidy habit is acquired, it is tremendously hard to break. Subsidies once granted become permanent with monotonous regularity.

Under the New Deal the subsidy is the most popular potion in the handling of economic ills. Let the processor get pinched between ceiling prices and increasing costs and he is given a subsidy. Let the need for a special farm product arise and a subsidy was offered as an inducement to produce it. Let an industry be twisted out of economic balance by any force whatsoever and a subsidy is offered as a corrective. Today almost any group can weep upon the shoulder of Uncle Sam and win a subsidy of some sort.

It is easier for a wealthy nation like the United States to give a subsidy than it is for it to dig out the solution for the economic ills which calls for this sort of financial pain killer. But subsidization is a short-sighted policy, as history has proved time and time again. Eventually the program will destroy its instigators. Rome offered free corn to the populace, and before long the farmers found it was easier to move to the city and receive free corn than it was to raise the corn themselves. Thus the agricultural class, which was the backbone of the nation, became so weakened and listless that its condition became one of the contributing factors in the collapse of the nation.

Eventually subsidies will destroy both the recipient and the donor. The more who receive them, the more there are who demand them and the establishment based upon subsidization becomes like an inverted pyramid with the number of supporters steadily dwindling while the number of those who receive grows proportionately larger, until the producers are completely crushed by the weight of the consumers and the whole

program falls of its own weight, taking the nation down with it.

This country has not progressed very far along this happy road to ruin, but unless the trend changes our nation, like those others of other times which have used the subsidy as the answer to every economic problem, will sink into oblivion.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Star of June 15, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The Polish question, which has caused so much ill feeling between Washington and London on one side and Moscow on the other, is expected to be settled to the satisfaction of the Big Three in the near future.

However, it is an open question whether the Poles themselves will like it.

The Crimea agreement dealing with formation of a Polish National Government was couched so loosely that it could have been interpreted in any manner each of the signatories desired. There was a tendency in American and British official circles to read in it the meaning that an entirely new government selected by representatives of the Big Three would be formed as soon as possible.

Moscow's interpretation was that it should preserve the administration sponsored by the U. S. S. R. to which should be added a number of hand-picked Poles from inside and outside Poland. When a number of names were suggested by the American and British representatives in Moscow, they were rejected by Russia and the situation became stalemated.

The agreement just reached between Harry Hopkins and Premier Stalin reportedly has been endorsed also by the British Government and provides a face-saving device for the western allies rather than an actual solution to the core of the problem. This problem fundamentally is whether Poland will become a puppet state with strings in the hands of the Soviet leaders or an actual free and independent country.

Everything appears to point to the fact that while a "paper solution" will be found, the sovereignty of Poland at the best will remain questionable.

The conversations slated to open Friday in Moscow will be attended by the following groups: The members of the Lublin committee who are already in office and have been recognized by the U. S. S. R. as the official government of Poland; some Polish political men who remained in the country during its occupation by the Germans, and finally a few Poles who reside in London and at one time—as is the case of former Premier Mikolajczyk—have been in the government in exile.

It is noteworthy, however, that not a single member of the Polish Government in London—the one still recognized by the United States, Great Britain, and the rest of the United Nations except Russia—has been selected to attend the meeting which will decide on the establishment of a National Polish Government, and be recognized immediately by the rest of the world.

Premier Arciszewsky, for instance, has an excellent anti-Nazi record, as far as is known here. He performed the duties of premier in the Polish underground "ghost cabinet." The underground had shown itself to be 100 percent loyal to all allies, including, of course, the U. S. S. R.

The test of how sovereign Poland will become after the present Warsaw administration has been "expanded" will come very soon.

In the Moscow agreements signed in 1943 by former Secretary of State Hull, Britain's Foreign Secretary Eden, and Russia's Foreign Commissar Molotov, it was provided specifically that the Big Three would withdraw their armies of occupation from the liberated countries at the end of the hostilities in Europe. The American and British foreign secretaries insisted on the inclusion of this declaration because they realized that there can be no free elections in any country so long as foreign armies are in control.

President Truman, at his press conference on Wednesday, intimated that soon after the organization of the new "broadened" government free elections would be held in Poland. These cannot be really free so long as the Red Army occupies the country.

It is recognized by the American and British Governments that Russia might have to maintain an army of occupation in her zone in Germany for some time—probably until after a peace conference has decided the exact frontier delimitation of the former Reich. It also is recognized that in order to maintain safe lines of communication a certain number of troops will have to be maintained in Poland.

But the real test of the agreement which Mr. Hopkins has brought back from Moscow will come when the Polish Government requests the withdrawal of the bulk of the Red Army from Poland, with the exception of the troops necessary to maintain an uninterrupted traffic between the Russian bases and the armies of occupation in the Reich.

Not a Cure-All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some of you may remember the old days of your childhood when a talkative, entertaining young man traveled the countryside with a high-stepping team, a gasoline torch, his conveyance filled with Wahoo, Swamproot, or an equally potent remedy. In the evening he would preempt a prominent road or street intersection, soon have around him a wide-eyed throng intent on listening to his fervid appeal to purchase his remedies and so cure all their physical ills. All the ills to which the flesh is subject—no matter what they were—could and would be cured if the bystander would only part with a dollar in return for a pint or 2 pints of any one of the remedies offered.

The remedy usually contained, whatever the label, a large proportion of alcohol, some paregoric or laudanum—always an opiate or sedative of some character—and beyond question if one took enough of it, he was for the moment free from care. But the "cure" never cured and in the end the deceived citizen went back to his family doctor, somewhat the worse for the experience.

Today our people no longer buy snake oil, patent medicines which are guaranteed to be a panacea for everything—they have grown more wary as experience has demonstrated the folly of expecting all the ills of body or mind to be forthwith cured by swallowing any concoction, no matter how attractively described, how prettily decorated. In another way we are still gullible, still looking for a guaranteed cure, easy to take.

War is a terrible, horrible thing, always leaving famine, pestilence, suffering, destruction in its wake. So it is that people and nations should earnestly and at all times seek a way to avoid war.

Down through the centuries some 8,000 treaties and agreements have been made, all having as an objective the end of war, a permanent peace. The present effort labeled "Dumbarton Oaks," "Yalta," the "San Francisco Conference," or whatever it may ultimately be called, is another praiseworthy effort to end war. It is a sedative—not a cure.

Every mother who has lost a son, who fears a future war may take a son, is praying that we be shown the way to avoid war. She is fiercely determined there shall never be another war if her efforts can prevent. Every sensible individual wants to help toward that objective. Unfortunately, the lessons of history, the experiences of mankind show that wars have not been prevented by international agreements—such agreements help but are not a cure.

The press of June 11 reported Gen. George Patton, Jr., in his home church at San Gabriel, to a group of Sunday school children, as saying:

> You kids are the soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the next war; * * * And there'll be another war because there have always been wars.

The general cannot be charged with disloyalty, as so many have been, because they recognized a reality.

While not only willing, but eager, to join a world-wide cooperative movement to end all war, believing as we do that the attainment of that objective is as yet impossible, many contend that we should do the next best thing, make ourselves secure against any and all aggressors. We believe that our form of government is the best yet devised to bring about the happiness, the freedom, the prosperity of the individual—the welfare of a nation. We are not ready to trade that form of government for any other which has demonstrated its inferiority in some other land. Believing that the people, every nation, should have the right to determine for themselves their own form of government, we contend that we not only should avoid interfer-

ence with the internal affairs of other nations, but should insist that others keep their hands out of our domestic policies. We go further and say that inasmuch as it is now acknowledged that we are the most powerful nation in all the world, with the best form of government, we should do everything within our power to maintain that position through the establishment and the maintenance of an invincible Army, Navy, and Air Force.

That we should on every front here at home fortify in every possible way our entire coastline, maintain an intelligence department, a group of scientists and military experts which will, so long as our Nation endures, make and keep us the most efficient, powerful nation in the world. We believe that we should be, at all times, prepared not to seek, but to meet any aggressor nation or group of nations. In short, while we are willing to experiment with any plan for peace, we cannot safely rely upon any plan or international organization for our national security. We must be prepared.

We still have faith in our people, in our form of government. We have confidence in our ability to protect our future. In our thoughts, our words, and our acts America shall ever be first.

Smaller Nations' Right on Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in the Washington Post of June 18 relating to a speech made in Boston, Mass., by the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, on the veto issue now before the San Francisco Conference:

SMALL NATIONS' RIGHT ON VETO—M'CORMACK

BOSTON, June 17.—United States Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader, tonight sided with the small nations on the veto issue now before the San Francisco Conference.

"The smaller nations are on the right side in this issue," he said. His statement:

"The representatives of the big nations—Big Five—at the San Francisco Conference should recognize the equitable position taken by the smaller nations on the last big issue remaining on the veto question.

"There is a large segment of Americans who feel that the veto power already agreed upon for the Big Five is too broad.

"There is a strong feeling on questions other than procedural concerning the Big Five that the better solution would have been a concurrent vote of four of the six representatives of the smaller nations on the council and three of the five of the Big Five.

"For any nation of the Big Five to have an absolute veto on future amendments or alterations to the Charter would tend toward international disorder, rather than the goal sought, international law and order.

"The smaller nations are on the right side of this issue.

"The Big Five can well afford to be considerate and understanding of the position of the smaller nations on this issue, and should compromise it in a satisfactory manner.

"Even the veto already agreed upon will have to be changed and liberalized later on in order that the international machinery established for peace can be successful from a long-range angle.

"The representatives of the Big Five should agree on a satisfactory solution of the remaining issue of the veto power of the Big Five."

St. Bernard's Centennial Sermon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most eloquent address and sermon delivered by Rev. Francis J. Carroll at the pontifical mass celebrating the centennial anniversary of St. Bernard's parish, Fitchburg, Mass.:

It is indeed a glorious event which brings His Excellency to us today, the hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the parish. This little unit of the great church of God brings to mind one day in our Lord's life when He was sitting by the side of the field teaching His listeners about the growth of the church He was founding among them. They were a common people so our Lord spoke a language they could easily understand. He called their attention to the mustard trees which were growing around them. They had planted the seeds of those trees, knew how tiny they were. They had watered, nurtured, and fertilized them as they grew. Now they saw them grown into such a shrub that the birds of the air could come and nest in their branches, strong enough so that man could climb among them. Such, Christ told them was the way His church would grow. He was beginning His church with these people. They knew they were unlettered and uneducated; they were oppressed, hated, and despised by the Romans. But even so, Christ promised that the church He would start with them as a beginning would grow into a structure which would embrace the whole world. The promise that Christ made that morning 1,900 years ago we see fulfilled right here in our own midst.

A hundred years ago a simple, hard-working, God-fearing group, in a manner hated, oppressed, and persecuted by their fellowmen, gathered again in the field nearby to worship their God, to participate in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass under the open canopy of Heaven. The mustard seed of that day has grown into this magnificent parish, a beautiful church reaching its spire to Heaven, schools to implant the knowledge of God in the minds of the little ones, convents to house those handmaids of the Lord who are doing the work so dear to His heart, teaching little ones to love Him. This work has been accomplished throughout the past century under the guidance of the pastors of the flock whom divine providence has sent to minister to you.

A hundred years ago Father Strain offered for the first time the holy sacrifice of the mass under the open canopy of heaven; Father Gibson, priest and scholar, erected the first humble church; and Father Foley, the priest of great faith and vision, built this present beautiful structure. In building a church of this type and size, others thought him foolhardy, but man of faith that he was, he had confidence in the promise of Christ that God would provide the increase. He built well, and left this magnificent structure for the glory of God and the service of the people. Father, later Bishop, Garrigan made one of the most important contributions to this parish organization of bringing to it the good Sisters of the Presentation, and opening the schools to train the minds of the little ones. Father, later Bishop, Feehan carried on the traditions of his predecessor with whom he had lived so long, increased the schools, and labored so faithfully in the cause of Christ that the Holy See called him to be supreme pastor of the flock in the neighboring diocese of Fall River.

Monsignor Donnelly, Father Donnelly as you knew him so long, whose memory you love and venerate, made St. Bernard's outstanding. He decorated the church, erected the beautiful high school, and by his interest and close supervision made its standard unsurpassed. By his love, energy, and devotion to you, he built a parish spirit that we by experience know is unequaled in the diocese. You can picture him in the years gone by standing at the entrance to the church and offering his greeting, calling you by your first name—Tom, Mary, Pat, and Ann; not only a word of greeting but a word of interest, a word of encouragement. He made you love your parish, made you proud of it, so that generation after generation has carried on the tradition of St. Bernard's. He so cared for the poor and needy through the work of the St. Vincent de Paul Society that it was his proudest boast that "St. Bernard's looks after its own." He instilled such a love of charity into your hearts that not only are your contributions to your parish needs most generous, but your gifts to the missions, your memberships in the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, your yearly contributions to the orphans, to the mission cooperative, and the Holy Father, I know the bishop will testify, are outstanding. This generosity is true not only of these, but of any worthy cause for which you are called upon to give.

Four years ago your present pastor, Father Curran, was sent by our most reverend bishop to carry on the traditions of his predecessors. The bishop chose well. Father Curran had no sooner appeared in our midst than the outstanding characteristic of his life made itself manifest—a burning love for the altar and the adornment and beauty of the house of God. His tireless energy has showed the result. He has taken up the mantle handed him by his saintly predecessors and carried on their noble traditions, beautifying the work that was left him. As a result, we love our parish, we are proud of it, justly boastful of it.

But all this was accomplished by the cooperation, devotion, sacrifice, and generosity of the thousands of the faithful during the past century. After all, it is the parishioners who make a parish. It is their toil, sacrifice, unselfishness, and the sharing of their material possessions under the grace of God that have made the growth of the church of God possible. We all can feel that we share in the wonderful results that we see today about us on the hundredth anniversary of a humble beginning.

Our Lord that day made another comparison to explain the effect and influence of His church. The kingdom of God, he said, is like leaven which a woman placed in her batch of dough until the whole was leavened. The women understood the comparison well.

Leaven was the yeast of old. Place some in a batch of dough, and immediately it changes its nature. It raises and makes light, palatable, and fit for food what would otherwise be heavy and insipid. This is what Christ promised His church would do to the masses of men. It would change man's nature, raise him, and elevate him from the depths of paganism to the heights of Christianity. Many of the effects of the leaven of Christ which those pioneers of a century ago planted in this community are evident. Young men have heard the call of Christ to take on the mantle of His priesthood and to labor for souls in this diocese, in the various religious orders, and the far-flung mission fields. Young women in this age of comfort and luxury have left home and friends, parents and relatives, and have entered the convent and the cloister to care for the aged and helpless, to minister to the sick and infirm, to mother the orphan, and to form little minds to know and love God.

The invaluable work of these chosen women is never adequately known or appreciated in life, it is only fully known and recorded in heaven. The leaven of Christ is seen in the countless numbers of men and women who have come here to the altar to pledge fidelity and loyalty to each other, to accept the souls God would entrust to their care and to bring up their children in the fear and love of God. The effect of the leaven of Christ which the first Catholics implanted in this community is seen in the thousands during the past century who have been brought to this baptismal font to have the saving waters of baptism poured over their heads and so to start their life as children of God and heirs of heaven. Thousands have entered the confessional to seek pardon and forgiveness. Hundreds of thousands have approached the altar rail to be nourished by the body of Christ. There are over 100,000 communions a year in St. Bernard's. That means a million in the last 10 years! How many in the past century? Tongues more eloquent than human are needed to describe the whole effect of the leaven planted by the first Catholics. We see but some of the self-evident results. The whole story can only be written on the golden pages of the book of heaven.

Oh, this is indeed a happy occasion in which we participate today, to see what a hundred years can do in the growth of Christ's church and the fulfillment of His promise.

Dear Excellency, in a few moments as Christ once more offering Himself to His Heavenly Father in the holy sacrifice of the mass, we join with you in the sincere and heartfelt act of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the graces and blessings He has bestowed upon us during the past century, and we of St. Bernard's pledge to you, and through you to Christ, our loyalty and cooperation. We shall continue to work and to sacrifice in the parish for the greater honor and glory of God and the sanctification and salvation of souls.

May God bless us all on this great day.

Olympia, Capital of the State of Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with President Truman's visit to Olympia, Wash., at the invitation of his old friend and former colleague in the Senate, and your former colleague in the House, Gov. Mon Wallgren, I thought that Members of the House might be interested in knowing something about this town which is suddenly in the news.

Olympia, the capital of the State of Washington, lies at the southern end of Puget Sound in western Washington, directly south of the densely populated Seattle-Tacoma metropolitan area and in the shadow of the scenic Olympic Mountains. It is located in the Third Congressional District of Washington, which I have the honor to represent. I know a great many of these fine, hospitable people personally and know that President Truman will receive a royal welcome.

Immediately south of Olympia is Tumwater, northern terminus of the Oregon Trail and the first American settlement north of the Columbia River. Thurston County, of which Olympia is also the county seat, was named for the Oregon Territory's first Congressman and was created by the Territorial legislature in 1852. During the next year the Washington Territory was formed and Olympia was made the capital. In 1944 the population was 15,000.

Built at a cost of over $11,000,000, the State capital group of seven buildings occupies a 12-acre tract in Oympia overlooking the Deschutes River and Budd Inlet. The design was selected in 1911 from plans submitted in a Nation-wide contest of architects. The first building, the Temple of Justice, was completed in 1919; and the Legislative Building, patterned after the National Capitol, was under construction from 1923 to 1928. With the opening of the Transportation Building in 1940, the group as originally designed was completed.

Olympia should become an important trading center for tourists and vacationists in the next decade because of its location at the hub of the Federal highway network serving the Olympic National Park and Mount Rainier National Park. In addition, the county and city have recreational and scenic attractions which should draw many vacationists.

Governor Wallgren has planned a full itinerary of vacation recreation for the President, including a possible trip down the scenic Quinault River to the Pacific Ocean in a dugout canoe manipulated by an Indian guide. Other possible trips include the Olympic National Park, Coulee Dam, Mount Rainier, a cruise on Puget Sound, and a visit to the Bremerton Navy Yard.

President Truman will find some relief from the National Capital's oppressive heat as Olympia has a typical Puget Sound climate of rather heavy rainfall, cool dry summers, and mild winters. At Olympia, annual precipitation averages 52 inches, less than 3 inches of which fall during the summer. Temperatures range from an average January minimum of 33° to an average July-August maximum of 77°.

The history of Thurston County is an interesting one. Tumwater, first American settlement north of the Columbia River, was founded a century ago. Despite attempts of the Hudson's Bay Co. to discourage pioneers from colonizing this territory, which the British were hoping to acquire, several families turned north from the Willamette Valley in 1854 and settled at Tumwater. When the boundary treaty was negotiated with Great Britain in 1846, the presence of these settlers supported the United States claim to territory north of the Columbia. Thurston County, named for the first Delegate to Congress from Oregon Territory, was created by the Oregon Territorial Legislature in 1852. Settlers in the newly opened area demanded separation from Oregon and in 1853 Washington Territory was created. Olympia, which had been founded in 1848, was made the capital.

In addition to being the State capital, Olympia is a terminus for lend-lease shipments to Russia and has been host to many ships flying the flag of the Soviets. During the early years of the war an important Army airfield was located there, and the city was a trading and recreational center for thousands of soldiers from Fort Lewis which is nearby. From Olympia have come over 10 percent of the population to serve in the Army and Navy of the United States, which is above the national average. Olympia has made great contributions to the war effort through its lumber and plywood mills, and its shipyards are busy turning out tugs for the Army.

Yes, in visiting Olympia, President Truman will find one of the most beautiful capital cities of any State in the Union.

Moral Effect of War Service

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, frequently we hear remarks about the demoralizing influence of service upon our boys, and particularly has that been true in connection with the hearings that have been held recently by the Postwar Military Policy Committee.

The Chief of Chaplains, Gen. Luther Miller, appeared before that committee a few days ago and made one of the finest and most reassuring statements I have ever heard about it. I think it will be reassuring not only to the Members of this Congress, but to the people of the country as a whole, to read the statement and I therefore ask unanimous consent to include the statement of the Chief of Chaplains as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my sole purpose in appearing before your committee is to shed what light I may on the question of the probable moral and spiritual effects of a year of military training upon our young men. I am certain that you gentlemen

share the deep concern of every parent on this point. While it is true that our primary consideration must be whether or not universal military training is essential to the security of our nation not even our defense should be purchased at the price of the moral disintegration of our young manhood. If I thought for a moment that a year of military training would destroy the morals of our men, I would oppose it with all my heart. As a parent and a clergyman, I could not do otherwise. But, this is not my conviction. On the contrary, as a chaplain with 26 years of experience working with our armed forces in peace and in war, at home and abroad, I am thoroughly convinced that far from being a menace to the moral and spiritual life of America, the proposed program of universal military training could serve to support and extend the efforts of the home, the church, and the community to enrich the character of our youth.

I think I have earned the right to say that I know the American soldier. I have lived with him in camps. I have served with him in combat. I have shared his work and his play; his joys and his sorrows; no one who has not been a chaplain can know how intimate is the association between a chaplain and his men. To us, they open their hearts. It is our high privilege to be in a real sense their closest friends. Out of the sacred intimacy of this experience extending over the years, I have come not only to know and to love these men, but to admire and respect them, as well. For this reason, I resent deeply the common and ill-considered imputation that the atmosphere of the Army degrades and debauches our youth. I do not refute this libel with words. Rather, I would point to the men now serving in our armed forces who have gone through not one, but many years of training and combat. They are the answer to such a calumny. I emphatically maintain that nowhere in our national life will you find a group of men whose character is less open to question than the soldiers with whom it is my privilege to serve. Granted that there are moral weaklings among them. Granted that some are vulgar and some vicious. This minority will find its counterpart on every college campus and in every civilian community, for the problem of juvenile delinquency is not localized in Army camps. But of the vast majority, I can say that if character means integrity, generosity, humility, courage and self-sacrifice, it would be difficult to equal and impossible to excel the moral and spiritual excellency of your boys and mine, who are now serving their country under circumstances far more trying than those to which trainees under the proposed program of universal military training would be subjected. The fire of war has tested the character of these men as nothing else could. They have not been found wanting.

Having said this, I hasten to add that it is not by mere chance that the morals of these men have been safeguarded and their characters strengthened. The results are due in no small measure to the policy and program of our Army and Navy which has always considered of primary importance the moral and spiritual welfare of the men committed to their care. It is extremely doubtful if our boys would have come through as clean and fine as they have if every effort had not been made to guard and guide them on their way. The efforts of the Army and Navy to this end are deserving of the highest praise and commendation. These efforts reflect the high character of the men entrusted with the training of our boys. I might pause here to enlarge on that point since the type of officers in our services is of supreme importance in considering the effects of the training upon the trainees. It has been my privilege through the years to serve as pastor to many of those who are now directing the Army in positions of authority and command and in whose hands will be the supervision of the program you are considering. In such a program, the training itself would be conducted by young officers carefully chosen from our reserves; college men, chiefly, who come from and return to civilian life selected not simply for their military knowledge, but also for their capacity to work with men. From my experience, I can state emphatically that there are in the American Army, no Prussianized militarists, hard-boiled and indifferent to the higher values of life. On the contrary, I have found the vast majority of them to be democratically minded Americans, faithful to the highest standards of Christian gentlemen. Their wholehearted support of the Army's religious program reflects their personal convictions. What they seek for their men, they accept for themselves. As they have earned the gratitude of our Nation for their professional excellency which has led us from the brink of disaster to the verge of victory in this war, so also they have merited the respect of our people for their personal character reflected in their lives and their leadership.

The program for the protection of our servicemen which they have sponsored and which will be continued and enlarged should universal military training be adopted is too complex to deal with in detail. Briefly it is based on the realization that the character building of youth whether at home, at school, or in military training is accomplished best by a threefold emphasis upon work, recreation, and worship.

One of the principal causes of juvenile delinquency is idleness. The busy boy is the best boy and in the training program, he will find plenty to keep him occupied. The work and study will be of a nature to inculcate habits of discipline, order, cooperation, and initiative which will come as valuable by-products of military training.

The leisure time of the trainee is also decisive in his moral growth. Well aware of this, the Army and Navy have developed an elaborate organization to serve this need. In few civilian communities or colleges could one find a more comprehensive program. It might well serve as a model for communities seeking to solve the problem of juvenile delinquency through provisions for the worthy use of leisure time. Much of the soldier's recreation will be found on the post itself. Here are the movies, with their thousands in attendance every night. Here are the athletic fields, tennis courts, swimming pools, gymnasiums with expert trainers and directors for the men. Here are the service clubs with their libraries, auditoriums, art classes, game rooms, and so on. You will find on the post none of the malodorous roadhouses, juke joints, or pool halls which contribute so largely to the problems of youth in civilian life. Instead there is provided a healthy, wholesome environment for recreation and entertainment at their best.

Naturally the soldier sometimes leaves the post and seeks diversion in nearby communities just as he would if he were in college. Here he meets the same temptations which exist in his own home town, but without the restraining influence of home and family as is also true of the college student. But unlike our universities, the Army seeks to provide protection to its men when they are off duty. Every effort is made to clean up communities adjacent to Army camps. Much more could be done with the cooperation of these communities which is sometimes tragically lacking. Much more will be done in days of peace since it must be remembered that the present problems in communities close to camps are problems common to all of wartime America and are unfortunately just as prevalent around war industries as Army establishments. The important point is that the Army does what it can to control these conditions and protect the men in uniform.

In considering the moral and spiritual environment of our youth in training, however, the most important consideration must be the positive influence for good which surrounds them through the chaplain. As never before in our history and as in no other military force in the world, our Government has provided for our men in service the finest of religious advantages. It is no exaggeration to say that our boys in the Army and Navy come into more vital contact with the ministry of religion than they ever did or could at home, and this is in no sense a criticism of the civilian church. It is simply a statement of fact and is due to the circumstances of military life which permit the chaplain to come into more intimate association with his men than would be possible in his peacetime pastorate.

With every sizable unit of the Army and Navy there is a chaplain. His duties are exclusively religious. He has one job and only one, and that is to minister to the religious needs of his men. He has none of the many duties which distract the civilian pastor from his primary task. For example, he does not have to concern himself with finances. His salary, his church, and his equipment from the cross on the altar to the car he rides in are provided by the Government. Everything possible is done to free him for the all-important spiritual ministry to the men. Moreover the chaplain lives with his men. He eats with them, sleeps with them, works with them, and shares their experiences in a way impossible to the civilian pastor. The relationship of a chaplain with his men is more closely analogous to that of the civilian minister at a summer conference of young people, where, in the happy intimacy of that relationship, so much creative work can be done, as every young person or minister who has attended such conferences knows. Day and night the chaplain is available to his flock and he is constantly seeking a closer contact. It is no wonder that young men who would never think of bringing their intimate problems to their pastor at home come to the chaplain and open their hearts to him. Here is a truly pastoral relationship which is personal and vital to the men and chaplains alike.

It is difficult for me to understand the concern of those who feel that in a year of training their boys might be lost to the church when I know that a far larger percentage of men attend services in the Army than in the home communities. If the same percentage of people in the average city attended church on Sunday morning, the churches could not contain them and, remember in the Army chapel the congregation is composed exclusively of men, and young men at that, which is hardly true of the typical civilian church, where men and youth are often conspicuous by their absence.

Time does not permit me to enlarge upon the program of the chaplains in this war. It is a thrilling chapter in the history of our church. The spiritual victories which have been won are comparable to the victories won on the battlefields of the world. Every month there comes to my office the record of the chaplains in the field, and these records read like the Acts of the Apostles on a grander scale as they tell of the tens of millions of men attending services, the millions receiving communion, the hundreds of thousands whose personal problems have been solved by understanding counsel, and the tens of thousands who have been baptized into the church. The record of our chaplains' service is a glorious one. The success which they have achieved is due to the quality of the men, ministers, priests, and rabbis which we have secured, the freedom and encouragement they are accorded by the Army and Navy to do their work and the splendid facilities placed at their disposal.

Consider, if you will, these physical facilities. Few realize that the most stupendous

church-building program in the history of America has been carried on by the Army and Navy in camps and stations throughout this country and around the world, wherever our troops have gone. In no comparable period in the history of our Nation have so many buildings been erected in so short a time to the glory of God and for the worship of men. This is true not only of the house of God but also of the word of God. The publication and the distribution by the Government of the Scriptures for Protestants, Catholics, and Jews has dwarfed even the efforts of such world-wide agencies as the American Bible Society. Millions of copies have been placed in the hands of servicemen. More than that, they have been read by these men as many chaplains who have taken well-worn copies from the pockets of fallen soldiers can testify. It is no exaggeration to say that, due to the religious program of our armed forces, more young men have attended church, read the Bible, and earnestly prayed than at any other time in the history of our Nation. True, war conditions may be conducive to this interest, but we have every reason to believe that this great religious program could be carried over into any post-war system of military training. Indeed, profiting from the mistakes which we have made and the experience we have had, we should be able to accomplish even greater things for God and the men whom we would serve.

Indeed I would like to consider the whole question in terms of the opportunity presented to the spiritual forces of America by such a program as is contemplated in universal military training. Can anyone doubt the magnitude of the opportunity? Into our training camps each year would flow a million young men from all sections of the country and from all walks of life. It humbles one to consider the challenge of this potential congregation of 1,000,000 boys. It is sobering for us to recall that barely 50 percent of these men would be even nominal church members. That means 500,000 lads with no religious background to say nothing of the large percentage of the nominal church members whose faith needs to be deepened and strengthened and their spiritual experience enlarged. If ours is to be a God-fearing people true to the religious principles upon which our Nation was founded, it is essential that we reach these men. We know how earnestly the church has tried and how frequently it has failed. I would not be so foolish as to suggest that universal military training offers a panacea for this problem. I do say that in such a program we would have gathered together the young manhood of America with the resources of the Government behind any program which the religious forces of our Nation might have the vision to devise for bringing to these men through the chaplains the message of religion. Considered in this light, universal military training might play an important part in the religious life of our people.

The proposal is something new in American life. For this reason, many have viewed it with apprehension or accepted it reluctantly as an unfortunate necessity. It would be unwise and unwarranted to say that, of itself, the program is potentially good or evil insofar as its effect on the character of the trainees is concerned. It will inevitably be what we choose to make it. Quite apart from its primary purpose of preparing men to defend their country and themselves in the event of war, it may do much to mar or make the character of the men involved. While the task of the Army and Navy is fundamentally to provide for the military training of the men, they have evidenced a realization of, and a concern for, the physical, mental, and moral needs of the trainees. But in the task of ministering to these needs, they will fail unless they have the counsel and support of the civilian agencies which share their concern. This is not a program of, by, and for the Army and Navy. I do not need to tell you gentlemen that, if it becomes that, it will fail. It must and can be a program of, by, and for the people. Then and then only will it be American, democratic, and effective. We can make it such if we will. If our parents, our educators, and our churchmen will do their part, something which they now accept as a military necessity may become under their guidance a great democratic and spiritual opportunity. The Army and Navy have demonstrated in the present emergency their willingness to cooperate to this end. But it must be a combined operation. Personally, I have faith that the American people will make of this means for their defense a great American institution in which the social and spiritual ideals of our Nation will be preserved and fostered. Then our young men will return from their year of training strengthened physically, mentally, and morally. They will be prepared not only to meet the possible eventuality of war, but also prepared within themselves to meet the certain demands of creative citizenship and the pressing personal problems of life.

Why I Asked Today That H. R. 520 Be Passed Over Without Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 520 is a bill to extend a 90-day preference to veterans on newly irrigated lands in future reclamation projects. It is a measure so urgently needed at this time to make due preparation for our returning veterans that I am anxious that it be enacted at the earliest possible moment. It may therefore seem strange that I should ask today that it be passed over without prejudice on this call of the calendar. The reason is as follows:

The main purpose of the bill is noncontroversial in that it gives preference to veterans. I have heard no criticism or objection to that provision. There was some criticism of the bill as originally drawn that it provided for duplication of effort on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Agriculture. I think that objection has been removed by the amendments incorporated in the clean bill, which was reported unanimously by the committee.

However, out of deference to our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. CLINTON ANDERSON, who is today absent from the city on official business, and who will later become Secretary of Agriculture, it seems appropriate to hold this matter in abeyance for a short time until his views can be ascertained. Knowing as I do Congressman ANDERSON'S great interest in Western development, and his desire to appeal to and satisfy the wishes of our returning veterans for homes and employment, I can forecast his attitude toward the main objectives of the bill. Naturally, we want to enact such legislation as will bring about the greatest degree of harmonious cooperation and maximum development by the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation. For that reason I have asked that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

A careful study of the revised form of H. R. 520 will convince every Member that the measure is not only right in spirit, but by its same provisions it implements the Bureau of Reclamation to help qualified veterans in the big task ahead and does so without conflict with any Governmental agency. It provides only one feature of America's postwar planning to preserve and develop that for which our veterans fought.

Welcome to General Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we Members of Congress had a rare privilege, that of welcoming General Eisenhower when he appeared before the joint session of the House and Senate, along with members of the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and top military commanders. From all accounts, everybody in Washington had a glimpse of the general either along the line of march or at the Capitol, and I have never seen the galleries so filled to overflowing capacity. The outburst of cheering was such a natural spontaneous welcome expressing the real honest gratitude of the American people for this outstanding military leader and all of his achievements.

In the general's talk before the Congress, he gave credit where credit was due, not only to his officers and our troops, but to our Allies who so gallantly helped in defeating the Germans.

The article taken from today's New York Herald Tribune by Walter Lippmann is so timely that I am putting it in the RECORD. We Americans were lucky to have such a man in command of the Allied Forces in the European theater of war. The example this great soldier set should reap unbounded harmony among our allies in all future dealings:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

EISENHOWER

General Eisenhower is not one to have thought too much about what history will say of him. But his friends have no reason to doubt the verdict: the cheering in the streets will die down but his renown will endure.

He has accomplished a great thing and he has done it in a great way. As supreme commander he has been most impressively true to the way of life which his armies were commissioned to defend. He has led victoriously the largest and most powerful international force in the annals of war: the democratic way is his ingrained personal habit, and he did not depart from it, or alter it, when he waged war: no small element of his success, almost certainly the determining element, is that the armies of the democratic nations were in fact commanded by a truly democratic man.

He created and he maintained unity of purpose and harmony in action among all the arms and services and among the Allies. Although he bore the majestic title of supreme commander, in fact he commanded by leading and he led by consent. It is an art which is not described in any book of rules because it is reserved for those who are gifted with a happy nature and are faithful to a good philosophy. Everyone likes Eisenhower. Men trust and do not fear him. They follow him and do not envy him. They take his orders and do not feel diminished. They are responding to a nature which is outgiving and responsive, affectionate, and modest. But it was not only his nature, it was his democratic virtue, his unquestioning and effortless respect for the ultimate equality of men, that enabled him to become preeminent, measured by the trust and admiration he inspired, among all who have commanded the armies of a coalition.

He is, of course, an uncommon man who along with great professional military competence has a mind of exceptional power—particularly for discerning clearly and for judging wisely among the plans, proposals, inspirations, and claims of other men. But neither his abilities nor his virtues are in themselves rare: his genius is to have in an uncommon degree command in an uncommon balance, common sense, and common humanity.

Thus he comes home the conquering hero, and it has never occurred to anyone to think that the vast powers he exercised could be abused. Yet they could have been, and in other hands less morally secure than his might easily have been. We do not perhaps realize how great was the power vested in Eisenhower because there has never been the slightest suspicion in any quarter that he was using his power for any purpose but that for which it was designed. Yet we do not appreciate this man if we do not realize that the political power of Eisenhower's command was potentially enormous, and that never in any slightest degree was that power used, much less abused.

In Eisenhower's command the true constitutional relationship of authority between the civilian and the military has been scrupulously maintained. The basic principle of the democratic system in subordinating military authority to civilian has been observed in the spirit and the letter. It has been evident that Eisenhower did not need to be reminded of this principle. It is his own principle.

And so, we do not express the full measure of our gratitude until we acclaim him not only for his achievements but for his example.

Parley Hears Voice of Dependent Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Century of June 13, 1945:

PARLEY HEARS VOICE OF DEPENDENT PEOPLES

"We understand only one word and that is independence," said Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, representative of the Philippine Commonwealth at San Francisco. "Where would America be today if those men of 1776 had issued a declaration of self-government instead of a declaration of independence? There is a world of difference. A people may have so-called self-government but still be part and parcel of another government against their will." General ROMULO's words will instantly be recognized as the authentic voice of the Filipino people, whose determination to attain full nationhood has not been diminished by their experience in this war. But they have a far wider meaning, which the San Francisco Conference will be well advised to heed. General ROMULO spoke for his own people, but he also represented India, whose leaders cannot speak for themselves because they are in prison. He spoke for Burma, for Malaysia, for the voiceless inhabitants of Indochina, and the Netherlands East Indies. His views are the views of China, as her representatives indicated at the preliminary Dumbarton Oaks Conference and have repeated at the Golden Gate meeting. In other words, the Philippine leader framed the deep convictions of that half of the people of the world who live in Asia. They want and are determined to get nothing less than national independence. San Francisco needed to hear their demand, for no system of world security will be worth the paper it is written on unless it provides a method by which independence can be reached by peaceful processes. Striking the word "independence" out of the charter will not root it out of the minds of a billion Asiatics. They are going to get independence—nothing less—before this century has run its course. In siding with the colonial powers to soft-pedal independence as the ultimate goal, the United States has turned against its own past, as General ROMULO's citation of the founding fathers suggested. Even more important, we have set our national destiny against the irresistible forces of the future.

The Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

BATON ROUGE, LA., *June 18, 1945.*

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Washington, D. C.:

I have this day sent Chester A. Bowles, Administrator, Office Price Administration the following telegram: "At a conference held in my office this 18th day of June attended by the Commissioner of Agriculture, my executive counsel, and representatives of the consumer, institutional feeders, meat wholesalers, packers, livestock producers and merchants, the following facts were presented. We now have the largest on hoof livestock population in the history of our State. Despite this surplus, there is less meat available to our people through legitimate channels than ever before. This meat shortage is brought about as the result of the quota restrictions contained in 'Control Order No. 1, Office of Price Administration.' We feel that this quota restriction results in a discriminatory and unfair hardship on producers, processors, and consumers in Louisiana. We appeal to you for relief by modifying this quota restriction. If necessary I shall send a representative committee of all interests to wait upon you at your convenience." Any assistance you can render toward securing a modification of OPA regulations and relief on the meat situation in this State will be appreciated.

JAMES H. DAVIS,
Governor of Louisiana.

Trial of War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very able and informative report of Mr. Justice Jackson to President Truman regarding the plans made for the trial of war criminals. There has been considerable comment by columnists and editorial writers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include some of these comments, as follows:

BRIDGING A GAP

(By Merlo Pusey)

A new idea that may change the course of history sprang into the current of world thought last week. It came directly from Robert H. Jackson's report to the President of the United States as prosecutor in chief of war criminals. If anyone assumes that this report is merely a prosaic recital of our plans to put nooses around the necks of Nazi fiends he would do well to broaden his vision and read it again.

What Justice Jackson has suggested is nothing less than an agreement among the Allies for the enforcement of international law against offending individuals. Ordinarily, of course, international law is concerned with the relations between nations. That has been one critical weakness of peace systems set up in the past. When a nation has run amok, we have been inclined to say that there is no effective remedy in international law. You cannot put an entire nation in jail. Principles of humanity forbid wholesale slaughter. Consequently, there has been a wide assumption that it is futile to try to outlaw war unless we can somehow set up a genuine world government dealing directly with individuals.

Some sharp criticism has been directed against the United Nations Organization taking shape at San Francisco because its acts to preserve the peace will be directed at governments instead of men. One aim of that organization is "the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace." But its critics say that it can suppress aggression only by making war itself. The argument is that you cannot effectively coerce an entire nation—that law enforcement to be at once effective and peaceful must be directed against men rather than nations.

The great significance of Justice Jackson's proposal, as I see it, is that he would bring international law directly to bear upon individual war plotters. He discards the mantle of protection that international law of the nineteenth century threw around warmaking. International law of the present century has outlawed war. That is clearly evident in the Briand-Kellogg Pact, the Geneva Protocol of 1924, and numerous other conventions and treaties.

In thus outlawing war the nations created a new crime—the crime of aggression. Germany and Japan, along with the other powers, agreed to put the making of unjustifiable war in the category of brigandage or piracy. "By the time the Nazis came to power," says Justice Jackson, "it was thoroughly established that launching an aggressive war, or the institution of war by treachery, was illegal and that the defense of legitimate warfare was no longer available to those who engaged in such an enterprise. It is high time that we act on the juridical principle

that aggressive war-making is illegal and criminal."

Of course, the idea that aggression is criminal is an old one. What Justice Jackson has enunciated, and President Truman has accepted, is a concrete policy of punishing the war plotters for this crime through an international tribunal that will honestly weigh concrete evidence and hand down verdicts accordingly. This policy is not to be confused with the wholesale slaughter of the leaders of any defeated nation. Only Fascists, or the equivalent, stoop to that practice. Future wars may break out without any conclusive evidence of aggression on the part of any clique or junta. The Jackson plan seems to be aimed only at conspirators who can be fairly convicted of utilizing the powers of a state for international pillage.

War Trials No Easy Job, United States Finds

(By Ernest Lindley)

There is no precedent for trial by an international tribunal of the political and military leaders of a nation. In trying the political, military, and economic heads of Nazi Germany, the Allies will be breaking new ground—terrain which, moreover, has been only partly and doubtfully surveyed by international law.

Old conflicts among the theorists of international law will be resolved and new law made by these prosecutions and the verdicts which are reached.

Justice Jackson is not disturbed by the lack of precedent because in the absence of a continuously sitting international legislature, international law "is not capable of being developed by legislation." Instead, he emphasizes in his report to the President, "It grows, as did the common law, through decisions reached from time to time in adapting settled principles to new situations."

QUESTIONS TROUBLING

The Jackson plan itself therefore represents creative thinking. As such it is bound to stimulate discussion and perhaps controversy.

Many laymen and experts had been troubled by the question: With what crimes are the leaders of defeated Germany to be charged? With specific atrocities or violations of the rules or accepted customs of war?

Undoubtedly the responsibility for many of the individual actions which have shocked the rest of the world can be traced to higher officials or officers. But the result would be myriads of individual trials and perhaps many of the key people could not be reached. And if they were all reached by this method, they would be convicted, not of starting a war, but of failing to fight it like gentlemen.

Moreover, some of the victims of individual atrocities were German nationals and some of the actions themselves occurred before the war and perhaps did not differ much, if any, from the internal actions of other governments with which we are not at war. According to our theory of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations, such offenses would be beyond our reach and might more appropriately be handled by German courts.

WON'T IGNORE INDIVIDUALS

Jackson realizes that our real complaint against these men is more than that they committed individual atrocities, either against Germans or against individuals of other nationality. It is that they started a war.

He does not intend to ignore individual atrocities and barbarities. Neither does he want to deal with them independently in trying the major defendants. He proposes to consider them as part of the Nazi master plan. He would regard the atrocities inflicted on German nationals as part of the Nazi plan to get a strangle hold on Germany for the purpose of launching an aggressive war.

In another chain of argument, Jackson says that the major defendants should be tried for all the offenses which shocked our conscience.

The big net advocated by Jackson would catch most of the top people of Nazi Germany and also such prime instruments of nazism as the Gestapo and SS. Some think that this would be stretching law and judicial procedures pretty far. They, and others who have given some thought to the subject, also fear that the prosecutions may drag on indefinitely.

NEED ALLIED AGREEMENT

Justice Jackson is aware of this danger. He reports that it will take an immense amount of work even to prepare evidence for the main trials. He recognizes that the accused cannot enjoy all the privileges they would have if they were to be tried for major crimes in American courts. This tribunal is to be military. Justice Jackson says that the trial "must not be protracted in duration by anything that is obstructive or dilatory, but we must see that it is fair and deliberative and not discredited in times to come by any mob spirit."

He is unable, however, to predict when the trials can be begun and how soon they can be brought to a close, not only for the reasons indicated above but because an Allied agreement on the whole subject must first be reached.

President Truman has indorsed the Jackson report. And the Justice is generally being credited with having approached his task with boldness and imagination. But his report, as it is studied, seems likely to stimulate discussion and possibly controversy.

A COOL HEAD

"I have no purpose to enter into any controversy as to what shall be done with war criminals, either high or humble. If it is considered good policy for the future peace of the world, if it is believed that the example will outweigh the tendency to create among their own countrymen a myth of martyrdom, then let them be executed. But in that case let the decision to execute them be made as a military or political decision. We must not use the forms of judicial proceedings to carry out or rationalize previously settled political or military policy. Farcical judicial trials conducted by us will destroy confidence in the judicial process as quickly as those conducted by any other people."

Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, chief American counsel to the United Nations War Crimes Commission, made this fearless statement in an article for a recent issue of the Saturday Review of Literature.

He further said:

"It is futile to think, as extreme nationalists do, that we can have an international law that is always working on our side. And it is futile to think that we can have international courts that will always render the decisions we want to promote our interests."

As impatient as most of us are to see the German leaders in crime get their desserts, in the form of quick and violent punishment, it is consoling to find that the man in charge of determining their guilt is capable of taking the long view in the matter.

Justice Jackson's admirable argument not only reminds us that there is a difference between punishment under law and punishment by policy; it drives home the point that a law which is not in accord with universal moral forces will not long survive.

He cites as proof Germany's two departures, in the last few decades, from the principles of just international law, asserting that people armed with a consciousness of moral righteousness have twice overcome great, prepared forces of material, but immoral, might.

"Nothing disintegrates power like lawlessness, nothing makes force so effective as the sentiment of people that it is somehow defending the right and is exercised in harmony with the higher moral values."

Justice Jackson wishes America to remain in harmony with the higher values that have made her strong. He is in a position to do a great deal in maintaining this harmony.

It is good, even in our anger, to know that there is a cool head among us to save us from rash misuses of law which may weaken this Nation's moral position in later years.

Jackson Favors Historic Trials

(By J. M. Roberts, Jr.)

Woven into Justice Robert H. Jackson's plans for the prosecution of war criminals are ideas of such import that they are likely to become historic.

Justice Jackson proclaims the right to try the makers of war for making war; the right, when civilization itself is outraged, to impose sentences which were not provided prior to the crime, and the right of humanity to sit in judgment.

In answer to those who fear we cannot reach the Nazi criminals through present international law and who feel the sanctity of legal precedent is more important than any miscarriage which may occur through its preservation, he says that there is no reason international law should not be built up as we have built up our own common law—through the application of public conscience to incidents of the moment.

The justice proposes to try whole organizations—the Nazi Party, the SS, the Gestapo—and then put it up to the members individually to offer mitigating evidence as to the effect of their connections.

He does not believe that anyone who commits a new crime, or who devises variations of an old one with which public conscience is now catching up, should go free until a law is passed (especially when there is as yet no organization for passing the law) which would only catch the next offender.

Mr. Jackson is insistent that all we do in this case shall be capable of standing the searching light of history—that aggressive war making shall stand from now on as prima facie crime, established as such in passionless dignity, and punishable.

He is preparing for the United States to proceed alone in individual cases if necessary, but is hopeful for establishment of an international tribunal which can truthfully be said to represent the peace-loving peoples of the world.

And in this we come to what may be the most historic portion of the whole pronouncement.

There have been international courts, and there is talk of a new one. Never yet has there been a real one, nor is there now any immediate prospect. But Justice Jackson's proposal to make the war criminal trials something far more important than the immediate fate of the war criminals.

Equity, in Anglo-Saxon legal procedure, is the application of right and justice to the settlement of disputes which the law does not cover specifically. Under our law, it is primarily a civil procedure.

So here we have the possible foundation of a great international court founded on equity.

Trying the Nazis

(By Mark Sullivan)

In the press last week appeared a document which, if its intent is carried out, will be a milestone in history. Its importance is just beginning to be grasped by scholars and lawyers; general understanding will take time. The document is a statement by Justice Robert W. Jackson of the United States Supreme Court, made by him in the role of counsel

for the United States in prosecuting the Axis war criminals.

The problem Mr. Jackson faced was to show legal justification for trying and punishing what he calls the top Nazis. For trying many minor war criminals there is already justification and precedent. Offenses against the laws of war are punishable by long established procedures.

As to the top Nazis, we could, as conquerors, execute them forthwith. But that we reject. The policy of the United States is to set up a legal tribunal, put the top Nazis on trial for crimes, produce evidence, and, if the Nazis are found guilty, execute thm.

The term "crimes" is used here in the legal sense, not in the colloquial sense of mere evil deeds. The crimes for which the top Nazis are to be tried must have been crimes, in the legal sense, at the time they were committed. It is not enough to show that the top Nazis committed evil deeds in 1939, and then, in 1945, declare those evil deeds to be legal crimes, and execute those guilty. That would run counter to well established principles of law and justice. It would be little better than executing them forthwith.

Mr. Jackson declares that the evil deeds which the top Nazis committed in 1939, and before and after, were, at that time, "criminal by standards generally accepted in all civilized countries." The essence and sum of what the Nazis did was to make aggressive war. And Mr. Jackson declares that the making of aggressive war was a crime, in the legal sense, at the time the Nazis did it.

To sustain this position, Mr. Jackson goes back to an international agreement made in 1928, the Briand-Kellogg Pact, to which Germany, Italy, and Japan subscribed, in common with ourselves and practically all other nations. The effect of this pact was stated in 1932 by Mr. Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of State, now Secretary of War. Mr. Stimson said, and Mr. Jackson now quotes:

"War between nations was renounced by the signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. This means that it has become illegal * * * It is an illegal thing."

Mr. Jackson cites also the Geneva protocol of 1924, signed by 48 governments, which declared that "a war of aggression constitutes * * * an international crime." He cites also the Pan-American Conference in 1928, which declared that "war of aggression constitutes an international crime against the human species."

Holding thus that the aggressive war committed by the top Nazis was a crime, Mr. Jackson goes further. He holds also that deeds done in anticipation of it were also crimes. This makes crimes of what the Nazis did years before, in getting hold of the Government of Germany and making themselves dominant in that country. All this, Mr. Jackson holds, was done as part of a master plan to make aggressive war on the world.

This enlarges greatly the number of crimes for which individual Nazis can be tried. It enlarges the number of Nazis to be put on trial. It would include not only the top Nazis in the government, but those in the Nazi political organization, and in such groups as the Gestapo.

The principle Mr. Jackson stands upon, that making aggressive war is a crime in the legal sense, is revolutionary. He admits that the principle did not exist in international law preceding such agreements as the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928 and the Geneva Protocol of 1924. There will be argument whether those agreements did, in fact, give aggressive war the status of a crime in the legal sense.

But the fact is that Mr. Jackson has formally proclaimed this principle, that he is the counsel of the United States in prosecuting Axis war criminals, and that the principle has been approved by President Truman. It is thus a national policy of the United States.

Omitting legal aspects, Justice Jackson's statement is a momentous event. He not only rejects execution forthwith as a primitive reprisal. He tries to salvage out of this brutal war an actual enlargement of the area in which law prevails.

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

Justice Robert H. Jackson, chief prosecutor of Axis war criminals for the United States, has performed a valuable service in stating clearly and forcefuly what the policy of this Government will be in the forthcoming trials.

There were two courses open to the western Allies. We could hold trials which would then, of necessity, be real trials and not merely a legal gloss for revenge which we intended to take in any event. Or, we could shoot out of hand a large number of known offenders.

A good argument could be made for the second course. Many influential Britishers took this line. It was one reason why no prosecutor was named by the Churchill government until Jackson went to London.

But a decision has been taken in favor of trials. That means an enormous work of preparation of evidence, complicated, as Jackson pointed out, by language difficulties.

It does not mean, however, quibbling legalism, the statement given out by the White House shows a very broad approach to the whole problem. Concisely and clearly, Jackson traces the growth of the concept that war—aggressive war—is in itself illegal.

In many ways, this is precedent-breaking. If that can be established, during the course of the trials, then we shall have taken a definite step forward in keeping the peace of the world. As Justice Jackson said:

"We stand at one of those rare moments when the thought and institutions and habits of the world have been shaken by the impact of world war on the lives of countless millions. Such occasions rarely come, and quickly pass. We are put under a heavy responsibility to see that our behavior during this unsettled period will direct the world's thought toward a firmer enforcement of the laws of international conduct, so as to make war less attractive to those who have governments and the destinies of peoples in their power."

Jackson intends to establish the guilt of groups of Nazis. He realizes the hopelessness of individual trials for thousands of Germans. The groundwork of the case, as he put it, must be the authentic history of "what we are convinced was a grand, concerted pattern to incite and commit the aggressions and barbarities which have shocked the world." Once the group guilt is established, it will be up to individual members of these organizations to prove they joined under duress.

According to War Department files, the Gestapo had at its height 10,000 officials. The German General Staff, which is to be brought to trial, had 5,000 officers and responsible clerks.

War Department records show in the SS, 25,000 to 50,000 in one classification, approximately 310,000 in another, and 37,000 in still another SS group.

In addition are high-ranking members of the Nazi Party who might not be included in any of the above groups.

Altogether, the total number tried by classification will be between 400,000 and 500,000.

No official figure has been reached. That can only come after examination of the mountain of evidence now in Allied hands.

Noteworthy in the Jackson statement was the determination to proceed with the trials alone, if necessary. That is to say, Britain and America will go ahead without Russia, if the Russians continue to show no interest in joining us in these war trials.

Likewise, if the French persist in delay, the western allies will go ahead without waiting for them. Among some Frenchmen there is a tendency toward the kind of legalism which the French are peculiarly prone to. War cannot be illegal, at least one Frenchman has argued, since the state makes war and the state itself cannot commit an illegal act.

Now that the prosecutor for the United States has made clear beyond any doubt his position in this all-important matter, it is up to us to be patient. The task of the prosecutors is an overwhelming one. They must, and they will, do a thorough job.

Ours is not the lynch law of nazism. Our case will be based on the evidence of the awful crimes that have been committed. We must, as Jackson says, establish incredible events by credible evidence.

Farm Loans for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, with the return of many young men now being dismissed from the armed forces, the question of finding employment for them and providing means by which they can start life over again, whether it be in the capacity of an employee, the owner of a farm or business, that question must receive serious consideration at the hands of this Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I enclose a set of resolutions adopted by the Wahpeton National Farm Loan Association at Ledgerwood, N. Dak.:

Whereas a great number of young men and women from the State of North Dakota, now engaged in the armed services of the United States, will soon be returned to their homes; and

Whereas it is known that the great majority of such returning servicemen will return to their own States to engage in their former occupation; and

Whereas North Dakota is chiefly an agricultural State, depending almost exclusively upon farming to give employment to such returning servicemen; and

Whereas a great majority of these men have indicated their desire to own and operate their own farms and have a right to expect that such opportunities will be available to them; and

Whereas a soldier's pay is not sufficient to permit accumulation of funds with which to purchase farms; and

Whereas it is the duty of the Congress of the United States, and of every man and woman within its borders, to assist all such returning servicemen; and

Whereas it is necessary that funds be made available to assist such returning servicemen in purchasing their own farms and to help them rehabilitate themselves; and

Whereas there is now no lending agency operating in the State of North Dakota offering to lend money on real-estate security with the exception of a few private, individual lenders; and

Whereas such private funds are loaned at an interest rate greater than our men now in the armed services can afford to pay; and

Whereas the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul has funds on hand for such purpose, which it urgently desires to lend, on such security; and

Whereas the laws of the State of North Dakota conflict with the Federal Farm Loan Act, in that they do not recognize any per-

sonal liability on the part of the borrower; and

Whereas it is not possible at this time to amend the present State laws of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the boards of directors hereinafter named, adopt a resolution, recommending and urgently requesting that the Federal Farm Mortgage Act be amended, as to any and all features now in conflict with the laws of the State of North Dakota, to protect the rights of such returning servicemen, and to make available to them, first-mortgage farm loans, through the medium of the Federal Land Bank system; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be mailed to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, with copies to all Members of Congress from this State.

L. O. Kretchman, Secretary-Treasurer, National Farm Loan Associations, Lidgerwood, N. Dak.; A. W. Luick, President, Wahpeton National Farm Loan Association; Jesse B. Olson, President, Silver Lake National Farm Loan Association.

Repeal of the Johnson Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to repeal the Johnson Act outright at the present time not only is unnecessary but in view of the pending Bretton Woods legislation would be unwise. Let me say at the outset, I am not against the repeal of the Johnson Act if certain safeguards are preserved to prevent the American public from being subjected to the risky financing of foreign governments. But for Congress to repeal the Johnson Act in toto, so as to permit our citizens to purchase securities of, or make loans to, foreign governments in default to the United States, without the protection of proper safeguards, would in my opinion be perpetrating a fraud upon the unsuspecting people of this country.

To do so would be to remove the protection of the Johnson Act to our citizens from unsound foreign investment.

To do so would be making it legal to mulct our people by international manipulators in securities of risky foreign governments.

Congress by its own act would be impliedly vouching for the solvency of these foreign countries.

It would be saying to these foreign countries, "Come on, sell your foreign bonds in this country. Congress thinks it is all right to do so now."

It would be recognizing the impossibility of collecting debts incurred by foreign nations in default to ourselves at the very moment it is proposing a new International Bank to make new loans to these governments, which I believe would have a very deleterious effect on the attitude of foreign borrowers when repayment of projected loans becomes due.

Why do I make these charges? Let us look at the facts before we repeal this act. All one has to do is examine the record. During the last war and in the years thereafter huge loans were made by the United States to foreign governments amounting to over $12,710,000,000 as of January 4, 1934. A large percentage of them are still in default. At the same time many foreign bonds and securities were sold to citizens in this country through private international banks. Many of these investments are a total loss to thousands of our people now holding the bag on these securities.

As a result there arose a deep resentment in this country against floating private loans to foreign governments, so in 1934 the Johnson Act was passed almost unanimously by the Congress. It put the United States on record that no more American private capital would be available to governments of defaulting nations.

The sentiment at that time and my sentiment today was most ably expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the acting chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, when he said:

> I do not think there should be any division in the support of this bill, either by Republican or Democratic Members of this House. It should meet with the approval of the entire membership of this House. * * * The loss by our Government in loans to foreign governments, large though it be, is small when compared with the billions of dollars our citizen have lost in the purchase of bonds and securities of foreign governments. My blood boils with righteous indignation when I recall the artful and unscrupulous methods used by some of the large banks of New York in unloading these worthless securities upon an unsuspecting and trusting people. To collect debts already due them and to make huge profits in commissions, these bankers in New York, using the prestige and the faith the smaller banks and the public generally had in them, by letter, telephone, telegram, and personal representatives scoured the United States in the nefarious business of selling these securities, many of which they knew, or should have known, were worthless. Many people in my district and in every congressional district in the United States, people of moderate means, were victims of this racket, and some of them as a result lost the savings of a lifetime. One of the contributing causes of the awful depression from which we have suffered for more than 4 years was this loss of billions of dollars by our people.

Our colleague was in good company at that time. Not only did the Johnson Act have the approval of the Departments of State, Justice, and the Treasury, but President Roosevelt expressed his disapproval of encouraging private individuals to invest in foreign securities to encourage trade. At Columbus, Ohio, on March 20, 1932, he used the story of Alice in Wonderland to illustrate his point. He said:

> Alice is talking. "What if we produce a surplus?" Oh, we can sell it to foreign consumers. "How can foreign consumers buy it?" Why we can lend them the money. "Oh, I see," said Alice. "They will buy our surplus with our money."

It might be well to recall to mind the situation which existed shortly before the repeal of the Johnson Act. President Hoover had endeavored to bring about an international conference for the stabilization of currency and he requested President-elect Roosevelt's cooperation. You will recall Mr. Roosevelt's reply—that wasn't his baby.

It is also a matter of history that the international conference for stabilization of currency was scuttled by the administration shortly thereafter.

It is indeed passing strange that the administration has now reversed itself and has adopted the recommendations of Mr. Hoover by supporting the passage of Bretton Woods agreements, one of the most important objectives of which is to stabilize the currencies of the world—the very thing Mr. Hoover was ridiculed for attempting to do just prior to the expiration of his term of office.

Since it is the apparent purpose of Congress to participate in a world-wide international bank and monetary stabilization fund, it is obvious that there must be relaxation of the terms of the Johnson Act if long term credit is to be established or the financing thereof by the sale of foreign securities to individuals in this country. The Bretton Woods proposal, as passed by the House, recognizes this fact and by section 3 makes the Johhnson Act inapplicable to those foreign governments who become members of both the international monetary fund and the international bank for reconstruction and development. By requiring these foreign governments to become members of the international organization they make them accept the conditions and provisions of the act. First, these countries must put up their proportionate share of capital both in the fund and the international bank so the risk involved may be borne proportionately. Second, they must tie their currency to gold. Third, they must evaluate their currency and prevent it from fluctuating more than 10 percent except with the consent of this international organization. Then in amendments adopted to the Bretton Woods agreement, proposed by Republican Members of the House, there are provisions which define and limit the purposes for which these funds can be used and the scope of the organization.

So while the Bretton Woods agreement makes the Johnson Act inapplicable under these conditions to foreign governments, at the same time it at least preserves certain safeguards designed to set up a sound financial structure in international banking and trade.

As a matter of fact the retention of the Johnson Act would be an inducement to foreign nations to join the Bretton Woods agreement in order to trade under its terms, and to get away from the restrictions of the Johnson Act.

This is entirely different than the outright repeal of the Johnson Act which would let down the bars for any foreign country to peddle its securities and bonds and make loans to private individuals no matter how risky, without the protection of these safeguards.

An outright repeal of the Johnson Act would remove all the restrictions so far as the act itself is concerned. It now prevents Germany, for example, from selling worthless marks to private citizens in this country as it did before. Under these circumstances a country with such a poor financial standing it was not even acceptable as a member,

could still sell its risky foreign securities in private trade in this country. For this reason we must not repeal the Johnson Act in toto but in modifying it, as under the Bretton Woods agreement, make it subject to restrictions which we hope will be administered in accordance with sound banking practice. Just because one citizen is law abiding you do not repeal a law penalizing those who are not.

Is there anything wrong in saying to foreign nations, "Before you sell your bonds and securities or make loans in this country you have to set your own house in order. You have to become a member of this international organization. You have to join the club. You have to put up your ante before you can play the game. You have to abide by the rules we formulate"? None of these conditions or restrictions could be met by the outright repeal of the Johnson Act.

Every reasonable latitude to carry on legitimate foreign trade is granted by the provisions of the Bretton Woods agreement. To go further than this would open the door, permitting abuses to creep in at the expense of the American public.

But we are told the Securities and Exchange Commission is now in operation and this is all the protection that our people need. There is nothing in the Securities and Exchange Act which would prevent foreign governments from selling bonds or securities in this country no matter how worthless. To date the Securities and Exchange Commission has never issued a stop order with respect to any foreign government issue; and in its whole existence has handled only six cases involving foreign government securities. All that the Securities and Exchange Act does is to enforce in the prospectus and public offering, a full statement of all the facts. It has nothing to do with the credit value of bonds.

But we are told by Mr. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, that one of the reasons why we must pass this repeal is because of its psychological effect. When we pause to consider that this country is almost $300,000,000,000 in debt; that we spent billions upon billions in lend-lease to our allies; that we have some 10 to 12 million men and women under arms; that our casualties are over 1,000,000; that we have authorized and appropriated $1,350,000,000 for rehabilitation of our allies under UNRRA; that we have set up an international bank where credit can be obtained under the Bretton Woods agreement, surely under these circumstances we do not have to repeal outright the Johnson Act for psychological reasons to show our good faith in the winning of this war and our attempts to win the peace.

Mr. Clayton, it seems to me, adopts a very strange philosophy when he says in his testimony:

> I don't conceive it is the duty of Congress to try to protect the American public, whether it is foreign or domestic. * * * I don't know of any protection of the American public as to the future development of any domestic loan.

With this philosophy I heartily disagree. I think it is about time we think of our own substance for a change. Is it not about time we should keep our money in the United States—except for such investments as permitted under Bretton Woods agreement, which we hope will be sound—for the benefit of those who perhaps will be unemployed and bankrupt, and for the reconversion period lying before us instead of making it possible to mulct our citizens by international manipulation in risky securities of foreign governments? I, for one, think it is.

Certainly with the terrible destruction of this World War II the financial stability of many of the European countries, or for that matter all over the world, is not as sound as it was in 1934 when the Johnson Act was passed.

If our people needed protection then, certainly they need certain safeguards now. Let us see to it they receive this protection.

My Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt:

MY DAY—WE STAND TO LOSE WHOLE GENERATION OF SCIENTISTS

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Wednesday.—There is much discussion now about the McDonough bill, which would authorize the release of persons from active military service and deferment of persons from military service, in order to aid in making possible the education and training and utilization of scientific and technological manpower to meet essential needs both in war and in peace.

It seems fairly obvious now that we should carefully screen the men in the Army and Navy, because we know that a Nation strong in both war and peace must not allow the education of certain gifted people to be neglected. The type of mind which is creative, the type of disposition which makes an individual a good research student and many other attributes and abilities should now be screened out and given a chance to develop for the benefit of the peace which must follow the war.

Certain countries skipped a generation after the last war, and I think they suffered as a result. Now many countries are in danger, and we, too, are not exempt from the danger, of losing a whole generation of scientists and able men in many fields because they have been inducted or have volunteered for service in the armed forces.

Consideration of the McDonough bill leads us quite naturally, I think, to the consideration of how we shall best give our country security in future years. I read two articles in the last few days—one by Max Lerner and one by Josephus Daniels—opposing compulsory military service. For months past, on the other hand, advocates of compulsory military service have sent me books and pamphlets showing the need for keeping our country strong by giving our young men military training. I am convinced that our country will be stronger if we give not only our young men, but also our young women, training. I am convinced, however, that this training has to be exclusive for the Army, or exclusively military training.

We are trying to build an organization where the people of the world will meet together, and we hope that our young people will work and build for peace. We know that this may not be completely successful, that we may make mistakes, that we may still have wars. But we hope that we can limit these wars so they will not spread and wipe out our civilization. We hope that in time people may learn really to outlaw war.

But we are not yet ready to say that that can be done completely by an organization which we are only beginning to create and which we must learn to use. Our search, therefore, must be for that which gives us the greatest security and, at the same time, the greatest hope for developing confidence among nations and peace in the future.

OPA, the Black Market, and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very thoughtful and provocative article from the Boston American of recent date:

OPA, THE BLACK MARKET, AND YOU—ALICE IN BLUNDERLAND RULES AID CHISELERS

(By Warren Stevens)

Unfair and contradictory bureaucratic regulations are breaking down the business of supplying food to more than a million Boston consumers. Designed to assure fair distribution of available food supplies, their net result, instead, has been to invite violations and force legitimate and established supply houses to face ruin or turn to black market channels.

Despite their denials and protestations of innocence, packers are forcing retailers to take quantities of useless and often unsalable products along with the supplies of meat they need for their customers.

"Tie-in" sales are forbidden by Government order, but the blackjacking goes on every day and the city is flooded with these products.

Unfair price ceiling regulations keep established products in warehouses because the dealers refuse to take a terrific loss by putting them on sale.

Instead, inferior substitute products have replaced them on the market, and these sell at a higher ceiling price than the real thing.

Other bureaucratic regulations have restricted the sale of products, such as canned milk and peanut butter, to restaurants.

But the restaurants get their canned milk and peanut butter just the same, and they do it perfectly legally.

They go to the retailer and make their purchases from him to make up the amount cut from their former supply by the bureaucratic restriction.

This not only cuts into the supply ordinarily available for the regular patrons of the retail stores, but it uses the time and gasoline of the restaurant owners, things the bureaucrats say should be conserved.

Firms which have been in business for more than 5 years have found themselves gradually losing business and facing the prospect of closing down, if they want to operate legally.

But new firms and food manufacturers, who have been in business only a short time, are reaping a harvest with the aid of rules

and regulations which allow him to sell at higher ceilings and cut the throat of the established businessman.

Pepper is an example.

The pepper on your table is probably an imitation of the real thing, yet there are more than 2,000,000 pounds of genuine pepper stored in a warehouse by a Boston concern because of contradictory and unfair price ceilings.

The ceiling price on genuine pepper has been set at 25 cents a pound retail, while wholesalers pay about 14 cents a pound for it.

But the retail price ceiling on imitation pepper is 32 cents a pound and 25 cents a pound for the wholesaler.

Selling the genuine article at the ceiling price would not pay spice dealers for the cost of storage, labor, upkeep or distribution, so they hold onto their product and the market is flooded with the imitation variety.

One of the Nation's biggest companies is limited in its output because it can't produce its chocolate syrup at the present ceiling price without losing considerable money.

But an Ohio dealer with a similar but inferior product has been granted a higher ceiling and higher selling price, and is flooding the market with it.

Thus, stupid bureaucratic regulations are ruining established businesses and producing a golden flood of profits for the Johnny-come-latelies.

The new man in business has no former price scale to abide by as do the established concerns.

All he needs is OPA permission and a set of rules under which he may operate.

Mayonnaise is an illustration.

The old established manufacturer sells his product at an average rate of $1.45 per gallon to wholesalers. But these same wholesalers must pay from $1.60 to $1.75 per gallon for mayonnaise they purchase from new operators.

Salad oil is one of the principal ingredients of mayonnaise and most of this has been diverted into the black market, with a 25 cents per gallon charge, in contrast with a 17-cent ceiling price on salad oil obtained through legitimate sources.

Established manufacturers, even if they wanted to, couldn't pay the black-market rate, but Johnny-come-lately, with his higher ceiling price for his product, can and often does.

One of the largest mayonnaise manufacturers in Boston once turned out 4,000 gallons of the product daily.

Today he has been waiting for a shipment of salad oil for 5 weeks and expects he will be forced to close down his plant before he gets it. He can't put out a half-pint of mayonnaise without it.

There is no salad oil in Boston, but New York is flooded with it—through black-market channels. This producer refuses to patronize black markets.

But still the OPA insists that its ceiling price is fair for one and all.

But the worst racket of all is the tie-in sales which retailers are forced to agree to in order to get scant supplies of meat.

All of them are agreed that it is nothing but a racket by which the packer disposes of often unsalable byproducts, but no one dares to protest openly for fear of being cut off from any supplies of meat.

One packer forces his customers to buy a case of meat extract with every 100 pounds of meat. The grocer has no use for the extract but he buys it to assure himself of getting his meat supply.

Another packer forces his customers to buy another byproduct, a dry dog food, in a direct tie-in sale with meat.

Retailers will buy up to 20 cases of the dog food in the morning and return to the packer in the afternoon to get supplies of meat.

Other retailers pay bonuses privately to packers and return the next day to pick up supplies of meat, for which he is given a slip showing that the ceiling price was paid for it. But there is nothing on the slip to show that the retailer slipped the packer, $20, $30, or even $50 as a bonus, the preceding day.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ogemaw County Herald, West Branch, Mich., of June 14, 1945:

WHAT ABOUT THE OPA? HAS IT BEEN A BLESSING OR A CURSE? WHO STARTED IT? WHO'S BACK OF IT? WHY DO WE HAVE TO PUT UP WITH THE THINGS WE DO?

That the OPA was started under laws passed by representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States, and is operating under powers delegated to it by the President of the United States, is a matter of record. The OPA's statement that it is operated locally, to a large extent, by volunteer workers, is also true to a certain extent. These unpaid workers are furnishing us with some of the finest examples of patriotic service to be found anywhere in this country.

These volunteer workers however, only carry out the orders handed down to them from above. They are in no way responsible for the board policies, and the socialistic and dictatorial trend of the organization at large.

Not everything the OPA says can be accepted as gospel truth. It is not yet a crime to obtain information from other sources, compare notes and draw your own conclusions.

Last week it was stated that the OPA's rules and regulations are made through 700 independent outside advisory committees, composed of farm, labor, and industry groups, and that the Emergency Price Control Act specifically directs the Administrator to consult these advisory committees "so far as practical."

Note the words—"so far as practical."

How practical does the OPA find it to do this? Here is an illustration from an authorative source. An industry advisory committee was summoned to New York City from 17 cities in the United States, one as far West as Seattle, Wash. At the appointed hour the OPA section chief entered the room, read a new order, explained the theory behind it, stated the effective date, and bowed out with the statement that he had to hurry to catch a train to Washington.

All the talking done was done by him. The committee, whose travel expenses to and from the meeting aggregated $4,750, were nonplussed. The whole process did not require more than 20 minutes. Yet it was stated, "this performance enabled the OPA to insert in its published text the routine gibberish to the effect that the industry had been consulted."

This, it is stated is the regular practice of the OPA. Industry representatives have no authority to veto proposals, or change their effective dates.

A House committee, investigating the OPA in 1943 said in its report "Your committee has found, not only that the OPA has developed an unauthorized and illegal judicial system, but that through the mass of rules and regulations enacted, has developed such an intricate and involved administrative review machinery that litigants are completely bewildered."

The OPA's statement that "Nobody loves the OPA because the OPA has gone far beyond the intent of the Congress, and is being governed by a lot of strategically placed economic planners, and economy controllists of left-wing tendencies and reddish tint, whose declared purpose it is to regiment the American people. It is also made up of a lot of men who are nothing but broken down businessmen and clerks who never before had as easy a job, or so much authority over others, and never before in their lives received so much money for what they did.

"I have been told" said Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana, in Congress, "all about these theorists who sit behind mahogany desks in Washington with a slide rule, and work out such miracles as postponing the lambing season, taking off the horse's shoes at night and putting them back in the morning."

Nobody wants inflation. Practically everybody concedes the necessity for rationing. But the OPA is going too far, and beyond the intent of Congress when it begins dictating inventories; fixing the margins of profits; ordering the distributors to discontinue trade discounts; fixing styles in men's and women's wear; wasting time and paper in giving the America people a definition of roast beef; distributing booklets to butchers instructing them how to cut up each carcass; writing 24-page booklets telling housewives how to launder sheets at home by using plenty of soap and water, and how to pile them neatly away on shelves, and how to rotate them so the last laundered shall be used last.

Today you can hardly buy a pound of meat in West Branch. Why? If you go out in the country you will see cattle grazing everywhere. Yet, local slaughterers are prohibited from slaughtering their usual amounts to supply their local demand.

It is more than a singular coincidence that everything the OPA has put under price control has disappeared from the market. The Chicago Daily Drovers Journal in its issue of May 23, said:

"The collapse of meat production seems to date directly to the start of price control."

The Chicago Daily Drovers Journal has been in business a long time. It is edited by practical men. It goes on to say: "Buying of stocker and feeder cattle rose during the early part of the conflict. During the entire year of 1941 farmers of 8 Corn Belt States bought a total of 2,395,450 head of cattle and calves which increased to 2,564,348 head in 1942, the year ceiling prices on meat were imposed. Buying the following year fell to 2,363,821 head, and in 1944 dropped down to 2,279,546, the lowest purchase since the war began in 1939."

There are too many fuzzy-wuzzy-woozie thinkers in authority in the OPA, interfering with the normal operation of the law of supply and demand.

Stock feeds were priced in relation to parity for wheat and other grains, instead of their relation to meat ceilings.

Price ceilings on dressed meats at wholesale were fixed before livestock prices were frozen. As livestock prices continue to advance the meat packers began to feel the squeeze, until by the spring of 1943 they were losing 4½ cents a pound on every beef carcass slaughtered.

In 1920 there were 50,400,000 head of cattle on American farms; in 1930 there were 61,003,000 head; in 1940 there were 68,197,000 head; in 1943 there were 78,170,000 according to figures of the Department of Agriculture in the 1945 World Almanac. Last year there were 82,192,000—more than ever before in the history of this country. The same thing was true of milk cows and hogs. Yet, today there is little meat in butcher-shop cases, and thousands of butchers are closing up shop.

Unable to buy some meat the other day, and unwilling to pay 65 cents a pound for trout and whitefish (trout at one local store was $1 a pound), the writer paid 35 cents a pound for herring. A few years ago herring sold for 8 cents a pound, and as low as 5 cents a pound. Fish is an article of food. Why it isn't price-ceilinged I don't know. That's another one for the OPA "brain trusters" to explain.

To give their menus some semblance of substantially restaurants are obliged to substitute fish. A West Branch restaurant had to pay 70 cents a pound for trout the other day. With that trout it was obliged to serve bread, coffee, sugar, cream, potatoes, soup, crackers, butter if it had it—in fact, everything it furnished with a meal when ceilings went into effect. For what? On the basis of 70 cents a pound for trout? No. For 75 cents—the same price charged for a meal when restaurant menu prices were frozen.

What about prices. Taking 100 as the index figure for the annual average living cost in large American cities in 1935–39 on all items of food, clothing, rent, fuel, electricity and ice, what do we find?

Quoting from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor we find that the index figure for average cost of living in the war year of 1918 was 107.5; in 1919 it was 123.8; in 1920 it was 143.3. From then it declined to 92.7 in 1933. The year before war broke out in Europe it was 100.8.

There was no OPA in those years. Yet the index of annual average living costs in large United States cities went above the index figure for 1943, which was 123.6 in only three of those years. In 1942 when the Emergency Price Control Act became law it was 116.5. So what?

The average retail price of a round steak in 1920 was 39.5 cents per pound. Ten years later it was 42.6 per pound; when war broke out in Europe it was 36 cents per pound; in 1940 it was 36.4 cents; in 1942 it was 43.5 cents. In 1943 it was 43.9 cents per pound.

In the war period 1915–1920 round steak retailed for an average of 23 cents to 39.5 cents per pound—no rationing, no price control. In the war period 1939 through 1943 the average retail price of round steak rose from 36 cents in 1939 to 43.5 cents in 1942, before rationing and price control. In 1943, under rationing and price control it was 43.9 cents per pound. And today there is no meat.

Where has it gone? Well, lend-lease exports, for one thing, rose from $741,000,000 in 1941 to $4,895,000,000 in 1942, to $10,100,000,000 in 1943. That accounts for some of it.

Maybe you can account for some of it in places like Onstead, Mich., and the Relocation Camp at Cody, Wyo., for 10,000 interned west coast Japanese.

Down in Onstead, a school with 354 pupils wanted some food for their school-lunch program. A week later a Government truck arrived with 864 cans of evaporated milk; 312 pounds of cheese; 150 pounds of butter; 288 cans of pork and beans; 300 pounds of dried beans; 600 pounds of white flour and 600 pounds of graham flour; 240 cans of grapefruit juice; 30 bushels of sweetpotatoes; 32 bushels of apples. When Congress accidentally heard of this, it ordered most of it back to Adrian, Mich.

When Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT, of Wyoming, visited the Jap Relocation Camp at Cody, Wyo., he found there 268,293 cans of vegetables; 141,405 packages of cereal; 61,914 jars of jellies and jams; 58,850 pounds of macaroni and noodles; 10,320 pounds of beans and peas; 6,853 gallons of mayonnaise; 10 cases of corn flakes; a carload of oranges and a carload of grapefruit.

No, sir; we do not believe it is necessary to wipe out American business, intimidate the American people, fine people, or jail them in order to control inflation. What the OPA needs is a general house cleaning. We believe that bureaucratic bunglers are responsible for all the shortages. We believe that price control and rationing can be accomplished without a lot of socialistic flapdoodle, and without the ruination of thousands of small businessmen.

Federal Stamp Tax on Automobiles and Boats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram sent to Hon. Robert L. Doughton, chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, and Hon. Walter F. George, chairman, Senate Finance Committee, by Mr. H. J. Brunnier, president, American Automobile Association, relative to the Federal stamp tax on automobiles and boats:

JUNE 5, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: Your committees are currently engaged in framing tax legislation which is primarily intended as an aid to business in the period of reconversion that we have now entered. This is all to the good. In this connection, however, we beg to urge upon you again a tax revision which would bring relief not to a comparatively few corporations, but to some 25,000,000 individual tax payers, including scores of thousands of returning service men and women. We refer to the owners of motor vehicles who have been paying the annual $5 motor vehicle use tax since it was first enacted on February 1, 1942.

Half a dozen bills are now pending in Congress calling for the abolition forthwith of this unfair levy. These bills reflect an enormous amount of dissatisfaction with this tax in every section of the country. In terms of loss of revenue to the Government, only $120,000,000 a year would be involved—a mere fraction of the comparatively minor relief now contemplated in the proposed tax adjustments affecting corporations. We are confident that the House and Senate would overwhelmingly vote for the immediate repeal of the motor vehicle use tax if the opportunity for a vote were presented. So we strongly urge that your committees provide this opportunity by reporting out one of the pending resolutions.

There is no time to lose, since the motor-vehicle use tax is again due for renewal on July 1. The record discloses that in the period between February 1, 1942, and March 30, 1945, the tax cost motor-vehicle owners approximately $475,000,000. Imposed as it was, during a period of greatly curtailed motor-vehicle operation, this tax constituted not a use tax in any sense of the term, but rather a pay-as-you-don't-go tax on highway transportation. In its very nature it was a nuisance tax, difficult of administration and almost impossible of enforcement. Hundreds of thousands of people have simply elected not to pay any attention to it, and millions who pay the use tax have no evidence of payment other than the records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The tax never had any relationship to vehicle value, vehicle use, or the ability of the owner to pay. It is wholly indefensible in theory and practice.

We are now in the most critical transportation period since Pearl Harbor, with Government urging every form of conservation to sustain the war effort and the civilian economy. So we respectfully urge, as we have on many former occasions, that this nuisance tax be forthwith repealed. We believe that repeal action at this time would be universally accepted as a recognition by Congress of the critical status of highway transportation today and its need of every possible aid. We further believe that it would have a beneficial effect on morale, since this tax has accumulated an amount of resentment out of all proportion to its paltry value from a national revenue standpoint.

H. J. BRUNNIER,
President, American
Automobile Association.

Effects of the Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a news item in a Washington paper a day or so ago called attention to the fact that local physicians expressed grave concern for the health of small children and expectant mothers unless the meat shortage is alleviated immediately.

Pregnancy complications, particularly toxemia, and malnutrition in children soon will manifest themselves if these expectant mothers and small children continue to receive an insufficient amount of protein, according to a prominent District physician. His contention was given further support by a famed obstetrician, who said that tests conducted in England during the period of wartime protein shortages showed a definite increase in every conceivable pregnancy complication.

A member of the staff at Children's Hospital declared he had found it almost impossible to keep certain classes of patients, particularly diabetic and those with digestive disorders, well fed. A former Army physician said that since his return to the States his child patients have a much lower average blood count and that far too many of them have abnormal metabolism than a few years ago.

To my knowledge and before the meat shortage became critical, local rationing boards refused to allow increased meat rationing upon a doctor's prescription to persons afflicted with anemia.

Now we have a very definite shortage and the people so afflicted are denied the protein so necessary to their well being. All of us understand quite well that if there is no meat in the markets we do not have meat on our tables, regardless of the necessity.

These facts are pertinent at the moment because we have the Price Control

Act in the House for consideration this week. We are told that nothing can be done now to alleviate the situation and afford any immediate relief. The sickening part of this story is that this condition is brought about by the unadulterated stubborness and inefficiency of the OPA administration.

It is to our everlasting shame that we have permitted a few "crackpot" theorists to sabotage our food supply. We can produce all the food necessary for our own welfare and make enormous contributions to the hungry peoples of the world simply by the intelligent handling of this problem. I think the bipartisan food committee under the chairmanship of Representative ANDERSON, newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture, made this very clear.

As there is now a possibility that the food shortage will affect the good health of millions of our citizens, I repeat what I have said on this floor many times—that lend-lease should be discontinued immediately all over the world, except to China, and Congress should be given the opportunity to review the entire food situation.

Postwar Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a column from the Evening Star of June 14 by Mr. Lowell Mellett. I like Mr. Mellett's fair approach to the very controversial subject of our postwar military policy, and I think that everyone could read this column with profit.

SAYS RESISTANCE TO PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION WILL NOT BE OVERCOME QUICKLY, IF EVER

(By Lowell Mellett)

There is one issue of vital importance before the American people that can be and is being considered in the good temper that usually produces the best results. It is the issue of peacetime conscription and military training. A special committee of the House of Representatives is endeavoring to learn how the plain people feel on the subject, while at the same time obtaining the views of what may be called experts. The latter include not only military men and civilian war leaders, but educators and others qualified to offer opinions based on study and information.

For the most part the witnesses have been earnest without being shrill. Those who oppose compulsory training have been disposed to concede the sincerity and patriotic purpose of those who favor it, and vice versa. One advocate of peacetime conscription did remark that 12 college presidents who had expressed their opposition were "talking through their 12 learned hats," but that isn't considered violent language in congressional circles.

Reasonable discussion is possible, because no one has ground for suspecting anyone else of selfish or sinister motives. The witness who suggested that college presidents were against the proposal for 1 year's training only because it would interfere with their own "business," probably was sorry when he read his words in cold print next day.

All in all, the matter is being debated in an atmosphere of good feeling. Some simply think we will not be properly prepared to fight any future enemy unless when the time comes we can instantly call up millions of young men who've had previous training. And some think this simply is not true; that instead, we can always assemble and train a first-class Army quickly without dislocating, year after year, the lives of millions of boys who may never be ordered to fight.

You can listen to it all and still remain uncertain in your own mind. It requires a lot of thinking, since it involves a basic departure in our whole manner of living, but presently you will arrive at a firm conviction on one side or the other. And what the majority of us come to believe is what Congress is likely to establish as the American policy. However, it is going to take some time for us to make up our minds, so don't look for any quick action by Congress.

This will be disappointing to those who already have convinced themselves that all the good argument is on the side of adopting the system that has furnished most of the European countries with their armies.

Particularly disappointed will be the military leaders who are certain that our fighting machine in Europe would have been better and our losses in men less had that machine been composed entirely of men who had had at least a year's thorough training before being sent overseas. The lessons of this war are so clear, from their standpoint, that they assume we all must see them. It has been their hope that with the demonstration freshly before us we will be willing to ratify their judgment. In other words, they believe this is the time—not later, when the lessons may be forgotten—to achieve what they regard as a great reform in military policy. Quite apart from military considerations, to give them full credit, they believe the proposed year of physical training and discipline will promote our national well-being.

The resistance, however, is instinctive and deep, too deep to be overcome quickly, if ever. Congress senses this resistance and doubtless shares it. Wherefore the patient study being given by the present exploratory committee.

In the meantime the delegates at San Francisco are perfecting an international security organization. If it should appear to be something that will work or, at least, something worth trying, the pleaders for peacetime conscription in this country are likely to find themselves pleading in vain.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution urging adoption of the free-press principle on a world-wide basis

Whereas Connecticut, the Constitution State, has long recognized that a free press is among "the great and essential principles of liberty and free government" and has decreed that "no law shall ever be passed to curtail or restrain the liberty of speech or of the press": Be it

Resolved, That the House and Senate of the General Assembly of Connecticut respectfully urge that those same principles be recognized and guaranteed by international compact as a world-wide right to the end that truth may forever be available to all peoples as a guide toward world freedom, understanding, and peace; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State of the United States, the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Affairs of the United States Congress, and the Connecticut Members of the Congress.

Public Favors Voice in Ratifying of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 7, in discussing House Joint Resolution 60 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, I said:

I am convinced that the people wish the adoption of this amendment. It is my conviction that the people desire to change the Constitution so that a majority of the entire Congress can validate treaties.

As further proof of my statement, I am inserting in the RECORD a news release, dated June 15, 1945, by Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion. This release appears in the Washington Post:

PUBLIC FAVORS HOUSE VOICE IN RATIFYING OF TREATIES

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., June 15.—When the United States House of Representatives went on record in favor of giving itself a voice in ratification of treaties, it had the backing of the American people.

A survey just completed across the Nation finds that a majority of the civilians in this country favor having treaties ratified by Presidential approval plus a majority of the House and Senate.

This is in contrast to the present method of treaty ratification, which calls for Presidential approval and approval of two-thirds of the Senate.

The idea actually has been acceptable to the American people as far back as October 1943, when the institute first questioned a cross-section of the public about it.

Whether the Senate will agree to share its august treaty-making prerogative with the House is of course another question. As for the general public, present sentiment on the issue is shown by replies to the following question:

Which one of these three ways would you, personally, favor as the best way to have peace treaties approved?

The three alternatives given voters are: (1) Approval by the President only, (2) approval by the President and a majority of the whole Congress, (3) approval by the President and two-thirds of the Senate—the present method.

The replies today, as compared to earlier surveys on the same issue:

	October 1943	May 1944	Today
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
President only	7	7	7
President and majority whole Congress	54	60	58
President and two-thirds Senate	25	19	21
Don't know	14	14	14

Analysis of the replies brought forth some other interesting facts about public thinking on the question of treaty ratification:

1. Throughout the Nation as a whole, only about one-third are able to say how treaties are at present ratified.

2. Among the people who are able to name present treaty ratification procedures, the majority favor changing requirements to approval of the President and a majority of both the House and Senate.

3. Among people who have attended college, almost two out of three know the present ratification procedures, but better than two out of three think the best system would be to provide approval of the President and a majority of both branches of Congress.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as we now consider the question of the extension of the Price Control Act, it is imperative that we approach this very important question in a spirit of sincerity and one of public service to the people of our Nation, and all of us must be possessed of all of the things that are important in connection with this legislation.

It must not be passed because the President has asked it to be passed, high as is my regard for him. No man can know all the angles. There does exist in this Nation today a veritable revolution against OPA and its does not of necessity come at the hands of monopolies and large capital-stock organizations, but rather it comes from the smallest type of business people in the country, together with many thousands of consumers.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial written by Cedric Adams in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, June 10:

IN THIS CORNER WITH CEDRIC ADAMS

Let's talk about the meat situation as an opener today. A group of eastern butchers, who, like most butchers, have been unable to obtain meat, decided to pool their funds and send two representatives up to Canada just to see what they could buy. Before going to Canada, the pair went to Washington to learn the lay of the land. They were told by the Department of Agriculture it had no objection to the deal. The Department even went so far as to say it would inspect the meat they might buy for free. The Canadian embassy even gave its okay to the proposed plan. An attaché of the Canadian embassy said, "Yes, we have plenty of meat. All you have to do is find it. If the Canadian Government doesn't need it, you may get a permit to ship it to the United States." The Americans went to Montreal and purchased 10 cars of prime dressed beef and veal and 6 cars of livestock—a total of 640,000 pounds. The meat cost 19 cents a pound—2½ cents less than the OPA ceiling price in this country.

The Montreal packers said they're anxious to do business with Americans. They explained the price they get from the British is 3 cents less than the American butchers paid them. After the meat was sealed in refrigerator cars the whole deal was canceled by a high Canadian food official who told the buyers he acted at the request of the United States State Department. When the butchers returned to the United States they were told by the State Department the deal was held up by the War Food Administration. These men, however, brought back some other interesting information from Canada that might interest you and the OPA: They saw huge quantities of cheese with a 21-cent-a-pound price tag against a 45-cent ceiling here. Butter up there was 36 cents a pound compared to our 51 cents a pound. There are more than 56,000,000 pounds of butter in storage for Canada's 11,500,000 population.

Eggs in Canada sell from 20 to 24 cents a dozen, compared with a retail ceiling here of 49 cents. And in Canada the supply is so great farmers are killing off laying hens to prevent a further price drop. Chickens are so abundant across the border that you can buy all you want at any price you're willing to pay. Here chickens are almost unobtainable except in the black market. One more item that should interest you in this little comparison is this: The only two major items that are rationed up there are gasoline and butter and the Canadians expect gasoline rationing to be entirely removed on or before July 1. There may be a thousand and one reasons behind, shall we say, this maladjustment. I hope the OPA doesn't think we're needling the Office. We're simply reporting what two butchers found in Canada. Don't you think the facts are interesting?

OWI Goes to President's Home Town in Missouri Again and Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House to extend my remarks I include the following brief news story from the June 14, 1945, edition of the Independence Examiner, of Independence, Mo., home town of the President of the United States. This is an Independent-Democratic newspaper edited by the widely known Missourian, William Southern, Jr.:

TWO BUREAU ARMS GET SAME STORY—INDEPENDENT SEES EXAMPLE OF EXTRAVAGANCE WHEN OWI SENDS FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC STAFFS HERE FOR IDENTICAL RECORDS

Here is a fact story to which we call the attention of Congress. Congress has been irritated by the OWI and cut off the revenue and while the department is to be continued there are Members who would refuse to make any appropriations.

A day after the death of President Roosevelt a crew of reporters and photographers from the OWI with their credentials, flew from Washington and arrived in Independence. They put in a week or two here taking pictures and gathering information and said it was for the OWI, official, at Government expense and for Government purposes.

Recently another crew arrived in Independence. The head man presented his credentials and said he was sent by the OWI officially to prepare an illustrated biography of Independence. When he was told that another crew from the OWI had spent a week here gathering exactly the same material he expressed surprise and took the trouble to find out.

The explanation was that the first crew was for the department of the OWI which covered only the United States. That its biography of Independence, its pictures and framework were for home consumption only. The second crew is to prepare the same information exactly and print the same information, pictures, and story for foreign consumption only. When asked why the work done by the first crew could not have been used he was told that the domestic crew of the OWI was not permitted to exchange information or lend pictures to the foreign department, that the two departments were entirely separate expense accounts and no exchange of information was permitted. One was entirely independent of the other.

So Independence got a combing over for stories and pictures at Government expense by two expensive crews from the same OWI. We might remark that this is Biblical in Washington bureaus, not to let the left hand know what the right hand is doing. The Government pays the bill. Two different crews came from Washington and spent a week each in Independence doing exactly the same work.

Treating Americans Like Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I offer a letter which has reached me from a loyal, American citizen of my district setting forth an example of the operation of the OPA. In the face of conditions existing today in the alleged land of plenty, it is difficult to reconcile the attitude of a Government agency toward our citizens who handle food.

Other instances of persecution of an indefensible nature similar to the one detailed in this letter have come to my personal attention.

OPA should not expect any continuance of the act without including correcting amendments which will eliminate abuses of the nature indicated.

PURSELL PUBLISHING CO.,
Plymouth, Mich., June 7, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE DONDERO:

Here is what happened in Plymouth tonight:

The owners of Denton's Grocery, 616 South Main Street, Plymouth, were requested to appear before the OPA price panel tonight at 7:30. As the store is open until 10 p. m. I was asked to accompany Mrs. Denton so

Mr. Denton could keep the store open. But both are needed in the store all the time.

After a 55-minute wait we were called. The secretary of this price panel claimed to have visited the store and noted several marked prices and checked these at the offices later. Out of several she found only one out of line. Old Dutch Cleanser was marked at 11 cents whereas the OPA price is fixed at 9 cents. No customer complained and no buy had been made.

Yet Mrs. Denton was requested to fill out a violation admission and when she asked for time to let her husband know about the request they threatened "to send the case in to Detroit for action." With that threat Mrs. Denton filled out said violation form and signed it. When she returned to the store it was discovered no Old Dutch Cleanser had been sold at that price.

Seems to me this is a high-handed procedure that is wholly unnecessary and should be stopped at once. Had this price panel been honestly interested in helping the merchants obey the law, a simple telephone notice to the Denton's would have solved everything in 30 seconds.

Obviously it is not intended to help the merchant but to prosecute him. These panel meetings are held under "private" screening and no Plymouth citizen is allowed to listen in when accusations are being made. Is this Americanism? Are we taking on nazism under the fine title of being "good citizens"? I'm sure you are opposed to this kind of treatment of our citizens.

You may use this letter and contents in any way that you would like.

R. R. PURSELL.

I have read the above and believe it to be true to the best of my knowledge.

WILDA DENTON.

Extension of the Stabilization Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am herewith including the remarks I made before the Banking and Currency Committee on the 15th of this month, said committee having under consideration and holding hearings on the extension of the Stabilization Act, which is authority for the Office of Price Administration. In my remarks to the Banking and Currency Committee I submitted the five points indorsed and requested by a large number of the business people of my district. I have carefully read these five points, and in the main endorse them, as I believe three of the points submitted have been under consideration before in the enactment of the Stabilization Act, as well as all extensions to same.

It is hoped that the committee, as well as this House, will give serious consideration to the requests of these businessmen from my district, and I am happy to present to the House in my remarks herein their requests. My statement before the Banking and Currency Committee was as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am appearing before you for the purpose of expressing the views of a large majority of the business people of my district in reference to the extension of the Stabilization Act, commonly referred to as the OPA.

In presenting the views of my constituents herein, I am also, in an abstract way, presenting some matters of my own which I think demand the attention of this committee in the formulation of an extension of the OPA Act.

In presenting the views of my constituents, as mentioned, as well as some of my own abstract views, I do not mean to insist or even recommend that the Stabilization Act be repealed or permitted to die; and from the information I have from my constituents, for whom I am speaking at this time, as well as for myself, I do not recommend to this committee nor to the Congress that this should be done.

In a representative democracy noted for its liberty-loving people and the freedom enjoyed by the citizenship of such a government, I am aware that it is almost impossible to pass even in wartime any control act that ca nbe enforced by an iron-clad rule. I am also aware that in a democracy, if such democracy continues to exist, a planned economy cannot succeed and will never succeed under such a system of government.

The people have passively acquiesced, so to speak, in such stabilization only for the purpose of controlling inflation, which we all know is and will be disastrous to any system of government. Notwithstanding this fact, however, we are now confronted with a serious question of whether or not it is best under the record made by the agency, to wit, the OPA's, success in handling this act. As just stated, I realize that it is almost an impossibility to carry out the intents and purposes of the Stabilization Act, by any agency, in a representative democracy; because even the temporary planned economy is so antagonistic toward the liberties that the citizenship have enjoyed under our free enterprise system. It being in the nature of a planned economy, I am becoming more doubtful as to the success of this act, and the administration seeking to enforce the act, by reason of the record made by the agency that has had charge and control of the administration of the same. An act as broad as the Stabilization Act, and one that is to succeed in any measure, has to cover the field of commerce of a population of more than 130,000,000 people, and will necessarily make many mistakes. This cannot be avoided in the enormous task this agency has been called upon to perform, and we all know that these mistakes have necessarily been many. But, it does occur to me, that when these mistakes appear in the record as they have on numerous occasions, it is the duty of this agency, instead of becoming hard-boiled, arrogant and dictatorial, to immediately seek means to revise and correct these mistakes. This in many instances has not been done, to the injury of the people as well as with the result of placing the representatives of the people in Congress on the spot, so to speak.

While it is true, perhaps, that this act has in a measure prevented more inflation than is existing today, and that it is recognized by all reasonable, thinking persons that it has been of assistance to many people who, without the help of this act, perhaps would have suffered untold hardships; yet, when weighed in the balances from all points, this committee and the Congress should take into consideration the benefits received by the administration of the act as well as the injuries sustained by the public and the cost of enforcing same.

In this connection, I am informed that for this year and for the year 1946 the Budget says that the subsidies paid to assist in carrying out the program have been in the amount of $2,400,000,000 in direct subsidies; and this amount does not include the many thousands of dollars that are being paid in indirect subsidies. The Budget also states, I am informed, that the salaries now being paid to the personnel of the Office of Price Administration amount yearly to $179,000,000. This does not include the expenses paid in administering this act by the personnel of this Agency. It could reasonably be mentioned that traveling expenses, rents, postage, stationery, printing, lights and fuel, and other items too numerous to mention, will increase this amount spent and to be spent to carry on this program will be in the approximate amount of four to five billion dollars annually.

With this in mind, I am wondering, with this enormous outlay of expenses, which is more than it cost the Government to operate a few years ago, together with the injury done in carrying on this program of planned economy, whether it is worth the price. Even those of us who favored this act have to admit that it has put many private businesses and private enterprises out of existence. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is a serious question, and should be taken into consideration by this committee as well as the Congress in extending this act. These statements and these figures are given in order that this committee could see the necessity of giving this matter their serious consideration.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am submitting herewith five points, which as stated before, are the desire of the majority and all of the businessmen in my district I have heard from have asked that these five points be included into the extension of the OPA. The five points are as follows:

1. Interpretation by OPA of the clause "generally fair and equitable" has resulted in narrowing the normal gross profit of retailers in a multitude of instances. Retail prices have been maintained by forcing the retailer to absorb additional costs. In the uncertain days ahead this condition could become even more serious. Congress can and should define the term "generally fair and equitable" to prevent the present "squeeze" on the retailers.

2. There are two distinct types of Price Control Act violations. One is a willful disregard of rationing and price control. The other is purely technical and unintentional. What individual merchant can guarantee that his place of business is absolutely free of any kind of error—with a constant turnover of employees (mainly inexperienced), and with the multiplicity of regulations that exist? Should this merchant be subjected to the same ill publicity as a willful violator? Therefore, the courts should be permitted to use discretion as to granting injunctions in cases of nonwillful violations.

3. The right to review OPA decisions should be extended to the United States district and circuit courts. This would enable the petitioner to take his case to a much nearer point, eliminating time, travel, and expense.

4. Commercial rents in war emergency areas should be placed under the act. Many merchants are now signing new leases at much higher rentals, increasing cost of operation.

5. The act should be renewed for only a 12-month period, instead of the proposed 18 months. No one can accurately predict when the emergency period will end. Periodic review is a sound principle to follow.

In the length of time which I have had to study the five points submitted herein for your consideration and the requests being made by my constituents that such be included in the way of amendments to the extension, I am of the opinion that each of these points is fair and should be included by way of amendment to the extension of this act if it is continued.

You will notice that they are all of the opinion that the act should be renewed, but

only for a period of 12 months, and personally, I am of the same opinion. Any extension short of 12 months, in my mind, would throw the machinery out of gear, and the time would be so limited that the agency could not perform in that fair manner which I am in hopes it will perform better than in the past.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, let me thank you in behalf of myself and all my constituents who are asking your consideration in this matter.

The Menace to American Industry in the Proposal to Reduce the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include as a part thereof a speech delivered by Hon. William S. Bennet at the John Hay Republican Club, the Bronx, New York City, Thursday, June 14, 1945:

While I am a life-long Republican, I am speaking tonight not primarily as a Republican, but as an American. I do not know that I shall say anything different on that account, but I refer to the fact that, at the moment, I am not the holder of any public office nor a candidate for any office, and am not even a county committeeman, and what I say is simply the thoughts of a man in the ranks, though however, one with considerable experience.

I am here to express my opposition, and indeed my amazement, at the proposal not only to extend the reciprocity law for 3 years but so to amend it that the State Department will have the right to reduce by 50 percent to every country in the world any existing duty from the amount at which it stood on January 1, 1945. This means that in the case of any one of the 1,910 separate reductions already made, which has the full 50 percent permitted by the law passed in 1934, that it will under the proposed additional reduction be possible to reduce it 75 percent from the rate fixed by the Congress in the Tariff Act of 1930 and, indeed, in a case where prior to the Trade Agreement Act a 50-percent reduction had been made under the Tariff Commission Act of the 1930 act itself, a total of 87½ percent.

At no time since George Washington signed the first Tariff Act on July 4, 1789, has any such dangerous, heedless, reckless, and even catastrophic and calamitous power been contemplated to be placed in the hands of any executive official, not even of the President of the United States.

I do not blame anyone in particular. The situation arises from the fact that we haven't had a thoroughgoing discussion of the tariff since the three elections of 1890, 1892, and 1894, and since William McKinley was elected President in 1896, as the result of these tariff discussions. It has been quite generally assumed that whenever there was a Republican President, Senate, and House there would be a protective tariff, and that if, when, and as the country wanted a low tariff or free trade, they would elect a Democratic President, Senate, and House. Therefore, in recent years few have ever given the tariff much thought. The series of discussions in 1890, 1892, and 1894 occurred before a great many Members of the present House were even born.

I am grateful for one thing, which is that there is no responsibility on the Republican Party for the passage of this act by the House of Representatives on May 26, 1945. The test vote was on the Republican motion to continue the present situation without change for 2 years. On that the vote was 181 ayes and 212 noes. Seven Republicans voted with the Democrats, 13 Democrats voted with the Republicans. What carried the vote was the Democratic majority. If the seven Republicans had voted with the rest of the Republicans the vote would merely have been changed to 188 ayes, 205 noes, and the bill would have passed just the same.

The protective tariff is not the product of modern Republicanism. It was worked out in the first House of Representatives and the first Senate which first met in New York City on April 6, 1789. At that time James Madison, incidentally all his life a theoretical free trader, introduced what he regarded when it was introduced as a revenue bill to levy a tariff on the products being brought over in what were known as the "spring ships" from England. Our country was without money and this revenue was needed. But it is interesting to note that regardless of the pressing need the 60 men in the House and the 20 men in the Senate took time to work out the philosophy of the situation and when the act got to George Washington who signed it, as I have already stated, on July 4, 1789, the second act that the First Congress had passed, it contained the following section:

"SECTION 1. Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares and merchandise imported: 'Be it enacted,' etc."

Years later the Supreme Court, in which at that time four Democrats and five Republicans sat, held unanimously in the case of *J. W. Hampton, Jr.* v. *U. S.* (276 U. S. 394, at pp. 411, 412), that the language of that first section made the act not a revenue act but a protective tariff act and from that date to this, 156 years, ours has been a protective tariff country. After 156 years of experience the facts justify the statement that our tariff system as it stands in the Tariff Act of 1930 is the best and fairest tariff system in the world. It has been changed the least. England, for instance, during that same period at one time had her corn laws, that is, a tariff system to protect the products of agriculture. She junked that, ruined her agriculture and become a so-called free-trade country, though the individual Englishman paid more per capita in tariff rates than did the individual American. About 1922 she changed her policy and became a protective tariff country.

In the days prior to the Civil War nearly everyone was for the protective tariff except the growers of cotton after about 1840. The disputes were quite generally over rates on particular classes of articles.

Among the Presidents of the United States who have favored the tariff either by signing a protective tariff act or by voting for it as a Member of Congress or by advocating it are: Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Van Buren, William Henry Harrison, Tyler, Buchanan, and Lincoln. I pause here to insert Lincoln's speech made in 1832 when he was 23 years of age and first a candidate for the Illinois Legislature.

"Fellow citizens, I presume you all know who I am—I am humble Abraham Lincoln. I have been solicited by many friends to become a candidate for the legislature. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal improvement system, and a high protective tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles. If elected I shall be thankful; if not it will be all the same."

It will be noted that he does not give the name of the party to which he belonged but so widespread was political knowledge at that time that practically every citizen in the district knew that it was a speech of a National Republican supporting Henry Clay. After the Civil War days, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, William H. Taft, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Herbert Hoover are to be added. Only one President ever vetoed a tariff bill—John Tyler. He was a protectionist; he didn't like the first two bills that Congress sent up to him and vetoed them, but when they sent the third one up in 1842 he signed it, and it was a good law.

One President, Cleveland, denounced a tariff bill as an instrument of perfidy and dishonor, but allowed it to become a law without his signature. I do not know offhand whether John Adams, Millard Fillmore, James K. Polk, Franklin Pierce, or Andrew Johnson had a specific record on the question. I am inclined to think that Johnson, while a Member of either the House or Senate voted for a protective tariff bill. I could add Polk and Pierce, because the one signed the bill of 1846 and the other that of 1857, neither of which was a free-trade bill but both of which were reductions from prior bills. Taylor and Grant came directly to the Presidency from the Army. Woodrow Wilson signed the Underwood bill, which had a good many protective features, some rates being as high as 60 percent; and, in addition, he made quite a good many speeches advocating tariffs on particular articles. Grover Cleveland was a free trader. He called it "tariff reform," but the campaigns of 1890, 1892, and 1894, in the latter two of which I personally participated, were free trade versus protection, and Cleveland recognized this by denouncing the Tariff Act of 1894, passed by a Democratic Congress and presented to him for signature. The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt was a very low tariff man. It will be noted from this recital that the men who have discharged the great responsibilities of the Presidency have, in the main, favored a protective tariff.

I have read a good deal of the debate in the House on May 23 to 26, more I think from Democratic sources than from the Republican, and I have been amazed at the evident lack of knowledge as to what has occurred in connection with tariffs in the past. It was early recognized that ours had become a protective tariff economy. Daniel Webster came to the House of Representatives from New Hampshire in 1815. Like James Madison, he was a believer in the theory of free trade, as advocated by Adam Smith, and in the case of Mr. Webster, that belief remained until his death. One of his earliest speeches in the House was a masterly effort to demonstrate that a tariff was unconstitutional. Later he came to the Senate from Massachusetts, voted for the Tariff Act of 1824 and that of 1828. On the latter occasion someone evidently brought up the fact of his free-trade speech of earlier days. Mr. Webster took nothing back but said that our whole economy was now on a protective tariff base and that to attempt to change it would be disastrous. So he voted for the 1828 tariff which contained two items very distasteful to New England; a tariff on hemp and a tariff on molasses, and enough Senators from New England followed him to pass the bill. Incidentally these two tariff items had been deliberately placed in the bill by John C. Calhoun who wished the bill defeated and thought that New England would not vote for a bill containing them, but New England did.

If our economy was inseparable from our tariff in 1828, what is it in 1945, and how great would be the disaster if the plans of

the New Dealers are now carried out? Until after the election in 1932 it had never occurred to anyone, Republican or Democrat, that the country might be faced with a situation where it would be within the power of an executive official, not elected by the people, to reduce tariff rates 75 percent at one fell swoop. Some will say that that cannot happen here because 1,910 separate rates have already been reduced, some the full 50 percent permitted by the 1934 act. It is true that some agreements for reductions had been made before September 1, 1939, on which day the European war commenced. These reductions, however, were few and both they and agreements for reductions entered into since have been largely nullified by the war. There is no higher protective tariff than a war, so, as these reductions have not been put into effect extensively, if they are further reduced 50 percent from the January 1, 1945 rate, it would in some cases be the full 75 percent reduction which strikes an American manufacturer. No manufacturer has ever heretofore been subjected to such a threat.

In 1930 the Tariff Commission compiled a comparative statement commencing with the McKinley Act of 1890. The comparative rates on these seven tariffs in 40 years, two of which, the Wilson and Underwood Acts, were Democratic acts, were as follows:

McKinley, 1890, 23 percent.
Wilson, 1894, 20.9 percent.
Dingley, 1897, 25.8 percent.
Payne, 1909, 19.3 percent.
Underwood, 1913 (disturbed by war conditions), from 6 to 14.8 percent.
Fordney, 1922, 13.83 percent.
Hawley, 1930, 16 percent (estimated).

Interestingly enough it will be noticed that the largest percentage of reduction was between two Republican bills. Compare these slight changes with the possibility that a rate in the 1930 act can be reduced 75 percent and that if the present rate had been put into effect since 1934 the average rate might possibly be reduced by 75 percent from the 16 percent of 1930 to 4 percent. Of course that danger exists as to only a very few of the 1910 changes already made but it does exist as to some. There is no business operating under a tariff that could stand such a reduction. The Underwood Act of 1913 demonstrates what would happen to a manufacturing business by what the Underwood bill did to agriculture. In many cases the Underwood bill put agricultural products on the free list. Fortunately for agriculture the Underwood bill went into effect in October 1913 and World War I commenced in July 1914 so that the Underwood bill was not effective as to agriculture even as to one harvest before the war. After the war, agriculture nearly collapsed, but a Republican House and Senate were in office by 1919; they passed an Emergency Tariff Act relating solely to agriculture products for which 40 Democrates, including John N. Garner, voted, but President Wilson vetoed it.

One of the first acts of the Republican administration was to repass it and make it a law by President Harding's signature; this saved agriculture. So we now know what a drastic reduction will do. What a time this is to try the proposed awful experiments. With the war in Europe over we are approaching the time when we must reconvert our industries from the demands of war to the requirements of peace and when we must bring about the integration of 12,000,000 men and women now in the armed services to the employments of peace and in addition transfer 9,000,000 from war to peace, a total of 21,000,000 persons. President Truman, from his experience on the Truman committee, understands something of what this will mean. He has asked legislation to pay unemployed men for a long term of weeks, $25 a week, and the current number of Time states that he has informed the Democratic leaders that this is absolutely necessary. Yet the opponents of the proposed reduction choose this time for the most drastic change in our tariff structure. This proposed change is madness and folly. I found no indication in the Democratic speeches of any perception of the following things: First, the devastating effect of uncertainty. Second, that at least twice in our history fear connected with the tariff situations has brought on disastrous panics. Third, that tariff-protected industries cannot get the necessary capital to expand their business if there is any possibility of tariff reduction affecting their industries in the near future. Fourth, how quickly prosperity can be translated into panic. I'll discuss the fourth first. On March 4, 1857, President Buchanan, who was then inaugurated with a Democratic Senate and House and with a Democratic tariff on the books, in his inaugural speech said:

"Our present financial condition is without a parallel in history. No nation has ever before been embarrassed from too large a surplus in its treasury."

On December 8, 1857, only 9 months later, he delivered his first annual message in the course of which he said:

"We have possessed all the elements of national wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, and our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want."

Contemporary newspaper accounts use even stronger language, including the statement that there were no sales except by the sheriff. President Buchanan applied in vain to the Congress for tariff changes. The people, in 1858, elected a House which was not Democratic but composed of Whigs and Republicans. The secession of the Southern States, put the Republicans in control of the Senate and on March 3, 1861, the day before he left office, President Buchanan signed a Republican Protective Tariff Act. It was a good act and remained in force until 1883, 22 years.

In 1890 the fight for free trade commenced. The House elected that year, after the passage of the McKinley Tariff Act in 1890, contained 88 Republicans and 231 Democrats. In 1892 the people elected Grover Cleveland as a free-trader and gave him a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, although the Republicans' strength then increased a little, 126 Republicans to 220 Democrats. As the Democratic campaign had been on a free-trade basis, and as the Democrats had a Democratic President, House and Senate, it suddenly dawned on the people that they were apparently in for free trade.

The panic started about the time President Cleveland was inaugurated and months before the bill was passed. In March of that year I saw, at 220 Broadway, Manhattan, the first line of people who had been thrown out of employment, had no money with which to buy winter clothing and who stood in the biting March breezes, for the free clothing distribution being conducted there by the New York Herald. The Democratic bill did not become a law until 9 months thereafter but fear had brought about the panic. The election of 1894, therefore, resulted in a House in which there were 246 Republicans and 104 Democrats. Confidence was considerably restored. A Republican House was elected again in 1896 and a Republican Senate with President McKinley. In 1897 the Dingley protective tariff bill was passed and under it the country prospered. What guaranty is there that what happened twice won't happen again, and what sense is there in taking a chance at a time when the employment of 21,000,000 men and women in peace time industries and the creation of those industries is in question?

I am really sorry that President Truman has been brought into this situation by the letter he wrote to Speaker Rayburn. So far the President's brief service in the White House has been fairly satisfactory to most people. He has answered many questions in a common sense way that the people have liked. His service as chairman of the Truman committee is generally regarded as satisfactory. Now he interposes himself in a matter on which he has very little knowledge. He is not an old man. He just passed his sixtieth birthday. He was in the Senate over 10 years. Before that he held a political position in Missouri for a considerable time. He was in World War I and had a very creditable record. He was connected with business only once, a small haberdashery business which was a complete failure. This is merely a recital of facts with no intention of disrespect. He gives the people an insurance and assurance which he has no power to back up.

It won't be any particular agreement or agreements under the proposed 50 percent reduction that will first affect business, but the fact that the power has been given to make the reduction. There are quite a number of industries in strong competition with factories abroad—shoes, watches, handblown glass, textiles and, in agriculture, cattle and sheep, which of course includes hides and wool. Let us assume the case of a shoe manufacturer in Massachusetts who wants to expand his business after this new reduction goes into effect. He goes to a friend who has money to invest. "Venture capital," it is sometimes called, or "risk money," in each instance meaning capital on which the investor must take the risk of the business. The shoe manufacturer states his need and the moneyed man says: Are you dependent on tariff protection? To which the answer is "Yes." What about the trade-agreement reductions? Well, they hurt me until the war started. Since September 1, 1939, the war has protected me. What about this new possible addition, 50 percent reduction? Could that be applied? Yes. So you might be subjected to the original reduction plus the additional reduction. Yes, but I do not think they would do that. But you would have to take the risk if they would. Yes. If they did could you continue in business, to which the answer would be "No." What good would President Truman's assurance be to that manufacturer? He wouldn't get his money. It would be the passage of the proposed 50 percent reduction from the January 1, 1945, price that would have ruined him because no one would risk the investment of additional capital. Oh! But they say this new reduction would not all be used. Then why pass the bill which gives the power to make it and which destroys confidence? To that there is no affirmative answer which any reasonable man can make.

I have examined carefully and have not found one valid argument in favor of the proposal. Let's take them up one by one. "We want to increase foreign trade." It seems to be overlooked that from 1893 until the World War we led the world in exports and were second only to the United Kingdom (Great Britain) in imports, so we have a high base from which to start an increase.

Another thing that is overlooked is that 93 percent of our products go into our domestic markets. The sole factual argument attempted to be based on anything that has occurred in 11 years, since the 1934 act went into effect, is that the increase of business between ours and the countries with which we have made agreements, is much higher than with the countries with which we had not made an agreement during a specified period. Break down those figures and you will find these things. First: on the ground

that agreements with Great Britain and other countries, experience with which had not been particularly good, has been in effect too short a time for the effects to be reflected, all those countries are omitted entirely from the calculation. In the list of countries with which we have not made agreements are five which were in wars: Germany, Austria, Italy, Japan, and Spain in bitter civil war. Each of these was a comparatively big country. Of course when they were in war their trade with us did not increase. As figures the statement is probably correct arithmetic. As something to be relied on it is nonexistent. Certainly it is not the basis on which the future of every tariff protected industry in this country should be put in jeopardy. A Nation of 140,000,000 people ought not to be asked to rely on anything except pretty certain things.

Another thing which the trade agreement people overlook is the fact that between 1934 when their act was passed and September 1939 when the war nullified its effects, the number of unemployed in this country did not decrease. As Governor Dewey has pointed out, it was not any Democratic legislation which ended unemployment. It took a war to do that.

The next point is that this proposed further decrease will prevent cutthroat wars. How will it do it, where will it do it, and what cutthroat wars? It has never been a part of our policy to prevent fair competition. What our tariff does, or is intended to do, is to equalize the cost of production at home and abroad. We realize that with our higher wages our production costs in some industries are higher, but the higher wages permit a higher standard of living, and that is what we want to protect. Over and above that, we welcome competition because it aids in keeping down the price to the consumer and prevents domestic monopoly. Here is an illustration:

In 1922 the rayon manufacturers said that if they were given a 45 percent tariff they could establish a competitive rayon industry in this country. They got their tariff. In 1930 the situation was investigated. It was found that the rayon industry had been established, and, interestingly, importations from foreign countries were larger than they had been in 1922 and the price to the consumer had been reduced. If we had not established the rayon industry in 1922 we would have been at the mercy of the foreign producers and it is even possible that the industry nowhere would have grown to the point which everyone knows it has now reached. The 1930 act continued an equivalent 45 percent duty in the form of a mixed, specific duty.

Some more illustrations from my own experience: In 1909 William A. Coakley, a union lithographer living in the Bronx, came to me, I being at that time a Member of Congress, and pointed out that picture post cards of our public buildings were all being manufactured in Germany and were stamped "Made in Germany." I assisted him to get a proper tariff. Within a year these picture post cards were being made in the United States by American workmen, being paid American wages, and the price to the consumer remained unchanged. During the same tariff period people from Kansas and Nebraska came to several of us and asked for a tariff on pumice, which as everyone knows, is the lava from volcanoes, usually, if not always, extinct volcanoes. Pumice is used in Old Dutch Cleanser and similar household abrasives. It was being imported from the Lipari Islands of Italy where the wage rate was 20 cents a day. There are deposits of pumice, curiously enough, in Kansas and Nebraska. We looked into the question, found out that on account of the fact that the deposits in Kansas and Nebraska were not extremely large and that labor was difficult to get, a rate ought to be adopted, for the protection of the consumers, which would allow the Italian pumice to come into the market east of Chicago and give the Kansas and Nebraska people everything west of Chicago. This was done, an American industry was established and the price of Old Dutch Cleanser and other abrasives remained unchanged. During the same period we took steps to establish the manufacture of cotton lace as an American industry on a sound basis. Abroad this industry was what we would call in this country a sweated industry, that is, home manufacture. Here it was desired to establish it in factories.

One of the factories was the Liberty Lace Works in the Bronx. Whether it is the same Liberty Lace Works that is still in the telephone book I do not know. What we did was to allow the lace manufacturers to import for a specified period the necessary machines from England (known as "lever-and-go-through" machines) duty free. In 4 years the industry had been so strongly built up that in the Democratic Underwood bill a rate of 60 percent ad valorem was continued on the product. It was found also that during the period prior to 1909 France had been charging whatever prices she saw fit in our market and sending us only a limited assortment of styles. We couldn't prevent it as we had no organized American industry to combat it. You will find those facts set out in the Underwood bill hearings in a letter of D. E. Sicher, who in 1909 joined others in asking that the then existing duty be reduced, but, when it was increased and machines were permitted to come in free and the industry was established, he changed his viewpoint, said that the Tariff Act of 1909 had been a good thing and that he was glad that his protest had been ineffectual. I could add instances.

Now what is happening? A representative of the rayon people appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and said that if the proposed 50-percent reduction was put on the statute books they would have to move to Brazil, and representatives of more than one lace workers union also appeared to protest.

Under both the 1922 and the 1930 Tariff Acts there was plenty of room for competition, possibly too much. It is the view of informed protectionists that foreign competition at prices above those necessary to protect our standard of living ought to be permitted and encouraged both for the benefit of the consumer and as a protection against domestic monopoly.

Another argument is that it is desired to expand markets. Where are the markets? On page 90 of the May Reader's Digest, W. R. Jenkins, formerly a business management counselor, and now vice president of Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., Minneapolis, Minn., in down to earth advice to returning service men about going into business, says tersely: "* * * nothing will take the place of a market." This sound advice is just as applicable to a nation as it is to a single soldier. It is true that our manufacturers can, if they wish, give goods away abroad, but what people in Europe are at this time potential customers with money to pay for what they buy? I imagine that we would all regard England as the best financial risk. Here is what Walter Lippmann recently said about England:

"She is deeply in debt; the industries which were once the source of her economic strength are technologically backward, and her newer industries, though promising, are not yet strong enough to be sure of their markets in open competition."

That doesn't sound like a very good credit risk, and, while the Scandinavian countries and Switzerland and Portugal may be good credit risks, the population of all of them together is only about 24,000,000. On the other hand, these decreases could permit every country in the world to enter the American market, which market now takes 93 percent of the American production.

Assistant Secretary Clayton actually, according to the newspapers, depends on increased exports for the success of the proposed plan. He told a committee of Congress that all that had to be done was to increase our exports to $10,000,000,000 a year. In 1944 they were, outside of lend-lease, about three billion. What would a factory manager say who had an output of $30,000 a month and called in Mr. Clayton as an expert and got his advice that what he needed was to increase his production to $100,000 a month. He would ask Mr. Clayton how he would do it. That information Mr. Clayton didn't give the committee. It doesn't exist. Mr. Clayton is in the raw cotton business in the South. His firm of Anderson & Clayton are possibly the biggest in their line. Raw cotton has lots of protection. It was stated in the House debate and not denied—in fact implicitly admitted—that there is an embargo against all foreign raw cotton and that it can be found in the Agricultural Adjustment Acts and the Soil Conservation Act. In addition, the cotton grower gets an export subsidy from the Treasury of the United States under certain conditions. Neither Mr. Clayton nor Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas, who spoke at some length, said anything about helping out the consumer by taking off this embargo and repealing the export subsidy. I hasten to add that cotton is not alone in this respect. Wheat enjoys something of the same protection. It is very easy for a man like Mr. Clayton whose product has a protection higher than the highest tariff to view with equanimity the putting into jeopardy of the products of manufacture and agriculture which enjoy no such privilege.

They also speak of increased bargaining powers. As a matter of fact the 1934 act gave them no bargaining powers. In the course of an active professional career I have done a good bit of bargaining for clients. I have bought silk mills, short-line railroads, standing timber and other things and I have sold or helped sell power from saw mill plants; standing timber I helped sell as well as buy. You never can bargain if you are in a weak position and the other side knows it. The whole world has known since 1932 that we had a low-tariff President and low-tariff Secretary of State and a low-tariff Congress, all desirous of reducing our tariffs materially, and since 1934, with statutory authority to make those reductions up to 50 percent. Naturally any nation that wanted to negotiate with us knew that if they stood out for a 50-percent reduction they had a good chance of getting it, so there was no bargaining power ever. All that the increased 50-percent reduction from January 1, 1945, will do is to give our low tariff representatives the opportunity to give away more protection which material positions of American agriculture, industry, and business need.

In this connection they also talk about the hearings which the law provides must be given to American industry interested in any pending agreement. I have not personally participated in any of these hearings, but those who have tell me they have very little value. Why should they? With everybody conducting the negotiations on our side a low-tariff man the cards are stacked. In most States there is a statute providing that when a man is convicted of a crime the judge, before sentencing him, must say: "Do you know of any reason why sentence should not be imposed upon you?" The court has to listen to whatever respectful statement the convicted man makes, but no one thinks that any such statement ever makes very much change in the sentence the judge had already determined to impose.

The prior method of making tariff changes up to 1932 is, of course, criticized. It is called political logrolling. The statement is made that when a tariff is being considered by the Ways and Means Committee in an executive session only the majority members are invited. This is true, but it is also equally true that in the Finance Committee

of the Senate there is no such division, all the members sit in an executive session. There is just as much chance of political log rolling under the trade-agreement system as there was under the old system. There was an advantage in connection with the hearings which does not exist with the hearings under the trade-agreement practice. On the Ways and Means Committee sat 15 majority members and 10 minority members. There was full power to cross-examine all witnesses, and on the other hand unfair cross-examination could be met by rebuttal. It was the same system that prevails in the courts. This system, incidentally, was the one pursued in connection with the hearings on this 50-percent reduction. Both sides availed themselves of its advantages and the results are reflected in the debate which took place on the floor of the House. It is the same system under which hearings were held before the bipartisan Tariff Commission under the 1922 and 1930 acts. I participated in one of those. The 1930 act put a nominal tariff of $1 a thousand on lumber. The company of which I was vice president and general counsel applied for the permitted 50-percent increase to $1.50 and had the support of the lumber industry generally. Some American lumbermen, however, with Canadian interests, applied for the permitted 50-percent reduction to 50 cents.

It will interest you to know that under the statute Canadian lumbermen, not citizens of our country, were permitted to appear on an equality of opportunity with American lumbermen and make their argument, too, for a reduction in an American tariff. This was not uncommon. There are instances where foreigners have initiated proceedings under the 1930 act, been given hearings, and secured reductions over American protests. No such statutory right exists in any other country. Right here is as good a place as any to call attention to the fact that our tariff system in addition to protecting the wages and earnings of labor, carries a free list under which substantially two-thirds of the imports come into this country free. Those imports are articles which do not compete with our production, such as silk, quinine, and the like. In addition, quite a number of articles, such as diamonds, automobiles, etc., are on the dutiable list, but at rates which merely insure revenue and are not imposed for protective purposes. Further, no one contends that our tariffs are the highest in the world in any branch of commerce. Our relative standing is said to be about sixth, but at any rate it is not first.

A fallacious slogan which has a wide currency is "We cannot sell if we do not buy." That assumes that trade is bilateral, but trade is multi-lateral. We buy coffee from Brazil. Brazil takes the money and buys what she wants where she pleases, and as she can buy some things from low-wage countries cheaper than she can buy them from our higher-wage country, she sometimes pursues that course. That country may, and frequently does, buy from a third country, and that third country may need things that we produce and be able and willing to buy them, so our money, or part of it, comes back to us after having promoted trade in three foreign countries. That simple fact knocks the slogan "We cannot sell if we do not buy" galley-west.

We hear a good deal of talk about trade barriers, but the trade-agreement men comfortably ignore the fact that long before the Tariff Act of 1930 foreign countries had taken measures "to protect the economic position of their farm producers" as well as of their industries. On July 11, 1932, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 280, Seventy-second Congress, first session, asking the United States Department of Agriculture and the Federal Farm Board, jointly or severally, to investigate. This was done. I show you Senate Document No. 70 of the Seventy-third Congress on this subject. It contains 525 printed pages as to such foreign measures, most of which had been taken prior to the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930. So it wasn't that tariff act which raised trade barriers; it was the actions of foreign countries.

From 1937 to 1940 I was a member of the platform preconvention committee appointed by the Republican National Committee. We held hearings on various subjects, and, as our committee was sharply divided on the trade-agreement question, we probably had before us the best talent existing on both sides. The question of these trade restrictions by foreign countries was brought up. The only thing on which the witnesses on both sides agreed—and this, as I recall it, was in 1939—was that the trade agreements so far had not taken off or reduced a single one of these trade barriers erected by foreign countries, with the single exception of France, where the trade agreement with that country took off some restrictions which, however, everyone agreed had been recently set up by France for the express purpose of being used for bargaining purposes. Score this as another failure of the trade-agreement negotiations.

I shall close with a few homely observations:

First. No election at which a Republican President and a Republican Congress were elected pledged to enact a protective tariff has ever brought about a business panic.

Second. No increase in tariff rates has ever brought about a business panic.

Third. The election of Cleveland in 1892 with its threat of free trade did bring about a business panic, and when the effects of the discovery of gold in California in 1849 and the Crimean War 2 or 3 years later had ceased to support the low tariff of 1846 and the lower tariff of 1857, the panic of 1857 already referred to hit the country, and hit it hard, resulting in the election of a Republican House in 1858 and contributing to the election of Lincoln in 1860.

Fourth. Congress ought not to subject the country to any risk greater than a competent businessman would take in his own private affairs.

Fifth. No competent businessman in connection with his own business will take a risk comparable to a 75-percent reduction in the tariff of 1930.

The dangers of the measure are commencing to be understood. In the House, Representative FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, an outstanding Democrat, spoke strongly on the subject and voted with the Republicans, and there were speeches by other Democrats. In the Senate Finance Committee three outstanding Democrats, WALSH, of Massachusetts, GERRY of Rhode Island, and JOHNSON of Colorado, voted with the Republicans and succeeded by a vote of 10 to 9 in striking out there the 50-percent reduction.

Last week there was the first special election to the House since the new Congress went in. It was in Montana, which has two districts, the second ordinarily being the more Democratic. The district had elected Democrats at seven elections in succession. It elected Representative O'CONNOR in 1944 by 10,000 majority. In the special election last week the Republican candidate had over 3,000 more votes than the Democratic candidate and was elected. There were two other candidates in the field but the vote for them apparently did not affect the result. Unquestionably the tariff situation entered into the result and in favor of the Republicans.

Sixth. It is almost a mathematical certainty (and I am very slow to make prophecies) that if the Congress passes the 50 percent reduction and the President approves the bill and makes it a law, the House to be elected in 1946 will be Republican, and by a substantial majority.

Until factories, industries, and farms in Europe have commenced to operate and ship, the effect of the trade agreements will be nullified by the war. Until that time there need be little fear of a business panic.

One more thing and I am through. I am proud of being an American. The fact that my ancestors have been Americans for 300 years does, of course, enter into it to some extent, but any citizen who was naturalized yesterday has the same right to be proud to be an American as I have. Up until now we have quite largely had the respect of every nation in the world. We have had it because we have respected ourselves. England, France, and Russia are also self-respecting nations. We and they each have the right to make our own laws and form our own governments free from outside interference. I am shocked beyond belief when I hear responsible men say that Congress ought to pass this reducing resolution so as to keep England and France, one or the other or both, from deserting the free-enterprise system. That is not much of a compliment to our recent ally in Europe, communistic Russia, but I pass that by. What I do resent is the argument that we should take unprecedented risks with our own domestic affairs so as to influence the action of any other country. That is a hysterical argument, un-American, unworthy, unmanly. Let other countries choose their own forms of government and pass their own statutes free from any interference from us.

In the early days of our Republic, George Washington sent the French Minister home for attempting to tell Americans in this country how they should vote, and in quite recent years a British Minister received his passports for the same reason. Especially, we ought to keep out of English affairs during an election. Who the British elect on the 5th of July is their own business. We may have our preferences but we should keep them to ourselves and, above all, we ought never to permit our own Congress to be used to pass an act affecting our domestic economy, not because of its relation to our own affairs but because it is thought that it will have an effect on the affairs of a foreign government. Such a course is monstrous, dangerous, and entirely unprecedented.

Congressmen Should See Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 13, 1945:

CONGRESSMEN SHOULD SEE EUROPE

Representative WILSON, Republican, Indiana, has proposed that every United States Congressman should be given a chance to "see, hear, feel, and smell what went on in German-occupied countries." He suggests that all of our Congressmen be sent to Europe during the summer recess.

This strikes us as being far from a funny idea. On the contrary, it is one of the soundest and most serious made in Congress in a long time. The negligible cost, compared to the war, of sending our entire Congress to see Europe should be fully justified by the knowledge they would obtain about Europe.

It could help them in many of the difficult decisions they will have to make in deciding American policy in the trying years to come.

Mr. Farley's Plan for Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from the Muncie (Ind.) Star and the Meriden (Conn.) Record commenting on Hon. James A. Farley's plan for a change in the present law relating to the presidential succession. These editorials follow:

[From the Muncie (Ind.) Star of May 16, 1945]

FARLEY ON SUCCESSION LAW

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, urges a change in the present law relating to Presidential succession. Speaking before the Hazleton (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, he pointed out that a Vice President who becomes President can pick the man who would succeed him. Under the law the Secretary of State would become President if President Truman were to die. The latter, of course, can name his Secretary of State.

The point Mr. Farley makes is true, but not necessarily disturbing. The same situation existed after the deaths of McKinley and of Harding. Theodore Roosevelt and Coolidge could pick their own successor during the unexpired parts of the Presidential terms they were serving. It is a matter of fact, however, that our Presidents generally name those who would follow them.

President Truman would not have been on his party's ticket for Vice President had not that been the wish of the late President Roosevelt. Of course, that selection had to be ratified at the polls, which would not be the case if the Secretary of State were to become President. Mr. Farley suggests, and the idea is entitled to attention, that a commission including Members of Congress and of the Supreme Court be named to consider what might or should be done, if anything.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Record of May 17, 1945]

MR. FARLEY FINDS FLAWS

James A. Farley's proposal that something be done to remedy the anomalous situation, whereby a Vice President succeeding to the Presidency can choose his own successor without reference to the electorate, has attracted widespread attention.

The situation contemplates, of course, a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of the President who, as Vice President, has succeeded the President under the same circumstances. It thus becomes, perhaps, a delicate matter. But Mr. Farley considers this possible short-circuiting of the electorate a gap in our democratic procedure that should be filled.

Mr. Farley is also disturbed by a possibility of confusion by the twentieth amendment, under which the election of a President on January 3 (to be followed by his inauguration on January 20) apparently devolves upon the House of Representatives in the event of the death of both President-elect and Vice President-elect before they take office.

If the President-elect and the Vice President-elect should both die before January 20 Mr. Farley pointed out that there is now no provision either in the Constitution or in the Federal statutes which would provide for a successor. Presumably the House-elect meeting on January 3 could pass some kind of law of succession to meet the emergency. But right there another possibility of trouble exists. If the House-elect should be closely divided party wise in its membership, so closely that a deadlock might result and January 20 might pass while the deadlock lasted and from January 20 till the deadlock was broken the country would be without a President.

The present statute provides that the Secretary of State is next in succession to the Vice President and after him in series the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy and finally the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Farley would have a special commission appointed to consider the problem of the death of President-elect and Vice President-elect and also to study the question of a change in the present Act of Succession. The delicate aspect of Mr. Farley's idea, in some people's opinion, is discussion or debate might be construed as reflecting on the President and his cabinet.

However, as the New York Sun points out, "No question of personalities is involved in admitting that there are flaws in our present procedure or in setting up machinery designed to correct them. The matter has been discussed often in general conversation in recent weeks. Mr. Farley simply happens to be the first to have attracted general attention with a speech on the subject. There are many suggestions which present themselves, such as an amendment to provide for the election of a new Vice President within 90 days after that office shall have become vacant because of death. A commission would find no shortage of ideas and from them might advocate changes which would strengthen our constitutional structure."

It is encouraging to learn, from the action of the last National Convention, that politicians have finally awakened to the danger of selecting a Vice Presidential candidate on the basis of geography or his vote getting ability. It was fortunate that Harry S. Truman was nominated by the Democrats as it would have been had Governor Dewey been elected and fate would have made John W. Bricker President of the United States.

Curtailment of Sugar Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1945, I attended a meeting of the New Hampshire-Vermont Bottlers Association in Manchester, N. H. The members of the association are much concerned about the drastic curtailment in sugar quotas. The sugar situation is extremely serious. At this meeting the sugar problem in connection with the manufacturing of soft drinks was thoroughly discussed.

It was the concensus of opinion that Congress should do everything in its power to see that the recommendations contained in the Anderson report on sugar be promptly carried out. They expressed the hope that Congress would use every effort to follow the suggestions made by the House committee. The 11 recommendations are as follows:

1. Establish authority and responsibility for procurement, transportation, pricing, and distribution under one coordinating head.
2. Open negotiations immediately for the purchase of the 1946 Cuban and Puerto Rican sugar crops.
3. Provide Hawaii with heavy type machinery, such as crawler cranes and front-axle-drive trucks for sugar production.
4. Provide adequate machinery, supplies, and labor for domestic beet and cane areas by fullest cooperation between War Food Administration, War Manpower Commission, War Production Board, and the War Department.
5. Make available to friendly European countries that are in short supply for plantings in the spring of 1946 our surplus beet seed. Consideration should be given to the substitution of other carbohydrates particularly cereals for part of the sugar now tentatively allocated to them.
6. Encourage the production of corn sugar and sirups in 1945.
7. Tighten rationing controls so that allocations will not be exceeded.
8. Establish a minimum figure below which the supply of sugar for United States civilian use will not be allowed to fall.
9. Reexamine allotments made to different classes of industrial users.
10. Review all foreign commitments and adjust to safeguard minimum allotments for United States civilian use.
11. Make public all commitments and allocations, domestic and foreign, with explanatory supporting data.

At this meeting the New Hampshire-Vermont Bottlers Association adopted the following resolution:

Whereas a drastic curtailment in the sugar quota of manufacturers of food products is being planned by Governmental agencies, according to reports currently circulating; and

Whereas the existing quotas set at 65 percent of 1941 sugar use already have reduced the manufacture of food products containing sugar to a point where the businesses of such manufacturers cannot be operated efficiently or produce earnings on the capital investment, with extra detrimental effect upon small businesses common to the food-manufacturing trades in this area; and

Whereas the businesses of the New Hampshire-Vermont bottlers of carbonated beverages are typical of the food-manufacturing industries of this area which face disruption and closing of their plants if sugar quotas are further curtailed and also will be more seriously hurt than others if such curtailment is made in the summer period because of the seasonal nature of their business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Hampshire-Vermont bottlers of carbonated beverages, on behalf of the manufacturers of soft drinks and other food products in these States, hereby urge their elected representatives in Congress to take such action as may be necessary to remedy the current situation involving sugar supply and distribution, in order that our businesses and those many others of similar scope and type in this area may not be prejudiced in their ability to maintain their place in the business life of the communities in which they are located, to maintain employment, and to provide the consumers in their respective communities with the sugar-containing food products to which they are accustomed.

In view of the serious shortage in sugar it is the duty of Congress to spare no effort in taking the steps necessary to alleviate the situation. We must make certain that the recommendations of the Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages will be put into effect at once.

Central Catholic High School Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which I delivered at the commencement exercises of Central Catholic High School in St. Mary's Auditorium, Lawrence, Mass., Friday evening, June 15, 1945:

This is a proud and happy day for you, the graduating class of Central Catholic High School. It means that you have successfully completed the basic training of education. Behind you lie the carefree days of boyhood. Ahead are the responsibilities of manhood.

As we, your parents and friends, look back to our graduation days, we fondly remember them as among the happiest in our lives. We were proud and confident, just as you are today. We felt that we could take on the whole world and mold it to our wishes. We were gay and idealistic, while the world seemed old and tired. Like Crusaders of the past, sure of faith and gallant of heart, we would ride to glorious victory. The bright armor of youth seemed invincible. And thus we left the cloistered halls of learning and went forth to battle life.

Look at us today. Our shining lances are soiled with strife and many are broken. We have won some battles * * * and have lost others. The trials of life have grayed our hair and dulled our eyes. We are just a little tired, because we have been fighting an enemy we underestimated. We have been fighting the world's slow stain. And we have suffered casualties in that struggle—some truth here, some loyalty there—giving ground before the pressure of living, even when we did not know it.

We tell you these things because we want you to benefit by our experience and avoid the mistakes that we have made. Your loving fathers and mothers would give life itself, if need be, to save you from labor and anxieties they have borne. For all the sacrifices they have made for you they ask but one thing in return and that is that you shall go on to live happy, useful lives, serving God and helping your fellow men. Today, in your youth, you cannot know the debt of love you owe to your parents. We hope that you will learn before it is too late, so that you may repay them in the respect and kindness which they so richly deserve.

Second only in importance to your parents, are your teachers. For 4 years they have labored with no other end in view than your welfare. They have prepared your minds and your souls to meet the tests of life. And as you go your separate ways, in spirit they will follow you, grateful for every decent success you achieve. Don't ever forget these brothers of your school days. Remember them with your friendship and in your prayers.

You are proud of Central Catholic because you have been a part of its sturdy growth, and it shall be a part of you as long as you shall live. As graduates, you will continue to cheer and support the teams of your alma mater, but what is more, you will help the brothers in every way to make Central Catholic a bigger and better school in the years to come. It came into being through the faith and labor of the Marist Brothers. It is dedicated to the education of the young men of our community. Its purpose is not only to develop a sound mind in a sound body, but to train youth in the Christian way of life, with the faith and the courage to resist the evils which will tempt them as they grow up in a material world. Central Catholic teaches its boys to go forth and lead a good life.

Down the slope from Auburn Hill is another building, of gray stone and iron bars, grim evidence of the world's temptations and of the price men pay who have failed not only themselves but their fellow men. They were once boys with faces as clean and eager as those we see here today. They too, meant to do right, but somewhere along the way they weakened. Perhaps they had forgotten the truths they had learned at school. Perhaps they never had the advantage of spiritual training such as you have had. For the start in life is not enough. To run the good race you have got to give the best that is in you, not for a day only, or a year, but for a lifetime. If there is one message above all that I would bring to you this day, it is this: "Keep the faith, practice good, and make it your habit. With each succeeding good you do comes greater strength to help you live as a true Christian, worthy of the soul which God has given to you."

Perhaps some of you think of this day as marking the end of your education. Nothing is farther from the truth In reality, this is the commencement. What you have learned in high school is merely a preparation for the longer and more difficult school of life.

For the past 4 years you have read, listened, spoken, written, and studied. By discipline in these skills you have developed the ability to learn. Your mind has come in contact with the facts and functions of language, science, mathematics, and history. You have enjoyed the companionship of the great men of all time, the saints, the poets, and the scholars who have led the way. And by the example of their lives they have seemed to say: "Come, you are just beginning. Take this torch of learning, go forth into the darkness of this world and open the way to light and truth as we have done, and better."

You were not born with learning. You have had to acquire it by patient practice. Just as you could not hope to make the baseball team without constant practice in knocking out fly balls, bunting, fielding, running the bases, catching, and throwing, so you have had to drill in the fundamentals of education in order to be ready to play the game of life.

Now you are stepping up into the big league, where the competition is keener. Here you will need more know-how, more courage, more sportsmanship, for this is the stuff of which champions are made. You've got to play the game fairly, taking your defeats without despair and your victories without vanity. For most of you the practice days and the warm-up sessions are over. The time has come for you to get in there and play. With the training you have had, we know that you will fight hard and clean.

Unlike the schoolboy games you have played, the contest you now face will sometimes have many different umpires and sometimes none. Your Government, by law, tells you what is right from wrong. The work you do will have certain rules you must obey. The armed services have codes which you must strictly follow. In certain situations, however, there will be no apparent umpire to decide what is fair and what is foul. At times the liar and the cheat will steal a cheap victory. You will be disappointed as you see evil triumph over good and you may be tempted to follow this easy way. Do not despair, for God is always with you. He is the unseen umpire called Conscience. Follow that guide within you and you cannot fail. Remember, it is not the winning or the losing that is most important but how you play the game.

The graduates of 1945 are going out into one of the most critical periods of history. It is a world in which the forces of evil, through desperate years, threatened to conquer all. It was an age of the anti-Christ, where men worshipped power and greed, where race was set against race, where books were burned, where the minds and souls of men were enslaved and scientific murder became the fixed policy of power-mad states.

At a terrible cost we are defeating that evil and leaving it in ruins behind us. We, who in our ignorance and self-centeredness permitted that evil to grow until it nearly overwhelmed us, must share part of the blame. Absorbed in our personal affairs, we forgot our duties to others. Like other peaceful nations in the world community, we failed to recognize that cooperation was imperative. History warned us that ours was the obligation to establish a just and durable peace that would outlaw aggression, but each nation shrugged its shoulders and said, "Let somebody else do it." By our indifference to morality, both personal and civic, we spawned and encouraged evil. The price we are paying for our carelessness is the present bloody holocaust of war.

Chastened by our sacrifices, we are learning the hard and costly way. Twenty-five years ago, by the application of reason and Christian faith we should and could have learned this lesson, at a saving to the world of millions of lives and of incalculable material wealth. We could have prevented the anguish and suffering that have tortured whole nations on this earth. All this we could have done, if we had simply learned a lesson in time, learned it well, and lived it.

We didn't, but we hope you will. Today we are faced with the problem of building a new world out of the ashes of the old. It is up to us, the generation of your fathers, to start that work, but you must finish it. That work will fail if you repeat the mistakes that we once made. For carelessness, or the refusal to face facts, is sometimes as harmful in its way, as a deliberate wrong. In the modern world, ignorance is no longer bliss, and it cannot be used as an alibi. On most of the problems facing us we have information available right in our own homes. Through newspapers, books, and radio, the world is brought to us. As mature citizens of democracy, we must weigh these facts, separating truth from propaganda, and making our decisions fairly, without passion or prejudice.

During the past 25 years we failed to face facts and make imperative decisions until it was very late, almost too late.

For the machine age, swift and confusing, was upon us and like children with new toys we did not know how to manage these wonders, how to make them go without bringing down destruction upon our house.

In our country some men worshipped these machines. They failed to see that for the great profits the machine brought to some it brought unemployment to others. The readjustments necessary to make the machine serve society and not divide it were not understood in time. In the United States we experienced the most serious economic collapse in our history. Jobs became scarce and your mothers and fathers had to worry and sacrifice over the problem of caring for you in a home in which there was little or no money coming in. Fear swept the Nation. Business and industry became over-cautious, intent on saving what they had left. Millions of people were set adrift. In these dark days, our Nation raised a leader who believed that the doctrine of excess profits for a few must give way to the need of providing self-sustaining jobs for all. As long as business failed to provide those jobs, Government must step into the breach and provide emergency work. This enlightened leadership tided us over a dangerous crisis. Industry now realized that the machine age must not be used for exploitation but for the progressive betterment of all the people. As this understanding developed, unemployment decreased and our Nation started to go forward again. In the field of economics, we had learned a hard lesson. Freedom is

not the right to do as one pleases. It imposes responsibilities even while it confers liberties. For every increase in power over the livelihood of people industry must assume the duty of providing steady jobs at fair pay for the people. In the United States we were gradually adjusting the machine age to serve the common welfare. Selfish individualism was giving way to economic cooperation. We had learned, through bitter experience, that no American can live unto himself alone.

Meanwhile, even as we were absorbed by domestic problems, events were happening elsewhere in the world. Other nations were suffering from mass unemployment and undertook severe measures to correct the situation. However, instead of trying to adapt the machine age to the needs of men, they subordinated man to the machine. Democratic government was abolished as dictators seized power. In return for the jobs which they made for the people, they demanded complete, unthinking obedience to the State. Religion was compromised or suppressed. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of action were denied the people. Trial by jury was forgotten as men were arbitrarily seized, tortured, and executed. Law as we know it ceased to exist. The fate of millions of men depended upon the personal whims of a few tyrants. All the hard-won liberties which man had struggled for centuries to win vanished overnight. Civilization went into eclipse.

In some countries, strange to report, the people welcomed this slavery. They demanded jobs at any price. Baffled by the machine age and the problems created by it, they lost faith in democracy's ability to solve the crisis. The responsibility of free men to think their way through difficulties and reach an adjustment that is fair to all became too much for them. The people surrendered their intelligence to the dictators and became like machines themselves—without thought, feeling, or conscience—responding mechanically to the controls of their masters.

Even children of preschool age were being regimented to follow the rigid course set by the State. Schoolbooks were being rewritten to conform to propoganda. All contact with the free-thinking outside world was cut off as the people were limited to but one source of information—the barrage of distorted facts showered upon them by the mouthpiece of the dictator, Hitler, in his book Mein Kampf, which became a bible for the German people, extolled the lie as the greatest of virtues. Only, he cautioned, when you tell a lie don't be modest about it. The bigger the lie, the more people will believe it. Such was the complete break-down or morality under the dictators. They set out deliberately to destroy every truth and decency taught by Christianity for 2,000 years.

And yet the people blindly followed these tyrants who shouted their cynical and brazen contempt for the human soul and human intelligence. Confused and bewildered, first by this lie and then by that, peoples who had once been famous for their Christian culture fell back into primitive and brutal ignorance. Never before in history had we witnessed such a systematic and successful assaullt upon the mind and spirit of millions.

With his own nation harnessed to his will, Hitler looked around for other conquests. First, there were his neighbors, and then, richest of all, the United States. Though we had not completely solved the problem of distribution, we did have the wealth. If Hitler could only conquer this wealth and add 139,000,000 Americans to his slave battalions, he would be master of the world. To succeed in this, he must prepare the ambush carefully. America must be lulled to sleep by the siren voice of Nazi propaganda.

First, we were steadily fed with the lie that poor Germany had nothing. She must have a little more room, or living space. Then came the vicious propaganda against the Jews, trying to blame this suffering people for all the crimes committed by all races and all countries throughout history. Finally came the alliance with Fascist Italy, and then militaristic Japan. This was designed to stop bolshevism, according to the propaganda. In truth, it was aimed to take advantage of the prejudice against Russia and to make the democracies believe that the Axis nations were somehow on their side. These lies opened the way to appeasement. Hitler seized Austria, and no one but some Austrians complained. Then he reached out for Czechoslovakia and the European democracies, who were pledged to its defense, shamefully stood by and let him have his own way again. Perhaps Hitler will be satisfied now, they tried to assure themselves. Hadn't he sworn that he had no more territorial ambitions? And he is against Russia, or isn't he?

Before they could make up their minds, Hitler was invading Poland. The mask of propaganda was off and the startled democracies took up arms in their own defense. Hitler's aggressive purpose was now all too clear, but propaganda had done its treachery well, and France, divided by it, soon fell. Britain fought on alone, as the Nazis conquered most of Europe.

Even at this moment of desperate peril to human freedom, there were millions of Americans who were duped by Hitler's lies. In spite of the fact that dozens of American foreign correspondents, coming from various racial origins and different religious backgrounds, all warned us of the danger, millions preferred not to see it. Organizations sprang up in this country, backed by eminent Americans, who unwittingly spread the Nazi line. Selective service won out in the Congress by an extremely narrow margin. This Nation was weakened internally by enemy propaganda, by the insidious technique that makes the intended victim assist in his own enslavement.

The physical shock of Pearl Harbor, coming at the very moment that Japanese representatives in Washington were assuring us of their peaceful intentions, swept away all our delusions. Through the lifting smoke screen of propaganda we saw naked force coming in to destroy us. In this crisis, all doubts were resolved. Appeaser joined with realist to fight on a solid front. The Nation became united as all Americans pitched in to help stop the foe. At first, the enemy's superior power drove us back, then we held, and now we are going forward to complete victory.

Out of the bloody agony of this war, we have learned two important lessons. One is that peace is not the natural state of human existence. We have peace in ourselves, in our home, city, Nation, and world only as we build it, maintain it and develop it. In the interrelated world of today, we cannot ignore a war in Europe or Asia and say that it is no concern of ours. For the skies are now swift highways to all nations and the smug, selfish theory of isolationism died with the coming of the airplane. Today, whether we like it or not, we must realize that our Nation is but one member, though a great and powerful one, of the family of nations. In that close grouping, the rich member must give opportunity to the poor member, the strong must encourage the weak, and all disputes must be settled by peaceful means. Failing that, a common law and authority must be available to prevent trouble. The freedoms and responsibilities existing side by side in the private family must be extended to the larger family of the nations of this world. In the year 1945 we have learned that the United States can have progress only within the larger framework of world peace and world progress.

From this war we have also learned that we must become mature and strong within ourselves. There are Americans who do not yet realize how close we came to disaster in 1941. Why was our Nation, which prided itself on its widespread education and its material power, so unprepared to meet the developing danger? Because Americans were careless with their heritage. They thought that Americans of the past had done the urgent work and that we of the present should merely reap the benefits of those early sacrifices. They failed to know and live the American tradition. Before the landing of the Pilgrims, before Valley Forge, and before Gettysburg our fathers knew the dangers that confronted them. They were prepared in their minds and in their souls to meet and master any challenge from any quarter. They were free men who knew the responsibilities that necessarily go with freedom. They talked things over, they faced the facts, and they put their decisions into action. As intelligent men and women they knew what was going on and they were ready for the test.

In early December of 1941, America was not ready. We were too concerned with our personal interests to do any thinking in behalf of our American interests. We were not then fulfilling our obligations under democracy—the first, that of making ourselves aware of developments that threaten the Nation. We were not using our minds to penetrate and expose the deceptive lullabies of hostile propaganda. We had forgotten that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty!"

That danger still exists. The other day I overheard a young lady exclaim, "Why don't they call it off? What is this war all about anyway?" She was in her early twenties, and in all probability was a graduate of high school. Yet that girl, in fact, is not living up to her responsibilities as a free American woman. She is not doing her share of the thinking that leads to an enlightened public opinion * * * that alert and intelligent public opinion upon which our democracy depends for its very life.

America is not merely a place in which to eat, sleep, work, and play. It is a way of life that encourages the highest possible development of the individual, not only for himself but for his fellow Americans, whose total work, spirit, and thought make that way of life possible. Loyalty to America means intelligent living in and for America that we may save and enrich our civilization in spite of any dangers that may challenge us.

Though fascism is defeated in battle, some of its poison will linger in the minds of certain men. You must be prepared to conquer this or any other ideology that may threaten us in the future. You must do this with your minds, minds that are trained to reject falsehood and error, minds that will not stop short of the unblemished truth. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

True liberty demands not only the application of the mind but the inspiration of the soul. In my generation, many men and women lost their faith in God. In His place they substituted a devotion to social well-being based on science. Others strayed from the Christian way—tempted by pride and greed. As men forgot God, they raised the false idols of race and class. Truth and right were supplanted by unscrupulous propaganda and primitive force. The difficult problems of the machine-age could not be solved in this jungle climate of hate and lies and violence. Christian morality was scorned by the dictators. Private virtue and public virtue weakened. The people, hungry for security, surrendered even conscience itself to their worldly masters. By their own people's obedience to force, and our indifference to force, the dictators were emboldened to make war on humanity.

You must not repeat the mistakes which my generation committed. Perhaps you will make others which no one here can foresee, but in the meantime learn from our range of experience. You have one great advantage

as you go out to face life and that is the character developed by your Catholic training. It will console you in time of sorrow, it will help you to keep your head through success or failure, and it will make your life not only a credit to yourself and your fellow man, but honorable in the sight of God. Through the grace of this education, which is spiritual as well as practical, you will come nearer to the highest reaches of your immortal soul.

Remember always that there are two roads to learning and you must travel both. One is through exploration of the world about you, through the study of men and places and facts, both past and present, through the creative work of combining phenomena to discover new conveniences for everyday living, and new manifestations of truth and beauty. The other is by contemplation of the life beyond this world and of the perfection that is God. By your love of and daily devotion to this Supreme Good, you will gain the spiritual strength which is superior to all the trials of this earth.

You, the graduates of 1945, are entering a life in these United States of America which may become a shining example to all the world. "May become," I say, if you work, not only with your hands, but with your minds and with the great unused spirit that lies dormant within each and every one of you, waiting only to be called to action.

You shall join with us in building this civilization, not by propaganda and not by force. In our country we shall try to advance the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. We shall build with the good and eternal truths which, in time, even dishonest men cannot deny.

This America of ours is bred of many racial strains which are gradually amalgamating into a human community that rises above the narrow barriers of blood and color. Catholic, Protestant, and Jew worship according to their several ways, but more frequently get together in the common fellowship of universal truth. We believe that our democracy, with its tolerance, freedom, responsibilities, and altruism, is a real attempt to bring spiritual values into our daily living.

The American Constitution is one expression of our individual and of our social rights and duties. We believe in neighborly consideration of the rights of others, and inspired by this, we go forward to achieve our destiny.

The phrase "All men are created equal" is not merely a statement of our political, social, and economic objectives. It is, more profoundly, an extension of Christian ethics. Lincoln's emancipation proclamation was the creation of a man who had felt and suffered for others. Woodrow Wilson's conception of a League of Nations was born of his belief in the essential brotherhood of man. The love and compassion in the heart of Franklin D. Roosevelt as he brought faith, hope, and charity to men who were burdened by want and fear, all these sublime examples are reflections of the Divine within us.

And so our belief is in Christianity and democracy, concerned with our individual relations to God and to the society we are trying to build for Him on earth.

The tension between good and evil is the battle of life. It goes on within ourselves and in the external world about us. The true function of education is to helf us win that conflict. Today you stand prepared, as well or better than any young man of your time can be, to fact that struggle with keen minds directed by noble purpose.

Some of you, in this fateful hours, will be summoned to serve in the armed froces. Here the discipline will be stern and you will be asked to give more to your country than the classmates who remain in civilian life. We hape that they, aware of the greater sacrifices you will make in defense of our common citizenship, will be inspired to become worthy of you. In war and in peace, it is the solemn duty of all of us to live and work and die, if need be, as Americans. We are not merely the spendthrift inheritors of a great tradition but creative workers in its behalf. We are not satisfied with an America identified chiefly by its automobiles, airplanes, movies, money, and material success. We do not pretend to have ready-made solutions for all the problems that confront us today. But we do aspire to the building of a civilization in cultural and spiritual values. This America of ours, alive with hope and promise, calls forth the best in every freedom-loving man. For democracy never rests. In spite of mistakes, in spite of those who would congeal its vitality, it course is ever progressively forward and upward. Our task is to pass it on fined and stronger than the day it was entrusted to our individual care.

We, of the older generation, have given to you our new comrades, an account of our stewardship. Frankly and honestly, in the American way, we have confessed our mistakes to you, so that you may avoid the errors we have made.

At the same time we want you to know that we have kept faith with America. It was that faith which enabled us to survive a grim and soul-searing depression. With that faith we have gained the world vision befitting a great Nation that is coming of age at the very same time as you are. Even though the hour was late, that faith gave us the wisdom and the strength to stand up and defy the most dangerous threat to liberty that the world has ever seen.

A few of you may yet be engaged in the final and victorious battles with our enemies. All of you will be expected to share responsibility for the peace that follows and to work hard on the problems that come with reconstruction.

May God be with you this day and all the days of your manhood. And may He grant to most of us, the friends and relatives who rejoice with you, the opportunity of saying some 20 years from now, "America is in good hands. For you, the graduates of 1945 have justified the confidence which she placed in you."

Beware! Dynamite in the Old Sock!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Josephine Ripley from the Christian Science Monitor:

BEWARE—DYNAMITE IN THE OLD SOCK

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—Americans today have cash that jingle-jangle-jingles—dangerously.

By the end of this year, some $35,000,000,000 more will be burning an ominous hole in their pockets. That sum represents the impressive total that Americans will have accumulated in liquid savings in 1945.

Normally, they tuck away only about $6,000,000,000. Altogether, in the four wartime years, American savings will be about $113,000,000,000 above normal. And that is potential inflation dynamite.

But it doesn't have to be that way. Americans have their choice. They can spend their way intemperately into an era of depression, or they can spend prudently and assure themselves an era of prosperity.

Right now, they can do neither because of wartime scarcities and Government controls. But if these controls are pried lose—too loose, too fast—watch that dynamite.

As a matter of fact, the red light is flashing ominously at this very moment. The Senate has just passed an amendment to the Price Stabilization Act that will knock the props out from under the whole price-control structure—that is, if the amendment survives in the House. Many hope and believe it won't.

It was an amazing piece of legislation which apparently caught administration forces offguard. It provides that ceiling prices of livestock and agricultural commodities must cover all costs and overhead expenses, including a return on capital and an allowance for the labor of the producer and his family, plus a reasonable profit.

If this amendment goes through, two things will happen. One of them will happen to your pocketbook—to every pocketbook in the country.

The other thing that will happen is this: If a special concession of this kind is made in behalf of the farmer, other groups will demand equal favors.

There is no doubt that many inequities exist under the present Price Control Act. There is little doubt, too, that the Office of Price Administration can do a better job.

It has been performing a tremendously complicated task under great handicaps, to be sure. But there is room for improvement, and probably OPA officials would be the last to deny this.

Both of these deficiencies can be corrected, however, without tossing price control to the winds of inflation. Many are convinced that there is sufficient flexibility within the present act to take care of any upward adjustments in price ceilings that need to be made.

In addition to deciding in what form the Stabilization Act is to be extended, Congress must decide for how long.

The Senate has voted extension for 1 year. The House is expected to cut this in half and make it 6 months. A compromise might be 9 months, after which the act would come up for review and revision.

At that time, it is believed, the act will be drastically rewritten, with controls being dropped from all but a few industrial items such as automobiles, which are expected to be in short supply for some years to come.

In the meantime, however, it is vitally important to protect that potential dynamite from explosion.

Just how well this is done depends (1) on what happens to the Government tax and price-control policy, and (2) on the behavior of Americans when they are free to spend that money.

The danger will not end with the war, either. Controls will be needed until supply and demand are in normal balance.

The Penalties of Indifference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the public has a vital in-

terest in clean government, I am inserting under leave to extend, an article published in the Washington Times-Herald under date of June 15, 1945, which throws more light upon the motives which may have prompted the $200,000 loan made by John Hartford to Elliott Roosevelt in 1939. There has been much criticism of the vast powers granted to the Executive by those who have realized the danger of the improper exercise of these powers. One of the most dangerous powers granted has been in relation to secret trade agreements, secretly formulated by internationalists whose primary interests have been in the foreign fields rather than in the domestic welfare of the United States. These transactions which are now coming to light are indicative of the whole pattern of the New Deal. The great totalitarian propaganda machine now operating in this country has been able to make the people believe that any criticism of the New Deal should be branded as unpatriotic.

Too long has the public been lulled into a sense of false security by the propaganda which has been circulated by letter, by radio, by movies, and by a horde of New Dealers and their unscrupulous cohorts, the internationalists, who have traveled throughout the country speaking whenever and wherever an audience could be procured. The fight to restore representative government is the people's fight and it is to be hoped that a sovereign people will not be further deceived by pious platitudes, catchy slogans, and emotional appeals, while bureaucrats like termites work to destroy the foundations of our free institutions. The deplorable transactions of the New Deal now emerging from dark places into the light of day should cause citizens in this country to heed the warning voiced by Herbert Spencer on the penalties of indifference, as follows:

The man who, expending his energies wholly on private affairs, refuses to take trouble about public affairs, pluming himself on his wisdom in minding his own business, is blind to the fact that his own business is made possible only by maintenance of a healthy social state, and that he loses all around by defective governmental arrangements. Where there are many like-minded with himself—where, as a consequence, offices come to be filled by political adventurers and opinion is swayed by demagogues—where bribery vitiates the administration of law and makes fraudulent state transactions habitual, heavy penalties fall on the community at large, and among other, on those who have thus done everything for self and nothing for society. Their investments are insecure; recovery of their debts is difficult, and even their lives are less safe than they would otherwise have been.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 15, 1945]

A. & P. IN FIGHT FOR ITS LIFE WHEN ROOSEVELT GOT THAT LOAN—PATMAN'S ANTI-CHAIN-STORE BILL LATER DIED WITH THE HELP OF SOME BIG NEW DEALERS

When Elliott Roosevelt went to John Hartford in 1939 for his $200,000 loan, the wealthy retailer even then was engaged in an all-out fight against legislation which would have taxed his A. & P. chain store system out of business.

Hartford, driving force back of the giant company and a man who all his life had shunned the spotlight, emerged from his self-imposed obscurity when Representative PATMAN (Democrat), of Texas, announced in 1938 that he would introduce a bill to drive all chain stores to the wall.

TOOK UP THE FIGHT

The A. & P. head immediately announced that he would fight the legislation with everything he had, and that he was amply heeled with battle funds.

He launched a Nation-wide campaign to inform the public of his views, and it was in the midst of this campaign that the son of the late President Roosevelt approached him for the $200,000 loan, subsequently written off as a bad debt for $4,000.

PATMAN'S measure, under which it was estimated the A. & P. would have been subjected to an annual governmental tax bill of $261,000,000, rallied powerful support for his bill, and many observers believed it stood a good chance of passage. In the preceding Congress, a similar measure was defeated, but it had the pledged support of 73 Members of the House as cosponsors.

BILL DIED A YEAR LATER

In the year which elapsed after Roosevelt secured his loan, important figures in the New Deal took a hand in heading the Patman bill toward the House Ways and Means Subcommittee pigeonhole, where it finally died an ignominous death June 18, 1940.

Henry Wallace, then Secretary of Agriculture, wrote to Chairman MCCORMACK (Democrat) of Massachusetts, of the committee, announcing the opposition of the Agriculture Department to the bill.

"We think it would be unwise and unnecessary to give up the economies which have been brought about by chain-store distribution in order to prevent certain practices which may not be in the public interest," Wallace said.

ANOTHER STRONG FRIEND

Another friend of the chain stores was Edward J. Noble, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and more recently involved in a congressional investigation of charges that he bought a radio station with the aid of Federal pressure exerted on its former owner.

Noble wrote to the committee May 17, 1940, listing seven specific objections to the Patman bill and stating the Commerce Department was opposed to it. Harry Hopkins was then Secretary of Commerce.

After the bill was killed off, records indicate that the A. & P. enjoyed a respite from Government attack until the spring of 1941, when the Justice Department began an investigation which culminated in the current antitrust prosecution.

SEVERAL OFFICIALS INDICTED

This probe began in earnest in September 1941, and led to the indictment of the company and several of its officers by a Federal grand jury in Dallas, on November 25, 1942.

It was sometime in the same year, according to Caruthers C. Ewing, chief counsel for the A. & P., that Elliott's bad debt was compromised for $4,000, with Jesse Jones, then Secretary of Commerce, acting for the Roosevelt family in effecting the settlement.

The original indictment against the A. & P. was quashed in February 1943, by a Dallas Federal judge. An appellate court overruled his decision in July 1943 and the Government in February 1944 dropped the Dallas case and began a new and similar action in Danville, Ill. The trial began April 16 and still is in progress.

Forgotten Man of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled, "Forgotten Man of War Is GI Railroaded by Court Martial," which appeared in the Boston Herald, Sunday, June 17, 1945, by Associate Justice Elijah Adlow of the Municipal Court of Boston, Mass.:

FORGOTTEN MAN OF WAR IS GI RAILROADED BY COURT MARTIAL

(By Judge Elijah Adlow, formerly judge advocate, Twenty-sixth Infantry Division)

Among the archaic vestiges of militarism that have survived the impact of modernization, the Manual for Courts Martial enjoys a prominent place. In this code regulating the administration of military justice the serviceman meets a real foe. Before this enemy he stands helpless, with no hope except the peculiar whim of the commanding officer in whose hands his fate lies. Fortunate, indeed, is the serviceman who serves under one who is intelligent, sympathetic, and fair.

The work of our military courts receive scant attention in the press. The little that the public has been allowed to learn about them is not comforting. More disturbing than all else is the speed with which sentences have been vacated once they have been brought to light. If public clamor can procure the exoneration of four Negro Wacs, convicted of mutiny, or the mitigation of Private McGee's sentence for assaulting German prisoners of war, how about the thousands whose offenses were less serious but who have no champions and are left to swelter out their sentences in our military prisons? They are the forgotten men of this war.

Of course, there are some rogues among them who deserve the sentences they received. But make no mistake about it, there are many among them whose punishment is cruel, oppressive, unjust, and out of all proportion to the offenses they have committed. Some are even innocent of any offense. The system permits it.

The professional soldiers feel that they need their own system of law for the government of the Military Establishment. For an excuse they plead necessity. But this proves nothing. The ravages of crime are devastating wherever they appear. If civil society resorts to courts and prisons to enforce conformity it does so only in response to the stern demands of necessity. Actually the behavior problems of both the soldier and the civilian are identical. They differ only in the systems which adjudicate guilt and determine punishment.

QUALIFICATIONS IGNORED

The 10,000,000 Americans who joined the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as citizens have already discovered that they are no longer treated as such. They live under a legal code which in substance and effect is harsh and arbitrary. It is American in neither spirit nor form, having derived from the legal system of the ancient Romans. It differs from the ancient system only in one notable respect—the ancients who administered the system were better qualified to administer justice than the amateurs who pro-

vide the makeshift personnel of our military courts today.

Our court-martial system ignores the professional and technical qualifications inherent in the character of the judge and the advocate. This is its major defect. It relies on amateurs for the performance of a most serious responsibility. The professional soldier ridicules the civilian who appears on the battlefield in command of troops; he fails to recognize how out of place he himself appears as he officiates at a trial with nothing to reinforce his pretensions except a military order and his rank. If the articles of war appear to confer a legal character on the proceedings by requiring the presence of a law member on every court, it only a token tribute to the profession whose domain has been invaded by the military. This law member is subordinate to the president of the court, who virtually dominates the proceedings.

Much lip service has been rendered to the sacred rights of the serviceman. The Articles of War have been proclaimed a shield against injustice. What counts for the serviceman, however, is the substance of the system, not its form. In substance, the fate of GI Joe depends on one man—the commanding officer. He decides whether the soldier should be prosecuted; he appoints the court and the counsel; when the trial is over, he approves, disapproves, or modifies the sentence of the court.

In form, it presents a complicated, unwieldly and involved routine, garbed in indicrous ceremony, and masquerading as a judicial proceeding. There are pleadings, and witnesses, and counsel, and arguments, but there is generally an amazing resemblance between the court's verdict and what the commanding officer wants done.

VICTIMS OF SYSTEM

This system is the personal property of the brass hats. Let a court make a disposition other than that desired by the appointing authority and see what happens. Officers who have sat on courts and voted to acquit defendants have felt the resentment of the commanding officer in more ways than one. Defense counsel who have secured the acquittal of clients have been found more useful thereafter on other assignments.

The Air Corps lieutenant who was dismissed from the service for obstructing justice—to wit, that he procured the acquittal of the soldier he had been ordered to defend—was only another victim of a system which is in a position to demand servility from its participants. The higher-ups want it because it can supply a scapegoat for every misadventure. Only an unusual officer will accept personal responsibility. Robert E. Lee could say "It's my fault," but thousands of less-worthy men have hastened to convene courts and fasten the blame on others.

A fair and impartial administration of justice is possible only when the judges are inaccessible to the parties to litigation. A general who orders the prosecution of a case is an interested party. To consider him a suitable person to appoint the judge is absurd. Nor is the presence of a judge advocate in the background as a legal adviser any guarantee that legal rights will be respected or protected. Some generals heed the advice of judge advocates. Others do not. I have seen both.

Equally revolting are the harsh sentences imposed by these courts. They ignore the modern and enlightened concepts of crime and punishment. The man's record as a civilian is completely ignored. It cannot be offered. No judge of experience ever would sentence a man without first ascertaining whether he is a first offender or a chronic criminal. To our military men this means nothing. It explains the absurd sentences we read about in the press. The notorious gangsters and racketeers of our generation seldom fare any worse than many of the defendants who have run the gamut of our military courts for much lesser offenses.

IMPARTIALITY VITAL

Has this severity resulted in enforcing obedience? Of course not. Civilians learned long ago what the military men refuse to recognize—that severity gets you nowhere. The long sentences which our naval courts have imposed upon men absent over leave has served only to encourage desertion. A man who has missed his ship, and knows a 5-year sentence awaits him, is not going to hurry back to his station.

The interests of the services would be better served by an enlightened policy. A man who makes a mistake is receptive to punishment and correction if he knows it is fair. How can we expect him to have faith in a cumbersome process, operated by amateurs whose slogan is "soak the so and so"?

Why can't we have impartial judges preside over our military courts? Why can't the question of guilt or innocence be decided by men who have nothing to fear from the commanding officer who ordered the prosecution? Why shouldn't professionally qualified men preside at proceedings when man's greatest possession—his liberty, and often his life—is at stake? Why shouldn't men who are often thousands of miles from home and without friends be assured, at least, of competent and loyal counsel to defend them? Many a soldier has pleaded guilty to charges on the advice of one who knew no more about law than he himself.

A fair and impartial administration of justice is available to our services without any extensive overhauling of the system. Minor disciplinary functions can remain in the hands of the commanding officers, much as the summary and deck courts now function. But serious offenses that carry severe penalties should be prosecuted under the direction of the judge advocate general of the Army or Navy, much as our attorney general controls prosecutions in Federal courts. Only members of the Judge Advocate General's department should prosecute or defend cases. They should be assigned by the Judge Advocate General and responsible to him alone. This would insure a full measure of devotion to the public interest and to the servicemen concerned.

HUMANITY NEEDED

Judges to preside over military courts should be appointed by the President or the Cabinet officers in charge of the respective services. These judges should be responsible only to the appointing authority. Above all else, only trained lawyers should be permitted to represent either side. This would permit a more expeditious handling of the business of our courts martial.

When a man is found guilty, his entire record, both as a civilian and a soldier, should be considered by the court in making a disposition. If, to all this, could be added a sprinkling of humanity, the serviceman might have a more wholesome respect for the legal system under which he lives.

Society would have solved the problem of lawlessness long ago if indiscriminate punishment and brutality curbed crime. But it does not. We're trying more enlightened ways today, and we're getting better results. Everyone recognizes this except the military men. They still think in terms suited to the era of Alfred the Great. They sentence a man to a term of years in prison, and when you ask them why, they say, "This is the Army, sir."

Perhaps some day they may discover that there is room for humanity and common sense in the Army. When they do, the guard house and military prison may lose their prominence in the military scene.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the central committee of the United Polish Societies, of Bridgeport, Conn.:

Whereas these, our United States of America, were founded on the sound democratic principles that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments derive their power from the consent of the governed; and

Whereas we, as free and peace-loving Americans, all believe that these principles are the only bases for a just and lasting peace throughout the entire world; and

Whereas these principles of democracy were reaffirmed in the Atlantic Charter in which a clear and unequivocal denunciation of territorial aggrandizement was proclaimed; and

Whereas our sons, brothers, and husbands are fighting and giving their life's blood for the preservation of these principles; and

Whereas at the Yalta Conference, decision was made permitting Russia to annex a portion of eastern Poland; and

Whereas at the Yalta Conference it was decided that Poland should be represented neither by the Polish Government in exile in England nor by the Lublin government set up by Russia, but by a truly representative form of government chosen by its people; and

Whereas Russia persists in laying claim and annexing the eastern part of Poland and in refusing to permit the people of Poland to choose their own representative form of government; and

Whereas this situation is sowing seeds of future wars in Europe and is resulting in Poland not sharing in its responsibilities and duties at the San Francisco Conference: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That we, Americans of Polish descent of Bridgeport, Conn., and vicinity, in meeting assembled, do hereby strongly disapprove of allowing Russia to annex any part of Poland east of the Curzon Line because of its dangerous potentialities, and we humbly urge our representatives at the San Francisco Conference to compel Russia to permit the Polish people promptly to select their Government and to oppose any partition of Poland; and be it hereby further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State; Senators and all Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from Connecticut, and to the Honorable Harold S. Stassen, Senators Arthur H. Vandenberg and Tom Connally; Represenative Sol Bloom, Charles A. Eaton, and Virginia C. Gildersleeve.

Dr. B. L. SWYKOWSKY,
President
ROMUALD J. ZIELINSKI,
Vice President.
Rev. CHARLES B. RATAJSZAK,
Chaplain.
HELEN C. STAROU,
Financial Secretary.
S. W. KORZA,
Recording Secretary.
WALTER BAKESZAK,
Treasurer.

Address by Hon. Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, Before National Public Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] before the National Public Housing Conference in Washington June 19, 1945.

Mr. President, this great meeting on housing is one of the vitally important conferences being held in anticipation of the reconversion activities which are facing us. The contributions of the Senator from Louisiana to American housing problems have been great in the past, and from his knowledge and understanding of those problems the people of our land will benefit greatly.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO OBTAIN PUBLIC HOUSING

I appreciate this opportunity of again addressing the members of the National Public Housing Conference and their friends. It will be recalled that I addressed you in the city of St. Louis in March 1944, and I made an earnest effort to give you my unvarnished views of the part that you should play in the over-all postwar housing program.

I came before you then and I come before you now, I hope, as a tried, trusted, and, may I add, accepted friend of public housing.

Since the introduction of the first United States Housing Act in 1937, I have battled without fear and without compromise for public housing legislation. I have never minced words about the need for public housing. I have always tried to be a realist in my approach to the problem. I have never sought to win over the opponents of public housing by concealing or compromising my purposes. I have endeavored, thus far without much success, to reduce the opposition, by showing that it is misguided—that it is wrong—and that it is not acting in its own best interests.

As a friend of public housing, I always try to champion its cause when the occasion presents itself, through correspondence, before public gatherings, and by other methods. In this way I seek to win additional supporters for public housing. I did this last week, before the Citizens' Council for Community Development, here in Washington. I hope all of you obtain copies of my remarks, because they contain some useful, and I believe compelling, factual information about the need for public housing.

But tonight I am not speaking to the opponents of public housing. I am not speaking to a neutral or general audience. I am speaking to advocates of public housing and their friends—to people who are committed to the just cause of public housing, and who do not need to be convinced of its necessity.

Therefore, as your friend, it would be wasteful energy and foolish talk for me to tell you all the good things about public housing or to pay you fine compliments. I believe I can render you a greater service by telling you, in a spirit of friendship, what some of your difficulties are, in attempting to obtain additional public housing legislation. And bear in mind that your difficulties are also my difficulties because I share your purposes and I am pledged to their attainment.

Difficulty No. 1 is that you have relied too much upon a small group of stalwarts to fight your battles. I have been to many public housing meetings and conferences, and almost everywhere I have come in contact with the same familiar faces. We cannot make public housing a national cause by talking to ourselves, by patting one another on the back, or by feeling moral indignation because the opposition is using unfair methods and distorting the facts.

The United States Housing Act operates through local housing authorities. When the law was passed, I felt that this decentralization would provide the basis for advocating public housing on its merits to a thousand American communities, and through these communities, making the Nation and the Congress conscious of the need of the program. No proposal enacted by the Congress ever had a more appealing cause, or a more suitable set-up for doing this job at the grass roots.

But this job, except in a few cases, has not been done sufficiently well. Some local authorities have been so busy with their projects they have forgotten that, living in a democracy, we must let the people know what we are doing and win their support. Other local authorities have felt that they could solve this problem of support by forming national organizations, by holding meetings in Chicago, in New York, and in other large centers, or by making trips to Washington and visiting with a few Congressmen and Senators.

But this procedure has not been very successful, and you know that it has not worked. Most of the people here tonight will not be any stronger for public housing after this meeting than they were before the meeting. And if there are any Trojan horses here they will have the same hostile views when they leave.

Instead, what those of you here from the localities need to do is to organize your forces and sell your program to the people. You have an educational job to do, which is just as important as building houses. In fact, it is even more important that you do the educational job. For almost anybody can build houses or manage real estate, while only a few people have the courage and the foresight to fight for progressive causes.

I think you should endeavor to have your city governments firmly committed to your public-housing programs. I believe you should get your own national legislators interested in the subject. You should seek the help of your welfare groups, your women's groups, your church groups, your educational groups, and firmly convince them of the worthiness of your cause.

With this solid core of strength, you should then start working on the business, financial, and private-housing groups in your communities. I know this is a hard task. But it must be done. You should sit down with them across the table, decide the total housing needs of your community, and then work out, as hard-headed realists, what must be done to meet those needs. You must demonstrate to private enterprise that you will help it to do a bigger job than it has ever done before. You must prove to private enterprise that public housing will be supplementary. You must convince private enterprise that a public-housing program can act as a stimulant to private enterprise. That is the way it has worked in England, and in other countries where public housing has gone ahead. That is the only way it can successfully work here.

I wish to emphasize that any legislation I join in sponsoring will contain an absolute requirement that this local unity, this local development of a complete, long-term housing program, this local determination that private enterprise be given the first chance to do as much of the job as it can, must precede any Federal assistance.

There is no use your telling me this is a difficult condition to meet. Of course, it will be an arduous undertaking. But we have all spent too much time expecting to get public housing by having someone else fight the battles. The Congressmen come from the communities. They will not be for public housing until their communities are for public housing. Their communities will not be for public housing until it is made a part of an effort to improve the housing conditions of the whole community, middle-income families as well as low-income families, through private as well as public housing.

This brings me to the second proposition which I hold with an equally unalterable conviction. Those in favor of public housing must be consistent in their actions. They must not say they desire private enterprise to do as much of the job as it can, without giving affirmative proof that they mean what they say. Mere lip service will not do. Public housing advocates cannot tell Congress that public housing is only a small part of the whole job, and then agitate for legislation which deals only with public housing in a one-sided fashion.

That is the reason, very frankly, why I have not been in agreement with certain proposed legislation which has been top-heavy on the side of public housing. By this I do not mean that I personally would not vote for such legislation if it came up in Congress. Of course, I would probably vote for it, because I would agree with its purposes. But I do not believe such legislation would have a ghost of a chance of being enacted into law. I would not sponsor such legislation, because that would be participating in what I would regard as a suicidal effort. In other words, I do not want to see public housing commit suicide.

This view, which I hold, must be obvious to anyone who is a Member of Congress and who, day in and day out, is in a position to size up the sentiment in Congress on many of the issues before it. And yet certain sincere persons who have had little opportunity to observe this situation, and whose well-meaning objectives far exceed their practical political experience, have advocated going ahead blindly in the face of certain defeat. And when proved friends of public housing, whose motives should not be questioned, have advocated a more realistic course, they have been subjected to most harsh criticism.

I will not support any one-legged bill. In my judgment, the only kind of bill that can pass Congress is one which shows on its face that we are going to help private enterprise do more of the job, and that we are going to found a public-housing program upon that proposition. I favor the proposals of the National Housing Agency that the Government undertake research and fact finding to help private enterprise do more of the job. I favor the extension of the principle of insurance, to bring the kind of capital into private housing which is willing to invest for long periods of time, at low interest rates.

This is the only way to serve the middle market. I also favor writing into this insurance legislation adequate safeguards, to make sure that the middle-income families are really served, rather than making such legislation a bonanza for investors and speculators at high interest rates and quick turn-the law should require that only those be assisted whom private enterprise cannot possibly reach. Likewise, in this new insurance proposal, I believe the law should require that only those be serviced who are far below the income levels served by FHA

mortgage insurance or other private builders. I am perfectly willing to have the Government guarantee the investment, so long as the investor in return accepts the low interest rate that should accompany a guarantee. And by this, I do not mean an interest rate of 4 or 4½ percent. I mean an interest rate around 3 percent.

As I indicated a while ago, giving mere lip service to this kind of legislation to help private enterprise is not enough. It is my belief that we must either put this legislation to help private enterprise ahead of public housing legislation, or we must put the two together. I am advocating that the two be put together, because I do not desire to delay public housing. It belongs in the picture if we are to fulfill the housing needs of most communities in this country. In short, after 12 years of experience with piecemeal housing legislation, each piece being supported by one group and opposed by another, we ought to be able to present an over-all, long-term program, which coordinates all parts, which faces the whole problem, and obtains more public support by so doing. In such legislation special attention should be paid to the housing needs of veterans, and also to the housing needs of the families on the farm.

The other main feature of the proposed legislation, now under discussion, involves aid for the clearance of slums, with redevelopment by private enterprise as well as by public improvement. This is sometimes called urban redevelopment. I am in favor of such a program. I believe it should be included in forthcoming legislation.

In my judgment, some of the proposals along this line have been mistaken. In this urban redevelopment legislation, we must prove the sincerity of our intention to encourage private enterprise, to redevelop as much of the cleared areas as it can—provided that it meets satisfactory standards under a master plan for the community. I have complete confidence in the Federal agency which deals with public housing. If the choice were mine I would have no hesitancy about entrusting it with the job of urban redevelopment.

But we must be practical and realistic. We cannot expect the Congress as a whole, or private enterprise as a whole, or the people as a whole, to believe private enterprise will be afforded a full chance to redevelop slum areas—if the controlling decisions are being made by the Federal agency which is doing public housing. To realists, this should seem obvious. Therefore, if the Federal agency which is empowered to do public housing tries to capture the urban redevelopment program I fear that the chances for public housing would be seriously impaired in Congress.

We have a National Housing Agency, which impartially represents both private housing and public housing. Even the spokesman for private enterprise, before our committee, said that the National Housing Agency had been absolutely fair in its dealings with private enterprise and with public housing. Since land is used for both types of housing, and should be made available for both without discrimination, practical wisdom dictates that this job should be given to a permanent National Housing Agency. Of course, the NHA could utilize the experience of its constituents, and also their staffs, in doing the job.

I hasten to add that by this I do not mean that local housing authorities should not be the urban redevelopment agency at the local level. That is entirely a matter for local determination. If a local housing authority becomes more than a public housing agency through community acceptance—if it is designated by the community as the agency for dealing with all aspects of housing—then in effect the local housing agency becomes the local equivalent of the National Housing Agency. Under such circumstances, it would be appropriate and in fact logical, for the local housing authority to handle the land program and to make the land available both for private redevelopment and for public housing. But this should be a matter entirely of local determination, expressed by the people of the community, through their city governments and by virtue of their State laws. Neither I, as a Member of the Senate, nor the Congress as a whole has anything whatever to do with that phase of the situation. Any Federal legislation on this subject should be so broad as to permit the use of any local public body that the community appropriately designates under and by virtue of State or municipal laws dealing with the subject.

I believe that public housing should attempt to consolidate its present position before it seeks to invade new fields. I am not advocating a strategic retreat. I think we should move forward. But we should move ahead only to the extent that our strength justifies. Spectacular advances, that break the line of supply, usually end in disastrous defeats.

Of course, we should immediately resume and expand the public-housing program in line with the suggestions heretofore made in the course of my remarks. We should do more of it than we have ever done before, because the program before the war was merely a token program. But public housing should not attempt to place under its jurisdiction urban redevelopment and farm housing, and a lot of other phases of housing until it has removed all doubt about congressional support for its main program.

I believe we should improve housing conditions on the farm as well as in the cities. I have said that legislation ought to include farm housing. But it is foolhardy to expect some newly formed organization, organized on the spur of the moment, to sell farm housing to Congress by a few hasty trips to Washington. For the farm housing program, we must have the support of the Department of Agriculture, and it must be worked out and planned with that department of Government.

One of the difficulties with the legislation earlier proposed was that it undertook to put farm housing in with public housing. It assumed that the public housers had enough strength to pass both, regardless of the views of the Department of Agriculture. Personally, I would like to see farm housing assisted through the housing agency. I would like to see the Department of Agriculture extending cooperative advice to the National Housing Agency in matters of farm housing, rather than vice versa. I intend to discuss this matter with the Department of Agriculture, in an endeavor to get agreement all around.

But we must put the job first, and the agency or bureau that is going to execute it second. We must not let the desire to enlarge or enhance the particular agency or bureau that we favor, interfere with congressional approval of the substance of the program. The man out on the farm in Louisiana who has a low income, needs and deserves better housing. He does not care very much, in fact he does not give a rap, which agency of his Government extends to him the aid which, in all good conscience, should be afforded him.

I repeat, my own efforts will be directed toward placing farm housing in the over-all housing agency because I think it belongs there. But I will listen to reason on this point, and I will probably agree to compromise the issue in order to secure legislative approval. It has been my experience that many agencies in Washington vie with each other as to which shall do the job. They should stop fighting for power, because the most important thing, after all is said and done, is to have the job completed.

If we follow the principles and procedure which I have attempted to outline, I believe there is a better chance to enact satisfactory housing legislation than ever before. Of course, no matter what we do, there will be strong misguided opposition. Whether we have one kind of bill or another kind of bill, one sort of proposal or many assortments of proposals, there will be an irreducible minimum of die-hards. They will proclaim from the tree tops that what we are doing is socialism. They will say that the public housers are taking over the country, and they will make quite a few more unjust accusations. They will assert that private enterprise is being destroyed and that we might as well give the country back to the Indians. But they will say all these things, and more, no matter what we do. They would be perfectly contented and satisfied only if we did nothing.

But we can overcome this opposition by applying common sense and getting maximum support. We can get more support through broad legislation than through narrow legislation. More important, we will be more deserving of support through broad legislation than through narrow legislation.

I know you well enough to feel you will take my remarks in the spirit in which they are offered. I have tried to give you sound and good advice as I visualize the situation. There is no harsh criticism intended. But we have made mistakes in the past, and we must profit from them in the future. We must broaden our base of support. We must mobilize community action and approval. We must not be defeatists. At the same time we must not confuse an enthusiastic rally of public housers, with a Congress that is still questioning and still skeptical. We have a terribly hard job ahead of us, and we must roll up our sleeves and get to work. Let us cast aside selfishness and pride and work together as a team for a common cause.

I am 100 percent in agreement with your objectives, and I hope you will value my appraisal of the congressional situation, with which I am familiar. I am on your side. You can count on me to remain there and to fight on your side, to the limit of my power. and to a successful conclusion.

Harry Hopkins' Mission to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Moscow Mission—Credit to Hopkins," written by Ernest Lindley and published in the Washington Post of June 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW MISSION—CREDIT TO HOPKINS

(By Ernest Lindley)

President Truman has publicly accorded to Harry Hopkins full credit for unraveling some

of the knots in the relations between the Soviet Union and the western allies. Proof of the success of the Hopkins mission is to be seen in the modification of the Soviet position on the veto power in the World Security Organization and in the meeting of Polish leaders to consider the formation of a new Polish provisional government.

The Polish question is very far from solved and can never be solved to the entire satisfaction of all parties concerned. But the Yalta agreement was widely approved as a sound compromise. The subsequent deterioration in relations between the Soviet Union and the western allies was due very largely to the refusal of the Soviet Union to carry out what Washington and London regarded as the plain meaning of the Yalta plan for setting up a Polish provisional government which all three powers could recognize. Mr. Hopkins appears to have persuaded Stalin to return to the path marked out at Yalta. On this path there are many visible obstacles. But it is the only route along which the Big Three can move together.

Mr. Hopkins discussed in Moscow most, if not all, of the specific difficulties in Russia's relation with the west and the common problems with respect to the organization of the peace with which the Big Three have to deal. On many of these decisions should be made when Truman, Stalin, and the British Prime Minister meet a month or so from now.

Taking the Hopkins report as a whole, President Truman found it encouraging, as he did that of his other special emissary, Joseph E. Davies, whose mission to London was less difficult than Hopkins' to Moscow, but important. The President is being widely and justly praised for his decision to send special emissaries and for his choice of Messrs. Davies and Hopkins for their respective assignments.

If President Truman had listened to the advice from conservative political quarters, both Democratic and Republican, he would not have sent Hopkins. He would have accepted Hopkins' resignation from the Government during his first few days in office. Indeed, some who professed to know the new President's mind predicted that Hopkins would be one of the first of the Roosevelt favorites to go.

Obviously, President Truman would have handicapped himself by letting Hopkins go. And the clamor for his expulsion revealed a persistent misconception of Hopkins' role during the last 4 years. He was, of course, a close personal friend of the late President. But he devoted nearly all of his time to the war and international affairs. He put winning the war and organizing a secure peace above all other objectives. Many of his old New Deal friends seldom saw him and, when they did, rarely found support for any measure which did not contribute directly to the winning of the war or the organization of the peace.

Working in the background, shunning publicity, as he did, Hopkins received little public recognition for his achievements, for his grasp of the matters with which he was dealing, or for the soundness of his advice. In fact, the nature of his advice was often known only to President Roosevelt.

On his recent mission to Moscow, Hopkins was, in a sense, on his own. His capacities were put to a severe test in more or less public view. The President says he did a fine job, and so much of the record as is known supports that conclusion.

Unfortunately, Hopkins' health will not permit him to work at top speed for long periods. He took a real personal risk in going to Moscow, as did Mr. Davies in going to London. But the President wants him to go to the Big Three meeting. And it is to be hoped that the Moscow mission will put an end to the sniping at an extremely capable, shrewd, and patriotic public servant who is unusually qualified by the knowledge and experience he has accumulated in the last 4 years to advise and assist the President in the management of international affairs.

J. B. (Jack) Hutson, the Farmers' Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "J. B. (Jack) Hutson, the Farmers' Friend," from the June 1945 issue of the North Carolina Farm Bureau News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. B. (JACK) HUTSON, THE FARMERS' FRIEND

The hearts of North Carolina farmers swell with gratitude today with the announcement by President Truman that Jack Hutson had been appointed Under Secretary of Agriculture. He holds the love, respect, and confidence of the rural people of North Carolina as few men in public life today. Although a native of Kentucky, he is known personally by more farmers in this State than any man in the national agricultural program.

If the history of lifting North Carolina agriculture out of bankruptcy were written, Hutson's name would appear in every chapter. Early in the AAA days, we hitched our wagon to his star and we have risen with him from the Bureau of Economics through the AAA; into the Commodity Credit Corporation; and are still with him today in the War Mobilization Office. No man outside of our official family has exerted a greater influence on the policies of the North Carolina Farm Bureau.

In the past 13 years the cotton, tobacco, and peanut growers of our State have called on him many times for help, and always we have received a friendly welcome and careful consideration. In the dark hours of our program he has been by our side, and as we have risen on the economic ladder toward parity we have had no stronger supporter.

As the farmers of the Nation struggle to meet the food crisis and to make the post-war adjustments that are inevitable, agriculture needs Hutson as never before. He knows farm people and farm problems as few men do in the Nation today. Farmers need a restoration of confidence in their program, and we have never yet from 13 years experience been caught short on any promise made by him to our farm people. A man firm in his convictions and one who will speak straight from the shoulder, is needed in this crucial hour. His practical judgment and common horse sense will add stimulus to a farm people in their efforts to meet their full responsibilities to a nation in war.

We farmers in North Carolina, who know him best, respect and admire Jack Hutson more today than we did 13 years ago, when we started with him. Is there any higher tribute that could be paid to a Washington bureaucrat?

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter on the subject of ship construction from Admiral Vickery and a summary from the Maritime Commission showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through the end of May 1945:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1945.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing they will be of interest to you, I am enclosing two charts and a tabulation, showing monthly tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through May 31, 1945.

Last month American merchant shipyards delivered into service 112 ships of 1,120,594 tons deadweight. At the end of May, the number of vessels of all types built under the auspices of the Maritime Commission since the inception of the Commission's program totaled 5,270, with an aggregate deadweight tonnage of approximately 52,000,000.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
January		30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730	1,229,296
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864	1,300,340
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357	1,294,432
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691	1,004,073
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915	1,120,594
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994	
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,433	
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	1,157,602	
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	1,185,997	
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	1,310,295	
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	1,430,660	
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	1,361,908	
Total dead-weight tons	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	9,089,732	19,238,626	16,348,446	
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	1,677	

The Presidential Succession

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, the message of the distinguished and beloved President of the United States relative to Presidential succession is, in my judgment, the expression of able and courageous statesmanship.

I sincerely hope that at an early date Congress will see fit to put the recommendations of the President into the form of a law. Certainly the recommendation, without any reflection whatsoever upon the distinguished members of the Cabinet, is a considerable improvement in view of the fact that it is more nearly an expression of the will of the American people.

[From the Washington Post]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The President has cut through a lot of Constitution-chopping in the matter of the succession to the Presidency. As the succession stands today, the next in line to Mr. Truman is the Secretary of State. Such a translation would bring into the highest office in the land a man who had owed nothing to the elective process. It is on this ground that we and many others have been troubled by the existing situation. But there are several elements in the succession which are unclear. Would the Secretary of State be empowered to serve out a Presidential term? Or would he be restricted to carrying out the powers and duties of the Presidency pending action by Congress? What action could Congress take? Is a special election authorized? These are the questions that have been causing controversy. The Constitution left it to Congress to declare, in the event of a vacancy in the White House when there was no Vice President, what officer shall take over the powers and duties of the Presidency. A law of 1886 supplied this deficiency by naming the Secretary of State. But the related problems were covered up by providing only for the convening of Congress to take unspecified action.

Now the President recommends to Congress that the whole question be reexamined. This is the purport of the Monroney bill, but the President's suggested step would dispose of study by a commission, as Representative MONRONEY propcses, and so would save time. Mr. Truman assumes the power to nominate his successor. Of course, he holds that power in virtue of the act of 1886, which names the Secretary of State as his successor—in other words, a person in the President's official family, who can be changed on the nomination of the President. The nomination of a successor is clearly Mr. Truman's. Mr. Truman now would nominate his successor not by changing the Secretaryship for that purpose but by naming another officeholder, viz, the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The suggestion has merits which will be obvious after a moment's reflection. Under our system of government the Speaker of the House is at present the third-ranking personage in the country, taking precedence after the President and the Chief Justice. He is also an elective person. Most of the perturbation over the succession has had to do with the possibility that a nonelected officer could enter the White House, even as a regent. The Speaker, on the contrary, is not under that disability. In fact, he is a doubly elected person, as Mr. Truman states. He is elected, first of all, in his own district, and, secondly, by a vote of all the Representatives of all the people. Thus "his selection next to that of the President and Vice President can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves."

It would be unsatisfactory, moreover, to make a change in the Secretaryship of State solely with an eye on the succession. In that event Mr. Truman might name a worthy successor but an inappropriate Secretary. The two cases should be disassociated. The country needs as never before a Secretary of State who will devote himself single-mindedly to the tasks of that significant office. As to the heir-apparency, this is merely a formal appointment to a dormant commission, having nothing to do with duties. Under the Truman suggestion the nominee would not fill out the unexpired term, but would merely act until a special election had been called. This, we think, is the right and proper course. Congress, after having been given such a statesmanlike lead from the White House, should now accord the problem top priority in its order of business, for the present uncertainty is unsettling.

[From the New York Times]

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The proposal which Mr. Truman submitted to Congress yesterday, for a change in the present order of the Presidential succession, fully merits the prompt and earnest consideration which he asks that it be given. The situation as it stands is unsatisfactory in one deeply fundamental respect. Under the statute of 1886, which now governs the succession, members of the Cabinet, in stated order, succeed to the office in the event of the death of both the elected President and Vice President. All of these Cabinet officials are, of course, chosen by the President. In effect, therefore, by reason of the death of Mr. Roosevelt, and because there is no Vice President in office, it now lies within the power of Mr. Truman himself to nominate the person who would be his immediate successor in the event of his own death or inability to act. He is a good enough Democrat to believe that in a democracy this great power should not lie in the hands of the Chief Executive.

Mr. Truman's solution of the problem is to propose that the law of succession be changed, so as to put the Speaker of the House of Representatives next in line, with the President pro tempore of the Senate following him, and then the Cabinet members in their present order. His reasons for giving the Speaker primacy are sound. They include the fact that the Speaker is an elected officer; the fact that he is not only elected by the voters of his own district but is then elected to be the presiding officer of the House by the vote of all the representatives of all the people; and the further fact that the House itself is usually in political agreement with the Chief Executive, a fact which would ease the transition for which Mr. Truman wishes to make provision.

There are various details in the President's proposal, particularly regarding the length of time which the Speaker would serve as Chief Executive and the possibility of holding a special election, which Mr. Truman leaves largely to Congress to determine.. But the problem he raises is real, the recommendation he makes is fundamentally sound, and the whole situation deserves the close attention of Congress, "in the interest," as the President says, "of orderly, democratic government."

[From the Philadelphia Record of June 20, 1945]

PROTECT THE PRESIDENCY—CONGRESS MUST PLAY SAFE

President Truman has called upon Congress to establish a new "line of succession" to the Presidency.

It is our hope that Congress will meet the need of the moment, and move swiftly to carry out Mr. Truman's suggestions.

There is nothing pleasant about contemplating the death of our President. But we can no more avoid that subject than could the founding fathers, who created the Vice Presidency as a national safeguard.

The death of President Roosevelt is still a painful memory. The period of formal mourning is over. The period of informal mourning never will be.

Yet the fact that President Truman was hurtled into the Presidency when he least expected it—

That is a warning to us now.

President Truman is flying to the west coast. He will make other flights to widely separated cities.

Chances are 1,000 to 1 against an accident.

But Congress should play safe.

The President will soon go to Berlin. We are sure that the vigilant Red Army and Soviet police will make that city as safe as a city can be. But there are still desperate, fanatical Nazis in Berlin who would gladly give their lives for one of the Big Three.

So Congress should play safe.

A law of 1886 provides that the Secretary of State shall be next in line. Then the Secretaries of Treasury, War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Navy, and Interior.

With the highest respect to Mr. Stettinius, we do not believe he is qualified for the Presidency, and we do not think he thinks so either.

If the necessity arose, we are sure Mr. Stettinius would resign to give the President a free hand if Congress fails to act.

But Congress should play safe.

Truman's proposal is in line with our President's deep attachment to democracy. He believes, and we agree with him, that the next in line—by law—should be the Speaker of the House—

Because the Speaker is the man who next represents most clearly a choice of the people themselves.

Further, Mr. Truman suggests special elections to fill vacancies.

This, too, is sound democratic doctrine.

President Truman's statement indeed echoed our own thoughts. We had in preparation at the time an editorial on almost identical lines.

We believe the situation is serious, and so does he.

And we say that even as we express our fervent hope that the Almighty will protect Harry Truman and guide him on the ardous journeys ahead.

The future of a nation is at stake. It is no time to gamble.

Congress must act swiftly.

Col. Florence A. Blanchfield

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week General Somervell conferred the Distinguished Service

Medal upon Colonel Blanchfield, the head of the Army Nurse Corps. The Distinguished Service Medal and the citation which went to her were most worthily deserved. Certainly, no one has done more toward the successful outcome of the war, the saving of human life, than has Colonel Blanchfield and the Army Nurse Corps. Colonel Blanchfield served also in World War I.

Col. Florence A. Blanchfield accepted the citation for Distinguished Service Medal with great humility in a very moving speech. She accepted it for all the nurses of the corps instead of just for her own very fine work of organization in the United States and in all theaters of the war from the Atlantic to the Pacific; in fact, in every part of the world where our soldiers fight. I know we all want to pay all tribute and honor to Col. Florence Blanchfield.

The citation is as follows:

Col. Florence A. Blanchfield demonstrated outstanding ability and devotion to duty as superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps from June 1943 to May 1945. By her precept and example, she inspired her corps, the oldest group of militarized women in the armed forces, to establish a glowing record of achievement in caring for our wounded soldiers on all the far-flung battle fronts. She was responsible for policies used in expanding the corps from a few hundred nurses to more than 52,000, displaying in this procedure administrative and executive ability of the highest order. In 1943 she supervised the establishment of basic training schools in the nine continental service commands and in all oversea theaters. In 1944 she was largely instrumental in securing full military rank for nurses. She exerted great efforts to enlist the support of civilian nurses' organizations, inaugurated a public-relations program, and engaged in extensive morale-building activities. High moral and professional standards which she established resulted in an extremely low discharge rate for the corps. She planned and put into operation a program which took nursing teams close to the front lines for surgical duty—a new procedure which helped save lives by insuring prompt nursing care. Much of her time was spent in the field. She made an extended tour of the European theater of operations to insure superior care of casualties. Colonel Blanchfield's wise understanding of nurses and their problems was a major factor in the success of her organization. Her contribution to the war effort merits the highest praise; her contribution to humanity, through the feats of her valiant corps, can be told adequately only by those who have suffered in battle.

Resignation of Under Secretary of Agriculture Grover Hill

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I recently read of the resignation of Grover Hill as Under Secretary of Agriculture. Since this resignation has become generally known I have received many wires and letters from farmers and livestock men from the West expressing their desire that Mr. Hill reconsider his resignation or that the President of the United States be asked to have Mr. Hill remain at his post.

During my time in Congress I have regarded Mr. Hill as one of the really fine public servants, so far as agriculture is concerned. By training and experience he not only has been able to see the problems of the farmer and the livestock men but wherever it has been possible he has tried to do something about those problems. No, he has not been able to do everything that has been asked of him but he has had the faculty of knowing how to work with people. He has not only understood their difficulties but he has taken the time to let them know of his tasks as an administrator and rather than causing ill will most people have returned to sing his praises. He has been a fine public servant and I join with those who have been anxious for him to remain at his present post in expressing our gratitude for a job well done. We express the hope that his leaving the Department does not mean that there will be a change in the policies that he has inaugurated in the vast production of food and fiber that has been so necessary in the prosecution of the war.

I want, at this point, to submit for the RECORD a brief biographical sketch of a fine American coming from the great Southwest.

Grover Bennett Hill, Under Secretary of Agriculture, was born in Gainesville, Tex., April 3, 1889, to Francis Marion and Mary Alice (Loyd) Hill. With his family he moved to Amarillo a year later, and that city has since been his "home town."

After graduation from the Amarillo high school in 1909, followed by 2 years of study at the University of Texas, he learned the ranching business as a cowboy on a Texas ranch. From that time to 1934 he was a ranchman and farmer, raising cattle, wheat, and grain sorghums. In 1934, he served as an alternate member of the "Committee of 25" appointed to work out a national cattle program by Chester C. Davis, at that time Administrator of Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Also in 1934 he became regional director for the Southwestern States of Texas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma in the cattle buying program under which 8,000,000 head of cattle were processed into meat for relief distribution during the great drought of that year. In November 1936 he went to Washington as head of the southern division, AAA, range program. Three years later he was appointed Assistant Secretary of Agriculture by President Roosevelt; and in February 1944, was made Under Secretary of Agriculture.

In July 1943, Mr. Hill was appointed First Assistant Administrator of the War Food Administration—in addition to his duties as Under Secretary of Agriculture—and since then has been closely associated with Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, in building and managing the United States program for food production and distribution to meet wartime needs.

While cattle raising has remained his business, Mr. Hill has become an authority on the major phases of agriculture, and through extensive travels and constant study he has an intimate knowledge of agriculture in every State in the Union. His intense interest in research is evidenced by several worth-while contributions in that field. He also was the motivating force behind the victory garden movement last year and this year.

Fishing and hunting are his hobbies, although he has not done either since Pearl Harbor. He has had to substitute more close-to-home activities, and gets his exercise working in his garden.

In Falls Church, Va., about 10 miles from Washington, he lives quietly in a modest home with his wife, a former Amarillo, Tex., girl, Jennie Bell Franklin, whom he married July 12, 1910. They have six children—three sons and three daughters. Two of the daughters, Mary Alice, now Mrs. Armound Swenson, and Florence, now Mrs. Freeman Gwyn, make their homes in Amarillo; the third, Mildred, is a member of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps in Washington, D. C., preparing to be an Army Nurse. One son, Felix Franklin, lives with his parents. The other two are in the Army, William Milton, a private first-class, stationed at Bolling Field, D. C.; and Lt. Richard Dean stationed at Camp Pickett, Va.

Mr. Hill's straightforward and practical manner of dealing with people has made him one of the best known and most popular men in American agriculture; and in spite of the pressure of his work he has never been too busy to see anyone, or to be of assistance.

His philosophy, as he so often has expressed it, is: "There is no place in this big, broad country of ours for a philosophy of scarcity. It only makes good common sense to produce all we can consume at home and sell abroad consistent with good soil practices and an adequate return to the producer."

OPA

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, before the passing of this day the bill to extend the life of the OPA will come before this body. Two things stand out most prominently in my mind:

First. Cancellation of slaughter permits by the OPA in the small cities and towns in the agricultural areas, thereby

burdening the consumers and the producers of livestock with an extra cost of transportation from home to the packer and from the packer back to the consumers' tables. Also the commission to the livestock commission merchant and loss by shrinkage in weight with an additional cost to the taxpayer of a subsidy to the packer.

It does not make sense.

Second. The fixing of ceiling prices on produce to where the producer refuses to sell to the dealer because he can more often get twice as much per pound or per dozen from the housewife.

If some remedial steps are not taken in the adjustments of the ceiling prices of such necessities of life, the dealers will have to close their doors.

The following letter from Mr. Frank Thornton, a very prominent businessman of McAlester, Okla., proprietor of the Farmers Produce Co., to the OPA, is a fair analysis of the situation. Mr. Thornton's letter is as follows:

FARMERS PRODUCE CO.,
McAlester, Okla., June 9, 1945.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Tulsa, Okla.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing you to seek some relief from a situation now existing here in McAlester on poultry and beef, with which situation I am sure you are in a measure familiar.

For the past 15 years, I have owned and operated a wholesale poultry and egg business here, and two retail general merchandise stores, one in McAlester and the other at Ashland, Okla., the names of which are properly designated on this letterhead.

First, I will refer to my poultry business. I have always handled a large volume of poultry. On account of the many restrictions, the volume is now so low that it is evident that I will be compelled to close this business unless some relief is forthcoming. I will gladly sign an affidavit and my records will verify the same, that I have not bought one single spring chicken since February 1, 1945. This is due to the ceiling price which I am allowed to pay the producer which is 30½ cents per pound. All the producers here are selling by the head at prices from $1 to $1.50 each for springs weighing as little as 1½ pounds. This is no secret, as it is generally known by everyone who patronizes the producers, including merchants, cafes, honky-tonks, and individual consumers.

Second, the meat situation. My retail business in the two stores is gradually going down in favor of the few stores here who are able to keep meat. Excessive prices are being paid to the one and only licensed slaughterer here and unless one is willing to pay black-market prices and resort to black-market practices, he is on the way out. There are only about 3 markets out of approximately 70 in the town, who have meat in any quantity.

In conclusion, I wish to ask these questions. Why does not the OPA investigate such violations here when they are so evident that a schoolboy could detect them? Why doesn't the OPA offer some protection to the taxpaying businessman who tries to live up to its requirements?

Will this lack of enforcement force honest men to resort to black-market methods to protect the business which they have spent years in establishing? Is the OPA law good or bad? Or, is the administration or enforcement good or bad?

Just a little food for thought gentlemen, and I will appreciate hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

FRANK THORNTON.

The Investoric System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by William Jackman, entitled "The Investoric System" before the Kiwanis Club, Trenton, N. J., June 20, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Kiwanis Club, ladies and gentlemen, in this great and bustling domain, known as the United States of America, we have inherited a way of life called the system of free enterprise, the capitalistic system.

Under this system, the Government has the exclusive right to coin money. Professional writers and scientists sometimes coin new phrases. Anyone in this free democracy—soldier, sailor, or candlestick maker, has the right to coin a new word.

A new word has about as much chance of finding its way into the dictionary as a newborn babe has of becoming President of the United States. It isn't impossible, but, mildly stated, it is highly improbable. However, there's no penalty for trying.

And so I am going to coin a new word: "investoric."

Just as the adjective "capitalistic" springs from "capitalist," so the adjective "investoric" comes from "investor."

We are a Nation of investors; this Nation has grown strong under the investoric system.

We invest in the stocks and bonds of private corporations; in securities of our Government; in the tools of our trade; in training and education; in lands and cattle; in fire insurance, so as to protect our investment; in life insurance, to protect our old age and to insure our loved ones of capital to invest in the American way of life: the investoric system.

I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that it is a good system, no matter what name you give it. Under its operation, a sharecropper's son has become the owner of rich acres; the janitor has become superintendent of the factory; the chairman of the board was once the office boy; a woodchopper became President of the United States.

Yet some would be foolhardy enough to abandon our system of government and of living which has enabled the United States of America to become the most powerful Nation in the world in such short time that it is a modern miracle; a system which emancipated us from the hates and prejudices of the old world.

Do you remember Benito Mussolini's sneer at "decadent democracies" and the Japanese admiral's phophecy that the peace terms would be dictated in Washington? One wonders what they think now.

The aggressors called us a nation of "softies" because we enjoyed the better things of life. Being "slow to anger" and loving the ways of peace, they expected to beat us to our knees before we had a chance to stand erect and attain our full stature.

Japan challenged our will to fight with her sneak attack on Pearl Harbor at the moment her emissaries were speaking words of friendship in Washington.

Slow to anger? Yes; but terrible when aroused.

A peace-loving nation? Yes; but swift in preparation and deadly in execution when forced to defend her sacred honor and obliged to crush the murderous, power-mad dictators.

Germany and Italy became dictatorships through inside forces acting through government. If we lose our freedom in America, this loss will also come from within, not from without.

If our system is to be perpetuated, we must continuously strive toward perfection. Although the best system yet conceived by the mind of man, none will deny need for improvement. That's your duty and mine. We must protect our freedom, not submit to curtailment of it.

If we wish to retain the right to go into business for ourselves without the killing competition of Government-operated business; if we wish to protect those employment-providing enterprises which have borrowed money from us and have issued us stock certificates and bonds; if we wish these certificates to give us healthy exercise in clipping coupons and cashing dividend checks, we must vigilantly consider the strategic position of the investor.

We must bear in mind that business has three component parts constituting the keystone of the free enterprise arch—management, labor, capital. I contend that it is more accurate to say the manager, the worker, the investor.

Labor is organized—and when labor speaks the echo of its voice is heard around the world. Management, too, speaks with authority.

But the investor who entrusts his savings to management so that business can expand, so that more workers can be hired and dividends may be earned—the investor, that forgotten and unsung hero in America's investoric system—has no full-sized megaphone through which his voice can ring, even though his numbers are legion: There being in America more investors than all union members, organized farmers, executives and managers combined.

How can the investor's voice be heard in the councils of labor and management and in the Halls of Congress when it still is like unto the voice of one crying in the wilderness?

Business will continue to lack that fine balance which is a requisite to permanence unless and until the investors harness their latent power, through organization. So I implore you, investors: Organize and make your voices heard. Plainly it is your right to organize for the protection of your investments and against unfair, crippling legislation.

Most of you gentlemen here today are executives as well as stockholders. You work continuously for all the stockholders who own your corporations. But who gets the subpena if your company is indicted? The stockholders? No. It's you, the executives.

Who is grilled if some Government agency decides to rake your business over the coals? The investor? No! Again, it's you.

Who takes harassment from some misinformed or ill-advised stockholder who may have brought his stock only a week before or who may be a chronic kicker? You, the executives in charges.

So I emphasize again: It's high time you organized all your stockholders and investors, so that adequate educating be done; so that you may gather strength through organized numbers.

The investor who is not an executive must be taught to realize that it is his duty to protect the value of his stock—as well as to promote the sale of its products or services.

Many duties fall squarely upon the shoulders of investors. When you organize, I recommend that you draw up a code of ethics, a set of rules. As an example, let me read the ten commandments for investors drawn up by the Investors Fairplay League.

Commandment I: I must protect and defend all honest, efficient managements, that we, the investors, hire to run our property: Help to make our companies productive and promote their products and services.

Commandment II: I must insist on generous and fair treatment for labor, fair prices to consumers, fair treatment of vendors and competitors.

Commandment III: I must help to protect managements against needless harassments by Government questionnaires, suits, or investigations; help to make all Americans realize tha' an attack on a public corporation is an attack on the property of its stockholders as well as upon management.

Commandment IV: I must oppose attacks upon the property of corporations by Government agencies in the field of international cooperation, attacks which violate economic agreements previously approved by proper Government authority, attacks which are in conflict with the best interests of our own people and those abroad.

Commandment V: I must see to it that the bill of Rights applies to our property as well as to ourselves; that American businessmen as well as workingmen have the right to assemble peacefully and work together to provide full employment, high wages, and buying power and higher standards of living; that any American has the right to go into business for himself on a fair, competitive basis; that politicians and officeholders be prevented from using antitrust laws as weapons against the property of American citizens when such action would be against the public interest.

Commandment VI: I must not make public charges of violation of trust against corporate managements without first securing explanation and information direct from such managements.

Commandment VII: I must require an accounting of legitimate and reasonable business facts and policies for which managements are responsible.

Commandment VIII: I must strive to prevent the Government from entering into unfair competition with a corporation or with private industry generally; must insist that managements also combat such activities; that corporations and/or stockholders be subjected to only one over-all direct tax from the Government; that corporate competitors set up by Government shall also pay taxes and compete on equal terms.

Commandment IX: I must seek to see to it that the laws of the respective States of the Union, as they affect America's free enterprise system, are as nearly uniform as possible, viz, laws regulating transportation over highways and laws affecting management, labor, and agriculture.

Commandment X: I must protect and preserve our property and our liberties. It is therefore my clear duty to join with other investors for mutual benefit, to organize our strength under leadership of recognized integrity, so that the voice of the investor may speak with authority in the councils of government and business, in a manner to which the millions of investors are entitled—the millions of constructive and patriotic citizens who have made America great and who cannot with impunity escape their responsibility of combining together now to build an even greater America.

Would you not like your stockholders to be guided by these 10 commandments?

We of the Investors Fairplay League simply want justice and equity—fair play. We want influence in proportion with the numbers and deserts of the many millions of American investors.

It may not have occurred to you before, but there is only one group in America which outnumbers the investoric group and that's the citizen group. Investors outnumber any religious or political group. Let me ask you, Why do you investors hide your light under a bushel? When I say "you investors," it's closely akin to saying "you Americans." Investors can truly be classified as the cream of America.

We want to continue the system which brought us the Robert Fultons, the Thomas Edisons, the Babe Ruths, the Abraham Lincolns, the Jim Thorpes, the Will Rogerses, the Henry Fords, the Robert E. Lees, the General Pershings, the Eddie Rickenbackers, the Clara Bartons.

In America there's room for all kinds of differences of opinion; room for the rich and room for the poor to become rich, through application of the tried and true formula—work, save, invest.

The United States of America enjoys more than half the telephones throughout the world. Just before the war, there was a radio here for every 3 persons, contrasted with 1 for each 90 Russians.

We used 75 percent of the world's entire output of silk. Statistics on the manufacture and use of rayon during the next 10 years should prove interesting indeed. Although we have only 7 percent of the world's population and 6 percent of the land area, yet in 1941 four out of every five automobiles in the world were rolling over the highways of that richly favored area bounded by two oceans and situated between friendly Canada and neighborly Mexico.

These facts and figures throw a little light on the United States, whose Constitution was ratified 156 years ago, and whose progress has outstripped all the old countries.

The years ahead should be more prosperous than any yet experienced in the investoric age in America.

It is heartening to note that President Truman is emphasizing the necessity of private enterprise to extend itself to the utmost in order to provide employment during reconversion, and following the end of the war. It is evident that business is going to have an opportunity to show just what it can do in picking up the unemployment slack.

In this connection, it becomes of greatest importance for investors who have idle money, to make such funds available for reconversion and expansion. Throughout the world products of American industry are going to be needed to rebuild in the wake of destruction, and to meet the new demands for a higher standard of living. The number of investors and the amount invested must show great increase if free enterprise is to operate without too much Government regulation and financing. As business measures up to this test, this confidence will grow. It might also be remarked that the individual investor will find courage to invest his money in free enterprise if he can be sure of a strong investor organization, committed to protecting his rights.

Just as home folks thought up the eighteenth amendment during World War I, without any help from the boys who were fighting and dying to save democracy, so, since they went away this time, there has been some legislation passed which they are not going to like. There has been concentration of power in the Federal Government, much of it necessary during the emergency of war.

But the time is coming when the strong voice of public opinion will be needed to persuade those who took these powers away from the people, to return them back to the people. It will be tragic for you and for the Nation if the voice of the investor remains unvocal.

There is no question but that public sentiment is strongly in favor of disbanding the emergency bureaus in Washington just as quickly as possible. I was pleased to note a few weeks ago that Madam Perkins made a statement that she believed in States' rights. Mrs. Perkins stated truly that the National Government should parcel out the authority to govern as much as possible to the State Governments.

Following the remarkable strides made by American industry during this war, the era of reconstruction and peacetime development promises to be fraught with greater progress than any period in our history during time of peace. Individual initiative and hard work will be well rewarded. There's a job for all of us to do. Nothing is perfect this side of heaven, but you and I can take a more effective part in helping to perfect the American way of life.

Here is my last injunction to you: Don't let yourself, American investors, don't let yourself remain the forgotten Americans! You have implemented the wheels of progress. You're the very backbone of America! It is time you made yourselves heard!

In closing I should like to read the "I Am an American" creed written by Benjamin Edwards Neal, founder of "I Am an American" Day. This is the solemn and inspiring obligation taken by new citizens on the third Sunday in May of each year. I think that it may be well worth while for us oldsters to adopt the same creed which our youngsters have accepted as their own. If every American will adopt this creed as his own, our future course, free from isms, is guaranteed.

"I am an American! The Golden Rule is my rule! In humility and with gratitude to Almighty God, I acknowledge my undying debt to the founding fathers, who left me a priceless heritage, which now is my responsibility. With steadfast loyalty, I will uphold the Constitution of the United States. I will treasure my birthright of American ideals; I will place moral integrity above worldly possessions. Problems of interest to my country shall be of interest to me. I will count my right of suffrage to be a sacred trust and I will diligently strive to prove worthy of that trust. I will give my full support to upright public servants but those with unclean hands I will firmly oppose. Each obligation that comes to me as a true American, I will discharge with honor. My heart is in America and America is in my heart! I am an American!"

The Food Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the food shortage, particularly the meat shortage in my district, has reached a new high. There is no question but that lack of meat, black-market racketeering, and failure of the Government to take remedial action are all having a most detrimental effect upon the morale of our people, as well as upon their nutritional and health standards. Administrative action which caused this situation in the first place through ill-advised price fixing and rationing policies and the gratuitous sending of American largess of almost every kind of foodstuffs and necessaries of life to foreign nations, not necessarily connected with the war effort, has failed to correct or even minimize these shortages.

The situation is steadily growing worse and the American people are now looking to Congress to take the leadership in providing desperately needed foodstuffs to sustain our workers, our children, our aged, and our people in the hospitals and the homes. I am conscious of the fact that our committees have been studying these vital questions. But there can be no further delay in providing food. Our war workers and our people cannot be starved. They cannot have their nutritional standards reduced any lower. Drastic action is warranted to eliminate price-fixing procedures which are stagnating the flow of livestock and to eliminate and punish the heartless black-market racketeers who are mulcting our people. Moreover, if this situation continues much longer, it will ruin thousands and thousands of small businessmen who are unable to procure meats and foodstuffs.

We are all interested in the work of the War Crimes Commission which seeks to ferret out and punish the war criminals abroad. But it is high time that this Congress took some affirmative action to ferret out and punish the war criminals at home who, whether by administrative rules or private manipulation, have brought about a condition which is subjecting a major part of the American people to progressive starvation and threatening the nutrition and health of the Nation.

Let us accelerate measures against the black market. Let us drive out of the Government service the blunderers whose unwise price and rationing policies and whose indiscriminate shipments abroad of food which we need for our sustenance have brought about this present great crisis which is doing more to shake the confidence of the people in their Government and lower their spirit and morale than any other single factor that has appeared in the Nation since the outbreak of the war.

WHITINSVILLE, MASS., *June 16, 1945.*

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: We, an unorganized group of meat cutters and small butcher shopkeepers, wish that you would investigate immediately the meat situation in this area covered by your representative district, in order to effect some sort of relief for the real down-to-earth workers in the various industries that covers a good size portion of the war-production program in Massachusetts.

We have heard through newspapers and radio for the past 8 or 9 weeks that the situation would be better in a few weeks and it seems that it is developing into 8 or 9 months at a time. It would apparently seem that if the OPA can curb the meat to the very lowest of minimums, it could reverse its procedure of untanglement by assuring each dealer of a fair amount to be distributed to his patrons. The OPA has greatly curbed the slaughtering of native stock thereby curbing the amount to be distributed to the lowest it has ever been in Northbridge and vicinity.

The Government emphatically and most prominently displays the wickedness of supposed black-market operations and operators through its posters and numerous radio utterings, but can you fairly see a family of 8 or 9 people going 6 and 7 weeks without even a pound of so-called hamburg? It isn't right to further the black-market activities, but the health of anyone's family is first in the hearts of the parents, thereby forcing clean-cut and level-headed heads of families going to the furthest point of obtaining meat products, caring little just what exists or who is thriving financially therefrom.

These families have given their sons and daughters to preserve American liberties and justices and in addition are giving their sweat and blood to keep the home front clear of injustices, and just what justice is given them in return for their sacrifices. There isn't 1 family in 20 that can afford to step out on a Sunday or a week end for meals at restaurants or hotels, why because between withholding taxes and pledges for the purchase of freedom savings bonds, they simply can't afford the fancy prices for ordinary quality foods served at these places.

We do feel that your earnest intentions are to further the progress of your constituents and also to care for their problems that affect their health and welfare, so that is the reason we are appealing to you personally for some healthful and helpful action—soon. We acknowledge with all fairness regarding the boys and girls of the American forces and their need of meat products, but we do not acknowledge any sort of arrangement that feeds every other peoples of foreign lands first and the good American people at home—last.

This appeal is urgent and much more serious than what is outlined above. Thanking you in advance, we remain,

Very truly yours,

FRANK J. GONYNOR.

What Will We Do With Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, many of us, myself included, were keenly disappointed and had our expectations cast down at the end of the last war when the Allied troops accepted an armistice and halted their march to Berlin before reaching the German border.

Now we have had to fight the war all over again at a terrible cost, and this time we have a large part of Germany on our hands. What will we do with the country and the German people? Let us listen to the advice of the veteran statesman, our former Ambassador to Germany, who for 4 years had the privilege and opportunity to deal with the Germans face to face and observe their traits and characteristics.

There is inserted herewith a letter from Mr. Gerard and a portion of an advertisement from Time magazine:

NEW YORK CITY, *April 28, 1945.*

DEAR MR. WHITE: I am writing to you and sending you the attached reprint because of our common interest in seeing that this time Germany stays defeated.

Between 1913 and 1917 I was America's Ambassador to Berlin. I saw the Germans at first hand—about to lose a war, but preparing for a peace they were to win. Two years later, I saw Americans victorious in war, but unprepared for the peace they were to lose.

In my opinion, it was lack of public thinking which lost that peace for our country. Public opinion was woefully uninformed on the nature of the German people, the German General Staff, the economics of reparations, the punishment of war criminals, the partition of Germany. Nor did many people bother to inquire into these matters. Echoing from coast to coast were prejudices and shibboleths which had not the slightest bearing on the real question of what to do with Germany and how to do it.

Today, we have been given another chance. Our leaders are again trying to plan a lasting peace. But this peace will not stick either, unless we, the people, can intelligently support it or constructively criticize it. We must attain, as we never have before, a level of thought and understanding on the basic problems of the peace which shall be so high that it can have no other result but wise action on the part of our leaders.

In the attached message, appearing in the Nation's newspapers this week, Time magazine's writers have, in my opinion, selected a group of the significant problems at stake and have stated them with clarity and fairness. I urge you to read this message, think about it, discuss it with you friends and associates.

Yours very sincerely,

JAMES W. GERARD.

You'll soon have 80,000,000 Germans on your doorstep.

What's to be done with them?

When the Big Three met at Yalta they did what they could to blueprint the reformatory in which the German people will live after the war.

But a blueprint will house no Germans. The reformatory itself is yet to be built; and meanwhile thinking on what constitutes the "right" peace for Germany will swing back and forth across a wide arc.

Some will wonder if a "tough" peace isn't just what the Nazis want—to drive the German people back into their arms again.

Others will ask if a peace as hard as Germany richly deserves can ever be enforced—will suggest that a milder, enforceable peace may be a wiser choice.

Still others will say "Germany is rubble. She is devastated as no nation has even been devastated; she knows now what it means to lose a modern war. Let us not be vondictive."

In any case, it will take more than just our leaders to write the peace and the punishment. It will take millions of men—and you are one of them. You have a great stake in this peace to come—and you will have a greater voice in its making than the citizens of any other nation.

Now, during the San Francisco Conference, you have the duty as well as the right to make your opinion known—provided you have earned that right, kept yourself informed, nourished your thinking on the raw material of the news—so your opinion will make the greatest, long-term, enlightened sense.

Of course nobody has the complete answers yet—not even the experts. But perhaps these are the big questions you ought to be chewing on so you can be better prepared to "sit in" when the first decisions are submitted to you.

The Big Three said at Yalta:

"We are determined to bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment."

But who are the war criminals? Those who can be convicted of actual crimes? Or the whole Nazi leadership, SS and Gestapo, those legions especially trained for torture and brutality? And under what international laws (if any) can they be tried?

"We are determined to break up for all time the German General Staff."

But Napoleon thought he had uprooted these professional warmakers forever; Wil-

son, Clemenceau, and Lloyd George thought so—but the Junkers outsmarted them all. You can't get older men like these—who have practiced war all their lives—to begin to think like peaceful lawyers, doctors, tradesmen—overnight. What can be done?

"We will eliminate or control all German industry that can be used for military production."

After the First World War we forbade Germany to manufacture arms—set up the best control system we could think of to enforce the ban. For years the midget German Army drilled with wooden tanks, dummy guns. But off came the mask in 1935—and we found Germany had been making arms right under our noses all along. * * * How did we fail in 1918? How can we succeed today?

"In reparation for the damage caused by Germany, Germany will be obliged to make compensation in kind, to the greatest possible extent."

But how? Do we agree with the Russians that the best way is to force masses of the German people in labor battalions to rebuild the cities they destroyed? Or can greater reparation be made with money earned by Germans working in Germany?

"And what of the idea to split up Germany into two or three small, separate, individual states?"

Has partition of a defeated nation ever been a real peace-keeping success? Would it make more sense to turn Germany into an international area under the management of the new world organization?

Reasons for Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Duluth Free Press, of Duluth, Minn., for Friday, June 15, gives an interesting viewpoint in connection with the problem which appears to be of paramount importance in connection with our domestic conditions right here at home. I refer to the shortage of meat and other food products, the reason for this condition, and just what will have to be done before it can be remedied. The viewpoint of the editorial writer of the Duluth Free Press is very forceful, and I submit his discussion of this matter to you because in final analysis he points out that the policy of the Government, through its administrative officials, is responsible for the present deplorable mess. The editorial is as follows:

THE FOOD MUDDLE

The food muddle—20 percent less in April than in March; 20 percent less in May than in April, with tightening belts assured for the next 3 months. It all seems inexcusable. The whole fiasco is the outgrowth of Washington's policy of scarcity, first put into practice by killing sheep and calves, plowing under cotton, corn, wheat, and paying farmers to keep land idle. Americans will reap fruits of that plan for some time to come. The theory of scarcity creating high prices and prosperity was an exploded fact long before Washington was blinded by that nightmare of delusion. The administration deliberately turned its back on proven methods, putting the theories of dreamers with governmental blessing and backing into action, levying taxes upon every man, woman, and child for subsidies to keep things scarce. The black markets of today are merely the outgrowth of such a policy. Is there no meaning to the fact that we went through World War I without black markets or food shortages while we are now beset with both? The difference between the two periods was in the method of approach. Whether we travel a path from east to west or from west to east, the distance will be the same over any given length. Traveling the path from production to distribution or back again may be the same, but there is a world of difference where the base price is located. Mr. Hoover's policy in food administration sets a base price which began with the farmer, the producer as it were. The price of a bushel of wheat was set at a figure at which he could earn a profit and no limit placed upon the amount grown. Assured of a profit the farmer continued to produce and no shortage occurred. In addition to the farmer came the railroads, elevators, mills, jobbers, and retailers who aided in preparing food for the market and getting it to the consumer. Assume that each one was entitled to a dime for his share in the transaction. That would add 50 cents to the original dollar with the result that the bushel of wheat when ground into flour and handed to the customer would retail at a price of $1.50. Under Washington's policy in this war the base price was moved to the other end of the distribution-production path. As an illustration, assume that same bushel of wheat was fixed at a base price of $1 for the jobber or retailer. Such a price means that the miller will get only 90 cents, the railroad only 80 cents, and the farmer only 70 cents. These three are now losing money, but Government control says: "Well, the dear old public is getting lots of money, we'll just take a dime from them and give the farmer a subsidy for the loss sustained. If the miller experiences too much difficulty, we'll take another dime or two away from each citizen and help him along with a subsidy."

This merely illustrates the general policy of our Government. We have been regimented by controls for the last 12 years which back theories of scarcities and no profits to anyone. It isn't all in this bleak story of tightening belts, nor is it likely to be overcome quickly unless the policy is changed. Price fixing for example is designed to keep prices down, but how does it work? If the test of a pudding is in the eating, the test of a policy should be in its results. The only reason for any man being in business or rendering a service of any kind is the hope of earning a profit from his activities. If that cannot be done he'll soon quit, in fact, cannot stay. If the Government says to the farmer, "the selling price of chickens to the consumer is 40 cents per pound," the producer must therefore get less. He will be on the losing end. No profits for him. Then along comes the black market operator who offers the farmer a dollar a pound. It's a chance to cover some losses and perhaps get a few dollars for other purposes. The black market gets it and the consumer pays $5 for a chicken. A black market exists only when scarcity enables people to bid for control, or when one cannot earn a sufficient amount to pay the cost of operations with a little over. The average man is a pretty good sort of a chap when given a fair break. All he wants is a fair return for his work, but artificial scarcity nor lack of a fair return will give no one an even break. While Washington refuses to permit producers and others to earn a fair profit, and their only method of breaking even is through the black market, scarcity is bound to continue for the average person simply will not produce at all, not even for the black market regardless of fancy prices offered. The average man is too honest to help crooks.

Consumer and Labor Groups Demand Strong OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a digest of statements made by consumer and labor groups at a meeting held on June 13 by the Committee for the Protection for the Consumer in the House Labor Committee room. Representative AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, presided. This meeting was called by me as acting chairman in the absence of the chairman, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, who is abroad with members of the Military Affairs Committee.

The following organizations which were represented at the gathering urged the extension of the Price Control Act:

American Association of University Women; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Congress of Women's Auxiliaries, CIO; Consumers Union of United States; League of Women Shoppers; National Education Association; National Farmers Union; National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People; National Council of Catholic Women; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Negro Women; National League of Women Voters; National Congress of Parents and Teachers; People's Lobby; Potomac Cooperative Federation; Union for Democratic Action; United Council of Church Women; and the Women's Trade Union League.

STATEMENT OF COLSTON E. WARNE, PRESIDENT OF CONSUMERS UNION OF UNITED STATES

It is heartening news to American consumers to learn that 66 Members of Congress have joined the congressional Committee for the Protection of the Consumer. Unfortunately, the consumer interest in the United States has, in the past, been neither well organized nor articulate. All too frequently, the most potent political pressures have been from producer groups, whose interests have not always coincided with the welfare of consumers.

Within the past 10 years, the growth of the American consumer movement has been most marked. The well-established women's organizations have concerned themselves with consumer problems. Trade unions have, through their women's auxiliaries and in their general membership, increasingly accented the interests of their members as buyers. Religious and educational organizations have come to share a concern with the ethical problems associated with consumption and the fair distribution of goods. The rapidly growing consumers cooperative movement has come to educate consumers in America in collective action. In addition, a considerable number of organizations have sprung up, devoted exclusively to the protection of consumer interests. In these numerous organizations of differing backgrounds of racial, religious, and occupational composition, a common interest is shared—the belief that our economic system must be tested by its capacity to deliver to the people—the consumers—the maximum flow of goods at equitable prices. The consumer movement opposes monopoly. It wishes the

steady advance of standards of living of the people with adequate governmental protection from fraud.

During the war period, the consumer movement has been a bulwark of our price-control system. Consumers realize the absolute necessity for effective wartime price control and rationing. With purchasing power at all-time highs and with half of the Nation's productive capacity withdrawn from consumer goods, we must have economic stabilization. Our consumer groups have from the beginning backed OPA. They have volunteered for price panel work. They have sought to educate consumers concerning the need for price control and rationing. Whenever the act was threatened through the selfishness of business groups who wished to "break the line," consumers have brought their organized support to bear.

It is in this light that consumer organizations are today appearing before this committee. We wish to tell you that we favor the extension of price control; that we wish no emasculating amendments. We realize that despite all the mistakes it has made, OPA has an important role to play in the months ahead.

Speaking for the organization with which I am particularly associated, Consumers Union of United States, I should indicate that it is a nonprofit organization of 85,000 consumers, national in its scope. Its work is in the testing and appraisal of consumer products and in affording to consumers a collective voice in legislative matters. Since the beginning of the defense effort, we have supported price control. Our members realize that, if OPA is discontinued or weakened now, prices will soar in an inflationary spiral which would be disastrous to millions of consumers with fixed incomes, to servicemen's wives on meager allotments, and to war workers whose pay envelopes have declined since VE-day.

The Wherry Amendment is, in our estimation, the latest threat to adequate price control. It would, we feel, be impossible to administer and decidedly inflationary in its effect. Farm organizations do not support it. It was forced through the Senate by the foes of price control.

We, of Consumers Union, feel that the Price Control Act should be renewed for 2 years without amendment. We feel that the handling of reconversion problems would be eased if the administrators of OPA could establish an explicit long-range policy. We cannot have orderly reconversion if price control is thrown into political discussion in another 6 months, as proposed by Senator Taft. The OPA should be freed from the sort of pressure which has compelled it constantly to concede ground to business groups.

Our organization is not satisfied with OPA's operation but we nevertheless support it. We feel that it has been, on the whole, too generous to business interests. It has allowed corporate profits, before taxes, to soar to a point three and one-half times greater than the prewar 1939 levels by failing to hold down prices in all fields, according to the Department of Commerce figures. As Chester Bowles says, a study of profits of 1,120 leading American corporations "refute so emphatically statements by some critics of price control that OPA policies have worked general hardship on business."

Mr. Bowles adds that the profits of unincorporated manufacturing, wholesale, retail, and service businesses almost doubled between 1939 and 1944.

"All available figures show that during the period of wartime prices control, American business, even after the payment of all taxes, has been more prosperous than during any other period in our history."

Surely with a record such as this, OPA cannot be accused of being on the whole, too tight in its pricing policies. If anything, the showing is that consumers have been aggrieved, not business.

STATEMENT BY MRS. F. F. ESPENSHIED, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

I am speaking for the American Association of University Women, a national organization of approximately 80,000 women college graduates, organized in local branches in every State of the Union. Most of these women are professional or white-collar workers, or are homemakers whose husbands are on fixed salaries. As civic leaders and homemakers, they are keenly aware of what uncontrolled and rapidly rising prices would mean to them and to all others who must provide for their families on fixed incomes. Through the regular legislative procedure of the association, our members are asking legislators to control inflation and to maintain consumer purchasing power. This means that they ask renewal of the Emergency Price Control Act without crippling amendments. Far from wishing a weakening of the OPA provisions, our members wish a strengthening of OPA so that it may adequately protect the country from the dangers of rapidly rising prices through this emergency period.

STATEMENT BY AGNES WINN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE AND FEDERAL RELATIONS DIVISION OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The National Education Association, with a membership of more than 325,000 teachers, wishes to speak in their behalf on the importance of renewing this legislation. No group of salaried workers would be more adversely affected by failure to extend price ceiling and rationing because public-school teachers receive relatively low salaries which respond slowly to changes in prices and commodities and in wage rates in private employment. Their average salaries are below subsistence level and they have no margin of income to tide them over when prices rise.

Therefore we strongly urge Congress (1) to renew the Price Control Act for 1 year or longer and thus prevent a runaway inflation; (2) to enlarge the present personnel and appropriations in order that the program may be carried out more effectively; and (3) to vote down any amendments that would weaken the controls provided for in the present legislation.

STATEMENT BY MRS. HAROLD A. STONE, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

The United States Senate action to amend the Price Control Act came as a surprise to even the most alert followers of the congressional scene. Senator WHERRY proposed the OPA be required to set ceiling prices for all agricultural products which would ensure a reasonable profit above all the costs of production, including such factors as the cost of the labor of a farmer's family, etc. That the result would be completely unworkable seems apparent. The requirement that a producer be given a price based on his individual costs of production entails astronomical accounting systems. There has never been any uniform means of computing costs on farms. The cost-plus method of setting ceiling prices has been discussed on numerous occasions and deemed impossible if price control is to be maintained. We can only look on such an amendment as a death blow to inflation control unless the House of Representatives acts to prevent this amendment from becoming law. If the House does so, the Wherry amendment could possibly be removed in the conference committee which will be appointed to reconcile the differences between the two bodies.

At a time when potential purchasing power is the greatest it has ever been—when money is itching to be spent—it is unthinkable that we consider abandoning any part of our economic stabilization program. The hold-the-line need is perhaps greater at this very moment than it has been at any point during the war emergency.

The League of Women Voters believes that the Price Control Act should be renewed for at least another year. We wish to be perfectly clear that we do not advocate price control as a permanent part of the functions of our Government. But until scarcities of goods are relieved—until the pressures of war production are relaxed—it will be necessary to maintain our economic stabilization program, of which price control is an indispensable part.

The most certain way to avoid inflation, of course, is sufficient production to satisfy consumer demands. When the armed services can release the manpower for civilian production, when our factories can turn to producing goods for civilian markets, there will be no need for the disciplines of price control. At this point we cannot foresee when it will be possible to allow the production of sufficient consumers' goods to satisfy pent-up demands. It would be unwise to renew controls for a period of only 3 to 6 months. That would have the effect of encouraging producers to keep goods off the market in hopes of soon getting better prices. Thus, we believe that renewal for too short a period would tend to increase the threat of inflation rather than reduce it.

Some of the consequences of inflation at this time need to be constantly borne in mind. The cost of the war would be greatly increased and our national debt, already very high, thereby made greater. The war bonds which people are now buying in good faith would become less and less valuable, and yet we must still sell war bonds. The fixed-income family, already hard pressed, would find it impossible to make ends meet.

That the situation is a critical one for inflation control is an incontrovertible fact. Every citizen should feel individually responsible for letting his representatives know that this is the time to hold the line—that such crippling amendments as proposed by Senator WHERRY are not acceptable to the American people.

STATEMENT BY MRS. HARPER SIBLEY, PRESIDENT, UNITED COUNCIL OF CHURCH WOMEN

The executive committee of the United Council of Church Women passed the following resolution on food and price control on May 26. The United Council represents the protestant women of the country through the thousand local councils and 10,000 community committees.

The end of the war in Europe is but the beginning of a long process of rebuilding the broken bodies and spirits of whole peoples. Food, clothing, and other material supplies are immediate needs. The United States must take the lead to see that these needs are supplied without delay.

Sensational publicity about food shortages and irresponsible attacks on the Office of Price Administration have fostered disillusionment with our system of price control and rationing, and have created skepticism about our program of sending food to Europe.

We church women pledge to cooperate in a continued program of rationing and price control.

We urge renewal of the Price Control Act by Congress, and strengthening of the Office of Price Administration.

We, the Christian homemakers of America pledge to avoid waste in food in our daily lives and to sacrifice gladly a part of our share of scarce foods, so that the health, and even lives, of millions abroad may be saved.

We urge our Government to fulfill promptly its obligations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

We also pledge more generous support for the church agencies of relief and reconstruction.

STATEMENT BY MISS RUTH CRAVEN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

The National Council of Catholic Women, a federation comprised of 18 national organizations, 73 diocesan councils, and approximately 45 local organizations of Catholic women, at its last national meeting adopted the following resolution:

"Unless prices are kept under control they will soar beyond all reason after the war, thus imperiling the value of wartime and other savings. Hence, cooperation of individuals and of organizations, including those of business, labor, farmers and consumers, with the Office of Price Administration is imperative * * * we condemn trafficking in the black market."

If prices are to be kept under control, we believe the present Price Control Act should be renewed without weakening, inflationary amendments and that the Office of Price Administration must be provided with the facilities necessary to carry out the act.

STATEMENT BY MRS. GERSON LEVY, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

The National Council of Jewish Women, an organization with 65,000 members in 200 sections throughout the United States, are vitally interested in the continuation of the Price Control Act without crippling amendments. They know that through this control inflation has been prevented. They remember the inflation that came at the close of World War I and they are determined that this shall not happen again. With the coming of VE-day, pressure has been brought to bear to relax controls. It is imperative that the Office of Price Administration be continued and with sufficient appropriations for enforcement. A weakened Price Control Act would mean disaster for millions of families, would interfere with stabilization and delay reconversion.

STATEMENT BY FREDERICK E. REISSIG, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, WASHINGTON FEDERATION OF CHURCHES

The board of directors of the Washington Federation of Churches appeals to President Harry S. Truman and to the Congress of the United States for an extension of the Price Control Act, without inflationary amendments.

In so appealing, members of the board are influenced by no partisan considerations but have in mind the evil effects of the inflation which followed World War I. The cost of living during 1919–20 nearly doubled, and among the first to suffer were aged persons on small retirement incomes, wives and children of men who were or who had been in the armed forces, and fixed-income workers.

Reported critical food shortages make imperative the continuance of rationing and price control if available goods are to be fairly distributed here at home. Our deep concern for the security and health of American families moves us to ask for strong Government controls until such food shortages no longer exist.

Likewise, we have in mind the needs of the suffering peoples of Europe and Asia and the food commitments our Government has made to them. We realize that these commitments can be respected only if our own citizens generously accept an extension of governmental regulations which have in some cases proved vexatious but which have thus far enabled us to fight with honor and power. By tightening our belts and by cooperating in the destruction of black markets, we can fulfill the agreements already made, and hold a place of leadership in the moral reconstruction of the world.

We appeal, therefore, to the church people of Washington and to all citizens to support these price-control measures, to refuse to patronize the black markets, and to play fair with their neighbors and friends of this and other peace-loving nations.

STATEMENT BY MRS. FLORENCE DYETT, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN

The National Council of Negro Women believes that by working with the Office of Price Administration and its programs on price control, rent ceilings, and rationing, it is making one of the most important contributions women can make to the war effort.

Fifteen metropolitan councils have established cost-of-living committees which follow through on the planning and study done by the cost-of-living committee which works at national headquarters. We believe that all Americans should participate in programs that deal with economics which directly affect standards of living. Economic victory depends on organized, informed, and articulate consumers who will use their enlightenment in behalf of economic stabilization, full employment, and a healthy post-war economy void of inflation.

We have supported and issued materials for the grade labeling program, rationing, rent control, and price ceilings. We are cooperating with the low-cost clothing program and the Fight Inflation Week.

The National Council of Negro Women, through its metropolitan councils, has accepted the responsibility for strengthening the rent-control program, since rent accounts for so large a proportion of the average Negro family's income.

We are wholeheartedly participating at present in the fight for the renewal of the Price Control Act and have kept our women informed with regard to it.

STATEMENT BY BENJAMIN C. MARSH, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, PEOPLES LOBBY, INC.

The OPA should be the last Government agency demobilized because millions of demobilized soldiers, as well as the home front, need the protection against inflated prices during the entire war economy. No weakening amendment should be considered, but the OPA should be given control of commercial rents. Really to meet postwar conditions of increasing unemployment and lowering of low incomes, all processors and distributors of foods, meat packers, millers, bakers, milk concerns, et cetera, should be made agencies of the Government with profits controlled and facilities and equipment pooled. Farmers now ask an annual income, and this principle, not a profit on every item, should apply to all food concerns.

Since this is Fight Inflation Week it is appropriate to emphasize that OPA cannot prevent inflation—regardless of the force and appropriation it has—it can only record it and try to mitigate the results.

We cannot prevent inflation unless we end the system under which speculators in land and other natural resources annually mulct consumers of $7,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000, and the system under which corporations from 1939 through 1944 retained nearly $47,000,000,000 of profits, after taxes.

Weakening of OPA would serve notice on the millions of soldiers to be demobilized, that profiteers are to be free to gouge them.

The soldiers won't like that.

STATEMENT BY ELEANOR ARON, LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS

The League of Women Shoppers was one of the first organizations to support price control. We have favored a strong Price Control Act which will continue until all danger of inflation has passed. Many of our members in various parts of the country are voluntary workers for OPA, serving as price-panel assistants and price-panel members. Our national chairman is on the Consumer Advisory Committee to OPA.

This week we are sponsoring a fight inflation caravan, consisting of speakers who, standing on the busy street corners of Washington, are explaining to housewives the implications of paying above ceiling prices, the meaning of inflation, and that every one of us has the greatest weapons with which to fight it—pennies and ration stamps.

We have not changed our stand.

We want a strong Price Control Act.

We do not want amendments, such as those of TAFT, THOMAS, and WHERRY, which would take away the meaning of the words "price control."

The lesson of the last war was a painful one. We dare not let our history of rising prices and rising wages followed by depression repeat itself.

STATEMENT BY HERBERT S. WOOD, POTOMAC COOPERATIVE FEDERATION

The size of our remaining war job is a fair measure of the continuing need for effective control of prices, profits, and wages. Germany's surrender will increase rather than decrease the total of civilian incomes, and will not increase disproportionally the supply of things civilians can buy—particularly not of food, which we must share with the starving people of Europe. It will not increase taxes or savings but will tend, instead, to release past savings for current spending. Civilians will still have more money than they can spend at present prices. Without effective Government controls, their efforts to spend the excess would inevitably push prices up until the excess was used up. Rising prices—especially food prices—would intensify the drive for higher wages, and rising wages would strengthen the drive for still higher prices. The entire Nation would pay the price in sharper class conflict, disrupted unity, reduced war production. American patriotism should be deep enough to prevent even a short step on that road.

The only feasible level at which to stabilize prices and wages is the present level. Attempted establishment of a new level would produce immeasurable friction and an impossible strain on administrative machinery. Any major adjustment in present price levels would call for compensating adjustments. The race between prices and wages would be on.

The net return to farmers, manufacturers, and employees must be high enough to induce maximum production, for full production is a strong shield against inflation. But if present prices fail to bring forth adequate quantities of any important commodity, the only safe remedy is a subsidy to the producer that will not intensify the wage-price struggle.

STATEMENT OF ELISABETH CHRISTMAN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER, NATIONAL WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE OF AMERICA

The National Women's Trade Union League of America, with a direct and affiliated membership of more than a million, urges extension of the Price Control Act, without any amendments, for the duration and at least 1 year after the war.

Many women in our membership have been acting on OPA price panels. They know from first-hand experience that the OPA and its price-control machinery has licked inflation during this war and held the line on runaway prices. We believe that the Price Control Act has been well administered. Any

Government agency that tried to control the economic forces of supply and demand would have run into difficulties. But where would we be without OPA?

The act, which is a life line for all consumers, and especially for some of our low-income groups—and there are plenty such groups—must not be abandoned or made utterly ineffective by crippling amendments. This would be a betrayal of the American people. We are opposed to the Wherry amendment attached to the Senate bill, because the result will be inflationary prices on all consumer goods.

We experienced a period of runaway prices after the last war and there are masses of consumers who remember. World stability in the years to come depends upon our economic status at home. We cannot risk eliminating or amending our present price-control system. We urge its extension, as is.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of May 17, 1945:

TO THE HILLS, MEN

For 3 and possibly 4 years the American public has cussed the OPA. But to junk it now would be catastrophic. It will be far better to continue to cuss it for a while longer than to abandon it and let the price structure sink or swim.

To desert the OPA at this time would be about as silly as the incident of the man who had been bailing water out of a leaky boat for several days, and as the shore line came into view with a storm brewing, he jumped out of the boat into dangerous water, thinking that he had bailed water long enough.

The financial storm which has been brewing and raging since the war began is getting worse. Far off on the horizon the clouds appear to be breaking up, but the hurricane is lashing at its worst and we better stay in the boat until we reach shore. We better keep on cussing and bailing water a while longer.

As the war in Europe appears to be drawing to an end, pressure to kick the ceilings off of prices is becoming tremendous. Many groups are working in an effort to get Congress to throw the OPA out the window. They are tired of the red tape, restrictions, regulations and bother. But we got along with it when things were blackest; we can still survive it until the sky is perfectly clear.

This is not to say that everything in the OPA has been perfectly lovely. But it is to say that everything has been a sight better than it was in the last war. Inflation has been controlled, at least to a degree, as compared to World War I.

The biggest job for the home front from here on out is to hold that inflation line where it is.

Planned Economy and the Shortage of Food Products

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, my attention was called yesterday to an editorial in Range Facts, of Virginia, Minn. This is a weekly newspaper of wide circulation in my district, and the editor and publisher is George A. Perham, who is rated one of our leading newspapermen in Minnesota. Mr. Perham in his editorial in the June 7, 1945, issue of Range Facts has this to say:

FOOD PRODUCTION

The country will have to look deeper than the bungling of the OPA to get to the roots of the current food shortage.

We do not pretend to say that we can drag out all hidden causes, and hold them up to see, but pondering on the food situation and the behind-the-scenes pattern of thought that came in with the New Deal and has persisted if not grown since, we are convinced that there may be found the real reasons for the mess the country is in.

The OPA errors are fairly obvious. With respect to meat, they included refusal in 1943 to give price support to the heavier weights of hogs, which resulted in a glutting of stockyards in late 1943 with hogs of all weights, and a comparative peak of pork on the market. Then this was followed by War Food Administration's call to farmers to produce less pork.

The corn situation that year was mishandled, and no one knows yet how much corn went into unessential channels such as making whisky.

Last year there was a record number of beef cattle in the country—82,000,000 head—but the "food managers," as Paul Mallon calls them, were so stiff in denying any lifting of ceilings on meat that those in the feed-lot business, which includes large numbers of Mid-west farmers, decided it was poor business to stock up as they otherwise would have done. So cattle went to market before putting on the weight that would have added immensely to the supply.

The above facts have to be mentioned to get something of a perspective. But they were only incidental to a policy of putting food producers in tight quarters.

Since the start of the war, farmers have been given goals and appealed to to produce up to the goals. Farmers did what they were asked to do. But the Government in numerous branches was busy making it tough for them to produce. Their machinery allotments were cut down and the machinery that came through was so tied up with red tape that often it lay in warehouses for months while the tillers of the soil were pleading for it. Wages for workers in defense industries were pushed so high through the Government's alliance with labor unions that farm workers left the farms. Then, the military branch insisted on drafting most of the farm boys left.

But where is that behind-the-scenes pattern of New Dealism which we mentioned at the start? It is to be found in the socialistic ideology of the planners—the school of thought which wants to make the world over and convert it to planned economy. The small farm is uneconomic, they argue. Therefore, why leave the farm boys home to produce uneconomically? This is just one phase of the New Deal pattern. They spurn the thought of small farms which produce an income of less than $2,500 to the owner. In so doing they disregard the fact that nearly a third of the Nation's crop land is on farms which produce less than $1,000 worth of products in 1940.

Get rid of such farms, that's the idea of the planners who have set the style in Washington. They have been working on it for years.

What they are looking forward to is the Russian style of farming, communal farms where the workers live in villages and operate on the factory plan. In Russia they work for the State. Our planners do not press that point. But all their actions point to that concept.

It is too late now to remedy the shortage for this year. But a change should be made at once. City people, who are the ones suffering the most because stores no longer can meet their demands, should wake up to the connection between food production and the aims of the planners to remodel farm life in America.

There are many conflicting activities, of course, and for the time being we do need one food administrator, as Congressman PITTENGER suggests. One is needed to straighten out distribution and eliminate bottlenecks. But the main problem is bigger than that.

Here in St. Louis County the meat that is being raised is not going to get even distribution under a policy restricting local slaughter. There isn't going to be as much of it either. But that, also, is incidental.

Subsidies will be fastened on the country for decades unless we get back to original principles.

The big thing to do now is to see that every farm—little and big—gets the labor it needs to produce. After wholesale depletion of farm labor, the country is in a bad fix. A right about face on what's behind policy making at Washington is the need of the hour.

I want to commend your attention to the analysis of the food question as presented so ably by Mr. Perham. He discusses the situation rather boldly and without any sentiment whatever; in speaking of the Office of Price Administration he states, "The OPA errors are fairly obvious." Mr. Perham discusses at some length the shortage of meat in this country, and he discusses that question in a nonpartisan manner. I know that the crystal-gazers, and the pinks, and the Communists, and the grand goody, goody fellow travelers will not like what George Perham has to say. He sticks to facts. He draws some startling conclusions.

At one point in his editorial he discusses what he calls the New Deal pattern which believes in socializing the farmers and doing away with small farms. I repeat his short phraseology because it is so powerful and so conclusive. Speaking of the New Dealers and their planned economy, Mr. Perham says:

Get rid of such farms, that's the idea of the planners who have set the style in Washington. They have been working on it for years. What they are looking forward to is the Russian style of farming, communal farms where the workers live in villages and operate on the factory plan. In Russia they

work for the state. Our planners do not press that point. But all their actions point to that concept.

Of course, Mr. Perham indicates clearly that tremendous damage to our food supply has already been accomplished by these irresponsible men in charge of our irresponsible Government bureaus. The important emphasis on his remarks is the fact that we are going to have to get rid of this program of planned economy, and the only way to do it is to get rid of these policy-making boys who draw big salaries and think they are smart in cutting down the production of food so as to create the present scarcity.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Buffalo Courier-Express of May 17, 1945:

EDUCATOR SAYS CANADA HASN'T NEED OF SEAWAY—URGES SETTLEMENT OF WAR OBLIGATIONS FIRST

TORONTO, May 17.—Branding the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project as "exceedingly costly as well as wholly unnecessary," W. T. Jackman, professor of transportation at the University of Toronto, declared today that any Canadian Government urging its construction would be "incompetent, unintelligent, and irrational."

"If the scheme were self-liquidating we might view it from a different angle," he added. "But when it involves an excessive expenditure and taxpayers would have the additional burden superimposed upon that of our heavy war taxes, the course of sanity would be to pay our war obligations first and think about the St. Lawrence scheme later."

The professor pointed out that the project is not needed in Canada either for hydroelectric power or for transportation facilities. A recent government survey, he said, shows that Canada is using less than 20 percent of its potential hydroelectric power. As to water transportation, he added, Canada's existing canal system never has been used to its full capacity.

Besides placing a huge tax burden upon Canadian and American taxpayers, according to Professor Jackman, the proposed waterway easily would cost $40,000,000 a year to maintain and if at all successful would cut heavily into the income of the Canadian National Railways, which in peacetime were operating in the red.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with this statement made by Professor Jackman with reference to Canada and also the United States. It contains true facts of the situation. We are coming out of this war with the heaviest demand in history for power and have had plenty to spare. In other words our program could have been expanded to a much greater extent before a power shortage would have been felt. The strain on the power has not been too great. We also have our railroads and interwaterways, which have taken care of all our shipping needs. While we have had a manpower shortage, we have had plenty of shipping space in our interwaterway route, which is much shorter in miles and hours to get all the material to the Atlantic ports and overseas to Europe where it was needed. This fact has been demonstrated by the winning of the war in Europe.

We have plenty of boys to take care of and plenty of bills to pay resulting from the war, without placing another millstone around the necks of these same boys who gave their all at $50 per month. Why should we develop another country's resources at our expense and place higher taxes on our people. This project would depreciate property all along Lake Erie and prevent many tons of freight from reaching all of our Atlantic seaboard ports.

I do hope those who are fostering this unfair project on this part of the country that is paying the most taxes will look at the picture from a national standpoint instead of for some small area with a selfish nature. If we must spend the money let us spend it in America and for Americans who will pay the bill through taxes.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, Chester Bowles and the Administration have refused to abide by the price control law and have run roughshod over the Congress and the best interest of the American people. By their arbitrary and bungling methods they are now denying the American people much needed canning sugar and sugar for various purposes; their policy has expanded the black markets and is forcing the people to violate their rules and regulations. Their policy has driven honest citizens to violating Federal regulations by the wholesale in order to get something to eat or to stay in business.

They have taken advantage of the war to ruthlessly regiment the American people.

The Republican Food Study Committee has offered a program and the Republican Members of the House, for the past 2 years, have attempted to amend the act and have tried to protect the American people. During the Seventy-eighth Congress we succeeded in the adoption of some beneficial amendments and there is much yet to be done.

The OPA, through the black market, has extended bootlegging—not of liquor—as in the old days of the eighteenth amendment, but of food and various other commodities throughout the Nations. Its bungling has driven meat, butter, and other foods off the tables of the American people. Mother Hubbard's proverbial cupboard in many instances is indeed bare.

The Republicans, generally, will make an effort to correct some of these abuses and will insist on better OPA direction and management. By amendments they seek to improve price control against inflation.

It is to be hoped that enough support will come from the majority party in the Congress which is now in power to correct some of these evils. The Congress should make a supreme effort while this Price Control Act is up for extension to write in helpful and corrective amendments.

At this point I desire to insert a telegram received from the two highest ranking American Legion officers in my twenty-third district, which refers to the local meat shortage:

DIETERICH, ILL., *June 7, 1945.*

Congressman CHARLES W. VURSELL,
Twenty-third District, Illinois.

Representing 7,000 Legion and Auxiliary members, we protest small-butcher OPA regulations. Time for Congress to act. Forcing local meat markets out of business. For sons' and daughters' sake, let us keep home front morale.

A. H. WESTENDORF,
Legislative Chairman.
G. W. FRITSCHER,
Commander, Twenty-third District, American Legion, Illinois.

I also wish to insert a letter from Mr. John T. Woody, Illinois veteran service officer of Effingham County, in my district, who was appointed by Governor Green to assist the returning veterans of this war:

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' REHABILITATION AND EMPLOYMENT,
Effingham, Ill., May 31, 1945.

Representative CHARLES VURSELL,
Member of House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VURSELL: Private Donald D. Stephens, of 105 St. Louis Street, Effingham, Ill., is returning home from the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. Stephens is 39 years old. He and family, with his brother and family, operate a grocery and meat market. They have secured their meats from packing houses for their trade. Some packing houses have closed and Mr. Stephens is unable to secure meat for his trade which consists of a number of laboring people from glove factory, railroad employees, truck mechanics, airport, Norge factory, CIPS, Bell Telephone, and contractor employees. This class of people need meat. It isn't anyone's intention of robbing the armed forces, but feel this should come before lend-lease. If such businesses could secure a butchering permit they could, to some extent, supply their trade from butchering animals secured in the country in and around their business community.

Veteran Lloyd O. Pinnell, of Montrose, Ill., who operates a grocery and meat market, is in the same condition.

As Illinois veteran service officer of this county, I appeal to you, thinking that in some way you might be in a position to consider this situation. Please inform them and me of whatever consideration you may give this.

I thank you very much for this hearing.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. WOODY.

I also want to insert a letter written by Mr. Donovan D. McCarty, of Olney, Ill., in my district, an outstanding and able lawyer and businessman who cries out to the Congress urging us to protect the interest of the people.

OLNEY, ILL., *June 4, 1945.*

Hon. CHARLES VURSELL,
Representative, Twenty-third District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: I see the OPA wants to extend itself for another year at least.

I think we are all agreed that the principle of rationing is entirely proper and that it was necessary to have price controls, but from its inception, the OPA and the WFA have had the biggest congregation of nitwits and muckleheads it has ever been the pleasure of the American people to witness in one bureau.

I had hopes when Chester Bowles was appointed that he would clean out the professors, professional planners, and inexperienced lawyers, and supplant them with people who had a practical know-how knowledge of what to do and who could at least price corn and hogs on a ratio that would keep everybody happy and the country supplied with pork.

This he has failed to do to any perceptible degree. I do not know that anyone can now straighten out the mess that these professional planners have made of the food situation in the United States. It is useless to tell you that things are going from bad to worse.

The local rationing board started to issue canning certificates and, as you know, this is the strawberry and cherry season in this neck of the woods, but they had to stop issuing them so that Mr. Bowles could issue some new directives to keep housewives honest, and by the time these are issued, there will be no cherries or strawberries to can. This is just one small example of the lack of knowledge that they have had.

The OPA has gone on the theory that everyone is a cheat and a liar and that every precaution must be taken to prove that they are and to try and catch them up. They have paid more attention to this than they have the proper distribution of foodstuffs.

I certainly hope that you Congressmen will not extend the life of this incapable bureau unless there is a complete change of personnel and the "planners" are supplanted by someone gifted with a little common horse sense and some knowledge of the work he is to perform.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very truly,

DONOVAN D. MCCARTY.

Allocation of Sugar to Distillers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted on June 18, 1945, by the Women's Bible Class of the Methodist Church of Marion, S. C.

I am receiving countless numbers of similar resolutions and letters calling for the enactment of H. R. 2082. I hope that soon favorable action may be taken thereon.

MARION, S. C., *June 18, 1945.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: At a meeting of the Women's Bible Class of the Methodist Church of Marion, S. C., on June 17, 1945, the following resolution was adopted and is respectfully submitted for your consideration:

"Whereas the season for canning fruit and vegetables has now arrived, and there is not a sufficiency of sugar to permit the housewives and others to preserve the fruit and vegetables and keep it from perishing; and

"Whereas this lack of sugar will cause a great portion of our fresh fruit and vegetables to be wasted; will cause a lowering of the prices and a shortage of these canned products which will seriously impair and jeopardize the health and well-being of our people; and will work a tremendous hardship on growers of fruits and vegetables; and

"Whereas there is an abundance of intoxicating beverages of all kinds which will last for a long period of time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Women's Bible Class of the Methodist Church of Marion, S. C., That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to immediately enact legislation providing that the supply of sugar now being allocated to distillers for the making of alcoholic beverages of all kinds be henceforth terminated, and that such supply be equitably apportioned among those who desire its use for the purpose of canning and preserving our perishable fruits and vegetables; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the South Carolina Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America."

Very respectfully yours,
Mrs. R. B. JONES,
President, Women's Bible Class,
Methodist Church, Marion, S. C.

Trial of the 16 Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the grim news of the trial of 16 Poles in Moscow for anti-Communist activities chills the blood of freedom-loving men everywhere. Contemporaneously, another attempt is made to formulate a new Communist government for Poland, a government, which, with a sprinkling of one or two non-Communists selected by the present Communist regime in Warsaw, it is expected, may attain respectability and ultimately acceptance by Great Britain and the United States. It is a curious coincidence that both these historical affairs should take place in Moscow simultaneously.

I hold no brief for either the Polish Government in London or the present government in Warsaw. Like every American, my concern is justice and fair play, which are most important to future world peace.

It is interesting to note that the de facto regime in Warsaw, which is recognized only by the Soviet Government and one or two of her puppet states and is recognized nowhere else in the world, is invited to participate in the formation of a "new" Polish Government. In fact this Communist, Soviet-sponsored government alone decides who should participate in this attempt to create a democratic regime. Meanwhile the de jure Polish Government in London, which is the only Polish government recognized by Great Britain, the United States and the world over, outside the Russian and Axis spheres of influence, is not invited to participate in the conference.

Instead, it appears a side show is being made of the trial of the 16 Poles and a deliberate attempt made to use them as a means of smearing and discrediting the present de jure government in London. Apparently, the Polish Government in London is on trial. It is a deliberate attempt by the Communist-Warsaw group to court the favor of Great Britain and the United States through the disfavor they hope to build up against the London regime.

It is not my purpose to condone any offenses that the 16 Poles may be guilty of committing. If, through their deliberate activities, the day of victory was delayed only a minute, they should be made to answer for it. But it is so apparent that whatever crime these men may have committed is not important to the Communist mind. They have spent more than 3 months preparing for this occasion, which they hope will crush and wipe out their legal rival.

Let us but look at the record, as the late Al Smith was wont to say:

The 16 men on trial for their lives were in Poland from the very beginning of World War II. They witnessed the partitioning of their country by the collaborative agreement between Communist Russia and Nazi Germany. They witnessed the brutality of both the Nazi and Communist invaders through the latter part of 1939, all of 1940, and until June 1941, when the Nazis turned on their Communist friends. They witnessed the wholesale killing of the Polish intelligentsia and middle classes by the Nazis and Communists alike. In self-preservation they took to the underground in the hope that someday this wrong might be righted.

When Russia became an ally of the United Nations, in June 1941, the Polish underground had reason to hope that a new day had come. They cooperated full-heartedly with the United Nations to defeat Germany. Their acts of sabotage delayed the movement of German troops and supplies, their Intelligence kept the United Nations advised of Nazi activities, and made it possible for us to anticipate Germany's action. These and various other activities of the Polish underground, which was among the best organized and most active in the occupied areas, speeded up the day of victory and spared the lives of hundreds of thousands of Russian men as well as our own and Allied soldiers. Yet, today, the leaders of this underground are charged with diversionary activity by our ally, Russia.

When the Soviet forces entered Poland, the underground accelerated its tempo of activity and came out and

fought the Nazis in the open. They battled in Warsaw in order to divert the Nazis from the Russians, expecting that their neighbor from the east would come through. But the Soviets allowed the Poles to be slaughtered while they stood by, a mere stone's throw from Warsaw. The Polish underground attempted to make contact with the Russian forces, but in vain. All underground Poles sent as emissaries were either shot or taken prisoners. A death sentence was pronounced upon their leader, General Bor. Is there small wonder then that the Polish underground remained underground after Russia reoccupied Poland?

Since the Russians have come back, it is reported that they have resumed their terrorizing of Poles who were not amenable to communism. Hundreds of Poles have been executed, thousands have been sent to die in the wilds of Siberia. Is there little wonder, then, that the Polish underground remained underground? Is there any wonder that they looked upon the Communists as intruders and trespassers?

When the leaders of the underground, under the promise of safe passage, were invited to Moscow, by a Soviet army colonel, to participate in the formation of a new Polish Government, they accepted. They had hoped that finally they might be able to live again like free men and rebuild their homeland. Little did they realize, until it was too late, that they were lured into a trap.

I wish to reiterate that it is not my intention to condone any offense of which these men may be guilty, but I believe we are all interested in seeing that they receive a just trial. To date, according to the Associated Press story appearing in the local press, the prosecution has made its opening statement and several of the defendants testified. It was interesting to note, however, that the court has taken under advisement a request from General Okulicki, that several witnesses named by him be called to testify in his behalf. One wonders whether the trial will not consist solely of the presentation of the prosecution? Will the accused be given a chance to interpose a defense? With the close censorship of news out of Russia, only such stories as are approved by the Kremlin are permitted to be transmitted. It may take many months before a forthright account of the trial is had. It may be well, therefore, to withhold judgment until "the whole truth and nothing but the truth" is made known by impartial reporters. Let us pray that these 16 patriotic heroes may not become pawns used merely to attain a political advantage.

Clothing Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Miami (Fla.) Herald of January 30, 1945, for which I have asked permission to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was handed to me by a member of the Consumers' Union, and I am inserting it as a courtesy to her.

AS WE SEE IT—CLOTHING COSTS

Joining forces, OPA and WPB are taking steps to bring clothing prices back into line.

They have discovered that, while the cost of living as a whole has increased only about 1 percent in the last year, the cost of clothing has jumped 11 percent. Quality has deteriorated, OPA Administrator Bowles says. Cheap lines have been discarded in favor of more expensive goods, which give the manufacturers a larger profit. This has created a real hardship for workers whose wages have not kept pace with prices.

The industry has now been told that 75 percent of the cotton, wool, and other material it gets for civilian manufacture must hereafter go directly into lower-priced clothing for "the common man" and his children.

The OPA and WPB are to be commended for taking action which they hope will enable the Nation to save $600,000,000 a year on its clothing bill.

The President's Home Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have included in the RECORD a recent WMAL news broadcast on the Headline Edition program, during which there was a colloquy between James Coy, Headline Edition correspondent of Kansas City, Mo., and Roger T. Sermon, mayor of Independence, Mo., the home town of President Harry S. Truman:

RADIO CORRESPONDENT INTERVIEWS MAYOR OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S HOME TOWN

Mr. COY. This is James Coy, headline edition correspondent of KCMO, Kansas City, Mo., speaking to you from the mayor's office in Independence, Mo., home town of the President of the United States and the summer home of the Truman family. Today we called Mayor Roger T. Sermon, of Independence, who, by the way, owns a grocery store here, and asked him to tell us a little about how he undertook the provisioning of the Truman home before the first family arrived. Mayor Sermon, who is sitting just across the desk from me now, didn't think that was any story at all.

"The Trumans have to eat just like anybody else," the mayor said. "We got them stocked up as far as their ration points permitted, and that's all there was to it."

However, Mayor Sermon did feel he had a message for the people of the United States—a message about his home and the President's—so, now, Mayor Roger T. Sermon, of Independence, Mo.

Mr. SERMON. Well, as I told Mr. Coy, it seems there is a regular campaign on to picture Independence in the eyes of the Nation as a hick town. Newspapermen think it's more picturesque for the President to have come from the backwoods. But we're normal human beings around here; we walk and talk like everybody else; and I've an idea that giving the impression Independence has a population of about 800 and a few log cabins doesn't add to the country's confidence in the President.

So what I want to point out is that President Truman comes from a thriving, busy, small American city with deep pioneer roots. Independence has a population of about 20,000, and a trade area of about 80,000. There are many old families here, many beautiful homes, old and new, and the residential section as well as the well-kept business district indicates the prosperity of the city.

And I'd like to point out, too, that even though Harry S. Truman is President of the United States, he's no curiosity here. I don't want to minimize our pride in him or in the family, but he's still as much a natural part of Independence as the grass on our lawns or the trees in our front yards. Having produced a President doesn't make a town a freak show, you know. We hope Mrs. Truman and Miss Margaret will be happy and comfortable here this summer, and since we know they're busy, we're going to try to make them happy by not bothering them. Independence is just going about its business.

Mr. COY. So your message, Mayor Sermon, is that the home of the President is progressive, a typically American small city, proud of its distinguished fellow citizens?

Mr. SERMON. Exactly, Mr. Coy. Proud of them and solidly behind them.

"I Am a Christian, But—"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting an article by David Lawrence entitled "I Am a Christian, But—." I do this because I am in thorough accord with the sentiments expressed in this article, and feel that my colleagues should have the article called to their attention.

[From the United States News of June 22, 1945]

"I AM A CHRISTIAN BUT—"

(By David Lawrence)

DIFFICULTIES OF APPLYING PRINCIPLES OF FAIRNESS TO A CONQUERED ENEMY—MEANING OF CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES AND THEIR USE IN RELATION TO PEACE IN EUROPE—PUNISHMENT FOR GUILTY IS JUSTIFIED

Letters come to my desk constantly in comment on a variety of public questions and issues. Lately many of these have discussed the future of Germany. Some reveal an understanding of the human problems involved in bringing peace to Europe; some do not.

There seems, curiously enough, in many of the letters a tendency to apologize for Christianity or at least to narrow its scope so that it shall not apply to everyday controversies. Thus, for example, when the Nazi atrocities are mentioned, it is suggested that American preachers ought to see the victims of Nazi cruelty and smell the stench of the concentration camps.

The implication is that preachers somehow have in the past condoned the crimes of the Germans or would condone them now. The inference also is that Christian preachers must necessarily favor a soft peace and hence their influence is to be carefully guarded against as something highly dangerous.

Many a letter says, in effect, "I am a Christian, but I hold the German people responsible for the war crimes and I want to see every man, woman, and child in Germany punished so that it'll be a lesson to them."

Is Christianity really incompatible with justice or punishment for the guilty? Must one, however, condemn a whole people for the crimes of a faction?

Crimes started long ago

It will be conceded that the crime of the present generation of Germans didn't have its origin in just the events of this decade or the last. A nation does not deteriorate overnight. The German people began to follow false gods 30 and even 50 years ago. The philosophers who were read most in the schools and colleges taught that the state was supreme and that the individual owed everything to the state. Conformity was made a creed and if religion interfered with the concept that the state was above all else, religion suffered. The dignity of the individual was gradually debased. We could debase it also in America in a generation if we allowed government to become our master instead of our servant.

What a tribute, therefore, to the clear thinking of a few millions of persons in Germany that they have steadfastly adhered to Christianity despite the sharp turn to paganism which prevailed as nazism became in 1933 the dominant religion of Germany. Are not those British churchmen who now warn against accepting German Christians until they can be trusted condemning out of hand the very group which could become the nucleus for a revived and restored Christianity inside Germany?

The guilty, of course, should be separated from the innocent. Those frauds who pose as ministers can certainly be identified. But what a shock it must have been to the superficial in our midst the other day when Niemoeller, the famous anti-Nazi pastor, told newspaper correspondents in Italy frankly that he had volunteered his services to the German Government early in the war and that he would have gladly returned to his command of a submarine if his services had been accepted. Instead he was imprisoned.

Patriotism even among enemies

But should we be surprised if a person born in Germany loves his country and is willing to lay down his life for it? Have we overlooked the fact that each country teaches patrioism and that the slogan "My country, right or wrong" is written indelibly in the history of our own Nation and that this doctrine always prevails when war breaks out? Did our isolationists who opposed war with Germany or Japan refuse to volunteer, and did they not send their sons into battle the same as anybody else? To ask the question is to answer it.

Why should we be surprised if the German people throw bouquets at their returning troops, defeated though they be? Why do the dispatches of our press associations, written by thoughtless correspondents, emphasize this sort of thing as only a manifestation of German arrogance? The dispatches at the time of the German surrender described the German officers as arrogant and haughty. Is it arrogant for a general to march erect into a room to sign surrender papers? Did we expect anything else of General Wainright as he signed the formal surrender of Bataan?

The real difficulty here is that we are beginning to spurn the principles of a Christian philosophy by failing to think in terms of the other fellow's reactions. Do we, after all, understand Christian principles? Many millions of Americans profess to be Christians because they are enrolled as church members or because their parents were Christians. But the moment you say something about the teachings of Jesus and remind them, for instance, that "love thine enemy" is actually a basic tenet of Christianity, they answer that, of course, this doesn't apply to the Germans or the Japanese or anybody else who happens to be opposed to you.

Jesus didn't mean, certainly, that it was the duty of the soldier to drop his gun and go over to the enemy lines and embrace the enemy. There is nothing in the philosophy of Jesus which condones the suicide of the state through failure to resist and conquer an aggressor.

Jesus was talking figuratively and expressing in a single phrase the whole basis of human brotherhood. What "love thine enemy" actually means is "understand thine enemy." Even more specifically, it means "understand those who are opposed to you." Love is the power to understand. And by trying to understand those with whom we disagree, we come to a point where the just in argument is readily separated from the unjust, the guilty from the innocent. Sometimes in this way we learn to understand even our own shortcomings.

But fundamentally we must rid our minds of preconceived prejudices and prejudgments as we approach the problem of Germany. Instead of condemning a whole people, we must painstakingly search for those who deplored nazism and really were frustrated in their attempts to fight it. Let us not carelessly contend that this is a small number. How shall we know unless we try to get the facts and the figures?

The power of example

All war criminals must, of course, be punished. But after executing the guilty, what impressions shall we leave on the minds of the remaining people? Will the photograph of a war criminal dangling from a scaffold teach children yet unborn that they must not allow their country to become an aggressor again? Or will it teach that these men were martyrs and heroes? Nathan Hale was executed as a spy but his words live on—"I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

We who are foreigners cannot teach Germans how to think. Germans must teach Germans. But there is one lesson we can teach. It is that we as a nation believe in the Christian philosophy of human brotherhood. The Germans who want to go back to Christianity must see in our attitude toward others that Christianity really works. Have we, for instance, a master race theory of our own in America? Are we abandoning it or strengthening it? If we in America say that a colored man isn't entitled to be considered a human being or that jobs may be handed out in our factories on the basis of color or religious discrimination, aren't we narrowing the Christian concept? If, by the attitude of our Government, we permit cruelties to be visited now on a whole people in Germany as punishment for the sins of the demagogs and the misguided rulers of the past, are we following the teachings of Jesus or are we just hypocrites who use the name "Christian" because it's fashionable or because it represents the dominant label attached to our numerous churches with their social groups?

Little Hitlers in America

Christianity is not an easy philosophy to practice if one's mind is closed to its tenets. It is a philosophy often inconvenient and perhaps even annoying to those who prefer the might-makes-right or wealth-makes-right doctrines of autocracy. There are in America plenty of little Hitlers who dominate the social and economic life of our communities. The paradox they inadvertently express every day is: "I am a Christian but—I am not a Christian."

Whether we agree or disagree on theological dogmas, whether as Catholics, Protestants, or Jews we have sectarian ways of separately worshipping God, the fact remains that Christianity and—thousands of years before Jesus came to the world—Judaism both have taught the simple precepts of human brotherhood.

Belief in a Supreme Being has been the faith of tribes and races universally as far back as human history is recorded. But unhappily this has been challenged all too often by belief in a supreme ego manifesting itself in greed and selfishness and bringing in the end the decline of once-powerful nations.

Human beings who today refuse to share this world with their fellow men except on a basis of poverty and slavery for the weak and who still say, as Cain did, that they are not their brother's keeper, are revealing the symptoms of this same deterioration.

Let us not turn back to paganism by allowing our vindictive instincts to get the upper hand over our sense of spiritual obligation. We shall hurt ourselves far more than we shall hurt the Germans if we give the brutish passions of vengeance within us full sway and become cynical of reason and justice.

For ultimately we must achieve peace. We can make it and keep it provided we understand and apply the simple principles of the Judeo-Christian philosophy that has survived through the ages as still the greatest charter and guide for human behavior the world has ever known.

OPA Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Congress considers seriously the extension of price control, it seems that too much cannot be said in order that all who may cast their vote may be as well informed as possible. I have no hesitancy in saying to this Congress that there does exist today a veritable revolution against many of the practices of OPA. Where this fault lies, I have no disposition to say.

I do criticize the fact that we are not informed as to just why we have no meat and why so many other things are occurring. It would seem to me that the most important, the most constructive thing that could be done would be for the heads of the OPA to come before at least the leadership of this Congress, admit their mistakes, and make it possible for us to advise our constituents of what is happening and what they propose to do.

Our task would be tremendously lessened if, for instance, we could write our constituents and tell them frankly, because of errors of the past, there would not be an adequate supply of sugar this year. In this particular case, however, the errors of the past cannot be wholly placed on OPA. It goes farther than that, to laws passed by this Congress that were drawn unfavorable to the growing of sugar within our own country.

Nevertheless, if the facts were known and we could advise our constituents ac-

cordingly it is my profound belief that they would meet the situation like the soldiers have met the test of battle. People will be charitable in errors, and reasonable in the face of truth.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to include a bulletin that comes to me from one of the important stores of the State of North Dakota, Sullivan's Department Store, Mandan, N. Dak.:

IMPORTANT BULLETIN ON FALL AND WINTER FLANNEL SHIRTS

We have received this bulletin from our wholesale house in Minneapolis, Minn.:

"Sometime ago, we received a small allotment of flannel shirts and at that time our resource promised to allocate an additional quantity for the last 6 months."

Now, we received a letter from them as follows:

"We are now faced with the problem that might make it impossible to make you this additional allocation and this letter is written to solicit your aid in helping us to fulfill our allocation plans for the last 6 months of 1945.

"The new revision of M-317A issued on May 10 requires the mill making this cotton flannel shirting to set aside 19 percent of its production for sale to the Treasury Department Procurement Division and an additional 19 percent for rated export orders. This makes a total of 38 percent of the production that has to be set aside for delivery for other channels than the normal civilian outlets.

"You can readily understand that, with this large percentage earmarked to go abroad, there will be less cotton flannel work shirts for us to offer through our normal channels but we feel that if enough consumer pressure is brought to bear on Washington that these percentages will be changed and that is where you can be helpful.

"We are going to ask that you write letters to your Senators explaining to them the acute shortage of both men's and boys' cotton flannel work shirts and impressing upon them the extreme need for having the export and lend-lease percentages of cotton flannel shirtings reduced materially.

"After you have written your Senators we ask that you write each one of your store managers, explaining to them the situation on these piece goods and request each one of these managers to write their Senators and their Representatives asking their help and assistance in doing something toward increasing the supply of these work shirts for our own civilian needs.

"You can tell your managers that the chances of their getting men's and boys' cotton flannel work shirts this fall are very slim unless they cooperate in this matter. We also suggest that you request each one of these managers to get some farmer or war worker to write his own individual Congressman a personal letter telling him of this situation and asking his help.

"The writer spent 2 days last week in Washington endeavoring to convince the War Production Board, the Office of Civilian Requirements, and the Foreign Economic Administration that these percentages should be reduced considerably for the good and welfare of our own citizens and we are writing this letter to every account who is entitled to an allotment the last half of this year and if each and everyone of you follow through with it we are confident the program will be changed and we will be able to give you the allotments we originally planned."

Let us all do our part to keep some goods in this country for our own needs.

SULLIVAN'S DEPARTMENT STORE.
MANDAN, N. DAK.

Hon. Frank S. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like the privilege of inserting in the RECORD a well deserved tribute to Hon. Frank S. Farley, at present the Acting Governor of New Jersey, which recently appeared in the editorial columns of the Atlantic City Press Union:

OUR ACTING GOVERNOR

Senator Frank S. (Hap) Farley, who used to go to school at Pennsylvania Avenue and was idolized by younger boys as a basketball star, today is Acting Governor of New Jersey. That is one of the highest honors because one of the greatest trusts that New Jersey can give a citizen.

We of Atlantic City would be excusable if we missed the significance; an unusual number of our own neighbors have climbed to high State and Federal offices; most counties are seldom as fortunate, some never.

But that we did not fail to appraise this occasion at its true value is evidenced by the large group that went to Trenton at the swearing-in ceremonies.

Acting Governor Farley merits the acclaim. He comes of a typical local family—large, average, without special advantage. A pleasing personality has paid dividends. In stepping ahead he has not stepped on others. Minus a ladder he has climbed to the top.

It is a real satisfaction to see his friends, neighbors, and political supporters acknowledge his success and share in his joy. They all hope that his political horizon is only just dawning.

And it can be. Ours are great times of almost limitless opportunities for those who can call the turn in public needs.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF BOILERMAKERS, IRON SHIP BUILDERS AND HELPERS OF AMERICA,
Kansas City, Kans., June 18, 1945.

Hon. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER,
Representative, Fifth District of Missouri, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Perusal of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13, 1945, which contains your comments relative to the FEPC and the efforts being made by certain pressure groups to obtain enactment of H. R. 2232 during this session of Congress, has been of profound interest to the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, AFL, with headquarters in Kansas City, Kans.

May I convey to you the commendation of this international brotherhood which has a historic record covering a period of 65 years as an international trade-union, and has a membership in the North American Continent and Hawaii of approximately half a million.

For your information, I am enclosing herewith a copy of a document prepared by Mr. Charles J. MacGowan, international president of this brotherhood, which rather vividly portrays the present Fair Employment Practice Committee's attitude and the trend toward industrial chaos which has stemmed from the activities of the FEPC under the Executive order which created this body as a temporary governmental agency.

Unquestionably the FEPC has presumed to extend its authority far beyond the provisions of the Executive order creating the agency, and that contemplated by H. R. 2232. You may be assured that while as an organization we are in complete accord with the principles of equal economic rights to all workers, we are violently opposed to the utilization of bureaucratic assumption of authority to transform any agency of Government into a launching platform for social equality such as you will find rather clearly emphasized in the document prepared by Mr. MacGowan.

Therefore, on behalf of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, I convey to you our thanks and appreciation.

Yours very truly,

W. A. CALVIN,
International Vice President.

Harvest Furloughs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 10-day stay in Kansas, where I was called by the serious illness of my mother. While at home a number of delegations and individuals contacted me urging that I request the furloughing of available men in the service for harvest help. On June 15 I wired Hon. Robert A. Patterson, Assistant Secretary of War, urging the War Department to give immediate consideration to this problem. In my wire to the Secretary I stated:

No one wants to disrupt immediate and urgent military plans or operations, but there must be a large number of men who could be spared for this critical harvest labor.

It was my sincere hope that the War Department would advise local commanding officers to give favorable consideration to requests for harvest furloughs where the men could be spared and where proof was furnished that they would be helpful in the harvest fields.

Yesterday the Secretary replied to my request and stated "that the furloughing of soldiers for civilian employment is not regarded with favor by the War Department."

This is a polite way of saying the War Department is opposed to harvest furloughs. Their decision in the matter is

final, and I regret this help will not be available. The War Department's position is expressed in the following letter from Secretary Patterson:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C. June 19, 1945.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: I have your telegram of 15 June 1945 asking whether mass furloughs of soldiers could be arranged to help meet manpower requirements for the Kansas farm harvest.

While, of course, I should be very glad to discuss the matter with you on your return to Washington and to give the most careful consideration to the merits of the case, I must inform you that the furloughing of soldiers for civilian employment is not regarded with favor by the War Department. For some time, and particularly since the defeat of Germany, the practice of furloughing soldiers for this purpose has been discontinued not only because it is believed cutbacks and releases from the Armed Services made possible by the defeat of Germany should provide necessary civilian help, but also, and perhaps more important, because we think the practice is contrary to the plan recently made effective for release of soldiers from service.

I should like to explain in some detail the reasons for this position. With the prospect that the war in Europe would come to an end before the war in the Pacific, the War Department months ago began a thorough study on the release of a considerable part of the Army following the cessation of fighting in Europe. One of the important questions was the order of priority of release from military service. A survey was made of soldier opinion on the point. The soldiers took the view that length of military service, length of overseas service, amount of combat service, and the number of children should be the controlling factors. Their opinion, in other words, was that those whose sacrifice had been the most severe should be the first to be entitled to discharge from the Army. Their opinion seemed sound to the War Department, and a plan of priority in demobilization based upon these factors was accordingly adopted. Values were attached to the several factors, and those with the highest number of points are the first to be released.

The plan is fair as among the soldiers, who are the persons primarily affected. The plan will also contribute to maintenance of morale among the larger number of soldiers who must continue in service for the war in the Pacific. The plan has been received with favor, both by the soldiers and by the general public.

Requests have recently been made by governmental groups responsible for particular products or particular essential activities, that soldiers with prior experience in those industries or activities be discharged first. The aim is of course to overcome the undoubted shortages of manpower that now exist in certain essential occupational activities in civilian life.

We have felt obliged to deny such requests. To grant them would involve us in a disregard of the present system of demobilization, a system, as already pointed out, that is based upon the individual's sacrifice in the military service. It would mean that soldiers with a short term of service in the Army would be released in advance of those who have had a long term of service. And the granting of such requests would serve as a precedent for many similar requests, leading to a complete breakdown of the present plan of priority in demobilization.

Under the present plan, more than a million men will be discharged from military service in due course. The effect of this should be to relieve existing strains on the civilian economy that are due to shortage of manpower. While there will doubtless be temporary dislocations, all civilian activities ought to obtain a considerable amount of relief before many months. I believe it is pertinent that no representations have been received by the War Department from the civilian agencies responsible for farm recruitment that civilian sources will be inadequate to take care of harvest needs.

I am sure you are familiar also with the provisions which have been made to employ German prisoners of war in agricultural activities. This has proved in the past to be a very helpful source of labor.

My comments apply to furloughs on a mass basis. Individual soldiers while on pass or furlough are of course permitted in appropriate situations to accept this type of employment if they so desire.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Memorial to Motherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by a gentle lady from South Carolina, Mrs. Clarence Crittenden Calhoun, who for more than a quarter of a century has devoted herself to the cause of establishing in our National Capital a memorial to motherhood:

As long ago as 1921 I urged the building of a national memorial to the mothers of America. After my initial efforts failed, a distinguished group of men and women in Washington, believing that the objective and the vision were too fine not to be carried out, incorporated in an organization bearing the name of the Women's Universal Alliance for the purpose. The incorporators included Senator Samuel M. Shortridge, of California; Senator N. B. Dial, of North Carolina; Representative William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, afterward Speaker of the House; Representative John W. Langley, Hon. John Temple Graves, Mr. Milton Fairchild, Capt. C. C. Calhoun, Mr. Charles E. Warden, Mrs. William B. Bankhead, Mrs. N. B. Dial, Mrs. L. S. Draper, Mrs. Wade Ellis, Mrs. G. K. Favrot, Mrs. M. C. Ford, Mrs. Charles Kerr, Mrs. John W. Langley, Mrs. Harry Lee Rust, Mrs. Charles Selden, Jr., and Mrs. Elonzo Tyner.

The incorporators elected me president, with power to name my successor, and, from 1921 to 1929, the plan progressed splendidly throughout our country, South America, and Europe. Prospective members were asked to sign certificates agreeing to contribute funds only after title to the property in view had been secured. Many women were so impressed with the objectives of this cause that they wished to become founder members. Due to the untimely death of a realtor, I lost $30,000 which I had advanced to secure an option on a beautiful site for the memorial.

Although the bank failures of 1929 deprived me of the personal means with which I had been carrying on the organization, and caused it to go into abeyance, it is gratifying that not a member of the Women's Universal Alliance has resigned. It can all be knit together again quickly and effectively. While it was in operation, Senator Shortridge, Mr. Bankhead, and Mr. Graves lost no opportunity of speaking for it whenever they could.

Arthur Brisbane, the celebrated columnist, was so heartily in favor of this project when it was first broached in 1921 that he wrote several glowing editorials about it. One, particularly, presented across the entire top of the page a row of monuments to men—generals, admirals, statesmen, heroes of all sorts. Below, looking up humbly at the impressive figures was a little mother with a babe in her arms, with Brisbane's caption: "Great men all, no doubt, but what about their mothers?" He also cited the fact that in Westminster Abbey there was a tomb to Pitt with the inscription "A great son of a great father." "Had he no mother?" inquired Brisbane.

Two of our greatest Presidents, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, both declared almost in the same words that all they were and hoped to be they owed to their mothers. Robert E. Lee said virtually the same thing. The French heroes, Lafayette and Napoleon Bonaparte, were proud to utter the same sentiments. In fact, most great men are proud to acknowledge what they owe to their mothers. Our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, was an example of this, as well as our present President, whose aged mother, now 92 years old, carried on his education, even teaching him to play the piano when that was not in vogue for boys in Independence. Without doubt it was she who inspired him with his simple straightforwardness and honest Americanism.

Although this Congress in its wisdom may make the Mothers' Memorial a Government project, all America will gladly join. For it is safe to say that not a mother's son, or a man who loves his mother, or the mother of his children, will be called upon in vain when asked to contribute to such a cause. The newsboy, who can give perhaps but his nickel or his dime, may have his name in the same book of memory with the millionaire, whose contribution will be a tribute not only to his mother but to himself.

I am sure all of you know that the Taj Mahal, which for centuries has made India the mecca for tourists, was built by one man in memory of one woman—his wife. The proposed memorial which Representative EUGENE COX has had the inspiration to bring to his colleagues visualizes a far more beautiful building than the Taj Mahal. It will be so beautiful in fact that it will make a mecca of Washington.

I have had a distinguished New York architect prepare a tentative sketch of the proposed memorial showing the central structure to house a theater, a public auditorium, and an opera house all under one roof, crowned by a revolving light flashing to all points of the compass typifying the love that reaches everywhere. On both sides of the central structure a curved colonnade reaches out like the arms of a mother to gather her children to her heart. Each column represents a State with the names of the great women and mothers of that State inscribed thereon. The memorial could be built of beautiful white marble available from a nearby Maryland quarry. Annually women representatives of our States will be invited to visit the memorial for conferences, to consider the best plans for the betterment of their homes, their communities, and for preserving peace.

Now is the psychological time to render this service to the mothers of America who, through their sons, have given their blood to their country, as well as young mothers who have lost their breadwinners and the fathers of their children in this terrible war. This memorial, as originally planned, will be no empty pile of stone but a memorial housing what Washington needs most—a national opera house, a fitting theater, and a public

auditorium, all in one beautiful structure. Strange as it may seem, Washington, the Capital of the greatest country in the world, is the only Capital without these advantages. The citizens of Washington long have felt this painful lack and now have banded together to build a national opera house. When they know that they can, in a doubly patriotic movement, build the opera house as part of the Mothers' Memorial and also furnish a fund for the mothers who lack the means of educating their children, they will have a spiritual as well as a patriotic incentive, not just a movement for a civic benefit. As I said in my poem on the subject:

The assets of tomorrow
Are the children of today;
What from my wealth they borrow,
From their earning they'll repay.

Memorials to veterans now are being planned all over the country, particularly in this, its Capital; but much as the veterans deserves the gratitude of the Nation, their mothers, who will bear forever the scars of anxiety and anguish in their hearts, together with the war mothers of this and the last World War, surely deserve recognition, also, not in a monument merely, but in a fitting memorial of active, practical service.

I have cherished this dream for 26 years. That I have been permitted to live to see the seed sown with so much faith, enthusiasm, and sacrifice, come to probable fruition as a Government enterprise is sufficient compensation.

The Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a report from another one of our leading restaurant men of the country:

DYER'S CHOP HOUSE, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, June 15, 1945.

Hon. HOMER A. RAMEY,
Representative to the Congress of the United States:

We beg to submit the following data in regard to the critical food situation and to which we have given a great deal of study in the hopes that our restaurant and others similarly situated might be able to continue in business.

First in importance is the method of computation of points. There has not been given any consideration to the type of operation which we were in before rationing. Under the present rules of rationing all the better type of hotels and restaurants serving food are reduced to the level or below of the 10-cent and 25-cent restaurants of prewar days.

If rationing was based on usage which the Honorable Mr. Bowles uses in his newspaper statements, it would surely be a great relief. It is one thing to make a newspaper headline this way, but in actual practice the OPA has a formula entirely different which it uses for its computations on point allotments. Therefore, the average restaurant or hotel does not receive a much greater usage in points than about 15 percent of his 1942 base period.

SUBSIDY

Personally we do not believe the cure for shortages or price control is in subsidies. We believe the Government should allow a reasonable return on any commodity which will not be burdened with taxes paid indirectly because the cost will ultimately be assumed by all taxpayers, and the assessment and collection of the taxes will prove to be very costly in itself.

BLACK-MARKET CURES

We believe the best cure would be like the one we had with prohibition. Take out the cause, and we will have no more black market.

Attached herewith is some additional memoranda compiled in connection with the operation of Dyer's Chop House.

L. K. DYER, *President.*

THIS IS A BRIEF EXPLANATION WHY WE ARE UNABLE TO SERVE MORE LAWFULLY RATIONED FOOD

December 1942 is used as a base period for food rationing by the United States Office of Food Administration—OPA.

During that month (December 1942) Dyer's Chop House served 16,189 meals to our patrons and employees: during March and April (a 2-month period) we served 42,044 meals or an increase of over 33⅓ percent over our base period.

The usage of meats, fats, and oils consumed in December 1942 was 6,758 pounds or in point language: It would take 70,568 points on May 15, 1945, to purchase the same amount of meat, fats, and oils as were used in the month of December 1942. Since we are now serving one-third more people, it would take the 70,568 points plus a third, 23,523 points or a total of 94,091 points, to serve our patrons today as we served them in December 1942 or twice this (188,182 points) for a 2-month period.

We are allotted 29,529 points under OPA regulations for the 2 months of May and June 1945 or a monthly average of 14,655 points or approximately 15 percent of our normal requirements compared to December of 1942.

Dyer's Chop House, Inc., is a corporation and as such is subject to corporation income taxes, including excess profits taxes. Consequently, after the operating profits reach a so-called normal figure, the tax rate upon such profits is 95 percent. In other words, for every dollar of profit earned by Dyer's Chop House, Inc., over its so-called normal profits, it pays to the Federal Government in excess profits taxes 95 cents out of that dollar. Thus, it is apparent that after the company attains its so-called normal profits, it is really from that point on operating for the benefit of the Government, since the Government gets 95 cents out of every dollar of profit.

Now, let us contrast Dyer's situation with another operator, who, let us say, operates three or four doors from Dyer's. He operates as an individual, let us say; he gets his ration points; and depending entirely upon the amount of his profit, he pays, let us say, about 30 percent of his profit to the Government in taxes. Consequently, the Government is losing the difference between 30 percent and 95 percent or 65 percent on these profits.

From the foregoing, it must be apparent that what Dyer's Chop House, Inc., is trying to accomplish by this adjustment, for which it is applying, is merely the right to stay in business for the duration with at least a semblance of its own policies still in force. It is not trying to make any more money, since it gives substantially all of its profits above normal back to the Government in taxes.

The stock of the company is entirely owned by L. K. Dyer and W. G. Mohr. These stockholders of the company are its officers and are active workers in the organization. The president, Louis K. Dyer, runs the kitchen and works approximately 16 hours each day for 6 days per week in the kitchen in order to keep the business running. The vice president of the company is William G. Mohr. He attends to the beverage department and he works approximately 12 hours per day for 6 days per week in order to keep his department in operation. On account of the manpower shortage, these men themselves are now doing much of the work that in prewar days was done by employees, since it is impossible for them to hire the necessary help. They do not complain about this since their objective is to keep the business running until the war is over so that they again can get back into normal operations; take back the employees who have entered the armed services, and give the customary service to the patrons, many of whom are Toledoans, but many of whom are traveling men, who have been patronizing Dyer's for many, many years.

In conclusion, it may not be amiss to repeat that the purpose of this application and appeal is merely to permit Dyer's Chop House to stay in business with a semblance of its old policies still in effect, but not to get rich at the expense of the Government with the help of ration points.

Rotation of Army Divisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., under date of June 10, 1945.

Only this morning I heard a radio commentator say that American doughboys and marines, closing in on the remaining Japanese on the southern tip of Okinawa, had been going constantly for 36 to 48 hours without sleep or rest. That kind of drive may be necessary in some instances, but certainly a man who has gone that long is so fatigued that he cannot possibly be alert enough to take the normal precautions that instinct and the Army have made a paramount part of his training. Sometimes he is so tired he doesn't even care. Humanitarianism and military efficiency would seem to dictate a reasonable rotation.

But here is the editorial:

REST THESE DIVISIONS

The United States Navy is following a system of rotated rest for entire Marine divisions in the Pacific that the Army would do well to duplicate. Under the present set-up the general Army policy is to give individual soldiers furloughs under a rotation system, but to keep the division itself in combat, or alerted for it in combat zones, for what become almost endless periods to the men concerned. Morale, health, and fighting efficiency all are endangered.

The Navy, on the other hand, takes Marine divisions that have been through a stiff campaign and sends them to sunny Pacific isles far out of combat zones, or even back to the States, and provides long periods of genuine mental rest and relaxation before putting the men into combat again.

What the Navy can do, certainly the Army can do in this respect; in fact it should be much easier for the Army because of its larger forces, and this is especially true now with the war in Europe ended.

For example, there's the Thirty-second Division of Wisconsin-Michigan men—originally—which came to Louisiana to train in

the fall of 1940—more than a full year before Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. It sailed for the Pacific rather early in 1942 and has been in combat, or preparing for it ever since. Its men were the ones who were transported by plane over the 10,000-foot Owen Stanley mountain range in New Guinea in 1942 when General MacArthur carried out his desperate and almost miraculous shoestring offensive against the Japs on that island in order to save Australia. From there the Thirty-second fought its way through jungle after jungle, island after island, month after month, finally helping spearhead the Philippine invasion. It now is in combat on Luzon. We understand that more than half of its personnel has been put out of action by jungle diseases and its combat casualties are reported high. Its men are being rotated back home on individual furloughs, but the division as a whole has been in service nearly 5 years, in dirty and bloody Pacific combat more than 3 years.

On the other hand, when the First Marines consolidated Guadalcanal in 1942, after making a shoestring invasion hold good solely through their own magnificent courage, they were brought back to the United States and kept out of combat until the invasion of Okinawa started some 2 months ago. They well deserved the rest, for they earned it with their blood. But so did the Thirty-second and other outfits. What's the difference between a marine and a soldier in such matters? Nothing—except that the Navy seems to have a better, more sensible, and more beneficial policy in rotating whole divisions than the Army has in rotating individual men.

There is no logical reason for this Army policy. It is not a MacArthur policy. The record shows that he fought against it from the start—back in 1942 and 1943. It's in the War Department that the policy was initiated and there it must be ended.

What about some action—now?

Statement of Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, on Sale of Surplus Ammunition Crates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1945, I wrote a letter to Lt. Gen. Levin Campbell regarding a broadcast by a prominent radio commentator on the sale of surplus ammunition crates and ammunition troughs. I asked General Campbell to investigate the facts as stated in the broadcast. I am including herewith General Campbell's letter giving the result of his investigation. The letter, which is self-explanatory and speaks for itself, reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1945.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: With further reference to your letter to me of May 15, 1945 (00 400.93/26956) enclosing a copy of a broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., concerning surplus ammunition crates and crate troughs, which matter I advised you under date of May 18, 1945 (00 400.93/27011) would be investigated and a report made to you, our study of the matter has been completed and I am accordingly pleased to present you herewith with the true facts of the situation insofar as they relate to the Ordnance Department, ASF.

These broadcasts related to the so-called triangular ammunition crate which was used by the Ordnance Department, ASF for a limited period of time for the packing of Ordnance ammunition. As you will appreciate, Ordnance has gone through an extensive history of experimentation, tests, and development work designed to insure the most efficient and effective method of packing ammunition to the end that when the ammunition was received by combat troops at the point of use it would be in a fit condition for use. The triangular ammunition crate was an intermediate method of packing in that it was preceded by the "cloverleaf" pack and succeeded by box packing when it was obsoleted by the experience of the using troops.

Ordnance procured an estimated total of 45,758,700 triangular ammunition crates. When the usage of these crates was suddenly terminated by reason of considerations of weight of the pack, maximum protection to the ammunition, and so forth, there were but 3,740,000 crates remaining in inventory at all Ordnance Department, ASF installations. This represented but 8 percent of the total procurement. Further, as of the completion of crating operations at ordnance loading plants there were but 2,333,138 crates on hand at those installations. After deducting the percentage of crates normally found unsuitable for use by reason of deterioration due to exposure to the elements and other factors, this quantity represents but a 14-day supply of crates usable for packing ordnance ammunition.

In the course of his broadcasts on this subject, Mr. Lewis stated that 22,500,000 crate troughs had been advertised for sale as surplus by the disposal agency Because such a figure is considerably out of proportion to the total of crates and components declared surplus to the disposal agency by Ordnance establishments as indicated by Ordnance records, the disposal agency was requested to furnish this office with information as to the quantities of crates and crate components which, according to its records, had been transferred to it by Ordnance establishments for disposal.

It was thereupon found that, based upon the records of the disposal agency as of approximately May 15, 1945, the following quantities of crates or crate components had been declared surplus by Ordnance Department, ASF, installations:

Assembled crates	116,233
Unassembled crates	363,289
Crate troughs	8,824,281
Crate slats	1,504,019
Crate ends	150,986

The disparity between these figures and the figures quoted by Mr. Lewis is obvious. The reasons for this disparity, however, are not known to this office, although a possible explanation may be found if considerable quantities of crate components had been declared surplus to the Treasury Department by other than Ordnance installations.

It may also be noted, relative to Mr. Lewis' broadcasts, that he stated that troughs for crates cost $2 apiece. This was in error, for the average cost of crates of all sizes to the Ordnance Department, ASF, during the period May 1943 to May 1944, was $0.953 per crate, and the average cost of a trough was $0.17.

The principal reason for having any crates in inventory upon the cessation of crating operations is found in the obsolescence of crates incidental to changes in the ammunition requirements of the Army Supply Program. Thus, an analysis of crates on hand at the termination of crating operations by sizes of crates remaining in inventory showed that considerable quantities of crates were still in inventory because the production schedules of the items involved had been canceled or cut back. For example, a supply of 1,105,000 M38 crates was on hand because the monthly requirements placed on the Ordnance Department, ASF, for 75 mm. shell were reduced from 530,000 to 311,000 in the first quarter of 1944 for the remainder of that year. Similarly, a supply of 389,000 M67 crates and 34,000 M97 crates was on hand because production schedules for these items had been canceled.

Finally, you will be glad to know that since the advent of VE-day new possible uses for the crates and crate components which have become excess to Ordnance needs by reasons of considerations outlined above have arisen. It has been found that the quantity of ammunition in storage in Ordnance depots, plus the considerable quantities of ammunition being returned from overseas theaters of operation, have necessitated considerable outside storage of certain types of ammunition. The necessity for this outside storage provides means for utilizing crate components in the outside storage areas for dunnage. In this fashion substantial quantities of the lumber previously fabricated into ammunition-crate components will be utilized and current dunnage-lumber requirements will be minimized. For example, at one depot the adoption of this plan obviated the necessity of ordering 1,000,000 board feet of lumber for use as dunnage. Consequently, many of the Ordnance depots as had declared quantities of crates and crate components to be surplus to their needs have withdrawn their declarations of surplus.

I trust that the foregoing provides you with all the information you desire. In the event, however, that you desire further information, as always, you need but call on me for it.

Sincerely yours,

L. H. CAMPBELL, Jr.,
Lieutenant General, Chief of Ordnance.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one of the major questions that interest the people of North Dakota today is the development of the Missouri River and its tributaries.

Two avenues for its development are open. First, under the direction of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Irrigation and Reclamation as they presently exist. The other under the principle of the Tennessee Valley Authority to be known as the Missouri Valley Authority.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the resolution drawn by the North Dakota Stockmen's Association adopted in opposition to the Missouri Valley Authority:

Whereas the North Dakota Stockmen's Association is opposed to the establishment of a Missouri River Authority and is further opposed to the establishment of any bureau or commission by the Federal Government which has as its purpose the removal of the

control of the use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin to an authority or other similar bureaus or commissions; and

Whereas the ranchers of North Dakota object to the Murray bill as a whole and particularly that section which provides "no dam, appurtenant works, etc., may be constructed, operated, or maintained over, across, along, in, or into the Missouri River, or any tributary stream of said river or any tributary of such stream, except in accordance with plans for construction, operation, and maintenance approved by Corporation." That under this law they would be unable to dam a creek to form a drinking pond for livestock or to flood hay meadows, nor would they have jurisdiction over any dry run or draw in the basin; and

Whereas the membership of the North Dakota Stockmen's Association believes that the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin should be under State law and in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers, as set forth in the flood-control bill signed by the President on December 22, 1944, and the rivers and harbors bill signed by the President on March 2, 1945: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Stockmen's Association go on record as opposed to the Missouri Valley Authority as represented by the Murray bill and also as opposed to the establishment of any authorities, boards, bureaus, or commissions which will tend to jeopardize the right and power of the people of North Dakota to fully participate in the management and control of its river basin.

Shortage of Manpower, Due to Draft, Affects National Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, in the widespread discussion of food shortage, few seem to remember that the selective-service draft drained more than a million workers from farms. This together with inability to procure farm machinery are basic factors of the food problem that many of the public have forgotten.

On the subject of farm manpower, I have written the following letter to a constituent of my district:

JUNE 2, 1945.

Mr. CARL E. MCALISTER,
Alliance, Ohio.

DEAR MCALISTER: I have received your letter in which you approve of my vote to override the veto of President Truman of the so-called Flannagan resolution which sought to clarify the Tydings amendment that directed draft boards to defer farm laborers, where their service was essential to farming and no replacement could be found.

My vote was motivated by the view that I long had entertained, that the Selective Service System, whilst building up a tremendous Army, was forgetting that men on the farms were necessary to provide the food supply for them as well as the civilian population.

We have now reached the stage where our local food problem, aggravated by the demands of the liberated populations of Europe, has become so formidable that responsible members of the administration are crying out for top priority for machinery and labor to step up production of food.

The Flannagan resolution would have been entirely unnecessary had the Selective Service System obeyed the letter and spirit of the Tydings amendment, which reads:

"Every registrant found by a selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

When I had reports from members of draft boards that special agents of the selective service were minimizing the meaning of the Tydings amendment, I resolved that it was the duty of Congress, in view of the pressing food shortage, to strengthen the amendment so that there could be not the slightest doubt about its meaning. Having supported the Flannagan amendment which aimed to do this, I decided that my convictions would not permit me to support the veto message.

I was sorry to disagree with the Presidential veto, and I assume that the President probably did not hear at firsthand the many reports Members of Congress received, of open disregard for the Tydings amendment. The various interpretations of the amendment furthermore were extremely disquieting and farmers were bewildered.

I am accompanying this letter with an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican that I believe justifies the position I took on the veto message.

I also submit a news item from Mansfield, Ohio:

MANSFIELD, OHIO.—Lack of manpower will leave 79 Richland County farms and 8,527 acres of land idle this year, when food supplies are most needed.

Guy L. Taylor, AAA Chairman, said the idle farms represent an increase of 24 over last year, with 3,155 more acres out of production. A total of 150 other farms will be under only partial cultivation, Taylor said.

Richland County has 295,017 acres of farm land with 185,384 in crop production, he said.

With kindest regards, I am

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM R. THOM.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican]

THE FIRST TRUMAN VETO

President Truman's first veto precipitated a severe test of his strength in Congress. The amendment to the draft law which he disapproved could be justified at this time more easily, perhaps, than hitherto. It provided for the deferment by draft boards of essential farm workers as an occupational group.

The military collapse of Germany could be cited as proving that there is now less need of an immense army for foreign service. And, more reasonably it could be urged that the whole of Europe now faces the prospect of a severe food shortage, while food production in this country does not now promise to equal last year's yield. Mr. Truman's veto was based wholly on principle. It was wrong, he contended, to exempt a whole occupational group from military service. The sound basis for exemption or deferment, he urged, was the individual case adjudged in the light of the question "whether the individual can better serve his country in the armed forces or in an essential activity in support of the war effort."

That principle must be accepted as sound. It is inevitable, however, that opinions will differ as to whether exceptional circumstances, particularly the imperative necessity for enlarged food production to save Europe from possible famine and social disorders, reacting on this country, may not justify a departure from the principle on which the draft law was originally conceived.

The vote in the House on sustaining the veto was close. On the motion to override the veto, 185 yeas were polled against 177 nays, but that majority was far from being the necessary two-thirds; and so the President won in his first clash with Congress. Viewed from the party angle, the Democrats generally speaking stood by the President, although 30 turned against him. The Republicans were not solid against him, 12 breaking away from Leader MARTIN; but 154 of them showed their teeth.

Futility Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem which was sent to me by one of our American boys, a member of a front-line Infantry division. It was written while he was "sweating it out" between battle engagements.

Sometimes it seemed that only the writer Ernie Pyle appreciated, loved, and understood the doughboy of the Infantry, the unsung hero of this war; what he was thinking about as he ate, slept, froze, and died in the mud of the battle fronts of the European sector; saw his comrades die; saw some decorated for bravery, and wondered why others were passed by when decorations were handed out; wondered if he would survive the next battle, or if the end of "Futility Street" was just around the corner for him; wondered if whether, when he survived in Europe, he would be sent into the Pacific, knowing that sooner or later the law of averages was going to catch up with him.

This boy's poem expresses many things. It propounds a question to himself, to you, and to me, and to civilization.

The poem follows:

FUTILITY STREET

I followed a path called Futility Street,
Carried along on unwilling feet.
I stagger and stumble and yet I go on,
Voice but a question—How long, oh, how long?

How long must I follow this macabre path,
Strewn with the hulks of Mars' evil wrath?
How long can I stand these sights of the dead,
Torn from a life that yet I am wed?

How long will my ears be pierced by the cry
Of those not as fortunate or those who must die?
How long must my nostrils harbor the stench
Of smoking life's fires eternally quenched?

How long must I taste this horrible life
Of filth, of blood, of hate, and of strife?
How long will I feel this ubiquitous fear
That shadows my mind like a towering bier?

And faintly, so faintly, this answering sigh
Slowly drifts down from its heavenly high
Until at last it is I that it greets—
"How long, oh, how long, is Futility Street?"

Reconversion in California Is a Problem That Affects the Well-Being of the Whole Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest States in the Union, from the standpoint of area, population, and resources, is California. It is also one of the most important manufacturing States as has been disclosed by its record in the present war. This great State, which is the center of the motion-picture industry, is also the gateway to the Orient—China, India, the rich Dutch East Indies, with its rubber, oil, fibers, coffee, tin, and spices; Australia—and the markets of South and Central America.

The industries of California were rapidly developing even before the commencement of hostilities. It is a leading center of many industries other than that of motion pictures. It is a leading center for automobile assembly, shipbuilding, aircraft manufacture, shipping, and the new plastics industries, to mention just a few.

Most of the war workers who have come from all parts of the United States intend to remain in California after the war. In addition, many of the servicemen who have had a brief stay in this great State before being shipped overseas will return to California after they are discharged. Indeed, discharged veterans are already flocking to her cities.

The future well-being of all these millions is a very great concern to the Nation's welfare. Unless there is full employment in California, her large population cannot purchase goods produced in other parts of the United States, cannot contribute to full employment throughout the Nation. One part of this Nation cannot prosper while another part is suffering from unemployment. California must be given an opportunity equal with other areas in reconverting to peacetime industry. She must be given a fair and equitable opportunity to reconvert so that her citizens both old and new will have jobs in the postwar era. It is vital to the Nation's welfare that full employment shall exist in California too.

The Terrible Cost of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Shreveport Times of Shreveport, La., under date of June 10, 1945:

THE TERRIBLE COST OF WAR

American casualties in World War II have passed the 1,000,000 mark—the latest officially announced figure being 1,012,049. This is 3 times the total in World War I and well beyond the total for both World War I and our Civil War.

But for those who think previous wars were Boy Scout wars by comparison with the present conflict, other figures must be considered. American troops were in combat only 7 months of our 19 months participation in World War I. Casualties in that period of hostilities were at the rate of 49,000 per month as compared with but 24,000 per month thus far in World War II.

In the Civil War, two-thirds of those wounded died, so far as rather vague records reveal. In this war only 3 to 4 percent of those wounded die and 50 percent of the wounded thus far have returned to action. In World War I death wounds were at the rate of double the World War II rate.

As Washington revealed that American casualties have passed the 1,000,000 mark, the American University at Washington, which has kept cumulative records of the money cost of World War II, announced that so far the total cost of this war for all nations is more than $1,000,000,000,000, a figure usually used only by Einsteins, or by day dreaming children. One trillion dollars is 1,000,000,000 thousand dollars. In figures alone it looks like this: $1,000,000,000,000. This American University estimate is the cost of fighting the war; it does not include property damage on either side, nor does it include Chinese expenditures, which are unknown except for $280,000,000 spent on China's war effort by the United States.

The casualty figure of more than a million for this World War II up to now includes more than 104,000 taken prisoner, some 90,000 of whom have been released. Prisoner totals were small in casualty lists in all of our previous wars. Also, there are many duplications in our World War II casualty list. The 1,012,049 casualties for World War II do not represent 1,012,049 men. Some have been casualties more than once, some listed for the same casualty, although there is every effort to eliminate the latter type of duplication—cases, for example, where a man may be listed first as missing and then as dead.

Remarkable strides in medicine, and efficiency of administration of aid to the wounded, has given the injured man in this war chances for life many, many times as great as those held by soldiers of any previous war anywhere in the world. Also, insurance companies point out that mortality rates indicate that 10 percent of the Americans killed in War II would have died had they remained in civilian life.

Total War II casualties for Great Britain, in this war 2½ years longer than the United States, have been about 125,000 greater thus far than the American total. Great Britain has had another 146,000 casualties—with 60,000 of them deaths—among civilians from bombing.

Last spring Hitler admitted 6,300,000 Germans killed in this war, 3,000,000 seriously wounded and another 3,000,000 taken prisoner. Official Russian sources recently admitted 5,300,000 Russians killed, missing, or prisoner, with no figure for the wounded. Hitler at the same time reported up to 7,500,000 Russians killed in action and an equal number of Russian civilians killed. Hitler figures on Russian casualties and Russian figures on German casualties always were astronomical.

The American Regional System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles, from the Washington Post of June 20, 1945:

AFTER SAN FRANCISCO

(By Sumner Welles)

THE AMERICAN REGIONAL SYSTEM

We have all been concentrating upon the problem of over-all world organization. Little constructive thought is being given to fortifying the inter-American system so that it will be of maximum value to all of the Americas in the future.

The new United Nations Charter permits the inter-American system to continue functioning.

The question now is whether the policy of the United States will make it possible for it to function effectively. For unless the future policies of Washington are designed to strengthen and to perfect the present regional system of the Americas, the other American Republics will not alone be able long to keep it alive.

We have reason to believe that the United Nations organization will succeed. We have every right to anticipate that with the passage of the years it will consolidate and extend its authority. But the period which lies ahead is necessarily filled with uncertainties. It is only prudent for the United States to do its utmost to strengthen the ties of common interest between the 21 American Republics as an essential measure of security in our part of the world. The great majority of the other American Republics are insistent that this be done. If this is to be accomplished, the people of the United States must see to it that our own hemispheric policy meets two basic requirements.

The first requisite is political. It involves the consecration in the Western Hemisphere of nonintervention in practice as well as in words.

The course which the Department of State has followed toward Argentina during the last 2 years will go down in inter-American history as an outstanding example of disastrous bungling. It has been responsive to no clear principle. It has wavered between coercion and effusion. First we ostracize and officially berate the Argentine dictatorship because of its political tendencies. Later we send a special mission to the very same dictatorship, and extend to it economic advantages withheld from other American governments which have supported us throughout the war.

President Roosevelt laid down the policy that joint action by all of the American Republics should be undertaken whenever the vital interests of the Americas were jeopardized. In the Argentine case the Department of State frequently pursued a wholly unilateral course of compulsion and of sanctions. Repeatedly the State Department blocked the demands of the other American Republics that an inter-American conference be held to find a common solution for the dangers arising from the situation in Argentina.

This government was finally rescued from its predicament through the determination and vision of other American governments. They forced the holding of the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City and the for-

mulation of the Act of Chapultepec. It was they who planned the method by which the Argentine people were brought back into the inter-American fold. It was through their efforts that Argentina signed the agreements reached at Mexico City.

Thereafter it would have seemed to be only common sense for the Department of State to wait and see whether the Argentine dictatorship carried out all of its new commitments in spirit and in letter. On the contrary, under circumstances which are too well known to require further elaboration, the United States took the lead in rushing the Argentine delegation into the United Nations Conference and in such a way as to create the impression that an anti-Soviet bloc was being deliberately fostered.

The result of these extraordinary vagaries has been hopelessly to confuse democratic opinion throughout the hemisphere, to create bitter popular antagonism toward us in Argentina, to prolong the disastrous regime now in control in Buenos Aires and to impair Latin-American confidence in the sincerity of our belief in the inter-American system.

It is worth remembering at this moment how frequently many elements in the United States which call themselves "liberal" have assailed the present governments of Brazil and of Peru. Time and again those two governments have been attacked as Fascist, and the demand has often been made that Washington ought to "do something about it." Yet both governments have from the time we entered the war valiantly supported the cause of the United Nations, and Brazilian expeditionary forces have rendered magnificent service. What is of equal significance is the fact that only a few days ago national elections were held in Peru in which every political party freely took part, with complete liberty of the press. And in Brazil not only was liberty of the press fully reestablished upon the conclusion of the war in Europe, but national elections will be held before the end of the current year.

The highest interests of all of the peoples of the Americas will best be served by the practice of democracy in every quarter of the hemisphere. But democracy will not be advanced by intervention on the part of the United States.

It will only be consolidated if the people of each sovereign republic put their own houses in order without even the semblance of outside interference and if the regional system which the Americas have built up is enabled to function freely and effectively.

Machinery exists through which all of the American Republics can take joint action whenever any development arises which threatens any part of the hemisphere.

If conditions in Argentina at any time represent a menace to the well-being of the continent, the remedy should be sought through formal inter-American consultation and such subsequent action as may jointly be agreed upon. It will not be found through unilateral coercion by the United States.

The second requisite of our policy is economic. Leadership by the United States in formulating practical plans for inter-American economic and financial cooperation during the postwar period is urgently needed. Inter-American agreements must be negotiated which will stimulate the profitable investment of private United States capital within the other American Republics in projects which will develop the industrialization and natural resources of those nations. Intergovernmental financing in the field of public utilities, of sanitation, and of education is equally necessary. In this way, and through the operation of the new Trade Agreements Act, standards of living can be rapidly raised in the other Americas, to the advantage of their nationals and to the immediate benefit of our own economic welfare.

But this Government must replace windy generalities on the subject of economic cooperation with detailed plans and progressive initiative. A practical economic foundation for the inter-American system is quite as indispensable as a sound political foundation.

The time for crystallization is now. If the inter-American system is to be a lasting means of security and progress for the peoples of the New World, the policy of the United States must become dynamic, enlightened, and realistic.

Administration of the Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from the patriotic members of Toledo and Northwestern Ohio Restaurant Association, of Toledo, Ohio.

I went to the Ninth Ohio Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, last Saturday night, June 16, and a group from the Toledo and Northwestern Ohio Restaurant Association came to my home. They are indeed a most unselfish group who have forgotten themselves in order to feed the patriotic mothers, fathers, and wives of our fighting men, our laboring men in the factories, as well as the men in business and industry with frayed nerves. Their temptation, of course, was to close because of the unjust persecution and maladministration of those who did not follow the Office of Price Administration law, but went beyond the law, and in some places, especially in plants of slaughterers, have put into practice the same Gestapo methods that have put many businessmen out of business; however, this group of long-suffering restaurant proprietors are not yielding to temptation, but like many others in this most patriotic and unselfish section of our country, are carrying on.

Not all members of the OPA belong to that small group of hyena-hearted vultures who have disobeyed the law which they are to enforce—in fact, the majority of them are doing a good job; but because of a few "rotten eggs" have succumbed to the temptation to put decent, self-sacrificing people in straitjackets, I am flooded ith letters from mothers of our fighting men as well as these noble restaurant men who spent Saturday evening in our home at 2102 Parkdale Avenue, Toledo. Yes, they could easily have closed their places and the hungry toilers of Toledo, who cannot eat at home, would have been in a riot. Bismarck said, "There are just four meals difference between a good citizen and a bandit." These noble men have saved these citizens from banditry.

I intend to support the extension of the Price Control Act, and I have constantly supported and befriended some of the good men connected with the Office of Price Administration in northwestern Ohio. I cannot say too much in praise of Birkett Williams, the regional director, and H. G. Bogart, the Toledo local manager. A few of the Gestapo men under them have thrown the real law to the winds and use it to pillage and plunder unselfish groups like these restaurant men in order to satisfy their own sadistic cravings to punish people who are sacrificing and sacrificing, and yet at the same time obeying the law.

As I stated before, I intend to support the law and will demand it be used for one purpose—to prevent skyrocket inflation; but in each and every instance where I find it has been used to prevent honest food administration, I shall call attention to these men in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I trust and demand that none of these men deceive the public. Messrs. Birkett Williams and H. G. Bogart will be asked to discharge immediately any man or woman in the OPA who talks to these noble citizens with an imperious voice. The greatest tyranny is the arrogance of the minority who wish to put people into mental slavery. These taxpaying citizens are the producers, and some of these inspectors who oppose them are members of the wrecking crew who are abusing those on the construction gang of our country.

I wish to add a personal tribute to Mr. Edwin Lynch, prominent attorney in the local Toledo office. Were all men in governmental agencies as competent and of the same serenity as Mr. Lynch, there would be none of the Gestapo, neither would there be mentally persecuted citizens among the noble, self-sacrificing taxpayers in any community.

The letter referred to follows:

TOLEDO AND NORTHWESTERN OHIO
RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,
Toledo, Ohio, June 18, 1945.

Hon. HOMER A. RAMEY,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAMEY: At your suggestion we are summarizing the various points brought out at the meeting of officers and directors of the Toledo and Northwestern Ohio Restaurant Association and the Toledo Hotel Association held at your home last Friday evening.

Restaurant and hotel operators of Toledo, and Lucas County, are approaching a critical situation in the operation of their business, and unless relief in some form can be secured, many will be forced to close in the near future.

The responsibility for the gross mismanagement in the direction of food production and the allocation and rationing of food after it has been produced, seems to be the $64 question throughout the country as of this writing.

Those of us in this business, who buy, prepare, and serve food to the general public do not claim to know who is at fault for the food muddle from which the entire population of the United States is now suffering. We do believe, however, that our industry has not had a square deal from the War Food Administration or the Office of Price Administration and we are of the opinion that we have been unduly legislated against and have been grossly misrepresented in the adverse publicity given out, through the channels of the public press, by these bureaus.

Our rations for meats and fats, sugar and processed foods have been based on our December 1942 usage and through the factor method of rationing we have been issued, in

ration currency, an ever-decreasing percentage of that base, until now it is proposed on July 1, 1945, to further decrease our allotment of meats and fats by at least 20 percent and that of canned fruits and vegetables by 12 to 15 percent, and sugar by 20 to 25 percent.

Point values have been greatly increased on oils, shortening, and butter since the beginning of rationing and as all restaurant and hotel operators use a large quantity of these items in cooking and baking, the increase of point values of these commodities automatically reduces the number of pounds of meat we can purchase with our meat points.

Public eating places were urged by OPA during 1944 to save points and build up a reserve bank account and those of us who followed OPA's advice became the victims of our own saving, due to the ruling made by OPA that those of us who had accumulated any points would receive no further allotment to which we were justly entitled until any surplus points we had accumulated were used under the new formula prescribed by OPA.

You will recall that all of those present Friday evening were of the opinion that they could get by on the reduced allotment of sugar and processed foods as scheduled by OPA for July 1, but felt it was impossible to operate their establishments with further cuts in meat points.

Comparisons were made between the housewife and the restaurant operator in which it was shown that the housewife has constantly had a decided advantage, as she was allotted practically the same number of points as the restaurant operator, and when her points ran out she could eat out at a restaurant and buy her baked goods, while the restaurant man could not obtain additional points to take care of his increased business unless it amounted to 20 percent.

The question was raised if any of those present had any difficulty in securing an adequate supply of meat with the points they had to spend. A majority stated they could not obtain meat at ceiling prices in this community in sufficient quantities to use up their allotments of points, but that there was plenty of meat available in the black market.

The question was then raised as to what are the real facts relative to the supply of meat in the United States. In answer to this question the following published figures were quoted:

Livestock on United States farms on Jan. 1, 1945

[In million heads]

Year	Cattle	Hogs	Lambs	Chickens
1935-39 average	66.8	43.9	51.3	405.1
1943	71.5	54.3	54.3	438.0
1944	82.4	83.9	51.8	576.4
1945	81.8	60.7	47.9	511.1

It was further brought out that the Department of Agriculture early in this month published the following statement that "production of beef and veal is expected to set a new record this year, totaling 11,200,000,000 pounds, approximately 5 percent more than the previous high in 1944."

According to the figures shown above it was pointed out that the supply of meat, with the possible exception of hogs, is as large this year as formerly so that with proper distribution it did not appear that the drastic cut proposed in rationing, for restaurants was warranted.

A discussion then followed on allocation and distribution of meat during which it was discovered that there has been many conflicting statements published as to where the meat goes. The armed forces represent only 8½ percent of our population and although men in service admittedly eat more than they do in civilian life, the average is only 270 pounds per year, or slightly more than double the peacetime average of 126 pounds per person. The WFA has stated that only 6 percent of our meat goes to lend-lease, making a total of not over 25 percent for these two groups, and allowing an additional 10 percent for stock, would bring this total up to 35 percent of our entire meat supply, yet 60 percent to 70 percent of all federally inspected meats is set aside for the armed forces alone. If the 35-percent figure is correct, then there should be left for civilians, including the housewife and institutional users, 65 percent of former supplies and yet restaurants are alloted less than 40 percent of the meats used in December 1942.

One restaurant operator present showed, by figures obtained from OPA that under the new July and August allotment he would only get 65 percent of his January and February 1945 allotment, which, of course, was already much less than that used in his base period.

Sources of supply were then discussed and it was pointed out that WFA had created and encouraged the black market by licensing 10,000 additional local slaughtering houses when by their own admission no local slaughterer could buy and sell beef at ceiling prices as shown by the following example of the purchase of a 1,000-pound steer:

Slaughterer's purchase price, 1,000 pounds live weight, grade AA, at $18 per hundred pounds	$180.00
Maximum yield, dressed weight, 610 pounds, at 21¼ cents per pound [1]	129.62
Government subsidy, 2 cents per pound	20.00
Hide	$6.00
Heart and liver	10.50
Net yield, exclusive of overhead and labor	166.12
Loss	13.88

[1] Wholesale selling price, OPA ceiling, 21¼ cents per pound.

Should the Government grader classify the animal as a grade A instead of choice or grade AA, the slaughterer's selling price is 20¼ cents per pound instead of 21¼ cents, and the Government subsidy is approximately $18 instead of $20, which means a further loss to the slaughterer.

Yet the legitimate local slaughterer is definitely essential as a supplier of meats for restaurants and local meat markets, as Armour and Swift state that they are only receiving 15 percent of their 1941 quota in their Toledo branches.

It is now proposed by OPA to eliminate a great many of these local slaughterers to divert even more meat to the large packers, but in our opinion what should be done is to permit the local slaughterer to pay enough more to the producer to keep cattle from going to the black market, and he should be allowed to sell at an increased price, sufficient to cover his overhead, and a legitimate profit.

In the 19 counties in this district there is enough cattle to supply the demand of the population, if allowed to be sold and killed in the community in which they are raised.

We understand OPA is now before Congress asking for another year's extension of their power of regimentation, and while some people may feel that this agency is necessary to control inflation, we are of the opinion if their powers are to be continued that the elected representatives of the people should keep a closer watch on how it is done.

Definite reports should be required as to where our meat is going, and if the OPA is permitting the armed forces to ship much more than they need for the use of our men, then an inquiry should be made as to whether this meat is really being shipped for lend-lease under the name of the Army or Navy and later will be distributed to civilians in other countries as surplus of our armed forces.

We trust that we have made the picture of conditions in Toledo and vicinity clear to you, and that you will make every effort to bring relief to a situation which, if not remedied in the near future, will cause the eating establishments in Toledo to close their doors.

Respectfully yours,

VIRGIL A. GLADIEUX, *President.*

Reconversion Pricing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received yesterday from Mr. Bowles, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, with reference to the reconversion pricing program and an address delivered by Mr. Bowles on the same subject. I think the letter and address contain information that will be valuable to the Senate and to the country.

There being no objection, the letter and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1945.

The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: In view of the many questions which have been raised about our reconversion-pricing policy, I am sending you a copy of a speech which I made to the Hartford Chamber of Commerce on June 15. In this speech I have emphasized two points:

1. We are determined that OPA pricing policies shall not stand in the way of the all-out production of civilian goods and services which is the only final answer to the tremendous inflationary pressures now threatening our economy. I have placed particular emphasis upon the need for individual price adjustments to get every ounce of production we can and to relieve hardship wherever possible. We have taken special steps to eliminate red tape for small business.

2. Price controls were developed solely to meet wartime conditions. We are pledged to remove these controls just as soon as the production of civilian goods and services eliminates the inflationary dangers and permits our return to a free market.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

It's always been good to get back home to Connecticut. It's doubly so now to get back home from Washington.

Washington is a hot spot in more ways than one. The processes of government, as you are no doubt aware, sometimes generate more heat than light. In Washington one's vision gets blurred and one's perspective distorted.

Here in Connecticut the pulse of our great Nation beats powerfully. The wheels of industry spin at top speed. Our dairy, poultry, and tobacco farmers are driving to main-

tain record production. On every side we see the power, the vitality, and the abundance of America.

Who, 5 or 6 years ago, foresaw the miracle of production that we have developed? Who foresaw the avalanche of planes, tanks, and guns that has snowed under the Nazis and will as certainly snow under the Japs?

In the last war we increased our industrial production by only 25 percent; farm production by only 5 percent. In this war industrial production has more than doubled, while farm production is 35 percent higher than before the war. This industrial and farm torrent of production has enabled us to fight an all-out war, and to have a lot of our comforts, too.

Five years ago we didn't know our own strength. But we know it now, and we shall never again forget it. It is a strength which has proved unbeatable in war; it is a strength which I am confident will prove unbeatable in peace.

It was Bernie Baruch who said that the war has been a crucible for the economic systems of the world. In that crucible our system of free enterprise has proved itself pure gold, because it is our system which has outproduced every other.

It was teamwork—teamwork of government, business, agriculture, and labor—which made possible the production miracles of recent years. I would be the last to contend that it has all been smooth sailing, and I would be the first to assert that the controls which had to be imposed during the war are wholly incompatible with the functioning of a free-enterprise system in time of peace.

These controls—let me emphasize—must be removed as soon as the emergency caused by the war is over. Let me say flatly that they will be removed as soon as it is possible to do so with safety. Having said that, I must go on and say that these controls have played a key part in our war achievement. We simply could not have done it without them. We simply cannot do without them today.

We are just now entering into a most dangerous economic period. The war expenditures are being decreased and reconversion is beginning. Seeing this, many people are persuaded that the danger of inflation has passed. Therein lies the real danger.

The cold fact is that the inflationary pressures have never been greater than they are today and will be in the coming months. It is true that VE-day has made possible a cut in war expenditures. But these expenditures are still running at the staggering rate of $90,000,000,000 a year, and until such time as the Japanese surrender they will probably not fall below $60,000,000,000. Sixty billion dollars, let me remind you, is twice the cost of fighting World War I.

Added to this there will be before long the rehabilitation expenditures of our allies. Most of them are desperately in need of food and clothing, but they are equally in need of raw materials, machinery, and transportation equipment in order to get their economies running again after the devastation of war. They will be in our markets very soon to get these things and they have $12,000,000,000 balances—twelve billions of cash—over and above the billions more they can borrow here with which to pay for them.

Finally, there are the unsatisfied demands and the vast buying power of our own people. Liquid assets in this country stand today at the almost unbelievable level of $300,000,000,000. These hundreds of billions of dollars in currency, bank balances, savings accounts, insurance, and war bonds, can provide rich markets, richer than anything we have known in peacetime, for anything we can produce for years to come. But these same hundreds of billions of dollars could simply smash our economy beyond hope of rescue if the door of inflation is once opened. I can think of no State that would suffer more than Connecticut—with its great industrial and insurance interests.

Today these dollars are held safely in savings accounts and in securities, because people have confidence in the inflation control program. They know that the dollar will buy next month as much as it buys today. If that confidence falters, if it is replaced by fear that inflation is on its way, it will produce just the inflation that is feared. Those dollars will be stampeded into a mad scramble for goods. Once that happens, no regulations of ours could stem the tide. We would simply go the inflationary way of Greece, France, Belgium, China, and a score of other countries.

In this connection we must never forget that it was just at this stage of the last war that we bungled the job of inflation control. Very few people know that almost half of the inflation of the last war took place after the armistice when price controls were stripped off in the mistaken belief that the danger was passed.

It was the inflation after the armistice that did the real damage, that set us up for the smash-up of 1920–21. All of the factors which were present then are present today, only infinitely more so. It can happen again; it will happen again unless we all resolve this time to see the job through to the end. We are all weary of regulations, of red tape, and of bureaucracy. But we have come too far and we have too much at stake to quit before the job is done.

Successful economic stabilization is a compound of three factors: Good laws, good administration, public support. The stabilization laws, which are at this moment before the Congress for renewal, are good laws. They have stood the test of time. They not only direct that prices and wages be stabilized; they provide the powers that are necessary to secure that objective. It is my hope that they will be renewed without significant change.

As for administration, I would be the last to claim that ours has been a perfect job. Probably no civilian organization in peace or in war was ever assigned a more difficult task. There have been irritations, delays, and some inevitable errors of judgment. Most of my friends have a favorite OPA story.

But the figures show that the basic job assigned to us has been done. Average prices today, according to all statistical authorities are close to the levels of 2 years ago, and roughly equivalent to those of 1926. For the most part, moreover, this has been accomplished with the maximum possible fairness. In this connection I should like to call my friend Mark Sullivan as a witness to the bar. In a recent column he said, and I quote:

"It is recognized that OPA has performed an indispensable wartime service. It has kept prices far lower than they otherwise would have been, to the satisfaction of the consuming public. The criticism of its methods is probably no graver than would have been the criticism of any other agency effectively carrying out so difficult a job."

But no law, no matter how good, no administration, no matter how conscientious, could have stabilized prices for two solid years without the full support of most businessmen, farmers, labor, and the consuming public. There have been criticisms of course—some sharp and even bitter.

But in the last 2 weeks when the chips were down, almost every organization representing business, labor, agriculture, and the consumer has put itself solidly on record in support of our price-control program—the American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the Farmers' Union for agriculture; the CIO, the AFL, the railroad labor organizations; the Committee for Economic Development and the chamber of commerce for business; and well-nigh every organization in America representing the consuming public. And this support, I may say, is not limited to testimony before the committees of the Congress. This support goes down to the grass roots. It is reflected in recent public-opinion polls each of which showed that a vast majority of the people is in favor of OPA's price-control program. We see it in our mail from thousands of individuals in all walks of life—including among the most outspoken, scores of veterans. It is this which gives us heart to go on with a difficult and thankless task.

Let me turn now to the problems we face in the coming year. So long as shortages continue we shall have to go on stabilizing food prices, rents, and the many other items that go to make up the cost of living of the average citizen. If we fail in this basic task the inflationary spiral will soon be on us. We shall have to go on stabilizing the prices of industrial raw materials and the thousands of industrial products which go to make up the cost of production for the average producer. This is, in itself, a job of tremendous proportions.

But at the same time we must take on the new job of providing prices for the tens of thousands of items which have been out of production since Pearl Harbor and which are just now beginning to come back into production.

The difficulties in pricing these products can hardly be exaggerated. In the usual case of a product in production throughout the war, we judge the need for price increases on the basis of actual cost and operating experience. In the case of the new reconversion products we have no such experience to guide us. These products for the most part have not been in production for 3 years.

We know, of course, that wages, parts, and materials have risen, in some cases sharply. We know, too, that these increases in many cases have not been uniform throughout an industry. In some sections of an industry costs of production have risen much more than they have in other sections. Finally, we know that reconversion will not be all smooth sailing. There will be after-production bottlenecks which will slow up the process and increase costs. There may be bottlenecks in some key types of equipment, in certain key components, in subassemblies, and even in key types of skilled labor. No man can say how soon these can be overcome.

On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that many of the inflated costs of the early reconversion period are not permanent. Those which arise out of the strains of war production in due course will disappear. Others which are the result of the bottlenecks and low-volume production as reconversion starts up will disappear as these bottlenecks are overcome and as production gets into full swing.

And we must not lose sight of the new plant and equipment built during the war and the increased production know-how we have all of us acquired. After the last war, output per man-hour in manufacturing increased 10 percent each year for 3 years. I am confident that once reconversion gets into full swing, this will happen again. American management and labor, the most productive in the world, will continue to produce better goods at lower cost as they always have in the past.

The problem, to put it in a nutshell, is simply this. We don't know, businessmen themselves don't know, what the actual cost of production is going to be once reconverting industries get into production. At the same time, no manufacturer can really get going until he knows what his prices are going to be. However difficult the job of pricing, and assuming our determination to avoid inflation, it is a job that has got to be done, and it has got to be done fast.

After many months of study we have made up our minds to the following procedure. The key elements in this procedure

are (1) speed of decision and (2) flexibility. Every reconverting manufacturer will know the prices at which he can come back into production, and he will know that these prices will be modified if necessary to meet his own situation.

Our reconversion pricing program falls into three parts.

1. Industry-wide pricing for those who cannot proceed under their last ceiling prices at which they sold in 1941 or 1942. For all reconverting industries there will be industry wide price increase factors which may be applied to the prices which were in effect during the last period of normal production, usually 1941. These price increase factors will be calculated by adjusting the 1941 costs of an industry for any subsequent increases in basic wage rate schedules of factory workers and for increases in the prices of materials and parts. To these adjusted 1941 costs will be added a margin to provide the same percentage profit on sales which the industry enjoyed in a representative peacetime period, ordinarily 1936–39.

Each firm may increase its own 1941 prices by the industry increase factor set by OPA. Where the result is higher than its existing ceiling, the higher price becomes its new ceiling. The resulting prices should provide any reconverting industry with the opportunity to earn good profits as soon as volume really starts rolling.

2. There will, of course, be some individual firms whose costs are out of line with the rest of the industry. For these, individual price adjustments will be provided. They will apply to any firm whose ceiling price—either his old ceiling price established in 1942, or the new one resulting from the application of the industry price increase factor—does not cover his own 1941 costs adjusted for increases in basic wage rate schedules and the general industry increase in materials and components. Such a firm will be entitled to a price which will cover its own 1941 costs adjusted for these increase factors, plus one-half the average industry percentage profit on sale in 1936–39.

In this connection, let me point out that this individual adjustment will be available to the reconverting manufacturer of a nonreconversion product. For example, a furniture manufacturer who has been in war work and who is now coming back into the production of furniture which his competitors have been producing all through the war, is eligible for this adjustment.

3. Finally, we have taken a major step in lifting the load of red tape from small business. Small reconverting firms whose 1941 civilian volume did not exceed $200,000, and who do not anticipate more than that volume of sales within the next 12 months, will not have to apply for individual adjustments but will compute their own ceiling prices on a streamlined form.

Each will apply the reconversion price increase standard to his own situation. If the firm's own 1936–39 profit margin on sales was less than one-half the industry's profit margin, he may use one-half the industry's average margin in computing his ceiling prices. This figure will be furnished by OPA. Having computed his ceiling price he will then report it, together with his calculations, to the OPA district office and is free to proceed to sell his product. His computation will, of course, be subject to audit.

Of course, any industry or individual firm may sell his product at once at his 1942 ceiling. Many firms are already doing this. But those who are unable to move ahead on that basis will have the full benefit of all the adjustments which I have described to cover their legitimate increased costs. This three-way pricing program we earnestly hope will speed the reconversion process.

But if developments show that changes in our standard are necessary, we shall be quick to change it. I have always been persuaded that the best way to fight inflation is to smother it under an avalanche of production. Under no circumstances—and let me emphasize this point—must OPA pricing policies stand in the way of production and employment.

Within the next week adjustment provisions in the program which I have outlined here will be put into effect. Already more than a score of meetings have been held with industry groups to secure the data upon which the industry-wide increase factors will be based and other meetings are taking place all the time. By early July prices of several major industries should be established. The full resources of the Office are being thrown into the job of setting fair reconversion prices and setting them fast.

These prices, built to yield good profits, will give the green light to the manufacturer. They will facilitate full production. At the same time we think they will not require, in most cases, any substantial increase at retail over the prices which were in effect when industry reconverted to war.

We have a good deal of confidence on this point. Most of the increases at the manufacturing level can be absorbed by distributors without hardship. Our studies show that distributors are enjoying increased sales, reduced expenses in relation to sales, higher realized margins, and greater profits than ever before. Thus wholesalers and retailers are in position to help the stabilization program by absorbing moderate cost increases.

But here, too, our minds are open. We shall consult with the distributive traders and are prepared to adjust our policies if circumstances warrant.

While some people seem to have forgotten it, most of my chief lieutenants are businessmen who have temporarily left their businesses to serve the Government in time of war. Having come from business, we know how important it is in our job to work closely with businessmen, to understand their problems, to tailor our regulations to meet their concrete needs and difficulties. In meeting the new problem of reconversion, close contact with business is going to be even more important than it has been in the past. That is why we have arranged for extensive consultation with all of the business groups concerned. That is why we shall consult with them at every stage of the reconversion process.

We have a special responsibility in regard to small business, in regard to veterans, who are either coming back to old businesses or who are planning to start new ones. We must keep open the door of opportunity for the little fellow. We cannot afford to block it by regulations which prove too cumbersome for him to handle. We believe that our program takes care of the needs of small business and that it is fair to all business, both large and small.

Lest there be some possibility of a doubt on this score, let me say once again that the key elements in our program are rapid decisions and a policy flexible enough to meet changing conditions. The Nation will face many bottlenecks as it moves toward full reconversion. I am determined that OPA price policy shall not be one of them. I pledge that OPA will not be one of them.

Before terminating my remarks, I should like to stress that we are going to bend our every effort to extend individual adjustments not only to reconverting firms, but to firms which have been producing goods right through the war, as far as it is humanly possible to do so. Already many of our price regulations include individual adjustment provisions which afford the individual high-cost producer the opportunity to secure a price which meets his individual needs. In the very near future we expect to make a big forward move in this direction.

In spite of the general prosperity of American business, there have been in many industries some cases of hardship. These hardships have always been of great concern to us, but the fact is that our personnel has been limited, and the job we have had to do has been enormously large. In many industries, therefore, we have been obliged to confine ourselves to regulations which are generally fair and equitable but which do not meet the requirements of every individual firm.

Our personnel is still limited and our job is still enormously large. Nonetheless, we are now going to undertake the administrative load of extending individual adjustments to many industries which have not hitherto had them. In no case, no matter how unimportant it may be—do we want anyone to be able legitimately to say "OPA ceilings have put me in an overall loss position." Frankly we don't know how ambitious a job we are undertaking. We don't know how successful we can be, but we are going to do our utmost.

We are going to do our utmost not only because we want to relieve hardship wherever hardship exists, but because every ounce of production we can get, and every job that can be provided is important. The keystone of our thinking during the reconversion period is that there should be a maximum of opportunity for free enterprise in this country to produce all the goods of which we are capable and to provide good jobs at good wages for everyone who wants to work.

We must speed production. But we must at the same time avoid the disaster of inflation which would in itself wreck our free enterprise system. As I said earlier, the year before us is one of extreme danger. It is a critical year, a year that will provide the acid test of our vision, our wisdom, and our capacity for working together. What is done in this year will determine what the postwar world will look like. While it is our determination in OPA to strip off our control as rapidly as supply comes into true balance with demand, it is equally our determination, until that time comes, not to let the economy drift into disaster.

In the meantime, I wish I could assure you that inflation can be kept in check without some irritations, without regulations, without occasional delays and unavoidable hardship. But, in all honesty, I am afraid I can't. We shall do our best to make our operation as painless as possible. But in such a stupendous undertaking it would be folly to promise perfection.

But let me say once more, so that no one can possibly misunderstand me, that wartime controls—price controls in particular—were born of the needs of the war itself. These controls will be stripped off as soon as the emergency caused by the war passes. I know you are all weary of regulations. I know your patience has been tried again and again.

But if there are any of you who have been thinking that we in the OPA have the notion of imposing these controls upon you for the rest of all time, that anyone in the organization has the notion of remaking our economic system, let him put that thought out of his mind. We are anxiously waiting the day when we can get back to the normal operations of the free market. We wait for it just as eagerly as you who have had to live under our regulations.

Price control on several items can be safely lifted in the near future. Others will follow as production increases. In industry after industry, price controls will be first suspended and then finally dropped as supplies come in line with demand. Let me say that the happy day when all wartime regulations are behind us can never come too soon to suit me personally.

Let me close with a forthright appeal for your continued support. Very frankly without it we cannot see our job through successfully to the end. There are a few people in every industry who will never be satisfied

whatever we may do. In addition, there are a few short-sighted people in every industry who are ready to sacrifice their own future well-being to their immediate gain. These particular people have hit us below the belt before, and they will do it again. They will continue to take every advantage of the shortages and hardships which are an inevitable part of war to try to undermine the confidence in price control and in war controls generally.

Thoughtlessly, irresponsibly they would bring inflation down on all our heads for the sake of a fleeting personal advantage.

Gentlemen, these people are a threat to our economic future.

The price-control program is designed for the protection of business no less than for the protection of the farmer, the worker, and the consumer. We all have an equal stake in it. We must stand solidly behind it.

What we need in the year ahead more than anything else is a spirit of reasonableness and good feeling. We have come a long way together. We have rung up a record in which all of us can take the greatest pride. Never before in our history has our free enterprise system performed so brilliantly. Let us resolve now to continue that performance. Let us resolve to work together in harmony and mutual understanding.

I know I can count on you in the difficult days that lie ahead of us.

Selling the American People Into Egyptian Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that certain elements in both Houses of Congress are bent on selling the white Americans into Egyptian bondage by the passage of the so-called FEPC, the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation ever proposed in the Congress of the United States.

As the American people learn what is in, and what is behind, this vicious measure, protests against it come pouring in from every section of the country.

Here are some excerpts from one that just came in from the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio:

ATTEMPT TO ACCOMPLISH OBJECTIVE THROUGH LEGISLATION DISAPPROVED

The method proposed for accomplishing the objective is to coerce the employer, labor union, or agency of the Federal Government to recognize certain principles of conduct and to establish certain social relations which are necessarily incident to the employment of persons. We recognize that the proponents of the bill say that there is no attempt therein to bring up the question of social equality. However, the employment of persons necessarily involves social distinctions both from the standpoint of the employee and the employer and such distinctions, often unfortunate and odious, are, nevertheless, not capable of elimination by legislation and coercive methods.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE LAW OBJECTIONABLE

Aside from the fundamental objection expressed above, we object to the following aspects of the proposed legislation:

1. This legislation involves the creating of a new Federal bureau and the appointment of five commissioners who will constitute the administrative, executive, and judicial board under the Fair Employment Practice Act.

Incidentally I might call your attention to the present personnel of this illegal outfit, that is now operating under Executive order. Here it is:

COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Macco	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Cooper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes, and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

This is the organization Members of Congress are now being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

The Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, goes on to say:

The bureau will be organized throughout the entire country for the purpose of policing industry and enforcing the act. The Commission will be empowered to designate one of its members or designate any number of agents, any one of whom could be empowered to conduct trials against employers anywhere in the land. There is no limit to the number of such agents who could be appointed. Witnesses could be subpenaed and forced to attend from any place in America. The qualifications of such one-man courts would be determined, not by Congress, but by the commission in accordance with its rule-making power. The Commission or any of its agents could, according to section 9 of the bill, have the power to enter private business places and there conduct searches, examine and copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against by such agent. The bill makes no requirement as to probable cause for such search or the need for a search warrant. If the victim should "willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere" with such a search, he would thereby become subject to a fine and imprisonment.

2. The legislation contemplates a self-executing system of enforcement. Those who are aggrieved will register complaint. It will result in thousands of lawsuits being filed by troublemakers and professional agitators. It has great potentialities for racketeering and blackmailing. It is feared that every act of the employer which relates in any manner to individuals of a minority group will be the subject of complaint because of the unfortunate consciousness of such individuals of their position which will be augmented by agitation, bickering, bureaucratic hearings, and litigation which will naturally and surely follow from this method of accomplishing a social reform.

3. The bill specifically provides under section 8 thereof that the orders of the Commission shall be "subject to judicial enforcement and judicial review in the same manner and to the same extent and subject to the same provisions of law as in the case of orders of the National Labor Relations Board." This procedure under the NLRA has been the subject of continued question and criticism and has frequently resulted in prejudiced and discriminatory decisions. It involves the abandonment of the formal, time-tested rules of evidence established for courts of law and evolved over many years of judicial history. The charge has been made with very great frequency that a procedure of this kind results frequently in orders based upon improper and inadequate evidence and that it does not assure both sides to the controversy equal opportunity in the presentation of their case. It is believed that an independent and more adequate tribunal with strict rules and regulations of procedure should be established for the hearing and the determination of controversies.

4. There is no sufficient assurance of proper and adequate rights of review. The circuit courts of appeal are not permitted to review the evidence and the findings of facts if the order of the Commission is "supported by evidence." The requirement as to the measure of proof found in the record coming before the reviewing court is not "sufficient evidence" or "adequate evidence" or "supported by the weight of the evidence" or by "substantial evidence." Under the procedure established by this Fair Employment Practice Act the decision by the Commisison or its agents is a final order in regard to the findings of fact no matter how flimsy or questionable or no matter how substantial the evidence to the contrary. It is true that the courts, in connection with the administration of the National Labor Relations Act, have held that "supported by evidence" means evidence of a substantial character. If it is intended to provide for a review of the facts and evidence in all cases where the court fails to find in the record "substantial evidence" to support the decision, let the law so provide rather than to provide what appears to be a rule precluding review if there is any evidence whatsoever to support the order of the Commission. The rights of appeal should not be unduly limited and circumscribed. There should be very definite assurance that the reviewing court shall have authority to pass on and will pass on the credibility of witnesses and the truth and falsity of testimony. It should be assured that the court will be able to consider the question of whether the order was issued as a result of a trumped-up lawsuit by a blackmailer or shyster. There should be sufficient assurance that the court may consider the question of whether the Commission, according to the record, acted with bias or prejudice. The court should have the right to consider whether the order might be detrimental to the defendant's business or injurious to the morale of other employees. It is a matter of very great importance that the order of any tribunal charged with the determination of facts upon the basis of which men may be fined and imprisoned should be subject to broad powers of review in an appellate court.

5. This law involves the establishment of another bureau which obviously would become a very large peacetime agency devoted to perpetuating itself, jealous of its prerogatives, and engaged in the spending of public funds.

6. The bill is a departure from the traditional American system of free enterprise with respect to the right that has always been enjoyed by employers to use their own

sound judgment and discretion in selecting loyal and capable employees. Under the American system of competitive free enterprise, a man has been able to excel and make progress because of his ability to judge men and surround himself with employees whom he could trust and who would produce more and better services. It is through that system of competition and improvement that private enterprise has succeeded in America when it has failed in other countries.

7. Legislation of this kind is unfair to the persons for whose benefit it was intended. It will foster and develop wide breaches of misunderstanding. It will develop greater race consciousness. It is calculated to result in strikes, riots, and violence and to develop greater discriminatory practices, particularly outside the field of employment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe 90 percent of the thinking people of America will agree with these statements.

One of the worst things that could possibly happen to the American people, and especially the businessmen of the Nation, at this time, would be the passage of this bill and the fastening upon them of this totalitarian communistic system of bureaucratic regimentation.

A Letter to Harry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a copy of a letter written to the President by "Dezauche—Himself" of my home town. The letter follows:

THE SWEET SHEET,
Opelousas, La., June 1, 1945.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: Been kinda holding back on this letter to you since you entered the White House but you're doing such a good job that I just have to pat you on the back and tell you about it.

I get to chat with fellows all over this old U. S. A. and to date they stamp you O. K. and there seems to be a feeling of confidence over the country that the old Nation is in safe hands and that you have your feet on the ground.

Just keep your eyes on these "groups," Harry, and don't let 'em steer you away from a practical and sensible course. Keep on being President for all the people—big and little—'cause it took us all to make this great Nation, and it will take us all to keep it great. Theories and idealistic thoughts and words are all right, but we are still living in a realistic old world, and fine phrases won't change people overnight.

Nations like Italy, Spain, Argentina, and any others that weren't with us through the fight; I'd let 'em wait outside until I got good and ready to talk to 'em. The balance of the Old World over there—well, I'd give 'em a bite or two, a pack of seed and a hoe and tell 'em to go to work.

Anyway, Harry, we like your blunt and sensible approach to problems that confront you. It's a heck of a lot better than high-sounding dreamy thoughts that mean nothing. And say, Harry, you ain't bad on the radio either. I like you and the way you are going about your job.

Thanks for your letter about the sweet-potatoes. I knew you'd like their vitamin fortified deliciousness, and they will give you that extra "umph" that you need for the days that lie ahead. Could tell you plenty about these sweets, but when I'm in Washington, Congressman LARCADE and I will drop in for a chat.

It was ridiculous to sentence this boy McKee to prison for booting German prisoners. Ask the boys who were in German camps. Glad Patterson took it in hand and settled it.

Congratulations on inviting Herbert Hoover to chat with you. He has too much ability and is too good an American not to have used him during these trying times. Ex-Governor Lehman is a misfit where he is compared to Hoover. I'm sorry but that's the way I feel.

Come down for a week end, Harry. I live on a spot where some of your kinfolks lived on the farm. W. L. Truman built the house that I first lived in. More later. If I can do anything to help you, Harry, just whistle and I'll be there. Good luck and God bless you.

Sincerely,

DEZAUCHE—HIMSELF.

Boston Post Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent editorial which appeared in the June 19, 1945, issue of the Boston Post, Boston, Mass.:

"A GOOD NAME IS—"

How long are the people of Boston going to permit these repeated attacks on the city's good name to pass by practically unchallenged? This is getting to be a serious business. It seems that every few weeks, now, Boston is held up before the country as decadent, racially biased, ultraprudish, intolerant of free speech or even seething with crime.

The latest is the charge that the teachers in the Boston public schools are "sowing the seeds of the third world war by telling the pupils that the next war will be with Russia and that they might as well be prepared for it." The man who made this charge, when questioned about it, admitted that he had no first-hand evidence to back up his charge, but merely that he had heard it said by a speaker in the Ford Hall Forum, a certain Miss Ella Winter, employed by a New York newspaper.

That an educated man holding a responsible position before the public should repeat and amplify such a charge without seeking to verify the facts is almost unbelievable. But the authorities who permit publicity seekers to come to Boston and make such charges without being able to back up their statements by concrete evidence are certainly open to censure.

This is not to imply that Boston should put any brakes on the privilege of free speech. Free speech was born right here in Boston in Faneuil Hall, at a time when it was almost unknown in any other country in the world, and where the things that were said here against the foreign oppressor might well have been paid for by the death penalty. But free speech does not mean freedom to libel and to tarnish the name of the whole community, as is being done so often in recent years.

To recall an instance of some weeks ago, a magazine with a national circulation went out of its way to belittle the people of Boston and sneeringly published a photograph of a couple of South Boston boys who were referred to as tough specimens. Did it ever occur to the editors of this magazine that they could have taken similar pictures of worse slums and of tougher specimens in New York, where the editors live, or in Chicago, or New Orleans, or even in that typical American city, Memphis, Tenn., which has the worst homicide record of any city in the country?

We find that similar magazines and newspapers, some of them with semi-communistic connections, start a clamor of derision every time the Boston authorities attempt to clamp the censorship on some particularly vicious, obscene new book. Apparently, in their opinion, there is no filth too foul to put in the hands of their children in the name of free speech or free press. Instead of attacking the sources of publications that are contaminating the public mind with the filth that seems to be a necessary backlog for every new best seller, they deride the men who make an honest attempt to cleanse the atmosphere.

We think it is high time that the various organizations representing Boston—church, cultural, civic, and even a business organization such as the chamber of commerce—should band together in a cooperative effort to put an end to these loud speakers who come here and besmirch the good name of our city. We think it is not beyond the bounds of ordinary fairness that before such speakers are allowed to make public their charges they should be made to verify the statements as to facts.

Perhaps if one or more of these false alarms were hauled before a grand jury for libel or slander, they might be a bit more wary of making wild charges.

Opposition to the Sale of Nazi Films by Alien Property Custodian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unalterably opposed to the sale of confiscated Nazi films for release in the United States by the Alien Property Custodian. I understand that this executive office had contemplated the sale of approximately 650 films, made in Germany during the Hitler regime, for general distribution to exhibitors here in America.

The purpose of these films first and foremost was to nazify those who witnessed them. The world will for a long while have enough reminders of the results of nazism, and certainly does not need these celluloid impressions to show it up for what it was. I firmly believe that those German films now in the possession of the American Government should be destroyed or suppressed. We are still warring against fascism, and it seems utterly absurd to parade these screen spokesmen of what we are fighting so desperately to defeat. If any copies of these films are to be preserved,

they certainly should not be for general consumption.

For anyone who has seen any of the German films made under Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels, it is quite obvious that neither travelogs, cartoons, or feature productions are immune from Nazi propaganda. They are all dangerous. As might be expected of the Nazi regime, a good number of the films are unsuited for the standards of exhibition in American motion-picture houses. Many are quite sordid. Even if a Nazi-made film has any artistic value, I am sure that our own motion-picture industry can produce something finer. I cannot see why we have to exhibit films produced under the slave conditions of Nazi Germany, when we can proudly witness the products of our own great motion-picture industry, as well as those of our allies.

The films under discussion glorify free love, the Hitler youth movement, Prussianism, and tell how "nazism freed Europe from oppression." They are the antithesis of the themes of all the great anti-Fascist films made by our American companies all during this war.

I protested as irreconcilable the auctioning of these confiscated Nazi films by a Government agency at this time, and am pleased that the Alien Property Custodian reconsidered this action before the proposed date of sale, July 9, 1945.

Food Administration in 1917–18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Freeman Journal, Webster City, Iowa, May 3, 1945:

FOOD ADMINISTRATION DIFFICULT IN 1917–18

Iowans have been hearing and reading a great deal about food rationing during the past 3 years. The establishment of the Office of Price Administration has forced people to become ever more conscious of their blue points and red points. At one time coffee stamps afforded a real problem, whereas, today, sugar stamps cause many an Iowan to pause before placing a second spoonful in his coffee. Local ration boards are doing their best to exercise honest judgment as friends, and neighbors come in with their problems. An Iowa Falls editor felt that OPA workers were the "busiest people in Hardin County." At Mason City it was said that Gordon Richards had contributed 5,500 tireless hours to the local OPA. Not all cooperated, however, for fully $206,000 was paid in fines by Iowans during 1944, three-fourths of which stemmed from the food group.

The OPA was created to stem the rising tide of inflation as well as to insure an equitable distribution of goods to all. The lessons of World War I were an impelling factor in bringing about the OPA. In 1917 the United States Food Administration had been established with Herbert Hoover as Commissioner. The story of food administration in Iowa in World War I was told by Ivan L. Pollock in a two-volume work on that subject issued by the State historical society in 1923.

It was not long before the word "Hooverize" became associated with meatless and wheatless days. People were urged by poster to save sugar, eat potatoes, and save wheat. Those who hoarded were sought out and punished. Despite such slogans, prices rose to high levels. Iowans can catch a glimpse of the difficulties of food administration in the Wilsonian period by consulting Dr. Pollock's books in their local library.

OWI Disagrees With President's Home-Town Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend in the RECORD the following letter written by the Director of the Office of War Information to the editor of the Independence (Mo.) Examiner, in reply to a news story appearing in that paper and extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 14:

JUNE 20, 1945.

Mr. WILLIAM SOUTHERN, Jr.,
Editor, Independence Examiner,
Independence, Mo.

DEAR MR. SOUTHERN: On June 14, according to a statement introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Examiner published a story about OWI operations in Independence, indicating that two separate crews of reporters and photographers from this Office had visited the town to do substantially the same work. The explanation, as given by a member of the second crew, was that one represented the Overseas Branch of OWI and the other the Domestic Branch, and that the two were not permitted to exchange information.

I am sorry to say that this gentleman, who was not a member of our staff and evidently does not know much about our procedure, misinformed you. The facts are as follows:

Our Domestic Branch has no photographer and has sent no one to Independence.

Our Overseas Branch sent a reporter-photographer, David Eisendrath, to Independence on April 13. He stayed about 2 weeks, taking pictures of the home town of the new President of the United States for use in foreign newspapers and in our magazines published abroad. So far as we know, he took nobody with him, so I do not know how he managed to look like a crew.

Some weeks later, with the announcement of the remodeling of the President's home for possible use as a summer White House, our Overseas Branch decided it needed a few more pictures. Rather than spend the money to send a photographer from Washington or New York, we told one of the news picture agencies that we would be glad to buy certain additional pictures from Independence at the usual rate. This inspired the agency to send a photographer—only one, so far as we know, though there may have been more—from a nearby city to take some pictures in Independence, some of which we subsequently purchased for overseas use. The pictures were not taken exclusively for OWI and the agency has been free to sell them to newspapers, magazines, or other clients.

It seems to me that it is a quite legitimate function of this Office to let the people of other countries know what the President's home town looks like, especially when it is not only one of the small cities which are perhaps of more importance in American social organization than they are in those of most countries, but also when it happens to be a town which has had historical importance in the westward migration. I feel that the expense of sending one photographer from New York for a 2-week stay in Independence was thoroughly justifiable.

Very truly,

ELMER DAVIS,
Director, OWI.

Jones Sees Peril to Rice Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a copy of a newspaper article by Hon. Sam H. Jones, former Governor of Louisiana, in regard to the proposal of the War Food Administration to allocate the entire rice crop of the United States for relief and other purposes. Mr. Speaker, this article most accurately and fully describes how this proposal, if carried out, will affect the State of Louisiana, and since the District which I represent is the largest rice-producing district in the United States, my constituents and I are greatly alarmed over the proposal not only because it will do great damage to our district but also affect the entire rice industry in the United States. Mr. Speaker, the Representatives and Senators from the rice-producing States hope that before this plan is definitely decided upon that our officials in the Government will give further consideration to the matter for the reasons outlined in the article by Governor Jones, which follows:

JONES SEES PERIL TO RICE INDUSTRY—SAYS WAR RELIEF PLAN WILL MEAN OVERPRODUCTION

LAKE CHARLES, LA., June 11.—The fate of Louisiana rice growers in the postwar period rests in the hands of the War Food Administration, which is about to make a decision on the allocation of American rice for 1945 and subsequent years, former Gov. Sam Houston Jones said here today.

Governor Jones' plea to the War Food Administration is:

"Use the huge surpluses of wheat and corn now overflowing the elevators of America instead of drawing further on the limited rice supplies of the rice-growing States of the South."

"The proposed rice export program of the American Government will wreck the rice industry," said former Governor Jones. "It will destroy the carefully developed domestic markets upon which the southern rice farmer must depend for a permanent market. The amount of relief it will give to the European and Asiatic distressed nations will not amount to more than 2 days' supply a year. At the same time huge surpluses of American corn and wheat are available to feed the hungry nations, while the wheat farmers are dumping the 1945 wheat crop on the

ground for lack of storage in the bulging elevators.

"The War Food Administration has been calling on the rice industries for increasing supplies of rice. Last year approximately 40 percent of the total crop of 18,000,000 pockets was earmarked for Government uses. This year, we are told, this amount will be stepped up and probably doubled. Such action, if carried out, would be nothing short of ruinous. The reasons are obvious.

"Normally, America produced about 12,000,000 pockets, of which some 8,000,000 pockets are needed for domestic consumption. Under the urge of war, production was increased to 18,000,000 pockets, but the domestic consumption has remained around the original 8,000,000 pockets. This 8,000,000 pockets has constituted, in the past, two-thirds to three-fourths of the total crop. When the war is over we shall lose most of our present exports, because the countries now importing will be able to raise their own rice or will get it from their normal sources of supply.

"This will leave the American rice industry with its domestic markets and the limited export market it has enjoyed in the past. Thus, there will be at least a 50-percent overproduction of rice for the normal markets. This is, of course, a sufficient reduction to jeopardize the future of very rice farmer in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. The answer, or at least the surest answer, is an expansion of the domestic market, and here we need the aid of the strong arm of the Federal Government."

HAZARD IS CITED

"But the War Food Administration, instead of assisting in the problem, is actually increasing the hazard. For if the new program is carried out the amount of American rice earmarked for foreign countries is to be increased. This can only mean that the amount left for domestic consumption is to be reduced. And when the domestic supply is reduced we are cutting the postwar security out from under the American rice farmer.

"Food habits are hard to form and hard to change. For many years the southern rice growers and millers have been trying to develop new domestic markets. The gulf coast States have been the principal consumers. But gradually the northern and eastern States have been increasing their purchases. Gradually these markets have been expanded. Thus new sources for disposal of American rice in America have been developed.

"Now it is proposed that the new domestic markets thus developed, be deprived of this commodity. If this be done it will be necessary for our people to go back to the use of the Irish potato and other products to replace the rice. And if the war situation does not clear up for several years our carefully nurtured new domestic markets will have been destroyed, and the work of 10 or 20 years on the part of southern rice growers and millers will have been lost.

"Not only this but we will have a rice production potential of 18,000,000 pockets with a domestic market for possibly 8,000,000 pockets. Add to this a possible postwar export market or three or four million pockets and you have a total of eleven or twelve million pockets which is 6,000,000 pockets too small. In other words, we will face a situation wherein one-third of our crop will go 'begging' because the artificial foreign market is gone and the carefully nurtured domestic market is reduced. We all know what this will do to the price."

PREVIOUS WAR RECALLED

"The rice farmers of southwest Louisiana have not forgotten what happened to them after the last war. They have not forgotten the disaster that came with the first or second crop after the war when bankruptcy swept the rice section, flattening not only the farmer, but the merchant and banker as well. It took a decade to recover from that catastrophe, and the southern rice farmer does not want a repetition.

"This time the mistakes of the last war are being avoided. Price controls are keeping things from going wild so far as prices are concerned. This time it will not be a case of raising $10 rice and getting a $2 price. But the destruction of our domestic markets can be just as disastrous in the Second World War as failure to control prices was in the First World War. The law of supply and demand still works.

"Nor is there anything selfish or unreasonable in the rice farmers' attitude. He is perfectly willing to supply to foreign countries being supplied by the United States Government all the available surplus over and above domestic and military needs. But it is a short-sighted policy that would attempt to feed the rice-eating nations with American rice.

"This is short-sighted for two reasons. The first is that the United States cannot commence to supply the food demands in the form of rice. The second is that any such attempt would indefinitely, if not permanently, cripple this important southern agricultural industry."

HUGE NEED CITED

"Expanding on these reasons if the United States deprived itself of all rice rations entirely and used its entire crop to feed China, our annual production would last China just 4½ days. If we add to China the nations of Europe, the islands of the Pacific, India, Burma, and other Asiatic countries who want our rice, we would be able to supply just about 1 day's needs. It is, therefore, perfectly ridiculous to attempt to feed the hungry nations with America's rice. It simply can't be done and the most casual investigation will convince anyone.

"Which brings us to this question: Is the furnishing, say, of 2 days' supply of rice to foreign nations sufficient justification for imperiling the future of every rice farmer of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas, not to mention California, which supplies a different market? It will be difficult enough trimming down the increased acreage born of war necessities. Now, if the Government steps in and further reduces our domestic markets we shall have a problem equal in its seriousness to that which confronted the southern rice farmer in the early twenties.

"There is a practical way of feeding the hungry nations without destroying American rice industry, and it can be done by helping other American farmers engaged in production of other crops of which huge surpluses have been built up. In fact, our storage facilities are being strained to house our surpluses of wheat and corn. Herbert Hoover says the United States and Canada now have 450,000,000 bushels of wheat in storage, with a huge crop growing. Recent Kansas City dispatches inform us that midwest farmers have commenced dumping the 1945 crop in the fields because of lack of storage in the already bulging elevators. The wheat requirements for Europe will not be more than 150,000,000 bushels. This leaves 300,000,000 bushels that could be diverted to the Far East in a Government-sponsored program. This would help the wheat farmer and would save the rice farmer.

"Then, in addition, there are United States stocks of corn reported at 180,000,000 bushels more than a year ago. Moving out these surpluses of wheat and corn would be of inestimable benefit to our corn and wheat farmers."

READY TO SEND SURPLUS

"It is a wise policy that would move the entire surplus of the rice crop. That is, that portion of the crop not reasonably needed for local consumption; but it would be very unwise to go beyond this and remove the crops which are to keep this American agricultural industry going after the war is over.

"Finally, if the proposed program of increasing the percentage of rice to be exported under Government control is carried through, that increase may go so far as to double the 'Government's take.' Then, if this be done the American consumers will have to face the possibility of cutting down their rice rations to one-half of that they have enjoyed in the past. And such a prospect is dreary, indeed, for Louisiana and her sister States where rice has become a basic food for our population.

"A meeting of the millers' advisory committee is to be called at an early date by the War Food Administration. Upon the decision of WFA will depend to a great degree the future of our rice farmers for years to come."

Hon. James M. Curley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK's tribute to a friend in November 1944 at a testimonial banquet tendered Hon. JAMES M. CURLEY on his birthday anniversary:

Seventy years young—JAMES M. CURLEY.

This gathering is a splendid and fitting birthday testimonial of real friendship for JAMES M. CURLEY, the man, and for JAMES M. CURLEY, the public official.

Planned by his friends as far back as last July, this tremendous outpouring clearly evidences the many friends that the guest of the evening has.

Nearly 50 years of active public service in elective office; member of the Massachusetts Legislature; member of the city government of Boston; mayor of Boston; Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; now a Member of Congress—what a great record.

Throughout all of these years, he has always been found on the side of the people, always fighting for the cause of the weak, the underprivileged, the unemployed.

I can remember well as a young man, starting out in public life, calling into his office when he was mayor and asking on the many occasions I called to see him, hundreds of favors of him for those who came to me. Whenever he could do a favor, he never refused.

There are tens of thousands of persons in Boston who have gone to JAMES M. CURLEY, or written him, or had others like myself go to him in their behalf who are the beneficiaries of his kind acts, and many other thousands throughout the State.

A hard and clean fighter, he has never forgotten the place from which he came, or the people from whom he came—the poor, those who are not possessed of much of the world's goods.

During his years of public life there are tens of thousands of persons who have been made happier, whose burdens in life have been lifted, by the humane acts of Governor CURLEY.

This splendid gathering shows clearly the respect and gratitude that exists for him. Outside of this banquet hall are many thousands of persons who would like to be here, but who cannot for one reason or another.

But their thoughts are here with Governor and Mrs. Curley tonight. They have not forgotten. Their messages of friendship and

gratitude to Governor CURLEY are here just as effectively as if they were here in person. I am conscious of that fact. I know that Governor and Mrs. Curley are also.

Outside of the sacredness of the family life, the closest relationship that can exist between two or more persons is real friendship.

A person is indeed fortunate who has many real friends.

That is a relationship that is earned through service and sacrifice. It cannot be obtained in any other way.

JAMES M. CURLEY possesses the real friendship and gratitude of countless thousands of persons. He possesses their friendship because he has earned it. I know from experience that the great majority of persons appreciate consideration and kindness shown them and they are everlastingly grateful.

Governor CURLEY has earned that friendship because underneath the exterior of a hard fighter in the political arena he possesses a big heart, an understanding heart, a heart that would never permit him to refuse to help when he could, someone else who sought and needed his assistance.

As we look over his whole life, as an individual and as a public official, we see a picture of constructive and progressive effort.

His progressive and humane vision of years ago, as a young man starting out in public life, has never been dimmed with the passing of years.

He is just as visionary and progressive today, after nearly 50 years of public service, as he was when he first started his public career. Few men with his years in public life can have that said about them.

That is why I started out with the observation "70 years young—JAMES M. CURLEY."

In his early years in public life, in whatever position he held, he was always a leader in the passage of humane and progressive legislation.

Later, as a Member of Congress, he was always found on the right side, fighting for the best interests of the people. No matter what the opposition was he never compromised his intense love of the average person.

His three terms as mayor have left their imprints everywhere one goes in Boston.

Parks and playgrounds that bring recreation and happiness—public buildings and hospital buildings that serve the poor and the sick exist everywhere. They are living monuments to the progressive and humane spirit of JAMES M. CURLEY.

It was only the other day when a friend of mine was visiting Boston that I took him through South Boston and along the Strandway. He enthused over the beach and over Columbus Park. I told him that when I was a boy that the tides came in to what is now called Old Colony Avenue, pointing it out to him. I told him of the mud flats and of the terrible stench that remained after the tides had gone out. I told him that on a hot day several hundreds of thousands of persons—men, women, and children—came from all parts of metropolitan Boston to enjoy the beach and God's sulight I told him of the work of reclamation done under JAMES M. CURLEY when he was mayor which gave to Boston and the poor people this wonderful gift of health, recreation, and pleasure.

He was amazed. He said, "I have visited nearly every city in the United States. This is the finest beach that I have ever seen located in a metropolitan city."

This is one of JAMES M. CURLEY'S monuments. In every section of the city, monuments of recreation, of pleasure to the youth, parks or public buildings exist to serve the people—all permanent monuments to the leadership of JAMES M. CURLEY.

Later as Governor, his progressive and humane vision never became dimmed. He continued his humane and constructive leadership. On the statute books of our commonwealth are humane laws recommended by him that will forever remain as monuments to his leadership, and to his memory.

Again, in his present position as a Member of Congress, his constructive vision is just as strong—JAMES M. CURLEY is carrying on with the same vigor—fighting the battles of the poor, the underprivileged, the unemployed, and the veteran.

Relax OPA Meat Curb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a newspaper article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of June 19, 1945, with respect to the meat situation in Louisiana.

The article is as follows:

RELAX OPA MEAT CURB, ASKS DAVIS—GOVERNOR CITES UNFAIR HARDSHIP IN LOUISIANA

BATON ROUGE, LA., June 18.—Gov. Jimmie H. Davis today asked Chester A. Bowles, OPA Administrator, to relax restrictions on State meat packers, producers, and processors so that the largest livestock population in the history of the State might be used to alleviate a critical meat shortage.

In a telegram to the OPA chief, Governor Davis said despite the fact that the Louisiana livestock supply is greater now than ever before there is a meat shortage from legitimate channels. This shortage, he said, was due to OPA Control Order No. 1, which resulted in discriminatory and unfair hardship on producers, processors, and consumers in Louisiana.

Copies of the telegram were sent to all Louisiana Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and assistance in securing modification of the OPA regulations was asked of them by the governor.

Earlier today a delegation of meat packers, slaughterers, and restaurant operators headed by Fred Dykhuizen, president of the Louisiana Meat Packers and Processors' Association; Clifton Ganus, president of the Louisiana Restaurant Association, and J. J. Kramer, executive director of the Louisiana Restaurant Association, met with Governor Davis to discuss the meat situation in the State.

Present at the meeting also was Harry D. Wilson, commissioner of agriculture, and George Wallace, executive counsel to the governor.

CALLS SITUATION ACUTE

Dykhuizen, who acted as spokesman for the group, told Governor Davis that the meat situation in Louisiana is chaotic and acute and warned that unless the State steps in and does something the meat industry in the State will be crushed.

Chief complaint of the group as voiced by its spokesman is the OPA regulation referred to as OPA Control Order No. 1, which limits packers operating in the State and not interstate to a meat quota of about 50 percent of the 1941 beef and pork supply.

All agreed that this is unfair to the small packer and unfair to the civilian buyers, as there are plenty of cattle that are not being bought by large packers handling Army, Navy, and lend-lease needs.

One member of the delegation said restaurant owners and retail butchers have plenty of points, there are plenty of cattle, the banks are eager to finance purchases of meat where the small buyer may not have enough cash and yet the OPA ruling is rapidly forcing the small dealers and packers out of business.

"We are ready to go to the OPA and tell them that we want an adequate supply of meat through ordinary channels or we are going to have to close up or go to the black market, which we don't propose to do," Ganus, who spoke for the restaurant operators, declared.

Several members of the delegation also pointed out to Governor Davis that there is no shortage of meat on the black market "if you want to get it there and pay the price." However, they asserted that what the packers and restaurant men want is a fair supply quota through legitimate channels.

DAVIS OFFERS TO HELP

Governor Davis assured the group that he was willing to do what he could to help but warned that "they tell us what to do just as often as they tell you" when the question of States' rights was brought into the matter.

It was finally agreed on by the Governor and members of the delegation that a committee would meet with Mr. Wallace and Mr. Wilson and draw up a telegram to the OPA head, which the Governor would sign and send in an effort to bring about some improvement in the situation.

Text of the Davis telegram follows:

"At a conference held in my office this 18th day of June attended by the commissioner of agriculture, my executive counsel and representatives of the consumer, institutional feeders, meat wholesalers, packers, livestock producers and merchants the following facts were presented.

"We have the largest on-hoof livestock population in the history of our State. Despite this surplus, there is less meat available to our people through legitimate channels than ever before. This meat shortage is brought about as the result of the quota restrictions contained in control order No. 1, Office of Price Administration.

"We feel that this quota restriction results in a discriminatory and unfair hardship on producers, processors, and consumers in Louisiana. We appeal to you for relief by modifying this quota restriction. If necessary I shall send a representative committee of all interests to wait upon you at your convenience."

Columbia River Authority—Editorial and Explanation of a Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject of the Columbia River Authority from the Wenatchee Daily World, and a statement in explanation of Senate bill 460.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wenatchee Daily World]

On the same day that the Columbia Basin Commission met in Wenatchee and discussed

the proposed Columbia Valley Authority, Senator HUGH MITCHELL announced that he had conferred with the President of the United States and had received a green light for such an Authority.

President Truman's approval of a Columbia Valley Authority is of great importance to this region.

It means that the President of the United States is willing to have the administration of the greatest project in the world taken away from Washington, D. C., and placed out here in the heart of the region.

It means that he is supporting the people of this region in their request for decentralization—in their request that Washington, D. C., grant more regional autonomy—in their request that a "piece of Washington" shall be transplanted out here in the region.

When President Truman told Senator MITCHELL he was in favor of a Columbia Valley Authority, he told MITCHELL, in other words, "I believe the men on the ground know best; I believe they can see the needs best and will plan and carry out the projects more efficiently.

"I recognize that these big multiple-purpose river development projects must be Federal, but that they should not be planned and administered by remote control from Washington, D. C."

Now it is up to the people of the Northwest to avail themselves of the opportunity which President Truman has offered to them—accept the responsibility which he offers to place in our hands.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER AUTHORITY BILL, S. 460, INTRODUCED BY SENATOR MITCHELL

1. Is the purpose of this bill to so improve the economic situation of the Pacific Northwest that this region can proportionately share in the 60,000,000-job program?

Definitely, yes. Through the avenue of coupling the unused resources of the region to the largest and cheapest potential power supply in the country. Through the coupling of resources and cheap electric power, purchasing power can be expanded. Purchasing power is the key to employment and reconversion.

2. Under CVA, how will power revenues be used?

Power revenues will be used to expand the transmission and distribution of power, to develop additional power stations, to irrigate and reclaim lands, to provide flood relief, to promote new power uses, to develop resources, and to operate new and to cooperate with existing laboratories and pilot plants, looking toward additional industrial and power uses and improved utilization processes.

3. What does the Mitchell bill provide?

This bill provides a rational approach to the problem of expanding production and consumption, thereby increasing job opportunities. The approach is no different than the methods used during the past century to expand our system of free enterprise. Government provides the leadership and creates the opportunity for the expansion of private business volume. The bill does not dictate how men will be employed; it merely gives to them the opportunity for employment.

4. Does S. 460 provide for adequate local autonomy?

It does. It provides for regional directors and an advisory council designated by the governors of the Basin States. The bill also provides for an executive office centrally located in the region.

5. How will the authority affect the status of municipally or privately owned power utilities in the region?

S. 460 will not change the nature of the present central Federal transmission grid. The Federal plants will continue to provide the region's basic power supply, and the major transmission lines and substations will bring that power at low cost to the major load centers or wholesale distributing points. Power system ownership and operation, public or private, beyond these wholesale delivery points, will still remain a matter of local option. The Authority in the retail field must operate through and under existing State laws.

6. What would the passage of this bill mean to business and agriculture?

The bill provides for increasing the levels of sustained production under a free enterprise system without Federal domination. To accomplish this objective, operations are transferred to the region, without bureaucratic domination.

7. What range of primary functions does the bill contemplate?

The bill provides a means for the development and maintenance of an over-all unified plan and program for the development of the water, land, and mineral resources of the region. It provides the necessary plan, program, and budget to accomplish these objectives. The bill will result in such a plan and program that will provide the greatest over-all benefits from all the resources of the region. The intent is to provide development through the utilization of all existing development agencies. It will encourage sound research activities, thereby creating regional resource development opportunities.

8. In what geographical area will the functions of this bill be exercised?

This bill will cover all the resources of the Columbia Basin, comprised of large areas in the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana, and smaller areas in Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada, plus closely related coastal and interior drainage areas in the remaining parts of the States of Washington and Oregon.

9. Is the Columbia an international stream?

It is. While the proposed bill covers only that part of the Columbia Basin within the United States, a parallel and harmonious development of the basin in Canada is important to both nations.

10. What are the advantages of a unified valley-developing program in the Columbia Basin from the national and regional viewpoints?

Through such programs a much more realistic and effective approach can be made to the improvement of national production, income, employment, security, and living standards. Regional economics are recognized as the basis for a rational and effective development of national assets. Such enterprises will strengthen the national economy. A strong national economy can only result from consistent well-balanced regional economies.

11. Are the present economies of the Columbia Basin balanced, both from a regional and national viewpoint?

The answer is "No." The following factual comparisons between a few heavy industrial States and the western raw material States show a marked unbalance. These facts are based on the survey made by the McCarran committee of the United States Senate, and for comparative purposes are expressed in the percentage of the entire national values:

	Percent industrial States	*Percent Western States*
Proportionate part of total United States mineral production	26	50
Amount of raw forest products	4	49
Amount of fish resources	30	50
Proportionate part of total manufactures	65	11
Proportionate part of land area	9	61
Proportionate part of national income	56	19

These comparisons show definitely that the States in the Columbia Basin and neighboring States must expand their manufacturing capability if they are to receive their proportionate part of national income and provide their part of national employment.

Although these States produce 50 percent of the Nation's raw materials, they only manufacture one-fifth of what they produce and only receive 19 percent of the national income.

12. Comparatively, will the Pacific Northwest receive a greater proportion of the impact of war reconversion?

It will. The increase in population in the Western States due to war industry has been 9 percent compared to 4 percent in the heavy eastern industrial sections of the country. The war boom area population increase in the eastern industrial States is only 11 percent, whereas in the Western States it is 24 percent, or nearly two and one-half times as great as in that section of this country that received nearly 60 percent of the national income.

The percentage increase in manufacturing employment in the industrial States during the war period has amounted to 59 percent compared to 148 percent in the Western States, with the largest concentration on the Pacific coast. Therefore, the Pacific coast States will have a reconversion problem proportionately three times as large as that of the eastern industrial States. Consequently, some tool must be provided to absorb the initial shock of reconversion. This is one of the objects of the CVA.

13. What is needed to provide a national scale of 60,000,000 jobs?

To provide 60,000,000 jobs will require a net national income (wages, salaries, and business income) of at least $130,000,000,000 per year in 1944 dollars. For every dollar of national net income there must be $1.40 representing gross sales. This is the balance necessary to provide 60,000,000 jobs.

This balance can only be realized when total public and private investment per year totals 28 percent of the annual net income, or, in round figures, $35,000,000,000 per year. In the past annual private investment has never exceeded 60 percent of the investment goal necessary to provide 60,000,000 jobs. However, with adequate encouragement, there is no reason why the private investment proportion cannot be advanced to 75 percent of the total, leaving 25 percent (or $9,000,000,000 annually) for Federal, State, county, and municipal investments.

14. How does the investment in manufacturing facilities in the State of Washington compare with other sections?

In 1939 the net annual manufacturing investment in the State of Washington only amounted to 5 percent of the value added from manufacturing products. The State of Washington has nearly $3,500,000,000 worth of war contracts. The plant investment in the State to turn out this value of war contracts amounts to 10 percent of the value of the contracts, whereas in the heavy industrial States in the East the plant investment under war contracts ran from 23 to 26 percent of the value of the products. This comparison shows definitely that the Pacific Northwest must increase its annual investment in plant facilities.

15. What relation do the five major States of the Columbia Basin bear to the national values?

The Columbia Basin comprises around 3 percent of the total population of the United States, has over 9 percent of its land area, and has potential resources approximating 20 percent of the national total. Considering this large percentage of resources which the Columbia Valley can contribute to the national total, a production volume equal to between 4 and 4½ percent of the national volume is necessary in order to balance its economy with the rest of the Nation. This is a very conservative allotment yardstick.

This means a gross regional production of goods and services between six and one-half

and seven and one-half billion dollars a year and a regional income in the form of wages, salaries, and dividends of around $5,000,000,000 a year. Such an economy will provide a total of over 2,000,000 jobs.

To accomplish this result, there must be a total annual investment in this region, both public and private, of approximately $1,250,000,000. Feasible private investment in this region is roughly estimated at 60 percent of this stated investment figure, leaving a necessary public investment of better than a half a billion dollars annually. This public investment includes Federal, State, county, and municipal investments of all kinds that produce employment. The regional authority is the base of this necessary expansion.

16. Would the cost of public investment in such a river program be repaid?

Unquestionably. A properly planned river development program will pay adequate dividends in new agricultural, industrial, and service income; in increased savings; in flood control and relief from other damages. In addition, it will provide power revenues and reduce transportation costs, all of which result in increased tax yields.

Such a development under this bill will pay out as a direct business investment. The bill provided that revenues from power sales will repay all the power investment, together with the operating costs. In addition, subsidies for reclamation works can be provided. The navigation costs, as is customary with all Federal projects, are not self-liquidating, but will be covered by savings to consumers and increased tax revenues.

17. Does this bill provide for postwar WPA?

It does not. It provides for a constructive valley development program through self-liquidating works. Programs of this kind will provide useful, regenerated, and permanent employment, and business-creating opportunities. Self-liquidating projects lessen the need for "make work" projects.

18. At the present, what provides job opportunities?

Approximately half the present job opportunities are the result of war contracts.

19. What is needed to protect against inflation?

The best protection against inflation is an expanded production of materials and services. The largest part of this expansion should come from private enterprise.

20. How does the war electrical expansion in the West compare with similar expansion in the more highly industrialized sections of this country?

Seventy-five percent of the total national war electrical expansion is in the Western States with a substantial part in the State of Washington because of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee developments. This was a natural situation. In the prewar period this country lagged behind European countries in the production of electrochemical and electrometallurgical matériel. This production situation actually resulted in the location of such plants in the Northwest. The metals of this war and the metals of future commerce will be the electrometals. The Northwestern electrical capacity and its natural byproducts have been a lifesaver in this war. They can also be a lifesaver in peace, provided this power resource is coupled with the other latent resources of the region. This is the objective of S. 460.

21. Would the enactment of S. 460 make other domestic economy legislation unnecessary?

No. S. 460 (the CVA) will deal principally with upbuilding our resource base. All of us realize the rate that our natural resource base is being eroded due to war contributions. All wealth comes from resources, capital, and labor. We need to rebuild the foundation before the entire structure can be completed.

22. How does the agricultural economy of the West compare with that of the Nation?

The land area of the 17 Western States comprises 61 percent of the total national land area. The farm income from this 61 percent area is only 32 percent of the national total. Agriculture, as well as industry, will provide opportunities for our veterans and war workers.

23. Are the veterans given preference under S. 460?

Yes.

24. Does S. 460 supplement the present Bonneville Act, which, by its terms, is temporary legislation?

It does; by providing added provisions for a unified valley development policy, plan, budget, and program.

This proposal may be looked upon as one of integration of the general river valley and power development. S. 460 is supplementary to the Bonneville Act, and in no sense can be considered a revolutionary change.

25. Under what form of direction and administration does the Authority operate?

It functions under the broad supervision and control of a Chairman and Board of Directors, operating in the field of policy formation and over-all relationships to the region, the Congress, and the Chief Executive through practical Cabinet-level channels. Under this bill the Board of Directors is required to bring its policies and plans closely into accord with the regional needs. In order to further this, a local advisory board is provided.

26. What are the fundamental organization needs in such a valley development?

A single, unified conservation and development policy, plan, budget, and program, and a single responsible regional agency, in order that all plans and programs can be coordinated.

Under the present division of regional development responsibilities, a unified program providing complete economic benefits to the region and Nation is not feasible. This bill provides for responsible and effective interstate and interagency cooperation, so essential to a successful program.

27. Will the establishment of such an authority result in further centralization of Federal authority and administration?

No. On the contrary, the formation and administration of a regional development program will be decentralized, resulting in a regional organization which will function within the region affected and be responsive to the needs of the region.

28. What will be the effect on the sphere of the action in the States?

Under this legislation, none of the powers and functions of the States are abridged. Practically, the States can deal with a more accessible regional agency instead of dealing with the heads of numerous departments and bureaus in the National Capital. The regional authority can utilize the services and cooperative efforts of the State and its subdivisions in carrying forward development projects or segments of the regional program.

29. Will the establishment of such a responsible semiautonomous regional agency be incompatible with our present form of government?

No. The authority will be subject to the basic enabling legislation and subsequent policy authorization and the appropriation acts of Congress, and will be subject to constitutional administrative controls. The powers and functions of the States remain intact and are utilized to a high degree. S. 460 provides that such State powers will be protected.

30. What should be the relationship of the regional authority to the National Government?

The policies and program of the authority should be broadly coordinated with those of the Federal Government. This may be done not only through general appropriations and directions of the Congress and the Executive, but through the broad adjustment to the investment and employment needs of the national economy and to the programs of other regions and other segments of the national economy. The controls to effect coordination between national and State agencies is vested in the administration of the authority.

31. Does S. 460 accelerate the early completion of the Columbia Basin project?

S. 460 definitely provides for such acceleration.

32. Does S. 460 protect existing rights of Indians?

It does.

Address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, Before National Public Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered on June 19 at the fourteenth annual meeting of the National Public Housing Conference, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, the National Public Housing Conference was established as a fighting organization. I believe that it can grow and prosper only as a fighting organization.

During 45 years of fighting for progressive causes, I have seen our country pass through periods of war and peace, prosperity and depression, progress and normalcy. During all these periods, I have been consistently a liberal, in advocating new laws to meet change and to produce change. I do not think that the years have slowed me down in this respect. I think that when the war is over, we shall need to change faster than ever before, to keep abreast of the tide of world events.

But in one respect, experience has made me a conservative. It has taught me that, in human motives, there is nothing new under the sun. It has taught me that most groups follow their own self-interests. It has taught me that progressive economic and social legislation does not result from unity. Progress results only from struggle. Progress is brought about by those who are willing to fight, and to risk themselves in combat. The so-called unity comes only several years after the victory is won. Total unity means that a matter has ceased to be a vital public issue. Where that has happened, my efforts are no longer needed.

I have been rather amused to hear it said that unity in housing was just around the corner. You all know that this is not so. Practically every interest group in the country, which opposed public housing in the past, is opposing it even more vigorously today. There has been little controversy about public housing during the war, because there has been no real public-housing program during the war. But now, even before the war is over, when anyone suggests a postwar public-housing program, the fight is all around us. We can pretend that there is no fight, and find ourselves without

a housing program. Or we can open our eyes, collect our forces, and win the decision.

I am in favor of a permanent National Housing Agency. Although there is much to be said on both sides, I presently favor a single administrator rather than a board. But I have no illusions about unity. I favor such an agency because I believe that one Government agency, dealing with housing, will fight more effectively for the housing needs of the people, than a number of scattered agencies. But the fight cannot be avoided. I would rather have several crusading agencies than one quiet agency.

When the war is over, the American people are faced with a terrific battle on the home front. Like the last war, the absence of our young people on the fighting lines has given the advocates of reaction a chance to dig in again. They have seized this chance with greater skill and more determination than ever before. Yet the progressive measures, which are now needed, far exceed those that were needed but neglected in 1920. Our whole economy is bigger and its problems are correspondingly bigger.

The problem of unemployment, after this war, will be so pressing as to defy comparison with the past.

The problem of a fair distribution of our national income, so that the people can buy what our factories and farms produce, will still be with us.

The people on our farms, against whom our economy discriminated in the past, will be hard put to maintain the relative gains which the war has brought them.

Our labor groups, who represent the most effective pooling of the interests of the common people that we have yet achieved, will need vigilance to maintain their gains.

And we must continue to develop protection against economic or political discrimination based on race or color.

Nobody should be associated with public housing who does not realize profoundly that public housing is at the very center of all these burning issues. It is the test of the toughness of our determination to make democracy work.

What are the great postwar issues we face, and what has public housing to do with them?

We face the issue of whether public funds shall be used to help guarantee full employment—and public housing raises this issue.

We face the issue of whether subsidy shall be used to share our wealth more equitably among the people of this country—and public housing raises this issue.

We face the issue of whether we shall solidify or break down the ghettos of segregation in our cities—and public housing is confronted with this issue in every step it takes.

We face the issue of whether we shall let our economy drift through alternate periods of false prosperity and genuine disaster, or whether we shall plan for the constant expansion of productive enterprise—and no one can talk of planning or expansion without talking about public housing.

In every field, we face the decision whether vested interests in existing properties are to bar the way to the creation of new values—even where these new values add more to the wealth of the country as a whole. The entire opposition to public housing is based upon the proposition that old values should be preserved at all costs.

We are faced with the dramatic challenge of rebuilding America—the greatest challenge ever issued to our inventive genius, plant capacity, and physical and mental resources. Without public housing, no such rebuilding program can even commence to get started.

We will be faced with a postwar challenge from overseas—from the other nations that will be rebuilding their cities. If we want to lead the world, the people of America cannot be left living in slums.

It defies all experience to hope for a minute that a cause which raises such issues can glide quietly and safely to uncontested accomplishments. Public housing will be fought against bitterly in Congress, in the press, and on every street corner in America. Therefore, I say to you that public housing must be fought for valiantly in Congress, in the press, and on every street corner in America.

I agree completely that a public-housing program alone is not enough. We must have affirmative housing programs for our middle-income groups. We must provide aid for slum clearance and land redevelopment. We must muse these various approaches into a common program to solve the housing problem—just as we must fuse housing into a common effort to achieve higher standards of living through full and fair employment of all our resources.

But even a comprehensive program must have degrees of emphasis. So far as housing action by the Government is concerned, the public-housing program is clearly the most important phase. I am for the FHA, and led in its enactment. But without a large public-housing program, we shall certainly have nothing more than a speculative building boom, ending in a spectacular collapse. And beyond the economic argument, there is the fundamental moral issue—that no Nation can call itself a true democracy which does not help those first who need help most.

I am very happy that Senator TAFT has indicated his intention to help with the extension of the public-housing program. As you all know, the distinguished Senator from Ohio has voted for and supported public housing ever since he entered the Senate in 1939. Senator TAFT will have to work hard to change the record of his party in Congress on public housing—just as I will have to work hard to change the record of a very small minority of my own party, who have taken a mistake attitude on this subject. Public housing should certainly be a nonpartisan issue. I hope and expect that Senator TAFT and I will agree on all the details of postwar housing legislation, so that he may act together with Senator ELLENDER and myself in the sponsorship of a bill.

My main concern now is about the size of the postwar public-housing program, to be authorized by Congress. The National Housing Agency has estimated that we must build about 12,600,000 houses in the 10 years after the war, or about 1,260,000 on an average each year. The NHA has also estimated that about 3,600,000 of these houses, or about 360,000 a year, must serve income groups who can pay only $20 or less per month. This is another way of saying that there should be about 360,000 units of public housing a year, because it is utterly inconceivable that private enterprise can produce profitably for these very low income groups. In fact, this is a very conservative estimate of the public-housing need, since it is considerably less than one-third of the total need, and we have generally felt that public housing should be built for the lowest-income third.

However, there has been recommended to me for study a legislative proposal which contemplates an average of only about 100,000 units of public housing per year, for the first 5 years after the war. Of course, it will be up to the Congress to determine the size of the program. It may reduce any amounts that are advocated. But I think that we should begin by proposing legislation based upon the real need. Until this matter is cleared up, I do not think that we will have agreement about the introduction of a bill. Unity achieved through a sacrifice of two-thirds of the objective, is a kind of unity to which I cannot subscribe.

My friends, if we approached each postwar problem by advocating one-third of what is needed, the result would be disastrous.

The only conceivable reason for such a small public-housing program would be because of the cost. Now, what are the costs?

A public-housing program of 100,000 units would increase Federal annual contributions by $17,500,000.

This would involve an aggregate increase in Federal annual expenditures, when the proposed 5-year building period was over, of only $87,500,000. Related to the postwar need, or to what we are now spending for war purposes, this is an indefensible, trivial amount to be devoted to the decent housing of the people of America.

I feel that we should commit ourselves to at least three times as much, and to a real program responsive to the real need. Even then, our commitments for this purpose would be tragically small—when we stop to think how easily we can afford to do more, when we think how much more we need to do to make the sacrifices of this war worth while.

Public housing embodies a fundamental human cause—a cause that must be stated clearly, faced boldly, and carried forward without compromise. We must not be disheartened because we cannot have complete unity on this subject. We can have unity to a degree—unity among the labor groups, welfare groups, public interest groups, and the plain people generally. This is all the unity we have a right to expect—and all that we are going to get. But with that kind of unity, and by tireless effort, we can win out in the end.

Those of you who are here tonight represent that kind of unity, and that kind of understanding. You can be counted upon to carry forward the torch of progress and liberalism.

And you can count upon me to be with you, so long as you do not change your course.

Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to have unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Go Slow on Peacetime Draft," from the Jamestown Sun, a North Dakota paper, the editorial being written by Colonel Hanson. This is the first editorial by Colonel Hanson after he served 4 years in the armed services. I think it is a very worth-while expression on peacetime conscription.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GO SLOW ON PEACETIME DRAFT

One of the first editorials appearing in the Sun, after it had come under the control of the present management nearly 20 years ago, advocated universal military training as the best method of keeping this Nation out of war and of regaining peace if we ever should be forced to fight. During the 16 years between the publication of that comment and the beginning of the so-called national-defense period, which preceded the present conflict, this newspaper and its editor waged an unceasing campaign for national defense and military preparedness. So active did we become in this effort that

we were charged many times with being a "war monger," whatever that may be.

In view of this background, it may come as a surprise to many that we now caution against a hasty passage of the proposed measure which would call all youth of the land into the armed forces for a period of 1 year. There are several reasons for our opposition to the proposed bill, and these reasons are born of 4 years of active service with the Army in this country and in two of the three sectors outside of the continental limits of the United States.

Proponents of the measure now before Congress openly admit that they are trying to force the passage of the bill before the millions of men now in the service in foreign countries return. They admit that their chance of securing the approval of the bill has lessened with the ending of the fighting on the European front and their fear of defeat if action is delayed until after the surrender of Japan. Millions of words have been written of how the prohibition amendment to the Constitution was secured by the antiliquor forces while the men were overseas, and it would appear that the present frenzy over passage of the universal military training bill may be caused, in part at least, by the fear that the veterans of the present conflict will be opposed to the measure.

Only yesterday the Veterans of Foreign Wars proposed a substitute measure which would not take high-school boys away from home at the critical, formative period of their lives, but would give them the necessary military training under competent instruction near their homes and without interfering with their education. The internationally recognized record of the One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry and the less spectacular but equally as deserving record of the One Hundred and Eighty-eighth Field Artillery in World War II lends strength to the stand of the VFW. Both of these regiments were graded as "ready for field service" as a result of their training in North Dakota and the neighboring State of Minnesota.

Opponents of national defense have, for many years, declared that universal military training would make us a militaristic nation and would promote rather than avert war. We do not subscribe to this view, if that military training is given under democratic conditions. There is, however, a serious danger of the professional military men of the Nation becoming too powerful if the National Guard and the Officers' Reserve Corps are replaced with a purely professional army. There is no question in the mind of any person who has been in the Army during the last 5 years but that the powerful, controlling clique in the Regular Army has planned for many years to eliminate the National Guard at the first opportunity and that every effort was made to attain this objective during the present war. Several general officers openly boasted to the writer that "the National Guard is dead." One brigade commander issued formal orders that the National Guard origin of one of this State's regiments was not to be mentioned by the officers of that regiment in any talks to their men nor in any news stories which were sent home. "There is no such thing as the National Guard," he announced, "and there never will be again."

Perhaps, the most outstanding incident which shows the attitude of the professional officer toward the civilian components of the Army of the United States was revealed with the publication of the story that General Marshall told President Truman, then a Member of the United States Senate and a colonel in the Officers' Reserve Corps, when he applied for active service that "we do not want any old goats like you in the Army."

Some of the most potent arguments against the measure now before Congress are that it will take the youth away from the influences of his home community and interrupt his education at a very critical period in his life. The high-school graduate, who is forced to delay going to college until after a full year in the armed services, is much less apt to continue on to college than one who is able to pursue his education uninterrupted. Thousands of men have been given commissions as officers after only 13 weeks of training and hundreds of thousands have been sent into battle with a similar or shorter period of training. The period of basic training in the present war was set at 17 weeks and thousands of marines and sailors went into action immediately upon completion of their 8 weeks' boot training. It should be remembered that this 17-week period was set by the War Department before Pearl Harbor and that, in many instances, it was materially shortened when the situation became more critical.

If it is possible to train men for battle in 13 or 17 weeks, why is it necessary to give them a full year of training? If they can be trained in 13 weeks or twice that time, why not induct them into service during the summer vacations of the sophomore and junior years in high school, leaving them free to prepare for college during the summer months immediately following their graduation from high school? After the completion of the two summer periods, their training could be continued in the National Guard or in a reserve component at such time as not to interfere with their education or civilian work.

When a great organization like the Veterans of Foreign Wars opposes a full year of military training, it would seem that it might be well to make haste slowly and wait until the present crop of veterans of foreign service have returned to their homes and can express their opinions. After all, they are the men who have, through hard experience, become experts on the matter of military training. Certainly, there will be no immediate danger of another world war after the defeat of Japan, and we can afford to study this matter carefully before taking final action.

Work of Subcommittee on Education and Labor in Connection With Wartime Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Wisconsin Medical Journal of June 1945, making some reference to the work of our Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education and some over-generous remarks about its chairman. I also ask that a statement entitled "No More Patchwork Medicine," signed by me, relating to the subject of the public health be printed following the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"EVER ENCOURAGE THAT CONTINUAL AND FEARLESS SIFTING AND WINNOWING BY WHICH ALONE THE TRUTH CAN BE FOUND" [1]

Senator PEPPER, a native southerner, 45 years of age, married, a lawyer, a Democrat, a former member of the Florida House of Representatives, member of the American Legion and numerous fraternal and professional organization, since 1936 a Member of the United States Senate from the State of Florida, is welcomed by the Wisconsin Medical Journal to its guest editorial page.

Senate Resolution 74 of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States authorized the now well-known Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Committee on Labor. Members of that subcommittee include Senator PEPPER, its chairman, and Senators THOMAS, Utah; TUNNELL, Delaware; WHERRY, Nebraska; and LA FOLLETTE, Wisconsin.[2] The charge of the subcommittee consisted in an investigation of the educational and physical fitness of the civilian population as related to the national defense. Hearings have been held in Pascagoula, Miss., said to be a typical war-boom community; and in Washington, D. C., for the purpose of surveying the "Nation's wartime health program and to point the way for future health planning."

Four reports by the subcommittee have thus far been submitted. Of report No. 3, the Journal of the American Medical Association, January 6, 1945, editorially commented: "The report, in general, would seem to be a more scientific, carefully considered document than has heretofore been available as a result of previous hearings in this field."

The stature of a committee perhaps becomes best characterized by its leader. The Truman committee became publicly known as an effective study of wartime supply practices; the Dies committee perhaps for its ability to secure publicity in scare headlines.

The Pepper committee lays claim to an earnest undertaking. Thus, it is with a sense of privilege and satisfaction that the Journal introduces to its readers the chairman of that committee, Senator PEPPER.

"NO MORE PATCHWORK MEDICINE

"There is now almost universal agreement on the need for prepayment of medical care costs. The question is, 'What kind of a prepayment system shall be adopt?'

"Last February at the New York Times Hall Forum I stated my belief that any system in order to be satisfactory, must provide comprehensive care; that is, hospitalization, surgical and general medical care, including modern diagnostic and preventive services, and ultimately dental care.

"The medical profession has long insisted that any proposed plan of medical service must be judged by the quality of the care rendered. With this I am in complete agreement. That is why I place so much emphasis on provision of general medical care, including diagnostic and preventive procedures. No system of medical service deserves to be labeled 'high quality' which merely brings the doctor and patient together after the patient is acutely ill. Such limited service is out of date. It is patchwork medicine. It neglects or postpones the use of those scientific aids without which the doctor today cannot truly fulfill his high mission.

"Yet organized medicine, which has so vigorously championed high-quality care, has

[1] Quoted from the memorial tablet, Bascom Hall, University of Wisconsin.

[2] The Senators named are those who were on the subcommittee during the Seventy-eighth Congress. Present members are: PEPPER (Florida), THOMAS (Utah), TUNNELL (Delaware), HILL (Alabama), MURRAY (Montana), LA FOLLETTE (Wisconsin), TAFT (Ohio), AIKEN (Vermont), and SMITH (New Jersey).

not seen fit to provide such care in the prepayment plans it has sponsored or supported.

"With few exceptions, these plans afford protection only in catastrophic illness. In order to receive care, the patient has to be sick enough to be admitted to a hospital. Little or no provision is made for early detection of ills which only early diagnosis can prevent from becoming serious. No treatment is given for many minor illnesses which may be aggravated by delay. Slight attention is paid to the nonacute chronic ailments which account for an ever-increasing share of the total burden of sickness.

"There is now some talk of broadening medical society surgical and obstetric prepayment plans to include general medical care. But this is usually regarded as an objective to be realized in a distant and somewhat hazy future. When and if general medical benefits are included, there will be great pressure to exclude this or that essential item—X-rays, anesthesia, or laboratory fees. There will likewise be pressure to insert into the contract a 'two-visit deductible' clause, under which the patient would pay the usual fees for his initial visits. In that case, early diagnosis and treatment would still be discouraged.

"The objection will be raised that comprehensive prepaid medical care such as I visualize will be expensive. That is undoubtedly true. But if we are to insist on high-quality care, we must find means of paying the bill. I am convinced that this rich Nation possesses the resources to do it, if not by private effort, then by governmental aid. In the long run, both the individual citizen and the Nation will benefit.

"Recently I discussed this subject with a physician who occupies a leading position in the councils of organized medicine. I was surprised to hear him say that if comprehensive medical care of the kind I have described were made available to everyone the result would be a great deal of unnecessary and costly work. He pointed out that the general run of persons does not require all the procedures which would be part of such a system of care.

"Later he told me about the medical care he himself receives. He said that every 6 months he has a general physical examination, a gastro-intestinal series, a chest X-ray, a urinalysis, and blood counts.

"That is high-quality medical care. If it is good for this physician, I am sure it would be good for the general run of Americans. I would like to see everyone get that kind of medical care. I think that one of these days Americans generally will insist upon getting it.

"CLAUDE PEPPER."

Survey of Price and Wage Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver has recently made a survey on the question of price and wage control. If the findings are reliable, and I have no reason to doubt its reliability, it would indicate that a vast majority of the people of the country are favorable to the continued control of prices, wages, and salaries. Even though they may personally dislike these regulations they seem to think it will be necessary to have these controls for some time to come.

The following is the result of this survey:

MAJORITY BELIEVE POSTWAR CONTROL OF PRICES AND WAGES WILL BE NECESSARY

DENVER, June 2.—Out of every 100 people in the United States, 84 think it will be necessary for the Government to continue to control prices during the reconversion period, and 74 think it will be necessary to control wages and salaries. These facts are revealed in a Nation-wide survey completed shortly before VE-day by the National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver.

NORC's trained interviewing staff talked with housewives, farmers, office and factory workers, professional people, service workers, and many others in cities, towns, villages, and on farms in every section of the United States. These civilian adults were asked:

"After the war, do you think it will be necessary or unnecessary for the Government to continue controlling prices while we are getting back to peacetime conditions? How about controlling how high wages and salaries can go?"

	Percent prices	*Percent wages and salaries*
Control necessary	84	74
Control unnecessary	11	19
Undecided	5	7
Total	100	100

Definite majorities of every population group considered in the survey concur closely with the opinions expressed by the public as a whole. On the question of price control a somewhat smaller majority of persons 40 years old and over than of adults under 40, and a somewhat smaller majority of farmers than of persons in other occupations, endorse continued Government regulation. On the issue of controlling wages and salaries, residents of the New England and Middle Atlantic States approve regulation during the reconversion period by a somewhat smaller majority than do persons in other parts of the United States.

IN THEIR OWN WORDS

A few of those people who feel that both price and wage control will be necessary during reconversion emphasize their conviction that the period should be limited: "Control will be necessary for only 12 to 18 months after the war." "When things get back to normal again, let private business take over." A Tucson, Ariz., freight clerk remarks that wage control, in particular, "may be more necessary after the war than it is now." A minority opinion is expressed by the wife of an Oklahoma oil worker: "The Government shouldn't ever turn loose of this business of price control."

From persons who believe that price control but not wage control will be necessary while we are getting back to peacetime conditions come remarks such as: "We're heading away from democracy when we control wages and salaries too strictly." "I think the unions will take care of controlling wages." "Most wages will fall. The munitions plants will be closing, and people will be looking for normal jobs again." A war worker in Newington, Conn.—one of the few who would control salaries but not prices after the war—says: "The presidents of large companies especially should have their salaries controlled."

Respondents who think neither price nor wage control will be necessary occasionally comment: "Both prices and wages will control themselves." "The Government controls too much."

This scientific survey by the National Opinion Research Center sampled a typical miniature of the population of the United States with the proper proportion—in each geographical section—of rich and poor, young and old, men and women, various minority groups, and residents of urban, town, and rural areas.

The National Opinion Research Center is an opinion-finding organization. As such, it simply reports the results of national surveys made by its personally trained staff of over 200 interviewers throughout the United States. NORC is an academic institution working under a grant from the Field Foundation and the University of Denver. The survey upon which this press release is based included 2,504 confidential interviews. Well-established laws of probable error due to size of sample prove that this number of cases will be within 3 percent of true opinion in 997 surveys out of any 1,000 conducted under comparable conditions. In other words, the mathematical probability is 332 to 1 that another random sample of the same size would come within 3 percent of finding the same results.

Army Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., June 18, 1945:

ARMY POINT SYSTEM IS DECLARED UNFAIR

Agitation is growing perceptibly in relation to the present system of granting discharges from the Army to holders of a rating of 85 points. The accumulation of such points is based on the wild fancies of a few brass hats. Points are graded for time in Army, time spent overseas, battle participations, medals, etc., but not a point is given for actual combat service.

Recognizing three battle stars for the Italian campaign, over 20 months, and then six battle stars for the European campaign, 11 months, just does not make sense. The men of Clark's Fifth Army really are given the run-around under the present system. No one will deny that the Battles of Anzio, Cassino, and Legoria were as tough as any on the European front, yet for some reason the months spent in taking and retaking Cassino and Monte Cassino count only one battle.

Then again we must remember that for nearly a year the Fifth Army was really in enemy territory; Italy during that time was also a fighting enemy. No complaint is made for granting credit points for time in service, or for time overseas, but since the award of battle stars seems open to criticism, going in many cases to noncombatants, some effort should be made to correct the injustices now heaped on plain GI Joe.

The least that can be done is to show our recognition of the actual time spent in combat. There is a great difference in spending a year in England preparing for assault and being thrown into combat after 4 months' training in the hilly terrain and sickening weather of Italy. Allow one additional point for each month of actual combat. Add such points to the present set-up, and the greater part of present criticism will be rectified.

Dumbarton Oaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on June 14 I addressed the Sons of the American Revolution at Harrisburg, Pa., on the subject, Dumbarton Oaks. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Harris Ferry Chapter of the Pennsylvania Society of the Sons of the American Revolution quite properly sponsor this meeting for the annual commemoration of Flag Day. It is with more than ordinary pleasure that I appear before you this evening, as I am in a way a native of Pennsylvania. My grandfather was a resident of your State and attended the college at Washington, Pa., before he, like most of the other young men of that day, decided to move West.

That I may properly appear before your society, let me say that my ancestors, residents of this State, fought in the American Revolution among the soldiers from Pennsylvania. My grandfather only made it as far West as Ohio, where he paused to marry, raise a family, and participate in the Civil War as the colonel of an Ohio regiment. It was left to his son, my father, to follow the western trail, to land in Dakota Territory, from whence I come today.

So I am happy to be in the great State of Pennsylvania tonight, feeling by reason of my family history as though I had come back to visit the home folks.

The observance of Flag Day, now national in scope, was definitely established in the year 1896, since which time the day has become a national holiday throughout the Nation.

As President Wilson said at the Flag Day celebration in Washington on June 14, 1914:

"The flag for the future is meant to stand for the just use of undisputed national power. No nation is ever going to doubt our power to assert its rights, and we should lay it to heart that no nation shall ever henceforth doubt our purpose to put it to the highest uses to which a great emblem of justice and government can be put.

"It is henceforth to stand for self-possession, for dignity, for the assertion of the right of one nation to serve the other nations of the world—an emblem that will not condescend to be used for purposes of aggression and self-aggrandizement; that is too great to be debased by selfishness; that has vindicated its right to be honored by all nations of the world and feared by none who do righteousness."

Let us hope that our flag, wherever it may be raised, will continue to stand for justice, right, and the just use of national power.

The Sons of the American Revolution organization was established and has been maintained for the purpose of perpetuating the memory of the men who by their services or sacrifices during the war of the American Revolution, achieved the independence of the American people; to unite and promote fellowship among their descendants; to inspire them and the community at large with a more profound reverence for the principles of the Government founded by our forefathers.

The society has done that with honor to its members and strength to the country. If it did nothing else than to call attention to the American Constitution, it would have performed a great service.

In these times of emotionalism, bitterness, destroyed governments, it is well for us, the descendants of the men of the American Revolution, to turn again to the conditions and terms upon which this Government of ours is founded and has grown stronger and more enduring with each generation.

I quote from the first paragraph of the Constitution of the United States:

"We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

I ask you people of Pennsylvania and of America to read that paragraph again and again until the meaning of it, the comprehension of it, the loftiness of it has seeped into your minds and hearts, because that paragraph contains all our aspirations, our hopes, our expectations of life, liberty, and happiness in this land of America.

Always in times of violence, of war and disruption, there are those who preach a doctrine of change, who demand something new, who assert that our Government has failed and must be abandoned for strange ideas.

Read that paragraph of the United States Constitution when strangers, idealists, and crackpots talk about abandoning the American form of government.

For the first time in the history of the human race, we the people have established a National Government that has endured and grown for a century and a half. Under it the American people have had more material prosperity, more spiritual and intellectual freedom, than the people of any other nation in all the history of the world. We should make haste slowly in following any proposal that means the complete alteration of the form of government under which we have lived and which proposes new and untried schemes of government, all of which result in the loss of freedom for the people.

You have asked me to come to Harrisburg tonight for the purpose of discussing security and peace as outlined in the proposal adopted at Dumbarton Oaks last year. This proposal, drafted by representatives of Russia, England, United States, and China, has been submitted to a Conference of some fifty nations, whose representatives have been meeting in San Francisco. Some of the ablest men in the world are in attendance at that Conference. I believe that those men are sincere and earnestly seeking a formula by which the world may be freed from war. There will be, and are, differences of opinion between the men in that conference. Whatever the result, whatever the structure built by it, will eventually be submitted to the various countries signatory of the agreement for confirmation or disapproval. The document prepared by the San Francisco Conference will be in the form of a treaty. As such, it must be submitted by the President to the United States Senate and can only take effect when confirmed by a favorable vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. Our chief concern is not what other nations will do with the treaty, but what will we do with it.

We cannot, of course, state categorically the terms of this agreement among nations, because we do not yet know what will be in the charter, but we have the framework of the charter as provided in the Conference at Dumbarton Oaks and we have the discussions and publicity about its provisions and changes therein, and I feel that we have a fairly definite picture of the proposal that will be made to us when the Conference adjourns.

For several months past, officials of the State Department in Washington have been touring the country telling the people that Dumbarton Oaks is the answer to our prayer. Propaganda put out by the State Department, or with its approval and blessing, has flooded the country through magazines, newspapers, and radio. We have been told that the plan developed at Dumbarton Oaks is the only plan that will protect the world from another war, that anyone who questions the correctness of that assertion is guilty of a disservice to our country, forgetting the provisions of the Constitution that grants free speech, free assembly, and free press. Those who have adopted this attitude of mind deny such freedoms.

In planning for freedom from war, some would deny freedom of speech and freedom of thought. In my judgment, freedom of speech, thought, and assembly are more important than freedom from war.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal is not new. It is in its general outline similar to other and earlier plans. The Holy Alliance of 1815, formed by Russia, Austria, and Prussia, was the first of such plans for the prevention of war. It provided, just as the Dumbarton Oaks plan provides today, for a military alliance between the strongest powers then existing. It lived but a short time because its leaders disagreed. The League of Nations was born in 1920. It, too, failed because its members refused to abide by its terms.

Under Dumbarton Oaks, an organization of nations is to be formed for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

This organization of nations is to be open to membership by all peace-loving states. It shall consist of a General Assembly; a Security Council with full power, even to waging war; and an international court of justice.

All members shall be members of the General Assembly. All nations, except Russia with three and Great Britain with six, shall each have one vote in the General Assembly.

The Security Council consists of 11 members. The representatives from the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France shall have permanent seats in the Security Council. The General Assembly shall then elect six states to fill the nonpermanent seats. These nonpermanent members are to be elected for terms of 2 years without power of succession.

Primary responsibility rests with, and all important decisions are made by, the Security Council. All members of the Organization shall bind themselves to abide by the decisions of the Security Council.

The Security Council shall have power to investigate any dispute or any situation which may lead to international friction. It shall have power to recommend appropriate methods of adjustment either by reference to the International Court of Justice, by use of peaceful means, or by the use of force to carry out its decision. It shall have power to take any measures necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security. All members of the Organization shall undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call, armed forces, facilities, and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. For urgent military measures, there shall be made available national air force contingents. The size and use of these contingents to be determined by the Security Council.

No action can be taken by the Security Council, except upon the unanimous vote of seven members which must include all the permanent members, but each permanent member of the Security Council shall have power to veto any decision of the Security Council.

Under Dumbarton Oaks the President will have the power to declare war without the knowledge, consent, or the approval of Congress. This is provided for by section B, chapter 8, which reads as follows:

"Should the Security Council deem that a failure to settle a dispute in accordance with procedures indicated in paragraph 3, of section A, or in accordance with its recommendations made under paragraph 5, of section A, constitutes a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security, it should take any measures necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security."

The administration in Washington under President Roosevelt favored vesting the American delegate with broad authority to enable the Security Council to act promptly and effectively in face of either a threat or actual breach of the peace. It is now proposed to establish this authority for the American member on the Security Council by an act of Congress to be passed by both Houses, since they say it will be an act of domestic legislation and not a treaty commitment. This will require a majority vote of Congress instead of the two-thirds vote of the Senate necessary to ratify a treaty.

Granting this power to the delegate of the United States on the Security Council is the same as granting it to the President, because the delegate will be the appointee of the President and subject to his wishes. If this power is granted to the President or to the American delegate, it will be a specific delegation of power to an individual to act instead of Congress. Can this be done? I assert that it cannot and that it is in direct violation of the United States Constitution.

Raymond Moley, one of our famous economists and writers, stated on December 4:

"In clothing the American representative with power to act, Congress is delegating one of its greatest prerogatives."

Thus one man becomes the voice of 130,000,000 people to decide when, where, and how American boys shall be sent into armed conflict anywhere in the world. Will Congress, by constitutional amendment, abdicate its exclusive power to declare war, to a single representative appointed by the President?

No one will seriously dispute the statement that Congress alone has power to declare war. Attempting to delegate such power is in direct violation of our Constitution. There are those who contend that giving the President or his delegate authority to consent to the use of armed forces of the United States to preserve peace is not a declaration of war. Such a statement is pure bunk. The sending of armies, or navies, or air forces against a foreign country is war.

Lest there be any misunderstanding or misinterpretation of my position, let me make it crystal clear. I am not opposed to the principles of the Dumbarton Oaks plan. I favor them. I have favored for years, by speech and written word, the creation of an association of nations that will attempt to abolish war. I favor it today. It can be done and must be done, but it must be done without destroying America.

The Government under which we have lived and prospered has proven the soundness of my thesis. The American people have advanced further in less time than any other nation. We are not now going to discard the things that have made that progress possible.

The Dumbarton Oaks plan is simply a new League of Nations, which three, or at the most four, great powers will completely dominate and control. There will be peace by force. That force will be administered by three or four men. They will be the sole judge of how and when to act. The life of such an agreement will depend upon how long those three or four men can get along together. Fifty or more nations will be ruled by these three or four men. Do we want that kind of world government? Would any of the three great nations, Russia, Britain or the United States, consent to a police force that could control it? We know they will not.

What faith can we, the American people, have in the promise of the individual leaders of three great powers that their intentions are purely benevolent?

Let us refer to the record.

In 1917, before this country entered World War I, when Japan was preparing to invade China, the British Government addressed a note to the Japanese Government. It said:

"His Majesty's Government accedes with pleasure to the request of the Japanese Government for an assurance that they will support Japan's claim in regard to the disposal of Germany's rights in Shantung, China, and possessions in islands north of the equator on the occasion of the peace conference, it being understood that the Japanese Government will, in the eventual peace settlement, treat in the same spirit Great Britain's claims to German islands south of the equator."

Thus, Britain agreed that Japan should rob China of essential territory if Japan would support the claims of the British. The French and Russians concurred in this proposal, each stipulating schemes of their own.

In 1934 Japan's continued aggression was prohibited by two treaties. One was the League of Nations Treaty, which the United States had not signed. The other was the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922, which the United States had signed with China, Japan, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, France, and Britain. It pledged all signatories to respect "territorial and administrative integrity" and "sovereignty" of China.

In 1937 the League met at Geneva to stop Japan under the League of Nations Treaty. It did nothing. Japan went on.

In the same year, 1937, the United States went to a Nine-Power Treaty Conference at Brussels to stop Japan. The Conference orated, attended a lot of dinners, and adjourned. It did nothing. Japan went on.

How can anybody believe that what the United States failed to do at Brussels it would have been willing and able to do at Geneva?

So complete was the failure at Brussels that 2 years later Britain went right over from the side of China to that of Japan and signed an agreement with Japan declaring that "the Japanese forces in China have special requirements for the purpose of safeguarding their own security; and His Britannic Majesty's Government have no intention of countenancing any act prejudicial to the attainment of that object."

Are our own skirts clear?

In 1882 we signed a treaty with Korea whereby we undertook to take diplomatic steps if any third country should deal "oppressively" with Korea. In 1905 Japan dealt with Korea "oppressively" by conquering it. and in 1910 it further dealt with Korea "oppressively" by annexing it. Did we take any diplomatic steps against Japan? Absolutely none. On the contrary, we were the very first government to recognize the Japanese conquest of Korea by withdrawing our diplomatic legation from Korean soil and by thus proclaiming to the world that Korea, our "ally," had ceased to exist as an independent country.

In 1846 we signed a treaty with Colombia whereby we undertook to guarantee the "sovereignty" of Colombia over the Isthmus of Panama. This commitment was in full force in 1903. In that year there was an artificially concocted revolution on the Isthmus. Did we then help Colombia to restore its sovereignty over the Isthmus? We did the reverse. We used our armed forces to prevent Colombia from itself restoring its sovereignty over the Isthmus. For doing so we ultimately paid Colombia an apologetic indemnity of $25,000,000. We acknowledged that in changed circumstances we had violated a commitment given in circumstances long gone by.

It is also interesting to note President Roosevelt's former attitude in connection with our entrance into a league of nations.

On December 28, 1933, he said of the League of Nations:

"We are not members and do not contemplate membership."

On January 3, 1934, he said:

"I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in the political arrangements in Europe."

On October 2, 1935, he said:

"Despite what happens to continents overseas, the United States of America shall and must remain untangled and free."

On August 4, 1933, he said:

"Both sides agree that this Nation should agree at all times to avoid entangling alliances or involvements with other nations."

Lord Winster, of England, speaking in the House of Lords on October 11, 1944, said:

"The Dumbarton Oaks proposal is an organization for keeping small boys in order by prefects, who would themselves be exempt from the rules they would have to administer."

For more than a thousand years there have been almost continuous wars in the Balkans and in the small states bordering Russia on the west. An attempt to intermingle racial groups and religious groups has never succeeded. Peace treaties, conferences, and various commissions have been set up for the purpose of bringing peace to the Balkans. None have succeeded.

Two world wars have come out of those small states along the western border of Russia. Millions of human beings have been slaughtered.

Do the Big Three intend to declare perpetual war against these small nations? Do they propose to permanently locate American troops within the boundaries of those nations for the purpose of preserving the peace?

With those who say that the President must have power to use force without approval by Congress, I cannot agree. I cannot agree to such delegation of power no matter by what verbal legerdemain it may be presented. I cannot assent to any treaty or law that has for its purpose the destruction or emasculation of the Constitution of the United States or of Congress. The President now has authority for defense in case of attack and for the suppression of bandits, but sending the Army into a foreign country in an attack upon the people of that country is war.

It is said that the President must be given the power to declare war without referring it back to Congress. The only argument made in support of this demand is that of time.

In no international trouble in which we have engaged has there been any question of time. President Roosevelt called Hitler an aggressor and demanded he be quarantined 5 years before the beginning of the European War. When the President asked Congress for war, it acted in less than 2 hours.

He called Japan an aggressor in 1934. When he asked Congress on December 8, 1941, for war, Congress acted in 33 minutes. Aggressors do not arise overnight. They require months and often years to commit the overt act.

Can anyone point to any necessity for speedier action than we have taken in these two present wars?

The decision for war is the most serious and terrible step that a nation can take. It should never be made by one man. In a republic like ours, it should be made by the constitutional processes provided only after open debate and without secrecy.

Can anyone suggest that attacking Germany or any other nation would not mean war? If we send a fleet of our war planes to destroy property and human beings, is there anyone so naive as to suggest that it would not mean war?

If we were ordered, by the Security Council, in the enforcement of our police control, as we may be, to destroy factories or to seize territory, does anyone suggest that such action would not mean war?

I am not willing to leave it to one man's decision to bring the United States into such a crisis. Policing a foreign nation by force means war against that nation and against its people, and no polished words will cover that ugly fact.

Civilization practically disappeared during the dark ages. It may disappear again. Our own civilization could be destroyed by a continuation of wars such as this one. One man may and can again reverse the march of civilization for a century or more. We cannot afford to place the future of mankind, to place civilization itself, in the hands of one man or a small group of men.

Some there are, who assure us that all we need is a token police force, merely to wave the policeman's club or blow his whistle to insure immediate obedience. That is wishful thinking. If a large nation starts a war it means total war. War is not divisible. You cannot measure it with a yardstick and say we will go this far and no farther. The nation attacked and the attacking nation will put every resource and every strength and every man they have in the struggle, to win. The fight must go on until one is down and out. One side must win. There must be a victor. Whenever this proposed United Nations police force crosses the boundary of a foreign country it asks for war. Dare we permit one man to make the decision?

If the Security Council proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks Agreement decides to disarm any nation, as it may, how is the order to be enforced? How many men will it take? How many guns? How many ships? How many airplanes? There is no limit to such a proposal. In dealing with nations we are not dealing with drunks. Will we, holding most of the facilities in the world, consent that Russia and Britain disarm us or perhaps order us to attack some friendly nation? Had the Security Council been in existence in 1776, there would have been no war for independence because the Council would have smashed the American Colonies. There would have been no United States.

Instead of alliances, let us endeavor to build an association of nations along the lines of the Pan American Union. All nations, big and little, should be in it with equal rights for all.

But Russia has stated that it expects to take certain foreign territory. The Yalta Conference apparently agreed to it. Is there anyone so simple as to believe that Russia is not going to take what it wants and when it does so, who is going to say no to it? Will Great Britain and the United States declare war upon Russia? Will several million American boys be sent to Europe to engage in that war? Those are some of the difficulties we face today.

We want nothing out of this war, except peace and security. We have no desire for a single acre of land. We have no wish to impose our will either politically or economically upon any other people in the world. Other nations do not agree, so until we learn to work together as neighbors, peacefully; until we live and act with Christian forbearance there is little hope of permanent peace.

"Speak softly and carry a big stick and we will go far," is still sound advice.

Russia recognized the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1920. They were then admitted to the League of Nations. The following year the United States recognized their independence.

The League of Nations is still in existence. All its commitments are still binding upon all its members. Russia, Britain, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, South America, and France are members.

Article 10 of the League binds the members to preserve the independence and sovereignty of these Baltic States. The right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live is admitted international law. Now Russia says she is going to annex those small states.

The League of Nations failed not because of what we did not do, but because of what Great Britain and France refused to do when the time for action came. It failed because they refused to carry out their bond in Manchuria, in China, in Germany, and in Ethiopia.

Winston Churchill said:

"I am not the King's First Minister to liquidate the British Empire."

I am not a Member of the United States Senate to liquidate the American Republic, and I do not intend to give away our property or our liberty through some altruistic dream that we must solve all the problems of mankind. Let us make the best agreement for peace that we can. Let us take every step forward that is possible, but let us be realistic while we are doing so.

By what pattern of reasoning or justice can the Big Three choose the form of government under which other nations will live just because those nations are small and cannot resist?

We either mean what we say or we do not. There has been too much double talk in world diplomacy. The American people are entitled to know what is planned for the 54 small nations of the world. We have no fear of serious war from them. Only the Big Three will start a major war.

There is a lot of wishful thinking in this country to the effect that it is our duty to police the world, that our resources wrung from the sweat and toil of our laboring men and women are to be distributed like Christmas gifts to anyone who asks for them. The United States can neither police nor finance the world without destroying ourselves.

We want an association of nations, but let us have an association of equality, of sincere honest-to-goodness participation by every nation, each having one vote, regardless of its size, regardless of its constituent parts.

The principle of Dumbarton Oaks will be, and should be, approved, but the wording of it must be changed to protect America.

First. No power other than the constitutional power residing in Congress should be given authority to declare war or to take American boys into armed conflict throughout the world. This proposal must be specifically limited to the lawful constitutional power of Congress to make that declaration.

Second. Under the terms of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal regional agreements can only exist by the approval of the Security Council, which in practical terms means, Russia, Britain, and the United States. If that proposal be insisted upon, the Monroe Doctrine, which has kept the western hemisphere free from invasion and aggression for more than a century, will be thrown out the window. America does not want the Monroe Doctrine junked. As a matter of national security, we must retain the Monroe Doctrine. We must retain the right to take any step which we alone decide is necessary for our national defense.

Third. For more than 50 years we have been cooperating with the South and Central American Republics in an organization known as the Pan American Union. We must retain the right to continue that organization without interference from Europe.

Let us meet then with our cards in front of us and with no hidden aces in the deck, determined to make an agreement by which civilized men can join in a workable plan by which we can live together in peace.

The principles upon which the American Nation has grown great and strong are those prescribed in the Constitution and upon which we have developed our civilization. We hold the cards. We are the most powerful nation in the world. Every country in this war looks to us for aid. Let us use that power for justice and peace.

Woodrow Wilson, in an address to the Senate January 22, 1917, stated:

"And there is a deeper thing involved than even equality of right among organized nations. No peace can last or ought to last which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand people from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property."

The future of this world agreement to preserve peace will depend upon the personalities who control the three or four big nations, and we must not forget that personalities change. Each of the three important leaders of the Big Three today is past 60. Inevitably death will remove all of them within a comparatively short time. Who then will follow in their steps? Who then will be the rulers? Will their differing personalities combine in complete agreement as that of recent leaders have done?

Walter Lippmann, famous author, said recently:

"There is no way of commiting any nation in 1945, least of all this one, to wage a theoretical war in say 1955 against an unknown power under unforeseeable conditions. If and when a threat of war arises in 1955, the man who will then be President, the Congress then in session, and the people then in active life will decide our action."

When the sun goes down for the last time upon this bloody, ghastly war in which supposedly civilized men have sought to destroy their fellowmen, when the guns have ceased to roar, and the exhausted world turns wearily to bind its wounds, let us pray that the gleaming sunrise of a better day will show us the way to a peace in which all people join in a solemn determination to work out plans that will forever banish war from the earth.

Discipline at Walter Reed Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some additional excerpts from articles in the New York Herald

Tribune, written by Miss Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, regarding the treatment given amputation cases in Walter Reed Hospital:

MANY AMPUTEE CASES COMPLAIN OF STRICT WALTER REED DISCIPLINE

(By Dorothy Dunbar Bromley)

Numbers of amputee patients who have been discharged from Walter Reed General Hospital, after being fitted with artificial limbs, complain that "it isn't a very human place."

In the course of a 2 weeks' visit to the hospital I found that the reconditioning program is only now getting under way in the fourth year of war.

An intelligent man, discharged from Walter Reed last December, summed up his criticism of the hospital by saying: "There aren't enough officers there who understand psychology." This man who had lost a leg, meant that there was too much military discipline, and too little effort was made by the staff as a whole to understand the individual man and his needs. * * *

Almost all of the 45 patients with whom I talked at the main center and the convalescent section at Forest Glen complained of overly strict discipline. The 45 included, besides a few inevitable chronic gripers, a number of men who spoke well of the reconditioning program itself. * * *

The patients whom I interviewed at the Army Air Forces Convalescent Hospital at Plattsburg, N. Y., men suffering from combat fatigue, had a different attitude.

The informal, nonmilitary atmosphere at Plattsburg, which is a relatively small hospital, and the well-planned program must have something to do with the men's not chafing under such regulations as there are.

Drinking among Walter Reed patients has been something of a problem, the hospital officers admitted. Men who are war casualties, if they care to drink at all, are more than likely to seek release from their tension in alcohol. * * *

Last summer and fall a CIO committee that visited the hospital every week observed a good deal of drinking in three amputee wards. It was extensive enough to be put down as a serious sign of restlessness and real desperation on the part of several men whom the committee members came to know well. * * * This spring I saw no drinking in the amputee wards. The improvement may have been brought about by somewhat stricter rules on the admission of visitors and also by the disciplining of patients who were disturbing elements. But it seemed noteworthy that General Marietta and the administrative officers, in discussing the subject, saw it as a problem of discipline, not one of relieving the patients' emotional tensions.

General Marietta referred to "the enforced treatment ward," which he had initiated and which other general hospitals have started. It is a locked ward where patients who misbehave are kept for anywhere from a week to a month or longer. Ambulatory patients may leave under escort to go to mess, to their physical reconditioning classes and to chapel on Sunday. They may have visitors in the late afternoon but not in the evening.

The ward has only 13 beds, a small proportion to the 1,600 beds for soldier patients at the main hospital. When I visited it I found 6 men there, all their records showed, because they had gone A. W. O. L., had been found intoxicated in the ward or had been brought back from Washington drunk.

The administrative officers insist patients are not sent to the enforced treatment ward as a form of discipline, but the men call it "the clink" and consider it a blot on a man's record. I heard of the ward from three amputees who were put there last fall following an altercation with the new night nurse, who was "too GI," they said, and had trouble keeping order in the ward.

These three young men, whose record before and since has been good, were kept in the enforced treatment ward for a full week, even though the day nurse, who knew them well, told the executive officer that the new night nurse had picked the wrong three boys, and even though the regular ward doctor, who returned 2 days later after a leave, gave them a clean record.

Four months later, the three men were still smarting over the injustice they believed had been done them.

If the enforced treatment ward is a necessary device—and it may be for refractory patients—it should, it would seem to a civilian, be used with justice and discretion. The captain in the detachment of patients, who passes on all such cases, assured me, when I made my first inquiry, that he sees every patient before he is put in the ward and gives him a chance to tell his story. It turned out that he had not seen the three men in question. Two days after they were called before the executive officer of the hospital, who asked them no questions about what happened and simply told them they would be kept in the ward for a week.

At Forest Glen almost all the patients with whom I talked complained about one rule in particular. Since the men are not allowed to keep their uniforms in the wards, they must, when they return on a pass from Washington at midnight or before 1 a. m., trudge a hundred yards to the baggage room to exchange their uniforms for the red hospital suits all patients are required to wear on the post.

For an amputee who comes back tired, his stump aching after the long trip by two busses or taxi to and from the city, this trip to the baggage room seems the last straw. The men think they should be allowed to keep their uniforms in the ward at least until morning, as are the few men with bilateral amputations who are sent to Forest Glen.

The three administrative officers at the Glen explained that if uniforms are kept in the ward for any length of time at all, other men borrow them and go A. W. O. L.

These three officers, the only ones who issue orders at the Glen apart from the ward doctors responsible for medical care, took the position, "this is the Army. You have to be hard-boiled with these men. It will do them no good to be coddled."

A patient who had been discharged told me he had heard the warrant officer at Forest Glen, when inspecting the wards to see if the patients had properly cleaned and dusted them, say to a patient, "A worse cripple than you could have done a better job than that."

"We call each other cripples," the man who told me the story said, "but we don't want any able-bodied man who hasn't been shot at calling us cripples."

A civilian doctor who knows military hospitals and is a believer in psychosomatic medicine said in discussing patient morale, "Respect for the patient as a man and consideration for his injury ought to be instilled by the commanding officer into every member of the staff, down to the lowest ward boy. A cruel jibe thoughtlessly made can set back a man's recovery."

Photographs that show war casualties dancing, playing baseball, and doing everything short of performing on a flying trapeze, after being fitted with artificial limbs in one of the Army's seven amputation centers, while they picture authentic cases, often give a somewhat too optimistic picture of the average amputee's prospects.

Talk to men who have been discharged from Walter Reed General Hospital or who are still patients there, learning to use their prostheses, and you hear about the trouble some are having with their artificial legs. Not all complain of the provisional limb that the Army supplies, but a significant number do.

A man now discharged who had both legs amputated high in the thigh was grounded twice while home on furlough. His legs broke down because the hip joints of his prostheses were not strong enough. Once he had to crawl a third of a block to his own doorway.

A New York City man with an above-the-knee artificial limb, had trouble with his leg after discharge and was restricted to crutches until the Veterans' Administration shop in the Bronx could make his permanent limb.

The experience of these men is typical. Charles C. McGonegal, a veteran who lost both hands in the last war and who now puts in his time, as national field secretary of the American Legion, visiting the Army amputation centers and industries that employ the handicapped, told me the rate of minor break-down among men who have recently been fitted with their artificial legs is high.

Mr. McGonegal said the new user often abuses his leg—expects too much of it—or fails to take proper care of it. But he also made the point that up to 1945 practically no research work was begun to improve artificial limbs in this country.

At the Surgeon General's Office, Col. Leonard T. Peterson, who has been chief of the orthopedic branch for a year and half, conceded that there have been more minor break-downs in the Army leg in such parts as joints and rubber bumpers than there should be. He admitted that the hip joints which we received for a while were not adequate, and that the knee joints have needed strengthening.

The United States Bureau of Standards and the limb manufacturers have given valuable assistance to the Surgeon General's Office in preparation of new detailed specifications so that parts from different manufacturers will be of the highest quality and can be used interchangeably.

The Army is now experimenting with metal and plastic limbs in two amputee centers, but, Colonel Peterson added, it is too early to predict whether either of these materials will prove superior to the present fiber for the Army's provisional limb. The socket of all these limbs will be identical and will be adjustable to allow for stump shrinkage and readjustment.

Asked why the Army had been so slow in improving artificial limbs, Colonel Peterson said, "It takes a certain length of time to test a program and to make necessary improvements." He said that the present type of limb was adopted after approval by the National Research Council and had received frequent favorable comment by authorities in this and other countries. He added that the first amputation centers were only designated in March, 1943, that "the amputation load has been heavy for little over a year and in recent months we have made noticeable improvements."

He thought the manufacturers should not be too much criticized for their failure to do research work and turn out a better product. Most of them have small businesses, he pointed out, and research takes money and time.

On the face of it, it seems surprising that the Association of Limb Manufacturers, whose members control the market, has failed to carry on research with a view to producing more serviceable prostheses for mass production in time of national emergencies. There must be a large market for improved limbs, since 1,849,000 people in this country have orthopedic impairments.

As long ago as 1942 the annual convention of the American Legion adopted a resolution which stated: "Improvement in the manufacturing of artificial limbs has not kept pace with mechanical progress shown in

many other phases of engineering; progress cannot be expected because the manufacturers have neither the resources nor the equipment to engage in the extensive research engineering work unless Government agencies will assist so that scientific talent can be applied in solving this urgent and important problem."

The Surgeon General's office is convinced of the necessity for research and since early this year has been moving rapidly in this direction. * * *

Very fine research has already been done in the development of arm protheses by the Northrup Aviation Co., Hawthorne, Calif. It was started at the request of Lt. Col. John J. Loutzenheiser, orthopedic consultant of the Ninth Service Command. John K. Northrup supervised the research and assigned to the job eight full-time engineers, mechanics, and machinists.

Mr. Northrup's laboratory has also developed a pronater appliance which gives a man with an artificial arm a rotating wrist. McGonegal, who now uses one of these appliances, is able to do almost anything with his artificial wrist and metal claw that the average person can with his hand. He is convinced that Northrup or some other company could do equally brilliant research work on artificial legs.

The minimum to be expected of artificial legs is that they be strong enough to hold a man up and to allow for normal activity. If a discharged serviceman leaves the hospital with a leg that soon breaks down, he may be humiliated in a bus or streetcar. A more serious matter, he will be discouraged at the outset in his search for a job—or if he has already started on a job he will have the disheartening experience of returning to his crutches or of being grounded at home.

OPA Proposes Bean Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received copy of a discussion of the food problem by Sam Pettengill, former Member of Congress, from the State of Indiana, and now author of articles bearing the caption "Inside Your Congress."

Under date of June 12, Mr. Pettengill discusses the subject of "beans" and calls attention to the fact that present OPA policies will produce a bean shortage just as those policies are responsible for scarcity of food in other directions. Mr. Pettengill approaches this subject of beans in a very interesting fashion and his article is as follows:

BEANS AND BOWLES

Meat and butter are going into the total eclipse of big government. In the gathering gloom I shall, as Churchill remarked of Spain, say "some kind words" about beans.

Due to OPA's neglect of the humble bean, the Farm Bureau reports that bean acreage in New York is being reduced 40 percent or more. And New York normally grows three-quarters of the Nation's crop of red kidney beans.

With beans one of the best protein food substitutes for meat, our protein hungry people will want to know the reason why. It is due to OPA's holding down the ceiling on beans. Yet with meat disappearing from human gaze, would not our housewives be glad to pay a few cents more for an abundance of beans especially when beans normally cost only one-fifth to one-tenth as much as meat?

This is nothing against chops and steaks if they could be had. The point is that OPA bungling is largely responsible for the shortage of both meat and one of its best vegetable substitutes. With manpower a problem on the farm front, it is interesting to note that dry beans provide more human food for a day's labor than any other crop, on stalks or hoofs, except soybeans, wheat, and corn. One day's labor will produce 5 times as many pounds of beans as pork, and 7 pounds of beans for each pound of milk.

Consider the mute, meek bean, my friends. No poet ever wrote a sonnet on the bean; no oil painting of the beautiful bean adorns our galleries; no sculptured marble bean rises majestic in our public squares; nor have we ever been lulled to reverie by a symphony in bean minor. This is grossly unjust. For truly the sturdy bean has served Britain better than Wellington, and America better than Bowles. Melt up the bronze generals, turn the portraits of bureaucrats to the wall, but give the bean its place in the sun.

If I forget the meek and lowly bean, may my right hand forget its cunning.

Senator ROBERT WAGNER tells us that we must be of good cheer and sing hosannas to OPA until 1950 at least. God forbid! America's 5-year plan! Keep up this planned economy and Russia will surely win the war. Secretary Morgenthau wants 10,000 more sleuths, detectives and dicks to run down the income tax evaders, already in the black market. By 1950 they will be legion, and gangsters will run America. Mr. Morgenthau even hints at authority to open safe deposit boxes and plumb mattresses to their secret depths.

Those who cheat on income tax when we are fighting a war (or at any other time) deserve to get the works. But the real cure for black markets is production, production, production. And the key to production is price. Price causes men to produce things which are scarce, and ample production holds down price.

Production is a better remedy for inflation than jails.

During World War I, price more than doubled New York's bean acreage. We paid a little more, but we had beans. And the black market was practically unknown.

In defense of OPA it is said that it protects the pocketbook of the serviceman's wife while he is fighting for $50 a month. There is some truth in this, but it is subject to qualifications. 1. Can she get what she needs in the white market? 2. As more commodities enter the black market will not her benefits level off? 3. How important to her and her children are the morale and crime conditions of the community in which she lives?

In the long run and for the Nation as a whole, it is doubtful indeed if ceiling prices are better than prices made by a free market. OPA is nothing but a temporary dam. Behind it the water of billions of purchasing power is rising. The more dollars artificially held back from the market now, the greater the final flood.

If you taught your parrot to say "supply and demand," he could answer every economic question which is really important.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana has rendered a great public service in defending the humble bean against the machination of the boys who believe in the doctrine of scarcity. In this connection I noticed a newspaper article yesterday indicating that someone had discovered that there might be a lousy Communist hid away over in OPA. Of course, the policy-making boys have tried to soft pedal this "big news" item but they have not succeeded very well. We have always been under the impression that the Communists and those wonderful fellow travelers were as thick over in the Office of Price Administration as fleas on a dog's back.

It would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to really find out just how many of those fellows are helping shape the policy of this Government bureau. I hope that the matter is thoroughly investigated.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers, of America on H. R. 2232, a bill providing for a permanent FEPC:

PRESENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF BOILERMAKERS, IRON SHIP BUILDERS AND HELPERS OF AMERICA ON H. R. 2232, A BILL PROVIDING FOR A PERMANENT FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, there is pending before the Congress of the United States a bill officially designated as H. R. 2232 and captioned "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry."

Before final action is taken on this bill by the Congress, the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, affiliated with American Federation of Labor, an organization composed of approximately 500,000 members employed in the railroad shops, ship yards, boiler manufacturing and repair plants, and in the construction field in the installation of power plants, petroleum refineries, and numerous similar pressure vessels made from steel and iron, with about 700 local lodges all over the United States, the Canal Zone, Hawaii, and Canada, respectfully requests the privilege of presenting certain facts and conclusions for the consideration of every Member of Congress in support of its opposition to certain features of said bill.

At the outset, we desire to state that the boilermakers union has always been in full accord with the traditional policy of the American Federation of Labor to the effect that there shall be no discrimination against any worker in regard to hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin; that no Negro member has ever been so discriminated against by the boilermakers union, and no Negro member has ever charged that as a member he has been discriminated against in regard to hire, terms, or conditions of employment because he was a Negro.

HISTORICAL

For many years the Boilermakers' International Union did not accept into membership any person who was not "a white, free-born male citizen of some civilized country."

However, at our Sixteenth Consolidated Convention held in September 1937 that policy was changed and provision was made for the organizing of colored workers of our trade into what were called auxiliary unions. This policy was arrived at after long consideration and was a compromise between two conflicting schools of thought in our organization as to the advisability of the admission of Negroes. The policy was eminently satisfactory until a huge influx of Negro workers were admitted to the closed-shop shipyards of the Pacific coast; whereupon a well-organized campaign was commenced by certain unscrupulous persons, for purposes of their own and for the purpose of causing those Negro workers to believe that they were being discriminated against in their employment by the Boilermakers' International Union. In furtherance of that campaign, carried on largely by agitators who were not members of the boilermakers' union, and who did not have the economic welfare of the Negro workers at heart, utterly false representations were made and litigation was commenced, based upon the assertion that under the auxiliary lodge set-up discrimination was possible. In the litigation that followed, as well as at the hearings conducted by the Fair Employment Practice Committee, there was no evidence that as a matter of fact there had been any discrimination against any Negro worker "in regard to hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment."

In the fall of 1943 the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, organized in compliance with Executive Order No. 9346, took cognizance of the said unfair campaign of misrepresentation and held hearings on the Pacific coast involving the boilermakers' union, and a number of its auxiliaries and some of the shipbuilding corporations with which the boilermakers' union had closed-shop agreements. As a result of those hearings, the FEPC issued a directive against the boilermakers' union and the said shipbuilding corporations, commanding the boilermakers' union to change its auxiliary lodge set-up in certain particulars which the committee found could result in discrimination such as was prohibited by Executive Order No. 9346.

A copy of the pertinent sections of said directive order is hereto attached and marked exhibit A.

In spite of the fact that the auxiliary lodge system had not resulted in discrimination against any Negro member "in regard to hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment" the Boilermakers' International Union, at its regular convention in January 1944, in Kansas City, Mo., effected certain changes in its policy in an effort to satisfy the membership of the FEPC. Thereafter, and on May 23, 1944, Mr. Charles J. MacGowan, international president of the boilermakers' union, wrote Mr. Malcolm Ross, chairman of FEPC, informing him of said changes and pointing out other facts with reference to said directive order and requesting that said directive order be withdrawn. A copy of said letter of May 23 is hereto attached and marked exhibit B.

Whereupon Mr. Ross replied, on September 11, 1944, stating that Mr. MacGowan's explanation of May 23 was satisfactory, with the exception of three items of the directive order. A copy of said letter of September 11, 1944, is hereto attached and marked exhibit C. An excerpt from said letter is as follows:

"As to the three remaining items lettered a, c, and d in the committee's finding No. 3, the committee does not feel that your statement adequately disposes of the issues involved. The committee will appreciate a report from you indicating what further steps to adjust these items have been taken since your letter of May 23, 1944."

"To adjust these items" it was necessary that the by-laws of the auxiliary lodges be changed so as to take the auxiliary lodges entirely out from under any supervision of the white subordinate lodges. Despite the fact that no Negro member was being discriminated against "in regard to hire, tenure, terms or conditions of employment," but for the purpose of complying with the strained construction placed upon Executive Order No. 9346 by the FEPC, the International Executive Council of the Union was called into session in January 1945, and authorized the international president to write Mr. Malcolm Ross on February 10, 1945, as follows:

"The auxiliary lodges mentioned in your committee's directives and the other auxiliary lodges in the States of California, Oregon and Washington, and other auxiliary lodges, as expeditiously as it is possible will be dissolved and rechartered as regular subordinate lodges of this Brotherhood with full autonomy subject to the controls defined in the international lodge constitution and the policies determined by the international convention and/or the executive council in conformity with the constitution, as are all other subordinate lodges."

President MacGowan and the international executive council has a right to believe that the said proposal would end the controversy, but such was not to be the case.

The committee, although specifically limiting its further objections by its letter of September 11, 1944, which the union specifically agreed to remove by its proposal of February 10, 1945, failed to act upon that proposal until March 17, 1945, despite the fact that during that interim the union clamored for a decision, while calling the committee's attention to the fact that several hundred thousand men were waiting. In true bureaucratic style the committee delayed until March 17, and then issued a brief statement that the offer of compliance of the union was insufficient and announced that it would, at a later date, set forth its reasons for the refusal. Again the Committee waited until April 4, 1945, to issue a statement of its so-called reasons. That statement based its refusal upon an issue that the union had every reason to believe had been closed by the correspondence of May 23 and September 11, 1944, hereinabove referred to, to wit, the issue of admitting Negroes into the white lodges. Mr. Boris Shiskin, member of the committee, filed a minority statement in which he pointed out that it was not necessary, in order "to eliminate discrimination in this regard to hire, tenure, terms or conditions of employment," to admit Negroes into the white lodges of the union. The said statement of the majority of the committee, and the statement of Mr. Shiskin, are hereto attached and marked exhibit D. That the statement of the majority of the committee is a mesh of false and superficial reasons is shown by an analysis of the statement hereto attached and marked exhibit E.

It is impossible for the union to comply with the order of the committee, that Negroes be admitted into the white lodges, and maintain its organization. Many of the lodges are located throughout the South, and in those lodges and many in the North and West, there is a membership that will not remain, if Negroes are admitted. The friction that would result would be calamitous to the welfare of the Negroes, the industry, and the public.

The union has offered the same facilities for the attainment of economic welfare to the Negro members, that are possessed by the white members.

The law of the Federal jurisdiction and of every State therein requires no more. Whether the objective to be sought is education, transportation, housing or wages and working conditions, the courts have invariably held that the law is satisfied with the furnishing of equal facilities.

The earliest reported case is *Robert* v. *City of Boston* (5 Cushing 198), decided by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts in 1849, in which the right of a school committee to segregate Negroes was upheld. In that case the Supreme Court of Massachusetts said:

"It is urged that this maintenance of separate schools tends to deepen and perpetuate the odious distinction of class founded in deep-rooted prejudice in public opinion. This prejudice, if it exists, was not created by law and probably cannot be changed by law."

A leading case in the Federal jurisdiction is *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, 16 Supreme Court Reporter 1138. That was a case dealing with the right of the State of Louisiana to provide separate railroad compartments for whites and Negroes. It was charged that the Louisiana statute was unconstitutional, in that it was a violation of the "equal protection" section of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The Supreme Court said:

"The object of the amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but, in the nature of things, it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political, equality, or a commingling of the two races on terms unsatisfactory to either."

The law of the Plessy case has never been modified by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In its controversy with the boilermakers' union, the FEPC seeks to avoid the edict of these decisions by claiming some imaginary nonexistent economic advantage to the members of white local lodges over the members of Negro local lodges. No such advantage exists or would exist. All are members of the international union and the international union negotiates all of the employer-employees contracts. The Committee seems to think that by the mere waving of its magic wand, it can socially amalgamate the white and Negro workers in this great union and this great industry, when in its entire history Negroes have not been members of the white lodges. The Committee holds as nothing the wise announcement of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, which in 1849 said:

"This prejudice, if it exists, was not created by law and probably cannot be changed by law."

COMMENTS ON H. R. 2232

The proponents of H. R. 2232 seek to enact into law the objectives of Executive Order No. 9346. Insofar as those objectives are to "eliminate discrimination in regard to hire, tenure, terms or conditions of employment, because of race, creed, color, or national origin," the Boilermakers' Union is in thorough accord. The Boilermakers' Union is in thorough accord with the objective of eliminating discrimination in regard to union membership because of race, creed, color, or national origin, but it is sure that it is not necessary that Negroes be admitted into the local lodges of the white workers in order to insure their economic equality.

We have given you the above history of the controversy between FEPC and the Boilermakers' Union in order that you may know of the extreme lengths to which any committee can go in interpreting the congressional act, should H. R. 2232 in its present form become a law.

We are cognizant of the fact that in Report No. 187, the committee of the House of Representatives, to which H. R. 2232 has been committed, said:

"Let it be clearly understood this bill has for its purpose economic opportunity only. The opponents of the bill are attempting to confuse the issue by bringing up the question of social equality. We repeat there is nothing in the bill concerned with anything other than economic equality."

That is what the Boilermakers' Union and the entire public had a right to believe the President had in mind when he promulgated Executive Order No. 9346, but the committee appointed to administer the policy of the order has interpreted the order to mean that a labor union must do more than "eliminate discrimination in regard to hire, tenure, terms or conditions of employment," and must admit Negroes into white local unions, where such admission is not necessary for the effectuation of the objective of the order.

H. R. 2232 contains the following provision:

"SEC. 5. (b) It shall be an unfair employment practice for the purpose of this act for any labor union—

"(1) To deny full membership rights and privileges to any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry."

The bill should be so amended as to make it impossible for any administrator of the act to force Negro members into white local lodges where the membership available offers the Negro economic opportunity equal to that of the white members.

Section 6 (2) of the bill provides that the Commission shall have power—

"To cooperate with or utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services."

That is, in our opinion, a most dangerous provision, for the reason that the bill in the first instance takes from voluntary unincorporated associations the right of selectivity of membership and control over the internal affairs of such voluntary associations. It then passes this police power to a permanent statutory body to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which Commission in turn may delegate certain of its powers at its own discretion to other voluntary agencies; so that it would be possible for the permanent FEPC to designate a rival or dual organization to investigate the American Federation of Labor, or even to appoint the Urban League or the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to investigate the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America. Such delegation of the powers of a lawful agency of Government is most certainly the introduction of an entirely new philosophy into our American way of life, and is without question fraught with serious implications.

CONCLUSION

The International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, despite its loyalty to our Government, its tremendous contribution to the war effort—because the records will show that work suspensions by our membership during the war period have been virtually nonexistent—and notwithstanding our intense devotion to the Nation and its ideals—cannot help but feel that we have been harassed, discriminated against, caused tremendous expense because of the litigation, and in many ways held up to public scorn by a temporary war agency which has lost entire sight of its real mission and has launched upon a heresy-hunting, witch-burning expedition which has made no contribution whatsoever to the war effort, but in many respects has impeded the production of the implements necessary to successfully wage the conflict.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, by its President,

CHAS. J. MACGOWAN,
International President.

EXHIBIT A

EXECUTIVE ORDER 9346, FURTHER AMENDING EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 8802 BY ESTABLISHING A NEW COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE AND DEFINING ITS POWERS AND DUTIES

In order to establish a new Committee on Fair Employment Practice, to promote the fullest utilization of all available manpower, and to eliminate discriminatory employment practices, Executive Order No. 8802, of June 25, 1941, as amended by Executive Order No. 8823, of July 18, 1941, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Whereas the successful prosecution of the war demands the maximum employment of all available workers regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the war effort by all persons in the United States regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders; and

"Whereas there is evidence that available and needed workers have been barred from employment in industries engaged in war production solely by reason of their race, creed, color, or national origin, to the detriment of the prosecution of the war, the workers' morale, and national unity;

"Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I do hereby reaffirm the policy of the United States that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of any person in war industries or in government by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin, and I do hereby declare that it is the duty of all employers, including the several Federal departments and agencies, and all labor organizations, in furtherance of this policy and of this order, to eliminate discrimination in regard of hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, or union membership because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"It is hereby ordered as follows:

"1. All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter negotiated or renegotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, and requiring him to include similar provision in all subcontracts.

"2. All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for war production shall take all measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"3. There is hereby established in the Office of Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President a Committee on Fair Employment Practice, hereinafter referred to as the Committee, which shall consist of a Chairman and not more than six other members to be appointed by the President. The Chairman shall receive such salary as shall be fixed by the President, not exceeding $10,000 per year. The other members of the Committee shall receive necessary traveling expenses and, unless their compensation is otherwise prescribed by the President, a per diem allowance not exceeding $25 per day and subsistence expenses on such days as they are actually engaged in the performance of duties pursuant to this order.

"4. The Committee shall formulate policies to achieve the purposes of this order and shall make recommendations to the various Federal departments and agencies and to the President which it deems necessary and proper to make effective the provisions of this order. The Committee shall also recommend to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission appropriate measures for bringing about the full utilization and training of manpower in and for war production without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"5. The Committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination forbidden by this order. It may conduct hearings, make findings of fact, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

"6. Upon the appointment of the Committee and the designation of its Chairman, the Fair Employment Practice Committee established by Executive Order No. 8802, of June 25, 1941, hereinafter referred to as the old Committee, shall cease to exist. All records and property of the old Committee and such unexpended balances of allocation or other funds available for its use as the Director of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Committee. The Committee shall assume jurisdiction over all complaints and matters pending before the old Committee and shall conduct such investigations and hearings as may be necessary in the performance of its duties under this order.

"7. Within the limits of the funds which may be made available for that purpose, the Chairman shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel and make provision for such supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out this order. The Committee may utilize the services and facilities of other Federal departments and agencies and such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. The Committee may accept the services of State and local authorities and officials, and may perform the functions and duties and exercise the powers conferred upon it by this order through such officials and agencies and in such manner as it may determine.

"8. The Committee shall have the power to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be appropriate or necessary to carry out the provisions of this order.

"9. The provisions of any other pertinent Executive order inconsistent with this order are hereby superseded.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

"THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1943.*"

EXHIBIT B

MAY 23, 1944.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE,
Standard Oil Building,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention: Mr. Malcolm Ross.)

GENTLEMEN: In conformity with our understanding of this date I am submitting herewith our detailed answer to the directives issued by the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice on or about December 9, 1943, addressed to several of our local unions on the west coast and to several shipyards in the same area. Inasmuch as these directives deal only with certain of our auxiliaries on the Pacific coast, the answers herewith submitted are likewise confined to the operation of the auxiliaries within the scope of your committee's directives. I make this stipulation for the reason that conditions in other sections of the country might vary slightly from those obtaining in the Pacific coast shipyards. I shall now direct my answers to the several questions raised under your third finding and the letter designation appearing on the left-hand margin of each answer corresponds with the same letter margin of your findings.

(a) Auxiliary lodges elect all their own officers, including a business representative, where they have sufficient finances to maintain one, just the same as any other subordinate lodge of the brotherhood. Their meetings are conducted in accordance with our standard ritual and in conformity with the international constitution and the auxiliary bylaws. The only requirement being that the business agent of the sponsoring local, where one is maintained, or the president of such local, shall attend all auxiliary meetings for the purpose of giving advice and direction to the deliberations of the auxiliary

members who, for the most part, are unfamiliar with the laws and policies of the brotherhood or the trade-union movement.

(b) The cause of complaint contained in item B of your directive has now been completely eliminated because the Seventeenth Consolidated Convention of our brotherhood held January 31 to February 9, 1944, made provisions for the seating of delegates from auxiliary lodges in subsequent conventions of the brotherhood.

(c) Auxiliary lodges, when they elect officers and if they have sufficient income with which to defray the salary and expenses of a business agent, may elect one, and some auxiliary lodges have already done so.

(d) In the particular shipyards to which your directive applies the grievance machinery does not consist of a grievance committee, but the method of handling grievances is by the appointment of a shop steward for gangs or subdivisions of gangs, and each auxiliary lodge appoints its own shop stewards, who hold regular meetings for the purpose of determining what grievances are bona fide and should be processed with management and what grievances are without merit and should be discarded. The grievances of merit are handled with the immediate supervision, in most cases this includes the assistant superintendent. Failing of adjustment there, it is turned over to the auxiliary's business agent, where one exists; if not, then it is turned over to the business agent of the sponsoring local who in turn handles it with the higher officials of the company, very frequently with auxiliary stewards sitting in the conferences. The same attention is given to the grievances of auxiliary members as that given any other member, for a violation of an agreement by management is just as serious from our standpoint whether the violation affects an auxiliary member or a subordinate lodge member, the effect is the same in that our general conditions are broken down if not corrected.

(e) There is no denial of the right of opportunity to change the classifications of auxiliary members. Every auxiliary member who is receiving the mechanic's rate of pay and performing mechanic's work is entitled to, and does receive, a change of classification and should any auxiliary local or sponsoring local undertake to deny to an individual member the right of a change of classification the appeal provisions of the constitution up to the international president, the executive council, and finally the convention are at the disposal of every dues-paying member. Personally, as the international president, I would not tolerate any such attempt to defeat the plain intent and purpose of our constitution or our collective-bargaining agreements.

(f) Auxiliary members may transfer their membership to other auxiliaries and if no auxiliary exists in the locality where an auxiliary member has gone to work he may deposit his clearance card with the international secretary-treasurer and pay his dues direct to the international secretary or through the secretary of the local union.

(g) With respect to the insurance premiums and benefits, our last convention corrected this complaint by extending to the auxiliary membership the same premium rate and the same benefits as that enjoyed by members of subordinate lodges, and our contract with the insurance company has been revised to that extent, even though this may mean that our general membership may have to absorb an additional cost due to the higher death rate among auxiliary members.

(h) In the shipyards covered by your directives, there is not now a well-established apprenticeship system in vogue. If one should be worked out later the same privileges of apprenticeship will be extended to auxiliary members as that enjoyed by subordinate lodge members. In the meantime, however, the trainee program operates with the same even-handed justice to both types of membership with the result that at least the majority of the auxiliary membership now employed in west coast shipyards are classified and paid as mechanics.

(i) There is no difference in the treatment accorded auxiliary members than that which is accorded subordinate lodge members for misconduct in lodge meetings including intoxication. This is a matter controlled by our international lodge constitution and applies equally to both types of membership.

(j) Our new constitution adopted at the seventeenth consolidated convention reads: "Citizen of some civilized country who has reached the age of 16 years and working in some branch of the trade at the time of making application."

This language will appear in both the subordinate lodge constitution and the auxiliary lodge constitution so that there is no issue on this point.

I have therefore, in detail, set forth above and answered the allegations upon which your complaint was founded and which is contained in your directives. I might add this further thought as the official position of our international brotherhood.

First. There has not been and there will not be any discrimination in the hiring of men because of race, color, creed, or national origin.

Second. There has not been and there will not be any discrimination over the length or tenure of employment of any worker regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Third. There has not been and there will not be any discrimination against any worker enjoying the full benefits of our collective bargaining agreements. This includes wages, seniority, training, upgrading, vacations with pay, the handling of grievances, and all other matters embraced within a collective bargaining agreement applies with the same force and effect to all workers regardless of race, creed, color, and national origin.

I might also point out in addition to the foregoing that our International union first opened its doors to the Negro worker of our trade in the 1937 convention, long before the war and long before there was any so-called Negro issue. Again in 1944 we advanced several strides more in the direction of eliminating real or fancied injustices and it is fair to assume that future conventions of our organization will go still further in this direction so that evenually all cause of complaint will be eliminated. However, attacks upon us by both whites and Negroes have already and will continue to inflame and breed resentment to the extent that a calm, judicial disposition of this problem will not be possible to the same degree that it would be if the natural evolutionary processes were permitted to work. We are deeply and vitally concerned with the well-being and the happiness and the advancement of every person who works at our trade, regardless of the color of their skin, and if left to ourselves without being annoyed with lawsuits and rabble-rousing public condemnation which is both unfortunate and unfounded we will in due time find a solution which will bring satisfaction and contentment to all members of our International Brotherhood, regardless of race, creed, color, and national origin.

Very respectfully submitted.

CHAS. J. MACGOWAN,
International President.

EXHIBIT C

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 11, 1944

Mr. CHARLES J. MACGOWAN,
International President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, Kansas City, Kans.

DEAR MR. MACGOWAN: Since the receipt of your letter of May 23, 1944, in which you set forth the present position of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers with reference to the status of auxiliaries and the members thereof, the committee has given careful consideration to its contents and has attempted to appraise the same in the light of all the evidence which has been made available to it.

The committee has directed me to advise you as follows:

1. Your statement of May 23, 1944, indicates that policies have been announced which, when made effective, will adjust the complaints referred to in items (b), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), listed in the committee's finding No. 3. The committee will appreciate a further report from you indicating whether the announced policies have been made effective.

2. As to the three remaining items lettered (a), (c), and (d) in the committee's finding No. 3, the committee does not feel that your statement adequately disposes of the issues involved. The committee will appreciate a report from you indicating what further steps to adjust these items have been taken since your letter of May 23, 1944.

3. Because of the basic and fundamental character of the issues involved in items (a), (c), and (d) referred to above, the committee takes the position that, pending their satisfactory adjustment the policies and practices of the International Brotherhood are not in conformity with national policy as reaffirmed in Executive Order 9346.

Sincerely yours,

MALCOLM ROSS,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT D

STATEMENT OF BASIS FOR COMMITTEE'S DECISION OF MARCH 17, 1945, IN RE BOILERMAKERS' PROPOSAL OF FEBRUARY 10, 1945

Under date of February 10, 1945, Mr. Charles J. MacGowan, international president of the boilermakers' union, advised the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice that the international executive council of the union, at a meeting in Kansas City in January, authorized him to so change the laws and practices of the union as to eliminate certain discriminatory features proscribed by the Committee in a decision issued December 9, 1943. Mr. MacGowan proposed accomplishment of these changes, as follows:

" * * * the auxiliary lodges mentioned in your Committee's directives and the other auxiliary lodges in the State of California, Oregon, and Washington, and other auxiliary lodges, as expeditiously as it is possible will be dissolved and rechartered as regular subordinate lodges of this brotherhood with full autonomy subject to the controls defined in the international lodge constitution and the policies determined by the international convention and/or the executive council in conformity with the constitution, as are all other subordinate lodges."

On February 20, 1945, Mr. Clif Langsdale, general counsel for the union, met with the Committee's Chairman and members of its staff "to explore the applicability of the proffer of compliance" with the Committee's direction as made in Mr. MacGowan's letter.

On March 13, 1945, Mr. Langsdale wrote to the Committee further eludicating upon the manner in which members from the proposed Negro and white lodges in the same area, working for the same employer, or in the same plant, would be dispatched to the employer for the purpose of employment.

The union's proffer of compliance presents the question as to whether the proposed changes in the policies and practices of the union, if put into operation, will guarantee to Negro workers affected thereby rights and privileges in regard to hire, tenure, terms of employment and union membership equal to those guaranteed to white workers similarly subject to the jurisdiction of the union.

The union has submitted this proposal for approval by the Committee. It contends that such proposal, when made effective, will constitute compliance with the Committee's directives. Implicit in Committee's directives was the intent that compliance therewith would take a form which would eliminate discrimination forbidden by the Executive order. It was not intended that substitution of another type of discrimination for that resulting from the auxiliary system would constitute satisfactory compliance either with the directives or the Executive order. Thus, it is necessary to analyze the proffer made by the union, not only superficially, but substantively.

The question must be considered in the light of the fundamental nature and purposes of the collective bargaining process and the rights and privileges generally recognized as accruing to workers thereunder, with special reference to the fact that the labor-management contract involved here is a closed-shop contract.

It was in this frame of reference that the Committee, upon consideration of the matter at its meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio, March 17, 1945, determined:

"The steps taken, and the proposals made by the Union do not constitute compliance with the Committee's directives, and * * * a detailed statement of the basis for the Committee's decision will be submitted to the union as soon as possible, with the view to further action on the part of the international to effect full compliance with the Committee's directives."

The above mentioned "detailed statement of the basis for the Committee's decision" is as follows:

(1) The proposed division of members of the union into separate lodges on a basis of race alone, assuming that the Negro lodges are represented in the metal-trades councils and district lodges under the identical terms and conditions as white lodges, denies to Negro war workers, members of union, essential equality in collective bargaining in regard to their hire, tenure, and terms of employment.

That part of the collective bargaining process having to do with negotiations of the labor-management contracts is not an issue in these cases. These contracts, between the metal trades councils and international unions affiliated therewith, on the one hand, and the various shipyards, on the other, were executed prior to the date of the complaints here. It is in the day-to-day application of these contracts to the individual workers through the subordinate lodge bargaining representatives, however, that the nature of the union representation afforded members, or prospective members, of Negro lodges as compared with that afforded members, or prospective members, of white lodges becomes a paramount consideration.

The proposal contemplates that workers, solely because of their race, would be members of different lodges in the same collective bargaining unit.

Such system of dual representation based upon race is inconsistent with the principle of majority rule as interpreted and applied by those agencies of government charged with administration of our labor relations laws. In addition, and more important to the issue here, such system facilitates and encourages the very practices which the committee and the union seek to eliminate. As foreseen by the predecessor to the present National Labor Relations Board, where an employer undertakes to deal with both a majority and minority bargaining representative in the same unit, dangerous consequences are portended. Division of workers within the same craft or industrial unit into separate locals of the same union, or separate craft organizations, when accomplished along racial lines merely accentuates the evil consequences.

A concrete illustration of the facility with which a structure such as is here proposed subverts the rights of an individual and lends itself to discrimination, is presented in Mr. MacGowan's suggestion of a common-sense method by which workers would be dispatched to jobs:

"If there are 200 whites and 20 Negroes unemployed and the employer asks for 50 men, then both the whites and the Negroes would be allocated in their proper percentage to the jobs open.

"We would not permit all of the 20 Negroes to go to work and only 30 whites, neither would we permit 45 or 50 whites to go to work and few, if any, Negroes. The mechanics of how this would be worked out might differ slightly in each port area, but this office would see to it that the principle of fair play was maintained."

Such description obviously contemplates job referrals based upon racial quotas or percentages. Thus, an individual's opportunity to be dispatched for employment would be based upon the artificial criterion of race or color and not upon his individual qualification or any other similarly pertinent objective factor. In the matter of McQuay-Norris Manufacturing Co. the committee clearly stated its position:

"Validation of a race 'quota' system of employment would be inconsistent with the individual protection against discrimination by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin to any person in war industries and Government afforded by Executive Order 9346. It is apparent that qualified, available, and needed workers can be denied employment under the operation of a quota system when the share allotted to their race group has been filled.

"Consequently, such a system works to the disadvantage of individuals in both minority and majority groups by providing that consideration of race rather than qualifications and availability shall operate as the criterion for hiring an employee. We cannot permit the rationals of the Executive order to be so subverted."

It is inevitable in the area from which these cases came that there will be some conflicts of interest between the members of the white and proposed Negro lodges. In the resolution of these conflicts the Negro lodge, even though it has equal status under the constitution and bylaws of the international, perforce represents a minority view to the employer. It may be suggested that the minority would be equally disadvantaged if there were but one lodge. However, provided a forum for discussion of union problems on a basis of objective interests rather than artificial racial considerations, it is in keeping with the basic concept of our democratic institutions that the minority may influence a sufficient proportion of the majority and thus achieve adoption of its viewpoint. Experts in the field of labor relations recognize that only by equal membership and equal voice in formulation of the decision of the majority union representative does the individual achieve the full measure of participation.

(2) The proposed establishment of separate subordinate lodges for Negro and white members of the union, assuming equal stature of such separate lodges under the constitution and bylaws of the International Brotherhood, does not accord Negro war workers equal terms and conditions of employment and discriminates against them because of their race or color.

Under a closed-shop contract, as here involved, it is both a condition prerequisite to obtaining employment and an agreed condition of maintaining employment that the worker join and remain in good standing with the union. This is at once a present burden upon and a present benefit to the worker. Union membership as a condition of employment under a closed-shop contract is as much a term and condition of employment as provisions for vacations, group insurance, hospitalization or any other nonmonetary benefit the worker gets out of his job. The worker gets the right to all these as well as to his monetary wage the instant he enters upon his employment. With union membership thus essential to employment, the rights, privileges, and benefits incidental to that membership are "terms" and "conditions" of employment the same as if spelled out in the employment contract itself or, indeed, in the collective-bargaining agreement and any discrimination with respect thereto is within the prohibitions of Executive Order No. 9346.

One of the rights, or benefits, which the boilermakers' union confers upon a worker at the moment of joining the union is the right of universal transfer—the right of a member in good standing to transfer his membership, including full participation in the affairs of the union, to the subordinate lodge having jurisdiction in any territory to which the member might go for employment.

It is clear from the correspondence and minutes of conferences between the committee and the international president and general counsel of the union that, under the proposal here being considered, it would be established as the policy of the union to limit and restrict the right of universal transfer by racial considerations. Thus, a Negro union member may exercise his right of transfer only to another Negro lodge and a white member may exercise his right of transfer only to another white lodge. Superficially such limitation may appear equal. Substantive analysis indicates that it is not.

There are approximately 600 boilermaker lodges. Of this number, approximately 40 are auxiliary lodges, which, under the union's proposal, would become Negro subordinate lodges. Assuming effectuation of the proposal, a Negro worker who acquires union membership as a term or condition of his employment by one of the five shipyards involved here, receives a right of universal transfer presently limited to 40 lodges. On the other hand, a white worker similarly employed receives a right of universal transfer presently exercisable in 560 lodges. Consequently, the present value of a Negro member's right of universal transfer is substantially less than the value of the corresponding right received by a white worker employed in the same classification, who assumes the same obligations and responsibilities to the union as are assumed by the Negro worker.

This inequity in regard to terms or conditions of employment because of race or color constitutes a present discrimination in employment forbidden by Executive Order 9346. The fact that white union members are precluded from transferring to a Negro lodge does not eliminate the discrimination against Negroes, but establishes a parallel discrimination against whites.

FOOTNOTES

Background: On December 9, 1943, the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice issued its summary, findings, and directives relating to its examination of the complaints of Negro workers alleging discrimination in regard to hire, tenure, terms of employment, and union membership by the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Welders, and Helpers of America and certain west coast shipbuilding companies. The summary, findings, and directives include the following:

"3. The committee finds that the policies and practices of the union involved herein with respect to membership in the aforesaid auxiliary lodges * * * discriminate against Negroes in regard to hire, tenure, terms of employment, and union membership, solely because of race or color in the following respects:

"(a) The establishment, jurisdiction, and proceedings of the auxiliary are supervised

by and subject to the approval of the supervising local, from which the Negroes are excluded.

"(b) The auxiliary lodge and the members thereof are denied any voice or direct representation in the International convention, the supreme and final policy and rule-making body of the International Brotherhood and they are denied any voice or vote in the selection of delegates to said International convention.

"(c) The auxiliary lodge and its members are denied any voice or vote in the selection of the business agent of the supervising local, from which Negroes are excluded, although said business agent is designated to perform the functions of that office for the auxiliary lodge.

"(d) The auxiliary lodge and its members are denied any voice or vote in the selection of the grievance committee of the supervising local, from which Negroes are excluded, which committee is designated to perform the grievance function for said auxiliary and its members, except that the auxiliary is permitted to select one member to serve said grievance committee.

"(e) Members of the auxiliary lodge are denied the right and opportunity to change their classification except with the approval of the supervising local, from which Negroes are excluded.

"(f) Members of the auxiliary lodge are denied the right of universal transfer afforded to members of the supervising local, but may transfer their membership only to another auxiliary lodge.

"(g) Members of the auxiliary lodge are denied equal opportunities to purchase and receive insurance benefits for themselves and families, provided by the International Brotherhood for members of subordinate lodges and their families.

"(h) The auxiliary lodge is denied the right to receive apprentices, although these rights are afforded respectively to the supervising local and its members.

"(i) Members of the auxiliary lodge are subject to a penalty for misconduct (intoxication) not similarly provided for members of the supervising local.

"(j) Membership in the auxiliary lodge is restricted to Negro males between the ages of 16 and 60 years, whereas membership in the supervising local is extended to males between the ages of 16 and 70 years."

The committee directed that the union "take such necessary steps and put in course of execution such required procedures as will effect an elimination of the discriminatory policies and practices found to be in conflict with and in violation of Executive Order 9346."

Thereafter, conferences took place between international officers of the union and members of the committee culminating on May 23, 1944, in a letter from Mr. Charles J. MacGowan, international president of the union, to the committee containing a detailed answer to its directives and representing that the policies and practices of the union were in compliance therewith.

Pursuant to direction of the committee, the chairman on September 11, 1944, advised Mr. MacGowan that his statement of May 23, indicated that policies have been announced which, when made effective, will adjust the complaints referred to in items (b), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), listed in the committee's finding No. 3; that as to the three remaining items lettered (a), (c), and (d) the committee did not feel that his statement adequately disposed of the issues involved; and that because of the basic and fundamental character of the issues involved in items (a), (c), and (d) the committee took the position that, pending their satisfactory adjustment, the union's policies and practices were not in conformity with national policy as reaffirmed in the Executive order.

Mr. MacGowan's letter reads, in part, as follows:

"I am now in a position to report to you that the international executive council of the International Brotherhood, at a meeting in Kansas City in January of this year, authorized the international president to so change the laws and practices of the International Brotherhood as to eliminate the objections found by your Committee in the said directive orders under the headings "3. (a), (c), and (d)."

Summary, findings, and directives relating to International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Welders and Helpers of America, AFL Subordinate Lodge No. 92; Subordinate Lodge No. 72; Subordinate Lodge No. 401; Auxiliary Lodge No. A-35; and Auxiliary No. A-32. (Issued by order of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, December 9, 1943, cases Nos. 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 52, and 53.)

Mr. Langsdale, in his letter of March 13, 1945, also states:

"Mr. MacGowan informs me that there is absolutely no chance that the union will offer any more on the issue of universal transfers than has already been offered.

"The universal transfer phase of this problem was thoroughly explored at our meeting of February 20, in connection with President MacGowan's letter to you on that subject, with the result that the brotherhood proposes that Negroes shall have the right to universal transfer among Negro subordinate lodges, but not into white subordinate lodges. Should a Negro go into an area where there is no Negro subordinate lodge, he may put his card into the international office and pay his dues to the international secretary-treasurer, or he may leave it in the last Negro subordinate lodge with which he was affiliated and pay his dues into that lodge. If there are five or more Negroes in a community to which he goes, where there is no Negro subordinate lodge, they may apply for a charter from the international. There is no possibility that universal transfer privileges can be granted members of Negro subordinates into white subordinate lodges, except by action of the international convention, which is several years off."

The importance of this phase of the collective bargaining process is illustrated by the following quotation from a paper read by George W. Taylor, Vice Chairman (now Chairman) of the National War Labor Board, The Function of Collective Bargaining, before the Special Collective Bargaining Conference of the American Management Association, held at the Hotel Astor, New York, May 24, 1944:

"First, collective bargaining is based upon an agreement which essentially preserves the necessary functions of both parties and enunciates the general principles which are to govern their relationships.

"Second, and more important, collective bargaining encompasses the effectuation of these principles of the agreement in the day-to-day solutions of problems which arise."

The principle of majority rule in collective bargaining has been endorsed and adopted by Congress in our legislation pertaining to labor relations. The report on the National Labor Relations Act noted that "the underlying purposes of the majority rule principle are simple and just," (H. Rept. No. 1147, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 20) and that it is "sanctioned by our governmental practices, by business procedure, and by the whole philosophy of democratic institutions." (H. Rept. No. 573, 78th Cong., 1st sess., p. 13.)

The National Labor Relations Board has encountered the problem in a number of different settings. *In the Matter of Crescent Bed Co., Inc.* (29 N. L. R. B. 34, 36), "The company had refused to grant exclusive recognition to the United because of a contract between it and the Independent * * * covering all the colored employees of the company." The Board ruled that, "Since the contract * * * covers only the colored employees of the company and the act does not permit the establishment of a bargaining unit based solely on distinctions of color, we find that the contract between the Independent and the company is no bar to a determination of representatives." *In the Matter of Columbian Iron Works* (52 N. L. R. B., 370, 372, 374), the Board held that a contract with a union which admitted only white employees was not a bar to an election, holding that the contract did not cover an appropriate unit because a unit could not be based on racial considerations. *In the Matter of Utah Copper Co.* (35 N. L. R. B., 1295, 1300), the Board dismissed a petition for certification because the unit sought was inappropriate stating, "the IAM proposes to limit the machinists unit to white employees, a limitation we have held not permissible." *In the Matter of U. S. Bedding Co.* (52 N. L. R. B. 382, 387-388), the employer and the AFL objected to the establishment of an industrial unit on the ground that Negro employees in the unit outnumbered the white employees. The Board said, "a finding that the industrial unit is inappropriate because the majority of the employees in the unit are colored would be contrary to the spirit of the Executive order (Executive Order 9346) and the established principles of this Board." *In the Matter of Brashear Freight Lines, Inc.* (13 N. L. R. B. 191, 201), the Board dismissed a complaint based on charges of refusal to bargain, it appearing that the union lacked a majority in the unit when the Negro employees whom the union claimed were not properly within the unit were counted in the unit.

The most usual cases are those in which either the employer or one of the unions seeking certification asks to have a small group of colored employees excluded from the unit. The Board's oft-repeated denial of such a request is usually phrased, "We have consistently held that, absent a showing of differentiation in functions which would warrant their exclusion, we will not exclude employees from a unit upon racial considerations. No such differentiation was established in the instant case." *Matter of Tampa Florida Brewery, Inc.* (42 N.L.R.B., 642, 645-646); *Matter of Aetna Iron & Steel Co.* (35 N. L. R. B., 136, 138); *Matter of Southern Brewing Co., Inc.* (42 N. L. R. B., 642, 645-646). The Board has followed this policy throughout its history. *Matter of American Tobacco Co., Inc., Reidsville (N. C.)* (2 N. L. R. B., 198); *Matter of American Tobacco Co., Inc.*, (Richmond, Va.) (9 N. L. R. B., 579); *Matter of Union Envelope Co.* (10 N. L. R. B., 1147); *Matter of Floyd A. Fridell* (11 N. L. R. B., 249); *Matter of Interstate Granite Corporation* (11 N. L. R. B., 1046).

The position of the National Mediation Board against setting up units on a Jim Crow basis has been summarized in one of its publications as follows:

"The Board has definitely ruled that a craft or class of employees may not be divided into two or more on the basis of race or color for the purpose of choosing representatives. All those employed in the craft or class regardless of race, creed, or color must be given the opportunity to vote for the representatives of the whole class or craft." National Mediation Board, The Railway Labor Act and the National Mediation Board (Government Printing Office 1940), p. 17.

The cases in which the National Mediation Board has rejected the request of a carrier or a union that Negro employees be segregated into a unit separate from the white employees are: In the *Matter of Representation of Employees of the Central of Georgia Railway Co.*, Case No. R-234.

In the *Matter of Houde Engineering Corporation* (1 N. L. R. B. (old) 35 (Aug. 30, 1934)), the Board pointed out:

"It seems clear that the company's policy of dealing first with one group and then with the other resulted, whether intentionally or

not, in defeating the object of the statute. In the first place, the company's policy inevitably produced a certain amount of rivalry, suspicion and friction between the leaders of the committees. * * * Secondly, the company's policy by enabling it to favor one organization at the expense of the other, and thus to check at will the growth of either organization, was calculated to confuse the employees, to make them uncertain which organization they should from time to time adhere to, and to maintain a permanent and artificial division in the ranks."

Speaking of the company's suggested alternative that it deal with a composite committee made up of representatives of the two major conflicting groups, supplemented by other individual employees, the Board pointed out:

"This vision of an employer dealing with a divided committee and calling in individual employees to assist the company in arriving at a decision is certainly far from what section 7 (a) must have contemplated in guaranteeing the right of collective bargaining. But whether or not the workers' representation by a composite committee would weaken their voice and confuse their counsels in negotiating with the employer, in the end whatever collective bargaining might be reached would have to be satisfactory to the majority within the committee. Hence the majority representatives would still control, and the only difference between this and the traditional method of bargaining with the majority alone would be that the suggestions of the minority would be advanced in the presence of the majority. The employer would ordinarily gain nothing from this arrangement if the two groups were united, and if they were not united he would gain only what he has no right to ask for, namely, dissension and rivalry. * * *" (Letter from Mr. Langsdale to Mr. Ross, March 13, 1945.)

Case No. 64, December 16, 1914. Cited with approval in the Matter of United States Cartridge Company, Case No. 65, December 23, 1944:

At the 1945 hearings on the Railway Labor Act (hearings before the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on H. R. 7650, 73d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 33–34) Coordinator of Transportation Eastman said, "If a majority of the people, even a plurality, select a Congress, that is the kind of a Congress they get and that sits until the next election, when those in minority have a chance to convert the others to their way of thinking. The same way with labor unions. * * * The will of the majority ought to govern; but there ought to be ample means so that the minority can have a chance to persuade others to their way of thinking and so that there can be an election, if they succeed in converting their minority into a majority."

Golden, Clinton S., and Ruttenberg, Harold J., the Dynamics of Industrial Democracy, Harpers (1942), pages 211, 214: "It is * * * a fact of industrial democracy, written into the law, that it is a one-party system of democracy. In this respect it differs from our traditional two-party system of political democracy. * * * To have a voice in making the decisions of the majority the minority or nonunion workers have to join the union." "* * * industrial democracy functions through a one-party system. All workers are represented by one union and they are not citizens of industry until they belong to it."

Matter of the Chicago Journeymen Plumbers Union, Local 130, Case No. A–37, April 4, 1942; Matter of the Steamfitters' Protective Association, Local 597, Case No. A–41, April 4, 1942; Matter of McAvoy Shipbuilding Corporation et al., Case No. A–50, June 20, 1942.

If there were a nondiscriminatory transfer policy this committee would not now speculate on the possibility of some local refusing to recognize the policy in the future. What the committee now deals with is the proposal for a present limitation on the right of transfer itself, which is entirely different from a speculation on what recognition will actually be accorded the right in the future.

MINORITY STATEMENT OF MEMBER SHISKIN

It is my view that the majority is in error in the matter of universal transfer.

The committee's jurisdiction in this proceeding cannot be stretched beyond the limits of discrimination in employment (including hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, or union membership), found by the committee. The committee can adjudicate issues on facts established in its findings. It should not prejudge issues or anticipate them. Where discriminatory conditions or practices have been found to exist, their cessation may be ordered. But the committee cannot estop discrimination which is merely alleged or implied but which has not been adjudicated.

In general, the jurisdiction of the committee extends to three categories of complaints alleging discrimination: (1) Complaints against agencies of the Federal Government; (2) complaints against employers (and the unions of the employers' employees) having contracts with the Federal Government containing a nondiscrimination clause; and (3) complaints against all employers (and the unions of such employers' employees) engaged in industries essential to the war effort.

In the present proceeding, discrimination has been found to exist in the specific employment in the shipyards in which the complaints arose. The duty imposed upon the committee by the Executive order is to effectuate compliance with the nondiscrimination policy of the United States in such specific employment and such employment alone.

Denial of universal transfer by the brotherhood because of race does not constitute discrimination in the present employment of the employees. Whether or not such denial of transfer constitutes discrimination in employment can be determined only if and when any employee, member of the union, leaves his present employment and makes application for another employment within the jurisdiction of the brotherhood.

Universal transfer is not a right inherent in the employee's employment status in the shipyards. Universal transfer is neither a condition nor an incident of such employment. It is not a part of the employer-employee relationship in the employment dealt with in this proceeding, and is beyond the scope of the collective bargaining agreement governing such a relationship.

Nor is universal transfer a right inherent in the employee's membership in the union. Many national and international unions have no provision for automatic or universal transfer of members from one local union to another. In fact, local autonomy on matters pertaining to the local affairs is often jealously guarded by local unions.

The brotherhood does in fact make a provision for transfer of membership of its members from one subordinate lodge to another. Under the brotherhood's latest proposal, it would make provision for such transfer on a limited basis: it would continue to provide for transfers of members of subordinate white lodges to other subordinate white lodges; it would also provide for transfer of members of subordinate Negro lodges to subordinate Negro lodges; or, where no subordinate lodges are established it would provide transfer to the membership status granted by the international itself.

Where employment subject to the Executive order is denied to qualified workers solely because of race, as the result of the failure of the brotherhood to extend universal transfer to all members regardless of race, discrimination forbidden by the order would exist. But if and when such denial of employment did occur, it would occur outside the employment relationship within the purview of the committee in the present proceeding. The committee has no knowledge or foreknowledge, moreover, whether a transfer to the direct international membership status would or would not result in differentiation because of race and lead to employment discrimination forbidden by the order.

EXHIBIT E

APRIL 12, 1945.

Mr. CHARLES J. MACGOWAN,
President, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers,
Brotherhood Block,
Kansas City, Kans.

Re: Statement of FEPC majority issued February 10, 1945.

DEAR MR. MACGOWAN: This letter is supplemental to the one which I wrote you April 5 from New York with reference to the above matter, and in furtherance of my statement in that letter to the effect that I would make a more complete analysis of the committee's statement issued on April 4, 1945, in support of the action of the majority of the committee of March 17, 1945, refusing to accept the brotherhood's proposal as compliance of the directive orders issued on December 9, 1943.

Since returning to Kansas City I have made a thorough analysis of the various cases cited by the committee majority as authority for its position in this matter. That work has entailed considerable research and accounts for my delay in getting this letter to you.

The board holds in its majority statement:

"(1) The proposed division of members of the union into separate lodges on a basis of race alone, assuming that the Negro lodges are represented in the metal trades councils and district lodges under the identical terms and conditions as white lodges, denied to Negro war workers, member of the union, essential equality in collective bargaining in regard to their hire, tenure, and terms of employment."

The statement that the proposal would deny to "members of the union, essential equality in collective bargaining in regard to their hire, tenure, and terms of employment," shows that the committee majority has a complete misconception of the collective-bargaining practice of the International Brotherhood, for the reason that the bargaining is done by the International and not by the subordinate lodges. The committee majority goes on to say that:

"It is in the day-to-day application of these contracts to the individual workers, through the subordinate lodge bargaining representatives, however, that the nature of the union representation afforded members, or prospective members, of Negro lodges as compared to that afforded members, or prospective members, of white lodges becomes a paramount consideration."

Of course, that it true, but the day-to-day application of the contracts is controlled by the International's laws and policies, which contemplate no discrimination because of race or any other reason. The statement of the committee is an assumption that the union will not be fair with the Negro members in the day-to-day application of the contract. There is no evidence before the committee to that effect. If, at any time in the future, there should be any such discrimination, then that would be a separate case for the FEPC to handle, but at the stage of the proceeding the committee majority is, by speculation and conjecture, convicting the union of discrimination that the committee majority thinks could happen under the union's proposal. Such a statement is an aspersion upon the

sincerity and integrity of the officers of the union, whose duty it would be to see that there would be no such discrimination. It probably has not occurred to the committee majority that if the union should wish to discriminate against Negro members, it would be much easier to accomplish by taking them into the same subordinate lodge, where they would be in the minority and unable to control the action of the subordinate lodge.

In support of the above conclusion of the Committee majority, there is cited under footnote 5 a statement by George W. Taylor, now Chairman of the National War Labor Board, made in a paper read in New York on May 24, 1944, as follows:

"First. Collective bargaining is based upon an agreement which essentially preserves the necessary functions of both parties and enunciates the general principles which are to govern their relationships.

"Second, and more important. Collective bargaining encompasses the effectuation of these principles of the agreement in the day-to-day solutions of problems which arise."

The said statement thus plucked from the said speech of Chairman Taylor has no force whatever in support of the Committee majority's position. Of course, it is true that no matter what the terms of any collective bargaining contract, it can be misapplied by either the union or the employer. The FEPC was created for the purpose of seeing that no such misapplication is made of a discriminatory character because of race, etc., but the Committee majority has no right to assume that there will be any discriminatory misapplication of the union's contracts with reference to Negroes, before there is any charge of such discriminatory misapplication. Chairman Taylor's paper was read for the purpose of informing those present that the mere entrance into a contract does not mean fair dealing between the parties.

In furtherance of the above conclusion of the Committee majority, they further say that:

"Such system of dual representation based upon race is inconsistent with the principle of majority rule as interpreted and applied by those agencies of Government charged with administration of our labor relations laws."

The fallacy of that statement is the assumption that there will be "dual representation" under the union's proposal. The representation will be by the international union and not by the subordinate unions working against each other. It does not seem to occur to the Committee majority that the members of a Negro subordinate lodge would have much greater power to govern themselves than they would have, swallowed up by the white majority in the same subordinate lodge.

In support of its assertion that "such system * * * is inconsistent with the principle of majority rule as interpreted and applied by those agencies of Government charged with administration of our labor relations laws," the Committee majority cites a large number of decisions, under footnote (6), by the National Labor Relations Board and the National Mediation Board, which have no relation whatever to their fantastic majority-rule theory. All of the cases cited under footnote (6) are representation cases decided by the NLRB and the National Mediation Board and every one of them deals with a situation where Negroes were not admitted into membership by the union involved. It appears that the Committee majority has gone through the books and picked out every decision by those Boards which mentions the word "Negro," in the hope of finding some decision that would sustain the Committee majority's position.

The *Crescent Bed Company case* (29 NLRB 84), cited by the Committee majority, was one in which the employer had a contract with an independent union which admitted only Negroes to membership. The Board ruled that such a contract was not a bar to representation election demanded by another union which admitted both Negroes and whites. There is no such issue here, as the boilermakers admit both Negroes and whites and represents them equally and without discrimination with their employers. The charge made against the union in the FEPC directives of December 9, 1943, was not that Negroes were not permitted to vote on the selection of a representative for the employees in any shipyard, but that after the representative was chosen, Negroes were not permitted an equal part in the internal workings of the union.

The *United States Bedding Co. case* (52 NLRB 382), was a contest before the NLRB between an A. F. of L. and CIO union as to what workers should constitute the bargaining unit. A. F. of L. and the company insisted that only skilled workers should be in the unit, whereas the CIO contended that common laborers should also be in the unit. Most of the common laborers were Negroes. The objection of the A. F. of L. and the company was not that they were Negroes, but that they were migratory and not stable. NLRB in ruling against that contention found that they were no more migratory and unstable than were the other workers, and directed that they should be permitted to vote on the selection of a representative. The Board said:

"We, therefore, reject the arguments of the company and the A. F. of L., based upon the alleged instability of the Negro personnel, for a unit which would exclude the common laborers group."

The Board further said:

"The color or race of employees is an irrelevant and extraneous consideration in determining, in any case, the unit appropriate for the purpose of collective bargaining. We have consistently refused to delimit units on the basis of race, and the national policy has recently been stated by the President to be opposed to any discrimination on racial grounds."

That is the position, and the only position, that the NLRB has ever taken in such situations, that is, the Board has refused to deny the right to vote on the issue of representation because of race or color. The Board has never sought to dictate to any labor union the manner in which it should conduct its internal affairs.

The Committee majority cites one decision by the National Mediation Board—the Central of Georgia Railway Co. case, No. R–234. That was another case in which two unions were contending over the make-up of the bargaining unit. An independent union sought to limit the membership of the unit to railway clerks. The name of the union was the Central of Georgia Railway Clerks' Organization. Such a unit would exclude laborers such as freight handlers, express and station employees, who were largely Negroes. The National Mediation Board said that there was no reasonable ground for excluding said laborers; that they were included in other railroad unions and that it was the custom of the industry to include them. The Board found that the announced motive of the Georgia Railway Clerks' Organization was not sincere, but that it was the desire of such organization to exclude Negroes from the bargaining unit. The Board said:

"It appears in the present case that the Central of Georgia Railway Clerks' Organization, by its constitution and bylaws, restricts its membership to white employees of the Central of Georgia Railway whom it designates as 'clerks,' but included in what it is pleased to call clerks, are such occupations as warehouse foremen, office boys, messengers, chore boys, checkers, baggage and parcel-room clerks, train- and engine-crew callers, and operators of office- and station-equipment devices."

The Board therefore ruled that those employees of the company sought to be excluded by the clerks' organization should be permitted to vote on the issue of representation. There is nothing in that case that is any way comparable to any of the issues before the FEPC in this case.

It therefore appears that the Committee majority has dug up a lot of representation cases, where the unions involved denied Negroes membership, in its effort to bolster its conclusion that it would be illegal for the boilermakers to segregate Negroes in subordinate lodges of their own.

The Committee majority's citation of the case of *Houde Engineering Corp.* (1 NLRB (old) 35) illustrates the desperation of the Committee majority in their effort to find some language in some decision that may seem to justify their opposition to segregating Negroes in subordinate lodges of their own. That was a case decided by the old NIRA Labor Board on August 30, 1934. The first paragraph of that decision shows how completely different the issue in the case is from the issue of providing one subordinate lodge for Negroes and another for whites in the same union—the same bargaining representative. It is:

"This case came before the Board upon complaint of the union that, although it had been chosen as the collective bargaining agency by a majority of the company's employees at an election conducted by the National Labor Board, the company declined to recognize the union as the collective bargaining agency for all of the employees eligible to vote in the election. The company insisted that under section 7 (a) of the Recovery Act, it was obligated to bargain collectively not merely with the union, but also with the organization voted for by the minority of the employees."

The contention of the committee majority that the situation of the employees of the Houde Co. in two separate unions, each bargaining for a part of the employees with the company, is similar to that of Negro and white boilermakers in separate subordinate lodges, both being bargained for by the international union, hardly seems worthy of a reply.

The characterization placed upon the statement of President MacGowan of the method that would be employed in dispatching workers to jobs from the two subordinate lodges, shows that the committee majority insists upon dealing with this great organization in a spirit of suspicion and distrust. It seems not to have occurred to the committee majority that it would be much easier to discriminate against Negroes in dispatching them to jobs from the same subordinate lodge, than it would be from a Negro subordinate lodge, where any discrimination would be perfectly obvious and could be easily checked.

The next heading of the majority statement is as follows:

"(2) The proposed establishment of separate subordinate lodges for Negro and white members of the union, assuming equal stature of such separate lodges under the constitution and bylaws of the international brotherhood, does not accord Negro war workers equal terms and conditions of employment and discriminates against them because of their race or color."

The argument under that heading is leveled at the union's proposal with reference to universal transfer. The committee majority's refusal to hold that the brotherhood's proposal would amount to compliance with the directive orders of December 9, 1943, is based upon a purely hypothetical supposition, without any present facts before the committee to sustain it. That is very clearly pointed out in the minority statement of committee member, Boris Shiskin.

As pointed out in my letter of April 5, the committee's jurisdiction is limited by para-

graph 5 of the Executive Order 9346, as follows:

"The Committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination forbidden by this order. It may conduct hearings, make findings of fact and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination."

There has been no such complaint, and therefore no such hearing, and no opportunity to make any findings of fact with respect thereto. The Committee assumes the authority to make general rulings covering situations that, in the minds of the Committee may arise at some future date. The Committee has no such authority. As pointed out by Mr. Shiskin:

"Nor is universal transfer a right inherent in the employee's membership in the union. Many national and international unions have no provision for automatic or universal transfer of members from one local union to another. In fact, local autonomy on matters pertaining to the local affairs is often jealously guarded by local unions."

The reasons advanced by the majority committee under this heading, against the transfer proposal, are superficial and based upon mere conjecture and guess work. The proposal of the union, contained in its correspondence with the FEPC, will provide equal facilities to the Negro members for hire, tenure, terms and conditions of employment.

The committee majority seems determined to force social equality, as between Negroes and white, upon the union. In my opinion such an intention is contrary to the word and spirit of Executive Order 9346. That that is true is shown by the report of the Committee on Labor of the National House of Representatives on H. R. 2232, the bill now pending in Congress, which is practically a replica of Executive Order 9346. The committee, reporting favorably upon that bill, said:

"Let it be clearly understood this bill has for its purpose economic opportunity only. The opponents of the bill are attempting to confuse the issue by bringing up the question of social equality. We repeat, there is nothing in the bill concerned with anything other than economic equality."

This analysis is rather lengthy, but it is such for the reason that I wanted to impress you with my opinion that no court would ever sustain the position of the committee majority, as set out in its statement of April 10.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours

CLIF LANGSDALE,
Attorney for International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America.

The Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SNIDER BROS., INC.,
Worcester, Mass., June 19, 1945.

Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing you with reference to amendment No. 55 to Order No. 169.

We have been slaughterers in this community for over 35 years. We have slaughtered a sizable volume; some years have been rather lean; other years have been better for us, but in this period of time we have not been able to build a slaughtering establishment for ourselves.

We have slaughtered our cattle the greater percentage at Wiegert's slaughtering house, 275 Greenwood Street, Worcester, on a cost-per-head basis.

We are not a concern that has recently opened for business in order to benefit by any wartime profits. We have been in the cattle and slaughtering business, as we have already mentioned, for over 35 years prior to the war, and if we understand this amendment correctly, this amendment orders us to close up our place of business and discontinue doing business in this community for the duration of the war, or at least until some new amendment is issued that will permit us to operate.

We have had a great number of difficulties, as every other business; the greater percentage of our best men have gone to the armed forces. We have been tied up with a terrific volume of Government regulations. We have had to pay high prices for livestock and sell dressed cattle at low ceilings. It seems that we have been presented with every kind of an order, rule, and regulations, but we did not think the Government would finally order a concern operating for over 35 years in this community out of business.

We are not distilling whisky or alcohol without a license; we are not peddling opium or narcotics; we are selling food to our regular customers, and we do not feel that such an amendment is legal. We do not think that it can be enforced, and we do feel that we are entitled to continue killing cattle and selling them in this community.

We have had advice on this amendment and from the advice as we see it, we need help and we wish that you would do everything in your power to get the amendment changed or abolished so that a concern of our kind does not have to close its doors, because our organization and a good many members of our family are dependent upon our operations and quite a number of good small customers are dependent on the cattle that we produce in order that they may continue in business.

Most of our trade supply quite a number of large families who are defense workers and we do not think the plants and manufacturers in this community will continue long with such a shortage of meat. We know that there should be no shortage of beef. There are too many live cattle in the country—in fact, the largest supply on record based on one of the big packer's statistical records. In views of this, and in view of the fact that the Army apparently has adequate supplies of beef, we do not feel that any further burden should be put on the slaughterers of cattle, and we hope that you can be influential in bringing about a change for the better.

Very truly yours,

SNIDER BROS., INC.,
By BENJAMIN SNIDER.

OPA Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from the North Platte food dealers at North Platte, Nebr. This letter was signed by 13 food dealers in North Platte.

At this very time the OPA is traveling over the State, dropping in on merchants and pursuing a gestapo technique of citing these merchants for supposed violation of OPA regulations. They are taken up before their own panel where the OPA acts as prosecutor, judge, and jury. These kangaroo courts are fining merchants $25 on each violation. The merchant has no right to appeal to his own local court. It is either pay the fine or be cited to some court hundreds of miles away. This procedure is most un-American and does smack of the methods which were used in Nazi Germany.

The letter which follows indicates the attitude of the merchants in Nebraska:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
North Platte, Nebr., June 16, 1945.

Representative A. L. MILLER,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned retail food dealers of North Platte find it necessary to petition the aid of you as our Representative in regard to some of the regulations of the Office of Price Administration under which we are working.

We are referring in particular to the enforcement end of the regulations. During the past 2 months threats have become numerous; in fact, so numerous as to become highly embarrassing. In each case the threats have been directed to dealers for failure to comply with such minor details as properly displaying prices on each and every item in their market and many other trivial matters which do not in any way affect the cost of living.

We feel that under the present method of handling complaints no distinction is made between the willful violator of price regulations and the honest merchant who makes a mistake. The penalty is levied without a fair trial and in most cases too severe.

It is our opinion the OPA is more interested in impressing the public with the justification of their existence by filling their files with such minor violations and issuing threats than for the purpose for which they were originally set up.

A check-up made by our own retail organization found that over a period of 2 years there have been but two cases of price violation in which a penalty was exacted and in neither case was it willful. This check-up also revealed that prices in North Platte are considerably below OPA ceilings.

Too little consideration is given to the fact that business has given up most of its competent help to the service of our country and that added OPA regulation and burdens cannot help but cause irregularities and noncompliances. This especially, due to the fact that regulations are often inconsistent and not applicable to this territory. It is also not uncommon to find retailers soliciting the aid of their office receiving delayed and confusing replies.

We believe that you are interested in the welfare of the people of your district in all matters that do not conflict with the war effort or the welfare of people as a whole and that our country could be better served if relieved of some of the burdens that are placed upon us by unnecessary regulations and too many bureaus.

Many of our boys who are returning to this country after several years of service are amazed over many things and among them are the many restrictions and regulations, and wondering if this is to become the American way of life.

We wish to thank you for any help that you can give us and will welcome any suggestions that you may have.

Very truly yours,

NORTH PLATTE FOOD DEALERS.

The Strength of Our American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the most catastrophic war in the history of mankind, the United States of America has changed its President. The manner of that change must have shattered every last argument which the dictators of the aggressor nations had ever advanced against the strength of the democratic system. Without the loss of a single day, with only the briefest of administrative pauses, the constitutional process by which a successor assumes the role of President of the United States swung into operation.

Here was a demonstration of the basic strength of our system. The man whom fate had just removed from the most important executive position in the world had occupied his position for more than 12 years, shattering precedent after precedent in his incumbency. There were some who regarded him as the incarnation of the National Government. They could not visualize the Nation without him at its head. Yet, the change from his leadership to the leadership of our new President was accomplished with a degree of orderliness and dispatch which could not have been duplicated anywhere in the world. Within a matter of a few hours, the new President had been sworn in, had summoned the Cabinet, had demonstrated that the reins of government had not been dropped, but had merely passed, in accordance with the American tradition, from the hands of one man to the hands of another. That remarkable shift of authority proved once more to the entire Nation that ours is a government of laws and not of men.

Imagine what would have happened in any other nation of the world had a similar event taken place. Even in England, the succession from Prime Minister Churchill to another would have caused repercussions within the Cabinet and throughout the Empire. In Russia the situation which developed at the death of Lenin would have been duplicated and perhaps magnified if Stalin had died in the midst of the war. But here in our country the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt was not permitted to interrupt the conduct of American governmental business.

Those who declare that the Constitution of the United States was the "greatest work of man ever struck off at one time" have won reinforcement for their view. It is a great nation which can recover from the shock of losing its leadership in the midst of bitter warfare and emerge with strength unimpaired. Just as we recovered from the initial shock of Pearl Harbor to become the greatest military and naval power on the face of the earth within the short space of 3 years, so, too, can our people rise from any challenge to its continuity and authority.

We have the means at hand to solve all problems no matter how difficult. Through the Constitution and the agencies which it establishes, the people have been given control of their destiny, more fully than in any other nation on earth. Time and again the people have shown their adaptability and their determination to build an ever greater nation. We have passed our latest test with flying American colors.

The tremendous scope of the tasks which have already come before the Nation in the brief weeks since our new President assumed office point more convincingly than any argument to the success of our political structure. With the end of the war in Europe the prospect for ultimate peace in the Pacific theater mounts hourly. Reconversion from military to civilian production means a transition in our governmental organization as well. The task of planning for this great change has already been undertaken by the new administration.

These evidences of the ability of our constitutional framework to provide the necessary flexibility which is one of the true tests of any great nation are an eternal tribute to the lasting wisdom of the founding fathers. America's achievement in this direction, its ability to move forward directly into the San Francisco World Conference, its success in passing on the reins of authority from one man's fallen hands to another's, must not pass unnoticed in a world which has known chaos far too long. Democracy works. We have proved it in America a score of times in the past. We have just proved it again.

At the end of the last war, our form of government was adopted by many of the new nations created at Versailles. This new illustration of its continued success should induce others to model themselves after the American mold.

Should the Lid Be Kept on Prices During the Postwar Reconversion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a broadcast on the Blue Network on the Town Hall Radio Program of June 7, 1945, at Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, appearing on the Town Hall program with me was the Honorable Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Leon Henderson, formerly the director of OPA, and Murray D. Lincoln, of the Farm Bureau Federation in Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the regulations coming from the OPA was well summed up by Lou Maxim, the former enforcement officer of OPA when he said:

Our young lawyers have OPA so bound up in legalistic red tap that Houdini, himself, couldn't untangle it. I don't know how many hours they spent on the wording of their classic order on fruit but it is 6 pages of fine print.

In our present consideration of this act, I feel it is the duty of Congress to spell out and direct the OPA on the road it must proceed. The OPA is a child of Congress. We created this baby and it sems now that it may have grown larger than its sire. They are making rules and regulation and go far beyond the original intent of Congress. They are getting so top-heavy that they are interfering with reconversion and getting tangled up in their own red tape.

The opening statement on the Town Hall, is as follows:

Tight price ceilings will foul the spark plugs of recovery. Price ceilings which control profit tamper with the very mainsprings of our economy. An unreasonable lid on prices will dry up production. Jobs will disappear. The incentive to produce is gone. True free competition is the hallmark of the free enterprise system and this cannot be attained under Government regulations which eliminate competition. Rigid price control which denies a profit places upon industry the harness of tyranny and causes a stagnation with economic atrophy.

Manufacturers by the thousands have been trying to find out through OPA what the legal ceiling prices will be on articles they want to manufacture. These factories have the material, the labor, and the know-how, but OPA, by keeping a tight lid on prices, prevents them from soliciting sales or going to work and thus nullifies the entire program of reconversion. They put such a business into economic oblivion.

Business should not be forced to come to Washington and stand, hat in hand, before some bureaucrat, begging for a price which will permit him to supply a hungry public with desired products. How can industry be expected to provide millions of new jobs if, through rigid price ceilings, they are denied a reasonable profit? In the next few months this country may have 5,000,000 unemployed.

John Q. Public has $120,000,000,000 in his pocket and is anxious to buy everything from hairpins to helicopters. The price means nothing unless there is something to buy. If you are hungry and have the money in your pocket, you would pay a dollar for a doughnut to satisfy your hunger. Price is open. It is an instrument for getting things done, agreed on between parties to aid transaction, the employee and the employer, seller and buyer, producer and customer; it keeps production flowing.

The OPA regulates prices on more than 8,000,000 separate items. The record shows that it is taking OPA from 4 to 6 months to establish what they call proper ceilings on new items. Government never moves quickly. The individual with his own money invested needs a quick decision. Democracy is a system of production. The OPA, by refusing to give proper consideration to the increased cost of material and labor, is following a destructive, delaying policy causing unemployment. This brings on scarcity, black markets, and inflation. Red tape and regimentation get tangled up in their own feet. Democracy is direct, voluntary employment of the individual by the individual and for the individual. Don't let democracy slip overboard on the icy decks of wage freezing and work freezing. If you don't have freedom to negotiate prices and wages, there may be no transactions.

Chester Bowles, the Administrator of OPA, testifying before a committee recently, said, "We must maintain every bit of tight con-

trols in the future on all portions on the costs of living. We have an interest in profits when a price increase is requested. This, in effect, is a simple statement of our objectives in the coming years." Now, let's take a look at what tight control of prices will do.

In this reconversion period, the OPA should limit their activities to the necessary items of living. They must permit industry the same margin of profit over production costs as they had before going into war work. Clipping the dollar's power and freedom to buy with a price ceiling, clipping the dollar's right to be earned with a wage ceiling, and clipping the dollar's right to be negotiated or used at all, even with a ration card, are not a postwar expedient nor an efficiency recourse nor an improvement for any purpose.

Rigid price fixing places a strangle hold upon industry. Price controls must be framed and administered in the light of how it will stimulate production and employment and not with a view of their perpetuation. Unless this is done, many little fellows will close their factories and go fishing. Establish a permanent OPA and the bureaucrats will blueprint and regiment the citizen and make him do a physical, mental, and ritualistic goose step, with the tune being played in Washington.

Henry Wallace Please Note: Small Business Is Hitting the Skids From OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, following earlier ravages from the war, the OPA today is putting the small businessman out of business. While big corporations with many lines of activity and great financial resources have prospered, the small individual businessman particularly in the food industry is having the future squeezed out of his business by the Government. Many are giving up, closing their plants and stores, are selling out to bigger companies. And more will do so in the months ahead, as volume declines rapidly and inventory costs increase.

This is not a situation exposed only by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, of which I am a member. It is a fact disclosed in a recent survey by the Smaller War Plants Corporation—an administration agency.

SWPC experts have charted the decline of small business month by month for the past 6 years and have compared it with the record back through the First World War. Here are the exact words of the SWPC. "Small businesses are being gobbled up by big businesses." Small businessmen should not be exposed, says SWPC, to conditions which bear so unfairly on them—merely because they are small—that "by far the most desirable alternative is to sell out."

And the conditions which bear so unequally on them are largely the impossible regulations of OPA which discriminate against the small businessman in favor of big business.

During 1940 and 1941, SWPC found little businessmen were selling out at just about the normal rate.

But by the third quarter of 1942, the SWPC survey reveals, small manufacturers merged or sold out their business at 132 percent of the average quarterly rate in 1939. By the fourth quarter, the sell-out was 182 percent of the 1939 rate.

The squeeze on small business seemed to decrease somewhat in the early months of 1943, for the rate for the first two quarters was only 141 and 145 percent of the 1939 rate.

Nevertheless, they disappeared in the third quarter of 1943 at 182 percent of the 1939 rate; and in the fourth quarter at 212 percent.

The trend has been similar ever since. Compared with 1939—a relatively normal year—small business was squeezed out in the first quarter of 1944 at 173 percent of the 1939 rate; in the second quarter at 223 percent; in the third quarter at 250 percent; and in the fourth quarter of last year at 282 percent, says SWPC.

It is not surprising that SWPC should discover that:

By far the greatest number of monopoly mergers occurred in the food industries. This part of the economy—

Says SWPC—

which has been one of the last to develop a trend toward large-scale organizations, apparently is now following the path of the conquest of the little and independent industries. Grocery chains, distilleries, dairy companies, and specialty food companies are all actively represented in the gobble-up movement.

Here is a list, furnished me by informed sources, of small independent firms in the meat-packing industry who found it expedient to give up as a result of OPA pricing policies. The list is not complete and was hastily compiled, so that it may contain errors, but it illustrates what is happening:

INDEPENDENT PACKING PLANTS WHICH HAVE BEEN SOLD OR LEASED TO CHAIN STORES OR SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS

Sold November 1942; location, Lincoln, Nebr.; former owner, Lincoln Packing Co.; new owner or lessee, American Stores, Philadelphia; chain store.

Sold January 1943; location, Omaha, Nebr.; former owner, Omaha Packing Co., Omaha, Nebr.; new owner or lessee, M. Rothchilds and Sons, Chicago. Products shipped to Chicago.

Sold March 1943; location, San Diego, Calif.; former owner, Vandenberg Packing Co., San Diego, Calif.; new owner or lessee, Andrew Williams Meat Co. Formerly supplied chain and independent operations; now supplies Andrew Williams chain only.

Sold about April 1943; location, San Fernando, Calif.; former owner, Paulson Packing Co.; new owner or lessee, Roberts Markets, Venice, Calif.; chain stores.

Sold about April 1943; location, Turlock, Calif.; former owner, Hill and Goterberg; new owner or lessee, Manteca Veal Co. Supplies Chinese-operated markets.

Leased about April 1943; location, Oakland, Calif; former owner, Golden West Meat Co.; new owner or lessee, group of East Bay independent dealers. About 40 or 50 dealers secure supplies according to their investment.

Sold about April 1943; location, Kansas City, Kans.; former owner, Kornblum Packing Co.; new owner or lessee, Campbell Soup Co., Camden, N. J.

Sold July 1943; location, Omaha, Nebr.; former owner, South Omaha Packing Co.; new owner or lessee, First National Stores, Boston, Mass.; chain store.

Leased December 1943; date sold March 1945; location, Pueblo, Colo; former owner, Nuckolls Packing Co.; new owner or lessee, American Stores Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; chain stores.

Leased January 1945; location, Phoenix, Ariz.; former owner, A. Z. Packing Co.; new owner or lessee, Associated Packing Co. Remarks: One hundred members of Retail Grocers Association leased to prevent closing by A. Z. Packing Co.

Sold January 1945; location, Fall River Mills, Calif.; former owner, Fall River Mills Meat Co.; new owner or lessee, George Puccini, San Francisco, Jack Metzer, Red Bluff. Remarks: Meat distributed through the 10 Puccini markets, San Francisco.

Sold February 1945; location, Kansas City, Mo.; former owner, Midwest Packing Co.; new owner or lessee, Milgrams Chains Store, Kansas City, Mo.

Leased April 1945; location, Watsonville, Calif.; former owner, Ed Peterson Meat Co.; new owner or lessee, Purity Chain Stores, San Francisco, Calif. Output to Purity Chain Stores.

Leased April 1945; location, Visalia, Calif.; former owner, Visalia Meat Co.; new owner or lessee, Justensen Chain Stores, Fresno, Calif. Supplying their 25 markets in San Joaquin Valley.

NOTE.—No dates of change of ownership for the following except that all are since the war began.

Location, Dixon, Calif.; former owner, Bruce Mace Co.; new owner or lessee, ——. Remarks: Has arrangement with Bono Meat Co. to furnish meat for Bono Markets located in Hagstroms and Andrew Williams Stores, Oakland, Calif.

Location, Huntington Beach, Calif.; former owner, Beach Packing Co.; new owner or lessee, Alpha Beta Stores. Remarks: Los Angeles chain.

Location, Colton, Calif.; former owner, Valley Meat Packing Co.

Location, Riverside, Calif.; former owner, Siek Packing Co.

Location, Temecula, Calif.; former owner, Temecula Packing Co.

New owner or lessee of the latter three plants, A. M. Lewis & Co., Riverside, Calif. Remarks: A. M. Lewis, wholesale grocer, sponsors Ideal Stores Association, a voluntary of 190 units.

In addition to the above, trade press reports that Kroger has just acquired the John B. Cook Packing Co., of Scottsbluff, Nebr., and Food Fair Stores have bought Regal Corporation at Elizabeth, N. J., another meat-packing plant.

Unless Congress acts to end this trend, both the efforts of Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, and all congressional attempts to help small business, may turn out to be futile.

The SWPC sums up the situation with this warning:

If we are going to raise great armies and fight global wars to preserve the American economic system, then here at home we must prevent the legalistic infiltration of monopoly controls and the insidious destruction of our basic concept of America as a land of opportunity. We must not allow superconcentration of industry, or free enterprise will cease to exist. Private treaties and secret diplomacy among the giants of industry and the gobbling up of free and independent small enterprises are as alien to democracy on the economic home front as they are in foreign affairs.

Injured Soldier Tells How He Was Treated in a Veterans' Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have read so much criticism of veterans' hospitals by writers who have never been a patient in one of these hospitals, never studied medicine, or served a day in the armed forces—"That never set a squadron in the field, nor the division of a battle knows"—that I thought it not inappropriate to bring to your attention a message from a real soldier who was wounded in one of the most dramatic air battles ever reported.

I am inserting a letter written by Mr. James R. Foster, of Fayetteville, N. C., on June 4, 1945, giving an account of an air battle over Germany in which he was badly injured, paying tribute to his brave comrade, and telling of the splendid service received by him at a veterans' hospital.

The matter referred to follows:

I just want to write you a letter to tell you of the fine treatment I have had at the Veterans' Administration, Fayetteville, N. C, I came here blind, and now I can see 20–20 and read fine newspaper print. I would just like to start at the beginning and tell you the whole story.

In April of 1943 our crew was formed and we were assigned to a Flying Fortress. In August of 1943 we flew to England and were assigned to the Three Hundred and Seventy-ninth Bomb Group of the Eighth Air Force. Our first raid was on August 27. Between August 27 and October 14 our crew had put in 13 raids.

The story really begins on October 14, 1943, at which time our bomb crew was over Schweinfurt, Germany. I was the right waist gunner. About 3 minutes after the bombardier called out "Bombs away" I knew we were headed home. We soon ran into terrific fighter opposition, and our plane was hit by a salvo of 20-millimeter cannon shells fired from one of the fighters. These shells blew up our oxygen tanks. Two shells blew up around the right waist, and since I was right waist gunner, the fragments hit me—one shell above my head and another shell in front of me. The fragments tore into my head, face, and eyes, and the other shell hit my right hand. My flak suit, a steel vest we wear for protection, stopped the fragments of the shells that blew up in front of me from hitting me in the stomach and chest. Since our oxygen was blown up, and, of course, my mask ripped off from the fragments, I would not have lived long if it had not been for my buddy, the left waist gunner, William Ronnie Britton, of Thorndale, Pa. Grabbing an emergency oxygen bottle and another oxygen mask, Ronnie Britton removed his gloves so that he could connect the bottle to the mask and wipe the blood that was freezing over my mouth and nose, making it hard for me to breathe.

I might add here that the temperature was 47° below zero, and the altitude was 27,000 feet. At that altitude you would only live a few minutes without oxygen. Ronnie knew this, and as he removed his gloves at that freezing temperature he also knew the danger of frostbite, which only takes a few moments to set in. Ronnie had to hold the mask to my face because it was impossible to connect it to my helmet because the left side of my face was ripped open. Between holding the mask to my face so that I could breathe and running back to his gun to fire at German planes as they attacked our plane, his hands were severely frozen and later he lost a great deal of use of them.

Our plane was damaged and hard to handle. For the next several hours we were under heavy fighter attack, and as I lay in the waist of the plane wondering if we would make it back, I thought of many things, mostly of my wife and of the baby we were expecting. I wondered whether it would be a boy or a girl, who it would favor, and if it were a boy, would he have to go through the same thing. I have been asked by many people if I was scared. Scared is not the word for it. I was petrified. I do not believe there is anyone living that can go through a battle and say he was not scared. I wanted to live then more than ever. I wanted to see my baby that we were expecting and to see my wife once again.

We finally found our field and headed in. In a very short time I was on the operating table and the doctors were working on me. My left eye was gone, my right one damaged. The fingers on my right hand were gone, and part of the hand itself. The left side of my head and face were ripped open, but due to the surgical skill of Major Kane, a surgeon in the United States Medical Corps, my face wounds are not noticeable.

The weeks went by, and in December 1943, Ronnie and I were sent back to the States, Ronnie arriving 1 day before I did. We met once again at the Halloran General Hospital, Staten Island, N. Y. Ronnie was sent to a hospital in West Virginia and I to the Northington General Hospital, Tuscaloose, Ala., where I received my discharge on February 4, 1944.

Three weeks after I was discharged the stork arrived at our home and on February 28 my son was born. For what Ronnie Britton did for me I could never repay him in any form or value or deed, but I could let him know that as long as I live I will always remember what he did; and my son when he is grown will also remember because he bears the name of my buddy. My son's name is also Ronnie.

In the meantime the sight of my right eye was becoming dimmer and dimmer. I was wearing a glass artificial left eye. In November of 1944 I reported to the Veterans' Administration in Fayetteville, N. C., and Maj. M. P. Hoot, the eye specialist, looked at my eye and told me that within 6 months I would be totally blind. At that time my vision was approximately 5 feet, and that was not clear, but a gray misty sight. In April of this year I returned to the hospital for treatment. Dr. Hoot performed the first operation over 5 weeks ago on my remaining blind right eye, and then about 2 weeks ago, the second operation. A few days ago for the first time since my son had been born I saw him as he really is and not as a little shadow as I used to see him; and for the first time since my return from overseas I saw my wife clearly.

I have heard that some people have been criticizing the treatment veterans are receiving in the Veterans' Administration. As for the treatment I have received since I entered this hospital I could not duplicate it anywhere at any civilian hospital. The operations I had would have cost me more than I could have paid for. As for the food here, it is excellent. The understanding that the doctors and nurses have for you makes you feel as if it were their eye they were saving instead of your own. To know that your doctor stops in several times a day to look at your eye gives you a feeling that he is personally interested in you and not just as another case.

I imagine that there are many veterans in the same condition that I was in before I entered this hospital but dread the thought of entering the veterans' hospital because of the rumors they have heard about veterans' hospitals. If I had not entered this hospital I would have gone through life in total darkness.

In mere words I cannot thank Dr. Hoot and the Veterans' Administration for all they have done for me. A person cannot find the words to thank a man for giving back his eyesight.

I hope that this will help to clear up in the minds of the public and the veterans that the Veterans' Administration is doing its utmost to help us veterans in every way possible. Of course, there are those people in every walk of life that will always be dissatisfied no matter what is done for them; and no doubt this is where those rumors originated.

Very truly yours,

JAMES R. FOSTER.

P. S.—If you wish to use this letter in part or in total for any purpose you are at liberty to do so.

Treatment of Amputation Cases at Walter Reed Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from articles in the New York Herald Tribune by Miss Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, on the treatment given amputation cases at Walter Reed Hospital, which I believe merits the attention of the Congress and the public:

WALTER REED HOSPITAL'S PROGRAM FOR TREATING AMPUTATION CASES

(By Dorothy Dunbar Bromley)

While all evidence goes to show that Walter Reed General Hospital, the most famous of the Army's seven amputation centers, gives its soldier patients excellent surgical and orthopedic care, a 2 weeks' visit to the hospital reveals that the reconditioning program designed to fit the amputees for return to civilian life has lagged by admission of the hospital authorities themselves.

The purpose of an Army hospital-reconditioning program is to bring a man back to normal physically—at least to the greatest extent possible—to iron out his mental kinks, and to give him prevocational training and vocational guidance.

By May 1, there were approximately 7,000 amputees in Army hospitals in the United States and an unascertainable number overseas who had lost one limb or more, about 70 percent of these being leg amputees. Four thousand have already been discharged.

The amputee's outlook differs from that of other patients. Since he often has no physical ills apart from his crippling in-

jury, he has more untapped energy. On the surface he is full of brave bravado. But deep down he may fear that he never will be completely acceptable socially. He may, if he is one of the lucky ones, know what job or course of study he hopes to take up, but the chances are, if he does not get proper guidance, that he will take a very limited view of his future. * * *

Recently, * * * I had a three-and-a-half hour interview with Maj. Gen. Shelly U. Marietta, who, as commanding officer is in charge not only of Walter Reed General Hospital, which has 2,000 beds at the main center and 1,000 at the Forest Glen convalescent section, but the entire Army Medical Center, where research, teaching, and production in preventive medicine are carried on. As the staff is set up today, no officer of a higher rank than major oversees the reconditioning program.

A medical officer, a pediatrician in civilian life, directs the reconditioning program at Walter Reed and the Forest Glen convalescent section. Until recently he devoted much of his attention to the Beltsville, Md., section, now closed down, where patients about to return to duty were physically toughened. The education officer, a captain who is a progressive educator from the Milwaukee State Teachers College is vigorously trying to cut military red tape to get the staff of instructors he needs. * * *

The physical education officer and the education officer both have working under them men with college degrees and good teaching experience. They need more, and they also need amputees who have leadership and teaching ability to teach other amputees.

A patient with no legs said to me, "How would you like it, supposing you had no legs, if an able-bodied man came into the ward and showed you how to take exercises?" * * *

The reconditioning officers admitted the desirability of using amputees as instructors but said they have found that qualified men eligible for discharge have considered the prospect of a pension and a civilian job more attractive than a low rating in the Army.

In March of this year the * * * education staff began to do an intensive job, going into the double amputee wards to talk with the men about their educational interests and following up their visits. It is not enough, as was done previously on the wards, merely to hand a patient a "self-study" manual put out by the United States Armed Forces Institute.

One man in ward 36, who has no legs but to the amazement of the hospital is now walking on his artificial limbs with the help of two canes, is a high-school graduate of more than average intelligence and great buoyancy of spirit. He was the beneficiary of brilliant surgery and orthopedic care, but up to March when the intensive counseling was begun on this ward, no one in the hospital had talked at any length with him about his vocational plans.

A patient in another ward, a man who had lost one leg and an eye and had been a stevedore before the war, told me he was planning on living on his pension of $164 after his discharge. Still another amputee told his ward doctor he expects to loaf for 6 months after his discharge. "If he does that," the doctor said, "he'll never go to work."

"The mental attitude in any hospital is insidious," a ward doctor who has served 29 months overseas said. "Degeneration, both physical and mental, sets in unless a man is gotten up as soon as he is able and stimulated—given some sort of goal * * *."

A casual visitor at Walter Reed might think the various activities one sees going on would be sufficient to stimulate the patient's interest and willing participation. There are morning orientation lectures, sometimes interesting, the occupational-therapy shop, the dancing class for amputees, music classes and private instruction, the typing class that now has a regular teacher, discussion groups, and other classes that will improve with regular instruction.

At the Forest Glen convalescent section there is a fine photography shop equipped by a private donor and directed by an able volunteer. There are other reconditioning arts and skills shops operated by Red Cross volunteers. There are also machine and radio shops that have so far depended on patients as teachers.

There are a gymnasium and a swimming pool at the Glenn and outdoor sports. A gym and swimming pool at the main center are now being completed. Bicycles and cars with dual control for teaching leg amputees to drive have recently been obtained.

There are, of course, more activities for the ambulatory patients than for bed patients. The net result of the reconditioning program is that it leaves too many men floundering about, with no sense of direction. More than a few resent their enforced attendance in classes for they see no relation between their class work and a solution to their own problems. The problem is a difficult one, since an amputee for many reasons is in an unsettled state of mind.

At Walter Reed General Hospital the entire emphasis cannot be on the reconditioning activities. On the other hand the convalescent program at Forest Glen section, where the amputees are sent when they have been fitted with their prostheses, could be a closer approximation to the AAF's.

The AAF convalescent hospital at Plattsburg, N. Y., was opened only 3 months ago. When I visited Plattsburg not all the equipment was installed, but I found the place humming with activity.

The commanding officer, Col. Victor A. Byrnes, is an alert young doctor of 38.

As soon as a man arrives at Plattsburg he is told he is not just a serial number, but a human being in whom the hospital is interested. He has a long talk with a psychologist, who finds out about his interests and problems and starts to help him "put his personal jigsaw puzzle together again." He is told at this time that he will be expected to work in one of the shops or classes, not because it is a military order but because it will aid his recovery.

Every day the patients go to the health club—the AAF name for a gymnasium—where a progress chart is kept on each man. Formal calisthentics are out in this gym, where I saw men doing everything from practicing golf strokes to lifting weights with a knee that needed strengthening.

All of this could not be accomplished without adequate personnel. Plattsburg for instance, has 6 officers and 10 enlisted men, all psychologists, for each 1,000 patients. While Walter Reed has no psychologists, so-called, the classification officer's staff of men who now do prevocational counseling is limited to 2 for each 1,000 patients. * * *

The AAF convalescent hospitals are not only better staffed, their program is better integrated and it has a philosophy. Every man has a personal physician who is at once next friend and doctor to him. These doctors get to know their patients intimately and consult with the psychologists and reconditioning officers. If the ward doctors at Walter Reed were selected for their understanding of men as well as their professional skill—and more than a few now have such an understanding—they could not do everything possible for their patients unless their case load and operating schedule at the main center was lightened. * * *

While the reconditioning program has lagged in the Army's leading amputation center, the public has been led to believe that our hospitalized servicemen are receiving the best possible care. Recently, Gen. Brehon D. Somervell who, as Chief of Services of Supply, is responsible for the Army's medical program, said: "The ASF will do everything in its power to see that your men and women come home to you in the best possible physical and mental health."

The Clarks Fork River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful rivers in the West have been the inspiration of many poems, including Bryant's Thanatopsis, with which so many of us are familiar.

To a railroad man who keeps his appointed rounds night and day in traversing the beautiful stretches of the waters of the rivers of north Idaho and western Montana on a run that borders the shore of beautiful Lake Pend Oreille, these branches of the mighty Columbia are a source of continual inspiration. It is my privilege to present a poem on the Clarks Fork River by the veteran railroad man Bob Robertson:

THE CLARKS FORK RIVER

(By Bob Robertson)

In tranquil silence here the river
Moves along its banks between,
Diamonds dancing where the river
Ripples in the sun's bright sheen.

Here the current headlong crashes,
Hurling protests to the sky,
Here it dreams in idle splashes
Like a lover passing by.

Here the mountains meet the river;
Here the trees bend to behold
Their reflections all-aquiver
With the water's amours bold.

Here the white sands leave the river
Like a naiad from her bath;
Thirsty deer seek here the river
Down a faintly beaten path.

Now a huge hawk skims the river,
Lightning swift with talons bent;
Here the songsters sweet deliver
Lilting paeans of content.

Sheer walls here a prison fashion
Thrusting rocky ramparts deep,
Darkly green in primal passion
Here the sullen waters creep.

Now the sun's light on the river
Turns from diamond point to gold,
Crimson poniards pierce the river
As the summer day grows old.

Twilight steals along the river
Slowly dimming sand and tree,
Darkness soon engulfs the river
In its cloak of mystery.
Still the birds their sleepy twitter,
Night brings slumber to the river.

Strikers Versus Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the week-old strike by members of the independent Chicago Truck Drivers' Union ended Wednesday night, about an hour after President Truman's order authorizing the Office of Defense Transportation to take over and operate the strike-bound trucking facilities. The day before, the Seven Hundred and First Military Police Battalion had arrived in Chicago from Fort Custer.

The strike had been called because of the WLB's failure to grant the full wage increase demanded by the union, and had been held by the WLB to be illegal because the requirement, under Federal law, that a 30-day cooling-off period elapse before a strike vote may be taken, had not been observed.

During the course of the strike, huge quantities of perishable food, including one firm's holding of tons of butter and three carloads of bananas, other fruits, eggs, and vegetables, spoiled in warehouses. One company gave away 19,000 loaves of bread because of inability to secure delivery to its store outlets. Some hospitals were reported running short of drugs. Deliveries of mail of two mail-order houses, usually handled by their own trucks, were tied up. An acute shortage of food was reported by restaurants, and housewives found many groceries with neither fruits nor vegetables. War materials marked for shipment to the Pacific war areas piled up in loading stations and depots. Private automobiles were pressed into delivery service, and Army and Navy trucks, operated by soldiers and sailors, were used to haul materials to vital war plants, whose operations had been curtailed by the strike.

Strikers were charged with having intimidated drivers, members of another union, who sought to operate their trucks, running them to the curb and warning them to quit work. Instances of violence were reported. Hundreds of police squads were on duty escorting trucks carrying war materials, drugs, and perishable foods.

For almost 5 years, our men have been drafted into the armed forces, subject to duty anywhere in the world that they may be ordered to serve. We are constantly reminded, and we know, of the absolute necessity of furnishing them with a continuous, never-ending stream of food, clothing, guns, ammunition, planes, ships—the hundred and one other things which a fighting man must have, and on time—in order to exist; in order to carry on the battle. Our farmers, handicapped as they are by lack of manpower and equipment, are urged to do their utmost in producing the maximum amount of raw materials, of food of every description.

Saving all comment on the merits of the demands made by the truck driver's union, what do you think of a plan of action which insists upon a strike in so vital a link in the transportation system; a strike which curtails delivery of food, of drugs needed to save lives here; of war materials absolutely necessary to continue production, delivery, of those articles of war which our servicemen must have?

President Truman followed the right course in ordering the ODT to take over the job of operating the strike-bound trucking facilities—an order which apparently has made the union see the light and brought about a decision on its part to order the return to work of the strikers, numbering about 6,500, pending the outcome of the further hearings promised by the WLB if the strike was ended.

CABINET CHANGES

President Truman recently announced the replacement of Postmaster General Frank C. Walker by Robert Hannagan. This week, three new Cabinet appointments were announced: Tom C. Clark, of Texas, to succeed Francis Biddle as Attorney General; Federal Judge Louis B. Schwellenbach, of Washington State, a former Senator, to succeed Frances Perkins as Secretary of Labor; and Representative Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, to succeed Claude R. Wickard as Secretary of Agriculture. In the main, the appointments seem to be well regarded.

Clark is young, with a background of a career lawyer in Federal service and is generally regarded as fair-minded. Judge Schwellenbach is known as a consistent supporter of New Deal measures and, while his appointment came as a surprise to labor leaders, their cooperation is indicated. ANDERSON is a Member of the House of Representatives; has the respect and confidence of the Members, and it is believed that he will do the best he can with an almost impossible situation, growing out of previous maladministration.

ARE WE TO LOSE STILL MORE?

The so-called Bretton Woods agreement proposes that the United States participate, with other nations—to the initial exent of almost $6,000,000,000, in a world bank and an international monetary fund and legislation to effectuate the program is being strongly urged by the administration. The repeal of the Johnson Act, which bars private loans to governments which have failed to pay their World War I debts to the United States, is also being sought as a corollary to the Bretton Woods proposals. Testifying this week before a Senate committee, Assistant Secretary of State Clayton recommended such repeal and stated that the United States will never recover the $11,000,000,000 which is still owed to it by European nations on their World War I debts.

Do you not sometimes wonder how much longer this country of ours, vast and rich as it is, will be able to stand the constant, heavy drain on her financial and other resources?

Regulate the Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, during the debate no voice has been heard approving the administration of OPA; in fact, almost without exception, Members have condemned and complained against the administration—rather the maladministration—of the law.

Congress delegated wide powers to OPA, under which they have issued regulations and orders, many of which have the force and effect of laws. In so doing, Congress delegated legislative powers.

To recapture this legislative power and control, the following amendment, a new section to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is proposed:

(a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by any governmental agency exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than intraagency administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of its activities or interagency rules governing relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the President of the Senate for the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House for the House of Representatives.

(b) The draft of such proposed regulation or order shall be immediately assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the Senate and to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House of Representatives, for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate or by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including, the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. If sooner approved by either committee, it may go into effect immediately upon such approval. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance: *Provided*, That in the event of conflicting committee actions the earlier action shall govern.

(c) For the purposes of this section the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of Congress.

(d) This section shall be effective from the date of its approval.

Adoption of this amendment will add work on the committee but it will protect the American public from improper,

unsound regulations, many of which are contrary to the letter, spirit, and intent of the Price Control Act.

You Cannot Make a Better World With Bathtubs Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech I made at the commencement exercises of the Evansville College at Evansville, Ind., on June 11, 1945:

I deeply appreciate the invitation to speak to this graduating class. I think it is proper that we should term such an occasion "commencement" because that word stresses the desire to look forward, even at the time when you, who are graduating, have completed a task which you gave yourselves to perform. Being human, your normal reaction would be to sit back and enjoy the satisfaction of accomplishment; but it is more realistic and much more courageous to forego the satisfaction of accomplishment and to direct your attention toward the things which are to come and the tasks which are you to be performed.

Because I appreciate both the significance of your accomplishments and the courage implied in your acknowledgment that you are beginning to face further tasks, I wish to assure you that it was with no feeling of flippancy or lack of understanding of the seriousness of this time for you who are graduating, that I chose the title for this talk. I confess, however, an attempt, if possible, to dramatize, by pungent phraseology, the dangers which confront not only you but all of us who must live in the world which lies ahead.

Today the world resounds continuously with the talk, exhortations, and, indeed, the screams of many speakers who declare that what they want and what the common man wants is "democracy." Unfortunately, few people have attempted to define democracy, and fewer still have attempted to agree upon its meaning. Consequently there exists great confusion, and out of this confusion many extremists, both on the extreme right and extreme left, who have definite ideas of the things which they desire to accomplish, are afforded a great opportunity to cover their aims under a welter of words. Indeed, this is certainly one of the times when it is well to remember that there are many false prophets on the national and international scene today who appear before us in the sheep's clothing of democracy, but inwardly they have no respect for, or believe in, either democracy or the people, but only seek to bend the people to their will and to control and direct them for their own special interests and purposes.

It seemed to me, therefore, as I considered what I would say here today, that the only justification for my taking your time would be an honest attempt by me to present to you a few thoughts with reference to the causes which have aroused this crying out for democracy; the aspirations and hopes which people expect to find through the operation of democracy; a definition of the term democracy; and a consideration of the things which shall be required of people in the future, if they are to attain to some measure of democracy and guarantee to themselves that they will retain in the future the goals which are the objects of their aspirations and their hopes. I confess, openly, my own confusion; I admit fully a complete lack of certainty and conviction which prohibits my giving you anything dogmatic. I do not arrogate to myself a solution, so that I shall not offer you a speech, heaven forbid that I confront you with oratory; in fact, I shall only think aloud before you, with the hope that some of my thoughts might be sufficiently sound to justify the invitation which you have given me to come here.

I believe that the causes of the present search for something better and the hopes of people for a condition which they understand to be democracy exist throughout the world. The causes exist in a varying degree, and the aspirations likewise vary with the economic, political, and geographic background and the cultural experiences of the people. This world aspiration is certainly too great for me to elaborate upon because of the variables which I have mentioned. Therefore I shall limit myself to the equally imposing task of discussing some of these causes as they exist in our Nation.

I think that in this country plain people, who own little, if any, part of the vast system by which we produce and distribute wealth, have a definite feeling that these facilities are not being used to their fullest or that they are not being used most efficiently or equitably, having regard to the material well being of all of our people, as contrasted with what that well being might be if these facilities were used more fully and their production distributed more equitably. This is a purely materialistic desire and on that level the debate is being conducted between those who assert that this can be done best under a system which they call free enterprise, and those at the extreme outer pole who contend that it can be done best under a socialist or government-owned system. Carl Friedrich, in his excellent book, The New Belief in the Common Man, points out the materialistic level of this debate between these extremes, who are actually elite theorists at the extreme ends of the poles, when he says:

"Stalinism seeks to bureaucratize society, whereas Fascism attempts to refeudalize it."

However, I hope—and because I hope, I find some signs which justify my believing that in this country our people aspire to a little bit more than the choice between two systems, each of which proclaim, at the expense of the individual freedom of action and individual dignity of the masses, its ability to produce the most bathtubs for the most people. Consequently, I believe that our people also want an opportunity to participate in the decisions which affect their lives, an opportunity and a willingness to accept the responsibility which goes with the right to make decisions; that they believe that it is possible to maintain control over their Government and the things which affect their material well-being, and, at the same time, actually participate in and become a guiding force in the formulation of the policies and the decisions by which this is done. This much is certain: That if we do not have such goals and aspirations in this country, then there is no other country in the world where the people will seek or attain them in my time or yours.

The attainment of the goals which I have last stated is possible only through the establishment of a vital dynamic and living democracy. Most people agree today that democracy is not merely a form of government. On the contrary, it is the underlying principle or norm to which people must conform in all of their activities and their relationships with one another. Not only must their form of government be one which is actually consistent with this principle, but the principle must be present in the economics of the country and in the relationships of the people of the country with each other, without regard to their race, their creed, or their color; and, above all, it must retain fluidity which will permit a change of leaders and a change of the benefits and emoluments received by individuals, based solely upon the capacity of the individuals to render service to society and to contribute to the welfare of the whole.

Democracy is an ethic which requires, above all, from the man who asserts his belief in it and who proclaims that he is practicing it; that he will not do unto another man that which he will not permit to be done to him; that he will take no action toward others which he will not readily consent to having applied to himself; that he will not use wrongful methods—of which force is but one—in retaining for himself a position in society or a share of the material well-being of that society; and that he will consent to accept from society only that position in its governing bodies and that share of its wealth which he is entitled to receive as the result of his own efforts and his own ability; and that he will accept as a measurement of his worth the honest decisions of those whom he serves.

I assure you that I do not claim that this definition of democracy is the best which can be given. I am sure that others can define it better than I; but I am equally sure that while this definition is not all-inclusive, no definition of democracy can be sound which leaves out any part of it.

Having established a definition of democracy—a statement of principle—it is necessary, if any good is to come from this talk or any responsibility is to be assumed by the speaker, to investigate in some degree the character habits, reasoning standards and conduct required of us as citizens if we are to have any chance of establishing and maintaining the democratic way of life in the United States. If I fail to attempt to discuss these methods of implementing my definition of democracy, I would be guilty of one of the great weaknesses presently prevailing in America—that is—the American habit of attempting to solve all things by passing pious resolutions and then leaving the subject, failing to do anything to implement it and, in fact, forgetting it in the vain, illogical, absurd assumption that once the pronouncement is made, the matter will take care of itself. You deserve something better than that from me. I shall try to be worthy of your confidence and respect.

If we are to maintain a democracy, people must understand that they must support principles and causes and not men and leaders. When the masses of the people are propagandized until they believe that a leader is infallible and have no basic, progressive principles, or philosophy, or understanding of the needs of the society in which they live, by which they can test the actions or the pronouncements of that leader, they have substituted a belief in men for a belief in principles. By so doing they have become conditioned psychologically to a point where democracy has disappeared and their capacity to participate in the making of the decisions under which they shall live has been destroyed. Under such a condition, those who seek to view the actions of the leader objectionably and to point out either that he has forsaken the objectives, the attainment of which is necessary for the advancement of the people, or that the means chosen by the leader are not calculated to

attain those objectives, are immediately subjected to a mental, if not a physical, lynching by the very people whom they are attempting to prevent from supporting a ruler in a course which is inimical to their own best interests.

The truth of this statement can be found by any person who examines the effect of this leader complex not only upon nations, but in every subsidiary organization where the leader complex has been deliberately built up by those who intend to benefit from it. Often these people are not necessarily the leader, but they are the people who, knowing that they can retain their subordinate positions of authority only through the development of the leader complex in the people, deliberately build it up, knowing, at the very least, that few leaders, being human, can resist the mass adulation thus created. If you doubt that this is true and you are a member of a church, a club, a young people's group, an association of employers, a labor union, an organization of farmers or a cooperative, examine your own organization and see for yourself what conditions exist in it after the leader of that organization or some subordinates around him have deliberately attempted to destroy the theory of government by principle and have substituted for it a blind adulation of the leader.

I issue a challenge to you, namely, that if you examine your own organization, you will find in it the following condition, which James Burnham, in the Machiavellians, sets out as a quotation from Michel's observations on the conditions which arise in every so-called democratic organization, once the leadership psychology has obtained control of the members of that organization:

"At a typical stage in this psychological metamorphosis, the leader identifies himself with the group—party or nation or whatever the group may be. 'The bureaucrat identifies himself completely with the organization, confounding his own interests with its interests. All objective criticism of the party (or nation, if he is the leader of a nation) is taken by him as a personal affront. This is the cause of the obvious incapacity of all party leaders to take a serene and just view of hostile criticism. * * * If, on the other hand, the leader is attacked personally, his first care is to make it appear that the attack is directed against the party (or nation) as a whole.' Criticism of the group is personal libel against the leader; criticism of the leader is subversion and treason against the group. 'The despotism of the leaders,' moreover, 'does not arise solely from a vulgar lust of power or from uncontrolled egoism, but is often the outcome of a profound and sincere conviction of their own value and of the services which they have rendered to the common cause.' * * *

"The intermediary political organs—parliaments, for example—still continue; but they are now subordinate to the Bonapartist leader, for only he completely expresses the popular will; they are his agents, and only through him are they agents of the people. 'Once elected, the chosen of the people can no longer be opposed in any way. He personifies the majority, and all resistance to his will is antidemocratic. The leader of such a democracy is irremovable, for the nation, having once spoken, cannot contradict itself. He is moreover, infallible. It is reasonable and necessary that the adversaries of the government should be exterminated in the name of popular sovereignty, for the chosen of the people acts within his rights as representative of the collective will, established in his position by a spontaneous decision. It is the electors themselves, we are assured, who demand from the chosen of the people that he should use severe repressive measures, should employ force, should concentrate all authority in his own hands.'"

No person acquainted with contemporary history can read those warning signs without shuddering at the lack of conditioning of the peoples, not only of the world, but of this country, for the maintenance of a democratic society.

But it is said by others that a set of principles is a too nebulous thing for people to follow; that principles must be represented by leaders; that people will only follow leaders; that consequently no set of principles can be enforced and no objectives attained unless there are leaders whom the people can support in order to have the principles in which they believe and the objectives which they seek implemented and attained. The answer to such a statement is found when we understand the nature of democratic leadership, the qualification which are necessary in a democratic leader and likewise the habits, thoughts, education and training required of people who are fit and capable of maintaining a democratic society. First, the people must understand generally the objectives which they seek and the principles which must be adhered to in attaining them. Second, the leader must be admired, not for himself, but only because he has promised and seeks to and intends to attain the objectives which the people want and to carry out the policies necessary to attain them.

These qualifications of democratic leadership are important, but more important is the capacity of the people to understand the goals to be attained and their appreciation of the necessity for using proper and efficient means to attain them. So that if power, which is headier than alcohol or narcotics, should begin to have its anti-democratic effects upon the leader, nevertheless, the people, having a full understanding of the goals to be obtained and the means to be used, can check or reject him if and when he loses sight of the goals or attempts to use inefficient or anti-democratic means to attain them.

Given a people who are thus trained and educated in the capacity to understand principles, objectives and democratic means of attaining objectives, we then can have and maintain a democracy. For such people will understand that any temporary leader is the creature of their own will—a servant selected by them to carry out their wishes. Such a people, so educated, conditioned and trained, would have a full appreciation of their own dignity as individuals. They would have the capacity to select principles, objectives, and means from among those conflicting proposals offered them by persons seeking their suffrage. Such people would understand clearly that they themselves chose the objectives, principles, and means which they considered best calculated to benefit the greatest number and, having done this, they would understand that the proponents of the principles which appeal to them were placed in office by them for the purpose of carrying out that which they, the people, wished to have done. They would understand then that the persons whom they, the people, chose temporarily to govern them for the purpose of implementing their desires, were their creatures and consequently their servants. A people possessed with this understanding of democracy, with confidence in themselves, with belief in their own dignity are worthy of being designated common men; they will be capable of establishing, maintaining, and sreading democracy over the face of the earth; and such people could preserve their freedom through the operation of the democratic ethic, without regard to the form of the economy of the country in which they live.

In passing, it should be pointed out that the opposite is true of a people who have been subjected, deliberately or through ignorance, to propaganda designed to produce the mass psychology inherent in those people who have succumbed to the leadership complex. A people who believe that a leader is their savior and not their servant are incapable of living under the democratic ethic or maintaining even the forms of a democratic state or the basic freedoms which the forms profess to protect. We must not forget that the forms which democratic institutions take, for example, the freedoms guaranteed under the Bill of Rights, become mere scraps of paper when the people of a so-called democratic society no longer believe in them sufficiently to demand that their leader or his subordinates shall submit to the restraint inherent in those principles or standards. Perhaps wou will best understand this when I call to your attention the fact that the constitution of the Weimar Republic in Germany was never submitted by Hitler to the people for repeal; that he at no time had the courage to say that he had abrogated it; that, nevertheless, Hitler and the Nazi regime set up a government completely contrary to all of the provisions of that constitution. They were able to do this purely and simply because the German people themselves had been conditioned to reject the theory of rule by principle or law. The German people had become so completely conditioned by the leadership psychology that few were left who had the courage to question the acts of the leader, and these few received no support from the masses of the people, who had lost all understanding of, as well as all capacity to practice, the principles and ethics upon which the democratic way of life must be based if it is to survive.

Now, if I have been able to make clear just a few of the standards and some of the qualifications of citizenship which the people of this country must acquire, if we are to have any assurances of establishing and then maintaining the democratic way of life in our country; if I have set up but a few of the qualifications of democratic leadership, you will logically state to me: "You have laid down certain standards and norms, but you have yet to discuss or present the means or methods by which the things you advocate can be established."

I acknowledge the logical sequence and therefore the propriety of the question.

The means which I shall discuss can, in turn, be divided into two classes. First, the obligations which are imposed upon professed leaders of a democratic society by the ethics of democracy; and second, the educational methods and practices which must be adopted by those who have the obligation of training citizens for living in a democratic society.

First and foremost, I declare that it is undemocratic for those who seek to occupy the place of leadership in a democratic society to engage in oratory. Oratory I define as an appeal to the emotions of men which seeks to inculcate hate of opponents or adulation of the speaker or of a leader for whom the speaker professes to speak. If we accept the foregoing definition of oratory, is it not true that the orator contributes to the development of the leadership complex in people and thereby destroys, by an appeal to their emotions, their capacity to retain or to develop their ability to rationalize? The use of oratory, as I have defined it, progressively destroys the ability of the citizens of a democracy to develop their own principles and to apply those principles for the purpose of choosing the objectives they wish to attain. By so doing, the orator progressively destroys the capacity of the common man to develop his ability to rationalize. It is certainly true that the ability to rationalize or to think and to judge principles or causes or statements or proposals upon their merits is a thinking habit which may be developed or destroyed in direct proportion to the extent that men are called upon to use it.

It is a self-evident truth that the hope of establishing and maintaining democracy is directly proportionate to the capacity of its citizens to think clearly and dispassionately upon the problems which confront them. Consequently, any man who, for his own personal gain, willfully adopts a policy calculated to injure or destroy this capacity, is engaging in an antidemocratic practice, which action of itself disqualifies him to assume the role of leadership in a democratic society.

Again no person worthy of leadership in a democracy will seek support for a present program by playing upon the gratitude of the people for past performance.

If a leader of the people is a servant of the people, then it follows that all of the things he has done in the past are things which he was obligated to do for them. Therefore, if a man does that which he was obligated to do, the people owe him no overweening sense of gratitude for performing an obligation which was their due. Men are not infallible, from which it follows that every proposal which a so-called leader brings before the members of a democratic society is not necessarily good, or certainly, not perfect. A leader who believes in democracy and who would assume the obligations imposed upon democratic leadership, if he is intellectually honest, forthright and morally courageous, will attempt to persuade people to approve of each proposal which he brings before them solely upon the merits of the proposal itself. It is dishonest and an antidemocratic practice for a professed leader in a democratic society to attempt to dull the capacity of people to analyze a new proposition, which he presently proposes, by utilizing the emotional narcotic of gratitude.

Again, it is antidemocratic for a professed leader of the people to resort to argumentum ad per suam as his sole means of argument.

The effectiveness of this argument in a so-called democratic society is directly proportionate to the degree to which the people have been lulled into a sense of personal obligation by the advancement of the leadership psychology. The test of any statement or any proposition is not "Who says it?" But "What is it that is said?" It is true that the members of a democratic community are entitled, as part of the rational process, to consider in the first instance, the source from which a proposal comes. But, this legitimate exercise of the thinking process becomes so perverted, where the leadership psychology has been built up in a nation, that all propositions become judged solely from the standpoint of the person who proposes them. The nation becomes divided into two emotional camps—those who say the leader can do no wrong and those who say he can do no right. The presence of this type of thinking in any community is a definite warning-sign, indicating the decadence of democracy in that community.

Therefore, if we are to create and maintain a democracy, we must reject as unworthy of democratic leadership any person who seeks to destroy our democracy through the use of any such antidemocratic leadership practice.

Let us turn now from a consideration of antidemocratic leadership to a consideration of the qualifications which must be developed by the people who hope to create a democracy and to make it work. A democracy cannot exist where a vast majority of the people are incapable of understanding, acknowledging the correctness of and practicing the standards of conduct and norms which are demanded of them by the democratic ethic. You cannot develop an understanding of democracy by merely teaching the mechanics of forms which a democratic government establishes as the means of implementing the ethic. In other words, you do not condition a people to live in a democratic society merely by teaching them that our National Government consists of a legislative branch, an executive or administrative branch, and a judicial branch; by teaching them that the same general pattern is followed down through the State and the city and the various subdivisions. For these things are not democracy; they are simply the methods which have been established by the people for conducting a democratic form of government. In fact, these methods themselves must change from time to time, if and when a fuller understanding of the requirements of democratic principles demand their amendment or change.

Affirmatively, the citizens of a democracy should be required to study those subjects which are calculated to develop their capacity for logical thinking. They must learn to stick to a lesson or a subject as an objective until they have produced the best result which the facilities for information and study make available to them. They must be taught not to abandon a job just when it becomes a hard mental effort; they must be taught that they cannot drop or discard subjects solely on the ground that they are boring, because most of life is boring, but we have to live it through. Above all, it is disgraceful to permit them to do only the things which they wish to do or like to do, because, again, such persons are the fit subjects for antidemocratic leadership, for they will follow such leadership with the hope that by incurring the favor of the leaders they may, in some degree, be released from the restraints which the leaders impose upon less fortunate or more obscure citizens. The citizens of a democracy must learn to perform a task at the time it should be performed, until the performing of some job becomes a part of life and not an unpleasant intrusion upon the normal person's desire to live a life of irresponsibility.

Do you ask me now what relation does all of this have to the title which I have given to this talk? I think it has everything to do with it. I am one of those who does not believe that the form which the economics or even the form which the government of a democracy takes necessarily determines the existence of a democratic society. I am foolish enough—or, let us say, hopeful enough—to believe that given a people with an understanding of the requirements of the democratic life and the experience of living under it and practicing it, that democracy can be preserved in that society.

We can have democracy in any society where the people understand—that men are not infallible; that leaders are not the saviors of the people, but the servants of the people; that the possession of power over a long period of time in the person of any individual is a thing to be guarded against more than any physical disease or pestilence; that a democracy only exists where people believe in principles. We can have democracy if the people understand the dangers which are inherent in the leadership psychology and the methods and means used by those who, for their own personal interests, attempt to advance it.

Such people can create a democratic society in which the reasources of the land can be used to the fullest extent for the benefit of all and a system which will offer to all persons, without regard to their race, their creed or the color of their skin or the economic position of their parents, ample rewards for a task well performed. They can create and maintain a society in which the individual makes of himself a self-disciplined trustee, using his talents for the benefit of all, because it offers him a reasonable assurance that the system will afford him, at all times, an opportunity to attain that position which his own ability and his own effort entitles him to attain.

I think that these are the legitimate goals to which the heretofore unrequited masses of our people aspire.

Surely they cannot want a system, no matter if it be a materialist utopia, under which a few self-ordained leaders, either of free enterprise or of bureaucratic totalitarianism, offer them a constant stream of material benefits without any opportunity for the development of their individual dignity or any sense of participation in the decisions by which their material well-being is advanced. Surely free men would find such a utopia unfit to live in if they did not feel that they had a sense of participation in its creation or that they could rise to any position of leadership in it, which their separate abilities, their energy, and their integrity of purpose entitled them to receive. The hopes and aspiration of men worthy of democracy demand something more than material well-being and physical satisfaction. Such a society would not be a democracy.

Yet, when we examine the current thought of today, we find that almost all of it is devoted to debate and arguments as to the methods by which men shall acquire material things. Of course, we want for our people a tomorrow in which freedom from want can be a certainty for all who are not too lazy or worthless to earn it. Material well-being and economic security for all is a legitimate national goal. But think for only a minute and recall all the people you know who combine the possession of material comfort and economic security with mean, dishonest, nasty, overbearing, little, undemocratic, anti-social habits and characters, which makes living with them, in any organization, large or small, unbearable. Then decide for yourselves whether the possession of material things alone will produce citizens capable of creating and maintaining a democratic society. No matter what goals of material well-being we may attain, if we fail to educate and develop a citizenry capable of understanding, expanding, and of living the democratic ethic, we will find neither peace nor freedom for ourselves or our children.

You cannot make a better world with bath tubs alone.

Polish Trial in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 22, 1945:

POLISH TRIAL IN MOSCOW

Now that the one-sided Soviet trial of 16 kidnaped Polish underground leaders is over, the public knows little more than when it started.

Of the 16 accused of subversive activities behind Red Army lines, 12 were given prison sentences of from 4 months to 10 years, 3 were acquitted and the trial of another postponed. Certainly the sentences are light if the men are guilty of the worst crimes charged.

That they were guilty of being Polish patriots was proudly confessed. But that they were guilty of terrorist activities—of the kind all too common on the part of both Russians and Poles in the disputed territory—is not clear. The chief defendant, General Okuliciki, commander of the Polish Home Army, in denying that he was guilty of any crime, testified:

"I consider myself guilty of not giving orders to hand over radios, guns, and ammunition to the Red Army * * * (and) of forming the NE political-military organization, of maintaining communication with London and of carrying out propaganda against the Soviet Union and Red Army, but I am not guilty of carrying out terror, espionage, and acts of diversion. * * * This is a political trial. * * * You accuse the home army—the Polish people."

The Soviet prosecutor said: "Of course the four principals did not kill anyone. But they had instructions from the emigre government to carry out terror and diversion in the Red Army's rear. * * * It (the Polish Government in London) bears the main guilt. It tried to create a Poland in opposition to the Soviet Union."

But that the Polish Government, officially recognized by virtually all the Allies except Russia, should continue to claim its territory against Soviet seizure is not remarkable. It has better credentials than the Red puppet regime in Warsaw.

Review of OPA Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I have read the report of the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with its recommendation to enact House Resolution 101. I find that while they are specifically opposed to amendments to specific sections of the Price Control or Stabilization Act at this time, they recognize that there are bona fide criticisms of the administrative and enforcement acts of the personnel which should be given very careful consideration and review by those responsible for the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act.

I hold that the Congress of the United States is an agency responsible for the actions complained of, and that therefore they should be in a position to review the regulations issued by the Office of Price Administration in order to determine whether or not these regulations are, in fact, fair and equitable to the consumer, the distributor, and the producer. I hold also that the Congress should be in a position to review complaints of the acts of administrative and enforcement officials to determine whether those acts have been fair and equitable to all concerned.

I hold further that where these acts of administration are found to have been unfair and inequitable in their effect upon persons engaged in similar enterprises, the personal responsibility should be fixed and definite administrative action should be taken to remove those responsible for these inequities from any connection with the administration of these acts.

I appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee on June 15, and made these suggestions to that committee. At that time I also asked that they approve the adoption of House Resolution 241, which I introduced on May 3, which requires the appointment of a special committee for the purpose of reviewing the regulations issued, to determine whether or not these regulations are fair and equitable to those whom they control, and also to review the acts of the administrative personnel and the enforcement personnel to determine whether or not those actions are fair and equitable in their effect upon persons engaged in similar enterprises.

At the time I appeared before this committee I also asked that they separate the hearing function from the Office of Price Administration and place it under the Federal courts, similar to our referees in bankruptcy; and further, that amendments be made to provide for appeals from price panel and local board rationing action by means of a series of fact-finding divisions which provide for the appellant to be heard orally before any action by the enforcement division.

These provisions would make it impossible for any local board to enforce an act which is based upon bias or revenge. There is no adequate means of securing such reviews under the existing administrative regulations. I believe that the national office of the Office of Price Administration has decentralized too much power into the hands of the regional and district offices, and has given too little consideration to the review of unfair acts.

The Internal Revenue Department, in administering the Internal Revenue Code, has developed an organization that provides for fair and equitable determination of all additional assessments proposed by their local deputy internal revenue collectors. In contrast to this, the Office of Price Administration has nowhere provided the public with any information concerning the vast body of regulations which has been built upon the existing laws. The committee report, in the last sentence of page 5, says:

> Business has become familiar with them [standards] and with the body of regulations which has been built upon them.

I disagree with this statement, because there is not available to the public any organized publication that will show uniform application of the regulations that are now governing the various items which are rationed or which are under price control at this time.

I note also in the committee report, on page 7, this statement:

> The committee feels, however, that administrative delays may at times have detracted from the practical value of soundly conceived policies. The committee considers time of the essence in cases of price adjustments, and urges upon OPA the necessity of providing within its organization for their expeditious handling. Red tape cannot be tolerated.

This statement applies to actions in connection with price fixing, and also to actions concerning correction of administrative abuses by administrative personnel and enforcement personnel.

The Director of Economic Stabilization, Mr. William A. Davis, in a letter to me on March 29, stated that there would be no discrimination between nonfederally inspected slaughterers and federally inspected slaughterers at the time that new regulations were to be issued. He assured me that he would give this matter personal attention and that he was securing detailed reports of the effect of regulations then under consideration. However, on May 15 the new regulations on slaughterers' operations were issued and they definitely do discriminate between nonfederally inspected slaughterers and federally inspected slaughterers.

These inconsistencies must be constantly reviewed by Congress in order to determine for the American public just why such inequities are permitted, and if, in the judgment of Congress, such inequities are not necessary for a fair and equitable distribution of available civilian supplies, amendments should be made to this law immediately.

Chester Bowles made a statement before a meeting of Congressmen that he used the figures of 68 packers before deciding upon the latest slaughter control regulations. Obviously these 68 packers did not include the nonfederally inspected slaughterers, but were taken wholly from the membership of the American Meat Institute. Congress is the only agency that can give adequate representation to the nonfederally inspected slaughterers during the consideration of proposals for meat distribution, and if such a committee as is contemplated by House Resolution 241 had been in existence the equity of the present meat-control regulations would have been substantially greater and these regulations would need fewer amendments and additional orders then will be required before the May 15 meat program can be made effective and the meat actually placed in the hands of the families through the retail stores.

The handling of canning sugar is another evidence of inequity and unfairness. Just why the State of Ohio should be restricted to 5 pounds per person while the State of Kentucky has an allotment of 10 pounds to a person is impossible for the layman to understand and is impossible for a Member of Congress to explain, despite the mountain of general averages that are offered in statistical support of these regulations.

On the matter of what has gone before in the administration of price control and the Stabilization Act, I have no responsibility. However, in the matter of what happens from this day on in connection with the administration of price control and the Stabilization Act, I do have a very definite responsibility, and in order to assure the people of the United States that the Price Control and Stabilization Acts will be administered in a fair and equitable manner I have proposed that a congressional committee be established for the purpose of reviewing the regulations and the actions of those directly responsible for the administration of this act.

I believe that if House Resolution 241 is enacted we would be justified in reenacting the two laws for the period of 1 year, because we would be in a position to review the happenings under these acts as they occur. We could then

amend the act in whatever specific way was indicated by these administrative inequities.

I believe that price control and rationing are necessary and that the general averages quoted by the Office of Price Administration as savings under the act and all the general statistics that have been given to us may perhaps be true, but, nevertheless, in every set of general averages there is an area of inequities that are completely covered up in the general statistics and never receive their proper consideration.

I shall vote for the extension of the act, but I assure you that I shall work consistently for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 241, and I would appreciate the support of all those who believe that Congress should retain jurisdiction over the acts of the Office of Price Administration.

Ceiling Prices on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1945.

The Honorable BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: You have asked me to clarify the policies and procedures which this Office will follow in making sure that ceiling prices do not stand in the way of livestock production, particularly cattle feeding. I am glad you have asked this question because, in my opinion, this is one of the most important problems confronting us in the immediate future.

I believe that existing legislation is fully adequate for production purposes and is sufficiently flexible to meet emergencies and maladjustments as they develop. As you know, the existing legislation contains many specific safeguards to protect farm prices and specifically requires the adjustment of maximum prices where necessary to reflect farmers' increased costs, including labor, and to secure necessary production.

I strongly favor these provisions. Together with the other responsible agencies, I shall continue our efforts to carry them out meticulously in the administration of price control policies.

On several occasions I have expressed the emphatic opinion that it is production—the huge production for which America is famous—that alone can furnish the final answer to inflation. Our policies have encouraged huge production and will continue to do so.

We, as you know, have taken a series of far-reaching actions designed to encourage increased meat production and to improve the distribution of meat supplies. Our program, however, must remain flexible. The steps thus far taken are for current conditions only. If during the coming months conditions change, or if the present program proves in any way inadequate to meet the situation, we shall take whatever further action is required.

As soon as Mr. CLINTON ANDERSON steps into his new position as Secretary of Agriculture, I plan to discuss the fall and winter livestock situation with him. We shall call in representative leaders of livestock producers before the main feeding season begins to reexamine our price and rationing regulations and obtain their advice and assistance. If additional steps should be required, we shall take them promptly.

I can see no occasion whatever for additional legislation at this time. In a program so vast and complicated as this one, some mistakes in administration are, of course, inevitable, regardless of what the law is or who administers it. I assure you that appropriate actions will continue to be taken to correct such mistakes and inequities as may develop and to carry out fully the objectives and provisions of the existing laws.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, there will be more and more people and groups, as the end of the war approaches, advocating the disbanding of all price control, immediately following the declaration of peace. The education we have from our experience following the last war would teach us not to take off the price controls while our peacetime economy is still off balance from the effects of the war.

The cost of living at the end of the First World War, even though it was a much shorter war, was up 62 percent. Nineteen months after the war's end, the cost of living had risen 108 percent, more than double what it was at the beginning of the war.

Should we allow such inflation to run wild following this war, it would dwarf the savings the workers, farmers, and others have on hand. The prices must be controlled so those important savings will not be deflated. The people with the smaller incomes would suffer most.

I include here an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of February 9, 1945, on this subject, which I think is very sensible:

INVITATION TO SPECULATORS

The Oregon Senate has adopted a resolution memorializing Congress to end price and other controls "as soon as posisble" after the end of the war. What is "as soon as possible?" Is it as soon as a bill can be rushed through Congress, or as soon as price controls can be lifted without endangering the economy of the country?

If the latter is its meaning we are for it, but as for the other meaning we know of no economist or competent and informed person who supports a resolution by Congress now declaring a purpose to cancel price stabilization at once when hostilities cease.

If the war ends suddenly in all areas, consumer demands and purchasing power will exceed amount of supplies—the latter affected by humane obligations to the starving peoples of war-torn countries—and we shall have a far more aggravated condition than we had at the close of the First World War.

Most price controls were then lifted immediately after the armistice. Though war plants were closing and many demobilized servicemen were hunting jobs, the people's purchasing power was for a time in excess of supplies. Retailers had difficulty in getting goods to meet the demand. Their orders pyramided in the hands of wholesalers. Prices were marked up from time to time by manufacturers, jobbers and retailers. An illusion was created of demand at unheard-of prices for more goods than the country could produce. A buyers' strike ensued, and a depression was created which brought widespread unemployment, cutting of wages and an epidemic of bankruptcies.

Says the National Bureau of Economic Research, which is composed of distinguished economists, financiers, industrialists and labor leaders, "Perhaps the gravest danger is that the first postwar year may bring a great inflation of prices such as occurred in 1919. * * * Unless we resist the temptation to grasp at paper profits, we shall repeat the costly errors we made then."

If war does not end at approximately the same time in all theaters, but tapers off under an extended period of mopping up, reconversion to peacetime levels of supply and demand may be accomplished gradually, ere the war has completely ended.

A memorial of this character is wholly premature, and in its more drastic meaning ignores the unhappy experiences of the past, and in effect proposes an invitation to the speculators of the world to assemble for big pickings from the common people.

Trial of the 16 Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Evening Star of June 20, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The strict Russian censorship has not permitted the filing of a complete picture of the trial of the 16 Polish underground leaders in Moscow, certain official Washington quarters say. The 16 Poles disappeared under mysterious circumstances on March 27 and are now being tried on charges of sabotage and high treason against the Soviet armies of liberation. In high American quarters there is still a strong belief that the trial may end in some light sentences. The matter of these arrested Poles, at least one of whom went to the headquarters of the First White Russian Army under a safe-conduct agreement, is said to have been discussed by President Truman's special envoy, Harry Hopkins, with Premier Stalin personally.

The American and British Governments have adopted the attitude that while conceding that Poland is in the Russian sphere of influence, the question of the accused men who were representing the Polish Government in exile during the years of German occupation is one of international interest, at least until a government is formed in Poland that is recognized by all the Allies.

It is now being revealed from reliable quarters that the decision of the 16 Polish leaders

to come out from their hiding places and meet with the Russian authorities was based on a letter written to J. S. Jankowski, a member of the underground government, by Colonel Pimienov, the head of the NKVD (Russian Secret and Security Police) in Poland.

On March 6, this officer, who holds a highly responsible position in the Red Army, wrote suggesting a meeting between Jankowski and the commander of the First Army, Colonel General Ivanov, at the army headquarters at Pruszkow, about 20 miles west of Warsaw. He stated that the suggestion of such a meeting, the tremendous importance of which could not be explained in a necessarily short letter, would meet with Jankowski's approval.

Colonel Pimienov added that a meeting with General Ivanov should pave the way for an accord on matters which otherwise would be difficult to settle. It should be remembered that at that time the Committee of Three named at Yalta to establish the Polish Government of National Unity, was in session.

The head of the NKVD said further that such a meeting might avoid a crisis.

It appears that an earlier attempt by the Russian Army security services to bring about a meeting with the Polish underground had failed, since Colonel Pimienov mentioned how very regrettable it was that the date originally set by General Ivanov had already passed. But he expressed the hope that the commander in chief of the White Russian Army would take into consideration his plea that the delayed meeting should take place within the next few days.

In order to dispel the doubts about Jankowski's security which in all likelihood prevented the earlier meeting Colonel Pimienov assured the Polish leader on his word as an officer of the Red Army that your fate will from now on be in my hands and that upon your arrival at our headquarters in Puruszkow you will be absolutely safe. The letter ended with these words: "I count on an early meeting and send you my respects and ask you to inform me of your decision."

After conferring with his colleagues and the underground national council, Jankowski is reported to have wirelessed London on March 15 of his decision to meet General Ivanov. The Polish Government in exile, after consulting the British Foreign Office, advised the underground leaders to use their own judgment and on March 27 they went to the headquarters of the First White Russian Army.

What happened after that date is a matter of conjecture. According to Polish quarters, the 16 men demanded a plane to go to London but were urged to go to Moscow first. Eventually they were placed in trucks and sent to the Russian capital, where incriminating documents are said to have been found in their possession. Their arrest followed. Whether the letter from the NKVD chief, which could be construed as a safe conduct pledge, covered the other members of the delegation is not known at this time. It is also not yet clear whether the "guarantee" mentioned by Colonel Pimienov which apparently had been given if the meeting occurred "within the next few days" still held good after 3 weeks.

It is assumed, however, that the members of the Polish underground, who since 1939 had escaped detection of the German Gestapo, would not come out of their hiding places if they had not been confident that they had the necessary assurances of safety.

From the international point of view, the trial of the 16 Poles is considered more important than the famous 1936 purge case. The followers of Leon Trotsky who were brought before the military tribunal were mostly Russian subjects and, without exception, all were members of the Communist Party. They knew the strict party discipline and the penalties.

The men who stand before the bar of the Russian court martial today are the citizens of a sovereign state and underground members of the government of that state. Unless the court-martial proceedings prove definitely that they have harmed the cause of the Allies, represented in Poland by the Red armies, it is difficult to conceive how they can be severely punished for their political attitude.

No Coddling for Nazi Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, much adverse publicity has recently been given—and rightly so—to the reported treatment accorded by some of our Army officers in the European theater to Hermann Goering, the captured Nazi. General Eisenhower, without naming names, promptly condemned the procedure and made it clear that no Nazi or high German officer is to be treated as a "friendly enemy."

Goering was at one time second in command to Hitler. He directed the indiscriminate bombings by the Luftwaffe. He looted the conquered countries of their art treasures. The record is clear that, with other high-ranking Nazis, he was directly responsible for the concentration camps, the killings, the studied brutal treatment of thousands upon thousands of helpless, defenseless human being, both civilians and war prisoners.

By their conduct, these Nazis have lost all claim to consideration as anything but sadistic criminals. Because of lack of knowledge on the subject, no comment is here made as to the treatment given to the average German prisoner of war, but there certainly is no reason on earth why these Nazi butchers should be given any special consideration, except as they are held individually responsible for the heinous crimes committed under their personal direction.

The European war has been no tournament, no jousting by skilled warriors merely to exhibit their prowess in the art of warfare. It has been a bitter ruthless struggle for supremacy and, on the part of the Nazi command, has been carried on in utter disregard of all rules of conduct recognized and heretofore observed by civilized nations.

The mere idea of fraternizing with any of those who have been responsible for the torturing, the maiming, the killing of civilians; the wanton murder of our servicemen, is repugnant, and we may hope that this incident will be the last of its kind. In view of General Eisenhower's stern rebuke and prompt orders, it probably will be.

THE OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Elmer Davis, head of the administration's propaganda agency, the OWI, on May 11, after the cessation of organized resistance in Germany, announced that American publications would be banned in Germany—the idea being that, in lieu thereof, OWI would use Treasury funds to print its own newspapers in certain German cities. Davis gave newspaper correspondents to understand that such decision had been reached by the United States military chiefs in Europe.

However, on May 15, President Truman announced to a news conference a reversal of OWI's proposed program in Germany and stated that Mr. Davis had misunderstood the policy agreed on; that "General Eisenhower has advised me that he has issued no policy or order dealing with the importation of publications into Germany," and further that, insofar as military security would permit, a free press should prevail in Germany.

The President's action was generally commended and was interpreted by Members of Congress as an indication that he was not inclined to permit any bureaucrat to form the policy of the administration—an encouraging sign.

BLANK CHECKS

Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, testifying recently before a Senate subcommittee in support of a bill proposed to tighten congressional control of the myriads of Government corporations, stated, referring to the Government corporate structure:

> It has become greater than Congress, its creator, and at times it arrogantly snaps its fingers in the face of Congress.

This week, Mr. Warren also told the joint committee studying the streamlining of Congress that it is time "to draw back to the Congress the control of expenditures."

That sentiment on the part of a Government official is heartening and it is to be hoped that the Congress will immediately take definite action to carry it into reality.

If the intention of President Truman—disclosed during the past week—to absorb independent agencies into regular departments of the Government is carried out, it may be, too, that the independent agencies which have mushroomed and expanded during the past 12 years are in the last stages of their existence. Businessmen, private citizens, all those who have been subjected to bureaucratic orders, regulations, restrictions, will probably mourn very little over their demise.

Succession Needs Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of May 18, 1945:

SUCCESSION NEEDS ATTENTION

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley made some interesting suggestions the other day regarding the succession to the Presidency.

He pointed out, for instance, that existing statutes permit a Vice President who becomes President to name his own possible successor without consulting the electorate.

This quirk provides that the Secretary of State shall succeed to the Presidency if the Vice President is removed from the scene. That partially explains the recurring reports that Secretary of State Stettinius, who is not an orthodox party man, may be succeeded soon by Mr. James F. Byrnes, who is a loyal party man.

These reports are an embarrassment to Mr. Stettinius in his efforts to make the San Francisco Conference move along smoothly. Foreign diplomats cannot be expected to take too seriously their dealings with an American Secretary of State who is thought likely to be out of a job, or demoted, in a matter of a few weeks or months. The situation is not primarily President Truman's fault but is chargeable to horse-and-buggy legislation that has been on the books for 60 years.

Mr. Farley also pointed out that the Nation might be left without a President in the event a newly elected President and Vice President both died prior to the January 20 inauguration. There is no provision either in the Constitution or in the Federal statutes which would provide for a successor under such a circumstance.

Congress would do well to listen to Mr. Farley. It seems quite evident that the entire succession machinery requires overhauling.

China Lantern Awarded Grand Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the China Lantern is the weekly newspaper of the United States forces in the China theater and is published by Lts. Lester H. Geiss and Harry D Purcell, Sgt. Maurice Pernod, and others, and includes among its reporters Pfc Tom Delaney, of Miles City, Mont., and before entering the service an outstanding reporter in my State. It has been awarded the grand prize in the 1945 Camp Newspaper Service contest.

I should like to extend to the staff of the China Lantern my congratulations on receiving this outstanding award. They are doing a good and necessary job in what to my mind has always been one of the most important of all the war theaters. I should like them to know also that the House of Representatives is very much interested in all our servicemen on the China station and that we are very grateful to them for the valiant and courageous work they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the China Lantern of June 8, 1945, concerning the award made to that paper:

LANTERN NAMED WORLD'S TOP SERVICE NEWSPAPER IN CONTEST

The China Lantern has been awarded the grand prize in the 1945 camp newspaper service contest among service publications all over the world. In taking top honors among all magazines and newspapers published officially by the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, women's auxiliaries, and Canadian services, the China theater's newspaper won praise from the three contest judges—Leland Stowe, Pulitzer prize winner and famed correspondent; John S. Remaly, editor of the Endicott (N. Y.) Daily Bulletin; and Basil L. Walter, executive editor of the Chicago Daily News.

OVER 500 ENTRIES

In typical China theater fashion the China Lantern operates over what is believed to be the most extended supply line in the world, maintaining editorial offices both in Kunming, China, and Calcutta, India.

Over 500 service publications were entered in the contest in which the Lantern won the grand prize. Fifty-nine publications earned honorable mention. Letterpress newspapers in the honorable-mention category include The Dispatch, published at APO 523, New York; The 45th Division News, APO 45, New York; Front Line, of the Third Infantry Division, APO 3, New York; The Stars & Stripes, APO 413, New York; and TTF, APO 83, New York. Of these the Front Line was considered in the finals.

OTHER AWARDS

Other publications received awards in domestic, offset, letterpress, and mimeograph categories.

The first edition of the China theater paper, published on February 9, was considered as the theater's entry in the contest. The name contest was announced in that issue of the paper which bore the temporary name of the China Command Post.

A large plaque, symbolic of the grand prize, will be awarded to the China Lantern. Six Oscarettes will go to category winners.

The Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. JAMES J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorials from the Council Bluffs Nonpareil and the Evening World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., relative to recommendations made by the Honorable James A. Farley concerning Presidential succession:

[From the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of May 15, 1945]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and Democratic national chairman, believes a commission should be appointed to examine the need for a constitutional amendment dealing with the succession to the Presidency of the United States.

"I think," he said in a recent speech, "that a special commission should now be set up, composed of Members of the Senate and of the House and with one or more members appointed by the President and perhaps one Supreme Court Justice selected by the Chief Justice. There might be other groups which should be associated with the work of such a commission.

"This commission should study and recommend with respect to the whole problem of the succession to the Presidency, including the succession after the Vice President, which now is in the Secretary of State. If a constitutional amendment is called for it should be initiated. If legislation alone is called for, this body should suggest such legislation. It seems to me common sense and governmental wisdom to study this question now and to act as soon as we wisely can."

Mr. Farley pointed out that under the present system the Vice President, in the event of his succession to the Presidency, could, by naming his Secretary of State, appoint his own successor without reference to the electorate. He said that there were other possibilities which have not yet been provided for by law. Among them, he said, would be the question of what would happen if both President-elect and Vice President-elect died before January 20. Although the selection of a President apparently would devolve upon the House of Representatives, it could leave the country without a Chief Executive for a long time if the House were deadlocked.

The law formerly provided that in the event of the death of the President and Vice President, the President of the Senate would succeed to the Presidency, and then the Speaker of the House.

But there came a time when a Vice President died shortly after taking office and the President of the Senate was a member of the opposing party. If death had struck in the White House, the Presidency would have passed to the opposition party. To avert such a possibility, Congress changed the succession to members of the Cabinet in the order departments were created.

But this is not an entirely satisfactory arrangement for the reason Mr. Farley pointed out and for other reasons. Indeed, there is talk that Secretary Stettinius may be asked to resign in order that a more regular and seasoned Democrat may be appointed Secretary of State.

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of May 18, 1945]

SUCCESSION NEEDS ATTENTION

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley made some interesting suggestions the other day regarding the succession to the Presidency.

He pointed out, for instance, that existing statutes permit a Vice President who becomes President to name his own possible successor without consulting the electorate.

This quirk provides that the Secretary of State shall succeed to the Presidency if the Vice President is removed from the scene. That partially explains the recurring reports that Secretary of State Stettinius, who is not an orthodox party man, may be succeeded soon by Mr. James F. Byrnes, who is a loyal party man.

These reports are an embarrassment to Mr. Stettinius in his efforts to make the San Francisco Conference move along smoothly. Foreign diplomats cannot be expected to take too seriously their dealings with an American Secretary of State who is thought likely to be out of a job, or demoted, in a matter of a few weeks or months. The situation is not primarily President Truman's fault but is chargeable to "horse and buggy" legislation that has been on the books for 60 years.

Mr. Farley also pointed out that the Nation might be left without a President in the event a newly elected President and Vice President both died prior to the January 20 inauguration. There is no provision either in the Constitution or in the Federal statutes which would provide for a successor under such a circumstance.

Congress would do well to listen to Mr. Farley. It seems quite evident that the entire succession machinery requires overhauling.

The Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Flint (Mich.) Journal of June 15, 1945:

A FLAW

What would have been a critical period for virtually any other nation in the world has been passed by the United States without tremor.

The sudden death of Franklin D. Roosevelt shocked the Nation. But there was no panic, no emergency orders, none of the unrest a less stable country might have experienced. Within a few minutes Vice President Truman had been sworn in as successor and the people calmly pledged their support.

For the smooth transition, tribute is due the new President because of the modest yet purposeful manner with which he has "taken hold." Credit also may be given the orderly framework of our laws which state clearly who shall succeed when the President dies.

Yet, closer analysis of our Presidential succession rules indicate gaps and flaws which, although happily not applicable to the recent emergency, might at some future time create a serious crisis.

For example, suppose President Truman should choose to resign. A Federal statute of 1886, of course, provides the Secretary of State, in the absence of any Vice President, shall thereupon become President. Yet the President, subject only to ratification by the Senate, appoints the Secretary of State. Thus through a loophole which has gone uncorrected 59 years, a Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency may literally choose his successor without reference to the electorate.

Similarly knotty is the problem of a successor to the Presidency if both the President-elect and the Vice President-elect should die before taking office. The twentieth amendment to the Constitution here provides the House of Representatives shall, in such case, meet on January 3 to choose a President to take office on January 20, yet it does not lay down an order of succession. And what if the House deadlocks, fails to reach a decision in the 17 days? The Nation would be without a Chief Executive for such time as the decision was held up.

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General now engaged in private business, mentioned these and related problems in a recent talk to the chamber of commerce at Hazleton, Pa.

Mr. Farley placed particular stress on the fact that of the 34 times a Vice President of the United States has been elected, the office has subsequently become vacant 15 times, either by death, succession to the Presidency, or resignation.

Plainly, Mr. Farley stated, there is need for a commission to "study and recommend with respect to the whole problem of the succession to the Presidency." It might consist of Members of the House and Senate, with one or more members appointed by the President and perhaps one Supreme Court justice, with possibly other groups represented as well, he added.

"If a constitutional amendment is called for, it should be initiated," Mr. Farley said, "if legislation alone is called for, this body should suggest such legislation. It seems to me common sense and governmental wisdom to study this question now and act as soon as we wisely can."

Soldierly Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot:

SOLDIERLY VISION

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

As the first thunderous cheers of welcome to General Eisenhower die away there is time to ask ourselves: How did Eisenhower happen? Who picked him for his great command with such unerring judgment? After all, he was only a lieutenant colonel of infantry when the war started, in an Army containing some 400 lieutenant colonels senior to himself, to say nothing of some 700 full colonels and nearly 150 general officers. How did he get up to the top so fast just when he was needed?

In fact, how does it happen that our great Army, the greatest we have ever sent into battle, has been universally so well commanded?

I think this is a very good time to pay the tribute that is his due to the man who is responsible for this outstanding record. He is the Chief of Staff, General of the Army George C. Marshall. The reason why our generals have been so well chosen and so successful is really threefold:

1. President Roosevelt left the choice entirely to General Marshall, exercising no influence on the matter himself, so that leaders were chosen by a soldier and not, as so often in the past, by a civilian President or Secretary of War.

2. General Marshall knew his men and chose them with skill.

3. Having chosen, he tested the men of his choice at every step forward until he was sure he had the right men for the right assignments.

When the Army was first being greatly expanded, at the time that the fall of France shocked the Nation into a realization of the danger across the Atlantic, General Marshall began choosing the men who might have to command millions of American boys in battle. He recognized that most of the general officers of the Regular Army, as it then existed, were too old for active field commands in modern war. Use could be made of their experience and wisdom in the training period, but they would have to be replaced when it came to actual fighting.

By whom? Not, in the first place, by citizen officers, because these did not yet have enough experience and training—they might acquire it later, but in the meantime the professional officers of the Regular Army would have to carry on. So the problem was to choose the generals of the new army from the colonels, lieutenant colonels and majors of the old Regular establishment.

In particular the problem was to select from these (there were in October, 1940, about 6,000 "promotion list" officers in these three grades) a very few outstanding men for the very highest commands. This was no easy task—and a mistake might cost hundreds, even thousands of lives; might risk the very safety of the Nation before it could be corrected. For there could be no real proof until battle was joined.

General Marshall made for himself a little list. He wrote names on that list of men he knew, from his own wide experience and acquaintance in the Army; he added to it men of high service reputation whom he did not know and some who were recommended to him by others in whose judgment he had confidence. It was not a very long list, but it was a list on which you might have seen a good many names which have been much in the headlines recently; and a few which have not.

Having made his list, General Marshall did not stop there. He proceeded to put each officer on that list through a period of trial and test as ruthless and soul-searching as he could make it. He piled burdens on them; he shifted them suddenly from one post to another of increased responsibility; he worked the very hearts out of them; and he judged them strictly and impartially by the results they produced.

Dwight Eisenhower was on that list. When it was first prepared he was executive officer of the Fifteenth Infantry at Fort Lewis, Wash. He was made chief of staff of the Third Division at the same post; making good in that job, he went to the Ninth Corps, also as chief of staff; from there he was transferred to Lt. Gen. Walter Krueger's Third Army, again as chief of staff, and served with that officer through the Louisiana maneuvers of 1941. Then he was abruptly shifted to the War Department General Staff as Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations. There, under General Marshall's own eyes, he served the final months of his stern apprenticeship for the command of 3,000,000 American soldiers, until the day when he was summoned from his desk to General Marshall's office to hear his chief say:

"Eisenhower, I've got to send somebody to Europe to command our forces there. I've picked you for the job. How soon can you leave?"

It was not only the commander in chief who was thus selected. The same process—varying somewhat in detail—was applied to every one of the present Army group, Army and corps commanders, and to some who didn't make the grade. Those who buckled under the strain were through. The older officers tended to fall by the wayside (General Krueger, for example, is the only officer now holding a field command who was a permanent major general of the Regular Army in October 1940), the younger men came to the top as they proved themselves worthy. And the result speaks for itself—speaks eloquently in terms of victories won, and won without needless sacrifice or cruel disaster.

The Nation—and particularly the fathers and mothers, the wives and sweethearts of America—owe a debt of gratitude to George Catlett Marshall which can never be repaid. As we honor our returning generals, fresh from their fields of victory, let us not forget the man who chose them and directed them so well and whose wise choice and soldierly vision gave us those victories at far less proportionate cost than any we have ever won before.

The Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Waterbury (Conn.) American on June 1, 1945, on an address made by the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York, concerning presidential succession:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION DEFECTIVE

It never has happened yet in the entire course of this country's national history, but

it conceivably might happen at any time—a series of mischances by which the Federal Government would be left without either a President or a Vice President, or even a line of Cabinet officers possessing clear legal and constitutional qualifications to take over the Chief Executive office pending another election. James A. Farley made note of the possibility in an address before the Chamber of Commerce of Hazleton, Pa., the other day. Within a week Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma City, proposed the appointment of a commission to study it and recommend due provision for the contingency if it ever arose.

For the interim, Representative MONRONEY introduced a proposed enactment whereby the Speaker of the House of Representatives would follow the Vice President in the line of succession to the Presidency in the event of a vacancy. That amendment of the present legal order, he explained, would assure tenure of the Presidential office by a popularly elected functionary, instead of leaving it to an Executive appointee. In imaginable circumstances, though, even that device would not meet the Government's need.

In his own discussion of the problem, Mr. Farley pointed out that if by a possible combination of misfortunes both a President-elect and a Vice President-elect died or were incapacitated between the days of election and inauguration, there might be no Cabinet officers clearly eligible to take over the Chief Executive office in their stead. There might not be any Speaker of the House or President pro tempore of the Senate, either, if one session of Congress had expired and the next had not yet got itself organized. A possible deadlock in either Chamber, or both, could delay them beyond the legally appointed date of inauguration day, in their efforts to elect presiding officers for the new legislative session.

Under ordinary conditions, of course, the gap could be temporarily filled, if necessary, within a matter of hours; but the main point is that there never should be any practical possibility of a gap. The legal line of Presidential succession should be extended far enough to guarantee that somebody should be immediately available to act as President for the duration of any possible emergency, no matter how unlikely.

When I raised the issue of Presidential succession in my speech in Hazleton, Pa., last month, it was with the hope that thoughtful discussion would follow. The bill introduced a few days later by Congressman MONRONEY, and now the President's message, indicate that action is imminent. There are several aspects to this issue which still remain to be discussed and I believe that Congress will want to inquire into them fully, as some Members already have been doing for the last several years.

For example, the proposal is that the Speaker of the House become the successor after the Vice President. But that could have results to which we are not accustomed. It frequently happens that the Speaker belongs to a different political party than the incumbent President and Vice President.

As a firm believer in safeguarding our party form of government, I would like to suggest that the succession after President and Vice President fall to the members of the President's party who hold the highest offices of the House and Senate. Thus in the House, the successor would either be the Speaker or the minority leader, depending on the political affiliation of the President; in the Senate, either the President pro tempore, or the minority leader. By this method, a political upheaval through overnight change of administrations could be avoided, and the course of Government could go smoothly forward as it has so admirably done under Mr. Truman since he succeeded the late President Roosevelt.

While I am happy that congressional discussion is under way, I would counsel against haste in attempting to reach a solution on the problem of succession. There are possible constitutional questions involved and I sincerely hope that when action is finally taken it will close not one but all the gaps that exist in the present line of succession. I renew my suggestion that a commission would be most useful in clarifying the problem and suggested legislation for its solution.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. James A. Farley, issued for release on June 22, with reference to Presidential succession. It was Mr. Farley who first called public attention to this subject in an address delivered in Hazleton, Pa., some weeks ago:

President Truman deserves the gratitude of the Nation for his statesmanlike message on the question of Presidential succession. Noting that under present law, "it now lies within my power to nominate the person who would be my immediate successor," the President added: "I do not believe that in a democracy this power should rest with the Chief Executive."

So far as I know this is the first time since the last war that a President has sought voluntarily to relinquish a power conferred upon him, and that is a wholesome sign which every real American will cheer.

Peacetime Military Conscription—Views of Our Boys at the Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, for various reasons many American people are being carried away with the idea of peacetime compulsory military training without giving thought to the rights of the millions of American soldiers now at the front to have their say on this vitally important question before we decide on a program which carries such tremendous consequences to the future of our country. I submit that the members of our armed forces—the men who are doing the fighting—have a right to be heard before a decision is made, and for the consideration of my colleagues, two letters from overseas veterans, appearing in Washington newspapers, are appended:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 21, 1945]

DISCUSSES PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION IN TERMS OF INTEGRITY

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

In the course of our national history, we have passed, as do all nations, through a series of crises. In all of these the Nation as a whole had a hand in the solution of the problem of the moment. However, we now are faced with a crisis concerning which not all of us can have our proper expression of opinion. The permanent selective-service bill now being debated in Congress can be viewed only as a crisis because it is so contrary to the principles of our Government. Yet millions of voters who have had a personal experience with a service draft are now, so far as effect can be measured, beyond the hearing of the Nation. It is with the hope that my weak voice may be heard that this is written.

The announced purpose of the permanent draft is permanent preparation of adequate defense for our country. Why do we wish to defend our country? We went to war to safeguard our national liberty and our individual freedom (of which the latter is more typically American and, to my way of thinking, more important). But does a man retain his personal freedom in the Army?

In time of war—a period of national emergency—a man may relinquish part of his liberty in order to insure total possession of that liberty at a later date. A comparison between the number of volunteers at the outbreak of war and the number of men in the Army during times of peace proves effectively that Americans are willing to sacrifice part of their freedom during war but that they are not prepared to do so during peace.

The Army and the Navy would have us believe that we are to live in a constant state of emergency. For a state of emergency is the only condition under which Americans have been willing to tolerate encroachments upon their liberty and submit to a service draft.

Assuming, on the other hand, that we are not to live in a perpetual state of emergency, we Americans should not be obliged to give up any part of our individual liberty. Yet we should provide for the defense of our country. How to do that properly is a very difficult question and one upon which not even military experts agree. But, for the sake of discussion, let us assume that the school of thought favoring a large Army is correct.

Previous to this war, we were not able to maintain a large standing Army. Why? One major factor was the unwillingness of Americans to give up their civil rights and personal dignity to the Army. And, as the Army has been and now is constituted, loss of liberty and dignity are foregone conclusions. It is only because of the Army's present organization that sufficient volunteers cannot be found. Reorganize the Army so that its Fascist traits are removed and inducements to initiative substituted, and it will be discovered that the Army, composed of volunteers only, will approach a satisfactory size.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the problem of permanent draft is the fact that its proponents are trying to push it through Congress now while most of the servicemen are overseas. As long as we try to maintain a representative government, no question so crucial should be discussed or brought to a vote in Congress until the large number of voters in the services are back in the States where their opinions can be heard properly.

Technical Sgt. ROBERT F. INGER.

BAVARIA.

[From the Washington Post]

VIEW FROM NEW GUINEA

I've just been reading the reports on the VFW and Legion views on a postwar conscription program. Here's one serviceman who finds himself in strong disagreement with the views put forward on his behalf.

I don't consider it either desirable or necessary. The argument that it will improve American youth in any way to spend a year in military training is completely false. The British survived the impact of World War II without it and the French succumbed with it.

In modern warfare, the learning that plays the critical part in winning is outmoded in a matter of a few years.

Aside from the hand grenade and a few of the heavier weapons, for example, the combat equipment of even so conservative an arm as the Infantry has completely changed in the course of the first few years of the war. The bazooka, Garand, and chemical mortar are only a few of those made public. Do you remember how much training the National Guard units required before they were judged fit for combat? And they were already organized. Even our Regular Army was prepared for little except squads right and the manual of arms.

In the more technical branches of the service the changes have been even more revolutionary. Only in a few of the lower Signal Corps organizations do the same activities continue that were performed by similar organizations just a few years ago. Radar is only one of the new inventions and developments.

The fundamentals of national defense found in our traditional policies are closer to our needs than ever before. What we need is an aggressive and alert professional army, made up of men whose interests lie in developing new techniques of warfare and in assimilating current technical discoveries. These men should be expected not only to master the ability to perform their military duties but to adopt the German pre-Hitler practice of considering themselves fundamentally as training cadre.

To keep men of any reasonable quality in the ranks, of course, they would have to be paid considerably more than our prewar Army was. The eighteenth-century notion that soldiers and sailors picked from the streets and prisons could fight a successful war was, unfortunately, carried over to our Army's pay and social scheme.

T/5 ISADORE BLUMEN.

NEW GUINEA, *June 5.*

An American Atrocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of June 13, 1945:

AN AMERICAN ATROCITY

In the same week that President Truman and the OWT appealed to the public to avoid all unnecessary travel the betting at the Belmont race track hit an all time high, 70,000 people traveled to Louisville to see the Derby, and plans got under way for record crowds at the Preakness, at Pimlico. Fast express trains were carting race horses to and fro across the country at the same time that important business meetings and conferences were being canceled to economize on travel. Thirty thousand miles of telegraph wires were tied up to peddle betting tips while legitimate telephone calls were under careful rationing.

The order permitting the operation of the race tracks and the transportation of racing animals, in the midst of the most serious transportation crisis of the war, continues to be a reproach to the administration. The criticisms of this policy cannot be answered. There is no acceptable explanation for this extraordinary inconsistency. It is a shocking and indefensible policy which no spokesman for the administration has dared defend. They have not even dared answer the criticism of the policy.

Who has applied the pressure that has resulted in this extraordinary tenderness for the race-track crowd? What individuals and what groups have asked that race horses ride the rails when there isn't enough transportation to handle our military redeployment as speedily as we could wish? What organized lobby has succeeded in having racing put ahead of every other industry and profession and even ahead of our armed forces? Who is responsible for sanctioning racing while the Government is cracking down on professional, religious, commercial, and industrial meetings?

These are questions that should be answered. The public which is being asked not to travel has a right to know at whose behest the race horses and the people who bet on them are being encouraged to use facilities denied the rest of the country.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the time for debate was set in the committee and I was unable to express myself on the OPA problem. Therefore, I take this method of transmitting my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have consistently criticized the muddling and bungling policies of the Office of Price Administration. The obvious efforts of the Administration to use the OPA as a political tool to exercise some measure of coercion or favor over the people do not need to be cited. The methods involved in their operation and the ends that were sought are well known. The unmitigated gall with which the OPA without warning indiscriminately and arbitrarily canceled the housewives' sugar stamps last December after promising them fair treatment is a typical example of the dishonesty and perversion of public faith and trust to which this agency resorted. This act alone caused the widest disbelief and distrust possible to a governmental bureau which needed the faith and cooperation of the people. It has been actions like this which the OPA has carried over into every field of production and business endeavor. Consequently the Nation has been treated to an unheard of spectacle of confusion and chaos. Today, we find the OPA a hollow shell of organization that maintains it is holding a price line by a cleverly disguised line of propaganda written and disseminated by its hirelings, which the public knows is erroneous because no recognition is taken of the flourishing black market which predominates in all business lines, and particularly in the shortages of foodstuffs.

The Office of Price Administration has evaded the highly conceived purposes of the Price Control Act, as first enacted by Congress. It has diverted the original objectives of the program from the primary economic law of supply and demand to one of paper strategy and analysis. It has handicapped the adequate marketing and production of materials and foodstuffs which would have simplified the administration and operation of the act. It has disregarded the advice and counsel of the Members of Congress who have been guided by the sight of thousands upon thousands of small businessmen, farmers, producers, and laborers losing their livelihoods because they could not operate successfully under the bewildering red tape, the maze of reports, and the foolish controls of the OPA. This administrative agency failed to take into consideration that an element of profit was necessary for any farmer, producer, or processor to operate and survive economically. In most instances, the OPA coldly said, "Casualties must be expected." It did not lend an understanding or sympathetic ear to the appeals for justice and assistance. No help was given to work out plans whereby the evils and inefficiency of the OPA directives were at fault. The food mess is an outstanding example of what a Government agency can do to our people, unless it functions, primarily for the purpose for which it was intended. In this case, to control inflationary prices, and to assist the public in working out practical solutions to the plaguing and perplexing handicaps of controlled production and marketing.

When it was originally adopted, I expressed my sincere support for a price-control program. I maintained that it was highly essential to preserving our economy during wartime and to the successful prosecution of the war. These objectives are still vital. We must press for speedy victory over Japan and prices must be controlled at home. Fair distribution, stability, and public cooperation in a program to secure our production and consumption of materials and foodstuffs are necessary.

This Nation remembers too well the disastrous inflation which followed in the wake of the last World War. Labor, industry, business, and farming remember the shocking ravages to our economic life that were felt from this blow. It took us 20 years to recover. This must not happen again. We cannot afford to yield to inflationary prices.

The OPA can protect us against such forces, if it fulfills its moral obligations and lives up to the letter and spirit of the original Price Control Act.

While I am opposed to the past performance of the economic theorists of the OPA and the paperweight attempts to provide convincing and reasonable excuses for its inconceivable maladministration of the price-control plan, I cannot with fairness vote for the abolition of the OPA. I believe that until the war with Japan is brought to a successful conclusion we must control prices and stop inflation until it is crushed by the overabundance of production which only the United States can produce. These controls must be administered in a practical and reasonable manner. The OPA as it was first legislated by Congress is flexible and elastic enough to meet the demands of the future and preserve our economic structure. More-

over, as the act is extended by the overwhelming force of the Democratic majority in the House, without amendments, I believe that we should issue a word of warning to the Director of the OPA and his vast personnel which extends into each community of the Nation. That word is that the OPA must take special pains in the future to listen to the admonitions of Congress and the people and that the agency works toward achieving an honest, trustworthy administration devoted to serving the public and helping maintain the kind of a government and home life here which our boys are dying for on Okinawa and the other fighting fronts to preserve.

The Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 21, 1945:

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The question of the Presidential succession strikes us as rather more complex than the changes in the law which Mr. Truman has recommended would seem to suggest. In place of the Secretary of State, an appointive official, as third in line for the job, he urges that the honor fall to the Speaker of the House. His arguments are both persuasive and typical of the man. "It now lies in my power," he has pointed out to Congress, "to nominate the person who would be my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act. I do not believe that in a democracy this power should rest with the Chief Executive." As for his choice of the Speaker, he is the one Federal official, in the President's opinion, "whose selection, next to that of the President and Vice President, can be said most accurately to stem from the people themselves."

Should the Speaker succeed to the Presidency and die or become incapacitated, Mr. Truman would have it provided that the President pro tempore of the Senate, another elective official, step into his shoes, followed by the members of the Cabinet in the order of succession as at present stipulated. In other words, he would get away as far as practicable from the possibility of an appointed President.

His countrymen will share his laudable desire, while speculating as to the specific method he proposes. Perhaps most of them will agree with him that the Speaker of the House is, next to the President and Vice President, the closest we come to a nationally elected representative. But they will remember that not infrequently the House in midterm has changed its political complexion and with it that of its Speaker, so that the latter, should he become President, might easily be a political opponent of the administration he takes over.

It has even happened twice in the last 90 years that a House and Speaker hostile to the Chief Executive have been elected with him, once in 1876 when Rutherford B. Hayes became President and again in 1916 when Woodrow Wilson gained his second term. In this same span of years the midterm elections for the House have gone against the party in power nine times. No one familiar with the difficulties caused when the House and Senate are on opposite sides of the fence needs to be reminded of the greater embarrassment should a Speaker of one party assume charge of the administration of another.

It may be that Congress, as it seems inclined to do, should carry out the President's wishes, but meanwhile we rather favor the proposal in a bill introduced last month by Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, that a commission be appointed to study the whole subject and work out a long-term solution.

Release of Conscientious Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the Allen County Council of Veterans Organizations, Fort Wayne, Ind.:

Whereas public announcement has been made through the press that beginning August 10, 1945, it is to be the policy of the War Department to start to release conscientious objectors; and

Whereas such conscientious objectors have never been subjected to the rigors of warfare or military training, and have never been called upon to leave their native shores but have consistently refused to defend their country in time of grave emergency; and

Whereas millions of men claiming no such exemption from the bearing of arms have gallantly and honorably served and are still serving their country under the greatest hardships with no prospect of returning to civilian life for many months or years to come, while thousands of others have made the supreme sacrifice or are suffering the ravages of war; and

Whereas if such release of conscientious objectors is allowed to take place according to plan they will be enabled to return to civilian pursuits prior to the release of many returning veterans, thus creating further hardships for our gallant fighting men on their return to civilian life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Allen County Council of Veterans Organizations composed of 9 veterans' groups, with a combined membership of 4,105, representing American Legion posts: Fort Wayne, No. 47; Lincoln, No. 82; Charles E. Anderson, No. 148; and New Haven, No. 330; Henry W. Lawton Encampment, No. 35, United Spanish-American War Veterans; Elmer Pond Chapter, No. 1; Disabled American Veterans; Fort Wayne Navy Club of United States of America ship, No. 48; Marine Corps League, Fort Wayne Detachment, and Jim Eby Post, No. 857, Veterans of Foreign Wars, vigorously protests such proposed action be deferred indefinitely with the end in view that conscientious objectors be detained until the end of the national emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That, after ratification by the groups represented in this council, a copy of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States; the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; the Honorable Raymond E. Willis, and the Honorable Homer E. Capehart, Senators from Indiana, the Honorable George W. Gillie, Congressman, fourth district, State of Indiana; the Honorable Ralph F. Gates, Governor of Indiana; to the national headquarters of all organizations represented in this council; to the offices of all national publications of such organizations, and be released to the local press for publication.

FRANK L. BARNETT, *President*.
OMAR R. MYERS, *Secretary*.

Adopted without dissenting vote by the delegates in regular meeting assembled at Fort Wayne, Ind., on May 31, 1945. Submitted to all groups named in the resolution, the members of this council, and returned with certificates of ratification by each, whereupon this resolution was released by special meeting on June 15, 1945:

ALBERT N. SMITH, *Vice President*.
OMAR R. MYERS, *Secretary*.

Whereas the inconsistency of sentences given by courts martial has been brought to the attention of the American people by the Honorable WILLIAM B. BARRY, Congressman from the State of New York, who has disclosed to the public a number of such sentences he has seen fit to describe as "incredible"; and

Whereas there is no objection on the part of the American people to a reasonable sentence at courts martial in keeping with offenses committed by members of the armed services, however, in the name of justice, the American people have the right to protest the imposition of inconsistently severe sentences; and

Whereas widely differing sentences have been meted out for like offenses seemingly at the whim of the presiding officer of the court martial: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Allen County Council of Veterans Organizations, representing nine veterans organizations of Allen County, State of Indiana, go on record as favoring a method for imposing like sentences for offenses of a similar nature even to the rewriting or amending of the Articles of War, if necessary, with such end in view; and be it further

Resolved, That Congressman BARRY is hereby commended by the Allen County Council of Veterans Organizations for his services in this matter and that we encourage him to continue his valuable efforts to secure justice for the members of the armed services; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; the Honorable James B. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; the Honorable Raymond E Willis, and the Honorable Homer E. Capehart, Senators from Indiana; the Honorable George W. Gillie, Congress, Fourth District, State of Indiana; the Honorable Ralph F. Gates, Governor of Indiana; to the national headquarters of all organizations represented in this council; to the offices of all national publications of such organizations and be released to the local press for publication.

Adopted without dissenting vote under emergency clause of the constitution and by-laws of the Allen County Council of Veterans Organizations by the delegates duly assembled in special meeting on June 15, 1945.

ALBERT N. SMITH,
President.
OMAR MYERS,
Secretary.

The Record of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. A bill to extend the Emergency Price Control Act

is again before the House. We are again asked to continue the authority of the Office of Price Administration to exercise almost unlimited power over the industries of this country during a period in which those industries will be converting from production for war to production for peace—a period that may set the pattern for our whole industrial future. This fact is of such great importance that I feel I must again state my position on the subject of price control.

I recognize the fact that it was necessary for the Government to provide for the control of prices to avoid a runaway inflation, but I still insist that no system of price control could be effective unless wages and materials were also controlled, otherwise price control will create shortages of consumers' goods and the resulting stresses and strains will drive these goods into the black market. Then, although official prices are kept down—on paper—the people will have to pay higher prices if they get the goods.

What is our situation today, after 3 years of Government price control? People have more money to spend than they have ever had before. I am glad to see this but it must be taken into consideration in setting up a pricing policy. Rather than taking it into consideration, our price-control experts have tried to hold prices down to unreasonable figures and make up the difference between them and the cost of production by granting Government subsidies. These subsidies must be paid for in taxes at some future time—on the average of $2 for $1—when the people will be less able to pay them. In addition, it has the effect of making the industries dependent upon the Government for their existence. I am sure that any person who understands the full meaning of subsidies would be willing to pay a slightly higher price now for an article and have done with it, rather than pass the cost on to his children and grandchildren. By their pricing policies they have brought about a condition which, in some absolutely necessary foods, almost amounts to a famine. Meat has been forced into the black market to such an extent that it is a national scandal. Butter is scarce and eggs, poultry, and canned goods have almost disappeared from the market. Sugar is so scarce that people will not be able to can the fruit they will produce.

Just this morning the Agriculture Department announced that there would be from 120 to 125 pounds of meat per person available this year as against 150 pounds last year. If the Agriculture Department is right, then the OPA must be wrong. One of the functions of OPA is to ration food. They give the housewife 50 red points per person each month. The average cut of meat requires 12½ points per pound. If the housewife spent all her points for meat, it would be about 4½ pounds a month or 54 a year. However, out of these red points the housewife must buy her butter, which is 24 points a pound; her cooking fats, which require 12 points; and her cheese. It would seem that someone is trying to fool the people.

The present shortage in the supply of beef for consumers is purely the fault of the pricing policy of the Office of Price Administration. Had this agency taken the advice of those engaged in the industry, it would not have made the mistake of changing the regulations and setting price ceilings so low that feeders would have no assurance of a reasonable profit for their efforts in putting on the extra meat which would have meant an adequate supply for all.

The manipulation of the rationing program for political purposes, before the election in 1944, provides a strong argument against granting Government agencies the power to control the economic welfare of our country. Unless Congress curbs their power, American industry can have no confidence that it will be free from interference for political reasons.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the record of the Office of Price Administration under the Emergency Price Control Act leads me to make the following statements. We must take from it the power to keep American business in a straight-jacket during the reconversion period. We must give it only the power to restrain inflationary prices in those commodities that enter into necessary living costs. American businessmen should not be required to come to Washington and stand hat in hand before some bureaucratic "expert" to beg for a price which will permit them to supply a product for which the people are hungry. We shall soon find an abundance of materials ready to be manufactured. Competition will soon regulate prices. With the threat of unemployment hanging over us, people are not going to be so foolish as to spend all their earnings and savings on high-priced commodities, no matter how badly they want them.

On the other hand, if OPA is permitted to continue regulating prices on eight million separate items, it will never be able to move fast enough to keep business from bogging down in a slough of inertia.

Not long ago, a small manufacturer from my State came to my office to tell me of the trouble he was having to get OPA to set a price on a new article he wants to make. His plant has been employed in war work and now faces the canceling of its contracts. He has the manpower, the machinery, and the materials, but he cannot get OPA to fix a price under which he can make a reasonable profit. This situation will be multiplied by the millions in the next few years. It will surely result in many businessmen, large and small, simply closing their plants and going fishing. OPA neither has the ability nor the desire to make quick decisions. The individual with his own money invested wants to make quick decisions. He cannot afford to wait.

The profit incentive has always been the spark plug of American business. To foul it by the weights of bureaucratic controls will destroy free enterprise and reduce employment. The only businesses that will be able to operate will be those that employ mass-production methods. That's what the bureaucrats want. Fewer and larger businesses are easier to control.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the American people do not envision this country's economic future characterized by mass production carried on by giant corporations taking their orders from bureaucrats in Washington. I am equally sure our soldiers, who are returning from Europe, do not have that idea either.

No; they and we are looking forward to the return of free enterprise with the Government acting only as referee to see that no one's rights are infringed on, no matter how small or inconspicuous he is.

Now, let us look at some of the activities of the OPA.

Poor administration by the OPA has brought this Nation to the brink of want. That there is a scarcity of essential foods cannot be denied.

In the very nature of the OPA we find that they are set up to ration articles that are scarce. By making many articles scarce, they have been able to enlarge their pay roll and activities. If articles were not scarce, some of them would be out of a job.

The OPA should pay more attention to keeping prices down and encouraging production. It is only by full production that prices can be kept down and the black markets eliminated.

The OPA, before the committee, tried desperately to get an amendment which would regulate the price of shaves, haircuts, beauty creams, and hair dresses in every shop in the Nation. They also tried to get an amendment which would regulate the price of a ticket to every movie theater in America. It is my honest belief that the OPA has a desire to regulate everything and everybody in the United States. They are laying plans to continue regulations long after the war is over. They have plans which would require every farmer who has a pig or cow to sell to first have a permit and license, which would cost a nominal sum, before he could sell that animal to anyone. Yes; they would trace the pork chop from the farm to the stomach. In administering all of these regulations, it requires money, manpower and office space. It requires gestapo snoopers and their own kangaroo courts. It is their desire to bypass the established courts in this country.

On a recent trip to my district, I was visited by a number of delegations who were complaining about the activities of the OPA. I quote from a letter signed by 13 members of the North Platte food dealers as follows:

> During the past 2 months threats have become numerous; in fact, so numerous as to become highly embarrassing. In each case, the threats have been directed to dealers for failure to comply with such minor details as properly displaying prices on each and every item in their market and many other trivial matters which do not in any way affect the cost of living.

They further said:

> No distinction is made between the willful violator of price regulations and the honest merchant who makes a mistake. The penalty is levied without a fair trial and, in most cases, is too severe. It is our opinion the OPA is more interested in impressing the public with the justification of their existence by filling their files with such minor violations and issuing threats, than for the purpose for which they were originally set up.
>
> Too little consideration is given to the fact that business has given up most of its competent help to the service of our country and that added OPA regulation and burden

cannot help but cause irregularities and noncompliances. * * * Regulations are often inconsistent and not applicable to this territory. * * * Our country could be better served if relieved of some of the burdens that are placed upon us by unnecessary regulations and too many bureaus.

Many of our boys who are returning to this country after several years of service are amazed over many things and among them are the many restrictions and regulations, and wondering if this is to become the American way of life.

I further quote, Mr. Speaker, a chamber of commerce in Nebraska from a recent letter:

This community is comprised of average good American citizens anxious and willing to exert their time, money, and talents to assure a more speedy victory.

They will gladly submit to any common sense rationing system administered by men of experience, ability, and possessed with a degree of justice. On the other hand, they will stubbornly resist such a program bungled with incompetent and impractical personnel prompted by dictatorial and selfish motives.

The citizens have patiently awaited an improvement in the administration of OPA. Their hopes fade as each day brings new and startling procedures which the OPA instigates in its futile and desperate effort to enforce some of its many useless edicts.

Recently in our city members of the OPA swooped down on a couple of merchants who have operated for many years and have established themselves as honest businessmen. Their self-made kangaroo court went through the motion of a regularly established court. A couple of carloads of young attorneys and the judge arrived and held so-called hearings.

We are all sympathetic with the idea of law enforcement but believe that the law should be reasonably administered and enforced.

It appears to us that the OPA, in attempting to increase their personnel, power, and appropriations, are motivated by the selfish purpose of perpetuating themselves in office, rather than that of serving the people more efficiently and competently.

We believe that their organization should not be maintained 1 minute longer than is absolutely necessary and that extension of power should be by 3-month periods, rather than for a full-year term. Furthermore, regardless of their tenure, the administration of the program should undergo drastic changes.

You can rest assured that the people of the State will support you in your efforts to correct maladjustments of the OPA.

The letter was signed by the secretary of the chamber of commerce at Chadron, Nebr.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what the OPA has gone far beyond the original intent of Congress. They are administering controls under the guise of war. They are fostering a totalitarian system upon this country. They try to wear the cloth of preventing inflation. They mouth slogans and print huge posters with untrue statements. This fraud should be exposed to the public. Their regulations are confusing. I quote from Richard A. Gilbert, who was a former economic adviser of OPA and still in the Agency.

He said before a Senate committee on June 10, 1943:

We have known for a long time that the merchant could not reasonably be expected to understand all the regulations to which he is being subjected.

Again, the present Administrator, who, by the way, is nothing but a super salesman making speeches two or three times a week, Chester Bowles, and he said on February 29, 1944:

In the past, a major stumbling block to better compliance with OPA regulations has been the complexity of the regulations themselves.

Lou Maxim, when he resigned as a chief law enforcement officer for the OPA, said as follows:

Our young lawyers have OPA so bound up in legalistic red tape that Houdini, himself, couldn't untangle it. I don't know how many hours they spent on the wording of their classic order on fruits but it is six pages of fine print.

The OPA, just a few days ago, rescinded their order of May 10, 1945, which was a regulation on feather pillows. This regulation contained more than 13,000 words and, if enforced, would have required some 22,000 retailers of feather pillows to send to the pillow section of OPA a sample of 30 different varieties they carry in stock, in order that OPA might place a proper price upon the pillows.

Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful if any businessman can operate under the OPA rules legally. Businessmen are pounced upon by an enforcement official of OPA with a summons. Many a businessman will be driven to bankruptcy through the caprice and whims of his own Government through too strict regulations.

The OPA is preventing an orderly reconversion program. They are refusing to recognize that raw materials, labor, and taxes have increased since 1939. The businessman may have a factory, the material, and the labor but he cannot go back to manufacturing, advertising, or selling his former product for any price except the one he had in 1939 or 1941 when he converted to war work.

Truely, the OPA has enforced its regulations with a ruthlessness and a pettiness far beyond the conception of Congress.

The OPA has a stranglehold on industry, preventing competition which is the best governor to business.

Our pattern of living and of producing is so complicated that it cannot be blueprinted and regimented by government which makes every individual travel the same path.

Black markets in meat cause people to pay 50 percent or more over the ceiling prices. The upgrading of clothes causes the citizen to buy expensive grades no better than those the OPA imagines to be on sale at half the price.

We have more cattle in the country than ever. There is plenty of feed. The OPA fails to realize that cattle plus feed plus a sound price makes beef. They have resorted to subsidies, roll-backs, freezes, marketing quotas, and many other regulations, yet the public has no meat. The pork policies of the Government discouraged the producers and have caused a shrinkage of available pork this year by 30 percent.

The OPA, when they prevent industry from reconverting quickly, may cause five or six million unemployed and they carry a pent-up explosive element which, when it explodes, will have a devastating reaction.

Our Government never tries to put itself out of business. Bureaucracy becomes more and more entrenched, grows and feeds upon itself. One control begets another control. Regulations and controls develop an intricate spiderlike mesh of regulations which confuse and confound the public.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that this House should adopt amendments to the Price Control Act which will eliminate some of the present maladministration and un-American tactics being employed by the Agency. We all want to control inflation. We want to keep prices in line, but I submit that many of the acts of the OPA actually encourage inflation. They have discouraged production, which is the only method of controlling inflation. Their rules and regulations bring on scarcity and black markets.

Unless amendments are adopted to correct some of the present evils in the Agency, I shall certainly vote against its continuance.

The Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, June 20, 1945:

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The proposal which Mr. Truman submitted to Congress yesterday for a change in the present order of the Presidential succession fully merits the prompt and earnest consideration which he asks that it be given. The situation as it stands is unsatisfactory in one deeply fundamental respect. Under the statute of 1886, which now governs the succession, members of the Cabinet, in stated order, succeed to the office in the event of the death of both the elected President and Vice President. All of these Cabinet officials are, of course, chosen by the President. In effect, therefore, by reason of the death of Mr. Roosevelt, and because there is no Vice President in office, it now lies within the power of Mr. Truman himself to nominate the person who would be his immediate successor in the event of his own death or inability to act. He is a good enough democrat to believe that in a democracy this great power should not lie in the hands of the Chief Executive.

Mr. Truman's solution of the problem is to propose that the law of succession be changed, so as to put the Speaker of the House of Representatives next in line, with the President pro tempore of the Senate following him, and then the Cabinet members in their present order. His reasons for giving the Speaker primacy are sound. They include the fact that the Speaker is an elected officer; the fact that he is not only elected by the voters of his own district but is then elected to be the presiding officer of the House by the vote of all the Representatives of all the people; and the further fact that the House itself is usually in political agreement with the Chief Executive—a fact which would

ease the transition for which Mr. Truman wishes to make provision.

There are various details in the President's proposal, particularly regarding the length of time which the Speaker would serve as Chief Executive and the possibility of holding a special election, which Mr. Truman leaves largely to Congress to determine. But the problem he raises is real; the recommendation he makes is fundamentally sound; and the whole situation deserves the close attention of Congress, "in the interest," as the President says, "of orderly, democratic government."

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter from Capt. Samuel R. Pitetti of the United States Marines addressed to his family prior to his death on Iwo Jima. In this letter "Poops" refers to his sister, Jane. "Tee" and "Dom" are his older sister Teresa and her husband, Dominick. "Pumpkin" is his little niece, "Tee" and "Dom's" daughter. "Nonna" is his mother, who has been dead for several years.

This is an inspiring letter, one filled with the thoughts and sentiment of a lad who felt that he was about to die.

The captain was, and his family is, from my congressional district, Rillton, Westmoreland County, Pa. I am proud to number them among my friends:

JANUARY 11, 1944.

DEAR POP, JANE, TEE, DOM, PUNKIN: Yes, I know—I should have joined the Army. Well, this is one letter I hoped you would never read, but I wanted to have my "last say" as I told Ella and Frank.

I am writing this aboard ship in San Diego (I guess it's all right to reveal that now) and I really don't know what to say except that I hope you are still happy and well as when I left you in Greensburg back in August 1943. Oh, I've prayed that this wouldn't happen—not because I was afraid to die, nor because I felt I was too young or had been cheated of many of life's years, but because I knew it would be such a blow to all of you. Especially to a darling nurse who I'm sure had a lot of wonderful dreams planned around this guy. I'm so sorry—really; I know how you must still be suffering.

Little I can say would console you (I imagine I am bringing more grief with this letter), but I can assure you I am with Mom—our Mom—and she is as wonderful a Mom as ever. She says she is proud of me, too, and together we are looking down on you and watching over you.

Pop—no one ever had a finer father. I've always been very proud of you, often wondered if I could have been the success you are had I been an immigrant young man in a strange land. Probably not. I guess I've been a cause of a lot of your headaches and worries, but I hope your paternal love has been strong enough to overcome them. During the time we worked together in the mine I learned to love and appreciate as never before all you had been doing for me. How often I hoped would come the day when you would leave the mine to come live with me, just taking things easy and enjoying the fruits of life as a father, grandfather, and even a great-grandfather. Columbia and I always wanted a little Ralph. Well!

"Poops," you're a grand sister. As grand as any boy could want—so fine and lovable a girl that I think I would have married you had you not been my sister. I have been praying every night that God would bless you, that you would find your young man to love, one who would love you, and that you would have the happy marriage, home, and children I know you must be dreaming of. Take good care of Pop as always. I shall never forget you.

Tee and Dom—I often wanted to write a book about you two, but I knew I would characterize you as such wonderful saint-like persons that people in ignorance would say, "Gwan, there can't be anyone that perfect in this world." Whatever I have learned in life about love, thoughtfulness, consideration of others has come mostly from you two. (Not slighting all that Mom, Pop, Jane, and others have represented in that respect.) But your devotion to each other and to others, little things—just can't seem to say what I want. I kept asking God to continue to bless you for I know from your personalities that He had been blessing you all along. I pray that He will continue to bless you. You two were, well—grand!

Punkin, you're too little to read and understand this now and it won't be until you're a big girl that you will ever realize all that you meant to us—especially to your mamma and daddy. Your Nonna died a much happier Nonna because you had come along to brighten her life. Your Uncle Sam used to look at your mommy and daddy's eyes when they were looking at you, and the joy he would see in their hearts because of you could never be described. It won't be until you're a big girl that you will understand how much happiness a little girl can be—and I pray that you will understand it then and have some idea of what a blessing your mamma and daddy had. Be kind to them, love, honor, and respect them, always. You're in wonderful hands, little Punkin—they'll see that you grow up properly. In time you may forget your Uncle Sam—not what he looked like or the little crucifix or shoes he gave you, for I know your mamma will try to keep the memory of me in your mind always—but there will be so many other people in your life. I won't mind, Punkin; I know you'll be praying for me, too. Be a good little girl—and a good big girl, too. Bless you!

Well, I've spouted off about all I can spout. Again, I'm sorry it happened because I know it must have grieved you very much. Please don't be angry with the Old Boy up there 'cause your prayers were in vain. He and I had an understanding that if He were to call me He'd look after you. I know He'll hold up His end of the bargain.

Know that I died in a state of grace, at peace with Him and His Son; and keep praying to the Blessed Virgin—she has been an endless source of comfort and sympathy to me.

Bless all of you, Uncle Dan and the rest of the folks. My regards to dear friends— Bazzos, Trozzos, Nick, Brune, Gabe, Miss Love, Mr. Good, and the others.

Keep loving each other.

Love, SAM.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to state for the record my view that House Joint Resolution 101 should be passed by the House without amendment. It is my firm conviction that, with inflationary pressures at a peak level and with the war in the Pacific not yet at a favorable conclusion, price stabilization on the home front is imperative. To relax our controls at this time would be disastrous.

The task of stabilization is always a difficult one. It is nevertheless a necessary one. While it is natural the people should grow restive under wartime controls, it should be recognized that there would be great danger in the premature demobilization of the agency which has, during the past 2 years, kept the cost of living from spiraling and has thus protected the living standards of Americans.

True, OPA has not been flawless in administration. The administration of the act cannot, however, be improved by the addition of inflationary amendments, such as the Wherry amendment, which would add substantially to food prices and throw the cost-price relationship badly out of balance, making the administrative task of OPA far more difficult. Nor would the administration of the act be aided by the renewal of price control for only 6 months. Congress would be involved in continued hearings involving administrative matters which could be more flexibly settled by the OPA, and OPA administrators would be drawn away from their jobs to attend the hearings. The wisest course is to pass House Resolution 101 and continue the Price Control Act unamended.

Social Security for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of June 22, 1945:

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR CONGRESS

Representative MARY T. NORTON, Democrat, New Jersey, has introduced a bill to permit Representatives and Senators to buy into the existing civil-service retirement plan by paying 5 percent of their annual salaries toward annuities to come out of the retirement fund. The bill, too, would extend the same right to Cabinet officers and Government bureau heads.

CONGRESSIONAL PENSION PLANS

Whether the Norton bill embodies the best plan that could be worked out, we don't know. But the principle of it looks good, and we hope the Seventy-ninth Congress gets up enough nerve to vote some kind of congressional pension system, either for itself or to take effect with the opening of the Eightieth Congress.

The longer a man stays in Congress, serving the country and his constituents as best he can, the harder it becomes, as a rule, for him to go back and make a living as a private citizen. This is especially true if in private life he happened to have been a lawyer or other professional man. His congressional salary is not big; his expenses are heavy, and he can't duck them.

COURAGE, CONGRESS

Social security now embraces tens of millions of Americans, and will probably soon be extended to take in millions more. Social security for Members of Congress looks like simple justice for them—and a good investment for the taxpayers in case it costs the taxpayers anything. A public servant who knows he will be pensioned on retirement can in many cases be somewhat more courageous and independent than one who knows he will be turned out to grass when the voters get tired of him.

We'd like to see Congress settle this long-standing argument soon, by establishing a pension system for its Members—sizes of pensions, preferably to depend on length of service in Congress.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Wednesday, June 20, 1945:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The President has cut through a lot of Constitution chopping in the matter of the succession to the Presidency. As the succession stands today, the next in line to Mr. Truman is the Secretary of State. Such a translation would bring into the highest office in the land a man who had owed nothing to the elective process. It is on this ground that we and many others have been troubled by the existing situation. But there are several elements in the succession which are unclear. Would the Secretary of State be empowered to serve out a Presidential term? Or would he be restricted to carrying out the powers and duties of the Presidency pending action by Congress? What action could Congress take? Is a special election authorized? These are the questions that have been causing controversy. The Constitution left it to Congress to declare, in the event of a vacancy in the White House when there was no Vice President, what officer shall take over the powers and duties of the Presidency. A law of 1886 supplied this deficiency by naming the Secretary of State. But the related problems were covered up by providing only for the convening of Congress to take unspecified action.

Now the President recommends to Congress that the whole question be reexamined. This is the purport of the Monroney bill, but the President's suggested step would dispose of study by a commission, as Representative MONRONEY proposes, and so would save time. Mr. Truman assumes the power to nominate his successor. Of course, he holds that power in virtue of the act of 1886, which names the Secretary of State as his successor; in other words, a person in the President's official family, who can be changed on the nomination of the President. The nomination of successor is clearly Mr. Truman's. Mr. Truman now would nominate his successor not by changing the Secretaryship for that purpose but by naming another officeholder, viz, the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The suggestion has merits which will be obvious after a moment's reflection. Under our system of government the Speaker of the House is at present the third ranking personage in the country, taking precedence after the President and the Chief Justice. He is also an elective person. Most of the perturbation over the succession has had to do with the possibility that a nonelected officer could enter the White House, even as a regent. The Speaker, on the contrary, is not under that disability. In fact, he is a doubly elected person, as Mr. Truman states. He is elected, first of all, in his own district and, secondly, by a vote of all the Representatives of all the people. Thus "his selection next to that of the President and Vice President can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves."

It would be unsatisfactory, moreover, to make a change in the Secretaryship of State solely with an eye on the succession. In that event Mr. Truman might name a worthy successor but an inappropriate Secretary. The two cases should be disassociated. The country needs, as never before, a Secretary of State who will devote himself single-mindedly to the tasks of that significant office. As to the heir-apparency, this is merely a formal appointment to a dormant commission, having nothing to do with duties. Under the Truman suggestion the nominee would not fill out the unexpired term, but would merely act until a special election had been called. This, we think, is the right and proper course. Congress, after having been given such a statesmanlike lead from the White House, should now accord the problem top priority in its order of business, for the present uncertainty is unsettling. It would be a good thing if Congress at the same time were to lay down the rule that a President's disability other than by death could be determinable by Congress, acting on medical evidence. The case of President Wilson is still fresh in memory in illustration of this need, and but for the grace of God the same situation might easily have arisen in the case of our late President.

Putting the Screws on Country Butchers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jefferson (Ohio) Gazette:

PUTTING THE SCREWS ON COUNTRY BUTCHERS—OPA IN CLEVELAND TO EXAMINE 275 NORTHEASTERN OHIO RURAL DEALERS

In an article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of last Thursday was a story that the Cleveland OPA office plans to call in 275 rural meat dealers and butchers from northeastern Ohio to have them explain discrepancies in their various reports on meats killed and butchered and stamps turned in for meats sold to rural patrons.

The inference is that many of these 275 dealers will not be granted licenses to continue in business. Then mention is made that only 50 of some 500 would be able to qualify to continue in business in rural sections.

We quote the following verbatim. It shows the "nigger in the wood pile:"

"Consumers in the metropolitan areas will benefit as a result of curtailment of these rural slaughterers," Ross asserted. "The livestock which the country places have been butchering will be shipped into city terminal markets where it was sold before the war."

That means the OPA proposes to take meat away from rural consumers.

And, dear reader, in the above paragraph you have the "real innards" of this outrageous treatment of men in small communities who have been doing an honorable business all of their lives, but now have become outlaws or in fear of being outlawed for buying, killing, dressing, and selling meats, just as they have done for generations.

If I were a dealer, I would do my best to comply with all regulations, but, knowing what the dealer is up against, I doubt if any of them, country, small town, or big city can do so to the last red point.

The meat cutters are harassed by a waiting line of buyers. Few buyers know how many points are necessary, nor what ones are good at the moment. That delays handling and adds to the cost of sales. I am one of that ignorant number. I haven't the slightest idea how many points are needed for a roast. I have not had points enough, with two in the family, to buy a roast in several weeks. Until a few days ago there was plenty of meat on the counters in Jefferson, though some kinds would be short. I could not buy for lack of red points.

I do not believe a single big dealer can match point for point the settlement requirements of the OPA. To do so would be superman or very clever. Changes are so frequent that it is difficult to remember each point requirement day after day. In the handling of meats there is a great waste. A carcass in total points, seldom can be cut to sell and restore the original point allowance by the OPA.

This newspaper never has advocated lawlessness but we say that the OPA is the most lawless, provoking organization this land ever saw. It lives on directives, which are changed overnight, and it asks the impossible and uses unconstitutional means for its acts.

The first law of nature is the right to live. To live one must eat. Therefore one who desires food when food can be had is provoked to lawlessness by foolish denial.

When some group of tinkerers, schemers, well-meaning theorists and nit wits get together to circumvent nature and the laws of economics—what else can you expect then the so-called black market?

What is a black market?

If a farmer raised hogs and, in the fall kills them, as he has been doing for many years, and his father before him, if I buy a quarter, as I used to, or a ham or some home-made sausage, and do not comply with all the limitations of red stamps, then the farmer and I are engaging in the awful crime of doing what was always an honest business until the New Deal became a side winder to the Communist Party. It hopes to put all America in a strait-jacket.

Unless a bit "teched" in the head no one would think it possible in a country so vast as the United States, to establish a fixed price on any item of food, over a long period. I have paid $5 a bushel for potatoes and I have seen hundreds of bushels dumped as the supply exceeded the demand. The New Dealers have wasted carloads. It sounds very attractive to say that a standard price, to insure a profit, should be made on potatoes and all other products, but that is an impossibility. It has been tried many times. It always fails.

I shall not starve, regardless of the OPA. I do not require much meat, but unless some one stands over me with a gun, if hunger is likely and I can get necessary food I shall get that food, It is my natural and legal right. If there is a genuine scarcity, then I must take a substitute and do so without

grumbling. I know that there is all the meat the rural people and the city people can reasonably use if the OPA were sunk in the ocean. I cannot sit calmly and see men cover up their own insane theories and actions by calling black market, when the OPA is the creator of the black market.

When the OPA issued its first order to cut the kill to 70 percent, it did so when there was more livestock on the hoof in this land than at any other time. There was enough if sent to market by normal channels without OPA interference to supply the armed forces double their normal needs, to send a reasonable amount to England and still feed the United States. This idea that we must feed the damned Huns don't go with me.

But under the appeal to patriotism, and under the bluff of a shortage, the schemers of the OPA sought to make all meats federally inspected. To do that required all killing be done in urban slaughter houses.

Then these economic tinkerers cut off their own noses by limiting the price of livestock the city slaughterers could pay. That forced a new kind of competition. Racket men paid higher prices at the farm for livestock than the city slaughterers were permitted to pay. That meant channeling meats through retail stores that had to buy of the racketeer or go out of business.

I favor inspection of meats, if and when it can be done. I do not want to buy any meat before the natural heat has gone, nor before the carcass has hung in the cooler long enough to be good. I do not criticize laws of that character. Nor do I want to buy meats that are not sanitarily prepared. Reasonable rules and laws to effect such care are defensible, but when the OPA fixes the price the city slaughterers can pay, then gives him a bonus or subsidy, and makes no limit on the price at the farm, what else but competition outside the OPA regulations can result?

The whole process is cockeyed.

No local meat dealer is engaged in interstate commerce even if a traveling man from another State comes in and buys and takes the meat home. The sale was made here. No one can be expected to follow the meat.

By what right does the administration take private property without due process and compensation? Or attempt to license intrastate business, even under the excuse of war, particularly when the way the effort is managed merely adds to the burden of the public and does not save the consumer's pocketbook?

The harder the OPA makes it to get food the more the racketeer can gouge. The consumer will get the food if it is available. On that simple fact anyone can count.

Now, there is meat enough if the OPA will take its hands off the small dealer's throat, and the administration not go haywire with the notion we must feed the dirty Huns.

I again ask the reader to review the quoted paragraph from Mr. Ross—

"Consumers in the metropolitan areas will benefit as a result of curtailment of these rural slaughterers," Ross asserted. "The livestock which the country places have been butchering will be shipped into city terminal markets where it was sold before the war."

If meat is denied the rural section that produces it, by penalizing the small dealer and denying him a license, then the cities are to get more meat. Both cities and country can have all the meat they want once normal competition is reestablished and OPA does not "fix the market" for the racketeer. That and little else is the benefit of the OPA in its meat fiasco.

The public is gouged, the dealer is out of business, but the wise lads in the OPA draw fat salaries.

CHET LAMPSON.

Early's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Early's Contribution" by Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post, June 2, 1945:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

EARLY'S CONTIBUTION

For 12 years and 4 months Stephen Early has held down one of the most trying jobs in the country. As press secretary to President Roosevelt, he was a buffer between the public, as represented by press and radio, and the greatest single source of power and prestige in the Nation.

It is a tribute to Steve Early's toughness that he has come through this ordeal. He is the only survivor of the small group of intimates whom Roosevelt brought into the White House with him.

Louis Howe, Marvin McIntyre, Marguerite Le Hand, General "Pa" Watson—one by one they went down. The pace of events has been furious and unceasing. America and the world moved from one crisis to another. The strain on those at the center of the whirlwind can be understood, really, only by those who have had to work there.

In his position Early served two temperamental masters. Franklin Roosevelt invariably presented a genial exterior. But his very geniality, his whimsicality, often must have made Early's task almost unbearably difficult. Of the many virtues that made up FDR's greatness, precision was not one.

On the other side of the desk were the working newspapermen and the broadcasters and behind them was the whole powerful complex of press and radio—the information industry. In the beginning years of the Roosevelt administration the relationship with the working press was excellent. Later it deteriorated, and Early was often forced into the role of arbiter between "the boss" and the men who wanted the news.

After Roosevelt's election to a fourth term Early begged to be released. Reluctantly the President consented, recognizing the sacrifice his old friend Steve had made in staying on so long at a salary very much less than he could have obtained in private life. Early accompanied "the boss" to the Yalta Conference and it was agreed that he should leave the White House on June 1.

Then came the President's death. Early stayed on to help Roosevelt's successor through the difficult transition period.

His help has been so invaluable that President Truman has said that if it weren't for the circumstances of Early's long term of service he would insist that he remain. In every possible way Early has helped to make the transition more smooth.

Most people think only of the public, ceremonial side of the Presidency. They do not realize the hard, slugging work that must come out of the White House. They do not see the endless swarm of chislers, favor-seekers, petitioners of every rank and kind who are forever plotting and planning to get to the source of power. They do not see the flood of papers that every day rains down on the executive offices, each document calling for a decision.

On top of this burden is the ceremonial side. The President must entertain princes and potentates in the style to which they are accustomed, giving each one enough personal attention to gratify his self-importance. He must do all this on a salary reduced by taxes to $28,000 a year, and out of the $28,000 come living costs for a staff of servants and other items incidental to existence in the big White House on Pennsylvania Avenue. The wonder is that ambitious men go on wanting to be President.

For a new man in the office, the problems are multiplied many times over. He has so much to learn. One reason for the ease of the transition, as Truman himself has told his intimates, is the guidance which Early has provided. Now, at several times his Government salary, Early will represent the Pullman Co. in Washington.

President Truman has meanwhile been assembling his own personal staff. This is the privilege of every President. The ties are close and the loyalties must be personal. At least two of the new White House staff are newcomers to Washington. Fortunately, in Charles G. Ross, his press secretary, the President has an adviser who knows out of long experience as a newspaper correspondent the ins and outs of the Capital.

The most difficult phase is ended. Truman is now familiar with the wheels within wheels at the center of Executive power. He has had an excellent coach in these first weeks, which may be one reason why his record at the start is good.

Good Time for the Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Meadville (Pa.) Republican of May 23, 1945:

GOOD TIME FOR THE STUDY

James A. Farley last week advocated that a special study be made of the question of succession to the Presidency; and Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has announced that he plans to introduce a bill in Congress that would authorize a special commission to make such a survey.

The idea appears to make good sense.

It may be that the present arrangement, with the Secretary of State and other Cabinet members in line to succeeded when the Vice President assumes the Presidency—as now—is the best possible.

Then, again, there may be better arrangements.

Studying the entire situation with a view to securing the most logical and most workable plan seems to be an entirely worthwhile project.

As a matter of fact, according to MONRONEY, there are many "blind spots and ambiguities" in the present system. Various contingencies that might arise, and for which neither the Constitution nor present law provides, could create serious doubt as to who should become President in case anything happens to President Truman. It is even possible that such a contingency might present the Nation with the problem of whether there would be anyone in the country legally qualified to become President, MONRONEY further asserts.

No such contingencies have arisen in 156 years, but the mere negative fact that they have not arisen is no guaranty that they will not arise.

We are entirely agreed with Messrs. Farley and MONRONEY that now is the time for a nonpolitical commission to study the whole subject and recommend such improvements in the Presidential succession system as may be found desirable.

The OPA Needs To Act To Make Possible Production of Work Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, OPA has all the authority it needs to adjust a sad situation which pertains with respect to the shortage of work clothing. In the absence of willingness on part of OPA to do something about it Congress should compel it to.

The Office of Price Administration has misinterpreted the act by not allowing price increases to cotton mills to be passed across the board so as to include the cutters or manufacturers who process the cloth. These people will be unable to absorb further increases on this cloth and continue to make from it the critically needed work clothing. Their price ceilings have remained frozen since 1942 yet they have experienced, along with other increased expenses, a 40-percent increase in wages which must be paid.

I wish to extend as a part of my remarks the following brief statement which is pertinent to this situation:

Work clothing for the past several months has been one of the chief concerns of all Government agencies and all distributors and all consumers. Since work clothes are the all-important working garments for millions of workers everywhere, on farms, in mines, and factories, supply and distribution have been critical problems in the national economy.

With millions of yards of chambray and denim being released because of Navy cutbacks, garment manufacturers, because of their unfavorable ceilings on civilian garments, are in no position to take advantage of this available increased cloth supply for badly needed work garments for the following reasons:

With only slight relief on cloth increases, work-clothing manufacturers continue to basically operate under their March 1942 ceilings. Since that time, the industry has been compelled to absorb wage increases of over 30 percent, make-up expenses of 25 to 40 percent, and other increases such as overtime, etc. During this period the industry was compelled to drop many low-cost staple numbers because of unfavorable ceilings and lack of cloth, and took on Government work which has been the main source of profit for the industry. Because of sharp cut-backs which have already taken place on Navy contracts and the possibility of nearby cutbacks on Army contracts, the industry, on their future civilian business, is in no position to take advantage of the present increased cloth supply, since the bills making the cloth are being granted further price increases by OPA under the Bankhead amendment with no machinery of passing these increases along to the manufacturer.

These cloth increases are being granted on all work-clothing fabrics as outlined in group 21, WPB M-317A and RMPR OPA Order 208. The OPA, while sympathetic to our situation, is only in a position of granting total costs on the garments, making for a situation which is briefly this. The work-clothing industry is expected to make goods at cost, buying the cloth they need from mills whose profits, according to the OPA, are 11 times prewar earnings and selling them to wholesalers and retailers whose profits are 10 times prewar earnings.

The situation is grossly unfair, intolerable, and, we think, tyrannical. If badly needed low-cost work garments are to be provided for the millions of workers who, because of the scarcity, have been forced to buy higher-priced and inferior garments, then our industry must be put in a position where we can operate at least on a reasonable profit on our civilian business, and our only source of help is to have Congress amend the Bankhead amendment to include these critical work-clothing items.

That is our problem, which is the most serious problem that has yet confronted our industry. Here we are face to face with reconversion. Here are millions of yards of denim and chambray available for the first time in about 2 years that can be made into badly needed overalls and work shirts, provided we can do so at a reasonable profit, for certainly we cannot be expected to carry the burden of other groups whose position is much stronger than ours, particularly since the industry is now faced with a partial peacetime operation.

While chambray and denim are again in liberal supply, cut-backs can be expected releasing other important work-clothing fabrics, such as drills, jeans, pant coverts, whipcords, twills, poplins, gabardine, cotton flannel, shirtings, cottonades, moleskins, ducks, pin checks, and pin stripes.

As manufacturers of important work-clothing garments, we are relatively small in number, there being about 1,200 manufacturers scattered over every State in the Union, with well over 100,000 employees whose welfare must also be considered in this very important problem. Unless immediate relief is granted, there is a possibility of partial or complete closing of a great many of these plants, resulting with serious unemployment in the industry.

If we are to resume partial peacetime operation and take advantage of the present increased cloth supply for badly needed work clothing, then our only hope is to have Congress amend the Bankhead amendment giving us the same consideration as granted the mills.

A Marine's Complaint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, in an article appearing in the veterans' papers in a biographical sketch of myself, it stated that I had formerly served in the United States Marine Corps.

Since then I have received numerous letters from personnel of the United States Marine Corps in which they air their gripes and complaints, as any good marine should. I am inserting in the RECORD a typical letter from a marine who quite generally covers most of the complaints that have come to me.

The rank and unjust discrimination in the pay received as between the Army Infantry soldier and the Infantry combat marine is so obviously unfair one can hardly understand why there has not been a great deal more complaint. The differential of 5 and 10 dollars a month between the soldier and the marine should no longer be maintained.

I am happy to advise my marine friends that the Navy Department and the Marine Corps have under active consideration at this moment proposed legislation that will eliminate this injustice, and I contemplate that the legislation will be retroactive to the date that increased pay went into effect for the infantry.

The letter to follow clearly indicates other complaints, and if they are true, they certainly ought to be rectified.

I want to assure my marine friends who have written to me that so far as I am concerned their identification will be kept in strictest confidence; therefore, I am eliminating any name or identification from this letter:

JUNE 18, 1945.

Hon. WALTER K. GRANGER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I saw in a Washington paper last week that you fought with the Eleventh Marines in the last war. I determined then and there to write you a letter, in spite of the fact that I am not from Utah, and make known to you a couple of legitimate gripes among enlisted marines in this war, one or two completely impractical conditions that exist among us to limit our spirits insofar as they affect us personally. I know that just because you are in the Congress of the United States, you can't pick up a phone and correct these discrepancies—if indeed they are discrepancies—but because you are one of only four or five marines there, I feel more at ease in writing you just in case your duties will allow you to think about our gum beatings for the time required to read this letter.

Congressman GRANGER, most marines actually don't expect any kind of point discharges until Japan is licked. But it hurts a little to hear talk of extra pay for Army men who rate discharges under their program who are forced to remain in uniform because of an essential classification when no extra combat pay has been suggested for the thousands of marine infantrymen who have carried the fight to Tojo on some six or seven island campaigns since the Army Infantry started receiving extra pay for actual combat operations. This, sir, might conceivably mean that the doughboys will be making up to $15 more a month for corresponding ratings (and rank) than the marine infantrymen doing the same job. By the same token, Navy pharmacist mates who serve with marine Infantry assault units don't receive extra pay. Though few complaints have been registered, we don't think this is fair.

Most of us have our family obligations. Through the Government allotments we manage to support our dependents and partial dependents to some degree. However, our pay is the main factor. And marines have come to be noticed by even unconcerned civilians as being notoriously lacking in a plan to prepare for promotions. The Navy allows its men and women to take examinations for promotion upon the expiration of a reasonable amount of time after their last advancement in rating. If our commandant

is to remain below Generals Marshall and Arnold and Admiral King, and if we are only a "bureau" in the Navy Department, why doesn't this scheme reach out and cover us too? There is something wrong when good proven marines, thousands of them, can't rise above the rating of private first class after nearly a cruise, and yet nine out of every dozen Waves and WR's draw sergeants' pay or higher with no families, generally, looking to them for the necessities of life. The fact that they draw much more money than us, to be squandered mostly, is understandable, in part. There has to be an inducement to get these girls to enlist their services. What is not clear to us is why we, too, can't be systematically promoted, even if only once a year, upon proof of guts and ability. I wouldn't be surprised if they couldn't show you some figures at headquarters, Marine Corps, to prove that we are promoted regularly. If so, more than half will be staff or technical ratings. The marines who died all the way from the 'Canal to Okinawa were preponderantly infantrymen, artillerymen, and pioneers (combat engineers). Whenever our lieutenants and sergeants and corporals get killed, they send in a flock of staff ratings, or navy-yard marines or conscripts who really didn't want in the Marine Corps in the first place to fill the vacancies. That, too, is understandable—they're all marines—but when these eternal privates, first class, get back to the States and start over again for the second time, 90 percent go back with the rating they had when they fought before. Now, sir, weed out your unruly guys with a complex for courts martial, and you have a crop of Uncle Sam's finest foot soldiers with perfectly legitimate gripes, and, if I must confess, a little damper spirits than you would have if they didn't see the kids they used to play with, including the girls, drawing two and three times more money with half the time in uniform.

Some of the above may be narrow-minded reasoning and exaggeration. But if you will go to Bethesda or Twenty-third and Constitution, or Marine Barracks, Eighth and Eye, SE., and ask the guys affected, you'll see that my feelings and thoughts as expressed herein come pretty close to being a universal opinion. And, sir, we can't all be that far off the beam. When I saw the publicity you afforded that rifle asscciation's proposal to commemorate a Marine Corps Day on the date Iwo was secured, I had to write to you to appeal our just cause.

Forgive me if this letter consumes more of your time than it is worth. Someday we may discover that we were exceptions rather than rules, but I hardly believe so now. However, if so, we'll go right on taking all the bloody islands the Navy and Air Forces want, and continue to receive our seemingly ceiling salary of sixty-six a month.

Very respectfully.

A Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter recently received by one of my constituents from his son who is serving in the United States Army outside continental United States:

MAY 27, 1945.

DEAR PA: Just a line to let you know I'm O. K. It's raining like the dickens and it makes things more miserable; it is bad enough in fair weather. I just had chow and I'm still hungry. I sure wish I could get hold of a good meal. There must be a terrible food shortage back there when the fighting front goes hungry. I wish Washington would wake up and do something about it or stop boasting that the fighting men come first. I'm sure the P. W.'s back there wouldn't stand for it. Can you imagine me trying to go to work on two pancakes and a cup of coffee? I haven't had fresh eggs, meat, or butter in months; at least MacArthur got us turkey for Christmas, but that's the last of it I saw. You remember I wore size 36 trousers; now I'm almost falling out of 32's. If things are so terribly scarce back there, I wish you would tell me in your next letter; then I'll know they are sending the best they can.

So long for now.

Reconversion and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, VE-day has come and gone. The first stage of reconversion is being embarked upon. Business has been given the green light—the go ahead on the production of household and similar goods—if they can obtain the materials.

All the materials in excess of the needs for the Jap war—and there are considerable quantities of these materials, iron, steel, aluminum, and so forth, are to be released for the production of civilian goods.

But, Mr. Speaker, the demand for these household items will outstrip our ability to produce them for a long while to come. There is great danger that big manufacturers will be able to corner the market on materials that are to be released and accumulate large reserves of stocks which they will not immediately be able to use and leave the small manufacturer without materials, unable to produce. This would drive the small man to the wall. The public would not only be deprived of goods they could and ought to have, but of jobs as well, while large stocks would remain idle on the shelves of the big manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, most of the jobs that are necessary for the full employment of our discharged servicemen and war workers, in a free-enterprise system, are going to have to come from these same small business that are threatened and imperiled with extinction should a few large producers corner the available supply of materials.

It is significant that despite a steady decline in the number of small businesses in this country throughout the depression, the so-called recovery, and the war, they still supply most of the jobs. This indicates that if we are to have full employment, small business must be allowed to survive and multiply. And the best way of making certain of that is to make sure that small business receives a fair and equitable opportunity to share in the materials that are now being released and which they will need for their factories.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of May 29, 1945:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Jim Farley has suggested in his usual politic way a method of approach to the problem of Presidential succession which should be acted upon. There is a certain delicacy attached to the approach. Discussion now might imply distrust of those standing next in line, which it should not; and might be interpreted as a too narrow calculation of President Truman's chances of survival.

Mr. Farley's suggestion is that a joint executive and congressional committee study possible ways of bringing the choice of successor closer to the people.

In 1886, 5 years after the assassination of President Garfield, Congress passed a law which established the order of succession which obtains today.

This law provides that in the event of the death, removal, resignation, or inability of both the President and Vice President the Secretary of State shall become President.

After him come the Secretary of the Treasury, of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, Secretary of the Navy, and of the Interior. The line stops there, for the other Cabinet offices—Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor—were created since.

This law has never been used. It probably will not be used before 1949. Yet the presidency has acquired hazards unknown to Presidents of the tranquil time, say, of Van Buren. Global travel, increasing pressure of responsibility, greater demands on energies, bring increased risks.

More to the point, the Republican nominees in 1940—Mr. Willkie and Senator McNary—both died before 1945. Had they won the 1940 election an appointive officer would have become President.

It is now argued, with some force, that the Presidency should not devolve upon an appointive officer, no matter what his abilities might be.

Among the suggestions is one within the genius of our republican institutions which delegate power to elected representatives. That is, the Congress should elect a President when the office is vacated by both the constitutional Presidents.

But should the House alone vote, both Houses, or a joint session of both Houses? And if the House alone, should its vote be cast by States, as in the case of a contested election, or as individuals?

Mr. Farley's suggestion is very much in order. A joint committee should study the problem and bring in a report, bringing the orderly succession closer to the people.

Postmaster Patrick J. Connelly, of Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extened my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following most interesting article in the recent edition of the Postmaster's Gazette concerning the establishment of public relations in the Boston, Mass., post office under the successful supervision of Postmaster Patrick J. Connelly:

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN THE BOSTON, MASS., POST OFFICE

The original draft of the Creed of the Postal Service embraced the following lines:

"Enlarger of the common life;
"Carrier of news and knowledge;
"Instrument of trade and industry."

These few lines of the postal creed bespeak the greatness of the service that spreads its tentacles into every farm and fireside in this great nation and extend itself into lands in all corners of the earth.

Peoples are informed only to the extent to which they read and hear. A public service has little value when patrons are unfamiliar with or have little knowledge of such a service.

Forty-nine years ago, when Patrick J. Connelly, now postmaster at Boston, entered the postal service, he recognized the need for a coordination of information that could be utilized to inform the public concerning new and current features of postal activities and developments. He based his arguments on the fact that this service is conducted exclusively for the public, and unless they were made aware of the services and facilities provided to them, it would be failing in its primary objective.

For 47 years Postmaster Connelly grasped at every opportunity to spread the news of modern postal progress. Chambers of commerce, retail trade boards, industrial organizations, churches, schools, all were contacted and sold on the use of the facilities of the post office.

The first official act of Mr. Connelly when he assumed the office of postmaster at Boston, Mass., was to create a "public-relations section." In the space of 2 years the accomplishments of this new unit has been widely applauded by business and financial executives throughout New England. Said the president of the Boston chamber of commerce: "This great movement by Postmaster Connelly marks the greatest contribution by the postal service to the public in 50 years."

Just what does the public-relations section do?

The full list of activities sponsored by this unit could not be accommodated in the length of this article and it is proposed to outline but a few of their valuable contributions to the Department and to the public.

Practically every issue of the Postal Bulletin outlines a new service, an extension of service, failure by the public to comply with regulations, etc. It has been the expressed desire of the Department that this information be made available to the public as widely as possible, without cost to the Department. In a great postal district like Boston, embracing 25 cities and towns and with over 150 newspapers, 140 periodicals and with key facilities for four leading radio chains, the preparation, distribution, and checking of these releases represented a sizable task. With no specially created facilities the assignment became a hit or miss task. The creation of the public relations section wiped out all of these inefficient promotions.

Complete files of all newspapers and periodicals in New England were prepared, information was assembled concerning the publishing day, closing for copy, these thousands of envelopes were addressographed, files of scrapbooks covering every subject were developed, statistics and information concerning all phases of postal activities were jacketed, a historical background of the postal service was compiled for the education of school children; radio facilities were secured for current distribution of postal news; national drives (infantile paralysis, Red Cross, war-bond programs, community fund) and other promotions intended to secure the cooperation of postal personnel were sponsored and directed by this public relations section.

Store windows were secured for display of postal services, business houses are regularly informed as to new postal rates, services, etc. The vast promotion of the postal zoning section was undertaken by this new unit. In short it has become the center of all promotional activity in this vast postal district.

Postmasters throughout the New England States have found the public relations section a source of general information on all postal and kindred subjects. The reopening of mail service to various foreign countries has brought hundreds of calls daily to this centralized unit for information. The press has found this unit to be of real assistance as evidenced by continuous communications from editors throughout New England.

Perhaps no greater evidence of the value of this newly created unit could be shown than the results they secured during the past two Christmas seasons in their appeal to the public throughout New England to mail early. Never before in the history of the postal service at Boston was the peak reached as early as during the past 2 years. Veteran postal men wiped their eyes and could scarcely believe that they had made news records.

The promotion of postal notes—overseas mail—and similar postal assignments were given into the public relations section. Daily releases were sent to 700 newspapers and four radio chains—letters were sent to thousands of business establishments. Under the direction of Postmaster Patrick J. Connelly they developed the first technicolor motion picture in the Nation for the instruction of Christmas temporary employees; they decorated postal lobbies; they advertised postal services.

Private industry has spent millions of dollars to accomplish the same purposes for which the public relations section at Boston was established by Postmaster Connelly. Representatives of the department who have had occasion to visit Boston were amazed at the systematic and efficient manner with which they developed a greater interest and use of postal services—without cost to the department. The businessmen of Boston have accepted their recommendations and ideas and have privately spent thousands of dollars in promoting a fuller knowledge of postal services. We can serve only to the extent that the public subscribe to our services. This is their service and they are entitled to know more about it. That is the task of the public relations section within the New England States.

Many post offices do not have the facilities to prepare and transmit news to newspapers and radio outlets. It may seem strange, but some do not even have a mimeograph machine. Some post offices are served by newspapers from an adjacent district. Radio facilities are cleared through distant offices and during wartime all scripts and time clearance must be transmitted through OWI. This can only be accomplished at Boston for the New England district. All packets for spot announcement are made up at Boston by the OWI, and it is perhaps natural that our Boston post office should prepare postal news for these packets to be sent to stations throughout New England.

Newspapers throughout New England are served through the Associated Press, United Press, and International News with district offices at Boston. The Public Relations Section at Boston has close contact with these news agencies. An official representative from each of the great leading Boston papers is stationed in the Federal Building at Boston, in their own press room, and these representatives also serve the national news agencies.

All copy prepared at Boston for any promotion is designed to permit the name of each postmaster to be inserted as his exclusive release and copies of all papers are filed by the Public Relations Section.

It might well be the pattern for the Department to follow for the establishment of similar units in key cities throughout the Nation.

The Public Relations Section of the Boston Post Office serves 1,250 post offices throughout the New England States—disseminating valuable information to millions of patrons of the postal service.

National University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was with pleasure that I noted that my friend, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, an honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, was invited to offer the invocation and to pronounce the benediction at the seventy-sixth annual convocation of National University for the conferring of degrees in the school of law and junior college on Friday evening, June 8, in the auditorium of the United States Chamber of Commerce Building. The commencement address on this occasion, I am happy to add, was prepared by one of the distinguished Members of the Congress of the United States, the Honorable KARL STEFAN, United States Representative from Nebraska. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the two prayers offered by Dr. Thorning at these exercises:

INVOCATION

Lord God, creator and savior and sanctifier of mankind, Source of every good and perfect gift, regard with beneficence all Thy children, whose studies and search for truth have been conducted under the aegis of the chancelor and faculty of the National University through its school of law and junior college. Grant them peace of mind and joy of soul in this moment of crowning victory. Strengthen their characters with these virtues, ever ancient and ever new: generosity of service, loyalty to family ties, faith in the Nation as well as in our fellow citizens and their institutions. In humility and thankfulness, we stand before Thee, eager to show by love and sacrifice that obedience to law is liberty. This we ask in Thy Name. Amen.

BENEDICTION

Father of light and love, we beg Thy blessing upon the years of struggle, crisis, and triumph that extend themselves before us. Guide our wills to do the right, as omnipotent wisdom may grant us in conscience to see our vision of what is noble, upright, and honorable. Pour forth Thy sweet grace to fill our hearts with confidence in the future of our people and their democratic liberties, which must be always linked with constitutional obligations. Vouchsafe Thy benediction in a special manner to all the youth of the land that in their hands the torch of truth may blaze from the mountain tops through the valleys, leading the sons and daughters of this new generation of scholars to the goal of justice, love, and peace. These favors we beg in the Name of the All-Holy Father, Son, and Sacred Spirit. Amen.

No Sugar for the Housewife—Nor Anyone Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is well for the American people to wake up to just what bungling procedure about sugar has been followed, and just how many mistakes the New Dealers and brain-trusters have made over a period of years. They have promised everything and in final analysis have done nothing. No one thing more clearly illustrates their shortcomings than the shortage of sugar which is with us today and will be with us in the days to come. I hesitate to discuss this matter because when you try to improve conditions, the policy-making boys of the governmental agencies always get ready with a number of alibis and then they assure you that if anybody interferes with them, we will destroy price control and bring about inflation. As a matter of fact, everybody recognizes the need for price control and everybody wants to avoid the evils of inflation.

But when you face a food shortage, such as sugar, those of you who want to get the facts just as well study the situation and you then come to the conclusion that it is not necessary to have a sugar shortage or a food shortage in order to have price controls. The matter of price control is one thing, and furnishing enough sugar for the American housewife and the various industries that use sugar is another and different story.

The housewife wants sugar for canning. The soft drink manufacturers want sugar because they cannot carry on their business without it. The man who operates a bread factory has to have sugar or else he cannot manufacture bread. When we think about it, almost everybody wants and needs sugar, and they cannot get it. We have repeatedly pointed out that incompetent and inefficient administrative officials are responsible for this situation. Congress is not responsible, even though one of my constituents did suggest that Congress ought to furnish sugar. Congress can do a lot of things, but has never been endowed with the powers of the production of sugar.

It is interesting to note that the man who will be Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, in an interview sometime ago discussed the food problem and had this to say about the sugar shortage:

And we found cases of divided responsibility. The Cuban sugar crop was purchased in 1943 by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Responsibility for the purchase of black-strap molasses was with the Defense Supplies Corporation. The latter tried to buy at a price so low that the Cubans put an extra 150,000,000 gallons of it into alcohol. We lost 450,000 tons of sugar there.

There seemed to be no one man to tell Defense Supplies Corporation to get that molasses.

Well, there are a lot of angles to this proposition. My attention has been called to the fact that over a period of years the Federal officials, and I mean Henry Wallace, who was then Secretary of Agriculture, as well as some others, adopted a hostile attitude toward the beet-sugar growers in the United States. They put these people on a quota, so that expansion of the domestic sugar industry was halted, and if they produced more sugar than Henry and the other boys told them to produce, they could not sell the sugar because they would have no marketing quota granted by the Federal Government. This certainly discouraged domestic producers of sugar.

Of course, other factors have entered into the sugar shortage, and a number of Government agencies have been responsible. The way to avoid a sugar shortage is to have sugar produced so that there will be enough for the American market. That sort of a program has not been carried out by any of the Government agencies involved.

The following news item in the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., under date of June 18, 1945, gives some very interesting observations on the sugar shortage, and if you are interested, I trust that you will take time to read this item. It is as follows:

SUGAR SHORTAGE EXPECTED TO LAST FOR 3 YEARS

(By Russ Symontowne)

HAVANA, June 17.—Despite anything we can do, the United States sugar shortage certainly will become worse this year and may be much worse next year. Not until the spring of 1948 does it appear likely that we will get enough sugar for all our needs.

The situation is far more serious than the public has yet been told. The disappearance of sugar from the bowl on the breakfast table is one of the least of the hardships facing us.

CANNERS TO BE HIT

Nearly half of our sugar goes into the preparation and preservation of other important foods. Not only home canners, who have become very important in feeding the Nation at war, but factory canners, as well, are going to be hard hit in the next 4 months.

The first mistake, and, as it turns out, the vital one, was made back in 1943. In that year we not only refused to buy all the sugar we needed from Cuba, but we forbade the Cubans to harvest all the sugar they had. It is true that we did collect this sugar, which was left in the fields the following year—that is, in 1944. It was this extra supply which got us by last year and kept the housewife from feeling any severe pinch of rationing.

But, as the result of our behavior in 1943, in the next two years Cuba planted only about three-fifths of the sugar she was able to raise.

Before the war we were consuming about 7,000,000 tons of sugar a year. When the Japs overran the Philippines we lost a supply of 1,000,000 tons a year. On top of that, we had to cut the production of beet sugar in our Western States because we needed the land and labor for other food crops. Then the war enormously increased our sugar needs, not only for food but for alcohol to make synthetic rubber and smokeless powder.

SUPPLY GROWING SHORT

This year we cannot count on more than 6,221,000 tons of sugar. The maximum amount civilians can count on this year is 5,000,000 tons.

We have consumed more than half this amount in the first 6 months of the year. Normally we consume 55 percent in the last half of the year, but this year we will have only 47 percent left.

Sugar is going to disappear not only from the household sugar bowl, but from all sorts of food products. Some foods, jams and jellies, for example, may vanish from the market.

One more gloomy touch must be added to this grim picture. Cuba is locked in the grip of the worst drought in sugar history. Cuban sugarcane must have rain in May and June. This year it had none.

Now why, back in 1943, did the United States Government forbid the Cubans to plant the sugar which today we need so desperately?

The answer is just one word: Submarines. The Nazis had turned the Caribbean into a graveyard of American ships.

The truth seems to be that the submarine war panicked us and that the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration officials lost their heads and threw away their ordinary horse sense.

FAILED TO GET FACTS

The Congressional Committee to Investigate Food Shortages failed completely to get the facts or to fix the responsibility after many hearings.

The 1943 mistake was bad, but even after it was recognized as a serious blunder we went right on making the situation worse, according to the committee. Sugar rationing was almost a joke in many parts of the country. Moreover, according to the committee, sugar was actually wasted.

This is only part of the sugar story, and in later articles I hope to show that as a nation we are going to do some very serious thinking about sugar.

The foregoing newspaper article, Mr. Speaker, illustrates just how great an interest there is in the sugar shortage which has been inflicted on the American people. This is a news item, and the newspapers do not devote that much space to a question unless the American people are asking the reason why. You will no doubt hear the old familiar song by the administrative officials. We will call it the alibi song. When they are forced to admit a sugar shortage, then they find a happy reason for it. Many of them will blame it on the war, and in desperation they will probably find that nature is at fault.

Just remember when you hear that sort of stuff that the writer of the foregoing article talks very plainly and has pointed out how increased sugar production was very much in order because of a number of things that happened. The important thing to remember is that the Government agencies refused to heed the warn-

ing. As this writer says, some of them "lost their heads." That is just a figure of speech because the important thing is the fact that there was not much in those heads, or else these policy-making boys would have planned for increased sugar production to meet future needs. It is important that the American people place responsibility where it belongs, and that is right square on these different Government agencies and the smart boys who believe in the doctrine of scarcity.

Extension of Price Control and Stabilization Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of meat in this country is reaching a critical stage, according to reports from every section. In my opinion, the greatest contributing factor to this shortage in most areas is the order establishing slaughter quotas in nonfederally inspected packing plants. I have protested with OPA that this order is reducing the supply of meat in many locaities and have urged that it be canceled. I have written Mr. Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator, a letter giving my reasons why this order in unfortunate and unnecessary.

I believe that this order has been in effect long enough for OPA to see that it is not accomplishing the purposes for which it was issued. The practical effect of the order has been to dry up the supplies of beef in areas where there is a surplus of cattle. It was the idea of OPA that the order would divert cattle to the federally inspected plants and bring about a more even distribution of meat. It has not worked in that direction, as there are plenty of cattle for all packers, both large and small.

In its report recommending extension of the Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act unchanged for another 12 months, the Banking and Currency Committee lays great emphasis on the success which it says recent orders of OPA are going to have in solving the meat shortage.

The committee refers specifically to the recent order placing a 50-cent subsidy on cattle for the benefit of cattle feeders and the order placing restrictive quotas on the quantity of beef which may be slaughtered by non-federally-inspected packing plants. These two orders, says the committee, are going to bring about great improvement in the meat situation and demonstrate that all our food troubles can be cured by administrative action under existing OPA regulations, and that no change is necessary.

The committee seems to have listened too long to Chester Bowles and other OPA officials and looked too long at OPA charts based on month-old statistics. For, if the committee had taken the trouble to secure up-to-the-minute information from men who are closest to the cattle business, it would have learned that the OPA orders granting a subsidy to cattle feeders and the quota restrictions on small local packers are not going to improve the meat supply. They are going to make the situation worse, and they are outstanding examples of administrative incompetence and inability or unwillingness to carry out a sound and sensible food-production program.

The fact is that the quota restriction on small local packers is not improving the meat supply. It is not driving one single steer into the federally inspected plants, but it is now bringing about a meat famine in areas where there are plenty of cattle on the hoof, local packers eager to slaughter them, but no meat in the stores because OPA has established these slaughter quotas. There is no reason why such a condition should exist, and the public is demanding it be corrected.

This unfortunate order will soon bring about a further scarcity of meat supplies because it is driving many small packers out of business. Four more of them closed their doors only last week in Sioux City, Iowa, the very heart of the cattle-feeding country. Others are following almost every day, but OPA refuses to admit a mistake has been made.

But the results of the 50-cent subsidy to cattle feeders are equally as serious. Instead of encouraging the grain feeding of cattle, the 50-cent subsidy is actually deterring such feeding. In order to secure the true facts on reports that movement of cattle into grain feed lots had virtually come to a standstill since the Vinson order, the Republican Food Study Committee day before yesterday got in touch with one of the men who is familiar with this situation and asked him for a report.

That man is Mr. P. O. Wilson, secretary of the National Livestock Producers Association, of Chicago, Ill. Here is Mr. Wilson's telegram of June 19, to Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, chairman of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee:

> Livestock producers and feeders desire to be helpful in solving the present meat shortage. Guaranteed profits to processors either by species or on over-all basis have not and will not increase meat production. Meat is produced on the ranches, farms, and in the feed lots, not in packing houses. In the case of beef production OPA regulations have restricted feed-lot operations and encouraged growing and maturing cattle on grass rather than by feeding. The new 50-cent subsidy accentuates this condition and will result in more cattle being held on ranches and in pastures until they weigh 800 pounds to qualify for the subsidy.
>
> The feed-lot operator has and will be forced to pay higher prices for his supply or go without cattle. The processor is paid a subsidy regardless of weight or condition of cattle he buys and with present consumer demand for any kind of beef the packer has and will continue to pay prices above those a feeder-operator can afford to pay for cattle to refill his lots.
>
> I have just returned from a trip across Illinois, Iowa, and a part of Nebraska where I observed many cattle in pastures but few were found in the feed lots. In my opinion these pasture cattle are recorded as feed-lot cattle by Government statisticians. They are not in feed lots but are being matured on grass which means a longer and slower production program. If you want more meat we suggest you repeal the McKellar amendment, remove the overriding ceiling on live cattle, and force OPA to adjust their wholesale and retail pricing schedules upward sufficiently to allow this industry a price that will permit increased beef production.

There again is direct and incontrovertible evidence that OPA, by its own regulations, is limiting production of basic food commodities and creating conditions of scarcity that are building up the very forces of inflation which it is supposed to be combating.

Information such as this was available to the Banking and Currency Committee if it had taken its eyes away from artfully prepared OPA charts long enough to look for real facts, not propaganda. Or the committee might have turned to other men close to the true facts for its evidence—State secretaries of agriculture, for example.

From one of them, Mr. Howard Leonard, State director of agriculture of Illinois, the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee this week received an unsolicited letter containing this interesting information:

> I am sending you attached herewith copy of a letter received from one of our good Illinois cattle feeders. I think Mr. Figgins' letter accurately describes the general situation among our cattle feeders. About the only effect the 50 cents per hundred subsidy has had is to increase the cost of feeder cattle.

This letter shows that this Illinois cattle feeder will lose 24 cents a day feeding 21 cattle on the cost of feed alone—nothing for his own labor, overhead, and taxes. "You can see," he says, "why we are getting out of the business."

Why is this 50-cent feeder subsidy ineffective? Let me show you what is happening. In order to qualify for the 50-cents-per-hundred feeder subsidy, the animal must weigh over 800 pounds, must sell for $14.25 or more, and must be sold for slaughter. The subsidy is paid only once—when the animal goes to slaughter. Now, an 800-pound steer should not be slaughtered; it should be sent to the feed lot to put on another two or three hundred pounds of grain-fed weight. But here is what happens when an 800-pound steer arrives in Chicago or some other market center.

If that steer sells at $14.25 or above—which is the price of the top grade of beef—the seller gets a 50-cent subsidy from the Government on each 100 pounds of weight if the animal goes to slaughter. So if the steer is bought by a packer at $14,25, the seller actually gets $14.75—counting the 50-cent subsidy. So if an Illinois cattle feeder wants to buy that animal, he has to bid $14.75 for it—for the owner will get no subsidy on such a sale. The net result of the 50-cent subsidy, therefore, has been to increase the price of range cattle 50 cents a hundred pounds and leave the feed-lot operator exactly where he was before.

It is time to put an end to this foolishness. It is time to take all authority over the price of food products from OPA, that thrives on scarcity, and put that control in an agency that is responsible for production. The OPA has

overlooked the fact that we must have production of food products before prices are important. One person should have full and exclusive jurisdiction over all food matters—otherwise, the present shortages will continue and become more acute.

Cheap Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Rev. W. W. Orr, of Des Moines, Iowa, broadcast over radio station WHO, May 27, 1945:

Daniel 8: 24, 25: "And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand."

Daniel dipped his pen in mysterious knowledge. Here he gives the account of a vision and its interpretation. Daniel sees the overthrow of the Persian monarchy by Alexander the Great; the consequent dividing of the new kingdom which follows into four parts; and the persecution that came to the children of Israel by Antiochus Epiphanes. The little phrase to which I attract your attention is this (I believe you will find it entirely apropos on this memorial Sunday), "* * * And by peace shall destroy many."

Daniel here combines two words which ordinarily do not come together in our thinking, "By peace shall destroy many"—"peace" and "destruction." At first it seems a mistake. Surely the copy here is in error. Peace and destruction are not synonymous. Yet there is no mistake. We, the people of this generation, should certainly be the generation that would understand that. The cry now all over the world is, "Oh, God give us peace. Stay Thy hand, the suffering is enough. The privation, the heartache is enough. O God give us peace. Please God give us peace." Anything we want so much must be understood better than we understand it.

There are two kinds of peace—the real and the honest, the actual and the genuine article, and then a substitute. The substitute is deliberately packaged to look like the real thing. So cleverly disguised is this article that millions upon millions are being, and will be, misled into accepting it for the real thing. It fooled a statesman as acute as Chamberlain, who returned from the conference at Munich with Hitler and Mussolini and announced to the people of Britain, and to the whole wide world, "Peace in our time." There was no peace! The next 5 years were the bitterest in human history. There will be peace in the future unless we guard ourselves very, very carefully at three points.

I

Our peace will be a cheap peace—unreal and withered—if civilians forget the cost of victory. The living who have thus far survived this world-wide revolution, pause today to honor those whose lives have been exacted. No person is entitled to freedom or to liberty who has no appreciation of its terrific cost. For the freedom we exercise today as we worship God, a man who loved life moved up front, examined his troops, stepped around the corner of a building and was shot dead by a sniper's bullet. His widow, and soon to be the mother of his child, lives within the city limits of Des Moines and can scarcely dry her tears because there is no one now to whom she may send the cablegram.

A boy, just 19, who was not even allowed to wait for his high-school diploma, set up his mortar and was ready to strike his first blow in the fight for freedom and victory, when an enemy shell wiped him out. It landed right at his feet, and threw him and his crew into a hundred pieces into the air.

A crippled plane fell out of formation, becoming easy prey for enemy fighter action. They got it. One of the men had a chance to bail out. The plane was a flaming funeral pyre. Its crew, screaming with pain and fear, knowing this was the end, tumbled and hurtled about inside until death, without any mercy, stood gaunt and grinning beside the wreckage. The one who bailed out? He was target practice for enemy action until his last screaming curse was silenced by a .50-caliber bullet through his head.

On a mud-spattered field a man lies wounded, pinned down by enemy fire. All night he screams with pain, growing weaker and weaker. Finally delirium persecutes his already tortured brain with a vision of a child, a child that he never saw, a vision of a wife whom he will never again see. Then quietly, the last of the blood in his body ran out, left his body empty. Soon it lay very still.

"Victory" is a strange word. It is separation, loneliness, privation, hardship, weariness beyond words. It is blood, warm, life-fluid, one cannot hold in with fingers. Or it is water, up to the armpits, up and up until frantic effort ceases. Or it is fire, singeing hair, burning clothing, until one is left crisp and flaky.

"Victory" has two faces. No person is really alive today who has not looked upon this ghostly, ghastly specter in pock-marked face and understood the wild delirium of joy in one home is sobered by the anguished wail in other homes, where wives and children or mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters cannot be comforted.

If this tragic day, called Memorial Day, does not bring from us a high resolve and deep dedication of self to the Eternal God and gratitude beyond measure to the permanently empty homes and hearts, then we forfeit their costly victory and our peace is cheap and flimsy, temporary, and withered, worthless. We shall have paid the price for a Packard and accepted delivery of a jeep.

II

Our peace will be a cheap peace if veterans abandon that for which they have fought. Possibly the greatest temptation confronting fighting men is that they will lose the principles of democracy in destroying the enemies of democracy. Our men have fought, bled, and died by the thousands that aggression might cease; that freedom to live in peace, without fear, under a chosen government, selected on the basis of ballots rather than bullets, might survive.

In order to defeat the enemies of freedom we have had to take up the weapons chosen by the enemies of democracy. We have had to learn from the enemy his method of warfare. We have had to be better at war than the enemy, whose business was war. Now the question is, Have some of us inadvertently, consciously or unconsciously, become like the enemy? We have had to destroy. Will some come home obedient only to the law of self-preservation, which is the first law of any battlefield? Will some be unable to break the habit of destroying the opposition?

The strength of the American democracy lies in the presence of opposition. It means a fair hearing of all sides of any proposition. I means an impartial action taken on the evidence, by which and in which the largest possible number of people benefit. This principle operates all the way from Walnut Street, Des Moines, to Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C. It operates in regard to installing parking meters in Des Moines business district or all the way to "packing" the Supreme Court in Washington, D. C. Now the question is, shall we come home from battlefields and be impatient with the processes of democracy? I know there are many foolish, tragic, and at time idiotic delays in the proceedings of democracy. No doubt many of our political processes need to be devised, revamped, and improved. Not all of the delays are necessarily democracy. However, neither are all the delays that mark our democracy "evils-to-be-eliminated." Now, will there be patience, wisdom, and good judgment used by millions of World War II veterans? Or, will they be impatient? Will they impetuously destroy that for which they have fought?

I served during April 1945 as civilian chaplain at Fort Benning, Ga. Out of 421 hospital calls, I met only one man who could no longer contain himself in reference to his attitude about the Army. He was thoroughly "griped" about everything in the Army. He poured out all the vials of his wrath on the powers from the Comander in Chief right down the line without missing a man. His gripe was the inefficiency of the Army. After he had somewhat run down and I had a chance to put a word in sideways, I said, "Well, son, there must be something good about this man's army. It couldn't be quite as bad as you say it is. America lived for 20 years blind, in the deepest, darkest, caverns of isolationism. When we were driven out of that, we came forth to meet the glaring lights of the world focused upon America. We took one blinking stare at our impossible position, then went to our lathes and to our shops, and to our parade grounds, and produced in a marveously and miraculously short time the No. 1 Army, the No. 1 Navy, and the No. 1 Air Force of the world. We have become the arsenal of democracy. And, son, we have done something else, too. We have delivered our fighting men all over the world. The boys who are slogging up toward the front in the mud on the Philippine Islands, or on Okinawa, are not talking like you are talking about the inefficiency, the wastage, of the Army. Some of those who are in the fighting zones would give an arm to be back where you are, so they could "hurry-up-to-wait" and live at home. There may be a time when you will feel, 'Oh, if I could hurry-up-to-wait a little while longer.' Take it easy, son." Presently, he smiled. I believe he understood. Anything as big as the winning of a world revolution must have in it certain things that appear to be inefficient. That is inevitable.

I am sure of one thing, that millions of our boys will return and be thrilled at the sight of home and peace and comfort again. I am sure that they will value and appreciate them in such a way as we civilians, who work it out on the home front, will never be able to know and understand. I am sure of that. That isn't the question. The question is, Will we have a cheap peace after this coming victory? That depends on whether or not there will be any considerable number of our men who will return home impatient with John L. Lewis and others whom they feel have delayed victory and jeopardized their chances of being survivors in this world revolution? That is the question. I tremble at it, for this reason: patience, long suffering, kindness, and forbearance have not, to my knowledge, ever been a part of any Army curriculum. In any block of 10,000,000 men there are men who tend to be men of violence. The uniform does not extract that tendency any more

than motherhood makes a saint out of every woman. We shall have a cheap and fragile peace if even a comparatively small minority of our veterans refuse the democracy for which they sacrificed so much. Shall we pay for a Packard and accept delivery of a jeep?

III

I have spoken to civilians, I have spoken to veterans; now, this to one and all: If we forget God, there is no hope for peace at any time, anywhere. This is found in the Delaware Conference: "We believe that moral law, no less than physical law, undergirds our world. There is a moral order which is fundamental and eternal, and which is relevant to the corporate life of men and the ordering of human society. If mankind is to escape chaos and recurrent war, social and political institutions must be brought into conformity with this moral order."

This is a moral universe. God has made it that way. Whatever God has created is good and it is right. And God has created this universe. He has done His utmost to influence men in the proper ordering of it. But man has persistently considered himself wiser than God. God has one of two choices: Either he may continue to weep out His heart in anguish for the things which we do to ourselves or He may strip from us the freedom of will and make us incapable of evil. This latter thing God will not do. God will not take from mankind his freedom of choice.

Dr. Richard S. Emrich says, "The great punishment is that God leaves us to ourselves, that He does not compel us to give our loyalty to Him. He permits us to organize our lives with ourselves as the center, whether in class, race, or nation. We then work out slowly, inevitably, the results of our disloyalty. From our self-centered souls there flows out a poison that breaks fellowship by Him who humbles us, who stills our pretentions, and who breathes into a lost world the breath of His love."

We shall have an exceedingly cheap peace if we leave God out of tomorrow.

Now perhaps I am unduly hopeful. Yet, it seems only fair to state the things that I find continually in correspondence from all over the world. The majority of our 207 men and women in service have most faithfully maintained their tie with the home church. Mary Stream in Washington, D. C., said, "I stood in line before the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church for 40 minutes before I could get in." Dr. E. G. Williams, the beloved former paster of this church and now pastor of the Highland Park Presbyterian Church of Los Angeles, Calif., says, "We had last year a net gain of 11 percent in the membership of this church." Mrs. Elizabeth Eddy, one of our members in California, said, "I was part of a congregation of 55,000 people on Easter Sabbath morning in the Forest Lawn Easter sunrise service."

So, one might go on and on. The story is the same from great cathedrals to little handmade chapels on Pacific islands, to the shattered churches of Europe. Under the anguish and the sorrow of this world revolution, I believe there is a cloud of hope in the sky. It is probably no bigger than a man's hand, but hopeful nonetheless. Are we turning once again to the God in whose image we are created? I have high hope. Westminster United Presbyterian Church is not the only church in Des Moines that has to have two worship services every Sabbath Day in order to care for its congregation. Ministers throughout this State say, "Never have we seen as many people in God's house." And VE-day? VE-day in Des Moines and all over the United States was a day in which man turned aside from business and from pleasures, and went into God's house and bowed in humble and contrite prayer. Now, you listen closely to me, and let me say something down deep in your heart—the place where you live, the place where you make your decisions—if there can grow a good, healthy, sane, sound, sense of God in the hearts of the people of this generation, there can be "peace in our time." Without it, whether you are soldier, or civilian (it matters not), there will be no "peace in this generation." None. None. It isn't enough to tritely sing "God Bless America." It is enough only when we have added to that "God here is my heart, here is my home, here is my business, dedicated to peace in our world in our time."

I challenge you this Memorial Day as you shall probably pause by some graveside (or what is worse imagine yourself at a graveside thousands of miles away) to think of those whose lives have been the price of the victory and the peace and the security which you now exercise. There will be no peace in this world until God comes into the hearts and lives of people in this world. Give Him room in your heart. And, if you haven't room in your heart, then be honest enough not to ask for peace. Ask for war and death and hell on earth.

Let us pray.

Father God, we beseech thee, that we may never be content with a sham, cheap peace. Grant us that such a costly victory may be followed by a real peace. We pray with all our hearts and all our lives, that these dead shall not have died in vain. Amen.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. Chester J. Nicklas, of Pittsburgh, Pa., to the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, June 14, 1945:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I volunteered in 1917. I have been an enlisted man, a noncommissioned and commissioned officer of the United States Army, and served 10 months in France in World War I. I have served over 10 years in the Army Reserve as a first lieutenant and later as a captain. I have just finished over 3 years of active service in the United States Navy as a line officer with the rank of lieutenant commander and spent 13 months of that time in the Pacific. I am presently of that rank on inactive duty. In both World War I and World War II, I have seen delay and confusion result from unpreparedness which in turn delayed the prosecution of both wars and consequently cost more blood and lives.

In my judgment, based upon my experience, it takes at least a year to make a soldier or a sailor relatively efficient, and I believe that the training which should be given all of our youths should be for that period of time, and constantly, rather than by any method of training used by the National Guard or the Reserve Corps.

I am well enough acquainted with the men of the armed forces who will have charge of this training to know that they will not endeavor to change our form of government into a military form of government. I know and sincerely believe they will endeavor to stimulate a greater interest in religion and education in our boys. No one in uniform has ever been ashamed to call upon God in an hour of need. Some of those in uniform probably never thought much about religion and education until they came into contact with those in the services who possessed both of these common-place American precepts. At least I have confidence that the men entrusted with the training of our youth will not allow the uniform to replace religion and education.

As for the cost of this training, let us all remember that America has always been ready to spend millions for defense, but nothing for tribute. Suppose it had not been necessary for us to enter and win the war? If the Germans had won, certainly the United States would have been an armed camp for the next generation. The cost of maintaining the whole United States as a complete military reservation would certainly cost more in money and the free lives of individuals than a year of compulsory military training.

It is true that military training will take a year from the life of every young man in his youth, but, on the other hand, it may, and undoubtedly will, preserve his life 5 or 10 years.

It is well to look beyond the year which a youth may be required to give and think of his life 5 or 10 years later in a world which has always been torn by strife. The knowledge that America is prepared to and can send an Army of trained men onto a battlefield within a short period of time may well deter any future enemy from ever attacking us.

I do not know of any city in the United States which reduces its fire department after a large fire or reduces its police department after a murder, and, for the life of me, I cannot understand the attitude of some of the teachers and religious leaders who seem to attack this question of universal military training without knowing anything about it. They speak of representing millions of people of this outfit or another. I am of the millions of both wars who have seen the folly of our unpreparedness.

It was forcibly called to my attention, and so very recently, that force can only be overcome by superior force.

I have two sons, both of whom are volunteers in the present war—one a first lieutenant of Infantry who has been in the African and Italian campaigns, and who has been over there almost 3 years; another who has just been commissioned an ensign in the United States Navy, and who will go into the Pacific fight shortly. Both of my sons have voluntarily told me that when the war is over they will continue in their respective reserves because they have seen the difficulty involved in the training of the armed forces during a period of war, and at a time when so few members of the armed forces have ever been subjected to military training.

William Jennings Bryan years ago made a statement that a million men would spring to arms overnight. That is a beautiful thought, but I wonder what Mr. Bryan thought they would use for the defense of this country.

I have seen simulated training of personnel in both the Army and Navy to the point where it was ludicrous. If we had been prepared, Japan would not have made her attack upon us. If Russia had been prepared, Germany would not have attacked her. If China had been prepared, I do not believe Japan could have attacked us. In my short life I have seen this country twice precipitated into war, and each time unprepared. I hate war, as every other sane person does, but unless we are able to change human nature I do not believe that the present conflict is the last war of this world, although I sincerely hope it will be.

The services never made a bum out of any man, but they have made men out of some bums. It is true though that war, not the services, has made derelicts out of some men. The services in my opinion have taken good care of the American boys and have developed a resourcefulness and sense of fellowship in these boys that could never have been acquired in any other manner.

When ill, we consult a doctor; when it comes to war, we ought to rely on our topside military men, and be guided by their thoughts concerning universal military training.

There are those who say that we should wait until this war is over because we do not know what the international situation will be. There are also those who say that we should rely on disarmament agreements; also some say that if we rearm it will be an invitation to other countries to prepare for war. My answers to these three things are that we have only to turn our attention to the Far East and to Europe during the past 10 years to know that regardless of what contention may be advanced, neither the Kellogg Peace Pact nor the League of Nations has prevented or so far had the slightest effect upon the military activities throughout the world. Disarmament agreements cannot be relied upon. In this war it was necessary to furnish over-age destroyers to another nation because that nation relied on certain ratios of sea power to those of other nations. Germany and Japan certainly did rearm despite any agreements to the contrary. In answer to the third criticism of peacetime military conscription, I can only say that it is my belief the creation of a large reserve of trained men will act as a deterrent to other nations who may desire war with us. At least we would be prepared to meet any challenge. In the next war we may be the first nation attacked. Certainly in the war against Japan, we were attacked first. This attack took place remote from this continent; the next time the location of the attack may be closer to home.

Last fall, as assistant chief of staff to the island commander, I went in with the First Marine Division in the assault on Peleliu in the western Carolines. I went ashore on D-plus-three day and I was there in combat for 51 days, and I saw the finest flower of America wounded and killed—and these men were prepared. I shudder to think what could have happened, if it had been necessary in invade an island like Peleliu with an untrained army pitted against a trained army like the Japanese.

It is true that with earlier and more training for these men so many of them may not have fallen at Peleliu; and in memory of those who gave their lives in both World Wars as unprepared but valiant soldiers, who may not have fallen if they had had earlier military training, I urge and respectfully plead with those in authority to enact a law calling for 1 year's military training for the youth of our Nation, so that never again will the youth of this Nation be called upon to enter a battle unprepared, and possibly to prevent them from ever being called upon to enter any battle.

Comparison of Cost of Production, Parity Price, and Average Price Received by Farmers for Certain Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement from the United States Department of Agriculture showing a comparison of cost of production, parity price, and average price received by farmers for certain basic commodities:

	United States average cost of production including rent [1]	United States parity price [2]	Season average price received by farmers [2]
1942 costs:			
Wheat	$0.77	$1.38	$1.10
Corn	.73	1.02	.92
Oats	.51	.62	.49
Cotton	.121	.1950	.1901
1943 costs:			
Wheat	1.04	1.48	1.36
Corn	.92	1.08	1.12
Oats	.66	.67	.72
Cotton	.155	.2077	.1983

[1] Crops and Markets for January 1945, BAE, U. S. Department of Agriculture.
[2] Data supplied by BAE, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The only agricultural commodities for which United States average cost-of-production figures are obtained and published by the United States Department of Agriculture are wheat, corn, oats, and cotton.

A comparison of these figures on cost of production with parity prices and actual prices received shows that the cost-of-production figures in recent years are considerably less than the parity prices. Parity price is therefore a more favorable yardstick than cost of production for use as a standard to safeguard farm prices in OPA price ceilings.

Memorial Address by Bishop Oliver J. Hart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from an address delivered by the Right Reverend Oliver James Hart, bishop of Pennsylvania, and a veteran of both World War I and II. The address was made on the occasion of the annual massing of the colors service at the Washington Cathedral on the Sunday prior to Memorial Day. In that service there were 102 organizations in the line of march representing 203 individual units carrying 608 flags. It was a great service and Bishop Hart gave an inspiring address. Excerpts follow:

The military victory in Europe has sobered us with the realization of the great consequences of our present actions. It has become increasingly clear that we have the choice of building a new world or preparing for a new world war. Victory of the United Nations is not equivalent to world peace. This truth has been expressed in these poignant words, "the military part of this war is the first phase in a long-drawn-out spiritual contest for the survival of man." Military victory can only give us the liberty with which to work for a decent world order. Such liberty has been used to accomplish hellish things. The magnitude and complexity of the world's problems make many people despair. Many feel that our generation will fail to make the right use of this liberty.

The primary task facing the world today is obviously the creation of some form of world community. A soldier has expressed it in these simple words, "Mankind deserves a better deal." Sacrifice it has taken to win the victory in Europe. Greater sacrifice it will take to win the victory in the Pacific. Still greater and more prolonged sacrifice it will take to win the peace. It is impossible to exaggerate the cost of winning the peace. To do that we must win the victory, not only over Germany and Japan, but over selfishness in our own hearts. We will either travel the road of selfish privilege to ruin or the road of unselfishness to world peace.

The proceedings of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco have brought two things vividly to our attention. The first is that peace is a positive thing. Peace is more than preventing aggression. This is fairly obvious, but the fact that we can see it so clearly does not lessen the difficulty of achieving it. There seems to me to be more confusion in regard to the second factor, namely the relationship between nations. A number of observers of the San Francisco proceedings have stated that there is very little historic basis for the assumption that nation-states are capable of, or even desirous of, applying law and justice to each other. This observation is based on the belief that groups always act on a lower moral level than individuals. It is claimed that here or there you may find an unselfish individual but you will never find an unselfish nation. To such people the immortal words of President Wilson are just so much foolishness. President Wilson said at the beginning of World War I, "We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion, we are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and freedom of the nations can make them."

God's call to Israel was not an individual call but a call to a people, "You shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." Jesus reiterated this when he said, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."

It is perfectly true that, under the influence of a mob, men do commit deeds which, as individuals, they would shrink from doing. When a mob goes into action, the thin veneer of civilization is peeled off and men act as beasts. At the same time, under the influence of a fellowship, men are lifted to a higher plane of living in the teeth of their lower desires. By participation in an on-going religious community an individual is lifted above himself. America can lead intelligently without sacrificing her legitimate national interests. Our material pursuits can be ordered to serve world need. A successful textile manufacturer told me recently that he had had to revise his whole idea of Hull trade program after looking into the eyes of his soldier son who just returned from 3 years' fighting in the Pacific. There is in America today a deep emotional recognition of the need of world collaboration. There are those who say, "Do not act now. Wait until after the war is over and we have had time to think calmly and then we can act more wisely." Our judgment may be bad at times under the influence of a great emotion, but I would rather trust that textile manufacturer when he was looking into

the eyes of his soldier son than to wait until 4 or 5 years after the war when he will be calmly talking business with his board of directors. I would rather trust the heart of America at this moment than at any moment in her history. The great steps forward in history have always been made under some deep emotional stress. The people of America today want some act of political colaboration worthy of the sacrifice which has been made and which will be made. The waste of this sacrifice would be the worst of all sacrilege. We dare not wait until inertia and indifference have gained their deadly sway over our people.

Never was there a time in history when so much has depended on so few. We shall ever be grateful to those who have planned and those who have taken part in the United Nations Conference. Throughout the length and breadth of the country—in church, in school, and public forum men and women have strived to prepare our minds and hearts for the United Nations Conference. Intercessions have been offered regularly in churches and synagogues for God's guidance of the Conference. Without in any way diminishing our debt to the leaders at that Conference it must be remembered that world peace cannot be built upon the insight of a few statesmen but must rest upon spiritual understanding and acceptance. Our people as a whole must make clear their willingness, nay more their desire, to sacrifice for a decent world order. The alternative is a new and more ghastly world war. God helping us, we must not miss the opportunity of our generation.

Let us pray:

Almighty God, who art the sovereign of history, before whose majesty the pride of nations, the glory of empires, and the prestige of rulers is but a little thing; give us grace to submit our tasks, ambitions, and aspirations to the discipline of Thy will. Thou hast entrusted our Nation, together with many other peoples, with an historic mission in this grave hour of the world's history. Thou hast called us to resist tyranny and to build a community of nations. Help us that we may not fail. Let Thy dominion and not ours be established, that men may live peaceably with one another because they have each learned to cooperate with Thy will, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Mr. Bowles Under Cross-Examination Discusses Meat Situation as It Applies to Canton, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Canton, Ohio, together with surrounding towns, has sent to me some 200 petitions signed by thousands of persons, protesting the meat shortage. These petitions I presented to Chester Bowles, of the Office of Price Administration, when he appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee. At the same time I examined Mr. Bowles on this subject, and in the colloquy which is reproduced here, Mr. Madigan, Ration Administrator, and Congressman MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, participated:

Mr. THOM. Mr. Bowles, I want to give you an idea of what is happening in the office of the ordinary Ohio Congressman by presenting you with exhibit A. This is a collection of petitions that were circulated through all the meat outlets in Canton. There are about 30 names to a page, and the sponsors say they have got altogether about 55,000.

The petition is headed:

"We, the undersigned, in exercising our right as free American citizens, are demanding that you as a representative of the voters and taxpayers of this community, apprise yourself of the deplorable and extremely serious shortage of meat and food products in this area. The apparent cause is due to the following factors:

"First. Unrestricted black-market operations between producer and consumer;

"Second. Quota restrictions under subsidized slaughtering of livestock.

"We urge that the level of the meat packer be allotted at once a production quota that will be fair and just for the population.

"Please reply to the above listed dealer."

I have a letter from a Canton packer which says:

"In 1944 we bought 3,000,000 pounds of pork materials, hams, and canned meats, but this year we cannot buy an ounce of meat, and no consideration is given to us on our present quota, to make up this 3,000,000 pounds which is denied to our area."

Now what does that mean?

Mr. MADIGAN. A number of slaughterers bought substantial quantities of materials, and a number of nonslaughterers, who make sausage and canned meats, bought a lot of materials, much as wholesalers and retailers buy for resale.

It is true that they are finding considerable difficulty buying those same materials this year, and the primary reason is that last year the Army was buying very lightly of many items, and this year they are buying tremendous quantities of them.

Last year the Army had no "set-aside" on manufacturing of beef. This year the Army is taking 80 percent of the manufacturing of beef from federally inspected plants. Thus the procurement program is taking up a tremendous chunk of the production of your federally inspected slaughterers, and they have very little to sell to anyone primarily for that reason.

Mr. THOM. This Canton company in particular made sausage. This letter reads as if there is some provision of the regulations that prohibits them from buying these supplies. There is nothing of that sort, is there?

Mr. MADIGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOM. You mean the market is just cleaned out?

Mr. MADIGAN. That is true.

Mr. THOM. I have another newspaper clipping to the effect that in public sales in my district, where cattle are disposed of, independent packing companies cannot buy the cattle because there are men there buying over the ceiling prices. Is that not a violation of the law?

Mr. MADIGAN. It is a violation to pay over ceiling prices for cattle for more than a month's time, as determined by your complete accounting analysis, except for the over-riding ceiling, which in the Canton area would probably be around $18.40.

It is impossible for a person to look at a given bull and say the price is over or under the ceiling. The only way you can tell is after the animal is killed and graded.

Mr. THOM. Well, how are you going to correct that?

Mr. BOWLES. You correct it by going after the packer who buys habitually over the ceiling. If he buys a few animals over and averages them down over the 3-day period, it is all right, but he has to check in with the weights and all that he has slaughtered at the end of the month's accounting period. So if he buys over that ceiling, he is in violation and he gets hit very hard.

Mr. THOM. What will they do to him?

Mr. BOWLES. Well, he will lose his subsidy for one thing, and he is also subject to injunction.

Mr. THOM. Do you take his slaughterer's license away from him?

Mr. BOWLES. No; you cannot do that. The Congress last year eliminated these cross-sanctions. You see your licenses are given out under our rationing power. The other is price. You can't under the law apply a rationing sanction for a price violation. But he will be hit hard, for the penalties are very big today for buying in an average monthly accounting period over the ceiling price.

Mr. MADIGAN. The control of trading in livestock is very loose, and we were directed by the Vinson office to hold a trade meeting on this question for the purpose of seeing that this livestock is sold in legitimate channels.

Mr. THOM. These independent packers in Canton also say that because they specialize in the slaughtering of hogs and do not have a great many byproducts like big packers, they have been losing money this year. Has there been anything done in these recent orders that will help them?

Mr. BOWLES. There is an increase of subsidy of 40 cents a hundredweight effective April 1. That allows 40 cents a hundredweight in addition to what they had before, and also any packer who was in a profitable position before the war is guaranteed against loss in 1945 by the so-called bail-out provision.

Mr. THOM. That is loss by reason of cutback in the amount of slaughtering he can do?

Mr. BOWLES. If he suffers a loss for any reason, cut-backs or any other thing, he will be "bailed out."

Mr. THOM. Where is that order?

Mr. BOWLES. It has not been issued in detail yet, but the packers have been ass d that they will be protected.

Mr. THOM. Packers do not know what the details are, and they do not seem to be willing to act upon it. They are suspicious of it.

Mr. MADIGAN. The information available to us would indicate that the action taken on pork, so far, with some price increases and some increase in subsidy, for the great bulk of the industry, will put them in a profitable position.

Now, if there are certain groups, due to the cut-back in their volume, that are still left in a loss position, we feel that this "bail-out" provision should give them assurance that at least from May 1 to the end of the year they will break even with full expenses and full overhead. That is our assurance to them, provided they were in a profitable position prior to the war, not just a war plant.

Mr. THOM. Now you say in a statement Mr. Bowles issued under date of May 3, that "the quotas for slaughtering were based on the number of animals which each nonfederally inspected slaughterer had killed and sold legitimately during 1944. All nonfederally inspected slaughterers, who failed during any quarter of 1944 to turn in ration stamps to cover the meat they sold, were refused quotas. All nonfederally inspected slaughterers who handed in fewer ration stamps than the amount of livestock which they claimed to kill were given quotas based on the number of ration stamps they turned in."

A slaughterer when he bought his cattle did not have to give stamps to anybody, did he?

Mr. MADIGAN. That is right.

Mr. THOM. But when he sold that slaughtered carcass he had to receive stamps?

Mr. MADIGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOM. Well, these men who are complaining about their quotas being small, am I to understand, then, that they were selling the meat without taking the stamps?

Mr. BOWLES. A lot of them appeared to be. There are some 11,000 of them that did not apply for quotas, since they knew their quota would be so extremely low because they handed in inadequate stamps, or no stamps, and we stated clearly they would not get quotas based on any meat they sold to the black market. Of course, some of those people who did not reapply were legitimate people, who may be coming in later. The great majority of them, however, were undoubtedly illegal operators.

Mr. THOM. Now, when it comes to this order for area distribution of cattle, which will compel every packer to ship to each county he supplied meat in 1944, a proportionate share of his meat this year, how are you going to enforce that?

Mr. BOWLES. The sanctions on that are very strong. It comes under the Second War Powers Act, and we have authority there, as you know, to hold administrative hearings. For instance, if anyone violates a rationing allocation order, the hearing commissioner can suspend him from doing business. In addition, we have the usual sanctions such as injunctions and criminal penalties.

Mr. THOM. How are you going to supervise and control the shipments of these slaughterers to the various towns?

Mr. BOWLES. The area distribution regulation requires all of the larger slaughterers in the country to file with us by the 30th of June their distribution pattern during the base period, which was the January, February, and March 1944 period. Then they are required to file a report during the first month of operation under the program, and we will see from that report whether they shipped the meat into the same areas.

Mr. THOM. In the city of Canton I assume that the great proportion of the customers were supplied by local packing plants, whereas the Federal-inspected plants shipped in the smaller amount.

Now, there has always been competition between them. I am fearful that after we ship our cattle, by reason of this quota restriction, to the Federal-inspected plant, it will say: "Well, we won't ship any back to Canton. They have got independent plants. Let the independent plants furnish it."

Mr. BOWLES. A packer would be breaking the regulation if he did that.

Mr. MADIGAN. He does not have that objection. He must ship meat into the same areas in the same proportion as he had in the base periods unless he has authority not to do so and we would grant that authority very reluctantly.

Mr. THOM. A question has been raised to this effect: That only 10 percent of the population of the country are in the Army, and if you even granted that they consumed twice as much meat, why would there be such a shortage in the country?

Mr. BOWLES. The military forces are consuming more meat than that. They are consuming three times. About 30 percent of all your meat this year will go to the Army. In other words, 10 percent of your population will eat 30 percent of your meat. I don't think anybody begrudges them that.

The next point, however, and the the very major one, is purchasing power. Almost half your population has had an income of $1,000 or less, before the present war period, and 40 percent of their whole income went to food. You have doubled the annual family income from a total of $1,300 to $2,600 now. The first thing all those people want is meat. They would have liked to have had it before but could not afford it. Where you perhaps had a hundred families trading in a given store, 10 of them occasionally in the market for a steak, today you have 60 or 70 of those families who want steak three times a week. You have this huge purchasing power with the Army taking out a good deal of the supply, leaving us roughly what we had before the war on a national basis.

Mr. THOM. Is there any prospect that the demands of the military services will be reduced now that the war in Europe is ended?

Mr. BOWLES. I would not think so, except to the extent to which the Army is reduced. You see, as you move men out of the active front area, they stop eating K rations and start looking for good meals. Our soldiers overseas in France are eating more food than they did before the war ended.

Incidentally, while we always talk of the Army, the Army does the purchasing for the Navy, or most of it, so when we say Army, we mean everybody. It is close to 400 pounds per man per year against a civilian before-the-war consumption of about 126 pounds.

Mr. THOM. In conclusion, I have got these petitions from hundreds of storekeepers in my home district, many of whom I know. I have got to write a letter to acknowledge the receipt of each petition. Now, what am I going to say to them about what their future expectations may be?

Mr. BOWLES. Well, Congressman, I sent you a note on what we have been doing, trying to get equal distribution.

Mr. THOM. Well, I read that over, but that stresses the improvement that is going to go to the big cities. That does not help people in the city of Canton.

Mr. BOWLES. Well, it should tend to bring them on a level equal to everybody else, and I would not think the people of Canton, or anywhere else, would want more than their share.

Mr. THOM. I think they are entitled to their share.

Mr. BOWLES. That is right.

Mr. THOM. What I am wondering about is whether they are getting their share.

Mr. BOWLES. I will look into Canton. I do not know the problem out there.

Mr. THOM. But we have got to satisfy the people of Canton that they are not being discriminated against.

Mr. MADIGAN. I think the fair-distribution order we spoke about is the answer to those petitions and complaints, because the packers will have to put in their proportion of meat in each county and we will have the figures to relate that shipment of meat to the population in the area and, if we find it is sharply out of line, we can direct a change in that pattern so that the area will get its share.

Mr. BOWLES. In other words, if, after the area-distribution order is in force, you are still below the proper share for the increased population, or something of that kind, we can make a specific directive to move more meat into that specific area, outside of the normal base-period pattern.

Mr. THOM. When is that order effective?

Mr. BOWLES. The first accounting period for each packer is after the 17th of June, so that for most packers it will take effect late in June or the first of July.

Mr. MONRONEY. Your quotas on your nonfederally inspected plants went on last month?

Mr. BOWLES. That is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. So the situation, Mr. THOM, has—he has a double rap coming now—first his local slaughterers are shut off, and the take-hold date has not come forward on these federally inspected plants to restore the distribution. Is that right?

Mr. BOWLES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MADIGAN. I might say, though, that we have met twice with most of the larger packers on this fair distribution problem and they are moving on it, preparing their records, and I am inclined to think they will be on that pattern long before the first of July.

Mr. MONRONEY. If we did not have a Federal-inspected meat law, your problem would be a hundred times easier, would it not, because you could just have every slaughterhouse set aside for the Army so much, and then they could kill an unlimited amount.

Mr. MADIGAN. That is right, and ship to the areas they have always shipped to.

Mr. THOM. I have had some dealings in that matter of obtaining Federal inspection in these local slaughtering plants, and, so far as I can ascertain, these local people do not have much success in getting inspection. The requirements are too rigid. They are compelled to make too much of an expenditure of money and purchase of materials which are hard to get, and I think the figures will show that the number of federally inspected plants has increased very slowly, and in a very small proportion. Is not that true, Mr. Madigan?

Mr. MADIGAN. I think you made a good point there. There are two types of Federal inspection available at the present time. One is full inspection of your entire plants. That takes a fairly high standard of cleanliness, equipment, and so forth. The other is limited inspection on one species for sale only to the Army or some canner for the Army. That second type of limited inspection can be given for just part of your plant, for your killing part, and most packers that have any reasonably decent facilities can get limited inspection for one species.

Advice to OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, with these remarks, I am inserting the resolutions adopted at the fifty-sixth annual business meeting of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association held at O'Neill, Nebr., June 14, 15, 16, 1945. I first want to call your attention to some remarks I made on price control on June 1, 1943. At that time there was much opposition to the price-control schemes advocated by the Office of Price Administration. A portion of my remarks as of June 1, 1943, is as follows:

The people of the Fourth District of Nebraska are wrought up over this latest scheme of price control, proposed by theoretically minded economists in the Office of Price Administration, known as the roll-back of prices by means of subsidy payments.

Some of the expressions of my constituents at that time are, as follows:

We believe that production will be further curtailed and black markets increased. Government bureaus must listen to common sense if they are to ward off starvation. Proposed subsidy program will mean only further Government control, will increase black markets tremendously, will add materially to already much-confused conditions, will tend to reduce production, and cost of operation will be exorbitant and extravagant.

The stockmen wired in June 1943 that—

Subsidies are wrong in principle and roll-back will be incentive to bootleg meat and decreased production. Let's win the war and quit messing things up.

The Dawson County (Nebr.) Feeders' Association wired in June 1943 as follows:

Government meddling has already taken half the cattle out of our feed lots, and we know that the proposed subsidy program will further discourage cattle and hog feeding in this territory.

On June 1, 1943, I wrote James F. Byrnes, then Director of War Mobilization, and Prentiss M. Brown, the Director of OPA, in part, as follows:

It is the considered judgment of the livestock producers and packers that a roll-back program is very unwise. Such a move will add to the already existing confusion. It means red tape and regimenting the livestock and meat industry, which have heretofore had an unequaled record of patriotic cooperation in our war effort. It will in the end not only create chaos but encourage black markets and decrease the production of meat.

The giving of subsidies is an unwise economic experiment designed to fool the people. It is un-American and unnecessary. Such a move will be an additional form of inflation. The subsidy scheme might in theory be workable, but from a practical administrative standpoint it is entirely devoid of any merits.

You will find that subsidies will act as a creeping, grasping narcotic, which will in the end lull industry to sleep and eventually paralyze and stifle free American enterprise.

I presume the next move of your group, if Congress refuses subsidies—and I am sure they will—will be to pass the roll-back to the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the people of my district were appealing to me to aid them against the schemes hatched up by the different bureaus here in Washington. They knew then that the scheme of the planners would make this land of plenty a land of scarcity. The constant bungling of the OPA and other Government agencies has served to discourage the producers and reduce the amount of food in this country. It has brought some sections of the country to the brink of want. The Governors of the 13 Eastern States are holding meetings this week to try and devise plans which may bring some food to the people in these consuming sections. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, with all the force at my command, that unless this Congress takes some steps to correct the maladministration which has existed since the OPA came into existence, there will be further shortages of foods and perhaps food riots in the United States. There are only 9 meals between man and revolution. People are demanding food and not the charts, formulas, and statistics which come from the economists of the OPA and the War Food Administration.

We have had a lot of nice high-sounding phrases about holding the lines. About the only lines that Chester Bowles, the present Administrator of OPA, has been able to hold are the newspaper lines. He is a good publicity man, but the administration of OPA is rotten to the core. If the Washington bureaucrats who know nothing about the production of food continue to issue red tape and regiment the farmer, they will cause a diminishing food supply.

The OPA was established to prevent uncontrolled wartime inflation. They have failed miserably. The best success that they have had to date is controlling prices on articles that are plentiful. When food becomes scarce, it seeks the black markets. The only way to control inflation is to have ample production. The OPA is actually hindering production. They are fouling the spark plugs of recovery. The rigid price ceilings which they attempt to enforce deny a reasonable profit to industry and thus places the harness of tyranny on business, causing a stagnation with economic atrophy.

John Q. Public has $120,000,000,000 in his pocket and is anxious to buy everything from hairpins to helicopters. The price means nothing unless there is something to buy. If you are hungry and have the money in your pocket, you would pay a dollar for a doughnut to satisfy your hunger.

The OPA has issued many confusing orders directly affecting the production of food. Their red tape and regimentation becomes tangled up in their own feet. They have brought on scarcity, black markets and inflation. Their attempt to put a strait-jacket upon the food industry has placed a strangle-hold upon the production of food. Their price controls must be framed and administered in the light of how it will stimulate production and employment and not with a view of their perpetuation.

It is my considered judgment, Mr. Speaker, that the OPA would like to become permanent. The bureaucrats would like to blueprint and regiment the citizen and make him do a physical, mental and ritualistic goose-step with the tune being played in Washington.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress is duty bound to make the necessary amendments to the Price Control Act which will correct some of the maladministration which presently exists.

I submit herewith the resolutions adopted by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association with the suggestion that the OPA and the War Food Administration not only read but follow the considered judgment and advice of the men in the bread basket section of America:

SUBSIDIES

Subsidies, as used in our present food price control, are inflationary and dangerous. The United States Treasury has already paid more than three-fourths of a billion dollars only to leave money in the hands of people to encourage black-market operations.

We urge Congress to provide a plan that will withdraw these payments in a gradual and orderly manner and at a time when there is consumer-purchasing power that will keep consumption at a high point and at prices that will maintain the stability of the cattle industry.

MEAT BOARD

We endorse the work of the National Livestock and Meat Board. They have rendered a valuable service to our armed forces in teaching our Army and Navy personnel to cook, prepare, and handle meat and have it kept in its proper place in the American diet by demonstrating its nutritional value.

We also extend our thanks to the various agencies on the central markets who have collected fees for the National Livestock and Meat Board.

INCREASED CEILINGS

Recent changes in the beef program have been of little benefit to the feeder as the greater portion of the payments go to the processors. We, therefore, urge a fair increase in the retail price of A and double A beef, so that feed-lot operators will be encouraged in the production of finished beef.

FEDERAL CONTROLS

Government control of meat and meat prices is now confused and impossible of understanding due to duplicating and overlapping agencies. The duplication and lack of this control authority is responsible for a complete lack of public confidence, for black-market operations, and for the shortage of meat.

We commend President Truman for his wisdom in selecting Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON as Secretary of Agriculture, and we urge Congress to make Secretary ANDERSON the over-all authority in matters of food distribution, processing, ceilings, prices, etc.

SUPPORT PRICES

Suggestions have been made that a price-support program would provide a means of cushioning the inevitable postwar adjustment in cattle prices. Price support and production control, of necessity, must go hand in hand. We, therefore, oppose any price-support program as further regimentation of our industry which we believe to be undesirable and impractical, and we urge our members to adhere to sound business practices and forego the lure of a price-support program.

TARIFF

We believe that the postwar world will look to the United States for international economic leadership. As our own economy must be preserved, we urge Nebraska's delegation in Congress to exert every effort toward the maintenance of adequate tariff protection.

SANITARY EMBARGO

Economic conditions in the postwar period may be conducive to renewed attempts to modify our country's sanitary embargo against the importation of meat and meat products from countries where foot and mouth disease is known to exist. The embargo does not discriminate against any country, but operates only to protect American livestock and the American public from the ruinous effects of foot and mouth disease. Our own experience and the very recent experience of England in importing meat from infected countries prove the necessity of continued vigilance and we urge Congress and all responsible Federal officials to maintain the sanitary embargo in its present form.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK TAX COMMITTEE

We urge the continuation and support of the National Livestock Tax Committee in their efforts in clarifying the regulations of the internal revenue office applying to fixed inventory methods in connection with sales of breeding herds, and to other tax matters.

We wish to extend our appreciation to those who have given their time and served on this committee.

FREIGHT RATE CONTROL PASSED

It is extremely important to the livestock industry of this country that the railroads enjoy postwar stability and that under regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission they shall continue to provide the Nation with efficient transportation service.

The carrier-shipper method of considering rates through railroad traffic associations has been in active operation for more than 40 years and the very essence of their operation is in giving publicity to changes in rates, charges, and practices, no matter by whom proposed, and offering opportunity for free and open discussion. The arrangements thus set up for consideration of changes in rates, charges, and practices have proven satisfactory to the livestock shippers who pay the bills and have proven satisfactory to the public body to which Congress has entrusted the day-by-day exercise of its power to regulate transportation.

There is pending in Congress H. R. 2536 introduced by Representative A. L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina. The purpose of this bill is to clarify questions raised as to how and by whom Federal regulation of rates and services of common carriers shall be administered, whether by an experienced agency of Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has a consistent and continuing policy, or the confusing and conflicting determinations of various courts under the antitrust laws: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Nebraska Stock Growers Association at their annual meeting at O'Neill, Nebr., June 14–16, 1945, That the Bulwinkle bill be enacted to further clarify the intent of Congress that regulation of carriers under the Interstate Commerce Act is the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the several State regulatory commissions, to the end that the national transportation policy as set forth in the Transportation Act of 1940 shall be upheld.

The Nebraska Stock Growers Association is opposed to the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, as proposed in the Murray and Gillette bills and as recommended by the President.

The sound and orderly development of the river and its tributaries can be achieved by other and less drastic steps. The Pick and Sloan plans now pending in Congress can be reconciled to form the framework for river development through existing agencies, which we approve.

WESTERN MEAT RATE CASE

The favorable decision in the Western Meat Rate case accomplishes one of the goals of our association. We express our most sincere appreciation to Mr. Harry B. Coffee, president of the Union Stock Yards Co., and his staff for their effective and intelligent support given us during the progress of these hearings. We also express our thanks to the members of Nebraska State Railway Commission for their statesmanlike efforts on behalf of all Nebraska's people.

OPA and the Milk Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Johnstown Tribune and Johnstown Democrat, Johnstown, Pa.:

[From the Johnstown Tribune of June 19, 1945]

OPA AND THE MILK SURPLUS

Just why the Office of Price Administration persists in holding the points requirement for the purchase of butter so high during this period of surplus milk production is beyond the comprehension of dairymen, milk processors, and the consumers of dairy products everywhere. Whole milk is being fed to hogs and milk-processing plants are dumping skim milk into the sewers. All this at a time when butter and cheese production could be greatly increased and made available to consumers. The latter, unfortunately, have not sufficient points with which to purchase butter at the present level—24 points per pound.

Because of frequent rains, pasturage is in unusually excellent condition. Dairy cows consequently are producing above average yields. Processing plants cannot handle the surplus and the producers in the area serving Johnstown have been asked to cut down the supply. The alleged shortage of sugar and OPA restrictions on the manufacture of ice cream add to the difficulties of both the producers and processors.

Why in the name of common sense the OPA does not reduce the points requirement on butter during this period of surplus production is hard to understand. By refusing to do so it is denying consumers a health-building food that would be readily obtainable except for their inability to get the necessary red points. The points requirement could be increased later when it appeared that milk production was again on the decline.

As it is, the benefits of good pasturage and surplus production are denied the public. Only the hogs and other farm animals are the beneficiaries of Nature's generosity.

Is this, too, a part of the New Deal's master plan?

[From the Johnstown Democrat]

OPA SHOULD ACT ON MILK SURPLUS USE

The Government has urged the American people to do everything possible to conserve food. The people have responded cheerfully to the rationing system. Here and there, it is true, there have been some complaints, but, as a whole, Americans have seen the need for rationing and the consequent cutting down of their daily food needs.

The Government, on its part should do everything possible to supply the maximum amount of foodstuffs to civilians after military needs are met. It would seem that instead of encouraging the waste of certain food commodities, OPA officials would encourage the full utilization of all types of food. Apparently, however, this is not being done.

Thousands of gallons of whole milk are being fed to hogs or poured down sewers, according to members of the Somerset Co. Pomona Grange This whole milk could very well be used to produce butter, cheese, and ice cream. It appears, however, that because of some senseless OPA regulation the amount of commodities milk producers can turn out is limited.

Certainly there is no logical reason why whole milk should be fed to hogs or poured down sewers when it could be used to make butter, cheese, or ice cream. Some persons may say that there is plenty of butter and cheese today under the rationing system. That may be true. But if processors were permitted to utilize the thousands of gallons of wasted whole milk to manufacture butter or cheese, the number of ration points required to purchase either of these items could be cut.

As a whole, the OPA has done a good job. But it is senseless regulations such as the one limiting the processing of foods from whole milk which embitters people. OPA officials should act without delay to remedy the situation.

Wartime Performance of the Western Pine Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous production, despite almost unsurmountable problems which have confronted the western lumber industry, are worthy of the consideration of everyone. I am, therefore, pleased to include, under the privilege granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, a discussion of the wartime performance of the western-pine industry:

For the first time during the war period there has, in recent weeks, been frank recognition of the highly essential nature of lumber by top-ranking officials in the war agencies at Washington. What has brought this about?

There has been a definite decline in lumber production, the inevitable result of the failure of these agencis to give the lumber industry the help it has so desperately needed in its one-sided struggle against all the obstacles of a wartime economy, against the unnecessary handicaps created by some war agencies, and against unfavorable weather conditions of the past few months. This decline and tardy realization that lumber is not only essential to the war effort but highly important to reconversion and to solution of postwar employment problems has brought such recognition.

Although the Lumber and Lumber Products Division of the War Production Board has generally foreseen and attempted to assist the industry with its problems, only of late have top WPB officials made adequate arrangements to give the lumber industry more trucks, tractors, and tires. Such help will not, of course, be reflected in increased production for several months. Further WPB cannot directly do anything to assist the industry with its serious manpower situation which has been grossly neglected by the agencies who are supposed to deal with it. Obviously the WPB can do nothing about the weather.

Criticism of the lumber situation by Members of Congress seems certain. This demands more action and there is thus the possibility that WPB will certify the lumber industry as "rare and unusual" to give the War Labor Board a basis for granting further wage increases in disregard of the "hold the line" policy. To anyone familiar with labor conditions in the West, it is obvious that such action would not solve the production problem. On the contrary, it is very probable that, by aggravating absenteeism, which is already a serious deterrent to maximum production, and by adding further to the costs of marginal producers, further loss of production would result. In view of this, it may well be expected that the final defense of the war agencies responsible will be accusations that the lumber industry has failed to do its part. A brief statement of our industry's wartime performance is therefore important at this time.

The lumber industry has done an excellent war job despite tremendous handicaps. No better proof can be offered than the oft-repeated statements by responsible Government officials that the war effort, with very

few minor exceptions, has never been delayed because of a lack of lumber.

The western pine industry can most certainly point with pride to its wartime performance. Prior to the year 1940, the annual production had reached 5,000,000,000 feet in only 3 years—1925, 1926, and 1929. Yet for the 5 years 1940 to 1944, inclusive, the average annual production has been 5,876,000,000 feet. This compares with an average annual production of 4,489,000,000 during the 1920 to 1929 period and 3,515,000,000 for the years 1930 to 1939.

The actual yearly production record for the past 5 years is as follows: 1940, 5,211,000,000; 1941, 6,151,000,000; 1942, 6,144,000,000; 1943, $5,967,000,000; 1944, 5,915,000,000.

During the first quarter of 1945, production in the western-pine region was off only 2.4 percent from that of the same 1944 period which was the largest first quarter production in the industry's history. Latest estimates indicate the production for the first 5 months will be about 4½ percent under the same period a year ago. Unseasonable rainfall during the past 2 months, which has broken all records in some districts, has been a major factor in this recent decline.

The major obstacles to production, the cumulative effects of which have resulted in a gradual decline since the peak in 1941, should be discussed. There is ample productive capacity, sufficient timber, and qualified management. However, the production of lumber also requires adequate labor, equipment, supplies, and in time of war, intelligent effective Government cooperation.

Manpower problems are a contributing factor. The loss of experienced, able-bodied workers has been large. Between 20 and 30 percent of the industry's normal labor force has gone to the armed forces. Some have left to seek employment in the new war industries. The natural labor drift in times of full employment has had its effect. Absenteeism contributes definitely to the decline in production. Work stoppages resulting from continual "quickie" strikes and from union jurisdictional disputes mean reduced production. Loss of efficiency due to the necessary employment of less experienced, handicapped, and older workers is a definite factor. The fight against weather conditions in the woods is a young man's game.

The average straight time hourly wage rate has been increased more than 50 percent since January 1941, the base period for the Little Steel formula. Actual weekly earnings show even greater increases. Wages in the western lumber industry compare favorably with any of the so-called war industries and our manpower shortage is simply a part of the general labor shortage now affecting all industries in this region.

The War Manpower Commission has been almost wholly ineffective in assisting our industry and Selective Service, until the past few months, has given it little recognition. The lumber industry is today suffering from the cumulative effects of the lack throughout the war of any positive Government labor plan or policy and from absenteeism and employee indifference which cannot be eliminated as long as the present abnormally high wages prevail and a job is available at any time.

The tremendous war requirements and Government controls of production and distribution of critical materials and products has necessarily operated to greatly restrict the availability of equipment and maintenance supplies used by our industry, for example, trucks, tractors, and heavy-duty tires, now indispensable in modern logging, have been in short supply. Maintenance delays and failure to obtain needed equipment promptly have been factors contributing to reduced production.

The numerous war agencies with their far-flung organizations have with some exceptions proved largely ineffective. Red tape and bureaucratic methods have only too often worked in reverse. The average sawmill operator, who in spite of present-day high tax levels in accelerating the depletion of his stumpage resource to meet the abnormal war requirements for lumber, is faced month in and month out with every conceivable obstacle and irritation in his effort to maintain a high level of production. For this man it is difficult to retain his enthusiasm when he is constantly harassed by technicalities and threats from OPA, Wage and Hour Division, Wage Stabilization, and other war agencies, by jurisdictional labor disputes, and Government actions which actually discourage production.

That the western pine industry has done a good job is amply attested by the repeated commendations of high Government officials. By holding production so close to record levels, in spite of having many less men, older equipment, and fewer tires, it is right now turning in fully as good a performance as at any time during the war. The fact that mounting needs for reconversion and reemployment may cause some criticism of officials who did not make available the men and equipment needed for increased production should not justify criticism of the industry at this late date for its performance. Those charged with responsibility for control of the industry knew what inevitably would happen to production if they took the industry's men and failed to furnish at least a minimum of repairs and replacements for its equipment. Both the decision and the responsibility were theirs. The western pine industry has discharged its full obligation and will continue to do so.

Fair Employment Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a proclamation by Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago, designating next Monday, June 25, 1945, as Fair Employment Day in Chicago. The proclamation follows:

Whereas on June 25, 1941, our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued the now historic Executive Order No. 8802, declaring it to be the policy of the United States that "there shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries or Government because of race, creed, color, or national origin"; and

Whereas the highly critical demands of our country's war economy, combined with the accomplishments of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice and various other organizations, have resulted in the employment of thousands of workers in jobs which previously had been closed to them; and

Whereas, this additional employment has greatly expedited and increased the production of a wide variety of materials urgently needed for the success of our country's war efforts; and

Whereas because the war industries of today are already becoming peace industries of tomorrow, it is our common task to lay the foundation for the permanent integration of minority groups to assure that the gains now being achieved will not be limited "for the duration;" and

Whereas though we have achieved victory over Nazi arms, it is equally important to achieve victory over Nazi doctrines of racial supremacy:

Now, therefore, I, Edward J. Kelly, mayor of the city of Chicago, do hereby designate Monday, June 25, 2945 as Fair Employment Day in Chicago in order that management, labor and all other segments of our population, shall be stimulated to establish in our factories and places of business the democratic principle of equality of opportunity for which our fighting men of all races and creeds are at this time bravely sacrificing their lives.

Dated this 13th day of June A. D. 1945.

EDWARD J. KELLY,
Mayor.

Record Should Silence Intolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address of Gov. Ingram M. Stainback, of Hawaii:

We have met today to pay homage to the valor of those who died that this country might live, and to draw new inspiration from their heroic deeds.

It is particularly fitting that we in Hawaii honor our patriotic dead. Here the first foul shock of treacherous attack was felt and here American blood was first shed in this conflict.

Here civilians and servicemen alike gallantly rallied to our common defense, and this roll of honored dead is proof positive of the service of Hawaii's sons throughout the world from Europe to the south seas.

We stand here today almost in sight of Pearl Harbor to honor our citizens who have made the supreme sacrifice in behalf of a democratic government for freemen; a government founded on a belief in the dignity of the common man; a government founded on the principle that even the minority has certain inalienable rights as freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of the individual to develop his own talents; only through such freedom can the individual develop his powers—his own soul.

No part of our Nation is composed of so many different racial strains. In no part of our country has such a large percentage of the population been of non-European parentage.

In no part of the Nation has faith in the unity of spirit, unity in a common idealism and devotion and loyalty to our country of local citizens been so closely scrutinized and doubted by not only those strangers to Hawaii and Hawaii's people, but by no small number of sincere and honest citizens dwelling in our midst.

Over a test of time Hawaii has proved to the Nation and to the world that people of every race and every creed can dwell in harmony in peaceful pursuits.

Now, under the strain and stress of war, the question has arisen whether those of alien parents, of alien cultures, of many nations, many races, white, black, brown, yellow, red, can really and truly be knit by a common idealism into a nation, whether

they have entered into and really become a part of the warp and woof of the pattern of our national life or whether they are merely a heterogeneous mass of clashing colors.

You, William Anderson, Lawrence Murphy, William Kamaka, Shiro Togo, William Goo, George Bergstrom, Ernest Damkroger, Douglas McNair, Kyotoshi Watanabe, Alvin Wong, Ralph Yang, Howard Vierra, and all others listed on this monument have answered that question.

Your deaths should silence for all time those preaching racial intolerance—should forever still the tongues of discord that would divide our people.

Your heroic sacrifice is not lost but will mold and inspire the characters of generations yet unborn.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, for 3 days now we have been debating the OPA bill. For 3 days we have been listening to the woes of the people as expressed by their duly elected Representatives to the Congress. During the past few days there has been some apprehension on the part of the exponents of the extension bill. They have actually condescended to give a reasonably prompt reply to mail—they take about a week now instead of a month or more to answer a letter. That's some improvement but it does not solve the problem. It does not compensate for the autocratic attitude of some of these OPA boys who seem to think that the people of the United States are pawns to be pushed around, that businessmen are something to set up to be broken at the will or whim of some guy who cannot make a living for himself in the business world yet wants to tell everybody how they should run their businesses. These little dictators seem to forget that they are the servants of the people and paid by the people, in fact in their perverted little minds they have the whole thing reversed and seem to think that instead of being the peoples' hired hand they are the peoples' dictator. Funny how a little authority goes to some peoples' heads—and the smaller the head the quicker it gets filled up—especially with authority. It is time to call a halt to this foolishness.

I would like to know what sort of theory provokes the OPA officials to believe that by putting people out of business and closing down their operations they can help the already claimed to be acute shortage of the particular commodity that particular business happens to handle. How can you help the lumber shortage by forcing the saw mills and lumber yards out of business? How can you help the paper and pulp shortage by forcing the paper mills to shut down because of regulations and restrictions that make it impossible to secure pulp wood? How can they help the meat shortage by restricting the slaughtering quotas of the local slaughterer? Or by refusing to issue him a permit on some fool technicality thought up by the bureaucrats? They cannot. You do not have to be even half smart to know that, but the bureaucrats do not know it.

The truth of the business is, sir, that in this meat situation it is a plain case of the big ones eating the little ones. The rural sections of this country have taken care of their fresh-meat requirements ever since the days this country was first settled by the white man. They are both willing and able to do so now, but the bureaucrats will not let them. Why? The answer is simple. If the Government let the small slaughterer take care of the local requirements he might get so well established that he would offer some real competition to the big packers when things return to normal again. Did you know that the man at the head of the meat program for OPA is one Mr. Madigan, a vice president of Armour & Co., one of the largest packers in the world? Do you think he wants to see the local packing plant or freezer-locker plant remain in business and thrive? Of course not. It might hurt his postwar markets, so he just issues orders to prevent it. Oh, I know that these orders issued under the guise of trying to distribute the meat more fairly throughout the country and the demagog will say that the folks in the country are not entitled to meat when their less fortunate brothers in the cities and thickly populated areas have their quotas cut down. Sounds good, does not it? Has a humanitarian touch, does it not? Sure it does—that is what these schemers want it to sound like. They are trying to sell the people of the United States a bill of goods.

But, Mr. Speaker, listen to this. Does not any thinking person know that for every pound of nonfederally inspected meat that is consumed in the rural areas there is another pound of federally inspected meat that can be shipped into the cities? Under the law the Army and Navy cannot use anything but federally inspected meat, neither can anything but federally inspected meat be shipped in interstate commerce. Federal inspectors are available in very few of the smaller packing plants so you see the large packing companies have a virtual monopoly on the Government and interstate business. But they are not satisfied with that they want to also keep a hold on their rural markets for the postwar era. It matters little to them that the rural communities will be forced to do without meat until after the war. They want to preserve their markets. They do not care about the people or the farmer who raises the cattle or the slaughterer who butchers them. They are looking after themselves and I say it is time to call a halt.

Of course, we need price control. OPA is the instrument set up by the Congress to administer price control. So, Mr. Speaker, I say it is up to this Congress to so amend this price-control bill that the OPA will be the servant and not the master of the people. It must be done.

Wage Differentials on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, as those of us who have kept in close touch with the situation know, there is a serious manpower shortage in the ship-repair yards on the Pacific coast. One of the principal contributing causes is the dissatisfaction which has been caused by a difference in wages paid for identical work in southern California from those paid in northern California, Oregon, and Washington. The wage rate in southern California is lower.

In order to maintain stability throughout the entire shipbuilding industry, the country was divided into four zones, namely, the Atlantic, the Great Lakes, the Gulf, and the Pacific. It is my information that the wages paid in each of the three eastern zones are uniform throughout each zone. Only in the Pacific coast zone, where the manpower situation is the most critical, has this kind of discrimination been shown by the Navy Department.

In the San Francisco Bay area alone the ship-repair yards estimate they need 14,000 skilled workers during the present month of June. Great effort is being put forth by all manner of advertising to recruit workers for these yards in the eastern sections of the United States. If these efforts are to be successfully met to carry on the war with Japan to an early conclusion, such wage discriminations must be eliminated.

This matter is now pending before the War Labor Board here in Washington. On Wednesday, June 20, I personally appeared before the War Labor Board with other Members of Congress from the Pacific coast to urge that it take action to eliminate this unjust discrimination. At the hearing I made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman and members of the War Labor Board, it is conceded that the manpower shortages in the Pacific coast ship-repair yards are so critical that they will seriously affect the prosecution of the war against the Japs unless the workers stay on the job and other thousands are recruited immediately.

In the San Francisco Bay area ship-repair yards alone, based on June repair estimates, over 14,000 new skilled workers are needed at once at the Mare Island and Hunters Point navy yards and in privately owned yards. The greatest need is for skilled workers—machinists, electricians, sheet-metal workers, and boilermakers. The Navy Department is quoted as stating that 48 light naval units and 2 heavy units have been damaged on the approaches to Okinawa, largely through Japanese aerial action. To maintain effectiveness in naval striking power, these units must be repaired and sent back into action at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Chairman, despite intensive widespread recruiting drives it is an alarming fact that the Navy has been hiring fewer workers than have been leaving, and the turn-over is in-

creasing. Several factors have contributed to this unprecedented situation. A belief by many workers that the war is nearly over for them is causing many to return to their eastern homes to secure peacetime jobs now that reconversion is taking place and new ship construction is drawing to a close. As further evidence of the completion of our new shipbuilding is the fact that the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I have been a member for 20 years, is reporting a bill authorizing the sale of 28,000,000 tons of surplus ships costing between seventeen and eighteen billion dollars. While it is true that wartime costs of new ship construction were greater than peacetime costs, the wage policy followed by the Maritime Commission secured the construction of these ships when they were needed. The Navy Department has failed to follow a similar wage policy and we are, therefore, facing this critical situation in the repair of damaged naval and merchant vessels at a time when their return to active duty is imperative.

The principal all-disturbing factor, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, is the discriminating differentials paid by the Government on ship-repair work on the Pacific coast. This entire matter has recently been referred to in a statement by the Navy Department, on June 4, 1945, known as a "History of payment of the repair differential on the west coast." This history goes back to 1934 and refers to a so-called "dirty hour" (11.6 percent differential) in southern California. It recites the history of the intervening period by citing various conferences, including the San Francisco conference which set up four zones, namely, the Atlantic, the Great Lakes, the Gulf, and the Pacific coast States.

Mr. Chairman, it is my information that there are no differentials within any of the eastern zones on ship-repair work. The rates in each zone are uniform. The west coast is the only exception to this rule. A higher rate is paid in the San Francisco Bay area, the Columbia River area and the Puget Sound area, than in southern California. This shortsighted policy has created more unrest and dissatisfaction, with resultant loss of manpower, than all other factors. Let me illustrate. Jim Brown, electrician first class, employed in the Bethlehem Steel ship-repair yard in Los Angeles, is receiving less pay than Tom Smith, electrician first class, employed in the Bethlehem Steel ship-repair yard at San Francisco. Both of these shipyards are owned by the same corporation. Tom and Jim are both skilled mechanics doing the same type of work. They belong to the same labor organization and are maintaining for equality. Both of these are dissatisfied.

Recital of agreements entered into as far back as 1934 is not a proper solution of the problem. Stripped of all other verbiage, it is not a history of the differential in payments dating back as far as 1934 that the Navy Department should be concerned with, but rather the question is will this policy retard or speed the repair of ships so imperatively needed to quickly bring Japan to her knees in the war in the Pacific? Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, to me the answer is obvious.

I wish to state in conclusion that I yield to no man in my respect for the United States Navy and the brave men who have made it great. My entire public record indicates my interest in and support of its welfare. The Members representing the West Coast States in both the Senate and the House of Representatives are, for obvious reasons, anxious that every obstacle that will retard the war and victory be removed at once. We are first and foremost interested in saving the lives of the flower of this country's manhood who are making the supreme sacrifice. We are interested in conserving the natural resources of our Nation, particularly oil and timber. Every barrel of oil taken from the bowels of the earth is gone forever. The Petroleum Administrator has stated that at the rate oil is being taken from the California fields the visible supply will be exhausted in 2 years. The same is true of Pacific coast timber. At this very time the heavy drain on it is being emphasized by Government construction of thousands of temporary wooden dwellings in California. In San Francisco Bay area alone over 5,000 units are being constructed to house harbor workers. This is occasioned by the fact that San Francisco is today the world's greatest port of embarkation. It will take generations to replace the timber thus used. My presence here today is prompted by reason of these facts.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, I thank you and sincerely hope you will remove the west-coast wage differential and in doing so it is my sincere belief you will remove an injustice that never should have been permitted to exist and which has tended to retard repairs on our battleships and merchant vessels so necessary in our war effort. I thank you for the opportunity of expressing my views.

OPA Regulations Affecting the Creamery Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it seems that one of the industries of the Northwest that finds itself in conflict particularly with rules and edicts issued by the Office of Price Administration is the creamery business. There are certain institutions that manufacture butter in the Northwest that have had long creditable records of many years. In this period of time they have developed markets in the largest cities of the Nation and have found their products to be constantly in demand over a period of 25 years and thus have developed methods in their business that have long been accepted as thoroughly honorable and in keeping with the best business practices of the country.

Some of these creameries have been compelled to change their policy to bring it into compliance with the requests of OPA after their practices have been in existence for a span of many years. This is a most difficult situation so far as the creameries are concerned, and I am inclined to feel a thoroughly unfair demand is being made upon them.

The fact that they have not immediately made these adjustments they have suffered severe penalties, and also have been asked to pay enormous amounts of money as representing—in the views of OPA at least—an overcharge, which in the final analysis is not a violation.

Before the OPA regulations were put into effect it was the practice of North Dakota creameries to ship butter subject to grading at destination and it was always sold and accepted as first-class butter. One of the reasons that North Dakota butter has been given a B grade is for the most part it is sour cream butter, whereby some of the Minnesota creameries produce what is known as sweet butter. The facts are that sour cream butter has better keeping qualities than sweet butter and commands just as high a price in the consumers' market.

Under unanimous consent, I include a statement made by Mr. William J. Murphy, dairy commissioner of North Dakota, an accomplished technical student of the butter industry:

I would like to clarify some of the issues involved in the matter under controversy. I wish to make it clear that Federal grading of butter is only incidental insofar as the persecutions against our North Dakota creameries are concerned.

I wish to state that the procedures followed by the Fargo office of the OPA are in direct contradiction to the intent of the grading law. When they state that the individual lot of butter must stand or fall on its own quality, they undoubtedly seem to be of the opinion that all butter with which our creameries are charged with up-grading has been federally graded which is wholly untrue.

In order to clarify the issue, I wish to inform you that the larger percentage of all butter marketed in the United States has never been federally graded. The methods employed by the district office of the OPA and their actions against our creameries have been generally as follows: The investigator for the OPA, together with the Federal grader, would visit our creameries and make a spot check on some butter on hand or they would spot-check a shipment of butter and this was done in many instances during the months of August and September of 1944 when the quality of butter manufactured by our plants is the lowest due to climatic conditions and to the fact that our farmers, being exceptionally busy in the harvest fields, do not have the time to take as good care of cream as they do other parts of the year. Charges were then filed against these creameries for up-grading butter, not on the butter actually graded, but on all butter sold for the previous year which butter, insofar as I know, was never federally graded.

No creamery would have any objections to being charged with up-grading butter if the charge against such up-grading consisted of a Federal grader's certificate, but they do object to being charged with up-grading butter which was never federally graded, and the OPA district office is assuming that they are guilty as charged and, if they do not have Federal graders' certificates on all the butter sold during the year covered by the charge, the OPA considers them guilty.

To me, this type of procedure is directly contrary to the Constitution of the United States which, I believe, provides that proof must be submitted as to the guilt of anyone charged with law violation whereas this type of prosecution considers the accused party guilty unless than can present documentary proof that they are innocent, and, as stated previously, the major percentage of the butter marketed has not been federally graded, and therefore, these creamery operators do not have the Federal grader's certificate to prove their innocence.

These prosecutions have, without a doubt, lowered the price of butterfat being paid to our farmers because of the fact that our creameries, in order to be sure that they will not be prosecuted, must, of necessity, place a score of B grade or lower on their invoice and, as the price paid to the farmers for butterfat is based directly on the price which the creameries receive for the butter, this type of unjust prosecution by the OPA automatically lowers the price which the creameries can pay to the farmer for his butterfat.

On the one hand we have the War Food Administration through the Commodity Credit Corporation paying a subsidy to the farmers to increase production and on the other hand we have the OPA through their prosecution procedures lowering the price which can be paid to the farmer for butterfat. Such actions as these add to the confusion and uncertainty and has a tendency to lower production in spite of the fact that we are so badly in need of butter at the present time.

The investigator in charge of this work has made the statement repeatedly to a number of our creamery operators that nothing better than a B grade butter could be produced in North Dakota. This is wholly untrue as North Dakota produces a good percentage of the highest quality butter manufactured.

During my 8 years as dairy commissioner, I have seen a wonderful improvement in the quality of butter manufactured in North Dakota and this type of prosecution by the OPA has very definitely wrecked our quality program in the State because of the fact that if our creamery operators, in order to protect themselves from prosecution, have to grade their butter B there is no incentive for the grading of cream in the plant or of continued work with the producers on a quality product.

I wish to make it clear that the grading of butter is not an exact science as grading is done by individuals on the basis of sight, smell, and taste with no scientific methods used to determine the quality of butter. We have had several instances where two Federal graders of many years experience have varied as much as two scores when grading the same butter.

Some of our plant operators, in order to check on the grades that were received, have taken half of the butter from a churning over to Minnesota and shipped it in the name of a Minnesota creamery and shipped the other half in their own name from North Dakota and have received as much as two points difference on the score of this butter coming out of the same churning.

In normal times, Federal grading does not create a hardship because of the fact that if a creamery isn't satisfied with the grades placed on the butter, they could ship it to another market or another buyer, but under this program of the OPA, no matter how honest or conscientious the creamery operator may be in placing the score on the butter at time of shipment, he may, because of the human equation involved in grading, have that butter graded with a lower score in transit or at the point of sale and because of this difference they would face prosecution for up-grading their butter.

Our creamery operators are compelled to place a grade on all butter shipped or sold from their plants which is something that has never been required or has never been done in the marketing of butter and this grade so placed on butter by the creamery operator, as stated before, may be completely discounted by a Federal grader's findings.

It is my sincere hope that because of information coming out of Washington that these agencies and bureaus will be coordinated in some way so that the producers, processors, and businessmen will have some definite knowledge as to what we are supposed to do and what is required of them in meeting the demands of our Nation for food. Under the present conditions, we have so many different agencies that seem to have authority over the same products that it is practically impossible for anyone in business today to know when they are in violation of some order issued by some Federal agency.

Leaning Over Backward in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, continuing the presentation of evidence as to how extensively this Government is, in the reputed words of Mr. Grew, "leaning over backward" to placate Russia, let us consider the question of Hungary.

Very much as in the case of Poland and other nations with long records of independence and freedom, the links between the United States and Hungary have been strong. Many Hungarians during the past century came to this country and have enriched America with their loyalty, their labor, and their brains.

It is true that in the last war Hungary, as a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, was officially classed as an enemy of the United States. This official enmity, however, never reached the general public of either nation. Throughout the war statues of Louis Kossuth, the great leader for Hungarian freedom who addressed a joint session of the United States Congress on December 30, 1851, stood in many American cities undefamed and undefaced. In Budapest, the great statue of Gen. George Washington stood until the Nazis entered the Hungarian capital.

During the last 5 years, Hungary has been commonly accepted as an accessory of the Axis. Officially it was, yet here again the Hungarian instinct for freedom and independence found ways to evade the laws laid down in Berlin. It is worth noting that in this very Christian capital, whose monarchs used to hold the title of Apostolic Majesty, Jews were safe, from Germany's inhuman laws, right up to the seizure of the whole country by German armies. There were 500,000 native Hungarian Jews in a total population of 9,000,000. In spite of this large percentage of Jews, the Hungarians kept the doors of their country open for Jews from all the other overrun nations of Europe.

When Hungary declared war upon the United States in December 1941, the Hungarian Government very plainly indicated that the act was done under duress—which in our laws, as well as Hungary's, rendered it null and void. Throughout the 11 years of atheistic Nazi domination of Europe, the Hungarians resisted every Nazi attempt to destroy their religious faith, or their political guaranties. We know that this finally drove the German Government to take violent possession of all Hungarian territory in March 1944, and to install a series of puppet regimes, ending with the arrest and deportation of Admiral Horthy, who survived his internment and is now a prisoner of our own forces.

Hungary is now occupied entirely by military units of the Red Army and by political units of the Communist NKVD. Orders issued are, however, officially stated to be in the name of the Soviet Union, the United States, and the United Kingdom. That fact makes us responsible to our own conscience and to history for what is happening politically in Hungary today.

We have already seen in Austria the pattern which Soviet occupation of a European country follows. It begins with the forcible disintegration of any existing political structure and the filling of the political void thus created with a carefully prepared regime, termed by Moscow "a free government." During the period of preparations these "free governments" were installed at Moscow as "free committees" and were furnished with office space, printing facilities, and transportation, as well as, in some cases, arms, ammunition, and drill fields for the training of military units. Final tactical decisions were, and are, made by the Kremlin, and the general strategy follows the plan long established by the now "dissolved" Communist International Secretariat—the Comintern.

Preparations for communizing Hungary took active form about January 1944, just after the Tehran Conference. This was marked by an announcement by Moscow that inside Hungary a United National Independence Front had been formed which combined three of the old Hungarian political parties—the Communist, the Social Democratic, and the Peasant Party. This was not precisely true, as the peasants of Hungary are numerically the greatest sufferers from the present Government of Hungary. The rich Hungarian plains have for centuries produced Europe's best horses and cattle. Hungary combines some of the agricultural features of Kentucky bluegrass and Texas range country. Imagine trying to graze a herd of cattle on a hundred-acre strip.

That is the kind of "new deal" Hungary is getting today. That is what they call "land reform" as superplanned in Moscow. The obvious purpose is to force the creation of communal agricultural factories on the Russian model.

The American-Hungarian daily paper in New York on May 26 publicly accused the Office of War Information of sponsoring the spread of false information about Hungary.

One specific instance was in regard to Dr. Albert Szent Györgyi, a professor at Szged University and a Nobel prize winner. The OWI on one occasion stated that this distinguished educator had been made president of the Cultural Council of Red Hungary; and on another date the OWI said he had been appointed by Russian military authorities as mayor of Szged, the second largest town in Hungary.

As a matter of fact, neither of these was true, as Dr Szent Györgyi had to flee for his life from the purges now being conducted in Hungary against all educated persons who are suspected of being unwilling to assist in Sovietizing their country.

Complete and detailed information concerning Hungary today is difficult to obtain, since the Soviet Government does not permit any American or British diplomats or newspaper correspondents to travel in Soviet-occupied territory. However, from news items sent out by the Soviet Government-controlled press, it is possible to make fairly accurate estimates of the present situation, which are confirmed by letters smuggled out from Hungary and reports from such groups as the Swiss Red Cross.

As in Austria, the provisional Hungarian Government is more of a governmental front than an actual administration. The Hungarian people have had practically no part in selecting any of its members. Indeed, the official publication of the Hungarian national independence front openly stated in February 1945:

> Between December 13 and 20, 1944, the local organization of the H. N. I. F., the artisans, the trade unions, the peasant committees, the autonomous representatives of the municipalities, and other democratic organizations, elected by purely democratic methods the 230 members of the provisional national assembly. Of course, the elections were not carried out directly by the electorate. General and direct suffrage could only have resulted in opening the gates to Fascist reaction.

This so-called election was engineered by the man in whose hands most of the real power in Hungary rests today. His name is Matthias Rakosi. Mr. Rakosi has a long record of satisfactory cooperation with his Communist superiors in Moscow. He was a commissar in Bela Kun's Communist Hungarian regime in 1919. After Bela Kun was driven out of Hungary by an infuriated majority of the Hungarian people, Rakosi accompanied his chief to Moscow, where he became a paid agent of the Comintern, making repeated trips back to Hungary to organize Communist cells. On each trip he was arrested by the Hungarian police and was exchanged on request of the Soviet Government for hostages held in Moscow. The last exchange was in return for Hungarian regimental flags which Russian troops had captured during the Hungarian fight for independence in 1849, and which seemed more valuable to Hungarian pride 20 years ago than was the keeping of Mr. Rakosi in prison. As it has proved, this was a very unwise choice, since Rakosi made diligent use of his years in Moscow to become a very influential member of the Comintern.

When the Red Army drove German forces out of Hungary, Rakosi was promptly installed in Budapest as head of the Hungarian Communist Party and was given full charge of all civil affairs in the capital and the necessary purges of uncooperative elements that follow Soviet occupation. While this situation existed the Moscow newspaper Izvestia attacked the provisional government for not moving into Budapest and stated that it showed a serious neglect of duty. This was a disingenuous statement on the part of the Soviet official press, as, at that very time, Premier Miklos was steadily petitioning the Red Army and Moscow for permission to enter the ruined capital.

This permission was withheld by Russia for many weeks, during which Rakosi had undisputed authority over all Hungarian officials and services not actually in the vicinity of Debreczen, where General Miklos was being kept.

Even today, although Rakosi holds no position in the Miklos government, yet he has about the same power in Hungary as Ernst Fischer has in Austria. In other words, both these gentlemen are old-line Communists, former members of the now-dissolved Comintern, and loyal agents of the Kremlin. The government being carried on from Budapest bears the name of the United States as one of the three responsible powers in control, and since we have made no contrary representations to our Soviet associate, it must be presumed that we are entirely content with these conditions.

The similarity between the Cabinet personnel in the Hungarian and Austrian Governments can be seen without much more than a glance. In each, the key positions are held by Communists of long standing and of long residence in Moscow, where they have close connections with the Comintern.

As in Austria, the head of the Hungarian Government is an honorable but aged relic of former times. Gen. Bela Miklos, now Prime Minister of Hungary, was the former commander of the First Corps of the Hungarian Army, and his devotion to his country is unquestionable. However, he is practically powerless.

Real power is centered in the Ministries of Public Welfare, Interior and Police, Agriculture, and Commerce, all of which are held by members of the Communist Party.

The minister of justice is a Communist fellow-traveler, who interprets the law to best serve the interests of the party. Thus, under legal form, almost any illegal act can be accomplished.

The only man of independent brains in the Hungarian cabinet is Dr. Istvan Vasary, Minister of Finance. His position is rendered anomalous, however, by the fact that the Soviet occupation authorities confiscated all funds found in Hungary—either public or private—and a portion of these funds are now being loaned to the Hungarian Government by its Moscow protector. The irony of reissuing stolen funds as loans which bear interest and are a direct charge on a subservient state has not been exceeded, or perhaps equalled, by any of the governments which Communists like to call rapacious capitalists. Considerable goodwill propaganda is being made by Moscow out of these generous loans to help restore Hungary; an aid no capitalist state has offered. Naturally, the propaganda does not mention that the funds so loaned are already Hungarian property; nor is anything said about the fact that Russia forbids all other nations to have any connection, financial or otherwise, with its puppets in Budapest.

From facts already obtained this is known to be only a small part of the whole picture. It is a picture which we here in the United States may not consider a very happy one, but we should remember that our name—the United States of America—is signed to it as one of the designers, and that no Hungarian, in Hungary, is permitted to know otherwise than that we are responsible.

Yes; we are certainly leaning over backward to avoid giving offense to our Russian allies in Hungary.

The OPA and the Restaurant Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1945

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following well-written letter sent to me by a constitutent:

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *June 14, 1945.*
Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TALLE: Mr. Harold J. Ross is a client of mine who, together with his family, operates a restaurant in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, known as The Hut.

Mr. Ross requested me to write you relative to the proposed cut in ration points applicable to restaurants and eating establishments from and after July 1, 1945. At the present time the restaurants are having a very serious problem in securing sufficient points to enable them to serve a healthful meal and the proposed cut in ration points will make it practically impossible for the restaurants to serve such a meal and in fact to operate.

Mr. Ross has two sons in the armed services of the United States and he was a veteran of World War I, having served in France in an artillery regiment. Heretofore, he has patiently submitted to all regulations as well as to all censorship and secrecy on the assumption that it was necessary and the patriotic thing to do, and that whatever we did to help shorten the war should be done willingly and gladly. In other words, Mr. Ross is typical of the millions of patriotic mid-westerners whose sons have always willingly volunteered to serve their country in the time of crisis and whose people have been unanimous in their support of every patriotic endeavor in this and the other wars in which our country has been involved.

In requesting me to write this letter, therefore, Mr. Ross is not actuated by any selfish or unpatriotic motive, nor is it his desire to do anything which will delay the end of the Japanese phase of the war for a single day. However, at this time it is impossible for him to understand the reason for the contemplated cut in ration points which is proposed to be enforced against eating houses and restaurants as of July 1.

Mr. Ross informed me that there is at the present time a greater number of cattle in the country than there has ever been before. He states that during the week of June 4, 1945, the cattle market was 50 cents to $1 per 100 pounds lower and that the cattle run at Chicago was 47,400 cattle, which was a 15 percent larger run than there was 1 year ago, and 18 percent larger run than there was 2 years ago. Mr. Ross stated further that during the same period the hog run was 53,200, which was the largest 4-day run this year since the month of February 1945. Every Iowan is familiar with the fact that the month of February is a big hog month and that normally the Iowa farmers do not market as large a percentage of hogs in June as they do in February. Therefore,

it would appear that the present meat slaughter is greatly in excess of our previous slaughter and probably in excess of any reasonable requirements, which we may have at this time. Further, a drive through the Iowa countryside would convince the greatest skeptic that there is an ample supply of livestock on the farms.

Mr. Ross also assumes that in all probability the Army established an enormous stock pile of food in Europe. Surprisingly enough, the administration has not seen fit to inform the American people of the size of the stock pile in Europe, either of food or anything else, but we presume that the minimum stock pile of food in Europe would be ample to supply an army of the size that was actually fighting on the Continent on VE-day for a period of at least 6 months. At the present time there is contemplated reduction in the armed forces of the United States and undoubtedly the requirements for meat will be substantially reduced. This is also a factor which should be taken into consideration in establishing the need for new ration regulations.

Furthermore, we have been advised that as of July 1, 1945, the lend-lease requirements will be canceled, for a period for at least 3 months. We cannot understand why the lend-lease requirements cannot be canceled for a greater period than 3 months, if we use the surplus food now in Europe, over and above the requirements of those members of the armed services who will be stationed in Europe, for the purpose of feeding the Europeans. Certainly no one is expecting that any of the food stored in Europe will be returned to us in this country.

Mr. Ross together with the other restaurant men have also informed me that certain cuts of meat, such as the large ribs and loins are not purchased by the housewife, but are used exclusively by eating establishments, and that therefore by making the drastic cut contemplated no useful purpose is served in obtaining additional meat for the housewife.

Mr. Ross further requested me to inform you that at a meeting of the local restaurant association there was serious discussion about the necessity for all restaurants closing for a period of 10 to 12 days some time after July 1, if the ration cut is made effective as of July 1. This closing would be made necessary by the OPA, as the restaurants would have no available food to serve.

If the OPA is seeking an extension of authority from and after July 1, I presume that it will be possible for you to secure information relative to the necessity for such cut, and to further see that the people are informed of the reason for such a cut. I would appreciate having you give me the benefit of your ideas as to this situation and informing me of what will be done to protect all of the people from irresponsible acts by the OPA. Your immediate reply will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially and sincerely,

JOHN D. RANDALL.

Succession to the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., for May 21, 1945:

THE SUCCESSION

As recently pointed out by James A. Farley and Representative MONRONEY, succession to the Presidency has long been one of the weak spots in our governmental system. As recently as 1886 there was nothing in the statute books to show who would become Chief Executive if both the President and Vice President should die or become incapacitated. The present law, passed in that year, establishes a line of succession beginning with the Secretary of State and going on down through the Cabinet. But it is unsatisfactory in many respects and it still leaves many questions unanswered.

The law as it now stands, for instance, says nothing about what is to be done if both the newly elected President and Vice President should be unable to take office on inauguration.

The President himself is made the sole judge of his ability to perform the duties of his office; if he should become incapacitated and incompetent it would be impossible to force him to retire.

A no less serious defect in the law is the fact that in the case of President Truman's death the Presidency would pass for nearly a full term to a man not elected by the people.

These are not remote contingencies. The Vice Presidency has been vacant no less than 15 times in our history. It is merely chance that a Cabinet officer has not stepped into the highest office in the land. Woodrow Wilson was paralyzed at the end and if President Roosevelt's illness had been disabling instead of mortal the Nation might have faced a full, 4-year term with a Chief Executive unable to conduct the duties of his office.

Representative MONRONEY urges that Congress set up a commission of Supreme Court justices, Presidential appointees, Senators, and Representatives to study these problems and recommend changes in the law. It is a sound and timely proposal and we hope Congress will adopt it.

No Sugar Used in Whisky Distillation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by George Dixon in the Washington Times-Herald of June 20, 1945:

Prohibitionists, who are hard at it all the time, have now started working on the Department of Agriculture. The burden of their cry is that the distillers of the soul-destroying stuff known as whisky plan to use millions of pounds of scarce sugar in the forthcoming July liquor-making holiday.

The disturbing part of it is that the Department of Agriculture has given heedful ear to the don't-let-'em-use-our-precious sugar-to-make-that-awful-stuff gripes.

For the benefit of the great scientists in the Department of Agriculture I would like to point out that not one single ounce of sugar is ever used by any registered distiller in making whisky.

The moonshiners down in the hills maybe use sugar and prune juice and anything sweet they can get, but the registered distillers, never. Whisky, kiddies, is a distillate of grain.

Truman Carries Out Dewey's Pledges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Strout, published recently in the Christian Science Monitor:

TRUMAN CARRIES OUT DEWEY'S PLEDGES

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Candidate Thomas Dewey made certain pledges when he was running for the Presidency last year. Harry S. Truman has been busy carrying them out.

Governor Dewey pledged himself, if elected, to choose a younger and more vigorous Cabinet and to include within it a fair representation of the West. Mr. Truman has been recasting his Cabinet and has made four changes so far, with others expected. The average Cabinet age has been reduced about 10 years, and three of the new Members are from west of the Mississippi, the largest number in history. On the whole, the Cabinet seems to have been strengthened in the process.

Governor Dewey made effective use, in the 1944 campaign, of his promise to create a closer and more cooperative relationship with Congress. Mr. Truman has set this idea in motion in spectacular fashion, including former Congressmen in his Cabinet, inviting a constant succession of Members to the White House, attending congressional gatherings in person, and sending frequent messages to the Hill. Whether he can overcome the traditional breach within the American Government between the executive and legislative remains to be seen, but his start is unusual.

Governor Dewey promised to reorganize the Government, if elected to office, with the idea of consolidating disconnected bureaus and streamlining the whole affair. President Truman has already sent a message to Congress asking for authority to achieve this much-needed goal. The difficulty here is that Congress must grant authority, and nearly every detached bureau or agency has some strong defender in Congress. Streamlining the Federal agency is easier said than done. Mr. Roosevelt tried it for a time, and some important changes were made. In any event, Mr. Truman is trying to do the job, and shows a disposition to bring temporary war agencies back into the control of time-honored Cabinet positions.

Governor Dewey, when asked to comment on the Democratic Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, took issue with the correspondent who put the question, declaring that it was really a traditional Republican policy to reduce trade barriers by reciprocal bargaining. His celebrated comment was frequently cited to show his support of the measure. Mr. Truman has now made this struggle his own, and it is rather remarkable to see Truman and Dewey apparently on the same side of the fence, while Republicans in Congress are fighting the measure.

A variation of this on the other side politically concerns the Fair Employment Practice Act. The Republican Party specifically endorsed establishment of the FEPC on a permanent basis. The Democratic platform was silent, although it was President Roosevelt who set up the agency. In any event, Mr. Truman has vigorously recommended continuation of the FEPC, although southern conservtives of his own party are fighting it. Presumably, Governor Dewey would have

taken the same stand—and met the same opposition had he been in office—which Mr. Truman faces.

These are important points which show a considerable similarity between what Governor Dewey proposed and what Mr. Truman is carrying out. In the other large field of foreign affairs, Mr. Truman even more emphatically is following a nonpartisan course which presumably would have been adopted by Governor Dewey. He is making fullest use of Republican congressional leadership, notably of Senator VANDENBERG and Representative CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, at San Francisco, along with the aid of ex-Governor Stassen (Republican) of Minnesota, thereby continuing the policy of President Roosevelt.

The quality and caliber of an administration is a different matter, however, either from its advance pledges or from its efforts to carry out a particular program. Mr. Truman's acts, thus far, have shown a striking parallelism with the recommendations made by the chief Republican critic of his predecessor in 1944. But his term has a long time yet to run and it remains to be seen whether he is able to supply that quality of coordination and leadership which are the intangibles that support any particular administration.

American Citizenship for Natives of Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House a bill (H. R. 3528) to confer American citizenship on the native people of the island of Guam. It seems to me that Congress should extend this privilege to these people at this time as an act of simple justice and in recognition of their devoted loyalty to our country during the critical years through which we have recently been passing.

I do not believe that any one can read the adventures of George Ray Tweed, American seaman, as outlined by Blake Clark in "Robinson Crusoe, U. S. N." and listen to what is said about the record of these people by those who have been closely associated with them since 1941 without feeling that they are not only deserving of, but have earned in full, the right to American citizenship.

In concluding the amazing record of how he eluded capture by the Japanese from the time the island of Guam fell until it was recovered by our forces, Yeoman Tweed writes of his departure from this island in these words:

> I know that island now. I knew that land from having crawled over it on hands and knees. I understand the Chamorros, having seen them suffer. And I knew that these people were as brave and loyal as any who ever lived under the American flag.

The census of 1940 showed the native population of Guam consisted of slightly more than 20,000 persons. These are the descendants of the original people of these islands who, since they came under American jurisdiction, have been nationals, but have never been given the privileges of American citizenship. This means they are without citizenship in any country. There can be no question as to where their interests and loyalties lie.

I believe, therefore, that in view of their contribution to the war effort and the important role that Guam is destined to play in the future of this country in the Pacific the time has come to make these people full-fledged citizens of the United States.

OPA and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which recently appeared in the Schuyler (Nebr.) Sun, contributed by Mrs. Joseph P. Heitz:

I see by the paper that there is a meat shortage. I read also that quite a bit of money, a good many thousands of dollars, is being spent to find out why. Huh! If you want my opinion, and if you don't you had better put this paper down and skedaddle because I fully intend to give it anyhow, anyone who really wants to know why there is a meat shortage can find out for the price of a 3-cent stamp. Any 10-year-old farm kid could tell them. Lack of help, lack of fair prices and lack of confidence in big-wigs who say one thing today and do another thing tomorrow.

The help thing is no one's fault I guess. When the war started we needed men much worse than we needed meat so our farm men went to the Army. But for every farm boy who left five or six thousand pounds of meat per year left as well. The older men, women, and kids left behind did the best we could to keep up production and we did a good job for several years. But now we are all 3 years older and these years have been hard enough to tell on us older workers. We can't keep up that pace too long until it tells on our health. And somewhere along the line we have sort of lost heart for this business.

Farm people have worked 12 to 16 hours a day for months on end to produce the pork, beef, cream, eggs, milk, and grain. We've gone without help, machinery, tires, underwear, and sugar, like the rest of the nations. We've had our checks shoved around and been heckled with forms to be filled and filed. We've paid our taxes and bought our share of bonds like everyone else. We are as patriotic as any group, but we don't feel we are getting a square deal in this war thing and our disgruntlement is being felt on your dinner tables.

We don't like to work ourselves and our families until we are ready to drop from exhaustion to produce steaks for white-collar workers who knock off at 5 p. m. after a heavy (?) 8-hour-day. We resent hitting the ball for 7 days a week and then going to town on Saturday night, with sunburned faces and broken fingernails, to be greeted by well-groomed armchair planners who raised tons of prime beef that day with a paper and pencil.

We aren't at all deluded by the "fair price" subsidy payments on our cream and beef. Subsidies are paid by taxes and who pays the taxes? It has been pointed out that a good many workers in this county alone don't even pay poll or old-age-pension tax, much less any tax money to pay subsidies. So what's so darn "fair price" about farmers paying themselves subsidy checks to raise the price of their own products?

We don't like raising hogs and then having them jammed up on the farms long after they were ready for market because some guy, who probably never saw a hog, put the cart before the horse. We don't appreciate sweating and swearing to raise a corn crop and then having a lot of it rot on the farms—while people starve—because some bungler keeps terminals full of empty freight cars. If we are so fortunate to have a bumper wheat crop watch the deal we'll get moving that.

We aren't at all pleased with the 10-point OPA program that uses nine of these points to suggest ways of getting more money in the packers' pockets. The OPA idea seems to be that more cash in the packers' pockets will finally jingle in the farmer's jeans. Oh, yeah!

In my opinion, the meat situation will get much worse before it gets much better. Farmers' patriotic zeal is wearing a little thin when they see magnificent cost-plus figures on paper turn to cost-minus in reality. We are beginning to wonder if some of the callouses on our hands couldn't be transferred to another part of our anatomy to better advantage. Callouses or not, we know the meat isn't on the farms. Yet we are paying taxes to pay the salaries of thousands of able-bodied men who dash about the country checking and searching for the meat that never has been there. We feel that if they spent half as much time helping us produce the meat as they do trying to ferret out what we did with the meat we never did produce, we'd all save time, energy, and tempers.

Farm Conditions "Down Under"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that the grass always looks greener on the other side of the fence. All of us have seen grazing cattle with their heads through the wire, nibbling the grass on the other side when it was not nearly so luxuriant and lush as on their own side.

We are frequently told how much better is the condition of the farmer in New Zealand and Australia where they have extreme socialism. For instance, in New Zealand a farmer cannot hire farm hands that do not belong to a union and they are regulated and regimented in a manner that is strongly suggestive of totalitarianism, and is fast driving them out of business.

I want the American farmer to know the truth about it because he is now being courted by elements that in time would destroy him as a freeman. It is for the purpose of giving him some informative facts about farm conditions in Australia and New Zealand that I am inserting in the RECORD the contents of a short pamphlet recently issued by the department of economic development, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Farm Conditions 'Down Under.'"

which is a report by a Canadian farmer named J. Gordon Ross, a liberal member of the Canadian Parliament for the Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, district, who recently visited those countries. I wish it were possible to get this report into the hands of every American farmer before it is too late:

FARM CONDITIONS "DOWN UNDER"

(By J. Gordon Ross)

During the summer of 1944, while visiting Australia and New Zealand with the Empire Parliamentary Association, Dr. T. F. Donnelly, Member of Parliament, and I were given an opportunity of visiting many of the farms and farmers of Australia and New Zealand. We met and talked with the heads of farmers' organizations in both countries. In some of the states we traveled with the Minister of Agriculture, and in New Zealand we traveled with Mr. E. U. Fawcett, Director General of Agriculture. We were given access to voluminous Government reports, many of which we brought back with us. Since my return I have been asked to make a comparison of farming in those two countries with farming conditions in Canada.

I took particular pains in both countries to find out the prices obtained by farmers for their produce and then compared these prices with those obtained by Canadian farmers. This, in my estimation, is the only sound basis for comparison.

I found that in Australia the top price for first-grade butterfat was 34 cents per pound. In New Zealand the same grade was 28½ cents per pound. In Saskatchewan the same grade was 47 cents per pound, and the average price for top grade through the year was 43½ cents.

I found that top-grade cheese in Australia was 18 cents; in New Zealand, 12¾; in Ontario and Quebec, 24 cents. Grade A hogs dressed were worth 14 cents per pound in Australia; 10.87 cents in New Zealand, and 16½ cents dressed in Saskatchewan plus a $4 bonus per carcass. In other words, dressed grade A hogs, that is, hogs weighing 160 pounds, brought $22.40 in Australia, $17.40 in New Zealand, and $30.40 in Saskatchewan.

Top baby beef on foot in Australia sells for 5¾ cents per pound, in Regina, 11 to 11½ cents. Thus, an 800-pound top baby beef would sell for $46 in Australia, compared to $88 in Regina. Choice beef steers in Australia bring 4½ cents a pound on foot; New Zealand, 4 cents, and Regina 11 to 11½ cents on foot. Thus a 1,500 pound steer in Australia would realize $67.50; in New Zealand, $60, and in Regina $165 to $175.

The Australian beekeeper gets 9 cents per pound for his honey compared to 13 cents received by the Saskatchewan beekeeper.

In Australia the price of wheat is 72 cents per bushel up to 3,000 bags, or about 6,000 bushels; 54 cents per bushel over that minimum. In Regina the price is $1.10 per bushel.

All these prices are based on exchange, that is, valuation of Australian and New Zealand pound at $3.60 in Canadian money. That is the price that Dr. Donnelly and I had to pay to buy Australian money.

I did not obtain all the prices of agricultural implements in New Zealand, but those given me proved to be slightly higher than the same machines in Australia, and much higher than Canadian prices. I found that an 8-foot four-horse hitch binder cost $533.70 in Brisbane, Australia, while the same binder in Regina cost $347. A 16-run drill, single disc costs $341.46 in Brisbane, while a 20-run drill of the same make in Regina cost $313. A 5-foot mowing machine cost $195.75 at Brisbane, compared to $120.50 at Regina. A 6-foot mowing machine cost $202.95 at Brisbane and $122.75 at Regina.

All these prices are given in Canadian dollars, for easier comparison, and all are based on the exchange value of the Australian pound at $3.60 in Canadian funds. In case any one might think these figures are being juggled in exchange, let us take, for example, the 6-foot mower, which is a standard machine used on dairy farms in Australia and Canada. Let us buy it with butter fat. In Australia, the farmer with top-grade butter fat will hand over 597 pounds of butter fat for this machine, while his Canadian counterpart will be required to surrender only 297 pounds.

Last spring, before leaving for Australia, I bought for my farm a new Massey-Harris tractor, 102–G Senior, on rubber wheels. It cost $1,486.90 cash in Regina. In Australia, the same tractor, made by the same firm cost $2,187.

Now, let us determine what this tractor will cost in each country in terms of wheat. The Australian farmer had to deliver 3,037 bushels of wheat, while I had to sell only 1,352 bushes.

The 102–G Junior tractor costs $1,620 in Brisbane and $1,189 in Regina. Let us buy this tractor in both countries with choice beef steers at 1,200 pounds each. The Australian farmer would have to sell 30 steers, while the farmer at Regina would have to sell but 8 to purchase the same tractor.

A disc plow, two-furrow, costs $339.30 at Brisbane. The same plow in Regina costs $168. A disc plow three-furrow, cost $412 at Brisbane and $200 in Regina. If we buy this plow with wheat the Australian farmer would have to sell 572½ bushels, while the Regina farmer would pay but 182 bushels.

In New Zealand all farm workers are unionized, and there are minimum wages on the farm, set by the government. The minimum wage for workers over 21 on New Zealand dairy farms today is $55 per month in Canadian money, plus a month's holiday with pay each year. But the going wage in New Zealand is $60 a month or better. With butterfat selling at 28½ cents per pound, for a top, this wage appeared to me to be too high for the farmer to pay, yet the farmer can hire only union workers.

In New Zealand I asked the farmers what price they got for their produce, and the answer was "so-and-so, but we understand that Prime Minister Fraser has a new price for farm produce for New Zealand when he returns home from the Conference." The Conference referred to was the Conference of premiers then being held in England. At the time of that conference, Mr. Fraser apparently had negotiated a new price for New Zealand farm products.

Mr. Fraser arrived back in New Zealand while we were there. We met him and found him to be a very fine man, and he was very kind to us. Parliament was called together before we left and on the opening day Mr. Fraser made a report on the premiers' conference. During his speech he was questioned by Mr. Holland, leader of the opposition, in regard to new farm prices, and his reply was to this effect: "Yes, I have a better price for New Zealand farm products, but the increased price belongs to the people of New Zealand and must be shared with them. We have been handling the farmers' products by our boards for some time and have been paying the farmers a fixed price. We will continue to pay that same price."

In both New Zealand and Australia the opposition to the socialist governments is made up of farmers. The farmers are the people who are suffering. I was questioned by the heads of farm organizations in both countries and I told them the exact situation of the farmer in Canada and the price he was getting. They all envied the position of Canadians and they said they wished they could persuade their governments to give the farmers that kind of generous treatment.

Australian, New Zealand, and Canadian farm products are being sold on the same market. It costs a bit more to get the produce of Australia and New Zealand to Great Britain than it does for Canadian goods, and Canada sells on the British market at the same price these other dominions receive. The difference in conditions in these three countries is that the Government of Canada is bonusing practically every farm product in Canada and the Canadian farmer thus is getting a higher price for his products than the British market is paying, whereas in Australia and New Zealand the farmer gets the price for his product that is paid on the British market, less the handling costs and carrying charges to Great Britain.

We have been told by people in Canada for the last 2 or 3 years, that, under Socialist governments, the farmers are better off in New Zealand and Australia. I am sorry to have to report that this is not true. If Canadian farmers had been privileged to accompany me they would have found the evidence against this theory. We have been told, too, that if governments went into business and produced farm machinery we would get it much cheaper.

The Government of Australia is in the farm implement business, is producing farm implements in competition with two Canadian companies, but the prices in Australia and New Zealand are higher than they are in Canada.

If the farmers of western Canada ever allow the closed shop and check-off to be applied to agriculture they will begin to suffer in the same way as the Australia and New Zealand farmers are suffering today. The farmers of Canada should beging a study of these questions at once if they wish to avoid being subjected to the same conditions that prevail in the Antipodes. Let me say that I believe the farmer in Australia and New Zealand is just as patriotic a citizen as the farmer in Canada, and if he has fallen down in the production of food for the war effort (as he has), it is because the price he received for his product is inadequate to give him a fair return.

The wool crop in the last 2 years has been reduced from 345,000,000 to 325,000,000 pounds in New Zealand; butterfat from 422,000,000 to 353,000,000 pounds; number of milk cows in production from 1,777,000 to 1,690,000 and hog production from 998,000 to 726,000. These reductions in production are easily understood in the light of conditions I have described.

There is not so much labor involved in operating farms either in Australia or New Zealand as in Canada, therefore the cost of production should be lower. Unfortunately, however, it is not, and I found the farmers a discouraged lot. In Australia I learned the dairy farmers are selling their milk cows that they might free themselves to go to the cities and obtain work. These were good milkers, but they were being sold at prices ranging from $35 to $45 per head.

Australia and New Zealand are agricultural countries. They export very little of anything but agricultural products, yet in Australia from 60 to 70 percent of the people live in cities and towns, with about 60 percent of New Zealanders living in urban centers. In both countries for some years there have been governments which call themselves labor governments, but which are more or less socialistic, and in both countries these socialistic governments are opposed mainly by farmers. In New Zealand the leader of the opposition is a farmer.

In my opinion labor and labor unions control both countries. Workers in all industries are unionized. Some of the farm workers in Australia are unionized; all New Zealand farm workers are unionized. In an agricultural country such as Australia, New Zealand, or western Canada, practically all the wealth comes from the farms, and that is all the wealth that can be distributed among the people in those areas. If certain sections of the population are able to demand and obtain a larger portion of that wealth, then the other sections of the population must, of necessity, take less.

In Australia, although there is no lack of coal, nor a scarcity of miners, the war effort of the country has had to be curtailed to a great extent because enough coal could not be produced to stoke the factories. The miners refuse to allow a stock pile of coal to accumulate by staging frequent strikes.

There are continual strikes in both countries, in the packing plants and food-processing plants, in order to raise wages and shorten hours. This, of course, makes for higher costs in the processing and lower returns to the farmers.

The dock workers who handle the produce over the docks are unionized and have the closed shop and the check-off. The closed shop means that none but union workers can unload boats, and the check-off means that union dues are deducted from the pay envelope of the worker by his employer.

If, for any reason whatever, the union decided that a worker may not join the union, he cannot obtain work in the industry so unionized. Further, if the union officials decide they have sufficient men in the union to handle available work, they simply close the book and will not permit anyone to join. That is the situation in Wellington, New Zealand, right now. The dock workers have closed their books and will not take new members into their union.

While I was in Wellington there were eight ships waiting in the harbor to be loaded for England with food products. For 2 days it drizzled a little, something in the nature of a Scotch mist. No dockworker worked these 2 days. The shipowners told me the men have the power to determine if weather conditions are favorable for work. They had decided the weather was too bad and they would not load the boats, but they sat under shelter on the docks and drew their pay just the same.

In another dockyard I saw a crane used in loading and unloading boats. The lifting capacity of this crane was 7 tons, yet the masters of the ships told me that union regulations would not permit this crane to lift more than 1,200 pounds at a time.

The conditions in New Zealand and Australia that I have described in this report are as I found them. They can be substantiated easily by governmental reports, or by inquiring from authoritative sources.

After a close study of agricultural conditions in Australia and New Zealand, and as a result of innumerable conversations I enjoyed with farmers and representatives of farmers organizations, I came away convinced that the lot of the western Canadian farmer, under wartime conditions, is much to be preferred to that of his cousin "down under" and that western Canadian farmers have nothing to gain and much to lose by assisting a socialistic government to gain power in Canada.

American Citizenship for Natives of American Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the native people of American Samoa numbering slightly more than 10,000 persons would become citizens of the United States under a bill (H. R. 3546) which I have introduced. This measure supplements a bill (H. R. 3528) previously introduced that would extend American citizenship to the people of Guam and complete the application of this policy to all areas that are permanently under the American flag.

The granting of American citizenship to the natives of Samoa was recommended 15 years ago by a commission that visited these islands and held extensive hearings. The recommendation, however, has never been enacted into law, and in consequence the people of these islands, although loyal to this country and completely subject to all of its laws, have never enjoyed the privileges of citizenship.

As part of a program that will make these islands, that are so important to our future in the Pacific, a permanent and integral part of this country I believe it is particularly appropriate at this time that these people be given American citizenship.

The Samoans are of Polynesian stock and closely related to the native Hawaiians, who became citizens of this country with the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands. Like the Hawaiians, the Samoans voluntarily ceded their islands to this country more than 45 years ago.

To give these people the rights of American citizenship is an act of justice that is long overdue and is an important step in the development of a sound Pacific policy.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, a majority of the Members of this Congress have not visited their districts for several months and I do not believe that they realize how their constitutents feel in regard to the present situation brought about by the maladministration of the Office of Price Administration, and the situation has been further aggravated by the issuance of the meat order No. 1, effective April 1. The result of this order has been to demoralize and almost destroy the cattle and meat industry, has deprived most of the civilian population of this country of meat, and has established the most notorious black market in the history of the OPA.

My district is a large producer of cattle and livestock, and as an example of the situation, which is more or less general, the only packinghouse in my home town had been forced to go out of business, and there were only two places where some meat could be purchased, and regular customers received preferential treatment. My first experience with OPA was an attempt of representatives of that agency to exclude me from a meeeting in my district being held for the purpose of placing a ceiling price on rough rice.

Other Members of Congress have received worse treatment.

Mr. Speaker, when an agency of the Government becomes so high-handed and bureaucratic as not to give consideration to the regularly elected representatives of the people of this country who seek to represent their constituents in matters and problems affecting them and their welfare, I think it is a travesty on our American and democratic form of government, and while I have put forth every effort in an attempt to bring to the attention of the Congress the maladministration and bureaucratic methods employed by the administrators and employees of this agency, it seems that it has had but little effect.

If sound judgment and common sense and justice had been applied in the administration of the Price Control Act, this agency would not be fighting for its life today.

With the amendments which have been adopted to the Price Control Act today, it may be that some little consideration may be given by that agency to the problems which confront the people of this country, and since the amendments adopted today provide for some supervision and control by the newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, a Member of Congress, and a man with sound judgment, ability, personality, and an experience in administration and government that will redound to the benefit of this country in his supervision and cooperation in the future conduct of the Price Control Act and the Office of Price Administration, we hopefully look forward to some relief for our people in bringing about such changes in the administration of our food and rationing problems which will inure, not only to the prosecution of our war effort, supply food for our own civilian population, but also a great contribution to this country in supplying food from our surplus agricultural and other products to the starving peoples of Europe. The amendments and debate on the extension of the Price Control Act should certainly impress those who have administered this program so high-handedly with the fact that Congress, at last, has served notice on them that they cannot continue to treat the people and the Members of Congress with disdain.

Don't Break Faith With Our Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, so many reports are beginning to come in from the men in the armed forces evincing their reactions to the so-called point system used in connection with their discharge from the service that it seems proper to call some of these situations to the attention of Congress, the President, and the War Department.

Many of the boys in the service have written letters indicating their disapproval of the point system. Some who

have returned from the European theater are very much disgruntled with the workings of the plan. Some have stated that the operation of the system is grossly unfair in many instances. But perhaps the most tragic of all is the report from some of the men in uniform that they have been told that they are not going to be discharged from the service, although perhaps technically entitled to be released, because of the unemployment situation that is developing in this country resulting from the closing of many of the war industries and the cutbacks all along the line. They say that they have been told it is cheaper to keep these boys in the service than to have to take care of them out of the service. This sounds like some of the same things we heard some 2 years ago from those high in authority. It reminds us further of the frequent criticisms of 2 years ago and more that unemployment could not be solved by the New Deal administration in peacetime and that it took a war to relieve unemployment in this country.

Any isolated report along these lines might be discounted or questioned, but the many rumors and the expressed dissatisfaction of so many of the men who are still in the European theater of operations and who are returning from that area lead one to believe that these stories are not without foundation. Have our boys been betrayed? Have they been deceived? Is deception and fraud being practiced upon the people of this country on such a large scale? After the people have endured so much sorrow and sustained such heavy losses and so many of their boys have given their lives and so many others have become crippled and maimed for life, it is almost unbelievable to think that here in America we will not keep faith with the boys in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from an outstanding citizen whom I have known for many years. He has been a jurist of some renown. He is a lifelong Democrat from one of the Southern States. No one who knows him or his reputation would question his veracity. This gentleman has a son who is a college graduate and a young man of more than ordinary ability, of noble character, and patriotic motive. He volunteered and went into the service several years ago and for more than 2 years has consistently performed a very important function as a member of our armed forces. This young man recently wrote his father of methods he stated are being employed by those in authority over the servicemen in the Pacific Ocean area. Of course, I cannot vouch personally for the authenticity and truthfulness of these statements, but, knowing the father as I have for some 30 years, I have no inclination to doubt the statements of the boy. The following is the letter to which I have referred, written by the son to the father several weeks ago:

DEAR DAD: They have put the needle to us again. Contrary to our belief that VE-day would give us relief, it is the opposite.

In the first place, they withheld two authorized campaign stars until after we signed our service-rating cards, which reduced our points by 10.

There is in this outfit at least 35 percent of the personnel that have 25 months overseas. Twenty months of this time has been spent in the islands of Gilbert, Ellice, Marshall, and Mariannas groups. You know that other than a 10-day rest in ——— we have had no contact with the outside world.

They have instituted a 2-year furlough plan which, on the surface, sounds fine. The trouble is that only a certain percentage may go each month, which means that the unlucky ones won't be furloughed before 33 or 34 months.

The POA has now put a clause in the furlough plan whereby all men with 80 points or over have to sign a waiver of all discharge rights before they receive their furlough. They are also to be furloughed with no possibility of reassignment, which means that we will have to return to the Pacific for undoubtedly the duration of the war.

I also believe we have a legitimate right to extra points for the time we have spent on remote islands. The men in the ETO at least had contact with civilians and were granted passes and furloughs while in England, France, Italy, and north Africa. The War Department, of course, says that this amounts to very little, but it did aid in breaking the monotony.

Before VE-day the CPA, which is now the POA (Pacific Ocean area), took cognizance of the remote-island disadvantages and allowed points for that time. This was in a reassignment plan but was never put in effect.

My main bone of contention is that the POA has exceeded its authority in forcing men to sign discharge waivers before they can get the furlough that they deserve and also it would be just as convenient for the War Department to send a replacement for the man who has 28 to 35 months overseas as it would be to return the man after his furlough.

Dad, I have heretofore accepted the high-handed Army methods in a more or less passive manner, but this is the rawest deal that I have seen. I believe it would do some good if the actual facts were brought to the attention of someone who could exert some pressure on the War Department.

Love.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a copy of this letter, as above quoted, to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of War, requesting their immediate investigation and report. I cannot conceive of a more serious breach of faith than that those in authority would tolerate such conduct as referred to in this soldier's letter which I have quoted.

Any man in authority who would deprive any one of these boys of 10 points, or even 1 point, on his rating card, should be withdrawn from the service and sentenced to hard labor for an extended period. Any officer or person in authority who would withhold an authorized campaign star until after the serviceman signed a service rating card should be summarily relieved of his authority and punished severely. Anyone in authority who would withhold two authorized campaign stars from one of our soldiers who has been through those terrible experiences in the Southwest Pacific, until after the boy had signed his service rating card and reduced his points by 10, in my humble opinion is not fit to serve in the armed forces of this country. Such a character belongs in armies such as Hitler had and not in American forces.

Mr. Speaker, if any of the complaints registered by the servicemen in the letter quoted above are true, our sons are being betrayed and the situation should be corrected immediately. What kind of an army is it that would insert a clause in the furlough plan requiring all men with 80 points or over to sign a waiver of all discharge rights before they receive their furlough? Certainly the American people will not tolerate such outrages and such betrayals. Our boys deserve and should receive only the fairest and most honorable consideration. The experiences and hardships these boys have had to undergo suggest that the least we can do for them is to demand that those in authority in this country and those who represent it abroad keep faith with these boys. We should demand that when a promise is made to them, it be kept. They are entitled to rely upon the promises that are made by those in charge of our military system.

Mr. Speaker, are these boys going to be kept in the service merely because unemployment in civilian life apparently is increasing? Will the boys in the service be required to forfeit some of their hard-earned points before they are allowed to receive their authorized campaign stars? Will we permit military authority to exact of these boys the signing of a waiver of all discharge rights before they receive a well-earned furlough?

If these conditions exist and if these practices are indulged in by the officials in our armed forces, let us take immediate steps to relieve them of their command and to punish those responsible for such un-American policies and practices. Let us not break faith with our servicemen.

Governors Ask for One Food Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Associated Press dispatch today from New York City:

NEW YORK, June 23.—Governors of 13 Northeastern States today recommended that red points in the OPA ration program be used for meat alone.

In a statement following a closed conference on food problems, the Governors also suggested that OPA enforcement be concentrated on food instead of on "minor and unimportant items."

A third recommendation was that a single Government agency be made responsible for all phases of the national food program.

Previously the Governors had recommended elimination of a "railroad bottleneck" which they said was the key to food shortages in their areas.

The Governors' statement, the second issued during their conference, said the United States was the only country which combined rationing of meats with rationing of fats, butter, cheese, and canned fish.

The statement declared that butter "appears to be backing up in warehouses because the consumer prefers to spend red points for meat and go without butter."

"We conclude, therefore," the statement continued, "that a major overhauling of the point system is immediately imperative and that points should be granted to consumers for meats alone * * *

"Only in this way, and with rigid enforcement on a national basis can every person get the share of national meat supply to which he is entitled."

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS MADE

Other points recommended in the Governors' statement included:

Reexamination of the quota system with a view to local quota-fixing in each area based on its own conditions.

Elimination of most of these new slaughterers who have recently entered the slaughtering business as an important step controlling the flow of meat products.

New regulations making provisions for seasonal variation in population when determining area meat allocations.

More effective control over the meat supply available to public eating establishments in order to correct this inequity in our distributive system.

Handling of OPA enforcement on a Federal basis because it is inherent in the food supply situation that States cannot take over the Federal function of enforcement of OPA regulations.

SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON FOOD

The statement said that "until our dealing in food is under control again the OPA should concentrate on this and related fields rather than enforcing ceilings on cocktails and fur coats."

In asking OPA to concentrate on good enforcement, the Governors said that unless this program can be made shortly to work, and work effectively, regulation of one or more groups of minor or unimportant items should be abandoned * * *

The Governors declared that the food program has been plagued from its inception by a multiplicity of agencies.

They added there should be a better coordination between the procurement officers for the armed forces, lease-lend, and other agencies dealing with the relief of liberated areas and the agencies dealing with civilian supplies.

RAP UNEVEN DISTRIBUTION

Alleged uneven distribution of food supplies resulting in black market operations was criticized.

"It is our conclusion," the statement said, "that one person or agency must have final responsibility for all phases of the food program if we are to bring order out of the present chaos."

Pointing out that the Anderson committee reports on the national food situation showed estimates of illegal sales as high as 90 percent of total sales in some areas, the Governors said:

"This represents an alarming tendency toward a complete break-down in price control of these essential foods."

States represented at the conference are New York, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Army Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the brightest days of the year for the millions of families and friends of the boys and girls in the armed services are those that bring us their letters. And nothing helps so much to lighten their load of discomfort, strain, boredom, and loneliness as letters from the loved ones back home. We know this to be true but let me call to witness a very great soldier and a very great man.

Last Monday General Eisenhower stood before a joint session of the Senate and the House. The Members of the Supreme Court, the President's Cabinet, the highest ranking Army and Naval officers, the diplomatic corps and hundreds of distinguished guests were also present to do him honor. He was greeted with tumultuous and heartfelt applause by that notable audience and he responded with a speech of simple eloquence which revealed the strength, the deep loyalties, the kindliness, and the human understanding of his character and personality.

Let me quote this much from his remarks:

> And now, because this meeting typifies for me the spiritual unity of the American home and battle fronts, I address a word to that relationship.
>
> The American fighting man has never failed to recognize his dependence upon you at home.
>
> This feeling goes beyond the tangible things—guns, ammunition, tanks, and planes—although in these things you have sent us the most and the best. It extends to such intangibles as the confidence and sympathetic understanding which have filled the letters written by families and friends to the men up front. For a few moments, simple words of affection and cheer blot out the danger and loneliness and hardship which are the soldier's life. They send him back with renewed vigor and courage to his inexorable task of crushing the enemy.

Last Wednesday, June 20, Mrs. Hancock and I received a letter from our son on the island of Guam, postmarked June 13. We received it on the first mail delivery in the morning of that day at our apartment in Washington. It had crossed the Pacific Ocean and the North American Continent—a distance of 10,000 miles—and was in our hands in 7 days. This in time of war with transportation facilities taxed to the limit of capacity.

It jolted me into a realization of the marvelously efficient job the postal service of the Army is doing for the boys and girls overseas and for us back home, and how little recognition we have given the modest and devoted men who are performing a task so intimately related to our affections and our morale on the battle front and the home front.

And so I sought out two of the high-ranking officers of the Army postal service a few days ago to pay them my compliments and to learn something of their organization. One of them has been postmaster in a Texas city for 9 years; the other a post-office inspector for 20 years. They asked me not to mention their names, or any names, and I will respect their wishes. I think they are typical of the postal service, personally modest and self-effacing, but immensely proud, and rightly so, of their great and vital branch of the service.

Practically all of the officers in charge of the APO's scattered from the Arctic Circle to the Equator and around the world—thousands of them—are former postal employees and will return to their jobs when the war is finished and won. They are letter carriers, post-office clerks, rural carriers, railway postal clerks, post-office inspectors, and postmasters.

Domestic mail for soldiers is handled by the civilian department but all overseas mail goes through the Army postal service with the complete cooperation of the Post Office Department.

This is not a statistical report but I wish to give a few figures to indicate the magnitude of the task of handling Army mail. Over 250,000,000 pieces of first-class mail are delivered every month to soldiers all around the world. It reaches them by ship, plane, truck, parachute, train, dog sled, and on the backs of men.

Seventy million Christmas packages were delivered to our overseas soldiers last year—95 percent of them on or before Christmas Day. They were carried on the backs of soldiers in the postal service through the jungles and the mountains to our men at the fighting front on Bougainville and distributed on Christmas Day. In India the Christmas packages arrived by ship only a few days before Christmas. Every available transport plane was commandeered to deliver the Christmas presents to our troops in that remote area. It is impossible to calculate the lift Christmas packages gave to the morale of those boys.

Before we leave this subject let me remind you that between September 15 and October 15 you may send packages weighing up to 5 pounds to your boys and girls overseas. The postal service makes special arrangements for transportation of Christmas packages during that period. At any other time you may not send your boys or girls any packages in excess of 8 ounces except upon their specific requests.

It would save cargo space and be helpful to the postal service if, instead of sending complete newspapers and magazines, you would send clippings of local news, special articles, and comments which you deem to be of real interest to your boys and girls overseas. If not too bulky, these clippings will go as first-class mail and arrive long before the newspapers and magazines.

If the American people had not responded generously to the request to use V-mail, the whole delivery plan would be greatly hampered. But whether you use V-mail or not, please write your letters on thin stationery.

We now have plane service to every theater of war, but sometimes space is inadequate to carry all the mail. That is why it is desirable to make our letters light and compact. When the volume of mail exceeds the capacity of available planes, or when weather conditions delay their flights, a large backlog is created which can only be cured by ship transportation. In such a situation it is a pure matter of chance whether your letters go by plane or by ship. Do not be alarmed or indignant if your letters to or from your boy or girl are delayed or out of sequence.

The postal service has been bitterly criticized many times because mail has been miscarried. Planes carrying mail

have often been obliged to jettison their cargoes, some have crashed, ships have been sunk with all the mail aboard, but the postal service has not been free to explain why mail has not been delivered for obvious military reasons.

The war of movement in Europe caused the postal service innumerable problems. For a considerable period there were 35,000 changes of addresses every day, caused by casualties, replacements, and transfers. The mail for these men has to be sent through a central control directory or a locator section for change of address. Your boy may be one of these.

One of the most staggering jobs ever confronting any postal service is the redeployment of mail to the camps and hospitals of the United States, the Pacific theater of war, and the homes of discharged soldiers. Mail is going to Europe while the soldiers are coming home or moving to the Far East. The postal service has anticipated this situation by supplying soldiers with formal notices, to be transmitted with the highest priority to their families asking them to withhold mail until the new military addresses are known. Please be patient and recognize the complicated problem of rerouting millions of pieces of mail matter halfway around the world.

This branch of the service is extremely reticent about publicizing the heroism of its members. They go on the beaches with the assault waves. In Normandy the postal service followed the first wave of assault and attempted to set up postal service in what seemed to be a suitable building. It was blown up by the enemy shell fire. The postal officer in command then occupied a second building. It was also destroyed. But within 4 days after D-day in Normandy he had a post office functioning fully, with stamps and money orders for sale and all the facilities of a first-class post office.

In the desperate days of Bastogne, or the Belgian Bulge, nothing went to the front except on requisition. This included what the Army regards as the bare necessities for fighting men—ammunition, food, and mail from home. The postal service carried the mail. It got through.

I salute the men of the Army postal service, conspicuous among the unheralded heroes of this war.

War Needs Scientists More Than Massed Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a thought-provoking editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of Tuesday, June 19, 1945:

WAR NEEDS SCIENTISTS MORE THAN MASSED MEN

Eight million German soldiers couldn't prevent Allied air power from destroying Germany's ability to make war.

But a handful of RAF fighters thwarted a German attempt to do the same thing to England.

Why? The answer is scientific brains.

Of course, there was heroism and doggedness on one side, and fumbling half-measures on the other. But what stood between Britain and air defeat in late 1940 was scientific brains that developed plane detection devices.

Pin-point detectors guided night fighters to the kill and Germany lost its bid. Magnetic mines told the same story. Scientific brains beat them, too.

That is one lesson of the war that cannot be ignored in the current eagerness to adopt for the United States the outmoded and beaten European system of universal military training.

Another is that war has rubbed out the old distinction between civilian and military forces. Victors have to defeat armies, but they also have to defeat whole peoples. For only so can an enemy's power to maintain an army be neutralized.

The last months of the war barely brought rockets and jet propulsion into battle. They are crude thus far. But last week Sven Lindequist, top Swedish inventor, said rockets will make guns out of date in the next war.

Our own experience in the Pacific shows that where extreme ranges and accuracy are no object, one LST can pour more explosive fire by rockets onto a hostile shore than the big guns of two battleships.

But accurate rockets are just around the corner. Lindequist says control of this weapon can be perfected in a matter of months. A 10-ton rocket shell can then be directed to hit a dime from hundreds of miles away.

Air power robbed German armies of their ability to continue the war. Rockets will snatch their guns from their hands. Why massed armies, then?

War has become a scientists' problem, both offensively and defensively.

This means only one thing. If defense is our object, we don't want universal military training. We want the combined services of every technical brain we can develop. And you don't make a scientist overnight, nor an invention important to defense by lucky accident.

We have already lost a whole generation of scientists and technicians. The wartime draft took them all. Physics, chemistry, metallurgy, medicine, and biology will all feel the effects for 30 years.

Defense requires that we reverse this condition, not aggravate it by universal compulsory military service.

Universal military service has never won a first-class war. But brains have, both scientific brains and the brains of the citizen-soldier whose initiative and resourcefulness make the American soldier the best in the world.

That type of brains comes from a youth's whole way of life—physical fitness, acquired in high organization games, strength through fun, teamwork against competition.

Universal, compulsory military service in peacetime should be defeated.

Race Is Not a Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made at the commencement exercises of Wilberforce University at Wilberforce, Ohio, June 14, 1945.

Note: For 88 years Wilberforce University, located in the village of Wilberforce, in Green County, Ohio, 52 miles westward from Columbus and 55 miles northeastward from Cincinnati, has sent forth leaders who came to its doors of opportunity. It was the first permanent institution for higher education of Negroes in the United States. Conceived in 1844, established in 1855, and incorporated in 1856, Wilberforce has continued to provide leaders who have helped to shape America's greatness. All over the Nation its graduates have been outstanding ministers, physicians, lawyers, educators, scientists, business pioneers, authors, artists, editors, writers, statesmen, and they are found in the front ranks of the communities in which they live and work. They have wielded tremendous influence in building bridges of understanding between the races and in making the Nation what it is today. From this campus have gone forth youths who have found new jobs in work and discovered God in common life.

The address follows:

Mr. President, members of the board of trustees and faculty, dignitaries of the Methodist Church, members of the graduating class, and friends, I deem it a high honor and a distinct privilege to have been invited to speak on this occasion. I deem it a high honor to have merited the consideration of the faculty and the student body of this great institution of learning—a high honor to have won the approval of your great president, Dr. Charles H. Wesley, a friend and colleague of my own college days, who has carved for himself a place of honor, influence, and power, in the life of our great Nation. I deem it a distinct privilege to have been afforded the opportunity of addressing these young men and women who have completed the prescribed course of study here, and who now go from here into many and varied fields of activity.

It is my one desire—my fervent prayer—that I may on this occasion be able to speak some word or drop some thought that shall be beneficial and useful to you along your journey's ways in the days to come.

From today on, you are on your own. Wilberforce has given you her best and her best, rightfully used, is sufficient, is attested to by a large coterie of magnificent men and women who have passed this way before you and who by their deeds have conferred honor upon their alma mater and have inscribed their names high in the firmanent of human achievement. Today you leave Wilberforce but Wilberforce shall never leave you. She will exult with you in your success and she will sorrow with you in your failures, if there be any.

You are graduating at a time when the entire civilized world is struggling in the throes of a tremendous readjustment; when individuals and groups and races and nations are striving to establish for themselves—in relationship to others—a place which will assure to them security, peace, and happiness. These are times that challenge the courage, intelligence, and resourcefulness of the Negro in America in the battle to win for themselves a place in the vanguard of progress.

As I walked about this campus and viewed its many imposing buildings, and as I read the roster of splendid men and women who constitute this faculty, and as I noted the kind and caliber of the student body gathered here from the four corners of the Nation to imbibe the mental and spiritual training offered, I could not but bow my head in reverence and give prayerful thanks to those millions who at the price of blood

and tears and suffering and death destroyed human slavery forever in this country and made possible these things we now enjoy.

Fourscore years have passed since that price was paid. These four score years have been frought with great progress and multitudinous gains and also with many handicaps and bitter disappointments. It's a long, hard journey from the sloughs of slavery to the heights of full free citizenship. To reach those heights has been and is now the hope and aspiration of every Negro in America today. And you step forth today to play your part and make your contribution to that end.

In the words of Paul Laurence Dunbar, "There are no beaten paths to glory's heights." As we go upward each gain presents unseen chasms and crags and obstacles ahead. The situation we face today, the obstacles to be overcome are different from those of our forefathers but we are today better equipped to meet them by reason of how well those who went on before bridged the way for us; and the future for our sons and daughters will be affected by how well we handled the problems of our day.

Permit me at this point to pay deference to our splendid forebears who were the first four million beneficiaries of the joys of freedom. Loosed in a hostile land—ofttimes hated and despised; exploited on every hand, without education or money, they used their God-given understanding to win for themselves a foothold and for their children an opportunity to go upward. And in the same breath, I hasten to express our deep appreciation for that noble band of white men and women who gave up wealth, social position, and influence, and dedicated their services and lives to teach and assist their newly freed fellow countrymen how to help themselves. Today we are over 15,000,000 strong. Today our men and women occupy high places in every phase of our national life—in agriculture, in science, in business, in literature, in sports, in religion, we have won a place. In fourscore years we have wrought well—but discrimination and segregation and disfranchisement still bar our way to the full enjoyment of all that free citizens hold most dear.

It is fitting and proper that we take stock of our position in a war-torn world. A representative of one of our great weeklies said to us not long ago, "Congressman, what is the present outlook for the Negro citizen in America?" Our anwer was, "The present holds out the greatest possibilities for progress of any time in the last two or three decades, but what he will get out of it will depend almost entirely on the Negro himself." Eighty years of freedom. Eighty years of contact with and participation in the life of the greatest country on the globe have brought us from the status of an untried child race to that of a virile adulthood. There will be no more noble band of men and women of another race leaving the security and peace of their happy homes to work among a poor and illiterate people. From now on we are on our own. Friends we do have; and many. But from now on their numbers and what they do will depend on the course of action we charter for ourselves. We, ourselves, must assume the responsibility for ourselves and abide by the results of our own achievements. The situation is here; the circumstances are set; the battle lines are drawn; our obstacles and enemies are known. The place we attain in the final analysis must necessarily depend upon how well we appraised the situation, how intelligently we mastered the circumstances, and how skillfully we planned and executed our battle strategy.

Our Nation is at war. Its very life is at stake. In battles on land, on and under the sea, and in the air, American boys and girls of every race, creed, and national origin fight and die that our Nation shall survive and that freedom from aggressors be established among the peoples of the world. Even as we fight the enemies abroad, here at home the entrenched custom and tradition of segregation, discrimination, and violence—born of the Civil War—seek to retain their tenacious hold upon American military and civil affairs.

Negro youth in seeking to enlist are brought face to face with hatred and bigotry not practiced against any other citizen. Upon induction into the service they find themselves the objects of discrimination and abuses not shown any other members of the military forces. Those who remain at home find themselves barred from places of employment, places of amusement, places to eat, places of worship, and vehicles of travel. Daily they face a hundred and one indignities and insults directed against them alone.

Were it my desire, I could cite to you from my own personal knowledge incidents which would chill the blood within you, whip your temper into frenzy, and fan the fires of your wrath into a devastating flame on which reason and judgment would be quickly consumed and give place to bitter vengeance and unbridled retaliation. I could here and now recite to you incidents which would reawaken in you intense memories of wrongs done to our men, women, and children. It would be like rubbing salt into an old wound and every painful sensation would be revived and lived over again. But, were I to do this and leave you so—were I to do this in some selfish desire to pose as a fighter for my people—and present no plan of action to overcome the situation; were I to do this and leave you embittered and angry and without hope to master the circumstances, I would prove myself today a worse enemy to you than any person of any other race could ever be.

The situation of the Negro in America today is a travesty against justice and fair play, and an insult to the vaunted boast of equality and democracy and gives the lie to the claim of Christianity based on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. As bad as is our situation today, it is but small when compared to that faced by our forebears 80 years ago. Every gain we have made and mile we have gone upward during those 80 years were beset with thorns that were thick and keen. Theirs were no beaten, smoothed-out pathways and the road which we face is likewise rocky, but the solution lies in our hands—yours and mine.

God made us men. God made us like all other men—in his own image—whether white or black or yellow or brown or red. God limited us only by the limitations which we place on ourselves. He gave us the capacity and the power to conquer every circumstance or situation in life if we but apply our God-given faculties to the task. Any animal—the dog, the bull, the elephant—when beset can get angry and in his anger destroy himself. But man was given reason, through it he can use the experiences of yesterday to aid and assist in solving the problems of today. He can use the experience and knowledge of men who have gone on before him and have left behind them a record by word of mouth or written, to aid in any present matter. We have the history, the record, the experience of all men of all races to guide our reasoning now. We have the events of the 80 years last past to help us in reaching our conclusions, in outlining our plans and shaping our strategy. We are convinced that the times demand that we quit talking so much about what other people are doing to us and do something for ourselves.

As bad as things may be for us here in this country today, America is still the best place in all the world for our people. I repeat—today America is at war. Its very life is at stake. The preservation of the Nation is the first major concern of every American—black and white alike. There are a lot of Negro-hating, Negro-baiting, Fascist-minded people in this country. I wish they could have been delivered to Hitler over in Germany so that they might have been liquidated at the same time he was. But, America is our country. The Stars and Stripes is our flag. The Constitution is our guaranty of citizenship and we are not going to let anybody inside or outside destroy them or the ideals for which they stand.

Here at home we will use every fit measure at our disposal, commensurate with the proper conduct of the war, to break down every un-American and undemocratic custom and tradition both within the military service and without. But any course of action calculated to destroy the fighting morale of the Negro boy and girl in the service is a distinct disservice to them and to the Nation. Morale—esprit de corps—sustains the soldier in battle. It drives them on when there is not much left except the spirit for the cause. Destroy that and you destroy the aggressive instinct of the soldier. God knows the Negro youth in the service has enough to fight to maintain his fighting morale already without adding to it a negative, quasi patriotic attitude from his own people not in the service. To fight for the country is a responsibility of citizenship. Our youths fight for us and for posterity and they pay the price for our right to enjoy the freedoms, for the right to participate in the fruits of victory and for the right to oppose those who seek to hinder our participation in these benefits.

There are thousands of patriotic, fair-minded white people in this country—North and South—who will stand at our side and fight for the things we are entitled to and deserve. This number will increase by leaps and bounds in proportion as we intelligently use the proper means at our disposal to meet the situation. Any Negro leader or institution whose action, words, and propaganda are calculated to breed racial hatred in the hearts of Negroes against any people because of race is a greater menace, a greater detriment to the group from within, than any outside person could ever be. We cannot win by arraying race against race. We cannot win by engendering and holding hatred against white people because they are white.

You can no longer classify your friends by reason of locale, where they were born or where they live, for today there are ever increasing numbers of men and women in the North and in the South who are determined to see that the Negro is protected in his rights as a citizen. But we can and will win by arraying the right against the wrong and welcoming to our aid all who stand for the right. To invoke the right a person or a people ought to be right. Everybody may be born equal but equality among men ceases as soon as something is required, and citizenship carries with it obligations that are required, as well as its rights to be enjoyed. When one man measures up to what is required and another fails, then equality between them ceases. Observance of law and obedience to the accepted rules of conduct are expected of every person. Those who invoke the protection of law and those who demand observance of the accepted rules of conduct toward themselves can best be heard when they themselves practice toward others that which they seek for themselves. Courtesy, politeness, consideration for other people still constitute the mark of culture and refinement and will open more doors and make more friends for us than all the switchblade knives, pistols and blackjacks made when placed in the hands of unreasoning and irresponsible persons. Boisterousness, uncouth actions and loud-mouthed obscenity on our part are more devastating on the minds of the public than the biased preachments of Negro-hating reactionaries.

The doctrine of white supremacy is fast losing ground. That man is to be pitied

whose only claim to supremacy lies in something over which he has no control—the color of his skin. The world is fast beginning to look to deeds and achievements as the badge of excellence and we must prepare ourselves to meet the requirements. But preparing our individual selves alone will not suffice, we must help and train our less fortunate brothers and sisters to measure up. The people of other groups are too busy trying to train their own young and to shape the thinking of their own people to meet the world's requirements to worry about us. They are not going to come into our homes or into our communities to do missionary work among us. The job of shaping and controlling the thinking and action of our people is our responsibility. It is from this day on a part of your responsibility. We are our brothers' keeper. We are bound together by ties of race and color and blood. What one Negro does, either good or ill, affects the well-being of every other Negro. We of today must accept the challenge and face the responsibilities. You go forth into a world where there are millions who never had the opportunity such as you have here enjoyed.

They are the products of their southern environment. They are ofttimes unlettered and inexperienced in the ways of modern "big city" life. Some can't read or write. Some never had $25 ahead in all their lives. Most have been trained to spend all their weekly earnings on Saturday night. Many will confuse liberty with license. What shall your attitude be? Shall you instruct them in "big city" conduct? Shall you teach them to save their money, to regulate their conduct, to make friends, and observe cleanliness at home and outside, and the many other things that big city life demands of its best citizens? Or shall you leave them alone to shift for themselves and make their way the best they can? If you do, don't blame them if they fail to measure up; for man can only act according to his light. To change the man you have got to change his thinking; give him some new ideas and new ideals. Others may exploit and fool them. It's up to us to aid and assist them. The responsibility is ours.

Many of us have acquired education, money, and influence. Do we regard these as a trust and resolve to use some part thereof to help our less fortunate brothers to measure up to required standards, or do we seek to get away from them and get for ourselves personally the benefits which should be extended to all. Life for the Negro in America is not like that. When the showdown comes we rise or fall together.

We are faced with more opportunities for advancement today than ever before. The war has opened up places in industry and business never before offered to us. We are getting the opportunity for experience and training which 20 years of peace might have failed to bring. The extent to which we shall hold on in the postwar period rests to a great extent upon how well we now make ourselves a part of the business; how well we fit into the industrial pattern, how well we make friends with the boss, the foreman, or forelady, and our fellow workers, whatever race and nationality. To win we must become job minded. We must regard a job as a real treasure to be protected. A job means a living. Carrying chips on our shoulders now—laying off the job now—failure to realize the execution of orders is as necessary to the maintenance of industry as the giving of orders—unseemly behavior and sullen demeanor will do more to put us in the line of the postwar unemployed than any outside influence can because of race.

For you who graduate today the challenge of life is clear. I repeat: Wilberforce has given you her best. That best has prepared you to render a great service to the Nation, to humanity and to God; by using some part thereof to aid, direct and lead your less fortunate brother. Christianity—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—and democracy—the right of all to participate in and enjoy the benefits of government—will be brought much nearer and much more quickly if we proceed fearlessly, unselfishly, and wisely to organize the thinking and shape the conduct of those about us to meet the requirements of present-day community life. Let us make friends where we find them and rally those friends to support our cause. Let us resolve among ourselves to make our children the best behaved, our schools the most orderly, our homes the cleanest, our neighborhoods the safest, our relationship with others the friendliest. With pride in our race, let us meet the challenge to our race and demonstrate to all mankind that race was never ordained to be a limitation on any of God's children.

As we part, I say to you individually: Read, digest, and make of your daily creed the immortal words of Rudyard Kipling:

"If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or being lied about, don't deal in lies,
Or being hated don't give way to hating,
And yet don't look too good, nor talk too wise;
"If you can dream, and not make dreams your master;
If you can think, and not make thoughts your aim;
If you can meet with Triumph and disaster
And treat those two imposters just the same;
If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
And stoop and build 'em up with worn-out tools.

"If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings
And never breathe a word about your loss;
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you
Except the Will which says to them: 'Hold on!'

"If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings, nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a man, my son!"

Hot Potato for Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of June 23, 1945:

HOT POTATO FOR ANDERSON

(By Peter Edson)

When the House of Representatives goes into one of its knock-down, drag-out free-for-alls—as it did Friday in its 7-hour nonstop fight over price control renewal—there isn't a better show in Washington. More bedlam, more wild statements, and millions of words-that-should-be-eaten—with or without ration points—spilled all over the floor.

On nearly every question the argument was split right down the middle aisle, the Republicans favoring amendment of OPA all over the lot, the Democrats favoring continuance of OPA as is for another full year. Less than a dozen Members from either side of the aisle broke over the party line on votes and for once it was almost possible to tell the difference between a Republican and Democrat.

The Republican strategy wasn't to repeal OPA outright. Nothing like that. Nearly every Republican speaker stressed how he was all for price control—but. The buts were that they wanted prices raised.

They didn't say this right out, but through a whole series of amendments intended to compel OPA to guarantee profits or costs of production on manufactured goods, on processed foods, on perishable agricultural commodities in season, and stuff like that.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said all the wisdom was on the Republican side and all the votes were on the Democratic side, and the Democrats did have enough votes to kill off all these amendments until THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, came up with his broadside proposal to transfer all OPA functions except rationing to the Department of Agriculture. When the Republicans caught the Democratic leaders off guard and put that one over 145 to 142, they cheered like wild men.

If the Republicans can make this amendment stick in the Senate, they will put OPA out of business, make life nice for Chester Bowles, and hand to the new Secretary of Agriculture, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, the hottest potato in the United States today.

Just how good a long-range political issue the Republicans have got hold of in their opposition to OPA is hard to measure. What the Republicans have seized on is the current dissatisfaction of producers and distributors who aren't allowed to make more money—of consumers who can't buy everything they want. The Republican urge is to meet this dissatisfaction by easing up on OPA controls so that suppliers will have added money incentive to make more goods available to the demanders who have the money to spend.

The political danger of this is that when you give an inch you have to let go a mile. If the Republicans should succeed in breaking price controls, there would be an immediate loud demand that wages would have to go up to meet the higher prices. To carry through and make the most of their initial victory, the Republicans would then have to land their support to breaking the Little Steel formula.

That might gain the Republicans some of the labor support they have lost in the last 12 years. On the other hand, broken price control plus broken wage control adds up to only one thing—inflation.

If the Republican Party should become known as the party that started the United States on the road to inflation, the GOP would be worse off than it has ever been, and it wouldn't have a chance in 1948.

Viewed that way, the Republican strategy may be extremely short-sighted.

Racial and Religious Tolerance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me I insert excerpts from a radio discussion on Racial and Religious Tolerance, participating in which were the Honorable Charles Fahy, Solicitor General of the United States; Mr. Phil Pearl, representing the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Joyce O'Hara, representing the United States Chamber of Commerce; and Mr. Paul Sifton, representing the National Farmers Union, who have given this subject their unbiased and unprejudicial study and consideration.

I commend a reading of this discussion by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The excerpts from the discussion follow:

Mr. FAHY. Intolerance is condemned by the immortal words of those who established our Nation. The Constitution provides:

"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

The very first amendment to the Constitution, adopted in 1791, reemphasizes and broadens this principle of tolerance:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Further back in our history the Declaration of Independence condemned intolerance by stating as a self-evident truth, "All men are created equal," endowed—not by man or by government—but by "their Creator" with the right to life and liberty, and to the "pursuit of happiness." Here in imperishable words are stated the simple and profound truths of the relationship of men to one another—equality in creation and endowment of each, regardless of race, color, religion, position or means, with the same basic rights. Because of circumstances men do not in all respects resemble one another; there are differences of race, color and religion, and of character and capacity. Our forefathers were conscious of this; the equality they recognized and proclaimed was more fundamental. It rests upon the common brotherhood of men as children of God, by whom each is endowed with equality of rights. No one, therefore, may in justice deprive another of this endowment. The Declaration of Independence states that governments are created to secure these rights. They are not granted by government; they are "endowed by the Creator," to use the old words again; and government is their protector. Each one of us must also be their protector and shield ourselves from thoughts and deeds of intolerance.

The convictions of those who in courage and suffering placed our Nation on the high road to its great destiny demonstrate that intolerance is at war with the basic principles of our national existence. America's outlook upon all men is controlled not by fear and pride which is at the root of intolerance; we are guided by a confident recognition that justice in an orderly society, local, national, or international, must rest upon the principles which lie at the very foundation of our own lives in America. It is through them that we have been able to grow in that freedom and strength now again putting an end to the oppression and persecution due to intolerance.

There is even higher authority than our own great documents of government, an authority to which those documents themselves refer. Today is peculiarly one on which to emphasize this higher authority. It is Easter Sunday. Hundreds of millions of people everywhere remember the words which on the first Easter heralded the greatest of all conquests: "He is risen." This was a conquest of charity, the antithesis of intolerance. He who on Good Friday had opened wide His arms to embrace in suffering all mankind, fulfilled in the Resurrection the promise of peace to all who would embrace Him. This complete charity is the answer to intolerance, the enemy of mankind that never has and never will bring peace. It was at the roots of this mad war.

We must not think in the abstract of the great principles of our Nation and of the great teachings of Easter. They need daily application in our habits of thought and in our conduct; because the inescapable condition of individual growth is charity, and all growth in the final analysis must be in individual men and women.

Mr. PEARL. As you have just said, Mr. Fahy, intolerance is at the very root of this war. By the same token, victory in this war must be regarded as victory over the forces of hate and intolerance. But how are we going to consolidate that victory, even right here in our own country where racial and religious discrimination are still widespread?

One method is legislation, such as the proposed anti-poll tax bill and the bill for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. Do you think, Mr. O'Hara, that such legislation will do the trick?

Mr. O'HARA. I have no objection to legislation. I know sincere men differ on the question, but I am more concerned really with what is in the hearts and the minds of men rather than the type of statutes we have on our law books to curb and get rid of intolerance.

Wherever we erect barriers on the grounds of race or religion, or of occupational or professional status, we hamper the full expression of our economic society, and I for one believe firmly that intolerance is destructive and produces no wealth. I don't believe that legislation alone will do the trick.

Mr. SIFTON. Mr. Pearl, on that same question, the Farmers Union doesn't believe that the two methods are exclusive. They can go together. They must go together. We feel, in the Farmers Union, very deeply on the question of tolerance and freedom from discrimination and equality of opportunity. We are for parity of opportunity between farm and city people and within agriculture, and for justice among nations.

We are definitely for the principle of a Fair Employment Practices Committee and for the anti-poll-tax bill, along with the other steps that Mr. Fahy has so plainly stated in his opening statement.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, June 14, after I had stated that notwithstanding the requests of the late President Roosevelt and President Truman for a rule to provide for the consideration of the Fair Employment Practice Commission measure (H. R. 2232), on which the Committee on Rules refused to grant a rule, I announced and stated that I felt in honor bound to sign the discharge petition on the Speaker's table. Shortly thereafter the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] stated that my appeal urging the signing of the petition by other Members would not bring about additional signatures. In my statement I appealed to the Republicans because many Democrats have already signed the petition.

Of course, I fully appreciate that my influence with the Republicans is not very great and surely not as great as that of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. The reason, as he himself stated on the floor a few days before, was that the Republicans owed him a debt of gratitude because, as he explained, he aided them materially in defeating the real, honest soldiers' vote bill and with their aid succeeded in passing his bill which deprived 70 percent of the most deserving American citizens—those in our armed forces—of the privilege under the Constitution of casting their votes. The underlying reasons for this cooperative action on the part of the Republicans was that the vast majority of the members of our armed forces would have voted, if not deprived of that right, for the reelection of President Roosevelt and Democratic candidates for Congress. However, the services which the gentleman from Mississippi rendered did not accomplish the aims that the Republicans anticipated because, notwithstanding that the gentleman succeeded in preventing over 7,000,000 of the members of our armed forces from casting their votes, President Roosevelt was reelected and the Democrats elected a majority of Democrats to Congress. Had not the great services of President Roosevelt been so properly appreciated by the voters the action of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] might have brought about the election of a majority of Republican Members to the House of Representatives. But I have observed that notwithstanding his appeal to the Republicans they have not voted as they frequently did except when they felt that it would aid the cause of the Republican Party. Yes; the gentleman from Mississippi has a right to expect greater support from the Republicans that I can possibly expect, being a progressive Democrat and having consistently supported the policies of the late President Roosevelt, and I shall continue to support the policies and recommendations of our present President Truman to the fullest extent of my ability because he, too, like our late President Roosevelt, has the interests of the masses of the people at heart.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], in an effort to rehabilitate himself with the servicemen and servicewomen, whom he deprived of their votes, has introduced a bill that would prevent all ex-members of our armed forces from joining a union. Does he not know and realize that a vast majority of our servicemen are members or the sons of members of various unions and labor organ-

izations that have done so much to improve the conditions of American wage earners?

Mr. Speaker, it appears from the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi that he distrusts President Truman when he says that a little group set up here in Washington would destroy constitutional government and would adversely affect business and the farmers. The Fair Employment Practice Committee has functioned for 4 or 5 years, and no one has been injured; in fact, commerce and agriculture has not complained because they have enjoyed greater freedom and prosperity than ever before in the history of our country—including the gentleman's own State of Mississippi.

During my years of service in the House of Representatives, I have observed from time to time a few of the Members who have shown similar prejudiced views on some legislation as those exhibited by the gentleman from Mississippi; but in the course of a few years of service in Congress I have noticed that their views have changed and they have become less prejudiced. I am, therefore, hopeful that this change in viewpoint on labor and other matters may happen to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD four articles written by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, published in the June 1945 issue of the Free World.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATORS DISCUSS SAN FRANCISCO

(How important are the results of San Francisco to the cause of establishing an enduring peace between the nations? Have the conversations of international delegates there been successful, or did strife over minor problems cloud the main objectives? What is America's role in maintaining the function of world organization? These questions are here discussed and placed in their historical setting by two Republican and two Democratic Senators.)

I

(By CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, Florida)

Despite sobering difficulties that have arisen, I am confident that our delegates and the delegates of the other United Nations at San Francisco will successfully accomplish their main task of setting up the basic pattern and machinery for the world security organization. The suffering, the devotion, and the will to peace of the people all over the world will brook no less. And the delegates cannot falter.

But the machinery set up at San Francisco is not an end in itself; it is the means to that end of lasting peace for which we and our allies have fought in Africa and Europe and are fighting now in Asia and the islands of the Pacific. The work of San Francisco will not be completed, then, until we have waged two other struggles.

First, we must secure Senate approval of the machinery established at San Francisco. Second, and even more important, we must make sure that the machinery of peace will be made to work effectively by the concerted will and continued unity of the great powers.

We cannot relax our efforts or diminish our vigilance if we are to secure the required two-thirds approval of the peace machinery in the Senate. Due, perhaps, to the grave problems that have arisen, some observers consider this approval difficult of attainment today. On the other hand, the manner in which some of these perplexing questions have been handled at San Francisco seems to some observers to increase the chances of Senate approval.

We need to understand these problems, and to probe the difficulties that arose. To gloss them over, to ignore them, or to view them with easy optimism or even easier prejudice, would weaken our own efforts to establish the peace organization, and would strengthen those enemies of international organization who have already exaggerated the tensions and belittled the positive accomplishments of the Conference.

In seeking the source of these difficulties we are handicapped by our distance from the Conference—a barrier which has not been diminished by the often highly colored and ill-tempered accounts found in many sections of the press. In this connection we should be grateful to the realistic reporting of such observers as Walter Lippmann and the staffs of the Washington Post, the New York Herald Tribune, and the New York Times, to mention but a few. With this limitation, I would say that the root of the problems that arose at San Francisco was two fold. First, there was insufficient allowance made for the grave difficulties that might arise to strain the unity of the great powers as victory in Europe approached. In our enthusiasm at the prospect of victory, we failed to see that the end of hostilities did not automatically insure continued unity, that the antagonisms and fears restrained by the necessity for unity in war were less restrained by the necessity to establish a durable structure of peace.

Second, and I think bound up with the first, we did not deeply appreciate or understand the central role which Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in his great wisdom, sought to have America play for the maintenance of the unity of the powers in peace as in war. Failing to understand fully the central role of America in keeping the concert of powers, we have by that measure failed to diminish the strains produced by the end of the war in Europe.

Differences exaggerated

All of the major problems and difficulties that arose in San Francisco fall into better perspective if we understand what Roosevelt so keenly saw as America's strategic role for the unity of the great powers beyond military victory. Having nothing to fear—save the outbreak of new devastations—and nothing to gain—save lasting peace itself—American power and American dominance must wisely be used to still and abate, not intensify, ancient fears and antagonisms, to conciliate differences and not join in perpetuating or exacerbating them.

The issues fought over in San Francisco are not yet settled, But I think the struggles that took place will increase our understanding, and renew our determination to resume our strategic role in preserving the unity of the powers. Those who do not want the San Francisco Conferenec to succeed in establishing a permanent structure of peace have welcomed and exaggerated the differences that have arisen. They have done their worst to intensify the atmosphere of ill will and suspicion, aiming particularly at embroiling America in artificial struggles with the Soviet Union, today's favorite international whipping boy. I might remind you that yesterday many of these same people were exaggerating our differences with Britain, just as tomorrow they will seize upon any difference to decry the possibility of establishing an international organization based on the agreement of the great powers.

It will be no easy matter to overcome a tendency toward disillusionment and defeatism spread with calculation by the enemies of international organization. I think we should be grateful to the more responsible observers of the Conference for helping us to a realistic appraisal of the Conference and its dangers. For only a realistic facing of the dangers will prevent the success of cynicism which is a more insidious and dangerous barrier to American participation in a world organization than outright opposition.

It will be easier to fight those who openly oppose the world organization than the spreaders of gloom and disillusion we shall find in Congress, in the press, on the radio, using every means to break up the unity that made military victory possible and that can make the world peace machinery work.

As citizens, our task is to preserve and strengthen that unity of the great powers which Franklin Roosevelt sought to the tragic end of his days, and which alone can make for enduring peace. I am confident that as he quietly but firmly takes over the reins of foreign policy, President Harry S. Truman will use the great power and prestige of America to maintain that unity and to resist every effort to destroy it.

II. WE CAN DISCOUNT THE SKEPTICS

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, Vermont)

As I write this, delegates from nearly 50 nations are meeting at San Francisco to establish an international organization for the promotion of peace and economic well-being for the peoples of the world. They have met to determine the form and the powers of the organization which will free the people of all nations from periodic wars and unbalanced economies.

As I follow the deliberations of the San Francisco Conference, I think back to that memorable Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1789. During those weeks while the delegates of the Thirteen Colonies were working out the vast series of compromises which is still the framework of our Federal Government, there must have been times when it appeared as though there never could be a meeting of the minds between the followers of Jefferson and the followers of Hamilton. I have come to the realization that those growing pains bore the same relationship to our strikingly successful system of checks and balances as the differences of the United States, England, Russia, and the smaller powers of Europe and Latin America bear to the future system of world security which will be evolved.

The people of the world demand peace after the unspeakable holocaust of today's war just as earnestly as the people of America demanded an organized government after the chaos of British colonial rule and the American Revolution.

As I watch the variations of opinion become welded into a strong front of civilization against the ravages of war and want, I realize that just as the Constitution itself was the preamble to American political and economic democracy, so will the San Francisco agreement be only the beginning of international collaboration in our political and economic world.

When America first started on the road to freedom and economic security for her people, she enacted a constitution. But fundamental to the success of that Constitution was the Bill of Rights which had to be added before it could be ratified by the requisite number of States and thus make possible not

only political solidarity, but the economic development of manufacture, free trade, and agriculture across the continent. The first 10 amendments to the Constitution meant more to the success of the new government than did the number of Representatives to the Congress or the formula for enacting legislation. Let us not forget the analogy of our own history to the San Francisco Conference and the agreement which will be devised there.

A bill of rights and the promise of economic opportunity and security for all men must either be a part of or quickly follow any charter for political organization that will come out of San Francisco.

Skeptics and scoffers

Let us not be too disturbed at the reports of dissension among the delegates at the Conference, for differences are not only inevitable, but if brought to the forefront now will, in the long run, make for a more stable foundation. There are no obstacles that are insurmountable if the will to overcome them is there. Certainly, no conference of the nations of the world was ever more firmly supported by the people of all nations in their will for peace.

San Francisco has its skeptics and its scoffers. Even while the delegates work earnestly to pave the road to a humane world, there are those who by intemperate speech and action would plant the seeds of suspicion among the nations. The scoffers and the skeptics are not new. Every great movement in the cause of human progress has had to endure them. We cannot expect to escape them now. Their pettiness will be ineffective. The fact that men and women of nearly all nations and races, supported by the will of their people, have worked for weeks to write the formula for world peace and security is of itself one of the most outstanding events of history.

I believe that out of San Francisco will come, not the perfect Charter for world organization, but one which will more nearly meet the needs of humanity than we have had before and which will take us a long way toward a tangible realization of the principles for which 60,000,000 dead and wounded of two World Wars have made their sacrifice.

III. THE WORLD WANTS MORE DEMOCRACY

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, Democrat, Utah)

Anyone who needs to be convinced concerning the necessity of world organization and the historic importance of the San Francisco Conference, should do what I have just done; go to Europe and witness with his own eyes the ravages that war and fascism have wrought on a great portion of humanity. Until one sees the atrocities committed by the Nazis one cannot realize the horror of the régime which was established in Germany. Nor can one adequately measure the great danger we ourselves have escaped.

There is no doubt in my mind that had the Nazi régime succeeded in Europe, and had it crushed both Britain and Russia, its next objective would have been the United States. The Nazis would have planned the invasion of our soil with all the science and modern technique necessary for a successful operation against us. Had they succeeded in invading our country they would have treated us exactly as they treated the peoples of Europe.

When I turn my eyes to the San Francisco Conference and to all other international agreements now being discussed, I do so having fully in mind these perils which we escaped. It is my definite conviction that the unity of the big powers is the most effective first step to be taken for the maintenance of the peace. As long as the big powers hold together and work together in unity, peace will be effective. Of course, there will always be little problems and frictions to deal with, a boundary problem here and there—but if the people and the governments of the great powers are decided to solve these problems by common understanding, none of them can become a major danger to the peace of the world.

As a matter of fact, there are two methods which present themselves to humanity. One is the method of cooperation. That means that the member states of the United Nations work together in all fields, economically, intellectually, industrially, politically. If any problem arises, their representatives sit together in the United Nations Conference or international organization to discuss the problem and recommend the measures necessary to avoid dangerous implications. Their cooperation must be extended not only to the field of prevention of war but also to that of work on positive problems, particularly in the economic field.

I submit that economic isolationism is as much out of date as military or political isolationism. Neither our country nor any other country can hope to maintain the peace or its independence by itself. No country can reasonably hope, over a long period of time, to maintain economic prosperity and full employment without full cooperation of the others. Right now the world needs economic cooperation as badly as we needed military cooperation during the war. That is why I am particularly happy that at San Francisco the Social and Economic Council has been given so much prominence, and that it really looks likely that that body will emerge as one of the major instruments of international cooperation.

The alternative

The only other alternative is the method of ruthless distrust, of limited armaments and of preparation for World War III.

I just cannot believe that any sensible human being will hesitate to choose between the two methods. I think that at San Francisco it has been clearly demonstrated that despite all its difficulties humanity can and must work in harmony.

Let me repeat, a world of peace is not a world of bliss. There will be clashes of interests; there will be great discussions; there will be common talk; and there will be plenty of side-taking on the part of writers, partisans, propagandists, and even advantage-takers.

The people of the world should realize that the fundamental suggestions for international organization are based upon the theory of consultation, deliberation, and discussion; all of which add up to the simple word, talk. If you are afraid of those clashes you cannot have democratic procedures. For an American to be fearful of those aspects of the processes of democracy merely means that that American has paid no attention to his own history. Judging from our own experience, America is always in a state of turmoil.

World peace is the important objective. The technique of how it can be maintained is equally important. Surely no one wants to solve all of the world's problems at one sitting. Whenever I am discouraged about the movement of great causes throughout the earth I read our own history. The fundamentals underlying the American Revolution are fundamentals which utlimately must have universal application. The American Revolution is still in process of fulfillment. The world, I am sure, likes what we have done so far and wants more of liberty, representation, democracy, and federal type institutions. They are coming but they will not come by flat.

IV. A MILESTONE TO PEACE

(By H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, New Jersey)

The San Francisco Conference, in my judgment, will go down in history as a most important milestone on the road to peace. Its importance can only be appreciated if we realize that it is but one more of a succession of milestones on that same road. The principal danger in looking at the results attained at San Francisco is in the assumption that some final, grandiose, over-all plan for preserving the peace of the world must come out of this Conference.

In our own United States we have seen, during the last few years, the evolution of a strong national conviction. We have moved from hesitation and doubt as to the wisdom and safety of our cooperation in some form of world organization for the preservation of the peace to a deep national conviction, which is Nation-wide, that this is very definitely the way ahead for us.

In arriving at this conviction, and in the development and strengthening of it, there has been a succession of steps. The Republican Party, at Mackinac Island in 1943, issued a striking statement on foreign policy. Coming as it did from the Republican leadership of the country, it made an important contribution. Shortly afterward there followed the Fulbright resolution in the House of Representatives and the Connally resolution in the Senate, both passed by overwhelming bipartisan votes. This was at about the same time that Secretary Hull participated for the United States in the Moscow Agreements by which the United States, Great Britain, and Russia undertook to collaborate in a world organization to preserve the future peace. The political conventions of both the Republican and Democratic Parties of 1944 reaffirmed the same principle. In the fall of 1944 and following the conventions, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference was held, and thereafter the Yalta Conference, the Mexican Conference at Chapultepec, and now the United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

If we can look upon this succession of events as milestones on the road that we are traveling, and bear in mind that no one of these milestones is a final destination, we can get the right perspective of the entire movement. This perspective will make us realize that what we are seeking is not final perfection this early in our gropings for a new world, but rather progress. Yalta was a very distinct milestone in this progress with all its limitations and with all its subsequent misunderstandings. There are real difficulties at San Francisco, as we see from the daily papers, and there will be more difficulties before that important Conference adjourns. But I predict, without fear of contradiction, that San Francisco will be another and significant milestone and will take us far along the road on which we are traveling. Let me repeat that we must not expect perfection from San Francisco, but we can expect progress, and let us rejoice as that progress is made.

As I try to see the whole picture and use a telescope for vision rather than a microscope to find the difficulties and shortcomings, I see an enormous advance in world collaboration from the very fact that we have representatives of 49 nations sitting around the table and discussing those differences which in the past have divided peoples and been the cause of conflict and war. But in addition to discussing the causes of past conflicts and wars, these same nations are thinking in terms of the uniting forces in the world and what can be done to bring the world together in the future with increasing opportunities for all peoples and the protection of small states as well as minorities within states.

Importance of unity

Of course, we are faced with the stark fact that some nations of the world are powerful and large, and some are weak and small. We know that the force and power of the world at the present moment is concentrated in our own country, in Great Britain, and in Russia. If we are realists, we are aware

that the peace of the world must be preserved by these nations acting as trustees for all the other nations pending such time as we can set up an effective and practical organization to preserve the peace. And we must realize that the unity of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, to which must be added France and China, as the five great powers, must be preserved if we are to prevent another conflagration.

Technically, the so-called veto power on the Security Council is a troublesome problem and from an organization standpoint it may be argued that it is fundamentally unsound. From a practical standpoint, however, the important thing is to preserve the solidarity of the five great powers in guarding the peace of the world, recognizing that irrespective of the technical veto question, the defection of any one of these great powers could very well precipitate world war III and destroy the whole structure. I can envisage a situation arising in our own Western Hemisphere where, because of the Act of Chapultepec, we would feel that the Western Hemisphere group was competent to handle the situation. Under such circumstances we might be glad to veto the participaton of the world-wide Security Council in this Western Hemisphere problem. The solution to all these problems must evolve from experience—from the trial and error method—maintaining all the while the main structure and experimenting with the best ways to preserve the peace in the different regions of the world.

There has been much talk about an international bill of rights being incorporated in the San Francisco agreements. I hope sincerely that a start may be made in this direction, but there again we must realize that we are dealing with peoples who have been widely separated geographically, by language, by racial traditions, and prejudices, and, above all, by diverse ideologies and religions. The minds of western Europe and the Americas function differently from the minds of central Europe, the Near East, central Asia, and the Far East. Because we Anglo-Saxons think that certain standards of conduct are right, it does not necessarily follow that these other minds will have the same conception of right, and it certainly would not be right for us to try to impose our definitions on others.

It does seem to me, however, and I hope the San Francisco agreements will reflect this idea, that we can find a universal common ground if we can think of freedom in its largest sense as the absence of physical control of an individual or group of individuals over the destinies of other individuals or groups; if we can think of the right of those who are governed to select those who are to govern them; and above all, if we can think of the principle of equality of opportunity as a fundamental right of both individuals and nations.

If we could grasp these simple conceptions of freedom and equality of opportunity, it seems to me that we would have a new vision of what we mean when we oppose discriminations because of race, creed, or color; when we fight prejudices or persecutions because of race, creed, or color; what we mean by the establishment of justice through the rule of law; what we mean when we look forward eagerly to the flowering of an ultimate human brotherhood of understanding and tolerance. These principles are vital. Only if the machinery of the charter of peace has life and a soul can peace be permanent and lasting.

By the hard road of suffering, the United States sees now that it can no longer live alone and should no longer live alone. We will emerge from this war the most powerful and influential nation in the world. We cannot, if we would, ignore the responsibilities of leadership that will be ours. Nor can we morally ignore the obligations that will be thrust upon us.

We must not become discouraged or look backward. We must courageously look forward to the victory of human freedom and to the setting up of a world organization to preserve that freedom. For, after all, freedom is the condition of peace.

We must hold to our faith—faith that these things can be done—faith in America—faith in our United States Constitution—faith in ourselves as Americans—faith in our fellow men and in the ultimate goodness of the people who comprise the peace-loving nations.

And finally, faith in the God of our fathers who guided our early destinies and who will guide us today in this hour of our great responsibility and opportunity.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on June 20 last, there was introduced in the Senate S. 1171, the so-called Federal labor-relations bill. The bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. It should be discussed by the public. On Sunday, June 24, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who are the authors of the bill, and Mr. Donald R. Richberg, chairman of the committee which helped to draft the bill, discussed the bill on the radio over Stations WJR, of Detroit, and WGAR, of Cleveland. I believe that their views will be of interest to the Senate and the public, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to insert their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the radio addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL A. HATCH

The new Federal Labor Relations Act is an effort on the part of its sponsors to write into the law of the land requirements concerning the peaceful settlement of so-called labor disputes. It is neither extreme nor partisan in any of its terms. It recognizes the age-old principle that any relationship of human life which is caused, brought about or which exists through duress, fear, force, coercion or violence of any kind is bad and cannot long endure. It also recognizes that to obviate the use of such evil methods and they are evil, no matter which side engages in them, there must be some adequate and efficient substitute to take their place. Providing such a substitute is the sole aim of the bill we introduced last week.

The new Board will supplant the present National Labor Relations Board. Its functions will apply generally to all such controversies rightfully within the province of Federal legislation, with a few exceptions which are named in the measure. It is intended to be comprehensive in its terms. Because its duties will include conciliation, the present conciliat service is removed from the department of labor, thus avoiding duplication and division of duty and responsibility.

The act specifically recognizes the duty and right of collective bargaining. It requires both management and labor to exert "every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning wages, hours, and conditions of employment," to avoid controversies and to provide the means for peaceful settlement when disputes do exist. For peaceful settlement various steps are provided in the bill. First, when a difficulty arises the measure makes it the duty of employees and employers to arrange conferences between the groups which differ, and to exert every effort to settle the controvery expeditiously through such conferences. If the conferences fail the Board then follows other settlement proceedure set up in the bill. The proceedures are of different types and can only be mentioned now. Those disputes which arise over representation are to be decided by a free election with a secret ballot. The election is to be "impartially conducted under the control of the Board."

For the settlement of controversies relating to the making or the maintaining of an agreement, the Board must first use its best efforts by conference, mediation, and conciliation to bring the parties into understanding and agreement. If such efforts fail the Board must endeavor to obtain agreement by the parties to submit the matter to voluntary arbitration under the arbitration proceedure provided for in the bill.

If all such methods fail to bring the parties into agreement, and if the controversy is one which threatens to result in substantial interruption of commerce, or if the public interest requires, a special fact-finding commission may be created, in some instances by the Board, in others by the President of the United States. Persons appointed to that commission must have no private or prejudicial interest in either the employers or the employees concerned. The commission must act promptly, make its investigation, and report within 30 days from the date it was created.

This barest of outlines reveals the following steps proposed in the new bill: First, conferences; second, conciliation and mediation; third, adjustment and voluntary arbitration; fourth, the special fact-finding commission. It should be said that during all these phases of peaceful adjustment or attempts therefor, neither party can take any unilateral, arbitrary, or coercive step. Frankly this means that until every peaceful method has been exhausted all coercive measures, lockouts, strikes, or other compulsory processes are prohibited. However, when such peaceful steps have been exhaused the right to strike is preserved. But it is our confident belief the right to use coercive measures will rarely if ever be necessary. By the procedures provided for in this bill law and justice can be made to prevail over force and injustice; a rule of order can be substituted for the rule of disorder.

One settlement method has not been mentioned. It applies in only a limited number of cases. That with some other features of the bill will be explained by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], whom I now gladly present to you.

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

The most important consideration in any law is its fairness. It is our purpose to make this law fully fair to labor, management, and the public. If it is not so, it should be made so.

I present three provisions of the bill. They relate to: Arbitration, jurisdiction, and the election of bargaining representatives.

First arbitration. There are two kinds of issues arising out of controversies involving labor agreements. The first are those which arise from then existing labor agreements. The second are those which arise in the very making of the terms of new labor agreements.

The first controversies are in the nature of alleged breaches of contract. In our bill they are called "grievances." The bill deals with them through adjustment boards

which are authorized to make binding awards. If the parties themselves fail to establish adjustment boards, the Federal Board may do so. These boards are to consist of an equal number of representatives, not less than two being designated by each party and an impartial chairman being appointed by the Federal Board. This procedure amounts to simplified litigation. The awards are enforceable through the Federal District Courts. There can be little doubt as to the acceptability of this established procedure.

The second class of cases relate to the making of new labor agreements or the amendment of existing labor agreements so as to establish new rights for the respective parties under them. Such cases present a different kind of issue. The freedom of the bargaining power of the parties must be preserved to the utmost limit consistent with the public welfare. Long experience, however, has demonstrated that the public welfare does require some limitations on the complete freedom of procedure by the parties. This is true in many cases in time of war and in certain types of cases even in time of peace. It is the obligation of Congress to define those limits in the public interest and with fairness to all concerned. If this is done justly and fairly, it should provide a welcome relief of the parties to such cases from an extremely difficult obligation on their part to determine these limitations at a critical moment when not only the public welfare but their personal interests are involved.

With a view to clearly preserving the rights of the individual to a full freedom of action consistent with the public welfare, the right of an individual employee to quit his labor or service or to withdraw from his place of employment is kept expressly and completely free. Similarly, the right to strike is restricted much as is done under the Railway Labor Act to the extent, but only to the extent, that the nature of the work in which the employee has engaged is clearly subject to important public obligations affecting the health, safety, or welfare of the community.

In its attempt to define this area where the public interest requires primary consideration, this bill proposes that after the exhaustion of proceedings by negotiation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration, the Board may find that the controversy threatens to result in such a substantial interruption of commerce as to make it necessary or desirable in the public interest to create, or to request the President to create, a special fact-finding commission.

The bill then also provides in the words of section 11 that in such a case the Board shall also determine "whether it is necessary, in protection of the public interest, to require the parties to accept temporarily a compulsory settlement of their labor relations controversy so as to avoid any interruption to the supply of a commodity or to a service on which the community affected is so dependent that severe hardship would be inflicted on a substantial number of persons by either a brief or prolonged deprivation of such commodity or service." The bill then refers to public utility service, the supply of essential food such as milk or the supply of an essential fuel such coal or oil as illustrative of the kind of cases which might come within this provision. In cases where such a finding of public concern is made then the settlement made by the especially appointed fact-finding commission shall be binding for the period stated in the award which normally shall be 1 year but in no instance shall be longer than 2 years.

As to jurisdiction, the bill limits itself to Federal cases and expressly excludes local controversies or those arising out of employment of State or Federal Governments or agencies, employment by an employer of less than 20 employees unless a substantial interruption of commerce is threatened, employment in agriculture or domestic service or by a labor organization or covered by the Railway Labor Act.

Controversies as to the election of bargaining representatives are to be handled directly through certifications of the results of the election; these certifications to be made by the Federal Board subject to jurisdictional review.

The bill expressly separates prosecutions for unfair labor practices from the settlement of contractual or election controversies. Senator BALL, of Minnesota, will discuss the provisions of the bill relating to unfair labor practices.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

Thank you, Senator BURTON. Title II of the labor peace bill sets up an Unfair Labor Practices Tribunal to hear and decide complaints of unfair-labor practices. The tribunal would consist of three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Its procedures in hearing complaints and enforcing its decisions through the Federal courts would be the same as those now used by the NLRB.

Section 7 of the present National Labor Relations Act which guarantees employees the right to organize and bargain collectively, would remain unchanged, but the unfair-labor practices defined in section 8 of the present law would be rewritten.

Every unfair-labor practice as it applies to employers and protects employees would remain exactly as it now is in the law, but the same protection would be extended to employers. For instance, the new clause on bribery would define as an unfair-labor practice, I quote:

"Bribing or otherwise paying or rewarding secretly or improperly any associate or representative of the other party."

In addition, two new unfair-labor practices are added. One would be "participating in any cessation, interruption, or variation of employment relations in violation of an existing written agreement, or of the provisions of title I of the Federal Industrial Relations Act (described by Senators HATCH and BURTON), or of any other legal requirement." Again the law would apply equally to both employers and employees.

The other new clause would make it an unfair-labor practice to interfere with management by interrupting, disorganizing or delaying production in order to force immediate adjustments of grievances or to prevent enforcement of reasonable management policies. It is provided that the right of employees to make suggestions to management on managerial policies shall be recognized. Obviously, management must be free in its own field or our system will collapse and this provision is to prevent overzealous unions from encroaching on this field.

The other major change in the present law relates to the closed shop. One of the present unfair-labor practices makes it illegal for an employer to discriminate in hiring between union and nonunion members. This would outlaw the closed shop completely except for a proviso which makes such a closed shop agreement legal if entered into voluntarily by an employer and a labor organization.

Our bill would rewrite that proviso to make a closed-shop agreement legal, I quote "unless the Tribunal, acting on complaint or on its own volition, finds that such labor organization is violating one or more of the following requirements: First, that the labor organization shall be the freely chosen representative of, and includes in its membership, at least 75 percent of the employees covered or proposed to be covered by such an agreement; second, that the agreement shall be ratified by at least 60 percent all such employees so covered as evidenced by a vote cast by secret ballot; third, that any person employed or seeking employment by said employer shall be admitted to membership in such labor organization on terms and with advantages substantially equivalent to those available to and enjoyed by at least a majority of the existing membership; and, fourth, that no member of such labor organization shall be deprived of membership, thereby losing his employment, except on written charges and after a fair hearing," close quotes.

A closed-shop contract, in unscrupulous hands, can become the instrument of monopoly, depriving individuals of their equal rights and job opportunities. With our Government generally committed to a full employment program, it cannot permit those job opportunities to be controlled and doled out by unions holding closed-shop contracts. That would be a travesty on justice and democracy. Yet the closed-shop contract is deeply imbedded in our labor relations structure and to tear it out completely would create chaos. We have chosen in this bill a middle path, simply requiring that where a union enjoys a closed-shop contract, it must be an open union, with membership available to all on reasonable terms, and the contract must be approved by a substantial majority of the employees covered by it. We think that is a fair and reasonable solution.

And now may I introduce the chairman of the volunteer committee of public-spirited citizens who devoted more than a year to the preliminary work on this bill. He is Donald R. Richberg, Washington attorney, well known for his work in this field. Mr. Richberg.

STATEMENT OF DONALD RICHBERG

I intend very briefly to show how mistaken some labor leaders have been in their hasty criticisms of this proposed law.

They have said that it changes the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which I helped to write and which protects labor from unfair injunctions. This is not true.

The proposed law simply provides that the Government can obtain an injunction to prevent employers or employees from violating the law. The Supreme Court held long ago that the Norris-LaGuardia Act was not intended to prevent such an injunction. The proposed law does not take away any of the protections of labor against injunctions sought by employers. It only makes it clear that the courts can help the Government to enforce the law. Does anyone dare to argue that the courts should not enforce the law?

These hasty critics also say that the proposed law takes away the protection of labor against unfair practices which are prohibited by the present National Labor Relations Act. This is not true.

Every unfair labor practice which is now forbidden has been forbidden in the proposed law; and the same provision is made for enforcement by a three-man board with the same aid from the Federal courts. In addition the new law would, first define more clearly a larger number of unfair labor practices by employers and then would also prohibit similar practices by employees against employers. For example, if it is made unlawful for an employer to refuse to confer and bargain with his employees, should it not be equally unlawful for employees to refuse to confer and bargain with their employer? If it is made unlawful to restrain employees from exercising their legal rights, should it not be equally unlawful to restrain employers from exercising the same legal rights?

Does anyone dare to argue that the constitutional rights of employees should be protected and the same constitutional rights of employers should be denied protection?

The hasty critics condemn the authors of the proposed law because they did not ask labor leaders to help draft it. But how could

fair-minded men consult labor leaders without also consulting employer associations? And what good would that do? The differences between the parties were well known. The bill drafters included men who had represented and worked with labor organizations for many years. In fact, the bill was drafted with the impartial aid of men who had a total of more than 200 years of experience in labor problems and a composite knowledge of centuries of law-making on this subject. They could not be aided but only hampered by partisan pressure groups. They were trying to write a law to preserve the peace and to protect the public interest.

Did anyone suggest that the commanders of opposing armies should be brought in to write a charter of international peace at San Francisco? The leaders of labor and management who want domestic peace will have a full opportunity to give the Congress a better peace plan than the proposed law. And the leaders who want to go on waging civil war, at the expense of the workers, the consumers and the general public, will have a full opportunity to explain why it is impossible or undesirable to have industrial peace.

Office of War Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me, over the National Broadcasting System, Friday night, June 22.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I suppose that anyone who knows me at all also knows that my answer to the question, "Is the OWI needed?" is a strong "Yes."

From its beginning I have spoken in the Senate, on the radio, and privately on its behalf. More than that, almost since Pearl Harbor Day I have personally participated actively in its overseas work. I know and like and believe in Elmer Davis and I feel the same way about the men and women who work under him. I have seen the Office of War Information in action both through report and studies in my official capacity as a Senator and as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and with my own eyes as a voluntary helper in the fine and effective work it is doing.

But my purpose tonight is not merely to give an endorsement of the OWI, for I don't think that is necessary. President Truman has done that, firmly and crisply, as President Roosevelt did before him. General Marshall has done it. General Eisenhower has done it. General MacArthur has done it. Acting Secretary of State Grew has done it. A host of war correspondents have done it. They combine in saying that OWI is needed and will be needed in the year ahead, both in the Pacific and in Europe.

So my purpose is not just to say that I, too, am for the OWI. It is instead to share with you some of my personal experiences in its work, and to try to explain some of the bigger things of which OWI is a part.

My own experience began late in December 1941. The predecessor of the Overseas Branch of the OWI, which was the Foreign Information Service of the Office of the Coordinator of Information, suggested that I broadcast a shortwave radio message to the people of Japan, telling them frankly what they had done. This was arranged, and was followed by a stream of similar messages which became part of our psychological warfare conducted against Japan. I recall that the first message said that the action of the Japanese war lords in attacking Pearl Harbor was the greatest single act of national suicide in recorded history. That now seems almost prophetic.

Everyone wondered in those early days, I included, whether or not such messages were heard by anyone in Japan and what effect they had. It wasn't very long before the Japanese radio began calling me Japan's enemy No. 2 and warning its people against believing what I said, so we decided the messages were making some impression.

Within a few months similar honors were being paid me by the German radio, for I cooperated in sending messages to Europe as well as to Japan. The Nazis thought me a very bad influence, it seemed, and said so in no uncertain terms.

As time passed, not only psychological warfare on the enemy but information service to neutral countries and to our allies became part of the work of the OWI and I was happy to be able to help in this also, for it ranks in importance with psychological warfare and has an important bearing on our present and future relations with all the nations of the world.

Of course, my own contribution was only a fraction of the work of OWI overseas. Over its 3 years of service it has built up a worldwide service by which newspapers, magazines and radio stations all over the globe tell the story of the United States—what is happening here, what Americans are really like, what we believe and fight for, what we think about war and peace, what our armies and navies are doing—the true story of our country.

In May of 1944, I broadcast nine messages to the world for the OWI on the activities of the International Labor Organization Conference being held then in Philadelphia. It was here that I spoke to the world of the full employment resolution.

Just a month ago, Acting Secretary of State Grew described one phase of this work in a letter which I think is worth quoting. He said in part:

"The Department of State is deeply appreciative of the work done by the Office of War Information in helping to make known to the peoples of other countries the basic objectives and purposes of American foreign policy.

"The Department feels that it is quite as important now that the war is over in Europe as it was during that war, to make the American position known and understood abroad.

"The peoples of many of the European countries are just now emerging from a period of occupation during which they were not only uninformed of American policy and American action, but were actively misled as to both by our enemies. It will require time and patience and hard work to correct the false and misleading conception of the American people and the American purpose disseminated by the Nazis over the years of their occupation of Europe."

In my opinion there is even more to this than what Mr. Grew has described. Two years ago I said in an address that if Adolf Hitler should make a list of the 10 Americans whom he would most like to see destroyed the name of Elmer Davis would be high on the list. I said that not because of Mr. Davis as an individual but because of his direction of the OWI, which is bigger than he is, just as the whole American conduct of the war peace is bigger than OWI. In other words, Mr. Davis and the OWI are all part of something immense, something overwhelming, which is the movement all over the world of men and women and children to learn to know one another and to live together in peace and with an opportunity for abundance.

This war has taught us above all that no individual directs the world and that no organization can control it. We are living in the greatest days of all time, the days when the word civilization begins to take on real meaning—personal meaning for each of us. We live in a world not of countries and rivers and mountains and oceans, but of people, of human beings with basically common hopes and hungers, friendliness and fears, disappointments and dreams. And we have reached the time when the barriers which separate people can be broken down.

We are becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that the world is, in fact, a unit. Nations have recognized that they cannot live alone, and they are preparing to take their place in an organized community, and thus accept their responsibility in relation to their neighbors. The responsibility of the United States in the new world that we are building is great indeed. It is not to build automobiles for Chinese, or make radios for Frenchmen, or supply gasoline to the Alaskan. America's job is greater than, as the phrase goes, playing Santa Claus to the suffering peoples of the world, although we certainly cannot afford to ignore them. America has the sober and noble task of teaching frightened depressed people all over Europe and Asia how to live together in peace and security. We must share with those who have known oppression and advantage-taking masters our heritage of liberty; our concepts of equality of opportunity, of free elections, of freedom of religion, of equality under law. We must help the beaten peoples of the world restore their faith in themselves, and thus their faith in democracy. Americans who realize and appreciate the blessings of their own land know that they can contribute nothing of greater value to the cause of mankind than America's experience in self-government.

Can the OWI accomplish all this? Of course not, not alone at least. The job belongs to all of us, to teachers and writers and statesmen and to the thousands of Americans who, for a little while, make their homes in a foreign land. But the achievements of the past point inevitably to the fact that the OWI can do its share in teaching the American way of life. These are the great things of which the OWI is a part. It does its work, not by preachments and pamphlets and threats, but by information.

Just as in the continuing war against Japan, its psychological warfare activities go hand in hand with our armed forces to bring unconditional surrender, so in the nation no longer at war, its information services aid our occupation forces, our foreign policy, and our work of international cooperation. Words and ideas are more powerful than the most powerful device for killing yet invented. We have seen fit to pour thousands of tons of high explosive purchased at the cost of billions of dollars into the cause of destroying a philosophy of hate and slavery. Thousands and millions of dollars more will be spent before final victory is won. Does it not seem illogical to fail to invest a few thousand dollars in facts and information to help exterminate the last vestage of totalitarianism from the minds of its victims? Indeed, until this is done, America has not met her challenge.

That is why I am for the OWI. That is why Congress must give it the appropriation which President Truman has asked for it in the coming year.

Food Production in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Iowa has long been recognized as the leading food-producing State in the Nation. No similar area in the world has ever been found to equal Iowa in the fertility and productivity of its soil. During this war period, Iowa has made an outstanding contribution to the food supply for our armed forces, for our domestic needs, and for the lend-lease and other foreign food commitments.

I have the official records from the United States Department of Agriculture to support these remarks. Below is a table that shows the cattle and calf production in pounds of live weight for the years from 1939 to 1944, both inclusive. This table shows that 8 to 10 percent of the cattle and calves of the Nation have come from Iowa:

TABLE 1.—*Production of cattle and calves, June 1945*

[Million pounds]

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944 [1]
United States [2]	15,097	15,583	16,719	17,964	18,708	18,997
Alabama	144	141	154	171	189	208
Arizona	124	161	183	168	160	179
Arkansas	192	201	219	222	254	269
California	542	543	561	625	596	652
Colorado	362	363	380	428	484	488
Connecticut	23	24	23	24	27	28
Delaware	7	8	8	10	10	10
Florida	71	73	72	86	112	147
Georgia	104	102	117	127	155	174
Idaho	174	183	204	218	232	244
Illinois	752	861	872	896	835	785
Indiana	437	457	460	473	481	503
Iowa	1,356	1,429	1,627	1,614	1,680	1,661
Kansas	849	852	954	1,158	1,219	1,099
Kentucky	275	272	272	306	321	324
Louisiana	172	169	175	167	188	191
Maine	34	35	33	33	34	37
Maryland	55	55	56	59	61	63
Massachusetts	26	26	26	25	31	32
Michigan	368	378	398	412	418	426
Minnesota	782	827	896	956	989	961
Mississippi	193	175	190	204	225	232
Missouri	705	755	883	940	1,004	1,026
Montana	271	317	349	388	433	495
Nebraska	788	817	864	941	1,020	1,033
Nevada	82	85	87	90	94	98
New Hampshire	18	18	18	17	19	19
New Jersey	33	31	32	32	34	32
New Mexico	276	282	264	279	285	292
New York	358	361	355	367	343	343
North Carolina	84	82	87	91	110	122
North Dakota	303	337	380	431	446	481
Ohio	470	473	487	493	515	525
Oklahoma	599	609	641	751	811	770
Oregon	212	223	256	274	268	292
Pennsylvania	276	276	275	289	302	315
Rhode Island	3	3	3	3	5	5
South Carolina	50	50	54	57	64	69
South Dakoa	405	440	496	551	594	638
Tennessee	239	245	262	270	292	313
Texas	1,347	1,279	1,355	1,471	1,578	1,517
Utah	104	105	112	123	122	129
Vermont	62	63	64	64	67	69
Virginia	164	171	178	182	204	201
Washington	174	175	195	227	227	242
West Virginia	122	120	124	126	129	133
Wisconsin	694	716	797	882	782	845
Wyoming	216	215	221	243	259	280

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Do not agree with totals shown on table 5 due to rounding State figures.

Table No. 2 shows the pork production of the Nation:

TABLE 2.—*Pork production, June 1945*

[Million pounds]

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944 [1]
United States [2]	17,082	17,040	17,475	21,054	25,469	20,784
Alabama	227	184	183	236	303	295
Arizona	10	11	11	14	18	13
Arkansas	274	226	230	269	335	258
California	175	175	182	188	220	175
Colorado	99	92	93	142	203	141
Connecticut	7	6	6	7	9	10
Delaware	9	8	7	9	11	11
Florida	102	96	100	108	122	122
Georgia	342	287	299	355	419	370
Idaho	121	121	121	150	182	119
Illinois	1,706	1,879	1,925	2,216	2,475	2,166
Indiana	1,320	1,410	1,440	1,637	1,774	1,691
Iowa	3,276	3,267	3,555	4,146	4,942	4,033
Kansas	453	427	437	630	848	573
Kentucky	393	354	333	450	533	442
Louisiana	170	140	133	145	184	183
Maine	18	16	15	16	24	24
Maryland	70	67	64	69	87	80
Massachusetts	31	29	26	28	32	32
Michigan	289	315	314	356	408	348
Minnesota	1,273	1,335	1,381	1,616	1,955	1,401
Mississippi	199	154	148	185	236	210
Missouri	1,047	1,111	1,151	1,362	1,624	1,358
Montana	51	57	60	85	131	112
Nebraska	755	648	659	968	1,403	978
Nevada	6	5	5	6	7	7
New Hampshire	5	5	4	5	8	8
New Jersey	27	24	23	29	39	34
New Mexico	21	21	18	27	35	31
New York	83	75	66	81	107	95
North Carolina	259	243	228	266	331	312
North Dakota	172	186	201	298	386	270
Ohio	943	1,071	1,051	1,190	1,344	1,197
Oklahoma	330	268	292	394	477	314
Oregon	86	84	84	97	111	86
Pennsylvania	206	201	179	211	272	239

TABLE 2.—*Pork production, June 1945*—Con.

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Rhode Island	2	2	2	3	3	3
South Carolina	141	123	113	137	161	150
South Dakota	422	410	439	563	790	540
Tennessee	363	335	327	408	492	412
Texas	525	474	454	629	825	613
Utah	31	31	30	42	60	42
Vermont	10	9	8	9	12	12
Virginia	210	195	191	224	287	253
Washington	85	85	82	107	134	104
West Virginia	76	67	62	72	90	81
Wisconsin	639	688	722	840	980	803
Wyoming	23	23	21	29	40	33

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Do not agree with totals shown on table 5 due to rounding State figures.

You will note that Iowa produced about 20 percent of the pork of the Nation during these war years. Without Iowa pork, how much sooner would the meat shortage have been encountered? Without Iowa pork and lard, where would the supply of meat products for the armed forces and for lend-lease have been secured?

Everyone knows why the 1944 production was below that of 1943. Everyone knows that the floor price was jerked from under the hog prices and that pork production was discouraged by the advocates of scarcity.

MUTTON AND LAMB

The following table indicates the mutton and lamb production, in live weight, from 1939 to 1944, both inclusive:

TABLE 3.—*Mutton and lamb production, June 1945*

[Thousands of pounds] [1]

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944 [2]
United States	2,040,699	2,087,037	2,267,056	2,332,259	2,133,546	1,977,762
Alabama	820	820	846	840	910	855
Arizona	26,159	30,670	32,743	30,384	23,996	24,423
Arkansas	2,660	2,685	3,454	3,344	2,917	3,197
California	166,287	150,500	163,610	162,430	141,192	131,713
Colorado	110,880	111,005	116,463	123,776	124,131	107,560
Connecticut	255	180	140	325	205	240
Delaware	110	110	110	110	100	100
Florida	440	355	347	236	209	211
Georgia	315	335	391	277	275	285
Idaho	110,930	114,955	124,690	117,741	105,127	98,002
Illinois	41,925	43,490	46,782	48,990	46,310	41,297
Indiana	43,855	44,620	46,764	46,283	44,184	38,744
Iowa	85,240	92,340	101,075	103,855	103,282	94,249
Kansas	34,650	43,655	52,816	64,312	60,476	56,875
Kentucky	60,915	59,695	64,394	67,109	61,444	55,350
Louisiana	4,370	4,210	4,174	625	1,760	2,676
Maine	1,180	1,200	1,440	1,380	1,425	1,180
Maryland	3,195	3,180	3,330	3,130	2,629	2,325
Massachusetts	195	260	215	210	305	185
Michigan	50,935	54,325	50,465	47,020	40,008	36,812
Minnesota	65,375	71,675	78,506	85,151	82,985	76,354
Mississippi	910	920	1,160	1,128	1,062	983
Missouri	79,813	83,190	91,332	99,865	91,201	82,054
Montana	339,355	153,790	173,510	166,110	154,337	150,363
Nebraska	50,190	45,090	51,250	65,840	69,860	55,343
Nevada	26,765	24,655	25,712	25,106	24,679	18,833
New Hampshire	265	280	315	485	370	355
New Jersey	290	260	330	330	345	420
New Mexico	69,865	70,380	67,586	71,540	53,540	45,785
New York	12,500	13,880	14,560	13,820	13,480	11,340
North Carolina	1,765	1,580	1,723	1,710	1,805	2,215
North Dakota	38,970	46,815	53,603	58,680	53,570	47,931
Ohio	75,220	73,085	74,570	76,176	72,584	62,220
Oklahoma	15,275	15,355	16,825	19,515	20,275	15,471
Oregon	81,181	77,564	82,973	65,549	50,443	50,738
Pennsylvania	13,240	12,605	12,335	13,612	11,161	11,533
Rhode Island	65	130	150	75	80	80
South Carolina	245	200	102	100	190	65
South Dakota	62,405	50,605	94,568	103,307	95,347	75,448
Tennessee	19,175	19,425	22,488	21,743	23,840	23,260
Texas	211,120	236,890	237,494	279,712	231,751	275,015
Utah	87,019	84,583	93,810	92,216	86,237	76,747
Vermont	685	620	570	720	595	560
Virginia	21,800	21,235	21,549	21,135	20,119	19,265
Washington	37,545	36,570	36,472	34,110	27,401	25,353
West Virginia	26,075	23,270	23,987	24,770	22,825	21,025
Wisconsin	19,800	21,115	22,352	23,772	23,914	20,937
Wyoming	138,470	142,680	152,975	143,605	138,665	111,790

[1] Shown in thousands because many States do not produce 1,000,000 pounds.
[2] Preliminary.

Iowa, though the seventh State in total mutton and lamb production, leads all the Midwestern States and its production of mutton and lamb is only exceeded by the larger range States.

EGGS

The following table indicates the egg production of the Nation:

TABLE 4.—*Egg production*

[Million eggs]

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944 [1]
United States	38,843	39,585	41,765	48,331	54,248	57,874
Alabama	529	486	532	633	777	730
Arizona	66	65	62	72	79	72
Arkansas	596	571	593	696	755	802
California	1,661	1,719	1,713	1,909	2,123	2,427
Colorado	322	334	329	420	482	515
Connecticut	342	363	366	421	449	513
Delaware	111	116	115	119	122	132
Florida	198	205	195	211	226	214
Georgia	487	524	509	621	688	703
Idaho	235	240	246	265	301	326
Illinois	2,008	1,932	2,042	2,346	2,642	2,856
Indiana	1,511	1,477	1,542	1,740	1,984	2,041
Iowa	2,739	2,725	2,964	3,613	3,999	4,333
Kansas	1,481	1,467	1,580	1,912	2,170	2,221
Kentucky	847	849	892	1,124	1,288	1,269
Louisiana	311	284	303	349	390	414
Maine	253	273	295	347	404	398
Maryland	368	379	372	400	410	453
Massachusetts	527	571	587	725	830	944
Michigan	1,214	1,287	1,335	1,422	1,517	1,697
Minnesota	1,873	2,063	2,236	2,826	3,477	3,705
Mississippi	466	437	468	546	643	664
Missouri	1,981	2,072	2,171	2,533	2,887	3,052
Montana	182	197	211	236	250	265
Nebraska	1,126	1,129	1,267	1,611	1,858	1,982
Nevada	28	28	31	34	36	41
New Hampshire	234	228	235	280	323	369
New Jersey	764	805	831	924	941	1,018
New Mexico	96	104	108	117	144	152
New York	1,666	1,743	1,810	1,889	2,032	2,172
North Carolina	660	672	715	832	1,007	1,080
North Dakota	324	364	404	534	637	668
Ohio	2,187	2,230	2,351	2,533	2,703	2,858
Oklahoma	983	983	1,103	1,349	1,510	1,668
Oregon	423	432	440	467	497	508
Pennsylvania	2,066	2,062	2,155	2,346	2,611	2,786
Rhode Island	57	63	72	70	72	80
South Carolina	257	254	266	299	328	385
South Dakota	594	595	651	875	988	1,104
Tennessee	785	700	810	970	1,171	1,156
Texas	2,229	2,308	2,430	2,807	3,216	3,475
Utah	256	269	280	300	322	379
Vermont	116	121	126	143	167	181
Virginia	823	867	870	975	1,021	1,062
Washington	767	824	866	866	943	954
West Virginia	422	426	418	481	526	530
Wisconsin	1,594	1,667	1,789	2,052	2,196	2,411
Wyoming	78	75	79	91	106	109

[1] Preliminary.

This table shows that Iowa is not only the leading egg-producing State but that it has a commanding position and produced over 7 percent of the eggs of the Nation during the war period.

In addition to the above remarkable food production record, I wish to call your attention to the fact that Iowa has produced, with Illinois, over 50 percent of the commercial corn and has produced over 6,000,000,000 pounds of milk. It has maintained its position as the second butter-producing State and also its position as the fourth milk-producing State of the Nation.

POULTRY FOR MEAT

The following table indicates production of poultry for meat from 1920 to 1944, both inclusive:

Supplement to table 5

[Million pounds]

	Farm production of chickens (1)	Farm production of turkeys (2)	Production of commercial broilers (3)	Total
1920	1,954	(1)	(1)	1,954
1921	2,111	(1)	(1)	2,111
1922	2,222	(1)	(1)	2,222
1923	2,319	(1)	(1)	2,319
1924	2,306	(1)	(1)	2,306
1925	2,379	(1)	(1)	2,379
1926	2,506	(1)	(1)	2,506
1927	2,608	(1)	(1)	2,608
1928	2,393	(1)	(1)	2,393
1929	2,596	239	(1)	2,835
1930	2,643	228	(1)	2,871
1931	2,457	244	(1)	2,701
1932	2,576	303	(1)	2,879
1933	2,616	319	(1)	2,935
1934	2,215	300	97	2,612
1935	2,313	297	123	2,733
1936	2,410	406	152	2,968
1937	2,042	376	196	2,614
1938	2,185	396	240	2,821
1939	2,338	495	297	3,130
1940	2,092	509	383	2,984
1941	2,477	521	506	3,504
1942	2,807	530	607	3,944
1943	3,410	527	735	4,672
1944	2,665	602	691	3,958

[1] Not available.

TOTALS OF PROTEIN FOOD PRODUCTION

The following table shows the annual production total from 1920 to 1945:

TABLE 5.—*United States production*

Year	Population of United States [1]	Farm production of beef and veal	Farm production of pork	Farm production of mutton and lamb	Farm production of poultry for meat	Farm production of eggs	Farm production of milk
		Mil. lb.	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. eggs*	*Mil. lb.*
1920	105,711	12,403	13,533	926	1,954	29,700	----------
1921	107,375	12,817	14,132	1,146	2,111	30,800	----------
1922	109,040	13,185	16,518	1,080	2,222	33,000	----------
1923	110,705	13,174	17,008	1,253	2,319	35,000	----------
1924	112,370	13,402	15,388	1,459	2,306	34,592	89,240
1925	114,035	12,953	14,168	1,508	2,379	34,969	90,699
1926	115,700	12,605	14,909	1,609	2,506	37,248	93,325
1927	117,364	12,072	16,340	1,664	2,608	38,627	95,172
1928	119,029	12,327	16,189	1,773	2,393	38,659	95,843
1929	121,136	12,754	15,582	1,823	2,835	37,921	98,988
1930	122,423	13,262	15,176	1,965	2,871	39,067	100,153
1931	123,643	13,401	16,541	2,050	2,701	38,532	103,029
1932	124,476	14,191	16,368	1,831	2,879	36,298	103,810
1933	125,223	15,370	16,566	1,863	2,935	35,514	104,762
1934	126,011	14,504	12,386	1,921	2,612	34,429	101,621
1935	126,865	13,651	10,673	1,835	2,733	33,609	101,205
1936	127,720	14,438	12,576	1,849	2,968	34,534	102,410
1937	128,475	13,746	12,506	1,938	2,614	37,564	101,908
1938	129,355	14,047	14,372	2,042	2,821	37,356	105,807
1939	130,406	15,097	17,082	2,041	3,130	38,843	106,792
1940	131,456	15,583	17,043	2,087	2,984	39,585	109,510
1941	132,638	16,718	17,473	2,267	3,504	41,765	115,498
1942	133,953	17,967	21,054	2,332	3,944	48,331	119,240
1943	135,646	18,707	25,470	2,134	4,672	54,248	118,140
1944 [2]	137,368	18,996	20,781	1,978	3,958	57,874	118,952
1945	138,955	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Estimates include armed forces overseas.
[2] Preliminary.

This table shows the remarkable production that the farmers of our Nation have accomplished. We are proud of the leading part that Iowa has taken in this part of the war effort. When one realizes the shortage of manpower, machinery, equipment, and transportation with which these producers have had to contend, we are all the more justified in paying honor to the food producers of our country. I wonder what would be the food situation today if no more attention had been paid to the Tydings amendment the past 3 years than has been paid to it the past 3 months.

It is pointed out too that these are production figures and do not indicate the amount of food available for domestic consumption. We must take into consideration the shipments of food to our armed forces as well as shipments under the lend-lease and the UNRRA. This is, however, another story and another problem.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address against peacetime conscription delivered by Walter H. Uphoff, June 17, 1945, and broadcast from Station WIBA, Madison, Wis.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to discuss with you what I consider the most important legislation affecting the postwar period now before Congress. I have just returned from Washington, D. C., where I testified before CLIFTON WOODRUM'S House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, Wednesday, June 13. This is what I told the committee. (I quote from the statement):

"My name is Walter H. Uphoff. I come from a farm near Oregon, Wis., to add my sentiments and the sentiments of the organization I represent, the Wisconsin Committee Against Peacetime Conscription, to those who have already testified before this committee. I don't know how long the proponents of peacetime conscription could continue with testimony, but I am sure that if the opponents were given a full hearing you would be in session for many months. I am sorry to see only 2 weeks devoted to what we consider the most important change in American policy and tradition proposed for the postwar era. At the conclusion of this statement I would like to file with the committee a number of petitions, asking for delay, signed by Wisconsin citizens from all over the State.

"The Wisconsin Committee Against Peacetime Conscription was organized last December by persons from all walks of life and from all political parties—Republic, Democrat, Progressive, and Socialist—all except the Communists who are (or shall I say were?) ardently espousing peacetime conscription. I don't know whether or not their line has been changed again recently. Among the members on the committee are people like Bishop Schuyler E. Garth, of the Wisconsin Methodist Conference; Father Al-

vin Kuchera, of St. Paul's University Chapel, Madison; Rev. Charles R. Bell, Jr., pastor of the First Baptist Church, Madison; George Haberman, Milwaukee, president of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor; Harry Miller, Chippewa Falls, editor of the Wisconsin Farmers Union News; William T. Evjue, editor of the Capital Times; Morris H. Rubin, editor of the Progressive; Prof. William B. Hesseltine, of the University of Wisconsin history department; Stephen Darling, president of the Appleton Consumers Cooperative, etc. Certainly the list of organizations on record against the adoption of peacetime conscription now is much greater and more representative of American life than is the case with its proponents, who are largely confined to the military and a few college presidents.

"The committee was organized to ask Congress to delay action on peacetime conscription until the war is over, until the peace terms are known and until the millions of men now overseas can return and have a part in making the decision. Peacetime conscription in no way affects the prosecution of this war, so it cannot be argued that it is a military necessity to act hastily on this matter. And let us hope that we can live in peace for at least 5 to 10 years during which period we could more thoroughly and intelligently discuss and decide the question. And if we should be plagued with another war in less time than that, the millions now in uniform will have had military training and a new draft act would undoubtedly be passed to get the younger boys.

"I have three small boys whom I hope will be permitted to grow up and do their part in building a better world, rather than being snatched at the age of 17 or 18 by the Army and taught that war is inevitable, therefore we must prepare to kill and be killed. I want to see them, and youngsters like them all over the world, able to live in peace and freedom.

"I am a farmer. When I plant corn, I know that I am going to harvest a crop of corn, and when you plant the seeds of militarism, you are going to get militarism.

"I am convinced that the common people of all countries hate war and don't want to fight. Yet, when war starts, they find themselves helpless, unable to protest. This winter I had occasion to debate Lt. John Hilger, of the Wisconsin State selective-service headquarters, on the question of peacetime conscription. One of the arguments he advanced was that people didn't want to fight. He stated, as evidence, that he was assigned the auditing of all the records of one local draft board and found that 92 percent claimed physical disability, which to him indicated a warped outlook which could be corrected by the indoctrination provided by peacetime conscription. To me it indicates that the common man doesn't want to fight, yet when drafted he feels helpless and at least 91 percent of the 92 percent who claimed physical disability end up in the Army (if not rejected) and from then on, wear the uniform, shoulder a gun, and go off to war. Is it not likely that, say 80 percent of the German draftees also claimed physical disabilities, yet were inducted and "made to like it"? And that say 70 percent of the Japanese felt the same way, yet once thrown into combat, both sides act on the premise (and rightly so) that it is "kill or be killed," finding themselves in a position where it is not safe to wonder whether the other side might not also prefer to stop fighting?

"We are witnessing in America the development of a situation which I think is a dangerous threat to our democracy. All of us object to having bureaucrats present their work in such a light that the facts are obscured and their work appears indispensable. Yet that is precisely what the big shots in the Army and Navy have been doing in pushing peacetime conscription. Naturally their chances of holding their jobs without reduction in rank and pay are better if they have a large number of men under them. I think it is high time for Congress to call a halt to all the proselyting the Army and Navy have been doing to entrench themselves deeper in American life. Experts should be on tap but not on top. As recipients of our taxpayers' mohey, the military should be our servant, not our master. Congressional committees should be free to consult with Army and Navy heads to get technical advice, but the matter of general peacetime policies for our Nation must be left to the people.

"I challenge the politicians to make the question of peacetime conscription an issue in the 1946 elections. The only fair, decent, and democratic thing to do is just that. Why was it that neither of the two major parties even mentioned the question during the last campaign when bills calling for peacetime conscription had been introduced in Congress and were scheduled for reintroduction in the new Congress? Let's have the issue debated in the 1946 campaign. We have gone so far down the road of war and militarism that it is high time for us to take time out after this war and reevaluate war as a way of settling international disputes. I saw a cartoon some time ago depicting a missionary talking to a group of African cannibals. A cannibal is asking the missionary: 'Is it true, pahson, that in de white man's land they kills mo' people den they can eat?' Hadn't we better take the time and effort to build a genuine international organization and establish just peace terms and avert World War III which undoubtedly will destroy most of civilization? If the committee is going to make any recommendations, let it recommend that conscription be outlawed in all countries as one of the terms of the end of this war, and that there be no privately owned munitions plants anywhere. Then, if war still comes, give the man in uniform $300 a month, and the man working in a defense plant, and the man owning a defense plant $50 a month, and you won't need conscription."

That is what I stated before the committee. No questions were asked and no comments made. There are supposed to be 23 members on the committee. You guess how many attended the hearings. The number ranged between three and six during the 2 days I attended the hearings. I was told that as many as 10 showed up when Josephus Daniels testified against peacetime conscription. If committee members are too busy or too disinterested to attend the committee hearings, will they find the time or take the time to study the testimony presented? I was told that all but 5 or 6 of the 23 members had made up their minds for peacetime conscription before the hearings started. Congressman WOODRUM told me that the majority of the committee were for a strong military program, but did not know how they would line up on the proposed 1 year compulsory training. You see, this committee did not have before it any specific bills but is just supposed to recommend general policies. At some later date the House Military Affairs Committee will begin hearings on specific bills introduced in the House. I hope you will write that committee and your Congressman how you feel about reversing our long-standing tradition of a voluntary Army in peacetime. Write to the House Military Affairs Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Let's look briefly at some of the organizations and groups for and against the adoption of peacetime conscription in wartime. Against such legislation we find all major religious bodies, the Federal Council of Churches, the Bishops and Archbishops of the Catholic Church, the Rabbinical Assembly, all major labor organizations—the AFL, the CIO and the Railway Brotherhoods, all major farm organizations—the National Grange, the Farmers Union and the Farm Bureau. Among educational and civic organizations we find the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Association of American Colleges, the National Educational Association, the American Federation of Teachers, etc.

For the adoption of peacetime conscription in wartime, we find the Army and Navy heads, the heads of the American Legion (I know plenty rank and file Legionnaires who are not for it), the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Yes, there are some individuals for peacetime conscription now, among the organizations against, just as there are people against it among the organizations for it, but it would require an awful lot of stretching to argue that a majority of church people, laborers, farmers, and educational circles favor such legislation now.

I talked with quite a number of Congressmen and Senators (in some instances, their secretaries) about their stand on adopting peacetime conscription in wartime. Both Wisconsin Senators an 9 out of 10 Wisconsin Congressmen (Congressman WASIELEWSKI, of Milwaukee, wouldn't commit himself) are for delaying action until the war is over. Both Senators from Minnesota and from North Dakota are for delay. In all cases I was informed that the great majority of letters received from back home are against peacetime conscription.

Here's a personal experience I had after attending the hearings of the proponents on Thursday afternoon, June 14. H. McAllister Griffiths, secretary of the American Council of Christian Churches, had testified for the legislation. This council is made up of about 20 small religious sects representing nowhere near the number of people that the Federal Council of Churches represents. I happened to overhear a conversation between Griffiths and an army chaplain from the office of Brig. Gen. Luther Miller, Chief of Chaplains. The chaplain told McAllister he was from Miller's office, but didn't give me his name. I heard him tell Griffiths, "We are not supposed to be doing anything to further this legislation, but you get in touch with me—I'd like to meet with your group and work out details so we will be all set if it goes through." Now isn't that a nice way to contravene the spirit of neutrality that is supposed to be maintained? I say, let the people democratically decide American policy on this issue after full discussion of all the implications involved. Let's insist on having candidates in the 1946 campaign state their position on this all-important question. My feeling is that those who are trying to rush the legislation through don't dare face their constituents with the proposition.

Instead of reversing our long tradition against peacetime conscription, let's be realistic and consider seriously the last proposal I made before the Woodrum committee. Let's have a more direct relationship between the pay received and the sacrifice involved. Let's pay the man in uniform a salary to compensate, to some extent, for the risk involved and you'll get voluntary soldiers who like that life, to make a better army than an army of conscript men at low pay (with the exception of the officers).

Help President Truman Make Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-

written guest editorial entitled "Help President Truman Make Good," by John L. Irvin, which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette, of Phoenix, Ariz., on June 2, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP PRESIDENT TRUMAN MAKE GOOD

(By John L. Irvin)

President Truman will need the support of Congress, the press, and divine guidance. When the load was shifted from President Roosevelt's shoulders to his, he humbly and very wisely asked for this help.

President Truman is a bigger man than the public gave him credit for, and has shown that he intends to be President, and not try to appease everyone but make his own decisions.

He had a tremendous responsibility suddenly thrust upon him and should have all possible encouragement and assistance until the treacherous Japs are destroyed and peace established.

He cannot expect his honeymoon to last much longer when the war is won, no matter how good a President he has been. If he is a candidate for election, the sharpshooting will begin, and he will be accused of all kinds of things, no matter whether true or false.

Many false accusations were made against President Roosevelt, some of them by Members of Congress, though he gave his life trying to help humanity, and will always be remembered as one of the greatest men this country has ever produced, while those who criticized him and fought him in and out of Congress will soon be forgotten.

If you are a good American, you will back up President Truman, at least until a lasting world peace is secured; then the politicians may be expected to start their fireworks, especially those who are opposed to reciprocal trade agreements, preferring a high tariff and a full dinner pail, the old, old story; but now the workingmen are more interested in a full gasoline tank, two cars in every garage, and a chicken in every pot, the fulfillment of the Hoover prophecy.

Integrity, Man's Greatest Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD a very able editorial from the Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N. J., commenting on a commencement address at Ithaca College by George E. Stringfellow, a distinguished citizen of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRITY, MAN'S GREATEST ASSET

In a commencement address at Ithaca College recently George E. Stringfellow, one of New Jersey's most distinguished citizens, discussed integrity as man's greatest asset. In a world of rapid change, torn by the ravages of war and confused by the uncertainties and disorders of reconstruction, men can well listen to Mr. Stringfellow's message and base their actions on an unchanging foundation, the integrity of makind.

Mr. Stringfellow sees the great success of men like Pulitzer and Edison and Lincoln and Wanamaker based firmly on integrity of character. Successful men and women, he says, are all individuals of integrity. "Is it not true that the crooked businessman, the unscrupulous lawyer, the quack doctor, and the insincere clergyman, are still rare enough to be news? Most people drive on the right side of the road, stop for red lights and pay their just debts."

Mr. Stringfellow's speech at Ithaca College is full of nuggets of wisdom. He eloquently scores the failure of many leading citizens to take a part in government. "We have been wishing for good government without working for it; we have been expecting something for nothing."

For the youth of today Mr. Stringfellow sees a great challenge. The war-torn world will be a test to those who go out from halls of learning into the professions and business and industry. But there is a bright future ahead for those who are armed with "that matchless ingredient, the most important equipment man can possess, integrity, man's greatest asset."

Commemoration of Twenty-fifth Anniversary in Priesthood of Bishop of Salt Lake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the banquet commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary in the priesthood of the Most Reverend Duanne G. Hunt, Bishop of Salt Lake, Utah.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When on July 29, 1776, Father Silvestre Valez de Escalante started out on his long trek from the mission of San Gabriel in California and journeyed through the land on which we now stand, he, no matter what his own national allegiance, was helping to found our beloved country. In that very month when he set out from San Gabriel, other pioneers had on July 4, hewn the cornerstone of principles on which this country was to stand; those principles which we Americans can never too frequently call to mind; those principles which have beat down tyranny, then and now; those principles we call the Declaration of Independence.

Father Escalante and the great pioneer priests of the West, whom Bishop Hunt succeeds, pierced the darkness of savagery with the light of the Gospel. The signers of the Declaration of Independence, on principles deriving directly from the Gospel, kindled for the oppressed peoples of this continent the light of liberty. It is saying the same thing in different words, I think, to say that we are children of God and heirs to the kingdom of heaven, and, to say with the signers, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." In other words, our natural inheritance and our supernatural inheritance have been conferred upon us by the one God.

No one knew this better than the immortal Father of our Country. He expressed it plainly in his Farewell Address when he said:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion, and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor and subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these foremost props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all the connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligations deserts the oaths which are the instrument in the courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

The idea of the dependence of political and social justice upon religion permeates the whole structure of the United States Government. It was not surprising, therefore, to hear that idea bravely voiced when lately tyranny raised its ugly and destructive head. On January 4, 1939, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in his message to the Congress:

"Storms from abroad directly challenge these institutions indispensable to Americans now as always. The first is religion; it is the source of the other two—democracy and international good faith. Religion by teaching man his relationship to God, gives the individual a sense of his own dignity and teaches him to respect himself by respecting others."

Religion and democracy have gone hand in hand in our country. Every attack on religion is indirectly an attack on democracy. As in the past, so in the present, in our own day we have seen that those who aim to de were not born with America. We might say they were born with man himself, but it should be added that their exact formulation took a long time.

They came, as we have just said, from stroy the inalienable natural rights of the individual begin their wicked work with an attack—sometimes covert, sometimes open—on religion.

These principles we have been discussing perennial Christian teaching, transmitted to us, through the common law of England. In fact, three basic institutions of the democratic tradition, constitutional limitation of power, representative assembly, and the jury system originated in the legal theory and practice of the Roman Catholic Church.

Loyalty to our American concepts requires acceptance of two-principles proclaimed by the saint for whom appropriately enough the oldest city in the United States is named, St. Augustine. The first is his famous doctrine of equality. Every human being, he said, is equal to every other, insofar as he is entitled to immunity from the arbitrary. He held that no man of himself can rightly force his will upon another. This is the cornerstone of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution.

By the phrase "all men are created equal" the signers of the Declaration of Independence meant that all men are equal because they were created equal under God. The framers of the Declaration repudiated the idea that any individual or group of individuals can obtain "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" at the cost or enslavement of his fellow man. This has been and will be our answer to dictators; it is for this we have fought and died from 1776 until now.

While we are aware that these principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were not, when announced, entirely new to the world, we do claim that we Americans have had, and still have, the hardihood to put them into practice. We have shown to all the world that democracy

works. We can proudly boast that the whole world would have been enslaved had it not been for America. Our enemies know this from their bitter experience with our power. Our allies fully and generously declare it.

By showing the centuries-old belief in the natural rights of man, I did not at all mean that the framers of our Constitution contributed nothing new. On the contrary they contributed a good deal. For the first time in history a group of men set out to create a balanced government; a government whose powers were written into a document which was to be the supreme law of the land. As important as these political convictions was the fact that at the Philadelphia Convention a new concept of sovereignty was born of the genius of James Wilson, a man too little known in American history. Up to that time sovereignty was believed to be indivisible. A concept of a state was easy enough. But a concept of a United States was something new. James Wilson pointed out that sovereignty, the ultimate power to decide, could be divided between State governments and the newly formed Federal Government, each to be sovereign in its own sphere. We know now that our Federal Government has sovereign power over those things which affect the several States in their interdependence one on the other, such as interstate commerce, postal service, coinage of money, relations with foreign governments, etc. The State governments are sovereign in realms of education, the laws of personal relations, voting procedures, etc. In all these ways the newly formed Government was unique and truly an experiment, but an experiment which the founders confidently expected to succeed, because it was founded on the natural law of God. Our Government is not perfect; nothing in this world is perfect. But we Americans are convinced, and I think the world is becoming increasingly convinced, that it is the best Government in the world at the present time. A better may be devised but we have no such intimation at the present time. Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist:

"It has been frequently remarked that it seems to have been reserved to the people of the country by their conduct and example to decide the important question whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force."

At a time which certainly is a turning point in history, I think we Americans can say that our Government was not established by accident, nor by force. We can wish, too, that in the world that is shaping the patterns of government will not haphazardly occur by accident or be imposed by force.

In his first inaugural address Washington said:

"The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered as deeply, perhaps, as finally stated, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

We can truthfully say, "We have kept the faith." We have kept it because the principles of our Government, as I have tried to show, are inextricably woven with the eternal principles of God and religion.

I dwell upon these things tonight because I feel that in this unsettled world it is necessary to call attention to these principles which are the very lifeblood of America. The first missionaries in this land sunk these principles deep in the bedrock of American democracy. The gospel of the pioneer priests spread them in these regions and all over the United States is 1,776 years older than the Declaration of Independence. Our form of government gets its power to endure from Him who is eternal.

Now, you may ask, what has all this to do with Bishop Hunt? Well, it has the same to do with Bishop Hunt that it had to do with the Catholic Charles Carroll of Carrollton, signer of the Declaration of Independence, or Daniel Carroll, or Thomas Fitzsimmons, Catholics who signed the Constitution. By way of parenthesis, this was quite a large delegation when Catholics were only 1 percent of the population. It is well to recall that it was Father John Carroll, the Jesuit, afterward the first bishop of the United States, who was instrumental in securing the adoption of article 6 of the Constitution, which states "that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for an office or public trust under the United States." It may be news to some that the man first instrumental in striking at bigotry by law in the United States was a Roman Catholic priest.

In his career as priest and bishop, Bishop Hunt has conformed himself to the great tradition formed by his predecessors in the hierarchy, from the great Archbishop Carroll to the present time. He has, like them, given himself to the nurture of the souls of citizens strong in the American spirit; such citizens are also citizens of the kingdom of God in the eternal precepts of Christianity. Bishops and priests who established this diocese knew, and we know, that any movement against the free exercise of religion is also directed against the principles on which the Government of the United States stands. We Catholics have given our energies, our talents, and our lives to the religious principles on which this Government thrives, in the knowledge that the stronger our faith the stronger our citizenship.

The inheritance of the Catholic episcopacy is a great American inheritance because it is the great Christian inheritance. It is a great inheritance for the welfare, temporal and eternal, of the individual human being. It is the inheritance of Christian charity.

All who know Bishop Hunt know how well he has labored for his God and his fellow man. That is, is it not, the fulfillment of the law and the prophets. If I were asked to point to one characteristic of Bishop Hunt which, more than any other, accounts for his rise in the hierarchy, I would say it is his passion for facts, his unremitting search for truth. This it was which, early in life, brought him, by the grace of God, face to face with the fact that Christianity did not begin in the sixteenth century or the seventeenth or the eighteenth centuries, but it began with Christ. One further quality of this good bishop I should like to mention—his generosity of nature. There is, in his record, no slightest hint that he ever engaged in personal controversy. He knows that men come and go; he knows as well that principles, right thinking, the facts, the truth remain. He has labored long and well in Utah, and Utah does well to honor him at this great meeting. No less a tribute is due a great churchman and a great American.

Something Needs Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with organized fighting in Europe over, we learn that three American armies, perhaps a million or more men, are to remain abroad for an indefinite period to rehabilitate Europe. Recently President Truman said within a year about 7,000,000 men would be thrown into the fighting in the Pacific.

Our casualties number more than a million, and every day the sun goes down on a thousand or more American boys dead, missing, or wounded. Every day young Americans are called from farm, village, and city to serve in the armed forces—not 40 hours a week—but, if need be, 24 hours a day; not in well-lighted, comfortable places where the work is comparatively easy, but in cramped quarters or in the mud, dirt, and filth. Hundreds of thousands of young Americans who love their friends, their homes and country, who have life before them, are being shipped to the Pacific, and in the Pacific they fight and die. Why?

Those who survive have the right to demand that while they are away we who live here at home in comfort, many of us prosperously, all of us safely, keep inviolate the freedom, the liberty, the opportunity which is their heritage.

Are we keeping the faith? Does something need fixing? Something need readjusting? Fourteen thousand teamsters go on strike in the city of Chicago, tie up the transportation of tons upon tons of food and necessary supplies.

What is wrong when the dead and missing on Tarawa number 913, on Saipan 3,387, on Iwo Jima 4,630, more than 45,000 casualties on Okinawa, while here in America 14,200 soldiers must be sent into Chicago to maintain peace and order and drive trucks which 14,000 teamsters refuse to touch?

Just one edition of the press tells us that 60,000 workers are out; that at Painesville, Ohio, 2,000 workers are on strike. The employees of Donnelly & Sons are out on strike, which the Under Secretary of War says is one of the most critical from a war standpoint that has occurred.

Between four and five thousand employees of International Harvester Co. refuse to work. In Detroit, the CIO and the A. F. of L. are quarreling and are on strike over the question as to which shall do a certain job. At the Packard Motor Car plant 400 A. F. of L. maintenance men walked off the job.

Is it not time that Federal Government, which takes the sons, the brothers, the fathers from their homes and ships them across the sea, says to the strikers, "Get to work on your present job or on some other and support the war effort or get into the armed forces and we will assign you a task"?

There has been too much coddling of special groups in return for political support.

JOBS FOR VETERANS

A news dispatch from Detroit states that four out of five men now in the armed forces will be barred from good postwar jobs in the automotive and other highly unionized industries by the seniority provisions of existing union contracts. The drafted men fight—many of them die—some of those who return after their fighting days are over find they are not permitted to take a job unless they pay an initiation fee and union dues for a job in the land for which they fought. That is not only wrong but it is an outrage.

Perhaps the returning veterans, some of whom have been away for two or more years, will have something to say to the strikers who are shirking; to those who have received two, three, four times in wages what the fighting man received and who walk out, quit work, whenever the fancy strikes them.

Yes; something needs fixing, something needs readjusting, and the country will hail with acclaim the man in authority in Washington who has the courage of a Cleveland, a Coolidge, who will insist that equal justice be the rule, at least in wartime; that all back the war effort.

Fair Employment Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a basic injustice and a violation of the principle of democracy for any person to be denied the opportunity for full development of his talents or for advancement in a job or profession as far as his abilities can carry him. Such conditions constitute a denial of the right to give of oneself to the welfare of one's country and the society in which he lives. It is wrong whether such situations exist on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or for any other cause.

America has asked the same sacrifice in her hour of danger of all groups of her citizens. All have shared equally the burdens, the dangers, and the sacrifices of war.

Any man or any group of men good enough to serve their country and risk their lives in her cause must be worthy of equal employment opportunities with their fellow citizens.

Few Americans will seriously dispute the rightness of these principles. The task of putting them into practice will remain a challenge to our country as long as we fall short of living up to them. But it is a task that will not be easily nor, I am afraid, quickly achieved, for it involves new thinking and new action on the part of millions of people.

The hopes of many, many people in our country have in this war period become centered in the work of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, established by Executive order of President Roosevelt. How much of the improved employment opportunities of minorities in our country have been due to the work of this Committee and how much they have been due, instead, to the conditions of full employment which have existed during the war is, I believe, a real question. As between the two influences it is my opinion the latter has been the more important.

Nonetheless, it is true that millions of Americans belonging to minority groups have come to pin their hopes upon the FEPC.

Furthermore, the efforts of the United States to work against discrimination in employment in her national life are today being watched by hundreds of millions of nonwhite people in all parts of the world, and equally, if not more important, by our Latin-American neighbors to the south of us.

For these reasons I believe it is wrong to suddenly end the work of the Fair Employment Practice Committee by the device of refusing an appropriation for the continuance of its work. And I furthermore believe, regardless of what a Member's opinion of the merits or demerits of particular legislation may be, that it has been and is wrong to deny to the House of Representatives the right and opportunity to consider, debate, amend, and pass or defeat any piece of legislation in which there is as much general public interest as there is in this case.

It is at least a question whether the integrity of the legislative process of the Congress is not threatened when the Rules Committee assumes the right to decide whether or not it will grant a rule to bring a bill to the floor simply on the basis of the opinions of the members of that committee about the merits of the legislation. This as I understand the matter is not a proper function of the Rules Committee. The true function of the Rules Committee is to decide what sort of rule to grant, in what order bills shall be brought to the floor, and to separate important and urgent bills from those which are of minor consequence, providing for prior consideration of the former, of course.

Surely in this case there is enough interest and importance in this problem of discrimination so that the answer to it cannot possibly be found simply by doing nothing. The President himself has said he holds this same opinion. To prevent consideration of this legislation is tantamount to saying that the decision of the majority of the House is not to be trusted to be a correct decision. And in a democracy questions are not supposed to be decided by prejudging that the decision of the duly constituted parliamentary body will be wrong.

It is true, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] pointed out so ably the other day, that the majority of the House has available to it a remedy for situations where the Rules Committee refuses to act. It is true that if a majority wants to bring a proposal to the floor it can do so by the method of petition. In the long run, the Rules Committee cannot, as he pointed out, prevail against a really convinced majority. But his very argument leaves a Member like myself in the position of either acquiescing in complete inaction, with which course he does not agree, or else signing a petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the legislation in question.

In the instant case this choice has not been a simple one for me, as will be clear as I proceed. But either I must myself become a party to preventing consideration of some bill on the subject of discrimination in matters of employment, and thus also contributing to the more or less devious method of abolishing the present Committee, or else I must take the course of signing the petition regardless of my point of view on the exact bill to which the petition refers. For these reasons I have signed the petition.

But the fact is, in this particular case, I doubt very seriously that I could or would vote for the Norton bill if it came to the floor and were to be voted on in its present form. The bill would undertake to regulate by Federal law millions of human relationships throughout this whole vast Nation. It would call in question millions of hirings and millions of dismissals of workers. In millions of cases the issue of discrimination because of race, color, or creed would be raised, whether or not it really was pertinent. The net effect would be to emphasize more than they have ever been emphasized before differences between our American citizens as to their racial, religious, or ancestral groups.

Here is part of what I have written to the people who have communicated with me on this subject:

> The new Norton bill, however, would, as you know, provide for mandatory enforcement powers and also rather severe penalties as well. It would attempt to regulate by law literally millions of human relationships throughout the country. In the first place, let me say that I think it quite inconceivable that the Norton bill can be passed by both Houses of the Congress. This, in my judgment, does not mean that a majority of the Members are in favor of discrimination or opposed to taking action against it. But it does mean that many Members, even many of a very liberal and progressive point of view, see this as a problem of human relations in the communities in America and are sincerely fearful of the consequences of an attempt to use the power of the Federal Government in the manner in which the Norton bill proposes to do. Every relationship between employers and employees would be subject to control by the Commission under the Norton bill. And it is also feared that one result of its passage would be to emphasize more than ever has been done before differences between people with regard to race, creed, color, and national origin.
>
> Let us suppose that the Norton bill were enacted into law. Members of minority groups in all parts of the country would begin to get jobs solely because the Federal Government compelled an employer to hire them. I am fearful that as a result there would be generated so much resentment in communities and sections where there is little or no local support for this legislation that 101 ways would be found to raise even higher than they are at present the barriers and difficulties against both the obtaining of decent employment opportunities by minorities and also against their chance to secure other worthwhile values of life in those communities. More and more they would have to depend upon the Federal law for a chance to work.
>
> We are fearful also that under the Norton bill other constructive efforts to break down discrimination would cease and everything would come to depend upon the exercising of more and more far-reaching powers by the Federal Government. If then the law were sometime to be repealed, as I am afraid it might be, the net result would be no kindness to minority groups.

But our choice need not and ought not to be between the Norton bill on the one hand and nothing at all on the other. I believe there should be a permament agency of our Government, probably in the Labor Department, that would be a Fair Employment Practices Commission regardless of whether it was officially so named. It should be an agency of outstanding citizens possessed of as much moral influence as possible for it to have. Its whole task should be to work to rid this great Nation of discrimination in employment. It should have full power to investigate cases of discrimination wherever found, to require testimony, to publish, and disseminate its findings. It should carry on a continuous educational job, furnishing material wherever it might prove useful against discrimination. It should develop constructive plans for the working out of problems of discrimination and use all its best efforts to bring about voluntary agreements for ending such practices in specific cases. But I do not believe it should exercise compulsion or employ measures of force or impose penalties. I simply do not believe that will work nor that it will actually help the very people intended to be helped.

Now some have argued "But whether it works or not the law will stand as the policy of the Government and will give encouragement to work against discrimination." There may be something in that. But there is a better way to gain this particular end. The Federal Government itself—in its own direct employment and possibly as to its contractors—can and should set an example. This, Congress could provide for. The Commission could be empowered to restore to Federal Government jobs anyone dismissed or to require the employment of anyone where, on the basis of all the evidence it was shown that the dismissal or the failure to hire for an available job was due to discrimination.

With such a bill we would be saying in effect that as to the one field of employment where Congress unquestionably can and should determine the policy there shall be no discrimination but that having set an example we are not going to attempt to regulate by Federal law all the employment relationships of America nor to attempt to cure by statute a problem which can only be truly solved in the communities of the Nation and in the attitudes of the people themselves.

A bill on this subject should be passed. We cannot leave the matter where it stands at present. But the bill ought, I believe, not to attempt more than the provisions such as I have generally outlined.

What I have said will probably not be popular with either side of the controversy. But that may well be unimportant. For it is my earnest hope that more and more people will rally to a forward-looking, realistic approach to this problem such as I have outlined, knowing that it must be faced, that it cannot be forgotten nor can it be solved by unwise legislation.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, on Presenting the Churchman's Award to Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on June 4, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, the Churchman's award for 1945 was given to the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Henry A. Wallace. I had the honor of making the presentation of the award. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Emerson has said that "an institution is but the lengthened shadow of one man." Democracy as we think of it in the world today is primarily the lengthened shadow of one man—Franklin D. Roosevelt. The greatest living spokesman of Rooseveltian democracy is Henry Agard Wallace. Well has the Churchman chosen to honor him with its eminent award.

William Jennings Bryan, when they called him an idealist (a political epithet not new apparently to our time) used to respond by saying, yes, he was an idealist. But when he thought of an idealist, he always thought of Joseph. And when he thought of Joseph, he always remembered that when the famine came, Joseph was the only man who had the corn. In a double sense, Henry Wallace has the corn—the corn of the good earth and the corn of the good life.

Perhaps the surest sign of greatness, at least in the political world, is that one arouses controversy, hate, and fear. Henry Wallace meets all these qualifications.

Why is Henry Wallace controversial, hated, and feared? Surely it isn't because he is personally provocative, offensive, or beligerent. On the contrary, you have but to look at him to see that in appearance he is the mildest sort of man. I am sure he gets along with his wife and children, and that his staff and associates love him, and that he hates nobody, and that he loves peace among nations and among men. Then why is Henry Wallace controversial, hated, and feared?

It is because as Henry Wallace believes in God, he believes also in man. He believes in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. As he respects God, he respects the dignity of every man, woman, and child. He has a faith about people as he has about a church and about a Deity. And he cannot compromise his faith about the one more than about the other. If one didn't really like a Christian, he would not like Henry Wallace, and if one in his heart does not really have the faith of democracy, he cannot but dislike Henry Wallace.

Henry Wallace, like Mirabeau, as Carlyle put it, "has an eye." He can see the many who are "ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed." He can see with his eye wasted resources of soil and minerals and metals, and of facilities and manpower and technology. He can see where lack of coordination in the use of what we have denies to the many what they should be able to enjoy.

Naturally, therefore, one who sees all these things wants to make them come true, and he fights for them. Naturally, he has to fight against those who see them too as possible, but don't want them to become dreams realized.

It has always interested me to see the lack of reciprocity between men who hate a really great man, and the really great man. They hate him, but he doesn't hate them. To him they are mere obstructions along the way forward. They sadden him. There are times, undoubtedly, when they vex him, but he, in his heart, can truly say like the Master upon the Cross, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do."

For a long time Henry Wallace has seen the danger of dictatorship and tyranny, and has fought against them. He has fought for the victory which we have gained, and the victory which is still in shadow. For a long time he has fought for peace, an abiding peace, which was the absence of war or oppression anywhere in the world, and he has stirred men to mighty deeds and thoughts in the building of the institutions which would assure such peace. He has fought for jobs, a simple chance to live decently and to earn it, for everybody

To Henry Wallace, you can't have democracy unless you have an end of despotism everywhere in the world, unless you have peace, and unless you have full employment. That is as right as the stars to him, and he cannot either compromise with or abandon those objectives any more than he can renounce his God.

We are just now facing the real testing time of democracy. It is not just democracy which makes people resist an assault upon their country and, if needs be, die in the attempt.

But it is democracy which makes men build a good world for all the people, which makes men respect their fellow men, and gives them the enlightened vision to see that in the general welfare is to be found the only real security for the individual welfare.

We think that those who have died, those who have given any part of themselves in this war, have deep in their hearts fought for the kind of life in America and in the world which only democracy can afford.

One in America, therefore, cannot really be true to the dead and deny the full implications of democracy to the living. One cannot be consistent and proclaim all honor for the hero who fell upon the battlefield and deny a home to that hero's widow and children, or deny that family which remains behind a job, or a chance for health, or a decent income and fair access to the good things of this great land.

Like Franklin D. Roosevelt, Henry Wallace loves every part of America, because he has so much of America in him. It has seemed to me he loves the common man because he has so much of the common man in him.

The people of America today have to make the choice as to whether they want the kind of democracy Franklin D. Roosevelt fought for and Henry Wallace is fighting for, or whether they don't, and are willing to face the consequences.

I cannot but have faith that the people of this Nation and this world who have suffered so much have somehow got a vision—as Tennyson said—

"Dipt into the future, far as human eye could see"—
[Seen] "the Vision of the world and all the wonder that would be."

I have faith that the people see that for the first time in human history peace and plenty are within the grasp of men, women and children in this land, and in many other lands of the earth. I cannot but believe that

we have been chastened like Job for our lack of faith, and that our only redemption is to prove our faith. The voice of Henry Wallace, therefore, is not a voice crying in the wilderness. It is the call to the faithful for the pilgrimage. Behind such men has the race always moved forward. Behind such men shall we move on yet further and higher.

I now ask Mr. Wallace and the audience to rise, I read the Citation of the Churchman:

"To Henry Agard Wallace, fearless liberal, whose faith in America as a 'sun of righteousness with healing in its wings' for its own people and neighbors of all the world, has inspired universal aspiration for a happier life among those bearing heavy burdens of fear and want and squalor. To a man of vision who has dared to speak to the modern world as the prophets of old spoke to theirs, against the privilege of the few and for the privilege of the many; who believes that social evolution is better than revolution; whose devotion to democracy stems from the Christian evaluation of individual worth. To one who knows that only the idealist can be a realist."

Henry Agard Wallace, because it is rightly yours, and you have been justly given it, I present you the Churchman's award.

Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Maj. George Fielding Eliot and published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 21 last. The article pays a tribute to Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, and is captioned "Army's able leadership traced to executive skill of Marshall."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY'S ABLE LEADERSHIP TRACED TO EXECUTIVE SKILL OF MARSHALL—CHIEF OF STAFF, ALLOWED A FREE HAND BY ROOSEVELT, CHOSE HIS COMMANDERS CAREFULLY AND TESTED THEM BEFORE SENDING THEM INTO BATTLE

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

As the first thunderous cheers of welcome to General Eisenhower die away, there is time to ask ourselves: How did Eisenhower happen? Who picked him for his great command with such unerring judgment? After all, he was only a lieutenant colonel of Infantry when the war started, in an Army containing some 400 lieutenant colonels senior to himself, to say nothing of some 700 full colonels and nearly 150 general officers. How did he get up to the top so fast, just when he was needed?

In fact, how does it happen that our great Army, the greatest we ever have sent into battle, has been universally so well commanded? How is it that there have been none of the disastrous failures of command which have occurred in previous wars? How is it that so few generals of any grade have had to be sent home because they fell down on the job—and the few that did have gone home so promptly?

THREEFOLD REASON GIVEN

I think this is a very good time to pay the tribute that is his due to the man who is responsible for this outstanding record. He is the Chief of Staff, General of the Army George C. Marshall. The reason why our generals have been so well chosen and so successful really is threefold: (1) President Roosevelt left the choice entirely to General Marshall, exercising no influence on the matter himself, so that leaders were chosen by a soldier and not, as so often in the past, by a civilian President or Secretary of War; (2) General Marshall knew his men and chose them with skill; (3) having chosen, he tested the men of his choice at every step forward until he was sure he had the right men for the right assignments.

When the Army was first being greatly expanded at the time that the fall of France shocked the Nation into a realization of the danger across the Atlantic, General Marshall began choosing the men who might have to command millions of American boys in battle. He recognized that most of the general officers of the Regular Army, as it then existed, were too old for active field commands in modern war. Use could be made of their experience and wisdom in the training period, but they would have to be replaced when it came to actual fighting. By whom? Not, in the first place, by citizen officers, because these did not yet have enough experience and training—they might acquire it later, but in the meantime the professional officers of the Regular Army would have to carry on. So the problem was to choose the generals of the new Army from the colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors of the old regular establishment. In particular the problem was to select from these (there were in October, 1940, 6,000 "promotion list" officers in these 3 grades) a very few outstanding men for the very highest commands. This was no easy task—and a mistake might cost hundreds, even thousands, of lives; might risk the very safety of the Nation before it could be corrected. For there could be no real proof until battle was joined.

General Marshall made himself a "little list." He wrote names on that list of men he knew, from his own wide experience and acquaintance in the Army; he added to it men of high "service reputation" whom he did not know, and some who were recommended to him by others in whose judgment he had confidence. It was not a very long list, but it was a list on which you might have seen a good many names which have been much in the headlines recently—and a few which have not.

Having made his list, General Marshall did not stop there. He proceeded to put each officer on that list through a period of trial and test as ruthless and soul-searching as he could make it. He piled burdens on them; he shifted them suddenly from one post to another of increased responsibility; he worked the very hearts out of them, and he judged them strictly and impartially by the results they produced.

Dwight Eisenhower was on that list. When it was first prepared, he was executive officer of the Fifteenth Infantry at Fort Lewis, Wash. He was made chief of staff of the Third Division at the same post; making good in that job, he went to the Ninth Corps, also as chief of staff; from there he was transferred to Lt. Gen. Walter Krueger's Third Army, again as chief of staff, and served with that officer through the Louisiana maneuvers of 1941. Then he was abruptly shifted to the War Department general staff as assistant chief of staff for operations. There, under General Marshall's own eye, he served the final months of his stern apprenticeship for the command of 3,000,000 American soldiers, until the day when he was summoned from his desk to Marshall's office to hear his chief say: "Eisenhower, I've got to send somebody to Europe to command our forces there. I've picked you for the job. How soon can you leave?"

A DEBT OF GRATITUDE

It was not only the commander in chief who was thus selected. The same process—varying somewhat in detail—was applied to every one of the present Army group, Army and corps commanders, and to some who didn't make the grade. Those who buckled under the strain were through. The older officers tended to fall by the wayside (General Krueger, for example, is the only officer now holding a field who was a permanent major general of the Regular Army in October, 1940). The younger men came to the top as they proved themselves worthy. And the result speaks for itself—speaks eloquently in terms of victories won, and won without needless sacrifice or cruel disaster.

The Nation—and particularly the fathers and mothers, the wives and sweethearts of America—owe a debt of gratitude to George Catlett Marshall which never can be repaid. As we honor our returning generals, fresh from their fields of victory, let us not forget the man who chose them and directed them so well, and whose wise choice and soldierly vision gave us those victories at far less proportionate cost than any we have won before.

Poland's Rebirth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Poland's Rebirth," published in the New York Times of June 25, 1945.

It is particularly gratifying that provision has been made for an election to give the Polish people an opportunity to select a government of their own choosing. Thus this great people, whose unhappy lot it was to be the first to take up arms in an effort to halt the Nazi troops, will be one of the first to enjoy the blessings of the democratic process for which so much blood and sacrifice has been expended.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S REBIRTH

The announcement from San Francisco that Poland will have a place reserved among the original signers of the new world Charter brings to a happy ending a situation that might have been perilous as well as tragically ironical. The Poles had the honor to put up the first armed resistance to Hitler's troops. Their cities were the first to be wrecked, their countryside the first to be pillaged, their citizens the first to be butchered or enslaved. Poland, moreover, had the sad distinction of being a possible source of disagreement between Russia and her western allies. If this disagreement had gone a little further the snarling ghosts of the Nazi leaders might have enjoyed bitter mirth in their black Valhalla.

The actual agreement which makes possible the recognition of Premier Osubka-Morawski's new Polish National Government is, and had to be, a compromise. The Russian-sponsored Lublin Government has been broadened by the inclusion of former Premier Mikolajczyk of the old London group as Deputy Premier and of other Poles lately in exile

or belonging to the Polish underground. So far as the Polish Republic is concerned, the London Government in Exile ceases to exist. The new government is provisional until elections can be held. For the point of view of most Poles it may be a better government than the one which lost the bloody campaign of 1939. The Communists are in, but the inept reactionaries of 1939 are out.

In accepting this settlement the British, Russian, and American Governments have again emphasized their intention to remove every possible obstacle to full and frank cooperation. The Polish question was as difficult as any that can confront us in Europe. There are still difficulties to be overcome. One test will be the election that turns the provisional government into a permanent government. We in this country will hope that it will be an election somewhat similar to the kind we know best, with unhampered presentation of opposing points of view and uncensored reporting of what goes on. If the three consulting governments have agreed, in the words of Saturday's official statement, that "the feeling of national dignity and the sovereignty of the Polish state requires Polish affairs to be settled by the Poles themselves," all should go well.

The restored Polish state will represent a decimated and impoverished nation. In this nation the fifteenth century mind mentioned by Mr. Jacobowsky in the play is probably pretty well extinct. There has been at least the democracy of a common suffering. We have to hope that another kind of democracy is being born and that Poland may be, not a buffer state, a marchland or a dependency, but a free and independent country.

Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, wish to say that a few days ago I inserted in the RECORD a copy of a newspaper article to the effect that the United States would furnish Argentina rubber and rubber tires.

Mr. Speaker, I now find a news article by Mr. Charles Corddry, United Press special writer, stating that he had learned from a high official that America has agreed to supply Argentina 500,000 tons of oil, which, he said, will raise that country's consumption close to prewar levels.

Of course, tires and oil are being rationed to the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, under my motion to include the newspaper article above referred to as part of my remarks, submit the same, as follows:

ARGENTINA REPORTED GETTING 500,000 TONS OF OIL FROM UNITED STATES

(By Charles Corddry)

A high official disclosed last night that America has agreed to supply Argentina 500,000 tons of oil which, he said, will raise that country's consumption close to prewar levels.

The official, who did not approve of the deal, said it may mean that Argentinians will be better supplied with oil than United States citizens.

He said the American-Argentine agreement was made despite this country's refusal to increase allocations to Brazil, where consumption is at 20 percent of the prewar level and when there is no gasoline for civilian automobiles.

Of the total in the Argentine deal, 100,000 tons will be shipped in American tankers, the official said, and 400,000 tons in ships furnished by Argentina.

The agreeement, it was stated, was one result of the recent renewal of Argentine-American diplomatic relations. Since then several top-ranking American officials have said Argentina still has much to do to fulfill her international commitments.

Disclosure of the oil deal came a few days after the Petroleum Administration announced that allocations to Latin-American countries could not be increased at present because of the tight shipping situation in the Pacific.

WRITER OF EXPOSÉ THREATENED IN ARGENTINA

(By Virginia Prewett)

BUENOS AIRES, June 9.—Despite the fact that official Argentine decrees and statements give the impression that press censorship is lifting in this country, American correspondents in Buenos Aires are keeping a 24-hour check on Arnaldo Cortesi, New York Times correspondent.

Cortesi was told by Alberto Teisaire, acting minister of the interior, last Tuesday not to be surprised at anything that might happen to him for revealing conditions inside Argentina.

Teisaire hauled Cortesi over the official coals for his dispatch of May 31 in which Cortesi called the imprisonment, the censorship, and the Gestapo methods in Argentina today worse than anything he had seen in 17 years of Italian fascism.

Teisaire flatly said the government would not permit correspondents to create "international difficulties" for it. He was referring to the furore caused in the United States by Cortesi's article.

Teisaire's warning was a direct contradiction of the statement yesterday of Foreign Minister Cesar Ameghino who said: "It is the intention of the government to guarantee absolute press freedom."

Cortesi has also been threatened by nonofficial sources with the kind of brutal attack suffered by Frank Breese of the United Press in July, 1943, and by Waldo Frank in July, 1942. Both were beaten by hoodlums for exposing conditions here.

Teisaire's warning came on the eve of the publication of a government decree permitting suspended newspapers to resume publication and providing pardons for jailed newspapermen. This was called a restoration of press freedom.

Newspapers in Buenos Aires published the decree side by side with reports of the closing down of La Tribuna, an important prodemocratic provincial daily published in Rosaria.

Dispatches to the United States telling about the clamping down on La Tribuna were censored. The ban was hastily lifted.

Meanwhile, censorship of both outgoing and incoming news continues. Ironically, the very day that the decree restoring "press freedom" was headlined, dispatches telling about an enthusiastic crowd of some 2,000 persons who were seeing Americ Ghioldi, crusading editor of La Van Guardia, off to exile in Chile, were not permitted to go through cable censorship to the United States.

The foreign minister's own statement on press freedom was held up 5 hours by censorship.

PRISONERS REPORTED BEING FREED

BUENOS AIRES, June 9.—Col. Filomeno J. Velazco, chief of police in Buenos Aires, said that all political prisoners in Argentina's four largest penitentiaries would be released as of today. He said more than 200 were freed this morning.

The police chief declared the liberation order affected "political and social prisoners" in Martin Garcia Island, the southern jails, and the Villa Devoto in the outskirts of Buenos Aires.

CIO Procedure

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the House gave a faint indication that at some time it was going to require OPA to make a change in its procedure. The press of last week, especially the papers from Detroit, carried the information that there was a shortage of meat in Detroit and that the CIO was marching on the city hall protesting the lack of meat, while in other parts of the city the union was on strike in the slaughtering houses. The workers who took away the refuse, and carted it to the rendering plants went on strike. The slaughterers could not continue to butcher cattle because of the failure to remove the refuse or waste.

In a screamer on the front page in the Detroit News of June 22, in large black-faced type we find these words, "Strike Cuts Off Detroit's Meat." Below is the caption over the news story, "All stocks to be gone in 48 hours—Rendering tie-up closes packers." The news story then reads in part:

Detroit's meat shortage became even more acute today with the walkout of 200 employees of four rendering companies. The action will close most of the city's 34 slaughter and packing houses by the end of the day.

Managers of the packing houses reported to city officials today that without the removal of the byproducts from the slaughtered animals, the killing will have to cease.

Benjamin Unwin, secretary of the Detroit Independent Meat Dealers, said the city "will be without meat in 48 hours, unless the dispute is settled."

He explained that the city's daily quota of 500,000 pounds of beef will stop tonight and shelves of butcher shops will be bare with the exception of some sausages and lunch meats.

* * * * *

The 200 striking employes are members of the Packing House Workers (CIO), District 7. They walked out to protest the Regional War Labor Board's delay in approving a contract with the companies.

Ironically enough, it was the failure of Russell Ballard, president of Dairy Workers Union (CIO), who is a member of the RWLB, to write his report on on the dispute that caused the delay. Pierce Wright, labor relations counsel for the rendering companies, said.

* * * * * *

CATTLE HERE—NO BUYERS

Detroit cattle brokers, meanwhile, reported that stockyards were loaded with cattle which they are unable to sell.

Jack Ridley, of the Ridley Commission Co., said he had 200 head of cattle, representing

100,000 pounds of beef, for sale but "no one wants to bid for them."

Ridley blamed the situation on the closing of the small packing houses, which were his main outlets. Four were reported closed before today's strikes because of quota difficulties with the OPA.

Ridley said he has told his western suppliers to stop delivering him cattle here.

What an absurdity in a civilized community. Cattle ready to be slaughtered, a population demanding meat, union employees going out on strike, slaughterhouses closed by strikers, and other union employees march on the city hall to demand that the city government give them meat.

All they had to do to get the meat was to have their buddies to go back to their jobs, do their work and the cattle would be slaughtered, the meat available, in the market.

If I was the mayor of Detroit I would write each housewife a letter telling her if she was the wife of a striker, who was helping to cause the meat shortage, she show him the rolling pin or the frying pan and "lay down the law to him."

If the Federal Government with all of its power, cannot get those who obstruct the slaughterers of cattle and the deliveries of meat out of the way, so that the housewife can feed her children, I am sure that if they will turn the situation over to the wives and the mothers, it will be solved without delay.

One Thousand Head of Hogs But No Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Braymer (Mo.) Bee:

ONE THOUSAND HEAD OF HOGS BUT NO MEAT—10 CARLOADS OF FAT HOGS SHIPPED FROM THE BRAYMER MARKET IN PAST 11 DAYS BUT NOT A POUND OF PORK TO BE HAD

From June 11 until June 21, inclusive, there have been shipped from the Braymer stockyards to Kansas City 10 carloads of fat hogs, or more than 165,000 pounds—yet it is doubtful if there has been 25 pounds of pork available from our retailers in that length of time.

Here is the epitome of asininity in Government marketing.

A community of 15,000 people without a pound of pork for sale. Only one quarter of beef has been received in Braymer in the last 10 days and that weighed less than 100 pounds.

Such in brief is the science in marketing as exhibited by OPA and kindred bureaus, and that is what is happening in Braymer. It undoubtedly has happened in hundreds of other communities. The only persons who have any meat on hands are the farmers who have lockers at the locker plant and they are not allowed to sell it even if they had sufficient to spare.

Lee Holder bought 268 head of hogs that would probably average from 230 to 250 pounds per head on June 11 and 12 and has bought several times that many since then. Yet, in the community that has produced hogs enough to ship 1,000 head to market within 10 or 12 days there isn't a pound of fresh meat now on sale and insufficient preserved meats to feed a dozen hungry men.

We read reports about meatless days in New York but here in the center of production confusion reigns supreme and the chumps who control the marketing have so muddled things that a local meat dealer can't have a hog killed for his patrons and every pound of meat sold over retail counters has to first run the gamut of packing plants in Kansas City.

Yet Congress proposes to continue this condition for another year.

As before stated we feel sure that Braymer is only one of the many communities in Missouri and other meat producing States that not only has meatless days but meatless weeks. How long, O Lord, how long?

Return of Prisoners of War to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution adopted by the Federation of Labor of Buffalo and vicinity should be read with interest by the Members of the House. I am in accord with this resolution and am of the opinion they are not asking too much or being too unreasonable in wanting the European war prisoners returned to Europe at the earliest possible moment and requesting that we adopt legislation prohibiting them from competing in any manner with our American workers.

I sincerely hope that those in charge of the war prisoners will give this matter their attention as I know, from talking to other Members of Congress, that similar situations exist in their districts:

Whereas all the people of the United States of America rejoice in the stupendous victories of our military forces but have refrained from hilarious celebrations and have continued their laborious task of full production to supply every need of armed forces in the Pacific and Asia; and

Whereas this action by the workers of this country serves notice upon public officials and military leaders that the workers are abreast of the times and have a full understanding of what is required of them without fanfare and without programs of propaganda; and

Whereas when properly compiled records compute the cost in terms of lives lost in this terrible conflict it will not be difficult to understand why the workers are so well informed because the greater number of those who gave their lives were workers or the sons of workers who kept their families well informed. The greater number of those who lived to witness victory in Europe and will continue the fight in the Pacific and Asia to a glorious victory, are workers and the sons of workers and their families need no program of propaganda to remind them the war still continues; and

Whereas while programs of propaganda jam our radio networks a most dangerous condition is quietly festering in the case of war prisoners in this country. With victory in Europe war orders are being canceled and cut back throwing many out of work, swelling the rapidly mounting ranks of the unemployed. The officials in charge of the European war prisoners must be required by law to return the prisoners at the earliest possible moment to the European Continent where they can be employed constructively and the Federation of Labor of Buffalo and vicinity memorializes Congress to enact the necessary legislation to secure this result; and

Whereas officials in charge of war prisoners may have a better job and may be receiving higher salaries than they can secure in civilian life, together with the possibility of conspiracy on the part of unscrupulous employers who would not hesitate to retain prison labor in their efforts to reduce the wages of the American worker, all of which is causing mistrust to breed in the minds of the workers; and

Whereas after free discussion and thoughtful deliberation, the Federation of Labor of Buffalo and Vicinity in meeting assembled on May 10, 1945, unanimously voted to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide that European war prisoners be returned to Europe at the earliest possible moment, and for the time they do remain in this country they be prohibited from competing in any manner with American workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federation of Labor of Buffalo and Vicinity memoralize the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to provide protection and safety for the workers of America against the inroads of prisoners of war labor, to return European war prisoners to Europe at the earliest possible moment, and while they remain in this country, prohibit their competition with American workers, all of which will prevent desecration of the cause for which our people fought and died.

Food Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. WOODRRFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a constituent living in my home city. She is a highly intelligent and patriotic housewife and mother. She has from the very first cooperated with the Government in every way in attempting to correct conditions, which at this time arouses the ire of those who are penalized and discriminated against by those participating in black markets, excessive prices, and so forth, on the things we all have to buy.

Her letter is most interesting. She sees clearly what is going on in the country, and, I believe, she speaks the minds of housewives throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert with these remarks the letter I refer to. I am happy in the knowledge that on Saturday last this House took action which will, in my opinion, remedy

to a marked degree the conditions of which she complains:

BAY CITY, MICH., *June 17, 1945.*

DEAR SIR: Brother, I'm hungry! How about you? This meat situation is a mess, and I'm beginning to believe something should be done.

Please put me straight on this. If Canada is a subject of England, how come they don't share with her. My niece was over in Canada, and she said you could get anything you wanted—the highest priced meal was 60 cents.

You might be interested to know that one week we didn't have butter, lard, or meat. We ate in a restaurant and it cost a small fortune. There are five of us.

Believe me, I'm not a fly-by-night manager either. My service is given for OPA store inspection once a month. We process our cans. Saved our fat. Keep our paper. Bought two bonds a month. No money spent foolish, because we don't drink, use cigarettes, or go to theaters. Our children are taught the clean fundamentals of life. We want to share and do what is right. We bought from day to day, because it was preached to us over the radio and in the newspapers. What happened. You took away our point value on the red stamp. Everything was raised on the blue point, because we believed in being patriotic—preached it, ate it, and slept it. But was justice rendered? No!

I'm fighting mad. You pick up the paper—graft, graft, graft!

The man and lady across the road are an old couple. He's lost weight. She with heart trouble, with their measly points, can't make a go of it. He works in a defense plant, too.

Yes; I have nine nephews, one brother in the armed forces. No; I can't send any more boxes. I haven't any points. Everything I ever got from the OPA I had to get with a doctor's permit. They don't have to call a conference to ask me if I'll check ceiling prices, etc., at this store or that. Don't misunderstand. I'm willing to work and do more than my share, but I'd like to have balanced justice for all, too.

I don't know of a better person to pour my heart out to than to one that's there representing us in Washington. This is my opinion.

Oh, yes; another thing. What about gasoline to go to a camp meeting? The spiritual recreation is good for the mind and heart. That is the only vacation I get. I know of 10 people that would like to go. But beer trucks get all the gas they want. Plenty of sugar is used for alcohol. How about my share of gas for camp meeting—my sugar in fruit or cakes for my family—instead of alcohol?

Brother WOODRUFF, that's just the way I feel. What about you? Because I'd like to know where you stand on this question.

I've written many letters, but tore them up. It's 12 o'clock; I'm going out and mail this.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs. CHARLES) SOPHIA MERCER.

Poultry Ceiling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter published in the Bayard (Iowa) News of June 21, 1945:

AN OPEN LETTER ON POULTRY CEILINGS IN WHICH WE EXERCISE OUR RIGHT TO GRIPE

(NOTE.—The following is an open letter written by the editor to various and sundry persons connected with the Office of Price Administration. About a dozen of them have been sent personal letters. It was written for the express purpose of bringing to our readers the impossibility of trying to enforce some of the silly rules sent out from Washington.)

To the OPA.

GENTLEMEN: Every true American believes in price control and most of us are agreed that the Office of Price Control has done a fine job of regulating in most instances. However, in some cases OPA rulings have caused discrimination.

It is my opinion that the most un-American and discriminatory ruling to come out of Washington during the war has to do with the handling of poultry ceiling prices.

According to the OPA rule on live poultry, the ceiling a producer can charge a buyer is just exactly the same as a dealer may charge a packer. In other words, in this particular district the producer may charge 23.1 cents a pound for live poultry and that is exactly the amount a dealer may charge a packer. However, there is one rule that makes it even more asinine. If a farmer delivers the chickens to the dealer, he is entitled to 29.6 cents a pound, and the dealer can still charge only 28.1 cents if his packer picks up the chickens.

FORCE OUT SMALL BUYERS

It certainly appears that under this set-up the Government is attempting to regulate all the small poultry buyers out of business, since a wide margin has been set up for the packers to work on and they are glad to buy direct from the producer and pay him ceiling price. The ceiling on dressed poultry is 58 cents so he has a margin of 30 cents to operate under and reliable sources say that the packers are making more money from their business this year than they ever have before.

Under a set-up like this our small-produce buyers who have operated for years find themselves faced with two alternatives. They can close their doors and let the Government force them out of business or they can sell on the black market. Most of these fellows are conscientious Americans and they do not like to be put in the position they now find themselves. However, their families have to eat.

From my vantage point it looks as if the OPA has set the trap and baited it, but so far the highly paid Government agents who have been sent out to catch the operators who fail to do the impossible aren't having much luck. It certainly isn't much of a tribute to their intelligence or their Sherlock Holmes ability when they can't find at least one buyer who isn't living up to the impossible regulations that have been devised, especially since everyone knows that the black market is flourishing.

OPA AGENTS LOITER

One poultry buyer friend of mine swears that two OPA gestapo agents spent more time in his office during a recent week than he did. Yet neither he nor anyone else in this territory has been arrested.

Why the OPA or any other governmental agency should try to change time-proven methods of marketing is beyond my feeble efforts to understand. If the black market in poultry is to be stamped out, for heaven's sake change the rules so old-established poultry dealers can make a legitimate profit. Then the black market will vanish overnight and the Government agents who waste their time and gasoline and tires that could be put to a good use could be sent to a battlefield where they would make good targets.

Everyone wants to be honest, but if a person has to cheat just a little he may as well do it on a bigger scale, because the penalty will be no more. That, gentlemen, is the cause for the black market in poultry. Let us see you do something about it.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH ROBINSON.

Statement of Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, as per permission granted by the House, I extend my remarks in the RECORD embodying the statement of Secretary of War, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, before the Select Committee on Postwar Military Power, on June 15, 1945:

I believe that a necessary foundation on which to build the security of the United States is a system of universal military training. And in saying this I intend the broadest meaning of the term "security." I mean not merely protection against the physical invasion of our territory. I mean the security which goes with the strong and tested character of the citizenship of a nation, giving to that nation a leadership among the peoples of the world and a well-founded respect for it on their part which swells its power and influence throughout the world.

This is not a new belief with me. It is a deep conviction which I as an individual American citizen have held for many years of a long life. From 1914 to 1917, the 3 years of uncertainty and anxiety which preceded our entry into the last great World War, I was constantly engaged, in company with and under the leadership of those great American citizens, Theodore Roosevelt and Leonard Wood, in traveling throughout this country and explaining to a reluctant people the imperative need of preparedness for the danger of the great war which we believed was coming to our Nation, and explaining the necessity of universal training of our young men as a primary part of that preparedness.

In the three decades since that time my convictions have been intensified by my own experience in public affairs and by the ominous course of world events. And so again speaking as an American citizen, I restate here my earnest belief that unless we are now willing to adopt a permanent program of universal military training we shall be gambling with the future security of our national inheritance.

In the first place, let me speak of universal military training as necessary for the physical protection of our country and its people. Never in my long life have we lived in a world where the very civilization of humanity has become so broken and unsettled; where the methods of war have become so brutal and so far-reaching in their peril as today; and where the respect of civilized man for those constitutional safeguards of government, not to say even the traditions of religious and humanitarian regard of one group of human beings for another, have become so shaken.

The fact that in America we ourselves have escaped the physical horrors of this war is the very last reason why we should be

oblivious to the need of preserving the integrity of our boundaries against aggression in the future. On the contrary, the fact that our continent has escaped ravage and destruction and is able to take the lead in the rehabilitation of the rest of the world only intensifies the necessity of preserving the sanctuary which we have been fortunate enough to possess. No nation ever knows what war is until the legions of the enemy have crossed its border. And no matter how dearly we may desire to preserve our way of life by peaceful persuasion alone, no matter how earnestly we may deplore the resort by other nations to aggressive force to gain their ends, these attitudes of peaceful persuasion can never be a substitute for the physical means of our own self-preservation—certainly not in such a world as that we now live in. No nation is fit to assume responsibility for others unless it is capable of being responsible for itself.

Universal military training is the fundamental basis of such security. No matter how complicated the weapons of war may become, no matter how necessary to the nation's future security are programs for scientific research and industrial mobilization, the disciplined, trained, and patriotic citizenry of a nation remain the bricks of the foundation upon which the other methods and means of security rest.

But in the second place, beyond and above any responsibility attending her own sovereignty, there now attaches to the United States as a great world power a further duty. In a short span of years we have seen our Nation emerge as a leading power of the world. It is worse than idle to blink the responsibility which goes with this position. Already in almost every international emergency which arises, the eyes of the other nations turn to us for leadership. Our country's retention in the years to come of a stature befitting such a position will depend in my judgment upon her possession of the balanced elements of greatness which now support her responsible position in the family of nations. Particularly she must retain her capacity effectively to discharge her obligations under the world peace organization which are now in process of being formed. The ideals which inspired the world plan now being framed in San Francisco must be supported and made to work by methods of known efficacy—by the use of force in the last analysis if necessary to prevent the depredations of an aggressor.

Again I speak from personal experience. From my service as Secretary of State during a period of national isolationism and irresponsibility for world affairs, I realize only too well the futility of what the Chinese call "spears of straw" and "swords of ice" when the first steps of a new war are seen approaching. In this disordered world, for decades to come, the success of a program for peace will depend upon the maintenance of sufficient strength by those who are responsible for that peace. To advocate any Dumbarton plan and then to shear ourselves of the power to carry it out would be even worse than our refusal to join the attempt at world organization in 1919. Although the objectives of a program for collective peace are loftier and more idealistic than the mere defense of national sovereignty, they take root in the same soil of national self-interest. The goal of each peace-loving nation is still its individual security, a goal now sought to be attained through the collective security of all nations.

Thus to meet our obligations of bearing our full share in preserving world peace, a part of America's present military readiness should be retained. At the present time this Nation enjoys a full state of military capacity. Today we are both the arsenal of democracy and democracy in arms. Yet at what a cost has this state of military capacity been achieved! Every American has paid some part of this cost by disruption of normal living. America has been forced to dig deep into her future reserves of human and material strength.

A very substantial part of this staggering cost may be charged to our unwillingness to prepare during the years preceding 1940. The breathless haste and improvization involved in the subsequent years of preparation while our allies withstood the aggressors' attacks were necessarily wasteful and exorbitantly expensive. Though we then began almost as soon as Germany unleashed her full strength, and had made good progress in training a fighting force at the time when Japan struck at Pearl Harbor, nevertheless the Japanese actually overran half a hemisphere before we could muster strength enough to challenge her. Can we now in this ringing time of victory in Europe recall the long anguish of Bataan and the dread uncertainty of the Solomons campaign? Can we recall the pitifully small margin that then separated our Pacific forces from disaster? I should not like to think what our victory would have cost had America begun her preparation for this war 1 year later than she actually did or if she had not had valiant allies during those two long years while her own armies were in training camps.

From these considerations the conclusion seems to me inescapable that the United States should retain for the future a sufficient degree of her existing military strength. To do so presents problems of ways and means which should be carefully dealt with in the light of our national experience, with a sober consciousness that if we repeat our past mistakes of procedure we run the risk of bloody and humiliating disaster. I have been interested to observe that already the passivistic advocates of the voluntary system have begun to appear and make their voices heard before your committee. I trust your members are old enough to remember that not so very long ago an American Secretary of State publicly announced that in the case of war against America a million men would spring to arms in this country overnight. Yet the most thoroughly established fact of American history is that the volunteer system has never yet brought to a successful finish a major war.

In the Revolution the two largest American States, Massachusetts and Virginia, were as early as 1777 compelled to resort to a draft of fighting men. And during the course of that war the patriot armies shrunk from the volunteer peak of 89,000 in 1776 to 29,000 in 1781. In the War of 1812 the volunteer system proved so deficient as to make that war the most conspicuous example in our history of how not to organize for military operations. During the War Between the States both the South and the North were compelled to resort to the draft, the South within a year of the commencement of hostilities and the North shortly thereafter. Even in our little war with Spain the full quota of volunteers called for by the President was never obtained.

In the light of this history the United States Government in 1917 inevitably turned to a system of compulsion through a selective-service law. And again in 1940, when it became obvious that the Nation would probably become involved in Wor War II, the Congress again adopted a Selective Service and Training Act. One year later, less than 6 months before the Japanese aggression at Pearl Harbor plunged us into the war, the Congress continued the selective-service law in operation. Thus, as an obvious conclusion which I have been forced to draw from my acquaintance with our national experience in military affairs, I believe that the United States cannot, through sole reliance on volunteer recruitment, maintain the strength which she will need for permanent year-in and year-out national defense and in support of her commitments as a member of a world peace organization. If we are to continue to have substantial military and naval strength, we shall have to resort to some permanent compulsory legislation such as universal military training.

I have been astonished at the shopworn catchwords and objections which have been advanced before your committee against this program of universal training. They are old acquaintances, often called on in past years to take the place of research and careful thinking. They have certainly shown ignorance of the history of the system which they oppose. Universal training for national defense did not have its birth in militarism or autocracy. It has almost everywhere followed the banner of freedom and democracy. It has been simultaneous with the growth of interest which the entire people take in the affairs of government. Such training has come equally in a free republic like Switzerland and in a constitutional monarchy like Sweden. It represents the steady growth of an ideal in justice and fair play, namely, that he who has a voice in the selection of his own government is bound in honor to be trained and ready to defend that government.

There can be no more curious contradiction of fact than the fear that universal military training makes nations more likely to go to war. Such training has, on the contrary, been the very means by which the professional soldier—the man who spends his entire life in planning and thinking about war—is reduced to the lowest possible number in the Nation. Under the old system of standing armies such professionals constituted the entire Army, and their presence in the Nation constituted an element whose aims and ambitions were at variance with their fellow citizens. Under the new system their place is taken by men who learn the art of national defense as a part of their normal education, and then after the period of training is over at once become merged in general citizenship of the Nation. These men thereafter have no special leaning toward war. Their subsequent occupations, habits, and ambitions lead in the same peaceful direction as those of their fellow citizens. Under the proposed system they can only be called into war service by the Congress in the event of a national emergency. Under the proposed system the only body of professional soldiers left in the Nation is a comparatively small professional nucleus in the shape of the Regular Army. Whether such a nucleus can become a source of militarism in a nation or not depends far more upon the attitude of the nation toward that nucleus than in any other consideration. If they are treated as a privileged and ruling caste, as has been the case in Germany and Japan, the danger may become real; if on the contrary they live constantly under the Anglo-Saxon tradition that military authority is ever subject to the civil as is the case in America, the danger in my opinion is wholly imaginary.

Not only would the unwelcome features of maintaining a large standing army in peacetime be absent under a system of universal military training, but there would accrue to the young trainees many incidental advantages which I shall touch upon. But in mentioning them, these by-products, I do not for an instant lose sight of the primary objective. That primary objective is to fit men to protect the national security.

First, a universal period of military training would bring physical well-being to those who lead its vigorous life; and lasting benefit in after years will be derived from the habits of health and exercise inculcated on the training fields. During the past century our Nation has been rapidly becoming a Nation of city indoor dwellers as contrasted with the inhabitants of farm and forest who brought that nation into its existence. Each time of the registration of the Selective Service, namely in 1917 and 1940, there has been brought to light the decline in fitness and physique which has accompanied this national change in our methods of life. To

such a Nation as ours, therefore, the general outdoor life of a year of military training would be particularly beneficial and valuable. Moreover it would come at the period of a trainee's individual life at which it would be most effective.

Again, a system of universal military training would draw together into close association, acquaintance, and friendship our youth from the plains and the mountains and our youth from the cities and industrial areas. In the universal sharing of common facilities and common tasks these boys would rub smooth the sharp edges of prejudice, sectionalism, and lack of understanding between groups in different parts of our land. Their democracy would take on both breadth and strength. The best way to teach a man to love his country is to let him know his fellow countrymen. In that way America ceases to be an abstraction and becomes a fact in each man's individual knowledge. My own personal observation during the last World War in my service in units thus brought together by the Selective Service System was one of the best trainings I ever had in national democracy. Such a period of training teaches the young men sharing in it many essentials of the democratic life. No more healthy lesson can be learned in youth than to appreciate the rights and privileges of others and to deal with them as one wishes to have his own rights and privileges dealt with. Such education in cooperative effort does not regiment or stifle individual merit. Far from it. He values liberty most who understands that it lies, not in license but in self-discipline.

Again, to many of the youths who will take the training there will develop opportunities of value in future civilian life. The course of training will both disclose and develop capacities and latent abilities in our youth. They will be stimulated to the further exercise of those capacities and abilities. In many cases, the training program will develop the rudiments of vocational skill in a way which will be helpful to the young man in his later civilian life.

Finally, I do not overlook the opportunities which such a program holds for matters of the spirit. From long past centuries we have inherited such catchwords as "rude and licentious soldiery." It is high time that such catchwords should be revised and rejected in regard to our present armies. The bringing together of young men in large bodies for patriotic training and discipline offers an unusual opportunity for lessons in decency, in mutual consideration, and in many of the other things which tie us to the spiritual side of human behavior. I know I am not mistaken when I say that this opportunity has been well taken care of by our chaplains and our other leaders in morale and general education in our present Army. In my present post I receive thousands and thousands of communications, written and verbal, from the parents of sons who are in the Army. I think that perhaps the most frequent comment from these parents has been gratification at the development in consideration, self-respect, morale, and responsible behavior which they have observed in their sons. Furthermore, I think each of us knows within his own intimate knowledge of American soldiers in our last two wars how deep and real have been the religious convictions of our men in arms, how their service has stirred within them springs of faith that in their civil life they scarcely knew, and how much solace they have drawn from their religious belief. Instead of a peril or a handicap to religious growth, the gathering together from the four corners of our Nation of our youth during the training year will present an unparelleled opportunity to our churches of every denomination to sow the seeds of religious faith in good ground.

Let me repeat once more that these incidental advantages which I have described as attendant on universal military training are not the fundamental reasons for my advocacy of it. Very likely some of these by-products might separately accrue under some different specialized program of health or education or vocational training. Even then the training would lack the inspiration of the central patriotic purpose of training for national defense and to that extent make less effective even the byproducts. But such a program would fail entirely in the major objective. That major objective can be obtained only through universal military training. That major objective is to produce the necessary military strength for the purpose of national defense and for the purpose of enabling us to discharge our obligation under an organized plan for world peace.

If the United States is to adopt universal military training in peacetime, the basic framework should by all means be enacted now. The European phase of the war is over. We are in the midst of redeployment, and partial demobilization is already underway. The transition from a war economy to a peace economy should be gradual and carefully planned.

We hold accumulated today an immense investment in equipment of all kinds, both arms and implements of war, camp installations and training grounds, and the millions of trained men now under arms. This investment has today what is known in industry as a going-concern value. Disband and junk this organization and that value is completely lost. To reestablish once more such an organization would involve our country in a cost comparable with that incurred in preparing for this war.

There is also another aspect, often overlooked, of our present military readiness which cannot be so adequately appraised in dollars and cents. I mean the time and effort that had to go into building up our existing training organizations. Key elements of these organizations would be invaluable to us in setting up a postwar training program. If we are not able to plan for the future now upon definite assumptions as to what will be authorized in the future, the going-concern value of these organizations also will be lost.

Our determination should be made now as to which parts of the physical equipment will be disposed of and which parts are capable to use in a postwar training program. Until we know what kind of program we shall have, we cannot make intelligent plans for disposal and dismantling of the various parts of the colossal machinery of war. These are some of the material reasons for now making decision on this fundamental national policy.

But I am also persuaded by another and different reason. My experience tells me that it is very real. We Americans are not warlike. We take up the sword only when we must, and after we have laid aside that sword we try to forget the atrocious necessities that forced us into conflict. After World War I we did forget—but had a rude awakening. As peace unfolds after this even more terrible struggle, we shall want again to forget. But I tell you that we owe it to the next generation, and those who will follow them, that we shall this time make decision while the lesson of experience is fresh upon us.

This is no counsel to act during a time of war hysteria. Who dares say that the solemn conviction which now animates this Nation after the bitter experience of 4 years of war is "hysterical"? It is only resolution and common sense for people to come to their decision while they are well-informed and mindful.

If the Nation is to retain its status as a world power, with a dignity and strength commensurate with that status, an orderly transition from our wartime Military Establishment to the peacetime Military Establishment is essential. Such an orderly transition can be made only if we are to know in the near future something of the character of the peacetime establishment that will be authorized by the Congress.

In determining the character of such an establishment, you, whose duty it is to plan the Nation's future military policy, will be thinking how already in this century we have twice been forced to plunge our youth into the cauldron of world war. In the future we may again be forced to send our young men into combat against armies of sudden aggression. We have no right to gamble on the hope that our country for the third time will have even the little breathing space she has had in these two wars for hasty preparation. We have fully experimented with unpreparedness as a means for avoiding war. It has not prevented war and it has led us into staggering costs and sacrificed lives. As one who has personally come very close to these experiences of two world wars, I beg you to cease listening to the false prophets of "no preparation." If, as history shows, wars recur, we owe it to our young men to provide a system of military training in peacetime. Then they will be ready to fight a good fight, and in that fight will have a decent chance to survive.

A Great American Gentleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on May 28, 1945, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Port Chester (N. Y.) Item titled "A Great American Gentleman," eulogizing the late Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright, a former Member of this House:

A GREAT AMERICAN GENTLEMAN

Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright, of Rye, was born in 1864, a significant year for a soldier and a practical philosopher of government to be born, in that it was the year which found the armies of Grant and Lee locked in the final struggle for national indivisibility. Throughout his long and highly valuable career, Colonel Wainwright was to work and to stand for this principle of national unity and strength.

Perhaps because of the time of his birth and its attendant struggle within the Nation, the next two wars, the Spanish-American and World War I, were to find this man prophetic in his vision and in his programs for preparedness, while even a third, World War II, was to find him almost as energetic, at the advanced age of 77, in his acceptance of the chairmanship of the Westchester County War Council.

From 1889, when J. Mayhew Wainwright enlisted in the New York National Guard, his executive and administrative capacities carried him through a long ascendancy in military rank until he became Assistant Secretary of War in 1921. And through every phase of his military career, Colonel Wainwright stood vigorously for all-out defense of this Nation against any and all foes. Typical of his attitude was the fact that, although himself a man of substantial wealth, he worked hard when in Congress for a universal draft act which would have conscripted not only men but also property and wealth for service in time of war. Equally valuable were his contributions toward our national policy with regard to the Philippines, Haiti, Nicaragua, and China, as well as to the development of our merchant marine, Muscle Shoals,

settlement of our war debts, and care for our wounded veterans.

In civic life he was even more impressive, and had there been a medal to be awarded the one person who had done most for Westchester it is likely he would have become the recipient in each of many years. From 1902 when he first became an assemblyman, through his work as the county's only State senator, for 8 years as this county's only Congressman, later as a park commissioner, as well as in our county historical society and county bar association, this man worked for the welfare of Westchester, earnestly, intelligently, and energetically.

Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a deserving tribute to Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States Army, written by the nationally known newspaperman and commentator, Robert L. Norton, and appearing in the Boston Post of June 20, 1945.

ROBERT L. NORTON COMMENTS

One of the really great soldiers of this war, and who meets little, or no public acclaim, is Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Quartermaster General. He is the head of the Corps, which together with 500,000 officers and enlisted men and 75,000 civilian employees has furnished the clothing, ammunition, and food which have made our Army the best fed, the best clothed, and the best equipped in the history of mankind.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY

This organization is celebrating its one hundred and seventieth anniversary and it is entitled to a salute from the armed forces, as well as from all of who have or have had sons, fathers, brothers, and daughters on the fighting fronts of the world.

The job done by this outfit, has, and continues to be magnificent. A recent report makes fascinating reading. By way of contrast, the first ration for the Army prescribed by Congress in 1775 included one pint of milk, one pint of Indian meal, and one quart of spruce beer, or cider, per day. People were canvassed from house to house for supplies. Lead was obtained from window and clock weights. Salt, lead, gunpowder, and saltpeter provided the headquarters with the most headaches. They had to be imported. The scarcity of salt produced in turn a scarcity of meat, inasmuch as salt was the chief preservative of meat. Complicating everything was a general lack of public faith in the Government's ability to pay off its contracts.

TWENTY-FOUR MILLION MEALS A DAY

In nearly two centuries civilization has achieved marvelous proficiency, not alone in the art of killing in war, but in fattening for the kill. Napoleon said something to the effect that an army fights on its belly, a fundamental fact observed by all great generals. But it is a fair cry from the primitive problems of the Revolution to those of World War II. In this war the Quartermaster Corps became the largest mass feeding organization in world history, at one time supplying 24,000,000 meals a day to the Army alone, each meal scientifically planned to sustain men in the toughest kind of work. Meals in mess halls, fox holes, tents, former luxury hotels, transport planes, and ships. Our armies had to race where Napoleon's army could not have even crawled, across deserts, Arctic wastes, jungle fastnesses. Rations for mobile armies had to be designed and processed to withstand heat, damp climates, subzero temperatures * * * and yet be fit to eat, with the nutritive content of a steak dinner and yet compact enough to fit in a soldier's pack.

In this tremendous accomplishment, General Gregory finds that if progress has been made in the arts of war, it also has its compensatory benefits in peacetime. He says, "This was has been the greatest proving ground ever known for new foods, textiles, and many kinds of materials and appliances."

A Lasting Monument to Those Who Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address I delivered in Perryopolis Pa., at the dedication of the memorial to the service men and women of Perry Township, Fayette County, Pa., May 30, 1945.

The address follows:

We meet today to dedicate a monument to the citizen soldiers of Perry Township. Many monuments have appropriately been erected to perpetuate the memory of spontaneous acts of heroism. A sudden plunge into angry waters to save a human life. An impetuous dash into a burning building to rescue a human being.

This monument is a memorial dedicated to some twelve hundred boys and girls of Perry Township who were not following a sudden impulse but rather who deliberately followed the light of the steadfast convictions of their own souls that man is more than an animal; the conviction that every man and woman is endowed by the Creator with an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that might does not make right; that the path to attainment of the dignity of man is the realization of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

The people of Perry Township dedicate this monument to some twelve hundred boys and girls who in World War I and in this present war laid aside their plans for acquiring education or building a home for themselves and their loved ones, their plans for establishing business, entering a profession, or securing a farm, and entered the armed forces in answer to their country's call. Boys and girls who offered all that life held dear to them, their hopes, their ambitions, their health, their very lives in defense of the right as God gave them to see the right.

The recognition of the sacrifices of those who fought and those who fell in the First World War in a sense comes late, a delay due in part to the fact that their country failed to recognize fully the purpose of that war and the responsibilities growing out of the victory they achieved.

At a staggering cost in blood and treasure, America, and we fondly believe the whole world, has learned:

"If a man before his duty
With listless spirit stands,
Ere long the Great Avenger
Takes the work from out his hands."

Because the world and particularly the United States failed to group the significance of World War I and the far-reaching possibilities of victory in that war, World War II became inevitable. Because war as an instrument of national policy was not renounced by the nations victorious in World War I and an organization of the nations of the world accomplished to outlaw war, an organization to ban war in settlement of national controversies by providing a forum with jurisdiction and power to which such controversies should be submitted, a second world war became as certain as the flight of time.

Those who have made the supreme sacrifice in this war, as well as those who must make it and all who have offered their lives unite in the demand that there shall be no third world war. Excessive nationalism and individual selfishness must not permit us to quit short of the goal this time.

The dedication of this monument is not offered in recompense for sacrifices made; in a real sense it is a monument the boys and girls from Perry Township have by their deeds dedicated to us. This monument is the articular voice of the boys and girls whose names are graven upon it. It is the voice of those boys and girls demanding that we make certain that their sacrifices will never need be repeated. That we make sure that their sacrifices were not in vain.

As we stand in the presence of this monument, we may catch the sound of a voice that is still. Here to our consciousness come whispers from beneath little white crosses or from unmarked graves in the sands of Africa, on the mountains of Italy, in the fields of France, in the valleys of Holland, on the hillsides of Germany, on the islands of the Pacific, and from the silent depths of the ocean, where boys from Perry Township rest. Here heroic dust becomes articulate; here boys and girls say it must not happen again.

Standing in the presence of this monument, answering the demand of those whose names are carved upon it, let us unite in a pledge to them that we shall make the realization of their vision the first demand we make of our Nation. That we shall not rest until, with God's help, we can offer those who survive and their children and all the children of mankind a world without war.

The Heart of Food Complaints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on May 28, 1945, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., titled "The Heart of Food Complaints":

Discharged and furloughed veterans frequently express surprise upon their return at the volume and nature of complaints rising from civilians as to food shortages. The veterans compare our situation to that abroad, to their own shortages in combat zones upon occasion, and are impelled to the opinion that we "don't know there's a war on."

Frankly, we do not believe that any large percentage of the complaints from housewives—particularly here in Westchester—comes because of lack of patriotism or failure to appreciate the existence of a terrible

war, or unwillingness to accept necessary sacrifices.

Rather, the complaints almost wholly are based upon a countrywide sentiment that there have been grave errors of judgment made by the OPA and the WFA and other Federal agencies connected with production and distribution of foodstuffs. Those who complain feel that the responsible officials who have erred now attempt to cover their failures through appeals to patriotism which are unnecessary.

The American people are patriotic; they will accept cheerfully any essential sacrifice; but they distinctly do not want bureaucrats in Washington utilizing patriotism as a mask for their own mistakes.

We had a few illustrations of this sort in the actual war, when leaders who had been guilty of short-sightedness or had failed to take proper precautions sought to cover these errors by censorship and by the unjustified declaration that military secrecy was involved.

Let's have more frankness in Washington as to how and why our record-breaking production has been maldistributed and we will have far better cooperation and understanding on the home front.

Replacement Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a short letter which I received from a serviceman in the higher-age bracket with several children. For military reasons I have withheld the name of the writer. With his letter he enclosed an article entitled "Replacement Plan" which appeared in the Stars and Stripes.

The letter and article follow:

MARIENBAD, CZECHOSLOVAKIA,
June 2, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SASSCER: While reading the Stars and Stripes over here I ran across this article and thought maybe you would be interested, so I am sending same with this letter.

Everything with me is O. K. but now that the fighting is over I think we should get home as soon as possible. Then if they need us in the Pacific we will be ready.

Hope this letter finds you in the best of health.

REPLACEMENT PLAN

To many thousands of soldiers sweating out VE-day in the ETO, seeing the film, Two Down and One To Go, offered little, if any, encouragement on prospects on getting home soon. My interpretation of the picture was that releases from the Army depend almost entirely on boys becoming 18 years of age.

There is a large reservoir of healthy men in the States between the ages of 18 and 35 who have stayed out of the Army through deferments of one kind or another. We have men in the Army qualified to fill any civilian job in the States who are entitled to be sent home. Their chances of getting home within the next 2 years depend upon replacements available.

If all civilian men deferred for other than physical disqualifications were now drafted in the next 6 months, thousands of soldiers with 1 to 3 years' service, and lacking the miraculous 85 points for discharge, could be sent home.

This plan, if adopted, would open up many jobs to the returning vet in the higher salaried brackets. Men not in the armed forces have had the opportunity in the last 4 years to accumulate large nest eggs. If they are drafted now they're already set with an economic cushion then they are released.

These men also have the inside track at present on a majority of new business opportunities and are leaving their present jobs daily to avail themselves of these opportunities. This will make it tougher on the returning vet 1 or 2 years from now.

Congress should take immediate steps to remove all deferments for other than physical disqualifications, and get these men into training centers where they could become replacements for veterans who have earned a right to civilian life.

OPA

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous letters regarding the OPA which other Members no doubt have received, relating to the fact that persons all over the United States are hungry. On the 22d I sent the following telegram to the President:

JUNE 22, 1945.

Hon. HARRY S TRUMAN,
The President, The White House:

I have read your statement in the newspapers to the effect that the food shortage will be solved automatically when Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON takes office as Secretary of Agriculture and War Food Administrator. Therefore, owing to the extreme shortage of food which appears to be getting worse in many parts of the country and especially in New England, I earnestly request that you have Mr. ANDERSON assume his new offices at once. There is an urgent need to take every means possible to relieve the food shortage and suffering caused by it, without delay.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

Every day counts when people are hungry. I trust the President will grant the request in my telegram.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of June 23 1945]

NEW THOUGHT ON FOOD

There seems to be increasing agitation throughout this partially starved Nation to shift the food problem from the supervision of day-dreaming and untrained Federal officials to men who are trained and skilled in such matters as production and distribution. It would not be surprising if, within the next several weeks, the OPA should be relieved of all its food responsibilities, other than the enforcement of prescribed rationing. And that, it is expected, will be a big improvement.

As an agency enforcing rationing, the OPA has its place in these times of war, but when it attempts to step in and control producers, wholesalers, retailers, consumers, and all others, it simply produces a mess, which as now exists.

President Truman seems confident that just as soon as Congressman ANDERSON steps in as Secretary of Agriculture a week from next Monday that there will be an immediate improvement. That being the case, it is probable that the new Secretary has some well-planned theories on reducing the number of cooks that have been stirring what is left of the Nation's broth.

The food picture cannot get much worse; there is, in fact, little time which can be wasted before there is an improvement. Another month or two of decreasing food supplies and the people would deluge Washington with those traditional letters and telegrams, demanding enough to eat for themselves and their growing families.

The effect of such public indignation would be to place the spotlight on agencies such as the OPA and the WFA, which have bungled things so thoroughly.

Thus, it is imperative for the peace of mind of everyone that the President's confidence in the ability of Secretary ANDERSON is justified by performance.

Mr. Hassett of the White House, Secretary of the President, writes me the President will give due consideration:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 23, 1945.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: This is in acknowledgment of your telegram of June 22, addressed to the President. I am glad to assure you that your recommendation will be given due consideration.

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM D. HASSETT,
Secretary to the President.

I wish the membership of the House would join with me also in making that same request. Immediate action is indicated. Twenty-four hours means a lot to hungry people. A letter from the town of Winchester in my district states there are workmen in the water works who cannot carry on their work properly and efficiently because they are not getting the proper food. The letter from the chairman of the Winchester Water and Sewer Board follows:

TOWN OF WINCHESTER, MASS.,
OFFICE OF THE WATER AND SEWER BOARD,
June 23, 1945.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Our men in the water and sewer department are not getting the proper food so that they can efficiently carry on their work.

In my opinion the OPA has made a terrible mess of the whole situation and reeks of politics from one end to the other. Something must be done or we will have a great deal of trouble in this connection. The tempers of our men are getting very strained. They think they are entitled to a reasonable amount of food when they see so much waste in the Army.

Although a Republican, I am a strong supporter of CLINTON ANDERSON and I think his views on the food situation are practical. He should be placed in charge of the whole food program.

Yours respectfully,
EDMUND C. SANDERSON,
Chairman of the Winchester Water and Sewer Board.

Another letter is as follows:

LOWELL, MASS., *June 22, 1945.*

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am writing to you to see if you can do anything about the meat situation; it is terrible around here. My husband works in the roundhouse in Charleston for the B. & M. Railroad, and I

have to go from market to market every day looking for meat so he will be able to keep on working—but no luck.

You know a man can't work as hard as he does without meat.

I am a nervous wreck running around trying to get something to eat. I hope you will be able to do something about it.

Hoping God will give you the health and strength to carry on the good work you are doing.

Best of luck to you.

Tribute to the Heroine From Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, women have always played a prominent part in the wars of the United States by relieving the suffering of our fighting men, and Saginaw County, Mich., is proud to claim as its native daughter Lt. Aleda E. Lutz, a heroine of World War II, who lost her life in November 1944 after an unprecedented record of service.

Lieutenant Lutz was one of the first women to have her name added to the list of recipients of the Distinguished Flying Cross. It is regrettable that the award was made posthumously.

The outstanding record of this nurse reveals that she lead her squadron—the first of its kind activated and sent overseas, in performance of duty. She was an original member of the Eight Hundred and Second Medical Air Evacuation Squadron. She had to her credit over 190 missions and had participated in the evacuation of over 3,500 wounded men. She also had more flying hours than any other member of her squadron.

Lieutenant Lutz was the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Lutz, of Freeland, Mich., and her sister, Miss Hilda Lutz, of Saginaw, is also a nurse.

A plane evacuating 15 American doughboys from southern France to an American hospital in Italy crashed on November 1, 1944. Lieutenant Lutz was on board, administering to the wounded men en route to a hospital where other wounds could receive the attention of skilled medical men. The pilots, the 15 soldiers, and Lieutenant Lutz were killed. The crash occurred near Lyons, France.

Today, a great mercy ship, the largest hospital ship now afloat, bears the name of Lieutenant Lutz. It was named in memory of this heroic flight nurse upon its completion in the shipyards of the Arthur Trickle Engineering Works, of Brooklyn.

This giant 16,000-ton vessel is equal in size and facilities to a ten-story land hospital of the most modern type and is equipped to give treatment to 800 patients, with a staff of 18 surgical, medical, and dental officers, 44 nurses and 188 attendants. It is complete even to facilities for mental patients.

A unique innovation is the installation on the deck of the ship of the first Red Cross to be illuminated by neon to make it more easily seen from the air than is possible by electric lights.

The United States hospital ship *Aleda Lutz* is today relieving the suffering of wounded fighters just as Lieutenant Lutz would have been doing were she alive.

The gallant service to her country given by Lieutenant Lutz has attracted widespread attention, not only in the United States but in Allied countries as well.

A few weeks ago Mr. H. B. Kenny, broadcasting over Virginia's premier station, WRVA, at Richmond, paid very fine tribute to Lieutenant Lutz. What he said is such a fitting tribute to this typical young woman from Michigan that I desire to incorporate his broadcast in my remarks. It follows:

THE GIRL FROM MICHIGAN

For the first time the Distinguished Flying Cross has been awarded to a woman in the Mediterranean theater. Unfortunately, the award is posthumous. Lt. Aleda E. Lutz isn't there any more. She crashed in France.

The Distinguished Flying Cross means just about what it says. It is awarded for distinguished performance in an aircraft. You don't have to be a pilot to win it, but you do have to be of those whose place in this war is somewhere between heaven and earth. I'll give you the official citation, because citations, in their restrained military language are often more eloquent than fancy phrases:

"For extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight as a flight nurse of a C-47 aircraft. Throughout her long period of service, Lieutenant Lutz distinguished herself through her superior professional skill and courage. Flying on more than 190 missions to evacuate wounded personnel from the forward areas. Lieutenant Lutz's resourcefulness and determination have been of high inspiration to those serving with her.

"On November 1, 1944, while she was flying on a mission to evacuate wounded personnel from the front lines, a severe storm rocked Lieutenant Lutz' aircraft from the pilot's control, and it crashed in Southern France.

"Her selfless devotion to duty and outstanding proficiency have reflected the highest credit upon herself and the armed forces of the United States."

That is the official citation, and this isn't a scb story, so I will just tell you what I know about Lieutenant Lutz (known to her friends as "Lutzy") as the other nurses told it to me.

It is just a story about an average American girl, not very big (because every ounce counts in a plane evacuating wounded) and not especially pretty, and never very glamorous in her overstuffed flying togs. At least she didn't look glamorous unless you were full of holes, and frightened, and in a bucking airplane perhaps for the first time in your life. Then she was glamorous, and something more. Then she was strong and beautiful and comforting. She was at once mother and sister, sweetheart and nurse.

I guess most of all she was nurse. Like most of the air evac nurses, she was from a small town—Freeland, Mich. She graduated from Saginaw General Hospital in 1937, when she was 21, and had 2 years' experience in private duty, 1 year in general duty, and 11 months in Army nursing, when war came. She was commissioned February 19, 1942.

She was in the first landing in Africa, and on every other American operation that went on around there. She wore the European-African theater ribbon, with five stars—for the Tunisian, Sicilian, Southern Italian, Central Italian, and Southern France campaigns. She wore the Air Medal with four oak-leaf clusters.

"Lutzy tried to win the war all by herself," her friends say.

When the weather was fit for fishes, not birds, and when the overcast was so heavy even a homing pigeon couldn't navigate, Lieutenant Lutz would fly. Any place that a pilot of Brig. Gen. Timothy Manning's Fifty-first Troop Carrier Command would fly, Lieutenant Lutz would fly, and Manning's boys—as everyone around there knows—will fly in weather in which you wouldn't risk a box kite.

She flew through flak, and she flew over the enemy's territory, and she landed on fields still cratered by artillery and mines. Several times in her 196 missions she landed on the strip at the Anzio beachhead when it was under shellfire. She landed there and saw that the C-47's complement of 16 wounded was safely aboard, and I don't think anybody ever saw her quiver.

Altogether she helped evacuate 3,500 wounded, and none died under her hand, and there is no telling how many she saved. Usually, flight nurses are accompanied by an enlisted man, usually a sergeant, who has the rank of medical technician. On her last trip Lieutenant Lutz went it alone.

People said that when the weather was worst and the C-47s bounced around and sank into air pockets and buffeted their way through the nasty fronts of the Italian and French mountain country, at those times Lieutenant Lutz was calmest and at her best.

They say that sometimes she was a little jumpy in a jeep, but when the chips were down, and she had 16 wounded men to care for, she was steady and cheerful as if she was on the eighth floor of Polyclinic.

Somewhere near Lyons the chips were down and the cards were stacked. It is certain that she went out quickly and without knowing it, for she was caring for someone else.

The other girls in Eight Hundred and Two say she didn't have a boy friend over there, but she does have several thousand men who can never forget her.

And there you have the story of a real American girl—the little lady from Michigan.

William Randolph Hearst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, recently awarded to William Randolph Hearst their Gold Medal of Honor, "for outstanding service to the American Nation during a lifetime of distinguished service."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Army and Navy Union News of May 1945 mailed to me by one of my constituents, Capt. G. H. Maines, of Flint, Mich.:

HEARST AWARDED HONOR MEDAL FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE—NOTED PUBLISHER TO RECEIVE ELEVENTH CITATION FROM OLDEST VETERAN GROUP—CAPT. HENRY W. GERBER ANNOUNCES FAMOUS AMERICAN AND PATRIOT DESERVES AWARD FOR LIFE OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND VETERAN AID

Hon. William Randolph Hearst, of San Simeon, Calif., noted publisher, and an established friend of the veteran, has been awarded the Gold Medal of Honor of the Army and Navy Union, U.S.A., "for outstanding service to the American Nation during a lifetime of distinguished service," it has been announced

by Capt. Henry W. Gerber, of Atlantic City, national commander.

The award, the eleventh of its kind to be presented in 57 years of the organization's existence, has been voted to Gen. Winfield Scott (posthumous); Gen. Douglas MacArthur; Gen. Peyton C. March, World War I Chief of Staff of the Army; the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt; J. Edgar Hoover; Col. Frank Knox; Col. George T. Shank, who was recommended for the U. S. Army Award for Merit for quelling a mutiny almost single handed; Gen. George Marshall, U. S. Army Chief of Staff in World War II; William C. Durant, founder of the General Motors Corp., "whose genius and foresight initiated and financed the establishment of factories employing more than 1,000,000 persons engaged in building materials used in the war effort"; the Unknown Soldier of the Revolutionary War; and Hugo Evon Frey, well known author, lecturer, and writer, "whose articles have carried the fame of America's perpetual veteran and service association to all parts of the world."

In a letter to Mr. Hearst, which National Commander Gerber handed to Capt. G. H. Maines, chairman of the Americanism Committee of the ANU, to give to the noted publisher on Memorial Day, Captain Gerber wrote:

ARMY AND NAVY UNION, U.S.A.,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER,
Atlantic City, N. J., May 10, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. HEARST: This writer is honored to inform you that the highest award granted by the Army and Navy Union, U.S.A., has been voted to be presented to you for outstanding service to the American Nation during your lifetime of distinguished service.

Your great contribution through your various publications, and your zeal and personal integrity as a pioneer of the freedom of the press, and your standards for unity and tolerance for all people has marked you to be one of the world's great citizens.

There will be no announcement made about this award until we have your permission, properly so.

This award and citation to follow has been presented by this oldest veteran and service organization to only 11 persons in 57 years.

Respectfully yours,
HENRY GERBER,
National Commander,
Army and Navy Union, U.S.A.

Mr. Hearst's letter and reply follows:

SAN SIMEON, CALIF., *June 5, 1945.*

Capt. G. M. HAINES,
Flint, Mich.

DEAR CAPTAIN MAINES: I shall be much honored to receive the medal which you and your notable organization so generously offer me.

I feel, however, that I little deserve the distinction, and that after all a sufficient reward for being a good American is the privilege of being a good American.

With sincerest thanks for your courtesy, I am,

Very faithfully yours,
W. R. HEARST.

Bad Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on May 28, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, of Larchmont, N. Y., titled "Bad Management":

BAD MANAGEMENT

Somewhere along the line somebody erred.

After months of urging that housewives make every endeavor to can fruits this summer to meet an anticipated worse shortage this fall and winter, Washington was forced to halt issuance of sugar-for-canning permits. Only recently have they been restored and in many communities it is reported that either the OPA has exhausted its June allotment or grocers are without supplies to sell.

This is definitely not good planning. If fruits are to be canned sugar must be available. And somewhere in Washington there should have been somebody who recognized that fact. It does no good to urge canning and other forms of food conservation upon housewives and then tell them that, unfortunately, the ingredients are lacking.

Many more such errors and the housewives of this Nation are going to be singing to the responsible bureaucrats in Washington:

"Roses are red and violets are blue; sugar is scarce—and so are our votes for you."

Rest These Divisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of June 19, 1945:

REST THESE DIVISIONS

The United States Navy is following a system of rotating rest for entire marine divisions in the Pacific that the Army would do well to duplicate. Under the present set-up the general Army policy is to give individual soldiers furloughs under a rotation system, but to keep the division itself in combat, or alerted for it in combat zones, for what become almost endless periods to the men concerned. Morale, health, and fighting efficiency all are endangered.

The Navy, on the other hand, takes marine divisions that have been through a stiff campaign and sends them to sunny Pacific isles far out of combat zones, or even back to the States, and provides long periods of genuine mental rest and relaxation before putting the men into combat again.

What the Navy can do, certainly the Army can do in this respect; in fact it should be much easier for the Army because of its larger forces, and this is especially true now with the war in Europe ended.

For example, there's the Thirty-second Division of Wisconsin-Michigan men (originally) which came to Louisiana to train in the fall of 1940—more than a full year before Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. It sailed for the Pacific rather early in 1942 and has been in combat, or preparing for it ever since. Its men were the ones who were transported by plane over the 10,000-foot Owen Stanley mountain range in New Guinea in 1942 when General MacArthur carried out his desperate and almost miraculous shoestrong offensive against the Japs on that island in order to save Australia. From there the Thirty-second fought its way through jungle after jungle, island after island, month after month, finally helping spearhead the Philippine invasion. It now is in combat on Luzon. We understand that more than half of its personnel has been put out of action by jungle diseases and its combat casualties are reported high. Its men are being rotated back home on individual furloughs, but the Division as a whole has been in service nearly 5 years, in dirty and bloody Pacific combat more than 3 years.

On the other hand, when the first Marines consolidated Guadalcanal in 1942, after making a shoestring invasion hold good solely through their own magnificent courage, they were brought back to the United States and kept out of combat until the invasion of Okinawa started some 2 months ago. They well deserved the rest, for they earned it with their blood. But so did the Thirty-second, and other outfits. What's the difference between a Marine and a soldier in such matters? Nothing—except that the Navy seems to have a better, more sensible and more beneficial policy in rotating whole divisions than the Army has in rotating individual men.

There is no logical reason for this Army policy. It is not a MacArthur policy. The record shows that he fought against it from the start—back in 1942 and 1943. It's in the War Department that the policy was initiated and there it must be ended.

What about some action—now?

Leaning Over Backward in Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, in showing how far we have—in Mr. Grew's reputed phrase, "leaned over backward" to avoid offending Stalin's Russia along the eastern shore of the Adriatic, I should like to remind my colleagues, how this House once rang with cheers for gallant little Serbia, first to defy the imperialist aggression of the Germans in 1914.

Throughout the First World War the Serbians kept on fighting to the end. Often defeated and overwhelmed by the numbers of our mutual enemies, they were never conquered. So, in 1919, this courageous mountain people naturally attracted their softer, wealthier neighbors, whose empire had vanished, and who were looking for a warm political blanket under which to crawl. These neighbors, the Croats and the Slovenes, became minority members of the Kingdom of the Southern Slavs, Yugoslavia. There were 6,000,000 Serbs and Montenegrins, and not quite that many combined Croats and Slovenes. It was admittedly an experiment in political federation. The results were never very happy.

Just how unhappy they were became visible to the whole world in 1941, when Hitler invaded Yugoslavia. The fiction of a true union fell apart and it became evident that Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes had never truly been one people. There was good historical reason for this. Croats and Slovenes had fought in the Austro-Hungarian Army and Navy, whereas the Austrian invasion of Serbia had been the immediate reason for the war, and the Serbs had been the first of

the Allies. Naturally then, after the defeat of the Central Powers the Serbs considered themselves victors and, as such, entitled to dominate the new southern Slav state, with Croats and Slovenes holding only minority places.

This risked putting two western Roman Catholic nations under the rule of a nation whose religion was eastern orthodox. The Serbs were accused of violating, from the outset, their postwar pact with the Croats and Slovenes according to which the new state was to be a confederacy of three races with equal autonomous rights.

Crotia, much wealthier and more industrialized than Serbia, had to bear the brunt of the high postwar taxation some of which was used for the development of Serbia. The tension between Croatia and Serbia grew steadily. At one time King Alexander even considered what he called the "amputation" of Croatia. Then, when Stephen Raditch, the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party, was murdered in Parliament, by a Serb deputy, the King realized that civil war could only be avoided by the establishment of a royal dictatorship. This dictatorship was by no means fascist in character, but it did include cruel police and military rule, by Serbian bureaucrats over the Croats and Slovenes.

Then, after King Alexander had been assassinated by a Fascist Croat at Marseilles, his successor, the Regent Paul, tried to reconcile the non-Serbian elements by constitutional concessions. These concessions came too late; they were possibly too liberal and too rapid, for they roused the bitter opposition of Serbian nationalists. In any case, when Germany attacked Yugoslavia in 1941 only the Serbs, independent as always, were willing to defend their country. The Croats, who had fought savagely against the Serbs from 1914 to 1918, declaring a kind of neutrality, actually welcomed the opportunity to avenge themselves for both real and fancied slights and imbued with ancient enmity, rose against the Serbs. This civil war broke out almost at once. In Croatia the Germans established the puppet regime of Ante Pavelitch, which lacked popular support because Matchek, the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party refused to become Hitler's tool. Nevertheless the Croatian Ustachi were very useful to Hitler in spreading terror and murder and harassing Serbian resistance. In Serbia the Germans installed another puppet regime under General Neditch, a former war minister who had only a small following. Most of the Serbians rallied around General Mikhailovic, a Serbian patriot who never forgot the treachery of the Croats in joining Hitler.

For this reason he could not obtain much support in Croatia or Slovenia. Nevertheless, King Peter, nominated him as Yugoslavian War Minister, and Mikhailovic gathered a strong force of hard-fighting mountaineers who struck swiftly and repeatedly at the German occupying armies.

This unhappy situation offered an opportunity to the Soviets which they at once seized upon. Stalin sent to Yugoslavia one of the best graduates of the Moscow Comintern School, a former Croat named Josef Bros, who adopted the party alias of "Tito" Very soon he added to this name the title of marshal, which had never before existed in the history of Serbia or Yugoslavia. Tito appealed very cleverly to all those who opposed General Mikhailovic's Serbian policy; first to the Catholic Croats; and then with Russian support he was soon able to muster an army of Croats and Slovenes which was better equipped than Mikhailovic's Chetniks.

The Governments of Britain and the United States, loyal to King Peter's government in exile, continued to regard Mikhailovic as their ally, until at Tehran, Stalin forced them to transfer their favor to Tito.

We need not go into the whole history of Anglo-American betrayal of Mikhailovic. It was splendidly told to this House by our colleague, Mr. O'KONSKI, on May 25, only a few weeks ago.

We know, from that disclosure, that Tito's chief efforts have always been directed against his internal opponents. Once the Germans, under the pressure of the western and the Russian armies began to withdraw from the Balkans, Tito stood revealed as a strictly Communist totalitarian agent. The collaboration of Catholic and other elements in the Yugoslav resistance movement was forgotten, and the Communists claimed unlimited power as saviors of the country. Mikhailovic, deserted by his former allies, was unable to resist the strength of Tito who has received lend-lease support in large quantities.

Today thousands of Mikhailovic's men have escaped to Italy. It is most significant that a good many of them are not Serbs, but Croats, which tends to show that even many Catholic Croats seem to prefer Mikhailovic's Serbianism to Tito's Communist dictatorship. When the Russians had seized Belgrade, Tito was able to establish his administration there, which was recognized as a government by the Anglo-Americans against the advice of King Peter. Tito's regime has acted more ruthlessly and oppressively than any of the Fascist-Nazi dictatorships for whose downfall the western powers went to war.

Yugoslavia has been Sovietized rapidly, whole classes have been wiped out, and the Roman Catholic Church is the favorite object of persecution. Tito has declared that the Catholic Church must be national, that it must be separate from Rome, and secondary to the Communist-dominated Russian church.

Tito is, of course, nothing but Stalin's outstretched arm. Territorial and political concessions to Tito are territorial and political concessions to the Soviet Union. By dominating Yugoslavia, the borders of Red Russia extend to the Italian frontier and to the Adriatic Sea, which is an inlet of the Mediterranean. One of Tito's avowed aims is a federation of Yugoslavia with Bulgaria. This federation would mean that Russia dominated the whole area reaching from the Black Sea to the Adriatic. No Russian Czar ever dreamed a more imperial dream.

The composition of Tito's cabinet follows the familiar line. Tito, himself, of course, was well schooled in Communist ideology and technique at Moscow. His second deputy Prime Minister Edvard Kardelj likewise was a student and then a teacher in Moscow's Communist academies. Kardelj has the vital task of preparing a new constitution for the new Yugoslav state.

The Minister of the Interior and Controller of Police is, of course, a Communist—a former Russian priest.

The Minister of Justice—as always in these Russian subsidiary administrations—is a member of the Communist Party. This man, Frac Frol, was formerly a leader of Croat Ustachi, and so a helper of Hitler's Nazi invasion into Yugoslavia.

The Minister of Industry is also the secretary of the Communist Party in Croatia.

The Minister of Social Policy is a Slovenian Communist—a former judge named Anton Krzisnik—the man who ordered the mass execution of Serbian patriots at Kocevje in October 1943 at Nazi behest.

There is much more available evidence of the Soviet influence on and in Yugoslavia. But these few facts should provoke every Member of this House to ask the question: Are we leaning over backward too far on Yugoslavia?

Award Given Infantryman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to ask unanimous consent to include with by remarks a newspaper article appearing in the Santa Ana Register, of Santa Ana, Calif., and telling of the award of the combat infantryman's badge to S/Sgt. Yoshimi Yoshida, a member of the Forty-second Battalion of the Seventh Army.

My own interest in this soldier is not alone a patriotic one, but also the fact that I was once his school teacher.

The article follows:

INFANTRYMAN IS GIVEN HONOR FOR RESCUING BUDDIES

Sgt. Yoshimi (Jimmy) Yoshida, 28, of Santa Ana, has been awarded the combat infantryman's badge for outstanding performance under enemy fire and also has received a commendation for crawling into no man's land with a group of Japanese-Americans to rescue Caucasian buddies marooned during fighting in the Vosges Mountains of France.

Sergeant Yoshida, a former student at Fullerton Junior College, has been in service since February 1941, when he enlisted and was assigned to the Engineers and later to the Quartermaster Corps. Eventually he was transferred to the Infantry and embarked for overseas duty last August and is now a member of the famed Four Hundred and Forty-second Battalion of the Seventh Army. His wife, the former Mary Kurata of Portland, Oreg., is living in St. Paul, Minn.

His younger brother, Pvt. Johnny H. Yoshida, 19, was captain of the local high-school B football team his sophomore year. He is now in training with a tank battalion.

The boys' sister, Mrs. Rose K. Yoshida, expects to return to the southland soon. Her mother, who died since her family left here, helped the family in operating a local florist and fruit business before the war.

OPA Operations Bringing Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles:

MEAT DEALERS SAY OPA ORDER MEANS FAMINE
(By A. L. Lindbeck)

SALEM, June 22.—The new OPA regulations governing slaughtering will dry up 90 percent of Oregon's meat supply, distributors and meat dealers declared at a conference with E. L. Peterson, State director of agriculture, here Thursday.

Peterson, after reading the new regulations, declared that they were "the most ridiculous thing I ever laid eyes on." The head of Oregon's Department of Agriculture, himself a dirt farmer with practical experience in slaughtering, laid the blame for the situation confronting Oregon meat dealers and consumers to the ignorance of OPA officials regarding conditions in the West.

"In the East," Peterson said, "practically all slaughtering is done by federally inspected packing plants. Out here we depend for our meat supply largely on custom slaughterers."

DEMANDS CONGRESSIONAL AID

Peterson pointed out that in Oregon there are only six federally inspected packing plants, whereas there are 190 licensed custom slaughterers.

"Under the new OPA regulations," Peterson said, "a custom slaughterer will have to pay the owner of a 600-pound beef animal $9 for the privilege of killing the animal. All he gets out of it is the hide and the nonedible byproducts worth about $8. In other words, the slaughterer would be out $1 in cash besides his time and labor under this new regulation."

Peterson telegraphed Members of the Oregon delegation in Congress today protesting against the new regulations.

"Our only hope for relief is through congressional action," he declared.

CUSTOM KILLERS IDLE

H. E. Carlson, of Portland, secretary of the Independent Retail Meat Dealers Association, told Peterson that all of the custom slaughterers in the State had quit killing because of the new regulations.

Three custom slaughterers in the Salem area who attended the conference declared they were out of business until the regulations were changed.

The old regulations were satisfactory to everybody, according to Bert Edwards, the largest meat distributor in the Salem district.

Harry M. Levy, owner of Salem's largest meat market, announced he had closed his market "for an indefinite period" because of inability to secure meat under the new regulations.

SALEM DELIVERIES HALTED

"The custom killers can't afford to butcher any more beef and the federally inspected plants have quit delivering to the Salem area, so there isn't any meat available any more," Levy declared.

Edwards told Peterson that, whereas the new regulations became effective June 15, a week ago, not a single custom slaughterer in the State had been supplied with a copy of the regulations.

Peterson declared that he regarded price regulation as necessary to prevent runaway inflation, but insisted that the country needs a change in the administration of price control, centralizing the administration in local groups who are familiar with conditions that they try to regulate.

MEAT OUTPUT DEFENSE MADE—SWIFT LAYS BLAME ON SET-ASIDE PLAN

Refuting charges that Swift & Co. has failed to supply civilians in this area with a fair share of meat and maintain production schedules, N. B. Swift, manager of the North Portland plant, Thursday branded the accusations "unfounded in fact."

Claiming that 1945 sales figures in the Portland area, both on plant sales and through the branch house, conform to the company policy of fair distribution, the packing firm executive stated Thursday "Swift & Co. is providing civilians in this area with their full proportionate share of available civilian supplies."

Swift pointed to the large increase in Government set-asides to fill requirements for the armed forces and sharply reduced livestock marketings as two developments affecting the available supplies.

MILITARY TAKES HALF

Government set-aside orders for all meats, beef, pork, lamb, and veal, he stated, resulted in about one-half of the total meat production of federally inspected plants during the first half of 1945 being used to fill government requirements.

In connection with the large reduction in livestock marketings in this area, Swift said market receipts of cattle, calves, and hogs in Portland in May this year were about 45 percent under May of last year. June receipts thus far, he continued, indicate that there will be a slight increase in cattle and lamb marketings over last year, but that the reduction in hog receipts will continue.

MAY VOLUME CITED

"Despite this large decrease in Portland livestock receipts we have tried to maintain production," the firm executive said, "but naturally we have had to adjust our processing schedules to available livestock supplies. During May this year, however, we were able to process within 12 percent of the total number of livestock handled for the same month a year ago."

TWENTY-THREE BAKERIES SHUT DOWN—SUGAR LOW—NEW OPA ORDER MAY CLOSE 90 PERCENT OF SLAUGHTERERS

Increased wartime shortages in sugar and shortening have resulted in a closing down of 23 Multnomah County bakeries for periods of 1 week to a month, with a threat of at least an additional 35 shutting their doors if sugar certificates are not received by the 15th of next month, a survey here indicated Thursday.

(Meanwhile in Salem, E. L. Peterson, State agricultural director, was advised at a meeting that enforcement of a new OPA order would result in the closing of 90 percent of the custom and independent slaughtering plants in Oregon.)

TEN PERCENT CUT DUE SOON

Ranson D. Meinke, attorney for the Master Bakers Association, said that although the pending sugar certificates, good for a 2-month period, had been promised, a 10-percent allotment cut is due July 1.

The cut, Meinke explained, means bakeries here will be operating on 50 percent of their 1941 sugar quota, plus an additional 30 percent based on increased Multnomah County population.

Shortening will remain at 80 percent of the 1941 allotment.

The boom in bakery-bought products, caused, bakers feel, by harassed housewives' reluctance to use rationed ingredients for home baking, has upped business as much as 50 to 100 percent.

Chief of Staff Gen. George C. Marshall Makes Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the unanimous consent request granted by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD including the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, on military training of our young men for 1 year:

STATEMENT BY GENERAL OF THE ARMY GEORGE C. MARSHALL, CHIEF OF STAFF, ON UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR MILITARY POLICY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The problem of the maintenance of the future peace of the world directly involves the problem of the postwar military policy of the United States. The decision regarding the military policy of the United States is directly related to the democratic processes of the Government, really meaning the reactions of the people to the services the individual citizen might be required to render the Government. Another factor is heavily though indirectly involved and that is consideration of the taxes to be imposed on the citizen for the maintenance of the military policy, to which must be added the very positive reaction of the citizen regarding the taxes to which he must submit to meet the huge existing war debt. Any fixed legal demand on the citizen for services to the community, the State, or the Federal Government, is quite naturally questioned by the majority and is usually bitterly opposed by at least an articulate minority.

The question of universal military training involves all of the foregoing factors, and the great difficulty as I see it, in reaching a correct decision, will be to avoid details and to get clearly focused in our minds what are the real necessities of the situation, and what will be the best method for meeting them, having in mind our traditions, our national characteristics and the military experience of this Government during its short life of 156 years among the nations of the world.

I think it would be best for me to state in the briefest possible form my own personal conclusions in the matter, which are as follows:

A decision regarding the general military policy of this Government is a matter of urgent necessity at this time.

A large standing Army is not an acceptable solution for three reasons: Its cost would be prohibitive; the necessary men to fill its ranks could not be hired in time of peace; and it would be repugnant to the American people. Therefore some other solution must be found.

To support our determination to maintain the peace, the world must recognize our military power as realistic and not as a remote potential.

Whatever military system we plan we must have a thorough understanding of the practicability of obtaining the annual appropriations necessary.

I know of no system other than universal military training that will meet the requirements I have just outlined, together with an effective program for industrial mobilization and continuous scientific research.

Until the settlement of the terms of the peace it will be impossible to determine the strength of the postwar military forces to be maintained on an active status. We shall not know until then just what our military obligations or requirements are to be. But it is clear to me that whatever the terms of peace, the fundamental basis of our defense must be universal military training. No other practical solution has been offered.

The acceptance at the present time of a general policy recognizing the necessity for universal military training would in my opinion have a far-reaching effect in obtaining a satisfactory international agreement for the terms of the peace. It would certainly be in keeping with the tragic lessons of our history. It would be a supremely democratic procedure, and would not involve the individual in military service except by further act of Congress and approval of the President. It would be far more economical than any other method for maintaining military power. If we are to have an effective and economical transition from our vast war establishment to our peace establishment we must now decide on the fundamental basis on which we are to proceed.

While I have not been able to read the testimony that has been given before this committee and have obtained my information largely from the press and by hearsay, it appears to me that those who object to compulsory military training have offered no practical solution for obtaining what is in all our minds today, and that is some guaranty for the future peace of the world.

Whether or not Army training methods would have an unfortunate influence on the individual can be determined, I think, from the experience of this war. I assert that we have produced a democratic army, one composed of self-respecting soldiers whose spirit has not been crushed and who have shown splendid evidences of high morale. I submit that the Army has demonstrated that it can efficiently and expeditiously instruct men and that it does this without detriment to the mind and character of this individual, rather the contrary. I firmly believe that universal training would be a stimulant to education rather than a deterrent. It would be a perfect demonstration of democracy, with rich and poor alike, side by side, rendering a common service.

Coal Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are all conscious of the severe problem which confronts this country today and which will be more apparent during this fall and winter in connection with the shortage of coal with which to meet the demand of industrial and domestic consumers.

A suggestion which will at least partially solve the problem has been brought to my attention in the form of a resolution adopted by the mayors and solid fuel dealers of Marinette, Wis., and Menominee, Mich. I sincerely believe that their recomendation should be very seriously considered by the Army and Navy and by the administrative agencies of the Government charged with the responsibility of meeting this problem and by the Congress itself.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas recent announcements by the Solid Fuels Administration for War indicate that bituminous coal requirements during the 1945-46 coal year will exceed production by approximately 40,000,000 tons, and that anthracite requirements will exceed production by approximately 6,500,000 tons; and

Whereas the Solid Fuels Administration for War has issued regulations restricting deliveries to domestic consumers and in addition has sharply reduced fuel inventories that may be maintained by industrial consumer; and

Whereas coal production could be increased to meet all needs if sufficient experienced manpower were available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the mayors and solid fuel dealers of Marinette, Wis., and Menominee, Mich., heartily endorse cooperation with mayors and governors committees in an effort to bring about necessary legislation or procedures which would permit the return to the mines of mine workers now in the armed srevices but who are still in this country, in order that coal production might be increased sufficiently to meet war needs and make unnecessary the cut-back in domestic consumption provided under Solid Fuels Administration for War regulations Nos. 26 and 27.

Otto R. Eickmeyer, mayor, Menominee, Mich.; J. H. Hinkler, president, Hinker Coal Co.; L. Blycker, manager, Menominee Lumber Yard; Martin Burke, Jr., manager, Central West Coal Co.; J. V. Tate, manager, Northland Fuels, Inc.; Arnold H. Schmitt, mayor, Marinette, Wis.; W. C. Campbell, president, Marinette Fuel & Dock Co.; John E. Compton, manager, Diamond Coal & Dock Co.; Frank J. Endrick, manager, Marinette Lumber Yard.

Looking Backward—Wilmington's Yesterday of 20 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the files of the Wilmington (Del.) Star of June 28, 1925:

LOOKING BACKWARD

At an exhibit of fine cattle on the Buck and Doe Run Valley farms of Lammot du Pont, George A. Casey, of this city (president of J. J. Felin & Sons, of Philadelphia) said: "If all of the farms in this section were stocked with a small number of the grade of cattle shown here today it would, in a few years, mean independence and wealth to the farmers."

Precautions for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted to me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a column from this morning's Washington Post. This column rather graphically discusses what this war has brought out from the limitless storehouse of the genius of men. We have seen the genius of men turned to destruction; the hope for the future is to see an equal genius turned to construction and cooperation. If mankind fails to balance the purposes of good and bad, this civilization which Carlyle called "at best a thin veneer," it is very apt to destroy itself.

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

PRECAUTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The facts are beginning to come out about the German plans for their V-weapons—plans they came close to putting into execution. The facts are far more startling than any fiction H. G. Wells ever dreamed up.

Nazi scientists had in preparation a stratosphere robot bomb that by November of this year would have been dropping on New York and Washington and hitting targets with pinpoint accuracy. A British scientist has said that within a few years it will be possible to project robot bombs from the British Isles to Tokyo, 15,000 miles away.

Background for this prediction are studies made by Americans and British who lead the field in physics and electronics. They have thoroughly analyzed the V-2, the German stratosphere weapon, and its potentialities. Their conclusions are more sensational than anything hitherto disclosed.

If the Germans had used only five times as much power in projecting their V-2, they could have sent it 200 miles into the upper atmosphere. At this height the projectiles would be caught in the pull of the earth's orbit.

They would continue to circle in the orbit of the earth until, by an electronic impulse, they would be sent down over whatever area of the earth's surface was to be demolished. Conceivably their course could be followed by other devices so that, in a sense, they would be at all times under the control of the nation that had sent them up.

This may be a little beyond the range of present-day science, but not very far. And what a picture of the human race it gives, with all of us cowering in terror while we wait for the moment of doom.

The new explosives that are certainly on the way will make anything we now have look like a popgun. The Germans boasted on the radio of an atomic explosive, and our commanders did not dismiss this as simply another propaganda boast. They took it as a very real threat which, if made good, might have altered the whole course of the war.

Remember, that the Germans came very close to wiping out London. The first battle

to save the vast, gray city on the Thames was fought in the summer of 1943, when the average Britisher was still blissfully unaware of the menace of the V-weapons. The Royal Air Force dropped several thousand tons of bombs on a German experimental station at Peenemunde on a little island in the Baltic.

In that raid more than 800 Nazi scientists and experts, who had been working on robot bombs being thrown into Sweden for tests, were killed. It set back the V program many months. If British Intelligence had not learned of that experimental station and if the raid had not been successful, the progress of the war might have been quite different. As it was, the margin of survival was narrow.

Sometimes it seems that the end of one war is a rehearsal for the next one. There was a little sporadic bombing against London and Paris in 1918. But the public and the professional soldiery did not take this air weapon seriously.

We now know that it is possible to obliterate a large city in a single raid lasting only two or three hours. Most of Europe is in ruins.

Gen. H. H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Forces, announced at Guam that bombs will fall on Japan at the rate of 2,000,000 tons a year. Nothing but rubble will be left of the great Japanese industrial cities. Yet until it happened, most people—including, again, many of the professional soldiery—simply would not believe it was possible. "Hap" Arnold had to fight his way against almost overwhelming obstacles to put his program across.

We humans have no guarantee of eternity for our species. The dinosaurs died in the Silurian swamps as their pinhead brains failed to control the hulking power of their overgrown bodies.

On the technical side, our development has progressed at an astonishing rate. But on the side of the conscience and the spirit we are still in the Stone Age. As the noted Egyptologist, James H. Breasted, wrote in his book, man has been a weapon-making animal for 2,000,000 years. The conscience is only 5,000 years old.

We, in our time, must somehow make up at least part of that enormous gap. This, as has been said so often, may be our last chance.

Establishment of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution of representatives of American Slovak organizations united in the Slovak League of America

Whereas the representatives of various American Slovak organizations have met, at the call of the president of the Slovak League of America, on the 6th day of April 1945, at Washington, D. C., and considered among other things, questions touching upon the future world peace and world order; and

Whereas the Honorable SAMUEL WEISS, United States Representatives in Congress from the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania; also the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Twentieth District of Ohio; and the Honorable CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, Eighth District of Indiana, have recently introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress a resolution (H. Con. Res. 23) respecting the sound principles which may guide those charged with the establishment of peace and world order based on justice; and

Whereas the principles advocated in the resolution are based upon the firm belief in God and His moral law, which binds not only individuals but also nations, states, and international societies; and

Whereas it is our firm belief and conviction that the inalienable rights of the individual, the rights of the oppressed, weak, and colonial peoples can be justly secured only by the recognition of and the adherence to the moral law based upon the belief in the Supre Law Gives; be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the representatives of the great majority of the American citizens of Slovak ancestry strongly urge the passage of the House Concurrent Resolution No. 23, so that our American representatives at the peace table may adopt the proposed principles as the code in their deliberations on the future peace and world order.

Given this 6th day of April 1945, at Washington, D. C.

For the Slovak League of America,
Rt. Rev. Msgr. F. J. DUBOSH,
President.

Attested by:
JOHN A. KOCUR,
Secretary.

Ratification of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, 1945, in speaking for the passage of House Joint Resolution 60, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relative to the making of treaties, I said:

Even though we admit, for the sake of argument, that the proposed amendment cannot become a part of the Constitution in time to have effect on the Charter of the United Nations, this is no argument for retaining the two-thirds rule. Many treaties and agreements implementing and supplementing the Charter of the United Nations must be agreed upon if we are to have permanent peace. During the next two decades we will be called upon to validate many treaties in the developmnt of a foreign policy designed to preserve the peace. The Charter of the United Nations will be but a beginning. We must change our constitutional machinery for the approval of treaties if we are to erect on the Charter of the United Nations a structure of international security and peace.

This morning there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial entitled "Vital to Peace." This editorial, which emphasizes the necessity of immediately adopting a constitutional amendment empowering a majority of both Houses of Congress to validate treaties, is as follows:

VITAL TO PEACE

We hope that the favorable outlook for approval of the United Nations Charter by the Senate will not minimize interest in abolition of the two-thirds rule in treaty making. As we have often pointed out, ratification of the Charter will be only the first step in our participation in the new peace system. To make that participation successful it is imperative that the treaty-making function be brought under democratic control. The Senate should not be allowed to forget the basic necessity of this reform merely because it now appears that the Charter itself can clear the two-thirds hurdle.

At present the Senate is in the mood of sitting tight and waiting for the people to speak on this issue. We may take it for granted that the Senate will not yield one iota of its power unless it is forced to do so by public opinion. That is why it is so important to keep the movement for abolition of the two-thirds rule constantly alive. The Senate can be forced to act. Article V of the Constitution requires Congress to call a convention for amendment of that document when applications are received from two-thirds of the State legislatures. Last month Florida became the first State to make such an application. Others doubtless will follow. Three other States—New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Connecticut—have memorialized Congress to propose an amendment abolishing the two-thirds rule. The House of Representatives has also acted by a large vote for that purpose.

The States can effectively build a fire under the Senate on this issue if they realize its importance. We continue to think that a national committee on repeal of the two-thirds rule is highly desirable. Some excellent work is being done by the League of Women Voters, the American Bar Association, and various other organizations. In our opinion, however, these campaigns could well be tied together as one great national endeavor to democratize our peace machinery. Considering how vital this step is to the future of America and the peace of the world, nothing less than a major national campaign, will do justice to the policy of collective security that we are now embarking upon.

The Meat Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Atlantic (Iowa) Telegraph:

THE MEAT PROBLEM

Recently we had a conversation with Wayland Hopley, president of the Iowa Beef Producers' Association and one of the country's leading authorities on the problems having to do with the production and marketing of beef. The conversation was brought about by some recent correspondence which Mr. Hopley has had with Mayor LaGuardia concerning the problems of getting beef to the citizens of the metropolis over which LaGuardia rules. It seems like a far cry from meat shortages in New York City to the feed lots of western Iowa, but Mr. Hopley believes, and many agree, that the Iowa feed lots hold at least a partial answer to the problem which is bothering Mayor LaGuardia and New York City.

When the Government established a set of conditions in the cattle market which caused the bypassing of the feeder, it cut the Nation out of unnumbered tons of meat, and especially of quality meat. A feeder will take cattle off the ranges and within 90 days put from two to three hundred pounds on the animal. Take the feeder out of the picture and this amount of meat is eliminated, for every animal that goes directly to the killer

without going through the feed lot. Obviously this extra meat which is now lost, largely as a result of bungling in Washington, would go far in answering the question which is facing Mayor LaGuardia.

On the subject of subsidies as a cure to the current meat problems, Mr. Hopley is entirely lacking in enthusiasm. He believes that the recent 50-cent subsidy given the feeders will do little good except to those who have their feed lots full. To this group it is a gift, but those feeders who are now going into the market will, in Mr. Hopley's opinion, simply add the 50 cents to the price they will pay for feeders and thus gain little through the subsidy. This, he feels, is true because the packers have already been the beneficiaries of subsidies considerably in excess of that offered the feeders and are therefore still in a position to outbid the feeder on cattle offerings which are of a quality suitable for either slaughter or the feed lot. This situation can be cured by equalizing the subsidies given to packers and feeders, or, and this is the program Mr. Hopley favors, the discontinuance of all subsidies. As he suggests, the citizenry cannot continue for long to feed at the public trough, and the practice of paying subsidies might just as well be discontinued now as later. In this we are in hearty agreement with Mr. Hopley.

One other suggestion which Mr. Hopley has to offer is that when the Government undertakes to make changes which will alter methods now in vogue in the production of beef it should give 6 months' notice of the coming change. This will give the producers opportunity to ready themselves for the coming change and will thus avoid inflicting unfair penalties upon them. Unlike most businesses, that of cattle raising cannot be made to alter its processes overnight without severe damage to the producer.

There are a great many angles to the problem of the beef shortage, and there is no panacea which will cure the ills to which the producers and consumers have fallen heir, but undoubtedly a bit more of consideration given to the feeders of beef cattle will go a long ways in creating an easier situation for those who would like to eat beef.

The $5 Federal Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 28, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on May 28, 1945, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial titled "The Federal $5 Tax," which appeared in the Daily Times published in Mamaroneck, N. Y.:

THE FEDERAL $5 TAX

Automobile owners are once more advised that as of the first of next month they must renew the Federal auto-use tax stamp upon the windshield. They may secure the stamps from the nearest post office at the price of $5.

We are definitely opposed to this "grab."

For many years taxation of automobiles has been considered the province of the States, which do the greater part of highway maintenance and expansion. For the Federal Government now to invade that field under the pretense of wartime fiscal emergency is unjustified and unethical.

Secondly, the amount raised is not sufficient to permit the Federal Government to compensate the motorist in any substantial degree for the tax.

And, third, this is an inconvenience which the busied motorist should not be asked to assume. He has to go to the automobile bureau yearly to license his car; he has to go there every year or every 3 years to renew his driving license; he has to pay taxes on his gasoline, oil, and accessories, as well as upon the car when originally purchased; now he is asked to meet another tax collector.

We believe the Federal tax should be discontinued at the earliest possible date. Certainly it should not be carried on after the war has ended.

Farm-to-Market Trucker Fees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

FARMERS ASK CONGRESS TO PROBE FARM-TO-MARKET TRUCKER FEES

(By Robert Taylor)

The threat of congressional action hangs over the AFL Teamsters Union because of the activities of the union's eastern seaboard food conference, formed by produce drivers' locals to force organization of farm-to-market food channels.

Farm organizations, viewing the campaign as an entering wedge of unionism and as an obstacle to the free marketing of their products, have organized to fight the campaign. They have also protested to Congress and Federal officials, demanding investigation and action.

As a result, the House Agriculture Committee is expected, within a few weeks, to start hearings on the complaints of farmers and revive the "hot-cargo" investigation of 1942 which exposed union practices in the food industry.

PROBE PRACTICES

Much of the testimony before the committee will deal with labor practices of producers drivers' locals in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and New York, where farm-to-market truckers have been required to pay union fees as high as $56 to unload perishable cargoes.

The committee already has been over some of the ground. A group of its members, headed by Representative JOHN W. FLANNAGAN (Democrat, Virginia), visited the Philadelphia market to inquire into trade obstructions and distribution costs. Committee investigators now are touring major eastern markets.

GROWERS TO TESTIFY

Representative FLANNAGAN indicated hearings will be scheduled after the preliminary investigation. Farm groups and growers' representatives have gathered material and will be ready to testify. In addition, the Department of Justice has investigated some markets. Whereas the Agriculture Committee is interested in the union campaign as a factor in costs of getting farm produce to market, the Justice Department is interested in collusive agreements to obstruct trade.

The investigations cover not only organizations of farm truckers but also the imposition of the 5-day week in the huge New York market, and those in Newark and Philadelphia. Growers and some distributors contend it will be ruinous to crops and trade and will diminish supplies to consumers in a period in which food supplies are citically needed.

THREAT SINCE 1942

The possibility of congressional action has been hanging over the teamsters union ever since the Supreme Court decision of 1942 dealing with the practice of New York Local 807 in requiring out-of-State trucks to hire a union member as "guest" driver at $9.42 or $8.41 per truck, depending on its size.

The Supreme Court, in a decision written by Justice James F. Byrnes, set aside the conviction of union members, but in doing so added significantly that "this does not mean that such activities are beyond the reach of Federal legislative control."

INVITATION TO LEGISLATE

Representative MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, Oklahoma, construed this as a clear invitation for Congress to legislate. He introduced a measure to amend the Clayton antitrust law to repeal, in a limited way, the exemptions labor unions enjoy under that law.

Representative SAM HOBBS, Democrat, Alabama, put in a bill to amend the Federal Antiracketeering Act to outlaw obstructions to interstate trade and define forced payment of union fees, under threats of violence, as extortion and robbery.

The House passed the Hobbs bill in 1942, but it died in the Senate. Both bills have been reintroduced in the present session. Mr. HOBBS' bill has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee and is now awaiting House action. Mr. MONRONEY's bill, aimed primarily at collusive practices and "featherbedding" is still before the committee.

Dedication of Honor Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the splendid address delivered by Brig. Gen. John M. Clark at the dedication of the Soldiers' Memorial Service Roll at Perryopolis, Pa., on May 30, 1945:

It is a pleasure to be here today and I warmly appreciate your courtesy in having me as your guest at the dedication of this beautiful memorial.

There are few places in the length and breadth of this Nation which, in my mind, equal the significance of a war memorial in Perryopolis.

I can feel that strong chain of lofty heroic sacrifice, of strong and resolute men who have held this Nation against every challenge from the days of its founding fathers through every crisis to the present. I stand in deep humility before this shrine, many of whose sturdy granite stones were actually taken from the very land which George Washington owned and perhaps even hewn from the stones standing proudly in the great Washington Monument.

And it is fitting that at a later date, the community took its name from one of America's great naval heroes who gave a tradition to the world's most powerful sea force.

This beautifully conceived roll of honor stands on historic soil. Even hallowed soil. On it are the names of men and women who followed the tradition of their ancestors and laid aside their peacetime tools and plows to

take up arms in defense of their soil and principles and their way of life.

Some of them are marked with a gold star. They gave an even bigger measure in terms of torn hearts and deep sorrow which will stay with their dear ones for a long, long time.

To me, these are perhaps just fine American names on this honor roll, but to you they are not names. They are personalities. They are a small boy or girl who grew up in the community, who, perhaps, played on the football team, who was perhaps president of his class, who went to work for the local grocer, or department store, or power company, or oil company. They had started to build a life and a family of their own, taking their place and their obligations as American citizens, laboring to make their contribution to the development of this great country.

Most of them, pray God, will return and pick up their life where they left off.

And when you pass this memorial, going to and from your daily work, I think you will pause for just an instant and think of them, of the sacrifices they're making for you and me, and realize that they have carried the torch handed down to them by their forefathers for another stretch of its journey which keeps true and bright the hope and future of this great Nation; for our children and their children and their children's children.

And on this day which we have long set aside in observance of those Americans who, in each generation, have made this sacrifice for us, it seems fitting that we re-examine our own conscience and ask ourselves privately, "Have we, at our stations, fulfilled our assignments with the same selflessness and the same resolute valor as those to whom we now pay homage?"

And it is not improper now that half of this dreadful war has been concluded to look forward and consider what kind of a country we are going to make for these fine sons and daughters upon their return. Looking back on the job which the people here at home have done to back up these fighting men, we realize that it is not inconsiderable.

We have built the most powerful war machine the world has ever seen. Our Navy has grown to a stature to rule without challenger the two great oceans. We have supported magnificently, the war effort of our valiant allies by providing them with more than $25,000,000,000 worth of war materials.

But even at this minute while I speak, a shell is bursting over a fox hole in Okinawa, a plane is going down in flames over a Japanese city, an American soldier is dying every 9 minutes. Who is he? Yes; we know who he is. He is John Smith, or Jack Mueller, or Joe Pulaski, or Tony Spaginni. That nice little kid who used to live around the corner at every community in our land.

They would like to come home. Yes; they would like to see an end to all this and get back to that job in the grocery store, or in the power plant, or on the farm.

And during those next trying months, may I suggest that we all remember, as we pass this memorial, that these boys get no vacation on the front lines, nor do they absent themselves from their jobs. They give 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to doing their part of winning the war. Likewise, think of this and let us remember this when we feel that impulse to take that day off from our assignment.

My experience in this war has been largely one of providing supplies and maintenance for our Air Forces throughout the world. During a year's tour of duty in England, I was forcibly reminded of the unique achievements of the Americans in the science of mass production. I am also filled with praise for the record of achievement of our gallant allies operating under the most adverse conditions. The tenacity, courage, and perseverance of our British brothers in arms during this war, their survival through the dark days of Dunkerque and fortitude during the blitz of England, have written bold pages in the history of all time. The national character of the British was best expressed to me one day last year. Near my flat in London there was a plant that manufactured small aircraft parts for subsequent assembly at airplane factories. Walking through it one day, I noticed an old lady standing over a lathe. I engaged her in conversation and ascertained that she was 74 years of age, that she had lost three sons in World War I, two grandsons at Dunkerque, that her home had been bombed while she was at work and in this bombing she lost a granddaughter and two great-grandchildren, together with all her worldly possessions. I asked her, "Grandma, don't you think you have done enough for your country and don't you think you deserve a rest?" She thought it over and then she turned to me and said, "Sir, my country needs me, the war is not over." I shall never forget these simple words.

For our soldiers the road back to Fayette County is yet a long one. All too many of us believe that the war is almost over, that our boys will soon be home, and, as a consequence, we are facing a problem of a natural apathy following VE-day.

No one fighting in the Pacific has any such ideas. Time and time again I've heard our soldiers say, "The war may be over but the Japs don't know it."

Defeating Japan calls for a different kind of fighting from what we did in Europe. It calls for different compositions of troops, different equipment, different employment, and different technique.

During the past 2½ years while the heaviest fighting was going on in both hemispheres, the Army had been looking ahead, working, planning for the all-out campaign against Japan.

We are all working now on redeployment upon defeat of Germany. The full realization of how strategy affects the individual man now becomes apparent. Many soldiers and airmen now in Europe undoubtedly will want to go home but not all will be able. Many men, particularly from the Air Forces, will have to stay in the service until Japan is defeated. We must have enough men, combat crews, planes available to bring our full might against the Japs and bring this war to a conclusion as quickly as possible.

Battles are won on two fronts, the fighting front and the home front. One cannot survive and be successful without the other. In 1938 200 planes were produced by American industry. In 1943 manufacture skyrocketed to 100,000 planes, bombers, fighters, transports, and trainers. This is a great tribute to the home front of America and this feat is duplicated in every war industry.

But let me assure you that unless these boys receive the continued full production of this country that road back will indeed be a long and blood-stained one, and I am certain that everyone gathered here today is hoping and praying for the quick and safe return of the men and women whose names you have listed on this roll of honor.

Remember, that as the size and scope of battle increases and the harder our men are called upon to fight, the more supplies they need and equally important the most support from home. The Army Air Forces have already put these supplies and equipment to good use. The Luftwaffe was eliminated as an effective striking force. German and German-controlled industry was battered day in and day out. On the continent of Europe vital supply arteries were cut by our far ranging craft. The Japanese mainland and the Philippines have begun to feel our blows. Our offensive has shifted into high and we propose to keep it there.

For us there are no foregone conclusions. Our airplanes went out yesterday and they are going out again tomorrow. Some of them will not come back. The men who fail to return will be succeeded but they will never be replaced; the airplanes and other equipment can and must be.

Despite our gains men at the front still face dangerous shortages. They need more bombs, more radios, more tires. Only the continuance of maximum pressure at home as well as abroad will shorten the time required to bring about the collapse of the enemy. Maintenance of this pressure means fewer lives are risked and fewer lives lost.

I, therefore, urge you not to merely honor your soldiers by inscribing their names upon a memorial but to honor them by doing everything posible in your power by continuing to purchase war bonds, by doing your job conscientiously and thoroughly and therefore hastening the return of these men to their homes. No matter how small your job may seem, remember that your failure to complete that task may result in the failure of vitally needed supplies reaching their destination on time, and supplies which are not there when they are needed are of no value whatever. In other words, the failure of an individual to do his part actually has its effect in the prolonging of the war.

Sad but true, there actually are people who want the war to continue. Wages are high, work is plentiful, and if they don't like their present job they can leave and get another. These ignorant, selfish, heartless individuals obviously are not interested in the boys you are honoring today. But you who are gathered here know full well that every month, every day, every battle that this war is prolonged means the sacrifice of the lives of more of our men.

It is said that war is a terrible waste. Yet it seems that all those things which are deemed valuable by human beings call for sacrifice. Many lives have been sacrificed in other wars for independence. We are highly resolved that our sons and their sons will not be called upon to fight another war. Many problems will remain after the cessation of hostilities. These problems must be met and settled wisely; for if not, at some future time we will certainly be precipitated into another even greater war. This country must and will remain strong, so that we can defend our rights and make any aggressor pause and weigh the costs of another sneak attack like Pearl Harbor.

All is not waste in war, however. Science has made rapid strides. Our servicemen have gained immeasurably in experience and knowledge. The average soldier will be a better citizen of the world and of the United States. His contacts with the natives of other lands will make him more appreciative of the problems of these countries. He has had the opportunity to travel about this country and has been stationed in its various sections. All of this has broadened him. He will return in many instances better educated and with a skill which will be useful to him in civilian life. Some people believe he may be a problem to handle and that as a result of his training to kill will return a gangster. Let us remember that our soldiers have been taught to kill because it is either a case of their lives or the enemies'. Allay any fears you might have of their coming home as professional killers. They will return to you, for the most part, healthier, better disciplined, and better citizens than when they entered the service.

In this war, as in no other, have the families of servicemen been provided for. Legislation has been passed which provides that those left at home receive financial and personal assistance. Yet no one can comfort them when they receive that dreaded news. It comes as a horrible shock. Have you ever had to inform a mother of the loss of her son and heard that quick gasp as though a knife had been plunged into her heart, seen the trembling hands, the tears rolling down her cheeks as she summed up her courage and said, "Do sit down with me for a while." Have you ever felt how utterly helpless you

are under these circumstances? What consolation can you offer as she tells you what a fine lad he was, how good he was to her?

And we think we are making sacrifices—gasoline rationing, food rationing, bond purchases. Can you look these heartbroken folks in the eye and say, "I am doing all I can"?

My friends, you have no doubt read or heard stories how men pause in the heat of battle to pray. Perhaps we at home should do as they do on the battlefield, pray more. For having done all that is humanly possible to provide for our soldiers, having given them our wholehearted effort to help them get the needed supplies, we then must commit their lives into the hands of Him who watches over all.

Marcellus Crocker Sheild, LL. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I refer to a recent academic ceremony, which I am certain is of deep personal interest to every Member of the House of Representatives. The American University conferred upon our own Marc Sheild the honorary degree of doctor of laws for distinguished public service. I had the privilege of presenting him when the purple hood of the law and the red, white, and blue colors of the university were placed about his shoulders by Dr. Amos Taylor, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and Prof. Pitman B. Potter, managing editor of the American Journal of International Law.

It is to be noted that the sole honorary degree conferred by the American University has a national importance. In the fall of each year the committee on the honorary degree for distinguished public service begins its work. This committee is composed of faculty members of the School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs, a division of the university known all over this world for the high quality of its faculty, its curriculum, and the distinguished public service which it itself performs. The members of that honorary degree committee are themselves a hall of fame: Solon J. Buck, Archivist of the United States; Leon C. Marshall, Clendenen professor of economics in the university and for many years dean at the University of Chicago; Pitman B. Potter, Grozier professor of international law; James J. Robbins, dean of the graduate division; and Amos E. Taylor, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce. This committee asks faculty members before January to nominate a panel of selection composed of outstanding persons having knowledge of those engaged in public service. From the hundreds of names submitted by the faculty, the committee compiles a panel of 100 electors selected according to the frequency of choices expressed.

Professor Marshall then writes to each person so selected and asks him to serve as an elector. The hundred electors proceed to cast a secret ballot expressing a first, second, and third choice with supporting reasons for the choice. In this way Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, was selected 2 years ago. In this way Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., as Lend-Lease Administrator, was selected last year. In this same way Marcellus C. Sheild was selected in 1945.

Mr. Speaker, an honorary degree conferred under these circumstances is an event of national as well as academic importance. The process of selection places the integrity of an honorary degree on a plane where it ought to be.

THE MESSAGE OF MR. STETTINIUS

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., who as Lend-Lease Administrator, received the degree in 1944, was busy in San Francisco when he heard the news of the selection of our great clerk. He sat down in the Fairmont Hotel out there and wrote this note:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE, WASHINGTON,
San Francisco, June 2, 1945.
Dr. PAUL F. DOUGLASS,
President, the American University,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. DOUGLASS: I am happy to join in the very deserved honor which the American University is paying to the Honorable Marcellus C. Sheild, clerk of the Appropriations Committee of the United States House of Representatives.

My own association with Mr. Sheild dates back to my service as Lend-Lease Administrator, when I had many occasions to appreciate the efficiency and understanding with which he has handled his heavy responsibilities. During the period of Sheild's service with the House of Representatives, I learn that more than five hundred billion dollars of funds have been appropriated. This staggering sum has been considered, discussed, and debated by the members of the Appropriations Committee. Membership on this committee has changed over the years, but for nearly four decades Marcellus C. Sheild has served this highly important group in our system of representative government.

Often we honor only those who hold positions of great public prominence. We tend to forget others whose patriotism, knowledge, and ability are just as indispensable to our progress. Thus I am glad that the American University is to honor Marcellus C. Sheild. I know of few public servants whose service is more deserving of recognition. In honoring him, the American University is paying tribute to that group of public officials whose tireless and conscientious effort keeps the great Government of the United States moving forward through successive generations.

Sincerely yours,
E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

THE MESSAGE OF MR. SMITH

Harold D. Smith, director of the Bureau of the Budget, wrote this about Mr. Sheild:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1945.
Dr. PAUL F. DOUGLASS,
President, the American University,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGLASS: The selection of Marcellus C. Sheild to be the recipient of The American University's honorary degree for distinguished public service is most appropriate. I know of no man who is more deserving of it.

All through his long career in the Goverment Marc Sheild constantly proved his devotion to duty and his constructive ability. His responsibilities required the largest measure of good judgment, tact, and discretion. He possessed these qualities and more.

His wonderful faculty for getting to the heart of a problem and finding the right answer contributed greatly to the orderly flow of governmental business. His encyclopedic knowledge of the operations of the Federal Government was valuable not only to his immediate associates, but also to all with whom he came in contact. Many persons sought his advice; he gave it generously. Yet he remained at all times modest and self-effacing.

Marc Sheild has done an outstanding job. He has served his country faithfully and well, to the best of his truly great ability.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE

President Harry S. Truman sent this message to be read at the commencement ceremony:

President PAUL F. DOUGLASS,
The American University,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT DOUGLASS: On the occasion of the conferring of the honorary degree for distinguished public service on my friend, Marcellus C. Sheild, may I be permitted to say that the American University itself performs a high social usefulness in calling the attention of our people at this time to the onerous task so selflessly performed by unsung heroes in the everyday legislative routine of government.

For nearly four decades Marc Sheild has presided over that sacred altar at which the public purposes of the American people are annually organized into a carefully studied program of public spending and translated into law for administrative action. As the great statesman of the public purse, he has exemplified the greatness of his integrity in the technical competence, the judicious understanding, and the human brotherliness with which he has discharged the obligations of his office.

Public servants like Marc Sheild are our guarantees that democracy works in America.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

COMMISSIONER ARTHUR S. FLEMMING

Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming, of the United States Civil Service Commission, delivered the commencement address. He has been doing a distinguished service these war years. Commissioner Flemming said the "musts" for the career service of the Federal Government if "tomorrow's staggering responsibilities" are to be discharged in an effective manner are:

First. The public servant must be put in his proper niche in our Nation's hall of fame.

Second. The Federal Government must become known as the most progressive employer.

Third. The public service must be sold to the ablest of our prospective public servants.

Fourth. Public servants must be kept out of mental and spiritual ruts.

Fifth. The public service must be responsive to changes in policy.

Sixth. There must be a more vigorous weeding out of unsatisfactory public servants.

STORY OF MARCELLUS SHEILD

The story of Marc Sheild is an epic of America. The newspapers, in reporting the commencement proceedings, summarized his biography as follows:

Marcellus C. Sheild, a Minnesota boy who came to the Capitol 37 years ago as a clerk,

climbed the marble steps of Hurst Hall in the campus quadrangle of the American University and by the Ionic columns on the heights above the Potomac received the honorary degree of doctor of laws which is conferred annually for distinguished public service. Holder of no academic degrees, unlisted in Who's Who, little known to the general public, Dr. Sheild was presented for the honor by Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. As the purple hood was placed about the shoulders of the man who as clerk of the Appropriations Committee had organized budgets into congressional appropriations through two wars and a great depression to the staggering aggregate sum of $580,000,000,000 by Prof. Pitman B. Potter and Dr. Amos Taylor, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, President Paul F. Douglass characterized the man who for nearly 4 decades served the Appropriations Committee, and since 1916 as its clerk, as having the "greatness of integrity." Believed to know more about the Government of the United States and its ramifications than any other living person, Sheild was selected for the recognition for distinguished public service as a result of a nomination conducted during the preceding year by secret ballot sent to a panel of 100 electors throughout the United States.

Shunning high salaries offered to him by business and temptation to accept administrative posts, Dr. Sheild has remained steadfast in his determination to see that the "power of the public purse" was exercised with wisdom and economy on the basis of social need. A skillful legislative draftsman with a memory for facts and an ability to recall and use them, which has for years been a marvel about Congress, he has seen the annual Budget of the United States increase more than 50 times from $919,163,823.19 when he came to Washington in 1908 to $61,198,413,854.84 in 1945.

The Appropriations Committee was created 80 years ago in 1865. During that period it has had but three clerks: Robert J. Stevens, 19 years; James C. Courts, 32 years; and Marcellus C. Sheild, 29 years. Serving under seven presidents—Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt, Sheild, who came to Washington on New Year's Day, 1908, retired as the year of 1944 came to its end, to give others a chance for promotion. He took the step only when he was assured that the men below him who had served so effectively with him would be advanced.

Sheild was born in Bellevue, Iowa, in 1885, the son of a railroad station master on the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad. Graduating from the Winona, Minn., high school in 1904, he began life as a shop clerk on the Chicago Great Western Railroad at $1 a day and began to save money to take him to the University of Minnesota. Visiting Washington for a brief time in 1907 and being convinced that the Capital held unparalleled advantage for the student, he left the University of Minnesota law school to work in Washington, to take his law degree by after-hours study, and begin the private practice of law. His degree was almost 40 years in coming, because Sheild never had time to study formal courses. His life study led him to become a foremost political scientist. Now he is going to buy a farm and write the book which may become a classic treatise on the Government of the United States.

CITATION

Every Member of this Congress will want to have in this RECORD a copy of the citation read by President Paul F. Douglass:

MARCELLUS CROCKER SHEILD

Son of the Middle West, summoned to the Capital of the Nation at the age of 23 by his Congressman;

Third clerk in the eight decades of the history of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America;

Humble and competent technical servant of lawmakers for 37 years during which $550,000,000,000 have been appropriated by the Federal Government and during which its annual expenditures have increased more than half a hundred times;

Clerk of the Committee on Appropriations for 29 years, serving under 7 Presidents of the United States, 9 Speakers of the House of Representatives, and 11 chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations;

Legislative draftsman ripened at that junction point of political society where annually the public purposes of the people are refined by scrutiny and debate into the program of budgeted national spending under law;

Statesman of the public purse in prosperity and depression, in peace and war;

Devout public servant, shunning the attractions of distinguished executive and administrative posts and of proffered high salaries in industry;

Judicious master of the details and ramifications of government as few others of his generation, applying facts with wisdom;

Citizen humble in power, faithful to his public trust under strain and pressure, possessing the greatness of integrity;

A man commanding respect because of the selflessness of his application to onerous and important duties; by the objectivity and impartiality of his fact-sustained judgments; and by sympathetic forthrightness in his relationships with members of the executive and legislative branches of government, with the representatives of interest groups, and with the press which informs the people;

Skilled spokesman of the objectives of a nation in the languages of legislation; and

By authority of the Congress of the United States invested in the trustees of the American University and by them delegated to me, and upon the nomination of the national panel of electors, I confer upon you for distinguished public service the degree of Doctor of Laws honoris causa, invest you with the hood appropriate to the honor, and welcome you to the rights and privileges of the office.

PAUL F. DOUGLASS,
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 4, 1945.*

Proposed Regional Authorities in Major River Basins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, editor of the Marine News, regarding proposed regional authorities in major river basins.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARINE NEWS,
New York, N. Y., June 20, 1945.

The Honorable JOHN H. OVERTON,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Much is appearing in the press with respect to what the proposed regional authorities will accomplish in the major river basins of the Nation. Much less is being said about what the Army Engineers have already accomplished in that direction. And practically nothing is being said about the 170 years of accumulated experience of the corps.

What you and Senators MCCLELLAN, ROBERTSON, and FERGUSON had to say about the Army engineers and the Pan-American and Alcan Highways, and the Canol project, in the June 18 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, has come to our attention. As you said, "What has thus far come out is wholly ex parte." We believe that an investigation, by competent investigators who know something about customary procedure with respect to equipment rental, will reveal that there has been a lot of shouting over nothing, or insignificantly little. We know from experience that any contractor who rents a piece of construction equipment out of the country, depriving himself of its use or rental elsewhere, will certainly expect agreed-upon rental, whether the equipment is used or not, or even uncrated at its destination. This procedure is so manifestly right that it is difficult to understand any intelligent man questioning it. There is only one way to thoroughly understand the construction equipment rental business: get into it. More unforeseen contingencies will arise than the know-it-all greenhorn ever dreamed of. Few things are kicked around or abused more than most rented construction equipment; the experienced renter knows this. The fulfillment of the requirement that all rented equipment be returned in first-class working condition is largely moonshine. The requirement is often met by spreading on a coat of black paint; the renter knows this, too.

We like the Corps of Engineers and the splendid tradition behind them. Directly, and in a supervisory capacity, they are creating in America an asset of incalculable value in the development of the greatest intracoastal and river system on earth, along with the necessary harbors, channels, anchorages, and roadsteads.

The corps is working to prevent rivers desolating the land year after year, carrying down to the sea fertile topsoil and flood wreckage; to improve navigation along our unrivalled intracoastal waterways and rivers, to harness river power running wild, and to convert it to constructive energy. All in all, to make American rivers create wealth rather than destroy it, to make them serve the people rather than injure them; to turn our unparalleled intracoastal waterways into safe lanes of commerce, with feeder canals, rather than having them remain marshes and swamps. Picture the plight of America today without its waterway improvements. Their contribution to the war effort alone, making all shipping possible, is beyond calculation.

Too few Americans know about the United States Army Engineers, or are familiar with their accomplishments. Established in 1775, they now have 170 years' experience behind them. The value of that experience is inestimable, but it is not all that makes the corps distinguished.

The late Gen. Hugh Johnson once proclaimed that, "Through more than a century the United States Corps of Engineers has built for itself, in the confidence of Congress and the country, an almost incredible something that exists nowhere else in this or any other government—absolute assurance of impartial, completely nonpolitical, nonbiased, efficient, and incorruptible planning, and administration.

"The corps mapped the West, laid out the great transcontinental rail routes, improved all our harbors and inland waterways, harnessed the rivers, created the Great Lakes navigation system—by all odds the most efficient waterway development in human history—and built the Panama Canal after many attempts had failed.

"The custom for any Federal project—99 out of 100 of which originate in 'State and local units'—is for Congress to call on the corps for surveys before action. It has been the most valuable professional auxiliary that Congress has ever had."

With integrity and efficiency, the Army engineers have supervised waterway improvements totaling over $4,000,000,000. They are a corps d'elite, aloof to politics, a credit to the Nation, an intrinsic national asset.

Yours very truly,
WENDELL PHILLIPS DODGE,
Editor.

Tribute to Hon. Tom Connally, of Texas, by Frank L. Main

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a well-deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], printed a few days ago in the Rusk Cherokeean, a daily newspaper, published at Rusk, Tex., by Frank L. Main, a former citizen of the State of Kansas.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

A FRIEND TO MAN

A group of Rusk citizens this week pay their respects to Senator TOM CONNALLY in a statement published elsewhere in this issue of the paper. Friends of TOM CONNALLY in Dallas paid a similar tribute in the Tuesday edition of the Dallas Morning News. Probably hundreds of other communities, large and small, will do the same. And large or small, they are all doing this because they feel that TOM CONNALLY is their friend.

And the fine thing about it is that they are all right about it. TOM CONNALLY is big enough that his friendship is not confined to individuals or individual communities. When Rusk asks a favor of him he puts all the power behind his efforts that his strong personality and his high office can command. He does the same for Dallas, Alto, Houston, Reklaw, or San Antonio. And those working with him are sure he did so because he was their friend. And they are right again, because TOM CONNALLY is a friend of man.

It is fortunate that at this time America has such a man with the United States delegation at San Francisco. For Russia, and Belgium, and the British Empire, and Ecuador, and all the rest will know, after it's all over, that they had one powerful and sincere friend with them at the World Peace Conference table.

Texans are justly proud that this great statesman is a citizen of Texas. They are glad to share him as a citizen of the world.

F. L. M.

STATEMENT BY FRIENDS OF SENATOR CONNALLY

"Fellow Texans, in this momentous hour, as we pay tribute in our hearts to our late, great President and pledge allegiance to our new national leader, President Truman, let us recognize anew our responsibilities of citizenship.

"'Texas and the world' is a phrase that takes on new meaning. Our own Senator TOM CONNALLY, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will bear a heavy burden in international relations as his group labors toward a peace that shall be lasting at the San Francisco Conference.

"People of Texas, we humbly and sincerely bespeak your unstinting help and prayers for our statesman, Senator CONNALLY."

The above statement was paid for by some of the many local friends of Senator CONNALLY, recognizing that Senator CONNALLY is not only in a position to render great help to the President, but, by long experience, and his position as chairman of the leading Senate committee, he wields, at this time, an influence in national affairs second only to that of the President himself, and Texas is fortunate in having him where he can render to his State this great help in the development of its natural resources, which he has done, and is now doing, as is evidenced by numerous industries, including those in east Texas.

Rural Electrification—Letter From Secretary Wickard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important items in the pending bill is that for funds for rural electrification.

It is absolutely necessary that we provide sufficient funds to meet the demands throughout the country if we are going to electrify the farm homes of this Nation, even in this generation.

With all the efforts we have put forth we have only about 42 percent of our farms electrified today, while, as I said on the floor recently, the countries of western Europe have an average of more than 90 percent of their farms electrified.

Farmers in every section of the country are begging for this service, and materials are now becoming available; yet we find that the amount asked for has been cut below the danger point, and must be increased if we are to keep step with the onward march of modern progress in taking care of the rural population of this country.

Secretary Wickard, who has just been appointed and confirmed as Rural Electrification Administrator, has his heart set on extending this service to the farmers of this Nation.

I am inserting at this point a letter which I have just received from him, which I hope every Member of this House will read carefully before he votes on this item tomorrow.

Let us follow Mr. Wickard's advice in this matter, provide the necessary funds, and electrify every farm home in America. Remember that this money will all come back with interest, and that it will add more to the value of the farm homes of America than anything else we could possibly do at this time.

The matter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 26, 1945.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: This is in answer to your request for a statement of the reasons for an increase in the loan funds available for the rural electrification program during the fiscal year 1946. The Bureau of the Budget submitted a supplemental estimate of $160,000,000 in addition to the $80,000,000 authorized in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal 1946.

There are now on hand, or in process of preparation, applications for new REA loans totaling approximately $214,000,000. The demand for such loans has shown a rapidly accelerated rate during the past 2 months. In the month of May alone it increased by more than $70,000,000. This is the result of two factors: first, the accumulated demand during the past 3 years when construction was heavily restricted; and second, the recent action of the War Production Board, lifting most of the restrictions. It is expected that the applications from these farm cooperatives will continue.

We are now completely out of funds for allotment and have been for several months. Of the $80,000,000 in the regular appropriation for fiscal 1946 we must use at least $40,000,000, to finance short extensions under wartime restrictions, either already completed or under construction. This means that we shall have available, from the $80,000,000 authorization for fiscal 1946, only $40,000,000 to meet the current applications for new loans, totaling $214,000,000. Under the present demand for loans and under a normal allotment program this $40,000,000 will be exhausted in 2 or 3 months.

The War Production Board, on May 12, 1945, rescinded its prior restrictions with respect to electric line extensions in rural areas and substituted a single restriction to the effect that no single project or extension having a net material cost of more than $25,000 may be constructed without special approval. There is no limitation as to the number of separate extensions which may be added to an existing system. This amount of materials will make possible, under average conditions, a single extension of approximately 50 miles and most REA-financed cooperatives are, therefore, in a position to proceed with their long deferred plans for complete coverage in their respective areas. On June 2, 1945, WPB issued another order by way of further liberalization.

It has been our recent experience that the materials for electric line construction which have been in short supply are now available on reasonable delivery terms for a rapidly expanding program. In keeping with present trends, the WPB limitations upon the purchase of transformers has been removed. Contractors are showing a rapidly increased interest in resuming the type of large scale construction which prevailed during the years immediately preceding the war.

Our primary interest in this supplemental authorization is to enable REA to make loan allotments upon what we call an "area coverage basis." An efficient, economical, and adequate completion of the job of rural electrification requires the setting up of future projects upon a basis of reaching the maximum number of consumers who can be reached feasibly under the requirements of the Rural Electrification Act as amended last year.

The advantages of such area coverage allotments are numerous. They will furnish reassurance to farmers who prefer to participate in consumer-owned enterprises and will assist in holding together such cooperative projects. Such allotments will also be of assistance in applications to State regulatory

bodies for certificates of necessity and convenience, by way of furnishing evidence of assured financing of extensive projects in the public interest. It will also be possible to design electric systems for future construction on a more efficient engineering basis and to obtain the economies resulting from the letting of construction contracts for large scale, mass construction.

As you know, the Rural Electrification Administration, during the 4 fiscal years immediately preceding the war (fiscal years 1939 to 1942, inclusive) received authorizations from Congress totalling $380,000,000. During the past 3 years, the authorizations totalled only $55,000,000 because of the heavy restrictions upon electric-line construction. This has meant a piling up of a very large backlog of farmer demand for electric service. A factor tending to accelerate the development of this backlog has been the increased purchasing power of the small farmer. The Bureau of the Budget estimate is for the purpose of taking care of this backlog. We do not want to be under the necessity of informing applicants for loans that their proposed projects must be cut down.

It should be noted that the requested authorization involves merely the authority to borrow from Reconstruction Finance Corporation as sums are needed. It is expected that construction can proceed rapidly but funds will be drawn down, of course, only as they are actually needed. Regardless of the rate of immediate construction, it is highly important that we have funds for an adequate allotment program on an area coverage basis. Under such a program, we can make allotments according to the demand throughout the country. By reason of such an adequate allotment program, construction can proceed more rapidly and more economically, particularly in those States where present conditions are most favorable.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

San Francisco Charter Must Be Ratified for Enduring Peace

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today, in my native State of California, our great American President will have the honor and world responsibility of making the concluding address, closing the greatest conference of nations in the world's history. Yes, the greatest in numbers and the greatest in purpose, for the objective of that history-making conference of these world nations is enduring peace.

I hope and pray with all the fervor that I have, as a Member of this great House, that as that history-making charter from San Francisco comes back to Washington for ratification or rejection by our Senate, I, myself, and that you, my distinguished associates in this great body, will so conduct ourselves with reference thereto that nothing we do or say or think or wish, and nothing we have left undone or unthought or unprayed for, shall be anything less than actively working, thinking, praying to the necessary end that this charter shall be speedily ratified by our great companion legislative body, the United States Senate. Distinguished and able Members of our Senate and also of this House have been giving their best to the cause of enduring world peace by being personally present at San Francisco at the Conference table day and night. They are to be credited with being not less able than are we; they were sent there to represent our beloved Nation; they have heard and seen at first hand the representatives of the other world nations individually and in small and larger groups in committee and Conference work. Several weeks of their dedicated selves have been exclusively set apart to help bring back to the United States—yes, to help prepare for the world at large—a charter for an enduring world peace. Our privilege—yes, our bounden duty, gentlemen—is to do our dead level best in every way and every day, to the end that our Nation shall promptly and forthrightly ratify the charter.

We have fought for peace; we have had to fight for our very lives; we have paid for this security and coming peace with thousands of lives; no doubt, thousands more will pay with their lives for the security and peace of those of us who survive, because of their supreme sacrifice. Can we do less on the home front of domestic and international relations and legislation than they have done in the fighting front for us? Mr. Speaker, these dead have a right to expect—yes, to know and to see—us at work steadfastly and in good faith for enduring world peace.

Again today we will debate and decide how many more billions of dollars we must again appropriate for the Military Establishments of our great Nation for the final year ending June 30, 1946. We will vote these billions; we must vote them. There is no other way whereby some of mankind can be compelled to stop mass murder. But the way of world enduring peace is the only way to world enduring prosperity. It is the way of the Prince of Peace. Let us here today and now so dedicate our thought, our prayers, our actions that we will, each of us, be conscious within our own hearts and minds that we daily do our dead level best for enduring world peace. Let us, the living, in thought and deed, seek to match the dedication of our dead. Nothing less is dignified; nothing less in our purposes as legislators is worthy as a daily objective and dedication on our part.

Therefore, in the presence of those who shall not have died in vain, no carping criticism, no unfounded or unworthy statements or remarks, no partisan politics, no lack of faith in the ability of the world to achieve an enduring world peace within the objectives and life of this very world peace charter can or will be uttered or given credence or be circulated in our minds or work. Let us, with resolute faith and with daily works, press forward to the high calling of an enduring world peace. Wars must cease.

International Institute of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of a recent statement by A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange, when he appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which was then hearing testimony relative to House Joint Resolution 145. I feel that this statement by Mr. Goss on the proposed charter for the food and agriculture organization is worthy of the careful and thorough consideration of all Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. ORIGIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE

The idea of the institute originated in the mind of an American farmer. David Lubin started farming after having succeeded in establishing a great merchandising business in Sacramento, Calif. Lubin found the business of farming complicated by the fact that he was competing with farmers in many parts of the world without knowing what the other farmers were doing or how they were doing it. Furthermore, he found that he could not secure adequate information about the foreign markets which absorbed a part of his product.

David Lubin conceived of a world institution which would collect and disseminate information which would enable farmers to work in the light of full information regarding world production and world markets, and thus be able to adjust their production intelligently instead of groping in the dark and running into glutted world markets.

Lubin presented his idea first to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States with the hope that his own Government would take the lead by calling an international conference authorized to formulate a plan and create a world institution for agriculture. The United States Government did not respond favorably but Lubin was a man of persistent purposefulness. He went to one country after another. He was turned down by 14 governments. He was far ahead of his time. Finally, with the assistance of the incomparable, English-born, Italian-married Madam Olivia Rossitti Agresti, Lubin caught the imagination of the King of Italy. King Victor Emmanuel III called the desired conference with the result that 40 nations, including the United States of America, became charter members of the International Institute of Agriculture under the convention of 1905 which is still in effect. Many other nations joined later. The membership totaled 74.

II. THE SCOPE OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE

According to the plans for the work of the International Institute of Agriculture, as provided for in the convention of 1905 and as developed by the policy-making body—the general assembly which met every 2 years—the International Institute of Agriculture is

first of all a clearinghouse of information on the production and marketing of agricultural products. Crop estimates are received from all countries by cable and cabled to all countries. Statistics of agricultural production, exports and imports are published annually in the International Yearbook of Statistics. This yearbook has for decades been the one great source book of statistics on world agriculture from which all countries have drawn. The statistics taken from these yearbooks have been printed by the receiving nations, and too few of those who benefit by the information have realized that the International Institute of Agriculture was the agency that made the statistics available. The crop estimates telegraphed to Washington by the International Institute of Agriculture are given to the American press by the United States Department of Agriculture and are used by farmers and merchants who often do not realize the important role of the International Institute of Agriculture as a world clearinghouse of information.

The International Institute of Agriculture has been a major source of the foreign information used each year in preparing the annual outlook reports of the United States Department of Agriculture.

So soon as the United States entered World War II several Government agencies, including the War Department, sought copies of the International Institute of Agriculture Yearbook of Statistics as a source of facts essential to military operations.

In addition to its statistical work the International Institute of Agriculture is a clearinghouse of information for the discoveries resulting from agricultural research and experimentation. There are Bureaus of Animal Industry and Plant Industry. These bureaus deal with the breeding and feeding of plants and animals, their diseases and their pests. The Economic Bureau gathers and publishes facts about agriculture and markets which supplement and interpret the data in the International Yearbook of Statistics. The division of legislation collects and makes available information concerning national legislation, Government orders, international agreements, etc., which influence production and international trade in farm products.

The International Institute of Agriculture has made studies relating to the desirability of establishing international grades and standards for agricultural products. From time to time recommendations have been made that an international conference be called to consider the adoption of a convention to provide for the setting up and the administering of grades and standards.

The International Institute of Agriculture has given considerable attention to the question of international commodity arrangements. It was at the urgent request of the International Institute of Agriculture that the conference was called which negotiated the International Wheat Agreement of 1933 and set up the committee to administer the quota system provided for in the agreement.

The International Institute of Agriculture is the one world institution to which the United States has been a treaty member. The accumulated wisdom of the 40 years of experience of this world organization for agriculture should not be lost.

III. CONTROL OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE

The policy making body of the International Institute of Agriculture is the biennial assembly. The continuing control is in the hands of a permanent committee. The secretary-general is the director to whom all bureaus and division heads report.

The question has been raised as to whether Italy may have too greatly dominated the International Institute of Agriculture. In this connection the following facts are presented: From 1905 to 1919, the United States was represented on the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture by David Lubin, the ideator of the institute. He was the natural leader in bringing the institute through the early years when, by trial and error, the ways of doing the work had to be discovered. After the death of Lubin, the French member of the permanent committee, Louis Dopp, became the outstanding leader in the committee but in no sense dominated it, although there were those who felt that he was too influential. From 1919 to 1923 the United States was represented on the permanent committee by first one and then another American professor of agriculture who chanced to be in Europe, but from 1923 to 1930 Asher Hobson, an economist formerly of the United States Department of Agriculture, was the United States member and rendered invaluable service in developing the institute library which is now the outstanding library of its kind in the world. It was also through Hobson's leadership that the International Institute of Agriculture arranged for a world census of agriculture. This was important as a means of improving the quality of the statistical material available to the institute from the various countries. Since the appropriations of the institute were meager, an American foundation furnished considerable sums of money which made these special projects possible. The International Institute of Agriculture employed Leon M. Estabrook, one time Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States Department of Agriculture, as director of the World Census of 1930.

During the years 1926 to 1933 the Italian member of the permanent committee undertook to play a more dominant role than is provided for in the convention of 1905. This was due to the personal ambitions of the member and was in no wise advocated by the Italian Government. Friction followed which resulted in about 3 years' suspension of active participation on the part of the United States. But in 1933 the Italian Government eliminated the disturbing element by appointing a member to the permanent committee who was acceptable to the United States. This done, the United States again became active in the institute, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Henry C. Taylor to serve as United States member of the permanent committee. He served from August 1933 to November 1935, and was president of the general assembly in 1936. J. Clyde Marquis succeeded him and served until July 1941. During the 8 years from 1933 to 1941 the International Institute of Agriculture carried forward its work in a harmonious and progressive manner. In spite of the all too limited resources, more and more analytical work was done year after year. In 1941 the institute published the 1,100-page volume entitled "World Trade in Agricultural Products," which is the most important document ever published on this subject, and which contains material essential to planning the agricultural reconstruction in the postwar era.

From 1938 to 1941 the American member of the permanent committee, J. Clyde Marquis, was vice president of the International Institute of Agriculture, and in the year 1940–41 served as president of the institute. Up to 1941 the International Institute of Agriculture was rendering a great service to world agriculture. Through the years the methods of collecting data continually improved, and the representatives of the various nations learned to work together remarkably well. During World War II the international character of the International Institute of Agriculture has been respected by the Axis Powers as well as by the United Nations. Of course, the institute has not been able to function normally during the war, but the skeleton staff continue to work as best they can with a view to being ready to resume their functions of collecting and distributing information as soon as channels are reopened. In the meantime, they have prepared and published a volume on postwar agricultural reconstruction.

The real handicap of the International Institute of Agriculture was the meager appropriations of $250,000 for the annual budget. This was the natural result of being the first of the world institutions. Later institutions, such as the International Labor Office, have been better financed. One of the matters under consideration before World War II was a move to refinance the institute on an adequate basis. The American representative, J. Clyde Marquis, as president of the institute, was taking the lead in this planning for the enlarged future of the International Institute of Agriculture.

Discard Pauper's Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me so to do, I desire to make a few remarks and to include a letter by Joseph Leib, vice commander, Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 13, American Legion Post in the District of Columbia.

On February 21, 1945, on page A761 of the Appendix of the RECORD, I spoke vehemently against the pauper's oath as an undignified, unworthy, and unnecessary requirement, being enforced in order for a veteran to qualify for that to which he is legally, morally, and ethically entitled. I am very pleased to say that under date of June 20, H. R. 3522 was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee. In reading the bill I note there is no requirement of pauper's oath contained therein for any veteran to swear that he is penniless and cannot pay for hospitalization or support himself in order to be entitled to domiciliary care, including transportation and medical treatment. I am very happy that the Veterans' Administration is, I believe, going to be permitted to cooperate with the needs of these distinguished veterans without further insulting them. The letter referred to follows:

GENERAL HINES PROPOSES ELIMINATION OF PAUPER OATH FOR VETERANS—IT IS NOW UP TO CONGRESS

(By Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C.)

Replying to a statement by this writer appearing in the June 8, 1945, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, General Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, asserted that he would support the present campaign aimed to discontinue the existing requirement of a pauper oath before needy veterans can secure Government hospitalization.

The general made this announcement in a letter to Representative GILLIE, dated June 16, at which time he attached a copy of proposed legislation to accomplish this revision. Explaining the purposes of the bill, General Hines said that it was intended "to codify provisions of present laws and would liberal-

ize them somewhat with respect to hospital and medical care" for veterans; also—and this provision is most important—the Veterans' Chief explained that the bill "would modify Public Law 312 and would eliminate the needs clause." To those who are not familiar with this legal terminology, the "needs clause" is the basis for the requirement of a pauper oath, but the Veterans' Administration prefers to call it by a more pleasant or perfumed name.

Recently Chairman RANKIN, of the World War Veterans' Committee, introduced H. R. 3115, which is a very worthy bill and deserves the consideration of every Member of Congress. It is a splendid start in the right direction and Mr. RANKIN should be congratulated for helping to clear up much of the confusion that has overtaken the many and complicated laws pertaining to hospital treatment. This Rankin bill, particularly section 17–B, eliminates the pauper oath. However, this legislation has been returned to General Hines for certain amendments and when approved by the Bureau of the Budget a new bill will be proposed to Congress by the Veterans' Administration.

It is certainly gratifying to know that the vicious and un-American pauper oath is finally to be removed from the statute books. When this is accomplished we will return to the situation as it was in 1926, when hospitalization was provided for veterans without regard to service connection, but that preference to beds would be given to those who were wounded and to those who could not afford private medical care. In 1933 this right was taken away from the veterans when the Economy Act was rushed through Congress by an administration that was more concerned with "boondoggling projects" and lavish squandering of public funds than it was in the welfare and security of those who went to war to save our form of government.

It was Costello Post that launched this campaign to eliminate the pauper oath, yet, without the assistance of certain veterans' units throughout the Nation, and the newspaper the National Tribune, Stars & Stripes, published in Washington, D. C., and without the backing of many Members of Congress, particularly those who introduced legislation to outlaw the pauper oath, this endeavor would not have been successful. Congressman SPRINGER introduced the first bill. This was followed by Senator LANGER, and then by Representatives MORRISON, WICKERSHAM, MARTIN of Massachusetts, and SASSCER. When and if this proposed legislation is enacted into law all veterans will be grateful to Representatives GILLIE, JOHNSON of Indiana, PETERSON of Florida, WILSON, DOYLE, ENGLE of California, KEARNEY, ABERNETHY, MCMILLAN, and ROWAN for being among the first to support this revision and assisting in bringing about this great victory.

In this connection it may be of interest to have the original Costello Post resolution reproduced as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9 months ago. Here it is:

"MUST A VETERAN IN NEED OF HOSPITALIZATION SWEAR TO A PAUPER'S OATH?

[Extension of remarks of Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of Indiana, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, September 7, 1944]

"Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, the largest American Legion Post in the District of Columbia and one of the largest in the Nation. The resolution is worthy of consideration by every Member of Congress:

"'*Be it resolved,* That the existing and written method of interrogation for admission to veteran hospitalization, as nonservice connected patients or as service-connected patients seeking treatment for ailment other than cause of discharge—either emergency or extensive cases—is un-American, degrading, and in addition clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of the world wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant or antagonistic governmental bureaucrats.

"'Whereas that the membership of this post respectfully suggests that Veterans' Administration officials be requested to authorize and institute a more democratic and more appropriate procedure of ascertaining and determining the financial status of an applicant or his/her eligibility for hospital treatment.

"'Whereas that these pleadings are not submitted for the intention of removing proper or necessary restrictions and safeguards for hospital admittance but to eliminate the apprehension of being stigmatized in official records by a so-called act of pauperism, and to remove the contingency of being coerced or threatened by overzealous public officials: Therefore be it

"'*Resolved,* That the Vincent B. Costello Post No. 15, of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, is authorized and directed to recommend for the consideration by the delegates of the national convention of the American Legion to be assembled at Chicago, Ill., September 18–20, 1944, the deletion of questions Nos. 5 and 9, respectively, from Veterans' Administration Form P–10 "Application for Hospital Treatment or Domiciliary Care," otherwise known as the "pauper's oath."

"'Approved:

"'THOMAS COSTELLO,
"'*Commander.*
"'JOSEPH LEIB,
"'*Vice Commander.*'"

Strange Paradoxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest writers and clearest thinkers among our citizens is John T. Flynn. Down the years he has contributed much to clear thinking and to better understanding of things as they are in this country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the following article by this gentleman:

One of the strange paradoxes of the war is to be found in two war agencies—the OWI and the Office of Censorship. There are two kinds of war agencies. One kind works on the enemy. The other kind works on the home folks. The war agencies that work on the enemy have been popular. The agencies that work on the home folks have been unpopular. The OPA, for instance, even if it had been managed by arch angels, would have come in for criticism because it interfered with our habits and appetites here at home.

The one striking exception to this rule has been the OWI and the Office of Censorship. The OWI was intended to work on the enemy to break down his morale and to help, not hamper, the home folks. The Office of Censorship was intended to work on the newspapers, the radio, and magazines, to interfere with their ancient habit of printing everything they knew. Under these circumstances, the OWI should have been popular and the Office of Censorship should have been unpopular. Yet the reverse is true—and the reason for this is of great importance to Congress now. The reason is that Byron Price in the Office of Censorship, in spite of his unpopular assignment, has done the job so well, so efficiently that he has won the praise of every publishing concern in America. But Elmer Davis, in the OWI, has surrounded himself with such a queer assortment of amateurs, crackpots, and generally troublesome assistants that the OWI is beyond all doubt more unpopular and more generally condemned than even the OPA. I say this is important because at this moment Congress is being asked to appropriate some enormous sums for this OWI.

To date the OWI has spent $132,000,000—to break down the morale of the Germans and the Japs. It has had the incredible assurance to boast that its propaganda induced the Germans to surrender and it has pictured in one of its own self-serving cartoons a Jap creeping humbly to surrender with an OWI leaflet in his hands. Actually never in the history of warfare have two enemies continued to fight so long after defeat was a fact than the Germans and the Japs. The reason for this, beyond any doubt, was chiefly in the peculiar features of this war and of the enemy. But it is also pretty certain that the propaganda of the OWI has had something to do with prolonging the resistance. But even if it did not prolong the resistance, it would be hard to imagine a more astonishing instance of self-congratulation than the boast that it has had anything to do with German and particularly Japanese surrender when the Japanese die almost to the last man and Germany quit only after the nation had been almost completely devastated.

The OWI was established to carry on psychological warfare against the enemy. Also it was intended to aid American newspapers by providing a central bureau to clear information and make it easier for the press. The war in Europe is over. But Elmer Davis and his performing propagandists are planning to go right on fighting in Europe. He is asking in the present appropriation bill for more money in Europe than he is asking for the war on Japan. He asked Congress to give him $42,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. The House committee cut him down to $35,000,000. But the House cut this down to $18,000,000.

He wanted roughly $23,000,000 for the war in Europe which is over, and $17,000,000 for the war in the Pacific which is still going on. The House eliminated all of the appropriation for the war in the Atlantic save what is needed to wind up.

What does Davis intend to do with all this money? The American Army is occupying only a fraction of Germany—less than one-fourth. It occupies in fact the old kingdom of Bavaria with about 15,000,000 people. To carry on his peacetime propaganda in Bavaria Davis asked for $23,000,000. The Associated Press is the greatest news-gathering and distributing agency in the world. It has its agents in every country in the world and supplies newspapers daily over the United States. It supplies not merely news, but features and photographs. Its news-receiving machines are ticking away 24 hours a day in newspaper offices in every city in the land. Yet that vast organization, employing the most highly-trained newsmen, spends annually all over the world only $12,000,000, while the United Press, which services more newspapers than the Associated Press in Latin America, as well as the United States, and has its agents in every corner of the globe, spends only $10,000,000. Yet Davis wants $23,000,000 to carry on his propaganda war in one-fourth of Hitler's Germany.

What does Davis intend to do in Germany? Any man who will read the testimony before the House committee will see plainly enough that he is thinking about reeducating Germany, remolding the German mind. He said:

"I am afraid the average German is not going to get religion without a good deal of evangelization and it will require not only the work of a staff in Germany, but the supplying of materials—news, radio programs, publications, pictures and so on from our London offices and our London base."

Davis is talking about the social and political evangelization not of Germany, but that one-fourth of Germany which we now occupy. Now, of course, if the United States is going to undertake the task of changing the German character, indoctrinating it in the principles of democracy, then that, we must assume, is going to take a great many years. It is going to call for a program which reaches into the schools, the press, and every form of psychological influence. What do we want to teach them? How will we do it? Surely that is going to take professional planning and administration of the highest order. Is that kind of talent in the OWI? Does the United States Senate know what kind of talent is there? Is Mr. Davis, by education and political philosophy and special training, fitted for that task? What kind of opinion dominates the personnel of the OWI? Does the Congress know? Do the men in that organization subscribe to the political philosophy which dominates the American Congress?

When the American Labor Party was organized many men joined it. Some favored a party in which American labor could find a means of enforcing its just demands on our American political machinery. But Mr. Davis joined it because, as he said, he hoped to see formed here a labor party like the British Labor Party which is a Socialist Party. Now Mr. Davis is entitled to such views and they are held by many respected Americans. But does the Congress of the United States want to entrust the job of propaganda in peace to men holding these views?

What is needed now in Bavaria, if anything is needed, is a mere publicity agency to distribute such information as the Army's civilian government requests. Later when this Government decides on what it is going to do in Bavaria, the question of an instrument to do it must be considered: But I am sure that Congress will not want to entrust that serious enterprise to Mr. Davis or to the odd assortment of persons gathered under his tent.

An example of the leanings of this organization in the matter of opinion may be seen from the following:

When the war began the Office of Censorship, headed by Mr. Price, was put in charge of the censorship of all forms of communication, including the radio. The OWI and the FCC had no authority in this. Nevertheless the OWI took it upon itself to censor radio stations and to carry on the most extensive and dangerous propaganda among the foreign-language broadcasting stations. There were about 125 of them—broadcasting stations especially in foreign languages and reaching millions of people. It is important that such programs and stations be watched closely for alien propaganda and that was the business of the Office of Censorship. The OWI and the FCC, however, decided to take a hand not merely in monitoring the stations but literally in directing and controlling them. The FCC put a young lawyer of very little experience in charge of this job in New York. The OWI collaborated with him through a gentleman named Lee Falk. His real name was Leon Harrison Gross. He went through college under the name of Epstein and after that changed it to Leon H. E. Falk and now calls himself Lee Falk.

A broadcasting station operates under the direction and supervision of a certain type of staff. There is a station manager, a program director, a censor, a monitor, announcers and commentators. If you can get control of most of those positions you control the broadcasting station. Mr. Eugene L. Garey, chief counsel of a Congressional select committee investigating the FCC and a distinguished New York lawyer who is also a lifelong Democrat, said:

"From the record thus far made it appears that, in one foreign language broadcasting station in New York City, the program director, the announcer, the script writer, the censor, and the monitor of the Italian-language programs are all aliens or persons owing their positions to the Office of War Information, with the approval of the FCC.

"The situation thus portrayed is not peculiar to this single station, or to this one city. Information in our possession indicates that the same situation prevails generally in the foreign-language stations throughout the country. Every such key position in each of the three radio stations presently under investigation are found to be similarly staffed. Those staffs select the news, edit the script, and announce the program. The program, in turn, is censored by them, monitored by them, and is presented under the direction of a program director of similar character.

"From these apparently unrelated facts the picture must be further developed.

"O. W. I. had the men and the material. It had the proper dye to color the news. It also had the desire to select and censor the news. What it lacked was the power, or perhaps more accurately stated, even the color of power, to carry its designs into effect. Hence the need to enlist the Federal Communications Commission in its purposes.

"True it is the Federal Communications Commission had no such lawful power, but the Federal Communications Commission did have the power to license and hence the power to compel obedience to its directions. The record now shows their unlawful use of this power.

"Working together in a common purpose, the Federal Communications Commission and the Office of War Information have accomplished a result that compels pause—and presents the solemn question of 'whither are we going?'

"A division called the War Problems Division was created in the Federal Communications Commission, and a staff of attorneys began to function.

"This division was not a regulatory body. It was not formed to instruct, or supervise, or to correct. It was formed for the avowed purpose of unlawfully liquidating all of the radio personnel in the foreign-language field that did not meet with its favor. A real gestapo was created and a lawless enterprise was launched.

"It is suggested that we accept this unlawful situation as a benevolent expedient of the moment, but no such purpose as we find here disclosed, however benevolently cloaked, can justify the practices we find. All tyranny begins under the guise of benevolence.

"In a time of war we are asked to place trust in lately arrived aliens whose sole claim to trustworthiness is the assumption that because they have been unfaithful to past vows they will be faithful to their new ones.

"The voices of these aliens go into our homes, and the unwary are led to believe that they speak with authority and official approval. They even censor our Christmas and Easter religious programs, and tell us what music we may hear. The FCC and the OWI is alarmed about whether we will react properly to news furnished by our national news agencies. Apparently we can still read the news in our press, but we can only hear what these aliens permit us to. What next medium of communication will receive the benevolent attention of these misguided zealots? Obviously, the press.

"These interpreters of our national policy—these slanters of our news—these destroyers of free speech—are alien in birth, alien in education, alien in training and in thought.

"And still these are the people who are permitted to mold our thoughts—to tell us what America's war aims and purposes are. These people are in position to color, to delete, or to slant, as they see fit, in accordance with their own peculiar alien views and ideologies.

"If the radio can thus be controlled in August of 1943, there is nothing to prevent the same control from slanting our political news and nothing to prevent the coloring of our war aims and purposes when peace comes."

How did these people get employment so swiftly in the OWI, and through it in the FCC? A private organization known as Short-Wave Research, Inc., was formed. Its purpose was to corral refugees as they arrived and get them employment with the OWI. Over 230 such aliens were funneled into the OWI and the FCC by this organization within a few days or weeks or months after they arrived here, and there found themselves operating the propoganda of the United States. One Italian whose trade was that of bricklayer was hired as censor and monitor. Another Italian walked in 5 weeks after he got here, without letters of recommendation, and became a censor. At Christmas and Easter he imposed his own peculiar notions in censoring religious programs. Many existing employees who did not meet the peculiar notions of the OWI snoopers and meddlers were forced out.

Some weeks ago Mr. John O'Donnell called attention to the case of Mr. George E. Taylor. First let us bear in mind that while America has allies in this war, we have interests which do not always run parallel with the interests of our allies. In the second place, it would seem that while any department of our Government might use the talents of men and women regardless of their nationality, at least in so delicate a thing as propaganda the task ought to be committed to Americans whose philosophy corresponds with that of the American people. Yet we see in the Pacific area a Mr. George E. Taylor, who is in charge of overseas propaganda in that vast area which now becomes the chief target of our propaganda. Mr. Taylor was a British subject and was a British subject in 1942 when he was put in charge of all the Pacific area. One cannot imagine the British Government putting a man of any other nationality in charge of its propaganda. Mr. O'Donnell called attention to the fact that Taylor had written a play which was produced at Hunter College in the city of New York. Mr. Burton Rascoe, the distinguished drama critic of the New York World-Telegram, reviewing it, said:

"The most conspicuous purpose of the play is to idealize the Red army of China under the Communist Party boss, Mao Tze-tung and to defame the Chungking government and forces under Chiang Kai-shek.

"Incidentally, the purpose of the play is to slander and ridicule the United States and the political, social, and educational ideas of the vast majority of the United States."

Is it into such hands we wish to commit the education of the American people or any other people whose minds we are bent on reforming? Mr. O'Donnell called attention to the fact that one of the sponsors of this play was William S. Gailmor, a convicted auto thief and Communist propagandist who, in spite of that fact, manages to be engaged by the Blue Network for a national broadcast every night to educate and mold the minds of the American people.

It is perhaps too late to do anything about our propaganda in the Pacific. The war is on

and let us hope nearing its end and perhaps we can do no better now than to use the machinery that is there, subject to close scrutiny by the Congress. But so far as propaganda for the education of the German people and propaganda for social and political ideas is concerned, if and when that job is to be done the Congress should see to it that it is in the hands of men who can be trusted not to use it for the promotion of ideas which the vast majority of the American people repudiate.

San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House, a communication from the Beverly-Westwood Democratic Committee to the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State.

The sentiments expressed in this letter are those of the great majority of residents in my district, and, I think, of the great mass of American people. It is important that our constituents let us know their thoughts, since we must put them into the form of law for them.

I heartily concur with the context of the letter from the Beverly-Westwood Democratic Committee, and am sure that many of my colleagues here will feel the same. I congratulate the members of this club on the very lucid manner in which they have expressed themselves.

The letter follows:

JUNE 20, 1945.

Hon. E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Secretary of State,
United Nations Conference,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We, the thousand members of the Beverly-Westwood Democratic Committee, desire certain clarifications on the future of American foreign policy.

We are a nonpartisan organization of professional people, businessmen, housewives and workers in the area of Southern California who came into being in 1943 for the purpose of supporting and furthering those democratic principles which have come to be known as "the Roosevelt heritage."

We are determined to give our full support to the United Nations Charter now being drawn at San Francisco.

We believe that the success of this charter and the whole future of world peace depends upon the continued and growing unity of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union as originally set forth in the Teheran Agreement and as rededicated at Yalta.

Therefore we are disturbed by persistent reports that powerful forces are at work in this country—some say within your own Department, Mr. Secretary—who have embarked on a program of isolating the Soviet Union and replacing Big Three unity with some sort of Anglo-American bloc.

We are loath to believe that responsible Americans could so misread history as to think that peace can be maintained on any other basis than the Yalta formula.

We are not political experts but we try to face facts realistically. And the facts as we see them indicate that while many fine words are being spoken there have been contradictory actions which, taken together, form a pattern of dwindling, not growing, unity.

The admission of the Argentine fascists is one such act.

The exclusion of the Polish Provisional Government is another.

Quite aside from the problems of these two nations themselves (and we believe the Conference acted mistakenly in both instances), the methods employed resulted in a strain on Big Three unity and gave encouragement to every defeatist force in this country.

The exclusion of the World Conference of Trade Unions from the modest position of observer at San Francisco was another example of pressure politics which could not but weaken the moral prestige of the United States among the democratically minded peoples of the world.

The opposition of the American delegation to the inclusion of the phrases "full employment" and "independence for colonial peoples" in the charter was opposition to basic American principles outlined by our late President and confirmed by the electorate last November.

And finally, there is the failure of the State Department to take a clear stand on the Trieste question, the Austrian Provisional Government and the dangerous disunity developing in China.

As shareholders in this great democratic Nation we believe that the time has come to take inventory. What is our stock in trade and what sort of business methods do we intend to follow in the future?

Is it the intention of our Government to return to the golden standard of Big Three unity as the anchor for world peace, or will we drift into an uncharted sea of international suspicion, power politics, and economic instability?

Do we support the right of self-determination for the liberated people of Europe as set forth in the Moscow Declarations and the Teheran and Yalta Agreements, or do we oppose the will of the people?

Will we use our tremendous economic power to raise the standard of living of all peoples to make freedom from want, and freedom from fear a living reality, or are we headed for a new period of imperialist ambitions, cartelization, and economic domination instead of cooperation?

Do we carry through our struggle to exterminate fascism or do we attempt to draw a line between good Fascists and bad Fascists?

In other words, are we headed for peace and security, or crisis, chaos, and a new war?

These are questions that trouble us deeply, Mr. Secretary, and we are sure you would agree, not without reason.

We would like a frank reply. We believe we speak for millions of other Americans when we say that clarification not only in words but in deeds is needed at this point out of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

We fervently hope—we urge—that your reply be a straightforward statement of the intention of your department to return to the principles of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and Great Britain for a peace based upon democracy, liberty, and justice.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. FRANK C. DAVIS,
Chairman, Executive Board, Beverly-Westwood Democratic Committee.

Peace in Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Republican Representative from Connecticut, published by the INS in American newspapers June 18 and 19, 1945:

"When does might make right, and when does might make wrong?"

"When is a principle not a principle?"

"When is appeasement not appeasement?"

These are questions which increasingly Americans have begun to ask since VE-day. They have begun to ask them of their liberals, the men who, between Munich and Stalingrad, challenged the conscience of the world to rise against nazism—largely on the ground of moral principle.

Between the years 1938 and 1942 these American liberals riveted the eyes of all their fellow citizens upon the tragedy being enacted in Hitler's Europe. They laid down a list of principles in international conduct, and of a nation's conduct to its own citizens and to the nationals of neighboring countries, which they declared to be incontestable by freemen and all men who believed in God.

What were those principles with which they sought to stab—and did stab—awake the conscience of so many Americans in the years just past?

The first of these principles was that military or political aggression by a great or major power on a smaller and weaker power was immoral, and therefore dangerous to the climate of freedom, and to the peace of the world. We can still hear their voices ringing in denunciation of Japan when she entered Manchuria, of Italy when she entered Ethiopia, of Germany when she entered Austria and Czechoslovakia, of Russia when she entered Finland, and both Germany and Russia when they jointly occupied Poland. No Japanese reasons that Japan needed borderline security, no Italian reasons that Italy needed a greater measure of world trade, no Nazi reasons that Germany needed friendly governments around her, no Russian reasons that Russia needed military security on her German or Finnish borders, were acceptable to the liberals, nor should they have been acceptable.

And the men in any country anywhere who accepted them were upbraided as appeasers. The national policy of peace in our time, which sought to avoid war between major powers by surrendering, or sanctioning the surrender, of any land or any part of the sovereignty of a weaker neighboring power to a greater power was a policy which all American liberals condemned not only as immoral—but as, in the end, opposed to the Nation's interests which adopted it.

Do you remember the scorn which was heaped on any American who claimed, at the time of Munich, that there was room in the world for the United States to live side by side with a strong totalitarian power, whose ideology differed from ours, providing it did not want to tangle with the United States of America either militarily or economically? Do you remember how the liberals pointed out to such Americans that not only was it

in the end economically impossible to do business with any totalitarian power, but that by the mere effort of trying to do business with a totalitarian power we would weaken our democratic concepts, and in the end we would grow totalitarian-minded, too? Indeed, from 1938 to the day of Pearl Harbor, the theme that "you can't do business with the totalitarians" was one of the most convincing arguments the liberals had.

Do you remember the speeches from pulpit and rostrum, from Cabinet members' offices, from the halls of the Capitol itself, that called upon all Americans who loved "individual freedom" to view with intense alarm the "universal threat to individual freedom" embodied in the simple principle of dictatorship itself? Do you remember President Franklin D. Roosevelt's statement (at the time of Russia's invasion of Finland) that "Russia is a dictatorship as absolute as any on earth"? Do you remember how the liberals told us that should Europe ever be dominated by one strong totalitarian power individual freedom for masses of Europeans would be gone forever? Do you remember how clarion-voiced liberals pointed out that there was, in totalitarianism itself, the basic evil, that which made mass violence and brutality, concentration camps, slave labor, firing squads, and political persecution inevitable methods of procedure; and that no materialistic or economic arguments for the "dynamic economic qualities," the "technological progress," which totalitarianism seemed to offer the world, could conceal the ugly, underlying fact that all material gains under totalitarianism were always made at the expense of the individual's personal and political freedom and spiritual growth?

The arguments of the liberals from the days of Munich until America's entry into the war—an entry that was secured largely because of these very arguments—were sound and noble arguments, worthy of the ears of all free and open-minded men.

All that they said was true yesterday. And if all that they said yesterday was true yesterday, is it not true today? Oh, yes; it is still true. But many of the liberals, alas most of them, are not saying it today.

Let us take, for example, Mr. Henry Wallace and Mr. Archibald MacLeish. These two men have established themselves in the public mind as champions of individual human freedom. Therefore, one supposes that these two men would never change their fundamental principles of human liberty to suit opportunistic or expedient international circumstances. Now their often-expounded principles (circa 1939–43) were:

1. Aggression is wrong.
2. Appeasement is immoral.
3. The cause of individual freedom is forever in conflict with tyranny.
4. One or the other must win in our time: i. e., this must be one world, either it will be a world of freedom for individuals, or a world of increasing tyranny.

But where do Mr. MacLeish and Mr. Henry Wallace stand on these fundamental principles of decent international conduct and political morality today? The answer is so disquieting that an ordinary citizen with a modicum of intellectual integrity, who has managed, in these past years of blood and toil and tears and sweat to get his own principles straight, can hardly believe that he is listening to the same men when he hears them use their familiar phrases—to support exactly contrary ideas.

Here is Mr. Henry Wallace, a man who has carved out for himself, even among those who think that he is often a little woolly-minded and vague in some of his utterances, the position of one of America's foremost idealists, a man of principle, a man who has claimed to hate power politics with all the fire of a crusading soul, a man who despises crass materialistic or economic arguments when the well-being, the freedom, the safety, the happiness of the human being, or, as he calls him, "the common man everywhere in the world," is in jeopardy.

Where does Henry Wallace stand today on the question of individual human liberty for the common man—everywhere in the world? Unhappily for his admirers among the true liberals—he does not stand. Do we hear Henry Wallace's voice raised against the aggressions of Soviet Russia in Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland? Do we hear him condemn the totalitarian policy of establishing "friendly governments" in the Balkans by mass deportations, concentration camps, and firing squads? We hear nothing but silence from Mr. Wallace on the score of the freedom of the little nations of Europe and the individual freedom of their citizens. Silence—that is all, on these basic moral questions which Mr. Wallace once claimed were the "great issues facing all freemen."

Back in 1939 American apologists for the Nazi rape of Austria and Czechoslovakia made an argument which went like this:

"Both America and Germany have occasionally stepped over the line where the principle of national defense was involved. But our two nations are so placed geographically that they do not have conflicting basic interests. The German and the American people—the plain people of Germany and America—have always liked one another. We Americans want to raise the standard of living of our people. So do the Germans, who understand modern industrial methods and technological means better than any other people in Europe. In our different ways we are groping for a way of life which will give the common man of our two countries the most good out of modern technology. There is nothing irreconcilable in our aims and purposes. Those who insist there is are wittingly or unwittingly trying to plunge America into another European war. We can do business with totalitarian Germany—and by so doing help to prevent Europe and the world from splitting into two warlike ideological camps."

What was Mr. Wallace's rejoinder, and Mr. MacLeish's—and many another liberal's and churchman's to such talk? "Appeaser!" they shouted, "You are a victim of the subversive propoganda groups in America and Europe who are putting this dangerous language of appeasement into your mouth. And even if Germany does not attack America now, she will in another 20 years. Besides, have you not heard of the Gestapo, of the torture of the Jews, of Buchenwald and Dachau? Respect of law and patriotic self-interest alike, both principle and power politics together say that you are wrong." Thus, Mr. Wallace and Mr. MacLeish from the days of Munich—to Stalingrad.

Now listen to Mr. Henry Wallace, that passionate lover of the common man everywhere in the world, writing about "America, Russia, and the World" in the June 11 issue of the New Republic:

"Both America and Russia have occasionally stepped over the line when the principle of national defense is involved. The two nations are so geographically placed that they have never had conflicting basic interests. * * * The Russian and the American people instinctively like each other. Neither * * * wants to use modern technology as an instrument of war. We want to raise the living standard of our people and we do not want to exploit other people. Both the Russians and the Americans are in their different ways groping for a way of life which will enable the common man everywhere to get the most good out of modern technology. There is nothing irreconcilable in our aims and purposes. Those who so proclaim are wittingly or unwittingly looking for war, and that in my opinion is criminal. * * * We must trade with Russia to prevent the world splitting into two hostile ideological camps."

And what, Mr. Wallace, about "the mortal peril which threatens our soul if we sanction the rape of small states," as you liberals once put it? What about the rape of small Poland, the Baltic states, Finland? Would the citizens of those states agree with you that the U. S. S. R. does not want to exploit other people? What about the subversive pressures, the military and economic forces being used upon the Balkans to sovietize them? What about the horror of Siberian prison camps, where 18,000,000 Russian "common men" languish today? What about the firing squads of the NVKD?

The voice of Mr. Wallace is curiously hushed. "We must trade with Russia to prevent the world from splitting into two hostile ideological camps," he murmurs. And then, more softly: "You cannot expect a large nation to take any risks for the sake of any small nation, can you?"

Who's an appeaser now?

When the men of Munich were driven to appeasement, Germany was strong and really to be feared, and America was isolated, and unarmed. If ever appeasement was justified by material circumstances it was justified at the time of Munich. But today Russia is weak. And America and Great Britain are strong, and Russia's greatest enemy, Germany, has been destroyed. From either a moral or material point of view appeasement was never less justified.

Why, I ask explicitly of Mr. Henry Wallace, if he was willing to fight for the common man of Austria and Czechoslovakia and of all of Europe, as Hitler took over there, why is he not willing to fight for the common man of Poland and the Baltic States and Finland, and the countries of central Europe that don't want Stalin to take over there?

When is appeasement not appeasement?

It is with considerable unhappiness that I personally contemplate the case of Mr. Archibald MacLeish. I have long thought Mr. MacLeish to be one of the most vibrant, sincere, and eloquent liberal voices in our country. America has need of poets in politics—and of politics in poetry.

All the best in America challenged Walt Whitman. Walt Whitman challenged all the best in America.

"America's covenant," thundered Whitman, "is eternally with individuals."

So, it seemed, thought Mr. MacLeish—until VE-day. Until VE-day he too sang the road of liberty that all freemen long to travel. No finer paragraph in modern oratory can be found than the one in which Mr. MacLeish, on July 18, 1942, described what a freeman really is.

"From the beginning of the Republic one of the inalienable American rights has been the right to cuss the Government. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of Congressmen, they used to say in the old time country newspapers. Maybe they still do. But whether they do or not, the principle still stands. It's a man's right, if he governs himself, to say what he thinks of his handiwork. Certainly it's the last right most of us would willingly surrender. * * * We're jealous of it because it is not only a freeman's right—it is the freeman's right—the right which, more than any other, distinguishes the man who has freedom from the man who hasn't."

Now Mr. MacLeish would be the last man in the world to claim that this right—the freeman's right—is one which the Soviet citizen enjoys or which the citizens of any country taken over by the Soviets are likely to enjoy. By his own definition the fundamental concept of freedom in America is neither understood nor enjoyed wherever the Red Flag flies.

In a State Department broadcast on May 26 of this year, Mr. MacLeish spoke of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Said he:

"The facts speak for themselves and what they speak are profoundly reassuring to any man who will open his ears and listen. The vital interests of the United States and the U. S. S. R. conflict at no point on the earth's surface * * *.

"However much they may differ in philosophy, and however they may differ in practice (they), aim in their several and dissimilar ways at what they believe to be the betterment of the lot of their own people * * *.

"What underlies the current talk of inevitable conflict between the two nations * * * is nothing real, nothing logical."

In short, says Mr. MacLeish today, there is no fundamental conflict between freedom and tyranny—no logical difference between the aims or purposes of the freemen of the world and the enslaved men. (Mr. Wallace, at least, thinks there could be but he thinks we can buy the Russian totalitarians off with chewing gum, cigarettes, frigidaires, and machine tools.) Mr. MacLeish obviously does not consider himself an appeaser of the forces of aggression, or totalitarianism, or tyranny or slavery because he no longer admits that these forces do or can conflict with the forces of freedom.

When is a principle not a principle?

It is passing strange to see this queer moral obliquity suddenly close down on a spirit as clean and honest, and a mind as fearless, as Mr. MacLeish's once was.

I do not know what will become of the great cause of the freeman—Mr. MacLeish's freeman, who has "the inalienable right to cuss his government" everywhere in the world—now that so many of our best liberals have abandoned that cause to appease Soviet aggression and Soviet ideology everywhere in the world. But in the words of Mr. MacLeish, "the principle still stands."

To Mr. MacLeish, to Mr. Wallace, and to all liberals of their ilk, I wish peace—peace in our time.

Regulations Discourage Lumber Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, lumber is near the top in the list of critical materials needed for war, yet its production is hampered by lack of Government cooperation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer:

The Pacific Northwest produces lumber—more than any other area in the Nation.

We produce many other things vital to prosecution of the war; but among all these items lumber is bracketed with those essentials standing at the very top.

Lumber is essential, in greater quantities than ever before, to prosecute and hasten to a successful end the war in the Pacific; it is needed for construction as island conquests continue; it is needed for crating war materials, for reconstructing docks, for the infinite number of uses into which lumber enters in serving military and naval purposes.

Lumber is needed to rebuild European docks, to house bombed-out Britons and homeless continentals.

And lumber is needed in vast quantities for essential uses here at home.

In view of this unprecedented demand for forest products, the easy conclusion would be that our officials and boards would not only remove every obstacle to their production, but would insist that every facility be given the industry in order that demands for lumber may be met.

The discouraging measure of official response to the lumber emergency is indicated by a warning given this week in Seattle by Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association. Said Colonel Greeley:

"Steady production of lumber in the Pacific Northwest has just been taken for granted by the war agencies. Although constantly citing the critical shortage of lumber, they have made no effective effort to provide men for this industry. Their lack of help has run through the drafting of key workers by selective service; the low rating given lumber, until very recently, in employment priorities; and the constant refusal to release on furlough skilled loggers from the armed forces.

"The unrest and migration of labor, at the loss of lumber production, has been seriously increased by the complete failure of the Government to enforce its own orders on wage stabilization. More disturbance of lumber's manpower has followed the gratuitous foisting of the travel time controversy upon West Coast logging by the Wage and Hour Administration."

The technical relationships between management and labor in the lumber industry are of a nature which cannot be intelligently considered from the outside.

However, certain facts stand out clearly, and until they are met and met squarely and decisively by responsible Government officials, the emergency, instant and pressing, cannot be met by the industry.

Current production is at a rate 11 percent under last year's.

The industry is operating under the paralyzing handicap of an over-all 20-percent shortage of manpower, while in the woods—the chief bottleneck—the labor deficiency is 25 to 30 percent.

The War Department has informed the lumber industry that construction troops will equal in number those assigned to combat with every landing in the attack upon Japan, and that lumber will be the basic building material.

War production officials have been repeatedly and completely informed on precisely the measures of relief and aid the industry must have to meet imperative production demands imposed upon it.

Lumber cannot be cut by the circular seesaw in which officialdom seems to be spinning.

It is up to these officials to move in a straight line—and move quickly.

Indecision and inactivity on their part would be as inexcusable as, and only little less hampering to the war effort than, blundering military direction.

The American people are in no mood to tolerate bad leadership or lack of leadership on either front.

Still a War to Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of June 23, 1945:

Some months ago it was impressed upon correspondents here that this was a "global war" in which the United States was engaged. The interdependence of what we did in Europe and what we did in the Pacific was stressed. America was urged to support the idea of a single war and it was indicated that as soon as Hitler was eliminated and Germany beaten all effort would then be turned toward the Pacific.

Today the fears that were felt many months ago have come to fruition. The ending of the war in Europe is being accepted for all practical purposes as the end of the war by millions of Americans. The demobilization of the armies in Europe is being attended by celebrations and parades which would appear to mean that there is a sharp line of demarcation between the European war and the war against Japan.

General Eisenhower deserves every bit of praise that he has or can be given and yet he would have made an indelible place in history if he had declined to permit the War Department to arrange the receptions in Washington, New York and elsewhere. He could have done so on the ground that this is not the time for celebration because the global war has not been won and that, in deference to the many millions of American boys in the Pacific, celebrations could well be postponed.

OTHER FIGHTING MEN

What a contrast it is these days as some of the fighting men from the Pacific come into Washington. The other day Admiral Marc Mitscher was here. He has been striking at Japan with carrier task forces and has done a notable job in the Pacific. Then there came Admiral Hewitt, who landed General Eisenhower's armies in Italy and in Normandy and commanded the amphibious phases of large operations. His tact and skill have not been publicized any more than has the sensational record of Admiral Kinkaid, who dropped into Washington quietly the other day after 3 years of almost continuous fighting in the Pacific, from the Aleutians to the Solomons—a record that should have earned him, too, the thanks of Congress.

It was Admiral Kinkaid who destroyed the Japanese Fleet in the Surigao Strait and saved General MacArthur's troops from annihilation in the Philippines. It was Admiral Kinkaid who commanded the brave line of ships that invaded the Lingayen Gulf when every commander knew there was no place to retreat for help if his ships were damaged. It was the same Admiral Kinkaid who supported the landings at Guadalcanal and who supervised every single amphibious operation that the MacArthur troops undertook from New Guinea to the Philippines—every bit of island-hopping and every landing.

These fighting men are modest. They did not ask for applause. But a grateful Nation will not forget them. They have fought without equipment and without the necessary supplies and under conditions made difficult by the remoteness of their operations from bases and homeland.

NAVY IS STILL AT WAR

Even if there were a disposition now to honor these brave commanders—and the above are only a few who have come back for a few days to get further orders or confer on battle plans—the Navy cannot engage in celebrations. The Navy is still at war. More than 4,000,000 boys and their families feel the war is still on and that bloody battles lie ahead.

Thus, while all praise is due the European commanders and their units for their unprecedented victory and their unparalleled achievement, the question arises whether it would not have been better to reduce the emphasis on the European war's end and

place it more on the need for ending the whole global war.

This correspondent is in receipt of many letters from the families of Army, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel in the Pacific who seem to think the demobilization plan should have been worked out on a global rather than an area basis, that length of service in the Pacific should count just as much as length of service in Europe, and that the point system should have been applied to all services instead of just the Army.

There is much talk these days about all branches of the service being placed in the same uniform and all units being put in a single department of national defense, but the principle somewhow doesn't seem to have been applied to the boys in the Pacific war, which only a few months ago was regarded as as integral part of a global war.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and telegram concerning amendments to the Price Control Act:

CONSUMER AND LABOR GROUPS ASK ELIMINATION OF DIRKSEN, ANDRESEN, AND WHERRY AMENDMENTS TO PRICE CONTROL ACT

Consumer and labor groups today wired President Harry Truman and members of the Senate and House conference committees warning that the inclusion of the Dirksen, Andresen, and Wherry amendments "would result in a seriously weakened price structure." The Dirksen amendment was held to make price control and rationing impossible to enforce because of the legal delays it would entail. The Andresen amendment, which gives the Department of Agriculture a veto power over OPA's food pricing, was condemned as creating "conflict, delay, and confusion."

The wire read:

"As friends of price control, we urge you to oppose the inclusion in the OPA extension bill of the Dirksen, Andresen, and Wherry amendments. The Dirksen amendment would, as Chairman SPENCE says, make price control and rationing impossible to enforce because of legal delays. The Andresen amendment would, by giving the Department of Agriculture a veto over OPA's food pricing, create conflict, delay, and confusion. The Wherry amendment has been condemned as inflationary and administratively unworkable by President Truman and by leading farm, labor, and consumer organizations. Enactment of any one of these amendments would result in a seriously weakened price structure."

The telegram was signed by Kathryn McHale, general director, American Association of University Women; Lelia Massey, executive secretary, American Home Economics Association; Francis W. McPeek, chairman, Legislative Committee, Council for Social Action, Congregational-Christian Churches; Eleanor Fowler, secretary-treasurer, Congress of Women's Auxiliaries, CIO; Colston E. Warne, president, Consumers Union of United States; Hanna Dorner, administrative director, Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; Rosina Tucker, international secretary-treasurer, International Ladies Auxiliaries, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Leslie F. Perry, National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People; Agnes Winn, chairman, Legislative Committee, National Education Association; Mrs. Gerson Levi, National Council of Jewish Women; Ruth Lamb Atkinson, National Council of Parents and Teachers; Elizabeth Christman, National Women's Trade Union League; Katherine Armatage, chairman, board of directors, National League of Women Shoppers; H. F. Kern, executive secretary, Potomac Cooperative Federation; Mrs. Leslie Falk, chairman, Public Affairs Committee, United Council of Church Women; Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Esther Hegler, chairman, consumer's division, AFL Council Auxiliary; National Lawyers Guild; National Federation of Settlements; New York Consumers Council.

If the Department of the Interior Wins the Action It Has Brought Against 65,000 Square Miles of Tidelands, It Will Result in Chaos in Every Seaport City in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following statement which I have made to the House Committee on the Judiciary which refers to my and several other identical resolutions it is now considering. These resolutions relate to the efforts of the Department of the Interior, through the Department of Justice, to secure title to all tidelands in the United States; I include the following:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 148

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee on the Judiciary, during the past several years the Secretary of the Interior has unsuccessfully attempted to have legislation passed to give the Federal Government control over certain submerged oil-producing tidelands in southern California. To accomplish this purpose such legislation, as maintained by the highest legal counsel, would question the validity of ownership of all submerged tidelands in every section of the United States. This involves more than 65,000 square miles of tidelands, a large proportion of which have been reclaimed and now include commercial, industrial, and residential properties, wharves, and harbor facilities in every seaport city of the Nation.

Failing to secure this legislation, the Attorney General, representing the Department of the Interior, has brought action to accomplish the same purpose in a case entitled "*the United States of America* v. *the Pacific Western Oil Corporation* (No. 4493-b-Civil)" in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

No one can at this time tell what will be the outcome of that litigation. Few people, however, realize its tremendous significance. If this case were determined in accordance with the contentions of the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior, chaos would be created in every seaport city of the Nation. For example, in the city and county of San Francisco it would mean that the Federal Government would come into possession of approximately 600 city blocks, all of the connecting streets and highways, all public-utility facilities, including street-railway transportation, water mains, gas mains, electric and telephone conduits, street-lighting system, and sanitary facilities such as sewage. It would bring into the possession of the Federal Government the entire State-owned harbor facilities of the city and county of San Francisco, with all wharves, docks, and appurtenances, which have a book value of close to $100,000,000. It would also include a section of the main line of the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., the Santa Fe Railroad Co. and Western Pacific Railroad Co. terminals, freight, and switchyards. It would bring into the possession of the Federal Government the greater part of San Francisco's commercial district, which includes some of the largest banking institutions in the West, office buildings, hotels, and every kind of business establishment, to be found in a large and thriving seaport city. It would bring under Government control the greater part of the land used by every shipyard on San Francisco Bay because they are built in large part on reclaimed land.

Multiply this by the number of seaport cities there are in the United States and the chaos that would be created staggers the imagination.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is to prevent such chaos that I have joined with other Members of the House in the introduction of legislation to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles. Thus, for all time, we can remove the sword of Damocles hanging so dangerously over the heads of every seaport city in the Nation.

I therefore file with the committee for the record a map of the city and county of San Francisco which has been marked in red pencil to show the large areas involved in this matter.

First GI Real-Estate Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised by the Veterans' Administration that the first GI real-estate loan to be made in Wisconsin was made in the Third District, which I have the honor to represent. The veteran receiving this loan is Sgt. Karsten Vold, of Vernon County, Wis. My good friend, Mr. Edward Schipper, of the State Bank of Viroqua, is the banker who made this loan possible for Sergeant Vold.

Sergeant Vold entered the service in 1942. He received severe back and nerve injuries in combat, resulting in a long period of hospitalization. He was a staff sergeant and received an honorable discharge in 1944. Sergeant Vold returned home to his wife and 3-year-old son, and they decided to purchase a 100-acre farm in Vernon County, together with livestock and equipment.

I congratulate Sergeant Vold, of Vernon County, and Mr. Eddie Schipper, cashier of the State Bank of Viroqua, for their part in putting the Third District of Wisconsin at the head of the rapidly growing list of GI's in Wisconsin who will benefit by the virtue of GI loans.

Sage Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 26, 1945:

SAGE COUNSEL

We can conceive of nothing more appropriate by way of comment on today's windup of the San Francisco Conference than to reprint the speech of Benjamin Franklin at the conclusion of the Constitutional Convention in 1787:

"I confess that I do not entirely approve of this Constitution at present; but, Sir, I am not sure I shall never approve it; for, having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged, by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects, which I once thought right, but found to be otherwise.

"It is therefore that, the older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment of others. Most men, indeed, as well as most sects in religion, think themselves in possession of all truth, and that wherever others differ from them, it is so far error. Steele, a Protestant, in a dedication, tells the Pope that the only difference between our two churches in their opinions of the certainty of their doctrine is that the Romish Church is infallible, and the Church of England is never in the wrong. But, though many private persons think almost as highly of their own infallibility as of that of their sect, few express it so naturally as a certain French lady, who, in a little dispute with her sister, said, 'But I meet with nobody but myself that is always in the right.' "

"In these sentiments, sir, I agree to this Constitution, with all its faults—if they are such; because I think a general government necessary for us, and there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people, if well administered; and I believe, further, that this is likely to be well administered for a course of years and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other. I doubt, too, whether any other convention we can obtain may be able to make a better constitution; for, when you assemble a number of men, to have the advantage of their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble with those men all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views. From such an assembly can a perfect production be expected? It therefore astonishes me, sir, to find this system approaching so near to perfection as it does, and I think it will astonish our enemies, who are waiting with confidence to hear that our counsels are confounded like those of the builders of Babel, and that our States are on the point of separation, only to meet hereafter for the purpose of cutting one another's throats.

"Thus I consent, Sir, to this Constitution, because I expect no better, and because I am not sure that is not the best. The opinions I have had of its errors I sacrifice to the public good. I have never whispered a syllable of them abroad. Within these walls they were born, and here they shall die. If every one of us, in returning to our constituents, were to report the objections he has had to it, and endeavor to gain partisans in support of them, we might prevent its being generally received, and thereby lose all the salutary effects and great advantages resulting naturally in our favor among foreign nations, as well as among ourselves, from our real or apparent unanimity. Much of the strength and efficiency of any government, in procuring and securing happiness to the people, depends on opinion, on the general opinion of the goodness of that government, as well as of the wisdom and integrity of its governors. I hope, therefore, for our own sakes, as a part of the people, and for the sake of our posterity, that we shall act heartily and unanimously in recommending this Constitution, wherever our influence may extend, and turn our future thoughts and endeavors to the means of having it well administered.

"On the whole, Sir, I cannot help expressing a wish, that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it, would with me on this occasion doubt a little of his own infallibility, and, to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument."

Domestic Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, two events of the past week clearly demonstrated that the people of Maine are not only producing the ships that are accounting for our victories, but are also sacrificing their own comforts and conveniences in order that the very ships which they have built will be sufficiently fueled to continue our victories.

One thousand three hundred and fifty-eight ships have slid down the ways in Maine shipyards since the war began; $900,000,000 of ship-construction contracts have been awarded to Maine shipbuilders. My two official trips to the Pacific fully impressed me with the great quantities of oil necessary for our fighting fleet. With this in mind I requested a report from the Petroleum Administrator for War on the prospects of increased quota of domestic fuel oil for the winter, and received the following explanation:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, June 15, 1945.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. SMITH: * * * With the cessation of hostilities in Europe, many people have assumed that the need for fuel oil conservation has passed, but actually the exact opposite is true. As we shift our war emphasis to the Pacific, the fuel oil requirements of the military increase tremendously. We have the largest Navy this world has ever seen, and every ship in that great Navy—battleship, cruiser, carrier, landing barge, and all others—is powered by fuel oil. Most of this fuel oil is "Navy Special," which is made up from a blend of heating oil and heavy industrial fuel and furnished only to the Navy. Diesel fuel, another of the principal Navy products, is interchangeable, gallon for gallon, for heating oil.

Now our war is many miles farther away, and the distances are increasing every day, so more and more fuel oil is needed to support our military activities. Just as an example of what this means to the home owner, it has been estimated that 600,000,000 gallons of fuel oil were required to bring up the men and materials to start and carry out the Okinawa campaign. That amount of fuel oil, if divided among home heating oil burners in the rationed area of this country, would have given to each one an additional 300 gallons—an average of about an 18-percent increase in rations for this coming winter.

The situation has changed from a two-front gasoline war to a one-front fuel oil war. Consequently, we were recently able to make available additional supplies of gasoline for civilians, but I am sure you realize that as long as the Pacific war lasts not only is no increase possible in fuel oil but we will be hard pressed to furnish as much as last year. Our supply program provides for the same amount for civilians as during the 1944–45 season, and we will make every effort to fulfill that program. Barring unforseen circumstances, such as a futher increase in military requirements or a break-down in our transportation system, due to causes beyond our control, we expect to meet our program.

You will probably continue to receive inquiries from some of your constitutents regarding the possibility of their being permitted to convert their heating equipment from coal to fuel oil this year, particularly since coal is also reported as being short. With the present high requirements, which will continue until the end of the Japanese war, you can understand why we will have no alternative except to deny such requests.

Any help you can give us in explaining this situation to your people and urging them to continue their conservation will be deeply appreciated. In the meantime, if I can, at any time, give you additional information on this or any other matter under our jurisdiction, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER HOCHULI,
Director, Distribution and Marketing.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. CURLEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the Bunker Hill Day celebration, State Armory, Charlestown, Mass., June 17, 1945:

It has been my pleasure to speak in Boston on many occasions and on many subjects, political and economic, and I am glad indeed to be allowed to take part in your celebration of Bunker Hill Day.

Every Charlestown schoolboy knows well the story of that first battle of the American Revolution, fought on this hill 170 years ago.

Why do we celebrate so fervently that event which was not, after all, an American victory on the battlefield? The answer is that here, for the first time, citizen soldiers dared to fight against the professional troops of one of the most powerful nations in the world.

Some historians tell us that Bunker Hill was for the colonists a foolish military venture. Perhaps, but in the larger sense, what a stimulus to patriotic spirit and determination. Those resolute New Englanders knew

that they had been deprived of their liberty of freedom to make a livelihood, and that they had to bear unjust taxation for the enrichment of another land. They knew that English soldiers had just invaded their countryside at Lexington and Concord to take away the supplies and ammunition stored there. They knew how heavy on them lay the authority of General Gage as military governor of New England, and that this military governor had taken away from them their rights as citizens; had deprived them of their provincial assembly, and had abolished the historic town meeting. They saw with anger and sorrow Boston occupied by British troops; and they knew that only by holding those troops within the limits of the town itself could they prepare elsewhere for the struggle which they boldly proposed to risk.

To further this greater objective, fortifications were rapidly being set up at strategic containing points in Dorchester, in Roxbury, and in Cambridge. Bunker Hill was the last of these strong points to be occupied by the colonists under arms.

History tells us that these brave men were only a handful; untrained, inexperienced, armed only with crude rifles and fowling pieces. The dormitories at Harvard College were their barracks. Before the battle we celebrate, these troops were assembled on Cambridge Common and led in prayer to Almighty God for victory for their cause by President Langdon of Harvard.

Doubtless the military wisdom of trying to hold Bunker Hill, which was within range of British warships anchored in the harbor, would not impress General Eisenhower.

After all, the council of war, locally formed and operating with the committee of safety, did not have a warrior on it. Two of its members were physicians. So the council, after due deliberation, decided to lead this little army to Charlestown. The tension of the times was such that they dared not wait and so they started their fortifications at dusk on June 16. By daybreak on June 17 the breastworks were completed. They could not have been much more than fox holes, because when an extra company of troops marched over from Medford on that June morning they found no space available behind the breastworks for protection. With Yankee ingenuity they made a barricade of an old rail fence, stuffed with green hay, hastily cut in the nearby fields.

The American Army of that day had no quartermaster; no balanced K rations were supplied. If the British intended to fight, the colonists assumed that they would attack in the early morning. Instead the battle was not joined until well afternoon. It was hot that June day, and by afternoon the untrained troops huddled on a bare hill were parched and hungry.

Remember, this was for the British an amphibious engagement. They came over in boats from Boston under a heavy barrage of supporting artillery from the battery on Copp's Hill, and from the guns aboard the British warships. To oppose this heavy fire, the Americans had only three small field pieces with a range of about 300 yards. The British had 2,500 troops, trained soldiers, all of them well equipped with the most modern arms. And in this fashion the battle began. Wave after wave of British soldiers swarmed up this little hill; and time after time they were repulsed until, at the end of the day, their powder gone, the Americans had to retreat with honor to Cambridge.

We of this generation have learned the bitter lesson of the human sacrifice exacted by war. Their roll of dead and wounded is not cold statistics to us. In the battle of Bunker Hill 226 British were killed, and 828 were wounded. The colonists' losses were 115 killed, 30 prisoners, 304 wounded; less than half the British loss.

As might be expected, because the British captured the Hill the battle was reported in London as a great victory. But the wisest of the English knew better. Edmund Burke, a critic of English misrule in America, had this to say: "The Americans are either the cleverest fellows in the world at making strong lines of trenches in 3 or 4 hours in the early morning, or the most desperate enemy in defending them. In this battle of Bunker Hill they killed or wounded nearly half of General Gage's army in marching 300 yards under a complete cover of artillery and naval fire. By this measure of arms, the Americans will put the whole British Army into the grave or the hospital in 3 or 4 nights of digging trenches and 1 hour's firing each morning."

Did I say that American losses were not great? One hundred and fifteen young New Englanders gave their lives. Among these many had the stuff and ability which America then needed so badly. Certainly this was true of Gen. Joseph Warren, a general by courtesy but a physician by profession, who already ranked with Samuel Adams, James Otis, and John Hancock as a leader in the great cause.

The Revolution, you well know, was not ended at Bunker Hill. On March 17th of the following year, another day you loyally celebrate hereabout, the British evacuated the town of Boston. In the light of the savagery of modern war this whole episode seems a gentleman's war. During all this time not a building in Boston was burned. True, some buildings in Charlestown in the path of the British firing were destroyed. But there was no Rotterdam, no Coventry, no Lidice.

Bunker Hill was followed for seven long years by Ticonderoga, Saratoga, White Plains, Trenton, Monmouth, Valley Forge, and Yorktown. And then came peace. The daring and hardy Americans had won a victory over a major European power. Their future was now theirs to make.

Today our young American soldiers, sailors, and aviators are demonstrating to the world that they are dedicated to the same high principles of freedom and democracy as were our Revolutionary forefathers.

Ambitious Italy and arrogant Germany have been crushed. Victory over a berserk Japan remains to be won.

In the past it has been the practice to celebrate victorious battles as if they insured peace. This time both victors and vanquished, and all the world besides, know that peace is not won in battle but as the aftermath of battle, if men's minds and hearts are right. For if peace is to be defined as only the absence of war there can be no guaranty that such a peace will last.

What terrifying times we have lived through! How shortsighted have we and our allies been. One fanatical Austrian, devilishly clever at playing on the hates and fears of the Germans, has caused more human misery and suffering and degradation than any monstrous man the world has ever seen.

We all know that the American Revolution occurred in the midst of a complex world political and military situation which did not resolve itself until Napoleon was defeated. The world dragged through that prolonged period of trouble and strife before it arrived at the relative stability which enabled the ordinary man to live for many decades in peace and without fear. Our twentieth-century world has been too long in the state of political and economic tension, and two shattering conflicts have occurred. The leaders of all the Allied Nations have contemplated the effects of past policy and by means of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the San Francisco Conference have set out to improve the international political machinery so that friction can be isolated and minimized. The expectation is that responsibility for trouble making and a disposition to make war can hereafter be fixed upon that nation which is considered by the others to be at fault in a given situation. The merits of a particular problem having been decided, it is hoped that cooperation among the peacefully inclined will be so complete and decisive that no group in any country will care to press for war when faced by a world which does not want another war, great or small.

I spent the last month in San Francisco. I had the advantage while there of conferences with the leaders of all of the delegations, except two who had been called away from the Conference. It is unfortunate that the attitudes and inclinations of the leaders of the various nations cannot be brought home to our people generally. I know that if each of you had had a chance to go about as I did among the foreign delegations you would be heartened to find the horror with which all contemplate war, the fear that all have of the shattering effect of another great war, and the disposition all have to make the accommodations that will minimize the possibility of another war.

We are often told—but it can't be said often enough—that we must accommodate ourselves in some degree to the ways of other nations. I think we know that now. Other nations will have to, in some degree, accommodate their ways to ours. It is a mattter of concession on the part of all. All must realize that there is no nation, however powerful, which can enforce its will against others regardless of world opinion. That principle was clearly behind everything in San Francisco, and the good beginning made there encourages us to think that political men may have at last begun to see the insanity of these periodic world convulsions.

I said the results had been good. I want to repeat that because the enormous publicity given the proceedings, the overemphasis given so many incidents, and the over-stimulated hopes of some people have tended, I think, to magnify problems and to diminish the impact upon people generally of the really good start that the nations are making at San Francisco. I am very hopeful that history will look to that meeting as the beginning of political common sense among the nations.

The beneficial effect of the San Francisco Conference and other meetings which must of necessity be held in the months and years which are ahead will depend upon the degree of confidence which all the nations have in one another. The extent to which that confidence is enjoyed will determine the success or failure of the great efforts started at San Francisco.

I ask you as citizens of one of the great nations of the world to view the difficult problems that will arise from time to time with maturity and a will to peace. We are fond of saying that we are peacefully inclined but we have perhaps been quite as ready as others to insist on our rights without concession. While we cannot compromise the essential principles to which we as a Nation are dedicated, we can avoid international political irritability and can bring to all our problems a cool and balanced judgment.

Peacetime Draft Stampede

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Se-

lect Committee on Postwar Military Policy:

A Congressman faces considerable difficulty in arguing against a peacetime draft when testimony favorable to such a draft has been given by such celebrities as Generals Eisenhower and Marshall, Admirals King, Halsey, and Nimitz, and Secretaries Stimson and Forrestal. But even a cat can look at a king. I am not overawed.

However, it is a tough assignment in view of my deference to his military genius to speak out in difference to General Eisenhower on compulsory peacetime training. But knowing his penchant for simple and direct speech, his tolerance and forbearance, he would want all Congressmen to express their views—even though in opposition. Let us not lose sight of the fact that this is a peacetime proposal and not a proposal for wartime. These great men who have testified are now concerned with the conduct of the war. They are experts on war. It is a time-honored tradition of this country; in fact, I believe, in all democracies worthy of the name, that the military authorities keep their hands off that lawmaking which controls peacetime living.

A great American, President Wilson, on July 18, 1918, emphasized this truth in the following words: "A very fundamental principle of our institutions is that the military power is subordinate to the civil." Jefferson said: "In times of peace, the people look most to their representatives." The armed forces of the country must be instruments of civilian authority which determines the Nation's policies and this was the idea of the framers of the Constitution. The founders insisted that the civilian head of our Government be Commander in Chief of our armed forces. And in this war, as in the last one, the President had to go to Congress to get essential war powers. Remember too, that Congress must declare war.

The Congress and not the War or Navy Departments control the Nation's destiny especially in peacetime.

Judging from the important men that have suddenly been bunched together to testify before this Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy one would conclude that the Nation is to be stampeded into adopting this legislation, and there seems to be a crusade engineered by the military to spread the idea that Congress cannot be trusted to act wisely after the stress and strains of war. The War, Navy, and State Departments have brought up their most powerful panzer divisions, as it were. One of two conclusions forces itself upon us. First, that the case for peacetime draft is so weak that glittering personalities had to be ushered in to bolster and support it. Or the opposition that came from the churches, labor, schools, and colleges was too powerful and thus appeals by colorful persons were essential.

General Marshall said, "The problem of the maintenance of the future peace of the world directly involves the problem of the postwar military policy of the United States." What is that postwar military policy? Assuredly, we should have no peacetime draft until we know what that policy is. Acting Secretary of State Grew, testifying before this committee, gave us no inkling as to what that policy is. The State Department is strangely silent on that subject. We don't even know the terms of the armistice, nor has the peace treaty been written. The Charter at San Francisco is still in the discussion stage. That charter will affect our military plans. As to postwar military policy—which certainly should be blue printed before we break our traditional aversion to peacetime draft—we do not even know the military policy to be followed in occupied Germany. General Eisenhower, Marshals Montgomery and Zukoff, and the French general having jurisdiction have yet to integrate their separate plans and procedures for the four separate zones of German occupation. How long shall the United States, Russia, France, and England, then the Allied Control Council, occupy Germany? Shall Germany again become a sovereign nation? If so when? Scores of questions on postwar military policy crowd for answer. Until we know the answers let us not prate about peace draft. The gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman BULWINKLE, asked General Marshall for his idea of the size of the Regular Army after the war. The general replied: "We can't determine that until we know the character of the peace." Certainly, if we cannot know the size of the Regular Army before we know the character of the peace, then by the process of the same reasoning how can we advocate a military draft in peacetime if we do not know the character of the peace? General Marshall stated that a large standing army "would be repugnant to the American people." Well, the plans for peacetime draft encompass forces larger than any Regular Army and, to my mind, will be just as repugnant to the American people.

Why, we certainly do not know the postwar military policy to be applied to Japan. We have not even settled the fate to be assigned Emperor Hirohito.

It seems to me that we are trying to settle a momentous question with too many undecided and unknown factors, not to speak of the undetermined ones, floating about. General Marshall himself in his testimony stated, "Until the settlement of the terms of the peace it will be impossible to determine the strength of the postwar military forces to be maintained on an active status. We shall not know until then just what our military obligations or requirements are to be." Adopting a peacetime conscription now would be like sailing on a sea without a shore. We know not wither we are going.

To show how far afield a considerable amount of the testimony went, I would like to quote Admiral Halsey who wrote to your committee as follows: "I have one more point to offer, namely, the need for wise, trained men to administer the national policy. We need men who understand the causes of war and conflict, who understand the fundamentals of our aims and ideals, who understand the interrelation of international policies, internal policies, trade, and finance and the true significance of military power. The British Empire has such men and our amateurs are rarely a match for them. Other countries are producing them—but few American names in that category come to my mind." I'd like to ask how a military peacetime draft could supply that wisdom and understanding. The British Empire is praised by him for its possession of men of perspicacity and rare acumen, but the British have no military draft in peacetime and several of the dominions have not got it in wartime.

General Eisenhower, urging the peacetime draft, stated in a letter to the committee, "That in spite of all technological devices, numbers were vitally important in war." He adds, most significantly, "Physical training will always have to be repeated after the war starts, but takes the least time." The general thus eliminates one of the most potent arguments in favor of peacetime training. The boys would have to be retrained. Training must be repeated. That is, we would have to do exactly what we are doing now. The general then adds, "Psychological indoctrination and moral training require the longest time, but fortunately, it is never completely forgotten." These terms are vague enough to mean anything. Psychological indoctrination may mean instantaneous response to military dictation, a shelving of independent judgment in the obeying of orders. Is that desirable for peacetime living in a democracy? "Fortunately," he says, "it is never completely forgotten." Are we interested in developing slavish responses in our young? Psychological indoctrination may mean patriotism as well. Is that not a function of our schools and our homes, and has our patriotism ever faltered without peacetime conscription? Moreover, psychological indoctrination, to be effective, must be directed against a specific enemy, against a specific aggressor. Against whom are we arming psychologically or otherwise? Surely, we need no peacetime draft to underscore our hatred of aggression or our proven love of liberty.

General Eisenhower, brilliant hero of the hour, necessarily talks from the military point of view. We are talking about peacetime conscription. When it comes to peace, we are better guided by men of peace than by men of war.

The nature of our national policy in times of peace should be determined by Congress and the President as representatives of the people.

Secretary of War Stimson testified likewise in favor of peacetime draft. "To advocate," he said, "any Dumbarton plan and then sheer ourselves of the power to carry it out would be even worse than our refusal to join the attempt at world organization in 1919." Then it must also follow that in order to keep our commitments in the new league, we must keep our factories and farms forever groomed for war.

Armaments and food and ships are as vital as men. Having the trained men but with matériel and guns and transportation facilities lacking, is like trying to play the fiddle with 3 strings broken and only one intact.

What would it avail us if we have troops ready for action but no tanks, jet-propelled planes, robot bombs, no jeeps, no attack transports, no P. C.'s, no electronics, ersatz rubber, radar. These implements of war must be built. That construction takes time. While they are being built men can be trained, as now.

Otherwise, to have the trained men and these armaments simultaneously we would have to have a continual armed camp. We would be forever geared for war—with repercussions highly dangerous—staggering taxes and a military regimentation that would bode ill for our democracy.

Keep this always in mind. A so-called citizens peacetime conscripted army alone will not keep us prepared.

Actually, does it not take less time to raise and train an army than it does to convert factories, process raw materiasl, shift manpower, and expand production?

Have we any idea of how many men are needed for our contribution to the policing force of the new League? How many are needed by the other of the United Nations? Nobody knows yet. It is like buying a pig in a poke. It logically follows from Mr. Stimson's statement that every member of the new League, in order to contribute to the maintenance of peace, would have to stay armed to the teeth, and every country turned into a huge military camp. That doesn't seem to me to be the way to peace.

He says, in addition, that "No matter how dearly we may desire to preserve our way of life by peaceful persuasion alone, no matter how earnestly we may deplore the resort by other nations to aggressive force to gain their ends, these attitudes of peaceful persuasion can never be a substitute for the physical means of our own self-preservation, certainly not in such a world as that we now live in."

Either we believe or don't believe in a comity of nations. We must have faith or skepticism. To say that "attitudes of peaceful persuasion can never be a substitute for the physical means of our own self-preservation" is approaching the problem of international peace on the wrong foot. It is like a

groom who views with suspicion his bride before the nuptials. Such a union is headed for the rocks, so is such a charter as Henry Stimson envisages.

Throughout all the Secretary's testimony, there is an echo of the old defeatist attitude of war is inevitable. Contrary to Mr. Stimson's interpretation I feel that if we do adopt peacetime conscription we are starting off in the direction of distrust and suspicion and we can never establish a successful comity of nations on that basis.

The generals and admirals and Cabinet officers may voice their views, but the lips of 12,000,000 soldiers and sailors are sealed. Revised Army Regulations provide that "Except as authorized by the War Department, efforts by any person in the active service of the United States * * * to procure or oppose or in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army * * * are forbidden." It is rather anomalous that high ranking officers are free to express themselves willy nilly, but the citizen soldiery is deprived of its rights to express itself on a peacetime measure, which affects not only the lives of our soldiers after demobilization, but the lives of their sons. Let the boys who participated in the invasion of Normandy, the Forest of Ardennes, who fought in Okinawa and Iwo Jima, on the beaches of Anzio and on Luzon have their say. They have a vital stake in this legislation. Let it not be said that we in Congress put something over on them when they were away from home fighting for their country. Let us wait, at least till Johnny comes marching home with his buddies.

AMERICAN SOLDIER NEVER FALTERED

Yesterday General Eisenhower spoke eloquently of the American soldier. He said:

"Willingly, he has suffered hardships. Without a whimper he has made heavy sacrifices. He has endured much, but he has never faltered. His aggressiveness—his readiness to close with the enemy—has become a byword in the embattled armies of Europe. You have read many reports of his individual exploits, but not one tenth of them ever has been or ever will be told. Any one of them is sufficient to fill a true American with emotion—with an intense pride of his countrymen.

"Never have soldiers been called upon to endure longer sustained periods of contact with a vicious enemy nor greater punishment from weather and terrain. The American has been harassed by rifle and automatic weapons, pounded by hand grenades, by artillery and rocket shells, attacked by tanks and airplane bombs! He has faced the hazards of countless mines and booby traps and every form of static obstacle. He has conquered them all!"

Let that soldier have a say in this matter.

Why the rush? We have 12,000,000 men in arms. With discharge on points of noncoms in the Army will still have millions trained for combat for a long time—even after VJ-day. Add to these seasoned soldiers the annual number of 18-year-old lads. Furthermore, under section 3 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act all inductees continue in the Army and Navy Reserves for 10 years and are subject to additional training and service. Certainly there is no immediate need for a decision. We dare not allow ourselves to be stampeded by glittering speeches by colorful characters. Screened by the dry light of reason the glitter may fade and the hues may seem in time far less roseate.

Against what enemy are we arming our peacetime army? Germany is kaput, Japan faces a setting sun. With what imaginary windmill do we tilt?

Assistant Secretary of State MacLeish, speaking on May 25, 1945, from San Francisco, put it well. He said, "Certain commentators have even spoken openly of an inevitable conflict of interest between the Russians and ourselves, and have debated the question whether Russia, our present ally, is our enemy or our friend—a serious debate, one would think, with our soldiers living side by side in conquered Germany and our common dead but freshly buried." He points out further, "The vital interests of the United States and the Soviet Union conflict at no point on the earth's surface. * * * There is no necessary reason, in other words, in the logic of geography or in the logic of economics, or in the logic of national objective, why the United States and the Soviet Union should ever find themselves in conflict with each other, let alone in the kind of conflict reckless and irresponsible men have begun now to suggest." Acting Secretary of State Grew reemphasized these views of amity and accord, saying that there was no part of the world where the United States and Russian interests were in basic conflict.

In conclusion, a most plaintive and eloquent letter appeared in the Army newspaper, Stars and Stripes. It was an imaginary letter from "one of the dead" who served under General Patton's command. The letter takes the General to task for telling children of a Sunday-school class that they would be the soldiers and nurses of the next war. The letter, in part, is as follows: "Another war—not a hundred years from now, but right around the corner. I don't know what the other 29,999 boys did, but I turned over in my grave, General, and the dirt above me moved because it isn't packed hard yet.

"Please don't tell us that, General—not just now. And don't say it again to our families. It's too soon for them to understand. And don't say it to the world at a time when all the decent nations in it are working to build a peace of some kind.

"Couldn't you just sort of hold your tongue at least until after that San Francisco Conference? A lot of people—smart people, too—are pretty hopeful about the way things are going out there."

Moral: Shoemaker, stick to your last.

Office of Price Administration Responsible in Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, several days ago one of the leading New Deal politicians from Minnesota called at my office. He probably gets a larger salary than does a Member of Congress. He discussed several pending legislative proposals with me. He smiled broadly when he asked me about the Office of Price Administration and his demand that it be renewed for another year. I told him that I had expressed my opinion in Pittenger's Washington Observations for May 28, 1945, and that while I recognized that we needed price control over a great many commodities, I did not consider OPA necessary to accomplish that result. There was no question as to my attitude on this matter or on other subjects which we talked over.

Imagine my surprise when a publication sometime after our interview quoted this distinguished politician as saying that Congressman PITTENGER would hardly speak to us on OPA; that he said he had campaigned against it and is unalterably opposed to it, and it is interesting for the Eighth District to know how its Congressman stands on price control, a thing so vital to keeping down the cost of living.

This effort to impress the readers of the publication with the idea that I was opposed to price control and therefore opposed to keeping down the cost of living is very clever, but of course is absolutely without foundation. From time to time certain elements in the district can be careless with the truth, when it serves their purpose. Therefore, it is well to repeat that I recognize the need for price controls, and some 2 years ago I told the readers of this publication that prices should have been frozen when wages were frozen, and it was nothing but a lot of unadulterated politics that prevented such procedure at that time.

Just to keep the record straight, I said on May 28, and I want to repeat now just what I said then in my Washington observations on this subject:

PITTENGER'S WASHINGTON OBSERVATIONS, MAY 28, 1945

Responsibility for food shortage: Many of us have felt that we would eventually face a crisis in connection with the problem of food, and that time has now arrived. As is customary, the question arises in the minds of a great many people, "What is Congress going to do about it?" Then it is easy to follow the line of reasoning that blames Congress for the food shortage. I am discussing the problem with you now because Congress has not had a thing to do with the handling of price control or the food problem. I want to deal frankly with this question, although I know what I say is not going to be very popular in some quarters. We all recognize the need for price controls, if inflation and its evil consequences are to be avoided. Consequently Congress passed a law creating the Office of Price Administration. This law was to be administered by the executive branch of the Government, as is true in connection with all bureaus and departments. You simply cannot have 435 Members of Congress framing policies and regulations and administering the same. So, under the Constitution of the United States, the administration of the laws has always been left to the Executive, although I think when the executive branch of the Government falls down, Congress ought to step in.

There can be no question about the food shortage, and in my opinion, there is no question about the responsibility for it. Just the other day I received a letter on this subject, and I quote this letter because I think it is typical and illustrates the difficulties now encountered by many people. It reads as follows:

"I'm writing to you to ask if something can't be done about this point system. We are a family of five and have three growing children in school and it's impossible for me to get along on so few points for butter and meat. I now have only enough points left for 1 pound of butter and all of 2 weeks left before the new points come in, and three school lunches to fix every day. Please try to do something about this situation to help us out."

Now this letter represents an appeal to Congress, and I have no desire to avoid the responsibility here suggested. I am in favor of abolishing the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration, and any other Government agencies that are responsible for the present disgraceful conditions in connection with food shortage. In plain English, I think the policy-making officials of these Government departments

ought to be fired because of the many mistakes they have made without interruption, and someone with common sense selected to administer the food problem. I shall support that kind of legislation. Unfortunately I belong to the minority party and if we tried to pass a law like that tomorrow, under our system of party politics, the majority party would have votes enough to defeat such a measure.

Now just remember that this subject is nothing new. I pointed out in remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD July 8, 1943, some of the terrible mistakes that were being made by OPA in connection with the food problem. I predicted then that the food shortage which appeared to be coming would get worse and worse as long as we had men in Washington shaping the policies of OPA, doing a bad job of it. Let me say that I am not now discussing the work done by the different employees throughout the United States of this agency. Those employees are given the rules and regulations, and they have to follow them. The whole trouble rests right here in Washington. When the people voted in the election last November, the majority of them endorsed just what we have—food shortage and all of these inconveniences, because these agencies are appointed by the administration. They can be changed by the administration, but in spite of the fact that a committee of the House of Representatives, and a committee of the Senate of the United States, have both investigated the food-shortage problem, and this was done in April and May of this year, and in spite of the fact that these reports both state emphatically that the Office of Price Administration and other agencies have totally failed in handling the food problem, we find some good party politician telling the President that there has been irresponsible criticism of OPA. It is unfortunate that the President was misadvised and wrongly advised. On the House committee and on the Senate committee the majority of the Members were Democrats, and it is noteworthy that the Republican Members of these two committees joined with the Democratic members in signing a report pointing out the mistakes of omission and commission of the OPA. Certainly those two reports were not dominated by party politics, they just told the truth.

I think it was a couple of years ago when I attended a meeting of some milk producers right here at one of the hotels in Washington. They were trying to get an order indicating the price they could charge for milk when they sold it to the consumers. These milk producers were experienced men. They wanted to know what they could charge, so they could make plans for producion of milk and dairy products throughout the summer. They had to hire help, arrange for food for the cattle, and otherwise get ready for the spring and summer program. After spending a couple of days with the Government food experts, they were blandly told by the experts that there was no hurry about the matter because summer was coming and the experts might take all that time in between arriving at a decision. Of course, it was laughable because anyone with an ounce of brains would know that a man who wanted to engage in milk production had to have many weeks or perhaps months advance notice as to the price he could charge, before starting out on his program of production.

Then just one more illustration: From time to time, and this covers quite a period of time, I have had letters telling me that the farmer was selling off his dairy herd. The last time this subject was discussed, was right here in Washington. A man, who is well known in Minnesota and held a State office in the recent past, said in substance that he thought OPA was a good thing, but that it had made one mistake right after the other. He said he owned and operated a large farm but when OPA started to fix prices so he could not make a profit on milk and dairy products he just sold off his dairy herd and quit the dairy business. This man was and is an ardent supporter of the administration.

What are we going to do about it? Congress can keep on protesting the mistakes of these Government agencies, and we can support legislation to help correct the same. But after all, you, too, can do something. Yon can write a letter to the White House and tell the President just what is taking place. He ought to know about it. He ought to make a chance. We cannot permit present conditions to continue. The sad thing about it is the fact that there really is no excuse for a food shortage. Those who have to do with the production of food, have always been willing to furnish plenty of it if they were paid for their services. In other words, they want something for the work they do. They want a profit. Until we get around to recognition of that fact, we will continue in the present mess.

The situation, of course, has its element of tragedy. Intelligent bureaucrats, if there is such an animal, have known right along that as the war progressed there would be starvation and famine in Europe and that America would be called on to help feed those people. Here we are—at a time when there should be a surplus of food, there is a shortage of the staple and substantial kinds of food needed in our American homes.

Norwegian-Americans Celebrate Liberation of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of addressing approximately 3,000 Americans of Norwegian ancestry at Carnegie Hall in New York City. The meeting, held on Wednesday, May 30, was arranged by the Norsk Fylking—Norwegian-American Assembly—an association formed in 1940 by approximately 50 Norwegian organizations of the Greater New York area. The membership includes the Sons of Norway lodges, several churches, and a number of other societies and organizations.

The particular aims of the Norsk Fylking are to arrange special events on occasions which they feel deserve the joint efforts and support of all types of Norwegian organizations, and all Norwegian-Americans. The Norsk Fylking sponsored a successful commemoration anniversary program on the April 9 invasion of Norway and also arranged a large dinner in honor of the Prime Minister of Norway on his first visit to the United States.

The keynote of the affair in New York on May 30 was the joy of Americans of Norwegian blood over the liberation of Norway from occupation by enemy forces. Selections were given by prominent musical artists and a chorus of Scandinavian singers. The New York Philharmonic Orchestra rendered an outstanding concert of music from the following Norwegian composers: John Svendsen, Edvard Grieg, and Eyvind Alnæs. The soloists were Ellen Repp, Stell Andersen, and Sven-Olof Sandberg, all accomplished artists.

Excellent addresses were given by the following: Rev. Erik L. Jensen, Rev. Lars P. Qualben, Ph. D., Sigrid Undset, Consul General Rolf A. Christensen, and Fredrik Haslund.

Much credit is due Mr. Arne Foss, chairman of the arrangements committee, and Mr. S. A. Haram, general chairman of the Free Norway festival and their associates of the New York area, for the splendid success of the event.

The Norwegian-American bond committee of the New York Seventh War Loan drive also arranged a program in Times Square on Saturday afternoon, June 2, at which time I spoke to approximately 20,000 people. Mr. Ole Singstad, of New York, was chairman of this group.

In compiling some of the details of my address at Carnegie Hall, I made it a point to confer with prominent Norwegians who are in this country representing Norway and also Norwegian-Americans who have made outstanding records as American citizens. Because I feel that the compilation of ideas resulting from these conferences are of general interest, I am inserting my address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

Brother Foss, Mr. Haram, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, all friends of Norway, it is a great honor and a rare privilege for me to be a part of this inspired free Norway festival program, arranged by the Norsk Fylking, the Norwegian-American assembly, of Greater New York. I am happy with you and glad to be here this evening.

On several occasions I have enjoyed the hospitality of the Norwegian-Americans of the New York area, and so Mrs. Hagen and I were anxious to renew and enlarge upon our friendships here.

I have speculated on why I was selected to speak on this happy occasion. Perhaps it was because of these personal facts of my life, so much Norwegian.

When I was a young man in high school in Minnesota, and after my father's death in 1919, I became editor-manager of a Norwegian weekly newspaper, called Vesterheimen. My father was well known all over the Northwest for his contributions to Norwegian journalism in North Dakota and Minnesota. He came from Eggedal, Sigdal, Norway. My mother, still living in Minnesota, came to America from Hardanger. If she personifies the womanhood of Norway, then that country is indeed rich in human resources.

I was baptized, confirmed, and married in the Norwegian Lutheran Church in my home town of Crookston, Minn. I spent 4 years at St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minn., the largest Lutheran school in America.

Or more likely, your committee knew that, as a Member of the United States Congress, I represented more Norwegian-Americans than any other Representative. I am certain that there are more Norwegians living in the Ninth District of Minnesota than any other congressional district in the United States. In the early days there were so many Norwegians in some areas, that the Irish and French, and even some of the Indians too, had to learn to speak Norwegian to do business, or expect to get along very well.

I notice that the Sons of Norway Lodges are cooperating with other groups in sponsoring this celebration and festival. This makes me even more appreciative of the invitation received, since I am the president of

the Sons of Norway Lodge in Washington, D. C.

During my years in the Nation's Capital, it has been my privilege and pleasure to meet most of the Norwegians in official life there. I have been happy to cooperate with them on many problems, some of special concern to Norway.

For the past several years my voice, or messages of mine, have been sent shortwave to Norway by the United State Office of War Information. I have talked to the Norwegian people, in an effort to give them hope and courage to carry on in their resistance to the German intruders. Perhaps my name is better known in Norway than here in New York.

So, all of this Norwegian background may suggest the reasons why a young Congressman from northwestern Minnesota is here in New York talking to you this evening in this famous, flag-bedecked palace of music.

After accepting the invitation, I wondered what I might talk about. I walked over to a picture hanging on my office wall. My eyes caught the word spirit and I read on. "That's it," I said to myself. So I have chosen the theme "Norway, the arsenal of the spirit of freedom, liberty, and democracy."

But first, a little bit about Norway itself. Norway is a small country in size. Its area is only 125,000 square miles, about as large as the New England States and New York and New Jersey combined. Its population is less than 3,000,000 people. So one might ask what could such a small nation contribute to the cause of the Allied Nations in this world conflict.

It is a privilege for me to briefly relate here, first, a part of its great material and supply assistance. Well, let's look at the record. As your late Al Smith, of New York often asked, "What does the record say?"

First of all, the Norwegians held back the mighty German forces for 62 days longer than any other smaller nation had done. This gave all our allies additional time to prepare themselves.

When Hitler invaded Norway in April 1940, he fully expected the Norwegian Fleet to capitulate. His stooges radioed messages to over 1,100 Norwegian ships on the seven seas, ordering them all to sail into Axis, Norwegian or neutral ports. Did they comply? You should have heard some of the short directive messages they sent back to the Hitler gang.

Without a single exception, and to their everlasting glorious credit, the captains brought their ships to Allied or neutral ports to await orders from their government and to continue in the fight for freedom.

Almost all of the 25,000 sons of Norway who manned these ships of the Norwegian merchant marine, had relatives back home who were subject to Gestapo torture and oppression. Yet they carried on without complaint and with even more determination and vigor. Until now, most of them have not heard from their families since the invasion and then only through the channels of the Red Cross. What happy, joyful days are in store for them and those at home when they return to their home ports to rejoin their families. For these people, too, we rejoice here tonight.

The entire Norwegian merchant marine, of almost 5,000,000 tons and 25,000 sturdy men, have done a thrilling and tremendous job in the transport of troops, food, and war materials to the fighting fronts. It will continue to do that job in the Pacific. What Norwegian shipping did to save Britain and help us during the early days of the war, and after Dunkirk, and early in 1942, will be gloriously engraved into the pages of world history. For a time when these things spelled the difference between continued resistance or defeat, she carried more than half the tonnage of war supplies to British ports. We are indebted so much to these Viking sons of the Norwegian merchant marine, the Royal Norwegian Navy, the Royal Air Force, and other fighting units. Their losses were heavy—about 50 percent of the Norwegian ships went to the bottom and many thousands of seamen, flyers, and others made the supreme sacrifice.

On this America's Memorial Day, we have paused briefly in tribute to their honor and memory, as well as to our own. No, they are not dead who fell in glory for freedom and for truth.

And this record of Norway's achievement is recognized by all Allied leaders. For instance, Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, in welcoming a group of Norwegian sailors to Washington, said:

"I think it was a British publication which said that the Norwegian merchant fleet was worth as much to the Allied cause as a million soldiers. Well, I want to say that this is no exaggeration; you are worth far more than a million men."

The late President Roosevelt, a great friend of Norway's, summed up America's appreciation of Norwegian help and valor in the war in the following words:

"At home, the Norwegian people have silently resisted the invaders' will. Abroad, Norwegian ships and Norwegian men have rallied to the cause of the United Nations. And their assistance to that cause has been out of all proportion to their small number."

Even though she was occupied and her government was forced into exile, Norway has paid her own way. From her treasury and from the income of her merchant fleet she has paid the interest and payments on her loans and foreign obligations and has financed her own part in the war against the Axis. Even the bonds of the cities of Bergen and Oslo have been paid.

She financed Little Norway camp up in Canada and it sent sturdy fighters and fliers to participate in the battle of Europe. The Royal Air Force said the Norwegians had the highest score of enemy victims in 1944 in relation to the number of planes in the air.

Now what about the Norwegians who stayed at home while the Germans occupied their country. For the past 5 years, Norway has been a mystery land to most of the world, but all this time the Germans have been harassed by, undoubtedly, the best organized resistance movement in occupied Europe. Norway has never been entirely cut off from some Allied aid and contacts.

The stubborn fight of Norway's men, women, and children accomplished more for Norway's future than any victory on the battlefields. Yes, we Americans of Norwegian descent, can, and should, be proud of these Norwegians.

Let me give you a few human interest, heart-warming incidents of that fight:

The world should know the story of the church and the clergy in Norway. It has been the inspiring, sustaining support to the people in their fight against the aggressor.

I love to tell this true story of the Lutheran Church leader of Norway. Quisling had demanded of Bishop Eivand Berggrav that he order the 1,100 bishops and ministers back to their churches. Bishop Berggrav refused to do so. He was called in by Quisling, who had become greatly exasperated because of the lack of "cooperation" received. So Quisling said to Bishop Berggrav, "I have a good notion to cut off your head."

The Bishop coolly replied, "Well, here I am!"

Such is the courage and spirit of the churchmen of Norway. The attitude and struggle of the church in Norway and Bishop Berggrav's leadership has caught the imagination of all churchmen in America.

You may have heard the story told by Gene Tunney, former world's boxing champion:

"I like to think of Norway and her people as being exemplified by the Norwegian officer in a Canadian aviation training camp who was asked this question by a kindly old lady, 'On what date was Norway conquered by Germany?' He immediately snapped to attention and replied politely but firmly, 'Madam, Norway has not been conquered; she is only occupied.'"

Ah, my friends what spirit there is in the hearts of the Vikings.

Some of you already have the story of the two men who had worked together in the underground resistance movement for three long years. They knew each other only by their first names, which were, of course, false ones. Finally one day, with the Gestapo getting close to them, both of them had to escape into Sweden. As they arrived into the safe territory of Sweden, the one man, Johan, asked the other, Christian, what he had done before the war. Christian answered "I was a supreme court justice." Surprised, Johan replied, "Well, I was a taxi driver in Oslo." They were close, understanding friends and will remain so in the never ending battle for freedom and liberty.

I regard all loyal groups, organizations, and individuals in Norway as heroes in the fight. For instance, the mothers, the housewives, the women of Norway. Theirs was the spirit of sacrifice and patience.

But before my time expires, I want to mention particularly the school teachers and the children. You know the dastardly treatment given 650 or more teachers imprisoned in Finmark. They would not yield to any pressure whatever. One teacher said this: "If I had 10 lives, I would gladly give them up if I could thus be assured that my children would not become like the Nazis."

You will remember having heard that the teachers were locked in railway cars and sent northward. At many of the stations along the route Norwegian children would congregate and sing the national anthem of Norway, Ja Vi Elsker Dette Landet, as the trains passed by.

There was a kindred feeling of fellowship between the teachers and the children.

There is the story of the small boy who went to his teacher and told him that he knew what the Nazis were trying to do but they, the children, would not let them do it.

Their standards were built up in their hearts from times of old.

In Bergen one day the school children had been ordered to attend a Nazi youth exhibition. But instead of entering the auditorium the youngsters marched right past the entrance singing the national anthem and shouting, "Long live the king!" All were arrested except a tiny 6-year-old who had been overlooked. The little chap ran up to a policeman and shouted:

"Long live the king! I want to be arrested too."

Such has been the spirit of Norwegian children and the spirit of any nation follows the spirit of its younger generation.

And so, in spite of all the suffering, Americans need not pity Norway's people.

As Frederick Paaske, an exiled Norwegian professor, in 1942, said in Stockholm, "Don't pity us, we have gained something in these last long years—deeper faith and deeper love." I might add—deeper understanding. He further added, "The country they wanted to take from us is now ours, more than ever."

So I want to pay tribute to the home frontiers of Norway. By their sterling courage and endurance, they inspired Norwegians beyond the country's borders, and freedom loving peoples everywhere, to try to emulate their courage and fortitude. They filled those who were free to fight, with the will to fight and work with all possible strength for the one common aim which was uppermost in all Norwegian hearts—the liberation of their beloved country.

We cannot ignore this fact: If the home front had crumbled, the Norwegian fight for

liberation would have crumbled. Because the home patriots held firm, Norway now lives again in freedom and honor.

Yet the Norwegian patriots seek no plaudits for themselves. Instead, from them, come expressions of thanks—appreciation for the aid of Norway's allies in the struggle; gratitude, too, to their courageous Government and King, now in Oslo and in London, for wise, effective and uncompromising leadership. What a joyous and gigantic reception is in store for King Haakon when he returns to Oslo early in the year, just about 5 years after leaving his homeland.

While testimonials for Norway are not needed, I want to give you only a few examples of hundreds of noted persons who have subscribed to the great spirit and devotion shown by Norway and the Norwegian people. And even Napoleon believed that moral power, the spirit, I would say, is three times as strong as physical power.

Bernard M. Baruch, of New York, said this: "Things of the spirit never die." It is a perpetual flame, consecrated to freedom. Norway—the whole world is stirred by the name."

Referring to the home front of Norway, Claude R. Wickard, United States Secretary of Agriculture, said: "I see in that resistance an unconquerable spirit."

William S. Knudsen, lieutenant general of the United States Army and motorcar manufacturer, is reported to have said: "The magnificent spirit shown by the Norwegian Nation will go down in history as an example of the rugged strength of its people."

Senator, JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, has stated: "The use of terrorism and brutality has not broken the spirit of the Norweigian people, but has only aroused that historic stubbornness and courage which characteristically has placed them in the vanguard of all movements of human progress. The spirit of Norway will not be conquered."

I could go on, but you understand what I mean. There are no words adequate to express the admiration, which we in America, feel for the courageous Norwegian people. The good fight they have been making both in and out of Norway, and their unbreakable spirit are inspirations to every free man and woman the world over. So long as human beings so reveal an invincible core of spiritual faith and an inner citadel of human dignity, that refuses to surrender, there is hope for the world.

And now you may ask—what are Norway's postwar problems and her future hopes.

We already have seen the political changeover from German occupation to Norwegian control accomplished peacefully. There was not the slightest sign of chaos or strife.

The first problem, of course, is the furnishing of food and clothing. Related to that is the development and reestablishment of her fishing industry in order to help feed themselves and other hungry peoples as well. Norway also wants the opportunity to buy food in the United States. She will get it.

The next immediate serious problem is the reconversion and rebuilding of her great merchant marine. And then, too, the rebuilding of some of her partially destroyed cities, homes, and factories.

In times ahead, I see Norway, sitting advantageously on the crossroads of polar and north hemispheric airplane routes, with her 1,800-mile coast line, becoming even more important in the field of transportation.

Norway also will become a "must" place to see and visit for world travelers and vacationists.

With her vast resources for hydroelectric power, Norway may become, if she wishes, a much larger manufacturing Nation.

And, as it has in the past, Norway will continue to give its great contributions to the world's best music, art, literature, science, discovery, and explorations.

And furthermore, she will press forward her democratic spirit in building a peaceful world.

My friends, in the days to come, the Norwegian and the American people will, for their own safety and for the good and welfare of all, walk together in majesty, in truth, in freedom, in justice, and in peace.

On this solemn Memorial Day in America, this is and must be our dedicated and divine purpose. My good people—this is my challenge to you. How will you walk? And what will you, each of you, do for the great cause of liberty and peace?

Jeg takke dere alle sammen—I thank you and good night.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, again the meddlesome demagogues are at it. Again every effort is being made to stir up racial and religious strife, and even strife between the different nationalities who make up the population of this Nation, through further agitation of the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee. This vicious bit of legislation sounds very innocuous at first glance. But read it again. It is the most vicious disturber we have seen in a long time. It definitely violates the constitutional right of every citizen to choose his own associates and employees. It is primarily designed to force employers of the Nation, particularly in the South, to intermix the Negro along with his white employees in his store, in his office, in his factory, and in the schools, too.

But it is more far-reaching than that. If carried to the extreme, and the radicals and extremists of this Nation will try to carry it to the extreme, it would mean that every business and organization would have to employ a proportionate number of every race, creed, and nationality in the community. No organization would be exempt. Race means white and black, brown and yellow. Creed means religious or political belief. National origin means just what it says. An employer would have to employ a proportionate number of persons of every national origin, English and Irish, Italian and French, Chinese and Mexican, even Japanese and Negro. Employment would have to be broken down to a proportionate number of all creeds, Catholics and Protestants, Jews and gentiles, and in the political field it would mean that you would have to ascertain that there was a proportionate number of Democrats and Republicans and even Communists in each organization. It could, in the extreme, reach even into the churches, any place where employment was offered and wages paid. Oh, I know that a lot of people will say that is carrying the thing too far, that it could never happen that way; I know that. But I also know that this thing is just a starter. The radicals are basing their arguments on the racial problems of the South. They are trying first to break down our racial segregation laws, but that is just a starter; they are just getting their foot in the door, and there is no telling what they might try to do once they got a foothold. Anything is possible under this act. Trouble is sure.

The so-called Fair Employment Practice Act is the most insidious and diabolical threat to the American social scheme that has ever been concocted. It breeds only dissension and chaos. It can accomplish no good but can bring untold strife and possibly bloodshed. We must do everything possible to defeat it.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Quincy, Mass.:

THE BEGINNING OF THE END?

"The decree here approved may well be, and I think threatens to be, but a first step in shackling of the press, which will subvert the constitutional freedom to print or to withhold, to print as and how one's reason or one's interest dictates. When that time comes, the state will be supreme and freedom of the state will have superseded freedom of the individual to print, being responsible before the law for abuse of the high privilege.

"It is not protecting a freedom but confining it to prescribe where and how and under what conditions one must impart the literary product of his thought and research. This is fettering the press, not striking off its chains."

When a Justice of the Supreme Court, supported by the Chief Justice, makes this statement about a Supreme Court decision, we think it high time for Americans to begin to wonder in just what direction this Nation is moving toward destruction of the Bill of Rights, the sacred document that guarantees freedom to every American.

Nor are these two members of the Court alone in expressing their apprehension. A third member of the Court says "If unsupported assumptions and conjectures as to the public interest and competition among newspapers are to warrant a relatively mild decree such as this one, they will also sustain unjust and more drastic measures. The blueprint will then have been drawn for use of the despot of tomorrow."

What caused the three distinguished jurists, Justice Roberts and Chief Justice Stone in the first instance, and Justice Murphy in the second, to write such condemnation and warning was the five to three decision of the Supreme Court in the Government's civil antitrust case against the Associated Press.

Those five members of the Court who for this decision seemed to have forgotten the Bill of Rights admitted placing the handling of news in the same category as the handling of food. They saw little difference despite the fact that freedom of the press, like our other great democratic freedoms, has been

guaranteed in article I of the Constitution which says "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Read these words and then tell us how five Members of the Supreme Court can justify this statement in their majority opinion:

"The fact that the publisher handles news while others handle food does not * * * afford the publisher a peculiar constitutional sanctuary in which he can with impunity violate laws regulating his business practices."

Mr. Justice Roberts, with Chief Justice Stone assenting, finds this paragraph hard to justify in the Associated Press case.

In discussing the grounds upon which the Associated Press allegedly violated the law, Mr. Justice Roberts says "I am unable to determine on which of such possible grounds the judgment of illegality is rested. The Court's opinion blends and mingles statements of fact, inferences, and conclusions, and quotations from prior opinions wrested from their setting and context in such a fashion that I find it impossible to deduce more than what orderly analysis and discussion of facts relevant to any one of the possible methods of violation of the Sherman Act is avoided, in the view that separate consideration would disclose lack of support of any finding of specific wrongdoing. But the general principle that nothing added to nothing will not add up to something holds true in this case."

Or perhaps we should quote another section of the dissenting opinion, which says the opinion "seems to attribute to the court below a finding that AP has unduly or unreasonably restrained trade. As will appear, the court below made no such finding and because it could not do so, sought another ground on which to base its decision. Moreover, the facts assumed are specifically denied by the answer, and contradicted by the proofs."

We think, too, that we should point to this statement of Mr. Justice Roberts, in which he says the "decree may well result not in freer competition but in a monopoly in AP or UP, or in some resulting agency, and thus force full and complete regimentation of all news service to the people of the Nation."

This is just what we fear may follow because of the Supreme Court decision. To those who know the story of regimentation of news agencies in other countries, the facts stand out only too clearly. Wolff, the German news agency, became the notorious DNB, which Hitler used to build up lies on the home front and abroad. DNB became the official news agency of the Third Reich, integrated with the entire propaganda setup. Stefani was the Italian news agency until Mussolini made it the official mouthpiece of Fascist Italy. Tass, the USSR news agency, distributes only the news the Government wishes to give out and the Japanese Domei agency, Government mouthpiece, is the result of consolidation of private agencies.

Now Mr. Justice Roberts warns us that the action of the Supreme Court, we repeat, "may well result not in freer competition but in a monopoly in AP or UP or in some resulting agency, and thus force full and complete regimentation of all news rervice to the people of the Nation."

Isn't that clear enough?

Aren't the words of warning enough to make us realize that our Bill of Rights is in dire jeopardy?

To say the least, this is an ironic welcome to those heroes who are returning by the thousands from Europe after waging the most magnificent fight in history to abolish despotism, only to find, quoting Justice Murphy again, that a Supreme Court decision paves the way for drawing the blueprint "for the use of the despot of tomorrow."

What a tragic commentary on the heroic sacrifice made by those boys who will never return from the beaches and fields of Europe.

This is no private fight between the Government and a corporation. This is a battle in which the rights of every citizen stand in jeopardy.

The ground work has been laid for the most serious threat to our Republic, since those dark days of Valley Forge.

There is only one out in this case, and it it through congressional action.

We can thank God that our laws are not yet set by court decree. We can turn once more to the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Roberts when he says "for myself, I prefer to entrust regulatory legislation of commerce to elected representatives of the people instead of freezing it in the decrees of courts less responsive to the public will. I still believe that 'the courts are without authority either to declare such policy, or when it is declared by the legislature, to override it'."

This is our only hope. We should now turn to Congress and demand that our freedom of the press, our cherished right along with freedom of worship and freedom of speech, may be safeguared from such decisions as that rendered by the Supreme Court in this Associated Press case.

Japanese-American Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 24, 1945:

JAPANESE-AMERICAN HEROES

"Nobody has asked where their grandpas came from," declares an editorial in Stars and Stripes. The Army newspaper was referring to American soldiers of Japanese ancestry who have rolled up a fighting record in Italy which evoked the highest commendation from Gen. Mark Clark. Its editorial recited some of the achievements of the One-hundredth Battalion of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat team, composed entirely of men referred to as "Japanese-Americans." This battalion fought at Cassino, Anzio, through the Apennines, and then in France, where among other acts it rescued a battalion of the Thirty-sixth (Texas) Division which had been cut off by the Germans.

"That was a pretty tough assignment," the editorial said. "A pretty dirty job in the hands of the Americans whose families were being beaten up by the families of other American lads." We think that this editorial ought to be read by the hoodlums in California who have been engaged in a campaign of planned terrorism against the Americans of Japanese descent evacuated from their homes after Pearl Harbor, and now, belatedly, authorized by the Army to return. We think it ought to be read by the law-enforcement authorities and the justices of the peace in California who have winked at this terrorism and exonerated the perpetrators of it. And, finally, we think it ought to be read also by the Army authorities in California who could, if they had a real regard for civil rights, act effectively for the protection of the families of men who wear the uniform of the United States. Fascism is no prettier at home than abroad.

The San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in Changing World there appears this month a very timely and comforting article by Clark M. Eichelberger on the work of the San Francisco Conference. This encouraging appraisal carries special weight and is worthy of more than passing notice because the author has spent many years of his life in the study of national and international affairs. For 10 years he was a director in the offices of the League of Nations Association and was, in 1938, attached to the League of Nations Secretariat. By unanimous consent from the House, I insert in the RECORD a copy of this very heartening article:

CHANGING WORLD CONFERENCE

(By Clark M. Eichelberger)

It is approximately 2 weeks before the anticipated adjournment of the San Francisco Conference. Important decisions remain to be taken. But enough decisions have been taken that one may predict with reasonable safety that the Conference will adjourn having produced a satisfactory Charter for the United Nations. The document will be an improvement on the League of Nations Covenant. It will be a refinement of Dumbarton Oaks. While not disturbing the delicate balance of the major bodies of the projected organization as outlined at Dumbarton Oaks, the Conference will have democratized the plan in many respects in favor of the small states. In addition, the provision on human rights has been strengthened; a trusteeship plan will probably be agreed to; the Act of Chapultepec has been clearly brought within the framework of the world organization with a dangerous temptation to regionalism avoided.

Certainly the San Francisco Conference is a democratic conference in which the forces of public opinion have been influential. No one can claim that there is anything secret about the Conference. The decisions are the result of certain impacts. There was first the impact of the four great powers upon each other. While there are some dangers in unanimity, in this crisis it is a very good thing in the beginning to have the major decisions agreed to by the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China. The marvel of the Conference is not to be found in Big Four disagreements but in how much there could be agreed upon.

The second impact has been that of the small States upon the decisions of the big four. Smuts, Masaryk, Rollin, Padilla, could not be ignored. Their influence has been toward liberalism, human rights, and democracy.

Then there was the impact of public opinion. So many newspapermen attended the Conference that one columnist remarked that the newspaper men would have to be demobilized from San Francisco on the point system.

No possible secret could escape the press and the radio. There are people from the European underground. There are people from all over the world expressing their views.

And finally, there are the American consultants. These representatives of 42 national organizations invited by the State Department, have expressed a vigorous public opinion which has resulted in a material strengthening of the provisions for human rights and for economic and social cooperation. The joint statement signed by the representatives of the three farm groups, the two labor groups, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the International Chamber of Commerce, achieved a unity without precedent in American business and industrial life.

Enough is now known of the decisions of the Conference for me to predict 2 weeks in advance that the Conference will be a success, having produced a workable Charter for the United Nations Organization.

From now on, the job is one of courageous statesmanship, and alert public opinion, and a vigorous process of world education. The United Nations Charter will not of itself guarantee security, human rights, or economic and social cooperation. The Charter opens doors. It opens the door to political security, if the nations will abandon the practice of power politics for collective security. It opens the door to a world recognition of the dignity of the individual from the curses which fascism and nazism have placed upon mankind. The Charter opens the door to a world in which all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. The Charter cannot guarantee the world against poverty. It opens the doors to cooperation in the economic and social field if the peoples wish to enter.

In other words, the United Nations Charter opens the door to political security and economic and social cooperation. It opens the door to the promised land. Whether or not man wishes to enter the door and turn his back to a Third World War depends not upon the Charter but upon the people. The League of Nations Covenant could have worked. From 1920 to 1931 the League kept the peace. But the people were not educated to economic practices that could have avoided the depression of 1929. In 1931 there occurred the first test of the security provisions of the covenant when Japan seized Manchuria. There had not been a sufficient campaign of public education so that the peoples would insist that the covenant be used to stop Japan.

For the next few years the world will be too exhausted to make war. In that time there must be a sufficient educational process among all of us to that if a test of aggression occurs, the United Nations Organization will be strong enough to meet it. There must be an educational campaign throughout the world so that people will follow decent economic practices, with the result, not returning to economic anarchy with poverty and revolution, but advancing to an organized world with a standard of living raised for all people. Obviously, building a successful United Nations is a very much more complex job than building the League of Nations. The world is much more exhausted from war. The loss of many millions of people has taken potential leadership to a greater extent than in the last war. The airplane has introduced an instantaneous factor in communication for potential destruction or cooperation. The means of destruction are greater. All make the problem more complex. The world organization itself must have many times the budget and many times the staff that the League of Nations did.

By the time this is printed the Charter will be drafted. It will not please the perfectionists. It will not be the constitution of a world government. It will, however, be the most workable plan that 49 nations could agree upon and, with the proper support, it may in the course of time become to the nations of the world what the American Constitution is to our 48 States.

The awareness of leaders of American thought on the need of public education was illustrated by the deliberations of the consultants on the educational parts of the Chafter itself. The leaders of American educational institutions found that in their request for a strengthening of the provisions for international education they had the support of both labor organizations, the three farm groups, and the two business organizations. In return, the educational bodies supported business, farm, and labor in their request that the Economic and Social Council in the composition of the commissions have the cooperation of economic groups of private citizens. It was a revelation to the education leaders to find that business, farm, and labor came to their support. And it was a revelation to the latter groups to find that the educators were less academic than they expected and wanted to work with them. This united front is of great importance in the United States, particularly since this country must occupy a place of leadership in building and maintaining the United Nations organization.

Another interesting development has been the informal conversations between leaders of various countries, particularly European, as to the need of developing the educational program in their countries and tying it together in an international movement. There are men in San Francisco recently from the underground and freed from German prison camps who were formerly leaders in the Federation of League of Nations Societies and the I. P. C. They are discussing among themselves the creation of a strong international movement.

For the European countries the problem is a particularly difficult and necessary one. A representative of one of the liberated countries whose name I am not privileged to give, outlined most forcibly the problem in his own country. He will return to a people enslaved by the Germans for 4 years. His people kept the faith and carried on active resistance throughout these years. But it is understandable that their information on what has happened in the world or is happening in San Francisco is very meager. Their schools are closed, in many cases desecrated or destroyed. Many of their teachers have been executed or driven into slavery in the German plan to destroy the leaders so this country could never rise again. His government has ordered some thousands of dollars' worth of textbooks in the United States, but because of shipping problems may not be able to secure delivery for many months.

Pamphlets describing the San Francisco Conference cannot be printed in Europe because of the shortage of paper and destruction of presses. It is agreed that there be printed in the United States or Great Britain one-page flyers summarizing the results of the San Francisco Conference that could be easily carried by these men personally when they return to their ravaged homelands. It is difficult for an American who sees hundreds of comic strips and pulp magazines daily on the newsstands to understand a people trying to rebuild the democratic processes without newsprint or presses. And yet the process must go on; it must go on quickly if public opinion is to support and make a living reality out of the United Nations Charter. The problem will be equally serious when vast areas of Asia are liberated from the Japanese, who have tried with equal ingenuity to destroy the cultural processes and leadership of vast populations in Asia.

The Charter must be a living reality to the masses of people. The most frequent criticism of the San Francisco Conference has been that there has been a certain air of unreality, divorced from the tragic problems of day-by-day reconstruction. That the criticism is unjust can only be proved by enabling the people to see that the United Nations organization is the only hope of avoiding a repetition of world war and of avoiding economic and moral bankruptcy. Courageous statesmanship will be required. Some men must speak with the moral authority and clarity of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, and these men must be supported by informed and determined public opinion. This public opinion must be developed in all countries. It must be united with worldwide understanding.

Universal Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in 1912 I had the honor of obtaining the privilege for Count Lutzow, of Austria, to address the House of Representatives. He had resigned his position as legal adviser to Emperor Franz Josef and collaborated with the great philosopher and later President of Czechoslovakia, Thomas Masaryk. Foretelling the trend of world events and the approaching shadow of World War I, he came to the United States and delivered many lectures advocating world cooperation and universal peace. Today, reading an editorial appearing in the Chicago Times, I recalled Count Lutzow's lecture tour in the United States and his appearance before the Congress, and I was so strongly impressed with the editorial entitled "Universal Peace" I felt it should be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, believing that it will be of interest to every American who believes in universal peace. The editorial is as follows:

UNIVERSAL PEACE

Fifty nations are about to begin a great experiment in friendship between the nations and the peoples of the world. In the years to come school children all over the earth will study the words that will be written into the big book of history at San Francisco Tuesday.

The nations are signing an historic declaration of independence from the tyranny of war. The words were learned at great cost in human life and happiness. So were the words of our own Declaration of Independence which American school children know so well—

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Our forefathers fought for the ideas those words conveyed. We fought for them in 1918, but the League of Nations didn't set down respect for human rights as one of its fundamental purposes. The new world charter does. It puts into a world document the kind of fundamentals that went into our own Constitution. The preamble of our Constitution reads:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure the domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of

liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

And what are the purposes of the new world organization? The nations hope to form a more perfect world union, to establish justice, to insure world tranquillity, provide for common defense against aggression, promote the general welfare of all peoples and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

These purposes are all in the United Nations Charter. The great new world document begins with these words:

"ARTICLE I

"The purposes of the United Nations are:

"1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

"2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

"3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

"4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

The Dumbarton Oaks draft had not mentioned justice and human rights as purposes. The League of Nations set out only to "promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security." The new world constitution will promote higher standards of living and cultural cooperation as well as to crack down on gangsters who would upset the peace. The League of Nations hoped merely that nations would promote peace by "acceptance of obligations not to resort to war." The new world charter says flatly:

"All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, and security, and justice, are not endangered."

Machinery is provided for settling disputes by force if necessary but the nations hope to chop away at the causes of war. For that reason the Economic and Social Council is set up. Its purposes are stated:

"ARTICLE 58

"With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

"(a) Higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

"(b) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation and

"(c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

So, here are the things mankind has dreamed about for centuries. They are what Woodrow Wilson had in mind when he proposed the League of Nations. And now, completed at last, is the great accomplishment nearest the heart of Franklin D. Roosevelt when he died.

Metallic Base for United States Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before the Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday favoring a metallic base for our monetary system.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Senator THOMAS. I have pending before the committee two amendments. They do not propose to amend the charter or the treaty or the agreement between nations. The amendments only amend, if enacted, the pending bill.

This bill deals with money and because of that fact it deals principally with United States money because we have the most money and the best money. Under the Constitution, Congress has original and exclusive jurisdiction over money, and for that reason this bill and this program is all-important.

The amendments I propose are two in number. I remember being before this committee 12 years ago. At that time I had a proposal to raise prices through money management. The Congress accepted the amendment and gave the President most of his powers over money, and to the extent and as fast as the President operated under the law, prices rose. The amendment incorporated into the law was responsible for prices taking a turn in the spring of 1933 and they kept increasing until 1937, when the people who had money and bonds became alarmed that we were facing uncontrolled inflation; then the money managers changed the trend of the value of the dollar and stopped its decrease in value and brought about an increase in the value of the dollar, thereby a decrease in prices, and we had the recession of 1937.

At that time I was accused of being everything but a sound money man. Nevertheless, the amendment that Congress adopted did the job of raising prices as intended and as fast as the authorities wanted the job done.

Now I come before the committee today with a proposal to keep the United States and through the United States the world, I hope, on a sound metallic monetary basis. I see a distinct trend now, not only here in the United States, but throughout the world, to permanently go off gold and to remain off all kinds of monetary metals, to go to purely managed paper currencies, not only in this country, but throughout the world and I am opposed to such a program, at least in our own country.

I have an amendment that is very simple; however, it is far reaching.

The amendment proposes to establish in our monetary system a new coin, and I exhibit to the committee a Treasury statement that comes out every day save Sunday. At the top of this statement under "gold" we find two designations: first, the value of our monetary gold in terms of gold ounces, and, second, the value of our monetary gold in terms of dollars. On the 18th of June we had in this country 579,037,307.09 ounces of gold, pure gold. On the same date we had 20,266,305,375.01 gold dollars.

Now, under our present system, the gold dollar is our standard and nobody wants that changed, but inasmuch as the Treasury Department prints the amount of gold in ounces I propose to add a new section to the bill, establishing a gold ounce in our monetary system, reading as follows:

"There is hereby established in the money of account of the United States a gold coin to be known as a gold ounce; such coin to contain 480 grains of pure gold (troy weight) and sufficient alloy to make it 9/10th fine and to be of the value of $35 or units."

Gentlemen of the committee, this does not direct the Secretary of the Treasury to actually coin gold ounces. It only establishes in the financial system of our country a gold ounce as a legal coin. Just as the gold dollar is established as the standard unit of our monetary system.

Now the purpose of this amendment is not to direct the Treasury Department to coin gold ounces and place them in circulation, but to have them established in the Treasury by law, so that if the managers of the fund or the bank so desire—and from my viewpoint if they are interested in keeping this country and the world on a gold standard, or on a metallic standard, they would deal as far as possible in gold ounces in the place of other units or forms of money.

At Bretton Woods Great Britain proposed to establish a theoretical coin called——

Senator TOBY. That didn't get up to Bretton Woods. It died before Bretton Woods came in existence.

Senator THOMAS. Well I know it was proposed by England to establish a coin to be known as a "bancor." The United States also proposed, either at Bretton Woods or earlier, the establishment of a gold coin to be called a "unitas." Other writers and economists have suggested a coin to be called a "gramor." Others have suggested a gold ounce to be known as a "goldoz," so this is not originally my idea.

If the bank and the fund begin to loan moneys—loan pounds, for example, or loan francs, for example, or loan liras or pesos, or rubles, I don't care what the money might be, I am of the opinion that some countries are certain to lose vast sums of money. We are putting into these two institutions gold. Everytime we put a gold dollar into the fund or the bank we are putting in a potential $44 of American money because under the present law one gold dollar stands for or supports $4 in currency and each currency dollar is a basis possibly for $10 of credit. So when we put a gold dollar into the fund or bank we deposit possibly $44 or American money. The other nations may not have gold and in such cases they must depend on paper currency which cannot be the basis of additional money, so everytime we put in a dollar in gold we are putting in the basis for $44 in currency and credit while other nations are putting in only their paper currency.

If the bank and the fund deal in the currencies of all nations, then supposing the fund or the bank should loan, for example, so many units of any nation's currency, the borrowing country could pay back those units in an identical number, but when the borrowing country proposes to pay back such units they might not be worth one-half of their value in terms of property that they were when the loan was made. That being true, the bank or the fund, as the case may be, would lose. If any country loses it will probably be the United States. So if the fund or the bank should deal in gold ounces, they could loan so many ounces to a country instead of local units. Of course local units could be secured but measured in terms of gold ounces.

Then the borrowing nation would be obligated to pay back gold ounces instead of units of their own country. If a loan of a million ounces of gold should be made to any nation, England for example, at the

present time the British pound is worth some $4.02—or it fluctuates, $4.02—and $4.03 so the fund would loan gold ounces and, at this time, each gold ounce is worth something like 8.7 pounds sterling.

Now, when it comes time for Great Britain to pay such loan, it should pay back enough pounds to get the number of gold ounces that were borrowed. It might take more or less, but all the time the lending institution would be protected.

In the case of France, for example, today the franc is worth 2 cents. Gold ounces today are worth some 1,750 francs. If a loan was made in gold ounces we could convert that into francs. When it came time for France to pay her loan back she would not pay back so many francs. She would pay back so many gold ounces. It would be no concern of the fund how many francs the French Nation had to secure to pay the gold ounces back. The same thing would be true of every other nation.

That is one of the reasons for the establishment of the gold ounce as an additional coin in our monetary system. It is not mandatory so far as coinage is concerned. The amendment only establishes the coin in our money of account.

The second amendment is with respect to silver. If we cannot keep gold as a basis for our money it is obvious we cannot keep silver. If gold goes out, silver goes out. If gold remains the basis of our monetary system the chances are we can keep silver in our monetary system. We have a very large stock of silver. At one time we had over 3,000,000,000 ounces. A part of that silver was used during the war and some is still being used. We yet have a large amount of silver. It is stored up at West Point, serving no particular purpose.

Inasmuch as we will have to put real money in this fund and in the bank, the second amendment proposes to direct that a part of our surplus silver be placed in the bank or in the fund to take care of our obligation. Silver would be placed in the bank or the fund on the basis of its present world-wide value. At the present time silver is worth something like 50 cents an ounce, so we could place our surplus silver in this fund or in the bank on the basis of 50 cents an ounce. It would take 2 ounces to be worth a dollar. It would be valued at all times in terms of gold. That would take care of our surplus silver to a good advantage, and then by providing that this silver should be valued from day to day in terms of gold, the silver would serve the same purpoee as gold. It is my conviction that if this amendment should be agreed to very shortly all the surplus silver in the world would come to be used as money. When I say fund, I mean either the bank or the fund.

It is my conviction if this is done very shortly there will be an effort made to establish the relative value between gold and silver on a production ratio. At the present time the production ratio of silver to gold is about 12 times that of gold. It was that when we were producing both metals, but more recently it isn't quite that much.

The amendment which I suggest is as follows:

On page 4, line 23, before the period, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to use all silver in the Treasury not held as security for outstanding currency of the United States and all silver which may from time to time come into the Treasury to pay that part of the subscription of the United States to such International Monetary Fund which is not required to be paid in gold under the provisions of the articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund: *Provided further,* That all silver which may be paid into such International Monetary Fund shall be valued in terms of gold from day to day on the basis of the commercial or fair world value per ounce of such silver and on such basis such silver shall be regarded as the full equivalent of gold: *Provided further,* That nothing herein shall be deemed to affect the obligation of the United States to pay in gold to such International Monetary Fund that portion of its subscription thereto required under the terms of such agreement to be paid in gold."

We have over twenty billions of the world's gold. There are only about thirty-two billions of monetary gold in the world. So we have twenty thirty-seconds of all the gold in the world. That makes our country by far the most important monetary country. I am of the conviction that when this war is over the demand for money is going to be very great. I am sure you gentlemen agree with that proposition.

The question is shall we keep our money on a metallic basis or shall we go off metal and begin to deal in paper currency. Those are the two amendments I have to suggest to the bill. As I said, they are not amendments to the charter. The nations would not have to be brought together to agree to them. They are simply amendments to the bill and they have to do wholly with America's monetary system and Congress has full jurisdiction to pass on the matter.

That completes my statement.

I thank you for hearing me at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator THOMAS.

Tribute to Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, which appears in the editorial columns of the Washington Star this afternoon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO STETTINIUS

The American delegation to the San Francisco Conference—Democrats and Republicans alike—have joined in paying handsome tribute to the leadership of Secretary of State Stettinius.

Expressing their gratitude for what the Secretary of State has done at San Francisco for our country and for mankind, the other delegates declared: "We have been very proud of your courage, your determination to achieve a new world order, your unfailing persistence through moments of dark perplexity, your poise and good temper, your tactful reconciliation of those who have differed and doubted."

Now that the Conference has come to a successful end, there will be few to deny that this praise is fully deserved. Mr. Stettinius and, indeed, the entire American delegation merit the fullest commendation for the splendid manner in which they have handled a difficult and delicate assignment. This is especially true, however, with respect to Mr. Stettinius. He has been handicapped in his role as chairman of the American delegation by repeated rumors to the effect that he was living on borrowed time as Secretary of State. And he has been the target of unprecedentedly violent criticism from those who opposed the admission of Argentina to the Conference.

These things added to the already considerable difficulties with which Mr. Stettinius had to deal. But despite the attempts, intentional or otherwise, to undermine his position, and despite the critics, the primary goal has been attained. The nations are in agreement on a charter, the Conference is ending in an atmosphere of good will, and the American delegation makes a point of expressing its confidence in Mr. Stettinius and its high regard for his work. For him, that will be vindication enough.

Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to labor relations by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Star of June 25, 1945, and three editorials relating to labor questions, one entitled "Labor's Blind Spot," from the Washington Sunday Star of June 24, 1945, one entitled "Bid for Industrial Peace," from the Washington Star of June 21, 1945, and one entitled "Faith in Union Contracts," from the Washington Daily News of June 25, 1945.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 25, 1945]

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—NEW BILL TO CORRECT LABOR UNION ABUSES GREETED WITH HOWLS OF FURY, SAYS WRITER

(By Frank R. Kent)

Recent developments have made two important things clearer than before. One is that the labor unions are really unregulated by law; that the laws which apply to other groups do not apply to them; that the special laws supposed to apply to them are ineffectual, entirely pushed aside, and ignored.

The second is that no relief from this condition can be expected from the Supreme Court. The radical majority of that Court made this plain last week when in a 5-to-4 decision it said that a labor union may not be sued under the antitrust laws for the destruction of an employ's business.

In this case a man's business was completely ruined by union action in refusing to permit employees of the firm to become members of the union, or members of the union to work for the firm. Unable to get workers, the business died. The Court said the firm had no redress.

Equally striking is the absurd futility of the Connally-Smith antistrike law. Under it the union can claim that a strike is legal if it is unauthorized, and they can also claim that it is legal if authorized. In brief, the act is a joke.

EXAMPLES CITED

For example, the recent New York bus line slow-down, which caused vast inconvenience to the public, was unauthorized. Therefore, the act did not apply. At the same time, in Akron, a more serious strike interfering with war production in the five

plants of the Goodyear Rubber Co., was avowedly an authorized strike. But that was legal because a favoring poll of workers had been taken on the question of interrupting war work by a strike if their demands were not granted. Hence, the authorized strike became as legal as the unauthorized strike.

Consider these things—the Supreme Court decision, exempting unions from the antitrust law; the silliness of the Connally-Smith Act which sanctions both authorized and unauthorized strikes; the freedom of labor agencies, such as the PAC, from the accounting to which other political agencies are subjected; the one-sided Wagner Act which puts the employer at a hopeless disadvantage—consider these things and it seems impossible to contend that justice prevails in the land or that all of us are equally subject to the law.

The remedy, of course, is in the hands of Congress. A new President, whose political debt to the CIO is not nearly so great as was Mr. Roosevelt's, has now taken over. A few days ago three Senators—one Democrat and two Republicans—sponsored a bill which is the first real attempt in 10 years to correct the glaring injustices of the Wagner Act and put labor-industrial relations on a decent plane. The principles of the Wagner Act are preserved. The right of collective bargaining and the right to strike are retained. But the utter helplessness of the employer is relieved and the power of the unions to dictate is decreased.

No fair-minded man can say that under the proposed bill any of the rights of labor are lessened. Yet, what has happened? Immediately, the labor spokesmen howl with fury. "The bill," they say, "is a bill to enslave labor." It is a scheme "to rob the poor and further enrich the rich." It is a "tailored strait-jacket" for labor, etc., etc.

These are the stock and exceedingly hackneyed phrases regularly mouthed by the labor press agents. They mean that all labor factions will unite against the bill just as they united against the work-or-fight bill and just as they are united against the national service bill.

TIME RIPE FOR CHANGE

But this time there is a real prospect they will not prevail. For one thing, the bill is framed not in the interest of labor or management but in the interest of the public. For another, public sentiment, disgusted by the long period of wartime strikes, is ripe for this kind of legislation. More than 70,000 men are idle today because of strikes.

For a third, in a short while millions of servicemen will have returned to this country, and there is no question whatever of their resentment over the strikes in war plants while the Army and Navy were calling for badly needed equipment for their fighting men.

Finally, Mr. Truman is in position to be more independent of the labor bosses than was his predecessor. To be sure, he is a politician who has his eye on 1948 when he will be nominated for the Presidency. Also, his nomination for the Vice Presidency last year, under the Roosevelt direction, was "cleared with Sidney."

It is true, too, that Mr. Hillman already has predicted his election in 1948. But Mr. Truman is a shrewd player of the political game and two things may occur to him: (1) that more votes could be lost than gained by subserviency to the CIO group; (2) that the CIO group will have to support him anyhow as there is no place else for it to go; (3) that there is much windy bluff about these labor bosses who have been getting credit for a lot more political power than they really have—largely because of the loudness of their claims and the pusillanimity of the politicians.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of June 24, 1945]

LABOR'S BLIND SPOT

The immediate and not unexpected reaction of labor spokesmen to the new labor legislation proposed by Senators HATCH, BALL, and BURTON has been one of unqualified and unrealistic opposition.

Their strategy is to put their own interpretation on the proposal, and then to reject it out of hand. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, says that the three Senators have "tailored a strait-jacket for labor and are now seeking to compel the Nation's workers by law to wear their creation." According to Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, this, of all antilabor measures proposed "is unquestionably the most bald-faced attempt to destroy unions and nullify the basic constitutional rights of workers." And the United Mine Workers, not often in agreement with either the AFL or CIO and almost never siding with both, joins the attack with the assertion that the bill is "a scheme blueprinted to rob the poor and further enrich the rich."

This strategy of sound and fury has been effective before in killing legislation opposed by labor leaders, and it may be effective in this instance. Yet it is indicative of a blind spot which, in the long run, is more than likely to prove subversive of the real interests of the workingman.

The UMW statement, deploring the "effrontery" of the three Senators in proposing such a bill, declares that their action "is more than we can understand." That is a significant admission, and it suggests that the leaders of labor are making the same mistake which prompted certain industrial leaders a decade ago to fight a blind and losing battle against long-due reforms which finally had become inevitable.

The three Senators have proposed this bill, not in the belief that it is necessarily the best measure, but because they are convinced that public sentiment will demand something of the sort. Organized labor in the past 10 years has acquired enormous power, and this power, in many instances, has been grossly abused. The Petrillos and the Lewises, the jurisdictional strikes and the slowdowns, defiance of Government and contempt for the public interest, have done their work. Slowly, but nonetheless surely, organized labor has alienated much of the public support which it once enjoyed, and the danger now is that reaction will carry to such an extent that serious damage will result to the legitimate and proper interests and rights of the workers.

Without any doubt, this danger is much greater and more imminent if authoritative labor leaders are going to permit arrogance or indifference to blind them to the signs of the times. Perhaps they can defeat the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill. They may be able, for a time, to hold on to all of their power while the abuses continue. But they are simply deluding themselves and doing a grave disservice to those whom they represent if they believe that they can hold out indefinitely against the force of a public opinion which demands protection of the public interest.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 21, 1945]

BID FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE

The sponsors of the National Labor Relations Act held it forth to the country as an instrument for the promotion of industrial harmony. It did not serve that purpose for at least two reasons. First, because the law itself was unbalanced and one-sided, and second, because the early administrators of the statute applied it with a degree of partisanship which soon convinced employers that the scales were hopelessly tipped against them. Now, in an effort to redress the balance and to protect the general public from abuses growing out of industrial strife, three respected Members of the Senate have come forward with a proposal for new labor legislation. They, too, say that their purpose is to establish a pattern for enduring industrial peace, and their proposal, on its face, holds greater promise of achieving this eminently desirable objective.

The proposed statute would be known as the Federal labor-relations law. It makes a favorable impression at the outset by calling for a reorganization and tightening up of the principal agencies now dealing with labor disputes. This is a reform which has long been advocated, and there probably will be wide agreement on its desirability.

Other important features of the proposed law contemplate compulsory arbitration of disputes arising from conflicting interpretations of contracts and of all disputes which might lead to strikes imposing hardship on the public, the establishment of a code of unfair labor practices for both employers and employees, the creation of safeguards and restrictions designed to prevent a monopoly of employment through the closed shop and the enlargement of the area in which the States would have jurisdiction over certain types of disputes. In all of this the right to strike is expressly preserved, but the sponsors feel that adoption of their proposals would tend substantially to eliminate the abuses and misunderstandings which lead to strikes.

The authors of the plan, which grew out of carefully considered recommendations of a volunteer committee of citizens, are Senators HATCH, BALL, and BURTON. Merely to mention these men as sponsors is to give assurance that the proposal is not intended to be pro-labor or anti-labor, but rather a sincere attempt to devise a formula which will serve the real interests of this country by forestalling an anticipated upsurge of postwar industrial conflict. At the least, their plan deserves careful and sympathetic attention, and men of vision, both in labor and in industry, will do everything in their power to see that it gets it.

[From the Washington Daily News of Monday, June 25, 1945]

FAITH IN UNION CONTRACTS

Labor leaders are justified in calling attention to the fact that the Federal Industrial Relations Act proposed by Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL would compel arbitration of certain kinds of management-labor disputes.

In this respect the suggested law goes beyond its prototype, the Railway Labor Act, which has prevented major railroad strikes for more than 19 years. But its resort to compulsory arbitration would be so limited and safeguarded that, in our opinion, no essential right of workers or employers would be endangered.

And labor, management, the general public and the principle of collective bargaining would all gain through the new emphasis placed on the sanctity of union contracts.

The Hatch-Burton-Ball bill does not propose compulsory arbitration in a great majority of controversies over the making of agreements between unions and employers. It does not say that such disputes must be settled without strikes—except when strikes, as on public utilities, in milk deliveries, etc., would cause severe public hardship. It merely requires reasonable effort to settle such disputes peaceably by a process of negotiation, mediation, voluntary arbitration and impartial fact-finding.

But when unions and managements have reached agreements and signed contracts, then the bill does say that disputes over what contracts mean must be arbitrated, as a last resort to prevent strikes, the arbitration decisions to be binding and enforceable through the courts.

We see nothing unreasonable or dangerous to anybody in that.

It is a direct and fair attempt to make union contracts what both workers and employers ought to want them to be—documents mutually respected as a basis for mutually profitable peace, instead of scraps of paper to be lightly disregarded by either side.

Progress toward genuine industrial peace depends on faith in contracts reached by collective bargaining. Strikes by unions or lockouts by employers undertaking to enforce their own ideas of what contracts mean undermine such faith. We think the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill would protect it. And we disagree with the contention of some labor leaders that this limited use of compulsory arbitration would lead to involuntary servitude, since the bill specifically preserves the right of any worker to quit his job if he is dissatisfied with its terms.

The Fundamental Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Fundamental Conflict," which I delivered over the Columbia network at Washington, D. C., on June 26, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, through the length and breadth of this land people vainly seek to buy meat for their tables. Why there should be a meat famine when there are more live animals on the ranges than ever before in our history, raises an interesting question. Spokesmen for the administration in power would have you think that the lack of meat in the markets of the United States is due to the war. The fact of the matter is that the shortage of meat available for the housewife, and she is the buyer for the American family, is due to the completely mistaken policy of those in charge.

The average American does not have the time to try to relate a whole series of policy actions to his own everyday life. He goes to the polls to vote for Members of Congress every 2 years or he goes to the polls to vote for a President every 4 years, or a United States Senator every 6 years. He votes for a Democrat, or he votes for a Republican. Unfortunately, too often he is not aware that the policies of those who control the Government have a direct and immediate bearing on every family.

Those who are really students of government and those who are charged in the Congress with the duty of writing the laws—realize full well that there is a clash of viewpoints on questions of policy. The shortage of beef is really only a symptom of an underlying mistake in policy, but it dramatically presents evidence of the fundamental conflict between the political philosophy of the administration in power and the Republicans who oppose that fallacious policy.

Thus, I am grateful for this opportunity to present some observations touching upon this fundamental conflict. It is impossible within the limits of the time available to me to deal adequately with all phases of what is going on in the political thinking of the administration in power, but it is my hope that I can help you to an understanding of some of the points, as I see them.

First. It should be remembered that for more than 12 years the administration forces have dominated both branches of the Congress. By that domination they organize every committee in the Congress, so that there is always a majority of the administration's legislators on every committee and on every subcommittee. People sometimes write me and ask, "Why doesn't Congress do this or do that?" What they should ask is "Why do not the administration forces in control take this step or that step?" The true workings of the American system of government require that party responsibility be fixed. Our people should strive to know how to appraise the fault as well as how to appoint credit. Since administration forces in fact have controlled all legislation, they have likewise had it within their power to pass—or to defeat—measures which will carry out the policies they support. Conversely it should be noted that over this entire 12-year period, no measure of national economic impact introduced by a Republican has ever been permitted to become law.

Many people think that the war has produced the great threat to the institutions which have made America great. Wherever interference with the normal interplay of forces in our economic life has resulted disastrously, the administration spokesmen are pleased, indeed, to lay the fault to the war. It is true that there are some dislocations which are inevitably due to wartime conditions. It should be recalled, however, that most of the legislative pattern under which we live was developed long before we entered the war.

The transfer by the administration controlled Congress to bureaucrats and to agencies of the power to administer our laws and to make rules and regulations, having the force and effect of law, is one of the main results for which the administration spokesmen have constantly exerted themselves. There is that school of thought, represented by policymakers in the administration, which sincerely and firmly represents that people in the bureaus and agencies know what is best for the American people. They assert that they can plan the lives of the American people better than you, speaking through your Congress, can do.

There is a fundamental conflict between those who hold to that point of view and those who believe that the American system of representative government should constantly be exalted, so that the people always will have a voice in their own affairs.

I will grant that the people as a whole or Congress speaking in their behalf may at some time or other make mistakes. But I urge that it is better to make mistakes and to retain a voice in our Government, for at least if we retain control of our own affairs, we can correct the mistakes. But if we transfer the power of decision the power of rule making and regulation, to people in the bureaus and agencies, we will be at their mercy. The American people should realize what is happening and reject that school of thought by defeating those who adhere to it.

In the last analysis the American people can govern themselves according to their wants and desires, if they have a voice in their own Government. Let me illustrate. Why have people been standing in line to buy cigarettes? Obviously, because those who really want cigarettes will sacrifice their time and their convenience to secure what they want. It isn't a case of money—or even of price—the buyers have the money. If you try to make the same people buy pipes and tobacco, they will not do so, because they want cigarettes. Why don't they stand in line to purchase a new type of can opener, or a candy bar, or blotters? Because they do not want them. In short, the buying public is able to control its own desires and actually by doing so it regulates the market. If the demand for goods is present, it can be met only through production. If production reaches a surplus point, that is, if it exceeds the demand, prices fall, as owners of inventories compete to move their goods. Price control which fails to take account of production needs will of necessity fail. People will simply refuse to produce goods at a loss. Is not that fundamentally so? Will you produce goods at a loss? The delicate mechanism known as the American economy depends historically and entirely on the quest for profit. Let the hope for a profit exist, and there will be producers who will seek to share in that profit and who will produce accordingly.

If steps are taken to break down the profit plan, it follows of necessity that production can be had only under regimentation of the producers, with government subsidies taking the place of the profit motive as an inducement for production. If in order to qualify for subsidies, producers also must meet standards prescribed by bureaucrats, it follows that control of the American economy will be vested in the bureaus and agencies of government.

Recently the Senate Banking and Currency Committee through its majority, composed of administration forces, reported that price control for any product will not be removed until production is brought into par with demand. But that's not enough, for it ignores supply. Demand, supply, and price are factors which go hand in hand. If each factor is not to be given its proper weight, failure of the price-control administration to permit adequate production, will result in an alternative demand that the Government become the producer.

There are those who systematically and deliberately have been taking steps to foster production by the Government. The whole process of paying subsidies is part of the plan, for the money to pay the subsidies must be raised through the sale of bonds; yes, War bonds, and through taxation, thus placing the cost of producing a particular item on the whole people rather than upon those who are in the market to buy that item to satisfy their individual wants.

The whole future of the economy of the United States is involved in the proper decision on the fundamental conflict in viewpoints. Reconversion of industry to peacetime production will be impeded if the present thinking of those in power prevails. With limited production there obviously will be need for fewer employees. As industrial payrolls decrease, the purchasing power of the whole American people will be adversely affected. Disastrous consequences to the American people can follow.

When our boys return, and God grant that day may be soon, you and I want them to return to a place in the American economy where opportunity will exist for them. They will wish to operate farms, to conduct businesses, to sell their services as employees in the great American system.

The whole American economy, the whole future of the whole American people is bound up in our willingness to retain the profit system in the United States. Production of

goods, whether from farm or factory, from range or mine, depends upon our holding out the hope for a profit. American acceptance of any other principle, for the guidance of our economy, will result in government control and government operation.

The fundamental conflict in this field must be resolved in favor of the American people, if they are to be free. Thus it is that you must insist upon a voice in your own government. Thus it is that your concerns, your lives, are, if you please, bound up in the policies pursued by your government. Honeyed words from those in high places will provide no consolation, if a course of conduct is pursued which makes Government control the only remaining alternative. Those who tell you that they contemplate no assault upon our institutions would simply delude you, when at the same time, step by step, they chart a course which leads irretrievably to economic stagnation.

What this country needs most is a reassertion and a reestablishment of the principles whose practice made us the most powerful nation in the world. Down through history the American people developed their farms and their industries and their mines while they sought profit as reward for their exertions. Only in the last few years do we find ourselves told that men back of desks in downtown Washington should be given control over the American economy.

The fundamental conflict presents a challenge on which we can no longer be silent. We need: (a) Relief from taxation which the planners would use to fasten their controls on our people; (b) a restoration of the profit motive as a stimulus to American production; (c) a recognition that through production we can create wealth; (d) that through production there will come employment; (e) that with employment there will follow pay rolls out of which to meet the American demand for goods and services; and (f) there will thus be possible the elevation and the expansion of the American standard of living. Above all, and to secure these results, there must be restored to the American people through their Congress a voice in their Government.

As a United States Senator I insist that only through returning to the Congress men and women who believe in these fundamentals can the American people thus succeed. I am heartened in my belief that there is a growing awareness among our people that this is so.

The Shortage of Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Malvina Lindsay entitled "Who Will Teach?" published in the Washington Post of June 27, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMING SCHOOL TIDE

(By Malvina Lindsay)

WHO WILL TEACH?

Two tidal waves of children will start flowing into American schools within the next 7 years. The first, consisting of the earlier war babies, will begin to invade kindergartens next year. The second, coming from the marriages of returned war veterans, will start rolling in around 1952.

Educators, sighting these waves afar, are troubled. Who will teach this great influx of beginners? Who will guide their minds through the grades, high school, and college? Who will man America's key job, one that, as Hitler so well demonstrated, shapes a nation's future?

The shortage of teachers during the war is critical. There are disquieting signs that it will continue into peacetime. Many teachers whom war drew from the schoolroom do not intend to return. Since this is true not only of men but also of women—who do virtually all of the teaching in the lower grades—today's bumper crop of babies may especially feel the educational pinch.

A large proportion of the officer group in the women's military services are former school teachers. Many of these, also many former teachers now in war jobs, have learned new skills and want to practice them. But dislike of the coop from which they have flown is likely to be a more powerful influence in their postwar planning. On every side is heard the resolve of capable and attractive young women not to go back to school teaching. Why is this?

Cramped social lives

Salaries have much to do with it. Average teaching salary for the country at large is $1,500. Some rural teachers receive as little as $600. Also, there is the load of extra duties demanded of teachers by communities. But intangibles play a large part in these young women's decisions. Put in Americanese, the stuffiness and nosiness of neighborhoods, even today, cramp the lives of many teachers. In many smaller communities teachers, like preachers' families, must live in glass houses. They must conform their social activities and their mental viewpoints to the standards of elderly and often reactionary school board members and town leaders.

Also, many communities lack recreational facilities, culture opportunities, even libraries. Moreover, the teacher is often set apart, meets few of her own group, especially few young men. She doesn't get mental growth or have fun. Repeatedly, young women describing their feeling toward teaching say they are fond of children, find the work interesting, but too often feel suffocated in the community environment.

American communities who want their children educated might well be considering how to attract good teachers. Already, about 4,000,000 American children are receiving inadequate schooling. Five hundred thousand young men were rejected by Selective Service because of educational lacks. Now with the expected ground swell from the war babies, the problem will be even more serious—unless the teaching profession can quickly recruit more volunteers.

Better pay, more respect

The problem is more than a visitation of war. Teachers' ranks were thinning before Pearl Harbor. Industry, business, the opportunities of a technological era have been enticing teachers from the schools, students from the teacher training courses. This competition will have to be met financially. Federal aid to poorer States with substandard school systems will help to some extent. But better-trained and better-paid teachers are needed in all communities. The American people must be awakened to a higher appraisal of the teacher in terms of money and professional respect.

Higher salaries and imposing school buildings will not alone solve the problem. Communities will have to offer more to teachers in living conditions, recreation, companionship, and, above all, understanding. Instead of saddling their religious and social service responsibilities on their teachers, they need to make the teacher's work a part of a larger goal to which they are enthusiastically giving of themselves—that of building enlightened and democratic neighborhoods. Thus, the teacher, taking a leaf in reverse from the Nazi schoolmaster, may be able to fit herself creatively—not destructively—into something greater than herself. This should make her job more interesting, more satisfying, more dynamic, more immune to the temptings of the machine world.

Reclassification of Postal Employees—Explanation of H. R. 3055

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed House bill 3035 providing for the reclassification of postal employees. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a section-by-section explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 3035

SECTION 1, PAGE 1. EMPLOYEES

Section 1 defines the term "employees." It excludes from this term postmasters. Special provisions are made for them, as well as skilled-trade employees of the mail equipment shops numbering 15 who are engaged in the manufacture of mail locks and equipment and are paid wages fixed by a wage board in conformity with salaries in private industry for similar work. Job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices also are excluded. These are part-time workers hired for the particular job only. Employees who are paid on a fee or contract basis are excluded. The only employees now paid on a fee basis are special-delivery messengers. It is believed advisable, however, to leave this provision in the law. No employees are included in this law who are paid on a contract basis.

SECTION 2, PAGE 2. HOURS OF DUTY

There is no change in this section from the provisions in the present law with the exception that any classified substitute employee who is ordered to report for duty shall be employed not less than 2 hours. Under present law there was no obligation to give a substitute any work even though he was called. Lax administrators at times call more substitutes than needed.

SECTION 3, PAGE 3. COMPENSATORY TIME

This section is the same as the present law with the exceptions: (1) that the amount of salary, $3,200, is given instead of the title "foreman" as defining that class of supervisory employee for whom payment for overtime is authorized during the month of December; (2) permits overtime to be paid on all Saturdays and Sundays in December instead of only the last three Saturdays and Sundays.

SECTION 4, PAGE 3. OVERTIME

This section provides for overtime on a basis of 150 percent of the annual rate of pay based upon a 253-day year of 2,024 hours. The 253 days are 365 days less 104 Saturdays and Sundays and 8 holidays. The present laws vary, being 305, 306, and 360 days. The conditions on which overtime may be paid are identical with those of pres-

ent laws. Payments are based on daily overtime over 8 hours. Overtime will be paid to employees for Saturday service on a basis of 150 percent during the period of emergency. Compensatory time is given to employees for Sundays and holidays. Section 4 does not apply to postmasters, post-office inspectors, and officers of the railway mail and air mail service who are provided for during the emergency only in section 20 of the act, page 58, which see in connection with section 4.

SECTION 5, PAGE 4. NIGHT DIFFERENTIAL

This section is the same as the present law with the exception that the payments are based on a 253-day basis. The base rate for overtime night differential will not be on a basis of 150 percent.

SECTION 6, PAGE 4. ANNUAL LEAVE

This is the same as the present law with the exception that postmasters who are now granted annual and sick leave administratively by the Department will be granted the same leave as other employees by law. The law pertaining to the annual leave of substitute employees also is liberalized by providing that a substitute's leave will accumulate as in the case of regular employees while he is in a pay status.

SECTION 7, PAGE 5. METHOD OF PAYMENT

This section provides that annual compensation shall be divided into 12 equal installments, one-half payable twice a month. This is the same method now used in Washington departments. It will save time and money. A General Accounting Office officer stated informally that Office will be able to save a considerable number of clerks in their Audit Section if the change is made.

SECTION 8, PAGE 6. COMPENSATION TO POSTMASTERS

This section provides that postmasters' salaries be based on gross postal receipts instead of 85 and 90 percent, as has been provided since 1932 when the rates of postage were increased. This will bring increased salaries to 45 percent of first-class, 51 percent of second-class, and 85 percent of third- and fourth-class postmasters. Postmasters' salaries are based upon the same grades as in existing law with the exception that the grade with receipts from $600,000 to $1,500,000 has been changed to $600,000 to $1,000,000 and $1,000,000 to $1,500,000, making two grades where there was but one. This change does not affect any of the postmasters now in office, but it does provide that the salary of the group with receipts of $600,000 to $1,000,000 will be $5,600 where formerly it was $6,000. The proposed law prescribes that no one shall lose any salary as a result of the law, and it is the successors of the present incumbents who will have the reduced salary. There are now 54 offices in the group from $600,000 to $1,000,000.

The initial grade for basing fourth-class postmasters' salaries is fixed at $100 instead of $50. There are 136 offices having gross receipts of less than $50 with a compensation of $72 a year. These will be increased to $168.

The proposed law makes no provisions for increases in the basic salaries of postmasters with salaries of $6,000 and over. There are 144 postmasters in this group at present. They will lose $300 apiece with the expiration of Public Law 25 on June 30, 1945.

SECTION 9, PAGE 9. SALARIES OF SUPERVISORS, OFFICES OF THE FIRST CLASS

This provides that there will be but one assistant postmaster instead of two in the 11 largest offices. This does not mean a reduction in the number of supervisors as it is provided that there be two general superintendents, one of mails and one of finances. These are new positions. It also provides for a general reclassification of supervisors. The positions of clerks in charge and general foremen have been established. The title of bookkeeper is abolished. This position will be handled by clerks in charge, foremen, general foremen, and auditors as the duties of present bookkeepers warrant. The average increase in base salaries for supervisors is $622 as compared with $400 for clerks and carriers. The law provides for the conversion of supervisors under the present law to corresponding positions under the new law.

SECTION 10, PAGE 21. ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS, SECOND-CLASS OFFICES

These assistants have been given an average increase in salary of $548. The salaries provided are but $100 and $200 above the top grades of clerks in the automatic grades in these offices and are not as high as the salaries clerks may attain in first-class offices.

SECTION 12. SALARIES, CLERKS AND CARRIERS, FIRST-, SECOND-, AND THIRD-CLASS OFFICES; DESPATCHERS AND OFFICERS OF THE PNEUMATIC TUBE SERVICE

Clerks and carriers in first-class offices begin at the same salaries as at present, $1,700, and advance automatically during 10 years to $2,700. They will receive increases of $100 each in the next 3, 5, and 7 years, permitting a salary of $3,000 in a period of 25 years, the first 10 of which must be for satisfactory service and the last 15 for faithful and meritorious service. The salaries of clerks and carriers in second-class offices are the same with the exception that there are no increases after the first 10 years. Under present salary laws, which include Public Law 25, the $300 bonus, a clerk or carrier would be paid $24,500 in his first 11 years; under the proposed law he would be paid only $24,200 during the same period. This same condition exists as it relates to all other employees in automatic grades.

This section also provides that the pay of substitute, temporary, or auxiliary employees in post offices be on the same basis as the hourly pay of regular employees. This is an increase of about 29 percent over base pay for substitute clerks and carriers.

This section also provides that clerks in third-class post offices, numbering some 17,000, will be placed on an annual salary rate with automatic promotions from $1,200 to $1,700. At present they receive an average salary through allowances granted postmasters of from 14 to 32 cents an hour.

The section also grants mail handlers and operators in the pneumatic tube service benefits that are given other employees, both as to salaries and working conditions.

SECTION 13. MOTOR-VEHICLE EMPLOYEES

In general this section provides for promotions as under existing law. General increases have been provided.

SECTION 14. CUSTODIAL SERVICE

The proposed law takes the custodial employees from under the Classification Act of 1923 and provides salaries and promotions on the same basis as all other field employees of the postal service.

SECTION 15. POST-OFFICE INSPECTORS, CLERKS IN THE INSPECTION SERVICE

This section and section 9–u and section 16–a place the salaries of inspectors in charge, assistant postmasters, and division superintendents of the railway mail service on an equality. Under present laws top salaries vary from $6,400 for inspectors in charge, $6,200 for division superintendents, and $4,900 for assistant postmasters. The work is comparable in difficulty and responsibility. On the whole the subordinate supervisory positions are on this standard with the exception that assistant division superintendents and assistant superintendents at large in the railway mail service, numbering 17 (see p. 39, line 23) should be placed on a salary of $6,000 and $5,800, respectively, instead of $5,700, to bring about an equality with other services.

Post-office inspectors are divided into 10 grades but the number who may be promoted to the two highest grades is limited to 25 percent of the authorized quota. Under present law the salary range of inspectors is from $2,600 to $5,400 per annum, whereas this law provides salary grades of $3,200 to $6,000 per annum.

The section also establishes a classification known as principal review clerks with four automatic grades and two additional grades. This classification is in the place of a provision of existing law permitting 35 percent of the clerical force to be promoted to the $2,600 grade.

SECTION 16, PAGE 39. RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE AND AIR MAIL SERVICE

Section 16 continues the present classification of railway post offices, terminals and transfer offices. Clerks in class A, which are the smaller lines, progress in 8 years through automatic annual promotions from the present entrance salary of $1,900 to $2,700 with 3 additional promotions of $100 each following 3, 5 and 7 years of service. Clerks in class B progress in the same manner from $1,900 to $2,900 per annum, with 3 additional promotions of $100 each following 3, 5 and 7 years of service. Clerks in charge of class A lines have a fixed salary of $3,200 per annum and clerks in charge of class B lines have a fixed salary of $3,400 per annum, provided that in class B trains in which more than 60 feet of distributing car space is authorized in either direction over the entire length of the run, the clerk in charge may be paid $3,500. The salaries of clerks in charge of terminal railway post offices, transfer offices, and air mail field post offices are determined as at present by the number of employees, with a range of $3,200 to $3,500. Under this section, railway postal clerks in class A, clerks in terminal railway post offices, and clerks in air mail field post offices and clerks in first-class post offices doing similar work have their salaries equalized.

SECTION 17, PAGE 51. RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE

This section provides salaries for rural carriers, with annual promotions, that place them in the same salary grades as city delivery carriers. The provisions of present laws providing for heavily patronized routes and the benefits of U. S. C. 1940, title 39, Sec. 197a, to protect certain carriers from a reduction in salary, are continued in the proposed laws.

SECTION 18, PAGE 55. MAIL EQUIPMENT SHOPS

Salaries and working conditions provided for under this section are fixed to conform with those for other postal employees throughout the service engaged in work of equal difficulty and responsibility.

SECTION 19, PAGE 57. EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

The 47 employees in this division are provided for in the proposed law in a manner conformable to other employees doing like work.

SECTION 20, PAGE 58

Executive Order 9289, December 26, 1942, and a memorandum dated December 22, 1942, issued by the President, extended the work-week of all government employees to 48 hours. The Post Office Department in the Postal Bulletin of January 4, 1943, advised that the order applied to all except postmasters, rural carriers, pneumatic-tube employees, substitute employees, all part-time emloyees, and certain railway postal clerks.

Public Law 334, June 12, 1944, provided that presidential postmasters and post-office inspectors shall be on duty not less than 48 hours a week and be paid 5 percent of their peacetime salaries when between $5,001 and $8,000; 10 percent when between $4,001 and $5,000; 15 percent between $2,001 and $4,000, and 20 percent when $2,000 or under. This law expires June 30, 1945. It was provided that other employees could be paid salaries

or given compensatory time as the conditions warranted for the additional 8 hours service.

It might be well to change the opening paragraph of section 20, page 58, to read:

"During the period of the emergency or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate," etc.

The President apparently has jurisdiction to fix the period of emergency in which a 48-hour week is necessary, and when he decides conditions do not require a 48-hour week, or if Congress decides a 48-hour week is unnecessary, the provisions of section 20 will expire.

SECTION 21, PAGE 60. CONVERSION

The purpose of this section is to prevent misunderstanding in converting salaries of employees from the present to the proposed rates. There is fear, for instance, that if this section is not in the law and in these words that an employee who had served 1 year in a grade and was eligible to a $100 promotion July 1, 1945, would not be given credit for the promotion earned when his salary was converted on that date.

SECTION 22, PAGE 61. SPECIAL DELIVERY SERVICE

The special delivery service is the least efficient of all postal operations because of a fee system which does not permit a living wage unless the messenger is given more special delivery articles than he can handle promptly. This section places messengers at first-class offices on a fixed-salary basis and also permits postmasters to use other regular employees as messengers.

SECTIONS 23 AND 24, PAGES 63 AND 64. CONVERSION

These are the conversion provisions for the change from the present to the proposed salaries and in general provide a $400 or 20-percent increase in all salaries. In a few cases where employees have been in the service less than a year the increase will be between $300 and $400 but never less than $300.

SECTION 25, PAGE 65. ALLOWABLE SERVICE

This defines allowable service, and gives credit for military service.

SECTION 26, PAGE 65. NO DECREASES IN SALARY

This is self-explanatory and prevents the decrease in any salary to an amount less than base pay plus $300.

SECTION 27, PAGE 65

This makes current appropriation available for the provisions of the act.

Qualifications of Mr. Justice Douglas for Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Is That Time," appearing in the May 29, 1945, issue of the Oregonian. The editorial comments upon the qualifications of Mr. Justice W. O. Douglas for the position of Secretary of State should the President determine to make a change in that high office.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THAT TIME

Justice W. O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, speaker Sunday night at a memorial service for Franklin D. Roosevelt, held in the huge Chicago stadium, brought out a point which all of us will do well never to forget. He brought out and reiterated the point so well illustrated by Mr. Roosevelt's own political career that in the long run it is not the opinion of officeholders and delegates which matters. In the long run what matters is the will of the people.

No one—whether he was of Mr. Roosevelt's political persuasion or in the camp of the opposition—can deny the fantastic success which the late President enjoyed through laying his cases directly before the people, over the heads of all those who sought to speak for the people. And it is doubtful if any other leader in the administration has held more unswervingly to this particular Rooseveltian principle than Justice Douglas. Two years ago when Justice Douglas addressed the Oregon Grange here in his home State, the burden of his talk was that we were fighting a people's war, and that we must formulate a people's peace. On the few occasions when he has emerged from the Supreme Court chambers since then the same faith has occupied him.

The following passage from the Chicago speech, dealing with the peace which is now being written, is typical of the justice's approach: "No one act can bring world order into being. No leader, no group of leaders, no conference can set up a world system and keep it in running order. Only the people, the determined common people of the world, can make peace and keep peace. No international order is worth anything unless it is based on the natural trust, understanding and concern of all the peoples of the earth in each other."

It boils down to this, that a marriage does not last, no matter how eloquent the contract and no matter how embossed the papers, without the will of the participants.

We have said before, and now emphasize, that if President Truman should relieve Mr. Stettinius as Secretary of State, perhaps offering full duties with the United Nations, the President could not do better than name Mr. Douglas. Perhaps we are prejudiced because Mr. Douglas is a resident of Oregon, and the Cabinet needs such a westerner. But it is more than that. If there ever was a time when the State Department needed to be under someone determined to shatter the silk-hat formulas, and break through to the aspirations of the people themselves, this is that time.

Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently the country was shocked to learn of the tragic but heroic death of a great soldier, Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner. It was my high privilege to have been a classmate of his at West Point. We were close friends in those days, and the friendship continued all through the years. About a year ago when he came from Alaska to Washington before assuming the command of the Tenth Army, I had the pleasure of being with him. He looked the part of a great soldier. Although a man nearing his sixties, he was straight, tall, and very muscular. His hair was gray, but his eyes and complexion were clear. He walked with the stride of a typical soldier.

I knew, as did many people, that he was a great officer, and he would have achieved much more had not death intervened. He was the son of a famous man, Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, of the Confederate Army, later Governor of Kentucky. His father was a close friend of General Grant, stemming from their West Point days. General Buckner was commander of Fort Donelson when General Grant wrote that famous message of unconditional surrender. The message was directed to his old, close friend, General Buckner. The story is told that in later years when General Grant became impoverished by financial failures General Buckner came to his relief and he was even one of the pallbearers at General Grant's funeral. He, too, was a fine-looking man—very handsome, tall, and straight, with a head of long white hair. I can remember seeing him many times at West Point. He lived to a great age—I believe he was 91 at the time of his death.

Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., the heroic officer at Okinawa, had many years of usefulness ahead of him. The Nation has suffered a great loss and the sympathy of the people goes out to his family—Mrs. Buckner, a daughter, one son who is an Army officer several years out of West Point, and a second son who is now a cadet at West Point.

FEPC

REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Halls of our Congress have seen some strange debates, but to my mind the tug of war we are now witnessing over the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission is the strangest of all. For we, the elected guardians of the people's welfare, are sitting here wrangling over a measure which offers the basic, the elementary protection of a man's right to work and earn a living whatever his race or religion.

We talk a good deal about our democratic practices here in the United States; we call them smugly the American way of life. We point with justifiable pride to our Constitution with its magnificent Bill of Rights, the greatest document so far devised on the subject of human freedom. In time of war we ask for every kind of sacrifice, to the offering of life itself, in the name of the precious liberties safeguarded in that Constitution. We draft millions into the armed services without regard to race or religion. If a man is healthy and of sound mind we call upon him to suffer untold miseries or death, or what is sometimes worse, terrible mutilation of

body and spirit in the name of American democracy, in the name of that splendid equality before the law and freedom of opportunity which have brought our country to its present greatness.

Yes, we are the world's foremost champion of democracy. American statesmen inspired the Bill of Rights, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, the Atlantic Charter, and the "four freedoms." Yet here in America we still find our Congress debating whether the basic rights of democracy shall be extended to Negroes.

What more do we see?

Families of Negro servicemen are still not allowed to vote in many States because the poll tax remains as one of the devices to prevent them from voting.

Can we blame peoples of other nations for wondering why one vast section of the United States of America refuses to practice what the whole Nation preaches? What about FEPC? All this legislation would do is assure equal economic rights to all Americans. Social equality is not involved. The only issue is whether Americans can be denied jobs on account of their creed or color.

Now, can we blame the peoples of other nations from thinking us a bit queer when we praise democracy—and then turn around and block legislation which would give those same Negroes democracy's minimum obligation—a job?

The attitude of some of our legislators is especially strange, in view of the fact that the two major political parties of our land pledged their aid in the fight against racial and religious prejudice. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties have been most outspoken on the subject. We sit here, elected on those promises. Does any one of us think for a moment that he can renege on his word, and not suffer the consequences? Let those who do think so be warned. There is no escaping the evil backwash of such treacherous action.

The Fair Employment Practice Commission was needed for the war effort; we are still at war, and we still need it. We are still waging the bitter, bloody struggle of our century against the forces of ignorance, bigotry, barbarism, and enslavement. An odd time, indeed, in which to refuse to sanction a man's legal right to earn a living, whatever his race, creed, or color.

Essential as it is in war, the FEPC is needed even more for the postwar era of transition. In President Truman's words:

> Even if the war were over, or nearly over, the question of fair employment practices during the reconversion period and thereafter would be of paramount importance. Discrimination in the matter of employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, creed, or color, is not only un-American in nature, but will lead eventually to industrial strife and unrest. It has a tendency to create substandard conditions of living for a large part of our population. The principle and policy of fair employment practice should be established permanently as a part of our national law.

There is nothing vague about the phrase, "industrial strife and unrest." President Truman voiced what every honest person knows to be the truth: Men who, in the uniform of the United States, have fought and crushed the enemy abroad will not tolerate any sign of his poisonous doctrines at home; nor will the workers who fought with their sweat in our factories and shipyards. Their energies were vital to the success of our home-front war effort. Under pressure of war contracts, employers forgot outmoded prejudices and welcomed workers of all races and all creeds. As a result, millions of men and women knew for the first time what it was to earn a decent living wage and to be welcomed into the ranks of their fellow men. These men and women will not willingly endure again the old discriminations which shut in their faces the door to security and well-being.

Let us be realistic, if we cannot be high-minded. Extending legal protection against discrimination is not a big-hearted piece of altruism. It is an imperative measure of self-protection. The man is truly blind who cannot foresee marches on Washington and riots in the streets, unless we act now, to assure every American the basic minimum right to the job he is qualified to fill. And if these marches and these riots do come, it will not only be the victims of discrimination who will suffer. Native agitators in our midst are waiting to ride to power on just such waves of discontent. Demagogues are already repeating here the "divide and conquer" tactics which paved the way for tyranny in Hitler Germany and elsewhere.

When Harry S. Truman was still Vice President, he said:

> America became great by being a secure haven for freedom of thought and action. We prove conclusively that people of every race and of every creed can dwell together in harmony. In fact, America has become the hope and inspiration of all oppressed people throughout the civilized world.

That hope and inspiration will die, if we here in Congress fail to live up to our word. A permanent FEPC now will tell Americans, and all the millions in foreign lands who look to these United States for guidance, that when we talk about the rights of man we mean the human rights of every man, including the right to work and earn a living according to his merits as an individual.

The San Francisco Conference

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, the most comforting message received by the mothers of the world within the memory of living man came from San Francisco where the Peace Conference ended its sessions last night. The message of hope and confidence in the adoption of a program that would end wars and make permanent peace possible was uttered by the leader of our Nation, President Harry S. Truman. It was a message that conveyed courage and confidence even to those who believed that the adoption of a program of permanent peace was impossible. For many thousands of years well-meaning men and women have striven without success for some means other than the shedding of human blood to prevent and to end wars. Out of the frightful holocaust of the present war has come a realization that provided the nations which control the agencies, namely, control of the air, control of the sea, control of the wealth, control of the food, and control of the munitions-manufacturing industries, provided they banded together and continued together, should find it a simple matter to establish and maintain permanent peace in the world.

The United States of America in the war to the present time has suffered the loss in killed, wounded, and captured of over more than 1,200,000 of the flower of American manhood, in addition to the creation of a colossal debt estimated to eventually be greater than $300,000,000,000. America's entry into the war was not with the desire for the acquisition of territory or peoples, and this position, unselfish as it was, is still the policy of the Nation. It is, however, the firm belief of forward-looking women and men that the time has arrived for a definite presentation of America's position, namely, that we have come to the rescue of European countries twice with a loss of our young manhood and the wasting of our resources, and that we in the present instance stand ready to waive the indebtedness of European countries to America, and in addition to aid in feeding the starving millions of the world and restoring order out of chaos. But we believe in return that we are entitled to be permitted to enjoy that for which we believe the war was fought, namely, permanent peace, and in the event that the Nations of the world refuse to abide by the program as outlined by the President of our Nation, in my judgment, it is about time to serve notice that we propose to build up our defensive and offensive resources, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and will refuse in the future to participate in European wars.

President Truman's message follows:

> Mr. Chairman and delegates to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, I deeply regret that the press of circumstances when this Conference opened made it impossible for me to be here to greet you in person. I have asked for the privilege of coming today, to express on behalf of the people of the United States our thanks for what you have done here, and to wish you Godspeed on your journeys home.
>
> UNITED STATES PEOPLE PROUD PARLEY HELD HERE
>
> Somewhere in this broad country, everyone of you can find some of our citizens who are sons and daughters, or descendants in some degree, of your own native land. All our people are glad and proud that this historic meeting and its accomplishments have taken place in our country. And that includes the millions of loyal and patriotic Americans who stem from the countries not represented at this Conference.
>
> We are grateful to you for coming. We hope you have enjoyed your stay and that you will come again.
>
> You assembled in San Francisco 9 weeks ago with the high hope and confidence of peace-loving people the world over.

Their confidence in you has been fulfilled.

The charter of the United Nations which you have just signed is a solid structure upon which we can build a better world. History will honor you for it. Between the victory in Europe and the final victory in Japan, in this most destructive of all wars, you have won a victory against war itself.

CHARTER GIVES FAITH TO PEOPLES OF WORLD

It was the hope of such a charter that helped sustain the courage of stricken peoples through the darkest days of the war. For it is a declaration of great faith by the nations of the earth—faith that war is not inevitable, faith that peace can be maintained.

If we had had this charter a few years ago—and above all, the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die.

It has already been said by many that this is only a first step to a lasting peace. That is true. The important thing is that all our thinking and all our actions be based on the realization that it is in fact only a first step. Let us all have it firmly in mind that we start today from a good beginning and, with our eye always on the final objective, let us march forward.

CITES EXAMPLE OF OUR OWN CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of my own country came from a convention which—like this one—was made up of delegates with many different views. Like this charter, our Constitution came from a free and sometimes bitter exchange of conflicting opinions. When it was adopted no one regarded it as a perfect document. But it grew and developed and expanded. And upon it there was built a bigger, a better, a more perfect union.

This charter, like our own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or a perfect instrument. It has not been poured into any fixed mold. Changing world conditions will require readjustments—but they will be the readjustments of peace and not of war.

That we now have this charter at all is a great wonder. It is also a cause for profound thanksgiving to Almighty God who has brought us so far in our search for peace through world organization.

There were many who doubted that agreement could ever be reached by these 50 countries differing so much in race and religion, in language and culture. But these differences were all forgotten in one unshakable unity of determination—to find a way to end war.

Out of all the arguments and disputes, and different points of view a way was found to agree. Here in the spotlight of full publicity, in the tradition of liberty-loving people, opinions were expressed openly and freely. The faith and the hope of 50 peaceful nations were laid before this world forum. Differences were overcome.

This charter was not the work of any single nation or group of nations, large or small. It was the result of a spirit of give-and-take, of tolerance for the views and interests of others.

It was proof that nations, like men, can state their differences, can face them, and then can find common ground on which to stand. That is the essence of democracy; that is the essence of keeping the peace in the future. By your agreement, the way was shown toward future agreement in the years to come.

OWES SUCCESS LARGELY TO ONE MAIN OBJECTIVE

This conference owes its success largely to the fact that you have kept your minds firmly on the main objective. You had the single job of writing a constitution—a charter for peace. And you stayed on that job.

In spite of the many distractions which came to you in the form of daily problems and disputes about such matters as new boundaries, war criminals, the form of government of some of the European countries—in spite of all these, you continued in the task of framing this document.

These problems and scores of others, which will arise, are all difficult. They are complicated. They are controversial and dangerous.

But with united spirit we met and solved even more difficult problems during the war. And with the same spirit, if we keep to our principles and never forsake our objectives, the problems we now face and those to come will also be solved.

COOPERATION PRINCIPLE PROVES WORKABLE

We have tested the principle of cooperation in this war and have found that it works. Through the pooling of resources, through joint and combined military command, through constant staff meetings, we have shown what united strength can do in war. That united strength forced Germany to surrender. United strength will force Japan to surrender.

The United Nations have also had experience, even while the fighting was still on, in reaching economic agreements for times of peace. What was done on the subjects of relief at Atlantic City, food at Hot Springs, finance at Bretton Woods, aviation at Chicago, was a fair test of what can be done by nations determined to live cooperatively in a world where they cannot live peacefully any other way.

What you have accomplished in San Francisco shows how well these lessons of military and economic cooperation have been learned. You have created a great instrument for peace and security and human progress in the world.

FAILURE TO USE PACT WOULD BETRAY THE DEAD

The world must now use it.

If we fail to use it, we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it.

If we seek to use it selfishly for the advantage of any one nation or any small group of nations—we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal.

The successful use of this instrument will require the united will and firm determination of the free peoples who have created it. The jobs will tax the moral strength and fiber of us all.

We all have to recognize—no matter how great our strength—that we must deny ourselves the license to do always as we please. No one nation, no regional group, can or should expect, any special privilege which harms any other nation. If any nation would keep security for itself, it must be ready and willing to share security with all.

That is the price which each nation will have to pay for world peace. Unless we are willing to pay that price, no organization for world peace can accomplish its purpose.

And what a reasonable price that is.

NO RIGHT GIVEN ANY NATION TO DOMINATE

Out of this conflict have come powerful military nations, now fully trained and equipped for war. But they have no right to dominate the world. It is rather the duty of these powerful nations to assume the responsibility for leadership toward a world of peace. That is why we have here resolved that power and strength shall be used not to wage war, but keep the world at peace, and free from fear of war.

By their own example the strong nations of the world should lead the way to international justice. That principle of justice is the foundation stone of this charter. That principle is the guiding spirit by which it must be carried out—not by words alone but by continued concrete acts of good will.

There is a time for making plan—and there is a time for action. The time for action is now. Let us, therefore, each in his own nation and according to his own way, seek immediate approval of this charter—and make it a living thing.

CERTAIN PEOPLE FAVOR QUICK RATIFICATION

I shall send this charter to the United States Senate at once. I am sure that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of my country and of their representatives in the Senate is in favor of immediate ratification.

A just and lasting peace cannot be attained by diplomatic agreement alone, or by military cooperation alone. Experience has shown how deeply the seeds of war are planted by economic rivalry and by social injustice. The charter recognizes this fact for it has provided for economic and social cooperation as well. It has provided for this cooperation as part of the very heart of the entire compact.

It has set up machinery of international cooperation which men and nations of good will can use to help correct economic and social causes for conflict.

FREEDOM FROM WANT IS GOAL WE ALL SEEK

Artificial and uneconomic trade barriers should be removed—to the end that the standards of living of as many people as possible throughout the world may be raised. For freedom from want is one of the basic "four freedoms" toward which we all strive. The large and powerful nations of the world must assume leadership in this economic field as in all others.

Under this document we have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights, acceptable to all the nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our own bill of rights is a part of our Constitution. The charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Unless we can attain those objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security.

With this charter the world can begin to look forward to the time when all worthy human beings may be permitted to live decently as free people.

WORLD HAS LEARNED MEANING OF FREEDOM

The world has learned again that nations, like individuals, must know the truth if they would be free—must read and hear the truth, learn and teach the truth.

SEARCH FOR PEACE ENDS ALL DIFFERENCES

We must set up an effective agency for constant and thorough interchange of thought and ideas. For there lies the road to a better and more tolerant understanding among nations and among peoples.

All fascism did not die with Mussolini. Hitler is finished—but the seeds spread by his disordered mind have firm root in too many fanatical brains. It is easier to remove tyrants and destroy concentration camps than it is to kill the ideas which gave them birth and strength. Victory on the battlefield was essential, but it was not enough. For a good peace, a lasting peace, the decent peoples of the earth must remain determined to strike down the evil spirit which has hung over the world for the last decade.

REACTIONARY FORCES WILL STRIVE AGAIN

The forces of reaction and tyranny all over the world will try to keep the United Nations from remaining united. Even while the military machine of the Axis was being destroyed in Europe—even down to its very end—they still tried to divide us.

They failed. But they will try again.

They are trying even now. To divide and conquer was—and still is—their plan. They still try to make one ally suspect the other, hate the other, desert the other.

But I know I speak for every one of you when I say that the United Nations will remain united. They will not be divided by propaganda either before the Japanese surrender or after.

This occasion shows again the continuity of history.

WILSON'S IDEAL IS GIVEN REALITY

By this character, you have given reality to the ideal of that great statesman of a generation ago—Woodrow Wilson.

By this charter, you have moved toward the goal for which that gallant leader in this second world struggle worked and fought and gave his life—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

By this charter, you have realized the objectives of many men of vision in your own countries who have devoted their lives to the cause of world organization for peace.

MUST TRANSFORM WORDS INTO ACTION

Upon all of us, in all our countries, is now laid the duty of transforming into action these words which you have written; upon our decisive action rests the hope of those who have fallen, those now living, those yet unborn—the hope for a world of free countries—with decent standards of living—which will work and cooperate in a friendly civilized community of nations.

This new structure of peace is rising upon strong foundations.

Let us not fail to grasp this supreme chance to establish a world-wide rule of reason—to create an enduring peace under the guidance of God.

Activities of the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. CAPEHART] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from John W. Anderson, president of the Anderson Co., of Gary, Ind., relative to the work of the OPA.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANDERSON CO.,
Gary, Ind., June 16, 1945.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: It has been my privilege to sit as an industry member of so-called advisory committees with various war agencies of the Government—over a considerable period.

In that time I have encountered some rather startling viewpoints reflecting somewhat less than a sound understanding of realities.

Perhaps the most astounding—and frightening—has been the insistence of OPA that one of its duties is to exhaust surpluses of provident manufacturers and producers before granting them any relief from price restrictions which create loss operations.

There is encountered a growing conviction that widespread financial exhaustion of productive units in our economy causes no great lament within OPA. There seems to be a growing feeling that—since the necessity for OPA is based primarily upon scarcities—those subsisting through their connection with OPA must look upon a perpetuation of scarcities primarily as a means of perpetuating their individual incomes and for gratifying whatever hunger they may have for power through the exercise of which scarcities are intensified and perpetuated.

It is not intended to suggest that all those in authority in OPA—or even those in highest authority—are so influenced. But a knowledge of the tenacity with which the "hitchhiking" fraternity grapevines itself into an underground obstruction to the viewpoints and policies of top personnel in such governmental agencies—causes one to wonder whether it may not require vigorous action and correspondingly vigorous publicity—by a sound congressional committee—to protect the public from the apparently accelerating disaster inspired by such anti-incentive thinking and plotting.

I have listened, in so-called advisory meetings, to apparently uabashed contentions of OPA personnel that it is the right and duty of OPA to decline to relieve OPA-oppressed producers until their surpluses are exhausted. The orders of OPA clearly reflect such intent. The pleas of manufacturers hopelessly trapped by OPA's regulations, to the point of surplus exhaustion and exhaustion of capacity for continuing employment, seem to fall upon unsympathetic official ears.

When, in addition, you consider the right of OPA to claim full credit for the delivery of our Nation again into the hands of ruthless gangsters and black-market racketeers why not put a complete end to OPA and let the natural vitality of American competitive enterprise reassert itself and begin, without further delay, to repair the damage done by blunderers and by schemers in official control positions?

Cordially,

JOHN W. ANDERSON, *President.*

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, when we were debating the renewal of the Emergency Price Control Act, I made a statement on this floor concerning some of the problems that were especially important in the field of rent control. I pointed out also that it was the policy of the Administrator for Rent to remove a community from rent control at the earliest possible moment. I should like to include here as part of my remarks a letter from Mr. Ivan D. Carson, Deputy Administrator for Rent, with a second memorandum on decontrols:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1945.

The Honorable GEORGE E. OUTLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I am enclosing a copy of Decontrol Memorandum No. 2 which we are sending to our field people.

In memorandum No. 1, which you very kindly put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we laid down the general policies to be followed. In this memorandum we are giving instructions to the field as to the type of reports they are to make. The instructions may appear to be unnecessarily detailed. However, it is necessary that we cover all types of situations, and you will note that in the third paragraph of the memorandum we mentioned that it will not be possible or desirable to obtain data on every item mentioned in the instructions. In other words, I believe it is clear that we do not expect the field to send us any more details than the particular situation warrants.

I would be very much interested if you would let me have your comments regarding the policy we have adopted with respect to decontrol and the methods we are following. I am very anxious that we comply in every respect with the intent of Congress.

I believe you will be interested to know that we expect to take two more decontrol actions early in July.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

IVAN D. CARSON,
Deputy Administrator for Rent.

REPORTS OF FIELD DECONTROL INVESTIGATIONS

All area rent directors should send to the regional rent executives and the regional rent executives should send to the national office their recommendations for decontrol as situations come to their attention indicating that decontrol may be in order. As soon as the national office receives a recommendation for decontrol from the field or obtains information in Washington that there has been a decline in war activitiy which may warrant decontrol, a preliminary study of the area will be made. The most important part of this preliminary study will usually be a field investigation. Requests for such field investigations will be sent to the regional rent executives, and they may designate an appropriate official in the regional, district, or area office to conduct each investigation.

The report on the field investigation should contain sufficient information to enable us to arrive at one of the following conclusions for an area or portion of an area:

1. Rent control is still needed and no further action is necessary, or

2. Rent control is no longer necessary and decontrol action can be taken without further investigation, or

3. It may be possible to decontrol, but a Bureau of Labor Statistics rent and vacancy survey is necessary before a final decision can be reached.

The outline which follows is intended as a guide for reports on field decontrol investigations. We realize that it will not be possible, nor even always desirable, to obtain data on every item in the outline nor to obtain all the details for each item. For example, none of the information on industrial establishments will be necessary for an area in which the only war activity is a single military establishment. On the other hand, there will frequently be aspects of the local rental situation not covered by the outline, which you will nevertheless want to include in your report because of their importance in a particular area.

Because of the urgency of all decontrol decisions, we should like every field investigation to be completed and a report transmitted to the national office within 2 weeks from the date the request for such an investigation is received by the regional rent executive.

OUTLINE FOR REPORTS ON FIELD DECONTROL INVESTIGATIONS

A. Status of war activities

1. Present Military or Naval Establishments

Obtain as much as possible of the following information from the commanding officer of each establishment:

(a) Type of activity and any prospective changes.

(b) Date of peak personnel and as of that date civilian employees, total military personnel, and military personnel living off the post.

(c) Similar personnel figures as of the present time.

(d) Prospects for increase or decrease in personnel. For an inactive establishment, the prospects for reactivation.

2. Present Industrial Establishments

Obtain as much as possible of the following information from the plant manager or personnel officer of each major war industrial establishment:

(a) Name, location, and type of products.

(b) Indicate whether engaged principally on prime contracts or subcontracts.

(c) Estimated date of completion of current war contracts or other war orders.

(d) Current employment, peak employment (give date), and anticipated changes during next 6 months.

(e) Cut-backs—date, products, amount, past or anticipated effect on employment, extent to which unemployed persons have withdrawn from the labor market (e. g., women who returned to their homes and no longer seek jobs).

(f) Reconversion plans and effect on employment.

3. New Activities in the Area

(a) Military or naval establishments: Information on plans for new military or naval establishments may be obtained from Army or Navy officials in the locality, the mayor, the chamber of commerce, and newspaper editors. For each establishment, obtain date of activation, type of activity, estimated initial personnel (civilian employees, total military, and military personnel expected to live off the post), and personnel 6 months after activation.

(b) Industrial establishments: Information on plans for new industrial establishments can usually be obtained from the chamber of commerce, the mayor, local businessmen, and newspaper editors. For such new industrial establishments, obtain the name, location, and type of products, estimated dates of completion of construction and start of operations, and estimated initial employment and employment 6 months after start of operations.

4. War Activities in Neighboring Areas

If there is a substantial demand for housing in the area as a result of war activities in neighboring areas, obtain for each war establishment which affects the area the same types of information as for the establishments in the area (see items 1 and 2 above). In addition, obtain information on the distance of these establishments from the cities in the area which are affected, commuting facilities, the number of persons who live in the area and commute to the war activity in the neighboring area, and any recent or anticipated changes in the number of people commuting.

B. Effect of decline in war activities on population, employment, rents, vacancies

1. Population (suggested sources: Mayors, chambers of commerce, newspaper editors, United States Employment Service):

(a) Extent of out-migration of population, if any.

(b) Estimated peak population of principal cities and date of peak.

(c) Estimated present population of principal cities.

(d) Anticipated increases or decreases in population.

2. Employment (suggested sources: United States Employment Service, mayors, chambers of commerce, newspaper editors):

(a) General trend of total employment in principal cities during last 6 months.

(b) Anticipated changes in total employment in near future.

3. Rents and sales prices (suggested sources: Mayors, chambers of commerce, real estate men, newspaper editors, labor organizations, ration boards):

(a) Extent of rent decreases, if any, during the past 6 months as result of decline in war activities. Specify whether decreases have occurred for high rent or low rent dwellings, and whether for those in good or poor condition.

(b) Prospective trend in rents if rent control should be removed. If possible, distinguish between the probability that there will be a few increases and the probability of a general rise in rents in the absence of rent control.

(c) Trend during past 6 months of number of sales of dwellings and sales prices.

4. Vacancies (suggested sources: Mayors, chambers of commerce, homes registration offices, real estate men, newspaper for-rent ads, labor organizations, newspaper editors, ration boards):

(a) Estimated number of vacant dwellings now and 6 months ago. Distinguish private from public housing, and furnished from unfurnished dwellings.

(b) Rent range of vacancies. Proportion among low-rental, medium-rental, and high-rental units.

(c) Condition of vacant dwellings. Indicate proportion in substandard and uninhabitable structures.

(d) Extent to which undoubling has reduced vacancies.

(e) Extent to which vacant dwellings have been removed from the rental market by owner occupancy, sale for owner occupancy, reabsorption into dwelling units from which previously separated by conversion.

(f) Vacancies in rooming houses and hotels.

(g) Extent of seasonal vacancies.

C. Opinions and recommendations as to need for continuing rent control

1. Obtain the opinions and recommendations as to the need for continuing rent control in the area from local officials and organizations. If possible, secure letters from these officials or their permission to quote their opinions. We are particularly interested in getting the opinions of the following: Mayors and other city officials, commanding officers of military or naval establishments, managers and personnel officers of war plants, chambers of commerce, real estate boards, labor organizations, newspaper editors.

2. Present your own summary of the rental situation and your opinions and recommendations as to the need for continuing rent control. Special attention should be given in your summary and recommendations to the possibility of removing rent control from a portion of an area (generally one or more counties) in those cases where it is clear that the principal city of the area still needs control.

Why Oppose Another Fascist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, using the above caption which refers to George Seldes, who for months by vicious, lying vilification has been attempting to destroy the confidence of American people in their elected Representatives by sending through the mails a sheet called In Fact, Eugene Lyons, who claims to be an old friend of Seldes, writes a piece about him.

Congress does not seem to have the courage or the inclination, whichever it may be, to call him before a committee, put him under oath, and compel him to either substantiate his statements or to admit that he is an unmitigated liar.

Eugene Lyons, in the New Dealer of June 23, 1945, takes a pot shot at Seldes in the following manner, and I quote:

I EXPOSE ANOTHER FASCIST—ONE RED-BAITER DEBUNKS ANOTHER

I propose, in this article, to perpetrate a dirty trick. My only excuse is that the victim richly deserves it. The trick begins with a quotation. In fact, it will be largely composed of quotes throughout. Read the starter, not for its originality but for its vigor. The author is one guy who doesn't pull his punches:

"Freedom has ceased to exist in Russia. There is no democracy. It is not wanted. Only American apologists for the Soviets have ever pretended there was democracy in Russia * * * Freedom, liberty, justice, as we know it, democracy, all the fundamental human rights for which the world has been fighting for civilized centuries, have been abolished in Russia in order that the Communist experiment might be made. They have been kept suppressed by the Cheka-GPU. * * * The terror is in the mind and marrow of the present generation, and nothing but generations of freedom and liberty will ever root it out."

Hold your seats—I am about to reveal the authorship of this toothsome quote. It is none other than that great debunking journalist, today the editor and publisher of that ugly duckling of gutter journalism, the hysterical little smear sheet, In Fact. Yes; George Seldes. If you doubt me, turn to pages 172–173 of his opus You Can't Print That.

What makes it a dirty trick, of course, is that the Seldes book was published in 1929. It is not quite fair to dig up a man's outmoded opinions. Consistency is an overrated virtue—provided a man explains how and why he changed his mind. Unfortunately, George has never explained his great conversion. As far as I know, he has never informed his adoring public when the supreme moment of enlightenment dazzled him and purged his mind of those libels of Soviet democracy which fill about 15 years of his published works.

The only certainty is that it transpired suddenly and dramatically somewhere deep within his conscience. He did not go back to Russia, from which he had been expelled for attempting to report some truths, to check on his first sad impressions. The reconciliation—the golden reconciliation—occurred at long range. His one experience in Moscow, rudely interrupted by the GPU, apparently convinced him permanently that admiration from afar is healthier, not to say easier.

Though the volume from which I lifted the quoted sentences was published in 1929, and never subsequently repudiated, its author continued to write and speak in the same unkind style at least until 1937. That much I can attest personally. In that year he contributed a chapter to a book which I edited for Harcourt-Brace, I Cover the World, and I saw a good deal of George. I was working on Assignment in Utopia at the time. As one author to another, I showed him passages. And at my dinner table on the West Side, in the presence of his new wife and my old one, he razzed me good-naturedly about how long it had taken me to catch on to the fact that Russian bolshevism was only another version of Italian fascism, except worse. He reminded me, rightly, that in our occasional meetings on the European Continent he had tried to set me right on this great truth. Ah, the good old days before George was converted and Gene was unconverted * * * may they never, never return.

What started me on my dirty trick was a telephone call. A friend wanted to know whether I'd read the latest attack on me in In Fact. I hadn't, but I guessed right off, with amazing accuracy, that George probably called me a Fascist. My interlocutor was impressed by this insight. But it was really

a cinch. I happen to know George's definition of a Fascist—namely, anyone who speaks ill of the Soviet dictator and his works at home and abroad—and by that definition I certainly qualified.

Then I got to thinking of the good old days when George was still a Fascist; that is to say, when he was lambasting the Kremlin and its minions. I searched my shelves for some memento of that epoch and found Yau Can't Print That. I began to leaf through its pages, nostalgically. And I discovered that if, by his current definition, I am a Fascist, then Comrade Seldes, in his previous incarnation, was a super-duper Fascist. I don't mean that he went further in his indictment of the terror and horror in the USSR than I, but simply that his style was so much more energetic, more slashing and swishing than I could hope to achieve. After all, he had been trained by the Chicago Tribune, whereas I, alas, passed my journalistic novitiate with the politer journals of opinion.

How, for instance, could I hope to achieve in my lumbering Fascist outbursts such pyrotechnic vigor as this, from George's introduction to the book, in a passage referring to Russia, Italy, and other dictatorships:

"Almost half of Europe is governed by violence and terrorism. Proclaim liberty tomorrow and you would have revolutions in 20 countries. * * * It is not true that the people of Soviet Russia are happy or that the people of Italy are happy with their dictatorships, or that the parliamentary system has failed. Suppression by force does not mean failure. * * * The bond dealers and the tourists and the noted magazine writers in advance in accordance with the views and instructions of their editors may tell you differently, but the resident reporters know it is not so."

A bit further his social passion takes the form of a rhetorical question:

"If America and England—the public, not the politicians—had known the facts of March 1917, could they not have insured a Russian democratic revolution without bolshevism?"

His answer, of course, is that they could have done so. This complaint that intervention was not vigorous enough, that democratic foreign support of the interim democratic regime under Kerensky was not adequate, certainly exceeds my own modest contribution to fascism. I am ashamed by the contrast. I yield to Comrade Seldes. Merely to humble myself and to polish up his Fascist laurels, I shall quote some more. It is in the body of the book, in the chapters on Russia, that George does it with all the stops pulled out. It will pay you to read the stuff, just to see what "red baiting" in the raw is really like. I give you my word as an expert and connoisseur.

He begins with an all-out attack on Moscow censorship: "There were revolts" against the Government during his sojourn in the Red capital, he reports. "There were serious troubles between the Government and the American Relief. There were splits in the Communist Party. There were, in short, news items which were tremendous in those days." But, alas, he could not send them. Some he "smuggled out through the American diplomatically immune mail pouches." But the rest had to wait until he was expelled. His expulsion, moreover, was no surprise to him. He was ready to risk it for a story worth the risk and the arrest of some Catholic priests was it.

And so he left "the crawling, rat-infested, Soviet official hotel" where he had been constantly watched by the police. At that he was lucky, for, as he attests, other "representatives of American papers who did not carry American passports fared badly." He mentions names and places: a certain Popoff who was "imprisoned and terrorized," a certain Mikhailoff of the Associated Press, who "was exiled to Solovetsky, the vast white wilderness of an island in the Arctic where nature and starvation and disease play the role of Bolshevik executioner." Seldes overdraws a bit—what can you expect from Fascists?—the said Mikhailov survived to work again for the American press and to be properly liquidated many years later.

His chapter on the Third Internationale alone should guarantee Seldes a niche in the Fascist hall of fame. The chapter is entitled "The Red World Plot"—there's the Tribune touch, inimitable—and begins with the following summation:

"It is an open and shut conspiracy. * * * The same leaders who meet one day as premier and cabinet of Russia, meet the following day as heads of the Communist Party and on another day as chiefs of the Third Internationale. No plot against the safety and forms of government of other nations has ever been carried on on such a vast scale and with such trumpeting and drumming."

Even the smell of the Internationale offends Mr. Seldes. His delicate nostrils are "overwhelmed with "the news that washing water is scarce in all holy Russia." He tells how in secret sessions "arrangements are made for money and propaganda via the Soviet Embassies, Legations, consulates, trade missions, and other agencies in many lands," including the United States of America. Elsewhere in the book he illustrates the methods of the Internationale by exposing a Communist plot to poison all of the Western Hemisphere centered in Mexico City, while Comrade Kollontai was in command.

His chapter The Terror in Russia Continues, is identified as being a report written for Senator McCormick for use in a congressional committee. The Senator certainly got an earful of murder, torture, and ugliness, rising to this peroration about the GPU.

"By its never-ceasing persecution it has smothered all liberty of expression, it has cowed the souls of the people, it has continued a reign of terror which makes bolshevism supreme, and will not let any change or liberalizing movement come into Soviet Russia."

George Seldes blames America for saving the regime of horror which he exposes. As an American, his conscience is bothered and he puts the matter straight.

"The Soviet Government survived," he insists, "thanks to the American people feeding its millions during the worst period of the regime. Only professional Communists believe it could have come through the crisis and still maintain its power. Gradually the American Relief Administration withdrew from Russia. As it left the frontiers, it could hear the insults which continued to be directed at it from Moscow. In all history there is probably no parallel case of such wholesale national biting of the hand which fed them."

Only in one passage does Seldes slip briefly from his role of procurator against the Russian Revolution. That is when he runs into a woman of the former rich classes, a daughter of the Morozovs, who tells him that despite everything there has been a "moral regeneration of Russia under the Bolsheviks." But by the end of that passage he redeems his all-Fascist standing. He reveals that this one exception was liquidated. "For days and nights she was tortured in the Cheka prison," he attests. "When we saw her again, it was in a sanitarium. She had gone mad. So if you want to hear about the regeneration of Russia under the Bolsheviks, you will have to read elsewhere."

Elsewhere? But where? The Seldes book doesn't say. But I can give you the answer. If you want to read about the moral regeneration of Russia under the Bolsheviks, you will find it any week in In Fact. There is no danger of its editor being liquidated, as Madame Morozov was liquidated, because the regeneration has not yet hit America. If he ends up in a sanitarium, which is not impossible, it will be for quite other and more clinical reasons.

You remember the old story of the judge who, after listening to the opposing lawyers describe each other, closed the discussion with the mild statement that he did not disagree with either.

New Warsaw Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Barnet Nover from the Washington Post of June 26, 1945:

NEW WARSAW REGIME
(By Barnet Nover)
SOLUTION OF THE POLISH PROBLEM?

It is the axiom of axioms in the world today that unless there is harmony and unity among the great powers, and particularly among the Big Three, there can be no real progress toward peace, no real security, no hope for a better world. This fact the San Francisco Charter did not create but only underlined.

Up to now the most thorny and troublesome matter (though by no means the only one) disturbing Anglo-Russian-American relations has been the Polish problem. It has been the source of endless friction among them. Nor did this friction disappear when, at Yalta, what was proclaimed as a satisfactory compromise solution was achieved.

That compromise consisted of acceptance by Great Britain and the United States of the Russian claim to territory east of the so-called Curzon line and Russian acceptance of a scheme by virtue of which Poland was to get a truly democratic and representative government.

In this, as in so many other particulars, Yalta proved to be a snare and a delusion.

For 4 months no progress was made in the direction of broadening the base of the existing Warsaw regime as desired by London and Washington. During all that time the Soviet-sponsored government at Warsaw continued to function with the Kremlin seeking continuously to get Britain and the United States to recognize that regime.

It was only after Mr. Harry Hopkins' latest visit to Moscow and his conversations with Marshal Stalin that the deadlock was finally broken. A new attempt to carry out the Yalta agreement regarding the government of Poland was then made. Ostensibly, it has achieved success, hence the rejoicing in London and Washington.

Since the new Polish regime is to include such Polish leaders as Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Premier of the Polish Government at London, Jan Stanczyk, Prof. Stanislaw Grabski and Wicenty Witos it can be argued that the letter of the Yalta plan has now been carried out. For at Yalta it was agreed that: "The provisional government which is now functioning in Poland should * * * be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

Perhaps, in view of the fact that this development does contribute, for the time being at least, to Anglo-Russian-American unity we should not look the gift horse too closely in the mouth. Such an attitude of

uncritical enthusiasm, however, is not without its dangers. It may have bitter disillusionment as its sequel.

The question that must be asked of the new Polish Government is: How really democratic is it?

It is true that the Soviet-sponsored Warsaw regime has been enriched with new blood. But of the 21 members of the new government 16 are hold-overs, and of the 5 new members of the Cabinet, 1, Wicenty Witos, Peasant Party leader, is an old and ailing man; another, Meczislaw Thugot, is without political experience and known only as the son of a distinguished democratic intellectual who died in exile 2 years ago.

If Messrs. Mikolajczk, Grabski, and Stanczyk prove strong enough to make their influence felt in the new regime the hopes engendered by the Moscow settlement may be realized. At the moment the fact remains that they are outnumbered in the Government by at least 4 to 1, with most of the principal posts, including the administration of the police, in the hands of Lublinites, i. e., of Polish Communists.

Of course, the composition of the new Polish regime is far less important, since it is admittedly a provisional government, than the policies it will pursue, particularly the manner in which it will prepare for and hold those "free and unfettered elections * * * on the basis of universal and secret ballot" that are stipulated in the Yalta agreement.

If such elections are really held and held as soon as possible (this also was agreed on at Yalta), Poland would for the first time in years be governed by a regime that the world could rightly regard as free, independent, and democratic.

Yet what assurance do we have that, once the new Warsaw regime has been recognized, it will carry out that pledge? In other words what assurance is there that Mikolajczyk and the other non-Lublin Poles in the new Government will not in actuality turn out to be prisoners of the regime?

It is of the utmost importance, then, that before the United States recognizes the new Polish regime the American Government be given very explicit assurances that the regime will, in effect, be democratic and will hold free and unfettered elections. And coupled with such assurances must be the immediate admission into Poland not only of an official American mission, but also of American newspapermen.

News regarding developments in Poland have hitherto reached us only by way of Moscow or London. It is high time we got the news direct, from our own observers.

The Problem of National Nutrition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address I made before the fifty-sixth annual business meeting of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association at O'Neill, Nebr., June 16, 1945, on the problem of national nutrition:

When I say that it is a pleasure and a great honor to address you at this time, I am not merely indulging in the conventional complimentary remarks. I have a high regard for this group and all of your activities. Your organization performs a most useful function. The country has good reasons to be proud and grateful to your fine contribution to the food needs of the world.

This little story will explain to you why I will try to keep my speech within the bounds of 25 minutes:

In a little suburban church in Washington, which I sometimes attend, there comes with great regularity a man with his dog. The man goes inside to worship and the dog lies outside to wait. If, however, the sermon lasts longer than 20 minutes, the dog puts his head inside the church door and looks inquiringly up the aisle to where the preacher is standing. This dog is a great favorite with the members of the congregation.

Now, I am not here to give you advice. I think I am too old to take advice and perhaps too young to give advice. Recently a man went into a cheap restaurant and began to give advice on how he wanted the porterhouse steak fixed. He wanted it 1½ inches thick, crisp on the outside, and oozing blood. "Can you give me a steak like that?" "Gosh, no," said the proprietor, "If I had a steak like that, I'd eat it myself." That's the way I feel about giving you advice. If I had any good enough, I'd eat it myself.

We in America, like the rest of the world, are passing through a critical period and from one stage of life to another. The actual fighting in Europe is over, but the problems of peace are assuming tremendous importance. We still have a nasty, difficult road to travel in defeating our brutal Japanese enemies.

The world has been facing a crisis in the matter of food. Meat is the No. 1 problem in this crisis. Millions of people, liberated and otherwise, are living a starved life because they lack protein, which is essentially meat. The problem of feeding a hungry world is a part of our responsibility because we know that stable free governments cannot be built by frantic starving people. Someone has said that there are only nine meals between man and revolution. This is being demonstrated in liberated Europe. The peace we pray for can never be built or kept while great nations of people are grievously undernourished. This country faces the double task of feeding our own people and helping the rest of the world to get on its feet. The greatest factor in this problem is the matter of adequate food supply.

There is an old proverb which says, "Tell me what you eat and I'll tell you what you are." There is also an old saying that "Man is what he eats," and that "An army marches on its stomach." Certainly, food concerns more people directly than any other thing in our war effort. A nation's strength depends on its people's strength, and the strength of th people depends to a large extent on the type of food they eat. Food is a weapon of war just as much as the machine gun, the airplane, and the bomb. The Germans subdued and conquered countries by the master-slave relationship which meant the control of all food.

The food committee in both the House and the Senate have directed rather strong criticism at the Government for its method of growing, distribution, and processing of food. They gave a blistering report on meat. There is no question but what the blundering, inept methods adopted by the several Government agencies are responsible for our present shortage of meat. There are a score of Federal agencies that have their finger in the production and distribution of sugar. Many do not see eye to eye. Is there any wonder that there is a shortage of sugar, as well as other foods?

One might ask, Why is meat so important to our Nation and the world? I shall try to answer, in part, this question.

From the beginning of time, meat has been one of the principal articles of the human diet. Primitive man chose it instinctively from the satisfaction it gave him. The human body is especially adapted to the consumption and digestion of food from animal sources. Well-cooked meat looks appetizing and tastes good. It stimulates the flow of the digestive juice from mouth to the stomach and thus aids digestion. The proteins found in meat make up a part of every cell, every tissue, every organ in the body. Proteins are needed to make blood and supply the glands, to repair tissue and produce energy to work. All meat is rich in proteins, vitamins, minerals, and needed fat. The vitamins of thiamin, riboflavin, and niacin, with the minerals of iron and phosphorus, are found in meat and are necessary to growth and good health. Nature has endowed no other food so lavishly as meat. Among the protein foods, it stands supreme. Meat is a masterpiece of nature's laboratories.

Truly, the functions of proteins in the body are astonishingly manifold. Every day of our lives, from the first day to the last, we use up not only the energies but the tissues that make up our bodies. The muscles, the glands, and the corpuscles are constantly wearing out. Proteins in meat provide the repair parts and it must be carried on continuously to keep this complex human machine of ours working.

There are also 22 amino acids in meat. Ten of these acids the body must have if it is to be kept healthy. The proteins, the acids, and the vitamins of meat are required not only for repairs but to increase new tissue which means growth.

The OPA has recently announced that each citizen might expect 115 pounds of meat per year in 1945. One need only look at the 50 red points allocated per month for meat, butter, cooking fats, and cheese to realize that, with meat averaging 12 points a pound, if you spent all your points for meat, you could not get more than 50 pounds in a year. The housewife must buy her butter, the fats, and the cheese from the same red points.

Your body needs so much protein to maintain good health, regardless of points allocated by the OPA. You need meat proteins every day, because you do not store up a reserve as in the case of sugar and fat. Meat, regardless of kind, cut, or point value, furnishes the same type and quality of proteins, vitamins, and minerals. Meat contains proteins as high as 35 percent after cooking and is 98 percent digestible.

We have often heard that the American people are the best-fed people in the world, and I believe they are. Yet when we examine selective-service records, we are startled by the fact that about one-third of the young men called up for draft were undernourished. These same young men, when placed in the Army on an adequate, well-balanced diet, gained from 10 to 20 pounds. According to Dr. Thomas Parran, the Director of the United States Public Health Service, 40 percent of our population is on a diet which is lacking in meat, fruit, vegetables, and dairy products. Morale, stamina, courage, and endurance depend to a large extent on good nutrition. An adequate food supply is as important a part of modern warfare as the machines with which it is waged. There is no question but that we do have the finest agricultural development in the world. We can produce. There is some question about how our food is being distributed and how our surpluses might be preserved.

Of the 700,000,000 head of cattle in the world some 160,000,000 are in India. Yet the Hindu in India will never kill any living animal or insect. India has about 470 people per square mile. An average of between four and five million people starve to death every year. The average age of life in India is less than 20 years. In America it approaches threescore years.

I have seen the half-starved, spindle-legged, pot-bellied, emaciated, bastard children of India, China, and Bataan. I have seen these naked, half-starved children by the thousands patting their empty bellies

and holding up a begging arm to approaching boats, saying, "No papa, no mamma, no whisky soda," which is a way of saying, "We need food." Millions of these children have never known what it is to have a full belly. If they do eat, it is a handful of rice lacking the proteins, vitamins, and minerals of good meat. I have seen Chinese children eating rats, cats, and dogs, craving a little protein. The countries of India and China, whose major diet is cereal and vegetables, certainly cannot be rated as a physically strong country. In the past hundreds of years they have neglected to maintain the fertility of their soil or adopt modern methods of farming, which would add to their diet.

As a physician, I am convinced that I have seen many scrawny, undernourished kids who were sickly because mother may have found it more convenient to feed that youngster out of a bottle or give it some prepared cereal without enough fresh fruit, vegetables, and essential meat products.

When that boy of yours rolls up his sleeves and says, "Dad, look at my muscles," he is telling you that he has buoyant, vigorous health because he has had the right kinds of food with minerals and vitamins which make the body and muscles grow. It means the glands of his body with its hormones and internal secretions have been able to function properly. That boy or girl of yours needs proteins not only before he is born, but during the nursing period, the growing period, and during his manhood to keep his body in repair and furnish energy. The proteins of animal origin, meat, fish, fowl, milk, and eggs are of the highest quality.

You might have a full dinnerpail and yet have a form of starvation if you lack the necessary proteins, minerals, and vitamins. Improperly balanced meals may cause undernutrition.

Every stockman knows that when a calf drops on a prairie, that, as soon as it is licked off, its first instinct is to find food. Without food, it soon dies. You also know there is a vast difference between the skimmed milk pig or calf and the one that suckles its mother.

The causes of malnutrition are numerous. It is a big job educating 130,000,000 people and making them conscious of the necessity of a properly balanced diet. Government agencies, through Public Health and their agricultural divisions, should assist in attacking the problem on the home front where people live, work, and eat three meals a day. There are too many Government agencies today working overtime, trying to find substitutes for meat and animal products. They try to crowd the hog away from the trough and the steer out of the feed lot. These substitutes generally lack some of the necessary acids, vitamins, and minerals contained in meat, milk, and butter. That is one reason for the vitamin business which has grown in astronomical proportions. I believe there ought to be more control over the promiscuous sale of shotgun vitamins. I do believe that vitamin therapy under a doctor's guidance is necessary for some people but it does not take the place of good meat, vegetables, fruit, and home cooking. The vitamin business has grown because Government has been urging substitutes for natural foods.

The Government should give more encouragement to scientists who, in their libraries and laboratories, may contribute more to the art of good eating and discovering new ways of utilizing the products of meat. There have been entirely too many advertisers serving as the only contact to society. Much bunk has been permitted to stream out over the radio and through the mails about vitamins and other foods. Not sufficient emphasis is being placed upon the value of meat. Research and science can play a great part in discovering new uses for meat and its byproducts. They can open up new fields and opportunities that are almost unlimited in pointing out the value of meat.

The war has called for new stock-taking as it relates to food, and more particularly, meat. Conquered nations, if they are to retain their health and strength, must have good nutrition. Our soldiers receive about 250 pounds of meat per year. They need this meat and protein to supply their bodies with energy. Meat is a good yardstick of protein value.

The modern knowledge of nutrition must be given to the people in simple, practical terms. Modern knowledge of production should be given to the farmer and the cattleman. Producers must be able to get materials and tools and to apply the methods necessary to increase the world's production to a point where all can have enough food. The Government's nutritional program should become the core of agriculture planning for abundance.

Workers in cities must be able to get the products they need from an expanding agricultural production program. This Nation must give earnest consideration to the adoption of policies designed to insure sufficient food to those who, for one reason or another, are at a disadvantage in our economic system and cannot find means for a reasonable nutrition. Our Government should encourage research and science in discovering new uses for meat and its byproducts. This will open up opportunities that are almost unlimited. We have hardly scratched the surface so far as completing our knowledge about the value of meat.

We should probe into the evidence of malnutrition to find its actual causes and how to eliminate it so this Nation may remain strong and self-sustaining. We must know more about the chemistry of food and the vitamins in food. In doing this, we eliminate the cause of human malnutrition and deficiencies which have plagued us for centuries.

Our new director of agriculture, Mr. CLINTON ANDERSON, believes in a program of abundance. We can all remember the time when our Government actually destroyed little pigs and other food in this country. The farmers were paid not to produce. At the same time, we brought in billions of dollars worth of farm products from other countries. Within the last year, the Department of Agriculture seriously considered paying every farmer a bonus of $1 for the hens he would bring to market. They wanted to reduce our egg-laying hens. In many cities today, people stand in line, take a number, and hope that they may get two or three eggs for the family. Yes, it hasn't been very long since we witnessed the ironic spectacle of goods to eat going to waste in farms and orchards just because the prices did not pay for harvesting and marketing the crop. At the same time, there were millions of people in the world who wanted and needed food. The economy of scarcity ended with a world facing the fact that one-third of our people were undernourished. With full employment the country will be eating 30 percent more meat in 1950 that they ate in 1935.

We used billions of dollars of Federal funds to solve the farmer's problems and we did not succeed before the war, either in establishing a stable and adequate price to the farmer, or a stable and adequate food supply for our people. We need a new approach to the entire food subject. We must abandon the planned idea of scarcity and accept the economy of abundance. We must think in terms of new uses for meat and agricultural products instead of suggesting that we grow less. We must think in terms of how to encourage and reward big production, hard work, and the skill of the cattle-raiser and farmer instead of paying to suppress his ability and skill.

We probably never had an overproduction, even though there were surpluses which hung menacingly over our food markets. These surpluses coincided with unemployment of labor and capital. Many people were hungry and malnourished; factories were closed; gluts of food could not be distributed; capital reserves were frozen; men could not find work. People eat less during periods of depression. They eat cheaper foods. They fail to eat meat which contains proteins, acids, minerals, and vitamins, which are so essential to good health, because meat costs more.

About two-thirds of the world's people are still engaged in some agricultural pursuits, yet many of them are undernourished. We need to preserve the good farm and grass lands in the United States. Fertilizer will be needed. New developments will help change our agricultural economy and be beneficial to the farmers of our Nation. It will mean a more efficient and prosperous agriculture everywhere. Our methods of distribution will be so greatly improved that trade with all parts of the earth will be swift and easy. We will pay less attention to producing for our own local needs. The world has grown small. The cattlemen of Nebraska tomorrow should be able to supply their meat not only to New York but to the Chinamen.

I am glad to have the opportunity of being here because every meeting of this kind gives me a better idea of your problems. It helps me in my deliberations in Washington. It helps me to cooperate with the cattlemen of the country. Speaking of cooperation, someone has said that real cooperation would be the spectacle of a Methodist bishop umpiring a Sunday ball game between the Knights of Columbus and the Ku Klux Klan for the benefit of Jewish charities.

In the course of my remarks, if I have spoken a word about nutrition that arrests your attention and aids in your deliberation or stimulates your thinking, then my ambition has been satisfied.

Stockmen of the country are in a position to exert a powerful influence upon Washington. You are needed in politics and economics. You are needed in society, the community, and the Nation. You have a duty to perform to the Nation in the production of meat. I know you will avoid the tragic consequences of inaction and indecision. You are strong enough and will have the courage and determination to go forward vigorously and fearlessly, performing a job before you. Then, when our men in khaki return from world wars, they will know that the cattlemen have carried on producing the meat so badly needed by all people.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Gettysburg (Pa.) Times of June 26, 1945:

SOLDIER ROTH IS OPPOSED TO "PEACE DRAFT"

Compulsory military training in peacetime is a much debated question. Congress will decide. General Eisenhower and General Marshall are in favor of the plan. Some Members of Congress favor it. Some oppose it.

The Gettysburg Times asked Pfc G. Henry Roth, member of its editorial staff now on leave while serving in the armed forces, to express his opinion on the question. Pfc Roth is at Camp Wheeler, Ga.

This is what he wrote about the peacetime military service:

"In the first place France, Poland, Belgium, etc., all had compulsory military education prior to the present war. I recall military experts prior to 1940 saying France had the greatest army in the world, with millions of trained men to call to the colors. Need I labor that point?

"Having had some small experience with the training of troops—a statement with which possibly you can agree—I think the greatest delusion we can have is to believe that we can call men who have been in the Army a year, and have then been out several years, trained troops.

"Take for example Joe Doaks, resident of Adams County, Pa. Joe is called up in his eighteenth year and spends his year in the Army. To begin with Joe thinks the whole matter a joke. There's no war going on, Joe is 18 and knows all there is in the world, the Army can't do anything to him anyway if he doesn't learn—so Joe wastes his year in the Army. How do I know Joe feels like this—well, the 18-year-old Doaks boys for the most part feel that way now while there is a war going on."

PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENT

"Joe ends his year as Pvt. Joe Doaks and goes home in a little better physical condition than when he joined, a splendid knowledge of tricks to employ in order to get out of work, and a confused memory of how to do flanking movements in close-order drill.

"America looks upon Joe as a thoroughly trained man and Joe, his old man, his mother, sister Julie and even aunt Mamie are content—there are millions of fine, trained young flower of a Nation's youth, like Joe, ready and available if trouble starts.

"When the need comes, as it frequently does in international as well as domestic relations for consideration and compromise, what happens? Joe's second cousin once removed, who is a Congressman because the electorate was blind and deaf as well as dumb, rises in the House.

"Congressman Doaks addresses a hushed assembly. 'There are 10,000,000 stalwart, well-trained youths, the pride of a Nation, ready to rise overnight to defend their Nation's sovereignty and honor,' says the Congressman. 'We will not tolerate this gross insult to our fair Nation.' The next morning the Doaks family reads what the Congressman said and the entire family nods its head in agreement—have they not their Joe as evidence, is he not well trained, well qualified, is he not ready? And poor Joe, who has been training in barrooms and taverns these last 5 years springs heavily to his feet, pushes his paunch back by tightening his belt, looks wildly about and says, 'Bring on the enemy. I can lick him any Wednesday before breakfast.' He seems to recall faintly that someone made that statement before but he can't quite recall that the speaker was an American admiral and the enemy to which he was referring was Japan. The admiral, by the way, must be getting mighty hungry by now."

GET A BEATING

"So off we go and our well-trained troops take a terrific beating and nobody can understand why.

"Just as an example of why the training of troops in advance of war is useless, consider the present war—who, trained in, let us say, 1930, would be able to enter our Army today, and without being retrained, be able to use the new weapons that have been developed or understand the new tactical organizations? Many things have changed two or three times in the 11 months I've been in the army. I've had to undergo continuous training in order to keep up with new developments. If there can be so many changes in less than a year what would occur in 5 or 10 years?

"Thus Joe Doaks would have to be physically reconditioned, retrained in weapons and tactics if he is to be of use to the Army and thus it would still take as long to retrain him as it would to train a brand new recruit.

"So, for my money, the Nation would be far better off spending $1,000,000 a year for better relations between nations than spending $10,000,000, or some comparable sum, pretending to give military education to everybody."

IMPLIES A FIGHT

"And while we're on the subject, compulsory military education implies that eventually we are going to fight someone. If so who are we going to fight—the Germans? The Japs? If we have to fight them then someone will have to make some very obvious mistakes after the war. The British? The Russians? If anyone can give me one reason why the United States will ever have to fight the British or Russians then my only answer would be—fight them now and get it over with while the Army and Navy are still at their peak. And, honestly, there is absolutely no reason why Britain, Russia, and the United States should fight except for the stupidity of people who think that they should.

"Just as a side remark on the Russian situation. Sometimes one wonders why the Reds are hard to get along with at times. Well, most of the trouble occurred after a certain United States Senator went to Italy and in an address to troops there asked the GI's whether they were ready for the war with Russia? Can you imagine what would happen if the situation were reversed and a high Russian Government official asked Russian troops if they were ready to fight the United States? Every American would be crying for vengeance—and it is to the credit of the Russians that they took into consideration that all donkeys must bray, and some on occasions get elected to the Senate. Just as a side note—the Senator, when the soldiers protested against his smug assertion that we should fight the Russians immediately issued a statement that the soldiers who protested were Communists. If they were Communists in repudiating and protesting such an irresponsible and highly dangerous speech, then, brother, my name is Stalin and I'm one of the most crimson of the Reds."

Effect on Agriculture of OPA Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Omar C. Spencer, of Portland, Oreg., commenting upon what he describes as an inexcusable mess in the field of agriculture resulting from faulty OPA administration. The letter was printed in a recent issue of the Portland Oregonian, and was called to my attention by my former colleague, Senator Holman.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE EDITOR:

While no one in this country is starving yet we seem to be in trouble over our food supply, either because of a shortage or wrong distribution or something. Our various governmental planners make excuses, offer alibis, quote statistics, grind out revised forms and issue new regulations, but the food situation seems to be growing worse. For a country with approximately 6,000,000 farms and unlimited capacity in food production, certainly this is an inexcusable mess.

Here is a simple illustration of one thing that has happened: My wife and I own a 750-acre farm and we have tried to crowd it to its utmost capacity in the production of food. Heretofore the farm produced 1 ton (about 1,000 quarts) of milk per day; now it produces none. Heretofore we fed and turned off from the farm each year 200 to 300 head of cattle; now we are not feeding any. Heretofore we shipped and sold one case (30 dozen) of eggs a day; now we have no eggs to sell. Multiply our example by thousands and you have a condition which every intelligent farmer knew was being brought about by the planners as much as 3 years ago.

The reason is simple. The governmental planners permitted fantastic wages and incredibly short hours in war industries to lure away part of farm labor and when the city draft boards got through with their work, there was little farm labor left. None of us operating farms has been concerned about making money, but we have been desperately anxious to do our part in the matter of producing food. Of course, the uncertain margin between farm costs and income and the restrictions and handicaps thrown around our getting essential farm machinery have not helped.

No wonder the President is seeking information from all sources and the new Secretary of Agriculture proposes to investigate. It is high time, but unfortunately the planenrs have done their work and our food situation is badly out of gear.

OMAR C. SPENCER.

SAUVIES ISLAND.

The San Francisco Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio speech delivered by me in Milwaukee, Wis., over radio station WTMJ on June 23, 1945:

At this very hour in San Francisco, the United Nations—50 in all, embracing more than nine-tenths of the world's population—are writing the last sentences in a new and hopeful chapter in human affairs.

Next Tuesday this chapter will be completed, and that will be a historic day—quite as historic as VE-day and destined, I believe, to be even more fateful for the future welfare of long-suffering mankind.

In spite of the defeatism of men of little faith and the loud clamors of professional prophets of doom, they have succeeded in framing a basic charter for international organization. The very process of accomplishing this provides a shining example of how international differences can be reconciled by peaceful debate, by patient effort, by a reasonable give-and-take in matters of special interest.

The San Francisco Charter will not be perfect. But it will be fundamentally sound, flexible enough to admit all kinds of improvements, and I unhesitatingly predict that for generations to come, all over the world, among peace-loving people everywhere, it will stand as a great milestone in mankind's long and painful struggle up-

ward toward the light, toward the age-old dream of the human race for a world of peace and justice and security, free at last of the scourge of war.

We Americans can be proud of the initiative we have taken in achieving this goal. We can be proud, too, of the decisive role we have played at San Francisco under the firm and able hand of President Harry S. Truman, already universally recognized as a great statesman, who will go on the radio next Tuesday to deliver the final address to the Conference which he did so much to speed to success.

Yes, we have won a great victory—and by "we" I do not mean our own or any other one nation, but the peoples of all the United Nations, large and small. All of us can and will work together to put down international anarchy and stop potential aggressors dead in their tracks, for in a lawless world it is the small and weak who are the first to suffer.

But it would be fatal at this time to lose our perspective.

Let us keep clear of dangerous illusions. It is more necessary than ever that we see quite clearly just where we stand, and what lies ahead.

We have taken a big step forward—but it is only the first step, and not the last, on the uphill climb to world security.

The fight for lasting international peace, begun years ago under the far-sighted leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, has not yet been won by any means.

Promising as it is, the San Francisco Charter will remain a mere blueprint until it is formally ratified by the governments involved, our own included. Already there are disturbing voices in the land crying out against it for one reason or another, some going to the length of characterizing it as a hoax or a fraud because they dislike this or that paragraph in it. There are those in the lunatic fringe—and some of them are very substantial citizens—who go so far as to denounce it in wild hysterical terms as an abomination.

This is ridiculous, of course, but cannot safely be ignored.

In light of our experience after the last war we must never forget that the San Francisco Charter requires a two-thirds vote in the United States Senate for ratification—that the opposition of 33 men can kill it.

Now, there can be not the slightest doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American people, especially of our men in uniform who have been and are still dying on the battlefield in our cause, are in favor of the most effective and the closest possible international cooperation to secure peace. I heard General Eisenhower tell the Congress only last Monday of the passionate desire of our boys in uniform for a world of lasting peace.

Even opponents of world organization in general and critics of the San Francisco Charter in particular represent themselves as men of peace, and many of them are sincerely so. Only a small but highly vociferous minority are plain wreckers intent on sabotaging the world's attempt to right itself and achieve the largest possible measure of stability after the worst cataclysm of history. These men live on chaos and confussion, and have no respect for any but their own narrow and arrogant opinions.

But I submit that almost all of these critics, even the men of good will among them, are not at the moment constructively serving the cause of peace they profess to favor.

Some are given to petty fault-finding, aided and abetted by certain sections of the press which have made mountains of molehills. Instead of emphasizing the extraordinarily wide area of agreement among the nations at the San Francisco Conference, they have sought to enlarge the narrow areas of disagreement. They have attempted to make major crises of minor differences which were later easily ironed out after calm and judicious exploration of conflicting points of view.

Sometimes it has seemed from reading certain newspapers and the statements of some public figures that the proceedings at San Francisco should have been reported on the sports page—score 1 for the Russians, score 2 for Britain, score 3 for the United States—as if we were witnessing a track meet at which each and every nation was striving to carry off the honors.

But the simple, obvious fact is, of course, that all of us will be winners—or all of us be losers—and not only us, but our children and our grandchildren, for what is at stake is the fate of the world for generations to come.

But more dangerous than the petty fault-finders and the light-hearted irresponsibles are the perfectionists, the advocates of the impossible. They are, for the most part men of integrity and imagination, but they face us with an impossible choice.

Let us have a perfect peace, they say, or none at all.

Nothing could be more socially, economically, or politically naive.

That is not the way the world works—that is not the way enduring institutions are built. That is not the way our own local, State, and National Governments were established.

In their more sensible and realistic moments these men well know Rome was not built in a day. They are well aware that every new departure in human affairs starts from scratch and is perfected by slow degrees, by trial and error, many of them costly.

That has been the history of civil society since it first took rudimentary form in the jungle. That has been the history of our own Constitution. It was not a perfect instrument in the beginning. It is not a perfect instrument now. But within its framework, as amended and broadened from time to time, we can achieve the highest ends to which we aspire.

So with the San Francisco Charter. It is a fruitful beginning and not the last word to be said on international organization to preserve the peace.

Every informed and intelligent man knows that the world is suffering from grave maladjustments, that it is filled with injustices that cry out for remedy. These are not going to be cured overnight by the San Francisco Charter—or by any charter. Let us have no illusions about that.

But if the nations of the world can now agree on orderly methods of tackling these problems and solving them without recourse to war, we shall have taken the longest step forward in the 6,000 years of recorded history.

If we can now agree on a few basic principles of international organization to put down lawlessness and banditry and murderous aggression, we shall be well on our way toward solving the most critical issue facing the human race.

The alternatives before us are effective organization for peace or the bewildering and agonizing chaos of war—total war on a scientifically destructive level never seen before.

Civilization simply cannot stand the strain—neither the moral nor the physical strain—of a world-wide conflagration every generation. With the whole world a military camp, with neighbors armed to the teeth against one another, each striving to be sufficient unto itself and have no trade across its borders, the very fabric of our lives would be torn apart. We should necessarily have to surrender many of our freedoms, and our high standard of living would inevitably decline.

We can do better than that if we have the will to succeed. Mankind has come a long way in the past 6,000 years, and I for one refuse to believe that we are now riveted to the spot on which we stand. Our feet are on the right road.

Those who tell us that we can do nothing to better our lot simply don't know anything about human society. Those who tell us that we should be at our destination when we are struggling sincerely to find a way to get there, are not very helpful either.

Let us keep first things first. We may fail in our quest for world security. But let us not abandon our quest before we start, and for purely speculative reasons. We have a reasonable basis on which to work in the San Francisco Charter.

And to critics who dogmatically predict that it won't work and to those who glibly say that it might have been much better, as it might have been if his were a very different world—to these critics, I say, that in the perilous waters on which we and the whole world find ourselves, this is no time to be rocking the boat.

As President Truman recently said—and I am sure all the American people will respond—give us a chance to see what we can do.

We have everything to gain, and nothing to lose.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, perhaps few gifts that have come to humanity are of greater value than is electricity. Particularly is this true on the farms of our Nation. While to a marked degree, electricity has come to the farm at a belated date in comparison to the city and town levels, nevertheless through the medium of the Federal Government's instrumentality known as Rural Electrification, great progress is now being made.

In the postwar period, this particular phase of our American life will move forward with great speed. No part of our American society has greater use for electricity than has the American farmer. The record of Rural Electrification over a period of 10 years is one toward which this Congress and the Nation can point with pride.

On May 11 of this year, Rural Electrification celebrated its tenth anniversary. It stands today after 10 years only in the vestibule of accomplishment. Before it stretches forth ever-increasing opportunities and in the period of another 10 years it is highly probable that only a very small percentage of the farms of our Nation will be without this most valuable contribution, electric current.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following statement taken from a prominent farm paper, the Farmer, in St. Paul, Minn., covering the tenth anniversary of Rural Electrification:

REA'S TENTH ANNIVERSARY

REA was 10 years old on May 11. During its lifetime 1,950,000 farms have been electrified, divided about equally between REA which gets its money from the Government and privately owned power companies which get theirs from investors. Now 50 percent of the Nation's farms have electricity, compared

with around 11 percent in 1935. In the Farmer territory, the percentage of electrified farms in that period has increased from around 10 percent to 45 percent.

In no period in history has so many farms been connected to electric lines. REA probably was the spark plug in this development, but we must also remember that the power companies have been busier than ever in extending their lines; the improved economic position of farmers has enabled them to afford electricity; and, too, the shortage of farm labor has hastened the use of electricity to save both time and labor.

Originally REA was just an idea. The first Administrator had no more definite instructions than to use Federal loans to get electric power to more farmers than had it. But to date the Government has advanced $410,000,000 with which 412,000 miles of power line have been strung to farms. Borrowers have paid $90,000,000 in principal and interest on their loans, of which $19,000,000 is on loans not yet due. Some local cooperatives, including the Kandiyohi at Willmar, Minn., have burned the mortgages of their original loans.

Loans of $68,000,000 have been made to 118 cooperatives in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Montana, and the Dakotas. Of these, 105 have about 53,000 miles of line in service, serving 125,000 consumers. The other 13 must wait until restrictions are lifted before carrying out their first construction.

Nationally, REA co-ops figure they can use $585,000,000 in 3 years after they get the postwar green light. In The Farmer territory, they plan to borrow $74,050,000 to build new lines, rehabilitate present lines and finance wiring of buildings. This postwar program in our territory is set to serve 132,700 additional consumers within 3 years after the war. Private companies also will continue to expand.

Farm folks who have electricity are using it for more and more tasks. They have learned under the pressures of war that it has far more uses than for lighting. They are using it for such productive equipment as water pumps to supply water for livestock and poultry as well as for household uses; pig and chick brooders; milking machines and milk coolers; feed grinders; and motors to perform many farm chores. Average consumption on REA lines in 8 years has jumped from 36 to 92 kilowatt-hours per month.

This increased appreciation of the value of electricity means that farmers will be buying much electrical equipment as soon as it is available. This buying will be a great stimulant to postwar business expansion.

Another Ration Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of April 23, 1945:

ANOTHER RATION BOOK

The OPA has started preparation of a new ration book which is expected to be distributed in the fall, and which will be adequate for a period of 24 months following its issuance.

James A. Farley, speaking before the Milwaukee Junior Chamber of Commerce last week, said: "In borrowing totalitarian ways for the prosecution of the war, it was our aim to rid ourselves of them at the earliest possible moment. I am certain that the Government had no other end in mind."

How certain? The question seems fair, since Mr. Farley also said: "We have all given up great measures of freedom to achieve victory. We should let no one forget for a minute that we want those freedoms back and that we intend to have them." There is a vehemence in this statement, and a note of warning that take the edge off Mr. Farley's certainty, and that suggest he is not so sure the aim of the Government actually is to restore those freedoms at the earliest possible moment.

No one expects a complete abandonment of controls after the end of the war in Europe. But many are disturbed by indications of a purpose to maintain controls even after both wars have been won, and the new 2-year ration book certainly does not allay their apprehensions. They are told that rationing must be continued until a proper adjustment between civilian demand and the supply of civilian goods has been established, but such an adjustment, effected under controls, would probably cease if controls were removed. It is easy to see how bureaus loath to give up their powers, and theorists who frankly favor a permanent Government-managed economy, might argue that controls must be continued indefinitely.

In the circumstances people are likely to take their cue from that part of Mr. Farley's statement which implied that if they want restored the freedoms they have given up because of the war, they must show some aggressiveness in demanding such restoration.

Change in the Presidential Succession Is Badly Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of Thursday, June 21, 1945:

CHANGE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION IS BADLY NEEDED

President Truman is to be applauded for his recommendations to Congress in respect to the Presidential succession "in the interest," as he said, "of orderly, democratic government."

It has long been recognized that the present procedure, which was adopted in 1886, is far from satisfactory, and ever since President Truman's accession, the issue has been frequently discussed in Government circles and elsewhere. There has been, however, a certain delicacy about the whole situation which tended to make leading Members of the Congress hesitate to bring the matter under discussion. Hence, the President's move was doubly welcome.

The weaknesses of the present succession, which goes from the Vice President to the Secretary of State and thence down the line of accepted Cabinet rank, has long been apparent. The discussions since President Roosevelt's death—as to whether Secretary of State Stettinius is of Presidential caliber and whether he should not be displaced at once, even though serving creditably in his present post—only served to emphasize the seriousness of the problem.

The underlying weakness is that any Vice President who has succeeded to the Presidency, or any President whose Vice President has died or become disqualified, is now able to pick his own successor. This is thoroughly un-American procedure and clashes with the whole spirit of our democratic form of government.

President Truman properly stresses the need of putting an elected officer next in the line of succession and suggests that the most fitting choice is the Speaker of the House. For the Speaker has not only been elected by the people of his own district but also has been elected to the Speakership by the whole body of the House from every State of the Union. Next in line Mr. Truman would place another elected official, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and then he would follow with the Cabinet. He also suggests provision for a special election of President and Vice President if the Congress feels that desirable.

The special advantage of putting the Speaker next in line is that he would be almost sure to be of the same party as the President and Vice President he would succeed, because of the fact that the whole House is elected every 2 years. Certainly it seems important that the general policies for which the people voted should be continued for the full 4 years.

In our judgment Congress should move promptly to enact this proposed new Presidential succession into law. It is a badly needed change.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two newspaper articles, one a column headed "Labor's Long Pants," by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Washington Daily News of June 26, 1945, and the second an editorial entitled "Labor Legislation," from the Washington Post of June 24, 1945.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 26, 1945]

LABOR'S LONG PANTS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

American labor is a big, strapping fellow now and should put on long pants and take the chip off his shoulder.

This is in reference to the shouts of anger that went up from professional labor leaders, crying about the new labor relations bill proposed jointly by Senators BALL (Minnesota), BURTON (Ohio), Republicans, and HATCH (New Mexico), Democrat.

Whatever the merits and faults of the bill—and it undoubtedly has both—it is the question of attitude that is raised here and the effect that labor's carping stand-offishness may have, in the long run, on its own best interests.

It is certainly true—and it is conceded in most quarters—that there are going to be, and should be, some changes in the labor relations machinery of the Government, and perhaps in method and approach. This was recognized by the late President Roosevelt, the friend and champion of labor, at least to the extent that he saw the necessity for pulling together the various labor relations

agencies now scattered through the Government and for coordinating policy.

This view is also shared by President Truman, and he has indicated he plans to do something about it through reorganization. That will be a job for the new Secretary of Labor, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, former Senator and Federal judge, also a friend of labor. If introduction of the Ball-Burton-Hatch measure did nothing more than hasten that reform, it would serve a useful purpose.

It would seem, therefore, that labor would be wise to show a willingness to come in and cooperate in legislation, especially considering the sincerity of purpose of the three Senators who presented the bill after long and careful study by an outside, disinterested group.

The three Senators are estimable and respected gentlemen and legislators, sympathetic to labor and progressive in inclination. They are not burglars or highwaymen, as might have been thought from the shrieks let out by professional labor leaders.

Labor's hypersuspicious attitude seems unjustified in these cases.

Labor, of course, has had to be suspicious. It has a right to look any gift horse in the mouth. There are those who would like to exploit the expected confusing postwar era of adjustment to deprive labor of some of its gains in the last dozen years. Some of these are in Congress, as experience has shown. They may be expected to become increasingly active, both in and out of Congress.

But it would appear that labor would have more success in beating off such attacks if it set its own house in order beforehand and agreed to certain modifications that would protect the employer, too, so that groundless attacks could make no headway.

Nor, at this late date, does there seem any danger that labor's fundamental right of collective bargaining could be disturbed. It is too well established, not only in the law of the land, but in the minds of the people.

To establish its basic rights, labor needed a champion and a protector when its hard fight began in the early years of the New Deal. It was proper that Government became its guardian for a time, considering the prevalence of the opposite attitude for so long. But now it has grown up and is able to stand on its own feet. It should not have to depend upon the whims of any political party or group of men in office at any particular time, for political parties and men in office change. It must depend upon its own power and organization and its sincerity to preserve exact justice in labor relations.

Labor should cooperate with its friends to set its house in order against its enemies.

[From the Washington Post of Sunday, June 24, 1945]

LABOR LEGISLATION

There is clear need, as we approach the period of reconversion, to give thought to a comprehensive program for the promotion of peaceful, orderly labor relations in our postwar economy. The proposal of a Federal industrial relations act, introduced by Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL, is a hopeful essay in this sphere. The character of its sponsors is a testimonial at once to the thoughtfulness and good faith with which the proposal is presented. They invite criticism in the hope that any defect in the proposal may be ironed out before legislation is passed. They will have performed a genuine public service, we believe, if their bill does no more than to focus public attention upon an urgent and vital postwar problem.

The bill has already encountered indignant condemnation from leaders of labor. Perhaps this was inevitable, considering the manner of its preparation. The committee of citizens which worked on it deliberately avoided the counsel of official representatives of either employers or employees. No doubt the committee felt that it would be impossible to forge agreement upon needed reforms between the spokesmen for special interests. For our own part, we feel that such agreement is by no means unattainable and hope that the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill will stimulate new efforts toward a meeting of minds on this vital issue. It would be tragic if opposition to the bill now introduced should create resistance to a program which is indisputably essential to the general welfare

The Hatch-Burton-Ball bill has certain obvious defects to which we think it will be useful to point. It would effect a reorganization of various governmental functions in the labor field without bringing them under the general supervision of the Labor Department. President Truman has indicated that the entire Federal structure is to be simplified and streamlined, if Congress will permit, and it may be taken for granted that Judge Schwellenbach, the new Secretary of Labor, will have something to say about how the labor agencies should be integrated into the organizational pattern. Congress certainly ought to obtain his views before proceeding very far with this particular reorganization task.

More fundamental is the mandatory arbitration which the bill imposes upon certain types of labor disputes. It is possible, of course, to compel arbitration; but it is not possible to compel acceptance of the results or arbitration. This kind of acceptance can come only when the parties to a dispute agree, of their own accord, to submit their differences to an impartial arbiter. Decisions so reached can, like contracts, be given the sanction of the courts and the law. We are inclined to think that the bill's entire ritual of negotiation and mediation, especially its provisions as to arbitration, can be made effective only on a voluntary basis. An attempt to enforce it against the will of organized workers is likely to evoke only the same sort of evasion and disregard of the law which has been evoked by the Smith-Connally Act.

We have misgivings as well about the reversion to the injunctive process which the bill proposes. But this is not to say, by any means, that labor unions should not be required, as a matter of law, to meet the obligations which are corollary to the immunities and privileges conferred upon them. Nor is it to suggest that reasonable protection should not be afforded to employers against such union irresponsibilities as jurisdictional strikes. The efforts of Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL and of the Richberg committee which drafted the bill to redress the imbalances of the Wagner Act in these respects seem to us altogether proper and praiseworthy.

This bill has a number of faults and many virtues. It is challenging and provacative. We hope that the arguments for and against it and the amendments which will be proposed will be offered in a spirit of reconciliation with due regard for the national interest. We hope, also, that they will be accompanied by continuing labor-management efforts to discover larger areas of common ground.

Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 27 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Revising the Labor Laws," from the New York Times of June 23, 1945, and the second entitled "For Industrial Peace," from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 21, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 23, 1945]

REVISING THE LABOR LAWS

A full and fair judgment of the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill to revise the Federal labor laws will not be possible until the text of the measure has been carefully studied. The final verdict will probably be a mixed one. The bill obviously represents an advance over present legislation in important respects. But if it had to be accepted or rejected as a unit, all its merits would be more than canceled by one provision alone—that for compulsory arbitration.

The labor union leaders, whatever their extravagance of language, are wholly justified in rejecting this. As William Green rightly declares, compulsory arbitration would be "the first step toward involuntary servitude." It may be gravely doubted, in fact, whether a democratic government would have either the wish or the power in peacetime to force men to work for private employers on the conditions that it prescribed.

The Government may, of course, stand ready at all times to offer its services as a mediator in any dispute when both sides ask for it. It may offer to act as conciliator. It may on its own initiative ascertain the facts of a dispute and make them public. The Department of Labor already has the power and personnel to perform such functions. There is no good reason why they should be taken out of the Department and placed in the hands of some separate board, as the new bill proposes.

There are other questionable provisions in the new bill—for example, some of those dealing with the closed shop. Yet while the defects in the measure justify union opposition to it as it stands, it is obvious from the comments of some of the labor leaders that they object as much to the merits of the bill as to its defects. The bill tries, for example, to limit Federal intervention in labor disputes to those of a clearly interstate character involving sizable bodies of employees. It would let local governments have jurisdiction over small local disputes. Some of the labor leaders object to this obviously sensible arrangement.

Above all, they object to the efforts of the new bill to bring some sort of balance into the Wagner Act. They want to continue, in other words, to make it illegal under Federal law for employers to coerce, intimidate or even discourage employees from joining unions. But they denounce in unbridled terms any effort to make it equally illegal under Federal law for unions to intimidate or coerce employes into joining them. They insist that the Federal law continue to give the unions special rights, exemptions, privileges, and immunities that apply to no one else. But they denounce every effort to impose on the unions any corresponding responsibilities or duties.

Union leaders cannot forever hope to enjoy this completely one-sided Federal status. Its implications are daily becoming plainer to the public in the dictatorship of the Petrillos and the Lewises and in the uncontrolled activities of Communist infiltrators. The balance must some day be restored. The union leaders must begin to decide now whether they prefer to give up their special legal immunities and privileges, or whether they will accept along with them corresponding legal duties and controls.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of June 21, 1945]

FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE

The need for revision of the Federal labor-management relations laws if the United States is to avoid a period of violent, and perhaps depression-breeding, labor disputes after the war has been so widely recognized that it was only a question of when and by whom the revisions would be proposed to Congress.

Since the passage of the poorly thought-out and largely unworkable Smith-Connally Act in a moment of anger, it has been clear that any changes in Government labor-management policy, if they were to have any constructive value, must be sponsored by someone who had the whole public welfare at heart and be developed through a calm and intelligent approach to the problem.

It will be agreed, we think, that the sweeping reorganization of this Government activity proposed by Senators BURTON, BALL, and HATCH could not have been sponsored by any group in whose fairmindedness and public spirit the Nation has greater confidence and that the 18 months of study given the subject by the three Senators in cooperation with a committee of highly qualified private citizens are sufficient evidence that the proposal is not the product either of anger or sudden impulse.

The bill, briefly, would apply penalties for unfair labor practices to employer and employee alike, require labor unions with closed-shop contracts to comply with democratic standards, substitute compulsory arbitration for strikes in disputes where work stoppages or lock-outs would result in direct hardships to the public, reorganize the Government's arbitration machinery with a view to bringing the force of public opinion behind the labor laws, and authorize Federal court review of arbitration awards within defined limits and in certain cases provide court enforcement of the awards.

Labor and management, neither of whom was directly represented in the preparation of the bill, undoubtedly will have faults to find with details of the proposal, and undoubtedly, through expressions of their opinions in committee hearings, will bring about some changes. There may be details with which the public as a whole does not agree.

But it seems to us that labor, industry, and the general public, will be favorably impressed by the underlying philosophy of the bill, which is that relations between labor and management have now progressed to the point where violent action and the creation of public hardship is no longer necessary to the settlement of disputes and that under impartial rules laid down by Congress in the public interest the same kind of peaceful competition is possible between management and labor as is now commonplace in the relations between business enterprises.

There is nothing in this bill which would take away from organized labor a single legitimate gain made up to this time. If it takes away anything it is only from those within the organized labor movement who have misused the unions for their own personal gain at the expense of the membership. Essentially, it asks only that labor, now that it has won the prestige and power which places it on an equal footing with management, join with management in recognizing the stake which the general public has in labor-management relations and accept at least some of the responsibilities which the public, through its lawmakers, has imposed upon management.

Labor has been in the forefront of those who have insisted, until it became generally accepted, on the principle that private enterprise could not conduct its affairs in the United States with no thought to the public welfare. Yet to date, not all of labor has been willing to apply the same principle to itself.

We believe that if organized labor as a whole will now accept this principle for itself as well as for industry it will not only add greatly to its prestige but benefit directly through public acceptance of the results of the Government's labor-management mediation.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, complaints about the operations of the OPA have been many and varied. I have had many letters from my constituents and others voicing their displeasure and disgust.

I have just received a letter from one of the housewives in my district, which I think will be of interest to the Members of the House and, therefore, include it with these remarks:

MIDLAND, MICH., *June 14, 1945.*

Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: No doubt what I am about to say is already an old story to you, nevertheless, circumstances are forcing me to register my protest against our present so-called fair rationing system.

Every since rationing began, I have rebelled, silently, against many obvious iniquities, because I felt that the sacrifices being made by our boys, made "griping" on the home front a pretty low pastime.

But the present muddle in the canning sugar is the straw that broke the camel's back as far as my own patience and good resolves about talking it silently, are concerned.

My husband and myself own a 2-acre tract, 1 acre of which is under cultivation. Our crops are small fruits and garden truck.

Because our local rationing board very conveniently ran out of canning sugar application blanks several weeks prior to the "freeze" and the resultant cut in allowances, I find myself with several hundred strawberry vines literally loaded with berries that are starting to ripen, and not one grain of sugar with which to care for them, and no hopes of getting any for at least 2 or 3 weeks to come. Why? Because our board refuses to accept any applications before next week, and when they do, it will take at least 10 days to get the application processed. By that time, my crop will be ruined.

Not a pleasant prospect, where one has spent endless hours of back-breaking labor, crawling around, digging out weeds, transplanting, etc., in order to get the plants to maturity.

How can we call rationing fair, when a lucky few got an allowance of 15 pounds per person, regardless of age, and the rest of us will have to settle for 8 pounds or maybe even less? That will give a man and wife, the magnificent total of 16 pounds to can a year's supply of fruit. I don't get it.

If the rationing program were really fair then small babies would most certainly not be allotted the same amount of sugar, red and blue points, as those allotted to an adult.

All too often I've been in homes where there are several small children under 5 years of age, and seen the stock pile of sugar (as much as 75 pounds) lovely steaks, butter, cakes, and pies that they can enjoy, simply because infants and small children cannot and do not use their allotment of these items, while a family of adults sits down to stew, or no meat at all, and their cakes and pies must come from the bakery, and butter is just a lovely memory. If that is fair rationing, well (pardon the slang), I'm a monkey's uncle.

For my part, I think it's high time that our Congress take this rotten system apart and institute a program that is really fair. I'll admit that rationing and price control are a wartime necessity, but let's have it fair for a change.

Sincerely,

MRS. JACK B. HINKLE.
ROUTE NO. 3, MIDLAND, MICH.

Our Children's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto, under leave to extend my remarks, is an editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Courier of June 21, calling attention to the fact that among those who are seriously affected by the faulty administration of price control are the children who necessarily and naturally need certain articles of diet, and must have them unless their health and normal development is to suffer. This editorial is also expressive of which is apparently well-established opinion among the people at large, namely, that it is futile to look for any improvement in OPA administration unless Congress acts to force such improvement. That, we hope, has been done in the recent action of the Congress by amendments to the Price Control Act.

OUR CHILDREN'S HEALTH

While every family has found it difficult to secure meats and other essential foods in recent weeks, the situation facing families with small children is rapidly approaching a dangerous condition—a condition which should be immediately remedied.

Heads of large families should contact their Congressman, ANGIER L. GOODWIN, or the two Senators from Massachusetts, DAVID I. WALSH and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, to urge that congressional action be speeded for the relief of the food situation facing childhood.

Children need certain meats, they need butter and they need sugar. They need certain commercial sirups for food formulas. They may need other articles which have become scarce or have wholly disappeared in local markets.

Older people, except the aged, can eat substitutes, so long as they can obtain substitutes which are becoming harder to secure. But children, particularly young children, and the aged and infirm require certain foods and provision should be made by the Federal Government to see that they are supplied.

We read of people crossing the border into Canada in order to buy meats and we are told that there is more beef as well as other

meats in this country than ever before—and yet we cannot buy it in our markets because something is wrong somewhere. We are told that there is a surplus of butter, but we can't buy it, either, because of its high ration point value, and butter substitutes are getting more difficult to obtain. Drastic cuts have been made in allotments of sugar, yet news dispatches tell of record beet sugar crops, while our sources for cane sugar have not been devastated by war. Shortage of manpower is blamed and yet our employment service is bound up with so much red tape it is impossible to comprehend the reason for it.

There is just one place where these conditions can be remedied, and that is by Congress.

If we protest strongly enough and loudly enough Congress is pretty certain to do something about it.

Thousands of fathers of little folks are fighting overseas to protect them from harm. The least we at home can do is to see that sufficient food is provided little children to permit their normal, healthy development.

Hon. James A. Farley on Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Houston Post of Friday, May 25, 1945, in which comments are made on the proposal of Hon. James A. Farley for the appointment of a special commission to study the question of Presidential succession and make a recommendation to the American people.

The article reads as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

James A. Farley, one of the more talented of modern Warwicks, is of the opinion that now, while the matter is fresh in our minds, would be a good time for this country to go into the problem of the succession to the Presidency, and to settle upon a plan of succession which would be most suitable under our form of government.

Seven times in our history the President has died. By a stroke of good luck, the Vice President, who was the choice of the people, was alive at the time to take over. Had the Vice President died before the President, the office would have passed to the Secretary of State, who was the choice of the President, and not necessarily the choice of the people.

So far in our history we have been spared the loss of both President and Vice President during a term of office. But had Wendell Willkie been elected that would have happened. Both Mr. Willkie and Senator McNary, his running mate, died before the term for which they were the Republican nominees expired. If that had happened, Mr. Willkie's Secretary of State, whoever he might have been, would have been President during some of the most crucial months in our history.

Mr. Farley proposes that a special commission be set up to study the question and make a recommendation to the American people. It may be that a constitutional amendment would be needed, or it may be that an act of Congress would be sufficient. The present plan of succession from Vice President through Members of the President's Cabinet was set by congressional action.

It can be argued, of course, that the Secretary of State and other eligible members of the Cabinet are appointed indirectly by the people in that their appointments must be approved by the Senate. But as a practical matter, the Senate at times approves for membership in the Cabinet men who would find it difficult to be elected President, if they were candidates for the office.

There is also the possibility, as Mr. Farley points out, of an elected President and Vice President dying between election day and the day they take office, in which case no Cabinet members would be available. Presumably, the choice of a President would then devolve upon the House of Representatives. In the case of a deadlock the Nation could be without a Chief Executive for some time, or if the House majority were of one political faith and the deceased President-elect of another, the will of the people could be defeated.

Far better would it be to provide for such possibilities now than to do something about them after one or another becomes an actuality. Mr. Farley's suggestion possesses merit.

Hope for Central Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, many people in California will be deeply disappointed because the conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill have seen fit to reject the Senate amendment which provided appropriations for preliminary studies of transmission lines and a stand-by station for the electric power generated on the Central Valley project.

The only encouragement they can derive from the conference report is that it substitutes new language for the very disheartening declaration of policy contained in the House committee report at the time the bill was first under consideration by the House. That committee report said:

It is the intention of the committee that none of the funds appropriated in the bill, or heretofore appropriated, shall be used for any purpose in connection with the establishment of a steam plant or a transmission system. The committee is advised that power now available from the project is being sold near the Shasta Dam under a contract which guarantees to the Government a fair and equitable price and which preserves for public agencies the preference they are entitled to under the reclamation law. Under these conditions it is unnecessary for the Government to appropriate funds to construct either a steam plant, estimated to cost $26,000,000, or a transmission system which would cost approximately $48,000,000, which would not produce greater returns to the Government. There is no unserved market in the area. The proposed steam plant and transmission system would duplicate if not destroy existing taxpaying facilities and take much valuable property off the tax rolls to the detriment of many towns and counties in the State of California.

The conference report, now before the House, contains the following language:

The action of the conferees in the elimination of funds for plans for a steam plant and transmission lines in connection with the Central Valley project, California, was taken in view of the fact that there is an agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. whereby their power is pooled for the period of the war and a reasonable time thereafter, which provides for the recapture, without prejudice, of any temporary advantage to either party. In view of this situation the conferees are of the opinion that the existing arrangements should be retained without prejudice to those in favor of or opposed to the construction of a steam plant or transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I understand this new language to mean that the way is open in the future, if the House so decides, to proceed with the construction of transmission lines and a stand-by station to make the hydroelectric power generated on the Central Valley project available for delivery at convenient places to the municipalities and other political subdivisions of California, which may desire to purchase it in wholesale quantities for distribution to their people. It is unfortunate that the impression has been created in the minds of some Members of Congress that the Central Valley project is designed to engage in the retail sale and distribution of electricity. I wrote the sections relating to disposal of electric power which were contained in the original Central Valley Act enacted by the California Legislature more than a decade ago, and I can assure the Members of this House that it was never the intent of the men who pioneered this great project that it should engage in the retail sale of electricity. But it was the definite intent of the framers of that legislation that the cities and other public bodies of California should have a prior right to purchase that electric power at wholesale in order that they might distribute it at reasonable rates to their people if they desired to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there will be no opportunity for the cities and public bodies of California to buy this power direct from the Central Valley project at wholesale rates, unless transmission lines are constructed to bring the power to places in reasonable proximity to these public purchasers.

Mr. Speaker, I am utterly unable to understand the reasoning of some Members of Congress who profess to believe that the construction of the facilities necessary to enable the cities and public bodies of California to buy Central Valley power at wholesale would impose upon the Federal Government a huge burden of irredeemable debt. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, a widespread sale of this immensely valuable power is absolutely necessary if the large investment of money which the Federal Government has already made in the Central Valley project is to be amortized within a reasonable period of time. The pioneers of Central Valley realized years ago that electric power would make this great project self-liquidating, and that without the revenue that could be derived from large sales of electricity the cost of water

would be so high that the landowners could not afford to pay the cost of irrigation. So, Mr. Speaker, electric power is a vital factor in the financial success of the Central Valley project, and electric power affords the chief hope of the taxpayers of this Nation for a return of their great investment in Central Valley within a reasonable period of time. I repeat that I am unable to understand how any Member of Congress who wants to relieve the taxpayers can logically oppose measures to increase the power revenues in Central Valley.

Crowley Sees Reich Rising to War Unless Plants Are Stripped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 26, 1945, on the comments made by Foreign Economic Administrator Leo T. Crowley to Congress, entitled "Crowley Sees Reich Rising to War Unless Plants Are Stripped." His deductions on this most important problem of the Allies seem to be very clear, instructive, and timely.

CROWLEY SEES REICH RISING TO WAR UNLESS PLANTS ARE STRIPPED

Foreign Economic Administrator Leo T. Crowley told Congress today the Allies must keep an eye on Germany for generations or there'll be war again.

Mr. Crowley, in testimony read to the Senate committee studying the German economic and political set-up by Henry H. Fowler, chief of FEA's enemy branch, proposed that an Allied general staff be set up to assure freedom from German aggression.

He said this might sound pessimistic, but that everything discovered by FEA, digging deep behind the motives add actions of the Germans in two world wars, supports it.

Mr. Crowley proposed disarmament of more than the German Army, Navy, and war factories; he said the whole German economic set-up must be disarmed because it contains a war potential.

WORLD PEACE DEMANDS IT

"The peace of the world requires considerable organized governmental attention to the course of industrial and economic development and operations in Germany," Mr. Crowley declared.

"This will be true at least until generations of peace from German aggression have demonstrated that it is no longer necessary to keep open the watchful eye and maintain the necessary surveillance and control."

He said the trouble in 1918 was that Germany was disarmed only on the surface; her whole ability to turn quickly from peacetime production to weapons of war never was disturbed.

This time, Mr. Crowley asserted, Allied bombing laid waste great plants, "but Allied bombing did not reduce most German plants to utter ruin."

The bombing accomplished its immediate purpose, he said, but many giant German industries could start up almost immediately if given a chance.

GERMANY STRONG ECONOMICALLY

"Germany has the better part of her economic and industrial strength today," Mr. Crowley said, "even though she could not marshal it immediately for a Third World War. It is there to build on."

He recommended that:

Complete disarmament be given precedence over all other Allied problems; not limited solely to weapons, but applying to all German industry so that it can be leveled off to what Germans can use for peacetime only.

This policy must be lasting in character so that it does not "expire into feeble and impractical ineffectiveness in 1956 or 1976."

Pin down the difference between a powerful economy and a healthy consumer economy and act accordingly.

Develop the program and make it understood as "a measure of security, not a device for punishment."

MAKE PLAN UNDERSTANDABLE

Make the plan simple and understandable to the common people of the world so that public opinion will back it up.

Set it up as a springboard for a peaceful industrial and agricultural future for Germany.

"All of us must get used to living in peace instead of in war or under threat of war," he said. "The United States must work with the other United Nations to achieve increased prosperity for itself and its allies. But neither the United States nor its Allies can afford to do this unless Germany is effectively disarmed, and kept disarmed."

Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee, of which George R. LeSauvage is the chairman, and John L. Hennessy, vice chairman, has rendered a splendid service in the interests of our national war effort. In this connection I am pleased to insert a communication received by me from the chairman of the committee, as well as various exhibits which are very pertinent:

NATIONAL RESTAURANT INDUSTRY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1945.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: There has been considerable comment in the public press to the effect that public feeding establishments are receiving an excessive share of the civilian meat supply. This criticism has generally been tied in with the broad statement that institutional users are catering essentially to the luxury trade. So that you may understand the situation, we are enclosing a series of exhibits which explain in detail the food problem as it affects public eating establishments, serving 60,000,000 meals per day. This statement has been prepared by the Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee of the OPA, the duly accredited industry committee.

Many of your constituents undoubtedly are engaged in the business of rendering a food service to the general public or must rely on restaurants for their daily meals. Because of reduction in allotments of rationed food to public feeding establishments, you will receive numerous inquiries from your constituents, both proprietors and patrons, on why they cannot receive their fair share of rationed food. As the exhibits are very comprehensive, the Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee is of the opinion they will be of material aid to you in your work as a representative of the people.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE R. LESAUVAGE,
Chairman.
JOHN L. HENNESSY,
Vice Chairman.

The National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee, officially appointed by the Government, is composed of the following:

Name	Region	Classification
George LeSauvage, chairman, care of Frank G. Shattuck Co., 58 West 23d St., New York, N. Y.; president, National Restaurant Association.	II	(Schrafft's.)
John L. Hennessy, vice chairman, vice president, Statler Corp., Hotel Pennsylvania, New York, N. Y.	II	Hotel.
Harry M. Anholt, Brown Palace Hotel, Denver, Colo	VII	Do.
F. C. C. Boyd, Walker 5-7031, Union News Co., 131 Varick St., New York, N. Y.	II	Train butcher, lunchroom, restaurant.
Andrew Crotty, president, Crotty Bros., 137 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.; industrial wartime feeding committee of National Restaurant Association.	I	Industrial.
Sam Dunham, general manager, Anderson Boarding & Supply Co., 915 North Sycamore Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.	VIII	Industrial (cafeteria mobile units for camp crews, etc.).
Bayard Evans, 4770 Lee Highway, Arlington, Va., National Restaurant Association.	IV	Restaurant.
J. F. Finnegan, general superintendent, dining car service, Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Long Island City, N. Y.	II	Dining cars.
Timothy Guiney, Triangle 5-2162, McLaughlin Restaurant, Inc., 1128 Bedford Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.; president, National Tavern Men's Association; president, United Retail Liquor Dealers and Restaurants of Kings County.	II	Tavern, bar, grill.
George Hanby, Walgreen Drug Stores, 744 Bowen Ave., Chicago, Ill.; National Association Chain Drug Stores.	VI	Chain drug.
W. A. Hatfield, vice president, Fred Harvey System, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co., 80 East Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.	VI	Dining cars and restaurants
Sidney Hodemaker, Pig'n Whistle, 945 Venice Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.	VIII	Restaurant.
G. Lebo, Thalhimer Bros., Richmond, Va.; National Retail Dry Goods Association.	IV	Department stores.
C. J. Mack, manager, Hotel Mayflower, Connecticut Ave., District of Columbia.	II	Hotel.
Arnold Saxe, White Tower Management Corp., 580 Main St., Stamford, Conn.	I	Lunchroom (hamburger).
M. E. Seward, F. W. Woolworth Co., 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; limited-price variety stores.	II	Variety chain.
Fred Simonsen, Greenfield Cafeterias, 2951 Woodward Ave., Detroit, Mich.; National Restaurant Association.	III	Cafeteria.
L. G. Treadway, Treadway Inns, Williamstown, Mass.; subchairman of American Hotel Association, subcommittee on resort hotels.	I	Hotels (including resort).
Vernon Stouffer, 1375 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio; president, the Stouffer Corp.	III	Restaurant chain.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT INDUSTRY,
ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y., June 4, 1945.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee to
Investigate Food Shortages,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: There has been considerable comment in the public press to the effect that commercial users of meats—restaurants, hotels, industrial and other food service establishments—are receiving an excessive share of the civilian meat pool because of price differentials given meat distributors serving such users.

This criticism has generally been tied in with the broad statement that institutional users are catering essentially to the luxury trade. This latter statement has been augmented with another broad generalization to the effect that the only way the consumer can receive his fair share of the available civilian meat supply is to eat away from home in public eating establishments. These statements are as incorrect as is the charge that on the average the restaurant patron receives more rationed food than the home consumer. For the purpose of discussing these statements and pointing out the true situation with respect to the supply of meat available to public eating establishments, we would appreciate your meeting with our committee, the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee of the Office of Price Administration.

For the past 3 years, as the duly accredited Advisory Committee selected by the Office of Price Administration, we have met with the Office of Price Administration to assist them in the formulation of various price and rationing programs affecting the restaurant groups.

Because of the critical meat and sugar shortage now facing the American public, we feel that certain information and statistical data which we now have available will prove invaluable to you.

Since the solution of the meat situation is an acute problem, we would appreciate meeting with you at the earliest possible date. We believe that because of the extensive representation on our committee of all public feeding groups, we are in a position to make certain suggestions which will assist you.

Sincerely yours,
[Signed] GEORGE R. LESAUVAGE,
Chairman.
[Signed] JOHN L. HENNESSY,
Vice Chairman.

JUNE 1, 1945.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Following are five documents regarding the food situation. These exhibits establish the following points:

A. 1. That the restaurant patron is not given preference over the home consumer in the allotments of meats and fats.

2. That home consumer is given a preference by the payment of red points for salvaged fats which is not paid to institutional user.

3. That many consumers of rationed commodities including members of the armed forces, factory workers are entirely dependent upon institutional user establishments for all their daily meals.

4. That institutional users' allotments for meats-fats are based on the lower of (a) persons served food, and (b) use of meats-fats during December 1942 and as a result actual use of meats-fats by institutional user is substantially lower than meal service factors indicate.

5. That home consumer can supplement allotment by buying bakery goods, pie-fillers, and other ready-made products.

6. That the violators of GRO–5 should be punished rather than reduce allotments of the many law-abiding.

Reference: Exhibit A—Presentation by the National Restaurant Advisory Committee to the Office of Price Administration. Dated April 6, 1945.

B. 1. That decrease in consumer or institutional user allotments or an increase in point values will aggravate black market situation.

2. That with assurance of a profit increased production of scarce commodities can be anticipated, which with proper channeling of supplies will allevate shortage of rationed commodities and will wipe out the black market.

Reference: Exhibit B—Report on meat and poultry black market to members of the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee. Dated May 8, 1945.

C. 1. That no preference is given institutional user over home consumer in the allotments of sugar.

2. That institutional users' allotments of sugar are based on the lower of (a) persons served food, and (b) use of sugar during December 1942 and as a result actual use of sugar by institutional users is substantially lower than meal service factor indicates.

Reference: Exhibit C—Memorandum on consumer and institutional users' sugar allowance per person, per meal after May 1, 1945. Dated May 17, 1945.

D. 1. That any reduction in allotments of rationed foods should be shared proportionately by all rationed food users.

Reference: Exhibit D—Presentation of the National Restaurant Advisory Committee with reference to proposals for the revision of GRO–5. Dated May 21, 1945.

E. 1. That public eating establishments serve Mr. and Mrs. America rather than the so-called "carriage trade."

2. That public eating establishments fulfill a useful public service and serve meals to satisfy every pocketbook.

Reference: Exhibit E—Memorandum to Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON on public eating establishments. Dated June 1, 1945.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE R. LESAUVAGE,
Chairman, National Restaurant
Advisory Committee.
JOHN L. HENNESSY,
Cochairman, National Restaurant
Advisory Committee.

EXHIBIT A

PRESENTATION BY THE NATIONAL RESTAURANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

APRIL 6, 1945.

The National Office of Price Administration has informed the National Restaurant Advisory Committee, that, effective April 1, 1945, the consumer ration of meats and fats will be reduced to 150 red points per calendar quarter, or an average of 0.55 point per meal.

This compares with a present allotment of 160 red points per 13-week period, or an average of 0.586 point per meal; and represents a decrease in the consumers' allotment of approximatly 6 percent.

The hotel and restaurant industry has been requested to show justicatifion of its present allotments of meats and fats in the light of the coming reduction for the home consumer. This brief is presented in the interest of the millions of consumers who, because of circumstances beyond their control, live in quarters without food preparation facilities and who work in establishments producing or servicing the material of war. All of these consumers and many others must receive their food from some institutional user establishment. It is on behalf of these people that the Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee is submitting these data.

The hotel and restaurant industry is prepared to show that its present allotments of meats and fats are below even the actual reduced home use of points per meal under the proposed new consumer program.

This leads to a natural conclusión that:

1. No reduction is indicated for the institutional user.

2. Present allotments are amply justified.

First. Let us review the statistics that show what the actual reduced home consumer factor will be per meal under the new program effective April 1, 1945.

The question: What will be the real average home consumer allowance per meal actually served in the home after April 1, 1945?

The answer:

(1) Total ration books issued in the United States of America, 133,000,000. (These are OPA figures.)

(2) 133,000,000 people eating 3 meals per day for 365 days in the year would consume 145,635,000,000 meals.

(3) New consumer red-point allotments, effective April 1, 1945, are 150 points per calendar quarter or an average of 0.55 point per meal.

(4) 145,635,000,000 times 0.55 point equals 80,099,250,000 points. (This represents the total points of meats and fats available to consumers in a 1-year period.)

(5) Consumers in 1 year are served the following number of meals in institutional user establishments: 25,000,000,000. (This figure was projected by the Institutional User Branch of OPA for the year 1943.)

(6) Subtracting 25,000,000,000 from 145,635,000,000 meals leaves the following total of meals consumers actually consume in the home in a 1-year period: 120,635,000,000.

(7) Therefore the weighted or real average home consumer allowance per meal actually served in the home after April 1, 1945, will be 0.664 point. (Since 80,099,250,000 points of meats and fats are provided each year by OPA for use in the home, the actual average home allowance per meal served is determined by dividing 80,099,250,000 points by 120,635,000,000, representing the total meals consumed in the home in a 1-year period.)

Next, let us look at statistics showing the average allowance per meal served which is granted by OPA to institutional users at the present time.

The question. What is the real average allowance per meal served by institutional users at the present time?

The answer. At the beginning of institutional user food rationing, this industry was told that in computing the food base two computations were to be made:

1. In the instance of meat fats, a minimum reduction of 25 percent of usage of meat fats during the base period was made.

2. The maximum allowance per person served multiplied by the number of persons served in the base period was regarded as a ceiling.

The lower of these two computations was the base in points for meat fats. Thus, the historic character or the pattern of operation of each establishment was recognized. It is obvious that the allowance per person served would range from a small allowance for the limited food service establishment on up to the ceiling allowance per person served. It follows then that in order to determine the average allowance per person served in institutional user establishments, a weighted average must be used.

The Office of Price Administration recently completed a survey of the files of institutional users registered in the District of Columbia. One thousand four hundred and ninety active institutional user files were examined in the tabulations recorded. This

survey includes all of the active files in the District of Columbia, and is therefore a truly representative pattern of institutional user rationing.

The weighted over-all average allowance per person, per meal for meat fats as of the January-February 1945 allotment period, for the 1,490 active institutional user registrations representing 2,144 institutional user establishments in the District of Columbia is .580.

The group break-down follows:

Group	Active registrations	Weighted average allowance per person	
		Per meal	Meat-fats
II	101	----------	0.726
III	1,293	0.582	----------
IV	5	.360	----------
V	15	.747	----------
VI	76	.424	----------
Total	1,490	.580	.726

NOTE.—The break-down of range of points per person served food, resulting in the over-all average per person served by range, is available from the OPA study of all institutional user registrations for meat-fats in the District of Columbia.

SUMMARY

Since it has been shown that:

(A) The weighted average home consumer allowance per meal actually served in the home after April 1, 1945 will be .664 points meats and fats.

(B) The weighted average allowance per meal actually served by institutional users at the present time is .580 points meats and fats.

We again return to the natural conclusion that:

1. No reduction is indicated for the institutional user.

2. Present allotments are amply justified.

Now, let us look at some of the operational problems peculiar to the institutional user, and not the home consumer, that make it impossible for the institutional user to serve as many meals with the same number of points as the home consumer.

OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL USER VERSUS THE HOME CONSUMER

1. It is not possible for institutional users to estimate precisely the number of persons to be served during any one meal. They must estimate not only the number of customers they will serve, but also estimate the customers' preference among items available. There results a substantial loss of rationed foods. This may be called overproduction or a less-than-estimated patronage. In either event, there are certain foods which cannot be reworked and therefore are totally lost. Other foods can be reworked and sold at a later meal, but not without appreciable point loss. It is estimated that this loss aggregates 5 percent. Whereas the consumer who knows the number to be served at her table, as well as the amount of food necessary to serve them, faces none of these risks.

2. Depending upon the type of operation, foods are required in some institutional user establishments to be held on the steam table for periods varying from a few minutes to perhaps 3 hours or longer. Losses occur from exposure to heat from the steam table; meat discolors, dries out, loses weight; creamed vegetables become encrusted on the sides of the pans. The home consumer has none of these problems because she knows, first, how many people will eat at her table, second, what time they will eat, and, finally, she has decided upon her menu for the meal and, therefore, suffers no such loss as the institutional user.

3. Institutional users suffer shrinkage of meats due to moisture evaporation in storage, loss of blood, hanging or thawing frozen meats—all shrinkages which the consumer does not suffer. In practice this loss has proved to be no less than 6 percent.

4. Losses from pilferage are substantially higher during the present wartime period for the following reasons:

(1) High turn-over of employees.

(2) Temptation of employees to take rationed food for home consumption. This condition will become more acute, depending upon the amount of food rationed and the point values of such food.

5. A substantial number of trained and experienced personnel have left institutional user establishments. It is impossible with the type of inexperienced personnel now available for institutional users to produce the same edible food yield as could have been obtained under prewar conditions. Despite good management, deterioration in rationed foods is inevitable, and results in decreased volume of rationed foods available to consumers who eat in public establishments.

6. Institutional users who bake to the degree recognized in present OPA regulations must have these additional fats, processed foods, and sugar to keep the consumer who eats in public establishments on a parity with consumers who eat in their own homes. The homemaker can supplement her allotment by buying baked goods as needed in a single unit, such as a cake or a pie. The institutional user who now produces his own baked goods cannot do this. He cannot step out and buy baked goods to supplement his allotment, because industrial users generally are unable to take on new accounts. Restrictions on the activity of industrial producers of baked goods, ice cream, and other prepared desserts prohibit their use as alternates. Therefore, institutional users who now do their own baking must continue to have a differential for such baking operations.

7. Consumers have and are currently receiving 2 red points per pound for salvaged fats. Institutional users never have received any point consideration for the return of fats. This is regarded as an injustice and it is suggested that the institutional users share equitably in any points paid for the recovery of salvaged fats.

8. Since fewer points are generally used in breakfast service as compared with luncheon and dinner service, and since in the restaurant industry there are comparatively few breakfasts served, the fact stands out that a restaurant serving only luncheons and dinners—and there are many of them—is at a marked disadvantage because of the extra points required for such services of luncheons and dinners. We quote from a transcribed official record, a statement made by Walter Straub, a former Director of the Food Rationing Division of OPA, before a meeting of the Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee on February 8, 1944: "I have made the point, in defense of the restaurant industry, that to me the restaurant industry offers the one balancing or saving factor to the urban dweller who is strictly rationed and who hasn't access to raising his own pigs and victory garden and eating the meat that he raises point free. He needs a restaurant to supplement. I have pointed that out to several Congressmen."

9. The committee is informed that there is a shortage of farm machinery. This, with the shortage of farm labor, is reducing feed and food crops, and giving the farmer relief in this respect would help to increase food production.

10. It is claimed, and is undoubtedly true, that some institutional users do have too much of the foods that are rationed. These eating places, however, do not acquire such foods in keeping with the rationing regulations. Such an over-generous supply of meat, butter, and sugar, is not allowed them under General Ration Order 5. No restaurant can serve steaks to all comers day in and day out, and operate under General Ration Order 5 regulations. That's impossible. The rationing program cannot be criticized for the actions of those who will not operate under it. Illegal procurement of rationed foods is an enforcement rather than a rationing problem. Much of the criticism of institutional users has arisen from the activities of operators who violate the regulations.

The Hotel and Restaurant Advisory Committee is submitting for perusal by the Office of Price Administration a set of luncheon and dinner menus furnished by a nationally known chain-restaurant operation. These menus cover an operating period for 1 week, from March 19 to March 24, 1945, inclusive, and are conclusive proof that any restaurant operator who lives within the framework of the rationing regulations cannot serve steaks and roast beef daily to all without sacrificing, on the part of his customers, all other items on the menu which use rationed foods in preparation, and which make for a well-balanced food service. Examination of these menus will disclose that from the total of the listed food items offered, 300 in number (1 week), 21 were rationed meats. These items consisted of low-point meat items, such as braised meat, sausage, leg of lamb, tongue, and kidneys. These menus are typical of the restaurant operator who lives within the rationing regulations, and the committee would be pleased to submit additonal menus for the Office of Price Administration's consideration to further substantiate our claim.

11. The dining cars of the railroads, as well as the railroad-station eating houses, have the problems of other institutional users plus many others peculiar to them alone.

Railroads are compelled to provide—without replacement—meal service for organized military movements, traveling under Government order. Recently, increased numbers of wounded members of the armed forces are being carried on trains, and special diets for these men require ration points in excess of those issued by OPA. Demands of this type are becoming more numerous, and this compulsory activity is not required of the average restaurant.

Many other divisions of the hotel and restaurant industry are now rationed at allotments already at the danger point. These divisions include, but are not limited to, the in-plant feeders, hospitals, school feeders, railroad construction and maintenance workers, fishermen, lumberjacks, miners, etc. If rations to restaurant operators are generally reduced, conditions may well develop that will break down food service to many essential groups, such as war workers, heavy-construction workers, etc., bringing such groups well below their recognized food requirements from a nutritional standpoint, with a resultant loss in manpower.

Here is a suggestion which this committee desires to make. There are in existence OPA institutional user advisory councils, constituted as follows:

(1) National Restaurant Advisory Committee.

(2) Eight regional restaurant advisory committees.

(3) Ninety-three district offices, a committee in each office, consisting in total of over 3,000 industry members.

(4) Five thousand four hundred and fifty-four local price panels.

The record, unfortunately, reveals that while these committes and panels have been extremely helpful in making effective price regulations of OPA, they have been used little in connection with rationing problems relating to institutional users. Let OPA enlist the services of every one of the institutional-user councils at all levels toward the elimination of black-market operations by institutional users. Currently the "heat" is on the entire public-feeding industry because a small percentage of operators are indulging

in the service of one- and two-pound steaks acquired via the black market. Radio commentators, columnists, and the press generally remind the public as well as the Government about this situation. Let's clamp down on this.

(1) Using the statistical data of OPA we have established the following facts:

Consumer allowance:	
Stated	0.55
Actual	.664
Institutional user allowance:	
Stated	.8 and .88
Actual	.580

This demonstrates that the over-all consumer allowance per meal in the home is actually higher than the over-all average institutional-user allowance per meal served.

(2) We have proved that it is impossible for the institutional user to prepare and serve the full allowance per meal of meats and fats to the consumer patron due to operational problems cited above.

(3) We have pointed out that any change in the institutional user allowance per meal will affect only the operator who complies with OPA rationing regulations.

IN CONCLUSION

The Office of Price Administration appears to be greatly concerned as to the amount of rationed food allotted to the home. The public feeding industry of this country is also concerned for the food allotted to our homes. They are also concerned as to the welfare of the millions of the citizens of our country who are unable to prepare their own food and who are workers in industry, people who travel, service men and women, and all those who live away from home, or are unable to prepare food in their homes.

It is our considered judgment that any further reduction to public feeding institutions in the allotment of rationed food will greatly stimulate the black market and penalize the people who eat in law-abiding institutions.

The present method of allotment of points to public feeding institutions was the result of careful consideration by the Office of Price Administration and should not be disturbed.

Respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
By G. R. LESAUVAGE, *Chairman.*
By J. L. HENNESSY, *Vice Chairman.*

EXHIBIT B

REPORT ON MEAT AND POULTRY BLACK MARKET TO MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL RESTAURANT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

At the request of the Office of Price Administration, the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee has appointed this task committee to prepare a preliminary report with suggestions for a coordinated program to eliminate the black market in meats and poultry. The term "black market" is used in its broadest sense, meaning markets in which unlawfully transported, killed, or prepared commodities are sold, whether at or below ceiling prices, with or without the surrender of ration evidence, and also includes market activities in which commodities are diverted from normal, legitimate commercial channels of distribution.

The task committee at first believed that the solution of the black-market problem might be found in a closely integrated Office of Price Administration enforcement program. However, a careful study of the many factors creating the black market in meat and poultry requires this task committee to make suggestions requiring the cooperation of other agencies in addition to the Office of Price Administration.

The following recommendations are therefore made to the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee of the Office of Price Administration by this task committee following the discussions of this task committee in Washington, D. C., on May 8 and 9, 1945. Some of the recommendations embody in substance recommendations made by the Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages for the House of Representatives. It is recommended that the members of the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee read the House of Representatives report.

1. Basically the problem of the black market is one of supply. Lower 1945 meat production compared with 1944 has created the problem of the equitable distribution of meat. Until the supply of meat and poultry is ample to meet all requirements, steps must be taken to assure the distribution of meat and poultry through lawful channels at not to exceed ceiling prices. It is the opinion of this task committee that additional steps can be taken by Federal authorities to increase the production of food commodities in short supply. Production increases may require manpower protection on the farm or the providing of additional farm machinery. In any event the War Manpower Commission, Selective Service, and the War Production Board should be consulted to determine whether or not existing labor curbs or equipment limitation orders have resulted in any curtailment of food supply which may be increased without detriment to our Japanese war program.

2. Farm and produce prices should be examined in order to determine whether or not support or subsidy payments should be increased in order to secure the production of better and heavier beef. If it is necessary to offer special price inducements to poultry producers to increase their supplies, such measures should also be taken. It should be understood, however, that any price adjustments, incentive payments, or other increases granted to producers cannot be reflected in increased commodity prices to retailers and consumers if the Office of Price Administration intends to maintain the present level of retail prices.

3. The lack of satisfactory control of meat slaughtered in nonfederally inspected plants has resulted in the diversion of millions of pounds of meat to unlawful channels. The support and enforcement of Control Order 1, Livestock Slaughter and Meat Distribution, issued April 25, 1945, by the Office of Price Administration, should result in the proper channeling of large quantities of meat hitherto diverted to the black market. This control order should be given adequate publicity and the support of the American public.

4. Existing price regulations of the Office of Price Administration should be reexamined and any false price differentials at processing levels which attract meat to operators detrimental to established methods of distribution should be eliminated. Price differentials which result in the attracting of excessive amounts of meat to special types of processing levels should also be eliminated.

5. The set-aside requirements of the armed forces are met out of legitimate distributional channels. The large percentage of meats and poultry admittedly diverted into black market channels has necessitated the gradual increase of set-aside percentages by the armed forces. Since an increase in set-aside percentages means a decrease in civilian allotments, the armed forces should be consulted for information on additional measures which can be taken to assure the distribution of all meat and poultry through legitimate channels. Civilian health and war production are concerns of the armed forces and their assistance should be sought in connection with the programs outlined in this memorandum.

6. The report to the House of Representatives referred to previously points out (p. 5) that daily market reports have been put out quoting going prices in the New York live poultry market at 10 to 12 cents a pound above the legal maximum. Publishing of such figures should be stopped immediately. Making such information available tends to strengthen the black market and give it a semblance of legality.

7. The enforcement staff of the Office of Price Administration is small in relation to the number of pricing programs issued. Since the problems of the black market in meat and poultry is an immediate one, available enforcement manpower should be diverted into this field. At the same time a national program to obtain public support in the battle against the black market in meat and poultry should be started. Without public support the Office of Price Administration enforcement staff could be trebled without eliminating the black market in any appreciable amount.

8. While Office of Price Administration enforcement emphasis has generally been directed at all levels of distribution, because of manpower limitations, available enforcement facilities should be directed at preretail supply levels in order to reach more quickly the sources of black-market commodities. We would also recommend that wherever necessary, additional enforcement manpower be increased. In connection with the other suggestions contained in this memorandum, we would also recommend that any program arrived at after a consideration of the suggestions of this task committee should be coordinated with the present grocer-consumer programs of the Office of Price Administration.

9. We would also recommend that in order to control the distribution of meat, some system of manifest control similar to those used in connection with other Office of Price Administration programs be placed in effect. Every shipment of meat at any level should be declared on a manifest carried in every vehicle in which meat is delivered. This manifest should show the type of meat, weight delivered, point value, ceiling price, and destination. While this involves additional record-keeping, the problem of the black market justifies such a measure.

10. One of the most potent weapons for the elimination of the black market in meat and poultry is the local restaurant advisory council. There are 93 such councils set up throughout the United States. It is the recommendation of this task committee that these councils be utilized by the Rationing Division of the Office of Price Administration. These councils can work with consumer groups, labor groups and related industry associations in their community.

An intensive radio, newsreel, and newspaper campaign should be worked out with the assistance of the Office of War Information to acquaint the public—consumer and operator—with the inflationary effect of "black markets." The housewife and the other ultimate users of meats and poultry will welcome any constructive program which will assure them of their equitable share of meats and poultry at ceiling prices.

The use of these advisory councils and an educational program at the consumer level is perhaps the most powerful suggestion this task committee could make. With very little legal action—but with considerable pressure of public opinion—the public opinion can be aroused in every community with proper coordination of existing groups within the community.

While the actual weight of poultry and meat sold in black-market channels is large, this task committee feels that the black-market sources are few in relation to the great number of businessmen and consumers who use only legitimate channels.

It is the opinion of this task committee that any decrease in consumer or institutional user allotment or an increase in point values will aggravate the black-market situation. Such action would place a premium on points and even in an unlawful market, the principle of supply and demand would operate and increase the black-market

prices as well as attract additional operators into the black market.

It is the further opinion of this task committee that the elimination of the black market is the job of everyone—consumers, retailers, wholesalers, and all other operations which are part of the raising and distribution of meat and poultry. While this task committee is reporting to National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee of the Office of Price Administration, the solution of the black market must be made by the American public in cooperating with any programs which may be instituted by any single groups.

H. B. MEEK,
Chairman, Task Committee, National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee of the Office of Price Administration.

Members, Thomas J. Barton, Douglas Boyle, B. F. Copp, Bayard Evans, Maynard Ingram, C. J. Mack, Willard Marriott, James K. Switzer, Horace D. Willis, Armin Kusswurm.

EXHIBIT C

MEMORANDUM

MAY 17, 1945.

Subject: Consumer and institutional user sugar allowance per person per meal after May 1, 1945.

The question: What was the real average home consumer allowance per meal actually served in the home after May 1, 1945?

The answer:

(1) Total ration books issued in the United States of America, 133,000,000.

(2) 133,000,000 people eating 3 meals per day for 365 days in the year would consume 145,635,000,000 meals.

(3) Consumer sugar allotments, effective after May 1, 1945, 5 pounds for 4 months, or an average of .014 pounds per meal.

(4) 145,635,000,000 times .014 pounds equals 2,038,890,000 pounds.

(5) Consumers in one year are served the following number of meals in institutional-user establishments, 25,000,000,000. (This figure was projected by the institutional user branch of OPA for the year 1943.)

(6) Subtracting 25,000,000,000 from 145,635,000,000 meals leaves the following total of meals consumers actually consume in the home in a 1-year period, 120,635,000,000.

(7) Therefore, the weighted or real average home-consumer allowance per meal actually served in the home after May 1, 1945, was .017 point. (Since 2,038,890,000 pounds of sugar are provided each year by OPA for use in the home, the actual average home allowance per meal served is determined by dividing 2,038,890,000 pounds by 120,635,000,000, representing the total meals consumed in the home in a 1-year period.)

Next, let us look at statistics showing the average allowance per meal served which is granted by OPA to institutional users at the present time.

The question: What was the real average allowance per meal served by institutional users after May 1, 1945?

The answer: At the beginning of institutional user food rationing, this industry was told that in computing the food base two computations were to be made:

1. In the instance of sugar, a minimum reduction of 40 percent of usage of sugar during the base period was made.

2. The maximum allowance per person served multiplied by the number of persons served in the base period was regarded as a ceiling.

The lower of these two computations was the base in pounds for sugar. Thus the historic character or the pattern of operation of each establishment was recognized. It is obvious that the allowance per person served would range from a small allowance for the limited food service establishment on up to the ceiling allowance per person served. It follows then that in order to determine the average allowance per person served in institutional user establishments, a weighted average must be used.

The Office of Price Administration recently completed a survey of the files of institutional users registered in the District of Columbia. One thousand four hundred and ninety active institutional user files were examined in the tabulations recorded. This survey includes all of the active files in the District of Columbia, and is therefore a truly representative pattern of institutional user rationing.

The over-all average allowance per person per meal for sugar as of the May-June allotment period (based on persons served in January-February) for the 1,490 active institutional user registrations, representing 2,144 institutional user establishments in the District of Columbia, is .017.

The group break-down follows:

Group	Active registrations	Average allowance per person	
		Per meal	Sugar
II	101	----------	0.012
III	1,293	0.020	----------
IV	5	.018	----------
V	15	.025	----------
VI	76	.012	----------
Total	1,490	.020	.012

NOTE.—The break-down of range of pounds per person served food, resulting in the over-all average per person served by range, is available from the OPA study of all institutional user registrations for sugar in the District of Columbia.

Since it has been shown that:

(A) The weighted average home consumer allowance per meal actually served in the home after May 1, 1945 was 0.017 pound sugar.

(B) The weighted average allowance per meal actually served by institutional users after May 1, 1945, 0.020 pound sugar.

EXHIBIT D

PRESENTATION OF THE NATIONAL RESTAURANT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION WITH REFERENCE TO PROPOSALS FOR THE REVISION OF GENERAL RATION ORDER 5 SUBMITTED BY OPA TO THE COMMITTEE ON MAY 21, 1945

The National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee after due consideration of the proposed changes in the rationing regulations as presented to the committee by the officials of the Office of Price Administration at a formal meeting of the committee and OPA on May 21 1945 and after carefully weighing the available food supply figures as presented by OPA, have reached unanimously the conclusions set forth below:

MEATS, FATS

The OPA's proposal:

Under this proposal, the Food Rationing Division hopes to accomplish a savings of 1¼ percent of the Nation's total meat supply. The proposed new regulation contemplates a reduction in the ceiling factor for institutions doing their own baking from 0.88 to 0.70, and for nonbaking institutions from 0.80 to 0.64. Further, OPA also proposes to reduce the December 1942 use percentage figure of 75 percent to 60 percent.

The conclusions of the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee:

The committee is in sympathy with the objectives of the rationing division, but the committee does not consider that further reductions are required of the institutional user at the present time. As shown in the report submitted by the committee to the Office of Price Administration on April 6, 1945, a consumer who must eat his meals in institutional establishments is already receiving less, on the average, than is the consumer taking his meals at home.

Further, if the national food supply situation actually does require that a cut be made, it is believed that all segments of the industry should contribute equally to that saving. The committee objects to the OPA proposal that a large sacrifice be required of some institutional operators while others continue with their allotments unchanged.

SUGAR

The OPA's proposal:

OPA proposes a change in the sugar rationing regulations involving a revision of the percentage of historical use to be allotted and also a change in the maximum ceiling factors from 0.05 per person for those who do from 75 percent to 100 percent of their baking to 0.025 per person; from 0.04 to 0.02 for those who do from 40 percent to 75 percent of their baking; and from 0.03 to 0.015 for those who do less than 40 percent of their baking.

The conclusions of the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee:

The committee is in full sympathy with the OPA objectives in keeping the usage of sugar in line with allocations on a National basis. However, it is the firm opinion of the committee that the reductions already made by OPA in the sugar allotments of institutional users have brought those allotments in line with the proposed reduced allotments for either the home consumer or the industrial user of sugar. Therefore, the committee holds that there should be no further reduction of the present greatly reduced allotments.

For example, the current allotments of nonbaking institutional users are 42 percent, or less, of their 1941 use; for institutional users that bake, 54 percent, or less. The proposed reductions for industrial users will still leave them with allotments ranging from 45 percent to 60 percent of their 1941 use.

Furthermore, as shown by a report prepared from a study of the OPA files of institutional users in the District of Columbia, the allotment of sugar to the institutional user is on a weighted average basis at the present time, .020 pound sugar per person served. This figure of .020 is in line with the weighted average for the consumer in the home of .017 pound sugar per meal, as shown by the same report.

Again, if the national sugar supply situation requires that a cut be made, it is believed that all segments of the industry should make an equal contribution percentagewise to the saving.

PROCESSED FOODS

The OPA's proposal: The proposal is to reduce the ceiling factor for institutional bakers from .8 to .7 and for nonbakers from .7 to .6.

The conclusions of the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee: Here again, it is the concensus of the committee that, if a reduction in allotments is actually necessary, it should be divided evenly among all institutional users on a percentage basis. The application of reductions percentagewise in all institutional user allotments is not only equitable, but also efficient and administratively feasible.

In summary, this committee has repeatedly taken the position that it will raise no objections to any equitable curtailment of allotments of rationed foods, no matter how drastic—if necessary and justified by the facts.

The National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee, representing as it does all segments of the public-feeding industry, is much concerned regarding the welfare of the mil-

lions of Americans—both military and civilian—who of necessity must take their meals in public eating places.

It is the interest of this committee that the consumers who take their meals in public eating establishments be given equitable treatment with all other users of rationed foods. The committee is convinced that such will not be the case under the OPA proposals outlined above.

There is one further point that we wish to stress: Any further reduction in the allotments of rationed foods as outlined by the Office of Price Administration in its proposals, will, in our judgment, have the effect of stimulating the black market rather than of curtailing its activities. This is substantiated by the statement of Harold Epstein, food enforcement attorney of the national office of OPA, which follows: "I think that whenever you cut down the quantity which an institutional user can legitimately get you increase the incentive for unlawful acquisition."

The committee has repeatedly offered its services, together with the services of the thousands of members of its 93 district councils spread over the country, to OPA for assistance in the administration of the food rationing regulations and in the curbing of black-market activities. To date, to our knowledge, no call has been made upon these committees for their assistance.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
By G. R. LESAUVAGE, *Chairman.*
By J. L. HENNESSY, *Vice Chairman.*

EXHIBIT E

JUNE 4, 1945.

Memorandum.

To: The Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman, Committee to Investigate Food Shortages, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Public eating establishments.

The attached table of figures, obtained from the Office of Price Administration, with reference to public eating establishments, conclusively proves that public eating establishments serve Mr. and Mrs. America rather than the so-called carriage trade.

The figures further establish that public eating establishments feed their patrons at a price to suit each patron's pocketbook.

Further examination of the figures substantiate the fact that it is not a tenet of the public feeding establishments' creed, particularly during the war economy, to provide food service to the wealthy without also providing adequate service to the patrons of average means or less.

On the contrary the war emergency has required public feeding establishments to serve an increasing number of meals to the patron of average means. This group makes up the bulk of people who receive their food from American public feeding establishments.

It is true that there are patrons who purchase high-priced meals; but the number of such high-priced food services is very small compared to the total number of food services that are rendered in public eating establishments.

General Ration Order 5 (Office of Price Administration food rationing regulations governing hotels and restaurants), provides that the amount of money paid for a food service or meal in a public eating establishment will in no event increase a hotel or restaurant's allotment of rationed food. Thus, whether $4 or 40 cents is charged for a meal or food service, the hotel or restaurant's allotment of rationed food for each person served will be the same.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
By GEORGE R. LESAUVAGE, *Chairman,*
By JOHN L. HENNESSY, *Vice Chairman.*

Figures on public eating establishments in the U. S. A.

	Persons served, food only	Dollar revenue, food only	Average check
December 1942 (base period month)	2,867,025,000	$752,325,000	$0.26
1944 (last 9 months, April to December)	31,084,189,338	8,141,445,704	.26
1945 (first 3 months, January, February, March)	10,237,623,548	2,686,225,616	.26

No Need for Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial from the Queen Anne's Record and Observer of Centreville, Md., in reference to the very drastic food shortage now confronting our people:

NO NEED FOR FOOD SHORTAGE

A story such as this should prove interesting to housewives who are faced daily with empty meat showcases and food they desire to buy in their local store.

Reading in the newspapers that supplies are plentiful in Canada, a group of New Jersey butchers who have been unable to obtain meat, pooled their funds and sent two representatives to the Dominion to see what they could buy.

But, before going to Canada, the representatives went to Washington to learn the lay of the land. They were told by the Department of Agriculture it had no objection to the deal. It even arranged to inspect the meat free. The Canadian Embassy gave its O. K. So did the Canadian Ministry of Agriculture.

At the Canadian Embassy an attaché said: "Yes; we have plenty of meat. All you have to do is find it. If the Canadian Government doesn't need it you will receive a permit to ship it to New Jersey."

The businessmen then went to Montreal and purchased 10 cars of prime dressed beef and veal and 6 cars of livestock—a total of 640,000 pounds. The meat cost 19 cents a pound, 2½ cents less than the OPA ceiling price in this country.

After the meat was sealed in refrigerator cars the deal was canceled by a high Canadian food official who told the buyers he acted at the request of the United States Department.

Returning to Washington, the businessmen set out to learn just who was responsible for the failure of their mission.

At the State Department they were told the meat was held up because of a War Food Administration regulation.

Over at the WFA, officials said the regulation cited by the State Department doesn't apply at all; that the WFA had no objection to bringing in Canadian beef.

Then the State Department sprang another alibi. It said there was an agreement between the United States, Great Britain, and Canada that any surplus Canadian beef would not be shipped into the United States—that if it was not wanted by Britain the surplus was to go to Governor Lehman's organization for the relief of liberated nations.

The Philadelphia Record asks: "Is there such an agreement? If so, why has it been kept secret?"

The Jersey businessmen brought back from Canada other interesting facts.

They saw huge quantities of cheese, with a 21-cent-a-pound price tag against 45-cent ceiling here.

Butter, 36 cents a pound, compared with 51 cents here. There are more than 56,000,000 pounds of butter in storage for Canada's 11,500,000 population.

Eggs sell from 20 to 24 cents a dozen compared with a retail ceiling here of 49 cents. In Canada the supply is so great farmers are killing laying hens to prevent a further price drop.

Chickens are so abundant across the border that "you can buy all you want at any price you're willing to pay." Here chickens are almost unobtainable, except in the black market.

This situation shows that this Government could do a lot to relieve the meat shortage in this country if it so desired. Again it is a case of red tape, bungling, and too many Government bureaus. If the American businessman was left to supply himself the consumers would find much more on the grocer's shelves.

Jurisdictional Dispute Among Labor Unions

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] wanted to know what Canada had that we did not have. I can tell him a few things that we have that Canada does not have. One thing, strikes, which interfere with war production. An administration which in return for political support, permits picket lines and work stoppages which limit and retard production of war materials and equipment.

I have here the noon issue of the Washington News.

The headline reads:

Detroit walk-out worries Washington—Chicago strike ends; 100,000 out elsewhere.

Down below:

CIO and AFL jurisdiction battle over reconversion and reconstruction. Maintenance jobs keep 37,000 away from work in Detroit.

It was not the failure to pass the FEPC or anything else that kept those fellows out of jobs. It is a fight between the unions. I was greatly interested in that statement in the paper where the gentleman from the majority side said that the House and Senate were "practicing double dealing." I wish he would drag that out into the open and let us straighten it out. As far as I am concerned, I

am willing to vote on FEPC any time they want to bring it out.

But to get back to the war and the strikes, every issue of every paper brings us a story of new battles in the Pacific where American boys are fighting and are dying. Almost every issue brings us news of new attacks by Jap suicide planes, of American ships sunk or damaged by the Japs. It is 14,000 miles to the battlefront. Millions of tons of supplies of munitions of war are desperately needed by the men we have forced from their homes and sent across the seas.

A few days ago we learned of a strike down in the South where workers refused for the time being to repair a warship damaged in the Pacific, needed in the Pacific. On the front page of this Washington paper are pictures of strikers holding workers back from their jobs in a factory which produces parts for B–29's. The pictures are captioned "Battle on the home front." Think of it. While young men—some of them the best that ever came out of America—each day set forth in B–29's to bomb the Japs, to win this war—while they are fighting your battle and mine, the battle of these strikers—these men, charged with the duty of producing parts to repair the damaged B–29's if they are so fortunate as to return to their bases, refuse to work, and Congress, a Congress which prides itself on its courage and its patriotism, sits here day after day and, either because of a lack of inclination or a lack of courage, refuses to adopt legislation, insist upon the enforcement of legislation which will end this intolerable situation.

It is no secret that these strikes are interfering with the war effort. Note this further story, captioned "Detroit walkouts worry Washington." The story reads as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 27, 1945]

DETROIT WALK-OUTS WORRY WASHINGTON

(By John W. Love)

All the administration's policies in labor relations, wartime and peacetime, have been built on the principle of representation for collective bargaining. This month's breakdown of representation out Detroit way has Washington worried.

Strikes have been occurring there and elsewhere since the beginning of the month, faster than they can be counted. The trouble in Detroit is considerably the worst, involving as it does many plants, many war contracts, upward of 40,000 workers and the most confusing and refractory labor situation the Government has had to deal with since the war started. The coal strikes were much larger, but they were simple. Those in Detroit are full of nasty technicalities, as always when labor fights labor.

DISCIPLINE DECAYS

The long decay of plant discipline, brought out forcefully in the Detroit sitting of the Mead committee last spring, has its counterpart there today in the collapse of union discipline. Locals or sections of locals are contending with one another, defying in some instances the advice and orders of their internationals. Employers are strictly in the middle. The quarrel is between units of the CIO and the AFL, and it concerns the control of the big job of automobile reconversion. No union officers are sure enough of their following to be able to make secure agreements.

TOOLS WEAR OUT

So far has the row progressed that no tool of labor relations which Washington has developed now seems applicable there, with the exception of plant seizure. Government take-overs are already more numerous in the Truman regime than in any equivalent period in the Roosevelt, and they are likely to be extended some more.

The duration of the Goodyear strike in Akron is now longer than these affairs have usually run before the plant was seized, but the production of some of Detroit's suspended plants or departments, in Packard, Hudson, Ford, and Budd Wheel, is currently even more essential to the military forces. (The Chrysler trouble is of somewhat different nature, there strikes of construction workers on similar grievances have stopped a $6,000,000 construction program for civilian expansion.)

Politically the dilemma in Detroit is a touchy one for the Government to walk into by means of enforcement action. The agency which took it on, the Army or other department, would either have to make decisions favoring a CIO union or a group of AFL crafts, or shove to one side all reconversion effort in the struck sections of the motor industry. No agency of the Government outside of two or three in labor is equipped with the technical knowledge required to handle it.

WLB ACCUSED

The War Labor Board has been repeatedly accused of favoritism, more often by A. F. of L. officers than than by CIO, but the agency which took on the Detroit mess would have to make up its mind to award particular pieces of work to very particular unions. It would have to force settlements in matters on which individual workmen feel deeply, in controversies which have run on for months without any progress being made.

On April 5 the manufacturers warned J. A. Krug, War Production Board Chairman, of the impending contest. Joseph Keenan, able trouble shooter for the WPB, thought he obtained a gentleman's agreement between the factions claiming the work of reconditioning the industry, as well as assurances from manufacturers that there would be plenty of jobs for all. After he had gone to London the understanding blew up. Several of the Labor Department's ace conciliators then went to Detroit and toiled for weeks, without success.

A new conference of representatives of the A. F. of L. and CIO unions was held at the Labor Department offices here yesterday but it recessed without making announcement. General officers of the CIO have appealed to the Labor Department for abritration.

But unfortunately the story does not worry Congress enough to induce it to take effective action. You ask what would I do? I would pass and enforce legislation which provided that if a man refused to work in a war plant and does not, within a specified time, find himself another job in an essential industry, he would automatically be inducted into the armed forces and he would be assigned a job by the military officer in command in his military district—and that job would be at the same compensation received by the fighting man on the battle front.

I sometimes wonder how Congressmen can day after day read of the war casualties, of our battle losses, then turn to the papers giving each day a list of strikes in war plants and sit idle here in the legislative halls refusing or failing to take effective action to end this intolerable situation.

I ask you my colleagues, what do you really think the men who are on the battle front, the boys who day by day are being sent out of this country to fight in the Pacific, will think of us when they know the facts?

Tribute to Stettinius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the hopes of the American people and mankind in general lies in the acceptance of the principles enunciated at the recent meetings of the 50 nations of the world at San Francisco. We have won a military victory in Europe. We will win the final military victory against Japan in the not too distant future. However, victory on the battlefields is not enough to insure peace nor is it sufficient payment for the lives we have paid in achieving this goal.

We must have economic peace and political cooperation in the years to come as well. The goal we strive for is peace, peace for all mankind, and the right and security to a decent livelihood for all peoples in all parts of the world. We pray, as free blood is spilling daily on our far-flung battlefields, that the new instrument created at the San Francisco Conference will lead us in the ways of peace, and we are determined to do everything in our power that this peace may be safeguarded to the very best of our ability. The Charter agreed to at San Francisco is a stronger Charter than that under which the old League of Nations operated. The strength of the charter depends on the permanence of the friendship among the Big Five. If the unity of the United States, Russia, Great Britain, China, and France should founder on conflicting interests, the fact that this new league has teeth in it will not save the world from another war. We have to understand that fact now and in doing so, we should realize we must support the United Nations' set-up and make every effort to understand and get along with our neighbor nations and they should make the same kind of effort to understand and get along with us. The new Charter is a better instrument than the League of Nations. We have not been given a perfect set of rules under which we can all get along with one another but we should accept it as the best the United Nations can do at this time and as a hopeful improvement over the peace plans of the past and as our greatest stake in security for the future.

We must see to it that the smaller nations are given every possible opportunity to participate in the affairs of the

world and we should use the instrument of the Charter not as something to further aggression, discontent, and suspicion but as a pact which will show clearly to all peoples that from now on the foremost ambition of all of us will be to establish a permanent and just world order. We should fight just as hard to safeguard the peace of the future as we have fought and are fighting to achieve military victory in the present.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of hearing over the radio yesterday our able Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, addressing the final plenary session of the UNCIO at San Francisco. I was very much impressed with the determination with which he spoke and the motion under which he was laboring as he brought this Conference to an end. I feel that Mr. Stettinius has proved himself to be a statesman in the highest American tradition in his conduct of this very difficult assignment and I know he has earned the respect and confidence, not only of the American people but also of their Representatives in the Congress of the United States as well. I can only say to Mr. Stettinius what has already been said at San Francisco by the American delegates to the Conference and that is: "We have been very proud of your courage, your determination to achieve a new world order, your unfailing persistence through moments of dark perplexity, your poise and good temper, your tactful reconciliation of those who have differed and doubted."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution received by me from the Rotary Club of Anaconda, Mont., dated June 14, 1945, and a copy of the remarks made by the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius at the closing plenary session of the Conference on Tuesday, June 26, 1945. I had also intended to include an editorial entitled "Tribute to Stettinius" appearing in the Washington Evening Star of June 26, 1945, but I find that the Honorable SCOTT LUCAS, Senator from the State of Illinois has already done so.

ROTARY CLUB OF ANACONDA, MONT.,
June 14, 1945.

Mr. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
United States Secretary of State, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On this wartime Flag Day, the Anaconda Rotary Club voted unanimously to send you a letter of appreciation approving your good work at the Peace Conference in San Francisco.

The club also instructed the secretary to send copies to President Harry Truman and Montana congressional delegation: Senators BURTON K. WHEELER and JAMES MURRAY, Congressmen MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY D'EWART.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. MANION,
President.
F. W. C. WHYTE,
Secretary.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, AT THE CLOSING PLENARY SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE, TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1945

It is with a full heart that I address this final plenary session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

Two months ago the delegates here assembled met for the first time. We came back from many parts of the earth, across continents and oceans. We came as the representatives of 50 different nations. But we came here first of all as the representatives of humanity and as the bearers of a common mandate to write the charter of a world organization to maintain peace for all nations and to promote the welfare of all men.

Every nation represented here has had a part in the making of the Charter. Sentence by sentence, article by article, it has been hammered out around the conference tables. We have spoken freely with each other. Often we have disagreed. When we disagreed we tried again, and then again, until we ended by reconciling the differences among us.

This is the way of friendship and of peace. This is the only way that nations of freemen can make a charter for peace and the only way that they can live at peace with one another.

The San Francisco Conference has fulfilled its mandate. The Charter of a permanent United Nations has now been written.

Today we meet together for the last time at this Conference. Tomorrow we shall separate and return home, each to his own country. But in this charter we will carry to our governments and to our peoples an identical message of purpose and an identical instrument for the fulfillment of that purpose.

We shall bring this Charter to a world that is still racked by war and by war's aftermath.

A few days ago I talked with some young Americans just back from the battle front. They lay wounded and in pain in the beds of an Army hospital.

As I talked with them I thought of the many millions who have risked all and sacrificed future and life itself to give the world this chance. I thought of all those men and women and children of the nations represented in this meeting place today whom tyranny with bomb and bayonet, starvation, fire, and torture, could kill but never conquer. And I thought of all the cities now in ruins and all the land laid waste.

The terrible trial is not yet over. The fighting continues. The reconstruction has only just begun.

This Charter is a compact born of suffering and of war. With it now rests our hope for good and lasting peace.

The words upon its parchment chart the course by which a world in agony can be restored and peace maintained and human rights and freedoms can be advanced. It is a course which I believe to be within the will and the capacity of the nations at this period of world history to follow.

To the Governments and peoples of the 50 nations whose representatives have labored here the Charter is now committed. May almighty God, from this day on, and in the months and years to come, sustain us in the unalterable purpose that its promise be fulfilled.

Tribute to General Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the American Disabled Veterans dinner in honor of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Tuesday, June 26, 1945, at Statler Hotel, Washington:

On my honor, I'll be brief. I have to begin with this solemn promise because the first thought that comes into the mind of an audience when a Congressman rises to speak is, "Please, in as few thousand words as possible."

It is pleasant to break bread with National Commander Milton B. Cohn, my esteemed friend—a splendid officer of a splendid organization—the Disabled American Veterans—a group of gallant soldiers who never forget their friends.

But I do want to add my tribute to our guest of honor, Gen. Frank T. Hines. It has been my pleasure to meet with him, to marvel at his unfailing patience, to note over these many years how General Hines faced with sturdy intelligence the tremendous problems that each day had to be solved anew. To General Hines, each case was not a number in a file. The cases were human beings, men who had fought and who had bled, men of soul and mind and heart to whom our country owed an unrepayable debt. He felt with them because he himself is a soldier, a gallant soldier who served "beyond the call of duty." General Hines is a modest man. Not many know that he holds the Distinguished Service Medal, that Great Britain bestowed upon him the Companion Order of the Bath. France pinned upon him the Legion of Honor and Czechoslovakia the War Cross. Belgium, too, honored him with the Grand Officer Order of Leopold.

We have not forgotten that it was General Hines who was responsible for the remarkable feat of returning over two million men from overseas after the last war in a period of 8 months. You can readily appreciate the superhuman labors that went into the job. In 8 months' time over 2,000,000 men were back on the beloved soil, back to waiting, anxious parents, wives, and friends. You who are back with us know what that means. If I'm making you a little uncomfortable, General, I'm not the least bit sorry. This is my chance to tell you and the others you're a swell fellow.

Talking about returning veterans and returned veterans of this war, there are one or two thoughts I want to leave with you. The pattern of 12,000,000 lives cannot be distorted as it has been by the plague of war and then reshaped with ease. The problems to be faced by the returning veterans are both individual and collective. Those of use who have stayed home in safety and comfort must make these problems our own. We know, we know very well, that every returning veteran is concerned with the future, his future, his job, his profession, his business, his trade, "Will I get a job? Will there be jobs to be had?" That's what the boys talked about in the fox holes, on the ships going over and coming back, in alien lands and in the homeland.

Our credo must be, "The veterans come first."

Some industries will contract, others will expand. The job may have been there when the soldier left, but due to the change of the business may no longer exist when he returns. The GI bill offers no protection in these instances. I am not pretending that I can cover even a portion of the dislocations which are not covered by the GI bill. I merely illustrate how complex the problem is.

Our debt to the soldier is so immeasurable that the small sacrifices—if so they can be called—of the civilian pale into insignificance. To my mind, a bonus, in no way meets the situation. Even calling it adjusted compensation won't help. It is like putting a bandage over a deep wound without attempting to cure it first. A bonus cannot mend the dislocations nor help to establish a sound economy that will not collapse at the first ill wind that blows.

The GI bill of rights must be perfected and strengthened to give every possible aid to the disabled veteran. The rehabilitation and retraining program must in no way ever be regarded as routine. It must be flexible and subject to change as new needs arise. The disabled veteran wants no pity. He wants above all to be a useful member of society and that must be our aim.

Farmers Need Additional Cooperation To Produce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America will have great difficulty to maintain, much less increase, the production of foods during the coming years. Here are a few of the reasons why I make this statement:

First. Unreasonable and unwise policies now being enforced by the Federal Selective Service System in the drafting of essential farm labor.

Second. Too low prices on some farm produce.

Third. The shortage of farm machinery. Many farmers managed to plant and harvest their crops with old and nearly worn-out equipment last year, but this same equipment will not hold up for another season in many cases.

Fourth. We have had reasonably good weather conditions for the past few years and there is always a chance that this will change. Last year in my district, a great deal of our potato crop was lost or damaged by excessive rainfall. Heavy rains and cool weather have hampered crop production this year.

In connection with the weather factor, it might be well to remember that Australia, Mexico, Cuba, and other agricultural countries last year and recently have suffered severe droughts. This country will try to make up that loss in increased production.

In a report prepared at my request, the Department of Agriculture had the following to say about the 1944 crop weather conditions in other countries:

The general situation is summarized as follows: Inadequate rainfall primarily affected regions south of the Equator. Australia and South America suffered most severely. Drought conditions in Australia, however, are not likely to prevent that country from covering its own food needs and its share in the food requirements of the Allied forces in the Pacific this year. The damage from drought in South America is expected to affect livestock, corn, wheat, rice, cotton, flaxseed, and probably coffee. In the Northern Hemisphere, early in the 1944 season, rainfall was scarce in the United Kingdom, parts of north Africa and Spain, southern Iran, the southeastern coast of China (Fukien Province), and Japan. The over-all effect of the droughts in these regions is not reported as serious.

The following is a somewhat more detailed discussion of the drought situation by regions:

The Australian drought has been one of the most severe in the country's history. The drought began early in 1943 and became more extensive and acute in 1944. All parts of the commonwealth except the island of Tasmania, the coastal fringes on the eastern and southeastern borders of the mainland, and the main crop-producing areas in the State of Western Australia have been affected. The main wheat belt has been hardest hit by the drought. The 1944 crop is now estimated at only 50,000,000 bushels, or one-third of the prewar average. Production and carry-over will meet home requirements, but only limited quantities will be available for export in 1945.

Earlier hopes for an increase in Australian dairy output were dissipated, as the drought spread to important dairy areas in November and December. During these flush season months dairy production declined sharply in two of the three important dairy states. This will place the output for the year ending June 30 well below that of last year. If the drought continues in areas already affected or spreads to the important producing areas in the State of Victoria, further declines can be expected. The reports do not indicate, however, that any liquidation of stock has occurred to prevent an average milk output during the next flush season which begins in October 1945, if the drought is definitely broken.

Thus far, Australia's main beef-producing aria, located in the State of Queensland, has been only moderately affected. It is too early, however, to forecast the effect of the drought on beef production. Supplies of cattle for slaughter may be reduced after 1945, if the drought should result in above-average death losses, a smaller calf crop, and forced liquidation of cattle for slaughter this year.

Heavy losses of sheep and lambs have been reported and a reduction of 10 percent in Australian mutton and lamb production is forecast for the 1945 calendar year. Hog numbers, now at record levels, are expected to decline because of reduced feed supplies. A 4-percent decrease of pork production in 1945 is forecast.

Drought in several areas from Mexico to Argentina has only just abated. The central grain belt of Argentina and in the Brazilian states of São Paulo, Minas Gereas, and Rio Grande do Sul were especially affected. The drought was interrupted late in October and early in November by a short period of normal rainfall, which did not, however, provide sufficient relief to prevent serious crop damage.

October reports from the State of São Paulo carried the statement that livestock were dying from starvation and that those sent to slaughter were thin. According to current reports, estimates of exportable supplies of frozen meats from Argentina, have been revised downward partially as a result of the drought.

Dairying in Argentina has also suffered, and production of butter during the last quarter of 1944 has been estimated as being 4,400 short tons less than the 21,400 short tons produced during the corresponding quarter of 1943.

Argentine corn is one of the crops most disastrously affected. Recent trade estimates place the corn crop at about 100,000,000 bushels, or less than one-third average. The yield of wheat is probably 30 to 40 percent below normal. Argentine wheat production for the current crop is estimated at about 5,000,000 short ton, a decrease of one-third from last year.

In the State of Rio Grande do Sul where 95 percent of Brazil's rice is produced, unfavorable weather has reduced crop prospects about 30 percent. This area has been an important rice supplier to the Allied Nations in recent years, exporting an estimated 5,000,000 bushels in 1944. Coffee like all other crops is reduced by the drought. Although it is too early to estimate the current coffee crop, it is reported that the trees are still suffering from the effects of the drought.

The acreage planted to cotton in São Paulo is smaller than usual because of late plantings due to drought. São Paulo produces about 80 percent of the Brazilian cotton crop. In Argentina, however, the cotton crop is generally good.

Flaxseed in Argentina, it is estimated, has suffered a 40 percent reduction. Because of the short crop and the practice of burning linseed oil as fuel, exports of this commodity will depend upon importation of fuel oil.

Drought was experienced in the United Kingdom during the winter and spring of 1944, followed by a very wet harvest season. This combination resulted in lower crop yields, but the effect on the water supply was felt more keenly than on crop production.

Continental Europe and Africa did not suffer from drought, although some inadequacies in rainfall were reported from North Africa and Spain in the fall of 1944.

In the Middle East rainfall is usually so limited that agriculture in most areas is dependent upon irrigation and it was only in southern Iran that a serious drought affected production.

In India, Bengal, and the Honan and Kwangtung regions of China, where disastrous droughts were suffered in 1942 and 1943, conditions are now more nearly normal. The Province of Fukien on the southeastern coast of China, however, is reported to have had a recent drought of medium severity. Early in the 1944 season, Japan suffered a mild drought which reduced to some extent the acreage in rice but other crops were substituted for it.

Cordell Hull Terms San Francisco Charter Magnificent Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no one better qualified to pass judgment upon the Charter, signed yesterday by the delegates of 50 countries at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, than Cordell Hull. His long service as Secretary of State during the most critical period of our history enabled him to know world conditions, and how to deal with them.

While his health would not permit him to attend the Conference as a delegate, to which he was appointed by President Roosevelt, President Truman, Secretary Stettinius, and other delegates from the United States were in constant communication with him, and his judgment and advice were sought on many occasions during the 9 weeks' consideration of this Charter.

In January 1943, Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, began making definite plans for a world organization, which culminated yesterday in the signing of this Charter.

Confirmatory of this statement, I submit herewith a letter to me from him, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 6, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: The President some time ago decided that vigorous and intensive work needs to be done in preparation for this country's effective participation in the solution of the vast and complicated

problems of international relations which will confront us and the world after the final defeat of the forces of aggression. He therefore directed that there be created in the Department of State an Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State and the vice chairmanship of the Under Secretary of State, and composed of members drawn from private life as well as from official positions, to be charged with the conduct of the necessary studies and with the preparation of recommendations to be submitted to him as to the policy which this Government should pursue in dealing with the international problems arising from the current war and to be anticipated at the conclusion of the war.

The committee, the existence and work of which it has been deemed desirable for the present to keep on a strictly confidential basis, has been organizing itself for work in the interrelated fields of political, territorial, and economic reconstruction and of general security, and is carrying out its responsibilities through frequent meetings of its various subcommittees and meetings from time to time of the committee as a whole.

With the approval of the President, I take pleasure in inviting you to become a member of this committee. Would you be good enough to inform me at your earliest convenience whether you find it possible to serve on the committee and to attend a meeting of the subcommittee on political problems on Saturday, January 9, 1943, at 10:30 o'clock in room 204, the Department of State?

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

The Advisory Committee on Postwar Foreign Policy had regular weekly meetings for more than a year, and much work was done in these meetings in formulating the ground work of the plans and decisions which were evolved at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and finally in the signing of the Charter yesterday by the 50 nations at San Francisco.

The American people will be interested in knowing the opinion of Cordell Hull concerning this Charter, and under leave granted, I submit herewith an article appearing yesterday in the New York Times, containing a statement and a message from Cordell Hull, commending the San Francisco Charter and urging swift ratification of it:

HULL ASKS NATIONS TO AFFIRM CHARTER—SAYS SAN FRANCISCO DOCUMENT HOLDS KEY TO THE SURVIVAL OF CIVILIZATION

WASHINGTON, June 26.—Former Secretary Cordell Hull appealed today to this country, and other countries for swift ratification to bring into existence the United Nations Charter that was signed today in San Francisco.

Analyzing the new Charter, Mr. Hull said it "draws together the basic moral and political ideals" through which, alone, mankind could hope, in the world today, to "achieve peace and security, justice and fair dealing, cultural and material advancement."

"The magnificent success of the San Francisco Conference," he said, "attests to the unshakeable resolve of the United Nations to work together in peace as they have worked together in war."

The document, he added, was a human, rather than a perfect instrument, and would grow and improve if the nations maintain the spirit in which it was created. Then, in view of the difficulties and complexities he said he foresaw in building the peace, Secretary Hull made his formal appeal.

"Out of long experience," he declared, "out of what I see ahead, I appeal with all my heart to our Nation and to all the United Nations to ratify the Charter and to bring into existence as soon as possible the international organization for which it provides."

HE FELICITATES STETTINIUS

In forwarding the statement to Secretary Stettinius Mr. Hull offered him "warmest and heartiest" congratulations on the successful conclusion of the conference and on adoption of the Charter.

In concluding his message Mr. Hull said: "Upon the success of the organization will depend the fulfillment of humanity's highest aspirations and the very survival of our civilization."

Mr. Hull's statement was as follows:

"The San Francisco Conference will live in history as one of the great milestones in man's upward climb toward a truly civilized existence. The Charter of the United Nations adopted there, provides an essential framework within which the peace-loving nations of the world can work together, more effectively than ever before, toward banishing war and toward providing wider opportunities and greater facilities for human progress.

"That Charter draws together and brings to a focus the basic moral and political ideals which must underlie a workable system of organized relations among nations.

"Through such a system alone can mankind hope, in the world of today, to achieve peace and security, justice and fair-dealing, cultural and material advancement. It builds on the experience of ages, as well as on the realties of the modern world forged in the ordeal of two World Wars.

"The delegations of the 50 nations represented at San Francisco have labored there in the spirit in which they have been fighting the latest and costliest war for human freedom."

CHARTER AN OUTGROWTH

"The Charter which they have produced stems from the great document that, in the darkest hours of the war, served for humanity as beacon lights of hope and determination—the Atlantic Charter, the declaration by United Nations, the Moscow four-nation declaration, the Teheran declaration, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, the decisions of the Crimea Conference.

"The magnificent success of the San Francisco Conference attests to the unshakeable resolve of the United Nations to work together in peace—as they have worked together in war—to preserve the ideals for which they have been and are making such tremendous sacrifices, to make the relaization of these ideals a living monument to those who have given their lives that these ideals may endure.

"We now have, at long last, a Charter of a world organization capable of fulfilling the hopes of mankind. It is a human rather than a perfect instrument. It has within it ample flexibility for growth and development, for dynamic adaptation to changing conditions."

FAITH IN CHARTER EXPRESSED

"The Charter will work, and grow, and improve, if our Nation and all nations devoted to peace maintain the spirit in which they have created it and remain eternally vigilant in support and defense of the great ideals on which it is founded.

"There are many difficulties and complexities ahead of us. We must still bring the present war to a victorious conclusion. We must heal the wounds of the war and repair its ravages. We need build toward new horizons of enduring peace and of an increasing measure of social and economic well-being. In the performance of these vast tasks our chances of success have been immeasurably strengthened because 50 nations—different in race, language, historic background, and attitude toward life—have found common ground at San Francisco and have agreed on a Charter for the United Nations.

"The Charter now goes to the peoples and legislatures of the world for ratification.

"Out of long experience—out of what I see ahead—I appeal with all my heart to our Nation and to all United Nations to ratify the Charter and to bring into existence, as soon as possible, the international organization for which it provides. Upon the success of that organization depends the fulfillment of humanity's highest aspirations and the very survival of our civilization."

The San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I inolude the following report:

REPORT ON THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE LOUIS C. RABAUT AND THE HONORABLE KARL STEFAN

The purpose of this report is to give the Membership of the House of Representatives some insight into the physical magnitude and administrative complexities of the Conference, an outline of the organization proposed to be established, together with a brief reference to the monetary aspects of the entire undertaking. The brief time spent in San Francisco by the undersigned, of necessity, limits this report to highlights and impressions. It is the hope, nonetheless, that the report will, even though in very small degree, add something to the information of the individual Members of the Congress, and thereby contribute that much more to the determination of the people of this country and the peoples of the rest of the world to in the future prevent the indiscriminate and wanton destruction of humanity and the products of human endeavor for centuries past.

PROVIDING FACILITIES FOR CONFERENCE

Any apprehension that the undersigned may have had concerning the efficiency with which the Conference was organized and subsequently conducted were soon dispelled. The preparation for the Conference was complex and of such size that it was necessary to set up a small city within a city, and solve acute problems of transportation, services, housing, finance, communications, coordination of committee work, and general public relations.

Representatives of the State Department worked closely with the mayor in establishing citizens committees and subcommittees, making certain that they were nonpartisan and represented the best talent available in the respective fields.

They established contact with the commanding officers of the Army and Navy in San Francisco, to lay the foundation for assistance in transportation, security matters, and other services.

The group acted in an advisory capacity in rearranging space in the Veterans' Building so that it would fit the needs of the various offices and working units of the International Secretariat and worked with Treasury Procurement to obtain contractors and construction materials.

This group also worked out the details of the American Women's Voluntary Service in the Opera House and Veterans' Building, and continued as liaison with the women's organization throughout the Conference.

If cooperative relations had not been set up with the city of San Francisco and its various organizations, the Conference could never have been successful. The cost to

the city has been considerable in overtime for the police force, additional lighting, hospitality, use of cars, the diversion of much of the military traffic and loss of income, etc. If there had been more time in which to plan, the city probably would have floated a bond issue for about a half million dollars to cover such cost. It is hoped that the resultant good will and publicity from the Conference will compensate the city of San Francisco for its generous contribution to the success of the Conference.

The United Nations Conference committee was an organization chairmanned by the mayor of San Francisco, with the president of the chamber of commerce as chairman of the executive committee. There were seven subcommittees under able civic leaders to handle: Finance press-radio aid, civic events, entertainment, hospitality and welfare, transportation and decoration, and display.

The framework of the citizens committee was ready to go into action at the opening of the Conference. While their activity did not start immediately, due to the difficulty of disseminating information concerning their services, it soon increased to considerable dimensions.

One of the early highlights was the manner in which this committee handled the foreign journalists, and they were responsible for many of the first impressions of this group. They arranged for an information desk in the press room of the Veterans' Building which was very active and required at least four people in constant attendance. So that the press might know San Francisco, they arranged scheduled daily trips by car, plane, and blimp for a view of the city and bay, to Kaiser's Shipyards, etc.

The citizens committee maintained card catalogs on people who would be willing to entertain some of the foreign delegates and press in their homes, and what languages were spoken. Also in these catalogs were offers from hospitable citizens for the use of their ski lodges in the mountains, or their summer homes, complete with service, food, etc.

The citizens committee provided a large pool of private cars, with drivers, who were available to augment the official pool of Army cars. This was particularly helpful to journalists and others who did not have access to the Army pool.

They had a shopping service, including guides who were linguists for the various foreign vistiors. There was a special subcommittee under the citizens committee which arranged for special public attractions during the Conference.

A Conference theater to show educational and informational documentary films was considered a necessity. The movie industry agreed to furnish the operator and machine and any other equipment, and the rental of the little theater in the St. Francis Hotel was paid jointly by CIAA and OWI. A member of the Canadian Film Board was borrowed to collect and choose the films from various governments, United States agencies, etc. This excellent service promoted an understanding of the endeavors in various countries and was well received. The Conference theater operated daily through June 9.

The United Nations Theater was the only activity sponsored by the movie industry which was approved officially by the Conference. The industry cooperated in keeping the theater simple, without press agents and without Hollywood star appearances. The theater was specially decorated for the Conference and specially named. The Conference officials approved all programs and included some of the better-known foreign films as well. Also, the news-reel group connected with the Conference carefully edited the many feet of film taken of the delegations and officials of the Conference so that some interesting news reels of the audience at work could be shown daily.

It was decided in Washington that there should be information booths in the lobbies of the main hotels and in the lobby of the Veterans' Building, and that they should be supplied with appropriate information for the guidance of delegates, press, and observers.

Two kinds of material had to be available—material such as the Journal and Order of the Day and information as to how to get tickets for public meetings, etc.; and background information associated with developments prior to the Conference proceedings.

The unofficial information was set up by the ladies of San Francisco for the purpose of arranging for hospitality and trips around the city and countryside. They also gave advice as to how to go to certain locations, information about the city, what sort of things could be seen, and trips organized by volunteer hosts and hostesses.

Another type of information dealt with correspondence which answered questions, cleared up misunderstandings, and gave background information.

There was close coordination between the information office's booths in hotel lobbies and those of the local women's information group. The booths were all provided by the volunteer organization.

The transportation unit was made up mainly of transportation specialists loaned by commercial air lines, railroads, and industry, including Standard Oil (2), U. S. Rubber (3), Airlines (2), Air Transport Association (2), R. H. Macy (1), Weyerhaeuser Steamship Line (1), United States Navy (1); Air Transport Command (5), War Shipping Administration (1), and others from State Department, etc. (4).

Beginning March 22 in Washington, this unit was gradually built into its present organization, which ably transported 2,300 people by rail and 1,200 by air to San Francisco between April 18 and 24.

In addition, the ATC brought in 63 planes from overseas. This number does not include the Russian and RAF planes which arrived under their own arrangements.

During the first 8 weeks of the Conference approximately 5,000 reservations by air and rail were handled by the transportation unit, plus a large volume of cargo.

All foreign delegates and staff paid the regular commercial transportation rates, and members of the State Department and staff were transported at the expense of the State Department.

All the planning for local transportation started on February 28 by the Army and Navy and was based on a maximum requirement which proved to be correct.

An Army-Navy coordination group was set up to service the Conference, and consisted of personnel assigned from the local Army and Navy installations, and some from outlying areas.

Local transportation consisted of 458 automobiles and buses, of which 48 were privately owned.

This service, operated on a 24-hour basis, required 613 Army and Navy personnel. In addition, 198 local women who volunteered their services at minimum salaries, were drivers for the pool cars.

The facilities of approximately 30 hotels and 3 clubs were used, with the major portion of personnel being accommodated at the 20 larger hotels. About 2,000 persons having direct connections with the Conference were housed in approximately 1,500 hotel rooms, exclusive of about 1,200 out-of-town newspaper correspondents and 75 consultants of national organizations who attended as observers.

In addition, 300 hotel rooms were used for offices of the members of the various delegations. The main offices were located in the Veterans' Building, the Opera House, and 4 temporary buildings in Civic Center, occupying about 75,000 square feet of space, not including the committee meeting rooms. Approximately 1,900 feet of partitions were erected to convert the space into the required types of offices and workrooms.

Space allocated on the first floor of the Veterans' Building to the radio networks was constructed into soundproof studios under the direction of, and at the expense of, the participating radio companies. Later it was considered desirable to have a soundproof studio on the second floor for the use of the combined news-reel companies in making pictures of the various foreign delegations and chairman who would make statements, and this cost was borne by the State Department for construction, and by the news-reel companies for hangings and necessary equipment.

Procurement and supply activity is indicated by the quantity of equiment used: Approximately 1,600 desks and tables, 5,000 chairs, 2,500 filing cabinets, 1,000 typewriters, and 35 duplicating machines. Through June 8, 20,000 lead pencils, 3,000 erasers, 600 bottles of ink, and 30 tons of paper had been consumed.

The entire country was scoured to secure certain kinds of specialty equipment and materials such as foreign-language typewriters and recording and photographic equipment.

A specially installed communications system had 60 trunk lines, 10 positions of multiple manual switchboard, 50 tie lines between conference headquarters, hotels and various offices, about 465 extension stations, and 3 leased lines between the State Department in Washington and the Conference. The average calls handled each day were 12,000, with a top number of 20,000 in 1 day.

At the peak 38 operators were required, of which 20 were foreign language operators speaking French, Chinese, Russian, Spanish, and Portuguese.

Official representation at the Conference

Delegates	279
Other officials and staff of delegations	1,441
The International Secretariat	1,070
Army and Navy personnel (including 35 officers)	2,262
Volunteer workers	2,000
Telephone operators	33
Telegraph operators	150
Accredited press, radio, and news-reel members	2,633

In addition, 22 unofficial representatives of 6 intergovernmental organizations attended: League of Nations, Permanent Court of International Justice, International Labor Organization; United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Pan American Union.

COST OF SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

The cost of the San Francisco Conference is estimated at about $2,000,000, payable from funds appropriated to the Department of State for this and similar purposes. All items of expense were carefully scrutinized by the office of the Comptroller, and will subsequently, of course, be audited by the General Accounting Office.

Hotel, transportation, food, and other expenses of the foreign delegations were paid by their respective governments. The transportation costs and hotel expenses of the United States representatives and staff were made a charge against the Department of State.

OUTLINE OF THE ORGANIZATION

Although certain details remain to be filled in, the general framework of the United Nations Organization has taken form. Subject to a few changes, it shapes up as follows:

The organization, which will be called the United Nations, will have the following principal organs: General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Inter-

national Court of Justice, Trusteeship Council, Secretariat.

The General Assembly: This body has been described by Senator VANDENBERG as the Town Meeting of the World. It will be composed of all states members of the Organization, each state having one vote.

The Security Council is made responsible under the charter for fulfilling the functions of the Organization in maintaining international peace and security. It will consist of the following permanent members: China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Great Britain, the United States of America, and of six nonpermanent members, elected by the General Assembly for 2-year terms, three to be elected each year.

It will be the duty of the Security Council first, to seek a solution of disputes between nations by peaceful means. This failing, the Council is to decide upon what nonmilitary or military enforcement measures should be taken to maintain or restore peace and security.

The Economic and Social Council: This body, under the authority of the General Assembly, is to be given the responsibility of facilitating the solution of international social, economic, and other humanitarian problems. It will consist of 18 states, elected for 3-year terms by the General Assembly, six to be elected annually.

It will be one of the functions of this Council to coordinate the policies of the political, economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and other specialized organizations or agencies. Examples of the specialized agencies referred to are: The International Labor Organization and the proposed Food and Agriculture Organization.

The International Court of Justice will be the principal judicial body of the new Organization. It will function under a statute annexed to the charter. All members of the Organization will ipso facto be parties to the statute. Other states may become parties to the statute under conditions determined by the General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The 15 judges will be elected jointly by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Court will not exercise compulsory jurisdiction, but by adhering to an optional clause, states may accept such jurisdiction, for certian categories of strictly legal questions.

A Trusteeship Council is to be established which will supervise the working of the trusteeship system of the Organization, except that it will have no responsibility for strategic areas placed under the system. The latter will be exercised by the Security Council.

Briefly, the objectives of the trusteeship system will be to further international peace and security and to promote the progressive development of the trust territories and their inhabitants. The territories which will be brought under the system will include (a) certain of those now held under mandate; (b) those which may be taken from Axis states or their satellites; and (c) those colonial territories which may be placed under the system voluntarily by the state now holding them.

The Secretariat, another of the principal organs of the Organization, is to be headed by the Secretary-General. This official is to be elected for a 3-year term by the General Assembly, upon recommendation of the Security Council, and will be eligible for reelection. He will act in the capacity of Secretary-General for the General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council. He and the secretariat staff will be responsible only to the Organization.

ESTIMATED COST OF PERMANENT ORGANIZATION

With respect to the cost of maintaining the permanent United Nations Organization, nothing could be done until the machinery with which the Organization is to operate is established and ratified as provided in the provisions of the charter. However, it is understood that an interim organization will be established by the participating nations for the purpose of determining the method and extent of financial participation by nations and for defraying such costs as may be incurred pending ratification by the member governments. What the ultimate permanent annual cost will be is difficult to predict. The annual budget of the old League of Nations was approximately $6,000,000. There is little question but that the increased scope and responsibilities of the United Nations Organization will call for a budget considerably in excess of this amount. Regardless of the amount that may be required it will, indeed, be a small price to pay for the peace of the world. This Nation must, and no doubt will, be prepared to assume leadership in providing funds adequate for the most effective realization of the expressed objectives and desires of the participating nations.

Expenses for the maintenance of national contingents of armed forces are to be borne by the individual governments and not by the Security Council.

Montana Leads the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I call the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that Montana has been the first State of the Union to meet all the Seventh War Loan quotas. In five out of seven war-loan drives, Montana has been the first to go over the top in individual sales.

The sale of bonds is only one of many contributions we are proud of. We have also produced much in vital metals, food, scrap drives, and many other war-supporting activities. Three Montanans have won the Congressional Medal of Honor and our sons are fighting valiantly on all the battle fronts of the world.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; I am proud of the many fine performances turned in by my State. Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD editorials and news articles from the Helena Independent-Record of June 24, 1945, the Montana Standard of June 24, 1945, the Billings Gazette of June 24, 1945, and the Great Falls Tribune of June 23, 1945:

[From the Helena (Mont.) Independent-Record of June 24, 1945]

SECRETARY OF TREASURY COMMENDS STATE FOR ANOTHER FIRST

The people of Montana have fulfilled a covenant with our fighting men and reaffirmed their faith in American freedom by their outstanding record in the Seventh War Loan, Henry J. Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, said in a message received yesterday by A. T. Hibbard, chairman of the State war finance committee.

"I wish to recognize with appreciation the outstanding record made by Montana in beingthe first State in the Union to meet all of its Seventh War Loan quotas," he said. "You, your coworkers, and all of the people of your State have fulfilled a covenant with our fighting men and reaffirmed your faith in American freedom."

[From the Montana Standard of June 24, 1945]

MONTANA FIRST, FIVE OUT OF SEVEN TIMES

In five out of seven war-loan drives, Montana has been the first to go over the top in individual sales. Individual, or E-bond sales, represent money coming directly from the pockets of the people of the Treasure State. It is money the people of Montana might have spent for other things. But, instead, they chose to put it into war bonds to back up the Nation's fighting men in Europe, before the end of the war there, and now to back the attack in the Far East against Japan.

Aside from the fact that the money is coming direct from the pockets of the people of the State, Montana's being first over the top five out of seven times is remarkable because of other circumstances.

Montana's economy has not been inflated by the war as has the economies of most other States. Rather, the economy of Montana has been deflated by the war. Montana's war contracts have averaged less than $5,000,000 a year while those of many other States have soared into the billions of dollars.

Montana has lost population during the war. The latest estimates are that perhaps 100,000 Montana people have gone to the armed services and to war plants outside the State. This is a serious loss when it is considered that the population of the State is only slightly over a half million in normal times.

It means that slightly more than 400,000 people remaining in Montana have bought more war bonds than it was expected of the 500,000 people who normally live in the State.

But Montana people have not been content to rest on their war-bond buying laurels. They have produced prodigiously in vital metals, food, scrap drives, and in all other war supporting activities.

And while the people of Montana have been hewing up the line on the home front, Montanans in the armed services have done more than their share of the fighting. Three Montanans won the Congressional Medal of Honor and many hundreds of Montanans wear medals which attest to their devotion to duty, their heroism, their gallantry.

Montana will be able to point eternally with pride to its accomplishments in World War II, just as it has in all other wars in which the Nation's way of life has been endangered.

The fact that Silver Bow lags slightly in individual war-bond sales must, however, be noted in passing. But Silver Bow always has gone over the top, and it will again this time. Silver Bow is noted as a slow starter, but it always comes in strong at the finish.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette of June 24, 1945]

MONTANA SETS THE PACE

The announcement that Montana is the first State in the Nation to go over the top in its Seventh War Loan E-bond quota is not only a source of satisfaction to us all, but also a tribute to the people of Montana as a whole and to those who helped carry on the campaign. We have been the first over the top in the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth war loans, and in addition to meeting the $16,000,000 E-bond quota in the seventh loan, Montanans have exceeded their quota of $25,000,000 in individual sales, and have topped the over-all $35,000,000 goal of the drive by $15,500,000.

The large holdings of war bonds throughout the State constitute a great reserve of funds that will contribute in the postwar years to the commercial activity of the State.

Bonds are being bought with many purposes in mind in addition to the immediate one that they help maintain the financial structure of our Government. Montanans are thinking of the day when they can invest these funds in a new home, new business, new automobile, new equipment for the home and many other things that they are doing without during these times. These reserves will put us in good stead as we shift to peacetime conditions.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of June 23, 1945]

MONTANA FIRST STATE IN NATION TO EXCEED QUOTA IN MIGHTY SEVENTH WAR LOAN DRIVE

HELENA, June 22.—Montana late today became the first State in the Nation to exceed its Seventh War Loan E-bond quota and reacted by accelerating its red-hot pace.

State War Finance Director A. T. Hibbard reported:

"Montana went over the top on the E quota tonight—and kept right on going."

Meeting the $16,000,000 quota maintained for Montana its reputation as the leading E-bond purchasing State in the Nation. In the Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth War Loans, the Treasure State was first over the top. Tonight they added the Seventh Loan title to the list.

The report gave Montana a victory over Mississippi in the race. The two States had carried on a spirited rivalry to be the first State to exceed its quota. Mississippi trailed today by 8.8 percent.

The Treasure State also was first to exceed its total individual quota of $25,000,000, reporting $26,300,000 total. The over-all $35,000,000 quota was topped by $15,500,000, with a grand total of $50,500,500 attained late today.

The war finance committee's latest tabulation listed 32 counties over E quotas, with 15 others passed the 90 percent mark. Fallon County, in last place, reported a percentage of 77.9 percent of quota.

Several other counties were unofficially over quotas tonight, but Federal Reserve bank figures were unavailable.

A review of Montana's record in previous loans includes, in part:

In the first month of World War II, Montana led the Nation in per capita E-bond sales.

In the Second War Loan, Montana was in sixth place in percentage on E bond quota, with 136.5 percent.

In the Third War Loan, Montana again led the Nation per capita sales and was second in percentage of E-bond sales.

And in the Fourth, Montana was the first in which every county exceeded its quota. The Treasure State was second in the Union to meet its total quota.

In the Fifth War Loan, Montana was the first and only State to exceed all its quotas on July 12. This included the E-bond quota, individual, total individual, corporation, and grand total quotas.

Montana again paced the Nation in the Sixth War Loan in every department.

Salaries of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 28 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a bulletin issued by the National Association of Letter Carriers regarding the passage of House bill 3035, increasing the salaries of postal employees. This bulletin is very complimentary to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] as well as my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. It praises them for their very fine work in assisting in the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PASSES SALARY INCREASE BILL—FRIENDS IN THE SENATE

It is next to impossible to mention our legion of friends in the Senate, except to state that they all were favorable to the bill, and the carriers in the various States should immediately send a letter of appreciation to their two United States Senators, thanking them for their support and favorable vote on this legislation.

However, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not call attention to the outstanding efforts and support that was received from Senator MCKELLAR and Senator MEAD. Senator MCKELLAR has been in favor of the salary increase bill ever since it was referred to his committee, and he at all times has been doing everything possible to expedite consideration of the bill.

We ran into a little difficulty on several points while the bill was in the committee, but Senator MCKELLAR took a firm stand on those questions and as a result a favorable unanimous report was received. The postal employees owe a debt of gratitude to Senator MCKELLAR and we greatly appreciate his support. Senator MEAD had graciously agreed to the substitution of H. R. 3035 for S. 908, and was a tower of strength when the bill was up in the Senate. Once again Senator MEAD has proven that he is the real champion of the postal employees.

We appear to be on the eve of a wonderful victory and the council of administration desires to express their thanks to the membership for the cooperation which they have given in this campaign.

WILLIAM J. GORMAN, *Secretary.*

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest mistakes made by some executives and agents of the Office of Price Administration was their assumption that almost every American businessman is a crook or chisler until proved otherwise. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a letter received from the secretary of the Northwestern Lumbermen's Association of Minneapolis, which demonstrates admirably the willingness and the desire of the great majority of American businesses to cooperate faithfully in obeying the law and the OPA regulations, if they are helped to understand them and approached in a constructive rather than in a punitive way.

The letter follows:

NORTHWESTERN LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 22, 1945.

HON. WALTER H. JUDD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Northwestern Lumbermen's Association, organized in the States of Minnesota, Iowa, North and South Dakota, with a membership of 2,244 dealers out of 2,700 retail lumber dealers in the above-named States, is on record and in favor of the continuation of the Office of Price Administration for the purpose for which the OPA was established, namely, to control inflation, and the rationing of scarce and critical materials.

The Northwestern Lumbermen's Association has and will continue to cooperate with the administrative offices of OPA, in keeping its membership advised at all times of all OPA regulations and directives affecting the retail lumber industry of the Northwest.

Compliance is an important factor if the purposes and aims of the OPA are to be successful, and it is with this in mind we present some features being practiced by certain regional and district offices of the OPA, which we feel should be changed in order to secure the fullest cooperation of this association and its members in securing better and more efficient compliance.

We have just completed a survey of supposed OPA violations in the area in which this association is organized, and this survey reveals the following.

1. Out of 1,400 dealers in the State of Iowa, only 24 were found to have overcharged to the extent of $1,442.68, with penalties applied, $1,994.44, on barbwire sales, overcharges amounting to from 2 cents to 50 cents per spool; 14 dealers overcharged on creosoted fence posts $982.54, with penalties applied $1,100; coal, 2 dealers overcharged $48.90, penalties applied, none. In each case the OPA regulation was complicated and not understandable by dealers, and these were not willful violations on the part of the dealers.

2. While each dealer was written a letter giving him an opportunity to appear before the OPA in Des Moines, many did not as the OPA stated that if the dealer would write a check to the United States Treasury, the case would be closed.

3. In the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, the OPA offices, when and if they found violations, proceeded in a constructive way, showed the dealer where and how he had overcharged, set the dealer right, and secured not only the dealer's cooperation for better compliance, but a real feeling of wanting to cooperate.

We feel that, in view of the fact that OPA is to be continued, and should be continued, for better compliance and real cooperation on the part of industry, the OPA should not intimidate or publicize any lumber dealer who has not willfully violated OPA regulations, and that better compliance and a better spirit of cooperation on the part of dealers can and will be secured if the OPA, in nonwillful cases, cooperates and helps dealers to adjust their price schedules when they are not right, instead of using intimidating methods and publicizing lumber dealers in newspapers on nonwillful overcharges; and that the OPA in Washington should instruct all regional offices to revert to a program of education similar to that of the WPB when nonwillful violations are found.

We want the OPA continued; we want to help secure strict compliance; and our dealers will cooperate if the OPA is willing to cooperate and not permit investigators to intimidate and use unfair methods in applying individual and personal interpretations for the purpose of collecting nonwillful overcharges, and then publicize the dealer in newspapers.

We also feel that the triple-damage penalty now incorporated in the OPA law should be definitely eliminated, and that when over-

charges are found, such overcharges be returned by the dealer to the customer and not to the United States Treasury.

We also believe, to avoid misinterpretations by the various regional and district offices, that official interpretations should be issued and/or secured from Washington, so that all regional and district offices will have the same interpretations and not several different interpretations, such as now exist and will continue to exist, thus creating confusion and noncompliance.

Would it be possible to secure these few adjustments for better compliance and a better spirit of cooperation on the part of industry?

Sincerely yours,

W. H. BADEAUX,
Secretary.

The Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 3, 1945:

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The death of Mr. Roosevelt having once again aroused public interest in the inadequacy of the constitutional provision for the Presidential succession, we hope this revived interest will be taken advantage of this time either to strengthen the constitutional provision itself or to pass legislation which will have the same effect.

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley has made a suggestion in this respect which deserves support. He would have created immediately a special commission composed of Members of the House and Senate, others named by the President, and perhaps one representative of the Supreme Court designated by the Chief Justice, which would study the whole question of the Presidential succession and recommend any necessary changes either in the Constitution or in the laws.

As Farley points out, the most serious technical gap now existing is the lack of any provision for the selection of a President in the event the President-elect and Vice President-elect both should die or be otherwise disqualified between the time of election and inauguration. To be sure, under the twentieth amendment, Congress is given the power to decide what to do in such a situation, but it has not yet exercised that power, and the chances of confusion if the matter is allowed to slide until such a situation actually arises are serious enough to make it dangerous to continue to neglect the matter.

But, while all other contingencies are now technically provided for, there is a growing feeling that they do not adequately serve the general political welfare of the Nation; that the Vice Presidency has grown to be too unimportant a position, resulting in too little attention being given to the qualifications of those nominated for this post; and that in the event of a President's death, there ought to continue to be a Vice President, picked with the succession in mind, instead of leaving in line for the office a Secretary of State who may or may not have been appointed with the thought that he might some day be elevated automatically to the White House.

Modern conditions, it seems to us, call for an entirely new attitude toward the Vice Presidency, one which probably can be brought about only by a constitutional amendment.

For the purpose of discussion, recognizing that valid objections may be raised to it, we make this suggestion: That the Vice President, by constitutional amendment be relieved of his duty as President of the Senate and be designated, instead, as the chief executive assistant to the President—a position very similar to that held first by James F. Byrnes and now by Fred W. Vinson; and that in the event of the President's death, the new President nominate a successor to the executive Vice Presidency who would be confirmed or rejected by a vote of both Houses of Congress. It would be necessary, of course, to provide for an alternative form of succession in the event of the simultaneous death of both the President and Vice President or for the interim between the accession of a new President and the confirmation of his successor. To prevent any possibility of the Nation being without a President, the Cabinet succession could be provided for in either of these contingencies.

Among the advantages of this system would be (1) more thoughtful consideration by the Presidential nominee and by the nominating convention of the executive abilities of the Vice Presidential candidate, (2) better training for the Vice President in the duties which he may have to assume as President, (3) less chance of an abrupt change in policy upon the death of a President, (4) a sharing of the burdens of the Presidency, relieving the President of much of the detail of his office so that he can give more attention to matters of broad policy, and (5) the assurance that anyone in line for the Presidency, except in the contingencies mentioned above, would be selected with his possible occupancy of the White House uppermost in mind.

Naturalization of Filipinos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill for the information of the Congress:

H. R. 542

A bill to authorize the naturalization of certain Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 324 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 324a. A native-born Filipino, not otherwise entitled to naturalization under this act, who, prior to May 1, 1934, was lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United Statse, may be naturalized upon compliance with the requirements of this act, except that no certificate of arrival shall be required."

SEC. 2. Section 303 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. The right to become a naturalized citizen under the provisions of this act shall extend only to white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and descendents of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent the naturalization of native-born Filipinos as specified in sections 324 and 324a, nor of former citizens of the United States who are otherwise eligible to naturalization under the provisions of section 317."

I also include the following resolution bearing on the desirability of naturalization of certain Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States:

Whereas there are about 40,000 Filipinos in the Territory of Hawaii, 20 percent having resided here since 1910 and 80 percent having arrrived in the islands about 15 years ago, and the greater portion having been born subsequent to occupation of the Philippine Islands by the United States of America; and

Whereas owing allegiance to the Government of the United States, many of us served the Army and Navy during World War I, and thousands of our people fell in the heroic defense of Bataan and Corregidor, and we have shown ourselves worthy of trust as loyal subjects; and

Whereas under American tutelage for more than four decades, we Filipino people have become imbued with democratic ideals and have adapted ourselves to the American way of life, and believe that we are capable of fulfilling the duties and responsibilities which American citizenship would require; and

Whereas as noncombatants in the present war, we have taken an active part in the national defense effort both as laborers and businessmen and are a valuable potentiality in the production of food and other essentials of life for the duration of the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors and members of Oriental Benevolent Association, a mutual benefit society organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to favorably consider the passage of the Randolph naturalization bill which would grant American citizenship to Filipinos; and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Committee on Immigration of the Senate of the United States, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii, and to Congressman JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Adopted this 17th day of February 1944, at Wailuku, Maui, T. H.

PHILIP P. GAMPONIA, *President.*
CANUTO TACDERAN, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, the following news story from the Honolulu Advertiser of January 22, 1944, is also included:

RANDOLPH BILL IS COMPLIMENT TO FILIPINOS

The bill presented before Congress Tuesday by Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, giving eligibility also to the Filipinos to become naturalized citizens is a sincere acknowledgment of the loyalty of the Filipinos and their worth as comrades in arms against the enemy, N. C. Villanueva, production manager of the Insular Life Assurance Co., of Honolulu, said yesterday.

"For quite some time the Filipinos have felt themselves a 'political football' in their status as American nationals—to be thrown over on one side as citizens at one time and then again to be passed back to the category of an alien at another time," the insurance-company executive said.

BASIS FOR NATURALIZATION

There should not be the least doubt now on the part of every true American as to the qualification of the Filipino for citizenship if alone the principles for which the democracies are now fightng in this war were to be taken as the basis for naturalization, Villanueva continued.

"One of the old wrongs, admittedly so by the President and the Congress of the United States, has been righted," he declared. It has now become also evident that the treatment of the Filipinos was one of those wrongs yet perhaps to be righted.

"It is, indeed, most unfortunate that it has to be in the field of battle where once again the Filipino should prove his claim to the privileges of an American citizen.

"Naturally the Filipinos of Hawaii thankfully appreciate the presentation of the bill and prayfully solicit a favorable action on it."

CIO Members Protest Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the members of the CIO who actually do the work are very much dissatisfied with the way the food problem has been handled, and when they talk about these matters they have no hesitation in telling the truth. In the Evening Star for June 23, 1945, is a newspaper item from Detroit, Mich., which reads as follows:

CIO GROUP PROTESTS DETROIT MEAT SHORTAGE IN MARCH ON CITY HALL

DETROIT, June 23.—A line of men and women, carrying placards with such legends as "All we get is OPA baloney" and "We want food", marched on the city hall and OPA offices today to protest Detroit's meat shortage.

The marchers, numbering some 50 and representing locals of the United Automobile Workers (CIO), stopped first at the city hall and from there continued on to the nearby OPA headquarters.

At the OPO, a marchers' committee secured an audience with Lee Montgomery, assistant information director, who told the group that Washington had been informed of meat shortage conditions here. Mr. Montgomery said OPA was trying to "break the black market, but needs an army to enforce its laws.

Of a great deal of interest, however, to the people in Minnesota is a statement by the CIO Labor Coordinating Committee of Ely, Minn. This statement was made to the OPA officials at Duluth, Minn., and it needs no comment or explanation. It tells its own story and reads as follows:

[Local 1664, United Steelworkers of America—Ely; Local 2445, United Steelworkers of America—Ely; Local 386, State, County and Municipal Workers of America—Ely; Local 2306, USA—Tower; Local 3467, USA—Tower; Local 473, SCMWA—Ely]

C. I. O. LABOR COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR CIVILIAN DEFENSE,
Ely, Minn., May 19, 1945.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
DULUTH-SUPERIOR DISTRICT,
Duluth, Minn.

(Attention Mr. DICKINSON.)

DEAR MR. DICKINSON: Your attention is being called to an acute shortage of meat in this area. While the rationing program is in effect and must be kept so, what happens when people have the red points with which to purchase meat, but cannot because the supply of meat at the retail markets is wholly inadequate?

The answer is that we have a potential black market in the making with people on the alert to make arrangements in advance to get meat from retailers with the distinct possibility that bidding may develop and lead to black-market practices.

When rationing first came into effect, our committee submitted to your office a survey of the situation in this area in regard to underground miners and their need for additional meat rations because of the nature of their work which kept them underground without the benefit of essential sunshine vitamins which surface workers receive. We were turned down on the request and have since gone along with the program and without special favors. Now, these same miners are confronted with a meat shortage which seriously threatens their well-being and productive ability.

It is possible that there is as much meat coming into this area as there was several years ago, but it is to be doubted. However, even if the amount coming in were the same, the impact of the war effort has increased the number of hard-working persons in this vicinity, who are heavy meat eaters. I refer specifically to the lumberjacks. A few years ago, we had a few small "gippo" camps but now we have five to six hundred hard-working jacks who need their daily ration of meat. Because of this added population, what seemed an adequate meat supply in this community under the individual point-ration system, now has developed into a shortage.

We have a report here that at one of the lumber camps in this vicinity, a crew of men were forced to get along on a diet of sausage and salt pork for a whole week. Such a condition is not conducive to maximum output in the timber industry which is very essential to the war effort.

Jelly and peanut-butter sandwiches in the dinner pails of underground miners are not what one would recommend as the diet of these hard-working employees of an industry which has contributed so much to our war effort.

I do not propose to present myself as an expert in this matter, but I feel that I do have a better than average layman's picture of the situation, because I am the price-panel chairman of our local OPA and have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with both the public and the retail merchants.

Not only has the added timber-worker population cut into the meat quota for this community, but the practice of some wholesale meat houses in refusing meat to retailers because they would not be a party to tie sales wherein the wholesaler would give meat but also several hundred pounds of sausage.

One of our retailers recently reported that such tie sales were being practiced. The result was that where he ordinarily did several thousand dollars worth of business in meat per month with that wholesaler, he can now only get less than $100 worth of meat per month.

In going over the situation with several retailers, I find that the meat situation could be greatly eased with the granting of additional slaughter permits for this community. At the present time, from what I can learn, there are only two persons or retailers in this community with slaughter permits and both of these always were small time operators.

I have learned that live animals could be obtained by other retailers if they were able to obtain permits to slaughter. I do not know how such permits could be obtained and have advised several persons to contact your office.

You will probably hear from them in the near future and be able to give them the information which they desire.

I am sure that additional slaughter permits would help the situation. In my own home, we have points for meat but can't get any. While poultry would serve, you well know what that situation is—there just isn't any to be had.

Hoping you may be able to offer some aid in the matter, I remain,

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. SOMROC,
CIO Labor Coordinating Committee.

Fuel-Oil Needs Are Crucial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter on the subject of fuel-oil needs:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, June 18, 1945.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: You have on several occasions in the past indicated an interest in the fuel-oil situation, and it occurs to me that you will want to know the prospects for this coming heating season.

With the cessation of hostilities in Europe many people have assumed that the need for fuel oil conservation has passed, but actually the exact opposite is true. As we shift our war emphasis to the Pacific, the fuel-oil requirements of the military increase tremendously. We have the largest Navy this world has ever seen, and every ship in that great navy—battleship, cruiser, carrier, landing barge, and all others—is powered by fuel oil. Most of this fuel oil is Navy special, which is made up from a blend of heating oil and heavy industrial fuel and furnished only to the Navy. Diesel fuel, another of the principal Navy products, is interchangeable, gallon for gallon, for heating oil.

Now our war is many miles farther away, and the distances are increasing every day, so more and more fuel oil is needed to support our military activities. Just as an example of what this means to the home owner, it has been estimated that 600,000,000 gallons of fuel oil were required to bring up the men and materials to start and carry out the Okinawa campaign. That amount of fuel oil, if diyided among home heating oil burners in the rationed area of this country, would have given to each one an additional 300 gallons—an average of about an 18-percent increase in rations for this coming winter.

The situation has changed from a two-front gasoline war to a one-front fuel-oil war. Consequently, we were recently able to make available additional supplies of gasoline for civilians, but I am sure you realize that as long as the Pacific war lasts not only is no increase possible in fuel oil, but we will be hard pressed to furnish as much as last year. Our supply program provides for the same amount for civilians as during the 1944-45 season, and we will make every effort to fulfill that program. Barring unforeseen circumstances, such as a further increase in military requirements or a break-down in our transportation system, due to causes beyond our control, we expect to meet our program.

You will probably receive, or perhaps have already received, inquiries from some of your constituents regarding the possibility of their being permitted to convert their heating equipment from coal to fuel oil this year, particularly since coal is also reported as being short. With the present high requirements, which will continue until the end of the Japanese war, you can understand why we will have no alternative except to deny such requests.

Any help you can give us in explaining this situation to your people and urging them to continue their conservation will be deeply appreciated. In the meantime, if I can, at any time, give you additional information on this or any other matter under our jurisdiction, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER HOCHULI,
Director, Distribution and Marketing.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the situation on fuel needs for war and for civilian uses is not lessening because Germany has been defeated. The following excerpts from a news article in the Washington News of June 28, 1945, is herewith set forth:

THAT EXTRA GASOLINE CAN DRY UP SOON

(By John W. Love)

Even more than the European war, the intensified conflict in the Pacific is a war of transportation. The strain on domestic transportation apparently is to increase for months and remain high until some time after Japs are through.

The war in the Far East is taking more fuel oil, more gasoline, more railroad coal, more passenger equipment than did the war with the Germans. Hopes rose for a little while that the recent revision in gasoline rations was only the beginning of a general release on motor travel, but there's no certainty that the slightly higher allowances can be maintained.

Within the last 10 days inquiries from the Middle West, especially from Ohio and Indiana, have been coming in to the Petroleum Administration for War as to why it would not be possible to lift the gas ration entirely, at least for a few months, as a means of relieving the passenger burden on the railroads while the millions of soldiers are being moved.

THE ARGUMENT

The argument is that even though tires are not yet in larger supply and new passenger cars in any quantity are still far in the future, it ought to be practical to allow motorists who were willing to take their own chances on these renewals to drive their own cars on intercity trips. "Let us drive as much as our tires will permit."

* * * * *

MILITARY RULES

Should the military have miscalculated its needs or its construction of storage facilities, then the story would be different, but for the present the domestic allotments are based on the assumption that the requirements of the armed forces and essential civilian needs in the one-front war will take 200,000 barrels a day of petroleum products in excess of what the two-front war formerly took.

This intensified drain is blamed chiefly on two circumstances, that of bombing operations on Japan, which are going to be taking three times as much fuel as the bombing of Germany required, and that of naval and transport fuel on the long Pacific hauls.

B-29'S ARE THIRSTY

The B-29 bomber fully gassed up uses a little more fuel than a railroad tank car will hold. The consumption of bunker oil by the fleets cuts directly into the supply of domestic fuel oil. Much of it is of identical formula.

A seasonal oversupply exists in that commodity at present, however, and householders are being importuned to take it off the market to the full extent of their rations, to get it into their own storage tanks.

The temporary release of petroleum products on VE-day made possible the raising of the value of A coupons by 50 percent and the equalization of B coupons the country over. This bonus accounted for 140,000 barrels a day.

Whether it can be held at that depends on military demands and a few other circumstances. Some industrial sources have been suspecting the local ration boards have been more liberal than they should, that they are putting out more coupons than there will be gasoline to meet them.

These 140,000 daily barrels of additional allotment plus the temporary increase in gasoline in storage, have had their share in leading even some petroleum refiners to think the situation is more promising than it really is. A further factor in the optimism was the release of tankers from the Atlantic routes which made it possible to move large quantities of gasoline from Gulf ports to the Atlantic seaboard, temporarily filling up eastern storage tanks.

Investigation of Raw-Material Resources for Steel Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, there are certain items in this bill which are woefully small for the job which needs to be done, and, were it not for the fact that this bill needs to become effective before next Monday, I would raise strenuous objection to adoption of the conference report. As it is, I wish merely to point out that by adopting this report we are seriously crippling some of the activities of the Bureau of Mines—activities which are vital to the national security.

I refer specifically to the item entitled "Investigation of Raw-Material Resources for Steel Production." I had hoped, as had others who are familiar with this work, that the House managers would see fit to concur with the Senate figure, which was $2,795,000. Instead I find that a compromise was reached setting up only $1,250,000 for this purpose.

I would like to point out that the Bureau of Mines, as a part of this program, has set up along these lines three important metallurgical laboratories, one in Redding Calif., another in Rolla, Mo., and a third in Raleigh, N. C. These three laboratories were planned and set up to determine the know-how of utilizing the raw material resources for steel making in three important geographical areas. As we have all been told so many times, the rich ores of the Messabi Range are being rapidly depleted, and if we are to have a virile continous steel industry we must start planning for the utilization of our widely scattered low-grade iron ore deposits.

In order to obtain maximum utilization of our domestic mineral resources, many mining problems must also be solved. Many of the deposits developed by the Bureau's exploratory program require that special mining methods be devised. The development of improved mining methods is necessarily a large-scale operation not adaptable to the confines of what is usually called the laboratory. It must be carried on practically as a full-scale mining operation. This requires considerable sums of money, but in the long run will pay off huge dividends for the Nation as a whole.

The Bureau's important work in developing processes for the manufacture of electrolytic manganese and chromium should not be slowed down. As has been said on this floor many times before, we have been largely dependent during the war on foreign sources for these two very important raw materials that go into the making of steel. The development of electrolytic processes for manganese and chromium will make it possible for us to utilize our domestic reserve of these two minerals and make this Nation self-sufficient insofar as they are concerned. I cannot state too strongly my belief that we should not be dependent upon foreign sources for any of the important ingredients of steel.

I would like to further point out the inadequacy of the appropriation in providing for the item headed "Investigation of Deposits of Critical and Essential Minerals in the United States and Its Possessions." This sum is at least a half million dollars less than it should be.

I do not know at the moment just how seriously these projects will be handicapped by the action we are taking today in providing such a meager sum for their operation and other phases of this important work of the Bureau of Mines. As chairman of the Committee on Ship Design and Construction Materials, I am asking the Bureau of Mines to advise my committee just what effect this will have on its program. At this time I would like to ask my good friend, the very able chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Judge JED JOHNSON, if he will get along with a supplemental budget for this purpose if it turns out that we are today crippling these laboratories, which have already been established, and other activities of the Bureau.

O. J. Beckworth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter that appeared in the Gilmer Weekly Mirror, June 21, 1945, concerning the father of one of our colleagues:

DALLAS, *June 13, 1945.*

GENTLEMEN: Please put me on the list for another year.

It has been 25 years now since I lived in Upshur County and a large number of the people I knew are not there anymore, but I like to read the old town news. I recognize many of the youngster names as they appear in the paper. I have many friends in Gilmer and Upshur County. There is no finer American than O. J. Beckworth, the father of LINDLEY BECKWORTH. I owe much of whatever I may have of democracy to his teaching, not so much in the schoolroom but in our

conversations on the grounds and in our activities at Union Ridge many years ago. I understand why Upshur County has young BECKWORTH in Washington.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

LLOYD DE SHAZO.

Government Control of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JUNE 26, 1945.

We have reached the point in affairs now where it is absolutely essential for business to either fight for its existence or die and see the entire country relegated into some form of socialism. This is not a wild imagination on my part but a studied conclusion.

For instance, we are being renegotiated right now in Washington by the Maritime Commission. The war is over. They desire nothing further from business and they are just getting around to negotiating 1943. Our concern went through all the war years without increasing the executive salaries, paying any bonus, accepting one machine tool or any subsidy from the Government, or spending any money for plant modernization and practically nothing for maintenance and repair. We wound up with what we thought was a modest profit, both dollarwise and percentagewise, and we were only trying to preserve our resources as a buffer against the tremendous impact of the post-war period. Now, after giving us no chance for rebuttal, the panel states that they must have a refund of $150,000 on our profit for 1943, which would leave us with a gross profit before taxes of 6.62 percent or 4.22 percent after taxes, or a return to the stockholders if it were all paid out of $0.494 per share.

Our only recourse is to appeal to the Commisison Board which naturally will have every disposition to sustain the panel. It is clearly a unilateral decision. We hesitate to think what will happen to 1944 and 1945 with the blade that sharp on 1943. In spite of the fact that any number of corporations have been allowed upwards to 19 percent in profits, we get nowhere. In fact, they have called us in to reprice 1945 and are talking about a gross profit of less than they allowed on 1943. The repricing and renegotiation law is a one-way street that puts honest business in the hands of inexperienced men who have but one thought in mind and that is to trim all they can. No concern should make an unreasonable profit out of the war, but no law to prevent that should be used to choke any concern to death.

Pardon me for burdening you at such length but I must call your attention to another matter which is hot as a firecracker now, politically and otherwise, in the country, and that is the FEPC Act. No one could have any kick about fair employment practices, and why under the sun should employers be saddled with another permanent agency, commission, or bureau empowered to inject itself into the employee relationship? Certainly Congress can pass laws prohibiting unfair labor practices without setting up a bureau to scatter people all over the country running around looking for violations. Labor will see to it that they are not violated, and I hope that there will be enough men in Congress to pigeonhole this and any other bureau-creating agencies to further harass the American public and fix control in Washington.

Cordially yours.

Canning Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Pocahontas, Iowa, June 25, 1945.

Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: You are probably aware of the situation concerning 1945 issuance of canning sugar. It does not seem to me that there can be any excuse for the situation that has arisen if the matter was given any actual thought and attention. In January of 1945 the announcement was made through the newspapers and over the radio that there would be 20 pounds canning sugar per person. Then we come up to the 1st of June and find that telegrams are sent out stopping issuance of canning sugar.

The Congress is busy over the OPA matter at the present time. And I thought that you might be interested in the enclosed advertisement which we found that it was necessary to publish at our own expense.

Very truly yours.

R. L. HUDSON,
Chairman of War Price and Rationing Board No. 76 of Pocahontas County, Iowa.

A STATEMENT ABOUT CANNING SUGAR

The commodity committee of the War Price and Rationing Board of Pocahontas County, Iowa, acting according to the rules and regulations of OPA, and under instructions and a schedule furnished by OPA, requested the people of Pocahontas County to file their applications for canning sugar for 1945 on or before May 15, 1945. And 4,003 applications were filed and had been processed by the committee before June 1, 1945. These applications represented 14,291 persons.

By June 1, 1945, our clerks had handled and mailed the canning-sugar coupons on 3,686 of those applications, representing 13,533 persons, for an issuance of 155,790 pounds of sugar, for an average of 11¼ pounds per person.

On June 1, 1945, a telegram was received stopping the issuance of further canning sugar. So that 317 processed applications, and representing 658 persons, have not been mailed their canning-sugar coupons.

The Des Moines office of OPA says we will have no more canning sugar until after August 31, 1945. It requires 8,166 pounds of sugar to handle the 317 processed applications. We have tried to get the additional sugar, but have been turned down.

Between May 1 and 15, 1945, we received a 1945 quota of canning sugar from the Des Moines office of OPA of more than 170,000 pounds. So our issuance would have been well under the quota. We acted on the good faith and basis of that quota.

As a result of the mess and the 'heat" created by the June 1 telegram, our two clerks handling fuel oil and commodities have resigned.

This Board is unable to do more about the situation. There is nothing we can do about it.

The only suggestion we can make to those who have not received their canning sugar coupons, and to those whose applications were filed on and after June 1, 1945, is that you have the right of appeal to OPA. Appeal to the Des Moines office of OPA by writing letters. And letter of our Representatives in Congress, may be of help. They should at least be advised of the situation.

There is no use coming to the rationing office, or contacting the board members, for there is nothing we can do to help you.

COMMODITY COMMITTEE, OF WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD OF POCAHONTAS COUNTY, IOWA.

Lend-Lease Program Should Be Terminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly vote on H. R. 3579, commonly known as the second deficiency appropriation bill. This bill contains a great many items and involves the expenditure of enormous sums of money. One item in particular challenges the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives. I refer to the item for lend-lease, and you will find this discussed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, June 27, on page 6836.

In the course of his talk the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out that this bill carries $5,534,000,000 appropriations and that the committee marked it up in an hour and thirty minutes by the clock, on page 6834, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday. I do not believe that a bill carrying this enormous appropriation should pass the House at this time.

I just want to comment that a large part of this appropriation is in connection with the lend-lease program. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we had better discontinue the fiction known as lend-lease. Under this fiction it has been possible to either loan or to lease materials and supplies to Allied countries. This was a part of our war program. I supported that legislation.

However, when the war ended in Europe on May 6 and officially declared at an end on May 8, I felt that the American people had met their obligations to European countries and that our administrative officials should quit giving away all of our resources in the United States for foreign nations. So I am opposed to this lend-lease expenditure contained in this bill.

I am not going to be misled with the idea that lend-lease is needed on account of the war in the Pacific. It ought to be clear to everybody that the United States of America is waging that war and that

any help from outside sources is of a minor nature.

The American Marines, the American Navy boys, and the American soldiers are the ones who are making history, and I do not need to tell you what they are doing. So far as I am concerned, there is no need for lend-lease in the Pacific theater of war. Let us cut out this spending of money for lend-lease purposes. To continue to spend money for such purposes is a subterfuge.

In the Times-Herald for today there is an article which ought to have some attention from the Members of the House of Representatives who feel that administrative officials ought to be checked and double-checked when it comes to spending money under the guise. This article reads as follows:

LEND-LEASE AND REVERSE COSTING BILLIONS TO UNITED STATES

(By Walter Trohan)

From Capitol Hill to the White House reverse lend-lease is coming to be regarded more or less openly as the biggest joke of the war.

To date this laugh has cost the American taxpayers almost $5,000,000,000. Before it is over the joke may cost American pocketbooks 10 times that much, or the total lend-lease outlay.

SATISFACTORY IN THEORY

Theoretically reverse lend-lease is aid furnished American forces in supplies and services in return for the vast flow of supplies and services this country is sending abroad under lend-lease.

To last April 1, the total of lend-lease aid was $39,846,179,000, of which $29,310,457,000 actually was shipped abroad as of that date. It is expected that the total will pass the $50,000,000,000 mark.

Against this vast total of American shipments in goods, supplies, and money abroad, the last White House report lists the substantial sum of $4,656,315,000 of reverse lend-lease.

This impressive five billions is charged against the United States without a single penny, centime, or ruble reaching the United States. It is charged for future offset against lend-lease for services purportedly rendered American troops abroad.

TRICKY HAIRSPLITTING

The costly joke comes in the determination of what constitutes lend-lease. Some of the finest legalistic hair-splitting in modern times has come in assessing the United States reverse lend-lease.

Even lend-lease experts are baffled at times to state where lend-lease ends and reverse lend-lease begins. Shipments of arms and supplies to French forces following the invasion were lend-lease. But the unloading of the weapons vital to victory was solemnly charged as reverse lend-lease because French stevedores did the unloading.

The United States did not pay the stevedores. The French insisted Americans might pay too much and asked that the French be allowed to pay workers lest the labor market be disturbed. The French authorities solemnly set down the payments as reverse lend-lease.

And what's more, the United States is charged for the use of docks, unloading facilities, and warehouses. It's all reverse lend-lease.

Since the invasion the United States has used 50 percent of French railroad capacity. This is for the supplying of the Army, for feeding civilians, and for the occupation. But to the French it's reverse lend-lease.

The same goes for the Belgians and Dutch and British and Russians. When it helps them it's lend-lease. When it helps the victors it's reverse lend-lease.

SOVIET "REVERSES" AIRPORTS

In Russia, shuttle-bombing bases were built for the American Air Force as part of the second front the Soviet had clamored for. To Russia, which has received $8,500,000,000 United States aid, this is not lend-lease but reverse lend-lense because some of the material and labor used in building the bases, part of the equipment and some of the food for American crewmen and mechanics was supplied by Russia. The fact that the bombing was contributing heavily to the success of Russian arms has nothing to do with the case.

Russia has received more than 13,300 American planes, 6,800 American tanks, 312,000 tons of American explosives, 135,000 American machine guns, 18,000 American self-propelled guns, and 8,300 other American guns as part of its lend-lease shipments.

In the South Pacific when Navy guns laying a barrage for attacking American troops mowed down coconut trees on British and Dutch possessions, that was war. When they knocked down trees in building air fields or installations for lend-lease equipment, that was reverse lend-lease. Such trees are charged against the United States as reverse lend-lease.

THREE BILLIONS CHARGED OFF

Under lend-lease $12,775,392,000 of American supplies have reached the United Kingdom. By a now-you-see-it-now-you-don't-see-it school of bookkeeping, the United Kingdom has already charged off $3,352,247,000 of this amount as reverse lend-lease.

For the British, reverse lend-lease begins at American shores. When lend-lease food is shipped to Britain in a British ship, that's reverse lend-lease. And when sorely needed troops arrived in England on the *Queen Mary*, each soldier's passage was carefully tabulated as reverse lend-lease. Over 1,000,000 passages for soldiers have been so charged, according to official record.

CHARGE UP COCA-COLA

When the United States sent hundreds of millions of gallons of alcohol to Britain, that was lend-lease. When Great Britain made—with American machinery, American sirups and flavorings and with an American formula—some 55,000,000 bottles of Coca-Cola for American troops, that was reverse lend-lease.

Use of British hospitals for troops who were wounded fighting for Britain is reverse lend-lease. The movement of wounded from the front, as well as the movement of soldiers to the front, was charged as reverse lend-lease. In the first 6 months of 1944 alone, England charged off to reverse lend-lease 9,255 special trains with 650,000 cars for the movement of American troops toward British ports for the invasion.

Canadian Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called your attention to dairy butter made in my district, practically unobtainable there, but selling in Canada freely and stamped "Lend-Lease."

Today I hold in my hand a Canadian newspaper of May 25, advertising the land of plenty. Pork shoulders, for which in my district we pay 28 cents, are advertised for 15 cents in Canada. Grade A plate boiling beef, for which we pay 20 cents, Canada gets for 10 cents. And listen to this—beef sausage, 12 cents a pound; pork and veal sausage, 16 cents a pound. In my district we pay 38 cents if we can get it. Fresh-killed fowl, heavy, fleshy birds, 33 cents. We scramble to get them at 43 cents. Select wieners, for which we pay 35 cents a pound, are advertised at 20 cents. Beef tongues, for which we pay 37 cents, seem to be plentiful at 23 cents in Canada. And again they offer to sell their butter for 38 cents with a discount of 2 cents on a purchase of 3 pounds.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting portions of an editorial recently appearing in the Bridgeton Evening News, of Bridgeton, N. J., which is a thoughtful discussion of one of the most important problems confronting us, namely, compulsory military training.

The editorial follows:

PEOPLE WANT TO BE CONVINCED

There is no sign that the overwhelming majority of American people are convinced that 1 year's military training for the Nation's young manhood is essential to world peace in the future.

True, at the hearings being conducted by a congressional committee in Washington, such powerful groups as the American Legion have endorsed the compulsory program as necessary to impress the rest of the world that we are ready to back up our international commitments by prompt force, whenever such extremes are required.

It does seem true that most Americans are in favor of some preparedness program. Twice within a generation we have transformed peace-loving civilians into great fighters, well-trained, smart, and brave. We have won wars whenever the challenge presented itself, without military training in advance. But what most opponents of the plan seem to forget is that our system didn't keep the peace.

When the European war broke loose, our Government urged countries like France, Yugoslavia, and Greece to resist the German invaders, but we, as a Nation, were helpless to give material assistance when the blows fell. These countries took courage from our pledge to uphold freedom, but at the time, we could not meet the piteous cries for modern weapons and planes.

We simply weren't ready to meet aggression ourselves and we could only ask other countries to resist it—without taking proper steps ourselves to step in and fight it.

Now if the United States, prior to 1939, when Hitler decided to go to war, had a great air force, a big Army and Navy, and had about 10,000,000 young men undergoing the fundamentals of modern warfare, would the Nazis have risked a world-wide conflict? It certainly doesn't appear likely that either Hitler or Mussolini would have taken the chance.

The powers struck because they knew the United States didn't have the military power to prevent them from taking what they wanted in 1939 and 1940.

Military training, especially that compulsory part of it, has an ominous sound, especially to the people who hate the idea of regimentation. But the program can be effectively carried out without the rigor and hardship of the modern training camp.

It could be presented effectively in the schools just the same as physical education, which is also compulsory today. It could be a part of a college course, and for those who didn't happen to go to college, the home-town armory could be the site with some field maneuvers added.

Compulsory military training doesn't necessarily have to become an ogre, designated to corrupt, harden, or contaminate the morals and the future life of the very young. It can be properly planned and conducted on a plane consistent with the American viewpoint on life.

And at the same time, it can act as a potent weapon against the defiance and encroachment on our civilization which has been so strikingly manifested within the past 18 years by foreign powers who underestimated our ability to fight.

Postwar Reconversion Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, permission having been heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very thought-provoking discussion sent me by Darwin L. Boyer, of Long Beach, Calif. He is recognized as a real student of national and international affairs.

There is a standing invitation by me, as Congressman from the Eighteenth District of California, to all of my constituents to communicate to me, as their Congressman, their thinking on any petinent subject. This communication from back home at the "grass roots" I consider is very worthy of being read by all.

The article follows:

POSTWAR RECONVERSION EMPLOYMENT

For more than 50 years past, we have believed and proclaimed that competition was the life of business; that free enterprise inspires initiative and is the backbone of prosperity. This being true, then enterprise cannot operate freely so long as trade agreements, cartels, or other restrictive measures, under whatever name it operates, are in restraint of trade. Such restrictive barriers must be dissolved or counteracted, otherwise free enterprise will remain a myth. And another depression, second to none that we have previously experienced, will be the consequences.

Legislation or prosecutions cannot "bust" or dissolve the trusts because of the existence of the credit dollar and its method of discount and rediscount operations. By this process in financing, huge amounts of credit money have been accumulated. Such concentrations have been forced into the control of most every important industry in America. These credit dollar investments multiply and compound, creating a Frankenstein which throttles or destroys small business, paralyzes credits, breeds business stagnation, and tends to destroy our way of life.

In self-defense of big business, in the interest of small enterprise and the welfare of our free America, these shackles on business must be and can be freed by multiple small industrial ventures.

Small business can successfully operate in competition with the giants of industry if subsidy-financed by the Government. This is possible because small business is flexible in making necessary adjustments; is self-interested in management; is economical, fluid with ample but limited finances at a low interest rate and long-time maturity loans. Free, encouraged competition will stimulate initiative, out of which will come undreamed of improvements in production methods, surprising quality in commodities produced, and remarkable competitive prices to the public of consumers' goods. Multiple small industrial plants competing for the consumers' dollar will break the monopolistic stranglehold on business and aid in freeing enterprise. They will decentralize mass employment, where laborers have been reduced to a number of identity, and individual interest nullified by stereotyped standards.

Small business enterprises will impart a better working understanding and personal relationship between employer and employee. These objectives can be accomplished by and through the creation and legalization of a small industrial Government subsidy loan agency. Legalized subsidy loans should be limited in amount of investment to any one corporation. This will stimulate industrial diversification, prevent over-capitalization and reduce the possibility of too rapid a rise in industrial expansion. It will augment the number of small plant enterprises and encourage plant locations away from congested populated centers. Government small business subsidy loans should be made and regulated by a Government small business agency, acting under legalized rules of operations. Such an agency can and should be independent of any private or corporate institution of finance. This will promote freedom of industrial action so necessary in the free field of competition and enterprise. It will tend to remove the influence or possibility of predesigned obstacles fostered by the captains of industry who have been and are bent on controlling the investments and credits of the Nation.

A small industrial Government subsidy loan agency should be operated under rigid laws and administered by carefully selected management, who is conversant with and sympathetic to the principle and object to be achieved. Once this has been accomplished the results will prove to be of incalculable value to the cause of employment and the restoration of free enterprise. It is necessary in creating employment through the channels of little business, to assist such enterprises by unsecured loans. This is imperative for the reason that war conditions have forced a dislocation of interests, a dissolution in production organizations, and forced untold thousands of small industries on the casualty lists without assets. The country is well stocked with men who possess creative ingenuity, production ability, management experience, and character dependability, to successfully operate and furnish employment through small plant production. Yet this storehouse of value is without tangible security or operating capital. Nor are they able to comply with the investment bankers' well-organized restrictions or surmount the many obstacles which prevent the raising of capital for small business undertakings.

Small business subsidy loans should be restricted to a legally incorporated identity, because of the insecure life expectancy of the individual and the restrictions and privileges incorporated in corporate law. Fifty-one percent of the corporate stock of the loan petitioner should be held in trust by the Government small business loan agency, the stock to be released when the loan has been fully liquidated. The holding of stock control by the Government loan agency should legally stipulate that default in loan or employment requirements is cause for Government foreclosure. This would act as a forced carefulness by management to fulfill the loan requirements and safeguard the Government against loss of principal.

The subsidy loan should be granted for 15-, 20-, or 25-year periods with a privilege of liquidating—at the option of the borrower—any part or all of the loan in the interim. This will encourage the desire to liquidate the obligation, inspire the hope of private ownership, and assist in reducing the hazards of failure.

The interest rate to be paid by the borrower should be low, commensurate with interest paid by the Government on bonds. This will reduce the burden of fixed charges and will further aid and insure success by reducing obstacles to a minimum. It will make it possible to hold commodity prices to a more equitable value level.

Since the paramount reason for the creation of a Government small business subsidy loan agency is to take up the slack in employment during the period of postwar reconversion; to maintain employment during distress times and to furnish means for purchasing power circulation; it therefore is imperative that the loan requirements embody a stipulated number of employees to be used. Such commitments should include guarantees to furnish employment for 11 months of each year and pay the prevailing wage for such labor. It should not be too difficult to budget finances against wage expectancy, calculated on commodity production and anticipated sales in a competitive market. This guaranteed employment should be governed by the amount of loan, commodity produced together with production experience of loan petitioners. The numerical employment should remain in full force and effect during the life of the subsidy loan.

Admitting that this plan is not a cure for all our economic or social ills; nor is it void of imperfection, I hold that the basis for the creation of the agency is fundamental. That if it is organized and administered in keeping with the objectives herein outlined, the need for another WPA or other depressing agencies will not be necessary.

Since we have appropriated large sums of our tax dollars to the aid of foreign countries without security or hope of repayment; and are now preparing for costly assistance to peoples of other tongues all over the world, let us pause and have concern with faith in the integrity of America and little business to the end that America will remain safe and our way of life secure.

DARWIN L. BOYER.

Cooperative Observers of the Weather Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, much to my surprise and I am sure to the surprise of other Members of Congress, I have just discovered there is a group of more than 5,000 persons working for the Government without pay. This is indeed an

oasis in an otherwise plethora of public positions.

I refer to the cooperative observers attached to the United States Weather Bureau. These volunteer workers supply all kinds of data to the regional Weather Bureau offices entailing the making of daily reports.

Many of these workers have given years of service. One in my State has served for 32 consecutive years. I am today introducing legislation directing the Secretary of Commerce to pay a gratuity of $25 monthly to any one of these men and women who have served for a period of 30 years and have reached the age of 65.

I trust it will be the pleasure of the Congress to look with favor on this effort to reward these faithful servants.

The San Francisco Charter—Wendell Willkie's Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, through some of the late years it has interested, if not amused, some alleged Republicans who hated Willkie, to call me "WILLKIE" PLUMLEY. I never resented it, I do not now. The joke never was on me. Quite a lot of history could be elaborated to justify my position, which warranted that appellation, both then and now. Today I have come into my own, if I may say so, modestly.

The San Francisco Charter is nothing less than a monument to the vision of my late friend, Wendell Willkie. I gave him credit in life, I do now, for his greatness. I challenge anybody of my party today to dispute his right to recognition as a leader.

Those who would waste their breath to undertake to deny the fact of his leadership—let them come on; let come those who would vilify him uselessly. Let those folks follow who do not know the truth, or never can see it. The San Francisco Charter is his monument.

As Republicans we should have the courage to thank God for the vision he had, despite his critics; such courage and vision as was recognized by the delegates at San Francisco, who absorbed and adopted almost letter perfect and word for word, the identic plan he had and defined before he died, for perpetual peace, and for "one world."

The Republican Party is entitled through him to the credit for his having initiated and compelled this San Francisco Conference. The program laid down at Chicago, at Mackinac, was inspired, generated, controlled, and delivered by this man Willkie, despite opposition.

He enumerated and enunciated his plan for peace right from my own house in Northfield, Vt., where he was a guest. He laid down the San Francisco plan in embryo then and there. He died before he could see his dreams come true.

Naturally, I hope to see the plan he formulated made the basis for perpetual peace, whatever it may be called. I contend also that despite power partisanships the Republican Party should recognize the fact of the loss of his great leadership—never more needed than now. I know of no man today who can take the place in world affairs his death made vacant.

I pay my tribute to him, and to his memory as that man of vision who compelled the regeneration and the completion of the plan for perpetual peace, world-wide, submitted stage by stage, and adopted as the San Francisco Charter.

I am firmly convinced that never, except for the influence Wendell Willkie exerted, would we have been able to accomplish what has been done so far.

Ration Points for Restaurants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a serious situation is rapidly developing in the restaurant industry in California, due to the action of the OPA in reducing the allotment of points for restaurants. It will be noted from the telegram which I received this morning from the San Francisco Restaurant Association that the problem is rapidly spreading to the entire State.

I am transmitting a copy of the wire to Chester Bowles with the request for an immediate survey, with the hope that corrective action can and will be taken immediately. The wire follows:

We strongly urge that you prevail upon OPA officials for postponement for at least 60 days or rescinding order reducing restaurant allotment for the next period. If this order becomes effective, it will make it impossible for legitimate restaurants to continue in business and will force them to go into the black market in order to stay open. We are very much afraid of the seriousness of the consequences should this order become effective. On Friday, June 22, I visited Watsonville, where all restaurants had to close on account of shortage of points. I persuaded some restaurants to open again, however. Many declared although meat, butter, and cheese were available, they could not open without points and had no desire to go into the black market, and for this reason remained closed. Stockton, Sacramento, and many other cities in this area reported similar conditions to this office. San Francisco restaurants will be faced with the same alternative to close or go into the black market, and this we do not desire. Local restaurant supply houses advise me that meat, butter, cheese are available and accumulating in storage due to the fact that the restaurants do not have points to purchase them. Further reductions would aggravate this condition. May we therefore ask you to do everything possible to prevent chaos in the restaurant industry, which is bound to follow a reduction in the next allotment?

SAN FRANCISCO RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION.

Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen's Local Union, No. 12, Protest Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, under date of May 29, 1945, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters' and Butcher Workmen's Local Union, No. 12, of Duluth, Minn., presented a resolution to the Federated Trades and Labor Assembly of Duluth, Minn.

The Federated Trades and Labor Assembly is an organization composed of labor unions which hold membership in the American Federation of Labor. The Federated Trades and Labor Assembly considered this resolution at one of its meetings and instructed the secretary of the assembly to advise me of the action taken. This communication, which I received from Secretary Carl Swenson, reads as follows:

(Affiliated with the American Federation of Labor—Affiliated with the State Federation of Labor)

(Charles Lyons, president, 2253 West Thirteenth Street, Duluth, Minn.; Carl Swenson, secretary, office, Labor Temple, Duluth, Minn.—home address, 2515 West Boulevard, Duluth, Minn.)

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
FEDERATED TRADES AND LABOR
ASSEMBLY OF DULUTH, MINN.,
May 29, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PITTENGER: The following resolution introduced by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, Local Union, No. 12, Duluth, Minn., was adopted at the meeting of the Federated Trades and Labor Assembly on Friday, May 25, 1945, and, as secretary, I was instructed to comply with the request of the resolution.

We respectfully request that you give this resolution your earnest consideration:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the food situation, particularly meats, is becoming more seriously short in supply every day, and unemployment has already resulted in the retail food trades; and

"Whereas a serious lack of adequate nutrition to working men and women in industry is becoming more and more apparent as these shortages are allowed to exist: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Federated Trades and Labor Assembly of Duluth does hereby protest the handling of food supply, particularly meat products, by the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration, and we do hereby fully support the recommendations for the purpose of improving the supply and distribution of meats as made in House Report No. 504, by the Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages, for the House of Representatives, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman, and the Senate Report No. 270, made by the Senate Committee Investigating the Distribution and Consumption of Food Products, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, chairman; and be it further

"*Resolved*, Senator JOSEPH H. BALL, Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, and Congressman WILLIAM A. PITTENGER be immediately notified by the Duluth Federated Trades and Labor Assembly

to initiate and support legislative action that will concur in all respects with the recommendations of the afore-mentioned investigation committees of both Houses."

Sincerely yours,

DULUTH FEDERATED TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
CARL SWENSON, *Secretary.*

The foregoing communication and resolution submitted to me by the Duluth Federated Trades and Labor Assembly represents an honest statement of facts regarding the food shortage which existed on May 25, 1945, when the resolution was adopted and which food shortage has increased in a marked degree since that date.

It is significant that the representatives of the American Federation of Labor endorsed the report made to the House of Representatives by CLINTON P. ANDERSON, one of the recognized Democratic leaders, and the man who will be Secretary of Agriculture in just about 4 days. It is also significant that the Food Committee report submitted by Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, recognized Democatic leader in the Senate, to the United States Senate is endosed by this group of workers who requested the Congressman from the Eighth Minnesota District to follow the recommendations of these investigating committees.

These facts certainly show that the representatives of the American people in the Congress of the United States are approaching this food shortage problem in a nonpolitical and nonpartisan manner.

The Negro in the Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at Madison Square Garden, Monday, June 25, during the annual Negro Freedom rally. The Negro Freedom rally is sponsored annually by the People's Committee, of which Ferdinand Smith, CIO, and George Brown, A. F. of L., are cochairmen.

Today V-day in Europe is behind us and V-day in the Pacific is imminent. The road to military victory has been a long, rugged, and bloody one. We number ourselves among the victorious nations by virtue of the ever-increasing unity which we developed on the home front, and the ever-expanding unity which we developed with our allies. We are winning this war because we made it a peoples' war. We as Americans and as world citizens said, "We will achieve victory at any price." And now that the days of peace are rapidly drawing near, what shall be our stand? The days of peace must exact from us no less sacrifices than we were willing to give during the days of war. We must be willing to have peace at any price. Peace can only be accomplished by unity on the home front and unity with those who fought with us during the days when the going was tough. Therefore, we the Negro people—an integral unit of the peoples of the earth—demand tonight complete unity of black and white, Jew and gentile, Protestant and Catholic, native-born and foreign-born—here and all over the world.

We, the Negro people, continue to take our historic stand for right, for truth, for justice, for equality—not at some vaguely promised date with destiny—but now, right now, in this immediate present. We will not compromise, we refuse to be neutral, and we are not even going to mark time.

When this war began the Negro people were almost as rigidly excluded from participation as the Jews were in Germany. Only a handful served in the Army in Jim Crow regiments. We were barred from the Air Corps and the Marine Corps; we were confined to the messrooms of the United States Navy—making the world safe for democracy in a toilet or kitchen. Our women were banned from the WAVES and the SPARS, our nurses were on a quota basis in the Army and completely kept out of the Navy. We could work in defense industries only in the most menial capacity—we were building bombers with brooms and mops. There were no ships named after Negroes, no Negro sea captains; in other words, we were prepared as a Nation to fight a white man's war. If we had continued to fight a white man's war there would be no V-day in Europe today for our side. We, the Negro people, therefore, by virtue of our unity, plus rapidly growing allies of the new white man, made up our minds soon after Pearl Harbor that we would fight to make the world safe for democracy—yes; but would demand at the same time democracy right here in America—now. And further, that we would wipe old man Hitler from the face of the earth and at the same time wipe American Hitlerism from off the streets of our towns as well. We were called traitors, fifth columnists, saboteurs, in those days.

I am proud to stand here tonight and say that time has vindicated us, that the concept of democracy has become enriched by virtue of the righteous indignation and disciplined resentment of the Negro mass.

Before the war in Europe came to an end, by order of the President of the United States, Negro men fought side by side with whites in the same regiments. The Air Corps was opened up to brown men. Black men covered themselves with glory in the uniforms of the Marine Corps at Tarawa and Bougainville. From out of the mess rooms came scores of thousands of brown sons of Uncle Sam. They manned the guns on the decks and from their midst came bronze men to be decked in the gold and blue of commissioned officers of the United States Navy. Our women today are marching in the WAVES and the SPARS, and serving in the United States Nursing Corps. On the home front, black hands of skilled men and women machinists work side by side with their white comrades on the machines of production. Great ships today are sailing the seven seas proudly bearing the names of Negro patriots—Booker T. Washington, Frederick Douglass, Sojourner Truth, Robert L. Vann. They are manned by black captains. Serving beneath them are Negro and white crews. So I repeat tonight, there can be no compromise, there can be no marking time. Our cry tonight is "Carry on; forward!"

As your Congressman serving in the Nation's Capitol for the past 6 months, I have continued the vigorous fight. Freshmen Congressmen should be seen and not heard. However, I have made six speeches, crying out for the rights of all people. My speech—calling for the Army and Navy to abolish discrimination in the Nursing Corps—marked the first time in the history of this Nation that an antidiscrimination amendment was passed by the Congress without one dissenting vote. I said on the floor, just before the vote was taken, "Can it be that democracy has sunk so low that the lives of white sailors are worth so little that you would rather have them die than be saved by the trained hands of black nurses?"

I have fought side by side with that great champion of the people, VITO MARCANTONIO, for the successful abolition of the poll tax. I have been in the fore front of the FEPC fight, from the very beginning, being one of the cosponsors of the bill and a member of the Labor Committee which reported it out. I have protected the civil liberties of scores of people and procured jobs and promotions for hundreds of others. Two of the most significant things that I have been privileged to help in were the cases of the four Negro Wacs in Massachusetts and the 101 Negro Air Corps men in Indiana. In both cases I got in touch with the Secretary of War, and the President, personally, and am proud to say that the court-martial condemning the four Negro Wacs to 1 year of hard labor and dishonorable discharge was completely reversed and they were reinstated honorably. I am also proud to say that the 101 officers of Indiana, protesting against the viciousness of their commanding officer, have been vindicated and today the former bigoted commander, Col. Robert Selway, has been replaced by a Negro colonel, Benjamin O. Davis, Jr.

Two things face the Negro people of paramount importance today. One, the problem of jobs in the postwar world, and two, the problem of Jim Crow in the United States Army now, in wartime, and later, in peacetime. As regards the latter, I am proud to say that I have introduced (H. R. 2708) to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States after the termination of hostilities of the present war. I am in receipt of a letter, as of June 12, from the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, stating that my bill has been referred to the War and Navy Departments, and immediately upon the receipt of their reports the bill will be referred to a subcommittee for consideration. I am further happy to say that when the bill comes up for peacetime military conscription I will introduce an amendment to whatever bill is brought forward. The amendment has been phrased by the Alpha Kappa Alpha Nonpartisan Council on Public Affairs which states, in substance, that if America is to have a peacetime armed force then that peacetime armed force must exist without any segregation whatsoever from the time a man enters until he finishes his period of service.

Now, as regards the FEPC. I charge tonight that there has been double-dealing on both sides of the aisle. I further charge that if the Republican Party had supported the FEPC the same as it supported the abolition of the poll-tax, legislation today would be enacted on the FEPC. Be that as it may, I want the Negro people and the right-thinking white people of America to remember that long before the FEPC was thought of we, the Negro people, established our own Fair Employment Practice Committee. As we look out on New York today we see thousands of Negro men and women working downtown and uptown in all types of jobs, placed there by virtue of the united Negro masses. Long before Executive Order No. 8802 was penned by the greatest Commander in Chief of modern times, Franklin D. Roosevelt, we marched with picket signs. Therefore, tonight, I say, if the FEPC is not passed then the following things should take place:

First. In those sections of America where there is no hope for the Negro people there should be an immediate mass migration, leaving the land of doom to rot in its own filth. This I will cover in full in my forthcoming book, Marching Blacks.

Second. Wherever we are concentrated in the North, West, and far West we shall—along

with the right-thinking whites of our areas—conduct picket campaigns to make sure that there shall be no discrimination. We did it before Pearl Harbor and we can do it now. Carry on. Forward.

The Negro people are out first to defeat the Japs, and second to defeat the American Hitlers, and third to cooperate with all allies of the right and left at home and abroad who are marching up freedom road. We are not beholden to any one political party. We are emancipated; we are free. We belong to the cavalcade of the common man.

When I was 10 years old I traced down the brown back of my grandfather the letter "P" burned in his back. That seared my memory and I resolved then that I would not rest until I had wiped from my memory and off of the conscience of white America what that letter stood for. Tonight I rededicate myself to the masses. The past 12 months have been turbulent ones for me, personally, and now, in the language of Duke Ellington, "I am beginning to see the light." From tonight on we shall go forward together. I am your servant. Whatever you want me to do, however little or however great, call upon me—I am at your command.

Black and whites stand together. Jews and gentiles stand together. Protestants and Catholics stand together. Carry on. Go forward. Let us not rest until every Fascist is whipped in Rome, every Nazi in Berlin, every Jap in Tokyo, and every un-American in Washington, D. C.

Walk together children
Don't you get weary
There's a great day a'comin' bye and bye.

Hon. D. Lane Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, certainly the entire delegation from New Jersey was recently thrilled with pride when we heard the deserved tribute paid to our fellow citizen, LANE POWERS, by a number of distinguished Members of this House. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, referred to his service on that important committee as invaluable, and stated that he had a large part in providing the funds for the Military Establishment during the entire course of the war. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said he knew of no man in his time in Congress who had given more of himself, or done a better job, than LANE POWERS. Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual thing in this House to find these gentlemen in agreement, but it is a man of unusual qualities upon whom they have agreed.

Among many great services which Congressman POWERS has contributed to the Nation was his fight in behalf of the HOLC in a reduction of interest to aid home owners, his leadership in the antilynching bill, his constant endeavors in behalf of war veterans, both of the last war and this, and most particularly his distinguished contribution toward the development of heavy aircraft which has played so large a part in this war.

He has exhibited throughout his career in Congress the highest order of statesmanship, and it is no exaggeration to say that the Nation will miss his services upon his retirement.

Those of us who are privileged to be his personal friends, will greatly miss the inspiration of his leadership, his wise and friendly counsel, and his genial personality.

Which Will You Have—Sufficient Food or Shortages?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of of our country are intensely interested in the food problems in America. The Congress for several weeks has been giving careful study to this subject. I believe the Honorable Blaine McLaughlin, commissioner of agriculture for West Virginia, has written for the July 1945 Market Bulletin, the following provocative article, which follows:

[From Market Bulletin of July 1, 1945]

WHICH WILL YOU HAVE—SUFFICIENT FOOD OR SHORTAGE OF FOOD?

(By Hon. J. B. McLaughlin, commissioner of agriculture of West Virginia)

In the January 1, 1944, issue of the Market Bulletin, I published an article headed "State farmers oppose subsidies—System puts farm industry at a grave disadvantage." I stated in the article that farmers generally were opposed to subsidy—that it would not work as an influence to create incentive to produce. Of course, the idea behind subsidies is to keep the price of farm products at a low level, prevent inflation and serve for a time as a panacea in preventing production from dropping off to a point where food would become scarce.

I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, neither am I writing this article for the purpose of saying "I told you so," but to the contrary with the hope that we may arrive at some plan by which we can work ourselves out of the worst food situation that has ever been known at any time in this country, and which will continue to get worse unless some radical changes are made in the policies of the WFA, OPA, and that part of the ODT gasoline and tire panels.

In 1942 we encouraged the farmers to increase their poultry production, with the guarantee that a floor price would be placed on that production that would keep the farmer from taking losses in the season when their production was heaviest. In 1943 we had a tremendous production of eggs and poultry, but eggs out in the country went as low as 12 cents to 15 cents a dozen, while feed ranged at a price of $3.50 to $4 per 100 pounds. We then failed to come to the farmers' rescue. Late in 1943 we made the same appeal to the farmers on the same commodity, poultry, and in the spring of 1944 the markets were filled with eggs at about the same prices, with no relief. Late in 1944 we were called upon to make the same plea to the farmers for 1945. The writer refused to have any part in any such program for the reason that we had failed to come through in supporting the farmer the two previous years, and the same story holds true for hogs. This reminds me of the story in the old McGuffey Third Reader, in which a sheep herder with his flock of sheep decided he would play a practical joke and have a lot of fun with his people in his community, therefore, he called to them that the wolves were coming, and the people all turned out in large numbers to kill the wolves, but there were no wolves. It worked so well the first time, he decided he would try it again, so again he called out that the wolves were coming, and the people came out to help but not in as large numbers as the first time, and all went home disgusted. The third time when he made the call for help the wolves were really there, it was no fun making job that time, he really needed help, but no one came, and the story goes that the flock of sheep were all destroyed, and the reason the people didn't come to help the third time was that they had been deceived twice before, the truth itself was not believed.

About the same processes have worked on the pork industry and the beef industry. Today we have the fewest beef calves kept on the farms that we have had for 16 years, or since we began to count, which was in 1929, the basic reasons for which are that as mentioned in my article heretofore referred to, the incentive to produce is diminishing. The fixers and their fixings—which are many, have served to discourage production. Farmers are at a distinct disadvantage in their farm operations on the labor market for the reason that they cannot employ labor at the price that industry is paying for it, and sell their farm products at the ceiling prices fixed for them.

We have a food shortage which will continue to grow worse if agriculture is not recognized as a part of the war effort and given the same consideration that other industries engaged in the manufacture of war materials are given. If they are paid a cost of operation of their factories plus a fixed profit, then the farmer must come in under the same rule if we are to have an adequate food supply. The call is being made now and will continue to be made for the farmer to step up his food supply, but it takes a farmer a year or more to make his plans before he starts to produce. In some particular activities it takes a longer time, for example, the beef calf crop that was kept on the farm in 1944 was more than 20 percent less than it was in 1943, and is the lowest in percentage of any year since 1929. It is a safe prediction that the calf crop kept on the farm in 1945 will be 50 percent short of the crop kept on the farm in 1943, which is beginning to answer the questions which are coming into our department, "What is the matter with the beef situation?" The fact is that with many consumers, the calf that was not kept on the farm in 1944 will not be here as a beef animal in 1946 for the consumer who is then wanting beef, and the same rule will hold for those not kept in 1945. Also the same principle applies to poultry and pork, but at the same time it is much easier for the farmer to produce more quickly either poultry or pork than beef cattle.

Why are the animals not being kept on the farm? Because the farmer generally is working 12 to 14 hours a day because he has not been able to employ labor that he could go through the year with, and labor is an important factor in the production of any product. The farmers are limited in their production program to their own efforts or their families' efforts, and it is pretty safe to assume that conditions generally will not improve until the farmer has been given an incentive to produce more, which means his ability to employ labor and receive a price for his product so that he can pay for that labor.

The fruit crop has been cut to about two-thirds of 1943 due to weather conditions, and of course fruit and its products occupy an important place in the family diet. The shortage of canning sugar will contribute

further to an ever-increasing shortage of the food supply. But the meat and poultry shortage seems to be the most critical as much complaint has already come from families which are not able to buy any meat and poultry. Much has been said about black markets, and I personally think that the black-market horse has been ridden until he is out of wind and will not be much good for the future, and what I mean by the future is unless conditions are changed we will have what has heretofore been called black markets. The blackest in the so-called black market is what is going on at the present time regarding meat and poultry. Friends are being taken care of first in many of our markets, which is just as wrong as the worst, but I know of no plans being devised by those who are fixing the rules by which the merchant must operate and by which an equal distribution of meat and poultry products can be given to their customers. A full significance of what I have just said is to be found around any of our markets. When the information leaks out that meat and poultry have come in to their markets, all a person has to do is to go and take a peek at the persons in line holding a number and waiting their time at the counter to be served. Then you see consumers going out into the country to purchase food of whatever they may be able to obtain, and at the same time see the notices in the store windows and in the newspapers that the merchants have discontinued business because of lack of food to serve their customers. The same rules that have fixed the farmer is fixing the merchant, and in turn is fixing the consumer.

The production curve has definitely turned down and will continue to go further down until we set up a plan by which in the course of a year or so it will begin to curve up and level off. That can be done by first giving the farmer an incentive to produce, which means that he must be in a position to employ labor and pay the price that industry can pay, or continue under the beneficent program of a subsidy for farm labor in an amount that will allow the worker to receive a price equal to that he can receive in an industrial plant—or will the consuming public be left to handle the situation themselves? Those charged with the responsibility of keeping down inflation with a well ordered and regulated food market have their choice. It is hoped that they select a wise policy. Shall we continue to have a scarcity of food, or shall we have plenty? It seems the consuming public may settle the whole question.

Address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at Testimonial Dinner to Hon. Frances Perkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 29 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered on June 27, 1945, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., at a testimonial dinner in honor of Hon. Frances Perkins.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, there is an old saying: "Let us go back, for that is one of the privileges of a storyteller."

Tonight I propose to go back and begin my story a number of years ago. But the story I am to relate proves once again that truth is more exciting than fiction. It proves that nothing in books of fiction is so inspiring as the true story of our great American men and women.

We are here tonight to honor a great American woman, Frances Perkins—to honor her, I hope, long before the end of the story of her contribution to the happiness and well-being of the American people.

Now, for the beginning of the story. It is written that the foundation for the Nation-wide social legislation of the 1930's was prepared two decades earlier in the State of New York. In saying this, I do not seek any special credit for my home State. It happens that industrialization was more advanced in New York than elsewhere—and thus conditions forced certain reforms there, before they became necessary on a national scale. But I do not believe that we would have moved so rapidly in New York after 1910 except for the fact that we were thrice blessed by the presence of people like Franklin D. Roosevelt, Alfred E. Smith, and Frances Perkins.

These three great Americans had similar interests but varied talents. Their varied talents led them to make different types of contributions to human welfare—but each in his or her own field was supreme.

Roosevelt was the supreme leader of the people. He stirred their hearts and quickened their pace in the direction of social justice. Al Smith was the supreme student of the practical art of government. He shaped the machinery of the State to meet the needs it had to serve. Frances Perkins was, and still is, the supreme student of social conditions and remedial social legislation. She uncovered the facts and told us what to do about them.

In 1911, after the horrible Triangle fire, the New York State Factory Investigating Commission was formed. The commission did not limit itself to how our factory workers could be made safe from fire. It extended its work to all the hazards of industrial life—the economic hazards as well as the physical hazards—the hazards of loss of earning power through unemployment, as well as loss of limb or sight or life through accident. The study of these hazards led inescapably to the development of safeguards against them.

By far my most important act, as chairman of this factory investigating commission, was to appoint Frances Perkins as investigator for the commission. All of you know that the success of a body of this kind depends on the staff much more than on the chairman. With a different chairman the achievements of the factory commission might have been pretty much the same. But without Frances Perkins they could not possibly have been the same. For Frances Perkins brought to this big job, more than 30 years ago, those qualities which fitted her preeminently for the bigger jobs that followed—qualities of absolute fearlessness, integrity, profound scholarship, human understanding, brilliance of intellect, and common sense.

The State of New York is a tough testing ground. For 20 years after coming with the factory commission, Miss Perkins grew steadily in stature, in public recognition, and in public responsibility. During her years as members and chairman of the New York State Industrial Board, and then as industrial commissioner, she administered with foresight and understanding an ever-growing code of labor laws and welfare legislation. But the skilled administrator never lost the quality of the ardent advocate. Our code of protective legislation was never so long but that Miss Perkins wanted to make it longer—and make it better.

The women of America may be eternally proud that their first representative in the President's Cabinet was not placed there because she was a woman. I am inclined to believe that President Roosevelt would have had a woman in his Cabinet, in any event. But I do not think that this was why he selected Frances Perkins. He selected her because she was the best qualified person for the job—because the record of her accomplishments made her selection an inevitable one.

The catalog of Frances Perkins' achievements as Secretary of Labor are known to all of us here.

During the economic crisis in 1933, Miss Perkins worked without rest toward the development of emergency legislation—and she always insisted that it must include protection of the legitimate interests of the wage earner.

In 1934, the Secretary of Labor became Chairman of the President's Committee on Economic Security. Under her experienced guidance, there was gathered together a committee of experts who assisted in the preparation of the Social Security Act. No finer or more unselfish work was ever undertaken and successfully concluded.

In 1935, in order to make the worker a freeman, by guaranteeing his right to belong to a union and bargain collectively, we passed the National Labor Relations Act. The opposition at times seemed almost insurmountable. Miss Perkins, before both Houses of Congress, stoutly championed the fair principles of this act, and aided magnificently in its passage.

During the second Roosevelt administration, the wages-and-hours law was enacted, and since then, it has been equitably and progressively administered under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor.

With the advent of troubled world conditions, and then the war, all of the permanent departments of our Government have become in fact, if not in name, war agencies. We have demonstrated that a country where labor is free can outproduce those countries where labor has been enslaved. Our production record, compared with our own record in the last war, proves beyond question that our labor legislation and our social-security laws have made us stronger than ever before. Frances Perkins, during her whole life, has been a foremost exponent of this philosophy of strength through democracy.

As the American leader in wartime conferences, where the international problems of labor have been under discussion, our American Secretary has been a tower of strength and discernment.

My friends, let no one blindly anticipate that the problems of the future will be less than those of the past.

There are no permanent plateaus on which we may rest in our quest for economic and social justice. We must continue always to aspire and to climb. We must regard past achievements merely as an inspiration to future achievements.

Our social-security program must be expanded and improved. Nation-wide health insurance has become an imperative, and it must be made an actuality.

Ten million families, still living in slums, must be assisted by their Government along the way to decent housing.

Affirmative measures must be taken to assure full postwar employment for all those who are eager and willing to work. Toward this end, maximum stimulation of private enterprise must be reinforced by governmental responsibility to present involuntary idleness.

Full employment in America, I firmly believe, is the first necessary condition for permanent peace with the rest of the world.

These goals will not be attained without a struggle. There is still a minority who mistakenly feel that it will profit them to hamstring labor, to maintain a reserve pool of unemployed, and to call a halt to further extension of social security. There is still a minority who have forgotten what happened after the last war—who do not realize that the only way to prevent history from repeating itself is by learning from experience.

The liberal and progressive forces of America must be marshaled as never before to fight for the future of America. Our total war against fascism must be succeeded by a total war against reaction and underprivilege at home. We must wage a total war for economic and political democracy.

People do not lose their interest in this total war for democracy simply because they leave a particular job. People surrender in this struggle only when they grow faint of heart. That will never be the case with Frances Perkins. Wherever she may be, whatever she may do, her whole life proves that she will continue to be a militant crusader in the battle for human dignity and freedom.

This is not a farewell meeting. It is merely the end of one chapter in the story of our friend and coworker, Frances Perkins. Miss Perkins, our wish for you is this: May each succeeding chapter in your endeavors be as useful to the people of America as those that have gone before.

Poland's Sun Fades Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 29 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Poland's Sun Fades Again," written by William Philip Simms, and published in the Washington Daily News of June 28, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S SUN FADES AGAIN

(By William Philip Simms)

SAN FRANCISCO, June 28.—Today is the twenty-sixth anniversary of Polish independence bestowed by the Treaty of Versailles signed June 28, 1919. For more than a century she had been snuffed out by the Russian-Prussian-Austrian partition.

Today, barring some unexpected turn for the better, also marks the beginning of a new Polish eclipse. It is one of the most tragic ironies of the Second World War that, for her part in the great Allied victory, Poland should have to pay with her life.

Poland has one more chance, but it is a slim one. It depends on whether or not the "free and unfettered elections" promised by the Big Three at Yalta are actually held on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. Russia, in all her 28 years since the Revolution, has held no such election. How a Soviet-controlled Poland can perform this feat, therefore, remains to be seen.

It can be done only if three steps are taken, beginning now.

1. The Polish news blackout must be lifted. Sources of information must be made accessible as they are in the United States and Britain.

2. The 1,200,000 Polish exiles—soldiers, sailors, airmen, Polish slaveworkers in Germany, and refugees generally—must be allowed and assisted to return to their homes freely. They must not be "screened" to make certain they will toe the Moscow-Warsaw party line.

3. The elections should be supervised by competent, neutral observers.

As this was written the announcement of a new provisional government was momentarily expected from Moscow. Presumably it was to comply with Yalta, hence should be on a broad, democratic basis.

Instead, according to reports, it will have 21 members, 16 of whom are of Communist persuasion and 5 non-Communist. Yet, of the 5 major parties in Poland at the time of the last election the Communists were by all odds the smallest.

A democratically organized regime, of course, would have had proportional representation: Three or four each from the National, Christian Democrat, Socialist, Peasant, and Communist Parties. Polish underground leaders do not appear in the line-up at all. They are in a Soviet prison following their strange arrest last March and even stranger trial a few days ago.

The Big Three, on whom the world—and especially the little nations—must pin its faith for an indefinite time to come, have little to be proud of in their handling of helpless Poland.

In a secret protocol attached to the Anglo-Polish treaty of alliance of 1939, Britain and Poland pledged themselves to make no agreement with a third power which would "prejudice either the sovereignty or territorial inviolability of the other party * * *."

Expediency, therefore, is clearly the only excuse either for Britain or the United States, whose policy, in the main, has been to go along with Britain. Lord Halifax made it courageously plain, here in San Francisco, that if one of the great powers insists on a given course the others can only acquiesce or go to war.

Which makes it all the more impressive that, at their forthcoming meeting in Germany, Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill, and President Truman should do something to implement the Yalta pledge to give Poland the promised free and unfettered elections. The prestige of the United States and Britain, among other things, is very much at stake.

OPA and Sugar

REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, since the Price Control Act passed the House a few days ago we have heard it referred to by the newswriters and radio commentators as a Republican victory, a coalition victory, and what not.

All of them are welcome to their opinions, but as for myself and judging from the press comments and the thousands of letters and telegrams the Members of Congress have received, it was a victory for the American people.

The most gratifying response was that from the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson. According to the press he said he was "pleased with the action of the House." He further related that the amendment relative to meat placed in his hands a weapon to deal with the black market and to channel more meat to the dinner table. Also, it gives him authority to require affirmative proof of the destination of every carcass of beef. He stated he intended to revoke the license of any slaughterer furnishing meat to the black market.

We must not underestimate the importance of these victories. We have right and justice on our side and are supported by the solid sentiment of the people. It must be remembered, and I want to emphasize it here, that the Executive, through the extraordinary war powers granted, and under the Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act and other laws, has complete power to control prices and prevent wild inflation. Let there be no misunderstanding about that.

All of our troubles have been administrative and not legislative. We trusted the regulative authorities and they failed.

Then it became necessary for the Congress to provide intelligent direction. The cause of the meat shortage was made clear in the debate last week. The amendment adopted by the House liberalizing the program for local slaughterers will undoubtedly afford some relief shortly after July 1. But it will take many months to correct the meat shortage condition.

Now as the canning season is upon us we are face to face with a severe sugar shortage. Already in some sections of the country housewives cannot use their rationing stamps because the only sugar available is that which has drifted into the black market, and home canning allotments have been stopped in many States. The reasons for the sugar shortage are well known to all of us. Faulty rationing, failure to stimulate sugar production during the past 3 years, and faulty allocation of manpower are the basic causes.

The story of sugar under New Deal management is similar to that of meat.

Cuba is the largest single cane-sugar producer—having a capacity of about 5,000,000 tons per year. Philippine production has been out since Pearl Harbor. Hawaii and Puerto Rico production is about 1,500,000 tons a year all told.

Beet-sugar production in this country was running around 1,900,000 tons a year in 1941 and has been going down since then because of administration direction and failure to understand the problem.

We can use 8,000,000 tons of sugar this year but only 6,221,000 tons will be available. Sugar is not just a luxury ingredient. It is also a very important and strategic material in wartime, both for its food value and as a source of alcohol to make synthetic rubber and smokeless powder.

The answer to the sugar question, according to recent reports, goes back to 1942, when we were losing ships in the Caribbean by enemy submarines—our War Food Administration and Department of Agriculture, which had to do with sugar, figuring that they could not find ships to bring us more than 3,000,000

tons of sugar from Cuba in 1943, so they contracted for only 2,700,000 tons. The Cubans wanted to plant 5,000,000 tons at their own risk for 1943 and store the extra tons on the chance that sooner or later the submarine menace would be reduced, which it eventually was, to zero. For some reason or other the United States authorities discouraged the idea. Anyway, as the plan worked out, for the past 2 years Cuba has only planted approximately 60 percent of the sugar it can raise. To make matters worse they are suffering from a drought this year. So, barring some sort of miracle, we cannot get back to normal sugar production inside of 2 years.

The story of meat and sugar makes an interesting commentary on the theory that the bureaucrats here in Washington are capable of doing all the thinking and planning for every person and every activity in the United States. These facts are certainly no comfort to the thousands of small local food processors throughout the country, many of whom will be forced to close their plants before the year is out. These mistakes cannot be corrected overnight, but to correct them at all we must now begin with sensible direction by people who know the business.

You are again reminded that meat, sugar, and other articles of food continue to go overseas in huge quantities on lend-lease and to countries making no contribution whatsoever to the war effort.

I have stated on this floor many times, and I reiterate today, that lend-lease should be stopped all over the world immediately, except to China, and Congress review the entire problem.

Our primary job today is to win the war, and our first job as far as food is concerned is to feed our armed forces and the second is to make secure a healthy diet for our people in this country. Our first duty is to our own.

Stop War Manpower Expansion

REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the War Manpower Commission is seeking to open up 600 new offices throughout the United States to extend its tentacles of bureaucracy further down into the small villages. I understand that a conference committee of the House and Senate is considering whether or not the $18,000,000 that the other body placed in the bill will come back to the House. For fear it may come back to the House, I want to insert my remarks in the RECORD touching on that problem, the war manpower problem, on the theory it may be of interest to the Members.

Mr. Speaker, the War Manpower Commission is attempting to expand its organization to the point of becoming one of the biggest bureaucratic organizations in the Nation. Those in charge, visualizing the end of the war, are now asking the Congress for greater appropriations and are attempting to make permanent the use of the State employment services which were loaned to the Government during the war under the promise of the President that all such State services would be returned to the States when the war emergency is over.

Many States in the Nation, rather than to see the extension of such a Federal bureaucracy, as visualized by the War Manpower Commission, want these State employment services now returned to the States.

The Legislature of Illinois is demanding such return in my State and Governor Green of Illinois, under date of June 22, sent the following telegram to President Truman, which reads as follows:

JUNE 22, 1945

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

I respectfully urge that recent developments in the manpower situation, resulting from the favorable progress of the war, make it advisable to take prompt action toward restoring the employment service to State operation and supervision. This view is supported by numerous organizations of businessmen in Illinois, who assert that the needs of both workers and employees would best be served by such action, and that the employment service, under the State director of labor would meet even more effectively the necessities of the war program by reason of its closer association with local industrial activity. I hope this matter will receive your early and favorable attention.

DWIGHT H. GREEN,
Governor of Illinois.

Let me give you the picture of the activities of the Federal Government and particularly the War Manpower Commission in direct opposition to the will of the State legislature and the Governor of Illinois, and I am certain if you Members of Congress will look into the matter you will find that the Federal Government is making such expansion for the extension of the power of the Federal Security Administration through the War Manpower Commission into every one of your States. I would suggest that you look into it before it is too late, and it is my opinion that a tremendous amount of money could be saved and the useless expensive expansion of Federal bureaucracies could be curbed and prevent such duplication of such governmental services in a reckless waste of the people's money.

At this point I insert a letter under date of May 2 addressed to me from the War Manpower Commission which conveys the information that this organization is setting up 22 additional down-State offices in Illinois outside of Cook County. They already have a number of such offices and the letter informs me that these 22 additional offices are provided for in a supplemental appropriation bill. This is only the beginning, according to their letter of an expansion that will further cover my State and the various States of the Union. They say that additional men and women to staff the offices will be recruited through the Civil Service Commission, and the letter is signed by Paul McNutt, Chairman. I herewith insert the letter:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1945.

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: The number of local United States Employment Service offices of the War Manpower Commission is now being increased under funds provided in a supplemental appropriation to carry out the requirements of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Attached hereto is a list of the proposed locations of the new offices to be opened in your State.

Some of these proposed locations have been serviced as itinerant offices. The personnel that has been serving these itinerant points in the past will be attached to the permanent offices as they are set up. We will transfer qualified and trained personnel to the other new offices and supplement it with additional personnel which may be required in order to adequately staff these offices and fully service the community. This supplemental personnel will be recruited through Civil Service Commission.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

Here is the additional offices to be opened up in Illinois, none of which are wanted or are necessary:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—NEW OFFICES FOR THE VETERANS' EXPANSION PROGRAM

ILLINOIS

Calumet City, Elmhurst, Geneva, Woodstock, Belvidere, Streator, Dixon, Galena, Macomb, Monmouth, Canton, Kewanee, Lincoln, Pontiac, Paris, Beardstown, Taylorville, Mount Carmel, Robinson, Carmi, Metropolis, DuQuoin.

Illinois, which we think is a rather important State in the heart of the Nation and which we are proud to say has over $110,000,000 in its State treasury, wants to take care of its own veterans and services to labor and does not want this further expansion of the War Manpower Commission under Mr. McNutt of the Federal Security Administration.

Illinois for 2 years, under the able leadership of Governor Green and with a patriotic legislature, has been preparing to take care not only of the returning veterans in securing for them jobs and in helping to rehabilitate the wounded through vocational and trade schools, but it has prepared to take care of job placement for all who want to work and for the rehabilitation of those civilians who have become physically handicapped in war work or in any other civilian capacity.

All the Governor of Illinois and the Illinois Legislature want is for the Federal Government to return the Illinois State Employment Service back to the State which loaned it to the Federal Government for the period of the emergency.

The public officials of Illinois, the people who have the greatest personal interest in their friends and neighbors within the confines of that State, have set up one of the best organizations in the United States to do this job. They are doing this job and will continue to do it without regard to the size of the task.

The Governor and the Legislature of Illinois, representing our people and our veterans have created, through statute, a State commission on veterans' rehabilitation and employment which provides for a coordinating and information service in every locality in Illinois. The State service, through the division of rehabilitation, the mental hospitals, the State employment service, the State health department, and the State department of agriculture, completes the picture to give the veteran every service possible under both State and Federal law supplementing the work of the Veterans' Administration.

Yet, with this fine organization which will not cost the Federal Government any money so far as the State is concerned, the War Manpower Commission, seeking to expand and perpetuate itself in a giant bureaucratic organization, insists on opening up a complete set of offices in Illinois to do the same work, and I repeat, this centralization of power and authority and intrusion of the tentacles of the War Manpower Commission into every State in the Union at the expense of the taxpayers is under way, and should be held up and denied.

At this point I want to read you a letter from a prominent serviceman in Illinois who is well informed and interested in the veterans:

JUNE 16, 1945.

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: Briefly the program of the War Manpower Commission boils down to a few fundamental facts. It is an emergency organization to deal with war production. It was made possible with the cooperation of the several States.

Its present expansion plans have in mind service to veterans in the postwar period. I take the position that these services should be returned to the States as soon as possible.

In Illinois the veterans' State commission will have 120 field offices where the veterans may receive a complete service including employment placement. The Illinois Department of Labor will have a field organization to train and supervise the commission organization in employment. Illinois can adequately meet the situation if the Illinois employment service is returned to the State.

With the close of the war there is no necessity for continuing and expanding the War Manpower Commission or the Selective Service Act in such endeavor. The Illinois commission, the Veterans' Administration and our State agencies are fully equipped to give the proper care, attention, and guidance to all veterans.

The General Assembly of Illinois has passed, and the Governor has signed a bill creating a commission which takes over the work formerly done by the Governor's committee on veterans' rehabilitation and employment and expands that work. This commission will have ample funds not only to thoroughly coordinate State agencies but to give direct counseling, advising, and assistance to all veterans. That work, among other things, will assist in placing veterans in direct contact with the proper agencies to get the assistance required and which will follow each individual carefully, assisting the veteran until the best results are accomplished.

The value of the State organization, as compared with the three Federal organizations operating in the States is that it gives a complete and careful personal service under one agency at the expense of the State and not the Government. We do not want or need these agencies meddling in our State affairs if the Government will return to our State its employment service.

A Modern Midnight Ride by Paul Revere

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE W. ERVIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask some Members of the House and, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, each good American, some pertinent questions, as follows:

If it had been within your power to do so—

Would you have prevented the midnight ride of Paul Revere?

Would you have forced George Washington, over his protest, to become our king?

Would you have prevented the assembling of the founding fathers who wrought our Constitution?

Would you now be willing to tear to shreds our Bill of Rights?

Of course, you would not. Your answer to each of those questions would be an emphatic "No."

Now, I shall ask a more pertinent question.

Are you willing to sit by idly, while the Congress is considering the passage of certain legislation which would abolish our democracy and give us a totalitarian government?

If you are not, then now is the time for action by you.

Because of the fact that the proposal to which I refer has been obscured by many "red herrings," many good Americans will be astounded to learn that the proposal to create a permanent FEPC would abolish our democracy and give us a totalitarian form of government.

I pointed this out in a thorough and convincing analysis of this proposal in a speech on the floor of the House on Tuesday, June 26. Any good lawyer will tell you that my analysis is correct.

The title of that speech was as follows:

Shall we lay the heavy hand of the FEPC bureaucracy upon our churches, schools, and fraternal orders, upon our courts, local elections, and local governments, upon our merchants and our farmers?

In my limited sphere, as a new Member of the House, I have done my best to sound the bugle call to arouse all good Americans to the danger of having our liberty destroyed. All Americans who love liberty must join in this fight.

It is now time to have a modern midnight ride by Paul Revere. It is again time to be—

Ready to ride and spread the alarm
Through every Middlesex village and farm,
For the country folk to be up and to arm.

It is time for every good American to sound the alarm. I hope that all patriots, including the publishers of newspapers and trade journals, who believe in democracy, in the freedom of the press and other provisons of the Bill of Rights, will adopt all appropriate means to give full publicity to the novel and revolutionary form of government which would be established by a permanent FEPC.

Such appropriate means could well include editorials, full-page or half-page advertisements containing a good analysis of the proposed bill, and reprinting and distributing copies of such good analysis.

Do not wait for someone else to sound the alarm. Do it yourself, and do it now.

Congressional Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil:

CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Certain writers seem to think it would be all right for Members of Congress to raise their salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 or even $25,000.

But they violently criticize Members of the House of Representatives for voting themselves a $2,500 annual expense allowance.

We submit this was the proper and honorable thing to do.

Expenses of Members of Congress have increased by leaps and bounds since Washington became so crowded. The war has added to their burdens. It probably costs the average Congressman 25 to 50 percent more to live in the Capital than it did 5 years ago. On top of this most Congressmen have more constituents to entertain than ever before. Some have to hire extra clerks to take care of their correspondence and pay them out of their own pockets. Telephone calls and telegrams have multiplied and the Government pays for no more than it did before the war.

Members of Congress are entitled to reimbursement for these extra expenses and they ought not to be squeamish about taking the money.

It is ridiculous to say that they entered into a contract with their constituents to represent them in Congress for $10,000 per year, and therefore aren't entitled to reimbursement money for extra expenses.

We are by no means convinced that congressional salaries should be increased. Ten thousand dollars is a good round sum and, in our opinion, very few Congressmen are worth more than that.

There is no reason to believe the country would get better Congressmen for $15,000 than for $10,000 a year. We have no abler Congressmen than we had a generation ago when the salary was only $5,000 a year.

But congressional expenses are much higher and the Government should take care of the increase, just as business firms pay the increased expenses of their representatives.

Instead of raising congressional salaries we favor an allowance up to $5,000 a year to cover increased congressional expenses, including suitable living quarters in Washington.

Similar allowances should be provided members of the Cabinet and perhaps other officials who have to live in Washington temporarily. The President should also be given a bigger expense allowance.

Department of Peace Would Be Created—H. R. 3628 Is Introduced—Proposal Is Subject of Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have today presented, for the consideration of my colleagues, H. R. 3628, a bill to create a Department of Peace. Language of the measure follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) there shall be at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Peace, at the head of which shall be a Secretary of Peace, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(b) There shall be in the Department of Peace an Under Secretary of Peace, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. In the absence of the Secretary, the Under Secretary shall perform the duties of the Secretary. The Under Secretary shall also perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary or by law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Peace shall have the duty—

(a) Of formulating and publicizing educational programs for promoting better understanding of the other peoples of the world and better understanding of the fundamental principles of international relations and of cooperation among nations;

(b) Of enccuraging the interchange of ideas and persons between colleges, churches, civic organizations and other institutions, organizations, and groups in the United States, on the one hand, and other similar institutions, organizations, and groups in other countries, on the other hand;

(c) Of assisting educational institutions and religious organizations in the United States in formulating educational programs dealing with international relations, international cooperation, and the problems of peace.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very real interest in this subject. Evidence of this concern is well expressed in the article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Star on June 26. It follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE DECLARED UNITED STATES NEED—WRITER WOULD FORM COMMISSION HEADED BY STETTINIUS AND BYRNES

(By David Lawrence)

Yes, President Truman will sign the United Nations Charter, the Senate will ratify in due time—and then what? Will the nations of the world settle down to wait for a dispute to arise before bringing the machinery of the new league into action? Is that the way to prevent war—to let disputes develop over the years and see positions and prejudices harden, and then, when passions are high, try to find a way to cool them down?

Billions are spent for war and war preparations, but virtually nothing is spent to prevent war except when a crisis arises. Thus the State Department is in charge of our relations with foreign governments and has a multitude of business chores to do for American business and the individual with interests abroad, but there is no department of the Government which gives its undivided attention to the subject of peace.

SENATOR WILEY'S IDEA

Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, Republican, had a good idea about this and made a speech about it in the Senate a year ago. He suggested that a department of peace be established, to concentrate and specialize on the maintenance of peace. Nothing came of it because at the time America was engrossed in war. Now the United Nations has set up an organization and the time has come for America to take the lead in establishing a special department of government to carry on the all-important work of our participation in such a league.

The American Commission to Preserve Peace might well be its name. It should consist not merely of representatives of the State Department, but also of the Treasury and Commerce Departments, as well as of both Houses of Congress. Such an over-all commission should have a special staff in the interest of efficiency, and to avoid any wires being crossed all communications should clear through the State Department. There is not the slightest reason why any duplication should occur between the State Department and the new commission. They can and should work together.

A man of Cabinet level should head up the American Commission to Preserve Peace and become thereby the head of the American delegation to the United Nations Conference. The first man to be given the post should be Edward R. Stettinius, who not only has served for nearly 2 years in the State Department and knows the background of that organization, but who has headed up the American commission at San Francisco. He now has made the acquaintance of diplomats throughout the world and knows the technique of conference and the meaning of the provisions of the new League's Charter.

MORE THAN DOCUMENTS

With James F. Byrnes as Secretary of State and Mr. Stettinius as executive head of the American Commission to Preserve Peace, President Truman would be carrying into instant effect the desire of the American people to do more than just sign documents in order to prevent a third world war.

The chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee should be automatically members of the new Commission which, of course, ought to have statutory sanction and be given a sizable appropriation by Congress. Such a department or commission, with an adequate staff, should constantly study and survey conditions, economic as well as political, throughout all countries in order to make reports to the American people of situations which, if aggravated, could become threats to the peace of the world.

Since moral force—and that means full publicity and a free press—is to be the chief instrument of prevention, inasmuch as major nations will not consent to be coerced by physical force or threats of such force, there is no reason why the America Commission should not begin at once to exert such moral force.

I also call attention to the desire of one of my constituents as expressed in the following letter to bring this important proposal to the President's attention:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *June 27, 1945.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In order that the new United Nations Charter recently signed at San Francisco may properly function, there must be a fundamental understanding of international relations by all of the people of the world. To accomplish this, there must be a broad educational program conducted on both the national and international levels.

Political science, properly referred to as the science of government, has essentially failed the people during your generation and mine or we would not have experienced two devastating World Wars in a period of 25 years. Industrial science, during the last quarter of a century, has performed marvels in improving the general conditions under which we live, yet, at the same time, it has developed weapons with which modern civilization may be destroyed under the process of war.

The destruction of man and property during World War II illustrates clearly the absolute necessity for all of us to direct our efforts from now on toward educating world public opinion in the ways of peace. If this had been done at the end of World War I we might well have avoided the pain and sorrow of this war. The cost of an adequate peace program in this country would be less than the cost of one modern battleship, and there is no question of a doubt that the people today are eager and ready to follow a leadership that looks toward peace.

To aid in obtaining this objective and to aid the United Nations Charter to function most effectively, I propose that there be created a department of peace to be headed by a secretary who shall be a member of the President's Cabinet on a plane of equality with all other members. The secretary of peace should formulate an educational program for a better understanding of fundamental principles of international relationship of all people of the world. Our colleges, universities, high schools, churches and religious organizations should be encouraged to teach such a program. Every encouragement should be offered to scholars to study and write in the field of world problems.

Within the limits of discretion, our Government should encourage other countries to carry on similar activities. Peace is possible only if the people generally become actively interested in it and feel that they have a vital part to play in its realization.

The creation of a department of peace in the Cabinet will, in my judgment, be the most important step we can take in this country to advance world peace now that we have signed the United Nations Charter. I trust that you will give this proposal your earnest consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

R. M. DAVIS.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that America assumes the leadership in effective machinery for the continuing program to eliminate war. This country can and must fabricate, within the framework of its governmental structure, the pattern for permanent peace.

Executive Order for Permission To Make Liquor Should Be Rescinded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the order of the War Production Board with which the War Food Administration appears to have concurred permitting distillers to take a further holiday during July for making liquor should be rescinded. It is not right that millions of bushels of grain needed for human consumption and for feed to fatten livestock for meat should go for making liquor. The dire shortage of sugar is known to everyone.

I am including herewith copies of letters I have written today to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Director of the War Production Board, and the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, demanding that this order be rescinded so we may have the grain to help provide more food not only for ourselves but to share with the starving people of devastated Europe.

JUNE 29, 1945.

Mr. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: The order of the War Production Board permitting the use of several million bushels of grain for the manufacture of beverage alcohol ought to be rescinded immediately. The grain allocated to the distillers under authority of the War Food Administration and to be used for liquor purposes should be withdrawn from the distillers and be used for food and feed purposes.

You are familiar with the dire need of grain for feeding livestock to help take care of an acute shortage of meat. You are also familiar with the need of this grain for food not only for our own people but to take care of commitments to feed starving people of countries that were overrun by the Nazis.

We are at a most critical period of the war. The supply of food is short. The demand is great. Our farmers and producers are bending every effort to meet that demand. Certainly it can't be right that you or anyone else should approve the use of millions of bushels of grain to be diverted to make beverage alcohol.

I trust you will cooperate to prevent the use of this grain for such unnecessary and inexcusable purposes.

Sincerely,

EDWARD H. REES.

JUNE 29, 1945.

Mr. J. A. KRUG,
Director, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KRUG: This letter is written for the purpose of requesting you to rescind an order issued by the War Production Board that permits the distillers to manufacture alcohol for liquor purposes.

This order will permit distillers to consume a hundred million bushels of grain for beverage alcohol that is sorely needed for food and feed purposes. The grain that will go for beverage alcohol is not only needed to supply the food demands of our people and the starving people of Europe, but it is also needed to feed our livestock to help take care of the shortage of meat that has become so acute in this country.

The order to permit food products to be used for alcohol at this critical time is wholly unwarranted and ought to be rescinded immediately.

EDWARD H. REES.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast made on June 24, 1945, by Upton Close:

CLOSE-UPS OF THE NEWS—AMERICANISM

Human liberties and decencies are the product of moderation, but are destroyed by extremes. Republics and all governments by and for the people exist through moderation in all things. Right now a rash of strikes is breaking out over the face of America. Strikes are becoming the pet peeve of our fighting men. Soldiers get out of military regimentation to find they can't work at their old jobs without submitting to labor-boss regimentation, and the union boss is sometimes a tyrant; too often a radical. This situation is making for extremes that could culminate in martial law. The root of much of this strike is in the Wagner Act. For some years now our liberals have been much too ready to go along to extremes. Now we have an attempt by three liberal Senators to reform the Wagner Act. Their bill may not go far enough, or may not succeed anyhow, but it is an admission of what is the matter—of the extreme to which we have gone.

Agents active in replacing popular government and destroying liberties specialize in extremes. These conspirators use catch words and smear phrases to drive us to extremes, as animal drivers use whips. If a number of us walk into these whips fearlessly we find them to be paper ribbons. Yet some Americans let themselves be scared by conspirators laughing up their sleeves, who call us "capitalists," or "fascists," or "reactionaries," or "racial bigots," or "anti-Semites," although these terms are used most improperly.

It is therefore time for a getting together and a speaking out by true Americans who love what our fathers built here and who while they want it improved realize how superior it is to what any other people in the world have now, or can hope to have. True Americans include those good people who are capitalists but who use their capital, large or small, to build America, not to oppress other Americans. True Americans include those good people who never belonged to the Fascist Party of Italy or any party anywhere like it, but who know that communism, fascism, and Hitlerism are alike the evil spawn of Marxism, which is now recommended to us, and that a good term for Communist statism under either bureaucracy or dictator is red fascism. True Americans include those who are conservatives in the sense that they want to conserve the liberties and properties our fathers have built in this Nation—which make it the most envied on earth. True Americans include those who are reactionaries in the sense that they are reacting most definitely against conspirators scheming to steal our country and liberties from us.

True Americans study and sense enough about world affairs to know that the only real first-class danger to world peace—the only thing that could cause a third global war in this tattered era—is the expansionism of Russia. True Americans do not go around covering up this unpleasant fact with an overplus of talk about Argentina or Franco or the wiped-out industries of Germany. True Americans recognize that among our allies, Russian expansionism first irks and menaces Britain although China may next be a major victim. True Americans, I submit, will resolutely refuse to be drawn into more global military expeditions either for the sake of bolstering Britain against Russia or vice versa. True Americans put America first, but allow no group or demagogue to own that phrase.

True Americans should include those Americans who equally oppose majority high-hatting of the minority and minority bedeviling of the majority. True Americans will condemn persecutions of the loose, unorganized majority just as much as they condemned persecutions of the tightly bound minority. True Americans include those who don't know what that shifty, newly popularized word "Semitic" means, but who do believe that a man's politics as well as his opportunities should have nothing to do with his racial origin in this Republic and should have everything to do with his living as a free American under free speech, free worship and free enterprise. True Americans include those who believe in fair practices even though they believe that fair practice laws will not create fairness any more than prohibition laws created temperance. True Americans see that what is needed is education in our American system instead of so much education in Marxism combined with efforts to make people fair and prosperous by law. True Americans should include those who notice, and dare to proclaim, that race antipathies have grown here right along with the most campaigning against the American system. All of that campaigning now comes from the Communist or left, side. If those who attack our American system would stop preaching their intolerant political system—the most intolerant now flourishing on earth—the wave of intolerance spreading across our fair country would no doubt recede to harmlessness. Intolerance begets intolerance.

It is therefore, time that good Americans and true begin to say in voices that will soon swell to the voice of a multitude: "Look, you guys who think you can take advantage of wars and our party system elections and the competition of big industry among us, and different racial heritages of our people to destroy our way of producing and electing, to turn laborers against employers and men of one union against men of another union and to destroy our two-party system in order to install one permanently ruling clique, to scatter our wealth about the world in the vain attempt to underwrite its printing press money, and to use us as tools to aid either the triumph of Marxist empire or the clinging fingers of dying old-style imperialism—look, you propagandists, connivers, and conspirators, we have discovered anew that we are new world Americans, and this is our land. Join in and help us keep it what it was—only make it more so for our sons who fought on its account—not to help one old-world empire against another." It is time that true Americans had a voice.

This past week a broadcasting network which has adopted the honored name "American" advertised a philosophy that should give true Americans a voice. I quote: "Radio

is a free weapon of decision for the American people. One of the foundations of this new concept was 'freedom of the air.' We pick newsmen and commentators with experience and a sense of responsibility—and then let them express their own opinions. We review their scripts only for good taste and for competent news authority—not for censorship—because we believe that no man in this or any other network is wise enough to know what the public should or should not hear. We trust the American people. Experience has proved that, given the facts, they will make sound decisions." The ad then names in their line of news and opinion—Drew Pearson, who was criticized by General MacArthur yesterday, making it practically unanimous, Walter Winchell, who in 1938 was our most caustic isolationist, and Earl Goodwin, a veteran whom I claim as a friend, but also the oldest journalist friend in Washington of the late F. D. R. Then there are listed conferences on international security, organized by Sumner Welles and Orson Welles. So much for the ad. Isn't this a little unbalanced? And does not the imbalance apply to more networks than the one whose advertisement I quote? I raise the question for the thousands who have written it to me. Some day I predict the other side will have adequate voices and the vaunted "freedom of the air" will not be a breeze blowing steadily toward collectivist and statist enterprise.

Any peaceful future for us rests on avoidance of extremes. Moderation is our salvation. Extremists at both ends hate moderates in the middle worse than one another at either end—naturally, because the extremes really touch and become one.

Tomorrow we shall have a new world charter if Marshal Stalin does not think up something else at the last minute to make the big nations more independent and keep President Truman fishing. What the Big Five have agreed on is that there be no interference with their separate selfishnesses. They have not agreed on any compromises where those selfishnesses clash. The proof of the pudding will be in the eating.

In the far Pacific where our boys fight the hardest war ever fought, where the enemy takes punishment that no enemy before ever took, the best bet is that MacArthur and Stilwell will go into China either south of Shanghai at Hangchow Bay, which is now under summer heat, or into Shanghai in north China, which has the feeder harbors for all Jap troops south of Manchuria. Additional advantage—these northern harbors have a delightful summer resort spot. With half a million Japs killed we have got less than 3,000 prisoners—mostly laborers or shock happy, doped, or unconscious soldiers, but we should really be thankful that the Japs follow the medieval custom of killing their own wounded. Our hospitals are not burdened with wounded Japs.

Speaking of the Pacific brings me to Eddie Rickenbacker. It is a weird feeling to see a living character whom one loves and senses portrayed on the stage or screen. Because I saw the film last week through the courtesy of producers Winfield Sheehan and Christy Walsh, and because this is Hollywood, and Captain Eddie is my friend, I'm going to give you the first review of this Fox film you will soon see: Captain Eddie. How our kids will love it. It will set them off on a new rampage of jalopy tinkering and it will take our older generation back to our bicycle days. The young Eddie, his mother, his wife, Adelaide, are all beautifully done. And in that narrative of a young American of enterprise, growing from poverty to everything he dreamed about, is depicted the 21-day epic of suffering and heroism in the rubber boats on the south Pacific. If I were doing it—I think that's the way Hollywood reviewers talk—if I were doing it, I would develop the early suspicion by the men shipwrecked with Captain Rickenbacker that he was a pet of Washington, and then their change to a suspicion that he was Washington's Jonah with whom they had to be sacrificed, and at last their turn to him in complete, simple, masculine trust for leadership. Fred MacMurray does his best, but the script does not let him bring out the tremendous, inspiring, amazing quality of leadership in Captain Eddie. I would have brought out the final ending of the spiritual tussle between Rickenbacker and Captain Whittaker, commander of the wrecked plane, as that astonishing character tells it in his book, We Thought We Heard the Angels Sing. And then—since I'm a critic today—Hollywood goes screwy—as so frequently—at the very end. The entire lesson of Captain Eddie's life, which is still the lesson of the film, is that when and where the machine utterly and completely fails—God takes over—if man has faith in Him.

Yet, after proving that, the film ends with a repetition of the early ebullient statement of Eddie's father, "Put your trust in the machine—it will see you through." That is what Hitler did; that is what Stalin is doing; that is the final weakness of every materialist. The machine is just another phase of brute force, unless operated by men who love their fellow men and go beyond faith in the machine to faith in God. But you will want to see the film "Capt. Eddie" and decide on your own if you agree. In our day we may not see another full length narrative portraying a still living hero.

Well, that's quite a sermon, for me. Our war in the Pacific needs more merchant seamen right away. In spite of a lot of fair criticism of our merchant marines, its men have made a heroic record. Our trained seamen can be proud to join now and help finish this thing.

I think listeners to American radio are entitled to speakers who delve into what causes our rash of events as well as the many voices which just describe the surface symptoms. I do not know many such figures, but on this network I want to recommend the conscientious and accurate Charles Hodges, who calls his program Memo for Tomorrow and on another network my physically tiny but spiritually brave friend, James Abbey.

Your requests for my news letter keep coming, and I am replying to tell you how we will work it and the cost. Mailed to so many offices—requests easily get lost. If you don't get our reply, please write again to Upton Close at Hollywood.

Next week I'll give my Independence Day talk—the last one of this series.

May you hear from your sons, as I have, or from your soldier husbands or daughters in the service to make your Fourth of July complete.

Victor Reuther's Letter on Reemployment of War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter that I have received from Victor G. Reuther, assistant director of the War Policy Division, UAW-CIO. This letter is most informative and states clearly the confusion that has arisen as a result of General Hershey's interpretation of the reemployment provisions of the Selective Service Act, and the dangers it presents to the reconversion period and postwar employment.

Congressman GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SADOWSKI: One of the CIO's greatest concerns is the employment and reemployment of war veterans as they return to civilian life. We have been working on the problem since 1939, even before the passage of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

At that early date, we took steps to protect the job rights of people who enlisted or were inducted into the armed forces from plants covered by union contracts. We provided in those contracts that a person so inducted or so enlisting should accumulate seniority during his absence and should reclaim his job on the basis of his accumulated seniority, displacing, if necessary, any employe whose original hiring date was later than the veteran's original hiring date.

With the active support and approval of organied labor, similar provisions were written by Congress into section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act when it was enacted in 1940, thus extending to all workers the same protection enjoyed by those working under union contracts.

On May 20, 1944, the Director of Selective Service, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, issued an interpretation of section 8 (local board memorandum 190-a) which has confused the issue of veterans' reemployment and perverts the meaning of the act.

In it, he says:

"A returning veteran is entitled to reinstatement in his former position of one of like seniority, status, and pay even though such reinstatement necessitates the discharge of a nonveteran with greater seniority."

This interpretation has aroused a storm of controversy because—

1. It is inconsistent with the language of the act which says that a veteran must be restored to his "position or to a position of like seniority, status and pay" and that he "shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence, * * * shall be so restored without loss of seniority."

2. It will weaken or destroy the seniority system established at so great a cost by organized labor as the only measure of job security so far enjoyed by workers.

3. It will be impractical to apply in many situations and will serve as a deterrent to the speedy reconversion of plants when employers have to replace old, experienced workers with veterans.

4. It makes possible the displacement by World War II veterans of World War I veterans, and the widows or other dependents of World War II servicemen who gave their lives in combat.

5. It pits veteran against nonveteran in a fight among themselves for jobs when our efforts should be united in a drive for an economy of full employment.

6. It unjustly imposes upon one section of the population, the section least able to afford it, the total payment of an obligation to veterans which should be shared by the whole population.

These are not the views exclusively of organized labor. They are shared by employers, employer associations, veterans organizations, business publications and others. The legality of the interpretation has been questioned or challenged by other Government

agencies, impartial arbitrators and corporation counsels.

Ex-Attorney General Francis Biddle on May 10, 1945, in Circular No. 3851, Supplement No. 3, directed to all United States attorneys, said:

"However, since the 'superseniority' interpretation is not free from doubt under the act, the Department of Justice will expect to present the issue to the courts with full candor. Any briefs submitted will disclose the considerations and the legislative history both pro and con."

Douglas B. Maggs, solicitor of the Department of Labor, informed Howard T. Colvin, acting director of the department's conciliation service in a memo on May 8, 1945:

"Thus it is our view that the returning veteran is entitled to his place on the seniority list in the business establishment and that the statute does not call for the displacement of senior workers in the event the force has been reduced to such an extent that the issue is raised."

The Boston Regional War Labor Board in Case No. 111-9591-D, December 19, 1944, in which the same issue was raised, upheld a penal recommendation which said:

"The intent of the 'law' (Selective Service) is not to give a positive benefit to the returning serviceman, but to protect him against loss of seniority he would otherwise have obtained."

Herman A. Gray, arbitrator in a case involving the United Steel Workers-CIO and the Timken Roller Bearing Co., Canton, Ohio, said in his decision:

"Nothing in the act provides that the returning veteran is to get more than he had when he left. Not a word is to be found that even suggests that he is to be favored above his older fellow workers and given a seniority standing superior to theirs. * * *

"To give the veterans seniority standing ahead of all ohers would entail a serious economic and social upheaval. * * *

"The task of reconversion to a peactime economy difficult, at best, would be hampered to a degree that might well prove dangerous. * * *

"The advantage which the interpretation set out in Memo 190-A would seemingly give the veteran, would, in the end, not profit him."

Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative and rehabilitation director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said in an interview published August 26, 1944, in Labor:

"On its face that rule (190-A) may seem to give a lot of security to servicemen. Actually, it's a gold brick. What's most serious is that the ruling would wreck existing union seniority systems—and in the end veterans would thus be left with practically no protection at all. The best and fairest method is that provided for in union contracts."

From Harry L. Derby, chairman, National Association of Manufacturers Committee on Veterans Reemployment:

"Take the man who has worked long and hard for some 20 years in your plant. Is he to be bumped to make room for a returning soldier?"

Other nonlabor groups who have challenged the legality of 190-A or questioned its wisdom include the law committee of the Association of American Railroads, C. A. Miller, vice president and general counsel of American Short Line Railroad Association, Industrial Relations Counselors, Inc., Automotive Council for War Production, the Journal of Commerce. A copy is enclosed of statements by nonlabor groups on their attitudes toward veterans seniority.

In his second report, April 1, 1945, James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, said:

"I am convinced that the section of the Selective Training and Service Act which provides reemployment rights for veterans will require some clarification. * * * We should not enter the demobilization period with any uncertainties as to the rights of reemployment or employment of returning veterans."

We hope that you will urge Mr. Byrnes' successor, Judge Vinson; the new Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, and General Frank T. Hines, Director of the Veterans' Administration, to remove such uncertainties and to take into consideration the facts presented above.

Very sincerely yours,

VICTOR G. REUTHER,
Assistant Director, War Policy Division, UAW-CIO.

Need Real Vice Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting and informative editorial, which comments on the observations of a distinguished American, Hon. James A. Farley, as follows:

[From the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Telegram of May 23, 1945]

NEED REAL VICE PRESIDENTS

You don't need a pair of glasses to see that some sharply needed pieces of Government reorganization should grow out of the chaos of this war.

For instance, we should like to direct the first piece of reorganization to the Vice Presidency.

It is really about time the Vice Presidency be given the power and prestige it requires—for the good of the Nation. To date, in this wide-spread, boastful democracy, the Vice Presidency has been a sort of comic supplement to the Presidency. It has been an office about which to make vaudeville jokes and giddy songs.

Of course, you remember "Throttlebottom" in Of Thee I Sing.

And also that "What the country needs is a good 5-cent cigar" quip of Thomas Marshall's. The quip was said to be the outstanding accomplishment of Mr. Marshall's two-term tenure of office.

Henry Wallace tried to be an active Vice President. Whatever he undertook was generally viewed with a half smile. Not because of Henry Wallace, himself. But because a Vice President—a harmless Vice President—was trying to give the impression that his office amounted to a row of pins.

When Mr. Truman was Vice President, he sought to be an active liaison officer between the United States Senate, of which he had so lately been a Member, and the White House. How well this plan would have succeeded is doubtful. For it has been the custom of Presidents of the United States to act as if their Vice President were not there at all.

According to the laws of this generous but sometime flighty America, it has been customary to give the Vice Presidents a seat as Presiding Officer of the Senate and a nice new gavel. With this he could bang away for "order!" when the gentlemen of the Senate got too noisy. There has been about all the poor Vice President could do—except to attend parties. If, however, he was seen at parties, people said he was light minded. And what a contrast to the President!

Yet from the beginning of the country, this man, whose office we have failed to take seriously, has been the second most important man in the Government. Never before has the importance of the Vice-Presidency been so evident as today.

A few weeks ago a President died. A President who had been something of a President of the world, who had dealt only in the lives of millions of people but in the political and physical lives of nations. And the man who had been just the Vice President inherited the stupendous responsibilities of his predecessor with only a general knowledge of the plans or the commitments his predecessor had made for the safety of this country and support of the world.

The point is that all the public business of the President—and by public business we mean trends in policy and hopes for better adjustments here and there—should be official. They could so easily be made official if the job of the Vice-Presidency were given the importance it desperately needs. The Vice President should be the confidant of the President. It has been said a thousand times, but it remains only a phrase, that he is removed from the Presidency by a heart-beat.

James A. Farley recently recalled, in an interesting address, that seven times in our short history the Vice President has succeeded to the Presidency. Farley also mentioned 15 times when the office of Vice President has become vacant. In addition to the gap left by the seven Vice-Presidential successions to the Presidency, at eight other times the country has been without a Vice President because seven Vice Presidents have died in office and one, John C. Calhoun, resigned to become a Senator.

Here, according to Farley, is a bad situation for a Republic. It gives a Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency, the chance to choose a Secretary of State who might become President of the United States.

Mighty loose business, this Vice Presidency situation. Now is the time to give it proper legal standing and importance, for the sake of the country and the guidance of the heavily burdened man who may some day succeed to the post for which he has had no fair preparation.

Shall We Accept the San Francisco Charter?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made on the radio broadcast, Town Meeting of the Air:

Let us frankly admit that the San Francisco Charter is far from a perfect instrument for establishing justice and enduring peace on this earth. Mr. Culbertson has pointed out some of its defects and I agree it is not as good in some respects as I had hoped, although on the whole better than I had expected 2 months ago.

But the fact that it is not as good as we should like does not prove that we should therefore reject it. (Every time a doctor operates on a malignant disease he realizes fully the dangers involved; but he operates

nevertheless because he knows there are even greater danger if he doesn't operate.)

After the last war we carefully calculated all the risks involved in going in with other nations to try to establish machinery to prevent war—and the risks were there. But we failed to evaluate adequately the risks and costs of not going in, of trying to go it alone, and, believe me, those risks and costs were there too.

Therefore, before we reject the Charter because of its obvious shortcomings, let us consider the possible alternatives.

First. We could try to escape the world, go back to so-called isolationism. This is a natural attitude because of the fact that it once was a good way to get security. Our forefathers escaped Europe by coming here: but will someone please suggest where we should go now to escape the world?

Second. We could try to run the world, depend solely on our own control of strategic islands and air bases and a gigantic Army and Navy and Air Force. But that could not assure us of long-term security, because other nations would unite against us just as we united against those who tried to dominate us; and because we do not have enough minerals or money or manpower. We cannot get around the hard fact that we have only 6 percent of the earth's land and 6½ percent of its population.

Third. We could try to buy the world, supply it with food, clothing, machinery, and money in the naive belief that then everybody would love us and we would have no further trouble. But it never has been possible to buy good will and never will be. And again, we simply do not have the resources to sustain any such program.

Well, if we cannot escape the world or run the world or buy the world, is there any course left but to join it in a genuine cooperative effort to organize the world for security? That has difficulties, yes; but it also has hope. And no other course has.

Thus it seems to me our choice is not between this charter and something better, but between this charter and nothing—which is worse.

The Charter does not settle any of the world's great problems, such as boundaries, minorities, access to raw materials, colonies, air routes, and the rest. Neither did our Constitution solve any of the various conflicts between the Thirteen Colonies. What it did do was to set up a mechanism by which conflicts could be solved. That was its strength, not its weakness.

This Charter with all its inadequacies does provide machinery by which I think the nations can settle peaceably the conflicts that exist now and those that will inevitably arise. It is workable if there is the will and good will to make it work. No plan can prevent war if there is not such a will and good will.

While I do not believe the Charter is as bad as some would have you think, I also do not believe it is as good as some others portray it to be in their concern to make sure our country will participate this time. I deplore that overenthusiasm, because it will almost certainly lead to overdisillusionment, producing three isolationists where only one grew before. I was glad to hear President Truman insist at San Francisco that it is only a first step.

For example, we recognize frankly that some members of this proposed organization have been and still are engaging in certain practices to which we are utterly opposed. When we accept this Charter we neither condemn nor condone the conduct of those nations. We merely recognize the practical fact that to join does not endanger any of our legitimate interests and does give more hope of improving relations between nations and thereby of preventing war, than if we don't join. And further, with regard to the very practices we disapprove, surely there is more chance of doing something about them if we are inside the organization.

Unquestionably the success of the new organization and the future of the world will depend largely on whether the Big Five can learn to work together in peace as they have in war. I hope and I cannot but believe they will, not primarily because of a sense of moral obligation or of altruism, but because of a hard-headed realization that to work together for the security of all is the best way to assure the security of each, and that any gains one nation makes at the expense of another's fundamental rights will be short-lived and, through building up enmities, will give it less, rather than greater, security.

In short, I believe we must actively participate in the organization because the stakes for our own future are so great that we cannot afford not to join on the best terms it has been possible to get at this time.

I recognize that the effort may fail; but it is certain no other course can succeed. Therefore we must try our best, because if we don't make a go of it this time, then there is no hope until after World War III. We dare not choose that.

The Plight of Older Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, "life begins at 40," so it is said, but for the older soldiers it begins over at 40.

The plight of these older men in their late thirties and early forties, practically all of whom have families, deserves consideration. If the Army does not afford them relief, then the Congress should act.

Many times I have urged the War Department to give consideration to age as a factor in determining priority for release in the Army discharge program, but to date it clings to the point system established, it is claimed, upon a poll of soldiers. It seems odd, however, that of the hundreds of servicemen I know personally, not one of them was ever polled on the question, and letters I have received indicate that a majority of men at many stations, especially here in the States, feel the age factor should be given weight.

Typical of letters I have received is the following from a 39-year-old father whose only child, a son, if the war lasts 2 more years, will be in the Army with his dad. He has a job to return to, but, as he says, he and his wife will start over, just where they started 18 years ago, but with heavier obligations, to try to carve out a future in the last one-third of their lives.

Since there seems to be same agitation for the discharge of men in service who are 38 years of age and, in some instances, for those of 35, I wish to set down a few points in support of that cause. Naturally, I am deeply interested. I'm in the higher bracket, now going on 39.

First, I don't want to appear selfish or intolerant. Am presenting my case as a GI.

To men of my age, there is a financial problem. True, what I have lost in the way of income does not commensurate in any way what other men have lost—their lives. My loss of income would in no way compensate for the grief members of families of the fallen ones have suffered.

But we of the older group with families do have our respective sides of the issue and they are almost universally typical. In the first place, I will state frankly that if and when I am discharged I am going home broke. My wife and I will start out where we did 18 years ago, but with the added expense of keeping a boy soon to be 16.

Someone figures that defense workers should have a high wage—a premium, so to speak—for making the bullets and weapons; wages of $300 to $400 a month. Yet, it is expected that a soldier's wife and son should get along on $80 a month. They have to pay the same prices for commodities as others. The $80 is what my wife and son receive from the Government, of which $22 is taken from my pay.

Therein is another injustice, as I view it. A single man of my rating draws the same pay—$78 a month. He has no deductions other than laundry and insurance, with the latter not being as high as mine. He may buy bonds. We have the $22 cut right at the start. However, I don't object to contributing to my family; most married men send additional money to help out. Here is where finances and morale fit in the same shoe. We men with families simply do not have the money to visit towns or run around on off-duty hours. Therefore, because of the lack of finances, we are not always able to enjoy our pass privileges. The single go out—we remain in camp, our routine being work, eat, and sleep. No wonder the morale of the older group is not of the best.

But what about the future? We started a little savings fund for the education of our son. It has become necessary to draw on that. And my years for regaining my losses are becoming fewer all the time. The same is true with others.

With the Government no longer seeking men over 29, it seems incompatible that we should be retained longer. We should be given a chance to get out and catch up while we can. There is slight hope for us in the replacement system as all of the younger men will be ordered for combat. It's not our fault that we have not been in combat. We are subject to orders the same as the rest and would have done our bit to the best of our ability over there had we been so ordered.

Most of us are men who declined deferments. I did, as a patriotic duty and as a matter of personal pride. I had not been in the Army 10 days when they stopped drafting men of my age. I have served the best I know how, but am now ready to go home and willing to let some of the others—yes; even those in their early thirties—take a while at it. Administrative personnel is the forgotten segment of the Army. We get no glory or headlines; yet, it is a pertinent part of the machine. There have been many times here when the administrative personnel have worked day and night with minor complaints. We feel there are many in civilian life just as capable, mentally and physically, to take our places. Yet, seemingly, they will never be called upon to serve. All we ask is a chance for a fresh start in life. If I rely on the point system, I'm a career man.

I admire any man who has been at the front. I have equal admiration for those retained on this side and attempt to unwind the red tape. But let's rotate some of the uncalled to our jobs.

Again I reiterate my losses as compared with some are small. It's the fortunes of war, but we are deserving of consideration.

Hope this letter does not sound idiotic, but am trying to write as though I were talking to you. There are many other points to be brought out, but will refrain.

Mr. Speaker, other men, approaching or past 40, who had spent 20 years de-

veloping their own businesses or becoming established in professional practices, are possibly in more precarious positions. If they were now performing essential or important military work, I am sure they would feel differently.

The following excerpts from a businessman's letter are indicative of the frame of mind in which the older soldiers find themselves, as they see their life savings slowly disappearing, their businesses disintegrating, and their professional practices vanishing, while they continue to be held in service doing routine clerical work:

The military has the reconversion of our war plans in such a shape that we are now faced with a serious unemployment problem, if reports from Washington are true. Now they want to hold the older men in the Army until the war is over and let our business affairs go to pieces. All of us will be in one hell of a mess if we are not released soon. In my own case, the last money I have is now invested in the business trying to save it until I can get back from the Army. The military group knows nothing about the economic situation we are all in and cares less. If you don't force them to reason, we are going to be in one sorry mess.

If they will not turn us loose, then you should insist that we be permitted to ask for transfers to Army Posts near our homes so that we can protect what we have left. I don't mind staying in the Army and most of the men here don't. Our complaint is that we are needlessly being kept from our businesses and homes. In 2 months, I will be 39. I know now that I am not going overseas. There is no reason on earth why I should not be sent to a camp close to home. If I am so necessary to the Army, I can be there pushing a pencil for them and at the same time exercise occasional control over my business and see my family.

The situation here is plenty rough. The older men are so burned up over the way we are being held that they will only do what they have to and no one gives a damn if the work is done right or not. If they think this kind of a situation is good for the Army or the men here, they are crazy. They can hold these men, but they will play hell getting any work from them, because the morale here is gone and has been for several weeks.

Mr. Speaker, a month lost to a man approaching or past 40 can never be regained. The remainder of life leaves them so little time for effective accomplishment that their pleas should receive attention—so they can begin life over without further delay.

Someone should remember these "forgotten" men, many of whom were in service prior to or soon after Pearl Harbor and who have been retained in service in this country where points amass altogether too slowly.

Sgt. Loring M. Black, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following citation received by Sgt. Loring M. Black, Jr., son of former Representative Loring M. Black:

CITATION

Sgt. Loring M. Black, Jr. (32338150) Infantry, United States Army: For meritorious achievement in connection with military operations against the enemy on Luzon, Philippine Islands, from January 29, to May 10, 1945. During this period Sergeant Black, working directly under the AC of S, G–2, displayed great determination and keen judgment in carrying out his duties as assistant chief of enlisted personnel of the G–2 section. With tireless and persistent effort, Sergeant Black kept himself constantly informed on enemy-held terrain that was often incorrectly mapped. In securing this valuable information he made many trips to forward points where terrain under enemy control could be observed. He accomplished this with utter disregard for his personal safety, and on several occasions was under enemy machine-gun, rifle, and mortar fire. Sergeant Black, in his clerical work in the division forward command post, was often called upon for duties normally executed by other specialists. He assumed responsibility for such varied duties as the distribution of maps to units of the division, the preparation of situation maps for general staff officers, keeping the G–2 journal, preparing messages and supervising their correct and rapid transmission to forward patrols, dropping of surrender leaflets over enemy positions, and securing supplies necessary for the proper functioning of the forward intelligence section. The speed and precision with which Sergeant Black executed these intelligence duties, under difficult and trying conditions, contributed in a large measure to the successful operation of the Division Intelligence Section.

Truman to the Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of June 27, 1945:

TRUMAN TO THE VETERANS

In his Portland, Oreg., speech of Monday President Truman said: "In the next generation the veterans of this war are going to run this country. They fought to save it; now they want to fight to maintain it, and that is their duty."

The President might tell that to the men in Detroit and elsewhere who say that returning veterans must not interfere with the seniority rights of workers who held high paying jobs while the veterans were fighting to save the country. But we doubt that he understands the viewpoint of the veterans.

They come home with an exalted concept of their duties as American citizens. They do not think any group should run the country. They believe in the constitutional rights of every American regardless of his or her status in life. The veteran comes home a good citizen, asking nothing more than a decent chance to make a living, hoping that when the law says he shall be entitled to the job which he left no other group will have the privilege of denying him this right.

Probably President Truman with his keen political perception visualizes the rise of another voting group. We do not think the veterans have any such notion. All the veterans we have met are modest and mannerly. They show the fine effects of training and discipline. They come back with no gripes. But they keenly realize there is another war to be won and they feel disturbed when they realize that here at home we place personal and group objectives above those of the Nation. They do not like this.

They may undertake to correct some unfair situations when they return and adjust themselves to the old routines, but they will not do so as an army. They will do it as individuals. They will not give up the freedom for which they fought, nor permit themselves to be led by selfish bosses. We hail them as a welcome force for the betterment of social and economic conditions—for the benefit of the Nation as a whole and not for any clique or party.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following excerpts from a letter from an old friend of mine, who served as a soldier in this war, for whatever it may be worth to my colleagues in the study of this legislation:

DEAR JIM: I am for compulsory military training 100 percent, or to use a slang expression, I am "fer it stronger than horse radish." For one thing, my short military experience convinced me that such a program is necessary for the welfare of our Nation. When I was drafted into the Army, I was very green about military matters, knew absolutely nothing about Army life and the things connected with it. I had to start in from the very first and much valuable time had to be taken to teach me even the first principles pertaining to military matters. The same can be said about millions of other men who were drafted. Had I, and those other men, received a year's training at the age of 18, before this war come upon us, it would have been necessary only to have us called to the colors, given a slight review of the things we had learned, and we would have been trained men—not green boys—to send against the enemy.

Had those men received that training at the age of 18, in my opinion it would have been possible for us to have rushed a large army of trained men to the Philippines before the Japs would have been able to take Bataan and Corregidor; we also could have gotten reinformements to the Dutch East Indies and prevented the Japs getting them and thus have shortened the war many months and possibly even many years. As it is, due to having only a small trained Army, we had to give up those positions, and now, with our trained troops, are having to take them back, at the cost of the lives of many of our boys. Time is a very essential thing in winning a war and a year's training at the age of 18 would insure the saving of time later on in case of a war.

Why did the Japs make that attack on Pearl Harbor? Because they believe we Americans are soft. They figured they would put a lot of our Navy out of commission, then have things their way as we would not have ships to protect our transports, and would not have many soldiers to transport anyway. During that time their large trained army would overpower us, and have the war won before we were ready to fight. The Japs

were fooled—we were not as soft as they thought we were—but had they known that we had millions of trained men in this Nation, men who could be sent against them immediately, she would never have, in my opinion, dared make that attack on December 7, 1941. I believe compulsory military training is a great preventative of war; it causes all other countries to know that we are capable of taking care of ourselves and of inflicting great punishment on nations who bother us. Therefore, those other nations will take particular care to let us alone. If they consider us soft, they will take no respect of our rights.

I realize that compulsory military training for all boys will mean a great expense to our Nation. I believe in economy and in keeping expenses down, but I think military training will prove economical in the long run. Think of the money we have had to spend in order to train those men, after we got into the war. Had those men been trained before, much of that expense would have been unnecessary. Also, the lack of trained men is responsible for this war lasting months and even years longer than it would have lasted had our boys been trained. And every day adds a huge amount to the cost we must pay in order to win this terrible conflict. I believe military training will actually pay big dividends in the long run.

The details of how this training is to be done, of course, must be left up to the military and naval men—they have forgotten more about such matters than I pretend to know. My own idea, however, is this: Take the boys at the age of 18. Give them 3 months of boot training. Give them careful physical examinations to learn what kind of special work they can do and cannot do. Also have military and naval men at the training camps carefully check the records made by the boys on all subjects in order to learn what class of work they can do well. After the 3 months are up and the grades and physical examination records are carefully checked, and it is determined from them what kind of special work the boys can best do, then send these boys to camps specializing in the kind of work they are best fitted for and give them 9 months of special training in their particular lines of duty. Thus, when the year is over, these boys would have their training and would know what their line of duty would be, in case of another war. And if that war should come, it will not be necessary to take the time to give the tests to show what a man can do best; that will already be known. The men can be assigned immediately to the units of their special kind of work.

KEITH HOLLAND.

Repeal the Windshield Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the June 29 issue of the Delaware Valley News, Frenchtown, N. J.:

REPEAL THE WINDSHIELD TAX

Sentiment favors repeal of the auto use tax, which is difficult to administer, almost impossible to enforce, and relatively unproductive.

Not long since we encountered an automobile owner who exhibited a use-tax stamp for 1944–45 in his pocket wallet. He had bought the stamp a year ago but never attached it to his windshield. Not in the entire year had anyone in authority demanded that he exhibit the stamp, not even when his car was inspected. This demonstrates the lack of enforcement of the tax, which is actually a penalty on the conscientious person who will pay the tax because it is the law, while there are thousands of the other type who will not hand over $5 until forced to do so.

While called a "use tax," the Federal car levy has no relationship to the amount of use to which a motor vehicle is put. It was, in fact, imposed at a time when automobile use was rapidly diminishing. Time has arrived to repeal this nuisance tax.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Evening Star of June 28, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD
(By Constantine Brown)

The United States and Great Britain may delay formal recognition of the new Polish Government until after the British elections, according to reports from political observers in London.

While on paper it looks as if the conditions of the Yalta agreement have been fulfilled, only three non-Lublin Poles have been included in the new administration.

A wave of "ill health" has caught the other Poles who were invited to join the new set-up. Besides the old peasant leader, Wincenty Witos, who claimed to be sick on his farm in Poland, Siegmund Zulawski, chairman of the Polish trade unions; Wladislaw Grabski and Mieczyslaw Thugut, members of the Polish Peasant Party, also have caught some kind of "political infection" which has prevented them from accepting posts in the revised regime.

None of these representatives of prewar Polish liberalism believes that the new government, even if they joined the cabinet, could hold "free elections." Their suspicions were strengthened when the Ministry of the Interior—headed by a non-Lublin Pole, Wladislaw Kiernik—was divided into two sections. The internal administration was left in Kiernik's hands, while the security forces were placed under Stanislaw Radkievicz, an officer of the NKVD (the Russian secret service).

Under these conditions the Polish liberals do not see any guaranty that there will be free elections in their country. They realize that as long as the security administration is in the hands of an agent of the NKVD, police force will see that the ballots are cast the "right way."

Thus, while Washington and London are breathing more freely because the irksome Polish question has been taken out of the international field, they are aware that the new Polish Government represents the carrying out of the Yalta agreement only on paper. It is a mere face-saving device.

Prime Minister Churchill is now facing a difficult election. He has indicated that unless he gets more than a working majority he will not form a cabinet. Mr. Churchill is said to be planning to withhold formal recognition of the new Warsaw cabinet until after the ballots have been cast because he fears an unfavorable reaction among his own conservative supporters.

There have been some unpublicized incidents in England which have shown him how a section of the British public feels about what many still describe as the "sacrifice of Poland."

On February 22, 1944, the British Prime Minister made a public announcement endorsing Russia's stand on the Curzon Line question.

The next day the general heading a British Bomber Command stationed in Scotland called up the commander of a similar Polish organization, informing him that he and his staff wanted to visit the Polish officer. This was not unusual, since these men had fought side by side since 1940 and were on friendly terms. The Poles were surprised, however, when all the British officers appeared in their formal uniforms with their medals and decorations.

The British entered the Polish officers' mess ceremoniously and their commander formally expressed their deep sorrow at the speech of the Prime Minister. Similar incidents occurred in other sections of England, and while they were not publicized in the press, they were brought to Mr. Churchill's attention. Mr. Churchill decided to take no disciplinary action against the officers despite their criticism of their own Prime Minister. The matter was discussed by the British Cabinet and all agreed that the men in uniform had a right to their own personal convictions.

Soldiers in all theaters of operations mingle with each other and talk matters over more frankly than diplomats and politicians. The British Army has had the Poles on its side in the most critical days of the London blitz, the Rommel blitz in north Africa, and later in France and in Germany, while in Italy the Polish divisions have fought valiantly at Monte Cassino and Bologne. A Polish armored division is now on its way to the Indian Ocean, where it will be used against the Japanese in Malaya and at Singapore.

Immediate recognition of the new Warsaw government is opposed by men of the Polish armed forces. Quick action by Great Britain might affect many of the votes of the British soldiers in the field and at home. Mr. Churchill is said to feel that he should straddle the issue for the next few weeks in order not to lose votes for his party's candidates.

Poems by Nick Kenny on the Late President Roosevelt and President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 29 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, Nick Kenny, an able and popular columnist of the New York Mirror, recently wrote a very beautiful poem on the late President Roosevelt. He has also written a very appropriate little poem about President Truman. Mr. Kenny has unusual ability, and his articles are widely read. I ask unanimous consent that these two poems be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM—1882–1945

He dreamed a dream that some day he would see,
All borders disappear—and all men free.
His heart burned with an everlasting flame
Of human light for humble folk, and lame.

All races were as one to this great man.
To him the world's oppressed for shelter ran.
His name was feared in Tokyo and Berlin—
This man with gentle eyes and fighting chin.

God took him as his dream was coming true.
The dreamer sleeps. O Lord, please let him view
From heaven all the things he wished to see—
The end of war, and all Your people free.

—*Nick Kenny.*

TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Since freedom launched our gallant ship of state
We've been befriended by the winds of fate.
We always found a leader, brace and strong,
Whenever some great crisis came along.

Out of the crowd you come to us unknown
To check the whirlwind by a monster sown.
They say you were a plow boy in your youth.
Plow then a furrow straight to peace and truth!

You must prevent humanity's eclipse—
Stop the wild steeds of the Apocalypse!
Your Nation knows it is a lot to ask.
May God's hand guide you in this mighty task!

—*Nick Kenny.*

Keynote Address Before National Council of Negro Democrats, June 8, 1945, by Emmett S. Cunningham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the keynote address and the resolutions passed by the National Council of Negro Democrats at their meeting in Washington in June 1945:

Ladies and gentlemen, first, allow me to thank you leaders of the several States for the splendid response you have given to the call to come here.

When men and women are willing to take time from their jobs and professions and come to Washington at their own expense, it is eloquent testimony that these people are interested in the Democratic Party, their group, and their organization, The National Council of Negro Democrats.

Leadership demands sacrifice of time, energy, and money, and you Democratic leaders have met that test.

We have assembled here as Democrats with a background of service and devotion to the great Democratic Party. This is not the time or place for me to extol the many virtures of our party, because you men and women know them as well as I—but we assemble here as representatives of a political party that has made the Government serve all of the people and not just a few, as had been the case in previous Republican administrations. Our party has historically been the spearhead of the people's cause, and we must keep it so.

For the past 12 years that our party has been in power, we have given the American people more progressive legislation and more honest and humane government than they have ever known in their history.

It was our party that gave to this Nation and to the world that great humanitarian and matchless leader, the honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

On April 12 of this year our great leader fell in battle in a war for world freedom and peace. At the news of his death, Negro men and women throughout America wept unashamedly. They knew that their friend and champion had fallen.

A young girl told me that the passing of the President was like the passing of a member of her own family. What a tribute from the humble people of the Nation. He sleeps now in a rose garden at Hyde Park, but he still lives in the hearts of millions of people throughout the world. We should ever keep Roosevelt's name fresh in our memory, and continue to fight for the things he lived and died for.

Nearly 2 months ago our new President, Hon. Harry S. Truman, assumed the duties of his office and at that time he asked for the cooperation and the prayers of the American people in his pledge to carry forward the Roosevelt policies. In fulfilling this sacred pledge, we here and now commit our support to Mr. Truman, and pray that the Almighty God give His guidance and strength to carry out the terrifying responsibilities of his office during these crucial days.

Based on his record in the United States Senate, we have every reason to believe that he will measure up to the requirements of his office, and that he will do as he has promised to do—carry out the policies of his immortal predecessor.

Since the last time we met, one of our own "stalwarts" of the Democratic Party has gone to his eternal reward. I refer to that great statesman and leader, the former Recorder of Deeds, Hon. William J. Thompkins.

He was the first Negro to conceive the idea of a national democratic organization among Negroes, and during his lifetime worked hard to keep such an organization alive.

I can never forget the last visit I had with him in Freedman's Hospital more than a year ago. We talked about the problems of the Democratic Party, which I think, next to his family, was the dearest thing to his heart.

I believe we are paying him a type of tribute that he would like, by carrying forward this national organization among Negroes. God bless his memory.

When we met in Washington in February last year, we had but one Negro Congressman, and now we have two. I refer to the man who was assistant national chairman of the Democratic National Committee in the last campaign, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON of Chicago; and to the first Representative of our race from the State of New York, the Honorable A. CLAYTON POWELL, Jr. These men have an opportunity to measure up to the high standards set by Robert Brown Elliott, John M. Langston, and the rest of those noble souls who represented us in the Congress during the reconstruction period.

The Democratic Party must face the voters in the next election on its record of accomplishments and program as a party, and the ability and sincerity of its leaders.

As the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, we have a capable, dynamic, aggressive, and resourceful leader in the person of the Honorable Robert E. Hannegan. He is an organization man who speaks our language and believes that we have men and women in the Democratic Party capable of holding the positions under a Democratic administration.

We have got to get down to building the Democratic Party from the ground up, and that means precinct work. We have got to give recognition to those who do the work. We have got to get rid of those whom we cannot find during a campaign and who are afraid to soil their delicate hands in political work but who emerge after election seeking the fruits of victory.

When Negroes came into the Democratic Party, they did not make any marriage vows to stick "until death do us part." Negroes will remain in the Democratic Party just so long as it fulfills its historic mission in giving equal justice to all and special privilege to none, and continues to serve the common man.

If it fails to keep the faith, and veers from the progressive course chartered by Roosevelt, we will help give it the same kind of spanking we have given the Republican Party the past four elections.

We want it to be known here and now that Negroes do not want government handed down to them, and that no government is good for them unless they can help administer it.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are things which we ourselves must do if we are to retain the respect of others:

1. We must support the party financially. There are many of us who are able to make substantial contributions to our party.

2. We must retain for the party the personal following that was Roosevelt's.

3. We must continue to work in the precincts, in the counties, in the States, and throughout the Nation to promote the Democratic Party and its principles.

To do this job effectively, we must be an integral part of the planning and machinery of the Democratic Party. We democratic workers must have full-time representation on the staff of the Democratic National Committee. Special attention to the Negro vote just before elections will no longer suffice; the cultivation of the Negro voter will need continuous, year-round attention as an integral part of the planning and work of the national committee.

More Negroes must be appointed to key governmental positions, including Federal judgeships and in administrative agencies, especially those dealing with labor and employment, housing, agriculture, veterans' affairs, and social security.

This organization is naturally interested in patronage as all political organizations are, but we are equally interested in legislation that will benefit and advance our people and make us first-class citizens.

We want everyone from the President down to take a firm stand for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee. President Truman has just spoken forcefully on this subject; the party must follow through.

We want the entire party to work for an antipoll tax bill, antilynch bill, Federal aid to education and health, and extension of price control without crippling amendments.

We want expansion of the public housing program to clean up the slums of our cities; extension of the Social Security Act to include a larger number of working people. The Negro people asked for these things—we asked for these things before election; we now want to work with our party so it can "deliver the goods."

We commend the steps already taken during the war toward integration of Negroes in the armed forces and urge extension of such measures. We demand that all forms of service by American citizens in the armed forces, including all phases of military training, be conducted on a nondiscriminatory and unsegregated basis.

You men and women have expressed your confidence in me by electing me for your

president. I am thankful for this honor, but I am also conscious of my obligations to you. The National Council of Negro Democrats will accomplish something, or you will know the reason why.

It is a well-known fact that the Negro vote was the deciding factor in a number of States in the last election. In many key cities Negroes voted from 70 to 80 percent for the Roosevelt-Truman ticket.

Are we going to sit back with a record like that and wait for someone to drop a few crumbs from the table, or are we going to take our seats at the table and demand that the pie be cut with due respect for the needs and rights of all of the guests. I know your answer.

My friends, let us make no mistake about it, or delude ourselves. The death of President Roosevelt is going to have a profound effect on the Negro vote.

During the past 12 years, the Negro vote has followed the Roosevelts. This vote has been attracted and held in the Democratic column by the broad programs advocated by Mr. Roosevelt designed to benefit the common man. Because of the open and personal interest of both the President and the First Lady in the problems of Negroes and other minorities, the credit for the good things done by the administration has gone to the Roosevelts rather than to the Democratic Party. As a result, the Democratic Party per se has never been sold to Negroes.

If the Democratic Party wishes to retain control of this crucial vote, it is imperative that specific measures be taken promptly to sell the party and its current standard-bearer, Mr. Truman, to Negroes. The opposition party has already taken the initiative to recapture this vote which they have always considered their private preserve. Rebuffed in three attempts to reclaim Negro support through traditional appeals, the opposition has discarded out-moded methods and has instituted a streamlined program designed to raise the economic and political status of Negroes. Specific legislation and unprecedented appointments have keynoted this program. Led by the Republican candidate in the last Presidential campaign, three Republican governors have already signed State FEPC bills this year.

The Democratic Party is facing the most trying days in its history, and Negro Democrats are facing also a serious situation. Roosevelt is gone. His magic name, his radiant personality and his appealing voice are no longer with us to charm the voters of this Nation. We are all now on our own.

Just recently the European war was terminated, and we thank God for it. We are hoping and praying, working and fighting that the Japanese war will be of short duration.

We are proud of the record our people have made during this war, both on the home front and on the battle front.

We are proud of our black falcons of the air, and our sons who sailed the seven seas, and of the valor of our boys in combat service, and in every branch of the armed forces.

We are proud of our WACS, WAVES, and nurses, and of our men in the merchant marine. They have all brought honor and glory to their flag.

We feel that there is nothing too good for these black boys and girls when they return. They will need employment and decent housing, and will demand a full share of that freedom that they fought, bled, and died for.

They will, like the common people all over the world, demand a peace that will be just and enduring. Not a peace with a few still exploiting the many.

Our party must continue to champion the rights of all the people. Men may cry peace, but there will be no peace without justice and freedom for all!

Resolutions adopted by the conference of the National Council of Negro Democrats held in Washington, D. C., Friday and Saturday, June 8–9, 1945

We, the members of the National Council of Negro Democrats from more than sixteen pivotal States of the Union, having assembled at the call of our president, Emmett S. Cunningham, at Washington, D. C., on Friday and Saturday, June 8 and 9, 1945, to honor the memory of our late lamented President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who exemplified the goodness and fineness of the American ideal, and who, more than any other President, served as the protagonist of all the people; whose humane policies extended the benefits of real democracy to the lowliest American, and whose spiritual leadership and very demeanor accelerated the forces moving toward interracial amity, and to reaffirm our allegiance to President Harry S. Truman, who has pledged himself to carry out the Roosevelt policies and in which sacred pledge he has our unstinted support, do offer the following resolutions:

Whereas as practical party workers it is our immediate task to awaken the Democratic National Committee to the necessity of taking specific steps to retain within the party ranks the 3,000,000 Negro voters who have faithfully followed the principles and practices of Franklin Roosevelt, and as representatives of the thousands upon thousands of loyal Democratic Party workers who have helped bring about the continued successes of the party, we urge that Negro Democrats be given permanent, full-time representation on the paid staff of the Democratic National Committee, and that our organization, the National Council of Negro Democrats, be the sole instrument through which matters affecting us be channeled; and

Whereas Negro Democrats have played a significant role in bringing continued success to the Democratc Party in three consecutive national elections, and whereas, trained and qualified Negro personnel have proved their competence and effectiveness in Government administration, we strongly urge the Democratic National Committee to exert its influence to obtain the integration of qualified Negroes into key positions in Government departments and agencies, especially those dealing with labor and employment, housing, agriculture, veterans' affairs, and social security; and

Whereas in the words of our new leader, President Harry S. Truman, "discrimination in the matter of employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, creed, or color is not only un-American in nature, but will lead eventually to industrial strife and unrest," and whereas, President Truman has given vigorous leadership to the fight to continue the work of the Fair Employment Practice Committee created by the late beloved President Roosevelt, the National Council of Negro Democrats earnestly urge the Democratic national committee to exert its full influence to see that Democrats in both Houses of Congress fully support President Truman's plea for adequate funds for the present emergency FEPC and for the passage of pending legislation for a permanent FEPC; and

Whereas extensive and continued war migration has intensified the need of additional living space and housing accommodations adapted to the incomes and family sizes of Negroes:

a. The public-housing program should be reactivated and expended as quickly as possible.

b. The policies and practices of the Federal Housing Administration must be adapted and specialized personnel, similar to the racial relations set-up in FPHA, should be utilized to assure that its program is used more extensively to meet the needs of the growing Negro market ready and able to pay the costs of decent private housing.

c. The several housing activities of the Federal Government should be administered under the direction of one national agency to assure a unified over-all approach in meeting the housing needs of all the American people.

Whereas a million Negroes will have seen service in the armed forces of this country, offering their lives for the perpetuation of the democratic way of living, we urge that these Americans be given the same opportunities, benefits, and considerations as all other veterans, and to this end we request Negro representation on a policy-making level in the Veterans' Bureau, specifically in the rehabilitation program, and the appointment of Negro counselors in each State; and

Whereas the steps already taken during the war toward integration of Negroes in the armed forces have been uniformly successful, such measures should be extended, and we insist that all forms of service by American citizens in the armed forces, including all phases of military training, be conducted on a nondiscriminatory and unsegregated basis; and

Whereas the selective service brought out the disproportionate deficiencies in health and education among Negroes, we urge Federal aid to education and the enactment of the Murray-Wagner-Dingle health bill; and

Whereas most of the deficiencies in Negro life arise out of their low economic status accentuated during periods of unemployment, we urge support of a full employment program, including the pending Murray bill and related legislation; and

Whereas the intent and purpose of the Social Security Act is to benefit the largest possible number of citizens, we request the broadening and extension of its scope, and whereas, the need of Negro people for protection against rising prices and unfair distribution of scarce commodities is unquestioned; we urge the Congress to renew the Emergency Price Control Act and the Stabilization Act without crippling amendments; and

Whereas the poll tax is democratically unsound and unreasonable, we urge that all efforts be made to secure the passage of legislation for its abolishment; and

Whereas lynching of citizens of this country by mob violence is barbarous; we urge the immediate passage of Federal anti-lynching legislation; and

Whereas Negro members of the armed forces and Negro citizens, in their travel throughout the South in common carriers, are subjected to inequities and indignities which disrupt morale and heighten racial tension, we urge the Democratic National Committee and the Administration to exert their influence with the Department of Justice and the Interstate Commerce Commission to remove these causes of national disunity; and

Whereas citizens of the District of Columbia are denied the right to vote; we reguest that the right of franchise be extended to them; and

Whereas Henry A. Wallace, as a member of the Democratic Party, has worked wholeheartedly for full employment and for equal opportunity for all Americans, the National Council of Negro Democrats has resolved as an organization to commend his efforts and to lend our support and full cooperation to Mr. Wallace as an exponent of liberalism: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the National Council of Negro Democrats here assembled urge our fellow Democrats to bring the full force of their influence toward the realization of these objectives.

Respectfully submitted.

Maynard Dickerson (Ohio), Chairman; J. Thompson Pettigrew (Pennsylvania), Secretary; Lloyal Randolph (Maryland); O. B. Graham (Oklahoma); P. L. Harden (Indiana); Thomas Orum (Michigan); Rev. George M. Banks (Tennessee); Mrs. M. E. Durham (California).

Full Employment: Dream or Possibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John W. Scoville before the Welfare Federation at Cleveland, Ohio, April 24, 1945:

Ladies and gentlemen, I think we all agree that society should be organized to assist us in satisfying our desires. The labor required to get food, clothing, shelter, and other material things has been made more effective through cooperation and specialization. But in this cooperative society we have conflicts of interest. There is not enough rich land, sirloin steak, palatial homes and handsome women to supply everyone. In industry there is a conflict between stockholders who desire big dividends, workers who desire high wages, and consumers who want cheap goods. The conflicts between nations lead to wars. In the economic sphere goods are produced, bought, sold and consumed only when the cooperating contestants agree on the terms. If the merchant asks higher prices than consumers will pay his goods are not sold. If the landlord asks more rent than the tenant will pay, his house is vacant. If the jobseeker asks higher wages than the employer will pay—he remains unemployed. These conflicts of interest cannot be eliminated. However, they can be settled. Two methods are available for resolving these conflicts. The first method is to set up a dictatorial government which will control the labor, occupation, production and consumption of each citizen. The second method is to allow individuals to make voluntary agreements with each other. We call this second method free enterprise or economic freedom. In this free society, many will wait for better terms and refuse to agree to the terms offered by the other parties, so in this free society we will have some vacant houses, some unsold merchandise, some closed down factories and some unemployed people.

The choice we must make is which method we prefer in resolving our conflicts. Is it better to have a dictatorship and full employment, or is it better to have a free society and a certain amount of unemployment? There are some who think there is a third method—a mixture of collectivism and individualism.

Professor Harper referred to these middle-of-the-roaders in these words: "Closely allied to the fatalistic argument is the one—Let us take the middle way. The middle way is frequently taken by those who do not know where they are going, and so find comfort in having company on both sides. But a position is not necessarily right simply because it is in the middle. A more rational basis for decision is called for."

There are those who believe that employment should no longer be left to voluntary agreements but should fall under the dominion of the compulsory state. These people have introduced into Congress a bill known as the full employment bill. I would like to discuss this bill with you.

The technique of those Congressmen who introduce socialistic bills is to recite all of the wonderful benefits that the law will bring and say nothing about the evil effects or the costs. This bill is so full of honeyed words and phrases that you would imagine it was written by a saint or an angel. They tell us this bill is enacted to promote the general welfare, protect the American home, raise the standard of living, provide jobs for returning veterans, develop trade, help small business, establish peace among nations, strengthen the national defense, provide jobs for everyone. If this bill will do all of these nice things, anyone who opposed it should be branded as a fiend in human form who wanted to destroy the home, lower the standard of living, promote war, fill the country with jobless men, and compel the veterans to sell apples on the streets. I think you are smart enough to see through this political palaver and buncombe.

These socialist Congressmen remind me of the old patent medicine men whose nostrums would cure rheumatism, indigestion, headaches, coughs, spots before the eyes, and all the diseases that human flesh is heir to.

I would like to pick the fine feathers off this bird and show you that underneath the fine plumage there is just a skinny ugly duckling.

I am against this bill—but that does not mean that I favor poverty, human misery, unemployment, or war.

The slogan of the reformers is: "The world owes me a living." I do not believe that. I prefer the old American slogan, "Root hog or die." I think when hard times come, society should provide temporary assistance to the unfortunates who are without food or shelter. We have always had poor laws and we have always relieved destitution. But I do not believe it is necessary or desirable to set these unfortunates up in business and give them full-time employment at union wages.

I think the industrious, thrifty, intelligent people should be rewarded for their good qualities. And I think that shiftless, thriftless, incompetent people should suffer the natural results of their own folly. How can we hope to progress if we take away from people the rewards of virtue and the penalties of vice and folly.

Our Federal debt will soon be $10,000 per family. For 14 years the Federal Government has not collected taxes enough to meet its expenditures. For 14 years we have moved toward national bankruptcy. Can we afford to take on this Murray full-employment bill, which may cost the taxpayers $20,000,000,000 a year or more?

We never had much unemployment in this country until 1931. Prior to 1931, the peak was reached in 1921, when 4,700,000 were unemployed; other years of considerable unemployment were 1908, 1914, and 1922, but in none of these years was the total as much as 3,000,000. But we have had great unemployment since 1930, except when we were engaged in war production, as the following table shows:

	Millions
1931	7.0
1932	11.3
1933	11.8
1934	9.7
1935	9.1
1936	7.4
1937	6.4
1938	9.8
1939	8.7
1940	7.6

What caused this prolonged and serious unemployment, which lasted 10 years and was not cured until the war came? In my opinion, the depression was prolonged because we abandoned the American system and imported socialistic laws and practices from poverty-stricken Europe, such as the National Recovery Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the wages-and-hours law, the Wagner Act, the Social Security Act, progressive income taxes, and other socialistic laws. If we do not have sense enough to repeal these socialistic laws, we may have 9,000,000 unemployed after the postwar boom is over.

Federal expenditures after the war will probably be about twenty billions a year, and if the Government supplies jobs to 9,000,000, the cost will be about twenty billions more, making a total of forty billions. This would mean a Federal tax of about $1,300 a family. A tax of $1,300 a family in peacetime would be unbearable, and I am sure you do not want anything like that.

I shall discuss the objections to this bill under five headings:

1. It is unconstitutional;
2. It will tend to destroy this Republic and to change it to a Socialist or Communist state;
3. It is vague, impractical, unnecessary, and unworkable;
4. It would not accomplish the alleged objectives;
5. Full employment is not a proper objective for legislation.

The bill is unconstitutional. The United States Constitution gives Congress certain specific powers. Congress was given power to lay and collect taxes, to provide for the common defense, to borrow money, to regulate commerce among the States, to coin money, to fix the standard weights and measures, to establish post offices, to grant patents, etc. But Congress is given no power in the Constitution to furnish everyone with a job. I realize that the United States Constitution is held in contempt in Washington, D. C.

Congress has passed many laws which usurp powers reserved to the States. Congress has no authority to establish hours of labor, wage rates, or crop quotas for farmers. It has no authority to loan money to foreign nations, to compel workmen to join labor unions, to fine farmers who raise too much wheat, or to fix prices. Congressmen, who make the laws, have themselves violated the law. These violations and usurpations of power have been sanctioned by the Presidents and by the United States Supreme Court. We, the people, are also to blame. We have been willing to see the charter of our liberties destroyed if thereby we could get a bigger handout from the Government. We have proved, by our apathy and indifference, that we do not deserve to be free.

In the matter of legislation, Congress has been operating a black market. All patriotic Americans will oppose the Murray full employment bill and every other bill which is in defiance of the United States Constitution. It is not safe to remove stone after stone from the constitutional edifice—for this progressive destruction will some day cause the whole noble structure to topple over in shapeless and irretrievable ruin. God forbid that our liberties should be buried under the rubble of a bombed and pulverized Constitution.

My second objection to this bill is that it is another measure for destroying our Republic and setting up a Socialist or Communist state. All through the ages, the proletarians, actuated by malice, greed, and envy, have sought to rob those who owned property. A century ago, the French Socialists were denouncing property owners. Porudhon said, "Property is theft." But they would compromise. They said, if we allow you to own property, you must give us the right to a job.

This right to a job is nothing new. It was advocated by the Socialists a hundred years ago. Here is what Considerant said a century ago:

"Very well, let an industrial society, which has appropriated the land, and taken away from man the power of exercising freely and at will his four natural rights, let this society cede to the individual, in compensation for those rights of which it has despoiled him, the right to employment. On this principle, rightly understood and applied, the individual has no longer any reason to complain.

"The condition sine qua non, then, of the legitimacy of property is, that society should concede to the proletaire—the man who has no property—the right to employment; and, in exchange for a given exertion of activity,

assure him of means of subsistence, at least as adequate as such exercise could have procured him in the primitive state."

In 1848, the French passed a law guaranteeing to everyone the right to a job. Thousands flocked in from the provinces to get a job in the national workshops. The law was passed in January and it worked so badly that it was repealed in June. Marx and Engels, in the Communist Manifesto of 1847, proposed, "The equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture."

The right to a job is a communistic doctrine. I will read you article 118 from the Russian Constitution of 1936:

"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to toil, that is the right to receive guaranteed work with payment for their toil in accordance with its quantity and quality. The right to toil is ensured by the Socialist organization of national economy, by the unceasing growth of the productive forces of Soviet society, the elimination of the possibility of economic crises and the liquidation of unemployment."

Hitler, when he became dictator, furnished full employment to the Germans.

We now pass from France, Russia, and Germany, to the United States of America. Who are the people here who are promoting this alleged right to a job? On January 14, 1944, there was a conference in New York City on full employment. Who was the chairman? Sidney Hillman, of the Political Action Committee.

Who spoke? R. J. Thomas, Walter Reuther, George Addes, and John Brophy, of the CIO, Philip Murray, Sam Wolcheck, and Joseph Curran. James Patton, of the Farmers' Union, spoke. Also Henry Wallace, who said we were not going to adopt all of the Russian practices. What Senator spoke? JAMES E. MURRAY, sponsor of the Murray-Dingell bill and the Murray full-employment bill. Now these people had a perfect right to meet and voice their opinions. But you must realize that this bill has a socialistic and communistic pedigree. It is advocated by the left-wingers who do not like our American form of government.

There is a battle on in this country and this book on the PAC is called the First Round. It was written by Joseph Gaer, I understand his real name is Fishman. Here is the poster on page 77: Jobs for all after the war—CIO Political Action Committee. Many of the advocates of this bill are New Deal Socialists who expect to make America over. If they succeed the American Republic won't be here any more.

My third objection to this bill is that it is vague, impractical, unnecessary, and unworkable. The bill says, "All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment." Think of the subnormal people—cripples, anemics, epileptics, tuberculous, halfwits, drunkards, bums—how can an official determine which ones are able to work? And able to work at what? Think of the sharecroppers, small shopkeepers, domestics, and others who have low incomes. If this bill should be passed they would quit their work and apply to the Government for full-time, remunerative jobs. How much must the job pay to be remunerative? Who determines which jobs are useful? What is full-time employment? What is meant by full employment? The bill is filled with words and phrases which are undefined and undefinable.

The bill is impractical. The unemployed will be scattered all over the land and they will be of all occupations—masons, carpenters, farmers, lawyers, clerks, typists, cooks, electricians, bookkeepers, machinists, barbers, writers, actors, painters, salesmen, photographers, plumbers, miners, sailors, etc. How can the Government set up projects in every town and city to utilize the talents and skills of the unemployed? It would probably give them all shovels and we would have another WPA. If they had full-time Government jobs at regular wages, how could they be induced to take jobs in private industry? The bill is unnecessary. We have gotten along without it for a hundred and fifty-eight years, and why do we need it now?

The bill is unworkable. The President is asked to estimate for the ensuing year the labor force, the number that will be employed in private industry, and how much the Government must spend to employ the others in the labor force. The President must estimate, over a year in advance, how active business will be and how many are likely to be unemployed. Of course, neither the President nor anyone else can do this. The President is not God and he is not a fortune teller. Alexander Pope said, "Oh, blindness to the future, kindly given, that each may fill the circle marked by heaven." Let me show you that our Presidents, like the rest of us, are blind to the future.

On October 30, 1940, President Roosevelt said: "Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign war." On December 29, 1940, he said: "You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth." On October 25, 1929, President Hoover said: "The fundamental business of the country, that is production and distribution of commodities, is on a sound and prosperous basis." March 8, 1930, President Hoover predicted that the worst effect of the crash upon unemployment will have been passed during the next 60 days. President Roosevelt and his Budget Bureau made big errors in forecasting Federal expenditures. Expenditures exceeded Budget estimates by 14 percent in 1935, 30 percent in 1937, 32 percent in 1938, and 27 percent in 1939.

Election to the Presidency does not confer the power to forecast the future. But suppose this bill should pass, and the President should forecast an increase in unemployment of 5,000,000. Would not this forecast destroy confidence and increase unemployment? Would any President have the courage to make such a forecast? On the other hand, would not a very optimistic forecast tend to bring an unhealthy boom? What will happen to the prestige of the President, if his forecast turns out to be all wrong? We should not pass a bill to compel the President to become a fortune teller.

Suppose that Congress is told to appropriate a lot of money to set up projects for the unemployed, and business becomes active and there are few unemployed. Then a lot of money has been spent to prepare for a catastrophe that failed to show up. That would mean wasted money and wasted effort. In many ways this bill is unworkable.

My fourth objection to this bill is the most telling of all; it would not accomplish the objective of full employment. Suppose that the Government takes $1,000 from John Smith in taxes and pays the money to Joe Doakes. Joe can now buy more food, clothing, furniture, etc., and thereby furnish employment to the bakers, tailors, etc. But John Smith must buy less. Any increase in employment caused by Joe Doakes is offset by the decrease in employment coming from the lower purchases of John Smith. Shuffling the money around does not increase purchasing power or employment. If the Government employees are paid by taxation, the increase in public employment is offset by an equivalent decrease in private employment. An anemic person cannot be cured by taking blood from his left arm and injecting it into his right arm. But the advocates of this bill do not expect to raise the money by taxation. They expect to increase the Federal debt and get more inflation.

I have here Full Employment in a Free Society by Sir William Beveridge. On page 136, he says: "But once the possibility of deficient private demand is admitted, the state, if it aims at full employment, must be prepared at need to spend more than it takes away from the citizens by taxation." And on page 149, he says: "But rigidly orthodox finance, in the sense of an annually balanced budget, involves, in the political and economic conditions of Britain, an impracticable route to full employment." But in the long run, can the Government increase employment by printing money and increasing the Federal debt? I think not.

As the supply of money is increased, prices rise. As prices rise, the owners of bonds, notes, and savings accounts, and the recipients of pensions and annuities have less purchasing power. These persons are really taxed and their property is taken away to pay the wages of those on the Government pay roll. To cure the disease of unemployment, we contract the disease of inflation. Then, if we try to hold down prices through price controls, we have ration cards, wage controls, and a socialistic state where the Government controls everything.

Why did Sir William Beveridge call his book Full Employment in a Free Society? Because he realizes that his critics claim, and rightly, that laws to bring full employment will destroy freedom. Just how free a society does Sir William contemplate? I will show you.

From page 23. "The list of essential liberties given above does not include liberty of a private citizen to own means of production and to employ other citizens in operating them at a wage." In his free society, the state may take over the factories, railroads, mines, and utilities. That, of course, is the Marxian program. And again: "If it should be shown that abolition of private property in the means of production was necessary for full employment, this abolition would have to be undertaken." On page 32, we learn that youths under 18 are not to be free to choose their occupations. They are to be "wisely directed." On page 238, we read: "The whole trend of the argument of this part of the report is toward a management of international trade, in place of leaving it to unregulated competition. That is to say, it is toward that for which the cartels stand." Sir William, on page 167, quotes a report calling for a "new central authority, national in scope and character, to plan the location of industry and population." The state will determine what you can buy and in what you invest your savings. On page 187 we find this: "The state cannot escape ultimate responsibility for the general direction of outlay by reference to social priorities. The state cannot undertake the responsibility for full employment without full powers." Let those last two words sink in—full powers.

Since with full employment there would be a constant upward pressure on wage rates, Sir William would have the state fix wage rates. He says, on page 207, "If trade-unions under full employment press wage claims unreasonably, maintenance of a stable price level will become impossible; wage determination will perforce become a function of the state." "If the private owners fail to stabilize the process of investment, the private owners cannot for long be left in their ownership." When the state fixes wages there will be no need for the CIO. In supporting this full-employment bill, the Political Action boys may be working themselves out of a job.

The Murray full employment bill prattles about preserving competitive private enterprise, fostering free competitive enterprise, that nothing in the bill calls for the operation of factories by the Federal Government. But Sir William lets the cat out of the bag, and shows how full employment would require complete regimentation and the destruction of individual liberty. He must have had a big laugh when he called his book Full Employment in a Free Society. Germans and Russia got full employment by establishing dictatorships.

My final objection to this bill is that full employment is not a proper legislative objective. We learn in Genesis that God pun-

ished Adam and Eve by cursing the ground and compelling them to earn their bread in the sweat of the brow. The plan of the left-wingers is to apply this curse to 60,000,000 people. But they have improved on the views of the Lord and claim that toil is a blessing and not a curse. They confuse ends and means.

The proper social objective is an abundance of goods and services, to be obtained with the least amount of toil or employment. The purpose of farming is not to give people opportunities to hoe corn and pitch hay, but to supply us with food. The purpose of industry is not to furnish work for machinists, mechanics, and laborers, but to supply us with manufactured goods. The proper objective is an abundance of commodities—not full employment. The thing to avoid is poverty—not unemployment. The progress of science and inventions enables us to have more and more goods with less and less toil. It is only in poor countries like China and India where full employment is necessary. In rich countries we can have more leisure and less toil. Young people, instead of working, go to school. Old people are able to retire. Those who labor, work fewer hours. Mass unemployment was not present in this country or England for extended periods until those countries passed social-security laws to enable people to live without working, encouraged labor unions which prevent wage rates from falling when the demand for labor declines, and by a soak-the-rich tax policy, made a grand assault on property owners. It seems to me that what a job seeker needs is an employer. I do not see how employees are helped by a government which penalizes, persecutes, and prosecutes employers.

We can have as much unemployment as we are willing to pay for. Those of us who wish to preserve a free America and who do not want socialism or communism, must work to prevent the passage of the Murray full-employment bill.

This bill, if enacted, would not guarantee jobs or provide any money for hiring the unemployed. It simply directs the President to give Congress an estimate of the amount of money that Congress should appropriate to hire the jobseekers. Congress is under no necessity of appropriating the money requested, or of appropriating any money at all. It is not a full employment bill, but simply a bill requesting the President to furnish Congress each year with an estimate. I am suspicious of section 6, which reads as follows:

"(a) The President shall review quarterly all Federal investment and expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the current and anticipated level of non-Federal investment and expenditure warrants any change in the volume of such Federal investment and expenditure. (b) Subject to such principles and standards as may be set forth in applicable appropriation acts and other statutes, the rate of Federal investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment, with due consideration being given to current and anticipated variations in savings and in investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government."

I gather from this language that Congress would make a lump sum appropriation and that the President would spend the money, in whatever manner he may determine. The President would determine the rate of spending and the projects in which the money is spent. Thus Congress would hand over to the President the control of our money taken from us through Federal taxes. This would be a dangerous procedure to give the President several billion dollars which he could use to reward his friends and punish his enemies. Perhaps a thrifty New Englander like Calvin Coolidge would not abuse this power—but we could not trust a President who was a lavish spender of other people's money. Congress should not surrender control of the purse.

It is no accident that this bill gives the President dictatorial power over expenditures. A deliberative body like Congress cannot carry on a planned economy and make the day-to-day decisions any more than it could direct and carry on war. It is no accident that a Communist nation like Russia has a dictator. Communism cannot function without a dictator. Hayek makes this observation in his book, The Road to Serfdom. I quote from page 88:

"Most planners who have seriously considered the practical aspects of their task have little doubt that a directed economy must be run on more or less dictatorial lines. That the complex system of interrelated activities, if it is to be consciously directed at all, must be directed by a single staff of experts, and that ultimate responsibility and power must rest in the hands of a commander in chief whose actions must not be fettered by democratic procedure, is too obvious a consequence of underlying ideas of central planning not to command fairly general assent."

On page 199 Hayek discusses the desertion of liberalism by the labor movement.

He says:

"The fatal turning point in the modern development was when the great movement which can serve its original ends only by fighting all privilege, the labor movement came under the influence of anticompetition doctrines and become itself entangled in the strife for privilege. The recent growth of monopoly is largely the result of a deliberate collaboration of organized capital and organized labor where the privileged groups of labor share in the monopoly profits at the expense of the community and particularly at the expense of the poorest, those employed in the less-well-organized industries and the unemployed.

"It is one of the saddest spectacles of our time to see a great democratic movement support a policy which must lead to the destruction of democracy and which meanwhile can benefit only a minority of the masses who support it. Yet it is this support from the left of the tendencies toward monopoly which make them so irresistible and the prospects of the future so dark. So long as labor continues to assist in the destruction of the only order under which at least some degree of independence and freedom has been secured to every worker, there is indeed little hope for the future."

Henry Wriston, president of Brown University, in his book, Challenge to Freedom, has a chapter on full employment, from which I will quote:

"As a primary goal full employment is self-defeating. It starts as a manifestation of sentimental humanitarianism. In seeking to escape the realities of the world, it sacrifices human liberty for a false promise of material benefits. No country has ever achieved it by political intervention without going totalitarian and becoming warlike. Even then its success is transitory. The longest periods of relatively full employment in any nation have been under an expanding free economy. As a by-product of ingenuity, skill, industry, thrift, courage, and faith, it becomes a rich dividend. When it is undertaken as a political program, it brings with it evils which, when experienced, are seen to be even worse than recurring periods of partial employment. It is likely, on the material side, to lower the standard of living, and on the spiritual side to destroy initiative and impair the spirit of freedom."

This full employment bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a dangerous and insidious attack upon our liberties. If it should become law, you will know that we have passed another milestone on the road to serfdom.

I know that you and I are interested in doing good and improving our society. But sincerity and good intentions are not sufficient. We must have good minds as well as good hearts. Every person of good will would like to abolish sickness, poverty, misery, and voluntary unemployment. The danger is that in attempting to do good, we adopt procedures in which there is more evil than good. Many of our present-day reformers are crass materialists, whose philosophy is to fill our bellies. The Bible says: "Man cannot live by bread alone." We must not be so anxious to do good that we forget to be just. There is more to life than food, clothing, and shelter. There are spiritual values to be preserved.

We must preserve self-reliance, initiative, freedom of opportunity, independence—our priceless heritage from the founders of our Republic. We must dig our own fox holes and not seek security at the expense of someone else. Let us seek inspiration from the ringing words of Patrick Henry, who said, "I know not what course others may pursue, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Sweltering Conditions Under Which Our Servicemen Labored in the Persian Gulf Area

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE J. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, forgotten men and battles of supply all but lost to public notice have and will continue to play vital parts in the great conflict now going on and until victory is written. Sweltering Washington is in reality but mild and gentle in comparison with the arid heat of Iran and other sections of the Persian Gulf area where many of our American boys made history in keeping our supply lines open and moving, in temperatures ranging from 135° to 180°.

Quietly and effectively, our men tackled a tremendous task with the characteristic American ingenuity and determination. It would take volumes to describe the struggles and difficulties that have been met in the operation of the truck route and the Americanized Iranian railway over which more than 1,000,000 tons of lend-lease supplies have been delivered to our Russian Allies. The dual line of supply, stretching northward from steaming Persian Gulf ports, is maintained by the Quartermaster Corps of the Army Service Forces. The railroad has been dubbed the "single-track wonder."

Many of the men in the arid wastes of Iran have had long experience on the smooth highways of America. The average of these men is over 30 years and some are more than 40, but nothing stopped them, including heat, varied and difficult terrain, terrific spring rains. According to official temperatures for Ahwaz, Iran, from May 1 to September 6, 1944, the mercury failed to

climb above 100 only five times. The high temperature was on August 23 when the mercury soared to 168 degrees. For 103 days in a row, the high was above 100. The high for May was 143. June was 163, July was 163, August was 168, and for the first 6 days of September the high was 161.

Only relief during the night makes it possible for our boys to work, fight, and live in such areas, and the purpose of my remarks today is not only to call attention to the great job done, but also to express the hope that the War Department will see to it that these men who have served from the beginning of these operations will be given some preference under the furlough program.

Official temperatures for Ahwaz, Iran, from May 1 to Sept. 6, 1944

Date	May		June		July		August		September	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
1	120	78	130	81	158	82	153	73	150	70
2	128	80	122	82	142	78	138	73	149	71
3	138	79	124	84	144	72	129	74	151	70
4	121	78	126	84	131	72	130	73	161	69
5	105	64	121	71	153	75	123	74	146	68
6	102	61	118	71	129	75	124	70	146	72
7	101	61	116	80	128	73	135	71	----	----
8	98	70	126	72	163	77	132	72	----	----
9	99	80	158	73	145	75	156	73	----	----
10	109	72	158	69	123	73	160	82	----	----
11	114	74	159	78	119	72	153	62	----	----
12	90	76	133	74	142	73	128	64	----	----
13	104	65	118	76	147	70	139	66	----	----
14	99	68	121	78	121	73	139	74	----	----
15	103	68	128	78	118	80	138	80	----	----
16	124	70	132	75	128	78	142	84	----	----
17	134	72	132	80	127	74	140	75	----	----
18	143	69	120	76	120	72	149	74	----	----
19	131	70	133	69	122	72	132	70	----	----
20	134	74	143	82	123	72	136	78	----	----
21	100	68	133	73	124	74	128	72	----	----
22	95	72	143	73	126	72	144	72	----	----
23	103	73	153	81	127	77	168	68	----	----
24	124	80	156	73	119	77	130	70	----	----
25	101	72	139	73	129	81	136	66	----	----
26	90	72	153	84	139	83	128	69	----	----
27	100	68	144	69	134	68	138	69	----	----
28	123	68	158	76	120	73	158	70	----	----
29	133	77	129	76	118	74	150	72	----	----
30	121	75	164	77	119	73	160	----	----	----
31	122	76	----	----	122	72	150	----	----	----

NOTE.—From May 1 to Sept. 6, 1944, the mercury failed to climb above 100 only 5 times and all 5 of these days were in the month of May. High temperature was on Aug. 23 when the mercury soared to 168°. For 103 days in a row the high was above 100. The high for May was 143. June was 163, July was 163, August was 168, and for the first 6 days of September the high was 161. These figures do not cover all the hot weather and it isn't over yet. The difference between high and low in 1 24-hour period was as much as 96°. The cool nights make it possible to live.

Rev. Niemoeller Pleads for Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's issue of the Sunday Star appeared an article by the Reverend Martin Niemoeller, well-known German minister who resisted Hitler and his cohorts, in which he pleads for an understanding of Christian Germans. Because of its timeliness and importance, under unanimous consent, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

NAPLES, June 23.—If it is difficult at present to see clearly and distinctly what has happened, and what is going to happen in the innermost heart of our German people, it is even harder to analyze those sentiments correctly respecting their origin and meaning. But it will be most difficult of all to reach even a probable conclusion of how this mental condition will develop and influence the total spiritual life of central Europe.

Interpretations already attempted give evidence of how great are the difficulties of judging and planning some sort of just consideration so long as war-stirred feelings are not calmed down to a normal state of mind. Therefore, I feel it my duty to contribute some of my thoughts, which may help at least a few Christian people to understand how we Christian Germans see these things and what our sorrows and hopes are.

In so doing, I cannot but include myself personally and without restraint in its misfortune and guilt, as well as with the fate and destiny of my nation, of which I have been and felt myself a member through all the long years of my imprisonment under the Hitler regime.

Clearly I must speak of my thoughts, thoughts only, inasmuch as my own experiences are few and the news I have had during the long years of seclusion is far from complete; but perhaps the walls and wires of prison have not been able totally to withhold from me that atmosphere in which my nation outside the concentration camp was feeling and thinking.

I know that during the last months of the European war the roads of Germany have been crowded and the towns overflowing with fugitives, all of them heading westward in fear and panic because they had been subjected to Nazi propaganda claiming awful excesses and cruelties committed by the advancing Russians.

Concurrently, the population of the western provinces looked out for the American and British troops, vaguely hoping that they might come to free them from the yoke which they had been unable to shake off by their own efforts.

But when these troops actually arrived, they were not welcomed with enthusiasm. They found a people dumb, dull, apathetic, still living, but not alive; and yet dead, but bare of aims and hopes, and, therefore, only "moving corpses."

There may have been some rural districts left where life had preserved a more normal appearance, but they are few and small. The great majority are stunned, just trying to keep up for the present, not knowing nor questioning what may happen tomorrow.

I have read of the werewolves, and have been asked whether this is or will become an underground movement. I think the former is only the last trick of propaganda, and that the latter never will take a share nor gain importance. Some elements which do not have anything to win or lose may cause some trouble for a while, but they will disappear.

I do not believe in general there is any hatred against the "enemy," and I doubt whether there has been any during the war.

If there is any kind of hatred, it is against that kind of people who throughout the whole world have dishonored all which is called German, and who have inflicted their inconceivable cruelties upon their own people as well as on foreign victims of their sadism and fanaticism.

We cannot forget—and the world should not, either—that concentration camps and extermination camps were not an invention of the war that began in 1939, but of 1933, and that "war crimes" had their beginning many years before the war began.

But this sort of hatred is deep-rooted in the past and may be by no means a fountainwell of energy. It only adds to the general feeling of misery and hopelessness which is today the prevalent trait of our mental condition.

On the surface, scarcely any other common sentiment will be found. Nevertheless, another does exist. The struggle which was fought by the German Christian churches to maintain their freedom of preaching and teaching, and which seemed to have ended years ago without success when the churches were silenced so far as the public life of our people is concerned, is a struggle which has not been without permanent effect.

For me, it has been the most delightful and strengthening experience to read the letters my wife has sent me from young people at the front, many of whom I did not know, letters proving these youths knew that power which proved strong enough to sustain them in the midst of a seemingly senseless fate; letters proving these youths knew what would be their Christian duty and task if they returned home.

In my own parish daily services of intercession never ceased during the 8 years, and if there was no pastor, you found in the pulpit a layman and often a teen-aged youth. I know that Christian faith and life has not been stifled in Germany, although military service took the great majority of the clergy.

The origins of the present spiritual crisis in Germany must be understood.

National socialism for years spread its doctrines with the fervor of a new gospel; its real meaning was condensed into a sentence: "The common welfare precedes individual profit." A new ideal was proclaimed; people were told that the original meaning of Christianity was to be put into action and accordingly the password, "Positive Christianity," was given out.

Thus it happened that innumerable "good" people joined the Nazi ranks, believing that a new golden age would follow.

Then Hitler came to power and the real character of nazism came to light step by step, slowly at first and later more rapidly.

Parties were dissolved, all kinds of associations and boards were coordinated, newspapers and public opinion were standardized and put under control, while every attempt to prevent or delay the totalitarian idea was broken by the Gestapo, which became the new government's most powerful institution. Mere violence was substituted for the former ideal. The tactic was to attack enemies singly to avoid combined resistance.

This method proved effective and the last power to surrender was the army in 1938. The people's spirit, the good people's particularly, declined so much that in 1939 the war began without signs of enthusiasm.

All ideals had been sacrificed for the one which had been preached as the only one, and now this vanished like a dream. What was left was sheer emptiness of mind and soul, bearable only so long as daily sorrows and duties kept the people going on, unbearable in the first moment of rest and relaxation.

And that is what the GI's saw when they entered Germany and found our people dumb, dull, and apathetic. The news and pictures of crimes and atrocities has infinitely deepened this abyss.

My impression is that nothing is left in the innermost soul of my people, and that this poorness surpasses all physical suffering. We Christians have our share in this affliction. We lost our sons and daughters, our homes, our fortunes, our freedom, and our chances for the future, as well as everyone else.

But we lost no ideal. On the contrary, strange as it may seem, we have gained something that is not small. We have found that God does not fail us, and that, therefore, our faith does not let us down. We do not question God's love, despite the graves, ruins, and crimes, and, therefore, we will try to hand

over this love to our people in order to fill their empty souls.

There is no doubt they are all longing for it, and that they will take it wherever it comes from. For a long time, I think, they will not ask for ideals and ideas. They are wary and weary of them. They are just looking for a little humanity, and they will take it wherever it is to be found, for they have not felt wholly human for years.

Thus we may take it from the Russians and bless them for it. Or from the Americans and bless them for it. We will take it from Christians everywhere and learn "to glorify our Father, which is in heaven." In this way only can I see the present situation of my nation. I do not believe there can be any reconstruction in a short time, because the foundations have been swept away.

I do not think there is any power left in the world which is able to lay new foundations, if not love. Therefore, I thank God that the Christian churches withstood Hitler, defied the Gestapo and were saved after all, so that our people has one friend left in its midst which can help to prevent a wave of despair from rising and overflowing Europe once more. There is a great work to be accomplished and in spite of all the misery there is a hope.

Discrimination in Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of June 27, 1945:

LAST REPORT MADE BY JOB BIAS GROUP—COMMITTEE TO BE REPLACED ON SATURDAY UNDER IVES BILL PUTS COMPLIANCE AT 95 PERCENT

Preparatory to handing over its functions to the new State commission against discrimination, the retiring New York State War Council Committee on Discrimination in Employment issued a report yesterday saying fair practices had been accepted by all but a small minority of employers and workers.

Dr. Alvin Johnson, chairman of the retiring committee, said the report, The Negro Integrated, reflected the acceptance by 95 percent of all groups concerned of a program of employment throughout the State without discrimination.

The tenure of Dr. Johnson's committee ends at midnight Saturday when the committee created under the Ives-Quinn bill takes over.

Dr. Johnson said his group would turn over its functions and responsibilities and also offer its personnel, its records, and a history of its experiences to the new committee.

The studies of the committee, Dr. Johnson declared, covered 2,000 cases in its 3 years of existence, involving employers, labor unions, and employment agencies, but virtually all of them were finally settled satisfactorily.

While the preponderance of the cases concerned Negroes or Jews, Dr. Johnson emphasized that many other minorities were discriminated against, depending upon the locality.

In Rochester, he said, there were cases of discrimination against Italians and in Buffalo against Poles. He also cited instances where Catholics, as a religious minority, and Irish, as a race, had been the victims of local prejudice.

THREE CASES TAKEN TO PROSECUTORS

According to Dr. Johnson, only three cases ever reached the stage where it was necessary to ask the district attorney of a county to act.

Two cases were in Manhattan. One of them concerned an employment agency that had application forms requiring the designation of racial affiliation, the other a railway union that had created auxiliary unions for Negroes. The third case involved a building-service union in the Bronx where a standard practice had been to replace white persons and Negroes with members of their own race when a vacancy developed.

It developed that the prosecuting attorneys decided insufficient evidence was available under existing law to bring any action, but the matters were worked out nevertheless.

"The alleged horror of some about Negroes working alongside whites is just hooey," Dr. Johnson asserted. "Labor in New York State is pretty fair-minded and the great majority of employers have been perfectly sympathetic. A few so-called recalcitrants who have been handled really tactfully have also been brought to the point where they do not discriminate."

The committee's final report was compiled by Nicholas S. Falcone, acting counsel, with the cooperation of Charles C. Berkley, executive director. It contains statements from the heads or personnel managers of many of the largest industrial concerns in the State on how racial barriers were successfully torn down and showing that it is possible for all racial groups to work together harmoniously.

Mr. Berkley said that while the work of the committee showed that discrimination could be eliminated, the new Ives commission probably would have considerable work to do when more cut-backs became effective and employment fell off.

Experience showed, he said, that in periods of slack employment the Negro worker had been the one who suffered first and most.

The committee is distributing 5,000 copies of the report, obtainable by writing to the State war council, State Capitol, Albany.

The Sponsors and Apologists for the OPA, an Unrepentant Prodigal, Who Has Wasted and Squandered the Food and Clothing of the People of This Country, Ask for Another Year's Blank Check Against the Resources and Liberties of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution extending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, for a period of 12 months and until June 30, 1946, as passed by the House, differed from the Senate resolution extending said act and, therefore, the resolution was sent to conference. As a result of this conference the conferees representing the House of Representatives and the Senate, after having considered the resolution, made a conference report. This report has been agreed to by the Senate, and the House will likely today, June 29, also agree to it.

The conference report eliminates the Dirksen amendment. This was a good amendment and should have been retained as a part of the resolution. The purpose of law is to make it as easy as possible to do right and as hard as possible to do wrong. The average American citizen, when his rights are trampled under feet by a New Deal bureaucrat, is not financially able to protect his rights against abuse at the hands of governmental agencies. He practically has no remedy as against the arbitrary and illegal act of the many New Deal agencies that daily trespass upon his rights. The average bureaucrat does not like the courts. They are set up to protect the rights and liberties of the people and the purpose of the Dirksen amendment was to give the citizen the right to go not only into the Court of Emergency Appeals but to take his case into the United States District Court, and also to seek an appeal from an adverse decision to the Supreme Court of the United States. The knowledge on the part of a bureaucrat that he may have to defend his illegal actions in the courts of the country has a wholesome and restraining effect upon these petty officials. By the defeat of the Dirksen amendment the rights of the citizen have been disregarded and the power of the bureaucrats has been increased.

By the conference report the so-called Patman amendment, which is in reality the Willis-Robertson amendment, is retained in the resolution. This amendment was adopted partly as a result of the meeting of the cattlemen held in Washington on the day before the vote was taken in the House; but in a larger measure it was adopted because of the two-fisted, courageous fight that the entire Republican Membership of the House made on behalf of the rights of the people to have meat. This amendment, as I have heretofore pointed out, was adopted by a solid Republican vote and, if it is properly administered by Chester Bowles, head of the OPA, and by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, who after Monday will be the Secretary of Agriculture and the War Food Administrator, it should materially increase the supply of beef in the Second District of Tennessee and throughout the country.

The Bates amendment which is retained in the resolution by the conference report, and which was adopted by a solid Republican vote and the votes of many Democrats, is substantially the same as the Barkley amendment adopted by the Senate. It will guarantee to the packers, large and small, a reasonable profit on each beef animal, each hog and each sheep killed by them.

The conference report modifies the Andresen amendment as originally adopted by the House. But this unwise modification of this amendment tremendously increases the responsibility of Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, the incoming Secretary of Agriculture and War Food Administrator. If he can force Chester Bowles to obey the Price Control Act and

administer it in a realistic manner, with the fixed purpose in mind of affording the people of this country adequate beef, pork, mutton, poultry, eggs and butter, and other agricultural products and can get the cooperation of other New Deal agencies, this amendment will go a long ways to give the people food they have heretofore been unable to obtain due to the bungling and incompetency of OPA.

On the whole, the Republican membership of the House of Representatives, in the successful fight they waged on behalf of the people of this country in making the Price Control Act a better law, have rendered a distinct service to the people. It is a heartening demonstration of the value of the two-party system.

It is a rebirth of the right of the people of this country to have their will expressed by their elected Representatives in the Congress.

Now let all those whose duty it is to administer this price-control law remember that their first duty is to the American people and that they are the servants of the people and not their master.

I voted in favor of the passage of this measure as amended and I can now, with a clear conscience, vote for the passage of the measure as finally agreed upon.

The Food Problem in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the war in unsettled Europe is over, but most serious problems still confront us and the world there.

Yes; we have conquered the military machine that was the German Army. We, with our allies, have decisively beaten Hitler's troops and his war machine. The criminal leadership of the Reich is in Allied prisons, in hiding, or in cowards' graves. But new and serious problems of Europe now face us all.

Looming on the horizon of almost every liberated country is the specter of starvation, disease, and even perhaps revolution. The military victory for which hundreds of thousands of our boys have died, will have been won in vain unless the menace in Europe to future peace in the world is dealt a fatal blow now.

The captive people of Europe who suffered untold misery at the hands of the brutal enemy, and still fought back with all their might, need food and clothing today. In addition, the need for machinery and tools to get back into the production of food and other supplies ranks second only to food itself.

I believe that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is best equipped to do the job and to bring this much-needed help to the liberated countries, because it is an organization sustained and supported by the countries most able to contribute to this good cause their proportionate share.

Following is a speech, which I think merits the attention of every Member, delivered on June 26 at the Food Forum meeting held in the Hotel Continental, Chicago, Ill., on the subject of Europe's food and health situation, by Roy F. Hendrickson, a former Minnesotan, and now Deputy Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration:

The coming winter in Europe will witness the most difficult food shortages of modern times. There will be few islands of relative plenty; for most areas it will be a period of serious scarcity.

Extensive restoration of inland transportation, badly shattered by the effects of war, would be a major ameliorating factor. The second mitigating factor will be the extent to which the rest of the world is willing and able to provide food which can be shipped into Europe.

Tonight I propose to discuss the situation as it appears to exist now, the progress being made, the dilemmas presented by decisions which must be made if real assistance is to be provided, and the consequences of half-hearted steps to meet the situation.

A glance at the war maps of last September and the positions of the armies through the months of winter and spring climaxed by Hitler's collapse in May, shows that a vast area of Europe was overrun by active warfare during that period. Among the significant byproducts of this activity was serious interference with harvests last fall, with autumn plantings of cereals, and with tillage and spring plantings in many areas. It follows—taking into account also the absence of fertilizers on most soils for several years, and the loss of draft animals—that this year's harvest in Europe will be far below normal despite heroic efforts on the part of its people.

Centuries of cultivation in Europe have depleted soil fertility which in most areas required frequent replenishment, especially with chemical fertilizer. This has been impossible for several years to any considerable extent, except for potash in some central European areas. Shipments of phosphates, mostly from north Africa, have been negligible because of war conditions and shipping shortages. Many countries went without nitrates except for the use of minor reserves for 3 to 5 years.

As a consequence, productivity is down even in such areas as were able to maintain a substantial production of animal draft power—and there are few if any areas which escaped military demands either on the part of their own armies or those of the enemy. The loss of tractors was very heavy, with relatively small replacements made during the war and with other machines immobilized by lack of fuel or repair parts.

Crop estimates are relatively unreliable at this time, but in the case of cereals it is unlikely that Europe will achieve much better than a half crop this year. Dairy production, while it may recover greatly in 18 months, cannot recover rapidly enough to affect the picture next winter very substantially, because the oilseeds that furnish protein supplements in dairy rations and other fodder are not available to the extent necessary to meet more than a small percentage of the need. Meat production will be low with emphasis laid as far as possible on restoring breeding herds and flocks. Sugar production too will be far below normal. Vegetable and potato production has the best prospect of making a contribution to the over winter food supply. But even the production of these will be affected by the fertilizer and transport shortage.

While the production picture may mean that certain limited areas, rich in soil and other resources, may have fair yields and a good outlook, the over-all situation, the total output, will be far below need—and Europe has normally for many years been a big importer of food.

The second over-all factor affecting the available food supply will be distribution. The physical aspects of distribution present a dark picture. First of all, the damage to railroads, the heavy losses of rolling stock, mean that a heavier-than-normal load is thrown on other forms of transportation—which means on trucks, primarily. And the shortage of trucks, of tires, of repair parts, and of fuel—unless a trend of greater success in making up the deficit in coming months develops than has been possible since liberation thus far—will mean that what amounts to an exportable surplus in one area cannot be moved into deficit areas.

Not only were physical communications, including telephone and telegraphs often reduced to little or no effectiveness, but the administrative organizations of the governments have been greatly harmed. To no single group did the Germans devote more of their attention than to the civil servants, that is the Government officials, and to the police of the countries they occupied. Without an adequate number of such experienced officers, any government does its work slowly, or in some cases not at all. The tools of effective work are lacking. When you find a cabinet of 27 members having only 9 jeeps among them, you have not only a reduction in efficiency of these important officials, but you have the makings of a cabinet crisis.

Deficit areas do not mean cities alone. There are vast areas which have long had a population load far greater than their land resources, even in times when per acre productivity was high. The transport shortage will also affect the ability to move inland and distribute properly the goods from abroad. But inland-transport shortages should not deter a substantial effort to bring goods in from the outside.

There are other aspects of distribution which cannot be remedied rapidly. Under German occupation black markets flourished. Those who patriotically resisted the Germans tried hard to avoid, despite extreme military regimentation, yielding up their produce when levies were made on them. They felt it was loyal, and certainly profitable, though often risky to contribute to the operations of the black market rather than to donate to the enemy.

New or liberated governments cannot quickly set up the necessary machinery, staffed from a population deeply cut in numbers and more deeply cut in skill by war. To meet the objective of equitable distribution becomes very nearly impossible when it involves meeting the demand with a supply half as large as the demand. It is not necessary to meet needs 100 percent, or to the point of saturation; no one really expects that. But even the best regulatory machinery with the best disciplined population behind it is not likely to achieve great success in distributing evenly a supply smaller by 25 to 50 percent than the demand, especially in the case of most foods. In the case of one product—meat—you need not go far from where we are sitting to find support for that statement.

When the occupation was at its peak, the Germans were able to supplement their food supplies in many ways. In the first place, many of the millions of people they had brought as slaves into Germany proper were used to keep the German farm plant at top production. Germany was able to call upon Bulgaria and Rumania for upward of a million tons of food annually, and to obtain vast quantities from France, Yugoslavia, the Netherlands, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and for a time the Ukraine of the Soviet Union. The occupied areas were severely rationed, with few exceptions. As

little as possible was thrown to food deficit areas—especially Belgium, Greece, and Norway.

As much emphasis as possible must be laid not only on meeting the crisis which is faced next winter but on taking all possible steps to insure that 1946 shall bring forth as bountiful a harvest as Europe can provide for itself. The first program then must envisage supplying fertilizers which need to be applied this fall and winter, providing farm tools, including tractors and draft animals where they can be used effectively, and having seed on hand in ample time to allow for some slowness in distribution. Meantime the need for doing everything possible to restore inland transportation, especially through the provision of trucks and repairs for those now incapacitated, should be made not only to assist in insuring next year's harvest but to distribute effectively the limited harvest of this year.

What has been done to date? Some of the nations of Europe are financing their own imported relief supplies, either through the use of foreign exchange they possessed from before the occupation or with credit plus some assistance from friendly neighbors. Norway is an instance of this. Two nations require only limited assistance from abroad, Denmark and Rumania. The Danes do require fertilizer, some machinery, and are anxious to import oilseeds and fodder once again so as to restore their livestock production, especially dairy output. The Netherlands, Belgium, and France require very substantial quantities of food, which to a large extent they are financing from their own resources. The Soviet Union is reported to be making every effort to restore her production. Italy is being assisted by the Allied Commission, with hopes that the relatively productive Po Valley will aid materially in overcoming in part the deficit position of Italy from Rome south, which has normally required substantial imports from outside. Germany is being dealt with by the military forces with responsibility for zones divided between the Soviet Union, the British, the French, and the United States. Bulgaria is reported to be having a drought, but no clear picture is available as to whether it will need outside assistance. In Austria it is likely that considerable outside assistance will be required, with the military again having responsibility.

To meet the needs of those countries with insufficient means to finance imports of supplies needed from abroad, the United Nations created UNRRA and subscribed contributions to carry out a program of assistance. In Europe thus far on their application, Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, Czechoslovakia and Poland have been found to be entitled to assistance. All of them suffered greatly under the occupation of the Germans and their needs are substantial.

In the case of Greece, Yugoslavia, and Albania, upon their liberation from the Germans, the combined military of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada provided relief assistance while the area was still considered to be important from the standpoint of military operations.

UNRRA began providing relief goods to Greece starting April 1, 1945, taking over responsibility for imported supplies from the military at that time. In the case of Yugoslavia, UNRRA began its responsibility April 15. In both cases it agreed to purchase goods then in the military pipe line, supplementing as soon as ships and supplies made it possible. As of July, only goods which UNRRA has procured will be available. In Albania, the period of military responsibility will end shortly with UNRRA assuming a supply responsibility within the next month.

In the case of Poland and Czechoslovakia, there was no similar period of military responsibility. UNRRA began supplying foodstuffs and other relief and rehabilitation goods as soon as possible, but it had to be and continues to be on a far smaller schedule than need for the following reasons: The course of the war did not provide easy access to either of these countries. Thus far the only means of sending supplies has been through a single port, Constanza in Rumania. This port suffered war damage and it is limited in its capacity to handle cargo. We loaded two boatloads in March, four more in April, four in May and during the month of June we are loading nine. In July, to this same port we hope to send 11 boatloads. Only a small portion of June and July shipments will be foodstuffs because of the high priority at this time which must be given to fertilizers, trucks, raw cotton and wool, and farm implements. It is hoped that the ports of Danzig and Gdynia, though mined and seriously damaged, will be in working condition soon. It is hoped also that the port of Trieste may soon be available to receive goods not only for Yugoslavia but for Czechoslovakia. The port of Hamburg in Germany through which large quantities of goods moved to Czechoslovakia in prewar days is not yet available.

The capacity to receive goods in substantial volume insofar as port handling facilities are concerned rose most rapidly in the countries being assisted by UNRRA in the case of Greece. On my recent visit there I saw the damage done to the great Greek port of Piraeus, where virtually all cargo-handling facilities had been destroyed. The Germans had systematically dynamited the great power cranes, and in the case of elevators and mills their demolition experts had, with some economy, put the dynamite charges in just the right places in the foundations to make the structures worthless for a long period ahead. But large boats can now move into the ports with ample working space and the Greeks have supplied ample manpower to do an expeditious job of unloading.

In the case of Yugoslavia, the early assistance provided by the military was severely limited because only two ports were first available, Split and Dubrovnik; and both had limited usage because dredging could not be continued during the war. As a result, the Liberty freighters, which carry most UNRRA cargo, have to be partly offloaded in Italy and then sent on, traveling light with about half cargoes into those ports. From a very small port receiving capacity in March, Yugoslavia's ports have moved steadily ahead in their capacity to receive cargo, and this can be expanded when Trieste is available. It is hoped that other ports will shortly be swept of mines and made available, too.

The Danube River, a highly important artery feeding eastern Europe, including Yugoslavia, should gradually provide assistance too, but there is a shortage of barges and tugs. When I was in Yugoslavia I found a group of officials who were bringing together information on points where barges had been sunk and a program for reclaiming them. But that is not fast work when a country is short of almost everything, including tools. In Yugoslavia I was told that out of some 2,300 locomotives which had been operating there before the war, only 9 were in operating condition when the Germans left. In late March, some 270 others had been restored to working conditions. But there are few cars for them to pull and not many stretches of more than 100 miles of rail that could be utilized until temporary bridges could be restored. Railroad transportation all the way between Trieste and Belgrade is now reported to be available.

In Albania I visited the small but principal port, Durazzo. It lies at the foot of a high hill on which stood one of King Zog's several palaces, a palace which, incidentally, is now a convalescent home for wounded or sick soldiers.

Again the Germans systematically destroyed the port which had been built up over many years of painstaking effort. The Germans in charge of the demolition went over, with local authorities, the installations to be destroyed making a careful record of them and saying that settlement would be made later. At least this will be one claim before the reparations authorities which should be fully documented. Every wharf and every crane, the concrete abutments and breakwaters, were put out of condition. Only one dock—an old wooden one with rotten piling—capable of handling about 30 tons a day, was intact. From Durazzo to the capital, Tirana, some 18 bridges had been put out of commission, but the Albanians had succeeded in building temporary bridges across all the streams and chasms.

For the next few months, until the end of November, the indigenous supply of food raised by the Europeans through their own efforts should be most in evidence. It is from December until the first results from the 1946 harvest are available that the most severe pinch will come. Nations being assisted by UNRRA and all others will therefore be more dependent on imported foods to be shipped during the fall for storing and in later months for immediate consumption than they are even at the present time.

Great emphasis is now being laid on inland transport supplies, on agricultural rehabilitation materials, on raw cotton and raw wool to restore the productivity of textile mills and provide cloth for winter wear, and on tools and similar equipment. But despite this, food is already the biggest single item in the UNRRA shipping program and proportionate to the shipping made available must increase as a percentage of the total loadings for many months to come.

For the second half of 1945 in metric tons, the minimum import requirements of food for nations to be assisted by UNRRA (including a small child-feeding program that averages 16,000 tons a month for Italy under a special provision authorized by the UNRRA Council) will be 2,423,000 tons. Of this supply, more than one-half or 1,259,000 tons will be grain and grain products. Even if we assume that less than 2,423,000 tons of food will be shipped the last 6 months of the year, food will still constitute more than one-haf of 3,895,000 tons of supplies which we should send to countries requiring UNRRA's assistance during that period. In terms of dollars, the cost of the over-all program would be about $750,000,000, which when shipping charges are added increases to a total cost of about $913,000,000.

The food needs for the period July through December include these: dairy products, 132,000 tons; meat, 168,000 tons, nearly half of which is fatbacks; fish, 87,000 tons; edible fats and oils, 154,000 tons; oilseeds, 122,000 tons; dried beans and dried peas, 102,000 tons; sugar, 69,000 tons; inedible fats and oils, 4,000 tons; soap, 40,000 tons, oil equivalent; animal feeds, 211,000 tons.

While the United States must be called upon for the largest share, very substantial quantities are being requested and obtained in Canada, Brazil, Mexico, Cuba and other Latin-American countries, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, South Africa, and others. We depend for our allocations upon the combined food authorities of the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada to assign UNRRA its sources of supply. UNRRA depends upon the united maritime authority which includes in addition to the United States and the United Kingdom, Norway, France, the Netherlands and other nations, for shipping. European countries financing imported food and other supplies and shipping with their own resources go to the same allocating authorities.

It has long been axiomatic to those who have studied the effects of war upon supplies that the end of a war increases rather than decreases the demand. UNRRA is hopeful that the period during which it must provide assistance—serving as an arranger between the nations of good will and the nations in need—will be short. But it is foolish to be so optimistic as to believe that these nations can recover quickly from the effects of long years of occupation and plundering. It is not possible for these countries, practically without foreign exchange, to restore quickly their former export position so that they can in effect trade surplus goods for foods and other items they must import although every effort must be made in that direction.

How well prepared are the nations of good will to meet the deficit during the coming year?

It has been a long and difficult war in which marked expansion in food production has taken place in the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and many other areas. The demands of the military forces are not dropping away fast. In addition to troops, there still are large numbers of prisoners of war, and in zones of military occupation the military has a responsibility for civilian supply. The brightest spot is in cereals, but cereals cannot do the whole job of meeting the food deficit.

It is evident that the deficits, as at the outset of the war, are in the fields of proteins and fat. Meat is short, and dairy products in terms of quantities apparently available to liberated areas, appear to be equally short; fish is also short.

I said "available to liberated areas." This availability has to be determined by the people and the governments of the supplying areas—it cannot be determined by the liberated areas. To make foods available to liberated areas will require sacrifices as well as a generous spirit motivated by humanitarianism. But it will also require an appreciation on the part of governments and people that starvation or near starvation in European countries will mean disease, unrest, and a threat to securing the foundations of a durable peace.

The American people are not without an appreciation of the facts, and their attitude, judging by Mr. Gallup's most recent poll, shows on the part of the great majority of people a true realization of the situation.

To the question, "Do you think many people in Europe will starve this year unless we send them food?" 70 percent replied in the affirmative, 23 percent in the negative. It is hard to find where the last group found ground for this optimism. To the question, "Do you think there is enough food in this country to keep Europeans from starving and still not reduce the amount people eat here?" 56 percent replied "No," while 35 percent replied "Yes."

Eighty-five percent replied "Yes" to the question, "Would you be willing to continue to put up with present shortages of butter, sugar, meat, and other rationed food products in order to give food to people who need it in Europe?"

Mr. Gallup's fourth question was: "If necessary, would you and your family be willing to eat about one-fifth less than you and your family are now eating in order to send more food to Europe?" Seventy percent replied in the affirmative, only 23 percent replied in the negative, and 7 percent had no opinion.

All of this indicates a realistic appreciation of the situation, a most generous spirit of helpfulness and sacrifice, and a determination to support the official position of the United States Government.

The share that the supplying nations can provide will of course depend not only on the attitude of the people and their governments but upon the fortunes of the crops this year, and it is always dangerous to divide up a crop which isn't made.

Now what is the attitude of the peoples of the countries in need? There is no categorical answer to this but there are some factors which we should not quickly overlook. These people met the forces of the German attack first, and without any really significant exceptions they fought bravely. Even after they were defeated and their lands occupied, their resistance continued. They heard over their radios from their Allies that the most patriotic measures they could take would be to resist the enemy fiercely, to harass him, to be uncooperative, to sacrifice their resources and their lives if necessary. In turn they were told obliquely and directly that their sacrifices would not be in vain, that when liberation came there would be stocks of supplies in the hands of supplying nations ready to be moved in to assist them. There must have been some scepticism, but the evidence of their bravery and their sacrifices indicates that scepticism was scant indeed.

As allies, they do not have the role of beggars. Their nationalism, driven underground for some years, has emerged and it is an asset to build upon and not a liability, just as the desire and the determination of those nations with foreign exchange resources to do everything possible for themselves is an asset of character and independence which is one of the truly impressive assets of the postwar period.

The supplies to be brought in from the outside will with the sole exception of Greece represent only a relatively small fraction of the total food they will have. Their indigenous supplies, while inadequate, will be the base of their programs. The outside help that will be so hard to obtain will be supplemental to indigenous supplies which in the face of great difficulties they will attempt to utilize effectively and equitably.

They are not going to quote chapter and verse of the promises made to them by official spokesmen during the war period, but they are likely to ask some questions which in the interest of amity among allies will require straight answers. They are going to be concerned first of all with the distribution of supplies among the Allies as compared with those who have been recent enemies of the Allies.

They are going to ask if enemy prisoners of war and recent enemy civilians deserve a better fate in terms of food during the winter of 1945–46 than those who fought the good fight against an enemy whose ruthlessness is matched only by that of the Japanese.

They are going to ask if their own governments are making fully clear and understandable their plight and if they don't get an answer that suits them, they may want to change their governments; and that can lead to further chaos, too. They are going to ask whether the principle of sharing alike, which they were told was a principle to be followed in fighting the Germans, is not also a proper principle during the emergency immediately following liberation.

And there are other questions which they will ask, which will have a bearing upon postwar trade, postwar good will, and the duration of the peace.

How long must assistance be provided to Europe? It is too early to supply a reasonably accurate forecast. This does not depend alone upon the rate of the restoration of European food production and upon its effective distribution by means of the restoration of inland transport. It also depends upon these factors:

1. The rate at which effective, efficient government can be restored.

2. The rate at which transport and industrial production in Europe can be restored, which, in turn, depends upon the output of coal, steel plants, the forests, and industry generally.

3. It depends, too, upon the rate at which effective instrumentalities are established in the outside world for providing credit and for supporting and stabilizing currency.

When I was in Greece, although it had then been liberated only a matter of 6 months, it was using its second currency established during that time. Inflation was proceeding rapidly, and one of the principal answers to that problem centered about providing enough supplies, particularly food, transport, and raw materials for industry. During June we are shipping from the United States enough raw cotton to feed the small cotton-textile industry of Greece for approximately 6 months. The output will stay in Greece, which is about as short of clothing and shoes as it is of food; and the shortage of food can be demonstrated most quickly by the fact that the diet during March did not average 1,600 calories per person in Greece. That is about 50 percent of the calory intake of the average American in 1944.

As rapidly as normal trade—trade other than relief goods—is restored, UNRRA assistance can be reduced, but normal trade does not restore itself without appropriate credit or other foreign exchange arrangements. These simply are not in sight for some months to come in the case of any of the countries now being assisted by UNRRA, which are the countries poorest by far in foreign exchange resources.

At a later stage comes assistance for China, which has fought a ruthless aggressor for a very long time and which has suffered painfully. She will need help promptly and on a substantial basis as her vast territory is liberated, district by district. In dealing with her problem one advantage appears which does not seem to exist in connection with Europe in relief.

Military food surpluses so far as Europe is concerned are a myth. The needs of the military during deployment, the needs of their prisoners of war and of areas under military occupation, will continue to make the military requirements large in Europe for sometime to come. Instead of yielding up food supplies which can be used in a substantial degree to alleviate European distress, military stockpiles will go for military needs. There will be some equipment—we hope there will be a goodly number of trucks—but actual progress to date in the release of surpluses has been inconsiderable even in these categories. The needs for vast armies to carry on the struggle in the Southern Pacific and the Far East are such that military demands show no sign of any rapid cut-back, despite the many optimistic forecasts that seemed to radiate in the late summer and early fall of 1944. Pipe-dreams they proved to be in the case of food—pipe-dreams which lured many to the belief that VE-day, which they then saw just ahead, would magically change the needs for food even though history provided no evidence for such a dangerous conclusion.

In the case of China, however, with Japan crushed, substantial demobilization of armies should become possible and some surpluses become available. Even so, however, such Army surpluses of food are not likely to be great. Far more important from a food standpoint for China is the prospect that liberation will open the way toward the utilization of productive areas of the Far East, itself—particularly in rice, oilseeds and, we hope, sugar, where the Japanese-occupied areas of the world normally account for well over 90 percent of the world rice supply. Gradually these rice producing areas will be liberated and some stocks for the succor of China, as well as for other Far Eastern areas so greatly dependent upon this food, should become available, with equitable distribution of this supply a pressing need for at least 2 years after Chinese liberation.

In the case of both Europe and China, UNRRA will emphasize plain, staple foods. These, not highly processed foods, will dominate the picture. But children especially, and adults too, cannot live on bread alone. I met a man in Greece who claimed that he and his family lived on raisins for 2 years, with the exception of some vegetables during the summertime. It was, as one can well imagine, not a very happy experience.

I also met many people there who had been forced to live on bread alone for many months at a time. Many Europeans, eastern Europeans particularly, have always consumed very large quantities of bread, but it produces a problem of malnutrition if this diet cannot be supplemented by other more concentrated foods which yield a better balance to the diet as a whole.

The solo bread diet is a challenge to man's powers of indigestion—you can't take in enough in three meals a day to meet bodily needs, even when one is relatively inactive physically. I found it a common sight in Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Italy for working people—truck drivers, streetcar operators, chambermaids—as well as adults and children in the stores, to reach into their pockets and pull out a chunk of bread. They would take a large bite and go on chewing. These in-between meals are necessary because the solo bread eaters require many extra eating periods to get necessary nourishment even when physical activity is moderate. Meat, milk products, and fats were very scarce. Any casual examination of a normal diet in this country will show how importantly they figure in the calory make-up of our diets.

The principal supplying countries are finding it difficult to provide either the supplies or the shipping necessary to carry out the program which appears essential to provide a decent level of assistance to the liberated countries. In the face of evidence that the people of supplying countries have a realistic appreciation of the facts and a desire to help generously, their governments appear to doubt whether further sacrifices will be accepted. We have found increasing doubt and hesitation on the part of the officials responsible for allocating and procuring for UNRRA the foods the peoples of the liberated areas definitely need.

For example, UNRRA could not obtain from the United States any cheese, dried eggs or margarine, and obtained only small quantities against its request for sugar, canned fish, dry skim and condensed milk for the second quarter of 1945. UNRRA's request for about 4,000 tons of canned pork from the United States for the second quarter of 1945 is expected to result in procurement of only 175 tons for this period. The request for over 31,000 tons of lard from the United States to fill UNRRA's requirements for the first half of 1945 resulted in procurement of only 6,000 tons in this period.

Where we asked for 12,500 tons of evaporated milk for the third quarter of 1945 for the small children of areas being assisted by UNRRA, indications are that we will be allocated not more than 5,670 tons; out of 14,000 tons of condensed milk which we requested for the same period, the allocation appears to be 1,134 tons. Out of 45,000 tons of refined sugar requested from the world supply, as in the case of evaporated and condensed milk, indications are that for the third quarter of 1945 we will get only the 20,000 tons we have bought in Cuba. And it has been indicated to us that we will get even less in the fourth quarter.

Perhaps it will require a considerable time for the very complex machinery of allegation and procurement to adjust to the demands resulting from liberation, but time runs out rapidly when the problem is as urgent and dangerous as the problem of shortages this coming winter.

I have drawn a picture of what the situation will be this coming winter unless we get some of the protective foods such as some milk for the small children, nursing mothers, and invalids, substantial quantities of fats and some small quantities of meats and other animal proteins. But these will not do the job alone, because inland transport is needed first to utilize the production in Europe, and, secondly, to move the important foods inland. Some additional trucks will be required to make up for destruction to the railroads. There are hundreds of thousands of trucks in the European area now. A small fraction of that number released by the military forces can practically solve that problem for the winter.

Unless the inland transport and food problems are attacked resolutely suffering will be intense, and the effects on the people physically and psychologically will be severe, with results that will take much from the contribution to the peace which the great military victory promised to make possible.

The most difficult problem appears to be to convert the good will, desire, and realistic appreciation of millions of people, anxious to help the peoples of liberated areas, into effective expression—the kind of expresssion that delivers the goods.

Address of Maj. Gen. George F. Lull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the graduating class of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, School of Nursing, Brooklyn, N. Y., June 4, 1945, by Maj. Gen. George F. Lull, United States Army, Deputy Surgeon General:

There is very little need of my telling you of the real, human service you have been doing and will do as nurses. You have spent enough time in training to be well aware of this. You are fortunate to have had this training in such a fine institution. Not only is this a fine hospital insofar as buildings and equipment are concerned, but it has something—rather intangible, perhaps—a spiritual asset of service, which makes it a "hospital with a heart." Not that other hospitals do not have hearts, but many of them are unaware that their hearts are living organs which pulsate day and night.

You entered training not only with the intention of educating yourselves, but also with the idea of rendering a real service to your fellow men. You have gained something here that will be of benefit to you all through your lives, even if you leave active participation in your profession tomorrow. You will be better citizens for having had this training.

No doubt many of you will enter Government service, and it is about this service, as it applies to the Army, that I want to talk to you tonight.

The history of nursing in the Army is most interesting. The first request for women nurses to take care of the wounded came from the Continental Army in 1776. The rule is now, as it was recommended then, that there be one nurse for every 10 patients. Women were chosen from among the mothers, wives, and sisters of the troops and sent to the hospitals. Besides tending the sick, they scrubbed floors and beds, looked after the provisions, and prepared the food. For 10 weeks' work they received about $25 and rations.

From Revolutionary days up to the beginning of the Civil War there was very little need for nurses and very little legislation concerning them, although the Medical Department was gradually improved. In 1847, military surgeons were first given rank as officers and they were allowed to appoint, and fix the compensation for, nurses they might need in their individual hospitals. In 1861, legislation gave definite place to women nurses to be paid 40 cents a day and rations.

At the beginning of the Civil War, Miss Dorothea Lynde Dix, noted for her work in the improvement of almshouses and hospitals for the insane, was appointed to superintend the women employed in the hospitals. No women were appointed without her sanction. That she selected carefully is proved by the fact that, as far as we can learn, not one of them disgraced her calling or gave cause for reproach. She exercised the kindest care and oversight over the women she had chosen. She wanted them to take every opportunity for rest and refreshment. A home was established by her in Washington where the nurses might go and rest from their arduous duties.

No accurate records of the appointment of nurses, their number, where they served, or the number who died, can be found. Among the many who served during this trying time, the names of a few are familiar to us through their letters and journals which have come down to us. For example: Louisa Mae Alcott.

In the days of peace between the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, nursing in the Army was done by men. Early in the latter conflict in 1898, Surgeon General Sternberg, although opposed to having any women with the Army in the field, obtained through the Congress authority to hire contract nurses for employment in base and camp hospitals at $30 a month with rations. Following this legislation, for the first time in the history of the United States, graduate women nurses became a part of the Army.

Although the Spanish War was of short duration, it gave the Army nurse ample time to become indispensable to the service. The esteem these women won, and the recognition of officers and men, undoubtedly let to the continual employment of women as Army nurses.

The Army Nurse Corps was authorized by law as an integral part of the Army on February 2, 1901. It was largely through the efforts of Dr. Anita Newcomb McGee that the Corps was established by law in 1901. The campaign to secure statutory recognition for a nurse corps as part of the Medical Department was assisted by a committee of prominent citizens which included the following nurses: Mrs. Hunter Robb, president, Associated Alumnæ of Trained Nurses (now the American Nurses' Association), Miss Anna C. Maxwell, superintendent of nurses, Presbyterian Hospital, New York, and Miss Linda Richards, superintendent of nurses, University of Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia. This committee drafted a bill which was introduced January 24, 1899, in the House of Representatives (H. R. 11770), and many nurses who had had experience in caring for the soldier typhoid victims of 1898 joined in the campaign for the passage of the bill. Success crowned their efforts with the passage of the act of February 2, 1901, and, later on, many of these same citizens and nurses joined, with the same interest and enthusiasm, to establish the Red Cross Nurse Corps as a reserve for the Army Medical Department in time of war.

Mrs. Dita Kinney, who had served in the Spanish-American War, was made superintendent of the newly-organized Corps in Washington in 1901 and served until July 31, 1909, when Miss Jane A. Delano was appointed in her place.

Until 1911, Army nurses served at only three stations—Fort Bayard, N. M., San

Francisco, and in the Philippine Department. In that year, they were assigned to Walter Reed General Hospital, Army and Navy General Hospital, Fort Sam Houston, and the Attending Surgeon's Office, Washington, D. C. Until 1916, their number never exceeded 220.

The Mexican Border uprising in 1916 necessitated an increase in the corps and reserve nurses (who were enrolled Red Cross nurses) were assigned to the Army Nurse Corps to augment its members. This brought the membership from approximately 160 to 450. On April 6, 1917, there were 403 nurses in the corps.

At the time the United States declared war on Germany, the office of the Superintendent of Nurses in the Office of the Surgeon General in Washington consisted of the Superintendent (Miss Dora E. Thompson) and one clerical assistant. Within 18 months the office staff numbered approximately 95 persons and there were 21,480 nurses in the corps.

This amazing expansion came as a result of a statement by the War Department regarding the need for nurses and the immediate response from the nursing profession throughout the country. None but graduate nurses were accepted, nor were aides of any sort made part of the corps. Assignments were made at the cantonment hospitals, general hospitals, and at many hospitals connected with the Coast Artillery posts, aviation stations, recruiting camps, and ports of embarkation located in all parts of the country. There were 10,400 sent overseas and they served in England, France, Italy, Belgium, the area of occupation, and Siberia. They were in base, evacuation, mobile, and convalescent hospitals. They also served on hospital trains and transports and with surgical teams in field hospitals.

In spite of the fact that many nurses were on duty in evacuation, mobile, and field hospitals, and in casualty clearing stations with the British, not a single nurse was killed by enemy action and only three were wounded. However, many succumbed to disease and a few were killed in accidents incident to the service. The total deaths in the corps during the war period were 272.

It is not generally known that many members of the corps were decorated for their services during the war. Three received the Distinguished Service Cross; 24 the Distinguished Service Medal, 28 the Croix de Guerre; 69 the British Royal Red Cross; and 2 the British Military Medal. Many were cited for heroic conduct or valor in American Army orders and a number were "mentioned" in British Army dispatches.

It was not until the passage of the amendment to the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, that members of the Nurse Corps received relative rank and, for the first time in the history of the corps, were authorized to wear the insignia of their various ranks from second lieutenant to major, and were accorded most of the rights and privileges of officers.

Now, let us take a look at what has happened in the present war. On June 30, 1940, there were 949 nurses on duty in the Army. When the President called out the National Guard in September 1940, there were 4,019 and at the time of Pearl Harbor there were 7,262. At the present there are 52,700.

Army nurses are the proudest members of a proud profession. They were the first women members of the Army and last February they celebrated the forty-fourth anniversary of their corps. The corps is made up entirely of commissioned officers, in grade from second lieutenant to colonel. Some of them have lost their lives in this war. Several hundred have been decorated or given citations. These women have been the means of saving untold lives, and they are making history of which every American can be proud.

Nurses in civil hospitals are more or less fixed. Their lives revolve around the institutions. Army nurses, on the other hand, may be sent from one hospital to another of a different type. They are on duty on hospital trains, ships, and planes, and in various other places.

Perhaps you will be interested in knowing just how a wounded soldier is handled from the front line back to the home territory, or the zone of the interior. This is called "the chain of evacuation," and is similar to a production line in a factory, except that the product being handled is a human being who must be given medical treatment, protected and fed while in transit. In addition, the evacuation of wounded moves against the supply of ammunition, food, etc., which is constantly coming up to the front from the rear. Much of this movement is carried on at night, without lights, and under unfavorable conditions of weather and terrain.

Each company has attached to it two Medical Department enlisted men, trained in first aid and other medical procedures. When a man is wounded, these first aid men give him first aid treatment, make out a tag and fasten it to his clothing and mark his location so that the litter bearers can readily find him. The aid men must keep with their company so, when evacuation starts, it is the battalion litter bearers who transport him back to the battalion aid station. Here the battalion surgeon checks him over, adjusts dressings, reapplies splints, etc. From the battalion aid station, the collecting company of the medical battalion has charge of his evacuation. He may be transported to a collecting station by litter and from there to the clearing station by ambulance or, under good conditions, ambulances may evacuate the aid stations directly.

In the clearing station he is fed and prepared for transportation to the rear. Some cases are too badly wounded or in shock to such an extent that they cannot be moved. At times, certain small auxiliary units are attached to the clearing stations during combat to care for these cases.

From the clearing station to the evacuation hospital, the patient is transported, as a rule, by truck or ambulance. At the evacuation hospital the patient receives definitive surgical treatment. Evacuation hospitals are of two types—400 and 750 beds. To these units nurses are assigned. They are busy places and they are mobile. That is, they can be rapidly assembled and set up in either buildings or tents.

From the evacuation hospital the patient is transported by ambulance, train or, in some instances, by plane, back to a general hospital. These general hospitals are fixed installations of 1,000 beds or more. They are well back of the lines and have all the modern equipment found in our big city hospitals. Patients are held here until they can be returned to duty or, if it is improbable that they will recover in a resonable time, they are made ready to be returned to the zone of the interior.

It should be borne in mind that all during this period of treatment and evacuation a constant sorting procedure must be going on so as to insure that no soldier will go farther to the rear than is necessary. If he can be returned to duty from any medical installation, he is sent back. One of the functions of the Medical Department is to get men back to duty in the best condition possible as well as to keep them fit. In order to do this, the hospitals in the rear areas and zone of the interior have reconditioning sections. Reconditioning is mental as well as physical. Patients who are still in bed are given graduated exercises, occupational therapy and are sometimes taught language and other subjects in which they are interested.

Let me read a statement of the famous novelist, John Galsworthy, made after the last war.

"Restoration is at least as much a matter of spirit as of body, and must have its central truth—body and spirit are inextricably conjoined. To heal the one without the other is impossible. If a man's mind, courage, and interest be enlisted in the cause of his own salvation, healing goes on apace, the sufferer is remade; if not, no mere surgical wonders, no careful nursing, will avail to make a man of him again. Therefore I would say: 'From the moment he enters the hospital, look after his mind and his will; give him food; nourish him in subtle ways; increase that nourishment as his strength increases. Give him interest in his future. Light a star for him to fix his eyes on, so that, when he steps out of the hospital, you shall not have to begin to train one who for months, perhaps years, has been living, mindless and will-less, the life of a half-dead creature.'

"That this is a hard task none who knows hospital life can doubt. That it needs special qualities and specia' effort, quite other than the average range of hospital devotion, is obvious. But it saves time in the end, and without it success is more than doubtful. The crucial period is the time spent in the hospital. Use that period to recreate not only the body, but mind and will power, and all shall come out right; neglect to use it thus and the heart of many a sufferer and of many a would-be healer will break from sheer discouragement. A niche of usefulness and self-respect exists for every man however handicapped; but that niche must be found for him. To carry the process of restoration to a point short of this is to leave the cathedral without spire. To restore him, and with him the future of our countries, that is sacred work."

The nurses of the Army are doing a splendid job in this war. Most of their work is all part of the day's task. However, I want to read to you one of many citations received by members of the corps. This particular citation was for the award of the Silver Star to First Lt. Elaine Roe and Second Lt. Rita Rourke, and is as follows:

"For gallantry in action on ——— February 1944 near ————, Italy. During a concentrated shelling of the ———— Field Hospital by heavy enemy artillery, the entire hospital area was sprayed with shell fragments which killed two nurses and wounded other military personnel. Electric wires were cut and lights extinguished. Working with flashlights, Leutenant Roe and Lieutenant Rourke immediately began the orderly evacuation of 42 patient while quieting others who had become alarmed and were attempting to leave their beds. Throughout the shelling, which included many air bursts, they exhibited remarkable coolness and courage and carried on with complete disregard for their own safety. The quick thinking, competence under unnerving conditions and the loyal consideration of Lieutenants Roe and Rourke for the welfare of their patients, prevented confusion which might have been critical, and were an inspiration to the enlisted men working under their supervision. Their actions reflected the finest traditions of the United States Army and the Army Nurse Corps.

You are members of a fine profession whose motto has always been one of service. May I wish you all the success possible, not only in a material sense, but also in a spiritual one. You have had to work hard and you will still have to do so, but you will have the satisfaction of knowing that you have done something to make this world a better place in which to live.

Roosevelt Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, 1945, I introduced a resolution, H. J. Res. 181, to make January 30 of each year, the birthday of our late President, a legal holiday of the same character as New Year's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day. I feel that to designate January 30 as Franklin Delano Roosevelt Day would be not only paying a well deserved tribute to a great leader and an outstanding humanitarian but it would also keep alive for posterity the ideals and principles for which he stood and under which our country has proven that democracy can and does function in times of stress as well as in times of peace.

Since I introduced my resolution I have received many communications urging its adoption at an early date. One of these I received today, and I include it as a part of these remarks:

Resolution memorializing Congress to designate the birthday of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a national holiday

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States from March 4, 1932, until his untimely death on April 12, 1945, having been elected to four successive terms, and having become the first American President honored by his fellow citizens with more than the traditional two terms; and

Whereas President Roosevelt assumed office during the depression, one of the great domestic crises in the Nation's history, and by wise, courageous, and humanitarian leadership restored confidence and faith in America; and

Whereas President Roosevelt championed the cause of the workingmen of America and ushered in a new era of consideration for the rights of labor and the common man; and

Whereas President Roosevelt espoused and signed the National Social Security Act, generally recognized as the greatest social measure in American history, climaxing a 14-year educational campaign by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in behalf of State and Federal old-age-security legislation; and

Whereas President Roosevelt awakened our Nation to the menace of fascism to our free institutions and our very existence as a free people, and led America and its allies, the United Nations, in the mightiest world struggle for human freedom, culminating in the unconditional surrender of Germany and in decisive victories over Japan; and

Whereas President Roosevelt charted a course for preventing future wars, by means of a permanent world peace organization, economic cooperation, and international good will, thereby embodying during the most critical period in modern history the hopes, the aspirations, and the ideals of his fellow countrymen, and the oppressed peoples of the entire world; and

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt is assured an immortal place in world history, and will earn the gratitude of American generations yet to come, and the esteem and affection of free peoples in all lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Washington Aerie, No. 125, Fraternal Order of Eagles, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to designate January 30, the birth date of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a national holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, of California, and Representative AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island.

The above is a true copy of resolution adopted by Washington Aerie, No. 125, Fraternal Order of Eagles, at its regular meeting, June 28, 1945.

JOHN C. MIHM,
Secretary.

Open Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the country now is greatly disturbed about food rationing and shortages and as the Price Control Act is now before the Congress, I submit to my colleagues a very timely and interesting editorial from the Huntington Herald-Dispatch, published in Huntington, W. Va., and edited by Mr. Raymond Brewster:

AN OPEN LETTER

This is an open letter to the Honorable Harry S. Truman—as it might have been written:

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Here is a letter from one of your soldiers. I was in Africa, in Sicily, in France and Germany, not to mention other way points, I have a lot of battle ribbons and a star or two. The Krauts threw plenty at me, but everything missed, so I got no Purple Heart. That's swell. While we were going through hell over there we soldiers used to laugh a little and cuss a lot about the reported hardships of civilians at home. Just the same, I knew Mom and Dad were doing what they could for me and for my kid brother who was and is with the Navy in the Pacific.

"After VE-day they sent me back to the United States and gave me a furlough to visit my folks. Gee, I was glad to get home and were Mom and Dad glad to see me! Now, I'm back in a rest camp and I guess it won't be long before they get around to discharging me. Then I'm going home and marry Mary, who has been working in a war plant—and waiting for me.

"For myself, I've got no kick. But I want to yell just as loud as I can about the break Mom isn't getting. As I said, we used to laugh and cuss about the tales of civilian hardships—just when we were dreaming of getting back to put our feet under the home tables. We were eating, but some of those GI cooks were fierce. We wanted things like mother used to make and my tooth was all set for them when I finally got to the kitchen table. At first, there was everything I expected, but I hadn't been home long before finding out that Mom had been saving up good things for me. I also found that in order to get even a little piece of beef she had to stand in line for an hour or more—and then like as not she couldn't get it. Bacon, it seemed, was almost out of the question and a woman had to be pretty slick to get a chicken. Sugar was scarce, too, but Mom could have gotten some for canning if she'd had a Philadelphia lawyer to fill out the questionnaire the ration board sent her.

"How much of this is avoidable I don't know. I do feel that I've been fighting to preserve the American way of life and that if Mom can't get enough to eat it's a hell of a payoff for my having wallowed in the rain and snow and mud in Europe while my brother fought Japs and mosquitoes and malaria in the Pacific.

"The papers say Mr. Herbert Hoover is offering some plan for improved distribution of food. Whatever it is you'd better let him have a try at it.

"And another thing—they say relief from food shortages may be slow in coming because of transportation difficulties. I notice they've lifted the racing ban and horses are being sent around from track to track. Maybe we'd better cut out the racing—and eat the horses.

"Loyally yours,

"GI JOE."

Resolution Memorializing Congress To Designate the Birthday of the Late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Aerie No. 1126 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles at Granite City, Ill., has paid a very fine tribute to our great leader, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Eagles order, of which I am a member, is sponsoring a movement to set aside as a national holiday January 30, the birth date of our beloved former President. I am hopeful that this drive is successful and trust that the Congress will recognize in this manner one of the greatest Americans of all times. I include the following resolution of the Eagles of Granite City:

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States from March 4, 1933, until his untimely death on April 12, 1945, having been elected to four successive terms and having become the first American President honored by his fellow-citizens with more than the traditional two terms; and

Whereas President Roosevelt assumed office during the depression, one of the great domestic crises in the Nation's history, and by wise, courageous and humanitarian leadership restored confidence and faith in America; and

Whereas President Roosevelt championed the cause of the workingman of America and ushered in a new era of consideration for the rights of labor and the common man; and

Whereas President Roosevelt espoused and signed the National Social Security Act generally recognized as the greatest social measure in American history, climaxing a 14-year educational campaign by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in behalf of State and Federal old-age security legislation; and

Whereas President Roosevelt awakened our Nation to the menace of fascism to our free institutions and our very existence as

a free people, and led America and its allies, the United Nations, in the mightiest world struggle for human freedom, culminating in the unconditional surrender of Germany and in decisive victories over Japan; and

Whereas President Roosevelt charted a course for preventing future wars, by means of a permanent world peace organization, economic cooperation and international good will, thereby embodying during the most critical period in modern history the hopes, the aspirations, and the ideals of his fellow countrymen, and the oppressed peoples of the entire world; and

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt is assured an immortal place in world history, and will earn the gratitude of American generations yet to come, and the esteem and affection of free peoples in all lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Granite City Aerie, No. 1126, Fraternal Order of Eagles, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to designate January 30, the birth date of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a national holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from this State and the Congressman of this district.

The Presidential Succession Is a Matter of Greatest Importance to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial from the Paterson Evening News, of Paterson, N. J., entitled:

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION IS A MATTER OF GREATEST IMPORTANCE TO THE NATION

There is much to recommend President Truman's proposal that Congress rewrite the statute governing the choice of a successor in event of the death or disqualification of both the President and the Vice President.

As matters stand, under a law passed in 1886, the Secretary of State is first in line of succession. The objections are raised, however, that he is not an elected officer, that the character of the duties of the Secretary of State make it undesirable that partisan political considerations should influence his selection, and that the choice of a successor to the President and the Vice President ought to conform as closely as possible to the wishes of the electorate. Furthermore, as Mr. Truman himself says, it is not desirable that the President should have power to name his own successor, which is the case under existing law.

There is no doubt that these are substantial considerations, and it is to meet them that the President has recommended new legislation to the Congress. Under Mr. Truman's proposal, the Speaker of the House would supplant the Secretary of State as successor-designate to the President and the Vice President. After him would come the President pro tempore of the Senate. Then would come the Cabinet officials in the order prescribed by the law of 1886. In Mr. Truman's opinion, a President taking office under the proposed new statute should serve only until the next ensuing congressional election could be held to choose a President for the remainder of the unexpired term.

Congressional reaction to this recommendation has been generally favorable and the indications are that it will be adopted, at least to the extent of providing for the succession of the Speaker and the President pro tempore. In any event, there can be no doubt that the matter deserves prompt and serious consideration.

Should Congress adopt the proposed law, however, it would not necessarily follow that the country would be assured of the services of a President with the best qualifications. It is entirely possible, for instance, that a Secretary of State at any given time might be better qualified for the Presidency than a Speaker. Another possibility, deserving of consideration, concerns the chance that a Speaker of the House might not be of the same political faith as a President and Vice President. This has happened before and it could happen again. If the Democrats should lose the House in next year's congressional elections, for example, a Republican—presumably Minority Leader MARTIN—would be in line for the Presidency in event Mr. Truman should die or become disqualified. It may be said that this would conform to the indicated wishes of the people. But it is not likely that it would be an attractive prospect to the professional Democratic politicians.

There had been some expectation that, for the very reason of Presidential succession, the President would, at a convenient moment, replace Secretary of State Stettinius with some definite Democrat of record in elective office. Mr. Truman may yet do that. If, however, Congress should now proceed to alter the succession law, that particular reason for supplanting Mr. Stettinius and shipping him to the Court of St. James or elsewhere will be removed, and Mr. Stettinius may stay on in his present post.

The proper issue, however, is not one of personalities. It is not to be weighed on the merits of Mr. Stettinius, Speaker Rayburn, or Senate President McKellar, but on the wisdom of insuring that the occupant of the White House shall always be a man elected by the people or their direct representatives. This Republic ought not to enable any man, having succeeded to the Presidency, to say to some favorite, "I'd like you to be my heir-apparent, so I'll make you Secretary of State."

Jefferson Day Dinner Address by Hon. James M. Tunnell, of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] at a Jefferson Day dinner at Fort Wayne, Ind., on June 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been 200 years since the birth of Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson, in many respects, was not only the outstanding American of his time but his record proved that he was one of the outstanding citizens of the world in all ages. His fame is greater with the passing years.

He was the most versatile man who has ever occupied high office in the United States. He was an outstanding lawyer, who was retained in 500 cases in 1 year, which is a very respectable clientele for any period, and particularly for the time and place when Thomas Jefferson was practicing law in Virginia. He, at an early age, was elected to the House of Burgesses in his home State. He became Governor, Member of Congress, keeper of patents, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President of the United States. However, he not only occupied these positions, but he has been described as being a farmer, author, musician, architect, inventor, traveler, horseman, naturalist, philosopher, mathematician, linguist (being a student of at least eight languages), scholar, manufacturer, builder, educator, executive, legislator, politician, and statesman. He was active in all of these lines. He wanted to be remembered for being the author of the Declaration of Independence, the author of the statute providing religious liberty in the State of Virginia, and as the founder of the University of Virginia. There are enough of his great accomplishments omitted from this last list to have made him one of the outstanding citizens of the world of all time.

It was under his management that Louisiana was purchased from Napoleon for a comparatively small amount. It was on his direction that the Barbary pirates were compelled to stop levying tribute on American shipping. He was the founder of the Military Academy at West Point. He was the originator of the Congressional Library in Washington, D. C. He wrote a treatise on procedure of the United States Senate, and it is the procedure which is followed in the Senate to a very great extent to the present. He was the first President who ever advocated the abolition of slavery. It may not be generally known that his first draft of the Declaration of Independence contained a provision of this sort. He was the father of the public-school system of America. He was the creator of a great party founded upon the principles which he advocated and around which his life work was built. The party was created around him without his effort. He was fortunate in his mentality, he was fortunate in his education, and he was fortunate in the period in which he lived.

Jefferson was a Democrat, not because he belonged to the Democratic Party but because of his beliefs, his confidence in the average man. He wrote:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

His political antagonist, Alexander Hamilton, said: "The people, your people, sir, is a great beast."

Jefferson could not have been the father of a party having the philosophy which Hamilton breathed. Jefferson was a Democrat. Hamilton could not have been the father of a Democratic Party because he believed that the people "is a great beast." Jefferson was the father of the Democratic Party. Hamilton was the father of the Republican Party of today.

This division of men into those who have faith in the people and those who do not is as old as written history. Thomas Jefferson was a born aristocrat who loved people. Alexander Hamilton was born in poverty and obscurity and hated the people from whom he sprang. Hamilton desired that the United States should have a king. He desired that kings should reign through life. He desired that State officers should be appointed by the sovereign. He never admitted that the people had rights; therefore, no rights could be taken away from them.

The founding of the Democratic Party by Thomas Jefferson was incidental to the doctrines which he espoused and the consequence of those doctrines. Thomas Jefferson was a master in many lines of activity, but never an orator. John Adams said that in

the Continental Congress he never knew of Thomas Jefferson speaking out but three times. However, no man could express the eternal principles of justice and democracy with a pen in a clearer style than could Thomas Jefferson.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

"All honor to Jefferson—to the man who in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people had the coolness, forecast, and sagacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so embalm it there that today in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression."

Senator George F. Hoar once said:

"Thomas Jefferson was one of those men who can differ from hemispheres, from generations, from administrations, and from centuries with the perfect assurance that on any question of liberty and righteousness, if the opinion of Thomas Jefferson stand on one side and the opinion of mankind on the other, the world will, in the end, come around to his way of thinking."

Jefferson, in line with his democratic principles favored the abolition of entailment of property. He also favored the abolition of primo geniture. The natural rights of man had never been guaranteed or preserved by any form of government until the days of Thomas Jefferson. He believed that men were capable of exercising the functions of government by electing the head of the executive department, and by electing the members of the legislative department of the government, and by appointment or election of judges dependent upon the circumstances of the particular locality. He believed that the form of government should be changed to conform to the capacity of the people at each stage of the Nation's development. He believed that immigration should be restricted and that the development of the country should be along agricultural lines. He was opposed to overpopulating the country in cities which would attract an industrial population. Through his whole life, liberalism was his guiding star, his objective, and his hope for America. His judgment was based on the present and the past. He was never a prophet as to the future.

Since the foundation of government, there have been advocates who believed that all wisdom and all power should come from above—from the higher walks of life, from the financier rather than the laborer, from the men of wealth rather than those of lower financial standing. These forces have been as opposite as centripetal and centrifugal tendencies. They are opposite today.

The American people have been liberally democratic through their whole history. The Democratic Party representing, as it has, liberalism, has been opposed by the Federalist, by the Whig, and by the Republican Party, as its principal opposition. The Federalist Party, not being particularly successful in National politics, was succeeded by the Whig Party. This party was also unfortunate in its elections. However, both Federalist and Whig Parties were true followers of Alexander Hamilton. The Republican Party was founded around the liberal policy of abolition of slavery. Under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, it pursued that policy to a successful conclusion. It has never seriously and loyally supported any liberal policy since that time. Can you recall a liberal policy pioneered by it?

The people of America have been overwhelmingly liberal in their tendencies. After the assassination of Lincoln, the Republican Party was taken over by the old special interests groups which had been represented by the Federalist and Whig Parties. One can scarcely think of Thad Stevens and those who surrounded him being considered as liberals. The Democratic Party has, in the main, been liberal throughout its history. When it is truly liberal, it is usually successful; when it relapses into Republican policies of reaction it is properly chastised by the people.

In its history of 156 years, the Hamilton party, under whatever name it was proceeding, has reelected but three candidates for the Presidency; the first of these was Abraham Lincoln who was reelected with a Democratic Vice Presidential candidate on the National Union Party ticket in 1864. The second one of its candidates to be reelected was Ulysses Grant, who, with Lincoln, were both reelected at a time when the southern portion of the United States could not participate in the election. However, Ulysses Grant was elected and reelected on the Republican ticket, and stands as the only man who represented the Hamiltonian Party in the White House for two full terms. William McKinley was the third.

The American people recognize, and have recognized, their friends from the days of George Washington, the days of Thomas Jefferson. The American people have recognized their friends and reelected Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, each of whom has served at least two terms as President of the United States; and all of whom were elected to their positions by the great Democratic Party of today.

In the first Continental Congress, the natural rights of man were described as being to life, liberty, and property. When Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence he used this language, "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Today it is generally recognized that the Democratic Party prefers human rights to property rights. The Republican Party prefers property rights to human rights. However, democracy in America is entrenched on a thousand fronts. Every clearing in our western advance, the breaking of land for every ranch created an outpost and forefront for democracy. The people whose ancestors cut the forests, plowed the prairie, fought the Indians, and depended upon their own resources, as did Americans, will not consent to a complete surrender of the right of government. They believe, as did Jefferson, that the fountain of power is in the people themselves. Jefferson believed in the simple government. He believed in State rights. He was a strict constructionist of the Federal Constitution. He was opposed to an alliance between government and business, between the church and the state; his sympathies were with the mortgagor rather than with the mortgagee, with the farmer rather than with the factory owner.

Franklin Roosevelt favored, as did Thomas Jefferson, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

In the last 12 years, the Democratic Party has favored a Federal guaranty of bank deposits, the Republican Party opposed this liberal policy; the Democratic Party favored the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Republican Party opposed this liberal policy; the Democratic Party favored Farm Security Administration, the Republican Party opposed this move. The Democratic Party put into effect rural electrification, the Republican Party generally opposed this policy. The Democratic Party favored soil conservation, but the Republican Party opposed it. The Democratic Party favored farm-mortgage acts, crop insurance, and parity payments, public works carried forward in every section of the Nation providing income in critical periods, road building, National Youth Administration, old-age and retirement insurance, unemployment insurance, vocational training to the crippled and the blind, Federal aid to starving and undernourished persons, slum clearance, private home building and comforatble quarters for war workers, legislation abolishing child labor, minimum-wage and maximum-hour legislation, a Securities and Exchange Commission, reciprocal trade agreements, the good-neighbor policy toward the nations of the Western Hemisphere, and increased compensation for our service men and women. These are some of the accomplishments of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. All of these policies are in keeping with the democratic beliefs of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our party.

The party of Hamilton prates about free enterprise, abatement of bureaucracy, the hold of paternalism, the creation of postwar jobs through private industry, the maintenance of labor's social gains. Their policies, when reduced to their real meaning, are simply a repetition of the beliefs of Alexander Hamilton. Why did the Democratic Party favor an opportunity for the soldier to vote at the last election? Why did the Republican Party oppose it? Each was running true to form; the Democratic Party was liberal, the Republican Party was reactionary.

In the State of Indiana, at the last election, we are told that many thousands of voters are disfranchised. On the Special Elections Committee of the Senate, we learned that in one county of Indiana, about 22,000 voters' names were stricken from the lists and approximately 90 percent of those voters were Democrats. The party of Hamilton was running true to form in the election of 1944 in the State of Indiana. This conflict is not confined to the United States Government.

The people of the various States of the Union are in a position to keep alive self-government in the States. Indiana, like every other State, has two United States Senatorships. If those Senate seats can, for a few thousand dollars, be placed in the pockets by certain special interests for use of those interests in the votes that come before the Senate, it will soon result in the control of the United States Senate by special interests. In one recent election, the influx of those whose viewpoints favor special interests was in almost exact proportion to the great amount of campaign funds handed out just before the election to affect the political complexion of the national Congress. The manipulation of your election in the State of Indiana in 1944 was so flagrant that many of us who were somewhat familiar with the situation wondered that there was not a national exposure of the situation.

Democratic government today, as in the days of Thomas Jefferson, is not automatic. Our country will not, without the vigilance of the citizens of the various States, remain a democratic nation. Disfranchisement of voters has long been a resort of the opposition to democrary in the United States. It was the method by which the Presidency was stolen in 1876 after the election of Samuel J. Tilden. It was the method by which the South was continued under carpetbag government, long after the necessity of such a government existed. It was the method contemplated by the force bill when soldiers or marshals were to be placed at the polling places in the South to prevent an honest expression of opinion at the elections. It was the method contemplated in 1944 when the great mass of Republicans in Congress objected to laws permitting soldiers across the seas to vote in the national election. It was the method used in Indiana in 1944. It was the same method used in my own State of Delaware during the War Between the States when soldiers were sent to our polls and no one but Republicans permitted to vote. There was one election at which only three Democratic votes were cast at the polling place of my birth. Notwithstanding these methods, Delaware was one of the three States permitted to vote, which cast its electoral vote against Abraham Lincoln in 1864.

A party that has no respect for the rights of the average man will not long permit the

votes of the average man to be counted. This places upon the citizens of States, such as Indiana, the burden to organize not only the Democratic Party as such but the people of this great State interested in Democratic government so that the electoral votes and the congressional votes of this Commonwealth shall be counted along Democratic lines and for Democratic principles such as were advocated by Thomas Jefferson, and such as are advocated today by those who follow the principles advocated by Thomas Jefferson.

No matter what temporary set-backs followers of democracy may meet, the underlying political philosophy of the people of every State in the Union, including Indiana, closely follow the pattern of Thomas Jefferson. There is the opportunity, there is the duty, for liberty-loving people in the State of Indiana to organize and to meet and defeat the disciples and servants of the special interests who would take from the people of your great State and of your Nation the right to govern themselves.

Europe today is a bloody battlefield because of the fight between democracy and aristocracy, between liberalism and conservatism, between monarchy and the right of people to govern themselves. When Adolf Hitler said that he would have President Roosevelt on his knees begging the totalitarian powers for certain favors he was representing the totalitarian idea, he was representing monarchy, he was representing the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, he was representing the right of a few to govern the many.

When we think that during the last 6 years Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, and France had no voice in their government, when we learn that these people were governed by a foreign nation, speaking a foreign tongue, with ideas foreign to their ideas and rights of government, we realize that the eternal and elemental contest between democracy and monarchy or autocracy is still in progress. What are we to do? We of America must realize that an onslaught is being made against democratic institutions in the Western Hemisphere.

There was a time when the Middle West was represented by liberals in the Congress of the United States. We now find that eastern monopolists are sending their money to the Middle West to dominate your elections. They are finding persons with the Hamilton idea are willing to take that money and use it for the purpose of strangling democratic and liberal advances. The danger is as real today in the State of Indiana as it was in the days of Thomas Jefferson. It is fortunate that in this world struggle for democracy, America has for its President, a believer in democratic principles, and one who will prove himself to be one of the greatest executives the Nation has ever had, one who is capable of consolidating the Nation into one unified whole under a democratic banner and of preserving to the United States and to the Western Hemisphere, not alone the flag of the United States, not alone the Government under the Star-Spangled Banner, but will preserve to the governments of the Western Hemisphere the ideals of government which have carried democracy forward for more than a century and a half.

The ideas and principles of Thomas Jefferson have spread beyond the Western Hemisphere, and Thomas Jefferson has, in President Truman, a true disciple and a faithful believer in the blessings of democracy to all Americans—not alone to the underprivileged, but to those who would be the special-privileged; not alone to those who agree with us in our philosophy of government, but to those who have fought the fight for the principles of Alexander Hamilton and to those who have always subscribed to the Hamilton theories of government.

The League of Nations was the product of the energy and ideas of a great disciple of Thomas Jefferson. Its defeat was brought about by a disciple of Alexander Hamilton. The present World War is the direct outcome of this defeat.

The San Francisco Conference is largely the conception of another great follower of Thomas Jefferson. It is to be hoped that the American people will make sure that it shall not be defeated by any preconceived isolationist views.

The San Francisco Conference is the democratic idea of the method of coping with totalitarianism throughout the world. It is to be hoped that the democratic efforts of peace-loving nations shall be successful in preventing another war such as the ones we have passed through. The cost of war cannot be calculated. The blessings of peace cannot be overestimated.

When the clouds of war have cleared away, the Star-Spangled Banner will still be flying over a democratic Nation as an assurance of democracy to the downtrodden of all nations, to the people of Europe, to the people of Asia, to the people of Africa, as well as to those of our beloved America.

Long may the principles of Thomas Jefferson serve as the guiding star to those who seek to maintain for all men, in all lands, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Editorial Endorsement of Wagner-Murray-Dingell Social Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three recent editorials endorsing provisions of the social-security bill, which I have introduced jointly with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and Mr. DINGELL, a Member of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 1, 1945]

SOCIAL SECURITY

Federalization of the State unemployment insurance systems and permanent Federal operation of United States Employment Service are necessary reforms. Proposals to that effect, however, are bound to raise a mountain of controversy. The issue is raised again by the introduction of the revised Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for the expansion and liberalization of the existing social-security system. At the heart of the new measure is federalization.

In our opinion federalization is a necessary reform because unemployment is essentially a national problem that can only be dealt with effectively by the Federal Government. That fact has been impressed upon us as a result of the wartime mass migration of workers. It will be realized even more strongly should unemployment develop on any large scale during the reconversion period. In that event idle workers, dependent upon State benefits that in many cases are inadequate both as to amount and duration, will rightly resent the better treatment accorded the unemployed living in States where liberal benefits are paid. Some States, too, may be confronted by localized unemployment—an aftermath of war—that will entail excessive drains upon their insurance reserves. The need for spreading unemployment insurance risks and for equalizing benefits is patent, and federalization of the unemployment insurance system seems to be the answer to the question of how to bring about the required equalization.

Two broad problems of policy will confront Congress in addition the problem of federalization. One concerns the timing of an expanding social-security program, the other relates to the cost. The proposal is to levy a 4-percent payroll tax upon employers and a tax equal amount upon insured employees—8 percent in all—to finance the program, Government contributions would also be authorized when necessary. Pay roll taxes bear with very unequal weight upon employing concerns and likewise upon workers. To impose increased levies of this kind at a critical stage of the reconversion process when voices are being raised in behalf of tax reduction would be unwise from an economic as well as a political standpoint.

The cost factor is likewise important—far more important than social-security reformers make out. To be sure, a comparison with an "actuarially sound" private insurance system is no longer considered valid. That does not mean, however, that cost can be disregarded. It can be disregarded only at our peril. If it were no consideration, support for the Wagner program would be unanimous, for it aims at securing for all of us the kind of security we all desire and few of us have against penniless old age, premature incapacity, sickness, and loss of jobs. Disregard for costs featured such daydreams as the Townsend plans. But, if you disregard cost, there is no limit you need put on benefit.

Cost must be related to many things. It must be figured against the background of schemes for keeping our resources in full operation, of the relation between benefits and wages, of the burden on industry, of the deflationary effect of contributions, and so on. Unfortunately there is no way of producing a single yardstick out of this host of variables. In default there is no option but to look for guidance to private insurance schemes. We trust that the Wagner bill will stimulate discussion of the problem of policy and of cost, and, to start with, the thing to proselytize is the need for federalization.

[From the American Labor Conference on International Affairs of June 5, 1945]

THE AMERICAN BEVERIDGE PLAN

The great progressive legislators, Senators WAGNER and MURRAY and Congressman DINGELL, have reintroduced in Congress, with some changes, their social security bill—a bill which may properly be termed the American Beveridge plan.

There may be hard sledding ahead for a plan which, for the first time in history, will give genuine social security to every American worker, businessman, and farmer. But it is the very fact of the grave obstacles in the path of the new social security bill which should induce organized labor throughout the country to lend the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill its most enthusiastic and militant support. For every worker, every businessman, every professional worker, and every farmer has a stake in the bill. For those workers who have already been covered by the Federal and State social security legislation the bill will not only substantially liberalize the existing old-age, survivors and unemployment benefits, but also add benefits for temporary and permanent disability, as well as free medical care and hospitalization. To those 15,000,000 employed and self-employed workers who have been left out in the cold by the existing social security legislation the bill will for the first time bring

protection from the hazards of old age, death of the breadwinner, invalidity, and sickness.

It is obvious that one cannot get this amount of protection for nothing; but the burden of bearing the costs can be alleviated by a wise distribution so that the benefits will far outbalance the sacrifices. This is precisely what the new bill proposes to do, and in this respect it constitutes an improvement over the original bill. The original bill proposed a tax burden of 12 percent of pay rolls and wages, divided half and half between employers and employees. This would have meant a heavy sacrifice for both employers and employees and might have had an unfavorable effect on employment. The new bill reduces the total tax to 8 percent so that employers will have to pay only the same 4 percent of pay rolls which they already have to pay for Federal and State social security. For the workers the social security tax will be increased from 1 perment to 4 percent of wages, but this additional 3-percent tax is no more than they have to pay on the average for medical services, hospitals, and wage loss on account of sickness. The balance needed to keep the system going in later years will have to be contributed by general taxes; this is a sound principle which is in use in nearly all other industrial countries.

Since the new social-security bill protects nearly every family in the country from severe social hazards, there should be no reason for anyone to oppose it on the ground of injustice or inequity. Yet heavy opposition can be expected, not only from powerful vested interests, such as the American Medical Association, private hospitalization services, and State unemployment insurance administrations, but from those arch-conservatives who are afraid of any protection of individual interests by community action. All friends of social progress will have to stand together against these powerful forces to secure the passage of the most progressive and beneficial legislative measure of our time.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of May 26, 1945]

FLORIDA'S STAKE IN EXPANDING NATIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Florida has an unusually high stake in the proposed broadening of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Due to the economic and social set-up in Florida, we have unusually large groups of employees in the new group that may come in under the benefits of the Federal security program.

At present the principal groups excluded from the insurance are: Farm and domestic laborers, fishermen, employees in religious and charitable institutions, and public employees. The first three groups total about 230,000 persons. In Florida generally, and in Pinellas County in particular, these groups are more important segments of the community than is true on the average.

More persons in Pinellas County who have reached 65 are within these presently excluded groups than are those covered. Importance of the program is measurable in light of the fact that present monthly payments in Pinellas County are approximately $700,000.

In the other two great governmental fields of protection against old age and economic misfortune: (1) State old-age assistance and (2) unemployment compensation; progress under this session of the legislature was rather disappointing. Except a material increase in aid to the blind and dependent children no progress was made. (These two groups are included in the State assistance program.)

The new program for children will provide a maximum of $18 a month for a mother and one child: $12 a month for each additional child. The field of benefits of unemployment compensation in the State remain as before and they are too narrow in application. Employees must have been working for a concern employing a minimum of eight. Maximum benefits are $15 a week for 16 weeks. The employee must have an accumulation of $240 in benefits to draw that maximum and but few can qualify. It is understood, of course, that to be eligible for the payments the prospective beneficiary must be willing and able to work.

In the field of State old-age assistance Floridians can take some pride in the fact that average Florida benefits paid are $28.59 a month, the highest in the South, and actually 7 cents a month above the national average of $28.52.

It is obvious, however, that with a maximum of $40 a month available for old people needing nursing and medical care the ultimate goal has not nearly been reached.

Too often overlooked, however, is the fact that State old-age assistance to some extent is a temporary stop-gap until the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance program has continued a sufficient number of years and has been properly enough broadened to care for the ever-increasing army of old folks.

Thus the expanded social-security law introduced Thursday in Congress by Senator WAGNER, of New York, and Representative DINGELL, of Michigan, is a step in that direction.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Phoney Argument," on the subject of the Burton-Ball-Hatch bill, from the Cleveland News of June 25, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHONY ARGUMENT

First returns of comment on the Burton-Ball-Hatch Federal industrial legislation are in from the labor side and, as anticipated, show vigorous opposition.

Spokesmen from the AFL, the CIO, and the mine workers seize upon the compulsory settlement provision of the proposed law to describe it as a bill "to enslave labor."

This is a wholly irresponsible attack. But it is the type that will be used to whip up sentiment against any fair labor bill.

The fact is that the BBH bill specifically provides that an individual employee is free to quite a job at any time, under any conditions. The courts are forbidden to interfere with that freedom.

What the labor leaders are shouting about is that, in two instances, unions are placed under the same responsibility for keeping peace as management. The bill states that it shall not be "construed so as to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike," save in two situations.

The first instance is during settlement efforts, when both employers and employees are charged with the duty of maintaining existing conditions while negotiation and fact-finding proceed. This is clearly an elemental condition if a peaceful settlement is to be arrived at without new provocations constantly arising.

Even then, the right of individuals to quit work if they choose is clearly stated. The responsibility attaches only to the union as an organization and in the same degree that it does to the employer.

The second case in which compulsory settlement is provided for is to "avoid any interruption to the supply of a commodity or to a service on which the community affected is so dependent that severe hardship would be inflicted on a substantial number of persons by either a brief or prolonged deprivation of such commodity or service."

Senator BALL well states the purpose of that clause. He says:

"The bill would protect the public against interruption of vital services, such as electricity or gas, or milk deliveries by requiring that disputes involving such industries be settled by compulsory arbitration. This may sound drastic, but actually it only recognizes the realities of actual practice today.

"No governor in any State today would permit a labor dispute to close down a vital public utility in a large city. He would utilize the National Guard and every other agency at his disposal first. The necessities of the populations of large cities would force him to do so, and both management and labor in these types of industry know it."

That is exactly so. It recognizes realities. Responsible labor leaders in Cleveland know perfectly well, for example, that a strike never would be permitted to close down the Illuminating Co. for any length of time. The public health and welfare would demand that electric service be maintained. If the workers left their jobs, others would have to be brought in and protected, if necessary. The city could not be subjected to the perils and hardships a strike would produce.

The community certainly would not under any circumstances allow the Illuminating Co. management to close down its plant. The Burton-Ball-Hatch Act prohibits this and applies the same restriction against the employee that it puts against the employer.

That is precisely what brings the unions charging out to fight the bill. They have long been the coddled and pampered beneficiaries of labor legislation, without being charged with any responsibilities.

The authors of the BBH Act understand, as every sensible person must, that this kind of one-sided Federal interference has to end if there is to be created an atmosphere in which true industrial peace and prosperity can come. Otherwise there will be constant conflict, in which the industry, labor, and the people of the United States all will lose heavily.

It is unfortunate that labor leaders disclose an intention to fight the BBH bill on invalid grounds. "Enslavement" is a handy shibboleth to rally prejudice against the bill. That's all it is. Labor will do itself no good with that kind of argument.

Article From PM in Tribute to Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very well-deserved tribute to Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., printed in the June 27 issue of PM.

The careers of Colonel Davis and his illustrious father, Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, as well as the history of every struggle for freedom in which our Nation

has engaged, are proof, if any were needed, that our Negro fellow citizens are taking their places in the armed forces of the Nation as they are in every other field of human endeavor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HATS OFF!

Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., of New York, son of Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, the only Negro general officer in the United States Army, has made an enviable record in the war. As commander of the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Mustang Fighter Group, Colonel Davis ran his flying string up to 60 combat missions in the European war. Last April 16 he led a strafing attack on railway targets in Austria, remaining in the danger area for an hour to destroy locomotives and rolling stock. The action won him the Silver Star for gallantry—the first time it has been awarded to a Negro fighter pilot in the Army. Davis, who also holds the Legion of Merit, took over last week as commander of the Four Hundred and Seventy-seventh Composite Air Group at Godman Field, Ky.

Hats off!

The Connecticut Plan Procedures for Veterans—The Education Program of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Francis J. Bassett, consultant, veterans' affairs, Connecticut State Department of Education, Bureau of Youth Services:

The State of Connecticut has a great tradition of community service. The town meeting democracy of Connecticut, where every citizen takes part in the responsibility of carrying on a democratic society is now preparing the way for the return of men and women in the armed forces. The Connecticut plan is based on this community responsibility and is a cooperative coordinated program of service to the veteran to whom we owe so much in this Second World War.

Dr. Alonzo G. Grace, commissioner of education of Connecticut, said recently: "Common sense must characterize the educational program for the returning veteran." We are adjusting our present program rather than setting up new institutions. We desire a guidance program that guides, and not one that attempts to tell the veteran what they may or may not do.

The Connecticut State Department of Education is one of the agencies working cooperatively with the other agencies such as:

1. Veterans' Administration.
2. Selective Service.
3. Local community advisory committees.
4. City advisory centers.
5. Vocational counseling service.
6. United States Employment Service.
7. Local school systems.
8. Labor.
9. Industry.
10. Red Cross.
11. Veterans' organizations.

They are coordinated by the Connecticut Reemployment Commission to work as a team, without competition, to help the veteran find his place in civilian life. We are not forcing the services of these agencies on the veteran, nor are we making him or her a special problem, but we are are avoiding the "run-around" by having a simple, direct program that will put the serviceman or woman in contact with the service that will satisfy his needs.

A series of charts have been sent out by the Connecticut State Department of Education which explains graphically the procedures for veterans under the Connecticut plan, and the part the State department of education plays in this program.

In chart II we have shown the procedure for the veteran who finds local adjustment in his or another community. He or she wants a job and perhaps has a problem dealing with GI loans, buying of real estate, a spiritual problem, medical advice, a banking problem, a tax problem, or a number of individual difficulties that need attention. The Local Reemployment and Advisory Committee of the towns of Connecticut have been organized on a democratic voluntary basis to serve the veteran. In preparation for these committees long before VE-day, forums and discussions were held to stimulate public interest in the service. The responsibility for adjustment thus does not lie only with the veteran but also with the folk back home. If the veteran wishes to discuss his education, the principal and the superintendent of the local school are ready to serve. The consultant, Veteran Affairs of the State Department of Education is one of the information sources for questions dealing with education under the GI bill, Public Law 16 or 113. The veteran finds adjustment and a job in the community. Representatives of labor, Red Cross, the clergy, veterans' organizations (including representatives of World War II veterans), farmers, industry, banking, real estate, medicine, education, serve on these local committees. In procedure III we have those veterans who need special counseling services. He will be referred by the local committee to a regional center. The best example of the regional center which successfully operates is the Bridgeport Community Advisory Service Center, Bridgeport, Conn. This center is community supported by the Community Chest. There, counsellors in education, medicine, social service, law, insurance, banking, labor, the clergy, selective service, and veterans' organizations are available for service. This center is open to nonveterans as well as veterans and is a community project sponsored by the Community Chest. No man is turned away without a sincere effort at solution of his problem. After adjustment, the services of the USES are available, and the man gets a job. The services of selective service are available for job advisory problems and the public school superintendent and principal are available for educational problems.

In procedure IV we have the disabled veteran who may go directly to the Veterans' Administration from the discharge centers or through the local committee or center. Under Public Law 16, vocational rehabilitation, the veteran may go to college, private vocational school, high school, public technical school, or training on the job. For non-service-connected disabilities the Division of Rehabilitation of the State department of education is ready to assist with medical care, diagnosis, counseling, vocational or professional training, artificial appliances, and aid in placement. Medical treatment is not provided for the veteran if available through the Veterans' Administration.

To insure against the rise of "fraudulent" schools which hope to benefit from the GI bill of Public Law 16, the Connecticut State Department of Education must certify all schools before the Veterans' Administration will accept the application for assistance.

In procedure V the veteran wishes to complete high-school training for a diploma. The State board of education equivalency examination is provided for those who wish to try for a State high-school diploma. That opportunity is made available by applying to the State department of education.

For those who must complete more high-school work before gaining a high-school diploma the State department of education looks to the setting up of regional high schools operating under the local school systems and giving condensed courses so that the work may be completed quickly by these young men who have become adults because of their war service. We feel that there is little likelihood of the veteran returning to the local day public high-school system to sit through the same classes with adolescents. After the veteran has his diploma (and this step is one of the most important for his future) there is available the technical school, college, or private vocational training.

The job-try-out school is made available for those who do not feel certain of what vocations they would like to follow. They are attached to the technical (trade) schools and offer him or her the opportunity of trying out many vocations before making a final choice. In the Connecticut plan we constantly remember that the ultimate objective is a job—the right job.

In procedure VI we have the veteran who has completed his high-school work and wishes to enter college or complete his college training. After contacting his local committee (or he may contact the Veterans' Administration directly) he or she may enter college under the GI bill. The local high-school principal or the consultant, Veterans' Affairs, of the State Department of Education, are available for consultation on educational questions.

Leaning Over Backward in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, when the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Grew, told Representatives COFFEE and DE LACY, of Washington, BAILEY, of West Virginia, and PATTERSON, of California, on June 1, that "this country is leaning over backward in order to avoid offending Russia," no plan for restoring political activities in Germany had been announced.

The first program for renewed German political activity by Germans themselves was issued on June 25. It was in the form of a manifesto, written at Moscow and signed by the members of the central committee of the German Communist Party, who have been in Moscow for some years. The manifesto was addressed to all German people throughout the world.

In New York, the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Political Association, commented:

After 12 years of bitter underground struggle, the Communist Party is now officially registered with Soviet military authorities in Berlin and with German magistrates. * * * It is not yet known whether any other political party has been legally formed in Germany.

The official Soviet news agency Tass quotes the manifesto as stating:

> We consider it incorrect for Germany to open the path for implanting the Soviet system because such a path does not correspond with the conditions of the development of Germany at this given moment.
>
> We consider that the real interests of the German people, under the present conditions in Germany, dictate another path, for instance, the path of establishing an anti-Fascist democratic regime and a democratic parliamentary republic with all democratic liberties.

The program of the German Communist Party, as outlined in this manifesto, includes: A thorough purge of all active Nazis from all public institutions; punishment by German courts of Hitler's accomplices not scheduled for trial by the United Nations. Some hint of the extent to which this punishment might be carried is given in the manifesto's statement that:

> Not only is Hitler guilty of the crimes committed on humanity, but a share of the guilt is borne by those 10,000,000 Germans who, in 1933, voted for Hitler.

The manifesto accepts guilt for the whole German people who, it declares: "became a weapon of Hitler and his imperialistic masters." So far as reported this is the only possible reference made to the German Army General Staff in the manifesto. Plans for punishment and economic reconstruction along class lines are the chief theme. "Removal of trade barriers, the development of free trade and private enterprise on the basis of private ownership" is one declared aim, along with "defense of the masses from arbitrary, excessive exploitation by owners of enterprises."

The signers of the manifesto do not try to exempt their own group from the guilt they assign to the German people as a whole. "We Communists declare that we also feel ourselves guilty inasmuch as, despite all sacrifices costing our best fighters, we were not able, as a consequence of a series of mistakes, to force an anti-Fascist unity of workers for the overthrow of Hitler."

Some of the signers of this manifesto have already been established in municipal offices in Russian-occupied Germany. Ottomar Geschke, who has been made director of welfare for the Berlin Municipal Council, is a pre-World War I Communist. He was a Communist member of the German Reichstag before Hitler, and was in constant touch with the Comintern, for which he performed numerous assignments in various countries. Geschke spent nearly 12 years in Hitler's concentration camps, but apparently never lost touch with his Communist comrades, and his sufferings for the party have made him fanatic, according to reports.

The chief signer of the manifesto, Wilhelm Pieck, has not yet received any official post. In the event a German government should be set up under Soviet auspices, it is more than likely that he will hold the key position.

Pieck is the best organizer the Comintern developed. He is 69 years old, and for 51 years he has been active in party work. He never went beyond grade school in formal education, but his contacts with Communists throughout Europe are, literally, countless. Pieck was a Communist member of the German Reichstag and in the 1928 Official Directory was listed as "without religion, by trade a carpenter."

It is very doubtful that he ever worked steadily at carpentering. His real trade since the age of 18 has been that of left-wing organizer. For that he was trained in the Social-Democratic Party school—similar to the left-wing training centers organized in the United States during the past 10 years. During the last war Pieck was a member of the revolutionary Spartakus Bund, which brought him into prominence with the Russian revolutionaries who headed the Comintern before that organization took control of Russia and established its international headquarters in Moscow. Since then he has maintained the closest relationship, being its most trusted emissary in Germany.

His record includes the betrayal of many former comrades to the powers that be in the Kremlin today. This fact can be offset in the memories of surviving German Communists by the fact that he was a close associate of the assassinated Communist leader, Karl Liebknecht, regarded as a martyr by Germans of the left.

Pieck's value as a reviver of Germany under Communist auspices lies in his encyclopedic knowledge of the surviving personnel of the left in Germany and Russia. Before Hitler, Pieck was repeatedly the delegate of the German Communist Party to the Comintern. At Comintern headquarters, the former Hotel Lux, on Tverskaya Street, in Moscow, he knew and became known to Comintern leaders from all over the world. This made him very useful to the Russian Communists during the purge of 1936–37, when he was able to add a number of names to the lists which might otherwise have escaped liquidation. Thus, Pieck has a long record of service to the secret police, under all its changes of initials, CHEKA, OGPU, NKVD.

During the last few years of the war in Europe Pieck has been the chief aid in screening German left-wing refugees who made their way into the Soviet Union. In the course of this assignment he has collected dossiers of helpful individuals in every city, town, and countryside of Germany. Throughout his residence in Russia Pieck carried a little notebook—or rather a series of notebooks—into which went the names and the record of those who could be counted on in post-Hitler times. Likewise into the same notebooks went the names of those who, one day, should be purged. When Herr Wilhelm Pieck returns to Germany those notebooks, or mimeographed sheets prepared from them, will go along with him. On the basis of the information Herr Pieck has collected, new faces will appear in the town halls and the police stations all over Germany. Old faces will disappear—forever.

Herr Pieck is a significant angle in how far the United States is "leaning over backward to avoid offending Russia."

Free Press Exposes Tax Dodge

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this morning's mail brings me a letter from a constituent which says in part:

> I am enclosing an article which I want you to read. It appeared in yesterday's Detroit Free Press. Mr. MICHENER, our people down here think this is the most damnable and most outrageous thing that has happened since the war began. Canada has put her money on a par with ours and her bonds are tax free, and draw 3 percent interest.
>
> Mr. MICHENER, what is Congress going to do about this? Is it going to let the rich buy bonds in Canada, get the higher interest, and let the poor people of the United States pay this war debt? We know that Congress can do something and should do it quickly.

The article from the Detroit Free Press is as follows:

FREE PRESS EXPOSES TAX DODGE—AMERICANS SPLURGE ON CANADIAN BONDS

(By Edward Dodds)

While Michigan faces the humiliation of failing to meet its seventh war bond quota, Detroiters are investing thousands of dollars in Canadian war bonds, a Free Press survey revealed Tuesday.

Throughout the Nation, millions of dollars are flowing across the border for investment in Canadian issues.

Frank N. Isbey, Michigan war-bond chairman, was "shocked" when informed by the Free Press of the Canadian bond-buying splurge.

"It's a shame," he said. "An official statement by the war bond committee will be released later on the situation."

He pointed out that Michigan has 4 days in which to raise $64,000,000 for E bonds.

Isbey wired more than 3,700 firms, asking their employees to exceed their quotas.

The day's sales in Wayne County hit a new high, reaching $5,360,181.

The sale of Canadian bonds to Americans has boomed during the past few days as a result of rumors that the Canadian dollar is to be placed on a par with American money.

This would eliminate the 10 percent premium Americans have been getting on their money.

The fact that interest on Canadian bonds is tax free for nonresidents of Canada has played a large part in the sale of the bonds.

Canadian bonds yield 3 percent interest, which the United States Internal Revenue Department has no way of collecting on if they are not declared.

Bankers in Canada state that there is no way that United States income tax officers can tell if a person is holding Canadian bonds under the system of sale in Canada.

A $1,000 bond bought in Canada with American money will return $1,652.50 in Canadian money for purchasers of the latest Canadian issue.

I quite agree with my constituent that if the conditions mentioned in the Free Press article are true, then our Government should do something about this matter at once. I am calling the attention of the proper authorities in the Government to these alleged conditions,

and feel sure that the Congress will agree with me and will assist in every way possible to correct the situation.

Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Walter Trohan relating to lend-lease:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 24, 1945]

REVEALS HOW LEND-LEASE GOBBLED FOOD—RUSSIA AND BRITAIN GET BULK OF SUPPLIES

(By Walter Trohan)

Shipments of billions upon billions of pounds of foodstuffs valued at hundreds upon hundreds of million dollars for the first year of lend-lease were made public yesterday from official records.

The flow of astronomical amounts of meat, vegetables, dairy products, and canned goods was found in official records of lend-lease operations for 1942—the year rationing was introduced in America.

MANY SCARCE ARTICLES SHIPPED

Many of the items shipped in the first year of lend-lease have virtually disappeared from American tables. These include hundreds of millions of pounds of ham and bacon, hundreds of millions of pounds of cheese, millions of pounds of canned salmon, and millions of pounds of butter.

On the butter shipments the official records disclose the truth of the reports, which had been denied by the administration spokesmen, that the Soviets spurned oleomargarine and insisted on receiving butter, which is little known among the Russian working classes.

The figures on the flood of foodstuffs this Nation sent abroad—some to countries not contributing to the war effort—are from the Foreign Commerce and Navigation Section of the Department of Commerce.

* * * * *

The following tables show amount of shipments by items to the countries and their value in dollars. Amounts are in pounds unless otherwise noted:

Country	Amount	Value
CATTLE HIDES, DRY		
United Kingdom	133,913	$45,196
SHEEPSKINS		
United Kingdom	430,004	9,864
SHEEPSKINS (PIECES)		
United Kingdom	210,480	----------
OTHER HIDES AND SKINS		
United Kingdom	809,401	183,484
GRAIN CATTLE SIDE LEATHER		
Russia	384,947	151,290
OTHER UPPER LEATHER		
Russia	1,498,662	365,202
SOLE LEATHER		
United Kingdom	844,772	381,894
Russia	25,032,282	11,099,186
OTHER SHOE STOCK		
Russia	----------	$806,436
BELT LEATHER		
Russia	1,900,651	705,151
OTHER BELT LEATHER		
United Kingdom	230,560	99,256
Russia	354,299	156,821
MEN'S SHOES		
Russia	202,626	588,913
MEN'S SHOES, WELT		
British Empire	164,587	535,379
Russia	1,591,094	5,555,663
MEN'S SHOES, STITCHED		
Russia	37,096	131,257
OTHER MEN'S SHOES		
Russia	20,163	57,551
MEN'S BELTS		
United Kingdom	----------	90,618
Russia	----------	513,800
LEATHER WEARING APPAREL		
Russia	----------	127,838

On truck tire shipments Russia received 266,882 and the United Kingdom 96,183 with the balance of a total of 869,354 going largely to British Empire units. The total value of truck tire shipments was $27,145,151. Other tires went almost entirely to the British Empire. These totaled 340,830 and were valued at $4,730,757.

INNER TUBES

Inner tubes totaled 1,198,696 of a value of $3,142,979. Of these 283,643 valued at $726,941 went to Russia and the balance almost entirely to the British Empire. Tires and tubes in sets totaled 392,666, valued at $6,177,461 went almost 50—50 between Russia and the British Empire.

Britain got all tobacco shipments. These included 176,722,237 pounds of flue cured leaf tobacco valued at $49,575,570; 5,174,099 pounds of Virginia leaf tobacco valued at $1,261,889; 451,968 pounds of smoking tobacco valued at $142,364 and 2,090,750 pounds of other tobacco manufactures valued at $632,217.

The United Kingdom and Canada got 559,308 pounds of nylon valued at $601,213. This would have made millions of pairs of nylon hose.

Chemical and related products were shipped to a total of more than $150,000,000. Of this more than $75,000,000 went to the United Kingdom and more than $40,000,000 to Russia. Of the balance of about $35,000,000, the great majority went to Empire units. One of the largest of these items was alcohol and related products, which went largely to the British Empire with sizable shipments to Empire units.

CHEMICALS SENT

Among the chemicals were 1,500 pounds of aspirin and 11,200 pounds of bicarbonate of soda which went to ease Chinese headaches, and settle Chinese stomachs at a time when they were receiving almost no lend-lease, except by air.

India, where wide starvation was reported, got 17,900 pounds of bicarbonate of soda. The Hindus also got 37,635 radio sets during a period of heavy unrest.

Other odd shipments went to Egypt at a time when Marshal Rommel, the Desert Fox was driving hard on British positions. Lend-lease sent 42,000 calling card cases, 976,868 wool blankets and 940,201 pounds of toilet paper.

Heavy petroleum product shipments went to Russia and Britain in this period. These included:

Country	Amount in barrels	Value
AVIATION GAS, HIGH OCTANE		
British Empire	10,303,916	$63,661,990
Russia	483,419	3,221,655
AVIATION GAS, MEDIUM OCTANE		
British Empire	7,784,502	21,198,610
Russia	34,816	234,255
GAS, 80 OCTANE		
British Empire	4,352,261	12,458,707
Russia	78,194	164,676
MOTOR FUELS AND GAS		
British Empire	1,885,717	4,864,722
Russia	100,600	224,443
NAPHTHA		
British Empire	379,187	876,591
Russia	2,853	47,597
KEROSENE		
British Empire	1,789,409	4,065,450
Russia	6,718	47,597
GAS, OIL, AND DISTILLATE FUEL OIL		
British Empire	16,493,415	28,133,464
Russia	70,877	373,634
RESIDUAL FUEL OIL		
British Empire	1,477,884	2,737,572
Russia	13,326	37,066

The shipment of petroleum products also includes more than 5,000,000 barrels of lubricating oil in nine grades, more than 16,000,000 pounds of lubricating grease; 41,000,000 pounds of petrolatum and petroleum jelly, and 100,000,000 pounds of petroleum wax, valued at more than $65,000,000. The bulk of these went to the British Empire with shipments to Russia proportionate to those of gasoline and fuel oil.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 27, 1945]

VIRTUALLY ENTIRE WORLD EXCEPT AXIS NATIONS SHARED IN HUGE FLOW OF LEND-LEASE GOODS—84 COUNTRIES AND COLONIES GOT AID—FIRST YEAR SHIPMENTS ONLY SMALL FRACTION

(By Walter Trohan)

Eighty-four allies and neutral nations and colonies shared in $4,926,449,237 of the lend-lease goods shipped from the United States in 1942, official Government records disclosed yesterday.

The files for the first year of operation of lend-lease showed that virtually every country in the world except the Axis nations shared in the free flow of 11 categories of goods.

WIDENS SINCE FIRST YEAR

Since that time the total of lend-lease, according to the last White House report to Congress, reached $40,000,000,000 as of last March 31, which means that the flow of American goods has widened rather than decreased since the first year.

Part of the shipments for 1942 were made at a time when a gallant band of heroic Americans were defending Bataan. While these defenders received almost nothing in the way of supplies and were passing the hat, with grim American irony, to buy a sorely needed bomber, the records show that

millions of dollars worth of goods were shipped to the Pacific area, some to countries which fell before the Philippines.

British Malaya received $4,153,688 of goods, and Burma $1,797,109. Both of these fell before Bataan. Australia, New Zealand, and China received a half billion dollars worth of aid.

LION'S SHARE TO BRITAIN

The lion's share of the lend-lease shipments went to the United Kingdom at over two billions, and British Empire units shared heavily in the remainder. Russia got more than $1,300,000,000 of goods. In addition, Russia got another 100,000,000 of goods shipped to Iran and Iraq.

Neutral countries which received goods while the United States was building an army included Turkey, which got a total of almost $11,000,000; Argentina, which got $287,346; and Irish Free State which got $106,658. Latin-American countries shared substantially in lend-lease.

The 11 categories and the amounts shipped under them are as follows:

	Amount
Animals and edible animal products	$742,709,738
Animals and inedible animal products	21,597,689
Vegetable and food products and beverages	68,332,760
Inedible vegetable products except fibers	128,128,985
Textile fibers and manufactures	100,357,353
Wood and paper	43,455,240
Nonmetallic minerals	234,947,742
Metals and manufactures except machinery and vehicles	554,945,183
Machinery and vehicles	2,039,881,752
Chemicals and related products	150,587,848
Miscellaneous	841,504,917

The 84 countries and colonies and the amounts they received in lend-lease shipments from America are as follows:

Iceland	$783,204
Canada	117,482,172
Newfoundland and Labrador	319,095
Miquelon and St. Pierre	14,208
Mexico	1,816,062
Guatemala	1,988
British Honduras	18,859
El Salvador	184,135
Honduras	22,898
Nicaragua	138,796
Costa Rica	36,837
Panama, Republic of	288
Panama Canal Zone	880
Burmuda	762,872
Bahamas	2,710,689
Cuba	1,347,722
Jamaica	2,696,611
Haiti	125,082
Dominican Republic	41,001
Leeward Islands	6,630
Windward Islands	15,749
Barbados	112,801
Trinidad and Tobago	4,103,537
Curacao (N. W. I.)	3,958,705
French West Indies	2,636
Colombia	644,299
Venezuela	341,549
British Guiana	182,209
Surinam	816,416
Ecuador	160,725
Peru	2,273,044
Bolivia	187,409
Chile	3,591,064
Brazil	21,882,350
Paraguay	330,579
Uruguay	1,376,393
Argentina	287,346
Falkland Islands	17,158
United Kingdom	2,034,707,017
Eire (Irish Free State)	106,658
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Russia)	1,358,180,922
Gibraltar	147,659
Malta and Goso	$74,150
Greece	328,472
Cyprus	118,281
Turkey	10,950,696
Syria	1,049,542
Iraq	68,517,947
Iran (Persia)	36,716,324
Palestine	2,106,318
Arabia Peninsula States	173,320
Aden	405,721
State of Bahrein	779,859
Afghanistan	14
India and dependencies	287,271,676
Ceylon	6,817,237
Burma	1,797,109
British Malaya	4,153,688
Netherlands Indies	23,220,800
China	67,218,189
Australia	211,098,972
New Guinea (Australian)	70,085
New Zealand	62,694,583
British Oceania	202,860
French Oceania	43,282
Libya	433,200
Egypt	449,379,905
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	4,961,672
Cameroon	927,994
French Equatorial Africa	1,050,843
French West Africa	60,582
Gold Coast	27,633,791
Nigeria	7,803,163
St. Helena and dependencies	976
Gambia and Sierra Leone (D. B. W. A. F.)	8,116,038
Belgian Congo	11,353,085
Eastern Italian Africa	1,362,901
Mauritius and dependencies	65,217
British East Africa	12,100,516
Mozambique	433,817
Madagascar	42,340
Union of South Africa	51,859,045
Northern Rhodesia	125,230
Southern Rhodesia	993,574
Total	4,926,449,237

Marvin Jones Talks About Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Marvin Jones, who has been serving as War Food Administrator, terminates his service as such today to resume his duties as judge of the Court of Claims of the United States.

One of his last public addresses was made over the Columbia Broadcasting System, the night of June 16, 1945, and since it contains information with reference to the production and distribution of food, which is of vital interest at this time, under leave granted, same is submitted below.

I desire especially to commend that portion of his address wherein he pays tribute to the farmers of America for the magnificent record made by them in the production of food in spite of the manpower shortage and other difficulties confronting them. Marvin Jones, as War Food Administrator, has also had difficulties, but in spite of them he has made a fine record and has rendered his country a great service in time of war.

During the last few weeks we have had a great deal of discussion about food—food that we eat three times a day, food that is as necessary as the air we breathe, food that we take for granted except when some item we want and like comes up short. Then we become alarmed and there are predictions that famine is just around the corner. These fears arise because it is not generally understood that the end of the war in Europe has not reduced the demand on our food supplies. In fact, the demands now are greater than at any other time during the period of the war. As a result, American civilians will have smaller supplies of some of our most favorite foods than during any other year of the war. At the same time, on an over-all basis, we have the greatest food supply of any nation in the world. We have had this supply all through the war years. We have consumed a greater amount of food per capita than in peacetime. People have accepted many shortages such as gasoline, electric irons, heaters, automobiles, refrigerators, clothing, and many other things we desire. But let anything interfere with our food and we immediately speak up since we eat it three times a day and it touches our very lives.

Only those engaged in the production of food realize how many problems are involved in the producing, processing, storing, handling, and transportation of the things we eat.

One might gain the impression from some of the comments that have been going the rounds, that the farmers had failed to produce the food which the Nation needs. Some of these statements have been made without due regard for the facts.

Let's not jump at conclusions; let's take a look at the record. Let's find out the facts. In 1943 the American farmers produced 32 percent more food than this or any other nation ever produced before the war.

In 1944 they exceeded even this by 5 percent, making an all-time record increase of 38 percent above prewar production.

This year they are planting an even greater acreage of food crops.

This record has been made in spite of the handicaps of war.

This is far in excess of what was done in the First World War.

Again, let us look at the record—

The United States has produced 50 percent more food annually in this war than in World War I.

Up to the first of this year, we had already supplied three times as much food for our armed services and for overseas shipment as was furnished for the same purposes during the last war. This is true despite the fact that the job of feeding the liberated areas has hardly begun and we still have to supply food in the war against Japan.

With 10 percent fewer workers on farms and with total national population 30 percent greater, our civilian population has had about 10 percent more food per capita during this war than in the 1917–18 period. True, some items have come up short at times. Distribution has not always been on a fair basis, but we can always buy some kind of wholesome food. This is not true in many other lands in this war-torn world. Do you know of anyone here who has actually gone hungry? We rarely pause to think how fortunate we have been in this free and fruitful land.

From the beginning the War Food Administration has sought prices that would enable farmers to secure all-out production, believing as we do that full production is the only way to assure stabilization and to prevent inflation. This is the best possible aid to successful rationing. For this reason we have at all times urged the fullest possible production. Without production no one can hold the price line. One of the first steps I took as War Food Administrator was to remove all restrictions on acreage and production of food crops, and to call for the greatest possible production of food all along the line.

Naturally, the demand for food has been terrific. For the first time in our history all our people were working harder, needed more food, and have had the income with which to buy it. This is as it should be.

We have the best-fed Army that ever marched and the best-fed Navy that ever sailed the seas. Naturally, they have first call on our food. In the other World War we had only 2,000,000 soldiers abroad. We have several times that number now.

The statement is as true today as it was when first uttered more than 100 years ago that "An army, like a serpent, travels on its belly." In this war we have 12,500,000 citizens in the armed services. In addition to feeding this vast military force, we have helped feed several hundred thousand fighting French soldiers, 19,000 Brazilian soldiers, 300,000 Italians in service units, and 335,000 Filipino guerrillas who have greatly helped us in our Pacific warfare. We have considerably larger numbers of our troops outside of this country than in 1944, and more food is needed to protect these long supply lines. Our Army has to feed millions of prisoners of war and to supply the relief needs of liberated people for a period of at least 6 months.

Early in the war the great wheat fields and the most productive part of Russia was overrun. It became necessary to ship more than a million tons of food to the hard-pressed Russian Army. Russian officials have told us that but for American food they could not have turned back the German hordes at Stalingrad and Leningrad and carried forward as they did. This perhaps saved a million American lives. When gallant old England was standing practically alone between civilization and the Nazi monsters, it was American food that helped turn the balance in that dark hour.

If we have been profligate in the use of food as well as all other supplies, it is because we deliberately chose to spend materials instead of men.

In this war we have been building planes at the rate of more than 75,000 per year. Unbelievable quantities of all kinds of weapons and munitions have been built and shipped. This war has been fought on a gigantic scale. Thus the shortage in some of the key items of food has not been a lack of production, but of greatly increased demand. For example, we are producing meat this year at the rate of more than 22,000,000,000 pounds, which is 6,000,000,000 pounds greater than the 1935-39 production. Comparing prewar with our wartime production, chicken meat production has been stepped up nearly 40 percent, but the demand is even greater. Egg production is up about 50 percent, milk production is up 17 percent and is now at record levels, corn is up 35 percent, wheat production up 43 percent, potato production, 10 percent, all far above prewar levels.

While there are some inequities in distribution, the food problem is not a lack of production, but the greatly increased demand that is being made on American food from all over the world.

The food supplies that have been required have been enough to stagger credulity. To produce, store, and channel to the battlefront these vast quantities of food has been a tremendous task. You cannot produce food by waving a magic wand. It takes hard work and long hours. We must not censure the farmers if they are unable to produce enough of all kinds of food to meet an unlimited world demand.

I want to tell you something about the difficulties that the War Food Administration has faced.

We began by holding farm meetings in every State, in each of the 3,000 counties, and in each of the several thousand communities that make up this broad, big country. We told the farmers of the food needs and asked them to set the goals they thought they could meet and do their best. They voluntarily set goals that no one thought they could reach but which they reached, and in many instances surpassed. We were met with tremendous transportation, storage, and manufacturing problems. Tank, gun, and shipyards have necessarily channeled much of the labor away from the farm, and at the same time came into direct conflict with farm machinery, which was badly needed to replace the lost manpower.

The War Food Administration has bought an average of more than $5,000,000 worth of food every day. Most of it was perishable. We dealt with 1,488 warehouses. Many times these warehouses were crowded and food had to be stored where the facilities were inadequate. Packaging materials were short. Labor was short. Materials were being used for war purposes. Farm machinery was short. It takes the same sort of materials to build a machine gun that it does to build a plow. No one wanted a machine gun to be taken out of the hands of one of the soldiers to make a plow, so we did the best we could with the tools at hand.

It is impossible to keep a constant supply of all foods available for the home front when fighting a global war. From time to time changes in military plans required us to divert large quantities of food into the manufacture of war materials. At the beginning of 1944, I was called into conference and told that it was necessary to take 900,000 tons from our sugar supplies and 160,000,000 bushels of wheat to make industrial alcohol for synthetic rubber; that several hundred thousand trucks and landing craft were needed at once and these would require rubber. They were to be used in the invasion of France. It was a severe drain on our food program because both sugar and wheat were then in short supply. The Philippines, which had furnished us as much as a million tons of sugar per year, were in the hands of the Japs. Some other producing areas were overrun and out of production.

Difficulties arose as to many other commodities. These problems had to be met and faced. There are hundreds of food commodities, all involving problems. In addition to all these difficulties, we have undertaken to hold the price line. The Office of Price Administration had a very difficult assignment. We have worked with them in endeavoring to stabilize prices. Notwithstanding the purchasing power of the American people and notwithstanding some of the items that were in short supply, we have sought to keep the situation as well-balanced as the uncertainties of seasons and changing war needs would permit. In one period of a year in which the feed supplies were scarce, we brought in 176,000,000 bushels of wheat and barley from Canada for feed. Even with this importation there was a tremendous shortage of feed for hogs, beef and dairy cattle, sheep, and poultry. Lack of feed is the nightmare of the livestock producer. A surplus of anything is usually followed by a shortage.

Let's see what happened to hogs. There was a tremendous production in the winter of 1943. Sufficient feed simply could not be had. We asked farmers all over the country to increase feed production in every possible way and to grow all the livestock that we could possibly produce and secure feed for. The goals were set on the basis of securing the greatest possible production all along the line.

At that very time in the spring of 1944 when the supply of corn and wheat was insufficient to feed our supply of hogs, cattle, sheep, and milch cows, it became necessary to set aside for the Army 70,000,000 bushels of corn, already desperately short, to make penicillin, explosives, chemicals, castings for airplane engines, and other items needed for strictly war purposes. It therefore became necessary to freeze the movement of corn for a period of 60 days. This was a necessary war measure but its enforcement discouraged farmers in their hog production and perhaps contributed to their inability to meet the goals which had been set for hog production.

The Office of Price Administration has had many difficulties in securing fair distribution. It was necessary to ration at one time or another the food items which could not be produced in quantities sufficient to meet all the demands.

This was naturally irritating to the American public, who have been traditionally accustomed to buying what they want, at any time they want it, at such price as they are willing to pay, and in such quantities as their hearts desire. This could naturally not be done in wartime.

Today we have another great problem—that of helping to provide food for millions of hungry and some starving peoples in the numerous liberated countries in Europe. It is in our own interest to make contributions to this cause. Otherwise, the fruits of the war will be lost and chaos might result. Permanent peace cannot be had in a hungry world. The relief needs in this war are far greater than in the First World War. They cover a much greater area and many more millions of people are involved. Only Belgium, which has a small area, and a portion of France were overrun in the last war. Practically all of Europe, a portion of North Africa, and about half of Russia and China, besides the Philippines and Pacific islands, have been overrun in this war.

This Nation has had the job of providing food for two major wars at the same time—a vast army in Europe, another in the Pacific, and feeding American soldiers fighting all over the world.

It will be impossible for anyone, no matter how capable he may be, or any group of men however efficient, to handle all these vast problems without making some mistakes. We must rely upon whatever satisfaction may come in knowing that along with the farmers and all other people in this country, we have worked long hours under difficult circumstances in an effort to secure the best possible results. Fortunately, most of the American people have caught the spirit. They are willing to make whatever small sacrifices they may be called upon to make in using substitute foods and thus contributing their part to the war effort, realizing at all times that whatever sacrifices they may make will be but faintly typical of the hardships that our heroic soldiers, sailors, and marines have endured.

In spite of the difficulties our armed forces must continue to be well fed. We will continue to help our fighting allies. Our own people must continue to have enough wholesome food, and we will continue to contribute our part to the relief of hungry and starving people. This is a practical matter and a part of the war itself.

The primary purpose of the War Food Administration is to aid in securing production of food. We are proud of the all-time production in each of the three war years. Credit for this goes primarily to the American producer. Anyone who sells the American farmer short makes a mistake.

These are but a few of the many problems that our organization has faced. We will continue to carry on. The thousands of men in our organization who have worked without recognition and who have accepted criticism uncomplainingly will continue to carry on. The production, handling, storing, transporting, loading, unloading, and preserving of our perishable food supply is and will continue to be a gigantic task. It must be handled with speed. It must go forward each day. It must be kept flowing to the war fronts. Our farmers and ranchmen must continue their all-out production effort until the end of the war in all its phases.

American food like other materials of war, must go forward with our armies until the Japanese Empire is crushed, until our victory is complete, and a free world has a chance to build itself anew.

The Wagner Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "At Last—The Needed Wagner Law Reform" on the subject of the Wagner Act, published in the Cleveland News of June 21, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT LAST—THE NEEDED WAGNER LAW REFORM

The Wagner law to protect the organization and contract pursuit by our labor unions is now about 9 years old, its practical application about 7. Of all the reforms of the New Deal, it has been the most sweeping, the cause of greatest upheaval of our life and times.

It was intended to give labor unions and their organizations a legal and actual advantage. It has. The unionization of at least the principal industrial fields of America has resulted from it.

To enforce and interpret it, the National Labor Relations Board was created, which has become one of the most important Federal agencies in determining the lot of workers and employers. In the act and in the Board, favoritism of the union movement has been implicit and deliberate. No employer, under the Wagner law, may resist the unionization of his employees or stall off in any way the free proselyting of them by the professional union organizer whose profit increases by the extent of the union he serves.

Once in a while the indifference of employees to unions has preserved a nonunion condition in a factory or industry, in spite of all efforts of unions and organizers; but in probably 90 percent of the industrial unions founded in the last 10 years, the Wagner law's one-sided provisions against employer pressure or defense has established these unions.

The Wagner law's wide protection of unionizing processes, even to the point of further favoring principally the CIO unions and occasionally the AFL unions over smaller or independent or local union organizations, probably has wide acceptance among the worker classes of the industrial centers. This is so accepted that early demands for repeal of the law have long since died away. In their place, among the great public not selfishly benefited by the unionizing processes, there has been born a feeling that the law should be more evenly constituted.

Not all the evils of industrial life are on the employer's side. Yet the employer is the only constrained target of the law. Not all the coercion in industrial workers' lives comes from the employer side. But that is the only coercion the law recognizes.

The word most applied to the act by those who do not uphold it, as is, out of selfish hopes or selfish gratitude, is "jughandled." That is quite accurate. Only one class of our citizens can pick it up to advantage.

Meanwhile, oppressions by the unions' side of the industrial equation have grown and gone to deeper root. Many workers are at the mercy of union bosses as well intrenched today as the most unscrupulous employers were 30 years ago.

It will pay us to remember that there is no legal reason why these union injustices should not exist. The law is not against them.

When this newspaper was publishing a series of editorials and disclosures back in 1938 about the bias and distorted favoritism of the early NLRB, the point and the moral to nearly every exposure was that the Wagner law, as it stands, fertilizes prounion favoritism of the rankest—and often racketeering—type.

We felt certain that the day would come when the law's protection of free union activity would be preserved in a two-sided act. That finally emerged yesterday at Washington when Senators HAROLD H. BURTON, JOSEPH BALL, and CARL A. HATCH, of international cooperation fame, brought forth a Federal labor-management bill intended to supplant and widen the Wagner law.

These are three pretty good Senators, all independent of their parties to a great degree of their thinking and voting. None is antilabor. None belongs to the violently anti-New Deal segments of either political party.

They have drawn a bill which would put comparable responsibilities on the unions as are now on employers. They have no purpose to withdraw the law's responsibilities from the employers. Under this bill, the jug would have an opposite handle, and both sides of the industrial equation could pick it up usefully.

The detailed proposals by which they would accomplish this will be reviewed in the news columns from now on. We will have much to say about them in the days ahead. We wish to say only this now—here is a reform long overdue; here is the move to correct injustice and one-sided inequality by extending, not removing, the principles of justice.

Nothing more important to America's internal future will be before Congress this year.

United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

AMERICANS UNITED FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION, INC.
Washington D. C., June 28, 1945.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are joining with many of the largest national organizations in asking that July 4 be made an occasion for public celebration of the United Nations Charter. The enclosed statement shows the widespread and wholehearted support which this proposal has received among national organizations. They are asking their local affiliates throughout the country to participate in this observance of the July 4 holiday.

We hope that you will add your authoritative discussion of the charter to your address in the event that you may be speaking on July 4.

It is our hope that all public gatherings on that appropriate holiday may use for their theme this great step toward peace and interdependence for all peoples throughout the world.

Sincerely,

ULRIC BELL,
Executive Vice President.

The signing of the United Nations Charter, drafted by the cooperative effort of 50 nations in San Francisco, is an event of such deep significance as to warrant special recognition and acclaim. We feel that no more appropriate action could be taken by the American people than to dedicate the forthcoming ceremonies on July 4 to the joint celebration of our national independence and of the establishment of machinery for international cooperation which alone can assure security in an interdependent world. Recognizing that no device can be effective without positive and continuing support of the peoples themselves, we call upon the people of this great democracy to express their determination that this charter shall mark the birth of an orderly and peaceful world society, so that the great sacrifices of the United Nations may not be vitiated by recurring wars. In this spirit we ask that the Fourth of July celebrations in every community in the land be used to express our appreciation for the achievement of the Charter of the United Nations Organizations.

Americans United for World Organization, Hugh Moore, president.

American Association for the United Nations, Clark Eichelberger, director.

American Association of University Women, Helen C. White, president.

American Council on Education, Dr. George Zook, president.

American Farm Bureau Federation, Edward A. O'Neal, president.

American Federation of Labor, William Green, president.

American Federation of Teachers, Joseph F. Landis, president.

American Jewish Committee, Marcus Cohn.

American Jewish Conference, I. L. Kenen, executive secretary.

American Library Association, Dr. Carl H. Milam, executive secretary.

American Legion, Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander.

American Veterans Committee, Charles Bolte, chairman.

Catholic Association for International Peace, Thomas H. Mahoney, chairman.

Church Pease Union, Dr. Henry Atkinson, general secretary.

Common Council for American Unity, Read Lewis, executive director.

Congress of Industrial Organizations, Philip Murray, president.

Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. Julius Talmadge, president general.

Disabled American Veterans, Milton D. Cohn, national commander.

Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president.

Federal Union, Clarence Streit, president.

Food for Freedom, Harold Weston, executive secretary.

Freedom House, George Field, executive secretary.

Friends of Democracy, Dr. L. M. Birkhead, chairman.

General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. La Fell Dickinson, president.

Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts and Sciences, Hannah Dorner, president.

Institute of International Education, Stephen Duggan.

Lions International, David A. Skeen, president.

Military Order of the Purple Heart, Frank Haley, national service director.

National Association of Secondary School Principles, Dr. Paul E. Elicker, executive secretary.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Mrs. William A. Hastings, president.

National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, John H. Davis, executive secretary.

National Council of Jewish Women, Mildred G. Welt, national president.

National Council of Negro Women, Inc., Mrs. Mary McCleod Bethune, president.

National Education Association, F. L. Schlagle, president.

National Farmers Union, James Patton, president.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Margaret A. Hickey, president.

National Grange, Albert A. Goss, master.

National Lawyers Guild, Hon. Robert Kenny, president.

National League of Women Voters, Anna Lord Strauss, president.

National Women's Trade Union League, Elizabeth Christman, executive secretary.

Railway Labor Executives Association, A. E. Lyon, executive secretary.

Southern Baptist Convention Committee on World Peace, J. M. Dawson, chairman.

United Christian Council for Democracy, Rev. Richard Morford, executive secretary.

United Council of Church Women, Mrs. Harper Sibley, president.

United States Associates, International Chamber of Commerce, John P. Gregg, executive director.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation, Mrs. Burnett Mahone, executive director.

Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace, Mrs. Norman de R. Whitehouse, national chairman.

World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, Dr. Henry Atkinson.

Young Women's Christian Association, Mrs. James Irwin.

Portland Depot Canteen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday Oregonian of June 24, 1945:

PORTLAND DEPOT CANTEEN: IT'S KNOWN FROM ROME TO RYUKYUS—SERVICEMEN EN ROUTE TO DESTINATIONS UNKNOWN FIND CHEERING HOSPITALITY IN STOP-OFF HERE; EVERYTHING IS FREE

(By Virginia Corning and Clara Shepard)

The early morning air was damp, with a slight chill in it, when the boy in khaki stepped out of the darkness into the lights and warmth of Portland's Red Cross Depot Canteen. It would be a long wait between trains—and he just had to have a cup of coffee.

But he wouldn't accept anything else. "Just coffee," he insisted, politely but wistfully. And it took a lot of urging and explanation from the hostesses to make him change his mind. Before he left, he had made up for lost time. He had consumed two full servings of hot cakes, plus fruit juice and cereal—topping off his breakfast with a generous serving of pie and ice cream.

Tactful questioning by canteen workers revealed that the boy's last meal had been 24 hours earlier. He was broke—and when he first wandered into the canteen, he just couldn't believe that everything was free.

That's one of the notable things about the hospitality of the Red Cross Depot Canteen and its comrade activity, the USO lounge. It's all of first quality—and, even in these days of soaring prices, it's all free.

Looking back upon 2 years of highly successful operation, since June 6, 1943, the Red Cross-USO Building in the rose gardens of Portland's Union Station is a heartening example of the pull-together spirit the war has developed. At the same time it is unique in being the only soldiers' canteen in the country where the Red Cross combines forces with other organizations, and the several groups who have had to do with its financing and maintenance are proud of its service to Uncle Sam's nephews and nieces.

Relaxation, food, cheer, and an atmosphere of friendly interest and personal attention—all are entirely without cost to the thousands of boys and girls in khaki and navy blue, who pass through the gates of Portland's war-busy Union Depot.

UNION SUPPLIED FUND FOR STRUCTURE

When, early in 1943, the Steam and Marine Fitters' Union, Local 235, AFL, decided to contribute a piece of equipment to Multnomah County Chapter of the Red Cross, their first idea was to give an ambulance or other motorized equipment. On consultation with Red Cross officials, however, the union executive board learned that the Red Cross was at that time very much interested in the creation of a canteen and lounge for service personnel, to be located at the Union Station.

When this suggestion was brought to their attention by the board, the union's membership voted $15,000 for the construction of such a building. On June 7, 1943, the dual-purpose structure, designed by Glenn Stanton and Hollis Johnston, was formally dedicated and, since that date, has been in constant operation. On the left-hand side of the entrance hall is the lounge, staffed by the USO. On the right is the canteen operated by the Red Cross.

Both achieved an instant popularity. When on two different occasions it has been found advisable to expand the building, the union provided the needed financial support. To date, it has contributed a total sum of $29,000.

The site on the grounds of the depot was given for the duration by the Northern Pacific Terminal Co., and other donors have assisted in equipping the building.

The Travelers' Aid of the Union Station is in charge of the commodious USO lounge, where ever-changing groups of USO hostesses provide a homelike atmosphere. There are showers and cots; desks and paper; a grand piano and a record player; deep chairs for sprawling; a sign above the bookshelves reading, "Take one with you on the train"; and scores of magazines, to be read depending upon the season, on the rose-bordered terrace or in front of a fire of crackling Oregon fir. A large check room for dunnage is also in charge of the USO—a facility greatly appreciated by travel-weary servicemen.

PATRON REVEALS HE HEARD ABOUT IT IN ROME

Directly across the reception hall from the hospitable front door shines the cherry-red sign of the Red Cross canteen—symbol of welcome known to service personnel the world over. Fifty-two pairs of legs can be thrust under its food counters and the two large tables.

With a thousand or more meals served every day, the Portland's Red Cross canteen has been given an extensive word-of-mouth publicity campaign. Red Cross canteen workers chat with servicemen from every part of America who have heard reports of Portland's Red Cross hospitality.

"Do you know where I heard about this place?" said a young soldier from Brooklyn.

"New York City?" hazarded a canteen hostess, placing a wedge of apple pie on the counter before him.

"No," said the soldier, pausing for a moment to give his words the proper effect. "In Rome."

And he went on to explain: "I heard about the Portland canteen when I was across the Atlantic, and I made up my mind some day I was going to see this city of Portland. But I didn't know how quick it was going to be."

There was little time for sightseeing on this occasion, however. The soldier, now on his way to the Pacific theater, had only an hour left before train time. He decided to spend it taking a bus ride up Broadway—to see the city whose Red Cross canteen is talked about even in Rome.

A canteen, however modern and well planned, does not operate automatically. It takes 120 volunteer woman-hours every day, including Sundays, to staff the one at the depot. Red Cross canteeners work hard. All are graduates of the standard Red Cross nutrition course, followed by a 20-hour canteen training course. The chapter boasts some 500 such volunteers—their working schedules at the fingertips of Miss Isabella Gauld, volunteer canteen chairman.

More than 1,000 are fed daily. One day near Christmas chalked up a record of 2,000 uniformed guests who went away with faces wreathed either in a smile or a sandwich. During the canteen's first year and a half of operation, approximately 500,000 meals were slid across its counters.

Nothing ersatz ever has a place on the shelves of the depot canteen. Everything is the real McCoy—from the maple sugar syrup, mingled with country butter, that trickles over the hotcakes at 6:30 in the morning, to the last bite of mountain huckleberry pie that bulges the cheek of a fightingman as he makes a dash for the late evening train.

Fruit juices, cereals, cakes, and coffee are the order of the day from 6:30 till 11:30 a. m. For the rest of the day, the menu includes soup; a sandwich plate, with salad; doughnuts, pie, ice cream, coffee, tea, or milk. Sandwich fillings are of three kinds—chopped, hardcooked eggs, cheese, and meat. Victory gardeners have found special places in their hearts for the depot canteen, and each summer have provided extras in the shape of salad fixings, bowls of cherries, plums, or pears. Through their generosity, too, huge bowls of steaming hot corn on the cob have adorned the counters at the appropriate season.

On one occasion a big-hearted taxi driver came beaming in with two cases of eggs. A grateful serviceman contributed half of a suitcaseful of avocadoes, which he was taking home with him on a furlough from California. And there have been numerous other gifts.

Canteeners work from 6:30 in the morning till 11:30 at night, on three shifts with seven or eight women to a shift. Volunteer drivers from the Red Cross motor corps are pressed into service to see that all arrive safely home at night. Work at the canteen is done according to definite schedule, with tasks divided into six classifications: Right counter, dishes; left counter, pie; center counter, sandwiches. Canteeners change from one to another on the striking of each hour.

WORKERS SERVE HOT CAKES TO VISITING VETS

The center-counter worker deals principally with coffee, virtually making the brew with her right hand and dealing it with her left. If she works on the last shift, she also makes the sirup for the morning hotcakes—making sure to leave at least 4 gallons of it, in addition to the filled jugs. The sandwich job would stagger a less hardy worker than a canteen artist. There are not only mountainous stacks of sandwiches to be put together, but the fillings must be made and tasted first.

Volunteers find their hours of service anything but monotonous—with an ever-changing sequence of happenings that may be pathetic or amusing. Unexpected emergencies, too, provide their undercurrent of excitement.

There was the occasion when, at 8:15 p. m., canteen workers telephoned Miss Gauld to report a very quiet evening—so quiet, in fact, that they hesitated to make a further supply of coffee or to prepare additional refreshments.

At 10:15 Miss Gauld received another telephone call. Over 300 sailors had suddenly thronged into the canteen, stretching the regular capacity of 50 to its elastic limits. The sailors had had dinner on the train several hours earlier, but it hadn't been enough

to satisfy them, even at the time. Now they were even hungrier. Piled up 4 and 5 deep at the counters, they consumed canteen food with a lack of ceremony that was frightening, but flattering.

A phase of depot-canteen work, not so well known to the public, springs into action on occasions when troop trains arrive for a brief stay in the Portland railroad yards. At such a time an onlooker in the canteen might well survey with amazement the production line of 1,200 sandwiches and 25 gallons of hot coffee in glass jugs, which canteen volunteers prepare to rush aboard the train—since doughboys or sailors, under such circumstances are not allowed to leave their cars. An order from the officer in charge asking for lunch for his 600 boys, can be dispatched during their 15-minute stop-over without a moment's notice.

GRATITUDE EXPRESSED OFTEN BY CANTEEN GUESTS

Sometimes these days, it's the trainloads of boys on their way back from foreign theaters, rather than en route to the front, who are benefited by the Red Cross canteen service.

Portland hospitality will long be remembered by the 297 men aboard a hospital train on their way to the naval hospital at Farragut, Idaho, for treatment of battle wounds received in the Pacific. Through an oversight the train had left California for Farragut without any reading material. A telegram was dispatched to Portland, seeking Red Cross aid.

Canteen workers in Portland were ready for the train's arrival at 7:30 in the evening. Miss Gauld and her canteen crew commandeered a red cap's cart, piled it high with supplies, and personally wheeled it to the tracks. There they distributed to the wounded veterans not only magazines and newspapers but ice cream, cigarettes, gum, and candy.

The men were still talking about it when they reached Farragut. "Tell the people of Portland—and the Red Cross in particular—we appreciate their kindness," they told the press—and the Portland papers relayed the story to the public. But it was only one instance among many which go unreported except by the soldiers, sailors, and marines who will long remember the sincere interest of Portland's Red Cross canteen crews.

The depot canteen has refuted the old adage that there is no such thing as gratitude. Letters, bills left snuggled under a sandwich plate, and even a few homesick tears have borne testimony to the fact that USO and Red Cross kindliness are appreciated the world over. A letter such as the following one from a parent is reward for the long hours of work given by canteen volunteers.

"DEAR FOLKS: Our 18-year-old Tommy arrived at home this morning after 7 weeks' boat training at San Diego. He stopped in Portland tired, lonesome—was 'treated swell' at your canteen.

"Thank you so much. The Red Cross has come home to me."

OPA Cursed, But Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, refusing to even consider simple offered legislation which would have stabilized prices of merchandise and payment of wages, prevented inflation, and encouraged production, the New Dealers forced through the overstaffed bureaucratic OPA bill. Its interpretation and administration by the bureaucrats has probably caused more dissatisfaction and bitter criticism than any law put upon the books in recent years.

Upon the solemn promise of its administrators to mend their ways in June of 1944, Congress amended the act and extended its life for a year. This week OPA was back before the House again asking for another extension but it was still needlessly oppressing the people. OPA was established to hold down prices, to conserve food, to encourage production. To a certain extent it has held down prices but speaking broadly it has neither conserved food nor encouraged production. Examples which justify that charge are many. Let me cite a few—today the housewife goes to the market and often can purchase but six eggs at a price of 55 cents a dozen. Not long ago 1,440,000,000 eggs, which because of OPA and other Federal agencies, had been stored too long, and for which there was not the usual demand, went on the market at 6 cents a case of 30 dozen per case, or about 60 eggs for 1 cent. They were used for the manufacture of fertilizer, stock, hog, or poultry food.

Earlier, after a scarcity of potatoes, carloads went on city dumps. Twenty million pounds of lard was permitted to spoil while lard and bacon were rationed, and at times almost unpurchaseable. Most people are familiar with the present meat shortage.

The Philadelphia Inquirer of June 21 states that at Milford, Del., not far from Washington, because of bureaucratic bungling by WFA, 5,000 chickens, part of a load of 9,000 chickens, became unfit for food when Washington refused to permit them to be moved.

In an adjoining column, W. S. B. Woodward, Market Research Director of the WFA, announced there were no chickens on the wholesale market for civilians in Philadelphia.

Most sensible people in southwestern Michigan know that in their locality there is, during the summer and fall, a surplus of berries and fruit. The sensible thing to do is to can or process that surplus. Housewives are hampered in doing that because of a lack of sugar. The scarcity is due in part to OPA's refusal to allow producers and refiners a fair price.

Commercial plants cannot can or process berries because of an OPA regulation which fixes the price on, for example, fresh strawberries at 24 cents per pound and prohibits the canners or the processors from selling a pound for more than 17¾ cents. Illustrations might be multiplied almost indefinitely.

In the debate on the bill to extend the life of OPA the New Dealers and many of the Democrats frankly conceded that many of its rules and regulations tend to destroy business; that its administration has been unfair and unjust in many instances; that it has not kept its promise made a year ago to correct its errors and cease abuse of its powers granted it.

Nevertheless, arguing that it was necessary, that OPA would reform and be good during the coming months, the administration with its yes men and its rubber stamps, steam rollered the bill through the House without adequate amendment. Why not insist OPA reform now, before it is granted a new lease on life?

None will criticize because of any personal inconveniences, because of any shortage of any item which is necessary to aid in the war effort. On the other hand, when we all know that if permitted to do so our farms and our factories, our farmers and our industrial workers will produce an abundance of food and of merchandise sufficient to supply the needs of all; the people are resentful of bureaucratic orders which hamper their productive efforts.

If during the coming months you are short of food, of machinery, of household necessities, of clothing, do not blame anyone but the present administration and its bureaucrats.

President Truman has promised to see to it that his new Secretary of Agriculture, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, will provide a remedy for the shortages. We wish him luck, but are fearful that unless he spanks OPA and makes it be good, he and the Secretary of Agriculture will not be successful in their effort. We hope he forces the necessary reform.

Communist Activities Directed Toward United States Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the House Committee on Military Affairs:

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES DIRECTED TOWARD UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

This study is more in the nature of a compilation than an original contribution to material on the subject of communism; and, save for an essential general background, it confines that subject to the Army, endeavoring, through the media of excerpts from authoritative and official Communist public statements, to outline the attitude of communism toward our national defense, particularly the military arm.

No effort is made to trace the ramifications of communism here and abroad; while to chart the sinuosities of the Communist Party of America throughout its innumerable front organizations and cell structures would call for an expenditure of time and effort poorly recompensed by the results achieved. Meanwhile identities would have been lost ere those results could be projected. One organization, for example, has changed its name a dozen times in a very few years; its "spots," however, have always remained the same.

II

On February 22, 1945, the War Department made public the information that it had inaugurated a new policy by removing the ban on Communists. This new policy was acknowledged by The Adjutant General, Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, in a letter to Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO (Michigan). General Ulio, reviewing the development of policy bearing upon Communists in the

Army, stated that it was easy to enforce the ban before passage of the Selective Service Act. The draft made it more difficult, he noted, to enforce the Hatch Act, which excludes from the military services persons who advocate overthrow of the Government. Legal proof of membership in the Communist Party was necessary under the law, he continued, and in conclusive proof might provide an escape corridor from the draft.

"As a preliminary step, pending determination of proof of membership, the Army excluded from officer rank persons strongly suspected of membership in the Communist Party or who appeared to be consistent followers of the Communist Party line. They were also not admitted to sensitive duties.

"Long experience and careful investigation showed conclusively the virtual impossibility of developing actual legal proof of membership in the Communist Party on the part of persons desiring to conceal such membership.

"Long experience in handling cases of this character has convinced the War Department that mere sympathy with a given ideology or suspected membership in a given organization neither legally nor as a matter of abstract justice furnishes sufficient justification for adverse action.

"It has been found that the only sound, though difficult, solution of this problem is to base action on the attitude and actions of the individual rather than on his alleged connection."

General Ulio called attention to a letter to commanding officers issued February 5, 1944, which established "individual attitudes and actions as the basis of restrictive determination." It did not, he noted, single out any organization or ideology, but "placed the policy squarely on the question of loyalty to the Government of the United States on the part of the individual in question." During the remainder of 1944, he continued, "Cases continued to be resolved purely on suspected sympathy with communism." Then, on December 30, the new directives were issued. "Consideration was given to the fact that persons in the Army suspected of, but not proved to be, Communists had not proved to be a source of any difficulty and were loyally supporting the war effort," he wrote. "There seemed little justification, therefore, not to use the services of such persons to the fullest in all capacities for which they were qualified."

"Application of this procedure will be watched with great care and it will be modified as may be shown necessary in the light of experience or in the light of changed conditions. No person who, after thorough investigation, is suspected by the War Department of disloyalty, has been given access to secret Army equipment or to any vital Army matters." [1]

Very soon after becoming apprised of the situation, the American Legion urged the War Department to withdraw immediately its recent directive "permitting Communists to attain officer rank and serve in positions involving military security." National Commander Edward N. Scherberling declared:

"The American Legion is unalterably opposed to permitting any person to hold a commission in the armed forces of this Nation whose loyalty is not solely to the Government of the United States."

Commander in Chief Jean A. Brunner, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, pointed out that the VFW had traditionally opposed recognition of Communists and their doctrines. Brunner described the War Department decision as "an open challenge to the millions of Americans fighting in the ranks without commissions to preserve the very American liberties and American way of life the Communists scheme and strive to destroy."

[1] Chicago Tribune Press Service, February 22, 1945.

For several days following the February 22 announcement of the War Department, the metropolitan press was bombarded with denials from Army men high in authority that any Communists held commissions in the Army. The Chicago Tribune then gave the names of 10 Army officers "about whose Communist connections there can be little question in the light of official records," [2] and several days later Earl Browder, in his new role of president of the Communist Political Association, issued two statements, to wit:

"(a) There actually are 'some 13,000 Communists in the armed forces.'

"(b) Of course there are Communists holding commissions in the United States Army."

Browder amplified these statements with the declaration:

"It is time to bring Attorney General Biddle and the Department of Justice into line with the War Department and the State Department—as well as with the President, who has learned the value of rubbing elbows with Communists in friendly cooperation at least in other lands." [3]

At the very beginning of the agitation provoked by Adjutant General Ulio's statement, Chairman MAY, of the House Committee on Military Affairs, named a special committee from the full committee to investigate the whole question of Communists in the United States Army. To that investigation this study is related by way of prologue.

III

Modern communism may be said to have begun in January 1848, when Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, two German radicals, brought forth the manifesto of the Communist Party, which is accepted as the gospel of that society.

The first International Association of Workers (popularly known as the First International), established in London September 28, 1864, was based to some extent on the manifesto. It survived until 1872, by which time the organization had become so dominated by anarchists that Marx withdrew.

In 1889, 6 years after the death of Marx, the Second International was held in Paris. This was more strongly Marxian than the First International had been. The majority of its members still placed loyalty to country above subjection to party, however, as a result of which the First World War disrupted the Second International. It was thoroughly repudiated later by the disciples of Lenin.

In March 1917, when Czar Nicholas II submitted his abdication, Nikolai Lenin, the founder of communism as we know it today, was in exile in Switzerland. His coadjutor, Leon Trotsky, who was some years later forced to leave Russia and was assassinated in Mexico, was then living in the Bronx, N. Y.

The United States was the first nation to recognize (March 20, 1917) the Provisional Russian Government under the Duma, the principles of which were, in the main, in harmony with those of our own country supported by both major political parties of that period.

On November 7, 1917, following a plan carefully concocted by Lenin and Trotsky, the blow of armed revolt was struck which deposed Alexander Kerensky and drove him into exile. About a month after this revolt a constituent assembly, which had previously been called by Kerensky, was elected, but because the Communists failed to elect a majority of the members the assembly was dissolved by Lenin.

It was for the purpose of carrying out the revolutionary program of the Communist Party that the Third or Communist International, popularly known as the Comintern, was organized by Lenin at Moscow in March 1919. It had its genesis in 1915–16 in Switzerland as a result of conferences of radical groups of the Second International. This was where Lenin first gained prominence as the international leader of the left-wing Socialists or Communists.

In September 1919 a convention of American extremists was held in Chicago, made up of left-wingers of the old Socialist Party and other radicals. This was the beginning of the Communist Party of America. The special committee to investigate Communist activities in the United States (House Rept. No. 2290, 71st Cong., 3d sess., January 17, 1931), stated that a Japanese, Sen Katayama, represented the American Communist Party and was its spokesman at Moscow for a decade. To quote from this House report (first parenthesis inserted):

"Almost as soon as the American Communist Party was organized it was driven under cover on account of its legality (illegality?). In December 1921, the Workers' Party of America was formed as a camouflage for the real Communist Party of America, which maintained its existence underground. In 1925 the official name was changed to Workers' (Communist) Party of America, and at a convention held in March 1928, the Communists finally threw off all camouflage and boldly came out into the open as the Communist Party of the United States of America, section of the Communist International, which is their present name."

In a memorandum from the Chief of the Division of Russian Affairs to our Under Secretary of State, submitted in October 1919, he states:

"The interrelation of the Bolsheviks, the Russian Soviets, and the Third International is such, in fact, that while the three may be distinguished theoretically, in practice they represent a single movement; backed by the administrative machinery and the resources of Soviet Russia.

"The program of the Russian Communist Party is one of world revolution, and the Communist International is avowedly the directing and coordinating center of an international revolutionary movement to establish the World Soviet Republic. It is impossible to differentiate as to world policy between the Russian Communist Party, the Third or Communist International, and the official Soviet administration, because of the system of interlocking directorates. * * *

"Therefore, while the Soviet institutions, as such, may agree to abstain from subversive propaganda abroad, neither the Russian Communist Party nor the Third International would be bound thereby."

Secretary of State Hughes stated, in a later report:

"It is believed that the evidence presented by the Department of State established the unity of the Soviet Government, and the Communist International, all of which are controlled by a small group of individuals, technically known as the political bureau of the Russian Communist Party. Second, the spiritual and organic connection between this Moscow group and its agents in this country—the American Communist Party and its legal counterpart, the Workers' Party. Not only are these organizations the creation of Moscow, but the latter has also elaborated their program and controlled and supervised their activities. While there may have existed in the United States individuals, and even groups imbued with the Marxist doctrines prior to the advent of the Communist International, the existence of a disciplined party equipped with a program aiming at the overthrow of the institutions of this country by force and violence is due to the intervention of the Bolshevik organizations into the domestic political life of the United States. The essential fact is the existence of an organization in the United States created by and completely subservient to a foreign or-

[2] Chicago Tribune, March 1, 1945.

[3] Journal and American, New York, March 15, 1945.

ganization striving to overthrow the existing social and political order of this country. Third, the subversive and pernicious activities of the American Communist Party and the Workers' Party and their subordinates and allied organs in the United States are activities resulting from and flowing out of the program elaborated for them by the Moscow group."

William Z. Foster, thrice Communist candidate for the Presidency of the United States, assures us that—

"The Communist International is a world party, based upon the mass parties in the respective countries. It works out its policy by the mass principles of these parties in all its deliberations. It is a party that conducts the most fundamental examination of all questions that come before it and, when a decision is arrived at in any given instance, this decision the workers, with their customary sense of proletarian discipline, accept and put into effect * * *. The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag and that is the red flag."

Edgar Snow, in his recent article, Strong Men Around Stalin, quotes Joseph Vissarionovich Djugashvili (Stalin's birth name) as declaring:

"No important political or organizational problem is ever decided by our soviets and other mass organizations without directives from our (Communist) party. In this sense we may say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is, substantially, the dictatorship of the party as the force which effectively guides." [4]

Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution, put out by International Publishers Co.[5] "as one of a series of readings in Leninism," quotes from Joseph Stalin's Leninism (vol. 1, p. 74) in setting forth the aim of the "third stage, commenced after the October revolution," as follows:

"Consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a stronghold for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. The revolution goes beyond the confines of one country and the period of world revolution commences. The main forces of the revolution: The dictatorship of the proletariat in one country and the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries. Main reserves: The semiproletarian and small peasant masses in the advanced countries and the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries. Direction of the main blow; the isolation of the petty bourgeois democrats and the isolation of the parties of the Second International which constitutes the main support of the policy of compromise with imperialism. Plan for the disposition of forces: Alliance of the proletarian revolution with the liberation movement of the colonies and the dependent countries.

"Strategy deals with the main forces of the revolution and their reserves. It changes with the transition of the revolution from one stage to another, but remains essentially unchanged throughout the entire duration of a given stage."

In Pravda,[6] (1923, No. 56) Stalin says:

"Tactics constitute a part of strategy subordinated to it and serving it. Tactics are concerned not with war in general, but with its individual episodes, battles, and engagements. While the aim of strategy is to win the war, or, let us say, to bring the struggle against czarism to a conclusion, the aim of tactics, on the contrary, is to win engagements and battles, and successfully to conduct campaigns and operations that are more or less suited to the concrete situation of the struggle at any given moment.

"The most important task of tactics is to determine the ways and means, the forms and methods of fighting which best correspond to the concrete situation of the moment and are more certain to prepare the way for the strategical success. Consequently, the operation and results of tactics must be regarded not in isolation, not from the point of view of their immediate effect, but from the point of view of the aims and the possibilities of strategy.

* * * * *

"The duty of tactics is primarily as follows: While guided by the indication of strategy, and drawing on the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the workers of all countries, it must determine the forms and methods of fighting that are most closely in accord with the concrete situation of the struggle at the given moment.

* * * * *

"The aim of the art of warfare is to utilize all the various kinds of troops, to perfect them and to skillfully combine their operations.

"The same is true of the forms of organization in the political sphere. Here, as in the military sphere, the forms of organization are adapted to the forms of struggle."

In chapter VI, part 2 of the Program of the Communist International can be found the following: [7]

"In order that it may fulfill its historic mission of achieving the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Communist Party must first of all set itself to accomplish the following fundamental strategic aims:

"Extend its influence over the majority of the members of its own class, including working women and the working youth. To achieve this the Communist Party must secure predominant influence in the broad mass proletarian organizations (soviets, trade unions, factory councils, cooperative societies, sport organizations, cultural organizations, etc.)."

And, if the military organization was not then tacitly embraced in the "et cetera," it certainly was specifically included soon afterward.

Strategy and Tactics quotes from Lenin's Left Wing Communism, as follows:

"The main task of contemporary communism in western Europe and America is to acquire the ability to seek, to find, to determine correctly its concrete path or the particular turn of events which will bring the masses right up to the real, decisive, last, and most revolutionary struggle.

"Never play with insurrection; but when it is once begun, know firmly that it must be carried through to the end. Concentrate, at the decisive place and time, forces greatly superior to those of the enemy; otherwise the latter, better prepared and better organized, will destroy the insurgents. Once the insurrection has begun, it is necessary to act with the greatest determination, and, at all costs, on the offensive. The defensive is the death of every armed rising. Make sure of taking the enemy by surprise, and seize the moment when his troops are scattered. Endeavor to win successes each day, even small ones (one might say each hour in the case of one town), and at all costs maintain moral ascendancy."

Strategy and Tactics is authority for the declaration that:

"Communists must not limit themselves merely to issuing appeals to struggle for proletarian dictatorship, but must show the masses what they are to do today to defend themselves against capitalist plunder and Fascist barbarity. They must strive, through the joint action of the labor organizations, to mobilize the masses around a program of demands that are calculated really to shift the burden of the consequences of the crises to the shoulders of the ruling classes—of demands, the fight for whose realization will disorganize fascism, hamper the preparations for imperialistic war, weaken the bourgeoisie, and strengthen the positions of the proletariat."

The Program of the Communist International requires that— [8]

"The Communist parties must openly recognize the right of the colonies to separation and their right to carry on propaganda for this separation, i. e., propaganda in favor of the independence of the colonies from the imperialist state; they must recognize their right of armed defense against imperialism (i. e., the right of rebellion and revolutionary war) and advocate and give active support to this defense by all the means in their power. The Communist parties must adopt this line of policy in regard to all oppressed nations.

* * * * *

"The Communist parties in imperialist countries, while supporting the struggle proceeding in the colonies, must carry on a campaign in their own respective countries for the withdrawal of imperialist troops, conduct propaganda in the army and navy in defense of the oppressed countries fighting for their liberation, mobilize the masses to refuse to transport troops and munitions, and in connection with this, organize strikes and other forms of mass protest, etc."

It may be remarked at this point that the importance to their cause of obtaining converts in the colonies of the so-called imperialistic powers has not been overlooked by the Communists, and in the category of the colonies they place Cuba, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Puerto Rico, Panama, Nicaragua, the Philippines, and other Territories which the United States has in the past held, or now maintains tutelary possession. Leon Platt, in his Struggle for the Comintern in America, says:

"The increasing pressure of the imperialist world on the colonial countries inevitably leads to a growing resistance on the part of the colonial people against imperialism and the growing class differentiation in the colonies, where the working class is also assuming the role of the leader of the national liberation movement."

And in Building Socialism in the Soviet Union, he asserts:

"The successful building of socialism and the great improvement of the conditions of the working class and the superiority of Soviet economy over the capitalist economy serves as an inspiration to the exploited workers of the capitalist countries and to the oppressed people in the colonial and semicolonial countries, encouraging them to throw off the capitalist class in their own country and follow the example of the Russian workers and establish a workers' and farmers' government under the leadership of the Communist Party."

IV

Serious thought and some activity had long been given by the Communist Party to the advantages which would accrue to their cause through control of the armed forces of the non-Soviet nations.

To quote from the Circular of General Instructions issued by a committee of the Soviet Government of Russia during the summer of 1919:

"The work of Bolshevist organizations in foreign countries is regulated as follows:

* * * * *

4. In the military sphere: (a) Carry on intensive propaganda among the troops. Cause misunderstandings between officers and soldiers. Unite the soldiers to assassination of the higher officers. (b) Blow up arsenals, bridges, tracks, powder magazines.

[4] Saturday Evening Post, March 24, 1945, p. 12.

[5] Official publishers of the Communists.

[6] Official publication of the Soviets.

[7] Quoted in Strategy and Tactics.

[8] Ch. VI, pt. 2.

Prevent the delivery of supplies of raw materials to factories and mills.

"Thus, the complete destruction of the army will be accomplished and the soldiers will adopt the program of the social democratic workers." (The Russian Soviet Regime, Doc. No. 3 of the Soviet Committee of the Soviet Government of Russia, p. 296.)

Comrade A. Piantnitsky, in the Twenty-one Conditions of Admission into the Communist International, lays down number—

"4. The duty of spreading communistic ideas includes the special obligation to carry on a vigorous and systematic propaganda in the army. Where this agitation is prohibited by exceptional laws, it is to be carried on illegally. Renunciation of such activities wolud be the same as treason to revolutionary duty and would be incompatible with membership in the Third International." (Quoted in vol. 1, hearings on H. Res. 282, August 16, 1938, p. 295.)

Excerpts from Theses and Resolutions, adopted at the Third World Congress of the Communist International, dealing with propaganda and agitation, provided that:

"The methods of propaganda in the armies and navies of capitalist states must be adapted to the peculiar conditions in each country. Antimilitarist agitation of a pacifist nature is extremely detrimental, and only assists the bourgeois in its efforts to disarm the proletariat. The proletariat rejects on principle and combats with the utmost energy, every kind of military institution of the bourgeois state, and the bourgeois class in general. Nevertheless, it utilizes these institutions (army, rifle clubs, citizen guard organizations, etc.) for the purpose of giving the workers military training for the revolutionary battles to come. Intensive agitation must therefore be directed not against the military training of the youth and workers, but against the militaristic regime, and the domination of the officers. Every possibility of providing the workers with weapons should most eagerly be taken advantage of.

"The class antagonisms, revealing themselves as they do in the materially favored positions of the officers as against the bad treatment and social insecurity of life of the common soldiers, must be made very clear to the soldiers. Besides, the agitation must bring home the fact to the rank and file that its future is inextricably bound up with the fate of the exploited classes. In a more advanced period of incipient revolutionary fermentation, agitation for the democratic election of all commanders by the privates and sailors and for the formation of soldiers' councils may prove very advantageous in undermining the foundations of capitalist rule.

"The closest attention and greatest care are always required when agitating against the picked troops used by the bourgeoisie in the class war, and especially against its armed volunteer bands.

"Wherever the social composition and corrupt conduct of those troops and bands make it possible, every favorable moment for agitation should be made use of for creating disruption. Wherever it possesses a distinct bourgeois class character, as for example, in the officers corps, it must be unmasked before the entire population, and made so despicable and repulsive, that they will be disrupted from within by virtue of their very isolation." (Hearings on H. Res. 282, 76th Cong., appendix, p. 268.)

It was not, however, until July 18 to August 27, 1928, during the sessions of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, that the American delegates were instructed to give consideration to the military question.

Among the instructions given the American delegates to the sixth congress were:

"To take into consideration the morale of the Army and the political situation in the country, and the demand for the election of officers which, as a rule can be advanced only when the Army has reached an advanced stage of disintegration.

"To link up closely political demands with the principal slogan of the Communist Party arming the proletariat, proletarian militia." (Daily Worker, July 27, 1927, p. 4.)

The congress said:

"These demands all have revolutionary significance only if they are linked up with a distinct political program for revolutionizing the bourgeois army.

"Special attention must be paid to organizing the soldiers for the protection of their own interests, in alliance with the revolutionary proletariat, prior to their being called up for service, during the period of military service (soldiers' councils) and also after the conclusion of military services (revolutionary ex-servicemen's leagues). It must be the special task of the trade-unions to help form the above-mentioned organizations.

"The conditions for revolutionary work in armies differ. Revolutionary work in the army must be linked up with the general revolutionary movement of the masses of the proletariat and poor peasantry.

"The main slogans upon which the democratic partial demands are based; disarm the bourgeoisie; arm the proletariat. The arming of the proletariat assumes various forms at various stages.

"In the period of the seizure of power—it takes the form of a proletarian militia, the guard, and also the Red guerrilla detachments.

"The Red Guard is an organ of the rebellion. It is the duty of the Communists to organize it when an immediate situation arises." (Daily Worker, July 27, 1929, p. 4.)

Communist followers and sympathizers were instructed to agitate the soldiers against war on the grounds that they are fighting for capitalists and not for their own interests, to show them that the only war worth fighting is one for their own liberation under a soviet.

Most if not all of these instructions have been endorsed at one time and one form or another since they were issued by the Sixth Communist International Congress of 1928.[9]

Three publications started about that time and distributed in camps, navy yards, and on vessels by agents of the Communists were the Soldiers' Voice, the Shipmate's Voice, and the Navy Yard Worker.

In the Tactics of Communism, a question-and-answer pamphlet distributed by the Right Reverend Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, D. D., appears the following:

"Query No. 49. Did Earl Browder, despite his love of America, advocate the united front tactics to win over the sailors and soldiers to foment revolution in America?

"Answer. Yes. Soldiers and sailors can be and must be won over for the revolution. All revolutions have been made with weapons which the overthrown rulers have relied on for their protection." (What Is Communism? p. 165.)

"Query No. 50. Has the International Communist Party ever recommended such a method?

"Answer. Yes. In seeking to prepare the transformation of a future imperialist war into a civil war, Communists must in every country concentrate their efforts on the essential portions of the imperialist military machine." (Thirteenth Plenary Session of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, December 1933, cf., International Correspondence, 1934, Nos. 1 and 2. The Communist, February 1934, p. 140.)

In the spring of 1928 the Daily Worker, leading Communist newspaper of America, initiated a special section (grouse sheet) under the caption "In the Army and Navy," where grievances, real or fancied, of corresponding soldiers were given publicity and Communist propagandizing activities among troops and ships were reported.

A resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, July–August 1928, declared that—

"A 'democratic' or 'just' peace cannot result from an imperialist war without the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the seizure of power by the proletariat in the most important belligerent states. Therefore, 'peace' cannot be the central slogan during imperialist war; the central slogan must be "proletarian revolution." It is the bounden duty of Communists strongly to combat all peace-phrase mongering; for at a certain moment in the war this can be utilized by the bourgeoisie as an extremely important ideological weapon to prevent the imperialist war from being transformed into civil war.

"Communists must not confine themselves merely to conducting propaganda in favor of this program; they must rouse the masses of the workers to fight for it by applying the tactics of the united proletarian front from below." [10]

The following is taken from the Daily Worker of August 10, 1928:

"SOLDIERS AID LEAGUE IN DISTRIBUTING PAPER

"(By a Worker correspondent)

"GARDNER, MASS.—The theoretical as well as practical training of our revolutionary youth is highly necessary, therefore the Young Workers (Communist) League has with the aid of sympathetic organizations been able to hold summer courses in various parts of this country where the teachings of Marx and Lenin may be expounded to the youth.

* * * * *

"The instructors, Kruth, Glotzer, and Bloomfield, are giving us a good and systematic training. They not only act as instructors but as comrades, and enter into our activities and sports as well as instructors in physical development.

"Recently at our regular unit meeting we decided to distribute the Young Worker to the soldiers of Camp Devens, 26 miles away from our school. This issue dealt with the Porter case and the struggle of the YWCL against the Citizens Military Training School and militarism."

In Inprecorr [11] for September 1, 1928, appears this statement:

"A beginning has been made in practical work in the Navy. Here we note the fraternization of the Young Communist League membrs with sailors in Philadlphia * * *. We have already begun some work in the Army through the sending in of some members. We have formulated demands for the soldiers. Here also can be noted a successful distribution of leaflets to soldiers from the inside on the eve of the sailing for service in the colonies * * *. Our press is being utilized increasingly among the military forces. We have established a special servicemen's and ex-servicemen's column in the Daily Worker. A mailing list of soldiers and sailors for the purpose of receiving weekly propaganda letters is being built up. * * *.

"The National Guard was recently called to do strike-breaking duty in the New Bedford strike. We issued an appeal which had some effect and increased the difficulties for obtaining volunteers to serve in this capacity.

"In reference to the attitude toward the CMTC (Citizens' Military Training Camps), the policy has been changed for some time. We no longer boycott this institution but on the contrary send selected workers into it."

[9] See particularly the Daily Worker, July 27, 1929, p. 4.

[10] A pamphlet published by Workers Library Publishers, New York, N. Y., July 1934.

[11] International Press Correspondence, the official organ of the Communist Third International, p. 1024.

About a month thereafter (October 6, 1928) the Washington Evening Star, which has never been accused of sensationalism, had the following to say:

"Hitherto Red activities in this country have been confined to inciting the proletariat to undermine the existing political order and to indulgence in excesses of various strikes in connection with labor disputes. In more recent times, as is now disclosed by the Third International's report, it has, in addition to its activities among the American civilian element, invaded the Military and Naval Establishments with deliberately seditious agitation.

"Among the marines in Nicaragua, among the marines and soldiers en route and in China, and even among the marines and sailors in navy yards in the United States, the Communists gloat that they have carried on their pernicious work. The report tells of mass meetings organized in the neighborhood of navy yards and of cooperation with the American Kuomintang, an alleged branch of the Chinese Nationalist movement.

"The Third International boasts brazenly that 'It is the first time in the history of the world' that the Communist crusade has ever been conducted within the ranks of a country's armed forces."

The Daily Worker of April 4, 1929, page 4, declared:

"The rapid expansion of American imperialism has given rise to a very rapid militarization. The United States has become one of the biggest military powers. It has the largest military budget of any country. It has already entered into a naval race with Great Britain for control of the sea, in which the United States is gaining headway. The United States has already assumed the characteristics of a gigantic capitalist military power. For universal conscription, it has substituted a strong and well-trained mercenary force, and large organized and unorganized reserves. The militarization of the entire population is proceeding rapidly. Industry is being prepared for wartime functioning.

"Through the CMTC, ROTC, and semimilitarist and militarist organizations, the youth is being militarized. Military organizations (American Legion) and semimilitary organizations (Boy Scouts) are receiving the fullest support from the capitalist class, and are becoming rapidly fused with the State apparatus, being transformed into direct State organizations. Compulsory military training is being introduced for the militarization of the youth. A military caste, the final product or symbol of modern militarism, is being created in the United States.

* * * * *

"On the basis of the beginnings of development toward mass organization the league can record certain successes in its practical work and improvement in its position Among these can be included: Active participation in strikes and the proper linking of the young workers with the strikers through relief activities; real antimilitarist work, including work in the armed forces; concrete steps toward the organization of the young workers—mining, textile, needle; orientation toward basic industry; consolidation of the league's position in the sports organization; the holding of district schools for improving the political level and training of functionaries.

* * * * *

"An important symptom of the semisectarian position of the league is the extremely poor social composition. This is an indication that the league has not yet understood how to orientate properly to the young workers and draw them into its ranks, how to develop the proletarian members and push them into leadership in the league.

"The small number of members in the basic industries, the absence of shop nuclei, unsystematic trade-union work, and failure to develop the youth sections of the new trade-unions, widespread provincialism, no contact with the revolutionary movement in the colonies, isolation from the Negro youth and the men in the armed forces—these are the indications that the league has really made only the beginning in the direction of mass organization, and still has a long distance to travel to become a mass organization.

* * * * *

"In beginning Communist antiwar work, in penetrating the armed forces of capitalism with the message of the proletariat revolutionary movement, the league has broken with all social democratic, pacifist traditions with which the American labor movement is laden. In continuing this activity with greater intensity utilizing the experiences of our brother leagues, the league will win mass influence among the young worker and in the armed forces of American imperialism. The answer of the league to the burdens of militarism and war that capitalism is placing upon the young workers is the mobilization of the young workers to struggle against imperialist wars, against capitalist militarism, for the defense of the Soviet Union, and for assistance to the revolutionary movement in the colonies.

"The answer of the league to the capitalist militarization campaign is a campaign against capitalist militarism, and for the disintegration of the forces of capitalist militarism and wars. For this purpose, the league should send its members into the armed force to carry on Communist work there, demoralize them as fighters for capitalism, and win them to the proletarian cause and fight for the demands of the members of the armed forces. The league also sends its members into the volunteer organization of capitalist militarization carrying on similar work there, but not tell the young workers to enter, and carry on a merciless struggle against these organizations and endeavoring to reach all sections of the working class in this work."

On July 27, 1929, the Daily Worker, page 4, stated:

"Although imperialist armies are a part of the bourgeois state apparatus, nevertheless, owing to mutual rivalries and wars among the capitalist states, modern armies are tending more and more directly or indirectly to embrace the whole Nation and to militarize it ('the armed nation') the militarization of women, military training of the youth, etc. This tendency subsided temporarily at the end of the World War; but at the same time, on the eve of a new war, it is manifesting itself again very strongly (United States, France, Poland). The immediate results of this tendency are, however, that the class antagonisms between the bourgeoise and the proletariat—between the exploiters and the exploited—are being reflected in the armies, between the officer class and the common people. In the words of Engels, mass militarism results in disintegration of all armies from within. Hence, Communists must not boycott bourgeois armies, but must join them and take revolutionary control of this objective of internal disintegration."

On August 2, 1929, the Daily Worker carried a directive declaring:

"The party and the Young Communist League must energetically conduct work of propaganda and agitation in the Army, Navy, Marines, and all armed forces, formulating a program of economic demands and complaints (such as increased pay for soldiers, improved maintenance, the establishment of regimental committees composed of soldiers' representatives, right to organize in trade-unions, and so on), linking up the struggle for these immediate demands with the struggle against imperialism and the struggle against imperialist war. The general political slogan of the party in this propaganda must be the slogan of 'fraternization.' At the same time, the Communists should fight against recruiting propaganda, against the introduction of conscription, etc. The party must establish a close connection of all members of the party with revolutionary elements in the Army and Navy; it must create Communist nuclei in the armed forces."

Among the demands in conection with the legal rights and economic position of the soldiers set forth by the Daily Worker of July 27, 1929, page 4, were:

"Increased pay for soldiers.

"Improved maintenance.

"The establishment of stores committees composed of soldiers' representatives.

"Abolition of disciplinary punishments.

"Abolition of compulsory saluting.

"The right to be absent from barracks every day.

"Furlough, and extra pay while on furlough.

"The right to organize in trade-unions."

Query: Was that Communist demand of the Sixth World Congress in 1928, namely, the right to elect their own military officers, overlooked, held in abeyance, or had they switched to another piece of strategy—that of securing commissions and subcommissions for their party comrades in the military forces, little by little, with the approval or connivance of Government officials and officers high in authority, complaisant or cooperative? Were these to be the "Communist nuclei in the armed forces"?

In addition to the foregoing demands mentioned by the Daily Worker, the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International set forth many others, declaring that they "must not only be put forward in the Army, but also outside of it—in Parliament, at mass meetings, etc. Propaganda in support of these demands will be successful only if they bear a concrete character. In order that they may do so, it is necessary:

"1. To have a close acquaintance with the Army, with the conditions of service, with the needs and demands of the soldiers, etc., which can only be acquired by maintaining close personal contact with the Army.

"2. To give consideration to the system of defense in the given States and to the situation in regard to the military question at the given moment.

"3. To take into consideration the morale of the Army and the political situation in the country at the given moment. For example, the demand for the election of officers, as a rule, can be advanced only when the Army has reached an advanced stage of disintegration.

"4. To link up closely partial demands with the principal slogans of the Communist Party—arming the proletariat, proletarian militia, etc.

"These demands will have revolutionary significances only if they are linked up with a distinct political program for revolutionizing the bourgeois army.

"Special attention must be paid to organizing the soldiers for the protection of their interests, in alliance with the revolutionary proletariat, prior to their being called up for service (recruits' leagues, mutual-aid clubs), during the period of military service (soldiers' councils) and also after the conclusion of military service (revolutionary ex-servicemen's leagues). It must be the special task of the trade-unions to maintain contact with their members in the Army and to help them to form the above-mentioned organizations."

Charles L. White, an information writer on Federal Arts Project No. 1, appearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, which was investigating the Works Progress Administration, testified that at the expense of the Communist Party he, with a number of others, had been sent to Russia to study at the College of Pro-

fessional Communists. When queried as to the type of instruction given him he replied:

"Mr. WHITE. Practically the whole time I was there, for about 18 months, I was with about 100 other Americans who were there for the same purpose, and we were instructed in sharpshooting classes, and taught the handling and manipulation of rapid-fire machine guns, how to construct the various barricades in street fighting, defending public squares, taking public buildings, and how to destroy the tank, that is, the military tank, and horseback riding, and secret coding.

"Counsel ROBERTS. Were you given any instruction with reference to connections which might be established with members of the armed forces of the United States?

"Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir; it was our instruction to pay special attention to the armed forces of the United States and use those as a chief arena of activity for recruiting members into the Communist Party, and using the grievances of the armed forces such as the high cost of uniforms, bad food and housing conditions, bureaucracy, the mistakes of officers, and things like that would enable us to get soldiers to tell us their problems so we could talk with them and work with them on the basis of their problems, and also to get in touch with them through our young girls, especially in the field work, because the women had a chance to approach them on a social basis."

The Washington Evening Star of January 12, 1935, quoted Rear Adm. Clark H. Woodward as asserting that—

"* * * an organized attempt was being made by 'first-class brains' to spread communism in the Navy. He called on marine officers to combat 'that vicious and alien enemy which strikes at the root of order and authority.' * * *

"Woodward referred to 'radical and pacifist publications' as publishing Communist articles and having a 'general hook-up' with the Communist Party. These, he said, 'strike at national defense in the guise of patriotism' while 'certain religious publications, either deliberately or unwittingly, advocate communistic methods in their antipreparedness and antiwar fights.'

"Communistic activities in the Navy, he said, began in 1930, and are now 'exceedingly well organized with trained agitators doing their work, constantly following ship movements from port to port.'"

The following is quoted from the Daily Worker for December 3, 1935, page 5, question and answer column:

"Question. In case of war should the Communists refuse to enlist, or enlist and organize the soldiers?

"Answer. The Communist's place is the Army and Navy. In every struggle of the working class, the place of the Communists is in the very thick of struggle, right among the other workers and toilers, winning them for the fight against capitalism. This is true above all among the armed forces, which are the capitalists' final weapon against the working class. What good can a militant worker do for his class locked up or shot as an 'objector'?

"In the resolution on war of the recent Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, you will find the following:

"'The Communists, while fighting also against the illusion that war can be eliminated while the capitalist system still exists, exert and will exert every effort to prevent war. Should a new imperialist world war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for peace, to struggle for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war against the Fascist instigators of war, against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism.'"

The following statements appeared on pages 390 and 391 of the Dies committee hearings on un-American propaganda activities, published in 1938.

"For many years the well-trained Communist forces have been attempting to bore within our armed forces. This they have succeeded in doing on numerous occasions and only because of the alertness of the intelligence agents in the defense units of our Government have these subverters been detected and summarily expelled. But they can only handle the situation after the Communists succeed in getting within the forces and not while boring.

"In a document entitled 'Textbook for the City Schools of the (Communist) Party,' commonly referred to in Communist circles as the A B C's of Lenin, is the following statement: "The third task of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the destruction of the bourgeois state, with its governmental organs, the police, army, officials." This book is published by the Soviet State Publishing House in Moscow. The sixth edition has been printed, of which 685,000 copies have been circulated. In another document, Lenin's Instructions Concerning Revolution and Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Communists are urged to take advantage of every opportunity in an effort to disarm the non-Communist governments. At the same time, however, agents are instructed to enlist in the fragmentary defense forces. In this connection, the following advice is given:

"'Disarmament is an ideal of socialism. * * * But he is not a Socialist who expects that socialism will become a reality without a Socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dictatorship is a government resting directly on the use of violence. It is necessary to become soldiers in order to take the deadly weapons out of the hands of the bourgeois and to turn them against them. The slogan of defeating one's own government is the slogan of the proletarian revolution."

* * * * *

"During the past few years Communists have taken advantage of this situation and have increased their efforts to penetrate the enlisted ranks. The Communist leaders, in May 1931, issued from Moscow the following instructions to their leaders in the United States:

"'Antimilitaristic work must be strengthened everywhere. It is necessary that the workers' and peasants' organizations should be in constant contact with the soldiers and sailors and the reserve forces. Lenin says: "The duty to spread Communist ideas includes the particular need of special and persistent, systematic propaganda within the fighting forces. Where this agitation is prohibted by law, it must be carried on illegally. To refuse to do this work would be equal to betrayal of revolutionary duty, and would be incompatible with what belongs to the Third International." At the same time it is necessary, steadfastly and stubbornly, to carry on the work among the workers in the war industries and, also, among the workers of those branches which come in contact with war production and transportation.'"

Communistic activities and propaganda had become so epidemic and so bold that Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK (Massachusetts) was moved to introduce H. R. 8645 early in 1935 "To make better provision for the Government of the military and naval forces of the United States by the suppression of attempts to incite the members thereof to disobelience." Section 1 provided:

"That whoever advises, counsels, urges, or solicits any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, including the Reserves thereof, to disobey the laws or regulations governing such military or naval forces, or whoever publishes or distributes any book, pamphlet, paper, print, article, letter, or other writing which advises, counsels, urges, or solicits any member of such military or naval forces of the United States to disobey the laws or regulations governing such military or naval forces shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both."

Section 2 reads:

"Any book, pamphlet, paper, print, article, letter, or other writing of the character described in section 1 of this act may be taken from any house or other place in which it may be found or from any person in whose possession it may be, under a search warrant issued pursuant to the provisions of title XI of the act entitled 'An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 228; U. S. C., title 18, ch. 18)." [12]

In his testimony before the subcommittee (Hon. R. EWING THOMASON, chairman) of the House Committee on Military Affairs, March 1, 1935, Mr. MCCORMACK said:

"This bill is aimed at some of the methods employed by the communistic movement to obtain their avowed objectives by the use of lawful or unlawful means, or a combination of both, force and violence if necessary, to bring about the overthrow of government. You note that I use the word "movement" as applying to communism, as distinguished from party. There are definite reasons why I do that, because communism is not a party in this country; it is an international movement. That fact is indisputably established.

"The Communist Party of the United States is not a national political party concerned primarily and legitimately with conditions in this country. Neither does it operate on American principes for the maintenance and improvement of the form of government established by the organic law of the land.

"The nature and extent of organized Communist activity in the United States have been established by testimony and the objectives of such activities clearly defined. Both from documentary evidence submitted to the committee and from the frank admission of Communist leaders Browder and Ford, at the New York hearing, July 12, 1934, these objectives include:

"1. The overthrow by force and violence of the republican form of government guaranteed by article IV, section 4, of the Federal Constitution.

"2. The substitution of a Soviet form of government based on class domination to be achieved by abolition of elected representatives both to the legislative and executive branches, as provided by article 1, by the several sections of article II of the same Constitution, and by the fourteenth amendment.

"3. The confiscation of private property by governmental decree, without the due process of law and compensation guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

"4. Restriction of the rights of religious freedom, of speech, and of the press as guaranteed by the first amendment.

"These specific purposes, by Communist admission, are to be achieved not by peaceful exercise of the ballot under constitutional right but by revolutionary upheavals, by fomenting class hatred, by incitement to class warfare, and by other illegal, as well as legal methods. The tactics and specific stages to be followed by the accomplishment of this end are set forth in circumstantial detail in the official program of the American Communist Party adopted at the convention held at Cleveland on April 2 to 8, 1934.

"The manifesto and the resolutions incite to civil war by requiring one class to take power by direct revolutionary process and then assume dictatorship over the country in the manner followed by the Communists

[12] Hearings on H. R. 5845, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 1.

in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is frequently mentioned as a guiding example.

"In pursuance of the revolutonary way to power, the program instructs members of the party to obtain a foothold in the Army and the Navy and develop 'revolutionary mass organizations in the decisive war industries and in the harbors.' The trade unions should be undermined and utilized as recruiting grounds for revolutionary workers." [13]

The secretary of War, endorsing the McCormack bill, declared in part:

"The War Department heartily concurs in the aim of the bill submitted for report. Such an act would have the effect of protecting members of the armed forces from insidious propaganda, oral and printed, urging disloyal and disobedient conduct among them. Its provisions constitute a reasonable and proper restriction which may be placed by Congress upon the freedom of contact of civilians with members of the Government's armed forces.

"A law of this nature does not violate the constitutional guaranties of freedom of the press, for that guaranty does not extend to protection of him who counsels and encourages the violation of the law as it exists." [14]

The Secretary of the Navy backed up his conferee with the assertion that—

"The Navy Department is heartily in accord with the purpose of this bill. Literature of a nature subversive to the Government has been distributed in increasing quantities in recent year to the personnel of the Navy. The literature, apparently emanating from Communist organizations, seeks to undermine the morale of the Navy by urging disloyalty and disobedience of laws and regulations for the government of the Navy.

"Existing law is inadequate to curb this propaganda. The pamphlets and leaflets are carefully worded to avoid the insurrection and sedition provisions of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 4 and 6) and the publishers likewise escape the penalties of sections 344 and 345 of title 18, United States Code, by avoiding use of the mails." [15]

Col. John Thomas Taylor, legislative counsel of the American Legion, on behalf of that organization, endorsed the McCormack bill, as did also Legislative Counsel Col. Thomas Kirby, speaking on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans, and Legislative Counsel George Brobeck, speaking for the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Said Mr. Brobeck:

"We are heartily in accord with this legislation, because we believe that communism is a very definite menace to our national defense, and I think a reading of those pamphlets will make you realize that with that sort of thing going to the men, a great number of whom are in their formative years, the younger enlisted men, they are apt to have ideas that may become warped, regardless of the continued vigilance of the officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps." [16]

Testifying in favor of the bill, Brig. Gen. Harry E. Knight, General Staff, United States Army, said, among other things:

"Various reports on the activities of Communists received by the War Department contain statements along the following lines:

"In a published article entitled "Certain Problems Connected With the Preparation for Underground Work," it was stated:

" 'Finally, the fourth condition for acceptance into the Communist International establishes for all Communist parties the necessity of persistent systematic propaganda among the troops. In localities where agitation is prohibited by extrordinary law, it should be conducted in an illegal manner. A refusal to perform such work is equivalent to betraying (one's) revolutionary duty and is incompatible with membership in the Third International.' " [17]

Commander S. A. Clement, United States Navy, outlined "some methods known to be used by the Communists to contact Navy personnel, as follows:

"Small groups, consisting of, say two men and three girls, will come aboard ship with the regular crowd of visitors and sightseers. The men of this group will circulate about the decks, stuffing their handbills into boats, behind ventilators, and so forth, where members of the crew eventually find them, read them, and then generally turn them over to the executive or the officer of the deck. Meanwhile the girls of the group—chosen for their good looks—will be picking out promising appearing enlisted men, engaging them in conversation with the object of making dates with them ashore and working on them there to convert them to the 'cause' and thus gain a recruit within the ship's company. Once gained, a cell is formed through which others may be talked over into joining. The same general method is used at shore stations.

"At boat landings and outside gates of shore stations, men and/or women pickets distribute to liberty parties their handbills and other radical literature.

"Handbills are occasionally left at doors of private homes, especially where naval personnel are known to reside.

"While ashore on liberty our men are often urged to attend Communist meetings, both public and at private houses. They are approached by these propagandists on the streets, in parks, beer joints, and so forth.

"Selected men are trained at Communist workers' schools for entry into the services. There are workers' schools in San Francisco, Oakland, and Los Angeles, and in every city where there is a large Communist organization. They are also in New York and Boston. One or two members of the secretariat or the executive committee of the district or section have as their specific duties the handling of subversive activities within the armed forces.

"When a 'cell' is once established on board a ship or at a station or in any unit of the armed forces they are instructed to carry out in general the following:

"1. To magnify and aggravate alleged grievances and petty grievances, such as food, living conditions, medical treatment, hours of watch, liberty, and in this to create dissatisfaction, disaffection, and disloyalty;

"2. To secure information relative to training, movements, improvement in equipment, etc.

"The basic idea behind this is to have sufficient Communists in every organization of the national defense, including navy yards, armories, etc., to have the personnel so disloyal that they will not obey commands in time of emergency. In the navy yards and arsenals the objective is to have men in strategic positions for sabotage." [18]

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS introduced a bill in the Senate identical with the McCormack bill. Both failed of passage.

The Voorhis Act of January 1941 required groups subject to foreign control to register with the Department of Justice. In anticipation of the passage of that act, the Communist Party of the United States voted, November 9, 1940, to dissolve its affiliation with the Communist International. Earl Browder, the party's general secretary and national leader, on this occasion reaffirmed—

"* * * the unshakable adherence of our party to the principles of proletarian internationalism in the spirit of its greatest leaders and teachers, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, as well as the * * * principles of proletarian internationalism to which the life of every Communist is unconditionally consecrated." [19]

Joseph Zack, once high in the councils of the Comintern, speaking of this resolution of dissolution, declared: [20]

"That was just a matter of strategy to suit the present circumstances. The Communist Party, if it would really separate from the Communist International, it would be a matter of a resolution. It would be a matter of a big fight inside, of which the whole public would become aware in very quick order. As it is, they just adopted a resolution and filed it somewhere in a little corner and, wherever a case occurs in court, they will drag it out as a technicality. That is all that means."

V

Throughout its relatively brief history the United States of America has sedulously abstained from attempting, through duress or propaganda, to impose its political ideologies on alien peoples. Even where, on a number of occasions, we have temporarily assumed control of foreign territories with a view primarily to restoring orderly procedure in government, we have been solicitous that their traditions, forms, ceremonies, laws, ordinances, codes, and political norms be respected and availed of so far as consistent with the work in hand, the goal of which has been the restoration of self-government to the controlled state. Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Panama, Nicaragua, the Philippine Islands—each are examples of improvements wrought, coercion suppressed, promises kept. Even with respect to the territory comprising the Panama Canal strip, indisputably American territory so long as we operate the Canal, we have considerately applied a legal (California) code derived from the same source as is the one by which the Panamanians have for more than three centuries been governed (Spanish Civil Code). Where at times there were clashes of interpretations or administration, councils were held and the disputes were more frequently than not resolved in favor of the controlled entity.

Not a single instance can be cited in all our history where our citizens, backed by the Government, either submissively or brazenly have intruded into a foreign land for the purpose of convincing its people that ours, and ours alone, is the ideal form of political rule, while theirs is all wrong. Yet for much more than a century this freedom-loving, forbearing, and hospitable Nation has been a prey to almost every "ism," "archy," and "ology" conceived by the febrile mind of man. It is our love of freedom and innate common sense which has tolerated these proselytizing interlopers. For the most part, however, they have represented either their own interests or private organizations. And their utopias have crashed in almost every instance.

But since 1919 we have been, at first faintly, later deeply, conscious of the fact that the strongest and most ruthless of all the "ists," the Communists, have been everywhere at work within this country, supported and financed liberally from abroad, and if they are able to do so they will penetrate within the armed forces on which we rely for security.

During the period of the war, the party line which Communists have been directed to follow has been consonant with the obvious

[13] Hearings on H. R. 5845, 71st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 3 and 4.

[14] Hearings on H. R. 5845, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 2.

[15] Hearings on H. R. 5845, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 2.

[16] Hearings on H. R. 5845, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 14.

[17] Hearings on H. R. 5845, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 15.

[18] Hearings on H. R. 5845, 71st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 19 and 20.

[19] Sunday Worker, November 17, 1940, p. 4.

[20] Legal Documents, New York, vol. —, p. 123.

interests of the United States, because in Nazi Germany we had a common enemy. The aim of overthrowing our Government by force and violence, in order to set up here a Communist state, has not been visible in Communist propaganda since the day Germany invaded Russia. Now, however, we are entering a new era, in which no one can foresee the turn of events. Groups of determined Communists here have not changed their ideas and will continue, with or without outside aid, to plot such a revolution as they think will realize the Marx-Lenin dream, and will stop at nothing to accomplish their aim.

Air Power Vital in Germany's Defeat—Congressional Flying Club Hears General Anderson's Informative and Challenging Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, last evening the Congressional Flying Club observed its first anniversary. It was our good fortune to hear Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Anderson, of the Army Air Forces, in an address which, I believe, all Members of Congress—and the American citizens—should read carefully.

General Anderson is one of our top airmen. He is a West Pointer, and has distinguished himself as deputy commander for operations under General Spaatz in the bombing activities with the United States Strategic Air Forces in Europe. The speech follows:

Team work, we all know, won the war in Europe—close, hard-hitting team plays run off against a determined and tough opponent—plays that were planned and executed by the Infantry, and by sailors, and the airmen, operating closely together.

In this war we flew 1,689,000 airplane sorties—or individual airplane trips. We dropped 1,555,000 tons of bombs. Individual airmen of the Army Air Forces crossed enemy lines and penetrated deep into German territory 7,235,562 times. That is equivalent to 482 divisions of 15,000 men going "over the top."

In this great campaign we destroyed 30,000 enemy aircraft, we wrecked the German system of communications, we virtually eliminated the oil industry, we raised hell with the German economy.

To do this we spent about $25,000,000,000.

But that isn't the heaviest price we paid.

Through May 31, 1945, the Army Air Forces in Europe suffered battle casualties totaling 93,000. Of the total casualties suffered in battle 24,000 are dead, 23,000 are listed as missing, and 31,000 are listed as prisoners. Final figures now are being compiled. When they are completed we will find that the AAF dead will total between 35,000 and 40,000 for the period July 1942 to June 1945—the 3 years we were fighting in Europe. This total, of course, includes the Mediterranean theater as well as France and Germany.

These are sobering facts and figures—and I assure you the senior air commanders are well aware of what they imply.

Now what is the background of the story of this tremendous effort.

What did we get for our money—and the blood of our men?

Our military discussions usually start with what we call the situation.

Well, what was the situation in the air war early in August 1942 when our first group was bombed up ready for operations against German targets?

First of all the German had undisputed control of the air over the continent. That was where our targets were located—that was where our airmen were destined to fight.

The Royal Air Force, our ally, had come up against the German Air Force and the RAF staff concluded that it could not support its losses in daylight operations—that it must turn to night bombing.

Our air war plan; that is, the Army Air Forces, assumed that we would carry out a series of attacks against German industry—that we would embark upon a program of strategic bombardment. We would hit the bottlenecks of the German economic structure. At that time we were not sure what industries we would strike—so we instructed our intelligence staffs to analyze the German economy and submit a tentative list of priorities for consideration. We wanted to know where the Hun was most vulnerable.

Further, we were convinced that we had to reduce the German Air Force. Large-scale amphibious operations against Europe were contemplated. To insure the success of these landings, to guarantee the required lines of supply and communication—to make it possible for the men on the ground to advance once the beachhead had been secured—the German Air Force had to be taken out of the air.

These were moments to pause.

We had to get air superiority.

And we couldn't get it by a series of dogfights over the channel and France.

We had to uproot the industrial structure that supported the German Air Force. The greater part of this industry was deep in Germany.

To destroy it we had to bomb with great accuracy. We had to fly in the daylight over the Reich.

Time, as usual, favored the defender. We assumed that eventually we would be on the offense. If we waited for an ideal set of circumstances—for our forces to arrive in large numbers—we donated the same amount of time to the German to stiffen his defenses, to get ready for the punch.

In a nutshell, we had to start fighting.

And so on August 17, 1942, we sent out our first force.

Our beginnings were modest. We only had 4 squadrons in England, of 12 aircraft each. We had no fighters for protective cover. We had to fly shallow penetrations into enemy territory to feel the situation out; we had to walk before we could run.

There was another reason we felt we had to engage the enemy without delay. This was 1942; American industry was gearing up for tremendous production. Our planes were designed for precision bombing; they were capable of long flights. They were equipped to defend themselves against enemy fighters. Our crews had been trained to do their jobs.

But neither crews nor airplanes had been battle tested. And in war battle is the payoff.

We wanted to find out where our doctrines were right and where they were wrong; we wanted to know what the vulnerable points were in our airplane design and armament. It was essential that we tell our engineering staffs at home as promptly as possible what changes they should make in the thousands of planes then starting to move down the assembly lines of a dozen factories.

And so we picked a fight with the German Air Force—an opponent who up until then had run things his own way.

This was the situation in 1942. Numerical superiority rested with the Germans. We had no battle experience—only untested doctrines. Our program called for an attack. The picture was hardly auspicious.

Much has been written—much more will be written—on what happened in the months that followed. We did engage the German Air Force and we made the Hun fight.

I would like here to tell you that in my opinion there are no braver men in this war than those early crews of the Eighth Air Force who fought over Europe against terrific odds—and without the benefit of fighter protection. They well knew that it was their lot to spearhead an attack. They knew that thousands of American boys would follow in their footsteps in the air, and that millions would fight on the ground beneath them. And they recognized that before there could ever be a D-day the enemy had to be driven from the skies. For air superiority is a prerequisite of invasion. They knew they had to win—that they couldn't be licked.

I have said that our force was small at that time. Further we had few replacement crews coming through. Some of our early groups, normally organized with four squadrons, were down to two and three squadrons. The messes were only half full. It was a grim picture. But our formations never were turned back by the enemy—the crews flew sometimes on three successive days.

These were brave men. I cannot speak too highly of them.

I do not want to give you the impression that our only targets were the aircraft and engine plants supporting the German Air Force. This was our first important system. The Luftwaffe had been an important factor in the war in Europe. It had to be trimmed down to size. That it was trimmed down is history now—well known to all of us. It did not operate effectively against the invasion fleets either in Normandy or in southern France. As a matter of fact the G. A. F. flew only a small number of sorties on the two D-days, I think it was about 80 in southern France.

Another target system, perhaps the most important, was oil. It is no fable that an Army moves on fuel. If we could hit the German refineries and the storage depots it was apparent to us, as it will be to you, that we would be striking a telling blow against all of the German war machine. For the Panzers required fuel, and the training planes of the Luftwaffe needed it, and, to the truck convoys supplying the Germans on half a dozen fronts, fuel was vital.

Fuel, in fact, was a natural.

The story of the fuel campaign, like the story of the rise and decline of the German Air Force is a subject for a full-length book. We followed the progress of this campaign step by step while it was being conducted, almost bomb by bomb. In addition to the Eighth Air Force, based in England, the Fifteenth Air Force, as you know, was located on the Foggia plain in eastern Italy and played a most important role in bringing the full impact of American air power to bear on the German oil industry—especially in connection with the series of attacks carried out against the Ploesti refineries in Rumania.

When the war ended, needless to say, we were most anxious to investigate the targets ourselves, to talk to the plant managers and to responsible officers of the Germany Army. We wanted to see what the Germans had to say. We wanted to see their records.

I went to Germany myself and of course we sent teams of intelligence officers and German-speaking interrogators to nearly all of the points where we felt we could get the required information.

One document which was seized was revealing.

It showed that German stocks of aviation gasoline fell from 500,000 tons in May 1944 to 230,000 tons in September 1944 to 84,000 tons in March 1945. More revealing, perhaps,

was the production figure which had gone from 150,000 tons per month in May 1944 to 7,000 tons in September 1944 to 40 tons in March 1945.

We talked to many of the top Nazis.

Here is a question we asked five of the leading German generals. I might add that we interrogated these generals separately as we did not want the answers of one to have a bearing on the answers of the others.

These are the generals we interrogated:

Colonel General von Vietinghoff, Supreme Commander Southwest; General Wolff, General of the SS; General Lemelson, commanding Fourteenth Army; Lieutenant General Boehlke, commanding Three Hundred and Thirty-fourth Division; General Roesener, General of Wehrkreis 18, the western half of Austria.

This is the question:

What is the general opinion of the effectiveness of the United States bombing?

These are the answers:

Colonel General von Vietinghoff: "Insofar as it is possible to judge from Italy, it is generally recognized that Allied air attacks were extremely successful. This is especially true with reference to attacks on the fuel industry which by the end of the war proved to be the decisive factor."

General Wolff: "Allied air attacks on the fuel industry had great effect and the results were cumulative until finally, in the last months of the war, the industry was almost totally destroyed."

General Lemelson: "The attacks on the fuel industries were the most important. The results of these attacks were perceptible in the steady decline of German Air Force effort in Italy, but particularly in an ever-increasing shortage of motor fuel."

Lieutenant General Boehlke: "During the first years of the war the Allied air attacks only had a small retarding effect on German aircraft and fuel production, but toward the end of the war the continuing attacks had a decisive effect in determining the course of the war."

General Roesener: "Air attacks forced decentralization of the aircraft industry and consequently affected production possibilities. In the fuel industry there occurred almost a total stoppage in the late stages of the war."

The outstanding thing you will note in these separate answers is that fuel is mentioned in each case, Von Vietinghoff calling it "the decisive factor."

Recently a friend of mine in the Engineer Corps returned from Germany and told me that he was surprised to see that many factories and industrial facilities were still standing.

In planning and carrying out its strategic bombardment program the Army Air Forces selected certain well defined objectives more properly termed target systems. As we saw it these were the bottlenecks. Once we had determined on these systems we adhered rather religiously to a policy of continuing attacks against these objectives. Perhaps the best two examples are oil and communications. The vital nature of these two systems readily is apparent.

Now, having committed ourselves to attacking oil and communications it would have been a grave error indeed to have deviated from these targets in the middle of the campaign. To have done so would have given the enemy time to catch his breath, to improvise, to disperse and, partially, to make his losses good. In strategic bombardment it is necessary to carry on sustained attacks to insure that there is no industrial recuperation or recovery. So we kept hammering away at oil, communications and a few other systems. This meant that many large industries, for example power, chemicals, machine tools and aluminum virtually were untouched by our bombers. But to have gone after all these other miscellaneous industries obviously would have diverted our effort and would have been a most uneconomical application of available forces.

I mention this here because I am sure you have heard people returning from Germany state that they have seen factories which relatively were untouched by air attack. When you visit Germany as I did you likewise will see these factories—but when you start to study the oil industry or the German aircraft industry or communications you will observe the full impact of the air attacks.

We are not willing to say for sure that the systems we selected were the perfect ones. A score of others was considered including power, machine tool manufacturing and many others. It is possible that similar results could have been obtained by attacking systems other than oil and communications. But from the intelligence we had at hand those two appeared to be the most vulnerable points for attacks. I frankly feel that they were the best and that the final record will show that they were the best. We do know that at the end of the Italian campaign due as to lack of fuel German tanks were being towed with oxen and, as far as strategic mobility was concerned, we know that in September 1944 it took a German Infantry unit between 12 and 18 days to go by rail from Verona to Milan, a distance of about 185 miles.

You have heard a great deal about the German Air Force. I would like to make one comment here on the main difference between the GAF and the Royal Air Force and the American Air Force.

The German Air Force looked good in the early days of the war. Which is to say it always looked good wher it was winning. The American Air Force and the Royal Air Force also looked good under those conditions. But here is a fundamental difference—the RAF and our own AAF never looked better than when they were fighting under terrific odds, when they were losing—if you like. The Prime Minister of England often has referred to that small group of airmen of the RAF that turned the Luftwaffe back during England's dark hours. In the AAF I don't think that our Air Force and our airmen ever looked better than when on the way to Schweinfurt they lost 60 airplanes to enemy action—carried out a successful attack and were ready to fight the next day. On the Schweinfurt mission one squadron was whittled down to a single aircraft which carried on and bombed the target as assigned and then flew home—alone.

It should be remembered that no force of American bombers ever was turned back from an assigned target by enemy action.

In contrast with the record of the RAF and the AAF, the German Air Force did not appear at its best when fighting against heavy odds. The fighting quality of the German Air Force went into a progressive decline which started when the Hun lost complete domination of the skies over Europe. It definitely was not made of the same stuff as the RAF and the AAF. When the GAF hit the skids—when it was up against tough opposition—when it had lost the initiative—it went downhill rapidly.

Most of my remarks have been concerned with the heavy-bomber picture—with strategic aviation.

Here I would like to say a word about the light and fighter bombers, the shorter-range planes that were employed in cooperation with the Army.

We had tactical air commands with each army. Each had several groups mostly of fighters and fighter bombers. Their role was to fight in cooperation with the man on the ground, to give protection and assistance to the armored columns, to conduct reconnaissance, to knock out whatever enemy air opposition might appear—to interdict the enemy lines of communication and supply, in general to assist the advance and to give as much freedom to the ground commander as possible.

General Patton had one of these tactical air commands with his army. It proved to be a busy little Air Force.

When Patton broke through and started his historic drive very often he moved 20 miles a day. And he is not one to worry about the problems created by rapid advance. As his army streaked forward they became, almost hourly, further from the bases used by the fighter bombers. Communications and command were complicated, to say the least.

However, control was maintained satisfactorily, and in addition to the usual missions General Patton called upon General Weyland, his air commander, to give protection to his exposed right flank along the Loire during a critical period of the advance.

Developed on the sands of Africa, the American ground-air team proved in France to be the undoing of the Germans. For 30 days, General Weyland's Nineteenth Tactical Air Command moved ahead with the Third Army without pause. Six days after it went into operation, all Brittany had been conquered except for three beleagured ports, 9 days later one jaw of the Falaise-Argentan trap had been clamped shut, in another week the Seine was crossed above and below Paris, and by the end of the first month this air-ground combination was fighting within 60 miles of Germany. In August alone, General Weyland, the commander, moved his headquarters five times.

To give you an idea of the scale of effort—Nineteenth Tactical Air Command attached to the Third Army flex a total of 13,000 fighter-bomber sorties in August or about 430 sorties a day. Our losses were 114 aircraft—our claims against enemy aircraft 229. Pilots' claims against ground targets include destruction or damaging of the following: 4,058 motor vehicles, 466 tanks and other armored vehicles, 246 locomotives, 3,000 railroad cars.

I have mentioned the Nineteenth Tactical Air Command. You understand, I am sure, that it is typical of all these commands—each Army having one.

Air Force terms—like most specialized terms—are not very descriptive.

We speak of squadrons and groups and wings—air divisions and air forces. Our wing and air-division organizations are not always uniform. It is our practice to organize whatever force we can administer and fight efficiently. This varies somewhat in the different theaters.

A squadron in heavy bombardment consists of 12 airplanes plus 3 in reserve, or 15. Four squadrons equal one group. Three to five groups comprise a wing, and in the Eighth Air Force we had five wings in an air division. The Eighth Air Force consisted of three divisions.

The highest air headquarters in Europe, General Spaatz's, was called United States Strategic Air Forces in Europe. Prior to returning to the Air Staff I served in USSTAF, as we called it, as General Spaatz's Deputy Commander for Operations. The American Air Forces in Europe were, as you know, the Eighth, Ninth, Twelfth, and Fifteenth. The Eighth was based in England, the Ninth in France, the Twelfth was in north Italy at the end of the war, and the Fifteenth was in southeastern Italy.

As the commanding officer of one of our wings has 15,000 men in his command, I usually compare a wing to an infantry division—two wings to a corps, and an air division to an army. Thus the Eighth Air Force, which had three air divisions, would be similar, roughly, to an Army group.

At the end of April 1945 the Army Air Forces had 18,428 airplanes deployed to fight the Germans. The greatest single day's activity—and the Germans would know about this—was on June 6, 1944, D-day, when 9,984 sorties were flown.

Earlier in this talk I referred to the comments of Von Vietinghoff and Wolff, and a few other of the more prominent German generals, on the effectiveness of air attack.

In the final analysis I am an Air Force officer and it seemed to me more authentic if I let these top Germans do the talking on this score—especially as we have them in a position now where we can get to them a little easier than we could a few months ago.

I have noticed when talking to the top Germans and in reading the interrogations of others that there are several big "ifs" in their statements.

They reveal that they had other intentions, that they had great hopes for these plans but unfortunately, for them, they were not able to carry them out due to lack of fuel, lack of mobility, or for some similar reason.

That they were unable to pursue these ambitious alternative plans is due almost entirely, according to their statements, to the fact that our Air Forces had them pinned down on the ground and in the air. In assessing the over-all effect of the air effort we should not lose sight of the fact that in addition to our victories against the German Air Force, against oil and communications, the German High Command definitely was limited the minute it lost control of the air. To say the least, it no longer had freedom of action.

When the final history is written the effect of the efforts of our Air Forces on the decisions of the German general staff will fill, I feel sure, an important chapter, perhaps the most important.

I have discussed briefly several types of air operations—strategic bombing of German industry, and the role of our Tactical Air Force in giving air cooperation to the Army.

There are other aspects of the air war. Time does not permit a detailed discussion of them all. However, I would like to mention supply dropping.

From the time the Germans overran Europe to the end of the war, he never was able to subjugate completely the valiant Partisan groups that carried on guerrilla warfare and underground activity and sabotage.

The men of the Army Air Forces felt very close to these groups, for they played a leading role in helping us to recover the members of our crews that had parachuted behind enemy lines. And so when we were assigned the task of supplying these outposts of resistance we undertook it with enthusiasm and zeal—from the headquarters staff down to the operational crews.

For the most part we used troop carrier squadrons for this work. They flew C–47 planes similar to the air liners flown on the domestic routes. I might add that these airplanes are not armed.

But the crews would slip behind the enemy lines or fly direct to some island of resistance and drop the cargo. When it was possible to land in some promising field they did so and frequently returned with a plane load of wounded and tired Partisans. Supply dropping was widespread. We dropped to the forces of Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia, to the Maquis in southern France, and in Haute Savoie, and to the Italians in north Italy. All types of supplies were dropped—food, clothing, medical supplies, arms, and ammunition.

I talked to the pilots of one of these troop carrier planes in Italy only a few months ago. He told me he had been on five types of operations in 5 weeks. He had dropped paratroopers in Greece, had flown supplies to the Partisans in France, had evacuated some of our wounded from Yugoslavia, had dropped medical supplies in north Italy, and had gone to Burma to take part in airborne operations there. His next assignment, he was told, was to go to Tehran in Persia, where he expected to base while he flew important supplies to our Army Air Force station in the Ukraine.

I will long remember his parting comment to me as he started off: "There is a lot of flexibility built into this airplane."

Mr. Speaker, there are now 118 members of the Congressional Flying Club. It is our hope that additional members and their staffs will join our organization. Officers are as follows:

OFFICERS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL FLYING CLUB

President, Representative Jennings Randolph (Democrat, West Virginia).

Vice president, Representative Karl Stefan (Republican, Nebraska).

Secretary, Mrs. Alline H. Dozier (Louisiana), Committee on Claims.

Treasurer, Representative Fred Bradley (Republican, Michigan).

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Representative Evan Howell (Republican, Illinois).

Representative Richard Harless (Democrat, Arizona).

Representative J. Leroy Johnson (Republican, California).

Representative Clair Engle (Democrat, California).

Representative Carl Hinshaw (Republican, California).

Representative Robert F. Rockwell (Republican, Colorado).

Miss Marcella Langdon (secretary to Representative Harris Ellsworth, Republican, Oregon).

Many Complaints But Not Much Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN

Thursday, June 28, 1945

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following timely editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

MANY COMPLAINTS, NOT MUCH ACTION

Somebody unfamiliar with Washington during the last 12 years would be mystified if he read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first time. The debates reported and the statements inserted in the appendix are full of grousing and complaining. Yet, every time a vote is taken to extend the existence or powers of the particular agencies which are the subject of the complaint, the majority required is forthcoming.

Here, for example, on page A2929 of the RECORD, is the complaint of a woman storekeeper in Michigan about the treatment she received when haled before the OPA price panel. The charge was that Old Dutch Cleanser was priced by the store at 11 cents, whereas the OPA ceiling price was 9 cents. Out of all the items offered for sale by the store, this was the only one OPA found which did not conform with the provisions of its thousands of ukases.

The woman storekeeper was kept waiting for 55 minutes before being granted a hearing. She was then ordered to fill out a "violation admission" on threat of OPA "to send the case in to Detroit for action." With that threat of punitive action, she signed the OPA confession. When she returned to her store, she found out that no cleanser had been sold at the above-ceiling price. OPA, however, has her in the toils. It could fine her or suspend her from business.

With this example of how the agency treats good Americans like criminals, even though they have contemplated no willful violation of the rules and have, in fact, committed none, the House a few days later extended the life of OPA 1 year. Such restrictions as were placed on its actions are meaningless. Most of them will be invoked, if at all, by the Secretary of Agriculture, who, like the rest of the administration and the OPA bureaucracy, is a faithful New Dealer.

The discussion on every appropriations bill shows not only a tremendous extravagance on the part of the departments and bureaus, but that the bureaucrats have an almost unlimited power of discretion in determining how the money allotted them by Congress is to be spent. The Office of Strategic Service, for example, is permitted to spend $21,000,000 on activities it says are so confidential that it dare not tell anybody what it is up to. This is the organization of uniformed malingerers and super-sleuths whose director, since promoted to major general, had his briefcase full of confidential documents pilfered from him by a bush league spy in the Balkans.

Complaints about the War Labor Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the Lend-Lease Administration, and dozens of other agencies abound in the debates on the floor, but when it comes to the moment of action the loyal New Deal majority votes the money and authority with a whoop and a holler. Frequently some alleged Republicans, most of them from the East, are to be found voting with them.

The people are getting a little weary of those in and out of Congress who are continually protesting, but won't use their votes to do anything about it. They remind us of querulous old women. The question arises: Why doesn't somebody ever do something about it?

Pony Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of June 22, 1945:

PONY PATRIOTISM

Administration officials generally have not had the effrontery to attempt an explanation of the Federal policy that permits horse-racing and the rail and highway transportation of racing animals and race-track patrons. Most of them have better sense than to try to defend this inexplicable tenderness toward a billion-dollar betting business at a time when it is using communications facilities desperately required by the war.

The exception is the War Committee on Conventions which has tried to explain the whole thing to protesting Minnesota Senators and Congressmen. They would look better if they hadn't tried. The committee's statement says:

"The appeals of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion for the cessation of horse racing and for the elimination of group meetings not necessary to the progress of the war are entirely separate and apart. The horse-racing ban was for the purpose of curbing absenteeism in war plants. With the cessation of war in Europe and consequent cut-backs in war materials, the question of absenteeism has become unimportant."

This is a lame, stupid, inaccurate, and misleading explanation.

The whole transportation problem, in the first place, is one major problem of which conventions, races, State fairs, and other functions which require transportation are but phases.

The purpose of the horse-racing ban was not solely that of curbing absenteeism. When he imposed this ban on December 23, James F. Byrnes, then Director of War Mobilization, requested WPB and ODT "to take such steps as fall within their power to prevent the use of critical materials, services, and transportation in the operation of these tracks".

The ban was aimed at transportation as well as at other interferences with the war effort. And the transportation problem that existed then is as nothing compared with the transportation problem that exists now. The committee's statement on this point is untrue.

It also is untrue that "absenteeism has become unimportant." The committee differs from the President of the United States on this point. He has publicly and repeatedly appealed to workers to stick to their jobs from which the race tracks are enticing them by the thousands. The question of absenteeism is unimportant. Is it unimportant that we continue to produce for the full-scale war that is going on in the Pacific?

What a task it is to attempt to keep a people on the job, devoted to the prosecution of the war, willing to sacrifice to further its success, anxious over all the related problems of production at home, when Government agencies tell the people that it is no longer important that they stick to their work.

The administration's racing policy is a scandal. It cannot be defended on any ground. It is diverting from the prosecution of the war-communications facilities for which there is a desperate need. It is tying up rail and highway equipment needed to handle troops and 30,000 miles of telegraph wire needed to handle messages. It is tying them up as effectively as if the enemy reached across the ocean and interdicted them by bombing and shelling. It is contributing to the weakening of morale and to the willingness of the public to make other sacrifices. Can the people be blamed for reasoning that a war that is not serious enough to call for an end to horse racing is not serious enough to call for the end of conventions and public gatherings of other sorts?

A straightforward and courageous rebuff to the unspeakable combination of upper-crust and underworld that has high pre-assured misguided officials into authorizing horse racing would be worth almost as much to morale at home, and among the fighting forces as another Okinawa victory. Is it too much to ask?

Russia Should Be Encouraged, Not Antagonized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the continuance attacks against Russia might be justified if there was any real evidence that the so-called Communists had not been 100 percent loyal and had not cooperated in every way in bringing about the defeat of Germany. These critics and alarmists in their deep prejudice close their eyes to the fact that the lives of thousands of young American men will be saved if Russia is permitted to cooperate in defeating the Japs. It is indeed unfortunate, therefore, that some people, even in high places, are so unwarrantedly prejudiced, but despite their talk and the dissemination of misinformation I hope it will have no bearing on Russia in continuing to cooperate in devious ways to eliminate the Jap danger.

I was much impressed in reading the speech of our able, fearless, and patriotic Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, and others, delivered at the testimonial dinner given to Dr. Thomas Mann, a gentleman who has strenuously combated nazism. I feel that the speech of Secretary Ickes was most timely as we have in this country some misguided gentlemen who have perverted views and who seem to feel that we are at war with Russia instead of with Japan, and I hope that more outstanding Americans will combat this anti-Russian propaganda.

Under the leave granted to me, I insert a newspaper article commenting on the speeches of Secretary Ickes and others attending the testimonial dinner which I feel will be of interest to the membership and to the country. The article is as follows:

ANTI-RUSSIAN TALK ASSAILED BY ICKES—WHY SHOULD UNITED STATES WANT TO FIGHT RECENT ALLY, HE ASKS AT DINNER TO MANN—AUTHUR WARNS OF POWER—IT IS EASILY USED SELFISHLY, HE SAYS

Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, speaking last night at a dinner to Thomas Mann, Nobel prize winner in literature, assailed those who conduct a "whispering campaign" against Russia designed to make us "suspicious and nervous." Asking why we should prepare to fight our recent ally, he declared that Russia's paramount need was for peace and that she had no reason for war with the United States.

Sponsored by the Nation Associates, the dinner was held in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel to mark the seventieth birthday on June 6 of Dr. Mann, who found a haven here from Nazi oppression.

Chairman of the dinner committee was Robert E. Sherwood, playwright and overseas director of the Office of War Information, and other speakers included Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, Dr. Mann, Dr. Juan Negrin, Prime Minister of Spain's last republican government; William L. Shirer, foreign correspondent and commentator, and Freda Kirchwey, editor of the Nation.

RUSSIA CALLED VITAL TO PEACE

Referring to Russia as "that great nation, without whose cooperation there can be no peace," Mr. Ickes declared:

"What Russia needs more than anything else in the world is peace, a peace that would allow her time to develop her enormous resources, to build up her ravaged industry and to restore her devastated lands."

The whisperers in the campaign to "stir up suspicions and foment fear and hate" of Russia, Mr. Ickes asserted, were the same pseudo-patriots who before the war "went up and down the land 'Lindberghing' that Hitler not only had no felonious designs upon us but that he could not attack us even if he had such intentions."

He acknowledged that in the working out of the terms of world peace, "we will have honest differences of opinion with Russia, as well as with other countries," but declared there would be no difficulties that could not be overcome by "patience and understanding and by adhering at all times to the principle of that great utterance embodied in the Sermon on the Mount, 'Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you.'"

Mr. Ickes said there were those among us who were bent on preventing the peace from being more than a short-lived armistice, but that instead of openly avowing their purpose they posed as "patriots undefiled."

"They love America so tenaciously," he said, "that they cannot find any other country that is fit to associate with America, even in the interest of a peace that cannot be forged or endure except upon the basis of association and mutuality."

Mr. Ickes said the "first and greatest task" confronting us in the making of a lasting peace was the punishment of those responsible "for the bestiality which befouled the whole of Europe for so long." But this, he declared, should not blind us to the fact that even the Germans were deserving of our help in the coming winter crisis.

"Cold and hunger will stalk through western Europe this fall and winter," he warned. "Unless we move quickly and vigorously a million or more people may be expected to die of privation in Switzerland, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Scandinavia, and Italy the coming winter."

MANN EULOGIZES ROOSEVELT

Bespeaking his gratitude and love for the late President Roosevelt, "that great statesman whom we mourn and whom we shall never cease to mourn," Dr. Mann said he was turning his address of thanks into a tribute "to him who for all of us incarnated the hopes of mankind in a great personality."

America today, as the preponderant world power with Russia, stands at the crossroads, Dr. Mann declared.

"Let us not evade this fact," he said. "Such an immense military potential always involves a great danger and a great temptation. It can be used in the old selfish spirit of economic exploitation and oppression, that is to say, in the spirit of imperialism—or it can be conceived as a mandate to leadership and to the service of the common cause of mankind."

Dr. Mann envisaged defeat for representatives of the "old order," those who, he said, were attempting to frustrate America's "humanitarian leadership," and saw ultimate victory for those who desire to go forward in the development and fulfillment" of democracy.

Expressing pride in his recently acquired citizenship, Dr. Mann said:

"I am no longer a guest in this country, I am one of its citizens. I can say 'we' when I speak of America, and I say it with pride. I suffer when 'we' occasionally create the appearance that we want at bottom to preserve the fascism that we have defeated—as a bulwark against the imminent socialization of democracy, of which we are afraid. I know that such an appearance is not according to the will of the American people, the nation of Roosevelt; it does not wish to retrogress from democracy, but to go forward in its development and fulfillment. And as this people wills, so will it be."

Justice Frankfurter declared that Dr. Mann symbolized events and principles "that can hardly fail to remain forever among the great stories in the destiny of man." He argued for the inseparability of art and politics, stating his view that "for artists to be unpolitical is to surrender to those who reject the rights of free inquiry and of the free play of the mind, the determination of the direction of society."

Petition of American Merchant Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following petition:

We the undersigned Congressmen memorialize the President of the United States to grant the following petition of American merchant seamen. Their faithful fulfillment of their pledge to deliver the goods entitles them to this consideration.

"Our wartime take-home wages consisted of basic wages plus bonus gratuities. The bonus payments were made because of our substandard basic wages, and the urgency of maintaining manpower supply.

"Our total take-home was barely enough to maintain the minimum standard of living. This total take-home has at all times been below that of shoreside workers.

"Since VE-day the Maritime War Emergency Board has ordered the elimination of the bonus where the war hazards were believed reduced.

"This reduction becomes effective as of July 15.

"The hourly wage rate of ordinary seamen is 34 cents per hour, that of skilled able-bodied seamen is 41 cents. These hourly wages are below the substandard hourly wage rate of 55 cents, declared necessary by the National War Labor Board to maintain the minimum standards of living.

"The higher wage rates of shoreside workers has resulted in thousands of seamen leaving the ships.

"We petition our duly elected representatives to assist us in our request to have the effective date of the bonus cut deferred.

"We ask that the National War Labor Board and the War Shipping Administration, our employer, to adjust wages at least to the substandard basis of shoreside workers to insure that the families of merchant seamen will be able to live in decency while the seamen are continuing the fight to destroy fascism forever."

John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; Henry M. Jackson; Vito Marcantonio; Jerry Voorhis; Franck R. Havenner; Ed. V. Izac, of California; A. L. Bulwinkle, of North Carolina; Chase Going Woodhouse, of Connecticut; Richard J. Welch, of California; William T. Byrne, of New York; Hugh De Lacy, of Washington; Chet Holifield, of California; Augustine B. Kelley, of Pennsylvania; George P. Miller, of California; John W. Murphy, of Pennsylvania; Benjamin J. Rabin, of New York; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey; Joseph F. Ryter, of Connecticut; A. J. Sabath, of Illinois; W. J. Green, Jr., of Pennsylvania; John M. Coffee, of Washington; Edward A. Kelly, of Illinois; John E. Fogarty; Robert Crosser; W. W. Link; Jas. H. Torrens; Philip J. Philbin; William T. Granahan; William A. Barrett; Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr.; George H. Fallon; Walter B. Huber; Thomas J. O'Brien; W. A. Rowan, of Illinois; Ray J. Madden; Aime J. Forand; James J. Heffernan; Joseph L. Pfeifer; Daniel J. Flood; Geo. F. Rogers; Emily Taft Douglas; Cecil R. King; William J. Gallagher; D. K. Hoch; Helen Gahagan Douglas; James J. Delaney; Louis Ludlow; George G. Sadowski, of Michigan; Michael J. Kirwan; Cleveland M. Bailey; Philip A. Traynor; Peter A. Quinn; Francis E. Walter; Alexander J. Resa, of Illinois; Charles R. Savage, of Washington; John B. Sullivan, of Missouri; Luther Patrick; Melvin Price, of Illinois; Andrew J. Biemiller, of Wisconsin; Frank W. Boykin, of Alabama; J. W. Trimble, of Arkansas; John Edward Sheridan, of Pennsylvania; Lyndon B. Johnson; Frank T. Starkey; John D. Dingell; Herman P. Eberharter; Jennings Randolph; Michael J. Bradley; Louis C. Rabaut; Thomas S. Gordon, of Illinois; Ellis E. Patterson; W. D. Mills; John J. Cochran; Orville Zimmerman; Robert Ramspeck.

Coffee Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one problem that will be faced by our new Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, is the possibility of a shortage of coffee in the United States. Now is the time to find out whether responsible government officials are giving this matter proper attention.

I am very much disturbed by the following communication which I received today, and which reads:

DULUTH, MINN., *June 30, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have a 5-day supply of coffee. There must be and there is something radically wrong when we are unable to buy coffee for our requirements. If there is, as alleged, a 4 months supply of coffee in this country, we still find it impossible to buy coffee in production countries, as our importers say our ceilings are too low. The three little Swiss guys in San Francisco are up against it, and so are we. Please see Drew Pearson's article on coffee in yesterday's papers.

ANDRESEN-RYAN COFFEE CO.

The article referred to reads, in part, as follows:

BOOST IN COFFEE PRICES

A debate has been raging inside the Government over the price of coffee, which this time may be boosted.

Chief problem is that Brazil, our biggest coffee shipper and our best friend in Latin America, is finding it so uneconomical to grow coffee that she is turning to cotton. In that case she would be our chief competitor instead of our chief customer.

Labor costs in Brazil have risen to such an extent that Brazilian coffee growers can't produce at the OPA ceiling price, which averages around 13 cents a pound. They want the price boosted to an average of 18 cents a pound. This would increase the cost of a cup of coffee one-eighth of a cent.

The State Department favors such a price rise. The OPA, anxious to hold the line, is opposed.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our new Food Administrator will want to look into this problem. It is rather serious for the coffee roasting and distributing company that may have to close down for lack of coffee. The Andresen-Ryan Coffee Co. is an old established business, and supplies a large trade. It has many employees who will face unemployment if the business is discontinued.

These unfortunate results surely can be avoided, if good business judgment and common sense are used by the men who prescribe Government regulations for the coffee industry. Anyhow, this should be investigated, and, if necessary, proper changes made to insure the American housewife an adequate supply of coffee.

Admission of the Territory of Hawaii to Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill proposing that Congress authorize the people of the Territory of Hawaii to take the steps necessary to qualify as the forty-ninth State of the Union.

Both houses of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in the twenty-third biennial session that was only recently concluded, adopted resolutions voicing their belief in and support of statehood for Hawaii, and asking Congress to take the steps necessary to elevate the Territory to a State, at the very earliest possible moment.

The resolution also extended an invitation to the Committee on Territories and such other Members of Congress as may be appropriate to visit the Territory on the first opportune occasion to give further study and impetus to the program for statehood.

For purposes of insuring this visit, the Territorial Legislature passed, and the Governor approved, a bill appropriating out of the funds of the Territorial treasury a substantial sum to defray the expenses of such a visit.

I join with the members of our legislature in urging that appropriate committees of Congress undertake an examination of the question of statehood for Hawaii at the earliest opportunity. That this should be done within the near future appears particularly appropriate in view of current developments.

The United States Senate is about to undertake consideration of the San Francisco Charter. The agreements reached in the San Francisco Conference involve principles and policies that have an unmistakable relationship to the future of the Territory of Hawaii.

The whole subject of the future government of our Territories and relationships to other outlying areas is commanding an extraordinary amount of attention. The feeling prevails, and very properly, that our future course should be carefully charted at this time.

Future American policy in the Pacific is now being formulated. This relates to many problems in whose solution the Territory of Hawaii is inextricably involved. Among these are the relationships of our country to Pacific peoples and the development of Pacific areas for purposes of national security and commercial and industrial ends.

The presence among American citizens of the Territory of representatives of the principal peoples of the Pacific in larger numbers than in any other part of

the country, the vital importance of the naval base and corollary defenses at Pearl Harbor on Oahu, and the broad experiences of the people of Hawaii in dealing with the economic and social problems of the Pacific islands and the Orient will inevitably mean that they are involved in a vital way in any program for the future development of the Pacific.

In recognition of the great importance of arriving at a sound basis for future Pacific policies, a succession of committees of Congress, other public officials, and representative men in many walks of life are now en route or planning to visit these areas and countries involved. A subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has just completed a tour of the Pacific island bases. A subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee will leave within 10 days for another tour of these bases. Within the same period a committee of the Senate is planning to cross the Pacific for the Philippines, on a similar mission.

The House Committee on the Territories, which has been appraised of the wishes of our territorial legislature, is tentatively planning to visit the Territory of Hawaii this winter under authority of a resolution adopted by the House. I am most emphatically in favor of this program as the future of the Territory is the responsibility of this committee.

Although the resolution authorizing this visit does not make any specific reference to this question, I am requesting the committee to make an examination of it in a preliminary way at least, in view of the situation that is developing generally. Eight years has elapsed since the appropriate committee of Congress has reviewed this subject.

A joint committee of Congress visited Hawaii in October 1937 for purposes of investigating this subject and presented its report on February 15, 1938.

This report is embodied in Document No. 151 of the Seventy-fifth Congress. It is an exceptionally comprehensive report on all aspects of conditions in the Territory.

The report made these recommendations:

The committee therefore recommends that the question of statehood for Hawaii be deferred, to be further considered by the Congress on some appropriate occasion, after determination of the sentiment of its people and upon further application by them through proper channels.

The committee further recommends that the people of Hawaii be assured of the continued interest of Congress in their progress under the American flag; that as fellow citizens they be assured of the same treatment as the people of the several States; that the status of Hawaii as an integral part of the Union and an incorporated Territory of the United States be recognized in all national legislation; that its industries and products receive the same treatment accorded those of any other part of the Nation; and that its people be reassured that the established practice of the United States, as repeatedly affirmed in the platforms of both national parties and carried out in practice by the Federal Government, of granting the largest degree of local self-government to its Territories, will continue until such time as the question of statehood may be reexamined.

In accordance with the recommendation of this committee, a plebiscite on statehood was held in 1940. The people of the islands, by a vote of 46,174 to 22,428, expressed themselves in favor of statehood for Hawaii. There can be no question therefore as to the wishes of the people of these islands.

The reexamination of this subject along the lines recommended by this joint committee manifestly should be undertaken in the near future. The changes that have taken place in the 8 years that have elapsed since this recommendation was made are enormous and of far-reaching importance. The record of what has transpired since the outbreak of war should be reviewed. The information of Congress on the Territory needs to be brought up-to-date.

There are many problems relating not only to the political but to the economic and social developments of the islands that deserve the attention of this Congress. These can only be adequately studied by first-hand examination. Many of these involve Federal laws recommended by the legislature of the Territory.

The people of the islands will welcome the opportunity to present to the appropriate Members of Congress their views on many questions vital to the future of this country in the Pacific. I believe, moreover, they are entitled to this opportunity.

The resolution adopted by the senate of the Territory, requesting that the committee make such a visit, is as follows:

Senate Resolution 75

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America, has enjoyed an enlightened form of constitutional government under the best traditions of Anglo-American concepts of freedom for more than 100 years, and, in the long period of years since annexation to the United States of America, has demonstrated its unity with the Nation, its devotion to the national ideals, and its full capacity for self-government; and

Whereas the people of this Territory have by plebiscite demonstrated their overwhelming desire that Hawaii become a State through the customary procedure by which the Congress has elevated other Territories to statehood; and

Whereas the legislature of this Territory has repeatedly addressed the Congress asking that statehood be granted, thus carrying out the known and expressed sentiment of the people of Hawaii; and

Whereas provision has been made by this legislature to invite visits of congressional committees and groups to the Territory, to acquaint the Congress of the United States with conditions and issues vitally affecting Hawaii in its relations to the National Government and to the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That this senate does hereby express its complete belief in and support of statehood for Hawaii at the earliest possible moment; that this Senate does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to take the steps necessary to elevate this Territory to a State; and that an invitation be, and it is hereby, extended to the Committee on Territorial Affairs of the Senate of the Congress, to the Committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress, or to such subcommittees thereof, respectively, as may be appointed, asking them to visit Hawaii upon the first opportune occasion to give further study and impetus to the program of statehood, and to give attention to any other matters of congressional interest and concern in Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Committee on Territorial Affairs of the Senate of the Congress, to the Committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Offered by W. H. Hill, senator, First Senatorial District.

The resolution passed by the lower House of the legislature follows:

H. R. 96

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America and for a long period of years has demonstrated its ability for self-government; and

Whereas the people of this territory have by plebiscite demonstrated their overwhelming desire that Hawaii shall become a State through the customary procedure as authorized by the Congress; and

Whereas provision has been made by this legislature to invite visits of congressional committees and groups to the territory, to acquaint the Congress of the United States with important conditions and issues affecting the relations of the territory to the National Government and to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

1. That this House express its complete belief in and support of statehood for Hawaii at the earliest possible moment.

2. That this House urge the Congress of the United States to take the steps necessary to elevate this Territory to a State.

3. That the Governor be requested to immediately extend an invitation to the Committee on the Territories of the National House of Representatives, and to any other Members of Congress whom it may appear appropriate to include, to visit Hawaii upon the first opportune occasion to give further study and impetus to the program of statehood, and to give attention to any other matters of congressional interest and concern; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States from Hawaii, and to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

Offered by: Marcallino, Fong, Paschoal, Representative.

HONOLULU, T. H., *May 4, 1945*.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I have introduced would carry out the recommendations of the Territorial legislature. It is similar to measures approved by earlier sesssions of the Territorial legislature and presented to past sessions of Congress.

The enactment of this measure would set in motion the procedure that is normally followed in qualifying a territory as a State.

The provisions of the bill provide that following its approval an election would be held of delegates to a convention which would be charged with the responsibility of drafting a State constitution. The number of delegates to be elected would be 99 in all, a total of 84 being chosen from the different representative districts of the islands and 15 at large.

Under the bill the convention would be convened the second Tuesday after the election.

The constitution drafted by the convention would be submitted to the voters of the Territory, for approval or rejection, at another election that would be held not earlier than 60 nor later than 90 days after the convention had adjourned. If the constitution should be approved, it would then be submitted to the President and Congress for approval. The measure provides, as in similar cases, that the constitution can become effective with the approval of the President alone in the event that Congress does not act on it.

Within 30 days after the receipt of notification of approval by the President, the Governor of the Territory shall issue a proclamation for the election of State and county officers and all officers provided for in the constitution, said election to take place not earlier than 60 days nor later than 90 days after the Governor's proclamation. The results of this election will be forwarded to the President, who shall then proclaim the state.

The bill would give the State of Hawaii two Members in the House of Representatives and two Members in the Senate.

The bill provides for the transfer of the public lands of the Territory to the State. The title to these lands now reposes in the Federal Government. The bill provides also that the debts and liabilities of the Territory should be assumed by the State. Provision is also made in the measure to transfer to State officials the responsibilities of the executive and judicial officials of the Territory and to the appropriate State courts all cases and other legal actions pending in the territorial courts.

The procedure outlined has been well established in the course that has been followed in the evolution of many Territories into States.

Write Your Own Ticket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some who insist that we must have price control in order to prevent inflation wonder why I so bitterly oppose OPA. Believing that we should have legislation to prevent inflation, secure production, a bill was introduced by me as long ago as 1940, in an effort to stabilize the prices of things, that is, merchandise and farm products, and the amount paid for wages and salaries at the then level for one will not work without the other.

Enforcement of such legislation was advocated by recourse to the courts, the simple, known, and customary method heretofore effective and familiar to every citizen. But the administration rejected any consideration of such a measure. Perhaps, because it left no room for bureaucrats, for a multitude of employees on the Federal pay roll, for the exercise of administrative power, all dear to the New Deal heart. So we have the OPA, which has held down price levels in some instances but not in all and which has beyond argument retarded production. Decreased production naturally tends to cause an increase in prices. OPA legislation has been maladministered. Many of its orders are impractical, restrictive, and tend to defeat the purpose for which OPA was created. When mistakes were pointed out, OPA has either refused to correct them or done so only in part and belatedly.

Let those who have felt some of the injustices of OPA, who, while we are told that we have a surplus of food, have searched in vain for such items as eggs, sugar, butter, meat, bacon, certain items of clothing, farm machinery which was unavailable, read the following ad from a New York paper, which I quote:

MACY'S: BEGINNING TOMORROW, JUNE 1, YOU CAN SEND 11 POUNDS OF FOOD AND NECESSITIES TO CIVILIANS IN FRANCE AT PARCEL-POST RATES

We've special parcels ready for you. No ration points needed. The Macy low price includes everything—food, packing, shipping, insurance. Delivery is guaranteed. And, we'll be glad to take a standing order for packages to be shipped at regular intervals. Gift-package canteen, fifth floor.

No. F-5, $5.34: 1 pound of sugar, 1 pound powdered milk, 1 pound orange marmalade, 1 pound of French roast coffee, 1 pound of split peas, 8 ounces breakfast sausage, 2 packages chicken noodle soup, 1 pound dried figs, 2 cakes of soap.

No. F-6, $5.96: 1 pound of butter, 1 pound orange marmalade, 2 pounds French roast coffee, 1 pound instant cocoa, 1 pound of split peas, 5 ounces dried eggs, 3½-ounce chocolate bar, 1 cake of soap.

No. F-7, $6.98: 1 pound butter, 1 pound rice, 13 ounces Pabst-Ett cheese, 2 pounds of French roast coffee, 7-ounce chocolate bar, 5 ounces dried eggs, 14 ounces farina, 1 pound honey, 4 cakes of soap.

No. F-8, $7.73: 1 pound of sugar, 2 pounds of French roast coffee, 12 ounces luncheon meat, 4 ounces tea, one-half pound instant cocoa, 7-ounce chocolate bar, 2 packages bouillon cubes, 4 cakes of soap, 6 pairs of men's hose or 3 pairs of women's hose, 1 sewing kit, 10 razor blades or bobby pins.

Orders in any quantity will be filled for corporations, organizations, clubs.

One package per person each week is permissible.

Many folks ask me questions about the why and the wherefore of things which come out of Washington. Now I am asking someone who favors OPA to tell me why it is our people, good citizens, cannot obtain necessities, while those who wish to send sugar, buttermilk, coffee, sausage, butter, women's stockings, and many other items abroad can purchase them without points at Macy's and in unlimited quantities.

In my judgment, all the good that OPA has accomplished and much more could have been brought about, could still be obtained, by simple legislation, providing that no one should charge, or receive for any thing or any service a sum greater than that which had been charged for a similar thing or service over a definite fixed period before inflation started. Production instead of being discouraged would have been increased.

Admittedly OPA has not functioned properly, its Administrators have not adhered to the law—they have been and are arbitrary. Because it refuses to reform, it should be wiped out and a new effort made by the enactment of simple general rules which all could understand—and the agency established, be held to the accomplishment of the purpose desired.

The enforcement of such an act should be left to the courts, to which any and every citizen could have recourse.

Communism Again a Menace in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, prior to the time that Germany attacked Russia in this World War II, and the date when Hitler marched his armies into Russia was June 22, 1941, the threat of communism was a real one in this country. That was a little over 4 years ago. On that date, or rather the day after, the Communists in the United States suspended their disloyal and traitorous activity against our form of government and against the Republic of the United States. Other activities claimed part of the attention of the Communists.

But following VE-day on May 8, 1945, there is evidence that the dog has returned to his vomit. Communism will again travel under its true colors. The menace is with us again. That I may not be considered intemperate in my remarks, I quote from an editorial in one of our leading newspapers, the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., which says in part on May 27, 1945:

There have been indications that the American Communists are preparing the ground for another reversal of their party line. This will not be hard for them to do, for they are totally lacking in integrity and devoid of any sense of loyalty to the United States.

There are other pungent observations in this interesting editorial, but the above quotation shows that I have been too modest in my estimate of communism and Communists.

In this connection, the House Military Affairs Committee made history yesterday when it submitted a report to Congress on its investigation of American Communists. The Washington Post in a news item for today, June 30, calling attention to the Military Affairs Committee report, has this to say:

COMMUNISTS STILL ACTIVE, NATION TOLD—HOUSE COMMITTEE FILES FIRST REPORT ON PROBE OF RANKS PRESENTED BY ARMY

The House Military Affairs Committee said yesterday that American Communists, "supported and financed liberally from abroad," will stop at nothing to establish communism in the United States.

Reporting to Congress on its investigation of the commissioning of Communists by the Army, the committee said:

"Since 1919 Communists have been everywhere at work within this country, supported and financed liberally from abroad, and if they are able to do so they will penetrate within the armed forces on which we rely for security."

The report said that Communist interests have coincided with the country's interests while the United States was at war with Germany.

"The aim of overthrowing our Government by force and violence in order to set up a Communist state has not been visible in Communist propaganda since the day Germany invaded Russia," it said.

"Now, however, we are entering on a new era in which no one can foresee the turn of events.

"Groups of determined Communists here have not changed their ideas and will continue, with or without outside aid, to plot such a revolution as they think will realize the Marx-Lenin dream, and will stop at nothing to accomplish their aim."

The report quoted the Daily Worker, Communist newspaper, for December 3, 1935, as advising Communists to enlist in the Army or Navy in event of war. The quotation:

"In every struggle of the working class, the place of the Communists is in the very thick of the struggle, right among the other workers and toilers, winning them for the fight against capitalism.

"This is true above all among the armed forces, which are the capitalists' final weapon against the working class. What good can a militant worker do for his class locked up or shot as an objector?

"Should a new imperialist war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for peace, to struggle for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war against the Fascist instigators of war, against the bourgeoise, for the overthrow of capitalism."

The preliminary report gave no data on Communists now in the United States armed forces.

The report, unanimously approved by the full committee, was prepared by a subcommittee of Representatives R. EWING THOMASON, Democrat, Texas; Carl T. DURHAM, Democrat, North Carolina; JAMES A. ROE, Democrat, New York; LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, Illinois; and CHARLES A. ELSTON, Republican, Ohio.

MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT IS FACTUAL AND NONFOLITICAL

As the foregoing newspaper item indicates, the report recites facts. It is not a political document. It is signed by Democrats and Republicans alike. The charges they make are, indeed, serious. The American people will do well to be on their guard. They must watch not only the Communists, but a still more dangerous group of people known as the fellow travelers. They are a curious bunch of odds and ends, pinks and punks, and so forth, who would disguise themselves. While believing in communism, they either do not have the nerve to join that party or prefer to remain respectable and help accomplish the purposes of communism by supporting its aims and principles, and at the same time denying any connections with the organization. The Communist at least lets it be known that he sails under his own colors.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and the same eternal vigilance is going to be needed in the days to come, if the American people are to preserve our constitutional form of government and the Republic of the United States.

Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an article on the full employment bill, written by Alfred Baker Lewis, which supports my own thinking in connection with this measure:

The full employment bill, Senate 380, introduced by Senators MURRAY, of Montana; WAGNER, of New York; O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming; and THOMAS, of Utah, deserves the study and active support of all union men and women.

The bill recognizes that a right to useful work at decent pay should be the heritage of every American able and willing to work, and that the Government has a duty to its citizens to carry out the obligation to provide jobs for all.

We have all learned enough economics from the war experience to know that expenditures provide employment. When the Government stands ready to spend practically unlimited sums there are jobs for all at high and rising pay. When the Government's expenditures are curtailed there are cutbacks in employment.

This is in accordance with our experience during the depression. As expenditures fell off, the depression grew steadily worse. With Roosevelt's election the Government started to spend more money and business and employment began to pick up. It picked up fairly steadily with only temporary and minor recessions, but genuinely full employment was not achieved until the limitless expenditures for war did the job.

The propagandists for big business (except that they are not called that but are referred to as the "spokesmen" for industry) assert that they could provide full employment "if." The "if" is the main thing, and it means that private business would give full employment if it did not have to pay heavy taxes, if there were no Government regulations against monopoly, etc., and if labor is reasonable by which they mean if labor is unorganized and powerless to resist wage cuts or speedups whenever businessmen feel that they want to cut their labor costs and increase their profits.

This propaganda (pardon me—political education) by big business is pushed with energy and plenty of cash. But it will fall on deaf ears if we have sense enough to remember that private profit-seeking enterprise had all the things it asks for now back in the days of Hoover before Roosevelt's election and the New Deal. Taxes on wealth were very low, there were no social-security laws, and other Government regulations were unimportant, antimonopoly regulations were not enforced, and organized labor outside of building trades was very weak and in the heavy industries like steel and automobiles was nonexistent. Nevertheless, private enterprise without any government planning or regulation plunged our country into the worst depression that we have ever known.

NEVER PROVIDED FOR ALL

Private enterprise without Government planning to back it up never did provide full employment. On the contrary, every 8 or 10 years it gave us a severe depression and widespread unemployment.

We always used to pull out of these pericdic depressions because of an economic fact which is passed, namely the existence of an abundance of free land in the West. Throughout most of our country's history there was free land on the western frontier. Any man who was out of work or underpaid could pull up stakes, move a few hundred miles farther west, and get 160 acres of first-class farming land from Uncle Sam for no more than a registration fee. To be sure he then had to work very hard to clear the land and make a living. But he was his own boss; his own master; no one could fire him; and if he had ordinarily good crop weather he could expect to make a decent living. Thus the free land in the West acted as the safety valve for unemployment.

Now this free land in the West is all taken up except for barren mountain tops or deserts. The safety valve for unemployment has gotten jammed. Therefore the depression under Hoover proved to be worse and more persistent than any other, and did not begin to get better until Government planning and expenditures under the New Deal started employment on the upward climb.

The full employment bill builds on this simple fact of economics: Unless somebody spends money there will be no jobs, and unless all of us together spend enough money for consumption and for investment combined, there will not be jobs for all.

NOT HARD TO FIGURE

It therefore directs the President, calling for advice and statistical help, of course, from varicus other departments of the Government, to prepare an estimate of the total amount of expenditures that will be necessary to provide worth-while and well-paying jobs for all.

This is not a very difficult calculation. It then directs the President also to prepare an estimate of how much money consumers will probably spend. There are figures already available of such things as department-store sales, sales of automobiles, chain-store sales, building permits, etc., which lay the foundation on which reliable estimates of consumers' expenditures can be built.

These estimates, of course, can be revised from time to time throughout the year.

Then the Government is to prepare estimates of probable expenditures by business for investment purposes. All big corporations have reinvestment programs and by totaling them up and making proper allowance for expenditures of smaller companies on investment, we can get a good idea of what the probable investment expenditures by private enterprise will be. Then, to the total figures on probable expenditures by consumers and by private business for investment must be added expenditures by State and local governments and by the Federal Government for ordinary expenses. These are very easy to obtain for they are budgeted.

If these total expenditures by consumers, by business, and by Government agencies do not add up to the total sum of expenditures needed to provide jobs for all, we must expect unemployment. By curtailing still further the expenditures of workers who are unemployed or who fear unemployment, this unemployment will roll up like a snowball unless measures are taken by the Government promptly to stop it.

The full-employment bill directs the President, therefore, to recommend to Congress steps to increase expenditures by consumers and by private business wherever a deficiency of expenditures seems likely to cause unemployment.

LOWER INTEREST RATES

These steps might mean, for example, a lowering of the interest rate, which would make the bankers yell, no doubt, but would make it easier for businessmen to borrow and then would probably increase their investments, therefore. Reducing the interest rate would also make it easier for farmers to build more silos, or buy more farm machinery, and

thus increase their useful expenditures. Also it would make it cheaper and easier for people in general to build homes or enlarge the homes they already have, thus increasing expenditures in another direction and providing more jobs.

Or the President might recommend raising minimum wage rates so as to increase the purchasing power of low-paid workers, who spend their money as fast as they get it. Or the President might recommend to Congress increasing the payments for social security benefits, so that the aged and the unemployed could spend more and by their spending help to provide more jobs.

Finally, if all these methods did not produce or did not seem likely to produce enough additional expenditures to bring the total up to the amount necessary to provide full employment, then as a last resort, the Government should stand ready with projects planned in advance to provide useful jobs, additional useful services; so as to make up the difference and make jobs for all a reality. For this purpose it might build more roads and streets, and more dams to generate cheap electric light and power and stop floods.

It might make more payments to farmers in the form of guaranteed prices to encourage them to grow food. It might build more hospitals, schools, colleges, or libraries, either directly or through noninterest bearing loans to States, counties, cities, towns, and school districts, for such purposes. It might encourage better health, recreation, and education by subsidies to local governments, for example, so that more doctors, teachers, dentists, etc., would find useful work, and the level of health and education of our population would be raised.

In all these ways the Government would stand as an impregnable second line of defense against unemployment, pledged to provide jobs for all if and whenever private industry failed to give full employment.

ATTACK ALREADY STARTED

Naturally this bill is already being attacked by antilabor tories and reactionaries. They hate Government planning, which they misname Government interference. But the fact is that no honest conservative, if he genuinely believes that private industry can provide jobs for all should hesitate to support the bill.

All the bill does in the first instance is to direct the preparation of statistical information and plans and blueprints for Government projects. The actual Government activity in business and industry need not come into play until it becomes clear that private industry is not able and will not be able to provide jobs for all.

Private industry will thus be left unhampered to serve as the first line of defense against joblessness. The propagandists (pardon me, "spokesmen") for private industry, say that this first line of defense is sufficient. Past experience is dead against them.

Private industry, except in wartime, never had provided jobs for all. But it is sufficient; if the propagandists really believe what they preach, they need never worry about Government action, for it will not be needed and will never be called into play if private industry fulfills the claims of its supporters and really does provide jobs enough to give full employment.

If these well-paid spokesmen for private industry still persist in their opposition to the bill (as they do), therefore, it can only be because they do not honestly believe that private industry can and will provide jobs for all. What they want is to use their promise to provide jobs for all as a lever to win their demands for lower taxes on wealth, no Government regulation of industry, and an end to Government support of the principle of collective bargaining.

Providing a second line of defense against unemployment through Government planning such as the full-employment bill contemplates, is as sensible as having two strings to your bow. It is necessary to prevent quarrels over jobs between returned veterans and older unionists; it is necessary to prevent possible race riots between whites and Negroes over who is to have the limited number of jobs available; and it is equally necessary to give the members of organized labor the minimum of economic security needed to enable them to maintain decent wages and a decent standard of living in postwar America.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter received from the Central Valley Project Association of California:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, Calif., June 27, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: The Central Valley Project Association is the organization which has sponsored the Central Valley project from its inception in 1933. We are the representatives of the counties and water districts most affected by the project and whose need for a supplemental water supply has always been the justification for the project.

On behalf of the association and those it represents I am most happy to convey to you our very sincere appreciation for your thorough understanding of our project problems, your thoughtful consideration of its needs and energetic support of its essential purposes as evidenced by your action in connection with the Central Valley item in the pending Interior appropriation bill. We believe that you have been considerate and wise in your judgment and through your efforts the primary purposes of the project will be successfully carried out and we will be able to meet our commitment to the Government to repay the reimbursable costs from project revenues.

Very truly,

ROLAND CURRAN,
Secretary-Manager.

Designation of the Birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution from the Tiffin Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Tiffin, Ohio:

Resolution memorializing Congress to designate the birthday of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a national holiday

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States, from March 4, 1932, until his untimely death on April 12, 1945, having been elected to four successive terms and having become the first American President honored by his fellow citizens with more than the traditional two terms; and

Whereas President Roosevelt assumed office during the depression, one of the great domestic crises in the Nation's history, and by wise, courageous, and humanitarian leadership restored confidence and faith in America; and

Whereas President Roosevelt championed the cause of the workingmen of America and ushered in a new era of consideration for the rights of labor and the common man; and

Whereas President Roosevelt espoused and signed the National Social Security Act generally recognized as the greatest social measure in American history, climaxing a 14-year educational campaign by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in behalf of State and Federal old-age security legislation; and

Whereas President Roosevelt awakened our Nation to the menace of fascism to our free institutions and our very existence as a free people, and led America and its allies, the United Nations, in the mightiest world struggle for human freedom, culminating in the unconditional surrender of Germany and in decisive victories over Japan; and

Whereas President Roosevelt charted a course for preventing future wars, by means of a permanent world peace organization, economic cooperation, and international good will, thereby embodying during the most critical period in modern history the hopes, the aspirations, and the ideals of his fellow countrymen, and the oppressed peoples of the entire world; and

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt is assured an immortal place in world history, and will earn the gratitude of American generations yet to come and the esteem and affection of free people in all lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Tiffin Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to designate January 31, the birth date of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a national holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from this State and the Congressman of this district.

Grim Prospect for Coast's Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond appearing in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

GRIM PROSPECT FOR COAST'S INDUSTRY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Reconversion is more than a word to the west coast. It is impossible to see and talk with people in California, Oregon, and Washington without feeling the grave awareness with which they view their own postwar world. It is at once a very considerable threat and a remarkable opportunity.

No other section of the United States faces problems of returning to a peacetime economy comparable to the west coast. The reason is that here the greater part of industry never converted to war; it was created for war. The West had long hoped to achieve a

substantial industrialization. It has achieved it, too—rapidly, under the terrific impact of war-born manufacturing.

The labor force in the three Pacific Coast States nearly tripled between 1939 and 1943, mounting from 560,000 to 1,590,000. This has produced a balanced population between agriculture and industry and, if it can be made to endure, a better-balanced economy. But at present, in terms of peacetime operations, the coast's wartime production is highly unbalanced, since nearly half of its industrial population is concentrated in shipbuilding and aircraft.

The dilemma is that there is no present assurance, there is really no visible plan, by which the West can convert its vast shipbuilding and aircraft manufacturing to the production of civilian goods. But that is the West's determined objective, and unless it is to face again a grave and dangerous unemployment it must find ways to do it. California has alone increased its population 1,500,000 during the war, and a postwar reversal of the century-old migration trend from west to east is hardly likely.

The central problem is that today the coast possesses a new, war-created industrial population which only an equivalent peace industry can employ, and that peacetime industry is not yet even on the drafting board.

The magnitude of this problem is brought sharply into focus by the findings of a survey undertaken by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco and the Committee for Economic Development. They obtained reports from 857 Pacific coast manufacturing companies on what they intend to do after the war with the plants, including Government-owned plants, that they now operate, what outlays they anticipate, how many people they expect to employ.

On the basis of this broad study, it develops that west coast manufacturers would employ about 780,000 persons after the change-over to postwar operations under good general business conditions. This is far from enough. While it is 40 percent more than were employed in 1939, it is 50 percent less than in 1943, and it would leave more than 800,000 of the present labor force on the coast without jobs. This does not take account of the several hundred thousand returned veterans after the defeat of Japan.

The crux of the problem concerns the fate of the Pacific war industries which must keep at it until the last fighting is done, which will have little or no opportunity to convert to peace production gradually and which must explore new markets and turn to manufacturing totally new products if they are to stay in business on anything approaching the present scale.

"Results of the survey suggest," the Federal Reserve report concludes, candidly but ominously, "that little can be expected in the way of conversion of war plants to peacetime production. So far as the survey shows, no major shipyard or aircraft plant is to be converted to large-scale manufacturing of new products. For manufacturing as a whole, plants accounting for about 42 percent of the total value of production at February 1944, rates are to be closed down."

This is a quiet, detached, economist's statement of a very grim prospect, a prospect which must be realistically seen if it is going to be substantially averted. It means that the unemployment hurricane which is presently headed in the direction of the Pacific coast, and particularly in the direction of its five greatest industrial areas, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, and San Diego, is perilous.

This west coast and its people are never without confidence and never without imagination. They are looking and planning ahead, management, labor, and Government alike. Henry Kaiser is whipping up a variety of breath-taking projects, and fortunately he has a habit of delivering the goods. State and municipal governments are on an extraordinarily sound financial basis. Many workers have accumulated substantial savings. It remains to be seen whether the size of the preparations to deal with the transition from war to peace are equal to the size of the task.

H. R. 2536

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the Public Service Commission of Wyoming endorsing H. R. 2536:

At a meeting of the Public Service Commission of Wyoming held at Cheyenne the 23d day of May 1945 the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the commission that there is pending in Congress H. R. 2536, known as the Bulwinkle bill; and

"Whereas the purpose of such bill is to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by providing that agreements between carriers (other than agreements for a pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition, or other transaction to which section 5 is applicable) may be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval, and if approved the parties to the agreement shall be relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making of such agreement and the carrying out of the same; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the members of this commission that conference and agreements between the carriers with respect to rates and other matters are a necessary part of the cooperative arrangements by which the railroads of this country operate as a unified system of rail transportation, and it is believed that such agreements and conferences are in the public interest when subject to proper regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

"Whereas it also appears to this commission that the Department of Justice of the United States has recently taken the position that such conferences and agreements have been in violation of the antitrust laws of United States; and

"Whereas, it is the belief of the members of this commission that the situation with which the carriers are thus confronted is an intolerable one for which there should be relief in the public interest; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the members of this commission that the Bulwinkle bill constitutes a proper method and measure of relief consistent with and conducive to the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Public Service Commission of the State of Wyoming, That this commission favors the adoption of the Bulwinkle bill or similar legislation and instructs the secretary of the commission to forward a copy of this resolution to Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney, and E. V. Robertson, Representative Frank A. Barrett, and Governor Lester C. Hunt."

Dated at Cheyenne, Wyo., this 23d day of May A. D. 1945.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF WYOMING,
EARL R. BURNS, *Chairman.*
ARCHIE EWOLDSEN, *Commissioner.*

San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the delightful experience of living for 2 months in San Francisco during the United Nations Conference has inspired the editor of the Washington Post to write the following eloquent tribute to my beautiful home city:

[From the Washington Post of June 30, 1945]

COSMOPOLIS

The disposition of the San Francisco delegates to the far ends of the earth will return the city to its quondam ways. We are sure the delegates said good-by to the Golden Gate with the kindliest feelings. They were the recipients of a warming hospitality, which kept up, in spite of rationing restrictions, during the entire 9 weeks of deliberations. It is invidious to particularize, but we shall risk it in picking out Mayor Roger Lapham, a "mine host" in looks as in manners, and the chairman of the local hospitality committee, Mr. Henry F. Grady. Both officials are now giving worthily to the city what they had already given to the Nation. However, all San Franciscans behaved as hosts, and there was no service to the throng of Conference workers the provision of which had to be cajoled out of the willing and friendly people.

San Francisco's hospitality is the true hospitality that is enjoyed by the people affording it. This is one reason that it never palled. San Francisco knows it has a lovely city, and likes to show it off. There is a surfeit of angles in this city of hills, in this setting of mountain and seascape, which provides views of unforgettable and surpassing beauty. The city becomes a jewel when you look at it from the range that bars the northern peninsula from the sea. The mountain, hazy with mist, has a peculiar grandeur when seen from the distance of the city limits. And the bay between, the Golden Gate, is almost too breathtaking to be broken even by the marvelous bridge that spans it. These are spectacles. But San Francisco likewise has its intimate sights. Past civilizations have left quiet memorials in San Francisco, and, in the surrounding countryside, the valleys teem with fertility and the woods and hillsides display all the floral color of creation. The pride of the city in itself is justified and never unbecoming.

People, however, make any city, no matter how fair it may be. In San Francisco the visitors from abroad must have noticed the combination in San Francisco of a cosmopolitan sophistication with a western forthrightness. The combination is irresistible. Both qualities are toned down to just the right level in inoffensiveness. So that San Francisco felt that the Conference was a moment for the city as well as for the world, and acted as a steward for the birth of the new world organization with a becoming awareness of its significance in the life of humanity. Now it goes back to its old status, throbbing again with life as the gateway to the Pacific, matching power and vigor with its beauty, and leaving an impression upon the world of this Nation's vitality.

The Farm-Machinery Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that food will win the war and food is ammunition, and yet food production has never been considered by the administration to be an essential war industry.

Even at this late date, when the end of the war in Europe has released materials, manpower, and facilities from direct munitions production—when there is actually unemployment in many great manufacturing centers—the administration is not emphasizing production of farm machinery but is merely removing some controls and letting farm machinery manufacturers take their chances on getting materials along with the makers of other civilian goods.

This short-sighted attitude has contributed greatly to our present food difficulties and may result in even more serious consequences unless immediate action is taken.

Reports from all over the United States reaching the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee indicate that the law of diminishing returns has set in. We have taken so much from our farmers—manpower, machinery, profits on many kinds of foods—that their capacity to produce has now been seriously curtailed.

Farm machinery is wearing out. In spite of WPB press release telling of the great quantity of repairs and replacement parts being made, farmers are finding it almost impossible to get repairs and replacements.

American farmers have been asked to do the biggest food production job in all history. It was a war job as definitely as the production of ammunition is a war job. The only difference between food and ammunition is that you can fight a little longer without food than you can without ammunition.

But while the munitions industry was being given the greatest flood of tools in history to do its war job, the food production industry was denied even its normal supply of tools, as production of farm machinery was severely curtailed as soon as the war came along. Here are the figures:

According to the War Production Board, the average annual production of machine tools for the 10 years 1930 to 1939, inclusive, was $99,147,000. The total for those 10 years was $991,470,000.

Here are the figures on machine-tool production for the early war years—when we were giving the mechanical industries the tools with which to do their war job:

1940	$442,633,000
1941	771,468,000
1942	1,321,748,000
1943	1,180,243,000

During those 4 years, we produced as many industrial tools for the mechanical industries as we did in 37½ average prewar years. Production in 1940 was four and one-half times the prewar average; in 1941 it was almost eight times as great; in 1942 it reached the peak of 13 times the prewar annual production; and in 1943 it was about 12 times as great.

In contrast, as soon as the war approached, our national planners immediately cut down the production of farm machinery—the tools farmers had to have to do their war job.

Tractor production, for example, has been limited to about half of the 1940 or 1941 production. Production of the following farm machinery is less than it was in 1940; tractors, mowers, hay loaders, disc harrows, irrigation pumps, tractor moldboard plows, disc plows, cream separators, horse-drawn cultivators, horse- and tractor-drawn planters, and tractor-mounted planters.

These are all items of essential farm equipment. They are only part of the list of necessary farm tools on which production has actually been curtailed—while production of machine tools has been expanded as never before in our history.

In January 1945 the War Food Administration said:

> In 1945 supplies of new farm machinery, even if manufacturing schedules are met, will not meet essential demands.

Latest report from the War Production Board—June 26, 1945—is that farm machinery manufacturers will fall about 8 or 9 percent behind schedule for the year ending June 30.

In spite of the great reduction in war production, WPB is not exerting any real effort to secure ample production of farm machinery. The reason is difficult to understand. Here is the situation:

"Quota restrictions" have been removed from farm machinery manufacturers—but this means very little, because—

Production is dependent on securing materials and farm machinery manufacturers will have no preferred rating over other civilian products.

Allocations of controlled materials have been increased for the third quarter of 1945 roughly 40 percent over the second quarter but farm machinery's priority here is no greater than other civilian products.

Instead of bending every effort to provide farmers with machinery, now that facilities are available, WPB is simply permitting some increase—as it is in many utterly nonessential lines.

England Relaxes Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, while we consider extension of price and rationing controls in America, they are being relaxed in England.

I hold in my hand a copy of the London News and Chronicle of June 18, 1945. Under the heading "Here is good news for motorists and railway passengers," are two articles to the effect that gasoline may be taken off the ration lists the last of August, and that many new permanent train services are being established.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these two articles:

PETROL MAY GO OFF RATION IN SEPTEMBER

Petrol will probably be taken off the ration when the basic petrol books expire at the end of August.

The return to motoring resulting from the issue of the books has not been nearly so great as had been anticipated.

The machinery for distributing basic permits is excessive and cumbersome, and in view of this it is not felt advisable to restrict a commodity which at present is in plentiful supply.

Many motorists have not taken advantage of basic petrol because they feel that the restricted range of the permit does not justify the high overhead costs entailed by registration and insurance.

WITHOUT PERMITS

The distribution of petrol without coupons is likely to be accompanied by the cancellation of buying permits for cars.

Already the manufacturers are building cars faster than the rate of consumption permitted by the ministry of war transport buying certificates, and exporting facilities are not such as to absorb the fast-accumulating stocks.

It may be anticipated, therefore, that all wartime restrictions on motoring will be removed by next September.

FIFTY-EIGHT EXTRA TRAINS RUN TO COAST

Twenty-three new and permanent train services from Victoria Station to the coast, unheralded and announced only on a small blackboard, was the Southern Railway's holiday gift to the thousands of Londoners who left for the seaside yesterday.

Altogether 58 main-line and 12 suburban services, either new or restored from prewar timetables, will now run from Victoria. On the main line there were 23 extra trains on Saturday and 23 yesterday, and there will be 12 during the week.

Of yesterday's extra trains, 11 were for Brighton, including nonstop trains at 10 a. m. and 11 a. m.

The Southern Railway's decision to add more trains was "made with a shrinking heart," an official said.

A Permanent FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, from correspondence received, it is evident that not everybody in Vermont is sold on the idea of establishing a permanent FEPC.

I am advised some people are very much disturbed by the program initiated by Ritchie Low to bring colored children from Harlem to Vermont to establish better racial relations. "Why," says one person, "should we be made the poorhouse for Harlem when there are so many poor children—white—in Ver-

mont who need a vacation?" Another cannot "magnify too much the spirit of tolerance and the desire to help solve the racial problem manifest by the Low plan." Yet another says, "Talk about international peace. What should bother us is how to keep from having a civil war in order to solve the problem of what to do with and for the Negroes and the Jews, before the white race is entirely submerged by them."

In view of the diversity of thought, and the disagreement among well-intentioned people, as evidenced by the letters I have received, I am convinced more than ever that David Harum was right when he said: "Difference of opinion makes horse races."

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am including two editorials from the St. Johnsbury Caledonian, which invite very careful consideration. The editor spends considerable time south of the border, and is fully informed with respect to the subject matters concerning which he writes:

[From the Evening Caledonian of May 15, 1945]

WATCH THIS BILL

Pending in the Congress is H. R. 2232, a bill to create a Fair Employment Practice Commission on a permanent basis. If passed, its impact upon the lives of our people would be more far reaching than any New Deal legislation heretofore placed on the statute books. The bill merits the careful analysis of every employer of labor, of the clergy, of educators, and of the individual citizen.

The substance of the bill is the provision that it shall be unfair employment practice "to refuse to hire any individual because of such individuals' race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry." Upon the foundation of this declared principle, which meets with the approval of every fair-minded American, the bill rears a monstrous superstructure of restrictive and annoying legislation, which might well create a condition of civil discord and an intensity of prejudice under the guise of the law.

The mechanics of the proposed legislation must first be considered. The bill sets up a five-man commission with 5-year overlapping terms. The commission would have the power to establish "such regional offices as it deems necessary" and could appoint "such officers and employees as it deems necessary." The agency is given power to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services. There is no limit placed upon the number of regions in which the commission could operate and there is no limit placed upon the number of employees who could be hired.

A further important provision relates to the actual operating methods of the commission. Section 6 (g) of the bill provides that the commission may meet at any place and may "by one or more of its members or by such agent, or agencies as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States."

The appalling implications of this bill have been pointed out on the floor of the House by Representative O. C. FISHER, of Texas, in advance of its actual consideration by the Congress. The Texas Congressman calls attention to the fact that this roving one-man court set up for the purpose of hearing complaints charging discrimination in employment, would be clothed with judicial powers exceeding that of a Federal judge. Each FEPC agent would occupy the role of judge, prosecuting attorney, and investigator. "It would be hard to imagine a more typical kangaroo court," declares the Congressman. "It would indeed be a travesty on the word 'justice.'"

In tomorrow's issue we shall point out further objections to the provisions of the bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission in support of our belief that discrimination in employment due to prejudice of any sort, can never be properly dealt with by bludgeons of the law.

[From the Evening Caledonian of May 16, 1945]

WATCH THIS BILL

In yesterday's discussion of pending congressional legislation to create a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent discrimination in employment by reason of race, creed, color, national origin, and ancestry, we stressed the thought that each member at the vast army of Federal agents appointed to take evidence of workers complaining of discrimination, would serve as judge, prosecuting attorney, and investigator, thus constituting kangaroo courts unknown outside the dictator countries.

But it is when we consider just how far the action of such agents could reach into the lives of our citizens that the inherent viciousness of the measure as presently framed becomes apparent.

Two Congressmen have already discussed the subject on the floor of the House. Representative FISHER has expressed the opinion that the Fair Employment Practice Commission could assume jurisdiction over employment practices of every highway department and every city and county school board. He terms the measure a "bold attempt to gain control of an important phase of our educational system—that of the employment of teachers." He alleges that this new Federal agency, if created by the Congress, would give control of employment practices of every corporation in the land, "regardless of the character of their business with respect to interstate commerce."

Extending his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Representative MANASCO, of Alabama, asserts that if the bill becomes law "a Protestant could force a publishing house owned and operated by the Catholic church to give him employment or vice versa." The same thing would be true, declares the Congressman, of employers of religious bookstores who cater solely to members of certain faiths. The Alabama Representative concludes that "any American who is worthy of being called American, desires to select his own employees without dictation from Congress, the President, or any Government bureau." He predicts that "if this bill ever becomes law an aroused public opinion will drive from office every person who votes for its passage."

Not the least of the practical objections to the passage of legislation forbidding discrimination in employment lie in the fact that such a law would open a wide field for the racketeer, the blackmailer, and the shyster. Infinitely easy would it be to embarrass the small-town merchant who turned down an applicant for employment. The merchant might soon find himself haled before a Government agent for alleged discrimination against the applicant on the ground of race, creed, or color. Personal annoyance and days lost in hearings would follow even though the ultimate decision might be in the merchant's favor.

H. R. 2232 is a bill to watch. Discrimination in employment on the ground of race, creed, color, or national origin is un-American, but an attempt to cure the situation by legislation so far reaching as is indicated by the terms of H. R. 2232 will lead to practices far more un-American.

The old adage "let sleeping dogs lie" has an instant application. To stir up these fiendish hounds of racial prejudice by the club of a law lacking the united support of the people might well precipitate race riots. The result would most certainly be to place all private business under Government control.

There is only one way to cure bigotry and racial discrimination, and that is by education and by the cooperative, voluntary efforts of all the groups comprising this great melting pot of America. The bill to create a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission in its present form is dangerous to the welfare of the American people.

Vermonters cannot treat the subject complacently in the belief that the law would effect only conditions in the large industrial cities. If the bill becomes law disturbing factors would arise to mar and possibly destroy the happy relations which exist among all classes of the population of the small towns of this State. We live as neighbors—and there has never been a time in the history of Vermont when distinctions of color, race, and creed meant so little in the lives of our people.

When H. R. 2232 comes up in the Congress for consideration the people of this State will expect calm, level-headed action on the part of their representatives. They will not look kindly upon action motivated by any false sense of liberalism or dictated by political expediency.

Give Us More Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of June 27, 1945:

GIVE US MORE MEAT

Western Oregon sheep growers have meat to sell. The public wants more meat. Under intelligent controls, the existing ceiling prices for dressed lamb would permit the grower to receive a satisfactory price for his live product. Yet, unless Government authorities permit more rational controls, the growers will have an unmarketable surplus, and the public will be denied the meat that it wants.

The western Oregon lamb situation has been set forth by R. C. Burkhart, president of the Western Oregon Livestock Association, in a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture. He reviews the conditions peculiar to this area and which were presented a year ago, and no doubt remembered by many readers. Then the availability of dressed meat in general was less critical than now. The consumer's red ration points had more value. No long queues reached into the streets from the chicken stalls in the markets. The sheep growers did not obtain adequate relief then. Some carried unmarketable lambs over to yearlings, despite heavy losses and use of feed critically needed for other livestock, and these yearlings aggravate the lamb problem this year.

Because of their pasture feeding, western Oregon lambs are too soft to stand shipment alive to eastern markets and will not stand shipping across the continent in dressed form. Milk-fat lambs when ready for market must go to market within 2 or 3 weeks or suffer severe deterioration.

Western Oregon needs to market about 150,000 lambs and sheep within the next 3 months. Roughly, only 10 percent are old ewes. Maximum quotas for killing plants not under Federal inspection will take only 9,932 of them. Federal inspection plants are

not limited as to quotas but, based on last year's figures, will be able to slaughter only 42,000 or so because of labor shortage. What's to become of the other almost 100,000?

Even in normal times Oregon slaughterers do not handle all of the western Oregon lamb crop. Normally the great bulk of the surplus over that which they kill would go to California and the remainder to the State of Washington. But in California and Washington the producer encounters quotas, ration points, and labor conditions in killing plants the same as he does in Oregon.

And even if these obstacles could be surmounted, transportation difficulties to California would remain. Wartime freight congestion causes delays and roundabout routings resulting in grievous shrinkage, and frequently growers cannot get their shipments started on the way until it is too late.

Due to surplus, animals were marketed in 1943 and 1944 at $4 per hundred pounds below prices justified by ceilins on meats and pelts. They are now $2 under par and likely to go lower. In prices and otherwise the grower takes it on the chin.

Here is a local condition that can be alleviated or corrected only by adjustments in quotas, ration points and buying policies applied locally. It might cause envy among some elsewhere to learn that Oregonians had leg of lamb and they had none, but it would be senseless for Government to make equality of deprivation an excuse for preventing consumption of a local abundance of food that must go to waste unless consumed locally, and for putting the hooks into the producers of it.

A Study of Neglect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Territories, under authity of this House will soon go to Alaska for the first time to make a study of the Territorial government and to inquire into other matters relating to the development of Alaska. Alaskans will welcome the opportunity to meet with the members of the Commitee on the Territories and to advise with them regarding the future of Alaska. Our present form of government in the Territory is far from satisfactory, and this is made abundantly clear in a thoughtful editorial appearing in the Anchorage Times of June 13 which is reprinted here:

A STUDY OF NEGLECT

Congress is sending a committee to Alaska this summer to study governmental problems and proposed changes in the organic act, according to an Associated Press dispatch from Washington yesterday. Subcommittees will look into more specialized fields, with one assigned to matters concerning transportation, one to lands, and the third to industries.

This is an ambitious program and Alaskans can wish the legislators the best of luck in their undertaking. If they are successful in "getting the feel" of things territorial, it may well be that Congress will legislate wisely in meeting some of the current problems.

We would suggest that the Congressmen busy themselves between now and their departure from Washington on August 1 with the history of Alaska. Let them look into the background from which so many of today's problems have generated.

It would be helpful if the Congressmen were aware of the neglect that has marked the administration of government in Alaska since its purchase from Russia in 1867. The historians have been almost unanimous in their contentions that the record adds no glory to the United States Government.

From 1867 until 1884 the status of Alaska was so questionable that it was rarely referred to as a Territory. It was usually called a district in official statements. There was no provision for government of any sort other than a customs collector stationed at Sitka.

For 17 long years after the Territory was purchased the Congress did not see fit to provide for any law enforcement or to otherwise supervise the affairs of Alaska. It was a hard battle to obtain passage of the first organic act of 1884, which merely set up a feeble system for the administration of justice.

The first organic act provided for one judge for the Territory. It also provided for one marshal with four deputies, and four commissioners. They were located at scattered points, with no provisions for transportation or communication. Naturally, they were impotent in administrating justice.

This organic act failed to provide a Territorial legislature. It failed to provide for a Delegate to Congress. The feeble governmental set-up was tantamount to no government at all.

The Army and the Navy dabbled at various times with law enforcement. Meanwhile, Alaskans continuously pleaded for more government. Conventions were held to send representatives to Washington to speak in behalf of the neglected Territory.

For 22 years this situation continued with Congress almost annually rejecting legislation proposed for the strengthening of government in Alaska. There are those who contend the mercantile interests were in control and they wanted no interference with their monopolies. Their powerful lobbies resisted efforts to obtain enactment of new laws.

The fur traders viewed with disfavor any increase in population because it might upset their industry. The fisheries likewise frowned on any development which might lead to regulation of their enjoyment of the abundant resources of Alaska.

But Alaskans continued their relentless battle to improve their governmental status. Congress was the only place to look for relief because Congress has always held and still holds full power to legislate for Alaska.

In 1906 Congress created the voteless seat in the House of Representatives for the Alaska delegate.

In 1912, after 15 years of United States ownership, the territorial legislature was created. The organic act enacted in that year is the one that still controls the territorial government today.

It limits the powers of the Alaska Legislature to certain actions. It makes the territorial lawmakers a branch of the Congress. Its actions may be negated by Congress at will. The list of "taboos" for action by the Alaskans is long.

Meanwhile, government by bureaus has run rampant. Congress has frequently admitted its inability to legislate intelligently for a land so far from Washington and so greatly misunderstood. But, instead of doing something about it, the Federal legislators have let it go without remedy.

Under bureaucracy, Alaska came under the jurisdiction of an array of officers of overlapping jurisdiction. Development of the territory was impeded by the necessity of obtaining Federal approval in a long chain of offices. This was remedied by reorganizing the territorial activities largely under the Secretary of the Interior who then became a dictatorial czar of extensive power. While he could have used this power wisely and to the benefit of Alaska and the Nation, he has used it only to throttle development.

The Congressmen will find Alaska suffering today under a form of government made impotent by the action of their body. They will find remote controls hampering activities in the various Government agencies as well as private enterprises. They will find the administration vested in officeholders under Federal appointment. The policies of Federal administrators too frequently are contrary to the welfare of the Territory.

In short, the power to act and make Alaska the great land she will be, is vested largely in men who don't know Alaska and cannot understand her present-day problems or future potentialities.

The Congressmen will see a land which has done remarkably well during 78 years of American ownership, in spite of, rather than because of, the wisdom and discretion of the Federal Government.

Get It Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Hartford Day Spring of June 21, published at Hartford, Mich., the editor quotes from a news letter I wrote on June 2, as follows:

Today we have all the strategic islands necessary for our defense from Japan. Japan should be taught a lesson, but the British Empire and Russia have greater interests at stake than have we and there is no reason why we should carry on this battle alone.

Then in black-face type, he asks this question: "Making a separate peace, Congressman?"

There is not a statement in my letter of June 2, which indicates that I advocate a separate peace with Japan. And I am quite sure Editor Sinclair does not want us to fight this war alone. I am quite sure he thinks that Russia, which has an enormous army in Asia, should get into the war with the Japs.

In that letter, after calling attention to our losses in the Pacific, I added this:

So what? Just this: We turned the tide of war in Europe; added the punch which saved the British Empire from destruction; furnished the material; and by the attack on the west enabled Russia first to save herself and then to overrun eastern Germany. All on the theory that if Hitler was not defeated we would be invaded. * * *

Today we have all the strategic islands necessary for our defense from Japan. Japan should be taught a lesson, but the British Empire and Russia have greater interests at stake than have we and there is no reason why we should carry on this battle alone. Russia has an enormous army in Asia. Britain has rich colonies in the east. And the time for asking is past. The time for demanding that they step into this war and bear a share of the burden proportionate to their interests has arrived. * * *

When this war is ended there should be a few million young American men to be re-

turned to the homeland, there to become the husbands of our young women, the fathers of the future generations, the foundation of an America such as our forefathers envisioned.

In the same column the editor quotes from my letter of June 16, as follows:

Down through the centuries some 8,000 treaties and agreements have been made. * * * The present effort, labeled "Dumbarton Oaks," "Yalta," the "San Francisco Conference," or whatever it may ultimately be called, is another praiseworthy effort to end the war. It is a sedative—not a cure. * * * We not only should avoid interference with the internal affairs of other nations, but should insist that others keep their hands out of our domestic policies.

Then the editor asks this question:

Isn't this a bit early to resume beating the drums for isolationism?

Does the editor disagree with my statement that we should avoid interference with the internal affairs of other nations? I but follow in Washington's footsteps on that issue. Does the editor disagree when I assert "that other nations should keep their hands out of our domestic policies?" Is that beating the drums for isolationism?

Immediately following the language quoted by him from my News Letter are the following words:

We (meaning I) go farther and say that inasmuch as it is now acknowledged that we are the most powerful Nation in all the world, with the best form of government, we should do everything within our power to maintain that position through the establishment and the maintenance of an invincible Army, Navy, and Air Force.

That we should on every front here at home fortify in every possible way our entire coastline, maintain an intelligence department, a group of scientists and military experts which will, so long as our Nation endures, make and keep us the most efficient, powerful nation in the world. We believe that we should be, at all times, prepared not to seek, but to meet any aggressor nation or group of nations. In short, while we are willing to experiment with any plan for peace, we cannot safely rely upon any plan or international organization for our national security. We must be prepared.

We still have faith in our people, in our form of government. We have confidence in our ability to protect our future. In our thoughts, our words and our acts, America shall ever be first.

The thought expressed in the letter of June 16, was that, while international agreements gave promise of an enduring peace, we should not place our sole reliance in them but should at all times be prepared.

That there may be no misunderstanding as to my position let me restate it: While believing that we should attempt to bring about a world-wide, enduring peace through international agreement, I would not, under any circumstances, rely solely upon such an agreement for the preservation of our Nation. I would keep our Nation as it is today, the most economically, militarily powerful nation in all the world, prepared at all times to meet all enemies. In these views I may be right, I may be wrong, but at least there is no misunderstanding as to where I stand.

Postwar ROTC Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress moves in the direction of consideration of peacetime conscription, many suggestions will be made as to the best methods to be adopted should this finally become our national policy.

Under unanimous consent, I include the recommendations of the Committee on Military Organization and Policy on Postwar ROTC Program submitted to the Executive Committee by the Military Affairs Committee of the Land-Grant College Association, whose chairman is Frank L. Eversull, president of the North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dak.:

RECOMMENDATION OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY ORGANIZATION AND POLICY ON POSTWAR ROTC PROGRAM SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND APPROVED APRIL 19, 1945

THE PROBLEM

To propose a plan of ROTC instruction for ROTC and NROTC colleges and which will be designed to produce reserve officers.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. It is assumed that a universal military training system of some type will be established by the Congress for the postwar era.

2. It is assumed that students entering college will have at least 17 weeks of basic military training under the universal military training system, and that after careful screening and selection they will be furloughed to the colleges for regular collegiate training with additional work in the ROTC programs.

3. It is assumed that colleges will be provided with sufficient military leadership and military teaching personnel, together with the necessary equipment, to do work commensurate with high scholarship and the needs of the War and Navy Departments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that colleges be used to furnish a continuous flow of officers beyond the capacity of West Point or Annapolis to provide.

2. It is recommended that a careful study be made of the facilities and personnel of the land-grant colleges as institutions for carrying on the work of the ROTC programs.

3. It is recommended that the advanced course, as it is now understood, be started in the freshman year, and that at the end of the sophomore year, upon the successful completion of college work and ROTC work, the student be given the rank of second lieutenant or ensign, and that, upon the completion of the junior and senior years with corresponding advanced ROTC work, he be eligible for the commission of first lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade).

4. It is recommended that suitable financial subsidies be granted for all ROTC students.

5. It is recommended that the amount of time spent on military training shall not exceed 5 hours a week except in cases where highly specialized training and branches of the armed services require specific courses in which case arrangements shall be made by the college administration and the War or Navy Department for majors in military or naval science.

RECOMMENDATION OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY ORGANIZATION AND POLICY ON SURPLUS MATERIALS SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND APPROVED APRIL 19, 1945

Whereas the war effort has absorbed most of the materials previously allocated to colleges for the conduct of ROTC programs, the colleges have been unable to replace materials which they previously had on loan from the Government and which have been recalled, and the land-grant colleges have had inadequate supplies to do training in ROTC courses in the past; and

Whereas the Government now owns and controls vast amounts of materials, supplies, and equipment which are most advantageous for ROTC instruction, as well as other materials, supplies, and equipment now owned and controlled by the armed forces of the United States which are invaluable for instructional purposes in those subjects and branches offered by the land-grant colleges; and

Whereas the land-grant colleges are experiencing an increase in enrollment due to students qualifying under Public Law 16, the Rehabilitation Act, and Public Law 346, the GI Act, which enrollments call for refresher courses, vocational courses, and those highly technical courses usually associated with land-grant colleges; and

Whereas the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, together with the armed forces of the United States, are eager and anxious to pursue research work in these branches of knowledge which have contributed so largely to the conduct and the winning of the war; and

Whereas the land-grant colleges have found it impossible to obtain adequate information about materials, supplies, and equipment and have not been given consideration in the disposition of those materials, supplies, and equipment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress and the various branches of the armed forces be requested to divert such materials, supplies, and equipment to the land-grant colleges as can be used for ROTC instruction and scientific instruction; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress and the branches of the armed forces be requested to provide lists of surplus materials to the presidents of the land-grant colleges in order that they may be apprised immediately of the existence of such materials, how to obtain them, and where they are located; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the various branches of the armed forces and to the Members of the Congress.

After the Vice President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, of Larchmont, N. Y., of Thursday, June 21, 1945, titled "After the Vice President?"

AFTER THE VICE PRESIDENT?

There is sound logic and common sense in the proposal of President Truman that Congress alter the present order of Presidential succession so that the Speaker of the House of Representatives rather than the Secretary of State as at present, should be third in line. And in this connection it should be noted that, while the succession of the Vice President is specified in the Constitution, Congress has a clear legal right, under a statute which has stood since 1886, to alter the order of succession below the Vice Presidency.

It should not have been a surprise to us that President Truman made this recommendation. And yet to a Nation which had become accustomed to executives bent on seizing and holding every whit of power obtainable, it was understandably unexpected that even Mr. Truman should be not merely willing but insistent that there be taken from him the authority to determine who should take his place—in the event of his own death or inability to serve. The more we observe this man Truman the better we like him.

As Mr. Truman points out, it is surely more within the American democratic tradition than an elected rather than an appointed person should become President. And while the Speaker of the House of Representatives is elected by only one of 435 congressional districts in the Nation, he presumably must be a person of experience and stature in governmental affairs to be chosen as the presiding officer of and most patent figure in the House.

Further, as the House is elected each 2 years, whereas only one-third of the Senate membership is elected each 2 years, the Speaker is almost certain to be more representative of immediate political trends than would be the President pro tempore of the Senate, who succeeds the Vice President as presiding officer of that body.

At present, with order of succession after the Vice Presidency confined to the Cabinet, it is quite possible—in fact, even quite likely—that a Secretary of State or Secretary of the Treasury, and so on, would be one qualified for the particular tasks of his department but not nearly so experienced in national affairs as a whole. Certainly, the chances are that the Speaker of the House would 9 times out of 10 make a better President. Accordingly, we are in favor of President Truman's recommendation, which we might point out was first advanced by the Honorable James A. Farley, of Nyack, across the river from Westchester.

There is, however, one point of the President's proposal with which we are not in complete agreement. That is his suggestion that a special election should be held as soon as possible after the Speaker has assumed the Presidency, to elect a new President to fill out the unexpired term. There are, we believe, certain sound objections to this phase of the proposal.

First. This might mean four Presidents within a space of 4 years, namely, the President, the Vice President, the Speaker, and the newly elected President. That is entirely too many Chief Executives, with possibly varying policies, to have in command of this Nation within such a short space of time.

Second. A Presidential election inevitably arouses national emotions and antagonisms and prejudices. Once every 4 years is quite enough for that sort of thing.

But for the main principle, that of substituting the Speaker of the House and after him the President pro tempore of the Senate as those who would follow the Vice President in order of Presidential succession, we are definitely favorably disposed. It is, we repeat, gratifying to note again that in the White House we have a man who so frequently and so openly places the best interests of the Nation above desire for personal power. Mr. Truman seemingly places as much trust in the American people as in himself—which is, to say the least, refreshing.

Editor Gets Lesson in Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 27, 1945:

EDITOR GETS LESSON IN AMERICANISM

COMMANDER OF NISEI BATTALION ON WESTERN FRONT REBUKES HOME-TOWN EDITOR FOR SNEER AT JAPANESE-AMERICAN SOLDIERS; CITING THEIR WILLINGNESS TO DIE FOR THE UNITED STATES, HE WARNS THAT JOKES BASED ON RACE PREJUDICE SHOW A LACK OF FAITH IN THE AMERICAN IDEAL

(From the Pacific Coast Citizen, San Francisco)

Lt. Col. James M. Hanley, commander of the famed Second Battalion of the Four Hundred and Forty-second (Japanese-American) Infantry Regiment, took time on the Western Front in March to write a letter to his home-town editor, Charles F. Pierce, of the Mandan (N. Dak.) Daily Pioneer.

Colonel Hanley took exception to a remark in Editor Pierce's column which read: "A squib in a paper makes the statement that there are some good Jap-Americans in this country, but it didn't say where they were buried."

Good Japanese-Americans

His letter, published in the Daily Pioneer, declared:

DEAR CHARLIE: Just received the Pioneer of January 20 and noted the paragraph enclosed.

Yes, Charlie, I know where there are some good Japanese Americans—there are some 5,000 of them in this unit. They are American soldiers—and I know where some of them are buried.

I wish I could show you some of them, Charlie. I remember one Japanese-American. He was walking ahead of me in a forest in France. A German shell took the right side of his face off. I recall another boy. An .88 had been trying to get us for some time—finally got him.

When they carried him out on a stretcher the bloody meat, from the middle of the thighs down, hung over the end of the stretcher and dragged in the dirt. The bone parts were gone.

I recall a sergeant—a Japanese-American if you will—who had his back blown in two. What was he doing? Why, he was only lying on top of a white officer who had been wounded, to protect him from shell fragments during a barrage.

I recall one of my boys who stopped a German counterattack single-handed. He fired all his BAR ammunition, picked up a German rifle, emptied that; used a German Luger pistol he had taken from a prisoner.

I wish I could tell you the number of Japanese-Americans who have died in this unit alone.

I wish I could tell you the number of wounded we have had—the sightless eyes, the missing limbs, the broken minds. I wish I could tell you the decorations we have won.

What are we fighting for?

I wish the boys in the "Lost Battalion" could tell you what they think of Japanese-Americans. I wish that all the troops we have fought beside could tell you what they know.

I know it makes a good joke—but it is the kind of joke that prejudice thrives upon.

It shows a lack of faith in the American ideal. Our system is supposed to make good Americans out of anyone—it certainly has done it in the case of these boys.

You, the Hood River Legion Post, Hearst and a few others make one wonder just what we are fighting for. I hope it isn't racial prejudice.

Come on over here, Charlie. I'll show you where "some good Jap-Americans are buried."

Religious Discrimination in the British Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received yesterday from Mr. John T. Rogan, Sr., a resident of my district and chairman of a committee of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Kings County, protesting religious discrimination in the British Empire:

JUNE 22, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As members of the vigilance committee of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Kings County, we wish to call to your attention the following news item which appeared on page 11 of the May 28, 1945, edition of the New York Times:

"WICK, SCOTLAND, May 27.—Roman Catholics have been barred from teaching and library positions in Caithness County by a 14 to 13 vote of the county's council.

"The action, however, has been challenged as illegal by D. A. Sinclair, local official, who cited the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 and said it never had been repealed. The matter will be referred to the Scotland Secretary of State's office.

"The measure, recommended by the county's education committee, said that 'no person shall hold or be eligible for the post of teacher, director of education or librarian under the county council who does not profess the Protestant faith.'

"Dr. S. W. Robertson, Roman Catholic who serves as Caithness County librarian, will be affected by the decision."

In view of all the talk about the Atlantic Charter the four freedoms and international goodwill, we resent this bigoted legislation against Catholics in Caithness County, Scotland.

We, therefore, call upon you to bring this matter upon the floor of the House of Representatives so that the Congress of the United States may be acquainted with this outrageous contemplated act of bigotry on the part of one of the United Nations.

In view of the thousands of American lives lost and the billions of dollars of American lend-lease supplies sent by the United States to England, we denounce this bigotry of a section of the British Empire against Catholics in Caithness County, Scotland.

We also denounce the continued political and religious persecution to which Irish Catholics are being subjected in British controlled northern Ireland.

With the hope that you will act on this matter immediately, we remain

Sincerely yours,

VIGILANCE COMMITTEE
ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS,
Per: JOHN T. ROGAN, Sr.
Chairman, Vigilance Committee.

Which Will You Have—Sufficient Food or Shortage of Food?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed with the sound reasoning contained in an article submitted by the Honorable J. B. McLaughlin, commissioner of agriculture in West Virginia, for publication in the July issue of the West Virginia Market Bulletin, and desire to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

In the January 1, 1944, issue of the Market Bulletin I published an article headed "State farmers oppose subsidies—System puts farm industry at a grave disadvantage." I stated in the article that farmers generally were opposed to subsidy—that it would not work as an influence to create incentive to produce. Of course, the idea behind subsidies is to keep the price of farm products at a low level, prevent inflation, and serve for a time as a panacea in preventing production from dropping off to a point where food would become scarce.

I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, neither am I writing this article for the purpose of saying "I told you so," but, to the contrary, with the hope that we may arrive at some plan by which we can work ourselves out of the worst food situation that has ever been known at any time in this country, and which will continue to get worse unless some radical changes are made in the policies of the WFA, OPA, and that part of the ODT gasoline and tire panels.

In 1942 we encouraged the farmers to increase their poultry production, with the guarantee that a floor price would be placed on that production that would keep the farmer from taking losses in the season when their production was heaviest. In 1943 we had a tremendous production of eggs and poultry, but eggs out in the country went as low as 12 to 15 cents a dozen, while feed ranged at a price of $3.50 to $4 per 100 pounds. We then failed to come to the farmers' rescue. Late in 1943 we made the same appeal to the farmers on the same commodity, poultry, and in the spring of 1944 the markets were filled with eggs at about the same prices, with no relief. Late in 1944 we were called upon to make the same plea to the farmers for 1945. The writer refused to have any part in any such program for the reason that we had failed to come through in supporting the farmer the two previous years, and the same story holds true for hogs.

This reminds me of the story in the old McGuffey Third Reader, in which a sheep herder with his flock of sheep decided he would play a practical joke and have a lot of fun with his people in his community, therefore, he called to them that the wolves were coming, and the people all turned out in large numbers to kill the wolves, but there were no wolves. It worked so well the first time, he decided he would try it again, so again he called out that the wolves were coming, and the people came out to help but not in as large numbers as the first time, and all went home disgusted. The third time when he made the call for help the wolves were really there, it was no fun-making job that time, he really needed help, but no one came, and the story goes that the flock of sheep were all destroyed, and the reason the people didn't come to help the third time was that they had been deceived twice before, the truth itself was not believed.

About the same processes have worked on the pork industry and the beef industry. Today we have the fewest beef calves kept on the farms that we have had for 16 years, or since we began to count, which was in 1929. The basic reasons for which are that, as mentioned in my article heretofore referred to, the incentive to produce is diminishing. The fixers and their fixings—which are many, have served to discourage production. Farmers are at a distinct disadvantage in their farm operations on the labor market for the reason that they cannot employ labor at the price that industry is paying for it, and sell their farm products at the ceiling prices fixed for them.

We have a food shortage which will continue to grow worse if agriculture is not recognized as a part of the war effort and given the same consideration that other industries engaged in the manufacture of war materials are given. If they are paid a cost of operation of their factories plus a fixed profit, then the farmer must come in under the same rule if we are to have an adequate food supply. The call is being made now and will continue to be made for the farmer to step up his food supply, but it takes a farmer a year or more to make his plans before he starts to produce.

In some particular activities it takes a longer time, for example the beef calf crop that was kept on the farm in 1944 was more than 20 percent less than it was in 1943, and is the lowest in percentage of any year since 1929. It is a safe prediction that the calf crop kept on the farm in 1945 will be 50 percent short of the crop kept on the farm in 1943, which is beginning to answer the questions which are coming into our department, "What is the matter with the beef situation?" The fact is that with many consumers, the calf that was not kept on the farm in 1944 will not be here as a beef animal in 1946 for the consumer who is then wanting beef, and the same rule will hold for those not kept in 1945. Also the same principle applies to poultry and pork, but at the same time it is much easier for the farmer to produce more quickly either poultry or pork than beef cattle.

Why are the animals not being kept on the farm? Because the farmer generally is working 12 to 14 hours a day because he has not been able to employ labor that he could go through the year with, and labor is an important factor in the production of any product. The farmers are limited in their production program to their own efforts or their families' efforts, and it is pretty safe to assume that conditions generally will not improve until the farmer has been given an incentive to produce more, which means his ability to employ labor and receive a price for his product so that he can pay for that labor.

The fruit crop has been cut to about two-thirds of 1943 due to weather conditions, and of course fruit and its products occupy an important place in the family diet. The shortage of canning sugar will contribute further to an ever-increasing shortage of the food supply. But the meat and poultry shortage seems to be the most critical as much complaint has already come from families which are not able to buy any meat and poultry. Much has been said about black markets, and I personally think that the "black-market horse" has been ridden until he is out of wind and will not be much good for the future, and what I mean by the future is unless conditions are changed we will have what has heretofore been called black markets.

The blackest in the so-called black market is what is going on at the present time regarding meat and poultry. Friends are being taken care of first in many of our markets, which is just as wrong as the worst, but I know of no plans being devised by those who are fixing the rules by which the merchant must operate and by which an equal distribution of meat and poultry products can be given to their customers. A full significance of what I have just said is to be found around any of our markets. When the information leaks out that meat and poultry have come in to their markets, all a person has to do is to go and take a peek at the persons in line holding a number and waiting their time at the counter to be served. Then you see consumers going out into the country to purchase food of whatever they may be able to obtain, and at the same time see the notices in the store windows and in the newspapers that the merchants have discontinued business because of lack of food to serve their customers. The same rule that has fixed the farmer is fixing the merchant, and in turn is fixing the consumer.

The production curve has definitely turned down and will continue to go further down until we set up a plan by which in the course of a year or so it will begin to curve up and level off. That can be done by first giving the farmer an incentive to produce, which means that he must be in a position to employ labor and pay the price that industry can pay, or continue under the beneficent program of a subsidy for farm labor in an amount that will allow the worker to receive a price equal to that he can receive in an industrial plant—or will the consuming public be left to handle the situation themselves? Those charged with the responsibility of keeping down inflation with a well-ordered and regulated food market have their choice. It is hoped that they select a wise policy. Shall we continue to have a scarcity of food, or shall we have plenty? It seems the consuming public may settle the whole question.

Farming as a Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at Purdue University, June 19, 1945, by Clement T. Malan, LL. B., Ph. D., Indiana State Superintendent of Public Instruction:

Farming is the one great and widespread business which has withstood the changing conditions brought about by a technological age. In practically every unit of business, the unit and the size of the unit have changed. But not so with farming. Many attempts have been made to encourage large-scale farming and small-scale farming, but to this day the small family-sized farm is the most practical and profitable unit, just as it was in the past.

Another major consideration relative to farming as an occupation is that the period of apprenticeship is short. A young man in only 2 or 3 years, living and working on a farm under the direction of a good farmer, can learn to operate a farm to splendid advantage, and at the same time earn his living while he is learning. The young man soon steps into the stature of adulthood. His wealth creeps up little by little, slowly, to be sure, for it does not come all at once. But, extended over a period of 30 years, the industrious and intelligent young man has become not only the owner and manager of a business but he has been privileged to enjoy the abundance of a good life and living as he has come along.

In comparison and contrast with this young man is the one of equal ability who goes into

some urban calling where he must serve perhaps for 20 years in a sort of apprenticeship to learn the business. During those 20 years he does not enjoy the full status of an adult. His salary is small in comparison to his necessary expenditures. He does not have the privilege of exercising his own independent judgment. He cannot make decisions and enjoy the sense of proprietorship, for always he is under the boss. In many instances he dares not have a family because of fear of failure and inability to support a family until he is far past his youth.

Not so is it with rural youth. Very soon an intelligent, hard-working young man on a farm knows that he can support himself and a family, so his vocation gives him a sense of economic security much earlier in life. That is why we find the country people reproduce their kind and rear large families. They know they can take care of them. In the rural population of our country there is a steady increase, while at the same time the city population in the United States is decreasing.

Since the rural community has been furnishing the major portion of the population of our cities and since it is going to continue to do so, it becomes necessary that the rural churches, the rural schools, rural recreation and rural roads should receive the foremost attention of the Government. The question arises again as to whether or not the children who have been reared in the cities can make successful farmers. If a son living in either a town or a city shows signs of talent for management and has a high-school education, and perhaps some college training, two types of careers are open to him. If the father lives in the city and is a successful man himself, he can give his son assistance and training, so that the son may take over the business when Dad lets go. But if the father is merely an employee himself, he has no business into which to induct the son.

On the other hand, the boy can work on a farm and with the same amount of money which his father would have spent upon him in the city, teaching him his business, he can become a successful farmer within a much shorter period of time, perhaps during his middle twenties, whereas the city son of even a successful family reaches his adult status, perhaps in his middle forties, although he works equally hard and is equally intelligent and well educated.

The city boy, being on a pay roll, is dependent upon the company or his boss or his father for direction and the amount of his rewards in money. He does not develop the same sense of importance, independence, and self-direction that the farm youth does, who feels his own sense of responsibility and proprietorship with an opportunity to exercise his own judgment and initiative.

Another advantage which farming as a business offers is that by the very nature of farm work it involves such a diversification of things that must be done daily that the farmer cannot get into a treadmill existence. Neither can he plan his work very far ahead as a business firm does. His work calls for constant adjustment to the weather and the seasons and the condition of growing things, so he is compelled to exercise his judgment constantly to make reappraisals and to be flexible in his management.

To use a simple illustration, peaches have to be picked on the day they ripen. No one can plan for the time of the ripening more than a day or two in advance, and even then the rain or the sunshine may change his plans. The farmer must constantly anticipate, adjust, and make decisions and changes reflecting intelligence, good judgment, and knowledge or the peach crop is lost.

Another very considerable advantage which the farmer has, and which many do not stop to reckon, is that he can produce most of the things which he and his family consume. On the other hand, the farmer is at a disadvantage in the things he must buy and the things he sells, because somebody else sets the price. For example, tomatoes may cost 30 cents a bushel to produce, while the consumer must pay $1 a bushel for these same tomatoes. The farmer profits by the difference between 30 cents and the dollar insofar as he and his family consume the tomatoes he raises. The farmer makes a profit, first on his work, and second on eliminating the middleman between the producer and consumer, for the farmer is both.

In our agricultural schools we ought to emphasize this advantage to the high-school boys and girls. I am disturbed when I see farmers selling all their produce and then turning around and buying the same kind of produce from some store. Using my illustration of the bushel of tomatoes, such a farmer loses the 70 cents profit which the merchant makes when the bushel of tomatoes leaves the farmer and in turn is sold to the consumer.

Did we have farmers on the charity and relief rolls in the panics of 1837, 1857, 1873, 1892, or the great depression of the 1930's? No; we did not find the farmers on WPA in the period between 1930 and 1940, although our Nation had 10,000,000 unemployed in the towns and cities who were on WPA and other relief rolls. The farmer always had enough to eat. He found food and shelter for his family and for his livestock, even though he might not have had much money in his pocket. But never did he experience the fear of not being able to meet the rent or the grocery bill.

The illustration used of tomatoes would also hold good for milk. For every 40 cents which the farmer gets for milk, the consumer must pay $1. A quart of string beans which would bring the farmer who raised them only 2½ cents can be canned by his wife for another 2½ cents, making the cost to him of 5 cents, as compared to 15 cents a can which he would have to pay at the store. Of course, this difference between 5 cents and 15 cents is consumed in the legitimate and universal cost of marketing and distribution. But the farmer can avoid both the exigencies of the milk market, and the canned string-bean market and enjoy these and other foods at less than half the cost that his city cousin must meet to eat the same food.

Farming, of course, is a business which is unsuited to that type of mentality which does not want to be bothered with making an effort or taking the initiative of making decisions. The people to whom work and initiative and responsibility are disagreeable should never elect farming as a career. They should go into the factories where they will need to punch a time clock; where they will not be bothered with initiative or taking responsibility; where they will not need to do planning; where they will only need to do as they are told, for they will have a boss to direct them and do their thinking for them.

The modern city business leaves the mechanics of cost-accounting to professionals. The selling is left to professionals also, and so is the production end of the business. The laborers and clerks in our cities do not have to bother themselves with any of these programs which require planning, initiative, and financing. But the farmer, on the other hand, is required not only to do these three things, but many other things as well. He must combine talent, intelligence, and judgment. He has to be his own cost-accountant. He has to be the producer and he also has to be the employer and general manager of his business.

Farming is a business suitable only for those of alert and active minds, with strong bodies as well. The occupation of farming can offer little joy and satisfaction to the slothful and unimaginative person who does not like to bestir himself or use his mind or judgment or strength. Farm work and farm living are very congenial to persons of high talent. Let none other expect to make a success of it. Farming is not a get-rich-quick business. But land is the basis of all value and it does not vanish like certain stocks or bonds.

The farmer faces the hazards of production and of selling that go with all other kinds of small producing businesses. However, the farmer is able, through diversified farming, in times of prosperity or in times of depression to make a good living for himself and his family. He can educate his family. He can have a modern home with all the modern conveniences to be found in the city, and at the same time he can enjoy the fresh air and sunshine in the summer and the snow in the winter. He can also enjoy a degree of space and privacy which only the very rich in the city are able to afford—only those who own large estates.

Modern American farming offers as its greatest compensation, however, to those of high talent an abundant living and a career conducive to a full and satisfying life in close touch with nature. Our vocational agriculture and vocational home economics leaders should develop the fuller appreciation of these advantages and point out the possibilities in this most basic of all businesses. We have failed to place enough emphasis upon the opportunities to exercise intelligence and skill in farming. We have always stressed the dull moments and the drudgery of farm work. But is it not true that in all lines of business and human endeavor one finds dull moments and drudgery? There is an old adage about "no excellence without labor."

I am never going to be satisfied with our vocational agriculture teaching in the high schools, colleges, and universities, nor with our vocational home economics teaching, either, until these courses are made attractive enough and challenging enough to appeal to the most intelligent, imaginative, and energetic students in our schools, the students who have the greatest amount of business ability and initiative.

The measurement of the civilization of any nation, in final analysis, has been and will continue to be the quality of its rural people and the standards of their living conditions.

Veterans' Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me:

A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraphs (k) to (o) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby amended, and two new subparagraphs (p) and (q) added to said paragraph II, to read as follows:

"(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension provided in part I, paragraph II, subparagraphs (a) to (j) shall be increased by $35 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light per-

ception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (l) to (o), inclusive, of part I, paragraph II, as herein amended, the rate of pension shall be increased by $35 per month but in no event to exceed $300 per month.

"(l) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $200.

"(m) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, the monthly pension shall be $215.

"(n) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $225.

"(o) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly pension shall be $250.

"(p) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of the subparagraphs (l) to (o), inclusive, of part I, paragraph II of this regulation, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, the monthly pension shall be $300.

"(q) In the event the disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $300."

SEC. 2. Subparagraphs (k) to (o) of paragraph II, part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby amended, and two new subparagraphs (p) and (q) are added to said paragraph II, to read as follows:

"(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension provided in part II, paragraph II, subparagraphs (a) to (j) shall be increased by $26.25 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (l) to (o), inclusive, of part II, paragraph II, as herein amended, the rate of pension shall be increased by $26.25 per month but in no event to exceed $225 per month.

"(l) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability has suffered the anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden, or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $150.

"(m) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, the monthly pension shall be $161.25.

"(n) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be $168.76.

"(o) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance, or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly pension shall be $187.50.

"(p) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of the subparagraphs (l) to (o), inclusive, of part II, paragraph II, of this regulation, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less the monthly pension shall be $225.

"(q) In the event the disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $225."

SEC. 3. The increased rates provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act, and shall be deemed to include the 15 percent increase in the rate of compensation or pension payable for service-incurred disability under section 1, Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, May 27, 1944, or Public Law 469, Seventy-eighth Congress, December 7, 1944.

Federal Salary Pay Increase Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. J. McCormack, staff director of the Civil Service Committee of the House, presented that committee on June 4, 1945, with a report dealing with the Federal salary pay increase bill that was then under consideration. The report, I am told, contained pertinent facts bearing upon that bill, which, if they became known, might have jeopardized the passage of that bill. The report was suppressed by the committee and its contents kept from the public and the House Members.

Since then Staff Director McCormack has addressed a letter to the members of the Civil Service Committee. In that letter he summarizes the situation that confronts that committee as a result of the suppression of his report. I am told now that Mr. McCormack has been fired by the Civil Service Committee as a result of the plain straight-forward letter he wrote to the committee.

In view of this fact I feel that the membership of this House is entitled to have access to a summary of the suppressed report, at least, a summary contained in his letter to the committee. I, therefore, include the section of Mr. McCormack's letter covering that summary as a part of my remarks:

The staff director certifies that the special supplemental report, dated June 4, 1945, to H. R. 514, concerning the pay structure of the Federal Government was, prior to the deletion of the statistical section, a complete and proper report for submission by the committee to the Congress in compliance with the Congressional directive of May 4, 1945.

It has been determined by the staff that these statistical tables can be incorporated in the report without cost to the committee.

Following the submission of the report to the committee, the spokesman for the United States Civil Service Commission was given a copy of the confidential committee print. The spokesman at several subsequent meetings of the committee insistently and repetitiously protested the findings of the staff report. These protestations have been carried to such lengths that the Commissioner has contradicted and invalidated much of his own testimony and protestation.

The facts reported by the staff in the original supplemental report, and in several addenda thereto, are in contradiction to the testimony of the spokesman.

During the progress of the study of the Federal pay structure (H. R. 514) the staff director and two consultants called upon the Commissioner in question for information as to the Federal pay structure.

It was, at that time, stated by the Commissioner that in his opinion:

1. The pay of classified Federal employees in grades 1 to 4, inclusive, or their equivalent, compared favorably and in some instances was more advantageous than the pay of industrial employees;

2. The salary of classified Federal employees from grade 5 to 11 compared more or less favorably with those of industrial employees; and

3. The pay of Federal employees in the top grades of the classified service was less, generally, than for comparable work in industry.

It is suggested that the Commissioner be requested to restate his opinion as to these pertinent points before the committee.

The Commissioner in his testimony used the device 4.2 percent. That is, he repetitiously stated to the House committee (19 times) that the salary increases of Federal employees during the present emergency due to within-grade promotions, grade promotions, and promotions by transfer did not excee' 4.2 percent and emphasized that this low percentage reflected the conservative policy of the Federal Government.

The 4.2 percentage is residual statistical sludge. Its utilization relates nothing of consequence to the actual fact. The Commissioner has, in effect, admitted that the 4.2 percent does not reflect increases received through promotions or transfers. The fact is, as reported by the staff, that the promotion policy of the Federal Government, whether warranted or not, has benefited a great majority of the classified civil-service employees to an extent not comparable with the 4.2 percent. In the Civil Service Commission alone, according to the Commission's own figures, the pay increase over the period of present employees including those just added to the staff has been 27 percent—not 4.2 percent.

The statement that there has been no increase in base pay of Federal employees, except for a possible 1 percent, is true insofar as it goes, but like the standard class specifications, it goes only a partial distance. The incomplete part of the statement is far more important and significant than is that which is recorded.

Within the past week, in the committee and on the floor of the House, statements have been made that the staff report was incomplete and had been categorically denied by the United States Civil Service Commission.

The staff report when submitted was not incomplete. After deletion of the tables this statement does have certain substance.

The "categorical denial" of the spokesman of the Commission, as everyone realizes, is the fervent protestation of an official who resents investigation. Not one scintilla of substantiating evidence is offered by the Commissioner to support the denial.

During the 18-month period which this staff has been investigating the Federal civil service, it has learned through experience that the statistics of the Civil Service Commission are—as is the 4.2 percent—unreliable.

Most recently the 4.05 safety statistic reported by the Commission to the Congress and to the President was found, upon inspection, to be false. This is admitted by the Commission.

The report on transfers which was submitted to the Congress and to the President and which became a part of the testimony of the present hearings is admittedly misleading and found to be false in fact and effect. This has been admitted by the Commissioner during the present controversy.

In sharp contrast, no important fact or statistic reported or used by this staff in its numerous reports has been found to be in error or false.

The crux of this situation is that the integrity of the investigations as conducted by the staff director, under the direction of the committee and the aegis of the Congress of the United States, is in question and under scrutiny. Regardless of the importance of the investigation, once substance is given to the thought or hope of the agencies or individuals under investigation, that pressure can be brought upon the staff, or that the reports of the staff can be altered to suit the importance or whim of the object of the inquiry, or that, through personal friendship or political circumstance, the staff reports may be delayed or suppressed, then the integrity, not only of this staff and the committee, but of the Congress, is impeached.

The prestige of the Congress, and of its committee, we must all agree, can be maintained only so long as the Congress and its committees merit such respect. If the Congress permits this prestige to become a convenience of those who would imperil it, then many sacrifices have become mockery.

As staff director I cannot concede that I do not have a right to expect reasonable protection and some confidence in discharging the duties of my position, for which I have high regard. It is not understood or appreciated when I find myself on the defensive and under attack because I have dared report the facts as my staff has found them, or in this instance as they have been reported to me by the duly appointed personnel officers of the Federal service.

At the time I came with this committee as staff director, Senator Truman was engaged in a two-fisted battle with graft, waste, corruption, and inefficiency. The Senator, as a Democratic leader and a strong party man, was reporting the facts as he found them. With manifest regret but without reservation it was on several notable occasions necessary for Senator Truman (now President) to lay the blame on those in the highest places, and the Senator unflinchingly discharged his duty in such manner that the name of his committee was synonymous with integrity and better government.

In this particular instance the staff has found and has reported to this committee that only a small percentage (10 percent) of the surveyed employees who have been in the Federal service 2 years or more have received less than one CAF-grade (or equivalent) promotion. The remaining 90 percent have received from 1 to 10 CAF-grade (or equivalent) increases. A large percentage of employees in war agencies have received over five grade promotions. Many employees have averaged from 30 to 68 percent increase in salary during the war period. This increase has been in addition to 20-percent increase due to overtime pay.

The statement of the staff is made in connection with investigations, the findings of which were to have been considered in connection with the current pay legislation. The pay legislation is said to involve $736,000,000. As a matter of cold fact, when the agencies and employees exempted or not covered are brought under the legislation by administrative or Executive order, the legislation will involve in excess of $1,000,000,000.

We can be amused momentarily by the remark: "What's a billion between friends" but the humor dies when we realize that this billion comes from the pennies, the dimes, quarters, and dollars of the so-called "little people." But are they "little people"? The answer may be found in the sons they have sent off to die; the daughters who nurse the jungle-fever ridden in many places; the battleships, the carriers, the submarines, and the planes that they have built; the masses of steel and men that they have thrown across the seas, the airways and the beaches—no; the answer is thunderous, those are not little people—no people were ever greater—none ever so much deserved honesty and integrity in Government.

This is their billion. Day in and day out, night in and night out, by mail, radio, and public forum they are besought to give just a little bit more—a few more dollars—a few more cents—a few more quarts of blood—a few more pounds of flesh by doing without—a few more bottles of milk—our boys need it. Tax, save, work—your pennies and dollars are needed in the "mighty seventh" march to Okinawa.

Well, let's see. Metropolitan Washington, your staff is informed, is allotted $43,000,000 of type E bonds as a quota in the mighty Seventh War Loan drive. (Type E bonds are the bonds bought by the public individually.) The proposed pay legislation is purported to involve a minimum of $736,000,000. It is estimated that approximately 9 percent of all Federal employees subject to this grant are located in Washington. It is therefore mathematically certain that 9 percent of $736,000,000 or $65,000,000 will be required annually to finance the proposed pay legislation for metropolitan Washington. This is almost $20,000,000 more than the quota for all citizens of Metropolitan Washington area for type E bonds of the mighty Seventh War Loan drive.

Insofar as Washington is concerned it appears that the "mighty seventh" will never get to Okinawa.

This experience will be repeated throughout the Nation wherever large or small concentrations of Federal employees meet the mighty Seventh War Loan drive.

Another recognizable measurement is the recollection that the soldier's bonus of the last war, which the Congress debated for months, cost $1,500,000,000 but this, unlike the current pay legislation, was nonrecurring.

These observations are not to question the proposed pay legislation but only an attempt to measure its shadow. It touches every crossroads, town, hamlet, city, church, school, factory, garage, and home. It will be felt by the returning soldier when he pays up his deferred Federal taxes.

During the past 18 months I have interviewed hundreds of Federal employees. Almost all of these employees have expressed a desire to have their jobs properly classified. Most of them have cited instances of other employees who were being paid more for similar duties. All of these employees have expressed a desire for equal opportunity in the service; many of them have cited instances of newer, less experienced employees promoted to higher jobs. Many have reported that they did not have enough to do. Some have reported discriminations from their supervisors and fellow employees because "they work too hard." Many have reported unfair applications of efficiency ratings. Many have been summarily separated from the service without a chance at a hearing and have found themselves barred from future employment.

All employees have expressed wishes for efficient government, adequate classification of their work, an opportunity to advance in proportion to their ability and willingness to perform, and a truly operative merit system.

I have been impressed by the confidence of the employees that if Congress knew of the present injustices and discriminations, immediate corrective steps would be taken. I have been impressed by the desire of the employees for fair play, for honest and efficient government.

In no instance has any employee discussed the matter of a salary raise with any member of this staff.

I trust that my insistence that the staff reports be given consideration is not misunderstood and that * * * this additional study * * * will be submitted to the House "and will be used when the committee considers pending legislation dealing with salary increases for Federal employees" (H. R. 514).

A great many young men are out of the country on business of the Nation. Some will not return. Others are now coming home, many of them are wounded, others have been in prison camps and are tired and sick. These men are the real and countable millions whose voices will be heeded and whose minds and hands will soon guide and handle the affairs of their Nation. They are perfectionists—trained, hard, rugged, exacting, and expectant. Two of these, our sons, within the last few days have come, briefly, back to our home. Their question is: "How are we doing?"

I find it desirable and necessary to request that the committee further advise and instruct the staff.

The Byrnes Directive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the country is incensed by the fact that authorities in our Government have raised the ban on horse races while they continue to hold the line against conventions or gatherings, farm fairs, and so forth, throughout the country. This question needs clarification on the part of Government authorities.

Religious bodies, fraternal organizations, and others, are constantly writing their Representatives in Congress protesting the fact that their normal gatherings cannot be held as in the past, while at the same time officials have seen fit to permit the Kentucky Derby and the Narragansett races.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution sent me from the Grand Lodge A. F. & A. M. of North Dakota on this question:

GRAND LODGE, A. F. & A. M.,
State of North Dakota.

"Resolution in Regard to the Byrnes Directive

"Whereas the Grand Lodge, A. F. & A. M. of North Dakota, through its properly authorized representatives did upon receipt of the so-called Byrnes directive, endeavor to comply with the same by arranging the annual communication with an attendance of

representatives limited to 50 persons outside the city of Fargo; and

"Whereas it has come to the knowledge of the principal officers of this grand lodge that other organizations with less justification have held meetings and conventions with no regard to limits upon attendance; and

"Whereas tens of thousands have attended the Kentucky Derby, the Narragansett races, and other similar affairs with no thought of obeying this directive; and where wholesale, legalized gambling was notorious: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this grand lodge, representing some 12,000 loyal representative citizens of this Commonwealth, hundreds of whom are in the uniform of our country, do respectfully but nonetheless emphatically protest against the continuance of the Byrnes directive, and ask for its early cancellation or its uniform enforcement.

"While we believe its open disregard by certain groups is a reflection upon all good citizens, we also believe its enforcement is contrary to the spirit of free America and the constitutional right of assembly; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, under the seal of this grand lodge be sent to the President and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

We hereby certify that the above resolution is a true copy of the resolution that was adopted by the Grand Lodge, A. F. & A. M. of North Dakota, June 19 A. D. 1945, A. L. 5945.

WALTER L. STOCKWELL,
Grand Secretary.

Dam Plans for Columbia and Snake Logical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia River, which runs through and forms the northern boundary of my congressional district, is a veritable storehouse of hydroelectric power, as well as a great artery for transportation and perpetual source of water supply for reclamation and domestic and industrial use. The House recently provided legislation for the further development of this great river. Mr. Philip H. Parrish, editor of the editorial page of the Oregonian, recently made a trip from Celilo to Pasco and up the Snake River from Pasco to Lewiston, Idaho. His observations are timely and worthy of our consideration. I include as part of my remarks Mr. Parrish's article describing his journey, as follows:

DAM PLANS FOR COLUMBIA AND SNAKE, LOGICAL—STILLING OF RAPIDS ABOVE NOW PASSABLE CELILO TO PASCO AND LEWISTON TO BE FIRST IN ORDER

(By Philip H. Parrish)

There can be no real quarrel, so far as I can see, with the over-all plan for development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers or with the priorities so far decided upon. Naturally there is impatience on the part of individuals and communities. Any community which is vigorous will push its own case. That is to be expected.

However, after making the run from Celilo to Pasco and then up the Snake from Pasco to Lewiston, during which I pored over the yard-by-yard maps provided by Col. Ralph A. Tudor, district engineer and my host, I am convinced that the program for the Columbia and the Snake is proceeding along absolutely logical lines.

This, in the fewest possible words, is the situation:

Bonneville Dam has been completed and is in operation. It not only provides power, but covers with deep water the formerly dangerous Cascades and makes easy navigation to The Dalles—navigation which will have no limits when an oceangoing channel, already assured, has been accomplished. Grand Coulee is in partial operation, with its reclamation features in particular yet to be exploited. Grand Coulee, however, is off the line of immediate future development. The immediate problem is not that of providing anything for the comparatively barren area between Pasco and Grand Coulee (that is, along the Columbia); it is that of conquering the Columbia from the headwaters of Bonneville at The Dalles to Pasco, and of conquering the Snake and its mouth near Pasco through the rich wheat country of southeastern Washington to Lewiston, Idaho.

That is the problem and what is the answer of the Army engineers?

On recommendation of the engineers, Congress has authorized a dam at Umatilla rapids—a dam which will much resemble Bonneville in construction and capacity. Congress likewise has authorized (March 2, 1945) what are know as the series "A" dams on the Snake. All these are authorized but the money has not yet been appropriated.

In addition, the engineers unquestionably will recommend construction of The Dalles dam just so soon as is feasible in view of the other work.

Meanwhile, the order of development is this: That the plans for Umatilla should be ready for the start of work in 1947, and that plans for the first dam on the Snake, at Gage Island, about 10 miles above the mouth, should be ready at the same time or only a little later. Then succeeding dams on the Snake should fall in regular order, all the way to Lewiston. When the chain is completed, deep and navigable water will be carried from each dam to the dam above it. There no longer will be any problem. The most tumultuous and difficult of all the navigable waterways of America will have become a series of lakes.

Almost, that is.

It is necessary to go back and explain why the stretch above The Dalles, up to Celilo Falls, is to be the last to be covered by still water. This, after all, is the worst stretch on the entire river.

The explanation lies in the fact that because of the impossibility of these falls and rapids, the Celilo Canal was built, and though the canal is far from being satisfactory for present-day traffic it at least does permit traffic. Colonel Tudor calls it "obsolescent but not obsolete."

Thus with The Dalles dam arbitrarily, and correctly, delayed, Umatilla dam became the No. 1 need, because the Umatilla and Homly rapids, which it will submerge, are the chief remaining obstacles on the Columbia. And with the Umatilla dam backing water to Pasco and the necessary number of miles up the Snake, the natural thing is to proceed with the Snake development, dam by dam, in regular order, up that stream.

One other matter, however, needs to be explained, and it is most important. In the action dated last March 2 the Congress authorized the series A dams between the mouth of the Snake and Lewiston—a distance of 140 miles with the dams running approximately 40 feet in height—10 of them.

This was the design worked out under General Robins (then colonel) as district engineer. The 10 dams rising from the Columbia to Lewiston would have been primarily for navigation, with power a byproduct. More recently, with the war revealing the Nation's need for a great backlog of power, Congress, with General Robins heartily subscribing, has authorized reconsideration of the plan for the Snake River dams, with more attention to kilowatts. And one proposal which will go to Washington and to Congress is for 4 Snake dams (known as series B), under which proposal the Snake would be stopped at Gage Island, Monumental, Little Goose Rapids, and Granite Point. The 4 dams would develop more power than the 10; they would require less unwatering in the process of construction; they would make navigation easier afterward because of the fewer and higher locks. More railroad locations along the banks would be submerged, but in the long run this would be a minor item.

Generally, we repeat, we see no bugs in the plans for the Columbia and Snake development.

Investment Banker Accepts Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD E. CAMPBELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. Samuel K. Cunningham, my constituent and brother of one of my colleagues, the Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM, of Iowa:

EXCERPT FROM TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECURITIES DEALERS, INC., AT THE HOMESTEAD, HOT SPRINGS, VA., JANUARY 23, 1945

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I don't propose to monopolize the time. These other men can speak for themselves, and I hope all of them will. It was suggested by some of them that one of two of us be the goats and do the speaking, and since I was suggested—I do not know what it means, whether it means an honor or a threat or something else, and as a matter of fact, when they began to suggest things like that, I became scared, because I was afraid that they were going to ask me to play the violin, and to avoid that danger, I went and got a hair cut.

If I may speak briefly for my colleagues—my departing colleagues—to the extent that they are willing to underwrite and confirm what I say, and with authority to eradicate and cancel what they might not approve—if I may speak to that extent for them, I suggest that we are officially, has-beens—we are the five or six old men—we are dead. We are passing into the shadows of obscurity.

If we might philosophize a moment, it brings to mind those lines of the poet:

"When all the world is young, lad,
And all the trees are green;
And every goose a swan, lad,
And every lass a queen;

"Then hie for boat and horse, lad,
And 'round the world away;
Young blood must have its course, lad,
And every dog his day.

"When all the world is old, lad,
And all the trees are brown;
And all the sport is stale, lad,
And all the wheels run down;

"Creep home, and take your place there,
The spent and maimed among;—
God grant you find one face there
You loved when all was young!"

So we are has-beens; we are old; we are dead; we are passing into those quiet shadows

of obscurity, but that, gentlemen, is officially only. [Laughter.] Otherwise, we are not dead, I assure you; we are not old.

It is said that life begins at 40. I say we are 40:

"We are 40; who says we are more?
He's tipsy, young jackanapes—
Show him the door."

And if you don't believe we are but 40, look at the boyish face of Warren Willard and Al Theis; but do not look at Hagood Clarke, nor at the bald spot on the top of my head. We are not old; we are young, and we are going to be strong for many years yet, and in the presence of this learned and distinguished and experienced group, I would not even claim that we are wise. We do not claim wisdom, even with 2 or 3 years' service on this board, although we claim that most of what we have, we gained here; so we do not claim wisdom, and in anything that I say I would not presume to give advice or information to this group.

Wisdom can safely be attributed to one only after he is dead. We are not dead, and, therefore, we do not claim wisdom, but if from a brief vantage point we may give any suggestion, I want to say that I believe in the maxim that all the people are wiser than any one, and all the membership of this board has more wisdom than any one person, which has been nicely demonstrated during the discussion we have had in recent years.

When opinions differ, after being thrashed out in the heat of discussion and argument, a wiser solution is arrived at than could have been arrived at to start with, which shows the wisdom of combined judgment and opinion and discussion.

I have even come, during my 2 or 3 years' service here, to have high respect for those who developed this organization in the early years, and for all of the predecessor chairmen, including the presently retiring chairman, and former and present members of the board. I am confident that they have done a good job, and I confess freely and humbly that many ideas which I had to start with have been revised and found that they were not the best originally; so that is the result of combined judgment and cooperation.

Furthermore, my observations, superficial as they are, have been that the executive office and the district secretaries and the district committee have been and are doing a good job, and anything that I have said that may indicate a question in regard thereto is hereby withdrawn and apologized for. As a matter of fact, raising questions, and even criticism, does not mean disapproval of administrations or board or other people's opinions, so I say that this board, through its various committees, has done a constructive and worth-while job. It has shown devotion to duty and to the public interest.

We hear a great deal about certain public officials protecting the public. They have an intense passion and zeal for the dear public, to see that they shall not be injured or taken advantage of. I do not surrender to those bureaucrats in Washington, or whoever they may be—I concede to them nothing in the way of devotion to the public welfare. I maintain that there is in the membership of this board and throughout the personnel of the invesment banking business, a higher degree of devotion to the public welfare than there is in the run-of-mine bureaucrat in Washington or elsewhere; so I feel that it is proper that we should publicize ourselves a little bit in that respect.

Certain people have great advantages from the standpoint of publicity. The men in this business go about their business and do little in that respect. I wonder if we are not justified in blowing our own horns a little more; and one other thing I should like to mention at this time is, because of the fact that at times I have mentioned the interests of the small dealer as compared with the large underwriter and stock exchange firm, etc., in any such mention of those things by me and I believe by others, it has not been in a divisional or critical spirit of any group in the business. I think the interests of the various groups—the fundamental interests—are one and the same, and I have been pleased to observe in the discussion throughout these years, that there is no apparent prejudice against the small dealer on the part of the large firms in New York and elsewhere, and there is complete recognition of the small dealer. Therefore, if anything I have said may indicate an idea of disunity in that respect, I want it erased, because I do not feel that way, and I feel that in the last analysis, the interests are one and the same.

We are not justified in trying to defend any branch of the business unless it is economically sound and fills a public need, and on that ground, we can defend any branch of the business; and so I feel that this board has done constructive work, and it will continue to do so. As a matter of fact, this board of governors impresses me as being an unusually representative board.

Think of it for a moment: it combines the gentle manners and historic traditions of Boston with the clearness of vision, the boldness of planning, and the courage of execution that originates in New York, and the Quaker's stability of Philadelphia. It brings the fragrance of the magnolia and the song of the mocking bird from Atlanta, and even the dulcet flavor of the sugar bowl now comes from New Orleans, and the golden stench of crude petroleum from Texas, a fresh breeze of pure mountain air from Denver, and the fine delicious taste of the large ripe, mellow pears from Portland, Oreg., and the glamour and romance, almost from Hollywood, that comes from the shores of the Pacific, now stabilized and dominated by the good judgment and common sense personified in the new chairman, who will, I am sure, bring together and fuse these various elements into a common thought and purpose that will spell out magnificent achievement. So this board is a cross-section of the industry and of the country, if you please, and it is well that it shall continue so to be.

Finally, I dare to say one thing more. I mentioned the devotion of members of the board and the people in the business to the public interests. I believe that sincerely. I believe there is a high degree of integrity and honor and good businss ethics here, as high a degree as you will find in any other profession or business; but I feel that the only firm and sure foundation for high moral conduct is built on the foundation of firm religious conviction, if you please, on a strong faith in a higher power—you may call it providence or luck, or you may call it evolution, but I call it God. I know it is in the hearts of all you men, in spite of the sometimes trivial superficial coating in our everyday conduct. I know it is there, and I wonder if we do not give too little recognition to it. We believe in service; we believe in the principle of service, that we get more by giving than by getting all the time.

If we want to save our lives we must lose them in a sense, and if we want to save our fortunes we must be willing to spend them; so we believe in this principle and practice it from day to day, but do not publicize it. I am not advocating that we should shout about it, but I think we should think about it a little more than we do; and isn't it, after all, the very future of our business, our individual businesses and our business as a whole? It is dependent upon some of these fundamental and basic things.

You all remember the story of Rickenbacker and his associates drifting in the Pacific, and how at that time they turned to God. Isn't it true that we are drifting, in a different sense, but just as truly, as they were at that time? And isn't it true that we are in as much danger, but in a different sense, as they were then? The worst that could have happened to them was death, but maybe something worse than death could happen to us, and I do not mean to sermonize or speak to any individual, but I am thinking of our group as a whole, and I am thinking of our country as a whole. We are talking a lot sometimes about what we are going to do for our young men when they come back from the battlefronts—what kind of a country are we going to have for them?

It is timely that we should start right within ourselves and prepare to make our country what it ought to be. Frankly—and I don't want to criticize here—but I think that the greatest weakness of our Government is a lack of a sound and firm moral foundation. I have heard that expressed in different words by others of this group, but whether it is expressed in terms of the blunt and forceful Hermann Clark language, or in the diplomatic language of Wally Fulton, it all means the same thing, does it not?

And so, as we look forward to the future of our business and our country, and we cannot disassociate the two, shouldn't we think on these things? That is the message I would like to suggest to you, not as advice, not as anything which you do not know and believe just as firmly as I, but something which we need to think about frequently. I make no apology for the fact that I have been an active churchman all my life, and I do not boast about it, and I do not claim that it makes me better than any other individual who may have different habits, but I do think that the principles and foundations back of all the church and Christian and religious institutions are the foundations which give strength to our whole political and economic structure, and which will lead us unto a better way in the future.

So, "Will you not come, grow old along with me? The best is yet to be, the last of life for which the first was made. Youth shows but part; trust God, see all, nor be afraid." And may I in the name of my colleagues, as we pass on into obscurity, say to you, "from feeble hands, we throw the torch; be yours to hold it high."

Leaning Over Backward in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the recent statement attributed to Mr. Grew, the Acting Secretary of State, that "this country is leaning over backward to avoid giving offense to Russia," applies particularly in the matter of Poland.

For the past three and a half years the Polish Government-in-exile and the Polish underground in occupied Poland have been the loyal allies of the United States. Much valuable information has been furnished our military intelligence through this source. Only a few months ago General Eisenhower, as Supreme Allied Commander, stated that officers and men of the Polish Home Army were members of the Allied Forces and, as such, were entitled to treatment as prisoners-of-war equal in every respect to

that given American and British prisoners.

Subsequently, General Okulicki, the commander of the Polish home army, and 14 Polish civilian representatives were taken into custody by the Soviet authorities and tried under Soviet law. General Okulicki was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment. This action has brought no protest from the Government of the United States. However, before the trials took place, Mr. Stettinius, then Secretary of State, said that our Government would not treat with the Soviet Goverment on any Polish issues until the arrest of General Okulicki and his companions had been satisfactorily explained.

The policy thus laid down by Secretary of State Stettinius was not followed. Even before the trials began, our Government had officially sent a plenipotentiary delegation to Moscow to meet with British and Russian delegations and certain Polish officials, for the purpose of insuring fulfilment of the Yalta agreements regarding Poland. The trials of the arrested Polish leaders and the meetings of the delegations took place simultaneously in Moscow. This could hardly have been accident or coincidence.

The results of both the trials and of the meetings are now a matter of public record. Considering the seriousness of the original charges brought by the Soviet Government against the arrested Poles, the sentences pronounced are extremely light. Considering the interpretation put upon the Yalta agreements about Poland by many Americans, the results of the delegation meetings are so inconclusive as to be meaningless.

It was generally understood that a compromise had been achieved at Yalta by which the Soviet Government would agree to a genuine reorganization of the Polish Provisional Government to include democratic representatives from within Poland and from the Polish Government in exile. The provisional government resulting from this latest Moscow meeting does not comply with that understanding.

Out of 21 members of the new Polish Provisional Government suggested by the delegation from the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, 17 are members of the former Lublin regime, established under Soviet auspices first in Moscow and then in liberated Polish territory. The head of this group, Boleslaw Krasnodebski, is not a Polish citizen. He has been an agent of the Comintern and a Soviet citizen for more than 20 years under the party alias of Boleslaw Bierut.

Only one of the new provisional government has a record of unbroken loyalty to Poland. This is Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former premier of the Polish Government in exile. Mr. Mikolajczyk, who is only 45, and in excellent health, has been announced as Second Deputy Premier of the provisional government. This position, however, is practically powerless, even coupled with the additional post of Minister of Agriculture, which should be a key spot in predominantly agricultural Poland. The Agriculture Department will be chiefly administered by the Department of National Reconstruction which has charge of redistribution of land.

The actual power in this provisional government rests in the hands of the First Deputy Premier Wladislaw Gomolka, who is likewise Secretary-General of the Polish Communist Party. Mr. Gomolka has lived in Russia since 1920 when, after trying to organize a mutiny in the Polish regiment to which he belonged, he deserted to the Russians then attacking Poland.

The other ministries either are filled by persons hitherto strangers to Polish public confidence or whose posts have been rendered powerless by shifting of real responsibility to other ministers.

Mr. Wincenty Rymowski, slated to be Foreign Minister, is the former editor of a violently pro-Pilsudski magazine. His literary reputation was damaged by being expelled from the Polish Academy of Literature in 1938 for plagiarizing from the British Socialist, Bertrand Russell.

Dr. Wladislaw Kiernik, who is to be Minister of Public Administration, shares the duties of Minister of Interior with Stanislaw Radkiewicz. The power of this Ministry rests on control of the internal police forces, which has been given wholly to Radkiewicz, who is a member of the Communist Party, and has been accused of working in Poland for the Russian NKVD.

Konstanty Dabrowski, Minister of the Treasury, is also a member of the Communist Party in Poland, and served in the same capacity in the Lublin regime.

Hilary Minc, a Communist Party member, is another hold-over from Lublin, still as Minister of Industry, which gives him complete power over factories and workers.

Mieczyslaw Thugut, who is announced as having accepted the Ministry of Posts and Telegraph, has also been reported too ill to go to Warsaw to perform the duties of his office. If this is so, the Ministry will probably be merged with that of Communications, now filled by Jan Rabanowski, who held it under the Lublin regime.

Dr. Stefan Jedrychowski, born in 1910, now Minister of Shipping and Foreign Trade, has spent most of his life in Wilmo, where his family owned considerable rental property which gave him an independent income. He was appointed Deputy to the Lithuanian National Assembly under Soviet occupation. Also, Mr. Jedrychowski served as assistant editor of the Wilno edition of Pravda, the Soviet newspaper, and as chairman of the Soviet-Lithuanian Trade Union of Culture and Art Workers. In 1940 he was granted Soviet citizenship and was immediately appointed a member of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. He is now listed as a Polish citizen and Polish Minister of Shipping and Foreign Trade. No record of his having changed from Soviet to Polish citizenship is known to exist.

Wladyslaw Kowalski, Minister of Culture and Arts, is head of the extreme radical wing of the Polish Peasant Party.

Stefan Matuszewski, Minister of Information and Propaganda, is a pre-World War I Communist. During that war he helped organize the Polish Red Brigade in Russia, which was later used against Poland in 1920–21. When Soviet forces occupied eastern Poland in 1939, Matuszewski went to Moscow, where he was a prime mover in the Committee for Free Poland, which later sponsored the Lublin group. He has had 30 years' experience in writing and spreading Communist propaganda.

These facts about the "enlarged provisional government for Poland," which the United States has officially taken part in sponsoring, should doubly reassure all those who doubt that this Government is in every way living up to the statement attributed to Mr. Grew, that the United States in its foreign policy "is leaning over backward to avoid giving offense to Red Russia."

Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the death on Okinawa of Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., occasioned particular sadness in Alaska where General Buckner served with such distinction from 1940 until he assumed the task of training and leading the Tenth Army in the battle for Okinawa. In Alaska General Buckner made himself one of the people. He always said he intended to return there after the war to make Alaska his home.

The sentiments of Alaskans are well reflected in an inspiring editorial written by my good friend, Robert B. Atwood, the editor and publisher of the Anchorage Times, which appeared in that newspaper on June 19. The editorial is reprinted here:

GENERAL BUCKNER

If General Buckner had had his choice of the way to die he would have chosen the very circumstances under which he died yesterday—in the front line of action, fighting alongside the troops of his command to conquer a strategic base for the Nation to which he was devoted and in which he invested his whole life.

While news of his death on Okinawa struck with such stunning effect in Alaska, his presence in the front line of action came as no surprise to those who knew him. His fighting was consistent with his living and with his thinking—hard, sincere, and thorough.

It is well known that the general never asked anyone, especially a soldier in his command, to do anything he would not do himself. Stories of his vim and vigor are almost legendary, always exemplifying his principle of doing himself all the things he expected others to do in, as he termed it, "the business of being shot at."

Through the loss of General Buckner the troops of the Tenth Army have lost a fine commander. The Nation has lost a man devoted to its service. Alaska has lost an eminent resident. Destiny has written that he was not to return to the Territory he learned to love, to live in retirement at Anchorage, "the city of friendly people," and enjoy the abundant outdoor life amid the rugged countryside that captured his heart.

Stories of Buckner's physical prowess have gained widespread publicity, because his way of living often verged on the spectacular. War correspondents, columnists, magazine writers, and others recognize the fact that a

general who spends a night in an experimental sleeping bag at 40 below zero to see if it is warm enough for the men of his command is news. They recognize it as news when he wears different type gear on each foot to check them for their practicability in extreme weather.

But General Buckner's many friends in Anchorage and throughout Alaska, who had the privilege of knowing him well, found many more spectacular features of his life to admire.

His mental alertness was refreshing and inspiring. His sense of humor was unequaled. His great fund of information on subjects of every nature, his quick repartee, and his sense of responsibility made him outstanding in any group.

Only a Buckner would solve the problems of arming Alaska during those days when war materials were hard to get and slow arriving, with the suggestion that Alaska could "secede from the Union, declare herself an ally of the United States, and become eligible for lend-lease."

Only a Buckner would suggest, during the days when strikes were upsetting war production, that "Green be sent to Germany and Lewis to Japan to help organize their war efforts."

Only a Buckner, during the days of heavy warfare on Okinawa, would suggest, "I would like nothing better than to fight my way all through Japan and the Kuriles and return to Anchorage via the Aleutians. It would be a great trip."

General Buckner so loved Alaska that he was at one time accused of favoring the Territory over military necessity. This came when he continually resisted efforts of the War Department to send Negro troops to Alaska on construction jobs. He fought a delaying battle, finally losing when the battalions were sent to interior points to build roads.

"Alaska is already plagued with problems of Indians who are half Swede, half Chinese, or half something else," he contended. "Certainly the Army has a responsibility in not further complicating the population characteristics of the Territory by leaving a trail of new racial mixtures."

In locating hospitals, building roads, and planning other phases of the Military Establishment in Alaska, General Buckner always had the future welfare of the Territory in mind. If he had the choice of two locations for an installation that might eventually help develop the Territory, he inevitably chose the one whose benefits would be most enduring.

His sponsorship of friendly civilian-military relations did much to make life in the Territory under strained conditions endurable, and added to the prosperity and happiness of both civilian and military communities.

That he loved Anchorage was demonstrated by the fact that he purchased four lots and had an architect draw plans for a picturesque lodge to be built when he retired after the war. It was to overlook the waters of Knik Arm. And he purchased 160 acres of farm land in Homer, where he planned to spend his summers.

General Buckner was tops in everything that he did and represented. He was master of himself and of every job he undertook.

His principle in living and working was demonstrated even in such a simple habit as that of the use of tobacco. An habitual cigarette consumer, he suddenly quit smoking except on Saturdays. A short time later he smoked only every other Saturday. Then it became the last Saturday of each month.

"If you don't smoke they say you are afraid to," he explained. "If you do smoke it is because you are afraid to stop. Therefore, I smoke on schedule and leave them alone the rest of the time to show that I am neither afraid to smoke nor to abstain."

Buckner had his serious side, equally consistent and analytical. While speaking lightly of many of his war activities, he was well aware of the significance of them.

He gave his life in conquering Okinawa, a move which he saw of lasting benefit to the Nation provided the island is retained by the United States as a mandate after the war. His beliefs on this subject bid well to become of international importance in the peace negotiations.

"I hope that we keep this island after the war, since it is a vital, strategic base to use for preventing trouble from any Asiatic power," he said.

"It looks right down Japan's throat, gives access to the China Sea and the Asiatic coast, cuts north-and-south traffic by sea in the western Pacific and gives our fleet and air forces an operating base connected by Iwo Jima and the Marianas with a line of bases that cannot well be broken nor isolated.

"I am a strong believer in putting potentially aggressive bases into the hands of peacefully minded people as a war preventive. We should not incorporate Okinawa into our country but control it as a 'mandate,' 'protectorate,' or some name that will keep the Okinawans from becoming American citizens."

Here his sense of humor crept into his statement, for he added after "citizens" the words, "and all coming to Anchorage."

Anchorage, and all of Alaska, can always remember General Buckner as a stanch friend and advocate. He has left a monument to himself in his defense system of the Territory, which he always stated openly was more "offensive" than "defensive." He has made Alaska the beneficiary to his efforts through his wise use of the extensive powers and the discretion of his office. He enriched the lives of those who had the privilege of knowing him.

General Buckner is gone but his spirit has a date that will be kept. It will "walk through the ashes of Tokyo" beside the men who fight their way there, a desire he had often expressed.

The Aircraft Carrier "Bunker Hill"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include newspaper articles regarding the attack upon the aircraft carrier *Bunker Hill*. Accompanying the following articles were pictures of the cruiser *Wilkes-Barre*, and its crew is seen in action while aiding the carrier *Bunker Hill:*

PRAISE WORK OF CRUISER WILKES-BARRE—GIVES EXTRAORDINARY ASSISTANCE TO CARRIER STRUCK BY PLANES

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT, PHILADELPHIA, June 28.—Commander Shane H. King, United States Naval Reserve, of Phoenixville, Pa., has drawn high praise from the commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Bunker Hill* for leading damage control parties in extinguishing the inferno aboard the carrier when two Japanese suicide planes crashed on her decks off Okinawa May 11.

"Commander King was outstanding in leading his men in the damage control work," said Capt. George A. Seitz, United States Navy, of Coronado, Calif.

NEED MANPOWER

Calling attention to the need for manpower in the west coast repair yards, Captain Seitz continued:

"The *Bunker Hill* wants to get back on the fighting line as soon as possible. We belong on the battle line with our seasoned, battle-wise crew."

Three hundred and seventy-five of the *Bunker Hill's* crew were killed or died from wounds received in the May 11 attack, while 19 are missing and 264 were wounded, including several of the staff of Vice Admiral Marc A. Mitscher, United States Navy, who was using the *Bunker Hill* as his flagship at the time.

As first lieutenant of the stricken carrier, Commander King was in charge of the damage control work which enabled the *Bunker Hill* to stay afloat and return to the west coast. The ship had been under almost constant attack during the Okinawa action and had accounted for 14 enemy planes in addition to the 475 shot down by her own planes.

DISREGARDS DANGER

As the U. S. S. *Bunker Hill* lay blazing, the light cruiser, U. S. S. *Wilkes-Barre*, built by the New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N. J., nosed up to her starboard quarter disregarding the fact exposions might damage her severely and played her fire hoses on the stricken ship while men trapped on the carrier's hangar deck leaped to safety.

In the words of Capt. George A. Seitz, United States Navy, the *Bunker Hill's* skipper, "the *Wilkes-Barre* did a magnificent job. It came alongside not knowing whether we were likely to have explosions on board. The *Wilkes-Barre* evacuated our seriously wounded, and with their able assistance, we got through."

U. S. S. "BUNKER HILL" SURVIVES TWO BOMB HITS BY JAP PLANES—CARRIER BADLY DAMAGED, 373 MEN KILLED, OFF OKINAWA—CRUISER "WILKES-BARRE" COMES TO RESCUE

WASHINGTON, June 27.—Japanese suicide planes scored two direct bomb hits on the carrier *Bunker Hill*, causing 656 casualties, but the flagship of Vice Adm. Marc A. Mitscher survived 4 hours of flaming death and will fight again.

The Navy disclosed today that the *Bunker Hill*, despite losses of 373 dead, 19 missing, and 264 wounded in the tragic episode off Okinawa May 11, is home under her own power for repairs at the Puget Sound Navy Yard.

A daring maneuver which literally flung the fire from her hangar deck capped the heroic efforts of her crew and assisting ships to conquer the flames.

Three hours after the attack, fire fighters were still waging a nip-and-tuck battle on the flaming deck.

Tons of water, poured on countless thousands of gallons of flaming oil and gasoline, were forcing the fire fighters back against the bulkhead. The sheer weight of the water was causing a 6° list in the ship. Below decks men were dying from heat and suffocation.

The cruiser *Wilkes-Barre*, a member of the task group, had come alongside, placing her bow hard against the *Bunker Hill's* starboard quarter, to add her hose to the fire fighting. With the *Wilkes-Barre* at her side, the *Bunker Hill* went into a wide, 70° turn, at 2½° rudder. In turning, the Navy account said, she shifted the load of water across the ship and "sumped" the heart of the roaring inferno on her hangar deck out into the sea.

"Men with lips too burned to cheer rushed forward with their hose," the Navy related. "Fresh air whipped across the deck at their backs, forcing the heavy smoke of burning oil and gas away from them. New life breathed through the ship. Men who were lying on blistering hot decks below knew, even as they drew their first breath of fresh air, that some miracle had saved them. They knew, too, that the *Bunker Hill* would live to fight again."

In the fantail Warrant Officer James O. Messick, Kansas City, rigged a line to the *Wilkes-Barre* and transferred stretcher cases

and less seriously injured, losing all count of their numbers. He had fought his way back through the smoke when he could not reach his battle station on the hangar deck. Many men crawled, groping in the darkness and choking smoke, along almost endless passageways to reach the flame-menaced refuge of the fantail.

Artificial respiration at the fire's edge, in isolated compartments, on deck and on the *Wilkes-Barre* and the destroyers revived dozens of smoke victims.

Commodore A. A. (31 Knot) Burke, chief of staff to Admiral Mitscher, said the admiral was in flag plot when the attack came and escaped unhurt, although 3 officers and 11 men of his staff were killed and about 20 injured.

PARTING SHOTS

At last our namesake cruiser makes first page mention in all newspapers of the country. The U. S. S. *Wilkes-Barre* deserved this mention long ago had not the ban of censorship been tightly clamped on all stirring news of submarine and surface warship activities. We knew then in vague and briefed form, culled from dry and uninformative official reports, that our submarines were sending to where they belonged a heavy toll of Jap surface vessels. We knew from the same source that ships of the Pacific fleet were performing heroic feats that would later become part and parcel of the Navy's proud record. But until within the last 2 weeks, the names of these subs and other ships of the fleet performing these deeds were withheld.

We then began to realize what life aboard a submarine has meant and what part these underseas craft have played in the annihilation of the enemy navy and its auxiliary supply ships. One story of what it means to serve on a crowded submersible in dangerous Jap waters came to this column from a nephew.

The account escaped censorship because it was penned from a United States port to which the damaged sub had proceeded under its own power and with its own crew after an epic experience.

Prowling in shoal waters immediately off the Jap coast where it had to surface to keep moving, it was attacked by suicide bombers. One of these just missed the deck and exploded alongside. The force of the explosion rolled the stanch little craft over and over three times before it finally righted. Every lad aboard was hurt in the mad gyrations but none was killed. Some of its plates were sprung but after repairs to its steering apparatus and a general bandaging up of the crew it was found as if by a miracle the sub could be maneuvered. So sure were the Japs the sub was done for they did not return for the kill. At night these lads brought their tiny craft out to the open sea and then to a home port.

Tales of this almost incredible sort are now being released. Since VE-day the American public is being told something of feats of the Navy no less than of our Marines and doughboys in faraway places. This is as it should be. Long hidden from public view and from newspaper audiences has been our own cruiser. Readers of this newspaper have been kept in as close touch through letters of appreciative Capt. Robert L. Porter, Jr., commander of the *Wilkes-Barre*, as censorship permitted. His last letter, dated June 1 and published in this column, modestly referred to an exploit of the ship in May as follows: "Last month when we had some wounded on board, Dr. Stone asked for some blood donors. The response by the crew was prompt and gratifying." That was all the mention he could then make of an heroic episode involving the tragic bombing of the huge carrier *Bunker Hill*, the thrilling account of which was released by the Navy Department today for publication in every newspaper of the country.

In the rescue of that crippled carrier and the saving of many lives of its crew, our own cruiser was to play a dramatic part as will be found in news columns of this paper today. Still in another letter from the captain dated June 5 and heretofore published in this space, a quiet, unassuming mention is made as follows: "During a recent air attack, several of our men were wounded—none fatally." That was all censorship would then permit. Later, no doubt, the Navy censors will release that story also. We may be sure that the ship gave a good account of itself then as it did in connection with saving the *Bunker Hill* and has on many other occasions. Whatever is going on in the Pacific our namesake cruiser is sharing.

Of its executive direction under any emergency, of its fighting ability under any circumstances, of its seaworthiness in 80,000 miles of plowing through the troubled seven seas, the community whose name it bears is now fully assured. That assurance was first gained when sponsors of naming the ship, with the dependable and powerful help of Admiral Stark, were permitted to see it commissioned at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Opportunity was then given to meet its officers and crew. Ceremonies attending the event were most impressive. Its crew lined up encircling the deck, its new band with 3 days' practice affording a musical background, its assignment of marines adding color to the scene gave a well substantiated impression that where duty called that ship and its picked personnel would not be found wanting.

It may be recalled also that part of the fund subscribed by the city of Wilkes-Barre and many patriotic citizens of the valley is still held in reserve to reequip the cruiser with special new record-playing devices to supplement the token gift along the same line presented at the ship's commissioning. This token gift has been proclaimed on many occasions as one of the most inspiring as well as welcome community gifts any ship could possess. It enlivened each of the 80,000 miles thus far sailed. It has reminded both officers and enlisted personnel aboard of the namesake city. To that extent at least the community can well be proud of its indirect share in the cruiser's achievements.

British Columbia's Blood Brother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the community of interest between Alaska and western Canada has nowhere been better described than by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger in an article he wrote recently for the Vancouver (British Columbia) Daily Province. That article is of such general interest that I am incorporating it in the RECORD:

BRITISH COLUMBIA'S BLOOD BROTHER—"HE WHO HOLDS ALASKA HOLDS THE WORLD!"

(By Capt. R. L. Neuberger)

Alaska and British Columbia are blood brothers. No natural boundary separates them, only an imaginary line.

The long, tapering panhandle of southeastern Alaska is wedged firmly into British Columbia's mountains and fiords. Great rivers which rise in British Columbia, the Stikine and the Tulsequah, have Alaskan outlets to the sea. All travel to Alaska is via British Columbia.

Ships bound for Juneau, Skagway, and Anchorage cruise along the British Columbia shore for 600 miles. More than a third of the Alaska Military Highway is on Canadian soil. British Columbia airfields at Dawson Creek, Fort Nelson, and Fort St. John anchor the principal air route between Alaska and the American continent.

Alaska is the most thinly populated land under the American flag. From the British Columbia coast range a climber could look down on measureless Alaskan fiords devoid of any sign of man. Yet these fiords have many of the resources of Norway and Sweden, where millions of people dwell.

In 1940 only 72,524 persons lived in Alaska, nearly half of these Indians and Eskimos. Iceland, one-fourteenth the size, supported more than 119,000 inhabitants.

Nowhere else has time stood so still. Not many more white people lived in Alaska in 1940 than lived there almost half a century ago at the time of the Yukon and Nome gold rushes.

But in the past 3 years approximately 200,000 soldiers, sailors, and coast guardsmen have served in Alaska. They have seen the broad valleys, wide rivers, dense forests, and far-flung uplands. They have pulled trout and salmon from swift creeks and shot moose and bear in the mountains. Despite loneliness, cold, and winter darkness, Alaska has seemed to many of these soldiers a frontier of rich opportunities.

TIES OF SOIL, WATER KNIT BRITISH COLUMBIA AND ALASKA

As early as 1880 a pioneer explorer saw that Alaska and British Columbia were virtual Siamese twins, knitted together by ties of soil and water. Lt. Frederick Schwatka, sent by the American War Department to map and survey southeastern Alaska, extended his explorations into British Columbia, because he saw the close geographical kinship between the two entities.

With the exception of such town sites as Juneau and Ketchikan, practically all of southeastern Alaska is in the Tongass National Forest. This forest contains 78,000,000,000 board feet of commercial timber. The trees are cedar, hemlock, and the Sitka spruce, now in great demand for airplane construction. A pulp industry here could supply one-third of the paper needs of the United States. "Hanging lakes" in the mountains are ideal sources of cheap electricity.

Upland meadows above the fiords can support dairy herds and beef cattle. Offshore waters abound with salmon. Minerals pack the ranges. Many world travelers compare the Alaskan "panhandle" with the coast of Norway. Yet Trondheim, Norway, has 55,000 inhabitants, whereas Ketchikan, Alaska, in the same latitude, has only 4,500.

Transportation in Alaska is still in the primitive stage, largely reliant upon dogsled, canoe, and horse and foot. Alaskans have always cast their ballots in early September; in the November voting period many have been snowed in. The war has ended much of this isolation. Extensive airfields dot the Territory. Planes wing across mountain ranges in a few hours. Journeys which once took days are now measured in minutes. Roads have been built.

United States Army engineers have constructed the Alaska Military Highway, the first land link between Alaska and the continent. A telephone system parallels the highway. The Alaska Railroad has been extended and improved. A generation of transportation advancement has been compressed into the past 3 years.

But Alaska is still under the one great economic handicap which distinguishes it from the favorable position of Scandinavian

nations, which are a comparatively short distance from centers of population and valuable markets.

Alaska is far away from Vancouver, Seattle, Portland, and San Francisco. The long transportation haul has kept Alaska from competing for markets with other regions where the dairy products, timber, and agricultural crops can be produced.

New conditions may balance this difficulty. A large Military Establishment may be maintained after the war. In 1939 the sole Army post in Alaska consisted of two companies of infantry at Chilkoot Barracks.

"Postwar Alaska," says Governor Gruening, "will have thousands of soldiers and soldiers' families. These people will support innumerable small businesses. Alaska after the war will offer genuine opportunity for modest investment."

BRITISH COLUMBIA HAS MAIN ENTRY PORTS

With Alaska's towns greatly enlarged, there may be a prosperous new market for locally grown farm products. Alaska has a number of potential argicultural regions, now principally wilderness, the timbered Kenai Peninsula, the Tanana Valley and the Matanuska Valley, where 200 families already have thriving farms.

Successful farming is possible in Alaska. Tye Wilson and his wife came up from Washington 12 years ago. Tye went to work for the railroad. He also staked a 160-acre homestead near Wasilla, felled spruce trees and built his log house and barn, tilled the soil and raised crops. He traded some of the crops for cloth and tools and kerosene lamps.

In a small truck garden the Wilsons last year grew $800 worth of lettuce and $500 worth of celery, 11 tons of potatoes.

The Wilson homestead now has eight Holstein and Guernsey cows and a flock of white Leghorn chickens. Money from this farm enabled the Tyes to take a trip "outside."

This example can not be followed everywhere. The United States General Land Office cautions against indiscriminate homesteading.

There is suitable land in Alaska, they say, but it should be taken up only under Government supervision by people who know the severe and trying conditions.

Many advocates of Alaskan development hope that the United States Government will establish a regional authority there, patterned after the TVA. This authority could build roads, clear land, erect fences, establish communication systems and otherwise prepare the wilderness for settlement. Alaska could be one of the major tourist centers of the world, with mountains higher than the Alps, a seacoast unequaled even in Norway, and fine hunting and fishing.

A bustling tourist trade would employ thousands of former soldiers in inns and camps, as guides and national park rangers. A large group of servicemen already has signified an intention of operating camps and resorts in Alaska after the war.

Such a tourist boom would be felt in British Columbia, too, for Vancouver and Prince Rupert are two of the main entry ports for embarkation to Alaska.

No land not contiguous to the rest of the Union has ever been admitted to statehood in the United States. Alaska's exponents of statehood are certain an exception to this rule will be made. They think Americans will remember the late Gen. Billy Mitchell's warning:

"He who holds Alaska, holds the world."

Alaska is a remarkable land. It gets very cold, but Alaskan moose are the biggest in the world. Alaska has glaciers matched only in the Himalayas. A herd of 23 Montana bison introduced to the Big Delta region in 1928 has now expanded to more than 500. Cabbages grow in Alaska as big as elephants' ears, and strawberries the size of a telephone dial.

Looking across the cold waters of the Bering Sea in the direction of Siberia's tundra shore, Alaskans are not unmindful of the vast strides made in the Arctic in recent years by the Soviet Union.

Leading scientists of the United States and Canada have established at Montreal the Arctic Institute of North America, to study and document knowledge on Alaska and the Canadian Arctic. It includes such men as Dr. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the explorer, and Philip Chester, of the Hudson's Bay Co. Data thus collected will be used for future settlement and development of the two regions.

The future of Alaska and the future of British Columbia are inextricably intertwined. Advancement and colonization in Alaska will inevitably be of benefit to Canada's westernmost province.

Truman Wants Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 26, 1945, entitled "Truman Wants Action." The editorial is as follows:

TRUMAN WANTS ACTION

We hope the American people will keep firmly in mind President Truman's main purpose in flying to San Francisco to the final session of the Conference this evening.

He did not got there merely to be the center of an impressive scene—though few in our annals can compare with this in which the No. 1 man of the United States personally attests America's determined leadership for world peace.

He did not go there only to be the messenger to bring back the precious Charter which he will submit to the Senate Monday.

His major purpose is to dramatize the importance of prompt action on the Charter. He took this course to signalize to the Senate that time is of the essence in completing American membership in this organization that means so much to world peace.

There is good reason to hope the present Senate won't act on the Charter the same way the Senate of Lodge, Watson, Borah, Johnson, and Reed acted on the treaty and Covenant 26 years ago. This time two Senators took part in the creation, and both CONNALLY, chairman of the mighty Committee on Foreign Relations, and VANDENBERG, Republican ex-isolationist, are rushing back to precondition their colleagues into affirmative action without delay. Mr. Truman's private poll, according to reports, shows that no more than a dozen will be bitter-enders.

All this is to the good. But the President is a student of history, and gives due heed to the lessons of the school of experience as to what to avoid. He knows that there is no real security for our participation in the new peace organization until every formality of our entry has been completed.

Mr. Truman is well aware, of course, of the overwhelming public sentiment in favor of our joining the new organization. But Woodrow Wilson was also aware of a tremendous public backing of his plan for a covenant, and so were the anti-Wilson Senators. On February 22, 1919, Lodge told Borah that 85 percent of the Senators were for the League and, a few days later, Watson of Indiana complained that 80 percent of the people were for the League, and he didn't see how it could be killed. Lodge replied that "the indirect method of reservation" would finally choke it to death.

Delay was of the essence with Lodge and the isolationists then. They didn't bring the Covenant before the Senate until July 10, 1919. The Committee on Foreign Relations reported 50 amendments. In November, the Senate voted 14 reservations. The ensuing debate created so much doubt and confusion that both treaty and League lost in the Senate. Later our entry into the World Court was defeated.

Harry S. Truman entered the Senate right after the World Court fiasco, and has a personal memory of the way a band of demagogs played on the Senate to keep us out. He is well aware of the standard arguments against action by that august body that calls itself "the greatest deliberative body in the world"; he knows the cries that go up against haste, gag rule, steam-roller tactics, etc. He knows that some Senators will say they are tired, and that debate had better be postponed until after they have had a summer vacation.

The President knows, too, that Senator WHEELER, who is the spearhead of this year's fight against international relationships of an effective character on our part, came back from Europe saying that action should be held back on the Charter until peace itself had been made for the whole world.

These are among the reasons Mr. Truman wants immediate Senate action on the charter. He wants to be able to tell Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill that we have not repeated our 1919 mistake. He is certainly right that time is of the essence. The people ought to back him in his justified desire for prompt action.

Infantry Day Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] at the Infantry Day exercises, Camp Blanding, Fla., on June 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman recently bestowed the Congressional Medal of Honor upon an Infantry soldier, Sgt. Jake W. Lindsey, of Lucedale, Miss., who was the one hundredth infantryman to receive this Medal of Honor in this war for bravery above and beyond the call of duty. The President said: "There is little glamor in his service. He faces not only the enemy before him, but the cold and heat, the rain and snow, the dust and mud, which so often make his life miserable. These things he endures, and rises above them to such valorous deeds as those we celebrate today."

From the earliest days of warfare the force which took and held enemy territory and that at last beat the enemy into subjugation has been the foot soldier.

That was true when the Macedonian phalanx under Philip and Alexander swept over all opposition. That was true when the legions of Caesar conquered the then-known world. It is still true.

As one looks back over the history of war, he sees the old catapults and battering rams. He sees the elephants of Hannibal and Hamilcar. He sees the sword, the shield, the

knight in armor. As invention makes its devilish contribution to war, he hears the blast of gunpowder, the shattering shock of artillery. One sees modern artillery with its immeasurable destructiveness. Finally, at Arras in World War I, came the steel-skinned monster, the tank. Finally the airplane, the terrible eagle of the air. Each of these, many thought, had become the decisive factor in war. Yet, in this the last and most horrible of all wars when devilish mechanical ingenuity was never so perfected for war, there was still and is still the Infantry foot soldier with his rifle, his tommy-gun, or his hand grenade, who has finally not only taken and held territory but in the last analysis beat the enemy to his knees and forced him to unconditional surrender.

The President was right. The dreary life of the man who plods on day after day through the dust, the rain, the mud, the snow in winter, the heat in summer, with the wet ground for his couch and a rock for his pillow, a wet uniform for his cover, deserves the acclaim of all. He gets war at its worst. Whatever honor and glory there is in war should rightly go to him, heaped up in full measure. If glory can be won in anguish, tragedy, and heartache, the infantry foot soldier should be decorated with a wreath of all the honors and the glory of war.

If this Infantry foot soldier, the most numerous branch of the service, must bear the burden of war, I remind you that he must also bear the burden for the battle of peace.

Why do we fight wars save for justice, security, honor and peace? A generation ago men who won World War I were betrayed by scheming politicians and calloused and indifferent people. To day it is your job to see that nobody betrays you again. A generation ago men who won World War I forgot that their victory was nothing if they lost the peace. For if that peace should be lost, their sons or their loved ones or they again would fight another war.

We have all learned a lesson. If there was excuse for failure to win the peace last time, there can be no excuse this time, for we know the horrible cost of failure to win the peace. We shall end the war with a debt of some $300,000,000,000, with casualties far exceeding a million, many of them gone—never to return to this earth, with the earth bloody and broken and devastated, world trade stopped, world culture thrown back in many places to the savagery of barbaric times, the earth crying out through the anguish of suffering, sorrow and tragedy. We cannot permit again this terrible conflagration of war.

Now, ahead of us is the task to beat down and destroy the fighting power of Japan; to mete out justice upon German, Italian, Jap and every other criminal who had to do with this war. Then, to make a just and fair peace.

After that, to set up the machinery of political and economic collaboration among the nations of the world. In that program there must be the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, the Bretton Woods agreement, the San Francisco Charter, the British-American oil agreement, the International Food Conference, and all those things outlined and provided for us through the wisdom, the great heart and head and hand of your late Commander in Chief, one of the greatest soldiers of democracy of all time, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Don't let ignorant or scheming politicians or selfish interests tell you it is all right to have the San Francisco Charter, but it is not important to have any other part of this great program. You tell them that we cannot have peace in this world unless we have a stable world economy. That means the well-being of all nations and peoples as far as can be. Don't let scheming obstructionists, who are wolves in sheep's clothing, deceive you with technicalities or petty differences. Tell them that the main thing is that we shall not fail on the big things.

To you, then, the Infantry foot soldier at Blanding today, let me first give you the commendation of your country for what you have done, for what you are doing, and for what you will do to build a better nation and a better world.

But let me, as one who knows something of the dangers of peace, warn you that the enemies of peace must not pass, and that again it is to the hero of the battlefield—the Infantry foot soldier—to whom the people must turn to bear the brunt of this other great fight to win the peace.

The Infantry foot soldier has never failed the call of his country. You will not fail your future.

An Outstanding Veteran Should Be Appointed to the Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me and in line with my statement on the floor of the House of last Saturday, I have addressed a letter to President Truman requesting that he appoint an outstanding veteran to one of the top policy-making positions of the Civil Service Commission in order that the interests of our veterans who are returning to, or just entering, Federal service are properly protected.

In view of the great number of veterans who will soon be discharged from the armed forces, many of whom will be seeking positions with the Federal Government, I feel the best way by which their interests may be properly protected is to appoint an outstanding veteran to one of the top policy-making positions of the Civil Service Commission. The veterans are entitled to this consideration.

My letter to President Truman follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 30, 1945.*
The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: For the past several months I have been concerned about the policies and activities of the Civil Service Commission with respect to veterans. I am of the opinion that the civil-service rights of veterans of World Wars I and II are not being fully protected.

I trust you will give consideration to this important matter. In connection therewith I call your attention to a statement I made on the floor of the House on June 30, 1945. I stated, "I ask that President Truman now appoint an outstanding veteran to one of the top policy-making positions of the Civil Service Commission in order that the interests of our veterans who are returning to, or just entering, the Federal service are properly protected."

Knowing of your interest in veterans' affairs, I am confident that you feel as I do that the veteran should be given absolute priority for Government jobs and be accorded the fullest protection possible while holding Federal positions.

In order to assure such a policy, I believe that an outstanding veteran should be appointed to the Civil Service Commission for the obvious reason that the Commission has control of Federal personnel policies affecting veterans.

Sincerely,

EDWARD H. REES.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Full Employment," which appeared in the Washington Post on June 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Sometimes the stimulating Mr. Beardsley Ruml seems to us wide of the mark, but he has just made a valuable contribution to the debate on full employment. After expressing his full support of the Murray bill's purposes, he said in a letter to Senator WAGNER: "I am afraid the program will fail if it is not implemented by appropriate measures that will automatically swing the pendulum in the right direction and keep it from swinging too far. To this end I suggest that there be incorpated in the bill specific statements of policy with respect to (a) taxation, (b) social security, and (c) public works and conservation. Two additional statements of policy are needed which I do not feel able to formulate, namely, (d) stabilization of the economic position of agriculture at a high level, and (e) the association into a full employment program of policies on Federal lending harmonious with the balance of the program."

What Mr. Ruml calls for, in short, is an integrated Federal economic policy for the postwar period. And, indeed, it seems self-evident that no legislative measure to encourage the maintenance of full production can be effective unless it takes into account all the major factors governing the operation of our national economy. The fact is that we have no rounded economic program now—even for the imminent problems of reconversion. There is no clearly enunciated long-range administration policy on taxation, for instance, nor, for that matter, on any of the other topics enumerated by Mr. Ruml. Of itself, the Murray bill is scarcely more than an acknowledgment of Federal responsibility for the promotion of full employment. Whether or not it is feasible to incorporate within the bill itself the various specific statements of policy which Mr. Ruml suggests, it is clear that such statements of policy should be formulated. Without them, Congress cannot legislate informedly.

The formulation of a rounded economic policy is an executive responsibility. There seems no doubt that the Murray bill is going to be one of the major projects of the Truman administration. This is plain not only from the endorsements of it which have come recently from Judge Vinson and from Secretary Wallace but also from the report on full employment which Mr. Truman himself, when he was still a Senator, made in collaboration with Senator MURRAY. In our judgment, the President could take no more effective step to promote realistic discussion on full employment than to request the preparation of a balanced and consistent economic program within the framework of which full employment could be aimed at.

We urge the President to form the department heads into a committee, put them to work, and then report to Congress with a concrete plan. He could do nothing which would afford a more salutary stimulus to intelligent discussion.

One Hundred and Twenty Million Dollars for Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment providing for the $120,000,000 for rural electrification was adopted by a vote of 102 to 29, and was unanimously approved by the Senate.

This is the greatest victory for rural electrification we have won since 1938. It means that we can now go forward with this great rural-electrification program that means more to the toiling farm men, women, and children of this Nation than anything else that Congress has ever done for them.

Air-Line Feeder Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in looking ahead and trying to envision postwar possibilities and activities, we must not overlook the importance of establishing feeder lines and service connections for our main trunk air lines and transcontinental air lines.

We are all interested in maintaining the present efficient service which our airway system is affording our major centers of population, and in improving their facilities and the service it is possible for them to render the country—our Government—its business interests and its private citizens. However, there is an enormous, undeveloped opportunity for a service to be rendered to the smaller units of population and the more or less isolated communities.

The railroad systems of the country early appreciated the importance of having feeder-line connections with their main or trunk lines. In many instances the profits of the system were derived chiefly from the feeder lines. These branch or feeder lines required less expensive equipment in their operations, and they frequently tapped rich reservoirs of resources affording handsome profits to the system. Those served by these branch lines did not expect the deluxe type of service that was demanded on the main or trunk lines, but were delighted to have railroad connections with the outside world. These feeder lines were, therefore, of untold benefit to the community which they served and resulted in attractive profits to the system of which they were a part.

With the improvement of our system of highways and emphasized motor transportation, our smaller communities have enjoyed a service that has been of incalculable benefit to these communities. In many instances where local service by the railroad was curtailed or abandoned, their place was filled by motor transportation—passenger, freight, and mail. A number of the railroads have seen the wisdom of this practice and have been operating busses and motor freight lines to take care of the demand for short hauls and service of small units of population and the rural sections of our country.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are living in an advanced age. Transportation by rail or by automobile has been demonstrated to be too slow. The importance of our air-mail service is recognized by all; and no one will question the fact that transportation of passengers, mail, and merchandise is now in its infancy. Time is so frequently of the essence that we are demanding more speed in the new movement of mail, passengers, and property. All admit the importance of this modern, speedy movement from one large city to another, and across the continent. It follows, as the night the day, that we must have established in this country, and the people are entitled to have the aid of Congress in, the furnishing of the same type of speedy service, so far as practicable, to our smaller cities, towns, and rural populations. Small-town merchants, businessmen, and farmers are as essential to a well-balanced economy in this country as are the enterprises and concerns in the big cities, and each needs and must have rapid means of communication with the other. They are interdependent; and it is for the best interests of both that air transportation be expanded and become as comprehensive as possible.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has jurisdiction to determine the convenience and necessity for the establishment of various types of service by air to the smaller cities and towns of this country. It is felt that they are giving serious consideration to this problem. This Board is making investigations and conducting hearings throughout given areas, to determine the feasibility of affording such services. They are hearing applications of concerns who have made application to render this type of service, as well as petitions of communities seeking such services, under regulations and methods of procedure outlined by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

However, it is felt that perhaps the Board has not been apprised of the attitude of Congress on this subject. At this point, I direct attention to House Concurrent Resolution No. 64 introduced June 22, 1945, by Representative RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, which has been referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The resolution is very brief, but expresses the sentiment of many Members of Congress. It reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as approving expansion of the air-transportation system in the United States so that it will include not only the larger cities but also, through feeder-line service, the greatest practicable number of smaller cities and towns.

By the adoption of this resolution, Congress will be expressing its interpretation of the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the establishment of this air-line feeder service, and will be expressing its desire that the Board proceed as expeditiously as possible to establish a maximum of such service to meet the spontaneous demand that we are receiving daily from our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the time is ripe for such action. Unnecessary delay must be avoided. We have an abundance of equipment ready, or which can be promptly converted into the required type. We have, in our returning veterans, the manpower—trained and ready to go, and who need the jobs. The people want the service. Why delay further?

In the language of a letter which I have just received from an Oklahoman, I think this situation is well expressed. I quote:

I don't think that there is any doubt in anybody's mind that there is a terrific public need and public demand for feeder air-line service, not only in Oklahoma, but all over the Nation. Any doubting Tom on this just needs to go to any town of five thousand or more and talk to the everyday small businessman as to his daily economic business need for feeder air lines in the daily operation of his business, which is his livelihood. Without going further into this, I think that a fair-minded person will concede that public convenience and necessity exist today and have existed since 1938 and 1939.

The second basic factor of my suggestion is that right today there are literally hundreds of veteran pilots and crew members of the ground forces of our military air arms that have already returned and have been discharged and are now out in civilian clothes looking for jobs in aviation today. I am just one hopeful feeder air-line operator in the Nation but I am averaging from two to six men a day with all kinds of flying ability and mechanical ability coming into my office asking for a job with our feeder air line. I simply have to tell them that the Government to date has not seen fit to establish any feeder lines in the Nation. This they do not like because they think that they are entitled to aviation jobs. They feel their flying, operating, overhauling, and maintaining of airplanes is the best in the world—and it is. * * * There are hundreds of these boys today who are going from airport to airport in Oklahoma looking for a job and being turned down.

The third and last point is that, to cite only one example, there are some 6,000 surplus Army airplanes of all types within roughly a 100-mile circle of Oklahoma City. These ships are just sitting out in the open doing nobody any good. The public has paid for these ships. It is admitted that many of these ships are not suitable for feeder air line operations but it cannot be denied that literally hundreds of these ships could be repaired, majored, overhauled, and put into shape in a very short period of time and that by so doing they would have the ability to carry in safety mail, passengers, and property from point A to point B to point C to point D and on down the line on feeder air line operations not only in Oklahoma but all over the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that House Concurrent Resolution No. 64 and all of its implications, will pass this House at the earliest possible date; and that we, as the Representatives of our constituents, may be able to assist them in obtaining this much needed service by putting into use and operation the equipment available, the manpower that is seeking employment—especially the returning well-trained veterans—and thus be instrumental in developing the air-line feeder service of this country as one of the most important of our pre-postwar activities.

New Labor Relations Bill Has Horns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Raymond McGowan from the Providence (R. I.) Visitor of June 28, 1945:

THE YARDSTICK

[By Rev. Raymond McGowan]

NEW LABOR RELATIONS BILL HAS HORNS

The new Ball-Burton-Hatch bill on labor relations has horns. Certainly the official description of it indicates so. It would lessen the protective powers of the National Labor Relations Board and give it antilabor powers. It would whittle away some of the anti-injunction bill. It would lessen labor's powers to establish a closed shop, which is a perfectly legitimate matter when necessary to protect the union. And it would set up a system of compulsory arbitration.

The mentality of the men who wrote the bill—and it was handed to the Senators by a private self-constituted committee—is clear in a sentence they wrote explaining it. "This governmental action," they say, namely, compulsory arbitration and compulsory acceptance of the terms of a compulsory decided contract, "does not impose involuntary servitude because the act specifically preserves the right of any worker to quit his job." They have missed the whole point of wage labor, of unionism, of collective bargaining and of the strike, or for that matte of the lock-out.

Since the individual worker is not free without a union and a collective contract, he is in involuntary servitude when his union is not free. He is free in an organized group and not free otherwise. If the terms of a union contract are imposed from outside and are made compulsory, it is scant freedom of the individual to be able to leave the group. He can leave it only to starve and to waste his abilities and manhood. The whole notion of unionism is based on free group action to meet the group fact of being compelled to work for other people so as to live. Men who don't see that cannot be trusted to write a new labor law for the troubled years that are slowly creeping on us and will come with a rush when Japan falls.

They have gone about the matter in exactly the wrong way. They have tried to set up rules that restrict labor in a game of life which itself restricts labor. They want to penalize by law people who are already penalized by the systematically unjust and pagan facts of the twentieth century. If the representatives of a business do not want to give in during a dispute with its employees—and business is dedicated to the aim of making the largest profit for the least amount of goods—then a Government board will be called in under the bill to decide. Labor would be hamstrung.

The right road is to increase labor's responsibilities and powers over business, expand the powers of the organized working people, and help put them where they can make business change its pagan rules so industry will finally come to serve the people and prevent unemployment and poverty, high prices and profiteering, businessmen's control of government, and another war.

Not restriction of the powers of the organized working people but their increase is the point, both for peace and for justice. This bill restricts.

But the bill, even though fundamentally wrong, tries to give an answer to an unanswerable question. The question is: How can owners and propertyless workers get along together when the owners are in control and want to pay them the least wages possible and the working people do not insist enough on partnership in control, profits, and ownership in companies, in industries, and in the country as a whole? The men who wrote this bill face this fact, accept it as not bad, and then try to solidify it. That is why they went to such pains to argue that what they want is not "involuntary servitude"—another name for which is slavery. The cure is for labor to insist, more than they have, on full partnership with business—but partnership for the good of the country and the world.

Labor Wins Favored Place Before Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by John H. Cline, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of July 1, 1945, which I wish every American, and especially every member of the Supreme Court of the United States, would read:

LABOR WINS FAVORED PLACE BEFORE COURT—A DOUBLE STANDARD OF JUSTICE NOW SEEN AS ESTABLISHED

(By John H. Cline)

There has been some suggestion that the Supreme Court, in refusing to approve the order for the deportation of Harry Bridges, was influenced by a deeply rooted prejudice against doing anything contrary to the interests or wishes of labor leaders. The record does not support this conclusion. But the record does reveal that the Court twisted its own concept of the law to fit the Bridges case and refused to apply a rule which it has often enforced to the benefit of unions and the disadvantage of employers.

In decisions beneficial to unions, the Court has said time and again that it will not go behind the findings of administrative agencies if they are supported by some evidence. And it has said that this is consistent with the intent of Congress, for which the Court professes a tender regard. The order for the deportation of Bridges was issued by the Attorney General under an act of Congress which unquestionably was intended to fit the Bridges case, and which provided specifically that the decision of the Attorney General should be final. Nevertheless, and despite its past professions, a majority of the Court proceeded to override the expressed intent of Congress, and through a process of reasoning reminiscent of Alice in Wonderland, to overrule the Attorney General's findings of fact, although they were undeniably supported by evidence. In brief, one can only conclude that the Court majority, believing that Bridges should not be deported, substituted its own judgment for the judgment of Congress and invented a double standard of law to achieve that purpose—one standard for Bridges and a diametrically opposed standard for employers accused of violating some regulatory statute.

But, aside from the fact that Bridges is a conspicuous and radical labor leader, the facts of his case were only remotely connected, if at all, with the troublesome issue of employer-employee relationships, and the Bridges decision is relevant to this issue only to the extent that it is an exceptionally clear illustration of the lengths to which some of the members of the Supreme Court will go in using their judicial power to make the law conform to what has been called the "predelictions of the judges." On the day of the Bridges decision, however, two other rulings were announced which show beyond any possibility of doubt that the most fundamental concepts of justice have been impaired by the interpretations which this Court has placed on acts of Congress. Primarily the fault rests with Congress and its attempt to give effect to two conflicting policies in the antitrust laws. On the one hand, Congress has sought to prevent business monopolies, and, on the other, it has sought to immunize certain labor monopolies which produce effects just as harmful to the public interest as any industrial monopoly. But the Court, in its zeal to promote the interests of labor, has gone to such extremes in interpreting the intent of Congress that neither employers nor the public have any protection against the most vicious union abuses, provided only that the union acts on its own account. If there is any way out of this dilemma short of congressional intervention, it is not apparent to the layman, for, as Mr. Justice Roberts says, the Court, "as a result of its past decisions, is in the position that whatever it decides must entail disastrous results."

The first of the two labor rulings is known as the Allen Bradley case. A union of electrical workers in New York City agreed with New York manufacturers and contractors, in return for contracts granting high pay and excellent working conditions, to bar all outside electrical products from the city. The plan was successful, and one result was an unconscionable increase in the price which New Yorkers had to pay for electrical equipment. Since the manufacturers and contractors were parties to the monopoly, and benefited from it, the Court struck it down. But the opinion stated very bluntly that the union, acting alone, could have done the things which became unlawful when done in concert with employers. In other words, the interests of the people of New York count for nothing because the Court says Congress intended to sanction a course of conduct by unions which becomes illegal only when employers are brought into the picture.

The other decision dealt with what is known as the Hunt cast, in which a union, with the court's approval, put an employer out of business, not in the course of a labor dispute but because the union thought that the employer ought to be punished. Hunt was a trucker, one of a number working under contract in Philadelphia for a chain grocery. In 1937 a local union called a strike to enforce a closed shop. There was a great deal of violence, and a union man was killed. A member of the Hunt firm was tried for the homicide and acquitted. Some time later, however, the union secured a closed-shop contract with the grocery concern, and all of

the truckers were notified that their employees must become members of the union. But the union refused to admit the Hunt employees, and demanded that the grocery cease doing business with the trucker. This was done. When Hunt secured another contract with another employer the union repeated the process, with the result that Hunt was forced out of business. The union was punishing the Hunt firm for an alleged past offense of one of its members—a complaint on which the accused had been tried and acquitted. But five members of the Supreme Court said that Congress also intended to shield that sort of union activity.

Chief Jusice Stone and Justices Jackson, Frankfurter, and Roberts dissented. Justice Jackson, writing the dissent, declared: "Those statutes which restricted the application of the Sherman Act against unions were intended only to shield the legitimate objectives of such organizations, not to give them a sword to use with unlimited immunity. The social interest in allowing workers to better their condition by their combined bargaining power was thought to outweigh the otherwise undesirable restriction on competition which all successful union activity necessarily entails. But there is no social interest served by union activities which are directed not to the advantage of union members but merely to capricious and retaliatory misuse of the power which unions have simply to impose their will on an employer. * * * This Court permits to employees the same arbitrary dominance over the economic sphere which they control that labor so long, so bitterly and so rightly asserted should belong to no man."

In other words the scales of justice have become unbalanced. No correction will come from the Supreme Court as presently constituted. This means that Congress must act if anything is to be done. And judging from what the Court did with the intent of Congress in the Bridges case, the legislators, should they decide to intervene, will have to speak in language that is clear and conclusive on the judges.

The Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article by Carleton R. Ball, entitled "What the Missouri Valley Authority Proposal Promises for America." Mr. Ball is an outstanding agricultural economist who has done considerable work for the Department of Agriculture throughout the Missouri Valley, and is a native son of that valley. The article appeared in the May 1945 number of Social Action, published by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY PROFOSAL PROMISES FOR AMERICA

(By Carleton R. Ball)

The magnificent Missouri Valley area is the largest watershed in the United States. Thirteen hundred miles northwest to southeast as the crow flies, it is nearly twice that as the channel winds. A victim of patriotic agricultural expansion during World War I, it has suffered since from depression, drought, dust storm, erosion, and flood, with increasing property loss and disheartenment.

It has a wealth of actual and potential natural resources in soil, water, minerals, plant life, animal life, and scenic and recreational areas. It has a wealth of human resources, rural and urban. Both groups need to be conserved and developed for the benefit of the whole area. That is a big job.

Individual Government agencies do good jobs in their limited fields. Often they fail to see relationships to other programs. Two administrative trends have resulted. One reduces the number of divisions per agency and broadens the objective of those remaining. Another creates correlating units to insure that one program does not injure another or that some problem is not neglected by all. A regional authority combines both trends. There is one responsible Federal agency, and its objective is broadened to cover all engineering, agricultural, industrial, economic, and social problems of the area.

The objective is to compel a vast river system to cease destructive and disheartening activities and to begin expending all of its vast energy in producing benefits for the entire area it occupies, and thus for the Nation. We strive vainly and expensively to cure our evils after they have occurred. We should remove the causes and thus prevent the harmful effects. We know how to do just that and have proved that we know.

The conflict, or the cooperation, of water and soil begin where the raindrop falls on the land. Only a single authority, with a unified plan and an integrated program, can harness the raindrop at that spot and follow through. Only that can make it irrigate a field, cover-crop a dustbowl, produce dryland grazing, nourish forests, stimulate shelterbelts, protect reservoirs, manufacture fertilizer, carry commerce, generate electricity, produce power revenue, lighten farm and household drudgery, create industry, arm national defense, produce sea foods, and provide abundant recreation, and at the same time cease eroding topsoil, refrain from destroying lives and property in floods, and desist from bankrupting an empire.

This is not guesswork. It has been done by TVA. In a smaller area? True! But with steeper slopes, higher rainfall, and more decades of destructive erosion. The bigger the problem, the greater the need for a single agency, a unified plan, and integrated procedures. Everybody gains if the whole job is done. Everybody loses while it is delayed. Why wait?

The many activities of TVA are conducted largely in cooperation with agencies of Federal, State, and local governments, and with organizations and groups of citizens. It took 66 pages recently to record TVA's cooperative projects. TVA law provides payments from gross receipts to state and local governments in lieu of utility taxes, thus maintaining their revenues.

Governors, elected by the people, are sensitive to Federal encroachment on States' rights and activities, especially in the South. Recently the Governors of the seven Tennessee Valley States declared emphatically that TVA cooperative activities actually have strengthened State and local governments, by enabling them to render more and better service to their people. This is highly significant.

What can church members do? Remember that each pressure group or special interest is organized, coherent, informed, and equipped to make its desires known. Society as a whole is not so organized, coherent, informed, or equipped. The church should represent the public interest, as compared with group interest. It can supply information and leadership. It can "Do unto others as ye would."

Tribute to Services of Local Draft Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Men Without Medals," by Edward T. Leech. It has to do with the members of local draft boards.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEN WITHOUT MEDALS

(By Edward T. Leech)

THEY'RE THE MEMBERS OF THE LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS, WHO'VE SHOWN HOW DEMOCRACY WORKS

They've never seen action, and never will—yet the war couldn't be won without these 10 American divisions.

They have served for 4½ years, without furlough or relief. And it has been hard service, trying, tiresome, and frequently sorrowful—performed without pay, without acclaim, without decorations, with almost no public recognition.

These 10 divisions consist of about 150,000 men who comprise the Nation's 6,500 draft boards and their related agents and agencies—appeal boards, appeals agents, legal advisers to registrants, examining physicians, medical advisers, and reemployment committeemen.

They are the human element of Selective Service—the machinery that put the major port of 12,000,000 men into uniform without disrupting the home front.

They've been on the job since late in 1940, when America's first peacetime draft began functioning with the drawing of blue capsules from a gigantic bowl in Washington. Remember when No. 158 came out first? They were working then.

Today, as victory approaches, they are still feeding men into the war; but increasingly, their work now is with men returning from war to seek jobs back home. For Selective Service has the double duty of putting men into uniform and getting them back into jobs when those uniforms are put aside.

The men who make up Selective Service are your neighbors. For the basis of Selective Service is local control. Washington fixes general policies; State headquarters administer them; but the local draft board applies them and determines who shall go and who shall stay. And the local board is a neighborhood group, living with those whom it must judge.

On your board you will find men who are the backbone of your community. Not only the judge, the banker, the merchant, and the teacher, but the man-around-the-corner, that civic-minded citizen who has given up the time in which he used to putter around the house, play with his kids, and who has volunteered, instead, for this important war job at home.

The draft board has more power than any group of unpaid volunteers in our history. Yet for all its troubles, for all the conflicts and complexities of the manpower question, it has worked with efficiency and freedom from major scandal, accusation, or politics.

There have been faults, of course; but no such scandals as marked Civil War drafting and some World War I instances.

It was inevitable that in creating a mass citizen army for all-out war there would be confusion of regulations, frequent shifting

of policies, border-line interpretations, and all the other uncertainties of constantly changing situations both at the front and at home. Plagued by those conditions and by all the questions they created among registrants and their families, the local draft boards had to carry on the most delicate of assignments.

Working usually in small and uninviting quarters in a schoolhouse or fire station or borough or township hall, or some available public room, with a modest assortment of old furniture and makeshift equipment, these groups of neighbors have decided the fate of their home town and home street young men.

Draft headquarters is seldom much to look at. Some patriotic posters, mimeographed notices, and newspaper clippings on the wall; a few desks and uncomfortable chairs; groups of boys and their fathers and mothers and employers waiting outside. This is where some little group of men has given many hours daily and several nights a week for over 4 years to unpaid public service. Only the clerical help receives pay.

Often the work has been agonizing. It has involved the lives of the sons of neighbors and friends, the disruption of homes, all the deep domestic dislocations and griefs of war. The draft-board members must rule—and then continue to live with the neighbors so vitally affected.

They've been able to go on living among their neighbors because they've done a hard job honestly. They must tell others to fight; they deal in lists, files, and folders—the cold stuff of paper and steel cabinets. Yet they also work with flesh and blood; out of which has come an armed force battling without reprieve to finish the war and gain the goal of peace.

After victory, when our aim once again will be happy living, these men—whose only badge is "local board member, Selective Service"—can feel real satisfaction. They've shown the world that democracy can act, quickly and effectively.

Attitude of Administration Toward Monopolies and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Leo Wolman appearing in the Washington Post of July 1, 1945, relating to the Hatch-Ball-Burton bill, which seeks to rewrite our Federal statutes governing labor relations. I have not had the opportunity yet to study this measure, but certainly a law so biased in its provisions and enforcement as the National Labor Relations Act ought not to remain unchanged on our statute books. The present law ignores entirely the rights of workers who do not belong to unions, and discriminates against them, as well as employers, and it has been enforced in such a manner as to give the public the impression that the Board is merely an adjunct of the labor unions. I believe every group is entitled to fair treatment, both in the provisions of the law and in the enforcement of the law. We have had it in neither. It is time that the law and the policy should be changed so that employers and unions would be treated alike, and the rights of workers who are not unionized should be adequately protected.

I think it is going to be necessary to have some reasonable and fair measure to deal with the strike situation. It is unthinkable that we shall continue to permit the whole routine of business to be disrupted by strikes, both authorized and unauthorized, and the public denied the essentials of life because of some real or imaginary grievance, and because of differences between contending forces.

It is necessary to have laws to control monopoly in business, but it is equally essential to have laws to control monopoly in labor. I have only contempt for a law that can control a Sewell Avery, but stands helpless before a James Petrillo or a John Lewis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION FIGHTS MONOPOLIES, BUT FAILS TO STOP THAT OF LABOR

(By Leo Wolman)

The three Senators—BALL, BURTON, and HATCH—who have undertaken to rewrite our Federal statutes governing the legal position of trade-unions are performing a signal public service whether or not they succeed in their efforts.

What they are doing represents the first serious attack in Congress on our foremost postwar industrial problem, the relations of organized labor to industry. On the proper handling of this problem depends much of our chances for prosperity after the war, and nothing is more important than to give the issues surrounding this problem a thorough public airing.

Hitherto they have been treated emotionally and with little light. The time has come to understand them.

Aside from considering the numerous details with which the drafting of legislation is concerned, the first thing to know is what the trouble with existing conditions is.

There is no point to framing new laws unless they are directed at real evils. Else we will have additional rules, new interpretations, more complications, and no effective remedies.

The greatest, and most threatening of these evils is labor monopoly. Whether by intention, or through inadvertence, the crop of labor laws we enacted since the middle twenties and the course of administrative and judicial interpretation have become the source of extensive and powerful labor monopolies. They have swiftly spread from occupation to occupation and from industry to industry.

CAN HELP PUBLIC BY NO STRETCH OF IMAGINATION

Like business monopolies, they pursue essentially private objectives. Their methods are similar to the methods of monopolistic enterprises in general. These methods are restrictive, obstructive, coercive, and costly.

By no stretch of the imagination can such methods be deemed to be in the public interest and, hence, in the interest of the 40,000,000 or more wage and salary earners who, for lack of a better name, are called "labor."

As these labor monopolies grow more inclusive and stronger, they tend irresistibly to create as their counterpart business monopolies, with which they have in the past and will in the future make collusive, restrictive, wage- and price-fixing agreements.

It is one of the curious anomalies of this critical period of our history that a Federal administration which undertook to enforce antitrust legislation with greater vigor than at anytime since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890, should at the same time have gone out of its way to protect organized labor from the consequence of its antimonopoly crusade.

LABOR BOARDS PERMITTED TO RUN WILD—AND DID

No small part in the creation of these conditions was played by administrative agencies and administrative law.

On the assumption that they were dealing with some mysterious and recondite body of facts and experience, the labor boards of this period were allowed to run wild. Unless the exception was the administration of national prohibition, it is doubtful that we have in a long time had poorer and more arbitrary execution of laws than we have received from these administrative agencies.

The misfortune is that the courts, also taken in by the doctrine of the natural superiority of administrative boards, hesitated so long to inquire into what they were doing and to overrule them.

For the truth is that administrative law, as it was practiced by such bodies, was too often tantamount to operating without any law at all. We might, indeed, have forestalled many of our impending difficulties if we had been willing to exchange some tested judicial procedure and common sense for all the "expert" lore with which administrative boards are believed to be endowed.

Any changes for the better in our labor law will be useless unless they aim to deal with these problems.

Labor monopoly, however regulated, will remain the cause of deep-seated economic and political evils.

Administrative law, as we now permit its practice, can be counted on to nullify a good deal of the most carefully drafted legislation.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, what was behind the vote of the Appropriations Committee to "defer consideration" of the appropriation for the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice?

The Appropriations Committee's report on the national war agencies bill has advanced the tenuous excuse that the House is considering legislation for this agency. The committee knew when it voted that the measures to make permanent the FEPC would not secure passage before June 30, when the agency's funds ran out. It knows, too, that the bill is now bottled in the Rules Committee without hope of even being considered unless Republican members of the committee deign to act.

This is, indeed, a spurious excuse. A permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission and the President's committee are separate and distinct. The solution of the problem of discrimination in peacetime employment, basic though it is to the continuing expansion of our democracy—is quite distinct from the emergency problems of expediting war production, of maintaining national unity in the midst of war, of devoting the

Nation's fullest strength to attaining victory. It is with these problems exclusively that the present FEPC deals.

By palming off on the public the specious argument that the committee had voted to "defer consideration" the Republican members of the committee are acting in accordance with their past practice of paying lip service to the people's program but rejecting it wherever affirmative action is required. By this device they seek to hide the truth and to escape responsibility for their actions.

But in this age the people cannot long be kept unaware of the true significance of such action. They know the committee attempted to kill FEPC.

In the recent election the party of Lincoln had fine words for Americans belonging to minority groups. Their platform for 1944—the program they would now have before this House, had they won—included this plank:

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Every test of that pledge in this House has found the Republican Party, with but few exceptions, lacking in sincerity.

During the hearings before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, employees of the FEPC and Malcolm Ross, its chairman, laid before the Congress a detailed and accurate account of its operations and its plans. The testimony and exhibits there show clearly that the work of the President's Committee is not yet done. At this time the Committee has nearly 2,600 cases of discrimination pending before it. Each of these cases represents at least one, and in some cases hundreds, of minority-group workers trying to contribute their skills to the war effort and meeting difficulty. The speed with which we prepare the goods to defeat our Pacific enemy is not unconnected with the success of our minority-group citizens in obtaining war employment.

The FEPC is handling a two-headed problem; trying, on the one hand, to break down the barriers to minority workers entering war industry and, on the other hand, to see that cut-backs in war employment are effected in an equitable and orderly manner without discrimination against Negroes, Jews, Mexican-Americans, or any other racial or religious group. Tension rises quickly in areas where unemployment looms and where insecurity threatens the worker. It is in such a context, by assuring that lay-offs are conducted fairly, that FEPC can contribute greatly to the morale and well-being of the Nation's war workers. For unless discharges are issued without prejudice, the Fascist seed of race hatred will inevitably be planted to plague our postwar years. Let us not forget the tragic example of our failure to meet this problem last time. The 26 race riots of 1919 would be a heavy toll to pay for our failure to organize a democratic demobilization now.

Think of what our failure to continue the present agency means.

In Detroit, on June 2, as the news of the Appropriations Committee action broke, the Fair Employment Practice Committee was holding a public hearing to examine complaints of discrimination against a labor union and 11 local trucking concerns. In this case, the unions and the companies had denied employment to Negro truck drivers while war goods in Detroit piled up untouched because the trucks could not be manned. Several of the complainants in this case were Negro veterans of World War II, men who, ironically enough, had driven supplies to the boys at the front in France. But in Detroit they could not be hired—because of their color.

Serving in the armed forces of the Nation are nearly 1,000,000 Negroes, men who, like all other veterans, expect that a grateful country will treat them squarely. How will these men receive the news of this case? They will surely follow FEPC's fate. How will the Negro troops, first ashore at Okinawa, feel when they learn that discharged soldiers are barred from backing up the men still fighting—their buddies—because of their color? These men have a lien upon our good will. We cannot ignore their plight without betraying the symbols of freedom and equality under which they fought and for which many of them died.

How will those at home, whom FEPC has helped, receive the news of this agency's fate? Since its reorganization in 1943, the FEPC has received 8,000 complaints of discrimination in war industry and in Government. Of these, 5,000 have been settled and 36 percent have been satisfactorily adjusted so that discriminatory barriers to minority group workers have been removed.

At the beginning of 1942, Negroes, our largest minority group, comprised less than 3 percent of all war workers. By November 1944, through the efforts of this Committee, and the exigencies of the manpower situation, Negroes were 8.3 percent of the workers in war industries reporting to the War Manpower Commission. Would the victories of our armies have been so complete without the productive capacity of these million and a quarter loyal Americans? To employers in aircraft and shipbuilding, ordnance manufacturers, to Government itself, and to all war industries, the FEPC has brought a source of labor, hitherto almost untapped, and, in many cases, forgotten. War work remains to be done, and the urgent needs of our fighting men cannot wait. The skills of all must be harnessed for victory. Labor is not completely moblie. It must, therefore, be completely used in every war production area. The present Committee or a permanent successor must continue to safeguard the full use of all workers until the last of the enemy lays down his arms.

There can be no rationalization of the delay of the appropriation for this agency. A full-scale war rages to which our brave men are committed. The critical needs of the Army and Navy for matériel continues. A country united against a common foe is still the prerequisite of victory. The dual problems of war production and the resumption of peace time pursuits demand the skill and strength of every hand. To fail, at this time, to do all in our power to meet and overcome these home-front problems would be criminal. We cannot afford reconversion to reaction.

Capital Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me I desire to call attention to an editorial in the Federal Machinist, an official publication of district 44, International Association of Machinists.

This editorial rightly calls attention to the strike of meat packers in this country against the American people, and against the whole question of price control.

I believe it is worthy of consideration of every Member of Congress.

It follows:

CAPITAL STRIKES

According to newspaper reports, there are some 26,000 independent slaughtering houses which have closed down during the last few weeks, after failing to persuade the OPA to allow them a larger margin of profit on their meat. In other words, the owners and managers of these packing plants have gone on strike for more money. The fact that they are interfering with the war effort by starving the American public for meat has not interfered with their course of action.

Most of them claimed that they were "losing money" by continuing in operation.

No one expects industries to operate at a loss; but it seems that with all of our congressional committees investigating these subjects, and agencies of the executive branch of the Government conducting investigations, it should have been possible to have continued these slaughtering houses in operation and thus supply the public with meat while the investigations were going on, and an adjustment in price or a subsidy provided to make up for any inequity which these investigations would disclose.

Now if a labor organization had gone on strike in an industry as essential as is the meat-production business, which is providing meat for our armed forces and the public generally working in war industries behind the front, the corporation-controlled press of the country would have created a tremendous furor about it; and an effort would be made to saddle the entire responsibility for the stoppage of work upon the strikers.

In such a case, the provisions of the Smith-Connally Artistrike Act would be invoked; the Government would take over and operate the plants pending a settlement of the dispute, and the case would be referred to the War Labor Board, with assurance that if the striking workmen had a justifiable complaint they would receive an increase in pay made retroactive to the date upon which the complaint was filed. In the meantime, production would be carried on without interruption.

Not so with the meat situation. When the employer goes on strike for more money, the public is expected to do without (in this case, meat) until the dispute is settled in accordance with procedure that is none too definite or certain to secure results within a reasonable length of time. Some Government agencies, for instance, will "guess" that if they ease a restriction here and a restriction there, or make some slight modification in the price structure, that in the course of 60 or 90 days there will be more meat on the market. If this guess does not produce results, they may try some other expedient in the hope of "coaxing" the employer to operate his plant; and along with these remedial measures, of course, comes the assurance

that there certainly will be more meat on the market soon.

If it is justifiable for the Government to take over a plant and operate it where workmen threaten to go on strike, why should it not have been equally proper for the Government to take over these 26,000 slaughtering houses, proceed to operate them with the workmen who were in the employ of the private owners, then turn the employers' dispute over to an appropriate Government agency to investigate the justice of their claims, with the assurance that if the employer were found to be enttiled to receive more profit, he would either receive an increase in the price for which he sold his meat and/or receive a Government subsidy to make up the difference between the price he formerly received and what the Board concluded was due him? In the meantime, the armed forces and the public would receive their quota of meat in the same way as production would be carried on by the Government in a plant where a labor dispute was in the process of being adjudicated, and where the workmen otherwise would be on strike.

Note the attitude of our corporationized press. Are they blaming the owners and managers of slaughtering houses for going on strike? No; they are abusing the OPA and Congress, and laying practically the entire blame on the Government generally, with only a "slap on the wrist" for the meat producers who are on a sit-down strike. Many Members of Congress privately admit that our Federal Government should have treated the striking owners and managers of slaughtering houses the same as they would if the workmen of these establishments had gone on strike. But, they point out, if they were even to mention such a thing, the newspapers of the country would "skin them alive" for an assault upon the sacred institution of private enterprise.

It would appear, therefore, that the newspapers of the country are directly to blame for not only the shortage of meat but the shortage of many other commodities, because if our elected public officials take effective action which interferes with the policies of the business interests, these newspapers would subject them to a barrage of abuse and vilification; would probably succeed in turning the public against the very individuals who are trying to protect the public interests.

We believe in private enterprise but we also believe that our Federal Government, representing all the people, should exercise effective managerial supervision with a view to avoid industrial scarcities, surpluses, and bottlenecks. The basic facts which were due to create the present shortages of such things as meat, butter, fats, sugar, and other commodities, were ascertainable a year ago. If machinery at that time had been set up, as suggested in the columns of the Federal Machinist, to bring about production, we would not now have scarcities in at least some of these commodities.

The issue is overwhelmingly clear. The voter dutifully goes to the polls on election day to elect representatives to public office. These representatives have no adequate means of reporting back to their constituents, as against the daily access which the newspapers of the country have to these constituents, but must rely upon the fairness of newspaperdom to report upon their activities. Entrenched privilege appears to have captured the instruments for disseminating news and the means by which the public may be indoctrinated with their opinions and policies, in that the newspapers, by and large, the magazines and the radio are owned or controlled by this outfit. Any public official who does their bidding receives favorable publicity. Any Government official whose action indicates that the public interests come first and special privilege second has visited upon him a volume of criticism dispensed by experts in the art, to the point where he will either "conform" or be driven out of public life. A few well-intentioned public men have had the courage to protect the public interests. Many, with a sense of futility, have decided that the best thing to do is to "play safe" and go along with this gigantic propaganda machine, and still others appear to be heart and soul in favor of this scheme for controlling the American people in the interests of the few.

Eventually, when the public finally learns how it has lost control of its own elected officials, ways doubtless will be found within the framework of our Constitution which will restore the people's right to effective representative government.

Preservation of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Sunday Star of July 1, 1945:

PEACE HINGES ON HOW WELL PEOPLES KNOW EACH OTHER—SAN FRANCISCO CHARTER PROVIDES MACHINERY, BUT MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND TRUST VITAL TO ITS SUCCESSFUL FUNCTIONING

(By Constantine Brown)

Until a full-dress debate has taken place on the floor of the Senate, the real meaning and implication of the San Francisco Charter will not be known in detail. Many of the matters presented so far to the public through official press releases seem still beclouded because of last-minute changes. Some of the delegates of the smaller nations who in public statements in this country have supported the Charter, are expressing certain doubts when speaking to their own people "off the record."

The principal concern of all the delegates who have toiled for 2 months to bring the Dumbarton Oaks "90 percent" agreement into a full 100-percent treaty seems to have been to get the whole business over as soon as practicable and hope for the best. The nations of the world have pledged themselves many times in the past to maintain order and security and to outlaw wars as an instrument of national policy. They all failed because the signatories kept their fingers crossed and sacrificed world peace to what they considered national interests.

Whether the new world which our leaders are now attempting to create after years of unimaginable horrors and hardships will be better remains to be seen. Whether the San Francisco Charter is just another "document," like the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the League of Nations Covenant, and the Atlantic Charter, depends on the willingness of the powers, and particularly the Big Three, to see that it is kept faithfully with justice and good will toward all the nations, big and small.

NO NOVEL THOUGHT

The nations which are being described as peace loving—those which have participated in the war all through it or at the eleventh hour—are placing their destinies in the hands of the Big Three because they are the only ones with sufficient military power to crack down on any peace breaker. This is not a novel thought.

King Francis I of France fought for years for the domination of Europe against his rival, Emperor Charles V. In the end he was defeated at the battle of Pavia, taken into captivity and after a year spent as the prisoner of his rival, he signed an onerous treaty of peace in Madrid. After this sad experience he devoted his life to organizing a balance of power in Europe. The Catholic King took as his allies the Turks, the German Lutherans and particularly the "heretic" King Henry VIII of England.

When he sent emissaries to the English King to organ ze the then restricted world in such a way that peace should no longer be disturbed, Henry answered that not only was he in favor of such an organization, but he was willing to fight any nation which was prepared to break the peace. The Treaty of Ardres was signed in 1546, but resulted in little more than a heavy letter of credit the British monarch drew on the French treasury.

BETTER UNDERSTANDING NEEDED

Pacts and agreements mean little unless they are backed by a genuine and strong decisi_n of all the signatories—or at least the most powerful ones—to see that they are being applied and enforced honestly. This requires a better understanding of each other than exists at present.

Since the end of the war in Europe, there has been an increased tendency between some of the Allies to mistrust each other. This is particularly true in respect to Russia, which is known to the people of the United States only as a great military nation and the exponent of what used to be considered a heretic social system, communism. The reports about Russia's conduct in the countries liberated by her armies led many observers who do not fear communism as a social and economic doctrine to believe that Russia has changed and has become a totalitarian imperialistic nation. Unless this suspicion can be dispelled, the chances of a real sincere and united collaboration are slim.

We hear in this country reports about the high-handed methods applied by the Russion armies in the Balkans. We are told, sometimes from the highest official quarters available, about tens of thousands of persons in Bulgaria, Rumania, and Poland being deported to Siberia or other Russian republics behind the Urals as slave laborers because they are considered opponents of Russia's domination of the liberated countries. We are told and there are no indications that these reports are fabrications—that Russia has installed her puppet regimes in all the liberated countries and that she intends to expand her zone of influence all over Europe, just as the French, Spanish, and German rulers did in past centuries.

KNOWN BY HEARSAY ONLY

If we are to believe the hushed reports from unbiased sources, even the Polish settlement did not live up to the spirit of the Yalta agreement since the major jobs in the new Warsaw government are in the hands of men hand-picked by Moscow. We hear reports that there still are mass executions in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. People who are earmarked as strong potential opponents of the new puppet regimes are immediately described as collaborationists or Fascists and sent before execution squads.

Many of these reports find their way into the American press which the Moscow official organs take pleasure in frequently describing as pro-Fascist. In some of the Russian broadcasts the United States, or a large section of it, is pictured as the last remaining hotbed of fascism in the world.

These attacks on the United States and other countries where unfavorable reports on Russia appear in print or are expressed in spoken words can be damaging in the long run. Good neighborliness is based on a close acquaintanceship between individuals and nations. Friendly relations are never

possible among people who don't know each other except by hearsay. And there is no question that, as far as this country is concerned, we don't know Russia better than by hearsay.

The whole trouble comes from the fact that the Soviet Government a long time ago built a wall around itself. The war, in which we became Russia's most important partner, has not modified this policy born after the Bolsheviks came to power.

The drastic changes which occurred in that immense empire were not palatable to the Western World. As a consequence, the strictest kind of censorship was imposed on the national press and the foreign reporters. Russia's entry into the concert of civilized powers did not change this policy. Quite the contrary. In all countries which became Russia's "proteges" the same kind of censorship was introduced as soon as the Russian troops and their puppet rulers took over.

For some reason or other, the Russian Government continues to be highly suspicious of any westerner, and newspaper correspondents are unjustly considered potential spies. They are confined to Moscow, or Belgrade, or whatever capital a few of them have been permitted to enter. Their movements are strictly restricted and their dispatches are heavily censored. There is neither argument nor appeal to the decisions taken frequently by minor officials as far as the application of the blue pencil is concerned.

Since Russia is a very important country, the newspapers, the news agencies, and the broadcasting services are anxious to have representatives there. The stories told by these able reporters when they return to this country would make interesting, though favorable reading for the American public. But they do not dare talk in public or be quoted, because they know their colleagues who have been left behind will suffer "reprisals." The organization which the overlocquacious reporter represents may find itself deprived of the coverage privileges. And this would be a heavy blow in the highly competitive system in which we live.

NO REAL REPORTING

A good professional newspaperman must write the news regardless of how unpleasant it might sound, if he is satisfied that the news is correct. Some stories about the political concentration camps in Russia and in the countries under Russia's protecting wing have aroused the ire of the Moscow authorities. They may or may not be true.

The strict Russian censorship which applies not only in Russia but also in the Balkans, in Poland, Finland, and in Germany forbids the transmission of any kind of news which is unfavorable. There is no real reporting in any of these countries. The few American newspapermen who are tolerated are supposed to send only highly colored dispatches which have become meaningless since they do not give a true picture of the station to which they are assigned.

Occasionally the Moscow correspondents are taken on personally conducted tours, that is to say, under the supervision of officials of the censorship department who in turn are supervised by members of the NKVD (secret police) to see things the Government wants them to see.

The American public, which is so willing to be favorable to Russia and become really friendly to that new world power, is kept in ignorance of what is actually going on in that vast empire. It knows even less about what is happening in the areas under Russian control in which the peoples of this country are so keenly interested. It was through the efforts of the last American generation that countries like Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, Poland, and Yugoslavia came to life.

FACE NO RESTRICTION THERE

There are millions of Americans of foreign descent whose people have come to this country from those areas. It is only natural that they should be warmly interested in the fate of the countries from which their parents or grandparents came and to have strong suspicions against one of our most powerful allies in this war because of the reports they read in newspapers or obtain from letters smuggled across the borders.

The Russian correspondents in this country are treated just like any other newspapermen. They are handicapped neither by censorship nor propaganda. They are free to go wherever they wish and talk with whomever they like. The Russian correspondents at San Francisco discovered probably for the first time in their lives what we understand by freedom of the press. And they did not hesitate to send some pretty strong stories to their papers in Moscow in which they attacked many Americans in public life and occasionally criticized the American mode of life.

Nobody objected to these dispatches. There was nobody with a blue pencil to cut off hundreds of words or whole sentences from their reports on America. It is likely that they themselves found many pleasant things in this country, one of the few left where the police are intended to keep order and prosecute only criminals. But to say so might have meant severe punishment on their return home.

Russia is a truly great country. The nations which she is by way of absorbing in her zone of influence are equally interesting and worth while. But they are a closed book to the American people because the Russian authorities will not permit the American reporter to do a constructive job.

And until the Russian Government understands that the Charter which has just been signed at San Francisco will become constructively effective only if people begin to know each other better and more intimately, there is little chance that it will be more than just another peace document.

This new Charter, like the other pacts, must be based on good will and neighborly friendliness. In the past this was more difficult because the means of communication were so slow and inefficient.

Shall We Again Have Slavery in the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to ask each good American the following question:

Shall we again have slavery in the United States of America?

Of course, in answer to that question, every good American would shout an emphatic "No." However, the answer is not so simple, because that ugly question now presents itself in disguise.

Now, I would like to ask each good American some additional questions.

How would you like for the Congress to enact a law which would require you to do the following things:

Wear a ball and chain and construct highways or dig potatoes for some other American?

Construct highways, or dig potatoes, or work in a manufacturing plant, or do any other work, without a ball and chain, if you should not desire to do such work?

Again the answer would be an emphatic "No," because that would be slavery.

Now, let us reverse the question.

If you owned a potato patch, or a manufacturing plant, or a grocery store, or any other kind of business, upon which the successful operation of which your family depended for its daily bread and support, how would you like for the Congress to enact a law to require you to employ some persons whom you might not want?

How would you like for your employees to be selected by some bureaucrat in Washington who would have no intimate knowledge of your business and who would disregard your wishes?

You would not like that, because that would also be slavery.

My advice then to the American people is that it is time for them to wake up and assert their rights, because the proposed permanent FEPC, if enacted into law, would establish a bureaucracy in Washington to select employees for practically every American, including employees of farmers and merchants, practically all employees of your State, county, and city or town, all school teachers, the employees of all church and fraternal-order corporations which operate orphanages and publishing houses, the faculty and employees of all church schools and colleges which happen to be incorporated, and, in all probability, the employees of every person who may hear or read these words.

If you continue to sit by idly, such slavery will again be established in the United States of America.

Legal Status of Filipinos in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I wish to include as part of my remarks a letter from the Territorial Filipino Council of Hawaii and the Inter-Filipino Community Organizations of the Western States.

It eloquently calls attention to the devotion of the Filipino people to the cause for which we are now fighting, and to the long-existing friendship and understanding between the Philippines and the United States, and to the natural desire of these people for the right of naturalization in this country.

The letter follows:

TERRITORIAL FILIPINO COUNCIL OF HAWAII,
Lihue, Kauai, T. H., June 21, 1945.

Hon. HUGH DE LACY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DE LACY: It is needless for us to remind you that the Filipino legal status in this country is so vague that frequently we have been placed in very embar-

rassing positions. For domestic purposes Filipinos are considered as aliens, while for foreign purposes we are being regarded as citizens of the United States. In other words, "we are neither citizens nor aliens" of the United States, a country of our adoption, to whom we owe complete and absolute allegiance.

The whole world is well aware of our undying loyalty to America. We have eloquently demonstrated our devotion to the ideals and principles for which America stands. Our partnership for almost half a century has been the subject of comment and commendation by competent experts and observers as a partnership of two great Christian peoples of different races, nationality, and color, linked together indissolubly by ties of friendship, understanding, and harmony, out of which tie American and Filipino soldiers have fought and died side by side, either in the fox holes of Bataan or on the beachheads of Leyte.

It is apparently clear, therefore, that it is for us the living to be here dedicated to the unfinished tasks remaining before us—that the full measure of devotion to a common cause shall not be in vain. It behooves us Americans and Filipinos to maintain that proverbial harmonious understanding now and in the postwar period. Such harmony can only be realized if and when you will extend to us that simple justice of naturalization which we so highly deserve.

In this connection we, representing the Filipinos of the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii, wish also to express our human desire for increasing the annual immigration quota from the Philippines in order that we may be able to bring Filipino women to this country, thus solving the problem of social instability of our people. It is our belief that the annual quota of 50 who are allowed to come to this country from the Philippines is too insignificant a number considering the 18,000,000 people inhabiting the Philippine Islands. May we remind you that Americans may enter into the Philippines in an unlimited number. We, therefore, earnestly appeal to you for your support and endorsement in the passage of such remedial legislation that will seek to relax the limited annual immigration quota from the Philippines.

With assurances of our gratefulness for your deep interest in our behalf and with kindest regards, we remain,

Very truly yours,

PHILIP P. GAMPONIA,
Chairman, Committee on Political Status of Filipinos,
CAYETANO R. LIGOT,
Chairman, Committee on Economics.
JUAN S. REGALA,
Chairman, Committee on Labor,
FORTUNATO G. TEHO,
Chairman, Committee on Education,
Mrs. JOSEPHINE E. GAMPONIA,
Chairman, Committee on Welfare, For the Delegation from Hawaii.
DIOSDADO M. YAP,
Washington Representative For the Inter-Filipino Community Organizations of the Western States.

New Yorker Favors Black Hills for World Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The proposal that the headquarters for the United Nations be placed in the Black Hills of South Dakota, geographical center of the North American Continent, is attracting growing attention. An interesting comment on the proposal appears in the magazine New Yorker, issue of June 30, which brings out a point that heretofore has been overlooked by the people of the Black Hills themselves.

Under permission granted by the House, I place the New Yorker's observations in the RECORD at this point:

Many excellent sites have been proposed as headquarters for the United Nations, but the location we like best is the Black Hills of South Dakota. Stanch advocacy of this site appears from time to time in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and we have been following it, first with interest, lately with enthusiasm. Unquestionably, the seat of the new world league capital should be Dinosaur Park, near Rapid City, S. Dak., in the Black Hills, for in Dinosaur Park stand the cement figures, full size, of the Big Five of long ago—trannosaurus rex (35 feet long), 16 feet high), triceratops (27 by 11), brontosauraus (90 feet long, weight 40 tons), and a couple of other plug-uglies of the period, all of them in combative attitudes astride a well-worn path. Much can be said for such a bizarre setting. Here let the new halls be built, so that earnest statesmen, glancing up from their secret instructions from the home office, may gaze out upon the prehistoric sovereigns who kept on fighting one another until they perished from the earth.

Poplar Bluff, Mo., City Officials Are Fighting to Keep Dirty Hands of OPA Gestapo Off of Local Meat Supply Unless Inspectors Comply With Local Health Ordinance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at Poplar Bluff, Mo., city officials are having a show-down fight with OPA to determine whether or not this Federal agency is more powerful than local government and has a right to ride rough-shod over the local ordinances enacted to protect the health of the community. It is an important issue and a fundamental one.

Two of the gestapo inspectors of OPA descended upon the peaceful little city of Poplar Bluff and began an inspection of local food lockers. They were handling and weighing meat taken from these lockers rented by citizens of the community from the Busby Frozen Food Bank. The city health officer, Claude Murray, asked the OPA inspectors if they had complied with State laws and city ordinances requiring handlers of food and drinks in Missouri to have health certificates. They had not. They were requested to stop their inspections. City officials at Popular Bluff are not trying to interfere with the work of OPA. They suggested that OPA officials could continue their inspection by letting people employed by the Busby Co., holding health certificates, handle the meat under their supervision. This reasonable offer of cooperation was refused. The OPA inspectors also refused to advise even the local newspaper, the Daily American Republic, with regard to regulations of locker plants and just what farmers and other persons had to do in order to comply with OPA regulations when storing meat. The local police chief, John W. Sims, then was put in the position of having to threaten the OPA inspectors with arrest for violating local ordinances if they attempted to continue their inspections. The OPA inspectors steadfastly refused to comply with the local ordinances or even to apply for health certificates, which would readily be granted to them if they are free from disease which would contaminate food.

Returning to their lair in St. Louis, these OPA gestapo agents then secured an order from a New Deal Federal judge directing the locker-plant owners to permit OPA officials to inspect meat stored in the plant or show cause on July 5 why they should not be cited for contempt of court. The New Deal Missouri attorney general's office has come forward with an opinion which seeks to uphold the right of the OPA in cases of this kind and have abdicated State rights to the OPA. Not so the courageous people of Popular Bluff. They are going to fight the issue out on the question of whether or not OPA can override their city ordinances and arbitrarily refuse to comply with them when they are reasonable and necessary for protection of the health of the community. This particular ordinance has been in effect for several years. It was not enacted or concocted to defeat the OPA which local city officials feel is a necessary evil in these times. The citizens of Poplar Bluff are taking up a collection to defray the expenses of their city officials who have been commanded by the long arm of Federal authority to go to St. Louis and defend themselves in these proceedings. I hope they succeed in keeping the dirty hands of this OPA gestapo off to their meat supply unless compliance with local ordinances shows those hands to be clean, and OPA thus entitled to proceed with its investigation. It is pertinent to add that if OPA wants to carry out the intent of Congress it will concern itself more with increasing meat production than in breaking laws, harrassing honest citizens and local officials, and trying to make them appear unpatriotic black-market operators.

War Wipes Out Entire 1940–41 Montana State Football Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of July 2

carried a story about the 1940–41 Montana State College football team and the fact that this war has wiped out the entire squad. These former students of our great agricultural college at Bozeman have given their greatest assets, their lives, that we may continue to live under a democratic system in this country and possibly in the world. They and all others who have made these sacrifices have done their part to lay the foundation stones in the present United Nations Charter, which looks forward to establishing and maintaining a just and permanent peace.

It is up to us who remain at home to carry on in the future the ideas and ideals for which these boys gave their lives. It is not going to be an easy job, but it is going to be a goal worth fighting for all the time. Just as these boys fought for victory on the football field and on the battlefield, so must we continue to fight for final victory so that peace can be achieved for those they left behind. The State of Montana owes to these boys, and all its sons who are serving on the far-flung battlefields of the world, a debt of gratitude which we can never repay, and we are proud of their contribution and humble in the knowledge of how great has been their sacrifices.

There will be other generations playing football on Gatton Field at the State agricultural college at Bozeman, and I know that the inspiration derived from the exploits of this little band will serve to encourage them and to make of them better and finer citizens for Montana and the Nation.

Many of these boys were personal friends of mine, and I feel their loss keenly. What they have done I will never forget, and I know I speak for all Montana when I say that their courage, valor, and sacrifice will be forever enshrined in our hearts.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am including an article from the Washington Post of July 2, 1945:

WAR WIPES OUT ENTIRE 1940–41 MONTANA STATE FOOTBALL TEAM

(By Frank Whitney)

BOZEMAN, MONT., June 30.—As students of Montana State College yell for their Golden Bobcat football team to roar on to victory when the sport is resumed, there will be lumps in their throats.

They'll know that their cheers will not be for the players on the field alone, but for the Bobcats Golden Ghosts—a full line-up from their 1940–41 squad.

Names of these 11 Golden Ghosts will live forever in the hearts of the Montanans. Each of them gave his life in the service of Uncle Sam so this Nation could march to victory.

Little did Al Zupan, forward pass star, and his teammates know, when they galloped over the greensward a few seasons back, that they would hit the jackpot of tragedy.

Tonight, the graves of the Golden Ghosts are located in far-flung spots, from New Guinea to Germany.

No college football team has been as hard hit by World War II as Montana State. Shubert Dyche, Bobcat athletic director and football headman, said he'll be unable to field an eleven this fall, but promised to be back with a team when the war is over.

Louis G. True, the college's director of publications, disclosed the list of the Golden Ghosts and the places and dates where they fell, as follows:

End Dana Bradford, a first lieutenant in the Army Air Forces, killed in a plane crash near Yoakum, Tex., March 11, 1942. He had been married only the December 24 before.

End Joe Hall, data unavailable.

Tackle Newell Berg, a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, killed presumably in New Guinea, date unknown.

Tackle Jack Burke, a captain in the Army, killed in France, date unknown.

Guard Joe McGeever, data unavailable.

Guard Bernard Cluzen, a major in the United States Marine Corps, from the South Pacific in the fall of 1944.

Center Carl Fye, Infantry, rank unknown, killed in Europe, date and place unknown.

Back Dick Toman, data unavailable.

Back Rick Roman, Infantry captain, killed in Germany, date unknown.

Back Orin Beller, second lieutenant in Army, place and date unknown.

Back Al Zupan, Army Air Forces, rank unknown, killed in plane crash in Texas while attached to a two-target squadron.

In addition to the 11 listed as dead, John Phelan, exquarterback, was reported missing in action.

Shall We Choose a Dictator in the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to ask each good American the following question:

Shall we choose a dictator for the United States of America?

Of course, in answer to that question, every good American would emphatically say "No." However, that answer will not suffice, because the question is not being asked so bluntly, but is being asked in a way to deceive many good Americans. Americans would not want a dictator, because a dictator would deprive us of our liberty and democracy and would give us slavery and a totalitarian government. To accomplish his evil purposes, a dictator would first abolish freedom of the press and freedom of speech. He would accomplish these things by seizing the newspapers, trade publications, and radio stations. His bureau of propaganda and public enlightenment would select all of the editors of all of the newspapers and trade publications and would also select all of the radio announcers and commentators. He would also seize and operate all picture shows.

A dictator would then abolish the good, old American right of freedom of assembly, by dissolving fraternal orders and societies, by abolishing the Rotary and Kiwanis and other civic clubs, and public and private meetings of every kind. A dictator might interfere with the freedom of religion, as has been done in other lands. A dictator would take charge of our schools and would teach our children strange doctrines. A dictator would gradually deprive us of all guaranties of liberty incorporated in the Bill of Rights.

Why do I speak of all of these things today?

I speak of them because there is pending in the Congress today a proposal which would give us, at least, a partial dictatorship.

Under the pending proposal to create a permanent FEPC, we would establish a bureaucracy which would have power to help select the editors, managers, and other employees of newspapers, periodicals, and trade publications; the managers, announcers, and commentators of radio stations; the managers and employees of motion-picture shows; the managers and employees of all orphanages, hospitals for crippled children, and publishing houses of fraternal orders, if such activities happened to be operated by a fraternal order corporation; the president, manager, and faculty of each church school or college and the editor of each church publication, if such college or publication should happen to be operated by a church corporation.

Furthermore, the FEPC bureaucracy would select all school teachers. It would select employees for almost everyone and, very possibly, even for you and for several organizations in which you have a vital interest.

Why should we spend billions in treasure and spill much American blood to defeat dictatorship abroad, only to establish a dictatorship in the United States of America by act of Congress?

Many good Americans do not understand that the proposed FEPC would do all these things. Many good Americans have even been misled by the title of the FEPC bill and think that they are in favor of it, not realizing that it would deprive them of some of their cherished rights.

All I have to say is that it is time to wake up, America.

Address of Hon. Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, a Member of Congress from Illinois, before the twenty-fifth anniversary luncheon of the Washington Better Business Bureau on June 19, 1945, at the Mayflower Hotel:

Ladies and gentleman, I notice it is only 10 minutes of 2, and I promised I would not talk beyond 3 o'clock.

Let me, however, emphasize the observation that was made a moment ago, that if you must go, do. I recognize that the business of Business must go on, so don't feel a bit squeamish or delicate about going about your business if there is something that must take you away.

First, let me express my delight in coming here to visit with you at this noonday

luncheon. Over a period of time I have steadfastly declined to make luncheon speeches in Washington, largely because of the uncertainties of the legislative program on the floor of the House. It is very difficult to get away from the floor at noonday because the session, as you so well know, begins at 12 o'clock and one never knows from one hour to another what will eventuate on the floor, so it is not from indisposition but because of difficulties with the legislative schedule that I have, over the years, steadfastly declined invitations to make luncheon speeches.

This is a little different. In the first place, it involves an old friend of mine who wanted me to come and I couldn't think up any excuses to tell him why I could not come; and secondly, I am a member of an advertising and selling organization in Peoria, Ill., which has some interest in the Better Business Bureau; so vicariously I can take some credit for the spirit that is so manifest here today. Let me say it is a delight and pleasure to be in common fellowship with you.

It is always a pleasure to come on an anniversary. It is rather interesting that we never observe the anniversaries of deaths of people, or events, or organizations. We always observe an anniversary of the creation, birth or organization of a person, an idea or a group. Whether it relates to Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, or the Better Business Bureau, forever we are marking the natal day because after all, that is the day when fruitful and creative service has been given to the world.

I like to participate in anniversaries because there is something truly inspiring about them. Let me add my congratulations on this 25th anniversary occasion and express my delight again that I am here.

I have no speech. I am just going to reminisce for a little while. I never have speeches. There is no time to get things on paper, so this is going to be in the nature of an informal visit that will not last over 1 hour and 30 minutes, so I hope that you will settle yourselves comfortably in your chairs and that the seats will not become too hard.

You know it is the mark of genius to tie up a wholly irrelevant speech to the business at hand, so this morning I spent 30 minutes, before testifying before a committee on the Hill, thinking out some kind of a connection between the thing I want to say and the business of the Better Business Bureau.

After all, the business of the Better Business Bureau is elimination of fraud and development of a sweet relationship between consumer and businessman which, in turn, in my considered judgment, is after all the thing that is so necessary to preserve one of the greatest things on the face of this earth and that is freedom and free enterprise.

Make no mistake about it, ladies and gentlemen, it is in jeopardy in the world and it is in jeopardy in our own country, so that anything that businessmen can do to eliminate frauds, to develop, shall I say, a fabric of confidence between the consumer and business of all types, whether retail, wholesale, or manufacturing in this country, is a very definite contribution to the ultimate conservation and salvation of freedom and free enterprise in this country.

I don't believe I have been so heartsick in my life as when I stepped off a four-motored plane at LaGuardia Field 1 month ago, after having toured 21 countries, sat with the authorities of the countries, examined the functions and responsibilities of our own Government afield, talked with our military commanders, and appraised and assessed the standards of living and business practices in all parts of the earth, ranging all the way from Washington to Ceylon, down off the coast of India.

I say you do get disillusioned when you see what is going on in the world and more and more you wonder whether or not your own country, with all its sweet traditions and loveliness, can finally endure under the forces that are operating in the world today.

I remember standing in the amphitheater in Tunis in north Africa, which marks the site of the ancient civilization of Carthage. Draw on your ancient history for a moment. Carthage was alive and alert and a great civilization and had great military leaders like Hamilcar and Hannibal and a great lawgiver, Hammurabi.

I remember looking down from the plane upon the ruins of the old Coliseum at Carthage and in my mind's eye I could almost see the elephants they used in their warfare against the Roman armies under the Caesars. Those were the ancient counterparts of the modern tank. All one can see today is stone, rubble, and fragments of marble columns.

Somehow you project yourself back and then forward and you wonder whether or not there will come a time when Washington's Monument, the Capitol Building, and all the glories of the National Capital will be in waste and ruins as a testimony to a dead civilization of our own. What assurance have we, after all, that that will not eventuate? I remember standing in Syria looking at the ruins of Baalbeck, the most magnificent thing you ever saw. These tremendous columns that the Greeks and Romans contrived in the Temple of Zeus and Venus are things of such beauty and grandeur and a testimony to a magnificent civilization in that day.

They take you to a quarry and they show you a stone that weighs 800 tons. It has been measured by the best American engineers and its weight carefully calculated. You wonder how they ever got such stones into place. Then you ask yourself, "A civilization that had all the glory, beauty, and capacity to do that sort of thing without any mechanical contrivances—where is it today?"

But here are the ruins staring you in the face and you say, "It is gone. It is done. It has been expunged from the pages of history," and you wonder all over again whether or not that is going to be the fate of your own civilization.

One experiences that same feeling as he beholds the ruins of still other civilizations in the world. In Egypt one can look down from a plane and see 60 miles of pyramids commemorating a civilization that was old before the Greeks and Romans even began.

In Athens one beholds the glory of the Parthenon setting atop the Acropolis or the temple to the Winged Victory and then wonders what could have happened that a civilization which history identifies as the golden age of ancient Greece should have toppled into ruin and waste.

In Iraq, land of ancient Mesopotamia where the historic Tigris and Euphrates still flow, one can see the tracery of irrigation works which sustained and subsisted an estimated 70,000,000 people with all the glory and grandeur which is represented by the ruins of Babylon and Nineveh. Once more one wonders why this civilization was rendered to ashes and that so little of it remains in this modern age.

This feeling of noble civilizations which went down to the dust accentuates one's sense of responsibility to the generations that shall come after and sharpens the conviction that every generation is but the steward of the generations that shall follow. After all, let's not forget that we too have a definite responsibility not only to our own generation but those who will live after us.

Suppose Washington, Adams, Hamilton, Franklin, Jefferson, and others had said here in Washington or in Philadelphia or New York, "We will not be concerned about the future of the country. After all, we are not laboring for posterity." Exactly what would have been the status of civilization in this pleasant Republic, the greatest on the face of the earth?

So, as I viewed the many things on the trip, I tried, insofar as possible, not only to see in the short range the things, the forces, the activities with which we have to be concerned today, but also see in perspective and appraise the obligations to the youngsters who will come on in still other generations to carry on the glory of this Republic.

To be a little more realistic about it and to go back to this theme that has been enunciated here today, namely, those business practices that will preserve freedom and free enterprise, that to me is one of the most important things before America today. Other countries don't realize what an atmosphere of freedom is. To us it has become something more than a word. We talk about free enterprise and freedom, but it has got to be something more than that; it has to be translated into terms of diligent, every-day human conduct until we can be assured and the generations to come afterward can be assured, that it will not get away and that we will not be reduced to that state of living that you find in so many countries in the world.

That is my principal concern at the present time.

As I go about the country and go back to my own people, I try to interpret the things I was privileged to see. Oddly enough, it was a trip that didn't cost the taxpayers of the United States anything.

You may remember that I was a candidate for the Vice Presidency in 1944 and that the people in my constituency back in Illinois became generously interested in my candidacy. They thereupon contributed a fund and put it in the bank to be used for campaign purposes at the Chicago Convention in June of that year. Eighty percent of that fund was not used and I modestly insisted that it be returned to the donors. However, the committee of citizens back home who had so much to do with the assembling of the fund insisted that it be used for a journey over the world to enlarge the perspective of their Representative in Congress. This was, indeed, gracious and generous on their part and I accepted only after 80 percent of each contribution had been offered back to the original donor. They, agreed, however, that the fund be used for this world trip and I shall be eternally grateful to them for one of the greatest and most stimulating adventures of my life. It took me into 21 countries and encompassed 90 days. During the journey I traveled more than 32,000 miles, of which 29,000 was traveled by plane. I promised those who made this journey possible that I would labor as earnestly as I knew how in appraising all aspects of life in the countries which I visited as well as the efficacy with which the functions which this country carries on abroad was being discharged.

I try now to repay this manifestation of faith and confidence on the part of my folks back home by making occasional reports over the country which may prove fruitful and constructive in determining our own responsibility as a nation and as individuals. Today, therefore, in the brief time that was available this morning to run through my notebooks and develop a point of view that might be pertinent to the discussion today, it occurred to me that the whole question of basic freedom for all humankind and the preservation of the free enterprise system as the great hope for raising the living standards of this and other countries is, after all, the fundamental issue on the horizon of the world today.

Let me be so frank and so bold to say that there is still very little freedom in this modern world. This is the time for frank and candid speech on an issue that is so vital to the human race and particularly to this

great country as we seek to chart our own position and direction in the world today. It is vital also in determining whether or not even as other civilizations which I visited have crumbled and fallen because of disruptive forces within that we too may some day succumb to disruptive forces that are at work not only here but in other sections of the earth.

Perhaps we can place a better value on this thing called freedom when we stop to contemplate that it is the thing for which thousands of fine virile young American GI's have already died. In the course of this trip I visited Teheran where the late President Roosevelt and Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill met. I saw the marble plaque embedded in the wall of the Soviet Embassy there to mark the conferences that were held and to dedicate one of the momentous meetings of this war. When all is said and done that meeting was in the interest of victory and victory is but the stepping stone to the objective of freedom which was embraced like some great crusade by this country in an anxious hour of the world. That conference marked but a step in the annihilation of the very forces which we have esteemed to be symbolic with the destruction of freedom everywhere.

Shortly thereafter I drove to a cemetery on the outskirts of Teheran near one of the military cantonments of the Persian Gulf Command. Here I found the graves of more than 200 American soldiers. That visit was, indeed, a revealing experience. With all the reverence I could muster I stood there a long time with my hat in my hand. I noted the trees which had been planted there with graceful drooping branches through which the wind that came down from snow tops of the Elburz Mountains was whistling a lovely melody. I saw the sad-eyed pansies on the graves making a brave effort in the morning chill to be bright and cheerful. I examined the names on the crosses which marked these the last sacred resting places of so many GI's and American officers who had been engaged in the undramatic and yet essential and in fact indispensable business of getting lend-lease goods from the Persian Gulf to the Russian border as one of our contributions to the cause of victory and freedom. Here at once was symbolized the terrible price of freedom and what a provocative challenge it is in every generation of mankind.

I remember also standing in a little cemetery a short distance out from Tel Aviv in Palestine and not so far from the ancient city of Jerusalem. Here were more graves. Here were more sacred bits of soil marking the last resting places of fathers and husbands and brothers and sweethearts who were a part of this great crusade of freedom. As I marked this holy place in my thoughts, I wondered whether some day there would be a huge and devastating frustration if when this war was finally over it became manifest that freedom was still a mythical virtue in so many parts of the world and that perhaps the youth of another generation would be required to meet freedom's costly challenge.

With these thoughts in mind I naturally went back to the spirit of the home front in the days prior to 1945 when, as you so well recall, there was still something of disunity and a cleavage of spirit everywhere in the land. When the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor that disunity was in large measure dissolved but cleavages of the spirit and unclear thinking still persisted.

Don't you recall with what vigor so many questions were raised everywhere? We undertook, if possible, to analyze confusion. On every hand it was asked, "Why do we fight and where do we fight?" We wondered with what weapons we would fight and how the weapons were to be procured. Little by little, however, these questions were gradually resolved as we saw in clearer perspective. What we needed, of course, was a text. What we needed was a spiritual cause that would serve as a crusade and that would stimulate the thinking of those who were called from every home and fireside in the land to go forth and undertake the grim and undramatic business of combat.

When all is said and done there must be a cause. There must be a spiritual force not only to sustain the home front but to sustain soldiers in the field as well. When the novelty of a machine gun or a bomber or a howitzer wears off, there must then be some sustaining force which bucks up morale and gives a soldier, whether on the home front or the battle front, an abiding sense that he is after all serving some ennobling cause. It makes little difference how the spirit may be encrusted with material things of life. When a soldier comes to that grim moment when he may have to make his peace with the Unseen Power there must be an inside force to keep him at his grim and unpleasant task.

So it was that I queried these great American GI's everywhere in the world concerning the cause for which they fight. In Calcutta and in Cairo, in ancient Jerusalem and in the eternal city of Rome, in Bombay, and Bangalore, in north Africa, and in France, I was forever visiting GI's everywhere I could find them and asking whether casually and in a way I thought might disarm them just what they thought they were fighting for. How delightfully sheepish they often seemed as they puzzled over that question and then with some hestitation answered almost invariably that they thought, of course, it was to wipe out nazism and fascism and to bring about freedom and perhaps the "four freedoms" everywhere. From these contacts in every section of the world I could readily feel that these American youngsters without consciously spelling it out for themselves felt that this was after all a great crusade for freedom and that it would not be successfully ended until that great and illuminating objective had been achieved.

Similarly this is the cause for which world leaders met at Teheran and Quebec, at Yalta and Casablanca, at Moscow and Cairo and this is the cause, the over-all basic cause, for which representatives from all parts of the world are assembled at San Francisco at this very moment. It is the cause of freedom which is never quite settled in any generation and which becomes a provocative challenge for every generation of mankind.

But let me go back to the original thought that there is still very little of freedom in the world. It is one of the unsolved problems.

One of the things that is so disturbing about it all is that someday when most of our troops will come back home this question will arise. Thousands of them will wear six and seven stripes and perhaps more indicating that they have served 36 months or 42 months or longer overseas. That is a long time for a virile young American to be lifted out of the finest, healthiest environment in all the world to be sent thousands of miles away to do battle in the interest of a great cause.

And when he reurns he will do what every soldier has done in every generation. He will do it sooner or later, and that is to take inventory. He will contemplate the fruitful years of his life which have been devoted to the objective of eliminating those hideous and destructive forces from the world in order to make freedom a living vital thing for all mankind. Gradually he will take inventory in his own thinking as to whether or not that crusade has failed and whether it has been worth the effort and the painful dislocation which the world has experienced.

And there will be others to take inventory with him. How easy it is to visualize that day when he will return home and the tender arms of a beloved mother or wife will encircle him and he in turn will encircle her in strong embrace and there will be the ecstasy of a blessed homecoming. To them he will make a patient recital of where he has been and what he has done, and in the bosom of millions of families this experience will become a common one. As he regales them with his sojourns in India or Burma, in France or Germany, in north Africa or the vast reaches of the Pacific at Okinawa or Iwo Jima there will be the inevitable question as to what it was all about and whether the expenditure of life and money after all achieved anything.

Suppose out of this very realistic inventory there comes the bitter and despairing realization that perhaps there was some vanity about it all and that while the forces of nazism and fascism have been annihilated, this blessed thing called freedom is still a mythical thing in so many parts of the world. Can't you imagine the all-engulfing frustration and what it will do to the thoughts and feelings of millions of people here and everywhere. If this should become true can one imagine any greater force in the universe to revive the very isolationism which was the moving core of our disunity of long ago, and how that very force can once more threaten the peace and security of this feverish world. Disillusionment can be a powerful force.

I have often thought that perhaps one of the greatest and most dramatic frustrations of the whole world was that of Moses. Doubtless you will remember from your reading in the Scriptures that after 40 years of wandering in the wilderness, the children of Israel under the leadership of Moses finally came to the Promised Land. The Scripture says that he stood on a mount call Mount Nebo and from that spot first beheld the beauty of ancient Palestine. That bit of Scripture strikes so deeply with me today for on my journey it was my privilege to stand on the shores of the Dead Sea and to look across at that range of high ground where Mount Nebo stands. Here stood Moses filled with exultation that this long 40-year journey had come to an end. It was then that the Lord spoke to him from the vast spaces of the Heaven and said, "I have caused thee to see it with thy own eyes but thou shalt not go over thither."

Can't you imagine this patriarch of old, filled with exultation as he sees the end of his long quest only to be denied the joy and the grace that flows from the full and rich experiencing of his objective. What a frustration that must have been.

But shall we in the days ahead experience an equal frustration on a mass scale as we think back to this thing called freedom and wonder where it is? Every holy grave in every part of the world will be a grim reminder of this crusade. Every painful and seemingly unsolvable problem will be a reminder and then comes the most pointed reminder of all and that is the extent and degree to which the fabric of freedom in our own country is still intact. At that point you and I and every freedom loving citizen in the land must develop an awareness of our own responsibility. If freedom fails at home what shall we then say of freedom elsewhere? Does it not get back to the very thing which we are memoralizing here today, namely the activities of a business bureau which has carried on quietly but undramatically for a quarter of a century and which has sought by the elimination of those practices which affect consumer confidence to serve the cause of freedom and free enterprise in this blessed land?

Freedom is, after all, an indivisible thing. While we so glibly speak of "four freedoms" and even add three or four for good measure, when all is said and done, the whole cause lies in the one word of "freedom," and it must become something more than a mere word.

But let us go back to the world for a minute and explore this thing for which young men fight and die this very hour. Consider

India with the teeming hundreds of millions of people. They, too, serve the war effort. They have raised an army of 2,000,000 men. They man and operate their own Royal India Navy. Thousands of humble coolie India women with children tugging at their soiled skirts carry baskets of earth on their head or baskets of rock for the ballasting of some of the runways of some unnamed airport, from which planes will take to the skies to hasten the day of complete and ultimate victory. Thousands upon thousands of these humble women carry baskets of coal on their heads with a kind of quiet stateliness to be dumped into the bunkers of a vessel so that it may be fueled for its victory mission. These humble people definitely service the victory effort and thereby serve the cause of freedom. One needs but go through India and visit with its leaders to fully appreciate that these millions do not enjoy freedom today. It has been said that they are not ready for freedom. I have often wondered what we would have said more than 150 years ago when we were struggling for our own independence if it had been suggested by King George III that we, too, should be free whenever we were ready for freedom and were capable of administering our own affairs. As one assesses this spirit in ancient India with a culture 5,000 years old one begins to wonder why GI's fight and die, and whether after all there may yet be a frustration if the holy objectives of this conflict are not achieved for the humblest people in the most remote corners of the earth.

Lift your eyes and take account of what is happening in Syria and Lebanon today. These are the two small countries at the head of the Mediterranean Sea where 4,000,000 peoplt or more are waiting patiently for the day when they, too, may enjoy a freedom that is real rather than nominal. I like the Syrians and the Lebanese. They are so self-reliant and so determined. They are good business people and are so diligent in making all available land produce a subsistence.

During my sojourn there it was my pleasure to lunch with the President of Syria and to have dinner with a very distinguished group, including Members of the Congress and of the Cabinet. It was also my delight to have a long session with the Prime Minister of Syria, who at the time was a bit agitated about flying across the Atlantic in order to attend the San Francisco Conference. I sought to reassure him on the efficacy of our huge four-motored planes in spanning the Atlantic and getting him safely to the Conference. He seems so typical of the ancient Gracchi of Rome who left the plow in the furrow to direct the destinies of the Roman Empire. So it is as one reads critically the dispatches that appear in the New York Times from day to day concerning the problems and troubles which have arisen in these Levantine states there develops a greater awareness that here again is the age-old issue of freedom.

You may recall that in the First World War Syrians and Lebanese fought on the side of the Allied Nations. They were assured in advance that their reward would be complete independence.

When World War I came to an end, their delegations proceeded to London to demand that the covenant be kept. Politely but firmly they were advised that conditions were different and that the covenant could not be kept. What a horrible breach of faith it was with a humble people, greater in number than the number of people who inhabited the Thirteen Original Colonies in 1775.

The net result of their sacrifice and their faith was that they were placed under a French mandate and have been under that mandate and direction ever since.

History will show that soon after this mandate was given to France by action of the Allied Nations who were a party to World War I, oppressions became so excessive and so extreme that General Sarrail, the French resident commissioner, had to be removed.

It is not difficult to understand the interest of outside nations in these little countries. A pipe line runs across Syria to a modern refinery in the city of Tripoli in Lebanon. This pipe line begins in the Mosul oil fields of northern Iraq and takes its way across the desert to provide the stuff that is the source of power in war and in peace. The longing eyes of outside nations are again upon this resource and, in addition, they are not insensible to the strategic geography of Syria and Lebanon. The question then arises all over again: "Is it freedom for which men fight and die or is it the perpetuation of an economic interest to a larger nation or group of nations which has the force and power to impose its will upon a humble people?"

Oddly enough, this Nation recognized the independence of Syria and Lebanon more than 16 months ago, but the occupying armies of two outside powers are still there, so far as I know, and one cannot help but feel curious about the thoughts that must have been coursing through the minds of the delegations of these little countries to the San Francisco Conference as they heard much oratory about freedom and peace and security.

But let us get back to our text for a moment. These are ancient countries. From Damascus in Syria the Apostle Paul carried on his ministry to all parts of the known world of his day. The legions of Alexander and Tamarlane set foot here. These lands knew something of the statute of the Emperor Justinian and the contributions which he made to world civilization. Here it is that one finds the ruins of ancient Baalbeck with its magnificent temples which truly reveal the greatness of a civilization that has long since gone down to the tongueless dust.

As one reads history he is overwhelmed with the conviction that the good civilizations of the past came to their death from within and not from without. Their decadence began with the destruction of freedom and liberty, and how can one help but wonder about this modern civilization where freedom is still such a mythical thing in so many areas of the world, notwithstanding the fact that millions have died in the present conflict to eliminate the forces that are hostile to freedom. You can be assured that this ferment for liberty is at work in the middle-east as it is elsewhere, and it will not be stifled and it will not be denied.

As we relate it to our own problems how apparent it becomes that in proportion as we crusade for these practices in our business life which preserve confidence and faith, one in another, so we serve the cause of freedom and free enterprise and thereby serve the larger cause of perpetuating the finest civilization that has thus far graced this earth.

Let us move for a moment to the ancient land of Egypt which was old in culture before Greece was even born. As one gazes upon the pyramids, the Sphinx, the ruins of the ancient city of Memphis and other mementoes of antiquity he can understand what a great civilization flourished in this land of the Nile thousands of years ago.

To me it was all so mystic and romantic. Cairo is such a stimulating city. Here the colorful east meets the realistic west. I wanted to see the countryside and particularly the humble peasants whom they call fellahin, who belabor a limited amount of soil in the Nile Valley in the hope of providing a subsistence for the 18,000,000 people in Egypt.

I watched them use the ancient treadmills, pumping water upon the land by methods that were several thousand years old, and marvelled that these old techniques still persisted. I obtained a driver and talked to him early and late as we motored through the countryside, in the hope that from one so humble as he, who was born and who reared a family in the ancient city of Cairo, I might get a true expression of the feelings of humble people.

How cautious he was in his every statement and it was not until I had begotten his full confidence that he would finally reveal his innermost thoughts and speak concerning that which rested on his soul. Oddly enough, from this humble person I got the story of freedom.

But it came from another source. I recall sitting on the balcony of the home of a former member of the Egyptian Cabinet, visiting at length over the affairs of the world and getting his viewpoint concerning the San Francisco and the general world effort to bring about peace and security. In a way I was surprised, and yet not surprised, that he should say that a good many years ago through a treaty of alliance his country had surrendered one-half of its freedom in order to retain the other half.

But the people of Egypt are neither content nor satisfied. Behind them lies a long and ancient culture. They want to manage their own country in their own way. They believe that they have the capacity to patrol the great Suez Canal, and to give assurance to the world that it will be efficiently maintained, carefully patrolled, and that rates of passage will be safeguarded on an equal basis to all countries. Yet, today they are confronted with the stark fact that they enjoy but half a freedom and that the soldiers of other countries are quartered there much against the wishes of the people. This is not a fact which is indigenous to wartime alone, because this outside control has been operative ever since 1936 and has another 11 years to go. The canal concession does not terminate until 1968, and so until that time they must submit to direction from the outside and quietly nurse the pain that attends a lack of complete freedom.

This ferment to which I refer was found in other places as well. One becomes quite sensible of it in Iran and Iraq, in Turkey and Tunis, in India and Egypt and from what I could learn it is in the air in the Balkans and the countries of eastern Europe.

But suppose that freedom is to be after all something mythical and unreal and suppose that Doctor Laskie in the article which he wrote for the New York Times Magazine is correct in his appraisal that the world is going left. Can you discern then how vital and how lively the issue of freedom and free enterprise is for us then—the one great democracy on the face of the earth? What assurance would there be in a world veering to the left that we could at long last escape the effect of these forces? It is a challenge at once to reassess the forces which made this a great country and to place a proper value thereon and to reinsure and redouble our every effort to see that those forces and that atmosphere is not impaired.

Out of my own experiences in another year I had opportunity to talk with a member of the cabinet in one of the larger South American countries. It was back in 1940 and in the course of our conversation in Latin America he frankly asserted that if we entered the war, we would not be able to defeat Germany because he had been reading in the newspapers that we could not even control and direct the labor forces of this country.

My answer to him was that he forgot the atmosphere of freedom and the genius of free enterprise which was the greatest assurance that if and when war came, we could forge all the necessary instruments of victory. I pointed out to him that if in his country it was determined to build a plane similar to the B–17, materials and machinery would be assembled for the building of only one. If the job was accomplished and the plane would fly, there would be a great celebration and thereafter it would be determined whether another plane would be built.

I pointed out further in contradistinction to that that the free-enterprise system had

permitted a development and technique and the marshaling of every mental and spiritual and material resource in the country on an assembly-line basis so that once the blueprints for a plane or a tank had been developed, production would get under way and those instrumentalities of victory would flow from the assembly line like pieces of stick candy. I even offered to pay his carfare from Washington to Detroit if he undertook a visit to America sometime so that he might see a combination of labor, management, and productive techniques such as he had never seen before.

It could not flower in the form of great productivity which enriches every strata of American life unless the atmosphere of freedom and free enterprise were there. These are the indispensable ingredients and accounts for the fact that this Nation has forged so far ahead of any other nation in the world in producing things for peace and war. It is the atmosphere of incentive which gives every man a chance to improve his condition in life but better than that to secure a hearing in the commercial markets of this country for the product of his mind and his labor which will raise our standards of living and enrich all life. To preserve it then becomes a tremendous challenge to every thoughtful American and that, of course, is definitely related to the objectives of the Better Business Bureau whose twenty-fifth anniversary we observe today.

I suppose that it is in the nature of mankind to look for mystical and magic things. Too often we look for the royal road which is the easiest to traverse in reaching a given objective. There is no royal road, however, in appraising our individual obligation to the cause of freedom and free enterprise in this country. It requires only an intense conviction plus a certain clarity of vision plus the humble effort of every citizen wherever he may be and whatever his sphere in life may be.

A single man in a community who quietly but sustainedly devotes a portion of his time to the preservation of those things which lie at the very bottom of the greatness of this country can do an immense amount of good. Suppose in every community in the land just a few men who felt the light of conviction on this matter quietly but persistently raised their voices, what an avalanche of sentiment they could really create. All this may sound quite academic but it is far from being academic to me. I presume I have talked to too many soldiers and have seen too many graves. From them and the things they say one gets a more abiding appreciation of the value of the structure of freedom than I ever had before.

Doubtless you are all familiar with the story that appears in the autobiography of Booker T. Washington. He speaks of a vessel somewhere in the mouth of the Orinoco River which ran out of water and sent up a distress flag to a vessel that was going by. As I remember the anecdote the first message which went to the passing vessel was "Send water, we die of thirst." Very shortly the passing vessel sent back the message, "Dip down where you are." Three times the message of distress was sent out and three times the same answer came back. Thereupon one of the sailors tied a rope to a bucket, threw it overboard and up came potable water from the mouth of a freshwater river.

Can we as individuals better serve the cause of free enterprise than to dip down where we are. No matter how large or small the community may be, if but a few catch the spark of what freedom is and how costly it has been through the centuries, what an enduring contribution can be made to its preservation throughout this Republic.

One day the youngsters of this land will grow up and take over and in proportion as we received a legacy of freedom from the generation which has gone before so they will expect an equal legacy from us. It will be our responsibility to transmit to them the ark of the covenant of freedom. It will after all be great glory and great satisfaction if we can hand it to them and say "in our generation we have kept it untarnished." We now entrust it to you for the preservation of generations yet unborn."

If we do less than that, recognizing as we do what it means to our daily living and to the enrichment of this land, we shall not have fulfilled our responsibilities to the hundreds of thousands of virile young American crusaders who lie sleeping at Anzio and Cassino, at Normandy Beach, in the green fields of France and Germany, at Guadalcanal and New Britain, at Okinawa, and those other islands and areas yet to be conquered. That is your job and mine.

Successes of Mr. Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of Independence Day. Has the Fourth of July come to mean less to a free people in this year of our Lord 1945? Should not Independence Day mean infinitely more to our people at this time when they observe the enslavement of millions of Polish men, women, and children, whose forebearers fought side by side with our brave colonists until victory and independence were won? Are we in league with tyranny to enslave the Polish people whose heroic ancestors fought for our liberty in those dark, decisive years of the American Revolution? Millions of the Polish race are now being marched from their homeland into the wild waste of Russia to spend a life of cruel and perpetual slavery.

Under leave to extend, I insert the following article, which appeared on the editorial page of the Polish Daily News, of Detroit, in its issue of June 15, 1945:

SUCCESSES OF MR. HOPKINS

(By Ignacy Matuszewski)

By the time you read this article, the unofficial rumors of Hopkins' success may be transformed into official understatements. In any event, let us take a look at this widely acclaimed success story which Hopkins or his intimates are purposefully circulating.

Like a returning comet, Mr. Hopkins brushed by Paris and London, leaving there a star-studded trail of fairy tale success stories: The Polish-Russian dispute settled; a Polish Government established; the arrested Poles set free—Success! Success! Success!

We know well this technique. The worse the actual facts are, the brighter the trimmings which will sell cheap wares to the American public. Do you remember the triumphs at the Moscow Conference and the successes of Tehran and Yalta? After every one of these "triumphs," the press shrieked its praises; the Congress thundered its acclaim.

Now look at the results: America endangered; Poland enslaved; Central Europe entrusted to the "tender mercies" of red totalitarianism; the British Army told to withdraw from the Baltic coast; the American Army told to evacuate Czechoslovakia; the Allied Supreme Command to be disbanded; the real victor of the anti-Nazi campaign, General Eisenhower, told to pack up and move.

After all those experiences, the louder the publicity of Mr. Hopkins' "success" is, the greater our suspicions that something is wrong. Now, let us analyze the result of his mission in the light of news spread, whether inspired by him or others.

As an example, let us consider just one issue—the Polish question. Let us go back to May 5 in San Francisco. On that day the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, issued the following statement upon receiving the news of the Soviet arrest of 16 Polish underground leaders:

"We demand that Mr. Molotov submit to us a complete list of the names of the arrested Polish political leaders as well as a detailed explanation of the Soviet action. Any further discussions must wait a reply to this question."

That same day the British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, asserted that all discussions regarding the Polish question are discontinued due to the arrest of these leaders, saying that "in the present situation no further discussions must await a reply to this possible."

Thus it is quite evident that Hopkins' first "triumph" is a complete reversal of this stand. According to Stettinius and Eden, as they spoke officially on May 5, the liberation of the imprisoned Poles was the primary condition upon which depended the continuation of any negotiations in the Polish matter.

Disregarding all this, Mr. Hopkins resumed the discussion while the 16 Polish leaders remained imprisoned. So his first "triumph" was in reality the United States Government's capitulation. The arrest and imprisonment of these men who, with the knowledge and intercession, and, what's more, at the suggestion of the British and United States Governments, revealed their identity and went to Moscow, was a slap at Messrs. Eden and Stettinius. Mr. Hopkins took upon himself the role of a magician who can change even insulting slaps into "successes." It is possible that the gullible American opinion will swallow it. But it is quite certain that this "success" of Mr. Hopkins will not enhance the prestige of the United States in the opinion of the world.

We consider the rumor about the "promised" liberation of the 16 leaders, or of some of them, primarily as a smokescreen to cover the humiliation of the United States brought about by Mr. Hopkins. But because such a rumor is being circulated, let us consider it.

Let's define, first, what "liberation" means under Russian conditions. Not only the dungeons of Russian secret police deprive humans of liberty, the whole of Russia is one huge prison. Poland under Russian occupation is also a prison. To set the 16 leaders at liberty means, therefore, to let them out of Russia and Russian occupation. They will be free only if they find themselves on British or American soil. Otherwise they will remain prisoners. While they were hiding in the shadows of underground Poland, risking their lives, they still could talk to and call upon the western allies in accordance with their own wishes. Today they are in the claws of Russian executioners. Their liberation, if they remain within reach of these claws, would be a farce, a scornful laugh at liberty.

When in 1939 the League of Nations called the Soviets to Geneva to explain the war declared upon Finland, Mr. Molotov declined the invitation with a note in which he explained that "there is no war whatsoever between the Soviets and Finland," inasmuch as the Soviets entered into a treaty of friendship with the Finnish quisling government of Kuosinen. If, according to Molotov, "peace" existed between Russia and Finland while Russian bombs rained on Helsinki and

Russian projectiles on Viipuri, then it is easy to assume that the arrested Poles will be considered at liberty while they will be tortured at the Lublin "embassy" in Moscow or in the Kremlin itself instead of being tortured in the dungeons of secret police.

Mr. Hopkins' advertised boast that he did or will liberate the arrested leaders of underground Poland will be true only when these leaders find themselves in England, as they wished. Otherwise Mr. Hopkins assumes upon himself the responsibility, and burdens the United States with co-responsibility, for the further imprisonment of these men, which the Soviets may advertise falsely as liberty.

(Translator's note: Since this was written and published—the UP news agency informs the world that the 16 Polish leaders went on trial; 12 of them were convicted and sentenced to terms in prison ranging from 6 months to 10 years.)

The enthusiastic publicity accompanying Mr. Hopkins' tournee, does not imply that all 16 of the arrested Poles are to be freed—it speaks of freedom for some of them. In everyday language, to those who are familiar with Russian techniques, the matter is clear. Liberation granted to some of the arrested men means that the rest are to be sentenced to death. This execution is to justify Russia's slanderous accusation that the Polish underground collaborated with the Nazis. If Mr. Hopkins claims that he has won freedom for some of the 16 arrested men, then, at the same time he must admit that he will be responsible for the death of the others, whether it shall be one, two, or more of these Polish leaders who may be sentenced. Mr. Hopkins shall share the responsibility for their death and imprisonment, shall share the guilt with the Russians for calling these allies, enemies; for branding these courageous heroes, traitors and enemy agents.

Russia is consistently striving to remove Poland from the ranks of the Allies and place her among the enemies. Clearly if she succeeds in this attempt, then the conscience of the Allies will be lulled in not protesting against the Russian reign of terror instituted in Poland. Toward this end—to remove Poland from the status of an ally to that of an enemy—Russia is consistently working by slanderous accusations stubbornly repeated by Stalin.

If the "liberation" of some of these Poles is to be one of Mr. Hopkins' "triumphs," then it is the most unfriendly act of the United States possible toward Poland. For, by consenting to the liberation of only a few of the underground leaders, Mr. Hopkins as the representative of the United States, has thus approved Russia's accusation that Poland was an enemy of the Allies.

What will be the effects if the United States Government approves Mr. Hopkins' stand? Obviously—the Polish Army in the west will be demobilized and sent into Soviet-occupied Poland. Furthermore, all Polish refugees and Nazi-held prisoners, liberated by American and British forces, would be forced to return to their homeland, now under Russian occupation. Perhaps Mr. Hopkins is able to convince himself and other credulous souls into believing that this is a splendid achievement; the Poles, however, will not be persuaded that slavery and death mean freedom and life.

Another one of Mr. Hopkins' "successes" is the pledge of a reorganized Polish Government, by adding a few persons from Soviet-occupied Poland, as well as Messrs. Mikolajczyk and Stanczyk to the present quisling outfit of Bierut and Osupka.

It is quite evident that such a government would not and will not be a Polish Government. The fact that some individuals, now residing in Poland, may agree to take part in such a government, formed by Moscow, is of no consequence. Occupied Poland is a prison. Prisoners are not free agents. They cannot be held responsible, nor can they be condemned. Consequently—they cannot be listened to. Not everybody has enough spiritual fortitude to become a martyr, particularly if Mr. Hopkins and his friends were to tempt these men, cut away from the world and always ready to trust the word of an American, that it is much better to become a minister (in a puppet government) than a martyr.

Mr. Hopkins may tell the American opinion that a government of traitors and executioners, with Mr. Mikolajczyk among them, is the government of an independent Poland. In reality such a government, as promised by Mr. Hopkins, consisting in part of slaves and in part of executioners—will serve as a tool to deprive Poland of her independence.

Such a government will not be recognized—neither by the Polish nation nor by the Polish army. What's more—America will turn away from such a government with contempt after the flashy publicity of Mr. Hopkins' mission dies down and the appalling truth becomes known.

Farmer Committees To Coordinate and Supervise All Phases of Federal Agricultural Program—H. R. 2115

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 22, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herewith two expressions of interest in my bill, H. R. 2115, which are, I believe, of great importance in connection with this legislation.

First, I should like to include a portion of the address delivered by Mr. Noble Clark, chairman of the Committee on Postwar Agricultural Policy of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, on June 11 of this year. Mr. Clark said, in part:

Recently there has been introduced into Congress by Mr. VOORHIS, of California, a bill that provides for the creation of local agricultural administrative areas, not to exceed a county in size. Farmers living in the area will elect, under procedures approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, three persons as their officers, and these three persons shall "supersede and replace all existing Federal facilities of a local nature which are now a part of various Federal agencies and instrumentalities engaged in administering such programs." They, of course, will be provided with Federal funds to cover the cost of their necessary activities, and will have authority to employ needed office and field workers, in addition to having general supervision of the employees of the various Federal bureaus who are stationed in the county.

I have no knowledge as to how much support this bill is receiving, but I submit it reflects the desires of many farmers that some way be found to put together under centralized leadership the numerous and competing agencies now striving to win local acceptance.

The county agricultural board is expected to determine broad issues of policy, and represent the farmers of the county in the general supervision of agricultural programs, rather than carry on the day to day tasks concerned with the various public activities related to farming. In a way their role would be something like that of the school board of this city in its relationships to your various city schools, both primary and secondary. Everyone recognizes that school boards, composed of public-spirited citizens making no claim to being professional teachers, have given highly effective and successful leadership to our public schools and those who teach in them.

How different it would be if we had the schools run solely by the professional teachers. Even worse would be the situation if there were separate school boards to supervise the teaching of history, of mathematics, of chemistry, botany, manual training, and all the other subjects. But do we not have just about this situation in a county where we have one board of farmers as advisers for the FSA, another board to run the AAA, still another to serve as officers of the soil conservation district, another board to supervise the agricultural extension workers in the county, and so on, ad infinitum?

Perhaps there are important limitations to the plan proposed by Mr. VOORHIS, but I believe it will have considerable appeal to many farmers. Certainly it attempts to meet a very real need that exists in agricultural counties throughout the Nation. I wonder if any of you have a better solution to the problem. I would like to hear your proposals.

In the second place, I wish to include the following letter from Mr. Ray B. Wiser, the president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, on the subject of the same bill:

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., June 14, 1945.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We greatly appreciate the copies of your bill, H. R. 2215, which you sent to Mr. Abel of this organization, under date of May 23.

After carefully reading the bill, we consider that it contains the germ of an excellent idea. We can subscribe wholeheartedly to the statements in section 2, on pages 1 and 2.

They seem to indicate a very definite and desirable objective with which we agree, and it would seem that where there is agreement on an objective, it ought not to be difficult to devise satisfactory means of attaining it.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours sincerely,

RAY B. WISER,
President, California Farm Bureau Federation.

Don't Blame Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal of June 29, 1945:

DON'T BLAME YOUR CONGRESSMAN

Whatever your feeling may be as you fork over $5 for that "use tax" sticker that's supposed to appear on every automobile windshield by Sunday morning, don't blame your Congressman, J. HARRY MCGREGOR—if he'd had his way about it this tax would have terminated tomorrow.

Mr. MCGREGOR introduced a bill last March to terminate the "use tax," which he said is unfair, discriminatory, and unenforced. The bill was not acted upon by Congress, however, and the tax remains.

It's a green sticker this time, and gives many purchasers their first opportunity to see a picture of Daniel Manning, who was Secretary of the Treasury during President Grover Cleveland's first administration. It might have relic value in another 100 years or so—except that it has to be stuck on the windshield, which makes it diffcult to preserve intact.

Now that the "use tax" is to be continued through at least another year, how about enforcing payment, as with other taxes? Objection is that enforcement would cost more than would be derived from the tax. So what? Why should any motorist pay the tax unless all are required to pay it?

Veterans and Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Mattison, executive vice president of Bank of America, now on leave, has been assigned to the Army to aid the Veterans' Administration in the formulation of regulations on the business-loan guaranty provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

He has made some pertinent suggestions well worth considering. They appeared in the American Banker of June 19, as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR BANKS IN THEIR RELATIONS WITH VETERANS?

(By E. A. Mattison, executive vice president, Bank of America N. T. & S. A., San Francisco)

"Each GI dreams constantly of the day when he can return home to realize what he is fighting for. He thinks of several things: his family, his home, his education, his business, his future."

The above quotation is from Capt. Wayland Avery, Jr., United States Marine Corps, recently returned veteran of New Caledonia, Guadalcanal, Russell Islands, and the New Hebrides campaigns.

He might well have added that the banks can do much to help turn the last two of those dreams into realities. But perhaps he saw another story in the San Francisco News of April 4, 1945, under the two-column head: "Loan plan biggest fizzle in the GI bill of rights."

The story was written by Ned Brooks, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, and in the course of it he said: "Instead of providing the mechanism for helping returning servicemen start a business or buy a farm or home, the loan system is becoming a source of disappointment and disillusionment among the would-be beneficiaries."

So what's ahead? Trouble, obviously. Some of it has already arrived.

It is nearly a year since the Servicemens Readjustment Act, popularly known as the GI bill of rights, was signed by President Roosevelt and the Veterans' Administration was charged with the responsibility of administering the act.

Announcements by the War Department following the end of the European war make it apparent that the number of returning veterans is to be increased substantially despite the redeployment of large numbers of troops to the Pacific theaters. If it is obvious that trouble is ahead, it is equally obvious that immediate corrective action, and drastic action, if necessary, must be undertaken.

BANKS EAGER TO HELP—RESULTS DISAPPOINTING

Thousands of banks have been doing everything in their power to make loans under the provisions of the act and the regulations. Never has there been a greater challenge to American banking, and I doubt if any other challenge, even the tremendous job of selling war bonds, has been approached with so much vigor and so great a desire to achieve results. Bankers are almost as one in their efforts to materialize for the veteran the benefits intended for him by the far-sighted legislation initiated by the American Legion.

Yet, despite this fine effort by thousands of banks acting individually, and by many working collectively in many communities through the establishment of service centers, the results to date have been bitterly disappointing both to the veterans and to the banks.

An examination into the causes of this failure fails to reveal anything fundamentally wrong with those sections of the act dealing with the loan privileges. Through and through the measure is American in aim and purpose. Manifestly the object of Congress was to give the veteran a competitive parity with those who remained at home with opportunities to accumulate savings or establish credit, and to furnish the veteran the means wherewith to buy a home, a farm, or establish a business.

Yet, despite his sacrifice, he has been denied the very thing the act seeks to provide: The help he needs, through Government credit, to make his fox-hole dreams a reality.

SOME FEATURES TO MAKE ACT WORKABLE LACKING

While the act itself is fundamentally sound, it does lack some features to make it practical and workable. However, this is not unusual in legislation of such broad application; as a matter of fact it is a tribute to those who drafted the act that few amendments seem necessary and that most of them pertain only to section 503, Loans for business purposes.

This section is unduly narrow, failing to allow many of the types of transactions so essential to the establishment and operation of a business. For instance, the veteran may buy a business but the act does not permit a guaranteed loan for repairs, alterations, improvements (construction or remodeling of business property). Also, while it is permitted to include initial inventory in the purchase price of an existing business no provision is made for the acquisition of subsequent inventory or for inventory required by a new business, or for other essential working capital. The requirement that loans be secured is too restrictive and should be eased to conform to ordinary and reasonable lending practice.

It would be a simple matter to amend the section to eliminate these shortcomings.

In addition at least two fundamental changes seem desirable: 1, to permit loans for business purposes to be made under insurance provisions similar to those now available under title 1 of the Federal Housing Act; 2, to permit a service charge or discount rate on the class of loans up to $5,000 to compensate for the added expense and hazard of loans for business ventures in contrast to loans secured by first liens on homes or farms. No bank desires to profit at the expense of the veteran, but if the rate will permit operations on at least a break even, it will do much to assure the availability of such loans to the veteran, and that is the important point.

SIX PROPOSALS FOR AMENDMENT

Some amendments pertinent to all three sections of the act seem desirable, and these would be:

(a) Change in the requirement that the purchase price shall not exceed a reasonable normal value to permit a degree of flexibility between buyer, seller, and lender, in the transaction, for, after all, an appraisal is a more or less arbitrary thing. Who can determine within narrow limits what a reasonable normal value is?

(b) Eliminate the necessity of an appraisal by the Veterans' Administration in all cases except where real estate in excess of $500 is involved.

(c) Permit loans secured by real estate to be made upon the appraisal of the appraisers appointed by the Veterans' Administration, and eliminate the necessity of prior approval of the loan by the Administrator.

(d) Provide for issuance of the certificate of eligibility to the veteran at the time of his discharge.

(e) Extend the period of eligibility in which the veteran may make application.

If such amendments are made, and most of those suggested above appear to be included in bills now before Congress, it would greatly facilitate the making of loans. However, my recommendation is that Congress give a clear green light to the Administrator by means of some directive to the effect that he shall by regulation establish such terms, rates, and other requirements as will assure the maximum availability of credit to the veteran for the purposes specified in the act.

GENERAL DIRECTIVE SEEMS NECESSARY

Under such a directive the success or failure of the administration of the act would rest squarely upon the agency charged with that responsibility. It would dispose of all previous doubt as to how far Congress wanted the Administrator to go and would eliminate the tendency toward legalisitc and narrow interpretations which is inevitable so long as there is doubt as to the intentions of Congress.

Assuming now that something along this line will be done, the following amendments to the Administrator's business loan regulations will be highly desirable:

1. Permit the veteran to purchase an equity in a going concern without the other owners being required to pledge their interest in the assets as security for the veteran's loan.

2. Permit a pledge of stock in corporation when all stock is owned by the active; and, most important of all—

3. Have the regulations differentiate between institutional and individual lenders.

So long as it is the desire of Congress to permit anyone to make loans the Administrator can, and should, recognize the differences that exist between various types of lenders. Unquestionably, and rightfully, it was the desire of the Administrator to protect the veteran against unscrupulous lenders and high pressure vendors, and too much protection cannot be provided against such hazards.

DIFFERENT TREATMENT FOR LOANS BY RESPONSIBLE LENDERS

It is unwise, however, to hamper the normal functions of established lending institutions in order to give protection against other types of lenders who in many cases contemplate manufacturing and sales profits and sometimes have even more ulterior motives in overselling the veteran. Loans originating in such circles should certainly be rigidly screened by processing agencies, as now provided, but lenders of the type subject to Federal or State regulation and supervision are to be relied upon and should be given the opportunity to do a job without the impediments in processing, appraisal, and preapproval that now exist.

Lending institutions operated under State and Federal regulation, whose principal business it is to make loans and whose subsistence comes from the making of sound loans, are deserving of greater reliance. This is true as concerns all types of loans, and it is especially vital to success in making business loans that commercial banks be permitted proper discretion.

There should be recognition that the more than 14,000 American commercial banks comprise the one agency best qualified by experience to make such loans. In no other

agency, Government or private, exists such a reservoir of knowledge and sound judgment available to the veteran as counsel in his own community in his own best interest. Nowhere else can be found the organization necessary to deal with the millions of men and women to be served under this act.

Although, as previously indicated, the foregoing basic amendments are already before Congress, many further amendments to the regulations have been submitted by various State bank associations and the American Bankers Association. It is unnecessary to detail here the nature of these changes, but any change that will improve the working of the act should be welcomed by the Administrator.

OPPORTUNITY IN FIELD IS GREAT

Let us assume for the sake of argument that the basic changes in the act and the amendments to the regulations will be made effective. What, then, lies ahead? In my opinion it is the greatest opportunity banks have ever had to be in the forefront of a popular movement. It will afford concrete evidence that the banks are interested in the veteran's problems and welfare, as by the smooth working of the loan provisions of the act the banks will assist in adjusting returning servicemen to civilian life. Approached with enthusiasm, this work can accomplish untold benefits for banking by popularizing it with the masses and convincing the people of something which is not at all clear to too many: The country's need of private-enterprise banking.

This program will call for the consistent application of skill and energy, no less than that applied to the success of the war bond campaigns, the ration banking, and other bank war activities. It will demand the devotion of each bank and banker. The defection of merely one or two banks in a given community could spoil the whole picture. The program must be aggressively organized, properly timed, and problems anticipated, educational efforts must be intelligently planned and bankers must be prepared to sacrifice a great deal of personal time to the job of interviewing veterans and fully discussing their individual problems.

In this respect, hundreds of our lending officers agree that the one thing that stands out above all others is the necessity for a sympathetic and understanding approach. Significantly, although many applying veterans have been told in the end that it would be unwise for them to risk their money and credit in ventures under consideration, more friends than enemies have been won through this policy of sound advice.

But there is no short-cut method in the making of friends. It requires a lot of the time of the best lending officers in the bank, but it can be done, it is being done, and it must be done.

Any reader who has followed me this far can see what's ahead if it is not done. Let us all get squarely and publicly behind the effort to amend the act and the regulations so that the most practicable and workable conditions under which we must operate will prevail.

Statement of League of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the legislative council, League of American Indians:

"THE AMERICAN INDIAN WAY OF LIFE

"No community, state, or nation, however great, can ever hope to acquire that position of national and international security and retain it, lest that nation make definite plans for recognition, participation, and function in the affairs of state and nation, by representatives of all nations, in times of peace, with the same spirit and force that is exacted of them in times of war.

"These recommendations are not based upon developments of the present, but they are appraisals and decisions drawn from the averages of the past which have defied all rules of legislation by nations who have attempted to substitute, at will, with provisions labeled 'Economic expediency,' for values in terms of human rights.

"Economic values are only temporary, but human rights are eternal. It is that constant and unfaltering application of honesty and fair dealing which shapes for any nation its eventual future."

Written and dedicated to the Indian people of America and the peace-loving nations of the world.

By FRANK TOM-PEE-SAW,
Secretary, Legislative Council,
League of American Indians.

Editorial Comment on Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Putting the Public First," from the Cleveland Press of June 22, 1945, and one entitled "A Major Peacetime Problem," from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 24, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Press of June 22, 1945]

PUTTING THE PUBLIC FIRST

We are for the proposed Federal Industrial Relations Act. Yet we concede, of course, that details of the Burton-Hatch-Ball bill now before the Senate may be subject to valid criticism and improvement.

Some labor leaders condemn the whole bill because they were not consulted by its drafters. That is not valid criticism. It is an absurd attack on one of the proposal's greatest merits.

It is true that the Senators and citizens who drew up the bill consulted neither labor nor management organizations. But this fact is not, as charged by William Green of the AFL, an evidence of antidemocratic and antilabor bias. It is just the opposite.

On their records, Senators BURTON, HATCH, and BALL are fair-minded friends of labor. They believe that government must protect all the essential rights of workers and employers. They represent the public and they believe that the paramount right is the public's right to domestic peace. And so they have undertaken, for once, to draft industrial-relation legislation primarily from the public viewpoint.

Theirs is the truly democratic way. The antidemocratic way is the one so often followed in past legislation, when employer spokesmen or union officers were consulted first and the public interest was considered last, if at all. That way long-produced laws that favored management. Then it produced laws that favored organized labor. It has not led to industrial peace. It has led through constant civil warfare to vast unnecessary loss for the American people, workers and employers included.

"Surely," says Mr. Green, "those principally affected by a radically new legislative proposal should be given opportunity to present their viewpoint."

Surely. Nobody has sought to deny labor or management that opportunity. They will have it when the Senate Labor Committee holds public hearings on the Burton-Hatch-Ball bill. If Mr. Green and other labor leaders really want to discuss the bill fairly on its merits or what they may consider its demerits, instead of attacking it with intemperate appeals to prejudice, they should join us in urging the committee to hold those hearings soon.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 24, 1945]

A MAJOR PEACETIME PROBLEM

Those who had hoped that organized labor, which has been coddled and pampered by the New Deal, would willingly give up its special privileges and accept a Federal Labor Relations Act that treats employers and labor alike and at the same time give the public a break were doomed to disappointment.

The preliminary blasts from the big labor organizations which maintain permanent lobbies in Washington have made it clear that labor will not relinquish its preferred position without a fight.

The anguished wails emanating from the headquarters of the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the United Mine Workers are strangely reminiscent of the loud outcries which greeted the first efforts on the part of Government to reform big business and to regulate monopolies. Just as the trusts branded as socialism the attempts to regulate them in the public interest 40 years ago, so the labor unions are now denouncing the Burton-Ball-Hatch bill as a straitjacket, a Labor Enslavement Act, and "a scheme to rob the poor and further enrich the rich."

These charges are nonsensical but not surprising. What the unions are really concerned about is that their wings would be clipped by any Federal act which required them to observe the same standards of decency and fairness in dealing with employers that the employers are now required to observe in dealing with labor.

The establishment of sound labor relations will be one of the Nation's major peacetime problems. If the labor leaders were sufficiently farsighted, they would realize that the best interests of organized labor would be served by voluntary acceptance of a code of employer-labor relations under which both sides would be treated fairly.

But, having grown powerful and arrogant on a diet of New Deal legislation designed to coerce employers and to exempt unions from all responsibility for unfair labor practices, accompanied by Supreme Court decisions which have gone so far as to hold that extortion is a legitimate labor practice and is therefore not punishable under the Federal Antiracketeering Act, they have determined to fight to retain their unfair advantages.

This attitude presents an issue to the Nation and poses a challenge which Congress cannot avoid. It also offers an opportunity for President Truman to demonstrate the quality of his leadership on one of the most important domestic problems that will confront his administration.

The issue is simply whether organized labor is powerful enough to avoid Government regulation in the public interest.

It is conceded that organized labor wields great political power. But it is inconceivable that any selfish minority in the long run

can win a fight taking a position of unfair advantage, however it may have been obtained.

Newspaper Comment on Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hatch-Burton-Ball Bill Seen Signifying Trend," by David Lawrence, from the Washington Star of June 21, and an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Industrial Peace Bill," from the Washington Post of June 25, both relating to Senate bill 1171.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 21, 1945]

HATCH, BURTON, BALL BILL SEEN SIGNIFYING TREND—BOTH LABOR AND CAPITAL SEEK END OF FEDERAL RULE SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Sponsorship of new legislation in the field of labor relations by Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL—a bipartisan trio with an objective approach to public policies—is a significant development.

Unquestionably the present labor laws are not contributing to the peaceful settlement of disputes, as had been hoped. Even the urge of wartime necessity has not abolished strikes. Friction which is piling up indicates that the moment war with Japan is ended there will be an unprecedented era of labor strife.

To tackle this problem now is the highest responsibility of statesmanship. Fortunately there is a recognition on the part of labor leaders as well as of management that Government control and regulation of labor relations is likely to be widened if strikes persist and industrial bitterness begins to tie up the Nation's peacetime effort to reconstruct our national economy.

NEITHER SIDE LIKES CLAMP

The desire to remove Government from the realm of control and to put management and labor in greater possession of power to settle their own disputes is recognized on all sides as basic. Neither management nor labor has enjoyed the clamp which has been placed upon them through wartime needs by the War Labor Board. A system wherein the Government decides issues that should be left to collective bargaining can only result in "buck passing" to the governmental agencies and then strikes in protest against Government awards. The record of the last 2 years shows that many a strike has been called in defiance of a War Labor Board order where the management had already agreed or showed a tendency to make the necessary concessions. This has been true particularly in Government contracts, where the employer shrugged his shoulders and said in effect that he would grant the pay raise if the Government wanted to foot the bill.

There obviously must be a change in the whole picture when peace comes, and because the subject is so complex it is eminently desirable that progress toward a solution be made right away. Hence the Hatch-Ball-Burton bill is a starter toward a general discussion.

One thing will become clear in the debate. It is that the Wagner labor relations law, while in need of some clarification, will not be repealed and will not be nullified. The right of collective bargaining has become imbedded in the American system of law and industrial relations. There are some employers who would repeal that law tomorrow if they could, but they are much fewer in number than when the act was first passed in 1935.

Today the attitude of industry is that while the Wagner law safeguards labor's right to bargain, it immunizes the labor organizations from any necessity of bargaining in good faith and permits abuses of power over the employees, especially in closed shops and in other compulsory unionization schemes.

NO HASTY ACTION SEEN

Congress will not act too hastily on these matters but it is significant that the subject has been brought up for action. In the Roosevelt administration much ill-will was engendered by the tactics of labor partisans in forcing congressional committees to squelch all amendments. This meant that wide discretionary powers were left with Government agencies. In peacetime, Government control of labor unions is a step toward fascism. Labor leaders would be ill-advised to resist attempts now being made to broaden present labor statutes so as to make them balanced and impartial. In the end the cause of collective bargaining will be strengthened thereby. No law which permits a monopoly to any group can stand up very long against public opinion.

Apparently the rivalry between the CIO and AFL has come to stay, and hence the employer would not have to suffer because of jurisdictional disputes between these two organizations. There are other problems that need attention such as the prevention of strikes where electric lights, streetcars, and other public utilities are concerned. The public interest supersedes the right of employers and unions in such instances. The Railway Mediation Act furnishes an excellent model for legislation in that field.

But the important thing is that three prominent Senators, after having given many months of study, have brought out a plan. There will be other plans. It's a healthy sign of the trend toward a restoration of collective bargaining.

[From the Washington Post of June 25, 1945]

INDUSTRIAL PEACE BILL

(By Mark Sullivan)

SEEN KEY TO FUTURE

In the Senate last week was introduced a new, over-all labor-relations bill. It is designed to modify and coordinate most of the existing Federal laws dealing with labor relations, and supersede many of the present agencies—in short, a comprehensive bill covering all phases of labor relations. That the measure is important is shown by the interest it instantly aroused. That it is impartial is suggested by the records of the sponsors, three Senators, commonly regarded as liberal—Democratic HATCH, of New Mexico; Republicans BALL, of Minnesota, and BURTON, of Ohio.

For understanding the details of this measure there will be opportunity in Senate hearings and the public discussion that has already begun. Beneath all lies a necessity from which the bill springs. This is suggested by two sentences in the plea for the bill made by Senator BALL:

"There is scant chance that managers of smaller enterprises will risk much expansion in the recoversion period. The uncertainty of Federal policy in this vital field or the lack of any clear policy, makes it impossible for any employer today to do his postwar planning with any degree of assurance that labor relations are on any kind of a stable and enduring basis."

Therein lies the bearing of this bill on the future economic pattern of the United States. We are committed to going ahead on the basis of private ownership of industry. The policy of private ownership is specifically written into statutes dealing with reconversion and looking to the future. It is the policy of President Truman. It is the policy of Congress. It is the policy of the two great political parties. It is the policy of all the national labor organizations, except as regards negligible minorities within some of them. This country is committed to private ownership so firmly that no other system has a serious bearing.

We not only approve the system of privately owned business, we go out of our way to promote it, especially small business. Several statutes recently passed contained specific provisions for help to small business, and for aid, including financial assistance by the Government to men, especially veterans, who wish to set up small businesses.

But all this encouragement will not help unless men actually wish to set up businesses. The wish is strong in many men, but to prudent men there is an arresting thought. It can be expressed in a question. Would a prudent man, having savings enough to set up a business, thus risk his savings, having in mind not only the ordinary hazards to success, but those which Senator BALL points out, the ones inherent in labor relations as they now are?

The principal labor relations law now on the books, the Wagner Act, was enacted in a spirit of resentment against practices unfair to labor which, preceding 1935, have been carried on in some areas of industry. This spirit characterized not so much the bill itself as the enforcement of it. And the spirit was increased by opposition to enforcement which arose in some areas of industry. Throughout, President Roosevelt supported the labor organizations and their leaders. Presently the power acquired by the latter went even beyond what President Roosevelt had contemplated or approved. Roosevelt told John L. Lewis, then head of CIO, that neither he nor Congress would authorize the closed shop, but Lewis got the closed shop. Roosevelt said that strikes by organizations of employees of local government were not permissible, but such strikes took place.

Even before the power of labor became extreme, there was doubt whether private industry could function successfully under these conditions of labor relations. A business recovery that had got under way stopped about the same time that sit-down strikes were practiced by labor unions. The sitdown strikes and the concern they engendered may not have been the sole cause. In any event business recovery was halted until it was stimulated by the abnormal conditions of preparedness and war. This abnormal stimulation is about to end. Whether in normal times the system of privately owned business can survive in the present status of labor relations is a real question, and one with far-reaching implications.

The Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a memorandum in opposition to the adoption of the equal-rights amendment prepared

by Marvin Harrison, attorney, Cleveland, Ohio:

BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION

If the equal-rights amendment, so-called, is to be fairly understood and adequately analyzed, one must begin with the grievances which it attempts to deal with, and which its ardent proponents hope and expect to solve.

It is obvious that these grievances must be very real and very bitter to have excited the immense enthusiasm of the women who have been fighting for an equal-rights amendment for more than 20 years.

Yet, neither indignation nor enthusiasm are likely to be safe or adequate guides for such a far-reaching step as this Constitutional amendment proposes.

Our Constitution should not be amended for trivial reasons nor without great concern over the final results of the proposed amendment. It is submitted that any thoughtful consideration will show that the actual gains from the equal-rights amendment will be small—very small, but that the evils resulting from its adoption will be extremely serious.

The grievances which underlie the demand for the amendment

The advocates of the equal-rights amendment point out with tireless reiteration that the laws of many States discriminate in some matters quite unfairly against women.

Undoubtedly this is true.

Yet when the list of these alleged discriminations is examined it is obvious that most of them are pretty trivial. At any rate they are certainly trivial compared with the major and basic discriminations which prevailed until comparatively recent times and under which women in general had very few independent civil rights, and married women had almost none at all.

In other words most of the job of giving women equal rights under the law has already been accomplished; and all that remains is to finish up a few tag-ends of the business.

For example, there are States in which women may not sit as jurors. There are others in which married women suffer some discriminations in the right to own or convey or mortgage property, and to possess their own earnings; and still others (a very few) in which women are not eligible to hold some public offices on equal terms with men.

And yet, when all of this has been said, it is extremely doubtful if these discriminations which are written in the law, unfair as they undoubtedly are, are the source of more than a very small part of the bitterness or the indignant enthusiasm which underlies the campaign for the equal-rights amendment.

The real source of that bitterness and that enthusiasm is to be found in the discriminations which exist by custom and convention and prejudice in the professions and in the sciences and in the world of business and industry.

These discriminations based on custom and prejudice are not trivial at all. They are very real. They are vast and far-reaching. Indeed, they invade almost every field of activity in which women work.

In many branches of industry women receive much less pay for exactly the same work than men.

In many public-school systems, it is extremely difficult for a woman teacher to receive the same consideration for advancement to the responsibility of principal as a man.

In most hospitals a woman physician or surgeon finds it almost impossible to secure appointment as an intern, or as a resident, or as a member of the staff, no matter how competent her training or how brilliant her achievements.

These are the kind of discriminations which, in one form or another, operate almost everywhere against equality for women, and it is these discriminations which have caused many of them to say impatiently, bitterly, and even belligerently, "Let us make an end of all this outrageously unfair discrimination. Let us amend the Constitution and once and for all have equality between the sexes written into the basic law of the land."

Every thoughtful and liberal-minded person must sympathize with the determination to end these discriminations, and to do it as quickly as possible.

But will the proposed amendment do the job?

The short answer, we think, is obviously "no"; and this will be made perfectly apparent by dividing it into two parts.

(a) What the amendment will not accomplish.

(b) What it will accomplish.

It is certain that it will not affect at all the serious discriminations which are the real grievances of women in modern life. These depend upon social customs and prejudices and cannot be, and will not be, affected in the slightest by the proposed amendment.

It will—probably—do the job so far as ending the few trivial discriminations which are still written in the law. One can only say "probably" for reasons that will be outlined below.

But it will also—with certainty—have the further and outrageous result of wiping off the statute books all of the laws for the special protection of women.

In other words, this amendment is an excellent illustration of the classic Chinese fable of burning down the house—a very large and fine old house—to roast a pig—and a very small one at that.

What does the amendment propose?

At the outset it is important to examine carefully the exact language of the proposed amendment. It reads as follows:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

"Equality" is, of course, a word to conjure with. It is one of our sacred words, and everybody is for it, just as everybody is for freedom, and for democracy, and for liberty.

But what does it mean in this first sentence?

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged * * * on account of sex."

First of all, it only guarantees "equality of rights under the law."

That does not mean that any employer must hire women if he wishes men.

Nor does it mean that he must pay women equally with men for the same work.

Private and charitable hospitals can and will continue to discriminate against women physicians just as they do now.

All that is guarantees is "equality" "under the law."

What does that mean?

That means—plainly enough—that women cannot be "denied" an "equality of rights" with men under any "law" because of their "sex."

But if that is true, it must mean also that men cannot be "denied" an "equality of rights" with women under any law because of their sex.

To put it another way, men cannot have any rights under the law which women do not receive, and women cannot have any rights under the law which men do not receive.

Or, to put it still more bluntly, it means that the law can make no distinction whatever between men and women.

No act of Congress, no act of a State legislature, no ordinance of any city, can make any distinction—not even the smallest—between men and women.

Stated in that blunt, bald manner the proposed amendment sounds preposterous and absurd. And yet that, we submit, is exactly what it says and exactly what it means.

"Equality of rights under the law, shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex."

There is no ambiguity there.

A man cannot have any legal right that a woman does not have.

A woman cannot have any legal right that a man does not have.

It is quite true that many women have thought of the proposed equal-rights amendment as merely excluding and prohibiting discriminations against women. But it will also by equal logic exclude and prohibit discriminations in favor of women.

This brings us to the major questions of this brief:

1. The proposed amendment will not accomplish the results which are chiefly desired by its proponents.

2. It will produce interminable confusion and uncertainty in the law.

3. It will wipe off the statute books all laws which now give special protection to women, and make any provision for their protection in the future extremely difficult if not entirely impossible.

I. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT WILL NOT ACCOMPLISH THE RESULTS WHICH ARE CHIEFLY DESIRED BY ITS PROPONENTS

As we have pointed out above, this proposed amendment will not accomplish the results which its proponents chiefly desire.

If it should be adopted, that would not mean that any employer could be required to hire women, if his prejudices dictated the employment of men.

Nor would it mean that he would be compelled to pay such women as were hired, equal pay for equal work.

The major, basic discriminations which are based upon custom and prejudice would not be affected in the least.

The adoption of the amendment would not bring advancement to any woman teacher, nor clients to any woman lawyer, nor hospital appointments or patients to any woman physician.

The young women who are employed in schools or in industrial or business offices would continue to see themselves bypassed when promotions and advancement were made, by their associates who happen to be men.

That does not mean that solutions should not be or cannot be found against the discriminatory practice of unequal pay for equal work.

What it does mean is that the problem must be tackled as a separate problem, to be solved in its own separate way.

In a few States definite progress has already been made. This progress—real progress—has been made in the only way real progress can ever be made, and that is by the devising of a particular remedy for a particular evil.

Accordingly laws have been enacted by several States which attempt to enforce the doctrine of equal pay for equal work. Such laws have been passed in the States of Michigan, Washington, Illinois, Montana, and New York; and under the provisions of General Order No. 16, the War Labor Board has also tried to enforce such an enlightened policy.

This, we repeat, is the method which has always produced results—a particular remedy for a particular evil. Or as sometimes stated, a separate bill for a separate ill.

Of course, there are many persons who are impatient and who resent the difficulty and the delay in such procedure.

They want a patent medicine—one perfect panacea—that will solve all their problems at one gulp.

And so they have devised a constitutional amendment panacea which they hope will cure all of the discriminations under which women suffer. A quick, painless panacea.

But like all the rest of the quack nostrums it will not only not cure the patient's complaints but will result in new and disturbing complications of its own creation.

Perhaps this criticism should be modified by adding that although it will not—most emphatically it will not—cure the deep-seated and widespread discriminations against women in business and in industry and in the professions, it will (probably) end the trivial discriminations against them which are still written in the law.

The reason why this must be stated only as a probability is because of the vagueness and ambiguity in the language of the proposed amendment, and in the matter in which it is left to the States and to the Federal Government for its enforcement.

This matter will be discussed somewhat further in the next major heading but it is enough to point out here that it cannot be assumed with confidence that the proposed amendment will immediately wipe out even those few existing discriminations which are still written in the law.

For example, the proponents of the amendment cite more frequently than any other the discrimination under which women are denied the right to serve as jurors in a number of States.

Will this amendment automatically give women the right to serve as jurors?

Perhaps, yes.

Probably, yes.

But not certainly. And that is true because service as a juror is frequently stated as a duty of a citizen, and not as a right. No person has the right to be a juror. It is the public rather which has the right to require that service of him. And it is entirely possible that some of the States will interpret the duty of jury service as a matter outside of the rights under the law.

We ought not to overlook that fact that the fourteenth amendment had a blanket provision for equality of rights. It provided (inter alia) "nor shall any State deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

That broad and apparently all-inclusive language was held to be ineffective to give women the vote or to guarantee them the "right" to jury service, etc.

Obviously women were "persons." Yet women did not secure the vote merely by guaranteeing them "the equal protection of the laws."

Will they get the right of jury service merely by guaranteeing them "equality of rights under the law?"

There is no certainty of such a result.

No one can be sure that women will be called for jury duty in every State merely because we write in the Constitution a guarantee of "equality of rights under the law."

The real truth of the matter is that the various States of the Union are rapidly taking care of this matter of jury service for women by separate State action.

For example, between the adoption of the nineteenth amendment in 1920 and 1938, 26 States admitted women to jury service. In the next 6 years seven more States were added to that list.

Women cast substantially one-half of the votes in every State.

They are, therefore, armed with tremendous political power.

Can anyone doubt that this power is ample to bring to an early end the discrimination regarding jury service or any other discrimination which is still written in the law of any State if the women of that State are seriously and sincerely concerned about it?

Surely the process of eliminating the trivial tag ends of historic discriminations in the law can be finished without the necessity of constitutional amendment—an amendment which will be totally ineffective to reach the discriminations of prejudice and custom which are the things which really oppress women in modern life.

II. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT WILL PRODUCE INTERMINABLE CONFUSION AND UNCERTAINTY IN THE LAW

We have pointed out above that the proposed amendment appears to say—and to say plainly—that there cannot be any discrimination against women nor any discrimination in their favor, and that, in short, the law can make no distinction whatever, not even the smallest, between men and women.

As against this preposterous result, some of its proponents assert that the amendment is only aimed at the guaranteeing of an equality of rights; and that such an equality of rights will not prevent the law making necessary and sensible distinctions between men and women.

This claim flies straight in the face of the plain language of the proposed amendment. Nevertheless, let us assume, arguendo, that it is sound.

What is our situation then?

Worse—if possible—than before.

That is true for the reason that we will then be faced with the most hopelessly confused situation imaginable.

Whatever else it may accomplish the amendment can be guaranteed to make many lawsuits grow where only few grew before!

Surely it is obvious that a constitutional amendment should be so drawn as to avoid all possible uncertainty regarding the meaning of its terms.

The equal rights amendment is so badly drawn that it will with absolute certainty provoke endless confusion and endless litigation.

This confusion and uncertainty results from two things:

(a) The phrase "equality of rights"; and

(b) The provision that "Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article."

What is meant by "equality of rights"?

Undoubtedly the proponents of this constitutional amendment assumed that this phrase means merely that women shall have equal rights with men.

But what distinction—if any—will be created between duties and obligations on the one hand, and rights or privileges on the other?

We have already pointed out the possible results of this ambiguity as it relates to the question of jury service.

Is jury service a right—or is it a duty?

And if it is a duty rather than a right would the amendment guarantee it for women on equal terms with men?

There are many other troublesome fields in which this question of the distinction between duties and rights must inevitably arise. Is military service a duty—or a right? Obviously if it should be construed as a right then the law could make no distinction whatever in creating an army between men and women. This would mean that women would not merely be eligible for ancillary duties as they are now in the WAVES, WACS, and SPARS, etc., but would be equally compelled with men to accept regular routine service in the armed forces. Not only would they have equality of rights to carry a gun and a bayonet, but equality of rights to carry a 60-pound pack on long marches.

If this distinction should be accepted by the courts that the amendment only guarantees rights and has no relation to duties, it is obvious that every new law involving the rights or duties of either men or women would have to run a gantlet of interminable litigation to determine whether or not it was inside or outside of the constitutional limits.

Even if the law was so written as to deal with the duties of one sex, would it not involve reciprocal rights of the other? How could any law which involved distinctions between men and women escape attack as being a violation of this constitutional amendment?

This would be true not only for the acts of Congress but would be equally true for the acts of State legislatures and the ordinances of every city council.

The joint jurisdiction in Congress and the several States

The confusion which is inherent in the phase "equality of rights" is much worse confounded by the strange language employed in the second paragraph that "Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

What is meant by "their respective jurisdictions"?

Does this language mean that within each separate State its own State action would be final?

And how and when and where would Congress act within its "jurisdiction"?

Could an act of Congress override the act of a separate State with reference to matters of local or only State-wide concern?

To be specific, could Congress require that the grounds for divorce should be equal and reciprocal as between men and women if the State legislature decided otherwise?

Could an act of Congress override a State law which declined to compel married women to serve as jurors?

These illustrations which could be continued indefinitely serve to point up the obvious fact that lawyers and legislators and judges are sure to disagree and disagree widely as to what is meant by the words "equality of rights"; and to disagree also as to the legal significance of the phrase giving to "Congress and the several States" the power to enforce the provisions of the amendment "within their respective jurisdictions."

We submit that it would be extremely difficult to write into the Constitution any provision which would create more doubt and confusion both in legislatures and courts than will result from the few words and phrases of this "equal rights" amendment.

Surely this is not the way of progress, to place within the basic law of our land an amendment which is so vague, so confusing, so badly drawn, that it will infallibly result in grave uncertainties, endless disputes, and interminable litigation.

Federal Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing on March 25, 1945, in the Denver Post:

FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY USES TAX DOLLARS TO BUY CONTROL OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Hundreds of millions of tax dollars, squeezed out of the American people, are being used annually by their Federal Government to buy control of their State and local governments and concentrate authority over everything and everybody in the Washington, D. C., arsenal of bureaucracy.

A survey by the Council of State Governments shows that Federal subsidies to States

alone increased from $5,400,000 in 1915 to eleven and seven-tenths millions in 1919, jumped to one hundred thirteen and six-tenths millions in 1925, and then skyrocketed to five hundred sixty-four and eight-tenths millions in 1937 and eight hundred fourteen and nine-tenths millions in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

And this is only a part of the story. In addition to these Federal subsidies, the survey discloses that "other Federal expenditures within States (such as, payments for unemployment relief, agricultural adjustment, emergency public works, etc.) have increased to a point where they exceed the amounts which are channeled through States as grants-in-aid."

COLORADO GOT FIFTEEN MILLIONS IN UNITED STATES SUBSIDIES IN 1943

Federal dollars carry with them Federal control. As Colorado, for example, becomes more dependent upon the Federal Government for the financing of State and local operations, it also becomes subject to the dictation of Federal officials and bureaucrats and the seat of government passes from the State capitol in Denver, the courthouses and city halls and school boards in the counties, to Constitution Avenue in Washington, D. C.

During the fiscal year of 1943 the Council of State Governments survey shows Colorado received a total of $14,772,000 in Federal subsidies. These included $2,535,000 of Federal aid for highways, $9,752,000 for public-welfare expenditures, $1,286,000 for national defense, $311,000 for schools, $304,000 for public health, $196,000 for the employment security administration, $323,000 for agriculture, and $65,000 for other hand-outs.

The Council of State Governments, in its study of the Federal subsidy system, found that "some confusion exists with respect to the actual amount of aid received by the several States from the Federal Government." It pointed out that there is a discrepancy between the figures of various Federal agencies. On Federal grants-in-aid, for example, the Treasury Department says the Federal Government paid out in the fiscal year of 1943, $600,978,242; the Census Bureau says it paid out $814,900,000; and the Budget Bureau says the amount was $1,091,204,701. The reason for these variations, the report states, is that "each figure is based on a somewhat different reporting method." Among the Federal payments to the States in the fiscal year of 1943, in addition to the so-called grants-in-aid, were some in-lieu-of-taxes on federally owned land and other property. In this connection, the Council of State Governments called attention to a recent report of the House Public Lands Committee, of which Congressman PETERSON of Florida is chairman, stating:

"The United States Government today is the greatest owner of real estate in the United States. More than 24 percent of the land area in continental United States is owned by the Federal Government and its various agencies. When we include the Territories in this figure, the Federal Government owns 36 percent of the land area.

"No one government agency has a complete list of the ownership of all federally owned lands and in order to find out the correct ownership of publicly owned land it is necessary to go various places. Even in a department having several bureaus oftentimes the records are scattered through these various bureaus. There are conflicts between departments in some instances and even conflicts between bureaus within the same department.

"The Federal Government and its various bureaus now own or control parks, forests, Indian reservations, cattle driveways, grazing areas, public domain, mineral lands, recreational areas, cemeteries, custom houses, post offices, housing projects, vegetable and fruit processing plants, nurseries, electrical plants, mines, oil properties, war factories of various kinds, shipyards, docks, wharfs, lakes, dams, power sites, waterfront properties, hotels, and hospitals."

In fact, the Federal Government owns so much and so many different kinds of property that nobody seems to know exactly how much it does own.

The study made by the Council of State Governments covers regular Federal grants-in-aid to States, Federal revenue shared with State and county in lieu of taxes; emergency grants and expenditures of an emergency nature for relief, recovery and war activity selected additional Federal expenditures within States, such as operation of public employment offices during the war, old-age and survivors' benefits, Veterans' Administration expenditures, airport development program; rivers and harbors and flood control, and war supply contracts.

The San Francisco Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Independent Voters of Illinois at Orchestra Hall, Chicago, Friday evening, June 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You are here because you have covenanted with the living and the dead that war shall not again come to curse your loved ones. At last the peoples of the world who pay the price of war have sworn to have peace.

Fifty nations, Tuesday of this week, signed in San Francisco the Charter of the United Nations, in its significance the greatest document in human history. In the presence of our President the signatures of the representatives of the United States were affixed. With that signing was given the moral commitment of the people and the Government of the United States that we would ratify that charter conceived upon our own soil, born out of the suffering of all those who have fought and worked through two wars, fathered by two of the bravest soldiers of democracy of all time, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

This great Charter was not born like Venus, full grown out of an ocean wave. It is the It has been long in the making. It has been carefully, painstakingly, and prayerfully carved out. It represents compromise, tolerance, and reciprocal confidence and trust among nations. It is both a dream and the anvil upon which dreams are beaten into moving reality. It comprehends the whole order of the earth and the whole reach and scope of man's life.

The eyes of the Nation, of the world, of the wounded, of those still fighting and dying in the war against Japan, the eyes of those who look upon us from the world above are now focused on the Senate of the United States. The Senate can not, must not, and shall not fail mankind. The Senate can not, must not, shall not be the cruel cross upon which shall be crucified another generation of guiltless men and women.

We cannot but expand with pride in the accomplishment of all those who have played their part in the consummation of this charter. President Roosevelt, who called this great conference, who named our able and bipartisan delegation; President Truman, who commissioned it to new life and gave it new impetus; all the members of our delegation and of other delegations; and untold numbers of others, nameless to fame, who gave themselves to it: these will always be honored in the everlasting memory of history and in the warm heart of the world.

Here truly was democracy functioning at its best. In San Francisco, significantly chosen as the Golden Gate to the golden future of peace, gathered 50 nations of many lands, languages, colors, cultures, and creeds. Picture in your mind's eye the variety of peoples which met in San Francisco to weld a new unity. There was no distinction in this great labor, as there has been none in this great war, of race, color, sex, or creed.

There is but one reservation in our joy, that is, that Franklin D. Roosevelt could not have lived to see how truly and greatly he had wrought. Yet, he knew that we were going to have this happy day. Only a few evenings ago a friend told me that 3 weeks before his death he talked to the President. He had looked fresh and buoyant, so much so that my friend remarked upon it. The President replied, "I feel better than I have felt in a long time, for a great load has been lifted from my heart—I now know we are going to win the peace." He knew then, he knows now, that we have won the peace.

This great charter was not born like Venus, full grown out of an ocean wave. It is the crowning achievement of centuries of the slow and painful development of a great idea. Down through the ages one sees the steady growth of the concept of peace and justice on the earth. In the city-states of ancient Greece, even before Rome became great, there were organizations to keep the peace. Again through the Middle Ages, scholars and statesmen of the church sought to establish among nations and peoples that accord and cooperation which would keep the peace and promote the welfare of all. And again in the jewelled cities of the Italian Renaissance that ideal was renewed.

In modern times we have seen this dream of an organization of nations gain greater and greater force. At Westphalia in 1648, at Utrecht in 1713, at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748, at Vienna after the downfall of Napoleon, at Paris in 1856 and at Berlin in 1878 and 1885, the nations of Europe, in so-called congresses, tried to set up the machinery for cooperation to prevent war and to maintain peace.

In 1899 nearly every nation in the world assembled at The Hague to consider disarmament and the substitution of arbitration and conciliation for war. A second Hague conference devoted to the same objectives met in 1907. A third was interrupted by the outbreak of the First World War.

We in this country can take a just pride in our own forerunners of this great organization of the United States.

On May 5, 1910, Theodore Roosevelt, speaking before the Nobel committee in Norway, cried out for "the establishment of some sort of international police force and power competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations." The United States Congress added its voice of approval, for in June of 1910 the Congress adopted a public resolution establishing a commission of five members to consider the expedience of constituting the combined navies of the world into an international force for the preservation of universal peace.

The world knows that Woodrow Wilson was one of the principal prophets of peace, for it was he who fathered the League of Nations at the Paris Peace Conference after the last war. That league failed doubly. It failed in the Senate of the United States and it failed to prevent World War II. But it was the highest point humanity had ever reached in organizing nations against war and in promoting the welfare of the world. Altogether, 56 nations were members of that League, even if we were not. It was housed

in a great edifice, the spacious elegance of which even today attests what that League might have been, had its high purposes been kept and had governments, who are the makers of war, given it their support. It did stop some wars and even yet there are living signs of its great accomplishments, in the International Labor Organization and in other league functions which still survive.

But, the League died as the keeper of the peace, and World War 2 followed after, to wreck the earth, to drench it in blood, to squander its riches, and to inflict upon it the unspeakable horror of needless death. As Divine Providence, it may be, provided, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the spiritual heir of Woodrow Wilson, was President of the United States in this war. He tried to stop it peacefully, but nothing save greater force could stop the determined dictators who were bent only upon war and conquest. But President Roosevelt knew when the seeds of that war were sown and he knew where they had grown. He must have prayed that he might be the gardener of the world who would uproot once and for all the poisonous weeds that grew from that sowing.

We see, therefore, the President starting, before we entered the war, the foundation of this great charter we now have. You will remember how the world was thrilled in August of 1941 by the promulgation of the Atlantic Charter, born in the Western Hemisphere. Not a month after the dagger of war was at last driven in our backs, the United Nations was born, on New Years Day 1942, in our White House. President Roosevelt and Churchill gave it that name. Twenty-six nations subscribed to it, and covenanted with one another to wage a common war against a common enemy and to subscribe to the principles embodied in the charter.

But this was only a start. In the midst of war, the United Nations began working together for peace. You will remember the Conference of 44 nations which, at Hot Springs in June 1943, set up an international food organization. And the conference at Atlantic City in November 1943 at which 44 nations set up an international relief and rehabilitation organization.

You will remember Bretton Woods where in July 1944, 44 nations put together a plan for an international bank and an international fund to stabilize the currencies of the world. You have not forgotten that here in your own great city of Chicago, 52 nations met in November 1944 in a momentous international air conference to regulate air commerce among the nations of the world. All these conferences were laying a firm foundation of international cooperation, establishing the pattern of united international agreement and action.

A few months before the Air Conference, in August 1944, representatives of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, the United States met at Dumbarton Oaks, in Washington, and carved out the rough outlines of a mighty political Charter for the future international peace and security.

Then, in the truly democratic way, that charter was made known to the world. Discussion and criticism were invited so that for months the opinion of mankind was brought to bear upon its perfections and its imperfections. Finally, this great congress of the nations was called to meet in San Francisco to perfect that charter.

President Roosevelt chose a great delegation, bipartisan in character and completely united in its desire to achieve the purposes for which it was called. And, unlike the secret conclaves of diplomats in the past history of mankind, the public was invited in a representative capacity. The official American delegation was aided and counseled by hundreds of organizations and individuals, reflecting a cross-section of the private citizenry of the Nation.

Our delegation went to San Francisco determined to work out a pattern for lasting world unity with delegations from the other nations there present. Together, the statesmen of the Fig Five and the Little Forty and Five, through long hours day and night, through meeting after meeting, committee after committee, crisis after crisis, fought a momentous battle.

No one man, no one nation, can claim responsibility for the great achievement that resulted. Mr. Molotov and Mr. Gromyko, Lord Halifax and Mr. Eden, Mr. Stettinius, Senator Connally, Senator Vandenberg and the other members of the American delegation, as representatives of the Big Three who carried most of the brunt of the battle against the Nazi hordes, ardently and with good will worked together to achieve the desired end, unity in peace, as there had been unity in war. The tolerance and the willingness to compromise of these men is in large part responsible for the splendor of the Charter.

Mr. Paul Boncour, of France, and Dr. Wellington Koo, of China, added the brilliance of their ideas and the warmth of their hopes for peace. General Smuts, of South Africa, and Mr. Evatt, of Australia, among many others of equal merit, brought to the meeting their fine ideals and their strong support for the rights of small nations to participate fully in the processes of the new international organization of the United Nations.

Finally, with the world beaming its approval and congratulations, the document was subscribed to in intelligible form on Tuesday last—a date which shall be a milestone in human history. The dead, this time, shall not have died in vain, if the United States Senate now does its part.

In the preamble of this charter is to be found the ranking purpose of the organization. Let me read it to you:

"PREAMBLE

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and

"To establish conditions under which justice and respect for law and the pledged word can be maintained; and

"To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and for these ends

"To practice tolerance and live together in peace as good neighbors; and

"To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods to insure that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and

"To employ international means for the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

"Accordingly, our respective governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations."

The cynics, the disillusioned, the poor in spirit still choose to sneer at the words I have just read, and at the ideas those words express. They choose to believe that these ideas are merely a false-face behind which the specter of power politics continues to grimace. They choose to disbelieve in the possibility of lasting peace and international unity. Specifically, they choose to promote as best they can with the weapons of slander and slur the notion that we cannot maintain our war-born unity with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union gave up much, just as it got much, in the San Francisco Charter. So did the United States, and Great Britain, and France, and China, and all the other nations who signed that great document. Russia has agreed, as we have agreed and as all the United Nations have agreed, to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and to act together with other countries to maintain international security. It will continue to do so. No nation which has lost so much and suffered so much from war as has Russia can want more war. The only people who want war are those who still believe that they can gain personal benefit from the slaughter of the people of the world in combat. And they shall not prevail. The unity that has been forged in the inferno of the greatest conflict the world has ever known is a unity which no petty, self-seeking, and fascist-minded minority in this or any other country can undermine.

The charter which has been born from this unity is not only high in its ideals, it is practical in the machinery it has established for putting those ideals into effect. It has outlined an organization through which the nations of the world may act to preserve peace, maintain international security, and improve the living standards of all people.

The organs through which this organization shall function are a general assembly, a security council, an economic and social council, an international court of justice, a trusteeship council, and a secretariat.

The general assembly will be the world forum. In it each member nation shall have one vote. It will be a meeting place where men may give expression to the hopes and fears of the peoples of the world.

The Security Council, composed of 11 members of which 5—Great Britain, Russia, China, France, and the United States—shall be permanent members, is the executive body, charged with the administration of the organization and with the maintenance of the peace of the world—if necessary, by force.

The economic and social council, composed of 18 member nations elected by the general assembly, is new. This council shall be the agency through which the organization will promote the health, prosperity, culture, and progress of the peoples of the world. It is the organ through which nations shall work together for the economic and social good of each and all.

It is our hope that this great council shall largely remove or mitigate the economic causes of war and, therefore, make the need for force to keep the peace ever less.

The international court of justice is the international organization under the United Nations through which the disputes of nations may be peacefully settled without recourse to war.

Finally, there is established a trusteeship council which shall be the guardian of those peoples who have not yet won their independence but to whom the nations of the world owe an obligation to help them in gaining their independence and maintaining their security.

There will be a permanent staff, a secretariat, of course made up from all the United Nations, because it will be a going organization all the time.

Now this great ideal of organizing for peace is within our grasp—only the ratification of the Senate stands between this Charter and an effective United Nations in being; for, if the Senate of the United States ratifies it, I am sure no other nation in the world will fail to ratify it.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate will begin hearings on the 9th of July. We are resolved that there will be no recess, no delay in bringing this matter to the floor of the Senate.

There is every reason for confidence in what the Senate will do, because the overwhelming majority—over 90 percent—of the people want this Charter. But we must remember that 80 percent of the people of the Nation were for the League of Nations a generation ago. We must remember that there is still the power of filibuster under the rules of the Senate. Another little group of willful men could defeat all that has been done in the winning of the war and the building of this Charter. We must remember that the charter will not be valid unless it is ratified by two-thirds of the Senate. That means it takes two Senators for it for every one against it.

We know that there may be those who will try to sabotage the Charter by amendment and reservation. Yet these Senators are the people's Senators, the Senators who sent the people's sons and loved ones to war. The people must let their Senators know that they are looking to them in this great moment to save their sons and grandsons, their husbands, brothers, and fathers from another war. Every white cross cries out to every Senator to keep the faith. Every broken body, every disordered mind in its anguish, pleads with every Senator to keep the faith. All those, all over the earth, who "sigh for the touch of a vanished hand, the sound of a voice that is still" beg, too, every United States Senator to ratify this Charter. Now is the time for the people to work and to fight, to let no petty partisanship, no ugly prejudice, no scheming obstructionism, no vaulting ambition, deny them this Charter which their gallant warriors, their great leaders, have now put in their keeping.

Let us forge the Nation into united support of this declaration of interdependence. Let us secure its speedy ratification by the Senate, bring to heel the last evil enemy in the Orient, and we can say that God has blessed us to live to see the dawn of that happy day of which Tennyson dreamed—when

"The war-drum throbb'd no longer,
And the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man,
The Federation of the world.
There the common sense of most
Shall hold a fretful relm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber,
Lapt in universal law."

Dog Torture Useless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 491, a bill to prohibit the vivisection of dogs in the District of Columbia. I introduced this bill at the request of some of the World War II veterans, and others, who know the valuable service rendered by dogs in the present war—people who believe that dog torture is worthless to science.

I am glad to note that Dr. Arthur V. Allen, in an article published July 1, 1945, in the American Weekly, takes the same position. Dr. Allen is one of Chicago's best-known physicians. A specialist in industrial medicine, he is a fellow of the American Association of Industrial Physicians and Surgeons and a member of the Central States Association of Industrial Medicine and Surgery. He is a graduate of the Chicago College of Medicine and Surgery and, from 1916 to 1918, was professor of ophthalmology at Illinois Post-Graduate Medical School. For the following 26 years he was chief surgeon for the Commonwealth Edison Co. and consultant for other large firms, including General Electric. He retired from industrial medicine because of ill health and at present is carrying on a private practice in Chicago.

Here is Dr. Allen's article:

Both as a medical man and a human being I am opposed to vivisection.

As a physician, I believe vivisection to be wrong in principle. I do not believe it is right to create disease or suffering in order to study it. I know it is not necessary to do so.

Animal experiments have been going on for more than 300 years. If they were ever going to be of benefit to the human race, surely they should have proved themselves by now. And yet, in the whole history of medicine, you will find few major scourges whose alleviation or cure has been aided by vivisection.

The use of quinine against malaria, the conquest of pneumonia by the sulfa drugs, the triumph of penicillin over the germs of infection, the discovery of the cause and method of transmission of yellow fever—none of these achievements owes anything to vivisection. Neither do most of our other signal discoveries.

As a human being, I am opposed to vivisection because it is very cruel.

Vivisectionists will tell you it is not, but I know, because I have seen what takes place in their laboratories.

There are too many dogs suffering on vivisection tables. Thousands of needless, and even useless, experiments are being performed on these helpless animals. There are dogs with tubes in their stomachs, dogs suffering in every organ, dogs being used unmercifully to satisfy the extravagant zeal of the gland investigators.

Such vital organs as kidneys are removed in whole or in part. The parathyroid gland, governing the body's calcium metabolism, is often cut out with resultant ill effects in every organ. Or, again, the dog is deprived of the pancreas, with the result that digestion is impaired and diabetes induced.

Most horrible of all, perhaps, was the experiment in which the appendices of some 96 dogs were tied off and left to rot in their bodies, until a severe, general peritonitis developed.

You can't anesthetize against things like these. For the actual operation, yes, but not for the conditions which follow—conditions which must be observed for days or even weeks if the experimentalist is to get results.

I once saw a group of dogs, every one of which had some part of the stomach or intestine removed by surgery to see if such removal would cause gastric ulcer. Thus mutilated, they were allowed to drag through the remaining weeks or months of their miserable existence while doctors observed the results of their handiwork.

Sick, trembling, thin to the point of emaciation, their suffering eyes pleaded for someone to put them out of their misery.

No one, however, need take my word for the essential cruelty of vivisection or even visit a laboratory. All he needs do is read current medical journals. True, the full import of the experiments described in nearly every issue is obscured for the layman by use of scientific terms; but when this concealing screen of technical language is torn aside, their really horrible cruelty is revealed to all.

Take, for instance, an experiment reported in the Illinois Medical Journal for June 1944. Sixteen animals were used, but, to be brief, I will give the case history of just one—a female dog weighing 18½ pounds.

After being given 1 grain of morphine as an anaesthetic, this dog was injected with 150 cc of a sclerosing solution, the operation being repeated once a week for 7 weeks.

That all sounds very innocent, doesn't it? To a doctor, however, it can mean just one thing, killing by inches, because a "sclerosing solution" is one which burns and destroys tissue. Imagine, then, what happens when such stuff is pumped directly into the veins.

Little by little, the blood, one of the body's most vital substances, is destroyed. If you know anything about the symptoms of a severe anemia—the terrific pounding headaches, the dizziness, the air hunger, the laboring breathing, the palpitation of the heart—you know something of what this dog suffered, and you would not be at all surprised to read the conclusion of the report that after the seventh "treatment" the poor beast was found dead, bleeding from nose and mouth.

Medical journals are full of such cruelties—dogs whose eyes have been all but burned out by injections of strong acid; dogs which have had virulent pus injected into the eyeball for the purpose of causing infection and swelling in that most sensitive spot; dogs subjected to constant injections of ice water in the ear for 24 to 36 hours.

If these things are not cruel, then I do not know what the word "cruel" means.

Worst of all, such experiments have a very limited value. They have told us a little about a lot of minor conditions and diseases so uncommon that they rarely, if ever, affect the average man, but they have contributed nothing concerning the diseases of which people are dying by thousands today—heart disease, coronary thrombosis, apoplexy, cancer.

Nor have most of medicine's great discoveries of the past been due to vivisection.

Consider smallpox, for instance. In the eighteenth century and earlier, it was one of the most dreaded ailments afflicting humankind, sweeping over whole countries in recurrent epidemics, scarring and killing wherever it traveled.

That it is not the same kind of a menace today is due, not to animal experimentation, but to the keen observation of a hard-working general practitioner in an English village, Dr. Edward Jenner.

Jenner was no vivisectionist. He didn't waste his time experimenting on animals. He treated the sick and studied the disease from which they were suffering and in doing so noticed a puzzling fact: In an epidemic of smallpox everybody seemed to come down with it except those who had already recovered during a previous epidemic—and the milkmaids.

The first was easy to understand. Smallpox built up its own immunity. But how about the milkmaids? They had never had smallpox and yet the worst outbreaks of the disease passed them by—them and no one else. Why?

Seeking the answer to this question, Jenner discovered that most milkmaids had little sores on their hands due to a mild disease known as cowpox. He correctly surmised that the milder disease contracted from milk cows protected them against the deadlier one, which affected only human beings.

In 1796 he made his first successful vaccination, inoculating an 8-year-old boy with

serum from cowpox vesicles on the hands of a milkmaid. In 1803 some 12,000 people were inoculated in the same way and the annual average of deaths from smallpox fell from 2,018 to 622.

That's the sort of medical victory you get from studying a disease where it should be studied—in those whom it attacks and kills.

In my opinion, one of the reasons why the work of animal experimenters has produced so little is because they study disease in the wrong places and in the wrong ways. They study artificially induced conditions in the artificial atmosphere of the laboratory.

Disease in animals and disease in man is never quite the same. The final test of any procedure (no matter how many times it has been tried in a laboratory on a dog) must be made on the human being. It is here that a disease must be observed, and all its vagaries, symptoms, complications, and responses learned.

Moreover, for the true physician, who knows his disease thoroughly—knows it as it affects people—the sight of human suffering is a powerful incentive. His pity is a fruitful force.

Sister Kenny didn't learn what she knows about polio by infecting dogs and then watching them suffer. It was her intense desire to relieve the pain of little children which gave birth to her epoch-making hot-pack treatment for polio.

Dr. Banting, the discoverer of insulin, is another who got his idea from the effect of a disease on human beings.

Reading of an operation to remove a stone from the pancreatic duct, Banting got the idea that the cells of the pancreas secrete a substance which controls the sugar metabolism of the body.

In his first efforts to extract the hormone to which the thousands of diabetics today owe their lives, he did try dogs but soon found that he could get it much more readily from calves' livers.

Once he had the hormone, his chief experiments were done on a friend with diabetes. He proved the value of insulin through treatment of other diabetics at a clinic he established at the Christie Street Hospital in Toronto.

Most really valuable medical discoveries which have not been made from actual care and study of the sick have come from chemical laboratories.

Two of the greatest medical triumps of all time are directly due to the art of the chemist and bacteriologist—the sulfa drugs and penicillin.

The first of these powerful curative drugs was discovered in the chemical laboratory of a German dye manufacturer and subsequent developmental work was done by English chemists. True, in the early stages the drugs were tested on mice but that most of the facts concerning their use as weapons against disease were learned by using them on afflicted human beings is very evident from report after report in our medical journals. And that is the best way in which anything very useful about them could have been learned.

Penicillin was discovered in the laboratory of Prof. Alexander Fleming at St. Mary's Hospital, London, in 1929. Fleming happened upon this discovery while examining some culture plates of staphylococci, or pus germs. He noticed a green mold with a clear zone around it where no germs grew. His curiosity was aroused and to satisfy it he took some of the mold and grew it in a broth, later finding that it was a powerful antibacterial agent.

The only animal experimentation in this case was the trial to see if it were poisonous to mice. Thus, animal experimentation should not receive credit for this discovery, more particularly as the discoverer was a biologist, not a vivisectionist.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the annual meeting of the Rocky Mount Chamber of Commerce, Rocky Mount, N. C., on June 23, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have again made the world safe for democracy. God helping us, we have already overthrown the most evil and cruel tyrants the world has ever seen. Nazism and facism is being routed out of Europe and the stream of democracy is being freed of its taint. All that hellish hierarchy which forced the curse of war upon the world which is left alive is now facing early and sure judgment and justice. The German general staff which has spawned war for generations is being utterly stripped of its capacity to plan war again. Its chief offenders will be shot or imprisoned and it shall be so scattered that it can never again make war—its horrible business.

We have shown Germany that war is what Sherman said it was. The ruins of their cities and their country will never let their own cost in this war escape their sad notice.

But more than that, we are going to strip their economic power to make war. They shall not in our time at least have the heavy industry with which alone war can be waged. No more shall the big Krupp works and other armament plants or industries which make the raw materials of war stand as a threat to civilization and to peace. Germany has forfeited the right to have a free economy because she has used her strength to kill and maim and plunder other people and their good earth. If the Germans must adapt themselves to a limited and simple economy, it is because the curse of both God and man is upon them for their sins.

But we are not going to stop there. We are going to try to straighten the twisted lives and characters of the German people. The aged, whom we cannot change, we shall hold under strict surveillance and custody. The young, whose minds are open, will be taught the Golden Rule and the morality of the brotherhood of man.

Russia, Britain, France, and we are not going to take any more chances with German international brigandage. We are going to keep policemen on the job day and night. And by policemen, I mean the best soldiers in the world; soldiers who know the Germans and have seen them kill, and rape, and slaughter; who have seen all their dastardly schemes and tricks and will know how to guard against their offenses.

But we are not only going to have our own forces in Germany, we are going to have the United Nations, an effective organization of nations, the purpose and function of which will be to keep peace, to suppress aggression, and to stimulate the well-being of all nations and peoples. That United Nations has been born before our very eyes. It is the real victory for which so many have died and fought. Our President will this very next week be bringing it back with him from San Francisco. Into its making has gone all the suffering and sacrifice of two wars in our time. It has been bought with the treasurers of two generations and the blood and broken lives of millions of men, women, and children. From the humblest child, the lowliest soldier, or sailor, or marine, or girl in the auxiliary forces to the President of the United States—all have bought it with their lives. It is a monument to every man, woman, and child whose sacrifices made it possible, and the one with whose memory it shall ever be associated, who has truly wrought it into reality, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We in the Senate of the United States must not think of a recess without ratifying the San Francisco Charter for the United Nations. Not a day, nor an hour, must be wasted in pressing that immortal document through the Senate so that President Truman may have that magnificent act of the Senate and the country behind him when he joins Stalin and Churchill in Berlin.

The world was bitterly disappointed that the United States Senate defeated the League of Nations, and will be skeptical of what we do until we have ratified the San Francisco Charter. This time we can only discharge our debt to the dead and keep the confidence of our allies by being the first to ratify the United Nations Charter, and to show the world that we are going to lead in the making of the peace as we have in winning the great victory.

Those men fighting in the Pacific, in the Philippines, upon all the far-flung Japanese battle fronts are not going to have a recess. Neither must we until we have made this United Nations a living thing for the American people.

Also before we think of a recess we must lay another one of the pillars of an effective peace by enacting the Bretton Woods agreement, just as we have already laid another substantial support for peace and well-being in the world by the enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

I am proud to say that the Congress of the United States is writing into law and into treaty a program not only for the peace but the well-being of the Nation and the world. Political isolation is dead in America. We must see to it that economic isolation is dead as well. And the people must know that a man who can't see the necessity of America trading with the rest of the world, taking a part in the rebuilding of the world, having a share in furnishing investment capital for world progress and the stabilization of world currencies is as blind and dangerous as the man who a little while ago fought lend-lease, selective service, and letting hard-pressed Britain have 50 American destroyers.

For we have learned that there cannot be world peace unless there is world prosperity. Only upon a stable world economy can peace really be built. The great function of the United Nations organization will be that it will not only have a police force to stop aggressors—it will not only have the machinery by which disputes among nations may be settled—but it will be the instrumentality through which the standard of living of the people of the world may be raised and people everywhere given a larger share of the good things of the world.

We have passed through difficult days; dangerous days. We are not yet out of danger. The dastardly and devilish Jap is yet to be conquered and the East freed of the virus of his tyranny. The most colossal job which ever faced any nation in history still remains to be accomplished in the defeat of Japan. Many hearts are yet to bleed; many tears to fall; many fresh, young lives yet in the sparkle of youth to be laid upon the altar before this difficult task is done. This is no time therefore either to rejoice over the great victory we have won or to let down. To slacken our pace now is to make more men pay with their lives for our default.

I wish we could spend more time in prayer and less in pleasure until this terrible Japanese war is over and the men and women fighting it could come again out of the range of the scythe of death.

We have difficulty and danger yet at home, too. Unemployment is beginning to stalk the land. Dislocations in our economy are becoming pronounced. Recovery is yet ahead of us. The task of furnishing hospitals and care to those who have fought this war is yet to be accomplished. A debt of $300,000,000,000 is to be serviced. All the things we have had to neglect during the war are to be done. We have yet to prove that we can make our democracy work as gloriously and victoriously against the dangers of depression and insecurity as against the threat of conquest and tyranny.

If a soldier after having fought through this war against the enemy to victory comes home and finds himself unable to support a family, to have a job, to live in a decent house, to send his children to a school or to a hospital, what can he think of the country he served by the offer of his life?

If a workman who by sweat and toil gave to the fighting forces the weapons with which they beat down the enemy cannot find a job after the enemy is destroyed, what will he think about the country he too served?

If the farmer who has fed our Nation and the fighting forces and many of our allies by Herculean labor and toil during this war can find no market for what he grows, what reward will he have found for his part in the victory?

If the businessman who has turned out all these weapons of war and against every obstacle won the battle of production is to lose his business, what will he think he has gained for his sacrifice.

We must not again let this country fall into another depression. We must not let unemployment sweep like a great blight over this land. We must not let business, agriculture, and trade stagnate. We must not let the national income substantially drop. On the contrary, we must formulate to meet this dangerous period of recovery ahead of us a plan which will see that these things do not happen. If the Government shall fail to formulate such plans in cooperation with leaders of business, labor, and agriculture, the Government shall have failed the people. This plan, of course, must be a democratic plan, conceived in the democratic way, and executed in the democratic way, for we did not win the victory for democracy to lose it to totalitarianism here at home.

But private enterprise, labor, and agriculture will have to have the help of Government. They cannot carry the load of full employment and prosperity alone. The Government must help them by coordinating their efforts, by furnishing leadership, and by giving financial support, either in the form of credits, loans, or markets, when they are required.

We must see that agricultural production is kept high so that the farmers shall have markets and good prices and the hungry world shall be fed. If we have to sell this food to hungry peoples on long-term credits or in return for trade considerations for the future, then we must do it. If we let agriculture fail, then the Nation will fail, and we shall fail the world.

We must not let unemployment gain headway. The President's recommendation must be enacted into law so that an unemployed family shall be assured decent subsistence, and that is at least $100 per month (and it ought to be more) for unemployment between the end of a war job and a peace job. State unemployment compensation is not enough to meet this situation; the Federal Government must help.

Unemployment benefits to discharged veterans must be raised from $20 per week where a veteran has a family to a minimum of $100 per month.

Opportunity for retraining must be given the workers of this country who now need to learn the arts of peace. It is prodigal economy to deny a man or woman, boy or girl a chance to learn a trade or a skill which will make them able not only to better themselves but their country. There should be set in motion at once, therefore, a combined State and Federal retraining program which will work with private industry to teach any person who wants to learn to do a better job.

Immediately the Government should require raises in wages, when hours have been shortened, so that the workers' take-home pay shall not be diminished. That is not inflationary. On the contrary, it is insurance against deflation.

And minimum wages in the substandard wage groups should immediately be raised. I hope the Senate shall shortly adopt a resolution, of which Senator JOHNSON, Senator LA FOLLETTE, and I are the authors, fixing any wage, including wages received by railroad labor, at less than 65 cents an hour as substandard wages and permitting any employer who is able and willing to raise wages to 65 cents an hour to do so and requiring every employer to do it who can.

We must also protect women against being forced out of needed jobs by discriminatory discharge. I do not favor the workman over the soldier, the soldier over the workman; women over the men, or the men over women in a chance to work. The policy of this Nation must be to provide jobs for all—veteran, workman, men and women. I hope therefore the Senate will soon pass the women's equal wage law, giving women equal wages for equal work and protect them against discrimination in respect to employment, of which Senator MORSE, of Oregon, and I are the authors.

Business also should immediately be assured by legislation to become effective as soon as the war is over that taxes are to be reduced so that business shall have an incentive to profit. And both big business and especially little business must be allowed to accumulate investment capital so that they can reconvert and expand in the future. We should pass such tax laws now so that the business community will know what they can count on as they join the battle to serve free enterprise in America as well as democracy.

We should also now enact legislation which will assure that every boy and girl in this country shall have a chance to enjoy the best education he or she can take and there will be no illiteracy in America; no more IV-F's who cannot fight for their country because they haven't had sufficient education; no more boys and girls handicapped in the battle of life because they did not get a chance to train themselves. I want to see a State-Federal loan plan which will make it possible for every boy and girl who doesn't have the money with which to go to school, college, or university, to borrow it on his or her own responsibility and to pay it back as they can. We can't lose money we put into making better citizens.

And we should also now formulate plans so that every man and woman, boy and girl, every child, in this Nation shall have access to a decent hospital and to adequate medical care and dental care, and to pay for it on a monthly basis, unless they are indigent, and if they are to get it from their Federal, State, and local governments.

I can only think of a strong and virile democracy in America if it is made up of healthy and trained citizens.

I have already mentioned a few things which lie in our hopes for the future. The Chinese have a symbol which has a double meaning. It means danger and opportunity. We are not yet out of danger, but never did we look upon such opportunities as stretch out ahead of us now. The present is only a dark corridor through which we will pass into the most progressive future the Nation and the world have ever seen. We now know that we can have peace—that we can stop war—if we will. We know that we can have a chance to live decent lives and to move with some satisfaction down life's highway. We now know that we can in the main have healthy and wholesome lives; that we can have a great and growing country whose magnificence shall grow more marvelous with the unfolding mysteries of nature and science. We now know that man can be free, not only of tyranny but of want and fear. We know that our future is not without us but within us, and that if we but will, we can at long last come into that inheritance which has been the dream of the ages—the good life.

Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Providence Sunday Journal of July 1, of this year. The editorial is entitled "General Marshall."

Mr. President, it has been very seldom, since I have been in the Senate, that I have asked to have a newspaper editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, but this editorial expresses so well my deep personal feelings toward General Marshall that I make the request now. My personal and official relations with General Marshall are such that my respect, and I may say my affection for him, have increased steadily. I have found that he has an extraordinary comprehension of world affairs on the one hand and a magnificient knowledge of details on the other, and that his tactical and personal ability is balanced by his human sympathy with the GI's under him. So I ask that the editorial which expresses my feelings better than I can now express them extemporaneously may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MARSHALL

The generals are coming home from the European war and are receiving the enthusiastic homage of the people of a grateful republic. Without a doubt, they are the finest set of commanders who ever led American forces in any of our wars—efficient masters of modern scientific warfare, with all possessing warm human qualities.

But there is one general who was not a battle commander, who stayed in Washington; yet who is the heart, soul, and spirit of the finest armies this democracy ever raised. He is the reason for these finest armies. There have been no parades for him—he would not want them. There is no popular acclaim for him—he would not wish it. The success of our armies on all fighting fronts traces through all branches and through all commanders to him.

We refer to George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, General of the Army, one of the greatest military leaders of all times, a genuine Democrat, and a gentleman. The United States

need not worry about its greatness when it can raise up a man like General Marshall.

He conceived with precision and imagination the type of army the United States would need to fight in World War II. He personally selected the men to lead it after rigorous tests of ability and character—General Eisenhower was a lieutenant colonel at the time of Pearl Harbor. He planned the specialized training the Army should have. He made the decisions upon equipment, emphasizing characteristically that it was better to save on lives than spare on equipment. He was the sure and honest diplomat who carried the needs and demands of the Army to Congress and, out of that body's respect for his judgment and integrity, he secured the most and the best for the men. He was a member of the staff which plotted the strategy and then left the decisions to carry it out with the men in the field.

He was the ultimate brains behind raising and maintaining the largest military force in the history of the country—and not once, to the knowledge of the public, has such a force or its commanders contravened or sought to dominate the democratic and civil authority. That in itself is a test of a man's greatness as a believer in democratic principles.

A modest man, he has asked for and sought nothing for himself—only the security through victory of his native land. We should all feel humble in the presence of this great American.

Edwards Perpetual Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 53 requests the President of the United States to urge the peace conference following the present war to adopt The Edwards Perpetual Calendar.

This calendar is the creation of Willard Eldridge Edwards, of Honolulu, T. H. It was formally endorsed by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its twenty-second biennial session.

The resolution, which follows, sets forth the advantages of this calendar.

Resolution requesting the President or Congress to propose the adoption of The Edwards Perpetual Calendar by all nations at the peace conference and to propose that all United Nations now appoint a national committee to study The Edwards Perpetual Calendar with a view toward accepting it at the peace conference.

Whereas the present calendar has fundamental defects, summarized as follows:

1. Inequality in the lengths of the months, quarters, and half-years.

(a) The months contain from 28 to 31 days;

(b) The quarters contain, respectively, 90 (91 in leap years), 91, 92, and 92 days;

(c) The first half-year contains 2 or 3 days less than the second half-year.

2. Lack of fixity and regularity.

The calendar is not fixed but changes every year. The year contains 52 weeks plus 1 odd day in usual years and 2 days in leap years. In consequence:

(a) Each year begins and ends on a different day of the week from the preceding year, holidays wander over each day of the week, and dates of periodic events cannot be fixed with precision;

(b) The positions of the weeks in the quarters vary each year, overlapping the divisions of the years and quarters in a different way each time, thus complicating all comparisons, statistics, and accounts;

(c) The extra day of leap year is now credited to February once in 4 years, thus making monthly computations and comparisons even more complex;

(d) Since, from year to year, neither the months nor the years contain the same number of individual week days (i. e., work days), there can be no true statistical or commercial comparisons between one year and another;

(e) The various subdivisions of the year itself, the half-years, quarters, and months are likewise incapable of accurate comparison;

(f) The fifteenth and thirtieth of each month are important dates as regards the falling due and the payment of wages and rents. When these dates are Sundays, the payments must be postponed or advanced;

(g) Under our present system Easter varies between March 22 and April 25, a range of 35 days for the celebration of one anniversary. This causes an annual displacement of all movable festivals and numerous civil disadvantages and inconveniences;

(h) The present calendar does not agree with the universal conception of the seventh day as a day of rest, of Saturday and Sunday as the week end, or of Monday as the first day of the week;

(i) With such a calendar, the loss in time and effort spent in needless computation is almost beyond belief; and

"Whereas The Edwards Perpetual Calendar simplifies the present calendar so as to remove these undisputed defects and result in the following advantages:

1. All months have exactly 26 workdays and are directly comparable. There are also 65 school days in any 3-month period;

2. All quarters have exactly 13 whole weeks, and fractions of weeks at ends of quarters, half years, and years are eliminated. This facilitates the preparation of all Government and other quarterly reports, saving much time and expense;

3. The position of the weeks in the quarters is fixed. The quarters are equal in length and the half years are equal in length. True comparisons can be made, both within the year and between one year and another;

4. Each year begins on New Year's Day, a holiday apart from any week or month, and is followed by Monday, January 1, the second day of the new year and the first workday;

5. The entire calendar becomes fixed and perpetual. Holidays and anniversaries fall on the same weekday each year and court sessions, educational schedules, and all public meetings and periodic events can be fixed with precision;

6. The 15th and 30th of each month always occur on weekdays, coordinating periods of earning and spending and the payments of wages, rents, and bills;

7. Leap-Year Day occurs in leap years as a second holiday apart from any week or month, and is the first day of the second half year;

8. Easter on April 14 follows a provisional bill enacted by the British Parliament in 1928 providing for the stabilization of Easter on the first Sunday after the second Saturday in April (i. e., on or between April 9 and 15);

9. Monday as the first day of the week agrees with common business practice and with the psychological conception of this day. It allows for a rest day after 6 workdays and Saturday and Sunday become the week end in fact;

10. Friday the thirteenth is eliminated from the calendar;

11. It is only necessary to remember 30, 30, 31—Monday, Wednesday, Friday, to be able to compute all future dates;

12. Several 3-day holiday periods are provided throughout the year; and

Whereas the perpetual calendar (also known as The Edwards Calendar) simplifies and revises the calendar scientifically and permanently with no more than 2 days' variation from the present system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-second session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested and urged to propose that The Edwards Perpetual Calendar be adopted by all nations at the peace conference and to propose to all United Nations that they now appoint a national committee to study The Edwards Perpetual Calendar with a view toward its acceptance at the peace conference.

The Edwards Perpetual Calendar

*New Year's Day (a day apart from any week or month) is the first day of each year, followed by the 364-day equal-quarter fixed calendar shown below:

JANUARY							FEBRUARY							MARCH						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

APRIL							MAY							JUNE						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

*Leap-Year Day (a second day apart) is observed only in leap years between June 31 and July 1 as the first day of the second half-year, an international holiday.

JULY							AUGUST							SEPTEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5			*		1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

OCTOBER							NOVEMBER							DECEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

*These 2 year-days, far from being "blank days," are definitely named and have a definite purpose. Considered apart from any week, they allow the calendar to become fixed and perpetual.

The OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me today to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I present for insertion an article in the New York Sun for Saturday, June 30, 1945, by George E. Sokolsky titled "The OPA":

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE OPA

No matter what politics ultimately does to the OPA, this much is clear: The OPA has lost the confidence of enough of the American people to require that a new agency of Government handle the food of the Nation. Congress might pass and the President might sign the bill extending the life of OPA, but that will not restore confidence in an agency which the people are daily learning to distrust. Shortages not only in meat and sugar but in articles of clothing are irking a Nation which has had no other explanation than that the black market is more powerful than the Government. A people whose sons have defeated Hitler's army and are defeating the Japanese cannot accept the impotence of a Government agency at home with equanimity.

The Hoover amendment is sound to the extent that it places responsibility for the food of the people in the Department of Agriculture, where it belongs. Clinton P. Anderson, the prospective Secretary of Agriculture, says that he does not want to be a policeman. But the American people want to eat the food they raise, and it is the obligation of Government to eliminate waste, hoarding, corruption, abuse of authority, and any other impediment to a proper distribution of food.

Were we a nation like England that had to import much of its food, we would have to face the consequences of geography. Were we a nation like Germany that had been defeated in war, we would have to face the consequences of failure. But we are the granary of the world. We possess an enormous population of cattle. We are rich beyond the dreams of most of the human race. We dare not admit that under our form of government it is impossible to devise a system of distribution of commodities that actually exist, adequate to the needs of the people. If this is an exhibition of the ability of the welfare state, it is to our advantage to know now how incompetent such a state is as compared with the normal operations of enterprise unfettered by State control.

President Truman has inherited the OPA, the WFA and all the agencies which inhibit the movement of food. He continues to take the position that he will sustain the Roosevelt policies. Nevertheless, one of his earliest acts of departure from the rigidities of the controlled state was the appointment of a new Secretary of Agriculture who, when he takes office, will have expanded powers over food. The House of Representatives has already increased those powers. The House responded to the will of the country. There are still partisans of confusion who, in spite of indisputable evidence, wish to adhere to a system because it was established in an administration which they admired. Such orthodoxy, if applied to other measures by opposite-minded persons, would be called reactionary.

The OPA is unfortunate because it was conceived in error and perpetuated by incompetence. Before it came into existence both Herbert Hoover and Bernard Baruch advised the necessity of dealing with food as an over-all proposition, not to be segmented into several differing and conflicting agencies. This advice was rejected. Instead, under Leon Henderson, a complicated bureaucracy was erected which became so elephantine that, as much as Mr. Roosevelt liked Henderson, a change in the leadership of that Administration had to be made. The present incumbent, Chester Bowles, inherited a faulty law, an incompetent Administration, and an unfocused program. He has not been able to save the situation and it has degenerated until now even the Democrats in the House of Representatives rebel against its continuance in its present form.

The simplest way is to turn it all into the Department of Agriculture. This is in keeping, anyhow, with President Truman's program for the reorganization of Government which must come sooner or later. The sooner this change, the more satisfactory.

Reciprocity a World Starter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind.:

RECIPROCITY A WORLD STARTER

The first of the after-the-war plans has gone through Congress—the reciprocity tariff bill. This law permits the President to reduce tariffs now in effect 50 percent for the purpose of encouraging the revival of trade.

The reciprocity principle has been in use long enough so that there is no longer any question about its practicability. It removes restrictions against the flow of goods from one country to another and thereby helps to create an improved economy.

For a time there seemed to be some doubt whether the bill extending the Reciprocity Act would be passed. High-tariff advocates ganged up on Congress, but they turned out to be merely the backwash of old times and were brushed aside.

We are learning from experience and we are refusing to be led by slogans which have no meaning. The reciprocity measure is part of the foundation of the new international order. Without it commerce could not develop as it must if the international order is to have economic health.

Economists are pretty well agreed that many tariff rates have been raised to unconscionable heights merely to enable the raising of prices. The purpose of the act is to make rates reasonable so that prices of goods may be reasonable. Along with the Bretton Woods proposals, tax revision, the new League of Nations, the Reciprocity Act may may well be a starter toward world progress and prosperity.

There is no complete agreement this will happen. Some sincere advocates of high tariffs remain. Nevertheless it seems to be true that most modern businessmen do not retain the old viewpoint. They have learned that American methods of production are so much more efficient than those of any other nation that the old argument of protecting the wages of labor has no substance.

It is doubtful if our own industrial leaders realized before this war how superior our methods are to those of any other nation. But we have the proof now and the knowledge of it is widespread. We are on the way to a trial of low tariffs, possibly very low ones. The proof of their efficacy alone will determine future action.

For these is nothing sacred about a low tariff, nor a no tariff, nor a high one. What we want from tariff rates is national income and protection for necessary industries which cannot stand alone. But it is a distinct national weakness to raise tariff rates to protect vested interests of any kind.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to a resolution which has been introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] and myself which reads as follows:

Whereas it is proposed to enact a law forthwith which would compel all physically qualified young men to submit to 1 year of military training, away from home; and

Whereas millions of citizens at home and in the armed services are deeply and vitally interested and opportunity for expression of opinion should be afforded them on this important issue; and

Whereas the present war will ultimately end in victory for our beloved Nation and the urgent need for the pending legislation has not been clearly stated and expression by the people seems highy desirable: Be it

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution the President of the United States shall certify to the governor of each State, for submission to the voters in the next congressional election, the following question:

"Do you favor the passage of a law by the Congress of the United States to compel 1 year of military training for young men in time of peace? Yes ____. No ____."

I believe that a national referendum is the most democratic method yet conceived to decide any national issue. Since a referendum that would be conclusive is not now possible, the next best step, in my opinion, would be the certification by all of the States to the people of those States of one very simple but very important question: Do you favor universal military training during peacetime for male citizens between the ages of 17 and 22 years?

Such a procedure would be in effect a national poll of public opinion, the result of which would not be binding on any individual or on any body. Since the earliest date for citizens to ballot would be the spring of 1946, this poll would have the effect of delaying final decision on this momentous question for at least another year. In that period public opinion will take more definite shape, and the people of this country will have had

time to view the facts stripped of propaganda or prejudice of one kind or another. Perhaps the most important result that would flow from the adoption of this resolution would be the creation of an opportunity for the members of our armed forces to have a voice in the matter. Certainly their experiences in the military field will make their opinions the more important.

The only committee which has gone into the question of universal military training to date in the House is its Committee on Postwar Military Policy. This committee is very largely composed of members of the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee of the House. It is probable, and it indeed would be most unusual if some of these Members were not to lean toward the opinions of our high-ranking military and naval officers, most of whom have already expressed themselves as being in favor of universal military training. To date, the committee considering the subject has given most of its time to "brass hats," college professors, and individuals who presume to represent the attitude of church groups and various other kinds of organizations. The viewpoint of the average person has not been adequately presented, and to any appreciable extent, will not be, unless he has the use of the ballot to express that viewpoint. For my part, I want to know what the average person and the GI Joes thing about this whole matter. It may be that the majority of them will take the attitude that if universal military training is to be considered at all it should be an all-inclusive consideration, embracing not only conscription of the individual who has to carry the gun, but also conscription of all resources of the country. It may be however, that they have no inclination to see any form of conscription enacted into law.

Who can complain, then, about the adoption of this resolution if its only purpose is to find out what the people want insofar as this legislation is concerned. Mail received by Members of Congress indicates that the people of this country are far from being unanimous on the question of compulsory military training. Individual polls have already been conducted by Congressmen, but because of the cost and lack of supervision as exercised by formal balloting, the results are unsatisfactory. Without some form of plebiscite no Member can possibly be aware of the wishes of the majority of the people of this country on this controversial issue.

Again I wish to emphasize the fact that this question is too important to be hurriedly resolved. Our national welfare, as well as the welfare of millions of individual Americans is involved. The attitude with which other nations will view our action is likewise of importance now. Time must be given our people to coolly deliberate every phase of this situation, and a medium such as the one proposed by this resolution should be made available in order that they may record their conclusions.

A national referendum or poll would assure this, and moreover, it would create a more satisfied and united feeling among us all, regardless of the final action on the legislation, if all of us were entitled to a say-so on the issue.

What Unconditional Surrender Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Unconditional Surrender Means," written by Felix Morley. Felix Morley is president of Hamilton College and was formerly editor of the Washington Post. The article appears in the June 27, 1945, issue of Human Events.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER MEANS

(By Felix Morley)

The doctrine of unconditional surrender, politically speaking, means the complete elimination of one government through the force exercised by its opponents. By right of conquest, all authority is then transferred to the victors, operating through their military organization. In terms of human relationships, this means that people who have been subject to the laws of one sovereignty become, without any choice of their own, subject to the military decrees of another.

Except where permanent conquest was intended by one belligerent, as in the struggle between Great Britain and the Boer Republics, unconditional surrender has seldom been demanded in modern warfare. The omission has not been due to humanitarian considerations, but solely to realistic statesmanship. When a belligerent surrenders unconditionally its entire system of government goes into liquidation. Full responsibility for maintaining minimum conditions of life and order in the conquered territory is then transferred to the victors. Few governments, unless they contemplate annexation of the defeated area, are anxious to assume a burden likely to weigh so heavily on their own taxpayers.

By contrast, the case of a civil war always demands a policy of unconditional surrender on the part of the government against which rebellion is directed. The only alternative to the complete subjection of the rebels is to permit them to take over the state or to form a separate sovereignty by secession. The latter was the choice eventually made by Great Britain in the American Revolution. In the war of 1861-65, on the other hand, the Federal Government insisted on the unconditional surrender and complete liquidation of the Confederacy.

Unconditional surrender was exacted from the Confederacy, and from various Indian tribes whose subjection by the United States fell in the category of colonial rather than international wars. Otherwise, until the present war, no American Government has ever sought to eliminate the government of its adversaries. We have, on the contrary, been active in mediating between the governments of other belligerents, as in the peace between Russia and Japan negotiated and signed at Portsmouth, N. H., in 1905.

II

It is natural that the full implications of a policy of unconditional surrender should not be apparent during the course of hostilities. While the fighting is going on, there is no encouragement to public consideration of what will follow military victory. The propaganda effort concentrates on the horrible consequences of failing to achieve military success. And any suggestion that the most satisfactory victory may quite possibly be obtained by negotiation with the enemy government is likely to be shouted down. Good sense, however, is often shouted down in wartime.

So far as the United States is concerned, the present war is being fought in two stages. Unconditional surrender has been successfully imposed on Germany, and is as yet only projected for Japan. Consequently it is possible to see how the policy is working out where it has been successfully applied. Examination of the European picture will give some insight into the probable results in Asia, if, as and when the Japanese Government is obliterated as in the case of Germany.

There is, additionally, the effect of a policy of unconditional surrender on the citizens of the government which demands that end. Before a people can exact unconditional surrender from the enemy they must themselves be prepared to surrender unconditionally to the wartime practices of their own government. The more arduous the war, the greater the extent of that domestic surrender.

Regimentation by one's own government is, of course, preferable to the triumph of the opponent. But complete subordination of the individual to the State is a heavy price to pay for victory in a society based on the principle that government is made for man—not man for government. The unconditional surrender of the enemy must bring very positive advantages for the victorious people if its gains are to outweigh the risks inherent in the surrender of liberties at home.

This latter surrender is naturally depicted as a transient and temporary sacrifice. Whether it will prove so depends on many factors over which the consoling assurances of officialdom have little control. The men who are fighting for our liberties, however, are generally grimly determined that these liberties shall not be lost at home.

III

Germany has surrendered unconditionally and as a natural consequence all German Government has ceased to exist. The effort of Admiral Doenitz to form a regime which would survive the military collapse might not have been successful with Allied support. But its enforced dissolution has left Germany without any government of its own. In the words of our Department of State:

"By the declaration made at Berlin on June 5 the Governments of the United States, United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Provisional Government of the French Republic have assumed supreme authority with respect to Germany."

In politics, as well as in physics, nature abhors a vacuum. The political vacuum existing in Germany, and in the adjacent area which the German Government dominated, is therefore being filled, and quickly. The agency filling the vacuum most effectively is naturally that victorious government most conveniently placed and best prepared for the political operation.

That agency, obviously, is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, operating through its ingenious federal formula, giving a large degree of autonomy to satellite socialist republics not yet formally a part of the Soviet Union, so long as they meet the essential condition of subordination to the general policies of Moscow. To criticize or condemn the Russians for moving into the German vacuum is as idle as it would be to condemn the wind for pouring through an open window. The westward movement of

Russia is at least as much the result of our policy of unconditional surrender as it is of any imperialistic design on Stalin's part.

That westward movement will absorb all of Germany probably permanently, which is not garrisoned by effective American, British, and French armies. And if those armies are withdrawn before stable government is built in the districts they hold, these western parts of Germany will also come under Russian control, not because the Kremlin planned it that way, but simply because nature abhors a vacuum.

Given similar conditions in the Far East, precisely the same outcome must and should be anticipated there. If Japan is battered into collapse as Germany was, the territory under Japanese control will then pass under the effective government of the neighbor most competent to exercise political power. In politics, as in physics, a vacuum is most readily filled from a contiguous area.

That China, deficient in nationalist organization and torn between rival political factions, would fill the far eastern vacuum is most improbable. Here again it would be Russia, which borders most of the Asiatic mainland under Japanese control, that would most easily move in. The assurances of Under Secretary Grew that Russia has not been promised control of Korea are meaningless. If Japanese Government in Manchukuo and Korea collapses, somebody will take over. It will not be the Manchus, and it will not be the Koreans.

Japan is apparently as yet a long distance from military collapse. Premier Suzuki still feels it possible to refer publicly to our unconditional surrender policy as "boastful talk." The dreadful toll exacted from our troops on the outpost of Okinawa is indication of the bitterness of the fighting that lies ahead as we approach the heart of the Nipponese Empire. If no terms are offered the Japanese, it is quite possible that their armies will resist on the Asiatic mainland even if all the home islands are laboriously and bloodily taken over.

But the destruction of Japan's economy from the air proceeds apace, and if the eventual collapse of enemy resistance of enemy resistance there can be little doubt. Unconditional surrender can be enforced on Japan, as on Germany, if that is what we really want and are prepared to face the consequences.

Evaluation of those consequences may be obtained by watching closely the results, so far as Europe is concerned, of the identical policy successfully applied against Germany. Only 2 months have passed since Germany's unconditional surrender. It is too soon to pass judgment with any sense of finality. But it seems all too clear that American ideals and political methods are not destined to fill a significant part of the vacuum that was Germany.

Another Principle at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of July 2:

ANOTHER PRINCIPLE AT STAKE

During his filibuster against the FEPC appropriation in the Senate, Senator BILBO, of Mississippi, said he was fighting for a principle. According to his lights, he was. The whole FEPC controversy is so tied up with other things—local conditions, local traditions, State sovereignty, the rights of minorities, and the rights of individuals, and the Negro vote in national elections—that almost anybody who is for or against the legislation can base his position on principle.

Yet, the fact remains that a defeat of an appropriation to continue the work of the FEPC will mean that a minority in Congress has been able to repudiate an organized attempt in this country to work toward breaking down racial and religious prejudices, the effect of which is to retard, if not to deny, equality of economic opportunity among our citizens. That will be the cardinal principle established if the minority in Congress opposed to the appropriation wins.

There are reasonable, wise, and good men on both sides of this controversy. The extremists have made a reconciliation of views more difficult. Establishment of the FEPC was a makeshift expedient in the beginning and in some cases it has functioned neither wisely nor too well. But the principle for which it stands is clear enough, and to disown it now is to put the National Government in a position—however temporary it may be—that is injurious to national morality.

AP Membership Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary Ind.:

AP MEMBERSHIP CASE

The Supreme Court has decided in favor of Marshall Field's contention that the Associated Press cannot refuse to sell its news service in any locality simply because the established newspaper does not want competition. Heretofore any member has had the veto power against the admission of new members in its territory.

The decision does not order the AP to sell its service to every buyer but merely to give up this one criterion of membership. It may be hard to determine in each case the exact basis for use of the veto but inasmuch as the lower court retains jurisdiction in the case some workable plan of procedure can be developed.

This has been a difficult case to decide and there are good arguments on both sides. It is true there are services other than AP that newspapers may buy, so it is not essential to publish AP news. Yet the chief force of this argument lies in the evening field. It is a fact that the AP morning service is supreme and that a newspaper without it is handicapped.

Although the majority of the court (the case was decided 5 to 3) did not adopt Justice Frankfurter's argument that the business of a newspaper is affected by a public interest which is totally different from other businesses, yet that is undoubtedly true. Newspapers exist only if they are successful businesses in a financial sense but their fundamental reason for being is to perform a public service.

Unfortunately some newspaper owners do not realize they are not in the peanut business. They conduct their newspapers simply to make a profit despite considerable talk about freedom of the press and other big sounding phrases. Furthermore, a lot of newspapermen have talked so much about freedom of the press that they imagine it means freedom for newspapers to do as they please.

Freedom of the press is one of the essential elements of American democracy. The American newspaper is the best and fairest newspaper in the world, and that is one reason our democracy is the best in the world. Nevertheless, the newspaper is not perfect and it never will be, but there seems to be no reason to think the newspapers of any other country will surpass it in foreseeable time.

The Supreme Court decision is a development of the times, and it suggests more emphasis on public service and less on the profit motive. Yet there is nothing sordid in newspaper profits unless made so by overemphasis by newspaper owners.

Every newspaper man knows that freedom of the press is not a slogan owned by newspapers but is a principle to defend in the interests of democracy. Let's drop the slogan idea and get back to first principles. When we do the Supreme Court may let us alone.

The Freedom Our Boys Died for

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, each day I receive letters from boys in service asking just what is it they are asked to die for. The following article will perhaps answer these letters better than anything I know:

Liberated Poland, as every other country in the Russian zone of Europe, is under complete blackout. The only news given is heavily censored in Moscow. We are, however, able to give here a few uncensored items received lately from Poland by the Polish Government in London and published in the Dziennik Polski (Polish Daily).

"Electioneering: The Polish Communist Party is preparing for elections in Poland and is fighting the reactionaries by every possible means. 'Reactionaries' are all opponents of the Communists, particularly the Socialists.

"It is reported that courses in Polish are being held in Russia for larger numbers of people who are to be transferred to Polish territory to strengthen the position of the Polish Communist Party at the elections. The date of the elections is to be kept secret up to the last moment.

"Pacification: On May 14 the NKVD (Russian Secret Police) and the Lublin People's Militia began arresting large numbers of young people in the province of Bialystok. During the round-ups, villages were surrounded by detachments of NKVD with machine guns. Anyone trying to escape was shot on the spot.

"In this way arrests were made in the following places:

"In the villages of Wisniowek, Jablonka, and Uszynskie—25 people.

"In the villages of Kolalno, Undy and Debniki-Czarnowo—120 people.

"In the village of Skarzyn—10 people; during the round-ups it was said that a search was being made for former soldiers of the disbanded home army; 10 people were shot while trying to escape.

"The village of Kamionka-Bory was plundered and set on fire; all the inhabitants, except those who managed to escape, were arrested.

"Mass arrests of the peaceful countryfolk have resulted in many districts in a general exodus to the woods. The Soviet authorities

have therefore begun clearing up whole wooded areas with the help of the army, supported by artillery, tanks, and planes. On May 10, 11, 12, and 13, numerous Soviet squadrons of fighters and bombers, mostly of American types, bombed and machine-gunned all the woods in the province of Bialystok, in some cases using heavy artillery as well.

"Such pacification has also been carried out on a large scale in the Lublin area, with particular violence in the districts of Wlodawa, Biligoraj and Hrubieszow; in the vicinity of Wola Wereszczynska in the Chelm district, and of Wolka Kanska, Wojniaki and Siedliszcze, all in the Krasnystaw district; and in the neighborhood of Mietki, in the Zemosc district. Near Wasewo, in the Ostrow Wazowiecki district, a detachment of the NKVD razed a village to the ground.

"One night, in the second half of April, 15 men were shot without trial by the NKVD in Siedlice. Their corpses were hung in public places near the entrances to the town.

"In the province of Cracow, mass round-ups are taking place in the villages; in Cracow itself large numbers of people were arrested in April, including some foreigners.

"Reports sent from Poland in the middle of May speak of clashes between the Citizens' Militia (a special guard formed by the Polish Communist Party) and the Russians. The Citizens' Militia refuse to act against their own countrymen.

"In Myslenice fighting broke out between the citizens' militia and the Russian detachment which had sent them to carry out the pacification of the district. In the districts of Rzeszow, Limanowa, and Miechow pacification measures are still in progress.

"Deportations: Former soldiers of the home army who have either been caught or revealed themselves to the Russians are still being deported to the east. If they try to escape during the journey or from prison their families are also arrested and deported. The following batches of deportees have left Cracow for the east: March 23, 50 truckloads; March 25, 3 trainloads; March 27, 1 trainload; March 30, 1 trainload; April 1, 30 truckloads.

"Nine hundred women soldiers of the disbanded home army have been arrested by the NKVD in the German prisoner of war camp at Muhlberg on the Elbe and deported to Russia.

"Confiscations: It is reported from various sources that large quantities of machinery, especially factory plants, are being sent eastward. As far as the Silesian foundries are concerned, 300 machine tools were taken from the Zgoda foundry; the whole war production plant from the Boildon foundry, all the machine tools and the majority of technical machinery, including engines, from the Batory foundry, and most of the machinery from the Pilsudski, Zygmunt, and Bankowa foundries. The armament plant has been removed from the Cegielski Works in Poznan and textile machinery from the industrial town of Bielsko.

"The railways in Poland are under Russian military control, and it has been announced that the railway officials will be held collectively responsible for their efficient running.

"Mobilization: Despite the end of war in Europe, mobilization into Zymierski's Army (the Polish army under Russian command) still continues. On May 26 posters appeared in the streets of Warsaw announcing the call-up to the army of the following categories: (1) Men born between 1921 and 1925 (five age groups); (2) reserve nco's up to the age of 40; (3) regular nco's up to the age of 45; (4) officers of the reserve up to the age of 45; (5) regular officers up to the age of 50; (6) specialists; (7) women doctors, dentists, pharmacists, and nurses up to the age of 40.

"Hitherto conscription has been carried out by means of individual call-up papers, sent out in large quantities.

"Those wishing to become cadets are directed to military training schools in Russia; the artillery to Rostow; the air force to Orel, and Kiev; the fleet air arm to Odessa; signals and engineers to Vladimir.

"A school of political science has been opened in Lublin to train agitators and political commissars for Zymierski's army.

"During a march the whole officers' school at Majdanek (Chelm district) revolted and escaped into the woods. They fought a pitched battle against detachments of a penal expedition, supported by artillery and tanks.

"The Council of National Unity and the Polish Government's delegate in Poland have appealed to the Poles not to defend themselves, whatever the provocation, against the Lublin and Soviet detachments, but to leave the woods and return to normal life. The appeal refers not only to the men who have escaped into the woods to avoid mobilization, but is intended to calm the whole population."

Congressional Medals of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD two citations for the Congressional Medal of Honor. Both of these winners of the Medal of Honor are young men from my Congressional District, Westmoreland County, Pa. Unfortunately, the one hero died in the gallant action for which he has been honored; the other fights on in the Pacific.

It is rather unusual that two of the Nation's highest awards should fall to one congressional district. Throughout the country there have been approximately 170 such awards from the Army, and Pennsylvania claims 19 of them, the highest number for any one State. Westmoreland County is proud of her two young heroes who have been so deservedly rewarded for their extraordinary valor.

The citations follow:

MEDAL OF HONOR—POSTHUMOUS

"Staff Sgt. Alvin P. Carey, Army serial No. 33031035, Company K, Thirty-eighth Infantry, Army of the United States. On August 23, 1944, Sergeant Carey, leader of a machine-gun section, was advancing with his company in the attack of the strongly held enemy Hill 154, near Plougastel, Brittany, France. The advance was held up when the attacking units were pinned down by intense enemy machine-gun fire from a pillbox 200 yards up the hill. From his position covering the right flank, Sergeant Carey displaced his guns to an advanced position and then, upon his own initiative, armed himself with as many hand grenades as he could carry, and without regard for his personal safety, started alone up the hill toward the pillbox. Crawling forward under its withering fire, he had proceeded 150 yards when he met a German rifleman, whom he killed with his carbine. Continuing his steady forward movement until he reached grenade-throwing distance, he hurled his grenades at the pillbox opening in the face of an intense fire which wounded him mortally. Undaunted, he gathered his strength and continued his grenade attack until one entered and exploded within the pillbox, killing the occupants and putting their guns out of action. Inspired by Sergeant Carey's heroic act, the riflemen quickly occupied the position and overpowered the remaining enemy resistance in the vicinity."

Date of award: March 28, 1945.

Born: Lycippus, Pa., August 16, 1916.

Residence at enlistment: Laughlintown, Pa.

Widow: Mrs. Anna M. Carey, General Delivery, Laughlintown, Pa.

MEDAL OF HONOR

"Maj. William A. Shomo, O439677, Air Corps, Army of the United States. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty over Luzon, Philippine Islands, on January 11, 1945. Major Shomo was lead pilot of a flight of two fighter planes charged with an armed photographic and strafing mission against the Aparri and Laoag airdromes. While en route to the objective he observed an enemy twin-engine bomber, protected by 12 fighters, flying about 2,500 feet above him and in the opposite direction. Although the odds were 13 to 2 Major Shomo immediately ordered an attack. Accompanied by his wingman he closed on the enemy formation in a climbing turn and scored hits on the leading plane of the third element, which exploded in midair. Major Shomo then attacked the second element from the left side of the formation and shot another fighter down in flames. When the enemy formed for counterattack Major Shomo moved to the other side of the formation and hit a third fighter which exploded and fell. Diving below the bomber he put a burst into its under side and it crashed and burned. Pulling up from this pass he encountered a fifth plane firing head on and destroyed it. He next dived upon the first element and shot down the lead plane; then diving to 300 feet in pursuit of another fighter he caught it with his initial burst and it crashed in flames. During this action his wingman had shot down three planes, while the three remaining enemy fighters had fled into a cloud-bank and escaped. Major Shomo's extraordinary gallantry and intrepidity in attacking such a far superior force and destroying seven enemy aircraft in one action is unparalleled in the Southwest Pacific area."

Date of award: March 1, 1945.

Organization: Eighty-second Tactical Reconnaissance Squadron.

Born: Jeannette, Pa., May 30, 1918.

Residence at appointment: Huff Post Office, Pa.

Shall We Have Storm Troopers in the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask some Members of the House, as well as all good Americans, a very important question. That question is as follows: Shall we have storm troopers in the United States?

By that question, I simply intend to inquire whether we shall sit by idly and complacently while there is pending in the Congress a proposal to create a bu-

reaucratic dictatorship with an army and militia to threaten the American people. Many good people do not realize that such a proposal is now pending in Congress and that many good Americans are unconsciously supporting such un-American legislation.

I am speaking of the proposal to create a permanent FEPC. Under sections 4 and 10 of the proposed FEPC bill, we would create a bureaucratic agency with full power and authority to select the members of our armed forces, who are employees of the War and Navy Departments, and the members of our State militias, who are employees of the respective States.

All of this is fully explained in the speech which I made in the House of Representatives of the United States on Tuesday, June 26, under the following title: "Shall We Lay the Heavy Hand of the FEPC Bureaucracy Upon Our Churches, Schools, and Fraternal Orders; Upon Our Courts, Local Elections, and Local Government; Upon Our Merchants and Our Farmers?"

If you have not already done so, I hope you will read that speech in order that you may be fully aware of the new form of government which we are about to create by means of a bill which is disguised under a high-sounding title.

What Unity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop:

WHAT "UNITY"?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Just how these propaganda tag-lines get accepted is something we'd like to know more about. As, for instance, this now widely circulated label, "Government of National Unity," hung on the lasted Moscow production for Poland. This Moscow outfit may be anything else, but "national unity" for Poles, it is not.

Just to get the facts straight about it all, let's go back to the beginning.

In 1939, Poland had a set of boundaries, a constitution and a going government. Hitler made demands on Poland from one side, Russia from the other. The Poles wanted neither Hitler not Stalin.

So they made an iron-clad treaty with England and France to the effect that Poland would give up nothing to any menace on any side, and in return England and France would give Poland every possible military and financial weapon of help.

It was a case of "let's you and him fight," with the added attraction of "I'll not only hold your coat, but help you, too."

So the Poles told Hitler to go to hell. Whereupon Hitler signed a deal with Stalin in August 1939, and the two of them within a month were all over Poland.

The Polish Government, under the pulverizing of the joint Russo-German assault, arranged itself into two parts—one an administration in exile and, two, an underground party in Poland itself, always in contact with the government in exile.

This government in exile, which finally settled in London after many adventures, was no phony.

For one thing, it was in constant contact with the people of Poland, and individual members were always coming and going between the exile headquarters and the fighting front at home. Hard up as they were under the heels of the conquerors, Poles in Poland issued bonds, raised money and carried on their own local government as a branch of the London exile concern.

More than that, they raised an army that battled "in exile," if you like that description, just as hard as the Poles fought who stayed at home. The "exile" army of Poland has fought in Africa, in Italy, in the air over Germany and across France, right in on the German soil itself.

And Polish boys in the exile army got killed just like any other boys in any other fighting army.

The older men in the Polish exile government at London didn't have any fun, either. Their job was a tough and perilous one that took them in and out of danger zones regularly.

Furthermore, that "exile" government in London was recognized from the outset by this country and Britain as the true Government of Poland.

Well, after Hitler and Stalin had each got what he wanted in the early stages of this great war of liberation, Hitler turned on his old pal, Joe.

With the aid first of American lend-lease and British chipping away (also plenty of lend-lease there), and finally the grand climactic joint war, with the United States furnishing more than 70 percent of the troops in the west, not to mention astronomical tonnages of supplies east and west. So Hitler was pulled down.

While all this was going on, the Poles stuck faithfully to the war. Nobody has yet come up with a Polish Quisling who said that Hitler was right and Germany should rule Poland.

All the Poles said was that Poland should be free of Germany and Russia.

But the Russians didn't see it that way.

As fast as Hitler was beaten out of Poland, the Reds moved in to finish the job of destroying Poland once and for all.

First, they set up a phony government at Lublin, in eastern Poland, of obscure Communists and Communist sympathizers. Then, at Yalta, Stalin promised to put the Lublin crowd aside in favor of a broader government more representative of Poles of all political shades and leanings, at home and abroad.

That's what he promised. And so the Poles abroad began to hunt around for a point of contact with him. It was finally arranged in early March for some representatives of the exile government, then working in Poland with the underground, to come out and do business with Stalin.

The British Government was the go-between. The Poles came out as accredited diplomatic agents of their Government—and the Russians hauled them off in United States lend-lease trucks under arrest for a phony treason trial. Said the Poles were working against the Red Army.

In time it was shown, even at the phony trial, that the Poles were not working against anybody. They were simply working for Poland and only wanted their country as free of Germany as of Russia.

But the smear was on, and the Polish Government at London was kept out of the San Francisco World Peace Conference. Also, it was only at the insistence of Secretary of State Stettinius that the Russians were kept from trying to drag the Lublin racket into the San Francisco sessions.

Now, after that is all over, Moscow produces another government of Poland—openly made in Moscow.

And puts it up to us to recognize same as official. And the label "government of national unity" is hung on this Moscow agency by Communist hand-outs, and respectable press associations which are supposed not to editorialize their dispatches blithely send it along that way.

They also send the news that Russia has "annexed" part of Poland's neighbor, Czechoslovakia, "with the Czech's consent."

Meanwhile, the Polish army in exile sends notice it won't take orders from this newest Moscow production. What unity?

Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the postwar period, due to the cancellation of contracts for war materials, there will be an end to hundreds of thousands of jobs. Only jobs with a pay check for millions of Americans can prevent Nation-wide unemployment, another disastrous depression. In my judgment, there is no necessity for actual suffering, but many of us will have to end the waste, the extravagance, the artificial scale of living which we have been practicing. Many things which have been called necessities are, in reality, luxuries—nonessentials, things we can do without, and yet be happy, well fed, well clothed, live in decent homes and obtain an education for our children.

But there must be jobs; there must be a willingness to work; there must be a willingness to save; and common sense must be used in our way of living. If we use common sense and good judgment, we will not be reduced to living on potatoes without gravy, eating black bread without butter. We can even have our cake, though it may be without frosting, but we will have to follow some of the saving practices so common among our ancestors. We will be unable to go to a show, a beer parlor, spend half of a night in a dance-and-dine place, but the loss of all that will not affect our health, nor will it bring about any overwhelming, unbearable condition. We may not be able to spend every waking moment in feverish activity, driving hell-bent to some distant place and, after arriving there, start off to some other destination. We may have more time for home work, for study, for improvement, for visiting with the members of our family and our neighbors, for going to church of a Sunday, and discussing sanely and intelligently some of the problems not only of our own lives but of those which affect the present and the future welfare of our Nation.

Yes, we will need jobs and pay checks—hundreds of thousands of them. There are just two ways in which those jobs can be provided. Some advocate that the Government from—to use a current

expression—"womb to tomb" care for every individual, whether he works, makes a pretense of working, or just frankly and openly loafs. That system, as we all know, means regimentation, the end of a people's government, a dictatorship, and finally, tyranny. This being theoretically, at least, a free government, our people—if they want that sort of procedure—can have it. If they take it, in my judgment, they will be for a time, a happier, apparently more prosperous, but—in the end—a wiser and a sadder people.

The other way of providing jobs and pay checks is to so continue our Government as to afford the individuals the opportunity to—in the future as they have in the past—create jobs and meet pay rolls. That can only be accomplished if the Government here at Washington permits the creators of jobs, those who make possible the continuation of jobs and who know how and are willing to make good a pay check, an opportunity to make a profit. Otherwise, there would be no incentive for the individual to create a job.

Of course, practices interfering with the welfare of the people as a whole, the piling up of exorbitant profits, should not be permitted, but beyond that the Government should not go, if private enterprise is to continue. There must be, if we are to endure as a free, independent people, equal justice under law. There cannot and there will not be equal justice under law if any organization or any group of organizations is permitted to decide who shall and who shall not work; is to hold a monopoly of jobs once they are created.

"YELLOW DOG" CONTRACTS

There was a time prior to 1935 when employers were permitted to compel employees to sign a contract that they would not become or remain a member of a labor organization. Those contracts were described as "yellow dog" contracts and Congress, by the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1935, outlawed them.

Today the pendulum has swung so far the other way that we have the closed-shop contract, the maintenance-of-membership contract, various other forms of contracts, all of which in the end, in substance, operate so as to prevent a man getting or holding a job unless he belongs to a union. Formerly, a man could not get a job nor hold a job if he belonged to a union. Today, in many instances, a man cannot get a job nor hold a job unless he belongs to the union. The Government has given its sanction to that form of a contract, and it has created a monopoly over labor, giving to the unions the right to deny to American citizens the opportunity of earning a livelihood, unless the citizen complies with union demands.

When there comes a scarcity of jobs—as there will when the war is over—if many of the women continue in industrial employment and Government contracts are canceled, then the unions will have a monopoly over jobs and will be able, as some of them have been able in the past, to exact tribute from the worker as a condition precedent to employment. In that period, as all too often now, if a worker wants bread or clothing for his wife or his children, before he can obtain it through the medium of a pay check; he must first pay tribute to a union.

The practice of the unions and the sanctioning of their activities by the administration, especially by the NLRB and the WLB, have not only created an extralegal body which levies what might be called taxes for the support of the unions but have enabled certain unions to—so far as the Federal Government is concerned—carry on open racketeering by means of violence.

It is all very well to say, as does the constitution of Russia, that the individual has a right to a job. It is equally true that either the Government or an individual, partnership, corporation, or association, must create that job. If the individual, the partnership, the association or the corporation is denied the right to make a profit out of creating a job, to give that job to the individual of his or its choice, few indeed will be those who are disposed to deny themselves in order to create capital to invest in the creation of new jobs. If the individual is not permitted to have some voice in the decision as to who shall work in the job he creates, as well might it be said that one segment of the population should sow or plant the grain, the trees, while another determines who shall harvest the crop, pick and use the fruit.

Creators of jobs are just as necessary to a national economy, to the existence of our Nation as a whole and of the individual therein, as is the worker. It is a significant fact that while some employers have disregarded the welfare of the workers, many union leaders have acted as though they thought the only function of an employer was to furnish a job, meet a pay roll, and that the sole responsibility of the union official was to see that the employer did not make a profit for himself or his stockholders.

While union leaders and spokesmen must realize that there can be no jobs until someone creates them, and while they have been loud in their insistence that they know what wage can and should be paid, how many hours should be worked by the employee and are quite sure as to the conditions under which the workers should carry on, they have never—so far as I know—successfully established and maintained an enterprise which furnished jobs, paid the wages they thought were adequate under working conditions which they deemed essential.

Just as an employer might well be required to take a job in an industrial plant and live on the wage paid the worker so that he might acquire a first-hand knowledge of how the employee can best perform his work in justice to himself and with profit to the employer, so, too, might some of those in control of unions and of union funds, reaching into the millions of dollars, with profit be required to gain a first-hand knowledge of what it takes to establish and to carry on successfully an industry or a mercantile business by establishing and operating one.

There is much talk about cooperation between labor and management, between workers and employers, and beyond question such cooperation based upon discussion has accomplished a great deal. More, much more good and progress might well result if, on occasion, employers and employees would exchange duties and responsibilities.

Repeated strikes during the war, when wages far beyond those paid in any prior period have been available to employees, have demonstrated that either union leadership does not realize the situation or is unable to control radical elements within the unions.

When the fighting men return they will insist upon having their share of the jobs and that without being forced to pay for exercising their God-given, their constitutionally guaranteed right to earn a livelihood without coercion, intimidation, or the imposition of violence. A readjustment is due and upon all of us rests the responsibility of bringing about a little of that cooperation of which we now, in international affairs, hear so much. Cooperation means that all parties to a controversy must concede something; that none will be able to have his way in all things. Now is the time for such cooperation between employees, unions, and employers, and Congress should immediately see to it that laws which are one-sided, practices which are unjust, should be prohibited, that all, whether employee or employer, or innocent bystander, should have equal opportunity, equal justice.

Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, wise as he may be, has disregarded this fundamental principle of equal justice under law.

I hereby reprint the so-called charter sponsored by Mr. Johnston, Mr. William Green, and Mr. Philip Murray.

To show the situation, I here reprint an open letter written to Mr. Johnston by Mr. Merwin K. Hart, Mr. Johnston's reply, and the subsequent reply of Mr. Hart:

COMPLETE TEXT OF THE NEW CHARTER FOR LABOR AND MANAGEMENT, AS MADE PUBLIC IN WASHINGTON ON MARCH 28, 1945, BY PRESIDENT ERIC A. JOHNSTON, OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES; PRESIDENT WILLIAM GREEN, OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR; AND PRESIDENT PHILIP MURRAY, OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

We in management and labor firmly believe that the end of this war will bring the unfolding of a new era based upon a vastly expanding economy and unlimited opportunities for every American.

This peacetime goal can only be attained through the united effort of all our people. Today we are united in national defense. Tomorrow we must be united equally in the national interest.

Management-labor unity, so effective in lifting war production to unprecedented heights, must be continued in the postwar period. To this end, we dedicate our joint efforts for a practical partnership within the framework of this code of principles:

1. Increased prosperity for all involves the highest degree of production and employment at wages assuring a steadily advancing standard of living. Improved productive efficiency and technological advancement must, therefore, be constantly encouraged.

2. The rights of private property and free choice of action, under a system of private competitive capitalism, must continue to be the foundation of our Nation's peaceful and prosperous expanding economy. Free competition and freemen are the strength of our free society.

3. The inherent rights and responsibility of management to direct the operations of an enterprise shall be recognized and preserved. So that enterprise may develop and expand and earn a reasonable profit, management must be free as well from unnecessary governmental interference or burdensome restrictions.

4. The fundamental rights of labor to organize and to engage in collective bargaining with management shall be recognized and preserved, free from legislative enactments which would interfere with or discourage these objectives. Through the acceptance of collective bargaining agreements, differences between management and labor can be disposed of between the parties through peaceful means, thereby discouraging avoidable strife through strikes and lock-outs.

5. The independence and dignity of the individual and the enjoyment of his democratic rights are inherent in our free American society. Our purpose is to cooperate in building an economic system for the Nation which will protect the individual against the hazards of unemployment, old age, and physical impairments beyond his control.

6. An expanding economy at home will be stimulated by a vastly increased foreign trade. Arrangements must therefore be perfected to afford the devastated or undeveloped nations reasonable assistance to encourage the rebuilding and development of sound economic systems. International trade cannot expand through subsidized competition among the nations for diminishing markets, but can be achieved only through expanding world markets and the elimination of any arbitrary and unreasonable practices.

7. An enduring peace must be secured. This calls for the establishment of an international security organization, with full participation by all the United Nations, capable of preventing aggression and assuring lasting peace.

We in management and labor agree that our primary duty is to win complete victory over nazism and Japanese militarism. We also agree that we have a common joint duty, in cooperation with other elements of our national life and with Government, to prepare and work for a prosperous and sustained peace.

In this spirit we agree to create a national committee, composed of representatives of business and labor organizations. This committee will seek to promote an understanding and sympathetic acceptance of this code of principles and will propose such national policies as will advance the best interests of our Nation.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT CHARTER LACKS THESE CORNERSTONES: EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW—FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

(An open letter to Mr. Eric Johnston)

In order that it may decide intelligently and fairly whether or not to commend the recent joint pronouncement of yourself and Messrs. William Green and Philip Murray, the National Economic Council, Inc., seeks enlightenment.

In its text, you call the document a "code of principles." In your letter to President Roosevelt, you refer to it as a "code" and also as a "charter." It has received Nation-wide publicity as "the new charter for labor and management," and you are represented as speaking for management.

Since the issuance of charters is an act of sovereignty, we ask: Do you, the Messrs. Green and Murray possess delegated authority of which the public is unaware?

According to the Standard Dictionary a charter may be "a document granting special rights and privileges." Your "charter" presumes to grant "special rights and privileges," in that it declares that labor unions shall be "free from legislative enactments which would interfere with or discourage" union objectives to organize and to engage in collective bargaining.

Apparently, under the terms of your "charter," labor union leaders and their political appeasers and collaborationists would have the power to determine what laws a sovereign people would be permitted to enact. Are we correct in this deduction? If we are, how, then, can we judge what these gentlemen would do except by their past and present performances?

And we wonder if you have not, unwittingly, agreed to the foreclosing of the American people's right to curb the abuses of undisciplined and irresponsible unionism?

In other words, does your charter mean that the one-sided Wagner Act, which even some union leaders believe should be modified, cannot be changed even in the public interest?

Does your charter mean that maintenance-of-membership—the price for the promise not to violate the no-strike pledge—shall be saddled on all postwar workers including returned soldiers?

That employers' property, but never the unions', shall be seized, no matter which one interrupts war production?

That the monopolistic practices of unions shall not be punishable as are the monopolistic practices of business?

That union funds may be poured into politics, but not the funds of business corporations?

That freedom to hold up trucks and extort tribute, which the Supreme Court declares to be beyond the law because it is part of traditional union activities—and all such aids to the attainment of union objectives, shall be forever free from legislative enactment?

Under your code, would Congress be forbidden to outlaw compulsion and put membership in unions on a voluntary basis? Or require labor union management to be responsible for the damages it inflicts, the same as business management is responsible under law?

If your code of principles did not contain the reservation against legal restraints, and if there were no room for doubt that the pacific commitments of your cosigners would be better respected than their no-strike pledge, then your pronouncement would meet unreserved commendation from all who believe, as we do, that responsible and voluntary organizations of labor have a rightful place in a free society.

We write, Mr. Johnston, in no narrow spirit in asking you to clarify this charter. We have in mind that millions of men and women have been compelled, against their will, to join unions.

But so long as union leaders refuse to submit to the legal restraints necessary to prevent some citizens from harming others, just so long will the public need to examine critically every such proposal as your charter.

We are reminded, for instance, that while the vote cast by all servicemen last fall was 57 percent in favor of the New Deal, yet, in the same election, servicemen from the State of California voted more than two to one in favor of the right-to-work amendment.

Very sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 12, 1945.

DEAR MR. HART: May I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 9 referring to the labor-management charter? I regret that it does not seem to have met with approval.

I do not question your right to criticize it. As a matter of fact, I welcome candid expression of opinion concerning it, whether it be favorable or unfavorable.

But if I may be permitted to say it, I find it rather difficult to follow your line of reasoning. First, I do not see much substance in your objection to calling it a "charter." Whether it is called a charter or a code, or a set of principles seems to me to be highly inconsequential. I doubt very much that anybody, except your self, is going to be misled by the title.

Second, you contend that Messrs. Green, Murray, and myself have no "delegated authority" to formulate such a document. No such authority was assumed. The code or charter, whatever you choose to call it, represents a consensus of our personal opinions, nothing more. From the outset we agreed to submit it to our respective organizations. That, too, is not an unusual procedure.

Third, you imply that it ought to go much farther in correcting existing abuses. If the fact that we are acting without "delegated authority" renders the charter innocuous and makes it a mere expression of personal opinion, why be disturbed about the possibility that it might foreclose "the American people's right to curb the abuses of undisciplined and irresponsible unionism."

Finally, the specific questions you ask—however important they may be—are, I think, somewhat beside the mark. The charter is not intended as a cure-all for industrial strife. To denounce it for its omissions would be like denouncing the Constitution because it did not contain a civil or criminal code.

The charter is a beginning, not an end. It is not in any sense a perfect and inflexible document. It represents an effort to substitute cooperation for conflict in adjusting industrial relations. That is a task still to be done. One thing is reasonably certain; it is not going to be done if we bend our efforts to keep alive the animosities which all too often obscure and delay our progress. Moreover, if labor and management are not going to solve their common problems themselves then the Government will step into the picture. The outcome will be detrimental to both management and labor. Of course, this is an eventuality we are trying to avoid.

I hope you will find it possible to join in the common effort. Your constructive opinion will, I am sure, be welcomed.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC A. JOHNSTON,
President.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 16, 1945.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you for your letter of April 12.

But we cannot see wherein your reply to our request for clarification of your "labor-management charter" answers our main objection.

We did not question the desirability or the need of "substituting cooperation for conflict in adjusting labor disputes." To the contrary, we stated that, were it not for its reservation against legal restraints upon undisciplined and irresponsible unionism, the principles you set forth "would meet unreserved commendation from all who believe, as we do, that responsible and voluntary organizations of labor have a rightful place in a free society."

The public interest is affected by your reservation to guarantee that labor unions shall be "free from legislative enactments which would interfere with or discourage" attainment of their objectives. Cecil de-Mille's is only one of many cases in point.

Suppose your "charter" is ratified; then some returned fighting men object to "maintenance of union membership" or ask for their jobs back from employers who have been compelled to sign closed-shop contracts.

What, then, would follow a demand for legislative relief? What would the gentlemen who have taken advantage of the war emergency to extend compulsory unionization say about "industry violating its no-legislation pledge"?

You state, Mr. Johnston, that to denounce the "charter" for its omissions "would be like denouncing the Constitution because it did not contain a civil or criminal code." But, would you be for the Constitution if it contained a prohibition against enactment of a civil or criminal code?

Appreciating your invitation for our "constructive opinion," we suggest as an indispensable basis for better industrial relations, the substitution for your "Free from legislative enactments," clause, in your "code of principles," the following two principles:

1. "Equal justice under law." Replace our present one-sided Labor Relations law with an impartial code of industrial peace, written, not to serve any privileged class, but the public interest.

2. "Freedom of association." Recognize that freedom cannot live in the same atmosphere with compulsion, and that the right not to join a union is as important a pillar of freedom as the right to join.

If the "code of principles" were to contain these two additional provisions, we would be glad to join in working for legislation to implement it.

And we believe that labor and capital would then enter upon a period of peace that would go far to assure future American contentment and prosperity.

Sincerly yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

Production and Distribution of Food Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, for many months, I have brought to the attention of Administrator Chester Bowles of the Office of Price Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and other Government officials well-founded complaints which I have received from residents of the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts. While criticism has been offered relative to other items, yet the great majority of the complaints have centered on the failure of those in charge of the production and distribution of food products to meet the great responsibilities placed upon them.

As an individual and as a Member of Congress, sometimes acting with the New England group of Congressmen and more often as Representative of my district, I have sought to accomplish the adoption of measures which would secure additional production of livestock, poultry, and eggs; additional supplies of feed for our farmers; and a better and more just distribution of food supplies in those parts of the country which are unfortunately the most distant from the great food-processing centers.

On July 1, former Congressman Clinton P. Anderson became Secretary of Agriculture and head of the War Food Administration. As chairman of a committee of investigation, he has become familiar not only with the complaints and criticisms which have been leveled against these and other Government agencies but also with the defects, faults, and failures of the programs pursued by those who have preceded him in high public office and some of those who are still on the Federal pay rolls. No Member of Congress can expect Secretary Anderson immediately to bring order out of the chaotic conditions which now flourish in the administration of our national food problem. The food problem in the United States, next to the war effort, the No. 1 problem for Americans just as much as it is for the peoples of all the other countries of the world. Our Government either alone or jointly with other governments is endeavoring to solve the food problems of the peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa. During the past few weeks I have visited in several of these countries. Thousands of tons of food supplies are being furnished by the American people to the unfortunate inhabitants of many of these stricken countries. Unfortunately, there is serious criticism of our activities abroad, both from the foreigners who are dissatisfied with our efforts and from local Americans who seem to feel that much of the criticism is warranted. Everywhere we were told that great additions to the supplies being sent in by the United States were expected shortly. While carrying out our responsibilities to these peoples who are in distress, I hope that the food problems of the people of the United States will not become further confounded.

I wish that I might bring to the attention of the House several of the individual letters which I have received lately on the subject. This is impracticable. However, I would like to have the Members of Congress read two recent editorials from the Springfield (Mass.) Union. They indicate clearly how many of my constituents are thinking relative to the present handling of foodstuffs by the Federal administration. It is not a sufficient answer to say that it is more or less difficult to secure food in Washington or New York than in Springfield, or in any other city of the United States.

Secretary of Agriculture Anderson should bring forward an improved program, and, above all, a far better administration. Members of Congress are being advised by Government officials that more foodstuffs are being raised in 1945 than in 1944 in the United States. I hope that within a month we will also know that a better distribution of these foodstuffs has come to pass.

In the meantime I hope that the two following editorials will receive consideration from those who are in a position to secure results. I hope that Secretary Anderson will check on our foodstuffs which are going abroad to make certain that fair consideration is given to American civilians. I hope that Secretary Anderson also will give consideration to the OPA point system as now administered with a view to making it possible for an American family to have a decent supply of meat, butter, and other available items even if the OPA's point system has to be amended or discarded.

LEND-LEASE

We have the word of the Federal Government that no lend-lease food will be sent out of the country during July, August, and September. So far so good.

Does this mean that, come October 1, shipments will resume, in full, of meat, butter, eggs, poultry, and other foods? How much of what is it planned to take from Americans to give to the British, Russians, French, Belgians, Dutch, Chinese, and others?

The American people, the taxpayers, the bond buyers, the hard-working average people of this country, who are fighting the war on both the home and the war fronts, have a right to all the information possible about what their elected and appointed servants are doing and plan to do with their money and their food.

They have a right to detailed statements concerning the food available, the amount taken by the armed services, the amount shipped on lend-lease, and the amount left for themselves. No broad estimates will suffice. They must know to the last pound how much food is produced here, what kind of food it is, where it goes and why.

How much first quality beef is sent out on lend-lease? How much lamb, pork, veal, ham, bacon, chickens, ducks, geese, how many eggs? How many pigs' snouts and feet and ears, how much liver, how many pounds of chicken gizzards are sent to Europe, if any? How much butter and margarine go abroad, how much is kept for us?

We have a perfect right to know, in detail, how much of what kind of food has been sent where, and what the plans are for future shipments. It is our food—not the food of any Government official—not the food, even, of the President of the United States. Nor does it belong to OPA, nor to the War Food Administration, nor to the Department of Agriculture, nor to Congress. It is produced by the American people, and it is theirs. When it is sent to Europe it is sent by our money. We produce it; we pay for it; our money sends it across the seas; American ships carry it and American boys man those ships. That food is of, by, and for us—and when more than should be is taken from us to be given to aliens, the givers are exceeding their rights.

We should know far more than we are being told about this giving away of too much of our best food. It is time we stopped it, time we were given a strict accounting of what is being done in our name by do-gooders who flout the old truism that charity begins at home.

Before lend-lease begins all over again on October 1 let's get a lot of food confusion and chaos all straightened out. If enough of us holler loud enough the Government boys will have to act.

WHEN DO WE EAT?

People must eat. Unless there is enough good food available, diseases result, teeth fall out, resistance is low, vitality ebbs. Children who do not get sufficient good food do not grow up to be sturdy adults. A year or more of poor feeding when a person is of tender years may stunt his growth, prevent proper development, make him a second-grade adult instead of a first-grade man or woman.

All over the country the people are becoming indignant concerning the amazing stupidity of those in control of our food. We noted here recently that the Providence Journal has turned its attention to the problem of food; now the Boston Globe is beginning. Speaking of the people's indignation, the Globe says: "Evidently the revolt of the public here at home is being borne in upon officialdom. Officialdom, surprisingly, discovered that, after all, it can do something. Why didn't it act sooner? Here is the real nub of the whole question. What ails the handling of the food problem here at home is not simply defects in administration, or errors in judgment, or the insufficiency of enforcement facilities. What ails the problem is a broad and flagrant mis-

take in policy. The primary responsibility of any government is to the people it represents. In present circumstances of war, the secondary responsibility is to our allies and their populations. A third responsibility (which will be shouldered upon the United States if it is permitted) will be feeding defeated enemy populations. Our policy directors have attempted, rashly, to equate the first two responsibilities—with results presently before us. If they load on the third, the public reaction will be explosive."

We have been saying in these columns for months now this very thing. We have said, over and over again, that the duty of our elected and appointed public servants is to see to it that the American people are decently fed. Then, if there is any food left that could be supplied to our allies and others in need. What our do-gooders and world-savers have done, plainly, is to see to it that our allies and others were splendidly supplied with prime American beef and creamery butter and the finest American eggs. What was left was for home distribution. The aliens got the prime American beef, the sugar-cured hams, the butter; we got pigs snouts and tails, canned fish, tripe, and a bit of oleo—if we could scrape up the red points for them—and usually we didn't have many red points, even for snouts and oleo.

"We Americans have long refrained from kicking about meat shortages because we thought the armed forces were getting the meat. Talk to any returned veteran and find out when he had meat last, when he was in active service. One boy who served in Italy tells me his outfit was 2 years without meat. Another, who was stationed at an air base in England, had K rations three times a day for 16 months, and never had a square meat meal. What deviltry has been going on, anyway, and how about a thorough airing of the whole business?" This is a recent letter appearing in the New York Daily News, signed by Elinor Shields, of Manhattan. There have been others, similar to it, in other newspapers.

The all-seeing OPA has grandly told New England that its allocations of meat during the present months are based on shipments received in January, February, and March of this year. Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, points out that this means New England will receive this summer insufficient meat to feed itself even the sparse foodstuffs it has been getting. For New England's population is increased each summer by many millions of visitors. With something like double our normal population, then, we will have about half the food we have been eating, for we shall have to divide with our visitors. "Meanwhile," Senator BREWSTER notes, "certain Southern States, filled with northern visitors during January, February, and March, will experience a very considerable surplus of food under this arrangement." Nice, isn't it? New England always gets it in the neck, somehow.

Lend-lease to Siberia, we note, is to be continued indefinitely, although the war with which we were allied with Russia to fight has been won, and Russia shows no signs of getting into the war against Japan. The guarded and cagey admissions from Washington concerning this lend-lease intrigue us. What's it all about? Are we sending any food to Siberia, lend-leased? If so why, what kind of food, how much, and how long are we to continue sending it?

And now the black market in meat and butter and poultry. It flourishes, we are told; it takes the food that should go to us on the legitimate market, doubles the price, and that is that. Well, of course, we are all indignant at the rise and power of the black market, but we always have criminals wtih us, and what about the FBI, and all the other Government agencies which have the duty, not only to track down criminals but to prevent crime? Where have our protectors and trackers-down been while the black-market gangsters have been organizing and operating so high, wide, and handsome? Where are they now? OPA, if it was even half awake, should have known of black-market operations when they first began. Why didn't it holler to the people, why didn't it tell Congress of the grave danger, why didn't it say, "Unless we check this thing now, and check it hard, food is going to be scarcer and scarcer?" Why didn't it? If OPA had paid half the attention to kayoing the black market when it had its first feeble beginnings that it paid and pays to hectoring and bedeveling every village butcher and grocer with forms and schedules and lists, we might now have a lot more food in the shops, and in our stomachs after dinner.

We're glad other newspapers are beginning to take an interest in food. We have been interested and talking about it for a long time, and intend to keep up our interest and our talk.

The Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the column, On the Other Hand, by Lowell Mellett, published in the Washington Star of this date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ON THE OTHER HAND"—THINKS SOUTHERN STATESMEN SHOULD NOT LEAVE PROBLEM TO BILBOS AND EASTLANDS

(By Lowell Mellett)

In the course of a raw filibuster against taking any vote on the FEPC bill, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, made a frank effort the other day to indict the whole Negro race. He succeeded instead in indicting a whole section of the United States. That is to say, if the premise on which he sought to indict the American Negro were true, the Senator made a completely convincing case against the South's treatment of the Negro.

The Senator dwelt at length on what he called the history of the Negro soldier in the American Army. He reported that he had talked with "numerous high-ranking generals," whom he did not name, and that he found them to be in agreement with his opinion that as soldiers the Negroes are just no good. Composing as they do one-twelfth of the whole Army, that statement goes for them all, according to the Senator. The fact that General Eisenhower, who also, no doubt, has talked to numerous "high-ranking generals," holds an entirely different view, was not mentioned by the Senator.

He established to his own satisfaction that the Negro soldiers "had no initiative, no sense of responsibility, very low intelligence, and were a failure." Whether he established this to the satisfaction of the two or three weary fellow-Senators who composed his entire audience on the floor, there was no indication. But he obviously did not persuade the well-filled galleries, for a spontaneous outburst of laughter greeted his assertion, "I am not prejudiced against the Negro."

WHO'S TO BLAME?

Assuming that Senator EASTLAND states the truth, that General Eisenhower does not, and that the Negro soldier has no initiative and no sense of responsibility, can the blame be placed entirely on that soldier? Can the South, which has determined to a large degree the conditions of the Negro's life, the extent to which he has been permitted to develop initiative and responsibility, escape a considerable share of the blame? Has not the Senator actually brought in an indictment against the manner in which he and his neighbors have handled the great problem that came to this country aboard the slave ships, a problem not solved by the bloodiest civil war in history?

And if that is so, is it not time that the best men in the South begin to recognize the fact, to recognize that the course that has been followed is not the one that will bring a solution? Southern statesmanship is not confined to the Bilbos and Eastlands, yet one might easily believe it is all of one piece if he reads the list of Senators voting to support the position taken by the Mississippi spokesmen.

Under the stress of war's necessity a small beginning has been made toward solving this problem, serious now and likely to become desperate soon. It was decreed at the war's outset that there should be no discrimination against any war worker because of his color or race or religion. One must believe either that this is right or that there should be discrimination. The Bilbos and Eastlands and other frightened little men definitely do believe there should be discrimination, but it is hard to conceive that this is true of the Georges, the Connallys and others who are, right at this time, contributing their full share to an enlightened world policy; hard to believe that they share in this wretched distortion of our own democratic ideal here at home.

TRAGIC PERIOD THREATENS

The most tragic period in American history was brought on by the stubborn conviction held by some people in the South that this Nation could exist half slave and half free. Another tragic period is bearing down upon us as surely as the sun rises and sets, unless Southern statesmanship opens its mind to this problem.

If it will put in some of the same good thinking it has given recently to our world problems—and some of the same ingenuity it has given to the circumvention of the United States Constitution during the past 80 years—Southern statesmanship should be able to provide a solution that will forestall another period of bloody civil strife.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, Calif., June 27, 1945.

Hon. W. F. NORRELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NORRELL: The Central Valley Project Association is the organization which has sponsored the Central Valley project from its inception in 1933. We are the representatives of the counties and water

districts most affected by the project and whose need for a supplemental water supply has always been the justification for the project.

On behalf of the association and those it represents, I am most happy to convey to you our very sincere appreciation for your thorough understanding of our project problems, your thoughtful consideration of its needs and energetic support of its essential purposes as evidenced by your action in connection with the Central Valley item in the pending Interior appropriation bill. We believe that you have been considerate and wise in your judgment, and through your efforts the primary purposes of the project will be successfully carried out and we will be able to meet our commitment to the Government to repay the reimbursable costs from project revenues.

Very truly,

ROLAND CURRAN,
Secretary-Manager.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two newspaper comments dealing with Senate bill 1171, the proposed Federal labor relations act, one an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, of June 26, 1945, entitled "Asking for Trouble," and the other an article by Westbrook Pegler, published in the Cleveland Press of June 27, 1945 entitled "Says Labor Relations Bill Admits Wagner Act Dangerous."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 26, 1945]

ASKING FOR TROUBLE

While their national leaders are denouncing the Burton-Ball-Hatch proposal for a reorganization of the Government's labor-management conciliation machinery and policy, local unions in Akron, Detroit, Chicago, and other cities are busily proving the unworkability of the present machinery and the drastic need for a change.

The Labor Department conciliation service announces that strikes have doubled in number since VE-day, averaging between 35 and 50 a day as compared with the peak of 20 a day reached during the European war. As of yesterday, nearly 90,000 workers, most of them employed in war plants whose products, like those of the struck Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., are vitally needed in the Pacific war, were idle, and their idleness was threatening in turn to throw many others involuntarily out of work.

It becomes evident that unless President Truman, on his return from San Francisco, takes strong executive action to stem the growing industrial unrest, Congress may be forced to adopt measures much less palatable to union labor than anything proposed by Senators BURTON, BALL, and HATCH to prevent our war against Japan from being sabotaged on the home front.

The Labor Department reports that a large share of the recent strikes have resulted from trivial disputes—such things as late arrival of pay checks; failure of catering firms, over whom management has no control, to put meat in the sandwiches sold to workers; wives making more money than their husbands in the same plants, or the prohibition of lunch-hour checker games. Of 40 strikes which occurred one day last week, 19 resulted from discharges of one, two, or three men, and in each of these cases the strikes were called without previous resort to the established machinery for settling grievances.

We are told by some labor observers that the wave of strikes has its fundamental cause in the fear produced in the minds of workers that they are going to lose their jobs or their present scale of pay as a result of cut-backs. If this is so, labor leaders have done a poor job of educating union members both in their responsibility to the Nation so long as the war continues against Japan and in the benefits to be obtained by the workers themselves from maintaining labor-management peace in the reconversion period ahead.

If union leaders are correct in their apparent belief that the months just ahead will determine whether labor will be able to preserve the economic and political gains it has made during the war, they and their followers ought to be aware that the general public, which is the umpire between labor and management, is going to watch the respective behavior of both groups very carefully.

It should not be necessary to remind labor leaders of the effect it would have on public opinion if management, worrying about its competitive position in the postwar area, began now to turn down war orders or otherwise disrupt war production in a contest to be the first to produce peacetime goods.

We don't believe the public will be any more lenient with labor if it—as it seems in danger of doing—indulges in essentially the same practice by using the strike weapon now in the effort to gain peacetime advantage.

Moreover, if labor imagines it has anything to fear in the adoption of such a labor-management relations bill as that proposed by three friendly Senators after 18 months of careful consideration, it will have genuine reason to fear the kind of legislation which may be adopted if Congress is forced by public indignation to protect our armed forces against strikers.

[From the Cleveland Press of June 27, 1945]

WESTBROOK PEGLER SAYS LABOR-RELATIONS BILL ADMITS WAGNER ACT DANGEROUS

NEW YORK.—The labor-relations bill introduced in the Senate last week is an admission by its sponsors—HATCH of New Mexico, a Democrat, and BURTON, of Ohio, and BALL, of Minnesota, Republicans—that the Wagner Act is a vicious and dangerous law and should be made harmless by superseding legislation.

The iniquity of the Wagner Act and of the operations of the Labor Relations Board, which it created, has been notorious for years. The bill now presented would acknowledge these evils and, among other measures of redress, would recognize the existence of an element known as the public, which often has suffered grievously from the brutal arrogance of political bosses miscalled labor leaders.

The recent distress of hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers during a slow-down strike in the omnibus service in stifling weather is an example of that irresponsibility. But, in the debates on the new bill, these Senators who now have become aware of the public interest should not fail to go further back and recall the time when a small group of revolutionaries, calling themselves a labor committee, pulled the switches in the municipal power plant of a large city in Michigan and then vanished, refusing to meet the city manager or in any way submit to negotiation the complains which were used as a pretext for this wanton blow at an innocent community. "The public" does exist, and the three Senators who offer this new plan are wise to direct an appeal to "the public" over the heads of the boss unioneers of the CIO and the American Federation of Labor.

American labor in particular and the Nation in general have no more dangerous internal enemies than the few hundred union officials who, by their insistence on the preservation of existing conditions, would inevitably provoke riots and a popular hatred of unionism after the war. Commotion, then revolution, is the Communist program. Will returned soldiers quietly submit and support labor if the switches are pulled again when they want to work?

What are the evils of the Wagner system of labor relations?

It maintains a Government bureau which frankly does not pretend to serve the public, but does frankly regard the unions as its clients and promotes their interests against those of industry and the public.

At the beginning it was deliberately loaded with Communists who diligently promoted strikes and connived at terrorism so that whole areas of the Nation were ruled by disciplined roving gangs of thugs and vandals.

The Labor Relations Board has the powers of a court, but does not even put up a pretense of impartiality. It is frankly against the employer in all cases and sits as a judge while its own agents appear as prosecutors and as counsel for the complaining parties.

The Wagner Act drives millions of workers into unions against their will in violation of its own stated purpose to let them select their own bargaining agents. But the Wagner Act does not provide that these unions shall conduct free internal elections or that they shall be accountable to their members for the thousands of millions of dollars which they collect as income taxes and the license to work.

The Wagner Act and the Labor Relations Board have never been concerned with the constitutions of the unions, with the result that Jimmy Petrillo, of the musicians, for example, may suspend his entire constitution at will and persecute any member to his heart's content.

Among the quick reactions of those union bosses who have exploited, robbed, and betrayed labor and imposed on the patience of the whole Nation, there has been a cry that compulsory arbitration to prevent strikes would be a denial of the right to strike.

The proposed Federal labor relations law offers a complete revision of the labor administration under Government, but it is still short of some of the reforms that must be adopted regardless of the selfish opposition of the boss unioneer.

It makes no provision that union constitutions must respect all the rights of citizens conferred by the National Constitution.

Simon Lake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to call attention of the House to the recent death of Simon Lake at the age of 79. Mr. Lake was not only an inventor of general note, but, as is well known, was the father of the submarine.

His first successful efforts in this direction date as far back as 1894, and not only were the original ideas of submers-

ible craft his, but he also had much to do with the perfection of this type of vessel.

What is perhaps more important is that throughout his life he deprecated the use of submarines in warfare and advocated their use in peaceful commerce.

Mr. Lake was born in Pleasantville, a fine community located within my district, and still has relatives living in the area, among whom are the Reverend Ellwell Lake and Harry Lake, members of a pioneer family of Ocean City.

His inventions have been very significant in the history of the world, and I feel it my duty to note the passing of this distinguished citizen of my congressional district.

Prevent Civil War in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article by Mr. Walter Lippman, which appeared in many American newspapers on June 27, 1945. In this article, Mr. Lippmann clearly outlines some of the major problems facing us in the Far East. Quite properly, I believe, he places considerable emphasis on the danger of civil war in China.

Today, every hour is bringing China nearer the brink of civil war. Unless the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain are able to avert this threat, of which Mr. Lippmann and other authorities on China are advising us, there will be no peace in Asia. And if there is no peace in Asia, there will be no peace in the world.

Clearly that threat is not China's concern alone. The Central Government's existing blockade of the northwest sections of China, which are under the Communist government at Yenan, ties up thousands of troops which could and should be engaging the Japanese. The blockade prevents the northern guerrilla forces from receiving badly needed medical supplies, military equipment, and relief. It holds back their guerrilla warfare behind the enemy lines. It aids no one but our mutual enemy. The blockade, of course, is not civil war—not yet. But as Mr. Lippmann points out, it is latent civil war. And it prolongs the war against Japan.

It was this very situation which our great General Stilwell saw so clearly. It was this situation which led him to insist on China's using all her strength against Japan. General Stilwell, being a soldier and not a diplomat, approached the problem with the directness of a soldier—a directness which characterizes his every act and which has raised him to the rank of general.

I trust that General Stilwell is now on his way back to China, leading American troops into the Japanese-held portions of that country. I trust that our Government which knows of China's dangerous lack of unity, of latent civil war there—will take steps, in concert with our allies, to aid all Chinese forces which are fighting Japan, and to foster a strong, democratic, united Chinese Nation.

We need and must have a coalition government in China. We need and must have a united China. We need it to win the war. It is vital to securing the peace. It is fundamental to the development of China's resources, buying power, and trade.

Mr. Lippmann's appraisal of the situation follows:

TOWARD AN ASIATIC SETTLEMENT

It is now necessary and practicable to make the master plan for a successful conclusion of the far eastern war. The strategical situation makes it necessary for the United States, China, Britain, and Russia to have a clear understanding of the part that each will play in the final campaigns of the war with Japan, and in the settlement that must follow from the reduction of Japan as a great power. An understanding of this kind is practicable because each of the four nations chiefly concerned has something to give which is of vital importance to the others, and no one of them can make a lasting settlement by itself.

To reach such a four-power understanding will surely make the result of the war more conclusive, and almost certainly it will make the war shorter and less costly. As long as Japan has reason to hope that China, the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States, may become divided over the far eastern settlement, she is not likely to make an acceptable offer but will wage war for the purpose of gaining time.

A war to gain time will mean on the part of the Japanese a campaign of suicidal resistance and on our part a campaign of extermination. Our object must therefore be to exclude from the Japanese calculation the possibility of obtaining any advantage by prolonging the war in order to gain time. This object will be achieved only if there is a united political front behind which there is taking place American, British, and Soviet redeployment, and the mobilization of well-armed Chinese forces.

Once there exists this political front with its vast military power, there will be no reason left why Japan should not make an offer which falls clearly within the formula of unconditional surrender and yet is far short of and far different from suicide and extermination. And then there will be no reason why the United Nations should refuse to consider such an offer from any Japanese authority capable in fact of surrendering unconditionally and of executing the terms of the surrender.

The formation of this united front will require statesmanship at the level where military and political policy have to be determined together. The territorial settlement which we intend to impose on Japan is known: it was announced at Cairo on December 1, 1943. In order to make these terms durable, and to lay the foundation of peace in the Far East, the unification of China and an international trusteeship of Korea are necessary.

An understanding with China and about China has the first and highest priority. There was open civil war in China for many years before the Japanese invasion. There has been latent civil war during the Japanese invasion. There will be no peace in eastern Asia if civil war breaks out after the defeat of Japan.

The Chinese civil war is not a purely Chinese affair: it is a threat to the peace of the world. The United States, out of loyalty to an ally, as a matter of good faith, and for military reasons in this war, is giving full support to the Chungking Government. It is committed to taking a leading part in assisting the reconstruction of China and its industrialization.

But the United States can have no interest in building up the military power of Chungking in order that it may then wage civil war after the Japanese war is concluded. That could hardly fail to bring Chungking into conflict with the Soviet Union, and to entangle the United States in that conflict. For Communist China lies between Nationalist China and the Soviet Union. An effort by Chungking to settle its differences with Yenan by military force would bring Chiang Kai-shek's armies face to face with the Red Army. It is, therefore, necessary that Chungking and Yenan settle their differences without fighting. On that the United States will have to insist.

Whenever the Soviet Union intervenes in the Japanese war, the right flank of its forces will rest upon that part of China which is under the control of Yenan. Therefore, we are confronted with a situation in which a Chinese civil war would find the United States supporting one side and the Soviet Union the other. It follows that just as we must insist that Chungking negotiate a Chinese settlement, so the Soviet Union must insist that Yenan negotiate a settlement.

The substance of the agreement then will have to be reciprocal undertakings by the Russians, the Chinese, and the Americans to use their influence unequivocally to prevent civil war and promote a Chinese settlement. The formula for that settlement is clearly indicated, and is in principle like that made at Yalta for Poland. It is to "reorganize on a broader democratic basis" the Chungking government by "the inclusion of democratic leaders" from Yenan and from other parts of China. For Moscow must agree that in this case the Chungking government is the core around which a more representative government has to be organized.

If such an agreement can be reached with the Chinese—Mr. T. V. Soong being now in Moscow—and by Stalin, Churchill, and Truman, a united political front in Asia will have been established. With this much unity achieved an international trusteeship for Korea would probably become quite feasible.

H. R. 2229

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

IOTA, LA., *June 24, 1945.*

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We, the people of Iota, voters of the Seventh Congressional District, are sending you a petition so you may know we favor a Federal pension equal to all citizens of the United States and at 60 years. If a pension is good for civil-service workers, judges, ex-Presidents' widows and so on, it is good for the people. All pensions are paid through taxation.

In CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1939, page 1803, you may read where Iota had sent a similar petition to deceased Mr. De Rouen, then our Representative, asking him to vote for bill H. R. 2 and in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

of June 16, 1939, he gave his reasons for voting against it—a United States citizen's privilege. If you are against bill H. R. 2229 would you be so kind as to give your views. Raising Congressmen's pay is appropriate, but let us not forget our fathers and mothers.

Our boys are now fighting and dying for justice and equality to all; let us have it.

Please record petition in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Cordially yours,

Mrs. A. S. BOURGEOIS.

California State Fair Employment Practices Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of the mayor of the city of San Francisco:

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
San Francisco, May 23, 1945.

The honorable the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
City and County of San Francisco,
City Hall, San Francisco.

GENTLEMEN: After a great deal of thought, I am returning, marked "disapproved" your proposal 4800, reading as follows:

"Resolved, That this board of supervisors does hereby approve for the purposes of assembly bill No. 3, the California State Fair Employment Practices Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to his honor the mayor with the request that they be transmitted to Mr. Don Cleary, the legislative representative, at Sacramento."

To understand fully the meaning of proposal 4800, a careful reading of assembly bill No. 3 is necessary.

Section 2 of this bill defines its purposes and reads as follows:

"It is hereby declared as the public policy of this State that it is necessary to protect and safeguard the right and opportunity of all persons to seek, obtain, and hold employment without discrimination or abridgement on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

"It is recognized that the practice of denying employment opportunity and discriminating in the terms of employment for such reasons, foments domestic strife and unrest, deprives the State of the fullest utilization of its capacities for development and advance, and substantially and adversely affects the interests of employees, employers, and the public in general.

"This act shall be deemed an exercise of the police power of the State for the protection of the public welfare, prosperity, health, and peace of the people of the State of California."

It is very plain that the use of the police powers of the State to accomplish a desirable objective, viz: No discrimination or abridgment in employment or in union membership on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, is the main purpose of the bill. I repeat the exercise of the police powers of the State to attain a desired objective is the meat and core of assembly bill No. 3.

If I had approved proposal 4800, I would have committed myself to all the policies clearly defined in section 2. Without any doubt, all fairminded people believe that no person should be deprived of employment or of union membership because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, but it is highly questionable whether the State police power is the right instrument to accomplish what is sought.

The act as drawn creates a State fair employment practice commission of five members appointed by the Governor. The commission is granted broad powers to formulate policies to effectuate the purposes of the act. It can, among other things, hold hearings, subpena witnesses, compel their attendance, and administer oaths.

The act makes it an unlawful practice for an employer, "because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry" of any person, to refuse to hire or employ him. It also makes it unlawful for any labor organization because of "race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry" to "exclude, expel, or restrict from its membership, such person."

In making its decisions, the commission is not bound by technical rules of evidence, and orders of the commission shall be enforced by the District Court of Appeal upon petition of the commission. Judicial review of commission orders shall be by certiorari and disobedience of an order of the court enforcing commission orders shall be punishable as contempt of court. In the case of employees of a political subdivision of the State, decisions of the commission must be appealed to the Governor.

I am aware that the State of New York and the State of New Jersey recently enacted antidiscrimination laws very similar to that proposed by assembly bill No. 3. The New Jersey act became effective a few weeks ago. The New York act takes effect on July 1 next.

Despite recent legislative trends to compel nondiscrimination in hiring and in union membership by the use of governmental police powers, I cannot conscientiously endorse this method. Based on my experience in the field of management-labor relations, it is my considered judgment that passage of antidiscrimination laws is not in the public interest or in the interest of any minority group. I do not believe that you can solve the always-present and eternal problems of human relations by legislation.

History teaches that prejudice exists, has always existed, and probably will continue to exist. We have heard of cause and effect. I do not believe that you can remedy effect unless you remove the cause. How to minimize the cause—in this case, prejudice—is our ever-present problem. I do not believe that prejudice leading to discrimination in employment or in union membership can be eliminated overnight. The evolution of civilization is a slow process. The pendulum swings back and forth; but always, despite set-backs, moving toward a higher plane. Education—the cultivation of tolerance, and the effort to understand the other man's viewpoint is a much more effective approach than legal compulsion. The passage of laws aimed to cure human relationship problems overnight only irritates and aggravates, and tends to set back progress in this particular field. Successful enforcement of any law is largely dependent on the almost unanimous support of public opinion. Based on experience, as evidenced by the repeal of the National Prohibition Act, I do not believe antidiscrimination legislation will have the public support necessary to accomplish enforcement.

A more rational approach would be for all employers individually and collectively to practice sincerely no discrimination in employment and for labor organizations to make certain no man fitted for a job is denied an opportunity for livelihood because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. In my opinion, voluntary efforts along these lines will be more helpful and effective than creating more laws and commissions. But to attain that goal—to avoid legal compulsion—forward-looking business and labor leaders should assume affirmative responsibility.

At this point I should like to have it clearly understood that the existence or nonexistence of this statute can in no way affect the tenure of men and women presently employed by the city and county of San Francisco under civil-service provisions of the charter. With the exception of those employed on a limited-tenure basis, the charter guarantees continuation of present employment. The same instrument also guarantees an equal opportunity to participate in all future civil-service examinations, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

May I here emphasize what forward-looking people are now concerned about, the problem of making peacetime jobs. Assembly bill No. 3, if passed, in no way solves that problem. It cannot help by adding even one job.

When there are more men and women than there are jobs, there will be job competition. If assembly bill No. 3 passes, it would leave to five individuals (and much will depend on the type of commissioner) final determination of thousands of complaints. It is certain that the Commission will be besieged by those who charge discrimination in the hope that the Commission will order hiring of the man or woman whom the employer—for good business reasons—has refused first choice.

I did consider disapproving this proposal on the same grounds as I have others—that the subject was not the business of the board of supervisors or the mayor. However, the more I studied assembly bill No. 3, the more I realized it dealt with a fundamental issue, of concern not only to the city but to the State and the Nation. For that reason, I have felt impelled to express fully and freely my own views on the merits of the issue.

I am aware that some holding political office prefer not to publicize their real opinions on issues of this kind because they are fearful of political retaliation which may be exerted by various pressure groups. I believe such fears should not influence any executive of a political subdivision. I believe the public is entitled to know the honest convictions of any elected executive.

I realize full well my own reasons for disapproving assembly bil No. 3 may be misunderstood and perhaps deliberately misinterpreted. I believe that all of us should recognize that discrimination is a matter which must be constantly considered and studied and that there can be honest differences of opinion how best to secure the desired objective.

I again repeat—I am against all discrimination or abridgment in employment or in union membership because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. But it is my conviction that man-made laws, the compulsory method, is not the right way to deal with a human relations problem of this kind.

Sincerely,

ROGER D. LAPHAM, *Mayor.*

Shall Americans Be Required To Vote "Ja"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, all good Americans should stop for a moment to consider the question of whether Americans shall be required to vote "ja." We

should also stop to consider the question of whether our votes shall be counted as "ja" votes, even if some of us should not vote "ja."

Mr. Speaker, those questions are not as silly as they may sound. As a matter of fact, they are not silly at all. They are asked in all earnestness, and under a very serious possibility and threat that they will be answered in the affirmative by the enactment of the pending proposal to create a permanent FEPC.

Under sections 4 and 10 of the pending FEPC bill we would create a bureaucratic agency with full power to select the county and precinct election officials in every State in the Union.

This is fully explained in a speech which I made in the House of Representatives of the United States on Tuesday, June 26, under the following title: "Shall We Lay the Heavy Hand of the FEPC Bureaucracy Upon Our Churches, Schools, and Fraternal Orders; Upon Our Courts, Local Elections, and Local Government; Upon Our Merchants and Our Farmers?"

All Americans who do not wish to vote "ja" should wake up and help defeat this proposed legislation.

The American Press Appraises Franco Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know of my aggressive activity on the public platforms of the country and in Congress, in urging that our State Department sever diplomatic relations with Franco Fascist Spain.

In January, I introduced a resolution in Congress (H. R. 100) seeking to accomplish such severance of diplomatic relations. For 2 years I have agitated throughout America, trying to arouse the American people to the menace inherent in the continued rule of Francisco Franco, as Fascist dictator of Spain.

At the outset, my crusade was tantamount to beating my head against a stone wall of apathy or hostility. The newspapers scoffed at anti-Franco propaganda. A critic of Franco was envisaged to the Nation as a Communist stooge or an anti-Catholic crackpot. However, much progress has taken place since then. I have watched the growth of a tidal wave of sentiment, which has recently culminated in universal condemnation of Franco in the press and over the radios of America. Finally, within the past few weeks, the great United Nations Conference at San Francisco, by unanimous vote, including that of the American delegation, solemnly declared that Spain could never become a member of the United Nations organization as long as Francisco Franco and his ilk are in control of the Spanish Government. This was a great victory for the forces of democracy.

The stand taken by the San Francisco delegates thrilled and enthused the lovers of democratic processes throughout the entire world.

I take no little pride in this action because, in my way, I contributed considerably to that result. The newspapers of America have expressed themselves forcefully on the subject.

Here are some typical editorials:

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of June 21, 1945]

BOOTED

Mexican Foreign Minister Quintanilla, who introduced the resolution at San Francisco in effect barring Spain from membership in the United Nations, had to go back to Franco-Hitler and Franco-Mussolini messages "to back up his thesis," as the Associated Press put it, "that the three were Fascist bedmates."

Much more recent history, we should think, would be quite as instructive. Only last Sunday, Generalissimo Franco, speaking to a wing of the Falangist (Fascist) Party, asserted that the "constructive revolution Spain started 9 years ago has placed her in an advanced position for the arduous task now awaiting the world."

Spain's constructive revolution was, of course, the first bid of German and Italian fascism to extend their systems to a major European country. Spain was the proving ground for the Second World War. Count Ciano's diary, which the Citizen is publishing, introduces some interesting evidence on this point. Paradoxically, however, Spain is now the isolated remnant of fascism on the European Continent.

We wouldn't know what the generalissimo means by "the arduous task now awaiting the world." If it means building peace, certainly he will be allowed to have no part of it in the United Nations organization. His Spain is now the well-advertised pariah among nations. Of all the things unanimously and promptly done at San Francisco, the boot to Franco smacks most of good common sense.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal of June 22, 1945]

JOINT POLICY NEEDED

A jittery terror of communism among the democracies, including our own, was responsible for the triumph of Franco in Spain. But the situation has changed a great deal in the ensuing 8 years. Witness the decision of the San Francisco Conference to blackball the Franco government from membership in the United Nations on the ground that no government born with Axis military aid shall be admitted.

This can hardly be considered the beginning of the end of the dictatorship; it's difficult to put a finger on the event that starts the decline of a regime. But it is another heavy and perhaps decisive stroke against the Spanish Fascists.

Franco's government has been tottering ever since the Italian surrender. Today Spain is a lonely Fascist island in a Europe of various political creeds that are completely united only in their denunciation of fascism. The action by the United Nations Conference makes the possibility of economic and political collaboration with Franco even more remote.

But the Spanish Fascists can hardly be expected to give up easily. Various subterfuges will be tried, "dummy" democracies, etc., before Spain actually acquires a democratic government.

There is some danger that the world powers might become too deeply involved in Spain's dilemma. Russia wants communism there. A British Tory group favors return of the monarchy. And the United States would like a republic. A happier solution would be for the powers to announce a joint policy concerning Spain, all encouraging free elections within the country and declining to deal, except on a provisional basis, with other than a truly representative government.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]

EL DESPICABLE IS FOOLING NO ONE

The world-wide contempt for Spain's Fascist dictator, Francisco Franco, could not be better demonstrated than in the unanimous vote by which the delegates to the San Francisco Conference blackballed the Franco government from participation in the world league.

The vote is particularly impressive because it shows that no one is being fooled by his frenzied bleating that he has undergone a conversion to democratic principles. No doubt the delegates recalled when this bloody dictator, protected by a wall of certified piety and the tanks of Hitler and Mussolini, was thundering his contempt for "decadent" democracy.

Nor has anyone been impressed with his recent acts to implement his 11:55 conversion.

Remembering that Franco once promised Hitler a million troops to defend Berlin and prayed that the "great German Empire may reach its immortal destiny under the glorious sign of the swastika and under your (Hitler's) inspired leadership," few Americans will disagree with the action of our San Francisco delegation.

But many Americans join with Representative JOHN COFFEE in wondering when our State Department will give our policy the virtue of consistency. It's about time that we rectify the sin against democracy we committed when we granted official recognition to the government of El Despicable.

[From the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News]

WHAT ABOUT FRANCO?

Isn't it about time to stop playing ball with Franco? That is the question, dressed up in proper diplomatic language, that the French Government's foreign affairs committee has asked the Allies.

There seems only one logical answer: Yes. The Allies appeased the Spanish dictator in return for the militarily necessary material they needed from Spain. But the fighting in Europe is over now. And Franco's government remains of the same mind and makeup as when it was the protege of Hitler and Mussolini.

Hitler and Mussolini used Franco's war as a laboratory for the World War to follow. Franco's "neutrality" in that war would have been a joke if it had not cost the lives of allied men. And today Spain remains the last European refuge of fascism and one of the most notorious European Fascists, Pierre Laval, whom Franco will not release to French authorities.

It seems incredible that the Allies, after paying such a staggering price to free Europe of fascism, should still tolerate this rank Fascist regime. And it seems impossible that they can much longer avoid doing what France suggests—demand that Franco abdicate in favor of a truly representative Spanish Government and, if he refuses, break off diplomatic relations.

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald of June 15, 1945]

FASCIST REGIME IN SPAIN

When the world security council begins to function as the United Nations' instrument to prevent war it may have an early opportunity to deal with Generalissimo Francisco Franco's Fascist regime in Spain.

But will the international body intervene in the internal affairs of a nation at peace? It has long been the policy of the United States, one of the Big Three and

slated to be one of the Big Five in the United Nations organization, to recognize existing governments. Both the United States and Great Britain have maintained diplomatic relations with Spain throughout the war.

However, Franco's Spanish regime was extremely cordial to Nazi Germany from the very beginning. In fact, Franco owed his political position to German and Italian planes and guns which were too much for the Spanish Republicans in the war which was a prelude to the global conflict. Only when the Third Reich began to fall apart did the Spanish Government sever relations with Adolf Hitler. It required a Japanese slaughter of Spanish nationals in Manila to force France to break off diplomatic ties with Japan. Since the reluctant break with the Axis the Spanish dictator has let it be known he would like to come abroad the Allied bandwagon.

Franco fools nobody. He admired Hitler throughout the years; such admiration seemed to be profitable and the Spanish Fascist leader undoubtedly holds to many of the doctrines which Hitler tried to impose upon all the world. His regime will be a threat to future peace.

It is not necessary that the United Nations send armies, air fleets and naval task forces against Spain. Economic sanctions could turn the trick. The withholding of gasoline and fuel oil might compel a political housecleaning in Spain.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two newspaper articles entitled, respectively, "Richberg Offers to Post $1,000 for Debate on New Labor Bill," by the Associated Press, and "Protecting the Public," by Donald R. Richberg, both articles being on the subject of the proposed Federal Labor Relations Act.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHBERG OFFERS TO POST $1,000 FOR DEBATE ON NEW LABOR BILL

(By the Associated Press)

Donald R. Richberg, credited with formulating the principles of the Ball-Burton-Hatch Federal industrial relations bill, yesterday challenged protesting labor leaders to a $1,000 debate on its fairness.

Richberg, chairman of a 13-member committee which drew up the measure, providing a Super Railway Act for all labor, offered to post $1,000, to be paid to the American Red Cross, "If I do not prove to impartial judges that these statements (of labor leaders) were unfair, inaccurate, and misleading."

He said he directed his challenge particularly at William Green, AFL president; Philip Murray, CIO president; and John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers. The first two issued individual statements attacking the bill, introduced 2 weeks ago, and Lewis' Mine Workers' Journal issued an official statement on that organization's opposition.

To save the labor leaders "from personal embarrassment," Richberg said he would consent to meet a "reputable lawyer" in their stead.

"I have given so much support so often for so many years to these men and the workers they represent that they might find it embarrassing to attack me and my motives in person," said the lawyer who wrote the Railway Labor Act and once presided over the National Recovery Administration.

"The fact is that the labor peace plan can harm no one except those leaders who can only hold their jobs by maintaining a state of continuing warfare between employers and employees."

Murray was in Pittsburgh yesterday and the CIO headquarters here declined to comment. Green likewise intended to be away from Washington all week and the AFL withheld comment.

There was no immediate reaction from the United Mine Workers.

PROTECTING THE PUBLIC

(By Donald R. Richberg)

Cries of rage from labor leaders greeted the industrial peace plan recently put forth by Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL.

The AFL, the CIO, and the United Mine Workers did not wait to read the proposed Federal Industrial Relations Act. They can denounce so much more freely when they don't know what they are talking about.

The proposed law guarantees to labor the right to organize and choose its own representatives. It requires collective bargaining and a full opportunity for labor to negotiate agreements and settle disputes and to obtain the aid of Government mediators if desired. It sets up a well-tried and successful machinery for the voluntary arbitration of labor disputes. In amending the Wagner Act, it reaffirms and adds to the list of unfair labor practices by employers which are prohibited for the protection of employees. The entire bill is carefully designed to protect and promote the welfare and freedom of the wage earners.

But the law would also protect the public as well as labor against costly and needless stoppages of production. This is the part of the program that enrages the labor leaders. They claim that it is a "compulsory arbitration bill which would enslave labor." That isn't true. There is no more compulsory arbitration in this bill than there is in the law today that requires the peaceful judicial settlement of all kinds of controveries—except labor disputes.

The bill provides that unsettled disputes over the meaning and enforcement of a labor agreement shall be submitted to the decision of an adjustment board. All contracts, including labor contracts, can now be legally interpreted and enforced by courts. The proposed law merely provides a simplified plan for settling grievances, which are disputes over the meaning of a contract. This is exactly the same sort of plan which is today written in hundreds of labor contracts. This is not compulsory arbitration any more than it is compulsory arbitration when a worker sues his employer in court for wages which he claims are due him under his contract.

In addition, the proposed law does provide that when a labor controversy can't be settled by agreement, and a stoppage of production will impose severe public hardship, then the decision of a fact-finding commission appointed by the President may be made binding on the parties for a period normally of 1 year. This temporary settlement can be called compulsory arbitration. But it doesn't enslave the workers, because no one is required to work under it.

However, if today there were a strike and the stoppage of an essential business, such as an electric power plant, the dispute would be settled under present law by compulsion. The Government could not permit a community to be without light, or power, or water, or food for any length of time. If the Government seized the plant, or if the Government used soldiers to take the place of civilian workers, this would be a compulsory settlement. Even if the Government did nothing until inflamed public opinion either broke the strike or forced the employer to give in, this would be a compulsory settlement.

Whenever force is turned loose to settle a dispute, that is compulsory arbitration. Most people would prefer compulsory arbitration by a public tribunal to compulsory arbitration by the police or by a mob.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum in opposition to the adoption of the equal rights amendment by Marvin Harrison, attorney, of Cleveland, Ohio:

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT WOULD WIPE OFF THE STATUTE BOOKS ALL LAWS WHICH NOW GIVE NEEDED AND SPECIAL PROTECTION TO WOMEN

Any discussion of the proposed equal rights amendment might well begin with the obvious fact that if the Constitution is so amended as to prohibit all discrimination in the law against women, it is plain that it will also prohibit all discrimination in their favor.

When such an amendment is adopted, all of the laws which have been passed to provide the special protection which they need will be automatically wiped off the books, because it is obvious that they are intended to discriminate, and do discriminate in favor of women.

Without attempting to make an exhaustive list of the laws which would be thus expunged, we suggest the following as some of the outstanding types of legislation which will be prohibited under the equal-rights amendment.

1. Protection of widows.
2. Support for wives and minor children.
3. Protection of girls and young women against sexual offenses.
4. Questions of divorce and alimony.
5. Protection of women who work in industry:
   (a) With reference to minimum wages.
   (b) With reference to maximum hours.
   (c) With reference to occupational hazards.

1. THE PROTECTION OF WIDOWS

Throughout all recorded history, the predicament of the widow has been a problem that has received constant—if not always adequate—attention of lawmakers.

In one of the earliest codes of law extant (the Code of Hammurabi) we find special laws for the protection of widows. Thus in Johns treatise on Babylonian and Assyrian Laws we find the following reference (p. 145):

"The Code (of Hammurabi) makes clear what was the position of the widow. She had a right to stay on in her husband's house until she died * * * the children had no power to turn her out."

This right of the widow to remain—for a limited period of time, at least—in the mansion house is recognized by the law of almost every civilized country in the world.

Shall the United States be the first to write it down in its basic law that no law

is valid if it extends to widows some special and discriminatory aid?

Our laws are simply filled with special laws for the help and protection of widows.

When our social-security acts were adopted a few years ago, Congress wrote in (title 42, U. S. C. A., sec. 402) special provisions for the protection of widows of men who may die while insured under the provisions of the act.

Under the laws of most States the rights of creditors to levy upon the property of widows are considerably limited. Upon the death of their husbands, allowance is generally made for the support of widows from the estate, for a period of at least 1 year.

When a man is killed in industrial employment, many States make it extremely easy for a widow to prove her dependence upon her husband so as to facilitate payment of workmen's compensation.

This special concern over the plight of widows which existed in the time of Hammurabi, and which appears repeatedly in expressions of solicitude by lawgivers throughout the Bible, did not arise from any silly or mawkish sentimentality.

It arose out of a realistic understanding of certain facts. These facts are simple and stubborn. A widow is vastly less able to care for herself and her children than a man of the same age.

That was true 5,000 years ago. It is true today.

Unless the law can deal appropriately with these simple and stubborn facts by discriminating in favor of widows, then the law is most certainly in the harsh language of Mr. Charles Dickens' Bumble, "an unmistakable ass."

2. SUPPORT FOR WIVES AND MINOR CHILDREN

Here again, it is necessary to deal honestly and frankly with the facts of life—the facts of family life.

Can anyone in his senses argue seriously that there is no real difference in the duty of support owed to their families by men from that owed by women?

And is there any doubt that the law may properly impose different duties on the one than on the other?

Unless we are prepared to abandon completely the concept of the family as our basic sociological unit, it is inevitable that the law must create and enforce different obligations upon the husband and father than upon the wife and mother.

Men and women may and should stand equally as voters.

Equally as jurors.

Equally as persons capable of creating and carrying out their own contracts.

But it is nothing less than retreat from all reason and common sense to pretend that there is "equality of rights" as between the bread winner who deserts his family, and the pregnant wife who is deserted.

The law of almost every State imposes the duty of support of the family upon the husband; and the right of support in the wife.

For example in a typical industrial State (Ohio) the matter is stated thus:

"Section 7997 general code: Duty of husband to support family. The husband must support himself, his wife, and his minor children out of his property or by his labor. If he is unable to do so, the wife must assist him so far as she is able."

There are similar provisions as to the husband's primary liability in the law of every State in the Union. And if this amendment is adopted, every one of them will be expunged from the law.

The proponents of the amendment have suggested that in place of this old, old law that a husband should support his family and that the law may properly discriminate in favor of women in order to enforce this duty, we should have a new law under equal rights amendment, to the effect that each spouse is under a duty to support the other. Which (for its obvious silly futility) brings to mind the famous statute which was once introduced in the Kansas legislature, and which related to the right of way of trains at intersecting railroad crossings. This law provided in substance that when two trains approached the crossing at the same time, each of them should stop; and neither should proceed until the other had gone.

So long as our modern society rests upon the family, there must certainly be special obligations upon the husband and father to support that family, and special rights of support in the wife and the children; and any constitutional amendment which makes that duty ambiguous or which prevents the arming of that duty and that right with legal sanctions is ridiculous and intolerable.

3. PROTECTION OF GIRLS AND YOUNG WOMEN AGAINST SEX OFFENSES

Our laws everywhere punish those persons who entice or coerce women into houses of ill fame.

Our Federal Statutes (the Mann Act) prohibit and punish the transportation of women across State lines for immoral purposes.

Rape, whether with or without consent, is everywhere punished as a crime against women.

In short, the law universally regards the sexual protection of women and particularly of young girls as a matter of enormous social concern.

Should it be otherwise?

To use one State again as an illustration (Ohio) of what can be duplicated in every other State, we find the following statutes which discriminate in favor of women to provide for their protection. (All references to the Ohio General Code.)

Section 13026. Punishing seduction under promise of marriage.

Section 13027. Punishing the keeper of a house of ill fame who detains female inmates.

Section 13028. Punishing any person who gives intoxicants to young girls in order to secure sexual intercourse.

Section 13029. Punishing any person who entices a girl under 18 years of age into a house of ill fame.

Section 13031. Punishing the use of force or threats to coerce any woman into a house of ill fame.

Section 13032. Punishing the use of indecent language in the presence of women or girls.

Section 12413. Punishing the crime of rape.

Section 12414. Punishing the crime of rape with consent, and fixing the age of consent for women.

Section 13382. Punishing the slander of chastity of any woman.

Is there anyone who believes that all of these statutes should be expunged? And that some laws can be substituted which make no distinction in their rights and duties between men and women?

4. THE QUESTIONS OF DIVORCE AND ALIMONY

In a good many States, the failure of a husband to support his wife and family is a valid ground for divorce.

That, of course, is a good illustration of a legal discrimination in favor of women.

Should it be rendered nugatory by the adoption of the equal rights amendment?

Generally speaking, the divorce and alimony laws are weighted very heavily in favor of women and against men.

That is based upon a realization of the obvious fact that when a home is broken up by divorce or legal separation, it is proper to throw the greater share of the burden of support upon the man than the woman.

Why?

Because it is comparatively easy for a man to make his way and make his living and comparatively difficult for a woman, and because further when there are little children involved, the father must continue to support them, no matter what factors have brought about the separation.

The rights and welfare of little children cannot be made to depend upon theoretical equal rights. They must get support from their father, because he is the one who in our modern society can best provide it.

This may not be equal rights but it is good common sense.

5. THE PROTECTION OF WOMEN WHO WORK IN INDUSTRY

(a) With reference to minimum wages.

(b) With reference to maximum hours.

(c) With reference to occupational hazards.

The proponents of this amendment admit freely enough that all of the protective legislation for women in industry will be wiped off the books if the amendment is adopted.

But they have a ready and cynical answer.

Let us substitute new legislation which will protect both men and women, and thus avoid all discrimination either for or against women, is their suggestion.

To this suggestion there are at least two complete answers.

In the first place, with the existing protective legislation scrapped, it is highly uncertain when or whether it can ever be replaced if it must be enlarged to include all men within the range of similar protection. It has taken many, many years to secure enactment of the laws that we have. Must we wait again for a long, long time to secure new legislation?

But secondly, and more important, it is simply impossible to write protective laws which are suited both for men and women.

Is it true, or is it not true, that a young girl is less able to endure long hours of work with safety than her brother?

Is it true, or is it not true, that her body is less well equipped to lift and carry heavy weights than his?

All medical treatises agree on this basic fact, that on the average women in industry cannot safely endure physical strains, or fatigue, or long hours, or heavy work, or occupational hazards that men can safely undertake.

This physical distinction is a fact, a very stubborn fact.

Are we to write in our basic law an amendment which will prohibit valid distinctions and discriminations in the law, which are based upon these stubborn facts?

Is it true, or is not true, that women are much more subject to the hazards and risks of occupational disease than men?

Is it true, or is not true, that under the same conditions of employment more women develop occupational disease than men?

If this is true, should not the law be permitted to discriminate in its protective provisions?

The laws guaranteeing to women a decent "minimum wage" were secured as the result of 25 years of unremitting effort by men and women who were determined that women in industry should be assured at least decent minimum wage.

Must this all go down the drain because of the equal rights amendment?

The proponents of the amendment reply that men and women should both have minimum wages guaranteed. This is no anwser at all. As already stated, no one can tell when, if at all, substitute acts can be passed by the respective State legislatures which will cover and include both men and women. And it will be extremely difficult, if not indeed impossible, to draw a minimum wage law fair and adequate for the one and not wholly useless as to the other.

Is it true, or is it not true, that women are more likely to be casual employees than men?

Is it true—or is it not true—that their work tends to be for a short period after school is finished and before the responsibilities of marriage are assumed?

Is it true—or is it not true—that because of the fact that women frequently regard their employment as a stop-gap or makeshift, they are less able to protect themselves in trades unions and are in greater need of protection by law?

These are the facts—the stubborn facts—about the employment of women; and they make the protection of a minimum wage for women a vital necessity, whereas men, by their trades unions, can provide a good deal of protection for themselves.

This is the realistic reason why the law must discriminate, and discriminate in favor of women, so far as protection for a minimum wage is concerned.

The same factors apply with respect to the laws relating to maximum hours. The need for these laws, which discriminate in favor of women, is reinforced, however, by the obvious fact that women are physically incapable of sustaining heavy labor for as many hours as men.

So also, with reference to the laws which discriminate in favor of women with reference to occupational hazards and provision for their comfort and safety.

In final analysis, all of these laws are based upon facts—stubborn facts. They are based upon the physical differences between men and women, and the law can and should take these physical differences into account; and any constitutional amendment which will prevent legislation along these lines is simply intolerable.

Some years ago a hearing on a similar equal rights amendment was held before the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, February 7, 1938. One of the members of this committee was Senator William E. Borah. During the testimony of Dean G. Acheson there occurred the following colloquy:

Mr. Acheson testified as follows:

"The fact that men should be proteced in these situations and have not been is no argument that women should not be so protected.

"Because we have not achieved the perfect goal we should not sweep away the efforts of a hundred years, the efforts that have been made all over he United States and in Europe to raise the standards under which women work, and to prevent the exploitation and abuse of women in industry * * * but apart from all that the committee will be told that this type of legislation has handicapped women * * * I suppose there may be some women in the United States who would like to work in mines. I do not know of any, but I presume they can be found."

Senator Borah:

"I do not believe women have the right to work in dangerous places on the same level with men. It seems to me we are trying to do what God has failed to do—make them equal when they are not equal. It is not a question of superiority; it is a question of physical differences."

Mr. Acheson:

"I quite agree with you."

Senator Borah:

"I think women have a right to shorter hours of work than men. I think they have that right by reason of the fact that they are women. When you say they have a right to the same employment that men have, regardless of their capacity, you utterly ignore the differences which the divine law provides." (Hearings on S. J. Res. 65, Feb. 7, 1938, pp. 51, 52).

There are many State laws which guarantee seats for women working in stores—other laws providing for rest periods—or limiting the weight of objects which may be handled—or prohibiting employment under conditions regarded as dangerous to the health or morals of women.

We submit that these laws represent a sensible, honest, realistic approach to the real facts of the situation.

As was said by Mr. Justice Holmes in his famous dissent (*Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital*, 261 U. S. 525, 570 (1922)):

"It will need more than the nineteenth amendment to convince me that there are no differences between men and women or that legislation cannot take those differences into account."

The proponents of the equal rights amendment insist that Mr. Justice Holmes was wrong, and that there are in fact no differences between men and women which legislation can deal with.

IN CONCLUSION

We have attached as a supplement or appendix to this brief a brief résumé of the laws of the several States which discriminate in favor of women.

Every one of these laws will be wiped off the books if the proposed amendment should be adopted. Surely such a result would be deplorable.

Our Constitution ought not to be amended merely because the proponents of a change have armed themselves with a good slogan. And yet that is the principal strength of the campaign for the "equal rights" amendment, and it is an astonishing tribute to the power of a good slogan that a proposition as inherently and obviously absurd as this proposed amendment can command any serious support.

"Equality" is itself a word to conjure with.

But when that sacred word is hitched up to another to create a phrase "equal rights for women," we have a phrase that sweeps almost everything before it.

It was Joseph Conrad, the famous and incomparable novelist, who must have had something of the modern slogan in mind when he wrote:

"Do you perceive the force of a word? He who wants to persuade should put his trust not in the right argument, but in the right word. The power of sound has always been greater than the power of sense. * * * You cannot fail to see the power of mere words; such words as glory, for instance, or pity. I won't mention more. They are not far to seek. Shouted with perseverance, with ardour, with conviction, these two by their sound alone have set whole nations in motion and upheaved the dry, hard ground on which rests our whole social fabric. * * * Don't talk to me of your Archimedes' lever. He was an absent-minded person with a mathematical imagination. * * * Give me the right word and the right accent, and I will move the world."

Obviously, "equality" and "equal rights for women" are words of the kind that Conrad had in mind; and since no one can dispute that they are now being shouted with "perseverance, with ardour and with conviction," it is no great wonder that the proponents of this amendment are hopeful of setting our Nation in motion.

But good words and good slogans sometimes have had unhappy ends.

"Liberty" also is a grand word. Yet as Madame Roland was carried along to her death on the guillotine, she uttered those immortal words, "Oh, liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name."

"Temperance"—there was a grand word too, but well-meaning crusaders in that cause fastened the eighteenth amendment upon us with serious and unexpected consequences. In that campaign as in this, the power of sound was vastly greater than the power of sense. And so cowards quailed before well-meaning fools, and the cause of real temperance was put back for many years.

It is true that there are some proponents of this amendment who say that women are now ready to stand on their own feet, and that they need no special protection of law. Such persons should turn back to the first chapters of the industrial history of England. Those were the good old days when women did stand on their own feet and had no benefit of remedial legislation. Women worked in the mines in England—and worked for 12, 14, yes, 16 hours a day. They worked under conditions of hideous and revolting brutality which are almost incredible to the modern mind. It was the shocking revelation of the brutalizing degradation of women in industrial employment which led to the first great reform laws of the nineteenth century, and which for the first time made it perfectly obvious that women were entitled to have—indeed were required to have—some special protection and some special legislative care.

There were, of course, many women then—as now—who had no concern for such things. These great ladies lived as handsomely, as beautifully, as they wished. If thousands of women were living in industrial employment like beasts of the field—and very dirty beasts of very dirty fields—what was that to them? Like Pontius Pilate they cared for none of those things.

So today. In order to have a paper victory under a sham slogan there are women, proponents of this amendment, who are quite willing to destroy in one moment the protective devices that have been built out of generations of hard work and patient endeavor.

No one can deny that "equal rights for women" has a persuasive and seductive sound. But it reminds one irresistible of other empty and spurious rights and liberties.

It was Anatole France who summed up a similar situation in his famous dictum, and with devastating irony:

"The law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread."

And when this amendment is adopted the law in its majestic equality will guarantee to all persons, whether strong men or weak women, the equal right to work long hours, to perform bone-crushing work, to incur hazards of health and bodily injury, and in times of old age and bereavement to support themselves in their own misery.

That is the spurious equality which is proposed by the "equal rights" amendment, and from which we trust the good sense of the people of this Nation will protect us.

Evolution of an Idea—Amendment Removing Quotas From Local Slaughtering Plants Certified as Clean and Sanitary

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives of which I have the honor of being chairman, has been investigating the meat situation since complaints began to come in to Congress soon after the enactment of the Office of Price Administration law. Our committee was in close touch with the situation at all times, particularly during the past 2 or 3 years.

FEDERAL INSPECTION BECAME MAJOR PROBLEM

In the early part of our investigation I realized, and I am sure other Members realized, that Federal inspection would play a major part in the distribution of meat. It finally developed that out of many thousands of packing plants and

slaughtering houses too few of them were federally inspected.

Federally inspected slaughterers alone could legally meet the requirements of the armed forces and could operate without any quota or slaughtering requirements.

Federally inspected slaughterers alone could legally ship meat across State lines to supply those civilians living in States producing only limited supplies of meat.

The nonfederally inspected slaughterers and farm slaughterers were limited in their distribution to the State in which they were situated.

Therefore, the basic cause of maldistribution of meat was due to the substantial growth of the amount of livestock being slaughtered in nonfederally inspected slaughtering houses. This growth sharply reduced the amount of meat available to the federally inspected plants. Naturally, the federally inspected slaughterers had to take care of the needs of the armed services first. For this reason, they had less and less meat available to ship across State lines to the low meat-producing areas, including large cities.

It was necessary in some way to channel meat through federally inspected packers, in order to increase the supply of livestock through these plants for the armed services and Government purchase first, and the civilian population next. In order to do this, the quota system was agreed upon, which restricted the amount of meat a nonfederally inspected slaughterer could process on the theory that this quota would hold the non-federally-inspected processor down and the remainder would go through the federally-inspected plant. The Federal-inspection laws were so strict and rigid that even nice, clean, sanitary places were unable to obtain Federal inspection approval, thereby making it impossible for the armed services to get any of the meat these particular plants slaughtered.

COMMON COMPLAINTS

A cry was heard from all over the country:

We have plenty of animals around our little town and local slaughtering plant, but our local plant cannot slaughter them because of a very low quota.

Another complaint:

We cannot get meat, there is an abundance of fat cattle available but our local packer who operates a nice plan under city supervision is not allowed to slaughter them.

Another complaint was:

I have 10 head of cattle, which I carried to the local plant this morning and could not sell because the local plant has already slaughtered its quota for this month. What can I do?

Another complaint;

The local slaughterer refuses to buy my cattle. The only way I can sell them is to ship them to a federally inspected plant, which is 300 miles away. Since I do not have enough cattle to make up a car, the Office of Defense Transportation will not allow me to ship them. The result is that my cattle will get thinner and the people will do without this much meat.

All kinds of complaints were coming in about the cattle population being the largest in history, and yet the local slaughterers could not slaughter those that were available, and the people were without meat.

The stock excuse given in answer to the complaint that lots of animals were available but the local slaughterer could not slaughter them, was that there were plenty of tires in Akron, Ohio, plenty of automobiles in Detroit, and plenty of gasoline in Longview, Tex., but it all belonged to the Nation, not to the local community, and that equitable distribution must be made. This was not a satisfactory answer in the case of meats. At least it did not satisfy.

For many months I have been convinced that eventually we would have to do something about Federal inspection during the war, that is, ease the requirements in order to permit more plants to qualify for Federal inspection or inspection tantamount to Federal inspection.

JUDGE JONES AS WFA TRIED TO CORRECT SITUATION

In the early part of this year I conferred with the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, about this problem a number of times. Judge Jones was convinced that something along this line had to be done, so he sent instructions to the field to relax Federal requirements for all plants producing meat that was not diseased and was clean and wholesome. Judge Jones, for several months, religiously endeavored to get these rigid Federal inspection requirements relaxed in the interest of the war effort and the civilian population. I often talked with him about it, but finally was convinced that the WFA and Agriculture Department agents in the field were not carrying out Judge Jones' orders and were not diligently endeavoring to bring into Federal inspection all the plants that were eligible.

DISCUSSED WITH TEXAS DELEGATION IN CONGRESS

In the early part of May 1945 this matter was discussed by the Texas delegation in Congress at one of our closed meetings, and it was agreed, after a thorough discussion of the many wrongs and the remedies therefor, that something must be done. During the week commencing June 18, 1945, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, who was present at the Texas delegation discussion suggested to me that I prepare an amendment to the Office of Price Administration Extension Act embodying my views on distribution of meat through all clean and sanitary plants which I had often discussed with him. I immediately commenced to work on such a proposal. By Thursday of that week, June 21, I had a rough draft in my own memorandum book in my own handwriting.

Friday, July 22, I again conferred with the Speaker and other Texas Members about it. The crudely drawn amendment, then in pencil form, was discussed.

Saturday morning, June 23, I had prepared in typewritten form the following very rough draft of an amendment to the OPA Act as follows:

No quota or other slaughtering limitation shall hereafter be imposed upon any slaughterer of animals, under this or any other law, if the Secretary of Agriculture has certified that such slaughterer is one who is complying with the following conditions:

(1) That no diseased animals are slaughtered.

(2) That the slaughtering plant is operated under sanitary conditions and that the meat produced therefrom is clean and wholesome.

(3) That the slaughterer is setting aside, properly storing, holding for and making available for the use of the armed services of the United States the percent (not exceeding 50 percent of the production of the plant) required by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided, however,* That in the event any slaughterer is unable to comply with this provision, the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the slaughterer to set aside a percentage (not to exceed 50 percent) of his live animals, by volume, to be transported to the nearest available slaughtering plants where the animals may be slaughtered and the meat properly stored and made available when needed.

The Secretary of Agriculture may provide for inspection in such manner and by such persons as he may deem advisable.

Nothwithstanding any law to the contrary, meat which is produced under the circumstances specified in this section shall be permitted to be transported in interstate commerce to any point in the United States.

ASSISTANCE SECURED IN DRAFTING AND IMPROVING AMENDMENT

Early Saturday morning, June 23, I contacted Mr. Allan H. Perley, of the Office of the Legislative Counsel, House of Representatives, and secured his assistance in putting the amendment in legal form. The following changes were made in this amendment from the time it was started:

First. It was agreed that it would be inserted in the Office of Price Administration extension bill, page 1, after line 9.

Second. That it would be a new section to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

Third. That it would have a heading "Provision relating to slaughterers."

Fourth. It was then agreed to make it a part of the Stabilization Act instead of the Emergency Price Control Act. Change was made.

Fifth. The heading "Provision relating to slaughterers" stricken out.

Sixth. While Mr. Perley was on his way to my office that morning, I contacted the Honorable Fred Vinson, Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, who had the amendment taken down over the telephone by a stenographer in his office and who later called me back and gave me his comments with the understanding that he did not want to be interfering with anything that was in the jurisdiction of another agency, but if I were going to insist upon the amendment, he would make certain suggestions; they were very helpful and constructive.

The Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, had the amendment taken down, recopied, and furnished to officials in the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture, and gave me the benefit of his and their views and suggestions later that morning, which were very helpful in the improvement of the proposal.

The Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, was contacted, and he had the amendment taken down over the telephone, copies distributed to interested people in OPA, and caused to come to my

office for interview and assistance Mr. John Madigan, head of the Meat Division of the Office of Price Administration, and Mr. Richard Field, general counsel of OPA. Mr. Bowles and his employees were also cooperative and helpful.

PRESENT AT CONFERENCE

In the conference that morning—which continued all morning—in my office were Mr. Perley, of the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives; Mr. Field, general counsel, OPA; Mr. Madigan, head of the Meat Division of OPA; and Mr. Morton O. Cooper, administrator of War Food Order 75, Department of Agriculture. While we were conferring about this amendment, we were in constant contact with Messrs. Vinson, Jones, and Bowles. We were unable to contact the Honorable Clinton Anderson, who was later to become Secretary of Agriculture, but succeeded in conferring with him before noon of that day. As a result of these conferences, additional changes were made in the amendment.

SOME OF THE MANY CHANGES MADE

Seventh. It was desired to make it plain that the letting down of the bars on Federal inspection would be temporary, therefore the language "While this act is in effect" was inserted as the first language in the proposal.

Eighth. The phrase "Under this or any other law" in the first paragraph was changed to read "Under authority of this or any other law."

Ninth. Instead of the language "If the Secretary of Agriculture has certified that such slaughterer is one who is complying with the following conditions," the following language was agreed upon:

If the Secretary of Agriculture has certified that the slaughtering plant is operated under sanitary conditions and that the meat produced therein is clean, wholesome, and suitable for human consumption.

Tenth. The phrase "That no diseased animals are slaughtered" was an unfortunate one. It was agreed that since slaughterers cannot determine in most instances whether animals are diseased until they are killed the intent would have to be indicated in different language.

Eleventh. It was agreed that instead of the 1, 2, and 3 conditions that it be written into more compact and better language and strike out the 1, 2, and 3 conditions.

Twelfth. The No. 3 provision was first amended to provide that the amount of meat set aside should not exceed 50 percent of the production of the plant.

Thirteenth. After the amendment of the No. 3 provision, it was decided that the setting aside of live animals would raise an additional problem and that was, Who would pay the expense of the live animals until they reached another slaughtering plant?

Fourteenth. In order to cure this provision, the following amendment was agreed upon:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including the amounts necessary for the payment of the costs of distributing animals as provided in subparagraph 3, under subsection (a).

Fifteenth. Then it was decided that the job of allocating these live animals to the different federally inspected packers would be one in which there would be very keen competition and rivalry and it would be an almost impossible task to determine which plant under the circumstances would be the nearest available plant and other problems which would be difficult of determination.

Sixteenth. It was decided to leave out entirely all of subparagraph 3 under subsection (a) and also the amendment about authorizing the appropriation.

Seventeenth. Instead of requiring these new packers to set aside so much meat or so many animals, it was decided to make the meat available to the armed services or for Government purchase, if desired.

Eighteenth. The following language was agreed upon:

(b) As a condition of making certification in the case of any such slaughterer, the Secretary of Agriculture may require that such slaughterer make available to the armed services of the United States, or for Government purchase, such percentage of the meat slaughtered and processed as he may deem necessary or advisable.

Nineteenth. The provision allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to use local, city, county, State, or other available inspectors, including local veterinarians was changed to read as follows:

(c) In order that he may make the certifications provided for under subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for inspection in such manner and by such persons as he may deem advisable.

Twentieth. In the provision about transporting the meat in interstate commerce, the phrase "to any point in the United States" was stricken out, and the phrase "interstate commerce" was changed to read "interstate or foreign commerce."

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ANDERSON CONSULTED

After we had reached this point in our deliberations, we were able to contact the Honorable Clinton Anderson, who is now Secretary of Agriculture. After reading and discussing the proposed amendment with him, he suggested that something should be inserted in the proposal to allow him to keep the meat out of black market. In other words, to allow him to cancel certification of slaughterers, who would not keep the meat in legitimate trade channels, so the following paragraphs were written and agreed upon:

(e) The Secretary of Agriculture may refuse certification in any case when he is not satisfied that the meat made available hereunder will be disposed of in legitimate trade channels in accordance with law.

(f) The Secretary of Agriculture may revoke any such certification if it is found at any time that the slaughterer does not meet any of the conditions required under this section.

With these amendments, Mr. Anderson agreed that the amendment would be a good one and would be very helpful to him in ironing out the meat problem.

In order to make it perfectly plain about what the Secretary of Agriculture had in mind, an additional amendment was agreed upon, as follows:

Nothing herein shall prevent the termination, suspension, or limitation of the right of any person to slaughter who fails to comply with the price rationing, or slaughter-control requirements imposed under the authority of this or any other law.

AMENDMENT FINALLY AGREED UPON

This was about 11:30 a. m., June 23, 1945. The crudely drawn amendment, which was considered from early morning, after consultation with these people, had been changed and after changes agreed upon for presentation to the House of Representatives that day as an amendment to the OPA Extension Act, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 1, after line 9, insert the following section:

"SEC. 3. The Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 3 thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 3A. (a) While this act is in effect, no quota or other slaughtering limitation shall be imposed upon any slaughterer of animals, under authority of this or any other law, if the Secretary of Agriculture has certified that the slaughtering plant is operated under sanitary conditions and that the meat produced therein is clean, wholesome, and suitable for human consumption.

"'(b) As a condition of making certification in the case of any such slaughterer, the Secretary of Agriculture may require that such slaughterer make available to the armed services of the United States, or for Government purchase, such percentage of the meat slaughtered and processed as he may deem necessary or advisable.

"'(c) In order that he may make the certifications provided for under subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for inspection in such manner and by such persons as he may deem advisable.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, meat which is produced under the circumstances specified in this section shall be permitted to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

"'(e) The Secretary of Agriculture may refuse certification in any case when he is not satisfied that the meat made available hereunder will be disposed of in legitimate trade channels in accordance with law.

"'(f) The Secretary of Agriculture may revoke any such certification if it is found at any time that the slaughterer does not meet any of the conditions required under this section.

"'(g) *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the termination, suspension, or limitation of the right to slaughter of any person who fails to comply with the price, rationing, or slaughter-control requirements imposed under the authority of this or any other law.'"

The amendment was constantly improved as a result of the consultations herein mentioned. Although it bears my name, many others are entitled to a lion's share of the credit for its formulation.

The amendment was adopted in the House of Representatives by a vote of 372 for to 3 against.

This proposal was mimeographed and made available at 12:15 p. m. that day. I immediately gave different interested people copies, including members of our Committee on Banking and Currency, and among others given copies on the floor before the proposal was submitted was the Honorable WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia. I asked him to read it and consider it, which he did, but that was the first time I had ever discussed the meat problem, to my knowledge, with Mr. ROBERTSON, and I had certainly never

discussed any proposed amendment with him. At no time did he ever suggest any amendment to me. I appreciate the interest Mr. ROBERTSON has taken in this matter and I am sure his efforts have been very helpful in the direction of solving the meat problem, but it just happens that we had not been working together on it. His meeting on Friday, June 22, was doubtless helpful in bringing to the attention of the authorities the seriousness of the problem and the necessity for early action.

CHANGE MADE BY CONFEREES

There was a conference between the House and the Senate to iron out the differences between the two bodies on the OPA bill. In the conference committee other changes in this amendment were made, as follows:

Twenty-first. At the end of the new section 3A, subsection (a), the following was added:

But certification under this section shall not be made with respect to any slaughtering plant (1) at which inspection is maintained under the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260), with respect to all its slaughtering operations, or (2) at which such inspection under such act was previously maintained if, in the ju lgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, the slaughterer withdrew such plant from such inspection for the purpose of applying for certification under this section.

This was intended for the purpose of preventing federally inspected slaughterers from withdrawing from Federal inspection to accept the terms of the new amendment and to give the Secretary of Agriculture power to prevent a slaughterer from receiving the benefits of the new amendment if he withdrew from Federal inspection for that purpose.

Twenty-second. Another provision was added by the conferees to permit a slaughtering plant to be divided, part of it federally inspected or inspected under this proposal or not inspected at all. In order to carry this out, the following provision was inserted by the conferees:

After subsection (b), of section 3A, add the following:

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture may make the certification provided for under subsection (a) with respect to a designated part of a slaughtering plant without making such certification with respect to the remainder of such slaughtering plant, in which event the provisions of this section shall apply only to meat produced in such designated part of the slaughtering plant.

Twenty-third. It was thought that the provision of permitting the meat to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, notwithstanding any law to the contrary, was too broad and possibly would not be within the provisions of the Pure Food and Drug Act.

Twenty-fourth. It was also agreed that some provision should be made for identifying meat to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce under the proposal, so the following language was agreed upon by the conferees instead of the language in the House amendment:

(e) Meat which is produced under the circumstances specified in this section shall have the same status for transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, when properly identified in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, as meat produced in plants at which inspection is maintained under the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260).

Twenty-fifth. The amendment, as agreed upon by the conferees, which was later adopted by the House and Senate and approved by the President of the United States when he approved the OPA Extension Act, was as follows:

SEC. 8. The Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 3 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3A. (a) While this Act is in effect, no quota or other slaughtering limitation shall be imposed upon any slaughterer of animals, under authority of this or any other law, if the Secretary of Agriculture has certified that the slaughtering plant is operated under sanitary conditions and that the meat produced therein is clean, wholesome, and suitable for human consumption; but certification under this section shall not be made with respect to any slaughtering plant (1) at which inspection is maintained under the Act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260), with respect to all its slaughtering operations, or, (2) at which such inspection under such Act was previously maintained if, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, the slaughterer withdrew such plant from such inspection for the purpose of applying for certification under this section.

"(b) As a condition of making certification in the case of any such slaughterer, the Secretary of Agriculture may require that such slaughterer make available to the armed services of the United States, or for Government purchase, such percentage of the meat slaughtered and processed as he may deem necessary or advisable.

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture may make the certification provided for under subsection (a) with respect to a designated part of a slaughtering plant without making such certification with respect to the remainder of such slaughtering plant, in which event the provisions of this section shall apply only to meat produced in such designated part of the slaughtering plant.

"(d) In order that he may make the certifications provided for under subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for inspection in such manner and by such persons as he may deem advisable.

"(e) Meat which is produced under the circumstances specified in this section shall have the same status for transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, when properly identified in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, as meat produced in plants at which inspection is maintained under the Act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260).

"(f) The Secretary of Agriculture may refuse or revoke certification in any case when he is not satisfied that the meat made available hereunder will be disposed of in legitimate trade channels in accordance with law.

"(g) The Secretary of Agriculture may revoke any certification under subsection (a) if it is found at any time that the slaughterer does not meet each of the conditions required under this section.

"(h) Nothing in this section shall prevent the termination, suspension, or limitation of the right of any person to slaughter if such person fails to comply with the price, rationing, or slaughter control requirements imposed under the authority of this or any other law."

ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

That is the amendment to be administered by the new Secretary of Agriculture. I am sure every effort will be made to expedite the issuance of rules and regulations concerning eligibility of slaughterers under its provisions and making it as easy as possible for clean, sanitary plants producing wholesome meats to get into operation at a very early date without quota or other slaughtering restrictions.

The Honorable Clinton Anderson, of New Mexico, then a Member of Congress from that State but now Secretary of Agriculture, supported the amendment. His speech appears on page 6703 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23, 1945.

I have enumerated the substantial changes in the original proposal. There were dozens and dozens of minor changes that were made, which improved the text.

The conferees mentioned on the part of the House were: Representatives BRENT SPENCE, Kentucky; PAUL BROWN, Georgia; WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas; MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma; JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan; FRED L. CRAWFORD, Michigan; and RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York.

The conferees on the part of the Senate were: Senators ROBERT F. WAGNER, New York; ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky; J. H. BANKHEAD, Alabama; GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, Maryland; CHARLES W. TOBEY, New Hampshire; ROBERT TAFT, Ohio; and HUGH BUTLER, Nebraska.

The conference report was adopted in the Senate, Friday, June 29, 1945, by a vote of 40 to 8; adopted in the House, Saturday, June 30, 1945, by a vote of 255 for to 94 against.

Industrialists Honor Seven Labor Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Cleveland (Ohio) Press on June 30, 1945:

INDUSTRIALISTS HONOR SEVEN LABOR LEADERS

(By Ray de Crane)

Seven of Cleveland's labor union officials were singled out today for demonstrating outstanding leadership.

The accolades came out from union members but from three prominent industrialists who have been observing the performance of the union leaders during the war emergency.

The unprecedented tributes were made in recognition of the city's peaceful labor-management relations at a time when the rest of the nation's industrial centers seem embroiled in bitter strife.

Selected by Robert A. Weaver, president of Ferro Enamel Co., as exemplifying the "best type of labor leadership in the country" are:

Edward F. Murphy, president of the AFL Teamsters Joint Council.

John H. Rohrich, vice president of the Teamsters Joint Council.

Thomas A. Lenehan, secretary, Cleveland Federation of Labor.

Matthew de More, president, AFL Machinists District Council.

William F. Donovan, district director, CIO United Steelworkers of America.

Joseph R. Kres, treasurer-manager CIO Cleveland Industrial Union Council.

Richard E. Reisinger, district director, CIO United Auto Workers Union.

"I have observed these men and know they are distinctly interested in the welfare of

Cleveland and have the ability and courage to provide leadership for their men," Mr. Weaver said.

Joining Mr. Weaver in attributing Cleveland's labor record to the quality of its leadership were Charles J. Stilwell, president of Warner & Swasey Co., and Abert S. Rodgers, president of White Sewing Machine Co.

All three have sat across the table and worked with labor union executives not only in a discussion of labor relations and contracts affecting workers in their own plants, but in joint labor-management committees of the War Manpower Commission and the mayor's war production committee.

Each has avoided labor difficulty in his own enterprise. They attribute it to a mutual respect they and their employees have for each others problems.

Mr. Weaver has had a signed contract with the CIO United Steelworkers of America since 1937. Not an hour's work has been lost through labor difficulty, he said.

"It may not sit so well with some of my business friends," the industrialist said with a smile, "but our relations have improved even more since we have had the closed shop."

"I have found Cleveland's union leaders exceptionally cooperative and unusually fair," said Mr. Rodgers. The CIO United Electrical Radio & Machine Workers represents the White Sewing Machine Co. employees.

"We don't always agree with everything—particularly in contract negotiations—but we argue good-naturedly."

Mr. Stilwell said he has found this city's union chiefs to be "sensible men" who "act in a businesslike way."

"I feel they should be complimented for the excellent job they have done," the head of Warner & Swasey Co., added.

A Tribute to the Late Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished lawyers of my State is the Honorable William V. Cowan, attorney, of Renton, Wash. He is a deep thinker, a profound scholar and a political writer of note.

Recently, in one of the weekly publications of our State, he wrote an article entitled "The Captain From the Battleship." It is a tribute to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Because this article is so eloquent, I am asking the unanimous consent of my colleagues for its incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues and my fellow citizens throughout America may read and be moved by it.

But let the article speak for itself. Here it is:

THE CAPTAIN FROM THE BATTLESHIP

(By William V. Cowan)

Slow moving out of Georgia in lilac time, the funeral train, bells tolling, carried his war-worried body back to the Capital City. Just the body of a man; that was all. A man who had worked too hard. Just a worn-out man who had tried to do too much; that was all.

But along the way, all along the way, men and women, heads bowed, faces sorrowing, stood while the organs and the drums sounded the wayside dirge.

"But for him," said a farmer, "I would have lost my farm and my horses."

"But for him," said a mother, "my child would still be a hopeless cripple." "Mine, too," said another, and another.

"But for him," said a widow, "I would be penniless and in the poorhouse."

"But for him," said two Jewish children to a Polish child, "we three would have been cast into a Nazi incinerator."

"But for him," said an Englishman, "there might have been no England now."

"But for him," scowled a Fascist prisoner, "we would have conquered. He stirred the people we had doomed."

On the paved streets of the Capital the black caisson carried his war-worn body. Sadly his fellow countrymen listened to the rumbling wheels, the measured tread of solemn feet, the mournful drums, the hushed voices.

Folk great and small listened. On every continent, on every sea, north and south, the folk listened.

The music of the bands, played as if the music itself were in tears; the sad singing; then the elegies and the eulogies.

Later up the Hudson he would belong privately to his family, to his little, life-long community. But here he belongs to his country, to his fellowmen, to all mankind.

In the spring, like another spring. In April, like another April. Why should it have happened again in April? Why before the shooting were done, before the victory won?

One stopped the slavery of men in his own country, the other the threatened slavery of mankind.

Two men out of a democracy. Two humble men. One born in worse poverty than the Son of Man, the other could walk only with strapped iron and crutches. Two men who, like Christ and Abou Ben Adhem, loved their fellowmen.

Strange what men can sometimes do. Strange what they can do when they love their fellowmen.

At every outpost, on every ship, on every nook of land, men and women listened.

The prayers of every creed, the requiems, the praises of friend and foe, the choirs singing his best-loved songs.

In the homes of the Americas wherever instruments were had, in London and Paris and Moscow, in the underground passages of Rotterdam and Prague and Copenhagen, in Siberia and India and South Africa, at the battle fronts in Europe and in the south Pacific, in the crude palaces of Chungking, in the caves of Yenan, sorrowfully they listened.

Again and again were repeated those words of Whitman:

"The ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won,
The port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting
But O Heart, on the deck my captain lies,
Fallen cold and dead."

No purple-robed king nor emperor ever received such glorious tribute as this crippled man, this man of democracy who hated conquerors and exploiters; no man such world-wide acclaim.

Gathered now with Nineveh and Tyre, with Confucius and Tolstoy, with Jefferson and Rousseau, with Paine and Lenin and Socrates, the great captain had left the ship.

Here was something new in all history: a man mourned in every nation, by every race, by all peoples. A simple Democrat out of a republic. A man of the people who preached the comradery of peoples, who aimed at the neighborliness of nations. A man whose fault was friendliness and friendship. A captain torn from his battleship. A crippled man who moved the world.

And everywhere they listened, the people listened:

"O Lord, O God of our fathers,
Earth to earth."

Taps.

Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Gen. Frank T. Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, to Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1945.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I have been advised of the action of the Finance Committee, of which you are chairman, to report favorable H. R. 3118, eliminating from the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives the language which, if enacted, would authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to employ during the emergency personnel of all categories without reference to the Civil Service and Classification Acts, but with due regard to veterans' preference. It is understood that the committee action was on the basis of this matter, being one properly for consideration of another committee, but inasmuch as the matter may come up in the Senate, and certainly in conference, should the two Houses disagree, I feel that you would desire an explanation of the objections which were raised, it is understood, by the Civil Service as well as by the Bureau of the Budget, and voiced in the debate in the House of Representatives by Congressman RAMSPECK, notwithstanding which it was passed by the House by the overwhelming vote of 225 to 39 on June 4, 1945. Further I feel that my successor, General Bradley, should not be handicapped as I have been in trying to bring the Veterans' Administration to a proper functioning basis.

I have stated without successful contradiction so far, and without fear thereof in the future, that all of the Administration's difficulties have been due to two factors, lack of adequate personnel and lack of adequate space. It was one of the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, Public, 346, 78th Congress, to afford such priorities and other authority as would enable the Veterans' Administration to secure adequate qualified personnel and the space in which they might perform their essential functions in extending benefits and relief to veterans and to the dependents of servicemen. In practice it has been found that this objective was not accomplished under said Act, and the amendment to Section 100 thereof was proposed accordingly. The objections which have been voiced thereto are as follows: First, that section 100 of the present act does afford sufficient priority; second, that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has authority, outside of the departmental service in the District of Columbia, to fix the classification and the salary of any position; and third, that to employ even for the duration temporary employees without reference to Civil Service and Classification Acts would be destructive of the present Civil Service in that it would

destroy the morale of those presently enjoying civil-service positions in the Veterans' Administration, and therefore it would not aid in recruitment.

Aside from the fact that these contentions do not seem entirely consistent with themselves, and particularly that the proposed amendment would restrict the salaries to the ranges fixed for classified grades, it has not been brought to my attention, nor I believe to that of the Congress, that similar provisions during the emergency of World War I were destructive of civil service, nor the similar statutes applicable to the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission during the present war have had such effect.

I think you may find it pertinent at this time to relate the history of some of the developments that have led to this proposal. To begin with, I am sure you are aware of the fact that the responsibilities of the Veterans Administration were approximately doubled by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and further, that there has been a 300 percent increase in the work of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the benefits of pension, medical care, hospitalization, and insurance provided in other basic statutes. While the Congress has evidenced every intent to afford the Administration sufficient authority, the following statement will illustrate some of the difficulties administratively encountered.

In February 1942 the Bureau of the Budget established a priority for employment purposes among Federal agencies and at that time the Veterans' Administration was placed in priority class V, the lowest possible rating. The personnel problem of the Veterans' Administration very quickly assumed proportions potentially serious in character. Request for transfer of employees increased sharply and the Administration was unable to prevent losses in personnel who could secure higher grades in agencies having higher classifications. Likewise so many of our key men being veterans of World War I or otherwise being Reserve officers, the Administration lost a great number of its key personnel, including its best doctors. Realizing that everything must be secondary to the winning of the war, few requests were made for retention of such personnel or for exemption from the draft. In fact, only an insignificant number of absolutely irreplaceable personnel were withheld from service in the armed forces. I made urgent appeals to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to other personnel and on April 17, 1942, those functions of the Administration associated with national service life-insurance activities were placed in priority II. This action was of very little assistance and served to complicate administration as related to personnel. In August 1942 a class IV priority was given to three units, a class III for one, and class II was given to national service life insurance activities. The units so recognized were then comparatively small in relation to total personnel strength. On December 24, 1943, chiefly because of congressional action, the Administration finally secured recognition as a war agency from the Bureau of the Budget and was given the proper priority rating.

Another complicating factor in the Administration's personnel problem resulted from directives of the War Manpower Commission. Under these directives all Government departments or agencies, including the Veterans' Administration, were placed in category 5. After an appeal to the Commission, certain functions of the Administration were placed in category 3 which represents the highest authority for clerical-administrative positions in the Federal Government. This rating was confined to central office clerical-administrative positions whereas the Administration requires personnel for other than clerical and administrative duties in central office, not to mention our needs for the field service. Category 5 was continued for all these other positions. However, in some instances, the field offices of the War Manpower Commission recently have given favorable consideration to requests of the Administration for assistance with reference to certain types of positions in hospital services in order to staff additional beds. You will recall that we are completing a hospital program calling for some 16,000 additional beds and are initiating another program calling for 26,000 additional beds.

None of these actions however enabled the Administration to compete with wage differentials and other factors governing the choice of jobs by prospective employees. Furthermore, even when applicants were willing to accept work immediately with the Veterans' Administration and were referred to the civil-service representatives for certification, they simply refused to be bothered with the necessary examinations in order to secure civil-service status.

The enactment of section 100, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, declared the congressional intent as to the Veterans' Administration being a war agency and gave full recognition as to the importance of its functions. In actual operation, however, the Administration has reason to believe that, notwithstanding this legislation, it has not been accorded the priority intended by the Congress. Because of the tremendous increase in the volume and character of its work, the fact that proper recognition was not given the Administration early in the war has served directly to complicate its numerous problems. In other words, we have a picture of constantly increasing activities and responsibilities with constant loss of efficient, qualified personnel, replaced, if at all, with untrained personnel often leaving their positions for better jobs elsewhere before learning their work with the Veterans' Administration.

Throughout the emergency the Administration has made every effort to acquaint the Civil Service Commission with a proper recognition of its recruitment problem. There have been numerous conferences with representatives of that agency concerning that subject, typical of which were those held in the office of the president of the Commission on February 25 and November 5, 1943. On June 27, 1944, President Mitchell and two members of his staff attended a conference here in this office in connection with the Administration's recruiting difficulties. In addition, there have been many appeals in writing on this general subject, illustrative of which are the attached letters marked "Exhibit A."

It becoming apparent in May 1943 that the Civil Service could not meet the demand for clerical personnel (clerks, typists, and stenographers), it became necessary to supplement efforts by recruiting employees through the Administration's field offices. Since that time approximately 1,400 employees have been obtained through these methods. In response to a request from the Administration, the Commission granted authority in June and November 1944 to appoint clerical employees (clerks, typists, and stenographers) on a temporary basis for assignment in central office by making local selections. Again this was due to the Commission's inability to meet our needs. The exact number of employees appointed under this authority is not available, but is estimated at approximately 900.

The lag in recruitment for clerical positions in the central office in Washington became so pronounced in March of this year, arrangements were made to designate one person at each of our field offices east of the Rocky Mountains to assist in recruiting and to assign one liaison representative for each Civil Service region, who, in conjunction with the Civil Service representatives and with the approval of the Commission, are making a concerted effort to fill quotas set up for central office clerical personnel. They have visited high schools, business schools, colleges, clubs, churches, etc. In addition, certain organizations have undertaken to recruit nurses and perhapes other personnel. Still further, approximately 50 percent of the central office activities were moved to New York City where both space and personnel at the time were available.

As I am sure you know, the Administration requires personnel in almost every grade, class, and type of work, professional, subprofessional, clerical, and administrative. It requires personnel in every State in the Union and the shortages are acute in areas such as Detroit, San Francisco, and Los Angeles where the manpower shortage has been most serious. As of April 1, 1945 the number of vacancies by Classification Services were:

Service:	
Clerical, Administrative and Fiscal	5,886
Professional and Scientific	[1] 2,959
Subprofessional	[2] 5,026
Crafts, Protective and Custodial	[2] 2,329

[1] This is off-set by approximately 2,000 commissioned officers of the Army and Navy, over 1,200 being Administration physicians commissioned by the Army.

[2] In the subprofessional and crafts, protective and custodial services are hospital attendants, mess attendants and laborers. The vacancies in these civilian positions are offset to an appreciable extent by approximately 6,500 enlisted men of the Army serving at the attendant level at 50 stations and approximately 1,200 prisoners of war at 17 of our hospitals. This number of enlisted men does not represent replacement for the same number of employees in regular positions as it has been necessary to request the detail of limited service enlisted men in the ratio of about two soldiers to one civilian employee because the soldiers have to drill, maintain their paper work, etc.

The doctors supplied by the Army and Navy were upon presidential direction. The enlisted men were supplied direct in an agreement with the Secretary of War. It is only fair to say that these arrangements have been less than wholly satisfactory either to the personnel concerned or to the Veterans' Administration for reasons which are rather readily apparent.

Under the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946 several thousand additional positions will be required and this agency will be confronted with the resultant recruitment problem in filling these jobs. At the present time there is a critical shortage of qualified physicians and of nurses and in addition to that would be the needs for the thousands of additional beds which are being constructed. Personnel matters have been very largely decentralized to the managers of our field offices and facilities except, of course, professional and key personnel. In August, 1944, the Veterans' Administration advised the Civil Service Commission that all positions filled from the civil-service registers for duty in the field offices should be decentralized to the regional directors of the Civil Service Commission with the exception of 32 positions out of 400 different types. The Commission has since that date taken action to comply with our request. During the period January 1, 1945 to May 31, 1945, 10,136 personnel actions were processed in the central office for the central office and the field areas. During the same period, 38,170 personnel transactions were processed in our field offices.

The statement that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has authority to establish classifications and rates of pay for field offices is simply not in accordance with fact. The fact is that the Administrator has no authority to allocate positions to classification grades or to establish pay rates other than in accordance with the principles embodied in the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. There is a long line of Comptroller General's

decisions holding in effect that under the authority of the law and the Executive order permitting the heads of agencies to extend classification to field positions the principles of classification require that the duties and responsibilities of field positions be allocated as far as may be practical in the same manner as those existing in the departmental service. Further, the proposed amendment does not authorize any departure from classification principles but simply permits the fixing of pay within the established grades provided for similarly classified positions.

It is contended that the proposed provisions would have the effect of disrupting the present civil service and of retarding rather than expediting the filling of vacancies in the Veterans' Administration. The act would not affect any employee presently in a civil-service position. All employees of the Veterans' Administration are under civil service either in permanent or temporary appointments and their right and status would remain unchanged. Relatively few of them are now at the minimum pay scale, and even if, for emergency purposes, it should be found necessary to pay newly recruited employees at a higher rate, such employees would lack all of the civil-service and retirement rights now enjoyed by employees in the Veterans' Administration. The act does provide that through regular competition they may secure in due course of time a civil-service status, but if they do not do so, their employment must cease not later than 1 year after the termination of the war. But let it be assumed that some regular employees would feel discriminated against. This act is intended to serve disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of those who are killed in the war; and not for the sole interest of civil-service employees. The Administration has had some experience in this respect which will illustrate the converse of the contention that recruitment would be retarded. In August 1942 the Civil Service Commission authorized the Administration to appoint nurses without prior approval of the Commission. Since the receipt of this authority approximately 4,100 nurses have been appointed, less than 1 percent of whom were secured from civil-service registers. On several occasions since September 1942 request has been made of the Civil Service Commission that the Veterans' Administration be authorized to appoint stenographers without prior approval of the Commission. Where such authority has been granted, results have been favorable.

Finally it has been contended that the Administration does not supply adequate transportation facilities for its employees who are required to travel considerable distances in order to work at its facilities, and that it has not supplied adequate quarters for certain types of employees at its facilities. I am sure you realize that there is a very strict statute absolutely forbidding the use of Government transportation except for authorized purposes. The Congress, upon my request, did, in Public Law 170, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorize the Administration to use Government-owned vehicles for its employees in the absence of adequate public or private transportation. Under this law, the authority granted the Administrator may be exercised with respect to any station only after determination by the Office of Defense Transportation that existing private or public facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by any other means, and that its exercise will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned and a utilization of transportation facilities consistent with the plans, policies, and purposes of the Office of Defense Transportation. Further, with the exception of one or two instances, in some of the older facilities taken over from other governmental agencies the quarters furnished employees at the Veterans' Administration facilities meet the generally required standards for housing of this kind.

The Veterans' Administration has always adhered to civil service and veterans' preference principles, and there would be no difficulty in giving effect to veterans' preference as would be required by the bill. Numerous similar acts are Public Laws 372, 365, 374, and 358, all of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The Civil Service Commission itself has recognized that the requirement of existing law that employment be commended at the minimum of the grade is a handicap in securing personnel. In its sixty-first annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, page 4, the Commission stated:

"The executive branch should have more freedom in determining the rates of pay, within the ceilings established by the Congress, at which employees may be hired," and while the Commission recommends that it be given authority to establish entrance rates of pay above the minimum now provided by law, it would app ar that pending the enactment of such a general law the Veterans' Administration may properly be given such authority temporarily, to supplement civil-service recruitment.

The Veterans' Administration has earnestly endeavored to operate within the confines of the Classification Act and other laws governing the employment of Federal personnel. The Civil Service Commission has been sympathetic and has cooperated with the Veterans' Administration, but the Veterans' Administration has been unable to compete with other agencies and with private employment in securing necessary personnel, and the Veterans' Administration is convinced that drastic action must be taken if it is to secure adequate personnel to perform the important and vital duties for which it was established.

In conclusion, may I say for your consideration, for the possible benefit of my successor in office, and with a view to adequate service to those to whom we all owe so much, the Veterans' Administration, no matter how it is organized, can be made to function efficiently only if it have adequate qualified employees in all categories and adequate space in which to perform its multitudinous functions and responsibilities. In fact, it is shown that all of our present difficulties derive from shortages of personnel and space, and if the war continues as estimated, needs in these respects will be doubled.

This factual report is submitted for your information and such use as you may deem it merits. No recommendation is made, as advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the bill is not in accord with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Why You Should Oppose FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE W. ERVIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have done my best, within recent days, to "sound the alarm, through every Middlesex village and farm" throughout America, as to why all good Americans should oppose FEPC.

I have done this by making some speeches in the House of Representatives of the United States on the following dates and subjects:

Monday, July 2: Shall We Chose a Dictator in the United States?

Monday, July 2: Shall We Again Have Slavery in the United States?

Tuesday, July 3: Shall We have 'Storm Troopers' in the United States?

Tuesday, July 3: Shall Americans Be Required to Vote "Ja"?

Tuesday, June 26: Shall We Lay the Heavy Hand of the FEPC Bureaucracy Upon Our Churches, Schools, and Fraternal Orders; Upon Our Courts, Local Elections, and Local Governments; Upon Our Merchants and Our Farmers?

It will take only a few minutes to read all of these speeches. By reading them, you will understand fully why all of the questions, propounded in the titles of those speeches, would be answered in the affirmative if the pending proposal to create a permanent FEPC should be enacted into law.

You will then understand why, on Friday, June 29, I again spoke in the House of Representatives on The Need for Another Midnight Ride by Paul Revere.

New York Port of Embarkation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the New York Port of Embarkation has been, even since before this war, the busiest port of its type in these United States. Under the command of Major General Groninger a magnificent job has been done. More than 80 percent of the supplies and equipment sent overseas, and perhaps an equal percentage of the men going to Europe, have cleared through this port.

Many Members of the House have visited the New York Port of Embarkation and have marveled at the efficient and speedy manner in which men and equipment were handled. This was made possible solely by reason of the wholehearted and unselfish devotion to duty of many thousands of Army officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees. The major part of the equipment was handled by thousands of stevedores, checkers, and clerks. Any loafing or malingering on the job would have held up the vital supplies that were so necessary to our men in battle. We, of New York, are very proud of these stevedores, checkers, and clerks, for not once during the trying years that we have just gone through was there a shadow of labor trouble. These hard-working fellows were intensely patriotic and worked unselfishly for long hours that our Army might never have reason to pause for the lack of equipment.

These men had reason to complain for all during that period and to this very day they have worked for a salary that is beneath that paid to men doing similar work for private contractors.

The usual weekly salary for a longshoreman in the Port of New York is $57.50, based on the following rates: Forty hours at $1.25 per hour are equal to $50; 4 hours at $1.87 per hour equals $7.50; total, $57.50. The Army Transport Service pays a man for 44 hours per week at $1.25 per hour, which gives the stevedore a $55 pay envelope, entailing a loss of $2.50 per week, in comparison with his privately employed brother stevedore. Commercial checkers are paid at the rate of $55.50 per week, based on 40 hours at $1.20 per hours equals $48 and 4 hours at $1.87½ equal $7.50 for a total of $55.50. In this case the Army Transport Service pays a checker $1.20 per hour for 44 hours, equals $52.80, or a loss of $2.70 per week.

In the case of casual office clerks, the commercial companies pay for 5 days or 40 hours at the rate of $10.85 per day or $54.25, plus 4 hours at $1.91 per hour, equaling $7.64 for a total of $61.89 per week. In the case of the Army Transport Service, the compensation for a similar position is about $55 per week, or a loss of $6 per week.

These losses may seem slight when computed on a weekly basis, but one must consider that these are workingmen to whom every dollar is essential. They have deductions for taxes, for bonds, for Red Cross drives and many other things. I say again that they have been unselfish, for they are not covered by pension laws or by social security. I sincerely hope that the War Department will do everything in its power to amend the present wage scale and thus recognize the splendid job that these men have done. I also feel that the Army should include in its next appropriation bill a request for a sum sufficient to cover the difference between the salary these men received and what they would have received in private employment, and that they will be so compensated in a lump sum.

Fraternal Order of Eagles Proposes That President Roosevelt's Birthday Be Made a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, aeries of the Fraternal Order of Eagles throughout the country are proposing that Congress designate January 31 of each year, the birthday anniversary of President Roosevelt, as a national holiday. Canton Aerie, No. 14, of Canton, Ohio, has endorsed the idea in the following set of resolutions forwarded to me:

CANTON, OHIO, *June 28, 1945.*

Hon. WILLIAM R. THOM,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: The following resolution was adopted by Canton Aerie, No. 141, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Canton, Ohio, at the regular meeting June 21, 1945:

"Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States, from March 4, 1932, until his untimely death on April 12, 1945, having been elected to four successive terms and having become the first American President honored by his fellow citizens with more than the traditional two terms;

"Whereas President Roosevelt assumed office during the depression, one of the great domestic crises in the Nation's history, and by wise, courageous and humanitarian leadership restored confidence and faith in America;

"Whereas President Roosevelt championed the cause of the workingman of America and ushered in a new era of consideration for the rights of labor and the common man,

"Whereas President Roosevelt espoused and signed the National Social Security Act generally recognized as the greatest social measure in American history, climaxing a 14-year educational campaign by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in behalf of State and Federal old-age-security legislation;

"Whereas President Roosevelt awakened our Nation to the menace of fascism to our free institutions and our very existence as a free people, and led America and its allies, the United Nations, in the mightiest world struggle for human freedom, culminating in the unconditional surrender of Germany and in decisive victories over Japan;

"Whereas President Roosevelt charted a course for preventing future wars, by means of a permanent world peace organization, economic cooperation and international good will, thereby embodying during the most critical period in modern history the hopes, the aspirations, and the ideals of his fellow countrymen, and the oppressed peoples of the entire world; and

"Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt is assured an immortal place in world history, and will earn the gratitude of American generations yet to come, and the esteem and affection of free peoples in all lands: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That Canton Aerie Fraternal Order of Eagles, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to designate, January 31, the birth date of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a national holiday; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from this State and the Congressman of this district."

Sincerely and fraternally yours in L. F. J. & E.

ROBERT G. SHISLER,
Secretary, Canton Aerie, No. 141, F. O. E.

Why Change?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, not so long ago, Mr. Churchill—who in world affairs knows "What it's all about"—told us that the United States of America was the most powerful of all the nations. Many of us knew that, but it was reassurring to have the admission from the representative of the British Empire upon whose flag—it has long been said—the sun never sets.

Britain not only has claimed to be the mistress of the seas but of the world, and long has she dominated world policy and trade. But when the Japanese took Singapore and other Pacific possessions from her, threatened to invade Australia, and her homeland was saved from invasion by United States' aid and arms, she realized and was forced to acknowledge that the Colonies which escaped her in 1776 had become, under the American Constitution and the American procedure, the most powerful nation in all the world.

That fact being now not only established but admitted, just why should we continue to listen to so-called intellectuals, people who have had more book education than worth-while experience; who adhere more closely to mental acrobatics than they do to common sense when they advocate the scrapping of the Constitution; of doing away with thrift, of the policy of conserving our resources that we may increase our production? Just why should we listen to refugees from other nations which have failed to protect their people, to make progress along either material, educational, or religious lines? Why should Americans, who have the best of everything, listen to a lot of international tramps who themselves and whose nations have been failures abroad? As well might the successful citizen take counsel with the hobo who would tell him how to run his business.

Following internationalists, thinking less of America than of other countries, has finally brought us to a situation where we were, on Friday last, told by our President that some 10,000,000 young Americans would be engaged in a war against Japan. Now, it is quite true that, being in this war, Japan must be conquered. It is also true that when that has been accomplished, America should follow a course which will make a repetition of these last two wars impossible.

A letter pointing out the necessity of disregarding the advice of alien minds was recently sent out by the National Economic Council, Inc., and it is so well worth reading that it is here reprinted, and is as follows:

SHALL ALIEN MINDS DETERMINE AMERICA'S FUTURE?

President Roosevelt has suddenly passed from the scene. In the presence of death, all differences of viewpoint and philosophy are forgotten. His administration was notable in many ways. How history will appraise him will depend perhaps on the proved wisdom of unwisdom of his measures, perhaps on the ideology of the historians.

To a certain extent the death of Mr. Roosevelt and the accession of Mr. Truman mark the end of an epoch. The viewpoint of an eastern man with the background of Goton and Harvard and a silver spoon, can hardly be the same as that of one who is bone and sinew of the Middle West and came up the hard farm way.

The people of the country have for 80 years been not too friendly to the candidacies of Presidential aspirants from the East. No Republican candidate living east of the Alleghanies has ever been elected President in the first instance, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, and Coolidge having succeeded from the Vice Presidency.

It is to be hoped that the new President will set a trend away from Mr. Roosevelt's more extreme policies—a trend back toward what we have always known as the American way of life. But, at the moment, we cannot be sure; we will know more about it 6 months hence. Mr. Truman has our earnest good

wishes. May the Lord bless him and guide him in right ways.

Never in our history has it been more important for Americans to think clearly. The question of whether the United States will continue toward national socialism will probably be settled in the next 4 years—possibly in the next 24 months.

The San Francisco Conference in which vitally important decisions can be made is just beginning.

Pending before Congress are such proposals as Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and the several other agreements or treaties negotiated the past year or two by Mr. Roosevelt's administration. Adoption of them without important modification would so enmesh us in the affairs of other nations, every one of them less devoted to genuine freedom than ourselves, that nothing short of an upheaval would ever extricate us. And domestically there is the question whether we are going to retain all existing New Deal measures—and perhaps add others; or to reject the newer proposals ("cradle-to-grave security," "60 million jobs—or else," etc.) and modify or eliminate some of the more drastic laws we now have.

It is hard to base a prediction for the future on past history, because a new factor has entered in. The art of modern propaganda has been developed. It has been clever, thorough, ruthless, and often untruthful. Relatively few Americans understand either its source or its extent and potency.

Every day we meet business and professional men of standing in their fields, as well as men and women highly regarded for their generous attitude toward their fellow men, who simply do not know what it is all about. They do not realize that many of the very views they express have been formulated by cunning men and women; and that through New Deal control of radio and New Deal influence among most of the country's writers, these ideas have been implanted in their minds so cleverly that they never doubt they are their own. They fail to note that the minds of the Germans were molded by Hitler in precisely similar ways.

They do not know that, with rare exceptions, many of the country's best writers simply cannot get magazine articles published if they express views contrary to the New Deal. They do not know that, while in 1944 Martin Dies and his friends could not find a publisher courageous enough to print in his book telling the truth about the New Deal and its communistic supporters, the counters of our bookshops have groaned under the weight of books extolling the New Deal, Russian communism, and pretty much every thing Russia has ever done. For fear of Washington retribution, the American people have been denied, in true totalitarian style, the right to know both sides.

One book, written by an Armenian immigrant with a communistic background, and which scurrilously and falsely attacked scores of patriotic Americans for the sole reason they opposed the New Deal and Communist Russia, sold more than 600,000 copies. We listened several times to grave conversations in well-known New York clubs between supposedly intelligent men who had been completely fooled by this book, which was, of course, a mere document in the 1944 political campaign.

This propaganda is alien in origin and conception. It stems directly from eastern and central Europe. It is designed to undermine and destroy America; and it is having that effect.

It follows the best techniques of Hitler and Mussolini. John T. Flynn, in his book, As We Go Marching, has traced the step-by-step development of fascism in Italy and nazism in Germany. In both cases the cornerstone of those edifices was deficit financing. And in tracing the growth of our own totalitarian government in Washington he has shown how closely it has paralleled these two European dictatorships. Austrian born Friedrich Hayek, in his The Road to Serfdom (reviewed in Council Review of Books for October 1944), has written in the same vein.

The fact that American Communists and their fellow travelers have been supporters of our American fascism need surprise no one. Their hope has been that, following the analogy in Italy and Germany, the next step after American fascism will be American communism.

In passing, it is worth noting some of those alien-minded persons who, whether in public office or outside, have been among the leading molders of public opinion in the United States in recent years. Some of them ,for reasons best known to themselves, have changed their names. Some are Communists or fellow travelers; and nearly all are more or less tolerant of communism. Many are artists in the technique of smear. Few, if any, give more than lip service to traditional American principles. Their writings are welcomed by publishers and reviewers; they have the freedom of the radio, while many advocates of the American system are refused radio time.

* * * * *

Several aliens, like Sir Bernard Pares, have taken up temporary residence here, apparently for the purpose of indoctrinating our people. John Maynard Keynes is the actual author of our 12-year policy of deficit financing and the principal inspiration of the Bretton Woods agreement. Harold Laski has had a profound influence on the Roosevelt administration.

We question at this time neither the ability nor sincerity of any of the above. But they are not believers in the American way of life. They, and others like minded, dominate our public opinion. The independent American republic will be destroyed if their domination continues.

Two characteristic current propaganda activities deserve mention. The International Latex Corp. (Abraham N. Spanel, president) has for many months been publishing in many American newspapers quarter-page advertisements urging New Deal policies, national and international. Thus the New York Herald Tribune of April 21 contained such an advertisement endorsing Bretton Woods. Over the company's name at the end of each advertisement is the legend, "Presented as a public service." The Blue Network (WJZ and affiliated stations) carries a news program at 11:05 o'clock five nights a week under the sponsorship of the Electronic Corp., of which Russian-born Samuel Novick is president. The broadcaster is William Gailmor who change his name from William Margolies under which he pleaded guilty of grand larceny and is now out on parole. He has a communistic record.

Considerable inquiry reveals that the business of both the International Latex Corp. and the Electronic Corp., is so modest as to suggest their chief activity may be the propaganda they are carrying on, if, indeed, they were not organized for this purpose.

America has two great needs today.

The first is to return to the American way of life. If we do not return to the American way of life, American liberty will have been lost. "What can it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What can it profit America if it set up a world organization in which its identity and independence are lost or even impaired, with the further result that in order to do our part in such an organization we must continue for the indefinite future to be a regimented people?

Of course, the current propaganda has it that America cannot return to the American way of life. We are told that, having achieved total employment in wartime (under coercion, of course), we can likewise achieve it in peacetime. We can. But only if the state tells every man where to work, for how long, and for how much; how he may spend his money, and where; only if we Americans permit the state to plan and regulate our lives. We can do this—but only if we continue deficit financing. But in doing it, we will have turned our back on all American experience. We will have deserted the principles that made America great and rendered her able to subsidize her allies and thus win the war. We will have rejected America and will have embraced the very fascism we say we hate.

Those of our boys overseas who come home will find the America they were told they were fighting for has irretrievably gone.

It is of mort importance to the 130,000,000 American people that we return to the liberty we have always known than it is even to achieve a world organization.

America's second need is to try to build a kind of world organization that will do something to prevent war in the future. But one grave danger of such a world organization is that we shall place too much reliance on it, and another is that, if controlled by Roosevelts, Stalins, or Churchills, it will tend to become a totalitarian superstate, just as the United States has tended the past 12 years to centralize all power in Washington.

We believe the greatest factor for peace is the existence of a strong, independent, law-abiding Nation, unwilling to make war against any of its neighbors and prepared to defend itself against all comers. The example of one such nation—and the United States during much of its history has been such a Nation—will be far more potent than treaties or agreements, no matter how high-sounding their phrases. Just one such powerful nation possessed of the complete will for peace can go far in maintaining the peace of the entire world. If the United States, Britain, and Russia all determine upon peace, then there will be peace, unless other nations believe that before reaching that determination one or more of them have first despoiled other countries, which Russia has actually done.

So it is an open question whether the existence of an elaborate world organization, constantly tempted to mess into all sorts of matters, will not tend to increase rather than decrease the chance of war. We know this thought flies in the face of the propaganda barrage we live under today. But our problem is not to accept highly propagandized ideas but to think.

Several fallacies of the propagandists are widely and unthinkingly accepted. One of these is the old saw that after the last war the United States "turned her back on Europe"—that if the United States had entered the League of Nations there would have been no more war. But, we did not turn our back on Europe. It was the willfulness of President Wilson that prevented our entering the League of Nations. Even Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Minister, in 1919 expressed the opinion that the reservations asked by the United States Senate were reasonable and should have been approved. No nation in the world did more to preserve the peace of Europe after 1919 than the United States. We scrapped nearly a million tons of our war vessels—though other nations scrapped few if any; we loaned Europe $6,000,000,000 for rebuilding—little of which was ever repaid; we took part in numerous international conferences; we led in pushing the Kellogg-Briand Pacts to outlaw war.

What brought on this war was not our staying out of the League of Nations, but rather the fact that Britain and France refused to lift a finger to stop Hitler when he made his first aggression by moving into the Rhineland in 1936. Though they were, of all parties to the Versailles Treaty, the most vitally concerned, yet, owing to Red pacifist

propaganda, they did not have the will to enforce their own treaty.

Another fallacy, constantly reiterated, is that economic inequalities in different parts of the world make for war. There is little in history to back this. If this argument had serious weight, why did not other nations far more powerful militarily than the United States make war on us when we were overtaking and passing them in the standard of living? Is it not possible the idea has its source in the have-not nations who have long had envious eyes on the United States and wish to force us to divide our living with them?

Then there is the one world argument—the theory that in the future it will be impossible to maintain peace unless all nations are welded together in one organization. The speed of communication, especially by airplane, is assigned as the reason for this. But, on analysis, this argument also falls down. There has been peace between the United States and Canada for a hundred and thirty years, and the reason is that there has been a will to peace. At least five countries in Europe—Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Turkey (till very recently) and Ireland—have kept out of even this present war; and, similarly, the reason has been the will to keep out.

Lastly, there is the fallacy that we cannot have prosperity in the United States unless all other countries have comparable prosperity. No good reason is given why this should be so, and all human experience indicates it is not so. As a matter of fact, the history of the past hundred years indicates the precise opposite, so far as the United States is concerned—namely, that the rest of the world can become more prosperous if the United States is prosperous. For the United States, by reason of achieving general liberty for its people, released energies of the body, mind, and spirit which have placed us far in the lead of all nations in the manner of our life and living. Practically all the world has sought to imitate us, but most of them have failed because they did not understand that our cornerstone was individual liberty. Testimony before Congress recently showed that we are far ahead of the Russians in the productive power of the individual, and that even in Britain it takes, on the average, the work of two and three-tenths men to produce what one man produces in the United States.

The proper course for the United States is to keep the sovereignty and independence of her Nation and her people. For only so can she continue in the future to be the example that has inspired the whole world in the past. And we can do no better than set an example.

After the war all Europe and Asia will be poverty-stricken. American wealth, imagination, and creative ability—provided they are preserved—will alone be able to help those countries. For us to enter into agreements with other nations that will give them the first call on our wealth and a large control over our affairs would, for us Americans, be the height of folly. To adopt the Bretton Woods agreement, for instance, by which, in effect, other countries may vote taxes on the American people by assessments against our resources would suggest that both our love of independence and our sanity had departed. We would have lied to our fighting men to whom we have promised a better future.

We know we can help the people of other countries if only we are free to help them. But to get down to their level and to surrender the freedom of our people would be practically to insure that our ability to help them in the future would be cramped if not destroyed. We would have sold ourselves and our descendants into bondage to them.

MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, we can best serve the peoples of the world by making ourselves strong and invincible, by refusing to take part in every quarrel which may be started by other belligerent nations, by standing aloof and remaining in a position where we can be the deciding factor in any future war without actually sending our men to engage in it.

If we continue to be—as Churchill said we now are—the most powerful nation in all the world, if any other nation or group of nations is so foolhardy as to attack us, such action will be disastrous.

Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Col. George E. Ijams, Assistant Administrator in charge of medical and domiciliary care, construction, and supplies, before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, June 29, 1945:

The Veterans' Administration is one of the world's largest and most important veterans-service agencies. It was created by the Congress of the United States to render many kinds of service, care, and treatment earned by the soldiers and sailors of our country who have defended us in time of war. Its male personnel consists very largely of war veterans, many of whom have sons and daughters in the armed services of World War II. Not only does the Veterans' Administration care for disabled men requiring hospitalization or domiciliary care, but it operates the largest insurance company the world has ever seen; it pays monetary benefits to those who have suffered disease or injury in our defense, and to the widows and orphans of the housands who have made the supreme sacrifice for this country. It also provides monetary, educational, vocational training, and other benefits to men and women who have served honorably in time of war.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was approved by the President on June 22 of that year, and shortly prior to the passage of that legislation Congress had passed a law granting hospitalization to all honorably discharged veterans irrespective of the time they spent in the service, a benefit which was not granted to veterans of World War I until years after the close of that conflict.

In this brief manner I am citing many of the activities of the Veterans' Administration which require a great deal of work and careful adjudication of millions of claims. I am stressing the scope of our activities because in the recent sessions of this committee so much time and thought have been directed to the operation of our hospitals that I fear some persons may possibly overlook the fact that the operation of our hospitals is only one of the many major problems confronting our organization.

I hope that the members of this committee have carefully observed the organization chart of the Veterans' Administration which has been furnished you. I feel confident all will realize that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs personally could not possibly cope with all of the problems of administration that arise in the numerous services and divisions of this great organization. For this reason he has appointed certain assistants and has assigned to them certain related activities which require constant coordination in order that they may function as expeditiously as possible. The various services are organized under and are operated by specially trained directors whose duty it is to carry out the functions of their respective responsibilities and to operate their services with the assistance of carefully chosen staff officers. These assistants are as necessary to the successful performance of the service directors as are the Administrator's assistants to him.

The Director of Supplies is responsible for the purchase, storage, and distribution of all supplies and equipment for all Veterans' Administration activities. He is accountable for all Government property and auditing of property accounts; the operation and management of supply depots; and the execution of contracts, leases, and agreements for all Veterans' Administration activities except construction contracts.

The Director of the National Homes Service is responsible for all matters relating to domiciliary care of beneficiaries and claimants under the laws relating to the Veterans' Administration.

The Director of Construction is responsible for the preliminary inspection and engineering work in connection with the selection of sites for new facilities; preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates covering construction, alteration, and repair of plants and equipment and supervision of performance of such work; for maintenance of contact with other services, bureaus, and Government departments; for the supervision of maintenance of buildings, grounds, and mechanical equipment under the control of the Veterans' Administration, and for all similar work pertaining to construction or maintenance of our facilities throughout the country.

The Medical Director is in charge of the medical and hospital service; is responsible for all medical and dental services rendered claimants and beneficiaries entitled thereto under the laws and regulations governing the operation of the Veterans' Administration. He is also responsible for the medical and dental treatment and care for hospitalized patients and for out-patients rendered at field stations or in the homes of entitled beneficiaries. The Medical Director is also responsible for physical and laboratory examinations which may be required for adjudication purposes or for the purpose of medical treatment.

It will be clearly seen from the above description of duties that there is no one in the Veterans' Administration with authority to handle medical diagnosis, treatment, and medical care except the Medical Director and his subordinates. I am stressing this point because many persons appearing before this committee have given the impression that the Medical Director is subordinated to others insofar as the practice of medicine is concerned. This is absolutely untrue, and I know of no instance in the 26 years that I have been in my present position where anyone in our organization who is not a physician has ever even suggested what medical treatment should be given to any patient in our hospitals. I feel confident that the present Medical Director and all the other medical directors through the years will testify to the truth of this statement. It is mos important that the members of this committee and the public should have clearly in mind that the Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration is the supreme medical authority of our organization.

It is also important for all to realize that in all hospitals there are two distinct jobs to be done—one is the treatment of patients, the other is the hotel or housekeeping job. In most private institutions of healing private doctors are employed for the treatment

of their patients in the hospitals. These hospitals also maintain a staff of resident physicians and internes who continue the treatment prescribed by the private physician when he is not present and who handle any emergencies which arise in the absence of the physician in charge of the case.

In Veterans' Administration hospitals all of our physicians of the various specialties are available for the care and treatment of all of our patients whenever their specialized services are required. Our laboratories are fully staffed and we maintain 24-hour service with graduate resident physicians always on the job day and night.

There are many problems in the operation of a hospital other than the practice of medicine. I have mentioned the hotel or housekeeping problem. This includes construction of the buildings, their maintenance, and the purchase and distribution of supplies required by the physicians at the time and place when they are needed. This work is not related to the practice of medicine except that it provides for the doctor those things which he requires in the treatment of his patients.

In order that this committee may have a clear picture of the situation which confronted our medical, domiciliary, construction, and supply services just prior to our entry into World War II and the difficulties experienced by us as a result of this war, I wish to make the following comments.

In the summer of 1941 we had an ample number of general medical and surgical and tuberculosis beds to met all of our needs. We also had a sufficient number of neuropsychiatric beds for our then known requirements. In fact, the increases in our patient load had been rather gradual during the preceding several years and we had been able to met all demands for beds by building approximately 3,000 beds per year. In 1940 our war industries had mushroomed in growth as we assumed contracts to supply the allies with war materials. This brought demand for workers in these war factories at high wages. This situation in turn had quite a material effect upon our general medical and surgical hospitals. We found that men who came to us for minor surgical care when they were unemployed or were employed at low wages were postponing medical care of this character because they were employed in war plants at high wages. As a result the load of patients in our general medical and surgical hospitals gradually diminished.

Shortly after World War I we had approximately 28,000 men in our hospitals suffering from tuberculosis but this load had gradually diminished until we had only approximately 4,500 beds devoted to tuberculous cases in the summer of 1940. The number of our psychiatric cases had gradually increased through the years. Naturally, employment opportunities in war industries were not open to men suffering from tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric diseases. Consequently, employment opportunities in war industries produced no vacant beds from these two types of hospitals.

Because our construction work consisted principally of maintenance and operation and the construction of approximately 3,000 beds a year, the force of trained employees in our construction service had been materially reduced.

Prior to Pearl Harbor our supply activities were in splendid condition. The volume of work had materially increased as we expanded our hospitals and domiciliary homes but ample supplies were available and prices were moderate.

War industry jobs also brought about a decline in the number of domiciliary cases in our soldiers' homes. Even though many of these men had been domiciled in our homes over a long period of years they were able to secure employment at high wages. Very briefly that is the picture in the summer of 1940.

It will be recalled that some months prior to Pearl Harbor we determined to organize what we called a training army and the results of this mobilization soon manifested themselves insofar as our hospital load was concerned. Many men taken into the training army could not stand the rigorous courses of training and broke down from both physical, mental, and nervous conditions. Large numbers of these men were discharged from the service and transported to veterans' hospitals for continued care because the Army and Navy lacked hospital facilities for mental cases. We had no difficulty in caring for the comparatively few general medical and surgical and tuberculosis cases which came to us directly from the Army, but the situation in our neuropsychiatric hospitals was quite different. More than 50 percent of the men being discharged and transported to our hospitals for continued care were suffering from conditions diagnosed by the Army as psychiatric in nature.

Having served in my present capacity since my return from France in June of 1919, and having lived through the difficult days following the last war, I was extremely anxious that everything possible be done to avoid a repetition of the unfortunate circumstances which followed demobilization of our armed forces in 1919. In those days we were confronted with a deplorable shortage of personnel. My personal experiences in the early twenties was no doubt responsible for the attitude I assumed when our training army was mobilized. I was convinced we would be drawn into the European war, and I hoped we might build an organization to meet our new responsibilities which would enable us to care for the veterans of the new war and their dependents with the utmost dispatch.

With this thought in mind, I discussed with the Administrator the possible effect of this increase in our armed forces on our hospital building program. This discussion resulted in a decision to await further developments before entering into a building program because at that time the number of patients in our general medical and surgical hospitals was decreasing. I have always believed in preparedness against any possible contingency.

Being convinced we would enter the war, and being fearful that some of our hospitals in exposed positions on the coasts might be subjected to sudden enemy attack, I felt that plans should be prepared for the prompt evacuation of any such hospitals in the event of a national emergency. Therefore, 6 months prior to Pearl Harbor I appointed a committee with instructions immediately to prepare detailed plans for the evacuation of any hospital in an exposed position on either coast. With the advent of Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, the situation materially changed. We were in the war. Wartime restrictions and limitations were placed on everything we did. It was indeed fortunate we had anticipated hostilities and had prepared plans for the evacuation of patients. These plans were immediately placed into effect. Within 72 hours we had evacuated all transportable patients from our hospital and diagnostic center at Fort Miley, San Francisco. This hospital is located just above the Golden Gate and is in close proximity to several batteries of large-caliber guns. Even if an enemy attack were directed at targets other than our hospital, the discharge of these guns would have shattered the window glass and made the facility untenable because of the heavy fogs which prevail in that locality.

Orders were also issued for the immediate removal of all patients from our 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Los Angeles and all but the ambulant patients at our general medical and surgical hospital there. We also removed our blind and badly crippled domiciliary members from the barracks at that facility, leaving at that institution only those men who could care for themselves in case of an emergency.

The transfer of these 1,000 neuropsychiatric cases to inland hosiptals presented quite a problem but there again our previously prepared plans were found to be most effective. Doctors, nurses, attendants, and other personnel had to accompany the patients and we also had to transport beds, bedding, and other supplies with the patients as the receiving hospitals could supply only buildings in which to house them. Our field personnel responsible for these transfers to hospitals hundreds of miles away deserve the greatest possible credit for the humane and efficient manner in which these moves were made. It is difficult to transport one psychotic patient. I am glad to state that the 1,000 patients were moved to three different facilities hundreds of miles from Sawtelle without injury to one patient.

With the announcement of wartime restrictions on food, supplies of every character, equipment and building materials, our difficulties of operation were greatly intensified. It became almost impossible to secure the supplies we needed for the operation of our field facilities and the equipment and materials necessary to build new ones. All of our requests for assistance in securing higher priorities were met with the statement that we were a civilian agency and as such we could expect no better treatment than any other civilian institution. Many meetings were held with boards, committees, and individuals employed by the Government agencies authorized to grant priorities. It was explained that the work we were doing in our hospitals and soldiers homes was quite different from that done in civilian hospitals; that the patients in our hospitals were men who had worn the uniform in time of war and many of them were young boys of the present war who were discharged directly from Army and Navy hospitals into our institutions for continued care.

The reply of these gentlemen was invariably the same—namely, that we were a civilian institution and as such we could not secure higher priority than that granted other civilian institutions. We even pointed out actual cases of men who one day were patients in Army and Navy hospitals where they could have two or three cups of coffee with as much sugar as they desired one morning and the next morning as patients in Veterans' hospitals they would receive only one cup of coffee with very little sugar added. I gave many other illustrations. I pointed out the difficulties and criticism which would ensue unless we could operate our hospitals on approximately the same level as the Army and Navy institutions and I stated my belief that discharged soldiers and sailors sent directly to our hospitals from service hospitals would certainly not understand why they were able to get everything they needed and desired while in uniform and were limited practically to the necessities of life as soon as the uniform was removed.

I shall not impose upon your time by going into more detail as to the difficulties we encountered in securing supplies and equipment. Mr. R. C. Kidd, the director of supplies; and Col. L. H. Tripp, the director of construction, will go into these matters at greater length. I do want to emphasize, however, the fact that constant attempts were made to place the Veterans' Administration hospitals and homes on a parity with Army and Navy institutions without success, and that we were continually struggling with the War Production Board in an effort to secure priorities rated high enough to effect deliveries within a reasonable period of time. As a matter of fact, it was not until the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, signed by the President June 22, 1944, just 1 year ago, that the restrictions which operated against us were liberalized and we were

given priorities comparable to or just under Army and Navy.

To carry out its responsibilities in an expeditious and efficient manner the Veterans' Administration required the assistance of several other departments of the Government which control the supply and material situations in the country. Unfortunately, these agencies appeared to have little appreciation of the necessity for assisting the Veterans' Administration to secure all the supplies and equipment it would need to take care of the patients in its hospitals and homes and to promptly expand its facilities.

The statements I have just made should not be construed to imply that all agencies of the Government were deaf to our pleas. I am very glad to testify to the fact that certain officers of the United States Army and certain officials of the War Food Administration have assisted us materially in securing for our hospitals certain supplies such as butter, chickens, turkeys, meats, etc., which we could not procure in the open market as a civilian agency. There is no doubt that the splendid assistance and cooperation of General Hardig saved us from severe criticism when he made available to us many items of food which we could not otherwise procure. Mr. Kidd, the Director of Supplies, will cover this point more adequately in his statement.

During some months following Pearl Harbor the number of hospital cases in our general medical and surgical hospitals continued to decline but our tuberculosis and psychiatric patients increased materially. In fact, the neuropsychiatric cases represented, and still represent, more than 50 percent of the patients discharged from the Army and admitted directly to our hospitals for continued care. As an illustration, in July 1943, we received directly from the Army 1,693 patients. Of these, 996 were diagnosed as psychiatric cases. In November of last year there were 1,723 direct admissions from the Army, of which 1,022 were psychiatric cases. In March 1944 we admitted 2,172 cases directly from the Army, of which 1,403 were diagnosed as psychiatric cases. And in May 1945 we received 2,206 direct admissions, of which 1,380 were psychiatric cases. I have not quoted all the monthly figures because I want to conserve your time, but these figures indicate the trend of direct hospital admissions from the Army. The figures quoted do not include Navy admissions which were lower than the Army, nor do they include other World War II men previously discharged who came into our hospitals from civil life.

Considering the fact that we had comparatively few vacant psychiatric beds when World War II began, it will be seen that we were immediately confronted with the most difficult task of providing beds for these men as quickly as possible so as to avoid the necessity of housing disabled veterans in jails, almshouses, and State and other institutions. Then, too, discharges from the Army and Navy for neuropsychiatric conditions came so quickly after mobilization that it was utterly impossible, because of the shortage of time, to erect sufficient beds to receive them. We were therefore forced to do the only thing we could do to care for these men—that was to set up in our existing institutions over-capacity beds through the reduction of bed spacing in certain instances, the utilization of space not previously used for dormitories and in some instances even placing beds in space previously used for day rooms. Simultaneously we recommended the construction of phychiatric beds to meet our ever-expanding demands and in the early days of the war we devoted all of the talents of our very meager construction force to the production of neuropsychiatric beds. Later, beds for our tuberculous patients had to be increased and more recently we have included in our building programs not only neuropsychiatric beds and tuberculosis beds but beds for general medical and surgical cases also.

At this point I should like to emphasize the fact that the only thing that saved us from disaster as far as the psychiatric cases is concerned was the fact that the physicians in our psychiatric hospitals through the use of modern psychiatric treatment cured and sent to their homes a very high percentage of the neuropsychiatric cases placed in our hospitals by the Armed Forces.

While this transition was taking place; while we were making every effort to secure sufficiently high priorities to enable us to give service to World War II men, we were confronted also with a great shrinkage in our personnel. It was quite apparent we could not hope to retain in our service personnel in the lower salaried brackets who could go into war industries and make more money in a week than we could pay them in a month. Also we had in our service a large number of Reserve officers. These men were called to the colors. They included men from every service of the Veterans' Administration—lawyers, engineers, doctors, and administrative personel. Also we had in our service a large number of young men who thought it was their patriotic duty to serve in time of war and they volunteered.

It will be noted that our hospitals were not the only part of our organization losing personnel. As a matter of fact, we lost a much higher percentage of supply men and engineers than we did doctors and we lost these men at a time when our load of work and responsibilities was greatly increasing and when it was extremely difficult and in most cases impossible to secure replacements. Every service of the Veterans' Administration suffered and is suffering today from a shortage of personnel. Not only were we required to continue the operation of previously authorized activities but new laws passed by Congress required us to assume additional responsibilities and to staff entirely new organizations to meet them. This required personnel and space in which to house them.

I am sorry to say that with this situation confronting us, the Veterans' Administration was placed in class 5 for personnel priority, the lowest classification given any department of the Government. As a matter of fact, we were listed in the public press just below the Washington Zoo insofar as our personnel requirements were concerned.

It doesn't require much imagination to appreciate what will certainly happen when any organization is confronted with a vast increase in its activities and a great shrinkage in trained personnel available to transact business. This situation was clear to all of us and particularly so to the many employees of the Veterans' Administration who had confronted the same situation 25 years ago—the very situation which we hoped might be avoided.

We made every effort to fill our personnel vacancies through the Civil Service Commission. We employed women on work performed formerly only by men; we recruited in parts of the country far distant from war plants for service in the more congested areas, and we considered every plan suggested which might bring us personnel to fill the ever-increasing vacancies in our organization.

When it became apparent that we were still losing ground in spite of every effort on our part to recruit, I recommended what I considered to be a solution not only of our personnel problem but a plan which I expected would at the same time place us in a position of higher priorities for supplies, materials, and equipment and enable us to prepare plans for hospitals and secure their construction more expeditiously. It was my hope that the plan I suggested would enable us to retain in our service many of our employees who very properly sought to wear the uniform in time of war and at the same time would enable us to recruit personnel in the lower grades who could be carefully selected for their ability to perform such work as hospital and mess attendants. This plan contemplated the militarization of the Veterans' Administration for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. I felt that the militarization of our organization would enable us to maintain our numerical strength, that it would take us out of the category of "civilian agency," which had made it impossible for us to secure all of the food and other essential supplies and materials and would give us priority second only to the Army and Navy.

It was not my thought that the Veterans' Administration would retain in its service any man young and healthy enough to fight and the suggestion was made that all able-bodied young men be turned over to the Army and Navy for their use provided the armed services would in turn replace such individuals with properly trained persons who because of minor physical defects or age were disqualified for service with line troops. It will thus be seen that the plan suggested did not contemplate our making use of any men that the Army and Navy needed for the fighting forces. It would, however, have maintained our numerical strength and would have enabled us to have secured the additional personnel we so greatly needed in all the services of the Veterans' Administration. The adoption of this plan would, in my opinion, have saved months of arguments with various Government boards, bureaus, and individuals on the questions of rationing and priorities.

During the past 20 years or more we had built a hospital organization which became the largest group of hospitals in the world under single direction. We employed in those hospitals thousands of doctors, nurses, technicians, and other personnel who had participated in the First World War. These persons were first rate, thoroughly competent and well-trained individuals. They had an enviable pride in the part they had played in defense of their country and were determined to give a service to their disabled comrades second to none in this country. Veterans hospitals were the envy of private practitioners. We developed among our staff members some of the outstanding physicians and surgeons in the country and there was made available to these men every type of equipment developed by science, no matter how much that equipment cost. Our hospitals were visited by medical missions from many countries who expressed amazement at the splendid care America gave to her fighting men. Plans of our hospitals have been requested by many foreign nations, and for many years our construction service has prepared all construction plans for St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D. C.

Representatives of all the major veteran organizations have not only had access to our hospitals at all times, but many of them have occupied offices in our institutions which have been given to them free of charge by their Government. Thus these men have been in a position to observe the daily operation of our institutions and have been invited by the Administrator to offer any suggestions for their improvement.

No one denies that our hospitals are better constructed and perhaps much better equipped than the vast majority of the leading civilian institutions in America.

Then came World War II and a very natural desire on the part of some of our very best and most adequately trained personnel to serve with the armed forces. For a time we could make replacements, but because of the ever increasing demands of the Army and Navy for the best medical and nursing personnel in America to serve in their hospitals, we soon found we were confronted with

a practically impossible situation in securing physicians of the high standards we had always maintained. Fortunately, not all of our best operators left us for the armed services. Many appreciated the difficulties under which we labored and gave up the advantages of military life to remain in our service and carry on for the boys who were returning to our hospitals in need of continued care.

Those of you who have investigated the situation in municipal, county, State, and private hospitals have no doubt discovered as I have from personal observation that the standards of those institutions are not as high as they were prior to the war. During these war years I have had occasion to visit many of the leading private hospitals in America to visit relatives and friends who were patients in them. I have always asked about the service the patients were receiving and in every instance I found that the service in these institutions during the war could not compare with the standards maintained prior to the war. In making this statement I speak not only of the medical and nursing attention for which very high prices are charged in private hospitals, but also of the physical cleanliness of these institutions and the food served. The answer if, of course, that the personnel necessary to operate perfect institutions under ideal conditions is just not available today. I fear that many of the persons we shall require in veterans' hospitals will not be available for employment by us until many months after demobilization.

Please do not interpret any statement I have made to mean that I think all of the physicians and all of the nurses and all of the other personnel in veterans' facilities were perfect. This ideal situation wil never exist on earth. But I do claim that the vast majority of our physicians were and are excellent men, graduates of class A medical colleges and imbued with the determination to give the best possible care and medical treatment to the patients whom they serve. Quite naturally, through the years we have employed some persons who did not live up to our expectations and we endeavored to eliminate these persons through the strict application of efficiency ratings.

I have never heard of any system which will prevent an incompetent or inept person from occasionally securing employment no matter what care is exercised in the selection of personnel. Fair-minded persons will admit that there are inept and incompetent persons in all institutions at the present time. All who patronize hotels, restaurants, stores, and railroads must agree with me. The only manner in which efficiency can be maintained is through careful selection, weeding out incompetents and replacing ineffectives. Under wartime conditions it is quite possible to weed out your ineffectives but we have found it to be utterly impossible to replace these persons with more competent individuals.

In recent days certain distinguished physicians, members of our own medical advisory group, have made quite a few recommendations which I believe it proper to comment upon at this time.

Several have urged the use of dictating machines by our doctors. The facts are that we have bought thousands of dollars worth of dictating machines in past years and have urged our physicians to use them. Some are now in use but many have been used for a short time and then returned to storage. I am at a loss to know why the personnel of our own medical service in central office did not inform the medical advisory group of this fact as they had complete information on this subject.

These gentlemen have also suggested and urged the use of administrative personnel to relieve doctors of paper work. General Hines and I have been urging this very action upon the Medical Director and his assistants for many months. We have suggested the utilization of well-trained administrative personnel in the Medical Director's office and in the offices of the Assistant Medical Directors to relieve them of certain correspondence which does not require medical knowledge for replies. We have also urged the utilization of legally trained personnel to handle all investigation work in our field facilities, thus relieving the doctors of performing duties for which they are not trained so that they can spend more of their time on clinical medicine. These recommendations have also met with the disapproval of our medical men. As these facts were fully known to the Medical Director and his assistants, it is most unfortunate they did not give the medical advisory group full information on this subject.

Some of our medical advisers have recommended more supervision. This is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Medical Director, who has full authority to require such supervision as he may determine to be suitable and proper. One of the advisers also stated he felt that more frequent meetings of the medical advisory group should be held. This recommendation has been made before and has been discussed with the Medical Director. This, too, is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Medical Director, who has but to recommend a meeting of the medical advisory group and that meeting will be approved by the Administrator as all such recommendations have been approved in the past.

In discussing the medical advisory group, I believe it would be well at this point to bring out the fact which appears to have been forgotten in the maze of time, that the original medical council was first organized upon my recommendation made many years ago and that at the time the suggestion was first made the then Medical Director opposed the establishment of such a council because he stated it would be impossible for us to secure outstanding medical men who would devote their time to this duty. I expressed my disagreement with his opinion and stated I felt that the outstanding medical men of America would be only too glad to devote their talents in an advisory capacity to the great medical and hospital organization we then contemplated building. The then Medical Director finally concurred in my recommendation and the council was established.

My original recommendation contemplated the establishment of a group of the finest medical men in the country in the various specialties who would visit our hospitals in the field, observe the clinical medicine practiced in them and then meet in Washington and criticize constructively the treatment we were giving. I stated that through this means we could always maintain the clinical medicine practiced in our hospitals at the very highest level and be certain that the medicine our doctors practiced was the latest thing known to medical science.

I feel it would also be well to remind the members of this committee, the public, and the members of our medical advisory group, that the diagnostic centers which we operate in several parts of the country were also brought into being through my recommendation made many years ago. This recommendation was also disapproved by the then Medical Director who stated that the creation of diagnostic centers would be an admission that our other hospitals were not as good as they should be. I pointed out the fact that in private practice when our family physician met a medical problem upon which he desired consultation he did not hesitate to call in consultants whom he considered to be better equipped to make a diagnosis in the particular case than he was as a general practitioner. I explained that this was the very thing I was recommending in the establishment of our diagnostic centers; that it was not my thought that all cases would go to these centers but only those problem cases where we were having difficulty in diagnosing the cause of the trouble.

Inasmuch as the distinguished physician for whom I have the highest regard has testified before this committee that the medical service of the Veterans' Administration will be improved only when the Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration is raised from a subsidiary position to report directly to the Administrator. I hope you will allow me to call attention to the organization of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service medical departments. It cannot be denied that these agencies occupy a most important place in the structure of medical organizations within the United States Government. I merely wish to point out that the Surgeons General of the Army, the Navy, and Public Health Service are not responsible directly to the heads of their departments but report through administrative channels set up for this purpose. The Surgeon General of the Army reports to the commanding general of the Army Service Forces who acts under the direction of the Under Secretary of War who in turn reports to the Secretary of War. Under this organization the Surgeon General occupies a similar position to that of the Chief of Engineers, the Quartermaster General, the Chief of Ordnance, the Adjutant General, the Judge Advocate General, etc., all of whom report to the commanding general of the Army Service Forces.

It would, therefore, appear that the argument used to place the Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration immediately under the Administrator in order that there might be an improvement in our medical service might likewise be applied and should be applied, if we are going to be consistent, to the medical departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Public Health Service.

I wish it known to the members of this committee that I have no objection whatever to an organization which will require the Administrator to handle all matters pertaining to the medical and hospital service of the Veterans' Administration. I so expressed myself to General Hines both verbally and in writing on several occasions. However, I call attention to the fact that this change would throw an additional heavy burden of administrative duties upon the shoulders of the Administrator and would require him personally to coordinate the work of the medical service with many other services. Also, such a change should logically be followed by having the directors of all other major services such as insurance, pensions, supply, construction, rehabilitation, loans, and finance, also report directly to the Administrator. Obviously it would be quite impossible for any one human being to assume such a burden of duties.

Inquiry of the present Medical Director will, I am certain, produce a statement from him that he has never been denied access to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and, further, on hundreds of occasions he has been requested by me to see the Administrator and discuss his problems without anyone else being present.

I feel that the statements of several doctors are based upon a most unfortunate lack of knowledge of the true situation which exists, and has always existed, in the Veterans' Administration. As I have stated before, our Medical Director is the supreme medical authority, and I have never known of anyone who has even suggested to him how clinical medicine should be practiced or how patients should be treated in Veterans' Administration hospitals. I am making this statement solely for the purpose of bringing out the truth of the situation so that this committee in its deliberations may have the actual facts before them.

I dislike to inject these personal matters into a report of this character, and I would not do so except that I feel certain statements have been made to this committee in all good faith but which show that the authors of those statements do not have the complete knowledge of the evolution, so to speak, of the great medical and hospital organization which the Veterans' Administration has built over the years. I only wish that through the years the medical council had continued to devote its entire time to the purpose for which it was organized; namely, inspection of our hospitals and constructive criticism of the clinical medicine practiced therein. I hope in future they will visit the hospitals and constructively criticize our work because it is only through this means that the high standards of medical practice which we have tried to establish and maintain can be achieved.

Some of the witnesses in recent days testified that our doctors are as well trained and conscientious as the doctors in civilian institutions. In the vast majority of cases this has been my reaction. I want here and now to express my respect for and confidence in the hundreds of fine medical men in our service who are laboring so hard to keep our organization together in functioning for the benefit of our patients under the most trying circumstances. I should like to point out one thing that I have always discussed with young, well-trained medical officers who wanted to come with this organization, and that is that the advancement in the service of the Veterans' Administration for a young medical man is far quicker than it is in any other organization in America. This is true because of our greatly expanding activities.

Adverse criticism of veterans' hospitals in recent months has had a most unfortunate effect upon a great many of our citizens, particularly so upon the parents and wives of our disabled defenders. I regret to say that this criticism has also had a serious effect upon the morale of thousands of our faithful, hard working, and competent employees. It would be not only foolish but untrue to deny that our service has been affected by the loss of trained and competent personnel to the armed forces. At the same time, I believe that the loyal and faithful men and women who remain with us should be given full credit and praise for the manner in which they have assumed added burdens and attempted to keep the machine going in spite of the disastrous effect of having lost so many of our personnel to the Army and Navy.

In time of war, soldiers and sailors who do the best they can under adverse circumstances are praised and sometimes decorated. Fortunately for the morale of our employees, since this unfavorable publicity commenced, we have received hundreds of communications from men who have been in our hospitals many times and who know from personal experience the high standards of service we have always tried to maintain. These letters coming from those who are most competent to judge because they themselves have profited from our service, are worth more to our personnel than any decoration they might receive. These letters, entirely unsolicited, have come from the hearts of grateful men who have served their country in time of war and who marvel at the fact that we are able to give as good service as we do today considering the many difficulties under which we operate.

Of course if the Axis had prevailed in this war and had conquered America, we would have nothing to worry about insofar as our hospitals are concerned. Those countries operate on the theory that all physically and mentally disabled should be destroyed. We in America and the citizens of all other decent civilized nations have always cared for those who have defended us in time of war. We have done the best we could with the tools available to us to do the job.

Mistakes have been made and unfortunate incidents have been discovered, but when these things have come to light we have acted quickly to discipline or prosecute those responsible for the conditions reported. We shall continue to use every means at our disposal to rid our service of incompetents and of those who do not fully comply with the instructions to give intelligent, conscientious and sympathetic service to our disabled men and women.

Within a comparatively short time we hope to bring this Second World War to a successful termination. When demobilization begins, and not until then, we shall be in a position to secure a higher type of personnel for all of the activities of the vast organization which is known as the Veterans' Administration. And again at this point I would like to reemphasize a statement I made early in this report on the great number of activities of the Veterans' Administration which require competent, trained personnel to enable us to give the service which the American people expect us to give to our disabled veterans. I call your attention to the fact that while hospitalization is of the utmost importance to disabled veterans in our hospitals, it is not the all important interest to the widows and orphans of the men who made the supreme sacrifice. What they are interested in is prompt adjudication of their insurance and pension claims, and I say again that we have as great a legal and moral obligation to adjudicate these claims quickly and sympathetically as we do to operate our hospitals in an efficient manner. Therefore it is absolutely essential that the entire Veterans' Administration be given competent personnel immediately and adequate space in which to house them.

When demobilization time arrives there will be available to us thousands of young men and young women, veterans of the Second World War—lawyers, doctors, engineers, nurses, technicians, clerks, and stenographers—who will be willing and anxious to come into the Veterans' Administration for a lifetime career of service to their disabled comrades just as thousands of us came into the service just after demobilization in 1919. Many of the young doctors, engineers, and attorneys now serving in the Army and Navy will find themselves without an established practice in their civilian communities and will be glad for an opportunity to serve through the Veterans' Administration their disabled comrades of the battlefields of Europe and Asia. I have no fear as to the availability of a sufficient number of well trained, competent personnel for our services after demobilization of the armed forces. What worries me and what has worried me for months and even years is the lack of trained personnel available currently to meet the problems of demobilization.

Even now we are doing our utmost to bring into our service veterans discharged from the present conflict and to place them in positions of responsibility. When the real demobilization begins we shall no doubt be able to select discharged men of all types and of all educational backgrounds, many of whom have received specialized training while in the service. Until that day arrives we, like all other organizations in America, shall be forced to do the best we can with the tools available to us.

In conclusion, I can only say that based upon my personal knowledge of the situation, and my observation of other institutions of healing, if I were unfortunate enough to require hospitalization, even under wartime conditions I would rather be a patient in a veterans' hospital than in any other hospital in the world.

How the Rent Control Operates in Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been given to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein two letters bearing upon the subject of rent control in the Detroit, Mich., area. The one is an answer from the Office of Price Control and the other is a reply from the Miller Holmes, Inc., one of the largest real-estate operators in the city of Detroit, Mich.:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1945.

The Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: It has come to my attention that you inserted in a recent issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. George W. Miller, president of the Miller Homes, Inc., Detroit, Mich. In his letter Mr. Miller complains of our rent-control operations.

I am sure you will be interested in learning that Ivan D. Carson, Deputy Administrator for Rent, and several members of his staff have had a number of conferences and much correspondence over a period of about 2 years concerning rent adjustments for Mr. Miller's properties. On more than one occasion a detailed investigation has been made both in the field and in the national office of the problems raised by Mr. Miller. He maintains that he should be permitted an upward adjustment of rent in certain housing constructed by him with priority assistance. He states that the rents previously fixed by the agency granting the priority are not sufficient to provide him adequate return and to permit the building up of a surplus to meet contingencies and repair costs.

Recently, upon his request, we again carefully reviewed Mr. Miller's case, but after complete consideration of all the facts concluded that no adjustment was possible under the Rent Regulation for Housing. Generally, rents fixed by the agency granting the priority, are the ceiling rents under the regulation. Sometime ago, however, it came to our attention that in a limited number of cases upward adjustments should be permitted.

In cooperation with the National Housing Administration the regulations were amended to meet this need. The regulations now provide that where prior to the first renting of an accommodation constructed with priority assistance, the landlord made a written request to the appropriate agency of the United States to approve a higher rent than the rent initially approved because of increased costs of construction, and a higher rent has been approved by such agency on or after March 29, 1944, because of increased costs of construction, the maximum rent on and after the date of such approval become the rent approved.

The rent regulations have always contemplated that, in establishing maximum rents, due consideration should be given to increased costs of construction. It came to the attention of the Administrator, however, that in some instances a builder had filed application with the National Housing Agency, the agency granting the priority, seeking approval of a higher rent because

of increased construction costs prior to initial renting, but had rented the accommodations before action was taken on the application. In such cases the regulation makes no provision for an increase in the rent. We concluded that it was appropriate to give relief in such cases and the amendment was added.

As a result of the amendment, a builder seeking approval of a higher rent because of increased costs of construction may rent the accommodations after filing a written request with the NHA and still obtain the benefit of any action by that agency approving a higher rent. The amendment, however, does not apply unless the application is filed before the accommodation is rented. Both the Administrator and the NHA felt that this limitation was wise and necessary.

The regulation was also amended to provide for upward adjustments in rent in cases where housing was constructed with priority rating pursuant to an application filed on a September 1941 form of the Office of Production Management. It had come to the attention of the Administrator that the landlord of such accommodations in many instances had been advised that the administrative sanctions of the agency granting the priority were not applicable to enforce the approved rents. Accordingly, in some instances, the landlord charged a higher rent without obtaining approval. The Administrator concluded, therefore, that accommodations constructed with priority rating pursuant to that particular form should be granted an adjustment to comparability.

Mr. Miller's case does not fall within the amendments and both the Administrator and the NHA have agreed that no further extension of the adjustment provisions with reference to priority housing is justified at this time.

I trust that this explanation will serve to advise you of the position that the Office has taken in Mr. Miller's case.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

DETROIT, MICH., *June 26, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I wish to congratulate you on your splendid presentation on OPA matters now before Congress. Also I wish to thank you for forwarding to me the letter you received from Chester Bowles in response to my letter which you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Without knowing the true situation, this letter from Mr. Bowles would appear quite convincing and conclusive and probably would satisfy those not acquainted with the facts. The truth as I see it is as follows:

The OPA has depended on price control of rentals as an important justification of its existence and it has been willing to go to any lengths to be sure that rents are not increased. The bold fact in my case is that I have numerous properties rented at $50 per month where the mortgage payment is $48 per month, and we are faced this year with a definite increase in Detroit taxes; that these properties are now mostly 3 years old and all require new painting and decorating and numerous other maintenance and repair items; and that some rent has been lost due to the continuous turn-over of tenants; and we have a total residue of $2 per month which does not pay the office overhead, let alone take care of the necessary items stated above. Also, that these homes are rented to people making $75 per week or more—and mostly more. In fact, I have people making as high as $10,000 per year living in these homes and numerous Army personnel with $100 per month shelter rent allowed by the Government. These are the actual facts and we should not be compelled to go beyond them.

I have brought great pressure to bear against the OPA in this matter as stated by Mr. Bowles. Mr. Bowles showed in his letter that there was no regulation that would give me relief, but in so stating he convicted himself because he stated that the OPA had created two regulations to take care of distressed cases, which is positive proof that he either had granted or usurped sufficient authority to give necessary and justifiable relief if he so desired.

The facts are that these regulations Mr. Bowles created have given practically no relief to any home builder. In other words, they were cover-up actions and, in my opinion, never were intended to correct the situation. The smart boys in the OPA are good at this sort of thing, but the facts in this case are so clear and indisputable that no amount of camouflage can conceal the intent that, first, the OPA does have the power to grant relief if they wish to create a regulation covering the particular condition involved; and, second, these homes, which are built right among exactly the same kind of homes rented for much more money, have in fact been given no relief whatever in spite of a perfectly obvious need.

In other words the amendment to the act which required applications requesting relief to be filed did not help because the amendment came out long after the time when we should have known we were compelled to file before occupancy and, since nobody did file for relief, therefore, the amendment was inoperative before it was ever treated.

In the case of comparability, the OPA has refused to recognize exactly the same house at exactly the same cost, built under exactly the same priority number, built in exactly the same location, as being the guidepost to comparability. Instead, they have gone back to the original date of freezing rents in Detroit, at which time no such houses were in existence, and, naturally, their field men have been unable to discover a basis for comparability.

Now, Mr. DONDERO, isn't this just plain nuts?—and you can put that in the RECORD.

Further facts are these: These homes were built under title VI act—under which the Government pledged the builder would not take a loss. They were built under a priority that was so confused in language that any investigation made by you will prove that it was common understanding of the builders that at the end of 1 year these homes could be rented for a higher figure or sold at whatever price the builder chose to sell.

To make clear on this point, I personally contacted Sullivan Jones, then in charge of the Housing Division of the War Production Board, and he sent a man to my office in Detroit. I have two sworn affidavits in my possession that this man confirmed our understanding of the wording of the priority. Neither Mr. Foley, local head of FHA, nor Mr. Divers, regional head of NHA, have ever been able to ascertain the true meaning of this priority requirement—at least they have so advised me.

What actually occurred was that the OPA came into existence and proceeded to freeze all these properties. For example, I had one group built where I did not use a single piece of priority material. The houses were rented for $75 per month and 6 months later they were cut back to $50 per month simply because they came under the first 6 months of the priority period. They are still rented at this figure with frozen occupancy although the market would be easily $75 to $85.

Mr. Bowles states in his letter that the application had to be filed on September 1941 form. These homes were all filed on a form of December 1941—4 months later—but, because of that little technicality, no relief can be obtained. I could go on and on and on establishing proof that the OPA has been completely dishonest in its approach to this matter and had no honest intent to treat these properties fairly.

The FHA and the NHA, to whom I have appealed numerous times, have claimed that the OPA has taken entire control of this matter. In fact, I saw a regulation printed by the National Housing Agency that would have granted the builders a measure of relief by giving control of this situation to the NHA, and from statements by people whom, I believe, know the facts, when Mr. Klutznick and Mr. Blandford went direct to the OPA pleading for help for builders such as myself, they were told that unless they deserted this line of action all authority granted the National Housing over such matters would be taken away.

The FHA has been fully sympathetic with the tremendous injustice that has been perpetrated in this matter. The honor of the Federal Government is directly involved. We builders proceeded with confidence in the integrity of our Government only to find that the authority to honor this integrity has been transferred to a dominant bureaucracy that is controlled by forces that have no intention to be fair to private enterprise.

This situation should be aired before the Congress and the Nation. As matters now stand, we have no recourse in court or otherwise. If the Congress does not change the situation, we can only continue to suffer the abuse we now suffer. I brought this situation to your attention only after I had exhausted every hope over years of struggle directly with the OPA.

I believe that after you have read this letter and reread the letter from Chester Bowles, you will see more clearly what has actually occurred and, I believe, will agree that no action on the part of the OPA, except one that actually takes care of this situation, should be accepted. There is no better case possible to show the insidious working of OPA methods.

I would like nothing better than to sit down with a fair investigator and give him all the conditions surrounding this matter. Also, I would be glad to answer any questions that you yourself might choose to ask.

I hope and trust that you will not let this matter rest. It would be a shame to let Mr. Bowles get away with this kind of an answer. Thanking you for your interest and help, I am,

Very truly yours,
MILLER HOMES, INC.,
GEORGE W. MILLER, *President.*

P. S.—Perhaps you can help me by pressing this contact with Bowles. This injustice demands immediate remedy. These homes are now badly in need of maintenance. They have FHA insured mortgages, thus making it a matter of national concern as well. I have all dates and data substantiating these statements.

G. W. M.

Will It Again Be Too Little or Too Late?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, very often—far too often—during the critical stages of this most terrible of all wars we heard the accusing cry "Too little and too late." The charge may not always have been true in all instances where such was charged, but in some cases it must have been true. It is not easy to fix the blame in cases of too little and too late during the confusing stages and amid the superlative com-

plexities of this Global War. I do not know what accounting the future will demand for too littleness or too lateness during the war. It may be that the verdict of guilt for the failure to supply our fighting men may be softened by consideration of the difficulties, dangers, unparalleled distances, and unmatched obstacles which had to be overcome in supplying them. Keener judgment than mine is required to weigh this matter properly. I merely refer to it.

But, Mr. Speaker, not alone in wartime is it possible for this Government and this Nation to fail its fighting men. Too little and too late are not exclusively wartime failures. It is perfectly possible for America to fail her fighting men after the guns have cooled by another kind of too littleness and too lateness. It has been done before and I see alarming possibilities of just that thing again. Yet of this we may be certain that the blame for postwar too littleness and too lateness, if it occurs, cannot so easily be excused or explained away as in the case of wartime failures. In the after-war treatment of our Nation's defenders it will be more easy to assess the guilt for failure properly to treat them. Our returning veterans want jobs and homes. I am resolved to do what I can to encourage the furnishing of both to our returning sons. I shall be as bitter as they will be toward any citizen or group of citizens, and especially toward any public officials, who, under whatsoever pretext, pursue an opposite course. But entirely apart from what I think, it is a stern fact that the assessment of guilt for postwar failures will be much more than merely "the verdict of history."

Where Is Equal Justice Under Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an item appearing in the Washington Star of July 1, 1945. From this item it appears that we now have a double standard of justice.

The American people from the very beginning of the Government have always believed and acted upon the premise that here in this country the humblest and obscurest citizen would have equal right before the law with the most powerful and most influential. Our whole system of jurisprudence is based upon that foundation.

Over the entrance of the Supreme Court of the United States are the words "Equal justice under law."

The decision recently rendered by the Court in that very building over which these words appear indicates that they are no longer true. If one group of citizens is to be granted a species of justice as against another group of citizens based upon the same facts and the same evidence before the Court, then, indeed, justice, as we have once known it in the United States, becomes a mockery.

In my opinion this is a severe blow to freedom. Freedom has vanished here in the land of its birth. Let us not be insensible to the fact that freedom has departed from other lands and it can also depart from America. Eternal vigilance is still the price we must pay for freedom.

LABOR WINS FAVORED PLACE BEFORE COURT—A DOUBLE STANDARD OF JUSTICE NOW SEEN AS ESTABLISHED

(By John H. Cline)

There has been some suggestion that the Supreme Court, in refusing to approve the order for the deportation of Harry Bridges, was influenced by a deeply rooted prejudice against doing anything contrary to the interests or wishes of labor leaders. The record does not support this conclusion. But the record does reveal that the Court twisted its own concept of the law to fit the Bridges case and refused to apply a rule which it has often enforced to the benefit of unions and the disadvantage of employers.

In decisions beneficial to unions, the Court has said time and again that it will not go behind the findings of administrative agencies if they are supported by some evidence. And it has said that this is consistent with the intent of Congress, for which the Court professes a tender regard. The order for the deportation of Bridges was issued by the Attorney General under an act of Congress which unquestionably was intended to fit the Bridges case, and which provided specifically that the decision of the Attorney General should be final. Nevertheless, and despite its past professions, a majority of the Court proceeded to override the expressed intent of Congress, and through a process of reasoning reminiscent of Alice in Wonderland, to overrule the Attorney General's findings of fact, although they were undeniably supported by evidence. In brief, one can only conclude that the Court majority, believing that Bridges should not be deported, substituted its own judgment for the judgment of Congress, and invented a double standard of law to achieve that purpose—one standard for Bridges and a diametrically opposed standard for employers accused of violating some regulatory statute.

Foreign Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Postwar Foreign Economic Policy of the United States, presided over by our distinguished colleague, WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi, made the following recommendations:

Our foreign trade would be further assisted by the creation of additional foreign-trade zones. At present, we have only a single foreign-trade zone, on Staten Island, N. Y.

The committee believes that two additional foreign-trade zones should be established, one on the Pacific coast and one on the Gulf coast.

In each of these zones, the importation of goods for the purpose of display, sampling, or manufacture for export should be permitted free of duty. This would avoid extra handling and freight charges, and would eliminate draw-backs on such goods.

In this connection, also, it is interesting to note the statement issued by the National Council of American Importers, Inc., to wit:

On June 5, 1945, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, introduced H. R. 3382 in the House of Representatives to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934.

As originally enacted, this law does not permit manufacturing or exhibition in the foreign trade zones that might be established under its provisions. H. R. 3382 would amend section 3 of the act to permit the exhibition, blending, sampling, and manufacturing of goods brought into foreign trade zones.

Although the present act prohibits manufacturing, it permits manipulation. In actual practice, this has caused much confusion, in view of the varying interpretations as to what constitutes manufacturing and what is manipulation, which have caused many difficulties to certain of those using the facilities offered by the zones.

The National Council of American Importers has always regarded the prohibition against manufacturing and exhibition as a grave shortcoming in the law, and ever since its enactment has advocated a change in the act to permit those operations. This position of the National Council was made publicly on many occasions. Our committee on research and planning included the amendment of the Zones Act in the 1945 action program approved by our board of directors last January.

H. R. 3382 offered by Representative CELLER, of New York, proposes to amend section 3 of the act to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Foreign and domestic merchandise of every description, except such as is prohibited by law, may, without being subject to the customs laws of the United States, except as otherwise provided in this act, be brought into a zone and may be stored, 'sampled, exhibited, blended,' broken up, repacked, assembled, distributed, sorted, graded, cleaned, mixed with foreign or domestic merchandise, manufactured, or otherwise manipulated, and be exported, and foreign merchandise may be sent into customs territory of the United States therefrom, in the original package or otherwise; but when foreign merchandise is so sent from a zone into customs territory of the United States it shall be subject to the laws and regulations of the United States affecting imported merchandise."

The quoted words are new. The words in the present section "and may not be manufactured or exhibited in such zone" following the words "brought into a zone" are omitted in H. R. 3382.

This bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. When this committee calls hearings, the National Council will be represented before it to support the proposed measure.

"Un-American Tactics"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday:

"UN-AMERICAN TACTICS"

The War Labor Board, having threatened to take punitive action against striking rubber workers, is scheduled to meet today to determine what its next step shall be.

This is a strike which illustrates the inherent falsity of the familiar contention that it is unfair to complain about strikes when more than 99 percent of the workers are sticking to their jobs. It is true that the total number of rubber strikers is only about 33,000—a small fraction of 1 percent of the working force. But they have already compelled the shipment of patched-up tires to our fliers in the Pacific. They have curtailed the production of self-sealing gas tanks. And, according to the War and Navy Departments, continuance of the strike would "condemn countless American soldiers, sailors, and fliers to death."

If this statement is not true, it ought to be repudiated immediately by responsible officials. But if it is true, then it is difficult to see how the Government can fail to take the most drastic measures in dealing with these strikers. The matter cannot safely be left to union discipline, of which we have heard so much, for there has been no indication of any determination on the part of CIO officials, who have justification over the strikers, to break the strike. Instead, the president of the Akron local of the CIO United Rubber Workers, C. V. Wheeler, has defied all appeals to send his men back to their jobs, and asserts in a telegram to the President that the Government agencies dealing with the strike are using "un-American and undemocratic tactics."

The best that can be said of this protest, uttered against the background of the War and Navy claim that the strike will condemn American fighting men to needless deaths, is that Mr. Wheeler has a strange concept of what is un-American and undemocratic. The great preponderance of public opinion will be that the only un-American tactic in this situation would be to temporize with the rubber strike. Appeals have gone unheeded for 16 days, and the strike is spreading. What remains to be seen now is whether the Government intends to take action consistent with its threats.

The Facts Behind the Veterans' Hospital Scandal Finally Come to Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib, vice commander, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

On June 26, 1945, Representative DOYLE inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a congratulatory statement by this writer regarding the introduction of H. R. 3522 a Veterans' Administration sponsored bill intended to discontinue the pauper oath requirement and to liberalize and codify existing hospital admission laws.

Upon the presentation of this bill I had hoped that the controversy over this vexing problem had finally come to a successful and happy conclusion. However, my hopes were in vain for Veterans' Administration bureaucrats who are more concerned about special interests groups than in the welfare of rank and file veterans are now emerging with a new kind of trickery.

Three days after I had congratulated Veterans' Administration officials on H. R. 3522, VA bureaucrats came before the House World War Committee to alarm Members of Congress that congestion will overtake Government hospitals as increasing soldiers are discharged from the armed forces and cleverly suggested that veterans who cannot prove service-connected disability or sickness should hereafter be prohibited from obtaining medical treatment at Government hospitals.

It is certainly difficult to reconcile these conflicting viewpoints within the Veterans' Administration. I wish that they would stop playing politics with the veterans of this Nation. Obviously, these bureaucrats are now using the congestion subterfuge to either win back the pauper oath authorization, or else they intend to go even further in what appears to be their basic objective and that is to discontinue altogether medical care to veterans who cannot trace disability or present illness directly to service duty. This is an unfortunate development. It is destined to have far-reaching significance. What are the facts behind the Veterans' Administration attitude relative to this great controversy?

Here is an amazing story:

It will be recalled that General Hines repeatedly stated in the public press that the Veterans' Administration had adequate facilities to accommodate veterans in need of hospitalization. He often publicly pledged that no veteran requiring medical aid would be turned away from veterans' hospitals and consistently answered all critics that he was watching developments and was taking necessary steps that might be necessary to provide effective and adequate institutional care for needy veterans.

Today the truth is slowly receiving public light.

Unadulterated Veterans' Administration statistics and the above statements prove beyond all doubt that General Hines and his deceitful cohorts purposely and deliberately mislead not only Members of Congress but the veterans of America themselves into believing that they had the situation well in hand.

In fact, at the very time that this writer repeatedly pointed out (since September 1944) the urgent need for more veterans hospitals and beds and charged that hospital construction was being held by red tape and by selfish groups, General Hines took it upon himself to write letters to Members of Congress denying and denouncing my warnings and assured Members of Congress that there was nothing to be concerned about.

But now Veterans' Administration bureaucrats are running to Congress crying that they do not even have enough beds to care for wounded veterans of World War II and that the older men of World War I are taking up all the beds with illnesses that have nothing to do with their war service. This statement by VA bureaucrats is a slap in the face to the veterans of the last war. If this is not a betrayal of older veterans, then what is it?

However, the responsibility for this scandal goes even deeper than one may realize. There is more involved than meets the eye. In some of my articles that have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have pointed out that the greedy American Medical Association was fighting and would continue to bitterly oppose construction of a forward-looking veterans' hospital program. I have charged and I have proved that the AMA was out to get their full share of business from veterans in need of medical care. They are determined that this future as well as present business will not be taken away from their membership, i. e., the civilian doctors and private hospitals.

This particular situation was discussed in 1933 at the very time that the Congress was high-pressured into enacting the vicious economy bill at which time the pauper oath requirement was placed on the statute books of this Nation.

On March 14, 1933, Senator Walcott read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from Dr. Hugh H. Young, famous surgeon of Johns Hopkins Hospital. (Source: P. 343 bound copy, p. 327 unbound RECORD.) The letter follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *March 14, 1933.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WALCOTT: You will be interested to learn that Dr. Dean Lewis, president-elect of the American Medical Association, telephoned to the executive offices of the American Medical Association in Chicago and presented to them the great desirability of the American Medical Association, showing how strongly the organized medical profession of America felt against the payment of the huge sums to veterans, particularly for nonservice disabilities and the fabulous hospital program which they have begun. As a result of this, a letter was dispatched from the executive offices of the American Medical Association strongly urging that the President be upheld in his efforts to effect these large economies, vitally important at this time in the balancing of the Budget; in particular, the great reduction of the money to be paid to nonservice veterans and for the program of excessive hospitalization.

I would like to say personally that this hospital program, if continued, will injure very greatly the established hospitals of the country, the great hospitals connected with medical schools, and will also be of incalculable injury to the medical profession of America.

Very sincerely,

HUGH H. YOUNG, M. D.

I wish to underscore part of Dr. Young's remarks. Note that he says "that this hospital program, if continued, will injure very greatly the established hospitals of the country, the great hospitals connected with medical schools, and will also be incalculable injury to the medical profession of America.

Does any sane person need further confirmation as to why the medical profession is exerting pressure not only to retain the pauper oath but also to keep veterans hospital construction to a minimum?

The selfish and disgusting position of the medical lobby organization is further pointed in a 4-page letter received from Dr. Olin West, secretary of the American Medical Association, dated as recent as March 7, 1945. Here are some illuminating paragraphs, as it is entirely to extensive to reprint the whole letter here:

"In 1934, the Committee on Legislative Activities of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association submitted a report in which reference was made to article 29, section 6 of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress. * * * It is provided in that section that the statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses. In the same report opposition to the Reed amendment was indicated and the opinion was expressed to the effect that any oath required in the law should be interpreted to mean that the veteran subscribing to such oath is in actual need."

Here the American Medical Association states that it is willing to have the Veterans' Administration provide medical care for veterans actually in need, obviously because they must realize that in such cases they could not collect their fees. Let's quote some more from this letter:

"Objection has been offered by the American Medical Association through the house of delegates, to the general policy of the

provisions by the Federal Government of hospitalization and medical care for veterans for conditions not even remotely associated with military service. Some of the remarks supporting this opposition were offered in a memorandum filed with the Senate Committee on Appropriations in 1934 and reproduced in the printed hearings on H. R. 6663, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1935. You will find this memorandum beginning on page 189. It was emphasized in the memorandum that nothing in it should be construed as directed in any degree against legislation make adequate provision for medical and hospital service for veterans suffering from disabilities, diseases, or defects of service origin. * * *

"In 1933, Dr. Lewis, as president-elect of the American Medical Association, addressed the house of delegates, stating that almost 70 percent of the cases that were hospitalized in veterans' hospitals presented disabilities that had nothing to do with the service and did not have even a presumptive service connection. * * *

"I think that it is probably true that Dr. Lewis may have been concerned over the possibility that more hospitals for the service of veterans might be erected than the existing situation justified. * * *

"There may be a possibility that a hospital building program could be initiated and put into effect that might conceivably affect existing civilian hospitals unfavorably. Much would depend, in my opinion, on the nature of the use that might be made of facilities provided by an unduly large number of Federal hospitals which facilities might be readily available to a large segment of the population. * * *

"Representatives of the American Medical Association have conferred on numerous occasions with the three surgeons general and with members of their official staffs concerning questions involved in the desire of the association to be helpful to the Federal Government and to the medical services of the Army, Navy, and the Public Health Service, as well as to the medical services of the Veterans' Administration.

"It may interest you to know that the committee on postwar medical service of the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians, and the American College of Surgeons has appointed a committee which has recently conferred with officials of the Veterans' Administration in the hope that the American Medical Association and the other two organizations represented on the committee may be able, if possible, to be of some service to the Veterans' Administration, and to those who may have to look to that agency for aid."

This letter speaks for itself. It tells what is going on inside the medical profession. With these facts at hand I respectfully urge Congress to carefully consider any recommendation now being presented by the bureaucrats within the Veterans' Administration or by the medical lobby itself. Also, it is well to bear in mind that Members of Congress and Government officials can and have secured free medical and hospital care, free from red tape and free from obnoxious questionnaires and forms. In this light I believe that veterans are entitled to as much consideration as is presently given to Members of Congress or Government officials relative to free hospital care.

Finally, in speaking of bureaucratic nonsense I know of a veteran who is service-connected in his lower jaw but recently he developed some trouble in his upper jaw and when he called at the local veterans' hospital the physician in charge adamantly refused to give him medical treatment simply because this man could not establish that his upper jaw was injured while serving overseas. There are hundreds of such cases I have been told but this case is enough to show how the service-connected racket is being used in our veterans' hospitals today.

[From the Washington Star of July 1, 1945]

NONSERVICE DISABILITY CARE MAY BE CURTAILED AT VETERANS' HOSPITALS

(By Carter Brooke Jones)

Veterans without service-connected disability or sickness may lose, at least temporarily, their right to treatment in veterans' hospitals.

This possibility developed on Capitol Hill yesterday as a result of the situation disclosed at the House Veterans' Committee investigation of veterans' hospitals.

Officials of the Veterans' Administration pointed to the congestion which will confront its hospitals as increasing numbers of men are discharged from the armed forces, many of them only to continue the medical care which they have been receiving in Army and Navy hospitals. Within the next 2 years, the committee believed, veterans' hospitals, including many to be constructed or turned over by the Army, are likely to overflow with cases of veterans with wounds or service-incurred maladies requiring prolonged treatment.

SAYS ACTION IS NECESSARY

"We might as well face the facts," Representative SCRIVNER, Republican of Kansas, told the committee. "However unpopular it may be in our districts—and certainly it will be—we've got to be realistic about this situation. We're going to have to curtail nonservice-connected cases. It's not what we want, but what has to be done. We've got to take care of all the service-connected cases. The veterans' hospitals won't be able to do both, at least until the war is over and the veterans' hospitals are able to get the personnel they need."

Chairman RANKIN agreed. "We are going to have to go back to the policy we had in the twenties," he said. "We then took care of service-connected disabilities plus constitutional diseases, such as tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric disorders. There is no reason why we should take care of every man who gets sick and happens once to have worn a uniform."

Mr. SCRIVNER conceded that the Government would have to care for tubercular and mentally disturbed veterans. But he felt that others whose illness or injury did not date back to military service might have to look elsewhere for medical treatment until the critical shortage of personnel and supplies in Government hospitals was eased.

CARNAHAN OFFERS OBJECTION

Representative CARNAHAN, Democrat, of Missouri, said he did not "accept that attitude." He added that he thought "we should take care of all the veterans, as we've been doing."

Mr. SCRIVNER replied that he also wanted to provide medical care for all veterans, and hoped any curtailment would be only temporary, but he did think Congress should face the facts.

Present regulations give priority to veterans with service-connected injuries or disorders and provide that others must await available beds.

This requirement may be tightened, it appears, to the point where the veterans with no service claim will be excluded from veterans' hospitals, in effect, until the present situation changes.

The committee was advised that most of the patients now in veterans' hospitals are veterans of the last war whose illnesses or disabilities are not connected with their fighting days. This picture is gradually changing as more men from the present war are discharged and begin entering these hospitals.

War Veterans Being Charged Exorbitant Prices for Used Farm Machinery

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, many war veterans who originally came from the farm are now being discharged and are anxious to resume their farming operations. Their contribution toward food production is sorely needed. Congress has provided in the GI bill a method by which they can finance the purchase of farm machinery. Unfortunately, however, many veterans have been unable to secure new machinery and while some used machinery is available, it can be purchased only at an exorbitant price. The regulations issued pursuant to the loan provisions of the GI bill provide, in effect, the loans for farm machinery may be approved when the price to be paid by the veteran does not exceed the reasonable normal value thereof. This is a wise provision in that it will prevent veterans from going in debt to purchase machinery at inflated prices. I am advised, however, that in many localities it is impossible to purchase used machinery at reasonable normal value.

I have before me a letter from the chairman of the certifying committee of one of the leading agricultural counties in Kansas. This letter states that farm machinery cannot be purchased by veterans in that county as reasonable normal value. Permit me to quote from this letter:

> We have before us now an application of a returned veteran to secure a loan for the purchase of a 9-year-old Case tractor for $1,530. The normal price of that tractor in the opinion of the committee is $1,000. The price of a new tractor of that make is $1,568—only $38 more than the price this veteran is forced to pay for the 9-year-old tractor.
>
> He is paying $305 for a four-bottom tractor plow. The committee feels that the normal value of this plow is $100. A new one can be purchased for $277, if the veteran had a priority and the plow was available.
>
> He is purchasing a five-section spring tooth plow for $121. The committee feels that the reasonable normal value of that plow is $40. A new one can be purchased for $90.

I have discussed this question with officials of the OPA who advise that there are ceilings upon only a few articles of used farm machinery. Among those upon which ceilings have been imposed are tractors. However, the enforcement of such ceilings must be ineffective because the amount mentioned as the purchase price for the tractor mentioned in the letter just quoted is far above the OPA ceiling.

As to plows, there are no ceilings, and it will be noted that in the letter above, the price which was being charged this war veteran is three times what the local committee feels is the reasonable normal value. The OPA imposes rigid price ceilings upon everything the farmer has to

sell and it seems no more than right that some effort should be made by the OPA to prevent war veterans from being required to pay three times the normal value of farm implements. I am urging that the OPA go into this matter at once.

In the meantime the War Food Administration has recently issued an order which will be of considerable help in this situation. Under this order war veterans will be given a preference over nearly all other prospective purchasers of farm machinery. Under the provisions of this order, which is War Food Order No. 135, county agricultural conservation committees will issue veterans' preference certificates. Dealers are required to honor these certificates notwithstanding any prior commitments or contracts for sales other than those carrying war-production ratings.

As a part of my remarks, I include herewith a press release by the War Food Administration under date of June 22, which explains this new order:

VETERANS GIVEN PREFERENCE IN PURCHASE OF NEW FARM MACHINERY

Veterans of this war are given preference over nearly all other prospective purchasers of new farm machinery through an order issued by the War Food Administration.

Provision for this special opportunity for veterans is made in War Food Order No. 135, which will be effective June 25, 1945. Under the order, veterans who can show the need for and the inability to obtain farm machinery to establish or reestablish themselves in farming may obtain preference certificates that require dealers to give priority to their needs.

Many veterans were forced to dispose of their farm machinery when they answered their country's call to service, the WFA pointed out. It is essential that they be given an opportunity to equip their farms again quickly. These men have earned the right to reestablish themselves without delay, and their contribution to wartime food production is also needed.

County agricultural conservation committees will issue the veterans' preference certificates. Dealers are required to honor these certificates notwithstanding any prior commitments or contracts for sale other than those carrying War Production Board ratings. The only orders carrying War Production Board ratings are for the military, or in those rare cases where farmers may be given a rating in an emergency situation. However, no dealer is required to honor the certificate of a veteran who is unwilling or unable to meet the regularly established price and terms of sale or payment. In case a dealer receives more than one veteran's certificate for the same piece of equipment, he is required to honor the certificates in the order of their receipt.

The items of machinery and equipment for which preference certificates may be issued are those listed in the War Production Board farm machinery order (L-257-c), not including repair parts.

The order provides safeguards against misuse of certificates, appeal procedure for both veteran and dealer, and penalties for violations of the order. Any person willfully violating the order is subject to both criminal and civil prosecution, and a dealer who violates the order may be prohibited from receiving, delivering, or using any equipment covered by the order.

The Director of Materials and Facilities, War Food Administration, will administer the order, delegating certain powers to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

Keeping the Record on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, from all parts of the country criticism of OPA administrative methods is registered in editorials and in letter to Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Waupun Leader News, of Waupun, Wis., on Thursday, June 28. It reflects the attitude of weekly newspapers in my State. The weak attempt to correct OPA abuses in the extension which was approved last Saturday is no answer to the criticisms that are now being made.

IS THE OPA A HAVEN FOR INCOMPETENTS AND PIDDLERS?

Before getting down to business today we might as well keep the record straight by stating that we, like the great majority of people, realize that both rationing and price controls are necessary today if unequal distribution and inflation are to be avoided. We're not arguing about the aims.

But looming larger all the time is the question of just how good a job is being done by the OPA as now organized.

When there are plenty of $10 sport shirts but no work shirts, when there aren't any potatoes, when there isn't much meat, when eggs are all scrambled up, when the cheese market is messed up, when restaurants close, etc., the public has a right to ask questions. When regulations interfere with the maximum production of food at a profit, the farmer has a right to ask questions.

We're glad to report that Wisconsin weekly editors have been more critical of the OPA policies than some of the larger papers, probably because they come in closer contact with the OPA activities.

Leroy W. Gore, in the Jefferson County Union, recently made one complaint quite clear, in part as follows:

"Worse still has been the failure of the OPA to stop black marketing activities at their source in the high places on the one hand, while they persecuted technical violators with good intentions on the other. With considerable flourish, the OPA has penalized a few farmers for selling poultry over ceiling prices, they have penalized a few frozen locker owners, they have nipped a handful of motorists for gasoline rationing violations, they have pointed the finger of shame at a few harrassed businessmen; but the scandalous black markets in the metropolitan areas have successfully thumbed their collective noses at them. The OPA has chopped the heads off angleworms while the rattlesnakes have gone their merry way."

The Whitewater Register has been outspoken in criticizing the OPA for making life miserable for the small businessman while ignoring big racketeers.

The Elkhorn Independent has complained that OPA acting as policeman, prosecutor, and judge still didn't do a good job.

Then you have the utterly ridiculous penalties dished out. A small grocer may be assessed $50 for a small, technical violation but a big locker plant found guilty of black-market operations is merely ordered to cease dealing in rationed food for 60 days. With its profits and hustling, it can afford to rest up for 60 days.

Wealthy Milwaukeeans found with illegally acquired meat in their lockers were penalized by having to surrender red points. Penalty? Nuts. They have the meat now when red points usually won't buy meat anyway.

When the black market in potatoes got so bad that the stench reached the Milwaukee Journal, a reporter investigated a bit. OPA officials insisted that they were unable to get convictions because no retailers, jobbers, or consumers would come forward and dump the evidence in their laps.

That all reminds us of some district attorneys, policemen, and sheriffs who are always ready to enforce the law if some dear citizen brings in enough evidence and signs a complaint—after the dear citizen has already paid taxes and elected men to enforce the law.

To us the Milwaukee district OPA looks bad. It has about 50 investigators. If, with 50 investigators it can't get evidence enough to bust a black market in potatoes, there's something wrong.

Thirty State beverage tax agents do a rather good job of policing Wisconsin taverns and their real work is checking to be sure State taxes are paid.

We'd be willing to bet money that one or two good newspapermen would dig up more evidence on black marketing in a month than those 50 investigators would gather in 2 months. Newspapermen have done it.

Right there, we believe, lies the big reason why OPA is a first-class mess. The paid employees have been recruited from among the class of people who will take such a temporary job and can't find anything better to do.

We believe that the OPA is, to too large an extent, a haven for incompetents and piddlers.

They are experts at dishing out red tape, holding conferences, planning to investigate something, threatening dire things, and all the rest of it. But when it comes down to actually penalizing anybody, they seem unwilling or unable to tackle anybody of much size. Small retailers unable to battle it out with the OPA are meat for it, but no enthusiasm is shown for tackling the big boys.

The unpaid workers—members of price panels, etc., together with clerical workers—have generally been high class. They've given generously of their time and energy trying to make the machinery work.

That rationing and price controls must be retained and must be made to work is certain. Congress has taken some steps to correct some of the evils. But we're personally not too optimistic that the machinery is going to run very well with the sort of paid help now operating it. It will be a glorious day when most of them have to go to work at jobs suited to their abilities.

Christian Century Calls for Definite Statement of Peace Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, I discussed on the floor of this House the destructive consequences to America of the use of the term "unconditional surrender" as a substitute for the statement of peace terms. Unfortunately, subsequent developments are confirming the fears I expressed on that date.

In the course of my remarks, then, I raised the following questions:

1. Is it right to keep secret our peace terms when their nonstatement prolongs resistance and results in the death of thousands of American boys and the blasting of thousands of American homes?

2. Moreover, are not the words "unconditional surrender" acting as a vengeance threat that make the poorest possible framework for lasting peace in the world?

3. Is not the continued failure to formulate conditions for peace evidence of a bankrupt statesmanship?

4. Do these words give groups seeking peace in the land of our enemies any possible framework on which to enlarge their ranks and sue for peace?

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the peace-loving people of America are desperately concerned about the failure of those in power to publicize, in exact language, the terms which Japan must accept to secure a cessation of hostilities.

The outstanding Protestant weekly of the country, the Christian Century, carried a solemn and appealing editorial on this subject in its June 27 issue, and included a petition to the President of the United States, which reads as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, whose names are signed to this petition, request the President of the United States, in concert with the heads of other states now at war with Japan, to proclaim the following as the basis on which peaceful relations will be restored with Japan after the unconditional surrender of that nation:

1. Evacuation by the armed forces of Japan of all territories outside the home islands of the Japanese Empire, including the islands held by Japan under mandate from the League of Nations.

2. Recession to China of all territory occupied in China (including Manchuria and Mongolia), of Formosa, the Pescadores and the Ryukyus.

3. Complete demobilization of the Japanese Navy, Army, and Air Force, and agreement that thereafter Japan shall maintain no armed forces other than those of a police nature necessary to preserve domestic order, the extent and equipment of which shall be determined by the United Nations.

4. Administration by commissions of the United Nations of the Japanese merchant marine, finance, and industry with a view to the complete demilitarization of Japanese life and the restoration of Japan to membership in the world community.

5. Delivery to the United Nations, for trial and punishment, on demand, of any Japanese charged by the proper agencies of the United Nations with responsibility for the crime of aggression on China, the precipitation of war in the Pacific, and for acts contrary to the laws of war committed in connection with the operations of Japan's armed forces.

6. A pledge that the people of Japan will establish a political order which shall guarantee freedom of speech and assembly, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience and religious exercise, freedom of elections, a democratic form of government responsible to the will of the people, with a view to entrance by Japan, when these are established, into full membership in the United Nations.

7. Guaranties to the people of Japan of the benefits promised in point 4 of the Atlantic Charter: "They will endeavor, with due respect to their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great and small, victor and vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

The signed petitions are to be sent to the White House late this month.

Postwar Civil Aviation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly during the last Congress and the present Congress I have invited attention to the realistic policy being followed by foreign maritime nations with reference to overseas air transport by their shipping companies as contrasted with the short-sighted, destructive, and unrealistic interpretation of law made by the Civil Aeronautics Board in denying to American shipping companies the right to supplement their surface shipping with overseas air lines.

The British Government recently took an official stand on this matter of submitting a white paper to Parliament which recognizes that only through coordination of surface and air overseas transport facilities can an efficient merchant marine be maintained. We must follow such a policy and encourage American shipping companies to operate air service if we are to successfully meet postwar maritime competition.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I invite attention to the following excellent editorial published in the San Francisco Examiner. Every Member of Congress should read and consider this editorial carefully:

The contrast between the prevailing viewpoint in the American Government on postwar civil-aviation policy and that of the British Government, particularly in regard to the utilization of established shipping lines in conjunction with overseas air transport, is already striking and is becoming most painful.

The British viewpoint, as expressed in the text of a white paper recently submitted to Parliament on the proposed new air-transport policy of Great Britain, is that an advantageous position in the postwar civil-aviation field is desirable and that the best way to get it is to make full use of the nation's existing facilities and vast experience in all transportation enterprises.

For as the white paper says:

"Civil aviation is essentially a transport business.

"Its problems are in many ways analogous to those of transport by land and by sea.

"To make our national air services effective, we must not only draw upon the best of aviation knowledge and skill at our command, but must also make the fullest use of the ripe experience and world-wide organization which has been built up over many years by British enterprise and initiative in other forms of transport. * * *

"It is, therefore, of the essence of the Government's plan that those interests concerned in transport by sea and by land should be brought into a real and effective partnership with the organizations which will be responsible for transport by air."

This means that Brtiish shipping lines all over the world will supplement and augment their services in the transport of passengers, cargo, and mail, by surface vessels with aircraft—wherever such a combination of service will make their operations more profitable to themselves and more beneficial to Great Britain.

Not only is the British Government favorable to this policy, but British aviation interests are supporting it and British shipping enterprises are both enthusiastic about it and thoroughly prepared to carry it out.

Unquestionably this policy will give Great Britain an important position in the commercial aviation fields of the postwar world, and will give Great Britain great prestige in those fields, and will accrue to the general advantage and profit of the whole British Nation.

By contrast, the prevailing American viewpoint is so unsound and stultifying—in its relation to American prospects and opportunities and interests in postwar commercial aviation—that Lord Swinton, the British Minister of Civil Aviaton, has said of it subtlely and almost smugly that it is "a good neighbor" policy.

American aviation interests would surely profit and prosper by full utilization of all American experience and facilities in existing fields of sea transport.

American maritime enterprises are able and anxious to devote their experience and facilities to such a sound and sensible, and profitable and beneficial purpose.

But incomprehensibly, the American Government is stubbornly and stupidly persisting in the obsolete and restrictive policy of prohibiting American shipping lines from operating supplementary air services—when such a policy will surely make British air and sea enterprises dominant all over the world, and will just as surely reduce American enterprise to impotence in the postwar commercial skies, and on the postwar commercial seas as well.

There is only honor and respect in the United States for the practical concern the British Government and British aviation and shipping interests have for the future of their country.

But why does not the American Government have a similar concern for our American future, which the American people could honor and respect?

The United States is not being a good neighbor in this matter, but a sucker.

Who Will Teach?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of June 27, 1945:

COMING SCHOOL TIDE
(By Malvina Lindsay)
WHO WILL TEACH?

Two tidal waves of children will start flowing into American schools within the next 7 years. The first, consisting of the earlier war babies, will begin to invade kindergartens next year. The second, coming from the marriages of returned war veterans, will start rolling in around 1952.

Educators, sighting these waves afar, are troubled. Who will teach this great influx of beginners? Who will guide their minds through the grades, high school, and college? Who will man America's key job, one that, as Hitler so well demonstrated, shapes a nation's future?

The shortage of teachers during this war is critical. There are disquieting signs that

it will continue into peacetime. Many teachers whom war drew from the schoolroom do not intend to return. Since this is true not only of men but also of women—who do virtually all of the teaching in the lower grades—today's bumper crop of babies may especially feel the educational pinch.

A large proportion of the officer group in the women's military services are former school teachers. Many of these, also many former teachers now in war jobs, have learned new skills and want to practice them. But dislike of the coop from which they have flown is likely to be a more powerful influence in their postwar planning. On every side is heard the resolve of capable and attractive young women not to "go back to school teaching." Why is this?

CRAMPED SOCIAL LIVES

Salaries have much to do with it. Average teaching salary for the country at large is $1,500. Some rural teachers receive as little as $600. Also, there is the load of extra duties demanded of teachers by communities. But intangibles play a large part in these young women's decisions. Put in Americanese, the stuffiness and nosiness of neighborhoods, even today, cramp the lives of many teachers. In many smaller communities teachers, like preachers' families, must live in glass houses. They must conform their social activities and their mental viewpoints to the standards of elderly and often reactionary school board members and town leaders.

Also, many communities lack recreational facilities, culture opportunities, even libraries. Moreover, the teacher is often set apart, meets few of her own group, especially few young men. She doesn't get mental growth or have fun. Repeatedly, young women describing their feeling toward teaching, say they are fond of children, find the work interesting, but too often feel suffocated in the community environment.

American communities who want their children educated might well be considering how to attract good teachers. Already, about 4,000,000 American children are receiving inadequate schooling. Five hundred thousand young men were rejected by Selective Service because of educational lacks. Now, with the expected ground swell from the war babies, the problem will be even more serious—unless the teaching profession can quickly recruit more volunteers.

BETTER PAY, MORE RESPECT

The problem is more than a visitation of war. Teachers' ranks were thinning before Pearl Harbor. Industry, business, the opportunities of a technological era have been enticing teachers from the schools, students from the teacher-training courses. This competition will have to be met financially. Federal aid to poorer States with substandard school systems will help to some extent. But better trained and better paid teachers are needed in all communities. The American people must be awakened to a higher appraisal of the teacher in terms of money and professional respect.

Higher salaries and imposing school buildings will not alone solve the problem. Communities will have to offer more to teachers in living conditions, recreation, companionship, and, above all, understanding. Instead of saddling their religious and social-service responsibilities on their teachers, they need to make the teacher's work a part of a larger goal to which they are enthusiastically giving of themselves, that of building enlightened and democratic neighborhoods. Thus the teacher, taking a leaf in reverse from the Nazi schoolmaster, may be able to fit herself creatively, not destructively, into something greater than herself. This should make her job more interesting, more satisfying, more dynamic, more immune to the temptings of the machine world.

Our Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me at a committee meeting this morning with regard to our patent system and its relation to small business:

From various individuals who speak for small business I have received urgent requests that I urge my associates in Congress to take prompt measures for the protection and continuance of our patent system as a vital influence in the era of reconversion, soon to be entered. There is now manifest throughout the Nation a deep and increasing interest in inventions and discoveries that will be foundations of new enterprises, both large and small. The past furnishes us a policy for the future. The airplane, the radio, and other inventions that were without wide use of major importance before World War I were in that conflict demonstrated to have value for peace as well as for war. They are now the basis of great industries, employing many thousands of workers. Some of the mechanisms and compositions created for the present war will offer the same opportunities for utilization by our industries. History proves to us that our inventions have begotten most of our enterprises. Our means of communication, our machines for agriculture, our processes of manufacture are the products of our inventiveness, spurred by the protection and reward of patents. We must remember also that every one of our great industries had a small beginning. Each of our big businesses began as a small business.

Had there been no incentives in the form of patents there would have been few ventures of capital in the development, making, and use of devices and discoveries. Alexander Graham Bell and every other American inventor was encouraged by the guaranty afforded by patents—even for a brief period.

In behalf of the inventor and the small maker, user, and vendor of inventions I appeal for a forthright assurance that our patent system be preserved in all the essentials which have assured its success for more than a century. We cannot at this critical juncture undertake any experimentation with a system that has impressively served our needs under all the economic conditions we have experienced. Let us, then, place at the head of our patent system an official who has the knowledge, the capacity, and the sympathy indispensable to its fruitful operation. The selection of a Commissioner of Patents is soon to be made by the President. Let us trust that he will choose for that post a person who has concern for the welfare of small business—yes all business—as well as the competence to meet that responsibility. All of us will benefit by the service rendered to our industrialists, great and small. The farmer and the wage workers; the merchandiser, the transporter, and all others will be served.

I have gone to the trouble to inquire into the fitness of one man who is, I am sure, the logical person to appoint. I refer to Mr. Conder C. Henry, the present Assistant Commissioner of Patents, who has the confidence and the endorsement of business as well as the bar, and who has demonstrated his ability to deal with these most important matters during his more than 30 years' service in the Patent Office.

The Government needs the services of this man, and the country needs him in the office of Commissioner of Patents. I call on the Members of this House to support his candidacy.

H. R. 3235—Postage Rates on Books

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. BURCH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I take this opportunity to present to the House a brief explanation of the bill (H. R. 3235) readjusting the rates of postage on books of fourth-class mail, and for other purposes.

Under existing law, firms engaged in the publication and distribution of books for profit are permitted to mail books at the flat rate of 4 cents per pound, including the increase made by the Revenue Act of 1943, without regard to length of haul.

The revenue derived from book mailings is considerably less than it costs the Post Office Department to transport and deliver them. A special cost-ascertainment study made by the Department reveals that the deficit in this class of mail amounts to approximately $2,200,000 annually. This sum represents a Government subsidy for which there is no justification. Book dealers and publishers who operate for profit are not entitled to this preferential treatment.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has approached and is considering the over-all subject of postal-rate revision and readjustment in an orderly and businesslike manner.

Legislation relating to the special services, including domestic insured, collect on delivery, and special delivery, was favorably reported and enacted.

The committee also reported legislation relating to the issuance of postal notes, and the same was enacted into law. It provides a more economical and convenient method by which the public may transmit small sums of money through the mail than could previously be done under the money-order system.

Public Law 566, approved May 29, 1928, provided that all fourth-class mail should be on a self-sustaining basis. The House has recently passed bills to readjust the rates of postage on parcel post and catalogs. The enactment of H. R. 3235 will complete action on all types of fourth-class mail matter and comply with the mandate of the Congress that the revenue derived from such mail be commensurate with the cost of handling same.

Over a period of 15 or more years the deficit in this class of mail has been from one-half million to eighteen million dollars annually. These deficits are paid by the taxpayers of the United States

when the Congress makes deficiency appropriations. The manufacturers and book distributors are the beneficiaries of this subsidy, and not the general public of the United States. It is our hope to make the Post Office Department self-sustaining. It is not the intention of the Post Office Department or the committee to make the Department a money-making institution, but that the citizens who use its facilities shall be required to pay the cost for handling each class of mail.

At this time the Post Office Department has an operating profit, but these are abnormal times, which will not continue, and, furthermore, the surplus over and above the operating expenses is derived entirely from first-class mail.

Section 1 of H. R. 3235 relates to books handled commercially at a profit. It presents a proposed schedule of rates, applied on a zone basis, as follows:

Zones	Rates		
	First pound	Additional pounds up to 10, inclusive	Additional pounds over 10
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
Local	5	1	0.7
1 and 2	6	1½	1
3	7	2	1½
4	8	2½	2
5	9	3	2½
6	10	3½	3.2
7	11	4½	4
8	12	5	4.8

The adoption of the above schedule will accomplish four desirable objectives:

First. Apply the rates by zones, in lieu of a flat rate, thus recognizing length of haul.

Second. Place this type of mail matter on a self-sustaining basis.

Third. Discontinue an unwarranted subsidy.

Fourth. Remove the necessity of ignoring the statutory book rate in cases where parcel-post rates are lower.

The postal rates proposed for books are lower in all instances than charges made by express companies.

Section 2 of H. R. 3235 will so amend existing law as to provide that books, when sent to or by libraries, schools, colleges, and organizations, not operated for profit, may be mailed in the local, first, second, and third zones at special low rates. Lower rates than those now in effect will also be granted to libraries, schools, and colleges on book mailings to and from points in the fourth, fifth, and sixth zones. Preferential rates, as compared to regular book rates, will be granted to library mailings in all zones.

Preferential rates are specifically provided for the mailing of the Holy Bible, or bound portions thereof.

Under existing law, the special rates allowed libraries apply only to outgoing mail sent to the local, first, second, and third zones. This bill provides more favorable rates to libraries since such rates will apply to both incoming and outgoing books and extend to greater distances.

Ninety-five percent of library book mailings are in the local, first, second, and third zones. A table showing library book rates now in effect in such zones, and those proposed, is as follows:

Zones	Present rates		Proposed rates	
	1 pound	Each additional pound	1 pound	Each additional pound
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Local	4	1	3	0.7
First	4	1	3	1
Second	4	1	3	1
Third	4	1	3	1

An examination of the above table reveals that libraries will enjoy lower rates on book mailings to and from the area in which practically all of their books are handled, and preferential rates, as compared to regular book rates, on mailings to and from all zones.

In connection with this bill, the following points should be emphasized:

(a) The bill provides that book mailings which are not entitled to a Government subsidy be charged postal rates sufficient to cover the cost of handling.

(b) Libraries, schools, and colleges are granted rates more favorable than those now in effect.

(c) The Holy Bible and bound portions thereof may be mailed at preferential rates.

(d) Schoolbooks, containing students' work sheets, will enjoy special rates to a greater extent than at present.

Who Are the Supporters of FEPC?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, who are the supporters of FEPC? The proponents of FEPC have answered this question repeatedly on the floor of the House of Representatives, in public forums, and in the press. Nevertheless the opponents continue to ignore the truth and becloud the issue by misstatements of fact and all they do to justify their un-American position and supreme intolerance is to shout "communism." Now, let us take a look at the record and list just a few of the leaders of the FEPC.

President Roosevelt, whose Presidential order created FEPC and who asked that it be made permanent by legislation; President Truman, who recently issued a statement endorsing the bill to make it permanent; Archbishop Lucey, of the San Antonio, Tex., diocese; Walter White, president, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Bishop Haas, of the Grand Rapids, Mich., diocese; Bishop L. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Rabbi Cohen, chairman of the Commission on Economic Discrimination of the American Jewish Congress; Father John La Farge, S. J., editor of America; William Green, president of the A. F. of L.; Phillip Murray, of the CIO; Senator Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Rabbi Wise of New York; Pearl S. Buck, director of the East-West Association; and a great many others whose testimony is contained in the hearings before the Committee on Labor. As against this public record not one opponent appeared in opposition nor have we any list of those in opposition. I tried to get recognition on the floor today during the debate but did not succeed. Therefore I am taking the only way open to spread the truth upon the RECORD. I include herewith three statements from three distinguished Americans in support of FEPC:

MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN TO TOWN HALL MEETING JUNE 19, 1945

I hope that the Save the FEPC Rally at Town Hall tonight will have the effect of arousing the community and the Nation to the vital importance of saving the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

In appealing to Chairman SABATH, of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, to allow the Members of the House to have an opportunity to vote on this question, I said:

"The war is not over. In fact, a bitter and deadly conflict lies ahead of us. To abandon at this time the fundamental principle upon which the Fair Employment Practice Committee was established is unthinkable."

I desire now to reiterate to the FEPC rally and to my country what I said in my message to Chairman SABATH, "Discrimination in the matter of employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, creed, or color is not only un-American in nature but will lead eventually to industrial strife and unrest. The principle and policy of fair employment practice should be established permanently as a part of our national law."

MESSAGE OF WILLIAM GREEN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, TO TOWN HALL MEETING, JUNE 19, 1945

Wherever Americans have fought for democracy they have fought for the right to equal opportunity. The right to an equal chance to earn a livelihood without discrimination because of race, color, or religion is an inalienable right in a democracy for which Americans have fought and died in this war.

The American Federation of Labor endorses and supports the existing President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice and also the Federal legislation for a permanent FEPC. In the interest of justice and fair play for all workers without regard to race, color, or creed, the American Federation of Labor calls for prompt and unequivocal congressional action in continuing the FEPC as an essential tool of industrial democracy in the difficult days of readjustment ahead.

MESSAGE OF PHILLIP MURRAY, PRESIDENT, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, TO TOWN HALL MEETING, JUNE 19, 1945

The principle demonstrted by establishment of fair employment practice procedure under stress of war must not be abandoned in peacetime. The FEPC must be saved. Otherwise, we are merely reverting to our old shameful disregard of justice in the fields of economic and political equality.

The war emergency did not establish the principle of such equality. The principle is eternal in a democracy. Surely black hands, white hands and yellow hands, with their equal skill, intelligently applied, should go on working today to win the peace just as they worked and will continue to work to win the military victory.

At San Francisco, the American delegates to the United Nations Conference, backed by the demands of millions of Americans, insisted that guaranties of human rights be written into the new world Charter as a major aim. The other powers agreed with this insistence. It is unthinkable that the Congress, by destroying the present FEPC, or refusing to establish a similar permanent agency, should now serve notice on the other nations that we were not sincere at San Francisco.

Rail Transportation of Troops and Prisoners of War

REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reference to the report made by the Secretary of War regarding prisoners of war.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a report of the Secretary of War with respect to the incident that is said to have occurred at Omaha on the trip I mentioned awhile ago. This report is as follows:

JULY 5, 1945.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson today was asked the following question at his news conference:

"Why is it that our returning troops have had to make long trips in day coaches, while it is reported that some German prisoners of war have been transported in Pullmans?"

Mr. Patterson replied as follows:

"The part of the story about German prisoners of war being carried in Pullmans is not true. The part of the story about our troops being carried from Boston to San Francisco without sleepers but in day coaches, and I think day coaches of the commuter type, is true.

"The War Department has foreseen that possibility and has called the attention some weeks ago to the railroads and to the Office of Defense Transportation, and has insisted that troops carried on long trips of that character be given suitable accommodations in sleepers or Pullmans. We have been promised relief, but adequate relief has not yet been forthcoming. I am sure that the Office of Defense Transportation and the railroads will give us the necessary cooperation and will make suitable accommodations available. We have been assured that they will.

"You may be sure and certain that the War Department will press for decent and comfortable accommodations for troops in the course of railroad travel across the continent and in other parts of the United States on long trips. They should have Pullman or sleeper accommodations when they are being carried for extended trips. There is no question about it.

"The situation and all the facts in it were called to the attention of the responsible authorities by the War Department and by the Navy by a letter under the date of June 26 covering this very thing, pointing out that the failure or inability to provide sleeper accommodations had resulted all the frequently in travel across the country by coach on the part of troops. It will require, of course, an adjustment in accommodations now enjoyed by regular travelers, or people who travel on short trips by rail, and the transfer of some of those accommodations over to long trips undertaken by troops. That is where the relief has got to come from."

Mr. Patterson then was asked:

"Is there any explanation of why these soldiers thought they saw prisoners of war in Pullmans?"

His reply was:

"I can't account for that. It is simply not so. No prisoners of war have been carried on Pullmans except, as I understand it, a few sick in a very limited number of cases."

Mr. Patterson was further questioned:

"I think you have a regulation in effect that if the medical authorities recommend it, it is done that way?"

The Under Secretary's reply was:

"That is so. That part of the story is unfounded. You know how rumors travel. I suppose someone said he thought he caught a glimpse of them and the next man said it was so. But the main point of the story, that is, the part relating to accommodations enjoyed by some 500 troops on the train, is true and regrettable and we will take every means in our power to correct it."

Imported Feeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

IMPORTED FEEDS—THEIR INFLUENCE ON DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF ANIMAL PRODUCTS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following tables show the grain imports and exports during the war and for the years previous:

WHEAT

Wheat: United States imports for consumption, 1937–44

Year	Quantity	Value
	Bushels (60 lbs.)	
1937	8,392,110	$9,660,509
1938	25,372	31,986
1939	18,863	21,205
1940	64,198	39,376
1941	895,412	720,078
1942	961,181	686,991
1943 [1]	[2] 49,205,780	[2] 56,590,781
1944 [1]	[2] 110,577,629	[2] 149,685,540

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Includes imports entered free of duty under "Provisions" (title 34, U. S. C., sec. 568) and Executive Order 9177—Emergency purchases of war materials abroad by agencies of the U. S. Government, 48,381,473 bushels valued at $55,848,606 in 1943 and 109,765,405 bushels valued at $148,802,457 in 1944. Also includes 776,680 bushels valued at $835,984 imported free of duty in 1944 under Public Laws 211 and 272.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

NOTE.—Figures do not include wheat for milling in bond and export or wheat unfit for human consumption.

Wheat: United States exports of domestic merchandise, 1937–44

Year	Quantity	Value
	Bushels (60 lbs.)	
1937	34,848,437	$38,711,199
1938	86,902,449	78,086,666
1939	63,214,293	36,815,212
1940	14,379,121	11,205,889
1941	13,109,483	11,199,592
1942	6,615,143	6,795,430
1943 [1]	11,840,681	16,196,599
1944 [1]	10,029,382	16,305,089

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

You will note from tables 1 and 2 that in 1944 we imported 110,000,000 bushels of wheat, largely free of duty, under Executive order. You will also note that the exports were only 10,000,000 bushels.

These wheat imports represent about one-tenth of the United States production of wheat. These wheat imports were used largely for livestock feeding in the United States.

The 10,000,000-bushel wheat exports had a 25–33 cents per bushel export subsidy available part of the year. Can you give any valid reason for inviting huge imports of a commodity and then turn around and pay an export subsidy in order to continue a prewar wheat program that did not make sense even in peacetime? In 1944 didn't the WFA pay an export subsidy of $3,000,000 in order to ship 6,000,000 bushels of wheat in the form of flour?

We imported more wheat in 1934, 1935, and 1936 than we exported although the planners were paying the American wheat farmers to not produce wheat during that period.

OATS

Oats: United States imports for consumption and exports of domestic merchandise, 1937–44

Year	Quantity	Value
	Imports for consumption	
	Bushel (32 lbs.)	
1937	57,797	$34,402
1938	5,316	3,885
1939	4,290,884	1,505,588
1940	12,150,242	4,464,380
1941	6,021,024	2,251,019
1942	9,269,659	3,924,686
1943 [1]	[2] 76,738,620	[2] 39,761,946
1944 [1]	[2] 80,126,191	[2] 59,261,977
	Exports of domestic merchandise	
	Bushel (32 lbs.)	
1937	6,727,557	$2,371,657
1938	8,516,661	2,726,066
1939	226,142	107,906
1940	185,429	130,772
1941	529,957	323,810
1942	415,537	311,802
1943 [1]	120,857	128,656
1944 [1]	291,698	294,918

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Includes imports entered free of duty under "Provisions" (title 34, U. S. C., sec. 568), and Executive Order 9177—Emergency purchases of war materials abroad by agencies of the U. S. Government, 4,814,874 bushels valued at $3,850,233 in 1944 and imports entered free of duty under Public Laws 211 and 272, as follows: 200,832 bushels valued at $153,797 in 1943 and 42,339,395 bushels valued at $34,815,373 in 1944. Also includes 5,381 bushels valued at $4,398 in 1943 imported free of duty for emergencies.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

The 1944 imports of 80,000,000 bushels is an appreciable percentage of the national oat production of around 1,000,000,000 bushels per year.

BARLEY

Barley: United States imports for consumption and exports of domestic merchandise, 1937–44

Year	Quantity	Value
	Imports for consumption	
	Bushels (48 lbs.)	
1937	10,384,108	$9,563,853
1938	125,781	70,773
1939	776,499	334,037
1940	1,406,172	571,840
1941	898,338	520,090
1942	6,387,496	4,276,498
1943 [1]	[2] 44,607,476	[2] 31,366,343
1944 [1]	[2] 42,300,548	[2] 38,992,562
	Exports of domestic merchandise	
	Bushels (48 lbs.)	
1937	11,473,002	$8,467,453
1938	16,129,664	9,136,111
1939	5,410,028	3,344,913
1940	1,402,587	840,312
1941	1,217,510	931,696
1942	827,133	808,773
1943 [1]	406,750	734,917
1944 [1]	306,287	491,888

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Includes imports entered free of duty under "Provisions" (title 34, U. S. C., sec. 568) and Executive Order 9177—Emergency purchases of war materials abroad by agencies of the United States Government, 1,709,578 bushels valued at $878,261 in 1944 and imports entered free of duty under Public Laws 211 and 272 as follows: 13,531 bushels valued at $14,007 in 1943 and 4,770,766 bushels valued at $4,662 086 in 1944.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

The 42,000,000-bushel barley import is over 15 percent of the United States barley production of 288,000,000 bushels produced in 1944.

RYE

Rye: United States imports for consumption and exports of domestic merchandise, 1938–44

Year	Quantity	Value
	Imports for consumption	
	Bushels (56 lbs.)	
1938	2	$3
1939	23	35
1940	59,633	42,004
1941	9,865,730	4,863,569
1942	407,797	274,407
1943 [1]	2,071,115	1,590,992
1944 [1]	[2] 10,848,131	[2] 10,957,890
	Exports of domestic merchandise	
1938	3,347,315	$2,298,603
1939	86,496	70,578
1940	889,918	833,797
1941	12,743	14,270
1942	10,762	34,872
1943 [1]	78,238	135,897
1944 [1]	46,808	76,830

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Includes 526,284 bushels valued at $515,708 imported free for supplies of certain vessels, and 5,166,812 bushels valued at $5,319,202 imported free under Public Law 211.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

There is a wide variation of the acreage of rye planted and the acreage harvested, since much of this crop is pastured. In 1942 the United States production was 57,000,000 bushels and the 1943 production was only 30,000,000 bushels.

About one-half the planted acreage is plowed under or pastured. North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska produce about one-half the rye of the Nation.

FLAXSEED

The importation of 10,000,000 bushels is a rather high percentage of the 30,000,000-bushel United States production of this crop.

Flaxseed: United States imports for consumption, 1937–44

Year	Quantity	Value
1937	28,032,000	$35,207,000
1938	15,364,000	19,872,000
1939	16,028,000	18,424,000
1940	11,825,000	14,121,000
1941	21,121,000	15,712,000
1942	13,691,000	17,790,000
1943 [1]	[2] 10,624,000	[2] 23,158,000
1944 [1]	[2] 10,897,000	[2] 31,356,000

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Includes imports entered free of duty under "Provisions" (title 34, U. S. C., sec. 568) and Executive Order 9177—Emergency purchases of war materials abroad by agencies of the United States Government, 3,848,424 bushels valued at $6,547,816 in 1943 and 306,189 bushels valued at $465,071 in 1944. Also includes 5,566,427 bushels valued at $16,283,732 imported free of duty in 1944 under Public Laws 211 and 272.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

While flax is imported to secure linseed oil the oil meal or flaxseed meal is a valuable byproduct. The United States and Argentina are the two largest flax-producing countries of the world.

The 1930–40 United States production was very small, averaging 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 bushels a year. The 1941 United States production was 32,000,000 bushels, and the 1943 production was 53,000,000 bushels.

While the 1944 import was about as large as the 1935–40 production, these same 1944 imports were only 20 percent of the 1943 flax production in the United States.

While there were over 9,000,000 bushels of corn imported in 1944 there were also exports of corn meal and other corn products. This crop did not show much difference so far as imports and exports were concerned.

You will note that very little rye, oats, wheat, or barley were exported during the war. This could be expected as the animal products derived from feeding these grains were being produced and exported in large volume.

When feed grain imports amount to a quarter of a billion bushels as in 1944, we must realize the influence that this huge amount of feed grain really had on the United States production of eggs, pork, milk, and other animal products. How many pounds of pork were or could be produced from 250,000,000 bushels of feeds imported? How many pounds of milk, poultry, eggs, or beef could be or were produced by these feed imports? The ever-normal granary might have furnished feeds in the beginning of the war, but imported feeds have played a rather important part in the 1943–44 production of the animal products.

Speech of Hon. Sergio Osmeña, President of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, the first Congress to convene in a liberated country during this war is that of the Philippines. President Sergio Osmeña called a special session of the Congress of the Philippines on June 9, 1945. Under unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks, I include therein the address of President Osmeña on that historic occasion:

Gentlemen of the congress, today, a moment of great historic significance, the voice of our people, muted throughout the long dreary night of enemy enslavement, is to be heard again in the halls of this congress, through their duly elected representatives.

It has been a long lapse of time since that day in November 1941, when you were elected, to this day when you gather in your first session. We can hardly recognize our country after the cataclysm that has engulfed it. The war has left its livid scars everywhere—on our buildings as well as on men's souls. Probably nothing can more starkly summarize our present plight than the fact that the executive and legislative branches of our government have to meet today in a borrowed house because our legislative building is a heap of rubble and ashes—mute witness to the savage desperation of the beaten enemy.

The tragedy that has afflicted our nation has lacerated our hearts. We all miss today many dear and familiar faces that are no more. But perhaps no sorrow has touched us more deeply than the passing of our beloved leader, Manuel L. Quezon. I know, however, that you feel, as I do, that his immortal spirit abides with us in this hour of trial and crisis, encouraging us to proceed with the arduous tasks that lie ahead. This great man, who dedicated his entire life to his country, died as he would have wanted to die—in line of duty. Soon his mortal remains, kept at the Arlington National Cemetery at Virginia, will be brought back to the Philippines and we shall all have the opportunity of rendering him our last homage of admiration and affection. We shall erect him a monument so that we and our generations yet unborn may keep his memory enshrined in our hearts.

The Philippines is the one territory under the American flag which has suffered the most at the invader's hands. Not only are its war casualties the highest in proportion to population, not only have its cities and towns been destroyed and looted, its countryside and farms laid waste, and its whole economic structure ruined, but its people have undergone more physical pain and mental anguish than in any other part of the United States. As early as December 8, 1941, a few hours after her felon attack on Pearl Harbor, Japan sent bombers and task forces to the Philippines. Unavoidably turned into a battlefield, our country suffered heavily in men and property, especially in Bataan, where the Filipino-American Army battled the Japanese forces for four long months.

Then followed a period of enemy occupation, cruel and humiliating. No sooner had the fighting in Bataan ended than the enemy began the systematic looting of our country. There was no limit to what he could requisition with his worthless money. Even our

barest necessities were commandeered. And when we tried to stand by our rights, force, ruthless force, immediately intervened. With or without cause, people by the scores were arrested and sent to prison and concentration camps—some to be tortured, others to be executed. As time went on, we became more impoverished, while the enemy became still more cruel and arrogant. After undergoing 3 years of enemy domination, no people was a more pitiful sight than the Filipinos—lean, ragged, and famished.

I wish to stress the fact that the extreme suffering of the Filipinos and the widespread destruction wrought on our country has been due, in a large measure, to their unwavering loyalty to the United States. No people, I believe, has given so much proof of fidelity to the cause of the mother country as the Filipinos.

When Japan invaded the Philippines, the American flag was here. Even without that flag, Japan would probably have launched her attack. But as long as the Philippines remained under American sovereignty, the responsibility for the defense of the islands lay with the United States. For forty-odd years, in our continuous preparation for self-government, we exercised jurisdiction over matters of education, public works, sanitation, and other functions of public administration, but never over our national defense. This function remained in the hands of the United States as the sovereign power. It is true that as soon as the Commonwealth was established, we started giving our citizens military training and building up a modest army, but these steps were in preparation, not for war, but for the fulfillment of our peaceful duties as an independent nation.

Notwithstanding these facts, the Filipino people rallied to the defense of the American flag, paying no heed to the cost and consequences. The sad moment came when it had to be admitted that the battle was lost, since a relief force could not be sent to the Philippines. But far from wavering, the Filipino soldier, side by side with his American comrade, fought on harder than ever until he was overwhelmed by superior numbers.

Unwilling to bow to the enemy, the Filipino people valiantly took up the struggle with all the strength they could muster. Patriotic groups soon sprang up throughout the length and breadth of the archipelago. At first eluding the enemy, the guerrillas took to the mountains, but with the active support of the civilian population they quickly grew in number and strength to become a virtual challenge to the enemy. The story of the guerrilleros and of the civilian patriots who helped them, is an epic of heroism, loyalty, and sacrifice. As far as possible they should be given recognition. Recognized guerrilla units have already been incorporated into the Philippine Army.

As I stated in Leyte, in praising the guerrillas we should not be forgetful of the loyal civilians who were left behind and, at the risk of their lives, supported the resistance movement. Included among these civilians were those who, at the beginning of the war, were civil-service employees or holders of subordinate positions in the Government, and who remained at their posts to protect the people and extend to them all possible aid and comfort. They should, as a general principle, be recalled as soon as their services should be needed; only for strong reasons should they be deprived of their privilege to serve. This policy applies as well to elected provincial and municipal officials who were chosen in the election of 1940, thus giving due consideration to the will of the people as expressed at the polls.

Filipino loyalty to America is an incontestable fact. It is the more remarkable when we consider that right from the start of the war the Filipinos were subjected to a terrific barrage of anti-American propaganda. Claiming invincibility and professing a brotherly spirit toward the Philippines, Japan declared that she had come to our country to free us from the American yoke, and offered us a place of honor in her much-vaunted coprosperity sphere. But we contrasted these soothing words with the factual, liberal and generous record of America. Against the obviously empty promises of Tojo was the solemn pledge of President Roosevelt to the Filipinos that "their freedom would be redeemed and their independence established and protected." This pledge was later enlarged to include the promise that the Philippines would be assisted in the full repair of the ravages caused by the war.

It was in quest of the fulfillment of the promises of President Roosevelt that President Quezon and his cabinet accepted his invitation to transfer the Commonwealth government to Washington. In the course of this session, I shall have occasion to report to you the activities of our government in the United States. In this message I propose to discuss only the salient phases of that labor.

When we reached the United States, this country was entirely preoccupied with the problems of her mighty war effort, and her attention was concentrated on the European front. She was straining all her means and resources toward the fulfillment of her resolution to crush Nazi Germany first. It was then extremely difficult to divert American attention to the Pacific, but determined to present our cause before the American people, President Quezon held conferences with President Roosevelt and appeared before the Senate and House of Representatives. In spite of the delicate state of his health, he worked ceaselessly during the first year of his stay in Washington, delivering important speeches and repeatedly broadcasting to the Philippines in an effort to maintain the faith of his people. In active support of the President, the members of his Cabinet also made speeches throughout the United States, calling the attention of the people of America to the loyal stand of the Filipinos and urging prompt efforts for their early redemption.

The United States has kept her pledge. The Philippines is now liberated. This arduous campaign of 8 months, beginning at Leyte Gulf, has ended with the current final phase of mopping up in Mindanao and northern Luzon. Only the mountain corridor of Cagayan Valley, a trap from which there is no escape, remains under Japanese occupation.

Yet, in the flush of victory, we are apt to take for granted the monumental effort which the United States has had to exert to liberate us. Into the Southwest Pacific area the Japanese General Staff had poured a tremendous amount of troops, planes, and ships. Estimates place the Japanese military forces in the Philippines as comprising an entire Army area, two Army corps, at least 22 divisions and brigades, and a large number of service troops, totaling at least 450,000 men. Merchant marine, laborers, and hastily drafted civilians swelled this locust plague of armed occupation forces.

Enormous distances had to be traversed, but within the framework of a master plan that took everything into consideration—climate, terrain, and an enemy who preferred suicide to capture—operations stretching over 3,000 miles were relentlessly pursued throughout the bitter years of 1942, 1943, and 1944, until the brilliant goal is within inescapable reach in 1945. The main goal of these far-flung operations was the liberation of the Philippines. Enemy losses in the Philippines to date exceed 380,000, a mortal wound inflicted on the Japanese Army. With relatively low losses to ourselves, we have before us another example of the brilliant strategy of that genial military leader, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

The strategic effect of the liberation of the Philippines has been to set the stage for ultimate Japanese defeat at home and in the south, two areas now severed from each other. Filipinos have done their part in this work by giving lavishly of their men and resources to the United States. But the fight is not yet over, and so I have offered to General MacArthur one division of Filipino troops, under Filipino officers, for the final assault on Japan. Words alone cannot express our gratitude to the United States for all it has done for us, and I take this opportunity to repeat the offer made by President Quezon in 1941 to the people of America—that the men and resources of the Philippines are unconditionally at the service of the United States.

While our Government in Washington did its utmost to present before the American people the political aspect of the struggle in the Philippines, it did not neglect the economic phase, fully aware that the war would produce serious dislocations in the economic life of our country. President Quezon initiated personally the negotiations with the Federal Government to obtain the necessary economic assistance after the war. He did not stop negotiating directly with that Government until, because of his health, he had to retire temporarily from active labor. To proceed with the work already commenced, he created a postwar planning board. This board held sessions continuously, and completed its preliminary work. This served as the basis for a program which was finally submitted by the representatives of our Government on the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission presided over by Senator TYDINGS. I am presenting to you with this message the reports which have been submitted to me by the Filipino group of this Commission. Upon their examination you will find that the program of relief and rehabilitation, as prepared by our representatives in Washington, is very comprehensive. I wish on this occasion to praise the work done by our group. Our men there accomplished a difficult task within very limited means. Now that there is available to me a wealth of human material, it is my purpose to appoint to this Commission new representatives, among whom will be members of this Congress.

When I assumed office as President of the Philippines, I considered it my duty to exert every possible effort to obtain the active personal interest of the President of the United States in our problems. But when I was prepared to confer with President Roosevelt on his return from Quebec last October, I received an urgent request from General MacArthur to join him and the forces of liberation that were poised to invade the Philippines. Because of this urgent request, I was able to have only a short conference with President Roosevelt, but I promised him that I would return to the United States as soon as possible to continue our conversations.

After the reestablishment of the Commonwealth Government in Leyte, I returned to the United States. President Roosevelt being then out of Washington and, on the other hand, finding myself in urgent need of submitting to a physical examination, I went to Jacksonville, Fla. Everything was in readiness for my hospitalization there when I received another telegram from General MacArthur urging me to join him in Luzon immediately. Reaching Lingayen on the very day I was expected, I rejoined General MacArthur in his headquarters and with him I entered Manila.

Upon resuming my functions in this capital, I endeavored to convene the Congress, but due to the military situation, it was not possible to do so. I then decided to return to the United States to renew my conference with President Roosevelt. We met on April 5 and reached an agreement on some of our basic problems. We further agreed to meet again in Washington. Unfortunately, the President died on the 12th.

Shocked by the sad news, I hastened to express to his successor the most profound condolences of the Filipino people. I flew to Washington to attend the funeral services. In the passing of President Roosevelt we, with the entire world, have suffered an irreparable loss. I recommend the erection, by public subscription, of a national library to be named "Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library" as a lasting tribute to him who was a true friend of the Filipinos and a great champion of human rights and liberties.

President Roosevelt had suggested that our next meeting be at the White House on April 19. On that date President Truman received me and we conferred in the presence of the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and the Interior. This was followed by another conference the next week in which President Truman accepted as his own President Roosevelt's commitments with respect to the Philippines and decided, with my concurrence, to send Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, as his special envoy to the Philippines.

The object of the Tydings mission was not to collect data here, since all the necessary statistical and other information were already available to Senator TYDINGS before he left Washington. The mission desired, firstly, to obtain a personal impression of the situation in which the war had left us, and secondly, to contact personally the officials of the Philippine Government, the military command, and other interested parties, with a view to coordinating their suggestions and fitting them into the rehabilitation plans already under consideration. Deeply moved by what he saw in Manila, Senator TYDINGS decided to return immediately to Washington to report to the President of the United States. Indicative of the sympathy, zeal, and industry of the Tydings mission is the four-point program for the rehabilitation of the Philippines which it has publicly announced. I am confident that action on this and other programs will soon be forthcoming.

First and foremost in our minds as Filipinos is the question of our political future. In this matter no greater and nobler message has been given to the Filipino people than that of President Roosevelt when, on August 13, 1943, reiterating his previous promise on independence made on December 28, 1941, he expressed himself in the following words:

"On December 28, 1941, 3 weeks after the armies of the Japanese launched their attack on Philippine soil, I sent a proclamation to you, the gallant people of the Philippines.

"I said then:

" 'I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected. The entire resources in men and materials of the United States stand behind that pledge.

" 'We shall keep this promise just as we have kept every promise which America has made to the Filipino people.' "

Soon after, on the initiative of President Quezon, steps were taken to obtain congressional sanction for these pledges. If President Quezon did nothing but this in his political career—and his political record can hardly be surpassed—it alone would entitle him to the eternal gratitude of his people. Senate Joint Resolution No. 93, which President Quezon and I asked for and accepted, is the culmination of our joint congressional efforts. This legislation authorizes the President of the United States to advance the date of independence provided in the independence law. It also provides, through the maintenance by the United States of bases in the Philippines, "for full security for the Philippines, for the mutual protection of the islands and the United States, and for the future maintenance of peace in the Pacific."

So that the import of this new legislation, and the responsibility which we Filipinos have assumed thereby, may be better understood, it is necessary that we review past events even if we have to walk again on well-trodden paths.

National independence was the goal which our revolutionaries of 1892 and 1896 set for themselves. When the fortunes of war were adverse to our arms and American sovereignty was established in 1898, individual liberties were recognized, among them the right of free assembly. Under the protection of this freedom, two political groups came into existence—the Federalistas, who declared themselves in favor of the annexation of the Philippines to the United States so as to constitute in due time a State of the Union; and the Nacionalistas, who advocated the ideal of independence which the Filipino revolutionaries had proclaimed but were not able to achieve in war.

This aspiration to be free, nurtured in an atmosphere of peace, was received with sympathy in the United States. The legitimacy of this aspiration was recognized by Dr. Jacob C. Schurman, president of the first American commission sent by President McKinley to the Philippines, in these memorable words:

"The watchword of progress, the key to the future of the political development of the archipelago, is neither colonialism nor federalism, but nationalism. The destiny of the Philippine Islands is not to be a State or Territory in the United States of America, but a daughter republic of ours—a new birth of liberty on the other side of the Pacific, which shall animate and energize those lovely islands of the tropical seas, and, rearing its head aloft, stand as a monument of progress and a beacon of hope to all the oppressed and benighted millions of the Asiatic continent."

On their part, the Filipino people, who had elected a majority of Nationalistas to the first Philippine Assembly, which met in 1907, repeatedly reiterated their confidence in them in successive elections, until the Congress approved in 1934 the Tydings-McDuffie Act creating the present Commonwealth. This law was accepted, first by the legislature and then directly by the people, thus binding America and the Philippines to a virtual covenant by which the United States formally committed itself to withdraw its sovereignty from the Philippines and proclaim our independence on July 4, 1946. The 10-year transition period was not established to delay the proclamation of independence, but only to prepare the Philippines adequately for the responsibilities of nationhood.

We were well advanced in our preparations for independence when we became the object of an unjust aggression by Japan. But Japan's military occupation of the Philippines had not affected the independence program agreed upon between the United States and the Philippines. When President Roosevelt invited the President of the Government of the Commonwealth and his cabinet to evacuate to the United States, he did not do so merely to preserve the constitutional integrity of the Philippine Government but also to assure the realization, in due time, of the program of independence.

With this fundamental idea in mind, the United States took the initiative of considering the Philippines as possessing all of the attributes of complete and respected nationhood. I cannot give you a more authoritative statement concerning the status of our Government in Washington than that which President Roosevelt himself made in his broadcast to the Philippines on August 13 1943:

"The Philippine Government is a signatory of the declaration by the United Nations, along with 31 other nations. President Quezon and Vice President Osmeña attend the meetings of the Pacific War Council, where the war in the Pacific is charted and planned. Your government has participated fully and equally in the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, and a Philippine representative is a member of the Interim Commission created by that Conference. And, of course, the Philippine Government will have its rightful place in the conference which will follow the defeat of Japan."

In confirmation of this status we are now participating, among the free and independent nations of the world, in the United Nations Conference on International Organization now taking place in San Francisco.

This war, which has ravaged the world and which is yet to be won in the Pacific, has brought to the Philippines a permanent blessing. I refer to the fundamental change in America's policy with regard to the outside world, namely, her abandonment of the attitude of isolation and her frank acknowledgment of her duty, as one of the most powerful nations on earth, to preserve for all mankind liberty, justice, peace, and security.

In conformity with this new, well-deserved ideology, Congress approved in 1943 Joint Resoultions 93 and 94 which provide, among other things, for the permanent security of the Philippines. America will not only acknowledge our independence as soon as it is possible after the Japanese have been expelled from our soil but will provide, besides, protection for that independence.

When the Philippine Assembly in 1907 formulated the first official petition of the Filipino people that it be granted independence, it did so fully aware of the responsibilities which the new status would impose on us with respect to our security. The Jones law of 1916 offered us independence as soon as we had organized a stable government, and we accepted it in spite of the fact that such a law did not contain any promise giving us the protection of America after the attainment of our political freedom. In 1934 the Filipino people had occasion in a plebiscite to accept or reject an independence law without adequate American guaranty for its maintenance. The people accepted the offer by an overwhelming majority. With America now offering us protection which assures the permanency of our independence, it would be inconceivable for any Filipino to vacillate.

The program of independence, initially written with the blood of the heroes and martyrs of our history, which took root in the days of the first Philippine Assembly in 1907, which acquired consistency throughout the long period of Filipino-American collaboration resulting in the approval of the Jones law in 1916 and the establishment of the Commonwealth in 1935, is a program definitely accepted by the Filipino people. Those of us who are temporarily in charge of the affairs of state are mere trustees of the sacred ideals of our people. We have no right to turn back—we shall not turn back—cowed by imaginary dangers or swayed by the desire to lead a life of ease and plenty. We cannot sell our liberty for a mess of pottage.

When Andres Bonifacio and his men uttered their now historic first cry of Balintawak, they were not held back by fear of the enemy, or by any love of earthly goods.

When we took over the banner of liberty from those that fell in the night of our defeat, we asked only for freedom and for nothing more. When we were asked in 1934 if we preferred liberty to prosperity, our people answered overwhelmingly that they desired liberty above everything else. Now that the United States, in recognition of our role in this war, has declared itself our ally and, with liberty, offers us security, it is our duty and our choice to accept.

So I say to every Filipino and to all other elements in our state, that the die is cast. Our course is straight and inflexible. We are going forward to the achievement of our national aspiration.

Gentlemen of the Congress, you are gathered today under the most trying circumstances. There are many serious problems ahead of us. But we who have so long and ardently clamored for self-government must prove to the world that we are equal to the most exacting tasks of public administration. That great and distinguished friend of the Filipino people, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, once said that they are only fit to live who are not afraid to die. Our people have shown on the battlefield that they are not afraid to die.

But the tasks of peace are at times more exacting than those of war. We are administering the affairs of 18,000,000 people just delivered from three long years of enslavement. To them we owe justice, order, and the means to live in contentment and happiness. I am aware that our means at the moment are inadequate. We are not able to provide our people with as much as they deserve. But we shall not falter in the line of duty.

Let us get together in one mighty effort. Let us set aside selfish considerations and forget petty differences. Only in unity can there be strength. To the experienced, I turn for advice. From the youth of the land I ask its enthusiasm and energies. My faith in our people is unbounded. Over the ruins of our cities and barrios we shall build anew. In this most crucial hour of our history, I look forward to our destiny unafraid, confident that, God willing, ours will be a happy, progressive, and prosperous land.

In closing, permit me to congratulate you most heartily for being the first elective Congress to meet in a country liberated from the enemy, although the Philippines is among the last to be free from enemy occupation and control.

I wish you all success in discharging the tremendous responsibility that is yours during the present emergency.

Amendment of Federal Farm Mortgage Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a matter which must of necessity claim the attention of the people in the mid-continental section of this country is the return of men from the armed forces. This trend has already started in, although it will never reach its full proportions until the war with Japan is concluded. It nevertheless becomes the duty of all citizens to give rightful consideration to placing these returning young men in a position where they can take their place in society and carry forth to build homes and to make their lives secure, both for themselves and their families.

With this thought in mind, and under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions expressing the views of the board of directors of the Mountrail County National Farm Loan Association, of Stanley, N. Dak., at a meeting held in the office of the association in Stanley, N. Dak., on June 26, 1945:

Resolution adopted at a meeting of the board of directors of the Mountrail County National Farm Loan Association of Stanley, N. Dak., held at the association office in Stanley, N. Dak., on June 26, 1945

Whereas a great number of young men and women from the State of North Dakota, now engaged in the armed services of the United States, will soon be returned to their homes; and

Whereas it is known that the great majority of such returning servicemen will return to their own State to engage in their former occupation; and

Whereas there are in the usual course of affairs many young men who wish to acquire farms and make their start in life, as well as tenants and others who wish to become farm owners, who need financial assistance; and

Whereas North Dakota is chiefly an agricultural State, depending almost exclusively upon farming to give employment to such returning servicemen; and

Whereas a great majority of these men have indicated their desire to own and operate their own farms and have a right to expect that such opportunities will be available to them; and

Whereas a soldier's pay is not sufficient to permit accumulation of funds, with which to purchase farms; and

Whereas it is the duty of the Congress of the United States, and of every man and woman within its borders, to assist all such returning servicemen; and

Whereas it is necessary that a source of credit be made available to assist such persons in purchasing their own farms and to help them get a start in life; and

Whereas there is now no lending agency operating in the State of North Dakota, offering to lend money on real estate security, with the exception of a few private individual lenders; and

Whereas such private funds are loaned at an interest rate greater than our men now in the armed services can afford to pay; and

Whereas the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, has funds on hand for such purpose, which it urgently desires to lend, on such security; and

Whereas the laws of the State of North Dakota conflict with the Federal Farm Loan Act, in that they do not recognize any personal liability on the part of the borrower; and

Whereas it is not possible at this time to amend the present State laws of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of this association recommend and urgently request that the Federal Farm Mortgage Act be amended, as to any and all features now in conflict with the laws of the State of North Dakota so as to provide a source of credit for real estate loans and purchases for farmers as a whole and servicemen in particular in the State of North Dakota through the medium of the Federal land bank system; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be mailed to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, with copies to all Members of Congress from this State.

MOUNTRAIL COUNTY NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION,
OLUF P. OSWALD, *President*.
R. O. BURBIDGE, *Secretary-Treasurer*.
LAURITZ NELSON.
JAMES WRIGHT.
HOWARD STEFFAN.
NELS EVANS.

Shipment of Steel Rails to Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very much heartened to read the following news item appearing in the Washington Post this morning under an Associated Press release, revealing that the Foreign Economic Administration had refused to issue an export license, and had thus turned thumbs down on a shipment of 100,000 tons of steel rails to Spain.

In my opinion it would be an outrageous situation to allow such strategic materials to be shipped out of our country to foreign nations who have done nothing to help us in our war against Germany and Japan. We need all such strategic materials for the postwar reconversion period to build up the United States and to build up our own industries, thereby making it possible to put our own labor to work on good paying jobs.

I only hope the State Department will profit by the object lesson set forth by the FEA in this instance and that the State Department will carry on the same good work for American industry, American workingmen, and American housewives by turning thumbs down on all future shipments of sugar to Spain and other foreign countries in the same category. Sugar is a strategic material as far as American industry, labor, and the American housewives are concerned. Congress should go on record encouraging the stand of the FEA and all other Government agencies who stand up for American needs, and thus protect American industry and the American family.

The article follows:

FEA FORBIDS SHIPPING SPAIN STEEL RAILS

The Foreign Economic Administration said yesterday that it had turned thumbs down on shipments of 100,000 tons of steel rails to Spain.

The agency said that last month private American exporters, whom it did not name, inquired whether such a shipment could be made to Spain, and were told that an export license would not be granted.

FEA officials disclosed their action when a reporter asked for comment on a protest by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, against any such shipment.

PROTEST SENT VINSON

Murray made public a letter to Mobilization Director Fred M. Vinson, which said:

"My information is that the Sparrows Point, Md., plant of the Bethlehem Corp. is rolling or preparing to roll 100,000 tons of

steel rails for shipment to Spain. I am advised that request had been made by the Export Traders Co., New York City for an export license to ship steel rails to Spain."

He called this an "outrageous situation" and said it was made possible because the War Production Board has permitted the sale of steel in the free market.

At Baltimore, S. J. Cort, general manager of the Sparrows Point plant, said that he had no knowledge of any planed shipments.

Urging retention of controls on all scarce materials, Murray said that to abandon such controls now would be detrimental to small businessmen, workers, and farmers, "who will be forced to go without essential goods" until the demands of other buyers are satisfied.

"It is unnecessary for me to point out," he said, "the need of our own railroads for rails in order to meet the current tremendous transportation demands, to say nothing of the need of rails for rebuilding the transportation systems of our allies and the liberated countries."

FEA officials said that no steel rails have been sent to Spain and that no license has been granted for such shipments. Advised of this, an aide to Murray said: "If that is the case, we are naturally pleased." Murray himself could not be reached for comment.

Leaning Over Backward in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, when the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Grew, assured the four inquiring Democratic Congressmen that "this country is leaning over backward in order to avoid offending Russia," he may, or he may not, have had in mind the specific case of Czechoslovakia. There have been a number of developments in this case since Mr. Grew's reassurance on June 1.

As in the case of all the other countries now enjoying Soviet protection steps have been taken toward centralization of political control. The Communist, Social Democratic, and People's Socialist Parties have been united into a familiar Front Party, called in this case: the Czech National Bloc. This maneuver puts the key governmental positions into Communist hands, just as has already been done in Hungary, Austria, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Russian-occupied Germany.

The Premier of Czechoslovakia, Zdenek Fierlinger, has always been politically identified with the pro-Stalinist group of the Czech Social Democratic Party. In practical effect the party merger means that Mr. Fierlinger will serve as gauleiter for Moscow in Czechoslovakia. This carries out the program quoted by the New York Communist paper, the Daily Worker, of June 19, 1945, in which Mr. Fierlinger stated that his government was formulating "a unique, permanent system of internal administration in which all parties will continue to form a coalition and give united support to its decisions. All parties now have a common purpose in practical policy." Mr. Fierlinger significantly added:

I know the Communist Party is absolutely loyal to the State and President Benes. The country is now completely united behind both.

Mr. Fierlinger's cabinet demonstrates the unity of the regime. As usual, the Ministry of Interior with control of the police forces, the Ministry of Foreign Trade—now largely to be carried on with Russia across the newly-joined frontier; the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Justice, of Agriculture, of Industry, and of Social Welfare, are held by members of the national bloc. Most important is the fact that an old-line Communist, Vaclav Kopecky, is Minister of Information. Reports have already been published that schools have been forbidden to include any religious training. Under mobilization orders issued last month, all able-bodied boys of 15 years will be drafted for military training in the Czech Army which, its commander stated "is being made ready to fight."

Officers of the Czech Army will henceforth be trained, not in Czechoslovakia, but in Russian military academies, where an important requirement is obtaining passing grades in the study of Communist—or Marxian—ideology.

That is the situation today in Czechoslovkia, the land which was hailed throughout America 26 years ago as the spearhead of democratic reconstruction in Europe after World War I. In 1919, there were many close ties between Czechoslovakia and the United States. The president of the new Czech Republic, Dr. Thomas G. Masaryk, had been a distinguished and esteemed professor at Harvard University. Most of his cabinet had been in the United States, and had wide circles of friends and admirers here. The aid given by the Czech underground to our military information service had been priceless. It can only be compared to the aid given in the present war by the Polish underground. Unlike some of the other communized countries, Czechoslovakia has steadily been regarded as an ally of the United States, a very special ally, for whose very existence this Government was, in part, responsible.

It is now apparent that no such feeling persists in Czechoslovakia. For that fact the policy pursued by our Government during the past 6 or more years is in large part responsible.

When the United States failed to pursue its original intention of promoting an economic federation between Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia, no recourse was left the Czechs but to seek shelter under the newly spreading wings of the Soviet Empire. From the standpoint of western Europe Czechoslovakia is more important, strategically, than Poland. The Carpathians are the hitherto uncrossed barrier between the east and the west. In Czechia, also, are very important deposits of iron and coal. One of the great munitions centers of the world is the Skoda works at Pilsen, from which Hitler obtained much of his panzer armor.

Czechoslovakia did not become a Soviet province last week. Its present course was mapped at Teheran. Until the Teheran Conference, Mr. Eden, the British Foreign Minister, had stubbornly rejected any proposal for a Russo-Czech alliance, and he had been supported by Mr. Cordell Hull. Pressure was brought on both of them from Moscow and from the Czech Government-in-exile, and in order to counter this pressure the Anglo-American Governments had to hedge. Messrs. Hull and Eden, and their principals, were trying to avoid the most serious political error of World War I, which was the making of definite territorial commitments while the war was being fought. No guaranty could be given by Washington or London as to the restoration of Czechoslovakia's prewar borders, especially without a return guaranty from Dr. Benes that the restored Czech state would truly fulfill President Masaryk's vow to give "the various peoples in his nation equal rights and privileges so that it would be a second Switzerland."

No such requirement was made by Marshal Stalin and, in default of any promise from the United States or Great Britain, Dr. Benes went to Moscow. The ment. After the Russo-Czech Alliance at Moscow differs in no important respect from the pomp formerly offered at Berchtesgaden. In each case a form, previously prepared, awaits merely signatures and a post-signature announcement. After the Russo-Czech Alliance was signed Dr. Benes proudly announced that he had the Soviets' unconditional pledge for restoration of his nation's pre-Munich boundaries. Czechoslovakia was to be intact. In all but the signatures and names of the countries and areas this pact was indistinguishable from the one in which General Sikorski was given the Soviet's unconditional pledge to erase the Molotov-Ribbentrop line, and restore to Poland its 1939 frontiers intact.

The two treaties have suffered the same fate, in fact though not on paper. During the past week, Premier Fierlinger made a trip to Moscow to ratify the annexation by the Soviets' Ukrainian satellite of Ruthenia, the easternmost province of the Czech Republic. Already Moscow has approved the transfer of the rich mineral area of Teschen to the "reorganized" Polish state.

American troops are still holding one small corner of Czechoslovakia. But our right to be there has been challenged both by Russian occupation units and by the Czech Government, which has announced it wishes all armies—except the Russian-trained Czech Army—to leave Czechoslovakia. Many Czechs hope our men will not be withdrawn speedily. These are the Czechs who believed in democracy 26 years ago, who followed Thomas Masaryk, and whose one hope during the past 6 years has been for a fulfillment of the task Dr. Masaryk began. These Czechs say that our withdrawal would mark the end of hope for them, and for Czechoslovakia itself, as anything but another unit in the Sovict system. They say, and there is evidence to support their statement, that, if we withdraw, all who do not support communism in Czechoslovakia are doomed. Liquidation of independent elements—which means murder on a large scale—is a primary step in "unifying" a country under a one-party system.

Money in a Rat Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one expects to purchase legislation. Neither is there sense in businessmen or industrialists backing a political party which lacks either the courage or the inclination to adopt a policy of advocating legislation which will give at least a measure of equal justice under law, make it possible for private enterprise to exist and pay the taxes which enable the Government to function.

For several years I have endeavored to point out to contributors of financial aid to political organizations that they were wasting their money when they failed to demand that political organizations not only get behind but push sound, constructive legislation. It is all very well to angle for votes, to play what is known as smart politics, but in the long run, unless legislation is fair and basically sound, vote-catching measures will not only fail of their objective but prove ruinous.

Hence, it was with some satisfaction that I read last night Frank R. Kent's article addressed to those who financially support political organizations. My only comment is: As long as you are only asking for legislation which is fair and equitable to everyone, get something for your money.

The article reads as follows:

The reaction in Congress to the recent deluge of strikes (in war industries as well as out) with which the country has been—and still is—afflicted makes it clear that a showdown in the labor industry situation is not far off. It is significant that among Members of the House, regardless of party, the comment is almost wholly unfavorable to the strikers.

In the country generally there is a greater realization of the completely phony character of the no-strike pledge. And the intolerable nature of another labor-dominated administration is being driven home to the people. As a result, the period in which both parties have been operating under the lash of the labor bosses competing for the labor vote with concessions that shackle industry and promote injustice seems about to end. The best evidence is the outspoken opposition to a continuance of this policy by men of both parties, not in active politics nor holders of public office, but regular and liberal contributors to the party treasuries. Replying recently to a request for funds from his national committee, one of these wrote that he had made up his mind to make no further party contribution, State or national, until his party had ceased to be pusillanimous in its attitude toward labor and become honest.

PROPOSES SERIES OF PRINCIPLES

To this end he suggested the adoption of certain principles, declaring his purpose to contribute as liberally as he could to the party which embraces them. If neither is courageous enough to act along these lines, then he would contribute to neither. Here are the things he wants his party—or the other—to advocate: (1) The right of a man to work, irrespective of race or creed or the fact that he does or does not belong to a union. (2) The unequivocal position that Government will neither connive at nor compel a contract which establishes a closed shop or the "involuntary check-off," or which compels an employer to discharge a man who, having once been a union man, resigns or fails to pay his union dues. Such contracts, if made at all, he said, should be voluntary and not compulsory, directly or indirectly.

(3) The right of an individual to do, during the hours he works, as much or as little work as he wishes for as high or as small a wage as he is willing to accept. (4) The unequivocal pledge that Government will not pay unemployment benefit to individuals who strike or refuse to work when they have voluntarily left employment or have been coerced so to do by their union bosses. (5) The unequivocal promise to abolish government by bureaus where the examiner, on evidence that would not be admissible in any court, may make a finding of facts which is binding upon the court of appeal. In concluding his letter, this contributor tells his party chairman that there are, of course, other fundamental principles which should be embraced, but that he will be content if his party makes a start with those above suggested. "Probably," he wrote, "a party proposing these things would meet with initial defeat. However, it would ultimately succeed, and through its success restore to citizens the liberties they have lost. If it did not meet with ultimate success, what difference would it make? Our country would be destroyed, anyway."

STRESSES POWER OF SUCKERS

Whether one agrees with these views or not, there are two things to be said about their presentation to a party chairman by a substantial and regular contributor: One is that they represent the practically unanimous views of the substantial contributors of both parties who have not got and do not want political jobs of any kind. The other is that if all—or a considerable number—of this class, the substantial contributors who believe in these principles, follow the example of the writer of this letter and make their contributions contingent upon the adoption of a party policy with which they are in accord, they certainly will get action.

There is no quicker or surer way of getting action from a party organization than by interfering with the flow of its finances. For more than 12 years the men of this substantial-contributor class in both parties have been giving money to party organizations which turned their respective parties in a direction they did not want to go and made them stand for things in which they do not believe. This would seem to make fools of these financial supporters. One of them suddenly has decided to stop being a sucker. If a few others followed his example, the effect would be felt all down the line—particularly as the course they suggest is distinctly in the public interest and reflects popular feeling. The labor unions have been playing the same old game in the same old way that was so long and so successfully played by the old Anti-Saloon League. It is a national mortification that they should be able to get away with it.

A Typical Pioneer—James H. Drummond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have something to say about the pioneers, those sturdy, self-reliant, God-fearing, energetic men and women who have helped build America into the greatest republic on the face of the earth. In today's mail I received the Daily Journal of International Falls, Minn., for Saturday, June 30, and am glad to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which pays tribute to James H. Drummond. He has served as clerk of court for Koochiching County, Minn., for a period of 38½ years, ever since that county was organized. Mr. Drummond is certainly qualified to be called a pioneer. While I do not know his middle name, I and everybody else know him as just pain Jim. The editorial reads as follows:

JIM DRUMMOND

Koochiching County loses a valuable and highly respected public servant by the resignation of James H. Drummond, clerk of court for 38½ years. Officially on duty today for the last time, he has prepared to turn the office over to younger hands and to spend the autumn of his life in well-earned leisure. There isn't a person in all the area who will deny that Jim Drummond deserves a happy retirement after these many years of mental and physical strain experienced in meeting the exacting requirements of his office.

Mr. Drummond was a young man when he joined the strong-hearted group of frontier leaders who, almost 40 years ago, first suggested that the area which is now called Koochiching should be a county by itself. He and his associates in the county division movement had a vision of progress. They stood by their guns, knowing that they were right, and eventually won their goal with the organization of Koochiching as a separate county on January 1, 1907.

A firm belief that Koochiching had the physical and human resources to stand by itself motivated Mr. Drummond and the other pioneers to fight for separation from Itasca County. Mr. Drummond believed in this border country. He loved it. He had faith in his neighbors, in his fellow workers, and in all the hardy woodsmen and settlers who moved in to harvest a forest crop, found industries, and to build flourishing communities.

Yes; Mr. Drummond had faith in Koochiching County, and that faith has remained undiminished through the years. On his retirement today he undoubtedly is thinking of the changes which have occurred, the progress that has been made in the half-century elapsed since he moved here from eastern Ontario.

Being a humble man, he will deny any credit for what has been accomplished. He will stoutly maintain that he has done no more than any other man would have done under similar circumstances. But the community knows better. His unnumbered friends and acquaintances are saying that he has done a marvelous job in a highly important public office. The Journal speaks for all of these in thanking James H. Drummond for his services to Koochiching County. His record, both as an official and as a citizen, is likely to be unmatched for a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could pay individual tribute to that multitude of other pioneers by calling attention to their individual records, in this Government document known as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I cannot, of course, do that, but I can say that our friend Jim Drummond is typical of this vast multitude of our elder citizens of whom all of us can be proud. They, and Jim deserve praise for the fine service they have rendered posterity in giving us a

land of liberty and opportunity, and constitutional Government, and the freedom which we enjoy here and which exists nowhere else in the wide world. And so we salute this typical pioneer, Jim Drummond, and all of those fine people, who like him, have served their community and their country faithfully and well.

Industry-Wide Plan of the Businessmen's Advisory Council to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

NEW YORK CITY POST, No. 505,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., June 29, 1945.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed please find copy of plan we are putting through to assist the veterans.

We know you are vitally interested in furthering the cause of the veteran, and believe this plan should be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanks and with kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH LOVE.

AN INDUSTRY-WIDE PLAN OF THE BUSINESSMEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL TO VETERANS—APPAREL, TEXTILES, IN THE ACCESSORIES AND RETAIL FIELDS

PURPOSES

The purpose of the council, in the first instance is to render every practical assistance to discharged war veterans, male and female, who may desire particular counsel and guidance to the end that they may become established in a business for which they are qualified in any of the wide ramifications of the manufacturing and retail fields.

It is a further purpose of the council to assist other discharged veterans to obtain employment with special attention to the development of situations suitable for disabled veterans insofar as it is within its power.

OBJECTIVES

1. To encourage, stimulate, and develop ethical private enterprise through the closest relationship between and among business, industry and the general public because private enterprise is the backbone of the American way of life.

2. To enlist the complete cooperation of Government bureaus and agencies with manufacturers and retailers in the wearing apparel, textile, knitwear and accessory, and retailing fields for the summary removal of any and all restrictions that would tend to delay, obstruct, encumber, or impede the opportunity of any veteran to start and continue the operation of a small business.

3. To seek the cooperation of organizations interested in the rehabilitation and readjustment of veterans.

4. To survey business prospects and facilities that may be utilized in the preparation of a program that will permit maximum benefits.

OPERATIONS

Business consultants from each branch of the industry will conduct all interviews with veterans. In order to expedite procedure with the least loss of time and effort, it is desirable that, prior to the preliminary interview, the veteran furnish a brief personal background history on a prescribed printed form sheet or card. Such information is to be held in confidence and the sheet or card is to bear the heading "Confidential."

Veterans are to be advised that whatever counsel and advice they receive is offered as the expert opinion of the consultants, given in good faith, without fee or other personal gain.

The consultant will help in the securing of priorities, price ceiling, permits, etc., which may be necessary for the normal organization and operation of a veteran's business.

Assistance is to be extended in cases where veterans encounter difficulty in the purchase of material, equipment, and machinery for the manufacture of products. Also, in cases where veterans desire to enter the retail field aid will be given in obtaining merchandise for resale.

This plan for help in the establishment of private enterprise is not restricted by geographical or sectional limitations but is on a Nation-wide basis with equal consideration for all.

DISPLAY EMBLEM

Each firm participating actively in this plan will be awarded by the council an emblem of distinction for display, which will be recognized by all who see it as a symbol of patriotic effort in the readjustment of our veterans.

COMMITTEES

All matters of policy determined by a committee representing each line of industry in this project. Each individual industry will pledge or allocate a percentage of their production to the veterans.

The members of the committee shall forward to the sponsoring committee the names and addresses of the veterans it assists and the amount of goods allotted to them, and shall further advise the sponsoring committee when its quota has been filled.

RFC Financing for the Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I introduced a bill—H. R. 3595—to provide RFC financing for mining and particularly for the rehabilitation of the gold mines. It is important that our Government protect the mining industry of this country. Shortly before he was assassinated, President Lincoln was invited to a miners' conference at Virginia City, locale of the famous Comstock Lode of Nevada. He was unable to attend, but sent his envoy, Schuyler Colfax, with a message to the assembled miners, in which President Lincoln emphasized his reasons for supporting the mining industry. I think his remarks are equally appropriate today. They were as follows:

I want you to take a message from me to the miners whom you visit. I have very large ideas of the mineral wealth of our Nation. I believe it is practically inexhaustible.

It's development is scarcely commenced.

During the war, when we were adding a couple of millions of dollars every day to our national debt, I did not care about encouraging the increase of the volume of our precious metals. We had the country to save first.

But now that the rebellion is overthrown and we know pretty nearly the amount of our national debt, the gold and silver we mine make the payment of that debt much the easier.

Now, I am going to encourage that in every possible way. We shall have hundreds of thousands of disbanded soldiers, and many have feared that their return home in such great numbers might paralyze industry by furnishing suddenly a greater supply of labor than there will be demand for.

I am going to try to attract them to the hidden wealth of our mountain ranges * * * here there is room enough for all. I intend to point them to the gold and silver that waits for them in the west.

Tell the miners for me that I shall promote their interests to the utmost of my ability; because their prosperity is the prosperity of the Nation, and we shall prove in a very few years that we are indeed the treasury of the world.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. STARKEY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been a keen disappointment to me in not being privileged to cast my vote in favor of at least the continuance of the temporary Fair Employment Practice Committee. I know from personal contact with citizens from all walks of life in my district who have worked diligently to stamp out racial and religious prejudice that they have made great strides toward that end. I know it will be a keen disappointment to them to learn that our Government does not appreciate their efforts, and refuses to grant a slight appropriation to carry on this work or to give recognition to the efforts they have put forth.

Through the late President Roosevelt, former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and our great President, Harry S. Truman, we have assumed world leadership to bring about economic equalities among all nations. To do less than that for groups of our own citizens is the height of ingratitude. These groups have participated fully and loyally in the prosecution of the war, on the battlefield, on the seas, and at home on the production lines. They have given whatever has been asked of them to bring freedom to oppressed people in other lands. If we are giving the lives of our citizens, their resources, and their talents to bring about peaceful and harmonious relations among the nations and peoples of the world, I say, in all sincerity, that it, like charity, should begin at home.

Our Nation has made tremendous progress in the matter of equal economic rights through the necessities of war. Are we, once the war is over, going to toss all this out of the window and return to the archaic system under which

minority groups, large and small, could be denied the right to earn a livelihood, on the same basis as all others with whom they could claim equal abilities?

Instances of racial strife have been almost negligible through the war, even though the wartime emergency powers of the FEPC were accepted with considerable misgivings at the outset. If the FEPC could work—and the war effort would have been greatly handicapped without it—so well as an emergency measure, is there reason to believe it would not work equally well in time of peace?

The emergency will not end when the war ends. Thousands of Negroes and members of the other minority groups have migrated to the shipyards and other industrial centers. We know from what happened after the last war, that most of these workers will stay in their new locations. When war production is cut back, there may be a struggle for the available jobs in these areas. Unless the members of the minority groups have equal opportunity for the available jobs it might well lead to some of the worst racial disturbances the Nation ever has known.

I do not expect that a permanent FEPC would forever end all racial strife, but it would help to educate us in the tolerance which, given free opportunity to achieve results, would some day put all human beings on an equal economic plane, so far as their rights to work and earn are concerned.

Despite all that those who oppose progress may do, that day will eventually come. We should do all in our power to hasten the day, and creation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission is one way to do so.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following history of FEPC, released by the National Council for a Permanent FEPC, Washington, D. C.:

June 1941: President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executime order of the President, "to promote the fullest utilization of all available manpower, and to eliminate discriminatory employment practices" in the Federal Government and war industry. Operated for 3 years with President's war funds.

January 1944: Bipartisan bill to establish permanent FEPC introduced in House. Companion bill introduced in Senate in June 1944.

June 1944: Congress appropriates funds for President's Committee for 1945 fiscal year. Republican National Convention puts into platform plank calling for Federal permanent FEPC. Subsequently, both Presidential candidates and scores of candidates for Senate and House advocate permanent FEPC in campaign speeches.

August to November 1944: House and Senate permanent FEPC bills favorably reported by respective committees.

January 1945: Permanent bills reintroduced in House and Senate, under bipartisan sponsorship. Soon after reported favorably by both committees.

June 1, 1945: House Appropriations Committee reports war agencies appropriations bill, but withholds FEPC item on grounds that legislation is pending and "the only logical course is to await legislative developments before making a recommendation." Subsequent discussion on House floor indicates FEPC was omitted to insure rule waiving points of order on other war agencies not authorized by legislation.

June 8, 1945: President Truman addresses a letter to the chairman of the House Rules Committee, which has delayed action on the rule for permanent FEPC bill, declaring "to abandon the fundamental principle upon which the Fair Employment Practice Committee was established is unthinkable," and adding, "I therefore urge the Rules Committee to adopt a rule permitting this legislation to be voted upon by the Members of the House as quickly as possible."

War agencies appropriations bill is passed in House and sent to Senate, despite protest of many Representatives at denial of opportunity to vote on inclusion of FEPC.

June 12, 1945: House Rules Committee denies rule to permanent FEPC bill by 6–6 tie vote, all southern members voting against, all Republicans and northern Democrats voting for.

June 20, 1945: Senate Committee on Appropriations votes 14–4 (with only southern members voting against) to move to restore FEPC item in war agencies appropriations bill on Senate floor. (Should point of order be made on floor, suspension of rules by two-thirds vote would be required.)

June 25, 1945: House Appropriations Committee reports resolution appropriating $125,000 to terminate FEPC.

June 28, 1945: House Rules Committee tables termination resolution.

June 30, 1945: Following 3 days of filibuster in Senate, Senator BARKLEY proposes compromise amendment appropriating $250,000 for FEPC for the fiscal year, instead of $699,000 originally approved by the Bureau of the Budget. No point of order is made, and amendment carries, 42 to 26.

June 30, 1945: Upon receipt of notification of Senate action, motion is made in House to appoint conferees to meet with Senate conferees on Senate amendments to total bill. Unanimous consent required for such a motion is denied on House floor. (Procedure requires referral to Rules Committee for rule when unanimous consent is unattainable for appointment of conferees, or to Appropriations Committee, which may report a favorable recommendation without a rule.)

July 2, 1945, a. m.: Rules Committee denies rule, and Speaker RAYBURN refers bill to House Appropriations Committee.

P. M.: Appropriations Committee votes against FEPC inclusion and, following only other alternative, reports entire new war agencies appropriation bill, substantially identical to bill it originally reported June 1. This has the effect of nullifying all amendments made in House and Senate, and requires the House and Senate to retrace all steps taken on the original bill. Since a new bill requires a rule, Appropriations Committee votes to request a closed rule, barring any amendments and waiving points of order on war agencies contained therein.

July 3, 1945: House Rules Committee denies rule on new war agencies appropriations Bill. Should the Rules Committee change its position and grant a rule, attempts will be made by FEPC proponents on the floor to vote down the previous question on the rule, thus enabling any Member to move to include FEPC's appropriation within the bill and the rule. If the bill is brought to the floor without a rule, all the other war agencies without statutory authority will be subject to point of order.

SPECIAL NOTES

1. The Comptroller General has ruled that, pending final enactment of the war agencies appropriations bill, the agencies included therein which have not previously been authorized by law can receive funds only for contractual obligations—not including pay roll. The employees of the following agencies, therefore, were taken off salary as of June 30, 1945: War Labor Board, Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Economic Stabilization, Office of Scientific Research and Development, Office of Inter-American Affairs, Office of War Production, Office of War Information, War Production Board, War Shipping Administration, Office of Strategic Services, Petroleum Administration for War, War Relocation Authority, and Fair Employment Practice Committee.

2. Because of the committee bottleneck, at no time have Members of the House of Representatives had an opportunity to vote on continuation of FEPC and to determine by the usual majority vote whether or not it wants FEPC.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the following article on the FEPC, from the Age-Herald of Birmingham, Ala.:

FEPC IN JEOPARDY

(By Ernest Lindley)

The national war agencies appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, reported last Friday by the House Appropriations Committee, makes no provision for the Fair Employment Practice Committee. Without funds, it will have to fold up June 30.

President Roosevelt's budget requests included $599,000 for the FEPC. The House Appropriations Committee did not give it a dollar. The committee's report gives as its reason the fact that bills to convert the FEPC, which is now a special wartime body, created by Executive order, into a permanent agency, are "currently under consideration."

The committee gave the same reason for omitting an appropriation for OPA. But legislation to extend the Price Control Act is now before the Senate, and almost certainly will be acted upon by both Houses within the next few weeks, probably before June 30. There is no doubt that OPA will be continued. The questions are for how long and whether its powers will be amended.

At present there is no comparable prospect of early action on the bills to make the FEPC permanent. In the House the Norton bill was reported favorably by the Labor Committee on February 20, but it remains locked up in the Rules Committee. In the Senate the Chavez bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor on May 24, but no effort has been made yet to bring it up for consideration. There is reported to be an understanding that this and various other bills will not be brought up during the absence of a number of Senators who are now on overseas junkets and will not be back until mid-June. Whenever it comes up it almost certainly will face an attempt to filibuster.

So the present prospect is that unless the present temporary FEPC is given an appropriation, there will be no FEPC of any kind after June 30, until or unless permanent legislation is passed. Some politicians think this will result in increasing the pressure for a permanent FEPC with enlarged powers. But that certainly was not the calculation behind the decision of the House Appropriations Committee. The advocates of the FEPC fought for the appropriation, and most of those who fought against the appropriation are known to be against a permanent FEPC. This last is, however, a matter on which some Members of both Houses would prefer never to be compelled to go on record. They would feel relieved if the agency could be killed indirectly.

The lack of solicitude for the FEPC which is now apparent in some quarters contrasts with the pledges which were made during the 1944 election. The Republican national platform pledged the party unequivocally to the creation of a permanent FEPC. Governor Dewey personally ratified this pledge in a speech on October 31.

Two days before Dewey spoke, President Roosevelt, in Chicago, spoke approvingly of the work of the FEPC, which he had created in 1941, and said: "I believe the Congress of the United States should by law make the Committee permanent."

Following this, Harry S. Truman, as the Vice Presidential candidate, said: "President Roosevelt established the Fair Employment Practice Committee to prevent job discrimination. The President now proposes to maintain the open door in industry. I have always voted in favor of appropriations for the Fair Employment Practice Committee."

At his first press conference as President, Mr. Truman was asked by a Negro newspaperman where he stood on the FEPC. He referred his questioner to his record, which he seemed to regard as quite clear, even though his own campaign statement, as quoted above, was less than a full commitment to support a permanent FEPC.

Opposition from southern Democrats to the FEPC was, and is, to be expected. (However, less than one-quarter of the cases handled by the FEPC have been in the South.) But the Republicans and the northern Democrats have the votes to save the agency and give it permanent form. If they fail to do so, the Negroes in the North are not likely to forget it, and the effect almost certainly will be to aggravate situations which, at best, will be difficult.

"Ride, Tory, Ride!"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, when all Americans are celebrating the anniversary of the birthday of our independence, I think it would be helpful for all of us to recall that George Washington and his followers encountered many obstacles and endured many hardships to gain that independence.

Some of George Washington's greatest obstacles were the Tories, who believed in government by remote control and wished to deprive the American people of their fundamental rights.

I am reminded of a story that was related to me many years ago, about a veteran of the American Revolution who never forgave the Tories. Several years after the Revolutionary War, this American patriot and his beloved wife were seated on the porch of their home, which was reached from a rather distant highway by means of a private road, through a grove, which was lined with beautiful trees.

This Revolutionary hero observed the approach of an acquaintance along that road toward his house. Without hesitation, our hero reached inside the door for his musket and was about to take aim at the approaching visitor when his charitable wife shouted to the visitor, "Ride, Tory, ride." The Tory and his horse disappeared in a cloud of dust.

If that Revolutionary patriot and his wife could return to our scene today and could read the pending FEPC proposal, they would see that we have among us today certain people who believe in Government by remote control, who believe in depriving Americans of their fundamental rights of selecting their own employees and who believe in depriving Americans of their fundamental rights of a trial by jury if they should be charged before the FEPC bureaucracy with discrimination.

I have no doubt that our Revolutionary hero, if here today to study the FEPC proposal, would again reach for his musket and that it would again be necessary for his forgiving wife to say to those who would deprive us of those fundamental rights: "Ride, Tory ride."

Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, I noticed with real interest the remarks of my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the District Committee, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, and the speech delivered by Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Anderson, of the Army Air Forces, before the Congressional Flying Club.

Mr. Speaker, General Anderson is one of my most distinguished constituents, hailing from Kingston, N. Y., which is the country seat of my home county of Ulster. In General Anderson's speech before the Congressional Flying Club he gives the most complete picture of the accomplishments made during the attack on Germany that I have read anywhere. The whole plan of attack is so clearly explained that I recommend every Member of the House read it at his first opportunity. The credit he gives our cuorageous men in the Air Forces is magnificent. His description of the modest beginning we made, gradually growing to the point where we could easily claim air supremacy, the planning and technique used to accomplish this end, are so interestingly explained, everyone should read it.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of this brave soldier, and to show their appreciation, the citizens of Kingston gave General Anderson a home-coming reception on June 19. I was unable to be home at the time, but from all accounts the citizens of Kingston and Ulster County turned out in overwhelming numbers to pay tribute to this distinguished American officer.

Mr. Speaker, General Anderson's ability as a great leader dates back several years before the outbreak of World War II. He was born in Kingston, N. Y., on October 4, 1905, and was commissioned a second lieutenant upon graduating from West Point in Cavalry, June 9, 1928. From this point on, his promotions began. Re transferred to the Air Corps November 1, 1929. The general went straight up the ladder from second lieutenant to first lieutenant, to captain, to major, to lieutenant colonel, to colonel, to brigadier general, and on November 4, 1943, was made a major general.

For heroism displayed while participating in an aerial flight in a burning plane over San Francisco on December 14, 1934, he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross. In 1943 he received the award of the Legion of Merit for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service and superior qualities of leadership in relation to operation tactics and technique of bombardment aircraft. In 1944 he received the Distinguished Service Medal as deputy commanding general for operations of the United States Strategic Air Forces in Europe from January 6 to September 21. General Anderson directed the Eighth and Fifteenth United States Army Air Forces in the most effective use of air power the world has ever known.

In June of this year General Anderson was assigned as assistant chief of air staff personnel, headquarters, Army Air Forces, here in Washington. I am certain he will continue giving in this assignment the same loyal service he has given in the past.

Mr. Speaker, every American joins me in congratulating General Anderson and wishing him success and happiness while he is with us in Washington and for all time to come.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lt. Charles H. Wheatley, United States Naval Reserve, from my home town of Washington, N. C.:

The press news which is received by radio from San Francisco is mimeographed and placed on the wardroom tables aboard my

ship each morning before breakfast. Included in these brief news releases one morning was a paragraph on the subject of universal military training. The paragraph quoted a statement made by the American Council on Education to the effect that 47 percent of American college administrators oppose universal military training. They stated as a reason for their opposition that such training may regiment the minds of our youth.

Of course, 47 percent is not a majority, but as the paragraph added that most of the college educators favor a delay in the decision on a peacetime draft until after peace is established, in this period they may well convert enough of those comprising the 53 percent favoring such training to tip the balance scales in the opposite direction. Should this happen, it would not necessarily mean that the proposal of universal military training as strongly advocated by the Army would be defeated, but even should the bill be passed, the direct support of our college administrators is almost a prerequisite for such training to produce the desired results.

I am not in favor of a year of compulsory military training in the Army for our youth upon arriving at their eighteenth birthday, or any birthday for that matter. Such action would necessarily interrupt the education of many young fellows, due to the fact that upon arriving at this age, many of them either have not completed high school or have passed either their freshman or sophomore year in college. If our youth were taken out of high school or college a goodly proportion of them might never return to complete their education. We might dispense with the clause referring to age, and require that all of our boys undergo the year of compulsory training immediately upon graduation from high school, but again there is always the danger that many of our youth would lose the desire to continue their educations and their earlier inclination toward entering college upon completion of their year of service. In my opinion these facts still do not warrant or propitiate the weak and almost pedantic reason set forth by our college administrators for their opposition to universal compulsory military training.

I underwent 4 years of military training in college—4 years of infantry ROTC—including a 6 weeks' training period at a Regular Army camp prior to entering the Navy. I am sure that my mind was not regimented in the sense that it thought only along military lines nor were the minds of any of my classmates who were exposed to the same training. Because of this training and the military knowledge we had absorbed, our minds had not joined forces toward the achievement of a common purpose, but rather each retained its individual initiative as a singular unit. We had been taught that knowledge is power, but because we had gained knowledge of the methods of war, we did not wish to test the power that it gave us.

True, there were many other subjects with which to occupy our thoughts and attentions, and we were not trained to fighting pitch as a pugilist is before meeting his adversary in the ring, but then I do not think that is the intent of the Army's proposed program. Of course, there were and probably will continue to be a very small minority who become deeply interested in the profession of arms, but there will still be the Regular Army and Navy standing by to absorb these individuals.

Our college administrators may say that universal military training such as the proposed draft for a year's training and the ROTC training such as I received are not one and the same. This is absolutely true to a certain extent. However, it is my conviction that so long as we continue to teach the fundamentals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to our youth in early years, and so long as America is the freedom and peace-loving country that it now is, there is no cause for concern for what will take place in the minds of our youth if and when subjected to a period of military training. To further insure this freedom from fear of mind regimentation, let us establish the military-training centers right in our high schools.

The use to which the training such as I received has been put during the past several years is clearly evident. However, should we have a great amount of assurance that we should not be called upon to defend our liberties during the remainder of this century, we may very well dispense with not only the idea of universal military training but also even our college ROTC units. Do we have such an assurance? America has developed into such a world power that I'm afraid that, as in the past, we cannot be a nation of isolationists and refrain from exerting all our influence and forces, if necessary, in order to maintain world peace and security for all nations.

Even should there never be any more armed violence in any generation, I feel that universal military training in our schools will not have been in vain. It makes better citizens; better physically, morally, and mentally. It teaches us how to stand and walk correctly, neatness of person and dress, the elements of common courtesy, loyalty, and allegiance to our flag and country, and many other things which we do not derive from regular high school or college courses. I am sure that at least 90 percent of the men who have had some well-organized form of military training in their youth will tell you that they are better men for having been exposed to it, even though they may have never been called upon to use their training in our Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

As I stated before, I am not in favor of drafting our youth for a year's service. Neither am I in favor of the compromise program outlined to the House of Representatives by the American Legion and the VFW, which calls for every youth being required to become a member of a National Guard or Naval or Marine Reserve unit upon arriving at a predetermined age. In my opinion, and from observation of the functioning of National Guard units in the past, in a short time they would lack qualified instructors and proper supervision necessary for the efficient training of our youth. The position of instructor or drill master would not appeal to qualified men and we may find our boys coming to use the armory or drill hall as a meeting place for something other than the intended purpose. Then public opinion would kill the program.

Let us establish Army and Navy cadet corps in all our high schools which have a student body of 200 or more under the direct supervision of the Regular Army and Navy in conjunction with our board of education. Then rather than having drills and instruction periods indoors and at night in an armory, let us have them during regular school hours on school grounds.

Let us make enrollment in the corps compulsory for physically fit junior and senior students. The junior cadets could be given basic instruction in military drill, customs, and courtesies of the service, physical fitness, and elementary military tactics. During the summer following their junior year have the cadets attend a Regular Army camp or take a cruise, as applicable, for a period of 6 weeks or 2 months for instruction and training in the practical factors of military science and tactics. This could be a period devoted to types of training similar to that given our ROTC and NROTC cadets before the war, but made less technical to suit the mental development of high-school juniors. Upon returning to school for his senior year the cadet could be made an officer or a noncom or a petty officer commensurate with his individual ability and interest as previously demonstrated while a cadet. He could then assist in the instruction of the junior cadets and be given more advanced instruction in the basic subjects studied in the junior class and in the summer period.

This plan does not allow for those who attend high schools of less than 200 students, but with the rapid development of transportation and the construction of larger schools, the number attending smaller schools should be reduced to a bare minimum within a very few years and it should be fairly simple to work out a plan whereby they may receive all of their training in summer camp.

With Regular Army and naval officers in the larger schools and Reserve officers in the smaller ones serving as instructors, either full or part time, this plan for universal military training in our schools should prove to serve our needs as adequately as a compulsory draft without the fear on the part of some of us that it might regiment the minds of our youth.

I have been told that a plan similar to this was adopted and placed into effect at the end of World War I, but that it was soon dropped due to the objections of so many parents to having their sons subjected to such training. I think, however, that many of them are now aware of how much more this war has cost us, both in lives and money, simply because we were not at least partially prepared for it. I also think they may now realize that should war come to us again our sons will have to enter the service regardless of whether they have or have not had such previous military training, and that it will be to their advantage if they have been exposed to it. At least after peace is secured once more, the years pass, and war appears more remote, military training in our schools is more likely to receive less opposition and to exist longer, and in my opinion be more beneficial to our youth than a year's service in the Regular Army.

A Bill To Provide for the Construction and Operation by the Federal Government of a New System of Superhighways and Airports for National Defense, for Government and Commercial Use in Time of Peace, To Promote Postwar Employment and Public Safety, and To Earn Revenue for the Federal Government; and for the General Welfare of All the People

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my bill to provide for construction and operation by the Federal Government of a new system of superhighways and airports for national defense; or Government and commercial use in time of peace; to promote postwar employment and public safety; to earn revenue for the Federal Government; and for the general welfare of all the people.

First. This bill (H. R. 3036), which I introduced in the House, is specifically designed to be life-saving, self-liquidating, job-creating, and revenue-producing to the Federal Government; and profit-making for the patrons.

Second. To enact this bill is to save the taxpayers billions of misspent dol-

lars which otherwise the Government may have to spend for relief, doles, handouts, and unemployment compensation during the readjustment period.

Third. To pass this public-works bill, is to provide remunerative and honorable jobs for all workers, which industry may not absorb during reconversion days, and that without a dollar of taxation.

Fourth. To vote into law this great transportation system is to build for the unlimited pleasure and maximum safety for the public; and to develop huge volumes of interstate commercial and industrial traffic, paying 100-percent profit to all patrons of this new practical network of protected modern thoroughfares throughout the Nation.

Fifth. To adopt this nonpartisan superhighway bill is to create a permanent invaluable legacy for our posterity; and to establish an everlasting monument to the profound wisdom, keen foresight, and patriotic statesmanship of the Congress which authorizes the construction of this national-defense superhighway and airport system.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a modification of a bill heretofore introduced. Mr. U. G. Robinson, of Atlantic City, has devoted a lifetime to the study of this matter, and subsequently, I hope to introduce into the RECORD an extensive analysis of its benefits prepared by him.

My bill follows:

H. R. 3036

A bill to provide for the construction and operation by the Federal Government of a new system of superhighways and airports for national defense in time of war, or other emergencies, and for Government and commercial use by automobiles and airplanes in time of peace; to provide for the financing of same; to assist in assuring full postwar employment; to promote public safety; to stimpulate general business throughout the Nation; to earn revenue for the Federal Government; and for the general welfare of all the people

Be it enacted, etc., That a new system of safety automobile superhighways and airplane emergency landing fields and commercial airports, and their appurtenances, for national defense in time of war, or other emergency, and for the use of Government, commercial, and private automobiles and airplanes in time of peace, be constructed and operated within and by the United States, following, as nearly as practicable, the routes hereinafter described, said highways to be known as the national superhighway system.

(a) Beginning at Portland, Maine, and thence running to Boston, Mass.; New York City, N. Y.; Trenton, N. J.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa. through West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada to San Francisco; herein designated as the central route.

(b) Beginning at a point on the central route between Woodbridge and New Brunswick, N. J., running in a southwesterly direction to near Lakehurst, Atlantic City, and Cape May, N. J.; herein designated as the Jersey coast defense route.

(c) Beginning at a point on the central route near Philadelphia, Pa., thence running in a southwesterly direction to near Baltimore, Md.; Washington, D. C.; Richmond, Va.; and through North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona to near San Diego, Calif. thence in a northerly direction to near Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif.; herein designated as the southern route.

(d) Beginning at a point on the central route near Boston, Mass., and near New York City, N. Y., converging near Albany, N. Y.; thence running to near Utica, Syracuse, Rochester, and Buffalo, N. Y.; Erie, Pa.; Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio; south and west near to Chicago, Ill.; thence northerly to near Milwaukee, Wis.; thence northwesterly to near St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn.; thence westerly through North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, to near Seattle, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.; thence running south to the intersection of the central and southern routes in California; herein designated as the northern route.

(e) Beginning at a point on the southern route near Washington, D. C.; thence running southwesterly through Tennessee and Arkansas, and joining the southern route in Texas; herein designated as the Washington-southwest route.

(f) Beginning at a point on the northern route near Buffalo, N. Y.; thence running southeasterly to near Harrisburg and Philadelphia, Pa.; thence to Atlantic City, N. J.; herein designated as the Buffalo-Atlantic City route.

(g) Beginning at a point on the northern route near Cleveland, Ohio; thence running in a southerly direction to the southern route; herein designated as the Cleveland-southern route.

(h) Beginning at a point on the northern route near Chicago, Ill.; thence running in a southeasterly direction to near Indianapolis, Ind.; Louisville, Ky.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Atlanta, Ga. and Miami, Fla. herein designated as the Chicago-Miami route.

(i) Beginning at a point on the northern route near Detroit, Mich.; thence running southerly to the intersection of the Chicago-Miami route with the Washington-southwest route; herein designated as the Detroit-southern route.

(j) Beginning at a point on the northern route near Chicago, Ill., where the Chicago-Miami route begins; thence running southwest intersecting the central route near St. Louis, Mo., to near Springfield, Mo.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; and intersecting the southern route near El Paso, Tex.; herein designated as the Chicago-southwestern route.

(k) Beginning at the intersection point near Chicago, Ill., on the northern and central routes; thence running westerly to near Des Moines, Iowa; Omaha, Nebr.; and intersecting the central route near Denver, Colo.; herein designated as the Chicago-Denver route.

(l) Beginning at a point on the northern route near Minneapolis, Minn.; thence running in a southerly direction to near St. Louis, Mo.; Memphis, Tenn.; and New Orleans, La.; herein designated as the Minneapolis-New Orleans route.

(m) Beginning at a point on the northern route in North Dakota; thence running in a southerly direction through South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, to near Galveston, Tex.; herein designated as the North Dakota-Galveston route.

(n) Beginning at a point on the northern route in Montana; thence running in a southerly direction through Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and to the southern route near El Paso, Tex.; herein designated as the Montana-El Paso route.

(o) Branch superhighways shall be extended to all centers of traffic deemed necessary for the completion of a comprehensive system of highways for commercial use and national defense, and shall likewise be extended to all State capitals.

SEC. 2. There is hereby created a National Superhighway Commission of 9 Commissioners, whose term of office shall be for 5 years, and whose salaries shall be $10,000 per year. Not more than 5 of such Commissioners shall be members of the same political party. The Commissioners shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall be eligible for reappointment, and may be removed by the President for incompetency or improper conduct. The Commission, upon organizing, shall appoint a Director and shall fix his term of office and salary. The Commission shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business, and shall employ such secretaries and technical help as is nceessary, including supervisors, engineers, adjusters, and other necessary help.

(a) The Director, with the Commission's approval, is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to take immediately whatever steps may be necessary to have plans and specifications prepared, locations determined, and rights-of-way secured, to the end that, upon termination of the war, useful jobs at standard wages will be provided for every able-bodied American citizen not able to be employed in private industry or otherwise.

(b) The Director shall, with the approval of the Commission, appoint, as Assistant Director, a qualified engineer, thoroughly experienced in road building, who shall immediately organize all necessary engineers and surveyors available among United States citizens, whose duty shall be to locate said national superhighway system along general lines described in this act.

(c) The Director, with the approval of the Commission, shall organize his office with necessary assistants and immediately prepare to carry out the provisions of this act; and, upon termination of the war, the Director shall be prepared to give orders immediately to American private industry for the amount of approved materials which will be required to forthwith commence to construct the national superhighway system, to such extent as funds may then be available. This provision shall apply to all American industries which are available to produce materials for highway construction: *Provided, however,* That no contract for any material whatsoever shall be let to any manufacturer who does not comply with all Federal laws relating to fair-labor standards, fair-employment practices, or otherwise.

(d) All people employed by the Commission shall be American citizens, and shall be employed at standard wages, and without discrimination on account of race, religion, or origin. The Commission shall set up rules to give preference in employment to honorably discharged personnel of the armed forces of the United States. All material used in the building of this national-defense superhighway and airport system shall be produced in America and by American-owned business.

(e) This public-works project is hereby declared to be for the general welfare of all the people in the reconversion period after the war. Every applicant for work, unable to obtain private employment, shall be assigned to a position which he or she is fitted to occupy, but shall be entitled to hold such position only so long as efficient service is rendered, and then only until there is private employment of approximately equal rank open to him or her.

(f) The Director, with the approval of the Commission, shall determine and publish the standard scale of wages for each class of workers as compared with wages paid for like service in normal private construction. The wage-and-hour law and all amendments thereto shall be complied with: *Provided, however,* That, except in cases of emergency, no overtime shall be worked by any employee or paid for by the Commission.

(g) Any satisfactory employee who secures a job in private industry shall be given an honorable discharge and shall be eligible for reinstatement on application, upon involuntary loss of private employment.

(h) No contribution, gift, or assessment for any political or other like purpose shall

be solicited, paid, or collected by any employee of the Commission. No employee shall solicit or receive any commission, bonus, rebate, or personal emolument whatsoever on any purchase, wage, or transaction in connection with the building of this superhighway and airport system, over and above his or her agreed salary or wage for service rendered. Any person convicted for the violation of any provision of this paragraph shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $10,000 or imprisonment not more than 5 years, or both, and shall be discharge from employment hereunder without privilege of reinstatement.

(i) No political appeals or speeches shall be made by an employee, or any other person, on the rights-of-way, and any employee who makes a political speech shall be discharged immediately from the job and prohibited from future entrance to the rights-of-way. It is the purpose of this provision to protect every employee from political pressure or influence by any other employee on this public-works project, or by any other person.

SEC. 3. (a) That the Director is hereby given full authority to make, and said Director shall make, with the approval of the Commission, all decisions affecting the location and construction of the highways authorized in this act.

(b) That the Director, with the approval of the Commission, is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such tracts of lands necessary to carry out the purpose and intent of this act.

(c) That the Director, with the approval of the Commission, shall make and publish all regulations and schedules of toll for various classes of transportation and service: *Provided, however,* That tolls shall be fixed at a price commensurate to the service, or benefit rendered to the patron and with the intention that the national superhighway system shall be self-sustaining, and also produce reasonable revenue to the United States. It is the purpose of this provision to have established a rate of tolls that will make long-distance traffic more profitable to the patron in the saving of fuel, depreciation, time, and expense, in addition to the assurance of safety, to use the national superhighway system rather than to use the standard public highways, thus leaving the free public highways for the convenience and use of local traffic, or such other traffic as may choose to use them: *Provided further,* That the roadway shall at all times be adequately guarded, and that the toll for passenger automobiles shall not exceed 1 cent per mile: *Provided, however,* That vehicles or airplanes owned or operated by the Government or any official agency, by any State or municipality or agency thereof, shall be exempt from payment of toll.

(d) That the Director, with the approval of the Commission shall make and publish all regulations and rental charges for gasoline service stations, restaurants, hotels, cabins, or other commercial structures required to render needed service to patrons of the national defense superhighway system. All leases shall define the kind and quality of service to be rendered patrons so that a uniform service shall prevail. Leases shall be made only to citizens of the United States.

(e) That the Director, with the approval of the Commission, is hereby authorized to take such action as may be necessary and proper to regulate and control all said traffic on said national superhighway system.

(f) That the national superhighway system provided for in this act shall be open to the public that pay the tolls and observe the rules and regulations under ordinary conditions: *Provided, however,* That in time of war or national emergency the President may direct the War Department to assume temporary control over said national superhighway system, or any part thereof, and issue such regulations for the use of the highway as may seem necessary under such circumstances, and also in case of actual or threatened serious riot, insurrection, or other public danger within a State, the President may, at the request of the Governor of such a State, direct the War Department to issue orders giving said State such temporary priorities in use of said highway within the State as the Secretary of War may deem necessary.

(g) That convict labor shall not be employed in the construction work provided for in this act. Only free citizens of the United States shall be employed by the Director.

(h) That the Director shall have the free use of the United States mail in conducting the business of the national defense superhighway system in like manner as other departments of the Government. The Director shall have the cooperation of all other departments of the Government, including information, service, officers, engineers, or agents thereof, in aiding the construction of this superhighway.

SEC. 4. (a) That said national defense superhighway system shall be constructed in strict accordance with the plans and specifications, in harmony with this act, prepared by the best engineering ability available, under the supervision of the Director.

(b) The materials used in the construction of this superhighway shall be of the best products of American manufacture and workmanship, and of the most durable construction known to modern engineering. The roadbed and bridges shall be constructed to safely carry, without injury, the maximum weight of any anticipated civilian or military use.

(c) All practical safety regulations and appliances possible shall be utilized. Permanent snow or landslide fences shall be built where necessary or feasible.

(d) There shall be no railroad or highway grade crossings. The superhighway shall be built over or under all other highways, and tunnels through mountains and under rivers shall be built where practical.

(e) There shall be, on either side of each-way traffic lanes, an insurmountable barrier, or solid wall, approximately 2 feet high. There shall be no poles, stakes, trees, abutments, ditches, banks, or any other obstacle exposed to traffic. The center barrier, which divides the traffic lanes running in either direction, shall be wide enough to safely maintain the lighting standards and also conduits for telephone and electric wires for the highway service, and commercial rental service: *Provided, however,* That where the terrain of the right-of-way is practically level and there is plenty of available space, landscaping, or parkways, may be substituted for concrete-wall barriers where, in the judgment of the Commission, such landscaping, or parkways, can be constructed so as to assure safety from dangerous obstacles and accomplish the same protective purpose of the concrete-wall barriers: *Provided further,* That where, in the judgment of the Commission, traffic conditions will justify, or require it, lanes for private passenger cars and public busses may be separated by concrete barriers, or landscaping or parkways, from the freight and truck lanes.

(f) The 14 main lines of the national defense superhighway system, described in this act, shall have at least three hard-surfaced protected traffic lanes and one hard-surfaced or gravel lane, for parking, making a total of at least three traffic and one shoulder lane running in each direction: *Provided, however,* That in thickly populated sections of the country, where traffic will be very heavy, one more traffic lane shall be built, the number to be determined by the Director, with the approval of the Commission, after the engineers have reported on probable traffic requirements: *Provided further,* That in thinly populated country, where in the judgment of the engineers and the Director, with the approval of the Commission, one less lane in each direction may be built.

(g) All engineering shall be planned with a view of adding traffic lanes, or more buildings, in the future as developments may require.

(h) The national superhighway system shall be located outside of cities, towns, and villages and shall not be used as pedestrian streets, or for animal-drawn or slowly moving vehicles, or interfere with the local traffic or the present free public roads.

(i) The main-line highways shall be located for the purpose of through traffic, with branches constructed to such cities or centers of traffic or strategic defense areas, or park or resort areas, as the Director may determine with the approval of the Commission.

(j) Entrances shall be established at convenient locations from traffic requirements.

(k) The Director, with the approval of the Commission, shall build modern permanent buildings, appropriate for tollhouses, gasoline-supply and repair stations, restaurants, hotels, cabins, first-aid facilities, emergency telephone service, and such other structures and facilities required to render needed service to patrons of the superhighway and airport system. There shall be no privately built structures of any kind on the right-of-way.

(l) Curves shall be reduced to the lowest degree possible in feasible engineering.

(m) The entire highway system shall be properly lighted, guarded, and serviced.

(n) The entire right-of-way shall be enclosed with substantial fences.

SEC. 5. (a) That emergency airplane landing fields all properly lighted, shall be built along the superhighway system at frequent intervals where the terrain is practical and the land available, in order to afford safe havens for all passenger, freight-carrying, or military airplanes in case of an emergency or bad weather conditions, and the highway shall be adequately marked to indicate such fields.

(b) That adequately equipped airports, suitable for private, commercial, and military planes to land and be serviced, shall be built as close to each center of traffic as practicable. They shall be open to the public for use in flight instruction and for the care and maintenance of private and public planes at reasonable fees.

(c) That the regulations in this act specifying types and manufacture of materials and labor to be used on the highway construction shall apply to the materials and labor used in the construction of emergency landing fields and airports.

(d) That in time of national crisis, upon Executive order of the President, these emergency landing fields and airports shall come under the direction of the War Department along with the national superhighway system, of which they are an integral part.

(e) The maintenance and regulations of air fields and airports shall be under the direction and control of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

SEC. 6. That for the purpose of providing for the payment of the costs of the national superhighway system and emergency landing fields and airports connected therewith, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and instructed to issue and sell bonds of the United States in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000,000 as needed.

(a) Said bonds shall be in such form and denominations and shall be subject to such terms and conditions and shall include such provisions for redemption or retirement as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with law.

(b) Said bonds shall bear interest at the rate to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but not to exceed 3 percent, payable semiannually.

(c) These bonds shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to the principal and interest by the United States, which owns the national superhighway system and receives all the revenue derived therefrom.

(d) All moneys received for bonds sold and for tolls, rents, franchises, or otherwise, from the national superhighway system shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a fund known as the national superhighway fund.

(e) Moneys in the superhighway fund shall be available for use in the construction and maintenance of the national superhighway system, and in the retirement or redemption of bonds issued therefor at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(f) That the Director and Commission each year shall make a full report to the President and to the Congress of all business transacted by said Director in carrying out the provisions of this act, and oftener when requested by the President or by the Congress to make reports.

SEC. 7. The Director, with the approval of the Commission, is hereby given plenary powers and authority to take, or cause to be taken, any action not otherwise provided for herein, which may be necessary to carry out the spirit and purpose of this act, which is hereby declared to be as follows, to wit:

(a) To construct a modern, Nation-wide system of new superhighways, emergency landing fields, and airports, specially designed to meet the imperative need of continuous national defense preparedness after the present World War; to make the United States impregnable to any possible invasion from any border line, or point, by any enemy whatsoever, by providing the swiftest means of safe transportation for mechanized units of the army of defense and their needed supplies for successful warfare.

(b) To have planned, organized, and ready for constructive operation, at the close of the war, the greatest public-works project ever before undertaken by any nation on earth. It is to be big enough to absorb, immediately, the labor of all unemployed citizens of the United States at a justly remunerative wage scale. It is to eliminate all need of dole, relief, or charity to any able-bodied citizen, and thus avoid the burdensome tax that would otherwise be required to pay the cost of relief caused by the disastrous depression which always follows vast unemployment in times of readjustment of unfavorable economic conditions created by the havoc of war.

(c) To have forever available, in time of peace, the greatest transportation system ever built. For the first time in history, it is for America to have a thoroughly safe roadbed scientifically planned and constructed, on a parity with the development of the high-speed automobile used in commerce. The all-inclusive purpose of this act is to build a life-saving, self-supporting, self-liquidating, business-developing, revenue-producing, job-creating, Nation-defending superhighway system with appropriate emergency landing fields and practical airports near all centers of traffic.

SEC. 8. That this act is not intended to repeal any provision of the Federal Highway Act unless such provision is in direct conflict with the purpose hereof.

(a) That if any provision of this act should be held to be invalid, such invalid provision shall not affect the validity of any other provision of this act which can be given effect.

(b) This act shall take effect immediately after its passage.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the following article on the FEPC from the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., of July 3, 1945:

ON THE OTHER HAND

(By Lowell Mellett)

THINKS SOUTHERN STATESMEN SHOULD NOT LEAVE PROBLEM TO BILBOS AND EASTLANDS

In the course of a raw filibuster against taking any vote on the FEPC bill, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND of Mississippi made a frank effort the other day to indict the whole Negro race. He succeeded instead in indicting a whole section of the United States. That is to say, if the premise on which he sought to indict the American Negro were true, the Senator made a completely convincing case against the South's treatment of the Negro.

The Senator dwelt at length on what he called the history of the Negro soldier in the American Army. He reported that he had talked with numerous high-ranking generals, whom he did not name, and that he found them to be in agreement with his opinion that as soldiers the Negroes are just no good. Composing as they do one-twelfth of the whole Army, that statement goes for them all, according to the Senator. The fact that General Eisenhower, who also, no doubt, has talked to numerous high-ranking generals, holds an entirely different view was not mentioned by the Senator.

He established to his own satisfaction that the Negro soldiers had no initiative, no sense of responsibility, very low intelligence, and were a failure. Whether he established this to the satisfaction of the two or three weary fellow Senators who composed his entire audience on the floor, there was no indication. But he obviously did not persuade the well-filled galleries, for a spontaneous outburst of laughter greeted his assertion, "I am not prejudiced against the Negro."

WHO'S TO BLAME?

Assuming that Senator EASTLAND states the truth, that General Eisenhower does not, and that the Negro soldier has no initiative and no sense of responsibility, can the blame be placed entirely on that soldier? Can the South, which has determined, to a large degree, the conditions of the Negro's life, the extent to which he has been permitted to develop initiative and responsibility, escape a considerable share of the blame? Has not the Senator actually brought in an indictment against the manner in which he and his neighbors have handled the great problem that came to this country aboard the slave ships, a problem not solved by the bloodiest civil war in history?

And if this is so, is it not time that the best men in the South begin to recognize the fact, to recognize that the course that has been followed is not the one that will bring a solution? Southern statesmanship is not confined to the Bilbos and Eastlands, yet one might easily believe it is all of one piece if he reads the list of Senators voting to support the position taken by the Mississippi spokesmen.

Under the stress of war's necessity a small beginning has been made toward solving this problem, serious now and likely to become desperate soon. It was decreed at the war's outset that there would be no discrimination against any war worker because of his color or race or religion. One must believe either that this is right or that there should be discrimination. The Bilbos and Eastlands and other frightened little men definitely do believe there should be discrimination, but it is hard to conceive that this is true of the Georges, the Connallys, and others who are, right at this time, contributing their full share to an enlightened world policy; hard to believe that they share in this wretched distortion of our own democratic ideal here at home.

TRAGIC PERIOD THREATENS

The most tragic period in American history was brought on by the stubborn conviction held by some people in the South that this Nation could exist half slave and half free. Another tragic period is bearing down upon us as surely as the sun rises and sets, unless Southern statemanship opens its mind to this problem.

If it will put in some of the same good thinking it has given recently to our world problems (and some of the same ingenuity it has given to the circumvention of the United States Constitution during the past 80 years), Southern statesmanship should be able to provide a solution that will forestall another period of bloody civil strife.

Capital Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a very interesting article written by Jack H. Pollack in the July issue of the magazine called This Month. While it does not cover the subject entirely, I do think it contains enough information that will give the general public just an idea of what is happening in the Capital.

Under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks:

CAPITAL CASUALTIES

(By Jack H. Pollack)

(Greatest casualty of this war has been Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Those who saw the drawn face and haggard look of his final days never really dared to believe the world was losing its first citizen. They had seen the buoyant President again and again recapture his strength. But there is a limit beyond which no mortal can go. It is then that cumulative strain exacts its inexorable toll. Franklin D. Roosevelt bore as heavy a burden as any man in history and then died so that other men could live in peace and security.)

Washington continues to be portrayed as a place swarming with bureaucrats, loafers, and squanderers of the taxpayers' money who are languidly sitting this war out. When not entwined in their own red tape or interoffice memoranda, Government employees are perennially pictured as dawdling in coffee and cigarette lines, dreaming up new alphabetical agencies or devising novel ways of perpetrating themselves on the public pay roll.

Every day newspaper and magazine writers, radio commentators, businessmen with priority problems, and publicity-seeking Congressmen assert this shibboleth as if it were gospel. They propose to solve everything by sweeping out the drones like a pile of dust.

Yet, countless Washington workers, mighty and unsung—especially since Pearl Harbor—have worn themselves out, died young or before their time because of overwork. Scorned at every turn, they have slaved long overtime hours usually without extra pay only to succumb in the end from the maddening pace. Taxing their strength to the limit, they have become Capital casualties surrendering their lives even as other patriots who fell under enemy fire.

Jonathan Daniels, White House administrative assistant, insists that "a bureaucrat is a man with a wife and four children being cussed out for living where he doesn't want to live, at an increasing rate of expense and a declining measure of comfort."

Perhaps the most widely known wartime fatality in the late President Roosevelt's official family was Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, newspaper publisher, who first joined the Cabinet in 1940.

Though 70 at the time of his demise, he had never suffered any illness which interfered with his faithful attendance to Navy Department duties until he was stricken with a heart attack on April 23, 1944.

Five days later he died in Washington, D. C., at his home. The doctor's report was coronary occlusion.

A man who gave dignity to the term "bureaucrat" was Joseph B. Eastman, whose capacity for toil became legendary even in his own lifetime. Called the ideal public servant, he literally worked himself to death last year as head of the Office of Defense Transportation.

He arrived at his office 7 days a week at 8:20 a. m., and took time out only for dinner between 5:30 and 6 p. m. Returning to his desk, he would remain until midnight. Joe Eastman considered it a holiday when he went home for Sunday dinner, but he cut this out after Pearl Harbor. A bachelor, he was always too busy—his aides explained—even to court a girl.

Unlike most agency heads, Eastman never delegated to his staff the thankless, time-consuming jobs. He never had a ghost-writer and during his 25 consecutive years on the Interstate Commerce Commission, wrote in longhand most of the majority and dissenting opinions.

Neither Congress nor the White House could high pressure him. On one occasion, before delivering an anti-Administration speech, he asked an associate to look it over.

"The President won't like this," his colleague warned.

"That's not what I asked," said Eastman, frowning. "Is there anything wrong in it?"

Another Washington workhorse was the late Senator Francis Maloney of Connecticut, who died in line of legislative duty last January. Known as a "Senator's Senator," Maloney was a conscientious lawmaker who took his committee assignments seriously. He was chairman of one standing and three special committees and served on five others. He would rush from hearing to hearings, vainly trying to keep up with all of them.

His secretary kept warning him to take it easier. "I will—just as soon as I get caught up," he would reply. One day she caught him remonstrating with Senator O'MAHONEY for working too hard, and chided him.

"That's different," he protested, "I'm younger than he is." Dearest to his heart was his proposal to streamline Congress. Among other improvements, it would lighten legislators' burdens. Result, at 50, FRANK MALONEY fell victim to the very thing which he had fought.

Two weeks later the grim reaper claimed still another Member of the Senate, its secretary, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, the "Ninety-seventh Senator," was the man who wound up the machinery that kept Members of the Upper Chamber running. His office was the headquarters for Senators seeking solutions to their knottiest problems. Big, kindly, understanding, Ed Halsey always offered a helping hand. Many times when he should have gone home he stayed behind to cope with senatorial affairs. Ed Halsey finally did go home to his Virginia fathers, but unquestionably he would have lived much longer in a less demanding job.

So would Charles M. Hay, who passed away 12 days earlier. Acting head of the War Manpower Commission while Paul V. McNutt was on an inspection tour of European battlefields, Hay was in one of Washington's hottest spots.

McNutt returned on the very day that his pinch-hitter was finally too ill to appear at the office. The two men, who were great friends, spoke to each other on the telephone. An hour later, Charley Hay, who had been living on borrowed energy for weeks, slumped down to his final sleep.

In Charley Hay, the country lost only a selfless American, but a prophet as well. A youthful Wilsonian disciple, he toured the country a generation ago battling isolationists who were then butchering the League of Nations. He attracted the attention of a man who invited him to spend the night at Hyde Park. The two sat up until early morning discussing international problems of 1920. The next day, Hay wrote to his wife, "I've met a remarkable man who some day ought to be President. His name is Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

One death that upset Roosevelt considerably was that of Gen. Edwin M. Watson who died on the way home from the Yalta Conference. Sturdy, genial "Pa" Watson made all the President's official appointments. Time was when Senators and Representatives sauntered in and out of the White House at will. But as the war drained more and more of the Chief Executive's strength, Watson's duty was tactfully to turn away important callers without offending them and to hasten in those with business to which only the President could attend.

A year and a half ago at Teheran, Watson suffered a heart attack and another one at the Quebec meeting of F. D. R. and Churchill. The day the Big Three Conference ended in Yalta he had another. Yet, he flew to Egypt with the Presidential party and there went aboard the cruiser for the return to America. But "Pa" Watson never got back to America alive.

Watson was the third full-fledged Presidential secretary to die in office since 1936. Louis M. Howe and Marvin McIntyre were the others. Miss Marguerite LeHand, President Roosevelt's personal secretary for 20 years, also passed away last July after being away from her desk almost 2 years because of illness. Rudolph Forster was another White House casualty, as was Gus Gennerich, F. D. R.'s bodyguard, who had a heart attack at Buenos Aires during Roosevelt's good-will tour of South America.

Though judges are normally supposed to lead peaceful lives, the rule doesn't apply to Washington. Last year the eyes of the world were focused upon a mass sedition trial in the Nation's Capital. The judge was Edward E. Eicher, as kindly and just a man as ever sat on the bench. For seven and a half tiresome and turbulent months he presided, tolerating the Nazi-like tactics of obstreperous defendants.

One day, early last December, he felt particularly ill. His colleagues pleaded with him to take the rest of the day off. But he felt duty bound not to prolong—even for a few hours—the already overlong trial. He worked until 6 p. m. as usual, and that night he passed away.

A more obscure Capital casualty was little Miss Olive Jack, for many years the assistant law librarian of the Library of Congress. In her desire to serve "above and beyond the call of duty," she spent every waking hour in the law library. No task was too difficult for her and no reference left unchecked, whether for a lazy law student or a Supreme Court Justice. Not content with working 14 hours a day, for years she was at her desk every Sunday morning—when the library was officially closed—just in case somebody should need assistance.

One day when her colleagues reported for work they found that Miss Jack had toiled the entire night with a Senator who had to finish an urgent job by morning. The lawmaker extolled her abilities to the skies, but when promoted to the highest court in the land he promptly forgot her—as did most of the rest.

The only person who ever took time to remember her was an appreciative professor who worked one summer in Washington and kept her desk laden with flowers and candy.

Only once did Olive Jack take annual leave. She said she was going on a vacation and her friends were overjoyed. Later, when she died, it was learned that she had spent her vacation at the Mayo Clinic.

Scarcely an agency in Washington hasn't a smiliar Capital casualty.

Just as the wounded in the field are listed as casualties, it is fitting to mention those denizens of wartime Washington who have sacrificed their health in the line of duty on the home front.

Outstanding among them is Tennessee-born Cordell Hull, who was Secretary of State from 1933, when Roosevelt first went into office in Washington, until October 2, 1944.

From the very inception of his term until 1942, Hull worked on an average of 16 hours a day, 7 days a week, going into his office nearly every Sunday during those 9 busy years. The exceptions were, of course, when he was out of Washington, and when he was actually ill.

It was not until after the first shock of December 7, 1941, was over and the country was properly mobilized to deal with the foe, that Hull—on the absolute orders of his physician—took what amounted to his first vacation since 1933.

Incidentally he has now made a remarkable recovery of his weight—he had lost many pounds during the illness which occasioned his resignation—and his strength is almost up to par.

Many others were forced to quit before the job killed them. They range from Presidential advisers to unknown clerks.

After Malcolm Kerlin, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, had a break-down, he couldn't resume his former work load. Ebert K. Burlew, special assistant at the Interior, had to retire because of poor health. Wayne Coy, Presidential aide, left Government service for the comparative peace and tranquility of a newspaper office. Richard Gilbert, OPA official who courageously fought profiteers in the home-front war against inflation, also had to resign because of failing health.

Answering a colleague who has been a consistent critic of Federal employees, Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS recently wrote that there were many Federal workers "too tired every night from long hours and hard work for any social activities or recreation, so all in from work every Saturday evening that all they ask, all they pray for, is for enough energy to be able to hit the ball again Monday morning."

Said to be as numerous as the sands of the sea, actually there are only 3,000,000 Federal employees. Of this number, two out of three work for the Army and Navy in arsenals, offices, and navy yards. The remaining 1,000,000 "bureaucrats" include 350,000 underpaid postal workers.

Of course, all Federal workers don't kill themselves. One very able Senator goes to a gym several times a week to preserve his health regardless of what the Upper Chamber is debating. But then there are businessmen who do the same.

But in spite of their role of perpetual scapegoat, most hard-working people on Uncle Sam's pay roll will continue to burn the midnight oil and throw their hearts and souls into jobs which entail limited rewards and limitless responsibilities.

Organization of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein the statement made before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress April 16, 1945, I submit the following:

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate your invitation and the honor carried with it to submit any suggestions I may have to offer that may enable you to make recommendations that will increase the efficiency of the Congress in the discharge of its functions and responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman I have a prepared statement which is short and I made it short purposely in order to emphasize only one or two suggestions. I have only a few suggestions to offer and I am sure your committee will have many others to consider before you finish.

In order to furnish a background for what I shall have to suggest it will be necessary to make a short statement which to you will appear to be very elementary. Our Government consists of three coordinate branches, each of which was given specific powers and specific functions when created. These specific powers and functions were provided for two reasons, one to be certain that the newly created Government would not absorb the powers and functions of the creating States, and the second was to make certain that neither of the coordinate branches would be able to trespass or infringe upon the powers or absorb the functions of another.

Complaint has been made that the legislative branch—the Congress—has been permitting or delegating directly or by acquiescence too much of its powers and responsibilities to the executive branch. Therefore, the primary objective of your committee, as I understand, is to provide ways and means that will enable the legislative branch to exercise all of its powers and discharge all of its functions and responsibilities more efficiently and effectively and thereby prevent further encroachment upon the powers vested in the Congress by the Constitution.

Before suggesting definitely my thoughts as to how the problem may be solved, it may be well to inquire as to how or why it arose. I shall not attempt to show in any detail the increased duties of Members of the Congress not directly related to their legislative responsibilities, but it is sufficient to say that for the past decade or longer there has been an increasing demand for service by constituents more nearly related to the administration of laws than in formulating and enacting bills into law. Therefore, due to lack of time on the part of Members of Congress, the executive branch has felt justified in preparing and submitting in detail to the legislative branch legislation considered essential and, in order to submit full and complete justifications for such suggestions, it has had at its disposal a number of persons to study, collect, analyze, and interpret information in support of any proposal made to be submitted by any branch of the executive department. This is largely a function of the Congress; and if Congress is to function effectively under present conditions, it will need such persons to collect and analyze information for the Congress.

Therefore, my first suggestion is that two or more persons, well trained and qualified, should be assigned to each of the major committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Their duties will be to obtain and provide information requested in order that members of such committees, as well as other members of the legislative branch, may be fully advised not only as to the merits of a proposal but as to its demerits as well. That is, there should be one or more persons assigned to each committee to collect and analyze information in support of a proposal and there should be a corresponding number to collect and analyze contrary information, if available. The total information should be such as to enable each committee to have a complete picture of proposed legislation before it is enacted into law. The information should be sufficient to enable members to foresee dangers and guard against the possibility of misinterpretation by an executive or administrative officer. Legislation may then be drafted so it will not be necessary to give the head of an executive department blanket authority to issue orders, rules, and regulations that would, in effect, enlarge his powers and as a result have incorporated in the administration of a law activities or functions not contemplated by the committee or the Congress.

I think there is a general complaint throughout the legislative branches that the executive branches or the administrative officers have misinterpreted the intentions of the Congress by reading into the law what they considered as implied or related functions or activities.

In the second place, it has been charged that the inclusion of a provision in laws enacted by Congress in recent years giving administrators the right to make such rules and regulations as they may find to be necessary in the administration of a law amounts to a transfer of the responsibilities of the Congress to one or more branches of the executive department of the Government. To some extent this is true. However, with the inclusion of such a provision, the rules and regulations made generally have full force and effect of law and furnish an opportunity for the development of what we know in recent years as the bureaucrat. Of course, the Congress has felt that such a provision in a law would aid and facilitate efficiency in its administration, but there seems to have been a hidden danger the Congress did not take into account. Apparently Congress failed to recognize that any administrator subject to human frailties could be expected to enlarge his powers in the administration of the law, because it is one of the observations of human history that a little power vested in a person begets a love for more power, and that the love for power, like any other human passion, grows by what it feeds upon. The modern bureaucrat, therefore, is not an accident and his existence is not due to any well-laid design or plan; he is simply an ambitious person to whom a little extra power has been given to be used in the administration of a law, and, after having been given an inch of additional power, he just naturally takes an ell. This brings me to my second suggestion.

Before any new legislation is put into operation the head of the agency charged with the administration of the law should be required to submit to the Congress, through the chairman of the committee reporting the bill in the first instance, two or more copies of any order, rule, or regulation he may issue for the guidance of subordinate officers in the administration of the law. This will give the Congress an opportunity to determine at the beginning whether there are any misinterpretations by the administrator as to the intentions of those who enacted the law, which should obviate the possibility of the Government in the future being run by bureaucrats.

Mr. Chairman, the two suggestions I have made are intended to be of a permanent nature, but I have one suggestion designed to meet an immediate need of what we hope may only be a temporary necessity. Many great and pressing problems will demand the attention of the Congress immediately following the war. We will not only have a number of great, delicate, and complicated domestic problems, but there will be a number of what may be international problems—problems of far-reaching import—and every effort should be made to see that the solution of these problems is based upon fundamental and well-established political and business principles. We should not be called upon on account of haste or lack of time to subscribe to programs based upon untried or speculative ideas. This Government is the greatest business in this country, and instead of putting the Government in business following the war, as has been suggested by some, we cannot emphasize too strongly, Mr. Chairman, the necessity of putting business in Government so that our governmental machinery may operate in harmony with sound business principles. Therefore, in order that the Congress may be able to meet the pressing demands for immediate legislation providing for postwar programs, I suggest the Congress should select a dozen or more men with well-known successful business experience from different business activities to collect and analyze data on domestic and world business conditions and submit their findings and justifications therefor to the Congress on such matters as may be requested. These men should be familiar, from the standpoint of experience, with all factors that enter into successful business enterprises under normal business practices and conditions.

They should consider the business and related activities of this country and personally contact successful business leaders of other countries. That is, the contacts should be made with people who, by reason of their past successful experience, will participate in or supervise the business policies of other countries following the war. These men, after a thorough study of the facts, circumstances, and conditions, should be able to bring to the appropriate committees of the Congress information indicating what legislation will be more likely to succeed with the least friction and with the highest degree of efficiency. My thought is that if the Congress is furnished with a complete and perfect picture of world conditions it will be able to formulate programs consistent with our established principles of Government and in a spirit of cooperation with other nations prompted by a similar spirit. At present there are many agencies, both in the executive branch of our Government as well as groups on the outside, preparing to submit formulas upon which postwar programs are to be based, but I doubt whether it is possible for these groups or agencies to collect and interpret facts without some bias or be independent of political considerations.

Therefore, at the expense of repetition, I want to emphasize that the group of men suggested should be selected by the Congress and chosen on the basis of well-recognized, successful business experience.

Mr. LANE. Congressman HARE, with such a group of men, it would be most helpful to the Congress in the matter of reciprocal trade agreements, would it not?

Mr. HARE. We are going to be confronted with just such problems within the very near future.

They should be men who will be actuated by no other purpose than to see the Congress enact fair and just legislation for the

benefit of all concerned, and that such legislation be in harmony with sound social and economic laws and consistent with the established political philosophy of our own country, leaving the political advisability or feasibility for determination by the people of the United States, because they and their representatives are going to assume the responsibility for whatever action is taken. This group should be directly responsible to the Congress and the people of the Nation. We cannot afford to accept and adopt plans and programs furnished solely by those who are responsible to no one and may be actuated largely by political or selfish business interests.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, this suggestion came to me as a result of the success, as I see it in most cases, of the selection of businessmen to head a number of special activities of this Government during the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Cox. Congressman, I want to say I think you have made an excellent statement and from the substantive point of view it was splendid.

Mr. MICHENER. There is no doubt that your last suggestion concerning the appointment of businessmen is fine. The only difficulty will be in the practical selection of those men. You suggest that this group be selected by the Congress. The Congress is composed of two bodies, the House and the Senate, and I am wondering how you would work out the recommendation to the Congress as to who should be appointed.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, that is a pertient inquiry and a pertinent observation. As I stated at the outset of my remarks, I am not going to make an argument for these suggestions did not go into great detail. My thought, just as yours, was on the difficulty of the selection of the men. If I were to be called upon to make a suggestion, my thought would be to take a committee consisting of the leadership of the two major political parties and let them select men to be approved by the Congress, both the House and the Senate.

I could go further and indicate that these men should come from industry, banking, labor, and many activities but let them first show that they have been successful.

Mr. Cox. If we limited this entirely to the two major parties we would miss the opportunity of utilizing every valuable service rendered by others. Of course, I do not want the major party to have all control and I would want the minority parties to have a part.

Mr. MICHENER. The real difficulty of the whole thing is the practical part of it. If wo could just adopt a decalog and everybody live up to it, we would get along pretty well, but when you come to working out the details after the general formula is written, that is where you run into the breakers.

Mr. HARE. I know it is a difficult problem, but shall we leave it as it is?

Mr. Cox. I think that is a smart suggestion.

Mr. HARE. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Representative HARE.

Why Not an Academy for Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD a speech delivered by me recently for movie news purposes. It was made while attending the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, Calif.:

THE PEACE OF THE WORLD

A beehive of activity involving 300 minds representing 49 different nations with many different languages, and each country schooled in a different line of thought, unites here in San Francisco to establish a permanent foundation for the structure of world peace.

Would that we the people could transfer our worries over the war—affecting as it does every family—to proper channels in the direction of peace. War and peace, horror and tranquillity, play host to family life. The cost of war in treasure and blood is now apparent to everyone everywhere. But few there are who realize that the annual expenditures of our State Department equal an 8-hour expense for 1 day in its relationship to the cost of war. Why not, then, a West Point and an Annapolis for the maintenance of peace, training the youth of the land in the understanding of diplomacy, economics, cultural, and other international affairs? By such action we would have highly trained generals of peace as efficient as are our great generals of war. This is a democracy, and the people rule. It is up to the people to be fully informed and to understand, and to achieve this understanding it would seem that every family should look with approval and encourage the ambition of its sons and daughters to serve in the diplomtic ranks of the great Department of State, thereby lending the sincerity of your family's tradition to the devoted task for peace. Pray God that the efforts of those assembled here may be augmented from time to time by new personnel from every race and every place, bent upon the great objective, the peace of the world.

The State Department Discusses Relations With the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently, to wit, on May 31, the gentleman from Washington, Mr. HUGH DE LACY; the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. CLEVELAND BAILEY; and the gentleman from California, Mr. ELLIS PATTERSON, accompanied me to the State Department, where we interviewed the Honorable Joseph Grew, Under Secretary of State and Acting Secretary in the absence, at San Francisco, of the then Secretary of State, Hon. Edward Stettinius. Mr. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, was also present. At that time we propounded to the Department five questions and orally discussed them at some length. We had a pleasant and agreeable interchange of ideas. Subsequently thereto I received a letter dated June 30 in which there was set forth in writing the Department's specific position on the interrogatories which we propounded to the Department. Because the letter contains interesting material of profound importance to the country and to the world, I am inserting it hereinbelow as a part of my remarks.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1945

The Honorable JOHN M. COFFEE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COFFEE: I found most helpful the exchange of views on the general trend of our foreign policy which I had with you and your colleagues in my office on May 31. Following your visit, I discussed with other officials of the Department the various questions raised in your letter of May 13, and the following material has been prepared in response to the five questions you raised:

Question 1: "Has there been any departure by the United States from its position, achieved by President Roosevelt, as a 'Disinterested third power which could mediate in and mollify whatever differences might develop between our two great allies?' "

President Roosevelt pursued a firm foreign policy whereby the United States participated as an active force in all foreign questions involving American interests or policy. In carrying out this policy of protecting vital American interests, President Roosevelt used his influence and that of the United States as mediator in those questions which, although not directly affecting our interests, might disturb international harmony if allowed to remain unsolved. This policy of active participation in the solution of all international questions concerning the United States is being continued by President Truman and the Department of State is diligent in its efforts to execute this policy. Mr. Stettinius in his report on the San Francisco Conference has further emphasized that the interests of the United States extend to the whole world and that "We must maintain those interests in our relations with the other great powers and we must mediate between them when their interests conflict among themselves."

Question 2: "Has our policy on the Polish question and on other eastern European questions changed since President Roosevelt's death?"

American policy in respect to the Polish and general eastern European questions has not changed since the death of President Roosevelt. It continues to be as it was under President Roosevelt, based on the decisions of the Crimea Conference, as well as on his program for the attainment by all peoples of the "four freedoms." All our efforts are exerted toward the earliest possible implementation of these aims along the lines planned and foreseen by President Roosevelt. With specific reference to Poland, both President Roosevelt and President Truman have gone on record that the United States Government stands unequivocally for a strong, free, and independent Polish state.

In pursuance of these policies, and as positive evidence of his desire to activate them, President Truman in May sent Mr. Harry Hopkins as his personal representative to Moscow to discuss with Marshal Stalin the points of difference outstanding between this Government and the Soviet Government. As a result of this friendly overture of the President, an agreement was achieved in complete harmony to reconvene the commission authorized by the Crimea decisions in an endeavor to bring about an early and equitable solution of the Polish problem and the establishment of a new Polish provisional government of national unity in accordance with the Crimea decisions. A harmonious settlement was also reached on other important questions outstanding between the two governments. There is no question of our policy having become an "appendage" of British foreign policy in eastern Europe or elsewhere. The British Government was an equal participant in the Crimea Conference and, as such, is bound by the decisions of that Conference. Despite rumors to the contrary, it may be stated that

the British people and Government, guided in general by the same basic democratic principle, have interpreted and have sought to put into effect the decisions of the Crimea Conference in much the same manner as this Government has been striving to do.

Question 3. Has the United States, through some tacit understanding or through day-to-day working relations, become de facto, part of an Anglo-American front against the Soviet Union?

It can be stated unequivocally that the United States Government has no tacit understanding or day-to-day working arrangement through which it has become de facto or otherwise a part of an Anglo-American or any other front against the Soviet Union. Conversely, there is no truth in the assertions made by some that we are playing into the hands of the Soviet Union to the detriment of the British Empire or any other nation. The United State Government freely consults with all governments of the United Nations, including those of Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

I am sure you are fully aware, however, that in the conduct of foreign relations differences arise in points of view based on different outlooks and different basic interests. The leading role we have taken in the creation of the World Security Organization in San Francisco is conclusive proof of our friendly attitude to all freedom-loving nations. It is regrettable that when these differences arise, one group of opinion or another often endeavors to build these differences into fundamental issues which are difficult to solve even in an atmosphere of patience and mutual understanding.

Question 4: "Have old anti-Soviet prejudices, clung to by a group within the State Department despite unity achieved among the Big Three at the Crimea Conference, caused a shift since Roosevelt's death from American friendliness toward our Russian ally?"

Such reports have no foundation in fact. Imputations of this kind may provoke misunderstandings which can be harmful to the basic interests of the United States and which can handicap us in our dealings with foreign governments. It has been inferred that there is a small group in the State Department who, regardless of the vital interests of our country, are able to influence the shaping of the policy of this Government on the basis of their supposed prejudices against the Soviet Union. The policies of this Government are not determined by any single group. They are based upon decisions reached after consultation with all competent officials and after weighing all the relevant facts. They are designed to carry out the will of the American people and to protect the United States in all instances. In regard to the officers charged primarily with the conduct of Soviet-American relations, I may add that they have assisted in preparing the fundamental undertakings which were finally agreed upon at the Moscow, Teheran, and Yalta Conferences. Several of them, in fact, have taken part in the actual conferences.

I can assure you, therefore, that since President Roosevelt's death there has been no shift in the American policy of friendliness toward the Soviet Union. As I have already pointed out, it is common knowledge that differences of opinion have at times arisen between the United States and the Soviet Union of the nature inevitably arising in the relations between any two friendly states. These were foreseen by President Roosevelt himself when he stated in his message to Congress on January 6, 1945 that:

"The nearer we come to vanquishing our enemies the more we inevitably become conscious of differences among the victors.

"We must not let those differences divide us and blind us to our more important common and continuing interests in winning the war and building the peace.

"International cooperation on which enduring peace must be based is not a one-way street."

Question 5: What do you think has caused responsible editorial criticism of the type we have quoted to be made at this time?

As long as there is freedom of the press in the United States there will be editorial criticism because there is practically never unanimity of opinion on any important subject. I would convey to you most earnestly, however, my own conviction that editorial comment characterizing President Roosevelt as playing primarily a mediator role in European areas is doing an injustice to our late President, since he pursued in those areas a policy looking toward the concrete attainment of the objectives for which we fought, rather than a policy of the disinterested mediator.

I wish to thank you again for calling since I am convinced that it is only by frank discussions of this kind that we can coordinate our efforts to the fullest extent to protect the fundamental interests of our country and bring its full influence to bear in order to achieve the principles for which we all stand and which we have not hesitated to defend when it was clear that it was our duty to do so.

Please bring the contents of this letter to the attention of your colleagues who called with you at my office and signed the letter under discussion.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

Lt. Robert K. Weichel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously given, I include herewith a news item from the Port Clinton Herald and Republican, at Port Clinton, Ohio, commending the distinguished service of Lt. Robert K. Weichel, of Danbury, Ohio:

ENEMY FORCED TO FLEE AS LT. ROBERT K. WEICHEL LEADS ASSAULT ON POSITION

WITH AN AIR DEPOT GROUP, ITALY, April 26.—For gallantry in action, First Lt. Robert K. Weichel, of Port Clinton, Ohio, received the Silver Star recently.

First Lieutenant Wiechel, son of E. A. Weichel, of Port Clinton, now with a postal unit here, was leading an Infantry platoon toward a strongly fortified enemy position protected by barbed-wire entanglements and a minefield.

Crawling forward with two men under severe machine-gun and mortar fire, Lieutenant Weichel breached the wire and led his platoon through the hole. He used bangalore torpedoes to do it.

Disregarding the severe fire all about him, Lieutenant Weichel gallantly crawled forward alone, probed a path through the minefield, and led his men through. He then deployed two squads to furnish covering fire, and personally led his other squad in an assault on the enemy position, through severe automatic fire, forcing the enemy to flee.

First Lieutenant Weichel, who has been overseas for 15 months, also holds the Purple Heart.

Lieutenant Weichel, who before entering service in 1942 was a resident of Danbury, near Port Clinton, was wounded seriously in action in Italy September 16, 1944. He recovered, however, and was soon back in action. He has been overseas since January of 1944.

Future Possibilities of Grain Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, with the full knowledge that at some time in the future the surplus production of grain such as wheat and corn will again become a problem on the American market, it is imperative that our research of the use of farm products continue.

Mr. J. L. Welsh, of Omaha, Nebr., the owner and operator of the Butler-Welsh Grain Co., of that city, presented some pertinent facts at a luncheon given in his honor by the Minneapolis businessmen recently. Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, was formerly a partner in this organization.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith the points made on this important question by Mr. J. L. Welsh, of Omaha:

1. One bushel of corn or wheat contains approximately 30 pounds of starch. One bushel of corn or wheat, plus 15 gallons of water and a small amount of malt and yeast will produce 2¾ gallons of alcohol and 20 pounds of dried livestock food, plus other byproducts of even greater value, research for which is only now really getting under way. The cost of production of a gallon of alcohol at the beginning of the present war ranged from $1.26 per gallon to $1.50. By the increased uses of the byproduct and by many economies in the conversion process developed in the Omaha plant, this cost has been reduced to 53 cents per gallon.

2. The Omaha plant is now in the process of radically changing the method of conversion of starch to alcohol, which they have proved in their pilot plant and which will further reduce the cost of alcohol to 33 cents per gallon. This last-mentioned change is a recent discovery by a university laboratory financed by the Omaha alcohol plant. The discovery was that by using bran mold rather than malt they reduced their fermentation and distillation time one-third and increased the production of their plant from 96,000 gallons per day to 126,000 gallons, with the same machinery, manpower, etc.

3. They have in the process of experiment many other projects, both for the increased productivity of their plant and for additional byproducts which they expect will further reduce the cost of alcohol. One of these which is really out of the experimental stage is as follows: In the course of production of alcohol a great deal of carbon dioxide is generated, which in the past has bubbled to the surface and was lost in the air. The Omaha plant is now in the process of capping their fermentation tanks in order to recover this carbon dioxide, which will be used to produce dry ice. They expect to manufacture dry ice at a cost of $7.50 to $9 per ton, and the price of dry ice in Omaha at the moment is $90 per ton.

4. The laboratory financed by this plaint is now working on a wafer made from the residue after the distillation process, and Mr.

Welsh claims that this wafer is entirely fit for human consumption, readily digestible, and contains all of the vitamins known to science. He states further that when they are ready to market this wafer, one small wafer will supply all of the vitamins required by the human system for a day. Welsh is probably overly optimistic, but he made the statement that if they do reach their goal on this vitamin wafer they should be able to bring the cost of alcohol down to zero.

So much for production and cost of production. As to the market for alcohol, Mr. Welsh made the following statement:

"The cost of raw natural rubber—prewar—ranged from $1.50 per pound to 2¾ cents per pound, and that the price rose and fell entirely at the will of the Dutch-British cartel, who controlled the rubber fields of the world."

He stated that the 2¾-cent price was very short-lived and that the price dropped that level when some years prior to the war attempts were made in the United States to produce our own rubber from the guayule plant, and that immediately after that experiment more or less was abandoned the price immediately jumped back to about 70 cents per pound.

Mr. Welsh states that 2¾ gallons of alcohol produced from 1 bushel of wheat or corn will make approximately 6 pounds of butadiene, and 6 pounds of butadiene plus carbon black will produce approximately 6 pounds of rubber. Incidentally, 6 pounds is the approximate rubber content of the average automobile tire.

Prior to the war the average annual rubber consumption in the United States was 600,000 tons. If we were to produce this synthetically, it would consume approximately 200,000,000 bushels of grain.

Before leaving the subject of use for grain alcohol in the manufacture of rubber, it might be well to mention Mr. Welsh's statements with reference to the rubber manufacturers' attitude toward synthetic rubber. Mr. Welsh indicated that he had visited with the executive heads of Goodrich, Goodyear, and Firestone and had found all of them very friendly toward synthetic rubber. He stated that the chief difficulty with synthetic rubber at the beginning was the fact that it didn't stand heat, but that rubber chemists for these companies had long since solved that problem and that at this writing synthetic rubber will stand up to natural rubber in every way and is much better than natural rubber for some purposes.

Mr. Welsh also stated that the rubber manufacturers look with great favor on a domestic synthetic-rubber program, since they would be out of the hands of the Dutch-British cartel and of equal importance, they would not find it necessary to carry almost a year's supply of rubber on hand or in transit, as was the case prior to the war in connection with natural rubber, which had to be moved half way around the world.

A second important outlet for alcohol will be for the manufacture of plastics, and while Mr. Welsh didn't go into detail on this subject, he did indicate that they estimated that an additional 200,000,000 bushels of grain could be used for this purpose via the alcohol route.

By far the greatest outlet, however, for grain alcohol would be in the replacement of gasoline, fuel, oil, etc. Mr. Welsh claims to be able to back his statements completely that a gallon of 180 percent proof alcohol mixed with an equal amount of water will generate two and one-half times as much power in an internal-combustion engine as will a gallon of gasoline. He states further that while eventually we may have internal-combustion engines built primarily for the use of alcohol, it is possible to use alcohol in the present type of internal-combustion engine by attaching what is called a vitameter to the carburetor.

It was stated that at the present time our B-29 bombers do have this attachment and are using a percentage of alcohol as their fuel, not because it is more readily available nor because it is cheaper, but because of the greater power developed which enables the B-29 to take off with their terrific loads of fuel and bombs.

It was pointed out also that the V-1 and V-2 robot bombs were possible only by using alcohol and liquid air for fuel, as with this combination as a fuel they could generate sufficient power for a high altitude long flight with a comparatively light load of fuel and power plant.

Mr. Welsh states that at this writing there are 400,000 vitameters under order to be used for airplanes, Army trucks, and other military and naval motive equipment, and that after the war these will be available for civilian use.

As an indication of the tremendous outlet for grain alcohol for use as motive fuel, it was pointed out that if 5 percent of our peacetime consumption of gasoline were replaced with alcohol, we would consume 400,000,000 bushels of wheat or corn to produce that amount of alcohol.

Mr. Welsh mentioned one additional important use and that would be for home heating, pointing out that the present oil burners for house heating could easily be converted to alcohol burners, and that for this purpose alone the demand for alcohol could consume several times over our surplus grain stocks.

Mr. Welsh firmly believes that as a result of the war and the alcohol program, a way out of our grain surplus problems has been found, provided the alcohol program has a little help and protection during the reconversion period. Mr. Welsh and others have recently appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and the House Agricultural Committee, urging that these alcohol plants be retained and protected following the war until they can switch into peacetime production. He stresses the point that they would want this protection and support for only a year or two after the war and that they have no intention of asking to be protected as an infant industry for years and years.

Postwar Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MASSACHUSETTS CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
Boston, Mass., June 28, 1945.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the recent annual meeting of our Massachusetts Congregational Conference and Missionary Society, the following resolution was passed, and I was directed to report it to you:

"Whereas the Congress and the people of the United States are now considering the possible adoption of legislation providing for postwar military conscription: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts Congregational Conference and Missionary Society recommends that congressional action on this matter be deferred until after the war."

We sincerely hope that you will use your influence to have final action upon this matter delayed until after the war is over, so that there can be a clearer understanding of our long-time military needs.

Very truly yours,

MYRON W. FOWELL,
Secretary.

What Is Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Easton Star-Democrat, Easton, Md., entitled "What Is Democracy?" This editorial refers to the very vicious bill known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission. It is written from a very broad, judicial standpoint. Certainly the Congress is not going to foster any such communistic regulation of a free people as is involved in the FEPC.

The editorial in question follows:

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

There is a bill now before Congress which if passed will greatly limit the freedom of employers. It provides for the employment of any competent person who might apply to fill a vacancy regardless of race, color, or creed. A man might drop out of his job, and if a woman made application for the vacancy and satisfied those in Washington that she was capable of filling the vacancy the proprietor or manager would be forced to engage the lady even though the management preferred a man for the job.

There are many more drastic provisions in the bill which are very obnoxious and which deprive a businessman from making a choice as to who he will employ. Freedom is a big word, and stands for more than simply being able to live under a democratic form of government. If dictators are to have full sway, then our democratic way of life is gone. We may call it democracy, but when an individual is guided and governed in his business in times of peace democracy disappears.

In a democratic form or government a manager should have the privilege and the right to hire the man or woman he deems best suited to his needs and not according to high salaried commissions in Washington possibly unfamiliar with the workings of an individual firm.

During wartimes we are greatly restricted in many ways. We are not allowed to buy what we want, but to take what we can get. Tons of butter in Philadelphia went bad while people in this community as well as in other places could get no butter. Now the officials, if the act passes Congress, will have the final say as to who shall be employed, regardless of the employer's wishes.

And if these officials are ignored and the employer sees fit not to hire the person they say, the act provides a fine up to $1,000 or a year in prison, or both. There is no trial by jury nor appeal from the decision of the Commission.

These facts were brought out at a discussion of the bill in Easton before a group of businessmen, and if they are true then our democratic form of government is being supplanted by a communistic form with dictatorship in the offing. All persons capable of

performing a task are not always commendable. They may have a record not in keeping with the job or their temperament may be against them in spite of their efficiency in one particular line.

A man was seeking an employee in his place of business recently, and when a name was suggested he replied that she might be competent to do the work but other draw-backs prevented him from hiring her. In the event this act passes Congress, the employer has no say. If he is in need of help and a Jap capable of performing the work applies for the job and can fill it, this Commission's powers are that the Jap must be hired. Race and creed are no barriers, at least these are the interpretations at the meeting.

And who would care to associate with a Jap even in a business way? Easton businessmen are flooding Washington with letters asking Members of Congress to vote against H. R. 2232.

Laws are drastic enough these days on account of the war. There is no need for such a bill as the one now before Congress. At least permit a businessman to run his own business as he deems best. Any such interference as the proposed law provides would deprive him of his personal liberty for which our boys have been fighting.

Designation of the Birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution from the Fostoria Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Fostoria, Ohio:

Resolution memorializing Congress to designate the birthday of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as a national holiday

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States, from March 4, 1932, until his untimely death on April 12, 1945, having been elected to four successive terms and having become the first American President honored by his fellow citizens with more than the traditional two terms; and

Whereas President Roosevelt assumed office during the depression, one of the great domestic crises in the Nation's history, and by wise, courageous, and humanitarian leadership restored confidence and faith in America; and

Whereas President Roosevelt championed the cause of the workingmen of America and ushered in a new era of consideration for the rights of labor and the common man; and

Whereas President Roosevelt espoused and signed the National Social Security Act generally recognized as the greatest social measure in American history, climaxing a 14-year educational campaign by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in behalf of State and Federal old-age-security legislation; and

Whereas President Roosevelt awakened our Nation to the menace of fascism to our free institutions and our very existence as a free people, and led America and its allies, the United Nations, in the mightiest world struggle for human freedom, culminating in the unconditional surrender of Germany and in decisive victories over Japan; and

Whereas, President Roosevelt charted a course for preventing future wars, by means of a permanent world peace organization, economic cooperation and international good will, thereby embodying during the most critical period in modern history the hopes, the aspirations and the ideals of his fellow countrymen, and the oppressed peoples of the entire world; and

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt is assured an immortal place in world history, and will earn the gratitude of American generations yet to come, and the esteem and affection of free peoples in all lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Fostoria, Ohio, Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to designate January 30, the birth date of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a national holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from this State and the Congressmen of this district.

OPA Regulations Affecting Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

YERLY COAL CO.,
La Crosse, Wis., June 26, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: You are a member of the Small Business Committee of the House, so this information should be of interest to you as well as Maurey Maverick.

Since 1937, when the Guffey Act was passed putting a floor under coal prices, the producers have been making money. It would be most interesting to have an analysis made of the profits of the operating companies since that time or since the war began.

It seems to me very definitely that the OPA is putting the retail dealer in a terrific spot because we lack the political influence to force a show-down when the operators have their lobbyists to take care of such things. For example, this year we are restricted to 80 percent of our volume of last year. This means that if a dealer sold 10,000 tons last year he is restricted to 8,000 tons this year. No one can automatically reduce his volume 20 percent and have his costs also go down 20 percent. At the same time that this is happening to the retail dealers the mine operators are functioning at a volume far in excess of what they ever operated at in peacetimes. Even though OPA has made the operators absorb some of the increase granted labor, their profit has been greater, I believe, because they have been able to run 6 days a week when in peacetimes their operating time was usually 3 to 4 days a week.

It is too bad, but I do not believe the State associations of the retail dealers nor our national association have the guts to fight the operators for fear of retaliation.

It is such actions as this of the OPA which allows discrimination against small businessmen that can create a lot of failures among the retail dealers. I would certainly be glad to know what the OPA has to say in answer to this.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT YERLY,
Secretary.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, new legislation inevitably draws fire from proponents of the status quo.

The bill to create a permanent FEPC would impose certain limitations, in the interest of more effective democracy, upon both employers and labor unions. It is not surprising, therefore, that some buckshot should come from elements of each group and that it should be in the nature of special pleading. The interesting thing is that this opposition did not show during open hearings on the bill. Four congressional committee hearings on the legislation have been held during the past 13 months and the only opponent who made an appearance was a Mrs. Agnes Waters, representing the Mothers of America. In passing it should be noted that opposition from the employer's side comes not so much from individual employers as from organizations like the Wholesale Grocers Association whose members, because of the fact that they have few employees, would scarcely be touched by a bill designed essentially to get at discrimination among large numbers of industrial workers. Such organizations, nevertheless, reach large numbers of persons through whom they can make an effective showing with the Congress.

This is not so of the boilermakers union. It would be vitally affected by the legislation. Its opposition is, however, like that of the self-styled employer organizations, couched in obfuscation and derision rather than honest debate. This is a disservice to our democratic process. Particularly because Government agencies must maintain the dignity of government and confine their pleading on behalf of the inarticulate public to the merits. This is as it should be on the side of government. The difficulty lies in failure similarly to circumscribe the opposition.

To the merits of the boilermakers case: The question is the simple one whether a labor union—and the boilermakers union because of the vastness of the wartime shipbuilding industry is now one of the biggest labor unions in the country—can properly refuse full and equal membership to Negro shipyard workers under a closed-shop contract requiring that every worker be a union member.

The background of the case is that the union assured the New York State Regional Director for the War Manpower Commission at the time it was recruiting workers in New York, and as a condition to their release from that labor area, that it would not discriminate against Negroes—you will recall the much-publicized special train which carried white and Negro recruits across the country to the shipyards in the West. However, the union did discriminate

against Negroes. It established jim crow auxiliaries under which it got their dues while depriving them of their votes and bargaining rights. Before the war the union was a small craft union. The shipyards were compelled to take Negro workmen in order to meet their war contracts, there being no other workers available. The union, recognizing the practicalities of the situation, consented to their employment but accepted them on a limited basis. Negroes worked at sufferance and without actual bargaining representation. They were fired upon the request of the union when they failed to pay their dues in protest of lack of quid pro quo.

Any reasonable man would recognize this as foul play. It was, moreover, an abuse of the union's status as sole bargaining agent under the NLRA, a status which because of special legislation could not be challenged by the NLRB. It was certainly contrary to the policy and democratic purposes of Executive Order 9346.

It was at that point that the FEPC stepped in. It found the union in violation of the Executive order. Its position was that the denial of basic union rights under a closed-shop contract, solely because of race, was tantamount to a denial of equal terms and conditions of employment and constituted illegal discrimination. Anyone with knowledge of labor relations and the operations of closed-shop contracts knows this to be sound.

It was in February 1944 that the FEPC issued its decision against the Boilermakers Union. In February 1945 the union offered its compliance plan, rejection of which the union now contends was outside the authority of the Committee, and would improperly interfere with the union's internal affairs. The plan called for separate subordinate lodges for Negroes and whites—allegedly "separate but equal" locals. The Committe found, however, that on its face this plan was potentially as discriminatory in terms of basic bargaining rights as was the auxiliary set-up, absent certain necessary guarantees from the union. These the union refused to give. It said in effect, you must take us on faith. The Committee replied, "We cannot fulfill our obligation as a Government agency by approving your plan on so tenuous a basis." The union now says the Committee's rejection of its plan was based on distrust.

The fact is that the guaranties asked by the committee could not be given by the union within the framework of its plan. The union tries to obscure its noncompliance by accusing the committee of demanding social equality for Negroes. Even if compliance with the national policy of nondiscrimination as expressed in the Executive order can be achieved in this case only by putting Negroes and whites in the same locals, that can hardly be said to be social equality. It is equality of job opportunity which is constitutionally guaranteed. These are facts which the committee, because of the necessary dignity of Government, cannot state in such plain words. It is supported abundantly on the merits.

The litigation which the union seeks to attribute to the FEPC was instigated independently of the agency by aggrieved Negro shipyard workers after the union had failed to comply with the Committee's decision. It was a suit at common law in the California courts which could have been brought even if the FEPC had not existed. The Supreme Court of California held against the union. It found that there cannot be a closed shop and a closed union, and that a closed-shop contract under such circumstances is contrary to public policy. It weighed the public interest in the monopolistic position of a union operating under a closed-shop contract against the alleged interference with internal union affairs and found the public interest to be paramount. It then sent the case back to the lower court for a determination of the facts. It was after that decision was rendered and before the case got back to the Supreme Court of California that the union offered its compliance plan to the FEPC. It doubtless hoped for acceptance of the plan by the committee as means of getting acceptance by the California Supreme Court since the court had not passed clearly upon the question whether Negroes must be admitted to membership in white locals. In other words, the union, finding its closed-shop contract in jeopardy under California law, comes now to the Congress in the hope of salvaging the contract by Congressional action which would sanction the continuation of its undemocratic policy.

In the closest case yet decided by the United States Supreme Court, it was held that a union having sole bargaining status under law cannot refuse to bargain equally for all members of the collective bargaining unit—Steele against Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. In that case the railroad brotherhood refused to admit Negroes to membership and denied them equal bargaining rights under the Railway Labor Act. The union overlooks that case. It cites cases dating back into the 1800's. Cases, moreover, which do not relate to problems of economic equality. The law has since changed. So have our mores which are necessarily reflected in the law, as the decisions of the Supreme Court of California and the United States Supreme Court illustrate.

The union discredits citation by the FEPC of NLRB decisions concerning certification of bargaining agents. Yet it knows that if this question could be raised before the Board—and it cannot only because of its privileged position under the NLRB—it could not qualify under those decisions as a legal bargaining agent so long as it continues its policy of discrimination.

These are the concerns of the union. They are natural concerns from the standpoint of perpetuation of the status quo. But they are contrary to the public interest and decent industrial labor relations. The union was bold to bring this case to the Congress because it is one of the most flagrant cases of discrimination on the part of labor unions. Rather than discredit the FEPC, it illustrates plainly the necessity for establishing the agency on a permanent basis and giving it effective sanctions.

The union objects in two respects to the pending bill, H. R. 2232. In the first respect, it would beg the very question here in issue. In the second, it sees bogies under beds. Neither objection merits serious consideration.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of June 7, 1945]

DON'T KILL FEPC

The House Appropriations Committee's failure to recommend funds to enable the Fair Employment Practice Committee to carry on has brought a stinging rebuke from the White House.

The FEPC was created by President Roosevelt as a temporary instrument for removing job discrimination against Negroes. That it has been measurably successful will not be denied. A bill to set up a permanent FEPC is now in the House Rules Committee. The President urges Chairman SABATH to permit it to be voted upon by the House "as quickly as possible." That should be done.

The denial of economic equality to 13,000,000 American citizens because of their color violates every concept of justice and prevents a tenth of our population from carrying its full share of the national load.

Congress should put FEPC on a permanent basis and give it enough money effectively to discharge its duties.

[From the Menominee (Mich.) Herald-Leader of June 4, 1945]

TODAY'S EDITORIAL

President Roosevelt in 1941 created the Fair Employment Practice Committee to prevent war plants from discrimination against hiring anyone because of race, creed, color, or racial origin. The FEPC has been kept afloat since then by congressional appropriations—$500,000 last year—but now appears on the way out. The South, with its Negro problem, hates FEPC's insistence on equal employment rights for white and Negro laborers. Most of the 5,500 complaints handled by FEPC have been about discrimination against Negroes. Five percent of complaints charged discrimination against Jews. Morality requires support of the principles of FEPC. Refusal of Congress to provide funds for FEPC may be construed as a green light for employment discriminating against color or class. Let the Republicans, whose 1944 party platform endorsed a permanent FEPC, drag this measure from committee for a show-down.

Resolution of the Ohio Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously given, I include herewith a resolution from the Ohio Senate:

"Resolution relative to naming certain reservoirs located in Mahoning and Trumbull Counties, Ohio

"Be it resolved, That the members of the Senate of the Ninety-sixth General Assembly of Ohio hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States that it take suitable action to change the name of "Berlin Reservoir", located in Mahoning County, to

Roosevelt Reservoir and that it change the name of Mosquito Creek Reservoir, located in Trumbull County, to Kirwan Reservoir; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to President Harry S. Truman, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the two United States Senators and to each Member of Congress from Ohio."

I, Thos. E. Bateman, clerk of the Ohio Senate, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of S. R. No. 57, adopted by the Ohio Senate on June 28, 1945.

THOS. E. BATEMAN,
Clerk of the Ohio Senate.

Statement of Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the splendid and inspirational statement made by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, the Secretary of State, at the time he formally took over the responsibilities of that great office. The statement sets forth the basic truth upon which future international action to assure peace must adhere to in order that the Charter agreed upon at San Francisco and as it may later be amended, can be successful. We are indeed fortunate in having now and in the days to come a man of such outstanding ability, and of sound judgment, as well as courage, as Secretary Byrnes. He deserves and receives the respect and confidence of people everywhere throughout the United States. President Truman is to be congratulated in his selection of Secretary Byrnes.

The statement follows:

I enter upon my duties as Secretary of State, deeply conscious of the great and grave responsibilities of that office.

It is the function of the State Department to advise the President in the formulation of foreign policy and to carry out the foreign policy of the United States as determined by the President and the Congress. It follows that a change in the Secretaryship at this time involves no change in the basic principles of our foreign policy in the prosecution of the war and in the struggle for enduring peace which have been chartered by the late President Roosevelt and affirmed by President Truman.

In advising President Truman on foreign policy I shall seek the constant help and guidance of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. My friend, Cordell Hull, with whom I have served in the Congress and in the executive branch of the Government and who has done so much to shape our foreign policy during the critical war years has promised to give me the benefit of his wise counsel. I am glad also that I will be in a position to advise with my immediate predecessor, Mr. Stettinius, particularly on the tremendously important tasks relating to the organization of the United Nations as a permanent institution to maintain peace.

PLANS NO CHANGES NOW

As I am leaving within a short time to accompany President Truman at his forthcoming conference with Premier Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill, I am asking all of those in the Department at home or abroad to remain at their posts and to carry on as usual. I have asked the Director of the Budget to make an investigation of the structure of the Department. Until I receive that report and have an opportunity to study it and make such personal inquiry as I deem advisable, no change in personnel will be made.

The making of enduring peace will depend on somehing more than skilled diplomacy, something more than paper treaties, something more even than the best charter the wisest statesman can draft. Important as is diplomacy, important as is our peace settlements and the basic charter of world peace, these cannot succeed unless backed by the will of the peoples of different lands not only to have peace but to live together as good neighbors.

Centuries ago devout men thought that they had to fight with one another to preserve their different religious beliefs. But we have learned through long and bitter experience that the only way to protect our religious belief is to respect and to recognize the right of others to their religious beliefs.

Today there can be no doubt that the peoples of this war-ravaged earth want to live in a free and peaceful world. But the supreme task of statesmanship the world over is to help them to understand that they can have peace and freedom only if they tolerate and respect the rights of others to opinions, feelings, and ways of life which they do not and cannot share.

Army Courts Martial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JULY 4, 1945.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKERSHAM: My attention has been called to your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 3 concerning Army courts martial.

I have given a great deal of personal attention to the administration of military justice. While undoubtedly there are cases where mistakes have been made, I believe that proper precautions are taken to make sure that the trials are fair and the sentences reasonable.

I agree with you that weight should be given to the background of the man on trial, his length of service, the character of his service, and the strain under which he was serving.

In order to make sure that sentences imposed by courts martial do not err on the side of severity, I recently appointed a clemency board of five members, two of whom are civilians—Judge Sherman Minton, of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and Mr. Austin H. MacCormick, former commissioner of correction for New York City. The board is now engaged in examining cases and in recommending reductions where the original sentence is deemed to be excessive.

I assure you that the matter of administering fair and impartial justice to the soldiers in the Army is deemed to be a matter of first importance by the War Department. No effort will be spared toward this end.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Nazi Berlin Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I wish to include as part of my remarks a broadcast from Berlin by the "Analyzer," on June 26, 1945. This broadcast was monitored by the British Broadcasting Co., and I have received in detail the comments of the Berlin radio, now in Allied hands.

After discussing the Nazi Berlin broadcasts and the material for use in these broadcasts, which fell into Allied hands in Berlin, the commentator makes some interesting disclosures about the use to which the Nazis put some of our American publications. I believe these disclosures should be called to the attention of every Member of Congress, and to the attention of the American people.

A portion of the broadcast, which tells of the discovery of the commentator of official documents in the Nazi propaganda bureau at Koenigswusterhausen, outside Berlin, follows:

I likewise discovered scraps of articles from several foreign journals and newspapers which were to be used as suitable material for Hitler propaganda.

There was, for example, a photostatic copy of an article from the Chicago Daily Tribune, dated January 6, 1944, entitled "The Tribune and the Island." What was it that Hitlerites found useful in this particular article? The words "Mr. Roosevelt consistently stresses the interests and wishes of other nations (without regard) to those of his own." This is heavily underlined. This piece of slander against a great President appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune as a part of an article which was so well liked by Hitlerites in its entirety that there is a note attached to it stating that copies of the article should be sent to nine Fascist propagandists.

It was also evident that articles appearing in another American newspaper, the New York Journal American, were also greatly to Hitler's liking. I have here a photostatic copy of an article which appeared in this paper on January 3, 1944, and is headed "Poles ask us to oppose Red land seizure." There was also a report from Milwaukee about 2,500 Americans of Polish descent who had adopted an anti-Soviet resolution which was heavily underscored. On this, too, there was a note attached saying it should be used by a number of Hitlerite propagandists.

I also have material to show that the Hitlerites likewise found the American Mercury very useful. I discovered several complete photostatic copies of entire issues of this magazine. An article by Eugene Lyons in a January 1943 issue which constituted a vicious attack on the Soviet Union, was considered quite a choice piece by the Nazis. The Fascists were so enthusiastic about another article by Lyons they published it in

their own press. This fact is established by an issue of the Hitlerite journal Signal for September 1943. On page 6, under a heading, "Americana: Moscow seen through American eyes," is a Eugene Lyons' article from the American Mercury.

As might well be expected, the American Mercury is presented by the Hitlerites to their readers as "an influential magazine, much esteemed."

Hitler and Goebbels obviously considered Lyons a firebrand.

House Joint Resolution 187

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a letter from Daniel W. Bell, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, to John W. Snyder, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the answer of Mr. Snyder.

The Treasury Department has asked that this correspondence be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 5, 1945.

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Federal Loan Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: My attention has been called to House Joint Resolution 187, a joint resolution "Authorizing the dissolution of the Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, Defense Supplies Corporation, and Disaster Loan and the transfer of all their functions, powers, assets, and liabilities to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation." This resolution is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 65, reported in the Senate May 21, 1945, with amendments.

One of the corporations included in the proposed transfer is the Disaster Loan Corporation, which was created by the Act of February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19). The capital stock of the Disaster Loan Corporation was subscribed for by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which issued notes to the Secretary of the Treasury for such capital stock. Under the act approved February 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 79) the Secretary of the Treasury canceled obligations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the amount of $24,000,000, representing the outstanding capital stock of the Disaster Loan Corporation. In exchange for the cancellation of such obligations, the capital stock of the Disaster Loan Corporation in the amount of $24,000,000 was transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, and is now held by him.

The latest financial statement of the Disaster Loan Corporation available in the Treasury shows total assets of $20,340,347, with deposits with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation amounting to $17,306,708. Liabilities are stated at $119,801, leaving an excess of assets over liabilities of $20,220,546. In view of the investment of the Government in the Disaster Loan Corporation, it would seem that provision should be made in the proposed legislation for depositing in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts such amount as is not needed to liquidate the Corporation's liabilities and for the retirement and cancellation of the stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury.

This Department would appreciate an expression of your views on this matter, and also any comments which you may care to make concerning the probability of returning money to the general Treasury in connection with the liquidation of other corporations referred to in the bill.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL.
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

JUNE 8, 1945.

Mr. D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BELL: Reference is made to your letter of June 5, 1945, and yesterday afternoon's discussion between representatives of the Treasury Department and of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation regarding the situation which will arise as to the $24,000,000 capital stock of Disaster Loan Corporation acquired by the Secretary of the Treasury under the act of February 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 79) upon the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 65, which, on June 6, was passed by the Senate without a record vote and is shortly to be considered in the House.

This is to confirm the understanding reached at the conference yesterday afternoon, namely, that upon the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 65 an estimate as of the close of business June 30, 1945, will be made in a manner satisfactory to the Treasury Department of the liquidating value of the assets of Disaster Loan Corporation, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation promptly thereafter will pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be covered in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, a sum equal to such estimated liquidating value.

Upon receipt of such payment we assume the Secretary of the Treasury will either cancel the stock he presently holds in Disaster Loan Corporation or will endorse thereon an appropriate legend referring to Senate Joint Resolution 65 and stating that he has received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and has covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, a sum representing the estimated liquidating value of the assets of Disaster Loan Corporation as of the close of business June 30, 1945, determined in a manner satisfactory to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Treasury Department.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER.

Statement of the Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to publicly laud the new Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach, for his General Order No. 1, which, I understand, was issued with the approval of the President of the United States.

He said in substance:

I am issuing this order now before any specific instance arises so as not to subject any one to embarrassment. Perhaps because my previous experience has been in the legislative and judicial branches of the Government, I am peculiarly sensitive to the importance of this question.

I must insist that in this Department there is given full recognition to the fact that it is the function of this Department to execute the laws. The duty of an officer in this Department is to accept the laws as Congress has written them and as the courts have interpreted them.

The fact that he may think the Congress should have written, or the courts should have interpreted a law differently in no case justifies him in ignoring or attempting to circumvent the law. I will expect full cooperation in this policy.

This is one of the most refreshing orders that has come to my attention during my short membership in this Congress.

Our system of executive, legislative, and judicial branches with its checks and balances, each on the other, has worked well in building our great Government. However, it is unfortunate when one of these great branches steps over into the field of the other, for then confusion arises, and it is most difficult to place responsibility.

I am deeply grateful to the new Secretary of Labor for the good judgment and understanding which prompted him to issue this important and sound statement.

Veterans' Rehabilitation and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to report on the program for veteran rehabilitation and education which has been developed in Connecticut. This program calls for the combined cooperation of various civic activities such as religious, educational, industrial, labor, and veterans, and has been working out most successfully in the various towns and cities where it is in force. Every effort is made by the community to receive back the veteran as an essential citizen who is needed by the community and whose readjustment to civic life at the earliest moment is of paramount importance to the Nation as well as to the veteran and his family.

The State of Connecticut has a great tradition of community service. The Connecticut plan is based on community responsibility and is a cooperative coordinated program of service to the veteran, to whom we owe so much in this Second World War.

Dr. Alonzo G. Grace, commissioner of education in Connecticut, said recently "Common sense must characterize the educational program for the returning veteran." Connecticut is adjusting its present veterans' program to established institutions rather than setting up new ones. We are endeavoring to set up a program that guides, and not one that attempts to tell the veterans what they may or may not do.

The Connecticut State Department is one of the agencies working cooperatively with the other agencies such as:

First. Veterans' Administration.

Second. Selective Service.

Third. Local community advisory committees.

Fourth. City advisory centers.

Fifth. Vocational counseling service.

Sixth. United States Employment Service.

Seventh. Local school systems.

Eighth. Labor.

Ninth. Industry.

Tenth. Red Cross.

Eleventh. Veterans' organizations.

They are coordinated by the Connecticut Reemployment Commission to work as a team, without competition, to help the veteran find his place in civilian life. We are not forcing the services of these agencies on the veteran, nor are we making him or her a special problem, but we are avoiding the "run-around" by having a simple direct program that will put the service man or woman in contact with the service that will satisfy his needs.

The program has been broken down into procedures covering the specific types of readjustment problems veterans are confronted with upon their return home.

A procedure has been devised for the veteran to find local adjustment in his or another community. The veteran may want a job, perhaps has a problem dealing with GI loans, buying of real estate, a spiritual problem, medical advice, a banking problem, a tax problem, or a number of individual difficulties that need attention. The local reemployment and advisory committee of the towns of Connecticut have been organized on a democratic voluntary basis to serve the veteran. In preparation for these committees, long before VE-day, forums and discussions were held to stimulate public interest in the service. The responsibility for adjustment thus does not lie only with the veteran but also with the folks back home. If the veteran wishes to discuss his education, the principal or the superintendent of the local school are ready to serve. The consultant, veterans' affairs of the State department of education is one of the information sources for questions dealing with education under the GI bill, Public Law 16 or 113.

Representatives of labor, Red Cross, the clergy, veterans' organizations—including representatives of World War II veterans—farmers, industry, banking, real estate, medicine, education, serve on these local committees.

A procedure has also been developed for the veteran who needs special counseling services. He will be referred by the local committee to a regional center. The best example of the regional center which successfully operates is the Bridgeport Community Advisory Service Center, Bridgeport, Conn. This center is community supported by the Community Chest. There, counsellors in education, medicine, social service, law, insurance, banking, labor, the clergy, selective service, veterans' organizations are available for service. This center is open to nonveterans as well as veterans and is a community project sponsored by the Community Chest. No man is turned away without a sincere effort at solution of his problem. After adjustment, the services of the USES are available, and the man gets a job. The services of Selective Service are available for job advisory problems and the public-school superintendent or principal are available for educational problems.

There is also the disabled veteran who may go directly to the Veterans' Administration from the discharge centers or through the local committee or center. Under Public Law 16, vocational rehabilitation, the veteran may go to college, private vocational school, high school, public technical school, or training on the job. For non-service-connected disabilities, the division of rehabilitation of the State Department of Education is ready to assist with medical care, diagnosis, counseling, vocational or professional training, artificial appliances, and aid in placement. Medical treatment is not provided for the veteran if available through the Veterans' Administration.

To insure against the rise of fraudulent schools, which hope to benefit from the GI bill or Public Law 16, the Connecticut State Department of Education must certify all schools before the Veterans' Administration will accept the application for assistance.

If the veteran wishes to complete high-school training for a diploma, the State board of education equivalency examination is provided by applying to the State department of education.

For those who must complete more high-school work before gaining a high-school diploma, the State department of education looks to the setting up of regional high schools operating under the local school systems and giving condensed courses so that the work may be completed quickly by these young men who have become adults because of their war service. We feel that there is little likelihood of the veteran returning to the local day public high-school system to sit through the same classes with adolescents. After the veteran has his diploma—and this step is one of the most important for his future—there is available the technical school, college, or private vocational training.

The job try-out school is made available for those who do not feel certain what vocations they would like to follow. They are attached to the technical trade schools and offer him or her the opportunity of trying out many vocations before making a final choice. In the Connecticut plan we constantly remember that the ultimate objective is a job—the right job.

Then there is the veteran who has completed his high-school work and wishes to enter college or complete his college training. After contacting his local committee—or he may contact the Veterans' Administration directly—he or she may enter college under the GI bill. The local high-school principal or the consultant, veterans' affairs, State Department of Education, are available for consultation on educational questions.

The Connecticut plan at present is, of course, operating with respect to the comparatively few veterans who have been released from service. Full advantage is being taken of procedural knowledge gained from each individual case so that those in charge of administering the program may be well equipped against the day when problems become more plentiful because of the larger case load, and job opportunities more limited. Those in charge of the various phases of the plan have performed remarkably well in the speed and accuracy with which they have sent each veteran appealing for help along his proper route for rehabilitation.

The plan merits the serious study of officials in other States who are preparing similar programs for their veterans.

The Sugar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, we now have a new Secretary of Agriculture and War Food Administrator, the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, formerly a Representative from the State of New Mexico. All of us who have been associated with Mr. Anderson feel that his appointment is particularly appropriate at this time. In the House he has been a consistent champion of fair treatment for farmers of our country, and as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages he has demonstrated an understanding of the causes and reasons underlying our wartime food situation. While on the constructive side, he and his fellow committeemen have recommended practical and businesslike methods of bringing about improvements in this matter.

While we applaud the appointment of Mr. Anderson as Secretary of Agriculture, every one of us must realize that he assumes tremendous duties and responsibilities. This job of Food Director reaches into the kitchen and pantry of every home of this Nation; and more than that, it directly touches every agricultural policy now in effect and will continue to have a direct bearing on new policies that may be adopted, both in the United States and for the liberated areas of Europe. Thus the policies to be evolved under our new Secretary of Agriculture could indirectly affect the possibilities of a lasting peace. Aside from our military leadership, this is the most important position in the United States today.

Mr. Anderson will have the complete cooperation of every Member of this House, and all the leaders of our agricultural organizations in designing a program to produce maximum food and fiber in the United States of America. We must produce food for the devastated war areas. Hunger knows no national boundaries.

It is obvious that Mr. Anderson faces a number of agricultural problems that require immediate attention. One of them, and one in which I have a special interest as I represent the largest sugar-beet-producing congressional district in the United States, is the sugar shortage. This problem is not confined to any particular sugar-producing region nor any

group of regions. Its use is universal and it has an important bearing on the quantity and the quality of many other foods.

Sugar is an essential ingredient of literally hundreds of food products. Canning is a familiar example. Sugar is used in all kinds of baked goods and in manufactured foods which our housewives were once accustomed to find in abundance at the corner grocery store. It contributes largely to the palatability and nutritional value of such products as ice cream, candy, and carbonated beverages, which are considered among the little luxuries of life that have been and are tremendous morale builders during the war, and which have a unique place in our food values.

Mr. Anderson has a full understanding of the problems involved in sugar production and distribution, as is evident by the report of his Food Study Committee, which recommended among other things the following:

1. Establish authority and responsibility for procurement, transportation, pricing, and distribution under one coordinating head.
2. Open negotiations immediately for the purchase of the 1946 Cuban and Puerto Rican sugar crops.
3. Provide Hawaii with heavy type machinery, such as crawler cranes, and front-axle drive trucks for sugar production.
4. Provide adequate machinery, supplies, and labor for domestic beet and cane areas by fullest cooperation between War Food Administration, War Manpower Commission, War Production Board, and the War Department.

The committee has already been helpful in bringing about a betterment of conditions. Even while the hearings were going on, the committee interested itself in making available additional labor supplies for domestic sugar producers. In my own district we needed this extra support to bring necessary help to our producers of sugar beets. With this start and with this understanding of the problem. I am sure Mr. Anderson, as Secretary of Agriculture and War Food Administrator, will contribute substantially to a solution of the sugar shortage. We of the West, where sugar-beet production is a necessary part of successful agriculture, especially on our irrigated land, firmly believe that the three factors most important in restoring sugar-beet production to normal levels are these:

First. A support price for sugar beets which will make the crop competitive with other foods that may be grown on the farmer's land.

Second. The earliest possible announcement of that program so that farmers, especially those in the early planting areas, can take full advantage of it.

Third. Assurances with respect to supplies of labor.

Everyone familiar with sugar-beet production understands the importance of the above suggestions.

In the 3 years preceding 1941 beet-sugar production in the United States averaged 1,820,000 tons, raw value. Late in 1940, with the war raging in Europe, the Department of Agriculture unfortunately came to the mistaken conclusion that the inventories of beet sugar were too large and that 1941 plantings must be reduced to bring inventories down to what the Department considered a normal level. The industry protested. Members of Congress, myself among them, protested. It was pointed out that a growing lack of ocean shipping and increasing costs of ocean freight made it wise to maintain the production of sugar at home—here on the continent—at a high level, as a method of guaranteeing adequate supplies to consumers at reasonable prices. We were overruled by the Department. A 16-percent reduction in acreage was decreed for the 1941 crop. As a result the production of beet sugar for 1941 was only 1,580,000 tons—a drop of nearly 225,000 tons from the average production of the three preceding years. In 1942, when there was no acreage limitation, production arose to 1,730,000 tons, but two bad crop years followed. In 1943 production was 925,000 tons. In 1944 it was 1,050,000 tons and this year it is estimated that it will approximate 1,200,000 tons. Had average production been maintained during the 3 years of short crops consumers of the United States would have been supplied at least 2,000,000 tons more sugar than was actually produced.

I am not here to dwell on the mistakes of the past. It is sufficient to point out—and to point out with regret rather than rancor—that the reduction in the production of beet sugar was caused largely by the failure of the officials in the Department of Agriculture to recognize the essentiality of sugar as a food, and the need, particularly in wartime, to maintain the fullest possible continental production.

The ceiling price on raw sugar was established even before the United States entered the war, and there have been no important changes in prices since that time. The support prices offered on sugar beets have been out of line with prices for other crops, and farmers quite naturally turned to those crops which promised them the greater rewards. Processors of sugar beets have had their own peculiar difficulties. On the one side they have been confronted with inflexible price ceilings, and on the other by rising costs of every kind. Margins have been reduced dangerously.

So much for the past. What can be done for the future? It is imperative that Mr. Anderson—as quickly as he can do so after assuming his new office—attempt to work out with beet producers a 1946 program which will make sugar beets competitive with other crops and to announce that program well in advance of the planting season. It is imperative, as reports indicate, Cuba is experiencing its most severe drought in 86 years. This means that sugar production in that territory will be at a minimum in 1946. The acreage of sugar beets normally grown in this country is only a minute portion of the total land in cultivation. An increase in sugar-beet acreage—an increase in acreage sufficient to give us the largest production in history at a time when we need it most—could not possibly have any adverse effect by way of reduction in acreage needed for other essential crops. Every 10 acres of sugar beets planted in our Western States will produce enough sugar to supply a normal household ration for 3,000 citizens for 1 year. Moreover, the crop can be grown, matured, and manufactured in 6 months, as contrasted with a 12- to 24-month period needed to grow a crop of cane. In other words, sugar produced from the next crop of sugar beets is the only new-crop sugar which can be put into the hands of the consumer in time to relieve the sugar shortage which is certain to continue through 1946.

Increasing the production of sugar is absolutely the only possible remedy. Rationing will probably continue into 1946, and unless the control of our sugar supply is administered more wisely in the future than it has been in the past, rationing might well continue for several years. I suggest that the new Secretary of Agriculture select a man of rare ability to administer and direct all sugar activities. This director should call into counsel experienced leaders of the sugar industry from all producing and processing areas. This group should study ways and means of increasing sugar production, and their advice should be treated with respect. A comprehensive program should and must be prepared and carefully directed. Unless such a program is forthcoming, and that immediately, world production of sugar may continue to decrease and the amount of sugar available for consumption be reduced to a dangerous level.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, of which the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, is chairman, has been doing a magnificent job in seeking reasons for our food shortages and suggesting solutions to them. This committee has pointed out how closely sugar is associated with the maintenance of other normal food supplies. They suggest that without sufficient sugar for home canning, many American families who depend on canned fruits and vegetables during the winter months will find themselves compelled to purchase extra quantities of food from their local grocers. They further state we are apt to lose thousands of tons of fruit and vegetables as well as the labor and the money that went into their production unless home canners are permitted to secure sufficient sugar to do their usual amount of canning.

Production and more production is the American way to solve our food shortages.

Attendance Allowance for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me:

A bill to provide adequate nurse or attendant allowance to service disabled veterans, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That any veteran who as a result of service-connected disability is so helpless as to be in need of a nurse or attendant shall be granted an allowance of $100 per month, and such allowance shall be in addition to the pension or compensation to which he is otherwise entitled under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Millions Can Benefit From New Industries Built on Wood Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I received a letter from Mr. T. F. Mueller, vice president of Newsweek. In this letter he pointed out that wood wizardry from wood waste is not a chemist's dream of the future. On the contrary, field work and pilot plant exploration have already tapped the amazing potential of bark, slabs, shavings, tailings, sawdust, and other logging debris.

This transformation of our now-mountainous waste into wood sugar, alcohol, lignin, and laminations, plus other products through chemical treatment, may well have profound effect on our national economy; new industries revitalizing areas which now are barren timber wastes, with attendant boon to locality and transportation; and new employment opportunities opened up where none exist today.

In the belief that these developments will have a far-reaching effect on our postwar living, Newsweek devoted the entire Postwar Horizons section of the February 12, 1945, issue to a comprehensive review of the past, present, and future of America's wood waste. Because I believe this report is of general interest, I am incorporating it in my remarks:

WOOD WASTE OF NATION A TREASURE IN THE CHEMIST'S POSTWAR WORLD

We have never been a Nation of faggot-pickers. The conviction that our natural resources were inexhaustible has shaped our economy. At once the wonder and the scandal of the world, our industrial practices have always been wasteful. We did not bother with inferior stuff. We took the best and went on. Wasn't there plenty more where that came from?

Today the signs are many that America's traditional plenty, while by no means worn out, is fraying about the edges. Unparalleled calls for war have gouged our mines, oil wells, and forests. Industry thinks of going in for faggot-picking, after all. But it will be faggot-picking on the typically American grand scale. Thanks to advanced technology, the mounds of rubbish cast off by industry can become profitable raw materials.

"Postwar Horizons" cites an outstanding example: the wealth latent in sawing refuse, long the No. 1 disposal problem in lumbering. Through the magic of chemistry, the Nation's sawdust heaps can sustain new industries, with products ranging from ethyl alcohol (identical with alcohol made from grain), motor fuels, and cattle feeds to plastics, dyes, drugs, and flavors.

SAWDUST HEAPS MAY FURNISH ALCOHOL, STOCK FOOD, MEDICINE, AND VITAL INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS

German industrial economy has had to rely heavily on wood. It is doubtful if the Nazis could have made war without the explosives, motor fuels, textiles, foods, and synthetic-rubber components which their scientists developed from odds and ends of wood.

In the United States, only about 30 percent of any stand of timber finds its way into finished lumber. The remainder goes to waste, either in the woods or at the mill. When cut, many trees turn out to be bad. They are left to rot along with stumps, tops, branches, and other debris. Every sawmill spews out its flanking dunes of slabs, tailings, shavings, and scraggy sawdust.

Some of this waste can be used. It goes for kindling and stove wood. It powers donkey engines and logging saws. In the Northwest, special sawdust furnaces heat homes and public buildings. There are other outlets for carefully graded types of wood scrap. But all present uses combined are only nibbles at an endless glut. Mills have to destroy their litter by mass or smother under it. In the Douglas fir region of the west coast, sawmill burners do away with 1,800,000 tons of it annually. In all, we throw away about 60,000,000 tons of wood each year in the woods and at the mill.

Tips from the Nazis

Appalled by such waste, knowing we can no longer afford it, industry and government are studying wood-scrap conversion. The American Forest Products Industries, with member firms across the country, have employed two refugee German wood specialists, Erwin Schaefer and Carl Levy, who helped develop the pioneer wood-wastes chemical works at Tornesch, near Hamburg—since bombed with the aid of details supplied to the RAF by Schaefer and Levy.

Dr. Heinrich Scholler devised the wood-wastes recovery process. Sawdust and macerated wood are treated by hydrolysis—that is, percolated in mild sulphuric-acid solution under high pressure and temperature—until the wood cellulose converts into sugar. Germany built nearly 30 Scholler plants. Japan has put an undetermined number into operation.

However effective technically the German process may be, before it is used here it must be reevaluated in terms of American economy. In Germany and Japan, profit doesn't matter. Industries are tightly controlled by Government cartels. The principal aim is to bridge shortages.

Our position is the exact reverse. Where German sawdust costs 20 marks a ton, in the Pacific Northwest it brings little or nothing. German labor draws 1 mark an hour. Our workers in the Northwest average $1.10 an hour. Transportation there is cheap. Here it is high. They can afford to handpick wood waste. We cannot.

American economy demands lowering of production costs. That means considerable mechanization for harvesting and processing scrap wood. This is the only way that wood waste end products can meet competition. The solution lies in research.

Evans proposes

The most practical approach so far is the plan of Col. Edward S. Evans, president of Evans Products Co., Detroit, manufacturers of molded plywood, wood battery separators, and similar products, with plants in the Pacific West and Northwest. The Evans program looks forward to Nation-wide marshaling of all wood-use research—whether by private industry or Government—for American industrial needs.

The research would be under the supervision of the Forest Products Division of the United States Department of Agriculture. Its Madison, Wis., laboratories, staffed by some of the world's best wood specialists, would serve as a clearing house.

For field work, Colonel Evans would split the country into five regions—Northwest, South, Northeast, Middle West, and the Appalachian area—each with its own wood-utilization unit. The units would comprise industrial and chemical engineers, paper experts, and technicians. They would study and analyze local problems, such as uses of plentiful trees and ways of solving transportation and equipment bottlenecks. They would test new methods and products under local conditions. They would work closely with college, State, and industrial research groups, furnishing information gathered all over the world. For private firms, the units would help work out cost, engineering, and other data on new wood uses keyed to local conditions.

The Evans plan has been adopted tentatively by the Department of Agriculture. Already two experimental units have taken the field, one for the South with headquarters at New Orleans the other serving the Northeast seaboard region from Philadelphia.

WOOD THE UNIVERSALROHSTUFF

With reason, the Germans term wood "universalrohstuff" (universal raw material). Their scientists view trees not simply as bundles of unsawn planks but as living chemical laboratories, drawing from soil, water, air, and sunlight the carbon compounds that make up all matter of organic source—coal and the human body alike.

Carbon compounds in wood take the form of cellulose and lignin. Every ton of dry sawdust or chips put through the Scholler process yields approximately 1,000 pounds of wood sugar from the cellulose and 500 pounds of lignin residue, a brown powder with dramatic chemical promise. The proportion of yield holds good for nearly every American species of tree, even "weed trees" such as sycamore, heretofore almost useless commercially.

Wood sugar is an edible mixture of glucose (starch sirup, usually made from corn) and other sugars. In a year an acre of choice forest land can produce more sugar for industrial use than an acre of sugar beets. A ton of sawdust is good for nearly as much sugar as a ton of blackstrap molasses. Wood sugar is marketed in Europe for cooking and table. Combined with grain, it makes excellent feed for cattle and poultry.

Alcohol distilled from wood-sugar mash averages 50 gallons to 1,000 pounds. This is ethyl alcohol, 190 proof, not to be confused with methyl or "wood alcohol" of prohibition deadliness.

Normal, easily available waste accumulations around mills could produce at least 150,000,000 gallons of ethyl alcohol a year. Oregon alone could probably contribute some 50,000,000 gallons. If all waste in the woods and at the mills could be used, the amount could be multiplied by twenty.

The first step toward commercial production of alcohol from wood was taken last spring when the Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co. began a $2,247,000 hydrolysis plant near Eugene, Oreg. Through a simplification of the Scholler process, accomplished by Forest Service chemists, the plant is expected to turn out 4,100,000 gallons of industrial alcohol yearly, at a postwar wholesale price, before tax, of no more than 25 cents a gallon. At present, industrial alcohol made from blackstrap molasses sells at about 48 cents a gallon, while grain alcohol averages between 80 cents and $1.30 a gallon.

Threat to gasoline?

Potential cheapness of wood-ethyl warrants it a place in postwar industry. Grain as a source of industrial alcohol will probably be unable to compete with it. Even blackstrap will be hard-pressed unless ways to cut corners and price can be found.

The gasoline industry, too, expects competition. The odds are that alcohol from

wood scrap will bid for a share of the motor-fuel trade. But before alcohol can challenge gasoline as a fuel, its habit of absorbing moisture in storage must be overcome. Enthusiasts believe that it can be. They also say that attempts such as those made by grain-alcohol-producing States to force the mixing of alcohol and gasoline will not be necessary to support the embryo industry. Wood-ethyl should be able to compete briskly on its own merits. Germany has developed efficient motors that run on straight alcohol. Most racing cars have their gasoline "souped" with alcohol.

Bureau of Standards tests reveal that pure ethyl alcohol in blend with gasoline makes good fuel, no more harmful to engines than the usual mixtures. When straight gas is supplemented with 20 to 25 percent ethyl, the antiknock quality is improved. Performance equals that of high-test gasolines available before the war—though not the 100-plus octane fuel evolved for war aviation. Before these superfuels can be used, however, ordinary car engines must be redesigned.

The lowest price to distributors for straight gasoline currently swings between 6 and 7 cents a gallon, f. o. b. the California refineries. Wood chemists say that this price can be undercut, that wood ethyl can be sold at the distillery for 4 cents or less a gallon—if lignin, the byproducts of hydrolysis, can be made for as little as 2 cents a pound.

THE PROMISE OF LIGNIN

Science has just begun exploring the potentialities of lignin. Although known to be made up of the same elements as coal and petroleum, it still awaits thorough analysis. But chemists believe that once they do hit upon the secret of how its hydrocarbon molecules link together, they can get from it, fairly simple, many coal-tar products, including aspirin, sleep-inducing drugs like sulfanol and veronal, the sulfa drugs, perfumes, resins, and bulk chemicals.

Fuel to burn

At present, however, there is practical use for lignin and its derivatives already known. From each ton of dry scrap wood processed by hydrolysis, 500 pounds of lignin remain. Its heat value is higher than that of wood. It burns with practically no smoke or ash. In briquettes, it helps fuel the hydrolysis process that produces it. The Willamette Valley alcohol plant will burn about 50 tons of lignin daily.

In European experiments, lignin briquettes have been found better than charcoal for gasogene—or wood gas—power units in motor vehicles (Newsweek, July 17, 1944). Pulverized lignin has been used successfully in the highly developed German rupa dust motor. Chemists say, however, that any kind of stoking with lignin will eventually be considered wasteful because of the potential wealth locked in the material.

A taste—A plastic

Treated with alkalis, lignin makes vanillin flavor, indistinguishable from the natural vanilla-bean extract. Add hydrogen and obtain phenol, cresol, methanol (the old wood alcohol), the higher alcohols, and heavy oils. From these derivatives come valuable plastics and drugs; even gasoline-type motor fuels are possible.

Lignin can also be used as humus. With nitrogen and phosphate, it makes a rich fertilizer.

Coal tar itself, once a vexatious problem for disposal, became the foundation of great industries when its carbon structure was charted. Of course, no one can predict the final tally for kindred lignin, but science is convinced it will be important. Meanwhile, it is the business of research to knock at doors, not sure what will open, but certain that something will.

EVERYTHING BUT THE LEAVES

Other prospects for further use of wood are:

Cork of the granulated type for gaskets and linoleum can be manufactured from the discarded bark of Douglas fir and other trees.

Tannin for processing leather can be extracted from the bark of hemlock and oak, perhaps freeing us from dependence on South American tannin monopolies.

Fabrics can be spun from shredded bark, especially of redwood trees; roofing felts and coarse sacking are examples.

Naval stores—tar, pitch, turpentine, and other resinous products derived from pine trees—have new economic implications for the South. Better yields and improved techniques for making plastics and drugs may lift the standard of living in large areas.

Laminated flooring and lumber can now be made from cull timber. The Tennessee Valley Authority and the University of Georgia are operating a pilot plant designed to produce 1,000 board-feet hourly.

Synthetic plywoods are obtained by halting hydrolysis one step short of sugar. The resulting wood pulp can be bonded in laminated sheets that are extremely tough, and inexpensive.

Wood iron results from chemical impregnation, under pressure; in this process the lumber takes on the hardness of ebony or even metal, no matter how soft originally. The "impreg" and "compreg" woods developed by the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., and several recently announced commercial adaptations have plastic qualities. Largely proof against fire, water, shrinkage, swelling, and insects, they are lighter and stronger than some steels. They machine easily. Military use and tests by private industry indicate that the postwar consumer can choose from a diversity of products made from transmuted wood.

Paul Bunyans of steel

Most of these developments depend on wider use of equipment to harvest waste in the woods. Before branches, tops, and other logging debris can be hauled out economically, they must be concentrated—and logging firms are now designing "hoggers" (machines that chew and bale scrap) on caterpillar treads. They will process the scrap in the forest much as a combine threshes and sacks grain. Mechanical chain sawing, a fairly standard practice in heavy timber operations, will probably be used more widely. In pulpwood areas, particularly the piney woods of the South, horizontal power saws operated from truck or tractor are already saving manpower and costs. They can salvage stumps and snags as efficiently as they cut timber. Giant shears to cut small trees at one snip are now being developed.

In the end large-scale mechanization in the woods should bring more employment to more men than it displaces. Thousands of workers will find permanent jobs in the new industries.

Thus, through making the most of our wood wastes, we shall need to cut less timber to gain a greater volume of forest products than ever before. Coming generations of Americans can have more use from our forests—and more will remain for them to use.

Seventh War Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my address over Station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., June 24, 1945, on the Seventh War Loan subject:

In this Seventh War Loan drive we are rounding the far turn that leads to the home stretch. The life-and-death race which began on December 7, 1941, found us getting off to a bad start. The Japs had jumped the gun and were off in the lead. At the halfway mark we caught up with them and went ahead. Though the Fascists and Nazis had been thoroughly beaten, the Japs did not quit but gave spur to their war efforts and kept right at our heels. This, then, is no time to slacken our pace. As we come into the stretch, we can expect the Jap to give everything he's got in order to overcome our lead and pull victory out of the fire. He would even be satisfied if he could pull up to a deadheat finish. That is why he is fighting so hard. He is counting on us to tire from our exertions and wilt before we can win. This we must prevent at all costs. We're ahead by a narrow margin, but we've got to have plenty of reserve power to stave off the Jap's last, desperate surge. That is why the Government is calling upon you to back up our colors to the limit. Those who fail to invest in bonds now will deprive us of the sinews without which this war cannot be won.

What are those sinews which give strength to the drive? They are the planes, ships, tanks, guns; the shells, rockets, bullets, bombs, and the thousands of other items that are used up in modern war. They are the elements of speed, power, and stamina that spell the difference between a winner and an also-ran. We need them in abundance because they are consumed in abundance. Besides the power being expended in action, we've got to have plenty more in reserve, ready for any emergency.

In May 1944 some people said that Hitler's Atlantic wall, prepared over a 4-year period, could never be broken. In June of that year our men poured onto the beaches of Normandy and crashed through the fortifications at a cost in casualties far below the conservative estimates of the Allied supreme command. Our armies then swept across France until they were stopped at the Siegfried line. After a pause, during which fresh men and supplies were brought up, our armies again went over to the attack, breaching the vaunted Siegfried line and hurtling across the river barrier of the Rhine. The Nazis now knew they were beaten.

How was the impossible accomplished? Our men were brave and skilfully led, but these two factors were not enough. Other brave armies, under able leaders, had gone down before the German war machine. What made the difference? War machine! For years the Germans had the most powerful one in history, until they were overtaken by a better one. Von Runstedt, when asked for the reasons which led to the defeat of his armies in the west, said there were two. In the first place, the giant Anglo-American air fleets bombing Germany day and night, destroyed her war factories and hopelessly snarled the railroads, highways, and other vital arteries in her communication system. Secondly, the amazing capacity of American industry to turn out weapons of war had completely exceeded Nazi calculations. The enemy armies simply could not stand up against the massive power we threw against them.

In 1941 our men were drilling with broomsticks because they had no rifles with which to train. In 1945 we had become the greatest military power on earth, with thousands of ships and tens of thousands of planes, tanks, and guns. What caused this transformation? The miracle of American production, retooling within months and sometimes weeks, turning from the production of peacetime goods to an all-out overwhelming production for war.

This was made possible by you, by the billions of dollars you loaned to your Government. It was this money which bought the

raw materials and hired labor and worked through our whole economy to set in motion the tide of production that turned the course of decisive battles. Your investments gave and are giving to our men the strength to turn defeat into victory.

Your dollars fought at Stalingrad. Our Russian allies were bleeding to death as they slowly retreated a thousand miles under the pressure of German mechanized might. Millions of men tried to stop that steamroller with nothing but raw courage and died in the hopeless attempt. But your dollars, pouring into American war production, finally fed to the weakening Russians the material strength which enabled them to stop, throw back, and break the German juggernaut in the east.

Your dollars fought in England too. When that embattled island, nearly cut off by submarine blockade, was within weeks of starvation, it was your money which built the cargo ships and the fighting ships that broke the blockade, brought relief to England, gave arms to her men so that they could hold at El Alamein, go forward through Italy and fight by our side in the invasions of France and Germany.

These dollars bought precious time for us, the time so desperately needed in holding off the aggressors while we called up millions of civilians and trained them to fight. While your dollars were helping our allies, they were also helping to equip our new armies with the weapons to win. Our commanders have never needlessly sacrificed their men. They have waited until they had a superiority in material power before they ordered an attack. This power not only insures victory, it also holds our casualties to a minimum. Your dollars, fighting and winning the great battle of production, have saved hundreds of thousands of lives. Your dollars, with the faith that went into them, have been helping your relatives and your friends on every battlefield in this global war.

But why should we need more production when Nazi Germany has been beaten? Because our war in the Pacific, until recently, was a holding action, with never more than a few divisions engaged. Now, as we turn our full attention toward the Pacific, we are faced with the great problem of sending supplies over vast distances. Men must be transferred from Europe to the Asiatic theater, which is half way around the world. Staging areas must be built up to hold enormous quantities of material before we can mount an attack in overwhelming force.

But what about the supplies in Europe, can't they be used? The answer is "no." Some must remain at the disposal of the occupying armies we leave to police a section of Germany. Much other material has been destroyed in combat. Part of the rest is battle-worn and in need of repairs.

We cannot go against the Japs with second-hand equipment. Better to refit our forces going to the Pacific with new and more modern arms, shipped from the United States, rather than the old equipment from Europe, which would have to be transported twice the distance.

The Japs are fanatical fighters, as evidenced by the fact that we took many hundreds of thousands of prisoners during the war in Europe, but only a handful in the Pacific. Our men on Okinawa took one hill nine times, and lost it eight. The only way to beat the Jap is to blast him out of his positions and make his nation punchdrunk under the massive material power we hurl against him.

We cannot expect our soldiers and sailors to bear the entire burden of this struggle. This is total war, where the fate of every one of us at home depends upon the weapons we can give our men to overcome a desperate foe.

The casualty lists should shame and challenge all of us for they cry out: "We at the front are giving, but are you at home lending?"

Last week the aircraft carrier *Franklin* limped into the Brooklyn Navy Yard, after a bloody and painful voyage of 12,000 miles. Deep in the home waters of Japan the enemy had caught her in ambush and blasted her full flight deck with bombs. She rocked and shuddered under the mortal blows. Explosions tore great holes in the proud ship and she was swept with flames. Gallantly her crew fought back against fire, explosions, and the enemy attack. Miraculously she survived, at a cost of 832 dead.

We cannot hope to match the sacrifices that these men of the *Franklin*, the living and the dead, undertook in the line of duty. But we can fight back with our dollars, to repair the *Franklin* and build other Franklins that will bring the enemy to his destruction.

The men of the *Franklin* have earned our undying respect. Now it is time for us to earn their respect. Let us do it, and do it now, by digging down into our pockets and buying every fighting bond that we possibly can.

Remember, more men will come home if we back the attack.

Inside Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following splendid article by Mr. Jim Brady, in his column Inside Washington, who placed an unusual slant on the return of General Eisenhower to this country. He told of the Supreme Commander's sincere appreciation for production on the home front.

At a time when the hardest and most costly battles lie ahead in the Pacific theater, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate to pay tribute to the war workers of America. Without their devotion to duty our cause might have been lost. It was with the materials of war produced here at home that United States doughboys established a foothold in France and ran German troops across the Continent to Berlin. Mr. Speaker, it is with similar production on the home front that we will overthrow the Japanese military machine.

The following is the portion of Brady's column dealing with General Eisenhower's return:

INSIDE WASHINGTON
(By Jim H. Brady)
A GRATEFUL COMMANDER

General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower and his party arrived here Monday. As I saw him step from President Truman's plane at the National Airport, looking humbly at the crowd of newsmen, his wife, and others—there seemed to be a deep sense of appreciation spread over the Supreme Commander's face. A battle-weary, rugged face wore a smile for the homefront. Those who backed him and his men so faithfully.

One could almost read his inner thoughts as he was escorted into Speaker Sam Rayburn's office. As he met President of the Senate KENNETH MCKELLAR of Tennessee, and other leaders on Capitol Hill, General Eisenhower carried a message—a message of appreciation from men, some gone forever, for the great contribution made in the factories, shipyards, textile mills, and other war work on the homefront.

A few strikes have occurred. Those, of course, have been exceptions to the rule. They are now history. Our American production record has spoken for itself.

The valor of our fighting men crushed Germany—however, it was the homefront backing that gave these heroes of freedom courage to strike so many important blows against the enemy. For their courage, we are indeed a grateful people.

During the first, and now completed European phase of this war, our people have shown the world how a free people can produce. We have proven that free men work harder and produce better materials than do enslaved men. Labor and management have each displayed their ability to deal with disputes with the smallest possible loss of working hours.

Accompanying General Eisenhower were approximately 57 officers and enlisted men. Vice Admiral Alan G. Kirk was among the group. He is commander of naval forces in France.

The admiral led the invasion of France with a naval task force on June 6, 1944. Admiral Kirk told me that without the excellent flow of military and naval supplies invasion of France would have failed. He says the men in the naval service are proud of the folks back home.

Both General Eisenhower and Admiral Kirk expect to return to Europe after their leave. General Eisenhower's return is almost certain. But Admiral Kirk wants a crack at the Japs. If he has his way, he might lead another invasion soon. If not lead it, he would play a big part in it.

Admiral Kirk asked this writer to mention the future Pacific operations. "The Army and Navy will require many supplies," he reminded. "The home front must keep up the good work if a victory with the least cost of American lives can be won."

Observers at Charter Conference Unite in Praise of Commander Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, every State is proud of its products, and the most important of a State's products are its sons and daughters.

Minnesota is very proud, indeed, of her distinguished son, Commander Harold Stassen for his great career of service to his State and to his Nation's armed forces. We are especially proud of his outstanding leadership as one of the American delegates to the San Francisco Conference.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include tributes to him from some of America's leading news commentators:

At the end of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco last week, the Minneapolis Tribune asked leading national commentators and reporters who were at the Conference to give in a paragraph apiece their

disinterested comment on the part played by Minnesota's Commander Harold Stassen, member of the United States delegation. Their replies follow:

Walter Lippmann: "Much was expected of Commander Stassen when he arrived at San Francisco. For among our delegates he stood out conspicuously as belonging to the generation which will govern the country when the war is over. The audience which watched him for 2 months was as experienced and critical as any that could be brought together. The audience wanted to believe in him since it is so easy to like him; yet, I think that same audience was peculiarly alert to detect anything shoddy, phony, time serving, or devious which would warn them not to expect too much of him.

"I have seen no one who does not think he met this exceptionally severe test impressively and with effortless sincerity. He emerges from San Francisco a recognized American national leader, high up in any list, however small and exclusive, of those whom the country can and will count on."

H. V. Kaltenborn: "For sheer brainpower Harold Stassen was the outstanding member of the American delegation. At the press conferences over which he presided his performance was that of an intellectual virtuoso. He has what we call the legal mind without the usual legal dogmatism. I sincerely hope that his friends will not ruin his promising career by persuading him to subordinate character and conviction to political expediency."

Raymond Swing: "I think it was bad luck for Stassen to have been shouldered with the trusteeship proposal which permits us to annex Japanese island bases, but he conducted himself so ably as to have made an impression not equalled by any other member of our delegation. No one seeing much of him had any doubt that he is a man of rare caliber."

Tom Stokes: "Commander Stassen comes from the San Francisco Conference with an enhanced reputation and prestige. His thinking was somewhat ahead of that of most of the American delegation, but he worked tirelessly and effectively in a fine spirit of cooperation to get the best possible results. Had his ideas triumphed wholly the charter would have been a better instrument. He looks forward and his sort of approach is needed in our public life. He is the most interesting new figure on the American political scene. The Republican Party must take him into account when it sits down to nominate a 1948 Presidential candidate."

William L. Shirer: "Harold Stassen was the outstanding member of our delegation at San Francisco. He emerges from the Conference with greatly increased stature as a statesman in a nation which is woefully short of real statesmen. I frankly admit I had some doubts about his ability to come down to earth and wrestle with the very practical problems involved in getting 50 nations to agree on a charter. I wondered, too, about his ability to negotiate with foreign statesmen who had had much more practical experience in world affairs than had he.

"Without sacrificing his ideals or his principles, he proved he could come down to earth in order to get a working agreement, in negotiation with some of the toughest and brightest European minds, he was superb, patient, conciliatory, intelligent, but never losing sight of his goal. He usually got what he went after. I think his greatest specific contribution to the Conference was the fight he made, first in his own delegation and then in conference committee, to make the security organization primarily a world body instead of a group of regional committees. Had those in favor of regionalism won the Charter would have become a mockery. Stassen knew it and more than any other man he saved the Conference on this issue.

"P. S.: I'm not a Republican."

Ernest K. Lindley: "From the very beginning of the Conference, Stassen was notable for his sure grasp of the problems and his skill in handling both large groups, such as press conferences, and smaller groups where differences of view had to be composed. I find other correspondents who remained in San Francisco longer than I did concur in view that Stassen was one of two or three most capable men at the Conference and that his contribution was outstanding."

James B. Reston: "Commander Stassen was not only one of the outstanding men in the United States delegation at San Francisco, but in the entire Conference as well. He proved to be an able negotiator on complex and often unfamiliar subjects, patient, courteous but firm. Every strong-willed man, of course, stirs up certain opposition among his colleagues and Stassen at San Francisco was no exception to this rule. But on the whole he greatly enriched his experience, served the Conference and his country well, and undoubtedly enhanced whatever political future he may wish to follow."

Drew Pearson: "Harold Stassen was the most progressive member of the American delegation at San Francisco. If he had stood out for his convictions the United Nations Charter might have been a more liberal document. Naturally, Stassen was in the difficult position of having to play on the team of the American delegation, and therefore, not entirely a free agent. In my opinion two potential candidates for the Republican nomination have already emerged as a result of San Francisco, Stassen and VANDENBERG; one the leader of the progressive wing, the other the leader of conservative Republicans."

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the three following editorials on the address by Hon. James A. Farley on Presidential succession. These editorials appeared in the Boston Herald; the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass.; and in the Springfield (Mass.) Union on May 20, May 17, and May 12, respectively:

[From the Boston Herald of May 20, 1945]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The suggestion of James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, for a study of the Presidential succession is obviously sound. The Presidential Succession Act of 1886 and the twentieth amendment do something but not enough.

The former names the order in which members of the Cabinet become President upon the death or removal of a Chief Executive. However, three current Cabinet offices are not included in the list of succession—labor, agriculture, and commerce—as these did not exist when the act was passed.

Mr. Farley mentions the possibility of the death of both the President-elect and the Vice President-elect between election and inauguration day. Such a contingency is specifically mentioned in the twentieth amendment, which says Congress shall have power to provide for it. To date, Congress has not acted.

Another contingency is specified in the twentieth amendment. That is the death of one or more of the eligible candidates for the Presidency when none has a majority in the general election and the choice falls upon the House of Representatives. The amendment authorizes Congress to act, but nothing has been done. Incidentally, Congress has similar authority when the Vice Presidency, rather than the Presidency, is involved, and the choice falls upon the Senate. Nothing has been accomplished in this field, either.

For some reason, Congress is traditionally slow in these matters. Not until 3 years after President Washington took office was there any arrangement for succession beyond the Vice Presidency. Then the act of 1792 named the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House as successors. Five years passed between the assassination of Garfield and the Presidential Succession Act of 1886, although the former prompted the latter. For several months after Chester A. Arthur became President upon the death of Garfield, he had no qualified successor. Although the law provided for succession of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, the two offices were vacant just then, as Congress was not in session. Had anything happened to Arthur, the Nation would have been without a President.

[From the Standard-Times of New Bedford (Mass.), May 17, 1945]

THE PRESIDENCY

James A. Farley has proposed that the existing law governing the Presidential succession be studied and amended.

Under the Constitution, in case of the death of an elected President, the Vice President succeeds to that office. Should he die an act of Congress provides that the Secretary of State shall become President, and after him the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Farley's point is that as the President can appoint the Secretary of State, he has the power to name his successor in case anything happens to him. In such a case the President might be a man never chosen by the people for any elective office.

No Vice President who has become President by right of succession has ever failed to live out his term. But one of them, President Tyler, who succeeded William Henry Harrison, had a close shave when the explosion of a gun on a warship on which he was cruising killed the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Navy, who were members of his party.

Mr. Farley thinks the question is of enough importance to warrant study by a special commission representing all three branches of the Government, and inclines to the belief that if the death of both the President and Vice President leaves a vacancy in the Presidency, it should be filled by a special election.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of May 12, 1945]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

President Roosevelt's recent death and the elevation of Harry Truman to the White House brought the problem of the Presidential succession to general public attention for the first time since Calvin Coolidge was called to the Nation's highest office more than 20 years ago. We seem to neglect the question entirely except when death brings it up

There are some obvious defects in the constitutional succession. They should be corrected. Former Postmaster General James A. Farley emphasized them in a recent address at Hazleton, Pa., when he said:

"Under our present method, the Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency is in the unique position of being able to choose his own successor without reference to the electorate. In his case, a vacancy caused by his death, resignation, or removal, is filled by the Secretary of State whom he appoints, subject only to Senate confirmation. This possible shortcircuiting of the electorate is a gap in our democratic procedure that we have not yet solved."

To take an extreme example, and without prejudice to partisan feelings, let us suppose that President Truman saw fit to ask for Secretary Stettinius' resignation as head of the State Department. Let us suppose that for some reason—shall we say not clearly discernible?—he appointed Thomas Dewey Secretary of State. And then, let us suppose, that President Truman died. Thomas Dewey would then become President of the United States, and he is the man rejected by the voters in the last national election at which they had the opportunity to make known their wishes concerning the job at the White House.

The method of choosing successors certainly appears subject to improvement. A means of correcting it should be found, whether, as Mr. Harley suggests, through a special commission to study the problem and recommend corrective legislation or a constitutional amendment, or through some other agency empowered to lay the groundwork for eventual revision.

Our Ally China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have discussed here the systematic Nation-wide propaganda campaign against the central government of China, which has been going on in our country for over a year. As part of it the claim has been repeatedly made that practically all the Americans returning from China have reported unfavorably on that government. Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose three letters recently received from Americans whose respective positions have given them far better opportunity to observe the true state of affairs in China than those visitors have who talk to a few Chinese officials or make short visits to various parts of the country and then report their findings along with the gossip heard in those places in China, as in every country, where foreigners gather to swap yarns about how bad or inefficient or stupid or different the peoples of that country.

July 7 marks the beginning of the ninth year of China's war of resistance. These tributes to her government and her leaders and her people are all the more remarkable when one tries to imagine the sufferings and hardships they have undergone:

WALWORTH CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 27, 1945.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JUDD: While on a trip to the Middle West, from which I returned today, I had an opportunity to read in the June 18 issue of Time magazine excerpts from your speech before the House of Representatives, March 15, 1945, on Our Ally China.

From mid-November 1944 to the last of March 1945 I was in Chungking as deputy to Donald M. Nelson and as Chief Advisor to the War Production Board of the National Government of China. In this position I had an unusual opportunity to gain a first-hand knowledge of the leading figures in China, of the unbelievable difficulties which they face, and the remarkable accomplishments which they have achieved under these adverse conditions. I have returned to this country with a feeling of high regard and warm friendship for the people of free China and for the men that are guiding her destinies.

Your speech is the clearest and most factual presentation of the situation that I have seen. In fact it is the only one that I have seen which gives an unbiased presentation of the truth.

I have written to my friend Roy E. Larsen, president of Time magazine, my appreciation of the constructive step that magazine has taken in publishing your speech, and wish to take this opportunity to indicate to you the gratitude that all friends of China will feel in having facts brought to light in this way.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD COONLEY.

HEADQUARTERS, NINETY-FIRST REGIMENT, IRTC,
Camp Hood, Tex., June 28, 1945.

Congressman WALTER H. JUDD,
Representative from Minnesota,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: I want to congratulate you on the article about our ally China, in June 18 Time magazine. I spent 6 months of last year with our Army in China traveling over a large part of unoccupied China. I served under General Stilwell and worked closely with the forward echelon of General Chennault's Fifteenth Air Force.

I want to say that I agree completely with everything in your article. It expresses my own ideas, based on my personal observations, better than I could express them myself. I am certainly glad that you have given the people of our country this clear and accurate picture of the situation in China.

Yours very truly,

C. R. TIPS,
Colonel, Infantry.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *June 20, 1945.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: The fairness, entirety of scope, and plain speaking which characterize your recent article in Time magazine on the subject of our ally, China, constitute the most reasonable and convincing presentation of national China and her problems that it has yet been my privilege to read.

There are many friends of China in this country who are, and who have been convinced for a long period, that a virtual campaign has been underway to discredit Chiang Kai-shek as a military leader and as President of China in the eyes of the American public. They will welcome your article as perhaps the first sign that an actual effort is being made in this country to counteract the anti-China propaganda which daily floods our news commentaries and press.

As a member of the American Volunteer Group (Flying Tigers), I served as General Chennault's personal secretary during the lifetime of that group. In a civilian capacity I served as General Chennault's liaison representative to the Chinese Government in Chungking until December of 1944. I gained my opinions and beliefs in the Chinese Government and the Chinese people from actual contact. I believe in them and believe that they are on the right track. Most of them recognize their own shortcomings and can be counted on to effectively eradicate them when the time comes. Aside from the good which I believe your article will accomplish in the United States, I am positive that it will have a morale-revitalizing force in Chungking, particularly in the minds of the middle-class officials and civilians. And it will reach them quickly and circulate widely there. As depressed and bitter as they are in the face of antiunderstanding American journalism, they clutch as avidly for any sign of American common sense as a drowning man clutches for a straw.

Unfortunately, the impression made on American public understanding, even by such genuinely brilliant articles as yours, is seldom very lasting. The public will read it, will be struck by the eminent reasonableness and justice of your presentation, and will in a few months' time forget they've ever read it, and will lend eagerly crediting ears to the subtle innuendoes and half-truth statements which are made over and over again, day in and day out, by our news commentators and analysts. The China you've shown in your Time article has got to be kept in the public view if any lasting good is to be accomplished.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS G. TRUMBLE.

If You Believe That the Stateless, Homeless Jew Should Be Permitted To Establish Himself in Palestine, Stand Up, Mr. Legislator, and Say So

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am handing to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks, a message to the American people which first appeared in the New York Post of June 7, 1945, in space which was provided by the American League for a Free Palestine, a national patriotic society in which I am privileged to hold membership. As is quite well known, Mr. Speaker, no patriotic American group can boast a more distinguished membership than this one, a membership which includes, among the others, more than 50 Members of this legislative body.

The poignant facts presented in this message are offered in support of House Resolution 196, a resolution which was originally introduced by our colleagues [Mr. SUMNERS of Texas and Mr. BENNETT of Missouri] and which has been more recently reintroduced in identical form by a rapidly growing number of other equally distinguished Senators and Representatives, each one of whom is an enthusiastic supporter of this modern political approach to the age-old problem which has, during the course of the instant war, been reflected in the massacre of over 5,000,000 innocent Hebrew people, Jews guilty of no greater crime than helplessness in the face of the vicious attacks of their oppressors.

If the remnants of this ancient and honorable race, among them some 2,000,000 stateless murder-camp survivors, are to avoid a similar fate, the unintended consequence of the preoccupation of the enlightened nationalties of the world with other pressing problems, the Sumners-Bennett resolution must receive the early and favorable consideration of the Congress, the compassionate action for which all humanity pleads.

To be convinced of the necessity for immediate legislative action, one must but inform himself of the facts. That these facts in all of their tragic horribleness may be made manifest, permit me at this point to read that which appeared in the message to which I have just adverted:

THE FACTS

RUMANIA

New York Times, October 22, 1944:

"Out of 270,000 Rumanian Jews who survived massacre, deportations, and forced labor camps, 150,000 face starvation or death from cold. They are without clothes or food, and without roofs over their heads. * * * These [concentration] camps have been abolished, and the Jews who survived the hard labor returned to their respective towns, hoping to resume their old jobs. But to their consternation they discovered that they had neither jobs nor home to go back to. Both had been occupied by Aryans."

FRANCE

J. T. A.—November 15, 1944:

"For hundreds of Jews in the concentration camps of southern France liberation has brought no change of residence. They are free, yes—but they have no place to go. So they are spending the winter in the very camps where they had been imprisoned."

AP, Paris—May 31, 1945:

"Several thousand repatriated prisoners demonstrated yesterday * * * they marched down the Boulevard Sevastopol crying 'Down with the Jews.' Some broke into shops and forced clerks to fit them in clothes and shoes * * * police watched the demonstrations but were not asked to interfere."

BULGARIA

New York Times, January 20, 1945, from its correspondent in Bulgaria, reports that 45,000 surviving Jews are starving and "envying those who died."

SWEDEN

J. T. A., correspondent in Stockholm—March 7, 1945:

"The newspaper Morgen Tidningen warned today that anti-Semitism will not end with the defeat of the Nazis."

BELGIUM

J. T. A., correspondent from Havana—March 15, 1945:

"Reports reaching Jewish refugees in Cuba from Belgium reveal that there is a good deal of anti-Jewish feeling there due to Nazi propaganda which has left roots in certain sections of the population."

HOLLAND

J. T. A., correspondent in Brussels—April 1, 1945:

"A typica' expression of the deep-rooted anti-Semitism left in Holland as a result of 4 years of German occupation is contained in a letter in the left-wing democratic newspaper Het Parol. The letter, itself advocating an anti-Semitic course, says in part: 'Consciously or unconsciously, an anti-Semitic train of thought has arisen among the majority of the people.'"

POLAND

From Lublin, by a UP correspondent—January 11, 1945:

"The new Poland now in process of formation will be a self-consciously nationalistic nation, its population as purely Polish as possible and free of minority races which have given rise to vexing [problems] ever since the Versailles settlement."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

J. T. A. correspondent from Prague—June 1, 1945:

"Jews returning to Czechoslovakia (from concentration camps) are not being welcomed home with open arms and have encountered a great deal of hostility, Dr. Inrich Rosenberg, deputy chief of the repatriation department of the Czechoslovak Government, disclosed today.

"Dr. Rosenberg told a Jewish Telegraphic Agency correspondent that the typical reaction (of the population) has been one of surprise that any Jews were still alive and discomfort at the thought that they will want their jobs and property back.

"In Slovakia, even native Jews are unwelcome * * * one shudders at what one sees * * * flagrant anti-Semitic posters are put out by the Slovak National Front * * * anti-Jewish demonstrations are being held in the streets."

GERMANY

J. T. A. correspondent with United States forces in southern Germany—May 1, 1945:

"Ghostlike, gaunt Jewish survivors of Dachau are still being encountered along all the roads to southern Germany. * * *

"A typical pair are Moses Gold and Abraham Koenigsberg, Czechoslovak Jews, both of whom have uncles living in New York City.

"When asked where they were going, they replied: 'We do not know.' Asked where they planned to live, they said: "Where can a Jew live? Once we had wives and children, but they were killed at Oswiecim. For years they tortured, starved, and whipped us, but it seems that a few of us are still alive." Similar replies came from other refugees from Dachau who are wandering around aimlessly."

J. T. A. Leipzig—June 3, 1945:

"Deportees and refugees of all nationalities arriving at one of the 150 camps set up at Leipzig to care for such persons have their affairs handled by a liaison officer named by the governments. But there is no liaison officer for Jews. * * *

"All these pitiful survivors can do is remain in the camps, watching other people leave for home."

Mr. Speaker, for two long years, we, preoccupied with the winning of the war and distracted by other considerations of great moment, have I fear, unwittingly created the impressions among the great humanitarians of the world that America, most powerful of all of the nations, is cold and indifferent to the shocking persecutions of Europe's helpless Hebrews. Some, so it is said, have shrugged their shoulders when pressed for action, protesting "What can we do?" "The war against the common foe comes first," they said. And we busied ourselves with the smashing of the armies of the enemy that was then ours as 5,000,000 human beings perished in agony and despair.

If we are looking for an easy way out—a quick way to forget—it is not hard to find. Some of us cannot sleep, visualizing, as we must, the cruel slaughter of the innocent that remains unavenged. Some of us sleep restlessly, knowing that now, when the war is no longer an excuse for the inaction that has been ours, that thousands upon thousands of hapless Hebrews, pitiful survivors of the worst religious persecution of all time, are left to wander alone in a horrible, homeless and hostile postwar world.

It is time to stand up and be counted, to separate the callous, the selfish, and the hypocritical from those who count no sacrifice too great in righting the wrongs from which humanity undeservedly suffers. If there is one within the hearing of my voice who wonders where his duty lies, let him listen intently as I read on:

IS IT HUMANE TO SEND THEM BACK?

There are about a million and a half Hebrews who survived German occupation. They are a wretched people. Their property is destroyed or given away. They have been displaced and driven, either from one concentration camp to another, or from one temporary place of exile to another. They are the most underfed of all. They are homeless and dispersed. In many cases they know that their families have been exterminated. In other cases, which are perhaps even worse, they are not certain.

Most of them say, "We don't want to go back to the scenes of our torture and to the places where our loved ones have been slaughtered."

If you agree that it is cruel to send them back, stand up and say so.

IS IT JUST TO COMPEL THEM TO OWE ALLEGIANCE TO THEIR TORMENTERS?

They say, "We don't want to have anything to do with our murderers, whether they were Germans, or Rumanians, or Poles, or Hungarians. We don't want any more to carry the name German, or Austrian, or Hungarian, or Rumanian."

Can you blame them?

Now, if you believe that it is cruel to compel them to resume allegiance to their tormentors and to answer to the name of German or Rumanian, then stand up and say so.

IS IT FAIR TO ASK THEM TO ENDURE PERSECUTION FOREVER?

They say, "We are sick and tired of going on being pariahs among the nations of Europe where we were persecuted generations and centuries before Hitler; we have no wish to bear further persecutions and humiliations. We don't even have the patience any more to endure the anti-Semites with their thousand faces. We want to start a new life after all this suffering and all these sacrifices and all these casualties we have sustained; we want to take up life as human beings with dignity and the normal chance of peace and freedom."

Can you blame them?

Now, if you believe that it is right and just before God and man to give these wretched survivors a chance to begin a new life after the long night of agony and torture, then stand up and say so.

IS IT RIGHT TO MAKE THEM EXPERIMENT AGAIN WITH THEIR VERY LIVES?

They say, "We have had enough of promises about human rights in the countries of our dispersion. Regardless of how sincere these promises are now, we can no longer risk building our future on paper declarations, because we did build on exactly the same promises and the same declarations and the same clauses 25 years ago; and because we believed naively what was promised to us then, we paid with four or five million casualties, and went through indescribable and unimaginable suffering. No more."

Can you blame them?

Now, if you think they are entitled to their doubts and suspicions, to their refusal to build on abstract expressions of sympathy, then stand up and say so!

CAN YOU BLAME THEM FOR ASPIRING TO LIBERTY?

They say, "We can take up a new life only in the country which for two thousand years

we have considered our national territory and therefore we have a right to go back there."

Can you blame them?

If you think the sacred right of self-determination should be extended to this renascent nation which wants only to be repatriated to the country from which it was driven by force, stand up and say so!

HERE IS YOUR CHANCE

Here is your chance—maybe the very last chance—to stand up and say these things which might trouble your conscience and disturb your sleep if you leave them unsaid. Here is your chance—maybe your very last—to prove yourself unfettered by partisan ties and unhampered by shibboleths of inertia.

The chance is offered by the Recognition and Repatriation Resolution (H. J. Res. 196) recently introduced in Congress by Members of both parties. This resolution demands recognition for the renascent Hebrew nation, and repatriation to Palestine of all those who survived.

If you are for this, then do not be shy about saying so. Do not be indecisive about it. Above all, do not procrastinate. If you are for it, stand up and say so, now!

Forgotten Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. G. M. Strand, of Benson, Minn., have called to my attention the following editorial from the Army Times of April 23, 1945, official servicemen's paper in Washington, D. C., which I think well worth reading by the Members of this House:

In an organization the size of the United States Army there always are a few forgotten men. In the Army it is the few thousands who have celebrated their thirty-fifth birthdays.

These oldsters are the victims of circumstances. Their draft numbers were low. They were eligible when the Selective Service System occasionally reached into their age brackets. They were able to meet the minimum physical standards. If it hadn't been for these circumstances, they would still be in tweeds, virtually immune from the draft.

The Army, by lowering the age for induction to those under 30, has admitted that it needs and wants only young men. This is no insult to the oldsters. They try valiantly to be good soldiers, and many succeed, but age has slowed most of them down. They just can't keep up with the younger fellows.

The oldsters face a serious problem in the postwar period. If forced to compete against the youngsters in a heavy labor market they probably will have extreme difficulty finding jobs. Many industries in prewar years would not hire men in their age groups. Others in their upper thirties have found that Army life and training have drained their strength and given them odd mental complexes—taking orders from "youngsters" has been tough. These men realize that the problems of the readjustment period promise to be much more acute than those faced by the younger men, and they are worried.

The over-age group receives no special consideration in the demobilization plan. It is just as well. The oldsters should not have to wait for VE-day to be discharged—they should be given that white paper now.

Setting up a demobilization plan for the small group would be comparatively simple. There are not enough of them to cause any great confusion or change in strategy. Each man 35 or over should be given the opportunity to apply for a discharge. If he wants to stay in the service let him stay. If he wants to get out let him out at the earliest possible moment. If he holds a key job, find him a replacement and then let him out. Above all, get the job done before the mass demobilization, with all its considerations, gets under way.

Congress Abdicates Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the bill to extend the OPA for another year, without insisting upon the restrictions the House had placed in the bill, especially the provision for court review, in my opinion the Congress again shirked its functions, its duties, its responsibilities, and weakly abdicated to an arrogant, inefficient, blundering Federal bureau. The Congress "cussed," but condoned and continued the OPA in spite of its manifold sins, both of commission and omission. This act of weakness and timidity on the part of Congress is so well described and analyzed in the following editorial, taken from the Chicago Tribune, Tuesday, July 3, 1945, that I insert it as a part of my remarks. The editorial expresses my feelings in this connection better than I can myself:

CONGRESS ABDICATES

OPA has been extended for another year. The question has been before Congress for months. Both Houses heard testimony to show that the organization was defeating the very purposes for which it was established. It was shown to be arrogant, inefficient, lacking in understanding of economic forces and processes. Its price controls were holding down production and thereby giving every encouragement to the black market. Proposals intended to restrict its scope were enthusiastically adopted in the House and some others less enthusiastically in the Senate.

But when the pressure was applied, in the closing hours of the fiscal year, OPA survived and practically all of its powers were renewed.

Once again Congress has abdicated in favor of the bureaucracy. OPA has been given a new license to stumble and blunder. Congressmen will continue to hear from their constituents about the absurdities and the petty tyrannies committed by the agency. Businessmen will be able to prove that OPA regulations are preventing the speedy conversion of industry to civilian production. Labor spokesmen will be able to prove that the regulations are responsible for much needless unemployment. Consumers will protest against avoidable shortages of needed goods. No doubt Congressmen will repeat these accusations on the floor, express indignation, and introduce denunciatory resolutions. Investigations will be demanded.

And that's all that will happen. Congress will scold and complain and attempt to persuade the people that the fault lies elsewhere, but everybody will know or should know that the blame rests upon Congress itself.

The plain fact is that the legislative branch once again has humbled itself before an utterly dominant executive branch. The rule of this Nation by bureaucrats continues. Congress is as timid, as forceless, and as obsequious as ever. The presence of new faces in the House and Senate has made no more difference in this respect than has the presence of a new face in the White House.

Independence Day Address by Senator Guffey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a timely address delivered by my colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] before the nineteenth annual Independence Day celebration under the auspices of the Soho Community Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One hundred and sixty-nine years ago today, a group of eminent Americans gathered in a city of this State and signed a document which accepted as its moral basis the idea that all men are born free and equal and with inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Since then, this great and diverse Nation has been striving to make the ideals of the Declaration of Independence a reality. Quite a few of those who signed the Declaration were slave owners, but few, if any, of the men who made the American Revolution believed in slavery for its own sake. Then and for 50 years thereafter there was, on the contrary, a steady sentiment North and South in favor of its abolition. The change came when a Connecticut inventor named Whitney devised the cotton gin, by which slave labor became profitable. On the profits from plantations, the South erected a whole mythology on the subjec' of slavery, able to quote scripture and later biology in support of what they called their peculiar institution.

The result, as you all know, was the Civil War, in which the free North defeated the slave States and by constitutional amendment prohibited involuntary servitude except as punishment for crime. The North went still further and added to the Bill of Rights the provision that no American citizen should be denied the vote for reasons of race, color, creed, or previous condition of servitude.

The Civil War amendments, despite all of the legalistic perversions by which smart corporation lawyers and the Federal Courts perverted their plain meaning, marked the start of the greatest social, political and economic advance ever registered by any single race on the face of the globe. Decade by decade the American Negroes improved themselves and adjusted themselves to the evolving nation. There were sharp reactions against their progress. The Ku Klux Klan in the reconstruction period, the "grandfather clause" and the poll taxes, the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920's—all slowed but did not check the great rise of the American Negroes.

In the First World War, as in the Civil War and the War of 1812 and the Revolution, American Negroes fought alongside of

their white fellow citizens and earned distinction for gallantry. American Negroes flocked into the war industries of the North and helped man the great war plants that made the guns that beat the Kaiser.

I do not need to tell you of what the American Negro has accomplished in this war. Under the humane, democratic leadership of our beloved Franklin Delano Roosevelt and now of his fine successor, President Truman, the energies and abilities of the American Negro have been at the service of our country on an ever larger scale. There have been Negro officers, including a Negro general; there have been Negro aviators, Negro ship captains, as well as Negro troops and Negro sailors and Negro ground forces and Negro labor battalions. Negroes have performed technical jobs calling for skill, as well as strength. Negroes have thronged into our war industries. In one southern shipyard, after there had been some race troubles, the Negro labor force was put to work on a single ship and they clipped 20 days off the yard's previous record made with white labor. The name of that ship, by the way, was *The Crow Wing*.

With or without the Fair Employment Practice Commission, the American Negro in the last 25 years has registered a further advance in skill, discipline, and responsibility which is, I repeat, the most impressive thing recorded in the history of a single race. In three generations, the descendants of the African savages who had been kidnapped by the slavers, after emancipation from slavery, proved their ability to master and to develop the advanced technology developed by the white race in 3,000 years of steady historical evolution.

I think that you, as American citizens, should be proud of this achievement. I know that I am proud of it and that I am proud to be a member of the party and a supporter of the administration which, at the risk of defection in its own ranks, insisted that the Nation should keep its word and should not discriminate against any of our citizens because of race, creed, or color.

There is one other thing which I must say, and that is that I am equally proud of the restraint and responsibility which the American Negroes have shown under pinpricks and provocations. You have learned the most difficult lesson of freedom, which is to know your own rights and to respect the rights and interests and even the prejudices of others. The world, like this country, is peopled by many different kinds of men, different in color, creed, race, language, civilization, and ideas. Thank God that it is so; I frankly confess that I would hate to live in a world populated entirely by Scotch-Irish Presbyterians like myself and I suspect that you would get tired of living in a world entirely inhabited by members of the Soho Community Association.

There are differences. Each group has its good and its bad qualities, just as each man has his good and bad qualities. There is bound to be some friction and some misunderstanding. That is life.

But here in America we have agreed to disagree without carrying our disagreements to extremes. We Democrats have even come to agree that Republicans have a right to exist and we certainly would not deny them the right to vote and to nominate candidates for political office. But we do not see why they should win and do our best to keep them from winning because they represent, under the form of property rights, that same contempt for human rights which gave us slavery and the Civil War and depression and bread lines in a land of plenty dedicated to the ideal of human freedom.

As I say, the American Negroes have every right to be proud of their contribution to the defeat of Germany and to the approaching victory over Japan. Your men have been on every battle front and in every war plant. And here and now let me add that I am proud that I belong to a nation in which the great majority stands pledged to this ideal of equal rights which enabled you to play your part like men in this terrible struggle. There have been and are other nations which, by a deliberate policy of suppressing minority rights, have robbed themselves of the power which is rightfully theirs. And I regret that there are still those in this country, as in my party, who still believe that this Nation can endure half slave and half free.

But the Fourth of July and the Declaration of Independence breathed the breath of life into American nationhood. Since then we have gone forward, conquering a great continent, fighting dangerous enemies, often puzzled and sometimes unable to conquer ourselves, but we have gone forward. Look back for a moment to what the Negro stood for even 40 years ago—almost a figure of fun, a tattered buffoon who was aped on vaudeville—and then look at him now and think ahead to what he will and must become—an equal member of an American community in which equal rights for all and special privileges for none is the rule. This no longer calls for faith, since we all can see it; it does call for patience, since the destined day will come surely but cannot be hurried. Think only of this one great fact: Hitler in his madness decreed that the Nazi Germans were the master race and all other peoples were destined to be German slaves. Where are Hitler and his Nazis? In hell. Who put Hitler and his Nazis there? You did, along with the rest of us—white, brown, red, yellow, and black. There's your answer.

Flag Day Address by Edward M. Connelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered by Edward M. Connelly, United States attorney at Spokane, Wash., before the Elks Lodge of Spokane, on Wednesday, June 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Worthy exalted ruler and brothers: Perhaps no object to which we render reverance, save the Creator Himself, has inspired more poetical utterance, loftier flight of rhetorical eloquence and sublimity of thought than has our country's flag. The facile diction of Beecher, Hale, and Everett, the matchless eloquence of Daniel Webster—the poetry of Oliver Wendell Holmes and Francis Scott Key have all been woven into beautiful garlands of entrancing thought and reverently laid upon the altar stone of the flag.

No war of aggression, exploitation, or greed has ever besmirched the folds of our country's banner, but liberty has ever been the battle cry which has placed the flag at the head of our moving armies and navies. We fought the War of 1812 for the liberty of American citizens pressed into British naval service. We fought the war of Mexico primarily for the liberty of the great State of Texas, and to vindicate our national honor. We engaged in internal strife in 1861 for the preservation of the Union and the liberty of an enslaved race of people. We fought the war with Spain for the liberty of Cuba and the island possessions of the New World.

In the First World War we remained aloof from the conflict of Europe until the liberty of millions of our citizens and those of other countries was placed in jeopardy as the dreams of world-wide empire controlled by the war lords of Germany were revealed to the world. The blood of our finest youth sanctified the battlefields of France and Belgium but the cause of human liberty was given added forward impetus since the Revolutionary days when our first glorious flag was stitched by the hands of Betsy Ross.

Now, in these grim days of World War II, when total global strife encompasses the earth and the very foundations of democracy and civilization were for a time threatened by fanatics and godless despots and dictators, we find Old Glory leading and inspiring millions of our youth on every battlefield on the face of the earth, and flying at the masthead of our Navy's ships in every corner of the seven seas.

We find it tenderly enfolding the shattered remains of boys who have died on the shores of Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Leyte, Guam, Wake, and Iwo Jima. We find it planted in triumph amid fallen bodies of gallant Americans dead on the hills of Tarawa and Okinawa. We see it leading our victorious armies in Europe, flying gaily along the Rhine and over the ruined cities of the so-called master race in Germany, and wherever it unfolds to the breeze, in whatever obscure corner of the earth, it flashes its message of freedom, liberty, and hope to subjugated and down-trodden races of men.

This flag is emblematic of the spirit and ideals of the American people. It represents our civilization, our form of government, our Constitution and laws, our Bill of Rights. It represents freedom of speech, of conscience, and of action; it represents security and loyal and patriotic allegiance to our Government; it represents the ideology of a noble, unselfish race of people, and in turn it may be said that the very foundation of American greatness is built of the qualities of soul and mind and heart which are represented by our flag—white for the purity and strength of virtue, red for courage and valor, blue for honesty, wisdom, and integrity.

These qualities were basic in the hearts and souls of the Colonists. They have been basic in the hearts and motives of the American people in every threatening crisis which we have faced. They are basic today in the roots of every American endeavor and are asserting themselves all over the world, among less fortunate peoples than we, who aspire to possess a form of government which will guarantee to them national security and individual liberty as defined by our Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights.

These qualities are nowhere more strikingly evident than in the patriotic activity of our own great fraternity, as typified in the report of the Elks' war commission which will be formally presented tomorrow forenoon at Washington, D. C. to our President, the Secretaries of War and of the Navy, to the Members of the Congress and the Senate by our Grand Exalted Ruler, Dr. Robert South Barrett.

Time will permit only the bare mention of a few of the activities of this commission. It has evacuated children from war zones; established more than 400 schools for training young men for the Aviation Cadet Corps; has recruited men for the Naval Air Corps; technicians for the Army Air Corps; volunteers for the Army engineers and Navy construction battalion; has collected books for the merchant marine; established Elks' fraternal centers throughout the United States

where more than 2,000,000 service men and women have enjoyed meals, overnight hospitality and relaxation. It has promoted letter writing to men in service; arranged for the sending of gift boxes, cigarettes, and tobacco; and has provided regular programs of entertainment for more than 150,000 veterans in hospitals in the United States. Only recently, it established a fund of $150,000 to extend aid to members of our order who are interned in Japanese prison camps in the Philippines. Already the commission has expended $1,300,000 in its war activities.

Commenting upon this great work of our order, President Truman said, "What you have done needs no praise from me. The report speaks for itself. It is the inspiring story of the efforts of 700,000 American citizens in the war, of the 80,000 of them who have actively served our Nation on land and sea and in the air, of the thousand and more who have made the supreme sacrifice. That is a shining record—a record of which the Order of Elks and the whole Nation can be proud."

In the days to come, when this war shall have been ended and the millions of our youth return from the battlefields of the world and from the distant high seas; when economic and political problems of serious import will again face us and new panaceas for the adjustment of human ills will be proclaimed and propounded, it will be well for us, as patriotic Americans, to remember and to keep uppermost in our minds the thought that there is no room in this great Nation of ours for two flags, or for any other national insignia than the Stars and Stripes of freedom. The scarlet emblem of the international Communist has no place in the American scheme of living. The ideals upon which our Nation was nurtured and reared are made of different stuff than economic and political theories of communism. We had too much of this parlor-pink un-American thought in our country in the days preceding the war. We would break faith with those who fought and died to preserve America, as it is, to ever tolerate it in America again. We may at times be beset by misguided statesmanship or by baneful and insidious influences from foreign powers, but the American people in their strength and courage will be able to meet and correct such abuses.

We may, as a free people, demand and make new laws and elect and appoint new lawmakers. But in so doing, we shall be guided by the dictates and decisions of established, orderly governmental procedure, not by revolt or the overthrow of our sacred altars of liberty.

The great hope and aspiration of the world today is to arrange a compact among the nations which will render future wars impossible and to stop forever the terrible toll of blood and life and youth and treasure and misery which war brings to mankind.

It is said that the men who are returning from the battlefields and the high seas are the most serious and emphatic in their demands that permanent peace among the nations of the earth be established. They should know. They have seen war in all its hideousness. They have borne its bitter hardships. They, above all, have a right to be heard in the discussions of future world peace. With their determination and with the courage and faith of the American people inspiring our leaders in the peace conference, it is possible that an edifice of peace can be erected which will endure through the ages and be an inspiration to future generations, a hallowed sanctuary of hope and faith for all the enlightened people of the earth.

So, in our celebration of Flag Day, we may look to the far horizons of the earth with renewed hope, for wherever Americans meet today, loyalty and love for the flag is being given fitting expression. No single tongue or heart or mind can render full expression of adequate homage to that glorious emblem nor to the thoughts which it epitomizes—the ideals which it reflects—nor the hope which it inspires.

May the immortal words with which Francis Scott Key described the beauty and the glory and the message of our flag go ringing down through the ages—a motto and inspiration for Americans of all future time and for all of the nations of the earth to emulate—

"O! Thus be it ever, when freemen shall stand
Between their loved homes and the war's desolation!
Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n rescued band
Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a Nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just,
For this be our motto—'In God is our trust:'
And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave."

Program at Exhibition of Photomurals Depicting Atrocities in Nazi Concentration Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, last Saturday afternoon a program was presented at the Library of Congress upon the occasion of the opening of an exhibition of photomurals depicting atrocities in Nazi concentration camps for political prisoners. The exhibit is sponsored jointly by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Washington Star.

The program included talks by Dr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, Representative JAMES W. MOTT, of Oregon, Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, and myself. Mr. B. M. McKelway and Mr. Raymond P. Brandt represented the Star and the Post-Dispatch, respectively.

Because of the great public interest in this exhibit and the subject depicted, I ask unanimous consent that proceedings be printed in the RECORD. I am informed that the cost will be approximately $121.40.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN ATROCITY PROGRAM
COOLIDGE AUDITORIUM,
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C. June 30, 1945.

The program was opened at 3:30 p. m. by Mr. B. M. McKelway, associate editor, the Star.

Mr. MCKELWAY. Ladies and gentleman: In behalf of the sponsors I welcome you here this afternoon and thank you for your presence.

In the course of the next few minutes we shall hear from the Librarian of Congress, whose quick perception of the significance of this undertaking in its relation to congressional and national policies has made possible the use of the Library for this exhibit.

We shall also hear from distinguished Member of Congress who, at the invitation of General Eisenhower, went to Germany and saw some of the sights we are bringing to you through pictures.

I wish at this time, however, to explain very briefly the origin and purpose of the exhibit which is the occasion for this assembly.

Mr. Joseph Pulitzer, editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was a member of the party of newspaper and magazine editors who took the same trip to Germany that Members of Congress took.

On his return, Mr. Pulitzer was filled with the desire, which all of us felt, that our people here at home—especially the mothers and fathers and loved ones of the men who have won the war against Germany—should see what we had seen. Photography, of course, offered a practical method of accomplishing that purpose and the Post-Dispatch prepared a unique and impressive display from official pictures taken by Army and news photographers.

After a convincing demonstration in St. Louis of the value of this display the exhibit was brought to Washington by the Post-Dispatch, and the Star is joining in sponsoring it here.

The pictures are being shown in the belief that they teach a grim lesson against war.

And they are shown in the belief that those who see them will realize the extent to which the German people, in giving way to race and religious prejudice, the persecution of minorities, and the lust for conquest, debased themselves along with the pitiful victims of their atrocities.

It is my great pleasure now to present to you a distinguished colleague in the field of journalism, Mr. Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. [Applause.]

Mr. BRANDT. Thank you, Mr. McKelway.

Wartime travel difficulties prevented Mr. Joseph Pulitzer from attending these ceremonies. He has sent me the following telegram:

"Congratulations and best wishes to the Washington Star on the occasion of the opening of the exhibit of the enlarged photographs of the German concentration camps. If the people of Washington will view these photographs and the Signal Corps moving-picture film, they will be convinced of the indescribable nature of the German atrocities. It is my earnest hope they will insist on speedy, fair, but remorselessly severe trials for the guilty; further, that they will conclude that of all the guilty the most guilty are the members of the German General Staff. These men have twice planned to conquer the world, and unless executed they will plan to conquer it again. It is idle to blame the German people, guilty though they unquestionably were. It is fair and just to blame those directly responsible for German militarism. Let us indict, try, and upon conviction shoot the members of the German General Staff. The Nazi leaders, the industrialists, the intellectuals, the SS, and the Gestapo can come next. I urge Washingtonians who think this is too strong medicine to see the pictures now on display at the Congressional Library.

"JOSEPH PULITZER."

Thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKELWAY. Thank you, Mr. Brandt.

The Library of Congress was established to perform the function which its title describes. But in the course of its continued growth as the largest bibliographic establishment in the world, it has come to assume, in addition, some of the characteristics of a national university of the people.

The use of its facilities for the exhibition of these pictures is in accordance with that conception, in addition to the fact that the exhibition itself supports a policy of the Congress.

The sponsors are deeply indebted to the willing and most helpful encouragement of our new Librarian of Congress, the Honorable Luther H. Evans, whom it is my pleasure to present now. Dr. Evans. [Applause.]

Dr. EVANS. Mr. McKelway, ladies, and gentlemen, on April 20 of this year, representatives from the office of the Chief of Staff called upon the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate, and laid before them a cablegram which General Marshall had received from General Eisenhower. It suggested that 12 Members of the Congress be invited to visit one of the German prison camps, where unspeakable conditions exist.

The following committee was appointed: Senators BARKLEY, of Kentucky; GEORGE, of Georgia; THOMAS of Utah; BROOKS, of Illinois; WHERRY, of Nebraska; SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; and Representatives THOMASON, of Texas; RICHARDS, of South Carolina; IZAC, of California; VORYS, of Ohio; MOTT, of Oregon; and SHORT, of Missouri.

The entire group, escorted by representatives of the War Department, left Washington by air transport Sunday, the 22nd, and arrived in Paris the next day. Three camps were visited: Buchenwald in Thuringen, Nordhausen in Saxony, and Dachau in Bavaria. These were said to be typical of the entire German political-prisoner-camp system and policy. At the time of the visit those prisoners who survived were still in the camps and were being cared for by the armed forces of the United States. Dachau was inspected only 48 hours after the SS garrison in charge of it had been driven out.

The committee reported to Congress on May 15. It declared that it had accepted three kinds of evidence: (1) visual inspection of the camps; (2) testimony of eyewitnesses among the prisoners; and (3) circumstantial evidence which the committee considered to be as accurate and reliable as the two kinds of direct evidence. It described conditions in each of the camps, and, in its conclusions, declared:

"Although differing in size, they all carried into effect the same pattern of death by hard labor, starvation, hanging, strangulation, disease, brutality, gas chambers, gallows, and filthy and unsanitary conditions which meant inevitable death to every imprisoned person."

When certain members of the committee were informed that through the generous cooperation and sponsorship of the Evening Star, of Washington, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, it would be possible to exhibit in the capital of the United States large-scale photographs of scenes similar to those they had witnessed, the proposal was instantly approved, and the Library of Congress was mentioned as an appropriate location for the display. It has been my privilege to respond to the suggestion.

These are not the pictures of the vanquished, but the pictures of the victims of our victory. In them we must recognize our sons, ourselves, and our sacrifice. And because they represent our own, and because they are so full of meaning for us, we cannot and should not avoid the image. For they bear a terrible testimony to the evil purpose of the enemy in the West whom we have lately overcome—overcome at the cost of cruel torture and bodily emaciation and brutal and blasphemous degradation of the human spirit. They constitute, in other words, an appeal to long memory, for they represent the most memorable legions of a liberty which is forever threatened by wickedness, insecurity, complacence, perversion, and a philosophy of intelligent savagery.

These things have happened to us, a people who seek and contend for equality among men. They have happened because our enemy by force of arms and enervation has sought to impose his supremacy upon his fellows. In this design he did not wholly succeed, but here for a little while he exercised his triumph, and in these documents of wretchedness and horror we can see, more clearly than we can read, the barbarous consequence of his depravity. For in looking we may see him, too.

> Cruelty has a human heart
> And jealousy a human face
> Terror the human form divine
> And secrecy the human dress

Somehow this war has maimed us all, but in these pictures we may find an explanation of our hurt, and come upon the basis of our hope. For decency and dignity and devotion can be restored and affirmed. Not in vengeance but in vindication it is well for us to understand our experience. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKELWAY. Thank you, Dr. Evans.

As Dr. Evans has mentioned, 12 Members of Congress, at the invitation of General Eisenhower, divided equally between the House and the Senate, flew to Germany to inspect concentration camps in the condition found by our liberating troops. Their report to Congress is one of the most impressive public documents printed in connection with this war.

Three of them have honored us by their presence on this platform and have agreed to give us the benefit of their observations on the significance of this exhibit.

It is a pleasure, first, to present Representative JAMES W. MOTT, of Oregon, a veteran of the First World War, now serving his sixth term in Congress and serving as ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to present the Honorable JAMES W. MOTT, of Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. McKelway, and ladies and gentlemen: I am very glad indeed to have an apportunity to see this excellent exhibit of German atrocity pictures, and I congratulate the Washington Evening Star and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for sponsoring the exhibit. You are going to see the pictures themselves. You will see the motion pictures. You have already seen the enlarged still photographs. So I believe there is no particular message that I personally could bring you except to remind you that in watching thse pictures it is well to remember that in Germany what you are going to see is not an exceptional thing at all. It is a policy as old as the Hitler regime itself, and everything that you see in these pictures are things which are being done or were being done and carried out as a part of a government policy.

As one of the members of the joint Senate and House committee which, at the request of General Eisenhower, investigated the atrocities and other conditions in political prisoner and slave labor camps in Germany, I can vouch for the accuracy of everything revealed by these pictures. I think all Americans should become acquainted with those conditions in order that they may be better able to help in doing their full share in seeing to it that these things shall never happen again.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKELWAY. Thank you, Mr. MOTT.

No gathering in Washington these days is complete without representation from the great State of Missouri, from which so many blessings now flow. [Laughter.] Representative DEWEY SHORT was a member of the party which inspected the concentration camps in Germany. One of his important committee assignments at this time is to the Select Committee of the House on Postwar Military Policy. Mr. SHORT is a credit to Missouri and to the House of Representatives. And so it is a great pleasure to present him to you now: The Honorable DEWEY SHORT.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. McKelway, fellow-countrymen: All that the American people have read, seen, or heard about Nazi atrocities is understatement rather than exaggeration.

As one of the 12 Members of Congress who visited the concentration camps at Buchenwald, Dora, and Dachau—only 3 out of approximately 100 similar camps in Germany, I was shocked and horrified at the scenes of unspeakable horror and indescribable misery which we witnessed.

We saw literally hundreds of dead bodies, most of them naked and others in dirty rags, scattered promiscuously over prison grounds and along railroad tracks or piled high on trucks or stacked like cordwood in rooms adjoining the crematories where their skeletons were consumed in furnaces. In the winter when there was a shortage of coal, the unfortunate human wrecks were forced to dig their own graves and were buried in long rows without identification.

We looked into the hollow and hopeless eyes and at the fevered cheeks and emaciated bodies of thousands of the living dead who were worse off than the dead themselves.

The overworked and underfed inmates were crowded into filthy, shabby barracks, forced to sleep on bare boards with only lice to cover their bodies. Tuberculosis was rampant; typhus widespread; and nearly all were suffering from dysentery due to undernourishment. There were only a few crude toilets and most of the victims were too weak or ill to walk to them. It is impossible for any human being to imagine the insanitary conditions and the reeking stench of dead and dying men. A pigpen would be preferable to the cesspools of hell in which these prisoners lived.

The daily diet consisted of a thin slice of black bread about 3 inches square, and a thin soup which was little more than water with a cabbage, a carrot, or a potato drawn through it. Starvation was the universal cruel weapon employed by the sinister and satanic Nazi regime by which whole populations were to be liquidated. Millions of the most intelligent and democratic peoples of all Europe, including Germans themselves, were exterminated merely because they refused to accept the Nazi philosophy of government or Hitler's ideology of stateism.

In all fairness to Germany, the outside world must not confuse the political prison camps with prisoner-of-war camps. I found no American or British soldiers in these concentration camps. For the most part our prisoners of war were fairly well treated until the last few weeks of the war when German cities and industries were totally destroyed and her transportation system wrecked. Then our soldiers suffered a great deal from long forced marches and lack of food. Many would have starved had it not been for the American Red Cross.

Germany must pay for her crimes not only against her neighbors and her own people but against God and civilization. She has robbed humanity of its sanctity and outraged the dignity of the human soul. She has sown the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind. Her large cities have been blasted to bits; her industries utterly destroyed; her land a heap of rubble, rats, and ruin—the fulfillment of Hitler's promise. Surely the Lord has rained fire and brimstone upon Nazi Germany, the modern Sodom and Gomorrah. Many of her leaders already have taken their lives by slashing wrists, drinking poison, and blasting themselves to pieces with dynamite. A nation that lives by the sword will perish by the sword.

The world must see to it, however, that all these archfiends and enemies of civilization are liquidated. The high leaders of the Nazi party, all bona fide members of the Gestapo and Schutzstaffel, certain industrialists and financiers, and the High Command of the Wehrmacht—the Potsdam Prus-

sian military clique—must be rubbed out. [Applause.] We will have no Kaisers running off to Holland or any other country after this war. These incomparable criminals must be properly punished for their bloodthirsty crimes. Germany must be taught forever that war is a crime and that crime never pays. We must rule her for years to come with an iron hand and mete out stern justice. No legal technicalities should unduly delay the swiftest trial and full punishment of the guilty.

On the other hand, we should realize that there is no method by which we can indict a whole people. We must avoid revenge and refuse to sink to the Nazis' low level. With General Eisenhower, we believe that a just and lasting peace cannot be built upon hate or with a club. It is impossible to drive the right ideas into a people's mind with a bayonet, and we cannot shoot the right ideals into their hearts with a machine gun. We must not give way to wrath, but after punishing the guilty, we should, with a Christian spirit and in the American manner, help bind up the world's wounds and heal its bleeding heart. This is the great challenge to our Nation and to a Christian world. The awful and terrible thing that has happened in Germany must never occur again. [Applause.]

Mr. McKELWAY. Thank you, Mr. SHORT.

A member of the Senate who was selected for the trip to Germany is the senior Senator from Utah, the very able and respected chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, whom it is my pleasure to present to you now—the Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah.

Senator THOMAS. On Sunday morning of April the 22d, this year, 12 Congressmen left Washington for the purpose of seeing first-hand evidence of Nazi atrocities and other conditions in concentration camps inside Germany.

The trip was suggested by General Eisenhower and was a direct result of an invitation from General Marshall to the leaders of Congress to send a delegation representing the American people as witnesses against these horrible war crimes. The Allied Armies crossing Europe had found such unbelievable conditions that it was deemed advisable to request that not only the representatives from our Government but members of the press and a delegation of representatives from the British Government see and examine the findings for themselves.

During the 16 days we were absent from Washington our group, six Senators and six Members of the House, toured much of Europe. We saw the extent to which the large industrial cities of Germany have been demolished and the havoc wrought upon the transportation system of Germany and France. But our attention was centered for the most part upon the three camps where the political prisoners of Germany were interned: Buchenwald, Nordhausen, and Dachau. We saw the unspeakable conditions existing in these camps where the Nazi policy of liquidation of personnel from all of continental Europe, particularly democratic or liberal leaders, was carried out through the devices of starvation and abuse. Most Americans are no doubt by now familiar with these extermination factories, with the beatings, tortures, incredibly crowded sleeping conditions, sickness, the medical experiments where prisoners were used as human guinea pigs, the body disposal plants, and the hanging and strangulation devices used to mechanize the wholesale executions.

For many years we have heard what we have regarded as wild tales from inside the so-called fortress of Europe regarding mass killings and torture of persons whom the Germans thought to be politically dangerous, those who were a threat to their self-appointed mission of world conquest. But most of us were inclined to be skeptical. We regarded the acts reported as being so barbaric that even the trained Nazi would not tolerate them. But the evidences and actual examples witnessed by those making this trip present such an authentic case that there is no longer room for doubt. The facts themselves condemn the practices in all their brutality.

Pictures of the bodies piled like cordwood, of the ashes of those cremated, and of the shrunken, starved bodies of those still alive have been seen in most of the newspapers and on most of the movie screens of the country. Although there are no authentic figures as to the number of persons held, tortured, and killed in these camps, the evidence supports the estimates of hundreds of thousands of victims, including French, Poles, Hungarians, Yugoslavs, Russians, Dutch, Belgians, Austrians, Italians, Czechs, anti-Franco Spanish, and Germans. Most of those exterminated were from the intelligentsia and leadership groups who would not submit to the Nazi ideologies of hate and force.

Newspapers and other news publishers who have portrayed in detail these findings have performed a real service to America and to the democratic cause. For these are the results of the application of the totalitarian philosophy carried to its logical extreme. We are now more able than ever before to see that the chief concern in this theory is the state, and that individuals are but an insignificant fraction of the whole. Men become mere cogs in the machine. Whatever steps are taken in the preservation of the state are justified. The state is all; therefore, when its will is opposed, it is supposed that the source of the opposition has outlived his usefulness. The minority groups receive no protection, for there is room for only one aim and one purpose. Interference must be smashed and shoved out of the way at the slightest provocation. Nazi Germany was the perfect example of the single-will theory.

We are able to see that, from the very nature of things, democracy and totalitarianism cannot exist in the same world. They are builded upon different, mutually opposed theories concerning the nature of man and the purpose of life.

The American Nation was founded by men imbued with the idea that the welfare, the happiness, the freedom (which were inseparable concepts) of the individual should be the universal concern of all. Man is not simply an animal, to be used to the advantage of the specially privileged. He is rather, endowed by nature with a sense of justice and goodness and becomes corrupt only through unhealthy influences. He does not need a self-appointed or divinely designated leader to evaluate his political and social needs. Man is capable of governing himself. He is endowed with rights which cannot be justly taken from him, including the right to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. He has the right to own and acquire property, to think, to aspire, to disagree with his fellows.

Government is not a means of subjecting the individual to a single will, but its purpose is to maintain the rights with which man is endowed, and to give them opportunity for expression. Only to the extent that it meets these tests is a government justified. When it abuses the trust imposed, it is replaced by the people through the orderly processes of the election.

Community growth comes through individual progress, not through administrative decree. Learning is therefore encouraged, the spirit of inquisitiveness and a kind of a healthy skepticism are praised as stimuli to individual thinking. Ignorance and oppression, wherever they exist, should be rooted out, for they are a threat to freedom. The foundation of democracy is thus the inborn goodness of man and the common man becomes the cornerstone of the political state.

Americans who have studied newspaper reports of the findings of this committee realize as perhaps they have never before the responsibility of this country in the period following the war. We recognize that we must deal with a nation whose distorted ideas present a real threat to permanent peace, even though its military strength is gone. We know that the only weapon we have to combat them are our own notions of justice and truth. We have confidence that our victory will be complete.

Many millions of men who have seen and felt the influence of the Nazi creed in the lives of its adherents will return to us soon, and in only a few years will become our leading citizens, making our laws, administering justice in our courts, expressing their opinions in the press and in the ballot, and in other ways making their contribution toward the better life. Let us hope that the reality of the spirit of hate and slavery encountered by these men in Germany today will not be forgotten as they attempt to strengthen democracy. Let us hope that we can thus demonstrate to others the kind of faith in man that makes democracy a living thing. [Applause.]

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard the opening program of an exhibit of German atrocities pictures at the Library of Congress. Among the speakers were Senator Thomas of Utah, Representatives Short of Missouri and Mott of Oregon; Dr. Luther Evans, Librarian of Congress; Raymond P. Brandt, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; and B. M. McKelway, of the Washington Star. The exhibit will be open daily here for 2 weeks, and motion pictures of Nazi crimes will be shown free to the adult public Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday afternoon at the Coolidge Auditorium in the Library of Congress. Later they will be shown at public school buildings. Watch the Star for further details.

This is Washington.

Federal Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from two constituents of mine taking issue with the opposition of the American Medical Association to the health-insurance provisions of the social-security bill which I have introduced in the Senate in conjunction with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], a similar bill having been introduced in the House by Representative DINGELL.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO DR. MORRIS FISHBEIN, CHICAGO, ILL.

ROCHESTER N. Y., *May 26, 1945.*

DEAR DR. FISHBEIN: The writers, both engaged in industrial personnel work, are taking this opportunity to comment on the debate in print, Should Industry Support Federal Health Insurance? published in the May 15, 1945, issue of Modern Industry. After some examination of your arguments, we are convinced that most of them lack the kind of validity which so urgent a subject demands.

1. You stated that out of 37 nations that have developed national systems of medical care, "not one provides a quality of medical service anywhere nearly resembling that

available to the vast majority of the people of the United States." This is undoubtedly true but would also be true if those countries did not have "national systems of medical care." In recent years our research facilities and medical training have surpassed those of the other countries. An attempt therefore to link these two points is illogical and serves only to confuse the issue.

2. You admit that a large minority of the population—12,000,000 Negroes—has inferior medical services. You also admit, unshamedly, that a high percentage of rejections under the Selective Service Act was incurred "because of preventable and correctable defects." These two facts weaken your oft-reiterated assertion that present-day United States medical services are adequate.

3. You infer that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill would turn over to the Government the entire system of medical care in the United States; yet in point of fact all this bill attempts to do is to expand social security to include compulsory Federal health insurance.

4. Your attempt to relate compulsory Federal health insurance with the rise of totalitarianism that developed in Ceneral Europe is a clever artifice to evoke emotionally toned responses rather than clear thinking. The term "totalitarianism" is a bugaboo; totalitarianism as a form of government is repugnant; but its rise, as you well know, is due to complex social and economic phenomena based primarily on insecurity and fear. The most effective antidote for the rise of the totalitarianism within this country is the provision of security, of which protection from disease (with its attendant economic effects) is one of the more important.

5. You state that "Regardless what modificatons Senator WAGNER might make in the proposed measure, the majority of the medical profession would probably oppose any attempt at a Federal compulsory sickness insurance measure." Have you taken a statistically valid sample of medical opinion on this question or is this your personal belief? Granting, for the convenence of forensics, that a majority of the medical profession is opposed to this measure, from the standpoint of the American people, this attitude is not so much an indictment of the measure as a condemnation of the thirteenth century thinking of the castor oil and capsule dispensers.

6. You admit that the present distribution of physicians in the country is inadequate. You also admit that "provision of financial assistance from Federal or State funds, or both," would be helpful in bringing about a more equitable type of distribution of medical service and yet you attack the bill by saying that "No one has shown that the passing of a national compulsory sickness insurance bill would induce physicians to go into areas where they do not now go." There is no attempt made in the bill to induce physicians to go anywhere, any more than the AMA induces physicians to locate where they are needed; but the possibility of earning a decent income would be a powerful motive as you yourself admit indirectly—in accomplishing a better distribution of medical facilities.

7. You make the absurd charge that compulsory Federal health insurance (which you label "control of medicine by the Federal Government" would "depreciate medical education and training, interfere with the personal relation between doctor and patient, and take away from the individual personal responsibility for himself and his family." It is obvious to any clear thinker that Federal health insurance has no relationship to medical education and training; that it does not necessarily interfere with the relationship between doctor and patient, primarily because, under this bill, the patient is free to choose his own doctor; and it does nothing to weaken the individual's responsibility for himself or his family. The same "responsibility" argument that you used was used by the opponents of unemployment insurance.

8. The jewel of your glittering generalizations is that passage of this bill means that the people would be surrendering "control over their lives, in sickness, to a political agency." If you wish to call a doctor a political agency, the statement is true; if not, your statement is full of sound and fury.

9. Your suggestion for the establishment of a national commission to investigate and plan for the future extension of medical care to all of the people is puerile. As you well know, such commissions accomplish nothing, having authority merely to recommend. This technique of establishing a commission is one of the best for fostering delay and for sabotaging effective action.

It is our opinion that Dr. Kingsley Roberts easily bested you in this debate. You have failed to advance one sound intelligent reason why this Federal health-insurance bill should not be passed by Congress. Your reaction to the bill is at a thalamic rather than at a cortical level. We are happy to know that many of your medical brethren do not share your unprogressive views.

Very truly yours,

STANLEY G. DULSKY,
Rochester, N. Y.
HAROLD ROSENTHAL,
Rochester, N. Y.

Navy Island as Proposed Site for United Nations Security Council Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Navy Island Ideal Site," published in the Buffalo Courier-Express. This is the site which is proposed as the capital for the United Nations Security Organization. It is located along the boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, where peace has been an established reality for more than 100 years.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY ISLAND IDEAL SITE

There is no question that Navy Island would be an admirable choice as the site for the headquarters of the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly as proposed by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board. This island lies in the middle of the Niagara River between the United States and Canada, two Nations which have been at peace with each other for more than 130 years. The fact that these two countries could live in tranquility for so long a time would serve as a reminder to the delegates that enduring friendship between nations of good will is always possible and it should prove a stimulus to their efforts to have peace prevail among any nations.

Another reason why the island would be a good choice is that it is located in the interior of a continent from which war has been far removed for the past 80 years. Since the American Civil War, both the United States and Canada have been engaged in international conflicts but the fighting involved did not touch the continent. This atmosphere of peace would serve as an actual background favorable for the preservation of world tranquility just as the century and more of peace between Canada and the United States would serve as an historic background.

It is difficult, in the light of the past, to think of any site for the organization's headquarters which would be as safe or accessible in the event that war did break out in some spot on the earth. It is the aim of the organization to have the place chosen free from the domination of any one nation. To meet this requirement it has been suggested both by American and Canadian groups that arrangements might be made whereby Canada would permit the United States to purchase a half interest in the island, whereupon both nations would transfer its sovereignty to the United Nations.

We could go on to enumerate the advantages which the security organization would enjoy through being located close to Buffalo and Niagara Falls, but that would require an infinite amount of time and space. Besides we suffer from civic modesty. But the Navy Island proposal seems really sound and intelligent.

Traveling Conditions for Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release by the Under Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, which was given out yesterday. It relates to traveling conditions in this country for members of the armed forces.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 5, 1945.

Memorandum for the Press:

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson today was asked the following question at his news conference:

"Why is it that our returning troops have had to make long trips in day coaches, while it is reported that some German prisoners of war have been transported in Pullmans?"

Mr. Patterson replied as follows:

"The part of the story about German prisoners of war being carried in Pullmans is not true. The part of the story about our troops being carried from Boston to San Francisco without sleepers but in day coaches, and I think day coaches of the commuter type, is true.

"The War Department has foreseen that possibility and has called the attention some weeks ago to the railroads and to the Office of Defense Transportation, and has insisted that troops carried on long trips of that character be given suitable accommodations in sleepers or Pullmans. We have been promised relief, but adequate relief has not yet been forthcoming. I am sure that the Office of Defense Transportation and the railroads will give us the necessary cooperation and will make suitable accommodations available. We have been assured that they will.

"You may be sure and certain that the War Department will press for decent and comfortable accommodations for troops in the course of railroad travel across the Continent and in other parts of the United States on long trips. They should have Pullman or sleeper accommodations when they are being carried for extended trips. There is no question about it.

"The situation and all the facts in it were called to the attention of the responsible authorities by the War Department and by the Navy by a letter under the date of June 26 covering this very thing, pointing out that the failure or inability to provide sleeper accommodations had resulted all too frequently in travel across the country by coach on the part of troops. It will require, of course, an adjustment in accommodations now enjoyed by regular travelers, or people who travel on short trips by rail, and the transfer of some of those accommodations over to long trips undertaken by troops. That is where the relief has got to come from."

Mr. Patterson then was asked:

"Is there any explanation of why these soldiers thought they saw prisoners of war in Pullmans?"

His reply was:

"I can't account for that. It is simply not so. No prisoners of war have been carried on Pullmans except, as I understand it, a few sick in a very limited number of cases."

Mr. Patterson was further questioned:

"I think you have a regulation in effect that if the medical authorities recommend it, it is done that way?"

The Under Secretary's reply was:

"That is so. That part of the story is unfounded. You know how rumors travel. I suppose someone said he thought he caught a glimpse of them and the next man said it was so. But the main point of the story; that is, the part relating to accommodations enjoyed by some 500 troops on the train, is true and regrettable and we will take every means in our power to correct it."

Wartime Performance of the Western Pine Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement in regard to the lumber industry:

WINTON LUMBER CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 19, 1945.

Dr. WALTER H. JUDD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: We are getting worried because there is an apparent tendency of top Government officials to criticize the industry because of the scarcity of lumber today, with accusations that the lumber industry has failed to do its job. That isn't the case. The situation today is the direct result of the policies and actions of the Government agencies involved.

To meet these criticisms, Mr. S. V. Fullaway, Jr., secretary-manager of the Western Pine Association, has prepared a statement, a copy of which I am sending to you, which I hope you can find time to read.

We are concerned lest our industry be declared "rare and unusual," the effect of which would be to raise wages, and consequently costs, without in my opinion providing relief from a labor shortage that does exist.

Yours very truly,

R. C. WINTON, *Vice President.*

WARTIME PERFORMANCE OF THE WESTERN PINE INDUSTRY

For the first time during the war period there has, in recent weeks, been frank recognition of the highly essential nature of lumber by top ranking officials in the war agencies at Washington. What has brought this about?

There has been a definite decline in lumber production, the inevitable result of the failure of these agencies to give the lumber industry the help it has so desperately needed in its one-sided struggle against all the obstacles of a wartime economy, against the unnecessary handicaps created by some war agencies, and against unfavorable weather conditions of the past few months. This decline and tardy realization that lumber is not only essential to the war effort, but highly important to reconversion and to solution of postwar employment problems, has brought such recognition.

Although the Lumber and Lumber Products Division of the War Production Board has generally foreseen and attempted to assist the industry with its problems, only of late have top WPB officials made adequate arrangements to give the lumber industry more trucks, tractors, and tires. Such help will not, of course, be reflected in increased production for several months. Further WPB cannot directly do anything to assist the industry with its serious manpower situation which has been grossly neglected by the agencies who are supposed to deal with it. Obviously the WPB can do nothing about the weather.

Criticism of the lumber situation by Members of Congress seems certain. This demands more action and there is thus the possibility that WPB will certify the lumber industry as "rare and unusual" to give the War Labor Board a basis for granting further wage increases in disregard of the "hold the line" policy. To anyone familiar with labor conditions in the West, it is obvious that such action would not solve the production problem. On the contrary it is very probable that, by aggravating absenteeism, which is already a serious deterrent to maximum production, and by adding further to the costs of marginal producers, further loss of production would result. In view of this, it may well be expected that the final defense of the war agencies responsible will be accusations that the lumber industry has failed to do its part. A brief statement of our industry's wartime performance is, therefore, important at this time.

The lumber industry has done an excellent war job despite tremendous handicaps. No better proof can be offered than the oft-repeated statements by responsible Government officials that the war effort, with few very minor exceptions, has never been delayed because of a lack of lumber.

The western-pine industry can most certainly point with pride to its wartime performance. Prior to the year 1940, the annual production had reached 5,000,000,000 feet in only 3 years—1925, 1926, and 1929. Yet for the 5 years, 1940 to 1944, inclusive, the average annual production has been 5,876,000,000 feet. This compares with an average annual production of 4,489,000,000 during the 1920 to 1929 period, and 3,515,000,000 for the years 1930 to 1939.

The actual yearly production record for the past 5 years is as follows: 1940, 5,211,00,000; 1941, 6,151,000,000; 1942, 6,144,000,000; 1943, 5,967,000,000; 1944, 5,915,000,000.

During the first quarter of 1945, production in the Western pine region was off only 2.4 percent from that of the same 1944 period, which was the largest first quarter production in the industry's history. Latest estimates indicate the production for the first 5 months will be about 4½ percent under the same period a year ago. Unseasonable rainfall during the past 2 months, which has broken all records in some districts, has been a major factor in this recent decline.

The major obstacles to production, the cumulative effects of which have resulted in a gradual decline since the peak in 1941, should be discussed. There is ample productive capacity, sufficient timber, and qualified management. However, the production of lumber also requires adequate labor, equipment, supplies, and, in time of war, intelligent, effective Government cooperation.

Manpower problems are a contributing factor. The loss of experienced, able-bodied workers has been large. Between 20 and 30 percent of the industry's normal labor force has gone to the armed forces. Some have left to seek employment in the new war industries. The natural labor drift in times of full employment has had its effect. Absenteeism contributes definitely to the decline in production. Work stoppages resulting from continual "quickie" strikes and from union jurisdictional disputes mean reduced production. Loss of efficiency due to the necessary employment of less experienced, handicapped, and older workers is a definite factor. The fight against weather conditions in the woods is a young man's game.

The average straight time hourly wage rate has been increased more than 50 percent since January 1941, the base period for the Little Steel formula. Actual weekly earnings show even greater increases. Wages in the western lumber industry compare favorably with any of the so-called war industries and our manpower shortage is simply a part of the general labor shortage now affecting all industries in this region.

The War Manpower Commission has been almost wholly ineffective in assisting our industry and selective service, until the past few months, has given it little recognition. The lumber industry is today suffering from the cumulative effects of the lack throughout the war of any positive Government labor plan or policy and from absenteeism and employee indifference which cannot be eliminated as long as the present abnormally high wages prevail and a job is available at any time.

The tremendous war requirements and Government controls of production and distribution of critical materials and products has necessarily operated to greatly restrict the availability of equipment and maintenance supplies used by our industry, for example, trucks, tractors, and heavy-duty tires, now indispensable in modern logging, have been in short supply. Maintenance delays and failure to obtain needed equipment promptly have been factors contributing to reduced production.

The numerous war agencies with their far-flung organizations have with some exceptions, proved largely ineffective. Red tape and bureaucratic methods have only too often worked in reverse. The average sawmill operator, who in spite of present-day high tax levels is accelerating the depletion of his stumpage resource to meet the abnormal war requirements for lumber, is faced month in and month out with every conceivable obstacle and irritation in his effort to maintain a high level of production. For this man it is difficult to retain his enthusiasm when he is constantly harassed by technicalities and threats from OPA, Wage and Hour Division, Wage Stabilization, and other war agencies, by jurisdictional labor disputes, and Government actions which actually discourage production.

That the western pine industry has done a good job is amply attested by the repeated commendations of high Government officials.

By holding production so close to record levels, in spite of having many less men, older equipment and fewer tires, it is right now turning in fully as good a performance as at any time during the war. The fact that mounting needs for reconversion and reemployment may cause some criticism of officials who did not make available the men and equipment needed for increased production, should not justify criticism of the industry, at this late date, for its performance. Those charged with responsibility for control of the industry knew what inevitably would happen to production if they took the industry's men and failed to furnish at least a minimum of repairs and replacements for its equipment. Both the decision and the responsibility were theirs. The western pine industry has discharged its full obligation and will continue to do so.

S. V. FULLAWAY, Jr.,
Secretary-Manager,
Western Pine Association.

JUNE 13, 1945.

FEPC, a Gestapo for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "FEPC, a Gestapo for America," published in the West Hartford (Conn.) Metropolitan News of May 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC—A GESTAPO FOR AMERICA

Legislation now pending in Congress, bill H. R. 2232, better known as the FEPC, is a well-meaning document, with intent commendable, it is however, frought with great danger to the very people who are working so hard for its passage. It seeks to set up in America a Gestapo, the like of which set the flames that started the conflagration that destroyed the German people and millions of innocent victims of Nazi rule.

The purposes of the Fair Employment Practices Act is to see that employers award jobs and opportunity to every one without regard to their race or creed. From our observation, this is already being done in great measure.

House bill 2232 would set up a commission to see that the law was invoked against discrimination toward any individual who wished to make a complaint. It would be the Gestapo of America, and fear would be its strongest weapon, to be picked up and used by any straggler that wished to use it.

The whole scheme smacks of communism and is contrary to our American way. When our forefathers gained their independence back in '76, they established here, a Nation dedicated to the principles that all men were created equal. The Constitution guarantees us the right of free speech and our right to any religion we care to abide by. If we so please we don't have to believe in any religion. The founding fathers, by past experience, knew exactly what they wanted and no one has been able to improve on their working set of rules. If we consider ourselves a free people, and our sons have not died in vain, we should not seek to pass a law taking away our freedoms while our sons still living are away from home. This law seeks to foist a foreign bureaucracy upon the American scene, while our guard is down.

To enumerate the various catch phrases of this bill would require too much time, but a glance at some of the features will give one an idea of its ramifications and dangers.

Under this bill it would be unfair to discharge any individual because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. It stands to reason that if such a person had been hired, without regard to race or creed, there would be little sense in firing him, unless he wasn't performing his job in a satisfactory manner. The rub here is that the disgruntled employee could bring you up on charges by saying you fired him because he went to a different church than you did. The truth could be that you fired the man because he was no good. The charge against the employer amounts to conviction in the eyes of the public and no amount of acquittal on the part of the Commission would be able to erase that blot against your good name and business.

Investigations of complaints could hog-tie any employer and brand him a bigot. The employer would live in fear of each and every employee. Any slacker in a plant could hold this weapon over the head of the employer, no matter how unjust the charge would be.

There are plenty of bigots in this country and there are just as many individuals hiding behind their racial strain willing to call everyone who doesn't agree with them "bigot." This is an entirely new phase in American life. Back in the old days our forefathers pioneered and built up this new Nation out of brawn and faith in God. When things looked blackest during our Revolution, George Washington borrowed money from Haym Salomon. It no doubt never occurred to either of these individuals to inquire of the other's religion during the transaction. The casualty lists are full of names that read like the roster of the Tower of Babel, but no GI in a fox hole inquires the religion or minds the color of his buddy in the next firing pit.

When a concern needs help, they usually look around for someone qualified to do a certain job, the individual is usually hired on that basis, and if he turns out to be a lemon he is replaced. From our observation of this bill, the rules only apply to an employer, which means anyone having in his employ, six or more individuals. The bill obviously discards small stores, etc. Again from our observation, it is in these closely knit smaller units where racial discretion is most apt to be used. Often times, this can be laid to one individual trying to find a place for some member of his family or an immediate relative. If these smaller stores were to be included, which they may well be, any disgruntled employee could start walking up and down in front of the store with a placard telling the neighbors that the owner of the store was a bigot and a heel. Even if the storekeeper was entirely innocent, the damage would be done.

It's a simple matter for any minority group to get together and by slinking, small talk put the onus on any individual who happens to mind his own business even though he may be outspoken on matters upon which all of us obviously can't agree.

One of the especially harmful intentions of this bill, would be its effect on the veterans' preference law. When Congress passed the draft law, they entered into a pact with the fighting men to assure them that they would have preference in getting their old jobs back. Under this bill, at the discretion of a member of the FEPC, any person displaced to make way for the veteran could bring charges against the employer.

No law in the world has the power to make you love your neighbor, you cannot legislate this sort of thing. It would seem to be the better aim if we taught brotherly love in the public schools. Education, not legislation, is in order.

Both New York and New Jersey, during the present year, have passed similar legislation to the bill now pending in Washington. In urging passage of the New York State act, it was readily seen that Governor Dewey sought to feather his political nest. If he did, he at least killed his future political career when he signed the measure.

This is a most dangerous piece of legislation in its present form. It should not be allowed to pass while millions of American youth are engaged against the enemy in the Pacific.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Remedial Legislation," by Mark Sullivan, published in the Washington Post of July 2, 1945, and an article entitled "Says Labor Bill in Senate 'Would Correct Many Evils,'" by Westbrook Pegler, published in the Cleveland Press of June 28, 1945, dealing with the proposed Federal Labor Relations Act.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 2, 1945]

LABOR STRIFE

(By Mark Sullivan)

REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

Last Saturday, June 30, the Cabinet member who had headed the Department of Labor for 12 years and 4 months, Miss Perkins, departed from that office, and was succeeded by another, ex-Judge and ex-Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach. Within a short time preceding, a new head was appointed to the next largest labor agency, the National Labor Relations Board. About the same time, during late June, a new and comprehensive bill to cover all phases of labor relations was introduced in the Senate, with the impressive sponsorship of Senators HATCH, of New Mexico, BURTON, of Ohio, and BALL, of Minnesota.

Except that all deal with labor, these events are quite unrelated. But this very fact of their unplanned simultaneousness makes the sum of them more significant as a symbol of a change that is getting under way.

For more than 12 years labor unions and labor leaders increased in power. The increase came to them through the New Deal. The policy of President Roosevelt and his administration was to give to labor unions and labor leaders not merely economic power but political power, to make them the dominant factor in government. Toward the end, the New Deal administration was in effect hardly different from the administration of a labor party.

That this should come to an end conforms to the pattern of history. Again and again a familiar cycle repeats itself. First there is a conservative regime which resists change. Presently the dammed-up need for change results in defeat of a conservative regime in an election. It is succeeded by a liberal or radical regime. The new regime not only introduces the needed and overdue reforms, but attempts to go to impracticable extremes. By that, it comes to an end, and in turn is succeeded by a new conservative regime.

That is the point we are now at, a point where the longest liberal regime in our history is passing out. If the pattern of his-

tory is repeated, it will be followed by a regime which will be at least relatively conservative.

It does not by any means follow that this conservative regime about to get under way will undo all, or even many, of the labor reforms that were introduced during the 12 years of the New Deal. What has happened historically in these alternations of liberal and conservative is that the conservative regime keeps most of the reforms, rejecting the impracticable ones. The ones it keeps, it makes workable.

That is the purpose of the Hatch-Burton-Ball labor bill. The Senators who sponsored it are liberals, favorable to labor. So are most of the men who, during several patient months, worked out the details of the measure. The purpose is to bring out of the existing welter of labor laws and court decisions and agencies, many overlapping or conflicting, a workable system of labor relations.

The purpose is imperative for, as Senator BALL said, business and industry cannot operate under the existing chaos of labor relations. Our economic system would break down and become paralyzed.

It does not at all follow that the present bill is a perfect formula, nor that it will be passed as it stands. There will be abundant discussion, including weeks of hearings, in which changes will be made. The views of labor leaders will be heard and in many cases followed. The initial reaction of most labor leaders, upon the first emergence of the bill, was one of violent denunciation. That, however, coming soon after the bill was introduced, does not necessarily mean much. There is some opposition, to some details of the measure, by really thoughtful students within the labor field and outside it. Such differences will be reconciled before the bill is in final form.

The attitude of Congress is strongly favorable, not necessarily to this bill as it stands, but to the broad purpose. At any time during some 6 years past a majority in Congress has been ready to pass remedial labor legislation, and only has been deterred by the steady pressure of President Roosevelt against any legislation whatever that was not approved by labor leaders.

[From the Cleveland Press of June 28, 1945]

FAIR ENOUGH—

SAYS LABOR BILL IN SENATE "WOULD CORRECT MANY EVILS"

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK.—About 7 years ago, I deliberately picked a fight with the union movement and the Roosevelt political group which had imposed on American labor and the whole community the hideous corruption which was the inevitable and plainly foreseen product of the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

Now for the first time I am encouraged to believe Congress will summon the manhood to smash the indecent alliance which has made the National Government the partner of the Communist traitors, union racketeers, reckless political opportunists, common underworld gangsters, and bumbling old ignoramuses who practice fascism even while they denounce it.

The Hatch-Burton-Ball bill is the first reform proposed in the Senate, which has a shameful record of cowardice in dealing with an evil that has become more serious than prohibition ever was. In the past, two good bills passed the House of Representatives but were put to sleep in committees of the Senate. Now, however, after a long, quiet study, Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL have presented a program which would correct many evils.

When this fight began, most of us, in our ignorance, believed the union movement truly represented labor. By a negative process, I became a member of the Newspaper Guild without the formality of applying for membership. Through this brief association and by careful reading of the Guild Reporter, the official publication, I perceived that union methods of dealing with quite decent newspapermen who would not join were harsh, unfair, and, to my mind, dishonest. I saw Communists sidling into positions of control and, in the Guild Reporter, I detected a bias which seemed to me to misinform the rank-and-file readers. I heard a high officer of the Guild declare that if a strike were called against his paper, he, too, would strike in violation of a personal service contract.

The denunciation of such scoundrels as Browne and Bioff, Scalise, Fay, Bove and a convicted burgler in Mr. Lewis' executive board of the mine workers, and a renegade policeman who had turned bootlegger, in the role of treasurer of the iron workers, were incidental developments.

More important to me was the discovery the Labor Relations Board was, in fact, organizing unions, recruiting membership, and actually encouraging strikes where strikes would cause civil commotion in accordance with the Communist program for revolution.

Throughout this time I have insisted the only proper role of the Government in labor relations should be that of umpire and moderator. It should try to head off disputes and prevent strikes, so that industry could proceed productively and men and women could remain at work.

The new act, presented by HATCH, BURTON, and BALL, belatedly admits that, under the Wagner Act, the professional unioneers themselves engaged in unfair practices at the expense of the workers. In the original debates on the act, Senator WAGNER fought down efforts by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, to forbid coercion of the workers by the union agents. Later the Labor Relations Board itself joined the union officials in this coercion.

The new bill would forbid unions, as well as employers, to interfere with or coerce workers. It would forbid unions, as well as employers, to spy on individual workers as unions often do. It would forbid employers to pay bribes or tribute to the familar AFL type of racketeer. It would compel unions, by force of law, to keep their contracts as employers always must. And it would rectify a number of utterly immoral decisions of the Roosevelt Supreme Court by forbidding unions to boycott or blacklist an employer in retaliation for any exercise of his own legal rights.

Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article on the question of Presidential succession, written by Arthur Krock, and appearing in the New York Times of July 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE SUCCESSION BILL FACES FIGHT IN SENATE—WHOLE SUBJECT MAY BE PIGEONHOLED IF BYRNES IS MADE STATE SECRETARY, BUT THE ISSUE IS MUCH ALIVE—EXACT COURT RULING LACKING

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 30.—With pardonable pride in itself and in its Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, the House has passed legislation to provide a new line of succession to the Presidency as recommended by President Truman. In moving thus speedily, the House vaulted the objections voted by 9 of 19 members of its Judiciary Committee (who felt that more study is required); and, in his favorable report on the bill, Chairman HATTON W. SUMNERS of the committee skipped lightly over the constitutional doubts and practical criticisms of the President's formula.

The procedure will be different in the Senate, however, where the constitutional doubt will be investigated and the practical objections will be reviewed; and the Senate's equally pardonable pride in itself will unite to retard the pace of eventual action and perhaps bring it to a complete halt for some months. After the new Secretary of State has qualified—who will then be first in the succession line, since there is no Vice President—it may be that the whole project will end in a pigeonhole, particularly if this officer is as satisfactory to Congress as a whole as James F. Byrnes would be.

NONLEGALISTIC SUMMARY

But even as Mr. SUMNERS and many fellow Representatives trod confidently along what many good constitutional lawyers believe to be a dark and pitfall-ridden path, these lawyers and others were in debates of their own over the question of Presidential succession. This correspondent listened to several such discussions—among men who have been successful advocates before the Supreme Court on issues arising out of the text of the national charter—and this is a nonlegalistic summary of what was said:

1. Th. Sumners bill is loosely drawn in several respects. One of the most important is the omission of the word "disability" in its first paragraph. The effect of this is at least to leave unclear when and how "disability" of a President or of an Acting President shall be certified.

2. The Supreme Court has never ruled on the exact definition of an "officer of the United States," to which group the Constitution restricts eligibiliy for succession in the lack of a President and a Vice President. It is true that the statute of 1792 accepted the Speaker and the Senate President pro tempore as "officers," but it was never tested, and the contrary implication in several decisions was one reason why Congress omitted these officials from the line of succession in the present law, passed in 1886.

ISSUE OF TECHNICALITY

This point is somewhat technical, and, if the law sought by the President should be passed and a Speaker come to act as President, any test of the statute would probably bring from the Supreme Court a "political" and pragmatic decision, as in the gold case, validating the title of the Acting President. Yet there is a doubt; there might be dissents on the court; and it would be wiser not to leave this cloud on the legality of succession and invite what would be a most disturbing national controversy.

3. If the Truman-Sumners bill should in substance become law, and the next House should elect a Republican Speaker, the Democrats would instantly set up a clamor for revision and repeal. This would bring about a bitter political fight and throw the executive administration into disorder. Moreover, it surely could happen.

4. It could also happen that a Speaker might be notoriously unfit for the office of President, which is not now the case (though it is unlikely that Mr. RAYBURN whom Democratic conventions have rejected for Vice President, could have been nominated for President by normal convention process). Or the future Speaker might be a woman, which was not contemplated in the Constitution; it was written when women could not vote.

5. For these and other reasons, it would be advisable that Congress merely provide by

law that, in the event of vacancies in the Presidency and the Vice Presidency at the same time, Congress in joint session shall choose an Acting President to serve until a special, or the next general, election, making provision for this in its bill. Each State would cast one vote, this being determined by a majority of its delegation, including the two Senators (whose vote would be equal in this instance to that of a Representative).

6. But if Congress wishes to follow the formula recommended by Mr. Truman, it should submit this as an amendment to the Constitution, so there could never be a legal cloud over succession, as there would be under a statute. An amendment could also provide, if desired, what a statute could not; that when a Vice President becomes President, leaving a vacancy in his own office, the immediate choice be made of a new Vice President who would then be first in the line of succession. And if, during the same term, the Presidency should again be vacant, another new Vice President should be chosen in the same way—at a joint session of Congress or however else the amendment might prescribe.

LAWYERS DIFFER OVER LAW

The lawyers who made the points listed above differed over the law, but very little over the practical aspects of the issue. While some placed great emphasis on the definition of an "officer of the United States" and others held it fairly negligible, all agreed that the Senate's action in the impeachment of Senator Blount, of Tennessee, in 1797 offered ample ground for any court to hold that Members of Congress are not "officers," if the court were so disposed, and that, therefore, a Speaker and a President pro tempore of the Senate, being Members of those branches, also were not.

In this connection it should be stated by way of correction that it was the Senate, sitting as a court (of impeachment), and not the Supreme Court, which made the ruling in the Blount case. He pleaded that he could not be impeached by the House—and therefore could not be tried on this basis by the Senate—because he was not an "officer." The Senate court agreed that for this reason it lacked jurisdiction.

PROBLEM TOUCHED PREVIOUSLY

The Supreme Court has touched the problem in several decisions, and in the 1916 litigation affecting David Lamar, accused of impersonating an "officer" (a Member of Congress), it finally held that a Member was a "legislative officer." But the Chief Justice pointed out that a word or phrase in a statute had meaning which was not necessarily that of the Constitution, and thus the basic point has not been resolved by any decision of the High Court.

Meanwhile the public is growing interested, and, though the identity of the next Secretary of State may defer action in Congress, some improvement of the present unsatisfactory arrangement and the equally unsatisfactory proposal to change it may come during Mr. Truman's term.

Performance of Negro Soldiers at the Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release by the Under Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, issued July 5, 1945, in regard to the conduct and performance of Negro troops at the front.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 5, 1945.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson today was asked the following question at his news conference:

"Daily newspaper stories about Senate debate on FEPC quote a Senator as having stated, on the Senate floor, that 'high ranking generals' had told him on a recent overseas trip that 'Negro troops would neither work nor fight,' and that their conduct and performance generally have been disgraceful.

"Are these statements—attributed to unnamed generals—representative of the Army's views of the performance of Negro troops?"

Mr. Patterson replied as follows:

"No. If any high-ranking general has made such a statement, I have no knowledge of it. You have already heard views of our leading commanders—General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, General Eaker, and others—which do not support any such conclusion.

"The War Department is proud of its troops, and that includes Negroes as well as all other groups.

"There have been a number of press releases in the last few months commending the behavior of a number of units made up of Negro troops. General Eisenhower spoke of the good performance of the volunteer platoons that were used in the European theater. The Inspector General commented favorably, went out of his way to comment favorably, on the performance of the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment in the Marianas, and there have been a number of similar commendations."

Memo for a Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Memo for a Speech" by Malvina Lindsay, published in the Washington Post of July 3, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRIOTIC INVENTORY

(By Malvina Lindsay)

MEMO FOR A SPEECH

"Ladies and gentlemen," began the Fourth of July orator, "if any of you are here to swell your chests over the patriotic deeds of your forefathers, or the military triumphs of your young men, you are at the wrong gathering. I am going to speak only of the job ahead—your job and mine.

"We are being told on every hand that the United Nations Charter, which is the world's chief hope for peace, now lies in our laps—that it will be up to us, the people, to make it work. What then are we going to do?

"First, let us appraise our job and ourselves. We must recognize that we have a weak Charter—the fact that the Senate is expected to ratify it with a minimum of sound and fury is proof enough of this. Our first job then is to see that it does not fall apart, that gulfs do not widen among the Five Powers that are its chief support. The Charter we have is a confederation, and in the past most political confederations have failed, while Federal unions, such as we have in the United States, have more often succeeded. But the Charter we have is the best we could get. We must keep it alive in the hope it may grow into something lustier."

NATIONAL WEAKNESS

"Now I am going to say some things you may not like to hear, especially on the Fourth of July. We must guard this Charter against our national weaknesses. Chief of these is that we are a people in a hurry. We want to do big things, and we want to do them quickly and easily, even shoddily, so we can get them out of the way and get on to something else. Will we have the patience to build slowly and perseveringly a foundation for world peace?

"Also, there is our vanity. We want to see permanent peace assured in our time, and we want the personal glory for assuring it. But our generation may have to be content only with the credit for breaking the ground and putting in the first few rocks of the structure. To guard against disappointment, we must realize this clearly.

"We must also ask ourselves, 'Will we quit too easily?' Our record on the League of Nations might so indicate. During the San Francisco Conference we repeatedly saw crisis and break-down in every difference of opinion. If we had had such an attitude toward our battles, we would have lost the war long ago. When obstacles arise in the operation of this new charter are we going to retreat again into disillusionment and futility?"

HANDOUTS NOT ENOUGH

"We know full well that cultivating good will toward other peoples is the most important thing we can do to make the Charter work. But good will quickly withers if it is not rooted in understanding. Are we willing to make the effort to understand the problems of other nations? In the past we have been mentally lazy and provincial in our attitudes toward other people. We have been good-hearted—yes. We have a great national tradition of generosity—in the Boxer indemnities, the Near East relief, in aiding famine sufferers in India and China. Now we expect to live up to this tradition by helping feed liberated Europe. We enjoy being Lady Bountiful to others; we frequently boast of our role as Santa Claus. But we must wage up to the fact that nations, like individuals, are no longer content with charity. They want justice and opportunity.

"Another way we can help make this Charter work is to improve our manners toward other peoples. A great era of travel will follow this war and Americans will do most of that traveling. Will we go abroad as swaggering sightseers or, better still, sympathetic students of other cultures? But we do not need to go abroad to practice courtesy in speech to and about the peoples of the world. Will we be able at home to curb our impulses to break into ignorant and tactless remarks that hurt international relations? Will we be able to show that democratic speech is also responsible speech?

"As I conclude, I sense the inevitable question waiting to be asked: 'What about the others—England, Russia—shouldn't they do their part of the trying?' My reply is that this question is juvenile, that now as presumable adult citizens, of a nation that has become adult in years, experience, and power, we must do our job regardless of what others may do—though there is no reason to believe the people of the 49 nations with whom we are allied and whose need of peace is even greater than our own, will not do theirs."

Tarawa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will no doubt recall that in April of this year I spoke briefly on the floor of the House about the island of Tarawa and the possibility of its future acquisition by the United States as a memorial to the United States marines who captured it from the Japanese at a tremendous cost in American lives. Since that time I have addressed communications to our own Department of State and to the British Embassy in order to ascertain what might be done through negotiation to acquire Tarawa and to bring it under the American flag.

My letter to Secretary Stettinius was answered by Acting Secretary Grew while the Secretary was attending the UNCIO in San Francisco. I am sure that the membership of the House will be interested in Mr. Grew's reply as well as the communication from the British Embassy:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 9, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Acknowledgement is made of your letter of June 1, 1945, on the subject of the island of Tarawa.

No negotiations have been undertaken with the British Government for the purpose of obtaining this island for the United States.

The military efforts of the United Nations at war with Japan are being pooled in the common war against the enemy. In his speech of August 12, 1944, President Roosevelt said, "We have no desire to ask for any possessions of the United Nations. But the United Nations who are working so well with us in the winning of the war will, I am confident, be glad to join us in protection against aggression and in machinery to prevent aggression. With them and with their help I am sure that we can agree completely so that Central and South America will be as safe against attack—attack from the South Pacific—as North America is going to be very soon from the north Pacific as well."

The Department is equally confident that it will prove possible with the cooperation of the British and other governments concerned to achieve the purposes which the President then had in mind. I may also add that I am sure our British allies share with us the same feelings with regard to the beaches of Tarawa that we would, without doubt, share with them with regard to American beaches on which British blood had been shed in defense of our common cause.

Your interest in the Pacific area and your courtesy in making available your views are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In the absence of Lord Halifax I am writing to thank you for your letter of June 12 about Tarawa.

May I say how glad I am to have this opportunity of expressing once again on behalf of my countrymen our profound admiration for the magnificent feat of arms which the United States forces performed at Tarawa and our deep sympathy for the losses they suffered. The name of Tarawa will remain in the memory of the British as of the United States people as a symbol of the gallantry, devotion, and sacrifice which the comrades in arms of the Allied Nations have displayed on so many battlefields in so many parts of the world in the cause of liberty.

Whilst I am not in a position to answer your inquiry about the acquisition of Tarawa by the United States Government, I am forwarding a copy of your letter and of your speech in Congress to the Foreign Office.

Believe me, my dear Mr. Congressman, I am

Yours sincerely,

JOHN BALFOUR.

It is gratifying to me to know that the subject has been referred to the British Foreign Office by Mr. Balfour, and it will be interesting to know the attitude of this office when ample consideration has been given to the entire subject. When further information is received I shall be pleased to submit it to the membership of the House.

One Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Wyoming Federation of Women's Clubs recently conducted a poetry contest which was won by Mrs. Mae Urbanek, of Lusk, Wyo. Her verses entitled "One Flag" are so appropriate now that the thoughts of all are turned toward permanent peace that I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE FLAG

Some day, waving spotless in the sky,
High above all flags shall fly
A flag of peace!
Men will be free to live and plan;
The earth will be a home for man
And not for races locked in endless war.
Grain will grow in soil once soaked in gore,
The bombed holes, the twisted tanks
Forever buried under fruitful banks
Of flowers. There will be left the graves,
Monuments to men who died as slaves
Of war, pitted in fruitless fight
Again other men, all groping in the night.

As long as one strong nation stands,
And will not dip its flag or still its bands
In tribute to a greater whole—
There will be war! The human soul
Must rise above all race and creed,
Must recognize the desperate need
For all the nations of the earth
To seek salvation and rebirth
In one great whole! To raise o'er Arctic sky
And tropic sea, a flag that every eye
In every land will thrill to see—
A symbol of a world set free
From war! A flag of peace!

MAE URBANEK,
Member of the Lusk Woman's Club,
Lusk, Wyo.

Staff Report of the Civil Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, because many Members have asked me when, if ever, the report of Colonel McCormack and his staff of investigators made to our Civil Service Committee will be reported to the Members of Congress, I take a minute's time to give you what information I can.

At a meeting of the committee yesterday, a subcommittee of three was appointed, consisting of the chairman, Congressman RAMSPECK, Congressman RANDOLPH, representing the majority of the committee and Congressman REES representing the minority.

These gentlemen are to go over the report and see if they can agree upon the language, charts and figures which will be reported to the full committee for its approval or disapproval.

It is most unfortunate that this report could not have been given to the Congress weeks ago. It should have been brought to the Members before the adjournment rather than in their absence.

We, who insisted on an earlier report, are confident that it would have a salutary effect in arousing the Congress to a determination to continue the investigation into every phase of government here in Washington and into every department in an effort to bring about greater efficiency and in the hope of really deflating the all-consuming bureaucracy here and bringing it under control so that it might be welded into an efficient business organization. To my mind this is one of the most important problems facing the Congress on the domestic front today.

Big Government, with the rapid extension of bureaucracy which has been builded up over the past number of years, continues to thwart the efforts of Congress and to bypass the laws made by the representatives of the people. Unless this current practice and centralized government is stopped the very liberties of the people, free enterprise and representative government, are in serious danger.

Laurels Where They Belong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have already brought to the attention of the House the fact that Montana was the first State in the Union to reach its quota in the Seventh War

Loan drive, and I have gone into some detail to show this House that during all 7 drives, we were either at the top or very close to it. There are many things I could say about the contributions to the war made by my State, but at this time I want to call to your attention an editorial from the Daily Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., dated June 30, 1945, and entitled "Laurels Where They Belong." This fine editorial gives full credit to the leaders of the drive in Missoula County, and I want to join with the Missoulian in seconding what it has had to say.

All of these people mentioned in this editorial are personal friends of mine and are folks whom I have known over a number of years and in whom we can always have the fullest confidence. They and thousands of others, unnamed, who worked to make this drive a success and who contributed their funds and energy to reach the assigned quota, are entitled to the thanks of all of us. It is indeed a real privilege for me to commend to the House of Representatives the outstanding, unselfish, and generous contribution they all have made in behalf of our country.

The editorial follows:

LAURELS WHERE THEY BELONG

The bond drive that is ending, the Mighty Seventh war loan, has broken all records. Total sales of Federal securities to American citizens have reached the amazing total of almost twenty-two billion dollars. Put this sum against the goal of the campaign, $14,000,000,000, and you get an adequate idea of the patriotism, the confidence, and the financial strength of the American people.

And that total talks to you, too, of the energy and intelligence and ability of those behind the great drive that is ending so triumphantly. And it speaks of organization, also, of the unselfish thousands who worked so hard to make the campaign successful. In eager, patriotic rivalry these thousands the country over strove to excel each other, pitted State against State and county against county and town against town. The results show what these people have done, from the head of the Treasury to the humblest canvasser in the smallest precinct of all America. Patriotic devotion drove this unpaid, unselfish, eager army to new records.

Montana, western Montana, Missoula County, and Missoula city all had more than their share in the success of the Mighty Seventh. We think it is fitting to name the leadership that made possible the local success. The community should bestow bay leaves upon each and every one of them. These people, most of them experienced in other drives, presented an organization that did not know how to fail, that was efficient from the first day of the campaign to its end, that never faltered. The organization was strong from top to bottom. We are sorry that we can name only the leaders, but we agree with the chairman of the drive in this county that "the hundreds of men and women who made up the teams of conscientious solicitors" deserve much credit. But, of course, the drive and direction came from the top and all of us must feel grateful to E. K. Taylor, county drive chairman, and to Theodore Jacobs, district war finance chairman, and to Oakley Coffee, county war finance chairman. (The latter two hold permanent positions in war finance matters.)

Other leaders to whom Chairman Taylor feels under great obligations are Lyle Wright, Conrad Brickson, Mrs. R. C. Shaver, Mrs. Francis Peterson, C. B. Worthen, John Linn, who was publicity chairman and did a fine job; L. A. Campbell, James A. Barber, Frank Larson, Scotty Myles, Glen Smith, W. E. Maddock, Carroll Nelson, R. J. Fremou, James Spittler, Paul Gillespie, C. S. Porter, E. E. Bennett, O. B. Parsons, Millard Peterson, Mrs. A. M. Weyand, Mrs. H. A. Schuder, and Robert Goocher.

And, if Mr. Taylor feels himself in debt to these deputy leaders, how should the rest of us feel?

Special Navy Food Committee Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, almost 3 years ago, Secretary of Navy Knox appointed a special food committee to make a complete detailed study of food administration in the United States Navy.

After Pearl Harbor, the personnel of our Navy was daily increasing at such a rapid rate, that the efficient feeding of several million sailors became one of the major problems of the war.

The Naval Food Committee, composed of seven outstanding food experts of America, upon accepting their patriotic assignment, traveled throughout the country, inspecting the mess halls and galleys on shore stations and ships. This committee was given free access, without reservation, to inspect all naval premises where food was prepared or stored, as well as to records pertaining to purchase, storage, issuing, wastage, and preparation of food. The time of the visits of this committee to shore stations and ships was entirely unannounced and made known to the personnel of the respective stations, only a few moments before the committee's arrival.

When this committee first began its work, the naval mess hall organizations were in the process of large-scale expansion, and its advice and counsel were willingly received after every inspection.

The committee paid special attention to the efficiency of (a) commissary personnel; (b) quality of food purchased; (c) storage, dry and refrigerated; (d) excessive stocks; (e) distribution of food supplies from procurement to local areas; (f) menus; (g) nutritional content of food; (h) type of service; (i) quantity served; (j) galleys; (k) sanitation and cleanliness; (l) preparation and palatability; (m) garbage disposal; (n) waste; (o) cost, per diem; (p) naval hospitals, special attention as to whether food was served hot to the patients in rooms and wards.

Immediately after inspection, the committee would make a verbal, confidential report with recommendations to the commandant of the station and to the chief mess hall officer. Within a few months after the committee's first inspection of the various naval establishments, a recheck was made in an effort to determine whether or not its various recommendations made previously had been carried out. These rechecks revealed that the recommendations had not only been carried out, but the efficiency of organization, service, palatability, wastage, and so forth, reflected such a remarkable improvement that Secretary Forrestal asked the committee to become a permanent part of the naval food organization.

The magnitude and importance of the Navy's food operation can best be appreciated by comparing the total cost of maintaining the Navy in the years 1935 and 1940 with the total cost of feeding the Navy in 1945. In 1935 the appropriation for maintenance of the Navy was $251,039,465. In 1940 the appropriation for maintenance was $515,444,439. The cost of feeding the Navy for 1945 is $669,802,000.

It might be well to call the attention of Congress to a few of the numerous recommendations this committee has made at the various naval food centers which have been followed and installed:

First. Oldest processed storage goods should be issued first even though they may be received last.

Second. All warehouse stocks be plainly marked on the outer case with the date they were packed or produced.

Third. Menus should be reviewed frequently to determine the variety, nutritional value, and appetite appeal.

Fourth. Better control of steam tables with aid of thermostat controls in order to assure hot food on plates.

Fifth. More practical galley equipment where facilities are overtaxed.

Sixth. More attention to the temperatures to which dishes and trays are subjected after the first washing.

Seventh. Reduce wherever possible lags between preparation and service.

Eighth. Drill cooks in school on techniques for improving palatability.

Ninth. Employ master menu scheme, with carefully planned and well-prepared recipes, and see that they are observed.

Tenth. Provide cooks with recipes (removable pages) which they must post in front of them for use in preparing food for each meal.

Eleventh. The time devoted to the training of cooks was too short. It did not allow for the development of sufficient skill and technique.

Twelfth. Organize staff of traveling supervising chefs for the purpose of checking, instructing, and improving the cooks' work.

Thirteenth. That groups of cooks and bakers be organized along the same lines and for the same purposes;

Fourteenth. Civilian manpower shortage on many fronts was evident for a variety of reasons;

Fifteenth. A special study of hospitals in order to be sure that there will be adequate equipment to handle not only current but future needs.

The major recommendation made by this committee after its recent inspection trip to the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Naval Districts on the Pacific coast, was recommending to the Secretary of the Navy, the appointment of a high-ranking administrative officer at Washington with an appropriate staff and experience, with authority to direct, supervise, and coordinate the entire

messing operations. Duties of this office should include responsibility for: First, personnel—quality and quantity; second, training of all in messing operations; third, recipes; fourth, menus—nutritional content and quantity; fifth, service of food; sixth, palatability of food; seventh, costs; eighth, galleys—size and equipment, sanitation, and cleanliness; ninth, central bakeries, and butcher shops; tenth, mess warehousing, both refrigerated and dry; eleventh, conservation measures; twelfth, establishing procedure for interchange of ideas, leading to the detection of best operating functions, the dissemination of knowledge of better methods, greater standardization, and so forth.

On the latest inspection trip, Chairman CARL VINSON of the House Naval Affairs Committee, at the request of Secretary Forrestal, appointed two members of the Naval Affairs Committee: The Honorable GEORGE J. BATES of Massachusetts, and myself, to take part in the inspection as representatives of the Naval Affairs Committee. This trip extended over a period of 2 weeks, during which time almost 100 galleys and mess halls at naval and marine stations, ships, and hospitals from San Diego to Seattle to Great Lakes were visited. The total naval personnel at the above-mentioned stations represents approximately 84 percent of the Navy's manpower within that area.

For me, working with this committee on its recent trip to the Pacific coast, was an education in the art of building an efficient organization for dispensing food to masses of service personnel. I also learned that the complex and intricate task of feeding of millions of fighting men has been one of this war's major problems.

Congressman BATES and I also learned that rising at 5:30 every morning and having breakfast with the sailors in the 6 o'clock line at the mess hall is an ideal beginning for a hard day's work. After the evening chow, the members of the committee would meet for a collective report on the day's inspections. After observing the special interest taken by the various naval mess hall personnel and their cooperation with the suggestions of this committee, I could understand why the 4,000,000 Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard personnel is the best fed group in the world.

Someone has well said that the planning and artistry involved in sending a potato from the State of Maine to be served, palatably, on the tray of a soldier or sailor in the South Pacific, constitutes one of our main lines of defense.

Other branches of the service have profited and incorporated a number of the practical recommendations made by this naval committee on food organization since its inception.

The members of this special Navy Food Committee, who are so patriotically and generously devoting their time and experience toward the cause of better food for the servicemen in World War II are the following: Clarence Francis (chairman), chairman, General Foods Corp., New York, chairman of the Food Industry War Committee; Andrew J. Crotty, president, Crotty Bros. & Co., Boston, Mass.; Sidney Hoedemaker, president, Pig'n Whistle Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.; F. O. Sherill, president, S. & W. Cafeterias, Charlotte, N. C.; George R. LeSauvage, Schraffts, New York, president, National Restaurant Association; Vernon Stouffer, president, Stouffer Corp., Cleveland, Ohio; Edwin B. Dooley, secretary of committee, director of public information, General Foods Corp.

Leaning Over Backward in Zion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Grew as Acting Secretary of State reputedly reassured pro-Soviet Congressmen COFFEE, DE LACY, BAILEY, AND PATTERSON that "this country is leaning over backward in order to avoid offending Russia," his hearers did not ask him what effect such a policy would have in relation to Jewry.

The crimes for which we have arraigned the German leadership are crimes on minorities within its power. Time after time the American Government and the American free press protested in the strongest terms against pogroms committed by Imperial Russian police upon the helpless minority of Jews in Russia. For well over a century it has been the practice of the United States to protest vigorously the mistreatment of any minority by any nation whether such minorities could be considered domestic or foreign affairs. This policy of the United States has been pursued—at some risk—in defense of a principle. That principle must be considered as abandoned under Mr. Grew's formula of "leaning over backward."

The United States has refrained from protesting against Russian communistic incursions into the Governments of Austria, of Hungary, of Yugoslavia, of Poland, of conquered Germany, of Czechoslovakia. By leaning backward we have relinquished our former claim to protest mistreatment of minorities in those countries. From the historic point of view we have also relinquished our more traditional freedom to rise in defense of the Jews who have been a mistreated minority in many countries and who have no country they can call their own.

Our Government and our press never feared to protest mistreatment of the Jews by czarist Russia and there should logically be even less reason to avoid protesting mistreatment of the Jews by Soviet Russia. The source of anti-Semitism in czarist Russia, as in Germany, was totalitarianism. The source of anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia is totalitarianism. Totalitarianism is synonymous with intolerance, and intolerance destroys minorities.

That such destruction is the deliberate policy of the Communist Party now governing Russia was proclaimed as early as 1933 by Hans Kohn, in his book Nationalism in the Soviet Union:

> The policy aims at creating a Communist Jewish people within the Soviet Union just as it aims at creating a Communist German people, but with no cultural association with that which, in the course of centuries of development, has become German or Jewish culture. * * * The cultural nationality policy of the Commmunist Party signifies * * * "death to the national culture. * * * Amid all the autonomy and independence given to the national republics and territories, there remains only and always the unity of the Communist Party as a supernational organization.

This same tendency is pointed out by a writer from Palestine in a letter published in the New York Jewish Forward on June 26, 1945. This writer, Mr. B. Ostrowski, quotes as saying:

> I served for 8 months as interpreter, living under the same roof with Russian, French, and Russian Jewish prisoners-of-war in Germany. About 15,000 Russian prisoners passed through our camp, people of some 24 of the various nationalities in Russia, of various ages and professions. From them we heard a great deal about the situation of the Jews and we saw some of the remnants of the Jewish communities from those countries.
>
> In our camp the Jews were segregated by the Nazis from all other prisoners. Only 13 Jews managed to remain among 12,000 Christian prisoners after medical examination. We always talked to the Jews to find cut how much Jewishness they had left. Some knew nothing about Jewish religion or history. Others pronounced the name of Palestine with a special, wistful warmth.
>
> In a group of 400 Russian officers who traveled with us from Marseilles to Toronto, after our release, there was a 42-year-old Jewish officer. He said that he found out he was a Jew only as a result of the war. He found it out when he was informed that his wife and son had been murdered at Dniepropetrovsk—not by the Nazis—but by people to whom he had been a neighbor on the same street for many years. * * * This same Russian officer, who now wants only to go to Palestine, said that even before the war there had been an increase of anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia, although the Government was trying to prevent it from spreading. * * * In the prison camps anti-Semitism among the Russian and Ukrainian prisoners was openly expressed. * * *
>
> Many Russian-Jewish prisoners asked us about the life of the working classes in England, Palestine, and the United States. They were astonished at the facts we gave them, as they had been told in Russia that the workers in all those countries are virtually slaves. One scholar among them admitted that one of the basic mistakes of the Soviet Government is in keeping its population isolated from and in complete ignorance of, the outside world.
>
> When we asked these Jews where they wanted to go, the answer from those with the slightest memory of Jewish or Zionist upbringing was always: "To Palestine"; from the others: "Anywhere—cutside."

The reasons for this desire of Jews to leave the Soviet Union are not mysterious. Many of them are described in a book, published in October 1944, the Jewish Problem in Soviet Russia, by Gregory Aronson, which was reviewed by David Shub in the Jewish newspaper Forward.

Before the present war there were 3,000,000 Jews in the Soviet Union, and this number was increased by refugees to 5,000,000 by the time Hitler attacked

his former ally. According to Mr. Aronson, these 5,000,000 Jews—more than half the whole surviving Jewish community—were completely isolated from all other Jews in the world to a greater degree than at any time since the Egyptian and Babylonian captivities of Biblical days.

The changes brought about by the Bolshevik Revolution in the social and economic structure of Russian Jewry were profound and devastating. In 1937, of the 3,000,000 Jews then in the Soviet Union, one-half million were workers and another half million government employees. Adding to these the Jewish agricultural laborers and artisans, about 80 percent belonged to the laboring class. Communism had transformed a population consisting mostly of merchants and tradesmen into an overwhelmingly proletarian majority.

By 1939, 71 percent of Jews in the Soviet Union worked in factories, 20 percent more were artisans, and less than 6 percents were members of collectives. In addition, the Jewish community had paid a high price for this transformation; approximately 50 percent of Jews who, before the revolution had engaged in trade or in professions had been physically exterminated. Partially, this extermination was direct and violent; partially, it was by the means made familiar to the whole world in German slave camps—the control of wages and of food and the forcing of labor to a point which prevented those marked for liquidation from obtaining enough fuel for their bodies.

Mr. Aronson cites very careful figures in support of this statement.

Likewise the cost of survival included the abandonment by Jews of their moral principles, their religious beliefs, and practices. It was forbidden to teach the tenets of Judaism to Jewish youth. In the first years of the revolution the attempt to restratify the Jewish masses struck at the very roots of Jewish life. Jewish Communists—themselves necessarily atheists—believed that the Jewish people, consisting primarily of middle-class and independent artisans, were doomed to extinction "according to the iron laws of historical revolution" enunciated by Karl Marx. By the end of the civil wars considerable progress had been made toward proving the truth of Herr Marx's prediction. Through the Communist policy of sequestration and confiscation the Jewish communities in so-called Jewish towns and villages had been reduced to complete ruin. Mr. Aronson computes the actual loss of Jewish lives through official violence during this period at a round figure of not less than one million.

Mr. Aronson also points out the fallacies in the much-advertised experiments made by the Soviet Government to colonize Jews in various regions of the Soviet Union. Before the First World War there were about 50,000 Jewish farmers in southern Russia. In 1926 Jewish Communists announced a plan to colonize 100,000 Jewish town families on farms. To aid in this, help was sought and obtained from Jews in the United States.

Between 1924 and 1929 the Soviet Government spent 10,500,000 rubles on this project. During the same period, and for the same purpose the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and other agencies from outside Russia invested some 15,785,630 rubles. Mr. Aronson cites the result of this expenditure: The number of Jewish families living on the land decreased from 226,000 in 1927 to 194,000 in 1935. Those are families averaging perhaps five members each—a decrease of a quarter million individuals. At the beginning of 1939 a very great further decrease had occurred, bringing the total Jewish rural population down to less than 150,000 families, another quarter million individuals in factories and bureaucratic jobs.

The reason for the failure of these grandiose colonization schemes lies partly in the reluctance of the younger generation to stay on remote farms. Radios, magazines, electricity, and other conveniences are not a part of Soviet rural life, and there are no private automobiles among the Russian working class.

But there are more profound reasons for the failure than the natural desire of youth to be where there is life and movement. Mr. Aronson gives as one of these the heavy taxes and special obligations on the Jewish colonists. The most serious handicap placed upon them, however, was that fact that in every colony groups of Communist Youth—Komsomol and Members of the Anti-God Society—were assigned to duty in combating every expression of the Jewish religion. On each Passover and New Year's Day, and the Day of Atonement—corresponding to the Christian Christmas, and New Year and Holy Week, these missionaries of atheism carried on campaigns of derision, of mockery, and of contemptuous argument. They were protected by Soviet law. Those who sought to practice their religion were outside the law.

Failure of these attempts to corrupt the 5,000-year tradition of Jewish faith, led the anti-God group to other measures. Hog raising was imposed upon the orthodox colonists, with the usual penalties for failure to cooperate if they refused. This was followed by a series of forced and complete collectivizations, with the usual accompaniment of liquidating "Kulaks" and "class enemies" which completed the extermination of those Jews of independent mind and integrity who would be natural leaders. Survivors gladly escaped to the factories where, at least, they could conceal the loss of hope and individuality as units of a machine system.

One of the most informative chapters in Mr. Aronson's book deals with the "Autonomous Jewish Republic of Birobidjnan," the colony at the far end of Siberia on the banks of the Amur River. Soviet official statistics are quoted to show that of the 37,200 Jews who had settled there before 1938, less than 18,000 remain today. Only about 300 Jewish families continue a precarious existence in a small river-town which was to have been the capital of a Jewish state.

They went there as Jews, but once established they were denied the right to be Jews, to teach or to practice their religion, or to hand down the Jewish culture and tradition to their children.

In 1939 there were 10 state-supported Jewish theaters in all Russia, but there remained no Jewish newspapers. Some books and pamphlets in Yiddish were still published, but 90 percent of these were entirely Communist propaganda, without relation to Jewish literature or culture. Partly this was due to the fact that in the purge of 1937–39 the more significant Jewish journalists, scientists, and intellectuals, as well as old Bolsheviks, who had taken part in Jewish activities, were liquidated. Since 1939 not a single scientific work has been published in Yiddish, nor a single volume in the field of Jewish history.

Mr. Aronson points out that the fact that classics of Yiddish literature may still be found on some library shelves in Russia does not mitigate the low state of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union. The only Jewish writers in Russia today, he says, are the scribblers and poetasters, who polish literary apples for the Soviet schoolmaster, and do the hack writing required by a dictatorship. Jewish literature, like all other, cannot exercise its function creatively and fruitfully in an atmosphere of oppression and slave-labor camps.

The Bolshevik revolution completely changed the face of Russian Jewry by removing its community leaders. The Communist system has altered the character of Jewish life by destroying the spiritual contacts which linked Russian Jews to Jews elsewhere. The war has likewise had a profound effect. A large proportion of the Jews in western Russia were killed by the Nazis. Many thousands of others died on the field of battle. Almost all of the formerly Jewish cities and towns in the Ukraine were destroyed and there are no Jews among the survivors. The Jews of Russia have fought well for Russia; 10,000 of them wear Soviet decorations, and there are more than 100 general officers of Jewish descent in the Red Army. These facts are used by Communist sympathizers to show how Jews have profited under communism. Mr. Aronson shows that these material gains have been made at the cost of the Jew's religious heritage, his personal freedom, and his self-respect as a Jew.

It was a Jew who first said: "What shall it profit a man though he gain the whole world yet lose his own soul?"

That these are not accidental tactics or purely domestic policies of the Soviet Union is indicated by the repetition of the same strategy in the countries now under domination by Communist subsidiaries of the Kremlin regime.

In February 1945, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency sent a despatch from Jerusalem quoting David Ben-Gurion, chairman of the executive committee of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, who had just returned from a week in Bulgaria. Mr. Ben-Gurion reported:

> That the Jewish Communists, although a small minority of the surviving Jewish community in Bulgaria, had been placed in complete control of Jewish communal life, where they were suppressing democracy among Jews and prohibiting Jewish education.

Under this autocratic rule, the officials of the Jewish communities in Bulgaria

together with the Jewish section of the Communist Fatherland Front passed a resolution in January of this year declaring that Bulgarian Jews are no longer part of the Jewish people and have nothing in common with other Jewish communities in Palestine, the United States, Great Britain, or other countries. Its only outside contact, the resolution stated, would be with the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee of Moscow. The resolution denounced zionism as chauvinistic and bourgeois, and demanded the prohibition of Hebrew studies. The Jews who tried to protest passage of this resolution were not recognized by the chairman, and were unable to do more than shout their denunciations.

The same situation exists among the Jews of Rumania, under its present Kremlin-dominated government. On June 22, 1945, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency reported from London that—

Dr. William Filderman, president of the Federation of Jewish Communities in Rumania, is under arrest in Bucharest on charges of supporting fascism. * * * A cable sent by the JTA a week ago to its Bucharest correspondent, asking for a report on Dr. Filderman, has not yet been answered. * * * The Communist press in Bucharest has been conducting a campaign against Dr. Filderman for some time.

In February 1945 Eliahu Dobkin, deputy member of the Jewish agency executive committee in charge of immigration to Palestine, is quoted by the JTA as reporting to Histadruth, Jewish Labor Federation, that—

At least 80 percent of the Jews in Rumania are prepared to go to Palestine, if and when their exit, transit, and admission visas can be arranged.

Mr. Dobkin also reported that—

The desire for settling in Palestine is developing among the Russo-Jewish community, with whom contact has been virtually nonexistent for the past two decades * * * this changed attitude is explained not alone by the desire of Europe's Jews no longer to tread ground soaked with the blood of millions of their murdered brethren but it is also based on actual postliberation realities.

That is a brief résumé of the present situation of the Jewish communities in Russia and in Kremlin-dominated Europe. Elsewhere, in following Mr. Grew's formula of "leaning over backward to avoid offending Russia," this Government has been able to lean backward in some specific country. But in regard to the Jews, who have no country, the United States can follow this new formula only by leaning over backward to destroy great portions of Jewry.

Why Dispense With Competition and Resort to Secrecy in Bids on Public Projects?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned from a prominent construction company that Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, War Department, Washington, D. C., has advised all district engineers offices of the War Department that in the future bids are not to be publicly opened and lists of contractors invited to bid are not to be made public.

This advice to district engineers is a matter of deep concern to the public, inasmuch as the public has to foot the bill for all construction work carried on by the United States Government. I do not believe that it is in the public interest to discourage honest, competitive bidding on Government projects. I can see no reason for secrecy in matters of this kind, and such a program lends itself to possible favoritism in matters which should be strictly competitive. The taxpayers have a right to know the purposes for which their money is being spent, and it is my hope that any such method of secrecy that is now in force will be revoked.

A New Risorgimento

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled, "A New Risorgimento," a reprint from the Economist of London of June 5, 1945:

The unconditional surrender of the German South West Command has given the Allies complete control in northern Italy and in large areas of Austria. The surrender crowns a long and arduous campaign, and it is appropriate that Field Marshal Alexander and the men fighting under him should end so sensationally a struggle which has not always commanded its share of public attention. It would, however, be unfortunate if the speed of the final collapse were to mask the hard fighting that preceded it. In particular, it should not be forgotten that the prime factor in the freeing of northern Italy was not the German surrender but the successful using of the partisans. Long before the Germans ceased fighting and long before the Allied armies reached the great cities—Milan, Turin, Genoa, Piacenza—the partisan armies and their political leaders were in full control.

In spite of the crowds who hissed and booed round the exposed bodies of Mussolini, his mistress, and his party bosses, discipline, not anarchy and violence, is the most striking feature of the movement of liberation. Field Marshal Alexander and General Clark have both praised the partisans for the skill and efficiency with which they followed the instructions of the general staff and worked out their own tactical plans. In almost every town in the north they managed to prevent the destruction of power stations, reservoirs, public utilities, and railways. In the factories, they knew exactly when to strike and did so in the most effective way of occupying, not deserting, the factories. In each community, a committee of liberation was already in being, ready to take over the civil administration until the arrival of the Allied armies.

The Central National Committee of Liberation for North Italy is based on a coalition of the principal political parties. It appears at present to include two Communists, two members of the Action Party, two Christian Democrats, two members of the Italian Liberation Party and two Socialists. It is impossible to say what is the balance of power between the different groups. The three strongest are undoubtedly the Communists, whose numbers have grown very considerably in recent months, the Socialists and the Christian Democrats. They are all of them committed to radical reforms in Italian society—a large measure of socialization and the establishment of a republic. Their prestige as the liberators and rulers of the richest, most populous, and most highly developed areas in Italy will enormously reinforce the power of their parties throughout the country. The Bonomi Government has already agreed that the National Liberation Committees of Rome and of the north shall meet and there is talk of summoning a conference of all the provincial committees. The Committees will undoubtedly demand a reshuffle of the Government with an active resister as Prime Minister.

The question mark over Italy's future is whether this new government, representing a strong coalition of the left, can guide the Italian people towards the free and progressive society which a great mass of them undoubtedly desire. As a result of liberation, there have been "springtimes of the people" in other countries, particularly in France. Put in each case the ensuing months have seen the weakening and disillusionment of the popular forces and the resurgence of old, compromised groups and interests. In Italy, there is perhaps a greater chance of successful political evolution. The resistance movement is not a heterogeneous medley of groups united by loyalty to one man. The parties which compose it have proved themselves capable of mass action on a scale achieved nowhere else—only in northern Italy have strikes been used effectively as a weapon of resistance. They appear to be united on the major issues of national reconstruction. On the vexed question of public ownership, the fact that Mussolini's Fascist republic nationalized the whole industrial system in north Italy may make the achievement of public control elsewhere and its maintenance in the north less difficult. Above all, the liberation movement, thanks to its great part in the actual fighting, must now enjoy that supremely important political asset—self-confidence.

It would, however, be very misleading to underestimate the potential opposition. The Fascists are defeated but not wiped out. It is not so long ago that the escape of General Roalta deeply disturbed the people of Rome by the evidence it gave of a quite widespread Fascist underground movement. The monarchists are far more active and vocal in southern and central Italy than they were a year ago. Industry is predominantly in private hands and there are reports in the Swiss press of the close contact maintained by such industrial leaders as Count Volpi with British circles in Switzerland. The basis for the usual coalition of frightened and compromised people exists in Italy as in any other liberated country. Accusations and disputes among the progressive parties may yet undo the first enthusiasm of freedom and sap the political initiative and drive necessary to carry through a really radical program.

It is too early to forecast the strength of the opposing groups. But it is not too soon to see clearly how influential must be the policy of the Allies in Italy. It is entirely in their interests that a radical and democratic Italy should emerge from this war. The voice of the people in north Italy is raised today in favor of peaceful relations with their neighbors, and of union between the states of Europe; in short, the new Italy denounces everything that made Fascist Italy an endless disturber of the peace. An Italy

based on a coalition of the antiprogressive parties might be tempted to return in foreign policy to the fractious, grabbing, warmongering mood of Mussolini's regime. There is at the moment a very good chance that a peace-loving and progressive Italy will be the result of liberation; but it is also true that a wrongly conceived Allied policy could frustrate the Italians' proper development.

First of all it is surely time to recognize the Italians' part in their own liberation by bringing democratic Italy back into the comity of nations. It is surely ludicrous that Argentina should sit at San Francisco while the men who liberated northern Italy are unrepresented. If, when the new government is formed, it were to receive a formal invitation to attend the Conference, its prestige would be enormously enhanced and that fact alone would strengthen it against an opposition in which extremist nationalists are bound to play an active part.

It is equally important that Allied supervision and control should be reduced to a minimum. It has already been stated that the period of AMG in the north will be short. At the first moment possible, the relative freedom of action restored to central and southern Italy should be extended to the politically far more mature north. It is very likely that the use the new government will make of its powers will not be altogether acceptable to conservative circles either in Italy or this country. The question of the monarchy's future is an obvious example. The British Government has acquired in Eurpope—not without some justification—the reputation of intervening only in favor of the right. It would be disastrous if the new political situation in Italy were, during the next crucial months, to be influenced or manipulated by the occupying powers.

Some of the gravest problems awaiting the united Italian Government lie in the economic field. There is a hope that most of this year's harvest will be gathered in, but there are some hungry months ahead. Coal was one of Italy's chief imports. Very little will be available from abroad for some time to come. Anything that the control commission can do to relieve the desperate economic situation will contribute directly to political stability. Even if the straightened supply position and a heavy list of priorities make large-scale deliveries impossible, the Aillies could take a load off the minds of the people by lightening the economic clauses of the armistice. The partisans, by saving thousands of lives and millions of dollars' worth of equipment, have at least earned this.

Finally, the Allies can probably make or mar the democratic future of Italy by the policies they permit on the part of Italy's neighbors. Nothing so weakens the prestige of a government as to sit by helplessly while undisputed national territory is unjustly given away. Nothing could give a better entry point for Nationalist and Fascist propaganda. Nothing would so confuse and divide the progressive parties themselves. Marshal Tito has demanded the Italian town of Trieste. His troops are in its outskirts. No Italian Government could consent to the transfer of an Italian town to Croat control. Most Italians are ready for a very drastic redrawing of the Italo-Yugoslav frontier in order to transfer as many Slavs as possible to Slav rule. They would also admit that the hinterland of Trieste is largely Slav. The compromise which probably offers most hope of a solution is the creation of a free city of Trieste, under Italian administration, but acting as a port and depot for Yugoslav, Italian, and Austrian trade. The Slav areas behind the city could then be transferred without endangering the rights of the Italian community and without condemning Trieste to share the economic decline of Fiume.

This question already threatens to divide the unity of the Italian liberation movement. Moscow has given its blessing to Marshal Tito's plan of annexation. Thus the Italian Communists cannot openly oppose it. The Christian Democrats and Socialists have already spoken firmly against the proposal. If the Communists are forced to take an unpopular line, it is of course the right wing, nationalist opposition that would stand to gain from their discomfiture.

There is a possibility of conflict on Italy's western frontier as well. French forces have crossed the Italian frontier and appear to be marching on Turin. It seems that they have already advanced beyond the line of occupation fixed for them by the Supreme Command. The purpose of this advance is difficult to understand. The Italian partisans certainly regard it with alarm and suspicion, and if the French were to enter Turin, an armed clash might be the result. One of the most encouraging features in the last 9 months has been General de Gaulle's readiness to see in liberated Italy a regime as different from that of Mussolini as is his own from that of Petain. It would be disastrous if now, for no reason at all, Franco-Italian relations were to drift back into the bickering animosity of the twenties and thirties.

The Allies' Italian policy presents them with a very grave responsibility. There are in Italy today fairer hopes of a genuine revival of freedom and social progress than anywhere else in central Europe. The movement of liberation faces difficult months. It has enough economic and political problems to daunt the most self-confident leadership. Its task will become impossible if, over and above the difficulties inherent in the situation, the Allies by indifference, clumsiness, stupidity, or self-interest, weaken in any way the new regime. On the other hand, a successful experiment in cooperation might lead not only to a new creative relationship between Italy and the Allies to a genuine renewal of freedom and responsibility throughout the Latin world.

Ownership of Forest Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Ownership of Forest Lands," written by W. F. McCulloch, assistant State forester of Oregon. The editorial appeared in the Timberman, an international lumber journal, published at Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OWNERSHIP OF FOREST LANDS
(By W. F. McCulloch, assistant State forester of Oregon)

(Not all public foresters are in agreement with the proposals for further acquisition of forest land which have characterized the speeches of some public foresters lately. I thought you might be interested in an opposing point of view.—W. F. McC.)

One of the important factors which prevents completely effective forest management today is the great diversity in the ownership of forest lands. Part of the remedy seems to lie in a reduction in the number of small scattered holdings, most of which are incapable of supporting essential forest practices within economic limitations. Not arguing that size alone is necessarily a virtue, it is nonetheless true that the large operations generally exhibit much better forestry than do the small ones. This statement is attested by the records of tax delinquency; today it is generally the small property which is denuded and abandoned.

As a general principle, it seems desirable to block up forest lands so that uniform management practices may be more effectively applied on larger forest areas. Such amalgamation of small units into fewer large units inevitably brings up the question of ownership. Regardless of size or physical condition, forest lands are now actively being sought by private and public agencies. The advent of tree farms among associated operators and the expanding acquisition programs of large companies, and of State and Federal Governments, have thrown into sharp relief the question, who shall acquire forest lands?" Accusations are made that the public agencies are acquiring too much land; equally strong statements urge still greater public acquisition; but no criterion has been offered as a yardstick for determining an equitable division of ownership.

It is suggested that public and private ownership might be divided on this basis: private ownership where it is possible to carry on long-term operations at a profit, and in such a manner as will assure sustained production on the site; public ownership elsewhere. In this connection the term profit does not mean profits as construed in the robber baron era; it does mean a return on capital sufficiently attractive to prevent diversion of that capital to competitive investment outside the forest industry. (The term public ownership as used here includes municipal, county, State, and Federal ownership.)

It is readily acknowledged that the public reservation of large bodies of forest land was of great importance in protecting this resource against undue exploitation during the period of rapid national expansion. Now the Nation has reached a fairly stable rate of growth with decreased per capita demand for lumber. There is less exploitation pressure on the forest as illustrated by the fact that lumber production as late as 1941 was 2,000,000,000 feet short of the cut in 1899. Forestry now can count on a relatively stable requirement for lumber, and the forest industry can advance toward planned forest management. Under these conditions it is possible that continued public ownership of forest reserves, and further public acquisition may block the growth of private forestry—which in the long run pays part of the cost of public forestry.

There are large areas in public ownership which could be operated in the public interest by private owners, and it may be desirable to transfer some of them to private ownership. Why? Because private foresters can do something with these lands that public foresters cannot—they can pay taxes.

Through public acquisition there is a continuous increase in tax-consuming lands and a decrease in tax-producing lands. Reversion of some of this public ownership to private ownership may be essential to maintenance of the tax base, especially in timber-dependent communities. Except in unusual circumstances, public forestry does not begin to make payments to local government equal to the tax revenues on those same lands under private ownership.

Some forest lands by reason of currently inferior species, poor stocking, low site, adverse operating conditions or other factors, will not pay the costs of sound forest practice, no matter who manages them. Such areas should be maintained in public ownership and administered as "green warehouses"—forests maintained for exploitation

in time of national emergency, but not operated in normal times. Even where a considerable volume of stumpage exists on these lands, the costs of recovery prohibit timber cropping in normal times and permit only timber mining. During a national crisis, however, cost is a secondary factor and operations formerly economically impossible become not only justifiable but essential.

In emergencies the publicly owned "warehouse forest" should be cut in order to relieve pressure on the privately owned industrial forest. In normal times these more valuable industrial forests must pay all costs, including taxes and forest practices necessary for regeneration, and still return a profit. The orderly harvesting of such forest is the very basis of the economy in most timbered areas. These forests should be protected against drastic overcutting during emergencies, so that they can continue to be a source of revenue during normal times. Losses occasioned by national emergencies are a legitimate charge against the whole Nation and should be borne as a national expense. For this reason the liquidation of publicly owned timber, if necessary in a crisis, is to be preferred to the liquidation of privately owned timber. Overcutting of the "warehouse forest" in an emergency period will not undermine the economy of local communities because in normal times that timber would not be cut and the communities would not be dependent upon its utilization. The lumber town is dependent upon the industrial forest in normal times, and if that forest is overcut in abnormal times, dislocations of the local economy is inevitable. Successful long-time management of the industrial forest is predicated upon a continuous flow of products. Overcutting in a war period results in a serious depletion of growing stock which may seriously impair or destroy that continuous flow, and with it, the economic base of the community.

If the private industrial forest cut is to be restricted to a normal level in times of abnormal demand, the excess requirement must be met elsewhere. The logical source is the publicly owned "warehouse forest."

It will be apparent that this warehouse forest concept would curtail public forestry to some extent. Other than the economically inoperable production forest, public ownership might be limited to the following: (1) Denuded forest areas too poorly stocked or too badly depreciated to support private forest management. These lands could be rehabilitated as a public-works project, and eventually might be returned to private ownership. (2) Noncommercial forest lands, or commercial forest lands of greater public service in uses other than in timber production. This would include such uses as watershed forests, recreational areas, wildlife refuges, and highway corridors. (3) Young stands too small to be productive but large enough to be destroyed by premature logging. If these stands cannot readily be incorporated into private sustained production operations, they should be protected against exploitation by public ownership. Wherever possible, the harvesting of such timber should be made to contribute to the sustained production of established, substantial companies; it should not go to irresponsible transients. (4) Commercial forest lands of sufficient area to permit adequate research in, and demonstration of desirable forest practices. Effective research in timber cropping methods must of necessity be conducted on typical industrial land.

SUBSIDIZED FORESTS

If the above principles are followed, public foresters would operate a subsidized forest, subsidized for its watershed, grazing, research, and recreational values; and subsidized as a living stock pile of timber, for insurance against great demands in times of national emergency.

There will be some objection that this proposal is grossly unfair to the public forester; that it would restrict him largely to sites IV and V. Why not? The purpose of public ownership is not to compete with the industrial activities which support it, but to protect the opportunity of the private citizen to maintain a high level of industrial activity. This level can be maintained on the higher sites, but generally is not possible on lower sites, less productive areas.

It is true that other factors than site complicate the classification of lands as productive or unproductive, and will affect considerations of ownership. Farm woodlots, for example, should remain in private ownership regardless of productivity. Local factors such as grazing rentals will make it possible for the private owner to carry relatively unproductive land. With changing times, new financial considerations in regard to taxes, insurance, credit, may make possible successful private forestry even on low-site land. For this reason, restrictions should not be placed upon the return of such land to private ownership where it is feasible to do so.

STEWARDS, NOT POSSESSORS

In the final analysis, public foresters are the stewards, not the possessors of the property. There is a growing tendency on the part of civil servants (probably including the writer) to speak of "our forest," or "our funds," as though the servants were the masters and not the employees of the public. It might be appropriate to inquire, in such cases, whether public ownership is in reality a service to the public or a service to those who obtain jobs in public administration. Insofar as the inferior forest lands are concerned, the important thing is not the quality of the site but the quality of the administrator. It is a challenge to stewardship to manage an inferior property with distinction.

Public foresters argue that they practice better forestry than private operators and are, therefore, justified in seeking to manage a larger share of the Nation's forests. It cannot be denied that some private forestry has been very irresponsible, and some still is. (But so, of course, was the general attitude toward forestry and forest-fire prevention for many years.) If public forestry is so much superior, what makes it so? Since the lands are often intermingled, the so-called poorer forestry on private lands cannot be due to the inherent character on this lands. Is expense the criterion? Public forestry is generally more costly. If it is also more effective, is it just because it is more expensive? Given the same amount of money to spend per acre, what can a public forester do that a private forester cannot duplicate on the same ground? Nothing; which disposes of the myth that public forestry is automatically of a higher order than private forestry.

THE SOCIAL CONSCIENCE

Another argument of public foresters for extension of their jurisdiction is that Government foresters have a well-developed social conscience; they work for the good of all the people. A private forester might reply that he must work for his own good because there are no public funds to subsidize altruism on his part. However, the evidence indicates a growing belief among private foresters that forestry in the public interest is also forestry in the private interest, or in other words, good forestry is also good business. Long-term plans for the perpetuation of forest properties are being made and implemented on a scale unthought of a few years ago. At the same time it must be said that not all private operators or foresters are motivated by concern for the welfare of the public. It is still true that some will do little or nothing voluntarily to perpetuate their stands. This circumstance gives public foresters their best argument for taking over private lands, but it also gives them their greatest opportunity to render public service. Since it costs money now, to practice good forestry now the man who does so suffers unfair competition when his neighbor does not. Here is the real province of public forestry, to administer basic minimum forest practice requirements fairly and impartially, so that all private foresters will have an equal chance and an equal responsibility, to practice forestry.

Such administration does not require a vast public acquisition program; it does not require a great increase in public personnel. It does require an increased appreciation on the part of public foresters of the economic difficulties which inhibit private foresters. If public foresters are sincere in their expressed wish to practice better forestry, let them retreat to, and acquire more of, the lands which cannot support private forestry; let them relinquish to taxpaying ownership those lands which are operable at a profit without detriment to the productivity of the site.

The Churches and the Charter of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Churches and the Charter of the United Nations," adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, on June 26, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHURCHES AND THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(A statement adopted by the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, June 26, 1945)

We are grateful to God that the prayers of the Christian peoples of the world for the success of the San Francisco Conference have been answered in the agreement to establish the United Nations organization.

The Charter of the United Nations offers mankind an important means for the achievement of a just and durable peace. The new organization, projected after so great suffering and sacrifice of this world war, can help governments to join their moral and material resources in support of a system of world order and justice. The churches of Christ in America have long held that nations can better serve God's purpose for the world as they are brought into organic relationship with one another for the common weal. The Charter signed at San Francisco marks a genuine advance toward this end. It remains for the peoples to make the promise of the Charter a living and growing reality.

We believe the overwhelming majority of the people of our churches desire to see our Nation join with other nations in a common effort to develop an international society free from the curse of war.

We believe it is the clear duty of our Government promptly to ratify the Charter and thus to assure cooperation by the United States in the task of making the organization an effective agency for the maintenance of international peace and security.

At the time when the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were before the country for public discussion, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America expressed the belief that "the proposed organization, with such beneficial modifications as ought to result from further consideration by the prospective members, can be developed into one which will commend itself to the Christian conscience."

The Charter of the United Nations embodies many of the changes recommended by thoughtful Christians of different communions for the improvement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The humanitarian aims set forth in the preamble, the greater importance and increased functions given to the general assembly and the economic and social council, the concern manifested for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the moral sanction given to the decisions of the international court of justice, and the purposes to be served by the trusteeship council, together with the declared policy regarding nonselfgoverning territories, tend to bring the organization more nearly into accord with Christian principles of world order.

We are aware of the need to develop the curative and creative functions of the organization. The best hope for the organization's success lies in building up as quickly as possible, during the period of relative military exhaustion, those methods of economic and social cooperation represented by the Economic and Social Council. Such cooperation over the years can prevent international tensions from becoming threats to the peace.

In many respects the charter will need continued improvement after it has been ratified and has become operative. To these improvements the churches and all men of good will must dedicate themselves in the coming years.

However, the greatest obstacle to the charter's potentialities for good lies in the tensions, misunderstandings, and still unbridged difficulties between the major powers upon whom the primary responsibility for maintaining peace at present devolves. There will be required of the peoples of the world and of our own Nation a very high sense of responsibility and a will to peace to overcome the obstacles which the world still faces in achieving genuinely mutual relationships. There needs to be developed a clearer recognition of the principle that there is a common concern of humanity which takes precedence over the narrow interests of any nation or group of nations. A new will to collaborate must be born in the hearts and minds of men if the organization is to fulfill its purpose. Lacking such a will to make the machinery work, a better organization than that proposed in the Charter would fail. There is no substitute for the will to peace and justice.

Accordingly, we believe that a heavy responsibility rests upon Christians to help create an invincible determination to use fully the procedures provided by the charter. The peoples and governments need to commit themselves to the long and difficult task of attaining the moral goals set forth in the charter. Let the church of Christ lead in making this commitment wholeheartedly.

The will to cooperate requires, as its foundation, a new international morality. Without this, the structure of the peace will rest on shifting sands. The building of a better world order under God's Providence requires better men and women. Herein is to be found the principal challenge to the churches. To establish a strong core of world-minded Christians at the center of international life is the inescapable duty of the ecumenical church. To this end we need to intensify our efforts for Christian reconstruction and missions. We must increase our educational programs for training Christian citizens in their obligations in an interdependent world. We ought to help build the world council of churches into the living expression of God's will for the Christian community. Let Christian fellowship pioneer in international understanding and reconciliation, so that all of the family of nations may work together in harmony.

The road to a better world order is long. The journey is arduous. Only God can assure its achievement. As we move forward we humbly seek His help.

Money Changers, Modern Style?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a news story by Bob Considine. Jerusalem is a strange city these days. I was very much impressed with the philosophy in this news release by Mr. Considine. Somehow I feel that he has put a lot of reflection in this story.

It follows:

JERUSALEM.—Most of the world's people get their meager good traits from this dusty cradle of ethics, humanitarianism, conscience, and hope of a hereafter.

Solomon chose this spot for his tabernacle.

Jesus Christ was born 6 miles away and was crucified on a nearby hill.

Mohammed journeyed here, picked out the same crusty hill from which the Angel of God deterred Abraham from sacrificing Isaac, was lifted for an audience with Allah and returned the next morning to pronounce this one of the three most sacred spots in the religious world he fashioned.

PAY FOR EVERYTHING

But the devout pilgrim to a local shrine—be he Jew, Christian, or Mohammedan—is treated with all the loving care bestowed upon a gap-toothed yokel by a Coney Island hustler.

A visitor is inclined to leave thoroughly disenchanted.

Other than the cost of a guide, you pay for the slippers which crabby, snarling natives place on your feet before you enter the Mosque of Omar (built in 700 A. D. on the site of previous temples).

You pay for illuminating candles at the Greek Orthodox altar which rests exactly over the spot where Christ's cross was placed.

Within the low-doored Holy Sepulcher, where Christ lay in His tomb, a bearded ecclesiastic asks you for money as you stand in thoughtful concentration.

MONEY OR CHEWING GUM

As you prepare to leave the mosque there are religious men who demand money or chewing gum, and clutch at your uniform.

Atop the Mount of Olives, hard by the anguished Garden of Gethsemane, a man selling rosaries shouts, "Pretty olive beads I give you—for just one cigar."

Near the holy Wailing Wall, crowded this day by lines of moaning and chanting Jews, dark-eyed kids and men sell picture postcards and scurry like thieves through the narrow streets at the sight of the stern, dark-dressed young British police.

In front of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, built by the Crusaders (the door-opening and door-locking concession has been owned for 800 years by two Moslem families named Judeh and Muselbeh), two youngsters search the faces of passing GI and plead, "Flash Gordon book? Dick Tracy book?"

Yet, this place—which took a month to reach by boat, but which the Army Air Transport Command can reach in 34 hours of effortless flight—imprints itself subtly upon the mind.

THREE WORDS IGNORED

Its sordidness is replaced in time by the wonder that such infinite good could have come from such a destitute spot of earth.

And you tend to recollect how deaf the world has been to the simple laws of peaceful, prosperous life laid down here, including Christ's tragically ignored three-word solution of all world problems: "Love thy neighbor."

The big planes drum overhead today; huge, slow British commercial liners en route to the far corners of the Empire; faster American planes hauling freight, fliers, and a few passengers to China.

The leading movie is currently featuring Abbott and Costello's, It Ain't Hay.

In the swank King David Hotel, put up by the British, you can have every luxury known to man, on a spot where Christ—who spoke obscure Aramaic and did no writing—fashioned the moral codes of unborn billions.

At the RAF field, sacred land also, the radio was blaring Pistol Packin' Mamma when we took off.

Eight American Congressmen in Germany and a Berlin Broadcast Before Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, whenever I note a press dispatch from Weimar, Germany, I cannot help but recall a few anxious moments spent by a group of Congressmen in that blitzed city on a Sunday night some few weeks before the Nazi surrender. Present were Representative JACKSON, of Washington; MANASCO, of Alabama; RAINS, of Alabama; WALTERS, of Pennsylvania; WORLEY, of Texas; BENNETT, of Missouri; WILSON, of Indiana; and the speaker.

Our group, part of us in the United Kingdom and part in France on various missions, had united at the request of General Eisenhower to visit the atrocity camp at Buchenwald just overrun by Patton's men. The latter had taken over a hotel, the Kaiserin Augusta, for our use. It was in Weimar, a short distance from Buchenwald. The proprietor assigned us to various suites—some had been occupied by Kesselring and Von Rundstedt, one had been the quarters of Nomura when he had visited this so-called cultural city, one of the principal Nazi Party seats.

We were unimpressed by these assignments, but the fact Jerry was still strafing from the air at night coupled with the fact gangs of Hitler youth were then taking potshots at our convoys on the Autobahn Highway nearby lent our hotel guards added importance.

That Sunday night, April 22, the first of our 3-day stay, found us craving news of the progress of the battles not far distant. We turned on a radio in the din-

ing room. A Berlin commentator was speaking in perfect English. The Soviet forces, he said, were being repulsed in their efforts to force their way into the capital city of the Reich. In the north Montgomery's men were being given a sound licking, and Patton was reeling back from Czech border territory. Everywhere, the commentator concluded, German youth, new troops, inexperienced in battle, were proving themselves the military miracles of all time. He indicated plainly the war had taken an extraordinary turn in favor of Hitler's forces.

"From all accounts tomorrow's broadcast will include a story about eight American congressional hostages," I observed.

One of my colleagues demanded that the hotel proprietor check the locale of the station. He insisted it was Berlin. Another colleague added he was certain the commentator was Lord Haw Haw. Col. Edward G. Moore, of Dallas, Tex., whom General Patton had assigned to look after our "good health and protection," laughed heartily. "We have been getting this 'bunk' for days," he said. Rest easy, gentlemen, these birds know the jig is up, and insofar as Weimar is concerned, the people here are scared to death of Patton and his men."

To Win the First Battle of the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, Director General, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, on ABC network, Tuesday, July 3, 1945:

I am speaking tonight in behalf of the liberated countries of Europe. I am leaving again within a day or two to visit many of them. The might of our armed forces and that of our allies have freed these countries forever from the monstrous yoke of Nazi Germany. In the great battles of the war we have been overwhelmingly victorious. But the first great battle of the peace is yet to be won.

That battle is the battle against want, hunger, and disease which are ravaging most of these countries to an extent that we of the Western Hemisphere can hardly grasp. General Eisenhower has stated that the first great need of Europe is food. Such food as the stricken continent has been able to produce under the crushing weight of war and enemy occupation is pitifully inadequate to meet even its minimum needs. By late autumn, the harvests will have been largely exhausted. After that—and until the 1946 harvests are available—Europe must depend heavily upon food imported from abroad. The alternative is starvation.

Nor is starvation the only danger. For with famine must inevitably come pestilence. Typhus, tuberculosis, diphtheria, malaria. Already some areas are in the grip of these dread scourges. Without strength-giving food to help the people combat them, they may well prove as devastating in their effect as some of the great plagues of the Middle Ages.

I am here on this program as a representative of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which many of you know under the simpler name of UNRRA. Through this organization, the nations which have not borne the brunt of actual invasion have pledged their aid to those war-ridden countries which have consumed their entire foreign exchange resources in the fight against the Fascist menace. Our task is to meet the most pressing needs of these countries and to provide some of the means by which they may get squarely on their feet again—to help them to help themselves.

Up to now we have done what could be done toward redeeming this pledge. Into the devastated areas of Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Italy there has been shipped over a quarter of a billion dollars worth of sorely needed supplies—food, clothing, medical supplies, farm and industrial equipment. Among the contributing nations are numbered Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United States and the United Kingdom.

In addition, we have organized and are administering a far-flung medical service to combat the spread of epidemic disease. And in cooperation with the military authorities, we have recruited a large army of trained workers, nearly 6,000 in number, to aid in the care and repatriation of those millions of displaced persons who were liberated in former enemy territory.

All this, however, is only the beginning. What we do—or fail to do—within the next critical 6 months will be the real test. But in this we are facing desperate problems—many of which are beyond our present control.

Basically, what we are up against is the problem of securing the actual supplies which must be shipped now, or within the next few months, if we are to meet Europe's fateful deadline. Let me make it clear: UNRRA cannot commandeer these needed supplies. We are completely dependent upon the willingness of the United Nations themselves to allocate a sufficient portion of their own resources to enable us to meet our schedules.

These schedules for the remaining 6 months of this year call for 3,895,000 metric tons of supplies, valued at over $900,000,000—or more than three times the amount that has already gone through our hands. To procure these supplies we are having to deal with deficiencies, some of them grave, in clothing, textiles, fuel, raw material and transport. But our greatest concern is food.

So far only one thing is encouraging. We can probably get all the wheat that is needed. Provided we obtain enough shipping and port-reception capacity, it should be possible at an early date for the liberated countries to abolish or lessen the rationing of bread. But cereal is about the only food item now in abundant supply.

Man, however, cannot live by bread alone. He must have some measure of animal or vegetable fats and of animal proteins—meats, fish, dairy products, eggs. For the last half of 1945, we asked for 725,000,000 pounds of meat as the minimum requirements of those European countries receiving UNRRA's assistance. But what was the result? From Canada we were promised only 20,000,000 pounds of canned meat and 10,000,000 pounds of canned blood sausage. These were delivered. From the United States, we were promised 100,000,000 pounds of canned pork and 100,000,000 pounds of fat cuts of pork. But here we have received actual deliveries of less than 2,000,000 pounds of the former and 12,000,000 pounds of the latter. The remainder of the allocation has been canceled and we are now told we can have no more meat of any sort from the United States for the current quarter.

Forty-four millions pounds of meat products so far granted, out of the minimum of 725,000,000 needed.

From all the supplying countries we asked for 235,000,000 pounds of canned fish to cover our needs for the year ending June 30, 1946. We have been granted only 59,000,000 pounds. We asked for the whole milk powder and dried eggs for babies and pregnant and nursing mothers. We were told we could have none of either of these essential items. For the third quarter of this year we asked for 12,500 tons of evaporated milk and got less than half of that amount. For the same period we asked for 14,000 tons of condensed milk and got only 1,134 tons.

Toward the minimum requirements of fats, for the last 6 months of 1945, we have not yet received the allocation of a single pound. Lately we have had renewed and most distressing appeals for shipments of fat to Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia. We have had to cable denials, because the supplying countries have made no fats available.

What is the answer? Without question the people of the supplying countries are faced with unaccustomed shortages in food and other supplies. The first instinct is to guard jealously those supplies for their own people. But in actual fact they still have an abundance that to the famished people of liberated Europe must seem like the wildest sort of luxury.

Take dairy products alone. Here in the United States, for instance, we consume vast amounts of fluid, condensed and evaporated milk and ice cream. Surely each of us could do without 1 pint of milk a month. If all of us would give up 1 pint a month of milk, UNRRA could meet its schedules for the critical last half of 1945. Yet millions of babies, young children, and mothers in Europe are denied this essential to their health and well-being.

A week ago, at San Francisco, the United Nations signed a great charter of international security. But that charter is as yet only a promise. If the liberated countries of Europe fall prey to famine and pestilence, there can be no security for any of us. Our responsibility is clear. We of the United Nations, who have suffered least from the cataclysm of war, must take steps now to provide out of our resources the means to meet this desperate crisis. This requires supplies. Kindly expressions will not feed empty stomachs. You can't avert starvation without food.

To cope with starvation in the liberated lands I submit that five actions should be taken, and taken now, by the uninvaded United Nations. They are:

First. Of the 40,000,000 cases of evaporated milk now being consumed annually in the United States, at least 20 percent should be set aside for the underfed babies and children of all the liberated countries of war-torn Europe. Another 2,000,000 cases of condensed milk should be made available by cutting down the supplies now devoted to ice cream and other uses. Furthermore the production of whole-milk powder for liberated areas should be required in every country like Canada and the United States, which has the equipment to produce it.

Second. Several million heads of the expanded cattle population of the supplying countries should be put into tin cans for immediate export to hungry Europe.

Third. A small decrease in the consumption of fats in each of the supplying countries should be initiated in order to turn the drab bread and potato diet of Europe into a tolerable one.

Fourth. Soap rationing should be instituted to provide Europe with sufficient soap to combat filth and epidemic disease.

Firth. Each nation should adopt as part of its food policy the definite principle that it will contribute its fair share to the needs of the suffering peoples in the liberated lands,

even though this will undoubtedly call for considerable sacrifice.

Only by such measures can we of the United Nations redeem our pledge to the liberated countries of Europe. Only by such means can be hope to win the first great battle of the peace.

Review by Dr. Edward Whiting Fox of the Book, The Four Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of my book, The Four Fears, written by Dr. Edward Whiting Fox, of Harvard University, and appearing in the New York Times some months ago.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICIAN AND IDEALIST

The Four Fears. By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS. 193 pp. Chicago: Ziff-Davis. $2.50.

(By Edward Whiting Fox)
(Department of history, Harvard)

The Four Fears is no blueprint for a postwar world. It is an attempt to build up a way of looking at the problems of winning the peace. Senator THOMAS is convinced that we can make a better world for everyone, but "only if we start out with the firm and unshakable conviction that we have a moral responsibility to make our world better." There is no need for fear and we must not listen to those who would exploit fear. It is the time for idealism, and "the more our idealism is attacked the harder we must fight to preserve it"; an idealism which "is nothing more than faith and principle * * * the faith in man, and the principle * * * that man shall have liberty to fulfill himself in a free society."

It is about this faith and this principle rather than fears that the book has been written. There are, it is true, chapters on The Fear of Entangling Alliances, The Fear of England, The Fear of Russia, and The Fear of Revolution. But the Senator does not really seem to understand fear. Each of the four he tries to dispel with patient reason and quiet force. One can only wonder if the Senator's children were ever afraid of the dark, and if a calm reminder of the appearance of the room by daylight settled once and for all the question of what might be hidden there by night.

It is clear beyond question that he understands both faith and principle. Not even the President, at least for some years, has dealt with them so unpretentiously and unequivocally. For example, "Our Red Cross is compelled by our military leaders to separate blood donations intended for the soldiers—black, white, brown, yellow, Jew, Catholic, Protestant—though these soldiers have been wounded in a struggle to prove that all blood is alike."

Senator THOMAS is not only a professional politician, he is also, like Woodrow Wilson (whom he greatly admires), a professor of political science. Even more than was Wilson, however, he is a student and disciple of Jefferson; and, in the eighteenth-century tradition, he believes that reason, rather than sin, is the original endowment of man. This conviction can hardly be attributed to naïveté or inexperience. He understand our oriental enemy, including his language, as do few men in this country; he is not ignorant of the German record; and he understood the world in 1934 sufficiently to urge this country to undertake the construction of strategic stock piles and air bases. He is even willing to contemplate the possibility that "a people (may) have a bad heart."

These unsentimental views he reconciles with his humanitarian faith by adding the complementary doctrine that none of the evil that has cursed our political life would have been possible "without a serious cause of discontent, without serious imbalance within a country or in the rest of the world." Nothing, he believes, but freedom from want will free men to be free. He sees no salvation for the world so long as we continue to think that it is all right for people in other countries to walk while we sail smoothly over the roads in 16-cylinder cars. "The blind and greedy will find that men enslaved by want will seek escape from the freedom to starve." It would be difficult to remain unmoved by Senator THOMAS' plea for a vast increase of industrial and agricultural production, and the unhampered exchange of goods all to the enrichment of the whole world. It is difficult to share his faith that this economic miracle would heal the political soul of the whole world.

Peace in terms of boundaries—or alliances—would not even be a truce, he believes. Walter Lippmann, in his United States Foreign Policy, tried to prove that combined action by America, Britain, and Russia "is the irreducible minimum guaranty of each * * * and the only condition under which it is possible to begin to establish any wider order of security." It is the basic thesis of "the four fears" that such combined action would be not only inadequate but actually a step in the wrong direction.

Nothing less than world organization satisfies Senator THOMAS' faith in the equality of men or his conviction that the world has become a single and indivisible economic unit. Because our Federal system works, he believes it can be expanded; and he points out that there are other "sovereign" entities within other "sovereign" frameworks. The British Commonwealth of Nations and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are examples.

"Sovereignty," as Senator THOMAS explains it, is "we, the people." And when we come to accept a world organization we shall do it out of the authority and conviction of "we, the people." This, it may fairly be objected, is the reasoning of a political scientist. A historian would have been more impressed by the common traditions and long and painful efforts behind the development of the existing federated sovereignities. He would remember that in spite of the common inheritance of the American States the federative principle had to be maintained by force in a major war. And he would be interested in who would compose "we, the people."

Some people have for a long time had a low opinion of the concept of a free society, and on various occasions have put their collective energies into violent efforts to root it from the earth. Geopolitics, as Senator THOMAS implies, may be a less noble base for political action than democratic philosophy; but geopolitics has all too recently and all too narrowly missed doing for us and our democratic philosophy. The benefits of a successful world federation cannot be denied; but the conviction that such a federation can be made to work successfully in the world we know is not lightly come by.

With a curious trick of style by which he tends to slide over some of his best, and also some of his most debatable points before they are really noticed. Senator THOMAS includes such sentences as, "Japan's entire economy must be subject to control and inspection," and "the United Nations' military force * * * must wipe out all remaining Nazi elements and help back up a civilian control which the people trust." Considering the forces which proved too heavy for the League to bear, these sentences should be weighed with care by the drafters of the new covenant which the Senator advocates. Where the League has worked, especially in its subsidiary agencies, such as the International Labor Organization, it should be strengthened and extended. Where it failed, specifically in preventing wars, it should be bolstered. Lippmann's "nuclear" alliance of Britain, Russia, and the United States could stop wars.

Any disagreement with Senator THOMAS must rest on a different view of human nature. If all politicians were of his stature, and if all citizens measured up to his belief in the common man, we should be ready to call a constituent assembly for a world state. Expecting less of man, it is possible to admire Senator THOMAS more; but in the light of our recent experience it is difficult to be persuaded by even his faith that man obeys economic motives or may be appealed to effectively by reasonable arguments. Before our affairs are put in order we may come to realize that not love nor even steam but fear has made our world go round until we are so dizzy that we can recognize neither our interests nor the right.

Senator THOMAS believes there is risk in whatever is done and warns against disguising the fact under any neat scheme. But let us calculate our risks; there may be less risk in an alliance than he thinks if we will all remember the injunction which he quotes from Mr. Justice Frankfurter—that "the business of America is not business, the business of America is civilization."

Can We Rationalize Egg Prices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article appearing in the Northeastern Poultryman on December 15, 1942, entitled "Can We Rationalize Egg Prices?" by Leavitt C. Parsons, marketing counsel, New England Poultry and Egg Institute:

CAN WE RATIONALIZE EGG PRICES?

(By Leavitt C. Parsons, marketing counsel, New England Poultry and Egg Institute)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Summary of a brief prepared in the campaign to protect the poultrymen of the Northeast from inadvertent injury due to inadequate price-ceiling formula.)

THE NORTHEASTERN EGG MARKET

The question of relationship of sizes and prices has always interested marketing officials. They early noted that the farmer who produced a given number of large eggs would get more income than the farmer who produced the same number of small eggs. They noted also that the cultivation of size alone was not enough to insure the maximum income to egg producers. Numerous studies initiated by State departments of agriculture and colleges all went to prove that degrees of quality were also usually reflected in the price received, and consequently the farmers who marketed eggs of high quality would secure a larger and more dependable income

than the farmer who disregarded the quality factor in marketing his products.

These observations led to two formal changes in the marketing of eggs, each urged by a different group, and both finding legalistic expression in what we now call the fresh-egg laws. The first group interested in legally grading egg quality were State and municipal health departments. These, often urged by political pressure following scandals having to do with spoiled or rotten eggs, set up penalties based on protecting the public health. Next, various agricultural officials seeking either to stimulate the farmer's income or to protect his market, capitalized the initiative of the health officials and in cooperation with a friendly Federal Department of Agriculture, succeeded in drawing up legal definitions of commercial egg grades which were tuned to meet trade conditions and which protected the producer and handler as well as the public.

Most of our Northeastern States are deficit areas in the marketing sense because the total demand for eggs from the densely concentrated population far exceeds the production of their own farmers. This volume demand for eggs conformed to the economic laws affecting the large demand for any product and reflected a high degree of specialized choice in many consumer grades. This meant in terms of our immediate egg problem there were enough discriminating egg buyers who wanted special quality factors and who were willing to pay a corresponding higher price for them to warrant the growth of new trade conventions catering directly to this top-quality market. Before long these new plus values found expression in new fresh-egg laws. With the appearance and the official recognition of these new super grades we find our Northeastern States with the cooperation of the Federal Extension Service carrying on extensive educational campaigns to encourage more and more farmers to produce not only more eggs but larger eggs. In this they emphasized marketing those eggs with the quality better—that is, higher—than the U. S. Extra which had been nationally regarded as a good top-quality egg. Sprouting from this evolution of eastern special-grade eggs we find the growth of promotional and educational organizations like the New England Poultry and Egg Institute and the New Jersey Egg Marketing Group, whose aim was largely to teach the public the advantage of asking for these special grades of extra-big and extra-fine fresh eggs.

Price determination in selling eggs up to the war crisis had been more or less an automatic process reflecting supply and demand of all eggs. Changes in seasonal production of domestic fowl accounted for certain major high and low price points as indicating peak periods of maximum shortage or maximum supply. Within the rhythm of these long-term seasonal changes there always have occurred a series of minor changes in the relationship between the prices of different grades and sizes in accordance with the individual supply or demand for each particular grade.

In their great price setting bulk, eggs of all grades have always enjoyed a free market in the big consuming centers. Lately the very considerable volume of "special" quality eggs being sold through the eastern farm cooperatives and auctions have already become an important index in influencing the price trends of all lower grades, which like the octaves on a piano keyboard, indicate all the graduated notes of changing quality which taken together make up the total market. Since the volume of quality eggs sold through these auctions has been increasing at a rate faster than our population increases it appears that consumer acceptance of grades higher than United States extra are definitely increasing, and its recognition and trade use may be expected to spread to other areas.

THE WAR THREAT

Such is the pattern of growth in our eastern egg marketing customs. Now, comes a war impact which introduces new problems and threatens all the investment of time and money and worry and the study that both the State and Federal officials have urged our northeastern poultrymen to devote to improving the size and quality of their eggs, as well as the size and quality of the consumer market they sought to supply. The impact of war has brought the risk of inflation. This means the necessity of fighting inflationary trends by applying arbitrary ceiling prices to all classes of commodities, particularly foodstuffs, which normally get the largest part of the workingman's dollar.

Some of these problems involve redefinition, that is, such questions as just what size and just what quality grades shall be recognized in setting price ceilings for the duration. Although free markets had allowed free price ranges before the war, now OPA rulings formally limit top prices and wipe out free auctions—as of this date General Max controls auction egg prices along with other prices.

The problem of approach involves further complications because of the number of variables involved; and also the limitations of language. For instance, it is difficult to get a two-dimensional formula that applies to a three-dimensional problem, for when we consider treating size, quality, and price all in the same ruling we get into a technical mixup difficult to clarify.

But this is not all. The egg-ceiling problem has a fourth complication. This is a predictable, seasonal price range. The very dependability of this rhythm adds to the difficulty in discussing price ceilings, for it leads to oversimplification and should be approached with the utmost caution in order that the best intended system of periodically graduated ceilings might not completely destroy the current weekly, and sometimes even daily, fluctuations in local markets which make the present traditional pricing system so sensitive to changes in supples that they regulate themselves. The broad beneficial effect of this psycholcgical price adjustment can never be reduced to a mathematical formula.

In light of these comments let us now examine some of the factors that should deserve consideration in setting up a system of egg-price ceilings of national application with a minimum disturbance of established trade customs.

Any consideration of a universal-price-ceilings formula for eggs must recognize at least four variables. The most important of these are: (a) Measures of quality; (b) measures of size; (c) price factors; and (d) seasonal price patterns. To these might also be added (e) regional price patterns.

MEASURES OF QUALITY

For our purposes it is sufficient to state that the USDA has already established adequately serviceable standards of quality in its official grades. These are acceptable to the trade and their importance should increase in accordance with the trend toward wider recognition of all Government labels, starting in the deficit areas where local poultry producers generally have higher production costs, many States have set up new grades of their own, recognizing higher quality than required in Federal grades. In fact, some State departments of agriculture and State development commissions have applied public funds to consumer education and sales promotion of these higher State grades. This was supported by breeding and management programs sponsored by State colleges and in cooperation with the Federal Extension Service, all tuned to increase the production of special high-grade eggs.

Any project for establishing price ceilings nationally, without taking into consideration the specialized husbandry and the higher operating costs that characterize the program of the producers of special quality eggs, would immediately threaten their economic life, for it would wipe out the little extra margin that discriminating consumers are willing to pay for assured top quality as now guaranteed by the special State grade labels.

FACTORS OF SIZE

The United States Department of Agriculture has established grades already enjoying a wide trade acceptance in which a series of sizes guide purchasers in establishing prices. These are based on a 2-ounce egg or lots of a dozen or more averaging 24 ounces to the dozen, known as large, and then at 3-ounce intervals, other approved grade designations known respectively as mediums and pullets.

We have noted now the State departments of agricurture and Federal Extension Services have cooperated to promote increased production of higher quality eggs in the Northeast. This same cooperation has worked also to increase the average size in Northeastern egg production. In the retail outlets these larger eggs bring higher prices. Jumbo eggs are preferred and specifically asked for by many discriminating customers. The Aladdin-like growth of the powdered-egg industry should give even greater importance to extra size in wholesale buying after the war.

FACTORS OF PRICE

The price the producer gets and the price the consumer pays for eggs are both effected by quality and by size. Whereas the ultimate consumer is protected by laws affecting misrepresentation both as to quality and to size, the middleman is not. He sets his price as a result of his own inspection or the word of the producer or auction or the receiver with whom he deals.

THE SEASONAL PATTERN OF PRICE

Fowl are more concerned with their biological function than with our economic needs. As a result of this the larger production in the springtime, which is the normal bird-life hatching season, and the critical decline to a low point in production each fall show a supply curve for eggs in which the total national spring supply of fresh eggs may run several times the national fall production.

Because human consumption of eggs is relatively steady these big seasonal changes in production react on prices and if written on a chart the price curve would always move in opposite directions from the curve of supply. The price curve may vary slightly from the supply curve but in normal times without political interference the fall price often exceeds the spring price by 100 percent.

Certain trends may be observed which are working to reduce the seasonal spread. Among them are a larger use of frozen eggs, more breeding for fall production and finally, the growth of the dried egg business.

Although the seasonal curves are astonishingly dependable and over a 10–12-year period hardly varying from a November high and April bottom war conditions have already deranged the curve and rate decline and by the support of egg prices through Government buying turned the market upward in March in 1941 or a month ahead of the 10-year average. It is such impacts of a war economy that make me feel the pattern of historical precedent is unsound as a basis for setting ceilings over which poultrymen can maintain and expand productions in the face of increasing operation costs.

THE PATTERN OF REGIONAL PRICE CHANGES

Regional differences in price are determined by whether or not any given area has a surplus or a shortage of any particular commodity. Applying this economic yardstick to our egg ceiling problem, the United States

may be resolved into three regional areas with sufficient fundamental difference to warrant consideration in determining our national price ceilings as regional ceilings if it should appear desirable. These areas would be (a) east of the Alleghenies; (b) the great Cereal Belt between the Alleghenies and the Rockies; and (c) the Pacific coast. Each of these sections have distinct economic and sociological differences.

In view of the various egg production and marketing factors here presented I feel that the most dependable formula for determining effective egg price ceilings would be one of the utmost simplicity. I would aim to set a single ceiling on a large size (like U. S. Extra Large). I would set my ceiling with a November maximum and like Canada ignore seasonal variations assuming that the pressure of the spring flush production would give consumers an undeniable advantage in lower price not enjoyed by most other commodities with fixed price ceilings. I would express my maximum ceiling in terms of weight, and by employing the 3-ounce interval between large, medium, and pullet as a yardstick, my large egg ceiling would automatically set a ceiling by weight for the other size grades thus medium and pullets would each decline 12½ while 27-ounce jumbos would bring 12½ percent higher. As I expect egg demands for 1943 to run at least as strong as 1942 I would put a money value on my single ceiling of 68 cents at retail. Based on this recommendation our schedule grade ceiling would automatically become:

Grade	Weight	Minus	Price
	Ounces	*Percent*	*Cents*
U. S. Extra Large	24	--------	68
U. S. Extra Medium	21	12½	59½
U. S. Extra Pullet	18	25	51

By this process any States recognizing official egg grades 3 ounces above 24 ounce would enjoy an 8¼ cents higher ceiling for each 3 ounces advanced; thus United States Extra 27-ounce jumbos would be quoted at 76¼ cents.

My strongest argument for the translation of egg-price ceilings into a straight poundage basis is one of departmental consistency. The OPA is trying to simplify. In its canned goods schedules the price is based primarily upon the weight of the contents. When man changes the size of the can and alters the amount of food the consumer gets, the consumer is expected to pay a higher retail price. When hens change the size of an egg shell it increases the size of a container and so also increases the amount of food the consumer gets. Hence if food values are to be sold on a weight ceiling basis it is difficult for OPA to claim eggs are different if sold at retail when the weight of a case of eggs already rules prices at wholesale. Whenever the buyer gets more the buyer should be expected to pay more.

Only for measuring the spread between the different grades of quality might historical precedents properly apply. Price histories are out because of war conditions. The whole price octave now goes up regardless of the past. However, the differentials between quality grades will continue, for they express consumer preference. They measure the difference buyers are willing to pay as between the same size eggs of different qualities.

The essence of a fair ceiling, therefore, should be based on a single focal point; that is on large eggs of "United States Extra" quality expressed in terms of a flat year-round price. These "extras" would be graded by size on a weight basis under present United States sizes, and would be so priced. In addition to the "United States Extra Large" size, there should be three other quality ceiling series: Specials, Standards, and Trades, each of which should be based on the United States Extra Large ceiling with such plus or minus differentials as historical records may show. Each of these quality series has its size price ceilings automatically expressed on established 3-ounce grade intervals, just the same as with the "United States Extras" base. Such a ceiling formula can be represented on a simple table and protects the public as well as the producer, the trade, and the war effort.

I fear Secretary Wickard cannot achieve his hoped for egg goals unless OPA provides some such simple, workable ceiling that, above all, will enable the producers to stay in business.

Truman Turns Trumps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to publish herewith a copy of an article by Frank C. Waldrop, columnist, published in the Washington Times-Herald:

TRUMAN TURNS TRUMPS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

President Truman has just let J. Stalin have one where it hurts. He has sent word that after July 1 no more food for Russia from the U. S. A. And just to let the diplomatic hot shots know this is not favoritism, he has done the same for General de Gaulle.

After July 1 no more food for France, also.

Finally, he has ordered a slow-down on lend-lease shipments to both countries. No more whole factories and trainloads of machine tools. No more newsprint, ladies' stockings, etc., etc.

Lend-lease from here on, President Truman orders, will be confined to strictly essential military items such as shells, guns, and things with which to kill our enemies.

Something new has been added, boys.

Mr. Truman's performance in office continues to be in tune with America and with American interests.

The country likes him not just because he is positive in his dealings with other nations but because positiveness on behalf of the U. S. A. is so novel in our time.

Mr. Truman has shown that he wants to do what is fair and right in world affairs. He has shown good will toward the understandable desires of all common-sense people for world peace and he favors agreements between nations that will help to keep the peace.

But he has also plainly shown that he remembers America, first. It is one thing to judge that money can be spent profitably in the interests of the United States of America, on international projects of some special kind. But it is another thing, entirely to throw our pocketbook open to any and all who want to raid it.

After all, Harry S. Truman knows the meaning of not only a dollar, but also a nickel. He has been a poor boy. And a poor man. Taxes to him, are not something theoretical for soaking and punishing the rich.

Taxes, in his experience, have had to be paid by the sweat of the brow, and that is very important, at this point in history.

For, monumental though lend-lease has been and continues to be, it is a little thing by comparison with the possibilities of UNRRA.

There are people who have been kidding themselves that the war is somehow going to end in everybody on our side having a lot more of everything nice than they had when it all began.

That, of course, is the most monumental lie of all.

This war has cost us the lives of many thousands of our best and most aggressive young men. Those were a national asset that will not be replaced by any or all the wonders of science.

This war has cost us hundreds of billions of dollars. Is any double-action, flip-of-the-wrist, push-button gadget going to pay back those billions, harmlessly, silently, and untouched by human hands?

This war has cost us copper, iron, timber, gold, silver, and on down through the list of natural wealth from apples to zirconium.

Is anybody silly enough to think that the drain on American property in this war is going to be bounced off at no expense?

We are coming out of this war poorer than we went in, both in human stock and in material wealth.

We will not find it easy to take care of ourselves.

If we undertake to care for the world in free-hand, WPA fashion, it will be only a little while before we, and the world with us, crash. Mr. Truman, who knows that a nickel is money, shows interest in that hard fact. We're lucky that he does.

The Building of This New National Defense Superhighway and Airport System, as Defined in H. R. 3036, Will Solve the Postwar Unemployment Problem, Save Human Life, Make 100 Percent Profit to Patrons, and Produce Immense Revenue to the Federal Government, Without a Dollar of Public Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement with Analysis and Proof thereof, by U. G. Robinson, president of the National Superhighway Association, of Atlantic City, N. J., that "The building of this new national defense superhighway and airport system, as defined in H. R. 3036, will solve the postwar unemployment problem, save human life, make 100 percent profit to patrons, and produce immense revenue to the Federal Government, without a dollar of public taxation":

THE BUILDING OF THIS NEW NATIONAL DEFENSE SUPERHIGHWAY AND AIRPORT SYSTEM, AS DEFINED IN H. R. 3036, WILL SOLVE THE POSTWAR UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM, SAVE HUMAN LIFE, MAKE 100 PERCENT PROFIT TO PATRONS, AND PRODUCE IMMENSE REVENUE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WITHOUT A DOLLAR OF PUBLIC TAXATION

(By U. G. Robinson, president, National Superhighway Association, Atlantic City, N. J.)

ANALYSIS AND PROOF

The enactment of this nonpartisan national defense superhighway and airport sys-

tem bill, H. R. 3036, introduced by Congressman HAND, to become effective at once and operative immediately after our victory over the barbarian aggressors, will satisfactorily solve all general unemployment problems resulting from the war.

To build the 25,000 miles of this proposed new superhighway and airport system, connecting all centers of traffic in every State in the Union, will require the well-remunerated services of millions of munition workers and veterans for 3 to 5 years during the perilous postwar readjustment period. Congressional action now determines the economic and unemployment conditions then.

This national defense superhighway and airport system would be lifesaving, self-liquidating, time lasting, Nation defending, profit-making, and revenue producing and, after the war, employment insurance. This all-comprehensive public-works project would be located by competent and unprejudiced civil and Army engineers. Its three main lines east and west, and seven north and south, as defined in this bill, H. R. 3036, would be run through the country, thus avoiding all city streets, pedestrian and local traffic on the present-day roads, while appropriate branches would be extended to city limits of all traffic centers. It would have three to six one-way traffic lanes and a parking shoulder in either direction, according to traffic requirements, for cars, trucks, and busses. It would have smooth concrete barriers, hub high, and steel plated on both sides of the traffic lanes in either direction, thereby eliminating all dangers of running into trees, poles, ditches, banks, bridge abutments, and other death traps. There would be no advertising signs to divert the attention of drivers. The hills would be cut down and the valleys filled up, while all highways, railroads, rivers, and mountains would be either bridged or tunneled. The right-of-way would be 500 to 1,000 feet or more wide with frequent emergency airplane-landing fields and modern airports all properly lighted and guarded for safety. The roadbed would be constructed to carry, at high speed, a load of approximately 100 tons for defense or commerce and, like the Pyramids of Egypt, built to stand forever. At entrance arenas off the highway there would be standard service stations, refreshment stands, and tourist cabins.

There will be 100-percent benefit profit to all patrons of this superhighway on the amount of all tolls paid by the saving of fuel, time, expense, and depreciation. In addition to this cash saving profit on every dollar paid for the use of this superhighway, the patron has the absolute assurance of scientific safety against head-on collisions, hitting pedestrians, animals, or any obstacle, grade-crossing accidents, wreck of automobile, or personal injury Those benefited by using this national superhighway, and not the general taxpayers, should and will pay for the building and maintaining of the system, plus a handsome revenue to the Federal Government in return for supplying the wisdom to authorize it and the credit with which to build the greatest national defense superhighway and airport system of all nations.

Forty thousand killed on the public highways in 1941. The Travelers Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn., states that each death in automobile accidents cost the Nation $60,000 economic loss or a total of about $2,400,000,000. Damage to 1,000,000 cars in accidents and 1,500,000 people injured, costing doctor and hospital fees, loss of time, court and legal expenses, are estimated at $2,600,000,000, or a staggering total loss of about $5,000,000,000 in 1941. What an appalling record. What an astounding cost. What a terrifying penalty the public pays for building and using cheap, antiquated highways for fast-moving modern automobiles.

Insurance statistics show over 80 percent of all auto accidents occur on unscientifically constructed roads, or over four billion annual cash loss due to inefficiently planned roads between cities. In about 4 years the saving of this economic loss would build 25,000 miles of a lifesaving superhighway throughout the country. This proposed scientific system will cost $15,000,000,000, more or less, depending on the price of well-paid labor and materials at time of building, but the Government will own it without levying a dollar of taxation on industry, and will derive an immense revenue from it for all time while providing the public with an astonishing opportunity to make 100 percent profit on all tolls paid for the use of it instead of using the dangerous death-trap free public roads now in use. This startling fact is absolutely proven by the clearly demonstrated results from the State built, owned, and operated Holland Tunnel, Philadelphia-Camden Bridge, Pennsylvania Turnpike, and the Bankhead Tunnel under Mobile Bay.

More murderous than war are the automobile highways of America, according to statistics by the Travelers Insurance Co. Quoting from their published record:

"Our Nation has engaged in six major wars since its birth in 1776. In total these wars extended over a period of 15 years. The number of American soldiers killed in action, or died of wounds, during these 15 years of war was 244,357."

By the same authentic authority during 15 years, 1927 to 1941, inclusive, there were killed (murdered) on the shambles of the present inefficient free public roads, a total of 499,729. It is a stunning fact that more than twice as many men, women and children were killed in 15 years of driving on our present-day highways built by the States as were soldiers killed in all the 15 years our country has been engaged in war between 1776 and 1941. It is genuine sanity and economic wisdom, patriotic statesmanship and a Federal Government duty to build this life-saving super-highway system, which would be commensurate with the development and use of the automobile in the growing interstate traffic, since it is impossible for the various States to build a homogeneous national defense super highway and airport system.

To produce all the materials in America required to build this national defense super highway and airport system and the dams to generate current to light it, will be a gigantic labor job. It will require about 400,000 employed, as soon as the super-highway and highway system is completed, to guard, maintain and operate this, the greatest and most profitable business institution in America, as well as the most important borderline of national defense.

It is a self-evident fact that the building of this life-saving, self-liquidating national defense and airport system would employ many millions of men and women for several years after the war. It is squarely up to the labor and business interests of the Nation to write to their Congressmen and Senators approving this postwar employment proposal and asking them to enact Congressman HAND'S bill, H. R. 3036, into law at once as a postwar employment measure so that construction may begin immediately when munition plants close and soldiers return. This enactment would surely eliminate all possibility of disastrous unemployment and consequent business depression following World War II, such as did follow World War I.

This national improvement would bind the four corners of our land together with an unbreakable band of steel and concrete which would immediately upon completion become the safe channel through which would flow the lifeblood of our economic structure. It would remain forever a monument to modern transportation and engineering skill. It would link together every section, every class, and every interest of our great Republic.

The highest prevailing wages would be paid for all labor producing the material to go into the superhighways, dams, and airports, as well as to all labor engaged on the construction work of the project. It would surely absorb all available labor of every description at American standard-of-living wages. Therefore it would create and maintain the greatest buying power ever developed in this country. Manufacturing and retail business would flourish. Professional men and women would be benefited and general prosperity would be assured.

The Federal Government did expend in 10 years, over $15,000,000,000 for unemployment-relief purposes, yet during that same period we experienced the most disastrous depression in history as the result of unemployment following in the wake of the First World War. This vast amount of taxpayer's money necessarily spent on unemployment-relief with no practical economic return would have built the 25,000 miles of this new superb national defense superhighway and airport system. It would have given self-sustaining work to all able-bodied unemployed and therefore would have ended the depression. This wasted relief money would have completed the greatest, safest, and cheapest transportation system on the globe.

Since I first wrote this proposal in 1922, coined the term "Superhighway" and copyrighted it, there has been developed an abundance of indisputable evidence which specifically proves the value, benefits, and success of better and safer automobile highways for toll.

The Holland Tunnel is a demonstrated example of such government-owned toll highways. Millions of automobiles have passed through that tunnel without a death from auto accidents. The year 1941 the Port of New York Authority reported to the owners, the States of New York and New Jersey, a net profit revenue from the tunnels and bridges it has built and operates, of $8,740,131.32, over all expenses, interest, and sinking-fund payments.

The Delaware River Joint Commission of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, which built and operates the Philadelphia-Camden Bridge, reported to the State Legislatures of Pennsylvania and New Jersey a net profit, in 1941, over all expenses and interest, of $1,576,075.50.

The Pennsylvania turnpike is a semi-superhighway since it has exposed to traffic the dangers of bridge abutments, poles, trees, ditches, etc., while a genuine superhighway as defined in this bill, H. R. 3036, has none of these death traps. However, this short-cut semi-superhighway, tunneling the mountains between Pittsburgh and Harrisburg about 160 miles, reported in 1941 a net profit of $1,232,136.56 to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, after paying operating expenses and interest on the investment. There is a general demand by industry, wrote Governor James, to have the turnpike, which is the best road of its length in the world today, extended to Philadelphia for a greater accommodation and profit to through traffic between the two metropolitan cities of Pennsylvania.

The Bankhead tunnel, under the bay at Mobile, Ala., is a marvelous demonstration of Government-owned toll highways. This tunnel and its improvements to date cost $4,418,450.23. The report of the board of commissioners of the city of Mobile states the "excess operating income over the expense for fiscal year ending September 30, 1944, was $411,549.17," which is over 9.31 percent net profit on the entire cost of construction. This tunnel saves patrons about 5 miles of city traffic and is a proven wise investment and tremendous financial success.

The marvelous financial results of these four Government built, owned, and operated public-works projects proves beyond a doubt that better built and safer superhighways, such as the Hand superhighway bill proposes for public use, with reasonable toll, will

pay a handsome profit to the patrons and an immense revenue to the Government.

High-speed Diesel-motored busses would provide transcontinental sleeper service from New York to San Francisco within 3 days. Southern winter resorts and northern patrons would be brought closer together. Persons living inland and seeking the benefits of shore, lake, and mountain resorts in summer could safely do so in half the time and less expense now required. All people would be brought closer together, see and understand each other better. Sectional prejudices would be greatly diminished.

Lighted superhighways would also mark the routes of major airlines. There would be no more of the tragic accidents where airplanes lose themselves in mountainous areas and crash with great loss of life. The light of the superhighways would be a never-failing guide to sky traffic. There would be along the right-of-way emergency landing fields, schools for the training of civilian and Army pilots and other local aviation facilities.

In time of war the superhighway and airport system would permit quick mobilization and transportation of troops to repel invasion. With the present high degree of mobility of the armed forces, the superhighway and airport system would give those forces the needed facilities for reaching maximum efficiency in defending the Nation.

All citizens of our glorious Republic can perform their patriotic duty and enjoy their constitutional right of petition by writing five brief letters, or postal cards, respectfully requesting the enactment of this national defense superhighway and airport bill, H. R. 3036. Address your letters to the Congressman representing your district, the two Senators from your States, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and to the President, Harry S. Truman, all at Washington, D. C. As good citizens, now is the time to express your convictions. Render a patriotic service to the Government of your country and your fellow citizens. Ask your neighbors to write likewise to the same officials expressing their desire for life-saving superhighways.

With every member of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I most respectfully plead to work and vote for this strictly nonpartisan measure because, without the preadventure of a reasonable doubt, the building of this new national defense superhighway and airport system as defined in H. R. 3036, will solve the postwar unemployment problem, save human life, make 100-percent profit to patrons and produce immense revenue to the Federal Government, without a dollar of public taxation.

An Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpt from a letter written me by a father who lost his son in the war:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks through you to the Army and the United States Government for all the attention which we have received. I realize that the letters which we have received from The Adjutant General, Secretary of War, the general commanding my son's division, the card of sympathy from General Marshall, the Memorial Scroll signed by Mr. Roosevelt, and the Purple Heart award are all a matter of routine and are the same in all similar cases. It is impossible to acknowledge each one, since I realize that acknowledgements would not reach the parties who really are responsible; however, someone or some group in Washington has given a great deal of sympathetic thought to the feelings of the next of kin of those lost in the war, and there should be some way for us to express our appreciation to whoever had the inspiration to plan this so carefully. If it were possible, through you, for me to express such appreciation as both my wife and I feel, I would be deeply grateful.

HARVEY E. FISK, Jr.

China Still Fights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I want to call attention to the fact that July 7 will mark the eighth anniversary of the Chinese war of resistance against the Japanese invasion. Eight years is a long time. This is our war as much as theirs. It has been fought with a minimum of help from the United States and from other countries. It has been fought with determination, with courage, with patience, and with great sacrifice. I hope the recent victory over the Axis will turn the tide of interest as well as the tide of war toward the Orient, and that we may realize what China has done and can still do. The hope of peace for the world of the future, toward which we all look hopefully, does not lie entirely in Europe. It lies also in the Far East, and in that picture China has the greatest possibilities of influence. The following statement was given by me to the Chinese Central Daily News, of Washington, for its anniversary edition on July 7:

For 8 years the Chinese people have stood between the rest of the world and chaos. Uncomplainingly they have seen the help to which they were entitled, and which they had been promised, go to other nations, on some grounds of greater immediate need. They have worked and fought uncomplainingly. Where other nations, whose names I might easily give here, have said that transportation was disrupted; that food was scarce; that the Government would be endangered without more food and more help from the United States, and have demanded food and arms and transportation as the price of cooperation for their own salvation, the Chinese Government in just as difficult a situation, and the Chinese people, under more desperate personal conditions, with the same lack of facilities and transportation, have built roads by hand, drawn the cars and boats by manpower on tow lines, carried material and food in baskets, and finally, and still uncomplainingly, have gone without. For the future of the United States, and the peace of the world, we look to the Orient, and to our long-established friendship with China. Those of us who come from the west coast know the importance of this statement, better perhaps than those whose homes are on the eastern seaboard, and whose eyes seldom turn to the Far East.

I join today gladly in doing honor to the Chinese people on the eighth anniversary of their war, which is also our war, and to their courage and their patience, and to the steadfastness of the Chinese Government, under the leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, on the eight anniversary of the Chinese war of resistance against Japan.

Farm Labor Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a statement made before the Anderson committee at Yakima, Wash., at its recent hearings there. Mr. W. M. Kohagen is a handler of perishables and knows that work intimately. In his statement before the committee he explained some of the difficulties of farmers, including, in part, the hardships imposed by Federal regulatory boards in dealing with agricultural labor problems with which they are not familiar. I quote some excerpts from his speech, as follows:

The crops are perishable in varying degrees. The harvesting and handling of soft fruits must be timed almost to the hour and day to avoid deterioration or loss. Closely intermeshed with the farmer's productive efforts in one continuing process is the packing, processing, and storing. If the farmer can timely harvest his fruit, but there is inadequate labor to pack, store, or process, the whole structure fails and the season's work and investment of the farmer is wasted and the food lost.

The problem of meeting the over-all labor requirements is not the simple one of a single crop area. The Yakima Valley is particularly illustrative of the multiple crop areas of the Northwest. It normally produces 190,000 tons of apples; 35,000 tons of peaches; 260,000 tons of sugar beets; 140,000 tons of potatoes; 40,000 green tons of hops; 95,000 tons of Bartlett pears; 13,000 tons of winter pears; 15,000 tons of cherries; 18,000 tons plums, prunes, and apricots; 24,000 tons miscellaneous vegetables, as well as large amounts of livestock, poultry, and forage crops. The labor demand consequently is a series of peaks and valleys from June until December. The high peak is in the fall, when an additional 17,000 workers have normally been required.

Equally important is the need for an equitable relationship in wages paid in the various crops and the industries that service them.

Last season substantial amounts of valuable fruit was lost in the Yakima Valley. An estimated 10,000 to 12,000 tons of Bartlett pears were lost, and on peaches and prunes the loss in money value ran substantially in excess of $500,000. Factors other than labor contributed to the situation, and it is with no desire to minimize them that these remarks are made:

1. Lack of coordination between farm labor wage rates and rates paid in warehouses of Agricultural Service Industries: Farmers, packers, storers, and processors all draw their labor from a common pool for the closely integrated activities within these areas of production. The hours of labor of all are dictated by nature and the weather. Con-

gress was wisely mindful of this situation and protected this relationship by classifying as agricultural labor the processes which were identical, whether performed on or off the farm or upon which the farmer was dependent for disposal of his crops.

Now we have many of these wise laws nullified by administrative regulation. In the case of labor, we have a house divided within itself with the War Labor Board having jurisdiction of packing, processing, and storing activities, whether on or off the farm, and the War Food Administration, the field labor. Criticism of which agency has frozen rates too high or too low is secondary in importance to the basic fact that the two must be in harmony at whatever rate is necessary to provide the labor to save the crops. Otherwise the available labor is siphoned off to the crop or part of the process which pays the highest rate. This is our present situation with an industrially minded War Labor Board predicating adjustments on industrial criteria totally unsuited to agriculture and without flexibility to meet local or fast changing crop conditions. The freezing and holding of wages of packers and processors at levels out of line with farm rates, permitted farmers to generally harvest their crops in timely fashion but an acute shortage existed to handle the crops. Illustrative of this is the testimony of a farmer who packs his own fruit, given at a Wage Board hearing. He was legally permitted to pay a keyman $1.25 per hour when working in the orchard, but on the day he stepped into the packing house, his legal rate was 80 cents. His worth to the farmer on either job was the same.

When packers or processors had received all they could presently handle with short labor supply, they could exercise discretion and avoid financial loss by purchasing no more than they could adequately handle from day to day. Fruit moved into cold storage for later handling experienced similar bottlenecks in receiving and stacking in storage. Once it got there it lay longer than normal because of slow movement to packers and processors. When storages were filled the fruit simply had to be left in high orchard temperatures and deteriorate or go unharvested. The extension of the processing season to the extreme limit of keepability of the soft fruits in turn denied the use of considerable cold storage to the later apple crops. Here was a pyramiding of bottlenecks with growers of these crops and the public suffering the major hardship rather than labor and industry, who alone have voice in the determination of the problem before the War Labor Board.

This agency which has its concern with the continuing industrial processes of tanks and airplanes; nuts and bolts; fixed workweeks which do not vary with the weather; predetermined production schedules; cannot be fairly expected to see with understanding eyes its occasional handling of unrelated agricultural problems.

The manufacturer of nuts and bolts forfeits only his day's production when a stoppage occurs for any reason. The material is not lost. An unseasonally hot day that softens a peach; a frost that starts an apple crop overnight; requires that the whole process immediately adjust for the situation or the material, which in this case is valuable food and the entire year's labor and investment of the producer is forfeited.

The War Food Administration State wage boards provide prompt flexibility to meet varying conditions in the field; the members are informed in the needs of agriculture. The complementary work of the service industries wait for weeks and months of delay through the War Labor Board.

The issues at stake demand a practical solution of the problem in the interest of the war effort and the saving of foods. We believe that a return to the historical and congressional concept of these processes being essentially agriculture and placing of jurisdiction in the Department of Agriculture would go far in remedying existing evils.

2. Application of industrial formula to agricultural problems: The Wages and Hours Act, as passed by Congress, provided an exemption from its provisions for the service performed in the area of production in the preparation of agricultural and horticultural commodities for market in their raw or natural state. The definition of what constituted the area was left to the Administrator. * * *

The purpose of the amendment is to permit the small farmer, who cannot afford to have his own warehouse and cannot afford to have his own washing machine, to be placed upon a parity with the larger producers who can afford to maintain their own warehouses and their own washing machines and their own equipment.

Last summer, after six long years, the Supreme Court held the definition invalid, which the Administrator had conceived. This definition based on complex criteria which required the establishment to be located in the open country or town of less than 2,500, employ less than 10 persons, and receive all its products from within 10 miles emasculated the exemption. A new definition is now being formulated and from the early statements of the Administrator increased complexity of criteria will be the basis for accomplishing the same erroneous end in a different manner. A similar situation occurred under the Social Security Act. To remedy this, Congress was forced after several years of confusion to write its own definition.

The administrative action, however, did not stop here. Last September, after the soft-fruit season and effective this year on an entire crop for the first time, the WLB in effort to approach a balance between field and warehouse labor, resorted to industrial fringe adjustments instead of direct hourly increases. Among these was the constriction of the "56-hour exemption" to 48 and "the unlimited" to 56, without the time and one-half penalty. After these are exhausted, the 40-hour week prevails with time and one-half after the 40.

The question is, how does this contribute to wastage of food?

The answer is, a lesser utilization of the available labor and artificial limitation of the producers' normal outlets. Processors, canners, packers, and storers of fruit, have ceilings on their products or services. They are based on costs at straight time rates of adequate labor and minimum hourly restrictions. The only relief given by OPA has been that based on increases in the straight times rates.

The reaction to the effect of overtime penalties is the normal one intended by the Wage-Hour Act, of discouraging work beyond the hourly limitations. Congress foresaw that this was unworkable in the case of perishable fruits and vegetables.

To avoid the 50-percent increase in costs, buyers, packers, and processors will generally confine their buying or performance of services to only what can be done at straight time. The effect would be the same as if about 15 percent of the plants closed their doors.

The farmer who has worked unlimited hours in response to the call for additional production witnesses the failure of his efforts through these unrealistic and artificial limitations on his normal outlets. It is he who must bear the burden of the losses when his fruit is wasted.

In this issue there is no quarrel with reasonable and adequate pay, or whether the farmer, employee, or employer would not enjoy stabilized and lesser hours; whether it is socially desirable or the hourly output is greater in an 8-hour day than in a 10-hour day. I believe all would grant their desirability. But nature and the weather pay no more attention to these desires than the tide did to King Canute.

The choice becomes one allowing agriculture processes to operate under natural law with maximum utilization of the crops produced or administrative regulation with losses of food.

Status of Filipino Seamen Serving on United States Merchant Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Territorial Filipino Council of Hawaii:

TERRITORIAL FILIPINO COUNCIL OF HAWAII,
Lihue, Kauai, T. H., July 2, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: In connection with the status of Filipino seamen who are now serving the United States merchant ships, may we be permitted to present for your consideration certain provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which operates to the great injustice of Filipino seamen residing in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii. We refer to section 303, A, B, and C, which, in effect, included Filipinos in the classification of aliens for purposes of employment in these merchant marine ships of the United States, not permitted to serve in subsidized American cargo vessels, and in passenger vessels only with the 20-percent quota for aliens. Said provision reads:

"(a) Vessels documented under the laws of the United States: All licensed officers of vessels documented under the laws of the United States as now required by law, shall be citizens of the United States, native-born or completely naturalized; and upon each departure from the United States of a cargo vessel in respect of which a subsidy has been granted all of the crew (crew including all employees of the ship) shall be citizens of the United States, native-born or completely naturalized."

"(b) Passenger vessels granted subsidies: For a period of 1 year after the effective date of this section, upon each departure from the United States of a passenger vessel in respect of which a construction or operation subsidy has been granted, all licensed officers shall be citizens of the United States as defined above, and no less than 80 percent of the crew (crew including all employees of the ship other than officers) shall be citizens of the United States, native-born or completely naturalized, and thereafter the percentage of citizens as above defined shall be increased 5 percent per annum until 90 percent of the entire crew, including all licensed officers of any such vessel, shall be citizens of the United States, native-born or completely naturalized.

"(c) Aliens: Conditions of Employment: Any member of the crew, not required by this section to be citizens of the United States, may be an alien only if he is in possession of a valid declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, or either evidence of legal admission to the United States for permanent residence. Such alien, as above defined, may be employed only in the steward's department on passenger vessels."

The language of the act must be carefully noted, to wit: "shall be citizens of the United States, native-born or completely naturalized."

These provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 have the effect of immediately causing the loss of employment of all the Filipinos on the cargo ships subsidized under the terms of the act, and leaving only a very small number of them employed in the steward's department on the passenger ships subsidized under the act. The actual number deprived of this employment has been estimated from 5,000 to 9,000. A survey showed that 95 percent of these Filipino seamen have been unable to find employment in other vocations, and in fact not adapted to other employment by reason of their long service in the merchant marine of the United States. However, when the war broke out these same Filipinos have been reemployed, notwithstanding the restrictive section of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as above cited which barred Filipinos as aliens from employment in the said ships of the United States.

Filipinos born in the Philippines and who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and who were not admitted to American citizenship because of lack of service in the armed forces, obviously were unable to qualify for employment under the above statute (49 Stat. 2016) in that they are neither native-born citizens, nor can they be completely naturalized. Consequently, several thousands of these Filipinos who have been employed in various cargo and passenger vessels for years before the enactment of the act have been layed off on account of their citizenship status, not being native-born nor completely naturalized American citizens.

Filipinos are admittedly not aliens. They are nationals. They owe no allegiance to any foreign power. They owe absolute allegiance to the United States. Under the constitution of the Philippines, Filipinos may be called to defend the United States flag (which they have done so unsparingly during this global war) and yet, by reason of the language of the law, they are barred from employment as provided by the Statute cited above.

These Filipinos entered the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii previous to passage of the Philippine Independence Act of 1934. Young as well as old Filipinos, encouraged by the liberality of the immigration laws of the United States with respect to citizens of the Philippines, came largely because they were taught to look upon the United States as the land of equal opportunity. A large number of them who have resided in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii for years have married American citizens; their children, American boys and girls, citizens of the United States. Several thousand Filipino couples, especially those who went to Hawaii, have raised families and whose children, by virtue of their birth, are citizens of the United States. During all these years of their residence in the United States they have learned to rely upon the traditional sense of fairness and justice of the American people, a people with whom the Filipinos have fought and died so heroically side by side in the fox holes of Bataan or on the beachheads of Leyte for the preservation of the American ideals and principles of human justice, liberty, and freedom.

Owing absolute allegiance to the United States and subject to call to arms in defense of the American flag under the provision of the Philippine Constitution, with the United States still having complete sovereignty over the Philippines, these Filipinos find themselves in some respect in far more serious predicament than aliens who have never recognized loyalty to the American flag. Under the existing law Filipinos, except in certain limited instances, cannot even apply for American citizenship, while aliens are given that right and privilege, irrespective of their loyalty to America.

During the transition period and until the Philippines become completely free and independent, the Congress of the United States still has the power to control our affairs. The Philippines, in an international sense, are still a part of the United States. The Filipinos are, to say the least, at this time legally American nationals and will remain so until the United States has withdrawn its sovereignty over the Philippines. Under the Philippine Constitution, Americans and American corporations are assured within the Philippines equal civil rights and privileges with Philippine citizens or corporations.

For almost half a century, citizens of the Philippines who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence have been treated as nationals "owing absolute allegiance" to the United States. But such persons are neither citizens nor aliens of the United States. Their legal status is undefined. Consequently, they have been subjected to numerous discriminations, notwithstanding the fact that they have raised respectable American families.

For almost half a century, the bonds of friendship between the two peoples have been growing stronger and stronger. Today, as for many years, Filipinos are adopting American ideas on all phases of their lives—economic, cultural, political, and social.

In view of these facts, we, therefore, rightly feel that Filipinos in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii, are at least prior to independence, entitled to recognition of the rights they have enjoyed prior to the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, thus enabling them to remain in their present employment in the subsidized vessels of the United States. It would be most unfortunate, if, after this war is won, the Filipinos now serving in merchant marine ships will not be permitted to continue in their present employment on account of the provisions above mentioned—removing from them their means of livelihood and threatening their families, United States citizens, with poverty, unemployment, and misery.

Filipinos today are given the right and privilege to serve the country of their allegiance in the civil branch of the Government, and the right to defend the United States by serving in the armed forces, but, by the term of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, they are ineligible to be employed in the merchant marine ships as seamen, except for the duration when they have been accorded that right of service. It seems manifestly unfair that these Filipinos should be allowed to serve in the armed forces of the United States and be deprived of serving the merchant marine which is being subsidized for one reason at least, so that both ships and trained seamen will be available to the United States for national-defense service. It seems inconsistent, too, for the reason that Congress has placed a premium on the seamanship of the Filipinos, and recognized their usefulness in the United States Navy. We respectfully beg to request that these anomalous situations with respect to Filipino seamen be solved once and for all in order that they may be treated impartially in the postwar period; that they will be made to continue their satisfactory services in their present employment in the merchant marine ships irrespective of the restrictive clause provided in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as regards Filipino crews.

We rely on your humanitarian and impartial treatment of this matter and we hope that you will find it expedient to recommend such remedial legislation that will safeguard the security of these Filipino seamen in the postwar period.

With assurances of our high esteem and consideration, we beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

PHILIP P. GAMPONIA,
Chairman of Committee on Political Status of Filipinos.
CEYETANO R. LIGOT,
Chairman, Committee on Economics.
JUAN S. REGALA,
Chairman, Committee on Labor,
FORTUNATO G. TEHO,
Chairman, Committee on Education,
JOSEPHINE E. GAMPONIA,
Chairman, Committee on Welfare,
For the Filipino Territorial Council Delegation.

DIOSDADO M. YAP,
Washington Representative for the Filipino Inter-Community Organization of the Western States.

Address in New York by Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by me at the Pennsylvania Hotel, New York City, on June 23, 1945, at the preemergency conference dinner in honor of Mr. Isidore Lipschutz, vice president of the Anti-Nazi League:

We are winning the vertical war. That war is fought between groups of nations with definite boundaries. It is fought on battlefields that we can pin-point on the map. Some of our own friends and neighbors are helping to win those battles. They are fighting with weapons which millions have worked to manufacture, weapons which the rest of us have seen and can identify. This is the type of war which is given such complete and excellent coverage by the press, radio, and news-reel services. Every home in America has felt the sharp, physical impact of this conflict. We know what this war means.

However, there is another struggle going on at the same time, which most of our people fail to see. Revolutionary forces are at work in every country of this world. Ideological, political, economic, and social conflicts are in constant ferment. They cannot be stopped by tanks, planes, or battleships. This horizontal type of warfare will become our biggest problem beginning with the very day that the guns are silenced. Unless we seek a solution to these clashes in the American way we may see our country weakened and divided like a great, strong tree that is corrupted by the interior enemies, the insects who bore from within. Like that great tree, our America of today is strong and imposing in her material might. We are prepared to weather any storm, but are we prepared to resist any disease?

There are germs in our American community which have become passive during this war. They could not hope to make any inroads on our national health while tens of millions of our citizens, alerted to danger, have given us a strength and unity which we never before possessed. But as the war comes to a close, these germs are becoming active again. With the coming of peace,

they expect our unity to dissolve. With the tensions inevitable to reconversion, they see their opportunity to play group against group. They will try to divide us so that they may conquer us.

These germs cannot be recognized at a glance even though they are large in size and are in the likeness of human beings. Though small in number, they multiply rapidly when conditions are suitable. Like all germs, they prey on weaknesses in the human system. In this case, they try to whip up to fever pitch two of man's oldest sore spots, his predisposition to racial hatred and religious bigotry.

Democracies in particular, have tried to immunize their peoples, to protect them from these poisons, by instituting free and universal education. It was believed that the power to reason, the ability to separate truth and falsehood, would save the people from infection. The Nazis, however, in perfecting their very powerful secret weapon, propaganda, directed it, not against reason, but toward the emotions. That propaganda confused and dismayed whole nations and two, Czechoslovakia and Denmark, surrendered without a show of resistance. Small wonder that a certain unprincipled Dr. Goebbels ranked high among the architects of the Nazi scourge. The defenseless Jewish minority was chosen as the scapegoat. All problems were blamed on the sons of Israel. Nazi propaganda deliberately fanned the mob spirit into the most barbarous carnival of torture and death in all history. Senators and publicists who returned from an investigation of the Nazi murder factories have given us off-the-record accounts of their findings. Good taste will not permit me to mention the gruesome details. It is enough that we take warning from the facts that we do know. Those facts show how propaganda can turn civilized men into beasts. And the beginning, the cornerstone of the deadly Nazi propaganda, was the creation of the racial myth.

Hitler and Goebbels may be dead. Others may be captured and punished for their crimes. But if we stop here, with the Nazis, and fall back into our old easy-going complacency, all our sacrifices may be in vain. Hitler and his partners-in-crime were not mere gangsters who seized power over the German people. The fact is they assumed authority by legitimate means, legitimate in the sense that they were supported by the majority of the German people. And the dominant feature of the Nazi revolution was the assertion that the Germans have the divine right to enslave the world because they are racially superior to others.

Racial nationalism as preached and practiced by the Nazis is the most dangerous form of all nationalisms. I say is because millions of people have been indoctrinated with Nazi prejudices, including some in our own country. It is difficult to combat with reason because it has primitive passions to sustain it. Though the Nazi state is gone, there are many men who remember how close it came to world power. Those men would like to avoid Nazi military mistakes, but employ again the effectiveness of Nazi propaganda. And they will begin with the cornerstones of racial hate and religious bigotry.

Even now they are trying to drive wedges between the United States and her allies, while American boys are still fighting and dying to win the military victory. In their eagerness to spread discord, they cannot wait for the war to end. Already the rumor factories are busy manufacturing their lies. And the pity is that some gullible Americans who never spoke up in righteous anger against the bestial crimes of the Nazis, are working overtime to pass on the propaganda which seeks to wreck the peace and with it the hopes of all humanity.

America must not go back to sleep! You and I recall how millions of our countrymen were made to order for the Nazi line in the years just preceding the war. And we remember how one man—who saw through the Nazi lies—set out to waken America to her danger. Time and again he spoke to us, earnestly and truthfully, to open our eyes and our minds to the insidious propaganda that was softening us up for the ambush. Thanks to him America did wake up, and just in time. That man was Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

A great American is gone, but other Americans, great and humble, must come forward to fill the void which his passing has left. Democracy cannot dwell upon its past. It must become dynamic, with passionate living of the values which have made it great, and will make it strong to resist any weakness which may threaten it from within. The spirit of America in arms must never be lost. The brotherhood of the battlefield, where no questions of race or religion were asked, as men fought and died for each other, must be preserved. I sincerely believe that the real comradeship of the men and women in the armed services will do more to promote democracy in the years to come than any other single factor in our national experience. During the past 3½ years millions of Americans were uprooted from their insularity and forced to live with other men in barracks, ships, and foxholes. This has done much to break down ancient prejudices. For when men must rely on each other in the ordeal of battle all that is small and mean is stripped away. A man is judged and respected not by his name or his rank but on his face value and on the way he cooperates unselfishly with others.

It is up to us, the stay-at-homes, to understand these men. After what they have been through there is much in our way of life they will not approve of. Our first duty is to show these men that we appreciate the sacrifices they have made for us. They will not be satisfied with pious phrases. They want jobs and fundamental security. It is up to us to bridge the gulf between veteran and civilian by proving that America has a place for the returning servicemen. We must do this not only in the spirit of obligation but because we are proud to do it for them.

In the special meaning of this meeting tonight, we have another reason. Unscrupulous individuals in this country will try to separate the veteran from the civilian instead of bringing them together in the classless fellowship which we mean when we say "Americans." Propagandists will play up one set of facts before veteran organizations and give a different slant to the same facts before other groups. The happy medium of rational discussion will be ignored. The mutual problems which we must face and solve as Americans will be separated and inflamed as group tensions. It is this confused atmosphere of fear and hate that propaganda is working for * * * in order to camouflage its own intentions as it reaches for power.

How can we combat this destructive technique? By being Americans in fact as well as in faith. We are not robots living under a dictator's control. Freedom does not mean release from responsibility. We are and shall remain Americans only so long as we exercise our conscience and our intelligence. It is our responsibility to corner every racial or religious lie that we hear. Don't be a conveyor belt for rumors, for that is the way to play into the hands of subversive propaganda.

This undeclared type of warfare uses the old advertising trick of repeating the same idea over and over again. Even a fantastic lie will gain credence in the minds of some people, hypnotizing them through monotonous repetition.

Even before the war, the Nazis used drawing-room spies to launch whispering campaigns in France, to demoralize that nation and weaken its will to resist. Defeatist rumors were rampant. The French Army was no good, the Nazis had secretly mined the Maginot line, French labor was communistic, French capital was Fascist, etc. For, as Hitler said as early as 1933, "Our strategy is to destroy the enemy from within, to conquer him through himself. Mental confusion, contradictions of feelings, indecisiveness, panic; these are our weapons."

Though the war may be over within a year, we may be sure that groups within our country will continue to use this same technique to sabotage our national unity for their own private ends. They will try to weaken our democratic faith, our confidence in our leaders and institutions and to set us quarreling among ourselves. This separatist propaganda is bent on stirring up racial hatred and arousing partly assimilated minorities. It is working constantly among the Negroes. Taking pages from Hitler's book, it seeks to set Gentile against Jew. This vicious form of anti-Semitism not only persecutes one racial group but generates discord among others as well. Any type of racial persecution is dangerous in our cosmopolitan country because, like a forest fire, once started, there is no telling where it can be stopped.

I am happy to join with you, the pioneers of the anti-Nazi League in pledging our determination to fight the forces of racial bias and bigotry in America. The Ku Klux Klan, the bund, and other un-American movements are a menace to our civilization. We shall not stand idly by and allow these poisons to spread. We shall fight and destroy these enemies with the weapons of intellectual honesty and neighborly good will.

Tonight we honor Mr. Isidore Lipschutz, who has fought nazism on two continents. With his experience and his conscience to counsel the League, the cause of human dignity is in good hands. As a champion of fair play, he is a living symbol of true Americanism.

He would be the first to tell you that we cannot fight propaganda with words alone but by the reality of democracy in action. Mutual understanding and cooperation is not an accident. It comes into being only as we work to achieve it. Already there are signs that in some communities, Americans recognize this fact. In Boston we have inter-faith meetings where men of all religious denominations gather in human fellowship. We see the need for stressing the fundamental truths which we share, rather than the individual variations of dogma and ceremony in which our souls find personal fulfillment.

In that same city, one of the newspapers has been running a rumor column. A typical line of propaganda is stated and then all the facts against it are marshaled together in order to spike the rumor and expose it as a dangerous falsehood. This public service has done much to kill off infiltrations of destructive prejudice.

In my home city of Lawrence the Young Men's Hebrew Association holds a weekly community breakfast. Here all the various chores connected with serving the meal and washing the dishes are done by the members. One week the janitor may be working with the K. P. detail, the next week the president. Speakers from all walks of life address these meetings. In the space of a year these gatherings reflect the myriad problems of the community and the Nation. Frank and open discussion has developed a new understanding and tolerance of which the whole community is justly proud. There are no social, economic, political, or sectarian barriers here. Brotherhood is achieved by getting together, not drifting apart.

To avert any possible antagonism between veterans and civilians, I suggest that each community set up a council, composed of representatives from all labor, business, fraternal, religious, and veteran organizations, to exchange information, to resolve any possible points of misunderstanding, and to promote positive fellowship. We've got to beat subversive propaganda to the punch by presenting a united front against intolerance.

And we've got to do it before the carriers of misinformation drive wedges between one group of Americans and any other group of Americans.

The take-it-for-granted attitude is a thing of the past. We must be just as vigilant in protecting democracy from perils at home as our servicemen are vigilant in beating off danger from without. This time we've got to mobilize our minds and our hearts to overcome the innuendoes of the false prophets. In this fight none can be deferred. For the privilege of being an American carries with it the responsibility to think hard and straight and true. Faithful to that trust, we shall never permit the lies which enslaved Europe to take root in these United States. With truth as our weapon, we shall defeat any and all propaganda which may rise to challenge our American way of life.

What Has The Tax Court of the United States Been Doing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. J. Edgar Murdock, presiding judge, Tax Court of the United States:

WHAT HAS THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES BEEN DOING?

(By Hon. J. Edgar Murdock, presiding judge, Tax Court of the United States)

Congress in 1924 created a new tribunal, then known as the Board of Tax Appeals, which, through successive changes, is now The Tax Court of the United States. One of the purposes was that the opinions of this new tribunal should serve as guiding precedents in the field of internal revenue. Another was to provide a tribunal, independent of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which would make impartial determinations of questions of fact and of law after full hearing before payment of the tax. Taxpayers sought such a tribunal to relieve them from the hardship, sometimes extreme and even fatal, of paying their tax before they could question the Commissioner's determination by a suit for refund in a district court or the Court of Claims.

The first petition was filed on July 30, 1924. Since then, over 120,000 proceedings have been instituted, involving almost $4,000,000,000 of tax, an average of more than $31,500 per docket number. Only about 4,500 of these proceedings are still pending, which means that more than 115,000 have been closed, an average of about 5,700 a year. Approximately, one-third are closed by written opinions, a few are dismissed for various reasons, and the remainder are settled by the parties. Individual judges have at times written more than 100 opinions a year and, at the other extreme, one judge was required to spend more than a year hearing the evidence in a single case. The all-time average for the court has been 950 opinions, closing 1,400 cases, annually, or an average of more than 60 opinions per judge per year. This is quite an accomplishment for judges of a trial court, who must spend a part of their time hearing the evidence. The first case was decided 28 days after the petition was filed. John H. Parrott (1 B. T. A. 1). The court has not been able to maintain that record, but it does keep its calendars current so that there are now pending only enough cases to keep the court busy for 1 year. New cases are being filed at the rate of about 4,500 per year and at least as many are closed each year. How has this task been accomplished? How is this court organized? What is its modus operandi? What are the questions involved in tax cases? And is the work dull and narrowing or interesting and broadening?

The Tax Court of the United States is apparently the largest unified court in the United States. Indeed, any larger court might prove too cumbersome. There are 16 judges. It is a single court and not 16 separate courts. The judges and employees all reside in Washington, D. C., where the office for the transaction of the business of the court is located, where all pleadings must be filed, and where all motions are heard. It has courtrooms there but the judges ride circuit at more or less regular intervals each year for the purpose of holding hearings on the merits in about 50 principal cities scattered over the country. This is done for the convenience of taxpayers so that they will not have to travel long distances with their witnesses in order to present their cases. This practice has been a great boon also to the Bureau in recent years since it decentralized its general counsel and technical staffs. The court has courtrooms of its own in Chicago and in New York. Elsewhere, it must borrow a courtroom, usually from a local Federal court. The judges sit individually, except that occasionally cases are heard by multiple divisions. The court has the right to use commissioners, as does the Court of Claims, but so far it has not followed that procedure. The judges are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for 12-year terms. The salary is $10,000 per year, with no retirement, old-age, or pension privileges provided.

There are 112 employees of the court. About one-half of these are secretaries, stenographers, or law clerks directly under the judges. The court employs no engineers, accountants, or professional men other than lawyers. The secretary of the court supervises 28 employees who keep the financial and statistical records, arrange for printing and publication of the opinions of the court, report those opinions, purchase material, handle mail, and provide messenger service. The Tax Court is a court of record and maintains the necessary dockets and files. This part of the work is under the supervision of the clerk, assisted by 18 employees engaged in making docket entries of each step of each proceeding, filing papers, arranging the calendar of cases for trial, acting as clerk at the trials, and preparing records for appeal.

The court has carefully selected and trained a staff of law clerks to assist its judges. They are a capable group. Each law clerk is assigned to one judge. Each judge chooses his law clerk to suit his own purposes. Some prefer a man who has had considerable experience, while others prefer young men, well educated and well trained in the law, even though they have had no tax experience. The present staff includes a number of very capable lawyers who have been with the court for many years, as well as some promising younger men. The court is constantly losing men from its staff to private firms which are able to pay them more money. This is not entirely a disadvantage to the court, which has learned that well educated, intelligent, and ambitious young men are eager to obtain training with the court in tax matters so that they may go out into private practice with this experience as an additional asset. The court is always on the lookout for recruits of this type, preferably men who have had at least a few years' experience in the practice of law. The law clerks are reasonably well paid in money, but the experience which they gain is perhaps of even greater value. Twenty-nine men have graduated from this school of experience and are doing excellent work in private practice, while eight employees have gone into the armed forces of the United States.

The cases are heard in the same way as cases are heard in a district court sitting without a jury. The court has no information about a case except that which is shown by the pleadings and the evidence introduced into the record before it. The hearings are stenographically reported by court reporters. The court decides each case upon the record made. A taxpayer institutes a proceeding before The Tax Court by filing a petition within 90 days after the mailing by the Commissioner of a notice of deficiency. The taxpayer is supposed to set forth in the petition a statement of facts showing jurisdiction in the court, assignments of error committed by the Commissioner, and a full statement of the facts relied upon by the taxpayer to show that these errors were committed. The case is at issue and ready for hearing when the Commissioner answers, unless he has set forth affirmative matter in his answer which calls for a reply upon the part of the taxpayer. The case is then set for trial, usually at or near the place requested by the petitioner. One of the judges is assigned to hear that calendar, the parties present their evidence, the judge rules upon objections, the stenographic notes are transcribed, thereafter the parties usually file complete briefs, and, next, the judge prepares findings of fact and an opinion. Congress has wisely required that the procedure be formal and judicial in character, but the court by its rules and practice has attempted to make these proceedings simple and straightforward in accordance with the most modern trends of court procedure. The court exercises no regulatory, investigatory, administrative, or policy-forming powers but merely decides the questions of fact and law in the cases coming before it. (Cf. final report of Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure, report of Brownlow committee, S. Doc. No. 8, 75th Cong., 1st sess.) Appeals lie to the circuit court of appeals.

The judges of The Tax Court, as required by law, elect one of their members presiding judge at least once every 2 years. One of his duties is to handle the many administrative problems of the court. Problem of personnel, of duties to be performed, of the budget, and the problem of arranging for the trial of the cases are all his. He must, with the assistance of his staff, consisting of the clerk and others, calendar for hearing about 4,000 cases every year in 50 different cities and make all arrangements incident thereto. He must see that there are enough cases on each calendar to justify the expenditures entailed in hearing that calendar, that there is no unavoidable delay in hearing the cases ready for trial at the various cities, and that a court room and a judge are available. No judge must be permitted to run out of cases or be burdened with so many at a time that they will become inordinately old in his hands before being decided. Calendars must be arranged almost continuously in New York; less frequently at such places as Seattle and Miami. Care must be taken in arranging these calendars so that some attorney for the Government or for taxpayers is not scheduled to be at two different places at the same time. The calendars must be arranged well in advance so that the parties, their counsel, and their witnesses may make ample preparations.

But an even larger task of the presiding judge is to review every opinion which the other 15 judges write. The statute requires each judge to hear and decide the cases assigned to him. The presiding judge, for example, may assign a calendar of cases at Denver, Colo., to one of the judges. That judge goes to Denver, hears those cases, returns to Washington, and after the briefs are filed, he writes an opinion in each case, including, wherever appropriate, findings of fact. The statute provides that each opinion

and findings of fact thus written shall become the opinion and findings of the court unless, within 30 days after having been forwarded to the presiding judge, the latter directs review by the full court. Thus the presiding judge must consider every opinion written by the other 15 judges. The judges frequently confer with one another in regard to the cases upon which they are working. The presiding judge gives the other judges the benefit of his thoughts in connection with their cases which he is reviewing and he tries to refer to the full court all cases involving any important new principle, doubtful cases, and cases which may be in conflict with some other decision of the court. He resolves doubts in favor of court review. This procedure is designed to prevent conflict, to bring about uniformity, and to gain the benefit of consideration by more than one mind of the various questions presented.

All of the opinions of the court are published, in that they are made public, but memorandum opinions are not published in printed form or included in the bound volumes of the reports of the court. The presiding judge also decides whether an opinion is or not to be printed. The memorandum opinions, that is, the ones that are not printed, are supposed to be limited to those having no value as a precedent. They include any case decided solely upon the authority of another, cases involving subjects already well covered by opinions appearing in the bound volumes of the reports, failure-of-proof cases, and some others. Doubts as to whether a case should be in memorandum form or printed are resolved in favor of printing. If counsel finds in a memorandum opinion some precedent of value he may cite it effectively in his brief, even though the opinion does not appear in the bound volumes of the reports of the court

The court meets in conference every Friday for the purpose of discussing its problems, formulating policies, changing its rules when necessary, and considering the cases which have been referred to it by the presiding judge. Copies of the opinions to be reviewed have been circulated well in advance and the judges come prepared for a full discussion of the cases. Frequently, the presiding judge has distributed a memorandum explaining why a particular case has been referred to the court and expressing his views thereon Not infrequently judges use this same method to acquaint the other judges with their views in advance of the meeting. The presiding judge acts as chairman of these conferences, and the 16 judges sit around one large table Each case is brought up for discussion at the conference and views are expressed freely, forcefully, and directly. A vote is taken at the end of the discussion on each case and the result determines whether the opinion stands or falls. If it falls, the author may be persuaded by the discussion to make some changes, or he may adhere to his original opinion, in which event the presiding judge will assign the case to some other judge to write up the majority views. The new opinion, whether by the same hand or a new one, will invariably come back to the conference for further discussion and a vote. It will be seen from the above that dissenting and concurring views are published only in opinions reviewed by the court. However, if any judge of the court disagrees with an opinion which has been published without being reviewed by the court, he can ask to have it considered by the full court. For 20 years these conferences have produced lively, stimulating, and most beneficial discussions. The judges feel that these open discussions have probably contributed more to the success of the court than has any other single procedure or practice, and it is their desire that they continue in full vigor.

The Tax Court has received great assistance in its work from outside sources. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and their staffs have been cooperative and helpful in many ways. The court can handle only a limited amount of litigation and could be swamped easily with cases if the Bureau were to fall down, even for a short time, in its efficient collection of the enormous revenues without litigation. Likewise, the excellence and cooperation of the tax bar, which is now scattered all over the country, has been most beneficial. An effective pretrial procedure or substitute for pretrial procedure has been developed. The court sends out notices that certain cases will be called for trial on a certain day at a certain place. These notices are sent out well in advance of the hearing. The attorney or technical staff representative having charge of one of these cases for the Bureau, who is located at the place set for the hearing, then sends an invitation to the counsel for the petitioner to come in and discuss the case to the end that it might be settled in whole or in part, or the facts stipulated in whole or in part. This system has worked most successfully for many years. The court encourages it in every way and reaps tremendous benefits.

A majority of the cases coming before the court are income tax cases, but many involve excess profits tax, estate tax, or gift tax, and recently the court has been given jurisdiction over processing tax cases and also cases involving determinations of excessive profits under war contracts which have been subject to renegotiation. The court has authority to determine overpayments, and also in some cases its jurisdiction is based upon a claim for refund. It does not have concurrent jurisdiction with the district courts in cases based upon claims for refund. Considerable duplication of effort might be avoided if it had such jurisdiction.

Forty-five million tax returns are filed every year, and in most instances the Commissioner and the taxpayer agree upon the amount of tax due. They are unable to agree in only a very small percentage of the cases, but most of those cases come to The Tax Court. Thus the cases which the court must decide are, for the most part, the difficult cases, the large cases, and the border-line cases. While taxes are based upon figures and accounting, nevertheless, the underlying figures in the cases coming before the court are generally not in dispute. Once the court has decided some substantive question of law, the parties frequently agree as to figures and even as to the amount of tax. This is probably due to the fact that mathematics is an exact science and, as a consequence, the parties are usually able to iron out their differences insofar as figures are concerned without calling for any assistance from the court. The questions involved in the cases coming before the court cover practically the entire field of the law. Questions are constantly arising based upon the law of corporations, partnerships, agency, community property, real and personal property (reversions, remainders, leaseholders, joint tenancy, tenancy by the entirety, tenants in common, the rule against perpetuities, etc.), trusts (testamentary, inter vivos, express, resulting, passive and active), insurance, contracts, wills, domestic relations death and distribution, res judicata, procedure, and practice, and the law relating to oil, gas, and other minerals. A question of the applicability of some provision of the revenue act or the proper interpretation of some document requires consideration of the rules of interpretation. Questions of the admissibility of evidence arising during the trial of a case. As one writer has said in this connection:

"* * * It seems difficult to find a field which leads practitioners more widely through the whole fabric of the law. * * * He must be broad in his background and broad in his outlook, if he is to deal effectively with the manifold problems which make up the modern field of tax law. There is no reason to expect that a judge in this field should become narrow and technical and specialized." (Prof. Erwin N. Griswold, Harvard Law Review.)

Certainly the judges of The Tax Court find their work absorbingly interesting and not in the least stifling or narrowing. Their cases give them intimate, sometimes dramatic, views of business, finance, inventions, and charities.

The court is about to "come of age" with its twenty-first birthday in June 1945. It has been able to establish lasting precedents in many subjects of tax litigation and has been sustained in most instances by the appellate courts. There are, of course, a few fields in which satisfactory answers are elusive and extremely difficult to devise. Family trusts, family partnerships, and cases coming within the shadow of the Hallock decision, might be cited as examples. The court has endeavored throughout its existence to earn and merit the respect of the taxpaying public, of the bar, of the courts, and of the Government. Its task is never ending.

Business Opportunities for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the employment or reemployment of returning veterans is a matter which has commanded the attention of the Congress, as well as many branches of the executive department. The thought so far is that the problem will be to find employment in existing agencies for a considerable number, and then it will be necessary for the Government to inaugurate construction or building programs of different types in order to accommodate the remainder. I really do not see much opportunity to place many returning veterans in existing establishments, occupations, or industries. Most of these activities, except agriculture, are now employing the maximum, and there will be some war industries wholly discontinued, and there will be a necessity for finding reemployment for the people there employed. Therefore, unless there are new or enlarged enterprises some unemployment will be certain, and the planning should be to make some provision for them.

My thought is that instead of the Government creating jobs for temporary employment attention should be given to the idea of assisting veterans to create their own jobs—jobs that will become going and permanent places of employment. I can probably best illustrate my idea. A few months ago I proceeded to make inquiry of civic organizations and others in practically every town in my district, suggesting they enumerate what new enterprise or enterprises, in their judgment, could be established and successfully maintained permanently in their town or community. The thought was that most of them would be small

enterprises at the beginning and many would be continued as small enterprises. My idea was that if we knew of a reasonable certainty what enterprises would be self-sustaining in town A, for example, and it was the judgment of the representative citizens of that town the enterprise would be well supported by the community and the returning veterans of such community were advised of this opportunity they would be able to take advantage of the facilities offered under the GI bill and, in most cases, be able to provide themselves with a job of their own creation. Or two or more veterans may be willing to pool their resources, ability, and efforts and undertake the promotion of an enterprise that would afford employment, not only to themselves but possibly others, and possibly in town A you would have a half-dozen, a dozen, or several dozen new jobs—jobs which did not exist before. They would be new facilities for creating wealth and thereby add to the financial resources of the community and to our National economy. The second impelling reason for such a program was it would relieve these men of the necessity or possibly the embarrassment of looking to a Government agency for an indefinite period to find a suitable or satisfactory place of employment. In other words, in such a program you have encouraged individual initiative on the part of a considerable number of returning veterans, which would prove to be a stimulus, an inspiration and encouragement to many others to follow.

Give a soldier a chance and opportunity to demonstrate his fighting spirit and he will set an example for future generations. These young men have endured the heat of the tropics, the cold and snow of Europe, the sunshine, the rain, the smoke of battle, the deadening hum of bullets and they are willing to fight their personal battles for life with a fair opportunity and a fair chance with others.

I recall one town in my district with a population of 2,500 or 3,000 reported they could support a bakery, laundry, a watch maker, a furniture plant, a lumber and building-supply establishment, a garment factory for men, women, and children, and a dressmaker's shop, and so forth.

Suppose two, three, or four returning soldiers of that town or county are willing to undertake the establishment of a bakery; they are willing to pool their interests, do their own work, pay their own wages, and take their chances in developing and operating a successful enterprise. With the application of honesty, work, and fair dealing, there is no reason why they should not succeed and within a few years have a business of their own—that will be contributing something to the support of the town, the community, the State, and to the Nation's economy. Instead of having to wait for someone to come along and offer them a job, they have created their own job and given hope, inspiration, and encouragement to their neighbors for a generation or longer.

Instead of being looked upon in the community as beneficiaries of a benefi-cent government they have the patriotic thrill and feeling that they not only preserved our system of government on the battle front but are now on the home front making this Nation the land of the free and the home of the brave. There are still a half-dozen or more activities in that town or community to be developed. Suppose all of them should be developed, and there seems to be no reason why they should not, because I am told from reliable sources that the town and community are financially able to support and maintain them; these veterans will have created jobs for 25, 50, 100, or possibly 200 or more, for themselves with the chance of a corresponding number of jobs for others. These boys saved this country from being overrun with totalitarianism, fascism, and other isms from abroad and I am hoping they will be able to save this country from state socialism, political favoritism, and communism at home. The time has come when we must do some real thinking and some real planning. The post-war planning so far has done nothing but follow the line of least resistance. In fact, there has been no real planning. The only planning done so far, as I have said, is to set up a half-dozen or more Government agencies to try and see if it is possible for existing activities to absorb some of the returning veterans and then if this cannot be done the only thing to do then is to create a few other Government agencies to set up and operate a few building and construction programs that will not within themselves create wealth or add but little to our national economy, and within less than a decade the program will be over and there will be nowhere to go. Our opportunities will have been lost or dissipated in the meantime, the country will have increased in population, and the real wealth of the Nation will be relatively less. I favor a constructive development program and avoid the continued necessity of resorting to expediencies. Let us find out and advise the returning veterans where these business opportunities exist, and then help them to take hold and not only create his own job but establish new lines of business and new enterprises.

Opponents' Tactics Prevented House of Representatives From Voting on FEPC Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, foreclosed by the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to close all debate, I avail myself of the privilege of extending my remarks for the purpose of expressing my resentment at the statements that any proposed legislation which is in the interest of the masses of the people of the United States is communistic. I wonder when these gentlemen in the House, as well as certain interests and so-called Fascists, will desist from branding everything they dislike as communistic?

For the purpose of clarifying the factors surrounding this proposed legislation, I wish briefly to say that this proposed legislation relating to the FEPC was reported by a legislative committee of the House with only one vote being cast against it; that when an application for a rule was made I called a meeting of the Committee on Rules for the purpose of giving the proponents as well as the opponents of the proposed legislation an opportunity to be heard, and though there was a great many persons that desired to be heard, the chairman of the Committee on Labor, reporting the bill for the purpose of saving time, made a short statement; but the opponents of the measure were given several hearings, and I am justified in the statement that they have utilized a great deal of time, have had many continuances and postponements notwithstanding the fact that I have endeavored to effect a vote on the application for a rule. However, due to the absence of some of the members of the committee from time to time it was the consensus among the members of the committee that all of the members of the Committee on Rules should be present when a final vote was taken. I always have felt, and feel now, that a rule should have been granted and that the House should have been given an opportunity to vote upon this proposed legislation.

The Committee on Rules was not created for the purpose of delaying or depriving the Members of the House of the right to vote upon important legislation, but it was created for the purpose of properly expediting proposed legislation under the rules and to give the membership of the House a proper opportunity to vote on a proposal. Unfortunately, in the instant case this right and privilege has been denied to the Members of the House. This I do fervently regret; therefore, I cannot find fault with or criticize the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and others, who have tried extremely hard to have the House vote on the bill, for entering technical points of order. By utilizing parliamentary tactics and the raising of objections to some of the provisions in the bill they have, up to the present time, prevented the House from voting on this measure, shorn of the FEPC provision. The facts are that the House passed this war agencies bill; it was sent to the Senate; it was amended by the Senate and a conference was asked by the Senate.

Under the strict rules of the House, unanimous consent was required to take such amended bill from the Speaker's table and send it to conference, failing which the Speaker would refer the bill to the Committee on Appropriations. On several occasions efforts were made to have the committee grant a rule agreeing to a conference, but without success.

Favorable action upon this proposed legislation has been urged by the late

President Roosevelt as well as by President Truman, who asked that a rule be granted so that the House might have an opportunity to vote on the FEPC proposal. Unfortunately, notwithstanding that fact, it has been impossible to obtain favorable action.

This, in brief, is the history of this measure; and those who are responsible for the delay and dilatory tactics against the measure in the Rules Committee should not now charge those who in good faith have been, and still are, trying to obtain a vote on the matter in the House.

Lawmakers' Vocations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to list the vocations of the present Members of Congress as compiled by our own Congressional Library. Since this list was complied the number of attorneys has been diminished by the death of our colleague, Jim O'Connor, of Montana. Mr. WESLEY A. D'EWART, who now represents Mr. O'Connor's district, is a stock raiser by vocation.

In the present House there are 241 lawyers, 47 Members are from the business and manufacturing field, 25 were former educators, 24 are real-estate and insurance men. There are 23 editors, 15 farmers, 10 bankers, 7 doctors, 6 municipal officers, 4 former congressional secretaries, 4 who list themselves as legislators, 3 dentists, 3 accountants, 3 investment bankers, 2 authors, 2 druggists, 2 social-welfare workers, 2 union officials, and 2 ministers. There is a former actress, an analyst, an architect, a merchandise broker, a civil engineer, a director of international relations, a chemist, a secret-service officer, a veterinarian, and one listed as a workingman.

In the Senate, there are 62 lawyers, 10 each from business or manufacturing and from the editorial field; 3 farmers, 2 former congressional secretaries, 2 legislators, 2 educators, and 2 bankers. Also an admiral, a dentist, and a radio performer.

I am also pleased to include a column from a recent issue of the Washington Post which lists the vocations of the present Members of the British Parliament. I feel that this information is always of broad interest not only to my colleagues but to people in general.

WHAT MANNER OF MEN?

With victory won in Europe, Great Britain is to have a general election, the first in 10 years. What kind of men will that bring to Westminster? The political color of the new Parliament is anyone's guess.

The certain thing is that there will be a very considerable change in personnel, for something approaching a quarter of the present membership of the House of Commons is not seeking reelection, not to mention those whom the electorate will throw out anyway. So at Westminster there may be as many as 200 new faces; perhaps more.

Politics is not commonly a profession in Britain. The M. P.'s pay is £600—say, $2,400—a year, and he will be lucky if his unavoidable expenses do not eat up most of that. Fred Montague, an old Labor M. P., has lately complained, with justice, that there was not a member who could live on his parliamentary salary, which, after deduction of income tax, amounted to £8 10s, or, roughly, $34 a week.

Students of politics in Britain have one fairly safe rule to guide them in their predictions: what happened last time has considerable bearing on what is to come. In the 1918 election, the first after the last war, the biggest group by far of successful candidates was of professional men—190 out of the 602 for whom records are traceable. The next biggest group, numbering 86, came from commerce and finance; the next, 67, from administration and defense, which includes civil servants and retired professional soldiers, sailors, and airmen. "Not gainfully occupied"—a category which oddly includes not only the idle rich but also the housewives—numbered 62. Thereafter, there is a drop to 34, the miners, and 33, the transport men. But the proportion of M. P.'s belonging to the professional and related groups taken together remains almost precisely at two-thirds.

People do not in general vote for members of their own trades and professions. The general run of rank-and-file workers, politics apart, have less than two-fifths of their proportionate representation in the House of Commons. More attention is paid to the kind of politician a man is, and to the way he tackles the issues of the day, than to the trade he follows. But certain groups do show some preferences.

It is not so many years, in the political life of a nation, since M. P.'s began to be elected to Parliament in any considerable numbers in the Labor and Socialist interest. But in those 30 or 40 years the practice has established itself in the trade unions of backing trade-union officials who are about to retire on pension as candidates for Parliament. The effect of all this is that fewer young men have been sent to Parliament by the Labor Party than by the others, that the party in Parliament has had little bloom of youth on it, and that the enthusiasm and drive of early manhood have been lacking.

Opinion that counts inside the party is aware of all this and party headquarters strongly discourages the putting-up of over-age candidates for election. It is not altogether easy; for the constituencies have a good deal of self-rule in these matters and it is understandably difficult to deny this expected reward to a man who has long understood that he was to succeed to a seat in Parliament when he retires from a local trade-union post.

The demands of parliamentary work will become more, not less, exacting; the House of Commons has just returned to afternoon and evening sittings, so that a conscientious MP will spend several of his mornings in committees and the rest of the day in, or about, the house. So that it will be harder and harder to follow any normal full-time occupation, and impossible if it is out of London. The dilemma is considerable.

All in all, the upshot is likely to be that the new 200 or so men in Parliament will be rather less rich, on the average, than any similar number entering Parliament ever before, that (assuming some swing to the left) the working classes and trade-union supporters generally will be a good deal more strongly represented, but that in general the cultural and educational background of M. P.'s will be much the same as before, for educational opportunity has been broadening these recent years.

If the experience of the 1918 election is any guide, the average age of new members will be high; that time it was 48½ years. But since most parties have been looking for good young men the average will almost certainly be lower this time.

Our typical new candidate for the new Parliament then will be a man in his early forties, with military service behind him, a professional job if he is on the right, a trade-union job if he is on the left, knowledgeable but not expert on international affairs, eager and a little anxious about overseas trade, with more of economics in his head than his forebears had, and very well versed in the domestic problems—of housing, social security, and resettlement. And he will be remembering that a great many of the men he wants to vote for him in the next election will still be in the forces, fighting Japan or policing Germany.

Approach to Enduring Peace Through Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make my humble contribution to the discussion over plans for world peace and the future happiness of the human race.

My thesis is predicated on the fundamental idea and belief that the people of the world do not want a warlike world but a peaceful world, and that if they were given the deciding power we would have a peaceful world. Wars are not made by the people, but by tyrants like Hitler and Mussolini, who override the people and impose their will on them.

In my opinion, the proposal to give the people the final authority over declaring war is the very essence of democracy, and America as the leading democratic nation of the world may well bring within its broadening vision the thought of exercising its leadership in that direction. President Truman has well stated what I believe is fundamentally true, and that is that world peace hinges on the United States. Speaking at the University of Kansas City on June 28 the President, looking forward to "an age of law and an age of reason," said that unless the United States leads the way there will be no peace in the world.

America is at the crossroads. It may adopt peacetime conscription and by so doing militarize our country permanently. In that event other nations will follow suit and the world will become an armed camp with a sudden explosion likely at any time to precipitate a third world war. Or America can take the lead in an approach to enduring peace through democracy.

In this connection, and as a prelude to my remarks, I call attention to a resolution for an amendment to the Constitution which I introduced in many successive Congresses and which once had the approval of this House when 218 Members signed a petition to bring it out of committee for consideration and many more were waiting to sign, but did not have the opportunity. This resolution is as follows:

SECTION 1. Except in case of attack by armed forces, actual or immediately threatened, upon the United States or its territorial

possessions, or by any non-American nation against any country in the Western Hemisphere, the people shall have the sole power by a national referendum to declare war or to engage in war overseas. Congress when it deems a national crisis to exist in conformance with this article shall by concurrent resolution refer the question to the people.

SEC. 2. Congress shall by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

SEC. 3. This article shall become operative when ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution.

This is the so-called war referendum resolution.

I am not offering this resolution now for immediate disposal but for consideration in connection with long-range postwar plans. Now is not the time to urge a vote upon it but when we are again at peace with the world, I shall press it with every ounce of my energy and with every scintilla of hope and faith that I can muster to the cause.

I am calling attention to the resolution now for two reasons:

First. To keep the record straight.

Second. Because there is soon to come up for consideration a proposal that is exactly the apposite of this war referendum resolution in its meaning and implications—the proposal for compulsory military training—and I hope that my resolution and my explanation of it will contribute a little bit at least to a rationalization of the thinking of America on these vital matters.

The American people, and we as their representatives, need to be doing some prayerful thinking as to whether we want the war power placed in the control of the people themselves who have to do the dying and the suffering and who have to pay the frightful costs of war or whether we want to still further remove the war power from the people by building up a system of military regimentation that will create a vast military machine and place it in the hands of a few top individuals to operate.

I am directing the attention of our fellow citizens to this resolution now because of my great love for democracy and my unbounded faith in democratic processes. I am doing so because I think I see the sinister shadow of totalitarianism reaching across our pathway and threatening to strike at our democratic institutions. Surely no one in whose body flows the blood of an American wants to see foreign ideologies take root in our free American soil. Let us keep that soil pure and undefiled, so that the only things that will thrive and bloom in it will be our cherished ideals of freedom. Gladstone described our Constitution as the greatest instrument of government ever stricken from the brain of man. That Constitution, praise be to the Almighty, is our heritage. Let us love it and revere it and defend it against all assailants, now and forevermore!

The part of the Constitution that is the sheet anchor of our liberties is the Bill of Rights. With all humility, I propose the war referendum amendment as a cap-sheaf for the Bill of Rights, to round out and perfect that immortal instrument of freedom. It would do this by giving the people who comprise this Nation the fundamental power over the making of war. It seems a strange anachronism, indeed, that in a democracy the people do not have that power. A citizen of the United States may vote for constable or dog catcher or he may cast his ballot for or against the construction of a pesthouse or a neighborhood sewer, but he has no opportunity to vote on whether or not his son shall be sent into the hell of a foreign war. This indicates a very serious defect in our Constitution which should be remedied. May I in all sincerity pose this question: "Why should our democracy stop at the water's edge?"

If democratic processes are desirable, which was decided in the affirmative when our Nation was created, why should the operation of those processes be limited to the management of our domestic affairs? Why should not the same democratic processes we employ to run our home affairs be applicable beyond the water line? Why should not the people who have the right to vote on the establishment of a local sewer or the election of a constable also have the right—except, of course, in case of attack or invasion—to vote on whether or not their sons shall be sent into the indescribable hell of a foreign conflict?

January 10, 1938, when this resolution was beaten down in the House by a bare majority of 21 votes against the motion to discharge the committee was one of the most sorrowful and tragic days in American history. Democracy was murdered in this House of Representatives on that day. The Government and all the agencies it controlled, including newspapers from coast to coast, brought terrific pressure to bear on the people's Congress and by using every imaginable device and stratagem managed to defeat it by so slim a margin that a change of 11 votes would have changed the verdict. James A. Farley, then the Postmaster General, tells in his book how he stayed at the telephone a whole day before the vote was taken, presenting to Members of Congress who had signed the discharge petition, the Government's request that they change their votes. Many refused to switch from "aye" to "no." Enough Members did switch under the intense pressure to defeat consideration of the resolution. I have no doubt that if Congress had been left free to perform its legislative duties it would have adopted the amendment.

The Constitution which we revere created three great departments of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—each to operate without interference from the others. I hope that if, and when, the war referendum resolution comes up again there will be no interference by Executive authority to hinder Congress in its historic function of legislating. It is not good for the country that there should be such interference.

Never was a proposal more misrepresented and misunderstood than the referendum on war has been. Its opponents have held forth the false idea that it would mean that a plebiscite would have to be conducted before our Nation could ever go to war. This is wholly erroneous. In the event the United States is attacked or invaded or if any country in the Western Hemisphere is attacked or invaded by any non-American nation, there would be no referendum.

In the case of Pearl Harbor, for instance, the referendum obviously would not have operated. When the Japanese attacked that outpost we already were at war. There was nothing America could do then except to go to war with all its might and resources.

Wars as a rule do not come suddenly. As a rule they are the climax of a long period of cumulative ill feeling, and a constitutional provision for a referendum on war would have this effect: It would tend to make our public officials refrain from incendiary speeches and more guarded in their actions if they knew that the people would be the final jury to decide whether or not we shall go to war. The agent would not want to run the risk of being overruled by the principal.

With all of my heart and soul I am for the San Francisco Charter as the crude beginning of a structure of world peace which I hope will be improved and strengthened as the years go on. I will be hoping—it may be an illusory hope—that sometime there will be written into that charter by way of amendment a provision that every nation in the world shall have the right to vote by referendum on war. The universal adoption of that democratic principle by all nations would indeed mean the end of wars and the establishment of permanent peace on earth. For the people all around the world are weary of war, they are weary of its appalling destruction, of its heartaches and suffering, of the pain it puts in the hearts of mothers.

It was apparent that a provision for a universal referendum on war would not be possible in the original draft of the San Francisco Charter. Russia, for instance, never would have consented to it and it is doubtful whether any signatory nation would approve it at this time. But the San Francisco Charter is not a static document and it may be made better and grander as the world struggles on toward the millenium of peace.

Meanwhile I hope that America, the leader of the world in good neighborliness and altruism, will take the lead and set an example for the world in giving encouragement to this great democratic principle of allowing the people to vote on participation in war. The right of America to exercise self-determination in that matter is not abridged by the San Francisco Charter, according to information which I have sought and obtained from the State Department to clarify that situation. On May 16, 1945, I wrote to Mr. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, as follows:

MAY 16, 1945.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in the hope that you may help to clarify my thinking in regard to the Dumbarton Oaks proposal.

Under it, what becomes of the constitutional process of declaring war by act of Congress? Is our future, as far as participation

in peace or war is concerned, to be governed by Congress or by the Security Council to be set up under the new organization? Is the constitutional provision relating to the declaration of war changed or diluted by the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, and if so, how is it changed or diluted? In other words, what happens to our constitutional war-declaring provision under the new world set-up?

I will be greatly obliged if you will enlighten me on this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

His reply was as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 13, 1945.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am sorry that there inadvertently has been a delay in replying to your letter to me of May 16, 1945. You asked a number of questions on the relationship of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals to our constitutional provision regarding the declaration of war.

The broad answer to your question is, I think, entirely clear. Nothing in the proposed United Nations organization is intended to or could possibly change any of our constitutional provisions in any way.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Assistant Secretary of State.

So there is no barrier in the way of consideration of the constitutional amendment I have proposed.

It may be that the proposal for a people's referendum on war was made two centuries too soon. It may be that the canker of war will have to eat what is left of the hearts of mothers, wives, and sweethearts. It may be that the world will have to be convulsed by more agonies and to wade through more oceans of blood. But on the other and brighter side of the unfolding picture perhaps we shall learn sometime that the moral rectitude of a nation is mightier than its battalions and battleships, and that it is righteousness and not big guns that exalteth a nation. The time may come when governments will begin to believe in the people and when the common men and women who comprise the bone and fiber of the world will join in a concord of good will and understanding to outlaw war. If the San Francisco Charter is ever amended to give voice to that common hope and aspiration of humanity by the inclusion of a referendum on war for all nations, it is my confident belief that we may look forward with gladness in our hearts to a fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah:

They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

Compulsory Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding universal military training by Norman Thomas, president of the Postwar World Council. The statement is in the form of testimony by Mr. Thomas before the Select Committee of the House of Representatives on Postwar Military Policy, and was made a few days ago.

In my opinion, no clearer, more concise, distinterestedly honest, or more scholarly, statesmanlike testimony has been given in behalf of the common people than that by Norman Thomas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF NORMAN THOMAS, PRESIDENT, POSTWAR WORLD COUNCIL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appear today as a representative of the Postwar World Council, a national organization, nonpartisan in character, of which I am chairman. It happens that in the matter before you the position which I shall take is also the position of the Socialist Party, which, however, will set forth its case through another spokesman or in a brief, or by both methods. I only am responsible for the particular form in which this case is presented.

As I understand it, you are considering the military policy of the United States rather than any particular bill, and these hearings are more narrowly devoted to the place of postwar military conscription for universal military training in that policy.

I begin by stressing what you gentlemen doubtless realize, but which is too often overlooked on both sides of this discussion. There is no such thing as shaping a military policy in a vacuum or as a thing in itself. Clausewitz and other theorists in the arts of war were entirely right in arguing that war is the extension of diplomacy or of the foreign policy of nations. No matter how sincere advocates of conscription or any other military policy for the United States may be in claiming that they are not thinking of particular potential enemies but are merely advocating a general policy of insurance against war, nothing of the sort is possible. No nation has ever practiced conscription and competitive militarism except with a view to specific potential enemies. The expense of the process makes it necessary to win popular support for conscription by playing up rivalry, fear, or suspicion of competitors. Other nations assume, as a matter of course, that a competitive military policy is an expression of a competitive imperialistic policy and act accordingly. Never in history has it been otherwise. Never will it be otherwise.

It is, you will agree, completely impossible even for a nation as strong as the United States to gain absolute security by any kind or degree of military preparation. Always some conceivable coalition against us, provoked by a wrong handling of our foreign policy, would be stronger. Therefore, I repeat, you cannot shape a military policy except in the light of the general economic and political policies which the United States will support in the world.

Hence, the present War Department propaganda for postwar military conscription is consciously or unconsciously disingenuous. First, it assumes incorrectly that conscription can provide protection, irrespective of national policies. Then it proceeds to add to that error by deliberately ignoring and obscuring in the high-powered propaganda the obvious fact the potential mass armies provided imperfectly by 1 year's training will be useless against the first impact of a third world war begun by surprise attack from the air by rocket bombs and other new developments. Even in this war, if England had had great mass armies, they could not have done for her in 1940 what her air force did. At most, mass armies, unless the United States is to take the aggressive in actually occupying a large part of the world, will be useful only in a secondary stage of war, and they cannot adequately be prepared in advance. This is the position taken by such experts as the British general, Fuller, father of the tank, and by Hanson Baldwin.

I cannot imagine that General Marshall himself, or any other official advocates of conscription, will seriously argue before your committee that the training of our able-bodied youth for 1 year is the vital and indispensable part of the defense system they will demand. Its heart will be highly mechanized forces, expertly trained. The emphasis will be on the development of aviation and electronics and the new weapons which the Germans produced late in this war. No competent American military leader would dare to repeat the mistakes of the French who had the longest unbroken tradition and practice of military conscription, but had so neglected the proper use of modern aviation and armor that Hitler overran them with fewer men than they had under arms.

I remember when my old friend, George Fielding Eliot, who appeared before your committee, used to say that the French were bound to win because they had a continuous tradition of conscription and that the Germans make up for the lost years between 1919 and 1935

Actually the Germans had to use their imagination and minds on a "horrible" level, and they more than made up for those years. In other words, what I am emphasizing is that it is a luxury.

Repeatedly we opponents of conscription have got certain of its advocates to admit, at least in private conversation, that what they really wanted was to keep in being an elaborate system of camps and supply agencies and, above all, to indoctrinate the Nation, not in love of war but in the acceptance of executive authority, which is at the heart of militarism. Lieutenant Colonel Conkling, out of experience in two wars with the Selective Service System, goes further and argues that the War Department and the Army high command which deny to military personnel the right to oppose the postwar conscription, which it uses the taxpayers' money so freely to advance, is motivated in considerable part by the natural self-interest of a military hierarchy in perpetuating jobs, ranks, and power. I should add that an even greater danger is the vested interests that makers of supplies, both capitalists and workers, acquire in competitive armaments and competitive imperialism which are always united like Siamese twins. You will have to take account of these self-interested motives in judging the case for conscription that some of the advocates present. And your committee and Congress itself should consider very seriously the effect upon democracy of War Department and Army propaganda in the policy-making field. For that is what is involved in the advocacy of conscription by official agencies backed by associations of men commanding great wealth.

In what I have been saying about the essential relation between a military policy for the United States and (a) our foreign policy in general; and (b) the technological nature of modern war, I am not trespassing on the field of the military expert but arguing what is common sense. Repeatedly I have summed up these points by a statement that no one has challenged; if mass armies and peacetime conscription for them are essential to our defense against attack, or to the degree that they are essential, we shall be increasingly disadvantaged as the decades go on. In this respect we cannot possibly compete with the U. S. S. R. or, later, with China. It is our business to do all in our power to make an end of military conscription throughout the world, not merely for the glorious cause of

universal peace but in our own selfish interest. If instead, without trying the obviously better way, you gentlemen now take a step which will fasten conscription upon mankind, a new generation of Americans in a not distant future may curse you for helping to forge the weapon by which our enemies were aided and our defeat made sure. If military conscription is the secret of defense, Russia will win. She will have the greater population, the strategic position in which mass armies are most useful, and the kind of totalitarian government to which peacetime conscription is far more appropriate and effective than to our democracy.

To avoid war with Soviet Russia is a must for American statesmanship. This cannot be done by appeasement or a refusal to face facts, one of which is that in the long run Russia will win if by playing the old militarist and imperialist game we fasten it upon the world. Have you ever puzzled over the fact that at present American Communists whose slavish and exclusive loyalty is to Stalin should favor conscription, although with increasing frankness most of its advocates urge it as a necessary step in arming against Russia? May it not be that in the long run the Communists believe the USSR can win if rivalry in conscription should determine the policies and the war techniques of Russia and the United States? Even more probably, may they not believe that conscription in America will help to produce the attitudes on which Communist agitation and later Communist totalitarianism can thrive?

This is, of course, speculative. What is not speculative is the fact that the greatest single help to peace would be a movement toward the total abolition of military conscription and a policy of progressive disarmament following the disarmament of Germany and Japan. A movement like this could not fail if the two most powerful nations, the Soviet Union and the United States, should institute it. No one has a right to say that such a movement is impossible until it has been tried. A little less than 20 years ago Stalin, through Litvinov, asked for this very thing at Geneva. In spite of what I have said to the effect that military conscription, if it is an advantage at all, would strengthen Russia more than the United States, Stalin might be wise enough to see that assured peace is even more to the interest of his own country.

In time the Russian people might come to realize it in spite of the barriers Stalin puts up against communication. Perhaps a beginning could be made by proposing a 5- to 10-year arms holiday in which there should be no conscription. If that worked well it would be very hard to reestablish the old military competition and to persuade people to turn over all their sons to the state for 1, 2, or 3 years. At any rate, it is a crime against the peace which is our heart's desire not to make this approach to the problem of security and lasting peace.

It would be easier to make it if the results at San Francisco should prove more encouraging than now appear likely. It is still possible to hope that those results will at least make further adjustments easier. At all events, war weariness in all countries, including Russia, and our own certain superiority in effective strength give us 5 or 10 years of grace to work out our problem in better terms than adoption of the system which did so much to plunge Europe into ruin.

I have heard the argument, as ridiculous as it is dangerous, that under the provisions of this new world organization we may be constrained to resort to conscription to do our part in a police job. Unsatisfactory as are the San Francisco arrangements, they aren't that bad. At the worst, the policing of the world won't require general conscription or be aided by it. It's a job for specialized, carefully selected and well-paid forces. We shall not need conscription in order to play our part in a sheriff's posse of nations to be called out against an aggressor. No sheriff in his right mind, trying to bring some sort of order into a lawless county, would urge every man in it who had never carried a gun to arm himself, and every woman to become a pistol-packing mama. The competitive armament which our adoption of conscription would certainly fasten on the world would produce an analogous situation among nations. Any valid system of international force for security, Ely Culbertson's quota-force system for instance, depends upon international control of offensive armaments and general disarmament.

Under Secretary of State Grew did his country a great disservice when before your committee he used the disingenious argument that conscription was necessary for us today in our association of nations when he well knows there can be no world war unless America and the U. S. S. R. are on opposite sides, and our adoption of conscription now will be a symbol and aggravation of the drift to the war with the U. S. S. R.

Again I insist that the best key to any sound policy of security and peace would be agreement with the Soviet Union on disarmament. That will depend on many things which we cannot here discuss. One of them is so important in relation to our future security that I must mention it briefly. It is that we try to bring an end to the war against Japan by laying down terms which will deny her the possibility of aggression, but which will not destroy the only strong independent nation in Asia and turn her embittered people over to Communist machinations. Unless America appears as the author of terms which will make her the friend of all the peoples of Asia rather than the underwriter of white imperialism, British, Dutch, or even American, Stalin will win the war even if he does not enter it. He will certainly win it if we bribe him by helping him make China an Asiatic Poland. What Congress should be considering is not conscription for peacetime but terms which might shorten a war of annihilation. We can win such a war with or without Russia's help but at such a cost on men, materials, our own ideals, and the friendship of Asiatic peoples that we should have lost in relative security what in peacetime conscription can restore.

So terrible would be a third world war that the victors, if any, would merely enjoy the advantage of the wounded in the kingdom of the dead. Your real concern is with the policies that will avert war. In a country definitely not persuaded of the power of nonviolent resistance it is inevitable that Congress, at any rate pending international agreements will concern itself with providing an army and a navy. Such forces must be composed of carefully selected well-paid experts. They will be necessary even if you also impose conscription. But you do not have to aggravate suspicion by our policy. For the United States, with its long record of opposition to conscription in peacetime, to adopt it now, no matter how great our own consciousness of virtue, would invite an almost universal fear of us and confirm the rest of the world in the old military way.

Certain facts are inescapable. Conscription which goes back to the French revolution and the first Napoleon never prevented any war or guaranteed victory to any nation in war. Indeed it made war more likely because it created great vested interests in the rivalries, fears, and hates that lead to war. The First World War, many historians believe, might have been avoided if there had been time for sober second thought. Conscription by its practical and psychological consequences prevented second thought.

The Second World War did not come because only the Germans had conscription but because the more numerous non-Germans in Europe, all of whom had enjoyed the blessings of conscription, most of them longer than their German foes, were divided in political policy and out of the date in their military stategy. So far was conscription from guaranteeing the life of nations or their soldiers that the two nations which best survived the shock of two world wars were the United States and Great Britain, neither of which had had conscription. Japan did not attack us until after we had had very extensive military conscription for more than a year and then she attacked us where we were strong. It was not our lack of peacetime conscription that explains our entry into the war.

Not only had conscription tended to make wars more likely in the world; it has contributed directly to the coming of the totalitarian state. In republican France military conscription was used against labor to break strikes, and thanks to it an army caste at the time of the Dreyfuss case came perilously close to making the whole French Nation anti-Semitic.

Throughout Europe conscription and militarism were forms of boondoggling for unemployment which diverted attention from its cure and made it easier to accept even war itself. It will not be different in America.

I could continue to argue the incidental injuries rather than benefits of conscription for character, education, and health, but you are concerned with military policy; I content myself with filing a statement signed by 74 educators of standing in America opposing peacetime military conscription.

I rest my own case on the arguments I have presented that for Congress to adopt peacetime military conscription now would not only fail to guarantee military security but would actually jeopardize it and enormously increase our difficulties in preventing a third world war.

(The statement referred to is on file with the committee.)

Mr. MAY. Any questions?

Mr. WADSWORTH. You referred to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Do you think we made a mistake in 1940 in enacting the selective-service law?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not. That was part of a whole policy. But I think it is water under the bridge. I think MacArthur made a mistake in following the policy advocated. I don't think the war with the Japanese was necessary. If you would like to debate that, at the proper time I will take your challenge.

I did not agree with the $5 provision.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You and I have debated this before.

Mr. THOMAS. And I will be glad to do it again.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You know perfectly well your reference to the $5 thing is perfectly unjustified.

Mr. THOMAS. Why?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am accustomed to these interruptions from you.

Mr. THOMAS. That is mutual.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was put in as a token because the committee had not passed anything regarding the question of pay. You have always referred to the $5 conscript. It was never the intention of anybody to keep the pay at such a level.

Mr. THOMAS. It is very unfortunate that a man holding a position such as yours should make a token such as that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You think we made a mistake in enacting the selective-service law in 1940?

Mr. THOMAS. Not if the war was the reason for the enactment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I asked your opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. I beg your pardon?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am asking you your opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. I have answered.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You are trying to delve into my intentions. I want to know if you think the Congress made a mistake.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it made a mistake in enacting that law, together with the other things that Congress did. I don't think it was a mistake if it was enacted with the intention of war. I am consistent. I was opposed to a policy at that time, of which this was a part. I am opposed now to a policy, but I am perfectly willing to say that I have been terribly mistaken on that, and it wouldn't prove I am wrong now any more than your $5 a month.

In other words, you ought to meet my arguments with arguments. If we begin to compare the past none of us has been altogether infallible. I think we would be better off if you would answer some of my arguments instead of talking about 1940.

I repeat, I am willing to argue that at the appropriate time and at the appropriate place.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not attempting to argue with you. I am trying to get your opinion.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Thomas, I have enjoyed your statement very much.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope you have enjoyed it, but too many people enjoy my statements and do nothing about them.

Bretton Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are two issues involved in what has come to be popularly referred to as Bretton Woods, both of which are of vital interest to every man, woman, and child in America. They are so complicated in their details, these issues, that it is well-nigh impossible for the lay mind to comprehend them. Briefly, however, one proposal is to establish a world bank to lend money to various governments for rehabilitation purposes. The other issue is to establish a fund which can be utilized by different governments to stabilize their currencies with each other. The United States will put into the bank fund $3,175,000,000, and into the stabilization fund, $2,750,000,000.

I voted for the establishment of this Bank and this Stabilization Fund as a last-ditch effort to help bring about a durable world peace. I want to say frankly that, if this move fails, if the other nations of the world do not respond to these efforts by the United States to help them back to peace, sanity, and prosperity, then we in the United States may just as well prepare to make America an armed camp, and to maintain armed forces in our land, sea, and air branches vastly greater than we ever dreamed of. Manifestly, to maintain for years, if not perpetually, such an enormous armed force, such a fleet of warships and collateral craft, and to maintain air forces with constantly improved machines of war, would yearly involve as much money as we will put into these two funds.

The United States has come to the point where we have stern and very unhappy decisions to make.

In the past few weeks it has become known that, prior to his death, President Roosevelt had committed this country to extending, after the war, aid for rehabilitation in the amount of $5,000,000,000 to Russia, $6,000,000,000 to Great Britain, $5,000,000,000 to China, two billion five hundred and seventy-five million to France, and only the Supreme Being knows how much to other nations. Mr. Roosevelt apparently conducted these stupendous negotiations and made these enormous promises on a personal basis, without consulting either the Congress or the American people.

Knowing the temper of our people, and realizing that they are informed as to how far we have already gone in the way of spending billions upon billions of dollars in behalf of our allies and other nations, it is difficult to believe that the present administration would provide these funds from lend-lease; therefore it must be assumed that these amounts would be based on so-called "loans."

We had a previous and unfortunate experience in making postwar loans to our allies a quarter of a century ago. Following the cessation of hostilities, after we had canceled our war loans, we loaned various sums to England, to France, to Italy, and to 13 other countries to enable them to rehabilitate themselves.

It was our armies and our Navy which then preserved the countries to which we extended those loans. We were hailed as the saviors of the world—until pay day arrived. I was in France soon after we entered the war, and I was told by officials of the French Government that when the United States came into the war France and Britain were defeated; that France was bled white; that it was only the knowledge that we were coming with our armed forces that gave them the courage to hang on until our troops arrived. Enthusiasm for the people of the United States was at high pitch everywhere throughout that country. We were in the minds of the French people—the saviors of the world. But when pay day arrived, their gratitude vanished, their enthusiasm evaporated, and they named us Uncle Shylock.

There are some figures it will be well for the American people to remember.

According to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1944, France is indebted to us in the sum of $4,529,589,000. Great Britain is shown as being indebted to us in the amount of $6,263,764,000. Italy's first World War account stood at $2,047,231,000. Armenia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, and Yugoslavia, have also defaulted on their debts to us. The entire indebtedness of all these nations aggregates $14,528,505,000. It is most significant that all of these nations with the exception of brave little Finland, served notice on us at the same time that they proposed to make no further payments on their debts to us. This experience should make it perfectly clear to the people of America that any further Government loans we might make to the nations of the world will receive scant consideration—and undoubtedly no repayment—after the money has been received and spent.

The so-called Lend-Lease Act provided a method whereby contributions could be made by the United States to other nations without involving loans. Under this act we have advanced in food, war materials and equipment, and in cash $40,000,000,000 during the period ending March 31, 1945. By this time, of course, this sum has been substantially increased. It will interest you to know that when the Lend-Lease Act was before Congress, it was known that no part of the expenditures we would make under this program would be paid for by anyone other than our own taxpayers. "Lend-lease" was a deliberate misnomer, chosen and used only for the purpose of misleading the American people. Some of us in the Congress at the time the act was pending declared that the title was a misnomer and that it should be named the "Give-Away" and not the "Lend-Lease" Act. We were howled down by the administration at that time as trying to interfere with the welfare of the world and the defense of America. These days nobody hears anyone in the administration even talk about repayment, or any return of the machines or the matériel of war, or the foodstuffs we have advanced to the other nations. Those who were loudest in their declarations that lend-lease was just what the administration claimed it to be are now conspicuous by their utter silence on the subject.

Today we are faced with a situation such as faced us following the armistice of a quarter of a century ago. The many billions we are committed to provide for rehabilitation of practically all of Europe, as well as the British Isles, will be provided in one way or another. It was intended by the Roosevelt administration to extend these funds through lend-lease. It is difficult to believe, however, that the present administration will follow this policy. It is possible that this money will be extended through loans. Unless another agency is provided whereby such loans can be adequately secured, this Government probably will repeat its disastrous and most unfortunate experience of a quarter of a century ago. Knowing from past experience what the result will be, it was with some degree of hope on my part, at least, that the World Bank Loan Fund and the Currency Stabilization Fund, provided for in the Bretton Woods agreement, would establish a medium whereby the war-torn countries could secure loans with which to meet their needs. Certainly if this bank is to be what it is declared to be, these funds will be provided through that medium. I voted for the Bretton Woods legislation. It involves a contribution by the United States of $5,925,000,000.

While it may be that we will lose every dollar we put into the World Bank fund and the Stabilization Fund, and while it may be that the other nations will no

more keep their solemn covenants with us than they did at the end of the First World War, the Bretton Woods agreement represents last-ditch hope, a last-resort expedient. Certainly if these billions of dollars were expended under lend-lease, after the statements from President Roosevelt himself that we could expect no repayment on lend-lease, it would be simply a gift of all of these additional billions of dollars.

Under proper management, the World Bank and the Currency Stabilization Fund should provide useful mechanisms in which proper accounting can be kept of the loans, and some sort of control can be held over the loans. It is of no avail to close our eyes to the fact that under the wrong kind of management, all the money we put into these two funds could be lost. Neither is there any point in closing our eyes to the possibility that, if the other nations borrow the funds from the Bank and the Stabilization Fund, and do not live up to their responsibilities as creditors, that not only will be lose the money we put into these funds, but the funds will not contribute to world peace.

We should keep ourselves in position where we can compel proper management. In such event the Bank and the Stabilization Fund may successfully survive the vicissitudes of the future, provided always that the whole world does not experience total economic collapse, as a result of the inconceivable destruction wrought everywhere on the globe. In that event, chaos would exist everywhere.

We must hope that such a collapse will not occur; many of us believe such a collapse will not occur; if all the nations do their part fairly and honestly in trying to get back to basis of peace, sanity, and production, such a collapse simply will not occur.

In any event, if the funds needed by other countries after the war can be secured from this bank, we will have gone a long way in bringing the world back to economic stability. If the loaning capacity is exhausted and there is need for further contributions by the several nations, we cannot participate except by consent of the Congress. Therefore it would seem that to utilize this mechanism for this purpose would result in relieving the American taxpayers of what otherwise would be additional gifts of fifteen or more billions of dollars.

I have long been convinced, as I believe you are convinced, that it is high time the taxpayers of other nations should share with us in making contributions to the welfare of all. It simply is a delusion—a delusion very assiduously fostered by some—that America can continue forever to carry the burden of not only the war, but of the entire world after the war as well.

There is no reason why other peoples should expect us to keep them, and to pay for their mistakes, their wars, their hatreds, their mismanagement, and their misgovernment, any more than there is for some of your neighbors to get drunk, refuse to work, fight among themselves, break up their furniture, injure their children, and finally burn down their houses and then to expect their more prosperous neighbors to make good for them, and to put them back on their feet to do the same thing again.

There can be advanced no legitimate reason why other nations should borrow from us. Whatever we lend we must first borrow from our people. There is no other source of revenue for us. Whatever we borrow increases the national debt to the same amount. Other nations can borrow from their people or finance their needs in other ways as they see fit. It is time we ceased being the Santa Claus for the whole world.

The Bretton Woods legislation, as I said in the beginning, represents last-ditch, last desperate efforts for the United States to help other nations to help themselves. If, instead of pursuing a course of rehabilitation, recovery, and peace, the other nations insist upon a future course of war intoxication, orgies of destruction, and blood-letting, then there will be no alternative for the United States except to make ourselves so strong on the land, on the sea, and in the air that no combination of nations could successfully war against us. I hope we can escape such a condition. I hope the world can escape such a fate. Only time will tell what the future holds for all of us.

American-Russian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses on the subject The Next Steps in American-Russian Relations, the first by Bruce Bliven, editor of the New Republic, and the second by myself. The addresses were broadcast on June 2 last over the Columbia Broadcasting System network.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY BRUCE BLIVEN, AN EDITOR OF THE NEW REPUBLIC

In common with millions of other persons, I have been disturbed by the deterioration in our relations with Russia in the past few weeks. That the situation is serious may be surmised from the fact that both Secretary Stettinius and Assistant Secretary MacLeish, of the Department of State, made Nation-wide broadcasts within 48 hours of each other to say, in effect, that our relations are all right, or if they are wrong, something will be done about it.

In Great Britain, leaders of the Labor Party say that Mr. Churchill and his followers are increasingly at cross purposes with Moscow. At San Francisco, the Russians rightly or wrongly believe that the United States was chiefly responsible for admitting Argentina to the Conference, and that this action had a strong anti-Russian tinge. They felt in our refusal to rotate the chairmanships of important committees—certainly a reasonable and fair proposal—in our refusal to delay the admission of Argentina even by a day, in our support of efforts to modify the essential terms of the Dumbarton Oaks-Yalta Charter, a sharp swing away from our policy as it existed under President Roosevelt. In thermometer terms, the temperature of cordiality between Russia on the one hand and Great Britain and the United States on the other has gone down from, say, 80 degrees to, let us say, 50 degrees, and freezing point is not far away.

This seems to me to threaten a disaster of the first magnitude. To be sure, there are a lot of things about Russia that I don't like. There are also some things about Great Britain that I don't like, just as there are things about this country and Great Britain that the Russians don't like. But the question we must ask ourselves is this: Can we afford the luxury of suddenly baiting each other and pursuing policies that are covertly hostile to each other? Who has started this sudden wave of hostility to, and criticism of, Russia in the United States?

The blunt truth is that, although so many gentlemen in New York, Washington, and London seem to have forgotten it, the war is not yet over. We still have a dangerous enemy to fight in the Pacific. We need Russia in that war, to help shorten it by many months, and to help save many thousands of American lives, and thereafter we need Russia to help create a world from which war has been banished through the San Francisco United Nations Charter. I have just returned from San Francisco, where I reported the Conference, and I realized, as did everyone else who was there, that the only chance for world peace is the continuing friendship of the three great powers—the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. If they remain friendly, there is no danger of a major conflict that could develop into World War III. If they begin quarreling, as they are already dangerously near to doing, then the San Francisco Charter will be so much waste paper, and we'd better begin universal compulsory military training for all our children as soon as they can carry a gun. We had also better start digging now to put all our cities underground in preparation for the horrors of the new, bigger, and worse buzz bombs and rocket bombs that are to come.

In this crisis I should like to see President Truman make a radio address—to the Nation and to the world—assuring us that the Russian haters, who have suddenly come to the fore, do not represent the settled policy of his Government. This does not mean that we should give way to Russia on matters of importance where we are profoundly convinced that we are right, but it does mean that we should reassure the Russians, who are pathologically suspicious and distrustful, that we are willing to cooperate if they are; that we have no designs upon them; that their way of life is their own business, just as our way of life is our own business. If it is true, as many people believe it is, that there are some men in the State Department who hate Russia with hysterical animosity, these men should be removed to some other department of the Government where their policies can do less harm. If recent acts of our Government have been put over by these men, so to speak, while no one was looking, those acts should be canceled, insofar as that is possible.

The San Francisco Organization, to be sure, is painfully imperfect. Power politics stalks the world, and its spokesmen, from many countries have had their influence on the new world charter. But however imperfect it is, I hope it will be accepted and ratified. Once it is in force, it can be amended and improved; but you cannot amend something which does not exist. No doubt we have some legitimate grievances against Russia, just as she has some legitimate grievances against us. But in the name of suffering humanity, this is no time to magnify these grievances, on either side, into national poli-

cies which will leave us to fight Japan alone, save for the limited help Great Britain can give us; and leave all countries then to face a situation where a new world war is already looming redly over the horizon.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WAYNE L. MORSE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OREGON (REPUBLICAN)

We are winning the war. We are winning it at tremendous sacrifice of life and national wealth. We are winning the war chiefly because, in the hour of great national crisis, we, as a people, rose up as one man, united in the determination to force the unconditional surrender of the leaders, the armies and the peoples of three Fascist nations which sought to subjugate freemen and destroy human rights the world around.

The war is not over and, although most Americans pooh-pooh the idea, final victory may be greatly delayed or may even peter out into less than total victory unless we remain a united people in harmony with our allies and with our eyes constantly on the great objectives of this war. Disunity here at home, and among the peoples of our allies abroad, will endanger the safety and lives of many of our fighting men abroad. International incidents between and among the Allies must be avoided. This is no time for name-calling and recriminations. It is not to be expected that we will always find ourselves in complete agreement with the foreign policies of Great Britain, France, China, or Russia; but, if we are to win the peace, if we are to accomplish the great objective of this war, namely the establishment of a world organization for permanent peace, based upon principles of a law of international justice, rather than military force, we must some way, somehow, reach a decent basis for understanding with Great Britain, France, Russia, and the other nations of the world, whose cooperation is essential to the success of any organization for peace.

In my remarks today I direct particular attention to growing difficulties with Russia. However, our foreign relations with Great Britain, France, and other countries also could very well be the subject of frank discussion. One of the great needs of the hour is for cool heads in high places who will face cold facts realistically. I would emphasize these points:

First, there can be no permanent peace in the world if Russia is not a cooperative partner in an international peace organization. Second, there can be no freedom from war unless feelings of suspicion and distrust and misunderstanding between the governments and the peoples of Russia, the United States, and Great Britain are dissolved. There is no denying the fact that today millions of Americans are confused in their attitudes toward Russia, if not downright suspicious of her. I have no doubt—in fact, all the available evidence indicates—that the same sort of feeling exists in Russia toward America. British news indicates that our English allies are not free of troubled brows.

Hence, I make my third point that Russian-American and Russian-Allied relationships cannot be improved by long-distance charges and countercharges. There is no method yet devised by men for resolving their differences which beats continuous conferences, negotiations, and man-to-man exchange of points of view. We must not lose sight of the fact that only a few days ago thousands of our soldiers and thousands of Russian soldiers were giving up their lives in a fight against a common enemy. We were, and are, allies of Russia in the struggle against Germany. That struggle is not over. Only the battle phase of it is over.

What the Allies do with Germany and Italy will determine, in a large measure, whether we are writing the last chapter in the history of war or the first chapter of the next world war. It certainly is devoutly to be hoped that the leaders of the Allied governments and the peacemaking commissions of each government will sit down in the very near future for prolonged and continuing conferences until they hammer out, by way of conscionable compromises in the full light of public attention, just peace terms which will prevail throughout war-torn Europe.

Unquestionably strong differences of opinion will develop in negotiations of those terms, but unless we remain united Allies in solving the problems of peace as we have in meeting the crisis of war we not only will condemn posterity to another holocaust but we will condemn ourselves in the appraisal of posterity. We must appreciate, as Americans, that our philosophy of government, our ideology in regard to the relation of the individual to the state, is very different from the Russian governmental philosophy. However, that does not mean that Russia cannot have her form of government and we ours and at the same time be allies in the great endeavor to establish just peace and a united world organization for preserving the peace.

It is easy for us to criticize Russia's policy, and many of her policies deserve firm and uncompromising criticism on the part of this Government. For example, we somehow must make perfectly clear to Russia that international cooperation is a two-way street. We must make clear to her that we do not propose to dictate to her what her internal Russian policies shall be but that, in her relations with conquered peoples, the policies to be applied to them must be mutually agreed upon and cooperatively administered.

I believe that if an Allied peace commission conference could be opened almost immediately by the heads of the Allied Governments it would be successful even if it required weeks, and even months, of continuous negotiations in forging a pattern of mutual understanding among the great Allied Powers that would guarantee that Russia, America, and Great Britain, along with France and every other peace-loving nation, would continue to be allies in the interests of permanent peace. I believe that only through such a continuous exchange of points of view can we hope to eliminate war-breeding suspicion and distrust between nations.

I believe that through immediate conferences we could get Russia to see that her program of censorship over the parts of conquered Europe which she controls and that her policy of nonaccessibility of Russian territory to Allied officials and to a free press explain in a large measure the growing suspicion and distrust in this country toward Russia. I think that only through such negotiations is any hope to be found in getting Russia to see that a peace, built upon revenge, enslavement of conquered peoples, and the refusal of each nation to be bound by just international rules governing all nations without exception, is certain to fail.

Russia cannot afford, any more than can the United States or Great Britain, to remain outside of a world organization for peace. However, if such negotiations as I have suggested should fail, and God forbid, if, after all attempts at conscionable compromise should come to naught, then I will say the course of action of this country is clear. We must continue to participate in the building of the best world order for peace that we can. We must keep ourself, as a nation, strong for the defense of that peace and continue to hope that Russia, once convinced that her suspicions of the Allies are without merit, will come in as a cooperative member of a world family of nations. If we follow that course and still fail to preserve the peace of the world at least the verdict of posterity will be that we kept the faith.

A Plan for Postwar Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a program for the encouragement of inventive genius and creative enterprise which I think is worthy of the attention of the best minds engaged in postwar planning.

This program was brought to my notice by Hon. Earl B. Teckemeyer, a member of the Indiana Legislature and a prominent businessman of Indianapolis. Writing to me under date of July 5, Mr. Teckemeyer said:

We have been reading in the papers about the activities now taking place under the jurisdiction of Secretary Henry Wallace with regard to revising the Patent Office. We believe two separate committees have been appointed to study this situation and that reports from them will soon be forthcoming.

A friend of mine in Indianapolis has given considerable thought to this subject and he has briefly outlined a program which to me seems to make sense and ought to be helpful.

The author of the plan referred to by Mr. Teckemeyer is Mr. Joseph M. Lawyer, of Indianapolis. It is entitled "A Plan for Postwar Enterprise." I think all who read it will agree with Mr. Teckemeyer that it furnishes much stimulating food for thought. I take pleasure in submitting it for the RECORD, as follows:

A PLAN FOR POSTWAR ENTERPRISE

Purpose: This is a plan to encourage by Federal assistance the creation and development of new ideas, such as may lend themselves to manufacture and distribution.

These ideas are present and originate each day in the minds of millions of people, but due to difficulties of patenting, lack of money, time, or fear of pirating, these ideas never come to fruition. If so, they would add greatly to the economy of the Nation, provide hundreds of thousands of new jobs (I believe many millions), and generally add to the well-being of all peoples by providing employment, encouraging personal initiative, and giving new satisfactions and conveniences to everyone.

The great service of this plan is to bring these ideas to fruition, and drain off this source of national wealth.

Today we need jobs. We need a rebirth of private initiative. Nearly everyone of us has had some private idea that could be manufactured, have seen some improvement in something we use every day, which we have never done anything about. We were too busy, it was forgotten, it was out of our line of endeavor, it cost too much money to investigate its possibilities, or the confusing details of patenting, left it as a dud. Beside these normal and personal impediments, was the fear of sharing it with an unscrupulous friend or patent attorney and having it pirated as their own. The patenting process alone, with its many ramifications, the search, the indiligent attorney, and cost before we know whether the idea is patentable or has any value at all, add to an inertia that thwarts nearly 999 out of 1,000 new ideas. So nothing is done, and it is as much of a waste of a great natural resource s our rivers before they were harnessed for their power, our millions of tons of inert mineral before

they were brought to amazing use, or miles of factory floor space lying idle without a single thought that will turn the wheels.

We have an industrial giant to keep busy after the war. We need everybody thinking for it. But we have never had a process for draining off the good and useful ideas of American citizens, and it is one of the most immodern facts in our American system.

The AAA will help a man buy a farm, the FHA will help a man buy a house, or a United States Employment Office will help a man get a job, but where can a man get help and protection with an idea that may be a boon to millions of people? He must run the gamut of experiment, tests, red tape, and possible sharpsters along the line, before he can hope to see it arrive in a protected, usable form.

Actually, few people expect to get rich from an idea. For this is an age of specialists. Most would probably be glad to sell, at a price a manufacturer in the field would be glad to purchase. A majority of Americans are in jobs they want to remain in after the war, and probably feel unequal to the tasks of patenting a product, launching a business, or bargaining with a possible manufacturer over a reasonable price.

As it has been in the past, for an American to have an idea, patent it, and see it amount to anything has always been a too imposing obstacle race.

Here is where the Government can come in. By the encouragement of new ideas, by assistance in draining them off the population's horizon, and acting as a protector and counselor, it can furnish the single most important development on the postwar horizon. It might eliminate the use of WPA entirely.

Here is how the plan works:

The Government will establish in certain leading American cities, to start, an office to which Americans can come with their ideas and get assistance, counsel, and protection. The idea is property after being registered in at the office, and as such our courts protect it. To achieve the initial step of protection, the citizen must do this:

First, he must write as clear and complete description of his invention as possible, with a sketch and statement of its purposes, etc., making an original and exact carbon copy. This he seals in separate envelopes, addressed to himself, and mails through the United States mails. The post office's cancellation stamp stamps the date and thereby establishes his priority of idea. The original can be opened and used for presentation and filing at the United States office, the carbon must be retained unopened and sealed at home or in a lock box, as it is his permanent proof of conception of the idea, and date.

Within a few days he must present the original at the United States office nearest him, where it is stamped with a time clock, marking the day and hour it comes with the hands. There, John Q. Citizen proceeds to get the help he wants. If he wants advice as to its merits, he is entitled to the best opinion of its staff. If he wants to patent it, they will help him in preparing his application. If he wants to manufacture it for himself, and needs Federal funds, they can send him to the proper agency. If he wants to sell it, they will assist him in contacting the manufacturers in the field, and act as go-between, if desired, in the negotiations.

The services this office can extend are manifold: It acts as a reception center for new thoughts and ideas. Its staff will soon acquire some skill to advise on value, whether a similar idea has been submitted or patented earlier that may preclude the last man's efforts. For a flat fee, it can arrange for a search of the records to see whether a prior patent has been granted, assist in helping make application for a patent, and advise the applicant of attending costs and what he can expect.

Even more unique, it becomes a clearinghouse between people with ideas and those who wish to market them. The staff can put the owner in touch with manufacturers in the field if desired, or it can bulletin out the idea for him to such manufacturers, for those who are interested to respond. The office can go further if desired and sit in on the negotiations and assist them in getting together on an equitable basis, acting as a counselor and adviser to each on their respective rights. The owner at all times has the right to reject, and the purchaser the right of offer. This service of go-between needs go no further than seeing that the two parties are together on a satisfied basis, legally drawn, for beyond that their rights come under the protection of the courts.

There will be those who will say there will be opportunity for flagrant skullduggery. Not more so than ordinary. The idea of the applicant is property on which he has proof of conception and date of priority, and is entitled to property owner's rights. The plan sets up a system for people to do something with their ideas and these Government offices would become veritable exchanges, with protection for all, where people who want to sell and those who want to buy can come.

JOS. M. LAWYER.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Unity for Postwar Readjustment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, whatever may have been the purposes of foreign leaders, or of our own leaders, for involving us in World War II, there can never be any question in history that the American people believed it was to protect our American ideals. Those ideals are all summed up in that marvelously comprehensive phrase coined by the founding fathers in the Declaration of Independence: "The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is inseparable from the right to work at one's chosen trade or profession without interference, so long as that trade or profession is within the law. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is the right to worship God as one chooses, to vote as one pleases; to be protected, through the police powers of our Federal, State, and municipal governments, from oppression, aggression, or molestation by anyone, or from any source, which would interfere with that inalienable right.

It was to maintain and uphold that ideal throughout the world, and especially to protect America against onslaughts by those who sought to extinguish the ideals expressed in that Declaration of Independence that our Nation went to war. It has been for that reason heroic men, generals, admirals, privates in the rear ranks, have died. It was in defense of that inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that more than 227,000 of our finest young men have yielded up their lives; that our total casualties are more than a million, and will go still higher.

It would be the most cruel, ironic fact in human history if, after the flower of our manhood and womanhood have gone forth to fight and to die for these high principles, we should lose them in our readjustment to peace. If our Nation should become embroiled in such industrial and social internecine warfare as could render futile all the struggles, the suffering, the heroism of the men and women in the front lines; and those other men and women who have given of their best in defense work on the home front.

A grave danger now confronts us. We can lose the peace. There is danger that thousands of men will be needlessly sacrificed, in our war with Japan, if strikes and industrial disputes are permitted to interfere with production of the machines and munitions of war. It is unconscionable that there should come any wave of strikes while we are still struggling to defeat Japan. It will be unconscionable if we permit any hotheaded or designing individuals to sabotage our efforts in our war with Japan by such strikes. They cannot be tolerated. They must not be tolerated. Full justice must always be done the wage earners of America—but full justice must always be done, too, to the men and women on the battle fronts who are laying their all on the altar of their country's defense.

Congress, industry, labor, agriculture—the leaders in every line of activity in the United States are planning for a postwar America in which full employment will be a fact. There is no necessity, therefore, for strikes, lock-outs, industrial warfare, to begin before we have conquered Japan, there will be no reason for it to begin afterward.

There will be no exploitation of labor in an era of full employment—there could not be.

If our soldiers and sailors, our men and women on the fighting fronts, come home only to find that the country they have fought for denies them the right to their old jobs, or an opportunity to secure the jobs they would have had if they had stayed at home, this Nation will be riven from coast to coast, and from Canada to the Mexican line, by bitterness between our own citizens. That bitterness could, and probably would, defeat our best efforts to attain a full employment, and to readjust the United States to a proper postwar position in the world.

If such a condition should come about in the United States, the cynicism which would fill the hearts of our fighting men and women would blast their ideals, would give the lie to everything they have been told they are fighting for. The United States Government could not endure; peace and cooperation and good will could not exist in any Nation wherein ten or fifteen millions of fighting men and women, and all of their loved ones, were convinced they had been tricked and lied to by their Government and their leaders, from the White House down.

Our only possible hope of achieving the full fruits of victory for which such a terrible price in blood and treasure has been paid, is to secure unity. We must have tolerance, fair dealing, between all elements of our population after the war is ended, and the soldiers and sailors

come back home to take their places in the peacetime plan of their country.

There will be no need under a condition of full employment for disputes as to seniority between returned veterans and home workers. There will be no need for anybody to fear that labor will be ground down and exploited after the war. The smartest industrial statesmen in America are in the very forefront of the movement for full employment in the United States; for good wages—the highest ever known in this Nation; for the shortest working hours, for the best working conditions we have ever known.

Under such a plan, and in view of such determination on the part of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of the Government, it would be unconscionable for industrial and labor disputes, and feuding between soldiers and civilians, to be permitted to wreck our plans for reaping the fruits of peace.

The pressure bloc system of government ruined France and made her fall easy prey to the German armies. The pressure bloc system of government will ruin any country. It is the very opposite of unity, concert of action, of our traditional American system of proposal, disagreement, discussion and compromise. The whole effect of the pressure bloc system is to cause each bloc to strive constantly for such strength as will enable it to override or disregard the desires or rights of all other minorities. Like sectionalism, such a bloc system inevitably becomes intensely selfish, scheming, unprincipled, and a ready tool for demagogs, dictators, and those who would seek self-aggrandizement above the welfare of their country and their fellow citizens.

Our American system in 150 years has given us the finest government, the highest living levels, the highest wages, the finest working conditions, the greatest religious tolerance and freedom, the greatest political freedom, the greatest individual liberty and privilege ever known by man because it has been a system of one people, one country, national aims instead of bloc or sectional selfishness, scheming, and feuding. In the bloc system of pressure government lies ruin for the United States.

Nothing on earth can stop America from readjusting successfully to a greater postwar prosperity than we have ever known before except our own blindness and sectional or group selfishness. Efforts to bring about the ruin of our grand and beloved country are being exerted by the Communists, those mentally unhealthy people who actually have deluded themselves into preferring slavery to freedom, alien rule instead of American independence.

Just why any man or woman wants to be a servile and slavering Communist, the tool of an alien dictator and the advocate and agent of alien doctrines diametrically opposed to everything American is beyond any logical reason. There simply is no reward in communism for the masses. It is the most vicious, false, and hideous doctrine ever invented under the guise of being good for the masses while it grinds them down and makes them the utter slaves of a few self-appointed dictators and ruthless rulers. There are countless proofs of this. Earl Browder offers a glaring example of the utter lack of any hope of reward in advocating communism. He was for years the bitter enemy of his own country. He was the willing and abject slave of the Stalin philosophy of dictatorship and interference in the governments of other countries—in short, of world revolution to overthrow freedom, and government by the people. Yet within the past few weeks it has suited the purpose of Stalin, and the other bosses at Moscow, to disgrace Browder, to make a scapegoat of him, and without compunction they did so. And Brother Browder, spineless, without principles, and now with no friends, has to appear to like the disgrace visited upon him; he has to take his public humiliation with a smile and ask for more; he has to suffer being kicked around by a French Communist who has no business interfering in American affairs at all, and who ought, if he comes to this country to interfere, be kicked into the Atlantic Ocean.

What, in heaven's name, is the sense or the logic in slaving for a dictatorial ruler and a dictatorial doctrine only to be shot, strangled, or publicly humiliated and cast aside in scorn when the rules and the doctrinaires have ceased to need one? Only a crazy man could or would subscribe to and work for such vile and false doctrines of government. Yet there have been infiltrated into this country a dangerously large number of such aliens. Ganging up with the miscreants, malcontents, misfits, and self-seekers of this country, they are working to bring about strikes, sabotage of our Japanese war efforts, dissension between labor unions and labor organizations, feuding between veterans and labor unions and labor leaders. All too many of our labor leaders are themselves Communists; many of them are aliens without a single American ideal.

If we are to safeguard our peace, if we are to make sure our readjustment to a peacetime prosperity and an expanding economy with full employment are to be realized, we must put an end to sectional and pressure bloc feuding. We must treat all minorities fairly, but we had better remember that men and women who have been through the countless hells of this war for their country are not going to stand for being pushed around by a bunch of alien-minded, alien-bossed Communist agitators when the war is over.

We must pull together, one country, one people—all faithful to those ideals and the American system which have in a century and a half made us the richest, the freest people on the face of the globe.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Hanley on Americanism," which was printed on July 5, 1945, in the Bismarck Tribune, a newspaper published at Bismarck, N. Dak., together with an editorial which appears on the same page of the newspaper entitled "In Defense of Mr. Pierce."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HANLEY ON AMERICANISM

MANDAN SOLDIER WRITES C. F. PIERCE OF PIONEER TO GIVE RECORD OF JAPANESE-AMERICAN SOLDIERS IN EUROPE—ANSWERS CRACK ABOUT ONLY GOOD JAPS BEING DEAD ONES BY SAYING HE KNOWS WHERE SOME GOOD ONES, WHO DIED IN DEFENSE OF THIS NATION, ARE BURIED—WARNS THAT JOKES BASED ON RACE PREJUDICES SHOW LACK OF FAITH IN AMERICAN IDEALS

(From the Pacific Coast Citizen, San Francisco)

Lt. Col. James M. Hanley, commander of the famed Second Battalion of the Four Hundred and Forty-second (Japanese-American) Infantry Regiment, took time on the western front in March to write a letter to his home-town editor, Charles F. Pierce, of the Mandan (N. Dak.) Daily Pioneer.

Colonel Hanley took exception to a remark in Editor Pierce's column which read: "A squib in a paper makes the statement that there are some good Jap-Americans in this country, but it didn't say where they were buried."

Good Japanese-Americans

His letter published in the Daily Pioneer, declared:

Dear Charlie: Just received the Pioneer of January 20 and noted the paragraph enclosed.

Yes, Charlie; I know where there are some good Japanese-Americans—there are some 5,000 of them in this unit. They are American soldiers—and I know where some of them are buried.

I wish I could show you some of them, Charlie. I remember one Japanese-American. He was walking ahead of me in a forest in France. A German shell took the right side of his face off. I recall another boy. An .88 had been trying to get us for some time—finally got him.

When they carried him out on a stretcher, the bloody meat, from the middle of the thighs down, hung over the end of the stretcher and dragged in the dirt. The bone parts were gone.

I recall a sergeant—a Japanese-American if you will—who had his back blown in two. What was he doing? Why, he was only lying on top of a white officer who had been wounded, to protect him from shell fragments during a barrage.

I recall one of my boys who stopped a German counterattack single-handed. He fired all his BAR ammunition, picked up a German rifle, emptied that; used a German Luger pistol he had taken from a prisoner.

I wish I could tell you the number of Japanese-Americans who have died in this unit alone.

I wish I could tell you the number of wounded we have had—the sightless eyes, the missing limbs, the broken minds. I wish I could tell you the decorations we have won.

What are we fighting for?

I wish the boys in the Lost Battalion could tell you what they think of Japanese-Americans. I wish that all the troops we have fought beside could tell you what they know.

I know it makes a good joke, but it is the kind of joke that prejudice thrives upon.

It shows a lack of faith in the American ideal.

Our system is supposed to make good Americans out of anyone. It certainly has done it in the case of these boys.

You, the Hood River Legion Post, Hearst, and a few others make one wonder just what we are fighting for. I hope it isn't racial prejudice.

Come on over here, Charlie. I'll show you where some good Jap-Americans are buried.

IN DEFENSE OF MR. PIERCE

In the Tribune's Mirror of Public Opinion, which appears in another part of this page, there is printed comment on a letter written by Lt. Col. J. M. Hanley, of Mandan, to Charles F. Pierce, editor of Mandan Pioneer.

This letter has attracted attention throughout the United States and has been printed in many publications which have joined the campaign to suppress intolerance. In this, by the way, the Tribune has joined wholeheartedly, for bigotry and intolerance are evils directly opposed to the true principles of Americanism.

Yet the heading of this editorial is In Defense of Mr. Piecre, because it offers a good excuse to tell the readers of the Tribune how newspapers are made. When this becomes plain it also is made clear that editors sometimes see some strange things in the publications for which they are responsible.

The item to which Lieutenant Colonel Hanley took exception read: "A squib in a paper makes a statement that there are some good Jap-Americans in this country, but it didn't say where they are buried."

In the first place, a "squib" is a short item of the type which usually appears at the bottom of a column so it will be the proper length for the page. Editorial squibs are those at the bottom of the editorial column in which someone tries to be brilliant, or funny, or pungent, as the case may be.

Usually they are not the product of the newspaper's editor at all but are obtained from a company which will supply him with editorials and short snappy paragraphs for a price. He buys this service just as he buys his comics. "Blondie" for example, is the top comic in America and appears daily in hundreds of newspapers. The Tribune could not afford to hire such an artist for its exclusive use, for its creator probably earns more money than any person in Bismarck. Humor is a precious commodity, as witness the earnings of newspaper and radio humorists, some of whom merit the title only by stretching the mantle of charity almost to the breaking point.

What happened in the Pioneer, then, is that Mr. Pierce merely made use of a squib which came to him from a source which regularly supplies him with material. It was no more an expression of his, personally, than that of any reader of his newspaper. The same thing could happen in any newspaper, but in this case there was a difference. That was represented in the fact that Lieutenant Colonel Hanley reads his home-town paper and he is one of the few Americans who might be expected to take exception to it. Why he did object to it is set forth in his letter to Mr. Pierce.

The Tribune uses "editorial squibs," too, but has chosen to use those of a type to which no one can object. At the bottom of its editorial column for June 30, for example, there appeared this "squib:" "Most men employ the first part of life to make the other part miserable.—La Bruyer."

Now it so happens that the Tribune's editor doesn't even know who La Bruyer was, but the remark was judged good enough to warrant publication in the book of philosophical sayings from which it was culled.

The Tribune prints quotations from the greats of history because it believes readers appreciate these casual contacts with great minds. It gets them by browsing around in the broad field of literature. But it does not originate them any more than Mr. Pierce originated that crack about the Japs.

The United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, Henry H. Turner, of Atlanta, Ga., made an outstanding address on the San Francisco treaty before the Atlanta Women's Republican Study Club on June 12 last, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NOTED SOUTHERNER STATES THE CASE AGAINST THE SAN FRANCISCO CHARTER

For more than 40 years I have been accustomed to speaking in public, often for others, seldom for myself. Today I shall speak for myself. Today I shall speak my thoughts and no one except myself is to be held responsible for them. They will be more than a little inconoclastic—they will not be popular. People do not like to hear what is displeasing to themselves and all the people of the earth have been hoping that something constructive would come from the San Francisco Conference. I have hoped. I now think that hope is vain.

As I begin let me state that I am not one of those who refuse to believe that the people of the earth must create an instrumentality to maintain peace or be destroyed. As one whose sons are now in the armed forces, as one who is a proud grandfather of six boys who will be ripe for cannon fodder if some method of war prevention is not found, I believe intensely that we must create an international machinery able and strong enough to prevent war even by martial means if that becomes necessary.

But because I do believe in the creation of such an instrumentality is no reason why I am willing to subordinate the sovereignty of the United States to the oligarchic and autocratic and despotic control of five men. The freedom of our citizens has been too hardly won to deliver them without protest into the custody of any man or group of men with unlimited and unrestricted powers to do anything that they, in their powerful discretion, may determine. The economic prosperity of the mass of our citizens is an asset too valuable to this Nation to be delivered to the discretions of others. The standard of wages and the living which the laboring men and women of America have earned for themselves has been too hardly won to permit its risks in the hands of any man.

To keep the record clear and to avoid misunderstandings on the part of those who will hear what I have to say, it is my contention that the international pact which we shall be asked to ratify will be that pact which is written and not the oratorical praises for it, the words that will bind us are not the interpretations which are put upon it by those who want to convince us, but the words which are written in the pact itself.

This Dumbarton Oaks proposal is a preposterous thing to offer to any nation—especially to small nations and to those nations which enjoy democracy. Every nation which subscribes to any proposal written along the lines of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals abjectly cedes all its sovereignty into the hands of five men who will have the power to govern this earth without limitation or restriction upon their powers. And the proposals actually contain an oath of allegiance and of obedience to the dictates of the Security Council.

Hitler promised security to the German people, Pilsudski promised security to the Poles, Mussolini promised security to the Italians and Admiral Horthy promised security to the Hungarians. Every one ended in the same way. Their every act was slowly and gradually made subject to the decrees of a dictator. In these United States of America, the people have been promised security and, while I make no invidious comparisons, I do state that too high a price can be paid for security. No man is so secure as is he who spends a life sentence in a good strong jail. There his every want is supplied and he has everything except freedom.

Make no mistake. For every bit of security you shall get you will pay in the coin of freedom already earned. And America has already earned its freedom. Almost are we now the only great nation which has any of the coin of freedom with which to pay for the security of the earth. You are not so foolish as to believe that you are going to get something for nothing, that any nation will have something for nothing. And there is no freedom with which to pay for the security of the earth except that which the democracies now enjoy.

This Nation was originally established as a government by established principles and aims. We rebelled against a government by the powers of government and we have prospered under our form of government. Here we have grown accustomed to being governed by laws and not by the discretion of men. In this United Nations Organization, proposed to be established by the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, there is no established principle. Chapter II which deals with the principles of the Organization, declares the equality of nations, contains an oath of allegiance, a promise of economic and martial support of the decrees of the Security Council. It lies when it even talks of any equality of nations and it does not lie when it takes the oath of the allegiance of the peoples of the earth to the government of an oligarchic five men.

If you doubt any statement I make, read the document itself. Forget what those who would sell you say about what it may mean. You can understand words. Read the words of the proposed contract.

This Nation was established upon the theory that the rights of the people were best served and protected under a form of government which placed the four branches of government in four different organs. The executive branch of government was placed in the President, the legislative branch was placed in the Congress, the judicial branch was placed in the courts, and the people retained for themselves the political branch of government that they might hold in their hands a balance wheel for the other branches of government.

But this proposed United Nations is different. At the time our Constitution was adopted there were here in America the most brilliant group of political thinkers ever to live upon the earth contemporaneously. They formulated this Constitution. But I say to you, that these men were no more brilliant than are those men who formulated the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. They were just thinkers of a different type; the men who formulated the Constitution were patriots who wanted to establish here a democratic republic in which men might live as freemen in a free nation. No man or nation can live free under the form of world government which is proposed for the United Nations.

To read and to study the proposals requires one to believe that they were formulated in good faith to maintain and to preserve peace. One must believe that there were

ambitious men who saw in the desire of all the peoples of the earth for a permanent peace an opportunity to establish for themselves an oligarchic control of all the peoples of the earth. So all the peoples of the earth have been taught to believe that this Conference now being held in San Francisco is a peace conference, designed and intended to maintain peace. Ladies and gentlemen, it will be an organization capable of maintaining peace and for a long period—but it will be a Roman peace in which five men will be absolute dictators of the earth. These men take the power, under proposals, to regulate the armament of every nation and to establish and maintain their own military staff and naval staff. No nation desiring to rebel would be able to do so—not even the most powerful. Do you doubt this? Then read the proposals—chapter VI, section B, and chapter VIII. The statements which I have made are implicit in the document.

Now, with all this fuss and feathers about the maintenance of peace everyone would think that there would be established some code of international law. But there is not proposed the establishment of any code of international law and there is vested in no organ of the United Nations any power or authority to establish any code of international law. True, there is a casual reference to existing international law but you and I know that there exists today no single international law excepting that which a powerful nation may be able to impose upon others. There is not one of the so-called international laws which has had the legal approval of all the nations of the earth.

The largest organ of the proposed United Nations is to be a General Assembly, which is to be the only organ of the United Nations in which all nations are represented and in which every one of them has a vote. Most naturally you would think that in this body there would be vested some degree of power—especially the lower to write a code on international law. But you would be most grievously mistaken. Not one single power is vested in this General Assembly except the power to allocate the expense of the United Nations.

Of course, the document states that this General Assembly shall have the power to "consider," to "discuss," to "initiate studies," to "receive reports," and to make recommendations about any matter in which the Security Council is not interested. There is not one single actual power vested in the General Assembly. The government of any nation would be false to their own peoples to approve such a pact.

I have stated that all powers are to be vested in the discretion of the five men who compose the Security Council. Actually the proposals provide that the Security Council shall be composed of 11—1 from the United States, 1 from Russia, 1 from Britain, 1 from China, and 1 from France, 5 members of the Security Council to be permanent members and 6 members elected by the General Assembly.

Now that sounds fine! But there is a trick in it. A nonpermanent member of the Security Council must have had a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly to have been elected. And Great Britain has 6 votes in the General Assembly, Russia has 3 and the United States, China, and France have 1 each. That is 12 votes. There are less than 50 votes in the General Assembly. It would be a queer day in anybody's politics when folk holding 12 of the necessary 17 votes to defeat anyone would not be able to control the election of 6 members of their associates on the Security Council.

I state again that the proposals contain no single limitation or restriction upon the powers of the Security Council when the five members and two others are in agreement. Another queer thing about these proposals. They refer to the six nonpermanent members as being members who shall hold office for only 2-year terms; they speak of the five others as permanent members.

Are these men who are to constitute the oligarchy empowered to rule the earth in all matters—to hold office for life? Some claim not, but the question as to why the proposals do not limit the terms of office if these men are not to be in fact permanent dictators of the earth.

Certainly there is a proposed court. But there is a requirement that the Security Council shall have all powers, legislative, executive, judicial, political, economic, and humanitarian. Just what do these words mean? Have you folks ever considered just what they mean? They mean that this Security Council can require the cancellation of the California alien land laws or the laws of any State of this Nation, that it can limit the international trade of this Nation as it may wish, that it can tell a manufacturer whom he can employ and for how many hours, what he can manufacture and when and where and at what price he can sell it. That it can tell a labor union that it must dissolve and work under directives of the Security Council and just anything else it may independently please.

Some of you will say that this is absurd. But, if they do not intend to use these powers, why not leave them out of the proposals? Why not insert in them some limitation—a bill of rights for the nations and for the people who make the nations?

The proposals also establish a Secretariat which is to keep the records. And not all of these records are to be public records. The Security Council may act in the old-fashioned and outmoded Star Chamber notorious in English history.

The proposals vest in the Security Council—in the hands of an oligarchy of five men, more power than is now vested by the people of these United States in the Federal Government and in the State governments of all 48 States, and without any limitation or restriction whatever. If that is not a new creation of tsaristic government upon a world-wide scale, then I do not know words.

But this Dumbarton Oaks proposal is just one of many proposed international pacts. The others operate to the disadvantage of "creditor nations" and to the advantage of debtor nations. Need I tell you that the United States is the only "creditor nation" and that the other nations are all "debtor nations"? All these international agencies will operate under expenses allocated by a governing body or otherwise established to require that this Nation will pay the greater part of the cost. And this United Nations proposed at Dumbarton Oaks is designed particularly to enable the other pacts to be enforced if this Nation should ever wish to withdraw from any pact.

But the San Francisco Conference, once it is organized, is a sovereign body. It is not bound by any agreements made by any group of powers, whether such arguments were made at Yalta or elsewhere. The powers making this agreement may be bound to support such arguments, but the Conference itself is not bound. It is entirely possible that the Conference might bring out a sane and reasonable proposal for acceptance or rejection by the nations of the world. But I doubt it.

If the proposals which are agreed upon at San Francisco are similar to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, then the question for this Nation to determine is whether or not it wishes to give up its independence and its national sovereignty to a supergovernment by an oligarchy of five men in whom shall be vested all the powers of the earth, including social and economic. Such powers should not be vested in men. Only gods are worthy of such powers. Humanity will do better to entrust its freedom and its liberty to the established and declared laws than to the ambitious discretions of men.

If such proposals are proposed and ratified by our Senate, then the decrees of the Security Council will constitute laws of nation greater in majesty than our own Constitution and our own laws. And they cannot be repealed by any act of Congress or any of our State legislatures.

Very easily the Security Council could direct the payment of the European war debts by taxing this Nation; very easily it could order the permanent rationing of this Nation in order to supply the teeming millions of overpopulated lands with the food they undoubtedly will need. Very easily it could establish a ceiling price upon the products of farm and factory in order to make them products easily and cheaply available to less prosperous peoples. Very easily it could require that this Nation permit entry into this land of prosperity of the workers of other lands.

Absurd? Not at all. If the Security Council were not deliberately intended to have these particular powers they would not have been written into the proposals? Do you think that a power to restrain such beastly actions as the Germans have done in Germany was not deliberately included in the proposals? Do you think that the proposals were not intended to give the United Nations power to intervene in internal matters in which the world is interested? It is undoubtedly true, even though it may be unfortunate that to give to this United Nations power to do the things we think ought to be done, will also give it power to do other things unless there be limitation and restrictions placed upon the powers granted.

In this United States the liberty and freedom of the people must not be destroyed. And the progress which has been made by those who labor must be protected. The independence and prosperity and freedom we have been too hard won over too long a period to entrust it to the discretion of any man or group of men. It might be or have been that this Nation might have had immediate confidence in its own representative on the Security Council, but because a people may have that immediate confidence in a man who presently sits in a position of power, there is no reason to remove from that power all limitations and to grant to him increases in power which might in the hands of unworthy men succeeding him prove shackles upon the liberties of the people. Let us paraphrase William Cullen Bryant:

Freedom is no fair young girl with hair of tangled sunbeams and arms of alabaster. Freedom is a bearded man, hairy with age and armed. One hand holds a shield and the other a sword. His brow is scarred with tokens of old wars. His limbs are strong with struggle. Power at him has launched his bolts but could not quench the life he had from heaven: Merciless Power has dug his dungeons deep and his armorers have forged his chain: Yet Freedom has always broken the chain and destroyed the jail, and conquered his oppressor. His birthright was not given by human hands—he was twin born with man. O Freedom.

Thou shalt wax stronger with the lapse of years. But he (Power) shall fade into a feebler age—feebler, yet subtler. He shall weave his snares and spring them on thy careless steps and clap his withered hands and from their ambush call his hordes to fall upon you. He shall send quaint maskers, wearing fair and gallant forms to catch thy gaze and uttering graceful words to charm the ear—while his sly imps, by stealth twine round thee threads of steel, light thread on thread that grow to fetters; or bind down thine arms with chains concealed in chaplets. Oh, not yet mayest thou unbrace thy corselet, nor lay by in slumber—for thine enemy never sleeps.

What Does the Future Hold for the Youth of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, these are days which make the fathers and mothers of America pause to ponder deeply what kind of a postwar America and what kind of a postwar world their sons and daughters may have to live in. All young folks must have their hours of wonderment, doubt, perhaps a tinge of fear, as to what the future may hold for them.

There are those apostles of gloom who would tell them that this Nation has reached maturity, that it is on the downside of the hill, as nations go, and that the opportunities for adventure and distinction which were offered the youth of other generations will be denied them. Does anyone believe any such stuff as that? The youngsters of today are living and coming into manhood and womanhood in the greatest nation and the finest country on the face of this globe. We are living under the most marvelous form of government ever devised by man. We have enjoyed all our lives up to recent years more freedom, greater liberty, more priceless privileges than the youth of any other land. The children of today were born into a wonderful heritage of freedom, a nation rich beyond conception in natural resources, an unsurpassed religious freedom, a wonderful educational system, and into a land teeming with opportunities for those who have the intelligence, the imagination, the character, and the energy to grasp them.

It is true that this wonderful heritage of all these bountiful blessings has been somewhat impaired by developments and events of the past few years. It is true that we older citizens have taken, as fixed and irrevocable, our liberty which in fact and in faith is kept alive only by the exercise of eternal vigilance on the part of the people. It is true that all too many of the liberties we have enjoyed under our bill of rights have become weakened and impaired because we were willing to accept them as something to which we were born; a right which could not be wrested from us; a heritage which required no exertion of any character on our part to retain and protect.

Let me say to you, my young friends who may be listening, that liberty is a quality of the soul; something which is gained, and held and protected day by day, right by right, freedom by freedom, privilege by privilege. Otherwise it is lost. John Stuart Mill was a great thinker in his day. He made a very profound statement in his work, Essay on Representative Government, which might well have been written for you yesterday:

> A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if, by monetary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of even a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions—in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it.

Those words are just as true today as they were when John Stuart Mill penned them.

You are coming into manhood and womanhood in a world rent asunder by war, aflame with the most bitter hatreds of which men are capable. Hatred is always destructive. It is a searing acid that corrodes the soul so long as it is entertained in human consciousness. Let me warn you against hatred.

You must be horrified, as I am horrified, by the terrible conflict which has raged all over the world in which men and women are still striving to their utmost to kill each other while they are destroying the finest works of civilization. It is a great madness in which we have, as a people, been compelled to participate by ruthless ravagers, brutal despots, insane marauders, who started out to subjugate the world. We had to engage in this awful carnage and oppose these brutal aggressors to protect this nation of yours and mine. We had to fight to protect those liberties which we believe are the birthright of every individual. We are fighting to prevent the subjugation of peoples in the other parts of the world who were compelled, under the lash and bayonet of the dictators, into a force to assault the citadels of civilization; to pull down the pillars of the Christian religion; to prepare the way to make you, and the rest of the youth of the world, to be the lashed and driven slaves of egomaniacs gone utterly mad with a wicked and insatiable lust for power.

This is a terrible picture to paint for you, but there is no point in trying to soothe you with gentle words into a false sense of security, or of trying to minimize the mess men have made of a wonderful world and a marvelous civilization.

Therefore, as you come into manhood and womanhood you must undertake the management and operation of a nation with the most enormous public debt any country in the world ever staggered under. The figures are so astronomical they are incomprehensible to the human mind. We have no way of measuring their immensity.

Now that we have looked on the dark side of this picture, let us turn it over and see if there is a bright side. There is. From a standpoint of material devastation you are living in a country comparatively untouched by war. Other nations have been blasted into rubble and ruin. We have escaped that awful experience. In other nations families have been separated; little children who have not, and cannot, have any conception of the reason for the carnage which surrounds them, line the highways and the byways of the Old World, hungry, frightened, bewildered, wailing for lost parents with whom many of them will never be reunited on this earth again. Thank God, the children of America are not undergoing such anguish as that.

It is true we will stagger under a monstrous debt. It is true we will lose many of our loved ones in the battles which are raging. But our capacity to produce is unimpaired—it is, in fact, enhanced and expanded. Our material industrial plants, our schools and colleges, our churches, our stores, are entirely intact and unimpaired.

We are not undergoing anything comparable to the privations of the peoples in the subjugated countries, and in those nations allied with us in the war.

Now, my young friends, there are many advocates of foreign "isms" and alien "doctrines" who would have you believe that this country is no longer a land of equal opportunity. Their premise is false. Their doctrines are false. Their statements are false. This Nation still is a land of equal opportunities. In America the boy or girl who has the talent, the energy, the imagination, the character, and the perseverance, can rise above the crowd and gain wealth and distinction. It is happening in these United States every day. When these peddlers of alien doctrines talk to you about lack of equal opportunity, what they really are talking about is their resentment because there is not equality of talent and capacity. Whenever you find a Communist or a Fascist, preaching the leveling down of all society, and the socializing, under the State, of all industry, you will find an individual who lusts for power, and who, to get that power, would be willing to enslave his fellow men; or you will find a man or woman who is a miserable discontented failure who, because of his or her lack of capacity, and character, and energy, seeks to pull all others down to a common level rather than to make the struggle necessary to rise to the world of the successful and distinguished.

There lies before you, young people, now the greatest adventure in molding a government to your highest ideals that has ever presented itself to the youth of any country.

Do not let anybody tell you that the frontiers are all gone; that there is no longer opportunity for adventure or for new discoveries. We have not yet scratched the surface of the opportunities for new modes of power from solar and other sources. I happened a few years ago to be the chairman of a congressional committee to study the future of plastics. I say to you we have not scratched the surface of the possibilities of a new world of plastics. The time may not be far ahead of you when you may be able to carry a walkie-talkie radio set in your car and talk to your best girl half way across the State. You may even be able, indeed, to see her smiling in the ground glass of your television set.

You will have an unparalleled opportunity to participate in the rebuilding of a war-shattered world. You will have your part in the greatest humanitarian work ever imagined by man.

The horizons of opportunity in the realms of science are not yet even in sight.

Heretofore frontiers have been regarded as largely geographical. We have, in these later years, begun to learn that the real frontiers are scientific and spiritual.

You love liberty as your fathers and mothers have loved liberty before you. It will be your magnificent opportunity to help carry liberty, enlightenment, and civilization to the farthest ends of the world. You can do that, you will be able to do it, only if you cling fast to your faith in God, your love of country, and your firm determination that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States shall never be destroyed or weakened.

Anyone who proposes to you a planned economy, or tells you it is a new idea, would deceive you. Personal liberty can live only under a free government, operated by consent of the governed.

There is no possibility of equality of opportunity under any kind of a government except a free government, or under any kind of an economy except a free-enterprise economy. There is no possibility of happiness for you, and those who are to come after you, except in a free society.

Each generation in this Nation, where we have a government of laws, and where we must shun a government by men, must, in its turn, take up both the privileges and the responsibilities of government.

The time is coming when your generation will have to take up the privileges and responsibilities of operating this Government.

The possibilities, the chances for adventure, the opportunities for each one of you individually, to distinguish yourself are greater today than they have ever been in the history of this Nation.

I am sure that the faith of the founding fathers in the faithfulness and wisdom of posterity to hold onto the priceless liberties and privileges they gained for us will not be found wanting in you. I am sure you will meet the tasks that lie ahead of you, and that you will grasp the opportunities which are yours as American youth always has. More power to young Americans everywhere.

Where the Game Shoots Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in response to a bill which passed the Senate last week, to vitiate restrictions against the baiting of feeding grounds and the use of live decoys in the protection of waterfowl against pot hunters, I include a letter from a doughboy, written from one of the Marianas in the Pacific area, which is self-explanatory.

The letter is as follows:

JUNE 21, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It has recently been brought to my attention that a certain minority group, the absence of most of the duck hunters in the service, is trying to legalize the use of live decoys in the sport of duck hunting.

Since the first Indian sighted an arrow at a canvasback there have always been a few who couldn't kill ducks if they were sitting in a washtub, and believe me it's these few who make the biggest racket when a question of this type comes up. Give them live decoys and they will immediately be looking for a new excuse.

I could quote you statistics proving that in 10 days with legal bag limits and the number of duck stamps sold per season we could kill more ducks than now exist in North America.

However, that is not the point. Such a law passed while millions of young hunters are away fighting for the rights of this sport and the other freedoms would be a stab in the back.

If it's live decoys they want, we could use a few over here in the Pacific and they'll find the game shoots back.

I'm agin' it and hope if you find it convenient you will put in a word to that effect.

R. C.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is representative of expressions of opinion I have received from various servicemen. We should not only preserve the game until these men get back from the war but, more important still, we should preserve it for future generations. Until the present regulations for conservation of wildlife were adopted our game birds were rapidly nearing extinction. Let us not relax the oversight of wildlife which has preserved this invaluable and irreplaceable natural resource to cater to large bags for mediocre hunters who want to shoot them sitting.

First Freedom for Returning Veterans Without Paying Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a report from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on H. R. 3384, a bill to guarantee to our returning veterans the enjoyment of the first freedom—that is, the freedom to work for their daily bread, without paying tribute.

The matter referred to follows:

PROTECTING HONORABLY DISCHARGED VETERANS IN THEIR RIGHTS TO JOIN OR REFRAIN FROM JOINING LABOR AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. RANKIN, from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, submitted the following report:

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3384) to protect honorably discharged veterans in their rights to join or refrain from joining labor and other organizations, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do pass:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill is designed to insure that no veteran discharged under honorable conditions shall be required, as a condition of employment, to be or become a member of, or to maintain membership in, any labor organization, club, association, or other organization, or, as a nonmember thereof, to make any payment thereto in the form of dues, assessments, charges, contributions, or other payments. The bill provides for enforcement of the rights of any veteran, under its provisions, by mandatory injunction or other suitable process by the district court of the United States (including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia) for the district in which the alleged violation or threatened violation of such rights occurred, or in which the veteran resides, and for such purposes process of the court may be served at any place in the United States.

JUSTIFICATION

Your committee in reporting this bill is cognizant of steps which have been taken by labor unions to waive payment of dues by members who have entered service, and to waive initiation fees for veterans desiring to become members. However, even though such programs may be enlarged to cover additional groups and types of employment, there still would exist the deterrent to full employment of veterans who can ill afford or who do not desire to become members of labor organizations, clubs, associations, or other organizations.

Your committee believes that the Congress should act to give full assurance to those who offered their lives in the service of their country that there shall be no deterrent to their immediate and full employment upon their return from service. The veteran should be permitted to enter any employment to earn his living and not be confronted with obstacles in the form of prerequisite requirements of membership heretofore stated, with the financial and other obligations flowing therefrom. Such requirements serve as a discouragement to the returning veteran, and if he meets them in order to get a job, he does so at financial loss and in many instances is forced to become and remain a member against his own desires and beliefs, thus producing dissatisfaction during employment. Those who refuse to accede to such impositions may be forced to join the ranks of the unemployed.

Our veterans have earned the right to jobs without strings attached other than satisfactory discharge of their duties, and, during employment, they should be permitted to use their own discretion as to membership in such organizations. It seems clear that the national policy of readjustment of veterans into the civilian economy is paramount to any adverse rights, contractual or otherwise.

The enactment of this measure will insure to our returning servicemen the enjoyment of the first freedom—that is the freedom to work for their daily bread without paying tribute.

The United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an able editorial from the Washington Post commenting favorably on the strong appeal by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on the floor of the Senate for support of the San Francisco treaty.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND NOW THE SENATE

As the scene in the drama of the United Nations shifts from San Francisco to Washington, the Senate is rising to the occasion with commendable spirit. There was every indication in the greetings to Senator CONNALLY and Senator VANDENBERG that the Senate is conscious of its great responsibility. Not only did their addresses bring the largest senatorial audiences within recent memory; Senators listened to them intently and applauded them heartily. Their demeanor as well as their open declarations on the floor indicate a healthy determination to rescue the Senate from its reputation as the graveyard of treaties.

For some time it has been evident that opposition to the United Nations Charter in the Senate has virtually collapsed. In part that is due to the house cleaning ordered by the voters last November. But several holdovers who were believed to be dyed-in-the-wool isolationists are now hastening to aline themselves with the new world peace agency. Some have been converted by the ruthless instruction of recent history. Others sense the impossibility of remaining in public life if they stand out against "the world's best hope"—to borrow Senator CONNALLY'S words—for future peace. In short, the terrible ordeal through which the world has passed has disciplined the Senate as it has the 50 nations which sent delegates to San Francisco.

This cooperative mood on the part of the Senate will be further strengthened, we believe, by Senator VANDENBERG'S candor. "I have signed the Charter," he said, "with no illusions regarding its imperfections and with no pretensions that it guarantees its own benign aims." He accepts it, rather, as Benjamin Franklin accepted the Constitution, as a hopeful alternative to chaos. It is true that the new peace organization faces staggering difficulties, that, even as the ink on the Charter is drying, some nations seem to be denying its principles. The basic fact is that the chance of averting another world catastrophe will be infinitely greater with the United Nations organization than without it. Fully conscious of the fact that "where there is no vision the people perish," Mr. VANDENBERG prefers to take his stand with the hopeful experimenters rather than with the hopeless prophets of doom. He spoke for the Senate as well as himself when he said, "We dare not fail to try."

To those who say that the Charter subjects the world to the mercy of the Big Five, the Senator from Michigan administers a stiff dose of realism. The indisputable fact is that world destiny is already in the hands of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain. It was not the Charter but human genius and toil exerted over several centuries that have created this condition. What the Charter does is to bind the great world powers to the objectives of peace and justice. It cannot honestly be regarded as other than a curb on the irresponsible use of existing power—an effort to direct the hegemony of the big powers into constructive channels for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

To the skeptics who say that the scheme will not work, Senator VANDENBERG replies: "I propose to try the only chance." We feel that his frankness will be contagious. There is no answer to the argument that we must take the forward road which may, with wise administration, lead to peace in preference to retreat once more into the jaws of World War III. If this keynote is followed in the hearings and debate on the Charter, it can be ratified within a few weeks with scarcely a peep of opposition.

Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, which we passed a few weeks ago, has created in the executive departments a most unfortunate situation.

Work on Saturdays is not voluntary; it is compulsory. Under the law, which we passed, it may be required by superior officials that their subordinates work Saturdays. Employees are not permitted to take annual leave or sick leave on Saturdays; nor are they permitted to take leave without pay, unless previously approved by superior officials.

Pay on Saturdays is at a rate different than that during the balance of the week. In practical operation of the law it has resulted in a condition where the top executives receive less in absolute numbers of dollars than any person working for them for this additional work on Saturdays. The maximum rate of pay is received by persons relatively far down the pay scale.

I consider it my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the House with the hope that we may do something about the mandatory phase of the work requirement on Saturdays with little hope that we can do anything about making adequate payment for these services rendered by the employees in the different grades.

In this connection, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a statement from a constituent together with a table showing the discrepancies and the unfairness in this legislation:

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: I wonder if you have given thought to the effect of Saturday overtime pay provided in the legislation recently enacted has upon those in the different pay schedules.

I believe that the Congress wants to play fair with the Government executives. However, the unfairness of the salary schedule for Saturday work—frequently referred to by the misnomer of overtime—is not generally understood, as it was not adequately brought out on the floor of either House of the Congress during the debate on the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945.

In his testimony before the Committee on the Civil Service of the House of Representatives, Mr. Luther C. Steward, president, National Federation of Federal Employees, said, "While we heartily endorse the action of the Senate in raising the percentage of basic increase in the lowest salary brackets, we feel constrained to point out that Federal salary schedules in the so-called higher brackets compare very unfavorably with the amounts very generally paid to key persons in private industry, and the efficiency of the operation of our Federal Government must very largely depend upon the securing and retention of key employees."

It is generally recognized in industry, as it should be in Government, that if work beyond the normal workweek is necessary, employment for the extra time should be compensated for at a punitive rate, that is at a rate which is in excess of the hourly rate for the normal workweek. It is only by penalizing the employer and making such employment expensive that we have the necessary checks on such requirements for overtime work.

Now let's see what the Congress has done with these hourly rates of pay under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945. The following table presents the facts in this connection:

Hourly rate of pay on Saturday compared with that during the basic workweek under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945

Basic rate [1]	Saturday rate	Percent Saturday rate is of basic rate
$0.42	$0.62	150
$0.45	.68	150
$0.48	.73	150
$0.52	.78	150
$0.55	.83	150
$0.69	1.04	150
$0.72	1.09	150
$0.76	1.13	150
$0.79	1.18	150
$0.82	1.23	150
$0.85	1.28	150
$0.88	1.32	150
$0.91	1.37	150
$0.95	1.42	150
$0.98	1.47	150
$1.01	1.51	150
$1.04	1.56	150
$1.07	1.61	150
$1.10	1.66	150
$1.12	1.67	150
$1.14	1.70	150
$1.17	1.75	150
$1.20	1.80	150
$1.22	1.83	150
$1.23	1.85	150
$1.27	1.91	150
$1.33	1.99	150
$1.38	2.07	150
$1.43	2.15	150
$1.49	2.13	143
$1.54	2.11	137
$1.59	2.09	131
$1.64	2.07	126
$1.70	2.05	121
$1.75	2.03	116
$1.80	2.01	112
$1.86	1.99	107
$1.91	1.97	103
$1.96	1.95	100
$2.01	1.93	96
$2.07	1.91	92
$2.12	1.89	89
$2.17	1.86	86
$2.23	1.84	83
$2.28	1.82	80
$2.38	1.78	75
$2.49	1.74	70
$2.59	1.70	66
$2.69	1.67	62
$2.79	1.63	58
$2.89	1.59	55
$3.00	1.55	52
$3.10	1.51	49
$3.20	1.51	47
$3.30	1.51	46
$3.40	1.51	44
$3.45	1.51	44
$3.58	1.51	42
$3.70	1.51	41
$3.83	1.51	39
$3.95	1.51	38
$4.21	1.51	36
$4.33	1.51	35
$4.46	1.51	34
$4.59	1.51	33
$4.71	1.51	32

[1] Computed on 2,080 hours per year since work without additional pay is now required on legal holidays.

The table shows that the top executives of the Government receive $1.51 per hour for work performed on Saturday. This gross rate of pay on Saturday is only 32 percent of the basic rate of pay during the week, which amounts to $4.71 an hour. This Saturday rate of $1.51 is the same rate of pay on Saturday as is received by a clerk who earns $1.01 an hour basic rate during the week. The comparison is even more disadvantageous to the executive when take-home pay after taxes is considered. A top executive with two dependents would have left after taxes only 97 cents out of the $1.51 per hour for his overtime work on Saturday, whereas the clerk with the same number of dependents receiving the $1.51 per hour on Saturday would have $1.20 left. When taxes are taken into consideration this top executive's take-home pay is less than that of a clerk who during the week receives only 82 cents an hour and who on Saturday receives $1.23 before taxes and 98 cents per hour after taxes.

Every executive gets less in absolute number of dollars and cents on Saturday than any person subordinate to him in the organization. This disrupts morale. The maximum Saturday rate of pay of $2.15 is received by those persons whose basic rate on other weekdays is $1.43.

The cost to the Federal Government of treating these few executives and their subordinates fairly when they are being required to work overtime is a matter which should concern every member of the legislative branch of the Government. It is only through the creation of a high morale among these top officials of the Government that we can have the most effective administration of the laws which the Congress passes. In the long run it would be true economy to pay these employees a fair rate of pay and not coerce them into work at a rate far less than the daily rate which they receive for the balance of the week.

If we can't pay a punitive overtime rate for overtime work, let's pay them at least the same hourly rate of pay as we do on other days of the week or else make clear to these employees that they will be permitted to take Saturdays off as leave without pay without being subject to disciplinary actions by superiors who decide that overtime work is necessary.

Yours very truly,

J. W. V.

Pvt. Richard G. Zurbrick

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in the battle of Iwo Jima a young marine 19 years of age was killed a half hour after he landed on the shore. Naturally, the loss of this young boy, who happened to be the son of a cousin of mine, is a great loss to the family. His mother has written a poem about him, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the poem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The poem referred to follows:)

OUR HERO

(Written by his mother and dedicated to Marine Pvt. Richard G. Zurbrick, killed in action on Iwo Jima on February 28, 1945)

We had a boy named Richard
Who went away to fight,
For land and home and country,
And everything that's right.

So—with a song in his heart
And a smile so serene,
He joined the outfit he loved best
The United States Marines.

He'd write about his training
And everything he'd do
But never once did he complain
Of the hardships he went through.

When finally he sailed away
To a far-off distant port,
Our hearts recoiled in sudden fear
For we knew that time was short.

But he'd always write, "Don't worry, Mom,
Cause I'm coming home some day
When all this awful warfare
Is finished—for always.

"I'll bring battle stripes and medals
For the whole wide world to see,
But please, don't worry, Mom and Dad,
I'll make you proud of me."

So with his new division,
The valiant Fifth Marines,
He hit the beach on Iwo
And hardships unforeseen.

For the enemy was dug in well
Behind pillboxes made of steel,
And every mortar that they fired
The marines were bound to feel.

But they fought for the mount and the airfields
And they won them, one by one
And they raised our flag on the highest point
To show what they had done.

Yes—the fighting was tough on Iwo
The boys called it—"Eight miles of hell"
And our hearts and prayers went out to them
Who did their jobs so well.

Yes—the battle for Iwo is over
And our hearts are filled with sorrow,
For the brave, young boy who sailed away
Will not return tomorrow.

Now a Gold Star hangs in our window
For the whole wide world to see
And though our hearts are heavy
We know he's as proud as can be.

He lies on that far-off island
And a little white cross bears his name,
And although he was only nineteen
He knew how to play the game.

—*Mrs. Gordon A. Zurbrick.*

BUFFALO, N. Y.

Shall We Have Peacetime Conscription?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Reverend Dr. W. R. Siegart, of Reading, Pa., on Sunday, July 8, 1945:

This question of peacetime conscription, or universal military training, affects every family. Church and educational groups are asking that it be put aside to await the return of peace and calmer judgment. For with the draft law in effect there is no need to rush such a thing through under the emotional stress of the war.

It is said that the training will prevent losses. I have been told on good authority that at Salerno and at Cherbourg divisions which were considered highly trained and tough as nails suffered heavy losses. The fact is that actual war training makes warriors. We showed our belief in that by keeping experienced men at the front and filling in with replacements.

Others say if we had been prepared Japan would not have attacked us. About the time of Pearl Harbor it was announced that we had the most powerful navy afloat. That did not save us from heavy losses. And we have lost heavily, especially in the early stages of the war, by reason of human failures. As one officer said to me, "You can have the best equipment and all the new gadgets but you can't control personnel failures and judgment."

War material soon becomes outmoded. No less an authority than General Eisenhower is quoted as saying that practically all the material of this war would have to be scrapped soon.

Nor does peacetime conscription offer much in the way of education. Partial education is harmful. A well rounded liberal education has, as we know, practically become a war casualty. And to interrupt an education by a year's military service brings dire results in such an educational process.

With such peacetime conscription we must have our Nation in all its parts always geared for war. All the training in the world will serve no useful purpose without the material. And we know material soon becomes outmoded. Waste becomes the rule.

Some say such military service will solve juvenile delinquency. Most of this is merely wishful thinking and due to the shirking of responsibility on the part of parents. There is no substitute for parental and home training and discipline. The training of children belongs to the home and the church in its basic and primary form. What is more, at 18 the child passes beyond the authority of the juvenile court. By the age of conscription the juvenile problem has been passed in age at least. And our experience shows that military service merely shows what kind of young people we have developed.

There are some who speak of the physical-fitness benefits. But the military does not take the physically unfit who might need such training; they take the best, and the argument falls by its own weight.

One of the chief arguments for conscription in peacetime is that it makes for peace. If that were so central Europe would be the most peaceful place on earth. France fell with universal conscription; England survived in one of the world's epic struggles without it.

Such conscription is inconsistent in a democracy. The military mind tells youth what to think. Democracy encourages youth to think and to ask questions.

In Germany we are seeing the results of such training long continued. With a stress on discipline, obedience and order we see how the individual's ability to think for himself is destroyed. Without a sense of guilt or moral responsibility the Nazis have bred a race of moral robots. And moral robots are no match for democratic, thinking Americans.

Yet after all is said and done this question must be decided on its military value. Such training would soon be outmoded, except for the barest essentials. After 5 or 10 years everyone would have to be given another year of such training.

The result would be a staggering cost in material, money, moral, and spiritual values; the development of a dictatorial system and the loss of our divine heritage of liberty, freedom, and democratic living.

Butter

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that our new Secretary of Agriculture and former Member of this body, Clint Anderson, has already secured beneficial results for the people of the United States of America who like butter on their bread. The Office of Price Administration and Department of Agriculture have just announced that the allotment of butter for American citizens will be stepped up 12 percent, which means an extra pound of butter for every 8 pounds we consume.

We Members of Congress from the dairy States have presented facts and arguments to the OPA for more than a year showing that with the high ration point system placed on butter—higher than that on meats—and with butter at 24 points a pound, the people of this country could not have both meat and butter. We have argued in vain that this system would either bring about black markets for meat or glut the market with butter—and that butter would lie in warehouses and grow rancid while our people craved for the butter they could not get.

They say the new ration cost per pound for butter will be 20 points, a cut of 4 points. It is said the OPA has now come to the conclusion after ascertaining that the butter supply in the United States is glutting the market to the extent of 10,000,000 pounds a month. From what I know of the situation, the ration-point cost of butter must be cut a lot more than 4 points a pound.

A survey in the District of Columbia shows that the supply of butter is exceedingly heavy in Washington. One retail food chain official is quoted as saying that the customers are frantic for meat, and when they get through paying out their ration points for meat there is not much left for butter. With the new OPA law in effect, I hope there will be no further case for paying black-market prices for meat anywhere in the United States. With meat back on the food merchant's shelves, the OPA will have good reason for reducing the ration-point cost on meats. We will then get meat back on our tables and butter on our bread.

Hotels and restaurants have been serving meals without butter for many weeks, on the excuse they did not know where to get butter. Of course, we paid for the butter we did not get. Now that the Department of Agriculture surveys show that butter is glutting the markets in Washington and throughout the country, I am wondering if the hotels and restaurants will put butter back on the bill of fare. After having started the people in the cities off on a butter-substitute diet, I doubt very much that hotel and restaurant proprietors will go back to serving good dairy butter to the people of this country until they are forced to do so by the persuasive powers of public opinion. The people should demand butter at public eating places. It is the gold standard of pure food. Our allies are demanding butter from us to feed their civilians. They realize there is no substitute for good dairy butter. Congress should demand as much for the people of the United States.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

BENTON HARBOR, MICH., *July 2, 1945.*
Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for voting against the OPA. I would like to tell you my experience.

I am a widow with no one to help me fight the battles of life.

The 26th of September 1944, I bought a house to make a home for myself, with a few rooms to rent out to help with my expenses. I notified the renters at once I had bought the place, but I wouldn't ask them to move until spring. I knew the OPA would give them 90 days, and I didn't want to remodel and decorate in the wintertime. On January 8 I gave them a written notice to vacate on or before April 8. One evening in February I met the woman in front of the house. I asked her if they had a nibble for a house. She said "No." I said, "Well, you know the time is drawing close." She nearly snapped my head off when she said "We can't move if we can't find a place," I said "Maybe you'll have to." She went into the house and slammed the door. Next morning I went down to see my lawyer and he started proceedings for eviction; their OPA notice expired May 28. They are still there. He has appealed the case to the circuit court and now he can sit there until court convenes this fall.

There is just the man and his wife, and there have been any amount of apartments for rent in the meantime, but they say they can't move into an apartment with their pets and, too, they are renting part of the house out for $12 or $15 a month more than they were paying me. What makes me so mad, the OPA protected the renter for 90 days, then washed their hands of it, and tell me to proceed according to the laws of the State. At the end of the 90 days why don't they do something for the landlord? They should be fair to both sides.

I had to sign a paper I wouldn't rent or sell the place for 6 months if I put them out. Last week I got a letter from the OPA wanting to know if I was living at 331 Pipestone Street, if not, why not, and who the present renter was. They are keeping tab on me. It is all so rotten. I've always been a good American citizen. I'm over 60 years old, and had never been to court, it burns me up, to think our Government is letting people who belong to a cult who refuses to salute or fight for our flag have my property to do with as they please.

I'm paying more rent than they paid me. Now they are paying nothing. Is there any justice any more?

I wish you would show this letter to those Congressmen who voted for this abominable thing.

I was born and lived many years at Fennville, Allegan County, and feel I am sort of an old neighbor of yours. Thanking you again.

I am

Yours very truly,

Mrs. JESSIE MORTON.

WATERVLIET, MICH., *July 3, 1945.*
Mr. HOFFMAN,
Congressman.

DEAR SIR: Will you please tell me why it is when I go into meat markets and places they sell meat and ask for meat I get balled out, and I can see packages one after another orders for other people? Why can't we all fare alike? My husband works defense work, but has to carry no lunch as I can't get no meat. I was in C. Weeks' store at Hartford, Mich., today. I saw plenty of "wienies" but was told I could only have 1 pound when I ask for 2. I got told a plenty—mistreated. I don't like this. What can we do about it? This don't seem to be a free country any more. No potatoes, no meat. Is it or isn't it a free country? Now, all I want is to be treated as certain others are. I can go without if everybody does.

Please advise me what to do.

Yours,

Mrs. R. YOUNG.

Abysmal Ignorance in OWI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission given me today to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Mr. Elmer Davis, Director, Office of War Information:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE,
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1945.
Mr. ELMER DAVIS,
Director, Office of War Information,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I am today in receipt of the enclosed letter from Mr. Lloyd A. Wilson, general manager of the Wichita (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, together with a copy of Mr. Wilson's letter to you under date of July 3, and a copy of a page from the

Wichita magazine for July 5, which contains a translation of what is stated to be an article on the Prairie States taken from the Russian edition of your magazine America Illustrated. That part of the article under the heading "Prairie States" reads as follows:

"This prairie land includes the following States: Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and Utah. This region, covering almost one-quarter of the whole territory of the United States, supports only one-twentieth part of the population of the country. The people in it are almost exclusively farmers. Livestock raising is carried on only in the mountainous parts of Montana and Wyoming. Industry is almost nonexistent. Raw materials and fabricated goods must be imported from other States. The rich natural resources of the region are as yet untouched.

"The climate of the region is very dry and it sometimes happens that a drouth lasts for 10 years in a row. Atmospheric precipitations do not exceed on the average 44.2 centimeters (17 inches) during the year. The agronomists are working hard to find new plants suitable for this arid land. As a result of their labors hundreds of thousands of hectares have already been turned into fertile fields."

If this is a correct translation of the article in question, and I have no reason to doubt that it is, I am amazed that such misinformation regarding this country should be sent abroad. There isn't a fifth-grade student in the United States who doesn't have more accurate information regarding the area in question than your presumably high-priced author. His ignorance is almost inconceivable. In fact, a man would almost have to possess a genius for ignorance in order to write an article which strays so far from the facts in every particular. It would take a great deal of space to refute even a small part of the misinformation contained in this article. I am not going to attempt to do so. I would like, however, to call your attention briefly to the resources and productivity of my own congressional districts, which is only 1 of 25 congressional districts in the area described in your article.

My district is the Fifth Kansas, located in the south central and southwest part of the State. Last year this district produced over 100,000,000 bushels of wheat and on the average it produces approximately one-tenth of all wheat produced in the United States. It is a large livestock producing district in spite of the fact that the Russians are being solemnly advised that "livestock raising is carried on only in the mountainous parts of Montana and Wyoming." It is one of the important broomcorn districts in the country. It produces about 15 percent of the grain sorghums in the United States. Dairying is important and constantly growing. In mineral production this district is outstanding. There are few congressional districts in the United States which produce more oil. It contains the great Hugeton gas field, one of the two or three largest natural gas fields in the world. It contains great deposits of helium gas which is now being extracted in two Government-owned plants for important uses in the war effort. It is an important producer of salt. Flour-milling is an important industry. The district is adjacent to Wichita, an important manufacturing center and one of the great aircraft production centers of the country.

Your article states that the people are almost exclusively farmers. It is true that my district contains some of the finest and most productive farms and some of the most efficient and progressive farmers in the world, but more than half of its inhabitants are not farmers. The area as a whole contains some of the greatest industrial areas and finest cities in the Nation, but I will let those representing Omaha, Kansas City, Wichita, Denver, and Salt Lake City answer your slanders of those cities.

At this particular time when it is so important that Americans understand the Russian people and that the Russian people understand America and the Americans, it is a tragic thing for an American governmental agency to be sending such misinformation to the people of Russia. Assuming that this is a fair sample of the accuracy with which your pamphlet describes America and its people, it can easily be understood why our relations with Russia have been characterized by misunderstandings. What possible good can your agency be accomplishing by misinforming the Russian people of the character and resources of an important part of this country?

This one instance in itself may not be important but if such misinformation as this is allowed to go out as official information by a Government agency, it is safe to assume that many similar instances have occurred and that rather than promoting understanding and better feeling between the two peoples, your agency is laying the foundation for misunderstanding and suspicion throughout the world.

Since its creation your agency has spent vast amounts of the taxpayers' money. You have thousands of employees on your pay roll at big salaries, presumably turning out reams of misinformation for the enlightenment and education of people in other lands. Has it ever occurred to you that there are probably a lot of people on your staff who could stand a little information and education about their own country? I recently voted to cut the appropriation for your agency in half in an effort to stop some of the waste and to prevent people in other nations from getting too distorted an idea of America. Probably I should have voted to eliminate the appropriation entirely. There is one thing, however, which I would be willing to do to help the agency financially. That is to head a subscription list to create a fund for the education of OWI writers, this course of study to include not only elementary geography and beginners' American history but a conducted and supervised tour of that small and insignificant part of the United States lying west of the Hudson River.

Very truly yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

How the Monetary Fund Proposed by Bretton Woods Agreement Will Operate in Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. THOM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the operation of the Monetary Fund proposed in the Bretton Woods agreement has puzzled many persons, and to aid them in an understanding of it, I have prepared the following statement in nontechnical language:

The Monetary Fund has three outstanding objectives. It will fix the value of currencies in terms of gold, and will not alter the gold content without reporting to the fund or receiving its approval. It will, as soon as feasible, induce countries to remove exchange controls. It will furnish a supplementary source of foreign exchange to which countries may resort for temporary assistance when international out-payments overbalance international in-payments.

The mechanism of the Monetary Fund is difficult to understand, unless one has a working knowledge of the foreign exchange operations that go on between the trading countries of the world.

To most of us the outstanding financial operation of a country is what we know as control and management of the Budget. Every man, however humble, understands the business of reconciling his expenditures with his income, and if he does not, he lands in bankruptcy court. With this personal knowledge, it is easy for him to grasp the budget problems of his country.

However, there is another balancing of payments that confronts a country, and it has to do with its imports and exports. When the trading of any two particular countries is summed up, there is usually a balance owing by one country to another. It becomes the business of government to facilitate the adjustments of these intercountry payments, and if it fails to do so it stands in danger of a fluctuating exchange rate. To stabilize exchange rates, therefore, is the chief purpose of the Monetary Fund.

The first lesson one must learn is that when American goods are shipped to a foreign country the seller wants his pay in United States dollars. Either he specifies that he will draw on the purchaser a draft payable in American dollars or, if he accepts the money of the nation of the buyer of the goods, be it denominated francs or what not, he wants to be able to exchange these francs for American dollars. Manifestly, the shipper of automobiles to France does not want francs, because they cannot be used in the pay envelopes of his workers, neither in payment to the farmer or the mine owner for raw materials.

All of this is elementary to the financial expert, but it is learned with some difficulty by the layman who does not deal in such matters.

How, then, does the foreign country accumulate a supply of dollars so that these demands coming from American manufacturers for goods sold can be met. There are a number of ways through which dollars or dollar credits flow to a foreign country. They are created, first and foremost, by the purchases of Americans from the producers of a foreign country. Secondly, by investments which Americans make in a foreign country, involving transfer of dollars to that foreign country. Then if you patronize the ships of the foreign country, you pay them dollars. You will understand this movement of money from country to country best when you recall the circumstances of a trip into a foreign country, if you have been fortunate enough to make one. You visit an American bank or express company, turn in a certain number of dollars, and receive in return express or bank checks that you can use in France or England or any other country. You personally deliver these paper rights to American dollars to some agency in the foreign country you are visiting that deals in foreign exchange, and in return you receive currency of the country where you need to meet local expenses. The dollars you have left with the foreign exchange agency are eventually used by some foreign merchant to pay for goods he bought in the United States.

It is plain that when the export of goods, insurance, and other services by country A to the United States falls below the imports into that country from the United States,

there are not enough dollars in the possession of country A to meet the demands of the United States.

What happens then?

The central bank or stabilization fund of country A in debt to the United States must use its gold reserves to buy dollars for its nationals. If this gold supply is meager, the indebted country decides that the future demands for dollars must be controlled, so that it does not break down the money system of the debtor country. It proclaims that if you want in the future to buy American goods, you must procure a license permitting you to buy American goods, the value of the purchases to be regulated so that the total will be roughly equivalent to the number of American dollars flowing into the country. That, of course, stops appreciable amount of buying of American goods, and shuts down or curtails your exporting industries in the United States.

But there is another thing the debtor country unable to rectify an imbalance in its exports and imports account can do. It can attract foreign currencies or perhaps gold to its banking system by depreciating its currency, chiefly through manipulating the price of gold. What exactly happens under these circumstances? Country A, to which I heretofore alluded as the country in distress, will exchange for an American dollars, 20 francs, if that be its monetary unit, instead of 17 francs. It is obvious that this reduces the cost of an article for export purpose, because if the article cost 17 francs, you are now able with a dollar to buy one of these articles and have 3 francs over to spend for something else. To sum up, this step of depreciation increases export sales in the country A and at the same time cuts down the imports. Why do the imports fall off? Because if a citizen of country A wants to buy an article in the United States priced at a dollar, he finds that while formerly he could buy the article for 17 francs, under the depreciated condition of his money he must pay 20 francs for a dollar to buy the same article. In other words the national of country A finds that prices of import goods have risen, and he accordingly stays out of the market. Out of the situation, however, country A has increased her exports and reduced her imports, and thus brought her trade into balance.

A third step country A can take is to enter into a bilateral agreement with another country, which, for instance, grows and sells cotton. Country A will sell certain of its products to the other partner to the agreement in exchange for the cotton. This is barter. If country A has been in deficit position with the United States, as before inferred, it can reduce the dollar demands on it by just transferring its cotton business to the other partner of the bilateral agreement just described and thus, perhaps, bring its trade position with the United States into balance.

Now, to revert to the position of country A which found itself owing dollars to America, without enough dollars in sight for the moment to meet the demands. I related to you three things it could do, and all of these things would be directly hurtful to the trade position of the United States. Now, what, under the same circumstances, can country A, short of dollars, do when the Monetary Fund is established and operating? Here is a remedy to her to tide over her financial situation.

Country A goes to the Monetary Fund, presents her case, and with her own currency buys dollars, from the basket, you might call it, in which each of the signatory countries would have a supply of its money, originally almost equal to its quota or share in the fund. This is not quite an accurate statement, because part of the quota must be in gold.

It then uses the dollars so loaned or bought, to meet the dollar demands and thus keep its exchange at par. This imbalance it corrects in this way must be due to a crop failure, to a cyclical business disturbance, or some emergency, and when that crisis has been met, country A must proceed to get its imports and exports balanced. Of course, the exchange which country A buys from the fund will not cure the lack of balance in its trade, but it will make it possible for country A to take steps to get back into balance without disrupting the trade of other countries by resorting to one of the practices I have just discussed.

Incidentally, it must be looking around in the near future to buy back from the Monetary Fund the excess currency of its own which it exchanged for dollars as above related. If it accumulates gold reserves during the year following the loan or purchase of American dollars, it must use part of this gold to buy back the excess of national currency in its quota. This enables a restoration of the fund of dollars to meet the recurring demands of other countries.

Each of the countries joining the fund, it is to be understood, must contribute a fixed quota in gold and its own currency. This assortment of currencies can be drawn upon, whether it be for American dollars, French francs, or English pounds by any country which finds itself short in one of these particular currencies needed to keep its international payments in balance. When it recovers its financial position the purchasing nation forthwith is expected to restore the currency it procured.

H. R. 421

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST
WAR SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1945.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: I was deeply interested in the letter which you were good enough to let me see from one of your constituents which, at your request, I am returning herewith.

This letter gives a very valuable and, I think, entirely accurate estimate of the important service being rendered by medical soldiers.

I shall look forward with pleasure to seeing this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation, I remain

Very sincerely yours,
WAR SERVICE COMMISSION,
CARLYLE B. HAYNES,
General Secretary.

AMESBURY, MASS., *June 4, 1945.*

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowledge of the bill known as H. R. 421 has come to me recently. As you, no doubt, are much better acquainted with this bill than I am, I will not go into details. I do wish, however, to protest against it most vigorously.

I do not believe that those organizations who are supporting this measure realize what they are doing.

As a soldier, I spent 13 months in camps scattered across the country, and have had considerable contact with those men listed as IA–0. While men of this classification do not bear arms, they do make a very valuable contribution to the armed forces.

As far as I know the IA–0 men are Seventh-Day Adventists mostly. Consequently they are well disciplined soldiers. I do not know of a single case where one of them ever got intoxicated or ever engaged the MP's. To me this is some kind of a miracle.

As far as efficiency, courage, and everything else is concerned, they have all that it takes.

My estimation of IA–0 soldiers has certainly not been lessened by the reports, coming in from time-to-time, from our far-flung battlefronts. The fact that these men are willing to serve the country, even on the most active fronts, is at least one good reason why they should not be called "conscientious objectors." This term "mostly one of reproach" surely does not fit an American soldier who is just as willing as the IA combatant to meet the rigors and dangers of battle. To make "fish" of this kind of men by offering them a second-hand discharge would be gross injustice.

With confidence that you will use the high office entrusted to you, to meet this kind of legislation whenever and wherever it comes up, I am,

Sincerely yours,
IRWIN F. SHENNETT.

Presidential Succession Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith an editorial from the Dallas News of July 5, commending the Presidential succession bill recently passed by the House:

SUCCESSION BILL

Appointment of James F. Byrnes as Secretary of State will lessen the chances of the Senate passing the succession measure asked by President Truman and voted by the House after introduction by Representative SUMNERS, according to Walter C. Hornaday, correspondent of the News in Washington. The Senators like the man presently picked for Secretary of State, so they will defer voting for a change in the system. Furthermore, the Senators do not like the idea of putting the Speaker of the House ahead of even the President pro tempore of the Senate. In both conclusions they are wrong. They are short-visioned in the one instance and little-visioned in the other.

There are some arguments on behalf of governmental efficiency and continuity of national policies on the side of putting an appointive official third in line in the Presidential succession, but arguments for efficiency and continuity of governmental policy are frequently divergent from those for democratic principles. They are in this instance. No one is in better position to see this than President Truman himself. No one is in position to be more strongly attracted by his own interests in letting the present arrangement stand. But he has said that the principle of permitting a Chief Executive

of the Nation to pick his successor is wrong under any and all circumstances.

His recommendation should be heeded by Congress. If the Senate permits its petty interest in its own prestige to block the bill by SUMNERS it will lose prestige in the eyes of the public. The Senate has as its presiding officer the Vice President of the United States. It would raise itself in public esteem by making a generous gesture toward the House by concurring in the succession bill that President Truman has requested.

Excerpts From the Annual Report, Office of Alien Property Custodian, Ending June 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote three paragraphs about the Hugo Stinnes Corp., paragraphs found in the Annual Report, Office of Alien Property Custodian, ending June 1944:

Hugo Stinnes Corp. and its principal wholly owned subsidiary, Hugo Stinnes Industries, Inc., were organized in 1926 and incorporated in Maryland. They were established in order to take over the assets of the estate of the late Hugo Stinnes, Sr., a German citizen and industrialist who died in 1924, and to redeem claims of German banks against these assets. Hugo Stinnes Corp. issued $12,500,000 of 10-year 7-percent gold notes, and Hugo Stinnes Industries, Inc., issued $12,500,000 20-year 7-percent gold debentures. American citizens were the principal purchasers of these notes and debentures. Of the proceeds, approximately $21,000,000 was paid to the German banks which had held the claims against the estate.

Over 99 percent of the assets underlying the investments of Hugo Stinnes Corp. and its American subsidiary holding companies are located in Germany and German-occupied countries, and less than 1 percent of their assets are located in the United States, as of June 30, 1944

Postwar conditions in Germany will vitally affect the ability of Hugo Stinnes Corp. and its American subsidiaries to realize upon their German investments. These investments include such indestructible assets as coal reserves and agricultural land in addition to mine equipment, urban buildings, and industrial plants. Payment of the American security holders in these companies, therefore, largely depends upon conditions in postwar Germany.

Even though the Alien Property Custodian says, "Payment of the American security holders in these companies, therefore, largely depends upon conditions in postwar Germany" the authorities of our own United States Treasury assert in a letter to me written June 11, 1945, by Mr. D. W. Bell, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury that, "Accordingly, I regret to state this Department is not in a position to supply you with the information requested." The information requested by mc is a list of persons in this country who own property in Germany and Japan and a list of persons in Germany and Japan who own property in this country.

I believe this information should be available to the Congress and the country especially when we read statements like the following which appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, July 8, 1945:

Dunning estimated the value of American holdings throughout Germany at $200,000,000. He said virtually all of the plants were compelled to work for Hitler's war machine, once war with the United States started.

Travel Restrictions on Religious Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

JUNE 28, 1945.

Mr. THEODORE CARCICH,
President, Southern New England Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, South Lancaster, Mass.

DEAR MR. CARCICH: I am enclosing self-explanatory correspondence from Judge Vinson, of the Office of War Mobilization, which I deeply regret is not more immediately favorable.

Believe me, it is my sincere hope that the situation will soon be such that the present travel restrictions can be removed and I want you to know that you can count on me to continue to assist in every way I can.

With usual good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

JUNE 21, 1945.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of June 7, transmitting to me communication which you received from Theodore Carcich, president of the Southern New England Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists, protesting against the continuation of existing travel restrictions which prevent the holding of large religious meetings, etc.

Several conservation measures have been employed by the Government. The three which have had the most publicity and attention are the curfew, the racing ban, and restrictions on travel.

The removal of the first two measures has, in some minds, augmented the arguments for the lifting of the third. It is always difficult to draw the proper line between the principle of waging a total effective war and the principle of individual freedom which we rightly cherish. But allow me to point out some of the factors involved.

The curfew which prevented adults from exercising a free choice on where they could be at certain times was probably the control that interfered most directly with our idea of the American way of life. The racing ban singled out a particular sport. Although the Government during war has employed at times stringent controls, it has always sought to avoid, and properly so, any discrimination. It is a precarious thing to tell the people you can play basketball but not handball.

Moreover, the Government has made a commitment to the people that when victory was achieved in Europe the racing ban and the curfew should be withdrawn. Justice Byrnes, my predecessor, so reported to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on April 1, 1945. At the same time he warned that the transportation load would probably require the continuance of the restrictions on travel.

Time has proved that the transportation load has not eased but has tightened. The President made a statement on June 7, 1945, concerning our critical transportation problem. I enclose a copy for your study. While the future travel restrictions may be more stringent than in the past, you can rest assured that no policy will be adopted that would permit the members of one religious denomination, lodge, or organization, to travel and, at the same time, prohibit others—a policy which some would have us adopt in the field of sports.

I can appreciate the attitude of certain folks on the lifting of the racing ban while other restrictions are retained during the war period. It may be that some of them would prefer a ban on racing even during peacetime. But I felt that the commitment of my predecessor should be honored. I firmly believe that the Government should keep faith with its people.

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Director.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

All too few realize the transportation difficulties which are now developing and which will continue well into 1946. It is important that the public understand the situation and at once lend full cooperation in order that the burden may be minimized.

The transportation performance in mobilizing our victorious armies in Europe over a period of four long, difficult years required the utmost effort. The plan of battle now requires that our armies be transferred to the far Pacific in the very short time of 10 months. We must now complete in 10 months a task that is only one-third less than the previous job which required nearly 48 months. The transportation job in the first phase of the war has often been called a miracle. The job ahead of us is even bigger.

The facilities for civilian passenger transportation will be greatly reduced. In order to obtain passenger equipment for troop movements, it will probably be necessary to reduce the capacity of sleeping-car equipment on regular trains by 50 percent. Men in uniform, other than on troop movements, now comprise about one-third of the passengers on a regular train. If the number of these travelers in uniform remained constant, a 50-percent reduction in sleeping-car capacity on regular trains would mean that only 1 out of 4 of the civilians now using this equipment could do so in the future. But the number of travelers in uniform will be greatly increased.

In addition, war material moving to the Pacific will be more than twice as much as heretofore. This tremendous increase must move over the western railroads, which are already loaded to capacity.

Thus, the various transportation restrictions will not only be retained but undoubtedly increased. Those asking for relaxation of the restrictions are asking for the impossible.

The situation requires the cooperation and self-denial of all users of transportation. The speed with which our men and munitions can be carried to within striking distance of Japan will largely determine how long the war must continue. I know that every American wants to add his effort to that of the millions of transportation workers on whom this grave responsibility rests.

Remember, the returning soldier is here for a few days on his way from one conflict to another.

The President has addressed the following letter to the Honorable J. M. Johnson, Director, Office of Defense Transportation:

"DEAR COLONEL JOHNSON: The transportation facilities of the Nation are now called upon for the most gigantic task in all the history of transportation. The American armies must be moved from the victorious battlefields of Europe to meet and wipe out the tyranny of the East. In order to do this job, most of our soldiers will be transported the full length of the American Continent.

"It required every transportation ingenuity to assemble our armies in Europe over a period of 4 years. This time the job is to be done in 10 months. The contemplation of this task would overtax our faith if we had not found during the course of this war that the impossible has become our daily job.

"I am asking you to extend my congratulations to all of our transportation agencies—and their millions of workers—on the results they have accomplished. At the same time express my confidence in them for the greater effort that lies ahead.

"Sincerely yours,

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

JUNE 7, 1945.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
Director of War Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE VINSON: Enclosed please find letter from my friend, President Theodore Carcich, of the Southern New England Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, protesting against the continued ban on large religious meetings and also a copy of a letter expressing the view point of one of his colleagues.

Since I am very much impressed with the arguments presented I should like to urge you to consider lifting the ban of large religious meetings, thereby removing the inconsistency in the application of these rules, and I will deeply appreciate your advice concerning the possibilities.

With thanks and usual good wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

JUNE 7, 1945.

Mr. THEODORE CARCICH,
President, Southern New England
Conference, South Lancaster, Mass.

DEAR MR. CARCICH: I am very glad you wrote me in opposition to the continued ban on large religious meetings.

Of course, your arguments are unanswerable, and I am making a direct request of appropriate Government officials urging the immediate lifting of this ban, and I hope my efforts will be successful.

Believe me I deeply appreciated your generous comments, and I hope you will feel free to call upon me whenever you think I can be helpful.

With usual good wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Increase of Salaries of School Teachers in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 3376, which will increase the salaries of the school teachers of the District of Columbia, if passed, with the increased cost of living in Washington, and every governmental department having salaries increased, the teachers are surely deserving of similar treatment.

The Board of Education of the City of Wilmington, Del., require their teachers to take courses in advanced education to keep up professional growth, at their own expense. The destiny of this country depends on the teaching the children are receiving in the schools. Teachers who are not receiving adequate salaries will not be inspired with their work to get the best from their pupils. Teachers' positions today are one of guidance, and they do much to prevent the prevalence of the so-called isms, which are attracting the young people of today. Education today should be fundamental in teaching the youth to think for themselves. Nazism in German received its impetus in the school room, and the world realizes the damage and suffering of such inhuman teaching.

Let we, the people of America, profit by the results of improper teaching in Germany and build a school system which will be above reproach. Higher salaries will elevate the morale and the efficiency of the teachers and the schools.

I hope that H. R. 3376 will receive favorable consideration.

The Law of Love and the Future Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. I herewith include in my extension of remarks oration delivered by Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, on July 4, 1945:

Your honor the mayor, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to be included in the roster of those honored citizens who, in unbroken succession since 1783, have delivered the orations at the municipal observance of the anniversary of our national independence.

Glancing back over the list of subjects chosen on this occasion in the past, one is impressed by the many times on which some relationship of religion to public society has been discussed here. With such a tradition behind me, I do not hesitate to develop a point which seems to me of particular importance now that the body politic is slowly purging itself of those hatreds, contentions, and divisions which have borne such painful effects in World War II. I propose to speak to you on Christ's law of charity as that law should and can affect the future of the world.

At the beginning of this war our late lamented President wrote these immortal words: "We shall win this war and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations." When a civil leader speaks in this outspoken fashion of the necessity that the spirit of Christ dominate the future, a religious leader, a teacher in the Church of Christ, need not apologize for availing himself of every possible opportunity to promulgate unto the public good that law of love which gives concrete expression to the spirit of Christ. If it be true, and it is true, that the establishment of an international order and the preservation of national security both require the inspiration of Christ's law, then he who preaches that law, in season and out, well serves his nation and best aids humanity.

I take it that the principal moral problem of life in society at this particular hour of the world's history is the problem of how to do precisely these two things: to serve one's nation worthily, and yet, at the same time, to aid in the building of an international order within which humanity can also be served. In terms of today's national holiday we might state that problem in some such way as this: How can we cherish, as cherish we must, the heritage which became ours with our national independence, and yet share, as share we must, in the common good of the interdependent family of nations? How can we love, as love we must, America and everything for which she stands, and yet love, as love we also must, all humanity and all the human values which America, or any people, can only hold in common with the men of every land?

This is the master knot of human fate as men gather from their several nations in the effort to plan a better world in the face of the myriad political, economic, and cultural forms which this problem takes: nationalism versus internationalism, independence versus interdependence. It is the stumbling block on every proposed path to peace. It is the foremost factor in every situation that leads to modern war.

We are told by the masters of jurisprudence that the solution of this problem must include a political factor in the form of a revision of the traditional concept of sovereignty, national and international. We are told by the economists that the solution of this problem must include an economic factor in the form of a new understanding of the proprietary rights of nations over the raw materials placed by Providence within their territorial limits; we are given to understand that the solution of the problem must include a more free and equal access on the part of all peoples to the goods of the earth. We are told by scholars generally that the solution of the conflict between national loyalty and international obligations, between national independence and international dependence, must be solved by education, by a new cosmopolitanism, by building, in the phrase of Mr. Churchill, "great new empires of the mind."

No one will quarrel with the essential validity of each of these contentions. It is true that the technical realization of peace must involve political, economic, educational, and other aspects, and it is well that specialists in all those parts of what we might call the "anatomy of peace" should devote their best energies to the leveling of these technical obstacles to world order. But it is also true that no one of these factors, nor all of them combined, can give us an organic society, a dynamic peace. President Roosevelt bore witness to this when he invoked the soul which must activate and organize these elements of the peace. He gave that soul, the soul which a healthy international body politic requires, its proper name when he spoke of it as the "spirit of Christ."

Charters and constitutions may diagram an international order. They cannot create it, for they are purely legal instruments and legalism kills the spirit more often than it quickens. Trade agreements and commerce may develop from an international order, but they presuppose its existence; they cannot create it. In the absence of an international order they become exploitation at their best and piracy at their worst. Education by itself does not guarantee the peace. Indeed, it is one of the most discouraging mysteries of our civilization that wars and the conditions which produce wars seem most to flourish among those peoples who, on the scientific level, at least, are the most, rather than

the least, educated nations. The Catholic hierarchy in the United States made an irrefutable analysis of the origins of the present crisis when they said: "This war came largely from bad education. It was not brought on by primitives or unlettered peoples."

Pervading all legal formulas, all economic arrangements, all educational programs there is needed the spirit of Christ. Inspiring all efforts to write a new political law or to direct the laws of economics, there must be Christ's law of love. But that law must live.

"The law is always dead in parchment, marble, stone,
Unless each generation relives it as its own;
'A scrap of paper,' adorned with names, tempts power on its throne.
As fuel for world-wide flames by all the four winds blown.

"When the spirit transcends the law men see beyond the letter,
When justice frames the law revenge has no abetter,
When mercy guides the law virtue holds vice its debtor,
When hearts enshrine the law peace stands free from fetter."

A Christian should readily understand Christ's law of love in all its natural and supernatural implications, but no man, I think, whatever his belief, will fail to recognize the wonderful social value of that law. One need not accept all that theology tells us of Christ's complete nature in order to be edified by what history tells us of Christ's exemplary human nature. It may require the special subtlety that comes with faith to discern all the eternal content of Christ's teaching; but there is needed only an honest mind to recognize how rich in lessons for more perfect living in temporal society, is the example of Christ's own practice in His daily life of the law of love.

Apply this to the problem—nationalism versus internationalism, independence versus interdependence. Christ blended in His personal life a perfect love for His own nation with an unparalleled love for humanity. Through all His life and even in the hour of His death, He fulfilled with scrupulous care the national observances of His people and the customs of His country. Reading His life, in the lines in which it is written and between those lines, we see and sense at every crisis of His career the tender preferential love of Christ for His own people and for their national way of life. He would have been less than human did not a perfect patriotism find its place in his moral personality. His parables provide so many precious pictures of the little details of daily life among the humble folk and in the out-of-the-way places where he spent His boyhood. The most sublime principles of His divine teaching come to us through the medium of figures of speech, comparisons and examples redolent of Nazareth and Galilee and of all the land and living of the Jewish people. With all His heart Christ loved this people to whom He belonged by bond of ancestry, of language, of common characteristics, of special friendships, of shared griefs, of mutually cherished traditions, land, and hopes.

He loved His own people on the heroic level of their national greatness; He loved the history of His nation, the names of its great men and the glorious incidents of its immemorial struggles. The memory of the Patriarchs who had gathered and organized the Hebrews of Palestine, especially the memory of Abraham, father of his people, flashes constantly through the preaching of Christ. The authority of Moses, law giver of his people, is constantly invoked by Christ in His own moral legislation, and with Moses and Elias. He chose to share the moment of His transfiguration.

He loved His own people on the humble level of their popular traditions, and it is interesting to note how many times the Scripture recounts His intimate presence at the national feasts and popular festivals of His people. Countless homely phrases of His nation's simple folk find their way to His lips; He loved to speak of the naive local manner in which they forecast the weather or planned their domestic economies or carried on their daily lives with one another. Little phrases, evocative of all these, illumine His most exalted doctrines, and even His most universal teachings are given lively form in local examples from the little province He best knew and loved.

Christ spent Himself so utterly for those who were close to Him, His friends, His people, His nation, that all His love might seem to have been not merely lavished, but exhausted on them. And yet, nothing could be further from the truth, for the truth is that He was the perfect type of the universal-minded man. Salvation, He taught, came from His people, the Jews, but he did not believe that it was destined for the people of any one nation. He sought to be the true light which illumines every man that comes into the world. He chose His Apostles from His own people but He gave them a world-wide mandate and fired them with a universal charity. He sent them to preach His Gospel to all men without distinction of race or nation, or color or social rank.

Sometimes Christ called Himself and suffered others to call Him the Son of God but, strangely enough, he seems especially to have loved His other title: Son of Man. This phrase, indicative of His solidarity with and love for all the human race, was constantly used by Him to describe Himself, His work and His destiny.

Christ felt as a "son" to all the human family, and His moral attitudes toward humanity are based, as a consequence, not on any cold sense of justice nor merely tender pity, but on an intense and reverent filial love for man whose Son He was. His pride in the title "Son of Man" reflects the manner in which He loved every human being in the world and reverenced human nature wherever it was to be found, however degraded or guilty the persons in whom it abided.

I know of no greater lesson which our generation must learn from Christ than this lesson. We must learn it not merely for our personal sanctification but also for our political and social security, if not, indeed, for our survival. A time of war, and especially the period immediately following a victory, is apt to produce in men attitudes alien to Christ's law of love. That, alas, is the reason why periods of peace are usually so brief and so precarious. No nation, however strong, can build a peace unless it be motivated by great love. Partisanship, nationalism, racism, any social particularisms and especially those tinged with hatred, can only be principles of destruction; love alone can bring a positive inspiration to the building of a better world.

Love for others inspires the missionary to give his life in the service of people who put to death, perhaps, his elder brothers and sisters in the faith. Love for others used to prompt even victorious princes in more humane days to seek their greater victories over the hearts and the intelligences of the conquered by means of clemency and forbearance. The world will belong to those who love it most and who win it by love; it can never belong to those who hate any part of it and strive to impose their will by violence upon their erstwhile enemies.

There is no lesson, I repeat, which we must more sincerely learn than this, and there is no more certain method of learning this lesson than by the development in our personal and collective lives of that spirit of Christ to which the late President pledged us. His spirit will require that we blend with our love for America a love for all humanity; His example will teach us how to do so.

Christ, we have said, loved His own people and His own land. He could be as meek as the "Lamb of God" and as courageous as the "Lion of the tribe of Juda" but He hated no one. He could place His hands in benediction on the heads of little children or He could raise them aloft to strike the money changers who profaned His house of prayer, but He loved everyone. In every contact with evil, He hated the sin but He loved the sinner. His character was entirely free from that clannishness of excessive family feeling which interferes with the love and service of the wider human family. It betrays no admixture of class consciousness or class prejudice. To be sure, He criticized the rich when they were unjust, but He criticized no less the poor when they were unrighteous. He neither feared nor hated the masses; He loved them all and strove in all things to serve them. But, what is more important in our present concern, Christ never permitted his loyal patriotism to degenerate into an arrogant nationalism. Much as He loved His countrymen and the national heritage which He shared with them, He never permitted Himself or those who heard Him to forget that no nation has a monopoly of either virtue or vice. God has called each nation to some vocation in the realization of His kingdom and He has divided His gifts among all the peoples of the earth. His divine providence has made nations so interdependent that, if they be realistic, they can never exclude one another from their common charity.

My illustrious predecessor in the see of Boston, when he stood on this platform to deliver the oration of this occasion, expressed the practical consequence for our Nation of its international dependence in these memorable words: "As no single man can stand absolutely alone so no single nation can stand absolutely alone. The well-being of every nation requires a sense of security in the world. For this reason, America, great as our Nation undoubtedly is, does not and cannot stand alone because Americans are not the only men on earth. For all the rest we must have that respect and kindly feeling which both our Constitution and the gospels teach. But those very principles demand in turn that the other nations of the earth show to America respect and justice."

These words are still in order, indeed they have acquired a new urgency. There are increased reasons why I must repeat them this year, pleading for their acceptance in the spirit of Christ's law of love. So alien to the spirit of Christ has become the spirit of the times that even many who esteem themselves to be devout are sometimes scandalized by one particular obligation of Christ's law of love. Yet the obligation at which they balk is the perfection of the law—its essential characteristic, the acid test of its sincere acceptance. Those who refuse to accept this particular precept sabotage the total law and nullify any chance it might have to operate in the world unto the redemption of society. By Christ's law of love we are bound to love our neighbor as ourself and all men, without exception, must be accepted as our potential neighbors. Hence the special attitude toward enemies which is dictated by the spirit of Christ.

Historical circumstances may set one group of men against another for a time, and occasionally all society must act against even one man who has tried to be a law unto himself. Sometimes retributive justice or even simple prudence will require measures of sternness against a group or an individual, but the substance of Christ's law of love still holds, and so long as our society is Christian, so long as it is humane, there can be no place in its vocabulary for hatred against any group or any nation, no matter what that nation may have done. The spirit of Christ is no longer abroad in a land whose leaders of public opinion can speak unchallenged of the possibility of hating their enemies. That nation has acquired a thoroughly pagan soul, whatever its outward religious rites, which

speaks of hatred as the due of its enemies and adopts measures based on hatred as the policy of its peacemaking.

"Vae victis." "Woe to the conquered." This brief, terrifying formula is the quintessence of the pagan spirit in which Christ has no part. There are disturbing indications of a renaissance in our society of that spirit. Men profess to consider just and proper measures which have about them no hint of the spirit of Christ, but which recall the ancient pagan spirit of a world which western civilization had supposed to be dead. When Athens decreed that all the Mitylenians, without distinction of sex or age, should be exterminated, she did not consider that she had exceeded her rights; when she revised this decision and contented herself with executing a thousand citizens and with confiscating the lands of all the rest, she considered herself indulgent, almost to a fault.

Christ's law of love tempered that spirit for more than a thousand years, but every now and again, especially during the past few hundred years, we have seen increasing indications that the old pagan spirit is reasserting itself. Nowhere does the decline in the social influence of Christianity more sadly manifest itself than in the attitudes of a victorious people toward the people whom they have conquered. Modern leaders in the field of literature have crystallized these attitudes. Machiavelli was inspired with a completely pagan spirit when he wrote that a ruler, particularly a conqueror, need not practice all the virtues which pass for decent among private persons, and may in the interests of his state, act contrary to the dictates of faith, charity, humanity, and religion. Comte reflected an un-Christlike spirit when he wrote that we must love all humanity, but that by humanity we need understand, not all men, but only those who can be assimilated into the community existence of a given moment in the race's history. Renan violated Christ's law of love when he wrote: "In reality, everyone is only more or less a man, more or less a son of God; one possesses only that much of God and of truth as he is capable of and as he deserves. I see no reason why every Tom, Dick, and Harry should be considered immortal." Nietzsche spoke pure paganism when he pretended that most of the evil in the world comes from the folly of those who try to sympathize and to bother with errant humanity. Disciples of such writers are legion.

While all around us many subtle powers are ranged against the Christian way of life or the influence of the spirit of Christ in the world. It is no longer a matter of physical force, but of an insinuating spirit which cloaks itself under such formulas as "righteous indignation."

There are grave indications in certain popular books, periodicals, radio columns, and public speeches that many influential leaders of opinion on the peace could scarcely consistently condemn the opinions of these pagan writers on the significance of these subtle forces. But their opinions are condemned by the spirit of Christ, "You have heard it said," Christ told His followers, "that thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy but I tell you, love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you."

I cannot say that if tomorrow all men begin the effort to keep this precept of Christ the peace of the world will be assured the day after tomorrow. The historical and psychological impediments to so speedy an operation of God's grace in the world are too many and too serious. I cannot promise that the imitation of Christ will renew the face of the earth in this or that predictable period of time. The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, and the building of a perfect society out of members still imperfect must be a long and patient task. I cannot predict that the acceptance of Christ's law of love will immediately result, even among the devout, in the resolution of the ancient conflict between loyalty to our national independence and love for the international community.

But I can proclaim that one of the indispensable prerequisites for the search of a new order with lasting peace is triumph over hate which is today a cause of division among peoples and renunciation therefor of the systems and practices from which hate constantly receives added nourishment.

I can assert that if we propose to reject the example of Christ, then we may as well despair of ever solving any of these problems now or later. And I do confidently make my own the implied warning of the departed President under whom this Nation went forth to war: The way will be lost and the victory in vain if we become ourselves victims of the spirit of vengeance and if we fail to establish an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations. To enter into the peace by way of increased hatred is contrary to the spirit of Christ and it is disastrous for any Christian peace, which must be the fruit of justice and love. It is impossible to attain a peace, tempered equally by equity and justice, with minds that are moved and motivated by hatred or vindictive feelings.

Perfect love for one's own people can be harmoniously blended with a sincere love for mankind; they were so blended in the character of the Son of Man and they have been blended in countless noble spirits of every land and group. National devotion and international loyalty can have a least common denominator; it is to be found in Christ's law of love. An international order is possible without any violence to the legitimate aspirations of any nation but all these things depend not on politics alone, nor on economics alone, nor on education alone, but on the inspiration of all those by the spirit of Christ. It was said of old by the Psalmist, and it is true forever, "unless the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it." It was said by our late President at the beginning of the war, and let us recall his words again on this birthday of our beloved country, "We shall win this war and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the stablishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I received from Earl C. Burkholder, secretary of the Carroll County Farm Bureau, as well as a resolution passed by the directors of the Carroll County Farm Bureau on the subject Surpluses and the Method of Disposal. In my opinion this resolution is a sound and equitable one and deserves the attention and consideration of Congress.

CARROLL COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Mount Carroll, Ill., July 5, 1945.

Hon. LEO E. ALLEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith please find copy of resolution passed at recent meeting of Carroll County Farm Bureau board of directors.

We would appreciate having you give this matter your consideration.

Sincerely,

EARL C. BURKHOLDER,
Secretary.

Whereas the part in World War 2 taken by the United States of America has made our Government the largest buyer of goods, both military and civil of all times; and

Whereas the needs of the military came first at all times, resulting in shortages for civilian use; and

Whereas large surpluses in goods, no longer suitable or required for military purposes, now exist; and

Whereas the said surplus goods should be released for civilian use and consumption, without delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Carroll County Farm Bureau in executive session:

(a) That the national economy requires that surplus goods, both military and civil, acquired by the United States Government in the prosecution of the war effort, be released without delay;

(b) That a fair, open and efficient method of liquidation and distribution of such surplus goods ought to be adopted by the Government for the guidance of its officers, agents, and agencies;

(c) That such distribution and liquidation should be under the supervision of well and favorably known merchandisers: and

(1) The sales thereof should be open, at public sale, or at unit price filed by the Government, in the several communities where demand exists, in quantities which such communities can absorb;

(2) That the names, addresses, purchases and prices at such sale be made a matter of public knowledge.

(3) That the lumping of large quantities, and divers classification, of said goods be avoided, to the end that said goods be liquidated for the best price, and reach the ultimate consumer without delay and without undue profit to middleman.

Since practically all war materials and equipment are purchased by the United States Government this immense amount of materials is public property.

Further, these physical assets represent the investiments of the general public. And further, much of this construction and manufacturing was done through contracts.

Now, therefore, since the disposal of all war materials is in the public interest, be it resolved by the Carroll County Farm Bureau in executive session, that in the disposition of all or any of such physical assets, the name of each and every purchaser be made known to the general public and that the disposal price of each and all such material be listed with name of purchaser.

New Secretary of Agriculture Expected to Improve Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a radio talk which I delivered by transcription over radio station WDAY, Fargo, N. Dak., Saturday evening, July 7.

My remarks at that time were as follows:

Dear friends of the great Northwest, since you last heard my voice over this station, WDAY, I have made a flying trip back to Minnesota to attend the food hearings held in Minneapolis on June 12, and to handle some other business and official matters. These hearings were conducted by the Special House Food Committee and were presided over by Congressman Clinton Anderson, who is our new Secretary of Agriculture and who is now vitally the food czar.

Delegations from all over Minnesota, including a group from the Ninth Congressional District, were on hand to offer their views on the food situation. It was interesting to note that in addition to their well-grounded criticisms of the way the whole food problem has been handled by the Government agencies, most of the delegates handed out some pretty sound advice as to how the food shortage can be remedied.

Listening to these businessmen and farmers testify before the committee confirmed my belief that our Government would be much stronger if we would place practical farmers and small businessmen at the head of more of our strategic bureaus and offices.

The acute food shortage has brought forth all sorts of explanations and excuses from the heads of the many bureaus and agencies charged with the responsibility of supervising the production and distribution of food. Neither Congress nor the people of the Nation have been given an accurate, coherent story of what has happened to our abundant food supply. Many of use here on Capitol Hill have suspected for a long time that America's food supply has been unnecessarily dissipated by extravagant and unnecessary shipments to foreign countries in the early days of lend-lease. It is a sad commentary on the cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, when we have to learn the truth from a report recently issued by the Foreign Commerce and Navigation Section of the Department of Commerce.

These official records show lend-lease shipments for 1942, the first year of rationing in this country, totalled $4,926,449,237. Of the total $742,709,738 was in edible animal products and $68,332,760 in edible vegetable products.

Files of the Department of Commerce show that almost all of this vast flow of food went to the United Kingdom and Soviet Russia, with sizable shipments to various units of the British Empire, including such units as Jamaica, Trinidad, and India, which are making slight contribution of men and materials to the war. Some foodstuffs went to nations making no contributions whatever.

The people of America are willing to make whatever sacrifices necessary to win the war and assist our allies, but like all humans we don't like to feel that we are being exploited.

Congressman AUGUST ANDRESEN, of Red Wing, Minn., who is a high-ranking Republican member of the Agriculture Committee, made the arrangements for the Minneapolis meeting and remained with Mr. Anderson and the committee to attend hearings elsewhere in the country. They recently returned to Washington.

Congress is about to recess for about 2 months. Many Congressmen will take advantage of their well-earned rest and return to their districts for the summer. The past few months have been strenuous ones in Washington. Never before has Congress worked harder under so much pressure. The death rate of Congressmen has increased during these war years. A short recess every summer helps straighten out jangled nerves, and gives the lawmakers a new and fresher outlook on the problems confronting the Nation.

For that reason I have in the past made it a point to travel about the Ninth District as much as time and gasoline rationing would permit, and it has been most helpful to me to listen to the advice and counsel of my Minnesota friends and neighbors relative to the issues before Congress.

This summer I will get very little rest. Immediately after Congress recesses I intend to spend a few weeks in the district, talking and visiting with my constituents. Soon after I will leave for Alaska with the Committee on Territories from the House of Representatives. The purpose of this trip is to investigate and survey conditions in Alaska.

The recent trend in world affairs, including rapid changes in the methods of commerce, transportation, and communications have brought to the forefront vitally important questions affecting Alaska and other Territories. Alaska is bound to play an increasingly important part in the various phases of the life of our Nation.

There is a growing demand for the revision of the legal organic acts under which Alaska is governed, and our Committee on Territories is constantly receiving petitions from citizens and the legislative body of Alaska for changes in various features of their legislative, judicial, and administrative laws.

There is also a great deal of interest being shown by veterans and others on the prospects of settling in Alaska. If any wholesale migration of people to Alaska takes place, the Government must be prepared to meet the problems resulting from the increase in population.

The committee expects to be gone for just a few weeks, and I hope that I will be able to return to the district for a short time before going back to Washington. In my absence my secretary and a clerk will be in charge of my office in the post-office building at Crookston, Minn., and two other members of my office staff will remain in Washington to handle departmental matters for me.

The House of Representatives heartily agrees with President Truman's recommendation that Congress pass legislation naming the Speaker of the House of Representatives next in line to succeed him as President.

From my own personal observations, I feel that President Truman is looking at this problem in the light of a long-term policy, and even though Speaker RAYBURN is a man of great ability and statesmanship, Mr. Truman was not making the suggestion merely because Mr. RAYBURN might be qualified to succeed him in the event of his death.

Under the existing law, now that the Vice President has succeeded to the Presidency, the next in line of succession, should the President die or be unable to complete his term, would be the Secretary of State. President Truman objects to this present arrangement on the grounds that it gives him or any other Vice President succeeding to the Presidency the right to name his own successor. He feels that it would be more in accordance with our democratic form of government to change the law so that the Speaker of the House would be next in line of succession, particularly in view of the fact that the Speaker is an elected officer and holds his position by reason of being selected by representatives of the people.

Although President Truman's suggestion has received enthusiastic support in the House, there is some hesitancy on the part of a few Senators to support the recommendations.

Yes, I believe the legislation recommended by the President will perhaps be enacted. The House already has done so. There is, of course, small likelihood that anything will happen to President Truman, but it is always good business to be prepared.

SAM RAYBURN

Speaker SAM RAYBURN of Texas, known to nearly all of the Members as "SAM," is a stocky man, of medium height, nearly bald, and with a ruddy complexion. In physical build, and in his characteristic of forthrightness, he resembles Winston Churchill. He is a stern man in the chair, but is kindly and fair, and has a delightful sense of humor which he reveals many times during every day of the session. SAM looks, talks, and acts like a real statesman.

Washington—along with the rest of the world—was thrilled by the signing on June 26 in San Francisco of the Charter of the new League of the United Nations.

Of course, we all realize the United Nations Charter of itself does not guarantee either peace or justice. However, we can be assured that the United Nations which have made this new charter possible solemnly undertake with two world wars as their lessons to employ it and abide by it, in good times as well as bad, and to use it as a means, an instrument, and a machine to maintain world peace.

The poll recently taken by the Associated Press indicates that the United Nations Charter will probably be ratified by a vote of well over two-thirds of the Senate. In reply to the question, "Will you vote for United States adherence to the United Nations Charter as it now stands, barring unforeseen developments?" 52 Senators committed themselves to vote for it.

A total of 76 Senators is reasonably certain to vote for the Charter, provided the vote is taken now. Perhaps all of them may vote for the charter, a few with reservations.

However, even after the Charter is ratified the battle will still be only half won. There will be introduced two collateral measures implementing the charter to which there will be some opposition. These measures are the heart of the World Organization, and without them the charter will be all but nullified as an effective instrument for world security. There will be a resolution to provide that the American representative on the Security Council shall have power to commit armed forces of the United States without reference to Congress.

There will be a treaty providing that armed contingents of the United States will be available to the Security Council for the purpose of maintaing peace in accordance with the Charter. Some Senators will probably make their main fight on these two measures.

On June 18, Washington went all out to welcome home one of the greatest generals of our time. Gen. Ike Eisenhower was given the key to the city and tremendous crowds lined the streets to watch the parade. In a joint session of the Members of the House of Representatives and United States Senate, General Eisenhower made a brief report on what had taken place in Europe. He impressed those who heard him as being very statesmanlike and sincere in his presentation and in the conclusions he has drawn from his personal observations as commander of the Allied forces in Europe. We are, indeed, fortunate to have a man at the head of our Allied government in Europe who so thoroughly understands the problems confronting the Allied nations at this time.

Guests of the Members of Congress at the event were the Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet members, and also members of the staffs of the foreign diplomatic services.

General Eisenhower is a great man and an outstanding commanding general. His feat in leading our armies to a complete victory over Germany in exactly 11 months is the greatest military achievement in all history. There have been other great military victories, but none with operations conducted on such a vast scale or under more difficult conditions.

Great as this achievement was, I think the fact that General Eisenhower was able to win victory with such a relatively small loss of men, considering the millions involved, is the thing for which he should be honored most.

As a member of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I am at the

present time working on the draft of a bill which would provide for a 4-cent air mail post card. I have talked to other members of the committee and have secured their promise of support for a measure of this kind. In order to insure speedy and favorable consideration, I may ask one of my colleagues on the committee who belongs to the majority party to also introduce the bill.

I want again to thank Station WDAY for its courtesy in making available this opportunity to talk to my constituents. Thank you and good night.

The West Needs the Fontana Steel Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a prosperous West enjoying full employment is necessary for a prosperous America. This full employment rests upon a foundation of free enterprise—upon small independent businesses. We know that if full employment is to be achieved these small producers must have an opportunity equal with the big fellows to obtain the materials that are being released during the reconversion period that we have embarked upon.

For the West this means that the steel mill at Fontana, Calif., built to meet the necessities of war must continue to operate to meet the necessities of peace. Several things, however, must be done in order for the benefits of this steel plant to be realized and for the protection of the Nation's investment.

First. Since this plant was built primarily for the production of plates and structural shapes for the shipbuilding industry, some alterations and additions will be necessary before it can meet the needs of our peacetime economy.

Second. The adjustment of the loan at Fontana should include a price policy based upon production costs plus a reasonable profit, and should not reflect the basing point system which in general has been $10 to $15 more per ton than in eastern steel centers. This system causes the price of steel to be the same regardless of production and shipping costs. It stifles fair competition between eastern and western steel manufacturers.

And finally in arriving at the value of this plant, after the alterations and additions have been made, consideration must be given to the invested capital per ton of rated capacity which would then exist as compared to the average of the steel industry. It must be remembered that this plant was built under the emergency of war and at higher costs of construction.

To the West, with its growing industries, the ability to obtain and use the metals that lie close at hand will play a vital roll in the future. The continued operation of the Fontana mill, and the adjustment of steel prices and freight rates are essential to the development of our postwar economy. The development of new industries based upon our steel production is essential to the provision of jobs—full employment—for our returning servicemen and our vastly increased population.

Indian Emancipation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD a letter from the Veterans' Administration, which will help to make clear why the Indians of this country are entitled to passage of the Indian Emancipation Act, H. R. 3710, which I have introduced again this year:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington 25, D. C., May 4, 1945.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: Further reference is made to your letter dated April 23, 1945, requesting a statement on the eligibility of Indian veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Generally speaking, as to veterans' benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, Indians who otherwise meet the requirements of the laws under which the claim is asserted are entitled to such benefits in the same manner as any other veteran. A problem has arisen, however, as to restricted Indians under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which contains provisions relating to the guaranty of loans. This problem, however, arises not because of the provisions of the law, under which they are entitled equally with any other veteran, but because of the veteran's status as a restricted Indian, which, in turn, results in difficulty insofar as the lending agency or agent is concerned.

This question has been the subject of conference with representatives of the Office of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, and recent correspondence sent to that office. When response is received from the Department of the Interior you will be further advised in connection with this matter.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian soldier has proved himself to be one of the best fighters we have had. He did it in World War I. He has done it again in World War II. And yet today, he finds himself discriminated against because of a "restricted status."

To solve his problem, and to solve the problem of other competent Indians who are entitled to manage their own property and entitled to a chance to be free and unrestricted in all respects as are other citizens, I have again introduced my bill for the emancipation of the American Indian. It was H. R. 5115 in the Seventy-eighth Congress. It is H. R. 3710 in this Congress. Under permission granted, I offer the provisions of the bill at this point.

A bill to emancipate the Indians of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter whenever any Indian meets any one of the tests set forth herein, he shal be a free and unrestricted Indian. Certificates of a free and unrestricted status shall be issued by the superintendent of the agency on which an Indian is enrolled and may be issued by the judge of any court empowered to grant citizenship to aliens upon application by the Indian and a showing that he meets any one of the following conditions:

(a) Holding of an honorable discharge from service in the armed forces of the United States in time of war;

(b) Graduation from a standard high school or its equivalent;

(c) Passing of the requirements for the naturalization of aliens; and

(d) Holding of a recommendation of competency approved jointly by the superintendent of the reservation and the official council for the tribe of which he is a member.

CIVIL RIGHTS

SEC. 2. A free and unrestricted Indian shall be entitled to all the rights of citizenship in the States of the United States, including, but not excluding rights not specified, the following:

(a) The right to administer personal property (including money) under the laws of the State of residence;

(b) The right to receive a patent in fee to any lands allotted to or inherited by him and to administer this or any other real property acquired by him through gift or purchase;

(c) The right to every right and benefit to which he would be entitled as a war veteran, if he is a veteran, regardless of the fact that he is an Indian; and

(d) The right to appeal from any Indian court to the State and Federal courts of appropriate jurisdiction; and the exercise of any of these rights shall not deprive the Indian of any rights to which he would otherwise be entitled as a member of any Indian tribe.

TRANSITION RIGHTS

SEC. 3. To assist Indians in transition from a restricted to a free and unrestricted status, it is specifically provided by this act that—

(a) upon application to the Secretary of the Interior, a special interim trust patent or title will be issued to the holder of any Indian lands upon the date of his certificate of free and unrestricted status for all the lands held for him in trust as of that date, and for any personal property acquired by or for him with restricted funds prior to that date, which will permit the Indian owner to contract for delivery of title in fee but which will keep such lands and property in trust status and not subject to taxes of any kind until such lands and property are disposed of by him and title is transferred to another person; and

(b) no lands or other property with respect to which restrictions are removed or a patent in fee issued pursuant to this act shall be liable for the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to such removal of restrictions or issuance of patent.

RIGHTS ON RESERVATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) All laws of the United States providing for the punishment of offenses committed by or against Indians, which would not be punishable by the United States if committed by or against persons other than Indians, or providing for the punishment of offenses committed on Indian reservations, which would not be punishable by the United States if committed elsewhere than on an Indian reservation, are hereby repealed.

(b) All Indian reservations, all persons upon such reservations, and all Indians, within any State, shall be subject to the criminal laws of such State to the same extent and

in the same manner as other places and persons within such State.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall permit the agents and employees of a State or county in which an Indian reservation is located to enter upon such reservation for the purpose of enforcing such laws, under such rules, regulations, and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into agreements with the several States, and the counties thereof, in which Indian reservations are located, to pay to such States or counties such amounts as he may determine to be proper to defray the expenses of the enforcement of the criminal laws of such States on such reservations.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Treasury such sums as are necessary to carry out this act.

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the "Indian Emancipation Act."

Shabby Treatment Given To Disabled War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, many thousands of men have given their lives for this country and untold thousands have had a living death from injuries received in the armed forces. The least we can do for these veterans is to give them the medical attention that they have so nobly earned.

However, there are those in the administrative branch of the Government who little care for the veteran even though they are handsomely paid by our Government.

This condition of affairs was demonstrated and again brought to our attention by the officer at Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington on July 4 this year. When Wallace Reed, a resident of Wayside, Ga., and a victim of battle fatigue, was shocked and nerve strung by fireworks on July 4 here in Washington, and taken by his buddies to Walter Reed Hospital for emergency treatment, the officer in charge did not bother himself to make an examination, just glanced at the shocked veteran in the automobile, said he would not take him into Walter Reed Hospital and told his buddies to take the shocked veteran to Mount Alto Hospital for treatment, making it much longer and harder for the shocked veteran to receive emergency treatment. His companions were Joe Adair, Durant, Okla.; John Stroud, of Kansas City, Mo.; Hollis A. Smith, of East Milton, Mass.; and Harry A. Titsworth, of Fremont, Ohio, all disabled veterans who are here in Washington along with their war-shocked comrade, Wallace Reed, of Wayside, Ga., working and studying the law, regulations, and orders of the Veterans' Administration, so that they might assist their disabled comrades in their own home communities. For this noble work they are refused medical attention at Walter Reed Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, how long must the veterans of this country be obliged to receive such shabby treatment by the bureaus and hangers-on in the Government service?

Address of Kenneth D. Tooill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by Kenneth D. Tooill at a recent meeting of the American Legion at Toledo, Ohio. Mr. Tooill is a distinguished author, orator, and journalist, and one of the constructive thinkers who is making a great contribution to forward thinking of not only northern Ohio and southern Michigan but the entire Nation as well.

Liberty is like a woman's love; it is not enough simply to win it. It has to be nurtured and fought for periodically and eternally safeguarded. Because liberty is like that, Americans have periodically to go to war.

Not everyone can go to war. Some don't want to. Some are too young or too old; some lack patriotism. Some must keep up production and make the tools of war.

During every war we have the spectacle of thousands remaining at home, some to work solemnly and faithfully in full appreciation of their duty; some to make of the occasion an opportunity to fulfill greedy desires, to get rich. We have the nauseating spectacle of men and women making merry while thousands are dying. The taverns ring with their laughter. Blood, sweat, and tears are not for them. December 7 of last year, a day our late President said would live in infamy, a day when every true American heart should have felt a load of grief, was marked in many places by drunken orgy.

The burdens of all wars, the blood letting and the life giving, are borne by a relatively small portion of the citizenship. They are the men—and the women, in this war—who follow the flag onto the battlefield and do the dying and endure the agony of wounds.

They are the ones who give all they have to preserve liberty that was won originally in the same manner.

When the smoke of battle is done and the politicians take over, these men and women come home to suffer anew amid the dislocations that war creates in civilian life; to try to find a personal peace and personal security; and those simple things are all they ask of their country; plus a little gratitude expressed not in monuments, or high-sounding oratory or financial reward * * * just in the hearts and souls of those they have saved from tyranny and slavery.

But regardless of their own humility, they nevertheless feel set a little apart from the noncombatants, and this they have every right to feel. It is only human. Those who have worn the uniform have formed a comradeship that is unlike any other comradeship in the world. They share with one another the impact of one of the worst of human experiences—war. Only they can know what it is like, only they know what it does to nerves, flesh and soul.

It is no wonder, then, that they band together, in the time of peace. It is no wonder that the American Legion was born at the end of the last war, and is destined to grow to heretofore unimagined proportions as a power in our national society, and with a voice that is certain to be heard above the prattle of petty politics and the bickerings of selfish factions.

Whenever I see an American Legion uniform, or those men on parade, the thought comes to me that here are the men who made of liberty something more than a word in a history text.

These are the men who went out and offered their lives to defend liberty while others who did not, or could not, rendered it only lip service. Without these men, there would be no liberty.

Already, commentators on the American scene are forecasting that the American Legion will become a greater power in American politics and economy.

Why shouldn't it be? Without these men, we would have no political system of our own and no economy.

If and when the men who are willing to die to preserve America shall have no voice in the running of America, then we shall indeed lose those things which our external enemies have so far been unable to take from us.

The Equal-Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an appeal to all women in the United States made by Nora Stanton Barney, chairman of the national advisory council of the National Woman's Party, and the granddaughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who is to be well remembered in connection with her splendid pioneer work in behalf of woman suffrage, and all equal rights under the Constitution:

WHY I AM FOR THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Nora Stanton Barney, chairman, National Advisory Council, National Woman's Party)

I am appealing to women to see our position. I am appealing as an individual, a friend of Susan B. Anthony, whom I know very well, as the granddaughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and the daughter of Harriot Stanton Blatch.

The first women's rights convention was held at Seneca Falls in 1848. In their "Declaration of Sentiments" was not only the demand for the vote, but for many rights. Among the resolutions adopted was the following:

"*Resolved*, That all laws that prevent a woman from occupying such a station in society as her conscience shall dictate, or which will place her in a position inferior to that of man, are contrary to the great precepts of nature, and therefore of no force or authority."

Nothing could be broader than that. Those great pioneers saw straighter than some of their descendants today.

Very few women realize the price they pay for hanging on to special laws for women instead of standing for equality and the equal rights amendment. We are not persons. We move and function in a so-called democracy without the protection of the Bill of Rights or of the Constitution, except as to the vote. We are at the mercy of any legislator in any of the 48 States who wants

to pass any law to curb our freedom, no matter how absurd. We have the economic status of a child of 5, and are continually linked up with minors instead of adults.

If we compare the health and labor laws for women of the various States, the inconsistency is simply ludicrous. It is unhealthy for a woman to work in certain States for over 7½ hours, while in others the Government licenses as high as 12 hours. In Massachusetts a woman can carry 75 pounds, while in California a woman is forbidden to carry any tray or box which weighs 10 pounds up steps of over 5 feet in height. This raises the question, naturally, that if carrying 10½ pounds is injurious, who is to carry the baby when 2 or 3 weeks old? Is the father to come home to carry it upstairs, or is the postman to be designated for extra-curricular duties?

It is evident that these laws are not for women's health, but are discriminatory laws to embarrass and discourage women from being employed in certain occupations. You, reader, and I could, I am sure, draft a more sensible law, choosing a weight that would not injure a frail man or woman, in the opinion of the medical profession. Such a law would state that any worker having to carry weights exceeding that amount should have medical inspection by a workmen's compensation doctor, who would certify the maximum weight that that individual could carry. A man suffering from rupture or hernia would be limited to a lower weight than a normal healthy woman.

I can remember way back in the nineties in England my mother's interest in this subject. In London they were keeping women out of the printing establishments on the plea that what they had to carry would injure them (trays of type, I believe, in those early days). I can remember my father taking a full scuttle of coal to his office to have it weighed, and that it was found that it weighed twice as much as the printing trays. I can remember my mother saying that it was always the well-paid women who were protected out of their jobs, while the underpaid housemaids could struggle on with their full coal scuttles, and they do so this day.

As to hours of work, excessively long hours are just as bad for men as women. Many a workingman's wife is telling me now that her husband is too exhausted on his return from work to take an interest in anything, least of all in his wife. For any State to sanction 12 hours work a day, straight time, for any human being is certainly no help to health legislation.

And what is the reason for laws forbidding the split-shift for women but not for men, except to throw them out of bus driving and as streetcar conductors? They liked working in the morning and evening and having the middle of the day off for dinner and shopping and children. The laws forbidding the split-shift for women are senseless and used only for discrimination against women. They were put through for that purpose, blatantly.

As to time for meals, a day of rest, and rest periods, all workers should have these, not women only. Why should men have to gobble their lunch faster than women? And 1 day at least, preferably one and a half, in seven, every human being is entitled to for freedom from work. The Bible says so and does not make it apply to women only.

The New York regulation that a partition is required in a core room if women are employed, "to effectively trap gases, fumes, and smoke," is indeed the height of absurdity. Men are just as liable to contract diseases of the lungs as women. How much simpler to say that core rooms shall have partitions.

As to night work, this bug-a-boo has been used to throw women out of one lucrative job after another. The latest absurdity is that a woman can perform as a musician in a night club in Port Chester, N. Y., but not in Greenwich, Conn. Women can telephone and nurse at night, but it was a 3-year fight in New York to get the bookbinders, proofreaders, and printers exempted from the no night-work law. They were determined, however, and they finally got their exemption, and a happy, healthy, well paid lot of women they are.

The telephone records that I have examined, show that the women night workers have fewer absences on account of sickness than the day workers. They get out more into God's sunshine, I suppose. The idea of the unhealthfulness of night work no doubt came from the old days of candlelight and poor light, and the fact that night work was usually a continuation of day work. Also day work usually meant working in the daylight, while now so much work is done by artificial light, that night and day work are very similar. Night workers often prefer night work. Why not let this law against night work for women remain permanently abrogated instead of temporarily suspended, as at the present?

The difficulty of inspecting home work is apparent, but whatever the law, let it be for all workers, for the same home work conditions that are bad for women are certainly bad for men.

There remains the minimum wage. Now that interstate minimum wage scales are in force for all interstate workers, men and women alike, why not the same equality of treatment in intrastate legislation to all industrial workers?

Also why have a minimum wage for women only when you have an equal pay law, as is now the case in New York? Women are certainly satisfied to have the same pay as men. They don't want a higher minimum or they couldn't compete, and if you set a lower minimum, then truly it is but an invitation to employers to violate the equal pay law, and pay the minimum. Some may counter that there are vast groups of women workers whose work cannot be compared to men's. I doubt if this is so. There are usually a few men in occupations in which women predominate, and even if there were not one male on the horizon, it does not help the status of women to set a wage which is often far below the union wage. Statistics and history have shown that the minimum wage has, in general, not raised wages for women at all. It has been the demand for labor, unionization, stiffening the backbones and self-respect of women that have raised the wages for women.

The recent decision of the New York attorney general that women employees of public institutions did not come under the equal pay for equal work bill (the Todd bill) is an outrage. If the equal rights amendment were in effect, his decision would be unconstitutional. This is a flagrant and very pertinent case showing just how women are treated by public officials because they do not have the protection of the Constitution and the bill of rights, and are economic footballs instead of persons.

The attempts to pass special laws for women have retarded health laws for all workers. Likewise, due to including women with minors, legislation for minors has been retarded.

But at the present time, as far as special laws for women in industry are concerned, we are sailing along without them since practically all have been abrogated for the duration, or winked at. Let us examine the result. The birth rate has gone up; the death rate, excepting for war casualties, has gone down. Infant mortality was never so low, and, at the same time, the number of women employed in gainful pursuits was never so high. The best guaranty for women's health and the health of children is good wages and a consequent high standard of living, and that is what we have today.

What was considered injurious to the health of women has differed from generation to generation, and has, therefore, been controlled by prejudice and not by medical science. Women have not changed as far as vulnerability to disease and fatigue is concerned. Yet, when Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony were young women, it was the general belief that the study of Greek and mathematics would render women sterile, and that education was dangerous.

Then there is that intangible attribute "femininity." The latest example of "femininity" being called in to stop a woman in her chosen field was by the Window Cleaners Union, Local 2, AFL, who declared that Mrs. Matilda Pashko shouldn't wash windows because she didn't belong to the union, and shouldn't belong to the union "because it was hazardous to wash windows, and also it's highly improper." What would the windows of the world look like if women didn't wash them? It is safe and proper if they wash them without remuneration, or for next to nothing, but if they are well paid then it is hazardous and improper.

And now we reach the final and, to me, the most conclusive argument for the immediate passage of the equal rights amendment. Is it good for our Republic, based as it is on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, to have half its voters wandering over the face of the United States as creatures apart, that live not under the sheltering wings of those great precepts, but who are at the mercey of every whim of whatever origin, and often imported from the totalitarian states? Does not this degraded position of women, representing over half of the electorate, stab as a dagger into the very heart of our body politic? Are not all these so-called protective laws, but in truth discriminatory laws, a manifestation of the growing totalitarian trend in this, our country, and one more blow to individual liberty?

The Cost of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled "The Cost of Peace," from the Sunshine magazine of June 1945:

THE COST OF PEACE

(A writer in the Greensboro, (N. C.) Daily News quotes a story from Lincoln Steffens' autobiography, which is thought-provoking in this day of repeating history)

It was the morning of the third day of the peace meetings of Clemenceau, Wilson, and Lloyd George, at the close of World War I M. Clemenceau was speaking:

"I desire, before we go any further, to make clear one essential point: I have heard something about a permanent peace. There has been a great deal of talk about a peace to end wars forever, and I am interested in that. But I would like to know whether you gentlemen meant it, the permanent peace."

Wilson and Lloyd George nodded.

"So," Clemenceau said "you really mean it! Well, it is possible we can do it; we can make permanent peace—but we French cannot quite believe you mean what you say. Do you, Mr. President?"

Mr. Wilson did.

"And you, Mr. Premier?"

Lloyd George did.

"All right," Clemenceau muttered. "We can make this permanent peace. We can re-

move all the causes of war. Have you counted the cost of such a peace?"

There was some hesitation. "What cost?" they asked.

"Well," said Clemenceau, "if we give up all future wars, if we are to prevent war, we must first give up our empires and all hope of empire. You, Mr. Lloyd George, you English will have to come out of India, for example. We French will have to come out of north Africa. You Americans, Mr. President, will have to come out of the Philippines and Puerto Rico, and leave Cuba alone. We can go to these and other countries as tourists, traders, travelers. We cannot any more govern them and exploit them, or have the inside track in them. We cannot longer possess the keys to trade routes and the sphere of influence.

"We must also tear down our tariff walls and open the whole to free trade and traffic. There are also other sacrifices we, the dominant powers, must make. But first, are you willing to pay these prices?"

The premier and the President protested that they did not mean all that, not all at once, anyhow. No, no, they did not mean exactly that.

"Then," said Clemenceau, sitting up straight and fisting the table sharply, "then you don't mean permanent peace. You mean war!"

Prelude to Potsdam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Barnet Nover, from the Washington Post of July 7, 1945:

PRELUDE TO POTSDAM

(By Barnet Nover)

THE WARSAW REGIME RECOGNIZED

In recognizing the newly formed Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, Great Britain and the United States have brought their policies regarding the Polish problem into line with those of Russia.

Given the imperative need of Big Three harmony at this time—with the Potsdam conference just around the corner—the steps leading up to this development should, perhaps, not be scrutinized too closely.

Certainly, on the surface at least, the letter of the Yalta agreement reached last February by Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill, and the late President Roosevelt has now been complied with.

The Yalta Agreement stipulated that "The provisional government which is now functioning in Poland (i. e., the Soviet-sponsored Lublin regime) should * * * be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

On June 23 that government reorganized to include such men as Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former premier of the Polish Government at London; Jan Stanczyk, Wicenty Witos and Wladyslaw Kiernik.

The Yalta agreement also provided that "This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections, all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates."

This pledge has now been given by the reorganized Warsaw regime.

"When a Polish Provisional Government of National Unity has been properly formed," the Yalta Agreement goes on to say, "the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics * * * and the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America will establish diplomatic relations with the new * * * government * * *."

Thus after the present Warsaw regime was formed and after it pledged itself to hold democratic elections, Great Britain and the United States had no alternative other than to recognize that regime.

Actually the broadening of the base of the Lublin government followed an old recipe for rabbit stew—add one rabbit to one horse. In the new regime, only a handful of posts, and none of any importance, are held by those not previously connected with the Lublin group.

Lublinites have the Premiership, the Ministries of War, Foreign Affairs, Justice, and Finance. They control the police. And they are dominant in the presidential council. The newcomers have the leavings.

However, since there was no agreement arrived at in Yalta as to just what would constitute a broadening of the base of the former provisional government, the United States and Great Britain cannot complain.

By the same token, nothing was said at Yalta giving any outside, impartial body any right to supervise the coming elections in Poland so as to make certain that they will be free and unfettered. We have to take on faith the pledge of the new government that such elections will be held.

We can only hope that our faith will be justified. But we must recognize that there is no assurance that such Yalta terms as "free and unfettered elections," "universal suffrage," "secret ballot," and "democratic and anti-Nazi parties" will be defined by the new Warsaw regime (and by Moscow) the way we define them.

Another, bigger, and more momentous conference of the "Big Three" than that which met at Yalta is now in the offing. It is not too much to say that the fate of Europe and Asia, indeed, of the entire world, may there be decided.

I is thus of the most vital importance that at Potsdam the mistakes we made at Yalta be not repeated. These mistakes were:

1. Depending on vague understandings rather than precise agreements to chart the course of the future policy of the three powers.

2. The failure to agree on definitions. The Russians do not think as we do and there is no reason to expect them to do so.

3. The failure to stipulate the exact methods by which agreements are to be carried out.

Everybody is agreed that Anglo-Russian, American unity is indispensable to the proper functioning of the new world organization as well as to the achievement of harmonious international relations.

Yet up to now that unity has largely been achieved by Russia making minor concessions, with Great Britain and the United States making major concessions.

The present solution of the Polish problem is a case in point. Because the terms of agreement at Yalta were vague, because nothing was pinned down, the very considerable initial concessions made by Great Britain and the United States to Russia at Yalta proved only the beginning. We had to make further concessions before we got through. That kind of diplomacy—diplomacy by capitulation—is destructive both of our interests and of our prestige. We should always be ready to meet the Russians half way. We must insist on no less from them.

Two Bills To Solve Land Problems of Heirs, Aged Indians, and Indian Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make a statement with respect to the bill H. R. 3680, which I introduced today, which provides for the purchase of restricted Indian lands from heirs or from any Indian over 60 years of age.

This bill is an attempt to do something for the land-poor Indian and for the heirship-land problem at one time.

I have been utterly ashamed for the Government of the United States when an old Indian has been brought to my attention who has anywhere from one to a dozen quarter sections of land, yet is without food or clothing because of the restrictions on the sale of his property.

Similarly, I have been disgusted with the growing spider web of entanglement for Indian lands through inheritance of fractionated interests under current policies of the Indian Office which prevent normal division of interests by prohibitions upon patenting and sale.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to buy all such lands in trust for the tribe where such lands are located and authorizes an appropriation for that purpose, and provides that if the Secretary either does not care to buy that land or does not have the money to do so that he must appraise the land and issue a patent in fee that will permit its sale if the owners so desire and have a bona fide prospective purchaser.

Under permission granted by the House, I include the provisions of the bill H. R. 3680 as follows:

A bill to provide for the purchase of restricted Indian lands from heirs or from any Indian over 60 years of age

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, upon request by the owners, is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to purchase restricted lands and improvements thereon, or any part thereof, or interest therein, belonging to the heirs of any deceased Indian or to any Indian 60 years of age. The lands so acquired shall be taken by the United States of America in trust for the Indian tribe of the reservation upon which the lands are located and shall become a part of such reservation, and thereafter shall have the same status as other tribal lands. Conveyance shall be by deed approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs upon the deed forms, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, applying to allotted and inherited lands, but in no case shall the conveyance require the grantor to surrender any right or benefit to which he or she may be entitled as a member of the tribe to which the lands are conveyed.

SEC. 2. Whenever the owner or owners of Indian lands described in section 1 of this act shall request in writing through the superintendent of the reservation on which such lands are located, the Secretary of the

Interior shall cause an appraisal of such lands to be made within 30 days and thereupon he shall notify the owner or owners of that appraised value and with that notification shall make a tender of purchase if he desires to buy the land in trust for the tribe: *Provided*, That if the Secretary, in his discretion, either does not desire to purchase said lands or does not have funds available for that purpose, he shall so state and shall offer to issue a patent in fee to the owner or owners whenever he or they shall file a bona fide offer of purchase equal to or greater than the appraised value, accompanied by a certified check or other satisfactory evidence of ability to pay by the prospective purchaser: *Provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to require any owner to accept a lesser amount from the Government for his land than from any other purchaser when that is in evidence.

SEC. 3. For the purchase of such lands, improvements, and interests therein, the sum of $500,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which funds shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in the expenditure of any funds appropriated as authorized herein, preference shall be given to the purchase of lands on reservations where tribal funds are not available for land purchase. The proceeds of each sale shall be paid to the regularly bonded officer of the proper Indian agency for deposit to the account of the Indian grantor and shall be available for expenditure under the regulations governing the disbursement of that individual's funds.

The other bill which I introduced today is H. R. 3681, a bill to provide for removal of restrictions on property of Indians who served in the armed forces. This bill speaks for itself, and under permission granted, I offer its provisions, as follows:

A bill to provide for removal of restrictions on property of Indians who serve in the armed forces

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, upon application by any Indian who shall have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States in time of war, to remove all restrictions upon the lands, interests in lands, funds, or other property of such Indian, and, if such lands or interests in lands are held by the United States in trust for such Indian, to issue an unrestricted patent in fee therefor. No lands or other property with respect to which restrictions are removed or a patent in fee issued pursuant to this act shall be liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to such removal of restrictions or issuance of patent.

The Special Committee to Investigate Food Shortages

REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN PACE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker has asked me to carry on as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the Food Situation.

This work involves labor which does not make the assignment a happy one, but with the assistance of the six able men on the committee I shall meet the responsibilities to the best of my ability.

The committee will, of course, work as the servant of the House and we welcome the comments and cooperation of every Member.

I am incorporating in my remarks copy of a statement I have issued this morning with regard to the work of the committee:

STATEMENT BY STEPHEN PACE, CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FOOD SHORTAGES

No hearings are scheduled at this time.

Continued studies, contacts, and conferences will be carried on so that the committee may be kept constantly informed of the food situation throughout the country.

The committee today recommended that the provisions of the Patman amendment, removing certain quota limitations on slaughterers, be put into effect immediately. This action should materially increase the meat supply.

The future policy of the committee will be governed by the following objectives:

1. To cooperate with and support the Secretary of Agriculture in his efforts to put into effect the recommendations heretofore made by this committee;

2. To secure better cooperation and coordination among the several agencies exercising authority in the production, processing, and distribution of food;

3. To secure increased production, abundant production, for those commodities now in short supply, and thereby not only insure an ample supply of food, counteract inflationary tendencies, and break the black market, but also hasten the day when supply will equal demand, and controls will no longer be necessary;

4. To investigate and expose black-market operations and submit suggestions for combating this menace, which is not only greatly increasing the cost of food, but denies the people an equal share of the limited supply;

5. To investigate all cases of waste, spoilage, and excess purchases by the different agencies and submit suggestions for the prevention of such practices;

6. To seek to eliminate those orders, rules, and regulations which tend to discourage production, retard distribution, and limit supply;

7. To try to secure adoption of the principle that the armed forces have the first claim on our food supplies, that the next claim rightfully belongs to the American people and that their needs should be met before any shipments to foreign countries are made, except such as are absolutely necessary to meet the calls of humanity.

State Maritime Academies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JULY 9, 1945.

Hon. EUGENE WORLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have seen a report of your Committee on Postwar Training for Officers and Seamen of the Merchant Marine of the United States.

One paragraph thereof speaks of the five State maritime academies located in California, Maine, New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. It speaks of the valuable contribution made by these schools to our merchant marine. They are operated by the States in which they are located with Federal contributions and under Federal supervision.

I am familiar with the New York school located at Fort Schuyler in the Borough of the Bronx, city and State of New York. This school has been in existence for over 70 years and has done an admirable job in training men and officers for our merchant marine.

The report recommends the reduction of officer replacements to two hundred to be graduated annually. The complement of training during the war at the 5 State maritime academies has been about 1,100. Recommendation is now made that the total complement for the five schools after the war be reduced to 750.

It is difficult to understand how this conclusion was reached. I was informed that nobody from the New York State Maritime Academy was called to testify. Nobody from its board of visitors or any of the officers were asked for an opinion. I am also informed that nobody from any of the other maritime academies was asked to testify.

It is hoped, therefore, that opportunity will be given to responsible officers of the academies to appear before your committee before the conclusions reached by it become final. They are in emphatic disagreement with the committee's conclusions.

New York State contemplates the spending of vast sums of money for the enlargement of the curricula. Other States are contemplating vast expenditures for the improvement of their academies. They do not view with complacency the recommendation to reduce the total complement for the five schools after war to 750.

This figure would be ruinous and is unwarranted. These States would refuse to make expenditures for the enlargement of the curricula and buildings if the complement of each academy is so cut.

It is hoped that the conclusions of your committee with reference to the State academies will not be final and that opportunity will be given for these various maritime academy officials to testify before your committee.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a letter from Missouri, in which the writer has something to say about jobs, unemployment, and social security, reads as follows:

WEBSTER GROVES, MO., *July 3, 1945.*

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

Thank you for your reply to our honorable Representative, JOHN (JACK) J. COCHRAN, regarding his proposal on unemployment social security. I do not believe that our worthy, honest, and able JACK COCHRAN realizes that thousands and thousands and thou-

sands of men and boys come in to the cities and metropolitan centers with the idea of only working at public works for a short time to make a stake. They leave a farm community with the firm intention of going back to gather the crops, many times leaving their children or relatives to hoe the weeds out and feed the stock. Most of these persons attach themselves to the labor market only in very good times, the remainder they spend on the farm. These so-called workers during the past 8 years have received unemployment benefits after they have gone to town and worked long enough to be eligible for social-security unemployment, then deliberately either gotten fired or laid off or quit, after which they went back to the rural district and filed and received social-security benefits, claiming that the work offered was too far distant from their domicile to permit them to accept it. Missouri, as you know, is one of the two States in the Union that pays benefits for 2 consecutive years for unemployment under the Social Security Act. I know that my friend, JACK COCHRAN, will admit that it does not take as much to live in Washington or Iron or Reynolds County, Mo., as it does in St. Louis city, Jackson, Cole, or St. Louis County. Also that it costs twice as much to live in Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, Jersey City, and other metropolitan centers as it does at Flat River, Doe Run, Bald Knob, Hollister, Potosi, Van Buren, Salem, Moselle, Ware, Hillsboro, all in rural Missouri. Let us stop burdening taxpayers, workers, and employers with will-o'-the-wisp taxes on pay rolls and otherwise, so we can go ahead and make goods, which means jobs, and so we can make materials at prices the worker can afford; let us try to get and keep this pay-roll and other taxes below 20 percent of the earnings, and we may be able to pay our way out. The enclosed covers a few of the faults of our present Social Security Act.

Very truly yours,

THOS. L. HARRINGTON.

[Enclosure]

SOCIAL-SECURITY, OLD-AGE, AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Many booklets have been published by the Government extolling the merits of social-security, old-age, and survivors' insurance benefits. These benefits are good and welcome to those who qualify. There are, however, payments made by workers who may never receive the benefits they could expect under a private retirement policy. A person at 21 years of age or any other age earlier than 65 can buy retirement insurance for age 65 with an enforceable contract stating that either the cash-surrender value or the premium paid amounts, whichever is greater, will be paid the widow or beneficiary should the annuitant die before reaching 65. There are no restrictions or strings tied to the retirement-insurance contract, the widow may remarry without sacrifice of her benefits, the children's benefits are not jeopardized by becoming 16 or 18 years of age, and they may attend school or work, as they please, and still receive the benefits from papa's contract with the insurance company operating under private enterprise. The worker who pays for the retirement annuity does not have to retire to secure the insurance monthly benefits for which he paid his hard-earned money. He gets them because he has paid for them, and the Federal Government would send the insurance executives to a Federal penitentiary if they failed to pay in accordance with the contract.

Now let us examine the Federal Social Security, Old-Age Act. Does it pay monthly benefits to the widow if she remarries? No. Does it pay monthly benefits if the children reach 16 years of age and do not go to school? No. Does the Government pay social-security benefits after the child reaches 18, even when he continues his desire for education? No. It is possible under social-security, old-age, and survivors insurance for a worker who works from age 21 to 64 to pay or have paid for social-security, old-age benefits the sum of $2,640 in taxes, and if his widow remarries and his children are over 18 years of age, his estate would receive only a small burial benefit. Check this with the amount your estate, your widow, your children, or any designated beneficiary, church or charity, would receive under a private insurance contract. If the worker reaches 65 or any age older and wants to keep on working, he gets nothing under social-security, old-age, and survivors insurance. Check this with the same expenditure or cost under a private retirement annuity policy which pays when age 65 or other designated age is reached.

This act should be amended so as to eliminate some of the delusions and snares with which it abounds. Social security compels the employer to deduct 1 percent from the wages of each and every employee and also to pay an additional 1 percent of each employee's wages for social-security insurance. Let us examine the social-security treatment of a segment of the workers of America, whose wages are assessed 2 percent for social-security benefits, who will likely never receive a dime in return through their social-security accounts. Many young ladies start working between the ages of 17 and 19 years; most of them marry and quit work before they are 26 years of age. These young women pay in sums amounting to millions and millions of dollars toward social-security benefits while they are working for a period of from 2 to 7 years. Their social-security accounts become worthless a few years after they cease working as their average quarterly earnings fail to qualify them under the act. What would our Government do to an insurance company who failed to contract and agree to pay back the cash surrender value or grant a paid-up amount on a like retirement policy? Our Government would prosecute or permit the prosecution of such an insurance fraud and would put the insurance chiseler out of business.

It is time to reform the Social Security Old-Age Insurance Act to provide payment or refund of cash value covering taxes paid on behalf of the worker for old-age benefits. This should be done before we extend the act to take in more taxpayers who may not be eligible for benefits but who will pay billions in taxes which can be used to pay for boondoggling, raking of leaves, and pump priming. Social-security insurance, if it is insurance, should extend benefits to each worker in proportion to the taxes paid by or on behalf of the worker and each person taxed should be assured that his or her estate would be entitled to at least the amount of benefits that would be available under a private enterprise retirement or annuity insurance contract. A worker who is taxed through pay-roll earnings at a percent of his wages for old-age benefits should be guaranteed a benefit amount in relation to the amount of compulsory taxation taken for such benefits.

WAGNER-DINGELL BILL

The cost of the proposed social-security benefits is unknown but the press states that to make certain changes in social security to include hospital and illness benefits the tax rate on the employee's pay would be changed from 1 percent, the present rate, to 4 percent and a like increase would be charged to the employer.

An example of the cost of this experiment in social welfare might be made by comparing it with the present cost of illness and hospital insurance now available through private enterprise. It would cost a person earning $225 per month 8 percent of his pay or $180 per year, half of which would be deducted from his wage or salary check. The amount of hospital or illness benefits in the proposed bill are vague; the press states hospital benefits would be for 60 days. The cost of accident and health insurance and hospitalization insurance in large responsible Government-regulated insurance companies is available in group form for the following costs:

	Per year
$30 weekly benefit for illness and accident cost	$27
$5 daily hospital benefit for 70-day period, plus $25 for laboratory, medicines, X-ray, and other charges, plus up to $150 surgical reimbursement cost	12
Total cost for above benefits	39

Hospital benefits as outlined above are paid for 70 days just as many times in a year as the employee may need it, provided his physician or surgeon find it necessary for his health or improvement, and he may go to any hospital and into any room or ward he may select and receive the daily benefits in cash payable to him, and this means that a veteran could go to a Government hospital at no cost to him and receive up to $350 for hospital-room charges under the private plans now available through insurance channels. Check these benefits carefully and note their cost, compare them with the additional tax about to be deducted from your pay check. You will discover that a promise by Government may cost many, many times the cost of an enforceable contract with a reliable insurance company operated under Government jurisdiction. It is not necessary for you to have your illness or accident approved by a politician in Washington before obtaining benefits under the private policy available and in force in many industrial concerns. When a contract is purchased from a private enterprise insurance company it cannot be changed by the insurance company as long as payments are made. Any Government insurance plan may be changed at the will of Congress.

The Polish Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram and statement of the Polish-American Congress:

JUNE 29, 1945.

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Independence, Mo.:

The Polish-American Congress, actually in session in Washington, has just learned with the deepest sorrow that the recognition by our United States of the new version of the Soviet-sponsored Polish Lublin Government is imminent and, in fact, only awaits your final decision, Mr. President.

On behalf of 6,000,000 loyal Americans of Polish descent, we beseech you, Mr. President, to postpone your decision, which, in our opinion, would be tantamount to giving your approval to the virtual extinction of Poland's independence on the eve of our own Independence Day, the Fourth of July. By recognizing a Soviet-appointed Communist set-up we would participate in sealing the doom of heroic Poland, whose death would thus become the price we have to pay Russia. The so-called provisional Government of Poland as announced today is the same Soviet puppet government which

had been justly denied American recognition, with only addition of three men dragged into submission at the very moment when the fighting men of the Polish underground were put into Soviet jails and the fighting men of Poland's Army abroad are being deprived of their country after their glorious fight for our common cause. This new version of the Soviet-sponsored puppet set-up in Poland is a sinister mockery of the Yalta compromise in which our late President put so much faith as the means of saving Poland's independence. No free and unfettered elections could be held in Poland under the rule of Soviet bayonets, Soviet police, and Soviet puppets.

We beseech you, Mr. President, to postpone your decision at least until you permit us personally to submit to you the details of this tragic case.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish-American Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DECLARATION OF POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC., ON PRESENT POLISH SITUATION

The Polish-American Congress held its regular quarterly meeting in Washington on June 28 and 29. President Rozmarek and other officers submitted reports on their activities since the last regular meeting held April 13, 1945.

Since its incorporation in Illinois, the Polish-American Congress has organized 28 divisions in the following states: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The Polish-American Congress noted also with deep satisfaction that its ties with the 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent which it represents, have been greatly strengthened through the wholehearted cooperation of all the big fraternal organizations (Polish National Alliance, Polish Roman Catholic Union, Polish Women's Alliance, and others) the 1,000 Polish parishes in America, all the 9 daily Polish-language newspapers and 85 Polish-language publications.

Conscious of its responsibility to 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent whom it represents, the Polish-American Congress expresses its views as follows:

1. The victorious end of the war in Europe and the unconditional surrender of Germany and her satellites, is a matter of deep satisfaction and pride for all Americans, conscious that the mighty effort of all the American people has made this victory possible. The elimination of the European theater of war now allows the American people to look forward to a speedy and complete victory over Japan.

2. In defense of its own safety the United States has been forced to take up arms and actively to participate in two world wars in the course of the last 25 years. This proves that in the present time of scientific development, the American people are no longer safe from aggression from the outside; and that, although our aims are peaceful, circumstances force us to become directly involved in any major conflict.

3. The problem of security of the United States has therefore become one of paramount importance to all American people. The Polish-American Congress adopts the watchword "American Security First" as its basic aim.

Recent developments have established beyond any doubt that American security has now become dependent on world security. Hence, the United States can only remain secure in a united world, in which all nations, great and small, willingly contribute their part toward the essential goal of a just and durable peace in proportion to their means and possibilities.

4. It is the firm conviction of all Americans of Polish descent that such a peace, based on democratic principles of freedom and justice for all individuals and nations, can only be achieved under active American leadership.

5. The Americans of Polish descent are conscious of the enormous power for good which the United States has now acquired through the joint loyal effort of all the American people working together unremittingly throughout these hard years of war toward the achievement of victory of the forces of democratic decency over the evil forces of totalitarian aggressive imperialism and militarism. This unprecedented power of the United States is constituted by its almost unlimited possibilities of production, its best trained and equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world, by the unlimited spirit of sacrifice of the American people at home to contribute labor and capital to the attainment of the common goal. All these elements of victory, but especially the splendid fighting spirit which inspires our boys to risk their young lives on foreign lands in order that American security and world peace could become realities, were born of the impulse driving all Americans in their common effort in the name of the noble principles of freedom and justice, of the rule of law and order, and right over might. These noble principles were solemnly declared at the outset of this war to be the fundamental aims of the American people and were embodied in the Atlantic Charter and in the Declaration of the United Nations.

6. On the basis of careful observation, the Polish-American Congress views with apprehension the present trend of our American foreign policy It notes with deep concern that the high principles in defense of which this country entered the war, are being abandoned in the great task of the establishment of a world system of security and peace. They are being abandoned at the time when their fullest application is imperative if American security and world peace is to be effectively ensured.

7. The Polish-American Congress has closely followed, through its observers at the San Francisco Conference, the evolution of that Conference. It is compelled regretfully to admit that at this momentous gathering on a world security organization, it was apparent to all present that American leadership did not assert itself. Concepts of power politics were allowed to take the lead, while the principles for which America stands, were sacrificed to concepts of power which alone cannot be the foundations of a sound peace, especially if they demand the abandonment of principles of human freedom and justice. The cynical slogan that agreement among the big powers could not be sacrificed to ideals, became the keynote of that Conference. It holds no promise for a durable peace. After the lengthy and depressing Conference at San Francisco, the Charter shows that practically all these principles have been sacrificed to the pressure of one non-democratic power, supported by a handful of its satellites and glamorized by skillful propaganda.

8. The fact that the United States did not insist at San Franciso, that the legal government of Poland be invited to participate in the Conference—although it has fully recognized it as the legal constitutional government of Poland throughout all the years of its existence and common, bloody struggle—is a regrettable act which most unfortunately had been generally interpreted as a sign of readiness to sacrifice democratic principles to totalitarian pressure.

9. The strong position acquired by the United States as a result of this war, opens to it exceptional possibilities and places upon it vast responsibilities as a world power for justice, peace, and democracy. The advantages of the United States deriving from the political and moral assets which it now holds, are especially important in regard to the problems of American security and must not be wasted. The Polish-American Congress notes with regret that the power of the United States is not being made use of as a means of persuasion in international negotiations.

10. No problem has been handled with such utter disregard for the rules of justice, legality, democracy, and individual freedom as the problem of Poland. And yet, she was the first to fight, the only one among the countries overrun by Hitler which produced no quisling, and her Allied loyalty throughout this war was unassailable, her war effort was out of all proportions to her means, and elicited from President Roosevelt the high comment that she is the "inspiration of nations." The 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent have followed the developments of the treatment of Poland very closely and have come to the conclusion that the cause of Poland has been dragged down from the heights of the principles declared in the Atlantic Charter, to the depths of unwarranted appeasement through continuous compromises on the part of her Allies—at Teheran, later at Yalta, until the final and most complete appeasement made by our govenmental envoy specially sent to Moscow, which after his return, contrary to the truth, was hailed as a "triumph of successful negotiations of the Polish problem." Contrary to these enthusiastic comments, the fact remains that the United States has remained indifferent to the sinister farce of the show trial of the 16 Polish political leaders and allowed the greatest humiliation that can be inflicted on a valiant and faithful ally to be meted out to the Polish people, no less attached to their freedom and human rights than our American people.

11. At Teheran the partition of Poland was first contemplated. From all declarations and conversations with the highest American officials the Polish-American Congress was led to believe after the Yalta meeting, where the seizure by Russia of almost half of Poland was agreed to by the United States, that this unfair and high price had to be paid to save Poland's real independence.

It was hoped that a new provisional body would be formed which would ultimately lead to a free expression of the will of the Polish Nation. However, the new body created in Moscow has all the earmarks of a conspiracy to frustrate the decisions reached at Yalta and to present the United Nations with a new distorted but accomplished fact made in Russia. Out of 21 members of the new government, 18 are Communists or Communist sponsored, definitely pledged to carry out a program of stifling the free will of the people and to force communism upon Poland. This is not what President Roosevelt had agreed to at Yalta; it does not fulfill any of our expectations nor can it be accepted by the American people as a happy beginning of a solution.

It is our unhappy lot today to oppose the new government in Poland as a Communist-controlled Moscow clique, which has accepted three individuals outside their organization, merely to create a too crude semblance of free decision. Mr. Mikolajczyk and Mr. Stanczyk have been chosen, because they have been in the United States where they were warmly greeted only because of what they then represented. Their inclusion and the assignment of insignificant positions to them is calculated to deceive and confuse Americans of Polish origin, as well as the American public opinion.

The inclusion of nine non-Communist Poles into the so-called national committee, is a further step in an effort to confuse and deceive American public opinion. As in Russia, where the executive committee of the Communist Party, composed of anonymous members, has been the governing body of Soviet Russia, so have Russian agents created a national committee in Poland, composed of 300 members whose names are un-

known, as are those of the Russians. To add 9 names to 300 nameless agents is undoubtedly a Moscow trick calculated to divert the attention of the American people from the true situation.

12. As an American organization, the Polish-American Congress has no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of Poland. However, it is not only attached to Poland, the country of its forefathers, but, above all, to the dignity of our United States, the land of true democracy, to which our ancestors came mainly to escape the dictatorial oppression of German and imperialistic rule. Americans of Polish descent cannot admit that the noble principles of President Woodrow Wilson, which helped in the reestablishment of Poland's independence after the last war, should, within 26 years, be disavowed by a series of back-room compromises, resulting in a renewed partition of Poland and enslavement of her people.

13. The Polish-American Congress asks its Government why the countries liberated by British-American forces, like France, Belgium, Holland, and even the ex-enemy country of Italy, have immediately been turned over to governments of those countries without imposing puppet governments and are being helped in their rehabilitation, while Poland alone among the United Nations has been handed over with the sanction of Great Britain and the United States to its rapacious neighbor? Why has Poland been partitioned? Why is she being governed by a Soviet-appointed group of Comintern agents? Why is Poland controlled and tortured by the Soviet political police? Why is the so-called Polish Army now being formed there, partly manned and entirely commanded by Soviet Russian commanders? Why has the legal Polish Government not been allowed freely to exercise its administration in Poland, although it has uninterruptedly led Poland's incomparable underground Allied army, recognized as a combatant Allied force, and through its official representatives in the Polish underground state has succeeded in keeping that country in the unique position of never collaborating with the enemy and of never faltering in its struggle against the Germans or in its Allied loyalty? Why have the Polish people never been consulted on matters concerning Poland? Does our American Government sincerely consider that there is any possibility of holding in Poland "free and unfettered elections," with the participation of all political parties, in a country occupied by Soviet troops and controlled by Soviet political police and run by a Soviet-controlled government?

14. It is difficult to imagine that our United States would ever endorse such a situation as that in which the Polish Nation finds itself at present without vigorously protesting and insisting that it be redressed.

15. The Polish-American Congress dedicated itself to the defense of the principles of the Atlantic Charter when in May 1944 at Buffalo, N. Y., over 3,000 delegates pledged in the name of 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent to defend America and Poland. Since then in all its pronouncements and acts, and particularly in the memorandum to the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, of May 30, 1944, in its resolution adopted in Chicago, Ill. (March 9, 1945), after the publication of the Yalta Agreement, and in its memorandum submitted at San Francisco to the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, on May 11, 1945, the Polish-American Congress staunchly defended the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The Polish-American Congress is firmly determined never to stop fighting for the survival of this, the most noble expression of American ideals. The Polish-American Congress is firmly determined to defend the cause of Poland with all its might and all the legal means at its disposal in the true spirit of American democracy.

16. The Polish-American Congress regards the acquiescence by the United States Government in any unjust solution of the Polish problem which wrongs the Polish nation, as an act of the gravest consequence and one fraught with considerable danger for the future peace and security of the United States. The Polish question has become the acid-test case of American principles and the way in which it will be solved will create an important precedent which may either enhance or diminish the moral prestige of the United States in the world.

17. Representing 6,000,000 Americans fervently attached to American principles of legality, the Polish-American Congress continues to regard the present constitutional Polish Government in London as the only legal Polish Government. It could not regard as a Polish government the Communist Soviet-sponsored Lublin group. It will adopt a similar attitude toward the government now set up in Moscow, which is in fact a new version of that same Lublin government, destined to function under continued Soviet Communist control, pressure and terrorism. The only difference will be the addition of a few individuals driven by coercion into submission.

No window dressing and sugar coating can make the servile Soviet puppets more palatable to the democratic American public opinion.

When Italy went Fascist, there were millions of Italian-born Americans who opposed Mussolini's Italy. The United States later on found out that these Italian-Americans were right. Their role in this war has shown that their opposition to their homeland under Fascist rule became a great asset to the United States, which had at that time recognized Mussolini and his rule.

We had no German fifth column in America because many German-Americans were against Hitler's rule in their homeland. This opposition became an asset to the United States—although our Government recognized and dealt with Hitler Germany.

A representative government can be set up in Poland only by the Polish people. This can only happen when the Soviet armies and Soviet political police are withdrawn from Poland; when Polish war refugees, exiles, and military forces now abroad are returned to Poland without fear of imprisonment or bloody reprisals; and when the Polish nation is allowed in fact to become master in its own house and freely to organize its own existence.

The Americans of Polish descent have always unstintingly given their blood, their labor, and their earnings, especially in this world war, for the greatness and safety of the United States in the firm conviction that the principles declared by the President of our great democracy as our war aims, were not empty slogans to be scrapped at the crucial time of the establishment of peace.

The Polish-American Congress insistently asks for justice for Poland and other downtrodden European countries now overrun by Soviet imperialism and misrepresented as liberated countries.

The Polish-American Congress insistently urges its Government to withhold recognition of any illegally formed, imposed, or puppet governments, such as the provisional government now manufactured in Moscow and imposed upon the Polish Nation.

It would be contrary to American tradition, American principles and American sense of justice and to the pledges given by our Government on behalf of the United States to recognize or accept any territorial changes unilaterally carried out without consulting the nations involved, and imposition or changes of governments, constitutions, social, or economic systems achieved by force or without the freely expressed will of the nations truly liberated from foreign occupation and oppression.

Polish-American Congress, Inc.: Charles Rozmarek, president; Mrs. H. B. Wolowska, vice president; Dr. T. A. Starzynski, vice president; John Mikuta, vice president; Fr. Januszewski, vice president; John J. Olejniczak, treasurer; S. A. Gutowski, secretary; directors: Stanley E. Czaster, S. W. Warakomski, W. S. Pytko, John Smolenski, B. Jaroszewski, J. Pawloski, Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. P. Bona, B. Filipiak, John Stanek, Felix Poplawski, Lucjan Kajko, Franciszek X. Rydzewski, Jozef Piech; chairman of committees: Rev. Martin Lipinski, Hon. Blair F. Gunther, Miss Janina Palczynska, Ignatius Nurkiewicz, Walter Poranski, Victor Alski.

Emergency Treatment of Shell-Shocked Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on the Fourth of July, a shell-shocked veteran of Guadalcanal, requiring emergency treatment, was peremptorily turned away without treatment at the Walter Reed Army Hospital by a sergeant in charge of the receiving ward.

The reason that he was denied treatment at this Army hospital, so it is reported in the public prints, was because Walter Reed is an Army hospital and that this suffering veteran of Guadalcanal was a marine.

There is no doubt in the world but that the case was one of an emergency character and that the marine was in dire need of treatment and attention, for half an hour later, when he sought access to the Mount Alto Veterans' Administration Facility, his case was so diagnosed. And the treatment he required was promptly supplied.

The question which now arises and which should most certainly be decided is, Should soldiers under such circumstances be turned away from naval hospitals, should sailors be denied admittance to Army hospitals, should marines be denied admission to public-health hospitals, just because the patient did not happen to be of the service which the particular institution was created to serve?

Should not a public hospital, yea, even a private hospital, supply emergency treatment in all emergency cases, leaving to the future the ascertainment of the appropriate institution for the transfer of the patient? Do not simple humanitarian considerations require that such treatment be extended not only to former servicemen but to civilians as well? What justification can there be for allowing men to writhe, perhaps die, on the steps of our public institutions?

And that seems to be what happened at Walter Reed on the Fourth of July, that day of all days.

I did not realize that that could happen to an American who has given his best in the service of his country on the battlefield. That a former serviceman should be turned away while undergoing a paroxysm resulting from shell shock cannot be justified in the estimation of right-thinking people on legalistic grounds.

Of all of the various types of wounded veterans, the man suffering from shell shock is in many ways the most tragic and pathetic, and my heart is very much with them. I have seen too many of them go to pieces in public places, with the consequent embarrassment and humiliation which follows. That any hospital institution should turn its back upon one who has such claims upon the gratitude of his country is simply outrageous.

In order that this tragedy shall never be reenacted at any Government hospital, that which occurred at Walter Reed should be thoroughly investigated by the House of Representatives' Committee on Military Affairs, and an appropriate humanitarian policy worked out, one which will turn away none who are in need of immediate treatment of an emergency character whether he be soldier or civilian.

Independence Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks I made at the Fourth of July exercises at Winchendon, Mass., July 4, 1945:

Since it was in towns like Winchendon all over this great Nation of ours that liberty has been nurtured and cherished since the early founders first proclaimed it to the world, it is particularly fitting that we should meet here today and in these indeed moving exercises celebrate the birthday of our American independence. Needless to say I am highly honored to be here on this most impressive occasion.

Since that stirring day when the freedom-loving colonists, battling with a sublime spirit of sacrifice and gallantry, threw off the shackles of tyranny and instituted a free government in this Nation, America has enjoyed a measure of freedom and happiness never given in all history to the rank and file of the people of any nation. Through crisis, struggle, sacrifice, and war American liberty has been preserved from tyrants and dictators. Our great goal has been independence—independence as a nation and independence as individuals. These great social and political ends have been the very soul of our country because here in America, under the unsurpassed form of government established by the immortal founders, men and women are born free, may live free so long as they obey the law, and may transmit this freedom which is not equaled in any country on earth to their children and descendants.

The illustrious men who founded this Nation were men of vision and clear thought. They possessed noble ideals but they never lost sight of the realities of life. The system they set up, with comparatively few basic changes, has endured through the years, and is as responsive to our needs today as it was on the day of its creation. It has lived through many trials but it has survived them all. It has been and is challenged by doubters, cynics, and radicals but the institutions which these great men molded into a solid compact over 160 years ago have met every test and will endure throughout the ages as the best, most effective, and most forward-looking means of resolving the problems of the individual citizen and maintaining free government.

The early founders knew that the nation that does not possess independence is a slave nation, that the individual that does not possess independence is himself a slave. They knew that the nation that is governed by another is a subject nation, that the man whose will is controlled by another is a puppet and a minion. Yes, indeed, independence is the very soul of America, one of the most precious attributes of our Nation and individual character which, from time immemorial, our people have valued more than life. So we should thank God for this great and glorious Independence Day that made our people free, for these matchless political institutions which have permitted us to live under representative democracy in happiness and prosperity throughout all these years.

And now, my friends, after all the trials and struggles of history, we have come to the greatest crisis of all in the affairs of our Nation, the outcome of which will determine whether we will continue to live as free men, whether we will live as citizens of a free country or as slaves and subjects of a totalitarian superstate; whether we are to retain our matchless form of government, our free initiative, our free enterprise for capital and labor, and our free American way of life, or whether we will surrender to the domination and control of some alien-minded, un-American philosophy that would convert our Government into an economic dictatorship.

We are making gratifying progress and headway with the war. Our gallant boys have already forged a smashing victory over the Nazi hordes and are on their way, believe me, to pound the Japs into complete submission. But while they are so engaged and while our people at home are resolutely fixing all their efforts and aims upon winning this great and terrible world conflict, dangerous internal enemies are attacking our liberties and plotting to overthrow and destroy our democracy and all our cherished American institutions. Call them by any name you will—call them Fascists, or Communists, or Bundists, or internationalists preaching the radical doctrines of Karl Marx—they are all moving toward the same end, the destruction of our American democracy and the substitution therefor of a regimented economic and social order which would stifle freedom, suppress the rights of the individual, nullify the American Constitution, stultify the immortal Declaration of Independence, and impose a ruthless economic tyranny upon the rank and file of the American people.

We are told by competent observers that much of Europe is in shambles—that poverty, social disorder, and starvation stalk on every hand. Radical governments are taking over control everywhere, so it seems. The United Nations have fought for democracy but have obtained antidemocracy instead—fascism, communism, revolutionary socialism, and the Lord knows what else. Now this is all very lamentable and, as Americans, we deplore it, and we are going to do everything we can, short of ruining our own country, and our own economy, to try to correct these terrible conditions. We have already sent billions of dollars' worth of food, clothing, and supplies to these afflicted peoples, and we have made it very clear that we intend to continue to render every possible assistance to the afflicted and the starving, the aged, the helpless, the children, and innocent victims of war and social disorder promoted by radicals coming in its wake. We have done more than this. We have moved expeditiously to salvage something out of all this terrible human wreckage and political and economic destruction that is scattered over most of Europe. We have taken the leadership in setting up a security organization to prevent future wars and maintain a durable peace so that the sacrifices and bloodshed of our young men and the countless millions of young men everywhere who have spilled their blood and sacrificed their lives in this great holocaust may not be in vain.

I think I am speaking accurately when I say that an overwhelming number of our people approve of the action we have taken to relieve the starving and to bind up the wounds of war and to seek to keep a permanent peace in this world. And I think it is also clear that we intend, without endangering the health of our own people and without jeopardizing the stability of our own political and economic institutions, to continue to hold out a helping hand so that these war-ridden nations may be able to get back on their own feet and establish stable, prosperous, well-ordered democratic governments of their own choosing. We cannot permit radical tyranny, or any other form of tyranny, to destroy the ideal of self-determination for which so many American boys have given their lives because this course would inevitably lead to another and unspeakable world war that might well obliterate civilized life.

These things are fundamental, yet we should ponder well and carefully as we gaze upon the ruins of the once glorious traditions and culture of some great European nations. We should ask ourselves, how can we avoid suffering the same fate that has come to them, how can we shape our governmental policies so as to avoid the impact of growing radical discontent fomented by those working for an international superstate, how can we maintain the health, security, and political stability of our own Nation in the face of the turmoil and chaos that spreads over much of the world today.

In my opinion, America can and will avoid the shoals of political and economic destruction onto which so many other so-called democratic nations were lured by the siren cry of those preaching doctrines of hate and discord under the guise of economic plenty and universal prosperity. First, we must not permit these obnoxious hates that have characterized European class struggles and strivings for economic dictatorship to come into our midst. We must zealously pursue our religious teachings and the precepts of our own Constitution and Declaration of Independence which accords to every man, woman, and child, regardless of race, class, creed, or station in life those God-given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to fullest opportunity under the law to work out their own salvation, to secure a decent standard of living for themselves and their families, to educate their children, to be secure in their health and well-being and to have the same chance that every American has to develop their individual capacity and talents and to strive for their own place in the sun. Secondly, we must be more resolute than ever in our determination to preserve at all costs the basic foundations of the Government, the Bill of Rights, free religious toleration, free initiative and enterprise, and those creative forces indigenous to the American

system which have contributed so vastly to our development and progress as a nation. Thirdly, we must reemphasize our insistence that whereas we stand ready and willing at all times to correct abuses that may exist in our system that we do not intend to abandon our form of government or our economic system and that we will combat and fight with all means within our power the encroachment of fascism, communism, or any other ism alien and hostile to American institutions.

As I said before, the war will go on to a victorious conclusion—there are trials ahead and there are dangers ahead which may make the way difficult. But our gallant boys are fighting desperately to save that liberty enthroned by the aroused colonists of 1776. These boys must have our full and unstinted support in thought, word and action. And they must also have the assurance that we, of the home front, are sustaining for them while they are away the great immutable principles and noble ideals for which they fight, that we are combating radicalism and subversion, that we are keeping our America strong, powerful and vibrant, the kind of an America that can take care of itself and all its own people and thus hold out promise and hope to all the afflicted peoples of the world.

On this great day of deliverance, on this glorious Fourth, the birthday of our Nation, let us reecho the stirring words of the great Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, "I have sworn eternal enmity toward every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Let us wage undying battle, to preserve our own country as a citadel of freedom, let us strive, work and fight for the great aims we all so ardently desire—speedy victory, the prompt return of our boys, a just durable peace, grateful treatment of our immortal veterans and full opportunity for all in the America of the future.

Soldiers of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Soldiers of Science":

SOLDIERS OF SCIENCE

Without taking away one bit of the glory due the soldier in battle, it may not be too much to say that this war is being won by men who labored years ago in laboratories and over drafting boards to discover new products and new processes. The world conflict may have been decided by synthetic rubber, high octane gasoline, radar, new methods in airplane construction, better ways of firing projectiles, or an improvement in the construction of ships. We all owe a great debt to these soldiers of science.

It seems a far cry from war to a quiet chemist in a smelly room working to discover the mystery of the molecules that made possible the manufacture of rubber from petroleum. Yet our national leaders knew when the Japs captured the rubber trees of the Dutch East Indies that we were very near to defeat. Then Government called upon business to make available all its knowledge on synthetic rubber and business and a big B responded marvelously. If it had not been for our free enterprise system that permitted corporations to grow large and rich through profits so that they could afford to spend millions for industrial research, we would not have known how to make rubber when the life of our Nation was at stake. Government bureaucrats and little business could not have done it.

A new voice is growing louder in business and it is the voice of scientific research. American business in 1940 was spending about $300,000,000 a year on research in 2,350 establishment with 70,000 scientists and helpers employed. "Boss" Kettering, research director of General Motors, says that his staff is working 10 to 15 years ahead of production. His laboratories are now developing improvements and conveniences which will make life better for the people in 1955 and 1960 as well as provide new jobs for labor and new opportunities of profit for capital.

Not only big business but small business must keep alert and aware of changing conditions or they may find themselves far outdistanced by competitors who have found new materials and new devices and new substitutes for raw materials that may decide the race for trade.

Military leaders, while joining in the prayers for peace, tell us that the only way we can prevent another attack by some ruthless would-be world conqueror is for our scientists to stay so far ahead of other countries on new methods and new implements of war that no one will dare to invade us.

Progress of business in the wonderful postwar period with all its new inventions, as well as our national security, will depend largely upon our soldiers of science. Truly, it has been said that facts are our scarcest raw material.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

Inside Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am including an editorial entitled "International Labor Council," by Jim Brady, in the Inside Washington column:

INSIDE WASHINGTON
(By Jim H. Brady)

INTERNATIONAL LABOR COUNCIL

The Economic Council of the new World Organization will have within its structure a special labor-relations group. This will be a supercommittee established to iron out labor problems on an international scale.

For 30 years there has been a crying need for such a set-up, to be handled on an international scale.

To protect labor and management, certain international wage scales should be established in order to prevent increased unemployment caused by low-paid immigrant wage scales. It is easy to understand why management takes advantages of immigrants by employing them at wages far below our American union standard.

This labor committee, within the Economic Council, can accomplish much toward preventing another war. By organization and cooperation all labor groups in the world could be organized in a common effort to prevent the hidden production of war materials by ambitious nations.

The International Labor Organization formed as a part of the old League of Nations was only an excuse for the real answer to solving labor problems on a global scale. ILO dared not strike at the establishment of cartels by capital. This new outfit in the Council can prevent the formation of cartels, better known as world monopolies.

Certain world-wide corporations will be against this labor unit of the Organization. The leaders of such companies realize that a well-organized world labor council means the end of cartels, low wages, and certain trade barriers.

President Truman is a strong supporter of an international labor group. However, he points out that this committee must not take advantage of its authority and power by imposing undue requirements on management. The President is confident that only by a well-balanced economy can the world live in peace.

FEPC ACT DOOMED

It is fair to establish a Fair Employment Practice Committee. However, the legislation now before Congress asking for authority to make the FEPC Act law will never reach the floor of Congress.

To begin with, this FEPC Act is unfair. It is dangerous. It does not tend to protect the workingman. The act would give certain minorities complete control over employment.

The Republicans have pledged themselves to the measure. The Democrats have taken the same action. However, after reading the bill they fear it to such an extent that they are keeping it off the docket.

Most of the lawmakers favor an FEPC. At the same time they are against FEPC legislation because it could force employers to give positions to anyone the Committee might recommend. Several Congressmen have stated that such a law is contrary to our democratic form of government.

German Priest Saves GI From Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article printed in the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph on June 29, 1945. It follows:

Pvt. Louis V. Crain, a former prisoner of war, who is spending a 30-day convalescent furlough with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ira Crain, 711 Highland, perhaps owes his life to a German priest, who found the Alton man after he had escaped from his guards, lying desperately ill of pneumonia along a roadside in Germany and nursed him until he was rescued by American soldiers.

During mid-April, while Private Crain was on a march from one prison camp to another, he broke away from the group of prisoners and attempted to reach American lines. In a weakened condition, from lack of food and exposure, he became ill of pneumonia and could go no further. A German priest discovered the soldier and took him to his home, where he and the other villagers treated him kindly and gave Private Crain the best of care they could under the circumstances.

Private Crain was rescued 2 weeks later, May 2, by American troops. He was taken to a rest camp in France, then brought to Wakeman General Hospital, Camp Atterbury,

Ind., where he was given a furlough to come home June 6. He will return to Wakeman, July 6, but expects to receive another 30-day furlough after he is given a thorough check-up at the hospital.

Just a few days ago Private Crain's mother received a letter, written May 3, by Pfc. Sterling M. Johnson, one of the soldiers who rescued her son. Private First Class Johnson had hoped his letter would reach Mrs. Crain to tell her the details of her son's rescue before the Red Cross informed her, but the letter, sent regular mail, was delayed en route. He told of finding Private Crain in an upstairs bedroom at the priest's home, and assured her that although he had been seriously ill, he was in fair condition when discovered and would be all right because he was turned over to the Red Cross. Private First Class Johnson said he and his buddies gave the Alton man cigarettes, rations, and chocolate candy. He also told of good care Private Crain had received from the German civilians. Private Crain already has answered the letter of Private First Class Johnson.

Formerly a member of the One Hundred and Sixth Infantry Division, Private Crain was captured December 21 in Germany. He was employed at Kinzel Flower Shop prior to entering service in April 1941.

Air Transportation System in America Should Be Extended Promptly to Smaller Cities and Towns—Requests for Service Are Listed—House Concurrent Resolution 64 Would Express Intent of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, I introduced in the House Concurrent Resolution 64, providing that the Congress hereby expresses itself as approving expansion of the air transportation system in the United States so that it will include not only the large cities but also, through feeder-line service, the greatest practicable number of smaller cities and towns.

The United States has the best air transportation system in the world but it must be vastly expanded to meet the need of our people. At present this system covers only 360 cities and towns and serves only about one-third of our population. This service cannot be called adequate.

Pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board are applications to extend air service to over 2,500 additional communities from coast to coast. Most of these communities are eager and anxious to embrace this service and stand ready to do whatever is necessary to get it.

It appears, however, that the program for the expansion of our domestic air-transportation system has reached a point where the inclusion of smaller cities and towns may depend on a vigorous expression by the Congress that it is interested in seeing them get direct air service wherever it is practicable. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this resolution.

It has never been the intention of Congress to limit our air-transportation system to a relatively few major cities, although the trend in air-line development, as aircraft have become faster and larger, has been unmistakably in that direction.

Lest it be forgotten, Congress in 1938 enacted the Experimental Air Mail Act for the purpose of finding a satisfactory means of providing the benefits and advantages of direct air-mail service to small cities and towns. Under this act the Post Office Department established two experimental routes covering 56 communities to test the practicability of providing such service by the air pick-up system. After a year's trial this system was pronounced successful by the Postmaster General, who recommended its establishment on a permanent basis.

Accordingly, the Congress in 1940 repealed the Experimental Air Mail Act in order to give the Civil Aeronautics Board unquestioned jurisdiction over the development of this system and others which might be created to perform this service.

The air pick-up system is in its seventh year of operation. In that time it has become self-sustaining and is now producing a substantial profit to the Post Office Department, demonstrating conclusively the need of small communities for air service and the fact that they will support it.

The Civil Aeronautics Board in 1943 conducted an investigation of the possibility of expanding the domestic air transportation system through local feeder pick-up routes and in its report the Board indicated that additional congressional action was needed in order to enable it to proceed. The Board's report, however, made no specific recommendation as to what additional legislation is necessary.

In my opinion, the Congress, in repealing the Experimental Air Mail Act had no thought of abandoning the benefits and advantages of direct air service to small communities. Further, I am of the opinion that the Civil Aeronautics Act gives both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Post Office Department sufficient authority to proceed with the expansion of our domestic air transportation system to include the smaller, as well as larger, cities and towns, and that no additional legislation is required.

There is, Mr. Speaker, urgent need for this expansion. Congress at this session undoubtedly will approve an airport program providing for either the establishment or the improvement of 3,000 airports throughout the country, mostly in our smaller communities. This development lends itself to the broadening of air transportation to our smaller cities and towns and should go hand-in-hand with a comprehensive plan to provide air service to these places.

The passage of Concurrent Resolution 64 will be notice that this action is the intent of the Congress and, I am sure, will provide the necessary impetus for further expansion of air service.

For the information and assistance of my colleagues, I have attempted to make a breakdown of the applications for new routes which are pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board to show the cities and towns in their own districts to which air service has been proposed. Considering the number of applications and communities involved this has been a sizable task and while there may be some omissions and errors in the list that I have compiled, it will serve to disclose how congressional districts and States are individually affected by these plans for additional air service.

These follow:

CITIES AND TOWNS WITHIN A STATE, LISTED BY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, TO WHICH AIR SERVICE HAS BEEN PROPOSED

ALABAMA

First District: Grove Hill, Demopolis.

Second District: Andalusia, Troy, Greenville, Brewton.

Third District: Auburn, Opelika, Eufaula, Phenix City.

Fourth District: Anniston, Jacksonville, Pell City, Piedmont, Talladega, Selma.

Fifth District: Alabama City, Albertville, Alexander City, Attalla, Boaz, Fort Payne, Gadsden, Guntersville.

Sixth District: Tuscaloosa.

Seventh District: Cordova, Cullman, Jasper, Oneonta, Hamilton.

Eighth District: Athens, Bridgeport, Courtland, Decatur, Florence, Hartselle, Muscle Shoals, Sheffield, Tuscumbia.

Ninth District: Leeds.

ARIZONA

Nogales, Yuma.

ARKANSAS

First District: Forrest City, Harrisburg, Helena, Jonesboro, Marianna, Paragould, Piggott, Rector, Wynne.

CALIFORNIA

First District: Arcata, Belvedere, Corte Madera, Chico, Cloverdale, Cresent City, Eureka, Fairfax, Fort Bragg, Fortuna, Gridley, Healdsburg, Lakeport, Marysville, Mill Valley, Orland, Petaluma, San Anselmo, San Rafael, Santa Rosa, Sausilito, Sebastopol, Ukiah, Willitts, Yuba City, Durham, Oroville, Scotia.

Second District: Anderson, Auburn, Corning, Dunsmuir, Lincoln, Mount Shasta, Roseville, Red Bluff, Redding, Weed, Yreka.

Third District: Benicia, Davis, Dixon, Fairfield, Lodi, Manteca, Napa, Ripon, Stockton, Tracy, Vacaville, Vallejo, Woodland.

Sixth District: Antioch, Concord, Crockett, Martinez, Pittsburgh, Richmond, Walnut Creek.

Seventh District: Centerville, Hayword, Livermore, Niles, Pleasanton, Newark.

Eighth District: Burlingame, Gilroy, Hollister, Los Gatos, Menlo Park, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Redwood City, San Jose, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Sunnyvale, Watsonville, Cupertino, Los Altos, Mayfield, Soquil.

Ninth District: Chowchilla, Kingsbury, Madera, Merced, Modesto, Reedley, Sanger, Selma, Turlock.

Tenth District: Corcoron, Delano, Dinuba, Exeter, Hanford, Lindsay, Porterville, Taft, Tulare, Visalia, Wasco, Maricopa, Fellows.

Eleventh District: Atascadero, Carmel, Fillmore, Gonzales, King City, Ojai, Oxnard, Pacific Grove, Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo, Santa Maria, Santa Paula, Ventura, Guadalupe, Seaside.

Twenty-second District: Anaheim, Arlington, Banning, Beaumont, Brawley, Brea, Calexico, Calipatria, Coachella, Corona, Costo Mesa, El Centro, Fullerton, Gordon Grove, Huntington Beach, Imperial, Indio, Laguna Beach, La Habra, Newport Beach, Orange, Riverside, San Juan Capistrano, Santa Ana, Westminster.

Twenty-third District: Carlsbad, Escondido, La Jolla, Oceanside, Vista.

COLORADO

Second District: Sterling, Fort Collins, Loveland, Estes Park, Boulder, Fort Morgan, Longmont, Greeley, Holyoke.

Third District: Alamosa, Canon City, Trinidad, Walsenburg, Rocky Ford.

Fourth District: Walden, Steamboat Springs, Craig, Montrose, Durango, Gunnison, Salida, Leadville, Delta, Grand Mesa.

CONNECTICUT

First District: Collinsville, Farmington, Manchester, Bristol, Plainville, New Britain, Hartford, Simsbury, Thompsonville.

Second District: Middletown, Portland, Rockville, Willimantic, Norwich, New London, Putnam.

Third District: Milford, New Haven, Meriden, Wallingford.

Fourth District: Stamford, Greenwich, Norwalk, South Norwalk, Westport, Stratford, Southport, Fairfield, Shelton, Danbury.

Fifth District: Lakeville, Salisbury, Canaan, Winsted, Torrington, New Milford, Ansonia, Derby, Waterbury, Naugatuck.

DELAWARE

New Castle, Newark, Middletown, Smyrna, Clayton, Dover, Harrington, Milford, Georgetown, Rehoboth Beach, Lewis, Seaford, Laurel.

FLORIDA

First District: Bradenton, Brooksville, Sebring, Winter Haven.

Second District: Cross City, Madison, Lake City, Gainesville, High Springs, Green Cove Springs, Starke.

Third District: Apalachicola, Panama City.

Fourth District: Everglades, Homestead.

Fifth District: Apopka, Clermont, Cocoa, De Land, Leesburg, Sanford, Tavares, Ocala, Flagler Beach, New Smyrna Beach, Titusville, Melbourne, St. Augustine, Kissimmee, Palatka.

Sixth District: Delray Beach, Ft. Lauderdale, Stuart, Ft. Pierce, Punta Gorda, Clewiston, Okeechobee.

GEORGIA

First District: Vidalia.

Second District: Albany, Moultrie, Tifton, Thomasville.

Third District: Americus, Cordele, Eastman, Fitzgerald.

Fourth District: Carrollton, Griffin, La Grange, Villa Rica.

Fifth District: Conyers, Lithonia, Rosewell.

Sixth District: Milledgeville, Dublin.

Seventh District: Bremen, Calhoun, Cartersville, Cedartown, Chickamauga, Dallas, Dalton, Douglasville, Austell, Clarkdale, LaFayette, Lindale, Marietta, Ringgold, Rockmart, Rome, Summerville, Tallapoosa, Trion.

Eighth District: Douglas, Valdosta, Waycross.

Ninth District: Buford, Cornelia, Gainesville, Lawrenceville, Toccoa, Winder.

Tenth District: Athens, Elberton, Washington, Thomson.

IDAHO

First District: Caldwell, Nampa, Payette, Weiser.

ILLINOIS

Third District: Chicago Heights, Lemont, Harvey.

Sixth District: Cicero, Berwyn, Lyons.

Tenth District: Antioch, Waukegan.

Eleventh District: Aurora, Batavia, Elgin, Geneva, Glen Ellyn, Hinsdale, Downers Grove, Naperville, Joliet, Lockport, Plainfield, St. Charles, Wheaton, Woodstock, Crete.

Twelfth District: Belvidere, De Kalb, Earlville, La Salle, Marseilles, Mendota, Morris, Oglesby, Ottawa, Peru, Rockford, Sandwich, Streator, Sycamore.

Thirteenth District: Amboy, Dixon, Freeport, Fulton, Galena, Mount Morris, Oregon, Prophetstown, Rochelle, Rock Falls, Savanna, Sterling.

Fourteenth District: Aledo, Bushnell, Carthage, East Moline, Macomb, Monmouth, Rock Island.

Fifteenth District: Abingdon, Astoria, Cambridge, Canton, Galesburg, Galva, Geneseo, Kewanee, Quincy, Rushville.

Sixteenth District: Delaven, East Peoria, Henry, Pekin, Princeton, Princeville, Spring Valley, Toulon, Washington, Wyoming.

Seventeenth District: Bloomington, Dwight, Eureka, Fairbury, Gibson City, Lexington, Lincoln, Minonk, Mount Pulaski, Normal, Paxton, Pontiac, Roanoke.

Eighteenth District: Bradley, Danville, Hoopeston, Kankakee, Marshall, Momence, Paris, Watseka.

Nineteenth District: Champaign, Charleston, Clinton, Decatur, Farmer City, Mattoon, Monticello, Rantoul, Shelbyville, Sullivan, Tuscola, Urbana.

Twentieth District: Barry, Beardstown, Carrollton, Griggsville, Havana, Jacksonville, Jerseyville, Petersburg, Roodhouse, Waverly, White Hall, Winchester.

Twenty-first District: Carlinville, Gillespie, Hillsboro, Litchfield, Mount Olive, Pana, Springfield, Staunton, Taylorville.

Twenty-second District: Alton, Belleville, Collinsville, East Alton, East St. Louis, Edwardsville, Greenville, Highland, Nashville, Waterloo, Granite City.

Twenty-third District: Breese, Bridgeport, Central City, Centralia, Effingham, Lawrenceville, Mason City, Mount Carmel, Mount Vernon, New Baden, Olney, Robinson, St. Elmo, Salem, Vandalia.

Twenty-fourth District: Carmi, Eldorado, Fairfield, Flora, Harrisburg, Norris City.

Twenty-fifth District: Cairo, Carbondale, Chester, Du Quoin, Herrin, Benton, Jonesboro-Anna, Marion, Murphysboro, Red Bud, Sparta, West Frankfort.

INDIANA

First District: Whiting, East Chicago, Hammond, Gary, Hobart, Crown Point, Munster, Highland, Griffith, Lowell.

Second District: Delphi, Logansport, Rochester, Rensselaer, Warsaw, Winona Lake, Valparaiso, Knox, LaFayette.

Third District: Elkhart, Goshen, Napponee, Wakarusa, Michigan City, La Porte, Plymouth, Bourbon, Bremen, South Bend, Mishawaka, Walkerton.

Fourth District: Decatur, Auburn, Garrett, Ligonier, Kendallville, Angola, Hamilton, Bluffton, Columbia City.

Fifth District: Hartford City, Frankfort, Marion, Gas City, Jonesboro, Kokomo, Huntington, Warren, Portland, Elwood, Alexandria, Anderson, Peru, Tipton, Wabash, North Manchester.

Sixth District: Lebanon, Attica, Veedersburg, Noblesville, Danville, Crawfordsville, Rockville, Greencastle, Clinton, West Terre Haute, Williamsport.

Seventh District: Brazil, Washington, Princeton, Bloomfield, Linton, Franklin, Edinburg, Vincennes, Bicknell, Shoals, Bloomington, Martinsville, Mooresville, Sullivan, Farmersburg, Shelburn.

Eighth District: Jeffersonville, Jasper, Huntingburg, New Albany, Corydon, Tell City, Mount Vernon, Rockport, Boonville.

Ninth District: Columbus, Lawrenceburg, Aurora, Brookville, Seymour, Brownstown, Madison, North Vernon, Vernon, Bedford, Mitchell, Rising Sun, French Lick, Orleans, Paloli, Osgood, Scottsburg, Venay, Salem.

Tenth District: Greensburg, Muncie, Connersville, Greenfield, New Castle, Knightstown, Rushville, Shelbyville, Liberty, Richmond, Hagerstown.

IOWA

First District: Mechanicsville, Tipton, Mount Pleasant, Fairfield, Fort Madison, Keokuk, Wapello, Muscatine, Davenport, Washington.

Second District: Lansing, Waukon, Belle Plaine, Vinton, Independence, Clinton, De Witt, Lost Nation, Wheatland, Manchester, Dubuque, Dyersville, Oelwein, Bellevue, Maquoketa, Anamosa, Monticello, Wyoming, Cedar Rapids, Marion, Mount Vernon, Decorah.

Third District: Cedar Falls, Waterloo, Waverly, Clarksville, Mason City, New Hampton, Charles City, Hampton, Eldora, Iowa Falls, Cresco, Marshalltown, Osage, Tama, Toledo, Traer, North Wood.

Fourth District: Centerville, Osceola, Bloomfield, Colfax, Newton, Chariton, Oskaloosa, Alpia, Grinnell, Montezuma, Mount Ayr, Creston, Ottuma.

Fifth District: Perry, Winterset, Knoxville, Pella, Nevada, Ames, Indianola.

Sixth District: Boone, Madrid, Carroll, Manning, Denison, Estherville, Jefferson, Webster City, Humboldt, Algona, Emmetsburg, Fort Dodge, Forest City, Eagle Grove.

Seventh District: Audubon, Atlantic, Griswold, Hamburg, Sidney, Logan, Missouri Valley, Woodbine, Glenwood, Onawa, Red Oak, Villisca, Clarinda, Shenandoah, Oakland, Harlan, Bedford.

Eighth District: Storm Lake, Cherokee, Spencer, Spirit Lake, Rock Rapids, Sheldon, Le Mars, Odebolt, Sac City, Hawarden.

KANSAS

First District: Atchison, Clay Center, Leavenworth, Manhattan, St. Mary's, Wamego.

Second District: Bonner Springs, Fort Scott, Garnett, Iola, Kansas City, Lawrence, Olathe, Ottawa.

Third District: Arkansas City, Baxter Springs, Chanute, Chetopa, Coffeyville, Coney, Fredonia, Independence, Neodesha, Parsons, Pittsburg, Winfield.

Fourth District: Abilene, Burlington, Eldorado, Emporia, Eureka, Junction City, Lindsborg, McPherson, Newton, Osage City, Yates Center.

Fifth District: Wellington.

Sixth District: Concordia, Minneapolis, Salina.

KENTUCKY

First District: Bardwell, Cadiz, Eddyville, Fulton, Harrodsburg, Hickman, Hopkinsville, Marion, Mayfield, Murray, Paducah, Princeton.

Second District: Beaver Dam, Bowling Green, Central City, Dawson Springs, Earlington, Franklin, Guthrie, Hartford, Henderson, Madisonville, Morganfield, Owensboro, Scottsville, Sturgis, Webster.

Fourth District: Elizabethtown, Fort Knox, Glasgow, Hodgenville, Horse Cave, Lawrenceburg, Lebanon, Shepherdsville, Shelbyville, Campbellsville.

Fifth District: Carrollton, Falmouth, La Grange.

Sixth District: Berea, Danville, Frankfort, Harrodsburg, Lancaster, Lexington, Paris, Richmond, Versailles, Winchester, Georgetown.

Seventh District: Hazard, Pikeville, Whitesburg.

Eighth District: Ashland, Cynthiana, Flemingsburg, Grayson, Greenup, Maysville, Morehead, Olive Hill.

Ninth District: Barbourville, Corbin, Harlan, London, Middlesboro, Mount Vernon, Pineville, Somerset, Williamsburg.

LOUISIANA

Sixth District: Bogalusa, Covington.

MAINE

First District: Sanford, Saco, Biddeford, Westbrook, Portland, Freeport, Brunswick, Topsham, Bath, Norway, South Paris, Rumford.

Second District: Wiscasset, Waldoboro, Thomaston, Rockland, Rockport, Camden, Waterville, Belfast, Lewiston, Auburn, Livermore Falls.

Third District: Bucksport, Ellsworth Falls, Ellsworth.

MARYLAND

First District: Federalsburg, Cambridge, Crisfield, Princess Anne, Easton, Salisbury, Berlin, Ocean City, Pocomoke City, Snow Hill.

Second District: Westminster.
Third and fourth Districts: Baltimore.
Fifth District: Annapolis, Fort George G. Meade.
Sixth District: Cumberland, Frostburg, Brunswick, Frederick, Oakland, Gaithersburg, Rockville, Hagerstown, Williamsport.

MASSACHUSETTS

First District: North Adams, Williamstown, Adams, Pittsfield, Great Barrington, Westfield, Holyoke, Greenfield, Turners Falls, Orange, Athol.
Second District: Chicopee, Northampton, Amherst.
Third District: Gardner, Fitchburg, Leominster, Southbridge, Webster, Milford, Clinton, Palmer, Ware, Marlboro, Hudson.
Fourth District: Worcester, Framingham.
Fifth District: Lowell, Concord, Bedford.
Sixth District: Amesbury, Newburyport, Ipswich, Gloucester, Beverly, Salem, Lawrence.
Ninth District: New Bedford, Fall River, Middleboro, Plymouth, Rockland, Whitman, Hyannis, Falmouth, Provincetown, Oak Bluffs, Nantucket.
Thirteenth District: Brockton, Norwood, Quincy, Weymouth.
Fourteenth District: Fall River, Attleboro, North Attleboro, Taunton.

MICHIGAN

Second District: Hudson, Adrian, Tecumseh, Blissfield, Monroe, Dundee, Milan, Chelsea, Ypsilanti.
Third District: Coldwater, Albion, Charlotte, Bellevue, Hillsdale.
Fourth District: Bridgman, Stevensville, Allegan, Sawyer, Plainwell, Otsego, Three Oaks, Benton Harbor, St. Joseph, Niles, Watervliet, Dowagiac, Lakeside, Union Pier, New Buffalo, Three Rivers, Sturgis, South Haven, Hartford, Paw Paw, Decatur, Lawrence.
Fifth District: Lowell, Holland, Grand Haven, Zeeland.
Seventh District: Imlay City, Lapeer, Mount Clemens, Romeo, Richmond, Marysville, Port Huron, Yale.
Eighth District: St. Johns, Fowler, Alma, St. Louis, Perry, Ionia, St. Charles, Chesaning, Owosso, Durand, Oakley.
Ninth District: Traverse City, Ludington, Frankfort, Manistee, White Cloud, Newaygo, Fremont, Cadillac.
Tenth District: Bay City, Midland, Oscoda, Mount Pleasant, Big Rapids.
Eleventh District: Cheboygan, Mackinaw City, Charlevoix, Pellston, Alpena, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Ignace, Rogers City.
Twelfth District: Ironwood.
Sixteenth District: Wyandotte, Dearborn.
Seventeenth District: Pontiac, Birmingham, Rochester.

MINNESOTA

First District: Albert Lea, Red Wing, Austin, Rochester, Faribault, Northfield, Owatonno, Lake City, Wabaska, Winona.
Second District: Mankato, New Ulm, Farmington, Hastings, Blue Earth, Fairmont, Shakapee.
Fourth District: Ramsey.
Seventh District: Worthington.

MISSISSIPPI

First District: Aberdeen, Amory, Booneville, Columbus, Corinth, Iuka, Macon, Starkville, Tupelo, West Point.
Second District: Batesville, Hernando, Holly Springs, Water Valley, New Albany, Oxford, Ripley, Senatobia.
Third District: Clarksdale, Cleveland, Greenville, Durant, Leland, Marks, Shaw, Shelby.
Fourth District: Ackerman, Eupora, Grenada, Kosciusko, Houston, Louisville, Okolona, Pontotac.
Fifth District: Newton, Philadelphia, Union, Mendenhall, Magee, Taylorsville.
Sixth District: Columbia, Hattiesburg, Laurel, Pascagoula, Waynesboro, Wiggins, Biloxi.
Seventh District: Tylertown, Yazoo, Vicksburg, Canton.

MISSOURI

First District: Kirksville, Gallatin, Trenton, Edina, Canton, Brookfield, Chillicothe, Macon, Hannibal, Palmyra, Unionville, Shelbina, Milan.
Second District: Warsaw, Columbia, Camdenton, Carrolton, Norborne, Brunswick, Salisbury, Jefferson City, Boonesville, Fayette, Higginsville, Lexington, Odessa, Eldon, Moberly, Marshall.
Third District: Savanna, Tarkio, St. Joseph, Excelsior Springs, Liberty, Cameron, Plattsburg, Albany, Bethany, Mound City, Maryville, Richmond.
Fifth District: Lees Summit.
Sixth District: Lamar, Butler, Rich Hill, Harrisonville, Pleasant Hill, Eldorado Springs, Springfield, Clinton, Windsor, Warrensburg, Sedalia, Bolivar, Nevada, Humansville.
Seventh District: Monett, Carthage, Webb City, Carterville, Aurora, Marshfield.
Eighth District: De Soto, Festus, Fredericktown, Farmington, Flat River, Bonne Terre, Lebanon, Newburg, Rolla, St. James, St. Genevieve.
Ninth District: Mexico, Fulton, Pacific, St. Clair, Sullivan, Washington, Hermann, Monroe City, Montgomery City, Louisiana, Warrenton.
Tenth District: Poplar Bluff, Cape Girardeau, Jackson, Campbell, Molden, Charleston, Sikeston, Morehouse, Dexter.

MONTANA

First District: Kalispell.
Second District: Glasgow, Havre, Shelby.

NEBRASKA

First District: Auburn, Beatrice, Fairbury, Falls City, Hastings, Holdredge, Minden.
Second District: Nebraska City.
Third District: Albion, Bloomfield, Cedar Rapids, Coleridge, Creighton, Crofton, Decatur, Elgin, Emerson, Fullerton, Genoa, Hartington, Homer, Laurel, Madison, Neligh, Newman Grove, Niobrara, Norfolk, Oakland, Pender, Pierce, Pilger, Plainview, Ponca, Randolph, Stanton, Tekamah, Wakefield, Walthill, Wausa, West Point, Wisner.
Fourth District: Ainsworth, Alliance, Anselmo, Arnold, Atkinson, Bartlett, Bassett, Broken Bow, Burwell, Chadron, Chambers, Cody, Crawford, Dunning, Ewing, Gordon, Greeley, Hay Springs, Hemingford, Hyannis, Kearney, Loup City, Merriman, Mullen, North Loup, O'Neill, Ord, Ravenna, St. Edward, St. Paul, Rushville, Spencer, Springview, Stapleton, Stuart, Thedford, Valentine, Ansley, Ellsworth, Wood Lake.

NEVADA

Wells, Winnemucca.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

First District: Portsmouth, Exeter, Farmington, Rochester, Dover, Somersworth, Conway, North Conway, Laconia.
Second District: Nashua, Berlin, Groveton, Littleton, Lebanon, Keene, Claremont, Sunapee.

NEW JERSEY

First District: Camden, Pittman, Glassboro, Penns Grove, Salem.
Second District: Bridgeton, Vineland, Millville, Cape May C. H., Cape May, Wildwood, Sea Isle City, Ocean City, Atlantic City.
Third District: Tuckerton, Toms River, Lakehurst, Lakewood, Point Pleasant, Manasquan, Spring Lake, Asbury Park, Ocean Grove, Bradley Beach, Avon-by-the-Sea, Belmar, Red Bank, Long Branch, Freehold.
Fifth District: Perth Amboy, Woodbridge, Sommerville, Bound Brook, Manville, Dunnellen, Morristown, Madison, Boonton, Dover.
Sixth District: Plainfield, Rahway, Linden, Westfield, Elizabeth, Summit.
Seventh District: Franklin Furnace, Phillipsburg, Washington, High Bridge, Flemington, Newton, Sussex, Ridgewood, Hackensack.
Eighth District: Passaic, Paterson.
Ninth District: Englewood.
Tenth District: Newark.
Eleventh District: Newark.

NEW MEXICO

Farmington, Gallup, Raton.

NEW YORK

Sixteenth District: Staten Island.
Twenty-seventh District: Brewster, Peekskill, Yonkers, Ossining.
Twenty-eighth District: White Plains, Scarsdale, Pleasantville, Chappaqua, Mount Kisco, New Rochelle, Mamaronek, Larchmonth, Port Chester, Rye, Tarrytown.
Twenty-ninth District: Nyack, Middletown, Newburgh, Port Jarvis, Monticello, Hancock.
Thirtieth District: Chatham, Hudson, Catskill, Saugerties, Kingston, Poughkeepsie, Beacon, Pawling, Millbrook, Millerton.
Thirty-first District: Fort Plain, Canajoharie, Amsterdam, Gloversville, Johnstown, Schenectady, Oneonta.
Thirty-second District: Cohoes, Watervliet, Troy.
Thirty-third District: Troy, Castleton-on-Hudson, Hoosick Falls, Ticonderoga, Dannemora, Plattsburg, Granville, Hudson Falls, Fort Edward, White Hall, Glens Falls, Saratoga Springs, Ballston Spa, Mechanicville, Lake George, Keeseville, Westport, Ellenburg.
Thirty-fourth District: Ilion, Herkimer, Mohawk, Little Falls, Malone, Adams, Watertown, Carthage, Alexandria Bay, Gouverneur, Ogdensburg, Canton, Pottsdam, Massena, Chateaugay, Hammond, Morristown, Norfolk, Cape Vincent, Dexter, Sackets Harbor, Chaumont, Mannsville.
Thirty-fifth District: Sherrill, Rome, Utica, Phoenix, Mexico, Pulaski, Oswego, Fulton.
Thirty-sixth District: Baldswinsville.
Thirty-seventh District: Canastota, Oneida, Binghamton, Endicott, Johnson City, Deposit, Greene, Norwich.
Thirty-eighth District: Canandaigua, Palmyra, Newark, Lyons, Clyde, Wolcott, Geneva, Seneca Falls, Waterloo, Auburn, Dundee, Penn Yan, Cortland, Naples.
Thirty-ninth District: Elmira, Corning, Ithaca, Bath, Hammondsport, Hornell, Owego, Watkins Glen, Painted Post, Richford, Waverly.
Fortieth District: East Rochester, Fairport, Honeoye Falls
Forty-first District: Medina, Albion, Brockport, Batavia, Dansville, Geneseo.
Forty-second District: North Tonawanda, Niagara Falls, Lockport.
Forty-fourth District: Tonawanda, East Aurora.
Forty-fifth District: Dunkirk, Jamestown, Olean, Salamanca, Wellsville, Fredonia, Gowanda.

NORTH CAROLINA

First District: Edenton, Elizabeth City, Greenville, Hertford, Plymouth, Washington, Williamston.
Second District: Enfield, Kinston, La Grange, Littleton, Roanoke Rapids, Rocky Mount, Tarboro, Warrenton, Weldon, Wilson, Windsor.
Third District: Beaufort, Burgaw, Cherry Point, Clinton, Goldsboro, Jacksonville, Maysville, Morehead City, New Bern, Wallace.
Fourth District: Asheboro, Benson, Clayton, Franklinton, Henderson, Louisburg, Nashville, Randleman, Rocky Mount, Selma, Smithfield, Wake Forest, Wendell, Zebulon.
Fifth District: Draper, Elkin, Kernersville, Leaksville, Madison, Mayodan, Mount Airy, Pilot Mountain, Reidsville, Roxboro, Oxford, Spray.
Sixth District: Burlington, Chapel Hill, Elon College, Gibsonville, Graham, Haw River, Hillsboro, Mebane.
Seventh District: Bolton, Chadbourn, Dunn, Erwin, Fairmount, Fayetteville, Lillington, Lumberton, Maxton, St. Pauls, Whiteville.

Eighth District: Aberdeen, Carthage, Cooleemee, Hamlet, Jonesville, Laurinburg, Lexington, Mocksville, Monroe, Pinehurst, Raeford, Rockingham, Sanford, Southern Pines, Thomasville, Troy, Wadeboro.

Ninth District: Albemarle, Concord, Granite Falls, Kannapolis, Lenoir, Mooresville, Salisbury, Spencer, Statesville.

Tenth District: Conover, Cornelius, Davidson, Hickory, Lincolnton, Morgantown, Newton, Valdese.

Eleventh District: Belmont, Bessemer City, Caroleen, Cliffside, Dallas, Forest City, Gastonia, Henrietta, Hot Springs, Shelby, Kings Mountain, Marion, Marshall, Mount Holly, Rutherfordton, Springdale, Tryon.

Twelfth District: Asheville, Brevard, Canton, Fletcher, Hazelwood, Hendersonville, Swannanoa, Waynesville.

NORTH DAKOTA

Bismarck, Carrington, Devils Lake, Dickinson, Ellendale, Enderlin, Fairmount, Forman, Garrison, Grafton, Hankinson, Jamestown, Lakota, Lidgerwood, Linton, Lisbon, Medina, Minot, Rugby, Steele, Valley City, Wahpeton, Watford City, Williston, Wilton.

OHIO

Second District: Lockland.

Third District: Hamilton, Middletown, Oxford, Vandalia, Eaton, College Corner, Miamisburg, Brookville.

Fourth District: Lima, Delphos, Bluffton, Wapakoneta, Minster, Saint Marys, Greenville, Arcanum, Bradford, Celina, Piqua, Troy, Covington, Sidney.

Fifth District: Defiance, Wauseon, Delta, Napoleon, Paulding, Columbus Grove, Ottawa, Leipsic, Van Wert, Bryan.

Sixth District: Georgetown, Aberdeen, Ripley, Batavia, New Richmond, Loveland, Bethel, Greenfield, Hillsboro.

Seventh District: Urbana, Springfield, Wilmington, Washington C. H., Xenia, Bellefontaine, West Liberty, London, West Jefferson, Marysville, Lebanon, Franklin.

Eighth District: Galion, Bucyrus, Crestline, Findlay, Kenton, Ada, Marion, Prospect, Mount Gilead, Upper Sandusky.

Ninth District: Maumee, Port Clinton.

Eleventh District: Lancaster, Circleville, Chillicothe.

Twelfth District: Westerville.

Thirteenth District: Sandusky, Vermilion, Huron, Norwalk, Bellevue, Fremont, Clyde, Gibsonburg, Tiffin, Fostoria, Bowling Green.

Fourteenth District: Lorain, Elyria, Oberlin, Avon Lake, Medina, Wadsworth, Ravenna, Kent, Barberton.

Fifteenth District: Cambridge, Zanesville, New Concord.

Sixteenth District: Millersburg, Massillon, Alliance, Navarre, Louisville, Strasburg, Newcomerstown, Uhrichsville, Dennison, New Philadelphia, Dover, Wooster, Orrville, Rittman, Doylestown.

Seventeenth District: Ashland, Coshocton, West Lafayette, Delaware, Mount Vernon, Newark, Granville, Shelby, Mansfield.

Eighteenth District: Barnesville, Saint Clairsville, Carrollton, Mechanicsburg, Salem, Lisbon, East Liverpool, Cadiz.

Nineteenth District: Ashtabula, Conneaut, Youngstown, Sebring, Canfield, Niles, Warren, Newton Falls.

Twenty-second District: Painesville, Willoughby, Bedford, Rocky River.

OKLAHOMA

First District: Barnsdall, Bartlesville, Chelsea, Claremore, Collinsville, Commerce, Dewey, Miami, Pawhuska, Picher, Quapaw, Shidler, Skiatook, Vinita.

Second District: Henryetta, Muskagee, Okmulgee, Wagoner.

Third District: Antlers, Ardmore, Atoka, Durant, Hugo, Madill, McAlester.

Fourth District: Ada, Bristow, Chandler, Coalgate, Drumright, Holdenville, Prague, Sapulpa, Seminole, Shawnee, Wewoka.

Fifth District: Cushing, Guthrie, Stillwater.

Sixth District: Chickasha, Duncan, El Reno, Ft. Sill, Kingfisher, Lawton, Marlow.

Seventh District: Frederick.

Eighth District: Blackwell; Enid, Newkirk.

OREGON

First District: Astoria, Beaverton, Corvallis, Dallas, Forest Grove, Hillsboro, Independence, McMinnville, Monmouth, Newburg, Oregon City, St. Helens, Seaside, Silverton, Woodburn, Klamath Falls, Warrenton, Gladstone, Mt. Angel, Oregon City.

Fourth District: Albany, Ashland, Coquille, Cottage Grove, Grants Pass, Junction City, Lebanon, Marshfield, Myrtle Point, Northbend, Reedsport, Roseburg, Springfield, Brownsville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ninth District: Phoenixville.

Tenth District: Carbondale, Scranton.

Eleventh District: Hazleton, Pittston, Wilkes-Barre.

Twelfth District: Sunbury, Milton, Mt. Carmel, Shamokin, Shenandoah, Pottsville, Tamaqua.

Thirteenth District: Birdsboro.

Fourteenth District: Danville, Bloomsburg, Honesdale, Tunkhannock, Montrose.

Fifteenth District: Muncy, Kane, Bradford.

Sixteenth District: Pottstown, Norristown, Conshohocken, Ardmore, Merion.

Seventeenth District: Duncannon, Selinsgrove, Lewisburg, Bedford.

Eighteenth District: Middletown, Palmyra, Hershey, Lebanon, Millersburg.

Nineteenth District: New Bethlehem, Knox, Clarion, Brookville, Ridgway, St. Marys.

Twentieth District: Lansford, Lehighton, Mauch Chunk, Northampton, Easton, Nazareth, Bangor, Stroudsburg, East Stroudsburg.

Twenty-first District: Waynesboro.

Twenty-third Disrtict: Somerset, Meyersdale, Belle Vernon, Brownsville.

Twenty-fourth District: Charleroi, West Brownsville, Waynesburg, Burgettstown, McDonald, California.

Twenty-fifth District: Aliquippa, Ambridge, Beaver Falls, Beaver, Rochester, New Brighton, Ellwood City, New Castle.

Twenty-sixth District: Kittanning, Ford City.

Twenty-seventh District: Monessen, Ligonier.

Twenty-eighth District: Mercer, Greenville, Meadville, Cambridge Springs, Union City, Sharon.

Thirtieth District: Sewickley.

Thirty-first District: Coraopolis.

Thirty-third District: McKeesport.

RHODE ISLAND

First District: Newport, Block Island, Warren, Barrington, Bristol, Providence, Pawtucket, Woonsocket.

Second District: Westerly, Wakefield, Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA

First District: Beaufort, Charleston, Manning, St. George, Summerville, Walterboro.

Second District: Aiken, Bamberg, Barnwell, Branchville, Denmark, Lexington, Orangeburg, St. Matthews, Sumter.

Third District: Abbeville, Anderson, Belton, Calhoun Falls, Easley, Greenwood, Liberty, Newberry, Pelzer, Pickens, Seneca, Walhalla, Westminster, Whitmire, Williamston.

Fourth District: Buffalo, Clinton, Fountain Inn, Greer, Laurens, Piedmont, Simpsonville, Taylors, Union, Woodruff.

Fifth District: Blacksburg, Camden, Chester, Fort Mill, Gaffney, Great Falls, Kershaw, Lancaster, Rock Hill, Winnsboro, York.

Sixth District: Andrews, Bennettsville, Bishopville, Darlington, Dillon, Florence, Georgetown, Hartsville, Kingstree, Lotta, Marion, McColl, Mullins, Myrtle Beach, Timmonsville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

First District: Elk Point, Mitchell, Scotland, Tyndall, Vermillion, Wagner, Yankton, Gayville.

TENNESSEE

First District: Bulls Gap, Dandridge, Elizabethton, Erwin, Greeneville, Jefferson City, Morristown, Newport, Rogersville, Sevierville, Tazewell.

Second District: Alcoa, Athens, Clinton, Etowah, Harriman, Jellico, Kingston, La Follette, Lake City, Lenoir City, Loudon, Maryville, Mascot, Oak Ridge, Rockwood, Sweetwater.

Third District: Cleveland, McMinnville, South Pittsburg, Sparta.

Fourth District: Carthage, Cookeville, Crossville, Gallatin, Hartsville, Hickman, Monterey, Oakdale, Petros, Portland, Springfield.

Fifth District: Cowan, Decherd, Fayetteville, Lebanon, Lewisburg, Manchester, Murfreesboro, Pulaski, Sewanee, Shelbyville, Tullahoma, Winchester.

Sixth District: Old Hickory.

Seventh District: Ashland City, Clarksville, Columbia, Dickson, Franklin, Mount Pleasant, Waverly.

Eighth District: Bolivar, Bruceton, Jackson, McKenzie, Paris, Somerville, Whiteville.

Ninth District: Brownsville, Covington, Dresden, Dyersburg, Humboldt, Fulton, Martin, Milan, Ripley, Tiptonville, Trenton, Union City.

Tenth District: Collierville, Millington.

TEXAS

First District: Cooper, Marshall, Mount Pleasant, Mount Vernon, Paris, Sulphur Springs.

Second District: Lufkin.

Third District: Carthage, Gilmer, Gladewater, Hawkins, Henderson, Kilgore, Longview, Mineola, Pittsburg, Tyler.

Fourth District: Bonham, Denison, Sherman.

Fifth District: Grand Prairie, Lancaster.

Sixth District: Bryan, Corsicana, Dawson, Ennis, Groesbeck, Hearne, Mexia, Midlothian, Wortham, Waxahachie.

Seventh District: Conroe, Crockett, Huntsville, Jacksonville, Nacogdoches, Navasota, Rusk, Trinity.

Eighth District: Humble.

Ninth District: Edna, El Campo, Hempstead, Richmond, Victoria, Wharton, Yoakum, Rosenberg.

Tenth District: Brenham, Lockhart, Luling, San Marcos.

Eleventh District: Cameron, Marlin, Mart, Rosebud, Temple.

Twelfth District: Cleburne, Granbury, Weatherford, Glen Rose.

Thirteenth District: Archer City, Denton, Electra, Gainesville, Graham, Newcastle, Olney, Vernon.

Fourteenth District: Cuero, Gonzales, New Braunfels, Sequin.

Seventeenth District: Breckenridge, Cisco, Comanche, Dublin, Eastland, Mineral Wells, Ranger, Stephenville, Strawn.

Nineteenth District: Lubbock.

Twenty-first District: Boerne; Brady; Brownwood, Coleman, Fredericksburg, Junction, Kerrville, Llano, Mason, Menard.

UTAH

First District: Logan, Price, Green River, Richfield, Cedar City, St. George, Moab.

Second District: Provo.

VERMONT

Bennington, Bristol, Middlebury, Rutland, Newport, Vergennes, White River Junction, Springfield, Bellows Falls, Brattleboro, St. Albans, Barton, Orleans, Newport, Morrisville, Hardwick, Randolph, St. Johnsbury, Island Pond.

VIRGINIA

First District: Bowling Green, Fort Monroe, Fredericksburg, Cape Charles, Hampton, Newport News, Phoebus, Yorktown.

Second District: Franklin, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach.

Third District: Ashland, Ettrick, West Point, Williamsburg.

Fourth District: Amelia C. H., Blackstone, Chase City, Crewe, Emporia, Farmville, Hopewell, Lawrenceville, Petersburg, South Hill, Victoria, Waverly.

Fifth District: Chatham, Danville, Fieldale, Fries, Galax, Bassetts, Keysville, Martinsville, Rockymount, South Boston, Wytheville.

Sixth District: Altavista, Bedford, Blacksburg, Christiansburg, Clifton Forge, Covington, Radford, Salem.

Seventh District: Amherst, Buena Vista, Elkton, Front Royal, Harrisonburg, Lexington, Luray, New Market, Shenandoah, Staunton, Strasburg, Waynesboro, Winchester, Woodstock.

Eighth District: Charlottesville, Culpeper, Fort Belvoir, Herndon, Alexandria, Leesburg, Manassas, Orange, Quantico, Warrenton.

Ninth District: Abingdon, Appalachia, Big Stone Gap, Bluefield, Dante, Gate City, Marion, Norton, Pulaski, Saltville, Richlands.

WASHINGTON

First District: Bremerton, Poulsbo.

Second District: Anacortes, Arlington, Burlington, Coupeville, Edmonds, Everett, Friday Harbor, Marysville, Monroe, Mount Vernon, Port Angeles, Oak Harbor, Port Townsend, Sedro Woolley, Sequim, Snohomish, Whidbey Island, San Juan Island, Orcas Island, Lopez Island.

Third District: Aberdeen, Centralia, Chehalis, Elma, Hoquim, Ilwaco, Koloma, Kelso, Long Beach, Longview, Montesano, Olympia, Raymond, Shelton, South Bend, Vancouver, Woodland, Tenino, Cosmopolis.

Sixth District: Auburn, Buckley, Enumclaw, Kent, Puyallup, Sumner, Tacoma.

WEST VIRGINIA

Second District: Berkeley Springs, Charles Town, Keyser, Martinsburg, Piedmont, Romney.

Third District: Boomer, Burnsville, Eagle, Montgomery, Mount Hope, Oak Hill.

Fifth District: Bluefield, Gary, Hinton, Iaeger, Keystone, Lewisburg, Mullens, Ronceverte, Princeton, Welch, White Sulphur Springs, Williamson.

Sixth District: Beckley, Belle, Logan, Marmet.

WISCONSIN

First District: Janesville, Kenosha, Racine, Delavan, Edgerton, Burlington.

Second District: Mount Horeb, Stoughton, Beaver Dam, Watertown, Juneau, Lodi, Oconomowoc, Waukesha, Fort Atkinson, Jefferson, Watertown, Portage.

Third District: Prairie du Chien, Baraboo, Reedsburg, Boscobel, Platteville, Dodgeville, Richland Center, La Crosse, Sparta, Viroqua.

Sixth District: Fond du Lac, Waupan, W. Fond du Lac, West Bend, Sheboygan, Menasha, Neenah, Oshkosh.

Seventh District: Mosinee, Wausau, Stephens Point, Wautoma, New London, Waupaca, Marshfield, Wisconsin Rapids, Antigo, Montello.

Eighth District: Sturgeon Bay, Green Bay, Marinette, Niagara, Two Rivers, Denmark, Algoma, Kewannee, Appleton, Kaukauna, Seymour, Kimberly, Little Chute, Manitowoc.

Ninth District: Menomonie, Alma, Eau Claire, Rush Lake, Cumberland, New Richmond, Hudson, River Falls, Chippewa Falls, Stanley, Owen.

Tenth District: Ashland, Rhinelander, Hurley, Hayward, Spooner, Amery, Medford, Tomahawk, Merrill.

WYOMING

Douglas, Lusk, Torrington.

Juvenile Delinquency—A Simple Answer to a Serious Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency is one of the most serious problems we have had to face during this war period. It is one of those problems of living that has been increasingly serious as time has gone on and yet very meager constructive results have been obtained.

While many people have been thinking about it and worrying about it, very few have done anything about it. But a thinking police officer really did something. We generally think of police officers as important persons who enforce the law, as that is their duty, but now a distinguished police officer has found an answer outside the enforcement of the law, and that is both surprising and yet not at all surprising. Who would be better qulaified than a police officer to find an answer to the problem of juvenile delinquency?

Lt. Walter L. Dixon, of the Burbank, (Calif.) Police Department and head of the juvenile bureau, is the spark plug of what are called Sterling Clubs. Sterling Clubs are that simple answer to juvenile delinquency that we have all thought about in the back of our minds. I take great pride and pleasure in presenting to you and to the country a statement by the Burbank (Calif.) Sterling Club made in the course of marking its first anniversary.

The statement is as follows:

The Sterling Club was not created for any particular creed, color, nationality, race, or religion. Above all it is not an organization designed for juvenile delinquents.

Sterling Club believes that every boy and girl has the right to enough good, clean, wholesome recreation to keep their minds and bodies busy and that they all should be able to enjoy the sports and athletics that only a few are able to take part in now.

Sterling Clubs are striving to place a playground in about every four blocks to comply with the recommendation of the National Playground Association.

Sterling Club thinks that the life of one child saved—that now plays in the streets and must dodge automobiles all day is worth all the effort that combined community planning can exert.

Sterling Club believes that a country with the intelligence and culture that United States has can solve the greatest problem that has arisen to blight our life except the war.

Sterling Club believes there can never be too many youth building organizations and that many children do not now belong to any group that plans for their welfare.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

The greatest wave of juvenile crime and delinquency has struck America that has ever been known. This you must believe because the daily papers are full of the cause and effect.

Studios plan and portray pictures almost every week that will educate the parents and the youth.

Radios devote a great deal of time on the air trying to press the lesson home to parents. Almost every service club has a program and lists speakers every week concerning the matter.

Juvenile delinquency is being studied by parents, teachers, by the public schools, by coordinating councils, and the chamber of commerce.

J. Edgar Hoover states the annual crime bill for the United States is $15,000,000,000 a year, 40 percent of which is charged to juvenile crime.

Los Angeles County recently had to add several judges to juvenile court and the detention homes are so full that it is almost impossible to have a delinquent detained.

Gang fights all over the country which can be laid to no particular nationality but which are participated in by all races and colors are rampant every night.

HOW DOES THIS CONCERN YOU?

Please read on.

HOW WILL THIS AFFECT MY CHILDREN?

A study of the children that come into juvenile bureaus and juvenile courts every day will convince anyone that every home can be an unwilling victim of this scourge.

Mothers and fathers of problem children who sit in juvenile court and weep are the very ones who said yesterday this cannot happen to me. But it did. Problem children do not always come from broken homes or working mothers or even from delinquent parents, but statistitics show they come from some of our most respected families.

Many boys and girls under 18 are being declared adults in court every day and are sent to the penitentiary.

Lack of discipline, disrespect for other people's rights and property is at the lowest ebb that has ever been known in our history among youth.

All this does not mean that all boys and girls are a problem or delinquent—on the contrary, the millions of good children are the hope of the whole situation and the light of the future generation.

Therefore, Sterling Club enters the picture in its own small way. Our Sterling Club is striving hard to solve at least some portion of the problem.

HERE IS HOW

The Sterling Club believes in a return to home and community life and a return to a higher moral standard of living and ethics and getting together of neighbors and friends in a—do-unto-others-as-you-would-have-them-do-unto-you—spirit with a good-neighbor policy to those of other races and creeds in our midst. Is this not what our boys are fighting for? In hopes we can make for better boys and girls.

Play with your children and they will stay with you. Sterling Club has installed seven parks in seven months—these parks and playgrounds have been built by community spirit. The community furnishes the money and the neighbors furnish the spirit. Fathers get out out for a couple of hours on Sunday or in the evening and dig a few post holes, mothers supervise the parks, and everyone contributes some small part to make Sterling Club playgrounds possible.

We think if youngsters can be given a place to play and with a little guidance from the parents who will supervise their own children, the children can be taught the fallacy of being problem children and in a few years the new crop of teen-agers will have a new conception on the decent way of living.

Sterling Club has an age limit—only those between the ages of 1 day and 101 years are eligible to participate.

GROW WITH STERLING CLUB—HOW TO START A STERLING CLUB

If your neighborhood wishes a club or playground—you first canvass the streets adjacent to your home and find at least 10 neighbors or more, if you wish, who can see the need for a playground and additional recreation and activity.

Call a meeting in your home or any convenient place and start preliminary discussion. An officer of the Sterling Club will come at your invitation and help you form your club.

Once the club is formed it will be officered by the folk who live around you. You will have a president, vice persident, treasurer, secretary, publicity, and four directors.

The site for the playground is leased or borrowed and work can commence in the good old neighborly fashion. It is a lot of fun to get out the folk next door and plan for your children and even those who have no children are interested because if the children have a place to play it keeps them out of mischief.

Each group will run its own business, plan its own activities. Your own aggressiveness and initiative can be brought into play.

You have the backing of a fast-growing organization that is rapidly becoming known throughout the country as an independent organization that can do things for you and yours.

THE SILVERSMITHS

What are the Silversmiths and what do they do?

The Silversmiths are the Parent Organization for the Sterling Club and are the guiding factor in the work the club carries on.

Where did the name "Sterling Club" originate? The name "Sterling Club" was taken from the quality name of "Sterling" which marks the high-quality silver, to make the community in which it operates a Sterling community.

The Sterling Club is a creator of fine characters in youth.

Who founded Sterling Clubs? The Sterling Club was founded by Lt. Walter L. Dixon, of the Burbank Juvenile Bureau whose interest in boys and girls has always been paramount, and who believes that seeds of good thoughts and deeds sown today will reap dividends tomorrow beyond our fondest dreams.

STERLING CLUBS

The following are the present Sterling Clubs in the order in which they were formed.

State Park: Flower and Verdugo, Burbank. Mrs. Francis Jasso, president.

Lincoln Park: 800 North Lincoln Street, Burbank. Mr. Ted Young, president.

Columbia Park: Woodland and Clybourne, Burbank. Mrs. Lucette Briggs, president.

Canoga Park: Canoga Park, Calif. Mr. Glen Heyden, president.

Sunset Park: Sunset Canyon Drive and Harvard Road, Burbank. Officers not yet elected.

Ampco Park: Scott Road and Burbank Boulevard. Sponsored by AmpCo Metal Inc. Officers not yet elected.

Pacoima Park: Pacoima, Calif. William Keski, president.

Columbia Juniors: Columbia Park. Mary Jane Mercier, president.

The Phantoms: Juniors in high school, Burbank. Dick Alexander, president.

Avon Park: Avon near Empire, Burbank. James Winslow, president.

Cross Rodeo Park: Pacoima.

Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to House Concurrent Resolution 64 introduced on June 22, 1945, by Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. It reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as approving expansion of the air-transportation system in the United States so that it will include not only the larger cities but also, through feeder-line service, the greatest practicable number of smaller cities and towns.

I think this resolution expresses the opinion of many Members of Congress and should provide the impetus necessary for the expansion of this service to the three-quarters of our citizens to which it has long been denied. The establishment of such a Nation-wide feeder-line system now should not prove an added financial burden to our Government but should, in fact, add materially to the profits the Post Office Department is now beginning to realize from the air-mail service.

The demand, and the need, has now been created. It would appear that the establishment of such a system would now constitute a sound business venture on the part of our Government.

The benefits from such an over-all air-transportation system would be far reaching. It will not only greatly improve the social and economic welfare of the communities served but would provide an incentive for the construction of additional airports, be a tremendous asset to our national-defense system and provide thousands of employment opportunities for our returning military personnel.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that House Concurrent Resolution No. 64 will receive the wholehearted support of every Member of this Congress and will pass this House at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, much attention has been focused by our Congress upon postwar aviation, its ability to absorb a large portion of our returning military personnel, the improvement of our domestic air-line service, the expansion of our international system, and the construction of several thousand new airports and the improvement of existing ones.

Little has been said, or done, concerning the extension of scheduled air transportation to the thousands of smaller communities of our Nation that have long been denied this service. These 16,452 neglected communities represent approximately three-quarters of our Nation's population.

It is true that our Nation boasts the world's largest, and best, air-transportation system, but it is my contention that this system is still far from adequate.

Under our present air-rail system, many precious mail-, cargo-, and passenger-hours, and even days in some instances, are now being lost. A great portion of our air mail, one-third of our air express, and untold numbers of air passengers, now, either originate at, or are destined for, off-air-line points. Certainly an air-transportation system that makes it necessary for this potential air-line traffic to travel many costly hours by bus, or truck, and then by rail, over a major portion of the total trip, in order to reach an air-line terminal, is far from an efficient, or adequate, one.

Our present air-transportation system was established in 1918 with the inauguration of air-mail service by the Post Office Department, over a system totaling some 218 route-miles. During that first year of operation, the Government-operated mail planes flew some 16,000 miles and carried about 18,000 pounds of air mail.

In 1944 our Nation's air carriers flew some 140,000,000 miles and carried over 132,000,000 pounds of air mail. Air-line passengers in 1944 totaled 4,668,330, and produced revenues totaling 72.34 percent of the air carrier's total income.

These figures represent a tremendous increase in mail volume, scheduled and route mileage, as well as an ever-increasing demand for personal transportation, which has resulted in a greatly decreased cost to the Government for the transportation of air mail.

Yet, as amazing as these figures are, it is equally as amazing to our nonflying public to learn that, despite this tremendous increase in air-line mileage and traffic, our much-publicized national trunk-line system in reality serves only about 203 cities and towns and is certificated for only about 300 points.

By simply comparing the increase in scheduled and system mileage and the points now actually receiving service with the total of 170 points receiving service in 1935, it can readily be seen that our much-talked-of "tremendous expansion of trunk-line service" has been in reality a "duplication" of service. Of the over 60,000 route-miles of our present trunk-line system, some 20,000 miles, or about one-third, represent duplicated routes, served by two or more carriers.

The trend in long-haul air transportation has always been toward larger and faster airplanes. This has forced the carrier to lengthen the distance between landings in order to utilize the ever-increasing speed of the air liners and to seek out the larger passenger-producing cities in order to maintain a high passenger pay load.

Many of the smaller air-line points still receiving trunk-line service are now receiving a greatly curtailed service through the operation of fewer schedules, flown at inconvenient hours, and, in fact, service has been discontinued at many of these points for various reasons.

With the adoption of the larger and faster equipment that the trunk lines intend to place into service in the immediate postwar future, these problems will become even more acute, and rather than an expansion of this service to more and smaller communities we may actually see a further curtailment of service to the smaller points now being served.

The solution to this problem would appear to be the establishment of a comprehensive network of feeder air-line routes coordinated with our present trunk-line system.

Although my home State of Ohio is the birthplace of aviation, only 18 of our 874 incorporated communities now receive direct air-line service of any kind. Only 7 of this number are served by the

trunk lines and the remain 11 are furnished air-mail and air-express feeder-line services through the air pick-up system.

That these smaller communities need and will support such a service is shown by the fact that this service has long since reached a self-sustaining basis, and by the record of increased mail volume since this feeder service was established some 6 years ago.

The average number of pieces dispatched monthly via this feeder line, from the nine Ohio towns of Gallipolis, Ironton, Jackson, Marietta, Martins Ferry, Pomeroy, Portsmouth, Steubenville, and Wellston and the yearly increases as compared to the national increase from July 30, 1941, to June 30, 1944, are as follows:

Year	Average monthly dispatch	Yearly increase	National yearly increase
		Percent	*Percent*
1941	8,377		
1942	14,541	73.6	39.7
1943	53,131	265.4	79.9
1944	106,826	101.1	51.9

Figures for 1945 are not available.

Service was not established to Bridgeport until 1943 and to Athens in 1944. These points have not been included in the above table. However, the figures for Bridgeport are available for 1943 and 1944 and show an average monthly dispatch of 4,578 in 1943 as compared to 8,179 in 1944. This represents an increase of 78.7 percent as against the national average for the same period of 51.9 percent.

These figures were taken from official Post Office Department piece counts and national air-mail volume increase records.

Of the 16,752 incorporated communities in these United States only about 409 are certificated for air-line service. Of this total 118, or over one-fourth, are receiving feeder-line service through the air pick-up system, the only presently operating feeder air line.

Only 65 of our 16,340 cities and towns with a population of 25,000, or less, are now receiving trunk line service.

There are at present, pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board, over 500 applications for this feeder type of air service. Most of these applicants are ready and willing to furnish this service to these long-neglected communities.

Although the Civil Aeronautics Board is now holding hearings on many of these applications it has been suggested by the Board, and by Members of this Congress, that new legislation is needed in order to accelerate the establishment of this service on a Nation-wide scale.

I am of the opinion that the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 gives the Board, and the Post Office Department, ample authority to expand this urgently needed air-transportation service to these smaller communities, but feel that the Board should now be informed of the attitude of Congress in this matter.

Proud Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul Gould from the American Hebrew of June 29, 1945:

PROUD MOTHER—SELECTED AS THE TYPICAL MOTHER BY UNITED STATES MOTHER'S DAY COMMEMORATIVE LEAGUE

(By Paul Gould)

In millions of pup tents in Europe and in thousands of fox holes in the Pacific theater of war, as well as on the high seas, Mother's Day this year was marked by a note of exultation, a tinge of soberness, a renewed longing for home. And in one little house in America, where previously devoted children had brought flowers and candy and sweet thoughts, a new home-front heroine—Mrs. Esther Scolnick, of 97 Belmont Avenue, in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn—was paid signal tribute this year.

Unsought honors came to this 62-year-old, 4-foot 10-inch lady who has been designated as "the outstanding mother of 1945" by the United States Mother's Day Commemorative League. It was the first time a Jewish woman had been so designated. And there were other economiums for the plump, rosy-cheeked little woman—citations from the CDVO, the American Legion, the United States Treasury, the Red Cross, and the Jewish War Veterans.

For Mrs. Scolnick—"Mom" to all who know her—has been doing as much to win the war within the limits of her energy and time as her eight sons on the battlefield—and it was for this reason that she was given laurels by the community.

It was 37 years ago that she had made her way alone from Austria to this country—alone, save for a 7-week-old daughter in her arms and a playful 2-year-old son tugging at her dress. It was her first trip away from her native Lemburg and she was setting forth to meet her husband who had arrived at Lynn, Mass., 6 months before.

Life was stupendous for her in those days—raising a family, making a living, setting up a home. Three decades later it had really only begun, for there was a war to be won and the Scolnicks were in it to the finish. "Mom" saw her job readily cut out from the day she kissed her first boy good-by when he left for the Army. She began to sell War bonds, roll bandages, collect donations—perform any job there was to do in her neighborhood.

"It was the one sure way I knew of getting my boys back," she said.

And when VE-day found her in the CDVO office around the corner on Pitkin Avenue, she cried and thought of her children all over the world.

She thought of Abraham, the 2-year-old son of her ocean trip, now a sergeant in the Air Forces, who has a 17-year-old boy ready to join his father in uniform. She thought of Nathan, a first lieutenant with the Flying Tigers, who had made 86 missions as a bombardier, and who had won the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with three clusters, and a Presidential citation. Nathan was now back home, discharged with a Purple Heart medal after suffering a wound when he was shot down in China.

She counted up—there was Harry, the sergeant in Germany, who had the British Cross and a Silver Star personally presented to him by General Eisenhower. She hadn't heard from him in 6 weeks. There were Robert and Arnold, Pacific sailors. And Sidney, home from the wars after 3½ years in New Guinea and Puerto Rico, discharged for malaria. And Arthur, a sergeant, who was at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, who is on this side after 4 years in the Pacific zones. And Carl, a sergeant, home with a honorable discharge after fighting in Europe. And Earl, a shipbuilding worker, now in I-A, and ready to do his share elsewhere.

Those who work at night and live in the neighborhood will tell you that promptly at 3:30 in the morning the lights go on in the Scolnick home. Its mom who's up and probably washing the floors. The day must begin early, as her schedule is crowded. At 1 p. m. like as not you'll find her in the booth in front of the movie house selling bonds and stamps, and there are two sessions for her at the CDVO. Canvassing, speaking, appearing at endless evening meetings—all may amount to a tremendous schedule for the average person but not for Mrs. Scolnick.

And her husband, Louis, 63, is there to help with the housework and the shopping. Despite his advanced years he is also a shipyard worker. Two married daughters, adding up to 11 of the brood of 14 that survived, come to the house to pitch in, too.

In the old days—before the war—life was hectic, too, but in another sort of way. She misses the Fridays when she transformed 24 pounds of flour into bread and strudel for the Sabbath—and tossed in 5 fat chickens for roasting. She misses the long evenings when she sewed stockings and dresses, after having tucked a veritable army of children to bed.

"Yes, I had to wash three of them in the bath at one time, there were so many to bathe," she smiled. "They were little angels, too. Here, take a look at this picture. This is what they looked like 15 years ago."

Mom can also look back with warmth and a smile on her courtship days, for she met her husband on a blind date. The next day he asked her mother for her hand in marriage—he was all of 18 at the time.

Mrs. Scolnick has become something of an ace saleslady and she has received many invitations to officiate at war-bond rallies. On one occasion more than $140,000 in bonds were purchased at the First Congregation Anshe Sfard, after she had been introduced by County Court Judge Louis Goldstein. Many of the bonds were bought specifically to honor her. Congressman DONALD L. O'TOOLE was on hand to witness the event.

Hailed as a champion bond seller, she was soon after decorated with an Emblem of Honor pin by Miles Kennedy, vice commander, New York State Department of the American Legion.

It wasn't long before her efforts attracted State-wide attention and her name selected from a list of 146, submitted by various organizations and clergymen, for the great honor of being the outstanding mother of the year. Albert P. Cornella, founder of the league, called the selection a splendid one and said she is typical of the mothers of today, "who are, indeed a great source of inspiration and courage to their sons. They endure many sacrifices and do much in upholding the morale of not only the men who are overseas but also of those remaining at home."

Four of her sons were at the dais when she was feted at the league's sixteenth annual dinner on Mother's Day at the Hotel

Granada, at which former Magistrate Leo Healy was toastmaster.

Saturday and Sunday were always Mother's Days for the Scolnick clan in prewar days, and the second Sunday of May will never be quite the same again until they are all reunited. Then they can modestly tell of the small part they contributed to the winning of the war—on the battle front—and over here.

Two Fruitful Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of July 7, 1945:

TWO FRUITFUL YEARS

The second anniversary of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps has been observed nationally during the present week with everyone agreeing that the country's largest and youngest uniformed group of women has made itself indispensable in these difficult times.

Since its founding, more than 112,000 women between the ages of 17 and 35 have enrolled as cadet nurses and an additional 60,000 will be needed during the coming year. The corps has achieved a two-fold purpose in that it has alleviated conditions resulting from the shortage of nurses and, moreover, it is preparing its members to be the graduate nurses of tomorrow when they will assume an important place in the postwar era.

The Nation is proud of these women in grey and scarlet who have rendered such honored and vital servic as replacements for thousands of trained nurses who are attending to the wounded behind the lines.

Young women who are finishing their schooling may consider membership in the Cadet Nursing Corps as a personal advancement that will pay substantial dividends as the years go by.

The Pampering of German War Prisoners Goes Merrily On—This Time at the Expense of Our Heroic American Fighting Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, from all corners of the United States protests are arising against the pampering of war prisoners with travel accommodations of the highest order while American soldiers, sailors, and marines, many of them battle scarred fighting men from the European and South Pacific theaters, are required to travel to their new assignments in railroad cars hardly fit for human occupancy.

Though I am quite sure that the War Department, in cooperation with the railroads, has already initiated steps to correct this shocking situation, a correction which must be immediately effected if these protests are ever to be allayed, expressions continue to pour in on my desk from indignant parents and protesting servicemen, a circumstance which impels me to believe that corrections are not being effected as fast they should be.

As an example of the protests which are reaching my desk, in wires and airmail letters, I am, in accordance with the permission of the membership heretofore expressed, privileged to read into the RECORD a telegram which reached me but a few moments ago from the Fresno (Calif.) Exchange Club, an organization in the membership of which are to be found only citizens of the highest probity, American citizens who are entitled to the respectful attention of the membership of this great legislative body. The telegram, Mr. Speaker, to which I have just adverted, is the following:

FRESNO, CALIF., *July 9, 1945.*

Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas newspaper reports state that Army veterans returning from Europe have been transported across the United States to Camp Beale in railway coaches without sufficient water or proper food, while German prisoners of war have been moved in pullman cars; and

Whereas Raymond E. Hall, a member of the Exchange Club of Fresno, Calif., reports that his son was one of those soldiers shipped from Tampa, Fla., to Camp Beale, Calif., in day coaches, vintage 1918, without sufficient water or proper food; and

Whereas said soldiers at Denver, Colo., saw German prisoners of war being transported by pullman car while they themselves were crowded into chair cars; and

Whereas the foregoing furnishes evidence of gross neglect and mismanagement in the handling of troop movements beyond the normal exigencies of war: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Exchange Club of Fresno, Calif., That we deplore the conditions as above reported; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask that punitive measures be taken against those individuals responsible for such conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that all branches of the military services take action to see that such conditions are not repeated; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this club and that a copy be sent to Hon. B. W. GEARHART, United States Representative, Ninth District of California, with a request that proper action be taken.

FRESNO EXCHANGE CLUB,
By A. V. JORDAN, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the request that is contained in the telegram I have just read, I am referring this most timely protest to the Secretary of War for his immediate consideration in the hope that the conditions complained against may be reversed and that our American fighting men, when traveling, be accorded the preferential consideration to which they are so eminently entitled.

San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me over radio station WIND, Chicago, Ill., on Saturday, July 7, 1945:

I wish to thank radio station WIND for its patriotic cooperation in extending to me this broadcast in order to discuss some features of the International Conference recently held in the city of San Francisco.

America rejoices that 50 nations have signed a Charter which we hope will insure the permanent peace of the world.

The San Francisco Conference was the first milestone toward international understanding, cooperation, and fellowship, which is indispensable to peace, prosperity, and world security. It was also the first response from a grateful world to the millions of our youth who were willing to sacrifice everything in battle that future generations can enjoy liberty and free government.

There are empty chairs in millions of our homes today which were vacated by boys whose fathers only a generation ago went to battle the aggressor and preserve world freedom. In 1919 those heroes returned, proud of the great victory they had won. Their slogan was, "We have won a war which will end all future wars." In 1919 those boys did not realize that bitter partisan politics would keep America out of an international organization to preserve the future peace. At that time those warriors did not know that we would lose the peace and that their sons would be fighting another world war a generation hence.

We know now that the failure of the United States Senate to ratify the League of Nations Covenant weakened the League and made it impotent from the beginning.

Without the prestige of the United States, powerful in war, powerful in peace, the League was doomed to failure from the beginning. We are grateful today that leaders of both political parties are working in unison and our Nation is leading the other nations in forming international machinery to prevent future wars.

When the American delegates returned to Washington last week I secured a copy of the "Charter of the United Nations," which consists of 41 typewritten pages. The brief preamble on page 1 will take its place in world history, along with the United States Constitution and the Magna Carta. The first line of this preamble is as follows, "We, the peoples of the United Nations." I distinctly remember the first line of the old League of Nations which was, "We, the high contracting parties." What a contrast in the first lines of these two great documents.

These two phrases exemplify the essential difference in spirit between the old League and the new United Nations Charter. You notice the sharply etched picture of the profound change in peoples' thinking that has taken place in 25 years. For just as this war was fought as a peoples' war, so recognition has been given in the new Charter that if there is to be any hope of success, it must be a peoples' peace.

The great test of San Francisco was not so much the production of a document as it was whether the nations really wanted to, and

could work together. Inevitably, the two key countries were the United States and the Soviet Union, hitherto, the two most outstanding isolationists, and now, as a result of the war, the two most powerful.

The Conference got off to a bad start. The death of President Roosevelt and the end of the European war unleashed all the bitter anti-Russian propaganda by isolationist politicians and press which, up until then, had been prudently silent. From certain sources in this country you would think we were at war with Russia instead of Japan.

That campaign has failed. It became clear to the dispensers of hate that American public opinion would not allow them to destroy the peace program as they did 25 years ago. Everybody recognizes the Soviet relations with the rest of the world, including ourselves, are better today than they were 2 months ago. Suspicions, jealousies, and hatreds between nations disappear when their representatives exchange ideas and meet with each other in the spirit of friends and neighbors.

The Conference was a success because it was the first demonstration of world unity and the first evidence that, after a devastating war, the victors can work together and agree on fundamental principles.

There was even a greater achievement back of the Conference. It was the splendid work of the American delegation, whose bipartisan membership and harmonized action now assures ratification by the United States Senate. Four of the outstanding leaders on foreign affairs from both political parties in the Congress led the American delegation. No doubt, in selecting these statesmen from the congressional membership, our late war President profited by the mistake which was made at the Peace Conference after World War I.

On last Monday I had the honor and privilege of being present when President Truman formally laid the United Nations Charter before the Senate and asked that it be ratified without unreasonable delay. The warm and cordial reception given the President on both sides of the floor and the almost unanimous and extended applause after he completed his brief address was sufficient for the observer to predict that the Charter would receive rapid and favorable action.

This Charter is built upon a solid foundation. The General Assembly, composed of 50 member nations, will be a great international legislature or sounding board before which questions that effect world peace may be given a public airing.

The Security Council is made up of the five major nations as permanent members. Six nonpermanent members will be elected by the Assembly to serve a term of 2 years. The Security Council may receive and consider a complaint by any member or nonmember state involving an international dispute. It may decide what measures short of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions.

The economic and social branch of the Charter gives recognition to commercial maladjustments that in the past have played so important a part in fomenting wars.

The International Court of Justice is a tribunal for nations to present all controversial international problems.

The entire Charter from start to finish breathes the spirit of western political philosophy and is not unlike the basic structure that underlies the fundamentals of our own Constitution. The rights and sovereignty of the United States are not imperiled.

All of us can and will work together to put down international anarchy or stop potential aggressors. In a lawless world, it is the small and the weak who are first to suffer. This applies to nations as well as individuals. Any member nation, large or small, can present its problem to the Assembly and the Security Council for arbitration and solution.

We have taken a great step forward—but it is only the first step to world security. The fight for lasting international peace began years ago under the far-sighted leadership of Woodrow Wilson. Later, our Nation and the world, were fortunate that divine providence gave us a leader, of similar qualifications and ability, in our late beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We have finally learned that the comradeship of war must be carried forward to a comradeship in peace. If we have been able to fight side by side in killing and destroying, why should we not join together to save millions of human lives in the future and aid the downtrodden peoples of the earth to rebuild their devastated lands and to recreate wasted wealth and shattered homes.

The Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods Conference of last summer were merely a preliminary to groove along with the United Nations Charter. We must take a lead in the establishment of world trade. No nation can cope with us in industrial production. That we have demonstrated in the last 4 years. American labor and industry have accomplished a miracle since Pearl Harbor. For our own good, it was imperative that we extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act as recommended by President Truman. Congress should enact without delay, the two Bretton Woods proposals, one creating a monetary fund to stabilize the value of all currencies in terms of each other, and the other, establishing an international bank, the functions of which will be to finance the construction of long-term-productive projects in war-torn countries. Both proposals involve an investment of about $6,000,000,000 on our part and should go far toward building a durable peace and reestablishing stable world trade. We have spent over $200,000,000,000 to fight the Axis in an effort to preserve freedom, so why should we quibble over a comparatively small investment which will enlarge and expand our foreign trade, create jobs, and international good will in an effort to avert future wars.

Our fighting men know that they were called to war for the preservation of freedom and an opportunity to live the American way of life. They have accomplished this patriotic undertaking. It is now our duty to prove worthy of their sacrifices. We can give them the opportunity to enjoy the freedom and equality for which they suffered. That opportunity will lie in full employment, decent living conditions, proper housing, educational advantages, and security for themselves and their families.

We must remember, however, that world peace will cost something. It will call for sacrifice and cooperation. It must be supported by our constant efforts and influence in the cause of peace. It is well worth the price. We have seen the world on fire twice in our lifetime. Millions of lives have been sacrificed, billions of dollars spent, oceans of tears have been shed. The grief and suffering endured is unbounded—civilization and economic progress have been retarded beyond comprehension.

The world has paid a dreadful price, but if this Charter of the United Nations will continue its initial success and bring nations to the table of arbitration rather than to the battlefield, our sufferings will not have been in vain.

International understanding, confidence, and tolerance must be the cornerstone upon which the postwar world will be rebuilt for progress, security, and permanent peace.

Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of determining the attitude of the people of central Missouri toward the all-important question of compulsory peacetime military training, I have sent out approximately 5,000 letters to a cross-section of representative citizens asking their view on the subject.

Over 3,000 of these letters were sent to a selected list consisting of Republican and Democratic county committeemen, Republican and Democratic county officials, persons believing in constitutional government, and professional men and women. Of this number I have received answers from about 700 persons, only 30 percent of whom favor action on the part of Congress at this time establishing peacetime military conscription.

A similar letter was sent to each of approximately 1,500 persons in my district representing the nearest of kin to boys who have been killed or wounded or missing in action. The very interesting thing is the replies from this latter group indicate that relatives of boys who have experienced the hardships of battle and who have suffered therefrom are far more inclined to favor compulsory military training. They are voting on a ratio of 60 percent in favor of military training. This, Mr. Speaker, is a striking contrast to the other group of persons whom I thought represented a cross-section of the thinking of my district and who were only 30 percent favorable to the proposed military training.

The letters which I have received in response to my inquiry clearly disclose the fact that there are two sides to the question. I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD one of the best letters in favor of peacetime conscription which was written by Mrs. T. J. Talbert, of Columbia, Mo., and also to include one of the best letters in opposition which was written by Mr. A. J. Bolinger, judge of the Probate Court of Morgan County, and who resides at Versailles, Mo.

The letters follow:

COLUMBIA, MO., *June 5, 1945.*

Hon. MAX SCHWABE,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In one of your recent reports to the people of your district you have presented a few pro and con statements on the question of military training for the youth of America.

It is my personal feeling that we must work out a military training program which will keep our youth ready at a moment's notice to protect the ideals of Americanism. With the instruments of war becoming more technical and difficult to operate it takes more time to learn to carry on with success any war program.

Let us not forget that America ushered into this era representative government which has raised the dignity of men and women to great heights. As long as there are un-Christian nations in the world it would seem logical that America must keep prepared a military force to protect a people who have chosen to live under a government founded upon the sound philosophy of God's laws in human relations. You notice that I said protect, not to aggress upon another. This makes the purpose of military training legitimate.

Through the educational department of the United Nations Organization we must do more to inform the world of the undergirding philosophy which has given mankind under the Stars and Stripes of America the freedoms which all mankind in the world cherish, yet are forbidden in many instances. Inalienable rights are sacred in origin, and we must protect those ideals in government which prevent an individual from becoming a mere economic political or biological unit of a social order. American ideals must go forward and not backward. This is why we must have a military force to protect them in a seemingly barbaric world.

Very truly yours,

MRS. T. J. TALBERT.

VERSAILLES, MO., *June 11, 1945.*

Hon. MAX SCHWABE, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MAX: I notice that you are inquiring in regard to the feeling of the people in this district as to postwar conscription.

My own reaction to this is, that this is a very inopportune time for the matter to be taken up. There can be no need for immediate action. Any soldier given training now, would under normal recurrence of war, be too old for military service, should the emergency arise. I am making this statement on a generally recognized fact, that about 20 years intervenes normally between major conflicts. Such being the case, a few years' delay in consireding the matter until such time as the war hysteria ends, certainly would make no difference if we should then determine that universal conscription is necessary.

I am, however, of the opinion that universal conscription would be a dangerous remedy for a none too certain disorder. Conscription always has been the death blow to a democracy. Our citizen soldier fights to a standstill and annihilates the trained men of militaristic nations. In my opinion the untrained man given a short opportunity for guidance, makes a better soldier than the man who has been cast in the hard and fast mold of military tradition.

I am not even considering the financial end of the matter. If one cared to do that, the cost in maintaining such a standing army as would be developed, would be staggering.

We are altogether too close now to a totalitarian government and the training of all of our young men in subservient and unquestioning obdience to commands would make a very fruitful seedbed for a future crop of that sort.

Also, against whom do we need this army. At the close of the present war, the Axis nations will be beyond ability to again become aggressors. The only other power we might fear would be either England or Russia. I doubt of any American actually anticipates military conflict with either nation.

It is a poor commentary on the San Francisco Conference to be demanding military training at this time. I do not question the good faith or patriotism of those who are making this demand. I do question very much their wisdom and attribute their attitude to the fact that they have not thought through the situation.

It may take some courage to oppose this plan and the supporting pressure. I trust that you will have that necessary fortitude.

As ever, your friend,

A. J. BOLINGER.

Stalin and World Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the information of the House the following very informative article which appeared in Collier's, by Admiral William H. Standley, former Ambassador to Russia. Our relations with Russia now are of paramount importance and Admiral Standley's article should be very helpful in that connection:

The purpose of this article is to show how the Soviet Union emerged from isolation into a position where it sincerely wants to cooperate with its allies in the postwar world. This change became apparent to me while I was in Russia as American Ambassador, and nothing that has happened since has shaken my conviction that it is to the interest of the Soviet Union to work wholeheartedly toward a stable peace.

Before becoming Ambassador I went to Russia as a member of the Beaverbrook-Harriman mission in October 1941. This was a critical period. The German attack was at its height and the Nazi armies were nearing Moscow. They had rolled like a juggernaut across the Russian plains and there were very few military authorities who dared hope they could be stopped. On the long trip on H. M. S. *London* from England to Archangel I remember Lord Beaverbrook twitting his military aides on their original predictions that the Russian war would be over in 3 weeks. They admitted that error with some wryness of countenance, but it was plain that they still had to be convinced that the Russians could withstand the weight of the tremendous German attack.

We were not an overly optimistic party, and I think our first real hopes for the Russians came when the Soviet pilots took us over at Archangel for the last lap to Moscow. They were flying Russianized DC–3s and they flew them exactly as a Cossack would ride a horse. They swooped and dipped, and at one point came so close to a military area of their own that the ground troops opened fire on them. Those daredevils merely ducked low over a grove of trees and looked like a covey of quail getting away. The episode didn't help our state of mind but it somehow gave us confidence about the general morale of the country.

The mission was there to arrange for the transportation of supplies to help Russia withstand the German attack. On the night of our arrival, Lord Beaverbrook and Mr. Harriman met Mr. Stalin and other important Soviet officials in a business session. It was so successful that they returned with the thought that they could settle the business on hand almost immediately. The various experts with the mission were urged to get their estimates and papers in order so that they could be laid before Mr. Stalin and the matter consummated at the earliest possible moment.

The next night brought a shocking change. Beaverbrook came back from the Kremlin almost in tears. It seemed that Stalin was cool toward the whole idea of accepting help. Our orders had been not to dicker, not to demand favors in exchange for gifts, not to insist on quid pro quo. The hope in Washington and London was that somehow the Russians could be kept going till spring. Here we were offering the Soviet Union help, and Stalin was spurning it. Why?

Naturally I don't know what went on in Mr. Stalin's mind but it is plain to me that we are under a misapprehension about his role as a dictator. From what I learned then and later, he never makes a decision without consulting the heads of departments and the military chiefs of staff. They evidently expressed the view to him that we couldn't possibly get supplies to Russia in time to be of any real assistance.

TO STAND—OR FALL—ALONE

In view of this, he evidently didn't want to be under obligations to us. He was having great problems of his own. His armies were still falling back; his industrial centers in the west had been overrun; the farm and factory regions of the Ukraine and White Russia were lost. He had everything to prove about the strength of his system and his country, and may have felt that outside aid would be taken by his people as a sign of weakness.

However, in the meantime, vital meetings were going on between the experts of our staff and their comparable Russian representatives and from them evidently came the Russian belief that we were not only sincere about bringing relief but could do it in time. The agreement was finally made on the third night, and Beaverbrook and Harriman came back from the Kremlin in great excitement to urge their assistants to get things in order so that the papers could be signed at once.

Two days later, after the usual terminal Kremlin banquet, we left Moscow, October 4, 1941, in almost a gale. Our planes bobbed around on the field like catboats in a squall, and it seemed like the worst possible flying weather, but the Russians insisted that we leave. It was only later we learned that the direct attack on Moscow had started 2 days earlier, October 2. Nobody knew if Moscow could hold. Even Stalin couldn't know and obviously he wanted us to get away in time.

As a matter of fact, Stalin was partly right about our supplies. We sent a shipload of P–40's to Archangel, but when they were assembled, it was found that certain essential parts were missing. The planes had been shipped knowing that this was true, and the extra parts had been sent on behind. However, the Soviet authorities had insisted that because of the difficulties of the Murmansk route, some of the supplies should come by way of Basra, and the spare parts happened to be among those supplies. The P–40's lay on the ground at Archangel for 6 months waiting for these spare parts.

The Beaverbrook-Harriman mission returned to London and immediately started implementing the agreements made at Moscow. In general, the members of the mission were optimistic about Russia. Personally, I was convinced after observation that the Russians would not quit, no matter how bad things looked. They would retire to the Volga line and even to the Urals if necessary. I expressed that view in a broadcast after I returned to this country.

On completion of the Beaverbrook-Harriman mission, I returned to my post at the Navy Department. Sometime later I met Secretary Hull, and my appointment as Ambassador was decided on. I got my credentials and, before leaving, called on President Roosevelt for my instructions. My main job was to stimulate the flow of supplies to the

Russians, but, in addition, Mr. Roosevelt had two messages which he gave me verbally. I was instructed to see Mr. Stalin and tell him that (a) Mr. Roosevelt felt it desirable for him to meet Mr. Stalin personally at an early date, to coordinate our efforts in anticipation of the eventual German collapse. When that collapse came, it might be harmful to relations between the United Nations if previous understandings had not been agreed on. And (b) that the President was very much interested in establishing a route across Alaska and Siberia for the delivery of planes.

On April 11, 1942, I arrived in Moscow. Two days later, I had my first meeting with Mr. Molotov, and on April 14 I presented my credentials to President Kalinin at the Kremlin. On April 23 I met Mr. Stalin for the first time and gave him Mr. Roosevelt's message.

Mr. Stalin smiled when I mentioned the matter of the personal meeting with Mr. Roosevelt and said, "That matter has been talked about, but nothing has been settled."

Then I took up the matter of the plane route across Alaska and Siberia, and again he seemed disinterested.

"Alaska and Siberia are too cold," he said. "Why not directly across the North Pole? That's easier."

A TRANS-SIBERIAN AIR ROUTE

I replied that I had had some experience with aviation and had been told that fliers preferred Alaska in wintertime. I said I was sure these practical men knew their business and would prefer the Alaska-Siberia route. Mr. Stalin shrugged again and said that even the Greenland route would be better, and we left it at that.

Although it doesn't follow in chronological order, I want to finish the story of the plane route. It was found that it was difficult to get planes to Murmansk, and the assembly job at Basra was very slow because of the intense heat, the sandstorms, and generally crude conditions there.

Washington kept pressing the matter, and in July, 1942, I had a letter from President Roosevelt proposing to help in establishing the Alaska-Siberia route. He made four propositions: (a) to survey the route (furnishing a plane to carry a spare Russian crew); (b) to build airfields and establish air aids (radio beams, beacons, direction finders, etc.); (c) to bring gas supplies in through the Russian rivers flowing to the Arctic; (d) to supply planes immediately on the completion of the route.

Mr. Stalin smiled and replied, "The fields have been built, gasoline supplies have been set up, and we are now sending Soviet officers on missions to survey the routes."

This was an eye-opener to me and gave me a new insight into Russian psychology. They are sensitive about their shortcomings and eager to show the world their best side. They are as reluctant as any other people to be shown up, and if they do anything at all, they want to do it themselves. While there was still a hang-over from their years of isolation, this incident proved to me that they were moving all the time toward cooperation.

This opinion was confirmed when, in May 1942, Mr. Molotov negotiated the 20-year nonaggression pact with Mr. Churchill in London and subsequently came to the United States to discuss plans with the President.

There was, however, an embarrassing outcome of the Molotov trip to Washington. At that time a joint communiqué was issued in Washington which said that "a full understanding was reached with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a second front in Europe in 1942."

The Russians regarded this as a definite promise, but I realized immediately that it could be taken several ways. It could mean that an agreement had been made to have the second front in Europe or it could mean that it had been agreed not to have it. Nothing was definite except that an agreement had been made on a second front. At any rate, it brought our relations to a crisis. The war was going badly for the Russians, and a great agitation arose about the second front.

It was said openly that in the absence of the second front, the "Red Army was fighting the war alone." This refrain appeared in speeches and even in war communiqués. I finally decided that it had become serious and wired President Roosevelt to that effect, urging him to correct the impression left by the Washington communiqué if it were not true. I also mentioned the matter to Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, the British Ambassador, who said he hadn't noticed the agitation, but in a few days he came to see me and let me know that he was also worried. He communicated his feeling to Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill immediately came to Moscow, and it is violating no confidence to say that the sessions between him and Mr. Stalin were stormy. There was one famous meeting that lasted until 3:30 in the morning and left nerves frayed on both sides. There is a diplomatic device whereby a host indicates that the visit of his guest is over; this is to invite him to a formal dinner. Mr. Stalin looked at Mr. Churchill and said, "I invite you to dinner at the Kremlin tomorrow night."

Mr. Churchill arose promptly and said, "I shall accept your invitation to dinner and I inform you now that I am leaving by plane at daylight the following morning."

At this Mr. Stalin burst out laughing. "What's your hurry?" he said, and that eased the tension and the meeting went on.

The crisis was still great when Wendell Willkie came over in September 1942. The great battle of Stalingrad was raging and Russia had reached the breaking point. When Mr. Willkie and I visited farms or factories or schools, invariably a worker or pupil or street urchin would pop up and ask when the Allies were going to open the second front. What stopped the agitation was the British-American landing in north Africa on November 8, 1942. The first reaction in Russia was that this was no substitute for a second front in Europe, but that died several days later when Stalin issued a statement congratulating the Allies, stating that the African invasion was a great step forward in the war.

The Russians never fooled themselves about the possibility of Stalingrad falling. Both Litvinov in Washington and Maisky in London gave pessimistic interviews, hinting that Stalingrad might fall but that it would make no difference in the Russians' determination to fight on.

Looking back now, it all seems like a bad dream, but even then I had faith that the Russians would hold. When I was in Moscow with the Beaverbrook-Harriman mission, there was determination, but there were also apprehension and a sullen defiance. When I returned as Ambassador, the effect of having repelled the enemy at the gates was very much in evidence. There was the same determination, but there was a definite heads-up attitude, a new confidence. The Russians had found that the German Army was not invincible and that meant all the difference.

In October 1942 I returned to Washington to report to Mr. Hull and the President. While there I called on Ambassador Litvinov and had a long talk with him. He referred to the suspicions of the Soviet Union still current in Washington and asked what could be done to allay them. He asked me for my opinion as to what caused the prejudice against his country.

I replied that I thought it was caused by the activities of the Comintern. I added that, while we like Russia, we certainly did not like American Communists and wouldn't like any group that sought to undermine us and destroy our form of government by force. He assured me that there was no connection between the activities of the Comintern and the Soviet Government. He endeavored to explain that, while the Communist Party of Russia sat in on the Comintern, the Soviet Government had nothing to do with it.

"Mr. Litvinov," I said, "I am a plain man, an average American. If you can't convince me of the soundness of what you are saying, I'm sure you can't convince other Americans. You don't convince me."

I arrived back in Kuibyshev early in January 1943, and the German Army capitulated at Stalingrad on January 31. This not only marked a turning point in the war but occasioned a definite reorientation of Soviet policy. Stalin went down and lived with the Army for 6 weeks. He had assumed the role of marshal and had officially taken over the military conduct of the war. Even before Stalingrad, the commissar system in the Army had been abolished, and many older Russian customs had been reestablished, such as the wearing of epaulets and the designation as "Guards" regiments for conquering divisions.

In short, Stalin now saw that he had a great Army and realized that at last the Soviet Union was in a position to take a leading role in world affairs. Before Stalingrad, Russia had been in retreat and its fate hung in the balance. The Russian armies that had fallen back mile by mile were now to pass over to the attack and prove the masters of the great Germany Army. The Soviet troops almost immediately began the march that was to make them conquerors of Berlin in May 1945. It was to be a long, tortuous drive, but Stalin even then could see the end of it.

Soon after this, Mr. Molotov asked the British Ambassador, Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, to call at the foreign office and informed him the Soviet Government had decided to recall the Russian Ambassador to London and replace him with the Russian representative in Canada. He assured Kerr this had no political significance, but that Marshal Stalin realized that his contacts with the British Government were growing and that he had no one in Moscow who had experience with the British and understood them.

A few days later, Mr. Molotov asked me to call and made almost the identical statements concerning Mr. Litvinov, adding that Marshal Stalin needed Mr. Litvinov's advice in connection with his dealings with the United States.

At the time, these moves were taken in some quarters as an indication of Marshal Stalin's dissatisfaction with British and American policy but I did not share the view. Mr. Litvinov was installed in the Foreign Office building, and I have every reason to believe he was used as indicated by Mr. Molotov.

It was at this point that former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies arrived in Moscow with the famous secret letter from President Roosevelt to Marshal Stalin. The contents of this letter forms no part in this story. What is important is that Mr. Litvinov arrived in Moscow the same day with Mr. Davies, although they had not traveled together. The night they arrived, Mr. Davies and I went to the circus with Mr. Litvinov. During the course of the performance, Mr. Litvinov leaned across Mr. Davies and said to me, "Have you heard the news? The Comintern has been dissolved."

Naturally I claim no credit for this development, since I was told that the move had been under consideration for at least a year. But it was my opinion at the time that the whole structure of the new Soviet foreign policy was based on that decision. Stalin found that the country could stand

a war and fight back. The hinterland was strained to the breaking point but it was supplying the Army, and now the Army was winning. It was as if Stalin had said, "I have a couple of aces and a king; now I want to sit in on the game."

TRIUMPH OF STALIN'S POLICY

He apparently felt that the war had not only proved to be a test of the Army and of the industrial economy, but it marked the triumph of Stalin's policy over Trotsky. Trotsky had maintained that socialism was not possible in one country surrounded by a sea of enemies; Stalin held that socialism could succeed in one country. He felt that propaganda and intrigue on an international scale toward world-wide socialism had been a failure. He insisted that if the Soviet Union triumphed as a socialist state, its example would do more toward swinging the world to socialism than all the words of persuasion and the doctrinal teachings. Stalin was now ready to act internationally. The meeting of the foreign ministers was arranged for in Moscow in October. Out of that grew the celebrated meeting of the Big Three at Tehran in November, from which it appeared that Russia was now prepared to cooperate.

Cooperation is not always easy. The Russians are sensitive and stubborn; we are sensitive and stubborn. As I once told Mr. Molotov, "This good-will thing is a two-way street." That phrase came about as a result of a newspaper interview I gave in Moscow, which caused great excitement over the world. Through the State Department, the OWI had been urging me to get some statement from the Russians on the "material effect" of lend-lease to be used in support of pending lend-lease legislation.

In cases where the Russians were not denying the effect of lend-lease, they were ignoring it. I put the matter of the statement for OWI uses up to Mr. Molotov, who said he would take it under advisement. At the same time, war communiqués were appearing saying that the Russians were fighting all alone, and prior to this had come the famous letter from Marshal Stalin in answer to questions put to him by Henry Cassidy, an American correspondent, in which he said that the material effect of lend-lease was very slight in view of what the Soviet Armies were doing in keeping the Germans off the necks of the other allies.

At a meeting in March 1943, with some American and British correspondents who had just come back from the front, I asked them if they had seen signs of American equipment. They answered that, with the exception of a few light trucks, they had seen none. They also stated that Soviet soldiers who were questioned denied any knowledge of American equipment on their front. In reply to a query as to the status of lend-lease legislation in Washington, I stated that our American legislators were bighearted people and would go to great lengths to give aid if it were being helpful, but give the contrary view, and their actions would be entirely different.

I added that since I had been in Russia I had carefully watched for and had failed to see or hear any evidence that the American aid (particularly the Russian War Relief or Red Cross supplies) was being received and used. On being asked, I replied that I had no objections to be quoted to this effect.

It caused an international stir and I think did a great deal of good. The Russians still didn't publish any statements of their own but they reprinted the stories on my interview which appeared in the papers of this country, and also information from our sources on lend-lease. There was never anything said to me about the interview by Russian officials but later at Teheran, Marshal Stalin gave full credit to the great help American industry had given in winning the war.

It was hinted to me in Moscow that perhaps the Russian reluctance to report the facts of lend-lease help was caused by a feeling that their own people might tend to relax their efforts. They had been strained to the utmost but any slackening at that time would have been fatal, regardless of how much we were sending.

This may well be true, but I am a believer in frankness in international relations and I know that the Russians appreciate frankness. Nothing is more futile and dangerous than a debate on what country won the war. In my view, Russia could not have won without us and we could not have won without Russia. The Russian people have seen our help and they appreciate it. I think the subject needn't be carried beyond that.

When the total war is over, Stalin has a chance to be the greatest Russian of all time. His people have had almost 30 years of struggle. Now they want to reap the benefits of their labors. They have been promised and they want consumer goods and pleasures and peace. It is absolutely essential for Mr. Stalin to supply these wants. Naturally he is not going to sacrifice the strong position of the Soviet Union in world affairs, but I am convinced that to attain these ends it is in his interest to cooperate in attaining a stable peace. His country not only needs it desperately, but I am certain that he desires it sincerely and fervently.

There are many problems unsolved, including Poland and other liberated countries. No matter how difficult and complicated they seem, I am sure that they will be handled satisfactorily in time. It seems to me that at the San Francisco Conference differences between nations were exaggerated out of all proportion. It is the height of folly to discuss diplomatic conflicts as if they were part of an athletic contest, with victories, defeats, and other belligerent phrases. Putting it bluntly, the world either gets peace now or it gets final disaster. No sane individual can look at the pictures of destruction in Europe without knowing that.

The Russians are a sensitive people. For 25 years they were virtually quarantined, and now they are feeling their oats. It may be naive of them to keep repeating that they really are a great power, but it is understandable. When Ambassador Gromyko represented the Soviet Union at Dumbarton Oaks there were no complaints that the Conference was being slighted. However, we felt that the San Francisco Conference required the presence of Mr. Molotov, and Mr. Molotov finally decided to come.

MR. MOLOTOV AT SAN FRANCISCO

It would be well to reread Mr. Molotov's statements upon arriving, in which he referred to the honor done him by the appointment and to the Soviet Union by his presence. He considered the conference important and represented his country in that manner. He won some of his points and lost others. He took rebuffs in good part and showed no desire to desert the Conference, although one might have thought that from the dispatches of certain writers.

The San Francisco Conference has not settled all points of dispute, but while the fireworks were going off on the roof the foundation of a peace structure was quietly being strengthened below. That framework has now been constructed, and San Francisco will be remembered for that success.

Mr. Molotov did not desert the Conference at San Francisco because the Soviet Union can't afford to allow the foundations of peace to be destroyed. They can't afford to do it, and we can't afford to allow them to do it. The world simply can't stand another great war. Is there any sensible person who thinks it can?

Our National Security and Postwar Economy Make the Further Development of Our Western Steel and Mineral Resources Imperative

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, a forthcoming report of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of which I am a member, will point very forcefully to the possibilities and probabilities of the western part of the United States becoming a great mineral processing and manufacturing area. This report, which condemns the concentration of the steel industry in one small section of the country at the expense of the remainder of the Nation, is based upon extensive investigations and studies.

These investigations were carried on cooperatively by the committee with the United States Bureau of Mines. Early in the report appears the following language:

Faced in 1941 with the immediate wartime problem of producing more than 100,000,000 tons of steel annually, the American steel industry undertook the vast job of expansion. This expansion called for increased plant capacity as steel was required at the right time and the right places. As part of the program to have steel at the right time and right places, the report points out two huge steel plants were placed in production in the western part of the United States; one at Geneva, Utah, near Salt Lake City, and the second at Fontana, Calif, near Los Angeles.

The report further points out that due to the looming depletion of high-grade iron-ore reserves in the Lake Superior region, that it was necessary to utilize the scattered deposits of iron ore and in addition to conserve the freight-carrying capacity of the country. To do this it obviously was necessary to undertake decentralization. Steel had to be produced at points nearer the shipyards and other industries where it was so urgently needed.

Referring to the Geneva and Fontana plants, this report says:

Such huge steel plants obviously required for their conception, the knowledge and evaluation of adequate raw materials. To assure these, the Bureau of Mines carried forward an extensive and effective exploration program. Large iron-ore deposits were found in California, in Nevada, and in Utah, on which production of these plants was based. At Eagle Mountain in California alone, more than 21,000,000 tons of ore containing 51.2 percent iron were found and mapped through an exploration project of the Bureau of Mines. In addition more than 11,000,000 tons of somewhat lower grade were found and mapped in the Bessemer iron deposits in San Bernardino, Calif. In Utah more than 12,000,000 tons of ore containing 46 percent iron was found. This ore has been produced at the rate of 60,000 tons per month to operate the Geneva plant. Without the assurance of these vast supplies of ore, the western steel project would not have been possible. Likewise, the exploration for coking coal, which has been carried forward by

the Bureau of Mines, has established more than 15,000,000 tons of coking coal at Kemmerer, Wyo. This vast reserve of coking coal stands back of the already known reserves so that these iron- and steel-producing plants in the West may go confidently forward.

Another important iron-ore project of the Bureau of Mines was the exploration of important reserves of magnetite ore in the Shasta region of California.

But steel is not made with iron alone. Fluorspar is an important ingredient not only in the making of steel but also in the production of aluminum, and it is also needed in the production of catalysts used in making high-octane gasoline and in the production of the chemical "freon," which has become so important in connection with insect control, as well as a refrigerant in many of our air-conditioning systems. Had not new deposits of fluorspar been discovered during the early days of the war, these industries would have suffered. One of the most important new deposits discovered is known as the Cougar spar deposit in southern Utah. Not only was a deposit of fluorspar discovered here but its extent was determined by drilling, a mill was built, and fluorspar is now being produced at the rate of 100 tons per day. At Myers Cove in Idaho another deposit has been explored and its extent determined. A 1,000-ton mill is being erected on the property.

Another important ingredient of steel is manganese, which is needed to the extent of approximately 14 pounds in every ton of steel. Exploration on a Nation-wide scale developed that this Nation's most important deposit of manganese thus far discovered is located at Las Vegas, Nev. The Defense Plant Corporation erected a plant there for the treatment of this ore to produce high-grade manganese nodules for use in blast furnaces for the production of ferromanganese. This project was placed in production, but due to the easing of the shipping situation it has not been continued. The deposit discovered through the work of this committee and the Bureau of Mines is available for future national defense.

In connection with the Las Vegas ferromanganese plant the report points out that in peacetime competition this plant would face economic hazards due to a lack of close-by materials needed in the manufacture of ferromanganese. However, it is pointed out that the Las Vegas manganese deposits offer an ideal combination for the production of electrolytic manganese. The report observes:

> Working in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines and industry, your committee has assisted in the presentation before appropriate governmental agencies of a proposal that an electrolytic manganese plant producing substantial daily tonnage be established at Las Vegas, Nev. This proposal has been submitted to the appropriate governmental agencies, and it is hoped that the idle plant at Las Vegas, now surplus property, can be utilized, and that there will be developed in this country a substantial electrolytic manganese industry.

Establishment and operation of such an electrolytic manganese plant is absolutely necessary in developing the steel industry in the West. It will provide employment for many miners and technical workers, as well as make available to the Geneva and Fontana steel plants manganese in its purest form. It is through such integrated regional plans and by the utilization of local raw materials to produce the things that the West needs that the development of heavy industry in the West will be effected and national defense will be made more effective.

Then there is chromite. Although chromium is not used as a constituent in all steel, many grades of steel, including much armor plate and all stainless steel, contain chromium. It is, therefore, a vitally important material to the steel industry. During the past 2 years the Bureau of Mines, under the sponsorship of the committee, has established approximately 5,000,000 tons of chrome-ore reserve containing 23 percent chromium oxide in Stillwater County, Mont. A Government mill having a capacity of 3,000 tons per day was built there. In Oregon a project was developed whereby beach sands containing chromite were evaluated for blast in production. In the French Hill Mine in California reserves in excess of 5,000 tons of 40-percent grade chromite have been found. The Gray Eagle Mine, also in California, was found to have large reserves of low-grade chromite ore. Additional deposits of this important material have been found in California at San Luis Obispo and in McDuffey Creek area. The result of this exploratory work on chromite is a further indication of what can be accomplished in developing domestic resources of the raw material required for national defense if the steel industry is decentralized.

When the war started, America was almost entirely dependent upon foreign importations of tungsten. The report shows that through exploratory work important deposits of tungsten have been found in Idaho, Nevada, California, as well as in North Carolina. The extent of these deposits is such that America is no longer dependent upon foreign sources for tungsten.

Vanadium is another necessary material in the manufacture of many steels. This metal in prewar years came almost entirely from foreign countries. A drilling campaign of the Bureau of Mines in Colorado and Utah enables the necessary vanadium to be developed for the manufacture of steel in the West.

Through the science of geophysics a tool has provided the means for discovering minerals hidden far below the surface of the earth. Through the application of this tool in a relatively few instances thus far, great things have been accomplished by the Bureau of Mines in locating iron-ore deposits. Iron ore deposits have been discovered in Missouri at a depth of more than 1,200 feet. The important deposit at Bessemer, Calif., which is being used at the present time as a source of ore for the Fontana plant, was established by the geography method to have a very great extension. Drilling proved that this was true.

The report draws attention to the fact that—

> Three demonstration areas have been set up by the Bureau of Mines to demonstrate how the ores of three important regions of the country can be most effectively utilized. (In each of these areas a laboratory has been set up. The western area laboratory is located at Redding, Calif., nearby to the great electric power supply of Shasta Dam.) These demonstration plants must continue. Their usefulness is not one of the moment. Our resources of iron ore and the other materials which go into the making of steel will only come into effective use by continued effort, by continually working out and adapting every improvement in world-wide metallurgical technology and in bringing about changes of use pattern for the finished raw materials which will enable the product of new iron ore reduction processes to be more effectively used.

The report clearly demonstrates that in the West are to be found all of those important raw materials which go into the making of steel. The West has an abundance of hydroelectric power. The West is likewise a large user of steel. It is economic folly for the West to secure its steel from mills 2,000 miles distant when it has within its own confines those raw materials, the power, and the labor which can be utilized in the manufacture on the spot of the steel requirements of the entire Pacific coast area.

It is likewise folly from the viewpoint of national security to centralize in one congested section the steel-making facilities of the Nation. In this connection the committee report says:

> Future national security demands that every safeguard be adopted now to prevent this Nation facing the hazard at any time in the future of having too little of any raw material that goes into the machinery of war. The United States is not an aggressor nation. Every American hopes there will never be another war. On the other hand, it is our solemn duty to adopt those policies, to take every step possible which will make the United States strong and virile against attack. War has been so refined through the development of superexplosives, aircraft, and the rocket-type weapon that never again after war has come will we be able to build up stock piles of imported raw materials of war. We will be strictly on our own.

It is not enough to merely have, and know that we have, the raw materials in the ground. We must have the ability to turn them into finished products, and there is but one way to attain that ability. It is to be engaged in turning them into finished products. The West has the raw materials. The dictates of a sound national peacetime economy, as well as national security, demands that these natural resources be developed by decentralizing the steel industry.

Public Works as Catch-All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith an editorial from the New York Times of July 3 entitled "Public Works as Catch-All," which has reference to the seventh report of the Special

House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning on the subject of Postwar Public Works and Construction. The editorial follows:

PUBLIC WORKS AS CATCH-ALL

A huge program of public works continues to be the favorite policy in Washington for dealing with the postwar period. Fred M. Vinson, making his first quarterly report as head of the OWMR, for example, declares that "if redeployment is slow, if a deflation spiral threatens, then the Government must be prepared to take positive action to bolster income and create jobs through public works." All such plans seem to ignore our huge budget deficit, our unparalleled public debt, and the great need of returning as soon as possible after the war to a balanced budget, if inflation is to be kept from getting out of hand.

A few sensible warnings, fortunately, have just come from the House Postwar Economic Planning Committee. The committee, it is true, urges the blueprinting of at least a $5,000,000,000 reserve of State and local-construction projects to stabilize the building industry after the war. But it declares flatly: "The Federal Government should hold out no promise of aid to States or municipalities during the first peace years for financing their public workers—especially since many such are in a stronger financial position than before the war." During the transition period, the committee urges an expansive program of public works should "not be pitted aaginst private construction." The committee adds the general warning that the construction industry "must not be made a catch-all for the unemployed to the exclusion of other areas of production which can provide more sustained emplyoment." "We shall not serve total economic stability," it points out, "by exaggerating the cycles in construction."

This study, let us hope, will mark the beginning of a more sensible approach to the postwar economic problem. Our real problem will be, in fact, not to substitute one kind of Government orders for another, but to get industry back to producing for private civilian demand.

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a letter on the subject of ship construction from Admiral Vickery and a summary from the Maritime Commission showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through the end of June 1945:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1945.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it will be of interest to you, I am enclosing a tabulation showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through the end of June.

Deliveries from United States merchant shipyards during the month of June totaled 107 ships of 1,010,519 tons dead weight. During the first 6 months of the year there were completed 693 vessels aggregating approximately 6,960,000 tons. Total deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program from January 1939 through June 1945, amounting to some 53,000,000 tons, are equivalent to, roughly, three-quarters of the entire world's merchant tonnage at the outbreak of the European war.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
January		30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730	1,229,296
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864	1,300,340
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357	1,294,432
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691	1,004,073
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915	1,120,594
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994	1,010,519
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,433	
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	1,157,602	
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	1,185,997	
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	1,310,295	
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	1,430,660	
December	55,724	61,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	1,361,908	
Total dead weight	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	16,348,446	
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,893	1,577	

Employment of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 27, 1945, the Baltimore News Post, a Hearst paper, carried a leading editorial weeping crocodile tears for jobs for veterans. They quote the automobile industry as "giving considerable thought to the question of preference in those jobs" to veterans. The Hearst paper then attacks the War Production Board and the UAW for what they call "opposition" to giving the veteran a job.

This effort to drive a wedge between the veterans and the worker is a serious threat to the unity of our country. It is being pressed under false colors and for ulterior motives.

The following excerpt from an article in the June 30, 1945, issue of the highly respected weekly periodical, The Nation, by Irving Richter, national legislative representative for the UAW-CIO, provides the essential facts, and answers the false propaganda about veterans' employment:

Chrysler's economist, John W. Scoville, makes it very clear why the corporations are out to destroy the CIO Automobile Workers: "Fair wages are wages that are just high enough to attract the required number of employees of the desired quality. No labor unions are required to secure fair wage rates." But it is with respect to veteran reemployment and seniority that the industry has most obviously tipped its hand and sown dragon's teeth which may some day cause serious trouble in Detroit. The UAW, with 300,000 members in the armed forces, has a staff of seven veterans working full time on veterans' needs. The organization knows what may happen if efforts to turn veteran against worker succeed and has demanded that all collective-bargaining contracts be reopened for the insertion of veteran-seniority clauses. To date none of the Big Three has complied.

Instead, the industry's proposal is to grant to veterans a so-called superseniority, which in effect provides that the employer can fire anybody at any time, even a veteran of World War I who has been with the company ever since, in order to put a returned veteran in his place. Having displaced the senior employee, however, the returned veteran does not achieve seniority himself under the company proposal. On the contrary, he can be fired like any other novice after the 1 year provided in the Selective Service Act. In short, the automobile industry proposes to destroy seniority altogether, for veterans and nonveterans alike, under the guise of providing jobs for returned servicemen. Ultimately the best protection for the veteran as for everyone else will be jobs for all—60,000,000 jobs. The industry's program is to sell the veteran the notion that the only way for him to get a job is to take it away from someone else.

The Priceless Prelude to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a poem entitled "The Priceless Prelude to World Peace." The author requests that it be used anonymously.

I believe that this poem sets forth our purposes, hopes, and aspirations for a better world.

THE PRICELESS PRELUDE TO WORLD PEACE

'Twas most fitting that the Conf'rence
Of United Nations should
Meet at San Francisco, city
Whose unique location could
For the purpose, not be equaled
In the orange-blossom State
Of the sun-kissed California,
With its open Golden Gate.

Suited city for the writing
Of the Charter, world-designed,
For the lasting preservation
Of the peace for all mankind,
San Francisco may in hist'ry
Stand next to Mount Sinai,
Where God dropped the Ten Commandments
Down to Moses, from the sky.

This world Charter's first commandment,
Tho' not writ therein with pen,
Is, beyond all question, binding
Both on nations and on men;
But it promises all nations,
Dwelling now upon the sod,
Peace, when they put first and foremost
Their faith in Creation's God.

Nations have faith in each other
When they all rely upon
God, and to Him pray, in earnest,
"Not my will, but Thine, be done"—
Then each man, in every nation,
Can, above his mantel-shelf,
Write, "Lord, make me love my neighbor,
Always, as I love myself."

Fifty diff'rent nations sponsored
This San Francisco affair,
Seeking peace, thru this world Charter,
For all nations, everywhere,
And there'll be peace 'mongst all nations
When, in church and home and school,
Men not only preach, but practice,
As they should, the Golden Rule.

This San Francisco World Conf'rence
Owes its marvelous success
To the one fact that its members
Were resolved to not digress
From their one supreme objective,
And were sworn to never cease
Working till they penned a Charter
Based on justice, right, and peace.

We have, thru cooperation,
Won the godless German war,
And, with unity of purpose,
We hope that the day's not far
When the Japs, too, will surrender;
And, when this World War shall cease,
If we will but stay united,
Under God, we'll win the peace.

If the precepts in this Charter
Be not faithfully applied,
With a universal fairness,
We'll betray those who have died
To preserve the freedom under
Whose flag 50 nations met
And created this world Charter,
Which mankind will not forget.

Mighty military nations,
Well equipped and trained for war,
Have emerged from this great conflict,
None of which again must mar
Mankind's peace, for selfish conquest,
But, when this World War shall cease,
We must use these armies only
To defend our blood-bought peace.

By their own examples, nations
That are strongest ought to lead
In the principles of justice
Which this Charter has decreed—
Now the task of planning's ended,
It is time for action now
Let the nations ratify it—
To the world peace makes its bow.

Freedom from want is the freedom
For which we ought to strive,
Without which the peace we're seeking,
When it's won, can't long survive—
And the nations that are strongest,
Each, in its own way, must seek
Opportunities for aiding,
Speedily, those that are weak.

We are planning for the framing
Of a world-wide bill of rights,
Founded solely upon justice,
Not on nations' combined might.
Whereby justice will be meted
Out, deservedly, to those
Who were, until they surrendered,
Recognized as freedom's foes.

Know the truth, because truth only
Is the world-wide guarantee
Of a world peace, that's enduring,
Which can keep all nations free.
Victory is most essential
On the battlefields afar,
But world peace is the objective
Of the Allies in this war.

By this Charter we've moved forward
Toward the goal which Wilson sought,
For which Roosevelt so bravely,
Till he was promoted, fought—
By this Charter, men of vision,
Out of 50 nations, see
Peace beyond war's devastations,
Through the truth that keeps men free.

This great San Francisco Charter
Is the means, but not the end,
Toward a world peace, on which nations
Of the whole world can depend—
It must be put into action,
And not underfoot be trod,
That the peace past understanding
May descend on earth from God.

Tax Relief for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I know that we here in Congress are very much interested, and that the citizens of our Nation as a whole are interested, in providing the greatest possible benefits for the members of our armed forces upon their return to civilian life. We are all concerned primarily in taking care of our disabled veterans and their dependents, and the needs of the widows and children of those who have paid the supreme sacrifice in this war for world freedom and justice. It is only right that those who have given most should be aided first and to the greatest extent. But while we are carrying out this duty of protecting the interests of those most directly affected by the war, we should also take into consideration the problems of that great number of veterans who face financial difficulties. Their task is that of readjusting and rebuilding their lives from an economic standpoint.

Thousands upon thousands of those in this war have sacrificed their business and professional careers to answer the call of their country. For most of them it will be a long, hard pull to reestablish themselves and they are entitled to the aid and cooperation of their government.

Of course, the GI bill and other laws provide assistance along various lines, but additional legislation is needed to assure financial help for so many who do not come under present provisions. With this thought in mind I introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress a bill to exempt veterans from payment of all or part of the tax on earned income during the first three taxable years following their release from the service. However, soon after initiating this movement I resigned from Congress to enter the Army and was unable to continue my efforts in behalf of the measure at that time. Today I have reintroduced this bill and intend to work vigorously in its behalf.

The least we can do as a grateful Nation is to help these ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen rehabilitate themselves financially, particularly during the first few years following their release from the service. I believe that the plan I offer is one of the very best methods of accomplishing this purpose. It would apply to all those serving in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war who are honorably discharged after active service of 90 days or more, or who are entitled to any benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. It provides for their exemption from payment of any income tax on earned income during the first taxable year following discharge, exemption on 75 percent of such income the second year, and on 50 percent the third year.

I feel that this is a most deserving proposal and I hope that it will receive favorable consideration by Congress.

American Slav Congress Concert Rally in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1945, in the city of New York, an enthusiastic group of Slavic-Americans and friends convened at Carnegie Hall, where an interesting program in celebration of the San Francisco Conference and of the unity among Slavic-Americans took place.

I am appending hereinbelow a summarized report on this concert-rally, together with the formal declaration statement, issued by the American Slav Congress, which is self-explanatory.

I am likewise including excerpts from an extemporaneous address delivered by myself at this meeting, as transcribed by shorthand reporters:

REPORT ON AMERICAN SLAV CONGRESS CONCERT RALLY, CARNEGIE HALL, MAY 3, 1945

Despite a heavy downpour, 2,000 Slavic Americans of New York gathered in Carnegie Hall on May 3, in a fighting, enthusiastic salute to the San Francisco Conference, and in celebration of the destruction of Nazi Germany.

The concert rally, sponsored by the American Slav Congress, hailed the fall of Berlin and imminent victory in songs, speeches, and drama, but warned the audience of serious problems yet to be solved in building the peace.

Calling upon the American delegation in San Francisco to adhere to the ideals of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the meeting unanimously approved a resolution to Secretary of State Stettinius, expressing "grave concern" over the admission to the Conference of the pro-Axis, Fascist Argentine Government, while at the same time denying representation to the people of Poland.

"The Conference in San Francisco must succeed," declared Representative JOHN M. COFFEE of Washington, principal speaker. "In order to do that, it must follow the decisions of Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods, and Yalta." Mr. COFFEE flayed all American pro-Fascist disrupters who speak of a third war against the Soviet Union and warned that peace can be made "only if there is close working cooperation of the two greatest powers, the United States and the Soviet Union."

Myrna Loy, famous screen star, stressed in her greetings on behalf of the Independent

Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, that "Fascist traitors and collaborators must be brought to account. These war criminals—those who starved, tortured, and murdered the Slav peoples, and those who starved and murdered our own American boys after taking them prisoners—must feel the force of outraged democracy and the hand of justice."

Chairman of the meeting Zlatko Balokovic and George Pirinsky, executive secretary of the American Slav Congress, both warned that with imminent victory over the Axis the problems of assuring peace must receive the whole-hearted support and attention of the people. All speakers referred to the admission of Argentina into the United Nations Conference as an "alarming, shocking" development and urged the American delegation in San Francisco to "reorientate its future work in the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who warned again and again that fascism and democracy cannot exist together in the same world."

Rev. Stephen Hole Fritchman, of Boston, Mass., praised the work of the American Slav Congress and also emphasized the danger of anti-Soviet, divisive propaganda of isolationist and pro-Fascist elements. He deplored the fact that the San Francisco Conference is being misrepresented and distorted by the majority of editors and reporters.

Greetings to the rally were received from Jan Masaryk, chairman of the Czechoslovak delegation to the San Francisco Conference; Dr. Ivan Subasic, chairman of the Yugoslav delegation; Premier Kimon Georgieff, of Bulgaria; and Leo Krzycki, chairman of the American Slav Congress, and at present attending the San Francisco Conference—all stressing the need for Allied unity to achieve world peace.

Participating in the intensely dramatic, exciting concert rally were Jan C. Werich and George Voskovec, Czech actors; Ivan Petroff, baritone; the Czechoslovak Choral Society of New York; the Yugoslav Partisan Chorus; the Ukrainian Leontovich Chorus; the Radischev Dancers; and drmaratic actors who performed in special sequences on each of the Slav countries in their liberation struggle.

The concert rally was the culmination of a Nation-wide campaign conducted by the American Slav Congress to facilitate the widest possible expression of support from Americans of Slav origin to President Truman and the program for peace as outlined in Roosevelt's report to Congress on the Yalta Conference.

American Slavs Salute United Nations Conference

Declaration of support to the American delegations at the San Francisco conference

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in his report to Congress and the people on the Crimea Conference, challenged every American to search his heart and to take his stand for an effective world peace organization or for another world conflict.

"There can be no middle ground here," Roosevelt declared. "America must decide now if it shall be peace or another war."

On behalf of millions of Americans of Slav extraction from all walks of life, we as writers, artists, scientists, professionals, trade unionists, clergymen, industrialists, public representatives and leaders of Slav organizations hereby assure you of our wholehearted and enthusiastic support for the fulfillment of America's contribution to the Crimea agreements for the establishment of enduring peace.

We consider it our duty to our brave American fighters, to our Slav kinsmen who have made so great a contribution to our common victory over Fascist Germany, and to all the freedom-loving peoples who have fought so gallantly in this war, to take our stand now in support of the Crimea agreements, of the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods Conferences, and of the San Francisco Conference.

We join with all other Americans in paying tribute to our late great Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, for his magnificent contribution toward building the structure for enduring world peace.

We pledge to President Harry S. Truman wholehearted support in striving for the complete destruction of nazism and fascism and the establishment of lasting peace.

Signers of declaration (partial list)

Archbishop Adam, New York, N. Y.; Louis Adamic, writer, Milford, N. J.; Prof. Igor N. Astrow, writer, Boston, Mass.; Zlatko Balokovic, violinist, New York; Very Rev. George S. Barnay, Central City, Pa.; Thomas Bell, writer, New York, N. Y.; Metropolitan Benjamin, New York, N. Y.; Nicolai Berezowsky, composer, New York, N. Y.; Nick Bez, industrialist, Seattle, Wash.; George M. Buban, attorney, St. Louis, Mo.; Zarko M. Buncick, attorney, Akron, Ohio; John Butkovich, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Vincent Cainkar, Chicago, Ill.; Thomas Capek, author, New York, N. Y.; Peter Cengia, Oakland, Calif.; Otakar Charvat, editor, Omaha, Nebr.; Stoyan Christowe, writer, West Dover, Vt.; Jaro Sokol Churain, conductor, Hollywood, Calif.; Rev. Joseph Chvatal, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Alois Cibulka, Baytown Highlands, Tex.; F. J. Doktor, attorney, Washington, Pa.

Rev. V. D. Furnadjieff, Washington, D. C.; Boleslaw Gebert, writer, New York, N. Y.; Very Rev. Daniel Gilevich, Bridgeport, Conn.; Prof. Geo. D. Grebentschikoff, Lakeland, Fla.; Peter Grigoroff, editor, Detroit, Mich.; Alexander Gretchaninoff, composer, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Joseph L. Hromadka, Princeton, N. J.; Prof. Vladimir N. Ipatieff, University of Chicago; Very Rev. Michael Jackovich, Passaic, N. J.; Dr. Eugene Jasinski, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Michael N. Kalantar, author-lecturer, New York, N. Y.; Stanley Kazorski, engineer, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Vincent Klein, state representative, Detroit, Mich.; Jan Kiepura, singer, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Joseph Krizek, city councilman, Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. C. D. Kojouharoff, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; Prof. Alois F. Kovarik, Yale University; Etbin Kristan, Grand Haven, Mich.; Leo Krzycki, Milwaukee, Wis.; Maria Kurenko, opera singer, New York, N. Y.

Helen Primozich Lampson, actress, Hollywood, Calif.; Karel Leitner, editor, New York, N. Y.; Very Rev. Nicholas K. Levitsky, Youngstown, Ohio; Vladimir Levitsky, editor, New York, N. Y.; Maxim Lieber, author's representative, New York, N. Y.; Boris Lovet-Lorski, sculptor, New York, N. Y.; Anthony Lucas, Civil Service Commissioner, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rev. Strahinja Maletich, New York, N. Y.; Mirko Markovich, editor, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Joseph Martinac, industrialist, Tacoma, Wash.; Joseph Martinek, editor, Chicago, Ill.; Zinka Milanov, opera singer, New York, N. Y.; Anton Minerich, editor, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Stefan Molski, economist, New York, N. Y.; Wesley J. Muzik, Chicago, Ill.; Jarmila Novotna, opera singer, New York, N. Y.; Prof. George R. Noyes, University of California; Harry Payer, attorney, Cleveland, Ohio; Ivan Petroff, opera singer, New York, N. Y.; Gregor Piatigorsky, cellist, Philadelphia, Pa.;

George Pirinsky, New York, N. Y.; V. S. Piatek, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Alexander Portnoff, sculptor, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Simeon S. Pysh, editor, Yonkers, N. Y.; Peter Ratica, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Charles Recht, attorney, New York, N. Y.; William Reznicek, New York, N. Y.; Janko N. Rogelj, editor, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Andrew Rolik, Johnstown, Pa.; Dr. Victor Sharenkoff, New York, N. Y.; Serge Semenenko, banker, Boston, Mass.; Miroslav Sichinsky, lecturer, Rochester, N. Y.; Irina Skariatina, writer, Washington, D. C.; Mia Slavenska, dancer, New York, N. Y.; John Sobczak, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Prof. Pitrim A. Sorokin, Harvard University; Wencil C. Storek, San Francisco, Calif.; Dr. C. M. Stoycoff, Gary, Ind.; Arthur Szyk, artist, New York, N. Y.; V. J. Tereshtenko, Acting Chief, Eastern European Branch, UNRRA, Washington, D. C.

Marie Tolstoy, New York, N. Y., teacher Prof. Radoslav A. Tsanoff, Houston, Tex.; Julian Tuwim, poet, New York, N. Y.; Judge August G. Urbanski, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Vital Vodusek, San Francisco, Calif.; George Voskovec, actor, New York, N. Y.; Joseph T. Votava, United States attorney, Omaha, Nebr.; Smeale Voydanoff, Pontic, Mich.; Rev. Mirko R. Vuisich, Los Angeles, Calif.; Jan C. Werich, actor, New York, N. Y.; Sigmund J. Wlodarczyk, Chicago, Ill.; Gen. Victor A. Yakhontoff, lecturer, New York, N. Y.; Blanche Yurka, actress, New York, N. Y.; Joseph J. Zaninovich, industrialist, San Pedro, Calif.; John Z. Zaremba, Detroit, Mich.; Bohdan Zawadzki, psychologist, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Casimir D. Zdanowicz, Madison, Wis.; John Zeman, Guttenberg, N. J.; Stephen Zeman, Jr., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Msgr. Oldrich Zlamal, Cleveland, O.; Prof. Ignace Zlotowski, Columbus, O.; Prof. J. J. Zmrhal, Chicago, Ill.

American Slav Congress,
New York, N. Y.

American Slav Congress, Address by the Honorable John M. Coffee, Member of United States House of Representatives

Good people out there, I cannot see you, but you can get a good slant at me. These lights are shining in my eyes very brightly and I hope you will forgive me if I squint once in a while.

My name is Coffee and I want to remind you folks that they say coffee is not good unless it is well roasted. I have been well roasted in every campaign. I have a slogan in connection with my campaign in the State of Washington that runs like this: "Keep Coffee in the House." The people did that out in my State. I had a man by the name of Price running against me not so long ago so we decided on a slogan, "In Choosing Your Coffee Remember Quality and Forget Price."

Recently I was speaking at the annual dinner of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, who fought in defense of the legitimate Government of Spain against Fascist invasion, and I was talking about America and its importance in history. I was talking on the night before Roosevelt died and since then a new date has been added in American history that shall live in the minds and hearts of Americans as long as history means anything, for our leader is gone. A mighty oak has fallen and there is a vacant place in the forest. He was the man who matched the mountains and compelled the stars to turn aside to conquer him. He was the man that exalted the hearts and lifted the souls of all humanity whether in the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia or Yugoslavia or in Greece or down in Italy or over in Spain.

I have been on the side of the suffering peoples who have been behind the enemy lines: and I include behind the enemy lines Portugal and Spain as well as in Italy, Poland, and in Greece and in Yugoslavia. I was the first man in public life to take up the cudgels for Marshal Tito and demand he be recognized. While some of our flag-waving patriots were singing praises in behalf of Draja Mahailovich, a few of us were demanding this great leader of the common people of Yugoslavia, Tito, be recognized and given the aid due him. Our predictions and our prayers were finally answered—a little reluctantly in the beginning, but they were answered—and today the Yugoslav peoples with the help of their great ally—the Soviet Union—are a free and independent people and they are marching in the vanguard of progress. [Applause.]

I was one of those who took the side of the Greeks—not the Greeks in exile, but those who fought behind the enemy lines,

[Applause], and right after a certain Tory persuaded British General Scobie to mistreat and shoot down their women and children in the first week in December of 1944. I took up the torch in behalf of the Belgian peoples who, when they had a peaceful parade in Brussels not so long ago without arms, were shot down in cold blood, women and children included. There were a few of us who stood up and demanded justice be accorded the people of Belgium—the common people also—and those good Belgians stood along with the Soviet Union when they fought in behalf of their rights in San Francisco. [Applause.]

I was one of those who said we should have severed diplomatic relations with the Argentine Republic the moment that government swung away from democracy. We did sever diplomatic relations while Roosevelt was alive, and for a time we were no longer keeping diplomatic interchanges with the Argentine and lo and behold, something happened in the State Department and we suddenly decided to enter upon renewed diplomatic relations with Fascist Argentina. I have an idea at whose behest we changed our front. Now we witness the amazing spectacle—at a conference which was supposed to implement and vivify Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods and the Moscow declaration and the Crimean Conference agreements—of our own beloved country taking the lead in requesting that the Argentine Republic—mind you, a Fascist country and the only genuinely unblushing Fascist Republic in all the Western Hemisphere—be invited to sit along with the United Nations which had fought and bled and hundreds of thousands of whose people had died for the cause of democracy.

This outstanding exponent of fascism was invited to sit alongside of the Soviet Union and of Great Britain and the United States and China—yes—and of Free France. You can call it the big five, the big four, or the big three, but I choose to call it the big two—the United States and the Soviet Union. [Applause.]

It is stimulating that the editor who preceded me on the platform so eloquently deplored the fact that the Argentine Republic has been invited by a so-called majority vote of the San Francisco Conference to become a member of the United Nations. I am very sure that next will be Franco's Fascist Spain, and if we let them get away with that, perhaps they will invite a new and converted Nazi Germany if we keep on pursuing the same course.

I arise as one of a great many liberals all over America in urging the delegates of the United States at the San Francisco Conference to recant and repudiate their previous course and join with the Soviet Union in dismissing Argentina. [Applause.]

I have been a friend of the Soviet Union from its very inception and one of the few men in public life who had the temerity to stand up and fight for the rights of and justice to the Soviet Union. I recall only too well Litvinov's fight during the thirties and his being scoffed and sneered at by certain of the diplomats of other countries of the world. I remember well that the Soviet Union took the lead in seeking to accord justice to Czechoslovakia before that wonderful little country was sold down the river by the Chamberlains and the appeasement diplomats of the modern world. I remember the Soviet Union sent a delegation to Poland to ask if Poland would accord it the right to transport its troops across her territory. Poland consulted other countries and they said, "No, it might be dangerous to get the Soviets on Polish territory. Perhaps they might whisper in the ears something about the economic and land policies of the government that was run within the Soviet Union." In any event, the U. S. S. R. were denied the right to send their troops across Poland. Had they been given the right, it is likely World War II would not have commenced.

Some wonder why Russia is sometimes suspicious of Great Britain and the United States. The Russians remember too well when we had certain conservative forces in control of our Government in Washington and how they were scoffed at and sneered at, and today they read in the headlines of the Washington Times-Herald, or the New York Daily News, or the Chicago Tribune, or the Hearst daily press that Stalin is a murderer. I saw that editorial in the Washington Times Herald 2 weeks ago. Think of it—insulting the most powerful ally the United States has in this world, insulting the country which has done so much to safeguard United States and Great Britain in this war. Let's not kid ourselves. [Applause.]

There is no Red-baiting in Russia. There is no Negro-baiting in Russia. There is no alien-baiting in Russia. There is no Jew-baiting in Russia. There are no cartels in Russia. There are no privately operated monopolies in Russia. No one is advocating we plant their form of government in the United States or ours in Russia, but we can learn a great many things from the example which Russia has set for us.

I don't want to take very much of your time, but I want to congratulate the American Slavic Congress for bringing together this magnificent gathering to urge support of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement and urge pressure upon the San Francisco Conference to prevent disunity from cropping up between the United States and the Soviet Union and to expose and oppose all forces in the United States which would promote a cleavage between the two most powerful countries in the world. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, the peace of the world rests in the hands of the United States and Soviet Russia. I say that without disparaging the important part that has been and will be played by Free France and by China and by Great Britain. But when these latter three countries are compared with the Soviet Union and the United States, not only in potential, but in actual, formidability and war machines and war manpower, the other three nations are not in the same class. There are two countries which when united can guarantee to all suffering humanity permanent peace, as long as they march down the road arm in arm together, but when they take divergent paths, when someone promotes suspicion and disunity and dangerous friction between these countries, then the peace of the world is threatened.

It behooves all of us to do all in our power to excoriate those who would destroy amity and friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union and to encourage all forces within the United States, and everywhere in the world, which will promote greater friendship, greater unity, greater understanding between the Slavic peoples of the world and those of the United States of America. By Slavic, I mean Russia and all its surrounding neighbors. Some of the finest blood that flows in the veins of American citizens comes from Slavic origin.

We must not delude ourselves. There are forces at work seeking to create difficulties in San Francisco. Let us not be worried about Poland. The plain and intelligent Polish people are not fooled by the arguments made in behalf of the Tories who cluttered up that country for 20 years. They are not fooled by the land-owning aristocracy which held their country in thrall for over 20 years. They are not worried over the argument about the Curzon Line and the old borders. They remember when Russia was emerging from chaos in World War I and after the revolution and when the Soviets were just establishing themselves Marshal Pilsudski came into Russia and stole a part of the area which they now claim should belong to Poland, and they remember Woodrow Wilson opposed any other border for the eastern part of Poland except the Curzon Line agreed to at the Crimean Conference. They remember Churchill supported the position of the Soviet Union. They remember Hugh Gibson, an American Ambassador, agreed to the Curzon Line. They remember the United States and Great Britain refused for over 2 years to recognize the new area which had been taken from Russia, so now why all this hue and cry over the Curzon Line?

Why all of a sudden is it unjust to live up to what we solemnly agreed upon 25 years ago? Remember, the United States and Great Britain, Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, all the ambassadors, the League of Nations, all of them agreed on the Curzon Line as the eastern border of Poland. Instead, it was taken away and when Russia was in the throes of chaos, fighting with her back to the wall, when the country had been desolated with privation and poverty and millions of men and women had been destroyed in World War I, an invading force came over and took away certain land. The peoples of the world know we are not going to war over such an excuse. That is only an alibi to create a cleavage between the United States and the Soviet Union and it won't hold up. The peoples of the world are too intelligent for that. [Applause.]

I want to say in conclusion that anyone who knows anything about history knows Russia has been the best friend among the great nations of the world to the United States in all its history. Even under the czars the Russians sent their fleet to the harbors of Boston and New York during the War Between the States as a guarantee of their friendship to the Union during the period when part of it sought to dismember itself. It was the prestige and power of the Russian Fleet in the Atlantic seaports of the North during the Civil War that prohibited Great Britain and France from taking a more pronounced stand against the Union, as was then their penchant. All during the period of American history, it was Russia which was a stanch and dependable friend of the United States. Way back in 1804 it was Russia which came to the rescue of the American expeditionary force during our war with the Barbary pirates in North Africa.

I could name a hundred examples of times when Russia was on our side, so I want to say along with Raymond Gram Swing and Walter Lippmann that the greatest task remaining before us is to show by practical and effective means a diplomatic willingness and amiable determination to join with Russia to assure the peace of the world. Let us compromise these minor differences. Let us dissolve all these inconsequential irritations, and let us look for the horizon and not lose the forest while we are looking for the trees. Then we will be able to say, as did Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War, "Let us highly resolve these dead [the dead in this war] shall not have died in vain."

The peoples of the world, the millions of people who survived the struggles of Europe, the resistance of those who have been dismembered and injured permanently, and those who have gone to their eternal abode are looking to us—the United States—to take the lead to give the world the surest human insurance we can devise that will guarantee, insofar as human beings can guarantee, against the recurrence of war. That is what the mothers of the American boys want tonight. That is what the parents of the boys want out of the San Francisco Conference. They want an effective instrument whereby the United States and Soviet Russia, along with Great Britain and China and Free France will enter into a postwar organization implemented by an international police force that will, so far as can possibly be worked out in a practical way, guarantee against any more Global Wars. Thank you. [Applause.]

Whoever Gave the OPA the Authority To Do This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to Mr. Bowles and his answer are self-explanatory:

APRIL 14, 1945.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I notice in the Washington Star of April 2 that the Office of Price Administration had placed a ceiling on imported Swiss cheese.

The article was as follows:

"OPA FIXES PRICE ON NONEXISTENT SWISS CHEESE

"The OPA today established specific ceiling prices for Swiss cheese made in Switzerland—but don't expect to buy any just yet.

"No Swiss cheese has been imported for several years, and the agency said it knows of no plans to resume importations in the near future.

" 'It's just something we won't have to do when Swiss cheese comes in again,' one OPA official explained.

"When Swiss cheese is available again, it will cost about 12¾ cents a pound more than Swiss cheese produced in this country. Previous ceilings were the same for domestic and imported Swiss."

What was the purpose of placing this ceiling on Swiss cheese?

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1945.

The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This acknowledges your letter of April 14, referring to specific ceiling prices established for Switzerland Swiss cheese.

Prior to the issuance of amendment 10 to RMPR 289, token shipments of Switzerland Swiss cheese periodically were imported into this country. However, the above amendment provided no price differential between imported and domestic Swiss, which indirectly resulted in an embargo being placed on Switzerland Swiss.

Shortly after the issuance of the regulation, the Switzerland Cheese Association, Inc., of New York City, representing the Switzerland Swiss Cheese Exporters, filed a protest, claiming that the amendment violated the tariff act, the anti-dumping act, and the reciprocal trade agreements in effect between the United States and Switzerland.

In answer to the protest, amendment 23 to RMPR 289 was issued, affording Switzerland Swiss cheese exporters the opportunity to export this commodity on the same price differential basis as existed between imported and domestic Swiss during the base period from 1936 to 1939.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

Here are two very pertinent questions:

First. Whoever gave Mr. Bowles the authority to fix prices on an agricultural product without the approval of the War Food Administration?

Second. How can imported cheese be sold for 12¾ cents per pound more than domestically produced cheese without causing inflation?

It would be amusing, if it were not so serious, to call attention to the extensions of remarks by some Members who themselves voted against the Andresen amendment. This amendment would have gone far to remove the confusion of the food picture, would have put the food problem in one agency. The need of the hour is a food holiday—a holiday from the senseless attitudes of the OPA in relation to providing adequate foods.

The OPA had better be spending their time attending to their own business instead of getting into fields no one ever intended them to enter.

If the OPA is going to take over, there will not be much need of the Tariff Commission, a Ways and Means Committee approach, or any legislative formula for trade with other countries.

Dr. Louis Finkelstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN J. RABIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly pleased to read an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on July 1 with respect to the work of Dr. Louis Finkelstein, president of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Dr. Finkelstein is one of the great scholars of our time. I regard the work that he is doing in mobilizing the great minds of this country in the effort to find the way to a common understanding among all peoples to be of the greatest value.

I have followed the work of Dr. Finkelstein for a great many years. I have a great admiration for him, and I take pleasure in presenting this editorial for insertion in the RECORD:

MOBILIZER OF SCHOLARS

The work and influence of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America are inevitably associated with the name of Dr. Louis Finkelstein. When the Rabbinical Assembly, alumni of the seminary, honored him on his fiftieth birthday last week, the occasion marked the anniversary as well of his twenty-fifth year on the seminary faculty, his fifth year as its president. In this quarter of a century the seminary has grown vastly in importance to the Jewish people through the influence of its graduates in all parts of the country (one-third are now serving with the armed forces) and through the invitation to scholars in invaluable collections of Jewish historical and cultural treasures in its museum and library. This invitation is, be it said, open to scholars of all creeds.

For under the aegis of Dr. Finkelstein the seminary has tried to stimulate closer cooperation among religious men of learning. The Institute for Religious Studies, which brings together philosophers and scholars of different faiths, is the product of Dr. Finkelstein's vision and enthusiasm. The institute, organized first in New York, now has branches in Chicago and Boston, all working toward common understanding and a solution of the problems which keep this ancient world embroiled in wars. Dr. Finkelstein is convinced, as are men of good will everywhere, that "basic world problems cannot be solved without closer cooperation of men of different backgrounds." His is a valuable contribution in fostering that cooperation.

The Invasion of Our Domestic Market Under the Free-Trade Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, another great propaganda drive is on by the internationalists to gain access to our domestic market on a free-trade level. This propaganda is to prepare the public mind for this foreign invasion of competitive goods. It is to divert public attention from the hundreds of thousands of idle men, including veterans, who will be deprived of jobs because of imported competitive goods which could and should be made here to insure steady work for our own veterans and displaced war workers. Our market, the richest in the world and the one and only one upon which our free enterprise system of America can and must depend if it is to survive, is selected and destined to be looted eventually by the products of a Russianized communistic Europe and Asia. The machines and technological instruments in American industry located abroad have been seized and moved into Russian-controlled industries. The war, so far as the countries of Europe and Russia are concerned, is over. They can reconvert; they are doing so. We have a war on our hands. Reconversion is difficult and it is made more so by competitive imports to be permitted under the free-trade regime now in power in the State Department. The trade-agreement policy of free trade will eventually do more to induce the idle and hungry masses to accept communism as a cure for their ills than all of the present activities of the un-American subversive groups.

Under leave to extend, I insert an article from the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial under date of July 9, 1945:

RAYON MILLS FACE MORE COMPETITION—FOREIGN FABRICS SEEN BEGINNING TO OFFER POSTWAR THREAT

Sellers of rayon dress goods are expecting to be faced with new competition over the next few months. They believe that imported silks and rayons will be coming into this market at a steadily increasing rate.

It is pointed out that already Brazilian silks are being received in this market in considerable quantity; the Italian silk mills are ready to resume weaving operations; Switzerland has goods to export; and the famed silk and rayon mills of Lyons are anxious for an opportunity to regain their postwar markets.

FUTURE DANGER SEEN

Although at the present time all apparel fabrics are in short supply, American weavers are looking beyond the present tight market to a time when every yard of goods

brought in will be a threat to capacity production of their mills in normal times. Meanwhile they feel that debasing of cloth quality under MAP, together with restrictions placed on sales by M-388B, will cause them to lose some good customers to sellers of imported fabrics.

It also is pointed out that with wage costs moving steadily higher, American mills will be handicapped from a price basis in competition with foreign textiles unless provided with adequate tariff protection. The average weekly earnings for silk and rayon workers in this country rose from $15.78 in 1939 to $30.04 in November 1944. There have been further increases in hourly minimums in the current year and now the CIO Textile Workers Union has set 65 cents as its minimum hourly wage goal.

While no definite recent statistics are available concerning wage rates in other textile countries, millmen assert that it is safe to assume that they still are well below the 1939 average weekly wage of $15.78, making it possible for them to undersell United States goods in this market unless adequately protected.

COMPETITION RISING

At the recent tariff hearing in Washington, it was stated by a spokesman for the industry that "from the postwar competitive standpoint, we know we will have to meet the competition of not only our old competitors—Great Britain, France, Czechoslovakia, Italy—but the many new countries—South American, for example—who have had a chance to see American machinery and to use American textiles.

"They will soon secure similar machinery, either through their own highly skilled textile machinery engineers or, as is indicated by recent British textile missions, through the purchase of American machinery. Furthermore, in contrast to our heavy consumption of our own textile products, the lower standard of living in other countries forces them to export a large percentage of their output."

Discussing the postwar competition which his industry will be forced to face, one millman said that it appeared to him that the only country which would not attempt to ship silks and rayons to this market would be Japan.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes were paid to the late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, but one which I feel is worthy of preserving for posterity and included in the public records of this country, was written by my good friend, Hon. E. D. Lambright, editor of the Tampa Morning Tribune, Tampa, Fla., and appeared in that paper on Sunday morning after the death of the President:

THE END, AND THE BEGINNING

His body will repose this morning in the soil of the land he loved—in a flower garden, near the slow-flowing, majestic Hudson, surrounded by the things he knew so well, which felt his intimate touch—in the spot that to him was home.

There he went often, when the burden was heaviest, when the clouds seemed darkest—there, from his place of power, for the brief blessing of temporal rest. There he goes today—for the rest eternal.

"Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the hunter, home from the hill,
And the sailor home from the sea."

Quietly, reverently, his casket will be borne this morning by men of the armed services—the services he commanded, soon to achieve the complete victory for which he strove, but which, suddenly stricken by the harsh hand of fate, he was not permitted to see.

Around that last sad act of a mighty drama will be grouped those who were closest to him, in the broken family circle, his coworkers in the councils of the Nation, those coming from far lands to do him honor.

In that grave will lie all that was mortal of him—but above it will bloom the immortelles of everlasting fame.

A grave is the end of a life physical—but the beginning of a life which will live on through the ages—the perpetual symbol of human liberty, of the constant vigilance of those who keep the faith and lead the fight to preserve it—now and forever.

From that grave will rise, for all time to come, the inspiration of loyalty to country, of love for fellow men, of courage to carry on the battle for the right.

This morning, at Hyde Park, a simple burial. Today, and every day hereafter, an illustrious example that will hold future generations true to the cause of freedom—a cause that never dies.

Minority Views on H. R. 3384

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, so that Congress and the public may know our views, the following minority views signed by 11, a majority, of the members of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee follow:

The future welfare of this Nation is tied up part and parcel with the welfare of over 15,000,000 veterans and their families, which welfare in turn depends largely upon their opportunities for continuous gainful employment immediately after discharge—a privilege they have earned by the honorable service they have rendered their Government in time of war.

Even though there must be a minimum number of barriers to this needed employment, consideration of this bill at this time without hearings is premature.

Without full and complete hearings, Congress will have no facts upon which to base its judgment and action; without facts, Congress cannot intelligently legislate.

The effects of this measure would be so many and varied as to be unforeseeable; the changes in contracts, agreements and laws would be so numerous as to be incalculable without study.

The necessity of enactment of this legislation to bring employment opportunities to veterans has not been established. There has been no convincing demonstration that the proposal will be in the best interests of veterans.

Recently, Gen. Frank T. Hines, in his capacity as chairman of the Veterans' Placement Training Board, reported to this committee that representatives of organized labor, industry, Government, and veterans were meeting together to discuss the problems relating to employment of veterans. This group, according to General Hines, has been conferring around the table, making steady progress, and they felt that in the immediate near future satisfactory solutions could be reached. Accordingly, General Hines recommended that action be deferred.

As long as these conferees can discuss these matters in a friendly spirit, maintaining a determination to solve the problem before them, there is, at the present, every reason to hope and believe that they will successfully meet the challenge facing them.

If they succeed, legislative action may not be necessary.

Until friendly negotiations have admittedly failed, legislative action should be deferred.

If such negotiations fail and legislative action becomes necessary, hearings should be held so that an opportunity of appearing before the committee could be given to representatives of veterans, labor, industry, and Government, especially the newly appointed Secretary of Labor. In this way, and in this way only, can all phases, effects, and possible results of a measure of this importance be thoroughly studied, considered, and discussed.

The Secret Is in His Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an admirable address delivered Sunday afternoon, July 8, 1945, over the American Broadcasting Co. by Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., under the auspices of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and the Lutheran Laymen's Radio Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is the privileged responsibility of each American citizen to turn every insight he possesses and all the influence he can command upon the tasks of this hour so that the sufferings of the past few years will not have been in vain. In this spirit I ask you to think with me this afternoon.

Adolph Keller, one of the most generally trusted church leaders in Europe, has titled his last book Christian Europe Today. In a one-page appendix he includes these words, "We are in the middle of a world catastrophe whose meaning is not yet entirely revealed. Nobody knows the absolute truth. It is God's secret. God has hidden it in Jesus Christ." This prompts the theme on which I speak with you today, The Secret Is in His Hands. My text is Hebrews ii: 8 and 9, "We see not yet all things put under Him, but we see Jesus."

For nearly 12 years I've watched the scenery in this town of Washington, and I believe, roughly speaking, there are about three types of men in public office. And these three types in public life are only reflections of the same kinds of people across the Nation.

First, there is the type of man and of mind in public and private life who thinks he has all the answers. If he should not by some chance have a specific answer at the moment, he can personally get it. He is self-contained

and self-sufficient, easily given, therefore, to vindictiveness. Often this kind of person is unable to hold his own in a discussion based on clear, quiet reason, so his way of handling issues is to assert whatever authority his position in business or politics may give him. This type of person might be called the social pagan. The secrets of an hour like this are hardly to be found in his hands.

The second type of person in public and private life is the man who believes that the only light and wisdom we ever will possess is within ourselves, that in man alone is his only hope, that man is literally the maker of his destiny and the master of his fate. This kind of man may seem like the first type, but here is the difference: The first man asserts that he has light; this second type is constantly searching for light. At best he is very sacrificial, quite humble, works hard, is generous and full of good will, brave but not vindictive, assertive only within cultured control. He bows reverently at the shrine of human personality, but at no other shrine. He believes that all the wisdom we can expect must be woven within ourselves as a spider spins his web out of his own body. You recognize that I have been describing the pure humanist. Personally I have great appreciation for such a man.

But there is a third type of man in public and private life who gathers up the courage of the social pagan and the sacrificial hard work of the pure humanist into something greater. This kind of man also holds humanity in high regard, practices patience and good will, but believes that man's utmost must be crowned by something greater, that there is a wisdom which is not so much achieved as it is discovered; that man at his highest can be the voluntary, free instrument and channel of something and someone beyond himself. In my judgment, this type of person in the professions, in business, in life at large, and notably in public office, is the most dependable and useful man I know. It seems to me that President Truman was confessing his desire to be a man like this when he said in his first address to the Congress, "I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and my people." And he used these similar words at the San Francisco Conference: "Let us not fail to grasp this supreme chance to establish a world-wide rule of reason—to create an enduring peace under the guidance of God." What does he mean by the words "under the guidance of God"? I believe he means what I mean today.

In a further effort to illustrate this type of person, may I suggest the kind of prayer all of us who would uphold the hands of the Chief Executive might make, "O Lord, grant to Thy servant, Harry Truman, such wilingness and readiness of spirit, such open-mindedness to men and God, that he may not alone be enlightened by good counselors, but also by Thy wisdom, and thus be enabled not alone to sit in judgment over clashing self-interests but to be guided by Thy mind and Thy purpose."

Ladies and gentlemen of this continental congregation, we are in the midst of a world picture where hardly any problem is nailed down, where our world is filled with loose planks and all loose at the same time. Thus, fronted with such gigantic responsibilities in the next decade, how we do need something of the courage of the self-assertive man but with much more light and a higher accountability than he possesses; how we do need something of the patience and respect for all men of the humanist—but beyond both of these, our moment calls for men in public position and private trust who make daily effort and prayer to open their minds to eternal light and guidance, to turn their lives into the free instruments and channels of God's purposes. That same effort, so resolutely done by some of the founding fathers of this Republic, must be done now. As George Washington gloriously phrased this idea, "The event is in the hands of God." If the little Nation then getting born was in His hands, how about the world today? The secret is in His hands.

And now, in case someone thinks this is just a preacher shooting at the stars with little or no relevance to Congress and the White House tomorrow or the rough world of business over this week, may I try to tell you precisely what I mean by being the instrument of the Eternal?

Let us grant at once that we cannot deal with practical politics and international relations with the precision and scientific accuracy with which we deal with physics, chemistry, and astronomy. Let us also grant that, strictly speaking, political science and sociology are not sciences at all. Even the law can hardly be called an exact science when Supreme Court Justices vote 5 to 4. It is also true that in public issue the way of democracy is to have all sides ably represented and in the clash of varied viewpoints and self-interests we get our nearest approximation to justice and solution.

But the very inadequacies which all approximations of justice represent, leave room for something more, and I believe that something more is the will and truth of God. So my plea is to search for the secrets of God in social tasks, politics, international relations with the same diligence and reverence for absolute truth which the natural scientist demonstrates in his search for the secrets of physical nature. Imagine a real scholar in physics or chemistry taking an arrogant, self-assertive attitude toward the universe. Rather, he sits humbly and patiently searches for truth. But notice: the truth is not in him; it is in the universe and the God within and behind it. The scientist is only the instrument and channel. What is true in physics, chemistry, and astronomy is also true in public social issues which flood our world today. Obviously, the instrument for the search is the mind of man—so the necessity and sacredness of such conferences as that held at San Francisco. But every political realist must know that decisions based on debate, compromise, and national self-interest will not stay nailed down except as debate and compromise—the way of trial and error—are ways of searching for the eternal truth of God. The secret is in His hands.

If these things be true, we never will construct a better society nor an international association of freemen, except through minds sensitive and receptive to the Eternal as great scientists, consciously or unconsciously, have to be. For example, ever since creation's dawn electricity has been in this world, waiting for men like Thomas Edison to open the door. The God of electricity has been standing, waiting, saying in effect, "Behold I stand at the door and knock. If any man will open the door, I will come in". But God had to wait a long time to get that door opened so He could light and bless the world through electricity. In the same way, the God of international peace, good will, and justice has been standing, waiting and saying, "Behold I stand at the door and knock. If any man will open the door, I will come in." We who would open that door must search for His secrets, His principles, His purpose in politics and society. All the collective brains at San Francisco and in Congress cannot produce all the light we need. The secret is in His hands.

So this Nation and this moment needs men of the spiritual sensitivity of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Harry Truman, so that our Nation may be the instrument of God's purposes. You remember Mr. Lincoln's steady concern that we should be on God's side. That, it seems to me, was his way of saying what I am trying to say. And many of you may recall Mr. Wilson's last radio broadcast from his home here in Washington. As my memory serves me, these were his closing words, "I would rather lose in a cause which will ultimately win than to win in a cause which will ultimately be defeated". That sense of a cause that will ultimately win, that sense of history, that sense of the ages, that sense of the eternal, that desire to be receptive to the mind of God is the hope of freemen everywhere.

So, George Washington put the event into the hands of God. Little men want to keep it in their own. Lincoln wanted to be on God's side. Little men want to be on the winning side at the moment. Wilson was concerned with a cause that would ultimately win. I tell you the glint of the Eternal is in men like that. They dramatize that which is imperishable. They are the custodians of those things which will not die. They symbolize those secrets which are in His hands.

I want to close this address with a personal reference. Some 3 years ago one of America's most widely read column writers passed away, and one of the country's very capable preachers conducted his funeral service. He pointed out that this newspaperman was a typical representative of the confusion and despair of the twentieth century, that all his life he had sought peace and found it finally in the church. I would like to add that he found peace and light in the church only because he found Christ there. To spend much time in Christ's company is to get something of His mind; to absorb His mind is to find a key to the secrets of God and secure the spirit which makes a man sensitive to God's fuller secrets. So, Christ becomes the way by which you and I may make our maximum contribution to the harassing, difficult, and challenging tasks of this hour. "We see not yet all things put under Him, but we see Jesus." The secret is in His hands—and the hope of freemen.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BANK OF ODESSA,
Odessa, Mo., July 12, 1945.

Hon. MAX SCHWABE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There are some things worse than inflation and that is the bogey raised by those seeking to perpetuate themselves in the OPA office; the people would rather have inflation and food than to have OPA and no food, and we are not averse to making any sacrifice necessary to support the Army and Navy in grand style but we know there are more cattle in our country than ever before in our history and we can get no meat so there is no meat shortage.

I think the sugar shortage has been created by the Army and Navy storing vast quantities that they can never need; I think this is true of other shortages and we are coming to believe that shortages have been created artificially to regiment the populace.

Sugar, soap, bacon, meat of all kinds, clothing and most of the essential commodities of life are nonexistent as far as civilians are concerned.

I know you will give careful consideration to the bill when it comes to the House, and some arrangement should be inserted to give civilians food but not at the expense, of

course, of the successful conclusion of the war but certainly the people of this country should be fed ahead of the Spaniards and Arabs and Huns and Dagoes and French and Russians as dire as may be their need.

Very truly yours,

O. H. CLARK.

Thomas Jefferson, a Force in the World of Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 30, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Bulletin of the Missouri Historical Society of July contains an interesting and thoughtful article on the life of Thomas Jefferson. He is pictured as not only a great builder of yesterday's America, but a continuing force in the world of today and tomorrow. The article was written by George F. Milton, a member of the staff of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Mr. Milton is one of the Nation's foremost historians, authors, and editors. The article to which I invite your attention is as follows:

THOMAS JEFFERSON, A FORCE IN THE WORLD OF TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By George Fort Milton)

On this the one hundred and forty-second anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase it seems fitting that the subject should be the man who achieved it, Thomas Jefferson, not only the great builder of yesterday's America but a continuing force in the world of today and tomorrow.

Such men as Jefferson, with minds so comprehensive and substantial that they combine astronomic sweep and microscopic exactness, appear in our world as infrequently as Halley's comet. With most men thought is no all-encompassing flood but a thin stream which digs a single winding channel and seldom overflows its banks. But I think of Jefferson as a timeless, universal man, an American Leonardo, with a mastery of pure and applied reason at least equal to that of the Florentine and with gifts to mankind much more rewarding.

There is no need to retrace the familiar ground of Jefferson's many-sided genius from agriculture and architecture to politics and philosophy. Claude Bowers is right in saying that Jefferson's title to a great place in American history was secure by the time of his return from France in 1789. In these years he had taken an active part in Virginia's opposition to the policy of George III; had served with distinction in the Continental Congress; had written the Declaration of Independence; had won his fight for religious freedom, the abolition of primogeniture and entail in Virginia; had been a war Governor of the Old Dominion; had designed the expansion of a free America through measures which set the pattern for the Ordinance for the Northwest Territory; and had represented the Confederation with great distinction at the most important court in Europe.

Equally great were his achievements in the first 12 years of the Federal Union. As Washington's Secretary of State, he promptly established the fundamental fact that the President is this Government's sole organ of communication with foreign nations. Then, during his 4 years' hibernation as Vice President, he laid the political foundation for democratic government by organizing a people's party that has endured for 150 years. This evening let us consider some of the qualities of greatness Jefferson showed as President of the United States—qualities which, I believe, make him a continuing force in the living world.

It is of the nature of that office that the President should be the Nation's No. 1 man. In this some fail—the instances of Madison, Pierce, Buchanan, and Johnson come immediately to mind—and woe betides the country when they do. But so commodious are the powers and offices of the President that any man who is possessed of the latent qualities of greatness—and who is confronted with a crisis to catalyze these qualities into action—can lead the people of the United States. This has proved true of the eight among whom we rank the great Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Its truth as to Jefferson is self-evident. None but the bitterest Hamiltonian would deny his possession of the qualities of greatness. Certainly his White House years both began and ended with high crises. The way he adapted his experience and talents to novel duties and problems reveals Jefferson as full height.

Consider the initial crisis—his election by a ballot-box revolution of such violence that he found it prudent to hold out an olive branch to the defeated partisans by saying, "We are all Republicans; we are all Federalists"; and, despite his own followers' insistence on the public patronage, he would not remove Federalists on the ground of party alone, but sought, as he said, to "conciliate the honest part" of the Federalists by retaining many in office.

Then again it is well to note the clash between branches of government reflected by John Marshall's war against him in his obiter dicta that the President was duty bound to deliver Marbury the commission as justice of the peace. Congress had no constitutional right to give the Supreme Court original jurisdiction to say so. Equally vexatious was Marshall's issue of subpena duces tecum for Presidential attendance with documents at the Richmond trial of Aaron Burr, which the President properly refused, pointing out his necessary right to decide what papers the public interest permit to be communicated.

Jefferson worked hard at the job of being President. Relations with Congress are a task for any chief of government, but the third President managed them with great success his first 6 years. Having won office through the efforts of the political party he had founded and drilled, he knew that much of his power resulted from his position as chief of party—that he could most easily influence congressional policy through controlling the Republican caucuses of the two Houses.

So he was assiduous in drilling the party whips—Henry Adams says they spent more time at the White House than Madison, Gallatin, and other members of the Cabinet.

The results were magnificent. From 1801 until late in 1807, Jefferson's legislative programs were put on the statute book with almost unfailing regularity, despite the pyrotechnical rebellions of his eerie cousin, John Randolph, of Roanoke, and the fuming malignance of Federalists like Pickering and Fisher Ames.

As chief of government, Jefferson could say that the Constitution had made it the province of the National Legislature to make the laws, as it had imposed on him the duty to see that these were faithfully executed. But as chief of party he could see to it that the Republican Members of House and Senate put through the measures of the administration. He did not insist on the syllabic inspiration of his legislative proposals—he preferred to be as easy boss, and so long as they preserved the principle, his lieutenants could formulate the phraseology.

There have been few counterparts to his success in bridging the gap on Pennsylvania Avenue. Neither Jackson nor Lincoln nor Cleveland was in the same class. Franklin Roosevelt in the famous first hundred days did almost as well. But Senator WHEELER's objections forced fundamental alterations in the original triple A bill, and the National Industrial Recovery Act contained congressional injections the White House did not welcome.

Jefferson's closest counterpart was Woodrow Wilson, whose lively appreciation of the party-leader concept led him to step out of character and work through caucuses and party whips for the great liberal reforms of the first 6 years of his Presidency.

Both the philosopher and the prophet controlled Congress well during the major part of their two terms. At length, however, each lost this power—Jefferson when his party left him because the embargo had backfired; Wilson when his party lost control of Congress. But for 6 years both of them got what they wanted from Capitol Hill. And that is an achievement for any President.

As chief executive officer, Jefferson had to learn how to administer the business of the Federal Government. This was not his most-practiced talent, and when he became President he put himself to school to transact the daily routine. His industry was prodigious, though not so painfully conspicuous as were Cleveland's midnight vigils with pension bills. He read personally all applications for jobs, marked each one and considered it from the double standpoint of the influence it would have on the party and its effect on the proper conduct of the public business. He wrote that of all Executive duties, appointment to office was "the most difficult and the most irksome."

He had five principles of administrative management—harmony within the executive establishment; simplicity—"we have more machinery of government than is necessary"; the need for constant change, because "laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind"; decentralization, because it was through the distribution of governmental powers, "the division and subdivision of duties alone that all matters, great and small, can be managed to perfection"; the fifth principle was to exact responsibility from an administrator for the decisions made and duties performed.

At the same time he recognized that "those who accept great charges must risk themselves on great occasions, when the safety of the Nation or some of its very high interests are at stake."

This was his practice as well as principle, as he demonstrated by the two greatest things he attempted as President—the Louisiana Purchase and the embargo.

The Louisiana Purchase, whose consummation we honor tonight on its one hundred and forty-second anniversary, was Jefferson's greatest success. In his first inaugural he had spoken of America as a rising Nation "advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye." Within 30 months the extraordinary procurement of the Louisiana Territory had added to the Federal Union an area larger than that of the then United States.

Jefferson's greatness in this transaction was many-sided. He sympathized with the determined purpose of the folk west of the mountains to float their produce down the Mississippi to the Gulf. He had hailed the provision of Tennessee's 1796 constitution that the State's right to free navigation of the Mississippi must be "alienated to no prince, potentate, or power whatsoever." He had the imagination to suspect that with the Peace of Amiens Napoleon might be in a mood to sell the island of Orleans; and the foresight to have Congress pass an appropria-

tion for its purchase before he sent Monroe to France to open negotiations.

As the event proved, a combination of irritations arising out of Europe's power politics in the spring of 1803 had caused Napoleon to decide to go to war again; and to free himself from European embarrassments he decided to give away not only the island of Orleans but the whole French domain in North America for $15,000,000. When Livingston and Monroe signed the treaty, Jefferson's purchase enabled the fledgling Nation to cross the continent at one leap.

Also he had a pressing personal and political dilemma. One horn was the fact that Napoleon, a creature of impulse, suspicious and irascible, had set a time limit for the receipt of America's first payment, so time was of the essence in gaining the new empire. The other horn of the dilemma was the Constitution, which said nothing about the Federal Government's acquisition of land beyond the initial borders of the Union.

Hamilton, in line with his doctrine of implied powers, had said in the Federalist that "It is impossible to foresee or define the extent and variety of national exigencies, or the correspondent extent and variety of the means which may be necessary to satisfy them." With this doctrine the Federalists had justified the alien and sedition laws. In 1798 Jefferson had drafted the Kentucky-Virginia resolutions to denounce such loose construction, and in 1802 an administration spokesman told Congress that the Jeffersonian doctrine was that "This Government is to be administered according to defined objects and situations. It is a Government of definition and not of trust and discretion."

Jefferson believed in the people's direct control of their Government and the vast distances and tardy transport and communications of the age caused him to fear that concentrated central power without efficient check by the citizens would destroy it. The strict construction precepts of the Kentucky-Virginia resolutions were his implementation of this general principle to fit the conditions of the day. But while he never abandoned his overriding philosophy of government with the participation and consent of the governed, whenever he found conditions so changed that a formula had results reverse of those intended, he found a new path to the goal.

So it was in regard to Napoleon's treaty. The President's first impulse was to seek a constitutional amendment. Congress was not then in session, and he considered waiting until it should assemble in December for its regular session, and that it could then submit to the States another amendment under which the Federal Government could be specifically empowered to acquire new territory through purchase or seizure, rather than to be forced to have it acquired by an existing state.

But the logic of the situation did not fit the reality. He wrote a few letters discussing such a program, drafted a possible amendment and circulated it among some close advisers. But soon he dropped the idea and called Congress into special session.

Nor was it a half-hearted change on Jefferson's part. Knowing the Federalists' bitter opposition to Senate consent to the treaty with Napoleon, because the new era would overbalance New England, he instructed a Kentucky Senator to get the western Members there for the first day of the extra session—they must, he said, cast metaphysical subtleties behind them, "ratify and pay for it."

His views on the form of government for the new territory went through the same sort of conversion under heat and pressure. Here again the strict-constructionist Jefferson first thought of a constitutional amendment meticulously prescribing the organization pattern for the new territory, and drafted one of about 600 words. By the time Congress gathered, he had reached the point of saying that, "With the wisdom of Congress it will rest to take those ulterior measures that may be necessary for the immediate occupation and temporary government of the country; for its incorporation in our Union."

Furthermore, he himself actually sketched the bill which Congress passed. This put in the President's hands the appointment of all officers in Louisiana Territory, and thus made Jefferson—the prophet of Government with the consent of the governed—the executive, legislature, and judiciary of Louisiana. In the beginning the people had no voice whatsoever as to their government, and all rights had to be legislated into the Territory from outside, through acts of Congress. Senator John Quincy Adams opposed the bill on the ground that it was government for the people without their consent. But Jefferson drafted and applied the act because circumstances demanded it. Again he acted as a realist.

The Louisiana Purchase was a success in every way. There is no need to suggest the direct benefit to the country of the new regions, as they were peopled, transformed from Territories into States, and developed their human and material resources. But the doctrines which were fashioned in 1803 to enable the purchase to be consummated and the territorial government brought into existence have had quite as important an influence on the development of our concepts of national growth. As Frederick J. Turner has well said, it can be argued that the Louisiana Purchase doctrines "were farther reaching in their effect upon the Constitution than even the measures of Alexander Hamilton. All the decisions of later American history were either traceable to or in some measure shaped or determined by it."

It took a big man to turn his back on the Kentucky-Virginia resolutions he had fathered. This was a complete about face in constitutional theory on Jefferson's part. He acted on the precept of the old Romans, salus populi suprema lex. Had Jefferson Davis as President of the Provisional Confederate Government in Montgomery, after reading Lincoln's First Inaugural, announced his intention to lead the seceded States back into the Union, it would have been no more complete break with his past doctrine.

As I have said, this was Jefferson's greatest success. But I suggest that there is even more profound instruction for today's America in Jefferson's greatest failure—the ill-fated embargo, his effort to gain for America some of the fruits of war without its costs in human life.

No man could have had a greater goal. The American purpose was to secure the freedom of the seas, to maintain our neutrality against both Britain and France, to retain the fruits of our growing foreign commerce and trade.

There was a great national necessity that these be done. Within 3 months of the signing of the Louisiana Purchase Treaty, Napoleon renewed his war with Britain, and almost at once the shipping of the United States became the target of both belligerents. This was almost inevitable because, until the outbreak of the War of 1812, America was the most prosperous neutral carrier. When the British Navy and privateers stopped direct trade between France and Spain and their colonies, American shipowners stepped in to take the profits of this vast commerce. The British countered by intensifying their use of admiralty courts to destroy the lucrative new trade. The Emperor rained decrees of reprisal.

Jefferson continually searched for ways to avoid British prohibition and French countermeasures and succeeded well enough for the Americans to build up a huge carrying trade of Colonial produce—and of such American staples as cotton, tobacco, and flour. In 1805 the British grew desperate over their own losses of trade, their sinews of war, and the Cabinet instructed the courts of admiralty to harden their hearts. The President then tried out a policy of commercial restriction, Congress at his behest passed a Non-Intercourse Act in April 1806, a club to be used on the British to soften their attitude. But they had their backs to the wall and would not deal.

The next year the British went even further—they issued two orders in council, one of which forbade neutral ships to trade between the ports of France, her allies and dependencies, while the other decreed a blockade of all ports under French control. Napoleon's Milan Decree answered that any ship which submitted to these orders in council became lawful French prize.

The legal situation was, in a nutshell, that no American ship could visit a French port unless it had first paid tribute at a British customhouse, and if it did so, the French would condemn both ship and cargo.

As Jefferson saw it, the United States had the option between fighting both the Mistress of the Seas and the foremost of land tyrants in a triangular duel, or submitting to outrages intolerable for a sovereign state, no matter how modest its position in the concert of nations. Jefferson thought the first choice quixotic and the second unthinkable, and so brought forward the Embargo as a measure short of war which would attain some of its ends.

The embargo was designed to be economic warfare of the most affirmative type. His resort to it was consistent both with his willingness to experiment, and with the logic of his prior experience.

The Colonies had used economic weapons against the British, the Boston Tea Party being only the most famous among many episodes. While Secretary of State for Washington, Jefferson had tried to bring business pressure on the British. Since 1793 American trade had doubled and redoubled. Neither Britain nor France would respect a neutral right; both had bankrupt diplomacies which spurned American good will as of no account. Jefferson's embargo was the best substitute for war that had so far been devised.

The essence was that Britain desperately needed supplies from the United States—and France to a less degree; and that both needed our ships to carry commodities from colonies; and that if we could deprive the two belligerents of our goods and our shipping services, they would be forced to respect our rights.

The embargo was aimed, in other words, to awaken the consuming populations of Europe to the folly of the course of their governments, by cutting them off from needed overseas supplies. To attain its ends it must also safeguard American shipping. Moreover, it was a means of asserting our national dignity against injuries beyond our immediate military power to remedy.

It was relatively easy to prevent American ships from sailing directly to Britain or France, but the coastwise trade was another matter. During the Non-Intercourse Act shipowners had repeatedly cleared from Norfolk with wheat or flour for Boston, only to be "blown off their course" and end up in Halifax—or Liverpool, where the British bought their cargo. So the Embargo Act instituted controls of coastwise trading.

The governmental interference with private activities was quite as drastic as anything that has been done in the United States in World War II—OPA was hardly in a class with it.

Under the new statute, the Governors of the States were to work with the Secretary of the Treasury and his collectors and other officials in its enforcement. The President issued a proclamation authorizing the detention of all coasting vessels and their cargoes

in the case of any suspicion of intent to evade the embargo, and designated flour, a large export item, as a suspect commodity. But Governors were allowed to issue to trusted merchants warrants to import from other sections of America amounts of flour needed by their respective communities.

Gallatin hadn't liked the measure—he thought war better. Also he doubted the Governors acting properly—but with one exception they all did their duties well. Gallatin set up admirably efficient machinery for enforcement, and within a comparatively short time the coastwise trade was brought under control. This greatly reduced the number of ships which cleared for Boston and wound up at Halifax.

Furthermore, the embargo did deal British industrial labor a grievous blow. Mills shut down and labor starved; the Elizabethan poor law was invoked more than had been the case since Good Queen Bess. There were bankruptcies and riots, but these did not have the expected political effect. Britain was in the heyday of her "rotton boroughs" which were sending more men to the House of Commons than all the manufacturing towns. So Castlereagh, Canning & Co. delayed in redressing the cause of the workers' suffering. They kept hoping some change would occur to enable them to find new sources of food and other supplies abroad, and new markets for British goods. But some important members of the Cabinet proposed revoking or amending the rule of 1756 and watering down the new orders in council, and there were pointed questions in the House of Commons.

These developments encouraged Jefferson, and he needed it, for there had been a sharp adverse reaction in America. This was because the enforcement had worked altogether too well. It did so well that exports to Europe dropped overnight. This meant that our farmers were being deprived of their overseas markets. Mississippi lost her foreign cotton market, many Virginia wheat growers went bankrupt when the domestic price dropped two-thirds in 6 months. But there were some offsets, due to increased domestic manufacture, and so Jefferson was not up against a veritable revolt in the Congress until fate—or chance—dealt him a scurvy trick.

This was Napoleon's invasion of the Spanish Peninsula just about the time the embargo was taking final hold. He wanted his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne, and deposed the Bourbon puppet who had been his ally, and the Portuguese House of Braganza fled to Brazil. Revolution flared in Spain, Wellington landed in Portugal. The South American trade so long denied to the British was reopened and their commerce revived overnight. This was the death knell for Jefferson's embargo.

The trade statistics tell the story. Britain's 1807 exports to the United States had been nearly 12,000,000 pounds; those in the embargo years only 5,250,000 pounds—but in total world exports she dropped only 7 percent between the 2 years. The revival of South American trade repaired both their cupboard and cash box. No longer need they fear the effect of Jefferson's economic war.

The people felt that the great experiment had failed, and Congress insisted that it be brought to an end. The Federalists jeered at Jefferson, the Republicans insisted on repeal of the act that had almost achieved its purpose.

Jefferson was disheartened by the denouement. He had announced in 1806 that he would not accept a third term, Madison was President-elect, and the President tried to divorce himself of responsibility for the next step. But neither Madison nor Gallatin would permit it, saying "You must decide the question." Jefferson intimated he would like the repeal to take effect sometime after he left office, but Congress was in a panic and would not wait. He signed the repealer on his last day in office and left for his beloved little hill, saying, "Never did a person released from his chains feel such relief as I feel on casting off the shackles of power." He never visited Washington again.

The embargo was his greatest failure. But I submit that the very fact that he made this experiment is a measure of the greatness of the man—in its way as splendid a one as the Louisiana Purchase. Its object was to secure the national interest and to do so without war. Only a man intellectually hospitable to new ideas, willing to make new approaches to unsolved problems, would ever have undertaken the embargo experiment. This is the live and vital thing about Jefferson; his mind looked ahead, it dealt with the problems of the living and evolving world. He believed in the school of experience, as a guide to better use of our talents. But if experience were lacking, he believed in exploring the unknown.

This willingness to seek new ways to do things people say can't be done is among man's most useful traits. It has added cubits to man's knowledge. It has been a mighty engine in science, invention, and philosophy. But it can have its greatest value in developing man's more intelligent self-government, and particularly the development of efficient substitutes for war.

Jefferson turned his great philosophical, practical mind to find the way to achieve national ends by means short of war. He believed that there must be an efficient substitute for deadly combat. His embargo seemed about to unlock the magic door when chance took a hand.

I have dwelt on his greatest failure because, as Lord Bolingbroke says in one of his Letters on the Study and Use of History, that "on our journey through life we may be beset on every side, and history is the journal of those who have been exposed to the same accidents—and their good and their ill success are equally instructive."

Both shall be useful to the conference in San Francisco which is endeavoring to find the solution to just the sort of problem Jefferson tried to handle with the embargo; they, too, are seeking an efficient substitute for war—a new pattern of organizing the peace which can secure the common good of man. This is the noblest of purposes, and its achievement will mean peace on earth and good will for men. There is the best of reasons for us to hope that at San Francisco the statesmen of the peace-loving nations will find the key for that magic door of a just and lasting peace.

Single Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much loose talk about a single Department of Defense. I herewith submit a very well-reasoned argument to the effect that we ought to go very slowly in this matter. It is an address by Hon. H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, delivered before the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce. He hoists the flag of caution and weighs the advantages against the disadvantages involved in such a single Department of Defense.

His address follows:

A SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE?

(By H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy)

I have chosen a much discussed and very important subject. It is the advisability of consolidating the existing War and Navy Departments into a single department of armed services. While I realize that final determination of that proposal must be left to the postwar period, there has already been an unusual amount of public attention given to the problem. Some citizens seem to have reached a decision. A full crystalization of public opinion without complete understanding would, however, be most undesirable. Therefore, I should like to present some of the considerations which I believe must be fully appreciated and appraised before a final decision can be made.

The merger or continued separation of the two departments means nothing to me that it does not mean to every other citizen. My sole desire is that we make no mistake. This country must have the most competent armed service, or group of armed services, which our ingenuity can provide. On that objective I am sure we are all agreed. Our future security is so important that it cannot be risked in the slightest. The organization of our armed forces must meet the test of effectiveness in peace and in war.

To meet that test, I believe that this country must remain a strong sea power. I agree with Admiral King that sea power consists of seven essential elements—surface ships, submarines, aircraft, merchant ships, naval bases, trained personnel, and the productive capacity to build, equip, operate and fight them, I am, therefore, opposed to all organizational changes which, intentionally or unintentionally, might weaken our sea power. I hope you start from the same premise.

In approaching this organizational problem, one other fact is basic. Our problem is whether an effective group of fighting forces can be made more effective. We are not discussing armed services which have failed. Our present departments have established themselves in this war as successful, going concerns. We and our allies have won the first phase against what was once a military colossus. We are winning the phase against Japan. The Japanese Navy has been driven from the Pacific. Our ground troops are firmly entrenched on the threshold of the Japanese Empire. Failing organizations could not have achieved those victories. We owe it to posterity to be certain of improvement before we discard a victorious combination.

I wish I could lay before you a reasoned conclusion one way or the other. Unfortunately, I have not arrived at any final decision. I cannot present a plan of consolidation. I cannot bring myself to recommend that no change in that direction be made. I see disadvantages and advantages in the present system. It seems to me that there will be an equal number of disadvantages and advantages in a single department.

My main difficulty is that I have not been able to work out the blueprint of an effective single department. I cannot accept a theoretical "general principle of consolidation" in the abstract and trust that the details will later fall in line. Successful organizational forms exist only in the concrete and depend on careful attention to many details. All mergers are not beneficial. Our national experience with corporate mergers is eloquent in that respect. Some mergers produce compact and efficient units. Others result in

loose, diffused, and unprofitable concerns, disappointing to the stockholders and the public alike. None of you would approve a merger of two industrial concerns without having a detailed plan presented and studied. I do not mean that you would want to envision where each clerk would sit. You would, however, insist on preparing a reasonably clear forecast as to the effect of the merger on the important divisions of both companies. You would probably want to study the experience of any other company which might have tried the same type of merger. It is my suggestion that we follow the identical cautious approach in thinking through this defense problem.

Let us start with a quick glance at history—first at the history of our own country. The United States started on its national career in 1789 with a single department for the armed services. The Department of War was given authority over both the land and naval forces. At that time we had no naval vessels. The depredations of the Barbary pirates in 1794 started our naval growth. In 1788, we drifted into an undeclared sea war with France. Ship construction was further increased. Agitation started for a separate Department of the Navy. On March 22, 1798, the Secretary of War, himself, as one alternative, proposed the separation of naval affairs from the War Department. The debates in Congress are worth examining. Some of the opponents of separation feared that it would lead to a great Navy. Those favoring a separate Navy urged that important economies would result through closer supervision of naval matters. It was also said that one department could not so spread itself efficiently to administer the business of both the Army and the Navy. After considerable debate and a close vote, our present separate Navy Department was created on April 30, 1798.

Germany and Russia have each experimented with a single department. The German Navy of World War I was built under a separate admiralty. After 1918, the German Army and Navy were placed under a single Ministry of Defense. There was at that time no German Navy. It had been scuttled at Scapa Flow. By 1936, the German war organization had been split into three separate departments—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. In 1938, a single supreme military command, which included fairly complete control over the economic life of the nation, was established. Whether it resembled our Joint Chiefs of Staff or a single department we do not as yet know.

Russia started her first 5-year plan by placing her armed forces under a single committee. Later this committee, or commissariat as it was called, was replaced by a single Minister of Defense. On December 7, 1937, when the idea of a strong Russian Navy was revived for the first time since 1918, the Navy was transferred to a separate naval commissar. Foreign Commissar Molotov then declared that Soviet Russia was determined to have a fleet equal to her great mission.

It may well be that we should draw no final conclusions from such history. I realize that the vitality of institutions depends greatly on environment. I do not feel that we are clear enough about the effect of environment upon our early combined department. We know much less about the environments of the Russian and German experiments. Even so, the need for caution seems considerably emphasized by the fact that on several occasions on this globe a single department was tried and abandoned.

The arguments in favor of a consolidated department are basically simple and are grounded entirely in dissatisfaction with the present situation. Separate departments are charged with three fundamental defects. It is said that separate departments lead to (1) uncoordinated operations in the field, (2) duplicating services and efforts, and (3) competitive interferences accompanied by a waste of manpower, material, and money. Consolidation is presented as the organizational panacea for such defects.

At this point I suggest an examination. At least two questions can well be asked—Can these defects be eliminated without consolidating the departments? Will these defects surely be eliminated by consolidation?

For instance, I think it is clear that coordination of command in the field can be accomplished without merger of the departments. In our Joint Chiefs of Staff I think we have created an instrumentality through which unity of military command can be effected. With some exceptions, I think unity of command has been achieved. In such exceptions, furthermore, the fault, if any there be, does not lie in the organizational form but rather in the decisions made. There is no form of organization possible which will prevent all error of judgment. I would retain permanently the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That will require legislation, but in that respect, consolidation of the departments is not essential. As a matter of fact, the different backgrounds of the men comprising our Joint Chiefs of Staff may well have contributed to the vitality of their decisions.

I agree that there is considerable duplication of effort between the services. Some of the most widely publicized, however, are not really duplications. As to others, it seems to me that consolidation would not be a cure. For instance, I do not think there is any duplication in the existence of two hospitals in Washington a few miles from each other. I have in mind the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md., and the Army Hospital in the District of Columbia. Both hospitals are full. All operating rooms, X-ray rooms, and laboratories are used to capacity. I am told that both hospitals are about as large as a single hospital should be for efficient operation by a single staff.

An example of a possible duplication which would not be cured by consolidation is the existence of two air stations in Washington—the Anacostia Naval Air Station and the Army's Bolling Field, immediately adjacent to each other. It is said that under a single department those fields could be combined with the saving of one control tower, one operations building and one operating staff.

That claim was first made early last year. Later in the same year, single operation of the two fields was tried. It was unsuccessful. The fields are located on a long narrow strip of land bounded on one side by the Anacostia River and on the other by some low hills. Control of both fields from a single tower resulted in delayed take-offs and landings, general confusion, and inefficiency in operation. The truth is that for modern planes the fields are badly located. Once the present location is accepted as a fact, there is no duplication. Combination of the departments would cure nothing.

In 1943, a point was made of the fact that the Army ordnance plants were not being used to peak capacity and yet the Navy was building additional shell-loading facilities. After the German attack in December 1944, the Army suddenly needed all loading capacity available and would have liked more. Then the additional Navy loading capacity seemed farsightedness indeed.

It must also, I think, be recognized that consolidation is not a certain cure for all duplication and overlapping. Duplication almost always exists in large organizations. It might well be termed a byproduct of enormous size as natural in that situation as the thorn is on the rose bush. Overlapping often exists and persists in spite of unity of command. The Navy, a single department, has unity of command in a single Secretary. All of the top military and civilian executives work as a team and are extremely conscious of the need for teamwork. Yet, one of the most difficult problems we face in the Navy is the elimination of duplications within our walls. After years of close attention, we are continually discovering unsuspected duplications. Some are deliberately created for the sake of what we deem to be efficiency. I fear that it will be some time before we discover the organizational secret which will guarantee the elimination of all inappropriate duplications and overlappings.

Unification will not necessarily remedy all the criticized defects. The resulting single department would be so large that existing duplications might possibly become accentuated and more numerous. As organizations expand, executive control becomes more and more tenuous and weakened. There is a limit to the direct executive control which can be exercised by any one man. In almost direct proportion to size and decentralization, the obstacles in the way of coordination multiply. In industry, mass production has provided savings which have counterbalanced the inefficiencies of diffused executive direction. What the counter weight in the armed services might be, I do not know.

The War Department provides an excellent clinical study of the operation of a huge organization. Size has, in my opinion, forced Army management to separate and decentralize much more than the Navy. That is not said in criticism. In an organization of the Army's size, I do not think there was any option. Nevertheless, it is inescapable that considerable duplication exists within the War Department.

I have also watched another phenomenon of evolution in the Army which I attribute to size. At the start of this war the Army voluntarily split into three parts—the Army Ground Forces, the Army Air Forces, and a joint Service of Supply, now known as the Army Service Forces. The Air Forces sought and obtained a high degree of autonomy, even in respect of the General Staff. The Air Forces established their own separate air judge advocate, air surgeon, air inspector general, Air Chaplains Division, and Civil Affairs Division. The Air Forces' procurement organization is now also quite separate from the Army Service Forces. The trend toward complete separation is continuing. As late as September 27, 1944, there was transferred from the Army Service Forces to the Air Forces independent authority over automotive maintenance, repair of real property, operation of utilities, contract with commercial laundries, and several other nonspecialized operations with respect to Air Force installations. Duplication in administration was thus deliberately created. It was probably wise.

Personally, I expect to see a continued trend toward separation in the huge War Department. It may well be that complete autonomy of the air forces is inevitable. That may be dictated not only by logic but by the natural limitations with respect to size. No one, I fear, knows how large an organization can become, before a separation into parts is essential to maintain effective control.

Many urge a merger of the armed services in the interests of economy. As you undoubtedly noted, the same argument was made in 1798 in favor of separation. I doubt whether anyone knows the path to true economy. War is not economical. It is the apotheosis of waste and destruction. Furthermore, it is as yet impossible in respect of this war to estimate the waste in duplication as compared with the waste through haste, changes in strategic plans, and diffused administration inside the two huge Departments.

And let me add that in war we cannot sacrifice effectiveness to economy. That could be the path to defeat.

Quite apart from my worries about the loss of efficiency in organizations of huge size, I do not think the plan of combining the departments, which was publicly proposed last year, involves unification. It is really a plan of separation. You will recall that such plan envisaged a single department headed by one secretary supported in turn by four subordinates—three separate under secretaries, one each for the Army, Navy, and Army Air Forces—and then an independent Director of Supply on a level somewhat below that of the under secretaries. The only signs of unification in that plan lie in the name of the over-all department and in the person of the single secretary. Unity in an organization of that size will, in my opinion, need many more aides. All criticisms of the existing situation will, I think, apply equally well to that type of organization.

It seems to me that the substance of such plan is the further separation of the Army Air Forces and the Services of Supply. Such thought is supported by the position taken by one of its proponents. On April 26, 1944, before the Select Committee of the House on Postwar Military Policy a high ranking Army Air Force officer was asked the following questions and made the following answers:

"Question. Then, you think that unity can be brought about by a merging together of the two armed services in their entirety, the Army and the Navy?

"Answer. No, sir; I do not.

"Question. You think the unity can only be brought about by further division?

"Answer. Yes, sir; I do."

Unification through separation may be practicable but I think we are entitled to a clear demonstration.

If the real purpose of this proposal is to establish the Army Air Forces on a separate and independent basis, I think it should be discussed from that angle and not presented as unification. That separation may well be an appropriate change. I am not sufficiently advised to comment on the wisdom of a separate Army Air Force. I know, however, that it is an entirely different subject from consolidation of the two present Departments.

I realize that I have done nothing more than sketch a shadowy outline of an important national problem. You must fill in the details yourself. A real burden is thus cast upon you. You must become informed and you must make your views known. You cannot let this question go by default. Our national security and power cannot be weakened.

If I have seemed to favor the present situation, such impression was not intended. I am still sincerely on the fence. Although I am satisfied that a change in the present victorious combination should not be hastily made, I am anxious that we think this proposal through. If I seemed to deal too emphatically with the disadvantages of size, it was because I fear such dangers are usually glossed over. I have tried simply to emulate the watchman at a dangerous railroad crossing. My whole appeal was intended to be one of caution—a cry of—"Stop, look, and listen."

The Alien-Property Riddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday Evening Post of June 30, 1945, there appeared a most timely and well-considered article, in which the alien-property problem is most interestingly and entertainingly dealt with.

Since an appropriate disposition of alien enemy owned properties and frozen assets—properties heretofore seized by the Alien Property Custodian and assets now held by the Secretary of the Treasury—will have to be determined upon by the Congress within the next few weeks, the factual information and historical background of the legislative problem which is so ably presented by the author will, I am quite certain, be very helpful to the membership during the days that lie immediately ahead.

As a suggested solution of the problem, I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 3371, dealing with this subject, one which, if adopted, would bring about, among other things, the final termination of all alien-enemy claims against the seized and frozen assets which are now in the custody or under the control of the United States; the immediate sale of all of such properties and assets to the highest bona fide American bidders; the deposit of the funds so derived from such sale in the Treasury in appropriately designated accounts; and the holding of such funds in trust for the benefit of American citizens who have suffered detriment by reason of alien-enemy action. The bill further provides for the establishment of such claims in American courts in accordance with the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice and for the execution of any judgments which may be secured against the funds so impounded, all this without protracted international negotiations or the necessity of setting up international commissions to deal with the subject.

Because of the great importance of the subject, I sincerely hope that this able article from the efficient pen of Mr. Henry B. Pringle will not escape the attention of anyone who is interested in finding an appropriate solution for this difficult problem.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous consent of the membership just granted, I hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of this date and as a part of my instant remarks the article from the Saturday Evening Post to which I have just adverted, the following constituting the text:

THE ALIEN PROPERTY RIDDLE

(By Henry F. Pringle)

Certain items in America's recent history are remarkable, to put it mildly. Among them is the fact that shortly before and immediately after the rise of Adolf Hitler to absolute power in March 1933, an amiable but befuddled Uncle Sam paid Germany something over $400,000,000 in property and cash. He tapped American taxpayers for about $40,000,000 of the total, although few of them knew anything about it. The rest represented the return of German property seized in the last World War or compensation for its loss.

The Fuhrer must have been delighted with this nest egg. He needed foreign assets desperately. Most of all, he needed American dollars with which to buy materials of war. The $400,000,000 was to be very useful in the years between 1933 and 1939. It bought aircraft for Hermann Goering. It helped to make Hitler strong enough to swallow Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938 and 1939. The tanks and submarines which it built were soon killing Poles, French, and British as they would in due course kill Americans.

The United States, acting through Congress in 1923 and 1928, had supposed that the $400,000,000 would go to private German citizens who had owned property, cash, or securities in this country in 1917. It had always been American policy to take over enemy property in the event of war, use it for the duration, and then return it. German citizens did receive part of the $400,000,000. But private property almost ceased to exist when the Nazi Party came into power. Even prior to Hitler, the Brüning government seized in 1931 all foreign assets of German citizens which it could uncover in exchange for reichmarks and other dubious forms of payment.

Our witless contribution to Hitler's rearmament program, combined with other unfortunate mistakes in dealing with enemy property between 1918 and 1934, calls attention to the fact that we shall have to face the whole puzzling problem again. The total enemy property is somewhat smaller this time, probably not more than $500,000,000, including cash and securities, compared with $600,000,000 in 1917–18. But this does not include a very large number of patents on chemical and almost every other kind of industrial process which as yet it has been impossible to evaluate.

In the last war an official appointed by the President, the Alien Property Custodian, controlled all forms of enemy property. Today the Foreign Funds Control of the Treasury Department handles cash and securities which, including those owned by friendly aliens, exceed $8,000,000,000. James E. Markham, the present Alien Property Custodian, has charge of German, Japanese, Italian, and other enemy-owned business houses, real estate, patents, copyrights, and industrial concerns. If enemy ownership was substantial, title in the property was vested, which means that Uncle Sam is the owner. Vested properties are held and operated, or sold, under the Custodian's supervision.

Admitting the legal fiction that Custodian Markham is the owner, acting for the Government, he has a greater variety of possessions than any potentate of India.

Among the 500,000 musical compositions that he owns are the operettas, Blossom Time and The Merry Widow, and he receives royalties whenever they are performed. He owns Japanese farms, mining companies, a vast dye-and-chemical plant, and a camera-and-film factory. He has American copyrights on German scientific books, on novels, and other literary works. He has tens of thousands of patents relating to aviation, chemistry, mining, drugs, and the manufacture of ammunition of all kinds. He runs a brewery in New England. He has 3 patents which concern bee culture and 58 on baths, sinks, and spittoons. He owns 145 wholesale and retail establishments, which he is seeking to liquidate as rapidly as he can.

Very much against his will, the Custodian owned, when the war was young, the false teeth belonging to the mother of an interned Italian. The old lady had been rated completely loyal by the FBI and appeared at the Custodian's office to demand her teeth, which she had somehow left in a trunk owned by her pro-Mussolini son. The trunk was finally located, after considerable work by the APC staff, and the teeth delivered.

Comparable perplexities accompanied the seizure of a small German jewelry store in downtown New York. The owner was whisked to Ellis Island. It was then discovered that about 20 watches, their works strewn on a table, had been partly repaired. The owners wrathfully called on the Custodian to produce their watches—in running order too. In despair, he brought the watch man back from Ellis Island under guard. But it was

too late. Various investigators had mixed up the parts. Claims are still pending.

Congress has the absolute power to decide what shall be done with enemy property when the war ends. Before it does so, however, the legislative branch will be subjected to pressure from two diametrically opposed groups. One calls for permanent holding of the property by the United States, for the benefit of Americans who have vastly greater claims against Germany. The other group shrinks from this with horror, calling it confiscation and a violation of international law. The first group replies that it isn't confiscation, so long as the enemy country is forced by the peace treaty to reimburse its nationals. Any other policy, it insists, is absurd; and the case of Hitler's Mein Kampf is offered in evidence. The APC vested the American copyright to this epic following Pearl Harbor and is holding about $20,000 in royalities. Are these to be returned to Der Fuhrer's heirs?

The opponents of confiscation, when faced with this specific challenge, say it doesn't change basic principles, and they constitute a powerful group of influences. The United States Chamber of Commerce has adopted a policy against confiscation, but believes that enemy property should be held until American claims have been met. A report drafted by the National Foreign Trade Council goes much further. Even the disappearance of private property in totalitarian states, it argues, is no justification for confiscation. Permanently to keep enemy property would "undermine our economic system * * * and wipe out the distinction between private and public property." The international law committee of the New York City Bar Association has taken a similar position. Its chairman, John Foster Dulles, filed a brief with the House Judiciary Committee pointing out that confiscation was in violation of American policy, that it would endanger "the confidence which is needed to create an expanding world economy."

At this point it seems pertinent to examine further what happened in the last war. Behind the activities and policies of the Alien Property Custodian, when the war ended, were two main objectives. The first, and more important, was to make certain that German interests would not again obtain a strangle hold on technical processes vital to war, notably the manufacture of dyes and related chemicals. The second was to see that American citizens, having hundreds of millions in claims against Germany, would be paid. The evidence is now overwhelming that we failed in both these objectives, although the fault was by no means entirely that of the Custodian.

The Bosch Magneto Co. is a good example of how the Germans swiftly regained control of a company making an important war product. It was seized in the last war. In 1919, the American Bosch Magneto Corp. was organized by American citizens and acquired the German patents and other properties.

THE LESSON OF WORLD WAR I

"As a result of these proceedings," Custodian Francis P. Garvan reported happily that year, "the magneto industry of the country is now wholly in American hands and is unfettered by patents held by or for the benefit of enemies. It seems reasonably safe to predict that the business will remain 100 percent American indefinitely."

It remained so for hardly a decade. The American company was badgered by litigation brought on behalf of Robert Bosch Gesellschaft, the original German owners. In 1930, a majority of the American company's stock was acquired by them. They used funds supplied, as authorized by Congress, by Mr. Garvan's successor as custodian. In May 1942, 77 percent of the stock of the American Bosch Co. was seized, although it was supposedly owned in Sweden. The Custodian is now operating it with American officials.

We were greatly handicapped in the last war by the German dye monopoly, particularly with respect to related ingredients for explosives. The American Government was determined that the monopoly should not be reestablished, and to that end the Chemical Foundation, Inc., was formed. The history of the Chemical Foundation has been so clouded with controversy that its original purpose has been forgotten. Despite all the talk about nonconfiscation as an American policy, almost 5,000 chemical patents were sold to the Chemical Foundation for $266,400, with the specification that they were to be made available, on fair and equal terms, to all American manufacturers. But somehow it didn't work out that way.

The Germans were prying their way back into American industry almost before the ink was dry on the peace treaty. They never achieved their earlier chemical monopoly, because of the industry and skill of American scientists; but they accomplished a lot, a good deal of it through the international ramifications of a German concern called I. G. Farbenindustrie.

The rising Adolf Hitler had been distrusted at first, by the heads of I. G. Farbenindustrie in Germany. To get votes, he had made speeches against the cartel. But he quickly disavowed these when he became chancellor in 1933. Soon I. G. was an essential part of the Nazi state and its war plans. It had 300,000 employees. It had charge of the production of synthetic rubber and gasoline, textile fibers, animal fodder, aluminum, plastics and, of course, explosives. It furnished foreign exchange for the Nazi government, financed propaganda and espionage, bought critical materials in foreign markets. By cartel agreements, it exchanged patent and other information with British, French, and American corporations.

The principal officers of I. G. took a personal oath of "blind allegiance" to Hitler. The parent company sent executives to the United States and to other countries with instructions to become citizens. This would be useful in case of war, and it was. Certain corporations ostensibly American were dangerously close to our war-production program. They may have had access to military secrets of great value. Their true ownership was obviously hidden. Their books set forth that they were owned by Dutch, Swiss, Swedish, or other interests. Only diligent investigation by the Treasury Department and other agencies uncovered their real owners.

Clearly, failure had marked the efforts of the American Government to block the reestablishment of German influence in industries essential to prosecution of the war.

"With startling rapidity in many fields," according to John E. Roe, now assistant counsel of APC, "control has again been built up in considerable measure through the use of rights granted by our Government under our own patent law. When America again found itself at war, it found itself confronted with many of the same problems and with many of the same disadvantages as existed in 1917, but in far more acute form."

"Even though the conditions under which the sales of patents and plants were made were designed to eliminate the possibility of future German control," the Kilgore committee has reported, "the German chemical trust succeeded within a few years in reentering the American market and again acquiring a degree of control over American dyestuffs and pharmaceutical production."

Did the American Government do any better in gaining its second objective—making sure that its citizens with claims against Germany would get their money? The failure to do so between 1918 and the rise of the Nazi Party was more excusable than will be a comparable failure after this war. The United States was virtually without experience in such negotiations. A long delay ensued before an Alien Property Custodian was appointed. Congress, in passing the Trading With the Enemy Act in 1917, set forth the principle that any enemy property taken over was to be held in trust and then returned to its owners.

But as A. Mitchell Palmer, first Alien Property Custodian, began to operate some of the large German corporations, an absurd situation developed. He was making, it appeared, large fortunes for the German industrialists who were fighting us. The value of enemy property increased by almost $100,000,000. Palmer urged that its worth at the outbreak of the war be fixed, and only this paid back. Meanwhile Americans were beginning to file claims for damage by Germany. Lives had been lost through submarine attacks. Property, both personal and commercial, had been destroyed and confiscated.

The Knox-Porter resolution of July 1921, which ended the war, radically altered American policy. Confirmed by the peace treaty with Germany, the new one specified that enemy property in the United States should be retained until suitable provision had been made for the settlement of all American claims. About $1,000,000,000 was being demanded, a large part of it without much basis. In August 1922 the United States and Germany set up a Mixed Claims Commission to pass on the cases.

THE GERMAN SKIN GAME

By refusing to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, the United States missed the boat so far as getting any substantial sums from Germany was concerned. We did not press an agreed upon $255,000,000 in reparations for our occupation army in the Rhineland. The other allies contrived to collect an estimated $3,000,000,000 in cash and goods up to May 1921. This was about all that Germany had. Inflation was soon wrecking her financial structure. American claimants did get a total of about $160,000,000. But shortly we were listening to demands that we pay the Germans far more.

The pleas reached Congress from all sides. A board of trade for German-American commerce popped up to say that American honor would be stained unless the German property was handed back. It flooded the country with pamphlets to that effect. Stories were told of poverty-stricken Germans and Austrians whose property in the United States did not exceed $10,000. In 1923, Congress ruled that all such claimants should get their holdings.

The total in property, securities, and cash of these "little owners" was $235,000,000. The argument was immediately raised, naturally, that a moral obligation to return any German property applied to all of it. This view was backed by Secretary of the Treasury Ogden Mills. The Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 was, however, a compromise. It provided that only 80 percent of the property was to be turned back. The balance was to be withheld until Germany had satisfied American claims in full. This was to be done through the Dawes plan payments. But Germany paid only $21,000,000; she defaulted in 1933. Next year the Harrison resolution forbade further payments to Germany.

By now Hitler was Chancelor. The 1928 settlement brought $140,000,000 to German owners. They received an additional $43,000,000 for ships seized by the United States, this sum being appropriated by Congress. How much did American claimants lose? It

will never be known. They lost, at the very least, the tens of millions of dollars in interest to which they were entitled because of the long delay. But this much is true: They did not lose as much as they would have had a rigid policy of nonconfiscation been continued. The only payment in that event, it now seems obvious, would have been the $21,000,000 under the Dawes plan. Germany would have recovered close to $600,000,000, the gross value of the enemy property in this country when peace came.

Few Americans cared, between 1923 and 1931, what happened to German property or to the claims of United States citizens. This was particularly true in 1928, when the final settlement was made. The stock market was booming. Everybody was going to be rich. Among the few influential voices raised in opposition were those of Cordell Hull and John Nance Garner, then Members of the House, who denounced the 1928 settlement as one of the greatest steals in history.

The United States grew more sophisticated, as well as disillusioned, as war again became imminent in Europe. This time, unlike 1917, we were ready to act. When Germany invaded Norway and Denmark on April 9, 1940, the Foreign Funds Control was created in the Treasury.

It was obvious that Germany would try to transfer Danish and Norwegian bank balances in the United States into German accounts, to be used at once against Great Britain and France, as well as against the United States if total war came. So the funds were frozen. One by one, the countries of Europe were overrun by the Nazi armies, and the freezing process was extended to their financial resources in the United States. It was extended to Japan in July 1941. This was economic warfare, and its blows would heavily damage the Axis.

THE NAZI NETWORK

The Treasury was the logical agency to be in charge. Through its tax collectors, customs inspectors, and other agents, the Treasury Department has a far greater knowledge of international financial operations than any other branch of the Government. In June 1941 it began to add to its existing knowledge by taking a census of all foreign-owned property of any kind. Very often actual ownership was hidden through Swedish, Swiss, Dutch, Latin-American, and even American dummies. The Treasury sleuths tracked down most of these, however, through the 600,000 foreign-property reports filed during the census. As Japanese-American relations approached disintegration, the Treasury had a clear picture of what had happened in the United States. It subsequently reported:

"In the 20-year period between 1919 and 1939, German interests succeeded in organizing within the United States another industrial and commercial network centered in the chemical field, but extending also to the electrical and heavy-goods industries, foreign commerce, and financing.

"It is unnecessary to point out that these business enterprises constituted a base of operations to carry out Axis plans to control production, to hold markets in this Hemisphere, to support fifth-column movements, and to mold out postwar economy to Axis plans. One of the primary reasons for freezing Axis assets was to combat this situation."

The Treasury Department was the original Alien Property Custodian in this war. It went into action at once when the attack on Pearl Harbor came. By dawn on December 8 it had agents posted at every single enemy-owned piece of property—even just a hamburger stand—in the United States. The Treasury first operated several large concerns after booting out pro-Nazi officers and executives. Logically, perhaps, it should have continued to do so. But some very basic issues were involved. Certain influences in the administration felt that the Department of Justice should handle alien property and use the opportunity to break up the huge cartels which had flourished in the past two decades. As a compromise, the office of Alien Property Custodian was established, with Leo T. Crowley as its head. He was succeeded by his first deputy, James E. Markham.

Supervision of alien cash and securities, friendly as well as enemy, was left with Foreign Funds Control of the Treasury. Persons or corporations in Latin America and European neutral countries were blacklisted when evidence was uncovered that they traded with the enemy. When Hitler conquered the Netherlands, Belgium, and France, he obtained large quantities of negotiable securities, cash, American currency, gold, and diamonds. His agents never abandoned their efforts to convert these assets into foreign exchange. The Treasury, to prevent it, ruled that all securities and currency imported into the United States must be examined by a Federal Reserve bank, which would seek to determine their true origin. At least $3,000,000 in tainted currency was impounded. Hundreds of millions, according to Foreign Funds Control officials, are still estimated to be in Axis hands because they could not get past the blockade. One plot to exchange diamonds for dollars was blocked with the arrest of Werner von Clemm, a relative of Von Ribbentrop.

Custodian Crowley, meanwhile, was familiarizing himself with his conglomerate empire. His first job was to find out what he had, and some interesting discoveries were made in the early weeks of this process. Scale models were found of the Fiat plant at Turin and of an arms-making war plant which our Army Air Forces subsequently reduced to bits. Supplies of maps and photographs of enemy roads and railroads which were invaluable to intelligence work were found. Detail maps of enemy cities, discovered among files, also turned out to be useful. A complete Italian passenger train, which had been exhibited at the New York World's Fair, was shipped to American forces in Italy.

But the big job was to get German-owned concerns into the largest possible production of war goods. Nearly all those taken over have greatly increased their output. Others have developed new products. Ironically, the Army-Navy E now flies over most of their plants. These companies continue to operate, of course. Others, such as Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha, Ltd., a foreign traiding company with branches all over the world, were liquidated. Yamanaka & Co., which sold oriental art and antiques in New York, Chicago, and Boston, was kept open until its stock could be sold without flooding the market.

Important among the copyrights held by APC were German scientific works and textbooks. Study of them was essential in American universities and research institutions. They included such jaw-breaking titles as Otto Faust's Cellulosеverbindungen unter ihre besonders wichtigen Verwendungs Gebiete, dargestellt an Hand der Patent-Weltliteratur. As editions of needed texts were exhausted, the custodian licensed American publishers to print new ones. A massive work on organic chemistry, imported, before the war at $1,800 a set, is now available to scientists for $400. The APC also licensed for republication a number of musical compositions, among them the famous Lila Marlene.

No pat, simple solution exists for this jumble of Axis companies and other properties now that the fighting has stopped in Europe. It is a safe assumption that the United States will not withdraw into commercial isolation. Our world trade must increase if prosperity is to be maintained at home. Part of that foreign trade will again be foreign investment in American business. A number of bills attempting to solve the puzzle of alien property have already been introduced in Congress, and others will follow. Some call for confiscation. Others disavow it. All the old controversies will again arise. If settlement is delayed for years, as in the last war, the likelihood is great that the United States will get fooled again. Germans and Japanese will demand that their property be returned intact and will sue in our courts if it is not. The Germans collected last time. They may do so once more.

WILL HISTORY REPEAT?

One myth should be dispelled, whatever the ultimate solution. This is that confiscation of private enemy property is forbidden by international law. Various treaties have barred it, but the best authorities agree that it has no relation to international law. Among them is Ralph M. Carson, a partner in the New York law firm, Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl.

"While lawyers discussing the subject are apt to characterize the practice forbidding confiscation as law or international law," Mr. Carson has written, "it is in reality nothing more than a usage composed of examples scanty in number arising in times quite different from our own."

Indeed, the United States went far toward confiscation in its handling—ineffective as it turned out in the long run—of patents in the last war. It has gone further this time. The APC has an announced policy of licensing patents, for a nominal fee, to any qualified American manufacturer who wants them. A master index listing 8,000 seized chemical patents has already been published. Critics of the Custodian's policy point out that all licenses are subject to the existing interests and rights of American companies. They see a tendency toward monopoly and the resumption of cartel agreements. But it is hard to believe that Germany can get hold of these patents again. The value of most will, in any case, have been dissipated by their wide use.

In any event, the solution is up to Congress. It would seem logical to take action before the pressure groups get organized. The form they will take is not difficult to anticipate. As before, their appearance will be innocent. Possibly an association of anti-Nazi scientists will be formed as the front for the same old interests. They will deny that I. G. Farbenindustrie ever did have any relations with the Nazi Party. Next, the stock of all the companies seized by the APC will be declared the property of widows and orphans. The people of the United States will be concerned with other things, as they were between 1918 and 1931. But several million young Americans will, unless all indications are wrong, be giving a period of their lives to universal military training. Whether it is wasted time or not will depend, to a degree, on the wisdom and common sense which govern the disposal of enemy property.

Letter to Congressman From Another Thinking, Fighting GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, seeking to learn from and listen at all times to the sincere expressions and opinions from the residents of the great Eighteenth

District of my native State of California, which I have the honor to represent in this great Congress, in every way I know how, I encourage folks to communicate to me and with me about their ideas, thinking, and desires for our great Nation in its domestic and, also, its world relationship. I strongly feel that a Member of Congress can only be thoroughly representative of the people in his district if he listens to these people and learns of their thinking, of their prayers, and desires.

Feeling as I do, that a most important group of thinking and working Americans is that group of American lads in uniform all over the world, and who are fighting for our freedom and security, I have been strengthened and inspired and helped in my thinking as a Member of the House by the many constructive and inspiring letters which I have received from all over the world and from young men from the Eighteenth Congressional District of California in uniform. Today I have received another one of these constructive, inspiring letters, and it is so full of "meat of the coconut," it so clearly proves that our boys are tirelessly thinking of their future and of their Nation's future, too, and of their part in it, that I desire every Member of this great Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to share with me the contents thereof. It comes from George Charles Heinrich, whose home is at Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif. I also specifically call to your attention that his letter to me emphasizes that the assertions and opinions in this splendid essay and treatise by him on veterans' financial security is not to be construed as official or as reflecting the views of the Navy Department or of the Navy service at large. But, Mr. Speaker, as it is manifest that there cannot be security for the mass of the people if there is insecurity for any goodly portion of the people, therefore economic security for the veterans is necessarily dependent upon economic security for all of the deserving, ambitious, industrious American population. If the millions of veterans of this war come home to economic insecurity, it is because there is no economic security for the other millions of American citizens either.

These lads of ours in uniform have all offered their maximum to the cause of the security of each person and all property in our Nation. Mr. Speaker, this Nation can do no less in reciprocation than to offer these men who still live to tell the tale and return to civilian ranks, the maximum of available economic security and opportunity and rehabilitation. The following powerful treatise by George Charles Heinrich states it far better than I am able so to do. The letter and the treatise which I received from him follow:

JULY 4, 1945.

CLYDE G. DOYLE,
Representative from California,
Washington, D. C.:

During the past 3 years I have been on active duty with our armed forces in both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters of operation, having served aboard the U. S. S. *Franklin* on my last tour of Pacific duty. Prior to entering the United States Naval Service I owned and managed the Compton Loan & Discount Co. and the Compton Packard agency, in the city of Compton, Calif., where my home is located.

Throughout my period of service I have been greatly interested in the reaction of our fighting men to legislation and proposals for veterans' benefits. Their suggestions, comments, and demands have run the gamut from wanting to, "just get the hell home, nuts to the benefits," to "We'll get ours, boys; just wait till we get organized." After carefully analyzing and sifting the comments and ideas of many of our fighting men one definite idea has been predominant in all their thoughts—that they must have for a reasonable length of time financial security to care for themselves and their families while becoming readjusted to civilian life and finding employment.

The attached article proposes a plan, of mustering-out pay to accomplish this security which lives between the "nuts to benefits" comment and the "wait till we get organized" threat.

All opinions or assertions contained herein are private ones of this writer and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.

GEORGE CHARLES HEINRICH,
Lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve, VPB-197, FPO, San Francisco.

VETERANS' FINANCIAL SECURITY IS A NATIONAL INVESTMENT IN OUR FUTURE

Overshadowing all domestic issues is that of our returning veterans. Every State and national legislator and Congressman—every businessman and civic leader is viewing the approaching avalanche of returning veterans with temerity. Well he may, for undeniably the reaction of the millions of men and women in the prime of their lives being demobilized, is going to establish the economic and social pattern of our Nation for many years to come. That it is a problem of the first magnitude is clearly indicated by all the study, thought, and effort being put forth from every cross road of America. The prime topic of conversation in every community, the object of thousands of committees formed by Kiwanians, Rotarians, Lions, Elks, Masons, chambers of commerce, and all civic organizations, is the finding of an answer to two gigantic questions: "What should we do for Johnny when he comes marching home?" and "What's Johnny going to do to us when he comes marching home?"

Sandwiched between the hundreds of overlapping proposals for Johnny's rehabilitation, lying under every sheet of printed benefits, and squirming in the coils of red tape, is the specter of of World War I veterans being cheered and slapped on the back in a gala celebration that ended with Johnny finding a place in a bread line, selling poppies on the street corners, and falling into economic and social disrepute. Nor do we have to look back any further than our present returning World War II veterans to find disorganization, chaos, red tape, and a complete lack of comprehending or satisfactory program of rehabilitation. The GI bill of rights, with its educational program, home loans, business loans, and the mustering-out pay, have all been bogged down in a mass of confusion and inefficiency. Clear-thinking Government and civic leaders are working against time to put these phases of the program into a workable shape before the avalanche hits.

All efforts, plans, and proposals are commendable and show that the welfare of the returning veteran is earnestly desired. So far, little actual criticism, good or bad, has been forthcoming from the returning veteran himself. Those who have been embroiled in the oceans of red tape connected with every benefit have been too few to make their voices effectively heard. The high rate of employment has enabled most discharged veterans to find jobs before their mustering-out pay ($100 minimum, $300 maximum) has given out. Now, with increasing numbers of discharged service personnel applying for veterans' benefits, widespread grumblings of dissatisfaction are starting to be heard. As this trickle of dischargees becomes a stream, then a raging torrent, the flood of criticism and discontent is going to engulf the United States in a catastrophic social and economic upheaval—unless more comprehensive provisions are made for returning service men and women without delay.

Let's consider what must be accomplished to reconvert our millions of veterans to normal lives in their home communities.

READAPTATION TO CIVILIAN LIFE

The readaptation may be placed into three separate periods. First, there is the initial contact with wife and family. This will be a time of mutual jubilation and thankfulness for a safe return. After this first flush of excitement, a general let-down and tiredness will prevail with the necessity for rest and physical relaxation. This first period will generally take from 30 to 60 days. Then will come a reacquaintance with surroundings, the wearing of civilian clothes, the meeting of friends, and the awakening of mutual interests in civilian affairs. A new perspective of life, or a returning to the old, must be acquired. The regimentation of the military has to be shaken off and the veteran must again start planning how best to utilize his own time. The average man, in 3 to 4 months will gain back most of his former feeling of freedom and self-assurance. His normal desires, and incentives of pride and love will start him seeking employment or business opportunities. The third period of this cycle of readaptation will find the veteran seeking employment; being classified and reclassified, hired and rehired, and gradually falling into a niche he can fit and that suits his employer. Six to twelve months after discharge will find the great majority of personnel resettled, working, and readapted to civilian life—if they have been able to feed and clothe themselves and their families, and have been able to maintain a respectable standard of living while passing through these periods of readjustment.

REDISTRIBUTION OF VETERANS TO THEIR FORMER HOMES OR TO EMPLOYMENT AREAS

Thousands of veterans will come back to their wives and families in unnatural surroundings—those wives who have been living together at coastal cities awaiting their returning husbands, and families who have been transplanted to sites near Army camps and war plants. These people have to be returned to their former homes or areas recommended for employment. In providing veterans' benefits, a severance pay sufficient to care for this part of his problem must be considered.

PREVENT DEMORALIZATION OF CHARACTER

Veterans' benefits must provide for a long enough period of financial security to enable him to weather the readjustment cycle without becoming so destitute and in want that he succumbs to unscrupulous schemes and plans. Being unprovided for during the time required to readjust his life may easily lead to a lessening of his moral principles and in his turning to crime for needed necessities of life. At any cost, we must not allow the seeds of moral and spiritual disintegration to find root in our returning veterans. After the last war too many men of good character were forced into rum running, bootlegging, gambling, and other vices in

order to provide for themselves and their families.

ELIMINATE THE CAUSES OF DISSATISFACTION

There is no more fertile field for fermenting discontent than in the mind of a man who feels that he has been unfairly treated. Adequate mustering-out pay must be provided to aid the veteran in becoming used to normal living again. An inadequate provision that leaves him stranded after a few months is apt to drive him into antigovernment or radical groups—the very type of organizations he has been fighting against. Dissatisfaction with the program offered—with the benefits provided—must be stopped before it starts. Adequate financial security for the veteran and his dependents during his readjustment to civilian life is the only realistic and satisfactory answer to this major issue of our veterans' problem.

VETERANS' BENEFITS A BOOST TO THE NATION

Whatever benefits are provided, the economic result upon the Nation as a whole must be evaluated. Mustering-out pay, the making of loans, the financing of homes, will all have a beneficial effect upon our economy. The money spent in channels of trade by the returning veteran will be a stimulant to industry and an aid in maintaining a high level of employment. The benefits will pay off to the Nation, morally as well as economically, by maintaining a decent standard of living for the veteran during his homecoming, his awakening to his changed status of living, and the period of time to become reemployed and adapted to his new earning capacity.

PRESENT PROGRAM INADEQUATE

Many of the provisions of the GI bill of rights that are now being clarified and made workable will go far toward assisting the returning veteran; however, the greatest weakness of the present program, which in itself can nullify and wreck the other benefits, is the insufficiency of the mustering-out pay. This payment of a minimum of $100 to a maximum of $300, depending upon length and type of service, will not fill the need. The first flush of homecoming will have worn off, a short period of relaxation will have taken place, and just as a mental awakening to new surrounding begins to predominate his thoughts Johnny will find his mustering-out pay gone. If by the end of this 30 to 90 days a job would be assured, this need for a greater amount and longer period of mustering-out pay would be eliminated. Such a condition is the promised land all of us would like to see. It is not likely that such a condition will exist. We may as well be realistic about these problems, because nothing in this world is going to be so real to Johnny as his plight in trying to become readapted to civilian life and caring for his dependents. The mustering-out pay must be sufficient and extend over a long enough period of time to allow the veteran security for himself and family while becoming demilitarized and civilianized.

IT IS PROPOSED

Having studied and reviewed the fundamentals of the problems involved, carefully considered opinion recommends that every discharged serviceman, up to and including the rank of captain in the Army or its equivalent rank in other branches of the armed forces, should receive for a period of 12 months after discharge the base pay of his last active-duty rate or rank, plus $21 per month food allowance. Enlisted men should further receive pay for dependents that was in effect at the time of their discharge.

The following table clearly indicates the amount each pay grade would receive. The base pay of each grade is totaled with the monthly food allowance. The dependents' pay allowed enlisted men is shown in the next three columns.

Table of proposed mustering-out pay for veterans

Rate or rank (Army and Navy)	Base pay	Food allowance	Total	Enlisted men only		
				Wife	First child	Each additional child
Private Seaman	$50.00	$21	$71.00	$28	$30	$20
Private, first class Seaman, second class	54.00	21	75.00	28	30	20
Corporal Seaman, first class	66.00	21	87.00	28	30	20
Sergeant Petty officer, third class	78.00	21	99.00	28	30	20
Staff sergeant Petty officer, second class	96.00	21	117.00	28	30	20
Technical sergeant Petty officer, first class	114.00	21	135.00	28	30	20
Master sergeant (AA) Chief petty officer (AA)	126.00	21	147.00	28	30	20
Master sergeant (PA) Chief petty officer (PA)	138.00	21	159.00	28	30	20
Warrant Warrant	150.00	21	171.00	----------	----------	----------
Commissioned warrant Chief warrant	175.00	21	196.00	----------	----------	----------
Second lieutenant Ensign	150.00	21	171.00	----------	----------	----------
First lieutenant Lieutenant (junior grade)	166.67	21	187.67	----------	----------	----------
Captain Lieutenant (senior)	200.00	21	221.00	----------	----------	----------

WE CAN'T AFFORD LESS

The amount and manner of payment under this proposal would assure the returning veteran of fair treatment; eliminating any bitterness that could lead to the support of unorthodox and radical demands—menacing our established American way of life.

Our veterans have seen over $10,000,000,000 spent on a single military operation. They have witnessed hundreds of aerial battles in which aircraft costing $100,000 or more each have been destroyed in great numbers. Countless millions of dollars' worth of supplies are now lying on ocean bottoms. Newsreels and periodicals have pictured this monetary mountain that makes up war. Further billions are being poured out in money and material to rebuild the devastated lands of our allies; yes, and even of our enemies. Logic, therefore, tells the veteran that a continuation of his pay for a year will hardly be able to be construed as the straw that will throw this country into economic chaos. It is a national investment in the security and rehabilitation of our fighting men. It will pay unpredictable dividends in beneficial and harmonious living.

This suggested pay is not a reward for hazardous or heroic duty. It is not a bonus for length of service. It is a continuation of an established rate of income, to which the men of every rate and rank have adjusted themselves, for a period that will allow them to readapt themselves to their normal manner of living. It is an investment in our country's economic and social security. This Nation invested over $3,000,000,000 to train, equip, and transport our men in order to maintain that very security. The financial status of these men and their dependents was assured while they trained, fought, and died. It must now be assured while they untrain, reequip, and readjust themselves to normalcy. The soldier and sailor have been on the short end of a terrific income differential for all of the war years. Not only has their's been a substandard pay on which they had to maintain their families in competition for goods with high-paid war workers, but they also have had to put their lives in jeopardy, uproot their homes, and sacrifice years of promising careers and business opportunities.

NO DUPLICATION OF EXISTING ALLOWANCES

It is not intended that this proposal should in any way duplicate existing allowances or mustering-out pay. All veterans, under this proposal, would be treated equally. Their choice of taking advantage of the educational program or of seeking employment or business opportunities would be guided by their best judgment and not influenced by special financial security offered only to those entering schools or training courses. Special educational allowances for self and dependents and mustering-out pay already paid returned veterans would be deducted from the total amount receivable under this plan.

This proposal calls for the support of all thinking men and women, not only veterans and their families. It will free our fighting men from need and want while fighting for their place on the home front. It will establish a bond of confidence between our home-front workers and the returning veterans. The germ of radical "isms" will find no fertile grounds upon which to fester. The wheels of industry will have gained a terrific boost. Employment will have an opportunity to become stabilized. Our social welfare will have been protected, and one of the greatest hurdles to a lasting peace will have been safely cleared.

"Opinions or assertions contained herein are private ones of the writer and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large."

GEORGE CHARLES HEINRICH,
United States Naval Reserve.

Postwar Prospects for Treatment of Enemy Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in the hope that there may be some ideas contained within it which may be helpful to the membership in their search for a legislative solution of the vexing problems which arise out of our wartime seizure of the properties and assets of our alien enemies, I am today handing to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an article which I wrote for the winter-spring 1945 issue of Law and Contempo-

rary Problems, the official publication of Duke University Law School of Durham, N. C.

The article which I have entitled "Postwar Prospects for Treatment of Enemy Property" to which I have just referred is the following:

POSTWAR PROSPECTS FOR TREATMENT OF ENEMY PROPERTY

(By BERTRAND W. GEARHART [1])

When I came to Congress in January of 1935, the subject of alien property seemed one of ancient history—never to be heard of again. Upon the outbreak of the present war interest in it was suddenly revived—so emphatically that I felt it my duty as a Representative in Congress to inform myself about it. From study and contacts with persons whom I regarded as informed, including publicists and lawyers who had participated in legislation and litigation related to the subject, I became convinced of several things, among them these: First, that it was a vastly important subject of national concern and hardly less complicated than it was important; second, that we had blundered in our treatment of it during and after the last war; and, third, that there were certain things to be done about it without delay and at this session of Congress.

Accordingly, on November 15, 1943, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3672, referred in due course to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which, together with one of my own committees, Ways and Means, had framed the legislation after the last war, known as the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928.[2] Several other bills have subsequently been introduced.[3] Hearings on some of these bills have begun. In the meantime the views and comments of interested Government departments and executive agencies have been received as to my bill, among them the Alien Property Custodian, the Attorney General, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Commerce Departments.

The chief outspoken opposition that I have heard since I introduced H. R. 3672 comes from three sources. It might be well to consider them briefly.

Two months prior to the introduction of my bill, and no doubt in anticipation of it, the foreign commerce department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States made a report to its board of directors, the grist of which was contained in these words:

"United States property in enemy and enemy-occupied countries exceed in value enemy property in the United States. The policy of nonconfiscation is thus not only a sound moral principle but in this instance is a course of enlightened self-interest."

The above statement overlooks several points, as brought out in a special article in the New York Times of December 5, 1943, by Mr. Godfrey N. Nelson, discussing under the title "Alien Properties Domestic Problem," the bill H. R. 3672:

"It would be conceivable that if there were the slightest apprehension of our winning the war it would be highly inadvisable to take legislative steps to reduce to ownership of the United States the vast amount of enemy-owned property seized by the Alien Property Custodian. Since there can be no such apprehension, however, one is forced to inquire into the question as to why the subject of such ownership has not been brought up in the Congress for full and free discussion.

"The matter of policy which should be settled without undue delay is primarily to preclude the return to enemy aliens of seized property before the valid claims of American citizens shall have been satisfied; to simplify the procedure by which such claims may be established by granting American courts jurisdiction over the determination of such claims.

"This subject is of vital interest to the American taxpayer, who stands to lose either by delayed action or by failure of the Congress to make proper provision for the disposition of property now held by the Government only as custodian. Mr. GEARHART observed: 'Prolonged Government administration will most certainly diminish the value of these assets, whereas their prompt sale, private management and aggressive commercial development would arrest depreciation and to that extent benefit all parties concerned, save those who plot profits upon the ruins of a war-torn world.'"

The second attack on the bill comes from Prof. Edward Borchard, of Yale University. Raising his voice against what he chooses to denounce as confiscation of private property, the cry which led us into the great error of returning enemy property after the First World War, he again advocates what amounts to abandonment of our own nationals of this war period, as he did for World War I, many of which nationals, because of the adoption of this mistaken policy, have never been compensated for their losses resulting from German war action, not even to this late day. This position is substantially one which was vigorously criticized and condemned by Mr. Garner, then a Member of the House, later Vice President of the United States. It is interesting to recall that at the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1926, when Mr. Newton, of the committee, stated that Professor Borchard—who filed voluminous memoranda and briefs in favor of the return of enemy property—"seemed to appear as a friend of the court," Mr. Garner remarked, and, not without reason, that "it develops now he is not only a friend of the court but a friend of the interested parties * * * retained by them for a consideration."

The third and other attack upon the principle upon which my bill is based is contained in a report of a special committee of the American Bar Association, the chairman of which is Mr. Otto C. Sommerich, of New York City. If one may be pardoned an argumentum ad hominem, one notes that Mr. Sommerich and another member of this special committee, Mr. James J. Lenihan, Jr., appeared before the United States Supreme Court in 1937 on behalf of the Deutsche Bank [4] in an unsuccessful attack upon the constitutionality of the so-called Harrison resolution,[5] which alone stood between our injured American nationals and a further rape of their right to compensation for their losses occasioned by the war action of the German Government; one is thereupon inclined to discount the disinterestedness of the American Bar Association committee and to speculate at whose instigation it was set up and its personnel chosen.

The principal conclusions I had reached when I introduced H. R. 3672 sum up as follows:

1. All enemy alien interest in seized properties and frozen assets should now and for all time be finally cut off.

2. Claimants who have suffered by action of our enemies should be afforded a present opportunity to go into the Federal court, to there establish their claims according to the principles of Anglo-Saxon law.

3. Congress should at once provide for an expert commission to advise Congress when the necessity arises in respect to what disposition should be made of enemy property.

My suggestion as to the appointment of an expert commission to advise the Congress seems to be supported by the intricacy of the field as explored in the various articles in this symposium. The importance of the related subjects cannot be denied. One has but to read the numerous topics which have been denominated as the subjects for special treatment and to contemplate the many aspects of each phase to realize that the problems of enemy property are too intricate and involved a subject for an unaided congressional committee to attack in the absence of full hearings, careful study, painstaking analysis, and scientific condensation in the pursuit of a sound conclusion, in search of a solution which will be foolproof against vexatious litigation, intolerate delays, and that distortion and abuse which might completely pervert the intention and objectives of the Congress. Hasty, ill-considered action must be avoided this time. The mistakes we made following the conclusion of World War I must not be repeated. I hope this symposium will help point up the problems and the difficulties.

My position is very different, however, with respect to the other two principal conclusions I have stated above. They demand immediate action by Congress for reasons I stated on the floor of the House on November 15, 1943, reasons which will bear repetition here.

"Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, according to unofficial reports which have reached my desk, we have lawfully in our possession and under our control enemy-owned properties, assets of various kinds, of a value of hundreds of millions of dollars.

"The Japanese and German owners of much of that colossal estate are now fighting in the armed forces of their respective countries to destroy us, or, in some other related capacity, are bending every effort to insure the success of our relentless enemies.

"To the extent that this magnificent enemy-owned estate belongs to our most contemptible enemies—Japan and Germany—they who are now striving to destroy us, should it not be immediately sold to the highest bona fide American bidders and the proceeds devoted to the protection rather than the destruction of these United States? * * *

"No thought of confiscation exists in the bill I introduce. No question of confiscation is involved. As but a hasty glance at the measure will reveal, the bill requires that defeated enemy governments shall compensate their own nationals for any losses suffered by them as a consequence of the seizure of their property as enemy property by virtue of American legal action.

"At the time the nonconfiscation argument was advanced in the Seventy-first Congress, the then Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Garrard B. Winston, was asked by Mr. Garner: 'Is it confiscation of property for us to carry out the provisions of a treaty where the German Government itself obligates itself to pay its citizens on account of our taking this property?' The Under Secretary of the Treasury replied: 'If you take the property of an individual citizen to pay the debts of his government and his government reimburses him for the property taken, there is no inequity.'

"Again, how can it be said that not to use this enemy property to pay losses of American citizens suffered through enemy action is a sound moral principle? Are we to give back this property and let American

---

[1] LL. B., 1914, University of Southern California. Member of the bar of California and bar of the United States Supreme Court. Member of Congress, Ninth District of California, since 1935. Author of the Gearhart bill, H. R. 3672, 78th Cong., 1st sess., 1943, relating to enemy property and claims.

[2] 45 Stat. 254 (1928), 50 U. S. C. App. (1940 ed.), secs. 9 (b) (12) to 9 (b) (22), inclusive, and 9 (l) to 9 (q), inclusive.

[3] S. 1940 and H. R. 4840 (same bill), May 19, 1944; S. 2038 and H. R. 5118 (same bill), June 23, 1944; all in 78th Cong., 2d sess.

[4] *Cummings* v. *Deutsche Bank* (300 U. S. 115 (1937)).

[5] Public Resolution No. 53 of June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1267).

citizens go totally uncompensated; or are we to compensate them out of the inexhaustible United States Treasury and make American taxpayers pay the losses caused by enemy governments, while the nationals of those countries get their properties back less only a custodian's charge of one-half of 1 percent, as they did to the extent of 80 percent when Germany made its former bid for world mastery?

"To delay action now is to open the way to an enemy-inspired propaganda campaign to arouse our sympathies for our soon-to-be-vanquished foe, at a time when the war spirit has waned, arouse a false sympathy for them which will lead us into a repetition of the same tragic mistake we made following World War I.

"Failure to act decisively will hearten the German and Japanese bankers and industrialists, encourage them in the belief that, however the war goes, they will get back their American investments.

"Anyone who says there is an element of confiscation of private property in the bill I have introduced is either not familiar with its provisions or is deliberately misrepresenting the facts. It was introduced to protect American citizens against those crafty creatures, some of them, I am afraid, paid German agents, who would be so generous with other people's property, our American claims, and so cosmic in their love of our enemies that they would give back to their original owners the assets of our enemies and let our own people, who have suffered private losses at the hands of our enemies, go unpaid, or, failing in that, to unload the claims on Uncle Sam, that is, upon our American taxpayers who, through taxation, would have to raise the money to pay the claimants.

"My bill requires Germany and Japan, as a condition of peace, to pay their own nationals the full value of any property which they had in this country at the outbreak of the war. If we are going to use words like 'confiscation,' let us use them honestly. If the word 'confiscation' is honestly defined, I challenge anyone to show where there is any confiscation under my bill. There can be no misunderstanding unless the word is purposely used to mislead and befuddle.

"If it is read in the light of established legal principles, my bill will be revealed as one based on the centuries-old principle of 'subrogation,' a principle of law quite the opposite in meaning from that which 'confiscation' implies.

"If anyone is disposed to argue that, possibly, Germany and Japan would not live up to their promise to compensate their own nationals, the answer is that, as between the two sets of claimants, the German and Japanese nationals, certainly not our American claimants, should assume that risk. To assert that Germany and Japan would not live up to their obligation is to declare them in advance quite unworthy of the confidence of even their own people. But that, Mr. Speaker, is not a matter of concern to those in whose interest we legislate.

"Be that as it may, my bill protects both the American claimants and the alien enemy nationals against confiscation of private property insofar as any law of the United States can do it. Therefore, we can well dismiss this cry of confiscation as unworthy of further consideration. It is but a weapon of obstruction, nothing more."

These conclusions and remarks made by me on the floor of the House were not made for oratorical effect or without careful study of the matter. Specialists, including practicing lawyers of undoubted integrity, had brought to my attention what had been said or written on both sides of the subject and the legislative and court action before and since the passage of the Trading With the Enemy Act in 1917 on our entry into the World War.

It is my firm resolve that we shall not be deceived, as was the Sixty-ninth Congress, by the false argument that it is confiscation to apply Japanese and German assets in our possession to the losses of our own people who have been injured by our Axis enemies. This is not the result of hatred from experience on battlefields of France in the last war but the considered judgment of a public servant trying to view the matter from the point of our own best national interest. In reaching my judgments, I find myself not without support in the opinions of jurists of our present courts, outstanding citizens, and eminent lawyers who have expressed themselves in favor of the principles embodied in my bill.

In my consideration of the subject, I have given careful thought and made inquiry as to whether there is any truth, not to speak of force, in the argument that the enactment of my bill will result in confiscation of private property, violate the settled principles of modern civilization, destroy the traditional policy or offend the Constitution of the United States and be a return to barbarism. I find there is no truth in any of these statements.

I have approached the matter from five angles: Principles, precedents, policy, experience, and national self-interest.

In principle, it is just that when a nation chooses to start a war of aggression private losses resulting therefrom shall fall on its nationals and not on the nationals of the aggrieved nation, if there is no other way of compensation.

There is no constitutional principle, as our Supreme Court has repeatedly decided, which imposes any limitation on the use to which Congress may put the property and assets of enemy aliens.[6]

There is no principle of law or equity which requires a victorious nation to do more in the protection of private property than we did in the Treaty of Berlin[7] or in the Treaty of Versailles in article 297–(i) which provided as follows: "Germany undertakes to compensate her nationals in respect to the sale or retention of their property rights or interests in Allied or associated states."[8] In this connection there is a very enlightening memorandum of the German Embassy in reply to Hon. William R. Castle, the Chief of Western European Affairs of the State Department, dated April 20, 1926, showing how Germany compensated her own citizens for their private property retained under the Treaty of Versailles by England, France, Belgium, and Italy.[9]

As to precedents, we have the action taken after the last war by England, France, Belgium, and Italy in applying enemy property to enemy debts and we do not consider these barbarous nations. Nor can we deny the fairness of the British position as then taken that it had not confiscated private property: first, because it was credited on valid claims against Germany and its nationals; second, because the Allies had charged Germany with the duty, to which Germany had by treaty solemnly agreed, of repaying to the individuals the value of any property so taken from private citizens, and third, because it seemed eminently just, since if damages were to be collected but delay in payment was unavoidable, that nationals of the wrong-doing country should suffer the hardship of delay rather than those of the country that had been wronged. The soundness of this British viewpoint seems established by the fact that American nationals after 27 years are still awaiting full compensation for war losses inflicted by Germany.

As to policy, I think my attention has been called to nearly all the statements that have been made on the law of enemy property and its uses since the days of Grotius. Time and again assertions of doubtful validity have been hung on these quotations before Congress and its committees; paragraphs are torn from their contexts, sentences are garbled and fallacious contentions are drawn from a single phrase or cliché. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, Chief Justice Marshall, Woodrow Wilson, John Bassett Moore, Philander C. Knox, Charles E. Hughes when Secretary of State, his distinguished successor, Cordell Hull, and a goodly sprinkling of university professors, are all called as witnesses by those who cry confiscation and barbarism and "quote scripture for their purpose." Limitations of space prevent detailed exploration and refutation here. Suffice it to point out that Mr. Hull's recent words have been quite consistent with the position he took, as a Member of the House of Representatives, in 1926 in denouncing arguments advanced on behalf of German interests for the return of enemy property, when he joined with Mr. Garner in opposing the scheme that America should return all enemy property and pay its own nationals for losses inflicted by Germany as a "stupendous steal—the greatest in the history of this country."[10]

There is an old legal maxim that when the reason faileth, the law no longer applies. To the extent that what recognized authorities have said has been correctly quoted and applied as to the use to be made of enemy property, my bill is in full accord. Nations that abide by their treaties earn for their nationals a different treatment than treaty-breaking countries, which present-day Germany and Japan have proved themselves to be. The generous treatment accorded Germany and her nationals as to enemy property after the last war was largely accounted for by the moral implications of statements made by Woodrow Wilson and Members of the Congress, such as the following words of the then President on April 2, 1917: "We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make * * *." "We have no quarrel with the German people; we have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship." That, in my opinion, is not the present-day attitude of the American people toward either Japan or Germany, and I am opposed to any disposition of the property of their nationals which proceeds on any such sentiment.

I come next to what our experience and the most recent action of our courts and Congress has shown, to my satisfaction, to be not only the right policy as to seized enemy property and assets but our established policy. Unanimous decisions of our Supreme Court have brushed aside the specious contentions that any right, susceptible of con-

[6] *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation, Inc.* (272 U. S. 1, 9–11 (1926)); *Woodson* v. *Deutsche Gold und Silber Scheideanstalt Vormals Roessler* (292 U. S. 449 (1934)); *Cummings* v. *Deutsche Bank* (300 U. S. 115 (1937)); see *Z. & F. Assets Realization Corp.* v. *Hull* (311 U. S. 470, 490 ff. (1941)). See also McNulty, Constitutionality of Alien Property Controls, supra, this symposium, p. 135 et seq.

[7] See sec. 5 of that treaty, providing that this Government is to retain property of German nationals until suitable provision is made for claims of our nationals against the German Government. Vol. III of Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols, and Agreements (S. Doc. No. 348, 67th Cong., 4th sess., 1923), 2597.

[8] *Id.* at 3464.

[9] Hearings before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, on H. R. 15009, 69th Cong., 2d sess. (1927) 367.

[10] See Return of Alien Property, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means sitting in conjunction with a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 10820, 69th Cong., 1st sess. (April 1926), passim; also Return of Alien Property—No. 3; id., No. 4 (Nov. 1926), pp. 25 ff., 67, 199, 235, 395—cf. p. 635 (letter from Mr. Sommerich to the committee).

stitutional protection, subsists in seized enemy property; and has reaffirmed the principle of international law that we have the unlimited right to use it as we will.[11] Since the end of the last war, the Congress of the United States has twice acted positively and definitively to establish the American policy in this matter—in 1934 when it passed the Harrison resolution[12] and in 1940 when it enacted Private Law 509.[13] The last word of the Congress of the United States on the subject of enemy property is summed up in the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in connection with the bill leading up to the above private law.[14]

This report is so clear, conclusive, scholarly, and expressive of my own views that I quote from it in extenso:

"The foundation of law for the bill is as follows:

"The Trading With the Enemy Act, October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), section 12, at page 424:

" 'After the end of the war any claim of any enemy or of an ally of enemy to any money or other property received and held by the Alien Property Custodian or deposited in the United States Treasury, shall be settled as Congress shall direct * * *.'

"Joint resolution terminating the state of war between the Imperial German Government and the United States of America, and between the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government and the United States of America, July 2, 1921, part 1 (42 Stat. 105).

"The Treaty of Berlin between the United States and Germany, August 25, 1921, to restore the friendly relations between the two nations, part 2 (42 Stat. 1939), incorporates the above act of July 2, 1921, which reserves to the United States and its nationals * * * 'all rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages, together with the right to enforce the same, to which it or they have become entitled under the terms of the armistice, signed November 11, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof; or which were acquired by or are in the possession of the United States of America by reason of its participation in the war or to which its nationals have thereby become rightfully entitled; or which, under the Treaty of Versailles, have been stipulated for its or their benefit; or to which it is entitled as one of the principal allied and associated powers; or to which it is entitled by virtue of any act or acts of Congress; or otherwise.'

"And section 5 thereof, providing, in part:

" 'All property of the Imperial German Government, * * * and of all German nationals, which was, on April 6, 1917, in or has since that date come into the possession or under control of, * * * the United States of America * * * shall be retained by the United States of America and no disposition thereof made, except as shall have been heretofore or specifically hereafter shall be provided by law until such time as the Imperial German Government * * * shall have * * * made suitable provision for the satisfaction of all claims against said governments respectively, of all persons, wheresoever domiciled, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States of America and who have suffered, through the acts of the Imperial German Government, or its agents, * * * since July 31, 1914, loss, damage, or injury to their persons or property, directly or indirectly. * * *'

"Article I provides:

" 'Germany undertakes to accord to the United States * * * all the rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages specified in the aforesaid joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of July 2, 1921, including all the rights and advantages stipulated for the benefit of the United States in the Treaty of Versailles which the United States shall fully enjoy notwithstanding the fact that such treaty has not been ratified by the United States.'

"The agreement between the United States and Germany for a mixed commission to determine the amount to be paid by Germany in satisfaction of Germany's financial obligations under the treaty concluded between the two governments on August 25, 1921, signed at Berlin, August 10, 1922, part II (42 Stat. 2200).

"The fourth annual message of President Calvin Coolidge, made to the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Coolidge 1925–29, at page 9629:

" 'We still have in the possession of the Government the alien property. It has always been the policy of America to hold that private enemy property should not be confiscated in time of war. This principle we have scrupulously observed. As this property is security for the claims of our citizens and our Government, we cannot relinquish it without adequate provision for their reimbursement. Legislation for the return of this property, accompanied by suitable provisions for the liquidation of the claims of our citizens and our Treasury, should be adopted. If our Government releases to foreigners the security which it holds for Americans, it must at the same time provide satisfactory safeguards for meeting American claims.'

"The Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, an act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of American nationals against Germany, Austria, and Hungary, and of nationals of Germany, Austria, and Hungary against the United States, and for the ultimate return of all property held by the Alien Property Custodian (45 Stat. 254).

"Public Resolution No. 53, Seventy-third Congress (48 Stat. 1267), June 27, 1934, amending the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928.

"The Settlement of the War Claims Act of 1928, in part, provided for the return of 80 percent of the seized former enemy-alien property and the retention of 20 percent thereof by the Treasury of the United States as security for the agreement of Germany to pay in full all proved damages of American nationals.

"Thus was created the German special deposit account.

"This legislation and the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 expressly retained in the Congress of the United States control and disposition of this German special deposit account and any money or other property received and held by the Alien Property Custodian or deposited in the United States Treasury, and the Supreme Court of the United States has twice unanimously expressed the following views:

"In *Woodson, Alien Property Custodian, et al.* v. *Deutsche Gold und Silber Scheideanstalt Vormals Roessler* (292 U. S. 449 (1934), at p. 453), Mr. Justice Sutherland, delivering the opinion, said:

" 'The Trading With the Enemy Act was passed by Congress in the exertion of the war power; its purpose was to weaken enemies by diminishing the sources from which they could obtain aid, and to strenghen this country by adding to resources for the successful prosecution of the war. Section 12 declares that after the end of the war any claim of any enemy to recover money or property received and held by the Custodian or deposited in the United States Treasury "shall be settled as Congress shall direct" (40 Stat. 424). While this suggests that confiscation was not effected or intended, it plainly shows that Congress reserved to its full freedom at any time to dispose of the property as might be deemed expedient and to deal with claimants as it should deem to be in accordance with right and justice, having regard to the conditions and circumstances that might arise during and after the war. It is clear the enemy owners were divested of every right in respect of property taken and held under the act (*United States* v. *Chemical Foundation* (272 U. S. 1, 9–11)).'

"In *Cummings, Attorney General, et al.* v. *Deutsche Bank und Discontogesselschaft* (300 U. S. (1937), p. 115, at p. 120), Mr. Justice Butler, delivering the opinion of the Court, said:

" 'Public Resolution No. 53 is not repugnant to the fifth amendment. By exertion of the war power, and untrammeled by the due process or just-compensation clause, Congress enacted laws directing seizure, use, and disposition of property in this country belonging to subjects of the enemy. Alien enemy owners were divested of every right in respect to the money and property seized and held by the Custodian under the Trading With the Enemy Act (*United States* v. *Chemical Foundation* (272 U. S. 1, 9–11); *Woodson* v. *Deutsche, etc., Vormals* (292 U. S. 449, 451)). The title acquired by the United States was absolute and unaffected by definition of duties or limitations upon the power of the Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States. Congress reserved to itself freedom at any time to dispose of the property as deemed expedient and right under circumstances that might arise during and after the war. Legislative history and terms of measures passed in relation to alien enemy property clearly disclose that from the beginning Congress intended after the war justly to deal with former owners and, by restitution or compensation in whole or part, to ameliorate hardships falling upon them as a result of the seizure of their property. But that intention detracted nothing from title acquired by the United States or its power to retain or dispose of the property upon such terms and conditions as from time to time Congress might direct. As the taking left in enemy owners no beneficial right to, or interest in, the property, the United States did not take or hold as trustee for their benefit.'

"And at page 122:

" 'To grant to former alien enemy owners of the privilege of becoming entitled upon conditions specified to have returned to them the property of which they had been deprived by exertion of the war power of the United States was made by the Congress in mitigation of the taking and in recognition of "the humane and wise policy of modern times" (*Brown* v. *United States*, 8 Cranch 110, 123). In *United States* v. *White Dental Co.* (274 U. S. 398) it appears that during the war the German Government sequestered the property of a German corporation which, through ownership of all its capital stock, was controlled by an American corporation. Speaking of the taking we said (pp. 402–403): "What would ultimately come back to it (the American owner), as the event proved, might be secured not as a matter of right, but as a matter either of grace to the vanquished or exaction by the victor. * * * It would require a high degree of optimism to discern in the seizure of enemy property by the German Government in 1918 more than a remote hope of ultimate salvage from the wreck of the war." We think it clear that the grant by the Settlement of War Claims Act was made as a matter of grace and so was subject to withdrawal by Congress (*United States* v. *Teller*, 107 U. S. 64, 68; *Frisbie* v. *United States*, 157 U. S. 160, 166; *Lynch* v. *United States*, supra, 577). The resolution does not infringe the fifth amendment.'

---

[11] *Brown* v. *United States* (8 Cranch 110 (U. S. 1814)); *Miller* v. *United States* (11 Wall. 268 (U. S. 1870)); *Stoehr* v. *Wallace* (255 U. S. 239 (1921)); cases cited supra, note 5; McNulty, Constitutionality of Alien Property Controls, supra, this symposium, p. 135.

[12] Supra, note 4.

[13] 54 Stat. (pt. 2) 1341 (July 19, 1940).

[14] S. Rept. No. 1300, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (1940).

"It being clear, therefore, that Congress is invested with full power, and that the claimant has no other resort or recourse for just compensation, it is the clear duty of the Congress to enact this measure following the principle laid down by Mr. Adams in the Spanish Treaty case of 1819, as to which the following is quoted in Moore's International Law Digest (vol. 5, p. 188):

" 'The treaty of February 22, 1819, which provided for the cession of the Floridas by Spain to the United States, and for the mutual adjustment of various claims, stipulated for the exchange of ratifications within 6 months. Before the treaty was signed, Mr. Onis, the Spanish Minister, delivered to Mr. Adams, who was then Secretary of State, his full powers, which contained the following clause:

" 'Obliging ourselves, as we do hereby oblige ourselves and promise, on the faith and word of a king, to approve, ratify, and fulfill, and to cause to be inviolably observed and fulfilled, whatsoever may be stipulated and signed by you; to which intent and purpose, I grant you all authority and full power, in most ample form, thereby as of right required.'

"With reference to this passage, Mr. Adams, after citing Vattel, book 2, chapter 12, section 156, and Martens' Summary, book 2, chapter 1, section 3, said: 'The obligation of the King of Spain, therefore, in honor and in justice, to ratify the treaty signed by his Minister, is as perfect and unqualified as his royal promise in the full power, and it gives the United States the right, equally perfect, to compel the performance of that promise. * * *

" 'The President considers the treaty of 22d February last as obligatory upon the honor and good faith of Spain, not as a perfect treaty (ratification being an essential formality to that), but as a compact which Spain was bound to ratify; as an adjustment of the differences between the two nations, which the King of Spain, by his full power to his Minister, had solemnly promised to approve, ratify, and fulfill. * * *

" 'The King of Spain was bound to ratify the treaty; bound by the principles of the law of nations applicable to the case; and further bound by the solemn promise in the full power. He refusing to perform this promise and obligation, the United States have a perfect right to do what a court of chancery would do in a transaction of a similar character between individuals, namely, to compel the performance of the engagement as far as compulsion can accomplish it, and to indemnify themselves for all the damages and charges incident to the necessity of using compulsion. * * *' "

This report of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, followed as it was by favorable action in both Houses, approved by the President, seems to me to make very clear the American attitude as to enemy property upon which my bill is based.

While no reference has as yet been made to this report in any court decision, nor was the principle on which it is based referred to in any of the mass of litigation that grew out of the Trading With the Enemy Act, passed on our entry into the war in 1917, I am persuaded that the American policy as to the enforcement of the rights and protection of the property of this country and its citizens against invasion or denial thereof by foreign nations was in fact fixed in 1819, along with the Monroe Doctrine, by strong men of a weak republic, one of whom sat in the Presidential chair and the other beside him as Secretary of State.

As I read this report and discussed it with counsel who presented the matter to Congress, it became clear to me that it was on this principle that the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 was really based, consciously or otherwise, and that ancient and modern ponderous citations as to the confiscation in war of enemy property had become obsolete and irrelevant as far as this country is concerned. We had not adopted a policy of confiscation but of equity. The truth being that the United States has never precipitated or participated in any foreign war of aggression and that we fought only in self-defense, where rights of the nation or its nationals under treaties, agreements, or international law have been invaded; in short, only having engaged in war with those who broke treaties, violated their agreements, and set at naught the law of nations, the Adams pronouncement is a complete declaration of our policy and specifically applies to seized enemy property. Under the Adams pronouncement, when the rights of the nation or its nationals have been violated or invaded, we assert our sovereignty by enforcing our rights and the derivative rights of our citizens as would a court of equity. By way of protecting those rights we seize and take into custody the property within our dominion of the offending nation and its nationals. From a legal aspect, this action is in the nature of that little-known but well-established implementation of the court of chancery, known as an equitable attachment. The purpose of such seizure is to enforce the right denied or recover compensation for losses resulting from its violation. As in any case in municipal law and procedure, when either objective is accomplished, the attachment is released and the property seized passes back into the possession of its original owner. And the same happens when, as it were, the attachment is bonded or proper security is given. Failing recognition of the right denied and recovery of compensation for the losses resulting from its violation, the proceeds of the seized property are equitably applied, to the extent necessary, to compensate for losses suffered from the injury or on account thereof, but if inadequate for full compensation, leaving the offender still liable for the remainder of the loss which has been suffered. In all this there is no taint of confiscation and confiscation is simply not involved any more than in any strictly judicial process. When a nation starts or enters a war of offense or aggression, and, as a war measure, seizes the property within its domain of the nationals of the nation attacked, then perhaps we come upon an act of deliberate confiscation in conflict with the law of private property and the modern law of nations. But such has demonstrably never been true of the United States of America. Hence, in dealing with the subject of enemy property and its treatment by our Government during or after this war it sounds strange to hear any voice lifted in a cry of confiscation, except, possibly, professional legal voices so lifted for a fee.

While it does not seem to have been realized, it is the fact that the settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 [15] was drawn to the principle of an equitable attachment as I am assured by learned counsel who was consulted in regard to that measure. Had the settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 been enforced in accordance with its terms, there might today have been a different story as to unpaid American claimants. The term equitable attachment was not used in the informal discussions which led to the rationale of that measure; it was, perhaps, a bit too technical for popular comprehension, but the expression was then used that the new bill would work on the principle of a compression tank, a homely equivalent of equitable attachment, and the seized property of German nationals would be released only as Germany paid or secured the payment of proved private war losses of American citizens. German duplicity and fraud and our own misguided trustfulness defeated the purpose of that act, but it set a high ideal of international justice and established an equitable basis for the treatment of enemy property. Germany's complete violation of the solemn agreements on which this congressional action relied, renders it, of course, absurd to think of so dealing with enemy property now in our control while Japanese treachery hardly entitles that country to claim debatable niceties of international law. Obviously, we must and shall apply every dollar of seized enemy property to proved war losses of our Nation and its citizens and we should do it instanter.

In the doing of it, we shall have neither acted in hatred or disregard of international law nor inconsistently with our Constitution and traditions or in violation of the principles of equity and good morals, for the conclusive reason that it is now apparent beyond cavil or doubt that the nations with which we are at war do not observe treaties and solemn covenants and that they have not the remotest possible chance of showing the ability, if they had the bona fide intent, to compensate this Nation or its nationals for war losses which they have inflicted.

This concept of equity as the unacknowledged and, perhaps, unrecognized rationale of American policy as to seized enemy property is not, of course, the motivating force in the original seizure of enemy property. It is seized and taken into custody, in the first instance, as a war measure to disable the enemy and to make use of the enemy-owned facilities, notably shipping, means of communication, and raw materials, patents, and formulas, needed for the production of arms and ammunition and their mobilization and transport. Once in custody, however, it is held not for unjust enrichment but to offset losses caused by enemy action during the war and once it becomes certain that such losses cannot or will not be indemnified except by resort to such seized enemy assets, its instant application to such purpose is indicated, without the slightest tinge or taint of confiscation. Citizens of any country, having ventured for profit to invest or create assets in foreign lands, must in full fairness answer with those assets for wrong doing of a marauding government which exists by their choice or acquiescence, and if their government willfully fail or is unable to compensate for the injuries to another nation or its nationals, it is again but to resort to long-established principles of equity to hold that the private citizen, who stands surety for his government's action, must make good his secondary liability by his assets located in foreign domains and be content to be subrogated for his private loss to claims against his own government for the property so made to respond. Were I to attempt to summarize what I conceive to be the American policy toward enemy-owned property, I would put it in four words: Protective seizure, equitable disposition, having due regard to the maxim that one must be just before one is generous, that where the equities are equal the law must prevail. The high courts of this country have in dealing with enemy property repeatedly given full force and effect to equitable principles, regardless of the character of the controversy or the nature of the property involved.

This diversion into background material has been intentional, for refinements in doctrinnaire systems of law (international, constitutional, or otherwise) are not in the spirit of the American public. It avails little for practical purposes to probe the technical aspects of enemy property, when the ultimate disposition of it rests with Congress, which does not decide such issues on a priori juridical grounds, but as it interprets the will of the people, within the framework of the Constitution. The general sense of fair play so prevails among our people that the strongest demonstration of legal and constitutional technical right to do as we see fit with enemy property will not suffice, unless it be shown that our use of it is

[15] Supra, note 1.

just and fair. That is the reason after the last World War we did not go the full distance of England, France, Belgium, and Italy of forthwith executing the same power they had availed of and did not instantly apply all seized enemy property to debts owing by the enemy and its nationals. Experience has shown we were wrong and, as a matter of fact, the beginning of Nazi insanity, Germany's self-destruction, and the attendant Axis Alliance may be found in the summer of 1931 when the German Reich, in simple English, "welshed" on the agreement by which, in good faith, we had been induced to return to her nationals 80 percent of the private property and assets we had seized and had the right by law and treaty to retain and use as we saw fit. As events have shown, she broke her agreement in order to help provide the means to start the present war.

Seizure and use of German and Japanese assets, whether owned publicly or privately, rests, then, on equitable principles, not confiscation, and upon constitutional principles, not barbarism, as some would have us believe.

I come to the final point from which I have viewed the subject, that of national self-interest.

As yet, my own mind is open in such questions as these:

To what extent, if any, shall we provide relief or payment, out of the proceeds of enemy property or otherwise, to others than American citizens; for instance, those who are aliens, but not enemy aliens, who suffered private losses in foreign countries through Axis invasion of the so-called conquered nations?

If any such recognition is to be given to injured aliens, is it to be at the expense of American citizens who have suffered private losses, through depletion thereby of any fund eventually established for the purpose?

Is a distinction to be made between such aliens who were resident abroad at the time the injuries were suffered and those who were domiciled here when the loss occurred?

On this point, however, a difference is to be recognized between permitting all friendly aliens or resident aliens, if so limited, to prove their claims in American courts and permitting them to share in any funds available for compensation. The bill offered by me throws the doors of our Federal court wide open for proof of claims but carries no commitment, express or implied, which in any way limits the Congress from excluding or including any particular group or class of claimants in the final distribution, much as in a Federal equity receivership. I think that is as far as we should now go; and I would not oppose any amendments which gave the courts power to limit proof of claims to American citizens and nonenemy aliens resident in this country when the loss occurred, including German nationals not resident in Germany when war was declared, or since escaped, upon proof of their loyalty to this country.

Another question on which I have reached no final conclusion is as to the eventual disposition of the very valuable seized enemy-owned patents, although my mind is very clear that unrestricted free licensing of such patents by the Alien Property Custodian is unwise and unjust. My bill interdicts this in the following language:

"(d) The Alien Property Custodian is directed to offer for sale, and to sell, with all convenient speed, all enemy patents, trademarks, and copyrights vested in him, except such patents, trade-marks, and copyrights belonging to persons whose funds are exempt from seizure as defined in subdivision (b) hereof, in accordance with, and upon the terms and conditions set forth in section 12, subdivision 4, of this act: *Provided, however,* That the Alien Property Custodian shall not offer for sale, or dispose of such patents, trade-marks or copyrights as the President, by Executive order, shall exempt from sale on account of the fact that such exemption is necessary to the prosecution of the war: *Provided, further,* That as to other than such patents, trade-marks, and copyrights, the Alien Property Custodian is directed not to grant any further license or licenses for the use thereof except upon payment of fees commensurate with the reasonable value of such licenses, such fees to be transmitted by him forthwith to the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subdivision (a) hereof: *And provided further,* That no such fee to be agreed upon shall be deemed commensurate with the reasonable value thereof, unless the Secretary of Commerce, upon due investigation, certifies that he considers the fee to be paid as a reasonable compensation for such license agreement."

I do not believe in socializing or nationalizing what we have always regarded as private property, including patents, and it will take a lot of sound argument to convince me that these patents should not forthwith be put in American ownership of competent management and established financial responsibility. They should not be given away like bread at a circus to make a Roman holiday for promoters or irresponsible financiers.

This leads to a further point of major importance as to which I am not certain what is the best implementation. Neither these patents (and much the same may be said, mutatis mutandis, about enemy-owned trademarks, copyrights, and secret formulas) nor any other of these enemy assets should be permitted to drift back or be siphoned back into the original enemy ownership through tricks and devices of nominally American corporations, as occurred after the last war. Unless someone presents a better idea, it is my intention at the proper time to offer an amendment to my bill, following a precedent in the National Housing Act, whereby some Government official or agency will, for a safe and reasonable period, retain a nominal stock interest in any corporation acquiring certain types of enemy assets, so there will be what in ecclesiastical and charitable corporations is called a power of visitation. As events proved after the last war, promises, pledges, and solemn covenants provide no safeguard against the recapture of these assets by the original enemy owners. It is amazing to learn to what extent our mistakes in handling enemy property after the World War supplied the means to our present enemies not only of preparing for this one but of building the machinery and devices of modern warfare. For a full and explicit discussion of the reentrenchment of enemy cartels, to which I referred on the floor when introducing the bill, attention is called to the recent report of the Kilgore committee.[36]

However, I do recognize the fact that some reservations are to be made with regard to the use of these patents, as I indicated on the floor of the House:

"Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that there also would be involved the use, for the public good, of certain patents, chemical formulas, and medical processes in the procedure such as you suggest?

"Mr. GEARHART. Yes; I failed to mention that the bill I have drawn provides that whenever the President is of the opinion that a patent should not be sold, it should be retained and licensed to American manufacturers, or, should it be deemed advisable, it might be released to the public domain."

There remains one other factor of national self-interest, which is easily lost sight of in these days of feverish war spending with the national debt reaching toward $300,000,000,000. That factor is the United States Treasury. Twenty years ago it was seriously proposed, with the backing of the then Secretary of the Treasury and the then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and it came very near happening, that the United States release all seized enemy property and pay out of its own Treasury the private losses which its own citizens had suffered at the hands of Germany during the World War. This indicates the extent to which some persons were confused by sentiment and misled by the fallacious argument of confiscation; other influences also entered in, of which we hear the present-day echo in the report of the Commerce Department of the United States Chamber of Commerce, contending that as a matter of expediency and good business, we should "turn the other cheek" and return to German Nazis and Japanese treachery private property and assets which they had in this country when Pearl Harbor was attacked. Then, too, I regret to say as a member of that profession, there were always lawyers ready to espouse the enemy side of any question of public or private concern. The postwar load of accumulated debt facing this country is staggering enough. Obligations which must be met in full to the returning men of the services will add tremendous new financial burdens on our taxpayers. As a Member of the Congress in dealing with decent compensation of American soldiers who have lost all but life itself, with American citizens who have had immeasurable material losses, I do not intend to have to square my conscience with a moment's hesitancy or delay in applying instantly and to the last dollar every German and Japanese asset in our possession to the compensation of the injuries and losses they have brought upon our people leaving, as my bill contemplates, Germany and Japan to compensate their nationals for private property so applied by us to the losses of our nationals. That to me is a sound and moral principle; that is the course of enlightened national self-interest; that is the way of insuring against future aggression by treaty-breaking nations.

[36] Cartels and National Security, 78th Cong., 2d sess. (1944), 2 parts (Report from Subcommittee on War Mobilization pursuant to S. Res. 107).

Assurance of Just Administration of Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is quite likely that every Member of Congress received a letter similar to the one I received from the Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, together with a copy of his memorandum carrying his personal comments on the outlook for price control during the coming year.

It is a straightforward statement that only an honest and conscientious man in high position, confident of the fact that he has earnestly sought to fufill the arduous duties and responsibilities of his office to the best of his ability, would make. I feel that instead of being criticized, he should be commended upon his straightforwardness and also for the assurance he has given that he will continue in the future to carry on in the interests of the people and to administer

the act in compliance with the intent of the Congress.

Under the leave granted me, I insert the letter from Administrator Bowles and the accompanying memorandum so that not only the membership of the House but the public may have the information contained therein:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1945.

The Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: A leader of Congress recently asked me if I thought OPA would continue to hold prices under firm control now that Congress had extended our powers for another year. The answer I gave him, he said, should be put down on paper and sent to all Members of Congress, and business, farm, labor, and other leaders.

Since whatever we accomplish or fail to accomplish during the coming year will be largely determined by the support we get from those who lead the Nation's thinking, I have done as he suggested and put my thoughts down on paper. You will find them attached to this letter.

I very much need the guidance of thoughtful Members of Congress during the difficult months that lie ahead and I shall greatly appreciate it if you will let me have your reaction when you have given this statement your consideration. Particularly, I shall appreciate it if you will call to my attention any statements made which do not jibe with your own point of view.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

[Enclosure]

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1945.

Memorandum to: Members of the Congress.
From: Chester Bowles, Price Administrator.

SOME PERSONAL COMMENTS ON THE OUTLOOK FOR PRICE CONTROL DURING THE COMING YEAR

As it was approved by the Congress on June 30, the Revised Price Control Act is, I believe, an excellent piece of legislation. While the bill was up for consideration I made it a special point to study each suggested amendment in the light of its possible effect on the President's order to "hold the line."

It was certainly obvious that many people thought the act should have been changed in many major respects. And I know that many of those who made such suggestions were just as sincere in their beliefs as those who could not agree that these major changes should be made. In addition, there were, I know, a few groups intent on securing some special benefits for themselves regardless of what the effect would have been on the whole price-control program. All in all, I think Congress did a grand job.

I am particularly pleased at the selection of your colleague Clinton Anderson as Secretary of Agriculture. I had a splendid talk with him earlier this week and we are working on a close program of day-to-day cooperation. I have assured him of the complete support and cooperation of the entire OPA organization in the difficult task which confronts him. He gave me similar assurance as to the Department of Agriculture.

OPA from the beginning has had a difficult and thankless task. Some people have told me that, in their opinion, our job from the beginning was theoretically impossible. It was their belief that inflation was an inevitable consequence of war, and there was little that could be done in a practical way to prevent it.

The fact remains that inflation has been controlled in the face of the greatest inflationary pressure that this country has ever seen. We have maintained a relatively stable price level and a sound and healthy economy through 3½ years of all-out war.

But the real test will be in the next 12 months. It was just at this time that we lost the fight against inflation in World War I. Today with more than $300,000,000,000 in liquid assets threatening our economic stability, we will need all our courage and good judgment if we are to come through safely.

Our problems are made tougher by the fact that the Nation as a whole has grown somewhat weary of war and the regulations and red tape that go with war. We are tired of Government regimentation and weary of bureaucrats. As I see it, we have four major tasks ahead:

1. We must make sure that the prices on basic commodities which go to make up the cost of living are kept from shooting upward. That means rents, clothing, food, and other essentials. If these prices move upward, wages must certainly follow and an ever-increasing inflationary spiral will most certainly result.

2. We must establish prices on items which are now going into peacetime production for the first time in 3 or 4 years. We have to make certain that these prices are fair to the public and fair to the manufacturer. Equally important, these prices must be established promptly so that there will be a minimum of delays and inconvenience.

The final answer to the inflationary dangers which confront us is production and more production. There will be inevitable bottlenecks in the process of reconversion. I would like to assure you again that the OPA will not be one of them.

I must say, however, that regardless of how fair the prices set by OPA may be, or how promptly they are established, there will be some few groups which will use every possible means to force OPA to give prices which are completely out of line with the costs. Regardless of the prices which we establish, there will be some who will claim that these prices are unfair. They will make demagogic appeals to public opinion to force still further increases.

I have discussed this point with responsible business leaders. It is their feeling and mine that our best defense against this group will be the overpowering force of responsible business and public opinion standing firmly behind our efforts.

We are particularly concerned that small business receives all possible consideration. That is why we have allowed all reconverting firms under $200,000 annual volume to set their own ceiling prices according to a formula which we are giving them. These firms make up 75 percent of all the firms which will be reconverting.

3. We must maintain the firmest possible grip on the black-market situation. Black markets, as you know, are the inevitable consequence of war shortages in all countries throughout the world. The fact that they have been a lesser problem in the United States so far is a real tribute to our people.

During the past year we have eliminated a dangerous black-market situation in gasoline. During that last 2 months we have substantially reduced the black market in meat, with some 2,700 cases already brought before the Federal courts since the middle of May. More than 9,000 black-market slaughterers have been put out of business in the last 6 weeks.

However, our enforcement task is perhaps the greatest ever undertaken by a Federal agency, and the staff available to us is small. I do not believe there is any more patriotic and hard-working group of people in the United States than the OPA enforcement organization. I believe we can count on them to do more than their share in protecting honest businessmen and the general public against the wartime chiseler and the profiteer. Our efforts will have the full backing of the Treasury Department and other Federal agencies.

Regardless of our best efforts, however, the final test on whether the black markets will be kept under control or whether they will grow to dangerous proportions rests with the general public itself. The final complete answer to our black markets will come from the righteous indignation of our businessmen and from the general public.

4. We must drop controls just as rapidly as we can, and let me say right here with emphasis that there is no group which is quite so anxious to drop them as we in OPA are.

As our peacetime production is stepped up, supplies will gradually come in balance with demand, first in one field then another. As quickly as this occurs price controls in that area will be eliminated. Rent control will be dropped area by area as rapidly as circumstances permit. It is my belief that during the coming year you will see price control eliminated on many products. During the last few months of the fiscal year, you will probably see these controls dropped at a faster and faster rate.

Let me repeat that in my opinion the next 12 months will constitute one of the greatest tests that we have ever faced. We are now on the last important stage as far as price control is concerned. In this last stage the final victory over wartime inflation can be either won or lost.

I wish I could promise you that rationing and price control could be made free from all irritation, and free from all possibility of hardship or inequity. Unfortunately, I can't. Our wartime economy is extremely complex. A lot of great forces are always exerting terrific pressures on that economy. If we push on it at one spot we're pretty sure to get a bulge or two at some other spot. Frequently those of us who have responsibility for this vast program are forced to choose between relative evils rather than between clear-cut alternatives or right and wrong.

I can assure you, however, that we will do our utmost. I can assure you that our approach will be one of flexibility and good sense, and that our procedures will be changed promptly to fit changing conditions.

But again I must repeat that we cannot do the job alone. Without the full support of the great majority of the people in business, labor, on our farms and in Congress, and backed up by the general public's acceptance and determination that inflation "will not happen here," our own best efforts will be helpless to stem the flood.

American, British, and Russian Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention an article appearing in the Reader's Digest by Stanley High entitled "An Open Letter to the Russians." The writer's intelligent presentation of the need for cooperation between the United States and Russia as well as with Great Britain and his enlightening recital of the advantages that will result to this country are splendidly set and have impressed me greatly. While the Reader's Digest has a large circulation, I feel the article is worthy of reading and study by as many people

as possible. It would indeed be helpful and beneficial if some gentlemen who continually seek to create discord between our country and Russia would give it real study and it may serve to have them desist in their ill-timed fault-finding and criticism of the mutual interests of both countries. Under the leave granted me, I insert the article, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE RUSSIANS

(By Stanley High)

The spirit of the world's peoples will not be free until they are delivered from the dark fear that—5, 10, 25 years from now—another more devastating war may overwhelm them.

For what is at stake in victory is nothing less than the release in every land of man's free spirit and its creative reemployment. It was the work of that spirit in the past which brought us so far out of the jungle; which brought the good life more nearly within the reach of multitudes of us; and which, most importantly of all, gives us to believe that we, our sons and daughters and our society can fashion a better fate than these recurring visitations of destruction, pillage and violent death.

In the freeing of the spirit that made these things possible and in its creative reemployment lies whatever hope the future holds. The decisions and the choices which will determine that future will be largely made by the Soviet Union, the United States, and Great Britain; by their choice of agreement and understanding or of bad faith and ill will.

We have fought and won a war together to establish that opportunity. Nothing else of moment is at stake in our victory. Those in authority who can see that, and—in the interest of the most urgent and most cherished needs of all nations—act accordingly, will be marked as more than statesmen. They will be marked, as men rarely are, as emancipators.

Between the United States and Great Britain the foundation of agreement and understanding is broad and deep. That is a fact the world can build on. It is a bulwark for the present and the future which, for our security and progress, we in the United States aim to strengthen.

But it is as clear in America as it must be in Russia that if the end of this war is to be peace—and not just another armistice—unity of purpose among the three great Allies is indispensable. Solely from the standpoint of the self-interest of each nation, there is no other sound policy.

ESSENTIAL TO US BOTH

For the well-being and progress of the peoples of each nation nothing is so urgently required as a long peace. Each nation holds before its people the same promise of a constantly rising standard of living and quality of life. Without peace that promise cannot be made good.

In the case of Russia, which, economically, has further to go, has a less-developed industrial plant, and has suffered immeasurably greater losses in the war, this need for a long peace is not far short of desperate.

In their occupation and retreat the German invaders scorched 150,000,000 acres of the best Russian farm land—an area equal to half the productive acreage of the United States. Dozens of Russian cities are from 50 to 95 percent destroyed. Totally or partly destroyed are industrial plants which produced 61 percent of the nation's iron, 59 percent of its pig iron, 50 percent of its steel, 77 percent of its aluminum, 60 percent of its coal, all of its mercury, and a large proportion of its iron and steel products.

Most of Russia's still operating factories are badly in need of repair and replacement. Machines have carried excess loads for many years. Many of them are obsolete. "Everywhere," writes Edgar Snow in the Saturday Evening Post, "public buildings have fallen into disrepair. All new housing, except where essential to the war effort, ceased in July 1941. Everybody's clothes are worn out or wearing out. Practically no garments but uniforms have been produced. Many thousands of people are now walking on paper soles stuffed in their only shoes."

"We believe we can restore that destruction and build better than before," said Molotov at San Francisco, "but the work is tremendous."

Russia's leaders must know how greatly their immense load would be lightened and how much their gigantic task of reconstruction speeded up if, through agreement, the United States and Britain could put their productive shoulders to the Soviet wheel.

There is no guesswork about that. Productively and to their mutual benefit, the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have already agreed and worked together. Their agreeing and working together laid the prewar foundation for Soviet industry and netted the United States many a productive job.

RUSSO-AMERICAN INTERDEPENDENCE

At Russia's invitation, American engineers built the famous Dnieprostroy Dam. Soviet gold, on the barrel head, bought the turbines from Westinghouse. American plans, drawn for a profit, furnished the basis for modernizing the coal mines of the Donets Basin. Quick to recognize a good thing, the Soviets subsequently made American mining practices standard throughout the Union.

Rigs, drills, refineries, and gasoline plants in the Caucasian oil fields came, for cash, from America. For the same over-the-counter reasons, Soviet tractors are Caterpillar and International Harvester models; its best locomotives, Baldwin and American Locomotive types; the continuous sheet rolling mills and presses in its steel plants, also American.

The United States and the Soviet Union are indispensable to the peace which, in turn, is indispensable to both. By a cold calculation of what their own self-interest requires, they are indispensable to each other.

And while the American people want more of the jobs and profits which would accrue from this productive agreement, reports invariably show that the people of the Soviet Union want more of the type of goods which America produces.

"We have seen your drugstores in the movies," a Russian told John Hersey, "and we are determined to have ice cream for all at 50 kopeks."

"Russians," writes Edgar Snow, "admire American products of all kinds and dream of the day when they can buy them or Russian copies just as good. Give a Russian a slick-paper magazine and he immediately becomes lost in the advertisements picturing goods on sale."

In Twelve Months That Changed the World, Larry Lesueur tells of an interview in Moscow with the head of a committee appointed by the government to draw up plans for the postwar rebuilding of Russia's cities.

"Here," said the Russian, "is what you are doing in America. Building model towns on one side of the road in a semicircle with a byroad coming off the main highway, half circling the center of the town and joining the highway farther along. That is what we will do, too.

"I saw some of your new apartment buildings in America. We will try to make ours like them. Those kitchens! How much labor they saved! And those beautiful bathrooms! We will have them in our new cities."

It is true that beyond this community of popular and highly practical desire for the same high standards of living, the governments of our two countries are widely dissimilar. Naturally, we are proud of our American way of life. Naturally, too, we feel as free to criticize Russia's as they do ours.

But in many particulars, our two nations and peoples are much alike. More nearly than any other great nation, both are economically self-sufficient. For its economic development, neither requires additional territory. Geography favors the security of both—as George III found out in regard to America, and Napoleon and Hitler in regard to Russia.

In fact and in spirit, both countries are young, ambitious, and abounding with pioneer energy and imagination. That may be why, being so lately arrived as dominant powers, we are both inclined to strut our stuff before the world. Recent assertions in the Soviet press of the almost singlehandedness with which the Red Army won the war are reminiscent of the American tendency to act as if we alone had won World War I.

LIKABLE TRAITS IN COMMON

Common characteristics in both peoples account for the fact that when the average Russian and the average American get together they instinctively like each other.

"It is difficult," writes Larry Lesueur, "not to like the Russian people. They are so impulsive, easily amused, and good-natured. All foreigners admit that the Russians show an involuntary preference for Americans because they find in them the same responsiveness, informality, and willingness to accept them as equals."

At an American bomber base on the Russian steppes, Edmund Stevens "met a group of five inseparable companions, Joe from New York, Shorty from Pittsburgh, and Nikolai, Kostya, and Misha from Leningrad, Moscow, and Rostov, respectively. When I saw them," Stevens writes in his article in the Saturday Evening Post, "the two Americans were initiating their Russian side-kicks into the mysteries of chewing gum and trying to get over the point that you weren't supposed to swallow it."

This good comradeship was typical in the several bases—in Iran, Russia, Alaska, and elsewhere—where the soldiers of our two nations have had opportunity to get acquainted and to fraternize.

In Collier's, Corey Ford, and Alastair MacBain tell of a night at the officers' club in Fairbanks. "An American ferry pilot sits at the piano, sounding tentative notes while a group of Russian flyers sing one of their own songs. The American follows by ear, gradually masters the melody, plays the accompaniment more confidently as the Americans and Russians gather closer.

"They try a Russian song that our own fliers know; or an American gets out his guitar, hums a soft, sad accompaniment to Old Man River; or a Russian youngster produces a magnificent pair of dress boots, made of white Siberian dogskin; a Yankee flier takes off his shoes and tries in vain to get them on. 'Nope,' pointing ruefully to his foot, 'too big.' They grin, break out paper bags of grapes and apples and lounge side by side practicing each other's language, laughing at each other's mistakes.

"It may be a historic scene. The two countries can never be quite so far apart again, you feel."

The Union, which the Soviet's 16 "autonomous" republics comprise, is as much a melting pot as ours. Soviet Russia is not a nation of one race, but of 175 different peoples. They speak 150 different languages. There, as in the United States, these diversities have produced not disruption but a high order of patriotism and national solidarity. Both nations are, in fact, a union. That is because of the way in which, in both, the rights and opportunities of minorities are protected.

It is of equal or even greater importance that, despite deep differences of opinion throughout their history, the United States has stood by Russia and Russia has stood by the United States in their periods of great national danger.

MUTUAL SUPPORT IN CRISES

In his book, United States Foreign Policy, Walter Lippmann writes that "the story of Russian-American relations is an impressive demonstration of how unimportant in the determination of policy is ideology—how compelling is national interest."

Americans, he says, have never liked Russia's governments. Russia has frequently returned the compliment by not liking ours. "Except for a few months between the fall of the Czars in March 1917 and the Bolshevik revolution in November 1917, the political ideologies of these two nations have always been poles apart. Nevertheless, Russia and the United States have usually, each in its own interest, supported one another in critical moments of their history."

Despite Czarist fear of the ideas of the American Revolution, Russia's policy of armed neutrality favored the Colonies. Though Russia continued to be antagonistic toward American democracy, the Czar's government, at the time of the Civil War, declared that the preservation of the Union was essential to Russia. This, with the subsequent dispatch of Russian naval forces to New York and San Francisco, helped to prevent the recognition, by Britain and France, of the Confederacy.

In the First World War, there was deep dislike in the United States for Russia's Czarist regime and, later, both fear and distrust of the Bolshevists. But, though Russia was represented neither at the signing of the armistice nor at the negotiation of the Versailles Treaty, it was on American insistence that both documents included provisions aimed to protect the integrity and interests of Russia. The chief reason for the dispatch of American forces to eastern Siberia in 1918 was to hold in check the anti-Russian ambitions of Japan. When American forces were withdrawn, the United States insisted that Japan withdraw also.

"Historic experience shows," says Mr. Lippmann, "that Russia and the United States, placed 'on opposite sides of the globe' have always been antagonistic in their political ideology, always suspicious that close contact would be subversive. Yet each has always opposed the dismemberment of the other. Each has always wished the other to be strong. They have never had a collision which made them enemies."

HISTORIC CHANCE TO COOPERATE

For every reason of immediate and long-time self-interest Russia and the United States at this critical moment in history should stand together, support each other, and cooperate to their mutual advantage.

The Soviet Government has been badly informed, indeed, if it is unaware how great is the measure of good will and friendliness in the United States toward the Soviet Union. There is not the slightest basis in fact for Russian mistrust of the United States. By every device of modern communication—newspapers, magazines, books, lectures, radio, and movies—the American people have been intensively and with the utmost sympathy informed about Soviet Russia.

We would, in return, feel happier were there less secretiveness in Russia concerning the United States. But only two Russian policies are really serious threats to good will between our countries. First, if the Soviet Union, with power such as Russia never before possessed, embarks upon a policy of territorial aggrandizement, a Russian collision with ourselves and Great Britain would be almost inevitable. Second, if the Soviet Union, flushed with its historic victories, undertakes to proselytize the world on behalf of revolutionary communism—that, too, would be resisted by the United States and Great Britain.

It is difficult to believe that either fear can materialize. Too much that Russia needs and the Russian people aspire for would be lost. At stake is Russia's present opportunity to achieve reconstruction and a resumption of the progress of the Russian people toward economic and cultural well-being.

At stake, also, is a historic opportunity for the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, together with all nations of good will, to lift the fear that hangs over the future and free mankind for the better destiny that is within reach.

Hampton Pitts Fulmer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HAMPTON PITTS FULMER, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it was a great loss to the country and a personal loss to me when the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, in his infinite wisdom, on October 19, 1944, called to his reward the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER, who had represented the Second District of South Carolina so faithfully and ably for almost 24 years. Representative FULMER served his district longer in Congress than any other man.

Hamp, as we affectionately knew him, came from good old South Carolina stock. He was born at a time when the going was tough in his beloved State. Without means of securing a college education he, as he was proud to say, entered the college of hard knocks and forged to the top in the business and agricultural fields. In these activities he met both triumph and disaster but treated those two impostors just the same.

With his knowledge of agriculture and his burning desire to help the farmers of America, it was only natural that Mr. FULMER should seek assignment to the powerful House Committee on Agriculture. Two years after coming to Congress he won the assignment he coveted and for 20 years was an able member of that committee, rising to the chairmanship, the position he occupied at the time of his death. The history of the advance of agriculture during the last 20 years is replete with milestones erected by HAMPTON P. FULMER. He was the author of many laws which have lightened the burdens of the farmer. He took special pride in his authorship of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. He never forgot that one of the great loads of the world is borne by those who till the soil. He agreed with the great poet who said of those who work in the field:

Bowed by the weight of the centuries,
He leans on his hoe and gazes upon the ground,
The miseries of the ages on his face
And on his back the burden of the world.

You had to know HAMP FULMER to get fully the tender side of his nature. He loved his wife and daughters dearly and enjoyed most of all his happy family circle. My heart goes out to his loved ones left behind, particularly to his widow whose tender care and devotion were lavished on her distinguished husband during his intermittent illness for several years prior to his death.

The illness that finally took Hamp away had been in evidence for some years. He often spoke to me about his physical condition with cheerfulness, confidence, and resignation. He knew that he should quit work and rest, but he wouldn't quit because he wanted to die with his boots on. With the dreamer he turned his eyes toward the eternal sea one evening and was ready.

Sometime at eve, when the tide is low,
I shall slip my moorings and sail away,
With no response to the friendly hail
Of kindred craft in the busy bay.
In the silent hush of the twilight pale,
When the night swoops down to embrace the day,
And the voices call in the water's flow—
Sometime at eve, when the tide is low,
I shall slip my moorings and sail away.
Through purple shades that darkly trail
O'er the ebbing tide of the unknown sea,
I shall fare me away with a dip of sail
And a ripple of waters to tell the tale
Of a lonely voyager, sailing away
To mystic isles, where at anchor lay
The craft of those who have sailed before,
O'er the unknown sea to the unseen shore.
A few who have watched me sail away
Will miss my craft from the busy bay;
Some friendly barks that were anchored near,
Some loving souls that my heart held dear,
In silent sorrow will drop a tear.
But I shall have peacefully furled my sail
In moorings sheltered from storm and gale,
And greeted the friends who have sailed before
O'er the unknown sea to the unseen shore.

Don't Count China Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from Collier's by Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, who has had such phenomenal success in the last 9 months as head of military operations in the China theater of operations.

His position of special knowledge and authority makes his statement an authentic refutation of many of the reckless charges which have been hurled in certain quarters at the Chinese Government and its leaders.

DON'T COUNT CHINA OUT

(By Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer as told to George Creel)

China is on the way to a unity, a strength, and an efficiency that will make her an aggressive and dependable ally. A hard, toilsome way, still thick with obstacles, but the climb is steady. In the final decisive stages of the war, when we will need a continental force to close with the enemy, I have the deep conviction that Chinese armies can be counted on for valuable contributions to the common effort.

These predictions have firmer base than hope or optimism. Today the Chinese Military Establishment and the American Military Establishment, the Chinese Government and the American Embassy in Chungking, are a team pledged to teamwork. Chiang

Kai-shek is keeping that pledge, for in our daily contact I have yet to meet with a failure in complete cooperation; a strong man, rigid in many respects, but owning an open mind and the courage to buck tradition.

With his full consent and backing, the Chinese Army is in process of reorganization, a new merit system is putting competent officials in key places, and the ancient supply service is being overhauled. Thanks to Donald Nelson and other American experts, China has a War Production Board, and order is being brought out of a well-nigh incredible chaos. "Squeeze," long regarded as a perfectly legitimate practice, now meets with severe punishment, and bureaucracy is also feeling the Generalissimo's heavy hand. He has dismissed 19,000 employees from the conscription service and has cut the number of offices in half.

Much has been told and printed about how China's war lords have taken our shipments of arms and munitions and hidden them away in caves and cellars for their own use in the expected civil conflicts of the postwar period.

I myself know of no such practices, and the Generalissimo, white with anger, has repeatedly told me that the charges are false.

In any event, all lend-lease material that comes into the Chinese theater today is under my direct control and supervision, and I decide every detail with respect to priorities and allocations. Not only does this guard against misappropriation, but it permits a balanced distribution of supplies to all the forces in the field.

In my position, I cannot, of course, discuss China's political conditions, but I can say that when the Japanese advance threatened the vital area between Kweiyang and Kunming, I requested a release of troops from the so-called "blockading army of the north," supposed to number 150,000. The Generalissimo, without discussion, authorized me to take as many as I needed. I decided on 60,000 men as the number that could be flown down from Siam. They were regarded as the pick of Chinese fighting men, but medical examination eliminated some 23,000 of that number.

Those men stopped the Japanese drive toward Chungking and they, reinforced by the United States trained troops from Burma, have been responsible for driving the Japs back toward the South China coast and severing the Jap-held rail line to Indochina and Thailand.

Do not understand me as saying that China's problems have been solved. Far from it. Progress is bound to be slow—heartbreakingly slow in all likelihood—and there is the chance that conditions may get worse before they get better. You don't change a country over from medievalism in a few years, and war-torn years at that. China started from miles behind scratch and, in spite of advances, is still behind scratch. But the people have the spirit, and their leadership has the will.

Proof is afforded by the record. A pacific, totally unprepared nation has stood up against a powerful enemy for more than 7 years, pitting inadequate and obsolete equipment against modern armies, and enduring horrors of devastation. And throughout that same period of sack and massacre, the Generalissimo has never once given ear to the peace offers that the Japanese have made with increasing regularity.

OBSCURE VIEW OF CHINA'S EFFORT

These facts, unhappily, have been obscured by the failure of most Americans to view China realistically. In the beginning, there was an outburst of sentimentalism that ignored obvious facts, and a chorus of overpraise that bred a lot of extravagant expectations.

Then, as a result of Japanese victories, came a tendency to minimize and disparage China's war effort. During a brief visit home, my first in a year, I have both read and heard that the Chinese are not fighting, that they have never really fought, and lack the heart to fight. Reports of pitched battles are sometimes dismissed as shadowboxing.

We should remember that it was only in 1928 that Chiang Kai-shek defeated the war lords of the north, giving him his chance for the unification and regeneration of China, and it was in 1937 that the Japanese invaded in overwhelming force; a space of less than 10 years in which to substitute a modern, democratic form of government for centuries of Manchu despotism. Even that short span was not without interruption, for the Japanese occupied Manchuria in 1931, and poured down through the Great Wall into Chahar in 1935.

China's 450,000,000, moreover, were spread out across a vast stretch of territory, divided by differences in languages and dialects, and an almost utter lack of means of communication and travel. In 1928 there were less than 2,500 miles of railroad, and the highways were purely coastal, the interior having only mud roads, lanes, and trails. Handcrafts constituted the bulk of industry, and the absence of mechanical transport doomed the greater part of the population to animal drudgeries. No man ever faced a more herculean task.

The Generalissimo himself would be the last to claim 100-percent success, but there was accomplishment. He set up a central government that restored some degree of law and order; he called a congress that drafted a democratic constitution; he launched comprehensive programs in connection with railway and highway building, education, sanitation, and public health. In addition he nationalized many natural resources and planned the development of China's heavy industries.

There is no doubt in my mind that the extent and progress of the program led the Japanese to decide on invasion and total war. China's moves toward unification and modernization made Tokyo afraid to wait. Unfortunately, Chiang Kai-shek had not been able to do two things at once. Having poured energy and public funds into reconstruction, he made the national defense a secondary consideration.

The Chinese Navy, at the time of invasion, consisted of 6 cruisers that were little more than training ships, and some 50 gunboats without firepower. Some 250 fighter planes, mostly old models, and a handful of trainers made up his air force. The Army, while numbering around 2,000,000, lacked officer personnel schooled in modern combat, and was critically weak in heavy artillery and mechanized equipment.

Aside from being inadequately armed, the troops were poorly clothed and half fed. Wearing only thin cotton uniforms in bitter weather, soldiers tramped through snow in bare feet. Under an antiquated system of supply, the regular rice ration was supposed to be supplemented from money supplied to division commanders. Some put it in their pockets, but even when honest, the commander had no system for the collection and distribution of foodstuffs. Often supplies were miles removed from troop concentrations, and there were only human carriers. These are some of the conditions that made successful resistance impossible, and to this day I marvel that the Chinese managed to do as well as they did. Do you see now what I mean by saying that China started from miles behind scratch?

Of all the thousand and one difficulties that have had to be overcome, production must be placed at the top of the list. Not that the Chinese lack resourcefulness, ingenuity, and industriousness. The great trouble was the utter absence of organization, as we understand the word. Having no transport or means of communication had much to do with it, but a principal cause was the highly individualized nature of the Chinese. Their entire economy, for countless years, has been built around the family, and even when industry went out of the home into the factory it stayed clannish and individualistic.

INCREASED INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT

Donald Nelson has changed that, or perhaps it is better to say he has made a start. The War Production Board, by sweeping reforms, has greatly increased China's industrial output. At the time of the invasion, some 600 factories were moved away from the coast, a job involving the transport of 120,000 tons of goods and machinery, and journeys of hundreds of miles. Today there are more than 1,500 privately owned industrial plants in the caves and hills of the interior, and a number of odd units of heavy industry under the direct control of the National Resources Commission.

Much of the production is still primitive, judged by our standards, but amazing in view of the handicaps. I have seen small vessels made out of salvaged steel plate, and steam engines constructed from what we would regard as scrap. In one town there is a textile mill that carries on in a 3-mile stretch of bombproof tunnels; and other factories, either underground or cleverly camouflaged, turn out electrical equipment, chemicals, and munitions. Even vegetable oils are processed in such manner as to produce an acceptable substitute for gasoline and Diesel oil.

Modern methods and modern machinery, now being provided by the War Production Board, are bound to show increasingly good results.

Another forward step is the correction of disorganization and confusions in the Supply Service. Yu Fei Peng, an honest and able civil servant, is now top man, thanks to the merit system recently installed by the Generalissimo. He has had our American experts make a thorough survey of the whole commissary situation, and on the basis of their report, a ration has been worked out in an effort to give each soldier a balanced and reasonably sufficient diet.

BETTER DISTRIBUTION OF SUPPLIES

The heart of the system is an improved method of collection and warehousing. The plan provides that instead of having foodstuffs commandeered, farmers are now paid for everything bought, and storage depots have been built at key points. At that, the supply picture, as a whole, is still far from rosy.

The railroad situation is bad, the main highways are not as good as our rural roads, and trucks remain a headache. At last count, there were only 6,000 in all Free China, and the newest of them was 3 years old.

To meet the lack of mechanical transport, the Chinese have built up what they call "stage lines." But for the pluck behind them, they would be laughed at by the most backward American community. Rafts, junks, and carts are pulled by men and animals—horses, mules, donkeys, camels. Where no roads or waterways are available but only rough trails, human carriers are used, packing as much as 90 pounds per man, and covering 20 miles a day.

It is in connection with the military establishment, however, that the greatest reforms are foreseen. Through the centuries, for instance, Chinese armies have been drawn from the peasantry and herded into uniform at the point of bayonets. Military service was scorned by the better classes, and honor was for the scholars. Now China has a Selective Service Act much like our own, and an Educated Youth Corps of 100,000 drawn from China's elite is nearly ready for the field. Chiang Kai-shek's son and the sons of high officials are in uniform, sharing dangers and hardships side by side with soldiers of the coolie class. I have asked the Generalissimo several times to let me have his son for staff

duty, but he refused to take him away from combat.

I cannot speak too highly of General Chen Cheng, the new Minister of War. A competent soldier and a capable administrator, his honesty is proved by the fact that he has nothing but his army pay after long years of military service.

Another good man is Yu Ta-wei, promoted to be Assistant Minister of War by reason of his brilliant record as Chief of Ordnance; a Harvard man, by the way, where he won the scholarship that sent him to Germany for military study.

These two are doing a great job with the Generalissimo's backing. It used to be that a soldier received about $1.50 a month, out of which he had to pay for his rations. Today he gets $30 a month, and his food and clothing are furnished by the government. Medical care was not even a promise a few years ago, but now there are field and base hospitals, training schools for nurses, and blood banks.

One of the fundamental reforms is what we call the "cannibalization" of the army. This means a concentration on fitness rather than size, and emphasis on quality rather than quantity. For example, we will take three divisions, say, weed out the unfits and misfits, and form one effective, well-equipped and well-trained division. That is an achievement, for the old-style army had a pathetic faith in the value of numbers.

Officer personnel is now being turned out by three schools in operation under American direction, one for artillery, one for infantry and the third a general staff college for advanced instruction. Americans, scattered all through the Army, are teaching the techniques of modern warfare, and the results are already apparent.

The Chinese American Composite Wing, General Chennault's "baby," holds a lot of promise. Trained in India by American officers, the youngsters fly back over the Hump for combat duty, and filter into the Chinese air force that is in process of building. Language differences are not the obstacles that might be imagined, for it is common to hear a Texas voice drawling "Kai-shih-sheh-chi," which means "Commence firing," and have a Cantonese call back, "Okay."

A fine lot, and recklessly brave, especially where their precious planes are concerned, you just can't make them bail out, and all take the most desperate chances to save a ship, knowing the difficulty of getting a replacement. Not long since I heard of a case where the main fuel tank had been shot away, leaving the gas tanks empty and, on top of this, one engine was dead and the other choking. American officers ordered the pilot to jump, but he hung on and finally made a landing that saved the plane.

From what I have seen with my own eyes, I have no hesitation in saying that the Chinese have fought, are fighting, and will keep on until Japan's complete defeat. Adequately armed and trained, properly fed, and well officered, they make as good soldiers as any in the world. This is not my own unsupported judgment. Ask Gen. Dan Sultan, who has had 75,000 of them with him in the Burmese jungles.

THE GENERALISSIMO FOLLOWS A PATTERN

It is untrue that the first three battles of Changsha were sham affairs, the Japanese advancing only to gather the crops, and then retreating. In each of the battles, as I have studied them, the Generalissimo followed much the same pattern. Road wrecking immobilized the enemy's mechanized units, while mines, planted under heavy aircraft fire, prevented Jap warships and auxiliary vessels from coming up the rivers. Then, instead of offering frontal resistance, the Chinese withdrew, and under cover of intense retreating action, shifted strong forces to the Japanese flanks and rear. After "sucking in" the enemy, they attacked and won decisive victories.

I think the Chinese a great people with a bone-deep love of country, and an intense ambition to take their place in the family of nations. In China today there is the upswing of a new, modern spirit, and plain evidence of a determination to cast off the medievalism imposed by centuries of Manchu rule. And I have come to esteem the Generalissimo as a great leader, a real patriot and an inspiring, unifying force.

Proof of it, to my mind, is furnished by the fact that when the opposition is asked to name a man for his post, in event of deposition, all disavow any thought of replacing him. From my conversations with him, I know that he counts the days until a congress, elected by the whole people, can frame democratic laws for democratic government.

With such a people and such a leader, how can China be counted out?

Nebraska—For the Information of the Office of War Information

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, some account has already been taken of an article emanating from OWI sources that appeared in the Russian-language magazine, America Illustrated. The article under the title "Prairie States" has in it the following statement:

To the west of the Mississippi stretches an immense land of prairies, the so-called Great Plains.

This prairie land includes the following States: Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and Utah. This region, covering almost one-quarter of the whole territory of the United States, supports only one-twentieth part of the population of the country. The people in it are almost exclusively farmers. Livestock raising is carried on only in the mountainous parts of Montana and Wyoming. Industry is almost nonexistent. Raw materials and fabricated goods must be imported from other States. The rich natural resources of the region are as yet untouched.

Because of the express mention of Nebraska, may I, for Nebraskans in and out of Congress, protest the obvious untruth of the article's implications? In the atmosphere of existing international conditions, such misleading information impairs our country's position at the world's conference table.

To informed Americans, the surface ridiculousness of this article is laughable. To say that the people in this all-inclusive region are "almost exclusively farmers," that "industry is almost nonexistent," that "livestock raising is carried on only in the mountainous parts of Montana and Wyoming," borders on the realm of amusing falsehood.

But such information is not amusing to the hungry peoples of Europe.

Martin bombers, made in Omaha, have helped to keep the sea lanes open to Murmansk. Nebraska livestock, fattened on Nebraska-raised feed, sent to Nebraska stockyards, and processed in Nebraska packing houses, have helped to feed the armies of Marshal Konev and Marshal Zhukov on their final drive to Berlin. It cannot be doubted that much of Nebraska's yearly production of 65,718,384 pounds of butter went to Russia and other lend-lease destinations.

Yes; the three and a quarter million cattle, the million sheep, the 14,000,000 chickens, and the three and three-quarter million hogs on Nebraska farms have contributed greatly to the food needs of our armed forces and those of our allies. We take no exception to the acclaim of Nebraska as a great agricultural producer.

What about the so-called nonexistent industry?

Nebraska's boiler shops, concrete products, barrels, drugs and medicines, its grease and tallow, its paint industry, its sheet-metal works, its structural-metal establishments, its machinery and machine shops products have helped to make possible the giant strides of American industry in war.

Abundant natural resources, including electrical power, give promise of maintaining and increasing Nebraska's industrial expansion in the postwar years. Byproducts of the chemical industry alone are such fermentation necessities as ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, lactic acid, and glycerol. Plastics, whose value has been proved under the most trying conditions, are being made in large quantities from Nebraska cellulose.

This element of permanent progress can scarcely have been derived from a purely agricultural economy. Neither can it have suddenly evolved from purely wartime conditions. The basic essentials of this agro-industrial economy have been operative in Nebraska for decades.

The greatest asset of the State of Nebraska is its people. The people of Nebraska have joined together to make their State one of the most efficient units within our Federal Government. They have done so because they have been consistently well informed. That is why false or misleading information about Nebraska and its relationship with its sister States is so dangerous. Nebraska has abundant facilities for travel by air, rail, and highway. In fact, 48 airports now serve Nebraska's 1,315,834 population. Three hundred Nebraska towns have newspapers. Seven hundred and fifty post offices serve the network of Nebraska communities and connect Nebraska farms by means of rural free delivery. Nebraskans read more than 300 State newspapers, support 245 public libraries, and have access to 80 college and university libraries. Nebraska children and adults are served by 7,000 school districts and 25 institutions of higher learning. The school population of Nebraska is 254,000.

This is the truth about Nebraska. Any departure from the truth builds a distorted picture. At this time, with the San Francisco Charter under consideration by the United States Senate, a distorted picture of individual State resources has international implications.

Russia may wonder why there is a reluctance on our part to ship farm machinery abroad. This farm machinery is needed within our own country in increasing amounts to replace worn-out

farm machinery and to open improved districts for cultivation. The article in America Illustrated would lead the reader to believe that Nebraska and her sister States in the Great Plains region are not carrying their own weight in the production of farm macihnery. That certainly is not true.

It is not my intention to take away any of the credit so richly deserved by States in all other sections of the United States. What they have done in this war has been the result of courage and planning. However, the reflection in the America Illustrated article has been on the States of the regicn that I represent. In telling the story of America abroad I believe that it is vital to show accurately the job every section of America has accomplished. No unbalanced account of our war effort should be given to a foreign public.

In this instance, Nebraska is a symbol. It is a symbol of the soundness of the region in which it is located. Nebraska has no bonded indebtedness. It preserves a fine balance between agriculture and industry. It has utilized the natural resources at its disposal—employing them to their best advantage, but not wasting them. The human resources of Nebraska have been the integrating factor that made possible this continuing progress. It is because of the people of Nebraska that I want to keep the record straight. They are doing a job well. They have done a job well. They will continue to do their job in the winning of this war and in the establishment of a lasting peace in line with their outstanding record.

Misinformation about the contribution of Nebraska or any other State at this time supplied to foreign readers by an agency of the United States Government is likely to have repercussions both at home and abroad. In earnestly seeking to get along with other nations, this Nation must be represented realistically. We are not a group of loosely connected States in a confederacy. We are a Federal Union. It is the duty of any agency connected with the Federal Union to display the true qualities of the individual States in our national showcase.

Only with truth can we expect to beget understanding. Misinformation is now, as it always has been, the root of national and international discord.

Pen Used in Signing Postal-Pay-Increase Bill Presented to Mr. Leo E. George

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to present to Mr. Leo E. George, president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, a pen used by President Truman in signing H. R. 3025, the bill which extends a measure of justice to postal employees, by giving them the first increase in basic salaries they have had in 20 years.

Under unanimous consent, I print in the RECORD a letter I wrote to Mr. George in connection with the presentation. It is as follows:

JULY 10, 1945.

Mr. LEO E. GEORGE,
President, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PRESIDENT GEORGE: Through the courtesy and kindness of President Truman it is my pleasure and privilege to present to you a pen that was used by the President in signing the postal-pay-increase bill, H. R. 3035. I also present with it, for your files, a letter which I received today from the White House, which reads, as follows:

"THE WHITE HOUSE,
"Washington, July 7, 1945.

"Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have pleasure in sending to you herewith for presentation to Mr. Leo George, president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, one of the pens used by the President on July 6 in signing:

"H. R. 3025, an act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation, and for other purposes.

"Very sincerely yours,

"M. C. LATTA,
"Executive Clerk."

I may say, Mr. George, that the initiative of the request that this historic pen be presented to you was taken by your many friends in the postal service in my home city of Indianapolis. After the bill passed Congress I received a telegram from a highly esteemed friend, Mr. Louis E. Decker, president of local No. 130, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, asking me to file a request at the White House that the pen to be used in signing the bill should be delivered to me for presentation to you. The request was graciously granted. I do not know of anyone on whom it could be more worthily bestowed, for your record of service to the postal workers and the public served by them stands out most luminously.

It gives me the utmost pleasure to be chosen as the instrumentality of presenting this pen to you because of my great interest in the postal employees, which has developed into a particularly close association, because for 10 years I have been chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that prepares the annual supply bill for the postal service. I give it as my considered opinion that there is no more efficient, no more faithful, no more devoted group of workers in the world than the postal employees of America. Weather handicaps never feaze them or deflect them from the path of duty. In rain or shine or storm or sleet or snow they see that the mail is carried and delivered. Often they work under circumstances that are a test of men's souls, yet, they go ahead unflinchingly in the performance of their duties. In my opinion the increase that has been granted them was too long deferred. It has been 20 years since there was a revision of basic postal pay and in that time the costs of living have risen enormously and the very least that we, as Members of Congress, representing the people of America, could do for them was to pass legislation bringing their salaries up to a just standard of compensation.

The bill that has just been signed is a step in that direction, and again I say that I am very glad to have been chosen to present to you, an outstanding leader of the postal employees, the pen with which it was signed.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Canada: Land of Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, many persons who live in Northern States cross over to Canada each year. In peacetime the tourist trade between the two countries is very large. Apparently, the Americans are finding Canada a particularly happy summer playground this year for reasons which are graphically set forth in the following article from the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of July 9, 1945. If, as the writer indicates, the Canadians have succeeded in securing an adequate production and equitable distribution of their meat and other foodstuffs through successful administration by their Government officials, I hope that our economists are, in fact, studying Canada's program which has, evidently, brought fine results for our neighbors. The article by the Oracle is well worth reading:

Canada, the land of beef, is a happy hunting ground for American vacationers this summer. People who normally would be going to the New England beaches are this season flocking to Canada, packing the trains or, if they have been prudent with their use of gasoline and have saved enough gas, driving to the border with their rationed motor fuel. For from then on to Montreal or Quebec it's like motoring in prewar days.

The Canadian Government allows coupons for 16 liters, which corresponds to 20 of our gallons, to every visiting motorist. But from all reports, there isn't much attention paid to the coupons in the rural regions of the Province of Quebec. And there are enough gasoline stations along the way for safe driving.

The Oracle was in Montreal and Quebec last week, and can speak from first-hand experience of the abundance of food in Canada, all at reasonable prices. We were of the hundreds of Americans who went there by train. The Saguenay trip is the goal of most of them, but is open only to those who were sufficiently foresighted to book their boat passages when the lists were opened late last winter. The accommodations on that trip were gone long before the Oracle decided to spend a holiday with his family in Canada.

So we continued our journey to Montreal and Quebec. Between George Watson, of Holyoke, and George Savoy, formerly of Holyoke and now one of Montreal's leading citizens, we got rooms at the Queen's Hotel in Montreal and the Chateau at Quebec. That was a triumph, for the vacation seekers from the United States, folks who want to eat well on their holidays, are filling up the hotels there.

What we hear about Canada being the land of plenty is all true. Steaks are sold everywhere, and at reasonable prices. We enjoyed one noon a delicious steak dinner at Drury's, one of the best Montreal restaurants, for $1.50. At Baker's Inn, between Quebec and St. Anne de Beaupre, we ate a delicious steak dinner for $1.25. And there were seconds of everything for those who wanted them. We looked over the register there and saw many familiar Holyoke names.

Butter is on the restricted list, but Canada's restrictions aren't as confining as ours. Everyone gets at least one large slice of butter at every meal, and to Americans who are now accustomed to making a little butter go a long way, it's more than enough. Bacon is

a bit short there, too. But bacon is available everywhere.

The Oracle was full of questions as to why Canada could have this adequate supply of food, all at reasonable prices, while we not many miles away have long been without these foods at any price. Canadians say they have done a better job of regulating. At the very beginning of the war pressure on the Dominion's economy, they froze everything—wages as well as prices. Whereas we in this country pegged prices half-heartedly and did nothing with wages for quite a while. There is none of the heavy war money in Canada that rose up to burst through the price levels. Canada handled its black market with bared hands. It had no political-minded OPA attempting to enforce the rules. The Canadian police cracked down on black-market offenders very early in the game, hit them so hard that there is little lure for illegal operators to reap the rich harvest of black markets. The penalties are too severe to make it worth the risk.

Canada is sensitive to the resentment shown on this side of the international boundary over the better balance there. Canadians are quick to say that they have done just as big a war job as we have. They never indulged in the false economy of restrictions on productions. They have turned out more produce than ever before, and they say that on a per-capita basis they are sending as much foodstuff abroad as we are. They sense our envy and are not happy about it.

A trip through the shops on St. Catherine Street in Montreal proves their argument that they have been more successful in holding prices than we have. There is the dreamland for the American housewife. Goods which we haven't seen in years are on display at prices of almost prewar size. The American visitors are making quite a drain on the merchandise but not enough to upset the balance. Canadians are proud of their accomplishment in carrying their war burden and at the same time holding the home-front line. They have every reason to boast. The economists can well afford to study Canada's program.

THE ORACLE.

Freedom of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I introduced the following bill to further protect the freedom of speech over the air:

A bill to further protect freedom of speech over radio

Be it enacted, etc., That section 326 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"CENSORSHIP; INDECENT LANGUAGE; FREEDOM OF SPEECH

"SEC. 326. (a) Nothing in this act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission whicr. shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication. No person within the jurisdiction of the United States shall utter any obscene, indecent, or profane language by means of radio communication, or by means of radio communication advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

"(b) In order that freedom of speech over the radio, and the right to indulge in and make legitimate and proper comment concerning matters of national interest, may be guaranteed and preserved for all regardless of point of view, no radio station shall—

"(1) deny any citizen of the United States access to, or the right to use, its radio communication facilities; or

"(2) in connection with its radio station activities discriminate in any manner against any citizen of the United States;

by reason of any opinion, conclusion, statement, or comment to be expressed or made by him which is not prohibited by subsection (a), or theretofore expressed or made by him which is not so prohibited, in respect of any matter or thing pertaining to or affecting the policies, or interests of the Government of the United States, or the policies or interests of any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(c) Any citizen of the United States who alleges that he has been denied access to, or the right to use, radio communication facilities in violation of subsection (b), or has been discriminated against in violation of subsection (b), and who is aggrieved thereby, may bring an action against the radio station concerned in the district court of the United States for the district in which such radio station is situated, for an injunction, mandatory or otherwise, to enjoin such violation and to compel compliance with the provisions of subsection (b), and for such further relief (including compensatory damages) as may be appropriate. Such court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall make and enter such orders, temporary or final, and such judgments (including judgment for compensatory damages) as the court deems proper.

"(d) The Commission shall not have power to deny, to fail to renew, to modify, or to revoke, a license under this act in the case of any applicant or licensee, or otherwise to discriminate against any applicant or licensee, by reason of any action of the applicant or licensee which constituted compliance with the provisions of subsection (b), or by reason of any opinion, conclusion, statement, or comment expressed or made by such applicant or licensee, or by any officer or employee of such applicant or licensee, in respect of any matter or thing pertaining to or affecting the policies or interests of the Government of the United States, or the policies or interests of any agency or instrumentality thereof."

Section 326 of the Communications Act of 1934 provides that nothing in the act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station and that no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which will interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication.

It has long been apparent that the spirit if not the letter of this provision has been violated directly or indirectly by the Commission or its licensees.

The bill which I have introduced is designed to assure to any commentator or broadcaster the freedom of speech over the air which the act clearly contemplates and to accord a court review to anyone aggrieved by the Commission or any of its licensees in this connection.

Freedom of speech over the air is fundamental to our entire system of government. It must be preserved.

In this connection my attention has just been called to a letter written by the President of the United States to Mr. Sol Taishoff, editor and publisher of Broadcasting magazine, emphasizing the vital importance of freedom of speech over the air.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point a copy of the letter and a copy of an editorial appearing in the July 9 edition of Broadcasting:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 3, 1945.

Mr. SOL TAISHOFF,
Editor and Publisher, Broadcasting Magazine, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAISHOFF: In my opinion, the free voice of radio never has faced a more important challenge in its 25-year history than that which lies before it now as Allied weapons are turned upon the last enemy of liberty. Broadcasters must direct their energies in the future, as they have so nobly in the past, toward the liquidation of all resistance to the principles upon which their own free charter is founded.

Our lawmakers demonstrated admirable foresight by decreeing that America, as the birthplace of radio, should have a free, competitive system, unfettered by artificial barriers and regulated only as to the laws of nature and the limitation of facilities. That this system has worked is demonstrated by radio's remarkable strides as a public service medium. The wisdom of that original policy, moreover, is reflected in radio's quick transition to full-fledged war service—a task yet unfinished. Since Pearl Harbor, American radio has written its own magna carta. But beyond the day of final victory there lies myriad problems.

Radio, with the press, must give inspired leadership and lend its facilities to making more intimate and workable the relationship between the people and the Government. For radio itself there are challenging days ahead. New services are in the offing—services such as television and FM broadcasting, which will open new vistas of opportunity for public service.

American radio is in good hands. With many hundreds of new stations possible by virtue of the opening of these new frontiers by our scientists and engineers, the free competition of the present will become even freer.

The American system has worked and must keep working. Regulation by natural forces of competition, even with obvious concomitant shortcomings, is to be preferred over rigid governmental regulation of a medium that by its very nature must be maintained as free as the press.

I salute America's broadcasters who have been, in their fashion, warriors for our common purpose and solicit their continued zeal in the cause of freedom and decency.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

TRUMAN'S RADIO CREDO

For the first time since radio regulation began there exists a national policy on radio. President Truman has decreed it. That policy is for a radio "as free as the press." It is for "regulation by natural forces of competition" rather than "rigid governmental regulation * * *." It is for "* * * a free, competitive system, unfettered by artificial barriers and regulated only as to the laws of nature and the limitations of facilities."

It is our privilege to publish in this issue a precedent-shattering letter from the Chief Executive expressing forthrightly and concretely his views on radio. That expression is a mandate not only to all who live by the microphone but to the FCC and the Congress.

For implicit in the President's statement is the instruction to those who regulate this art to alter their concepts and discard their extreme philosophies which tend toward greater arrogations of power. A radio "as free as the

press" can't be a radio half free. A competitive radio can't be a servile radio which by fiat must delicately balance commercials as against sustaining or public-service programs; throw open its books to the public gaze, or be told what programs can or cannot broadcast.

With innate wisdom the Chief Executive envisages an even freer radio resulting from the influx of new FM and television stations. That augurs too for less rather than more stringent regulation. For with facilities available to all comers who are qualified, a truly open competition in radio will obtain—the sort of competition which has animated the press. Then a radio "as free as the press" will not be an empty phrase or a will-o'-the-wisp.

The President gives to the Nation's broadcasters their cue for a more abundant radio life. In clear, understandable, direct fashion he has staked off the area in which a new and revitalized NAB should function. In less than 400 words he sets forth what should be the nucleus of the new radio law. Those basic views can be molded into the legislative language which will clearly define and limit the scope of the radio licensing body.

That is the mission of the NAB. The new NAB president should be one who can take the Truman radio credo and by sheer force of logic and soundness, pilot it through Congress. Such a man need not necessarily be an austere national figure, an eminent jurist or a practical broadcaster (although such radio craftsmanship would be a boon). He should be one inspired with the rightness of radio's cause, with the solid backing of the broadcasters, and an ability to follow the leadership that President Truman has provided.

The President did more than hand to radio the key to complete future freedom. He took note of radio's exemplary war work. He found American radio "in good hands."

His closing words, "I salute America's broadcasters who have been, in their fashion, warriors for our common purpose * * *," forever should ring in the ears of every one whose talents and energies are devoted to radio.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio speech I recently made over the American Broadcasting System:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I want to talk to you for a few minutes this evening about a bill now pending before Congress in which I know that you, as an average American citizen, are interested. I know you are interested in this pending bill because if enacted it would set up a Federal control over you in your business and in your job to an extent the like of which has never before been proposed in American history.

I refer to the proposed permanent Federal self-styled Fair Employment Practice Commission, known as the FEPC.

Very few people can find fault with the high objectives of those who advocate equality of opportunity and equal pay for equal work performed, regardless of race or color. But that simply cannot be done by force and coercion and by the use of jails, as is proposed in the FEPC bill.

You may be surprised to learn that the bill, if adopted, would create a permanent bureau in Washington that would have the power to tell the merchants and farmers of America affected by it whom they can hire, whom they can fire, and whom they can promote.

The bill would create a five-man commission, which in turn would have the power to employ unlimited numbers of administrators, directors, clerks, stenographers, referees, reporters, attorneys, agents, etc.

Now let's examine some of the contents of the measure, and, as a famous American once said, "see what the record says."

The bill gives to any disappointed or disgruntled job seeker the right to go before any FEPC "agent"—of whom there would be hundreds—and complain that he was denied a job, a promotion, or had been fired because of his race, creed, color, or national origin.

After the filing of the complaint it is provided the merchant or farmer involved could be ordered by the FEPC agent into court for trial.

Let us assume the defendant in the case should deny there had been any racial or other discrimination involved in his action, and that he had acted in good faith for reasons of efficiency and in the interest of the success of his own business.

But who would decide that issue? Who would decide what the mental reasoning of the employer was that caused him to refuse to employ the job seeker?

The merchant or farmer would thus say one thing and the job seeker would say another thing. Who would decide which of the two was telling the truth, and if the defendant should be found guilty?

Would a local court decide the issue? It would not. Would a jury of local people decide the issue of who told the truth and which of the two parties was right? No; it would not.

Then who would decide the ultimate issue of whether there had been discrimination on account of race or creed in the employer's mind when he made his decision that gave rise to the complaint, charging him with failing to hire the complainant?

By the terms of this bill, that issue would be finally decided by the FEPC agent with the approval of the FEPC in Washington, and no jury or local court would be allowed to have anything to say about it.

I mention that example because a similar issue of probing the mind and reading the thoughts of defendants to such complaints would be involved in every one of the thousands of such prosecutions alleging discrimination that would occur if this proposal were enacted into law.

I believe you will be astounded to learn that by the terms of the bill as now written the FEPC agent to whom I have referred would at the same time act as the investigator, the prosecuting attorney, and the judge in every prosecution that would arise.

I have no doubt in my mind but that the average American who believes in fair play would resent such a monstrous method of meting out alleged justice to American citizens.

Yes; you will be amazed to learn that those who favor the FEPC and who are sponsoring it are bitterly and uncompromisingly opposed to allowing the victim of a prosecution the right of a trial by jury—a right the denial of which caused many of our founding fathers to come to this country.

I want to make it perfectly clear that in all prosecutions under the terms of the pending bill the results—which might well involve valuable property rights—would depend entirely upon the whims and prejudices of the FEPC.

Indeed, the proposal is to create a Federal agency and give it the power to itself discriminate with impunity against good American citizens in denying them the right to jobs and to arm that agency with power to have the jails used to enforce its own acts of discrimination.

Moreover, you will be amazed to learn that under section 4 of the measure it is provided that the right to work or to seek work without discrimination is an "immunity which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State."

Now, what does that mean? Everyone knows that every common and independent school district in America is legally a "creature" of the State where each is located. Therefore, it is clear that this section of the bill is a brazen attempt to give a measure of Federal control over local education by giving the FEPC power to control the employment practices in the hiring of school teachers in every school district in the land.

And the same control would apply to all policemen and firemen and to all other State and municipal employees.

Let me give you two or three other illustrations of how the proposed law would operate.

Suppose the FEPC were adopted into law and a Communist were to apply to fill a vacant position and was otherwise qualified. But suppose the merchant to whom he applied had a prejudice against communism and refused to hire him. If the Communist filed a complaint charging discrimination because of his political creed—that is, being a Communist—the merchant could be forced to hire the man and pay him back wages from the time he first applied for the job.

Or, suppose a conscientious objector should apply, let us say, to a war veteran to fill a vacant job. If the veteran refused to hire him on the ground he did not like to work around conscientious objectors and a complaint were filed, the veteran could be forced to hire the man, because being a conscientious objector is a religion, with respect to which discrimination is prohibited by the proposed law.

Now, you know and I know that kind of thing won't work in free America.

Mr. Robert Moses, a prominent member of the Jewish faith, in New York, has pointed out that a proposal similar to this would set the clock of progress back and do irreparable harm to the very people it is meant to benefit, and would make the life of every employer miserable.

Mr. Moses very properly pointed out that a law of this kind would inevitably lead to the establishment of what in European universities and institutions from the Middle Ages to World War II was known as the Numerous Clausus, that is, the quota system, under which Jews and other minorities were permitted only up to a fixed number proportionate to their percentage of the total population.

An honest employer harassed by the system proposed to be established here would ask that there be fixed the various religious and racial quotas which would satisfy the FEPC, or he would be forced to establish his own quotas in an attempt to satisfy the anticipated whims and prejudices of the FEPC and its agents. That is the only way he could hope to stay out of constant trouble.

How can such an outrageous and intolerable situation benefit the members of any minority group? It would, indeed, mean the end of honest competition, and the death knell of selection and advancement on the basis of talent and proven merit.

In view of the brief analysis I have made of the proposed FEPC, is it any wonder that in recent weeks thousands of Americans who have become informed as to its vicious contents have protested to their Congressmen and Senators?

It is well-known in Washington, by those who know something of the history of the drive to make FEPC permament, that it is

minority group pressure legislation, pure and simple.

Those organized pressure groups are very active. They are at work when you of the great unorganized majority are asleep. Their agents and lobbyists can be seen every day in the corridors of the Nation's Capitol. They are there urging that Congressmen and Senators support FEPC—or else.

They have friendly support from those who believe in bureaucratic control of the people rather than control by elected representatives who are responsible to the people being governed by them.

In addition, they have the support of those who are against allowing the States to handle their own local problems and affairs. That class of people believe in a highly centralized Government in Washington, and it is easy to understand why they are for a bureau empowered with arbitrary powers to be known as the FEPC. To those groups of friends of FEPC may be added those who are opposed to job preference laws for war veterans, because the passage of this bill would effectively repeal many veterans preference laws.

But, I repeat, the people generally are becoming informed and aroused as to the viciousnesses of this proposal and the voices of those people are being heard in Washington.

Those people believe in America and in its institutions. They are opposed to taking a radical step toward state socialism when under our present system progress has been and is being made by all races and creeds.

Why, they ask, impose practices and controls that would result in resentment and irritation and lead to racial bitterness, violence and strikes? Why, they ask, not let the American method continue, of progress through education, mutual understanding, and local cooperation, and in that way provide more and better jobs for all the people, regardless of race, creed or color?

The Immigration Problem

SPEECHES

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, I think the situation now developing to make it easy for the thousands of war refugees and other aliens domiciled in this country to become citizens or have permanent residence should be brought forcibly to the attention of this House and the American people.

The keel is laid and the skids are being well greased to open the gates for all of the unhappy people and political outcasts of the world to come to this country, live happily, and occupy the places of your sons and daughters who are fighting the battles for civilization all over the world.

This threatens to be a serious situation, and I pray we will take heed in time to protect ourselves and future generations. We do not need more people in this country. It will tax our capacity to take care of our own.

A propaganda campaign is now in progress to permit the 1,000 refugees at a camp near Oswego, N. Y., to remain in this country. This is the group admitted by the late President Roosevelt with a promise they would be returned to their homeland upon the termination of the war.

In the nearby islands of the Atlantic, and north and south of the borders, there are literally thousands awaiting their opportunity to enter the United States. The war in Europe is over and all of them should be sent home.

I do not subscribe to the theory that belonging to a minority party in their homeland is sufficient reason for us to give them permanent asylum.

Two or three years ago President Roosevelt proposed that our immigration laws be suspended. We have a right to believe that this was for the one purpose of permitting immigration wholesale. This request reveals the attitude of this Government for the past 4 or 5 years and the present administration has not indicated in any manner whatsoever that the policy has been changed. Instead of this line of thinking we should be seriously considering legislation to stop all immigration for a period of 5 or 10 years to give us time to take stock of ourselves.

There are 100,000,000 oppressed people in Europe. Upon what basis are we to choose a few thousand for special treatment?

We read in the current press that refugee stock traders who fled here from Europe have reaped profits of close to $800,000,000 in the New York stock market without having to pay a dollar of their profits into the war-strained United States Treasury as income tax.

Upon investigation here in Washington, I find that there is a strong possibility that this statement is true. How long are we going to stand for such as this? We will stop it when the people become sufficiently aroused.

I cannot join with those who think we are indebted to all the world and are obligated to cure the ills of all peoples. On the contrary, the world will not stand long enough for these peoples to pay their moral and material debts to this country.

Why the Sugar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, bureaucratic bungling, inefficiency, divided authority, have brought about a sugar shortage in this country that is resulting in the waste of hundreds of thousands of tons of food. No thought of serving domestic needs for sugar ever enters into the calculation of the international-minded bureaucrats who hold the power of life and death over our food supplies. Without any survey of our domestic requirements, our ships are loaded with sugar and consigned to foreign countries. The article in the Journal of Commerce and Commercial New York under date of July 11, 1945, which I am inserting under leave to extend, is illuminating on the subject of the sugar shortage:

UNITED STATES SUGAR USERS LEFT HOLDING BAG—1946 TO BE AS DIFFICULT OR MORE SO THAN NOW UNLESS GOVERNMENT ACTS

"We are all familiar with the old rhyme, 'For want of a nail the shoe was lost; for want of the shoe the horse was lost,' until finally the kingdom was lost,'" Lamborn & Co. comment in their weekly sugar-market summary.

"Daily it is becoming more evident to the people of the United States that quantities of valuable products are being lost because of the lack of sugar," this company says.

This is especially true since many processed foods cannot be manufactured without sugar and since much fruit is going to waste because there is not enough sugar to preserve it. Precious milk is being dumped for the same reason. In addition, plant capacities are not being used and jobs are being lost.

"Since the Government has taken no action on the only solution to the supply problem for the balance of this year," the Lamborn Co. asserts, "i. e., to stop shipments of sugar to foreign destinations, to use our own facilities for the production of processed foods, and to ship a part of the resultant products abroad (as we have previously recommended), we might as well turn our minds and thoughts to the possibilities for 1946. That year bids fair to present as unfortunate and grim a situation as we now have.

"The stringency on the first quarter will be an extremely serious one, especially if a large percentage of the new-crop beet production is taken to bolster the sugar supply in the United States in the last quarter of this year, as we understand the Government plans to do. Then, too, recently a Government spokesman stated, in effect, that in 1946 there would be further substantial shipments to foreign destinations. If the Government follows in 1946 the same policy which it has followed in 1945, namely, the making of sugar allocations to foreign destinations without first knowing how much sugar it will have at its disposal, then again the people of the United States will be left holding the bag. This would be in line with the policy that has existed since the war began—our public gets what is left, however little that may be."

MORE SUGAR ONLY SOLUTION

Continuing, the report says:

"More sugar production is obviously the only real long-range solution to our problem. Dividing scant supplies among the people does, of course, require time, some kind of effort, and a modest amount of gray matter. It is our belief that if the same amount of time during the last 3½ years had been devoted to planning for production, we would not be in our present dilemma. The question, then, is whether we shall plan for continued division or for multiplication. Shall we keep the American people in an economy of scarcity or shall we think along the lines of an economy of plenty?"

FIFTY-PERCENT QUOTA A MOCKERY

"When chambers of commerce of some of our cities, to say nothing of many other organizations, find it necessary to call meetings to discuss the sugar-supply situation in their local communities in efforts to find ways and means of operating bakeries, ice-cream plants, and other factories, and to secure enough sugar to save the fruit crops, we think it is a fair indication of the catastrophe visited on our country by the lack of sugar.

"When canners come to us and state that they need 10,000 bags to process certain fruits and vegetables and that they can only secure 1,000 bags, when chocolate factories are closed down without knowledge as to when they will open again, when, in fact, the 50-percent

allotment for the third quarter becomes a mockery because the refiners cannot honor in full the Government 'paper,' then it is obvious that we must, as a nation, institute creative measures which will end as quickly as possible the current abortive situation.

"It is true that a human being can, in times of stress, adjust himself to great physical discomforts and deprivations which normally he would not have thought possible, but it is not good to force a free and enlightened people to accept discomforts if they are not necessary or can be corrected.

"If we turn to the American record of machinery and matériel production for the past 4 years, we find that once given the 'go' signal our industrialists and labor have turned out a job that has amazed all of us, far surpassing the most optimistic expectations. Now, in the food situation we are in a somewhat similar position to that of 1940 and 1941, when our soldiers were being trained with broomsticks and trucks in place of guns and tanks."

SUGAR IS BASIC

"Any level-headed study of the American scene today demonstrates that the matter of correcting our food-supply situation is of the highest importance. And the sugar problem is in the forefront because sugar is a basic necessity in the utilization of many other foods. Sugar is a big factor in contributing to the balanced diet of our Nation."

PRICE SETTLEMENT URGENT

"A review of the sugar situation since the Government took control in the fall of 1941 indicates that our negotiations with Cuba have been used as a pattern for establishing the price of sugar for other producing areas supplying the United States. That is a very important reason for the early conclusion of negotiations for the 1946 Cuban crop. We should, by this time, have contracted for that crop so that Cuba would know what to expect and might plan accordingly, and so that our Government and other sugar-producing areas could complete plans for the 1946 production.

"We doubt very much that the Government will lay out a definite program, for example, in the beet and cane fields of the United States until it has completed its Cuban negotiations. Hence the postponement of those negotiations merely delays planning for 1946 production in domestic cane, beet, and other areas. For example, in the State of California, which normally is a large beet sugar producing State, plans should be made by August 15, certainly not later than September 1, for fall plantings."

GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN TARDY

"Instead of postponing the Cuban negotiations until the late summer or early fall they should be immediately carried forward to a conclusion. Any careful and studied review of the mistakes we have made in regard to sugar production since the war began will disclose that one of the greatest errors has been the tardy development of the Government program.

"If we profit by these repeated errors, there is the opportunity now to create promptly a forceful, dynamic program for sugar production with the purpose of producing every possible ounce of sugar in 1946 and 1947. The development now of a plan which will insure prompt completion of negotiations in all areas will also have the effect of giving the sugar producers, whether cane or beet, an opportunity to plan their 1947 production.

"In the Tropics plantings begin in the fall for production 2 years following. If our purchases are not made in the West Indies promptly on a basis that will encourage production, then the fall plantings in those areas will fall far short of what they should be.

"As to going as far ahead as 1947, the situation is such that some kind of Government control, probably through purchase, must be envisaged in that year because world supplies will hardly equal the 1947 demand, to say nothing of the fact that it will take still longer to bring world visibles and invisibles back to normal.

"The urgency of the sugar supply situation is so great that no time should be lost in working out a positive, effective, intelligent program which will encourage maximum production in all areas. To fail so to do is to ask for more black markets, inflation, injury to many of our food processors, and great loss of employment, and to deny the needs of our people."

Address of Noah Van Cleef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, there is one plant in the Second Congressional District of Illinois that has had no strikes, no work stoppages, no delay in production during the war period. Recently the employees, as a pledge of their continued loyalty, presented the management of Van Cleef Bros. with a bronze plaque. In accepting this gift from the employees, Mr. Noah Van Cleef, one of the executives, outlined the policy of cooperation in their industry. Among other things he said:

Today's meeting will ever be an outstanding one in the minds of the members of the firm. Your presentation of a beautiful bronze plaque as a tribute of your loyalty to the interests of the firm came as a complete surprise. The thirty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of this business could not have been commemorated in a more impressive way so far as the members of the firm are concerned. An event of this kind is most unusual. First, it is exceptional for any firm to remain uninterruptedly and successfully in business under the same management for 35 years and, second, to have employees spontaneously and solely of their own accord indicate in such an impressive way their high regard for the firm. Speaking for the firm, we shall continue to spare no effort to maintain at all times the wonderfully fine personnel relations which exist between Van Cleef Bros. and the entire staff regardless of position held. So long as the present spirit of both firm and workers is maintained, we have nothing to fear for the future.

The reports of progress made by the club as usual give all of us pleasure and encouragement. This should be of special interest to newcomers to whom many of our personnel policies must seem unusual and attractive. It does not take them long to catch the spirit of loyalty from those who have been with the firm for many years.

It may be of interest to you to know what the general situation is with reference to markets as they affect this business. Recently I had occasion to be both in Washington and in New York where I went for the purpose of conferring with Government officials and with suppliers. In spite of the ending of hostilities in Europe, there has been no easing at all in demand for textiles of the type we use. While the demand for certain kinds of combat matériel has lessened, the things required for the personal use of the armed forces are needed to almost the same extent as was the case while the fighting was still raging on the European front. It must be borne in mind that clothing, food, medical supplies, and other types of maintenance articles are needed by the vast forces which will remain engaged until the end of the Japanese War.

The various bureaus at Washington contend with complicated problems and often make errors of judgment which have a very unfavorable effect on the production of goods. This is a condition which often leads to "black markets." We have been very fortunate in having had a reasonably good flow of materials secured through regular channels which has enabled us to keep operating steadily. We have watched markets so closely and have kept ourselves so well informed on regulations that rarely have we been confronted with the necessity of holding up production of any specific item. Occasionally due to transportation conditions or changes of specifications by the Government short delays have occurred, but because of our flexible operating policy there has been no lost time for any of our workers. If, perchance, a delay has occurred preventing a man from operating one machine, he immediately has been put on another one. This is in contrast to the working conditions in other places where men sometimes are laid off when something has happened to prevent them from operating the machine to which they have been regularly assigned.

Since our last meeting we have had VE-day. On that occasion there was a temptation to celebrate, and it certainly was a day of joy, but we operated our office and plant throughout the day and everyone conducted himself beautifully. It was realized that the war was less than half over and that intensive efforts must still be made before victory could be proclaimed.

You showed a fine spirit in working on all holidays throughout the year (Christmas excepted). That was the desire of the armed forces. A day off would have been pleasant; everyone enjoys leisure and so would the boys in the fox holes. The least we can do is to forego personal pleasures while helping the men at the front to win battles. We must take a broad point of view, grit our teeth, and see things through to the end.

Although the European part of the war is over, that does not mean half of the war is over. Japan is very far away and it requires almost three times the effort to maintain contact with the enemy. We shall need far more than half of the present total force to complete the task of defeating Japan. Because it takes so much longer for supplies to reach the Pacific theater of operations, much more matériel must be in transit at all times than was the case when we were also fighting across the Atlantic. This emphasizes the importance of our not permitting any relaxation in our war efforts.

There is bound to be a postwar period and naturally everybody is anxious about its effect on him. Industry is going at top speed now because of the war, but that is not a natural kind of activity. If we were given the choice of inactivity and no war, or great activity and war, we would choose the former condition. In our own specific case the postwar period has no terrors for us. We shall not need to pause for any special preparation to enable us to proceed with making everything we produced in the prewar period. Most of the items which we discontinued manufacturing solely on account of governmental war regulations will still be in great demand after the war has ended and we shall be in position to meet such demands without delay, thus maintaining sales activity at a high rate.

Recently, everyone who was on the pay roll on April 1, 1945, received a little memorandum indicating how much 3 percent of his wages earned from November 1, 1942, to that date would equal. Since then, there has been an additional accumulation, not only for them, but for those who have come with the firm since April 1, last. This is the amount which will be paid out when the Japanese War comes to a conclusion and permission from the Government has been received to do so.

The total now amounts to about $35,000, and of course, it will grow until hostilities come to a close. That is a very tidy sum to be distributed to those who have indicated their loyalty to the firm by remaining steadily on the job.

Let us all work diligently together.

Shortage of Farm Labor in the Territory of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we were doing more about the current and prospective sugar shortage in this country. The Hawaiian sugar crop for this year is at least 50,000 tons short for lack of manpower in the islands. Our Filipino friends have a surplus of manpower and are in need of employment. It is my understanding that several thousand of them now wish to go to Hawaii to assist in increasing our sugar production. Under proper arrangements it seems to me this would be an excellent idea and one mutually beneficial. On this subject, and to make same a matter of record, I insert the following resolution:

Resolution endorsing the request of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association for the importation of 6,000 Filipinos from the Philippines to Hawaii in order to relieve shortage of farm labor in the Territory

Whereas we the undersigned, representing approximately 52,000 Filipinos who are now lawfully residing in the Territory of Hawaii, do hereby wish to state that the said Filipinos in the Territory have determined to reside therein permanently; and

Whereas we know definitely that a great number of the Filipinos working in various sugar and pineapple plantations have left their jobs and transferred themselves to various jobs and positions offered by the Government in furtherance of the war effort, with the purpose of expediting the ultimate victory which is our main goal; and

Whereas in view of the transfer of these Filipinos from the plantations to essential war industries that a great shortage of farm labor is now being felt by the sugar and pineapple plantations; and

Whereas the inhabitants of Hawaii are greatly concerned in the progress and stability of the main Hawaiian industries, namely, sugar and pineapple, because they depend on them for their subsistence and general welfare; and

Whereas while this Global War is going on in the Pacific area, and reparations and rehabilitations are taking place in Europe and the various countries now occupied by the Allied forces, the need of sugar and pineapple is becoming more and more acute; and

Whereas we are of the opinion that the importation of 6,000 laborers from the Philippines to Hawaii will greatly relieve thousands of distressed families in the Philippines and at the same time will also relieve the shortage of farm labor in the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members and chairmen of the various committees of the delegation to Washington, D. C., from the Territorial Filipino Council of Hawaii, after thorough consideration and thoughtful deliberation of the situation, and in conformity with the desire and wishes of our respective constituents, and in their behalf, do hereby wish to register our undivided support and endorsement to the request made by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association to the Secretary of the Interior for the importation of 6,000 Filipinos from the Philippines to the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Philippines, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, Governor Ingram Stainback of the Territory of Hawaii, Secretary of the Interior, Attorney General of the United States, Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Asosciation, Honolulu, Hawaii; Mr. Ernest Greene, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Washington, D. C.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be spread in the minutes of the Territorial Filipino Council at its next regular meeting, and furthermore, copies be sent to all Filipino publications in the Territory, including the Honolulu Star Bulletin, the Honolulu Advertiser and all Filipino newspapers in the United States.

Adopted on this 19th day of June 1945, in the city of Washington, D. C.

Respectfully submitted for the Territorial Filipino Council delegation:

PHILIP P. GAMPONIA,
Chairman, Committee on Political Status of Filipinos.
CAYETANO R. LIGOT,
Chairman, Committee on Economics.
JUAN S. REGALA,
Chairman, Committee on Labor.
FORTUNATO G. TEHO,
Chairman, Committee on Education.
JOSEPHINE E. GAMPONIA,
Chairman, Committee on Welfare.

The First Marines—And Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of July 7, 1945:

THE FIRST MARINES—AND OTHERS

After the Army's First Infantry Division had engaged in bloody carving matches with the Germans in Africa and Sicily, newspaper correspondents remarked to Maj. Gen. Terry Allen, its commander in those offensives, that they'd never seen an outfit that could grouse and gripe, between engagements, like the First. General Allen replied that an army that doesn't gripe can't fight either, and that he always was happy when there was plenty of full-fledged griping and grousing in his outfits—whether it was about other outfits, about going home, the food, the sergeant, the colonel, the general, or just anything that came up.

The grousing and griping between men of various World War I fighting outfits over which had the toughest combats, the longest service, and did the best fighting started with the armistice in 1918 and hasn't ended yet. It never will. And now there's a lot of it going on between and about and by divisions of World War II. The lull for European divisions has given them a chance to draw up their official records and tell themselves and everyone else just who did what. The only trouble is there's considerable disagreement in some quarters.

For example, the Army's Thirty-fourth Infantry Division, the second in this war to start training in Louisiana—at Camp Claiborne—announces quite unequivocally in the April 17 issue of Stars and Stripes that it has had the longest period of continuous service in combat of any American outfit of any kind anywhere. (In Italy.) It claims 500 continuous combat days as of last April 16. The Army's Thirty-second Infantry claimed 595 days of combat as of about the same date—in the Pacific. The Thirty-fourth waves all the Pacific divisions aside as actually ineligible for competition, saying island invasions don't count in combat longevity records because of the lull between the invasions. The First and Third Marines—famous Pacific outfits—can't equal the Thirty-fourth's record by putting their records together—says the Thirty-fourth. (You marines understand clearly that we are not saying this.)

There's going to be some real grousing and griping when these various claims get together, but right now a lot of members of the First Marine Division are aiming their current complaints at the Times—and with justification. Inadvertently a recent editorial praising the Marine Corps as handling certain phases of its war work more efficiently than the Army, and particularly the First Marines, also said that this division had returned to the United States after Guadalcanal. It never returned as a division, though of course many of its men have come back and many are back now. And many others will never come back from Guadalcanal or other bloody islands on which it has fought in a manner to write new marine records of glory and courage. How many casualties and how many replacements the First Marine Division has had is not known here—but its casualties were terrific. The Thirty-fourth lists about 80 percent replacements. The Thirty-second is said to have had more men out of combat by fever than by bullets and to have been substantially replaced numerically by now. Some European divisions claim over 100 percent casualties.

But, 19 First Division marines have taken time out from killing Japs on Okinawa, three more of the First Marines have sent letters from a naval ordnance base in Oklahoma, and several more of the original First Marines have written from elsewhere in this country to explain that the First never has come back to this country as a division, since it sailed early in 1942 and invaded Guadalcanal on August 7 of that year. To set the record entirely straight, we gladly print the following excerpts from the joint letter of 19 First Division marines on Okinawa:

"After the Guadalcanal operation the First Marine Division went to Australia in January 1943 to train for their next blitz. In September 1943 this division invaded Cape Gloucester and after securing that island were garrisoned on Pavuvu in the Russell Islands, which is nothing more than a fungus festoon. After reorganizing and further training on this mosquitoed, rat, crab, fungus-infested island this division took Pelelieu from the Japs in one of the bloodiest campaigns of the Pacific. The division was then returned to the 'sunny Pacific isle' of Pavuvu for further training, and on April 1, 1945, we were one of the spearheads of the Okinawa invasion. In a short time, we will be readying ourselves for the next operation, which we hope will be the last.

"In short, the First Marine Division has never seen the United States since 1942, and what is more, we don't expect to until Japan surrenders unconditionally."

As to the claims of the Army Thirty-fourth Division, which landed in the north Africa invasion in November 1942 and wound up at the end of the war in northern Italy, we present the following excerpt from a Stars and Stripes article by Sgt. Jack Foisle,

correspondent with the Fifth Army for that service paper:

"By five-hundredth day of combat, the Thirty-fourth means that it has commanded a sector, with component units, committed to action, for a length of time covering that many days. No other division can make that claim. The Third and Forty-fifth Infantry Divisions come nearest. Due to the type of fighting in the Pacific, where there are layovers between island invasions, even the veteran troops in that region can't claim first place.

"By this reckoning, the Thirty-fourth has had more days in the line than the famed First and Third Marine Divisions both put together, according to figures released by the Marine Public Relations in New York."

Regardless of the claims, there is no finer evidence of morale in an army than loyalty of fighters to their outfit—whether to company, regiment, division, or army. And those outside have their favorite outfits, too; ours are all Marine divisions, starting with the First; all of the approximately 75 Army divisions, all Navy outfits, the air forces of every branch of the fighting service, the Seabees, Coast Guard, and all others.

New OPA Ration Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, under the unanimous consent granted me, I had placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A3102, an editorial from the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of April 23. I placed this editorial in the RECORD because it cited a statement made by the Honorable James A. Farley in an address he recently made before the Milwaukee Junior Chamber of Commerce. The editorial of the New Bedford paper made some comments with reference to the new ration book to be issued by the OPA. The OPA takes issue with the statement, and in order to keep the record straight I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in my remarks the letter written to me by Mr. James G. Rogers, Jr., Acting Administrator of the OPA, which I believe will clear the OPA's position. The letter reads as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1945.
The Honorable THAD F. WASIELEWSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WASIELEWSKI: On June 27, under extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you had printed an editorial from the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of April 23 in which it was stated that the Office of Price Administration was having a ration book printed to cover a 24-month period following its issuance, which was offered as evidence of the fact that the OPA intended to perpetuate rationing at least 2 years into the future.

Both the facts and the deductions made from them in this case are mistaken. The new ration book will be only half the size of any previous ration book, and will be designed for 1 year only. In working out the design for this new book we not only have limited our prospects for rationing out of the book to 1 year but have, in the course of doing so, saved about $700,000 in printing cost and hundreds of thousands of pounds of valuable paper in comparison with the production of previous ration books.

Since no one seems able at the present to predict when the end of the Japanese War will come; and since, even if this were possible, no one can now predict when supplies of scarce commodities will become plentiful we cannot now determine when rationing will end. I can assure you, however, that rationing will be abandoned product by product as soon as it can be done without a considerable degree of consumer hardship. No one looks forward more eagerly to the day when wartime rationing and price regulations will be abandoned than those who are in charge of the OPA.

I do not know whether you will care to enter this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to correct the misinformation given unwittingly in the previous entry. If you care to do so, I shall greatly appreciate it.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. ROGERS,
Acting Administrator.

International Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a short address I delivered before the parent-teachers association of my district on international cooperation:

I am happy to appear before an association that has done so much for the education of the boys and girls of Virginia. While our public school system, perhaps, is in a stronger position today than ever before, there is much work to be done before Virginia takes her rightful place among the progressive educational States in the Union. I know you will carry on until this great goal has been reached.

I shall only detain you for a few minutes. If I were as laconic as President Coolidge, who, when asked what he thought about sin, replied, "I'm ag'n it," I would simply say in answer to the question, "What do you think of international cooperation?" "I'm for it." Yes; I am for it mind, heart, and soul, because I believe the fate of mankind depends upon international cooperation and good will.

A representative democracy, such as we enjoy, is based upon cooperation. It believes that men, if they will cooperate and work together, have the capacity to govern themselves through their chosen representatives. And the capacity of men to rightly govern themselves depends—absolutely depends—upon knowledge. An educated democracy will ever be a cooperative, well-governed democracy that is willing to submit all controversies to the decision of the majority. Education gives the people a knowledge and insight into the problems of society, it furnishes them with facts upon which to intelligently build, and it gives them the vision to translate those facts into government by cooperatively abiding by the will of the majority. While ignorance is the food upon which dictators fatten, education is the food upon which democratic government is sustained.

It was the cooperative spirit that first brought the American colonies together under the Articles of Confederation. Knowledge, gained chiefly through education and experience, that they had not as yet cooperated together—that they had not as yet united together—as closely as they should, led the American people, in order to further promote the general welfare of all, to abandon the restricted cooperation of the Articles of Confederation and substitute in its place the great cooperative document, known as the American Constitution, the greatest governmental paper yet devised by man in his struggle to regulate society.

The cooperative spirit is the underlying principle that has made it possible for 48 sovereign States to come together under a central sovereign head and work and cooperate together for the common welfare of all.

If Tennyson's vision of the time when "the war drums throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furled, in the parliament of man, the Federation of the World" ever comes true, and I believe that it will, it will come through international cooperation and good will.

Cooperation is the spirit that has been the foundation upon which society from the tribal unit all the way up to the national unit has been established. And the only way that spirit can take on international proportions is by the nations of the earth realizing that international cooperation is the only way the peace, happiness, and general welfare of all can be promoted. Centuries of costly blood-earned educational experience have, I now believe, brought most of the nations of the earth to such a realization.

I have not lost faith in the genius of man to continue to work out problems of government. The process at times may be slow. Discouragements come. Set-backs come. And yet, the spark of international cooperation and good will among the nations of the earth has survived every discouragement, triumphed over every set-back, and today permeates the hearts and minds of a greater number of men and women than at any other time in the history of the world.

The challenge to this generation is to bring the spirit of international cooperation and good will to fruition in such a way that it will promote the general welfare of all and guarantee a just and lasting peace among the nations of the earth. Let us act the part of real men and women, cooperative, God-fearing, peace-loving courageous men and women; men and women who are not afraid to shoulder the responsibilities of their day and accept the challenge.

Classification of Residents of the Territories as Dependent People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a suggestion appearing in a newspaper article that the San Francisco Charter provided the United States would be required to report from time to time on conditions in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico prompted Delegate J. R. FARRINGTON, of Hawaii, to seek an opinion on this from Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG. I am happy to say that Senator VANDENBERG has unequivocally rejected any interpretation of the language of the Charter which would classify the residents of the Territories as dependent peoples. Alaskans and Hawaiians and Puerto Ricans

are residents of the United States in the same sense as are residents of the several States. These Territories are part of the United States and, obviously, the conduct of their affairs is an internal problem of the United States, and not subject to any outside intervention or even inspection. I think Delegate FARRINGTON has performed a very useful service in presenting this matter, and Senator VANDENBERG has made it clear beyond all question that the proposition of trusteeship does not involve Territories of the United States.

[From the New York Times]

REPORTS ON DEPENDENT PEOPLES

SAN FRANCISCO, June 21, 1945.—The Conference established the principle that any nation administering territory whose people are not wholly independent and are not members of the United Nations should make reports to an international agency on the conditions and progress of those so-called dependent peoples.

This has been done before for territories which were mandates under the League of Nations, but never before in history have all the major administering powers of the world agreed to follow a code of conduct for all dependent peoples and to make reports on all those peoples to a central international agency. Under this agreement, for example, the United States would agree to report to the new league on conditions in Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 28, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: During the course of the Conference of United Nations at San Francisco statements were made from time to time indicating that some persons believed that the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska come within the meaning of the word "territories" as used in the Charter that was approved by the Conference.

By way of illustration, I am enclosing a clipping from the New York Times of Thursday, June 21, that has recently been brought to my attention.

I have examined the document and followed the proceedings as closely as is possible for me to do so, but find nothing that would justify this interpretation. My understanding is that "the territories" is used in the Charter for purposes of describing certain areas rather than a form of government as it is presumably used in reference to Alaska and Hawaii.

I feel, nevertheless, that it is very important from the standpoint of our future in the Territory of Hawaii that this point be thoroughly clarified, and am, therefore, addressing this letter to you. I want to know specifically whether there is anything in this agreement that contemplates that report should be made to any agency of the United Nations Organization concerning the Territory of Hawaii that implies that the Territory's status is that of a dependency rather than an integral part of this country.

I am addressing this letter to you not only as one of our delegates to the Conference, but as you are a member of the Committee on Territories and unusually well acquainted with our problems.

In closing, I would like to congratulate you on your excellent speech, as a delegate, which I had the privilege of hearing you make in the Senate Friday.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 2, 1945.

Hon. J. R. FARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: This will reply to your letter of June 28.

I fully understand how you feel about any possibility of an interpretation of the language in the San Francisco Charter which would classify Hawaii as a dependency subject to any sort of special obligation to the new international organization. It never remotely occurred to me that the language in the trusteeship chapter of the Charter could refer to Hawaii or Alaska by any stretch of the imagination until I read some of these newspaper comments to the contrary. I immediately made a very blunt statement on the subject to the American delegation, and I believe it is our unanimous opinion that Hawaii and Alaska are not included and cannot be included within any such jurisdiction as that to which you refer.

I shall be very glad to have this phase of the matter explicitly covered in the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In the meantime I suggest that you ask Commander Stassen for his interpretation, inasmuch as he had more to do with the trusteeship chapter than any other member of the American delegation.

I want to make it plain for myself that I totally agree with your point of view, and you are at liberty to quote me in any way you wish.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Cordially and faithfully,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

Travel Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, curtailment of railroad travel is a serious blow to New Hampshire and to all those States where income from recreational industry is an important part of their livelihood. Rail travel accommodations have been drastically curtailed for the duration of the transportation emergency caused by the travel of troops from the eastern seaboard to the west coast. Since the income from recreational industry yields an important part of the earnings of New Hampshire people, the cancellation of seasonal train service is a severe handicap. However, the need for Pullman equipment for military travel has been evident for some time. To see long troop trains coming into Washington from the South crowded with soldiers riding in old, obsolete coaches on a hot July afternoon is reason enough for some of the orders which are being belatedly put into effect. New Hampshire will get along cheerfully without its seasonal trains and expects only the same treatment accorded other regions. It will, of course, expect that the spirit of the orders will be carried out throughout the country without discrimination or favoritism. If the Administrator of ODT treats all regions alike, New Hampshire will not complain. It appears that Colonel Johnson intends to follow this procedure.

There have been many complaints concerning the reduction in convention travel. Certainly no organizations in America are more convention-minded than are the national veterans' organizations. One of the means by which these bodies refresh themselves, mend their fences, and rejuvenate their programs and their services is through the many conventions, State and national, which are held annually throughout the country. These were hard hit by travel restrictions. Critical of orders barring these conventions, they have watched carefully the conditions justifying the drastic regulations.

The following editorial appears in the July 12 issue of the Stars and Stripes. It summarizes the point of view so well taken by informed veterans' groups throughout the country that it will merit reading by all of us who are interested in this difficult problem:

During the past several weeks the National Tribune has been receiving reports of streamlined State meetings of the major veterans' organizations. Along with these have come many letters from department adjutants that tell of mass confusion because the national bodies, still hopeful of holding some sort of annual conventions, have been unable to guide or advise their subordinate units. From midsummer through fall each year it has been customary to hold these gatherings, and they are indeed a worthwhile institution.

Regardless of the ban clamped down by the Office of Defense Transportation on meetings to be attended by more than 50 persons, hope still runs high that by some miracle the redeployment of troops from Europe to the Pacific area will be so directed that by late fall or early winter existing restrictions will be relaxed. Being convention addicts, we plead guilty to having also entertained such notions. Those conventions are something. They are well worth hoping for, and there is something stimulating in meeting with old comrades and fighting the wars all over again. We, with others, have been inclined to think that "Rowboat" Johnson, ODT director, was something of a wet rag even though we know him to be as solid a veteran as ever wore shoes.

But when we picked up our dispatches the other day and read the well-founded gripes of 500 of our veterans of European battles who had to spend 5 days in vermin-infested day coaches crossing our fair land to California while civilians and even prisoners of war rode Pullmans, we sort of found ourselves. We agreed to their complaint that this was not fair, and, looking into statistics a little, we determined that this guy Johnson knew what he was talking about after all. It looks as if national conventions and some State meets are completely out of order for a long time to come whether the war in the Pacific lasts weeks or months, whether the Nips fight on until we burn them out or whether they get sensible and fold up.

Here is enough of what we found to make most veterans agree to stay home for the time being. During the next few months, transportation facilities will be subjected to a strain greater than anything so far experienced in the course of a war that demanded the seemingly impossible from railroads. According to official Washington, the shifting of troops, plus essential travel, will push passenger travel 10 percent above last year's record level, and there is little prospect of much replacement of strained and crumbling railway equipment. The country has seen 4

years of marvelous transport performance, such as carrying a 1944 load of 730 billion ton-miles of freight in addition to a highly abnormal passenger burden, but this is nothing as compared to what lies ahead.

With travel facilities for civilians greatly reduced and the Army taking over anywhere from 75 percent up of the less than 7,000 Pullman cars available, many trains must be taken from regular schedules to handle 3,000,000 soldiers who will be landed at east coast ports before next March. Nearly 400,000 will arrive this month, and this number is expected to increase monthly by fall. Most of them must be carried 3,000 miles across the country. Meantime, they will be sent to camps for regrouping and retraining after brief furloughs, then sent to staging areas on the west coast for transshipment to the war against Japan. An equivalent of 20,000,000 of service men must be moved. In addition, the railroads will be called upon to accommodate comfortably as many as 40,000 casualties a month. They must transport a million new inductees within the next 12 months. There will always be, in addition, some thousands of essential civilian travelers, and those hundreds of billions of ton-miles of freight will also need to move over the rails.

What it took 4 years to get to the European front, most of it from the East and Midwest over scores of trunk lines, must now be moved westward over seven transcontinental single-track railroads in an anticipated 10 months, and added to it will be 40 percent more of war machines, ammunition and other matériel. During that time, there will be an anticipated 300,000 to 400,000 service men and women on leave at all times, and there will have to be met the need to transport food and warmth to the civilian population and all else required to maintain the domestic economy. Statistically, it is impossible to do what must be done.

It is evident that as transportation approaches peak levels, travel congestion must keep pace. No normal travel will be available for many months to come. It is already far above the saturation point. The ban on conventions has saved 6 percent travel as compared with 1944, a mere drop in the bucket, vital as it has been.

So much for figures and facts. Old soldiers who never die would not mind too much the certain delays, discomforts and hardships attendant upon possible 1945 conventions because there is something about those meetings that gets in the blood. The young-old boys would take their chances about getting home, once there, but surely they will not want to have any part in causing unnecessary hardships to the men who are fighting the rest of their war for them. They would not knowingly hinder the war effort nor lengthen for a minute the promised victory over Japan. We have had worse commanders, both State and national, than are now in office. Even if incumbents must remain at the helm for a few added months, the great veteran work will not unduly suffer. On top of that, our friend Johnson says there is just not enough space for convention travel, and we have learned that he knows whereof he speaks.

Misleading Figures on Cattle Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have heard a great deal about the immense cattle population of this country. The figures which have been used, however, have not generally differentiated between beef cattle and dairy cattle. A recent issue of the Live Stock Producer calls attention to this fact and, under leave to extend my remarks, I have included the following editorial statement from the current issue of that publication:

"Figures are available in Washington which show that the percentage of beef cattle has declined from about 57 percent of a 70,000,000 cattle population in 1920 to around 50 percent of a cattle population of 82,000,000 in 1944," it is stated.

"In 1920, we had somewhat more than 40,100,000 beef cattle in the United States while, in 1944, the total reached 41,300,000. In the meantime, moreover, the population of the country had increased from 105,000,000 to nearly 139,000,000. Hence, our beef cattle population has declined from 382 head per thousand persons in 1920 to 297 head per thousand persons in 1944. In the same period, the percentage of increase in dairy cattle numbers from 30,200,000 in 1920 to 40,800,000 in 1944 is practically the same as that of the increase in population."

A Legal Barrier to Farm Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "A Legal Barrier to Farm Independence," which appeared in the July 1, 1945, edition of the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky. This editorial graphically presents the hindrances imposed by a congressional strait-jacket limiting the operations of the Bankhead-Jones Act, approved July 22, 1937, and at the same time points to the remedy which could be found to this impediment through the enactment of House Joint Resolution 216, to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., of the House Committee on Agriculture. As the Courier-Journal editorial states, here is one program of public financing in which nobody loses, everybody gains—in better production, better standards of living, better communities, greater incentive, and security. The State of Kentucky, as well as many other States, would derive great benefit from the enactment of House Joint Resolution 216, and I am hopeful that this measure will be brought before the House for consideration and action in the immediate future.

A LEGAL BARRIER TO FARM INDEPENDENCE

Kentucky, with other agricultural States, has suffered for 5 years from the constrictions of a congressional strait-jacket which has limited the growth and impaired the vitality of a great agency for independence and security.

The agency is the Bankhead-Jones Act, which was designed to attack the blight of farm tenancy by enabling competent but landless farmers to become owners of land. The strait-jacket is the so-called Tarver amendment, continued each year since 1941, which forbade loans under the act to buy farms of greater value than the average farm unit of 30 acres more in the county where it is situated.

This means that the poor, inadequate and unsuccessful farms, the wasted lands still barely arable, and abandoned and unwanted failures, must be counted along with the good land to calculate the average. Thus it means that the average becomes too low to buy a farm from which a man may make a living while earning enough besides to pay off the loan.

In Kentucky, the extension of this program is all but stopped because of the legislative restriction, and aid is sought for an attempt, now in Congress, to remove it. The hope for the landless lies in adoption of House Joint Resolution 216, by Representative FLANNAGAN, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, which would make the average measure for loans not that of all farms, bad or good, but "the average of efficient family type farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

The need of this change is demonstrated by reports that suitable land cannot be purchased in 75 Kentucky counties under the limits imposed by the old restrictive amendment. In 35 counties the average value of farm units is under $2,000, dragged down by poor and uneconomic farms which would defeat the very purpose of a man struggling however heroically to live on and pay for the land. In the appropriation bill for 1946 an effort to overcome the blight of the Tarver amendment was undertaken with a provision adopted to add 15 percent to the average value. But this was found to be too small an addition.

Such arbitrary destruction of the program would be little short of tragic, for this venture of making independent farmers out of the landless has proved itself over and over. So carefully are the tenants selected for the loans by local committees, so scrupulous are the plans of farm and home management prepared and supervised through the Farm Security Administration to go along with each contract and assure an adequate return, that of 900 loans made to Kentucky tenants since the program began in 1937, there has been but one foreclosure and only two borrowers are delinquent—and they are expected by their supervisors to catch up. Forty borrowers have paid out entirely, although the term of the contract is 40 years—and last year payments were 417 percent of installments due.

Here is one program of public financing in which nobody loses, everybody gains—in better production, better standards of living, better communities, greater incentive and security. With soldiers returning, many of them looking to the land for their future, it is a program that must be broadened, not handicapped.

Resolution on Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, since I believe it goes to the very root of some of the most compelling arguments against a system of peacetime conscription, I am including with my remarks a resolution recently adopted by

the Central Labor Council of Los Angeles:

Whereas military peacetime conscription as a defense measure can be seriously questioned when free America, in conjunction with her allies has destroyed what was called the strongest military machine of all ages; and

Whereas the peacetime compulsory armies of the Axis Powers are proving inadequate against the mechanized military forces of free America; and

Whereas the results of the inventive genius of America so successfully used in the war against aggressor nations are the results of American citizens maintaining complete freedom in peacetime; and

Whereas the strength of a free nation cannot be necessarily measured by its military might; and

Whereas history reveals that the economies of dictatorial nations based upon military expenditures usually decay on the inside; and

Whereas history further discloses that a peacetime conscripted army has a tendency to aid the decay; and

Whereas William Green, president of the AFL, has made public statements opposing peacetime conscription: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles Central Labor Council go on record supporting the stand of President Green against peacetime conscription; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to United States Senators from California and district United States Representatives from California.

Adopted in regular session by the Los Angeles Central Labor Council this 2d day of July 1945.

W. J. BASSETT, *Secretary*.

Subversive Publications Seek to Destroy National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision by the United States Supreme Court in the matter of Esquire Magazine, clearly shows the limits imposed on the Post Office in banning from the mails matters which are scurrilous or obscene.

You may recall that for some time past, I have urged the House to take the necessary steps to make certain that the Post Office Department bar from the mails publications which would tend to foment racial or religious hatred and intolerance.

Now more than ever a statute of this type is necessary. My attention has been called to a vicious little pamphlet being distributed through the mails and printed by the Hoosier Press in Indiana. The pamphlet is filled with vile lies gathered for the sole purpose of creating disunity among our people. The editor rehashes falsehoods which have been discredited time and again by eminent historians. For example, he quotes some anti-Semitic remarks supposed to have been made by Grant and Franklin.

The so-called Grant quotation is from an order which was issued by military command apparently by error and which General Grant very promptly canceled. President Lincoln, when his attention was called to the order, sent a rebuke to the officers who were responsible for it and specifically pointed out that there was no reason or foundation of any kind for such order.

This story is told in full in Lincoln's biography by Carl Sandburg, as well as in the Grant biography by W. E. Woodward.

One would think that by this time no one would revive this unsavory story, but apparently a mere denial or rejection of a myth will not prevent it from being revived by unscrupulous persons who do not care whether the statements they make are true or false—just as long as they serve their fiendish purpose.

Now as to the Franklin quotation it comes directly from Joseph Goebbels' lie factory and was published for the first time in the United States in Dudley Pelley's Liberation.

Carl Van Doren, who wrote the definitive biography of Benjamin Franklin, denies the story completely and it is really a mystery how this so-called speech ever found its way into literature.

I suppose Mr. Goebbels, being angry at Benjamin Franklin for his dislike of the Germans, since Benjamin Franklin said that he could not trust the Germans because they were not accustomed to liberty, twisted the story around and made up a speech in which Franklin was supposed to have maligned the Jews. Of course, no such speech was ever delivered.

The term "Asiatics," which is supposed to have been used by Franklin, surely did not mean to the American era of 1776 what it means today.

OTHER QUOTATIONS ANALYZED

A quotation from some silly book written by one Samuel Roth is too ridiculous to be dignified by an answer. He also quotes from a magazine article in 1928, in which some picayune writer saw fit to boast about Jewish influence on the stage and in the churches.

These quotations are headed under the title "The Jews Admit Their Own Guilt."

Quotations from other writers are in the same style. The author tries to besmirch Jewish patriotism and tries to show that Jews are not patriotic, misquoting from many authors or tearing sentences out of their context, which reminds me very much of the story as to how somebody tried to prove from the Bible that there is no God.

He quoted one of the Psalms, which reads:

The fool said in his heart, "There is no God."

Now, the person who quoted it took the last part without the first part, and in this way this clever compiler quotes from all kinds of statements the most heterogeneous kind of material just to prove that the Jews are no good.

He quotes from "Jesus Christ's" statements, which, of course, are addressed to everybody, and since Jesus Christ necessarily spoke to Jews, he tries to prove by that that the Jews are no good.

Of course, if Jesus Christ were to speak to Turks, Frenchmen, Romans, or Americans, He would make these remarks applicable to those nations, and it is blasphemous in the extreme to make statements like this apply to Jews alone.

In order to make sure that he covers everybody, the author quotes Jewish statements against the Catholic Church, but, at the same time, he is careful enough not to quote any statements by Martin Luther against the Catholic Church, but selects from Luther only remarks which could be addressed against the Jewish religion, and he does not hesitate to quote Mohammed against the Jews, but forgets that Mohammed said the same things about the Christians.

He twisted some remarks by Cardinal Hayes, who was always a friend of the Jews, into making it appear that the cardinal had meant the Jews when he said that the theaters were reeking with filth. To the author of this book, "theaters" means "Jews."

Then, of course, he is trying to show that millions of Jews are entering the United States, which is preposterously ridiculous because under our quota law not more than 150,000 aliens can enter the United States from all countries and of course 150,000 is a long way under "millions."

As a matter of fact, in the last 10 years the quotas were never filled and transportation difficulties have kept American quotas way below the authorized 150,000.

The author also speaks in one place of the Jewish attempt to swamp the United States, and particularly uses this phrase, "Jew refugees see a great opportunity in America. They can take the places of our men while they are in the armed forces."

They do not realize apparently that every refugee, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, who enters the United States and is of military age immediately joins our Army and that thousands of refugees have not only served in our armed forces, but have received decorations for bravery in practically every battle or engagement. But, this is the way of all "special pleaders." They can only see their own way and what does not suit them simply is not mentioned.

Evidently, the author does not know that the whole number of Jews remaining in Europe today, after the Nazi butcheries, is less than a million.

Judging by the viciousness with which the editor goes about spreading these known falsehoods I do not for a moment think that my calling his attention to the true facts in the case will make any difference to him or his followers. The only reason I bothered to discuss the pamphlet and its scurrilous contents is to call the attention of the House to the type of literature which is being distributed through the mails. It is peculiar that a department which seems so much concerned about the morals of the reading public should permit such filth to go through the mails. It is also surprising that the Congressional Committee on un-American Activities should pay so little attention to such obviously subversive activities while it deems it necessary to go all the way out to Hollywood to find out about supposedly subversive elements who are undermining the morals of our children.

I do not care who takes the appropriate steps to stop filthy publications like the pamphlet mentioned from further circulation, whether it be the Post Office Department or the Committee on Un-American Activities, but I hope that some action is taken soon so as to stop further disruption of our national unity.

Americanism—These Truths Are Self-Evident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Howard W. Jackson, former mayor of Baltimore, entitled "Americanism—These Truths Are Self-Evident":

My subject for today, "Americanism," was assigned to me by my friends Phil Morgan and Mike Towner. Fortunately, it is one on which I have placed concentrated thought and effort for the past 10 years—and one which has taken on the utmost importance for Americans who are determined to keep their system of government and their way of life. A quarter of a century ago, the American citizen pretty well knew the definition of Americanism, but today the thinking of even our most solid citizens has become confused and has wandered from the strict and original meaning of Americanism as it was meant to be. In the words of James Madison, "It is proper to take alarms at the first experiment on our liberites."

One hundred sixty-nine years ago tomorrow, the representatives of the people of America wrote and signed, for the whole world to see, a Declaration of Independence. Behind this magnificent document was a people's love of freedom and a better hatred for all forms of tyranny and dictatorship. On the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, we do well to reexamine its text. In that way, we shall see how far afield we have wandered from the principle and purpose laid down by our founding fathers. You will remember the simple dignity and beauty of that eloquent document: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." And that, "when a long train of abuses and usurpations evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security." A further reading of the Declaration reveals the various complaints of the American colonists against their tyrant George III. In this year of our Lord, 1945, how well might we echo some of those same complaints, for in the past dozen years, we, too, have seen erected a multitude of new offices with swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

We, too, have seen jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws and we have seen heavier peacetime taxes imposed upon us than we can bear without detriment to economic progress. We have seen the fundamental principles of American government violated time and time again. Every school child knows that the Constitution provides for three branches of government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Among these three there is meant to be a delicate balance—each to be a check upon the other. At no time must one encroach upon the other, but lately we have seen the balance all but lost and the fine mechanism of this governmental scale badly jangled. Undreamed of power has been vested in the executive branch, thus weakening the other two, and this move is one of the most dangerous we have made toward dictatorship. Congress is elected by the people to assume certain responsibilities. Those who fashioned our Constitution did not mean for Congress to delegate its powers to the executive branch or to bureaucrats. If Congress continues to delegate its constitutional powers to executive and bureaucratic Government officials, it will become no more than a name. Power-grabbing executives do not have to abolish Congress—they know a simpler way, and that is to get Congress to delegate them the powers they seek. Many Government agencies have taken all three branches of Government into their own hands—they are the lawmakers, the enforcers, and the judge and jury. The OPA hears its own cases and renders its own decisions. We are consistently moving toward a form of government foreign to American democracy. The advocates of a planned economy for America are gathering recruits. Government control has been steadily expanding, and its expansion began years before the tidal wave of total war broke over the world. Government control cannot be reconciled with Americanism as we know it.

True Americanism, once a strong and potent inspiration to initiative and opportunity, has been diluted by foreign ideologies to the point where it is becoming "neither flesh nor fowl nor good red herring." Americanism began with the aspiration of freedom-loving people to attain freedom. The early colonists bore bitter suffering with amazing fortitude—they bore the hunger, the cold, the nakedness, and the labor; they faced danger boldly and patiently, endured it all for the sake of individual liberty. As long ago as 1725 John Wise, of Massachusetts, wrote: "Government was never established by God or nature to give one man a prerogative to insult another. The end of all good government is to cultivate humanity and promote happiness for all and the good of every man in his rights, his liberty, his life, estate, and honor without injury or abuse to anyone."

Americanism is all of this—with the right of every individual to live his own life, worship his God as he sees fit, and to remain an humble tinker or to climb to the "stars" according to his ambition and his ability. Americanism is the right of the people to govern themselves—with government their servant and they the master. Americanism is progress—it is happiness and prosperity. Americanism has builded well. The proof of the strength of the American system is here for all to see from Canada to Mexico, from Sandy Hook to the Golden Gate—more than that, its proof lies in the arsenals of the Allied Nations and on every battlefield around the world. Riches beyond the dreams of the little band of colonists have made us the treasure house of the world; industry, commerce, education, literature, art, and philosophy have flourished under the American system; the brain and brawn of our people have developed under freedom and the untrammeled right of the American citizen to carve out his own destiny. It has become the custom to say, as we count the blessings divine providence has poured upon this Nation, that our industrial system has not been damaged by action of our armed enemies. That is wholly true. Yet there are ideas abroad in our land that would substitute "planning" for enterprise, decrees for initiative, paternalism for freedom, and a so-called security for the right to venture and to win or lose. Had "security" been the goal of the souls aboard her, the *Mayflower* would never have sailed. Had "security" been their first objective, the men who assembled in Philadelphia in 1776 would have issued no ringing declaration of the "inalienable rights" of men. We must retain our ancient landmarks and the principles which established them. By no other method can we guarantee to our returning soldiers the freedoms here for which they fought abroad. But Americanism, like any other government system, can function only when it is the sole system. Hitler himself said of national socialism that the democracies would have to go; that national socialism and democracies could not rule in the same world. Two different ideologies, two different systems, cannot function at the same time. Communism in Russia could not exist were there elements of democracy diluting it. The price of socialism is slavery, for socialism is communism that silently creeps. Socialism, or communism, proposes to own all the means of production, distribution, and transportation. This cannot be done without control by the socialistic government of all who produce, distribute, and transport. The result of trying to reconcile two diametrically opposed systems in one country is confusion, inefficiency, and, at its worst, civil war. Today—now—in our own country there are those in high places who are endeavoring to splice the tree of liberty and graft onto it ideas similar to those of communism, fascism, or socialism. One system must give way to the other. It is for us to say which shall survive here—which shall direct our destinies.

Many times lately we have heard or read of first-hand interviews with the conquered German people. All of them point out that the German has only one answer: "I couldn't help it. I'm a little man. It was the party; I had no say. I had to do as I was told." Should communism or fascism or any other ism overthrow our Americanism, what would our answer be? Could we in all conscience say, "We couldn't help it. We are little people. It was the party's fault; it was the fault of our leaders"? I'm afraid for us that would be no excuse, because the Constitution, thank God, is still intact, even though it has taken a beating in the recent past. We are still, if we care to take advantage of it, a self-governing people with all the right of petition, representation, and franchise. If catastrophe overtakes this Nation, it cannot be laid wholly at the door of our leaders, nor the Communist Party nor the Fascists nor to the propagandists of other ideologies working under ground and above ground. Storm warnings—such as the NRA; several attempts to limit individual incomes; proposal to change the Supreme Court; Earl Browder, former candidate for President on the Communist ticket, was satisfied with the candidate for President of one of the major parties last election; the recent meeting of Communists in Los Angeles, what the speakers said, and the designation of Los Angeles as the citadel of communism; the public declaration of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee of the CIO of its determination to control the next Congress and State legislatures; a recent decision of the Supreme Court against the Associated Press; House Military Committee in a preliminary report a few days ago stated that Communists bent on Marxist revolution seek to penetrate into the United States armed forces; the report further stated they are everywhere at work within this country—have been flown in the face of the American people for several years, and the blame can be laid only at the door of American citizenry as a whole. Moreover, the American public has itself to blame for its dependence

on Government. Whenever there is a difficult problem to be settled, or money is needed, we run to the Federal Government for aid. There was a day when we handled these matters from the local level, and by so doing kept our independence and our dignity.

Now, the spirit of independence is dead in the breast of many individuals—now it is easier to take the line of least resistance and say, "Let Government do it for us. We're paying taxes, aren't we?" You bet we are paying taxes and all we owe, we owe to ourselves, for we are the Government. The more we take from the Treasury to help ourselves, the more we must put back in interest and principal. One of our Representatives in the Congress said recently: "Never before have so many millions of our people been led to believe that although the people cannot support the Government (that is, must always run in debt) nevertheless, the Government can support the people. Deficit spending has become a national narcotic. Its victims have rationalized the Government printing press by saying, 'We owe us,' and, therefore, why worry about a debt which will soon average $10,000 per family." An utterance of Woodrow Wilson is worth repeating here. When the big Government planners tried to persuade him to impose wartime controls on peacetime America, he said, "I do not want to be taken care of by government, either directly or by any instruments through which government is acting. Give me right and justice and I will take care of myself." These words clash strangely against the promise of guaranteed full employment of which we have heard so much from the politicians. To be specific, we are told that 60,000,000 jobs should be guaranteed. Full employment has a fine sound—it is music to the ears of many who foresee security from the cradle to the grave. There is no use saying that government cannot provide and guarantee full employment, because it has been done and is being done in other countries. Germany did it, Italy did, and Russia has full employment under communism. In our own country, under wartime pressure, there is practically full employment—but even now we are paying the price—a price in suffering and death of thousands of young Americans; we are paying the price in rigid governmental control and restriction, but we are paying it willingly because we want again the kind of freedom that has made us strong.

Government can supply full employment, but the kind of government that can do it will not be our own, it will not be American democracy as we know it, it will not be Americanism but communism or fascism or some like regimentation instead. Let's look at the exact figures we have been given. Sixty million jobs. In the first place, is it necessary to have 60,000,000 jobs when we have only approximately 135,000,000 people in the country? This census includes children, aged, insane, incompetents, criminals, physically handicapped, men and women engaged in their own business, professional men and women, and women, who, after the war, want nothing more than to go back home and again take up the career of homemaker and mother.

But suppose, for the sake of argument, 60,000,000 jobs are created and guaranteed? Who will guarantee them? Who is going to balance production against manpower? Who will regulate centers of industry against worker supply in the area? Who will tell the machinists, riveters, glassmakers, carpenters, and metal workers and the others where they will be needed? Who is going to regulate prices and wages? A constant situation where we have more jobs than workers would have us juggling with inflation day after day. Sir William Beveridge, in his full-employment plan for Britain, answers the questions honestly—more honestly than those who advocate the same plan here. "Full employment cannot be won and held without a great extension of the responsibilities and powers of the state exercised through organs of the central government. No power less than that of the state can insure adequate total outlay at all times or can control, in the general interest, the location of industry and the use of the land. To ask for full employment while objecting to these extensions of state activity is to will the end and refuse the means." And there we have the answer—full employment cannot be guaranteed unless the Government takes control of business and economic life in this country. As we know already Government control means the death of all free competitive enterprise, the end of the open market, the end of labor unions, the end of individual ambition, the end of progress as we have known it. "Full employment" is a glamorous slogan for the politicians. It is full of promise and seems the ultimate answer to the third freedom—freedom from want. But the word "want" has more than one implication—Americans have always wanted freedom itself. They have wanted it so much that they have sacrificed and died to get it. The tea dumped in Boston Harbor would have made many a comforting cup—but liberty to Americans has always meant more than bread. My mother had a saying: "You never get anything for nothing." I believe she was right. The price of the Beveridge or Wallace plan for security from cradle to the grave is a price higher than liberty-loving Americans care to pay.

Last January, the Murray-Dingle full-employment bill was introduced into the United States Senate. Under this bill, the Federal Government would assume the responsibility of pursuing policies to encourage the highest level of employment through private or other non-Federal investment or expenditures. So far, so good! But, the bill goes on to provide that when non-Federal investment and expenditure fails to absorb the total labor supply, then we will resort to Federal expenditure. In this bill, we again see the balance of power put into the hands of the Chief Executive, for it will be his duty to make recommendations to Congress for supplementary Federal expenditures, it will also be his duty to find out the size of the labor force, the estimated volume of investment and consumption expenditure by both private and public authority necessary to absorb the total labor force. This would be an impossible task and could lead nowhere but to more and more deficit spending, more agencies and commissions and more red tape than this country has ever seen before, and that, gentlemen would be a lot of red tape. Certainly, war regimentation on the home front should have taught us that private business is more efficient than Government controled enterprises. It stands to reason that decisions can be made more quickly and with less confusion in private enterprise than on the mammoth scale which characterizes Government enterprise.

Labor unions who hail the 60,000,000 job program as a cure-all have overlooked the fact that if this comes to pass, the labor force will belong to their employers, the Government. Labor unions cannot strike against their Government. In Germany, Italy, and Russia, free labor unions were quickly abolished and all the workers required to become members of government unions. Former Vice President Henry Wallace, when promising 60,000,000 jobs, said: "Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat." He's right, except that men and women in America care from what source the food comes. He forgot to explain that the bread of slavery sticks in the throat and that food and plenty without freedom goes against the grain of Americanism. The promise of 60,000,000 jobs is a dangerous promise that cannot be fulfilled under democracy, it is a cheap, political promise which it is our duty to expose before it makes any more insidious inroads in the imagination of our people.

So what then? A return to the bread lines? No. A return to apple selling? No. I believe—and I am not alone in this belief—that prosperity can be brought about through a voluntary free market under a capitalistic system where free enterprise can flourish under Government regulation. Not Government control—but regulation. There is a vast difference between the two. I believe that we have by no means exhausted the remedial measures in our power—measures which would gradually bring us to maximum employment and still preserve for us our society based on individual effort and responsibility. Is there a kind of alchemy which transforms an ordinary man into an all-wise economist or prophet or a god when he takes Government office? What kind of thinking makes a great many people believe that men—most of them unfamiliar with business of any kind—set up as executives in Government bureaus have more ability to run the Nation's economy than the great industrialists who know their business and who have proved they know it by efficient and incredibly large production? Remove the policies which have hobbled the capitalistic system of free competitive enterprise for so long. Pare down the useless agencies and bureaus instead of borrowing more and more money, start paying it back for a change. The American people know that taxes will be heavy—and by right they will have to be—but let us have a fair and equitable levy of taxes so that a man in business will have a chance to progress, create jobs, and move forward, instead of closing his doors.

The world situation is so grave as to require all our attention—but we can give only part of it, for the Government at home presents problems so urgent that until they are settled we shall not even be ready to take our proper place in a world court as a strong, united government functioning under democratic principles as conceived and visualized by our founding fathers.

We must approve the San Francisco Charter. We must have a coordinated foreign and domestic policy. Our dollars scattered to the four winds of the heavens will not buy lasting friendships. If the American people are puzzled it is not because the bureaus of their Government are silent. These bureaus dipping deeply into public funds are constantly telling them—in fact, seem eager to tell the people what to think. Government publicity, promotion, propaganda, and information cost about $300,000,000 last year, and this amount was about the total annual cost of the Federal Government in the eighties. Unnecessary Government expenditures and waste, if we are to avoid national bankruptcy, must stop. Our President—I have faith in him—should impress this upon the heads of the various bureaus, and he should set up an organization of a few competent unpaid men whose sole responsibility and job would be to advise and assist the President in the reorganization of the Federal Government to the end that we have a plan, a policy, and an economy that will result in opportunity for all—employment, fair farm prices, fair and equitable employer and employee relations, purchasing power, reduced debt, lower taxes, and the ability to meet our responsibility for leadership in foreign affairs. Our President, our Congress, our courts must provide a leadership that will inspire confidence and support at home and abroad.

To quote again from the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident," and because they are so self-evident, it is our duty to make some move to remedy the damage which has already been done. A turn in American affairs which would establish communism or fascism would be disastrous to civil liberties and the democratic process of constitutional government. Many inspired leaders in business, organized

labor, and industry have already started to combat the communistic tendency. Their object, too, is to maintain full production, furnish adequate employment, and raise the standard of living; they are, however, determined to accomplish this in the American way. In 1765 John Adams described the duties of American citizens—he said: "Let us dare to read, to think, to speak and write. Let every order and degree among us, the people, rouse their attention and animate their resolution. Let them all become attentive to the grounds and principles of government. Let us read and recollect and impress upon our souls the views and ends of our own forefathers in exchanging their native country for a dreary, inhospitable wilderness—and recollect it was liberty, the hope of liberty for themselves and us and ours, which conquered all discouragements, dangers, and trials."

I submit that now is the time for the people of America to again take a stand for Americanism against the invasion of their individual rights and to once again declare their independence. And it would not be amiss to remember the final words of that original Declaration: "And for the support of the Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Give Us Men in Times Like These

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, during my term of service in the House, I have had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on several different occasions, editorials from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item. I do not know of a more progressive, enterprising, live, up-to-date daily newspaper anywhere, regardless of the size of the community which it serves. Its editorials are timely, fearless, and direct in appeal. Under leave to extend these remarks, I am including another editorial from this paper. This time it is a guest editorial. It was written by Raymond S. Dower, Sr., a member of the Wakefield High School faculty for 27 years, a keen student of economics and prominent in educational and civic affairs.

In these times when the charge is so often made that many of our educators are too prone to embrace new philosophies of government, I am glad to have this editorial reproduced to show that the teachers in our high schools still believe there is a place in the world of tomorrow for the America of yesterday and today. The editorial follows:

GIVE US MEN IN TIMES LIKE THESE

(One of our readers, whose thinking often follows the kind in this column, wrote something the other day with the idea of sending it to the Item Forum. Then he decided he had gotton it out of his system and would tear it up. Then he thought he'd show it to the editor. He did, and we thought it more than good enough to print as a "guest editorial" and asked permission to use it as such. Here it is. The author is Raymond S. Dower, Sr., of the high-school faculty.)

You recall, no doubt, those lines about the written word:

"The moving finger writes,
And having writ moves on;
Nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back, nor all
Your tears wash out a word of it."

Paraphrase this in terms of action and we have something like this:

"The moving forces of so-called liberalism crash,
And having wrecked move on;
Nor all their platitudes nor deceit
Shall save mankind from certain defeat
Nor all their socialistic panaceas that fill our mind with dreaded fears
Can right their terrible wrongs and bring us peace."

It rather appears that, with definite assurance of war's successful conclusion, the forces of greed and selfishness again rear their ugly heads only to begin anew their devastating stalking of our political and economic leaders and make them easy prey for their cunning and diabolical machinations.

Will the people of the world ever learn? Will the people of your land and my land meekly submit without a protest?

You, certainly, and many other writers are striving diligently to point out the destructive forces at work in our midst.

At this moment we are experiencing in a most realistic manner a taste of what the liberal zealots have in store for your children and my children in the days to come. Translated into understandable language it is simply this:

America enjoys too high a standard of living compared with the rest of the world. She has too much food, too much clothing, too much shelter. She must bring her standard down below the level of the rest of the world. She has enjoyed prosperity too long. We will let America have all the liquor she wants, operate all the race tracks she can build with million-dollar-a-day gates. Of course, liquor and race-track traffic help prevent supplying the minimum requirements of even the children of America, but this is necessary to bring about this lower standard of living. We must encourage strikes. "More and better strikes" shall be our slogan.

Strikes help break down morale at home and kill off many more of the cream of American manhood at the front. This will lower the level of American genius.

Then we must gather the American harvest and ship it to the four corners of the globe. The American people are easily duped. By inaugurating more complicated rules and regulations, the OPA, the WPB, and the WLB can keep the public completely bewildered. And this, too, will help increase black-market activity, which in turn makes liars out of good citizens and foments hates and distrust.

Yes; America is about ripe for the killing. All that is needed now is for Browder to say the word.

Wake up America! Wake up you Governors, Senators, and Representatives! Forget the plaudits of the crowd! Give up the dining, wining, and dancing and give us leadership!

Postwar International Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address entitled "Postwar International Air Transportation," delivered by Col. J. Carroll Cone, assistant vice president of the Pan American Airways system, at a luncheon meeting of the Aviation Writers Association at Chicago, Ill., on June 9, 1945.

I have received a communication from the Public Printer stating that it is estimated the address will cover approximately two and one-third pages, and that the printing will cost $121.40.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Aviation Writers Association of America, along with all other American journalists and molders of public opinion, are among the busiest and most vitally important people in our country today.

With the close of the European war and the resulting rise of many national and international misunderstandings, it becomes more necessary than ever before to have accurate and complete reporting of the facts to the American people.

This freedom of the press is one of our most cherished possessions. It can render a service to the American public never before approached in American journalistic history, because it is only with a full and complete knowledge of the truth that our patriotic citizens can make the right decisions for our country in these critical days. This places a great and serious responsibility upon the shoulders of the writers who shape the opinion of the American public.

We may find it harder to win a victory in peace than in war. We have won a decisive military victory over Germany and are certain to win such a victory over Japan. We are not, however, certain to win a complete and permanent victory in peace. The conferences at Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, San Francisco, and others to come are each a vital step in that direction.

But before final peace machinery has been completed and put into operation many policies must be determined by our Government and by other governments in order to insure a fair and lasting peace. It is in the determination of these issues that it is so important for our people to be told by our writers the full and complete story in each case. Of all the issues, there is none so vital as aviation.

We have come to think of the airplane primarily as an instrument of death and destruction. We must now educate ourselves to think of it and use it as an instrument for the promotion of world trade and commerce, and, above all, as an effective means of preventing wars.

The determination of our national air policy will not only have an important bearing upon our economic prosperity, but it will also be one of the principle factors in safeguarding our national security and establishing our country as an effective force in maintaining peace.

However, our national air policy has not been clearly defined by our Government. Several important factors have not yet been resolved. The most important of those is the question of freedom of the air.

Our country has always partiotically and zealously safeguarded our own air space. Under this policy, America's aviation industry has flourished. We have achieved world leadership in international air commerce.

The Chicago Aviation Conference, under the sponsorship of Adolph Berle, recommended adoption of the theory of freedom of the air. The State Department, again on the recommendation of Mr. Berle, recently announced that by Executive order, this country would subscribe to that theory.

Authorities on Constitutional law maintain that this action is unconstitutional and that it dangerously alters one of the basic policies of our country. They point out that such a change can be made, logically, only in the form of a treaty, which, before being adopted, must go to the Senate for open investigation, debate, and a two-thirds majority vote.

Freedom of the air gives the right to any nation subscribing to the theory to fly its civil airplanes in air commerce into, across, and out of all other nations likewise subscribing thereto.

Let's get one fact clearly fixed in our minds: Freedom of the air is in no way analogous to freedom of the seas. Freedom of the seas merely means freedom of the high seas, and freedom of the high seas does not give seagoing ships of other nations the right to operate into the interior of our country through its inland waterways. Therefore, since the air covers both the high seas and the land area of a country, it would be comparable and be safe to have freedom of the air over the high seas, only so long as we maintain sovereignty of the air over our own country.

Under existing policy of sovereignty over our own air space, the law requires that all foreign air carriers must secure permits to operate into or over American territory. There must be public hearings resulting in approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the President of the United States before such permits can be issued. In considering such applications, the President discusses the national defense angle with the State, War, and Navy Departments before taking final action.

Freedom of the air at one stroke would do away with all these protective measures, and open our country to the civil airplanes of all other countries subscribing to the theory. It would permit the planes of all such countries to fly into and out of the United States without adequate safeguards or checks by our Government.

This war has brought home to us all the fact that the fate of nations will be at the mercy of air power in future years.

The greatest threat to our Nation's security in the postwar years will come from airplanes of possible unfriendly foreign powers. We must retain the right to exclude the aircraft of doubtful nations from our air space, just as we denied Germany and Japan, in prewar years, commercial air rights into our country.

Even if an unfriendly foreign power has not subscribed to freedom of the air and, therefore, could not fly its planes under its own flag into our country, it could secretly arrange under the theory of freedom of the air to have its planes registered under the flag of some other country which has subscribed to the theory, and then fly in and out of our country practically at will.

Our geographic position makes it easy for us to fly across the Atlantic Ocean to Scandinavia, England, Holland, France, Spain, Portugal, and Africa, and across the Pacific Ocean to Russia, Japan, China, Australia, and New Zealand, without crossing other countries. Our country already has firmly established rights to fly into and across every Central and South American country. Therefore, freedom of the air is not needed by us, and it would be dangerous for us to give it to others.

The United States originates 80 percent of all international traffic. In one prewar year, American tourists spent over $800,000,000 in foreign travel. This is in addition to the millions of dollars that we spend in foreign commercial shipments. Therefore, all foreign countries eagerly seek our business and our dollars—our money to them is the "pot of gold at the end of the rainbow". This places us in the strongest possible trading position, which position should not be destroyed by unsound policies.

Unless we continue to retain control of air travel into and out of our country, and by so doing capitalize on our geographic and economic advantages, we will never be able to stand up against the low-wage standard and heavily subsidized foreign competition.

If we become bound by the theory of freedom of the air and push our overseas air industry outside of our protective tariff wall, the results will be ruinous. American operators would be encouraged or forced to move their capital and key personnel to foreign lands where they would organize and operate under foreign registry, flying back into the continental United States as foreign flag carriers outside the control of our Government. They would thus have the advantage of cheap foreign labor, which would be necessary, should they be forced to operate under the theory of freedom of the air. As we all know, the labor costs of an air line constitute about 55 percent of its operating costs.

A freedom-of-the-air policy would be harmful to our entire aviation industry including all domestic air lines, aircraft manufacturing and operating organization, as well as to our rail and steamship lines. It would reduce the value of securities in every form of American transportation.

We must remember that in the school of world diplomacy, the United States of America is an infant. As a nation, we are still in kindergarten, whereas, many of our foreign neighbors hold postgraduate degrees with nearly a thousand years of schooling and experience in international affairs behind them.

We must be careful not to adopt foreign ideas, such as freedom of the air, planted in this country by foreign agents, or advocated by misled Americans.

Foreign aviation leaders are sitting back with their fingers crossed hoping that we will adopt unsound air policies such as freedom of the air, or cutthroat competition among American air lines in the international field, thus giving them the opportunity to destroy our hard-won position of leadership in the world airways. This is just another example of Old World tactics, to "divide and conquer," in diplomatic, military, and economic activities. It was Hitler's technique in the present war and it almost resulted in the enslavement of the world.

The Old World technique coupled with our own international policies which have proved to be unsound and shortsighted, caused us to lose leadership in merchant shipping and in the field of international communications.

There is much opposition in our country to the freedom-of-the-air theory. Among others, the American Federation of Labor has gone on record opposing this doctrine. Their position has been transmitted by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This great labor organization opposes not only the adoption of the theory in principle, but particularly its adoption by the dangerous technique of Executive order without public hearings.

All good Americans should study this issue with great care—and then they should make their voices heard in patriotic support of a sound policy. The Senate should review this entire question before the Government irrevocably commits our country to a policy which would be detrimental to the prosperity and security of our Nation.

The policy of our Government on an issue of this importance should be determined, not by the interest of any individual, company, group of companies, or other minority interests, but by what will be in the best interest of our country as a whole.

After freedom of the air, the most important unsettled issue in our national air policy is, How will we compete in the international field?

In this connection, we have really only three choices:

1. Competition among Americans as well as foreigners.

2. The so-called zone system.

3. A unified American organization and effort.

One of the reasons we are confronted at this time with these choices stems from the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is ambiguous in one important respect.

It provides in section 2 (d) that the Board "shall consider competition to the extent necessary to assure the development of an air transportation system properly adapted to the needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense."

Now the critical question is, What is meant by "competition to the extent necessary?"

It is a very vague term. And it is subjected to many interpretations regarding both domestic and foreign commerce.

The difference between domestic and foreign commerce is the key to the whole matter. The yardstick for the former is wholly unsuited to serve as a yardstick for the latter. In fact, one might be said to be measured in feet and the other in meters—two entirely different scales.

The basic and most striking difference between the domestic and the international fields in air commerce is one of size. To bear this out I shall refer to figures prepared recently by Curtiss-Wright after extensive research. Excluding all intercity traffic between cities 100 miles apart in the continental United States, that is, the domestic field, a total of 21,300,000,000 passenger-miles is estimated as our traffic market, according to the Curtiss-Wright survey. On the other hand, in the overseas and international field—but including traffic to our territories beyond the continental limits of the United States—the total, according to the same source, is but 4,000,000,800 miles—or only 18 percent of the whole.

On this basis alone, it would seem clear that in such a comparatively small market the very intense foreign competition would be not only adequate but serious without complicating matters by having numerous American companies competing among themselves at the same time as they are competing with numerous strong foreign-flag lines in the same areas.

By the time the Japs are beaten there will literally be an invasion of this country by foreign air lines. To the great trading powers of Europe, such as England, France, and Holland, air transportation is their lifeblood. They must trade to prosper, and they must bind their far-flung imperial interests together into a harmonized, coordinated body. Their air lines will be the sinews of this body.

Furthermore, in the last year and a half, there were 31 American applicants for international routes including 14 domestic air lines. (See map.) All of these would be dividing the 18 percent of United States potential total foreign-travel market. The dilution of this 18 percent by Americans competing among themselves would add immeasurably to the operating costs, would decrease efficiency, and lead to heavy subsidies, resulting in an increased burden on the taxpayers.

When one considers the Curtiss-Wright report contemplates that a billion and a half passenger miles will be flown by American-flag carriers in the international field by 1950, it will be seen that if there is but a 2-cent-per-mile increase in cost caused by diluting this traffic among numerous competing American carriers, $30,000,000 will be saddled on the backs of the American taxpayer or the traveling public. This dilution,

as the years go by, will become a great burden and one impossible to justify.

This dilution of the foreign market would be far greater than now actually exists amongst our domestic air lines. For instance, on two of the most heavily traveled routes, namely, New York to Washington and San Francisco to Los Angeles, there are three competing lines on each run. This is considered by all concerned to be adequate competition in the interest of progress and efficiency.

It is interesting to note that even with this agreed adequate competition the rates, flying times, and equipment of each of the three lines are all the same.

When one line develops new equipment it usually asks the other lines to join in on the purchase of such equipment in order to cut unit production costs. Experience shows that this pooling of aircraft purchase and standardization is a most effective and efficient way to reduce equipment costs.

The dangers of dividing up the small foreign traffic volume amongst several American companies was foreseen many years ago. The Federal Aviation Commission appointed by the President in accordance with the act of Congress, June 12, 1934, recommended to the President and to the Congress as follows:

"If American airlines are to compete with lines under foreign direction, it would be an obvious absurdity to divide the American strength by competition among a multiplicity of American-flag enterprises. The aid that is appropriated for foreign air transport in any particular part of the globe ought not to be squandered by dividing it among two or more competitors who will use Government-provided funds to duplicate each other's facilities. The spur to progress that only competition can supply should be adequately furnished by the foreign countries, coupled with the constant watchfulness of American governmental authorities over the standard of service rendered and with their periodic specification of standards as high as the commercial importance of the lines may justify."

In this foreign field, we have not only a much smaller market than the domestic to consider, with intense foreign competition, but that foreign competition is based on the low operating costs of cheap foreign labor. These are some of the factors which distinguish the foreign from the domestic field. If we embark upon a policy of so-called controlled competition or a zone system for our international airlines it will only be a few years before our Government will be forced to take over all these air lines to save them from bankruptcy or else the required subsidies will become a heavy burden to our people.

We can avoid all the difficulties I have just outlined by adopting the third alternative: That is, a unified American effort with a community company.

Such a community company would not be a "monopoly," nor a "chosen instrument," nor Government-owned. It would be participated in by all American transportation companies on sea, land, and in the air who are able to contribute. Each of these companies would be participating members of the community company, not only financially but also in the management of the company by representation on the board. The actual organization of the community company would take place under the direction and supervision of the Government, but would remain entirely privately owned and operated.

The community company would represent all of the collective efforts, ingenuity and resources of American transportation companies, united as one to maintain our present position of world leadership in the world airways. It would have the united political, diplomatic, and financial support of our Government.

Those who oppose this plan erroneously claim that such a company would be a monopoly. By Webster's definition of "monopoly," "the exclusive control of any industry in a particular area," we see that the community company would not be a monopoly. No one who favors the plan wants it to be a monopoly. It would not have the exclusive control of the industry but would be competing for its very existence with not less than 16 strong, unified foreign operators. One-sixteenth of a slice is certainly not exclusive control.

Nor would this community company be too dangerously large as is often alleged. According to Curtiss-Wright estimates, it would, in 1950, be only 75 percent as large as the largest domestic air line.

Let us analyze this community company to find out why it will be more effective from a purely operational standpoint. The community company would leave America's domestic air lines untouched, as it would operate only in the international field. It would deposit goods and passengers at its various ports of entry in the United States, where the domestic lines would then take over. It would not influence or upset in any way the complete free play of competition among these domestic air lines in their own domestic field. Furthermore, the domestic air lines would route all their overseas business over their own community company rather than over competing foreign air lines.

If several American air lines were to compete in the foreign as well as the domestic field, just the reverse of this would be true. Clearly, what would happen is that soon all domestic air lines, in self-defense, would try to operate overseas, and our present international air line would, also in self-defense try to operate in the domestic field. We would then have our domestic field confused and thrown out of balance by our international air line entering the domestic picture, and America's efforts in the foreign field would be greatly weakened because our energies would be divided into small packages to many competing American companies and our Government's support to them would likewise be diluted and weakened.

Among other advantages of a community company is that it would be possible to spread profits in order to maintain operations over necessary but unprofitable sections of its system. The great seasonal fluctuations of air travel in various parts of the world could be taken care of by seasonal transfers of equipment and personnel which would reduce equipment and personnel costs and improve the service. However, the 36,000 existing United States travel agents, ticket offices, etc., scattered all over the world would concentrate on promoting travel solely for their own community company.

This plan has the endorsement of many companies and leaders. It is urged by all the outstanding labor leaders, whose interest lies in the fact that a unified international air line is a necessary factor, in protecting the American worker's high wage scale and our standards of living. American foreign communications companies have tried the plan of competing amongst themselves in the international field and found it unsound and disastrous. They have now asked for legislation uniting them into a single American company. We must profit by their past mistakes.

The British Empire has adopted its air policy and is now putting it into operation.

The British program sets up an integrated, unified effort to cover the entire world. It considerably strengthens their position, as under the provisions of the recent white paper. Their effort now consolidates the strength of all British transportation companies—railroads, shipping lines, and travel bureaus. The public is represented by the stockholders of the predecessor lines, all joined in their common effort, which is cooperative and noncompetitive, and which is thoroughly integrated through their equipment, maintenance, training, and personal pools into one unified British effort.

It is also clear from this white paper that the British Government is envisaging strong cooperation from numerous small foreign countries over which the British have powerful influence, in the operation of this giant Empire combine, which cooperation will, in effect, set up a powerful cartel. The strength of this combination will be so great that it compels us to unify our efforts in order to hold our own against such a combine.

To compete most effectively against these foreign cartels that do and will face us, I urge you in all sincerity and honesty to bring your support to bear for the establishment of a strong unified American effort in the international airways. It is folly for us to fail, at this critical time, to present a united front to the rest of the world in this important effort.

In making its final decision on the issue of both freedom of the air and cutthroat competition among American air lines in the international field, our Government must consider the future of our children and our children's children.

We do not have the right, nor can we justify, embarking on any national policies which would jeopardize their future, and there is no one thing more important to their future than a sound national policy on aviation.

Memorandum to the President of the United States on Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum:

The organizations of American citizens of Italian descent represented by the undersigned wish to call the attention of the President of the United States to the following urgent and vital issues.

A. The time has come to accept Italy as one of the United Nations. Italy has enormously contributed to her liberation and to our victory. The stigma of ex-enemy country should be canceled; the armistice regime and its economic and political clauses should be abolished, and in their stead a provisional peace treaty should be concluded as son as possible.

B. The disastrous economic condition of Italy and the consequent social-political dangers demand urgent and far-reaching emergency aid, not only for immediate "food and fuel" relief, but for the rehabilitation of her transportation and industries. Italy urgently needs coal, oil, trucks, cotton, wool, and other essential raw materials. We hope that an appropriation of $100,000,000 for relief in Italy—as recommended by the Foreign Economic Administration—will be approved, in substitution for the relief given at present by the United States Army which will end soon. This, however, will not be a drop in the bucket unless such relief activities shall be considerably expanded. The wheat crop forecast for this year has dropped from 64,000,000 quintals to 44,000,000 quintals as a result of a severe drought. Already mass demonstrations have taken place in the industrial centers of the north; the crowds have been demanding bread and work. Yet, the present

unemployment is nothing in comparison with that which will develop as soon as the existing meager coal reserves are gone.

An organ of the Italian Resistance Movement in Florence, La Nazione del Popolo, which tremendously helped our cause during the Nazi occupation, recently wrote the following:

"Unemployment is widespread; transportation is lacking, the people are bearing their troubles as they have borne them for many years. They are embittered and inclined to believe that life holds no hope for them."

The new government of Italy has worked out a plan for immediate economic improvement; it stated, however, that "the execution of this plan depends on the help and support of the Allies."

C. Italy could do much more in the way of self-help if an adequate number of merchant ships, including the Italian merchant ships which were seized at the beginning of the war, were assigned to her.

D. The Post Office Department should increase the maximum weight of packages for Italy from 4 to 11 pounds, as in the case of France. Moreover the parcel-post service should be extended to all those numerous Italian towns where the available transportation makes such service feasible.

On September 26, 1944, the late President Roosevelt, in a joint statement with Prime Minister Churchill, promised prompt action for the rehabilitation of the Italian economy, for "the restoration of power systems, railways, motor transport, roads, and other communications." It is vital to fulfill that promise.

On the issue of the acceptance of Italy as one of the United Nations, we wish to observe the following:

1. The Italians are an extremely sensitive people. They have been expecting recognition as allies even since before the liberation of Rome because they felt that they were our friends and allies, because they contributed heavily to their liberation and the Allied cause, and because the Allies had made promises to that effect. There is, therefore, considerable disappointment and some bitterness in Italy at the Allied policies. Still more, there is great bewilderment and confusion since they cannot understand how, after the strong contribution of the partisans and the armed forces, we still maintain on Italy the stigma of an exenemy country. Immediate recognition, therefore, would have extremely favorable psychological and moral results. We should remember the tremendous benefits, from the morale standpoint, produced in this country by the elimination of Italians from the category of enemy alien. Moreover, the recognition of Italy would automatically open considerable new possibilities for economic relief and rehabilitation which are excluded today.

2. Recognition has been deserved by Italy through her magnificent contribution to her liberation and our victory. According to the OWI bulletin, Italy Today of August 25, 1944, the authorities of the Allied commission in Italy stated:

"The Italian Army has been reorganized out of chaos. It has cooperated loyally with us * * * I want the Italian press to get its just measure of praise, not only in the press in Italy, but also in the minds of the Allies.

"The Italian Air Force has considerable results to its credit, and its significant contributions to the Allies' war effort should never be forgotten.

"The Italian Navy has given an enormous contribution to the war effort of the Allies since the day of the armistice."

On May 11, 1945, General Clark, in a message of thanks to the Italian Partisans, said that they had liberated more than 200 cities, including Milan, Turin, Genoa, Venice, and Spezia. General Clark added that the patriots working with the Fifteenth Army Group had taken 45,000 prisoners. He concluded, "You bore yourselves like disciplined soldiers obeying to the letter the orders I sent you."

General Alexander was quoted in the British Parliament, saying that the resistance movement of the Italian Partisans was the strongest resistance in Europe.

The London Economist of June 5, 1945, said: "The parties which compose it (the resistance movement) proved themselves capable of mass action on a scale achieved nowhere else—only in northern Italy have strikes been used effectively as a weapon of resistance."

3. Because of her peace-loving, humanistic, and universalistic tradition, Italy can contribute considerably to the democratic reconstruction of Europe and the maintenance of world peace. The democratic, anti-Fascist forces of Italy, as represented in the new government, ardently long to serve the Allied cause in the building of a new democratic world. By all means we must encourage them and give them as soon as possible a full chance to participate in the big job ahead.

This plea for the recognition of Italy as one of the United Nations has been signed by hundreds of thousands of Americans of Italian descent. We feel that it is in the interest of our country to keep our promises to the Italian people and promote now this act of democratic statesmanship and justice.

Respectfully submitted.

George Baldanzi, Executive Vice President, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, and Secretary, Free Italy American Labor Council; Joseph Catalanotti, President, Free Italy American Labor Council; Ulisse DeDominicis, CIO Council for the State of Maryland; Philip DeLuca, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, State of Pennsylvania; Benjamin Fielding, Secretary, American Labor Party; Dr. C. L. Guarini, head of Independent Order of the Sons of Italy, Boston; Monsignor Luigi Ligutti, People and Liberty (Catholic Association), New York; Judge George Quilici, Chairman, Italian-American Victory Council of Illinois; Joseph Salerno, CIO Political Action Committee; Mrs. Jimmy Savo, Chairman, Committee for the Recognition of Italy as an Ally; Judge Frank W. Tomasello, Boston.

JULY 3, 1945.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1945.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I was pleased to have your letter of July 7 with your statement to Members of Congress setting out your personal comments on the outlook for price control during the coming year.

In the last paragraph of your letter you say, "I very much need the guidance of thoughtful Members of Congress during the difficult months that lie ahead * * *." Now since most of us are doing a lot of thinking and considerable worrying about a lot of things these days, and OPA being one of our worries, I shall try in this letter to offer a few helpful suggestions.

First, I would suggest that if you really want OPA to work, you should immediately abolish all district and regional offices. That alone would eliminate about 75 percent of your troubles by making the State officers directly responsible to you. By so doing you could eliminate all or most of the inefficient little czars who are today doing little but antagonizing and insulting good Americans. The good help you have you could then put into the State offices and release all the troublesome little czars. No doubt most of them would have to go on relief, but that would be much cheaper for the taxpayers and much better for the country in the long run than what they are doing to and with OPA.

Secondly, the food shortage, especially beef shortage, is one of our greatest food problems. I suggest you and our Secretary of Agriculture and War Food Administrator, Clinton Anderson, immediately get your heads together and do the one and only thing that will solve that problem, namely, allow a sufficient price margin between the ceiling prices on feeder cattle and corn-fed finished cattle, thus making it financially possible for the feeder to go to the stockyards; buy the grass-fed cattle; pay the freight to their feed lot; pay the high wage cost; pay for the corn and other necessary commercial feeds; pay the veterinary bills; possible loss of a critter; then after 6 or 8 months of proper nursing and feeding morning, noon, and night while putting on each critter several hundred pounds of the best and most nourishing and tasteful food to man, corn-fed beef, which every soldier craves and needs; then load the finished cattle on the train or a truck and ship them back to the stockyards to be slaughtered, an average distance of over 100 miles; pay the transportation charges, the yard charges, the yard feed charges, and then hope to receive large enough check to pay just a little profit for all the work and worry.

Mr. Bowles, unless you do that, and just that, the beef shortage will be with us until the OPA is kicked out—lock, stock, and barrel. Subsidies from the taxpayers to make up the margin is only postponing the evil day when the returning veterans, their children, and our children will have to pay our board bill, and will further drive this Nation into uncontrollable currency inflation, the very thing that will destroy confidence of the people and bring ruin to us, as it has to every nation that let it go unchecked, as we have been doing these past several years.

Now, in conclusion I am going to ask you just as I asked my former colleague, Clinton Anderson, when amendments to the OPA bill were being considered on the floor of the House of Representatives (June 23, 1945), "What are you going to do about it?"

Thanking you for the opportunity of offering these suggestions, I am,

Respectfully yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

The Work of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are compelling reasons why forthright and definite action to immediately strengthen the hand and

improve the functioning of Congress is absolutely imperative.

Never in the history of our country has the Congress been called upon to make such tremendously important decisions as will be the case in the next few months and years. The whole future of democratic constitutional government and human liberty and human hope will depend in very large measure indeed upon how the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States act in these critical days.

We will confront a whole series of decisions having to do with American relations to the other nations of the world and American participation in the machinery of maintaining peace. These decisions will run all the way from that of approving or disapproving an international organization for the maintenance of peace to proposals for setting up international monetary machinery, the adoption of tariff and trade policies and very weighty decisions as to the future military policy of the United States.

The action of Congress on a wide variety of domestic problems will in large measure determine whether or not we shall have the economy of full production and full employment of our people which has been repeatedly promised to the veterans of this war, and upon the attainment of which the whole economic and hence the whole political future of our country depends.

Decisions will have to be made as to when and in what manner the extraordinary and in some respects almost unbelievable powers granted to the Executive during this war period are to be taken back into the hands of the people and their Congress where they belong. Upon the accomplishment of this third purpose, together with the effective meeting of the first two problems will depend the future position of the Congress in the American scheme of government and the possibility of the maintenance in the future of democratic constitutional government.

In a sentence, Congress must be prepared to act with sufficient expedition, sufficient wisdom, sufficient courage, and sufficient foresight to set a worth-while pattern for the whole future of our own people, and through them in all probability, for the world itself.

Is Congress equipped to meet effectively jobs of this magnitude?

Without answering this question in the absolute negative, it is, to speak most conservatively, my strong opinion that Congress is not nearly as well equipped to do this job as it can be or as it is the evident duty of Members of Congress to make it.

Throughout the length and breadth of this Nation there is tremendous public interest. For the people seem to sense the fact that Congress is in truth the final repository of their rights and liberties, and that upon an effectively functioning Congress depend primarily their hopes for the vigorous continuance of free government, free institutions, and individual rights, immunities, and liberties.

For whenever a national legislature in any country has declined in prestige and substantially lost its position as a coequal branch of government, the basic freedoms of the Nation itself have been imperiled.

It is a simple fact that frequently escapes us that the first institution which every dictatorship has destroyed has been the national legislature, that no dictatorship dares tolerate such a body in the government of the nation in question, and conversely that no form of totalitarian government is possible as long as the national legislature retains its effective and proper constitutional place in the scheme of government.

In the absence of such effective action by the national legislature, in the absence of that national legislature holding a tight rein on any grants of power which it may make and seeing that those grants of power are not abused but are employed in accordance with legislative intent, above all in the absence of an effective, constructive legislative program conceived by the legislature for the meeting of the needs of the Nation, it is absolutely inevitable that the executive and the departments which compose it, will be making rules and regulations which have the force of law itself, and becoming, therefore, not only a law-enforcing body but a law-making body as well.

I shall not indulge in dramatic phrases about what such a situation constitutes. Suffice it to say that it means the end of democratic government as we have known it in America. It is to avoid that situation that, from my point of view, this committee has been set up, and it is to avoid that situation that the whole Congress must act constructively upon recommendations which this committee makes.

It would be childish indeed for us to conceive the problems of today or tomorrow as anything but vastly different in both nature and scope from the problems confronting American Government and American Congress even a brief 30 or 40 years ago.

Whatever political party may be in power and whatever particular policies may be pursued by it, it is perfectly obvious that the role of Government in the life of our Nation will in the future be far more crucial and important than it has been in the past.

For the interdependence of every American citizen upon every other one is manifold greater than it was in the earlier simpler days of our country; and the economic fate of millions may depend upon events utterly beyond their own control and taking place thousands of miles from their home communities.

Under these circumstances there are two possible courses which the American Government can take. In my judgment, the decision as to which of these courses is to be followed will be made in the House of Representatives and in the Senate Chamber.

The Congress of the United States holds within its own hands the determination of its own future and hence the future of our American Government itself. For one possible course of development would consist of a continuous extension of the power and authority of the executive branch of the Government, the abandonment by Congress to the executive department of the admittedly difficult and detailed job of conceiving precise legislation to meet the needs and problems of modern America, and the reduction of the Congress to the position of a mere ratifying body, either approving or disapproving executive acts and proposals and occasionally making broad and indeterminate grants of power to the Executive.

I doubt that more than a mere handful of Americans would consciously favor such a course for our country's Government. It means the gradual growth of a type of government which the whole tradition of our country is against.

But if we are to avoid this course, we must recognize the hard, indispuntable fact that the people of every nation, including our own, will always demand first of all reasonable hope of a solution of their everyday bread and butter problems and a sense of continuous progress toward a better life. The people will not for long abandon themselves to economic hopelessness and social confusion for the sake of governmental principles alone.

I have never cared particularly for the phrase "reorganization of Congress" to describe this task. I have preferred the phrase "strengthening of the Congress", and for two reasons.

First, the reorganization of the machinery of Congress is of no consequence in itself and can only be justified to the extent that it will contribute to the strengthening of the hand of Congress and to the promotion of its more effective dealing with the problems it must solve.

Second, the more important measures to be taken apply not to matters of machinery, but rather to substantial questions where Congress must equip itself to act in a stronger and more vigorous fashion.

A short time ago the committee of the House of which Congressman SMITH, of Virginia, is chairman, made its final report for the Seventy-eighth Congress and devoted that entire report to the question of the strengthening of the functioning of Congress.

Consequent upon that action Congressman SMITH, and I introduced identical bills in the House which were virtually identical with one another and I should like to present for the record of this committee the text of one of those bills.

I do this to indicate that support for the measures which your committee may recommend is not limited to Members of Congress of any one particular economic or political point of view, but is to be found among conservative and progressive Members alike and was considered by the Smith committee perhaps its primary duty to the House which set it up.

HOW CAN CONGRESSMEN DO THEIR DUTIES?

In the first place, there is the problem of enabling the individual Congressman to do his job and thus to have the kind of relationship to the people whom he represents which he ought to have. What is that relationship? First and foremost it is that the Congressman has been sent by his people to legislate on national questions. They expect him to know about those national questions; they expect him to take a conscientious and statesmanlike attitude toward

them. They expect him to represent their best interests, and through that best interest the interest of the whole Nation.

They expect more than that, however, and they have a right to expect more than that, in my judgment, with Government as complex as it is today, with hardly an act of the people of the Nation possible without touching some Government agency somewhere.

The people of the districts of this Nation need somebody to act in the nature of an ambassador on their behalf in Washington. Some people call it an errand boy. I prefer to call it an ambassador. The people, especially those who have no great financial resources, need someone whom they can call on to represent their interests before Government agencies in somewhat the same manner in which people who do have great financial resources are represented by paid employees.

That is only one example. There is also the vast number of cases of veterans' problems and claims in which the veterans have a primary right to expect Members of Congress to interest themselves. Each one requires a great deal of study as well as constructive action.

I could, of course, catalog other types of work that is expected of Senators and Congressmen, which I do not think is to be regarded as unworthy in any respect whatsoever, but which is tremendously time-consuming, and is quite a different type of task from the national legislative job.

Night after night I do not finish reading my mail until after midnight. After that I might have time to study some legislative problems. I want time to study those problems before midnight.

The problem is not primarily one of congressional salaries. I think it is a problem of enabling the Members of the House and Senate to have an adequate staff to enable them to get their jobs done, to enable them to do their duties. To that end I should like to see it possible for every Senator and Member of the House to have what might be termed an administrative assistant, a person who would command a salary of perhaps $6,500 or $7,500 a year, who would be of such a caliber that the Congressman or Senator would feel justified in turning over to that individual a considerable portion of the work which does not have to do with the task of national legislation.

In addition to that, Members of the House at any rate need more technical assistance. Although there are very excellent people available to do work such as bill drafting, it is very difficult for an individual Member to secure that type of assistance on any large-scale job. The reason is that the people simply do not have time to do it since they must give preference to work for committees. I am not blaming them in the slightest degree.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Now, related to this subject is the question of committee structure, because there we get into the problem of a Member being confronted with the utter impossibility of doing his duty. By that I mean that he frequently has a duty to be in three or four different places at the same given time, and he, therefore, can at best only do one-fourth of his duty; that is all he can do.

To my mind, the main importance of the simplification of the committee structure is just that. I think, for example, that the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Flood Control Committee could be combined, and I think perhaps the Public Lands Committee and the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee could be combined. I am sure there are a number of committees dealing with veterans' affairs that could all be combined and we could have one major committee in that very important field instead of a number of minor committees, and in that way I think we would do a better job.

I think in connection with the committee structure that some consideration must be given to the fact that there are some committees that have too much to do. For example, I believe the Ways and Means Committee has its hand completely full with taxation, and I believe the field of social security and related matters is large enough so that a committee might be established to deal with those things.

THE MACHINERY OF LEADERSHIP

Since the main function of the Congress is carrying through a coordinated and constructive program of national legislation to meet the Nation's needs, there is very great importance in having a somewhat broader leadership in the Congress than exists today. It must be a leadership or program committee of Congress, by Congress, and for the entire Nation.

There is a need for a committee consisting of the chairmen of the more important committees, together with the Speaker and the majority leader, that would have the function of laying out broad legislative programs, with the whole over-all national picture in view.

I believe other members ought to be able to freely appear before meetings of such a committee to urge their views as to what the legislative program ought to be. Thus we would have a means whereby the Congress itself would arrange its program with a view to the future as well as the immediate present and would be planning its action in the light of the over-all problem of the Nation.

I believe we are too much inclined to focus our attention on the next appropriation bill, the immediate jobs that have to be ground out in the legislative mill. We have left to an all too great extent to the Executive the function of taking this over-all view of the national problem as a whole.

THE CENTRAL FUNCTION OF THE CONGRESS

And this, after all, is the key to the future position of the Congress in our scheme of government. For the main reason for such decline in power of Congress relative to the Executive as has taken place is the fact that the Executive has become the agency of government taking an inclusive view not only of the Nation's immediate problems but also of its long-run future needs.

Generally, Congress has been inclined to become absorbed in year-to-year, if not day-to-day, routine matters and has thus largely abdicated its most essential function, namely, that of devising on its own motion long-range legislative programs geared to the necessities of the times.

It is too obvious to require long exposition that the central function of any national legislature should be the devising of a national legislative program with all that that implies. Yet, by and large, this is a thing that Congress has not been doing.

It is true, as I have said, that there are some signs the Congress is beginning to recognize this fact. Both the Senate and the House have created committees on postwar policy and planning and that the House also has a committee on future military policy.

The function of these special committees is to study great areas of our national life and recommend to the Congress a coordinated pattern of legislation which can, it is hoped, lead to a reasonable solution of the problems that lie ahead.

It is true that so far the work of the postwar policy and planning committees has been largely limited to matters of the immediate reconversion period but it is to be hoped that these committees will get on as speedily as possible with the far more difficult and important task of outlining a coordinated legislative program to insure a full production, full employment, and full home market economy in the United States after the war.

At the very least, however, the existence of these committees indicates a congressional recognition that it is high time Congress began to exercise its own most basic function.

There is far too much tendency in Congress for that body to assert its independence of the Executive merely by voting against proposals of the executive, without putting forward any alternative constructive program of its own. The press of the country is in part responsible for this situation. Every time Congress votes down any proposal of the President, Congress is lauded in the columns of the press for being a body of courage and independence. But the same acclaim is by no means forthcoming for attempts on the part of individual Members or even committees of the Congress who advance constructive solutions to the same problems.

Furthermore, the Congress has fallen into the habit of fighting out some of the most important issues, at least in domestic policy, on appropriation bills instead of passing basic substantive legislation.

For example, there has been a struggle going on for many years over the work of the Farm Security Administration and the school-lunch program. In both cases opponents of these programs have sought merely to defeat appropriations to im-

plement them. The Farm Security Administration has not yet been authorized by an act of Congress. It has only been permitted to continue with its work by the fact that it received appropriations. Meanwhile proponents of these two programs have up to date not faced the real issue and brought before the Congress basic legislation authorizing the carrying on of the programs and setting forth in law the standards to govern them.

The Agriculture Committee of the House, be it said to its credit, did finally appoint a committee to investigate the whole farm-security program and out of this committee there has come a bill which was before the last Congress and is before the present Congress, which would authorize a program of credit for low-income farmers such as the Farm Security Administration has carried on and which would spell out in the legislation just how the job is to be done. So far, however, this bill has not been reported out by the committee.

The question as to whether or not one agrees with all the provisions of the Cooley bill is beside the point. The important point is that the right way for Congress to deal with the problem of the declining number of family sized farms in America and the plight of the low-income farm group is to pass a bill on the subject.

So far, however, the Congress has preferred not to face this issue squarely, but instead to leave the whole fate of any program for this group to be decided from year to year by the number of votes for or against an appropriation for the carrying on of work never authorized by Congress, and not subject therefore to a congressional mandate as to exactly how the work is to be carried on.

The Committee on Agriculture has also done its part with regard to basic legislation governing a school-lunch program. A bill on this subject has been reported out by the committee and a rule has been requested. But the Rules Committee has not acted.

I might give other examples of this same sort of thing. I think Congress should itself have brought forward a coordinated, sound financial policy for the war period. Instead of that, we neither accepted wholeheartedly the Executive program, nor did we advance one of our own.

I believe when the war came the Congress should have said, "We are going to attempt to finance such-and-such percentage of this war by means of taxation, and insofar as there must be Government borrowing we will borrow from the people and see that the national debt is evenly distributed among them."

There was only one way that could be done, in my judgment, and that was by a compulsory-savings program. Beyond that we should have said, "To the extent that we cannot finance the war in one of those two ways, to the extent that it is necessary in this war period to finance the battle for national existence by an issue of new money that money shall be created debt-free by the national Government and not by private banks."

Now I do not think it is at all improper for a Member of Congress or a committee of Congress that is working on a draft of legislation to deal with a certain problem, to get the advice and assistance of people who are in Government departments and who have at their fingertips a great store of information and experience. I think that should be done in many, many cases.

But certainly it is wrong that a bill which comes from the secretary of so-and-so, or from such-and-such an executive department, should in every instance have more chance before a congressional committee than any bill originating in the Congress itself, even one introduced by a member of that same committee. That ought not to be the case, but it is.

We have heard many times on the floor of the House when a Member has introduced a substitute bill that he has spent a long time in drafting, that the bill was no good because it originated on the Hill, it had not been properly considered, it did not come from down town. Therefore I suggest that once each month, or better once every 2 weeks, every committee have a day on which any Member could appear before the entire committee and plead for a hearing on his legislation.

Now, to go back to my example, this Congress might have said when this war broke out: "We will finance this war so far as humanly possible by means of a courageous tax program and the real savings of the people, not by monetary inflation through the banking system. If any new money is required it shall be created in such fashion that no interest will have to be paid upon it by the generation now bearing the brunt of the fighting." That would have constituted dynamic leadership. It would have been a program better than the Treasury's, better than the President's. Above all, it would have been a program.

It would have enabled the American people to know that their choice was not between Presidential proposals and no proposals at all, but between Presidential proposals on the one hand and a constructive congressional program on the other.

THE STAFFING OF THE CONGRESS

I now come to what alone can enable us to do the type of constructive work for which I have been pleading. This is the necessity of adequate, dependable, and complete sources of factual and analytical information, available to Members of Congress. This, to my mind, is one of the two most outstanding necessities in this whole field of legislative procedure.

To take a simple illustration from the Appropriations Committee, in which field some action has already been taken, the Appropriations Committee ought not to be dependent wholly upon the testimony of the people who are going to spend the money as to how much money is needed. The Appropriations Committee should be able, and should be staffed so they would be able, to make their own independent investigation of those matters.

I am entirely open to the proposal that further use be made of the General Accounting Office in this connection, and I do not presume to judge the degree to which that would be a practical answer. I am inclined to think it might be the answer. But certain it is that the Appropriations Committee should have that kind of staff, or at any rate that type of information brought to them directly and continuously.

Nor do I believe that the information so obtained ought to be the exclusive prerogativ of the Appropriations Committee; nor that members of such committees ought to come on the floor and say, "Our investigation has revealed so and so, but the rest of you Members cannot see it."

However, that is only the beginning, because the present sources of information for legislative committees are generally only two. In the first place, we hear the testimony of an executive department—very good testimony usually, testimony very well prepared by very well-equipped people, people who come, out of their experience, to tell us what they believe the legislation ought to be. I think that is all to the good.

Against that, however, we have only the testimony, so far as carefully prepared facts are concerned, of various groups within the Nation who have a particular interest in this legislation. Now, I do not mean to cast the slightest criticism upon those groups. I think a part of the functioning of democracy is that groups of people in the Nation have a right to have their representatives appear before committees of Congress. I think it is part of our machinery. I think we are always going to have it. I think that 90 percent of it is good and 10 percent probably is not.

In any event that is the other source of our information. So when the committee finally comes down to making its decisions, those decisions are made primarily upon the basis of evidence presented either by an executive department or by a group with special interest in the legislation. What is clearly required is a means whereby such infromation can be checked against independent information developed from a congressional source.

When a representative of a special group comes before a congressional committee, or when the solicitor or head of an executive department comes before the committee, the committee should be able to call upon its own staff witnesses afterwards to tell what their findings have been in this regard.

Such information should come from two sources: First, it should come from very good people, the best that can be found, who would be attached to the committees themselves. The Joint Committee on Taxation is an example. Every committee of Congress should be staffed in that fashion. It would not take a great number of people, but it

certainly would take one very good person for each committee, and probably a couple of people to assist him.

In addition to that, however, there must be an over-all staff. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is the ideal agency from which to develop such a staff. I do not believe the Legislative Reference Service is appreciated by a great number of the Members of Congress. I have used it extensively, and they have done a monumental job of getting information for me when I asked them to. Nevertheless, they are handicapped. They are handicapped because they have to use, to take an offhand example, $3,200-a-year people to do $9,000-a-year jobs. The Congress of the United States certainly ought to be able to afford a staff of the best people it can get in all the fields of national legislation, to bring about not only a full analysis of the facts in a given field where Congress must legislate but also analyses of opinion.

Now, the Legislative Reference Service is certainly a nonpolitical agency if there ever was one and upon it should be built the structure for gathering this information.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day of the present session I introduced H. R. 628. The first three sections thereof would set up the National Legislative Service for the purpose just discussed. Section 4 would give to the Appropriations Committees a joint investigating group, available to members of the Appropriations Committees who would thus be empowered to have a staff to make the investigations for the Appropriations Committees. Other provisions of that bill I will discuss later.

Congress is largely dependent today for its information upon people who are hired by somebody else. All I am proposing is we should be guided by people who are hired by ourselves, because somebody has got to do this job of bringing the facts together.

There are, then, three parts to the business of providing adequate staff for the Congress: First, the adequate staffing of the individual member; second, the adequate staffing of the committees, and, third, what I believe to be very important, an adequate over-all staff for the Congress as a whole.

In that latter connection thought should be given to the possibility of a congressional national advisory group, which would not consist of so-called experts but which would bring together, into a body that would have no power but only an advisory function, representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, the churches of the Nation, education, veterans' groups, cooperatives, consumer groups, and so on.

If, in some manner, such groups could be brought together for the advising of the Congress and for giving us the benefit of their coordinated views we might begin the job that must be done, namely, of getting from each group a closer approach to recognition of America's problem as a unified problem. For no particular group can expect to further its own interests to the exclusion of others.

THE PROBLEM OF GRANTS OF POWER AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

The second of the two major necessities, in my opinion, is the finding of an answer to the problems of grants of power to executive agencies. This really is the same thing as the problem of administrative law, about which so much has been written and spoken in recent years.

It is probably true that in any Nation like the United States, however carefully legislation is framed, there will be even in peacetime certain essential tasks of government which can only be handled efficiently through the method of making grants of power to executive agencies and according to them some discretion in the exercise of those powers.

Such discretion should, I heartily agree, be held to a minimum, but that it can be altogether avoided is too much to hope. If, however, there is any fundamental principle of democratic government, it is this: the executive department can derive no power properly which is not either bestowed upon it by the Constitution itself or specifically granted it by an act of national legislature.

Hence, if the Congress is to discharge effectively its full duty, it must at the very least supervise each grant of power which it makes with great care, and must assume the function not only of passing legislation but of seeing that that legislation is carried out in accordance with congressional intent.

In the absence of the exercise of this second function, Congress will be only half effective at best, for no law is better than its administration, and the people of the country have a right to expect their direct representatives in Congress to see not only that the laws which they—the people—desire are passed but that such laws are administered in accordance with the people's will.

Above all, it is important that Congress be responsible for seeing that no executive agency exercises power in an arbitrary or capricious manner or in such fashion as to deny fundamental rights or immunities to the people.

It is up to Congress to legislate with more care, to define objectives more specifically, to set forth exactly the powers and methods to be employed. Where rules and regulations are necessary, they should be directed toward specific objectives and not general ones.

To exercise a delegated power is one thing, but to interpret the objective of a statute so as to give powers never mentioned in it is quite another.

No executive agency should be able to fix penalties for violations of its own orders. This should either be done by Congress or the courts. Ultimately no citizen having a substantial interest in the decisions of any executive agency should be denied opportunity to have his case heard in some impartial judicial tribunal.

Progress for the common people can in the long run not be made by Executive orders, questionable or invalid administrative interpretations of powers and authority, or by the creation of executive agencies exercising all powers of government.

Sooner or later, as long as democracy really persists, such agencies will be destroyed by act of Congress, nullifying the apparent progress for the public interest which may have seemed to have been made.

Inability of an executive agency to meet a problem should immediately suggest its coming to Congress for more power to enable it to do its job.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to section 5 of H. R. 628, which sets forth my proposal for a solution of this problem of supervising grants of power.

Now, most of the proposals for dealing with this problem have taken the form of bills like the Walter-Logan bill, and have endeavored to outline administrative procedure for executive agencies—lumping all such agencies into one basket.

This, in my judgment, is not practical, due to the tremendous diversity of the tasks which different executive agencies must perform. My own proposal, embodied in section 5 of H. R. 628, is that each standing committee of the House and Senate be given, in addition to its task of reporting legislation, the duty, obligation, and right to continuously review the actions of any executive department or agency over whose work that particular committee has jurisdiction.

Such a plan would lead quite naturally to a more adequate staffing of the committees in order to enable this work to be done. It would create a new relationship between the Congress, on the one hand, and executive agencies, on the other—a relationship in which there would almost certainly be a greater degree of mutual understanding and in which there could be developed the healthy situation in which every executive agency would know that if it failed to carry out an act of Congress in accordance with congressional intent there was a committee waiting to look into the matter and, if necessary, to pass remedial legislation.

Thus every agency set up by the Congress would be subject to continuous review of its work, not by special committees featuring sensational hearings but with a view to amending the law to correct the situation.

Congress should know from day to day whether powers granted by it are being properly used, or, on the other hand, whether an agency has been given a task to perform but granted power inadequate to do the job effectively. And the correct remedy is not publicity but rather the reporting to Congress by a responsible standing committee of a bill amending the law in such fashion as to correct whatever weakness may have appeared in it.

Thus we would be able to get back to a government of laws instead of a government of men. And this, after all, is pretty close to the fundamental problem of the position of the Congress. For the job of Congress in our National Government is to see to it that the Nation is governed by law and that the laws are adequate to meet the Nation's need.

If Congress does this we need have no fear about the future of democratic government or of the human liberty which finds its only ultimate protection in the National Legislature. If Congress fails to do this, then, indeed, we shall see a continuous growth of executive authority and power and a corresponding decline in the prestige of the National Legislature.

Surveys of Hospital and Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of Dr. Louis T. Wright, chairman of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, prepared to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in support of Senate bill 191, stating the opinion of the doctor with regard to the bill. The statement was inadvertently omitted from the reports printed covering the committee hearings on the Senate bill for hospital construction.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People takes pleasure in endorsing the basic principle of S. 191, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to authorize grants to States for surveying their hospital and public-health centers, and appropriating $100,000,000 for the planning and construction of additional hospital facilities. Such a program is badly needed in the United States, and is long overdue.

I believe all authorities agree that at least one-third of the entire population of the United States is without proper medical care. This urgently needed medical service can be supplied only through a positive and permanent program of Federal aid to existing public hospitals, and the speedy construction of desperately needed hospitals and health centers. It is not necessary to make an extended examination of the effect on national health which flows from the failure of the United States to meet the crying need by a broad and constructive program. It suffices to say that in 1943 the Selective Service reported that 3,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 44 had been rejected for military service because of physical, educational, and moral defects. The exact number of men rejected for physical deficiencies is not a matter of official information, however, current estimates put that figure at 2,000,000.

I want, however, to address myself particularly to the health problem of Negroes in the United States. For the overwhelming majority of the colored race in this country, clinical and hospital care is, for all practical purposes, nonexistent. The few exceptions where good care can be had, found chiefly in northern urban centers, merely balance off the situation in southern rural communities where, for the most part, there is a total absence of medical facilities of any kind. For example, the Negro population of Mississippi is 1,074,578, yet in 1938 there were only 0.7 beds per thousand for Negroes. In this connection, after a careful study of hospital facilities for Negro patients for the years 1940–42, a responsible organization concluded that "* * * in some areas where the population is heavily Negro, there are as few as 75 beds set aside for over a million Negroes."

A great number of private hospitals completely exclude Negro patients. This is true even in many northern urban communities. Such private and public medical institutions that admit Negroes place heavy restrictions on the number of beds for Negro use. Moreover, they are invariably placed in segregated quarters inferior to those obtaining elsewhere in the same facility. With this overview, I advert to the situation obtaining in Mississippi. According to Harold F. Dorn, the beds per 1,000 whites were 2.1 as compared with 0.7 for Negroes. Although the number of beds required will vary with the type and prevalence of the disease, modern medical authorities set four beds per thousand as the minimum requirement for a well-cared-for community.

The Negro not only suffers with the general population from the lack of a broad and adequate Federal health program but, as has been indicated, he is further victimized by practices of segregation and discrimination. How does this reflect inself in the general health of the Negro? By and large, it can be safely said that he suffers more from all sorts of diseases than white citizens. Current figures show that infant mortality for Negroes is 69 percent higher than for whites; that a Negro child born alive has an average life expectancy of 53 years as compared with a white child who may, in the normal course of things, expect to reach the age of 65.

I am satisfied, from a medical standpoint, that these differentials in no wise reflect any innate susceptibility of the Negro to disease, but rather show the combined impact of discrimination in economic life and the aforesaid discriminations in obtaining medical assistance. As one authority has put it, "a white person who is ill, under existing racial provisions, has 14 times better a chance of recovering than a Negro."

In any discussion of the health of the Negro, it would be remiss not to touch on the status of the Negro physician, technician, and nurse. In 1944 there were 3,500 physicians in private practice and 7,500 nurses and technicians. The net result is a qualified Negro physician is denied staff and in-patient privileges in practically every non-Negro hospital in the United States. This limitation applies equally to Negro nurses and technicians. The net result is that in many southern hospitals, I regret to say, the attitude of white physicians toward Negro patients is one of indifference bordering on criminal neglect. Moreover, the denial of staff privileges to the Negro medical profession considerably lowers opportunities for training and specialization.

In these circumstances, I am deeply concerned by the fact that S. 191 provides for State control over medical facilities constructed with Federal funds without any safeguards whatsoever to protect Negro patients and Negro members of the medical profession. The inequitable manner in which certain States allocate their own general funds affords ample justification for my concern. I believe, therefore, that this bill should be amended so as to provide such safeguards and recommend that:

1. Page 3, line 6 be amended to read as follows:

"Council, shall be fairly representative of trade or industry, labor, farm, consumer, and minority racial groups, and State agencies," etc.

2. Page 3, line 14 to read:

"Council shall be representative of trade or industry, labor, farm, consumer, and minority racial groups; and"

3. Page 7, following line 10, shall be added a new section as follows:

"Assure that all services and physical accommodations of such hospitals shall be available to persons without regard to religion, sex, race, national origin, or degree of indigency; that all physicians licensed in the State shall be eligible to the various levels of staff appointments according to their training, experience, and demonstrated professional qualifications; that professional training opportunities shall be open to all qualified persons in such manner as to obtain trainees of the highest ability, character, and professional promise; that all of the other professional and service personnel shall be recruited and employed solely on the basis of ability, training, experience, and character."

With the incorporation of these changes, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People endorses, without reservation, S. 191.

Fourth of July Address by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on July 4 a great celebration was held in Gainesville, Ga. A vast throng of people from all over the State gathered in that beautiful little city to express their confidence in President Harry S. Truman, and to assure him of their wholehearted support of his administration. The day was designated "Truman Day."

It was most appropriate that Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, should deliver the principal address. His speech was a notable one, and was broadcast over a Nation-wide radio hook-up. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to join with you in setting apart this Independence Day as Truman day. I know if circumstances would permit it, that President Truman would like nothing better than to be with us here today, and he has asked me to convey to you both his gratitude for the honor which you have done him, and his heartfelt good wishes.

Georgia is noted for many things and for many men. In a very special sense, she will always be associated in my heart and mind with the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who called Georgia "his other State." I know that it is a matter of intense pride and satisfaction to you that the healing waters at Warm Springs brought restoration and relief for the physical affliction to one of America's and the world's greatest leaders. And how fitting it was that when the end came, in a flashing moment of dramatic and shocking suddenness he should have been resting in his "other State." Franklin Roosevelt loved Georgia and Georgia loved him.

I am equally sure that President Truman and Georgia, as they come to know one another better, will come to love one another better. I know that the President feels, as I feel, a high respect and admiration for the

outstanding contribution which Georgia's statesmen are making in the field of national and State government. In Washington you are represented with distinction by Senator WALTER GEORGE, an outstanding Member of the United States Senate whose respected judicial temperament and wealth of experience give special value and attention to his judgment and counsel. Senator RUSSELL is an outstanding popular and effective legislator. He has made many constructive contributions to the national welfare, but his special interest in the problems of agriculture has especially endeared him to the farmers—the soldiers of the soil to whom the Nation is so much indebted for the tremendous part they are playing in the successful prosecution of the war. Your congressional delegation is outstanding and composed of men with wide experience and great ability. Your militant and progressive Governor, Ellis Arnall, is known throughout the Nation as the leader of the New South, a relentless fighter for the progressive principles for which the Democratic Party stands.

I am sure that this day signifies your warm-hearted and generous response to the splendid manner in which President Truman has measured up to his unparalleled responsibilities. No man ever assumed the Presidency under such solemn and momentous circumstances. America was at the very climax of a global war. The world was on the threshold of a great international conference, called to form an international organization to keep the peace. A preview of the future showed many critical and vexing problems ahead in both the domestic and international fields. In all these problems, President Roosevelt was deeply and personally immersed.

And yet—he was gone, and Harry Truman stepped into his place. The Nation's response, and Harry Truman's response, were such as to affirm and increase the world's confidence in the vitality of our democratic institutions. The Nation's generous impulse and civic fervor rallied her people as one man to his side. He did not falter or hesitate. With a full realization of the lead he was assuming of the tremendous burdens he must henceforth bear, Harry Truman stepped to the helm.

From the first moment, he was master of the situation. His head was clear, his hand was steady, his feet were on the ground. Straightway he commenced to steer the ship of state on the forward course which his predecessor had charter. But he brought to his task talents of simplicity, directness, and clear thinking energy which were peculiarly his own.

In the same measure as Harry Truman has given, the people have responded. In him they instantly recognized a leader of distinction and capacity, of clarity, firmness, and courage. Already in the brief period of his Presidency, he has acquired not only the confidence and loyal support, but the devotion and affection of the entire American people, without regard to party or section.

Therefore I believe that this Truman day is a personal and peculiarly appropriate expression of your share in that genuine American response to a typical American—Harry Truman.

This united demonstration by typical Americans of their faith in a typical American President is a truly heartening and inspiring omen for our Nation's future. Only the unity of all our people has brought us to the verge of total victory in a total war. Likewise, only a continuation of this unity will make it possible for us to meet the equally difficult task which lies ahead.

All our differing and diverse groups have united to meet and surmount the challenges of war. Under the leadership of President Truman I am confident that they will, with equal vigor and resolution, meet and surmount the challenges of peace.

What are those challenges? If I could summarize them in two phrases, those phrases would be "lasting peace" and "full employment."

It is a tragic thing that men must die because of the evil that other men do. It is tragic that evil is allowed to take root and flourish until only the savagery of war can tear it out. There is another way and we must find it.

These wars that destroy treasure and manhood do not just happen. Let us once and for all root out of our thinking the idea that wars are beyond control. Wars are not acts of God. They are caused by man, by man-made institutions, by the way in which man has organized his society. What man has made, man can change. We can alter the shape of things so that war is no longer an ever-constant threat. It is within our power, as members of the United Nations, to accomplish this. It will not be easy, but the homage we pay our dead here today will be a mockery unless we use to the utmost the opportunity for which they fought and died.

We of the United Nations can do this, because the future of the world is in the hands of mankind. We must do this because mankind must progress and grow. We will do this because it is mankind's destiny to live in peace and liberty.

What are the means by which we may accomplish lasting peace? The means are not simple to find, nor are they easy to put into operation. Yet, ways must be found: the world must work together. The separate nations of the world must not only be willing that other nations should have economic security, but they also should assist each other to attain it. There must be a method for working in concert, with force if necessary, to put down those who seek by violence to attain selfish ends.

At Dumbarton Oaks and at Yalta and at San Francisco, we of the United Nations have been shaping machinery intended to prevent aggressions. We have been blocking out the systems and the methods by which men and nations can come to a peaceful solution of their differences. We are seeking to substitute debate, discussion, compromise, and legislation for the horror of modern war.

We are making progress. It is a healthy thing that the problems of the world are being decided, with all the world listening in. This is not secret diplomacy such as marked the end of the last war. This is the modern, democratic way of working, free debate in the open. Through these means, we are shaping the constitution of the United Nations.

Out of San Francisco has come a Charter which, I firmly believe, can and will succeed—because the people of the world have demanded it.

Solid measures are also being forged in the Congress of the United States, and in the parliaments and assemblies of the United Nations to serve the cause of world cooperation.

The United Nations confront two main problems: the suppression of aggression, and the assurance of a full flow of trade among nations. It is equally important that we are applying to the task of peace the cooperation that we learned in the hard school of war. We are determined to eliminate the causes of war. We cannot evade this responsibility. The world looks to us for leadership, and we are accepting the role.

America has never wished for war. Yet there are things dearer than peace—and so, sometimes we do go to war. What are these things dearer than peace? What is it that makes American men willing to die in fields and seas and skies of battle?

They are simple things, as our men, as all men everywhere are simple in their hearts; security of their homes and loved ones; the opportunity to work, to achieve, to grow in a land free from the tyranny of little men greedy for power.

Yes; these are simple things. But their attainment is not simple. The Declaration of Independence is a living document that was born in strife and whose fulfillment has required, and still requires, the devotion of generations of men. The "four freedoms" of man have been proclaimed. They are being born in battles more savage, more demanding of courage than the framers of our Independence could ever have imagined. We are setting about the fulfillment of those freedoms.

A job for every man and woman who wants to work would constitute a good beginning to the fulfillment of the "four freedoms," and to the prevention of war. Our country has more than attained this goal during the war.

We have glimpsed a treasure of prosperity beyond anything this Nation, or the world, has ever known—by providing a multitude of jobs. But there is something wrong when such standards of living can be attained only by producing for war. There is something wrong with us, with the systems of mankind that have caused war.

There will be something wrong with mankind, too, if we allow wars and depressions to return with clocklike regularity as of old. Depressions, like wars, are not acts of God. Man makes them. If we make them, we can unmake them. We must create, in peace, a new prosperity and a greater opportunity for jobs than has existed before.

A difficult task? Of course it is. But during the last 5 years, America has accomplished many difficult tasks. In 5 years, we have doubled our national production. We have piled an entire war economy on top of a civilian economy already operating at what, a few years before, some would have considered an impossible peak of nearly $100,000,000,000.

We are a nation of prodigious accomplishment and we can do this job, too. Our efforts in this war have opened our own eyes to the tremendous production which American labor and the American genius for management and organization can accomplish as a team. But this record, this vast number of jobs, has been attained through the establishment of an unlimited market by the Government's purchases for war. The change to peacetime production and employment, on a similar scale, will call once more upon the genius of all of us, upon business and agriculture, labor and management, State, local, and Federal Governments to create new peacetime markets to take the place of war-born demands.

We have the means to produce a standard of living far higher than any we have ever known. We are rich in resources, in manufacturing facilities, and in manpower, and the know-how of management.

If the ceiling of our production seems almost unlimited the needs of our people are also great. Our needs, plus those of the war-blighted lands overseas, are so various and so great that they challenge the production capacity of even the greatest industrial nation on earth. Yes; the needs are great, but needs do not constitute the means. The people of the United States must have steady income and must feel sufficiently secure to want to spend that income before the people become customers for all their needs.

This is a real challenge to America. We know we can produce what people need and what people want. We know that our system of distribution can get the goods to them. But the creation of steady pay presents the test of the genius of our business management large and small. They must actuate demand by expanding their business, offering better services and better goods at fair prices. Labor and agriculture can increase man-hour production and thus make an important contribution to higher incomes and higher standards of living.

Government, too, has its responsibility and it is a large one. Business, labor, and agriculture cannot alone assure the maintenance of high levels of production and employment. The Government, acting on behalf of all the people, must be responsible for broad economic policies. Their purpose should be to promote and encourage the expansion of business, and to broaden markets, to support consumer spending.

The way to this goal, like the way to enduring world peace, lies through the joint work of all of us, through the genius of all of us; through the spirit of mankind. What can be done here at home will be done. The leaders of America, in every walk of life, will work individually and collectively. Where government can help, it will. But the task is, first and foremost, the job of every one of us; of every living man and woman of America and in the world. The living owe it to those who have died. We owe it to those who will return. They are fighting to get the job done, to get home and to pick up the task, the happiness, of living. What we, and they, do now and in the future will be the measure of whether or not we who live have fulfilled our duty to those who die.

Let us, on this Independence Day, honor our President and our dead by dedicating ourselves to accept and surmount challenges of lasting peace and full employment.

Address by Col. Eugene M. Caffey at Utah Beach D-Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on June 6, 1945, exercises were held on Utah Beach, near Cherbourg, France, commemorating the landing 1 year earlier of the American Army of liberation on those historic sands. A few days before the celebration I was one of a group of Senators who had the privilege of hearing Col. Eugene M. Caffey, commanding officer of the First Engineer Brigade, describe the achievements of that heroic organization in clearing the beaches and making secure our bridgehead in Hitler's Europe.

Speaking at the ceremonies celebrating D-day in the shadow of the monument erected to the memory of those who fought and were killed there, Colonel Caffey briefly outlined the unsurpassed performance of his command.

I think his remarks should have widespread circulation. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Minister, distinguished guests, my friends, last summer over 800,000 American soldiers crossed this strip of sand to engage in battle with the enemy. Uncounted airmen thronged these skies. Unnumbered sailors from the British and American Navies and merchant fleets came to this coast. The great military, naval, and civil leaders of our time have visited this place. It is of none of these that I wish to speak; their fame needs no words from me.

All but hidden in the events that took place here are the officers and men of the First Engineer Brigade. As their long-time commander in Africa, in Sicily, in Italy, in Normandy, it is my desire and it is my duty to them to mention them to you.

It was the task of the First Brigade to land promptly on this beach and to assist in every way possible the debarking of the American forces. Its work began with the destruction of the obstacles that had been placed along the water's edge and in the water to wreck our craft and drown our soldiers. Its work continued with the breaching of the sea wall with charges of explosives so that tanks and cannon could get off the beach and at the enemy. It neutralized the flame throwers along the sea wall; removed the mine fields which lay back of the dunes, even one the spot where we now stand; assaulted enemy points of resistance; and dragged the dead and wounded from the surf. Inland it opened up routes of advance and speeded the Army's forward movement. For over 5 months it labored here without rest until the storms of winter made it impossible to continue. During this period it landed about half the American forces which came to Normandy; over 200,000 guns and vehicles; 700,000 tons of supplies and equipment; evacuated 40,000 wounded and 60,000 prisoners of war; and shipped out 2 divisions. Had the brigade failed or faltered, history might have been very different.

The First Brigade did not come here to fail. It came here to do all that men could do. It did much more than that. The condition of the newly won port of Cherbourg was such that much of the load intended for that port was laid on the shoulders of the brigade. For months the success of the American forces depended on the successful operation of this beach, Utah, and of Omaha, just around yonder point.

The First Brigade did not come here with any illusions as to what lay before it. It had been to the wars before. It came here with the fixed purpose of overcoming all obstacles or of leaving its bones in these sands. No matter what happened, no matter how badly the day went, no matter what others might do, the orders to the First Brigade were to hold fast as long as the breath of life remained. I am very certain that the brigade would have obeyed.

To the members of the brigade who have gone from this world, but whose spirits are here today, your old commander says, "Well done. Wherever you rest, in Algeria, in Tunisia, in Sicily, in Italy, in England, in the waters of the Channel, in Normandy, we remember you always. May the Almighty God, who loves brave soldiers, grant you a place of refreshment, peace, and light. Especially do I commend to Him my orderly, and my friend, Pfc Leonce Sonnier, who died only a hundred paces from here that first D-day morning."

To you others, you men of the brigade who are here today, I remember how the shells swept back and forth across this very spot when you came here 1 year ago. I remember how, in spite of wounds and death and destruction, you went calmly about your appointed tasks. Not only our country but the whole world of freedom owes you admiration and homage. To you I say, too, "Well done." Remember your dead, remember your duty, and surround with your hopes and your prayers those others of the brigade who have gone ahead of us to the Pacific. At this moment they are locked with the enemy in the far reaches of the western ocean. To them I say, "Hold fast, we are coming."

Protection of Raw Materials in Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Arizona Republic of June 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

M'FARLAND SEEKS TO PROTECT RAW MATERIALS IN TRADE AGREEMENTS

Believing the American people are entitled to protection from the effects of a lowered tariff on the importation of agricultural products, wool and livestock, metals, minerals, ores, and concentrates when the market prices of such raw materials in this country are less than parity, Senator ERNEST W. McFARLAND, of Arizona, has introduced an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to prevent the lowering of the tariffs in trade agreements with other countries unless the market price of these raw materials is parity or above. The American people are entitled to that protection.

It is apparent in spite of vigorous opposition, that Congress will extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 2 or 3 years. If Senator McFARLAND's amendment becomes a part of the extended act, the leading industries in Arizona will be protected against foreign competition when and if the market prices fall below the parities established by the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the parities on metals, minerals, ores, and concentrates which the Senator's amendment provides shall be determined in the same manner except the base period for such determination shall be the years 1925 to 1929, inclusive.

Full significance of the amendment proposed by Senator McFARLAND is realized when it is considered that the measure proposing the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would give the President power to reduce all existing tariff rates by an additional 50 percent in return for similar concessions by other countries. If this authority is granted to the President, it will mean that he has the power to reduce tariff rates on products imported into this country from other countries highly competitive to our own products in return for the lowering by those countries of their tariffs on products we might export to them. The latter products largely would be manufactured goods whereas the imports would be chiefly raw materials.

Under such an arrangement, manufacturing States would benefit at the expense of nonmanufacturing States such as Arizona which produces large quantities of raw materials. To prevent that discriminating effect is the desire of Senator McFARLAND, especially when market prices for these raw materials are below parity. This country has never been able to compete with other countries in the production of raw materials because of the higher labor costs. One of the evils of the reciprocal trade agreements has been the breaking of tariff barriers which protect raw materials from unequal foreign competition in return for a lowering of their tariffs on our finished products. In a lesser degree some fabricators of articles suffer in

the breaking of the barriers on importation of products in competition to their own so that raw materials not produced in this country may be imported.

The reciprocal trade agreements work somewhat like pushing rising bread dough back into a bowl. Pressure applied on one side forces the dough out on the other. There seems to be no way in which the effects of tariff reductions can be equalized so no industry will be unduly affected.

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A United MVA Front," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of July 7, 1945. It comments on the regional conference for MVA held in Omaha, Nebr., July 6 and 7, when delegates from all the Missouri Valley States assembled and formed the Missouri Valley Regional Committee for MVA. This recent conference is the outgrowth of a Missouri State conference held on May 11–12 at Jefferson City, Mo. The people of the valley—the men and women who have been suffering from the perennial floods and droughts and declining economic conditions—are fully awake to the need of an MVA, and are uniting to make their voices heard.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A UNITED MVA FRONT

Maybe it could not have come earlier, but certainly it is well that the Missouri Valley Regional Committee for MVA, organized in Omaha this week, has come no later. Organized opponents are steadily getting in every lick they can, taking full advantage of the incompletely organized state of pro-MVA sentiment. The Murray-Cochran bill is in the hands of its enemies and, for the most part, Members of Congress from the Missouri Valley and elsewhere wait on the sidelines to make sure what the people want. Unified, vigorous action on a valley-wide scale is the only way to surmount such difficulties.

The great hope is that the committee can spread so much truth that it will prevail over the flood of untruth and spur Congress to favorable action. It will be a big job, but the committee does have excellent materials to work with, in the form of a rich body of highly favorable experience in the Tennessee Valley. State Senator Claude B. Ricketts, chairman of the Missouri commission that recently studied TVA on the ground, testified to that before the Omaha conference.

Both the scale and the promise of the job were brought out in a Gallup poll 6 weeks ago which found that people with a reasonably good grasp of the facts about TVA are more than 6 to 1 in favor—so much so that they are more than 5 to 1 in favor of extending the principle to the Missouri Valley. The catch is that these informed people represent only 41 percent of the American public. The poll found that the other 59 percent had TVA mixed up with the air line, TWA, or given to other fundamental misconceptions, and therefore not competent to express opinions.

The opposition relies on defeating MVA by adding still more to the ignorance and confusion of that 59 percent. The valley-wide MVA committee's job is to remove ignorance and confusion. It is about as fine an opportunity for public education as was ever put in the hands of a group of people. May they get on with it.

Problems at Potsdam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Problems at Potsdam," from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS AT POTSDAM

For sheer magnitude and complexity, the problems that will confront President Truman, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin will transcend any faced by any group of statesmen, including Messrs. Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd-George, and Orlando who met in Paris some months after the end of World War I to write the treaty of peace with Germany. To be sure, the coming meeting of the "Big Three" will not, in a literal sense, be a peace conference. It will be the preliminary to a peace conference. But if the gathering at Potsdam is to be successful it must produce a big-power agreement regarding the broad outlines of the European settlement that is to be made later.

The greatest question facing the conferees will, of course, be that of the future of Germany. Although this had been taken up both at Tehran and Yalta, the area of dispute and differences among Russia, Britain, and America is still wider than the area of agreement. This is borne out by the tangled situation in Berlin, where for days after the arrival of the Americans and British occupation forces over-all rule remained in Russian hands. It is also borne out by the fact that 2 months after VE-day the zones of occupation in Germany as a whole have not yet been straightened out. The same is true in the case of Austria.

Under the happiest of circumstances the occupation of a country by four separate armies located in four distinct zones would make for difficulties. The situation in Germany has been greatly complicated by the different policies the occupation authorities have been pursuing in the four zones. There is an imperative need for coordinated effort and truly central control. There is need for an agreement as to the measure of industrial recovery that is to be allowed the Reich. There are such problems as reparations, the trial or war criminals, and the future boundaries of Germany to be taken up.

But the German problem, far-reaching as it is, is only one of a number of great issues that the "Big Three" must consider. The flare-up at Trieste last May and the current difficulties between Yugoslavia and Greece are indicative of the turmoil we may have in Europe unless and until the postwar boundaries of the defeated and the victorious countries are clearly delimited. There is also the problem of what is to be done with Italy. For many months that country has lived under an armistice the terms of which have been kept secret. There is the question of the Dardanelles. And last but by no means least there is that vast congeries of problems involving the future settlement in the Far East. Some of these problems may have been settled at the meetings which Marshal Stalin has had with Prime Minister Soong of China. But if any Russo-Chinese agreements have been reached, they will have to be submitted to the United States and Great Britain for their scrutiny.

From any point of view, therefore, the coming Potsdam Conference will be the most momentous of modern times. And to a far greater degree than ever before it will serve as a test of the ability of the three principal Allies to work together.

Newspaper Comment on Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ten Years of NLRB," by Ernest Lindley, from the Washington Post of July 4, and an editorial entitled "Safeguards for Workers," from the Washington News of July 5.

There being no objection ,the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 4, 1945]

TEN YEARS OF NLRB

(By Ernest Lindley)

TROUBLESOME PERIOD AHEAD

On July 5, one of the most controversial creations of the New Deal, the National Labor Relations Act, will be 10 years old. In this decade, the NLRB has handled over 74,000 cases, of which 62,000 were disposed of informally. It has issued over 11,000 formal decisions which fill 60 bound volumes.

Probably no other statute in the history of the United States has been so extensively litigated in so short a period. For 2 years or more the NLRB was so thoroughly tied up in lawsuits that it was not very effective. An impressive array of prominent lawyers said the act was unconstitutional. But it was upheld by the Supreme Court—the old Supreme Court, before it contained even one Roosevelt appointee. And of the 55 cases involving NLRB orders on which the Supreme Court has acted, it has denied enforcement in only 2.

As a result, there exists today a very extensive body of law concerning collective bargaining. In most situations, both parties have a pretty good idea of their respective rights and duties. As the law about unfair labor practices has become clarified, an increasing percentage—more than 75 percent—of the NLRB's business has been to determine what union, if any, should represent the employees. Often that requires an election. The NLRB has held approximately 24,000 elections. About 8,000 were won by A. F. of L. affiliates, about 9,500 by CIO affiliates, and about 2,500 by independent unions, while in 3,800 no union was selected.

After a relatively quiet period, the NLRB's volume of business has been on the upgrade again for several months. We are entering into another period of troublesome labor relations, not only as between employers and

employees, but as between unions. For with reconversion, many plants, of course, are laying off a great many workers, some of them permanently. Old employees are returning from the Army and from war industries. The union chosen by temporary war workers in a particular plant may not be the union favored by the more or less permanent postwar workers in the same plant.

In some instances, the nature of the production will change drastically. One case now before the NLRB involves a company which during the war has been making ships' parts—operations consisting largely of the assembly and welding of sheet metal and armor plate. It is now getting ready to go back to its peacetime manufacture of machinery for wire processing and elevator parts—operations which call mostly for machine work with very little welding.

The company estimated that the switch would require the discharge or transfer to diffrent jobs of about half its old personnel, and the employment of many new workers with entirely different skills. The question which the Board has to decide is whether the company must bargain now with the wartime union about postreconversion working conditions, or whether it should wait until the postreconversion employees have a chance to decide who shall represent them.

When especially aggressive union members are included in the thousands of men being laid off, the suspicion is likely to arise in some minds that discrimination is being shown. To run down the facts will be difficult in many cases.

These special problems growing out of tremendous shifts in employment during the reconversion period will aggravate a situation which would be troublesome enough without them.

The Wagner Act has served a useful purpose, up to a point. Any attempt to destroy or impair it seriously would have grave results, but it could be supplemented, and very probably will be before many years have passed. The unions are hotly against the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill drafted by Donald Richberg. It merits calmer consideration, even though it may not be the best answer to the problem of putting employer-employee relations on a firmer footing and protecting the public interest.

Under the Wagner Act, unions and collective bargaining have grown and spread. They are here to stay. But organized labor can much more surely consolidate its gains by acting as if it were of age, instead of as if it were still fighting for the right to exist.

[From the Washington News of July 5, 1945]

SAFEGUARDS FOR WORKERS

Closed-shop contracts can operate for the mutual benefit of workers and employers. In many cases they do.

But closed-shop contracts can be used as instruments of monopoly and injustice to workers. And in far too many cases they have been. For Federal law, while permitting and encouraging unions to press for the closed shop, provides no safeguards against abuse of the power it gives them.

This is one of the situations which Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL propose to correct by a new Federal Industrial Relations Act. Their bill would make it an unfair labor practice to enforce a closed-shop contract unless four democratic requirements were met.

The union would have to be the freely chosen representative of at least 75 percent of the employees covered by the contract. The contract would have to be ratified by at least 60 percent of the employees covered, voting by secret ballot. Union membership would have to be open to any employee or employment seeker on substantially the same terms employed by the members already in. The union would be forbidden to deprive any member of his membership—and so of his job—except on written charges and after a fair hearing.

These are safeguards for workers. We think they are reasonable and essential. Their adoption would mean better, more responsible unions and greater equality of opportunity for jobs.

There is no fairness in making union membership a condition of employment for large minorities which object to compulsory unionism. Or in barring people from employment by excluding new members from unions except on unreasonable terms. Or in throwing people out of employment by expelling them from unions without fair hearings. Yet many unions have done these things, and will continue to do them until something like the Hatch-Burton-Ball proposal becomes law.

Presidential Succession Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to the recent article in the July 13 issue of United States News.

In this article giving the views of several leaders of both parties on the question of the line of succession of the Presidency, it is most interesting to see the strong support given to the idea of President Truman that the succession should go through the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Included in those who strongly endorse the Speaker being next to the Vice President in the line of succession are such leaders as John Nance Garner, of Texas, a former Speaker of the House and a former Vice President of the United States; Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, former Republican Presidential nominee, and Homer Cummings, former Attorney General of the United States.

The article in full follows:

QUESTION OF THE WEEK

Should Presidential succession, in event of a Vice Presidential vacancy, pass first to the Speaker of the House, or to the Secretary of State?

President Truman's proposal to amend the law governing succession to the Presidency has aroused widespread discussion. To present a cross-section of informed opinion, the United States News asked Members of Congress, lawyers, authorities on constitutional law, and others, the preceding question.

Answers are printed herewith. Others will appear next week.

John N. Garner, Uvalde, Tex., Vice President of the United States, 1933–41, Speaker of the House of Representatives, 1931–33, answers (by telegraph): "The Presidential succession should first pass to the Speaker of the House."

Alf M. Landon, Topeka, Kans., Republican nominee for President of the United States, 1936; Governor of Kansas, 1933–37, answers:

"I am for President Truman's proposal to make the Speaker of the House, rather than the Secretary of State, next in line for the Presidency after the Vice President because it is repugnant to all democratic ideas of government to let an elected official pick his own successor.

"Furthermore, the President and his Secretary of State traveling together, as they are about to do in their trip to Europe, offer the risk of a double calamity."

Josephus Daniels, Raleigh, N. C., president the Raleigh News and Observer; Secretary of the Navy in President Wilson's Cabinet, 1913–21; United States Ambassador to Mexico, 1933–41, answers:

"The matter of succession ought to insure that the administration will be conducted by approved members of the party which won the election in which the President and Vice President were chosen.

"I am not particularly interested in the method or in individuals who might succeed in case of disability of the President and Vice President, but I strongly believe there ought to be no possibility of change in political administration in case of death or inability.

"The people's will should be respected. A short time before the election in 1916, when Wilson thought it might be possible that Hughes would win, he wrote a letter to the Secretary of State saying that there ought to be no government by officers except those elected by the people in the November election, and that if Hughes were elected he would resign and ask the Vice President to resign, after appointing Hughes as Secretary of State. This would automatically make Hughes President without waiting for March 4. Wilson felt in the emergency that the newly elected President ought to take over at once in the critical situation that then existed."

Homer Cummings, Washington, D. C., chairman, Democratic National Committee, 1919–20; Attorney General of the United States, 1933–39, answers:

"I think that the Presidential succession, in the event of a Vice-Presidential vacancy, should pass to the Speaker of the House."

Edward S. Corwin, Princeton, N. J.; professor of jurisprudence, Princeton University; consultant of Attorney General on constitutional questions, 1935; past president, American Political Science Association, answers (by telegraph):

"Either the Speaker or Secretary of State would have to continue as such 'officer' while 'acting' as President. This is especially objectionable as to the Speaker. Congress should create forthwith the greatly needed office of Assistant President, one of whose duties should be to 'act as President' whenever that office fell vacant with no Vice President to succeed. Then at the next election for choosing Congressmen, a new President and Vice President should be chosen for 4 years in the constitutional manner. Thus the coordination which the Constitution contemplates between a newly elected President, a newly elected House, and a newly elected one-third of the Senate would be preserved."

Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, member of House Committee on Banking and Currency; author of Presidential succession bill, H. R. 3206, answers:

"Having introduced the original bill for Presidential succession in the House, I definitely feel the succession should go to the Speaker, for he represents more nearly than any other Federal official the choice of the whole population of the country.

"Composition of the House more nearly approaches composition of the electoral college. With the size of the executive departments now at more than 3,000,000 employees, I believe it would be extremely bad public policy for the line of succession to fall to a purely appointive officer such as a Cabinet member.

"The uncertainty of the tenure in office is more clearly illustrated when it is realized that within the last few days we have had three heirs apparent, Mr. Stettinius, then Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, and now the new Secretary of State Byrnes. It is important for our system of representative

democracy to have a more nearly representative election of the successor to the Presidency."

Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio; chairman, Republican Steering Committee, United States Senate; member, Senate Committees on Finance, Banking and Currency, and Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, answers:

"I believe the succession to the Presidency should remain as is now provided in the law, to the Secretary of State.

"Presumably, he will carry out the general policies of the President and Vice President elected by the people. Certainly he is more likely to do so than the Speaker of the House, who might even belong to a different party."

Charles Michelson, Washington, D. C., editor and writer, associate director of publicity, Democratic National Committee, chief Washington correspondent, New York World, 1917-29, answers:

"Your question is complicated by the circumstances that the present Speaker has eminent qualifications, and the Nation's confidence.

"However, the not infrequent advent of a House of opposite political faith to the elected administration, and other obvious possibilities provide objections to a change.

"Ordinarily a President chooses as Secretary of State a man of proven stature.

"Theodore Roosevelt picked Elihu Root; Wilson selected Bryan, thrice his party's nominee for President; Harding brought in Charles Evans Hughes, who remained under Coolidge; Hoover named Stimson; and Roosevelt, Cordell Hull. With these precedents, I believe the existing system is safer in the long run."

Ernest Angell, New York, N. Y., president, Council for Democracy, regional administrator, United States Securities and Exchange Commission, 1936-38; author, Supreme Court Primer (1937), answers (by telegraph):

"It is fundamental in our democrracy that the people shall select their Chief Executive. The precise method of changing the law, suggested by President Truman, may or may not be the best way, or even the possible way to safeguard his right. The important point is that the statute of 1886 makes possible an undemocratic succession. How the law shall be changed is a matter for Congress to decide."

Problems of Returning Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 12 (iegislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimcus consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Irving F. Sack to his draft board in Brooklyn. This letter was furnished to me by his sister, Mrs. Evelyn R. Blacker, in Philadelphia. I wish to place this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD because it will give the Members of this body an opportunity to learn what some of our boys are thinking about in connection with their return to this country and to civilian life.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL DRAFT BOARD, No. 16,
New York City.

DEAR FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS: At your instigation, sometime in the dim past, I was honored with greetings—not to be confused with felicitations—from the President.

Subsequently I've corroborated the slogan on the recruiting posters and seen the world.

I feel somewhat qualified, because of my name, to the task of presenting to you the aspirations and hopes of my fellow sad sacks upon our return home.

Aside from kissing the ground where we first set foot once more on American soil, there are many things we're going to do.

There may be some of us who will look for a restaurant where bread is available with one meat ball. But most of us will renew old friendships with ice cream and milk, eggs from shells, commercial radio blurbs, dogs who will fetch a stick, a stool in a drug store, a seat in the bleachers, and a raid on the ice box.

We'll all try on the civilian clothes we sent home from the reception centers. We'll joke about the drape shapes with reet pleats or enjoy the familiar feel of our overalls and work clothes. Every old pair of shoes will be tight; some will never be filled. The sleeves and pants legs of some suits will be tucked up with safety pins.

For most of us the absence of years will be bridged by minutes of love. The tears of happiness of a wife, the sighs of relief of a mother, the happy recognition of a child, the hungry embrace of a sweetheart will erase the screams of "mimis," the whistled thud of 88's, the primitive life of the fox hole.

After we've reaccustomed ourselves to the sounds of traffic and the clang, clang, clang of the trolley, and you've accustomed yourselves to new profanities in every language, we'll all settle down to living our lives again.

What happened to that discharge pay of $300? And the allotments we sent home these many months? Somehow our families never managed to save anything out of the allotment. Something about an increase of some high percentage in the cost of living. And that $300 you arranged to give us on being mustered out—that practically all went to buy civvies.

Oh, we'll go to work. That vacation in the country will have to wait awhile. Plenty of time for that later. We're thankful to get back at all.

Some of you may have kept our jobs waiting for us. That's swell. It's good to be back in harness again.

Hey! Wait a minute. What happens to those guys and Rosie Riveters—our families—who held our jobs while we were away? Will they just be laid off?

We all know it doesn't take an awful lot of lay-offs to start depressions going and then we'll probably lose our jobs to someone else who'll work cheaper than we will. No, thanks. We want our jobs back. But if those other folks, who made the stuff that helped us win, need jobs, they're entitled to have jobs, too.

Lots of us never had jobs before we came into the Army. Remember, there were the CCC's and the WPA and unemployment? Where do we get our jobs? Some of us were boys when we left—office boys, schools boys, college kids, mama's darlings. But a few places like Okinawa and Guadalcanal, Normandy, and Anzio made men out of us. Where does a former boy get a job?

It appears to us that that business of former Vice President Wallace's about 60,000,000 jobs is just about what will be needed to take care of everybody.

Seems as if our Uncle Sam is the guy to do it, too. He equipped, fed, and supplied 11,000,000 of us and did a good job at that. He organized the production of planes and tanks, bombs and bullets, oil and gasoline, clothes and food, so well there was enough for us and our allies, too. Private industry could never have done the job alone. Similarly, after the war, there's no one industry or group of industries that can provide 60,000,000 jobs unless our Uncle Sam can say who will produce how much of what, even as he's doing now.

In addition to supervising production, our Uncle has got to control prices. In France and Italy we saw only too well what American cigarettes could buy, and the results of inflation. When we got home we don't expect to get paid off in cigarettes, although it might seem like a good idea to some of you. We want our pay envelopes to have cash in them that we can spend to get all the things we need, not just a few of them.

We want a medical service that will understand us. One that will keep us well and healthy but also take care of us when we're ill. It should provide maternity benefits, too, because we don't believe that one about the stork anymore.

Completely adequate pensions should be provided for those of us who return incapacitated. The families of our dead comrades should, in addition to pensions and insurance, be eligible for all benefits their deceased would have been eligible for.

Cultural and educational facilities should be extended beyond the limitations of the present GI bill of rights.

Our democracy must be made to live for all of us. You must remove poll tax restrictions. You must not discriminate against Japanese Americans of proven loyalty. There must be an end to help wanted advertisements which say "Christians preferred." Negroes must have open to them any position for which they can qualify.

Finally, you must build the future and the peace not only for our time but for all time. The decisions of the Crimea Conference must assume physical being in a world organization empowered to act against any future aggressor. The close association of Britain, Russia, and the United States must be continued beyond the war.

Dear friends and neighbors, we hope you'll forgive this intrusion, but you got most of us into this and we thought you'd like to hear from us about getting us out of it.

For myself, I'm a patient in a hospital in England who, for the first time in a long time, can indulge myself to the extent of putting my thoughts on paper.

Hope to see you soon.

Very sincerely,

Sgt. IRVING F. SACK,
Company A, Three Hundred and Third Medical Battalion, care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

Truth Crushed to Earth Will Rise Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the base, unwarranted attack on the integrity and bravery of Negro Americans serving in our armed forces by a Senator from Mississippi, demonstrates how racial prejudice can blind the judgment and warp the reason of its possessor. Those who are in position to know state:

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson today was asked the following question at his news conference: "Daily newspaper stories about Senate debate on FEPC quote a Senator as having stated, on the Senate floor, that 'High ranking generals' had told him on a recent overseas trip that 'Negro troops would neither work nor fight' and that their conduct and performance generally have been disgraceful. Are these statements—attributed to unnamed generals—representa-

tive of the Army's views of the performance of Negro troops?"

Mr. Patterson replied as follows:

"No. If any high ranking general has made such a statement, I have no knowledge of it. You have already heard views of our leading commanders—General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, General Eaker and others—which do not support any such conclusion.

"The War Department is proud of its troops, and that includes Negroes as well as all other groups.

"There have been a number of press releases in the last few months commending the behavior of a number of units made up of Negro troops. General Eisenhower spoke of the good performance of the volunteer platoons that were used in the European theater. The Inspector General commented favorably, went out of his way to comment favorably, on the performance of the 24th Infantry Regiment in the Marianas, and there have been a number of similar commendations."

I also wish to include an article by the foreign editor of the Chicago Times, who states:

FOR THE RECORD

(By Irving Pflaum)

One of the first questions I asked our war correspondent, James Wellard, on his return from Europe, concerned the statements Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND of Mississippi recently made in the United States Senate about Negro-American troops. I knew that Wellard, who covered the American advance from North Africa through Italy and France to Germany, would have an eyewitness report of the Negro fighters in our Army. And he did.

Wellard saw our Negro pilots in action in North Africa, flying planes then considered out of date and doing an excellent job with them. Later he saw Negro soldiers in the Infantry, Artillery, and Quartermaster Corps doing their full share on the Italian front.

He says they were "O. K." Many Negro-American soldiers were assigned to the quartermaster corps as truck drivers. They carried supplies to our front line soldiers and, as our successful campaigns testify, they didn't fail them.

Another large group of Negro-American soldiers was in chemical warfare unit. They handled smoke screens along the front in France and Germany, Wellard reports.

In France, he saw one such group panic, but it soon was reformed and returned to its advance positions to finish the job.

Wellard also saw inexperienced white American soldiers panic in North Africa. But they returned to battle too, and eventually they won.

In General Patton's Third Army, to which Wellard was attached during the battle for France, there was a tank group of Negro-Americans. Wellard is of the opinion that these men conducted themselves well, and he recalls hearing Patton compliment them for their behavior in battle.

"The Negro in the American Army," Wellard told me, "was exactly like all the GI's. He did the job he was told to do."

Another statement made by Senator EASTLAND in the Senate—that French-Negro-Senegalese troops had raped 5,000 German girls in Stuttgart—was found to have "no basis in fact" by the United States Army.

The United States Sixth Army group made an investigation of EASTLAND's charges.

As a result of this investigation, the Army now says, "All United States liaison officers with the French Army Corps and lower units which could have been in or near that city at any time, have submitted written reports that, to their knowledge and belief, incidents such as alleged did not take place."

And that's that—for the record.

Help Battle-Shocked Veteran Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously granted, I want to say that on the 26th day of April 1945, I made some remarks that there were no hospitals for discharged veterans. At that time I called particular attention to the lack of hospitals not only for those who are physically disabled, but for those who have been mentally unbalanced by battle shock.

There are more than 5,000 cases of mentally disturbed veterans walking the streets of northern Ohio, who should be lovingly treated in hospitals by the Government for whom they have borne arms. Again I say it seems that the Government was thoughtful in granting priorities to everyone, excepting to World War Veterans who are especially in need of hospitals for mental disturbances caused by service in the Armed Forces.

Since 1941, our country has been at war and those in the Administrative branch of the Government, especially the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization, who are particularly charged with having facilities ready for the veteran, have no hospitals available. This is especially due to the lack of diligence and the negligence of the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization.

Because of the absolute lack of hospital facilities covering those who have been mentally shocked by the war, hundreds of veterans and their families are being sacrificed by the suicide of these deranged men who also murder their wives and children.

To again serve notice on the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization of this horrible condition, I am inserting a news item from the Toledo Blade, of Toledo, Ohio, and I quote: "Ohio vet drowns five children, self; mother and sixth child in hospital." "I have seen too much," father writes. And the news item continues:

MONTPELIER, OHIO, June 11.—A discharged war veteran whose nerves gave way at the sight of hundreds of battlefield casualties in France and Germany was dead today, along with five of his six children, because "I don't want my children to go through with what I did."

Driving a 1932 model automobile at a reported speed of 40 miles an hour, the father left United States Route 20, 7 miles northwest of here, Saturday and plunged the car and screaming children into a water-filled quarry, authorities reported. All drowned.

Only survivors of the family are the mother, Mrs. Irene Stoner, 31, and a daughter born the previous day in Detwiler Memorial Hospital, Wauseon, Ohio.

THOSE WHO DROWNED

The dead:

Alfred Stoner, 36, Fayette, Ohio; Mary Jane, 11; Earl, 10; Alice May, 6; Betty Lou, 4, and Alva, 1.

Dr. C. Paul Waid, Bryan, coroner of Williams County, said a note found in Stoner's wallet, said in part:

"I've seen too much. I don't want my children to go through with what I did."

Dr. Waid did not disclose other contents of the note which he said was of a personal nature and addressed to Stoner's wife. The wallet contained $100 in cash and a Government check for a larger amount, he said.

CORONER'S VERDICT

The coroner gave a verdict of suicide and homicide.

The family moved to Fayette from a small farm home near Archbold, Ohio, 3 weeks ago following Stoner's discharge from military service and 3 months' treatment in Army hospitals for nervous disorders reportedly suffered over the sight of wounded men, Dr. Waid said.

Relatives said Stoner appeared nervous after his arrival home. Inducted March 27, 1944, he was home on furlough last September and then went overseas as a cook for a hospital unit.

Mr. Speaker, the death of this veteran and his five little children is chargeable directly to the Board of Hospitalization and the Veterans' Administration. The delay and absolute failure to provide for this type of discharged veteran is not only a blot on the administrative side of our Government but an indictment of those who sit in the bureaus and are charged with the responsibility for the hospitalization of our veterans, who have fought to preserve America.

I am again insisting that immediate hospital facilities for the mentally ill discharged veterans be made available to care for the thousands who are now walking the streets of northern Ohio.

Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, letters and complaints are pouring into Congress about food. A clergyman writes:

We have just obtained our application for home-canning sugar and it is the most insulting piece of Government affrontery that I have ever yet seen.

OPA demands the strictest truth in answers to such questions as these:

First. "How many pounds of sugar did you use for canning fruit in 1944"?

Second. "How many pounds of sugar did you use in 1944 for making jams, jellies," and so forth. If the housewife wants any sugar for canning or jams in 1945 she must remember and put down in the spaces provided a definite number of pounds used in 1944.

Then she must certify to the truth of her statements under a threat of jail for 10 years or a $10,000 fine, or both. The Government on the other hand, while appealing to the fear and patriotism of citizens, makes five statements explaing the sugar shortage. "Four out of

these five statements are out-right falsehoods," the minister points out in his letter.

The first is: "Ships which otherwise might be bringing sugar into the United States are hauling supplies to the battle fronts." Sugar is brought, not in ships on the way out to the battle fronts, but on their return ships, empty. If sugar had been available in Cuba and Puerto Rico there were plenty of returning ships to transport it. There was no sugar for empty boats to transport. Planting of sugar was reduced by inadequate prices—the sole explanation why the ships did not carry sugar.

The second is: "Manpower is scarce at sugar refineries and shipping ports." This is just another attempt to hide the real reason. Labor at ports and refineries is now and has been adequate. The newspapers of July 3, 1945, reported that two sugar refineries suspended operations for lack of raw sugar.

The third is: "Beet-sugar production last year was 500,000 tons short, making the stock smaller for this year." The truth is it was 780,000 tons short of capacity to produce as shown in 1940. And the shortage was due solely to inadequate prices.

The fourth is the worst misrepresentation of all. The familiar and disgraceful charge is that housewives themselves created the sugar shortage. OPA says: "Last year many people overapplied for canning sugar. We used so much sugar that stocks at the beginning of this year were abnormally low." It is quite true that stocks are abnormally low in 1945, first because of the shortage of production brought about by bad price management, and because OPA ignored the limitation placed on it by the War Food Administration. WFA allocated but 750,000 tons of sugar for home canning for the year 1944. Instead of abiding by this order OPA issued and authorized coupons to housewives good for 1,150,000 tons of sugar for home canning.

This made sugar comparatively plentiful in the summer of 1944. There was to be a national election that fall. Now, OPA diverts attention from itself and its political purposes by making accusations against the housewife. The OPA chief said, according to the New York Times, May 31, 1945, that housewives made false statements in the summer of 1944 and caused an overissuance of coupons and then accused them of literally robbing our country.

Such propaganda is supposed to divert attention from the mistakes and failures of OPA by constantly accusing of crime the free citizens whose liberties it encroaches upon. It attempts to manage prices when prices insist on managing themselves if production of beef, butter, and sugar, and all foods is the objective. OPA is attempting to turn back the experience of history, with 62,615 employees costing $169,500,000 last year.

The Russian farmers have recently described it all thus: "It is too little at the top and too big at the bottom. It can not work". Lord Acton described it another way: "A little power corrupts, absolute power corrupts, absolutely".

The result is an accumulation of scarcity for our fighting forces, dangerous shortage at home, and starvation abroad we can not relieve. The logical solution is a renewal of faith in free men and free prices as the surest way to get the greatest production of food. It works in peacetime. It worked in the last war in spite of the present Government propaganda to the contrary. It is alleged even by the Government that freedom will work again when peacetime comes better than management by Government itself. If that is so, it is impossible to explain why it is not best as a means to get maximum production of food in wartime when the need is greatest.

About Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me last week, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial titled "About Presidential Succession" which appeared in the Larchmont (N. Y.) Daily Times:

ABOUT PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

In correspondence which has followed the expression in this column that President Truman is right in wishing to substitute the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Secretary of State in order of Presidential succession, one point has been frequently raised. It is that the Speaker is elected by the people of only one congressional district and that it is, therefore, unfair to assert that he is closer to the people than would be any Secretary of State.

It is true that the Speaker is elected to Congress by the voters of only one of 435 districts. But to become Speaker he must be elected to that office by the Members of Congress of the majority party, who certainly represent the latest expressed trend of public opinion—since the House is elected wholly every 2 years, as against a President every 4 years and a complete Senate every 6 years.

Further, we have such confidence in this elected representation by the people that our Constitution reposes solely in the House of Representatives the power of Presidential impeachment. If the House of Representatives has that sole power—the Senate trying the case after the House has drawn the charge—it would seem that the head of the House of Representatives must be a man of considerable national stature and prestige.

Whether our Secretaries of State in recent years have been of higher caliber than have our Speakers is, naturally, a matter of personal opinion, although we were surprised to have one correspondent rate William Jennings Bryan above SAM RAYBURN.

As to the argument that a Speaker, succeeding to the Presidency, might conceivably be of a different political party than were the President and Vice President before him, we are willing to concede this might upon occasion happen. But since the membership in the House of Representatives changes every 2 years—we are inclined to the opinion that the person representing the majority's viewpoint in the House would be more representative of the people than would be an Executive elected 2 or 3 years earlier.

Democracy is founded upon majority rule.

The Bretton Woods Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of the Bretton Woods Agreement and the International Bank proposal, delivered at La Grange, Ga., by Hon. Richard W. Courts, of Atlanta, Ga. Mr. Courts is one of the Nation's outstanding financiers and economists, and his thoughtful comment is worthy of study and consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRETTON WOODS PROPOSALS—WILL WE MISS THE BOAT AGAIN?

(By Richard W. Courts, senior partner in Courts & Co., of Atlanta, Ga., delivered before a group of bankers and textile executives at La Grange, Ga.)

If you go into the corner store and buy goods, a debit is immediately set up on the books of the store against you. At the end of the month you discharge this debt by the payment of dollars or a check representing dollars, which you secured in return for goods or services. If you become incapacitated, you may have to give an interest-bearing note. In that event, additional debits are set up on account of accruing interest on your note.

If a foreign country buys goods from this country, a debit is immediately set up against the purchaser. That country must deliver goods of its own to us to meet this debit or it must deliver gold, or it must give notes. If that country loses its ability to deliver gold and/or goods to meet its debits, the money and in turn the production costs of that country decline in terms of ours.

In the early history of this country, foreign countries loaned us money to open our mines, build plants, later railroads, and utilities. For more than 200 years prior to the First World War we were delivering goods in payment of our debts. We respected our obligations and wanted to pay, but—and very important—our creditors were willing to accept our goods. The result was, we shipped an exportable surplus of goods over this long period.

DEBTOR TO CREDITOR

During the First World War we suddenly reversed ourselves from debtor to creditor. We came out of that war in possession of some 40 percent of the monetary gold of the world. In addition, we were a large creditor holding the obligations of the major countries. Whether we liked it or not, it was then time to become an import country and get back some of the natural resources we had been giving Europe for some 200 years.

Instead of pursuing that policy, we did just the opposite. From 1919 through 1922 England had paid off one billion three hundred million of her external debt and other countries were on the mend, but in 1922 we passed the Fordney-McCumber Act, jacking tariffs to an all-time high. We gave notice to the world that we would not accept payment for debts in goods and materials. In succeeding years we continued to sell more abroad than we bought, continued to make additional loans, with the result that foreign countries transferred a great part of their remaining gold to us in

an effort to pay debts. In 1931 we capped the climax by passing the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, again raising tariffs. Most countries found themselves unable to pay, the American people became irked—yet no Government official had ever undertaken to explain these simple economic facts.

THE GREAT SILENCE

In spite of our policy, England in 1925 had put the British pound back on the gold standard and was making a strenuous effort to protect the original purchasing value of the pound and at the same time to pay her foreign obligations. In September 1931, a few months after the passage of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, England had lost so much of her remaining gold to us that she was forced off the gold standard, the British pound crashing from 4.86 to 3.25. Other major countries followed suit, many central banks failed, foreign currencies and production costs declined in terms of ours. Finally the London Economic Conference was proposed. In early 1933 delegates from the major countries came to Washington. It was a late hour, but even then had we realized that world economic collapse, resulting in dictatorships and political disturbances, would engulf us, had we then taken bold and aggressive leadership even at such late hour, it might have been another story. There was neither order nor leadership. The great creditor country, holding the key to world economic recovery, was silent. Delegates were hopelessly confused. Neither in our Treasury Department nor in our Department of Commerce was there the slightest comprehension of the need for rapid decision in announcing and pursuing a sound foreign economic policy. In the State Department it was even worse. Foreign delegates left in bewilderment.

A few months later the Conference arrived. The decision of the United States Government not to participate in proposals for currency stabilization fell like a bombshell upon the Conference and the accomplishments were zero.

Through all the period 1922 to 1933 our policy contributed to the depreciation of foreign currencies, foreign living standards and production costs in terms of our own. Worst of all, we failed to get back goods, and particularly the irreplaceable products of our mines, to which we were entitled. Further, we fostered a cynical disregard for debt. In the meantime, the United States dollar had gained such purchasing power over other currencies that our own domestic producers found foreign products produced in depreciated currencies upsetting our domestic price structure in spite of our tariff walls. In order to keep our industrial plant going, we then started a Government spending program.

SQUANDERING OUR RESOURCES

In the years before the Second World War we sold billions of goods to Germany, much of it going into their war machine—we sold scrap iron and oil to the Japs—now we find ourselves lend-leasing to allies, spending prodigious amounts for our own war effort, with our Government debt at $250,000,000,000 and our banks loaded with inflationary deposits.

We might well ask—How long can we continue to squander the natural resources of our land in return for gold and I O U's of the whole world? How long can we continue to tamper with the purchasing value of money, the value of life-insurance policies and life savings of our people? Get this—first we depreciate foreign currencies, in the meantime bringing about an unreasonably high purchasing value of our dollar, therefore depreciating for 10 long years the value of our cotton, our homes, our properties, making it difficult for individuals who had obligations to meet them. Almost overnight in 1933 we start depreciating our dollar, flooding the country with money, and now we find ourselves facing the possibility of an inflation that could reap untold hardship and injustice on a whole generation. Clearly, we missed the boat after the First World War. Clearly, something is needed to end economic warfare and destructive practices between countries.

THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL BANK

Now, as to the Bretton Woods proposals—the very fact that 44 countries are willing to sit in conference and recognize the necessity for economic cooperation and agree on continued collaboration is something in itself to give hope and faith in the future. That is a great step in the right direction. The plan provides first for an international monetary fund, and second, an international bank for reconstruction and development. I will discuss the bank first, it is more simple, more practical, has met with widespread approval and little criticism.

The purposes are to promote international lending, to help restore economies disrupted by the war, to develop resources of less developed countries, (1) by making or participating in direct loans out of its own funds up to 20 percent of its subscribed capital; (2) by making or participating in direct loans out of borrowed funds; (3) principally, and most important, by guaranteeing in whole or in part loans made by private investors; that means the bank is to get private capital to function when otherwise it might fail in view of postwar uncertainties.

The bank is to have authorized capital of $10,000,000,000; $9,100,000,000 immediately subscribed by 44 countries, the largest subscription by the United States—$3,175,000,000. Twenty percent of the subscribed capital is to be called for and used in making loans, the remaining 80 percent to be treated as a reserve or guarantee to be called for as needed to meet losses on loans guaranteed or made with borrowed funds. The bank is to be managed by a board of governors of one, and one alternate, from each country, 12 executive directors, the 5 largest participants appointing 1 each. There is a long and impressive list of requirements and safeguards—the bank seems soundly conceived, and is necessary to provide for reconstruction and for getting private capital again to function. The UNRRA has been set up to provide food and supplies to destitute countries in the immediate reconstruction period.

THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

As to the International Monetary Fund, the management will be similar to that proposed for the bank—the amount proposed is $8,800,000,000 contributed by member countries according to quotas agreed upon at the Conference, the United States quota being the largest at $2,750,000,000. The fund will consist of gold and the currencies of 44 countries, and promissory notes. These currencies are naturally of varying degrees of quality, the dollar being the only one with universal acceptance in world trade. Among the purposes of the fund are the following: (1) To promote international monetary cooperation; (2) to facilitate expansion and balanced growth of international trade and thereby promote employment and real income in each country; (3) to eliminate foreign exchange restrictions; (4) to lessen disequilibrium in international balances; (5) primarily, the over-all purpose is to lend the currencies of its members to facilitate international payments and promote exchange stabilization, to avoid competitive exchange depreciation, and in turn eliminate violent fluctuations in production costs of one country as compared to another. It is this over-all purpose that has created the greatest criticism and doubt as to practicability. It seems that any member in good standing has the right to borrow from the fund to meet its adverse balance of payments, even though political and economic conditions in the borrowing country might be unsound. Further, the war-devastated countries will be under pressure to buy for reconstruction purposes, creating adverse balances, and as a result borrowing from the fund. The criticism is that it will be extremely difficult for the management of the fund to gage for what purpose a member country might be importing and with this criticism I am in accord.

As a layman, I am wondering whether the fund's assets will be sound at the start. I am wondering how any group of men can value the currencies of one country in terms of another under present conditions. Who can say what Chinese dollars are worth in terms of United States dollars? Had these proposals been made in 1914 at a time when the major countries were operating on the gold standard, when each country had a fair amount of gold as a base for currencies, the proposals in toto would unquestionably have been practicable and a blessing to mankind. They may well have prevented the two World Wars. When I doubt the practicability of the fund I do not mean that we should junk it. What I have in mind is that the fund should be deferred—that there is a more necessary procedure for the present.

REDIVISION OF THE CHIPS

In the first place, no fund can be successful unless creditor countries act like creditors and make it possible for debtors to pay, and unless debtor countries behave like debtors and adopt measures in their own countries to enable them to best meet their obligations. At the present time the United States is the greatest creditor. We must recognize our creditor position and make it work. We now hold most of the chips in the form of gold. Further, we hold the I O U's of the major countries of the world in the form of reparations from the First World War, commercial and stabilization loans made between the wars, and lend-lease made in the Second World War.

If 44 of us are in a poker game and I win all the chips, the game is over. If there is to be a redivision of those chips, I don't think I need 43 other people to tell me how to divide up. I may well make loans or gifts, but I want to judge who is to get those chips, what he is going to do with them, and how good a friend he will be to me. In poker we are realistic—why not be realistic in government where the stakes involve our resources? The British always know what they want and I have no doubt about Uncle Joe Stalin knowing what he wants, and that is all right. We can ask nothing better than that the major countries act to their own self-interest, provided they are honest and practical about it. Their neighbors will fare all right. My quarrel is when one country acts like a jackass, disturbing everybody around him, then kicking himself in the belly.

During the two wars, particularly the first, we sold goods at abnormally high prices. Moreover, we made loans to allies to win the wars. It is plain that part of these advances must be considered as gifts. Why don't we call them gifts, deduct that part that is gift, arrive at what is sound debt, soundly owed to us, and say we are out to collect it? This debt did not result from gambling; it resulted from the fact that we gave goods including natural resources—iron, lead, zinc, copper, oil. These are the things we want back.

A SUPREME ECONOMIC COUNCIL FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?

If the above program is what we want let's make it a national policy and stick to it regardless of the party in power. Before entering the International Fund let us first set up in this country a Supreme Economic Council a sort of supreme court that will have complete authority over our creditor and debtor relations with other countries—the council to proceed with a national policy as follows: First we give credit to debtor countries by giving them orders for goods. When they deliver those goods they get

credits in this country, the council to see to it that those credits are used to buy goods from us but in lesser amount, the remaining credits to be used to meet debt service on prior existing debts to us. In giving those orders for goods we not only give credit to bankrupt countries, we give them hope and faith that they can live, produce, and ultimately profit. That type of credit is far more sound than any loan of dollars can ever hope to be. That means reversing our trade balance and becoming an import country. The best time to reverse is the immediate postwar years when there is pent-up demand for goods in our own country and unemployment not a great problem.

OPENING THE THROTTLE FOR PRODUCTION

There are vastly greater reasons for following this policy. During this war we have built a productive capacity we never dreamed of. With some 10,000,000 men away in the armed services we have been able to produce about 70 percent of civilian requirements plus the vast billions of materials for war. That increased production could bring us a great unemployment problem in future years if we increase our creditor position now. Therefore, it is vital that in the early postwar period, with great demand for our goods, we reverse our trade balance, and by buying abroad set a pattern of increasing production and consumption throughout the world. If the fund were in operation in this early period, I am much afraid that poorer countries in natural haste to get going might use the fund for credit to support too large imports from us, as happened at the close of the First War, giving an unnecessarily high production rate for this country at a time when not needed and which could not be maintained.

Further we have built a United States Government debt of over two hundred and fifty billion. That debt must be paid. Our peacetime daily commerce will stand a certain maximum percentage shaved off to meet debt—it is perfectly plain that if we double our daily commerce, we double the debt kitty without increasing the percentage—another reason to set a pattern of increasing consumption and production.

In the early postwar we must be free to follow this policy. With our trade balances once reversed we can open the throttle for production with confidence and remove the regulations hampering production, knowing that every dollar of purchases from abroad means additional purchases here, increasing production and consumption throughout the world with increased employment everywhere, knowing that we are gradually pulling foreign currencies up in terms of ours, foreign production costs and living standards up in terms of our own. Human nature is the same everywhere. There is hardly a man who doesn't want two pairs of shoes where he now has one, two radios where he now has one. When we buy abroad they buy from us—they want things just as we do. Further, we will reestablish faith in credit, desire and capacity on the part of a debtor country to meet its obligations, and I believe a more healthy respect on the part of the individual in this country for meeting obligations. Men can then make long-term plans, extend and use credit, and rely on the promises of men. Men will again have faith in men. That will be the time to put the International Monetary Fund in operation, knowing it will work, bringing a trend of increasing activity and prosperity that cannot be punctured. Our first problem is a national policy, recognizing that being a world creditor is not only our privilege but our great responsibility, a problem to be faced and solved by us alone. Why not go at it vigorously and aggressively? Will we face our responsibility or will we miss the boat again?

Letter From a Constituent Regarding New Type Money Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me last week, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two letters I have received from Mr. Robert Foster, 1 Battle Avenue, White Plains:

JANUARY 23, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the New York Daily News, issue of January 19, 1945, there appeared an illustration of the new-type money order that will go into effect February 1.

Basically, it is the same idea I conceived in 1941, and in proof of that claim there is on file right now with reputable New York publishers a sealed envelope containing the note form stamp money order bearing the 1941 post marks. Furthermore, that very same year I exhibited the plan to some very noted New York bankers and others dealing with banks, and there are letters in my files to verify it.

I outlined the idea of my plan to the Office of the Postmaster General in early July of 1943, and on July 26, 1943, one of the postal officials wrote inviting me to send a copy of the plan. Then, in a letter dated September 13, 1943, from another postal official, I also had an invitation to send a copy of my plan. In this latter letter there was a statement about money orders, but no mention of any contemplated change in them. But it did very definitely state the money order system was being studied in an effort to ascertain if accounting procedures may be simplified.

Congressman HARTLEY, of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads wrote in September 1943 inviting me to send him a copy of my plan, and as you know, he did have an opportunity to see it in post-card form, which, of course, could be in note form, if so desired. It was through your good offices the plan reached him.

There are other letters in my files from postal officials and from the congressional Committee on Post Offices, which very definitely indicate no change in money orders and no revival of postal notes were contemplated before my plan was submitted. And in two of the letters mention is made of the impracticalness and utter failure of the original postal notes, but which has since undergone a remarkable face-lifting and now embody the very idea of my plan. So, of course, postal notes are nothing like their old selves, except in name.

My plan with all the material relative to its operation, advantages, etc., has been retained for nearly a year and a half now. During that time I could do nothing about interesting private enterprise in its operation, because no one would think of doing it if the Post Office Department was contemplating a similar one—and finally they are.

So, if they now wish to deny me any of the credit for the idea I conceived in 1941, and which I sent to them, not voluntarily, but only after invitation to do so, and have kept the plan until one of theirs with the same idea is launched, thus thwarting any possible effort to interest private enterprise in the operation, then I feel justified in filing a very substantial claim against the individual and/or the Office of the Postmaster General.

Before I close I would like to make this comment about the new postal-note plan. It appears to me the Post Office Department intends using a tremendous number of stamp denominations to operate it, the very thing I tried to avoid. I was expecting just such a move on their part. They did not know I had another very much more simplified version of the plan and in every way superior to the one about to be launched.

The new version does away with all stamps, provides much easier and assuredly accurate accounting, eliminates writing of amounts, provides all essential stubs, offers the same security—and all of it is done without a multiple of note denominations—just one single note denomination, two of the simplest of operations and no stamps whatsoever. You would simply be amazed at its simplicity, yet it has unquestioned security, and, above all, much more practical and less bother, because there is no sticking on, possible losing, and the counting and printing of the multiple stamps required in the new postal note.

I would be glad to submit this new version.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT FOSTER.

FEBRUARY 27, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am gratified to receive your very kind letter of February 22 in relation to the stamp money order.

Your willingness to have my letter of January 29, 1945, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not only very thoughtful of you but very generous. Indeed I would be grateful if you will take the necessary steps to do it.

My files contain many letters from the Post Office Department officials, and not in a single one of them was it intimated that any such plan as I proposed was in work or contemplated. In fact, the letters I have indicate quite the contrary. Moreover, nothing was ever done with postal notes after my plan was, by invitation, in the hands of the Post Office Department. Then about a month ago they launched a plan; called it postal note. And by a remarkable coincidence it is practically the same idea I sent to them—in all its phases—use of stamps to cover all amounts under the dollar, filling in by purchasers, elimination of applications, post-card texture of paper, delivery by carrier when requested, etc. Isn't that remarkable? I also proposed reduced rates for the small amounts.

I am not a novice at such planning. Just let me cite you two other suggestions to Government departments. One is stated in a letter from a Congressman which you will find enclosed. Except for Form W-2, which is a splendid idea, I can produce records that will show I proposed in 1942 much of the same tax idea as was adopted in 1944, namely, one flat exemption for easy calculation—$1,040 for married, $520 for single, and $260 for children—the last is about the only marked difference. But notice I fixed the rates so that they could be easily divided into weekly rates. I suggested, too, that the victory tax be eliminated and fixed flat rates of about 20 percent on incomes of $3,000 and less and set up for each dollar of income. And, there was much more, and all were submitted to various members of tax committees, the Treasury, etc. In my files are the acknowledgments. All the above was in tables, etc.

I also proposed the War Savings stamp and album idea May 28, 1917, and in a letter dated the following day the United States Treasury acknowledged it and said it would be of value in their future work. It has now been used in two wars. The Treasury letter I still have in my files. However, the administration which came into office 15 years later said others submitted the same idea, which, of course, was downright bunk.

When I challenged them to produce some evidence to back up their statement they admitted they could not do so. Any Government official who makes statements which he cannot produce evidence to support does not rate very high in my opinion. I would be ashamed to make any statement that I cannot produce documentary evidence to substantiate, and that goes for every claim I made in this and my letter of January 29.

The new money order idea that I would like to pass along can be applied to postal notes or all money orders. It is much more practical and simple than the postal-note operation and less work and cost. It requires no stamps, therefore no accounting of the many denominations and no sticking them on and possible loss of them. Indeed this new idea absolutely assures accurate accounting with much less labor and produces a money order just as secure as those now issued. If the Post Office Department had this idea before they proceeded to launch the postal-note stamp method they undoubtedly would have adopted it.

Let me again thank you for your very generous offer to publish my letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and if you can obtain a couple of copies of it when published I would be very grateful.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT FOSTER.

The Scientific Suicide of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving an increasing number of letters from scientific organizations protesting against our present policy of drafting advanced technical students for routine military service.

In every other country of the world such students are exempted as essential to the scientific progress of the country after the war. It is pointed out by those in position to know that our policy amounts to committing national scientific suicide. Since it is largely our technical knowledge which has gained the victory for us in this war, it seems very foolish indeed to deprive ourselves of those who can carry on in this field for the immediate future.

I ask unanimous consent to insert two articles on the subject which I believe warrant the attention of the whole American people.

One is a column by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, July 7; the other is a report by Dr. Charles A. Thomas, of the Research Department of Monsanto Chemical Co., to the stockholders on March 27.

[From the Washington Post of July 7, 1945]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

SCIENCE LAID WASTE

Near the top of the honors list in this war is the Office of Scientific Research and Development, of which Dr. Vannevar Bush is the head. We've heard a great deal about the fantastic projects that German scientists were pushing, but very little about the solid achievements of our men and women of science who have worked literally day and night for the past 5 years.

The staff of OSRD is one of our great national assets. It would be hard to measure it in terms of guns or oil in the ground. You can't create brains and technical training by signing a check or letting a contract.

But now an extraordinary stupid thing is happening. With the war in a new phase, OSRD is closing down some big test and laboratory projects. Younger men who have served OSRD in Europe are being transferred to the Pacific.

Many of these younger men—some of them dismissed, some of them in process of transfer—are being grabbed by Selective Service and put into the Infantry. These men are being given no credit for the time they spent in Europe. Some have worked a year and a half or 2 years, often in forward areas under conditions of great hazard.

The tough break for the individual is not, however, so important as the stake that all of us have in this situation. The individual may be better off if he has a service record behind him when the war ends.

But if this great national asset is frittered away, we are all losers. The very safety of the Nation, to say nothing of its prosperity, and well-being, depends on maintaining the high standards of scientific training we have had in the past.

Dr. Bush is deeply concerned about what is happening. He will stress this threat in his annual report, soon to be released.

Because of selective-service policy, we are already short 150,000 young men with bachelor of science degrees. We will be short 17,000 doctors of philosophy.

That may seem pretty unimportant in the toll of loss and wreckage. It seems unimportant until you recall that trained technicians and scientists are vital to industry. They are the spark plug of the industrial machine.

This relates directly to reconversion. Because the Army has wasted men trained in science and technology and a short-sighted draft policy has stopped the supply at the source, industry will have to scrape the bottom of the barrel for experts. Men with the technical know-how are necessary to create the millions of new jobs that we must have after the war.

To find these men, industry is likely to turn to the teaching staffs of our big universities. Business can offer higher salaries. That could mean permanent damage to the core of our scientific advance. It would be like—and we say we're not going to disarm after this war—scrapping half of our fleet. As a matter of fact, when you think about the amazing weapons to come out of the laboratories, it might be a lot more serious than junking half of our warships.

Neither ally nor foe in this war has followed such a short-sighted policy. In Russian laboratories, young Soviet scientists have gone right on with pure research which would have no practical results for the current conflict.

But out of those Russian test tubes might come the all-powerful weapon of another war.

Scientists themselves cannot do much about all this. They can't very well themselves agitate to become an elect group. They recognize the principle of equality that has guided Selective Service, although it hasn't worked when potent pressure groups intervened—the outstanding case being the hoarding of farm labor thanks to the Tydings amendment..

There is now a bill before the House, introduced by Representative GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, of Los Angeles, a Republican, which would correct the worst errors. It would call on the Army to comb out men with scientific training and it would order deferment of 20,000 qualified 18-year-olds for scientific and technical training. There is still time, if Congress will act quickly, to save one of our vital national resources.

THE SCIENTIFIC SUICIDE OF AMERICA—TRAINING OF TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC STUDENTS

(By Dr. Charles A. Thomas)

A great deal of publicity has been given to chemical developments which have been brought out during the war. These developments are the result of the labors of the research, development, and engineering talent of this Nation. The pattern of development follows pretty much these lines: First there is conceived the idea; then experimentation begins in the laboratory. At this stage there are hundreds of failures for one successful result. The engineers study only those problems which have been found to be successful in the laboratory. Often they find that a product which looked good in the laboratory stage cannot be manufactured cheaply enough to be interesting commercially. Here, again, there is another weeding-out process. Hence, the new developments which were brought out in the year 1944 represent only a few of the many projects which were worked upon. These were the few which were successful in both laboratory and plant and represent thousands of man hours of research chemists, engineers and technicians.

There is no royal highway to successful development and contrary to what our newspapers and radio announcers would have you believe, no flash of genius can conceive an idea one day and have it ready for successful exploitation the next day. It takes brain power, much experimentation, and unfortunately a lot of time. The average span from the conception of an idea to its practical utilization is somewhere between 3 and 7 years. Therefore, the products which were brought out in 1944 were largely conceived prior to 1940 and these represent only a few successes out of hundreds of starts.

It takes not only time but also brain power. In the last 10 years industry has been steadily increasing its research, engineering, and technical personnel. In prewar years it engaged a constantly increasing number of technically trained men per year to take care of its normal growth and replacements. Young talent is industry's most important raw material; it bears fruit in future developments 5 to 7 years hence. Due to our Selective Service System, however, the supply of this basic raw material has been cut off. It takes from 6 to 7 years of college or university training to develop a first-rate scientist. At present, practically none are being trained; go to our universities and you will find their classrooms empty. Before the war, the normal production of scientific men of doctor-of-philosophy rank by our universities in all of the sciences was only about 2,000 per year. If the war were over tomorrow, it would take between 3 and 6 years before future young scientists could be trained, depending upon the education level of the student upon reentering college. That means an inevitable loss of approximately 8,200 scientists, even though we resumed the training of our young men at once. It has been estimated that it will be 1955 before our colleges can recover this deficit even with no increased demand on the part of industry in the postwar years. These figures appear very insignificant as compared with our total population of 130,000,000, but what do they foretell as to our future leadership in science and technological advances?

We approach the postwar era with a pent-up demand for scientific progress and industrial applications of our science by industry, but we are making no provision for supplying scientists which we must have in order to meet this demand. Instead of accelerating their production as we should in order

to assure increased scientific accomplishment, we have retarded it. Unless something is done immediately our country faces scientific bankruptcy.

Our Selective Service System has not only virtually eliminated the training of young scientists but it has made it very difficult for industries and universities to retain their young, already trained men. There are thousands of scientists in the ranks of the Army and Navy at present doing work of a nonscientific nature. Retention of these young men in our industries and universities would help to assure this country of its continued leadership in technological development.

Technological development brings about new things which in turn create new jobs, and new jobs are most important to our returning soldiers. Several thousand young scientists in uniform can do no more than several thousand other soldiers on the battlefield, but in the laboratories these young scientists may be able to create new things which would assure jobs for millions of our returning soldiers.

It is very significant to note what is going on in England, Russia, and up to a year ago in Germany in this respect. In the last war, England handled her young scientists very much the same as we are handling ours in this war, and as a consequence she lost the flower of her young scientific brains. This put England back many years technologically after the last war. In that war England put all of her men into uniforms, up to a certain age limit, irrespective of scientific achievements. One of these men was Henry Moseley, who in 1913 had given to the world, at the age of 25, the first direct experimental evidence for allocation of atomic numbers to elements. In 1915, 2 years later, he was killed in action.

From a recent first-hand report on conditions in Russia,[1] we learn that higher education has been accelerated, rather than curtailed during the war. In 1941, Russia inaugurated a new educational plan, whereby selection of students destined for technical schools, colleges, and universities is conducted somewhat as in the selection in our Army of candidates to officers' schools. Upon graduation from the seventh grade, each student is considered as a prospect for either the factory or for further schooling, and a constant weeding-out process thereafter assures the retention of worthy students and graduates in civilian, professional fields. In one year, alone, in 1942, about 75,000 new industrial, transport, and communication engineers, physicians, agronomists, and other specialists were graduated from Soviet schools, according to Sergei Ogoltsov, head of higher education in that U. S. S. R. This number increased in 1943. By the spring of 1943 the new plan had provided the Soviet Union with over a million trained technicians of various educational levels for employment in the iron and steel, metal, electrical, mining, railway, building, and other industries. Because the system can draw upon about 40,000,000 grade-school students for future trainees, its possibilities are enormous. In spite of Russia's total war against Hitler, the 1944 state budget of Soviet Russia actually planned for a greater expenditure for educational purposes than for power of defense. This is true of no other country at war.

Realizing that she has been very foolish in the last war, England has taken steps not to commit this error in World War II. In England,[2] deferment for college and university students varies with the course taken. Scientific and technical students are deferable for 1 year in the first instance, after which their case is reviewed to decide whether they should be granted further deferment, or be allotted to technical work in the forces or industry, or whether their technical qualifications do not merit further consideration. Consequently we find that England's scientific and technical schools are crowded; for example, in the 1942–43 session, so many men undergraduates were taking scientific courses at Cambridge University that there was a "resulting congestion in the laboratories."[3]

At the end of their training period, technical and scientific students are at the disposal of the Ministry of Labor and National Service[4] for allocation to technical service in the forces or to important work in civilian life, as may be decided.

Obviously, England is not neglecting the training of scientific personnel; instead, she will emerge from this war more strongly equipped with scientists and technicians than at any time in her history. England realizes that this is most important in facing the postwar era.

Only the United States is following the course of scientific suicide. Research in these United States will carry on; but inevitably, due to the lack of scientific personnel, it may be drastically curtailed. This only means one thing, that new products, advances into new fields, which promise an ever-enlarging economic opportunity for many will be hampered. The longer we go on with the practice of denying scientific and engineering training to young men, the longer we go on with the practice of sending our young, already trained, men into the battlefield, the worse will be our plight.

[1] Edgar Snow. People on Our Side, Random House, N. Y., 1944, see particularly pp. 143–144, 220–230.

[2] British Information Services, Bulletin I. D. 313 (Revised to March 1944), Control of Manpower in Britain, p. 7, lines 9–17, published by British Information Services, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

[3] Encyclopaedia Brittanica. Year Book, 1944, p. 149, article entitled "Cambridge University," lines 5–6.

[4] British Information Services, Bulletin I. D. 310 (revised Dec. 1943), The British Universities After 4 Years of War, p. 2, lines 40–43, published by British Information Services, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

Orders of the Day to Polish Divisions in Italy and Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following orders of the day issued on July 6, 1945, by Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, Commander of the Second Polish Corps in Italy, and by Gen. Klemens Rudnicki, Commander of the Polish First Armored Division in Germany.

The orders are as follows:

The following order of the day was issued July 6 by Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, commander of the Second Polish Corps in Italy:

"Soldiers, we are one of a few groups of the Polish Nation today, which can and wish to express our will and it is for this reason that we must stress in word and action that we are faithful to our soldier's oath, faithful to our duties as citizens, to our homeland, and to the will of fallen brothers-in-arms, who fought and died in the name of independent Poland. The historical part which the Polish forces are playing abroad is a sting in the eye of the foe. They will try to destroy our armed forces. We will all be in the line of fire of their insincere agitation. They will call us back to Poland, a return which would end in a manner well known to us. I do not doubt for a single minute that the soldiers of the Second Corps, who know how and why Poland fights, will be able to resist the dangerous temptations. The future of the Second Corps, in the difficult times ahead, is assured. I am thinking, both of the means which we need to exist and our further training. I am not only thinking of material goods which are directly linked up with us, but also of a question of families of Polish soldiers in the Second Corps. Whatever happens and whatever turn events may take, I personally and all your superior officers will do all we can to keep our common gains. They will remain with you at their posts in order not to lose any of our heritage, but to increase it for the good of our country. I want to see us all on our native soil again, for which we too are longing with all our heart. But I want to see us there, not as slaves of force, but with flying banners as a herald of real freedom. If such a return home is not possible today, we must wait in closed ranks for a more favorable turn of events. The change must take place; if not, then all the terrible sacrifices borne by the whole world during the last 6 years would be in vain. It is impossible to believe that humanity has suddenly turned blind and does not see mortal danger ahead."

The following order of the day was issued July 6 by Gen. Klemens Rudnicki, commander of the Polish First Armored Division in Germany:

"A soldier has only one life to give up, just as he has one word and one honor to sacrifice. At this decisive moment I address you soldiers of the First Polish Armored Division. The great nations allied to us with which we shed blood in brotherhood in arms, on so many battlefields have ceased to recognize the legal Polish Government. We, soldiers, do not judge or accuse anyone, and memories of brotherhood and friendship with the valiant British and American soldier is and will remain our common good. But, we, although soldiers in these circumstances have also to take a clear and decisive stand. That is our own right. We shall remain loyal to our soldier's oath and remain obedient to the Polish President, supreme commander of the armed forces. We shall not abandon the thought of fighting for our ideals, neither shall we suppress hardship and toils to fight for really free and independent Poland. We shall wait patiently. Tasks of occupational division imposed on us by our superiors shall be fulfilled loyally and honestly by us until the end. We shall return to Poland with arms in hand, to Poland which we have dreamed of during 5 years of continuous fight, to a free and really independent Poland. We shall return to wipe off the tears of our women and children, and to make sure that Polish law and not foreign force shall reign in Poland. We shall never renounce the fight for freedom of Poland and all nations deprived of freedom, in the name of the traditional motto: 'For our and your freedom.'"

Shall We Establish Compulsory Military Training?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a most important decision will face Congress before the close of the year 1945, "Shall we pass legislation which will establish

compulsory military training during peacetime in the United States?"

In order to ascertain the views of my constituents, I plan to mail several thousand questionnaires during the next few months. The questions to be answered are as follows:

Public-opinion poll on military training

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the principle of military training for boys between the age of 18 and 21 years?		
2. Are you opposed to all forms of compulsory military training in peacetime?		
If you favor military training, please answer the next 3 questions		
3. Should military training be established on—		
(a) A compulsory basis?		
(b) A voluntary basis?		
4. How many months of military training should be required?		
(a) 6 months		
(b) 12 months		
5. When should Congress decide America's postwar national policy on compulsory military training?		
(a) Within the next few months		
(b) After the war		

Remarks:

Signature: _____
(Optional)

American Labor Memorandum on Jewish Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the Jewish trade unions in Palestine:

During the six long and bitter years of the war—while the Jews of Europe were being systematically exterminated by Nazi bestiality—immigration into Palestine was for periods completely shut off by the British administration, and, when permitted, restricted to a bare minimum at best. While millions of Jews were being massacred, not more than ten or twelve thousand were permitted to enter Palestine each year since the promulgation of the Chamberlain white paper in 1939. Today the certificates of immigration have been exhausted and still the doors of Palestine are closed to the hundreds of thousands who are waiting in the desperate hope of at last finding rest from their wanderings and of attaining permanent security of mind and body in the Jewish homeland.

There is no valid economic reason for keeping the Jews out of Palestine. During the last 25 years Jews all over the world have bent their energies toward the upbuilding of Palestine and have poured in great resources of capital, labor, and scientific knowledge to increase the absorptive capacity of the country. The Jewish pioneers in Palestine, under the leadership of the General Federation of Jewish Labor (the Histadrut), have given the world an example of cooperative endeavor which has aroused the admiration of men of all views and of all walks of life. Palestine has been transformed from a poverty-stricken, disease-ridden backwater of the Turkish Empire into the most advanced country in the Middle East; it has become a symbol of what can be accomplished when organized labor is united with public-spirited capital. What has been achieved is merely the beginning of the development of unprecedented possibilities in bringing back to Palestine its ancient productiveness and in restoring to the Middle East generally its former position as a great center of culture and civilization.

The economic and social advances in Palestine, made possible by the Jewish endeavor, have been reflected in the life of all its inhabitants. The general population has more than doubled, and the growth of the Arab population has in fact been larger than the Jewish. Due to the remarkable reduction in the Arab death rate resulting from the improved conditions, the rate of natural increase among the Moslem population of Palestine is probably among the highest in the world; in fact, higher than officially recorded in any other country. In wages and conditions of labor, in standards of health, and in educational opportunities, the Arab community in Palestine presents a remarkable contrast to the lagging social conditions of the neighboring Arab countries whose political rulers are concerned with nothing so much as with retaining their hold on the exploited Arab masses.

Labor organizations throughout the world have all along recognized the justice of the Jewish cause in Palestine. They have been resolute in their demand for a repudiation of the 1939 white paper policy and for an honest fulfillment of the pledges made to the Jews in the Balfour declaration and in the Palestine mandate. At its sixty-fourth annual convention held in November 1944 in New Orleans, the American Federation of Labor called upon the Government of the United States "to take speedy and definite action on the Palestine question." In harmony with the bipartisan measures then before both Houses of Congress, the AFL resolution on Palestine called for "the free entry of Jews into Palestine and full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth." The Congress of Industrial Organizations, meeting at the same time in Chicago, likewise urged that "steps be taken to effect the immediate rescue of the Jews in Axis-dominated countries" and appealed to Great Britain for the "unequivocal removal of the white paper policy and the full implementation of the Balfour declaration toward the ultimate establishment of a Palestinian Jewish commonwealth in accordance with the principles of democratic action."

The British Labor Party at its convention in June 1944 accepted the resolution of its executive committee, which called upon the British Government for an end to conflicting policies and halting halfway measures. It urged that Jewish immigration into Palestine be permitted in such numbers as would enable the Jews to become a majority, and that the boundaries of Palestine be extended so that once for all a decisive solution of the Jewish problem would become possible. The Liberal Party, at its annual conference held in February 1945, emphatically declared that "both British honor and British interest required His Majesty's Government to reverse the policy laid down in the white paper of May 1939 regarding Palestine and to carry out faithfully the obligations under the mandate and Balfour declaration." Other liberal and labor parties—the British Commonwealth Party and the Socialist Parties—made declarations in the same vein. The International Trade Union Conference held in London in February 1945, with delegates from 38 national trade-union organizations and with strong representation from England, the United States, France, and Russia, likewise made an unequivocal declaration calling for the fulfillment of the Balfour declaration and the establishment of the Jewish National Home.

Labor opinion in the United States is but a firmer expression of a general American attitude voiced by the public at large and by American statesmen and legislators. From the time of President Wilson, who played a creative role in obtaining the Balfour declaration, every succeeding President has reiterated support for the Jewish national home. In 1922, shortly before the approval of the Palestine mandate by the League of Nations, the Senate and the House of Representatives in a joint resolution expressed themselves, in the language of the Balfour declaration, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. Although the United States was not a member of the League of Nations, it became party to the terms of the mandate through the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, in accordance with which our Government consented to the administration of Palestine by Great Britain.

On March 9, 1944, President Roosevelt gave assurance that "the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939," and express the belief that full justice would be done in the matter of the Jewish National Home.

The traditional American position on the Palestine question has been reaffirmed and strengthened during the past year by planks included in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties and by President Roosevelt's statement of October 15—historic pronouncements pledging support for the Jewish people's aim to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth.

In line with long standing American public policy, in harmony with the liberal and labor opinion throughout the world, and, not least, in a sense of kinship with the Jewish people, with its need and destiny, we of the American Jewish Trade Union Committee find ourselves in profound sympathy with Jewish aspirations in Palestine. In April 1944, in behalf of hundreds of thousands of workers in the United States, members of both the AFL and the CIO, we made a solmen declaration denouncing the White Paper, appealing to the American Government for action, and urging Congress to adopt the Palestine resolution. Today, in this historic hour, when the general structure of international security has been outlined and the fate of the nations of the world is about to be decided, we again stand united in an appeal that the pledge to the Jewish people be fulfilled and that the remnant of Israel in Europe be saved. We call upon the leaders of the United Nations no longer to neglect the pressing Jewish need, and we appeal for an immediate decision on Palestine on the two minimum requisites of any solution of the Jewish problem:

1. To abolish without further delay all restrictions on free Jewish immigration into Palestine and all limitations on the right of Jews to purchase and settle the land.

2. To make simultaneously a definitive announcement, in the spirit and purpose of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, of the determination to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth.

A Postwar Transportation Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a resolution authorizing an investigation of the Nation's transportation situation, with particular reference to postwar problems. This proposal stems

from a growing realization on the part of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that in this field of industry we face a most perplexing and vital postwar problem. This realization is shared by our full committee.

This problem is vital because transportation is the connecting link between our producing machine and the consuming public. Without adequate, economical transportation our whole economy can bog down no matter how much energy, wisdom, and capital our industrial executives may put into the other phases of reconversion from a war economy to an economy of peace.

Failure to provide legislative remedies to meet the needs of our transportation system or failure to focus the thought of leaders in the transportation field upon their own responsibility, apart from legislation, in meeting their postwar problems, can prolong by years the Nation's period of reconversion to peace. Indeed, it might even throw our economy into chaos.

In spite of the overwhelming importance of these problems, our planning to date for a national transportation system geared to a postwar United States, has been sporadic, haphazard and without sufficient coordination.

I am fortunate, as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to have for this proposed inquiry a subcommittee on transportation of ability and experience. Through long service on the committee they have an intimate knowledge of the development of the problems with which we must deal.

Aside from myself, who will serve as chairman of the subcommittee, our members are ROBERT CROSSER, of Ohio; ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; LYLE H. BOREN, of Oklahoma; J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee; OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas; GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, of Michigan; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey; PEHR G. HOLMES, of Massachusetts; B. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee; CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio.

While the whole committee will, of course, be called upon eventually to labor with this problem, the preliminary spade work will be done by this transportation subcommittee. I have discussed the plans for the inquiry with members of this subcommittee and I am assured of their whole-hearted support.

The committee proposes to assume its responsibility as to these problems as promptly and effectively as their complexities will permit. We are preparing a list of suggested topics for consideration of all who may be interested in these problems. These topics are in no way intended to be exclusive of other subjects which may be presented. These suggested topics will be given wide circulation to operators of transportation facilities, shippers and shipper organizations, committees and associations with an interest in transportation, chambers of commerce and similar public bodies, and to Federal and State regulatory commissions.

However, the committee will not only welcome but invite information and constructive suggestions from students of transportation and any other persons who may be interested in these problems. We wish to make it clear to the recipients of our invitations that they are not confronted by a questionnaire. They are at liberty to comment on as much or as little of the suggested subjects as they may desire. We want their independent, voluntary information and constructive suggestions. They must understand also that replying to our invitations will not necessarily involve their appearance before the committee.

We would welcome these replies as soon as possible, but hope that they may all be furnished by December 1st. The information and suggestions furnished will be carefully studied and analyzed for the use of the committee in consideration of proposed legislation.

A quarter of a century ago, when Congress approached the task of turning the railroads back to their owners, after 26 months of Federal control, the problem faced was mainly a railroad problem. That is not so today. It is, on the other hand, a general transportation problem.

THE PROBLEM

Today we have the problem of a general transportation system—a system composed of important competing agencies including transportation by rail, highway, water, air and pipe lines. Each of these types of transportation are capable of performing a service that in some respects has advantages over all of its competitors. The nation has the problem of coordinating these different types of transportation with a view of best serving the interest of the nation and with fairness to the competing agencies.

At the beginning of the war, our country had 30,500 miles of navigable inland waterways served in peacetime by over 11,000 vessels; over 8,000 miles of coastal and inter-coastal water routes competing with our rail and highway carriers.

There are 1,302 railroad corporations in the United States, of which 136 are so-called class I roads, operating 230,000 miles of privately-owned lines and terminals.

From less than 10,000 miles of hard-surfaced highways in 1919, this country now has nearly 1½ million miles of such roads—230,000 miles of which have received Federal aid. 26,200 trucking companies and over 1,500 motor bus companies operate more than 5 million trucks and busses over this network of roadways.

There are now over 3,000 airports in the United States; the Civil Aeronautics Authority has plans for 3,000 more. There are approximately 35,000 lighted airline miles.

There is a vast network of pipe lines throughout the United States. These facilities are being expanded and are a potent force in the changing areas of production and distribution.

These transportation agencies have demonstrated their ability to perform a great service to our nation. With confidence we believe they will yet perform a more highly perfected service. Our regulatory system, more perfected can aid them.

To a very large extent, all of these forms of transportation have been developed without proper coordination with each other. Each has its own economic problems; each is highly competitive with the others, yet each is a useful part of our transportation system.

The public is paying a tremendous bill for all of these services, both through direct charges and taxation. The services of all these agencies intimately touch the daily life of every citizen. Those engaged in agriculture and industry are dependent on efficient transportation to move their products to consumers at the lowest possible cost. This Nation cannot prosper and can scarcely exist without an adequate and efficient system of transportation.

In the light of profound changes in the economy of this industry and its relation to the country, we must adjust legislation and administrative control to an entirely new set of conditions.

Obviously, the primary function of all agencies is to render adequate, efficient, and convenient service for shippers and travelers at the most reasonable charges consistent with the enlightened treatment of the carriers. Charges for services should be as low as they can be made without sacrificing the sound standards evolved from the experience of many years.

Our committee is fully conscious of the extreme complexity of the problems involved in this situation and the difficulties of their solution. Our hope and purpose in engaging in this survey of transportation problems are summarized in the resolution which I have introduced today. We trust that our inquiry will result in "a consistent public policy fair to all competing agencies of transport, to the using and investing public, and to labor to the end that the country's commerce may be moved with the greatest possible degree of economy, safety, and dispatch."

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to investigate the transportation situation with a view to recommending legislation that will result in a consistent public policy fair to all competing agencies of transport, to the using and investing public, and to labor to the end that the country's commerce may be moved with the greatest possible degree of economy, safety, and dispatch.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures within the limits hereinafter fixed, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. (a). The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such assistants, experts, and employees, as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties under this resolution.

(b) The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

SEC. 4. The committee shall, from time to time, in its discretion, make such preliminary report or reports to the House of

Representatives as it deems desirable; and shall, during the present Congress, report to the House the results of its investigation and study, and submit its recommendations.

Health Provisions of Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 12 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, since the introduction of the first Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bill in 1943, the Nation has been flooded with propaganda attacking the health provisions of the bill as "socialized medicine" and "State medicine." This propaganda purports to speak for the whole medical profession. There are a great many doctors, however, who though they are themselves members of organized medicine, do not share this hostility. One of these is Dr. Miles Atkinson, one of New York City's leading doctors and a well-known writer on medical subjects. His views on health insurance are representative of those rapidly gaining support among liberal United States doctors who recognize that all is not well with our present methods of making health services available to the people who need them.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Atkinson's article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE FOR ALL

(By Miles Atkinson, M. D.)

The doctors of America realize increasingly, as do the men and women in the factories, on the farms, in the villages and in the cities, that the health of the American people is not what it should be.

In the past we doctors and the public have boasted about our tremendous advancement in medical science, about the giant strides medicine has made in the last 75 years. Today we are forced to acknowledge that, in the very country with the finest doctors and hospitals and laboratories in the world, there is still far too much preventable illness. The draft rejections dramatized this fact for us. They shocked the conscience of the Nation.

We cannot maintain our equanimity, either, in the face of more than 100,000,000 cases of sickness occurring in this country every year; sickness causing a $3,000,000,000 direct yearly wage loss, not to mention the toll in needless suffering and death.

We know now that the problem is largely one of finance, that a great deal of this illness is due to the inability of large sections of the public to pay for doctors and hospitals. The American Medical Association says that every family earning less than $3,000 a year needs help in meeting the costs of serious illness. This is a staggering finding, for it really means that at least 75 percent of all Americans need such help.

The Nation's health has become a social problem. As one eminent doctor has said: "Because the doctor's services are purchaseable and yet almost beyond price, they are coming to be regarded like life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—a civic right, a public necessity." And our late President Roosevelt included in his economic bill of rights "the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health."

WORKERS' UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS

We doctors recognize that you workers of America have vast unmet medical needs. We want to meet them, not only for your sake, but for our own sake as well. A method is needed to pay for those who cannot afford to buy good health, and to insure for doctors an adequate financial return.

The size of the investment in training a doctor is often forgotten. Doctors, too, must live and they have to meet heavy expenses—under present conditions it costs 40 percent of a doctor's gross income to maintain his practice.

The young doctors in this country, even in boom times, often have a very hard time getting along. Some physicians do not like to admit this, but it is nevertheless true. They usually do a great deal of clinic work, also, for which they are not paid. All they do, if their private practice diminishes—because of patients' inability to pay—and their free-clinic practice increases, is to stand agape and say, "Look what's happening to me." When the Government comes along, however, with an offer to pay them for the work they now do for nothing, they draw themselves up with great dignity to announce, "I'll have none of this. My patients must come to me only on a private-practice basis."

This is a head-in-the-sand attitude, which, unfortunately, is encouraged by the leaders of organized medicine. A group of progressive doctors have joined together, however, in an organization which we call the Physicians' Forum. We are members of organized medicine, but we disagree with the official policies of the AMA in these matters. We stand with organized labor in actively supporting compulsory national health insurance as the only satisfactory way to distribute good medical care to all.

We all see cases every day where men and women needed medical attention long ago, but did not get it because they had not the money to pay for it and would not accept charity.

I am going to cite some of these cases.

There was a train engineer who thought he had indigestion, but put off getting the X-rays his doctor wanted because he was putting two sons through school and was perpetually short of cash.

By the time the pain became so severe that he couldn't bear it, stomach ulcers had developed and he had to have an operation that cost him $200 plus weeks of hospital care and lost wages. If his difficulty had been diagnosed in time, good care might have saved him all this pain and expense.

There was a housewife whose seemingly slight cold was neglected until she was in bed with pneumonia. It took weeks of expensive doctoring and nursing to put her back on her feet. Fortunately, she had hospital insurance, so that phase of her care was prepaid.

Think how wonderful if she and the engineer had belonged to a comprehensive medical plan such as would be set up under a system of national health insurance! Each would have called the doctor earlier, each might have received preventive care rather than have waited until they were seriously ill.

That is why the Physicians' Forum believes the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill now pending in Congress is an approach to solving the problem. By its provisions Americans would receive comprehensive medical care from birth to death.

You—and all of us—would pay for this by pay-roll deductions of 1½ percent of your wages, with the employer paying a like sum. In this way you could afford complete medical care for yourself and every member of your family. The self-employed would pay into the fund, too, and the indigent would be covevred by taxes.

I recognize with pleasure that labor helped to draft and is supporting the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. We doctors who approve the bill have made some suggestions for changes in it so that it will give the highest type of medical care to you, the consumers, and also guarantee the right of adequate medical education, intellectual freedom, and economic security to us doctors.

We feel very strongly that such a system of national health insurance should be compulsory rather than voluntary. Voluntary schemes of health insurance have been with us for a long time. In fact, there are more than 200 such plans in effect now, enrolling 21,000,000 of the population, and new ones are springing up all over the country, raised as last-minute dikes by some frightened doctors and others against the encroaching tide of public action. The main objection to them is the very fact that they are voluntary.

Now, I am all for the individual and against regimentation, but there are times when even the individualist with the best of intentions needs a little prod. We would need a vast amount of education before the public would join in the numbers necessary—the majority of the population, remember—and ask to be enrolled in a scheme of health insurance. Many millions of persons who need health insurance—in fact, those who need it most—will never recognize that they need it or be able to afford it.

The main argument for compulsory health insurance is that nearly all existing voluntary systems give only limited service. The Blue Cross Hospital plans have been quite successful in reaching many people in many cities, but they only pay your hospital bill, not your doctor bill. In 12 years they have reached only 12 percent of the population. The voluntary plans generally accept for membership only those entering in a group. This usually excludes wives and children of workers. A few plans have experimented and have permitted everyone to join. This has usually been disastrous financially, for the poorest medical risks rush into such a plan.

Normally there must be at least 50 in a group. Thus, employees in small units, the self-employed and the farmers are not taken care of. Further, this type of insurance is expensive.

Some plans are sponsored by commercial insurance companies that operate on the cash-idemnity system, whereby a flat payment of cash is made to cover certain specified ailments. For instance, the company will pay you $75 for an appendectomy, $25 for the removal of tonsils, or $50 for a fractured pelvis. But your doctor bill alone may exceed these sums, not to mention the weeks of hospital care that may run costs up hundreds of dollars more.

This sort of insurance puts the emphasis in the wrong place. It treats ills after they have occurred, rather than trying to prevent them before.

"With the growth in the powers of medicine to prevent and control disease," says the report of the Health Program Conference, which is made up of eminent doctors, economists, and medical administrators, "a program that mainly deals with serious or 'catastrophic' illness is insufficient medically and uneconomical financially."

These cash indemnity plans are favored by the American Medical Association, however, because they preserve an illusion of the traditional method and because payment comes not from the state but from a private company, a large proportion of whose directors are often doctors.

Medical societies also sponsor health insurance plans that go further than cash indemnity. These usually provide insurance only

to cover surgical or obstetrical cases in hospitals, and the doctors must be paid on the usual fee-for-service basis. The Pepper committee report said of fee for service:

"The pay-as-you-go or fee-for-service system, which is now the predominant method of payment for medical service, is not well suited to the needs of most people or to the widest possible distribution of high-quality medical care. It tends to keep people away from the doctor until illness has reached a stage where treatment is likely to be prolonged and medical bills large. It deters patients from seeking services which are sometimes essential, such as specialist care, X-ray and laboratory examinations, and hospitalization. Individuals with low incomes, whose need is greatest, are most likely to postpone or forego diagnosis and treatment."

Organized medicine has insisted on this fee-for-service principle which invites abuse when carried over into a health-insurance system. The best and most economical type of service can be given the ailing public by a group of doctors who work together instead of in separate offices. This is called group practice. The group should include general physicians and specialists in various fields, since the advance of medical knowledge makes it no longer possible for one physician to master more than a fraction of medical knowledge and skill. Moreover, modern equipment such as X-ray machines and other facilities costs too much for each individual physician to own.

Under the group practice plan you, as a patient, would have the advantages of pooled knowledge, experience, and equipment. Doctors in the best group practices are paid on salary. They work like a well-organized hospital staff and they can supply good care at lower cost than solo doctors.

The enemies of compulsory insurance attack the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill on many counts. Actually, the compulsory feature does not mean that everyone would be compelled to receive Government-ordered care. There will be no regimentation of either doctors or patients. There will always remain those patients who prefer to pay the private fees to one man rather than accept the services of another, just as there are private schools and public schools, and there will always be doctors who will cater to this type of practice.

We progressive doctors, along with other liberals and friends of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, say:

The bill would not rob the patient of his right to choose his own doctor, but would extend that privilege to those who have never had it before.

Standards of care would be raised because a physician, working in a group in a hospital or health center, could make free use of costly equipment, specialists' services and laboratory tests, now often too expensive for patients to use.

Doctors would be as independent as now, except that they would be sure of getting paid.

Most doctors' incomes would be raised (certainly the half of all United States doctors who earn less than $3,000 annually would benefit).

The many persons who now have no care at all would receive it.

This method would not violate any of our American traditions, since the Government already helps pay the medical bills of many impoverished people, and the local and State health departments and the United States Public Health Service look out for the health of all of us in certain particulars.

Medical fees could be kept as stable as in the past, with the net income of the profession increased through the increased consumption of medical care.

Very little "new" money would be called for, since the American people already spend between three and four billion dollars on medical care and the latter sum is what would be spent under the Wagner-Murray-Dingell plan.

Passage of a national health insurance bill would not destroy voluntary plans meeting good standards—many would continue.

Along with the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill there is a hospital construction bill which we favor because it would provide hospitals and health centers in all those sections that are now so pitifully devoid of them—especially the rural sections where it is a commonplace for sick people to travel from twenty-five to a hundred miles to visit a doctor or a hospital. If these hospitals are built they will help to draw some of the 20,000 young doctors returning from the war to the areas that need them so badly. The doctors would be glad to go where they are sure of a livelihood and of the opportunity of taking their patients to fine modern hospitals, of using the laboratories and of consulting with other doctors on the hospital staffs.

We progressive doctors believe, along with organized labor, that a bill of the nature of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill should be passed as quickly as possible by the Congress. We hope that organized labor will be active in pushing it, and we ourselves will do all we can to make our voices heard.

Ten to Ten on Boston Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, when so many public-spirited individuals, civic groups, and organizations are striving to insure that in the development of the port of Boston as a vital step in the future prosperity of Massachusetts and New England, our airport shall be made an international terminus, I include herein under leave to extend my remarks a timely editorial from the Boston Herald of July 10, 1945:

TEN TO TEN ON OUR AIRPORT

The 10 to 10 tie vote in the Senate Commerce Committee on the McCarran bill to create a single foreign airline in which United States companies would participate was an unpleasantly narrow squeak for Boston's aeronautical ambitions. If it had been adopted by the committee and favorably reported, it would have imperiled our position as an international air terminus so bravely won when the Civil Aeronautics Board last week approved the operation of foreign routes to and from this port.

The arguments in favor of a single airline were advanced last year as a means of meeting the competition of the heavily subsidized international routes of other air-aspiring nations. It is highly dubious reasoning, and the CAB has gone ahead on the assumption that we shall have several foreign lines and that domestic companies will be able to operate both here and abroad. This is a policy which makes economic sense.

A single foreign line would probably deprive Boston of its status as an international terminus, for there would not be the same incentive to integrate trans-Atlantic and domestic routes. It is to be hoped that if the McCarran bill is reconsidered by the committee it will again be rejected.

Delmo Labor Homes Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony presented to Subcommittee No. 4, House Committee on Agriculture, July 10, 1945, by Rev. David S. Burgess, Congregational minister of southeast Missouri, on behalf of the independent tenants committee of the Delmo Labor Homes projects:

As a Congregational minister who has been working among the residents of the Delmo Labor Homes, I wish to prove two basic propositions in my brief statement: (1) that if the Farm Security Administration follows out its contemplated method of liquidation of these housing projects, it will be depriving the low-income families of southeast Missouri of the opportunity to become home owners; it will be selling the dwellings, furniture, and public facilities to the large planters thereby setting an unfortunate precedent for the future liquidation of FSA projects and for the sale of war surpluses in agriculture; and above all, by deserting the farm labor families in their hour of need, it will be reversing the intent of Congress which created the FSA to aid the small farmer, tenant, sharecropper, and migrant; (2) I also wish to prove that H. R. 3071, the bill which your committee is now considering, will benefit both the farm workers and the planters of southeast Missouri.

The Delmo Labor Homes projects consist of 580 houses spread among 10 separate projects, 3 of which are for Negroes. Each home is equipped with furniture, water pump, and 2 acres or less of land which can be used for a garden spot. Roads have been constructed in each project, and public laundry facilities, and in a few cases a small public meeting hall has been provided. These homes, furnishings, and public facilities will be auctioned off in the following way, according to Mr. Frank Hancock, Administrator of the FSA, in a letter to Congressman ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN dated April 12:

"Based on the consideration of several methods of disposal, it seems to us that the most feasible method for protecting the Government interests and complying with the congressional would be: (1) to offer each of the 10 camps, as a whole, at public sale pursuant to sealed bids on terms of not less than 20 percent and the balance to bear interest at a rate of 5 percent per annum; and (2) at the same time, to offer the individual houses for sale to the general public, each purchaser to remove the buildings within 90 days. This would enable the purchasers to remove the buildings to larger tracts of land in the vicinity. FSA would reserve the right to reject all bids. Under each of these plans, the present occupants would have the same opportunity as anyone to bid for either houses or for each of the camps as a whole. It is planned also to offer such of the household furniture as is owned by the Government to the present occupants and users at OPA ceiling prices, for cash."

Such a plan, I fear, would virtually prohibit the present occupants and other worthy farm labor families from purchasing the lots, houses and the furniture for the following reasons: (1) few could make an initial down payment of 20 percent of the estimated and quoted original cost; (2) the requirement that the houses must be removed within 90 days would rule out these families because

there are not enough moving facilities in this region according to some planters with whom I have spoken, and because these families cannot buy land on which to move these dwellings in a day when boom prices in land exist and the present owners are holding on to their assets; (3) the requirement that public facilities are to be auctioned and that the houses and the land are to be in separate sales virtually rings a death knoll to the future of these workers' communities and finally (4) the present occupants and other farm labor families do not have the business experience nor the cash resources to bid against the powerful planters. Thus in reality the present occupants and other farm families under the present FSA plan do not have any chance to become landowners.

Thus, in effect, by carrying out this method of liquidation, the FSA will be selling projects to large landowners, projects originally built by emergency-relief funds. It will make a mockery of its original purpose of aiding the small men and women of the land. It will be robbing the farm labor families of the opportunities of their present community life: improved health conditions, a choice of employers, increased school facilities for the children, the hope for a better life. It will be strengthening the hand of the already powerful landowners who from the inception of the Delmo Labor Homes have tried to wreck the projects, to drive the occupants back to the farms or onto the highways to follow the migrant trail. The large planters are determined to destroy these communities, and the FSA is now the agency which is seeking to accomplish their purpose. Said Mr. Dillard a planter from Wardell: "The project residents are organized and clannish. They look for more money than they are getting. They'll sit up there and not work until they get what they want."

Furthermore, the present FSA plan will work special hardship on the present residents. They were forced to give up their old furniture when they moved into the projects. If evicted, they will go out without furniture and will be forced to start from scratch again. At a time when there are decreasing employment opportunities in industry, they will have the choice of becoming migrants or going back to their former share-cropper shacks. They will not take the second alternative. Instead they will join the ever-increasing number of migrants.

As an alternative to the chaos and privation which the FSA liquidation plan would cause we must now consider the merits of H. R. 3071 a bill which in my opinion will benefit both the farm workers and planters of southeast Missouri. In no way does it amend the decision of Congress that the FSA should liquidate such projects. It merely provides an equitable method of liquidation so that farm labor families can become eventual home owners and enjoy the independence which the American dream has promised them. After living in southeast Missouri and after reading carefully both the recent report of ex-Secretary Wickard on "A Conversion Program for the Cotton South," and the report of Congressman COOLEY'S committee which investigated the FSA, my support of the bill before you is based upon the following arguments:

1. At present and for some time to come, despite the mechanization of cotton, the farm workers who occupy the Delmo Homes and live in this area, are needed. Planters have stated this fact publicly. Their extensive and sometimes unjustified use of German war prisoners constitutes present evidence of this fact.

2. Only with good housing in independent projects will the workers stay in southeast Missouri. Satisfied and independent workers make good and reliable workers.

3. The residents of these projects desire to stay in these projects. Four hundred and sixty families have signed a statement to this effect, and a great majority have declared their ability and willingness to make an initial down payment as high as $100 for their homes. Certainly, the will of the residents must be taken into consideration by your committee.

4. The community facilities could be sold at a reasonable price on similar terms to an association to be formed by the residents of these communities. A private group of interested citizens in Missouri have already told me that they would attempt to raise a sufficient fund to underwrite the down payment on community facilities and to insure continued operation and upkeep over a period of years until the residents can assume full responsibility for the maintenance of these facilities.

5. The procedure set forth in H. R. 3071 would give the 300 or more men of these projects now serving in the armed forces an opportunity to become home owners. Already, I know of one father in Germany who, when informed by his wife that she and the children might be evicted from the projects, threatened to go AWOL if such an event took place.

6. Finally I wish to point out the fact this H. R. 3071 has the unqualified support of the following organizations: The Missouri Council of Churches, the Liberal Voters League of St. Louis, the CIO Industrial Council of St. Louis, the National Consumers League, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Farmers Union, the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Union for Democratic Action.

In addition, I have been told by an official of the Farm Security Administration in Washington that hundreds of individuals have written in protesting the sale of these homes in FSA way. These persons are in favor of H. R. 3071.

Already, the FSA, even before you gentlemen had a chance to consider the merits of H. R. 3071, has announced the date for the public auction of these projects according to the plan of Mr. Hancock. There is no time to lose. To put the matter concisely, gentlemen, you must take a choice. Are you going to reject H. R. 3071, thereby pushing these farm-labor families into the ever-enlarging migrant army, or are you going to support H. R. 3071, thereby assuring these American workers the freedom and opportunity for which the young men of our land are dying this very day?

War Agencies Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 12, 1945.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,

Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

War agencies appropriation bill proposed by House Appropriations Committee contains provision barring War Labor Board to handle wage or dispute cases involving approximately 1,000,000 workers employed in packing and processing of agricultural commodities. The Senate has rejected this provision. These workers who are protected under the Wagner Act to organize and bargain collectively will under this provision have no recourse for the peaceful adjustment of their disputes with employers. This provision thereby actually provokes and will encourage strikes. No possible justification for any such provision. Most urgently request that a roll-call vote be obtained on this provision and that it be overwhelmingly defeated.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, CIO.

Injured Veterans and Service Personnel Hear Air Progress Discussed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, last night a forum on aviation progress was held before an audience of service people in Washington. I include the address of Joseph T. Geuting, Jr., manager, Personal Aircraft Council, Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc.:

Patients and staff members of Walter Reed Hospital, you have now heard two important phases of our postwar air age and their relation to you individually. The Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Representative from West Virginia, has detailed for you the legislator's viewpoint on aviation development in the sense of Federal aid and guidance. He has told you of the rising tide of appreciation among his colleagues as to the importance of air commerce—both commercial air transportation of people and merchandise and the use of personal aircraft by individuals. Following his enlightening and encouraging remarks, the Honorable William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air, has reviewed the administrative activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the mandates of the people as expressed through congressional action. Mr. Burden has sketched for you a preview of postwar aviation possibilities in the sense of economics—jobs that can be created and maintained by a full usage of aerial transportation. Now it is my privilege to round out the informal discussion of this aviation panel by a brief outline of the general subject of air power, in an endeavor to show you just how the particular phases discussed by these two gentlemen form an integral part of our Nation's over-all air power and the needs of our national security.

Out of our war experience we have come to visualize air power as the trinity of air force, air commerce, and aircraft industry. In this concept we have drawn the analogy with sea power, and we have been impressed with the example of the British, the Dutch, and the Scandinavians, all enterprising people, living in lands of small natural resources, who have gone out into the world to promote maritime commerce. This in turn fostered domestic industry and brought peace and prosperity to these lands. The sea-power trident comprised the navy, maritime commerce, and shipbuilding. And sea power stood on two firm foundations—strategic bases and, more important, a strong maritime tradition.

In the past the every-day British citizen had a thorough understanding of the importance of sea power to his well-being. Whether or not you talked to the butcher, the

baker, or the pastor of the village church, you found every British citizen steeped in the tradition of sea power.

This tradition had its basis in the early voyages of trade and exploration so well outlined in Haklyt's "Voyages" written about 1600. In this work Richard Haklyt, a patriotic Englishman who was shocked by the squalor and proverty in England, revealed the vision of sea power to the English people. The British naval tradition is founded in the exploits of Sir Francis Drake, the destruction of the Spanish armada and in the victories of Nelson at Trafalgar, the Nile and Copenhagen, and in the final triumph over the Germans in the North Sea. And so well was this tradition established that it constituted the cornerstone of British sea power.

Now today we are all aware of the exploits of our naval and military air forces. Our aircraft industry has become the greatest industry in the history of the world and the quality of its production is unquestioned. Now we are beginning to be aware, too, of the tremendous importance of air commerce. (The airplane as a means of transport has contributed quite as much to the progress of this war as has the airplane as a weapon.)

In order that you may have a better understanding let me define what we mean by air power: First of all, within the trinity of air power we find five principles, each of which is interdependent upon the others.

Combat force is only one of the five principles, although in wartime we are inclined to think of air force as the dominant factor of air power.

Air power, in its coverall character, requires air forces of such strength, technological excellence and readiness as to preclude a successful assault upon our Nation or possessions.

Second. Air power implies freedom of the air consistent with national sovereignty and jurisdiction.

Air power connotes, as its third factor, the orderly and economic expansion of domestic and international air transport and of personal flying.

Preservation of a strong aircraft manufacturing industry is the fourth requirement

And the fifth phase of air power is the cultivation of the air-mindedness of the public to the wholehearted desire to use and fly airplanes.

Throughout history, that nation has been secure whose borders are secure. Today, of course, the borders of a nation cover the whole country, not just the rim. Adolf Hitler thought that he had constructed a fortress Europe by ringing Germany around with vassal conquered nations but the air forces of the Allies came in through the roof of Germany and took fortress Europe apart.

Today we have a new border on every nation—the border of the sky. Only through air power can we protect that border.

When we understand the true meaning of air power, we are able to visualize the possibilities which lie ahead. It becomes obvious that we must, in looking ahead, appreciate the underlying causes upon which the future operations of air power must be based.

The basis of all our theory was summed up in 1889 by the brilliant United States Navy captain, A. T. Mahan.

Since man first was able to travel from his native shore to another country, Mahan wrote, victory in war and prosperity in peace depended on the control of waterborne communication.

This control, said Mahan, depended upon the merchant marine, strategic bases, the Navy, the shipbuilding industry and a seafaring tradition—again five points.

Now comes air power which takes up where sea power leaves off, for we have proved in this war that the striking punch of aviation can disrupt—if not eliminate—all surface transportation, sea as well as land.

Looking back at ancient and medieval history we can find numerous examples of the way control of the sea has fostered international trade.

One of the best examples is the control Rome exercised which permitted trade throughout the known world and led to a long era of peace which gave us the phrase "pax Romana."

Perhaps now we are on the threshold of a "pax aeronautica."

You who are listening to me must feel that you are in the forefront of the mightiest economic force civilization has yet experienced. No matter what your relationship to the aviation industry may be, the attitude of each one of you is vital. For the air-mindedness in you, and in each of your children, is going to determine our air power for the future.

Following the First World War, a wave of pacifist reaction swept over the country. The men who went to France in 1918 and a lot of others who lost a year or more out of their lives because of an inconclusive war, were disgusted with anything that had to do with the Army.

Our preparedness rusted away. Our aircraft industry, developed wonderfully in a few brief months, came apart at the seams.

The country reached a state of mind in which no sufficient support could be given the military end of the aviation industry.

At the same time, back in the 1930's, totalitarian governments arose in Europe and in Japan which built up their aviation industries strictly for war purposes.

Only you people who are listening to me can prevent our Nation being again unprepared to ward off enemy air force.

Of all forms of human endeavor, transportation is one of the most important. Only through transportation have people developed civilization. The caveman emerged from his savagery by such degrees as he was able to associate with his fellow cavemen.

When the canoe was first launched from a friendly shore to reach a strange land, a great stride in transportation was taken. The use of horses, the invention of the wheel, of steam, of rails, of the telegraph, of wireless, of radar—each has knit the whole world closer together. Each has been a step in the evolution toward the goal of understanding among all men. Now comes the airplane, mightiest of all means of transportation, for it surpasses all barriers of time and distance.

The airplane represents what we know as air power. It is the end product of our air-mindedness, of our industry, and of our need for national defense.

Thus it is that we see that air power actually can be summed up as transportation. It brings us into a new era of international relationships.

And since all of this is not something which can be just written into a law but rather something of great daily importance in the lives of all of us, it is our responsibility to give our advice in the development of an American air tradition as a public responsibility of the highest importance. The trinity of air force, air commerce, and aircraft industry is the basic concept of air power. American air power can be and must be one of the strongest factors in world peace. American air power will be no stronger than its foundation. Its foundation lies in the air-mindedness of our people and their understanding of the principles of air tradition. As citizens of this great country to which many of you men have already made a contribution of pain and suffering you have the additional responsibility of knowing that the development of this tradition is largely in your hands.

Choice of a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Savannah Evening Press of June 20, 1945, and is entitled "Choice of a President":

CHOICE OF A PRESIDENT

For a great many years it has been recognized that there is some weakness in the procedure for the Presidential succession in the event of the death or disability of the President and Vice President, and from time to time there has been talk of the Congress, by statute, and perhaps the people by constitutional amendment, doing something about it.

Some weeks ago James A. Farley touched on the situation in an address that attracted widespread attention and there was considerable talk and writing on the subject then, but nothing was done. President Truman has now thrown the weight of his influence behind a change that would give us a President in the event of death or disability of both the President and Vice President, who had at least in some measure been passed on by the people.

President Truman is asking Congress to pass legislation making the Speaker of the House first in line for the Presidency in case of death or disqualification of the President and Vice President. The recommendation made in a message to Congress, would change the 59-year-old law under which Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., would advance to the Presidency if President Truman were to die or leave office for some other reason.

The present statute, Mr. Truman tells Congress, gives him power "to nominate the person who would be by immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act. I do not believe that in a democracy this power should rest with the Chief Executive," he said.

The change suggested by Mr. Truman would put Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas first in line for the Presidency with Senator Kenneth MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, President pro tempore of the Senate, second in line. The order of succession after that "might pass to the members of the Cabinet as now provided." The same would apply if there were neither a Speaker nor Senate President qualified to succeed.

The President expresses belief that "no matter who succeeds to the Presidency after the death of the elected President and Vice President * * * he should not serve any longer than until the next congressional election or until a special election called for the purpose of electing a new President and Vice President." This period should be fixed by the Congress, he declares.

Mr. Truman adds that "insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer." "There is no officer in our system of government, besides the President and Vice President," he stated to Congress, "who has been elected by all the voters of the country." He said, however, that the Speaker of the House is the official in the Government "whose selection next to that of the President and Vice President can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves." The Speaker is elected to Congress by his own district and then is elected to be

presiding officer of the House by the vote of all Representatives. They, Mr. Truman's message pointed out, are representatives "of all the people of the country."

The recommendation for a change in the succession law came from President Truman as he undertook a series of long trips, one of which will be to Berlin to a meeting of the Big Three. He will travel most of the way in these journeys by air.

The President asks Congress to give "early consideration to this most important subject." It should.

The Contribution of the Foreign Language Press to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a speech on "The Contribution of the Foreign Language Press to the War Effort," made recently in Boston, Mass., to the Boston Advertising Club by Alexander Kahn, general manager of the Jewish Daily Forward of Boston, Mass.:

His Excellency Governor Tobin, His Honor Mayor Kerrigan, Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, this meeting was scheduled long before the tragic event that has spread sadness all over the world—the untimely death of our beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He is deeply mourned, not only by the American people, but by the people in every land. He symbolized America more than any other President in our history. The finest and noblest of every nationality, of every race, and every religion—the total of which is the American people—found expression through him. Every man, irrespective of his religion, race, or origin, was his brother. He was the first among our great public men, who realized that this is one world, and unless we can make it possible for all to live in peace and security, free from fear and free from want, we shall all be destroyed, or worse—reduced to slavery.

Racial and religious prejudice and bigotry existed, and still exist to a lesser or greater degree, in all countries. It was to escape from these, that men left the old countries, and sailed on treacherous seas, to pioneer in the wilderness and build a country based on justice and liberty. And when our Founding Fathers drew up a Declaration of Independence, the first thing they proclaimed to the world was:

"That all men are created free and equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This and the Bill of Rights, guaranteeing freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion, opened a new chapter in the history of the world. Other nations have striven equally for these freedoms. But our Nation is the first which has succeeded in putting them into successful practice. And we have become the most prosperous and happiest country in the world.

Racial and religious persecution has always been smouldering among us. The record of this country is not free from it. The early Dutch settlers were prejudiced against the English. Later the Dutch and the English persecuted the Quakers. The Know-Nothings hated all immigrants and wanted to deprive them of citizenship. When the Irish came to America in large numbers they were persecuted and abused. Later there was prejudice against Jewish immigration, and still later, against Italians.

Fortunately, these hatreds and prejudices were entertained by a small minority of our people. The great majority believed in, and carried into effect, the principles of our Declaration of Independence. By virtue of these principles, this country has grown large and strong, prosperous, and happy. But it required constant vigilance, which is the price of all liberties. We must continue to be on guard forever against racial and religious prejudice, just as much as against infringement on free speech and free press.

This country is made up of all nationalties and people of all religions. Each one of us is a member of some minority. If we condone persecution of any minority—Catholic, Protestant, Jew; Spaniard, Frenchman, German, or Pole—white or Negro—if we condone it one day against one group, we shall condone it next day against another, and then against all the others, until we shall fall to the level of madness of the herren volk which tried to enslave or destroy the entire world, murdered millions of people, and finally brought about its own ruin and destruction.

This World War, in which we generously supplied all the Allied Nations with ammunition and food, in which we sacrificed so much, for which our children and our Commander in Chief have given their lives, is fortunately coming to a victorious end. This victory was only possible because we were a united nation—united now more than ever before. This victory was obtained by the sacrifices of all the United Nations, led by the British, the Russian, and the American, and we Americans paid for it with the blood of the Cabots, Johnsons, Maguires, Goldsteins, and Molinaries. All of them went cheerfully to defend the liberties which they enjoyed, and which they wanted their children to enjoy. On the battle front you found the British, American, and French armies, the Polish, the Irish, and the Jewish brigades, fighting side by side against the gangs that wanted to rob us of our liberties and destroy civilization.

In this united war effort the foreign-language press played an important role.

There are 22,000,000 people in the United States who were born and raised—abroad and in this country—in homes where English was not the spoken language. There are 2,000,000 in this country who do not understand English.

Agents of the enemy countries have been spreading poison among these 22,000,000 Americans, erroneously believing them to be the easiest victims of this poisonous propaganda. But, believe it or not, the foreign-language newspapers did not fall for this poison any more than the English-language newspapers, because, on the whole, the foreign-language press is free and honest; the loyalty of the foreign-language press has been beyond question.

In their devilish plan to destroy civilization, Germany and Japan made many mistakes. But their greatest mistake was in believing that the American people are not a united people.

Germany and Japan knew that we could produce more ammunition, more ships, more food, and more of every essential of war, than they could. They knew that we could equip and muster larger and better-equipped armies. But they also knew that we had 22,000,000 in the homes of recent immigrants, and they thought we would never be able, under our democratic process, to unite our people to wage war, even on such sneaky and treacherous enemies. They are paying for this mistake now. Our people, who come from every land, who speak in every language, are united as one.

The foreign-language press is entitled to a great deal of credit in bringing this about.

The objects of the war have been made clear. The danger to liberty, the danger of fascism, the danger of becoming the slaves of the "herren volk" have been made clear and the necessity to defend our liberties with our lives is every freeman's duty. There are hundreds of thousands of men and women who come from these homes, who work on our farms, in mills, on our railroads, in airplane and gun factories. They have not only enthusiastically participated in speedy production, but have guarded against sabotage and treachery. The people of all nationalities, of all religions—Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, work together in these factories, mills, and railroad yards, and there is perfect unity for the common cause.

The foreign language press has contributed its share—which was the hardest—to the marvelous record of production which has astounded the world.

On this job there are 1,402 foreign-language newspapers in 35 languages.

It was a marked and concentrated field easily open to enemy attack. I have no doubt the Nazi agents tried to bribe the editors and publishers, but the foreign-language press came out true and loyal to the United States.

I remember World War I and the difficulties of the foreign-language press. How you had to print English translations and sleep at the door of the Second Assistant Postmaster General to retain, or obtain restoration of your mailing privileges. There is certainly great credit due to this administration for its trust in the foreign-language press. None of these difficulties exist this time, with much better results.

We helped in every effort essential for the war: Selective Service, War Manpower Commission, Department of Agriculture, Department of Justice, blood-donor campaigns, war bonds. Besides, there are the campaigns for overseas charities. The Jewish press has helped the American Red Cross drives and the United Jewish Appeal for war sufferers. The other papers did the same.

I remember one woman who came to our office with a savings box of 365 pennies for the Red Cross, in response to our appeal, showing she thought about it every day.

Mr. Alan Cranston, Chief of Foreign Language Division of OWI, told you the other day—I quote:

"If a foreign-language press did not exist in this country, the Government would virtually have to invent one."

I can only add to this: If the Government had done it, it would not have been as good. There are 10,000,000 readers of the foreign-language press. No one is compelled to buy these papers. Since people do, they evidently want and like them, and believe in them—the advertisers should take notice. Many of these papers are not published for profit. My paper, the Jewish Daily Forward, for instance, is published by a non-profit-sharing association. It is the largest in the world, and the most philanthropic, for we have donated $2,000,000 for charitable and philanthropic causes.

Many of the newspapers have a hard struggle for existence, and are supported by voluntary contributions. But these people need the foreign-language newspapers, and are glad to pay the price for maintaining them.

The foreign-language press was instrumental in introducing America to the new arrivals and helped the old settlers to understand the new immigrant. I feel convinced that each helped the other in understanding this complicated world of ours. Due to our mixed composition, we sympathize with all peoples. Our charity to all, our humanity, and our entire culture has been enriched from the noblest sources that flowed from every corner of the world, and from every nationality and race.

It was this that made it possible for our country to become a leader in the effort of creating a world organization that will prevent war and guarantee the independence and sovereignty of all nations, large and small.

We are on the verge of a great victory, which is the victory of civilization against barbarism. But this victory will be in vain if, together with the enemies without, we do not exterminate national, religious, and racial prejudice and bigotry within.

The foreign-language press has performed a gigantic task in Americanizing the immigrant, and in uniting this country for war. It has a still nobler task to perform in helping to unite our people for a just and lasting peace. It is our task to see that the peace should be based on the "four freedoms" promulgated by our late Commander in Chief: The freedom of religion; the freedom of press; the freedom from want; and the freedom from fear.

Resolution on Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the First District, Department of Indiana, Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States, Steel City Post No. 909, of Gary, Ind., adopted the following resolution:

Whereas Steel City Post, 99, first district, Department of Indiana, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, feel that certain improvements and changes can and should be made in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Public Law No. 346, commonly known as the GI bill, enacted by the Congress on June 22, 1944, and also in the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend the following changes and improvements:

A. PUBLIC 346 (GI BILL)

We recommend the following:

GI bill recommendations

1. We recommend that rules and regulations concerning veterans' benefits be disseminated by the State service officers to all post and district service officers from time to time.

2. That a speed-up be made by the Veterans' Administration in the approval or disapproval, in the granting or denying of loans.

3. That when the loan to be made amounts to three times the amount which the Veterans' Administration will guarantee, then said loan should be approved on application providing that the lender is satisfied.

4. We recommend that all applications for and papers necessary to make a loan be simplified and condensed.

5. That the readjustment allowance for former members of the Armed Forces who are unemployed, be more definite and certain and be made applicable to disabled veterans who are unable to work because of illness.

6. That every veteran who has served 90 days or more and who has a disability of 10 percent or more, shall be entitled to vocational training regardless of handicap or not and that said person shall be entitled to not less than 4 years of schooling.

7. That in determining the time granted for education, the veterans' term of military service shall be construed to be the total time from date of enlistment, induction, or appointment to date of discharge.

8. That where application has been made for review of discharge, letters and statements of any nature or kind which have not been sworn to or verified shall be considered as fully as if same had been.

B. NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940, APPROVED OCTOBER 8, 1940

1. We recommend that the beneficiary have the right to determine the mode of payment, including the right to request each payment of 25 percent if the beneficiary is 31 years of age or over, and if 50 years of age or over, then 50 percent of the amount of the policy as first payment and the balance in monthly payments.

2. That in every case where insurance is issued, that a certificate be issued and delivered to the person and place designated by the insured.

3. That a law be passed immediately extending national service life insurance for another 5 years.

4 That every person in the armed forces be presumed to have applied for at least $5,000 national service life insurance at time of death.

5. That wherever any beneficiary is either widow, children, mother, or father, said person does not have to prove dependency.

6. That the date of the insurance shall become effective as of date of application for said insurance and it shall be presumed that application for insurance was made by all persons in the armed forces since September 16, 1940.

7. We further recommend that the real reason for discharge from the armed forces be stated on discharges, that the veteran be adequately protected when military records are lost. That adequate subsistence allowance be given veterans in the matter of education; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be presented to our next district meeting for its approval and presentation to our next department convention or conference for action, by it for further action at our next national encampment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent our First Congressional District Congressman, RAY J. MADDEN; our Second Congressional District Congressman, CHARLES HALLECK; our Third District Congressman, ROBERT GRANT, and to each of our United States Senators from Indiana, RAYMOND E. WILLIS and HOMER E. CAPEHART.

LESLIE R. FALKNER,
Commander, Steel City Post, 909.

Attest:

MAURICE H. ECK,
Adjutant, Steel City Post, 909.

Approved by regular seconded motion and vote at regular meeting of First District, Department of Indiana, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Hubner-Swanson Post, No. 1130, at La Porte, Ind., on July 1, 1945.

CHARLES T. BOOHER,
First District, Department of Indiana, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Attest:

MAURICE H. ECK,
Adjutant, First District, Department of Indiana, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Transportation Agencies, Including Washington's Transit Company, Do Good War Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States recently wrote to Col. J. M. Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, commending the transportation agencies of our country and their millions of workers for their accomplishments. They have done a wonderful job, almost performing miracles under difficult conditions, and the praise of our President is deserving. It is noteworthy in the job that has been done that the local transit industry has played a big part in helping mass America's industrial might. Not too much credit has been given this branch of the transportation industry for a job well done. In 1944, for example, the local transit lines of this country carried more than 23,000,000,000 people. It was a new all-time high and 6 times more people than all other forms of transportation put together. They carried a billion more people last year than they did in 1943, with less manpower, spare parts in slow supply, and vehicles strictly rationed. It was a challenge met by old-fashioned American skill and ingenuity.

Locally, the job performed by Washington's transit company has been typical of the industry nationally. Since the war Capital Transit Co.'s passenger burden has more than doubled. With foresight, the company was able to meet the demand for more equipment by ordering new vehicles before the situation became critical. In metropolitan Washington alone in 1944 Capital Transit Co. carried 415,900,000 revenue passengers. This is a million more than were carried the previous year.

Facing critical manpower shortages, it has continued to carry on, providing a service that might not be always comfortable or convenient, but ever meeting its primary responsibility and obligation to the community. In 1944 the company had a net loss of 580 employees for the year, 450 of whom were platform personnel. This is, indeed, a serious shortage and has resulted in those who are still on the job working longer hours and more days to enable Washington's Government war workers to get to and from their jobs. The firm now has more than 1,000 of its employees in the armed services. Many women have been hired to take the place of these men, and I cite this as an example of the attempts made by the company to see we all are served to the best of their ability.

The shortage of gasoline and tires has been a problem not easy to overcome. But again the ability of Americans to meet a situation courageously and with ingenuity has resulted in procedures and practices for conservation that would have been considered impossible by maintenance men only a few years ago.

I understand we now have more modern streetcars in this city in proportion to cars operated than any other city in the country. The recently delivered streamline streetcars with "standee" windows have proven helpful to those Representatives and Senators who have had to relinquish their seats to the ladies and stand for the duration of their ride. They can now see the passing sights and perhaps reflect on some of the attention to detail the engineers of this company have considered in the midst of all their other problems. Despite the war, much more than half of Capital Transit Co. vehicles are less than 5 years old, and are

the last prewar word in design and safety.

The transit industry here has done much to serve our Nation during this war. The firm was the first company to put streamline streetcars in service and only recently instituted two-way radio which enables their key people to talk back and forth and thus clear up delays in about half the time it took previous to the installation of this modern wonder. Coupled with the installation of the headway recorders which register the passing of vehicles, Capital Transit has looked ahead and stepped ahead, all to the benefit of the millions of this city who ride their lines.

To quote a few more statistics, the company in 1944 operated almost 48 million miles. This is more than 1,500 times the circumference of the earth.

I end this comment by paying tribute to the employees who have held forth so strongly and firmly on the home front. As a group they are among the largest buyers of war bonds in the city. To date they have purchased more than two and one-half million dollars in war bonds and in the recent mighty seventh drive they were over the top in their quota before the drive was half over. In the Seventh alone they purchased more than $400,000 in war bonds and in addition are credited with purchasing two heavy bombers in other war bond drives. They have been donors to the Red Cross blood bank, and have been liberal contributors to the Red Cross drives and Community War Fund drives and other community activities.

Salary Increases for Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Journal of the American Judicature Society for June 1945 endorsing the salary increases for Federal judges provided for in the Hobbs bill, H. R. 2181. These same salary increases have been incorporated in the bill which I recently introduced to revise completely the laws relating to the organization of the courts, H. R. 3498. I urge the membership to read the endorsements of these increases which I believe are timely and essential to the maintenance of the high caliber of the Federal judicial office.

The article is as follows:

SOCIETY ENDORSES SALARY INCREASES FOR FEDERAL JUDGES

"If the high standard of our Federal judiciary is to be maintained, the passage of the Hobbs bill is not only necessary but very urgent." Frederic M. Miller.

Approval of salary increases for Federal judges, as proposed in bills introduced in Congress by Representative HOBBS and Senator WAGNER, has been announced by the American Judicature Society, in accordance with a vote of the directors and officers taken by mail last month, and a statement of the society's position and of the comments of the various directors and officers has been put in the record for the consideration of the congressional committees studying the proposal.

Following are the salary changes that would go into effect upon termination of the Stabilization Act of 1942, if the bill (H. R. 2181) is passed:

Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, from $20,500 to $25,500 a year; associate justices of the same court, from $20,000 to $25,000; judges of the circuit courts of appeals, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Court of Claims, from $12,500 to $17,500; chief justice of the District Court for the District of Columbia, from $10,500 to $15,500; and all other district judges, from $10,000 to $15,000.

The approval of the directors was more than overwhelming although not unanimous. Of the 108 officers and directors, up to the time of going to press 72 had voted in favor of supporting the measure, 4 approved the principle with qualifications or reservations as to certain provisions of the Hobbs bill, 7 opposed it, and 25 did not commit themselves or were not in a position to cast a vote. Among the latter are 7 directors and officers who are themselves Federal judges and personally interested in the outcome, and a few in military service or otherwise inaccessible at the time who have not yet been heard from.

A survey of the letters by which the votes were cast indicates that the following were the leading factors that led the directors and officers to give the measure their approval:

1. Higher salaries must be paid to assure getting the grade of men necessary to maintain the high caliber of the Federal bench.

2. Salaries are too low and in many instances result in actual hardship.

3. Many State court judges, both trial and appellate, are better paid than the corresponding judges in the Federal system.

4. Low salaries are not in keeping with the dignity and importance of the Federal courts.

5. Increases are necessary to offset the substantial reduction in actual compensation resulting from the subjecting of judicial salaries to Federal and State income taxes.

6. Judicial service will be improved by relieving the judges of financial worries.

7. Judicial service will be improved if judges are not forced, as many are today, to accept outside employment as writers and teachers to supplement their regular income.

8. Continuation of the present salary scale will result in the judiciary being manned largely by lawyers of lesser ability or of independent fortune, neither of which is desirable.

9. The purchasing power of the dollar has greatly declined since the present salary scale was established.

10. The problems with which the Federal judges now and in the near future must deal are of the greatest magnitude and importance to the American people, and we cannot afford to let those who perform those services go underpaid.

The opinions of the officers and directors, themselves leaders of the bench and bar and representing in each State that element known to be unselfishly interested and active in the promotion of the efficient administration of justice, are of exceptional significance, and extracts from their letters follow:

"I am convinced that salaries for judges should be such amount as would attract the best legal talent and not penalize a successful practitioner by reducing his income too much. In my judgment a proposed increase of $5,000 is more than modest. I really think that for the circuit courts of appeals the increase should be half again as much, and for the Supreme Court twice as much as $5,000." (Stuart B. Campbell, Wytheville, Va.)

"It's ridiculous to expect the leaders of the bar to accept appointment on a salary of $10,000 a year, from which income tax must then be deducted." (Benjamin Wham, Chicago.)

"If we get the best men possible on the bench we must expect to pay them adequately, and the proposed amount to which the salary is to be raised is probably less than any appointee would earn if in private practice." (Lawrence R. Hamblen, Spokane, Wash.)

"We cannot hope to get men on the bench capable of handling big problems unless we pay them salaries comparable to those being earned by big men who create and deal with these problems." (James P. Alexander, chief justice, Supreme Court of Texas.)

"I feel that we have, in this country, by failing to raise the salaries of the Federal judges, brought about a situation where this high office becomes unattractive to the leading members of the profession. This situation should be remedied." (Pike Hall, Shreveport, La.)

"I favor the passage of the bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges. While it must be taken as an accepted fact that judicial salaries cannot be made sufficiently high to approximate the income of lawyers in the higher income brackets of the practice, they nevertheless should be raised high enough so that the judiciary is in a position to draw on the best talent of the bar." (Albert J. Harno, dean, College of Law, University of Illinois.)

"I am in favor of this proposal because it will tend to dignify our Federal judiciary and will make a Federal court judgeship attractive to capable and qualified men." (Robert M. Clark, Topeka, Kans.)

"Our own United States district judge here in the southern district of Mississippi was a highly successful practitioner before he was appointed to the bench, and I am sure that his acceptance of the appointment meant a very substantial pecuniary sacrifice. Furthermore, he was appointed to the bench, and accepted the appointment, during the depression. Now, what with inflation and the greatly lowered purchasing power of a dollar, it means much more of a sacrifice than it did at the time of the appointment. If the judiciary expects to attract the services of the type of men on the bench that the practicing lawyer wants, and that we are fortunate enough to have here in our district, it should make certain that the holder of the office is adequately compensated." (Hubert S. Lipscomb, Jackson, Miss.)

"The present salaries of Federal judges, particularly in the district courts and the circuit courts of appeal, have long been wholly inadequate and are not in keeping with the dignity and importance of our Federal courts." (Edson R. Sunderland, University of Michigan Law School.)

"It is a well-recognized fact that the Federal judges have been greatly underpaid. Many State trial and appellate judges receive compensation greatly in excess of what has been allotted to our Federal judiciary." (William Doll, Milwaukee.)

"I have always felt that one of the most certain ways to insure a completely independent judiciary was to select competent men and pay them adequate compensation. Under existing conditions the salaries of Federal judges, particularly circuit and district judges, are inadequate. The purchasing power of the dollar is not what it was when their salaries were fixed at the present amounts, and the imposition of Federal income taxes further reduces their actual compensation to a point where Federal judges cannot be expected adequately to maintain themselves unless they happen to be men of independent means." (Thomas B. Guy, Richmond, Va.)

"If conditions were normal, the proposed increase of $5,000 a year might not seem inadequate, but in these days of inflation an

increase of double that amount would be reasonable. Since the Congress in making an increase of this kind must keep in mind normal conditions, it is perhaps wise to support the bill, but the proposed increase is certainly the minimum that should be considered." (Wilbur F. Denious, Denver.)

"I have long felt that judges of courts of record, both in the Federal system and in the several States, in general are not paid adequate salaries, and inasmuch as substantial raises can be obtained without any appreciable increase in the per capita tax rate, I favor any appropriate efforts in the direction of authorizing fair compensation for members of the judiciary." (Judge Frank C. Haymond, Fairmont, W. Va.)

"The increase is certainly merited, and I am only sorry that it seems impossible to provide for proportionate increases in the salaries of trial and appellate judges in our State courts." (Ray S. Fellows, Tulsa, Okla.)

"Federal judges are notoriously underpaid. Any person who possesses the skill, education, and standing required of a Federal judge should receive a respectable salary. Under existing conditions, an increase of $5,000 is proper." (Judge Van Buren Perry, Aberdeen, S. Dak.)

"Having served as a member of the committee on judicial salaries of the American Bar Association, and, as such, having become acquainted with the inadequate salaries now being paid to the judges, I am firmly convinced that there is an urgent necessity for the increases in compensation which are provided for by the proposed legislation." (Harry B. Mackoy, Cincinnati.)

"I think this legislation is particularly timely in view of the rising costs of living and the fact that the salaries are now subject to income taxes." (Pinckney L. Cain, Columbia, S. C.)

"I think the justice of such an increase is too clear to require argument. The whole situation demonstrates the shortsightedness of the action of Congress in 1932, when it made the salaries of the judges subject to income tax. If this action had not been taken, there would be little need for the suggested increases, and all of the administrative work in assessing and collecting the taxes would have been obviated. It seems to me that if the increased salaries are not voted, there ought to be action exempting such salaries from income tax." (Charles M. Lyman, New Haven, Conn.)

"I am strongly in favor of that legislation because I think it only does simple justice to Federal judges, whose actual net return was drastically cut when it was held that they were subject to Federal income taxes, and when they were also subjected to State income taxes." (Will Shaforth, Washington, D. C.)

"The rise in living costs and high taxes have, in effect, reduced the amount of the salaries of Federal judges which may be spent in support of themselves and their families. At no other time in the recent history of the Nation have Federal judges been required to consider and decide more new, difficult, and complex questions. Post-war days will probably increase the number and importance of the cases which they must decide. Congress cannot well diminish their official burdens, but the Hobbs bill, if enacted, will at least diminish their financial worries. I hope that the bill becomes law." (Henry P. Adair, Jacksonville, Fla.)

"The judicial department, as a separate branch of the Government, has been starved too long. It is in the public interst that its importance in our Federal system be constantly emphasized by the lawyers, who understand what an essential part the administration of justice plays in the protection of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. The salaries of the judges are low and out of all proportion to the value of the services they perform, and their niggardly pay tends to minimize the importance of the courts. We and the English are the only peoples whose liberties are founded on law, and only the English have shown, in the compensation of their judges, that they appreciate that fact." (Francis E. Winslow, Rocky Mount, N. C.)

"Since the birth of our nation the Federal judiciary has been the most powerful factor in the world for the development of constitutional law. It has consistently preserved the privileges guaranteed to the citizen by the Bill of Rights. Without the Federal judiciary what would our Nation have been? And what rights would the citizen possess? * * * The Federal judges surely have earned their right to the increase in salary proposed by this measure. Not only have they earned their right but present conditions render the increase inevitable." (George Rossman, Supreme Court of Oregon.)

"I think it is very important that an increase be made at this time in order to insure the maintenance of high standards in the Federal judicial system for the difficult period of readjustment from war to peace time conditions. This can only be done if men of sufficient capacity, character, and ability can be induced to accept and continue in judicial office. Undoubtedly there will be a great increase in business activity at the close of the war, which will test the capacity of the courts to handle it properly and promptly. There must be made available sufficient compensation to attract and retain the highest type of men to judgeships in order to enable the courts to meet these conditions." (Laurance M. Hyde, Supreme Court of Missouri.)

"It is difficult to see where it is even debatable that this increase should be made for the dignity of the Federal bench and the independence of its judges." (Lester D. Summerfield, Reno, Nev.)

"I have always felt that if the compensation were more commensurate with the responsibilities and dignity of the office, we would have better judges." (Loyd Wright, Los Angeles.)

"Webster said, 'Justice is the greatest interest of man on earth,' and I feel that those who administer justice should be adequately compensated." (Adolph J. Rodenbeck, Rochester, N. Y.)

"Strongly favor society supporting bill to increase salaries of Federal judges. Am sending you air-mail copy of resolution adopted by Los Angeles Bar Association supporting judges' raise in salary." (Alexander Macdonald, Los Angeles.)

"Heartily approve Hobbs bill, and State bar of Arizona at its last annual meeting unanimously recommended increase in Federal judicial salaries." (T. J. Byrne, Prescott, Ariz.)

"I vigorously favor society's support of H. R. 2181. Judicial office should attract lawyers of highest and ablest type. Federal judicial salaries low before they became subject to Federal and State income taxes. Now so inadequate as to prevent most lawyers of ability from accepting office unless otherwise financially independent." (Robert F. Maguire, Portland, Oreg.)

"Present salaries are inadequate, and rate with those paid the minor State judicial officers. This situation has been a definite deterrent in attracting able men to the Federal bench, especially in the district courts. Exceptions may be noted where men of ability are sitting, but this is at a personal sacrifice." (William W. Evans, Paterson, N. J.)

"Members of the bar in active practice, with the ability and standing which judges should have, receive very much larger compensation for their services than do the judges. To some extent this deficiency is compensated by the added honor and dignity which naturally goes with judicial office, but I do not think the present salaries of judges are in any wise commensurate with the services they are called upon to perform." (Harold A. Ritz, Charleston, W. Va.)

"Considering the enormous increase in the work and responsibilities of the Federal judges during recent years, and the increased financial burdens that have been put upon them by income taxes and in other ways without any opportunity for them to increase their income to meet these drains upon it, the granting of an increase such as is proposed in the Hobbs bill is only a matter of ordinary fairness. In addition, the continuance of the present low scale of compensation available to the judges after taxes will inevitably lead to a lowering of the caliber of the judiciary, if it has not already begun to have that effect. Certainly this is a matter on which the Government of the United States cannot afford to be penurious from the standpoint of the proper conduct of judicial business, aside from all questions of fairness to the incumbents of the judicial office." (Ralph M. Hoyt, Milwaukee.)

"There is absolutely no question in my mind but that our Federal judges, particularly here in New Jersey, are the most overworked and underpaid men on the bench. So far as I am aware, there are no full-time judges in New Jersey who receive as little as $10,000 a year. Our circuit judges even receive $16,000 a year. If we are to secure the type of men necessary to properly administer justice in the Federal courts, it is my opinion that such a raise is not only desirable but absolutely essential." (L. Stanley Ford, Hackensack, N. J.)

"I favor this legislation because I think such a measure is necessary in order to keep able men in these important offices. It goes without saying that the orderly conduct of our Government rests very largely upon the courts and that the courts cannot function well unless the judges are men of character, education, and ability who command the respect of the community and who are able to view the questions before them in full perspective. While from time to time men appear who have all the qualifications and who are willing to serve as judges at salaries very much less than they can command elsewhere, there are not enough such men to supply vacancies as they occur. The task of finding and interesting the right men is hard enough without an added handicap of inadequate salaries." (Robert N. Miller, Washington, D. C.)

"In my opinion, the present compensation paid to Federal judges is below the amount which men with the qualifications and ability desirable for these offices would be able to earn in the practice of their profession. Added to this fact is the decrease in the actual income and purchasing power of Federal judges due to the events of the past few years. A public servant should not be penalized by his willingness to accept office, but, rather, the compensation paid for the position should be commensurate with the ability required to fill the position." (Ronald J. Foulis, St. Louis, Mo.)

"I believe in paying good judges really adequate salaries, and the variety of work that comes before the district courts, especially in the larger districts in the busy centers, is probably the most varied and responsible judicial work in any court in the country. As there is no practical way of grading the judicial salaries in accordance with judicial capacity, I record my vote in favor of the bill before Congress in order to provide more adequate salaries for the position, which should be made reasonably attractice to the best men available, and which should also yield enough above taxes which are likely to continue to remove or reduce to a minimum the financial worries of a judge." (Frank W. Grinnell, Boston.)

"If we are going to get the caliber of lawyers that we ought to get to accept such appointments, we must pay them enough so they can live decently and like 'white men' on their pay. We should not have to resort

to lawyers who have already amassed a fortune. I am sure that all the judges and members of the bar in this State would be in favor of such an increase." (Chief Justice Charles Loring, Supreme Court of Minnesota.)

"When we consider that these salaries are now subject to income tax, it seems to me that it is of the highest importance that they be raised by this modest sum; else suitable candidates for appointment to the Federal bench will not be found. With the proposed aditions to their salaries, the Justices of the Supreme Court will receive no more than judges of courts of first instance in New York City and judges of the High Court of Judicature in England. As I recall, the salary of the Lord Chancellor is about twice as great as the proposed salary of the Chief Justice of the United States. When we consider the salaries of judges of the lower courts, the proposed increases are equally urgent. In this country, for instance, the judges of the courts of first instance receive $4,000 more per annum than the judges of the United States District Court. In this State the judges of the supreme court receive $7,500 more per annum than the judges of the circuit court of appeals. An admirable judge of that court undertook last year the burden and expense of a political campaign to be elected to the supreme court of Pennsylvania. He was elected. Is it likely that the Federal bench would have lost his services if he had been assured for life a salary comparable to that of the State judgeship, which is for a term of 21 years?" (John G. Buchanan, Pittsburgh.)

"With Federal salaries subjected to income tax and with the increase in the cost of living, Federal judges have had a very substantial reduction in salary when considered with the cost of living. If the high standard of our Federal judiciary is to be maintained, the passage of the Hobbs bill is not only necessary but very urgent." (Frederic M. Miller, Supreme Court of Iowa.)

In addition to those quoted, the following directors and officers also voted in favor of support of the Hobbs bill: Chauncey E. Wheeler, Providence, R. I.; Donald A. Finkbeiner, Toledo, Ohio; Judge William H. Hutchinson, Wahpeton, N. Dak.; William C. Mathes, Los Angeles; Henry I. Quinn, Washington, D. C.; Conrad E. Snow, Rochester, N. H.; Charles B. Stephens, Springfield, Ill.; E. Smythe Gambrell, Atlanta; Frank Hartgraves, Menard, Tex.; David A. Simmons, Houston; Judge Lawrence C. Jones, Rutland, Vt.; Clement F. Robinson, Portland, Maine; James L. Shepherd, Jr., Houston; William H. Rogers, Jacksonville, Fla.; W. G. McLaren, Seattle; Charles A. Beardsley, Oakland, Calif.; Joseph F. Berry, Hartford, Conn.; George E. Brand, Detroit; Glenn R. Winters, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John W. Bricker, Columbus, Ohio; Homer Cummings, Washington; John T. Barker, Kansas City; Albert Smith Faught, Philadelphia; William Clarke Mason, Philadelphia; Glenn C. Gillespie, Pontiac, Mich.; James R. Morford, Wilmington, Del.; E. R. Beckwith, New York; Howard L. Barkdull, Cleveland; Herbert Harley, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Samuel G. Fisher, Baltimore; Burt J. Thompson, Forest City, Iowa; and Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Newark, N. J. Sam Hobbs, Alabama director, is sponsor of the bill in the House of Representatives.

Approval of the bill in the society's governing body, while overwhelming, was not unanimous. Two of the directors who cast negative votes indicated their general sympathy with the objectives of the bill, but opposed it at this time because of its inflationary effect. The fact that the Hobbs bill, by its own terms, does not propose to go into effect until the expiration of the Stabilization Act might, if brought to their attention, have influenced their views to some extent. Two more, likewise sympathizing with the general principle of increased compensation for the Federal judges, withheld unqualified approval from this bill because they thought the amount of the increase (50 percent in the case of district judges) excessive, and because they disapproved of a blanket raise to all in the same amount without preserving the existing salary differential. Directors from three western States were of the opinion that present salaries are high enough; their opinion, in contrast with that of the New Jersey and Pennsylvania directors, lending force to the suggestion of one that there ought to be a salary differential for judges of the same grade based on geographical considerations, to compensate for the permanently higher cost of living in the big metropolitan centers. One director, while not opposing increases for Federal judges, thought the position of the State judges so much worse that remedy of their plight might be of more immediate concern.

Following is an excerpt from a memorandum in support of the Hobbs bill written by the Honorable Harold M. Stephens of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, part of which was taken from House Report No. 232, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session (1926), accompanying the bill which when enacted into law established the present salary scale for Federal judges. The considerations persuasive in 1926 are equally apt at the present time, and speak eloquently not only for the passage of the Hobbs bill, but for adequate salaries for all judges everywhere.

"The service performed by the judges of the Federal courts is second to none in this country in its importance to the Nation. In the words of the late Mr. Justice Sutherland, 'If the political structure erected by the fathers rests upon any one pillar more securely than upon another, it is upon that which upholds the right of the individual to invoke the judgment of the civil courts of the land upon his conduct.' As Chief Justice Marshall said, 'The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes on his property, his reputation, his life, his all.' The duty of the judiciary is to protect society against the individual who attempts to interfere with its peace and order, but at the same time to be no less fearless and independent to protect the individual against the unjust demands of society. Of special importance is the judiciary under our written constitution in preserving for the people the structure and functions of the Government and the guaranteed rights of the individual.

"Judges are required constantly to pass upon questions which affect the rights and the well-being of the people. Far-reaching questions of constitutional law depend upon them for solution. Matters involving almost incredibly large property interests are submitted to them for determination. The meaning and effect of such a statute as the Sherman antitrust law and application thereof to great industrial concerns depend upon the learning, wisdom, integrity, and judgment of the judges. They administer in the courts, in review and enforcement proceedings, statutes such as the National Labor Relations Act, the Securities Act, the Securities Exchange Act, the Communications Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Civil Aeronautics Act, all of which vitally touch the activities of individuals and of business enterprises throughout the country. The judges deal with criminal cases involving both the liberty and the life of the citizen. The successful administration of receiverships, such as those which involve large railroad systems, rests with them; and the successful reorganization of public utilities depends to a substantial extent upon the ability of the judges. With the judges rests also the determination of difficult and important patent litigation which frequently involves matters of magnitude and importance. The determination of questions of general significance relating to income taxation and other Federal taxes rests with the judges. The number and importance of matters submitted to our Federal judges has in recent years increased in large degree.

"More important than all of the foregoing, the very stability of our system of government, a government of laws rather than of men, depends upon the confidence and respect of the people for those who hold the scales of justice in their hands, and therefore, depends upon the character and wisdom of the judges. The ablest and best of our citizens and those most learned in the law are needed to fill these positions of power and responsibility. The high consideration due the Federal judiciary as an independent element in our system of government is written into our fundamental law. As the system stands, it is imperative that the courts command the respect and approval of all, and, in all fairness and propriety, judges must maintain their position on a basis of true merit.

"Adequate salaries are a necessary part of any plan to keep competent men in the courts. Membership in the judiciary is an honor, but honor alone cannot compensate; it is more a question of economic competition. If men of worth and capacity are to be induced to accept and to continue in judgeships, there must be an available monetary compensation sufficiently attractive to the caliber of men desired. Also, judges once appointed must be so compensated as to be able to meet reasonable personal and family financial demands so that they can apply themselves to the tasks of their office.

"The increased cost of living and the heavy impact of taxes has reduced the actual worth of judges' salaries to a low point. Judges, like all others, are obliged to provide for the support of dependents, the education of children, and the protection of their families in event of death. A judge's salary terminates in the event of his death and in consequence affords no protection to those who survive him unless he is able during his lifetime to accumulate savings or to carry insurance. At the present worth of a judge's salary it is difficult for him to continue to meet such obligations. A judge is, moreover, called upon, in common with others, for charitable contributions, and because of his position must live, not upon a pretentious scale but in reasonably dignified circumstances. For a good many years last past some judges have been driven by necessity to accepting employment as law teachers in night schools, or to writing books, magazine articles, and the like, in order to augment their judicial salaries. The importance of judicial work is such that judges ought to be in a position to devote their entire time and energies to it.

"If the present scale of salaries is to be continued, it seems probable that appointments to the bench will have to be made either from among lawyers of independent means or from among those who have been so unsuccessful in practice that even the present salary scale will bear comparison with present earnings. Neither alternative is desirable for the public or the bench. It is not assumed that only those lawyers who have been successful in practice make competent judges. There are, of course, instances in which a lawyer not fitted by temperament for the practice of law, or not favored by opportunity for substantial earnings, makes an excellent judge. But usually success in practice is the result of professional competency and character, and these qualities are an assurance of dependability in judicial office. According to a sample survey, the earnings of the upper 10.5 percent of lawyers in 1941 were from $9,000 to $150,000 per year. Most lawyers of first-class ability in metropolitan centers, where the bulk of the work of the courts is carried on, are able to make $25,000 and upward before taxes.

"It is hardly reasonable to suppose that men who have proved their worth in the practice of law will surrender incomes many times as great for the honor of a Federal judgeship. This will sometimes happen; but is it fair to ask such men to undertake judicial service—granting the honor to be great—when the salaries attached will not enable them to maintain themselves and their families in reasonable comfort according to the manner and station of life to which they are accustomed, and without most serious concern over current needs? Do we wish our Federal judges to come only from the class of wealthy lawyers who can afford inadequate salaries in return for the honor of the office? If, as asserted above, the payment of substantial salaries is likely to result in attracting men of high competency to judicial office, the setting up of an increased salary scale is a measure of economy because it will aid in maintaining an efficient dispatch of the business of the courts. Surely the Federal judges should be on a level in competency with the best of the bar.

"There are but two alternatives, for it is not to be admitted that the American people will knowingly demand the lifelong service of judges while denying them reasonable compensation. It must, therefore, be said either that the people want a lower standard of service, a less able judiciary, a bench drawn from the mediocre members of the bar or from wealthy practitioners alone, or that the people will pay to their Federal judges salaries more nearly commensurate with the worth of such men as should be called to the judicial service. At the present time that service is entitled to greater compensation than ever before, both because of the increased burdens and the increased importance of the work of the courts and because of the reduced value of the presently established salaries."

The Moscow Show Trials—1945 Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very informative article entitled, "The Moscow Show Trials—1945 Version," written by Christopher T. Emmet, which appeared in the July 3, 1945, edition of the A. L. C. News Letter. In my opinion it is one of the most concise and fair articles I have read on this subject. The writer has approached the matter from a different angle than that generally viewed by our newspapermen and it should be read by all students of this important subject.

The article referred to is as follows:

THE MOSCOW SHOW TRIALS—1945 VERSION

(By Christopher T. Emmet)

One of the basic rights for which humanity has struggled in the long up-hill march of civilization is the immunity of envoys traveling under safe conduct. Another is the right of every individual to a fair trial. Both of these rights were violated in the trial of the 16 Polish leaders in Moscow.

These men were not captured. They were not denounced. They were not caught in any raid by the Russian secret police. They came at the invitation of a Russian commander, Colonel Pimenov, acting on behalf of Colonel General Ivanov, for the announced purpose of arranging for friendly cooperation with the Soviet authorities. They came on the orders of the Polish Government, which was the first to fight Hitler and which was still recognized by nearly all the United Nations. Their very names were revealed to the Russian authorities by the Polish Government in London through the British Government.

In so doing the Polish Goverment followed the advice of the British and American Governments, which repeatedly urged the Polish underground leaders to offer their help to the Soviet authorities, which they repeatedly did with tragic results.

"DEMOCRATIC LEADERS"

These 16 leaders are the men who were described by Anthony Eden as "just the sort of men" who should take part in any effort to set up a new Polish Government, the men who were described by Secretary Stettinius at San Francisco as "democratic leaders." Some of them were even selected by Ambassadors Harriman and Kerr to take part in the negotiations about the new Polish Provisional Government in Moscow.

Four of the most important and most heavily sentenced of the arrested men—Deputy Prime Minister Jan Jankowski, Stanislaw Janiukowicz, Adam Bien and Antoni Pajdak—were actually appointed by former Premier Mikolajczyk, who has always tried to cooperate with the Russians and is doing so now.

Since these men enjoyed the status of envoys of an Allied Government with the promised protection of the Russian Government, and since they were acting in conformity with the policy urged by the leading Allied governments, it is hard to see how Britain and America can in honor disinterest themselves in their fate.

ALLIES ON TRIAL

Hence, it was not only these Polish leaders who were put on trial. In a sense, the British and American Governments are on trial if they fail to oppose this travesty of justice. Soviet methods of dealing with its own citizens cannot be our concern, but we cannot acquiesce in applying this method to the leaders of an Allied Nation which acted on our advice.

Appropriately enough, the present scenes were enacted before the same judge, with the same legal technique, and in the very same hall where Stalin liquidated his chief comrades of the Russian revolution in the famous purge trials of 1936. These men had no jury to appeal to; they could call no witnesses. They had been held incommunicado for over 3 months, subject to the same pressures and the same threats which the veterans of the Russian revolution, hardened by the worst of czarist jails, could not withstand.

LEGAL BASIS

The legal basis of the Soviet Government's charge that the 16 leaders represented illegal Polish parties rested on the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact by which all of eastern Poland up to Warsaw was Russian territory, subject to Soviet law. The fantastic nature of the charge was further underlined by the part of the indictment which referred to their possessing and operating illegal radios. These radios were special American models, paid for by lend-lease, manufactured for underground use, supplied to the Polish Underground Army under the orders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and flown to Poland in British planes. It was because of the good use they made of these radios, and other equipment supplied by the western Allies, that the members of the Polish Home Army were recognized as Allied soldiers with full military rights, not only by Britain and America but also by the Germans.

TIMING OF THE TRIALS

As for the ultimate purpose of these trials, is there any reasonable doubt that they represent another in the long series of Soviet maneuvers to subjugate the Polish people by discrediting their leaders, where they cannot be deported or executed? These men were inaccessible to the Soviet authorities because of the wonderful organization of the Polish underground, that, for 5 years, had defied the best efforts of the Gestapo to stamp it out. The leaders, therefore, had to be lured to the meeting by false promises. Since to execute or deport them out of hand would have been a political blunder under the circumstances, an effort was made to discredit them by means of the dubious witnesses which the Soviet Government has the power to produce, or by damaging confessions, however induced.

The timing of these trials at the very moment when negotiations were being conducted in Moscow was one more method of putting pressure both on Polish leaders, like Mr. Mikolajczyk, and on the British and American Governments, who felt responsible for the lives of these men. The famous French correspondent, Pertinax, revealed the purpose and effect of these trials in the New York Times: "The trial is therefore to be regarded as insurance underwritten against the possibility of final discord in the conference," he wrote. "In practice, Mr. Mikolajczyk has been notified that, if the proceeding [concerning the new Polish Government] end in a deadlock, the underground leaders may have to suffer and he also may be involved somehow. The indictment contains accusations that go back to the time when Mr. Mikolajczyk was President, that is, responsible, at least in theory, for what happened in the Polish underground. Conversely, if an all-around understanding is arrived at and a Polish Provisional Government of national unity emerges from the session, the defendants are likely to escape with light sentences or to be pardoned."

BLACKMAIL

Pertinax, who is well-known as a friend of Russia, stressed that this analysis was not based only on conjecture but on well-ascertained facts. If so, this was a classic case of blackmail on an international scale.

How well the blackmail worked is indicated by the following facts: The ratio of the new Polish Cabinet, which emerged from these negotiations carried on under the shadow of the Moscow trials is 4 members of the London group to 10 Lublinites. But Mr. Stanczyk, one of the appointees from London, has been dismissed from the Socialist Party, and former Premier Mikolajczyk is only Second Vice Premier of the new government. He is not even a member of its presidential council. The only non-Lublin members of this council, Wites and Grabski, were too old and too ill even to participate actively in recent negotiations. The new unity government thus represents only part of the Peasant Party, plus the Communist Party, whose prewar conventions in Poland could have been held in the proverbial telephone booth. This is the solution of the Polish problem which we are now asked to celebrate and which is hailed as a triumph of the diplomatic skill of Harry Hopkins.

Hon. Brooks Fletcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker I was shocked and grieved to learn of the sudden passing of our former colleague, and my close personal friend, Hon. Brooks Fletcher, who served in this House from

the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio for 10 years.

When he first came to Congress in 1925, Mr. Fletcher was my neighbor in the Old House Office Building, and we became closely associated in congressional work. I soon learned to admire him for his fine qualities, his resourcefulness, and his vision and wisdom in dealing with the many legislative problems that arose during those changing times.

From personal contacts, and through his friends, I learned about his struggles as a typical American boy, who, born and reared on a farm, became imbued with a great ambition to help his fellow men. By working on the farm, in the steel mills, and later as a newspaper reporter, editor, and publisher, he scaled the heights in the accomplishment of his ideals, that of helping other people to succeed in life.

Brooks Fletcher was born on a farm, as I said, in Carroll County, Ohio. Through hard work he acquired a high-school and college education. His early ambition led him into the field of newspaper work where he was able to express his views through his paper in behalf of the average man, carry on his fight for a better America, and inspire his fellowmen to greater accomplishments.

His early hero was the late William Jennings Bryan, who was largely responsible for his great ambition to spread his educational and inspirational doctrines from the platform. As editor and publisher of a daily newspaper, and with his gift as an orator, he created demands for his educational programs that far exceeded his ability to fill them. He is best described by many of his friends as "another William Jennings Bryan" both in his appearances and in his dramatic delivery.

He was editor and publisher of the Marion (Ohio) Tribune, at the same time that Warren G. Harding, the late President, was publisher of the Marion (Ohio) Star. Although of different political views and business competitors, they were close, personal friends, and were booked on the same platform in many sections of the country.

Brooks Fletcher's dynamic personality, progressive ideas, and vibrant platform manner, soon attracted the attention of audiences from coast to coast, and resulted in his Nation-wide reputation as one of the outstanding speakers and progressive leaders in America. He appeared on the same platform with such outstanding speakers as William Jennings Bryan, William Howard Taft, and Dr. S. Parkes Cadman.

He was nominated and elected to Congress in 1924, a Democrat from an overwhelmingly Republican district, known as the "Harding district," the Eighth Ohio.

While in Congress he served on the Committee on Education and was a leader in championing the cause of education, and improving the educational facilities for the youth of America. His lecture entitled "Tragedies of the Unprepared" is said to have inspired more young people to attain a successful career than probably any other platform educator's work of his day.

He left Congress after serving two terms, in order to carry on his educational work, but within a few years his friends and neighbors in the Eighth Ohio District nominated him for Congress again while he was on the west coast, 3,000 miles away from home, carrying on his work as platform educator.

Returning to Congress at the beginning of the Roosevelt administration, he was subsequently made chairman of the Committee on Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, and later made chairman of the Census Committee. His greatest interest, and his greatest accomplishment, however, were in behalf of education for American youth, and he received thousands of letters from men and women who have heard him speak, telling him of the influence his messages have had on their lives.

Many Members of this House who served with Brooks Fletcher will recall his pleasing and charming personality, and his eager search for information.

He was always cheerful and entertaining, and our exchange of ideas on political and economic affairs of the Nation was most profitable to me.

I mourn his passing and I will forever cherish his memory.

At this point I desire to insert an editorial from the Presbyterian Tribune, written by Dr. Carlyle Adams, chancelor at Park College, Parkville, Mo.

The matter referred to follows:

BROOKS FLETCHER, TEACHER-STATESMAN

(By Dr. Carlyle Adams)

Brooks Fletcher, the Presbyterian layman who in the palmy days of the lyceum and chautauqua circuits talked to more American people than any other man save William Jennings Bryan, died last month in his apartment in Washington, D. C.

For 40 years Brooks Fletcher's eloquent voice was heard up and down the land. He had a particular appeal to children. Hundreds of thousands of them had heard him speak to them in high school and elementary school assemblies. He used to spend several hundred dollars a year corresponding with those who wrote to him after hearing him speak. He built some of his great lectures out of those letters.

Brooks Fletcher was a newspaper publisher and most of his career in journalism was given to the old Marion (Ohio) Tribune. In those days his business competitor was Warren Gamaliel Harding, editor and publisher of the Marion Star. The two men had mutual admiration for each other. Fletcher knew Harding's weaknesses but loved the late President for his capacity to trust friends—even when those friends were sometimes not worthy of trust.

The lectures with which Brooks Fletcher used to sway great crowds of people were born out of tremendously hard work. He wrote and rewrote them, submitting them to the severest critics. He used to spend hours each day in rehearsal to keep his remarkable voice resonant. On the platform he seemed to be speaking extemporaneously, but every word and every gesture and every movement had been carefully studied. He was deeply interested in religion and a faithful church attendant, but often he was critical of preachers who seemed to him to be slovenly in their habits of preparation and thought. He was a deep scholar. Several times through his career he would stop lecturing for a season and enroll in a university to sit at the feet of a great teacher.

On the day Brooks Fletcher died the editor of the Presbyterian Tribune—who had known him well for more than 20 years—received a 10-page closely spaced typewritten letter from the great man. We were looking forward to another visit this summer when the editor was scheduled to preach in Washington. Because so many Presbyterians—both laymen and ministers—have known Fletcher, we want to share with you a glimpse into the depth of his soul. It is a glimpse he would not want to have had revealed while he was yet among us.

In that long letter Brooks Fletcher wrote:

"I have never mentioned this to you before and maybe it is not necessary to do it now, for I think you have a capacity to understand what is in the hearts and minds of men. If I have judged you rightly, then you must know that I feel more deeply on the subject of religion than some of the things I have said and written might on the surface seem to indicate. That is why I have so resented the manner in which so many creeds, churches, and preachers have misled, confused, befuddled the masses on a subject that ought to be so simple and easy to understand and explain. For the soul hunger for a religion in which they can believe is one of the greatest unsatisfied yearnings of countless millions groping in the dark."

Five times Brooks Fletcher represented the Eighth Ohio District in the United States Congress. He was most valuable as a champion of schools while he was on the House Committee on Education. But people will remember him longest because those brilliant flashing eyes of his seemed to look into their very souls and see what lay hidden there. He never wanted anything of life to be concealed. He used to startle his audiences when he lectured on The Martyrdom of Fools as he began, "A fool is born every minute and some of them live. If anyone of you here tonight has not made a fool of yourself sometime in life, don't worry; there is plenty of time. Your turn will come. Just keep trying."

With deep reverence he delivered scores of times his powerful lecture on Modern Judases. With drama and spiritual power that left his hearers stunned, he told the glorious story of the betrayal and death of the Son of God. On the platform and in private conversation he referred to Jesus as though our Lord were a deep friend of his. He had read the gospels many, many times and, in addition, had read every Life of Christ he could find.

Some day the life of this great man must be written in a book, for he symbolized the passing of an era of American life that must not be forgotten.

Leaning Over Backward in Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert a very short letter in the Record as further evidence of our policy of deserting our friends in Europe under the program which has been called "leaning over backward to avoid offense to Russia."

This letter was written in Vienna on May 14, less than two months ago. The facts as to Soviet occupation of that city speak for themselves. But in the part of Austria occupied by American troops

these facts are not known. All that the Austrians in our section know is that the United States Army's policy of nonfraternization prevents any display of the friendship with which our troops were originally greeted. From Vienna the Soviet-controlled radio broadcasts a twenty-four-hour program of the dances, and meetings of Viennese citizens with Soviet troops. Compared with out official coldness, this propaganda has a great effect even in the areas under our control.

[Confidential]

VIENNA, *May 14, 1945.*

MY DEAR ———: What a strange feeling to write to you again after all these years. I do hope this will reach you. We live here in another world. I hope you are keeping well and having a better time than we are having over here—it could not be worse anyway.

The last years were by no means easy for any of us. The last months, when we had the heavy raids, were often rather awful. Vienna has suffered rather badly. The Opera House, the Burgtheater, the Albertina and the Schwarzenberg Palace are destroyed and so are a great number of residential houses. But all this was not to be compared with what we have had to go through since Vienna was besieged by the Russians. Our flat which was damaged by bombs on February 13, was set on fire on May 1, by drunken Russians and completely burned out. There is no fire service and the Russians never think of bringing any fire under control. Do not worry, the pictures, silver, and the sculptures are stored in a safe place. All the rest is lost. I, personally, just as most other people, am robbed of all belongings and possess only a few suits and hardly any underwear. I tried to oppose some drunken Russians (here a very frequent sight) who tried to rape women and received a bullet wound through my shoulder as well as a bad hit with a heavy pistol in my face.

In general the situation can be summarized as follows: It seems impossible to reestablish any form of economic life at the moment. The Russians drive away all livestock, slaughter all pigs and thus bring the country into a state of semistarvation. There is no shed in the Marchfeld where any cattle is left. In the factories the machinery has been dismantled. Siemens, AEG, Saurer, Graef und Stift, Vereinigte Faerberein, Simmeringer Waggonfabrik, etc.—to quote only the more important ones—are empty shells. It is a systematic looting of a country which must lead to a catastrophe. Everybody over here was waiting daily for the British and the Americans to arrive, but apparently in vain. It looks as if we had been bargained away. * * *

I shall be able to return to my position soon which I had to give up for political reasons in the beginning of 1944. Up to that time I have earned well, but how things will now develop, I do not know. If nothing is being done soon, anarchy is bound to follow. Is this not known in Britain? Does one not know that no bank was open since Vienna was occupied because the Russians took all the money away and forced the safe deposits? Is it not known that Vienna has no electricity, no water, no gas, no telephone?

That there exists no collection of refuse, no funerals, no postal service? Is it not known that the Russians requisitioned all transport including that of the ambulances and the fire service? Is it not known that infants up to age of 1 year get one-quarter of a litre of milk only, and when they are over that age no allocation at all is made to them? We adults get 500 grams of bread a week. A small police force, recruited from the Viennese police, is supposed to keep order without arms being given to them. Their endeavors seem rather farcical. Surely you will not be in position to form an idea of the real situation. We, too, thought hitherto that similar reports were atrocity stories, but it is the bitter truth. If there exists any interest for Austria, immediate action is imperative. We never were overoptimistic and always knew that we should have to get out of the mess by our own efforts. If every possibility to work is frustrated and, on top of it, all food and inventory is carried away, then the limit is reached where nothing can be done any more—and that limit is very nearly reached now.

Common Sense in FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just granted by the unanimous consent of the House, I include therein a part of a radio address delivered by Dr. J. S. Nathaniel Tross, Charlotte, N. C., December 8, 1944. This address contains common sense and good judgment. Apparently, Dr. Tross is a colored man and the advice that he handed out to his people is excellent medicine for white folks as well. I know of no one who is not in favor of fair employment for all people. It becomes a serious question, however, when we attempt to substitute force for freedom. If good will, understanding, cooperation, and brotherhood could be legislated, the causes of war would be easily solved. I do not believe that these problems yield to so simple a solution. Such values of life are established by mutual trust, faith, and confidence. I include the following:

No one knows it better than Negroes themselves that all of white America is not hostile and unjust to black America. There are white men and white women in America who not only know what justice and good will mean, but in whose lives practical democracy reigns supreme, with them democracy is not a theory, but a passion, a practice, a devotion. There are white men and women in our beloved Southland who will never knowingly be unjust. I know them, and you know them, too. If this were not true our future would be hopeless. We must come to understand, therefore, as quickly as possible, that our primary obligation as a race is to take stock of ourselves, to analyze critcially our own thoughts, our own attitudes, and our own actions. We shall find that there is need for greater self-reliance on our part, but simultaneously we shall also discover that we can do little now or tomorrow without friends. Whether we work in field or factory, whether we work as common laborers or as skilled mechanics, whether we be professionals or domestics, our success must depend upon the friendships we make and the good will we guarantee. The Nation has taught our hands to wage victorious war. Negroes themselves must cultivate their hearts to be victorious in peace. We are on the verge of victory in which Negroes are gloriously participating but victory in war must mean freedom for opportunities. And this will be made possible not by waiting and wailing to be lifted to the heights to which we might be climbing now with our own efforts, for

"The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight,
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night."

This is true of races as it is of individuals. Our enslaved fathers and mothers worked from dawn to night, and prayed from night to dawn; but we, their free children, sleep from dawn to night and dance from night to dawn. My colored comrades, I speak in calm deliberation, and with tender solicitude for our future welfare. I speak with prophetic certainly that unless our Negro masses change their present mode and manner of living the gifts of democracy will profit us little; unless by self-imposed discipline of body and mind and heart we prepare ourselves for postwar responsibilities and obligations we could not fit into any healthy program of industrial opportunity or social security our Nation may launch tomorrow. While we wait the sunrise of a new racial hope, let us remind ourselves that fretful minds and idle hands can never unlock the door or remove the obstacles that impede our march to the land of democratic promises and racial security. You cannot prevent intolerance by merely agitating and demanding tolerance; you cannot create social interdependence by merely legislating for economic justice. No, no; racial tolerance and racial respect and appreciation, economic justice are industrial and moral achievements. They are attained and maintained by the industry of our hands, by the enlightenment of our minds, by the purity of our hearts, and the loftiness of our souls. Law does not and cannot create brotherhood and good will except it be the law of love; neither does enforced social intimacy in work or play, in industry or recreation, in home or school or play—enforcing people to live together or to tolerate or respect each other does not, and cannot promote neighborliness or brotherhood, nor does it promote good will. For these are attributes that spring from man's inner life. They spring from cultivated hearts and minds and souls. They are not circumscribed by race or creed or color or social or economic circumstance.

Someone facetiously inquired of me if I held any hope for the unity of the Negro. I answer, you cannot unify what is so rapidly disintegrating and decaying; you cannot organize individuals who are so thoughtless and irresponsible; you cannot build from the top. And more, the Negro is not a problem to other races; he is a problem to his own race; a problem to those who desire to see him emancipate himself from self-imposed bondages, who desire to see him develop and survive. We are a problem because we are attempting solutions different from all other minority groups. We are attempting to run with false legs, and to fly with borrowed wings. We are attempting to reap where we have not sown, and to inherit that for which we have not labored; we seek the short, the soft, the shallow way to glamor, to grandeur, and to greatness; and more than this we seek to possess that which we have not learned to use. This is our problem, this is the riddle of the Negro life. Instead of creating for ourselves the necessities of our lives we seem bent only on dispossessing and possesisng. We must gear ourselves for rigorous toil and painful sacrifice, only so can we escape being a race of false and unworthy inheritors. We must not find delight only in occupying what others have discarded and abandoned. We must be producers and creators. To do this we must go to work; we must stick to our jobs; we must cease our idleness; we must stop this wasting of our lives by drink and by reckless and irresponsible living. The world needs you, needs what little you have left of your God-given life.

Yes; Negroes are a problem to themselves. We make ourselves social and economic liabilities by our acts and behavior and attitude; by our idleness, self-pity, and sensitiveness. Today we Negroes are free to work or not to work; we ask for equal wages for equal work. Never before have Negroes been in possession of so much wealth; but never before have Negroes been so confused and so uncertain of what they want, of where they are going, of what they ought to save, of the essential needs of life; but with all the economic prosperity of Negroes, never before have we been so miserably destitude in the things that make stalwart men and women; destitute in the things that produce character and worth. We spend our easy earnings today with frightful and outlandish extravagance, and when V-day comes we may be found in the most pitiable state of economic bondage.

President Safeguards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Daily Record of July 12, 1945:

PRESIDENT SAFEGUARDS

Departure of President Truman for an overseas meeting with Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin has revived national concern in the matter of Presidential succession—and accentuates the urgent need for revision of the system.

This is particularly true since the President is accompanied on the present journey by Secretary of State Byrnes, who stands next in line of succession.

In the event of tragedy befalling both the President and the Secretary of State in the course of their travels, the strange situation would arise in which the Presidency would devolve upon a man already resigned from the office which qualifies him as the third in the line of succession—Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, whose resignation has been accepted, but with the effective date held in abeyance until Mr. Truman's return.

It is anticipated, and certainly to be hoped, that nothing will happen to give these speculations immediate importance—but nevertheless the speculations are not without immediate purpose.

President Truman has himself proposed a remedy, suggesting revision of the law of Presidential succession by Congress, making the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate next in line and in that order—but that is neither an adequate nor a desirable remedy.

The remedy most adequate and desirable is only to be found through constitutional amendment, leaving the members of the President's Cabinet in the line of succession as at present, but providing for their direct election by the people.

There are several vital matters relating to the Presidency of the United States which have long required remedy by constitutional amendment.

The most pressing of these matters, as our own JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican minority leader, has emphasized, is that relating to a limit on the tenure of any President.

No President of the United States should have more than two 4-year terms in office, Mr. MARTIN says.

Why should any President of the United States ever leave the continental limits of the country, in these times of world-wide and instantaneous communications—when to do so is to risk his own life and to hold the ominous shadow of confusion and tragedy over the country?

The Constitution might very well be made to require the continuous presence of the President in the country, and thus relieve the President himself of the necessity for a decision in the matter under conditions—such as those which have influenced Mr. Truman—which preclude a decision grounded in the best interests of the American people.

Wagner-Murray Bill, S. 1050

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the thrills which comes to a Member of Congress is hearing from their constituents about matters of public business, and once in a while there comes a breath of real grass-roots Americanism, stalwart in its unselfishness and thrilling in its love for our country.

I received such a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. William Flintzer, of Neptune, N. J., who wrote me the letter which follows. Whether one agrees with the sentiments expressed in his letter or not, there can be no doubt about Mr. Flintzer's sincerity and patriotism. To me his words sound like a ringing challenge coming down through the ages from our forefathers, urging us to maintain that firm and rugged belief that this is the land of free opportunity and free enterprise without the softening effects produced by too much government.

NEPTUNE, N. J., *July 9, 1945.*
Re: Wagner-Murray bill, S. 1050.
Representative J. C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I may be old-fashioned, and realize that these United States of America has made tremendous strides in the past years, and many changes have taken place in many ways, and the average citizen has more of the good things of life than anyone of any country on earth.

This high standard of living to my mind is the result of the rugged, independent freeness of those who have gone before us from Plymouth Rock down the sands of time; this independence of thought and action, the realization that one must work, strive for a higher goal, save for the rainy day ahead, coupled with a faith in God, and a faith in the future of this wonderful land has been, was, and as of today, to my mind, still is the one foundation on which we can survive and prosper.

This taking care of a person from the cradle to the grave to me is sure to kill individual initiative, desire to work to the best of one's ability, and slow but sure decay would set in and like Rome and former great countries, this freedom we so much enjoy would be lost and our standard of living greatly lowered.

I am no radical, believe in a decent wage, a fair profit to management, a square deal to unionism, but I do not believe in the Federal Government doing what this bill calls for.

All any respecting citizen asks for is the opportunity to work and get somewhere.

I look to you to do the absolutely right thing in this matter for much is at stake.

How about it?

Yours very truly,

WM. FLINTZER.

No Caste System in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, here in this Congress there are those who, in effect, would deny the right of any but white Protestants of American birth to live, to eat, to dwell in decent sanitary homes, to clothe themselves adequately. If ever any philosophy were un-American, this is it. This Nation's historic tradition, won in blood and reaffirmed in blood, is that it is a land for the many, not for the few. I regret that there are those in Congress who would deny this tradition.

By opposing the Fair Employment Practice Committee, these men, under the false guise of protecting the right of the employer to hire whom he wishes, or of preventing enforced social equality are in effect subverting a proud American tradition.

These verbal guises mask the issue. The issue is that of equality of economic opportunity. The issue is that of a man's right to find employment commensurate with his ability, and without discrimination because of the color of his skin, his racial ancestry, the country his parents were born in, or the manner of their worship. The issue is that of fairness to the American people—fairness, justice, in permitting every man the right to earn a living.

A man must work to live, and must earn enough to sustain him. Hiring solely on the basis of ability is not only the fair way, but the best way to promote maximum efficiency in a working force.

We cannot legislate against prejudice. We do not attempt to do so. But we can legislate against discrimination, the harmful effect of prejudice, and we must do so. We can and we must protect the right of every American to live, by protecting his right to employment based on ability.

We cannot legislate to enforce social equality. We do not attempt to do so. But we can and we must legislate to protect economic equality.

We do not attempt to force a man to hire those who are unable to do their jobs. We do not attempt to force an employer to associate with his employees socially. But we do attempt, and must not fail, to provide a job for every man, a guarantee to every American that his livelihood shall not be at the mercy of the prejudice of another.

We do not want a caste system in America. Our American tradition glorifies the right of every human being to stand or fall on his own ability. To limit that right is to limit democracy, to limit Americanism and America.

Production of Work Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clinton P. Anderson, the newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture, has wisely suggested that the problem of food can be better solved by increasing production. This could well be said of all commodities of which there is a shortage.

There is today a constantly growing problem among the working people and farmers of our country to obtain satistory work clothing. This, like products of the farm, might find a solution could production be increased. So long as this Nation operates under the capitalistic system—and no one has conceived a better one or even suggested the beginning of a better one—then it is well for us to adhere to what we possess. Profit is the stimulus of human endeavor.

It is the duty of the Office of Price Administration to hold the line against inflation but the question can be challenged always when we are face to face with the problem of production. The question of work clothing today is very serious. The solution rests in increasing production. It could probably have been attained by giving to those who manufacture these goods reasonable price ceilings by which they can be the beneficiary of some reasonable profit for their efforts and their investment.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made at a mass meeting of the work-clothing manufacturers from all sections of the United States at the Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., under date of June 13, 1945:

Work clothing for the past several months has been one of the chief concerns of all Government agencies and all distributors and all consumers. Since work clothes are the all-important working garments for millions of workers everywhere—on farms, in mines and factories, supply and distribution have been critical problems in the national economy.

With millions of yards of chambray and denim being released because of Navy cutbacks, garment manufacturers—because of their unfavorable ceilings on civilian garments—are in no position to take advantage of this available increased cloth supply for badly needed work garments, for the following reasons.

With only slight relief on cloth increases, work clothing manufacturers continue to basically operate under their March 1942 ceilings. Since that time, the industry has been compelled to absorb wage increases of over 30 percent, make up expenses of 25 to 40 percent, and other increases, such as overtime, etc. During this period, the industry was compelled to drop many low cost staple numbers because of unfavorable ceilings and lack of cloth, and took on Government work which has been the main source of profit for the industry. Because of sharp cut-backs which have already taken place on Navy contracts and the possibility of nearby cut-backs on Army contracts, the industry—on their future civilian business—is in no position to take advantage of the present increased cloth supply, since the mills making the cloth are being granted further price increases by OPA under the Bankhead amendment with no machinery of passing these increases along to the manufacturer.

These cloth increases are being granted on all work clothing fabrics as outlined in group 21, WPB M317A and RMPR OPA order 208. the OPA, while sympathetic to our situation, is only in a position of granting total costs on the garments, making for a situation which is briefly this. The work-clothing industry is expected to make goods at cost, buying the cloth they need from mills whose profits—according to the OPA—are eleven times prewar earnings and selling them to wholesalers and retailers whose profits are 10 times prewar earnings.

The situation is grossly unfair, intolerable, and, we think, tyrannical. If badly needed low-cost work garments are to be provided for the millions of workers who, because of the scarcity, have been forced to buy higher priced and inferior garments, then our industry must be put in a position where we can operate at least on a reasonable profit on our civilian business, and our only source of help is to have Congress amend the Bankhead amendment to include these critical work-clothing items.

That is our problem, which is the most serious problem that has yet confronted our industry. Here we are face to face with reconversion. Here are millions of yards of denim and chambray available for the first time in about 2 years that can be made into badly needed overalls and work shirts, provided we can do so at a reasonable profit, for certainly we cannot be expected to carry the burden of other groups whose position is much stronger than ours, particularly since the industry is now faced with a partial peacetime operation.

While chambray and denim are again in liberal supply, cut-backs can be expected releasing other important work-clothing fabrics, such as drills, jeans, pant coverts, whipcords, twills, poplins, gabardine, cotton flannel, shirtings, cottonades, moleskins, ducks, pin checks, and pin stripes.

As manufacturers of important work-clothing garments, we are relatively small in number, there being about 1,200 manufacturers scattered over every State in the Union with well over 100,000 employees whose welfare must also be considered in this very important problem. Unless immediate relief is granted, there is a possibility of partial or complete closing of a great many of these plants, resulting with serious unemployment in the industry.

If we are to resume partial peacetime operation and take advantage of the present increased cloth supply for badly needed work clothing, then our only hope is to have Congress amend the Bankhead amendment giving us the same consideration as granted the mills.

Un-American Activities in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Associated Press article relative to un-American activities in California:

LOS ANGELES, July 11.—State Senator Jack B. Tenney, today said Hollywood was headquarters for a dangerous plot to overthrow the United States Government, and announced membership of an un-American activities committee of the California State Senate.

He said the committee would work closely with the United States House of Representatives in a projected investigation of Hollywood.

"When Acting Chairman RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi) said one of the most dangerous plots to overthrow the Government has its headquarters in Hollywood, he was not wrong," Tenney said in a newspaper interview." Our investigations since 1940 and intensified in the last year have borne this out.

"All of our records, showing a steady, growing rise of communistic activities stemming from Hollywood, are being offered to the congressional committee, and we will cooperate with its investigators in every possible way.

"We have great volumes of information from our investigations which have shown widespread marxism in the film colony. The official reports for 1943 and 1945 contain summaries of the programs of individuals and organizations in Hollywood for the destruction of the Constitution and the American way of life."

The Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to note that a number of comparatively new business organizations are in the forefront for H. R. 2202, the full employment bill.

Typical of these groups is Progressive Businessmen, Inc., which was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1944 and maintains its offices in Washington. Although not yet a year old, it has close to 400 members in 35 of the 48 States.

Progressive Businessmen, Inc., recently produced a primer on the bill, called A Job To Do, which, I believe, has been received by all Members of the House and of the Senate. In the simplest language possible this pamphlet seeks to explain the workings of H. R. 2202 so that businessmen may be familiar with it.

The inspiration for this publication and for Progressive Businessmen, Inc., is a progressive businessman—Mr. Harry Golden. He is a manufacturer in New York City, employing about 100. Although his products have been almost entirely for civilian customers, he, like other manufacturers and businessmen, has become acutely conscious of the Government's impact on business during the recent years. For this reason Mr. Golden has sought to educate his fellow businessmen on the probable effect of measures like the full-employment bill on their own business.

Mr. Golden served in the Navy in World War I and was an importer and

exporter before entering the manufacturing business a dozen years ago. This background, coupled with an education in engineering, served to equip him to come to Washington in recent years and plead the cause of small business.

Associated with Mr. Golden in organizing P. B. I. and in its first year of growth has been Mr. Nathan L. Silberberg, a member of the District of Columbia and New York bars, who is general counsel of the organization.

In our fight for an America in which unemployment will be cut to a minimum, the work of business groups such as this will be especially effective. As chairman of the House steering committee on H. R. 2202, I extend our thanks to Progressive Businessmen, Inc., and hope that many such groups will join us in working for this most important piece of legislation.

Federal Social Security for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
CITY OF WEST ALLIS, WIS.,
June 28, 1945.

Mr. THADDEUS F. B. WASIELEWSKI,
Milwaukee, Wis.

Dear SIR: At a meeting of the Common Council of the City of West Allis, held on June 19, 1945, Resolution No. 1736 was adopted. This resolution is relative to House bill No. 2787, dealing with Federal Social Security for Servicemen.

A copy of this resolution is attached for your consideration.

Yours very truly,
FRED A. SANLADER,
City Clerk.

Resolution 1736

Whereas under the old-age and survivors provisions of the Federal Social Security Act, every person in service is under the following disabilities:

1. He is not considered fully insured if he has spent more quarter-years in service than in covered employment, since 1936, or his becoming 21, whichever is later (sec. 209 (g) of title II).

2. He is not considered currently insured, if he dies and has not earned at least $50 in each of at least 6 of the 12 quarter-years prior to his death, earnings in service not being counted (sec. 209 (h) of title II).

3. In computing the average monthly wage on which the amount of his benefits is based, months in service are included in the denominator, but service pay is not included in the numerator (sec. 209 (s) of title II); and

Whereas by virtue of these disabilities, many persons in spite of their contributions to the fund, are dying in service not fully insured, or not currently insured, thereby cutting off their dependents from benefits to which they would otherwise be entitled (sec. 202 of title II); and

Whereas in the case of older service persons, these disabilities may even prevent them from drawing benefits themselves at the age of sixty-five; and

Whereas all servicemen will find their own and their dependents' benefits at least reduced in amounts by virtue of this period of service; and

Whereas the foregoing represents an intolerable discrimination against our men and women in service; and

Whereas a bill, H. R. 2787, has recently been introduced in Congress to remedy this situation, which bill freezes the rights of all military personnel at the time of entry into military service, and which bill does not require any appropriation nor service credits, and hence does not require any revision of the GI bill of rights nor being tacked onto any appropriation bill, but rather can be acted upon at once on its own individual merits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Honorable Mayor and Common Council of the City of West Allis, this 19 day of June 1945, as follows:

1. That immediate action be taken by Congress on bill H. R. 2787.

2. Copies of this resolution be sent to all Wisconsin Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Adopted June 19, 1945.
FRED A. SANLADER,
City Clerk.

Approved June 19, 1945.
ARNOLD H. KLENTZ.
Mayor.

American Labor Memorandum on Jewish Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying memorandum:

AMERICAN JEWISH TRADE UNION
COMMITTEE FOR PALESTINE,
New York, N. Y., July 10, 1945.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DICKSTEIN: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a memorandum submitted to the President and to the Secretary of State, expressing the viewpoint of American labor on Jewish Palestine.

May we respectfully urge you to do all you can to further this program.

Respectfully yours,
MAX ZARITSKY, *Chairman.*

AMERICAN LABOR MEMORANDUM ON JEWISH PALESTINE

During the six long and bitter years of the war—while the Jews of Europe were being systematically exterminated by Nazi bestiality—immigration into Palestine was for periods completely shut off by the British administration, and when permitted, restricted to a bare minimum at best. While millions of Jews were being massacred, not more than ten or twelve thousand were permitted to enter Palestine each year since the promulgation of the Chamberlain white paper in 1939. Today the certificates of immigration have been exhausted and still the doors of Palestine are closed to the hundreds of thousands who are waiting in the desperate hope of at last finding rest from their wanderings and of attaining permanent security of mind and body in the Jewish homeland.

There is no valid economic reason for keeping the Jews out of Palestine. During the last 25 years Jews all over the world have bent their energies toward the upbuilding of Palestine and have poured in great resources of capital, labor, and scientific knowledge to increase the absorptive capacity of the country. The Jewish pioneers in Palestine, under the leadership of the General Federation of Jewish Labor (the Histadrut), have given the world an example of cooperative endeavor which has aroused the admiration of men of all views and of all walks of life. Palestine has been transformed from a poverty-stricken, disease-ridden backwater of the Turkish Empire into the most advanced country in the Middle East; it has become a symbol of what can be accomplished when organized labor is united with public-spirited capital. What has been achieved is merely the beginning of the development of unprecedented possibilities in bringing back to Palestine its ancient productiveness and in restoring to the Middle East generally its former position as a great center of culture and civilization.

The economic and social advances in Palestine, made possible by the Jewish endeavor, have been reflected in the life of all its inhabitants. The general population has more than doubled, and the growth of the Arab population has in fact been larger than the Jewish. Due to the remarkable reduction in the Arab death rate resulting from the improved conditions, the rate of natural increase among the Moslem population of Palestine is probably among the highest in the world; in fact, higher than officially recorded in any other country. In wages and conditions of labor, in standards of health, and in educational opportunities, the Arab community in Palestine presents a remarkable contrast to the lagging social conditions of the neighboring Arab countries whose political rulers are concerned with nothing so much as with retaining their hold on the exploited Arab masses. Labor organizations throughout the world have all along recognized the justice of the Jewish cause in Palentine. They have been resolute in their demand for a repudiation of the 1939 white paper policy and for an honest fulfillment of the pledges made to the Jews in the Balfour Declaration and in the Palestine Mandate. At its 64th Annual Convention held in November 1944 in New Orleans, the American Federation of Labor called upon the Government of the United States "to take speedy and definite action on the Palestine question." In harmony with the bi-partisan measures then before both Houses of Congress, the AFL resolution on Palestine called for "the free entry of Jews into Palestine and full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth." The Congress of Industrial Organizations, meeting at the same time in Chicago, likewise urged that "steps be taken to effect the immediate rescue of the Jews in Axis-dominated countries" and appealed to Great Britain for the "unequivocal removal of the white paper policy and the full implementation of the Balfour Declaration toward the ultimate establishment of a Palestinian Jewish Commonwealth in accordance with the principles of democratic action."

The British Labor Party, at its convention in June 1944, accepted the resolution of its executive committee which called upon the British Government for an end to conflicting policies and halting, halfway measures. It urged that Jewish immigration into Palestine be permitted in such numbers as would enable the Jews to become a majority, and that the boundaries of Palestine be extended so that once for all a decisive solution of the Jewish problem would become possible. The Liberal Party at its annual conference held in February 1945 emphatically declared that "both British honor and British interest required His Majesty's Government to reverse the policy laid down in the white paper of May 1939 regarding Palestine and to carry

out faithfully the obligations under the mandate and the Balfour Declaration." Other liberal and labor parties—the British Commonwealth Party and the Socialist Parties—made declarations in the same vein. The international trade union conference held in London in February 1945, with delegates from 38 national trade-union organizations and with strong representation from England, the United States, France, and Russia, likewise made an unequivocal declaration calling for the fulfillment of the Balfour Declaration and the establishment of the Jewish national home.

Labor opinion in the United States is but a firmer expression of a general American attitude voiced by the public at large and by American statesmen and legislators. From the time of President Wilson, who played a creative role in obtaining the Balfour Declaration, every succeeding President has reiterated support for the Jewish national home. In 1922, shortly before the approval of the Palestine mandate by the League of Nations, the Senate and the House of Representatives in a joint resolution expressed themselves, in the language of the Balfour Declaration, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. Although the United States was not a member of the League of Nations, it became party to the terms of the mandate through the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, in accordance with which our Government consented to the administration of Palestine by Great Britain.

On March 9, 1944, President Roosevelt gave assurance that "the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939," and expressed the belief that full justice would be done in the matter of the Jewish national home.

The traditional American position on the Palestine question has been reaffirmed and strengthened during the past year by planks included in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties and by President Roosevelt's statement of October 15—historic pronouncements pledging support for the Jewish people's aim to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

In line with long standing American public policy, in harmony with the liberal and labor opinion throughout the world, and, not least, in a sense of kinship with the Jewish people, with its need and destiny, we of the American-Jewish trade-union committee find ourselves in profound sympathy with Jewish aspirations in Palestine. In April 1944, in behalf of hundreds of thousands of workers in the United States, members of both the AFL and the CIO, we make a solemn declaration denouncing the white paper, appealing to the American Government for action, and urging Congress to adopt the Palestine resolution. Today, in this historic hour, when the general structure of international security has been outlined and the fate of the nations of the world is about to be decided, we again stand united in an appeal that the pledge to the Jewish people be fulfilled and that the remnant of Israel in Europe be saved. We call upon the leaders of the United Nations no longer to neglect the pressing Jewish need, and we appeal for an immediate decision on Palestine on the two minimum requisites of any solution of the Jewish problem:

1. To abolish without further delay all restrictions on free Jewish immigration into Palestine and all limitations on the right of Jews to purchase and settle the land;

2. To make simultaneously a definite announcement, in the spirit and purpose of the Balfour Declaration and the mandate, of the determination to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

JULY 5, 1945.

Labor's Stake in Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an article appearing the New Republic, July 9, 1945, by Emil Rieve, general president, Textile Workers' Union of America, CIO, who is also secretary of the National Planning Association, alternate labor member of the National War Labor Board, and who was a delegate to the planning conference of the World Trade Union Conference held in London last year.

LABOR'S STAKE IN RECONVERSION

As the effect of the victory in Europe upon the Nation's gigantic war-production machine begins to become evident, our failure adequately to prepare for our postwar economy becomes increasingly clear. The termination of contracts hits the headlines—and tens of thousands of workers hit the streets. And the end is not yet, nor even the beginning. Lack of provision for workers who are thrown out of jobs, correctly labeled by President Truman as the most serious defect in our reconversion policy, is no longer a theoretical problem for tomorrow's solution, but an insistent fact for today.

Because we failed to complete plans for reconversion when there was time to do so, the deluge of problems is upon us and we find ourselves unable to plan the methodical adjustment of workers to the postwar period. It is plain that any workable and thoroughgoing reconversion program must establish a firm foundation for full, permanent employment. In order to achieve this end, certain basic economic facts must be kept uppermost in the thinking of the planners.

Although tens of thousands of workers are now being thrown out of their jobs in heavy-industry war-production plants, we cannot look at the over-all employment situation in the Nation and say that we have more workers than jobs. In certain areas and in certain industries the demand for labor is greater than it ever has been. For example, the textile industry needs 150,000 workers if it is to meet essential, rock-bottom military and civilian requirements. Serious labor shortages—or, more accurately, serious manpower-maldistribution problems—exist in almost every consumer-goods and service industry. The problem obviously is to bring the unemployed worker to th unmanned job and to make that job sufficiently attractive for him to want to take it and keep it.

Some of the plans that have been put forward for effecting the transition to peacetime production rest on the theory that the heavy-goods industries must continue to maintain the high employment levels of the last 4 or 5 years. I am convinced that in the immediate future it will be impossible for the Nation to absorb for use the same tremendous volume of heavy industry products it produced for destruction. The inevitable conclusion is that a substantial number of persons who are now employed in the heavy-goods industries will have to turn to the consumer-goods industries for employment. In short, the achievement of a sound peacetime economy will necessitate the transfer of workers from employment in heavy industry, where wages have been relatively high, to jobs in the consumer-goods industries and trades, where wages have been relatively low.

The process of going over to a complete peacetime economy will depress the country's wage bill, because workers will be forced into jobs in which wages are low. According to recent authoritative estimates, nonagricultural employees (exclusive of Government workers, professionals, and domestic servants) total some 27,700,000 persons, of whom 10,710,000 earn less than 65 cents an hour; more than three-quarters of these 10,710,000 are employed in the retail and service trades and manufacturing industries, primarily the consumer-goods industries. It is obvious that the transfer of workers to these industries will automatically reduce the country's wage bill and prevent the maintenance of a sound economy.

Thus, low wages in the consumer-goods and service industries menace orderly transition to a civilian economy. Earnings of workers in the durable-goods manufacturing industries are now about 25 percent higher than those in nondurable goods, and are probably 100 percent higher than in the service and trades industries. Workers who have become adjusted to such standards of living are naturally reluctant to take a cut in their current standards. The problem of reshifting such workers will not be easy. Munitions workers whose earnings have reached $60 to $70 a week will not willingly and freely move their families into a new community where they can earn only about $25 a week. The relatively high wages in war industries facilitated the quick adjustment of workers to job opportunities when the United States was arming for war, but reconversion offers no such incentive. Low wages are the barrier.

It is plain, therefore, that reconversion planning must take into account the fact that the greatest employment opportunities of today and tomorrow will be in those industries in which wages are what the War Labor Board would call substandard. And so long as we permit this substandard condition to exist, two things will be true. First, we shall find it impossible to attract to these industries workers whose weekly earnings have gone far beyond what the new jobs will pay and whose unemployment insurance may even be greater than the prospective wage. Second, and more important, the low wages in the so-called substandard industries will become an economic abyss which the Nation cannot bridge. Our national pay roll is now running at about $90,000,000,000 a year. Even if we return to a peacetime economy at the same level of business activity, the pay roll is expected to shrink to about $70,000,000,000 annually because of the loss of overtime and other factors. This contraction in national purchasing power could very well set off a downward spiral that would result in a major depression. And it cannot be corrected wholly by a general percentage increase in wage rates to compensate for the loss of overtime. So long as the inevitable shift from high-wage to low-wage industries takes place, a dangerous contraction of buying power is inevitable.

For these compelling reasons, the basis of any realistic reconversion wage program in the United States must be the complete elimination of substandard wages from American industry. It would be simple enough to justify such action on humanitarian grounds alone, but at this time the economic hazard should be a greater driving force than social conscience.

Several immediate steps can be taken. Senator PEPPER and others have introduced a resolution in Congress which would establish 65 cents an hour as the dividing line for substandard wages. Passage of the resolution would serve as an emergency measure to begin to correct substandard wages and living conditions. Meanwhile, the WLB

should establish a 65-cent minimum. There are ample data on the Board's records to justify such action.

Important as they are, these steps would be permissive, not mandatory. The only really permanent and basic solution of this problem is an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide a minimum wage of at least 65 cents an hour, with authority given to industry committees to raise that level as high as they feel industry can stand. Only by attacking the problem boldly can we hope to solve it. And only by solving the problem of substandard wages can we hope to achieve full production, full employment, and a balanced economy.

EMIL RIEVE.

Special Study of Black-Market Conditions by Stanley Kreutzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, June 25), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report of a special study of black-market conditions, by Stanley Kreutzer, chairman of the committee to investigate black markets of the New York Board of Trade.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SPECIAL STUDY OF BLACK-MARKET CONDITIONS BY STANLEY KREUTZER, OF NEW YORK CITY

John Q. Adams, chairman of the food division of the New York Board of Trade, appointed Mr. Stanley Kreutzer chairman of the committee to investigate black-market conditions in the food industry. The existence of a black market in the food industry has been common knowledge for some time. Since March 10, 1945, an inquiry was conducted to ascertain the nature, extent and practices of this illicit trade. The food division of the board of trade consists of the following branches of the food industry:

1. Wholesale and retail meats.
2. Wholesale and retail poultry.
3. Wholesale and retail ducks.
4. Eggs.
5. Butter.
6. Fresh fruits and vegetables.
7. Frozen fruits and vegetables.
8. Retail grocers.
9. Chain stores.
10. Restaurants.
11. Milk and milk products.
12. Baking.
13. Hotel and steamship purveyors.

The survey was directed to the foregoing industries, as well as food truckers and storage warehousemen. It embraced producers, wholesalers, jobbers, restaurants, and retailers. They were asked for information concerning the existence of black-market conditions in their industries; the extent of these conditions; the form in which black-market operations are practiced; whether food products are equitably distributed; whether New York receives its fair share of the food supply; and whether in their opinion the OPA ceiling prices are fair and reasonable.

The survey discloses a tremendous black market, particularly in meats, poultry, butter, and eggs, and a break-down in the agencies of law enforcement.

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY

In the following industries, we found very little or no evidence of black-marketing practices:

1. Milk.
2. Frozen fruits.
3. Dry groceries, cereals, coffee, etc.
4. Baking products.
5. Sales to Government agencies.

Our inquiry revealed that the most frequent black-market practices include—

1. Overceiling prices.
2. Tie-in sales.
3. Upgrading.
4. Short weight.
5. Special gratuities for special favors.
6. Fictitious sales.
7. New brands.

These practices exist in similar or slightly different form throughout all levels of industry from producer to consumer. And the effects are equally disastrous to each legitimate class. A product which is infected with the black-market virus at any point of distribution is invariably removed from legitimate distribution.

MEATS AND POULTRY

A. The returns show that cash payments on the side are almost universal. Ninety percent of the purchasers in the wholesale and jobber class responding to our inquiry, fear they will be blacklisted if they don't play the game—and that they will not obtain supplies if they complain of these conditions. As an illustration: Commissioner of Markets H. M. Brundage appeared without warning at a wholesale meat establishment that had 117,000 pounds of beef for sale. The Commissioner asked for the price, and ceiling prices were quoted. Commissioner Brundage rounded up a dozen retailers and told them to go ahead and buy. Not one of them would even enter the door. They were afraid of being permanently blacklisted by the wholesalers.

Most of the meat industry replied that the inability of enforcement agencies to control wholesalers coupled with the low prices paid to cattle producers destroyed incentive and channeled merchandise to the black market.

Seventy percent reported that there were inequities in distribution, and 65 percent felt that New York City was not getting a fair allocation of food products. Complaint was made that meats were diverted to restaurants and hotels because they had a higher OPA ceiling. It was also reported that other cities are favored because they are permitted to operate noninspected slaughterhouses, whereas all meats brought to New York are subject to local or Federal inspection. The survey further disclosed that the set-aside of meats and poultry for the armed forces and other Government uses discriminated most severely against New York.

The lack of effective control over distribution by wholesalers is the breeding ground for discrimination in favor of those who violate the law. It is obvious that a retailer who is required to maintain a large overhead, while at the same time receiving but a fraction of his supplies, cannot continue in business. Testimony submitted to the Anderson congressional committee in New York on April 26, 1945, was that many meat wholesalers were exacting double the ceiling price, which in turn was passed on to the consumer.

B. In the poultry field, our inquiry indicates that 85 percent of the dressed poultry sold in this area is sold at black-market prices. On May 17, 1945, Commissioner Brundage, in an endeavor to halt the flow of black-market poultry into the city, posted inspectors at every western approach to the city. As a result, only 30,000 pounds of live poultry reached here, about 5 percent of the normal supply for the day. Our survey reveals numerous instances of sales at the farm for excessive prices. For example, a newspaper in a large up-State city stated on April 4, 1945: "The fact that the retail supply of poultry has been depleted almost to the vanishing point * * * was attributed in well-informed quarters to large-scale black-market operations." That city is in a rural part of the State. This was confirmed by members of the industry. These products bypass historical lines of distribution in favor of the black market. In consequence, a very serious condition has developed, one which may have a disastrous effect on our entire poultry and egg supply. Farmers have been selling their laying hens to unscrupulous black-marketeers. Thus, these hens are slaughtered, their egg-laying capacities are destroyed, and the effect on future production of both hens and eggs is manifest. The ruthless practices in this highly profitable field are causing a destruction of our poultry and egg supply.

Here is an illustration showing the effects of the black market on the consumer, the legitimate businessman, and the armed forces: Laying hens usually are retained by the grower for egg and hatching purposes and, therefore, are not included in Government set-asides. Quick to take advantage of this, black-marketeers roam the countryside and offer the farmers fantastic prices for laying hens. These prices are so high that it pays the farmer well to dispose of them. Their laying capacity and their eggs are destroyed. Much poultry is sold before it has matured, resulting in lightweight flocks. As a result, the Government, as well as legitimate civilian markets, are deprived of much-needed poultry supplies. The result is also a shortage not only of poultry but also of eggs, which is daily becoming more serious. On May 27, 1945, Mayor LaGuardia said that poultry is about the same as liquor was at the height of the racketeer era during prohibition.

EGGS, BUTTER, CHEESE, AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Over 80 percent of those answering our inquiry stated that black-market conditions affect 50 percent of these food items. In addition to the usual price-control evasions, "bootlegging" by manufacturers of unknown brands was reported, as well as the sale of ice cream in containers of other companies and the use of black-market butterfat in ice-cream manufacture. Certain wholesalers stated that they were unable to obtain bulk cheese at legitimate prices. Fifty-six percent stated that there was not an equitable distribution of dairy products within the industry. It was definitely reported, however, that black markets have upset normal receipts in most lines. Fifty-three percent of those replying said that New York was discriminated against because New York prices were the same as those in small towns in the Midwest, where operating and distributing costs were considerably lower.

RESTAURANTS AND HOTELS

The report discloses that the purchase of food supplies by restaurants and hotels is honeycombed with excessive prices. Seventy percent of all food items were affected. Practices included overceiling prices, tie-in sales, upgrading, purchase without points, short weights, and other subterfuges. Ninety-two percent of the replies received alleged inequitable distribution and the failure of New York City to get its fair share of food products through legitimate channels. The quality of foods available to the hotels and restaurants has been lowered.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

In the fruit and vegetable industry black-market conditions were so rampant that continuation in business was almost impossible

along lawful lines. Fifty percent of all items are affected. Here, as in the other food fields, scarcity, black markets, and maldistribution existed side by side. Forty percent stated that OPA prices and regulations forced distribution changes, creating shortages at various times in most fresh fruits and vegetables.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEW YORK MARKET

New York City is the largest nonproducing consuming area in the United States. It is one of the greatest distribution points. It is one of the greatest receiving areas. In the national scheme of food distribution, it has been considered like any other city—although its population is 300 times as large as a city of 25,000 and larger than all of the other States in the Union but two. Huge quantities of food come to New York destined for distribution to other places. The extent of food receipts is no true indication of the food available for consumption here. Far removed from producing regions, its food receipts depend upon smoothly functioning systems of distribution. Consequently, any disturbance in the normal channels of distribution adversely affects consumers' supplies—not only of the city, but of the entire metropolitan area which it serves.

GENERAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Meats

Meat consumed by civilians in 1944 averaged close to 150 pounds per person. During the 5 prewar years, the average consumption per person was 126 pounds. Hog production is 35 percent lower than 1944. In point of numbers of cattle, the beef supply is almost as high as it was a year ago, but cattle are coming to market considerably lighter in weight. The total supply of meat for civilians for the first 3 months of this year was 38 percent less than a year ago, with clear indications of a progressively worsening condition. Meat is practically unobtainable at ceiling prices—and is being most inequitably distributed.

Fabulous amounts—literally millions of dollars—have been surreptitiously paid in cash—in order to obtain supplies.

Black-market meats constitute a threat to health. The American Dietary Association and Dr. Edwin P. Jordan, associate editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, have warned that life-long illness may be the price for eating black-market meat. Not all black-market meat is uninspected, but those who buy black-market meat do not know whether it is or is not free of disease. Our survey indicates that unmarked, ungraded, and uninspected meat has come to this city. Coming from filthy barns or unsanitary slaughterhouses, which provide no protection against bacteria, such meat even when cooked, may cause undulant fever, tuberculosis, and intestinal worms. Thus, black-marketeering is a menace to the health of our people.

The principal factor contributing to illicit trade is the serious disclocation in historical channels of distribution.

Noninspected slaughterhouses have increased. Many of these new slaughterers sell their meat to the highest bidder. Every pound of meat so sold is diverted from normal channels of distribution. In the metropolitan area alone during the last year, licensed slaughterers have grown from 38 to 224. According to the Office of Price Administration, most of these new slaughtering concerns operate in the black market. There are approximately 1,000 new meat wholesalers in the area. Before OPA there were 150. Long-established legitimate concerns have been and are being squeezed out of business by these new concerns. The attraction of black-market profits is greater than the fear of apprehension. Mayor LaGuardia testified before the Anderson congressional committee on May 16, 1945, that there were 17,958 convictions for violations in 1944; 378 jail sentences and $291,000 in fines. Obviously, the average fine of $15–$20 is considered in the nature of a license. It has thus resulted in flagrant violations of law and diversions of food supplies by a few who by their actions compel the small businessman to tag along—because a sale at black-market price almost certainly requires resales under similar conditions.

Poultry

With civilian requirements for meat far in excess of supply, there is an increased demand for poultry.

Practically all poultry reaching New York City is tainted by black market. In fact, a new expression has developed—blacker than black. It does not reach the average consumer, and when it does, it is not through the usual distribution channels.

Unscrupulous profiteers pay excessively high prices for laying hens, thus depleting the supply of eggs and chicks which these hens would normally produce for some time. Thus, our three great mainstays of protein foods, meat, poultry, and eggs, are being drawn out of the supplies available for the average consumer.

At present, ducks are at a peak of production. Enforcement officials were assigned to the Fourteenth Street Market, where New York deliveries are usually made. As a result, deliveries are diverted to the egg market center which is about a mile away, and the black market does a flourishing business.

Eggs

The egg scarcity is daily becoming more acute. Hospitals in New York City have complained about their inability to obtain eggs or poultry. Many egg wholesalers in New York City have already been forced out of business. The State emergency food commission has reported that current egg production was 10 percent below 1944. The New York Times on May 14, 1945, stated that egg production fell off 30 to 40 percent throughout New England and New York State—where most of our egg supplies come from. The destruction of the laying hens is rapidly reducing the number of egg-producing units. There is a black market in eggs rivaling the illicit trade in meat and poultry.

The report of the State emergency food commission indicates that total food production, even with good yields, seems likely to fall below 1944. New York egg production is reputed to be 10 percent below 1944.

Threats to close have been recently made by major food distributors. The Associated Retail Food Merchants and the All-Boro Retail Fruit Association have threatened that 3,000 fruit and vegetable shops will close on Saturday because of black-market conditions. On May 29, 1945, 2,000 delicatessen shopkeepers threatened to close their shops due to black-market conditions. Just a short while ago most meat and poultry stores in this city were closed for similar reasons. Inventory stocks are depleted.

On May 13 the president of the State Association of Retail Meat Dealers estimated that 80 percent of the 6,500 nonkosher meat markets were without supplies and that 95 percent of the kosher poultry dealers were closed. The Greater New York Hospital Association stated that patients were denied prescribed foods. The WFA was obliged to issue priorities to obtain eggs and poultry. Mayor LaGuardia recently stated, "We did not have a single egg in all of our city hospitals," and that "we've reached a point now in meat, poultry, and eggs where legitimate operation just isn't possible."

Complaint was recently made about a poultry racket involving shipment of uninspected poultry into the city at night by cabs and private cars—all catering to the black market.

The black market breeds disrespect for law. It perverts otherwise honest, decent, and patriotic citizens. It lends force to an inflationary spiral, which, if unchecked, will certainly prove disastrous to our domestic economy. It feeds upon scarcities and disrupts normal and established channels of distribution. It destroys legitimate business, upon whom the consumer must depend for his fair share of the available supply. It favors the reckless, the rich, and the unscrupulous at the expense of decent, law-abiding citizens. It militates against civil-service employees and all, in fact, whose incomes have remained static through these war years. It places an unfair strain upon the families of those in the armed services who have been stricken in this war and who depend upon Government allotments. Actual food costs have in many instances risen unconscionably high. Black-market profits are frequently concealed from tax authorities. Unless checked, it will create evils that will bedevil the public, our law-enforcement agencies, and Government for years to come.

Because of the very magnitude of the New York food market, on both the wholesale and retail level, the task of effectively enforcing price controls involves great practical difficulties. On the other hand, enforcement of price ceilings in New York City, no matter how intensive, is only a nuisance to its citizens and ineffective if there is laxity of enforcement elsewhere.

Japan—An Opportunity for Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial under the date of July 6, from Life magazine, entitled "Japan—An Opportunity for Statesmanship."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN—AN OPPORTUNITY FOR STATESMANSHIP

The big problem confronting the United States with regard to Japan is no longer a military problem; it is now essentially a problem in statesmanship.

The primary question is not: How can we beat Japan? The primary question is: What does the United States wish to do with Japan? Or: What does the United States want out of the war with Japan? Or: What situation does the United States wish to bring about as the result of our inevitable victory over Japan?

The first task of the American Government is to formulate correct answers to this big question. That done, the second task of the American Government is to get other powers to agree to our policy as far as posisble. That done, the final task of the American Government is to impose its policy upon Japan by whatever means—military or political—may be available.

THE FACTS OF THE CASE

The clarification of United States Government policy toward Japan must be based on an audit of the actual situation. The actual situation of Japan is this: She has already suffered such disastrous defeats, while our power rises with such momentum, that her

complete defeat is as absolutely inevitable as anything in human history.

There is one big variable in this situation—the cost. How many Americans, Chinese, Australians, Filipinos, British, Dutch, and other allies will Japan succeed in killing or wounding before she stops fighting? And who controls this variable—we or Japan?

The Japanese are a strange people and their inscrutable devotion to suicide gives them a kind of negative control over their own destiny—and ours—beyond both reason and force. Our military plans have already taken this into account. At Harvard last month Admiral King said that if the intensification of our blockade and siege does not bring Japan to her knees, then we are prepared to invade her home islands. The cost to our side of that invasion will obviously be high—perhaps another million American casualties.

If Japan forces us to this course and this cost, it must be paid, for her defeat is our objective. But we should first be sure that we are not being unnecessarily inscrutable, even a little suicidal, ourselves. If we fail to define "unconditional surrender" as precisely as possible before the invasion, we are failing to use that mixture of reason and force known as statesmanship.

There is one more fact—a new fact—which needs to be recognized and pondered before the question of what to do with Japan is finally answered. This fact is that the United States has already planted itself firmly and irreversibly in the Western Pacific and is there to stay in force. Henceforth, the military border of the United States will be a line running roughly Alaska-Aleutians-Iwo Jima-Okinawa-Philippines. Necessarily, regardless of phrases, the United States has become primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace throughout most of the Pacific. This is what the United States has already got out of the war with Japan—effective military control of the world's vastest ocean.

From this astonishing new fact of history many consequences flow. One is that, regardless of what may happen from now on, Japan will never again in the foreseeable future be a threat to the United States from the sea. Japan is now and hereafter will be not an empire but an island realm half-surrounded by American military power.

The American Army and Navy and their allies in arms have thus presented to American statesmen an extraordinary opportunity for constructive statesmanship.

THREE CHOICES

What, then, does America propose to do with its enemy, Japan? There are, without quibbling, only three main lines of policy.

There is, first, the policy of extermination. We can solve the Japanese problem once and for all by exterminating the Japanese people—by killing something like 80,000,000 men, women, and children. President Truman in one of his most important utterances made it abundantly clear, for Americans, that this is not our intention or policy. Unfortunately, many Japanese think it is. It is to be hoped that from now on our efforts to correct this misapprehension in Japan will be more successful.

Ruling out this simple though arduous and bloody possibility, there remain only two alternatives: (1) To undertake to rule Japan; (2) to let Japan continue as an independent nation, gradually adjusting herself to whatever kind of world we and our allies make in the next round of history.

The first of these alternatives involves various schemes to occupy Japan for 20 or 50 years with the purpose of reforming the Japanese people and establishing a form of society in Japan of which our occupying authorities approve. This is, in effect, to make the people of Japan wards of the United States for a generation or more.

Needless to say, the American people would be both vexed and astonished to find themselves, a few years hence, in the position of being responsible for feeding the Japanese, clothing them, housing them, doctoring them, educating them, and in all other respects maintaining them in a condition of sound economics and good morals. The idea is so impractical that it would not need to be taken seriously except for the tragic possibility that we might embark on or rather slip and slide into some confused and ambiguous variant of this policy. It is to be hoped that our statesmen will make it clear, quickly, that the United States has no desire to burden itself with the governance and welfare of the Japanese people after the war.

There remains just one other policy—the policy of classic statesmanship. It is that, having subjected the enemy to overwhelming defeat and having stripped him of all that may make him dangerous in the foreseeable future, we let him by his own efforts recover as best he may from the catastrophic consequences of unsuccessful war.

SOME TERMS OF SURRENDER

To translate this policy of statesmanship into the particulars of our present occasion, we come to something like the following basic points. The United States, capable of waging against Japan a war of extermination, will grant peace to Japan through any Japanese Government which can substantially assist the United States (and her allies) to bring about the following conditions:

1. All members of the armed forces of Japan to lay down their arms wherever they may be.

2. In accordance with the Cairo declaration, Japan to yield up every foot of territory which she has seized or occupied since 1914, and also Korea, Formosa, and the Pescadores.

3. Japan—meaning the home islands—to be rendered militarily impotent.

4. Such war criminals to be punished and such reparations to be made as may seem to us necessary to satisfy the requirements of international justice.

5. After a brief military occupation of Tokyo and other key points in Japan, the United States to recognize as the legitimate government of Japan those authorities which shall have demonstrated their capacity to assist in the fulfillment of these conditions.

These points add up to a clear, clean policy which would fit every consideration of American interest. There can be no objection to it even from the point of view of those who believed, with a good deal of reason, that one of America's war aims should have been the abolition of the imperial throne.

The real argument for elimination of the Emperor was not any objection to the Emperor personally. It was based on the fact that the trouble with Japan runs very deep—a good deal deeper than the notion that Japan just happened to be "taken over by a military clique." But any essential need for getting rid of the Emperor has been superseded by the catastrophic consequences of the war itself. Japan can hardly avoid an internal upheaval after the war. The less we outsiders try to direct it, the healthier this upheaval is likely to be. Postwar Japan, besides being militarily impotent, will be a very different country from what it was in 1941. Out of its tragic turmoil there may come no emperor at all, or an emperor of purely religious and no political significance, or even a "constitutional monarchy." In any case, the intelligent thing for us to do is to let the Japs figure it out for themselves.

The policy of leaving Japan to work out her own redemption does not mean that she is to be strictly isolated. There will be some international restrictions and there will be ways in which the United States may assist Japan toward new and more democratic political goals. Much of the assistance should be essentially nongovernmental. Thus there might well be a much greater interchange than ever before of students and teachers. There should be no bar to missionary and other educative and philanthropic activities. And except for a very few clear and carefully thought-out restrictions (on aviation and some other technologies) there should be no bar to Japan's development of economic relations with the rest of the world. The most important requirement is that all commercial transactions should be given full and accurate publicity.

JAPAN'S ONLY WAY OUT

Even under these conditions, the economic position of the Japanese people will be extraordinarily difficult for many years to come. A seafaring nation, Japan will start with no merchant marine. Her heavy industries will be almost completely gone. She will have been stripped of all the economic resources of Manchuria and the rest of the overseas empire. Her whole economy will be a shambles. Millions of Japanese must necessarily suffer severe malnutrition and even starvation. The policy urged here gives the Japanese just one thing—a chance to work their way out of this appalling situation with pain and suffering in their own way.

They will have no chance of working their way out of it by the sword because they will be confronted on every hand by overwhelming military might. The only way they can work their way out of the pit they have dug for themselves is by learning how to win the good opinion of their neighbors (including the United States) by decent behavior. This will almost certainly result, as we have said, in the most profound changes in Japanese life and thought. What the course of these changes will be no man can predict. All we know is that if the Japanese are to become as useful citizens of the world as, say, the once aggressive Danes or Dutch, they must create that role out of their own resources and virtues. Nobody can do it for them, and nobody should try.

China's Communist Puzzle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, about 15 newspaper correspondents visited the Chinese Communist area last year. Some have returned to this country to give lectures or write books making only favorable reports on the Communists and unfavorable reports on conditions in the great bulk of China which is under the legitimate recognized Government of China.

One of the correspondents who visited Yenan was Father Cormac Shanahan, a hard-headed Boston Irishman who has spent many years in China as a missionary, knows the people and the language well and was thus in a far better position to understand and evaluate accurately what he saw.

I talked to Father Shanahan last October in Chungking just after his return from the Communist border region. He

has written in the China Monthly for June 1945 a first-hand account of some of his well-founded impressions which I am including under leave to extend my remarks:

CHINA'S COMMUNIST PUZZLE

(By Cormac Shanahan)

Puzzles are made by persons. Their solution is really simple, although purposely or otherwise it is not made too obvious. To the Chinese people as well as to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and China's recognized Government, there is no puzzle in the Chinese Communist situation. It is most unfortunate that the round of publicity during the last several months in books, newspapers, magazines, and on the radio has actually made the situation puzzling to many Americans. Some millions of them have been misled, though retaining their ordinary good will toward China. Some sincere friends of China have puzzled themselves further by seeking solutions which are based on misleading reports. As life goes, a thing becomes all the more of a puzzle when we persist in trying some simple, logical solution, and, annoyingly, do not find the key. All puzzles are like that. Frustration makes them more bewildering, more intriguing. No harm is done if the work of solving is just a recreation; but when hundreds of millions of lives are at stake, the result might easily be tragic.

The most puzzling feature in the China situation is the unwarranted assumption, widely advertised, that it is just one political party against another, "like Democrats and Republicans in the United States." That is not so. The Chinese Communists are a minority group (not one-fifth of 1 percent of the population), with their own army in rebellion against the legitimate Government recognized by the people of China and the great powers of the world. On a very insignificant scale, their case is like that of our South, which rose in rebellion against the North in the Civil War. The Chinese Communists are distrusted, and, where possible, opposed by the people of China because they know the Communists abuse their power. The Chinese Communists are an ideological group whose narrow requirements for membership will always keep their numbers small, and never entitle them to the rank of a political party among the people.

The Kuomintang, established on broad lines by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, is more than just a political party. It is a temporary, tutelary power. It overlaps ordinary party lines and can include members of any party. The Kuomintang had 12 of the leading Communists on its central executive committee, with Communists in the key bureaus of the Government, until their record proved their bad faith and caused their dismissal. Even then, in 1927, 21 out of the 33 members of the central executive committee, according to Vincent Sheean, held out for a while with the Communist government in Hankow after Chiang Kai-shek had established the National Government at Nanking. Dr. Sun Yat-sen's policy in the earlier 1920's, of toleration for the Communists, has never been regarded in China and must not be regarded here as an abdication in favor of the Communists. "China is a San Min Chu I Republic," as stated in the first line of its Constitution. It is a triple demism, not a Soviet, as was admitted by the Chinese Communists in their renunciation of their Soviet and Communist methods when they made their fairest submission to the Government in 1937. They have not kept those promises.

If it were not for the need of an all-out effort on the part of all our allies, China's difficulty with its Communists would have attracted little attention except through well-known Communist sympathizers in foreign countries. The total membership in the Chinese Communist Party, according to their own figures, is only 900,000. Their border region, their only political set-up in China, comprises only 32 counties, 21 of which were forcibly occupied since 1939. There has never been any fighting there between the National Army and the Communists. And the National Army, south of the Communist border, had no American military equipment. In Sian and Keh Nan Po, as well as at Yenan itself, the figures for both forces were given us and substantially agreed to be between 80,000 and 90,000 Communist soldiers, around 80,000 of the National Army. In numbers and territory involved, the Communist rebellion is a small affair compared with China as a whole. It can never, without foreign help, reach down to interfere with the progress China is bound to make after the war, nor can it harm foreign investments that may be developed in the country. Settling the Communist affair in China would add little to China's war effort against the Japanese.

But to those outside China, particularly in America, war interest and war haste have made China's internal difficulty a puzzle worth studying. "The trouble with China is the disunity there," said a highly educated American to me on my return. Unity seems an easy solution. But unity is not the key, because, to most of the interested puzzle-solvers, unity means a coalition in power and place. That would lead certainly to disorder and weakness in the Government and Army, with fear and distrust among the people. It is not such "unity," tried already and found wanting, but true submission, with the strength and order it brings, that is the proper solution.

The solution of some foreign military men was also at fault, well-meaning and well-founded though it seemed to be. Allied military intelligence reported on the fighting spirit of the Communist soldiers. This we saw for ourselves. But to the people of China, who know more of their bad record, they are regarded in much the same light as Americans regard gangsters. Superior though such gangsters might be at times to our FBI agents, no one would insist on the President's giving them assignments in the FBI, his opening our arsenals to them, or on his making them officers in our Army. Furthermore, foreign observers readily accepted the explanation of the Communist Armies in the Yenan area when they said that they were not fighting because the Central Government would not use them. One foreign correspondent reports that they have been farming there since 1939, "15 days of travel from the nearest Jap blockhouses"—"a thousand miles by horseback"—but they were as well equipped (and their arsenals kept them supplied) as other Chinese soldiers of the Central Government fighting a frontal warfare against the Japanese. The other foreign correspondents have in their notes, as I have in mine, the story that Communist Gen. Wang Cheng told us. He related how in October 1939 he was ordered to lead the men under him back from the north China front to Shensi and to establish there the "stationary soldier policy." Those orders came from Mao Tse-tung, against the orders of the National Military Council, the supreme war command. The order to discontinue the pay of those soldiers, however, was not issued by the National Military Council until January 1941. There has never been any blockade to stop them from going back to the front they deserted in obedience to Mao Tse-tung.

That is still the Communist Army situation in the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia border region, where all the party and army leaders are assembled. They allow the people no guns there. We saw nearly 40,000 of these people gathered at Yenan on United Nations Day, mostly the People's Militia, armed only with short spears. The Communist Army had all the guns. In Jap-occupied China, where the Communists claim not a party set-up but only anti-Japanese bases, the situation is different. There light guerrilla activity is carried on, but still no frontal warfare, as they admitted. Even on the maps prepared by the Communists themselves there are dotted areas of Jap occupation along every railroad and large river route and motor highway, and around every large city. The Communists have not held the enemy back from any important objective. The Japs have everything they could want there. They are not immobilized; they have been able to mobilize from there and bring other troops down through there to the fronts where they were attacking the Central Government's forces. These fronts did hold objectives of value to the Japs and the contention seems logical to more than the Chinese that when Allied help is given, it is there that it should be applied. Loyal National forces also carry on guerrilla activity in occupied China; and there is even a loyal provincial government in Shantung—although the Communists indicate on their maps that Shantung is their area.

It is only an Allied effort on the China front that can bring victory over the Japanese, just as much as Allied effort was necessary in Africa, Italy, and France. It is idle to blame the Chinese Government for defeats, because of the Communist break or because of anything within the Kuomintang. The situation is clear, as one Congressman pointed out after his recent visit to China: If our world strategy in this war had been reversed and the war against Japan given first place, where would England be today? Would we be blaming England and saying that the "military defeats were not only disappointing, they were exasperating"?

But China has held out in spite of the opportunities and overtures for an easy peace with Japan. And there is this much, to the great glory of the Chinese, they are solidly behind Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Government is not seeking an easy peace with the Japanese. The sufferings and deaths among over 60,000,000 refugees tell the eloquent story. And American fliers who have had to bail out, almost everywhere in China, have found loyalty, help, and hospitality. It would be a serious danger to strain that friendship for our American boys by foisting on the Chinese people a power they fear and dread, even as they hate the Japs. There must be an end here to what one of our magazines said in a recent issue: "Americans are exerting great pressure to bring about the coalition (between the Communists and the Government) which is a basic condition for victory."

Another wrong solution of the foreign-made puzzle of China is based on a false sympathy for the "poor downtrodden people of the land." "The Communists are doing things; they have something to offer." The fact is, the Communists had their chance at power and as a result the people of China will never have confidence in them. I can speak from experience since I arrived in China in 1926. I lived and worked among the people. Gen. Chen Cheng, in a private conference granted me last year in Sian, stated: "If one of us were up for election even against Mao Tse-tung, I am positive Mao would not be elected by the people." My own experience corroborates that. Although there have been complaints against individuals in the Government ("We, too, have had our faults," said Gen. Chen Cheng), the people feel it is still their government, and they resent the many foreign criticisms favoring the Communists to that government. I found a healthy condition of criticism in Free China; only Communist agitation was strictly controlled. There were charges in a free and most democratic way

against Ho Yin-ching in the People's Political Council; there have been complaints against H. H. Kung. For more than a year Chen Li-fu was reported "on the way out." But as to the stir created in America against Minister Chen last year, I found much of the criticism unfair. It was based on a misunderstanding of his words and upon a lack of knowledge of the conditions to be met.

Chen Li-fu has been a special target of the Communists since the time of the Kuomintang-Communist break in 1927, when he was given the job of lecturing to win back the Communists to the triple demism of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and his party. He had done a very creditable job of it among the students and even with several of the prominent Communists.

Talk about the "Soong family," you may remember, led eventually to the removal of T. V. Soong. He is again in power, and he is there as a move after the Stilwell misunderstanding to please the American administration which favored him. But you will find nothing like that criticism against Mao Tse-tung, or even against Stalin, in the Chinese Communist area. Those who tried it are in the party doghouse, like Comrade Wang Shih-wei.

There is far more sympathy being wasted on the Chinese people than they feel for themselves (politically, I mean, of course, and not the sympathy they so heartily deserve because of sufferings due to the war). The people of China do resent having their name used as a propaganda flare to bring them help which is beyond being merely questionable and which they decidedly do not want. Even the people directly under the Communists in their border region have not been won over to recognize their present rulers as anything more than "strangers" who have usurped the power in that territory. It was a Communist propaganda leader who used the expression in explaining to me why the local people would never arrange a marriage between one of their daughters and a member of one of the various Communist groups—although on a permanent farming project under General Wang Cheng there were 10,000 Red Army soldiers and only 400 women and girls.

There are solid reasons for the resentment the people of the Communist area feel toward the whole set-up. Those people are strictly regimented and subdued. There is no true democracy in the Communist-controlled border region, only complete organization from the top. Asking the people's opinion or vote is a mere formality. The "Program of administration for the border region government" was prepared by the party and voted "unanimously." The 18 members of the committee of the border region government—the central governing body which "unifies the executive, legislative, and judiciary"—were hand-picked by Mao Tse-tung and accepted en bloc.

The same is true of the nine members of the Standing Committee of the People's Political Assembly. The system of having one-third of the members Communists, one-third members of other political parties, and one-third with no party affiliation, is a farce as to the representation to which the Communist Party is entitled.

There is already a thoroughly organized spy system established by the Communists, and there are four party schools training 10,000 more of these "cadres." A person cannot leave his residential locality without a written "road pass," good for the one occasion only. Arrests are made on mere suspicion by the Peace Preservation Bureau and the persons are held without court trial until they confess. We were shown the court records, but when we asked to be taken to the Peace Preservation Bureau we were told there was "nothing there to see." A Chinese Catholic priest, arrested in Suiteh, was accused of having a gun. He couldn't confess for he would have had to turn over a gun which he did not have. He was held in the custody of the Peace Preservation Bureau until he got sick and died.

"The most striking thing about the Communist-led areas of China," wrote one of the foreign correspondents, "is the extent to which they are mobilized for production and war. The present plight of Kuomintang China shows * * * she has not been able to achieve such mobilization." I am sorry that my friend did not see the factory run by the Bank of China where, with a personnel of only 800 (compared with more than 1,500,000 in the border region), more is produced in a few days than the whole Communist area produces in a year—all under model labor conditions, with most modern methods. And that is only one of many such factories. Donald Nelson has something to work on in Free China. After all, it is production figures that count, not the regimentation methods. The greatest production the world has ever known was attained in the United States without a National Service Act. Even Stalin gave it due credit at Teheran. And while on the subject, I would like to ask the above-quoted correspondent what he did with his notes on the Foh Sing and Sung Sing Mills, a private enterprise in "Kuomintang China."

I assume I have been addressing fair-minded persons, sincerely anxious to understand China and as sincerely interested in furthering the war effort. It is useless even to consider those who try to force the jumbled puzzle into the solution they desire. Let us all be fair. "There have been many mistakes on our side, and we must correct them," said Gen. Chen Cheng. The Communists on their side have admittedly abused their military power to kill or drive away Government officials and remnants of national forces found trying to carry on behind the enemy lines. On my recent visit to Hunan, I found confirmation of the report that Communist guerrillas had sneaked into a city behind the Japs near Changsha and killed the local magistrate in order to gain the leadership of the people. Communist forces once fought with and captured the governor of Kiangsu Province. They admitted this by releasing him after several protests had been made. Gen. Wang Cheng was bluntly honest in his admission to us of usurping the political power of Ho Shao-nan, special district commissioner of Suiteh. He admitted, "We marched in and found Commissioner Ho was bad, a bureaucrat. I drove him out, and I became the commissioner." Mr. Ho was more fortunate than many other officials in meeting up with General Wang, by whom he was allowed to escape to enjoy the fruits of the excellent reputation he has always had in Free China.

In judging the Communists and the Central Government, it will be found that there is some glory to divide. There is room for both to work, separately, each in its present sphere. Within the framework of legitimate government there is a place for the present Communist political set-up of the border region as there is for their present guerrilla activity in the war. Within the present structure of the Chinese Government the Communist area of Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia could easily be constituted a special district with its own special commissioner (Chuan Yuan). Such an official has powers that are almost unlimited in freedom to institute needed forums, organize the people's militia, and even control the Regular Army forces in detached units. All this and more has been offered to the Communists by the Central Government, but with each reverse of the Government, the Communists' demands have been increased. Mao Tse-tung must be persuaded to accept such a set-up; Chairman Mao alone is the one to deal with. But "there's the rub." Maybe, as some people have remarked, Chairman Mao Tse-tung must wait for the green light from elsewhere before settling. The present situation is too much to the advantage of the Communists.

But there should be no need for civil war. Each side would have its opportunity to advance the good of China, with the ultimate test for both in the free, democratic choice of the people. It is all quite simple. The Chinese people wonder why we find it such a puzzle.

Japan and Unconditional Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of July 13, written by Ernest Lindley, entitled "Japanese Surrender—Define 'Unconditional.'"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPANESE SURRENDER
(By Ernest Lindley)
DEFINE "UNCONDITIONAL"

The phrase "unconditional surrender" handicapped American propaganda directed at Germany. It is handicapping our propaganda directed at Japan. The Japanese Government has interpreted it to the Japanese people as the equivalent of "extermination." A people who believe that they will be exterminated if they quit fighting may be expected to keep on fighting as long as they have any means of fighting.

It is too late now to expunge the phrase, "unconditional surrender," unless the Allies are willing to settle with Japan for less than a complete victory. But to stop short of a complete victory over Japan and of the steps necessary to assure that the victory is permanent would surely be a terrible mistake.

The alternative to dropping the phrase, unconditional surrender, is to give it a more concrete meaning—that is, to put less emphasis on "unconditional" and more on "surrender." President Truman made a start with his first message to Japan stating that unconditional surrender did not mean the extermination or the enslavement of the Japanese people. This was a partial negative interpretation. It has been followed up vigorously by our regular propaganda broadcasts to Japan.

Our propaganda directed at Japanese forces in the field runs along the same line. It attempts to convince them that if they surrender they will not be killed, tortured, or otherwise mistreated, but, on the contrary, will find food, shelter, and safety. This propaganda apparently has begun to take hold. The bag of prisoners on Okinawa was large in comparison with earlier campaigns.

President Truman's first message to Japan was the result of long deliberation preceding his entry into the White House by American officials concerned with propaganda. There has been and still is a great deal of debate behind the scenes as to how much farther it would be useful to go in defining "unconditional surrender"—always assuming that we will accept nothing less than a complete surrender in fact.

Senator WHITE, of Maine, thinks "unconditional surrender" should be defined to mean "the total loss of Japan's fleets, the

disarmament of its other military forces, the surrender of its conquered lands, the destruction of its war productive agencies, the complete control by the United Nations of its economic capacity for war, and the punishment of Japan's war criminals."

Senator WHITE did not mention two other requirements which are favored by some: large-scale military occupation of Japan, and abolition of the imperial institutions, with their attendant religious customs or beliefs.

Under any circumstances, of course, it would be necessary to send into Japan military missions to supervise disarmament and the fulfillment of other terms. But a large-scale military occupation might not be necessary if there is an effective Japanese Government.

As to whether or not the imperial institutions should go, there are sharp differences of opinion among the experts on Japan. But if adequate steps are taken to disarm Japan and to prevent its rearmament, the type of government which the Japanese have after the war will become a matter of secondary importance.

Japan is doomed to crushing defeat. There is no way in which unconditional surrender can be made attractive, except by comparison with the cost to the Japanese of fighting to the end. These costs are becoming clear, and they are mounting. If the Japanese fight to the end, they will not be exterminated, quite, but most of the material evidence of their civilization will be annihilated.

The possibility of a Japanese surrender before Allied armies have defeated the Japanese armies in the Japanese home islands may be extremely slender. But surely no harm can come from exploiting it to the utmost. This requires an agreement among the major Allies as to what is essential to make sure that Japan does not again become a military menace. But it may well be found that these essential demands will permit some additional inducements to the Japanese to quit before the homeland is invaded.

The League Is Dead—Long Live the Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Free World magazine of July 1945, entitled "The League Is Dead—Long Live the Charter." The article is a little longer than under the rule can be inserted in the RECORD without an estimate, but I feel that I have not abused the privilege of putting material into the RECORD and I have ascertained that printing this article will cost $124.80. That is a small amount if scholars and students who read the RECORD can get more light on the subject of the United Nations Charter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE IS DEAD—LONG LIVE THE CHARTER

(By Serge Fliegers)

(In this important comparative study, the author had the close cooperation of Max Mandellaub and other writers on international affairs.)

With the close of the San Francisco Conference, the world enters into a new phase of political history. Graduating from the striped-pants diplomacy and flowery-language ideology of the League of Nations, the new Golden Gate Charter welds the "peace-loving" nations of the world into a vigorous organization pledged to the maintenance of security and the furtherance of human rights.

The idea of enforcing peace through a world-wide organization first took shape in the 14 points of Woodrow Wilson and the League Covenant, but the League degenerated into a debating society. Embodied in the Versailles Treaty, it began as nothing more than a crippled coalition of victorious powers and ended as an impotent agglomeration of technical committees, stripped of all fundamental political functions.

The San Francisco Charter, drawn up by men who had learned the bitter lesson of Versailles and Geneva, today emerges as an international instrument independent of any peace treaty, but founded upon the historical defeat of totalitarianism.

It is only by comparing, point by point, the new Charter with the Old League Covenant that we can realize what a tremendous step forward the United Nations have taken toward the establishment of a permanent peace.

PREAMBLE

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war * * *." Thus starts the preamble of the United Nations Charter.

It is the first time in the history of international conventions that the common man—rather than the state—is made the subject of a world organization. The preamble to the Covenant starts: "The high contracting parties * * *" and never once mentions the individual, but instead refers to "states," "nations," and governments."

The new Charter is the first official international declaration of human rights—"To reaffirm faith in the dignity and value of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women. * * * To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom * * * to practice tolerance. * * *"

In the preamble to the League Covenant not a single mention is made of these ideas. Rather, it goes into such legalistic phraseology as "by acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by establishment of the understanding of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments. * * *"

MEMBERSHIP

"The Organization is open to all peace-loving states." This phrase "peace-loving" does not appear in the League Covenant. Nor has it been mentioned in any previous international agreement—from the Holy Alliance in 1815 to the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907.

In the admission of new members the General Assembly can recommend a nation for inclusion in the Organization, but it is up to the Security Council to make the final decision as to whether the record of a country really shows that it is "peace-loving."

In the membership requirements of the League of Nations, joining the League was restricted to "any fully self-governing state." The San Francisco Charter makes no such provision. It therefore gives a chance to many a country with limited sovereignty to join the new Organization in the future.

ORGANIZATION

The United Nations Organization for the maintenance of peace and security is composed of an Assembly, a Council, a Secretariat, an International Court of Justice, and an economic and social as well as a trusteeship council.

SECRETARIAT

The Secretariat in the new organization functions more or less like the administrative departments of a government and corresponds in a general way to the old League of Nations Secretariat. One interesting innovation, however, was brought out at San Francisco which has not often been mentioned. It is that employees of the Secretariat shed their individual nationality and assume allegiance not to any particular nation but to the international body. Thus this group of specialists may become the first body of truly world citizens. At present this does not seem too significant but in due time these internationally minded men and women of all races, creeds, and colors may become the nucleus for a world federation of peace-loving people. The League attempted to create a certain internationalism of the Secretariat along the above lines but failed miserably, and ended by having the various members of the Secretariat become mere mouthpieces of their individual governments.

There is another great improvement. According to San Francisco decisions, the new Secretary-General has the right to bring to the attention of the Security Council any threat to the peace of the world. The League Secretary had no such powers, and was merely the head of an immense and costly cross-reference section.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

"The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter and it may make recommendations to members of the United Nations or to the Security Council on any such questions." This gives a broad expanse of action to the assembled representatives of most of the nations of the world. They may discuss a variety of subjects such as the maintenance of world security, disarmament, or the regulations of armament, and any other matter which they consider of world importance. However, they cannot take any definite action concerning major world problems. If in considering such a problem they find that something should be done about it, they make known their recommendations to the Security Council. The Council, which controls enough military and economic power to make any of its decisions stick, can then go about taking action on the recommendations of the Assembly, or can even improve upon these recommendations.

The new Assembly has a strong democratically representative function, even more so than, for example, the Congress of the United States, for in addition to the fact that any member of the Assembly or the Security Council can bring up matters for discussion, an outside state, nonmember of the Organization, can also bring up matter for consideration by the Assembly. In addition, the Assembly, in public sessions which will be broadcast and cabled to every corner of the civilized world, can even take up matters which are not directly under its jurisdiction but which are within the scope of the functions of the Security Council. Although in such instances it will not be able to recommend any definite course of action, it can muster up the forces of world public opinion to a point where the action it desires will be automatically forthcoming.

In the case of the old League of Nations, the Geneva Assembly had the right to discuss any matter it wished. The Covenant says: "The Assembly—(or) the Council—may deal at its meetings with any matter * * * affecting the peace of the world." But as in many other instances of League organization, there was an overlapping of power between the Assembly and the Council. While these two bodies argued as to who should take the ultimate action, it might become too late for action, as, for example, when Italy had gobbled up Ethiopia.

In the case of the San Francisco Charter there is no duplication of power, for, if the Security Council decides that an international dispute has enough urgency to necessitate immediate action, it can lock out any discussion of that problem by the Assembly, and it therefore does not have to engage in lengthy diatribes with Assembly members.

Another important—but nonpolitical—function of the Assembly is "that it shall promote international cooperation in economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields and assist in the realization of human rights and basic freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Here the fathers of the United Nations Charter have shown deep wisdom and understanding. For the first time it has been officially recognized that by promoting the material welfare of the people the fundamental causes of wars can be eliminated. By stressing the importance of economic and social cooperation, the men who drew up the Charter looked into the future and saw the day when political frictions will slowly be eliminated and replaced by smooth, friendly economic and social cooperation of peoples throughout the world.

In regard to trusteeships, the Assembly will have the final word over all dependent territories which are considered by the Council not to be of any strategic or military value. It will have under its general supervision a specialized body to prepare such non-strategic dependent areas for ultimate self-government.

Each member of the Assembly in good standing shall have one vote. On important questions a two-thirds majority of those present and voting shall decide the issue. These questions will include general matters concerning international security, election of nonpermanent members of the Security Council, election of the Economic and Social Council, election of Trusteeship Council members, admission of new members to the United Nations Organization, expulsion of members, suspension of rights and privileges of members, and questions relating to trusteeship and budgetary matters. All other questions shall be decided by simple majority.

SECURITY COUNCIL

As in the League, this Council is composed of a set of permanent and a set of nonpermanent members. The permanent members are representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Soviet Russia, China, and France. The importance of these five permanent members in the Security Council cannot be overestimated. For the first time, five great powers of the world are united in a single international organization pledged to prevent wars.

The League of Nations never included the United States, and its Council tended to be a purely European affair with some Latin Americans playing a minor role. Now two countries which have been outside of the world organization—the United States and the Soviet Union—have firmly bound their destiny to the other United Nations, and the universalism which the League of Nations so ineffectually tried to achieve has finally been attained to all practical purposes.

The permanency of the five veto members of the Council shows a marked difference from the structure of the Geneva Council. Article 4 of the Covenant says, "The Council may name additional members of the League whose representatives shall always be members of the Council." No such provision exists in the Golden Gate Charter, thus effectively preventing a possible situation in which Germany or Japan might claim at some future date permanent membership in the Security Council.

Six nonpermanent members of the Security Council shall be elected by the Assembly. In order to insure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf. For the Council is not a dictatorial authority established over the Organization, but a group of strong-arm countries which are entrusted with the responsibility of keeping the peace. In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The Council, therefore, is not a body dominating the Assembly but an executive organization dominated by the spirit of the whole Organization. Its actions are strictly bound by the law as laid down in San Francisco—the preamble and the purposes of the Charter.

An erroneous impression has been circulated that the new Organization is controlled and bound to the will of the Big Five through the veto power given to the permanent members of the Council. It is interesting to compare the question of veto power with the League of Nations set-up. Article 5 of the Covenant says in part, "decision at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the members of the League represented at the meeting."

In effect this establishes the veto power of each of the 53 nations who were members of the League at the outbreak of the war. The San Francisco Charter thus reduces by more than 10 times the veto power in the new Security Organization. Instead of any one of 53 nations being able to stand up and by a single vote of "no" block the entire world's action to maintain peace, only one out of five highly responsible countries has the power to veto any decision of the Organization.

In an attempt to democratize the new Council, the Charter provides that a nonpermanent member of the Council cannot immediately be reelected after his term expires. The League of Nations had no such provision and nonpermanent members in its Council were chosen from a certain group of "eligible" nations who were often reelected. When the first election of nonpermanent members takes place after San Francisco, the more important "middle powers" will be elected to the nonpermanent seats of the Council for 2 years, or in certain cases 1 year.

These first nonpermanent members will probably not be called upon to decide any major security problems. The world, weary of war, will surely not develop any international disputes for at least a few years. But every following set of nonpermanent Council members will be faced with an increasing probability of international conflict. And as elections progress these members will be representatives of less important and gradually smaller countries, their more important brothers having already held office.

The Security Council will control the armament policy of all nations. Through its military staff committees, definite plans for international regulation of armaments will be worked out and enforced by the Council. The League Council never possessed such strength of action. Article 8 says that "members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety * * *" and the Council of the League was charged with working out equitable disarmament plans. But the execution of these plans was subject to their acceptance by the individual member concerned. The new Council, on the contrary, has the power and the means to enforce its disarmament plans.

A great improvement on the old League of Nations system is also presented by the stipulation that the Security Council shall be on the job 24 hours a day—"it shall be able to function continuously." The League of Nations required only that "the Council shall meet from time to time as occasion may require and at least once a year * * *."

Military sanctions in the League Covenant did not guarantee a speedy and effctive military action against the aggressor. Article 16 says, "It shall be the duty of the Council to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military, naval, or air forces the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenant of the League." It is not an accident that so many words say nothing.

The Golden Gate Charter on the other hand provides that "the Council may take such action by air, sea, or land as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." For the first time in human history a world military force under a joint general staff can be put into motion at a moment's notice to extinguish the first spark that might set off another world conflagration.

This use of force to prevent wars is vested exclusively in the Security Council. No other nation or regional group of nations has the right to use armed force without the authorization of the Council.

Like the Briand-Kellogg Pact, this outlaws war as an instrument of national policy. It gives the Council a monopoly of military action for the enforcement of peace. No nation will now be able to use force, claiming that it does so only to keep the peace. The League did not outlaw all such use of force. In a major loophole, slipped into article 15, it reserves for its members "the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice" if both parties to a dispute do not accept the unanimous decision of the Council.

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

An important innovation of San Francisco is the fact that regional security systems—"baby leagues"—will have power to settle disputes among themselves in a peaceful manner. For example, the Pan American Union, or the Pan-Arab League, maintain their right to mediate in a local dispute. Should that dispute, however, develop into a threat of war, the Council will take over immediately.

The League's reference to regional systems is in article 21, which states that "nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements such as treaties of arbitration or regional understanding, like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace." The weakness of this lies in the fact that such regional systems could have greater power than the League.

The ideology of collective security, as expressed in Litvinov's famous sentence, "peace is indivisible," was always opposed by the fascist conception of localization of conflicts, which boiled down to nothing else than exposing weak nations to the overwhelming force of their stronger neighbors. The Charter very successfully combines the principle of regional autonomy with the idea that peace is indivisible.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

"With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being, which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," the Charter establishes a social and economic council. This council is charged with "the promotion of high standards of living, full employment, the solution of international social, health, and other problems, and international cultural and educational cooperation." It will also attempt to establish "universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all

without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

The League of Nations never had such a creative instrument. Only as an afterthought in article 23 entitled "Social and Other Activities" did it vaguely admit that, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international conventions existing or hereafter to be agreed upon, the members of the League will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor (and) just treatment of native inhabitants * * *." In no instance does the League Covenant mention respect for universal human rights and fundamental freedoms, which the Charter so effectively presents to the world. The numerous committees of the League, set up with high-sounding names and well-paid personnel, were merely information and registration bodies. After the fall of the political functions of the League, these nonpolitical bureaus remained and were used as an alibi to screen the failure of Geneva.

The new Council has all-embracing authority to go into every sphere of nonpolitical life of peoples of the United Nations. It is charged with the task of bettering the life of the common man. Thus, at last, one of the firmest foundations for the creation of a contented and peaceful world has been laid.

INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP

"Members of the United Nations recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the dependent territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost their well-being * * * and their progressive development toward self-government or independence."

The League of Nations, in instituting the mandatory system, never endeavored to recommend the establishment of full independence for the countries under tutelage. Article 22 says, "The tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience, or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility * * *." Thus the League officially recognized and perpetuated the doctrine of inequality of human rights and seemed to eternalize it.

INTERNATIONAL COURT

Drawing upon the statute of the Hague Court of International Justice, international lawyers from most of the United Nations have worked out a new judicial body. The main difference between the old and the new Court is that decisions of the United Nations Court will be carried out, if necessary, by the Security Council.

The Hague Court handed down a lot of beautifully worded verdicts, but there was no authority to put these decisions into effect. The League did provide that in the event of failure to carry out decisions (of the World Court) the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto. But the League Council would never have had the strength to take such steps.

AMENDMENTS

Within the next 10 years the United Nations Charter can be adapted to changed world conditions with relatively little difficulty. In fact, the authors of the Charter provide that, at the tenth annual session of the Assembly, the subject of revision shall automatically be placed upon the agenda if it has not already been brought up. But such an amendment conference can only be held once. The Golden Gate Pact therefore does not permit, as in the case of the League of Nations, the introduction of various loopholes by countries which feel that their style is being cramped by too much international regulation.

Under article 26 of the Covenant "amendments will take effect when ratified by members of the Council and by a majority of the Assembly." This obviously opened the way for any country which could muster up enough support among its fellow members to introduce amendments which might have completely defeated the initial purpose of the League.

CONCLUSION

San Francisco saw the birth of a new type of Federal world organization imbued with a vigorous spirit of international cooperation. Nations have decided to sacrifice part of their individual sovereignty in order to prevent another holocaust.

The San Francisco Pact was authored by a group of utterly realistic politicians—sobered by the terrible experiences of two world wars. The result of their work thus becomes a predominantly political instrument, with all the advantages and disadvantages attached thereto.

It is far from being a perfect Charter. The League of Nations Covenant, for example, is juridically a more perfect document. This is understandable. It was drawn up by some of the world's most eminent jurists. The men of Geneva, inspired by Wilsonian optimism, entrusted their work to the good will of the world.

Today we entrust our hopes for permanent security to the five great powers. They bore the brunt of this war. Will they be able to bear the brunt of the peace?

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *July 11, 1945.*

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In all that I have read about the matter of peacetime conscription, I have not yet seen where an alternative plan was suggested. You'd think there wasn't any other way, but there is.

Left to our extremists, we would almost surely become either militarily helpless or go the way of Europe. Over there they have thoroughly tried out the conscription idea—and have had neither peace nor security. We have gone our ways, and have not only taken care of ourselves but have also pulled them out of their messes. It must be that there is something good about our way, don't you think? And wasn't there a previous occasion, about a generation ago?

"Well," says someone, "next time it will be too swift, times have changed." Very well, times do change, so we modify our way to fit the need, but we keep it our way.

I am suggesting:

1. Voluntary enlistments, 6 to 12 months (to be determined), for ages 18 to 22 only, which would give them basic training and field maneuvers. Then home with them; or those so inclined be given opportunity then to enter the Regular Army, i. e., simply continue, with full credit for time in service thus far. Over age 22 enlist for the full term as now, 4 years.

2. Maintain our Regular Army, say 10 to 20 divisions, enough to provide good officer training. Pay officers and "noncoms" well, so that men of real caliber would be induced to make it a career. Continue the best features of the service schools. Also conduct annual full-dress war games.

3. Maintain first-class research for all our armed services. And don't disclose to aggressor peoples knowledge of our discoveries and developments (military).

I honestly believe that enough of our young men, 18 to 22, would enlist for a year's service, if the plan were made available to them, to provide a skeleton of trained men in case of need for a suddenly expanded force.

And I also honestly believe that our people pretty generally do not favor peacetime conscription.

Furthermore, is there any reason why this plan could not be further modified from time to time, as experience might indicate? As for instance, create a reserve force of the trainees (1 year) who went home. Or make it easy to assimilate them in units of the National Guard.

Yes; I volunteered, the other war.

Yes; my son volunteered, this war (he is still going it).

Also, my younger son, 18½, IV–F, is a parachute fire fighter, United States Forestry Service.

Cordially,

WALTER A. PUPHAL.

JULY 13, 1945.

Mr. WALTER A. PUPHAL,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. PUPHAL: Thank you very much for your most interesting and constructive treatment of this problem of making sure that our country is adequately prepared to defend itself while at the same time preserving the priceless benefits of the voluntary way we have hitherto maintained. In fact, I think it is of such value that I am planning to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The important thing is not whether your particular suggestions are the final answer; the important thing is the open-minded approach to a problem without going to either of two extremes.

If we do not succeed in getting a reasonably decent world organization and better relations with less suspicion among the nations, then the mere instinct of self-preservation will require that we arm to the teeth.

However, it is certain we will not have a shortage of adequate reserves in the next year or so. I cannot believe it is either necessary or wise to rush through universal military conscription legislation at this time, and especially until those who have had most experience are home and able to participate in the decision.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER H. JUDD.

Unconditional Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post under date of July 13, 1945, written by Mark Sullivan and entitled "Grant's Ultimatum — Unconditional Surrender."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRANT'S ULTIMATUM

(By Mark Sullivan)

UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER

Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew, speaking with obvious intention to be complete and final, has summed up the facts

about so-called peace feelers from Japan, and our official attitude about the peace. In two oft-repeated words our position continues to be "unconditional surrender." What that means and its bearing on bringing the Japanese War to an end calls for understanding. The precise historical meaning of the phrase is especially important at this time.

The phrase was introduced in this war by President Roosevelt under circumstances which he later described in a private talk. On his visit to Casablanca in 1943 the hour for a prearranged press conference arrived. He was told the newsmen were waiting, and he wished to give them something worth while. Searching his mind for inspiration, he recalled that at the end of our Civil War General Grant had given unconditional surrender as his terms to General Lee and the Confederacy. Mr. Roosevelt told the newsmen this would be the Allied Nations' terms to the enemy in this war.

The phrase served the purpose of giving the newsmen something worth while, it leaped into the headlines of the world. It served also, at that stage of the war, as a tonic to Allied determination to fight to complete victory. But it was a casual way to give out a major war policy, indeed the supreme one, and some of Mr. Roosevelt's associates were perturbed though they endorsed it; they could hardly do otherwise even though their misgivings might remain.

If it was a tonic to Allied determination, it was a tonic also to enemy resistance—Goebbels in propaganda to the German people used it over and over. He used it to show that defeat would mean much more than unconditional surrender as an armed power. Had unconditional surrender meant only that, the German people might come to be willing to thus surrender. But Goebbels told them it would mean obliteration of them, not only as a nation but as a nationality, as a people having an entity of its own. To offset the Goebbels' propaganda, Mr. Roosevelt later took pains publicly to interpret the phrase in such a way as to soften it. Goebbels' interpretation of "unconditional surrender" had, by an odd divagation of that hardy liar into relative truth, some justification. For the war in which Grant made the phrase historic was a civil war, which is quite different from a war between nations. Unconditional surrender by the Confederacy meant that the Confederacy was no longer to exist. It would be utterly obliterated, wiped from the map. It would be absorbed and permanently governed by the power to which it unconditionally surrendered.

This is not what is intended at the conclusion of a war between separate nations, as distinct from a civil war. There is only one kind of war between nations in which the term "unconditional surrender" can be used with faithfulness to the meaning the phrase had when it became historic. That would be a war in which the victor nation intends to annex the vanquished one, incorporating it wholly and permanently into the victor nation, leaving the vanquished without any separate existence whatever. There is interesting light on this in a historical study by President Felix Morley, of Haverford College, in Human Events.

America has not the faintest intention of doing to Japan what was meant when Grant used the term "unconditional surrender" to the Southern Confederacy. We are not going to annex nor even make it a permanent satrapy of our Government. We are not going to end its separate existence.

Since our intentions about Japan differ from what "unconditional surrender" historically means, there is no possible harm, and there might be great saving of American lives, if we would make perfectly clear to the Japanese people just what we mean, and do not mean, by an unconditional surrender. Official Japanese propaganda, like Goebbels' propaganda, tells the Japanese people that by unconditional surrender we intend the most terrible fate for them as a people and as individuals. Both President Truman and President Roosevelt, in a way too diplomatically cautious to be fully successful, have gone some distance in softening the terrifying phrase. President Truman could go further and probably will, thereby reconciling the Japanese people to earlier acceptance of their inevitable defeat.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Labor Relations," from the Washington Post of July 6, and an editorial entitled "Progressive Labor Legislation," from the Cedar Falls (Iowa) Record of June 22.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 6, 1945]

LABOR RELATIONS

(By Mark Sullivan)

WAYS TO CURE CHAOS

The new Secretary of Labor, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, announces that he will reorganize the Department and bring into it several of the many Federal agencies dealing with labor which now sprawl outside the Department. He expects to have a survey by August 1 and have the consolidation effected by September 1. This is the task for which, mainly, President Truman appointed Secretary Schwellenbach. The aim is to cure the welter of confusion which grew up throughout 12 years during which President Roosevelt kept Miss Perkins as Secretary of Labor, but set up agency after agency outside her jurisdiction.

Separate from this, but parallel to it, is the bill in Congress introduced by Democratic Senator HATCH, of New Mexico, and Republican Senators BURTON, of Ohio, and BALL, of Minnesota. Officially, it is described as the Federal Industrial Relations Act, in the technique of abbreviation of Washington practices it is called the HBB bill. Its aim is to survey and in part overhaul and coordinate the labor legislation now on the books, much of it written during the last 12 years.

Of these two approaches to the labor problem, the Federal industrial relations bill is the more fundamental. For no amount of administrative reorganization by Secretary Schwellenbach, however thorough and careful, can cure the existing chaos of labor relations. The deeper cause lies in the nexus of laws, court decisions, and precedents established in practice. It is this that HBB deals with.

The bill contains more than 10,000 words, much of the verbiage necessarily technical. The bill will be read minutely by two groups of specialists—those who serve industry and those who serve labor unions. From these will come conflicting claims and arguments, and this will be about all the public will hear. Yet the primary need is that the public understand this bill, for its distinguishing characteristic is that it is written from the point of view of the public interest.

The basic assumption of the bill is that the public has an interest in labor disputes, that employers and unions shall not be left free to fight out their battles regardless of the results to the public, that the interest of the public in labor disputes is superior to the interest of either of the contestants.

This extremely important principle is embodied in a powerful "must" which the bill contains. It sets up a Federal Labor Relations Board (taking the place of the existing National Labor Relations Board). Under the new board will be established a mediation, arbitration, and conciliation service for all labor controversies over wages, hours, and conditions of employment. This of itself is an important step. But beyond this, the bill goes into new ground. It asserts the supremacy of the public interest in labor disputes. This is set forth in a provision containing powerful teeth. This provision authorizes the board:

"In the protection of the public interest, to require the parties (employers and unions) to accept temporarily a compulsory settlement of their * * * controversy, so as to avoid any interruption to the supply of a commodity or to a service on which the community affected is so dependent that severe hardship would be inflicted on a substantial number of persons by either a brief or prolonged deprivation of such commodity or service."

That passage will bear careful reading and should be made familiar to the country. It means that in any labor controversy the new board can, in its discretion, forbid interruption of work. This compulsory arbitration would be used in cases where the board finds it necessary in the public interest to assure, for example, the continued delivery of milk, or the continuance of electric service, or any other vital service or commodity. Doubtless it could be used in such a case as the present strike in New York City which deprived the public of newspapers for several days.

That the public suffers from strikes is commonplace. That the public has a right to protect itself is novel. The means for doing so is in this bill.

[From the Cedar Falls (Iowa) Record of June 22, 1945]

PROGRESSIVE LABOR LEGISLATION

Nobody, except the coal miners who habitually take a brief vacation each spring while a new contract is being negotiated, enjoys the prospect of a strike. When employees feel that they have a just grievance and negotiations with the employer are deadlocked, the strike has been accepted as the only recourse open to them. But liberal students of the labor problem have long realized that a strike is only the extreme method of settling a dispute and that it is an economic waste which provides a loss to both sides.

If, when the war ends, the United States goes into the period of full reconversion without the wartime restraints provided by patriotism and the compulsions of the War Labor Board, we are likely to face a period of industrial chaos. Many difficult adjustments will have to be made, and everybody—worker, employer, and the general public—will benefit if those adjustments are made in a sane, fair, and peaceable manner. And experience has shown that the public at large has a very direct and abiding interest in seeing that this is done.

The public, therefore, should give close attention to the progressive labor legislation proposed by Senators HATCH, BALL, and BURTON and announced Wednesday. In any labor dispute arising from conflicting interpretations of existing contracts and in all disputes in which strikes would result in hardships to the public, the disputants would be required to submit the case to an arbitration board or a fact-finding commission. The two parties, thereupon, "are expected but not required" to accept the decision.

In most disputes it is necessary to emphasize there would be no ban on the right to strike. At the most there would be a delay before a strike could be held. In a few instances involving the public welfare, however, the new Labor Relations Board could enforce temporary compulsory settlements to prevent, for example, interruption in milk deliveries or curtailment of necessary public utility service.

Some leaders of organized labor have already indicated that they will oppose this reform. That is regrettable because it will only widen the breach between them and general public thinking on this issue. The principles involved have been tested in Minnesota, where a similar law has been in effect, and in the Railway Mediation Act. Experience has shown that such legislation, far from weakening unions, actually strengthens them and makes them more democratic and responsible. It insures that each dispute will be given a fair hearing.

When two neighbors get into a quarrel over a fence line they are expected to go to court, where each has a fair hearing and where the facts in the dispute can be established. When an employer and his employees get into a dispute they issue defamatory broadsides, resort to various forms of violence, and the public interest is ignored. Ultimately, in the evolution of the labor problem, that chaotic method will be reformed. Why not make a beginning now before much harm is done?

The United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 13 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Colby Alumnus for July 1945. The Colby Alumnus, I take it, is published under the authority of Colby College, of Waterville, Maine.

In this editorial there is a quotation from a soldier in a hospital in New York State which I think is especially deserving of reading by those who may see this insertion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As this is written, the United States Senate is beginning its consideration of the United Nations Charter. Before they reach a decision, many hundreds of thousands of words will have been uttered on the floor and committee chambers. We submit, however, that they will not add up to much more than do 55 words scribbled by a Colby College man who has been on his back in hospitals for four and a half months since being wounded in four places and pulled back, more dead than alive, from a mine-clearing patrol ahead of the American advance in Germany. Writing from the Rhoads General Hospital, Utica, at the end of a chatty letter and with seriousness, but no intention of being profound, Lt. Morris Cohen, 35, reflected:

"Today is VE-day. In the field, after an objective is taken, the first duty of the commanders is the organization of the ground against counterattack. We've taken our objective. I hope, now, that at San Francisco the ground is being organized effectively against any possible counterattack by the same—or any—hate-inspired enemy."

There you have it, Mr. Senator. And, if you want to be political about it, there are about 12,000,000 men who aren't saying much, but who have been taught the same basic tactics and are watching you with gimlet eyes to see what you are going to do about "organizing against counterattack" the ground which they are winning and have won the hard, hard way.

Coffee Shortage May Become Serious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I took occasion on June 30 to discuss the coffee shortage which exists in the United States and to call attention to the fact that the condition is serious. My remarks appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD, on page A3174. Following that discussion, I wrote Government officials, pointing out that there is need for drastic changes in the handling of the coffee problem. Up to date I have not had an acknowledgment of those letters, but no doubt, in due time, such an acknowledgment will come. I hope it will not come after it is too late for responsible Government officials to do something.

I hardly need to remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that there is a meat and food shortage, a sugar shortage, and so the story goes. We might well consider before this House takes an adjournment the possibilities of the housewife being unable to get any coffee for the breakfast table. If responsible Government agencies are as unsuccessful in handling the coffee problem as they have so miserably failed in handling the food, meat, and sugar problems, then we can make up our minds that there is not going to be any coffee.

From what little information I can get, Mr. Speaker, the coffee industry, like the others, needs a coffee czar and it needs one right away. Here is a statement that was submitted to me. A number of coffee roasters are finding it impossible to buy coffee because of the present policy of the Government. Right now Brazil ships the United States all the junk they have—poor quality and poor grade coffee—at top ceiling prices. At the same time European countries pay more than our ceiling for good coffee and they use our money with which to make the purchases. The reason we can not get good coffee from Brazil is because we are not permitted by United States Government agencies to pay the price. All of this means that under present Government bureau regulations it is impossible for the coffee-roasting trade to secure an adequate supply of good coffee in coffee-producing countries.

Then this statement has been made without any qualification, namely, that the policy of the OPA with respect to coffee prices has done immeasurable harm to the good neighbor policy. The statement is made that OPA's obstinate policy with respect to green coffee price ceilings calls for concerted action by the public and that if this is not done within 2 or 3 months this country will be without supplies of coffee of quality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the foregoing statements, which I have quoted almost literally from people who know their business, will convince the Members of this House that this whole subject ought to be investigated by the proper committee and steps taken to avoid the mistakes that have been made by Government agencies and Government officials in connection with other food products. If this is not done, then the responsibility certainly rests on the administration for the failures and mistakes that are now taking place.

Mr. Grew on Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 13 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of Friday, July 13, entitled "Mr. Grew on Peace."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. GREW ON PEACE

We must take at face value the denial by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Grew, that the Japanese Government has ever made any requests for conditions of peace. The ambiguous and unofficial approaches that were mentioned by Mr. Grew in his interview last Tuesday certainly do not amount to a suit for peace; if they were as vague and insubstantial as he describes them, the Department of State seems to have been fully justified in ignoring them.

But Mr. Grew's statement, it seems to us, has no bearing on the main question. That question is whether we should make known not merely to Japan but also to ourselves, and particularly to the men who are bearing the greatest pain and burden of the battles, precisely what are our purposes in continuing them. In the earlier days of the Pacific war our immediate purposes were so obvious that they could almost be said to have stated themselves; they were to redeem the territories seized by the enemy and to punish him for the indignities he had inflicted upon us at Pearl Harbor and elsewhere. The United States and our far eastern allies had been the victims of unprovoked aggression which we had every moral right to resist and to defeat.

These immediate purposes have now been largely accomplished at the cost of many lives and of uncountable treasure. Our loss is not the less grievous for the knowledge that the Japanese have paid even more in blood and treasure than ourselves. The defeat of Japan is now certain, but how many more lives we must sacrifice, what further privations we must endure, to achieve our further purposes is something we cannot know until we know what our further purposes are. If these purposes are clear in the minds of our statesmen, they are never-

theless masked under the purely rhetorical and meaningless phrase, "unconditional surrender."

It is sometimes possible, perhaps, for an individual to surrender himself unconditionally, that is to abandon all means of resistance and to place himself utterly in his enemy's hands. (This is not exactly the case, however, when, for example, a felon surrenders to a policeman, for there the implicit condition of surrender is that he shall be dealt with according to the known law.) But unconditional surrender by a nation is virtually impossible. It would be tantamount to a government's saying to its people, "We command you to obey us in not giving us any obedience." Italy did not surrender unconditionally to the Allies, as was evident from Marshal Badoglio's reluctance to accept the harsh conditions of the armistice; conditions, however harsh, are nonetheless conditions. As for Germany, she collapsed in both the military and political sense and was overrun and occupied. Individual German commanders surrendered themselves and their men, but under the implied conditions of the Geneva Convention. But there was no surrender of sovereignty, because none any longer existed; the only authority was the authority of Allied arms. The surrender of General Jodl was thus a meaningless gesture, a surrender of something he did not possess.

Is it our purpose, then, to continue the Pacific War until Japan has collapsed not only as a military power but also, like Germany, as a political entity? Mr. Grew seems to imply there is something treasonable in such a question. It would be, he says, to the Japanese interest, "as they see their interest, to initiate a public discussion of the terms to be applied to Japan," in the hope that it might "produce a division of opinion within the Allied countries." We confess ourselves unable to follow either Mr. Grew's reasoning or his meaning here. If the Japanese are wrong in supposing that the mere announcement of our war aims in the Pacific would produce a division of opinion, then what harm is to be accomplished by stating them?

But surely Mr. Grew does not mean that the Japanese may be right, that a statement of our purposes would really cause a division of opinion among the American people as to whether the purposes are consonant with former professions or as to whether they will be worth the cost. Yet if one does not accept either of these interpretations of Mr. Grew's statement, only one other interpretation, it seems to us, is possible; namely, that the reason we are so reluctant to tell ourselves and the Japanese about our purposes is because we dare not confess that we do not yet know what they are.

Confusion Worse Confounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the confusion in our handling of surplus goods seems to be increasing by the hour. Our third prospective Surplus Property Board Chairman within the space of 6 months is preparing to take office. Unless he is given real authority to cut through the miles of red tape which now prevent effective disposal, his resignation will be on the President's desk in another 6 months. No man can do a good job of selling our surplus commodities when he may merely establish policies without actual supervision of the sales.

Our Surplus Properties Board sells through the Defense Corporation, Commerce Department, Agriculture Department, Interior Department, Office of the Army-Navy Liquidation Commission, Maritime Commission, War Shipping Administration, War Food Administration, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and National Housing Agency. No wonder the job is so cluttered up that the interested purchaser gives up in disgust while the surplus goods deteriorate in the warehouses. It is certainly time to cut through this confusion and set up a workable Surplus Properties Sales Act.

Servicemen's Right to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, letters are pouring in from all over the country, and from the servicemen overseas, urging the passage of my bill to protect our veterans of this war in their right to work without paying tribute, and in their right to join or not to join any labor or other organization before being permitted to work for their daily bread.

The following article appeared in the Daily Corinthian, published in Corinth, Miss., on Tuesday, July 10, 1945:

GI'S GRIPE ABOUT PAY TO TRUCK DRIVERS—INDIA-BURMA THEATER PAPER CHIDES DRAFT BOARDS IN STATES

The following article, clipped from a recent issue of the India-Burma theater Roundup, a serviceman's newspaper in that war area, is reprinted to give the people on the home front some idea of the gripes the servicemen have coming regarding happenings on the home front. The article is a Roundup staff article and is as follows:

From Myitkyina, deep in the heart of Burma, Sgt. F. J. Yocum has written the Roundup, enclosing a clipping from his home-town (Flint, Mich.) newspaper which offers civilians jobs keeping trucks rolling along the Stilwell Highway. The astonishing salary: Between $450 and $550 per month.

The sergeant, exceedingly miffed, asks the Roundup if there are no longer draft boards in Michigan.

He writes, "Read it and weep. Take a good look and see if it hits you between the eyes as it does us up here."

The article reads as follows:

"Burma calls. Five hundred skilled auto and truck repairmen are needed to keep trucks rolling over the 4,700-mile Ledo-Burma Road into Free China," Edward L. Cushman, State director of the War Manpower Commission, said yesterday.

"The pay of $450 to $550 a month will be practically unencumbered as men on the jobs will be given military uniforms, eat Army food and sleep in barracks. The program, being set up by Chrysler Corp., calls for engineer-mechanic crews to man 6 stations along the road with 248 persons at each station, and 8 stations each with a personnel of 164 persons."

The Roundup estimates that each civilian would receive base pay equal to that of a brigadier general, $6,000 yearly.

It seems more than somewhat incongruous to GI's to pay civilians $450 to $550 a month to come to Burma, plus Army maintenance, as compared to the pay of any Army private, who gets $60 monthly, plus Army maintenance, and, we might add, Army discipline.

You will note it is stated that the pay to these workingmen averaged from $450 to $550 per month, while the men in the armed forces were fighting for a base pay of $50 per month. And I might add here they would not have got $50 a month if it had not been for my amendment raising their base pay to that amount.

Some people may contend that it is an exaggeration to say that these men are paid $450 to $550 per month to repair trucks. But I have before me a copy of the Detroit Free Pfess of Sunday, February 11, 1945, showing pictures of men at work and giving the salaries they receive.

I wish it were possible to insert these pictures in the RECORD. It would be an eye opener to the boys over there to see these pictures of these men doing "essential" work, and to note the wages they receive.

One of them is a picture of a man rolling a wheelbarrow loaded with coal. Under that picture is this statement:

The man who delivers your coal earns this average wage yearly in return for keeping you warm, $6,000.

No wonder it burns an ex-serviceman up when he comes home and finds the man who shovels coal drawing $6,000 a year whereas he has been drawing $50 a month, and realizes that he is excluded from such employment by union rules or contribution requirements which he is unable to meet.

The next picture is that of a man delivering milk in bottles. Under that picture is this statement:

First up in the icy winter mornings is the milkman, whose wage insures delivery to your door.

It gives his salary as $5,000 a year.

The next picture is that of a man bringing in laundry. Under that picture it is stated:

Laundry, fresh and crisp from modern plants is delivered with care by hard-working drivers.

It is stated that he receives a salary of $4,500 a year.

The next picture is one of a man carrying loaves of bread in his arms. Under that picture it is stated:

Detroit has learned during the war what an interruption to the flow of bread means.

This man's salary is given as $6,000 a year.

The next picture is one of an insurance salesman in an automobile. Under that picture is this statement:

Rating high in importance is the insurance salesman and agent, who keeps policies in force.

His salary is indicated as $5,000 a year.

The next picture is one of a man delivering clothes from a pressing shop. Under that picture it is stated:

A spick and span Detroit places reliance on the dry-cleaning deliveryman for sharp creases.

His salary is indicated at $4,500 a year.

The next picture is one of a motorman on a streetcar, and under that picture is this statement:

Traffic to and from war plants and downtown areas is kept moving by conscientious motormen.

His salary is stated to be $5,000 a year.

The next picture is one of a bus driver. Under that picture it is stated:

A steady hand on the wheel is needed to keep one of Detroit's busses within wartime schedules.

His salary is indicated as $5,000 a year.

This article was brought to the attention of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to show why we could not get employees in the Veterans' Administration facility in Michigan when men on the outside were receiving these high wages.

Yet when these servicemen return after years of fighting for their country on a base pay of $50 per month they are often denied the right to work for their daily bread unless they are willing to pay tribute they cannot afford; and even then many of them are turned away to keep in these jobs men of military age who have got deferment during the war because they were alleged to be doing "essential work."

That is the reason these young men who are now coming back to the country they have been defending are urging the passage of my bill to guarantee to them the first freedom—the freedom to work for their daily bread without paying tribute.

Oppose Citizenship for Harry Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a resolution approved by the Casper J. Middlekauf Post, No. 173, of the American Legion, Hays, Kans. Those of us who are familiar with the report of the Dies committee on the activities of Harry Bridges are insisting that the Department of Justice study every angle of the application. Following the war there will be a demand that we relax our immigration laws and grant citizenship to a large number of undesirable aliens. I am opposed to this. We must not relax our vigilance against the entry of individuals who desire to overthrow or change our democratic form of government. These individuals who favor foreign ideologies should be promptly deported. Let them go to a country of their liking.

"Whereas Harry Bridges is an agitator and an undesirable alien—

"Who has been guilty of and participated in subversive activities against the people and Government of the United States.

"Who has called, aided and abetted unlawful strikes, fostered strife and violence in labor and essential war industries, and otherwise interfered with the war effort in the present emergency.

"Who is a member of or is affiliated with a party or organization advocating the overthrow of the duly constituted authority and Government of the United States and its people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by Casper J. Middlekauf Post, No. 173, of the American Legion, located at Hays, Ellis County, Kans., in regular meeting assembled:

"First. That Casper J. Middlekauf Post of the American Legion protests against the naturalization of Harry Bridges as a citizen of the United States, demands that his application for citizenship be denied, and requests that the Governor of the State of Kansas, and the Senators and Representatives from Kansas in Congress, leave nothing undone to secure a denial of the application of Harry Bridges for citizenship.

"Second. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Kansas, to each Senator and Representative from Kansas in Congress, and the Department of the American Legion of Kansas."

Unanimously adopted and passed this 9th day of July 1945.

ADOLPH SCHUMACHER,
First Vice Commander, Acting Commander.

Attest:

F. B. SPENCER,
Post Adjutant.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of resolution passed by the Casper J. Middlekauf Post, No. 173, of the American Legion on July 9, 1945.

PAULINE WEIGEL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of July 1945.

[SEAL] J. C. PENROD,
Notary Public.

My commisison expires November 5, 1947.

Training Plan for Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article as reprinted in my home-town newspaper, the Kirksville Daily Express, Kirksville, Mo., being a statement by Dr. J. S. Denslow, Kirksville, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Osteopathic Colleges and director of research at the Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery:

URGES BIGGER TRAINING PLAN FOR DOCTORS—DR. J. S. DENSLOW ANTICIPATES FAMINE OF PHYSICIANS

CHICAGO, June 20.—A sharply increased doctor and hospital training program should be inaugurated immediately to avert the threat of a serious postwar famine of physicians, Dr. J. S. Denslow, Kirksville, secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Osteopathic Colleges and director of research at the Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery, yesterday told the college association, in session here.

Pointing out that war's end will see a still greater doctor shortage than at present because of the increased postwar demand for health services, Dr. Denslow said that much of the hope of meeting future health needs depends upon enrollment of ex-servicemen in colleges training physicians under the so-called GI bill of rights and other laws providing benefits for service men and women.

These laws grant certain types of compensation to veterans. Included are provisions for Government-financed continuation of schooling with a maximum of 4 years of tuition, maintenance allowance, and grants for books and equipment. Dr. Denslow pointed out that all approved osteopathic colleges have been recognized by the Government as eligible to receive students under this provision.

"In the immediate postwar period," Dr. Denslow declared, "an estimated 660,000 hospital beds will be required for wounded, sick, and injured ex-servicemen. In addition, there will be hundreds of thousands of nonhospitalized cases with service-connected disabilities requiring medical care to a greater or lesser degree for years to come. Of the first 1,500,000 men discharged from the armed services, 375,000 have service-connected disabilities.

"If this rate of disability of about 25 percent holds true for the entire group in service, we will have approximately 3,000,000 men requiring some measure of medical care in postwar years.

"Passage of pending legislation, both national and State, to bring adequate health care to vast numbers of the civil population who do not have it will also increase the total of patients who must be served by the Nation's physicians."

To meet increasing requirements, Dr. Denslow pointed out, there are only about 180,000 registered physicians, including those now in the armed services. Since this number has been found barely adequate to meet present requirements, he said, they could not be expected to cope with a sharply raised demand.

At present, fewer than 7,000 doctors are being graduated from colleges each year, Dr. Denslow said, adding that this is insufficient to replace physicians who die, retire, or otherwise cease professional practice, let alone increase the total of practitioners.

One hindrance to training physicians, Dr. Denslow said, has been relatively high cost in money and time to complete the required minimum of 6 years of preprofessional and professional college work.

"With thousands of service men and women entitled to up to 4 years of Government-paid schooling, plus living and other allowances, under the GI bill of rights, and other laws relating to servicemen, the cost in money to the individual student is materially reduced since at least a third of the expense is borne by the Government.

"These ex-service men and women are one of the important groups to which we must look for the raw human material of which our future physicians will be made. Unless a substantial number of them choose healing as a profession, the doctor shortage of a few years hence may make the present situation seem like 'the good old days'."

The GI bill of rights, Dr. Denslow told his colleagues, also assures refresher courses to physicians now in the armed services to bring their personal training abreast of the progress made in the profession.

An Opportunity for Investment Brokers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me before the Investors Fair Play League, June 28, 1945:

I appreciate all that has been said today about my work in Congress and I hope that my conduct from here on may be such as to demand your respect and confidence.

There are such things in this world as spiritual and moral forces, and I have such a high respect for our enterprise system, for the investors of this country who put their risk capital in it, for the commissionmen and brokers and exchanges, both stock and commodity, that I came up here today to get a litle inspiration from the home front firing line. We Members of Congress who sit in Washington, entirely dependent upon such information as you may give us from time to time, find it very necessary to get out into the field now and then, contact those who make the wheels go around, and get a clearer understanding of what the momentary situation is about. That is my object in coming here today.

It is the thrifty people of the United States who put their risk capital in American enterprise who provide the keystone, the foundation, which has led to the American industrial worker and pay-rollees having the tools in their hands with which to turn out the highest per capita production in the world. The ability of our pay-rollees to do this work is what is turning the wheels and winning World War II. Our workers have more than two and a half times the necessary tools to turn out products compared to the British, and when you attempt to compare what our group has with other parts of the world, other than Britain, it is really useless to make the comparison.

How did those workers get access to the tools in order to produce the things our people are now turning out? Government agencies or legislative forces that stand in the way of ample production will run into difficulty through economic and social chaos occurring in the United States. If you eduate the people of this country about the enterprise system and get the people of this country who have accumulated savings back into an attitude of investing so that our production will continue, you will render a great service.

Mr. Forbes has spoken about the disinclination of people to put their funds into private enterprise and thus create more tools for workers to use. Why did they hesitate to invest during the thirties? Why are they hesitating now? Those are questions which you should be discussing. The answer to questions of that kind is what you should get before the public, in my opinion.

Since January 1942, our people in this country have accumulated liquid savings of $124,000,000,000. The last calendar year it was forty billions. The first 3 months of this year it was eight and four-tenths billions. Since 1941, a total of one hundred and twenty-four billions have been accumulated—net liquid savings.

Suppose I accumulated on my ranch in Texas 500 head of beef steers and had no market through which to trade them. In the first place, I would be foolish if I did that without any market. In the second place, an accident might occur and I might die as a result of it—and then what? Who would want the steers? How would they be sold? It is important to have a market for trading. In that connection, I have expressed my admiration for stock and commodity exchanges. They create a means of liquidating my holdings, if I want to do so. I am not interested in holding beef steers or pork on the hoof or wheat in the granary if there is no means of my liquidating it. I am not interested in owning a security, if there is no means whereby I can liquidate that security.

Do our people understand the fundamentals expressed in those thoughts? I am afraid that millions of those who would have participated in this accumulation of savings for the last 4 years do not understand all that is involved. Therein is your job as brokers to make them understand. You implement the market—your furnish the mechanism through which they can liquidate. You make it possible for those wheels to turn around. I do not think you have met your responsibility to the public insofar as educational work is concerned.

You may say that you do not have the necessary income from your job, from your commissions, to enable you to do this educational work. If that is true, then I insist that your remuneration be increased because I want a market. I want a free market. A member of the exchange said to me this morning that you can let these great difficulties appear momentarily but the people will soon take care of those difficulties and equalize the situation, if the public is free to act. But if you do not permit this freedom, and attempt to do the thing through planned economy, you will create a bad situation which may be perpetuated 5, 10, 15, or 20 years until we go through the wringer and the pressures work it out. Do you get what I mean?

The less our people understand about this machinery of exchanges, the more that public misunderstanding or lack of understanding will be reflected through Federal acts of Congress, and thus greatly circumscribe our activities and take away from us the freedom which we should have, and thus generally interfere with the free-enterprise system of this country. If you do not go to Washington from time to time and make yourself known to the House and Senate Members and in turn tell them the truth, not only today but tomorrow and next week and next month and next year and forever after tell it to them, never letting them forget what you say—if you fail to do that, why do you expect any consideration in either the House or Senate committees? If someone is going down there to poison the minds of those who sit on your committee against your operations, and if your operation is decent and in harmony with American ideals and situations and you never go there and offer something as a substitute, why should you blame the Members of the House and Senate for following bad leadership? You should go to Washington, even when there is not up for consideration something that you are particularly interested in. You should go down there and take an interest in the fellow who represents your district and your State, so that when he thinks of production of foodstuffs, of clothing, or anything else, he will automatically think of someone who will make an investment through the stock-exchange machinery so that our machinery and tools may be provided and also working capital and somebody given a job so the goods may flow from the production line. If his mind does not go through with the flow sheet, then he does not comprehend the wheels of American enterprise.

Who is to do that job? In my opinion, the brokerage man and the commission man are the people who are best equipped to do that. If I sit down there on a committee that has a lot to do with American industry, and if I am friendly to the enterprise system, I am entitled to your respect and confidence and to information from you so that at any moment if an adverse proposition comes before the committee or in the discussion groups or on the floor, I can defend you with the most up-to-date information available. If I am unfriendly to you, it is up to you to make me friendly. That is your responsibility. I do not mean to say by that that I would excuse anyone that is unfriendly to American enterprise. I do not excuse them. If you would sit in on our sessions, you would find out that I do not excuse them because I am very extreme on these matters and at times I get very bombastic about the situation and say some very cutting things. I have no sympathy with a philosophy which opposes investment or production. I go so far as to make it very clearly understood what my position is. But I am depending upon you for information at all times, from this end of the line, and if I do not get it, it is your fault—not mine—because the facts constantly flow before you and you should send some of them along to me. You should knew every Member in the House and Senate who has a friendly attitude towards your industry. If you do not know them, that is your fault, because no public official that I know of is unconscious of the fact that he is elected by the people. If an elected public official is so dumb that he does not recognize the voting power of the people, then God help him! There is no hope for him. If he does recognize that people elect him, then he properly evaluates public information. Therefore, he is responsive to public information and you are the ones that should make public information with respect to this particular industry. The farm spokesman should make public information with respect to farming. The steel man steel. The oil man oil.

I can well understand why Mr. Rockefeller made that statement to Mr. Forbes about "Do the right thing and let the public know you are doing the right thing." If you don't toot your own horn, with respect to this particular industry, who is going to toot it? You cannot often enough say these things to Congress. Congress is in a continual flow. A Member of the Senate and House must deal with 15 or 20 different subjects a day. A Cabinet member said to me as late as day before yesterday, "If I decide to spend 5 minutes on some particularly important subject and start out to do so, before I can get rid of that, a dozen more things come into my hands—entirely disassociated matters." Why? Because we are serving the public. But that does not excuse you from placing before me facts pertaining to your industry.

You have gone through a great reorganizing process here in the last few years—the Securities Exchange Act. Personally, I think you have at the head of your stock exchange now a model, capable Government employee. I mean Mr. Emil Schram. I said so when the change was made. I am not intimate with this gentleman—we do know each other, however. But you recognize forces when you see them. Nobody has to apologize for the job he has done since he came here. I looked at him a while ago and admired his youth, because I comprehend some of the job that is ahead of him. You take the educational program that he is promoting. You cannot get into that quickly enough. There is an unlimited field in which you can work.

Take the work of this league headed by Mr. Forbes. The first time I heard of it, I was in my district. Some fellow called me up from the hotel and said he wanted to speak with me. He talked to my wife. I got in touch with him and he told me about the league. I told him I was interested in it because it was educational. Investors Fairplay League. Fair play. If I could get into politics and into Congress one-fifth of the fair play that you have in industry—between the wholesale jobber and the retailer—between you and your customers—between the man that represents your particular product and the fellow who buys it from him. You fellows have really learned how to develop fair play. You know how to make obligations over the telephone and carry them out. You don't have to have a long written document. You live up to those obligations or you pass out of the picture from unfair dealing.

The public doesn't know that. People who have never had practical experience do not know how industrial transactions are conducted.

Here you have twelve to fifteen million young men and women who are going to come back to civilian life. Keep in mind that they grew up primarily during the last two decades. What are you going to do with those people when they come back? There is an untouched field. Few of them know anything whatsoever about investments and how the wheels go around. Yet that group, I hope, will control this country. I prefer to have the forces of the country in their hands above the group that has been here. You will say, "They are young." Well, they have lived 50 or 60 years within 4 years. They have been abroad and have seen what goes on in other countries. When they come back here, I am ready for them to take over the forces of the United States. If we cannot trust them, whom can we trust? They will come back into politics and industry and all the walks of life and start out. What road will they travel? A free market road or the Government-owned road? You are going to have something to say about that. You should have a program ready to place in their hands.

Take the other group who have been here at home during the past 4 years and who have received these Government checks which has enabled $124,000,000,000 to be saved. What do they know about investment? You have to tell them. Therein is your educational opportunity.

I said to Mr. Forbes' man last night, "Mr. Jackman, I hope you have these open discussions in every region of the United States just as quickly as possible."

People have been saying to me, "There is no longer any opportunity of consequence in the United States where our people can invest their savings. We hope to have them export their capital from the United States to the other countries of the world and build buildings, put in machinery, and supply tools." I said "That's fine as far as you go. Then what?" "We are going to bring the standard of living up in the other parts of the world." Yes, but in the meantime, what are you going to do about employing 60,000,000 skilled workers in this country?

Mr. Truman made this remark in his home town yesterday: "My duties: No. 1, win the war with Japan; No. 2, win a peace that will work. That is all I shall devote my time to from now on."

A Member of the House came back from a world tour the other day, having visited 30 different countries, and he made one of the most beautiful and entertaining speeches I ever heard on the troubles of other countries and other people. I was on the floor and I referred to that in this way: "I enjoyed my friend's speech. I love to hear him talk. But, incidentally, we have some problems in the United States with which to deal. God Almighty doesn't expect me to work out all the problems of my friend from Michigan. God expects me to work out my own salvation and that of my family. The British and the Russians and the Chinese will have to work out some of their own problems. There is something to be done in the United States."

If you have the free-enterprise system and then let it die by permitting our people to fail to invest the necessary funds in this country's enterprise required for our expanding economy, we shall thereby cause unemployment and social unrest under such conditions, and where do you think the work of Mr. Truman will land with the world peace? In my opinion, it won't amount to a hill of beans. The foundation of all peace is for our people of this country to receive what they conceive to be social and economic justice reasonably satisfactory to the people of the United States. In the absence of that, what have you got? You have an accumulated debt of $300,000,000,000. You have a young force coming up that will not have the form of government under which we older ones have lived. The relations with other countries will break down, the Bretton Woods, the San Francisco Charter, all of it, will go out of the window if we have great social unrest and unemployment. We have got to maintain some sense of balance here in the United States.

You take any young man or woman who is in the service. How can they fall in love and build a home and raise and educate a family under the tax burden imposed upon them by a $300,000,000,000 debt? They will give you some hot answers pretty fast. Suppose a man earns five or ten thousand dollars a year. What has he left after living and paying taxes? You say taxes will be reduced. Maybe they will. We may increase them. When I say, "We may increase them," I mean our errors may force an increase. You have the job of inducing our people to invest in the capital structures of present and prospective industry whatever funds are necessary to maintain reasonably full employment in the United States. To me, that is your biggest job. You have to do educational work along that line. You have to do whatever is necessary to educate the public to have a respect for stock and commodity exchanges. You have a lot of people in Congress who have not too much respect for them. I am sorry that that situation exists. But I think you can correct it. You have your ethical rules and just regulations. I don't know how they can be improved upon. Altogether, however, I think you are doing a pretty fine job in that respect. But I do not think you are paying enough attention to this question of public relationship. I don't think you have ironed out all your difficulties here as between the exchange and the customers.

We have sufficient situations in Washington to prove conclusively these truths. If this enterprise system is to survive, you have got to have free markets. How free can they be, and if they are free, then, as Mr. Schram pointed out, you are going to have an accident once in a while. Somebody is going to get out into the road and get hurt. But there is no reason for the road to be destroyed because some fellow had an accident. In the presence of freedom, we can afford an accident once in a while. How much freedom are we to have?

There have been a lot of discussions on this matter in the last 3 weeks between our committee and Mr. Bowles. I have repeatedly said that it is my opinion that just from the present flow sheet you will have OPA regulations anywhere from 3 to 10 years. Why do I say this? Because where the public—you and I—have built up in our own minds a conception that we must have a Government agency controlling our affairs to prevent you and you and you taking your cash and credits and converting them into goods and chattels, etc.—a Government agency standing here ready to serve that prevents us from making that conversion—and if you are to justify that that Government agency is to stay as long as you have those credits and currency at your command, how long do you think you will have an OPA?

If you are of the opinion that a Government agency must be maintained to prevent that, as long as you have buying power at your command, then the OPA will go on. Let us get rid of the philosophy and then you can rid yourselves of the controls.

How can you move $200,000,000,000 worth of buying power back into the market and do it quickly, simultaneously with reasonably full employment and high wages and salaries as under our present concept of paying the fellow for what he produces and all without great price inflation? Suppose in the calendar year of 1946 we produce $150,000,000,000 worth of goods and services, and the employees receive wages and salaries incident thereto and still hold in their hands $200,000,000,000 worth of buying power, which gives you $350,000,000,000 worth of buying power to buy $150,000,000,000 worth of goods.

I contend that if we have reasonably full employment and you and you and you have wages coming in, then it becomes unnecessary to cash in your War Savings bonds. You can let those bonds run, thus making it unnecessary for the Treasury to refund. I contend that under full employment there is no reason for you to liquidate the Government savings bonds you have. Reasonably full employment will answer at least a half a dozen great difficulties that will face us if we do not have reasonably full employment.

You have an opportunity to do some educational work on that particular phase. We go out and sell savings bonds to the payrollees and say to them that after the war they can cash them in and buy what they want. Why do we preach such philosophy? You cannot cash in and buy unless the goods are there to be bought. Go to the automobile industry, the refrigerator, and the household industry, and try to find goods to buy. If you cash in your bonds, where is the Treasury to get the money to cash those bonds with? Either from the printing press or the commercial banks. We do not want the dollars from either source because either increases the inflationary forces and makes it even worse than it is now. Do you see what I mean?

Suppose I take my savings and place them through the stock exchange into the capital goods structure and build a new plant to produce civilian goods and employ 1,000 people instead of taking those savings and buying some new household gadgets. That is the course you should be pointing out to the people of this country right now in every way that you can. That is, invest and employ and produce until we again have the goods.

What have you as a group done to teach the people of this country what freedom in the market place means? Show me a bulletin that you have issued. Show me an advertisement that you have run in the daily papers of this country. You have members who have put out a lot of perfectly grand individual discussions in this line, with limited circulation, going to a very highly intelligent group. But what have you done to educate the masses along the line I here mention? Send me copies of it and I will use it on the floor and try to advertise it for you. If you have not done such a thing, do you have a committee doing it? If your present income will not permit you to do so, then raise your fees, because I want a market place to liquidate securities if I am forced to do so. And I am depending on you for that market place. If I want that market place, I am willing to pay for it.

The OPA Price Policy as It Affects the Boiler and Radiator Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD E. CAMPBELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters received by me from two constituents of mine, William G. Heiner and Carl E. Glock, showing how the OPA price policy affects the boiler and radiator industry:

PITTSBURGH, *June 21, 1945.*

Hon. HOWARD E. CAMPBELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CAMPBELL: Again I am presuming upon your good offices to bring to your attention a matter which I believe

affects the general economy and particularly the boiler and radiator industry, in which I am interested. It is this:

The Office of Price Administration and everyone else naturally support an anti-inflationary price-control policy. In support of this policy, the OPA announced about a month ago that no industry-wide adjustment of ceiling prices of boilers and radiators will be made during the time when over-all profits are obtainable. This means that boiler and radiator manufacturing companies which have been making money up to now on the production and sale of war goods but which have been losing money on the production and sale of radiators and boilers will not be allowed an adjustment upwards of ceiling prices for boilers and radiators until the over-all profits of the industry or the manufacturing company have disappeared. Specifically, this policy could be illustrated as follows:

A boiler and radiator manufacturing company by reason of the war turned to the production of war goods and is at the present time making a profit on its war goods division of $100,000 a year, but is losing on its radiator and boiler division $90,000 a year. Because the net over-all profit is $10,000 a year, the OPA declines to consider any adjustment upward of boiler and radiator prices.

Immediately a number of questions come to mind when this policy is thus analyzed: What is going to happen to the company with the over-all net profit of $10,000 when within the very near future serious cut-backs in the production and sale of war goods will have taken place? What inducement is there to such a company to lay plans now for the future production of boilers and radiators under such a policy? Why must the company have an over-all loss before the OPA will consent to adjustment of ceiling prices upward?

It is a well-known fact that the demand for housing will be tremendous in the rather immediate future, but what boiler- and radiator-manufacturing company will attempt now to reconvert its facilities if it is to be restricted by the OPA so that its manufacturing, selling, and administrative costs exceed its net sales of boilers and radiators, to say nothing of profit on its invested capital? Is it not high time that Congress expressed in mandatory language to the OPA the adoption of a definite pricing policy for a given commodity which will permit the manufacturer at least to break even and induce him to formulate plans for reconversion? If OPA continues this over-all profit policy much longer, you may be assured that there will be plenty of unemployment in many normal peacetime industries.

I respectfully submit for your consideration the advisability of congressional action along this line so that manufacturers of peacetime goods will not refrain from reopening their closed plants, will not refrain from reconversion, and will not refrain from making improvements, on account of compulsory losses through OPA, but will go forward with increased employment and peacetime expansion hand in hand and simultaneous with cut-backs in the manufacture of war goods.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM G. HEINER.

REED, SMITH, SHAW & MCCLAY,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 22, 1945.

Hon. HOWARD E. CAMPBELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: This letter relates specifically to OPA price policy in the boiler and radiation industry but the principle involves our business economy generally and congressional action is mandatory in directing OPA policy so as to prevent a disastrous economic dislocation.

In 1942 OPA established ceiling prices on boilers and radiators below prevailing prices. Thereafter wage and material costs were allowed to increase without any compensating increase in sale price. OPA has justified this squeeze under its policy of not adjusting price ceilings so long as an industry is making an over-all profit on war production. It has come about, however, in the boiler and radiation industry, generally speaking, that manufacturing costs are now higher than ceiling prices and work will cease unless relief is given.

The consequence of OPA's rigid squeeze policy is obvious. As manufacturers cease war production, they will not be able to assume normal production until they are allowed to charge prices which will be sufficient to pay their workmen, buy materials, meet their overhead, and procure capital.

OPA's resistance to price adjustments has been so determined and its delays so calculated that individual manufacturers ceasing war work are going to be obliged to cease manufacture of losing items. The OPA policy of "industry-wide adjustments" will not meet the emergency. Public demand for the products of this industry is very urgent and not only will the consuming public suffer from the lack of heating equipment, but the employees of the industry will have no work. The whole building program will be impeded.

Apparently OPA has been mesmerized by the catch word of "profit control" as a preventive of inflation, forgetting all about wage increases and material costs.

My interest in writing you arises from the fact that I have stock interest in radiation concerns, my brother does work in plumbing and heating and, in my own legal work, I see the operations of one large radiator manufacturer.

I understand that the OPA problem is being considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee. I believe that Congress should intervene in the pricing policy of OPA and require that manufacturers be allowed recovery of their normal manufacturing costs. Furthermore, OPA should be required to render reasonably prompt price decisions to forestall their pigeonhole policy of delay.

I hope that you will be in position to urge relief in the situation.

Respectfully yours,

CARL E. GLOCK.

Catholics and Jews During the Terror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., a national publication:

CATHOLICS AND JEWS DURING THE TERROR

Some day, when the fighting is all finished and we've time to sit down and think things over, a freshet of learned books about the war will be written. Here's a suggestion for a stimulating little volume which could do a great deal of good. Let some author with a talent for research write on Catholics and Jews during the Hitler terror. The idea is this: Go through Europe and take depositions from those Jewish families which found refuge in Catholic homes, orphanages, convents, rectories, and the Vatican itself when Hitler's pogrom was foaming at the mouth all over occupied Europe.

In the foreword to this unwritten history, this history which may never appear in print, the author should indicate that the Catholics who gave harborage in these circumstances did so at the risk of their lives.

How many Catholic families opened their doors to Jews during the worst terror the race has known? There are no statistics; one can only estimate. But the number must be enormous. Every week the N. C. W. C. has some more testimony on this point. For example, here's a fairly late dispatch quoting from the Jewish organization, Office Israelite, which warmly praises Cardinal Van Roey, archbishop of Malines. This source lauds "the admirable conduct of the Catholic clergy in Belgium." Through the cardinal's intercession, it is stated, "Several religious communities shielded Jews from the Gestapo and sheltered numerous Jewish children."

If this case is isolated, if it were one of only a few instances, one could draw no particular conclusion from it. But actually such incidents are innumerable. If the witnesses were Catholics, the legal value of their testimony might be impaired. But the fact is that these tributes are all voluntary and that they come from the Jewish people themselves. And Israel, freed now from the shadow, is little disposed to praise where praise is not due.

In the light of evidence now before us (and there must be countless other instances) it's a reasonable assertion that not only were European Catholics guiltless of anti-Semitism but they took dangerous risks to afford Jewish fugitives a refuge from the storm.

This story would make a noble book. Students have spent months on doctorate theses far less important. Let's hope someone may write a book on Catholics and Jews during the Hitler terror. Such a study could rout and scatter the campaign now in progress to create an unreal antagonism between Catholics and Jews. Because, to suppose the impossible, if a Hitler by another name were to take over New England, Catholics and Jews, as in Europe, would be found bearing one another's burdens, sheltering one another at the risk of life. And nowhere would this driven people find a braver and warmer hospitality than in that Boston, stigmatized by false friends of Jewry a hotbed of anti-Semitism. Write it in letters of flame—Catholics cannot be anti-Semites. Catholics are not anti-Semites.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the record, I should like to say that I listened with a great deal of interest to the great speech of our colleague, Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, on the pending amendment concerning the extension of the Fair Employment Practice Act. I endorse his stand. As he says, there is a pent-up feeling in this country against bureaucracy. One George Washington Carver does more for racial agreement and understanding than 10,000 statutes. We can work out our differences and misunderstandings.

Unknown Heroines of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, after every war, due honor and respect have been paid by a grateful people to the men who had taken up arms in the defense of our country. After World War I, special attention was given to the unknown hero of that bloody holocaust. After the Civil War, tribute was also extended to the women by dedicating the Red Cross Building to their service.

Bravery is not confined to the men in the armed services alone. Women have always played an important role in war, as well as peace. Women are often responsible for the accomplishments of men, either as a source of inspiration or through actual physical participation. Many women in their own right have performed distinguished service to our country.

In the present conflict women are a part of each of our armed and civilian services and are carrying out their duties with distinction. Their work, however, is of such a nature as not to lend itself to the spectacular and consequently does not gain nearly the recognition it deserves. The millions of mothers, wives, sweethearts, and sisters of the men in the services are carrying on tasks that aid considerably in keeping up the job on the home front and in maintaining morale on the fighting front. They have aided in speeding up production by leaving their homes to take their places in war plants. They are buying bonds and contributing to the blood bank. They write cheerful letters to those at the front. They remember their loved ones in their daily prayers.

It is proper and fitting that a grateful nation pay homage to these unknown heroines of World War II, who are playing such an important role in the victory we have gained in Europe and shall yet realize in the Pacific. Recognition of these unknown heroines, whether they be in the armed forces, Red Cross, or other services, in the war plants, or in our homes, is the very least we can do in appreciation of their job so well done.

Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced H. R. 3797—a bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to erect at a suitable location in the Arlington National Cemetery a shrine typifying the spirit of the Madonna and dedicated to the unknown heroine of World War II—in recognition of the services and sacrifices at home and abroad of the women of America in this global struggle.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith a copy of a resolution approved and adopted August 26, 1944, by the Wisconsin Elks Association "to memorialize Congress to have erected a shrine typifying the spirit of the Madonna and dedicated to God's great galaxy The Unknown Heroine."

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolution 5

Whereas there never was a fatal shot fired on the field of battle, save that which found lodgment in a woman's heart; and

Whereas there is many an unknown heroine who nightly retires with bowed head and bleeding heart prayerfully hopeful of an honored and safe return of her soldier boy; and

Whereas there is many a Red Cross nurse, many a modern Betsy Ross who, through service and sacrifice on foreign fields and at home, offering their lives on the altar of our country's cause, who are entitled to rank with the men who responded to our country's call: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Wisconsin Elks Association in convention assembled memorialize Congress to have erected in Arlington Cemetery a shrine typifying the spirit of the Madonna and dedicated to God's great galaxy The Unknown Heroine.

WISCONSIN ELKS ASSOCIATION.

Proposed and unanimously adopted August 26, 1944.

Boston Transocean Port for Three Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., Friday, July 6, 1945:

BOSTON TRANSOCEAN PORT FOR THREE LINES—CAB AUTHORIZATION ADVANCES PLAN TO DEVELOP MAJOR TERMINAL

Successfully over the highest obstacle in the development of Boston as a foremost terminal in this country for trans-Atlantic air travel—the granting of authorization by the Civil Aeronautics Board yesterday to three of the largest commercial air carriers to operate North Atlantic routes out of this city—aviation and civic leaders last night moved to hasten actual operation of the services.

Meanwhile, on all sides it was agreed that the decision of the CAB was the greatest victory thus far in the battle to put Boston at the top in international aviation.

"Boston finally has won its fight for recognition as an overseas air terminal, recognition of its strategic location on the northern Great Circle route to Europe, its potential traffic-generating possibilities, and its far-reaching airport development program," M. D. Liming, managing director of the chamber of commerce, jubilantly pointed out.

The city's next move, officials asserted, will be to have the Logan International Airport, at East Boston, ready for the big four-motored trans-Atlantic planes when the Government releases them for civilian service, or new ones for commercial purposes are available.

Recipients of authorization to fly the Atlantic out of Boston were: Pan-American Airways, Inc., Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., and the American Airlines by virtue of its acquisition of American Export Airlines. American and TWA have been flying domestic routes out of Logan airport for some time.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES

With its decision, the CAB also approved acquisition by the American Airlines of the American Export Airlines. The combination will form the world's first air transportation system of its kind, and for the first time will provide one-system service from inland as well as the coastal cities of North America to the cities of the British Island and the European Continent.

The head of the TWA, Jack Frye, last night told the Herald that "in the natural expansion which will occur from the development of the new route there will be job opportunities for our war veterans and for many others interested in air transportation."

Referring to his organization, Frye said, "Our entire effort is now devoted to transportation across the Atlantic under the contract to the Air Transport Command, and across the United States in connection with the transfer of military activities from Europe to the Pacific."

RUNWAYS NEXT YEAR

"The date of the inauguration of commercial service over the new route will depend on getting these jobs done and on the completion of the necessary arrangements with foreign governments," Frye added.

Liming, meanwhile, explained that "until the many necessary governmental agreements can be worked out by these three carriers and until war conditions permit the acquisition of new equipment these new overseas routes cannot be operated."

"In the meantime," he said, "work is going on apace at the Logan International Airport, and the three new 7,000-foot paved runways for which the commonwealth recently appropriated additional millions ought to be ready next year.

MAJOR TERMINAL

"With the frequent domestic service now afforded by five great air lines, the completion of the new runways and the inauguration of transatlantic service, Boston can claim to be a major international air terminus."

American Export, the line acquired by American Airlines, now is operating three commercial round-trip flights weekly between New York and Foynes, Eire. The authorization issued yesterday permits operation from New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Detroit, and Chicago to Labrador, Greenland to Stavanger, Stockholm, Helsinki, Leningrad, and Moscow; and also, by way of Newfoundland and the Azores, to Foynes, Glasgow, London, Amsterdam, Copenhagen, Berlin, Warsaw, and Moscow.

EIGHT THOUSAND CROSSINGS

American Airlines paid $3,000,000 for treasury stock of American Export, obtaining approximately 51 percent of the corporation's outstanding stock. American Airlines, serving as contract carrier for the Army Transport Command since October 1942, has made more than 7,800 over-ocean flights, including 7,000 crossings of the Atlantic, up to May 31.

The decision certifies TWA to operate from Boston and other American terminals, through 16 foreign countries. For more than 3½ years, TWA's intercontinental division has been operating over the northern and southern Atlantic under contract with the ATC, with about 8,000 crossings.

Pan American Airways is the only United States air carrier that heretofore has had permanent authorization from the CAB for flying service across the north Atlantic.

Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, recently there was mailed to me an origi-

nal poem entitled "Truth," by William Ewald, of Montclair, N. J. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH

Truth bottled up
And slyly choked
Becomes a lie
Though never spoke.

Truth dethroned.
Trickery acclaimed.
Where are the voices
Crying "Shame!"?

O Truth! O Truth!
Who barricades your way?
A Renaissance of Truth
Is man's great need today.

—*William Ewald.*

Cardinal Principles of an International Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I insert the following plan for an international world charter:

CONGRESSMAN WHITE'S PLAN FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CHARTER

The United Nations, in order to maintain peace and prevent war, will create no supergovernment, and will insure the retention of complete sovereignty of every nation.

The nations subscribing to the charter will establish

A WORLD COURT

to be composed of proportionate representatives of the several nations, with an

INTERNATIONAL WORLD COMMISSION

with power to settle international grievances and prevent aggression and invasion of any nation, implemented with an international army and navy, each country to have proportionate representation on the Commission and supply a relative quota of the policing force;

The personnel composing the policing force not to be permitted to serve in the country of which they are nationals;

The Commission to maintain freedom of the air and freedom of the seas with universal disarmament;

No nation to be permitted to maintain a navy or armed force above its domestic policing requirements;

All international disputes to be settled by the Commission under the rules of judicial procedure with right of appeal to the World Court, whose decision shall be final and enforced by the International Commission.

The nations subscribing to the charter will establish an

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

in which the monetary unit of the several governments subscribing to the Charter of the United Nations shall be made standard by weight and fineness to the metals gold and silver at a ratio of relative value to be fixed by international agreement.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, since a majority of the Members of Congress have provided for a continuation of the grossly misnamed and highly un-American agency designated as Fair Employment Practice Commission, let us all hope that in the year's extension people throughout the country will become fully aware of the effect of the law.

Those of us who are fortunate enough to live in the South, for which fact we are everlastingly grateful, are immediately charged with sectionalism or race prejudice in fighting FEPC. This charge, of course, is unfounded, because we fight this pernicious agency, not as southerners but as Americans.

From the coast of Massachusetts to San Francisco Bay, from Puget Sound to the Gulf of Mexico, America is singing the national anthem, America the Beautiful, and God Bless America. If we listen intently, we hear her praying, "God save America." Millions of the finest of young American manhood are in the defense forces and millions of workers are keeping defense machinery whirling. But patriotism must not end here, for the soil will not be worth saving unless the soul of America can be saved first.

Today our Nation is confronted with momentous problems that affect us all. It is time for us to take inventory of the rights and privileges we enjoy as citizens of this United States of America. It is time for us to make certain that we appreciate these privileges. It is time for us to ask ourselves just what kind of citizens we are, and to make certain that we are the kind of citizens who will safeguard these rights and privileges for ourselves and our children; that we are the kind of citizens who will not be trapped by any foreign "ism" or permit any propaganda to break our faith in our Government. That it is time for us to do our part in our communities to awaken an active appreciation of what we enjoy to overcome an apathetic acceptance which is all too often present.

We propose to be more and more American.

We believe that we can best serve our own country and most successfully discharge our obligations to humanity by continuing to be openly and candidly, intensely and scrupulously, American. If we have any heritage, it has been that. If we have any destiny, we have found it in that direction.

The United States is much more than a geographical location. It is the destiny of a masterful, pioneering people, fundamentally determined to be free. It is the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution with a system of local self-government.

As a Nation, we believe in self-protection. We should follow a policy which will guarantee our future strength. When we participate in international affairs, we should at all times, when our interests come in conflict with those of other nations, act first for the best interests of America.

This means nothing more—it can be nothing less—than self preservation.

The so-called Fair Employment Practice Act proposes that "Individuals shall have the right to work without discrimination against them because of their race, color, national origin, or ancestry."

At this point, I quote from an address by John Temple Graves, delivered at America's Town Meeting of the Air on February 17, 1944.

Mr. Graves said:

Negroes and white people don't hate each other in the Southern States. They may not treat each other right, but they don't hate each other. Or they didn't until this wartime fallacy began to be agitated by outsiders.

We have to do too much business with each other down there to hate the way they do in other places. In New York are millions of white people who didn't know any Negroes at all. In the South, no such segregation as that exists. All whites and all blacks have some dealing with members of the other race. We may quarrel and be unjust, but we simply can't afford to hate each other. It isn't practical. And the time has come when it isn't practical anywhere else.

If Negro populations in the South were confined to only 4 percent of the total as in New York or only 2 percent as in California, we think we could handle them with no trouble at all.

There are 40,000,000 people in the South and 10,000,000 are Negroes. There are 90,000,000 people in the rest of the country and only 3,000,000 are Negroes.

It's in the South that the two races have to get along together in greatest numbers and proximities, and it's there that the problem has to be worked out. The solution affects the rest of the country, yes; but that doesn't make it any the less a southern problem—a matter for States' rights, if you will.

I know they are enemies, not friends, of States' rights who mean only the right of the selfish to be let alone in selfishness, of the strong to prey on the weak, of the backward to hold the forward back, of the chain gangs of prejudice to stop the march of time. I know that States which demand rights must recognize duties—and see lights. But I know that the race question and many other questions can be settled only at home. This recurring States' rights cry is the old American one for local self-government—the old demand of the community, the individual, to make their own ways. It's the thing for which we are winning this war, not a war for democracy but a war for States' rights—for the right of individual lands, not to be invaded by outsiders, not to be dictated to or aggressed against; and even as we win a war for that principle a great political reaction in America is directed at the same principle—the settlement of problems at home.

Not all the laws this Nation can pass, not all the excitement this Nation's race leaders can create, not all the Federal bureaus laid end to end can force 30,000,000 white people of the South to do what they are passionately and deeply resolved not to do in race relationships. Right or wrong, they feel that something as vital as this war—as dear as life itself—is involved for them. However you may judge them, you are bound to face that fact about them, and the depth of that feeling.

Let us hope that before the expiration of this year's extension of FEPC the full and complete truth will be known and that those who are espousing the cause of this destructive agency will receive little encouragement for making it permanent.

Veterans' Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered recently over the Five Radio Stations network in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan:

My friends in the Twelfth District, we have heard a great deal during the course of the war, and now with the collapse of Germany, will hear a great deal more about the veteran problem. That there is a veteran problem is an indisputable and acknowledged fact. There is a unanimity among all groups—politicians, community leaders, industrialists, labor union heads—that "nothing is to good for our boys." This feeling is, I believe, a genuine one, growing out of a real sense of gratitude and responsibility. Unfortunately, there is a wide disparity between promise and performance when it comes to really doing something for the boys.

The War Department's plan for demobilization anticipates the release of about 2,000,000 men during the next 12 months. Eventually, when complete victory is achieved, 12,000,000 men will be veterans of World War II.

This is a sizable portion of our adult population. The manner in which the country absorbs these ex-soldiers, sailors, and marines back into civilian life will have profound effects on all the population.

High as is the motive of gratitude for service well done, the additional motive of national welfare must be taken into account in our attitude toward the veteran.

It is not generally appreciated that already a million and a half men have already been discharged from the armed services of the United States. A review of the treatment these men have received and their reaction to that treatment will forecast the problem, and perhaps the solution of it, when their number has swelled to 12,000,000.

From conversations I have had with returned servicemen and with their families, and from reports by various committees and organizations concerned with veterans' activities, I believe that it is fair to say that most veterans are disappointed with the treatment they have received.

The loud promises of reward for war sacrifices, the much-publicized GI bill of rights, the sentimentalizing of war heroes—all these have held out to the returning serviceman a promise of a better and richer life after he ceases to be a soldier, or sailor, or marine.

The cold reality of the day when he has been processed out of the service and becomes a civilian again brings swift disillusionment.

Everyone wants to help the veteran, but few are capable of giving him what he needs quickly, without red tape and without humiliation. There are a myriad of organizations eager to help him—fraternal, community, service organizations—in addition to the Veterans' Administration of the Government. By actual count there are 62 separate organizations which are recognized by the Veterans' Administration as properly concerned with the problem of the veteran.

He applies at one place for a job, another for legal aid, another for financial and, and still another for medical aid.

Of course the inevitable result of this is confusion, inefficiency, duplication of effort, and frustration for the veteran who is the object of all this disordered helpfulness.

In the Federal Government alone there are these departments or bureaus to whom the veteran must go for various kinds of aid or information; the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, the War or Navy Departments, the Veterans' Administration, the Veterans' Placement Service Board, the Selective Service System, the United States Employment Service, the United States Civil Service Commission, and the American Red Cross.

Now, with the war still in progress and jobs not yet scarce, most veterans have been able to find what they most want, and need; that is a job. This basic need is not going to be so easily filled when the war is over and when 12,000,000 ex-servicemen join America's work force. It will be then that the real test of the veterans' program will come.

The men now in service have an idealized concept of what their rights under the GI bill of rights will be. Ill-advised and widespread talk of superseniority for veterans has led servicemen to expect that they, at any rate, will be able to get jobs even when jobs are scarce.

As a matter of cold fact, even by estimates of the Selective Service System, only about 2,500,000 men in service have any seniority claim to a job when the war is over.

I feel that comparatively few veterans and servicemen feel that the country owes them a living. Most of them do feel that they should be restored to the status in life they would have had if they had not gone to war.

This restoration of the veteran to a position in civilian life comparable to what he would have had had he not been drafted, or enlisted, is the objective of the GI bill of rights.

When first adopted by Congress this bill was hailed widely as the answer to the "veteran problem." It has many excellent features and does try to meet the actual needs of the veteran. But, in practice and from the viewpoint of the men already subject to its benefits, the bill has many shortcomings.

Under the bill as now written, the veteran can resume his education if he was under 24 when he entered service and if he can live on $50 a month; he can get the Government to guarantee up to $2,000 of a loan at 4-percent interest to buy a house, a farm or to go into business, but only if the lending agency, which is not the Government, thinks he is a good risk; he can get up to $20 per week unemployment compensation for up to 52 weeks if he is unemployed through no fault of his own within 2 years after his discharge or after the end of the war, whichever is greater.

All of these are good provisions, as far as they go, and they have been looked upon by most servicemen as pretty fair protection for them after the war. The administration of the law has shown up its inadequacies, and has also shown up the shortcomings in the agencies charged with the administration of the law.

As the law now stands it provides inadequate economic protection for the veteran, and gives no assurance of being able to stand up under the avalanche of claims from the 12,000,000 potential veterans.

Scores of amendments to the law have been proposed and it is very likely that some amendments, or a totally new law, will be adopted this session of Congress.

Many of these proposed amendments seek to honestly correct the law so that the veteran as well as the country will benefit. Others were obvious demagoguery, designed to make political capital for their proponents.

Not only is it necessary, in my view, that the law be revised, liberalized both as to the amount of benefits and to its coverage, but more intelligent provision for administration of the law must be made. The administrative agency, or agencies, must be streamlined to fit the colossal job facing them.

Not the least of the complaints of veterans of this war is that their claims, or inquiries, get so bogged down in red tape that sometimes it seems simpler not to bother with them at all, and try to work out the problems individually, without the aid of the Government.

I don't believe that any charge of administrative carelessness can be correctly directed at the Veterans' Administration, as it is now constituted. I have many occasions to observe the workings of the agency, and it is my observation that it is honestly and, within its limits, efficiently run. General Hines has done a magnificent job of rescuing the Administration from the scandalous reputation it earned under its previous Administrator, Colonel Forbes.

Unfortunately, the Veterans' Administration was set up to administer to the needs of the veterans of World War I, and has not yet been streamlined to meet the vastly increased and more complex needs of the veterans of World War II. I don't see how it could avoid confusion, red tape, and delay with the inadequate staff and facilities it now has. This is a situation that is crying for correction. It will take more than just additional appropriations. Careful planning as to the scope and intent of the Administration must be undertaken.

All of us must keep in mind the very important fact that the transition from war to peace is one of the most difficult shifts an individual can make. Both in our personal attitudes and in legislative proposals this must be remembered. I don't mean that all veterans must be treated as psychiatric cases. There isn't anything a veteran resents more than good intentioned coddling or babying. He does have very special problems of adjustment, however, which must be recognized.

Not only must they be recognized through improved legislation and expanded Government facilities, a coherent, comprehensive veterans program, designed to serve the ex-servicemen as well as the country as a whole, must include national and State legislation plus intelligent community action.

There is a danger that unscrupulous propaganda can take hold in veterans groups, propaganda against labor, against minority groups, against the Government.

The best possible answer to this threat is intelligent understanding by the people of the community as to what the real needs of the veteran are, what his hopes are.

There are many very real and very difficult individual problems of ex-servicemen, but the one overriding problem of the veteran is the same as the problem of the whole community. That is how to create a democratic, prosperous America in a world organized against war.

The veteran is learning already that his job is not safe when other men are without jobs. He is learning that his security is part of the security of the whole community. More than anything else, more than special benefits or compensation, what the veteran recognizes as the solution to his problem is the establishment of a postwar economy in which he and all men and women who need to work can find jobs. They do not want a Government handout or retirement in an old soldiers home. They do want what they fought for, peace and prosperity for them-

selves and for their children. They are a challenge to the rest of the country, to the Government, to see that this goal is attained.

Uncle Sam Still Playing Santa Claus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following Associated Press article appeared in the Washington Daily News of July 12, 1945:

UNITED STATES CONTINUING MEAT SHIPMENTS TO SOVIET RUSSIA THREE MORE MONTHS

The United States Army will stop supplying food to civilians in liberated Europe August 31, it was learned today.

The action will save American taxpayers millions of dollars but it is not expected to mean more food for United States civilians because purchase and distribution at about the same level will be handled by the liberated governments themselves.

At the same time it was disclosed that the United States, contrary to earlier announcements, would continue lend-lease shipments of meat to Russia during July, August, and September.

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION POUNDS

New food allocations for the Soviet include 25,000,000 pounds of meat in the form of toshonka, a canned pork and beef combination. No other United States meat will go abroad in the 3-month period except to the armed forces.

The other scheduled Russian shipments are 25,000,000 pounds of flour, 5,000,000 pounds of butter or other oil, 2,000,000 pounds of cheese, 4,000,000 pounds of dry peas, 2,500,000 pounds of dehydrated vegetables, and 2,000,000 pounds of dried milk.

Agriculture Department officials said the Russians had requested 430,000 tons of food for the last 6 months of 1945. The 3-month allocations amount to less than 30,000 tons.

SEVEN-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR CHORE

The United States Army has handled approximately half of all food shipped from this country for European civilians but has been gradually relinquishing the relief job since early spring. The Army estimates it has distributed more than $700,000,000 worth of goods, mostly food, in Europe in the past 2 years.

The Army stopped feeding of French civilians April 30. In the Balkans the relief job was turned over to UNRRA at the end of May. Present plans are to halt the relief programs in western Europe, including Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, and Norway, at the end of August.

Relief foods still will be supplied by the United States in its contributions to UNRRA; American food also will be distributed in Italy by the Foreign Economic Administration.

It is gratifying to note that shipments to some foreign countries have ceased. But it is not gratifying to our people to note the tremendous quantities that are still being shipped abroad and to be told how much more is to be sent to Russia and other European countries.

The people of this country want our servicemen to be properly fed and clothed. We all insist upon that first. But why should we continue to supply food and other commodities to countries whose borders we are scarcely allowed to enter, and without knowing what their needs are or what is being done with the provisions we are furnishing? Many wonder if our enemy Japan is benefiting from some of these shipments. We all remember the errors committed by this country and those in charge of our Government before Pearl Harbor. We furnished Japan with scrap iron, steel, oil, gasoline, and many other things that enabled Japan to wage a cruel war against the United States. Is Japan still getting some of the things she needs from us with which to fight us?

Medal of Honor to Private (First Class) Merli

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, granted to me on Thursday, July 12, I wish to have included the following:

On last Saturday evening at Scranton, Pa., the citizens of my congressional district joined with the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, Hon. Edward J. Martin, in showing our esteem, respect, and love for Gino Merli, private first class, who was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor on Friday, June 15, at noon by the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, of Missouri.

Among the remarks on that occasion made by me, I read from the press release issued by the United States Army, as follows:

MEDAL OF HONOR TO PRIVATE (FIRST CLASS) MERLI

President Truman, on Friday, June 15, at noon, presented the Medal of Honor to Pfc Gino J. Merli, infantryman, of Peckville, Pa., for gallantry in action beyond the call of duty and at risk of his life.

Private Merli's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Egisto Merli, 608 Ridge Road, Peckville, were present at the ceremony, which took place at the White House.

A member of the Eighteenth Infantry Regiment, First Infantry Division, Private Merli repeatedly feigned death under probing German bayonets and then continued to fire his machine gun on the enemy overrunning his position during a night battle last September 4–5, near Sars-la-Bruyère, Belgium.

The citation for the Medal of Honor reads:

"Pfc Gino J. Merli, Eighteenth Infantry, was serving as a machine gunner in the vicinity of Sars-la-Bruyère, Belgium, on the night of September 4–5, 1944, when his company was attacked by a superior German force. Its position was overrun and he was surrounded when our troops were driven back by overwhelming numbers and fire power.

"Disregarding the fury of the enemy fire concentrated on him, he maintained his position, covering the withdrawal of our riflemen and breaking the force of the enemy pressure. His assistant machine gunner was killed and the position captured; the other eight members of the section were forced to surrender; Private Merli slumped down beside the dead assistant gunner and feigned death.

"No sooner had the enemy group withdrawn than he was up and firing in all directions. Once more his position was taken and the captors found two apparently lifeless bodies. Throughout the night Private Merli stayed at his weapon.

"By daybreak the enemy had suffered heavy losses, and as our troops launched an assault, asked for a truce. Our negotiating party, who accepted the German surrender, found Private Merli still at his gun. On the battlefield lay 52 enemy dead, 19 of whom were directly in front of the gun. Private Merli's gallantry and courage, and the losses and confusion that he caused the enemy, contributed materially to our victory."

First Lt. Albert C. Packwood, Jr., executive officer of Private Merli's company, reported that the determined stand by Private Merli took the heart out of the Germans.

"The following day 700 Germans surrendered, 85 other enemy infantrymen came in from patrols and surrendered, and 100 wounded were captured," he said.

Lieutenant Packwood, whose home was 1407 Grand Avenue, Dallas, Tex., was reported killed in action during the First Division's sweep through Germany last March 19.

As the Germans swept forward in the full fury of their attack, members of Private Merli's machine-gun section were taken prisoner, then released the following day by the counterattacking doughboys. Among these was Corp. Lyle E. Kuenzer, of Bear Lake, Mich., who related:

"As the enemy riflemen overran Private Merli's position, he slumped to the ground and lay beside his dead assistant gunner. The troops entered the emplacement and prodded Private Merli and his dead comrade with their bayonets.

"Assuming both were dead, they continued their assault on our withdrawing troops. As they left, he jumped to the machine gun and opened fire on them. He continued to deliver effective fire, which enabled the withdrawal of our men with a minimum of casualties.

"The enemy again attacked the emplacement but found only two apparently lifeless bodies. This time, to satisfy themselves, they turned each body over with their bayonets.

"They hadn't gone 10 yards when Private Merli opened up on them with the machine gun. As each attacking wave rushed the emplacement he played dead and then kept up the fire. Private Merli stayed at his weapon and broke up each assault wave all through the night."

When it was apparent the German attack would carry through the American lines, members of Private Merli's section discussed withdrawing, but realized the weapon would have to be abandoned. Sgt. Milton V. Kokoszka, of 121 Lewis Street, Chester, Pa., reported:

"We knew the enemy would have us surrounded very quickly," he said. "Private Merli said, 'I'm staying,' and the rest of us stayed too. Just back of the position I saw two of the enemy get to within 5 yards of the gun and kill his assistant gunner with a bullet. Their fire damaged the water jacket of the gun. He swung the gun around and killed these two.

"The enemy passed on both sides and we realized we were surrounded. They came in from all sides and I realized Private Merli couldn't fire in all directions at once. The rest of us had to surrender.

"I noticed he had not been taken prisoner and after we'd moved some distance I heard our machine gun open fire again. He had pretended to be dead to escape capture. I saw different enemy groups move into the emplacement and the gun would stop firing

but start up again as soon as they left. Next morning, when we were recaptured, I saw Private Merli.

"He was covered with the blood of the dead assistant gunner. His clothing was tattered and cut where they'd probed at him with bayonets."

Second Lt. Harry Kelly, whose home is 1632 East Thirty-sixth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., described the fury of the fighting thus:

"The enemy pushed through from sheer weight of numbers and overpowering fire. Only Private Merli's gun remained to cover the withdrawal of our troops. All the fury of the enemy centered on this lone gun. The area was criss-crossed by tracer bullets and lighted by shell bursts. It was Private Merli's last chance to withdraw and he knew it. But he stayed on.

"The bayonet assault on our line swept past his position and engulfed it. But in spite of the large number of grenades that were exploding, his gun continued to fire. I saw the fire of the gun swing in a complete circle and for short periods it would stop, then start up again."

"By daybreak," Lieutenant Packwood's report concluded, "the enemy was tired and frustrated. They had suffered heavy losses. When they saw that our assault was coming, they surrendered."

Private Merli was born in Scranton, Pa., May 13, 1924. He entered the Army November 28, 1942, and in the fighting of the First Infantry Division in France last August 25 was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for heroic achievement in action against the enemy. He also wears the Purple Heart for a wound suffered in action in Germany October 10, 1944.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the servicemen present, as well as all servicemen in my district, I include in my remarks a summary of the provisions made by Congress for the service men and women of World War II. As part of those remarks I include the following:

In order to aid returning service men and women to bridge the gap from war activities to peacetime activities and to readjust themselves in civil life the Congress has enacted measures forming a comprehensive program providing such rights and benefits as are needed to assist in this readjustment.

The following are among the outstanding benefits that have been provided for honorably discharged veterans of the present war:

Mustering-out payments from $100 to $300 are automatically made to tide over the immediate period after discharge.

Government insurance, which is provided during service, may be converted into ordinary life or 20-payment life.

Former jobs, whether with the Federal Government or in private employment, must be held for the veteran, if applied for within 90 days after discharge.

The Government guarantees 50 percent of loans up to $2,000 for the purchase, construction, or improvement of homes, farms, and business property.

For those who entered the service before the age of 25, and upon proof of interruption of education if over that age, 1 year's educational training is accorded; and upon satisfactory completion of the 1 year, additional education or training is granted equivalent to length of service. While the veteran is pursuing a course of training he may be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 if without a dependent or $75 if he has dependents.

An unemployment allowance of $20 a week is provided up to 52 weeks, depending upon length of service.

A Veterans Placement Service Board is created to assist the United States Employment Service so as to provide veterans the maximum opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

Preference is given to veterans in employment in the Federal civil service.

Disability pensions ranging from $11.50 a month to $115 a month, depending upon the degree of disability, are allowed.

Seeing-eye dogs trained to aid blind persons are furnished to blind veterans.

The period of service up to 2 years is allowed to be deducted from the 3 years' residence required under the homestead laws.

The Production of Natural Rubber in Continental United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the acute shortage of natural rubber has forced the American people to give consideration to the importance of providing a supply of this vital commodity within our own boundaries in order that we might not again find ourselves lacking in such an essential and strategic produce. We have invested nearly a billion dollars of tax money in the erection of synthetic-rubber plants. This synthetic production was absolutely essential, but it has not solved our entire rubber problem. We still need natural rubber. The only practical source of natural rubber in continental United States seems to be the guayule plant. This House has passed legislation establishing a floor price for domestically produced guayule. I believe this is a sound policy. I believe our first duty is to provide the United States with a dependable domestic supply of every possible strategic material. It was on this basis that this legislation was prepared.

Recently Members of Congress, and I suppose other citizens, have received a pamphlet from one of the large rubber companies pointing out certain objections to the proposed legislation. It is true that the suggested objections are from an entirely different standpoint and do not take into consideration the strategic needs of the Nation. I think most Americans will agree that our national defense is of primary importance, but we cannot and should not overlook the advice and suggestions of those who have attained a position in the rubber industry as outstanding as that occupied by Mr. Litchfield. I have, therefore, thought that it was proper to invite Mr. Litchfield to elaborate on his suggestions. On yesterday I directed to him the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1945.

HON. P. W. LITCHFIELD,
Chairman of the Board,
The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.,
Akron, Ohio.

DEAR MR. LITCHFIELD: A copy of your recent pamphlet on guayule has just reached me. Personally, I do not live in a guayule-producing area, although my home State, Texas, is one of those in which guayule may be cultivated on a commercial basis at some time in the future. I have, nevertheless, been much interested in the development of this plant as a means of providing our Nation with the kind of insurance policy that General Eisenhower had in mind when he, in 1931, recommended the planting of 400,000 acres of guayule.

I know that you are thoroughly familiar with the entire rubber industry and that you have devoted years to a study of its problems. Together with other Members of Congress, I served on a subcommittee which made a brief study of the availability of natural rubber in the United States, but, of course, we claim no such knowledge as you possess. We are, however, very deeply concerned with getting the facts. We do not understand that the statements contained in your pamphlet are in accord with the information heretofore given to us. We sincerely hope that you will be kind enough to appear before the House Committee on Agriculture at the earliest convenient date and give us the benefit of your knowledge of this subject and to help us to reconcile, insofar as may be possible, the conflicting information that has been presented.

If we have arrived at erroneous conclusions, or if we have misinterpreted the information heretofore available to us, I am sure you will want to set us straight that we may not lead the Congress into any ill-advised action. If there should happen to be factors in connection with the development of guayule that have not been brought to your attention, I am sure you would want us to suggest them that you might correct any erroneous impression that your publication might have produced. It may be that you cannot conveniently come to Washington at once. Therefore, I feel that it might be helpful if I would point out some of the matters where there was a lack of full agreement. You will doubtless desire to elaborate on your views by mail pending a personal meeting.

You indicate that it would be well to continue to replant the existing 32,000 acres of guayule that we have in California. These plantings were made by the United States Government on leased land. I have not felt that it was desirable to have the Government in the business of producing guayule or any other crop when that production could be shifted into private hands. I would like to have your views on the desirability of continuing this operation as a Government project. Do you believe that the Government can ever produce any crop on a large scale as cheaply as private enterprise can? If you do not believe that direct Government operation is the proper method of maintaining these guayule plantings, how would you suggest that they should be continued?

I am sure that you will keep in mind the fact that most of the large rubber companies have evidenced no interest whatever in taking over these operations, or at least that they did not evidence any interest until a contract was let to Firestone to mill out the rubber now in California. As soon as that contract was let, your company and other companies expressed a deep interest in handling some of this guayule.

I am also interested in your comments that guayule may be expected to develop on a 4-year crop cycle. I hope this is a correct estimate, but the best estimates we have been able to get are that it will take at least a 5-year cycle to secure an economical production. Of course, as you say, the cycle may be shortened, but if it is, the cost of rubber will be increased.

Possibly you have some information that has not come to our attention. If you have, we would appreciate it because your estimates, of course, indicate at least a 20 percent greater production of guayule rubber than we have felt was possible with the present knowledge of the plant. We recognize, of course, that progress is being made both in regard to the breeding of the plant, its cultivation, and the processing of the rubber and that all of these may contribute to a larger production and a reduced cost.

As an example, you suggest, "In present practice the whole shrub is ground up, therefore, it must be replanted." While this correctly describes the present practice, much experimental work is being done with the practice that involves the cutting of the shrub just above the ground and the growth of a new crop from the old roots. It is impossible at this time to say whether this will prove to be an economical practice or not, but the point is that the same type of improvement in methods is going on in the guayule industry that is going on in the synthetic industry.

In this connection, I realize perfectly well that our scientists may at any day produce a synthetic that will serve every purpose of natural rubber at a lower cost, but until that is done, it has seemed to me that we should have the protection of a domestic supply of natural rubber.

You suggest that the development of such a domestic supply "is bound to be discouraging to the progress of expanded hevea plantings in tropical America." I am much interested in this suggestion as we have been unable to ascertain where in tropical American hevea plantings of any considerable size were being made and where in tropical America these plantings were meeting with reasonable success. I would appreciate very much further information on this phase.

I cannot overlook the fact that the existence of an adequate supply of hevea rubber, even if it could be produced in tropical America, would not necessarily guarantee the United States a supply for consumptive uses. For instance, it has only been a matter of months since the German submarines were able to interfere with our movement of supplies even from the Caribbean Islands to the United States, much less from South America. Our committee has, therefore, felt that if it were to have the real insurance policy that we think we should have that we must have production at home and not in some far away tropical land.

You suggest that plantings of guayule at home "will undoubtedly cause these affected countries (the tropical countries) to view our intentions in this direction with some misgiving. Doubt would arise in the minds of the British and Dutch to whom we are looking for our major supplies of hevea rubber at reasonable prices." I do not understand what kind of misgivings you expect these tropical countries to suffer. Do you mean to suggest that these countries have a right to insist that the United States should not grow in its own borders a vitally needed commodity simply in order that these people might enjoy a continued monopoly of American market? Nor do I understand what kind of doubt you mean would arise in the minds of the British and Dutch. Do you mean to suggest that the British and Dutch would demand and secure a higher price for their rubber if they were faced with competition in the United States.

I confess that I am not thoroughly familiar with the details of the rubber industry, but I do know that in most lines of business competition will lower, and not increase, the price. And I do recall that when the British and Dutch established a practical world monopoly of natural rubber several years ago, they forced the price of rubber extremely high.

It would seem to me that even the small competition that 80,000 acres of guayule per year would provide would have a tendency to reduce rather than to increase the British and Dutch price.

In this connection there is another important and interesting angle on which I am not informed and on which I am sure you can and will be glad to enlighten me. You speak of the purchase of supplies of hevea rubber from the British and Dutch. We all realize that prior to the war, most of our hevea rubber came from parts of the world controlled by the British and Dutch, but there was a general belief among the people that much of that rubber was produced by and owned by American corporations, including the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. Is this an erroneous conclusion? If, in fact, the large American rubber companies actually own a large number of plantations and produce a large amount of hevea rubber themselves in the Far East, is it not the American rubber companies, rather than the British and Dutch, who would be most likely to become disturbed over the development of a domestic supply of rubber that might not be controlled in as large units as that of the Far East?

I was also interested in your suggestion that the "contemplated expansion program would serve to destroy the market for wild guayule now grown in northern Mexico and thereby present another inconsistency with our good-neighbor policy." Again, it seems to me that if we are going to be more disturbed over the effect that this program will have on the economy of some foreign nation than over our own strategic needs, we must have some common understanding as to whether our first duty is to protect the United States or to support the economy of other lands. Of course, the whole guayule program is based on the assumption that our first duty is to the United States. If we are wrong in that assumption, then I can see little reason for proceeding further. I invite your comment.

There is, however, a most interesting angle to this question of destroying the market for wild Mexican guayule. By far the larger part of the Mexican guayule is handled by American corporations. I have visited the largest of these operations, and I am acquainted with the officials of the operating company. None of them have indicated to me that they had any objection whatever to developing guayule in the United States, nor did they appear to share your concern over the prospects of their continued operation. On the contrary, they have expressed every interst in th development in this country and have extended every courtesy to members of the congressional committee studying the problem.

The other large American operator in Mexican guayule is the General Tire & Rubber Co. I have not had the opportunity to visit their Mexican plant, but I have talked with many officials of that company, and they have been outstanding in their interest in the development of guayule in the United States.

Incidentally, I have been advised that this company does not own or operate any plantations in the Far East.

You paid tribute to the fine research work being conducted by the Department of Agriculture in connection with guayule and state that "We must continue to have a supply (of growing guayule) on hand so we can learn more about bringing down its cost and improving its usefulness." This conclusion is in full accord with my own, but I have doubted the ability of the Department of Agriculture or any other Government agency to carry on much further unless we make guayule a commercial crop grown by farmers, which, is, of course, what the pending legislation would do.

The pending bill contains a provision limiting the benefits of the price guarantee to 100 acres of guayule in the hands of any one owner in any one year. While this, of course, completely eliminates the possibility that any of the large rubber corporations could profit by the floor price thus established, it does seem probable that it would spread the production into the hands of many individual farmers with a substantial increase in knowledge about the plant and its cultivation.

Finally, you make the statement that "It is estimated that the cost of the proposed project would, in the final analysis, reach a minimum of $100,000,000 to be born by the taxpayers and consumers of rubber products." I would be interested to know on what basis this estimate of a minimum cost is justified. Actually, the cost of the project must, of course, depend upon the price of rubber. You are in a much better position than I am to know what the price of rubber will be after the war. Quayule rubber is now bringing 33 cents per pound. Should the price of guayule remain as high as 28 cents a pound, this project would not cost the taxpayers of the United States one penny and would undoubtedly save the consumers a substantial amount in providing competition calculated to hold down the cost of foreign rubber. It seems, therefore, to me that the only fair statement as to minimum cost would be that there might be no cost and might actually be a saving to American consumers.

The proponents of this legislation have not, however, tried to justify it on that assumption. They have recognized that prior to the war guayule rubber sold at an average price over a 10-year period of about 14 cents a pound. It seems quite probable to many of us that after the war the wage scale in the Far East will inevitably advance to such an extent that Far Eastern rubber can never again sell as low as it did during the 10 years prior to the war. We have felt that in determining the maximum cost of this program we should ignore the almost certain increase in Far Eastern costs. Assuming that guayule rubber brings only 14 cents during the entire period of the guaranteed price, there would be a loss to the Government of 14 cents on each pound of rubber produced. While it is almost inconceivable that the entire 400,000 acres would be planted and kept planted each and every year, there would be a maximum theoretical possibility of a total acreage of 400,000 acres on which there could be five crop years of production. If this production amounted to 1,000 pounds per acre, there would be a total production during the 5 years of 400,000,000 pounds, which would amount to a maximum loss to the Government of $56,000,000—and this calculation is based upon the assumption that every acre would be planted, a thing that we all know simply will not happen.

Actually it seems quite probable that the cost to the Government would be a mere fraction of this sum. I hope you will, therefore, give us the detailed calculations whereby it is estimated that the "minimum cost to the taxpayers will be $100,000,000."

Again let me repeat that your position in the rubber industry is such that the American people look to you for leadership. It will, therefore, be extremely helpful to the entire Nation if you will furnish me with full and complete answers to the above questions and thereby assist the American people to come to a correct conclusion in regard to this important matter.

Thanking you, I am

Yours for victory,

W. R. POAGE,

Congressman, Eleventh Texas District.

P. S.: The other members of the special subcommittee appointed to study domestic sources of natural rubber have read the above letter and authorized me to state that they join me in inviting you to elaborate on the subject matter.

W. R. POAGE.

Two-Term Limitation for All Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial appearing

in the Boston Traveler of July 10, 1945, commenting on the recent proposal by our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], that the two-term tradition in America be made the law of the land by constitutional amendment:

MAKE THE TRADITION THE LAW

House Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, feeling that time has removed the delicacy from the issue, urges that the two-term tradition be made the law of the land.

Let us by-pass the most important consideration, the threat always implicit in the "indispensable man" illusion. Italy had an indispensable man named Mussolini. Now Italy is paying the price.

There are other ways of looking at it, less delicate and just as valid. Consider the physical argument. The Presidency of the United States is a killing job. The last man it killed was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Suppose that the two-term tradition had been law in 1940. Despite the unsettled state of the world, we would have faced the certainty of a new man in the Nation's highest office with national composure. A thing that is certain can always be faced.

The time came when a power mightier than man forced us to "change horses." That was a certainty and we faced it with national composure. Those who revered the late President as Ben Jonson did Shakespeare, "this side idolatry," concede that President Truman is doing an exceptional job. Others are warmer in their approbation.

Would the certainty of a change have been harder to face on January 1, 1945, than on April 12? Yet the fourth term followed easily after the two-term tradition was broken and it put a dying man into office for 102 days. Wasn't it a mistake?

The two-term tradition is politically and physically sound. A violation of it does no good to the Nation's political frame and 8 years is all the human frame can stand.

H. D. Murray Family, of Coshocton, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that all parents, regardless of the number of sons and daughters they have serving in the armed forces, are sacrificing and contributing to the war effort, but I feel that special recognition should be given those parents who have seven sons who have worn, or are wearing, the uniform of our country, and are carrying the banner for victory. Therefore, I wish to bring to the attention of this body, the H. D. Murray family of Coshocton, Ohio.

Corp. Ellis Murray entered the service in March 1942 and is with an engineers battalion, APO, New York; Corp. Donis Murray entered the service July 1942 and is in an ordnance unit, APO, New York. Pfc. Oden Murray entered the service January 1943, and is with an anti-aircraft automatic weapons battalion, APO, New York. Pfc. Fred V. Murray entered the service May 1943 and is serving with a depot repair squadron of an air depot group, APO, New York. Pfc. Encil Murray entered the service June 1943 and is a member of an anti-aircraft automatic weapons battalion, APO, San Francisco, Calif. Pfc. Ward C. Murray entered the service April 1944 and is with a field artillery battalion, APO, San Francisco, Calif. Russell Murray entered the service April 1944 and was discharged in January 1945. He now resides in Coshocton, Ohio.

In tribute to this family having a service flag with this number of stars, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad to present to you for recognition, the H. D. Murray family of Coshocton, Ohio.

Congress Should Act Now, Not 3 Months From Now, on Postwar Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have already mailed my dime for the printed copy of the radio program last night on which Senator O'MAHONEY and Mr. Patton of the Farm Union organization, on the one side, discussed legislation for postwar full employment with publisher Gannett and President Wilson of an airline company on the other side of this moot question. To me it was an intensely interesting discussion and, I think, vitally important. I must say that these four gentlemen minced no words and did not cross the plain highway of speech as they drove home their views.

Forceful as the prepared discussions were, I was even more intrigued by the question and answer part of the program which came later. As I remember it, a discharged veteran asked Publisher Gannett this question in substance: "What has private enterprise done, or planned, for the returning veterans comparable to what the Government has done for them?" Publisher Gannett saw fit to answer that question by asking another. Said he: "What has the Government done for returning veterans?" One would need to hear his voice in order to get the element of contempt in the question. Well, I thought the Government had done at least something, in a legislative way for veterans, though of course, far less than should have been done, even by this time. I am afraid of "too little too late."

When the motion comes to adjourn for recess presently, I shall vote "No." Not that I expect to be able to prevent adjournment, and not because I do not think the Members of Congress ought to get away from Washington for a while, but as one way of expressing my protest against Congress taking time out at this critical moment, leaving so much postwar planning undone. We should have done more by this time in laying the legislative foundation for proper care of our veterans now returning and proper economic planning for the postwar period. I can get no satisfaction out of a few days or weeks absence from Washington with certain vital legislation pending that should by now be on the statute books.

As I said in the House on July 3, we are apparently in great danger of again, and in several respects, being charged with "too little and too late." I feel deeply in this matter, that if we do not lay a complete and adequate legislative foundation for the economic welfare of our returning men, to whatever extent may be necessary now, thousands and millions of them will be home before actual benefits can be provided them. And by actual benefits I mean jobs and opportunity to provide homes for themselves so they may be fully returned to civilian life. Everywhere I hear it said that returning veterans are bitter because of what they find, or rather—fail to find, on their return home.

This "too little and too late" may apply to hospitalization and health and physical care, fully as much as to economic provisions of jobs and homes. Several times I have said to General Hines that I felt that his program for hospitalization was inadequate. Undoubtedly that inadequacy will be plainly apparent to everybody within the next few months. Who will be to blame for "too little and too late?" Surely the Congress which has taken pride, and rightfully so, in preparing for the greatest miiltary conflict in human history and in supplying with a lavish hand the legislative furnishing of every call by the Army and the Navy, will not at this late hour be shorthanded and miserly in dealing with the veterans on their return. I am not talking about merely handing out money, which to a certain extent and in a certain way might be very bad for the veterans, but I am talking about practical economic provision for jobs and homes and I am stressing full and complete and adequate care for the sick and the disabled. Congress should provide for these needs now. Three months from now will be late, very late, to start. It is later than we think.

OPA Suspension Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Office of Price Administration.

This letter sets forth that there have been 23,066 suspension orders issued by the OPA as of May 31, 1945. I think one of the primary concerns before the American Congress today is going to be the question of seeing that business is in position to provide employment for our returning soldier boys. These boys are returning now, and we must see to it that every possible opportunity is given to business to function and to give these boys jobs. As I see it, these OPA suspensions cannot help but have tragic effects upon the economy of our Nation,

and cannot but help to add materially to our unemployment problems.

The letter follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1945.

The Honorable DUDLEY G. ROE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROE: In reply to your letter of June 25, the Office of Price Administration had issued 23,066 suspension orders as of May 31, 1945. This figure includes suspension orders for rationing and restriction order violations, and also, suspension orders for price violations on sales of rationed commodities before July 1, 1944.

Moreover, this total includes all suspension orders regardless of the length of the suspension. In many cases the suspension was for a very short period of time, as, for example, 1 to 30 days, and in many other cases the order was probationary in nature, in that the suspension would not become effective unless another violation occurred.

If you have any further questions on this matter I shall be glad to hear from you.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. ROGERS, Jr.,
Acting Administrator.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Evening Star of July 11, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD
(By Constantine Brown)

Whether by design or otherwise, the American troops and American representatives in the areas assigned to Russia by the Teheran and Yalta agreements are being made to feel that they are not welcome.

In order to avoid unfavorable reactions in this country much of what is going on in the Balkans, Central Europe, and Russian-occupied Germany is either passed in silence or dressed up to show that only the inevitable minor incidents are taking place.

There seems to be no friction between the fighting men when they happen to get together. Quite the contrary. The American soldiers like the Russians and the feeling is mutual. The rank and file of officers are getting along splendidly and whenever the opportunity arises they entertain one another with drinks in the most friendly manner.

But the highest-ranking officers, unquestionably acting under orders, are placing all kinds of difficulties before our men in the area where by agreement they are supposed to be on duty.

The Berlin incidents of last week merely topped a series of other incidents which have not received much prominence. Some of them occurred before the American Second Armored Division reached Berlin, where it found that the prearranged understanding between the top officers had so many loopholes that we did not know whether to stay in our assigned area or get out.

American engineers arrived to establish the lines of communication for the pending Big Three conference. They met numerous hindrances until the commanding officer, tired of being sent from pillar to post, demanded to see his opposite number—a Red Army general.

The Russian officer was most courteous and assured his colleague that the matter of communications for all parties was being efficiently taken care of by Soviet engineers. This, of course, did not suit the American since his instructions were to assure the utmost secrecy of our wires and other means of communication.

It is not considered wise at an international conference of this type to place the secret messages in the hands of another power even if it is our most friendly ally. At the San Francisco Conference, for instance, the Russians kept a ship in the harbor from which all communications with Moscow were sent. And the matters discussed at San Francisco were far less secretive than those to be discussed at Potsdam.

After a strong protest and several days' delay we were allowed to establish our own lines of communication for the Big Three meeting. The Russians, who are legalistically minded, accepted our point of view that we were not Russia's guests at the conference but equal partners in the capital of a defeated country.

We have entered the Berlin area assigned to us, in accordance with the Yalta agreements. But while our presence is tolerated we have not yet obtained full right to control that section of Berlin. The local German authorities are still receiving orders from the Russian commanders. Our friendly representatives received the reply that the previous agreements did not stipulate literally what our rights were to be and consequently a new set of regulations would have to be issued after another meeting of the highest policy framers.

The sending of an American occupational force to Vienna also has been delayed, reputedly because of a loophole. The Big Three agreed at Teheran that Vienna would be occupied by the forces of the major Allies, but no particular areas were blueprinted.

After the Russians broke the Nazi resistance in the Austrian capital and later recognized the government of Dr. Karl Renner, they assumed control of all the airports, placing the American troops in the position of having to ask the Russian commander for permission every time an American plane arrived. Previous experience proved that such arrangements were highly unsatisfactory and likely to cause friction. The matter is still under discussion by the higher levels, but we are not yet in Vienna.

The American diplomatic and military representatives in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Yugoslavia, according to their own dispatches to the authorities in Washington, received little better treatment than prisoners on parole Their movements are restricted to certain areas indicated to them by the Russian authorities, and secret service agents watch every step they make. Natives who at first rushed to talk to them and place some of their complaints before them were blacklisted by the local and Russian secret police, and that is no laughing matter these days.

Many of these people disappeared, and nobody knows their whereabouts. The result is that the American officers and diplomats who have been sent to represent this country in the capitals of the former vassals of Germany or in liberated Yugoslavia are completely out of touch with the people at the stations to which they have been assigned. They can see the puppet cabinet minister but are cut off from any real source of information concerning the true situation which they are supposed to observe and report to Washington.

Whether this situation is due to the legalistic mind of the Russians, who stick literally to written agreements and allow no interpretation, or whether it is a planned policy to show the puppet states that they need not look to the western powers for assistance and support has never been definitely determined. But the men on the spot feel themselves greatly humiliated in spite of the personal friendliness and good fellowship shown by the Russian officers.

Protest Over Shortage of Meats and Other Necessities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by Railway Machinists Lodge, No. 507, Miles City, Mont., with reference to present shortage of meat and other necessities:

Whereas the physical requirements in the performance of our duties as railroad workers necessitates proper and sufficient foods in order to fulfill these requirements; and

Whereas the present shortage of meats and other necessities, a condition not prevalent of our neighboring allies, is now undermining the health and stamina of the worker of this country and has caused, and will increase, absenteeism to the extent of jeopardizing the now important operation of railroads; and

Whereas, in contrast, certain privileges are accorded those able to patronize hotels, restaurants, and night clubs, thereby not having to surrender ration points, a luxury a worker cannot indulge in; also, priorities granted to Mexican imported labor camps, prisoner-of-war camps, etc.; and

Whereas improper rationing and control by our Food Administration has caused a hardship upon the workers, thus making it imperative to preserve health and vitality in order to perform his duties in a safe, able, and efficient manner: Therefore be it

Resolved, That drastic action by Congress, the Food Administration, and such bodies under directive order of the President be set into motion to correct this condition; and be it further

Resolved, That should such action be delayed, work stoppages must result, thereby undermining your overloaded transportation facilities and the war effort.

M. V. MOORE,
Recording Secretary, Lodge 507,
I. A. of M. (Machinists).

Speeches Delivered at the Closing Plenary Session of the San Francisco Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is my wish to submit for the attention of Senators in the hope of their deepest consideration, two documents. One is taken from the other; it is the former that I would submit first.

This, the first of the two, might well be termed "the spirit of the United Nations Charter," for it is the expression in part of those who, at San Francisco, represented more than 950,000,000 of the peoples of this earth.

It incorporates excerpts from the remarks of each of 10 speakers at closing session, each representing a great nation. In this form it embodies, I believe, the voice and the spirit of the great charter which is before this body for consideration.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPIRIT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

This charter is a compact born of suffering and of war. With it now rests our hope for good and lasting peace.

This instrument will, I believe, prove itself to be an epoch-making document and will rank in its contribution to international justice and peace with the Magna Carta and the Constitution of the United States in their contribution to political liberty and representative government.

Thus, for each member of the International Organization, for all states, great and small, there are great opportunities for making contributions to the common cause of the maintenance of peace and strengthening cooperation between the United Nations in the interest of the well-being and prosperity of all peoples.

We cannot, indeed, claim that our work is perfect or that we have created an unbreakable guaranty of peace. But we have, I am convinced, forged an instrument by which, if men are serious in wanting peace and are ready to make sacrifices for it, they may find means to win it.

In the charter sanctioned by this plenary assembly which President Truman honored by his presence, the obligation for all member states to help in suppressing aggression is plainly established.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, revised and greatly extended in their political, juridical, social and economic aspects, have been fashioned into an instrument of international order, in the effectiveness of which we must all have the greatest confidence. It may have the faults inherent in anything made by man; but it can never be said that it was not created by capable men, moved by sincere good faith.

If we consider the magnitude of our task, the conditions prevailing in this world of ours in April 1945, and even today; if we realize how thoroughly our civilization has been shaken up by years of concentrated destruction of values material, moral, and cultural, we are bound to come to the conclusion that the time spent on drafting the charter, in my estimation one of the most important documents in human history, was neither long nor wasted.

In this charter are gathered all the hopes for human solidarity. Henceforth no nation need any longer be isolated in silence and darkness, in the indifference or the complicity of the rest of the world. We are now met at the forum of universal conscience.

Let that faith which led the Conference to success guide our future footsteps. Let us practice and preserve the principles which we have here put down on paper. Once and for all let us put an end to selfishness, greed, persecution, tyranny, and oppression. Let this charter be the solid foundation upon which we shall build our new and better world.

Great as our achievement is, I feel that more is needed than a machine of peace. Unless the spirit to operate it is there the best plan or machine may fail. It is for our peace-loving peoples to see that this great peace plan is backed with all their energy, all their heart and soul. In faith and trust we hand our charter down to the future.

May heaven's blessing rest on it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, such were the comments of note spoken at the closing plenary session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, at San Francisco, June 26, 1945.

True, there still are those who say, who keep saying, that there can be no accord among the nations of the earth. Let them look to the spirit of the charter.

For these are the expressions of the peoples of the earth, spoken through their own representatives:

It was the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., chairman of the United States delegation, who said that our hope for good and lasting peace rests with the charter.

It was the Honorable V. K. Wellington Koo, acting chairman of the delegation of China, who voiced faith that the document will rank with the Magna Carta and our own Constitution.

The Honorable A. A. Gromyko, acting chairman of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, was he who said that all states, great and small, have great opportunities for making contributions to the common cause of peace.

And the mention that there is no claim that an unbreakable guaranty of peace has been forged was made by the Earl of Halifax, chairman of the delegation of the United Kingdom, who said that if men are ready to make sacrifices for this goal, they may win it.

The Honorable Joseph Paul-Boncour, acting chairman of the delegation of France, pointed to the obligation for all member states to aid in suppressing aggression.

The chairman of the Brazilian delegation, the Honorable Pedro Leao Vellosa, spoke of the sincere good faith of the men who drafted the Charter.

Czechoslovakia's delegation chairman, the Honorable Jan Masaryk, directed attention to the magnitude of the task, the opinion he gave was that it is one of the most important documents in human history.

The phrase: "We are now met at the forum of universal conscience," so aptly coined that it may become a notable addition to the wealth of mankind's favored expressions, was added by the Honorable Ezequiel Padilla, chairman of the delegation of Mexico.

It was His Royal Highness Amir Faisal Ibn Abdul Aziz, chairman of the delegation of Saudi Arabia, who spoke of the document as the solid foundation for a new and better world.

Heaven's blessing was asked by Field Marshal Jan Christiaan Smuts, chairman of the delegation of the Union of South Africa.

This is the spirit in the world today, such is the spirit of the Charter. But the expressions of that day, in full, merit the closest attention of the Senate of the United States and of the peoples who are looking to the Charter for peace in the future.

I commend the program of the closing plenary session of the United Nations Conference to the Senate.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speeches made by 10 of the delegates to the Conference, at the closing plenary session, the United Nations Conference on International Organization, at San Francisco, on June 26, 1945. I have ascertained from the Public Printer that, according to an estimate which has been made, the speeches will occupy four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and will cost $208. I think it very fitting to have these speeches published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have conferred with the majority leader and with other Senators, and they agree that the matter should be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM CLOSING PLENARY SESSION, THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 26, 1945

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

It is with a full heart that I address this final plenary session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

Two months ago the delegates here assembled met for the first time. We came from many parts of the earth, across continents and oceans. We came as the representatives of 50 different nations. But we came here first of all as the representatives of humanity and as the bearers of a common mandate—to write the Charter of a World Organization to maintain peace for all nations and to promote the welfare of all men.

Every nation represented here has had a part in the making of the charter. Sentence by sentence, article by article, it has been hammered out around the conference tables. We have spoken freely with each other. Often we have disagreed. When we disagreed we tried again, and then again, until we ended by reconciling the differences among us.

This is the way of friendship and of peace. This is the only way that nations of freemen can make a charter for peace and the only way that they can live at peace with one another.

The San Francisco Conference has fulfilled its mandate. The charter of a permanent United Nations has now been written.

Today we meet together for the last time at this Conference. Tomorrow we shall separate and return home, each to his own country. But in this charter we will carry to our governments and to our peoples an identical message of purpose and an identical instrument for the fulfillment of that purpose.

We shall bring this charter to a world that is still racked by war and by war's aftermath.

A few days ago I talked with some young Americans just back from the battlefront. They lay—wounded and in pain—in the beds of an Army hospital.

As I talked with them I thought of the many millions who have risked all and sacrificed future and life itself to give the world this chance. I thought of all those men and women and children of the nations represented in this meeting place today whom tyranny with bomb and bayonet, starvation, fire and torture, could kill but never conquer. And I thought of all the cities now in ruins and all the land laid waste.

The terrible trial is not yet over. The fighting continues. The reconstruction has only just begun.

This charter is a compact born of suffering and of war. With it now rests our hope for good and lasting peace.

The words upon its parchment chart the course by which a world in agony can be restored and peace maintained and human rights and freedoms can be advanced. It is a course which I believe to be within the will and the capacity of the nations at this period of world history to follow.

To the governments and peoples of the 50 nations whose representatives have labored here the charter is now committed. May Almighty God, from this day on, and in the months and years to come, sustain us in the unalterable purpose that its promise be fulfilled.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF CHINA, THE HONORABLE V. K. WELLINGTON KOO

The United Nations Conference on International Organization has concluded its vitally important mission of writing a charter. This instrument will, I believe, prove itself to be an epoch-making document and will rank in its contribution to international justice and peace with the Magna Carta and the Constitution of the United States in their contribution to political liberty and representative government. As we look back upon the 8 weeks we have spent on this stupendous task, we cannot fail to recall with even greater appreciation the fullness of the discussion, the earnestness in the debates, the hard work of the technical committees, and the spirit of conciliation, all of which factors have helped to make the charter an instrument of high ideal and practical wisdom. None of the delegations may find all that they wished to see embodied in it, but they will agree, I am sure, that it contains the essential features for the building of a world organization to promote international justice, peace, and prosperity. Without the valuable contribution, however, of all the participating delegations, we could not have achieved this splendid result.

The idea of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security, was first conceived by that preeminent leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the late President of the United States, and the veteran statesman, Cordell Hull, when he was Secretary of State. It was consecrated in the Four-Power Declaration of Moscow and implemented by a set of concrete proposals at Dumbarton Oaks. These proposals have now been further elaborated and improved at San Francisco.

Mere mention of the fact that 29 amendments were jointly submitted to the Conference by the four sponsoring powers and literally hundreds of other amendments by the other participating delegations gives an indication of the common desire and determination to complete and perfect the Dumbarton Oaks plan of a permanent charter. We are glad to see in the completed instrument today many new features. Provisions have been added which emphasize that the adjustment or settlement of international disputes should be in conformity with the principles of justice and international law; which aim to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex; which expressly recognize the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense in the event of an armed attack; which stress the importance of cooperation in the solution of international economic, social, cultural, and other humanitarian problems; which empower the Economic and Social Council to set up commissions in these diverse fields of activity in order to achieve positive results; and which, lastly but far from being of the least importance, provide a comprehensive and liberal system of international trusteeship, stipulating independence and self-government among its fundamental objectives. These are only illustrations, but they are sufficient, I hope, to show the broad scope, the high principles, and the noble purposes of the new charter.

The constitution of the Organization of the United Nations is now written and signed and will in due course be ratified by the governments represented at this Conference. It remains for us to continue to foster mutual trust and friendly collaboration in order to make this, the greatest of international experiments, a great success in fact.

We of the Chinese delegation came to San Francisco to cooperate and we have been glad to find cooperation the happy keynote of the whole Conference. We are confident that, with faith in the future and with the same spirit of cooperation as has guided us in our deliberations here in the Golden Gate City, lasting peace and continued prosperity will be within the gift of the new organization to the whole world. This is not a utopian dream. We believe it to be a legitimate aspiration, a reasonable hope, and indeed, when fully realized, it will be a just reward for our exertions in the arduous common struggle which has cost us all, and will cost us more still, untold sacrifice of life, blood, and treasure. The genius of man has devised the plan and completed the instrument, and we fervently hope that the spirt of cooperation will always guide its operation in order to achieve its lofty aims.

We have stayed 2 months here in San Francisco. The excellent arrangements made by the Government of the United States have made our sojourn here both pleasant and fruitful. As the representatives of one of the sponsoring powers, we of the Chinese delegation feel especially grateful to the host nation. We wish also to express our deep appreciation of the hospitalities of the city and people of San Francisco. But I cannot conclude my remarks without acknowledging also the splendid and most valuable work of the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State and chairman of the American delegation, who, in his various high capacities in the Conference and with the assistance of an efficient secretariat, has made a unique contribution to the success of the Conference. To him as also to his able and distinguished colleagues on his delegation, we owe an immense debt of gratitude, and to them all we wish to extend our thanks and our admiration. I sincerely believe that these sentiments are not ours alone but are fully shared by the other delegations to the Conference.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, THE HONORABLE A. A. GROMYKO

Today we sum up the results of the historic Conference of the United Nations, gathered to work out the charter of the Organization on the maintenance of peace and security. The foundation of this International Organization was laid down even at the time when the war was raging in Europe, when the enemy, though having suffered a serious defeat, resisted furiously. These foundations, as it is known, were laid at the Moscow Conference of the ministers for foreign affairs of the United States of America, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and at the historic Crimea Conference.

The peace-loving nations who suffered countless sacrifices in this war naturally rest their hopes on the establishment, by collective efforts, of an international instrument which could prevent the repetition of a new tragedy for humanity. In accordance with the decisions adopted at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, Marshal Stalin said: "To win the war against Germany means to carry out a great historical deed. But to win the war still does not mean the insurance of lasting peace and security for the people in the future. The task is not only to win the war but also to make impossible the occurrence of a new aggression and a new war, if not forever, then at least for a long period of time."

When asked whether there is some means for preventing German aggression, to nip it in the bud if war breaks out, and keep it from developing into a big war, Marshal Stalin gave the following answer: "To achieve this, there is only one means besides the complete disarmament of the aggressor nations: to establish a special organization for defense of peace and insurance of security, from among the representatives of the peace-loving nations; to place at the disposal of the steering body of this Organization the maximum quantity of armed forces sufficient for the suppression of aggression; and to convince this organization, in case of necessity, to send without any delay these armed forces for the prevention and liquidation of aggression, for the punishment of those guilty of aggression."

At the same time Marshal Stalin pointed out that the actions of that organization would be sufficiently effective if the great powers who carried the main burden of the war against Hitlerite Germany would continue to act in the spirit of unanimity and accord. These actions will not be effective if a breach of this indispensable condition occurs.

Such are the principles by which the Soviet Government has been guided while taking an active part in the establishment of the International Security Organization and by which the Soviet delegation has been guided in the course of the work of this Conference.

Naturally, at this final session a question arises as to the results of this Conference and whether it has fulfilled its task. The charter of the organization, which is the result of ceaseless work of delegations participating in the Conference, affords solid ground to consider the work of the Conference a success.

The Charter of the United Nations provides for the establishment of the Security Council possessing powers and means necessary for prevention or suppression of aggression. The Security Council, exercising its functions and powers for the maintenance of peace, will act on behalf of all members of the United Nations. States members of the United Nations, as the charter provides, agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. These provisions of the charter alone emphasize the efficient character of the international machine for the maintenance of the peace which we are establishing.

The charter provides that the body of the Security Council will include five great powers as permanent members: the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain, France, and China. The decision of the conference to give permanent seats in the council to five great powers is recognition of the obvious fact that the Security Council can possess sufficient means and forces necessary for the maintenance of peace only if it permanently includes those countries which have sufficient resources in men and material necessary for the successful and effective fulfillment of its duties.

The whole world is aware of the role of these powers in their fight together against aggression in the course of the Second World War, and the role played by each of them.

In the European war which has just ended, the Allied Powers demonstrated their ability to carry out the task of annihilating the strongest and most cunning enemy in history. Without cooperation between them it would be impossible to carry out so successfully the task of defeating Hitlerite Germany. Without such cooperation, it would be impossible in the future to carry out the task of preserving peace.

The Conference devoted much of its time to the question of working out the part of the charter dealing with the establishment of the second important organ of the organization—the General Assembly—and defining its functions and powers. These functions and

powers, as defined by the charter, give the assembly great opportunities to make an important contribution to the cause of the maintenance of peace and security. Besides, within the sphere of functions and powers of the General Assembly there are a great number of questions on economic, social, political, and cultural cooperation and other questions within the scope of the charter and within the scope of functions and powers of the organs provided for by this charter: the Economic and Social Council, the Council on Territorial Trusteeship, and other organs.

Thus, for each member of the International Organization, for all states, great and small, there are great opportunities for making contributions to the common cause of the maintenance of peace and strengthening cooperation between the United Nations in the interest of the well-being and prosperity of all peoples.

Of course, in the course of the work of the Conference there were some difficulties and differences of views between separate delegations on these or other questions. However, one should be surprised not at the existence of these difficulties and not at the existence of different viewpoints between separate delegations on these or other questions, but at the fact that, as a result of the work of the Conference, all the main difficulties were overcome, and we succeeded in fulfilling successfully the tasks before the Conference. We prepared a document which should become the basis for the actions of the International Organization—its constitution. Naturally the very best and most perfect charter in itself is not yet a guarantee that its provisions will be carried out and ensure the preservation of peace. In order to achieve this important and noble task it is also necessary, in addition to the existing charter, to have the unity and coordination of actions of members of the International Organization, and first of all the unity and coordination of actions between the most powerful military powers of the world. It is also necessary that all members of the International Organization should try to settle all disputes by peaceful means in the spirit of cooperation and good will.

The delegation of the Soviet Union, in the course of the work of the Conference, aimed at the creation of a charter of the International Organization which could guarantee the effective fulfillment of the tasks confronting the Organization.

I am glad to emphasize that the Soviet delegation in its work found understanding and support on the part of many other delegations participating in this Conference. It could not be otherwise. The peoples of the countries represented at this Conference pursue a common objective—to prevent the repetition of a new war.

The provisions of the charter, which have been worked out, cover a great number of questions and problems defining the future activity of the Orgnization as a whole and its separate organs. In this connection it is necessary to point out specially the significance of those provisions of the charter which refer to peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts. The participants in the Conference paid great attention to this field of their work. Under the charter, members of the International Organization obligate themselves to achieve peaceful settlements of the disputes. Let us hope that this aim will be fully realized.

In conclusion I wish to express confidence that this Conference of the United Nations will go down in the history of humanity as one of the most significant events and that our efforts will be beneficial for all peace-loving peoples of the world, who endured so many hardships and sufferings as a result of the conflagration set by Hitlerite Germany.

I take this occasion to thank the Government of the United States on behalf of the Soviet delegation for the hospitality shown to us, participants in the Conference, and especially to thank Mr. Truman, President of the United States, whom we have the pleasure of seeing today at this historic final session of the United Nations Conference.

Now I also wish to thank Mr. Stettinius for his work and efforts directed toward the successful completion of the work of this Conference.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, THE EARL OF HALIFAX

The United Kingdom is proud to have shared with our allies and friends in all that has led to this gathering of nations. And it is fitting that we should have met in a great American city. For it was a President of the United States who brought a project of peace before the world in 1918. To another President we largely owe our very name, our victory, and our present purpose. Finally, on this historic day in the world's long search for peace, his successor comes to set his own stamp of approval and support upon our labors.

Our work now stands for the world to judge and I am confident that neither Mr. Cordell Hull, in whose vision this design took shape, nor Mr. Stettinius, whose courage and character have served it well, need fear the verdict. For the charter is a notable advance, both on all that has gone before and on the plan of the sponsor powers, from which it grew. I do not doubt that in this result the future will acknowledge the part of all nations, and not the least, I hope, that of the different members of the British Commonwealth. We cannot indeed claim that our work is perfect or that we have created an unbreakable guarantee of peace. For ours is no enchanted palace to "spring into sight at once" by magic touch or hidden power. But we have, I am convinced, forged an instrument by which, if men are serious in wanting peace and are ready to make sacrifices for it, they may find means to win it.

Here in San Francisco we have seen but the beginnings of a long and challenging endeavor. And there is a sense in which what we have done here is less important than what we have learned here. We have learned to know one another better; to argue with patience; to differ with respect; and at all times to pay honor to sincerity. That the thought of many men of many nations should thus have met in a large constructive task will have a value beyond price during the coming years, as stone by stone we carry on what we have here begun. Time alone can show whether the house that we have tried to build rests upon shifting sand, or, as I firmly hope, upon solid rock, to stand as shield and shelter against every storm.

Long years ago in Europe men set themselves to raise a cathedral to God's glory. "Let us," they said, "build a church so great that those who come after us will think us mad to have attempted it." So they said, and wrought, and, after many years, achieved; and the great cathedral at Seville is their monument.

Let us also, mindful alike of the world's need and of our own weakness, pray that, under God's guidance, what we have done here in these last weeks will be found worthy of the faith that gave it birth and of the human suffering that has been its price.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF FRANCE, THE HONORABLE JOSEPH PAUL-BONCOUR

I am greatly honored to speak in the presence of the President who personifies the future of the great Republic which has extended its invaluable hospitality to the Conference. Having achieved freedom and peace among the States of which it is composed, it now turns to the noble task of establishing freedom and peace among all the states of the world.

I shall be brief, as befits the solemnity of the occasion.

Of all the matters on which we have cause to rejoice deeply and sincerely at the results obtained, I simply wish to express the happiness of a country and of a man on seeing the ideas for which they have fought since the last war unanimously sanctioned by the powers represented here.

A great and just ideal was conceived in the faith and enthusiasm which followed the last war. We built a League of Nations. Humanity, its wounds still bleeding, did not find the shelter it had hoped for, and a second World War came to ravage the human race.

For there was a serious flaw in the structure. When everything possible has been done to maintain peace, if the aggressor persists in his purpose, there is only one way to oppose him, and that is by force. But the Covenant of the League merely provided for the recommendation of military sanctions involving air, sea, or land forces, and consequently left the nations the option of backing out.

Today this flaw has been eliminated. In the charter sanctioned by this plenary assembly which President Truman has honored by his presence, the obligation for all member states to help in suppressing aggression is plainly established. An international force is to be formed and placed at the disposal of the Security Council in order to insure respect for its decisions. This force will consist of national contingents arranged for in advance by special agreements negotiated on the initiative of the Security Council. These special agreements will determine the composition of this force, its strength, degree of preparedness, and location. If called upon to do so by the Security Council, the entire force will march against a state convicted of aggression, in accordance with the provisions for enforcement as laid down for the Security Council.

An international military staff committee will draw up plans for employing this collective force under an international command to be determined if and when occasion arises.

The international military staff committee, which is to give technical advice to the Security Council as regards its military task, will be composed of the chiefs of staff of permanent members of the Council, it being understood that other states not permanent members, or not members of the Council, which are called upon to provide contingents in accordance with the special agreements to which they are parties, will also be called upon to attend meetings of the international military staff committee, if and when the latter has to discuss how these contingents are to be used.

In this way, the international organization will no longer be unarmed against violence. The forceful idea of our writer, Pascal, will no longer be belied: "Strength without justice is tyrannical, and justice without strength is a mockery."

That is the great thing, the great historic act accomplished by the San Francisco Conference, which gives to the world the hope, based on an obvious reality, that henceforward it may live in peace.

This reality is the unquestionable superiority which the sum total of the strength of the United Nations, their formidable resources in men and material, together with their productive capacity, will give them over an aggressor rising alone in rebellion. And the certainty of defeat will most probably discourage any aggressor from starting a fight.

But the United Nations, and more especially the great nations with a permanent seat on the Council, must remain truly united.

The whole efficacy of the Charter depends on this unity. In the hour when immense hope rises from our hearts, let us swear to remain faithful in peace to this unity which was our strength in war.

The war is not over, and from the sunny splendors of San Francisco, across the magnificent bay which spreads each morning before our eyes, a little tired because of the work we have taken upon ourselves, our good wishes accompany the soldiers and sailors of the United States setting out for the final onslaught.

But union has already brought us victory in Europe. Whole countries, including my own, have been freed from the hated yoke they suffered for four interminable years.

And it is particularly in the name of these liberated countries which have endured all the physical and moral hardships of enemy occupation, which still suffer—and suffer badly—from its consequences, which are plundered and destroyed, hungry and cold; and because they feel more deeply, even in their physical being, the warmth of this welcome and the comforts lavished upon them—it is particularly on their behalf that I propose that the entire Conference express its grateful appreciation to California, to San Francisco, which have brought such joy to us, the representatives of these countries, and to them all.

This is the proposal which I offer for your endorsement:

In recognition of the innumerable courtesies and manifestations of spontaneous hospitality which the people of San Francisco have offered to the members of the delegations to the United Nations Conference;

In recognition of the contribution which the arrangements for the reception and entertainment of the members of the delegations has made to their effective participation in the work of the Conference; and

In recognition of the efforts of the citizens of San Francisco, appointed by the Honorable Roger D. Lapham, mayor of San Francisco, to be members of the United Nations Conference Committee, in the planning and organization of the hospitality extended to the delegations;

The chairmen of the delegations to the United Nations Conference on International Organization unanimously express their heartfelt thanks to the people of San Francisco and the members of the aforesaid committee and request that the original of the present testimonial be deposited with His Honor the Mayor of San Francisco and that appropriate copies thereof be presented to the individual members of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF BRAZIL, THE HONORABLE PEDRO LEAO VELLOSO

Forgathered in this beautiful city of San Francisco, whose people have lavished upon us their splendid hospitality, we can now, after 2 months of difficult and arduous labor, offer to the world the Charter of the United Nations, which is to govern its destiny. When we arrived here, victory, though near, had not yet come completely to the Allied armies in Europe. We had constantly before us the thought of the tragic and terrible spectacle of destruction and death in which our civilization was being consumed.

Now, by the grace of God, we are witnessing the end of this tremendous catastrophe, which had its primary origin in a criminal mentality based on a false political philosophy, on pagan principles, on barbarous methods. This philosophy brought about the resurgence of the ancient peoples of conquest, looking and aiming toward the domination of the world by force, while trampling under foot the sacred principles of law and justice.

They chose the time to begin this monstrous war, and with a might of arms hitherto unknown they devastated and burned towns and fields, they slaughtered peaceful populations and took innocent lives, they sowed misery, pain, and sorrow in a holocaust of immeasurable magnitude such as had never been known throughout history.

Once again the representatives of many nations, men of divers races and creeds, from all regions of the world, have gathered with one unspoken and constant purpose, that of doing all within their power to prevent such a war from occurring again, to prevent the world from becoming again an immense and desperate battlefield.

Our task here in San Francisco, complementary to that of the peace which must be drawn up in due time, with all its complexities and details, was of the greatest importance. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals, revised and greatly extended in their political, juridical, social, and economic aspects, have been fashioned into an instrument of international order, in the effectiveness of which we must all have the greatest confidence. It may have the faults inherent in anything made by man. But it can never be said that it was not created by capable men, moved by sincere good faith.

In the international as well as in the social field inequalities are unavoidable. They are derived from geographical, economic, and historic factors which contributed to the formation of the nations of the earth. The remedy for this is to be found only in the principles and in the rule of law and justice. Before the law there are no great, medium, or small powers. All have the same right to respect for their individuality, their territorial integrity, and their complete independence. The nations here represented in one way or another fought with the means at their disposal against the forces of a philosophy which stood for the very opposite of the concepts just mentioned. They are firmly disposed to cooperate, each within its own sphere, so that respect for law shall be the basic principle of their relationship and in order that the use of force be permitted only when it becomes necessary to enforce that respect.

As a citizen of a nation of the American Continent, I cannot end this brief address without mentioning the role all these nations have played in San Francisco. The Americas do not constitute a bloc. The Americas are much more than that: they constitute a way of life, a system with traditions and ideals peculiar to them, traditions going back more than 60 years, ideals of noble and rare degree. We are all firmly convinced that our inter-American system will be a stimulus to the wishes for peace of the rest of the world. From the days of our independence we have always fought for the establishment of a solid international morality based on justice and peace, and the truth is that this principle has today such deep roots that none can uproot it in this hemisphere.

With such traditions and ideals, the contribution of the American nations could not fail to be of outstanding value.

They were supported in the fight for what they deemed indispensable to the existence of the continental system, which, as was shown by the war, is necessary for the peace and security of the world, by the great sister nation which welcomed us in this magnificent city and which is represented in this closing session of her eminent President, Harry S. Truman, and her illustrious Secretary of State, Mr. Edward Stettinius. The United States, a powerful manifestation of the New World represented by this continent, constitutes a moral force without parallel in this historic moment. The awareness of this fact on the part of her people and her leaders is not a whit inferior to the faith we repose in them.

Let us all swear solemnly by this charter, as we do by the sacred book, that by its means we shall maintain peace in the world and that we shall order the relations among all peoples in accordance with its principles of law and justice.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA, THE HONORABLE JAN MASARYK

The great San Francisco Conference has terminated its all-important historic deliberations. To some it seemed too long. But if we consider the magnitude of our task, the conditions prevailing in this world of ours in April 1945 and even today, if we realize how thoroughly our civilization has been shaken up by years of concentrated destruction of values material, moral, and cultural, we are bound to come to the conclusion that the time spent on drafting the charter, in my estimation one of the most important documents in human history, was neither long nor wasted. From 50 different countries—and how different—representatives came to the Golden Gate for a tremendous purpose, our handling of which shall be judged by many coming generations. The Czechoslovak delegation is proud of the opportunity to cooperate modestly in this epoch-making task.

A great deal has been said about the great, medium, and small nations. Although the Czechoslovak Government from the beginning fullheartedly agreed with the thesis that the great powers, who will have to carry the overwhelming brunt of the political and economic responsibility, should have more to say than the rest of us, we realized at the same time that an honorable and dignified role could, would, and should be played by any delegation who had something worth while to contribute. The charter is the proof of both these points.

There may have been created in some quarters the impression that the 45 so-called small and medium nations—though some of them are great in tradition and in achievement—had been in a steady opposition to the Big Five. That is certainly not correct. On the contrary, a friendly and fruitful cooperation between all the 50 powers represented here was very much in evidence throughout our labors, even if sometimes differences of opinion were not unnoticeable. Let me repeat what I have often said before, that there are so many vital interests we have in common—the big and the small—and that the common denominator of peace with security is overwhelming. This has been so gloriously manifested on the fields of battle and we all hope will be equally strongly manifested once peace is established.

The small and smaller countries need security, crave security, pray for security, so that they can keep step with the great ones and serve humanity as equals among equals.

In a short while now we shall disperse into all corners of the earth to explain to our people what we did, why we did it, and how we did it. It is my considered opinion that we can face our respective governments, parliaments, and peoples with a calm conscience and a feeling of modest satisfaction.

This charter is a good document, honestly arrived at, and if the same spirit of friendly cooperation prevails in bringing it into actual force, I do not see any insurmountable difficulties looming ahead.

We have in our hands an effective weapon against the repetition of wanton aggression by the beaten Nazi and Fascist evildoers, and after the second part of the war is crowned with the same absolute military victory—as it surely will be—also against the medieval imperialism of the Japanese. There will be many important, complex and far-reaching problems to solve—but we can, we shall, solve them, because we know that sorely wounded humanity could not stand another cataclysm such as the one out of which we are laboriously, but victoriously, emerging at this moment.

May I in conclusion utter a humble word of warning? Let us please stop talking of the next world war. The language one hears in certain places is lamentably unconstructive; it arouses suspicions at a moment when mutual confidence is all-important. Not one of us in this room wants another war. None of us want the children of these selfless children of ours, whose graves are scattered as sacred mementos all over the face of the

scarred earth—none of us want these children to die in another war in another generation—we want them to live and work for their respective countries in peace and security in a socially just and safe world. That's why we assembled here, that's why we drafted the charter. It contains all the necessary safeguards against future wars. Let us see to it that our lofty aims are carried into deeds worthy of the memory of our heroic beloved youngsters.

The spirit and ideals of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt are present here today. I know they would give us their blessing, and we the 50 nations united here are wishing Godspeed to their successor, Harry S. Truman—for his journey to the next meeting and for a successful accomplishment of the gigantic task which he took over so ably, so efficiently, and so humbly.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF MEXICO, THE HONORABLE EZEQUIEL PADILLA

We have now completed the historic task so fervently awaited by all men of good will. To appreciate the profound significance of our successful undertaking, in whose execution its leaders have displayed extraordinary ability and wisdom, we need only to realize that the three great victorious powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain—could have determined the immediate future of the world by themselves and for themselves. Instead, their Governments convoked all the United Nations, both great and small, to lay at this conference the foundations of an international structure based on cooperation and law. The governments of the great powers have done this because their peoples have charged them with the responsibility of protecting the coming generations against new and frightful sacrifices.

We may, therefore, assert that the Conference at San Francisco has not been a somber expression of force, but the embodiment of the highest aspiration of man toward permanent world peace and justice.

The manner in which the work of this conference has been carried out constitutes a consecration of the principles of freedom and of the dignity of nations. And in itself this Conference has become a living proof of the spiritual value of victory. For had the Nazi-Fascist dictatorships been triumphant, the world would have never been able to gaze upon the genuinely democratic spectacle of effective international cooperation.

The charter is not only an instrument of security against the horrors of war. It is also, for the peoples who have been fighting to uphold the principles of human dignity, an instrument of well-being and happiness against the horrors of a peace without hope, in which men would be subjected to humiliating privations and injustices. "Blood, sweat, and tears" comprised the glorious but provisional rule of war. It must not become the rule of peace.

The great powers will be the safest guarantors of world security. If good faith informs their actions and their actions conform to the standards of justice which should govern international friendship, the peoples of the world will be able to devote themselves to the task of developing prosperity, freedom, and confidence, and the power of good will become stronger each day. On the other hand, were any of the great powers to rush headlong, spurred by illegitimate ambitions, mistrust and fear would emerge once more and the forces of evil would grow from day to day.

The small nations, who have displayed in this Conference a great sense of responsibility, noble cooperation, and dignity, are destined to fulfill a great mission; to tend with devotion and courage the sacred fire of law. They will not be alone in this luminous task, for the common men of all nations, great and small, hold the same aspirations and have the same faith in a common destiny. Whenever the cause of justice will raise its banner, the peoples, great and small, shall cry with the same conviction, shall act with the same strength.

The small nations must not forget that they are not too small to dream of, yearn and fight for the cause of mankind. Potent forces emanating from the great powers meet and support the aspirations and efforts of weaker peoples.

In this charter are gathered all the hopes for human solidarity. Henceforth no nation need any longer be isolated in silence and darkness, in the indifference or the complicity of the rest of the world. We are now met at the forum of universal conscience.

Our faith must rest, not on the great or the small nations, but upon the common man of all nations. All peoples, large and small, fully know that the world cannot bear the terrible stress of another total war without turning back to the dark ages. There is, therefore, a peremptory necessity to live in peace. Let us have reciprocal confidence, let us have the full measure of our good will.

And in bidding each other farewell, let us engrave on our hearts and minds the conviction that unlimited opportunities now exist to alleviate suffering and to build, in an atmosphere of enduring peace, the welfare, the freedom, and the justice of a new world.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF SAUDI ARABIA, H. R. H. AMIR FAISAL IBN ABDUL AZIZ

Today marks the end of this great historic occasion in which many nations struggling for the establishment and support of peace have participated. We have finished today what may be called the "Charter of Justice and Peace," after hard work, long discussion, and deliberations, in order to put this organization in the most effective form to safeguard peace and justice for the future world.

This charter does not represent perfection as visualized by the small states. Nevertheless, it is doubtless the best ever produced by people representing 50 states, many of which have suffered much in their struggle for liberty, the defense of humanity, and its liberation from slavery, which only God knows how long would have lasted or when we would have been saved from its tragedies and calamities had injustice prevailed.

We have seen the powers of tyranny prevail in Europe and threaten the Near and Middle East. But, with God's help, these powers have been completely defeated. We, the sons of the Near and Middle East, and particularly of the Arab Nations, are filled with happiness and joy at the collapse of these powers of evil. We look forward with rejoicing to the collapse of the last stronghold of tyranny and oppression. Indeed, the whole world is indebted for its survival to the United Nations, which engaged themselves in war, sacrificing the best of their youth and the wealth of their resources for their security and for the security of mankind.

In such a moment we should not forget the great efforts which were put forth by the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt for the cause of peace and his farsighted action in initiating this Conference. By having achieved these purposes, we have given credit to his memory. We must also pay our tribute to President Truman for his noble efforts for the achievement of peace and security through this Conference.

No doubt this charter will lead toward prosperity and happiness for all nations, great and small. We have all done our best here to fulfill our obligations to humanity. As long as we are united together in a spirit of cooperation, the hand of Almighty God will lead us. We shall always have His aid insofar as we help one another.

I wish to thank the people of this beautiful city, the pride of the Pacific, for their hospitality, kindness, and friendship. From now on, indeed, San Francisco should be called the city of peace.

Let that faith which led the Conference to success guide our future footsteps. Let us practice and preserve the principles which we have here put down on paper. Once and for all, let us put an end to selfishness, greed, persecution, tyranny, and oppression. Let this charter be the solid foundation upon which we shall build our new and better world.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, FIELD MARSHAL JAN CHRISTIAAN SMUTS

The President of the United States has honored us and added luster to this Conference by personally attending this final session, and thus associating himself with our labors, and with an event which will stand out among the most significant of our time.

San Francisco is today in the center of the vast drama of war and peace which has dominated our time. Men and women on a world-wide scale have suffered as never before in history. However much they may try to remain cheerful they cannot help being gripped by secret fear for the future. They have seen the mounting horror of war, and science warns them to expect far worse in future wars. Not even our overwhelming victory in Europe has stilled their fears. No wonder that for the last couple of months their eyes have been fixed on San Francisco—their eyes, their hopes, their prayers. If the charter we have drafted here should fulfill their longings for a peaceful world, it may yet come to rank among the greatest documents of history. What hopes have we delegates ourselves of our labors?

If I, as an old veteran of the wars and of peace conferences, extending for almost half a century, should have to answer this question, I would do so as follows:

Our charter is not a perfect document. It is full of compromises over very difficult and tangled problems. But at least it is a good practical workmanlike plan for peace—a very real and substantial advance on all previous plans for security against war.

It provides for a peace with teeth; for a unified front of peace-loving peoples against future aggressors; for a united front among the great powers backed by the forces of the smaller powers as well. It provides also for lesser combinations for prompt defense on a regional or local basis. And it provides for central organization and direction of the joint forces for peace.

Looking for precautions and remedies against war beyond the war machine itself, the charter envisages also a social and economic organization of the peoples intended to raise the levels and standards of life and work for all, and by thus removing social unrest and injustice to strike at the very roots of war. Men and women everywhere, including dependent peoples still unable to look after themselves, are thus drawn into the vast plan to prevent war, not only by direct force, but also by promoting justice and freedom and social peace among the peoples. No such far-reaching and ambitious plan for war and peace has ever been conceived before, and at this Conference no effort has been spared to broaden it into an effective machine both for security against war and for human advance. To this happy result the delegates in particular of the United Kingdom as the greatest colonial world power, and the delegates of the Dominions, especially Australia and New Zealand, as well as of India, have made outstanding contributions, for which I gladly pay my warm tribute.

Great as our achievement is, I feel that more is needed than a machine of peace. Unless the spirit to operate it is there, the best plan or machine may fail. The human factor must play its part. It is for our peace-loving peoples to see that this great peace plan is backed with all their energy, all their heart, and soul. All the social and political and spiritual forces of our peoples should be

mobilized behind this plan. War today is total, totalitarian, all in. Similarly defense should draft and conscript and organize all the resources of the human spirit behind security against war.

For this total mobilization of the human spirit for peace we must look to all who labor in the wider sphere of our human advance—to the press, the church, the schools and universities, and to all intellectual forces, all the vast network of social and moral agencies which are the support of our civilization. The great imponderables must also be enlisted for peace.

In this respect too we have set a good example at this Conference. Our work has been done in a spirit of good will, good comradeship, good faith, without which it could in fact never have been accomplished. Good will and good faith are written or implied in every provision of this great document. And in our trust of the future we expect that those who come after us, and who will have to carry our charter in the generations to come, will also show no less good will and good faith in their part of the great job of peace.

And so in faith and trust we hand our charter down to the future.

May Heaven's blessing rest on it.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful and profound address, delivered by my colleague, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] at Old Fort Raleigh, Roanoke Island, N. C., a few years ago, under the auspices of the Roanoke Colony Memorial Association, upon the occasion of the celebration of the three hundred and thirty-seventh anniversary of the birth of Virginia Dare.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANISM

(By JOSIAH W. BAILEY)

On the spot where the first child of the English speaking people was born in America and on the occasion of the celebration of that significant event, and in a time when our 100-percent Americanism has become the shibboleth of a secret society, operating in politics, I invite you to seek with me a definition of Americanism; a definition that will stand the tests of history, answer the demands of the hour, and guide us through the storms of the future.

We have no such noun as Asiaism, or Europeanism. Why such a noun as Americanism? Because America—and in our view America is the symbolic word for our republic, the United States—has come to mean something new and distinct in the thinking of all mankind. Americanism sums up the spirit of the United States—expresses our Republic's peculiar spiritual contribution to civilization, comprehends in a word the distinguished spirit of our Republic.

Americanism is not a thing of birth. Some of the best and most American of Americans were born in the old world. Our foundations were laid by men born in Europe, or sons of Europe-born fathers. To call their names would be to call the roll of the fathers and founders of our Republic.

Americanism is not a thing of race. A Bok, a Brandeis, a Riis, a Bonaparte, a Schurz prove to the core as American as a Davis, a Bryan, a Cleveland, a Wilson, or a Roosevelt. In North Carolina even we are most of us Europeans by extraction—we are sons and daughters of immigrants. We proudly speak of ourselves as Anglo-Saxons, as English or Scotch or Scotch-Irish. But we are none the less but rather all the more Americans for that.

Nor is Americanism in any sense a matter of religion. One does not have to be a Christian to be an American, however much being a Christian might add to his moral and spiritual worth. Nor does one have to be a Protestant to be an American. America is not sectarian in any sense. Rather, America is distinguished historically from all other lands in that here there are no religious tests whatsoever—and no penalties or hindrances to the free exercise of the individual conscience in matters religious. We visit no personal or political penalties upon an individual for being a Baptist—and none for being a Catholic. We have no personal or political rewards for Presbyterians, and none for Jews. Religious proscription is un-American, totally un-American. Tolerance is un-American. Intolerance is anti-American. Liberty—absolute religious liberty—is a cardinal principle of Americanism, liberty and not toleration. None of us are tolerated in religious matters—we are free!

Of all the factors going to create the distinctions implied in the noun "Americanism," this one—this broad application of the doctrine of liberty to religion—is the most outstanding. A true American will never raise the question of religion in his dealings, whether public or private, with another American. Religion to the true American is a thing of the conscience, and whatsoever its form, is utterly to be respected. This is the golden rule of Americanism. As you would be free to believe, to think, and to worship, so see to it that every other shall be free to believe, to think, and to worship. If you think your way of it better than another's, let its superiority be manifested in superior living and in works—in the all-powerful form of light, rather than the impotent form of force—a word that has no place in the lexicon of religious progress. Let me reiterate—our America is a land of liberty—not toleration, but liberty. And by liberty let us understand that every individual is free, not only politically but personally free, to worship and also not to worship according to his own conscience; to believe as he chooses or not to believe.

I am constrained to dwell at length upon this essential of Americanism. It is the outstanding contribution of our people to human civilization, and it is our most priceless possession. But if we would preserve it as a heritage to our children there are alarming demands that we renew ourselves in its spirit here and without delay. Many of us are ignorant of its meaning, and the rising generation seems utterly unappreciative of its value, its implications, and its spirit.

What do we mean by religious liberty? Hear John Locke: "Freedom of conscience," "absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty." Bancroft: "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind." Madison in his famous Remonstrance: "The religion of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an inalienable right. We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance. Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess, and observe the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to those whose minds have not yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom is abused it is an offense against God, not against man. To God, therefore, and not to man, must an account of it be rendered." And above all, Jefferson in his statute establishing religious freedom in Virginia:

"Be it enacted by the general assembly, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever; nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities."

These quotations sufficiently establish the meaning of religious freedom—to the effect that that freedom is absolute; that no pains or penalties, no rewards or punishments, no discriminations shall be visited upon a human being because of his religion or because of the want of religion. Here is absolute freedom; and here the first great distinguishing doctrine of Americanism.

Having thus far come in our search for a definition of "Americanism" in terms of what it is not, we may now proceed affirmatively to set out in what terms our land and Government are distinguished from all others.

Our Government is peculiar in its emphasis upon law. There is in America but one authority—the law. And this is our second great distinction.

This is a Government of civil liberty limited and made possible by law. I have been speaking of religious liberty. Religious liberty is not limited by law. It is utter liberty, unlimited. But civil liberty is limited and defined by law. There is but one civil authority in America. It is not the authority of office or of force or of power. Not of thrones, nor of armies, nor of courts. It is the authority of law. Our fathers brought from Europe very little of this world's goods, but they brought the English Bible and the common law, and with these they laid the foundations of this Republic—with these and the spirit of liberty.

The Old-World authority is the throne. In America the authority is the law.

The officer is under the law, as well as the private individual—and each is equal under that law; and each is accountable—responsible—not to thrones and powers, but to the law.

For this reason it has become an axiom of government in America that this is a government of laws, and not of men. And until quite recently, ours was the only government of which this could be said. I wish we might all grasp the tremendous significance of that. It is the bulwark of equality. Men may not be fair, but the law must be fair. There may not be equality before men, but there must be equality before the law. Officers are human, but the law is, if not divine, always approaching the divine. The law is the shadow of the divine order. The legislature is always seeking the ultimate will and wisdom of God. As men find the truth, the laws made by them will reflect it. Often do we blunder, but so often as we discover our blunders just so often do we move nearer to that will and wisdom of God in which the race must at length discover the way of life—here as well as hereafter. Wherefore, this land dedicated to government by law and not men promises to all men not only justice but equality.

When men undertake to enforce the law without themselves being under the form of responsibility of law, or to create standards of conduct outside the law, they oppose real Americanism—they have set out upon a course which will surely return us

to the European and Asiatic standard of government by men—the ancient outworn conception of government by men and not by law. They would lead us back to the wilderess of ancient wrong, not forward to the open plain of freedom.

Americanism means responsibility under the law to the makers of the law; that is, to the sovereign people.

Europeanism, old-world-ism recognized a ruling class that is not responsible. The King can do no wrong; that is, whatsoever the ruling class may do is right. There was none to hold that class to responsibility. There was no law—no standard of conduct—for them. Even Europe has outgrown this antique conception. Nevertheless, of late here in America men have formed themselves into secret groups and have proceeded in disguises to regulate the conduct of their fellows, have adopted all manner of indirect means to assume authority without exposing themselves to that responsibility which is of the vital essence of Americanism. How such men can summon the face to speak of themselves as "100 percent Americans" is beyond fathoming. The only charitable view of inconsistence so gross is that they are utterly ignorant of Americanism and too stupid to learn the most obvious truths. Truly the germ of Americanism has died within them—if it ever existed.

Let us write it here across the sky line of our land—Americanism means direct responsibility under the law. No man in disguise—thereby hiding himself and evading responsibility for his action—is fit to breathe the word "American." His proper place is in the ambush of Africa or the secret Tongs of China. He is in point of time of the Dark Ages. He is spiritually to be classed at best with the children of evil who love the darkness rather than light. Morally he is a coward; and his hood is the physical symbol of his cowardice. He dares not stand in the open and invite the consequences of his conduct. He is unworthy of the cause he assumes to espouse—in that he is unwilling to battle for it in the open.

Americanism means not only liberty limited by law, officers and citizens equally under the law, but also that law administered in open court. If any man is to be disciplined, he must be disciplined either by some organization to which he has voluntarily submitted himself, or in open court, upon indictment or presentment, in the presence of his accusers, by a jury of his fellows, before a judge himself under the law and responsible to the voters. He must be heard in the open before he may be condemned and whosoever would punish or discipline him must be accountable. If a man joins a Baptist church, for example, he submits himself to the discipline of that church. If he joins the Masons, he submits himself to the discipline of the Masons. It is his and their concern. It is a matter of private contract. But what should we say if the Baptists should set out to discipline Methodists or Presbyterians or unbelievers? What if Masons should take a hand to improve the behavior of Odd Fellows or mere non-Masons? Nevertheless it has lately come to pass in America that a secret society called the Ku Klux has assumed to meet in secret counsel, pass judgment, and proceed to regulate all mankind. It is not only meddlesomeness conceived in self-righteousness and presumptuousness but there is added to it a contemptible appearance of downright cowardice, in that the action is taken not in the open but under cover; and in that, groups undertake what the individual members thereof would not dare to do.

The head of this society has recently announced that it has now the power to kill and make alive politically in North Carolina. Here is the challenge. Bow to it or die the death. Stand for it, or be crushed. He ignores the fact, judge that he is, that he and all his followers are sworn to support a Constitution that declares the eternal truth that "secret political societies are dangerous to the liberties of a free people and ought not to be tolerated"; and drunk with the cowardly power of the hood, the power of intimidation, the secret conclave, the secret assault, the torch of terror, and the cowardly mob, proceeds to inform the free men and women of our commonwealth who ought to be the most American of Americans, that he and his klan are supreme therein. If there is in this land a human being due for a rude awakening and a stunning rebuke it is the judge who so far forgets his oath to support the Constitution under which he holds his office and is so ignorant of the spirit of the men and women who hold that ours is a government of laws and not of men of responsibility and not of evasion of responsibility by secrecy.

Widely over our land this society, feeding upon sectarian prejudice, race prejudice, foreign prejudice, the appeal of secrecy to the weak, and the fear of occult influences by the craven, is operating in politics. It endorses one candidate and condemns another. Men hungry for office either make terms with it or wink at it. This in America—the land of responsibility under the law, of responsibility to the whole people, the land of courage and of the open forum. In all soberness, I declare that the time has come when those in whose hearts Americanism yet has a citadel shall make one issue, and that in absolute terms, to wit, that no man who stands in alliance with or fear of a secret political society shall hold any position of responsibility. If he is to be responsible to any others than all the people, if he fears any other save God, if he serves any save the whole people, then he is not fit for any power or authority or public trust whatsoever.

These devotees of secret irresponsibility, these self-appointed regulators of their fellows, even seek by secret, covert, occult means to enforce the law. May I dare to say that it were better not to enforce the law at all than to recognize a secret and irresponsible power in its enforcement? It would be better to go back to the wilderness whence we came and struggle up the painful path our fathers made than to follow this lead to the dungeon and the star chamber. To what end will such a policy come? In all soberness, I affirm that it can come to but one end—the overthrow of every principle of government dear to America. Groups irresponsible to the whole people are never to be trusted. It is of the essence of free government that power must be responsible, must be known, must be exercised in the open, must be itself regulated by law.

If you believe this, you will repudiate every manifestation of secret, undisclosed influence even in the noble cause of law enforcement; for, obviously, by enforcing a given set of laws by such means the foundation of law and liberty are overthrown. What doth it profit a free republic if it gain the enforcement of a few laws and lose its soul—the Constitution—the spirit of liberty?

Bear it ever in mind that in America the power to make laws, to enforce laws, to command officials to their duties, to regulate conduct must come in the open from all the people, must answer in the open to all the people, must operate under law and through its forms, and resist as you would a foreign invader whosoever comes with any other doctrine, for if he come with any other doctrine, be his motive ever so good, ever so dear, his professions ever so noble, he comes to destroy this civilization that bears the name of Americanism.

In short, the law in the American view is not the mere means of regulating conduct or maintaining order—it is the bulwark of liberty. And whosoever offends against the law strikes a blow at liberty—at the foundation of Americanism. Those who take the law into their own hands are offenders no less than they who violate the law as mere criminals. Those who assume without formal warrant of authority to enforce the law are no better essentially than the mob that goes forth to avenge an outrage. And those who disregard the law in any respect are offenders against the means whereby we have our cherished liberties.

It is in response to these higher conceptions of the law that the noble method of passive resistance has been invoked. Men and women, too deeply impressed with the value of the law to disobey a law that seems to them unjust, have resisted passively rather than be put in the position of opposition even to laws that they conceived to be bad laws. This is the true spirit of Americanism. So long as a law is on the books it must be respected—regardless of one's opinions of it. Resist it—but do so passively, not by transgression. By-and-by the opportunity will be presented. If it is not sound law it will be repealed.

So, too, with officers of the law. So long as they are officers they must be respected as ministers of the law. They are not to be disregarded, nor are they to be intimidated. The time always comes when they may be replaced.

So Americanism is not a thing of birth, or race, or religion. It is not a thing of geography or location. Americanism is a spirit—the spirit of absolute religious liberty, the spirit of civil liberty defined by the law of the land, a spirit that demands equality for all men by demanding that all the forces and means of regulation and of discipline shall be in the open and responsible to all the people. This is Americanism; and whoever finds this spirit within him is American, whether he comes from some distant land on yesterday or traces his lineage back to those who founded civilization upon this continent.

It is the spirit that makes for truth, and, therefore, for right. In matters religious the field of discovery is always to be open in America. Pilgrim preacher Robertson, proceeding with his flock across the Atlantic and looking ever for "new light to break forth from God's word," is an American symbol of religious liberty. Roger Williams founding a colony in Rhode Island dedicated to liberty of the soul, Jefferson and Madison planting the doctrine in our organic laws—these are the fathers to whom we must ever and ever again appeal. In their spirit we shall yet know the truth, as the Master promised, and the truth itself—and nothing else than the truth—shall make us free.

In matters political, by means of the publicity of the law, of accountability to the law, of responsibility under the law, we shall yet arrive at the point of justice, we shall yet drink of the fountains of equality, and by no other means shall we arrive, and by none other shall we drink.

And so we shall come to freedom and to justice, and only so shall we come.

That we have wandered here in America so far from the landmarks that our fathers have set, that we should find ourselves suddenly surrounded by numberless groups of men doing violence to the priceless principles of our civilization in the name of Americanism, and that so many of those who constitute these groups should be well-meaning men of really noble motives is, to say the least, most amazing. It is no less disheartening. But we must no the overcome with either amazement or discouragement. We must turn back this tide. We must preach a crusade, we must perform a crusade, of real Americanism. We must fearlessly of all consequence resist and repudiate this corruption of our civilization on the one hand, and on the other we must manifest to all about us the real spirit of America. Not only so, we must revive in our homes and schools, the plant beds of our civilization, an appreciation of the American principles, the American history, and the American spirit. Ignorance is at bottom of most of our ills. And reading, writing, arithmetic, and geog-

raphy are by no means the antidote to ignorance. There must be in the content of real education somewhat more. There must be schooling in citizenship, there must be schooling in the principles of liberty, there must be schooling in essential Americanism—in the history of liberty and the doctrines thereof. It ought to be impossible for a child to remain in a free school 3 years without acquiring a lifelong appreciation of the simple principles I have here set out. And it surely ought to be impossible for any man or woman to reach the point of citizenship without a clear attachment to these principles. Indeed, it ought to be impossible to breathe the atmosphere of an American home 10 years without imbibing these simple but essential principles of Americanism.

Each generation begins anew. Truth is not born in men. All the evil that ever was in man was potential in the babe, Virginia Dare; all the good that ever was in man was possible to her. And so with the new-born babe of this hour. Here is our great lesson. Fathers and mothers must pass on the light not by inheritance, not by will or devise, but by the painful process of the fireside, by luminous example, by the light of life itself, and by line upon line, precept upon precept.

The Public's Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the public's bill of rights, made by me, as published in the Cleveland News for July 14, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC'S BILL OF RIGHTS

(By United States Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio)

The labor peace bill recently introduced in the United States Senate as S. 1171 by Senators HATCH, BALL, and myself is the public's bill of rights.

It seeks to be fair, for nothing can last long in America that is not fair. Our Constitution is for the protection and benefit of all. It does not sanction the use of arbitrary force even by a majority against a minority. It recognizes the universal obligation of everyone to be fair to the general public from whom all just governmental powers are derived.

Those vested with governmental authority are not owners of it; they are trustees of it for the benefit of the public.

This bill takes no backward step. It is a step forward in the cause of labor. It clarifies and equalizes the rights of all parties in the light of experience. It protects the public where the public is concerned.

If we are to have steady employment and prosperity, fair treatment must be applied to the industrial employer, employee, investor, consumer, and also to those who do not work in organized industry but are affected by it. This includes, among others, small businessmen, returning soldiers, white-collar workers, farmers, Government workers, domestic servants, and all who contribute to the American standard of living.

The public's bill of rights touches upon seven labor relations:

1. Delay and cumbersome procedure in solving labor disputes: The bill decentralizes and thereby reduces the load of labor disputes on Federal agencies. It limits the Federal jurisdiction by excluding from it local controversies and controversies which affect interstate commerce only indirectly. These it leaves to State agencies. It excludes controversies concerning Government employment and employment by an employer of less than 20 employees, unless the controversy threatens substantial interruption of commerce. It excludes employment of agricultural labor, domestic service, employment by labor organizations, controversies provided for by the Railway Labor Act, and those within the scope of the National War Labor Board.

2. Unfair labor practices: It clarifies these. It prohibits them by employer and employee alike. It assigns the prevention and punishment of them to an unfair labor practices tribunal of three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

3. The closed shop: It recognizes the closed shop but requires fairness to its members and nonmembers. Because of the great economic power of a closed-shop union over not only those who wish to join it but over those who do not wish to join it, this bill declines to recognize a closed-shop union as the representative of the employees of a shop if it violates one or more of the following requirements: That its membership include at least 75 percent of the employees to be covered by the proposed labor agreement; that the agreement be ratified on a secret ballot by 60 percent of the employees covered; that admission to membership shall be on terms substantially equivalent to those enjoyed by the majority of its existing members; and that no member shall be deprived of membership in such a manner as also to lose his employment except on written charges and after a fair hearing. These are part of the bill of rights of the individual worker and part of the trusteeship that a closed-shop union owes to the public in return for the public's grant to it of certain legal authority over minority employees.

4. Controversies under existing agreements need simplified procedure: These grievances are to be settled by adjustment boards set up by the parties or by the Federal Industrial Relations Board. This procedure follows that of most modern labor agreements. It amounts to the substitution by law of a simplified industrial procedure in place of the complex court procedure which otherwise is prescribed by law for the determination of such violations of contracts.

5. Need for dependable elections of bargaining representatives: Controversies over the choice of bargaining representatives are to be decided by the Federal Industrial Relations Board, subject to court review. Elections may be held under direction of the Board. Fairness is as essential in these elections as in public elections. If these elections are recognized by law their fairness should be secured by law.

6. Need for authorized procedure and public protection in making new agreements and amendments to existing agreements: Controversies arising out of new agreements or new amendments to existing agreements are to be settled by negotiation, mediation, or voluntary arbitration, somewhat as under the Railway Labor Act. Procedure will be simplified by consolidating all Federal conciliation services under the Federal Industrial Relations Board of five members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. If these voluntary procedures fail, the Federal Board may appoint a fact-finding commission or may recommend that one be appointed by the President. Except to the limited extent indicated below, all of these proceedings are voluntary. The right of the individual to quit his work and to leave his place of employment is fully protected. The right to strike is protected, subject to the reasonable limitations prescribed below which are in the interest of the public.

The limitations on strikes are only that during the brief periods while the Federal procedures are being followed to reach a voluntary adjustment, the right to strike and the right to lock-out are suspended. Also in a few cases of severe hardship, to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, the fact-finding commission as a last rescourse has the right to prescribe temporary terms of settlement normally for 1 year and in no event for longer than 2 years. The kind of cases where the public interest requires this protection are to be determined by the Board in accordance with the provisions of the bill and examples of cases where severe hardship on the public would justify such temporary compulsory settlements of industrial differences are those where otherwise there would occur a serious or protracted interruption of public utility or other public service, or of the supply of an essential food such as milk, or the supply of an essential fuel such as coal or oil.

7. Report on the democratic control and operation of employer organizations and labor organizations: The bill requires the Unfair Labor Practices Tribunal to investigate this subject and report, within 2 years, as to the need for legislation in this field.

The public is becoming more and more vitally dependent upon industrial relations, price levels, general employment, and ready access to the necessities of life. There is, therefore, increasing need for fair legislation in the nature of an industrial bill of rights for the public. This bill seeks to meet that need.

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, recently over radio station KGHL, Billings, Mont., Mr. Wallace E. Pearson, president of the First National Bank of Lovell, Wyo., delivered an address in which he discussed the Missouri Valley Authority bill. Mr. Pearson resides in a neighboring State, but his community, a prosperous farming center, would be affected by the proper development of irrigation and hydroelectric power projects the same as hundreds of other communities throughout the Missouri Basin, and he has found many reasons for supporting the bill.

Mr. Pearson is not actively engaged in politics in any way whatever, but is an independent banker and a member of the Republican Party. He has a keen sense of his duty as a public-spirited citizen to become informed upon public questions. Reading in the press of my State many unmerited attacks on the MVA proposal, Mr. Pearson at his own expense went to the Tennessee Valley and made a thorough study of the Tennessee Valley Authority and conditions existing there which are in a large measure traceable to the developments sponsored and promoted by the TVA. Upon returning from

the Tennessee Valley he delivered a radio address telling the people of eastern Montana and northern Wyoming the facts as he found them. In his own way he placed these facts before the public over the radio. It was a most commendable public-spirited act, and I ask that his remarks be incorporated in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Missouri Valley Authority, the MVA, is modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority, the TVA. When it was first proposed I figured it would be interesting to look over the TVA, see what it had accomplished, and consider whether the same plans would work out in this country.

First I got all the information obtainable on the TVA. I was told of all the fine things it had accomplished in the Tennessee Valley. I was also told it was a radical, socialistic experiment, that it was a further move to centralized government, and to government by bureaucracies, that it was another way of substituting government enterprise for private enterprise. If all these latter things were true naturally, as a lifelong Republican, I was against it.

So when I went over the TVA and for a couple of weeks talked with farmers, businessmen, State extension workers and others, I was continually looking for the wild-eyed long-haired impractical type, for socialistic experiments, for encroachment on private business, for the nigger in the woodpile.

Here is what I found: The TVA has been administered in a sound manner, their power program is operating in the black and on a basis that will repay to the Nation within 30 to 60 years the entire cost of the power development, which is the major item in the cost of TVA. There have been experiments naturally but I would class most of them as "hard headed" experiments and God help us when we quit experimenting and throw up our hands at every new idea. I did not find the long-haired radicals in its management that had been rumored. I did not find any encroachment on private business other than in the public utility field and that is nothing new; we have had the Government producing power at the Shoshone Dam near Cody for 35 years and municipal power plants are certainly nothing new. In fact, I found that they leaned over backward to keep from encroaching on private business.

I found the people within the area strongly in favor fo the TVA. How could they be otherwise when you consider what TVA has done for them. Specifically:

Flood control has been achieved.

There is navigation of the river from its mouth up to Knoxville, 650 miles, by means of a 9-foot channel.

Power resources of the river have received full development, rates have been materially reduced with resulting increased and wider consumption.

Use of phosphates and other fertilizers have been greatly increased by making them available and by an aggressive program of publicity through the use of test demonstration farms.

The rivers and lakes and reservoirs are being fully developed for recreational facilities.

Stream sanitation is being studied, with a resulting decrease in stream pollution.

The mineral resources of the region are being explored and given publicity.

The forests are being scientifically handled by reforestation, long-term planning on the cutting of timber, and experiments on new uses of the available timber.

The resources of the region are being studied for their value to industry. This information is passed on to the public—to private business—for its use.

More than half of the region has been covered by soil surveys and this work is continuing.

The TVA, by reforestation, planting of cover crops, and other methods, is fighting soil erosion, not only to preserve the land but also to control silt deposit in the dam reservoirs.

These are some of the varied activities of the TVA, and there are many others, all carried on in a unified program for the material development of the region affected. Bear in mind that these are not just vague proposals—that the power, flood control, and navigation work on the Tennessee River is already completed, and that the various other activities are being carried on in a very comprehensive fashion. They have harnessed the Tennessee River for the use of mankind—the old river can't flood any more; from now on it's working 24 hours a day.

The astonishing thing about all these definite achievements and progressing programs is the speed and efficiency within which they have been accomplished. The TVA Act was passed in May 1933, just 12 years ago. One might say, "Anybody could do that with $750,000,000." But there's more to it than that. There must be a soundly conceived plan placed into effect and administered by an efficient management.

The argument that such a regional public corporation is an interference with States' rights has disappeared with experience as to how it operates. The best proof of this is that while the South is strong on States' rights yet on December 31, 1944, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried an interview with the governors of the seven States within which the TVA operates and all of them definitely endorsed the TVA as a proven instrument for regional development. They can show value received down there for the money spent and we have many justifiable projects in this area that should receive similar treatment.

I presume you are all familiar with the TVA, after which it is proposed to model the MVA. It is a public corporation, possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoints a board of three directors, designating the chairman. All other officials and employees are selected by the corporation itself, the intent being to keep politics strictly out of the picture. I think it is just sound business that management should have the right to choose its own employees. Looks like the administrative set-up is good and divorced from politics insofar as humanly possible, a condition frequently absent and much to be desired in governmental agencies. The corporation maintains its principal office at a convenient place in its area. This means that the business is run, decisions are made and carried out within the area and without reference to Washington. I like that. We have all learned how far this western country is from Washington.

The goal of the TVA has been stated to be "to uncover and develop economic opportunity." This has always been a function of Government and the TVA is a modern device to do the job more effectively. It streamlines the efforts of the various existing Government agencies, unifies and coordinates their activities, effecting a regional integration of agencies, public and private, upon which future economic growth depends.

The method of translating plans into action is interesting. There were already Government bureaus doing most of the things—or at least having an interest in them—that TVA proposed to do. But each bureau was primarily interested in its own affairs and program. Moreover the fountain head of each bureau was in Washington with policies and important decisions made there. The offices of the TVA had to be located, by the terms of the act, within the region itself and the board of directors there located had the authority to carry on the business of the corporation in all its aspects. This effected a very important decentralization and not only speeded up things, but also took away that paralyzing doubt field men of Government bureaus seem to have as to what Washington will say and that makes them sometimes so slow in their operations. Authority out in the field then was one reason for their success and this was coupled with the plan of having one authority that could unify and correlate the activities of these various governmental agencies whose work should so often dovetail, an authority that would consider the welfare of the region from the standpoint of its fullest development, embracing all the things to be done, rather than piecemeal through the eyes of a single Government bureau interested of necessity in its own work.

In carrying on this unified plan the TVA has made use of all existing agencies, both Federal and State, who have facilities to do the work desired, entering into contracts with them for the performance of the work. It should be here noted that much of the worthwhile results have been accomplished by these agencies working with the TVA. I contacted a number of State extension workers and did not run into any friction problems. One assistant county agent told me, "The TVA has helped us do a better job and given us full credit for doing it."

The TVA has been actively interested in the adjustment of class freight rates as they adversely affect the South, a matter that vitally affects the West also. This is mentioned to show the extent of the endeavor made by TVA to build up the industry of its region.

After going over the TVA on the ground, studying it and talking with the people who have operated under it for 12 years I am convinced the Tennessee Valley has been tremendously benefited by it. I do not regard the plan as a trend towards socialism, rather it appeals to me as a change in the administrative set-up of a large number of Government bureaus who needed to have their activities tied in together by a decentralized management more familiar with the problems of the region than Washington bureaucrats.

The Missouri Valley is much larger than that of the Tennessee. Its interests are more diverse. Unless the administrative set-up provides for an upper States and a lower States general office clothed with full authority to handle all local problems much of the advantage accruing from a regional authority is lost. I would urge therefore a manager for the upper part of the river located say at Billings, making possible quicker, close-to-the-ground decisions, all under the policies laid down by the directors. This should be strongly urged.

We must be sure that our water rights for irrigation purposes have absolute protection.

The method of reimbursement for loss of local taxes should be studied. Inevitably there will be competition between MVA power and private utilities. When Government goes into business I think in all fairness it should not be subsidized by lower taxes and at the expense of the State and county within which it operates.

We now have Government bureaus that have great efficiency and are well staffed. The Reclamation Bureau is a good example. But its present set-up does not provide, nor does it have the funds, to service and protect the interests of land not embraced within their projects. That leaves these nonproject lands at a disadvantage. When it comes to a conflict of interest on water rights as between reclamation projects and privately owned lands, they have in the past taken the attitude that it is a conflict between the Government and nonproject lands. The

Government pays the bill for fighting the battle of the project water users and the nonproject users are put in the position of fighting the Government and incidentally paying for it. They forget we are all part of the United States of America. An MVA would give wider application of Government development work than presently exists. But let's not criticize these bureaus; they function as they are presently set up. The point I want to make is that if we don't go MVA, the Reclamation Bureau should be directed by Congress to represent all the people, not just the project users, and should be adequately staffed and financed to do the work.

We should carefully consider therefore whether the present Government and State agencies, or the proposed new type regional agency, can best do this development work for us. If we think well of the MVA but think certain amendments are necessary, let's study and think them out. If we conclude we don't like the MVA we should pick out the flaws in the present development setup, because there is no fooling about what TVA has done for its region nor what MVA could do for us. And finally, when we analyze it, let's not get sidetracked on vague generalities nor be afraid of a new idea that has proven its worth.

Our National Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our National Birthday," from the Duluth Free Press of July 6, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL BIRTHDAY

July Fourth marks the birthday of this Republic, a day when men daringly signed their names to a charter which gave human rights a greater recognition than ever known. Under that charter we grew, thrived, and created a Nation which not only has been an inspiration throughout the world, but actually has been the mainstay of all Government by law when the Hitler organized forces of paganistic barbarism would destroy man's best hope on earth.

Today there is a problem at home—one that needs searching answers: "Whence came and whither going?" It cannot be denied that there are many, even in high places, who would willingly surrender the liberties of people for what they choose to call a Government-controlled economy. Seeking to deceive the people, they do not say that controlled economy means a return to dictatorship or the rule of kings, nor that the people will again become slaves of a ruling power. They seek to promote class distinction, hatred by one group for some other. They dare not tell the American people that they themselves are the real rulers in America; that they can achieve all social benefits without sacrificing one iota of constitutional liberty. Enemies from without can never overthrow our Government, but enemies from within can, if enough citizens are willing to become blind followers of blind leaders who again would fasten the shackles of physical slavery upon the wrists of men.

People know that when public sentiment is fully aroused its power is supreme. Public sentiment makes and unmakes nations. It writes the law. Some may oppose but they, like twigs, upon the breast of some flooding stream are swept away. We, in this Nation, can achieve changes without physical violence. Others may require force. We can use the ballot and effect a bloodless revolution. If demands for equal wealth were backed by an aroused, understanding electorate it can be attained under our own form of government and that without a great army of office holders. A single change within our law would accomplish such results.

Understanding the underlying principles is necessary. Residents within a city, through elected officials, appoint police to safeguard the public welfare. Neither the businessman nor the workingman feel the need of walking the streets at night to see that prowlers or thieves do not break in and steal. That is a responsibility of the police, not that of the citizen. Hence without responsibility little regard for other problems exist.

The chief cause of strife and friction between management and labor springs from the fact that neither fully understands problems of the other. Each one assumes that understanding their own problems is largely sufficient. Neither feels a responsibility for acquiring a knowledge of the other. Labor neither studies the problem of production, management, supplies, taxation, distribution, sales, meeting payrolls, etc., nor understands them. Management is equally lax. Whether labor receives an earning of 5 or 25 dollars per day, it still is only a wage. As long as there is no responsibility for understanding the problems involved in its earning there will be no brake upon seeking more. Lost earnings and wages due to strikes and friction will continue. Management must learn the problems of labor and willingly share with them the earnings of business, for neither can profit without the other.

A single law adopted would create such a responsibility. Returning to the original desire for equality of wealth, assume that a law was enacted requiring corporations to seat on the directorate members of the laboring crafts with a voting power equal to that of the investors. Labor then becomes equally responsible for success or failure of the enterprise. To protect its own welfare labor must study the problems of management and management must study the problems of labor. Each must understand the other to maintain harmony and output, distribution and income. If it shall be assumed that 6 percent is a fair return upon investment, let that offset or be equal to wages paid. Distribute any amount earned in excess of all other requirements equally between the two. Equal responsibilities would mean equal distribution of business earnings for neither can profitably operate without the other. Stock ownership and bonus sharing with employees is a step in this direction. The creation of responsibility will fully achieve it. It may be the only means of retaining our national liberty.

When the Constitution was first written it stated that all men were free. That was not literally true but it was a goal to aim at, something to be achieved. It remained for Lincoln, with the aid of citizens, to strike the shackles of slavery from the wrists of men, to make that Constitution a living, breathing thing of reality when all men were freed from bondage. Americans can free themselves from threats of renewed slavery under dictators or kings; from intellectual and economic bondage by establishing responsibility and equality for all. We can return to the road from whence we came and be a light to citizens of the world. Dare to resolve that we shall have a new birth of freedom and human rights enshrined within the hearts of all liberty-loving people.

Tribute to Gen. Omar N. Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post commending the appointment of Gen. Omar N. Bradley as head of the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' GENERAL

It is doubtful whether President Truman has made or will make an appointment more appropriate than that of Gen. Omar N. Bradley to head the Veterans' Administration. On the fields of battle, first in Tunisia and Sicily and then in France and Germany, he won the respect and admiration of the men in the ranks. Indeed, he might be described as the GI's general. The warm feeling of these fighting men toward General Bradley will give him the best possible assurance of full support in the essential reorganization of the Veterans' Administration for its new responsibilities.

General Bradley early established a reputation as an organizer and morale builder. In north Africa he welded scattered units into a strong fighting force. He used organization, planning and relentless work as means of saving lives. Without a trace of theatrics in his nature and without resort to flamboyant discipline, he made himself known as the quiet, thoughtful general who was a marvel at getting things done. Bradley's reputation grew because he inspired his men in addition to commanding them. He understood their problems and worked with them in the accomplishment of two great purposes: the defeat of the enemy and the saving of life wherever that was possible. These are the qualities that automatically put the seal of greatness on an able strategist and tactician when destiny gives him a unique command.

These qualities—organizing skill, human understanding and concern for the welfare of his men—could not be put to better use now that the war in Europe is over, than in readjustment of the care of veterans to present-day techniques. In the 22 years that General Hines headed the Veterans' Administration he has served faithfully and well, as the President fully recognized in accepting his resignation. The fact remains that some veterans' hospitals have fallen shockingly behind the march of progress in medicine. With thousands of wounded veterans from the present war filling up these hospitals, moreover, a whole new program is in order. Hereafter veterans' affairs must be geared primarily to the requirements of the victims of World War II. Veterans' hospitals must seek new methods, new techniques and new concepts of service. It is a task that will challenge General Bradley's ingenuity and devotion no less than did the direction of our conquering armies in their advance into Germany. We have every confidence that he will meet the challenge with the same masterful but unobtrusive touch that has already won for him the deep thanks and affection of the Nation.

A Needed Deflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Needed Deflation," from the Wall Street Journal of July 10, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

A NEEDED DEFLATION

A propaganda which has certainly had official blessing, if not actual sponsorship, is leading the American people—insofar as they have been persuaded to think about the matter at all—to expect from the Bretton Woods international financial program far greater benefits than it will be humanly possible to deliver.

Unless the promises that are clearly being implied are deflated, unless in some way the hard facts of the world's economic situation and the difficulty in dealing with them are told to the people of this country, unless there is a reversal of the "line" that a couple of untried institutions are going to set everything right in a hurry, the American people are in for some disappointments which certainly will be bitter and which may be very expensive. If such disillusionment occurs, the chance for international economic cooperation, which was so badly fumbled at London in 1933 may be wholly lost for a number of years.

Let's look at some of these claims.

One of them is that an institution called the International Monetary Fund will stimulate export and import trade. It will do this, according to the words commonly used, by stabilizing the rate of international exchange.

The Monetary Fund can stimulate American exports beyond what they would ordinarily be only by putting into the hands of other nations, or the citizens of those nations, purchasing power which would not exist without the fund. The sponsors of the fund defend it by saying that they do not intend to do this. They say that they intend to safeguard the fund to prevent its irresponsible use. Perhaps they do, but it can't be two ways. You cannot give nations access to a pool of money on the grounds that it will enable them to buy and at the same time make good the assertion that you don't intend to let them use it very much.

The sponsors of this measure talk about the value of stabilizing the rates of exchange. We think you can't do that. You can stabilize currencies and when they are stabilized they will bear to each other a relationship that will not fluctuate widely. This will engender confidence and promote exchanges of goods. But until the currencies are stabilized you cannot stabilize the relationships. Any attempt to stabilize rates of exchange without stabilizing the currencies is equivalent to the thought that you can say that 10 cigar coupons are worth a dollar and have people believe you.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee in reporting the Bretton Woods bill intimates that it provides for the elimination of unfair and discriminatory currency practices. There may be a wide definition of what is unfair and discriminatory, but if the Senate committee meant that the Bretton Woods program would eliminate the various practices that prevailed just before the outbreak of the war, the statement is just so extravagant as to be untrue. The Bretton Woods agreement provides that in certain cases these practices of devaluation, blocked balances and bilaterial arrangements may be continued for a period of years.

The Bretton Woods bill which already has passed the House will soon come before the Senate. Surely there is in that body some individual or some group with the capacity to tell the country what this program is, what it will do and what it will not do. Whoever undertakes the job probably will be the victim of defamatory attack, but there is also the probability that he or they will, when the smoke has cleared away, receive recognition as having performed a valuable public service.

There was a time when overenthusiastic people foresaw the millenium in a world organization such as that set up at San Francisco. The country has now come to the saner view that the United Nations Charter is not a solution for all our ills but an opportunity to work out a solution for some of them. That is as it should be. Someone should bring Bretton Woods to the same basis.

Don't Call Me a Communist Any More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Don't Call Me a Communist Any More," written by Martin Crowe and published in the Progressive for July 16, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T CALL ME A COMMUNIST ANY MORE

(By Martin Crowe)

I used to enjoy being called a Communist. I don't any more.

I remember way back around 1920, when my dad ran for representative in Minnesota. He was a Farmer-Laborite. And that apparently was bad.

Because I remember that they called him a "bolshevik," and I remember the eggs they hurled at my dad one afternoon in a farmer's yard.

My dad was a simple man. He was a bookbinder by trade and a crusader by inclination. I'm sure he didn't know who Lenin was. I'm sure the term "bolshevik" confused him. But he used to get in his old Model T and go out in the country and try to talk to the farmers.

My dad was never scared out. He may have been afraid, of course—I guess, now, he probably was. But he believed in something—a vague idea like justice—and they never could make him change, or turn back, or give in.

I was very proud of my dad then. I didn't understand just how it was—but I kind of caught the feeling my dad had, I think. I didn't mind being called a "little bolshevik." It was fun.

I'm still proud of my dad now—when I think back. When I remember.

In 1924 I was 10 years old and old Bob La Follette ran for president. Fighting Bob La Follette. I used to go from door to door in the town where I lived and pass out buttons and literature.

"Vote for Bob La Follette," I'd say when they opened the door.

Usually they slammed it shut—and some snarled, "Communist," and some said, "Red." I remember, though, that others were very nice to me. One old lady gave me cookies, and a younger one gave me an apple.

It was my dad who got me to take the stump for Bob La Follette, of course. But I got to like him a lot. He became my hero along with Jumpin' Joe Dugan, who played third base for the Yankees, and Jack Dempsey.

I remember that I disliked Cal Coolidge very much. And I didn't mind when they called me a "Red." It was a badge of honor, in a way. They were too stupid to know it. But it was.

My political activities were set aside, more or less, in favor of baseball, until my senior year in high school.

THE GREAT FLOYD OLSON

Then 1932. Floyd Olson was running for Governor in Minnesota, and every paper in the State, it seemed, was out to get him.

I considered Floyd Olson the greatest man in America and the best friend the common people had ever had. I argued with other boys in school—and with their parents. I argued with my teachers.

Almost everyone who disagreed with me called me a Communist. I didn't mind. I wasn't a Communist, but if supporting a great man like Floyd Olson meant that you seemed like a Communist, I began to feel that Communists couldn't be so bad. Anyhow, I didn't mind being called one.

In 1936 Floyd Olson died. I remember that I prayed he wouldn't die when I heard he was critically ill. I remember that I cried when he was dead. I remember going to his funeral in the Minneapolis Auditorium and looking at all the humble, little people who were there. I remember that Phil La Follette, who was Governor of Wisconsin, gave the eulogy as a close friend of Floyd Olson—and as a believer in the same bright dream for the common man.

I remember Phil La Follette spoke very briefly. I remember he quoted from Markham's Lincoln, Man of the People.

"* * * as when a lordly cedar green with boughs
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leave a lonesome place against the sky."

I heard the quiet sobbing all around me. But my heart was leaping with a song. Because I know then that all I ever wanted to do was to be like Floyd Olson—and believe in the things he believed in, and fight for them. And fight for the people—the little people. Always. No matter what they called me. In some ways that was the greatest day of my life.

I spoke at rallies for Elmer Benson, who ran for Governor as Floyd Olson's successor. I spoke for Ernest Lundeen, who was Floyd Olson's friend, when he ran for United States Senator. My friends assured me I was a pawn in the hands of Communists. My Catholic friends, particularly, despaired of me.

I didn't mind.

I joined a theater group which included many Jews. They were Communists, I was told. I didn't know, for sure, if they were or not. I didn't care. They put on plays like Waiting for Lefty, by Clifford Odets. Their dramatic aims were high. Their social aims were higher still. I liked them.

I began to teach night school for the WPA education program. I was elected president of the teachers union of our group in St. Paul. The union was called communistic. So was I. Our Minneapolis group went on strike and the papers condemned them. I was proud of them for their courage.

I am a Catholic and I believe in Catholicism. I never really found a way to coordinate my Catholicism with formal communism. I never became a Communist.

But I didn't mind being called one. I enjoyed it. The people I knew who were Communists were good people—sincere and idealistic. At least, most of them were. The political leaders I'd most admired had always been labeled as Communists. The New Deal, in which I put my new hopes of fair play for humanity, was called communistic. I didn't mind being grouped with such people and such ideas. I liked it.

Then the war got going.

Germany was fighting with Russia as an ally. The Communists wanted us to stay out of it. It got so everyone who wanted us to stay out was suspected of being a Communist—or accused of it by those who wanted us to get in. Again I didn't mind the charge. I liked it. I went to Chicago in 1940 as a delegate to a peace mobilization rally. We were called Communists—and many there were Communists. The rally was a failure——but I enjoyed it and the bright idea it held before me.

Then Germany attacked Russia. The Communists began to demand we go into the war. I was confused. I hated war. I didn't believe a war could be a good thing. Not really good.

But I changed.

NOT ANY MORE, PLEASE

I saw many men who had supported Floyd Olson and Bob La Follette and all the rest going over to the war idea—prescribing the war as a crusade. I heard the man in whom I believed so much, Franklin D. Roosevelt, preach the war as a crusade. And so I began to see it as a crusade—and I changed over. Not completely, maybe; but most of the way, at least.

Then I saw a strange thing happen. I saw men like Bob and Phil La Follette and Burt Wheeler, who'd carried the torch for the common man from the beginning—from way back when it was dangerous to carry it—I saw them charged with being reactionaries and Fascists all of a sudden just because they opposed our entrance into the war. I was confused again. But finally I was convinced that they had changed. That the light of liberalism had died out in their souls. That they'd sold out the people. My friends who were liberals, and had been called Communists, convinced me.

Then Japan attacked and almost every American was united. The war was on.

Recently I've had the old charge of Communism leveled again. I've supported my new vision of the great American, Henry Wallace, in speech and in print. I've supported the CIO. I haven't minded the communistic label. I've liked it.

But not any more. Please don't call me a Communist now. It is a term in which I no longer find a thrill. It is a term of contempt now. For me.

The change began when I read some of the words of the "lost liberals" like La Follette and found them still good and still liberal. It began when I found these men still fighting for the laboring man—the common people. It began when I found these men—these men who they said were Tories and Fascists—fighting for the rights of free speech and a fair shake for all the little, forsaken people of the earth. Anywhere. Any time. It began when I found that charity and decency and tolerance and liberalism and justice were still in the minds and hearts of these men I thought had abandoned the fight. It was I who abandoned it.

My awakening began when I found these men again—and read their words and reviewed their acts. It reached its completion when I looked at Joe Stalin.

For Stalin is the one who sold out the liberals. Russia is the country which today practices the imperialism as old as the British Navy. Stalin's men have been preaching revenge and cruelty and contempt for the conquered which are as old as Attila or Genghis Khan. Stalin is the one who runs true to form as a conqueror—true as Bonaparte—or Bismarck—or Alexander the Great.

Liberalism is young and new and alive—and different. Stalinism is old and dead and heavy with a gray sameness. Liberalism dares to preach a new, shining hope in a doctrine of starting over in a world brotherhood with everyone—friend and enemy—in it. Stalinism preaches a doctrine as old as that which Cato led the Romans to apply to Carthage—a doctrine of domination, of division of spoils, of might over right.

So please don't call me a Communist again. The thrill is gone.

My dad used to laugh when they threatened him back in the Model T days. But it was because there was something to laugh at—the laughter was in the dream.

He would not laugh today. There is no laughter in Stalinism. There is none of the old under-dog idea, of the one who is down but is grinning and getting ready to get back up again. Stalinism is on its feet. Very steady, too. But the laughter is gone. The dream is dead.

Don't call me a Communist now. Unless you mean the kind Christ was. He believed in the brotherhood of men, in mercy, in the dignity of the human being and the human soul. Stalin isn't that kind of a Communist. Maybe he isn't any kind. Maybe he isn't a Communist at all.

I guess it won't be unpopular now to be called a Communist. The boys on the radio praise Stalin every night. The Junior Chamber of Commerce likes it, I guess. The National Association of Manufacturers will, too, perhaps. Thomas Lamont, they say, issues statements in behalf of J. P. Morgan & Co. on how nice Stalin is once you get to deal with him. And a J. P. Morgan partner ought to know. Yes; it's fashionable now to flirt with the Communists.

But I'll just as soon be unpopular then. It was always fun that way. Don't call me a Communist now. Call me a radical maybe. Or a nonconformist. Or whatever may strike you.

Or else just call me a young man slightly disappointed in love. Call me a man who vaguely wooed a girl with the wind in her hair—and now finds her with a permanent wave and an expensive new hat on her head.

And nothing more.

Some Facts About Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a serious sugar shortage. Because sugar is not available, great quantities of fruits and vegetables are being wasted that should be canned. Bakers and other food-processing plants are being curtailed. Each day I receive a number of letters protesting the Government sugar program.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to list a few of the factors responsible for the present situation. Our sugar shortage is caused by the blundering and mishandling of the program by the Government. The following facts have a direct bearing on our present shortage:

First. This administration has been hostile to domestic sugar production, particularly the expansion of the sugar-beet industry. High officials, including Henry Wallace, were opposed to an expansion of sugar-beet raising.

Second. When the war threatened this policy was not changed. Early in 1941, H. R. 3582 was introduced by Congressman Harry Coffee, of Nebraska. This bill provided, that if the Philippine Islands could not market their full quota of sugar in the United States, that the quota be assigned to domestic producers by increasing their quota accordingly. Although Pearl Harbor was only about 10 months away, the administration opposed this legislation.

Third. The greatest possible domestic production of sugar has not been attained during the war, because of the Government's delays in setting prices and giving the necessary go signals. Similar delays have hurt production in Cuba and the West Indies.

Fourth. The failure of the Government to get the labor troubles in Puerto Rico settled caused us to lose 500,000 tons.

Fifth. The recent allocation to Spain of 60,000 tons of sugar. Spain is not our ally, and is not even a member of the United Nations.

Sixth. In recent months the lend-lease shipments of sugar to foreign countries has amounted to 1,300,000,000 pounds. This is approximately 10 pounds per person in the United States.

It is not my intention, in listing lend-lease shipment of sugar, to imply that this constituted blundering, if these shipments were made according to law and to bring about an early victory in Europe. I do list this amount of lend-lease sugar because I think the people should have all the facts bearing upon our sugar situation.

War Chests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as paradoxical as it may seem, the British Empire, producing 70 percent of the world's gold, with an unmined gold reserve estimated to be 400,000,000 ounces in South Africa alone, and one of the greatest enemies of silver and its use as money, has been forced to come to America for silver for a war chest to save British credit in both World Wars.

We were told in this conflict that days of war chests were over—and accordingly we shut down our gold mines and stopped production of gold in the United States. Not so the British—the gold mines of Canada have continued to operate and expand, mostly with United States money. And while many of our mining companies producing strategic metals have had their delays and troubles getting priorities for the necessary equipment and replacements to produce these vitally needed war metals, the British

South African gold mines have been running full time. The South African Purchasing Commission, domiciled in the United States, is free to go into our markets and buy all the gold-mine equipment it can find for shipment to South Africa. At the same time, the silver reserves of the United States Treasury have been opened to the British to build up a British war chest to the extent of some 300,000,000 ounces of silver, without cost, mainly to be coined into money for circulation in the British Empire, the silver to be returned to us when it has served its purpose in bolstering British credit by circulating in the channels of British trade and business.

American silver went to the rescue of the British in the last World War to be returned to us in a way that had drastic results. Most of us recall how in their financial extremity in the last war, the British drew on silver reserves of our Treasury for 200,000,000 ounces for coinage, for which they paid us a dollar an ounce, to be used mainly to bolster British credit in India. The British credit was saved and the war was won, and the British proceeded with their plans to recapture their foreign trade and the world banking business.

First they called in their silver coinage in England, extracted 90,000,000 ounces of silver from these coin by reducing the silver content from .925 fine to .500 fine. They then returned to circulation the same amount of money by replacing the silver extracted with the equivalent amount of alloy and were successful in selling the 90,000,000 ounces of silver taken from their coinage in the Orient without breaking the market. The next move "to return the useless silver" they had obtained from the United States was to shift India to a monetary system on a gold bullion basis which meant that Indian paper rupees would only be redeemable in gold bullion in quantities of $8,000. This defeated the gold redemption feature as far as any monetary use of gold by the people of India was concerned.

With the silver rupees flowing into the bank in the ordinary course of business, the mechanics of retiring the silver and replacing it with paper rupees was a simple banking operation and the stage was set to "return" our silver which was dumped on the market with disastrous results to the purchasing power of the oriental customers of business in the United States. When, by this manipulation, the price of silver fell to 25 cents per ounce, the wharves and docks on our west coast and the wharves and docks of the oriential countries on the other side of the Pacific were soon blocked with grain, flour, and all kinds of exports which could not be moved across the ocean or into the interior of China because the money of the orientals had lost its purchasing power. We soon saw the price of wheat in the Northwest States fall as low as 19 cents a bushel. With their western wheat unsalable, the farmers could not pay their taxes and many rural schools could not open. Business stagnation set in and the depression of 1930 was on.

In the last war we only furnished the British 200,000,000 ounces of silver, for which we received $200,000,000. This silver, after turning the trick of saving British credit, was thrown on the market with disastrous results. Now, this time we have handed them a bigger war chest of 300,000,000 ounces of silver as a lend-lease item, without any cost to them, which has been coined and put into circulation with a purchasing power ranging from $1.60 an ounce in India to $2 per ounce in England and New Zealand. This brotherly assistance is given to the British Empire at a time when the British Government has taken away half the purchasing power of the Indian rupee in international trade by reducing the silver content by half, or from 0.925 fine to 0.500 fine, and by depriving the standard silver rupee of its legal-tender features, naturally we can have little trade with India in the future.

Our officials complacently tell us with all the assurance in the world that every ounce of silver we furnished the British for their war chest will be returned to us—we have had that done before, and President Hoover and Secretary Mellon were not smart enough to foresee the effect of cheap silver on world trade, and by their neglect to do something to protect the price of silver, let us slip into a financial tailspin that wound up in a depression.

Let us not forget that this 300,000,000 ounces of silver could have been put into circulation here in the form of silver dollars or silver certificates to the amount of $387,000,000, interest free, toward paying our own war expense at an annual saving in interest, calculated at 3 percent, of $1,161,000 to the taxpayers of this country.

Let us hope that the American people will see the light and that the patriotism of our Government and financial leaders will spare us from the distress and disaster of another financial depression.

BRITISH MONEY TABLES

One shilling is equal to approximately 20 cents.

There are 20 shillings to the pound.

There are 12 pence in a shilling.

The value of a penny in our money, is equal to 2 cents.

Six pence equal one-half shilling.

The minor coins of the British are represented by: 2 pence—tuppence; 3 pence—threepence; 4 pence; 6 pence.

Anything above 2 pence is minted from silver.

One-half penny—hapenny—is equal to one of our cents.

Value of ounce of silver in silver currency in the British Empire

Australia	$1.1146
Indian rupee (eleven-twelfths fine)	.8728
Indian rupee (0.500 fine)	1.5950
Canada	1.6666
Egypt	1.2797
Ireland	1.4790
New Zealand	2.0688

The Need for Lumber and for Railroad Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the War Production Board and the Office of Defense Transportation can render some immediate assistance to the farmers of Nebraska. There are many things they need for an adequate production of food, including more farm machinery, but I want to particularly stress the need for lumber and for grain cars.

A big wheat crop is being harvested in my section of Nebraska. I am informed by one elevator operator, that his elevator will be full of wheat 2 days after it starts to come in. He has been assured that he will receive two grain cars per week to ship out this wheat. These two cars per week will only take care of 3½ hours run for the elevator. This will give an idea of the car situation. Countless other elevators are in a similar position.

Lumber is needed not only for building grain bins and cribs, but for general farm purposes. A priority or an allocation on paper does not help anyone, but it adds to the headaches of all. The wage scales and manpower controls should so be adjusted that a greater production of lumber can be instituted at once. I am informed that the production of lumber is retarded in some sections of the country, particularly the South, because of these controls. It is highly important to the production of food that we have full speed ahead on our production of lumber.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that these Government agencies such as the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, the War Manpower Commission, and the War Production Board take cognizance of the drastic need for lumber and for railroad cars and do something about it immediately.

Government Responsibility for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 16 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject of Government responsibility for continuing full employ-

ment, delivered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on the Town Hall Meeting program in New York City on July 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE QUESTION IS, SHOULD GOVERNMENT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTINUING FULL EMPLOYMENT? YES

Let us begin with a stark fact. The interest on the national debt this year will amount to $4,500,000,000.

That is more than the total annual Federal tax revenues before the depression.

If Government bonds are to remain the best investment in the world, we've got to be certain that the Government will collect in taxes every year enough to pay the interest on the debt.

We know that only a fully employed America can provide this revenue. The issue, therefore, is Shall the Government accept the responsibility to plan in advance for full employment, or shall it repudiate responsibility and trust to luck?

With the national debt rapidly boiling up to three hundred billions, we cannot afford to take a chance.

Federal revenues took a nose dive after the crash of 1929. They fell from four billions annually to only two. That was because industry, acting alone, could not put people back to work.

Then we tried RFC loans to big business. That failed. Then we tried Government spending through WPA. That also failed.

Now let Government profit by these mistakes of the past and maintain full employment, first by adopting policies to stimulate the investment of private capital in free enterprise and, second, by investing Government funds in productive projects when private investment is not sufficient to keep the Federal revenues high enough to pay the interest on the national debt.

Either Government will assume the responsibility of preventing another economic collapse or, after the collapse has come, it will find itself struggling inadequately to meet a new unemployment crisis.

The danger signals are already flying. Farm income is lower than a year ago. There are more unemployed. Business activity is decreasing. The National City Bank of New York begins its July review of economic conditions with this sentence:

"The influence of cut-backs in war orders is becoming more apparent in industrial reports as the weeks pass, and a downward trend in manufacturing activity is now well established."

Thus speaks the National City Bank. Those naive optimists who think that industry alone can stop this trend wear the same rosy glasses as those who in 1930 saw prosperity around every corner.

We cannot begin to carry the present national debt unless we have a high national income, and we cannot have such an income unless we have full employment at good pay. Business needs full employment. Agriculture needs it. Industry needs it. Management needs it, and labor needs it.

The whole national economy needs it because there will be no market for the prodigious output of American farms and factories when Uncle Sam stops buying for purposes of war unless Government undertakes to make sure that a fully employed America shall be purchasing for peace.

Critics of the proposal that the Government act now instead of waiting until rising unemployment is well on the way to creating a new depression talk as though full employment were the deadly enemy of free enterprise. They scream charges that the pending full employment bill will be the beginning of a planned economy. Well, what is a planned economy? Every successful industry in the Nation is managed by planners. There are steel planners and chemical planners and railroad planners and oil planners. We are winning this war because we planned it successfully. This broadcast is being carried on only because the radio industry has successfully planned the radio networks that cover the continent and the Town Hall managers planned this program.

There is nothing wrong with planning. There is nothing worth while without it. Planning is good or bad according to its purposes and its methods.

The plan for full employment now pending in Washington is good because it is a plan to save free enterprise by making it possible for farms and factories to produce at a profit by preserving the purchasing power of the people of America.

This proposal depends, first of all, upon the adoption of economic policies that will stimulate private investment. It is carefully drawn so as to avoid the possibility of Executive control. It contains three principal safeguards. First, it provides for the preparation of a job budget in the Executive offices of the President. Second, it sets up a joint committee of Congress composed of Members of both Houses and all political parties the duty of which will be to recommend any program that may be submitted. Third and finally, it is so drawn that not a dollar of public money can be spent until the program has run the gauntlet of the standing committees of both Houses and open debate upon the floor.

Thus it is a proposal by which the representatives of the people, elected by the people, shall assume in Congress the national responsibility of making certain that the economic machine shall not run down again as it did in 1930.

Address of Hon. Robert P. Patterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a powerful and informative address made on July 13, 1945, by the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, our able Under Secretary of War, before the Warren County Bankers Association of Glens Falls, N. Y.:

The reasons for my presence tonight are suggestive of the reply of a young selectee to a couple of reporters in his home town who asked him why he got into the Army so promptly after his eighteenth birthday. He answered (1) I wanted to fight to defend my country, (2) I knew it would build me up physically, (3) they came and took me.

Well, your chairman came and took me. But I have a further reason for being here—a big reason—the pleasure of being back with old friends, in the place where I was born and raised, the place for which I shall have the warmest attachment all the days of my life.

My talk tonight is on the soldiers that make up this great Army of the United States, the most powerful fighting force our country has ever sent to the field. The strong fighting teams we have created from the ranks of free men have given sure proof of the irresistible might of the Nation. The massive blows we have delivered from the Baltic to the Sea of Japan, have had behind them the impact of determined and disciplined fighting men; they have also had behind them the sustained power of management and labor in a free industry that has produced a weight of war production that nothing could withstand. The Axis had proclaimed that it needed a dictatorship to produce the full force and momentum of modern war. Democracy rose in its "finest hour," and destroyed that illusion.

The minor inconveniences of our daily lives remind us that in the process we have had to accept economic controls and compulsions of various sorts. But let us not forget that these have been cheerfully and readily accepted in the hour of danger, and that their tenure rests on a revocable consent of the whole people.

It has been my fortune to work with the men in our armed forces who have made it possible for us to meet in peace and security here tonight. I know the leadership and the heroism that broke the German Atlantic wall a year ago and that are now breaking the back of a treacherous enemy in the Far East. We will not forget the strength of that Atlantic wall. It would have been impregnable against any attack not based upon profound knowledge of the obstacles to be surmounted, prolonged planning, air and sea superiority, a high standard of training; and an unbeatable spirit on the part of the troops who stormed the wall. For every one of a million tasks the men had been appointed and trained. In no other way could such a colossal undertaking have been launched and sustained without immediate disaster. Nothing could be left to chance, for every chance favored the enemy. Our gratitude and that of all the free world go out to the great competent leadership that planned and won the vast campaigns on the Continent. Yet even while we pay tribute to that leadership, we remain aware that victory is won less by genius in the few than by faithfulness in the many, and in that great enterprise the humblest GI marched to heights of the heroic. This GI of ours has the appealing trait of masking the heroic with the commonplace, as you know.

The other day when a troop train on its way to an embarkation point was stopped at a siding, a GI got out of his car and scrawled on the side of it with a piece of chalk, "Is this trip necessary?"

We will not forget the dark days of last December in the Ardennes, when the Germans won a break-through and disaster was imminent. In zero weather, in 3 feet of snow, those foot soldiers of the First Army and the Third Army first stopped them in their tracks and then drove them back. There is no heroism in our history greater than that.

A task as tough as the breaking of the German wall is ahead of us in the Far East, where the ramparts of a foe as deadly as the German still stand. We are assigning to our superb military and naval leadership and to the resolution of our soldiers and sailors the task of breaking down that final bastion.

This leadership and the fighting teams it directs and disposes will get the finest fighting tools that American skill can devise and fashion. The weapons we are sending out there, from ships and planes to tanks and rifles, are the real business, better than anything possessed by any other army; but I hasten to point out these weapons, powerful as they are, would not have taken us from Pearl Harbor to Okinawa if the Americans who use them were not made of heroic stuff and proving themselves worthy of our finest traditions. I work with the men who plan and improve and produce these weapons, but I am ever mindful of the alertness and valor and steadfastness of fighting Americans who

bring these weapons to bear on the enemy and who die in every battle wielding these weapons in our defense. Their devotion to duty always surmounts their normal instinct to live.

Our priceless weapon in this war is our soldier, this matchless American who by skill and alertness, ingenuity and understanding, sacrifice and courage, has whipped the Wehrmacht and is going to finish off the Imperial Japanese Army. It is not entirely correct to assume that now, after nearly 4 years of war, the GI is just a civilian dressed up in military clothing, performing the hard tasks of war.

The GI is a great soldier, the flower of all the armies I have ever seen, or of which I have read or heard.

No other soldier in history has been as well educated. No other soldier has ever advanced into battle so keenly aware of the roots and causes of war, of the implications of war or of the awful cost of war.

Steuben, 160 years ago, wrote a friend in Europe about the American soldier of the Revolutionary Army, "The genius of this nation is not to be compared to Prussians, Austrians or French. You say to one of your soldiers, 'Do this', and he doeth it; but here I'm obliged to say: 'This is the reason why you ought to do this', and then he does it."

Our soldier today is serious and grim—but keen, intelligent, tactically, and he has learned well the old lesson of war, kill or get killed. He knows and studies his weapons—and does not waste time in bravado. His job is a soldier's job, and he has shouldered its burdens along with his rifle. That rifle can be a burden, too. A youngster just ordered from the firing line to a command post for examination for commission as second lieutenant was asked what a decimal point was. He looked uncertain for a moment, then he nudged the Garand higher up on his shoulder by its sling and said, "This thing weighs 9 point 4 pounds, and after you've carried it for 6 hours you drop the decimal point." He has dispensed with the sentimentalism of war and has replaced it with a technical adaptability which makes effective the most advanced weapons of modern times.

Without his easy skill in adapting the advanced principles of science, all the factories and laboratories and advanced technique of modern weapons would be of no avail. He is the best soldier in the world, because he not only has the best equipment in the world, but because he has the mind and heart to use it effectively. Our men are always on the offensive, with a supreme confidence which is akin to genius.

A flight by airplane over the islands of the Pacific is astounding. The one island in a group held by us is a hive of activity. The terrain is scarred with air strips and good roads. Shops and depots are running full blast to keep all equipment in condition. Airplanes strike out at enemy-held islands at any signs of activity. Over and over again the Japanese repair bombed runways and camps, only to see their work ruined by another sharp attack. They try to build boats and rafts in hidden places only to have these craft blown to pieces as soon as they touch the water.

The American island is a site of energy and will to work and win. The Japanese-held islands are locked in the primitive stillness of the jungles and forests and are hemmed in by our Navy.

This will to work and win springs from the soldier's fearless heart. He carries into these far-off battles a love of country and a pride in his military skill.

This Army, with its better weapons than any in history, makes better use of them. This Army has better health than any in history, not only because we give the soldier the best medical attention but because the soldier is intelligent enough to take care of himself. He does not go into battle helpless and hopeless, feeling that he is doomed. He goes in to kill the enemy and to come out a whole man.

The American soldier of today is taller, heavier, and is tougher mentally and physically than any he has met. He not only has a higher regard for physical soundness, but is more religious than the soldier of the past. Our soldier is not ashamed to pray.

He is open-handed and open-hearted, but he is democracy's favorite son, and he has stirred the imagination of the world. The simple, unaffected charm of his personality has been sobered in the crucible of war, but it has not been changed materially. There is no cause for concern over what his behavior will be after this war. Out of all the millions of us, the GI makes up one huge class that appreciates home and country, for he has seen so much under foreign skies, so much which is so different. Many of our soldiers have spent years overseas without once seeing the American flag displayed. The flag does not float over posts and fortifications when the enemy is about. Our soldiers carry the flag in their hearts, and for this let us be thankful. I hope that I have not dwelled too long on this, but inquiries are now coming in thick and fast about the soldier—how long it will take him to finish his job, and what kind of a man he will be when he comes home.

There is plenty of nonsense afloat about the mind of the returning soldier, as if he had become in some way abnormal and would require some special treatment. Let no one lose any sleep over that.

I would say that a man will return, where once was a boy. He will be maturer and harder and healthier. You can depend upon him for a definite idea of what he wants to do. You will find him self-reliant.

Like the father whose son came home for a furlough before being redeployed to the Pacific. The father settled down in his chair. lit his pipe and got comfortable.

"Son," he said, "I would like you to drop in at the garage and see your old boss when you have time. I also would like to have you see your grandmother. She has prayed for you every night. Then I suppose you want to see your girl friend, Mary."

The son said, "I attended to all that on the way up from the station." "What do you mean?" "Well, I bought the lot across the street from the garage to start a garage of my own. Then I went to the bank, the city hall, and then to grandma's."

"Well, what about Mary?" "Mary wasn't home, so I married her kid sister and left her at grandma's."

While overdrawn as to the speed even of American youth, this story contains a lesson for all of us.

I have been talking about our soldier. Now a word about the man he is fighting in the Far East.

You might feel that the Japanese are as good as defeated as of this moment. That may be correct, but our armed forces know that we are going to finish off a major war, with major effort and major figures, including casualty lists, to prove to them that they are defeated.

In short, the surrender we are demanding will have to be exacted by force. The Japanese army will not surrender to an inference—the inference that it is beaten.

I want to point out that Japan remains a formidable enemy. Whipped in the air and on the sea, deprived of Germany's aid, driven back to its inner fortress, with cities in ruins, it still retains as allies great oceans, great distances, and great hazards of weather. The main Japanese armies are intact.

The Japanese soldier is still just as willing to fight it out to the end as he was 3 years ago when he was winning his victories.

He is fighting more effectively. Many qualified military experts believe that his best fighting in the whole war was on Okinawa. He has developed a new method of cave warfare, and has become clever in the defense of his intricate, deeply dug cave positions. During the period of jungle warfare these cave fortifications did not have mutual support because the nature of the ground and lack of visibility did not permit it, but from now on the fighting will be in country where the defender will have good visibility, and three or more mutually supporting cave strongpoints can bring defensive fire to the support of the position that is under attack. No matter how closely our attacking forces follow our barrage, there will be an interval of minutes before they can close with the enemy and in that time the Japanese try to emerge from their deep shelters and man their guns. That is one reason why Okinawa was so much tougher than New Guinea.

You may depend on our forces to develop methods to knock out the caves. For one thing, we have self-propelled heavy guns, used on direct high-precision fire with special fuses. These guns are capable of blocking up the entrance to the caves.

The Japanese are fighting a progressively smarter war. On Okinawa they did not attempt a defense of the beaches where they would be under point-blank naval gunfire. They went back to prepared positions; in other words, picked their battlefield.

Their artillery fire is far more effective than a year ago. A former major Japanese weakness was lack of supporting artillery, and failure to make full use of available equipment. When they fired, it was each gun for itself, without control or coordination. Now their artillery tactics and technique show great improvement.

When our men got ashore on Okinawa they found it to be an artillery training area supervised by artillery technicians. Every yard of the island was zeroed in, and the Japanese could bring down a concentration of fire on a given point at a moment's notice.

They have also developed what our men call a murderous efficiency in the cross-fire of heavy mortars, their favorite weapon, throwing a shell of about the same caliber as a 105-mm. When one of their concrete strong points is coming under attack they blanket it with mortar fire. You simply cannot advance over ground swept by accurate mortar fire laid in sufficient volume.

Their suicide bombers used to come in low along the water in an attempt to torpedo a ship's hull. They were an easy mark for our gunners. Now they try to drop vertically on the deck from cloud cover.

We recently captured an efficient new type of amphibious tank, and new Japanese jeeps and reconnaissance cars have air-cooled engines which offer many advantages for operations in Manchuria and China where low temperatures are often encountered.

It all sums up to additional proof that we must prepare ourselves to win our war with Japan the hard way—by killing Japanese soldiers right through the ruins of Tokyo and throughout the home islands.

It doesn't shorten the war for us to ask ourselves why the Japanese do not see the logic of surrender now.

We cannot count on a surrender until the last weapon is struck from the hands of the last Japanese soldier. True, the Japanese might surrender before that time, but we would be fooling ourselves with wishful thinking if we put any faith in such an event. The final defeat of Japan must be so complete that there will be no possibility of a renewal of the war in future years.

I have kept you overlong, but I wanted to leave with you the conviction that we have a big job ahead of us. The other day in Washington a six-foot-five officer accepted the offer of a couple of boys to shine his boots. One of the boys looked down at the vast expanse of leather spread before him. "Boy," he called to the other shine boy, "Gimme a hand—I've got an Army contract."

Well, we have got an Army contract, and that is, not to send 4,000,000 American boys out alone to lick 80,000,000 Japanese. We have all got to fight this war tc the last ditch that stands between us and victory.

Our men who have died, our men who will die all had a right to live. We owe to them and to ourselves a rededication of spirit and energy to the prosecution of the grim tasks that lie ahead. Let us push on with higher hearts and a long-range faith, working, praying, fighting for final victory for the best of all countries.

The Food Situation in Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW-CIO),
EXCELLO LOCAL No. 49,
Detroit, Mich., June 29, 1945.

DEAR SIR: In order to alleviate the critical food situation in Detroit, we respectfully request that you give the problem your most serious consideration and act on it accordingly.

We, of Local 40, UAW-CIO, Excello, representing 10,000 members, have done our best to retain our peak production; we have not had a work stoppage or strike since June 1941, but when workers cannot buy the necessary food to retain their strength and ability to work, absenteeism prevails.

We have taken a thorough survey and we have close to 5,000 "survey slips" on hand which we would be more than glad to present as evidence. The following is the result of our survey (per pound per person for a 2-week period):

Meat to cook, 0.82 of 1 pound.
Potatoes, 1.65 of 1 pound.
Cold meats, 0.27 of 1 pound.
Eggs, 0.45 of 1 dozen.

Gentlemen, the proof is in the above figures; our people must eat to produce the necessary equipment and you as our elected guardians have the responsibility of seeing that action is taken so as the workers won't have to take time off from the shop to look for their meager substance of life.

You must do away with the terrible meat and potato shortage in Detroit to help the workers on the production lines.

Yours very truly,
GENE BECKER,
President, Local 49, UAW-CIO.

Unconditional Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter, written by Miller Freeman, editor and publisher of several western magazines and industrial journals in Seattle, Wash., to the Seattle Times. In this letter, Mr. Freeman who has devoted much of his time to a study of Japan and who foresaw the preparation of this Nation for war upon the United States long before the sneak attack at Pearl Harbor, points out the danger of the loose talk about peace with Japan without unconditional surrender.

Such peace would be no peace at all. It would mean that we had given to the Japanese Empire a little more time to prepare for a second war with the same imperial aims as this. It would mean that we would have fought in vain, and that our men had died in vain in the Pacific and in Europe. There can be no peace in Asia or in the world without unconditional surrender. Yet, today, we hear the voices of the weak and the unwilling and the uninformed raised with those who have ever opposed this war and who think more of saving the Emperor of Japan for his subjects than of the lives of Americans or the need for democracy.

Mr. Freeman points to the industrial and agricultural holdings of the Japanese Emperor and dispels the myth of his disassociation from the material things of life and from the Japanese Fascists and militarists who brought this war upon the world.

It is a letter worthy of reading and rereading by every Member of this House. It reads:

SEATTLE, WASH., *July 9, 1945.*
EDITOR, SEATTLE TIMES,
Seattle, Wash.:

In the July 8th edition of the Seattle Times, Constantine Brown quotes the report that "Japan's leaders are willing to surrender all its conquests on the Asiatic mainland, including Korea and the Kwangtung Peninsula, the mandated territories, and might even go so far as to return Formosa to the Chinese, provided they are not required to accept unconditional surrender which they believe must mean the abdication of Hirohito and his dynasty.

The Far East Year Book, Tokyo, 1941, gives the following partial list of the industrial holdings of the Japanese Emperor in 1938:

	No. of Shares
Nippon Yusen Kaishi (shipping)	161,000
Mitsui Bank	54,000
Hypothec Bank	10,000
Oji Paper	62,000
South Manchurian Railway	38,000
Tokyo Electric Light	24,000
Bank of Japan	141,000
Taiwan (Formosa) sugar	40,000

Shirosi Nasu, in his Aspects of Japanese Agriculture, New York, 1941, lists the following imperial land holdings in 1939:

	No. of Acres
Forest	292,775,000
Prairie	340,550
Fit for paddy rice	22,596
Fit for upland rice	56,220

Owen Lattimore, noted Asiatic authority, in his recently published book Solution in Asia challenges the divinity of the doctrine of the Japanese Emperor as a racket. He declares: "Sacred cow No. 1, and in fact the cow to end all cows, is the Japanese Emperor. * * * The orthodox expert approach to the position of the Emperor in Japan is all too often weakened by accepting the premise that in Japan the Emperor is officially holy." Mr. Lattimore points out that under the Meiji Era (1868–1912) the Emperor was dug out of his innocuous desuetude and made into a new focus of national loyalty The people of Japan were brought under hypnotic control by heavy and continuous indoctrination from childhood. History will expose the divinity of the Emperor hoax as one of the greatest rackets of all time. Hitler and Mussolini were pikers by comparison. No wonder the criminal gangsters controlling Japan don't like to have the Emperor unhorsed. But Admiral Halsey will attend to that. So sorry.

Yours sincerely,
MILLER FREEMAN.

Food Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk by Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson over the American Broadcasting Co. network, Monday, July 16, 1945:

Tonight I want to make a frank report on where this Nation now stands on food supplies. When I became Secretary of Agriculture 2 weeks ago I called for a complete reexamination of our food outlook. And now I can tell you frankly what the picture is and what we can expect in the months to come. It will be better for all of us to know now and in the future the real facts about the food situation as rapidly as they come to light.

I can report to you that we are taking positive steps to deal with the problem of food shortages. Our first objective is to increase production to the limit of our ability in order to meet the needs that confront us as a nation. This goal, however, cannot be reached overnight. It takes time and the blessing of good weather to produce more food. And with confidence among our farmers and a determination to back them up, we can have more food in this country.

While laying the groundwork for increased production, we are not overlooking any opportunities for bringing immediate relief from shortages. We are taking action to improve the distribution of food. Our aim is to choke off the black market which is draining our food supplies away from legitimate trade channels.

We have embarked on a rigid policy of close and constant scrutiny of military and foreign demands for food. I am insisting that all requests be made on a realistic basis with due recognition for the needs of our own civilians and the availability of food supplies from all sources. As the first result of this policy, we have pared down Government purchases of butter and meat. Steps are also being taken to improve the civilian poultry supply situation by changes in Government buying practices. In addition, we have put into operation a plan to make more effective use of packing-house facilities and provide greater flexibility in the distribution of meat to ease regional shortages. But don't expect this to be the solution to the meat shortage problem. The total demand for meat will continue far above our supply for many months to come.

On another front we are now taking aggressive steps to tap resources in other parts of the world for additional food and feed supplies needed by this country. Whatever we can do in this way may not be of great help immediately, but I do not intend to miss any opportunity to get the food we so urgently need.

Meanwhile our own farmers are driving hard to hold up their end on food production this year despite a poor start as the result of adverse weather. We now are at that stage in this year's crop season where the pattern that will determine our civilian food supplies during the next 12 or 15 months is fairly definite. In many ways what we see is not encouraging. But the crops are planted—most of them have been in for many weeks—and there is nothing that farmers can do now to increase acreage or change the pattern of these crops.

Stacked up against this crop production pattern for 1945 is the definite prospect of continuing high demands for food for use at home and shipment abroad. We know in general how much food our armed forces will need. We know also pretty well what our allies and the liberated areas will want within the next year. The now impoverished people of Europe who gave up their substance and lives to help defeat the Nazis must not be forgotten. They need all the help we can give them to get back on their feet. The role that food can play in building a lasting peace cannot be ignored. That is one reason why we want to do as much as we can to help the needy in the liberated areas. At the same time, however, we must be as honest with them on this question of food as we intend to be with our own people and not lead them to expect more than we can supply. We still have a big war to win. But in line with President Truman's request, we shall meet the minimum requirements of ravaged nations to the fullest extent that successful prosecution of the war and the maintenance of our domestic economy permit.

In the face of our great demands, we can expect that for many months to come there will be difficult shortages of important items of food. But once again, I want to emphasize that it takes time to get production. Only one crop of corn can be produced in a year. From breeding to marketing it takes a year to produce a hog, and the plans for that hog production must be based pretty largely on feed grain already produced. The weather so far this season has been unfavorable in the heart of the corn-producing country. Only miraculously good weather can give us a big corn crop this season. The size of this year's corn crop will determine to a large extent the amount of heat and milk and eggs we can have next year.

Right here I want to comment on the crop report which the Department of Agriculture issued only a few days ago. It indicated that we might expect a 1945 corn crop almost a fifth below the 1944 yield. But remember that to reach even the yield now indicated we will need good weather the rest of the summer and all the fall. Actually, the weather during the first 2 weeks of July has not been corn weather. It has been too cold. The temperature has averaged nearly 6° below normal through the Corn Belt. As a result, corn has not been growing as it should for this time of the year.

Last week we in the Department of Agriculture began to prepare for what may have to be done if the corn crop fails or if an abnormal percentage of the crop is soft corn. Our feed needs are so great that we must be ready in advance to give the American farmers and the livestock producer the benefit of any help that Government can provide if the weather should play us false.

I cannot, however, pass on without referring to the report of the Feed Industry Council, which was filed last Friday. I cannot review all the recommendations, but I want to refer to one: That we reinstate a feed-wheat program. To this I add a hearty amen. We must begin to replace a portion of the corn ration with wheat, which is more abundant. We must conserve corn and stretch its use for feed. In this I will cooperate. I have already reached the conclusion that no corn can be spared for whisky or other alcoholic beverages until we are sure that all our feed needs can be fully met.

Because of the time it takes to produce food, not much relief from actual shortages can be expected during the rest of 1945. The supply of food we have available to us at this time was fixed by what was done a year or more ago just as what we do now will determine the food supply that will be on hand next year.

For the months ahead meats, fats and oils, sugar, condensed and evaporated milk, and canned fruits and vegetables will continue in short supply. In addition, rice and dry-bean supplies will get shorter. While the fruit crop, as a whole, will be good this year, apples will be much scarcer than last year. Transportation difficulties may make it impossible to move to consumers all of our fruit and fresh vegetables. One bright spot is in our milk supply. It is good, and civilians will have a billion pounds more milk than last year. Except for wheat, potatoes, and most fresh vegetables, the 1945 crops will not be adequate for all of the demands that are being put upon the food production of this country.

On the whole this is not an optimistic picture and yet it is not much different from what the people of this country have been experiencing during recent months. True, the measures we are taking to improve distribution and choke off black markets will bring some relief from shortages, but they cannot increase the total volume of food that will be available for the rest of this year. This can only be done through increased production as long as the present high demand for food continues.

During the months ahead the people of this country will be eating at least as well as they did in recent months. We are hopeful that through corrective measures now contemplated, and with the help of the consuming public, we will get more equitable sharing of scarce foods. But some important foods will still be unavailable in the amounts we would like. This means that our meals will have to be somewhat different in composition than they were last year.

We ate far more last year than we were accustomed to eating in peacetime. We ate into our stocks of many foods which we need now in more plentiful supply. Part of this was because we did not have the foresight to hold on to our abundance for the time of greater need. Therefore, we are now paying the price for our failure to conserve and husband our record output of food last year. The food shortages which we are now experiencing will mean a reduction this year of about 5 percent from last year's record eating spree. That reduction may be irritating but is not alarming from a health standpoint. We shall still be eating on the average a greater total amount of food than we did before the war. We are likely to dine on more simple fare, minus the choice roasts, the thick juicy steaks, and much of the sweetening of prewar years.

America still throws away the richest garbage of the whole world despite shortages in various food items. Here is where every citizen can help by seeing to it that no food is wasted either in the kitchen or on the table. Every pound of food saved is just as good as a pound of extra food produced.

Civilian supplies of meat will increase slowly. If the war with Japan should end tomorrow we would still be short of fats and oils and sugar in 1946. The key to the food-fat situation is the output of lard which will continue at a low level until next spring when the slaughter of this year's somewhat larger fall pig crop begins.

Now about sugar. It may be several years before the important sugar producing and exporting countries regain their prewar output. Until that time, nations that import as large a part of their total supplies as the United States does can expect to be short of sugar.

Civilian consumption of fluid milk has increased more than one-fourth above the prewar average.

The supplies of dairy products for civilians are smaller because war needs for these products are so great.

Perhaps you are saying, "Why does that affect me? I want butter. I never bought much condensed milk nor any dried whole milk." True, but look at it this way: You are short of butter because the Government needed ice-cream mix, cheese, and other dairy products. Two million gallons of ice cream went to our fighting men every week last year. When you lacked butter on your bread, some soldier, sailor, or marine on a Pacific island received by your sacrifice a dish of ice cream with his dinner. I think it was a fair trade.

Because eggs are in such great demand it is hard to realize we are consuming record quantities this year—an average of more than one egg a day per person. But supplies will be seasonally smaller in the last half of this year. Poultry supplies allocated for civilians this year will be smaller than last year.

The prospective civilian supply of canned fruits is about the same as for last year, but much below prewar levels because of large military requirements. Citrus juices, however, will be plentiful.

The supply of commercially canned vegetables for civilians will continue short. This means that if you want to have plenty of canned vegetables it will be up to you to can more at home.

There will be a big crop of potatoes but none to waste because the demand is greater when the supply of other food is limited.

A large crop of rice is in prospect, but increased military requirements will reduce civilian supplies to low levels.

Right now farmers of America are harvesting the greatest wheat crop we have ever known—well above a billion bushels and more even than last year's record crop. Europe's grain production this year will be the poorest of the entire war period. Probably from our wheat supply we shall have the best opportunity to provide food for relief in Europe.

I have given you the facts about food as nearly as we are now able to determine them. Now, what are we going to do about the future?

First, we will have abundant production as our goal at home with the farm prices that are necessary to obtain record crops. Then we shall reach out into the far corners of the earth for every available source of additional food. I believe our Government can be a lot more aggressive in getting from abroad certain of the food and feed items which are critically short here at home. If we tell foreign countries now, particularly South American countries, what we want, they can plan to fill in our gaps. Everything we can do to get European agriculture back on its feet should be done to reduce demands on us. A few tons of seed, fertilizer, and equipment now may do more good than a shipload of food later on. We can drive harder to get Philippine sugar and oils back into the picture. This will require the highest degree of cooperation among Government agencies.

Here at home, the black market is our biggest enemy. The Department of Agriculture will help in every way it can to see that the foods that are short reach the people who should have them, and get to them through legitimate channels. It's a job that is going to require the cooperation of everyone.

In the meantime, we are now planning for more adequate production next year and it should be possible to produce more of some types of food. But don't expect too much too soon. Farm manpower and other food-production resources are limited. It takes a long

time after planting to grow and process and deliver food to the consumer.

Farmers have done a magnificent job under difficult conditions, but even their record productions have not kept pace with increased demands. We have seen the food they have so generously provided help in the winning of the first phase of the war. As the Charter of the United Nations starts its long route through the legislative bodies of the world, we see food prove its value in the writing of a lasting peace. Yet with all this outpouring of food for our military needs, to relief feeding, to suffering people in the wake of battle and to those Allies whose cause is common with our own, the people of America find themselves reasonably well fed and know that their sacrifices of food have not been greater than they counted on nor more than they could bear.

Knowing that, we can face our future in food without alarm.

The United Nations Charter and Other Legislation for a Peaceful World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The United Nations Charter and Other Legislation for a Peaceful World," which I delivered over Station WOL in Washington last evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator WILEY. "Will America's sons and daughters fight in a third world war?"

This is the question which is in the hearts and minds of millions of Americans today. This question is being asked even while we wage the battles of the Second World War in the Pacific.

I want the answer to that question to be: "No. America will not again have to shed her precious blood in world war."

And that is why I have voted, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to recommend the San Francisco Charter favorably to the Senate. That is why I shall vote to ratify the Charter after the Senate has fully considered it in debate.

Friends, my reason for supporting the Charter is a simple and obvious one. It is this:

With the Charter we have a definite course to follow which may lead to a just and lasting peace. With the Charter we have a highway of peace to travel. It is not an easy highway. There will be stumbling blocks and dead-end paths. But the highway to a just and lasting peace does have finger posts or signposts, as outlined in the Charter and in our past experience. So we can take this highway with confidence, with courage, and with faith.

But without the United Nations Charter, there is no highway to peace, no road which Charter for her protection from war.

That is our choice—a highway of peace or no highway of peace.

But this does not mean that the United States is going to rely exclusively on the charter for her protection from war.

It does not mean that America will be putting "all her security eggs" in the basket of the charter. On the contrary, "we ourselves must keep our powder dry!" After the war, we must remain strong militarily, strong politically, strong spiritually. "Eternal vigilance will still be the price of liberty."

But the Charter will be of help in keeping America out of war by keeping war out of the world. If the Charter is used properly, it will put out the fires of war before they get started.

Note that big "if," my friends—"If the Charter is used properly."

Remember that the Charter is just a collection of 10,000 words. Those words can become empty words. The Charter itself can become another scrap of paper, just as the Nine Power Pact was or the League of Nations Covenant was.

Yes, the Charter won't be worth the paper which it was written upon unless all the signatory nations have the will, the intent, and the purpose to live up to their obligations as outlined in the Charter.

For years I have emphasized this point. The nations must have more than documents of peace. They must have the continuing spirit of peace.

And so, the United Nations Charter challenges us all to fulfill the spirit of its 10,000 words. It challenges us to realize its great possibilities to make a peaceful world.

This, my fellow citizens, is our hour of decision. This is a time for greatness. We must be as great in carrying out the blueprints of peace, as our gallant boys have been in carrying out the blueprints of war.

We must be adequate to the great challenge of peace. If we are adequate, we of this generation will become the saviors of the race. If we are not adequate, then war will come again and again to suffering mankind.

Adequacy will be ours—if we reach for it, if we are inspired by God's direction. We must fulfill the great promise of Isaiah: "I create new heavens and a new earth."

It can be done if we awaken from the nightmare of the past, if we try to understand other nations' viewpoints, their problems, their fears, and if they try to understand ours.

"We must put ourselves in the other fellows' shoes," as Lincoln said. We must understand their different political, economic, and social concepts—Russia's different concepts, England's different concepts. We must rid ourselves of the "little foxes," the little hates, the little sins which create ill-will among nations.

It can be done. It must be done.

War is man made. Peace must be man made, made in action, in living, not merely in promises. We must act to breathe the spirit of life into the San Francisco Charter.

That is why, as my humble contribution to the goal of peace, I have recently introduced three separate foreign policy bills in the Senate. All of these bills would supplement the United Nations Charter. They would help to breathe the spirit of life into that document.

Mr. REPAID. Won't you tell us about your three bills, Senator WILEY?

Senator WILEY. Well, Mr. Repaid, you remember the quotation from the Book of Books: "Blessed are the peacemakers." That is the subject of my first bill—the making of peace.

This bill would set up a department of peace as a cabinet department in the United States Government. We have a War Department and we have a Navy Department. Why could we not have a department of peace?

Mr. REPAID. Just what would be the functions of this department, Senator?

Senator WILEY. The department would specialize and concentrate on the maintenance of world peace. It would try to remove sources of friction between peoples. It would use moral force to encourage the unity of mankind.

Mr. REPAID. Who would be in the department, Senator?

Senator WILEY. A secretary of peace, an under secretary of peace, and a small group of experts, not many men, not a vast bureaucratic machine, Mr. Repaid. And let me call your attention to this fact: the secretary of peace would hold down two related jobs. He would be a member of the President's Cabinet and he would also be the United States representative on the United Nations Security Council. Mr. Edward Stettinius would be our secretary of peace. He would work with Mr. James Byrnes who is our Secretary of State in President Truman's Cabinet. And Mr. Stettinius would also work with the diplomats of the other United Nations in the new world organization.

Mr. REPAID. Well, Senator, that is your Department of Peace bill Now, how about your other two bills?

Senator WILEY. Mr. Repaid, you remember another biblical quotation: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free." Well, my second bill is aimed at giving the world's peoples the truth. It will do this by encouraging international freedom of the press.

Mr. REPAID. Is there a special reason for this bill, now, Senator Wiley?

Senator WILEY. Yes; unfortunately so. There is censorship in many countries today. There is a blackout of news in many areas of Europe. We must pierce that blackout. The world cannot exist half in news darkness, half in news light, any more than it can exist half slave, half free.

We must have reliable news between the Allies—broadcast by the radio and published in newspapers and magazines.

Otherwise without such reliable news, there will be misunderstandings, confusion, and ill will among the nations.

Mr. REPAID. Well, as you see it, Senator WILEY, those conditions would, in part, be prevented by your freedom of the press bill. And now, Senator, for your third bill.

Senator WILEY. This bill, Mr. Repaid, would make America the peace capitol of the world. It would do so by inviting the United Nations to establish their peace organization on our shores.

There is a quotation in the Good Book which gives inspiration to this bill. It is this: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works. A city that is built upon a hill cannot be hid."

Well, Mr. Repaid, America has good works and she should let the light shine upon them. Ours is a "city built upon a hill that should not be hid."

That is why the United Nations representatives should come to our blessed land for their meetings, just as they came to the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. REPAID. What would be the particular advantages of setting up the world organization here rather than, say in Europe?

Senator WILEY. That's an easy one to answer, Mr. Repaid. America would provide the freest and most democratic atmosphere for the new League. The United States has the most modern facilities—housing, transportation, communication—to handle the new organization. What is more, we have the pioneer faith and leadership of a young nation which are so needed today.

Mr. REPAID. Well, Senator, unfortunately, our time is about up. So, speaking of needs, would you be good enough to sum up the needs of today as you see them and as you have discussed them with us.

Senator WILEY. Certainly, and I should be happy to hear from our radio audience with regard to their thoughts on them.

Here they are:

1. We need the United Nations Charter because it can be our highway of peace if we will it so.

2. We need a Department of Peace. I crave for my Government, as I believe millions of others do, the distinction of having created the first Department of Peace in the history of mankind.

Incidentally, I might note that my bill for the creation of this Department of Peace is

now in the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments where I am hoping for early action upon it.

3. We need international freedom of the press, because without a free press we and our allies have little chance of understanding the truth about one another.

My bill for such press freedom is now in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as is my bill to fulfill the fourth need.

4. We need to have America become the peace capitol of the world by inviting the United Nations to set up their organization within our country.

Through these and other measures which we may take, we may be able to rid the world of war. We may be able to fulfill the promise of Isaiah which I quoted to you before. And that promise is "I create new heavens and a new earth."

Message to the Japanese People by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio message to the Japanese people, written by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and sent out on July 14, 1945.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. On the 7th day of each month since the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the Voice of America has presented a monthly message to the people of Japan by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah.

Senator THOMAS, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Military Affairs, is a prominent leader in American public affairs. His years of residence in Japan and the Far East and his continuing interest in the peoples and problems of the Pacific Ocean area have been drawn upon by both the legislative and executive branches of the American Government as sources for advice upon the conduct of our foreign affairs. Among his other services, Senator THOMAS was an active participant in conferences between representatives of the United States Department of State and envoys from Japan at the very time that Japan opened war against the American people.

Today, after 43 monthly broadcasts, Senator THOMAS feels that the time has come when the people of Japan will realize that their leaders have deceived them and that their cause is hopeless. He believes that a frank presentation of facts will be welcomed by many Japanese who cannot hear the truth from their own warmongers. He is today inaugurating, therefore, the first of a series of weekly talks directly to the people of Japan.

Senator THOMAS. Fifty-five years ago this month, the world believed that Japan had entered the society of civilized nations. All Europe and America greeted you as partners in the promotion of progress.

That was because, in July 1890, under direct command of Emperor Meiji, Japan held its first general election. By Meiji's order, the people of the Empire sent delegates to Tokyo to give him their suggestions. The old feudal type of autocratic government, many Americans thought, had ended in Japan and all measures for the improvement of the nation would be decided as the result of free debate.

Listen to the words of Meiji's Rescript: "The uncivilized customs of former times shall be broken through. The practice of discussion and debate shall be universally adopted and all measures shall be decided by public argument."

Is this a call for the return of Japan to the days when the empire sat in dark seclusion? We should meditate well upon the question, for the men about the throne today scorn the words of Meiji's Rescript. They discard his advice. Instead of holding general elections, the military politicians who have usurped the right to give advice deny the people of Japan any voice in governing. Those who still remember Meiji's wishes are condemned as dangerous thinkers, and as enemies to the country.

Would they call Meiji himself a dangerous thinker?

Three times now, in defiance of the spirit of the Meiji Rescript the evil men who cluster round the throne have postponed elections to the Diet. The Diet, those evil advisers say, must hold its tongue. The only voices those wicked counselors desire to hear are those that echo what the army politicians say.

Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the world now turns its face away from Japan. We who cherish the principles of free discussion and open debate shudder when we see Japan repudiating freedom. We are not happy to see Japan plunging ever deeper into mental darkness. Meiji commanded Japan to open its eyes and to become modern but the militarists defy him.

We in America now wonder whether Meiji truly spoke for the spirit of Japan. We would be interested to know whether you in Japan admire Meiji or the greedy false advisers who now mislead the Emperor.

As a Senator of the United States, I know how much can be accomplished for the welfare of a nation and for the happiness of the world when wise legislators cooperate with able administrators. Here in the United States we have free speech and free elections. Even in wartime, though we did not slacken in the least our ever increasing production of war materials, we carried out last year a general election to choose those who would make the laws and those who would enforce them. No policeman interfered with our freedom to do this. No terrorist societies threatened us with violence. Calmly and with open discussion we debated our future, just as Meiji commanded in Japan. And this is what your military usurpers now deny you, in defiance of the Meiji Rescript.

This was not always true in Japan. When I lived among you, I saw how scrupulously you then followed Meiji's wishes. As long as you did so, you were happy. Japan prospered in those days.

But as soon as military adventurers usurped the right to give advice all this changed. They tore up Meiji's Rescript, sneered at his commands, and said that they alone knew what was best for Japan. Almost at once the picture changed. Your false leaders brought scorn upon you. Europe and America turned their backs upon Japan. The only friends whom Japan possessed were the coward Mussolini and the evil Hitler.

Let us ask ourselves if these were the kind of people whom Meiji would have trusted.

And so, on this fifty-fifth anniversary of one of Japan's brightest days, let me, as a former dweller among you, recall to your minds the ideals for which you once stood.

How long will it be before you expel your tyrants and follow once again the wishes of Meiji?

Japanese Surrender Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of July 8, 1945, entitled "Understanding Asked." It is in the form of a letter to the New York Times written by Stanley Washburn, of Lakewood, N. J., and discusses Japanese surrender terms.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDERSTANDING ASKED—CLEAR JAPANESE SURRENDER TERMS TO ALLAY FEARS ADVOCATED

(The writer of the following letter was a war correspondent for many years, starting with the Russo-Japanese War. He was an officer in our Military Intelligence Service. He was also an aide to the Root Diplomatic Mission and active as liaison officer to the American and Japanese delegations at the Washington Disarmament Conference.)

The time has now come to analyze the problem that faces us in regard to the Japanese. The philosophy of hate, ridicule of their peculiar and to us fantastic form of worship, and constant threats to treat the Emperor as a war criminal and suggestions of his execution simply are getting us nowhere and only stiffens the Japanese resistance. In the first place, it is time for us to understand that we cannot judge the Japanese from the western standpoint, for they are utterly different from us in religion, philosophy, and point of view. The Emperor is worshipped not as an individual but as a symbol of Japanese traditions, history, pride of race, and of their own peculiar form of spiritual life. It must be clear to anyone capable of detached judgment and uninfluenced by violent emotions and prejudice that it is impossible to execute a symbol or an idea, much less the traditions which they, at least, believe date back 2,600 years. History has ever shown that the persecution of any form of religion has only served to strengthen and perpetuate the convictions of the believers in that faith. Be it ever so peculiar from our point of view.

In any event, such attacks on the Japanese religion, which is interwoven with the Emperor, whoever he may be at the time, is inconsistent with our Constitution, which, in the first amendment to the Bill of Rights, guarantees freedom of worship, as does, in fact, the Atlantic Charter. The Emperor himself is probably no more responsible for the war than was the Czar of Russia responsible for World War I. Neither, even had they wished, could have by any possibility prevented the war.

The most important thing in war is to understand the psychology of the enemy and know what he fears and what he hopes for. Hating the Japanese, calling them rats, pagans, savages, and other terms of opprobrium gets us exactly nowhere. Probably the whole world favors unconditional surrender but the time has come to define just what is meant by these terms. President Truman has wisely stated that it does not mean slavery or depriving the Japanese of any hope for the future, but for the moment at least, there is no explanation of just what

it does mean, other than of depriving them of means to start another war or build up a military machine. As long as the Japanese believe it to be an attack on their religion of which, just now, the unfortunate Hirohito is the symbol, and as long as they see possible hope for their future they will continue to fight with the same desperate fanaticism as at Iwo, Okinawa, and elsewhere. It must be realized that 85,000,000 people are living on an arable area no larger than the State of West Virginia and that at least 85 percent of their food supplies come from the Asiatic mainland. Likewise all their iron, most of their coal, and minerals are imported.

At the Cairo Conference Churchill and the late President Roosevelt agreed that all that the Japanese had taken by conquest and aggression was to be returned to the former owners. This of course meant Formosa, Manchuria including Port Arthur, Korea, and other stolen territory on the Asiatic mainland. Without access to the raw materials both in agrarian, mineral, and other resurces, the Japanese will simply perish. It is not feasible to kill or starve to death 85,000,000, though it is quite proper to kill five or six million of their army if that be necessary. It is then the thought of this writer that some concrete plan be worked out whereby the Japanese may see the possibility of living and step by step rebuilding their cities and such of their industries as can never be made available for building up another war machine. Perhaps the formulation of treaties guaranteeing on favorable terms trade agreements which could be made, would make it at least possible for them to live. It seems clear that as long as there is no tangible hope even for survival and that their cherished traditions are to be destroyed, they will never quit. The continuous bombing of Japan and destruction of cities will, within an appreciable time, create a demand, first by industrialists and then the civil population, for any form of peace which gives them any hope for the future. The war was brought by the militarists and perhaps encouraged by the industrialists but neither withcut the Emperor can curb the whirlwind that they let loose in 1941.

With the slow disintegration of the power of the militant parties of Japan, there seems but little doubt that ultimately the Emperor will be influenced by the conservative elements, backed by the civilian population, to make any form of peace which assures the Japanese some future, however dismal it may seem to them.

One wonders who these professional haters, who are demanding the scalp of the Emperor, expect to deal with when the moment comes, as it surely will. Surely no one who knows anything about Japan conceives that a provisional government of any form like our western democracies can be set up overnight. We have to work through available channels until, out of sheer expediency, the Japanese will accept a more representative and modern form of government, though the process may take generations. The main thing that it is essential to realize is that for the moment 85,000,000 people on the Island Empire are imbued with the morale based on their fantastic religion and tradition. It really is immaterial what we think about it.

The Japanese will do exactly as they are told by the Emperor, and the chances are that he will do exactly as he is told by the conservative leaders, who, though now submerged, will ultimately come to the surface. In the Russo-Japanese War, when this writer was attached to both Army and Navy for 18 months (1904–05), they were ordered to be gentle, and no war was ever conducted more strictly in accordance with the Hague Convention and western ideas of war. I suppose this was primarily because that conflict had to be financed abroad. In this war, seeing the success of the Germans with their campaigns of terrorism, the troops were ordered to conduct themselves likewise. At the appropriate time, if we are wise in the handling of our enemy, they will again be ordered to behave like human beings, and so they will do. If we substitute hate for reason, ridicule for understanding, the war may last 2 and possibly 3 years and our casualties run anywhere from one to two millions. One wonders if the outcry for vengeance and reprisals are worth this price.

STANLEY WASHBURN.

LAKEWOOD, N. J., *July 7, 1945.*

Something to Think About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in my youth as a school boy, impressed with the importance of an education and imbued with an ambition to obtain knowledge, I was taken aback when, upon entering the halls of a college for the first time, I read from a framed letter on the wall, addressed to the school by an eminent lawyer: "In entrusting you with the education of my son, I care not what you teach him of theory and books if you will teach him to think."

It has taken a long time for the import of the good judge's wisdom to be fully appreciated. Today in the critical hour when forces are shaping our country's destiny—the full meaning of the good judge's admonition "to think" comes to mind, when reading a letter distributed to the American people by President Hart of the National Economic Council, which I have taken the liberty of condensing and submitting for the consideration of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

Never in our history has it been more important for Americans to think clearly. The question of whether the United States will continue toward national socialism will probably be settled in the next 4 years—possibly in the next 24 months.

The San Francisco Conference in which vitally important decisions can be made is just beginning.

Pending before Congress are such proposals as Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and the several other agreements or treaties negotiated the past year or two. Adoption of them without important modification would so enmesh us in the affairs of other nations, every one of them less devoted to genuine freedom than ourselves, that nothing short of an upheaval would ever extricate us.

It is hard to base a prediction for the future on past history, because a new factor has entered in. The art of modern propaganda has been developed. It has been clever, thorough, ruthless, and often untruthful. Relatively few Americans understand either its source or its extent and potency.

Every day we meet business and professional men of standing in their fields, as well as men and women highly regarded for their generous attitude toward their fellowmen, who simply do not know what it is all about. They do not realize that many of the very views they express have been formulated by cunning men and women; and that through control of radio and influences among most of the country's writers, these ideas have been implanted in their minds so cleverly that they never doubt they are their own. They fail to note that the minds of the Germans were molded by Hitler in precisely similar ways.

They do not know that, with rare exceptions, many of the country's best writers simply cannot get magazine articles published.

This propaganda is alien in origin and conception. It stems directly from eastern and central Europe. It is designed to undermine and destroy America; and it is having that effect.

In passing, it is worth noting some of those alien-minded persons, who, whether in public office or outside, have been among the leading molders of public opinion in the United States in recent years. Several aliens, like Sir Bernard Pares, have taken up temporary residence here, apparently for the purpose of indoctrinating our people. John Maynard Keynes is the actual author of our 12-year policy of deficit-financing and the principal inspiration of the Bretton Woods agreement.

We question at this time neither the ability or sincerity of any of the above. But they are not believers in the American way of life. They, and others likeminded, dominate our public opinion. The independent American Republic will be destroyed if their domination continues.

America has two great needs today.

The first is to return to the American way of life. If we do not return to the American way of life, American liberty will have been lost. "What can it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What can it profit America if it set up a world organization in which its identity and independence are lost or even impaired, with the further result that in order to do our part in such an organization we must continue for the indefinite future to be a regimented people?

Those of our boys overseas who come home will find the America they were fighting for has irretrievably gone.

It is of more importance to the 130,000,000 American people that we return to the liberty we have always known than it is even to achieve a world organization.

America's second need is to try to build a kind of world organization that will do something to prevent war in the future. But one grave danger of such a world organization is that we shall place too much reliance on it.

We believe the greatest factor for peace is the existence of a strong, independent, law-abiding nation, unwilling to make war against any of its neighbors, and prepared to defend itself against all comers. The example of one such nation—and the United States during much of its history has been such a nation—will be far more potent than treaties or agreements, no matter how high-sounding their phrases. Just one such powerful nation possessed of the complete will for peace can go far in maintaining the peace of the entire world. If the United States, Britain, and Russia all determine upon peace, then there will be peace.

The proper course for the United States is to keep the sovereignty and independence of her Nation and her people. For only so can she continue in the future to be the example that has inspired the whole world in the past. And we can do no better than set an example.

After the war all Europe and Asia will be poverty stricken. American wealth, imagination, and creative ability—provided they are preserved—will alone be able to help those countries. For us to enter into agreements with other nations that will give them the first call on our wealth and a large control over our affairs would, for us Americans, be the height of folly. To adopt the Bretton Woods agreement, for instance, by which, in effect, other countries may vote taxes on

the American people by assessments against our resources, would suggest that both our love of independence and our sanity had departed. We would have lied to our fighting men to whom we have promised a better future.

We know we can help the people of other countries, if only we are free to help them. But to get down to their level, and to surrender the freedom of our people, would be practically to insure that our ability to help them in the future would be cramped, if not destroyed. We would have sold ourselves and our descendants into bondage to them.

It is an open question whether the existence of an elaborate world organization, constantly tempted to mess into all sorts of matters, will not tend to increase rather than decrease the chance of war. We know this thought flies in the face of the propaganda barrage we live under today. But our problem is, not to accept highly propagandized ideas, but to think.

Punishment of War Criminals Under International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on the subject Punishment of War Criminals Under International Law. The article was published in the Christian Sun of June 28, 1945, and it was prepared in connection with Mr. Glenn Everett, who some time ago wrote his master's thesis for the University of Iowa under the partial direction of the Senator from Utah.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUNISHMENT OF WAR CRIMINALS UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

(By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, as told to Glenn Everett)

The end of the war in Europe has moved the discussion of the punishment of war criminals from the realm of the academic to a stage which demands immediate practical action. Completion of the occupation of Germany has revealed in full horror to the world some of the worst crimes that have ever been committed by members of the human race.

Between April 22 and May 9, I traveled through western and central Germany as a member of a party of six Senators and six Representatives, who were invited by General Eisenhower to inspect the concentration camps that had been uncovered and to document for the American people and the world for all time the truth of the evidence which our forces found there. We visited areas being liberated by our flying columns during those last 2 weeks of German warfare and at one time, at Dachau, were just 2 days behind the retreating Germans.

We saw the barracks, the work places, the physical facilities for torture, degradation, and execution. We saw the victims, both dead and alive, of the atrocities practiced at the camps. We saw the process of murder by starvation while it was still going on. We saw the indescribable filth before it was cleaned up, and sickened with nausea at the stench, and we saw a number of the pitiful victims of this liquidation process actually die.

At Buchenwald we examined the barracks buildings, each measuring only 42 by 23 feet, 10 feet high, into which an amazing total of 38 stacks of triple-decked bunks had been crowded. Each bunk measured 30 by 72 inches, with a 24-inch aisle at one side. Into these human pens the incredible number of 250 persons were crowded each night. That allowed just 40 cubic feet of space per capita, when our own Army manual prescribes 600 cubic feet as an absolute minimum for health and decency. Disease spread like wildfire in these barrack pens, while vermin, rodents, and filth infested them. Each morning the ill and dying were taken to the "hospital" where they lay on cold, bare floors without medical aid until dead or recovered. When the number of dead bodies arriving at the camp crematory ovens failed to meet the camp's daily death quota, selected groups of "undesirable" prisoners were sent into the strangling room for slaughter. We personally handled the still freshly bloodstained wooden mallet used to stun victims who struggled against the garroting, and counted the decaying bodies left there when the coal supply of the crematory became exhausted just before the Americans overran the camp.

This is just a sample of the irrefutable evidence of Nazi criminality which we encountered and which we have reported to the Congress and to the public.

If it is wrong to punish the evildoer, then it is wrong to punish the war criminals who were responsible for these acts. But throughout the range of society's thought on law and punishment, it has always been accepted that the wrongdoer is responsible for his act, and that his punishment by the society he has wronged follows as a just consequence.

It is possible to punish these criminals under international law, and it is, in my opinion, in keeping with justice that we do so. I have always contended that our reason for being in this war was that this conflict, on our part, was a war against wickedness. We can find in the acts of these war criminals the cause which would inevitably have led the American people to wra. Regardless of the time or method of our entry into the conflict, we could not have lived permanently at peace with the forces represented by Germany, Italy, and Japan. Everything we believe in—just trials, protection of minorities, freedom of conscience, freedom of thought, freedom of religion, every principle we try to maintain under our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and our way of life—was deliberately violated by the governments of those nations. To win victory over them and then not to punish them for the wickedness which we fought against would be incomprehensible.

What we must do, however, is make certain that we are punishing the real criminals who are responsible for the wicked acts, and that the trials are conducted in such a way that civil justice will prevail rather than primeval vengeance. We must be careful that a spirit of vengeance is not allowed to direct the actions of those who are to conduct the trials and set the punishments. The trials are too important both to the present and to future world generations to be mishandled.

Under what laws shall war criminals be tried? It may in a sense be said that there is no international law which gives representatives of a group of nations authority to punish evildoers who have wronged the rights of persons or nations. Heretofore, the acts of individual persons during wars have been generally fused with the concept of the act of the whole state. With the coming of peace both sides have usually let punishment rest on the theory that each side has brought hurt to the other. But this time something different has occurred.

First, it should be remembered that the great majority of all nations took a stand against the use of war as a means of settling international differences. This agreement was honestly entered into and has undeniably represented the view of the community of nations. Second, it should be remembered that the states of Germany, Italy, and Japan had, at the outbreak of their respective aggressions, fallen under the doctrine of the single will. Each had fallen under a specific authoritarian dictatorship. There was one man or group of men who were solely responsible for the actions of that state when it broke international law. The same line of responsibility can be traced to the single will for all of the acts which subsequently occurred.

Mussolini destroyed every political person in Italy. I was in Germany in 1934 when Hitler, in his bloody purge, started a similar process in that nation. These evil-intending leaders were thereafter solely responsible for the actions of their states. Consequently, it is my opinion that the leaders of those states have unquestionably been criminals against society within the meaning of established international law.

The concentration camps which we visited in Germany had all been established before the War. Notorious Dachau was already in operation in 1934. I heard renewed reports of atrocities which were being committed in these horror camps during my visits to Germany in 1936 and 1937. The Nazi gangsters filled these camps first with citizens of their own nation, men who dared to stand out against them or protest the violations of international law and of the rights of the people of the world which these rulers were then plotting. When the Nazis sought to extend their gangster rule beyond the recognized national boundaries of their own states, they took the concentration camp principle with them. Not only did they violate international law by making war upon neighboring peoples, but after temporary victory they flagrantly violated the basic human rights of any persons in those countries who dared to refuse the yoke of slavery that was thrust upon them.

We found that the entire program of the concentration camps in Germany constituted a systematic form of torture and death administered to intellectuals, political leaders, and all others who would not embrace and support the Nazi philosophy and program. In addition, the citizens of many states who were without crime other than their racial origin or religious belief were systematically put to death. In the concentration camp at Buchenwald among 30,000 prisoners, there were found, in addition to 1,800 Germans, 2,900 French, 3,800 Polish, 1,240 Hungarians, 4,380 Russians, 242 Italians, 550 Austrians, and 2,105 Czechs. When one political group gains control of a national state by ruthless tactics, uses that control to wage war upon its neighbors, and then deports vast numbers of the latter's citizens to endure slavery or bestial punishment, the line of criminal responsibility ought to be sufficiently clear for an impartial court to determine.

War criminals, as represented by the evildoers among the Fascists, are not in any sense to be compared with leaders of states who have carried on war against another state. The Nazis were fighting solely to impose their rule upon the continent of Europe, and were using methods, at once outrageous and unjust by all Christian standards of conduct, in order to extend their personal political and economic rule. Together with the Italians and Japanese they have been fighting not to defend their states against aggression, but have fought in defense of some of the worst evils the world has ever had to contend with.

I agree with Oswald Garrison Villard when he says that it is well that we did not punish the alleged criminals of previous wars. For the North to have hanged General Lee after the Civil War would have been a terrible crime. I do not believe, however, that it necessarily follows that the men responsible for the atrocities of this war must go scot free simply because they have been high political or military leaders.

Take Reichmarshal Herman Goering for an example. We ought not to try him for the bombing of London, for we ourselves have bombed Berlin. But on May 15, 1940, an entirely different incident, the bombing of Rotterdam occurred. Two hours after a surrender armistice had been signed between Dutch and German officials, the Luftwaffe deliberately attacked the defenseless Rotterdam and laid it waste, killing by conservative estimates, at least 20,000 civilians. This was a wanton act of malice which had no connection wtih the then-concluded state of war; it was designed, as later propaganda proved, as a threat to other nations which the Germans intended to attack. If Goering was in command of the western front air force at that time, he and his staff officers should be tried for the deliberate crime of Rotterdam.

Similarly, Marshal Von Rundstedt should not be tried as a military leader, but as an individual responsible for certain violations of international law. If it can be proved that he was responsible for the behavior of the SS troops who machine gunned 150 American prisoners during the Ardennes offensive after the latter had surrendered, thus placing themselves under the protection of the Geneva Convention, his trial is justified on that charge and he should be punished. Since treaties become the law of a nation which signs them, Von Rundstedt, or the officers responsible, were violating not only recognized international law, but German law as well.

Where these criminals have violated the laws of their own states, and the rights of their own people, it is a good thing, as Mr. Villard suggests, if they are tried and punished by their own people. Thus, Mussolini has been put out of the way by the Italians themselves, though in a manner which I cannot approve, and Hitler last July 20 narrowly escaped the same fate (which he may still have met). Quisling is being dealt with by Norway. Emil Hocha by Czechoslovakia, and others, in both cobelligerent and enemy lands, have not and will not escape.

It is unfortunate that organized government and society have been destroyed in Germany to such an extent, and political opponents of the Nazis so thoroughly liquidated, that it is difficult to conceive that German criminals will be tried by their own people.

How then, in the probable absence of an ideal way, are we to deal with these criminals? The War Crimes Commission is now meeting in London to decide this problem. The questions of jurisdiction and supervision over trials appear to be the most difficult ones facing them. The late President Roosevelt laid down a formula that the Nazis should be returned to the countries where they committed the atrocities to be tried by the authorities of the people they had wronged. This is a good formula and ought to be followed. It leaves unanswered, however, the problem of what to do with men who may be wanted on charges of equal gravity by a half dozen or more countries. Perhaps it will be possible to assign the jurisdiction in some fashion such as that followed by the States of our own Union. If Utah has a criminal whom they want for arson, and New York has a charge of burglary against him, he is first tried in Utah and punished, and then released after completion of his penitentiary sentence to the jurisdiction of New York.

Generally speaking, the Allied Nations having charges against Axis criminals should satisfy themselves that the trial as conducted in the first jurisdiction represents the will of all. The sentence imposed should satisfy all on a given crime and the criminal not exposed to double jeopardy.

It may be decided, however, that a special international tribunal ought to be set up to try criminals against whom charges are made by several states. If this be done, it will be in accordance with international law, for establishment of the court will be a legislative act undertaken by a large majority of the community of nations, dealing with a new problem in their midst that has never been faced before. It may also be decided that the international body ought to exercise supervision over the trials in various national courts in order that the rights of the accused be protected, disorderly vengeance prohibited, and the trials conducted in accordance with democratic concepts of justice.

It may seem that I am suggesting an ex-post facto operation. No; the law on which the criminal is tried was in existence at the time of the crime commitment. The court and the court's procedure are all that can be called ex post facto. It is not contrary to a defendant's rights to have a new forum imposed. Anything else would be anarchy.

Whatever the War Crimes Commission decides, it ought to reach its decisions as quickly as possible in order that regular judicial procedure may be instituted, and further instances of lynch law avoided. The demand that these war criminals be tried has its origin in a universal sense of outraged justice, a sense which among liberated nations must be satisfied. No trial will make right the wrong that has been done, but we can hope that the trials will be conducted in such a fashion that they will pass the test that all trials must meet, that the punishment administered serves as a deterrent only when it teaches decent habits. To that end they should be made a constructive step in the Axis Nations' rehabilitation.

The Jewish Palestine Homeland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an important letter written by Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, to Alger Hiss, Secretary General of the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF
NATIONAL LIBERATION,
San Francisco, Calif., May 1, 1945.

Mr. ALGER HISS,
Secretary General, United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR: The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, as temporary Hebrew national authority, hereby submits for the consideration of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, the following requests:

1. That the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation be invited to constitute a delegation representing the interests and viewpoint of the Hebrew Nation at the United Nations Conference on International Organization;

2. That the Hebrew Nation be accorded membership in the General Assembly.

May we at the same time point out that this request differs fundamentally from the many appeals that have been made for representation of "the Jewish people" in the councils of the United Nations. We respectfully submit that there exists an inescapable distinction between the Hebrews of Europe and Palestine on the one hand, and the vague term "the Jewish people" on the other. The latter term cannot refer to any political or national entity. The Jews of the world are adherents of a religious faith, fully comparable to Catholics, Protestants, or Mohammedans They are nationals of many countries and as such are fully represented by the delegates of their respective countries in those councils.

Your delegation, for example, represents those Jews who are citizens of your country, precisely as it represents all citizens of your country regardless of their religious adherence. Hebrews are today unrepresented in any international councils because they have not yet been recognized to be what in fact they are—members of the Hebrew Nation—but are regarded and still referred to as "stateless Jews" and "Axis—or former Axis—nationals."

The renascent Hebrew nation, composed of the Hebrews of Palestine and the surviving Hebrews of Europe, is fully deserving of recognition as a fellow member of the United Nations. The Hebrews have borne the brunt of the Axis onslaught on civilization, not only by the staggering number of our casualties, but by the impressive Hebrew contributions to the arms of the United Nations; the tens of thousands of Hebrew fighting men serving with the British armies; the tens of thousands of guerrilla fighters in occupied Europe who never ceased harassing the enemy, and whose "battles of the ghettos" have taken their place with the most heroic military epics—as well as Palestine's concentrated and sacrificial mobilization for war production. This claim for recognition of the Hebrew nation is in no degree related to the services rendered by soldiers of the United Nations who happen to be of the Jewish faith; they, as was pointed out before, are, like their compatriots of any other faith, Americans, Russians, Brazilians, etc.

The present status of the so-called "stateless" and "Axis Jews" is a contradiction of the very principles to which the United Nations are dedicated and for the attainment of which so much has been sacrificed. These people should not be forced to share the nationality of their murderers. They must not be denied the elemental right of self-determination. Hundreds of thousands of German, Hungarian, Rumanian, Italian Jews have asserted their unwillingness to be anything but members of the Hebrew nation.

Because they have been denied this elemental right of self-determination they are the one people constrainedly absent from the joint effort to shape the peace of the world for centuries to come. Unless this absence is redressed, the efforts will fail, because the one people which has been repeatedly made the scapegoat for the world's ills will again be available to aggressor nations as a tragic vehicle for the disturbance of world peace. Fascist forces will again utilize anti-Semitism as a weapon for destroying democratic governments and menacing international security.

In 1933 the Germans began their butchery of Jews who were Axis citizens. The world shut its ears to warnings that the butchery was not going to stop with Jews. Today millions of the best youths of the United Nations are dead because this warning was not heeded and the activity of the German murderers was not curbed before it spread.

We feel duty-bound to sound another warning today. The German nation-murderers have created a precedent which carries in it all the threats of neo-barbarism in which nations will try not merely to subjugate other nations and conquer their territories, but in which nations will endeavor to exterminate entire segments of populations.

If humanity and civilization are to survive, this system must be fundamentally altered. Maintaining the status quo of the s-called Jewish problem, after the mass murder of over 50 percent of the total Hebrew population in Europe, would mean to sustain a precedent and leave in existence a free zone for aggression and extermination. Within this free zone the philosophy of barbarism would continue to feed itself on its own cruelties and make the coming peace only an armistice which is sure to be followed by another war, just as surely as the present war followed the last.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation believes that considerations of world peace in our time, as well as the dictates of humanity and justice, make it imperative to grant a Hebrew delegation full and equal rights of participation in the deliberations that will determine the life of the Hebrews today and the fate of their children tomorrow.

Jewish organizations in the United States, in Great Britain or in any other country, however sympathetic their attitude to the woes of their coreligionists in the Hebrew nation, cannot possibly represent that nation. They do not even belong to it. Memoranda by or proposals of religious or cultural bodies like the World Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Conference, the American Jewish Committee, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and similar organizations cannot serve as a substitute for the direct and legitimate representation of the Hebrew nation in the deliberations of nations. On the contrary, they will tend to increase the misunderstanding and confusion that characterize the general attitude toward the Hebrew problem and its solution.

This is one of the issues that must be faced squarely. And the Hebrew people must be given the opportunity to present their views as to what constitutes a permanent and effective determination of the problem that has plagued them for centuries and continues to threaten the future of world peace. They must be granted the same degree of self-determination within the general program of international adjustment as is accorded any other sovereign nation. There must be an end to the lack of status that for 2,000 years has kept this people an anomaly among the nations of the world.

There is only one solution in the light of history; the restoration of the Hebrew people of Europe and Palestine to normal life and national dignity on a par with other nations. This might have seemed fraught with insurmountable technical difficulties and legalistic obstacles a mere week ago. But in these days of progressive streamlining of history, the recent unanimous recognition by the United Nations Conference on International Organization of the sovereignty of the Ukraine and White Russia establishes fitting precedent for the recognition of the Hebrew Nation.

We beg to request that you transmit this memorandum to the attention of the Executive Committee and plenary session of the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

I beg to remain, sir,

Faithfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

A Letter to General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to General MacArthur and printed in the Purple Heart.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER TO GENERAL MAC ARTHUR

(Reprinted from the Gen. Douglas MacArthur edition of the Purple Heart, the official organ of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, December 1944 anniversary issue)

DEAR GENERAL MACARTHUR: The world knows you not only as a skillful militarist but also as a devout humanitarian. Out of these and other commanding qualities has come your greatness as a general.

Those who have served America and humanity at your command know well that nothing within your resources will ever be left undone to heal and help those wounded in any cause for which you fight.

But neither the warmth of your great heart nor hatred for the beasts that seek to break it will alone suffice to bring, to bearers of the Purple Heart, that comfort and security their sacrifice has won for them their right to earn.

That millions of grateful hearts may bleed for him, sincerely and in deepest sympathy, can never satisfy the longing of the bearer of the Purple Heart for the proud right to feel a part of what goes on in our America—and, too the prouder right to know that what he gives to neighbors measures, according to his strength, a fair return for what those neighbors give to him.

All must return to civil life—to renew such hopes and to resume such helpful tasks as their remaining years and strengths permit. That these honored casualties of war may not become the hopeless wreckage of a helpless industrial economy, confused by false doctrines and bedeviled by an entrenched bureaucracy, is a responsibility of no one man but of our entire citizenry.

The sacrificial heart that conquers seething jungles and its venomous Japs is the same stout heart that learned its sportsmanship—and built its strengths and skills—in the eager competitions of the sand lots and the open enterprises of our free America.

America was born in the blood of productive peoples made desperate by prolonged extortions. Men fought and died that children might go free.

As your brave soldiers fight today, they learn again, the bitter way, the ruthless crimes of men gone wild with overmuch authority—as petty men so often do.

The children of America today are the controlling citizens of its tomorrow. What they believe today shapes the America to come.

For America lies not in her waters and her fields—not in her mines and factories. Those are but the workshops and the playgrounds of America.

America lies instead in the minds and hearts of her people. As their faith endures, her traditions hold fast. As their courage lives, there is sustained her will to fight aggression—whether from without, and armed with guns, or from within, and armed with false philosophies.

Our America will survive only through the determination of succeeding generations of her people to permit, along her road to higher destiny, no meddlesome hitchhikers, eager to grab the steering wheel of government and throw away the maps that brought her safely where she is today.

There are among us deluded men who teach that we should shackle now, at home, that courage which, inspired by the inducements of our open enterprise, has built that tough creative and productive muscle which, twice now in less than half a century, has helped freemen to turn the tide agianst enslaving tyrannies.

There are among us faltering men who teach that the peacetime tasks of our citizens, tomorrow, will exceed their understanding and their strength. They plead for acquiescence in their witless plans, by which all citizens would share alike, and eat, what cake there is—while those among us skilled in failure mix and bake another batch by history's repeatedly discarded recipes.

Thus is defined, for our returning champions, a task no less important than today's defense by them against armed foreign gangsters bent upon destruction of all liberty, wherever found.

May the contagious courage of returning bearers of the Purple Heart, and of their comrades, so inspire our faltering people as to lift them far above the deadly teachings of fanatical impracticals. May that same courage, by example, set our Nation firmly on the road to new and limitless frontiers unveiled for us from day to day by patient men of science and invention.

Our debt to you, stout general, is measured not alone in lands reconquered and in enemies destroyed. Just as your courage and resourcefulness inspire your soldiers to heroic deeds so you, and your companion immortals leading our fight at other battle fronts, lift to new heights the courage of our people to achieve all things which strengthen our America.

And may she be full strong, to meet that sacrificial hour which comes again as there is ended, in stupidity and greed of unredeemed humanity, the next long armistice.

May your strength endure and may your tribe increase.

JNO. W. ANDERSON.

GARY, IND., *December 1944.*

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of "News on Reciprocal Tariff Act," published by the Associated Industries of Vermont under date of July 5, 1945, which contains a letter written by me and an address delivered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

There being no objection, the letter and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS ON RECIPROCAL TARIFF ACT

ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF VERMONT,
July 5, 1945.

The bill known as H. R. 2652 extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act is now a law. The subject of tariffs has always been a controversial one and a major issue between political parties throughout the history of our country. Apparently the present war and the problems of reconversion and reconstruction have had their effect on the thinking of many interests, including political representatives in Washington on this important subject. In order to acquaint our members with some of the reasons given by United States Senators from our State we publish below, with their permission, a letter addressed to President James F. Dewey by the Honorable WARREN R. AUSTIN and excerpts from an address by the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN delivered before the United States Senate and taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1945.

WILLIAM L. MCKEE,
Manager.

JUNE 25, 1945.

Mr. JAMES F. DEWEY,
President, Associated Industries of Vermont, Quechee, Vt.

DEAR JIM: I have your letter of June 21 asking for my reasons for supporting the bill to extend and expand the authority of the President to negotiate trade agreements.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity, through the medium of mimeographs sent to all the members of such a representative organization as the Associated Industries of Vermont, to try to clear up any doubt or ambiguity respecting my objectives in supporting this bill.

My interest in developing wider markets and greater production of industrial and agricultural products and in increasing employment, was a reason for my vote.

My firm conviction that economic peace is necessary for political peace was another reason.

My opinion that reversion to the old method of determining tariff rates by back scratching would result, as the old method resulted, in unbalanced trade, and ultimately, depression and unemployment, was another reason.

Change from war to peace economy will suddenly reveal the vast extent of destruction of the property, transport and economic systems of Europe and Asia.

I now envisage each country desperately trying to save its people from starvation. In liberated Europe, there is a shortage of everything that is necessary for life—basically, power, light, heat, and transportation.

As I see it, international-trade policies cannot wait on the old-fashioned methods. If we are not ready and equipped with the flexible methods necessary to deal with our neighbors, we will force them to state-operated industry, secret subsidies, exchange manipulations, and other totalitarian devices, to overcome trade barriers.

We must take the leadership in expansion of both consumption and production, which means increased employment, and we cannot do this if we return to the old method of dealing with trade barriers.

Our capitalistic competitive system of economy is subject to a great strain. We must fight to save it. It is obvious to me that it is exposed to a tremendous collectivist drive, and that the only specific method of meeting it is the expansion and amplification of the authority of the executive department to deal promptly with every attack upon it by foreign nations.

The assurance held out by the passage of this law will be an encouraging factor to those greatly frightened nations whose shortage of everything, and inability to purchase overseas, is a threat to peace.

If we had refused to extend this authority we would have accelerated the race toward extreme nationalism in the family of nations.

We all recognize that we are going into a new world, in which the standards of living all over ought to be raised, and in which the promotion of our own interests—our selfish interests, candidly speaking—will best be achieved by an expanding economy.

The old-fashioned fight of competing countries for a larger piece of the same old pie must be abandoned, and our energies must be devoted to increasing the size of the pie so that all peoples may have more and better food and goods and employment for their health and happiness.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

Mr. President, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, now before the Senate, is only one of the many factors which will affect both our national and international economy in the coming years.

We are on the verge of the world's greatest era of progress. New inventions developed as a means of more successfully prosecuting war will be turned to peacetime usage, with the result that production, transportation, distribution, and merchandising methods will be vastly changed.

Stabilization of money and ample means of financing the world's commerce and industry will be necessary to enable us to reap the peacetime benefits of the great improvements in industry.

I repeat that today we are only on the fringe of the future, a glorious future where peace and plenty and opportunity will prevail if we do not put up the bars to progress.

Some fear that future. They would avoid it or prevent it if they could. They struggle to hold it back, because its nature is unknown to them.

They cling desperately to the old methods, the old ways, even though deep in their hearts they must know that theirs is a losing fight against progress.

They would erect a wall around themselves. That is why they struggle today to maintain an artificial barrier around their production plants, their methods, their commerce, their pocketbooks, even their country.

The population of the United States is about 135,000,000. There are nearly 2,000,000,000 people in the rest of the world. If we have learned nothing else from this war, we have learned that we alone are not a superior race.

We have learned to respect the ability of people of other races who speak other languages. We cannot ignore their existence either in the social, the geographical, or the economic world of the future.

They will produce. They will transport. They will market their production. They will fight for economic existence, if necessary.

We have depended on artificial protection in this country to an unwarranted degree.

I want no one to infer from that that I would abandon protection for American labor, industry, and agriculture.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act does not do that. It simply provides a scientific and sensible approach to the problem of raising the standards of living of other peoples of the world as well as maintaining those of our own; but I would never carry protection for American industry to such an extent that it would put a premium on obsolescence and inefficiency.

Our protected industries, many of them monopolies with virtually guaranteed incomes, depend on their pressure groups, their lobbyists and their influence on political organizations and politicians to perpetuate the special privileges, protection, and guaranty of profits which they now enjoy. They almost invariably press their demands in the name of the farmer, the laborer, or the small businessman.

The United States must take the lead in bringing about economic agreements among the nations because today, unravaged by war, we are the only Nation in the world that can assume this position. We have the wealth; we have the power to do this. If we do not take the lead now, I fear that the United States will not always occupy its present enviable position.

It will not be economically profitable or politically wise for us to undertake to maintain our dominance in world affairs by might alone.

It will not be possible to protect our American industry and standards of living by a rigid high-tariff wall alone.

American industry can take its place and hold its own in the commerce of the world without building a wall around our borders.

We can cut costs of production without cutting wages and incomes or profits.

By installing modern generating equipment, we can cut the cost of power and energy in half. We can greatly reduce the cost of transportation.

We can develop our natural resources so as to reduce the costs of production in this country far more than the value of our present tariff protection. We can finance the industries of America at a fraction of the cost of financing foreign industries.

Yet there are so many who are afraid.

Oh, yes; I know that the skeptics and the timid souls say the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act could be used to ruin American industry; to ruin American agriculture; that the President might sell us down the river; that the State Department might sell out the President and that the departmental experts might sell out the State Department and some evil influence might get to our unknown experts, and corrupt them.

I agree with all this. It all could happen. The President could sell out America. So could the Congress.

If one follows this line of thought to its logical conclusion, we would not even dare to elect a President or a Congress.

I am not afraid that President Truman or the State Department will sell the country down the river. There has been no proof that President Roosevelt and the State Department did this in the past 10 years.

With the inclusion of the Mexican escape clause in the trade agreements hereafter to be negotiated, as promised by Mr. Clayton, we shall be able to make this measure a cornerstone of expanding world economy, getting all the advantages of free and unhampered private trade with the added protection that any industry that can prove injury on account of excessive imports will obtain redress by the application of the escape clause.

Rich as the traditions of the past may be, we must realize that we no longer live in the days of the oxcart and the toll road.

This is the day of radar, of plastics, of electronics, of light metals, and the rocket plane.

We cannot discuss trade agreements on the level of 1893 or the level of 1930, but must think in terms of the conditions that will prevail in the years ahead of us.

Let us raise our sights to the unknown future, not with fear, but with confidence.

Reasons for a New Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH H. BALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD five articles written by me relative to Senate bill 1171, the proposed Federal Industrial Relations Act, which were written for and published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

WHY A NEW LABOR RELATIONS ACT?

(This is the first of five articles by Senator BALL on the proposed Federal Labor Relations Act of which he is co-author.)

(By JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota)

Four major reasons impelled the authors of S. 1171 (Senators CARL A. HATCH, Democrat, of New Mexico; HAROLD H. BURTON, Republican, of Ohio, and myself) to propose at this time a bill attempting to write into law a new peacetime Federal labor relations policy.

First, there is grave danger of widespread stoppages of production as a result of labor disputes in the United States in the reconversion and immediate postwar period. If we stand idly by and permit that to happen, the full employment and prosperity goals for postwar are seriously endangered. Workers, employers and the public would all lose heavily.

Second, Federal labor policy on labor disputes today is confused, with jurisdiction scattered among many agencies and policies non-existent or determined by various executive agencies and often conflicting. Decisions are delayed months and sometimes years.

Third, as Government prepares to assume responsibility for assuring full employment, we find many closed unions, which arbitrarily restrict their membership, in a position, because of closed shop contracts, to monopolize for a privileged few the employment opportunities which all the Nation's taxpayers will provide.

Fourth, it is high time, if we want industry to expand, to afford employers some protecton against arbitrary and coercive actions by employees, such as slowdowns, wildcat strikes and sitdowns, scores of which are now occurring daily, often in violation of collective bargaining contracts. Employees' rights are and should be protected by Federal law, and would still be under S. 1171. But the employer has no protection against such violations by employees and union leadership so far has been unable to prevent them. Small employers, particularly, are not likely to risk additional capital in expansion if this situation continues.

S. 1171 is an attempt to solve these problems in a fair and impartial manner. The preliminary drafting was done over some twelve months by a committee of impartial citizens who contributed their efforts, headed by Donald R. Richberg, Washington attorney who helped draft the Railway Labor Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, and section 7A of the National Industrial Recovery Act, known as labor's Magna Charta.

Neither labor nor management was consulted before the bill was introduced. It is obvious that the two partisans in this field are not ready at this time to agree and the authors of the bill are familiar with their positions generally.

* * * * *

It is our plan to ask for extended hearings before the Senate Education and Labor Committee, to which the bill was referred, as soon as the summer recess is over. In those hearings, both management and labor, as well as any other interested parties, will be given every opportunity to present their views on the bill.

HOW DISPUTES WOULD BE SETTLED

(Second of a series by JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota)

S. 1171 would establish a new five-member Federal Labor Relations Board, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, to have sole jurisdiction of all activities of the Federal Government in connection with labor disputes. The conciliation service of the Department of Labor would be transferred to the board. The board would be independent.

We did not place it under the Secretary of Labor for two reasons. The Secretary is regarded as the representative of labor in Government and therefore partisan, where a mediation board must be impartial. Second, in mediation, it is always the tendency of both parties to carry a tough dispute clear to the highest authority.

ACT STRENGTHENED

If the board were under the Secretary, then the latter would be the court of last appeal and the board's effectiveness and prestige in settling disputes would be weakened proportionately.

The bill makes it the duty of both parties to a dispute to try first in good faith to settle the dispute by collective bargaining, and if that fails, to then exhaust the procedures set forth in title I of the act before resorting to other means, such as a strike or lockout. It would be a violation of law and an unfair labor practice for either party to refuse to bargain collectively, to refuse to utilize the act's procedures or to attempt any one-sided change in conditions under dispute while these procedures were being followed.

FINAL WORD

In disputes over representation, the board would hold elections and its certifications would be final, as is the case now with the National Labor Relations Board. In other disputes, where the board's services are invoked and where it intervenes on its own motion, these steps are to be followed:

Efforts by a conciliator to get the parties to agree.

Mediation by the board or a member thereof, which is merely conciliation with the added prestige of the board behind it.

Offer of voluntary arbitration under the act, with awards enforceable in the courts.

IN SERIOUS CASES

Reference, in serious cases, to a special fact-finding commission appointed by the board or the President.

These are all standard procedures, tested by experience under both the Federal and State Governments, particularly the Railway Labor Act.

The most valid and frequent criticism of the War Labor Board is the delay, sometimes interminable, in getting decisions. Such delay is almost inevitable where a board has judicial power to decide, and the denial of such power to the proposed Federal Labor Relations Board would tend to speed up action.

In addition, S. 1171 would limit the board's jurisdiction to disputes which threaten "substantial" interruption of interstate or foreign commerce, and disputes of a purely local character, such as local distribution of food and clothing, are specifically eliminated, as are disputes involving an employer of less than 20 employees, unless the board itself decides such a dispute threatens a substantial interruption of commerce. Such local controversies would be left to State agencies, and the load of work on the Federal board lessened proportionately. The board also is directed to cooperate with and utilize State mediation agencies where they exist.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION UNDER HBB

(By JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota)

(Third of a series)

A few labor leaders have protested so violently about the compulsory arbitration features of S. 1171 that a clear statement of just what the bill would do is in order. Compulsory arbitration would apply in two categories of disputes, and two only.

The first category is disputes over the interpretation or application of the terms of a collective-bargaining contract in existence. In such cases, the Federal Labor Relations Board would direct the parties to refer the dispute to an adjustment board, consisting of one or two representatives of each party with a chairman named by them or by the board. The decision of the adjustment board would be binding upon both parties.

This is standard practice in the best collective-bargaining contracts, which usually contain provisions for such arbitration, and so far as I know is sought by unions in all contracts, although opposed by some employers. In effect, it merely provides that where a grievance arises over interpretation or application of an existing contract, it shall be decided by arbitration. Actually, such contracts could, under law, be interpreted by the courts, but such practices would clutter up court calendars.

The other category of disputes where compulsory arbitration would apply is those where the board finds that it is necessary in protection of the public interest, to require the parties to accept temporarily a compulsory settlement of their labor-relations controversy so as to avoid any interruption in the supply of a commodity or of a service on which the community affected is so dependent that severe hardship would be inflicted on a substantial number of persons by either a brief or prolonged deprivation of such commodity or service. The board is authorized and directed to find that severe hardship would be so inflicted in case of any serious or protracted interruption of a public utility or other public service or of the supply of an essential food such as milk, or of the supply of an essential fuel such as coal or oil.

In such cases, if the parties refused to accept voluntary arbitration, the special fact-finding commission named to investigate the dispute would be invested with the powers of a board of arbitration and its decision would be enforceable in the courts, normally for a period of 1 year but not more than 2 years.

Whatever anyone may say, the necessities of modern life have made a strike or lockout in this field intolerable today. No Governor will permit a labor dispute to close down an electric plant serving a large city. He will use every force at his command to prevent it, including the National Guard.

The Federal Government during this war has twice had to take over and operate the coal mines for the same reason. In reality, no strike or lock-out in this field is possible today, and both management and labor know it. But no alternative procedure for

settlement is available, and too often the party who is most ruthless in disregard of the public interest is the one who gains most, regardless of merits. It is high time that a fair and reasonable alternative to the chaos and hasty improvisations that now rule in this field be provided, and that is all S. 1171 would do.

MAKING THE CLOSED SHOP LEGAL

(Fourth of a series by JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota)

S. 1171 would separate completely the quasi judicial functions of the Federal Government in hearing and deciding complaints of unfair labor practices, and its mediation functions in attempting to bring about peaceful settlement of labor disputes.

The new Federal Labor Relations Board would handle the former function. A new Unfair Labor Practices Tribunal of three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, would take over the latter. Its procedures in hearing complaints and enforcing its decisions through the Federal courts would be the same asa those now used by the National Labor Relations Boards.

Section 7 of the Wagner Act, which guarantees employes' rights to organize and bargain collectivel ywould remain unchanged, but the unfair labor practices defined in section 8 of the present law would be rewritten.

Every unfair labor practice as it applies to employers and protects employees would remain as it now is in the act and additional protection against procrastination and stalling in bargaining would be added, but the same protection would be extended to employers.

Two new unfair practices are added. One would make any violation of the duties imposed by title I, to bargain collectively and follow settlement procedures under the Board, or to strike or to lock out during such procedures an unfair practice. It would apply to employers and employees alike. Another new provision would make it illegal for employees to attempt by slow-downs, wildcat strikes, or other methods to interfere with or dictate managerial decisions.

The most controversial change is that relating to closed-shop contracts. They are now legalized by a proviso to the Wagner Act clause which prohibits an employer from discriminating between union and nonunion employees, except where a closed-shop contract has been signed voluntarily.

S. 1171 would rewrite the proviso to make a closed shop legal under the same conditions unless the tribunal, acting on complaint or on its own volition, finds that the union involved violates any or all of these requirements: (1) The union is the freely chosen representative of at least 75 percent of the employees covered by the closed-shop contract; (2) the contract itself has been approved by secret ballot by 60 percent of the employees covered by it; (3) any person employed or seeking employment will be admitted to union membership on the same terms enjoyed by the majority of its membership, and (4) no union member can be deprived of membership, thereby losing his job, except on written charges and after a fair hearing.

A closed-shop contract, in the hands of unscrupulous union leaders, can become and has been used as an instrument of monopoly, depriving individuals of their equal rights to job opportunities. With our Government generally committed to a full-employment program, it cannot permit those job opportunities to be controlled and doled out by unions holding closed-shop contracts.

Yet the closed-shop contract is deeply imbedded in our complex labor relations structure and to tear it cut completely would create chaos. We have chosen in S. 1171 a middle path, simply requiring that where a union enjoys a closed-shop contract, it must be an open union, with membership open to all on reasonable terms.

SENATOR BALL ANSWERS A CRITIC

(Last of a series by JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota)

The initial blasts of labor leaders at S. 1171 had little relation to the actual provisions of the bill, and seemed to be a frantic attempt to label and smear it as antilabor without any study at all. We had expected labor opposition to some provisions, but had hoped for a positive and constructive approach rather than the smear tactics which have been used.

What few specific criticisms were made seemed to be based on misinformation, but since they have been widely disseminated, it is worth while to discuss the more important ones.

1. It was charged that S. 1171 would destroy labor's protection under the Wagner Act; "rape" was the term John L. Lewis used. The facts are that section 7, heart of the Wagner Act, would remain unchanged. Every unfair labor practice protecting employees' rights against employer coercion is continued, and the same protection accorded to employers.

2. Labor was not consulted in drafting the bill. We said that when it was introduced. Neither was management consulted.

3. Labor opposed the compulsory arbitration feature. Since labor has always supported arbitration of grievances under a contract, this must apply to public utilities and other essential public services, which is the only other field where it would apply under the bill. Government cannot and will not permit stoppages of essential production in such fields now, and we simply propose a workable alternative to chaos.

4. Labor has condemned the closed-shop provision, which would merely require that to have a closed-shop contract a union must be an open union and the contract must be approved by a substantial majority of those covered by it. There is ample evidence of abuse of the closed-shop contract in the construction, shipbuilding and other industries. This provision would not hamper in the slightest a democratic union obtaining a closed-shop contract desired by a majority of employes covered by it, but it would provide a method of checking the rackets which have developed around some closed-shop contracts.

5. Labor has charged that S. 1171 would repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which prohibits employers from obtaining injunctions in labor disputes. That is not true. The proposed Federal Labor Relations Board would be authorized to enjoin violations of the act, but no such privilege is extended to employers and the courts have held that the Government in any case is not affected by the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

I believe myself that in confining jurisdiction of the Federal Labor Relations Board to disputes "substantially" affecting interstate commerce, we inadvertently narrow the jurisdiction of the Wagner Act. That was a mistake which should be corrected in committee, and I am confident will be corrected.

There are undoubtedly other provisions of the bill which could and should be improved. The authors of the bill would welcome constructive criticism from the leaders of organized labor looking toward that end. But if it is the contention of organized labor's leaders that the present situation as regards Federal policy on labor relations is perfect and they are determined to use their admitted great political power in an effort to block any and all legislation, then we differ fundamentally. I do not believe any group in the United States is or should be above Government.

Haters of Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have read with a great deal of interest an article by Rev. George H. Dunne, S. J., University of San Francisco, in the historical bulletin, Catholic Quarterly, published at St. Louis University and republished in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 8, 1945, in which he criticizes, and properly so, the haters of Russia.

For years I have urged and advocated friendly relationship with Russia, believing Stalin's oft-repeated statement that Russia desires to bring about universal peace; that she does not desire any territorial accessions, but the only thing that she does desire is to safeguard herself in the future—as I have always believed—from any possible German attacks. Furthermore, I have always believed his statement that Russia was willing that the peoples of all the small nations should have the right of self-determination; that kind of a government they desired, which I fervently hope will apply to all the countries, including Poland.

The article is as follows:

PRIEST CRITICIZES HATERS OF RUSSIA

(Drum beaters of Soviet menace are really proposing war, which would make triump of communism inevitable, Catholic writer says, urges efforts for unity instead, sees European trend to left as inevitable because of need for reform, not Moscow pressure.)

(By George H. Dunne, S. J., University of San Francisco, in the Historical Bulletin, Catholic Quarterly published at St. Louis University)

The Europe which had lived intimately with violence, terror, starvation, and death for all the years of Nazi domination could not restore—would have no desire to restore—the social patterns whose inadequacy had been pitilessly revealed in the last two decades. None but the completely naive could have failed to realize that the Europe which comes out of this war would have moved socially and politically far to the left.

Not to have known for years the meaning of security, to have lived under the constant apprehension of death and terror, to have beheld one's country overrun by a brutal oppressor, to have watched the sickening spectacle of some of your wealthy industrialists turning a pretty penny by collaboration with the enemy—these are not experiences which make political rightists out of people.

NECESSARY AND INEVITABLE

By a trend to the left, I mean a trend toward adoption of a greater or lesser part of the Socialist program. Because measures form part of the Socialist program of social reform, they are not necessarily to be condemned. Pope Pius XI has pointed out that the Socialist programs often strikingly approach the just demands of Christian social reformers. I regard the trend to the left in Europe as in itself necessary and inevitable.

The primary concern of every man of good will should be to exploit to the full every possibility which offers hope of establishing a lasting peace.

Pamphleteers who have nothing better to offer than fierce diatribes against "bloody-handed" Joe Stalin, the "Asiatic atheist" (an expression, by the way, whose overtones are an insult to every Oriental), are not making any contribution to a better world.

They are saying in effect that war with the U. S. S. R. is inevitable—that she can be stopped only by force—that if she is not stopped now, she cannot be stopped later. If these propositions are correct, the only sensible conclusion is to advocate war.

PEOPLE WOULD OPPOSE WAR

The self-appointed prophets of despair shrink, however, from committing themselves explicitly to this conclusion. Possibly they sense, if they will not admit, that the people of the United States, much less the people of Great Britain, will not support a war with the Soviet Union. It would be a long, bloody, exhausting, probably inconclusive war which would create such mass despair and cynicism as to make the triumph of communism inevitable in the end.

There are many reasons to think that the primary objective of Russian policy after this war will not be either European conquest or world revolution, but will be instead concerned with military and political security for the Soviet Union.

It is unlikely that Stalin, at the age of 65, will jeopardize his chances of assuring himself a unique place in history in order to embark upon dubious revolutionary adventures in western Europe.

Stalin will be first of all concerned with securing the position of the U. S. S. R. so that he can prosecute the task of Socialist construction without interference from abroad. To that end, he will need the aid of Great Britain and especially the United States. He will, consequently, be desirous of continuing his cooperation with them. He indicated this clearly at Yalta.

The only possible bargaining point that Roosevelt and Churchill had was the promise of continued cooperation after the war. If Stalin set no value upon that cooperation, he could have refused any concessions. The fact that he conceded anything is a clear indication that the possibility of cooperation remains open and should be exploited to the full.

TWO BASES FOR SECURITY

It is likely that Stalin will seek to establish the security of the U. S. S. R. upon two foundations. He will seek whatever security is promised through cooperation with the western powers within the framework of a society of nations. But he will not trust entirely to this device. Consequently, in eastern Europe he will establish his own system of security, which will consist in using the predominant position of Russia to assure that the political regimes of neighboring states have a pro-Soviet orientation.

What of the threat of communism in western Europe? The threat exists, but it is not directly related to Russian policy.

The danger of communism is internal and arises from social, economic, and political conditions which inevitably breed communism. If those conditions are not remedied, if a challenging program of social, economic, and political reform cannot be offered the people of those countries, communism will triumph without any positive intervention by Stalin.

If Europe moves all the way to communism, it will not be because of Russian intervention, but because of the obstructionist tactics of die-hard reactionaries.

PLEA FOR SOCIAL REFORM

The answer to communism lies in a dynamic program of social revolution. Christian social philosophy, as Archbishop McNicholas has pointed out, can supply such a program. Unfortunately, too many Christians regard the principles of "true Christion social justice" as "radical, dangerous, and revolutionary" and are as afraid of them as they are of communism. In fact, they often identify them with communism.

The prophets of doom can keep beating their drums; they can keep viewing with alarm the rise of Soviet power, until the Communist revolution sweeps over them. Or they can abandon their drums and come out into the arena of the world and unite their efforts with men of good will everywhere to build a better world.

If that better world is to be built, it will be built not by dividing the world into two warring camps, the Communists and the anti-Communists. That has been tried, and the common people of the world have had enough of it. It gave them fascism and nazism. The end result of that tactic can only mean eventual communism.

That better world can be built only by establishing an international society of nations, however imperfect, and on the domestic front, by developing an imaginative, courageous and frankly revolutionary program of social reformation.

China's Contribution to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Pan Chao-ying is author of China Fights On and secretary to Bishop Paul Yu-pin, most outstanding Chinese bishop, and well known and admired in the United States. Dr. Pan was professor of political science at Providence College, Rhode Island, lecturer on international relations, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, and the Catholic University of America. He is also a distinguished Chinese authority on world problems.

The following article is a reprint of an article in last issue of July in the China Monthly, which was found by Bishop Yu-pin and was edited by Dr. Pan—1939 to 1941:

CHINA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Pan Chao-Ying)

China, although militarily unprepared, was strong in her determination and courage to resist Japanese aggression. Before Pearl Harbor, however, China received very little assistance from democratic countries in her struggle against Japanese aggression. From 1937 to 1938, in spite of China's heroic fight against the onslaught of the Japanese war lords, city after city fell into the hands of the enemy, during the 18 months following the Marco Polo Bridge attack. The courageous defense of the unprotected city of Shanghai and the spectacular victory of Tai-Erh Chuang have been accorded world-wide admiration by friend and foe alike.

The Chinese Army, poorly equipped, made up in sheer courage what they lacked in equipment. Pitting their bodies against the mechanized Japanese forces and spilling their blood in torrents, they stopped the invader abruptly in the midst of his ruthless carnage and devastation. If England, by checking German aggression in western Europe in 1940, may be regarded as the first line of American defense, and the Soviet Union as a bulwark against the German onslaught in eastern Europe in 1941–42, China surely may be said to have played an effective role in the defense of the United States by checking Japanese aggression in Asia.

China, though the least prepared, was the first to withstand the surging wave of world aggression. As early as 1937, the Chinese people became conscious that their battle was more than the defense of China alone. In their battle for right against might arose a determination to stop at no sacrifice that right might triumph. Thereby, China gave to the world an inspiring example of the power of right to ensure victory. She demonstrated to democratic nations how a militarily weak nation can effectively resist a formidable enemy.

As a result the Japanese war machine bogged down in China. Japanese war lords, realizing their impotency in the face of such spirit, became most anxious to settle the so-called China incident. The Japanese war machine wanted to be free to enter upon its main aggressive purpose. Several times China refused the Japanese peace overtures, although the terms offered grew more liberal or generous, as the Japanese explained.

In the pre-Pearl Harbor years there were two schools of thought on expansion in Japan, namely, (1) the north school or the continental school; and (2) the south or the oceanic school. The former advocated an attack on Soviet Russia; the latter an attack on the United States and Great Britain. But since the Japanese war in China could not be settled, more than 1,000,000 Japanese soldiers were tied up on the Chinese battlefield, and 800,000 troops were stationed in Manchuria. This caused Japan to defer her planned attacks on both the USSR and the United States and Great Britain. Through the unforeseen power of China, Japan found herself outmatched in her struggle for world conquest.

Consequently, long before the Japanese attack on America and on British and Dutch territories, China fought the battle, not only for self-preservation, but also for the preservation of the world democracies. On October 20, 1943, in an interview between Bishop Paul Yu-Pin and Canadian Premier McKenzie King, at which Dr. Lu Shih-shun, now Chinese Ambassador to Canada, and I were also present, the Premier was of the opinion that Canada, as well as other democratic countries owed a debt of gratitude to China because of her courageous and successful resistance to Japanese aggression. The reason for his opinion is clear; for if China had not so successfully resisted Japan, the Japanese might have succeeded in landing temporarily in Vancouver and Victoria.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION

In this connection it should be recalled that about 24 hours after the treachercus attack on Pearl Harbor, the Chinese National Government formally declared war against Germany and Italy, along with Japan. It is also interesting to note that the Congress of the United States declared war on Japan on December 8, 1941, at 4:10 e. s. t., while it declared war on Germany and Italy only on December 11, 1941, 3:05–3:06 e. s. t.; whereas China declared war on Japan, Germany, and Italy in the morning of December 9, 1941, Chungking time (that is, December 8, 1941, in the United States). In reality, then, China declared war on Germany and Italy about 3 days before the United States declared war on them.

Futhermore, only 1 day after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Generalissimo Chiang sent a message to President Roosevelt assuring the United States that in the now common battle, the Chinese would offer all we are

and all we have to stand with the United States until the Pacific and the world are freed from the curse of brute force and endless perfidy.

In China's declaration of war on Germany and Italy, the Chinese Government emphatically stated that Japan, Germany, and Italy in the Tri-Partite Pact of September 1940, had banded together for world conquest; and, as a consequence, China has severed her diplomatic relations with Germany and Italy in July of that year. It was further declared that China could no longer tolerate Japan's aggression, which had now spread to the whole Pacific. This proved that China strictly adhered to the principles of international justice and morality, as well as to her international commitments. It also demonstrates that China proved faithful to her American and British friends in their greatest crisis.

As a signatory of the declaration of the United Nations, January 1, 1942, the Chinese Government bound itself (1) "to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tri-Partite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war," and (2) "to cooperate with the Governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies."

In a message to the Indian people, February 22, 1942, Generalissimo Chiang expressed China's adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the joint declaration of the United Nations. He also hoped that the Indians "will wholeheartedly join the Allies, namely, China, Great Britain, America, and the Soviet Union, and participate in the struggle for the survival of a free world, until complete victory is achieved and the duties incident upon them in these troubled times have been fully discharged."

In pursuance to this pledge, the Chinese Government has cooperated with the United Nations in the fullest measure. About 2 days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, when addressing a meeting of the Chinese National Government, the generalissimo announced that he had appointed Rear Admiral Chenchak to direct the Chinese in Hong Kong to help the British defend that city, and also stated that he had given similar orders to Chinese leaders in Singapore, Malaya, the Philippines, Burma, and the Dutch East Indies. Detailed instructions were also given by Gen. Wu Te-chen, Secretary-General of the Kuomintang, and by other Chinese leaders, urging the Chinese in the South Seas, America, and other parts of the world to defend the territories of the Allies, as they would defend their homeland. Many speeches and broadcasts were made by other prominent Government leaders, asking the overseas Chinese to help their allies to the best of their ability in their respective areas.

As to China's cooperative effort with the United States, Dr. T. V. Soong, Chinese Foreign Minister, and Mr. Cordell Hull, United States Secretary of State, representing their respective Governments, signed a mutual aid agreement on June 2, 1943. This agreement provided for close cooperation and coordination of war efforts between China and the United States. Its provisions are substantially the same as those of the agreement between the United States and Great Britain signed on February 23, 1942.

In a special message to the Chinese people at home and abroad, December 10, 1942, the Chinese generalissimo told the overseas Chinese to fight shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain, the United States, Soviet Russia, and other friendly nations in a united endeavor to suppress the enemies of civilization and to establish lasting peace in the world, and to exert their strength for the defeat of the common enemy, and, thereby, add luster to the good name of China. On January 4, 1944, President Chiang declared China's willingness to bear her full responsibility for the defeat of the Japanese on the Asiatic mainland. He said that the Cairo Conference had been qualified by the aims of the common war against Japan, and that China will be the last defense of Japan, where she will make her most stubborn stand.

MILITARY CONTRIBUTION

As to China's military contributions to the cause of the United Nations, it is regrettable that some military commentators and analysts, who have no personal knowledge of the war situation in China, foster the following erroneous military notions: (1) the Chinese war theater has come to a stage of stalemate or a state of moratorium; (2) the Chinese have never won any big battle in the war theater; and (3) the Chinese have not and cannot offer much assistance or service to the United Nations.

The vital role of China in this Global War has been recognized only gradually by military and naval authorities. Admiral Ernest J. King, Command in Chief of the United States Fleet, in an interview August 7, 1943, said: "You can imagine what the situation would be if China were out of the war." The Admiral further explained that the main effort of the Allies here and now is to defeat Germany and Italy. But at the same time be predicted that amphibious operations were contemplated in the Pacific to acquire new bases from which to exert an all-out effort against Japan.

Furthermore, while Russia maintains neutrality with Japan, the best potential bases for air operations against Japan are still in China. Gen. H. H. Arnold, in his report of January 4, 1944, to the Secretary of War, emphasized the fact that United States bombers have made their presence felt in Japan, and that China remains America's most effective base for aerial operations against Japan. In following this conviction, General Arnold temporarily retains personal command of the B-29 Superfortresses, which are now operating in the western part of China and carrying out many successful missions in Manchuria, Formosa, and Japan.

The Japanese Imperial Army met disaster in Tai-Erh Chuang, Shangtung Province, in 1938. This Chinese victory was the first effective challenge to the invincibility of the Japanese Imperial Army. It could have been accomplished only through the undaunted courage, determination, and skillful strategy of China's able military leaders and brave soldiers. Had Chinese fighting forces ample guns, tanks, and airplanes, there is not the slightest doubt that they could readily free China from the barbarous Japanese. Even with the scant supply of inferior arms at its disposal, the Chinese Army has been able to win fierce battles over extensive fronts. The victory of Changsha (1942-43) indicated what was possible even with inferior arms.

Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor, while the United Nations were experiencing great setbacks, it fell to the lot of China to inflict a defeat upon the Japanese in which 30,000 Japanese casualties were left on the field. The victory of Changsha has had even a greater military significance than that of being a stimulus to the United Nations. Japan is eager to establish a land communication lines from Korea and Manchuria, passing through Peiping, Hankow, Changsha, via Kwangsi Province to Indo-China and Thailand, down to Singapore, in order to avoid a naval attack on their coastal transport from American and British forces. Three times Chinese troops defeated the Japanese at Changsha. These defeats frustrated or at least delayed this Japanese military plan. But, unfortunately, on account of a lack of equipment and the continued ferocious Japanese attacks, Changsha was lost to the enemy in June 1944. The Japanese had been advancing to Kwangsi Province with the hope of splitting China into two parts.

The Japanse capture of Kweilin and Liuchow in the early part of November 1944, is a decided advance towards the realization of their aim to divide China into two separate sections. The present Japanese advance on Kweiyang and Kunming is an indication of this divide-and-conquer policy of the invader. It further proves the aim of the enemy in the Pacific to frustrate any attempt at reopening the Burma Road or at using the new Ledo Road. Moreover, if Japanese efforts are successful, the consequence will be a master move against Allied naval attacks along the entire coastline of China.

Another prime factor in the division of China is the part the Chinese Communists played against the Central Government. In order to remedy this lack of cooperation of the Communists, the People's Political Council appointed a special commission of investigation. It made inquiries of the Communist leaders as to the immediate aims of their party's policy in China. After exploratory conferences and conversations with the Communist leaders, reports of this commission were submitted to the People's Political Council and the Central's Government.

The recent appointment of Dr. T. V. Soong to his status in China's affairs of state is significant. He is now the state councilor of the Central Government and acting president of the Executive Yuan. In addition he retains his original position as Foreign Minister, a post he has held since 1942. Both President Chiang and Dr. Soong have acquiesced to all the legitimate demands made by the Communists upon the Central Government, especially the due recognition of the right of this party's existence in the Chinese political scheme of things and the right to the party's policy of action within China.

All possible concessions have been made by the Chinese Central Government in order to induce the Communists to yield to the jurisdiction of the Central Government. These concessions on the part of the Government to the Communists are a genuine gesture of good will to get China's house in order. It now remains for the United Nations and especially the United States forces in China to assist the Central Government to capitalize on this unity and solidarity, so that a united effort may be made against our common enemy, Japan.

CHINA, A BASIS FOR OPERATIONS

It will not do for the Allied forces to adopt the strategy of passing China by on the road to final victory. This so-termed "bypassing" maneuver with regard to China would have the following results: (1) A devastating toll in Chinese lives and a longer duration of the war in the Pacific; (2) a tremendous expenditure of American manpower if any attacks are made on Japan proper; and (3) an advantage to the Japanese because it will afford them adequate time to entrench themselves on the Asiatic mainland for a long-drawn-out war.

No less an authority than Maj. Gen. Albert Wedemeyer has sensed the situation in its proper prospective. General Wedemeyer, who has succeeded General Stilwell in the Chinese theater of the war, voiced his opinion that the Japanese will not be defeated by "island hopping." He holds that China's mainland will best serve as bases of operations in the move to come into close contact with the enemy. With regard to this strategy, General Wedemeyer has had several successful conferences with Gen. Ho Ying-cheng, the military leader so bitterly opposed by the leaders of the Chinese Communistic Party. In public utterances General Wedemeyer, by the way, expressed the high personal esteem with which he regards the military ability of

China's new Minister of War, Gen. Chen Cheng.

Needless to say, the Chinese are only too willing to give full cooperation to the United States to defeat Japan before she can consolidate her temporary gains. Their sacrifices in the past are proof of this. No absolutely reliable statistics of the Chinese casualties, dead and wounded, are available. But it is generally believed in official circles that more than one million soldiers have been killed and disabled, and four to five million civilians have been killed by the invaders. A conservative estimate of the number of Chinese refugees now amounts to 50,000,000. Take the recent battles in Hupeh Province as an example: Upward of 25,000 civilians were killed and wounded, and more than 10,000,000 Chinese dollars' worth of property was destroyed by the Japanese during their recent short-lived occupation of Chihkiang, Sungtze, Kungan, and Shishow. These figures were compiled by the authorities of the war-stricken towns after careful investigations. Yet, the fighting in that Province alone cannot be considered the most intense or devastating.

Gen. Ho Ying-chin, Chinese Chief of Staff, in his New Year's Day (1943) review of military developments in China, declared that "since Japan started her war of aggression against China, large numbers of her crack troops have been thrown into the China battlefields only to be decimated by the Chinese defenders. Japan has now sunk into the China quagmire from which there is no way to extract herself." General Ho said that under the constant hammering of China's war of resistance during the past 8 years, the fighting strength of the enemy has dwindled considerably as compared with China's ever-growing strength. This change of situation has become more apparent during the past year. The number of casualties among enemy troops employed in the China theater during the last year is indicated by General Ho, when he stated that Japan maintained 39 divisions and that over 160,000 of their troops were killed or wounded. But according to a Central News Agency report of February 19, 1945, Gen. Ho Ying-chin estimated that the Japanese have thrown up to 50 divisions, or two-fifths of their army, on the Chinese mainland, into efforts to prevent an American landing on the Chinese coast. This did not include the Kwantung army of 22 divisions stationed in Manchuria.

During the Japanese attacks on Hong Kong, the Philippine Islands, Hawaii, Singapore, Burma, and the Dutch East Indies, Chinese in these regions enthusiastically cooperated with the British, American, and Dutch authorities in resisting the Japanese onslaughts. These Chinese, some native-born, others of British, American, or Dutch citizenship, have enlisted in the armed forces, intelligence service, Red Cross, and police force of the respective governments. Tens of thousands of them have sacrificed their lives for the defense of these territories. Untold loss of property has been suffered by these Chinese. I have met many Chinese leaders from the regions mentioned, who have escaped to Chungking and Kunming and other places. Many of them were very wealthy in the pre-Pearl Harbor days, but they now depend on relief funds given by the Chinese Government. I asked them whether or not they had any complaints. Their answer was that since so many soldiers and civilians of China, as well as of the United Nations, have lost their lives for the sake of China and of the United Nations, their material loss is, of course, regrettable, but that no fault could be attributed to the Governments of China or the United Nations. They hold the barbarous Japanese responsible for the disasters that have overtaken them.

For the defense of Burma, the Chinese sent tens of thousands of crack soldiers to help the British. Since the war is not yet concluded, the extent of the Chinese Expeditionary Forces sent to Burma in 1942, is still a military secret. It should not be revealed here how the negotiations were conducted between the British and the Chinese concerning the sending of Chinese troops to Burma for the defense of that region, nor the reasons for the failure of that defense.

HOLDING THE ENEMY OFF

However, authentic reports indicate that during the Burma campaign in 1942, while major battles were still raging within the Chinese borders, China sent some 60,000 crack soldiers to Burma. Thereby, China demonstrated to the world that she considered the battle of Burma no less important for world victory than the battles waged within the various provinces of China. The Chinese Expeditionary Forces, sent to Burma, were composed of three armies assigned to positions east of the Rangoon-Mandalay Railway extending to the Burma-Thailand border, a stretch of more than 500 miles. The Chinese and Japanese met at Toungoo on March 19, and for 10 days a lone Chinese division fought the Japanese motorized Fifty-fifth Division and regiments from the Thirty-third Division. Relay bombing and intensive artillery shelling rendered the Chinese position untenable, while the use of poison gas by the enemy suffocated many of the defenders. Still the Chinese held on. After the Japanese occupation of all the strategic cities in Burma, the British forces retired to India. The Chinese armies remained behind the Japanese lines. They were ordered to harass the invaders in Burma. As they were fighting on foreign soil and received little cooperation from the Burmese, planes were used on several occasions to drop them needed supplies.

The battle of Burma, in 1942, in many ways resembled the battles of Shanghai against the Japanese in 1937. The Japanese appeared on the stage first, with the Chinese rushing to positions when the situation already had become critical. It was much worse than at Shanghai, as the Chinese had to defend Burma under intensive Japanese aerial bombardments and against naval and land forces. Thus, the tragedy of numerous casualties at Shanghai was repeated at Toungoo. The valiant spirit of the Shanghai defenders was again manifest in Burma. Eventually, the battle of Burma was lost, as was the battle of Shanghai. The Chinese have regretted deeply that they could not bring needed reinforcements in time to save Burma. However, no one can question the courage and heroism which they displayed in their attempt to save Burma for the British. Even after the Japanese capture of Rangoon, the Chinese troops inflicted heavy losses on invading forces, although one Chinese division was completely wiped out by the enemy. When the Chinese soldiers found it was impossible to continue effectively to resist the enemy, Gen. Lo Jao-ying succeeded in taking part of his troops across the jungles and finally reached India. Most of these troops are now in India, where they are playing an effective role in developing a new army for the future recapture of Burma. Of this, Gen. George C. Marshall, in his report to the Secretary of War in 1943, states that a considerable Chinese force had retired into India and was the nucleus of General Stilwell's operations; a similar project was in process in the training of Chinese air cadets in the United States and with the American Tenth Air Force in India. The Chinese are now fighting vigorously and successfully with the other allied forces in the present Burma campaign against the Japanese.

It is likewise notable that thousands and thousands of Chinese soldiers have been sent to India for military training under American, British, and Chinese officers. Within a short time they become mechanized units and, undoubtedly, will be useful for the recapture of Burma. Many Chinese officials and specialists have been sent to India for the present Burma campaign. Some Burmese leaders are already in India and China, cooperating with the Chinese and British authorities.

The presence of the Chinese soldiers and many Chinese officials in India demonstrated to the Indians that the Chinese and the British were united in their war effort against the brutal forces which sought to enslave the world. As the Chinese and the Indians are traditional friends, the Indians have cooperated closely with the Chinese, especially after Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru's visit to China in 1940, and Generalissimo Chiang's visit to India in 1942. These factors constitute an effective measure, counteracting the Japanese poisonous propaganda, "Asia for Asiatics."

CHINA AIR BASES

In close cooperation with the Allies, China has built many airfields for the American Voluntary Group, the Fourteenth United States Air Force, the China-India Air Transport Operation, and the Chinese Air Forces. Some of the airfields were built by hand by hundreds of thousands of Chinese coolies, laborers, and skilled workers. Since they were built with such great manpower, some of them were completed faster than La Guardia Field in New York. Although some of these airfields have been captured by the enemy, there are still some bases in China from which to bomb Japan with the new Super-fortresses and other types of airplanes. Lieutenant General Wedemeyer and Major General Chennault are now using Chinese bases to bomb Japanse communications and other military targets.

These operations help to nullify the advance Japan gained after the attack on Pearl Harbor. In cooperation with American Air Forces, hundreds of thousands of Chinese, with all kinds of signal devices, have kept the United Nations' air forces in China informed of the major Japanese movements. When an airplane motor starts to warm up in a field of occupied China, the Chinese intelligence immediately flashes the information to the American forces.

In short, China is a champion and a bulwark of strength against the formidable and violent forces of aggression. She has given a noted example to the world that a militarily unprepared democratic nation can still resist aggression successfully. In her long and hard fight with the Japanese, China follows her traditional policy for the maintenance of justice and peace. While the democratic nations were for a time dominated by sentiments of appeasement and isolation, China's belief that justice must triumph was never shaken. She has again and again turned a deaf ear to Japan and her Axis partners who tried to induce her to join them against the United Nations.

Politically speaking, China has been a faithful ally of the democratic nations since long before the Japanese treachery of Pearl Harbor. In spite of the fact that the China war theater has long been overlooked or subordinated, the Chinese Government and people still have firm confidence in their allies and in final united victory. From the standpoint of strategic, economic, and other factors, China is a great asset to the United Nations. Her contribution to the war effort of the United Nations, though not generally appreciated by many people outside of China, should be known to all her allies.

Job Plans That Cunningly Seek Veteran-Labor Brawls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot obtain a copy of the Chicago Times as frequently as I would like because there are so many splendid articles and editorials in it that deserve greater publicity than it receives, but I refer to an article by Mr. Samuel Grafton on the bill proposed by Congressman RANKIN, headed: "Job plans that cunningly seek veteran-labor brawls."

The article is as follows:

JOB PLANS THAT CUNNINGLY SEEK VETERAN-LABOR BRAWLS

(By Samuel Grafton)

A number of American social philosophers of the second grade are licking their chops in unison and indulging in a kind of massed-chorus drool as they think of what the returning veteran is going to do to labor.

Proposals for deliberately setting the veteran against labor, just in case he doesn't happen to think of it himself, are floating about Washington. One is the suggestion that returning veterans be allowed to work in any factory, regardless of union contracts, rules, seniority, or initiation fees. These proposals are hard to refute (which is why they are so useful to opponents of labor); they seem superficially fair, they are concerned with giving jobs to our fighting men, and they are charged with the national emotion of gratitude. Yet they cry out for examination.

HOPING FOR A FIGHT

The sponsors for some of these ideas make no secret of the fact that they look for a sensational brawl between veterans and labor. They expect a decline in the strength of organized labor to follow the return of the soldier. They do not regret this, as an incidental effect of their job program for veterans; they welcome it; it is, as they say in the barber shops, the beauty part of the idea.

Thus the first point to be made in regard to some of these proposals is that they are declarations of class war. We are used to thinking of class war as something which always originates on the labor side; but class war can originate on either side; and the gunpowder smell of it is all over some of these suggestions.

A second point comes instantly to mind, and that is that the real question is not whether the veterans are going to have jobs; of course, they must have jobs; the real question is who is going to pay for it. A fatal flaw in the schemes sketched out above is that they call on labor to pay for the entire job program; they call on one class in the population to carry the social and human cost of demobilization.

The idea that we are going to make jobs for veterans by putting some workers out of work altogether is taxation with a vengeance; it would require some Americans to give up all of their income, every bit of it, in order to put the soldiers to work. A fairer distribution of the after-cost of war must be attempted than this crude, vaguely cannibalistic project.

ONLY ONE PERSPECTIVE

There is another point: The proponents of some of these schemes seem to be able to set up no perspective for America except one of social strife. Their mirrors, perhaps because they reflect hate in their own hearts, show them no other possibility.

The are perpetually setting up social fight cards; they are not interested in plans which might enable us to get along with each other. Judge Vinson's new "economic charter," proposing that the Government shall aid business expansion and a high-wage policy and full employment, merely gives them a headache; they turn away from it and refresh themselves with the thought that soon, now, somebody is going to be awful mad at somebody, and is going to take a job away from somebody.

Th veterans would be well advised to go slowly in accepting the leadership of these prophets of a grade-B Goetterdaemmerung, who, after sullenly enduring unity during the war years, have come up with the ingenious proposal that we shall, in effect, turn the armed forces of the United States against the people from whose loins they sprang.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, so that we might have a picture of the operations of UNRRA and what its present status is, I have requested the head of FEA, Mr. Crowley, to furnish me with certain information. I have that information, and I feel that it should be placed in the RECORD so that the membership may see it.

It is absolutely impossible to tell much about UNRRA or its operations from the report that was submitted to Congress as of March 31, 1945. About the only thing that anyone could tell was that the total expenditures to that date were $41,000,000 and the total obligations of funds were $163,000,000 out of the appropriations that were made by Congress. The funds provided are as follows:

Direct appropriation	$450,000,000
Authority to transfer out of lend-lease	350,000,000
Total funds available	800,000,000
Expenditures:	
Transfers to UNRRA	25,315,000
Other expenditures	50,639,411
Total expenditures	75,954,411
Balance still available	724,045,589

Expenditures for the last 3 months have stepped up; they were for:

March	$25,252,004
April	22,693,560
May	12,173,315

The obligations to May 31, total $253,064,585 and the allocations for definite activities total $372,713,689. In other words, in practically a whole year less than one-half of the funds had been allocated, less than one-third had been obligated and less than 10 percent had been spent.

Various funds have been set up by UNRRA but its operations are on such a scale that it is very difficult to follow. I would express the hope that the next time the managers of UNRRA got out a statement they would get one out in which the so-called needs and their expenditures appeared more clearly so that one might check the thing up with some idea of what they have been doing and so that we may be able to check the operations fully and with some degree of exactitude.

How much of the money they have spent for civilian pay roll and how much occasion they have had to spend for that purpose, there is no published record to show. How much of the $25,315,000 transferred to UNRRA has actually been spent, there is nothing to show. We have statements with reference to some items but no general over-all statement as to just what the status of the thing is. The situation is and has become so involved that it is very difficult to understand.

The only thing we know is that after the operations of the last 12 months they still have nine times more money left than they have already spent. The obligations to now are less than one-third of their appropriation and with any kind of management they should be able to get along another year and do everything they need to do. It is distressing to get continued reports of lack of business management in connection with all their activities and under those circumstances it would seem that the situation called for more management and less planning on how to get money out of the Treasury. It would seem as if it was their first problem to clean up their management and then not come back to us until they were able to give us a clean picture.

Strengthening America's Overseas Air Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a speech delivered by Almon E. Roth, president, National Federation of American Shipping, before the aviation section of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., on July 13, 1945, on the subject of strengthening America's overseas air services:

Eight American shipping companies have applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for certificates of convenience and necessity authorizing them to inaugurate overseas air transport services in coordination with their regular surface operations.

The participation of American steamship lines in air transport is a matter of grave concern to this Nation, and especially to this great seaport of New York which has such a vital stake in the development of world commerce and the maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine.

I am glad of this opportunity to explain to the members of your organization the position of the steamship companies, and to clear away some of the misconceptions

which have developed in public discussions of sea-air transportation.

The applicant steamship companies subscribe to the principle of regulated competition, as defined in the 1938 Civil Aeronautics Act. They do not contend that the fact that they have carried the American flag over their present routes in the past and have spent millions in developing both cargo and passenger business in their trade areas, automatically entitles them to air certificates. They do not ask exclusive rights to provide air service even over their own routes. They do contend that they are entitled to equal consideration along with airline applicants, who now seek for the first time, to enter the overseas field and who would bar all shipping companies from participation simply because they have not previously employed the airplane as a type of transportation equipment. Each applicant shipping company stands ready to meet the test of fitness, willingness, and ability required by the Civil Aeronautics Act.

These shipping companies do not plan to invade the territory of any other American interest. In essence, all they ask is that they be given the right to provide a complete transportation overseas service for their patrons, in areas which they have been serving, by adding the airplane to their existing facilities for carrying their goods and passengers.

LOOK TO THE SEA

Today we are facing to the sea. We know we cannot live to ourselves. Our whole program for international security is predicated upon a freer and more extensive exchange of goods and travel among the nations of the world. If we are to play our proper part in this expanded world commerce, it is important that we develop and maintain efficient modes of transportation which will adequately protect America's position against all contingencies in the overseas carriage of goods and persons.

It is a curious commentary that despite this new perspective, this new outlook, we have not come to realistic grips with the mechanics or machinery by which we implement our national objectives. We still think and talk in terms of promoting one form of transportation against another under the American flag.

Our prime objective today should be to develop the most efficient and adequate overseas transportation, whatever the mode. The airplane and the surface vessel are not competitive in any real sense. They are simply different tools for carrying on the over-all job of transportation of goods and passengers. A plumber is not required, when he comes to fix your plumbing, to use the screw driver only. He has the Government's consent, at least as of this date, to carry a wrench and other tools. His job is to fix the plumbing, not to promote the use of the screw driver as against the wrench. He has sense enough to use both.

This is not to deny that we should use every proper means to further the development of every tool in overseas transportation. Quite the contrary; for if we neglect any tool, we simply limit our ability to do the job. But let's not forget what the job is. In the case at issue, it is the furnishing of adequate American-flag overseas transportation services through an integrated sea and air service which will offer many advantages to the public.

As we look back over the history of transportation, we find ample precedent for the use of airplanes as a new and supplementary instrument of transport by surface carriers. The use of steam vessels, taxicabs, busses, and trucks was considered a logical and necessary step in the progress of transportation. The use of airplanes is likewise a logical and necessary advancement.

The joint operation of aircraft and surface vessels would provide the public a brand new type of service, with which neither an air service alone, nor a steamship service alone, would be comparable. This principle is well established by transportation authorities.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, for example, has repeatedly held that such coordinated service of rail and motor-carrier transportation is "a new form of service, utilizing both forms of transport to advantage, and differing from the service given by the railway alone or by competing motor carriers alone."

If this premise be granted—and we know of none who deny it—the consequence of refusing steamship companies the right to use aircraft would be to deprive the public of a new, different, and improved type of service. The public certainly is entitled to the best that can be provided, and it is entitled to make its choice among the several services. If we tell the traveler that he may choose only between an American steamship service alone or an American aircraft service alone, and he prefers a coordinated sea-air service, we will drive him straight into the arms of our foreign competitors who offer the integrated service the traveler wants.

Mr. John Q. Public, who is interested in the most efficient and economical transportation service, is probably wondering why anyone should oppose such a logical development as an integrated sea-air service.

The principal opposition to steamship company participation in the development of overseas aviation comes from two sources—the Civil Aeronautics Board and a few air lines.

Let us now examine the arguments which they have advanced. The Civil Aeronautics Board has taken the position that it is the declared policy of Congress to rigidly limit steamship carriers in the air-transportation field. This conclusion by the CAB is based upon the false assumption that it is the intent of Congress to prohibit one type of carrier from making use of another in its operations.

We are at a loss to understand how anyone can seriously contend that it is the intent of Congress to prohibit steamship lines from using airplanes to supplement their surface operations, in view of the following specific provision in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936:

"Section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 authorized and directed the Commission 'to study and to cooperate with vessel owners in devising means by which * * * (2) there may be constructed by or with the aid of the United States express-liner or super-liner vessels comparable with those of other nations, especially with a view to their use in national emergency and the use in connection with or in lieu of such vessels of transoceanic aircraft service.'"

It can hardly be said that Congress looked with disfavor upon the use of aircraft by a steamship carrier when it directed that Government aid should be furnished in devising means by which aircraft might be used in connection with or in lieu of vessels in transoceanic service.

The discussions before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, in March 1938, on H. R. 9738, commonly known as the Lea bill, clearly indicate that it was the intention of Congress to permit surface carriers to engage in air transport.

In this hearing, the chairman of the interdepartmental committee, C. M. Hester, indicated that the only requirements a steamship company would have to meet, in connection with applications to the CAB, would be the general requirements for the issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity.

At this hearing, the late Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, made the leading statement on behalf of air companies. In speaking of the purposes of the proposed Lea bill, Colonel Gorrell said, "If shipping or other transportation companies wish to engage in air transportation, there is no reason why they should stand on any different basis from any other person desiring to enter this business."

In view of these statements in the official congressional hearings which preceded the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act, it is little wonder that many Congressmen have expressed amazement on learning of the CAB's hostility toward the use of aircraft by steamship lines.

In referring to the above statements at the congressional hearings, to the effect that steamship companies would be treated the same as other applicants under the Civil Aeronautics Act, Chairman BLAND of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee recently said:

"As one member of the committee I will say they would have fought to the death unless that statement had been agreed to."

Some air-line officials have been fair enough to recognize that there is no present legal bar against steamship participation in air transport.

In a recent article in Aero Digest, Mr. William A. Patterson, president of the United Air Lines, makes the following statement concerning the legal aspects of this question:

"Much is made of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which, as interpreted by some, makes it difficult or virtually impossible for surface carriers to get into the air. Such laws do not have to be regarded as permanent. They can and should be changed if the public interest so dictates.

"As a matter of fact, in United Air Lines brief which supported our application to serve Hawaii, we expressly stated that 'United does not maintain that the Matson Navigation Co. is prohibited, as a matter of law, from acquiring a certificate of convenience and necessity under the Civil Aeronautics Act, because it is a common carrier by steamship.'

"We argued that case on the basis that United was in a better position to provide public service than any other applicant, whether that applicant was an air line or a steamship operator."

It is absurd to contend that our national transportation policy prevents one form of carrier from using a type or mode of transportation employed by another.

It is common knowledge that scores of railroads are now operating bus lines and truck lines with the full approval of the ICC. Hundreds of street railways are operating busses. These practices certainly negate the contention that all forms of transportation must be kept separate and distinct.

The CAB has now developed a new ground for discriminating against steamship lines. In denying the application of the Moore-McCormack Lines in the North Atlantic case, the CAB takes the position that a steamship company should not be permitted to enter the field of international aviation because the company is without operating experience in the field of air transportation. The Board points out that the steamship company's development of an organization to conduct the proposed service is dependent upon obtaining capable administrative executives and operating personnel in air-transport service. This is a most curious ruling when viewed in the light of well-known facts.

It is a matter of common knowledge that steamship companies can readily obtain all the technical air personnel required to operate airplanes, and it is noteworthy that the CAB does not find that such technical assistants are not readily procurable by steamship companies. It is interesting to note in this conection that the American Export Air Lines was pioneered and developed by a steamship company, and that this steamship company apparently had no difficulty in obtaining all the technical personnel which

it required for the operation of airplanes. In approving the acquisition of the American Export Air Lines by the American Air Lines, the Commission put its stamp of approval upon the successful efforts of a steamship line to develop aviation services. If there is anything to the old adage that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating," the CAB certainly is on weak ground in insisting that no one shall be given a certificate unless he has had experience in air operations.

If we carry the CAB's argument to its logical conclusion, no new transportation company, whether it be an air or a surface carrier, could ever hope to engage in air transport simply because it had not had experience in air operations, even though it might not have any difficulty in obtaining all the technical staff needed for its operations. The adoption of such a policy would freeze existing air lines in the business and deny opportunities for new enterprise and initiative. It would be contrary to the best interests of our returning veterans who have a very direct stake in the development of new aviation enterprises. We do not believe that American citizens will approve a doctrine which smacks so strongly of monopoly.

Some spokesmen for individual air lines have based their opposition to steamship participation on two grounds: First, that steamship companies plan to get control of overseas air services in order to subordinate them to their surface operations and; secondly, that the steamship companies would neglect their surface operations in the interest of developing their air services. These arguments, of course, are mutually exclusive. They can't both be valid. But let's consider them both.

There is no basis for the fear that steamship companies might stifle the development of air transport, for the following reasons:

Self-interest alone would preclude any such action. American steamship lines will have to meet the competition of both foreign air lines and of American air lines. It will therefore be impossible for them to acquire any monopoly of air service. No steamship company would be so foolish as to invest its money in air facilities and then retard their use in the face of competition by foreign and American air lines.

Take one of the applicant steamship companies as an example. This line has set aside $8,000,000 as its initial investment in equipment and facilities for the promotion of an air arm of its proposed integrated sea-air services. Is it conceivable that this company would throw away $8,000,000 to suppress its air arm in favor of its surface operations, even if it were granted that such suppression were possible in the light of other competition? Such a suggestion simply does not make sense.

Furthermore, if any steamship company were foolish enough to attempt to suppress the development of air transport in favor of its surface operations, it would immediately hear from the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is charged with the specific duty of fostering and developing civil aviation. The CAB has ample authority to prevent any possible attempt to stifle aviation by a steamship company. It could revoke such steamship company's certificate or issue new certificates to additional competitors.

The second contention that a shipping company might neglect its surface operations in favor of air is equally untenable. In seeking the right to use aircraft as a mode of transportation, the steamship companies do not intend to abandon either their passenger or cargo services. On the contrary, they plan to use the airplane as a means of supplementing their present services to the public, and as an instrument for holding and developing cargo traffic.

On this point I should like to quote the testimony of a practical steamship operator, Mr. Lewis D. Parmelee, executive vice president of the Atlantic, Gulf, and West Indies Steamship Lines and president of the Propeller Club, Port of New York. In a recent article in Travel Trade, Mr. Parmelee says:

"In the past, a steamship company's passenger service afforded a means of contact with shippers or potential shippers, and was most effective in building and maintaining cargo business.

"If, after the war, businessmen travel on American-flag air lines, which have no connection with American steamship lines, our steamship companies will have lost their strongest and most effective contacts for procuring freight business. It will become more difficult than ever for our steamship companies to compete with foreign-flag carriers for freight business.

"This competitive disadvantage will be aggravated by the fact that a considerable number of foreign-flag steamship companies will be operating combined sea-air service after the war. In Great Britain, Sweden, Holland, Portugal, France, and Norway steamship companies have already formed air-transportation companies or are in the process of organizing such companies for the purpose of offering combined sea and air service. Under the 'five freedoms' policy of international air transportation which is favored by our Government these foreign-flag sea-air carriers will be given free access to United States gateways for the purpose of carrying passengers between the United States and foreign destinations. Both American and foreign businessmen will travel over the air routes of such carriers as well as over the routes of American-flag air carriers. As a result a large cross section of potential cargo shippers will constantly be exposed to direct contacts with foreign carriers operating both a sea and an air service. We can be sure that these highly successful and resourceful foreign carriers will use this valuable contact as a means of procuring for themselves the sea and air cargo business of these air passengers. And the flexible service which can be supplied by a single company operating both sea and air transportation will be most attractive.

"It is quite evident, therefore, that despite greatly increased foreign trade after the war, our merchant marine cannot hope to capture its fair share of this business, unless American-flag steamship companies are given the same opportunity as foreign lines to enter the field of air transportation. Should our shipping interests be placed on a competitive parity with these foreign interests, we should be able to increase immeasurably the volume of cargo carried by our merchant marine in the sea lanes.

"A steamship operator conducting both sea and air service will have every reason to exploit air transportation to the fullest extent, because every air passenger as well as every sea passenger will not only mean revenue to the company, but will also provide effective contact with potential cargo shippers."

In its North Atlantic decision, the Civil Aeronautics Board in effect establishes three interior United States cities as ports of entry. Chicago, Detroit, and Washington, D. C., are designed as points of origin for direct air service to foreign points. Pan-American, which heretofore has operated only to coastal cities, principally New York and San Francisco, is permitted to move its termini inland to the three cities just named. Mark this well, for it establishes a new policy which may have profound effect upon our coastal areas and our great seaports. It is in keeping with the Board's tentative route proposals announced some months ago, which would in many cases practically ignore the existence of the coast lines of America in laying out our postwar overseas air routes.

This is as it should be. If it is shorter and more practical to fly direct from Chicago to the Orient or to Europe, and more travelers will be accommodated thereby, then common sense recommends such course. If overseas air carriers were to be stopped at the border or at the coastline, we would be imposing an artificial restriction which unquestionably would hamper and jeopardize America's overseas air service, especially in relation to foreign competitors.

Now, while we all agree that the interior points are fully entitled to such service, and that it would be unjust to deny the air carriers the right to serve inland points, by the same token it is equally unjust to deny steamship companies the right to serve with air equipment the coast cities with which they have been so intimately connected for so many decades.

No steamship company proposes to go inland. They all recognize that the type of service they propose to render is different from that to be rendered by the strictly air-line companies. Instead, the shipping companies seek only to serve their regular routes and trade areas. Some of these routes and trade areas, and certainly some of the coast cities which are home ports for steamship passenger services, may have no overseas air service at all unless steamship companies are permitted to provide it.

Take Seattle as an example. Northwest Airlines, recently given a transcontinental certificate, also proposes to fly to the Orient. Northwest's present western terminus is Seattle. Yet its president, Mr. Croil Hunter, recently told the Seattle Chamber of Commerce that Northwest's overseas service would originate at Chicago or Minneapolis, and fly over Canada to Alaska, by-passing Seattle. This same by-passing route has been recommended by the CAB's public counsel. The argument is advanced that the Pacific Northwest would not originate enough traffic to warrant a service starting from Seattle or Portland. Yet, if a steamship company is willing to provide overseas air service from Seattle for travelers who desire to embark from this seaport, why should they be deprived of that service?

We submit that there are strong, equitable reasons why steamship lines should be permitted to engage in overseas air transport.

Ever since this country was founded, its merchant marine has pioneered in the development of its overseas commerce. It has carried the American flag into every port of the world. It has been a builder of national prestige and of national security, as well as an aggressive salesman for our goods and products. Shipping companies have risked their capital to build trade routes where none existed. They have developed new territory, thereby opening new fields to the American manufacturer and exporter. They have built or helped finance hotels and other tourist facilities; they have spent huge sums in promotional activities and in developing reciprocal trade areas.

American shipping companies were among the first to recognize the advantages and the future role of the airplane in overseas transportation.

They were among the first to encourage and develop its use. For example:

A shipping company built, despite discouragements, what is still the only American-flag competitor of Pan American Airways in the Atlantic.

It was another shipping company which, by investing large sums of its own capital and by the use of its facilities, aided in the establishment of the only American-flag commercial overseas service in the Pacific.

It was a company with shipping interests which jointly pioneered the first air transport service under the American flag to the west coast of South America.

Ocean shipping is the only form of transportation which has been wholly devoted to war purposes. It began converting to a full war footing long before Pearl Harbor. Since shortly after war was declared, every American shipping company has been working hammer and tongs for the Government. There is no regular overseas commercial passenger ship service anywhere under the American flag today.

Meanwhile, other forms of transportation have been able to continue their regular commercial operations on a partial basis. Some of them are even carrying more freight and passengers today than ever before in their history. In contrast, our steamship lines cannot know when they will regain control of their vessels, when or under what circumstances they will be able to resume normal trade, or what conditions their vessels will be in at the end of the war. They have sustained heavy losses, immeasurably greater than any other form of transportation. And even those vessels in comparatively good condition must remain in Government service for a log time after the peace. They will be engaged in the gigantic task of bringing home millions of our troops from all over the world.

While our foreign competitors also have lost many vessels, the fact remains that they will be able to resume their passenger-liner service at an earlier date than American vesesls can be restored by the Government to private ownership and reconverted for commercial service after the war. In the meantime it is extremely important that American steamship lines be permitted to reestablish their trade contacts by engaging in air transport, for which facilities will be available immediately.

The question of whether shipping companies shall be permitted to participate in the development of American-flag overseas aviation is much broader than any issue as between types of transport or of equities based on past service. In the last analysis, it is a question of public interest. The steamship company applicants are willing to rest their case on the issue of public interest alone.

It would be in the public interest to permit steamship lines to establish integrated sea-air services, for the following reasons:

Over the years American steamship lines have built up world-wide organizations and connections in international trade which will be of tremendous value in the development of American postwar aviation and overseas commerce. It would be a serious mistake not to utilize this national asset, especially when foreign lines are planning to use their steamship know-how and organizational set-ups for the development of aviation and international air commerce.

Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, recently stated that at least 26 foreign-flag shipping companies have received approval from their governments to engage in overseas air transportation.

The British Minister for Civil Aviation, in a recent white paper on Britain's aviation policy, lays great stress upon the public necessity of using the transportation experience, commercial contacts and world-wide organizations of steamship lines in the practical and realistic expansion of British overseas air transport. I quote as follows from the British white paper on this point:

"Civil aviation is essentially a transport business. Its problems are in many ways analogous to those of transport by land and by sea. To make our national air services effective, we must not only draw upon the best of aviation knowledge and skill at our command, but must also make the fullest use of ripe experience and world-wide organization which has been built up over many years by British enterprise and initiative in other forms of transport.

"The British shipping lines which have for so many years carried a large proportion of the passengers and trade between Europe and South America and have their wide connections and organization and their good will in the areas to be served by the new air routes are, in the view of His Majesty's Government, in the best position to make the service a success."

It is a certainty that foreign operators will provide a coordinated sea-air service with which no American shipping company, operating surface craft alone, and no air-line company, operating aircraft alone, can compete on an equal basis.

As we have already pointed out, a coordinated service of surface craft and long-range aircraft will be, in effect, a new type of service, offering many advantages to the traveler and shipper which neither surface nor air services, operating independently of each other, can provide.

The advantages of both types of service, under single management, have been stated by Admiral Land as including the following:

Interchangeability of tickets.

Interchange of weather reports.

Interchange of reports on ship and plane positions.

Communication between units en route, either on surface or in the air.

Knowledge of trade conditions, tariff, money exchange, etc.

Experience in the peculiarities of particular trades and of travel habits which vary from route to route.

Economies of overhead, such as utilization of the same sales promotion, accounting, and general business office personnel.

Conveniences to the traveler, such as ability to ship automobiles and baggage by surface while traveling by air.

Sale of "package" tours.

Surveys show that unless both air and sea services are available under single management, considerable passenger traffic potential, postwar, may never be developed on certain routes. Many persons, especially those in the 2- and 3-week vacation group, desire to spend part of their vacation aboard a surface vessel but must utilize aircraft for the remainder of the trip in order to return to their homes within their vacation periods. Unless able to purchase a complete vacation in a single "package," through a company operating both types of equipment, it is unlikely that this group will take overseas vacations but will elect, instead, to stay on the mainland.

Further, a shipping company operating surface craft only, and an air-line operating aircraft only, would have no incentive to develop this combination sea-air potential.

The advancement of aeronautical science will be stimulated by widening, rather than narrowing, the range of those permitted to participate in the development of America's overseas air services and hence by widening the market for transport equipment of various types and designs.

If America's overseas air transport is concentrated in the hands of a few companies committed to a particular type of aircraft and to a particular type of service, it follows that experimentation and development will be more readily "frozen."

A strong merchant marine of the sea and of the air is, by testimony of the highest civil and military authorities, a prime requisite of the national defense, both as an instrument of war and as insurance against future wars. The soundness, adequacy, and stability of both our overseas air and our surface shipping will be imperiled if either is strait-jacketed by unnecessary restrictions or handicaps.

For all these reasons, it appears that the right of steamship companies to establish integrated sea-air service is a sound, realistic, and practical policy, important to our national economy and to our national security.

War Veterans Should Be Appointed to Placement and Counselor Service To Handle Veterans' Placement and Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Leslie and Douglas McNair American Legion Post, World War II, of the city of Washington, adopted a resolution on July 12, which I believe is of interest to the Members of this House.

This resolution demands, among other things, that the Congress, the War Manpower Commission, the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Placement Service, and the United States Civil Service Commission put veterans' job placement and counseling services in the hands of veterans who understand veterans' problems and that all Government agencies dealing with veterans' affairs be informed with respect to veterans' rights and privileges as provided by law.

I believe the resolution is of such importance that it commands the attention of Members of Congress as well as others dealing with veterans' problems. A copy of the resolution follows:

Whereas the public press in Washington has recently carried statements indicating that the War Manpower Commission for the District of Columbia is not giving to discharged servicemen of World War II the effective job placement and counseling service to which the Congress has said they are entitled; and

Whereas Washington, being the Capital of the Nation, conditions here are likely to be interpreted elsewhere as the policy of the Government; and

Whereas of the twelve to fifteen million men and women who will have seen service in this war about 2,000,000 already have been discharged, of whom we are a few; and

Whereas we have fought in the air, on the land, and on the sea, in Africa, Italy, France, and the far Pacific for preservation of a government whose policy—for reasons which must be obvious to all—has tended more and more to give job preference to the veterans of our wars; and

Whereas being fortunate enough to have returned to our homes ahead of those beside whom we fought, we feel a stern responsibility to those who are yet away, to safeguard the rights and privileges which Congress has granted to veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress, the War Manpower Commission, the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Placement Service, and the United States Civil Service Commission proceed immediately to put the veterans' job placement and counseling service in the hands of veterans of our various wars who understand the veterans' problems, and not with nonveterans; and be it further

Resolved, That all personnel of all Government agencies involved in handling veterans' affairs be immediately informed that veterans' rights and privileges are to be fully granted in accordance with the law and not administered according to picayune and narrow departmental regulations and interpretations which nullify the will of Congress

and tend to minimize the rights and privileges of veterans if not to deny them altogether to the distinct advantage of nonveterans; and be it further

Resolved, That those responsible for failure to accord veterans the rights, privileges, and benefits granted to them by act of Congress be immediately removed from their positions of authority; and be it further

Resolved, That all Government and private agencies handling veteran job placement and counseling matters provide male counselors to men and female counselors to women in proportion to the number who have seen service so that neither will be subjected to the embarrassing and often humiliating reservations which time and social custom inevitably impose in relationships between men and women; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent immediately to all of the agencies herein named and to the District of Columbia Department of the American Legion under whose jurisdiction we are intending to organize and charter an American Legion Post comprised exclusively of World War II men and named in honor of Lt. Gen. Leslie McNair and his son, Lt. Col. Douglas McNair, both of whom made the supreme sacrifice for their country within the space of 1 week in this war.

Signed this 12th day of July 1945 at the city of Washington in the District of Columbia.

LEE GARLING,
Acting Commander.

We Accept the Challenge of America's Fascists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days I have read an article in the Chicago Sentinel under the title of "We Accept the Challenge of America's Fascists."

It is a courageous, strong, and patriotic article, and I want to congratulate the Sentinel, as well as the writer, upon the strong position which they have taken, as I firmly believe, to preserve our freedom and democratic form of government, it is absolutely necessary that we combat the Fascist, Nazi idealogistic activities.

The article is as follows:

WE ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE OF AMERICA'S FASCISTS!

A STATEMENT OF POLICY BY THE PUBLISHERS OF THE SENTINEL

During the past week, the Sentinel has been served notice of two libel suits. One asking $50,000, entered in the Circuit Court by George Vose, former lecturer and organizer employed by Gerald L. K. Smith's American First Party, is based upon an expose written by Archie Greenberg, National Commander of the Jewish War Veterans, United States of America. Commander Greenberg's article, which appeared in a number of other weeklies, was based upon a story appearing in Reader's Scope—a coparty to the suit.

The other suit asking a total of $90,000 has been filed in the Superior Court by Joe McWilliams, George E. Deatheridge, Eugene N. Sanctuary, Ernest F. Elmhurst, Robert E. Edmonson, Lawrence Dennis, E. J. Parker Sage, William H. Lyman, Jr., and Charles B. Hudson charging that an article published in the Sentinel "brought ridicule and disgrace on the plaintiffs." Maximilian S. St. George, one of the counselors in the mass sedition trials, is the attorney in both instances.

It is apparent at the outset that the issue involved in both of these cases far transcend the legal technicalities upon which the suits themselves are being based. It is our opinion that these trials are of the greatest significance to everyone concerned with the future of American democracy. Without attempting to discuss the legal aspects and the evidence upon which we expect to base our case, we believe the following preliminary observations are important for everyone to understand.

To begin with, we must ask ourselves the question, why was the Sentinel selected—although we, of course, are merely a symbol in these suits. Obviously, for a number of very good reasons. First of all, because from the very outset of the war, we have been the staunchest advocates of militant unity of the Jewish people, indissolubly bound up with the unity of all freedom loving people, as a major prerequisite for the complete and total destruction of nazism and fascism. We have pulled no punches. We have placed this question together with the winning of the war as the basic purpose upon which all of our editorial policy has been irrevocably founded. Naturally, we have aroused the enmity of all the forces in this country opposed to this policy. Also, we have taken the position that anti-Semitism and discrimination is a traitorous crime against the well-being and security of our country. Therefore, the anti-Semites have justly centered their main ire upon us. Finally, we have advocated the closest cooperation between all of the United Nations for the building of a lasting peace. Logically, the defeatists and the isolationists have bitterly opposed us.

Now, however, it is apparent that there are even deeper motives than these for this new concerted attack directed against us. It must be clearly understood that this attack is in the first place directed primarily against the entire American people. It is a blatant attempt to prevent the complete and final victory over fascism for which 1,000,000 of our boys have already paid with casualties. It is an attempt to mock the sacrifices of our heroic fighting men who for 3½ years have given freely of their blood in order to destroy the poison of fascist enslavement and Nazi tyranny. It is an audacious challenge to every American who believes in the principles of democracy and who is determined that American fascism will not steal the victory from us which world fascism has been denied on the battlefields.

These suits against the Sentinel, is the opening gun in the attempt of America's Fascist movement to legalize, through the courts of the land their Hitler-inspired technique of "divide and conquer." It has arisen in the first place because of the failure of our Government to speedily reindict the 29 involved in the original mass sedition trials and to bring them to speedy justice. It has arisen, secondly, because of our failure to bring the international Fascist gangsters to justice in Europe and elsewhere. It is undeniably tied up with the fact that fat Hermann Goering, brutal murderer of millions of people, is still permitted to live. All of us bear the responsibility for not having taken the action to bring world fascism, European fascism, and American fascism to justice. Because of this indecision, our native Fascists have been encouraged to change from the defensive to the attack. These suits are clearly the opening gun in a well thought out plot to take the initiative in bringing fascism to America. They know our finances and business structure. They have selected a relatively small publication hoping that we will not have the resources to wage a vigorous battle.

We propose to accept this challenge. We propose to place American fascism on trial and to expose it for the dastardly danger that it is.

This attack, however, is primarily aimed against the Jewish people. It is an attempt to utilize our militant anti-fascism as a political weapon against us in the postwar world. These Fascists propose to try not the Sentinel alone—but the whole of American Jewry. We must blunt their weapon and turn it against them. We must not permit them to succeed in their attempt to frighten us into nonresistance. This is the way it began in Germany. We have paid a high enough price in this war, in the blood of our 6,000,000 slaughtered kinsmen, to have earned full equality before the world. The record of our heroes in all of the armies of the United Nations and our unparelleled patriotism on the home front, unsurpassed by that of any other group or people, has given us the right to demand that any anti-Jewish action is in fact a crime against the principles for which we are fighting this war. Let us draw closer than ever before in the defense of our country, our homes, and our children. Heed not the counsel of the fearmongers, some of whom will say, "Is it not better to avoid a fight?" Rather, let us be reminded of the immortal words of Patrick Henry, "The gentlemen speak of peace when the enemy is already in the field * * *. Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death."

This attack, however, is not directed alone against we Jews. It is also a challenge to all Catholics. Remember that the Ku Klux Klan which arose after the last war was even more viciously anti-Catholic than anything else. American Fascists will be no different. We proudly accept this challenge on behalf of the freedom-loving Catholic minority of America.

The Negro people, too, are directly involved. They know what fascism means to them. They have felt it on their backs in Ethiopia and everywhere else the evil beast has appeared. They know, too, that they will be the first to suffer once reaction is legalized in this country. They know that this opening gun of America's Fascists is aimed at their hearts just as it is aimed at ours. It is a flagrant attempt to continue "Jim Crowism," the poll tax, discrimination against Negro America. We call upon the Negro people and their press to join with us in the common struggle to defeat this attack of American fascism. This is your fight, too, as much as it is ours.

The working people of America organized in both the AFL, CIO, and independent unions, are also the target symbolized by the Sentinel. We know that fascism arose in Europe because of the desire to destroy the labor movement and eliminate the gains of the common people. We call upon labor to now rally to our defense and to join with us in the common struggle to preserve American democracy. We know they will. Therefore, we gladly accept this challenge on behalf of American labor, confident it understands that its most immediate interests will also be on trial.

Nor can we for one moment forget that this attempt to divide and conquer is aimed at every nationality group which make up this great country. Not alone are the Jewish people on trial. The millions of Poles, Czechs, Italians, and all other nationality groups whose sons have fought this war constitute the so-called foreigners whom the supernationalists seek to humiliate. Repression against the foreign-born is a primary aim of American fascism. True, the Jews will be the first, the rest will follow. Hitler has given us ample proof of this. The pattern is

clear. We welcome this opportunity to test the rights of foreign-born Americans.

Fully cognizant, therefore, of the great historic responsibility which rests upon us, we propose to fight this battle through to the finish on the principles, not alone on the technicality. To do less would be to betray the millions of our boys who have and are making every sacrifice so that freedom will prevail. We will not let them down. We are confident that the issue will be made clear. Simply put, it is, Have American Fascists the right to subvert American democracy? We maintain that they have not. We believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people agree with us. We believe that by bringing the issue to a head in the courts we will render an invaluable service to the cause of democracy. We believe in the inherent righteousness and justice of our cause. We propose to wage this struggle with every means at our disposal, confident that tremendous support of every kind from millions of decent Americans will be forthcoming.

We accept the challenge of America's Fascists. We are proud to have earned the right to have been singled out for the test. With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, we take up the challenge. Victory will be ours.

Report of the Feed Survey Committee and the Feed Industry Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, it is daily becoming more evident that the most important factor which will determine our food supplies for the coming year is the amount of livestock feed which may be available. The feed situation is now a matter of deep concern to all who have given it consideration.

The best statement of the present situation which has come to my attention is a report which was made last Friday, July 13, by the Feed Survey Committee and the Feed Industry Council. This report was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture and I know that the recommendations contained therein are receiving careful consideration by the Secretary.

The Feed Survey Committee is composed of representatives of a number of leading colleges of agriculture. The Feed Industry Council is composed of representative members of the feed industry throughout the Nation. I believe that every Member of Congress should be familiar with the information contained in this report and should carefully consider the recommendations which are made therein. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the report herewith.

REPORT OF THE FEED SURVEY COMMITTEE AND THE FEED INDUSTRY COUNCIL, JULY 13, 1945

In January 1945 the Feed Survey Committee prepared a livestock-feed balance sheet which indicated that the domestic supply of grains and mill feeds would be adequate for the feeding of the then anticipated livestock population at the rates indicated, and that the domestic supplies of high-protein feeds would be short in terms of the estimated rates of feeding.

During the first 2 quarters—October to March—of the current feed year, the disappearance of feeds was about as anticipated in January.

Since the January estimates, however, important new developments have entered the picture. Among these are:

1. A reexpansion of livestock production beyond what was anticipated in January, as indicated by—

(a) Grain feeding per dairy cow on June 1 was 25 percent heavier than a year ago.

(b) The movement of cattle into feedlots in 8 Corn Belt States in the first 4 months of 1945 was 35 percent larger than a year ago.

(c) The average slaughter weight of hogs has increased at the following rate over a year ago: April up 10 percent; May up 12 percent; June up 14 percent.

(d) Farmers' intentions for 1945 fall farrowing in the Corn Belt show an increase of 19 percent over 1944.

(e) Even though laying flock numbers were down 7 percent in June 1945, the number of young chickens on farms July 1, 1945, is up 11 percent. Turkey production in 1945 is reported to be about 15 percent higher than last year.

This reexpansion in livestock production has resulted in a greatly increased use of grains and high-protein feeds. In the case of corn, according to the July 1 crop report, "Disappearance from farms was the heaviest on record for the period April 1 to July 1, amounting to 592,000,000 bushels." This is 18 percent greater than a year ago.

2. Unfavorable weather conditions for the 1945 corn crop caused the July 1 estimate to be 543,000,000 bushels under last year, or a 17 percent decrease. Because of this uncertainty, farmers are holding their 1944 corn on farms pending the outcome of the 1945 crop.

3. Fuller realization that the high-moisture content of much of the 1944 corn crop reduced its livestock carrying capacity.

4. Increased transportation difficulties due to several factors, including the increased exports of wheat.

Among the favorable factors in the food and feed picture are:

1. The record-high wheat crop in prospect.

2. A prospective oat crop 22 percent higher than last year, as indicated on July 1.

3. A larger-than-average hay crop and favorable pasture conditions to date.

These favorable factors may have been the basis for the following statement in the July 1 crop report: "Under present prospects, feed grain production should be ample for the livestock and poultry to be fed, but disappearance cannot be as large as the last 12 months without cutting down the carryover."

Never-the-less, the reexpansion of livestock production, the uncertainty over the 1945 corn crop, transportation difficulties and labor shortages have tightened up available feed supplies to the point that a serious emergency confronts producers of meat, milk, and eggs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the analysis just presented, the following recommendations are made:

1. Develop a broad realization of the vital necessity of keeping livestock production in balance with available and prospective feed supplies.

2. Reinstate a feed wheat program, but with the feed wheat price not less than the price of corn, on a weight basis.

3. Make maximum use of our water transportation facilities in the movement of feed grains.

4. During periods of shortage, reserve available grain supplies for use as food and feed, and for essential war needs.

5. Make every effort to increase imports of proteins—animal, marine, and vegetable.

6. Continue export restrictions on corn indefinitely.

7. Do everything possible to import additional quantities of molasses for feeding purposes.

8. Place feed processing plants on the national urgency production list for manpower.

9. Build roofs for gondola cars and remodel other types of cars for handling grain, if this will improve the transportation situation.

10. Take steps to see that an adequate supply of cotton and burlap bags is available for the shipping of feedstuffs.

We believe in a program of full production of meat, eggs, milk, and other dairy products, to meet the heavy wartime demands for these essential foods. We regard a full production program as the most effective means of dealing with black markets.

In achieving full production, however, first consideration must be given to available and prospective feed supplies. Feed comes before food in producing meat, milk, and eggs. Grains and proteins are raw materials from which the finished products are produced. The available feed supply must therefore govern the production of these important foods.

Feed supplies in commercial channels are now being strained to the limit by the present heavy demand. There is a danger that many feeders who must purchase their feed supplies may not be able to carry out their feeding program. It has already been necessary to use sorghum grains and open-market wheat to replace corn, and it appears that any further increase in livestock and poultry feeding would necessitate the use of large quantities of wheat, as was the case in 1943.

We offer our full support and cooperation in every possible way in the successful handling of the feed situation in its relation to maximum food production.

R. M. BETHKE,
Chairman, Feed Survey Committee.
F. E. BOLING,
Chairman, Feed Industry Council.

If We Sell We Must Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Post of May 26, 1945:

IF WE SELL WE MUST BUY

James A. Farley, a man of perspicuity and vision, has looked down the road ahead and perceived what too few Americans as yet have realized: that if this Nation is to pay off the war mortgage and keep its head above water financially, we must do a volume of post-war business never dreamed of before Pearl Harbor; and that in order to get the necessary business we must develop a tremendous foreign trade.

"It seems to me," said the former Postmaster General in a recent address at Hazleton, Pa., "that it will be upon the margin represented by foreign trade after the war that national prosperity or depression will depend."

If we are to sell abroad we must buy abroad; we must import as well as export, else the other nations cannot pay for our goods. And in order to permit imports we must lower our tariff walls. This means that we

must tear down the economic isolationist thinking which has fenced us in hitherto. We must revise the old-fashioned belief that if somebody else makes any kind of goods which can be made here, then somebody here loses his job. The more foreign business we do, the more jobs will be created for Americans.

And now is the time to prepare for this new era in our economic policies and thought—now, while European production is being slowly and gradually resumed. If we hesitate and procrastinate in laying the foundations for a postwar foreign trade, other nations may beat us to it.

Said Mr. Farley:

"The grim handwriting is on the wall for everyone to see. Unless we do arrange in some way to obtain payment for our goods—and now is the time to start arranging for that—then we risk having to go through the experience of another great series of defaults. Once more, we may have the bitter experience of unpaid debts, of hard feelings between nations, of a paralyzed trade, and the unpredictable results beyond."

We have lent money abroad and probably will lend more for reconstruction. If we expect to get our money back, we must buy abroad A Europe rising from her ruins will be a good customer and a good supplier of valuable products to us, if we are willing to accept them in payment for what we sell. Let us put our tariffs in such order that we can accept payment in the only way in which payment can be made.

The San Francisco Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JESSIE SUMNER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by me:

The San Francisco Charter is a step in a program of unconstitutional steps surrendering our country to rule by a world bureaucracy. It will have power enogh to make permanent the present temporary arrangement by which our Government furnishes to Russia and England all the American resources, soldiers, dollars, and military and civilian articles they demand. This Charter makes permanent the present policy of giving England and Russia all our military secrets and military defenses. Your common sense ought to warn you that surrendering our military and economic independence to these two imperialistic nations can only bring you increasing want and war. Look at enslaved Poland. Look at India.

Look at those who have been leading the fight for this program. They are the same people who dragged us step-by-step into the present war while pretending that their purpose was to keep us out of war. By piously promising future peace, these war mongrels, masquerading as princes-of-peace, hope to make you forget that while you were winning this war your Government officials were surrendering our war aims and creating the next world war.

True, Germany and Japan will have been destroyed never to rise again unless England or Russia help build them up again the same way they did Hitler. But don't think they won't. Because during this war, thanks to American aid, Russia has seized control of Europe, and is trying to seize control of governments all over the world. The British and Moscow-controlled Communists have already clashed in Greece and Yugoslavia and will probably fight soon in Turkey or other points along the British Empire life line. And the United States is acting as the arsenal for both sides in growing World War III.

If the American people really want to prevent that war, they must insist that our Government do exactly the opposite of their proposed program. Our Government must stop giving aid unconditionally and give it only on condition we can be sure foreign governments will give the peoples they dominate at least as much liberty as they had before Hitler enslaved them. And—we must immediately bring our Army home from Europe. Because our Army encourages those who are trying to start a war against Russia. They hope, with good reason, that once more as twice before in our lifetime, our Government will go to war to preserve the British Empire. We must bring our armed forces home from Europe immediately and start using our money to buy peace instead of buying war as we are now doing, and would continue to do under this program. It would not interfere with the bombing now burning out Japan. It would not delay the invasion of Japan nearly so long as the ruinous war against Russia now likely to start at any time.

The artificially generated celebration over the San Francisco Conference sounds like the celebration over the hypocritical Munich Conference, which started World War II. It also sounds suspiciously like an attempt to divert public attention from the still more dangerous step in their program, the Bretton Woods bill, soon to be passed by the Senate. That bill surrenders to Russia and other foreign governments billions of dollars we know in advance they will use to create World War III. It surrenders to them power enough to create practically unlimited billions of dollars the same way our banking system creates dollars. Those dollars will be used to drain all kinds of goods out of America in unlimited quantities. It surrenders power to impose economic sanctions, by rationing dollars and cutting off our foreign trade and the power to create booms and depressions the way our Federal Reserve bank through money manipulation created the 1927 stock-market boom and the 1929 crash. It surrenders power enough to make economic slaves of the American people. You are going to learn from sad experience that what they mean by international cooperation is international communism. And continual war.

If you value your country and your own skins, you will rise up and demand that your leaders throw this program into the same waste basket where they threw the Atlantic Charter. Bring our soldier boys home immediately, stop using American money to buy more war, and start using it to buy peace instead.

The Chinese Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, because the spreaders of unfavorable reports about the Chinese Government and its armies and about the whole Chinese situation have been so vocal and so insistent, I feel under obligation to include portions of additional letters received from Americans who are on the ground in China and whose active first-hand participation in events there qualifies them to give authentic testimony as to the true situation:

IN THE FIELD, SOMEWHERE IN CHINA,
June 29, 1945.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JUDD: * * * Having been in the field with the Chinese armies for the past 19 months, I think I know a little of the situation here, and think your speech to Congress more accurate than any of the many articles I have read on China. * * *.

Yours truly,

HARRY M. ARTHUR,
Colonel, Infantry, United States Army.

JULY 1, 1945.

DEAR SIR: Have just read your speech to the Congress as briefed in Time magazine for June 18. We have needed that speech out here for a long time! You have presented not only the facts of the case but a sincere plea for justice and frankness as we view China and the Chinese. I've followed the Chinese troops for 18 months through the jungles of Burma. I can say much in praise of them and have found their faults only human ones. Only too often the American attitude has not been one either of justice, candor, or sympathy. I hope that your speech will help clear the atmosphere and help us to really good relations.

Capt. H. N. BAKER, M. P.

OMAHA, NEBR., *June 30, 1945.*

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reference to your March 15 speech in Congress, excerpts of which appeared in a recent issue of Time Magazine. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, not as an Army officer, but as an American citizen, on a most excellent, statesmanlike, and timely speech.

I have recently returned from the China-Burma-India theater, where I was stationed for a period of two and a half years. At first, like most Americans, I was inclined to be overly critical of China, due to its apparent backwardness as compared to western standards; but as I came to know its people better, I began to realize the real worth of the Chinese, both as a nation and as individuals. That China will play an increasingly important part in world affairs, is recognized by most of us; but the very great importance of China developing into a strong and democratic nation, is realized by far too few Americans.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK H. STIRES,
Captain, Signal Corps.

CHINA, *June 25, 1945.*

MY DEAR MR. JUDD: I read enthusiastically your article in Time magazine, based on excerpts from your speech before the House on March 15 of this year Having finished the article, I simply had to express to you my elation and satisfaction for your timely and masterly statement, saturated with commonsense logic, on the China situation.

Although my interest in China dates back only 3 years, and I have not yet been out here a year, I very early became disappointed in the appraisal of China taken by most Americans, both here and at home. It is undoubtedly true that one of our greatest faults is persisting to look at China through United States-colored glasses. Because of this failing most Americans become hypercritical of China even in matters they have not taken the trouble to analyze.

DR. ARTHUR D. HOWARD,
Technical Representative,
Office of Strategic Services.

Commodore John Barry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the consent given me to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid letter I have received from James Patrick McGovern, of Washington, D. C., relating to Commodore John Barry, one of the outstanding heroes of our Nation's history.

The statement in his letter that when the present war is won the presentation to Ireland, now known as Eire, of a statue of Commodore John Barry, as provided for in Public Law 109 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, should be carried out by our country, is an excellent one. It should be carried out.

MAGEE, BEEDY & MCGOVERN,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1945.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Most of the heroes of Irish blood, distinguished for outstanding bravery in World War II, had not yet found occasion to show their quality when the Seventy-seventh Congress approved, on June 10, 1941, Public Law 109 (S. J. 31), authorizing the President of the United States to present to the Irish Nation, now known as Eire, a statue of Commodore John Barry, in honor of the bicentenary of the birth in 1745, of this famous naval officer of the American Revolution and of the early history of the United States.

At war, as we still are, it does not seem fitting to provide the contemplated statue, as planned, for the bicentenary; but the gallant spirit which moved Barry, as one of our earliest naval officers, might well be reverenced as an historic symbol of the love of freedom in the hearts of Irishmen everywhere, and of their spontaneous ardor to fight for it, altogether regardless of the political stand of the Eire Government.

Born in County Wexford, Ireland, John Barry was one of our greatest naval officers in both the Continental and the early United States Navies. He outfitted the *Black Prince* (later the *Alfred*) of the first Continental fleet, and other ships, before the initial cruise under the command of Commodore Hopkins. As captain of the *Lexington*, he shortly rendered daring and skillful service in the coastal waters of Pennsylvania by the capture and dispersal of marauding British vessels. He became the seventh ranking officer more on the basis of merit than the notorious political influences in naval appointments—with the frigate *Effingham* as his command, when Congress established the order of seniority of captains in the Continental Navy. He proved his sound independent judgment as president of the court martial which displaced the half-mad Landais from his usurpation of the command of the *Alliance*. As captain of the *Alliance* himself, Barry won a hard-fought battle against the *Trepassey* and *Atalanta* of the British Navy.

After the revolution John Barry received from President George Washington the appointment as senior captain of the new American Navy, with the frigate *United States* as his command, upon its founding in 1794, for the immediate purpose of combatting the Algerian corsairs and the Barbary States in general. As captain of the *United States*, he also had the distinction to command the first squadron dispatched to fight offensively in the quasi-war with France.

These and other deeds and honors speak eloquently enough for John Barry. The misleading claims that he was the father of our Navy and that he was the first to command a commissioned naval vessel in the revolution are superfluous to establish his revered memory, as one of our earliest distinguished patriots, in the minds of all Americans, non-Irish as well as Irish.

The tradition set by John Barry illuminates the truth that Irishmen serve in World War II, both in numbers and with devotion the more notable in view of Eire's neutrality, which is clearly of the letter and not of the spirit. The valor of the Celt is not to be denied:

"What mean the neutral mandates of today
As long as Irish hearts, not laws, hold sway?
Two thousand years ago the Celts were bold
To prove their valor, never since grown cold;
For centuries their sons have heard drums roll
Abroad and home, and won the hero's scroll.

"Who can recount each deed, recall each name,
Enrolling Irish warriors in halls of fame?
Their spirit on every front has never ceased
To be among the Allies a buoyant yeast.
The race itself stands now with vision clear
An international and stalwart peer.

"No mortal power can cloud fair Ireland's brow;
As her men always fought, so they fight now;
They fill the foremost ranks where danger lies,
Spurred by the valorous will which death defies,
Impelled by native love for soil that's free,
Dauntless wherever they meet with tyranny.

"For many flags, by land, in sky, on sea,
The Celtic race fulfills its destiny;
A hundred ships of war slip down the ways,
Each christened in an Irish martyr's praise;
And untold shrines in foreign, distant parts
Will keep Old Erin warm within true hearts."

When the war has been won, this spirit would probably find its most suitable commemoration by a memorial from the United States to the Irish Nation expressive of John Barry's part as the Celt's first historic exemplar in America.

With personal regards and assurances of high esteem, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES PATRICK MCGOVERN.

Suggestion of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Boone (Iowa) Republican of May 26, 1945, entitled, "Suggestion of Merit":

SUGGESTION OF MERIT

Recently James A. Farley, in the course of a speech made to the chamber of commerce at Hazelton, Pa., suggested that a commission be appointed to study the matter of Presidential succession. As it stands now, should a Vice President who succeeded to office through death of the President also be removed the Secretary of State would become Chief Executive. Certain other Cabinet officers would then be next in line.

This is not an entirely satisfactory arrangement from some points of view. Seven Vice Presidents have succeeded to the Presidency. Of the six prior to Truman, only four ever ran for reelection, and only two, Theodore Roosevelt and Coolidge, were elected.

The point is made by Mr. Farley that, with the Presidential succession going to Cabinet officers, it is conceivable that a man might some day be President whom the people had no part in electing. Cabinet members are purely appointive. There have been Cabinet members who would have made good Presidents, but there have been some who would have been both unpopular and undesirable.

Under the old arrangement, which was superseded by the statute of 1886 designating Cabinet succession in the event of the death or removal from office of both President and Vice President, the office went first to the President pro tempore of the Senate and next to the Speaker of the House. One reason this was changed was because, in either case, a man from the party not in power might have succeeded.

While the matter of the succession through loss of the Vice President become President may never arise, still Farley's suggestion that the question be studied is a good one. The present arrangement might be bettered.

Tomorrow Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening I listened with pleasure to an address by the new Secretary of Labor, Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach. His remarks so impressed me that I felt the membership and the country should have the benefit of reading his strong and intelligent presentation of plans to meet the future problems of industrial relationships. Under the leave granted me, I insert the Secretary of Labor's address, as follows:

First, I want to thank the National Broadcasting Co. for giving me this chance to come into your homes to talk with you.

I borrowed the title "Tomorrow Is Here" because it vividly depicts our present situation. Usually we have to wait through the night and dawn for tomorrow to come. It was expected that the war would end before the problems of industrial relationships would become acute. The war's end in Europe has resulted in a shutting down, or the slowing down, of many war industries, at the same time that the portion of our productive machine which is producing war goods must continue on a wartime level. Actually, until we lick the Japanese we must maintain two economies: One, the wartime economy in war industries. The other, the peacetime economy in those industries no longer necessary for war. Therefore, I say, "Tomorrow is here."

My purpose tonight is not to present details, but to plead with you for an understanding of the basic nature of the problems we must meet. My hope is that through this plea I may minimize industrial strife. This Nation, which in 3 years produced the greatest military machine the world has ever known, and which has already won one major war, is not going to be licked by difficulties and controversies which may arise at home.

As Secretary of Labor, I work under a mandate of the Congress. Congress said, when it

established the Department of Labor, that its Secretary and other employees were "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." We, in the Department of Labor, intend to carry out that mandate. For us to do this during this readjustment period requires an understanding by everyone of the basic causes which result in industrial strife. Industrial strife is an ugly thing. It is costly to labor, it is costly to industry, it is costly to the public. When management and labor get into arguments and strife, it is not enough to become indignant about it and try to put the finger of blame on either side. What all of us must do is to find out why such strife exists and attempt to eliminate the causes of it.

The duty of men who want to understand and to solve employment problems is to refrain from inflaming the suspicious and ill-feelings that attend differences between industry and labor. You, as citizens of this democracy, have tremendous authority. With authority must go responsibility and you and I must accept responsibility. We must seek to know and understand causes and to deal intelligently with facts. Emotion has its place, but emotion and temper never solve anything.

The first need is to understand the situation in which millions of our workers today find themselves. They have left their regular places of employment; very largely they have left their homes and moved hundreds and even thousands of miles away. It is true that they have received wages which were high in comparison with what they received before. On the other hand, their living costs have increased materially. They now face the outlook of the factory in which they work being shut down and the need to return to their homes, or seek other employment in their present localities. I do not wonder that they have the "jitters". Man's prime instinct is for security. He wants a job and a chance to earn a living. It is no answer to our problem to say that these people should have saved more money. The fact is that they have made substantial savings. The fear of the ordinary workingman is not that he will be compelled to spend his savings in the months of unemployment. It is that when the savings are gone, no job will be available under a peacetime economy.

One of the first tasks of Government today is to do everything it can to minimize that fear. We need not discuss it as an academic question of the duty of Government to provide opportunities for employment. The stark fact is that we have a war to win. I think it's a bigger, harder, and more important war than we won in Europe. Those who are needed in war industries must stay in war industries. If, through fear of future unemployment, work stoppages in war industries result, we risk the danger of losing the Japanese war. We risk the danger of making fruitless the sacrifices of all who have died or been wounded in the scene of action. It would be a tragedy, unforgivable and inexcusable, should that occur. Industrial strife cannot be permitted to destroy that for which those men fight and die.

It is not government alone which has this responsibility. Those engaged in industry, either as employer or employee, must recognize and assume their responsibilities as well. We already have had over a million casualties in this war. No one knows how many more we will have. I cannot see how anyone who wants to live with himself can know this and fail to live up to his responsibility to minimize industrial strife. "Responsibility," said the late Justice Brandeis, "is the great developer. Democracy," he added, "is more difficult to retain than it is to achieve." Democracy requires the finest development and the finest expression of responsibility on the part of everyone of us. We can only insure an equal degree of freedom for ourselves through making certain that our neighbor shall also be free. We are fighting this war that our democracy may be safe. We must make sure that it is as safe here as we want it to be in the world. Management on the one side, and labor on the other, must each assume its full share of this responsibility.

Enlightened management must know that it is only the agent in the giving of jobs to wage earners. The jobs are created by the consumers of goods and services. A free economy must be an economy of plenty. If we are to have an economy of plenty, we must build it upon the foundation of the ability of the consumer to buy the goods, and thus hire the workers to produce the goods. We boast—and rightfully so—that American ingenuity has created the greatest productive machine in the history of the world. So long as the Government, under war economy, consumes the output of this machine, it functions smoothly. During this transition period, and under a peacetime economy thereafter, we must think more and more on the basis of a consuming economy. In the past we have thought of producing goods and then of some means of forcing these goods into consumption. The time has come to become more concerned about the development of a strong consuming power. Only through this may we provide a natural outlet for all the goods we can produce. That being true, now is not the time for short-sighted management to seize upon the chance to reduce wages and crush the wage earners' organizations.

This responsibility does not lie exclusively with management. Labor must accept an equal responsibility. That is particularly true when labor is organized. Those men who have done the very fine work of building organizations to represent, through the medium of collective bargaining, the wage earners of the United States, must be peculiarly conscious of their individual responsibility. I do not propose to tell union leaders how to run their unions. I do feel free, however, to tell them that they must know that they represent their members, not only at the bargaining table, but also in the court of public opinion.

For 10 years I represented labor unions in the city in which I then lived. I insisted that they permit me to be not only their advocate, but also their adviser. I hope that in my present position I may also advise with labor union leaders. I tell them now, as I told my clients then, that the most powerful weapon a labor union has is the good will and the sympathetic support of the general public. That can only be maintained if the public believes that the unions and their leaders are aware of, and willing to recognize, their responsibility to the community in which we live.

Furthermore, the people have the right to demand of the leaders of both industry and labor the highest degree of integrity. The seriousness of the times requires that we no longer be confused as to ordered convictions upon the principles of conduct under which we live. The people today have the right to demand from those who lead—in Government, industry, and labor—that honest principles of living be recognized and lived up to through the deliberate effort of free men.

Men are entitled to the right to work and we must underscore the fact that this country, and this world, will only be reconstructed through work. If we are to survive, it will be through the work of the people. People will work only when they understand the dignity of work. Every job—big or small—is important. Every man must consider the importance of his work and give credit to its dignity.

After all, we must realize there is within all of us something which cries out for expression. It is the spirit or the soul of men. Every man is endowed with a certain talent or ability. One desires to be a mechanic, another a longshoreman, another a coal miner. There is and there must be the greatest degree of dignity in work, or else all the doctrines of Christianity are false. Just remember that the greatest of all men, Christ Himself, was a laborer, a worker in a humble carpenter's shop.

At San Francisco men met and wrote a Charter for future peace. In various parts of the world in the next few years a number of peace treaties will be written. Right here in this country, during the next few years, thousands of peace treaties will be written. They will be written around council tables, between representatives of management and of labor. If those treaties are to endure, they must be just. If they are to be just, they must be written by men of good will representing constituencies of good will. That goes for both management and labor. Both must accept freely and readily the principles of collective bargaining. Both must accept freely the responsibility to the nation which they assume when they sit down to bargain.

At the outset I told you of the mandate which Congress has given to the Department of Labor. I am glad it refers to the welfare of wage earners. I have two reasons for this. First, because it does not refer to the working class—there is no working class in America. Practically all of us are wage earners, or members of the families of wage earners. I get a monthly wage—some of you get a daily wage and some an hourly wage. It makes no difference. The mandate which the statute places upon me is to protect the welfare of almost everyone of us. The second reason I am glad is because the statute makes no distinction between organized and unorganized wage earners, between the skilled and unskilled, or between those who work with their hands and those who have come to be known as white collar workers. The statute enjoins me to protect the welfare of all. I intend to obey that statute.

This is not my Department of Labor—it belongs to all of you. You pay the bills, including my wages. Too often men in public office begin to think that the office belongs to them and not to the people who support the Government. When that time comes they become the masters of the people and not the servants of the people. The Labor Department is not a group of offices, nor a great stone building in Washington. It is a part of the blood which flows through our society. It is a part of our existence as a democratic society and its success, or failure, will go to make up a part of what is tomorrow in America.

As I conclude I want to leave with you this truth for careful consideration: This Nation now at war has adequate machinery available to peacefully settle any labor dispute. To advance any demand to the point of stopping production instead of using machinery available for peaceful settlement, is not in the national interest and will not be supported by public opinion. As a representative of all the people, but particularly interested in promoting the real welfare of those who work, I urge labor to respect the no-strike pledge. I shall expect management to refrain from doing those things, thoughtlessly or purposefully, which provoke men, and tempt them to act first and reason later. We must place the interest of the whole Nation above the interest of any individual, or any group. Only then can we end this war in the shortest possible time and promote the best interests of all our people. I pledge you my best efforts and shall need your full cooperation.

Why They Hate Mrs. Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Sunday Post:

WHY THEY HATE MRS. LUCE

Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, finds herself the latest addition to the long list of American individuals or American institutions vilified by the Moscow fountainhead of official Communist lies, a newspaper called Pravda, meaning "truth" (in delicate irony).

Pravda, accusing Mrs. LUCE of "hating us (the Communists) with African, rather than American passion," practically froths at the mouth. But it gives no answer to the carefully collated, factually documented articles which Mrs. LUCE has been inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These articles are the occasion of Pravda's outburst and the reason is apparent enough.

In the strange, dark woodland of our European policy Mrs. LUCE has been poking with an exploratory cane, turning over one log after another and watching the white Communist termites wriggle from underneath.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD she has given the results of her explorations into Communist natural history with the quiet detachment of a naturalist recording the antics of insect life. She has restrained from expressing opinions or indulging in emotional reasoning. Her articles are models of fact finding.

That a woman should dare to enter this forbidden field, where men in official life (for reasons of personal safety) are holding their tongues or pretending to be busily looking the other way—has filled the editors of Pravda with fury.

Not knowing how to meet the facts they now take the usual line of violently abusing the author. And the Communist termites on this side of the water, who were so vocal during the election campaign, will undoubtedly revive and hastily wriggle up to the party line, each with his little contribution of personal abuse.

Meantime Mrs. LUCE is doing a service to the United States of America. In fact, it might be added that anyone who really is doing a service to the United States of America today rather than to Communist Russia—or some other nation—is almost certain to be accused of being a Fascist. To love your own country in preference to Moscow is practically treason in the eyes of the left wingers.

Arrangements should be made to publish all of Mrs. LUCE'S articles under one cover, where American citizens may see the whole record. These studies of the communizing of so-called liberated Europe have been appearing from time to time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the general title of "Leaning Over Backward"—a phrase selected by Mrs. LUCE from a statement of Acting Secretary of State Grew.

"This country is leaning over backward in order to avoid offending Russia."

How far we are leaning over backward has been shown by Mrs. LUCE with names, facts, dates, figures, and the record of one liberated European country after another.

We have liquidated the paper hanger of Berchtesgaden and we are now apparently engaged, as actively as our foreign policy, or lack of foreign policy can assist, in installing Joe Stalin in his place.

Mrs. LUCE thinks it is a good idea that her fellow countrymen should know exactly what their representatives are engaged in doing so they won't be too surprised when the accomplished fact burst upon them later.

That fact—which has already progressed far toward consummation—is the complete communization of the Continent of Europe.

OWI Under Suspicion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial concerning the OWI recently appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital. This editorial suggests that, in view of the exposures which have recently revealed amazing ignorance of their own country on the part of OWI officials, a searching inquiry of the entire set-up is in order. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I submit herewith that editorial:

OWI UNDER SUSPICION

Angry midwesterners, aroused by a ridiculous article prepared by the OWI for the "education" of the Russian people, have succeeded in obtaining an apology and a promised correction. But the incident should not be forgotten too quickly.

The Office of War Information has been spending large sums of money, both at home and abroad, for programs of questionable benefit. Indeed, there is suspicion that the OWI often injures the international standing of the United States, and this article so recently in dispute seems to prove the point.

Each time the agency seeks congressional appropriations, it is with the plea that its work is vital to the war effort and the peace to come. It preaches a theory that, in order to get along with the peoples of other lands, we must understand their problems and they must understand ours. And so, the OWI is conducting an overseas propaganda campaign dedicated in part toward showing others that the United States is a superior Nation and that democracy is effective. But what will the Russians or other foreigners think of a country which has high governmental officials who show an appalling ignorance of what the United States really is?

One of many expensive articles prepared for the Russians undertook to describe Kansas and the Midwest. It was filled with gross errors, painted a dreary picture of this region, declared there are almost no industries here, said livestock raising is confined to the mountainous regions of a couple of Western States, and in general showed a remarkable stupidity on the part of high-powered bureaucrats.

Naturally, the Midwest took violent exception, acting through individuals and organizations back home as well as through Members of Congress.

Finally, an OWI man who wrote the offending article said he was "in a hurry" and obtained his information from an old magazine. Elmer Davis, chief of the Office of War Information, promised that a new and correct article would be prepared and sent to the Russians. This is the only decent course which could be taken, but it does not solve the problem.

Congress has a right and a duty to inquire into all of the activities of the OWI to determine just how careless that agency is when its workers are "in a hurry." Bales upon bales of information are being turned out. How much is correct and how much is wrong?

Getting down to cases, is there any justification at all for retaining the OWI, even though it reforms and issues only factual information?

One of the most dangerous practices fostered by bureaucratic Washington is that of straining news releases through OWI. This is an oblique but effective method of defeating freedom of the press. Frequently, when reporters ask for information to which the public is entitled, they are informed that it is being issued through the OWI. The result is a governmental screening. It leads to censorship and propaganda, paid for by governmental funds, to cheat the taxpayer of the truth.

The OWI got caught on the Russian handout which maligned the Midwest. A searching inquiry of the entire set-up is in order.

Japanese Unconditional Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in dealing with Japan at this stage of her disastrous defeats, I believe we should not abandon the unconditional surrender formula, but that we should define it clearly and exactly. If we will add to the Cairo Declaration these four requirements, surrender of Japan's Navy and her Air Force, destruction of her armaments, dismantling of her shipbuilding and heavy industries, with close supervision for at least a generation, and present the terms to Japan on a basis of "take it or leave it," there is a chance of Japan's surrendering fairly soon without the loss of any advantage to us and our allies—and certainly with enormous benefit to all concerned.

Japan is not like Germany. She does not have industrial coal or iron or oil in her own soil. Therefore she simply cannot make war if confined to her main islands. All that the Allies need to do is to isolate her and let the Japanese struggle with their own internal problem until they have worked out a government which has demonstrated for a generation that it is willing and able to cooperate properly with the other nations of the world. That will be better for the peace of Asia and certainly better for the lives and the pocketbooks of Americans.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech I made on this subject on a Nation-wide broadcast in October 1943:

HOW SHALL WE DEAL WITH JAPAN?

We must either kill the Japanese—or we must let them live. We are not going to kill them—75,000,000 of them. We just don't have it in us to do it. Under what conditions then, are we to let them live, for the greatest good and security of us all? May I suggest 10 measures:

First. Complete and total military defeat until every last person in Japan's armed forces and every civilian at home knows it

from personal experience. The myth of their divine invulnerability must be smashed for all to see.

Second. Removal from Japan's control of all territories she has seized—Formosa, Korea, Manchuria, the mandated islands. Without them she could not have become strong enough to wage the present war. Without them she cannot start another.

Third. Occupation and control by a joint United Nations force. It must be brought home to the Japanese once and for all that they are being defeated, disarmed, and occupied, not because of any one nation's designs on them, but because by their own lawlessness they have outraged world opinion. That occupation should be terminated as soon as possible. Japan can be prevented from waging war by isolation until her own people clean house and set up a government that demonstrates it will cooperate loyally with the other nations of the world.

Fourth. Japan must be totally disarmed—her navy, air force, artillery, and tanks surrendered; her arsenals, naval bases, ship yards, and military installations dismantled or destroyed. Her disarmament must be rigidly supervised for at least two generations.

Fifth. To insure further against Japan's rearming we should limit her imports of certain critical minerals. Japan has entirely inadequate amounts of iron ore, coking coal, and the various alloys which are indispensable in the manufacture of modern armaments. Withholding the raw materials of steel beyond the amounts required for the approximately 2,000,000 tons needed in her peacetime industry, would make it absolutely impossible for Japan to rearm.

Sixth. We must also try to disarm Japan psychologically—a much more difficult task. There is no way the common people of Japan can escape suffering for the errors and crimes of the government they chose or tolerated. But just to defeat and disarm them and do nothing to develop different leadership and attitudes is not a solution of the problem—for them or for us. It is utterly unrealistic to imagine that we can keep 75,000,000 people permanently discontented, sullen, and rebellious without our whole Pacific relations being constantly poisoned from the festering sore.

The only alternative is to try to get them to see that their future lies in emerging from medieval feudalism and modernizing their thinking and social system as they have learned to modernize their machinery. There is a real advantage to the United Nations in allowing the Japanese to preserve as much as they wish of those institutions in Japan which are uniting and steadying and hopegiving to them and are not vicious or trouble-making or hostile to other nations. It would seem to me very unwise for us to demand, for example, that the Japanese overthrow their emperor-worship system. You can destroy a man's machine gun by force, but you cannot destroy by compulsion an idea in his mind or a loyalty in his heart. It is certain that, after defeat, the disillusioned Japanese intellectuals, the embittered workers and peasants will be in despair and probably in revolution. It will be most advantageous for all concerned if that revolution is against the real cause of Japan's trouble—her medieval militaristic feudalism. I do not believe the Japanse will revolt against their imperial house, or that we should try by derogatory insults to turn them against the throne which has been the center of their national life for 26 centuries, and which can be most valuable to us as a unifying and steadying focus of loyalty during the period when they are being forced by crushing defeat to reconstruct their whole national thinking. When it is driven home relentlessly to the Japanese people that it is their own military which has betrayed their emperor—has brought him not respect and prestige and honor as it promised, but instead disrespect, dishonor, and disaster; I believe they can be brought to throw out not the imperial house, but the military clique and its usurpation of the prerogative of being sole interpreter of what is the true way to serve the throne.

Seventh. While withholding war materials so that there is no possibility of Japan's rearming, we should permit her to recover economically by giving her access to food supplies, to material necessary for production of consumer goods and rebuilding of light industries, to markets where she can sell the things she produces in order to pay for the things she needs to buy.

Eighth. We should take every proper means to develop China as the great stabilizing bulwark in Asia. Japan can never seriously threaten us as long as in her rear is a strong, independent China, friendly to the democracies.

Ninth. We should at once resume cultural and educational and missionary activities in Japan. A wise observer at the turn of the century warned that Japan was then in the valley of decision, and that if we did not send 10,000 Christian missionaries quickly, we would eventually have to send 100,000 bayonets. Well, we are having to send the bayonets. I believe our very best hope of helping the Japanese develop a willingness to play with the world team instead of against it is through the thousands of Japanese Christians who have not bowed their hearts to militarism nor broken their ties with fellow Christians around the world.

Lastly the United Nations must succeed in evolving a system of organized security for the world. Let the Japanese realize that they are being excluded from the family of nations not because of their race or their nationality but because of their country's behavior. They cannot change their race. They can change their behavior. And they, like other people, will if there is adequate incentive. That incentive can come only from assurance that their ultimate position in the world depends upon themselves, that there is an honorable place for them when they prove themselves honorable, that there is more for them to gain in the long run by joining the world than by trying to conquer it.

Industrial Peace Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years the Sacramento Bee has been a fearless and independent paper. It has battled for proposals that it thought would correct injustices and wrongs. This paper has fought predatory interests which it believed were using their power or their wealth to undermine the public welfare. It has criticized certain practices of labor unions, although it is a friend of labor.

Therefore, it is interesting to note that the Sacramento Bee recommends that Congress carefully and seriously consider the proposal for industrial peace set forth in the bill introduced in the Senate by Senators BURTON, HATCH, and BALL. On the face of it, the proposal by these gentlemen is to settle industrial disputes by peaceable means; that is, by conciliation, arbitration, hearing, and decision.

Many labor disputes are the result of misunderstanding and of stubbornness on one or both sides. A means of getting the complete facts, as suggested in the proposal under discussion, might bring about more complete understanding and promote more tolerant and understanding relations of workers and employers. The workers still have their right to strike, after the peaceful means have been exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Sacramento Bee as part of my remarks:

INDUSTRIAL PEACE CHARTER IS A TIMELY PROPOSAL

Senators HATCH, of New Mexico, BALL, of Minnesota, and BURTON, of Ohio, three of the most progressive and clearest thinking Members of the United States Senate, are joint authors of a bill which they call a charter for industrial peace.

The measure, officially titled the Federal Industrial Relations Act, was drawn by Donald R. Richberg and a group of prominent men interested and experienced in labor relations. Richberg, incidentally, was author of the Railway Labor Act, which has prevented major railroad strikes for more than 19 years.

As introduced, the Hatch-Ball-Burton bill would overhaul and amend the 10-year-old National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act. It would abolish the National Labor Relations Board and substitute for it and present conciliation machinery two separate agencies to maintain peace between management and labor and to avert the "serious danger of a knock-down, drag-out fight in the immediate postwar period."

Regarded as the most ambitious approach toward an over-all national labor relations policy yet attempted, the measure would set up a three-man unfair labor practices tribunal limited solely to administering the quasi-judicial functions of the NLRB.

All other NLRB functions retained would be transferred to a five-man Federal labor relations board which would be granted wide powers over the mediation, conciliation, and adjustment of labor disputes. To this board also would be transferred the Department of Labor's conciliation service and all mediatory duties of the Secretary of Labor and the War Labor Board.

The measure also would require compulsory arbitration in all cases of grievances arising from interpretation of labor-management contracts, and whenever a work stoppage would cause severe public hardship, such as a milk or coal strike.

It would ban unfair labor practices by employees as well as by employers as now provided by the Wagner Act. In other words, it would attempt to equalize the Wagner law provision which hitherto has been sought by industry but opposed by labor.

Adoption of the closed shop would be permitted only when 75 percent of the employed belonged to a union and 60 percent of these approved the closed shop; provided further that the union agreed to admit all qualified persons to membership.

It would restrict the operation of the Wagner Act to persons "directly" and not "indirectly" engaged in interstate commerce.

Some officials of the CIO and AFL already have denounced the Hatch-Ball-Burton measure as "reactionary" and the "turning back of the clock of progress." These charges are silly in view of the character and legislative record of the authors.

Furthermore, such an attitude on the part of labor is shortsighted, for the employer is entitled to his day in court as well as is labor.

Regulation of the excesses of unionism is inevitable and it will be better for labor to accept legislative changes proposed by its friends rather than to face outright attacks by its enemies.

The Hatch-Ball-Burton "charter for industrial peace" deserves the most careful and serious attention of Congress.

More About OWI Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the recent purely accidental discovery of a very inaccurate and misleading article on the Prairie and Mountain States which was included in an OWI publication printed in the Russian language, has created a great deal of righteous indignation in that part of the country.

This indignation is not based on the fact that the Russians have been grossly misinformed on the matter, but rather because of the disclosure of such collossal ignorance in a Government agency charged with the duty of telling the rest of the world about the United States. The revelation that those charged with this responsibility were wholly uninformed concerning important parts of their own country came as something of a shock.

The apology of Mr. Elmer Davis, contained in his letter to the Wichita Chamber of Commerce, is not reassuring on this point. Mr. Davis admits that the material "was inadvertently drawn from outdated sources and presented on unfair and inaccurate picture." That is very true. Then he continues "because it did not take account of the development of war industries and wartime agriculture in your great section of the country." This statement implies that Mr. Davis is still of the opinion that the description fitted the area right up until the beginning of the war. As a matter of fact, it never fitted it, as Mr. Davis would discover if he would take the trouble to ascertain the facts.

This impels me to renew the suggestion which I made to Mr. Davis recently, that before the OWI starts out to explain America to the rest of the world that it take the time and trouble to find out something about that part of the country west of the Hudson and Potomac Rivers.

The Denver Post for July 12 editorially discusses this matter and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I sumbit herewith the editorial:

The alphabetical designation—OWI—is supposed to stand for Office of War Information. What this bureaucratic agency really is is an office of misinformation. Its ignorance is appalling. If it doesn't know any more about war matters than it does about its own country, its very existence is an insult to and a crime against the American taxpayers who are forced to support it. What the OWI doesn't know about the United States would fill a library.

At the expense of American taxpayers, the OWI has published and is circulating in Soviet Russia, a magazine called America Illustrated. One of the articles written by the OWI staff for this magazine purports to give a description of a "prairie land" section which includes Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, and Utah. It says "this region, covering almost one-quarter of the whole territory of the United States, supports only one-twentieth of the population of the country. The people in it are almost exclusively farmers. Livestock raising is carried on only in the mountainous parts of Montana and Wyoming. Industry is almost nonexistent. Raw materials and fabricated goods must be imported from other States. The rich natural resources of the region are as yet untouched."

As Congressman HOPE of Kansas says, "There isn't a fifth grade student in the United States who doesn't have more accurate information regarding the area in question" than the author of this article circulated by the OWI. Even Director Davis of the OWI confesses the article was "badly written, was a badly done piece, carried misstatements." His alibi is that "material on the prairie and mountain States was inadvertently drawn from outdated sources." Those "sources" must have been outdated for 20 years at least.

Whether the Russians have accurate information about any section of the United States is of no consequence. But it is scandalous to find that a Federal bureaucracy, maintained at the expense of American taxpayers, doesn't know any more about its own country than this OWI article indicates. Information given by a governmental agency is presumed to be authentic and it should be Davis' alibi about material drawn from outdated sources is as stupid as the article which has aroused this whole intermountain region. His OWI writers have available Government statistics which are up to date. They have accurate information at the fingertips. Are they so dumb they can't even read that?

The most damnable thing about the OWI's ignorance of the Prairie and Mountain States is that it is typical of Washington's lack of knowledge about the part of the country west of the Mississippi. The "dimwits" of the OWI are not the only Washington bureaucrats who know nothing about this part of the country. The National Capital is full of such ignorance.

According to the OWI article this intermountain region "covering almost one-quarter of the whole territory of the United States, supports only one-twentieth of the population of the country." Colorado is the Nation's sugar bowl. Kansas is the Nation's bread basket. Without the food production of Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, and Utah the rest of the Nation would starve to death. Without the meat, corn, wheat, sugar, and other foods supplied by these States to the rest of the country, these OWI bureaucrats wouldn't eat. Before Elmer Davis and his OWI "dimwits" try to tell the Russians about the United States they should acquaint themselves with the United States.

The OWI is merely a bureaucratic rat hole into which millions of American tax dollars have been poured. There never was any justification for its existence. It should be abolished. Publicizing the United States in Soviet Russia is not by any conceivable stretch of the imagination disseminating war information. If the Federal Government wants to give people of any foreign country information about any section of the United States, there are plenty of chamber of commerce pamphlets available in every section with accurate information.

Legislators' Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the Sioux City Journal of Wednesday, July 11, 1945:

A Treasury Department ruling on the question of whether Members of Congress should be permitted to deduct their expenses while in Washington, if favorable, would save the average legislator approximately $1,000 a year. Business expenses for others are deductible. So the question the Treasury must answer is, Are meals and lodging in Washington to be considered business expenses for Congressmen and Senators, and therefore deductible in making out their income-tax returns?

It is possible that the Department will allow this deduction. On the ground that virtually every Member of Congress does not have a home in Washington and is there only temporarily on Government business, the regulatory decision easily could be made allowing the deduction of the cost of meals and lodging.

The founders of the Constitution did not know anything about Federal income taxes. However they did require that every Member of Congress have his official residence in the State where he runs for office. If a Member of Congress felt that he was so sure of reelection that he could live in Washington permanently he still would have to pretend that his home was in a particular State, else he could not legally be chosen for the office in the first place.

Most of the Members of Congress, if not all, own homes in their States and districts and live in them when the legislative body is not in session. A good many of them are engaged in business or have professions. Many depend upon incomes outside their salaries as legislators in order to live comfortably. There are hundreds of Senators and Representatives whose salaries as Members of Congress do not equal the amount they spend while in Washington attending sessions.

A Government official who travels out of Washington on Federal business does not even have to pay his expenses while away. It is a time-honored custom for business executives and other employees to turn in expense accounts when representing their employers in other cities.

Everything considered, the pay of a Member of Congress is small. The obscure nondescript type of legislator who makes any money out of his congressional salary, who goes to Washington and is never heard from is not the proper person to represent a State or a district in the Halls of Congress. It wouldn't hurt Uncle Sam's pocketbook much if the deduction were allowed.

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Under permission to extend my remarks I include herein a statement recently made by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, entitled "Americans All," which appeared in a recent edition of the Telegram-News, of Lynn, Mass.:

AMERICANS ALL
(By Dr. Daniel A. Poling)

President Daniel Marsh of Boston University has said that it is the responsibility of majority groups, whatever the issue and wherever raised, to see to it that minorities have their rights. And it is more than responsibility. It is life and very existence—

for the majority groups. Minorities can and do survive persecutions and bloody liquidations, but responsible majorities cannot survive their own brutalities. The Jew, after centuries of travail and horror imposed upon him by those who overwhelmed him in numbers and physical strength, remains today, to friend and foe alike, the most baffling human phenomenon of history.

On the other hand, the powerful majorities that tortured the Jew have, sometimes rapidly but always steadily, weakened. Some of these majorities have completely disappeared. The nations that led Israel into captivity from the Jordan Valley are only names today.

Again, in our time, history begins to repeat itself. As I write these lines, the guns of the Russians are almost within sounding distance. A young American officer said yesterday, "Watch your sights, men. We don't want to shoot our allies." Herr Hitler unleashed the lightning, but he could not control its fury, and now it consumes him and his misguided followers.

I write as a Christian. My faith is the majority faith of America. And I write to say that the Christian majority of America carries now the responsibility for its own life and prosperity, as well as for justice to the Jew, the Japanese-American, and the Negro. Indeed, the principle applies to us, the majority, even as it relates to every minority among us. The Christian majority, under whatever guise, cannot persecute nor consent to persecution, cannot allow injustice, nor condone it, and cannot remain silent in the presence of twentieth-century totalitarian horrors—and survive.

The Christian must be Christian if he would continue to be.

Decentralization and Prevention of Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by the Washington Post of July 17, 1945:

DECENTRALIZATION

The distribution of war plants in the United States followed the Biblical principle of "unto everyone that hath shall be given." A current WPB analysis of where these plants were located explains that "labor supply, existing transportation facilities, housing and above all the need for top speed combined to bring about the placement of the added facilities in the prewar manufacturing centers." Approximately 93 percent of the $20,000,000,000 spent for new plants and facilities went into 179 previously existing manufacturing areas.

There is nothing strange about this fact. Having to expand production as quickly as possible, the WPB could not have proceeded in any other way. For the most part it had to utilize manpower, materials, electric energy, housing and so forth where they were available. Now that the peak of war production has passed, however, and we are again confronted by the problem of developing a well-balanced economy and a well-balanced country, the effects of this further centralization of industry ought to be faced with candor and understanding.

We had attained very little economic balance in the prewar years. A recent study by the Senate's Special Committee to Investigate the Centralization of Heavy Industry found that only 10 States had achieved a relatively balanced development. These States are Indiana, Louisiana, Florida, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire. Listed as "overpopulated and overdeveloped" were Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois. These States have only 9 percent of the total area of the United States but 65 percent of its manufacturing, 43 percent of its population, and 56 percent of its income. "Overpopulated and overdeveloped" is an unfortunate choice of words. But the facts as to our unbalanced economic development nevertheless stand out from the committee's report as a real national problem.

It was in this group of highly developed States that most of the Government war plants were built. The largest investment in war plants was in Ohio. Next on the list were Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, and New York. Not only has the concentration of industry within a few highly industrialized States been accentuated, but even within those States industrial growth has been confined to previously congested areas. That is a misfortune which the Nation is not likely to overcome for many years and then only through comprehensive planning for decentralization.

We have no doubt that many of the forces working for a better balance in our industrial development will be strong after the war. Census records show that before the wartime emergency reversed the trend, the industrialized East was slowing down, while the undeveloped areas of the West and South were experiencing much more rapid growth. There are many indications that this trend will be resumed when the pressure for maximum war production is relaxed. Yet the regions working for greater industrialization will be handicapped by the existence of vast plant capacity, some of it surplus capacity, in the densely populated areas.

We have no thought, of course, that industry may be evenly distributed throughout the country without regard for natural resources, power, climatic conditions, and so forth. To sacrifice natural advantages in the location of industry would be to penalize all consumers, who would have to pay higher prices for the products of the disadvantaged plants. But there is a wide margin within which decentralization can be carried out with advantage to consumers and producers alike. We think it is to the advantage of the entire Nation to encourage this evening-up process. Depression pockets and underprivileged areas are quite out of place in the United States. Certainly one key to reconversion policy should be revival of the decentralization trend wherever that is feasible.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I greatly deplore the unfair and unjustifiable attack and criticism of this bill and against even the gentlemen who have favored this appropriation for the Fair Employment Practice Committee. This committee has been in existence since 1941 and up to now I have heard less criticism of this committee than any other committee or commission. It is composed of very able, competent and honest men with equal representation of industry and labor. Their rulings have been recognized by all fair-minded men as just and unbiased. The record shows a large number of complaints dismissed on their part and how fairly they have been adjudicated under all conditions. However, notwithstanding that fact, the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], has seen fit not only to attack the bill but those who have been for the continuation of the committee and its appropriation. As is his custom he has assailed those favoring the bill as being communistic and charged that it will cause strife, yes, even revolution. I am surprised that he did not threaten that his State or his district would secede from the Union! He attacked the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] during the course of debate, and others who favored this legislation.

I regret that in this he was aided by his colleagues from Mississippi Mr. COLMER and Mr. WHITTINGTON; by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and several other gentlemen.

It is unfortunate that we who advocate just and humane legislation are regarded in the minds of these gentlemen as alien and communistic-minded. It is not unusual for the gentleman to allege that we are advocating legislation which is in violation of the Constitution. I have observed, however, that this is the first time that they have not utilized that unfair argument against us because they fully realize and should appreciate, and I am sure they are aware of the fact that they, themselves, are attacking and opposing legislation which is in strict conformity with and provided for in the Constitution of the United States. As was so ably stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in his remarks of July 12, which I quote:

> The genesis of FEPC is found in the greatest American document of all time, the Declaration of Independence, in which it is unqualifiedly stated that all men are created equal. And when they said, "All men are created equal," they meant that every man had a right to work, irrespective of his race, color, and creed.

So the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], not to make himself ridiculous in making his oft-repeated charge, designates this Fair Employment Practice Committee as bunk and deliberately insults the integrity of the membership when he charges that if a secret vote were taken, only a handful of Members would vote for it. I therefore deplore the attacks on the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], whom everyone must recognize as an honest, scholarly, and sincere gentleman. Surely, he at times does not restrain himself in forcibly countering all attacks against himself or against legislation that he advocates.

Several of the gentlemen charged that this legislation will increase strife and intolerance. I am inclined to believe that they are in error, as they have been in the past when they expressed fear that progressive New Deal legislation would be detrimental to them, when, in fact, it has proven to be helpful and beneficial. Due to the enactment of this New Deal

and progressive legislation their districts—yes; their States and the entire country—derived tremendous advantages and benefits from every one of the laws which were passed against their very strong opposition.

Instead of finding fault and criticising they should be thankful and appreciative of the benefits which have inured to their districts out of the New Deal legislation that to me, for some unknown reason, they so despise. They cannot deny the fact that never before in the history of our country has their districts and States been as prosperous as during the last 12 years. Very frequently we hear the charge of bureaucracy and governmental encroachment upon States' rights but in nearly every piece of legislation they strive to insert provisions that will allow greater and greater appropriations thereby relieving the counties in their districts and their States themselves and unloading upon the Federal Government additional tax burdens. This not only applies to the agricultural bill, the roads bill, the rural electrification bill, the the rivers and harbors bill, the flood-control appropriation bill, but many others too numerous to mention, for which we have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, most of which has been borne by other sections of the country. The beneficiaries of these huge appropriations oppose any fair employment legislation while the taxpayers who have borne the major portion of the tax load derive very little benefit from these appropriations. I myself and most progressive Democrats have invariably voted for legislation and have never raised the question that it would benefit only certain sections of the country or have we pointed out that it was sectional legislation. We have voted for legislation because we believe that if it helps one section it will benefit the other sections of the country as well. Therefore, I hope these gentlemen will in the future refrain in their unfair attacks and charges against those of us who favor liberal and progressive legislation as being alien or communistic-minded. I hope that they will show a little more tolerance toward those who do not at all times agree with their reactionary views.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I defy any or all of them to show or prove that we progressive Democrats are not as patriotic as they are and that the future welfare of our country is as near and dear to our hearts and, perhaps, more so. As I was about to conclude my attention was called to quotations taken from the winter 1944–45 issue of South Today, which I insert in the hope that it will reach the hearts of these gentlemen and all other good Christians:

OUR PREACHERS ARE THINKING

(These quotations were taken from the winter 1944–45 issue of South Today)

Bishop Walter Mitchell, Phoenix, Ariz.: "The job of the church is to persuade enough white people to cast out fear; treat the Negro as they know our Lord would want him to be treated and trust God for the event."

John Knox, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.: "What will we say when we are confronted with our real crime against the body of Christ, when we are unable to hide longer from ourselves that we have valued more highly the community of race than the community of Christ?"

The Reverend Frank S. Persons II, Christ Church Rectory, Bastrop, La.: "Anything less than fellowship, in international or interracial relations, is a denial of God our Father, and a betrayal of our brother man."

James Yard, Director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Chicago, Ill.: "We have talked long encugh. It is now time to practice brotherhood in all human relations. Segregation is the great sin against society."

Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. J. Flanagan, Boys Town, Nebr.: "It is sad but true that we are some 400 years late in finding that Christianity confined to one nation or class or race is an anomaly: That 'Christianity limited is Christ betrayed.'"

The Rev. C. S. Ledbetter, Plymouth Congregational Church, Charleston, S. C.: "In the world of tomorrow there must not be any national, racial, or creedal lines in the church."

The Rev. C. D. Knight, Greater Shiloh Baptist Church, Dallas, Tex.: "If we are to have a better world in which to live, in which there will be no racial segregation and discrimination, the church leadership will have to practice what it preaches."

Federal Aid for Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, asked how he stands regarding the subject of giving the opportunities of education to the youth of America, every Congressman in Congress will avow his stand to strongly support these opportunities. Yet there are Congressmen who let sectional bias cause them to act officially in such fashion that we have not been able to expand our national opportunities to their true ground coverage. Every educational bill that calls for Federal aid to State schools is cried down.

Arguments used are many. Predominating we find three cries. One, some sort of devilish joker is in the bill with some hidden trick as its object. Another, the people in one part of the United States are trying to make the people in another part educate their children. Third, Federal control follows Federal aid.

My good friend from New Jersey, Mr. THOMAS, over on my left, in effect stated on May 26, 1945, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that proponents of Federal aid for education are trying to school our children by the old shell game. Now, Mr. THOMAS is a very able lawmaker who has the respect of this entire body. I wish he were with us in this fight. I assume from his argument he would be were it not for the fact that under the bill more would be paid by New Jersey than immediately comes back.

Suppose every family in New Jersey who pays taxes into the New Jersey tax fund should take that position. Or better yet, suppose every section of New Jersey should take that attitude as to every other section. Where would it leave New Jersey's school program? I'll state where. It would leave it right where the school program of the United States is today.

But let us look further. Does the gentleman from New Jersey or the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentleman from Illinois reflect on the vital results of the unblanced educational ration in this country? What happens to the boy in Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, who did not get his fair share of schooling? Does he stay where he was brought up? No, he moves into New Jersey, Massachusetts, Illinois. What does he there? He marries a lovely girl reared in New Jersey, Massachusetts, Illinois. Try out a test of this fact on the first crowd you address when you get back home. You will be surprised at the number of your constituents who have married and brought to you constituents from other States.

What does this mean? It means that our people are not tied down in America. America keeps singing "Don't Fence Me In." America's people will continue to sing that song.

True, they marry far across the country and are happy. Can you answer by saying that social dissemination breaks the spell of the evil? No; for figures prove the sad truth. It is otherwise.

The National Education Association of the United States ran down facts and figures and came out with the statement that over 650,000 men have been rejected for service in our armed forces because of lack of educational qualifications—and a man certainly does not have to be a scholar to get into our fighting forces. Nearly five millions—not thousands, millions—have been turned down because of educational, physical, and mental causes, many of which could have been bridged by proper schooling and training.

Let us take a look at the 1940 census. We find over 10,000,000 grown people unable to read and write. Also we find that the percentages are extremely close in their alliance with needed school provisions and educational opportunities. This is a problem for the United States as a nation. In a relationship so near that any map of the United States revealing the one can be used to illustrate the other we find that over 2,000,000 children below 15 years of age and over 6 years of age were not in any school at that crucial time in their lives.

Teachers in the South and West are leaving the profession in great numbers. Few will ever return to it. It does not pay to be a school teacher in the South or West. During one school month of last year the NEA found approximately 10,000 schoolrooms without teachers, leaving in the neighborhood of 250,000 to 260,000 pupils out of school. This may please the children but it is not good for them. With the cost of living going up about 32 percent the salaries of teachers in some parts of the South and Middle West have gone up less than 10 percent. In a few, less than 5 percent. It simply means that this country must get

away from its prejudices and come to Federal aid for schools.

Nobody would seriously contend that peoples in some States and areas are morally and intellectually inferior to those in other parts of the United States, yet the amounts of money available for school purposes in some sections varies so from that in others that when first seen one thinks there was a mistake in running the figures down. The mistake, however, lies in our having allowed our system to grow into such a lopsided structure. For example for fiscal 1939 the cost per classroom was over $6,000 a year in some locations as against only $95 a year in others. During that year, which is the last in which I have been able to get the figures, 38,253 pupils in our public schools were in classrooms for which less than $100 a year were spent. The average public school classroom will run to about $1,700 a year and yet approximately 7,000,000 of our children attended classrooms that fell below an annual $1,200 a year while almost 2,000,000 attended classrooms falling below $600 a year, some of them considerably below that figure.

Results of a careful survey and study recently made public by Columbia University reveals that the percentage of public moneys applied to funding schools is actually greater in the areas wherein the sums prove smallest. The tables are too exhaustive for this speech but may be had by writing Columbia University. Of course, this proves poor opportunities for education in the lower-income areas, due only to the fact that they do not have the money. The NEA recently published figures proving this same vital truth, showing that the States with the greatest percentage of children to be schooled have the least money to school them. Some people produce money, others children. This is as true of the wide area of the country as of any community. Now already, the States with the least money and the most children are spending the highest percentage for schooling. Notwithstanding this, the program is all atilt. What is the remedy? There must be a remedy. Federal aid to education is the remedy. If any Congressman on this floor can think of another remedy, I am ready to hear from him. No other has been advanced. Why? Because this is the natural remedy, the only remedy.

If democracy means equality of opportunity—and we have long so insisted—I can think of no place more proper to apply it than in the education of the country's children.

For some strange reason we have permitted our educational system to lag in the United States. It is time for us to get busy with it. H. R. 1296 proposes the legislating and the funding necessary to begin a healthful democratic educational system. It does so giving each State full and complete control of the carrying out of the program. This gets out of the way the fear that once went with the solution. Now, with that ground for fear removed, this Congress should have no great trouble in passing this long-needed legislation.

American Labor Can Protect Itself Against the Products of Low-Paid Labor of Foreign Countries Only by Adequate Tariff Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as it is becoming increasingly evident from the resolutions of great agricultural organizations and the expressions of acknowledged farm leaders that agriculture no longer regards the Trade Agreements Act as anything other than a menace to the farming industry, I, under leave to extend my remarks, offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I received a few days ago from Mr. Charles C. Teague, of Santa Paula, Calif., a letter which, I am quite sure, will be of great interest to all of those who derive their livelihood from the tilling of the soil, as well as to those who compose the membership of this legislative body.

Even though mention of his great accomplishments in the agricultural field would be by many regarded as quite superfluous, so well is he known in agricultural circles, it might be well to point out for the benefit of the RECORD that Charles C. Teague has been for many years an ever active member of innumerable farm organizations, among them the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, the Agricultural Council of California, the California Walnut Growers Association, and the California Fruit Growers Exchange. His repeated reelection as president of each of the cooperatives that I have just named for more than 20 years reflects a confidence and respect among those in whose interests he devotes his talents which is seldom encountered as one makes his way down life's pathway.

As this record clearly reveals, there is no one engaged in the agricultural industry who is held in higher respect or warmer affection than is this ever faithful public-spirited citizen of the great West. And well might that be so.

The letter to which I have just adverted, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

SANTA PAULA, CALIF., *May 31, 1945.*
Hon. BERTRAND W. GEARHART,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GEARHART: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 25, and also the copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which you so kindly sent me.

I have read all of the testimony in these records and also another that was sent me by the California State Chamber of Commerce, and have noted the valiant fight that you have been putting up in an effort to convince the Members of Congress of the folly of continuing to grant such broad powers to the Executive and to still further reduce our protective tariffs under which our American industry and agriculture and standard of living in this country have been established and maintained down through the years.

Ever since the administration of Cordell Hull began there has been a continual propaganda for the removal of the tariff barriers and the establishment of a free economy throughout the world. It has been very skillfully done on the basis that the future peace of the world depended upon it, and a great many well-intentioned people in this country have been sold on that idea who have little knowledge of the principles of economies and business that make for a prosperous country.

I am of the opinion that it is the most serious question that confronts the American people today. We certainly cannot maintain our standards of living and the purchasing power of our workers and our agriculture if we have to compete with the cheap labor of the low-standard-of-living countries of the rest of the world, and the end result is bound to be large unemployment in this country before these treaties can be denounced and our industries again protected.

I have often said that labor unions have pretty well proved their ability to protect themselves and the industries in which they work from immigrants who come to this country or from unemployment in other industries, but they cannot protect themselves by organization from the products of low-paid labor of foreign countries, and people will buy where they can buy the cheapest (quality considered) if there are no tariff barriers.

I am of the opinion that in the long run it may be the undoing of the Democratic Party, and perhaps also of the labor unions themselves if they do not become alive to its dangers. It looks as though nothing can be done to stop the trend. When we have the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the State Department all advocating free trade, with all of the propaganda of Government behind them, it looks as though it will have to be tried out, but it will take us years to get over it. This is my firm conviction after having studied this question for many years.

I think the people in California here appreciate the fine work that you have been doing in trying to stem the tide without too much help. The arguments and figures that you have presented are unanswerable.

Sincerely,

C. C. TEAGUE.

Ruthless Individualism—Unconscious Victims of Self

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it seems that turbulent times lead to strange thinking as well as strange actions. Some people in an effort to discredit the free private enterprise system and a free economy are now embracing a new philosophy. They charge that we must beware of ourselves; that if we are ambitious and have a desire to own property, educate our children, and support our families in some measure of respect that we are usually unconscious victims of our "own personality

make-up and forgotten childhood." Has a more screwy theory ever been advanced in this country? I doubt it, but so that you may know the source of this information, I submit herewith as a part of my remarks, an excerpt that appeared in the current issue of the New Republic, July 16, 1945, page 67, and which purports to be part of an article which appeared in the Saturday Review of Literature:

We are beginning to recognize that the individual who ruthlessly strives for power, prestige, and property and utilizes our legally sanctioned patterns of competitive rivalry for these strivings is usually an unconscious victim of his own personality make-up and forgotten childhood. Thus, he is driven to sacrifice not only others but himself for achievement of his ambitions, as he attempts to show them or get even or releases his otherwise intolerable feelings in his interpersonal relations or various psychosomatic disorders.

So long as individuals are so driven, coerced, or self-defeated by their own personality, they have no freedom, however freely they may appear to be living, conducting their business or carrying on their professional activities. Nor can such unhappy, internally conflicted individuals participate in creating and maintaining a social order dedicated to human needs and values, because of their distorted personalities. We are just beginning to recognize that an even more crucial task than winning the four freedoms is to achieve freedom for the personality, without which all other freedoms are of little avail.

When Dr. Friedrich Hayek bids us submit to the impersonal forces of competition, he is telling us to submit to the irrational and often neurotically distorted individuals whose aggregate economic behavior makes up what he calls the forces of competition. While he offers competition as a bulwark against the arbitrary power of man, his doctrine delivers us into the irresponsible powers of the men who, at whatever cost to social order and human values, must dominate and exploit social life for their own personality needs. Dr. Hayek assures us that if ambitious men are encouraged to struggle ruthlessly against each other with no interference by legislation, we may escape the slavery he sees coming from our attempts to develop some economic planning.

But this remedy which Dr. Hayek offers is of little avail, for, as he himself points out, not only the misguided economic planners but the businessmen themselves, through devious methods of controlling production and prices, dividing markets, and otherwise preventing competition, as in cartels, are also interfering with the forces of competition which offer our only hope for escaping serfdom. It would appear that we are indeed lost.—Lawrence K. Frank in the Saturday Review of Literature.

Dixie Is Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER PATRICK

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, in Birmingham, Ala., is a pair of southern eyes that has been for years able to sometimes look beyond the horizon. What those eyes have seen for the South has been reported from time to time on page 1 of the Birmingham Age-Herald written by John Temple Graves, for those are the eyes of Mr. Graves. It would be difficult to find a man whose mind more clearly thinks the South, whose heart more warmly loves the South.

Many remember the understanding comment that ran through This Morning—the title of the Graves column—following the well-known verdict that the South was the No. 1 economic problem of America.

Readers of This Morning nowadays frequently find a warm and cheerful note regarding the South. In last Wednesday's This Morning I find another worthy and characteristic John Temple Graves paragraph in the column. Here it is:

The vast new industry awaiting unfoldment in the South is the manufacture of newsprint and other white paper from Southern slash pine has only one plant in being today. That is at Lufkin, Tex. A plant costs about $9,000,000, I am told. Where will the second plant be some day, and the third, fourth, fifth, etc.? Certainly with the enormous war installations that have come to the South and may go begging after the war if peacetime uses are not found for them, the possibility of using some of them for newsprint paper manufacture must be under consideration.

America is about to discover Dixie. Dixie is opportunity. America is learning about Dixie's desirable climate, is about to know Dixie's excellent people, of Dixie's abiding strength of character. America is beginning to realize Dixie's rich natural resources. America is soon to see that Dixie is learning her way around in the world, to find that Dixie has progressive and intelligent employees and has industrious and capable workers.

All these things are real. The South has the resources and the sense. The fact that she was slow in getting started now adds to the value of what she has. Opportunities the South has missed add up in the sum of what she has retained.

The best producing coal field on earth is the Appalachian. It is imbedded in Alabama and the South in the main. The deposits of this rich natural accumulation are sufficient to supply all fuel required by the Western Hemisphere for decades to come.

There has not been discovered better pottery clay nor better fire clay than is found in Alabama and in quantity—as well as cement, dolomite, marble, building stone, sand, and superior gravel. When we shall have settled with Japan how an expanding building America is going to call for these! Well, here they are, the world's best.

Alabama's—and all of Dixie's—power supply for hydroelectricity is already known to the world and there are thousands of potential sites for power plants inviting developmen' all over Dixieland.

In an article recently published in Mercury, Donald Nelson of War Production Board fame—you will agree he has other claims to fame—stated:

The South cannot be prevented from moving swiftly into an era of development that will astound the world and add strength to our democracy.

Had this been said by some southerner it might be subject to the charge of local pride or sectional enthusiasm. But Mr. Nelson is neither a southerner nor a man of emotional statement.

The war made everybody look for the quickest way to produce the most. This war has brought the important truth about the South to attention. As Mr. Nelson sated in the same article, "The war has had an explosive effect on the industrialization of the South." He mentions that the largest combination powder and explosive plant in the United States is near Birmingham, Ala., and the largest bomber and modification plant is not the one at Willow Run but one near Marietta, Ga., while near Huntsville, Ala., is located the country's largest chemical-warfare plant. There are other great chemical plants dotted across the Southern States.

More ships have been built near Mobile, Ala., since this war began than were built over the entire South during World War I. There is even a shipbuilding plant near Decatur, Ala. Its turn-out has to be carried down the Tennessee River into the Mississippi thence to the Gulf of Mexico. Memphis and Nashville also do shipbuilding. These are inland places.

Observing minds have been attracted to the fact that the manufacturers of the South have shown a keen ingenuity in converting their factories into war plants. Of course, they will show even greater gift in reconverting to peace production.

Likewise they have been attracted to the fact that the farm boy of the South quickly bcomes a skilled workman with a facility and understanding that has given the American the world over the title of the workman with the know-how.

Mack Gowder of Hall County, Ga., taught farmers how to cultivate the land so as to prevent topsoil, or land richness, escaping into the surrounding streams. His cousins are quite as alert when they find themselves at work in a machine shop. I have talked with a number of men who employ workmen in separated sections of the country. All attest the fact that while it has been charged that workmen have held back on output to avoid more work for the same pay the natural tendency of the southern workman is to find ways to speed up production as well as to improve efficiency. And he is clever at both. Now this is the very essence of progress.

History will reveal how this American southern spirit enabled a group of southerners, Steven Debman, of Texas, Charles Davis, of Louisiana, and 16 others—three of them midwesterners—under Bruce McDaniel of southern California, to rig up and execute a plan to feed France right after crucial D-day. It is a piece of know-how and delivery that will live as long as men record deeds of achievement. The plan and work led France through a day when starvation was imminent. The French people can never forget it.

Mr. Speaker, you often witness Members of Congress pointing with pride to this and that. Well, in the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama our major point-with-pride item is the fact that within a radius of less than 10 miles we have in abundance: iron ore for smelting,

coal for fueling, and limestone for processing. This is the triumvirate of the iron and steel industry. Thus you may know Birmingham's permanence as an iron and steel center is assured. We regard ourselves as quite a part of Dixie and of her economic structure.

When you read of how a fleet of American planes brought the Japanese unconditional surrender much nearer in one night you may also remember that the great North American Aviation plant is located at Dallas, Tex., and aviation plants are in 11 other southern spots.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that almost 45 percent of the commercial forest territory in this country lies in the South? Well such is the case. And it is the only part of the United States that still has old-growth hardwood. About one-half of this Nation's lumber now comes from the South and this percentage will increase as the years go by, for second-growth timber grows faster in the South—a very important fact. Already we have over a hundred pulp mills and paper mills in Dixie.

Chemistry is looking more and more to wood every day. The day of plastics is fast approaching and this will jump the value of the South's forest reserves higher and higher. One of the most important ingredients of synthetic rubber—isoprene—is made from the southern pine. Seventy percent of the rosin and turpentine for the whole world—not merely the United States, the whole world—comes from Dixie. And young pines grow into sizable trees very fast. This means that this source of wealth cannot be soon exhausted or even diminished.

When you think of rayon, lacquer, isoprene, cellophane, lignin, cellulose, synthetic rubber, and many other products so swiftly moving into the world market today you are thinking toward the certain prosperity of the South.

Auburn College has discovered a potential gold mine in the sweetpotato. The peanut is another source of future wealth. Georgia Tech in Georgia and Auburn in Alabama have established research laboratories; so have other southern colleges.

Mississippi and Georgia have legislated special authorities for the study and development of agricultural products. Louisiana has created a committee to develop her State as to resources and their relations to the Nation's economy.

More than half our Nation's petroleum and natural gas is produced in the South. New petroleum areas are being discovered there. Iron, lead, sulfur, copper, bauxite, salt, helium, magnesium, graphite, phosphate, mica, and other minerals come from beneath the South's soil.

Nothing has sped up southern marketing so much as the new dehydrating and quick-freezing methods and discoveries of recent years. The effective dehydrating process that is proving so great a boon to food producers was invented at Auburn College in Alabama. There sweet potatoes are made into breakfast foods, jams, candies, and so forth—and they are delicious.

Not only is America discovering the South, but the South is discovering more about herself. Her per capita income has advanced more than 18 percent since 1930. Her people have been buying on a much broader market for the past 10 years. They are earning more and buying more.

Their interest in nationally circulated magazines has nearly doubled in 12 years.

The war job being done by and in the South is a challenge to the rest of the Nation. Not only does she send out a superior fighting man but gives him support from the farm, from the shop, and from the heart. When peacetime comes her industrial development is certain, her place in an expanding world economy is assured, and her greater, richer, brighter future will not be denied.

The modern southern father has been saying to his son, "Quicken the spirit within you." The son has heard. The South has the skill, the genius, the natural resources, and is about to help lead the world into a bright new tomorrow.

War Agencies—OWI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, because of the denial by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of any opportunity to speak on the conference report on the war agencies bill, I desire to make the following statement:

I signed the conference report as a conferee except as to Senate amendments in respect to the OWI. I could not accept or recommend those amendments providing for an over-all appropriation of $35,000,000. My position in this connection is, I think, clear from the remarks which I made on the floor when the bill was under consideration by the House.

I have the greatest respect for our distinguished and eloquent colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. In this instance, however, I may point out that the conclusion which he has reached in the course of his recent trip is not shared by other competent observers who have also had the opportunity for observation overseas.

A year or so ago, several Members of the Senate returned from a trip abroad and were particularly critical of OWI. One member of the group delivered an address to the Republican Members of the House in which he criticized this agency severely.

Other Senators returning only recently from abroad have also been very critical, advocating the liquidation of the agency and the transfer of any essential functions, now that the war in Europe is terminated.

For sometime past I have made it a point to inquire from competent observers returning from abroad as to the work, not only of OWI but of all war agencies operating abroad. It has been surprising to me to note the amount of criticism in respect to the work of OWI.

Among those most outspoken in criticism of OWI have been persons with wide diplomatic experience, both in our own service and in the service of other countries.

When this appropriation was first under consideration I made it a point to inquire specifically as to the value of the work of OWI, both in the war and in the postwar period, from two very high officials in the executive branch of the Government. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was with me at one of these conferences. The substance of the opinion expressed in each instance was that the value of the work of the agency during the war had been exaggerated and that its plans for the postwar period were considered beyond reason and of little value.

It has been impossible for me to escape the conclusion that much of the work of OWI has been valueless, and therefore wasteful; that some of its work has been actually harmful; and that included in its personnel have been those who should not have been included in the personnel of any Federal agency.

The conference report recommends an appropriation of $35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1946 in addition to $132,320,000 made available since 1943.

Thirty-five million dollars is 70 percent of the amount spent during the past fiscal year, although war has terminated except against Japan.

Thirty-five million dollars compares with an annual expenditure for the Associated Press of $12,000,000, with an annual expenditure for the United Press of $10,000,000, and with an appropriation of $2,000,000 under which George Creel operated for the Federal Government in this general field during World War I.

Thirty-five million dollars will permit an expenditure of $12,200,000 in the Pacific, the amount spent there in the past fiscal year. It will permit an expenditure of, say, $200,000 for a small domestic set-up, and leave some $22,600,000 for Europe where war has terminated.

Thirty-five million dollars will permit an expenditure of $16,500,000 in the Pacific, an increase of 33 percent which is now suggested. It will permit the expenditure of, say, $200,000 for a small domestic set-up, and leave some $18,300,000 for expenditure in Europe, or 12 percent in excess of the expenditure in the Far East.

Elmer Davis tells us that he wants to do three things: First, to tell other countries about the war with Japan; second, to help other peoples understand the American soldier who is still abroad; third, to tell other countries what America is and what it wants.

In Germany, he plans to publish several small newspapers, to provide a radio service, to supervise moving picture houses, and to use his own words, to help the Germans to "get religion" by "evangelization."

Having lived in Germany for 4 years in reparation days after World War I, I have no faith whatsoever that Germany can be reeducated in any reasonable

period of time by means of publicity, forcibly fed under the label of government propaganda. On the contrary, I think the attempt can easily prove more harmful than helpful.

The Senate hearings on this bill make it perfectly clear that Mr. Davis recognizes that when the war is over OWI should go out of existence, except for a small portion of its work which he recommends for continuation under the State Department.

We have made available $5,300,000 for the cultural relations work of the State Department. This bill carries $13,000,000 for the work of the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Adding these two figures to the appropriation of $35,000,000 for OWI, gives an over-all total for the dissemination of information for the fiscal year 1946 of $53,300,000.

In my judgment, such an expenditure for this purpose cannot be justified. I regret that the Congress has not seen fit to consider the whole informational problem as one question, taking the necessary steps to liquidate OWI and perhaps OIAA at the earliest possible time, any essential functions being consolidated in one compact economical office to be operated under the direction of either the high command or the Department of State.

Strikes Versus Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strikes Versus Contracts," published in the Cleveland Press of July 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKES VERSUS CONTRACTS

Apparently the holiday brought a local outbreak of the current tide of country-wide labor lawlessness which has featured the Akron rubber strikes.

The hot mill of the Republic Steel Co. in the valley closed Fourth of July eve because of what company and union officials agree is an unauthorized stay-at-home stoppage of work. It has the same characteristic of lawless, rebellious disregard of union agreement which has showed up in Akron.

The men may have moral grounds, as is suggested by William F. Donovan, regional head of the CIO steel workers. We are not judging the grievances. How can they fairly be taken into account as long as procedure for redress of grievances is under accepted contract, which is now broken?

Conceding grievances may constitute moral grounds—although we think it's time that contracts themselves be accepted by union membership as constituting most fundamental moral grounds—Donovan nevertheless orders the men back to work.

Bill Donovan ought to be followed by his union membership, as usually he is. There isn't in this country a leader of more integrity to trade unionism and to the best principles of sound union practices than is Bill Donovan.

What's going on in trade unionism? Why this wave of lawless strikes, this disregard of leadership? Happily, it has bypassed Cleveland for the most part, but now we get a little of it.

Its hard to believe that the Commies, who may be getting obstreperous since their latest "conversion," are getting in any licks in the steel union. Donovan has been the ruggedest enemy of the travelers and fellow travelers—sacrificing his C. I. U. C. presidency over that issue—and his union has been solidly behind him.

But whatever is going on is dangerous and bad. It is bad for the unions and for the public. There is certainly a need for that "something added" in the establishment of an orderly framework, under law, for trade unionism in this country.

If the Burton-Ball-Hatch formula isn't it, and certainly it shouldn't be considered perfect in detail, then what is needed? The public finds it hard to understand why labor refuses absolutely even to discuss the issues presented by the 2B–1H proposal.

The Republic strike will be settled, but the main issue will still be with us. Let's talk it over. That's what the Senators propose.

We urge labor leaders: If you don't want to discuss the 2B–1H proposal, then what have you got? Certainly you can't claim that the present framework of labor legislation is perfect and completely adequate, either to meet your interest or that if the public.

Arguments For and Against Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the American people will face in the very near future a most important and far-reaching decision. The question: Shall we establish compulsory military training? should be answered intelligently rather than sentimentally.

In order that my constituents might have the knowledge contained in the following compilation of arguments on both sides of this important question, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the appended subject matter. I also intend to mail with this subject matter several thousand post card questionnaires on this subject, which I hope will be returned to my office marked in such a manner as to indicate their thoughtful and careful advice on this very important legislative problem.

The compilation follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

FOR

In the 168 years of its existence the United States has had seven major wars, all undertaken with various degrees of unpreparedness. Realism demands that in the future we prepare continuously for whatever emergencies may come.

In spite of any peace terms that may be made and any system of international cooperation that may be established at the end of World War II, compulsory military training is essential to the future security of the United States.

Universal military training is the only dependable way in which the United States can match the military strength of other world powers.

For defense against sudden attack in undeclared wars the United States should have at all times a large reserve force of trained civilians—perhaps a constant reserve of about 10,000,000 men. This would be more economical and more effective than to maintain a large professional military establishment.

Because of technological advances the geographic location of the United States no longer affords sufficient protection to permit adequate preparation for war after it has been declared.

Military preparedness not only affords safety in case of attack but is the best way to prevent attack. Thus, in a nonaggressor nation such as this, it promotes peace.

Universal military training would give the United States greater stature in international affairs; create greater respect for our international policies and proposals.

In the United States universal military training would always be regarded as a defense measure. Committed as we are to the principles of democracy and the right of self-government, our military force—no matter how powerful—would never be used in a war of aggression.

AGAINST

There is no convincing proof that universal military training from the beginning of our national life would have prevented any of the major wars in which we have engaged and the outcome, in each case, has been satisfactory.

Universal military training will be entirely superfluous if suitable peace terms and a workable international organization can be developed. The introduction of universal military training now would be a retreat toward isolationism, would deny our faith in world cooperation and would jeopardize any plan of international collaboration that may be developed.

Military training alone would be no guarantee of security, or victory, if the United States were to come in conflict with a highly industrialized China or Russia with manpower and production in excess of our own.

For defense against sudden attack the United States should have, not an enormous reserve of common soldiers with training only more or less up to date, but a powerful Navy, a large and effective Air Force, and a well-equipped mechanized Army that is highly mobile and has plenty of striking power.

Assuming that the Navy, Air Force, and Regular Army are strong enough to withstand the first shock of a surprise attack, a well-educated citizenry, together with a highly developed industrial and agricultural life, afford the only basic protection that is needed in the United States. Specific military training en masse can be given after the threat of war appears.

Active military preparation stimulates armament rivalries and tends to provoke wars rather than prevent them. That compulsory training does not prevent aggression, witness the German attack on France and Russia, particularly.

Peacetime conscription would cause other nations to regard us with suspicion, particularly our Latin-American neighbors who would resent this obvious threat of interference in their affairs.

A powerful military machine, to military and political leaders, is ever a source of temptation. It could lead, even in the United States, to overaggressiveness in international affairs and perhaps even to imperialistic ambitions.

POSTWAR MILITARY NEEDS

FOR

For several years after this war ends, the responsibility which the United States will

have in policing various regions will require a large military force.

Because of the unrest and uncertainty which are sure to follow World War II, the United States should have a trained reserve ready for any emergency.

AGAINST

Although the size of the military force needed after war ends cannot be accurately determined now, every probable need can be met with those trained under the present Selective Service System.

The seven to ten million veterans and trainees who will return to civilian life at the close of this war will constitute a reserve adequate for any emergency for a period of at least 10 years.

MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS

FOR

Unpreparedness at the outbreak of a war always results in hasty, partial training, which in turn results in a large number of needless casualties.

In order to train a large reserve army the United States would necessarily have at all times, a considerable stock of military equipment and supplies In the absence of such a program, the tendency is to allow these stocks to dwindle.

Universal military training would give our reservists an esprit de corps which is never developed in a hastily-assembled civilian army. If called to combat duty the reservist would be a professional, not an amateur.

Compulsory military training would develop physical fitness, generally, and build the toughness and stamina which are essential to effective military service.

After we are engaged in war there is not sufficient time to give a conscript army the training the men should have in basic military facts and skills.

AGAINST

Training given when needed is up to date, not out of date. Without extensive retraining, a reserve army, too, would be subject to the "casualties of ignorance."

Existence of standard equipment and supplies may be a handicap rather than a help, leading to the use of obsolete materials. Without a large stock pile our armies must be equipped with new materials produced to latest specifications.

Much of the success of our armies in all wars is attributed, by some military authorities, to the fact that they have been composed of civilian rather than professional soldiers—men who were fighting to defend their homes or their ideals rather than disinterested, well-disciplined regulars.

Most of the reservists, if away from training a year or more, would require essentially the same toughening up schedule as if they had never been in service. Military training would do nothing for those rejected because of defects.

Physical fitness, not specific military instruction and drill, has been the outstanding training problem both in the present war and in World War I.

ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

FOR

Preparation after war begins must necessarily result in extravagant outlays for the necessary military equipment and supplies. The step is too great in changing over from peacetime to wartime production.

Manufacture of the equipment and supplies used in the training program would provide employment for thousands of people and thus add a substantial amount to our annual national income.

The boys in training would be off the labor market, out of competition with older men, and the total number of gainfully employed persons would be permanently reduced by narrowing the age range of employment 1 year.

AGAINST

A continuous program of military training at an estimated annual cost of two to four billion dollars would, in the long run, be less economical than periodic preparation which admittedly involves a certain amount of waste. In addition to the actual cash outlay, peacetime conscription would keep about a million men out of productive pursuits at all times.

Production for military purposes is economically unsound, since the output is focused on destruction. Economically, from every point of view, extensive military training represents the choice of guns rather than butter.

Because of the pool of unemployed persons which regularly exists, a system of compulsory military training would have little influence on the labor market except for the first year. About the same number of new workers would be seeking jobs each year, whether at age 18 or age 19.

PERSONAL VALUES

FOR

Through induction procedures health defects would be discovered and, in many cases, would be corrected. Thus the whole level of health would be materially lifted in the United States.

Military training establishes good health habits and teaches personal health care. These are valuable assets in civilian life.

Military training develops acquaintance with outdoor living and independence in taking care of one's self under whatever circumstances arise.

The proposed year of military training would include not only basic military instruction and drill but also, in a large percent of cases, a valuable program of vocational education.

Military training is a valuable experience in citizenship. If universally required, it would increase patriotism and give each trainee a feeling of personal investment in the country's welfare. It would teach the responsibilities as well as the rights of citizenship.

Military training affords valuable lessons in cooperation, efficient teamwork, assumption of personal responsibility, and so on.

In their military training, many boys would find vocational interests and aptitudes and lay the foundation for their peacetime careers.

In military camps, many would be removed from a too-sheltered home life, would overcome homesickness, and gain that degree of personal self-reliance necessary to their own success.

Military training would often bring out qualities of leadership and administrative ability which had not been discovered and developed in civilian life.

The discipline imposed during military service would be a valuable asset to the individual all through life. Everyone needs a wholesome respect for duly constituted authority and the habit of prompt obedience to it.

Military training would afford opportunities for boys to travel about over the United States, becoming acquainted with the different regions, and to experience something of the frontier adventure once available but now virtually gone.

AGAINST

Induction age is too late to check up on health defects. This should be done through an adequate school-health program beginning with the first grade and extending through the entire period of school attendance.

The health improvement claimed for military training could be achieved at lower cost and with better results through adequate school- and public-health programs.

The same degree of self-reliance in outdoor living which military training gives can be acquired in nonmilitary activities, notably in well-planned camps for older children and youth.

Vocational training, the same as education of other types, should be the function of the schools rather than the Army.

Citizenship in a democracy can be taught more effectively in schools and in civilian pursuits than in an army camp. Even a period of national service, if that were deemed advisable, might be required without resort to military training.

Effective teamwork and group loyalty can be developed—are being developed—by schools, camps, and many other nonmilitary agencies.

Compulsory military service would necessarily interrupt either the educational or occupational plans of young men and tend to postpone the time when they could marry and establish homes.

The moral atmosphere of military camps usually is not the most wholesome. Probably the dangers from this quarter are fully as great as that of an excessive amount of "apron-string" control.

Those who would "find themselves" through military training must be balanced against those who, because of the delay, would not go on to college and whose vocational plans would be revised downward.

Enforced obedience, as exacted in military discipline, is not the conduct pattern needed in a democracy. Military life makes a small contribution to self-discipline and to harmony in personal relationships.

Due to improvements in travel facilities we are well on the way toward the elimination of provincialism. Travel is neither an adventure nor a novel experience for a substantial number of American youth.

RELATION TO DEMOCRACY

FOR

Since volunteer military service is never, never adequate when the United States is at war, universal peacetime conscription is a logical national policy. Compulsory military training in peacetime is just as democratic as universal conscription in wartime.

A year of military service would help young men to understand, and to revere, the principles of democratic government. It would help them to understand and appreciate the basic freedoms on which democracy rests.

Lack of preparedness at the onset of war makes it necessary to yield dictatorial powers to the executive branch of Government in times of crisis. Because of the difficulty in recalling these powers, every war emergency is a threat to democracy.

Compulsory military training is democracy in action. In the training camp, rich and poor would live together and engage in common tasks. Boys from city and country, the sons of professional men and unskilled laborers, youth of all nationalities and creeds, would live and work together.

A year of compulsory military service would increase the percent of voting citizens. Through preparing to defend democracy, with their lives if necessary, the trainees would learn the importance of the ballot.

Through military training many competent leaders would develop their powers and afterward use them in the service of their country.

A reservist army would be useful in preserving the peace in case of any internal disturbance or emergency situation arising within the United States.

Those whose formal education ends with high-school graduation or before, need, especially, another year of educative experience and training. Even those who continue in college would profit by a year of military instruction.

AGAINST

The fact that conscription in wartime is the fairest, most democratic way of meeting an emergency, nowise means that peacetime conscription is also democratic. On the contrary, it is an encroachment on personal rights and freedom which millions of immigrants came here to escape.

Conscript armies have beeen the foundation of the totalitarian states. Schooled in the use of force and trained to unquestioning obedience, they have been ready to follow a strong leader. Democracy is not enhanced by training which makes "the voice of the drill sergeant louder than the voice of conviction."

Dictatorial powers must be given to the executive branch of government in wartime, irrespective of degree of preparation. The threat to democracy in peacetime conscription is fully as great as the threat arising from the wartime delegation of any additional discretionary powers to the President of the United States.

Military training, no matter if universal, is undemocratic. The officer caste system accentuates inequalities. Aside from accidental acquaintance little is done to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. Military camp management is autocratic, not democratic.

Trainees would acquire a dangerous respect for, reliance upon, and skill in the use of force. This would soon be reflected in public opinion on international issues. Perhaps, also it would result in greater violence in the case of strikes, more frequent attempts at mob rule, and other resorts to force instead of to the ballot.

Just as some of the most intelligent and aggressive young men from other countries have come to the United States to escape military service, so would military training here tend to drive out some of our best potential leaders.

Reservists, including union members, could be called into service and sent back to their jobs, in uniform, to break strikes. This was done in France.

In a system of universal military training all boys would come under complete Federal jurisdiction just before they reach the present voting age. Yet Federal control of education—which surely could never be so complete—is generally recognized as a hazard to democracy.

THE TIME TO DECIDE

FOR

Universal military training should be introduced now while there are officers and camp facilities to handle such a program.

Unless the issue is settled now, while there is a keen awareness of defense needs, the public is likely to take no action. In peacetime it is hard to dispel the sense of false security which is blind sometimes even to the most essential requirements.

AGAINST

Facilities and training officers will be readily available for a considerable time after the present war ends. This is a secondary rather than a primary consideration.

If military training is a wise national policy, the American people can be trusted to make that decision on the basis of cold facts, without the strong emotions and hysteria of war. Also, those now under arms should participate in any decision of such importance, both to the Nation they are defending and to their own sons.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the subject of the proposed Federal labor relations act, by Paul Mallon, published in the Washington News of June 25, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

(By Paul Mallon)

WASHINGTON, June 25.—A fair-trade practices bill for labor (Richberg) is supposed to lie around Congress until the coming expected wave of union strikes generates an irresistible demand for its adoption—then it, or something like it is passed. This, indeed, is the sotto voce program.

Such delay may sound like a back-end way to handle an expected national crisis, because the bill proposes to avert the strikes by providing machinery for just settlements, not only in the public interest, but in the long-range interest of the unions. Yet you can see what is beginning to happen to the legislation in the probable absence of Alabama's Senator LISTER HILL from the list of sponsors.

This was supposed to be a four-Senator bill, introduced by two Democrats and two Republicans; in fact, the same ones who sponsored the declaration of Senatorial peace principles, BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL. But on this bill, HILL says he was "just too busy" to fill out the B2 H2 leadership, so it became B2 H1. Most people think the real reason is that the CIO was instrumental in HILL'S recent reelection.

The "too busy" treatment is likely to be applied generally to the proposal, because nothing in its announced purposes can very well be openly opposed by the unions, or anyone.

Basically, the bill would require arbitrary unions to moderate their "the public be damned" policy. Disruption of public service such as in the Fifth Avenue bus slowdown in New York recently, where the drivers just decided to run an hour or so late, as well as strikes in public utilities, milk deliveries, etc., would be prevented by judicial compulsory arbitration.

This is in the sound interest of the unions, because all now are suffering from the conspicuous public-be-damned policy of a few unions.

The bill was not written by manufacturers or employers, but by an old union lawyer, Donald Richberg, who composed the most successful labor law ever enacted, the Railway Labor Act. Under it the railway brotherhoods have prospered better than other labor unions, and without strikes.

The Senatorial sponsors are not antilabor people either, but somewhat left-leaning. The way they described their general purposes is this:

They would break up the competitive handling of labor through various Government agencies now, and put all conciliation and mediation activities in a new five-man board.

A second board of three would handle complaints of unfair practices by labor or employer, not just labor alone, as now.

The Wagner Act would be further amended to make unions democratic and to limit the closed shop to places where the union controls at least 75 percent of the workers and is open to all members, and thus is not in itself a closed shop handing employment down from generation to generation in its own ranks, or otherwise limiting workers' rights.

Further logical limitations would cut down the number of captious strikes now expanding in the country.

Labor could stop all the national opposition arising against it in many States where laws or constitutional changes are being advocated or enacted, to protect public interest against the unions, if they would take the mild reasonable purposes of this bill, or alter them to suit the situation. If they would say the word to Senators like HILL, the bill would go through in a minute.

Unfortunately too many labor leaders now are shotsighted reactionaries who want to defend the status quo and prevent any reform of existing unsatisfactory conditions.

So it is quite possible Congress will not only wait until the strike horse runs away but the whole labor barn burns down, before taking up this key to lock the door.

Excessive use of power always kills itself by its own excesses. History is bulging with undeviating examples. Latest one is Hitler, who contrived his won defeat by carrying his power to lengths which caused an overwhelming opposition to be aroused. Statesmen, labor leaders or other humans, seem unable to realize that power lasts only as long as it is wisely used.

Ship Repair Crisis On Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I desire to call the attention of the House to the grave situation in our ship repair yards on the Pacific coast.

At this very moment, when the war against Japan is being stepped up to a new pitch of ferocity, we are short of the essential manpower and facilities to get our fighting ships back into battle in the shortest possible time.

Thousands of workers are needed on the Pacific coast in the vital skills necessary to ship repair. Lack of security in the postwar era ahead, lack of adequate wage rates in navy yards, where workers receive from 8 to 12 cents an hour less for the same work as those employed in private yards, and lack of sufficient housing and other facilities are keeping men from this vital war work.

An article in the July issue of Western Industry, a publication of wide circulation among western businessmen which speaks authoritatively for a great section of Pacific coast industry, focuses attention on this most important war problem. While I do not agree with all the conclusions of the article and with some of its reasoning, I believe it should be read by every Member of the House. It sets forth concisely and well many of the problems facing us in our efforts to get ships repaired and back into battle against the Japanese. The article reads:

DRASTIC ACTION NEEDED TO MEET SHIP REPAIR CRISIS—FUSING OF AUTHORITY FROM ALL WEST COAST MILITARY, NAVAL, AND CIVILIAN AGENCIES CONCERNED UNDER ONE DIRECTING HEAD WOULD PROVIDE ANSWER

A new instrument of power is evidently required to break the log jam in which the west coast ship-repair program is gripped. Preliminary steps employed by the Navy, War Manpower Commission, War Production Board, Maritime Commission, and the Army have not proved successful in meeting the challenge c this national emergency.

Continually the number of ships awaiting repair, both from battle damage and ordinary wear and tear, grows greater. Were it not for

security reasons, one photograph could tell the whole story better than dozens of statements from admirals, generals, Government officials, industrialists, and labor leaders.

Paul McNutt, WMC Chairman, after his visit to the coast in May, reported that he "had been informed that lines of damaged craft are waiting in the harbors of some west coast ports for repairs," a polite way of saying that he just opened his eyes and was dumfounded by what he saw.

Battle damage alone would be a major repair problem. As of early June, more than 48 light naval units and two heavy units had suffered damage on the sea approaches to Okinawa, largely through Japanese aerial action. Military and naval authorities predict that even greater damage must be anticipated as the allied naval forces approach closer to the Japanese homeland.

Above this, however, is the enormous amount of repair, overhaul, and maintenance work that must be done on undamaged warships and the thousands of other vessels carrying troops and supplies in an unbroken stream to the Pacific war area.

The west coast's primary importance in this critical war job is significantly indicated by two examples: (1) the fact that the carrier *Franklin*, which takes as much space in a drydock as six destroyers, was taken to the Atlantic coast for rebuilding because it would have tied up immediately needed facilities for many months, (2) the drawing accompanying this article showing the comparative value to the war effort of ships sailing from Pacific, Gulf, and Atlantic ports.

As the repair problem mounts, it becomes more obvious that no single agency has the power to deal effectively with the problems that now seem to defy solution. Examples of these are low pay in navy yards, more promising job futures elsewhere, feast-or-famine production schedules in private yards, and the necessity of keeping other war programs and essential civilian economy in operation, to say nothing of the lure of reconversion.

An over-all west coast ship repair strategy board is necessary, with power to act of itself and authority to force action from others. Senator MORSE of Oregon recently urged in Congress that all interests on the coast get together and work out the entire problem. A voluntary committee of cooperation, however, cannot gather to itself enough authority to meet the present crisis.

BALANCED REPRESENTATION

To be effective, it is obvious that a supervising board or committee must be endowed with real power, such as President Truman himself could supply. To evaluate the situation accurately and impartially, it should not be dominated by any one agency. Navy, Maritime Commission, War Manpower, War Production, War Labor, Defense Transportation, private management groups, and both A. F. of L. and CIO could well constitute its make-up.

A precedent in that direction was set up by the Area Production Urgency and Area Manpower Priority Committees, which functioned effectively in screening orders and men in the general war effort on the coast. With the European War ended, however, the trend toward resumption of civilian production has introduced new factors that call for a new approach.

More important than the imposing manpower shortage figures (a tabulation of the situation in the San Francisco Bay area is published in connection with this article) is the fact that only skilled men can satisfy the extremely technical requirements of repair work. In the earlier phases of the war, when construction of new ships was the major effort, management overcame the inadequate supply of skilled men by breaking the work down into so many operations that single-skilled men and women could be trained in a short time to do the simple tasks required of them.

Repair work cannot be handled by such methods, because each man has to be ready to meet a variety of tasks and situations. Also, many skills may be involved in a small job; for example, a gun turret may require the services of a machinist, electrician, ordnance man, and instrument man. Today the problem revolves around attracting and holding an adequate supply of electricians, machinists, and sheet-metal workers, who cannot be trained overnight.

CAUSES MUST BE REMOVED

Furthermore, no recruiting program, no matter how ambitious, is likely to fill up the vacancies as long as the other causes of the log jam remain untouched. This already has been demonstrated by the fact that the War Manpower Commission's drastic referral order, by which a man may transfer to ship repair from any other job except merchant marine or railroading, has not yet produced a sufficient number of workers to meet shipbuilding quotas; nor has the Navy's offer to pay the transportation (by private automobile as well as train or bus) and subsistence en route to employees who remain for 6 months.

Country-wide recruiting campaigns are beginning to bring men to the west coast, but the turn-over in the yards is so great as to make it unsafe to count on the rest of the country being able to supply the coast's manpower needs.

Some of the outstanding considerations involved in the problem are as follows:

Manpower: Chairman McNutt, of WMC, estimated the over-all urgent need for the west coast as 15,000 men, while the Twelfth Naval District set the mark for the San Francisco Bay area for 14,007 new workers, based on June repair estimates. In addition to the requirements of private yards, the Navy reported a need for 1,500 machinists at Mare Island, more than 800 at Hunters Point, and a total of 3,008 for all shipyards handling repair work. Other classes of skilled craftsmen listed on the June estimate include sheet-metal workers, Government yards, 490, private yards, 553; electricians, 1,477 and 561; coppersmiths, 111 and 112; other crafts, 4,185 and 699.

Turn-over: In April the Government yard turn-over in the San Francisco Bay area was 25 percent more than in March, and May was expected to be down 10 to 15 percent from April. Admiral M. S. Tisdale, Mare Island commandant, reported the rate of hires there decline 40 percent in the spring in comparison with January and February, while Hunters Point showed a 60-percent decline.

Private yards have had the same difficulty also, the Kaiser and Moore yards losing competent repairmen faster than they could be hired, despite higher wage scales than in the navy yards. The situation may be due to the uncertainty of the employment situation and the desire of men to get established in jobs promising a future. A. T. Wynn, secretary of the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, asserts that the Government's inability to assure skilled men of repair work 2 or 3 months ago resulted in a large number of journeymen leaving the area altogether.

Wages: Pay in private yards in the San Francisco Bay area for Navy, Maritime Commission, or any other class of repair work is $1.34 an hour, while the navy-yard scale is $1.26. Southern California private yards pay 11.6 percent less than $1.34, and the situation has been threatening to result in strikes both in southern California and Puget Sound.

Navy and Maritime Commission officials have informed west-coast Congressmen that only the War Labor Board could abolish the differential, and meanwhile the Shipbuilding Commission, a War Labor Board subsidiary, refused on May 23 to grant the demand of the AFL Metal Trades Council to raise the southern California rate. The Commission refused to find that the Pacific-coast repair agreement applied in this case, the principals in the present case not being represented in the repair agreement.

Labor leaders generally have taken the position that if the high wage can be paid on Navy jobs in private yards, the Navy can establish the same rate in the navy yards themselves.

Working conditions: Navy requirements for skills are criticized by labor leaders as unnecessarily high, making it difficult for any men with lesser experience or skill to qualify, despite the calls of the Navy for manpower. Civil-service status of navy-yard employees bars the unions from the yards entirely, which tends to reduce the interest of the unions in keeping navy yards staffed.

Transportation and housing conditions hinder shipyard employment, because the skilled men needed for the yards can easily find jobs in other industries without undergoing the inconveniences and discomforts of transportation and housing conditions.

Distribution of repair work: Many critics say the Navy should subcontract more of its jobs, in order to reduce the present bottleneck in the navy yards. Navy reluctance to this step apparently is based on a feeling that this would be more expensive, would increase the possibility of unsatisfactory work and subject rush jobs to the danger of being tied up by labor disputes.

It is pointed out that an increasing number of subcontractors are available for the ship-repair program because of the curtailment of other war contracts. Many such firms are between the devil and the deep sea, however, because of inability to get Navy contracts or materials for civilian production. Max Lowe, secretary-manager of the California Metal Trades Association, was quoted in the June issue of Western Industry to the effect that only one-third of the member shops were working at anywhere near full capacity.

One typical case is that of a precision machine shop which has Navy contracts which use about a third of its capacity, he said. It can't take civilian work because the Navy may want the rest of the production capacity. The owner can't get enough work from the Navy to make his shop pay and he can't do anything else.

Influence of civilian production. With the relaxation of material and manpower controls, San Francisco and Los Angeles now being No. 2 labor areas, applications for building permits for stores, bars, and other occupations are increasing. Many men are interested in getting in on the ground floor with organizations who are likely to employ them for years to come, and so have their eyes fixed on all these civilian developments, rather than on repair jobs which will end with termination of the war, if not before. Patriotic appeals alone do not meet this situation, but a strategy board might be able to control the supply of material allotted to these civilian jobs.

As other new war problems on the west coast develop—and who would have predicted last year that ship repair would become a national emergency—a strategy board could be helpful in solving them.

Men with long automotive experience, preferably service or shop managers, were chosen as civilian instructors and the courses are practical in the extreme, with movie films of repair operations, practical demonstrations and participation in the actual work. The final work is complete overhauling and reconditioning on automotive units under actual conditions on automotive units taken from the dead line.

Approximate labor shortages in private ship-repair yards, San Francisco Bay area, week ending May 26, 1945

Facilities with labor shortages for allocated ship repair work on hand	Machinists	Sheet metal	Electricians	Laborers	Pipe fitters	Painters	Carpenters-joiners	Ship fitters	Coppersmiths	All other crafts	Labor shortages
Amship, Alameda	6	15	25	15	0	15	0	0	0	0	76
Bethlehem Steel, Alameda	0	0	0	2	4	4	0	16	10	11	37
Bethlehem Steel, San Francisco	84	44	75	14	110	0	56	50	60	302	795
General Engineering, Alameda	215	146	154	65	102	25	18	76	0	96	897
General Engineering, San Francisco	43	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	81
Hurley, Oakland	5	24	9	14	2	0	0	11	0	32	97
Matson, San Francisco	50	30	18	50	5	0	0	5	2	38	198
Moore, Drydocks, Oakland	140	200	200	140	15	30	40	0	30	40	835
Stockton Ship Works	15	0	15	30	10	10	15	20	0	77	192
United Engineering, Alameda	60	40	40	30	0	15	0	30	20	18	253
United Engineering, San Francisco	25	0	0	0	10	30	30	0	0	30	125
Western Pipe, South San Francisco	40	31	25	89	0	5	0	0	0	40	230
Private yard totals	683	553	561	449	258	134	159	208	112	699	816
Needs for June (all needs include journeymen and helpers):											
Mare Island	1,500	200	950	[1] 1,275	25	0	50	3	38	2,011	6,052
Hunters Point	820	290	524	[1] 250	0	0	0	0	73	2,163	4,120
Treasure Island (industrial division)	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	19
Government yard totals	2,325	490	1,477	[1] 1,525	25	0	50	3	111	4,185	10,191
Gross total (private and Government yards)	3,008	1,043	2,038	----------	283	134	209	211	223	4,884	14,007

[1] Helpers.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles on the proposed Federal Industrial Relations Act, Senate bill 1171, written for the Baltimore Sun by Donald R. Richberg, and published on July 11, 12, and 13.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the articles will make three pages of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and will cost $156 to print.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 11, 1945]

PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ACT

I. NEED FOR NEW LABOR LAW

(By Donald R. Richberg)

All well-informed persons know that there is urgent need for a Federal law to promote peaceful labor relations. They will understand that there is a good reason for every controversial provision in the bill introduced in the Senate on June 20 by Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL, even if they do not agree with a particular proposal.

Our structure of labor law to date has not grown out of any sound and defined public policy. It has been the product of partisan efforts of employer organizations and labor unions, each seeking to gain an advantage in an economic struggle.

The ancient intimate relation of employer and employee has been completely changed by the modern development of machinery, big business, mass production, and distribution. For many decades the power of large employers to regulate the wages and working conditions of the wage earners steadily grew. With a normal surplus of workers, maintained largely by immigration, the helplessness of the individual employee to determine his wages and working conditions became more and more obvious and distressing.

Employer had advantage

Furthermore, the laws protecting individual freedom and rights of property gave the employer an overwhelming advantage in combating efforts of wage earners to organize and to insist upon a voice in determining the wages they should be paid and the hours and conditions under which they should work. The only effective weapon of labor organizations to compel consideration of their interests was the strike.

Public sympathy in this period ran largely in favor of the employees. They could usually demonstrate conditions of overwork and underpay which appealed to the public sense of justice; and the very fact that the Government seemed always to be aiding the employer helped to justify, in common opinion, the frequent uses of violence and intimidation by the workers.

Slowly, but surely, the numbers of organized labor increased and appreciation of their political power grew among labor leaders. More and more successfully they rewarded their political friends with public office and punished their enemies. Meanwhile the sentiment rose in a prospering nation that better wages and working conditions could be afforded by industries which were creating not only many great fortunes but also a very large class of well-to-do people.

Social justice demand grows

The demand for social justice rose out of poverty-stricken areas and up through families of moderate means into circles of well-educated and comfortable people. It became a strong political force when Wilson, the progressive Democrat, was elected President, and Theodore Roosevelt, the progressive Republican, ran second, with the conservative Republican, Taft, running third.

From 1912 to 1929 the political economic power of organized labor grew steadily, and after a limited decline during the great depression increased at a tremendous rate under the favoring auspices of the Roosevelt administrations.

Today organized labor, despite internal division, possesses a composite political power greater than any other economic class in the United States. It is the best organized and financed pressure group operating upon the Congress. But labor leaders and workers generally have not come to realize that this great economic and political power cannot be exercised without accepting the restraints and public responsibilities which must be either voluntarily accepted or ultimately imposed upon all those who possess such great power to advance or to injure the public welfare.

Indeed, labor leaders still commonly assume that they are representing a weaker and oppressed element of society, and therefore are entitled to special aid from Government in combating a more powerful, antagonistic element. It should be conceded that, through the control of property and the ability to hire the best managerial talent and scientific ability, a well-knit organization of capitalists and managers might have a distinct advantage over poorly organized workers.

Small owners of stock

But, in addition to many large fortunes, the investors in American business include an enormous number of small owners of stocks and bonds. The managers of business, including all the would-be or half-way monopolists, are in very active competition to make money out of their enterprises. There is no unity of thought or interest among the owners and managers of business which is at all comparable with the unity of organized labor.

A good example of this difference in unity was given in the public reception of the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill. Three major labor organizations, AFL, CIO, and UMW, although bitter competitors for labor power, promptly issued similar statements denouncing the bill, and Labor, the propaganda organ of railroad labor, printed a typical mess of mudslinging and misrepresentation.

But organizations of employers were notably silent. Their members were too divided in opinion and interest to support any hasty approval or disapproval. The most influential newspapers (which labor leaders always criticize as spokesmen for business) were divided between favorable and unfavorable comment, with a general tendency to advise careful consideration of a program that might be regarded as a step in the right direction.

Regarded as significant

The chorus of opposition, from outstanding labor leaders is, however, deeply significant. Thirty years ago the proposed law would have been hailed by wage earners as a charter of liberty and denounced by many employers as a radical interference with the freedom of business management. Today labor leaders are so blind to increasing abuses of labor power that they have antagonized millions of their natural and old-time friends, and that they can see no good in a law that promises tremendous benefits to all the workers and that would save sensible, well-meaning labor leaders from the curse of needless injuries that vicious and ignorant labor bosses inflict on both organized labor and the general public.

Let it be plain that I have no personal quarrel with Green, Murray, or Lewis, each of whom, according to his lights, is trying to advance the welfare of the workers. I do not accuse them, as they are so ready to accuse others, of unworthy motives. But I say frankly that they are outdated and do not represent the leadership that is needed today and must be in control tomorrow.

The present pretense of peaceful negotiations, backed by arrogant but half-hearted threats of violence, cannot last. The bluff of economic strength in organizations that will not follow their leaders will lose its force. The choice between a rule of force and a rule of reason in labor relations must soon be made. Those who are now trying to ride both horses in opposite directions eventually will fall off.

Labor organizations are now too large and powerful to continue irresponsible and undisciplined. To serve their members in the Nation-wide economic struggles of the coming years, labor leaders must exercise greater authority than ever before. They must also accept greater responsibilities. They must be able to make binding agreements and to make certain that these are carried out.

Green, Murray, Lewis to go

If these leaders of tomorrow undertake to seize and to maintain their authority by force and violence they will be able to tyrannize over the wage earners and the rest of the people only by the control of a disciplined army as large and as brutal as that of Nazi storm troopers. If they undertake to gain and use power by peaceful means they must have for their support a national law that will protect peaceful negotiators and democratic organizations from interference and destruction by enemies who use force and coercion—whether these are employers or rival labor leaders.

The labor leader of tomorrow will not be a Green or a Murray who pledges his followers to a no-strike policy and cannot fulfill his pledge because he has no real authority. He will not be a Lewis who scoffs at legal restraints but believes that he is a law-abiding citizen, a Lewis who does not openly call a strike but who in time of war, actually leads his followers into a strike.

The labor leader of tomorrow may be a super-Green or a super-Murray who wages an economic and political struggle in behalf of labor with all the power behind him of a disciplined, responsible organization which relies, however, on a just cause and on legal rights and orderly methods to maintain and advance its interests. Or the labor leader of tomorrow may be a super-Lewis who openly wages civil warfare that can only end in a labor tyranny or some other dictatorship.

Industrial harmony essential

But a choice is inevitable. This is one of the historic times when a pitched battle between opposing ideas cannot be avoided much longer. Politicians have nearly worn out the device of having the Government license a private warfare under rules of fair play which are not enforced except occasionally for the benefit of one side that has friends in public office.

The Nation cannot grow and prosper as a responsible democracy with an irresponsible industrial leadership divided between belligerent managers and battling labor leaders. The Nation cannot grow and prosper with a majority of its law-abiding people subject to the minority rule of private war-makers supported by a soldiery of labor volunteers and labor conscripts. The Nation will either become a battleground for a fight to the finish between organized labor and the rest of the people, or organized labor will choose a leadership which is able and willing to meet the obligations to the public which have arisen with its rise to power and which must be written and accepted as legal obligations.

The Federal Industrial Relations Act was prepared with full knowledge and understanding of a critical need which I have tried briefly to explain in order that the true purposes and objectives of the act may be understood. The reasons why it offers a practical and just program to preserve industrial peace will be presented in the next article in this series. Also the principal objections raised to the act will be given careful and, I believe, fair consideration.

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 12, 1945]

PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ACT

II—RESTRAINTS ON LABOR

(By Donald R. Richberg)

Those who have demanded laws to stop strikes and to regulate labor unions have usually been seeking aid in a counterattack against labor aggression. That is not the way to promote peace. What is needed is a comprehensive law declaring a national labor policy and providing a program for the peaceful and just settlement of labor controversies.

Such a law should sustain all the present legally protected rights of labor, and, at the same time, safeguard equally well-established rights of management.

Such a law should require both employers and employees to exercise their rights and powers in ways which will not be unfair or oppressive to each other, nor in violation of public rights and injurious to public interests.

Provided in new legislation

That kind of law was the objective of the Senators and the volunteer committee who drafted the proposed Federal Industrial Relations Act introduced on June 20 by Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL. The major part of that act cannot be subject to any reasonable criticism.

The well-tried provisions requiring employers and employees to make every reasonable effort to settle controversies peacefully, and providing for conferences, Government mediation, and voluntary arbitration, are so basically sound and have preserved peace so well for 19 years in the railroad industry that they need no explanation or defense.

Also, the provision for protecting and determining by secret ballot, if necessary, the employees' free choice of representation should not arouse debate.

Finally, provision for the report of an impartial fact-finding commission, when voluntary arbitration of an important dispute has been rejected, is supported by the long successful use of this procedure in the Railway Labor Act, and elsewhere.

Essential requirement

There are, however, four objections to the proposed law which have been raised and are worthy of thorough discussion. A great many minor objections have been raised which may be hotly argued but which can be easily overcome or discredited.

Many of them proceed simply from a partisan desire to pick flaws in the act without making a difficult attack on its fundamental merits. But the four objections present vital issues. I will group them and discuss them as follows:

1. Restraint on freedom to strike (or on the employer's freedom to change conditions arbitrarily).

2. Restraint on freedom to harass employers (or employees).

3. Compulsory settlement of grievances.

4. Compulsory arbitration of public-service agreements.

Objection 1. The proposed law would require both employers and employees not to take any arbitrary, one-sided method to win a controversy until after the peaceful-settlement procedures provided by the law shall have been fully used.

This requirement is absolutely essential to the success of any peace plan. If employees are free to strike, or employers to lock them out or otherwise to change conditions while negotiations or public efforts to settle a controversy are in progress, there can be no assurance of industrial peace.

There is no constitutional freedom to prevent the Government from preserving order and protecting the public from suffering needless injury.

The right to strike, when peace efforts fail, is expressly preserved. The exercise of a right to strike against the Government has never been recognized.

To exactly the same extent employers are also restrained from any action to nullify the law. The right of an individual to quit his job is expressly affirmed, so there can be no "involuntary servitude" imposed on anyone.

Never legally recognized

It is a fact, legally recognized, that men who strike do not want to give up their employment. They continue to be "employees" under the law. They are simply trying to compel their employer to change the conditions of their employment.

Plainly they are not "enslaved" or even injured by a requirement that their employment continue while a reasonable effort is being made to settle the dispute peaceably, without loss of their earnings or injury to innocent consumers who need their products.

The right to strike, the organized use of force has never been legally recognized as an unrestricted right. It is not an unlimited constitutional right. A strike is illegal if for unlawful purposes or if carried on by unlawful means. A strike to stop the machinery of Government is, in plain language, a rebellion.

The real question

The only real question presented is whether the Government should establish a machinery to provide for the just, peaceful settlement of labor disputes, or should remain helpless to protect the public while labor and management fight to a finish like savage tribes battling over a hunting ground.

If we Americans, who are trying to create a machinery to preserve international peace, wish also to end civil warfare in industry, we must create a Government machinery for that purpose.

It would make the law a sad joke if employers or employees were permitted, at their own sweet will and for their own advantage, to stop the machinery of justice and thumb their noses at the Government.

Second objection discussed

Objection 2: The proposed law also amends the Wagner Act by forbidding not only unfair practices by employers against employees but also unfair practices by employees against employers. Every unfair labor practice forbidden by the Wagner Act has been reenacted and others have been added further to protect labor.

But there is a violent outcry from organized labor against amendments that restrain employees from harassing employers with equally unfair practices.

Where is the boasted American spirit of fair play? If it is made unlawful for employers to refuse to bargain collectively with employees, why should it not be made equally unlawful for employees to refuse to bargain with their employers? If it is unlawful for employers to spy upon employees, why should it not be unlawful for employees to spy upon employers? If it is unlawful for an employer to interfere with a labor organization, why should it not be unlawful for employees to interfere with a management organization?

Where the trouble lies

The trouble is that the Wagner Act was written on the assumption that workers were a helpless, oppressed class who needed special protections and privileges to aid them in fighting a powerful class of employers who could protect themselves.

A little while ago this was true. But today the economic and political advantage of organized labor is so great that employers obviously need as much protection against unfair labor practices as labor needs against employer unfairness.

What can possibly be wrong with giving to both sides the same protection against the same unfairness? The laws against fraud and crime apply to all persons alike. They do not punish only the rich and permit the poor to cheat and steal, although, Heaven knows, the poor may have better excuses for wrongdoing.

Just labor laws vital

If we are to establish peaceful labor relations, they must be founded on just labor laws. Those laws should protect the rights and interests of labor.

But if they do not at the same time give reciprocal protection to the rights and interests of management, they will not bring industrial peace. The worker or the manager who can obtain justice under the law should be law-abiding; and public opinion will not support him in disregard for the law.

But if the law is unfair and partisan, the victim of political injustice will not respect the law, and public opinion will give quiet support to evasions of the law.

The way to industrial peace is through a law that will provide peaceful means of settling labor controversies through the willing cooperation of uncoerced representatives of labor and management, working under rules that are written to insure fair play and even-handed justice.

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 13, 1945]

PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ACT

III—COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

(By Donald R. Richberg)

Before taking up the thorny subject of compulsory arbitration, let me briefly refer to the provision of the proposed law which legalizes a closed shop under certain conditions. These are: (1) A contract made by an organization containing 75 percent of the employees covered; (2) a contract approved on secret ballot by 60 percent of employees covered; (3) union membership open to all employees or applicants for work on the same terms as to existing members; (4) expulsion from the union only after a fair trial.

To those who object because they would outlaw the closed shop, it should be pointed out, first, that many unions and some employers want a closed shop and there are a great many such contracts in effect today. It would be a questionable policy to forbid by law the making of contracts which so many of the parties desire to make. Second, the requirement that only an open union can maintain a closed shop answers largely the valid objection to approving any monopoly of employment. Third, the requirement of 75 percent membership and 60 percent approval should prevent any minority from imposing such a contract on a majority of unwilling employees.

Loudest in objecting

To those who want a closed shop but object to these restrictions it should be stated that the idea of a closed shop is so contrary to American principles of liberty and to the labor demand for freedom of association and no coercion of workers that the advocates of a closed shop should welcome requirements which may make a closed shop tolerable and postpone, perhaps indefinitely, the day when there will be an irresistible demand to have the closed shop made unlawful.

Finally, it is amusing to note that closed-shop advocates are entirely willing and anxious to impose compulsory arbitration on all minorities among the workers. But they are the loudest in objecting to the imposition of anything like compulsory arbitration by a majority of the people on a minority who happen to be workers.

Two phases of criticism

Objection 3: There are two phases of the criticism of the FIRA as a compulsory arbitration act. One criticism, listed heretofore as the third major objection to the act, is directed to the provision that grievance disputes shall be settled by the binding decision of an adjustment board created either by the parties or by the new Federal Labor Relations Board.

If it is understood that grievance disputes are defined by law as those arising out of the making or application of a contract (or concerning discipline, which should be covered in a contract), it will become plain that this provision is no more compulsory arbitration than the existing law under which a worker can sue his employer and enforce a labor contract in the courts.

Enforceable in courts

It is, however, costly and usually impractical for an employee to sue an employer to collect a small wage claim, or prevent a denial of seniority, or redress an unfair discipline. All such rights of employees should be covered by the labor agreement, and in hundreds of cases such agreements now provide for settling grievances by appeal to an adjustment board, which is composed normally of equal representatives of employer and employees and an impartial referee.

The decisions of such adjustment boards are made enforceable in the courts. Thousands of such cases have been thus decided under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

There is no more reason for not requiring employers and employees to submit their disputed claims under a labor contract to a final impartial decision than there would be for arguing that a landlord should not be allowed to sue for rent, or a merchant for the price of goods sold, or a worker for wages due. Under State and Federal law, hundreds of courts are open to everyone who has a claim against someone else under a contract or because of an injury done him; and the complainant can force his opponent to come into court and be bound by the decision made.

No foundation in law

No one ever thought of denouncing this as compulsory arbitration. It is only a labor leader, accustomed to regard himself as the spokesman of a specially privileged class, that has the audacity to claim that the Government cannot require employees and employers to accept the decision of a public tribunal setting all contract and damage claims of employees against their employer.

The objection to this requirement has no foundation in law or common sense. It simply exhibits an ignorance of law and our institutions for the administration of justice. The act merely provides a simplified plan for handling a mass of petty cases through an administrative tribunal, which the parties themselves can establish or which the Government will provide. These administrative rulings can then be enforced, if necessary, by the regular courts.

Issue worthy of debate

Objection 4. The provision for an enforceable award by a fact-finding commission in a few cases of great public importance does raise a serious issue worthy of extended debate. But let it be understood how rarely this provision will be used and how necessary it is to find a peaceful way to protect the public interest in these rare cases.

When a controversy between employees and employers is not settled by negotiation or mediation or voluntary arbitration, how should it be settled?

If serious public injury will not result from a stoppage of production while the quarreling parties try to starve each other into a settlement, the Government may confine its action simply to maintaining order. The workers will lose their earnings and the investors will lose their income. So long as other competing enterprises can serve the public the fighting employees and employers will only be injuring each other, and the Government can let the fighters continue the struggle until they have exhausted themselves and end the self-destructive warfare.

Must fulfill responsibility

But there are some struggles between labor and management which bring immediate and intolerable destruction of public interests, which both parties know the public will not long endure.

A plain example is a dispute which brings a stoppage of a public service which is vital to the community existence. No city can tolerate the cessation of electric light and power service or the deprivation of an essential food such as milk. No government can permit its citizens to suffer for lack of light or heat or food just because the producers and distributors cannot agree upon the division of rewards for their cooperative public service.

The Government must act to compel one or both parties to fulfill the responsibility they have assumed to supply a public necessity. The Government must either seize the enterprise and operate it or use force to make one contestant yield to the other. Government cannot remain impotent to protect the people from suffering, disease, and death that will come from deprivation of the necessities of life.

Impartial arbitration

Such a conflict must be ended by compulsion, by using the organized force of Government to combat the organized force of any private interest. The decision to use force somewhere and somehow must be made by public officials.

The proposed law provides an orderly judicial procedure to reach that decision instead of leaving it to the hurried, and probably emotional, judgment of executive officials not chosen or not usually equipped to make a just decision. It may be the mayor of a city, the Governor of a State, or the President of the United States who will be suddenly required to call upon the police, the State militia, or the Army to end an intolerable war upon the public.

In such circumstances the proposed law provides for a peaceful and impartial arbitration of the controversy with a decision which the contestants are required to accept for a trial period of a year.

A modern civil trial

What more could any fighting labor organization or employer ask for?

What else would insure justice to all parties and protection to the public interest?

How can such an irreconcilable conflict be decided except by compulsion?

Is not the compulsion of a judicial decision to be preferred to the compulsion of the armed forces of the Government or of privately organized force?

There is no solution in a contest of force except compulsory arbitration. In a choice between compulsory arbitration through the use of brutal force by organized labor or organized money, and compulsory arbitration by an impartial Government tribunal, is there any question as to which is the civilized and just method?

The Federal Industrial Relations Act proposes to substitute for a medieval trial by combat a modern civil trial in which con-

testants, after a full opportunity to plead their case, submit it to the impartial judgment of a jury of their fellow citizens.

Can anyone suggest a better, fairer way to establish and maintain justice and equal protection of the law?

The Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times of June 1, 1945, entitled "The Presidential Succession":

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The problem of Presidential succession was brought to public attention recently by James A. Farley, former Postmaster General. Pointing that the existing law, under which the Secretary of State would become President if a vacancy occurred before January 1949, Mr. Farley suggests that a rule which, in effect, gives a President the right to name his successor, is an undemocratic one. He proposes appointment of a special commission, to include members of the Supreme Court, congressional leaders, and others to work out a different rule which could be embodied in a constitutional amendment, if necessary.

Seven times in our country's history Presidents have died in office. In each instance the Vice President who was thus elevated to the Presidency lived out his term, so that it has never been necessary to apply the rule of Presidential succession. The first Vice President to succeed to the office on the death of a President came uncomfortably close to leaving the office vacant. John Tyler was on board a naval vessel when an explosion killed two members of his Cabinet and seriously endangered the President himself.

The existing law, under the Secretary of State would become President in the event of the deaths of both the President and Vice President, was enacted about 60 years ago, after Garfield's assassination. Previously, though there was no law covering the matter, it had been assumed that the President pro tempore of the Senate, who must take over the Vice President's duties, would succeed to the Presidency. Thus if President Andrew Johnson had been removed by impeachment, Senator Ben Wade of Massachusetts would have become President. He would have been about as much of an ornament to the office as the incumbent President pro tempore of the Senate, MCKELLAR, of Tennessee.

When the law of succession was enacted, some Members of Congress wanted the Senate's President pro tempore, not the Secretary of State, to be the third man in line. Somebody wrecked that effort by reading a list of the Senate's President pro tempore, which included several negligible figures, and then reading a list of the Secretaries of State.

The existing rule is subject to the objection which Farley has raised, that it places a henchman of the President directly in line. Perhaps if the commission proposed by Farley is created, a wiser measure will result. One that would allow Congress to make the selection would meet with general approval.

The fact that the Vice Presidency has been vacant 15 times gives force to the Farley idea. Seven Vice Presidents were elevated to the Presidency, seven died in office, and one, Calhoun, resigned.

Credits to Russia and Soviet Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much discussion of late of the subject of postwar loans and their probable effect upon American economy that I am quite sure that an article which Mr. Robert P. Vanderpool recently wrote for the Chicago Herald-American will arouse the interest of the membership of this body and of the American people.

In accordance with the unanimous consent of the membership I am handing a copy of this article which its able author has entitled "Credits to Russia and Soviet Trade" to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The article to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

CREDITS TO RUSSIA AND SOVIET TRADE

(By Robert P. Vanderpool)

We are among those who believe that it is highly essential that the United States and Russia be friends rather than enemies and that trade between these two great countries be encouraged through every means possible. It is to be hoped that neither country will interfere with the internal affairs of the other.

It is quite in accordance with these views that we are strongly against the United States granting huge credits to the Soviets such as has been suggested.

Long-term Government credits of $6,000,000,000 to $12,000,000,000 have been mentioned in addition to short-term commercial credits, which would be guaranteed by our Government if some people had their way.

If we should grant Russia a credit of $6,000,000,000 at 4 percent—a lower rate than most Americans can secure from their banks on good collateral—the interest cost alone would be $240,000,000 a year.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY MILLION SOVIET GOODS

In other words, for Russia to get her international exchange in balance with that of the United States, it would be necessary for this country to purchase $240,000,000 of Russian products each year. This would not allow for any reduction in debt and would be over and above the goods that Russia would have to send to balance merchandise exports from this country to the Soviets.

We have been looking forward to a good market for our products in the vast Soviet Empire. If we could sell the Russians $110,000,000 worth of goods annually, it is believed that it would go far toward keeping up employment in this country and maintaining our factory output.

INCREASE OF 1,300 PERCENT

But in such case Russia would have to sell to the United States $350,000,000 of goods in a year merely to balance accounts, say nothing of paying a bit back on our loans.

In the prewar years of 1936 to 1938 imports from the Soviets averaged about $25,000,000 a year.

It is fantastic to believe that these could be expanded in the foreseeable future to $350,000,000. They would have to be increased 14 fold, or 1,300 percent.

Does anyone believe that this could be done? If it cannot, we are just making for trouble by talking about credits of this size.

INFLATION OR DEFLATION

There has been some complaint that the so-called Government planners don't know whether we are going to have inflation or deflation and consequently are figuring either way.

Well, does anyone else know? Has man ever been given the privilege of looking with certainty into the future? Does the businessman who has to do considerable planning of his own know?

Personally we are confident that for the next few years (maybe 3 to 5) the problems facing this country will be mainly in connection with inflation, and that there will then follow problems of deflation. Nevertheless, it is clear that there are so many uncertainties and imponderables that being too certain would be a sign of foolishness.

Meanwhile, we should regard it as a healthy sign rather than an admission of confusion for Government agencies as well as for business to have plans prepared for both contingencies.

Conditions in Liberated Nations of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by a youth in Germany with one of the most extraordinary descriptions I have seen in the way in which the people of Europe have been enslaved and broken and of the way in which our own imprisoned men reacted on their liberation.

FRANCE, *April 20, 1945.*

DEAR FOLKS: * * * I won't bother to apologize for what might appear to one across the ocean to be laxity in correspondence, but will trust that you realize that any lapse between my letters is occasioned by a great multitude of potential alibis—bombs, bullets, streams, flat tires, yellow jaundice, and the "master race." * * *

The United States of America certainly could stand a good dose of "war horror," properly administered, less to the end of glorifying individuals and ideals than to the end of debasing and condemning the societies and ignorances which allow such a method of settling differences.

I have seen many thousands of people, aside from the men in uniform, whom the war has completely ruined. I speak here of the enslaved peoples. They are still alive in a zoological sense, but their morale, ideals, hopes, and bodies are irretrievably broken. I am convinced that future wars—if we foolishly persist in such bitter luxury—will wreak this havoc on a world-wide scale, just as this one has on a somewhat smaller scale. The actual number of soldiers killed and maimed—in itself a horrendous picture—does not compare with the cruel, cunning barbarism of destroying a nation. The people I have in mind are the enslaved Poles. Not all of them fared so badly, but many are nothing more than witless, soulless, willless zombies. Every reason for living has been removed from their lives; they continue to live merely because they do not have the

will to take their own lives. Such people are worthless to their nation and heavy, heavy burdens to themselves. In 1939 there was a newspaper story about a serum used by the Nazis to destroy will power. It is very true. The serum is not injected with a needle, but with a whip, with cold weather, bad food, arbitrary cruelty, and with misinformation. Small wonder that these slaves would come to believe what year after year they are told, what every day they see proven. Namely, that the Germans are master—all others, slaves.

For many thousands of them, Allied liberation has given that the lie. But after a brief moment of intense, hilarious joy at being free, the slaves are personally, mentally no better off than they were formerly. They are free—free to what? Hunger and fear have lost their pain; the people are still poor, cold, homeless. Freedom, for them, is merely a mental attitude which they don't comprehend and don't know how to use. Of course, that does not mark the end of the world; there will be children who will learn, and grow and build. At most we have lost two generations. That may be the world builder's view. But the great crime of war cannot easily be seen from that perspective. It's pretty small potatoes to a man who has watched his wife and children tortured and killed to tell him that there will be other children. And from a multitude of these personal crimes and atrocities there arises a crime against a nation—in short, the murder of Poland The murder isn't an everlasting one, but again will never wholly be repaired. And just such a thing could be done to the world—and will be if we don't wake up and live as a world instead of as a bunch of self-centered, self-bounded, "so-and-so first" countries.

The most wildly happy day I have had over here was when we liberated a couple PW camps containing about 20,000 Americans, English, and French. Never in my life have I heard anything like the cheer that went up from those men. It was a roar of unspeakable relief and joy, defiance of the Nazi. It was like the voice of a thousand cannons; there were no words distinguishable. First, as my first vehicles came into view of the camp, there was a low, excited, almost whispered rustle of thousands of tongues. As the column drove on into the camp this sound rose and swelled and spread, louder and louder, until with a mighty, surging, deafening crescendo the entire valley echoed and trembled with the voice of the prisoners. Before the shoulders of hundreds of hilarious men, the gates and walls that had held them for years crashed to the ground, and 20,000 laughing, shouting, weeping soldiers swept into the road, swarmed over the vehicles, talking, crying, singing, shaking hands—the happiest men I have ever seen. They hugged us, pulled us from the vehicles, pounded our backs, waved flags in our faces—flags they had smuggled in and kept hidden for 5 years, English, French, American, Canadian flags, flags with the colors faded almost to extinction, flags worn thin with handling, but flags those men dearly loved. As we pushed on in pursuit of Jerry, our ears buzzing with the roar, our hands crushed, and salty tears on our faces, we could hear the glorious pandemonium raging behind us. How much of it we could still hear, and how much was a delicious memory we couldn't shut out—I don't know; but all that day and clear through the next fight, I swear, we could hear that roar of freed men pounding and throbbing in our ears as loud and fierce as ever. That's a day I'll never forget, nor will those men. I only wish that you people in the States, the war-workers especially, could have seen it or have some conception of it. Even at a football game, you don't get it; not everyone shouts, and the sympathies are divided. But here every man of 20,000 was making his maximum amount of noise, everyone agreed on one thing—They were free. I know of nothing with which to compare such an experience. Maybe some day I can tell you about it and make you see it. Along with going home, that represents the only memorable joy of this whole infernal mess.

* * * * *

So long you birds; take care of yourselves and write again soon.

Love,

JACK.

New Dealocracy a Snare and a Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, when the pangs of depression began to be felt the world around, the peoples of almost every land turned in desperation to fresh leadership. Political panacea, demagogic declarations and nostrums of all types were offered by the political medicine-men to their fellow citizens. History reveals that people are most gullible and vulnerable when they are most distressed; and tyrants, dictators, demagogues, and unprincipled leaders prey upon the misfortunes of their distressed citizens. They offer remedies which are guaranteed to cure, but which are only experimental specifics. When a man is dying, he will take almost anything that is offered as a cure. So it is with a sick public. Unscrupulous and unheralded self-styled leaders take unfair advantage of this well-known principle of psychology.

Civilization has been almost wrecked by the mad leadership of men who have recently preyed upon the distress and credulity of their peoples. In this country, the same practice has almost wrecked our system of constitutional representative government, free enterprise, and the independence of the individual.

The New Dealocrats, the brain-trusters, and their theoretical satellites pretended to sympathize with us, and told us they would cure our civil and political ills with a newly discovered medicine. They inspired class prejudice and condemned the practices that were becoming rampant in other countries under false leaders. Our pretended saviors styled themselves New Dealers. They might well be termed "New Dealocrats," and their philosophy New Dealocracy. As compared with some of the foreign countries, the New Dealocrats gave us experimental and emergency remedies in broken doses. Little by little they have sought to deprive us of our liberties, until today they have circumscribed our almost every activity in life. The methods used may have been a little slower, but the poison is just as deadly to the freedom of our people.

The methods employed and the relief promised are not in any sense new. History is replete with the accounts of tyrants and dictators who decried and condemned the faults of others, while actually guilty of insidious methods of perpetrating the same depredations against their own people. The condemnation of others is used as a smoke-screen to hide their own iniquities. DeBourriene, a Frenchman, for 10 years a private secretary of Napoleon the First, gives this word picture of a deceiver's mind when he said of Napoleon:

> Each time that Napoleon planned to wreck another segment of the French Republic he first disarmed criticism by lauding liberty and praising the democratic system, so that his deluded followers cheered him as the champion hero of liberal ideals. * * * Thus Napoleon, step by step, relieved French democracy of its powers so that he could, and eventually did, dissolve legislatures and courts and emerged the most dangerous despot of his time.

One of the first evidences of the desires of the New Deal Party and those who later were to become the bureaucrats, was the enactment by the New Deal Congress in 1933 of the National Recovery Act, commonly known as the NRA. It was referred to by the President and those in authority as a code of fair competition. It has been said that it was patterned largely after and perhaps copied to some extent from a communistic law in Russia. All who did not submit to its rules and regulations were to be boycotted, or fined, or imprisoned. These un-American policies are to be found in most of the subsequent New Deal legislation, and methods similar to the Nazi Gestapo have been employed to enforce harshly the directives of the bureaucrats.

The symbol of the NRA was required to be displayed in all business houses and on all articles of merchandise. The administration chose the blue eagle for such symbol. There never lived a blue eagle. It was an imaginary bird. Some have said it resembled the Russian hawk. Others have likened it to the thunderbird of Indian legend, which was a sign of death. In those days we were frequently reminded by the President that things were planned that way. The blue eagle meant certain death to all small business concerns attempting to operate under its codes. The NRA codes were written, as the administrator thereof himself said, by the leaders in the respective industries.

No one would assume that the leaders in an industry would write a code for the benefit of their smaller and independent competitors. These codes spelled certain death and destruction to small businessmen who had no voice whatever in the writing or enforcement of the codes. Thank God, we had a Supreme Court in those days which held the NRA unconstitutional, which means in plain English, that the letter and spirit of the law were un-American.

One bureau after another was created, and almost all of them were given the power to write rules and regulations with the effect of law, to enable the bureaus to take over the functions of the Congress as representatives of the people, and to take the liberties of the people away from them, one by one. The ultimate result apparently was calculated to become a form of regimentation and dictatorship. Mr. Roosevelt himself, in

those early days of his regime, said that such power placed in the Executive might prove dangerous to our freedom. It certainly has worked out that way.

The New Dealocrats loudly proclaimed that they were the friends of liberty and freedom, but at the same time they fostered measures calculated to destroy our American way of life. The tendency has been slowly but surely to close the doors of opportunity to the youth of this land, and to oncoming generations.

By indulging in flattery of the people under pretense of friendship for them, and with proffered assistance, and by "must" orders to Congress, or otherwise, there was evolved a multiplicity of bureaus, boards, and commissions. Bureaucrats and dictators do not take the people into their confidence. A sinister method is used by which the people are lead to believe that the administration is their friend, and that some element of society is their enemy, and that they need the protection of the administration.

Finally, the people are so hedged about, as they now are in this country, by all manner of regulations and directives, that they can scarcely pursue any form of work without being told by one or more bureaucrats, for whom they can work, or for whom they must work, how much and how little they are to be paid, and how much or how little they may pay others, the minimum wage that prevails, the hours that must be observed, and so forth. With the OPA controlling the prices on nearly eight million items of food, clothing, and other commodities, it is almost literally true that our daily diet is determined for us by the Washington bureaucrats. We have been told so often that it is necessary to control prices in order to prevent inflation that the people have been inclined to submit to an oppressiveness heretofore unheard of in this country.

Under the guise of preventing inflation, the prices of edibles are held to certain levels—which levels are constantly rising—and at the same time the producer, the processor, and frequently the wholesaler and retailer, are paid subsidies out of the Treasury of the United States, or in other words, out of the taxpayers' pockets. Thus is the public flattered to think it is being favored on the one hand, while it is being robbed on the other. All have been misled.

Do not be deceived. The costs of food and other necessities must include subsidies and interest. All subsidies are being paid by the Government out of borrowed money. These subsidies and the interest on the borrowed money with which they are paid, come out of the wage earner's envelope, the salaried man's check, and from every other person who pays taxes to the Federal Government. Those subsidies on food and other necessities, constitute a scheme by which the OPA is attempting to receive unmerited credit for holding prices down, while actually injuring everybody and building Federal taxes higher and higher toward national bankruptcy. It is only a half-truth to say that prices are being held, and failing to say that all of us are paying indirectly, and to some extent unconsciously, the subsidies to the producers, the processors, and the distributors in addition to the prices we pay over the counter for the merchandise. This is sheer deception, and a fraud upon the public. The administration seems unequivocably committed to the principle of subsidies. The payment of subsidies was resorted to as a subterfuge for the purpose of foisting upon the American people a system of planned economy. If this practice is continued, it will wreck our American system of business and free enterprise, and will bankrupt our National Government. It has proven a failure everywhere it has been tried by other peoples.

We were told that the bureaus were estabished to win the war against the depression. Then some excuse had to be devised to continue bureaucracy and make it more severe and complicated. The war came along, and further emergencies existed, and the further excuse was offered that these same bureaus must be continued, and many others must be established. We were assured that they should last only for the duration. Now that the European war is over and there is little or no excuse for the continued existence of this tyranny, we find the bureaucrats trying to justify their continuance, or the integration of one bureau into another, or the giving of a new name to the same set of folks, or some other subterfuge being employed to increase Uncle Sam's pay-roll family, and heap a further burden upon the taxpayers.

An example has recently come within my personal observation. It was the general impression, and I think that it had been promised to the public, that the War Production Board was only a war-emergency organization, and that its existence would terminate with the cessation of hostilities. Now we find branch offices of the War Production Board being set up all over the country in places where they never existed even during the most pressing days of the war. They are employing new and additional help in these new offices, and transferring help from some of the other bureaus which they fear have less likelihood of continued existence. Some of the help are being transferred by the bureaus in Washington to these new positions with the prophesy and moral assurance that such employment may last for 5 years. This is not an isolated case, but a frequent occurrence in and out of Washington. To make the situation more odious, certain transfers are even being made from various branches of the military service here in Washington to these new offices of the war emergency agencies and bureaus, extension of whose longevity is now being advocated by the New Dealocrats.

Just as the NRA was destined to destroy the small and independent business concerns of this country, so the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, and others are being used, if they were not originally so designed, to put out of business, wreck, and destroy all of the small business concerns which have been able to survive bureaucratic control up to this time.

An estimable gentleman who has been in the drygoods business in a small city of my district for some 40 years has written me of the effect of War Production Board Regulation M–388 relating to piece goods. He states that this regulation was undoubtedly designed to favor the manufacturers of ready-to-wear garments "under the guise of cheaper ready-to-wear" garments for the people. But the facts are, he states:

> It gives them all the material which should go to those who want to make their own dresses, at a saving of two or three hundred percent. It is a racket of the most vicious kind.

This same experienced and successful merchant further says:

> Please try and help repeal this regulation so that the merchants throughout the country might continue in business and the public will not have to pay 10 or 12 dollars for a print dress which they could make for 2 or 3 dollars if they could buy the cloth.

Another merchant in another city in my district narrates a situation which reflects the unreasonableness of some of the OPA regulations. This merchant refers to retail sales by regulations MPR–580 and RMPR–330. He cites a situation in his own store where he had certain clothing items which proved to be a bad buy and which he had to mark down and sell at cost or less in order to get rid of the merchandise. A Government investigator who recently called on this merchant held that dresses which cost the merchant $10 today must be sold under a ceiling price of $8.75 "because during the base period in 1941 we happened to have bought some dresses at $10 and at that time sold out the majority or greater number at or below the cost price, and therefore we now have a fixed ceiling price at such close-out or marked-down price."

This same merchant points out that the foolishness of such a regulation and its literal interpretation and enforcement was recognized with reference to men's clothing, but has never been recognized as to women's clothing.

This same merchant had another dress which cost him $18.75 wholesale which he put on sale during the base period of 1941 for $18.75, with an additional inducement that for every one bought at that price the purchaser might have an additional dress for $1.

> Now, the local investigator has advised that since the dresses were sold as low as $1 if the greater number of the dresses for that price were sold on that basis, then dresses of that price line now have a present ceiling price of $1 * * * In fact, taking a basis of selling a dress that cost $18.75 for $18.75 on the condition that the purchaser may buy an additional dress for $1, which makes the two dresses cost $19.75 to the purchaser, so that actually the purchaser is now getting the two dresses at $9.87 each, which, of course, is a mark-down below cost. This also does not make horse sense, nor is it within the bounds of reason to penalize a merchant whereby he should be bound to sell an article that cost $18.75 for either $1 or one-half of the $19.75.

In another town in Oklahoma, a merchant has written me, as follows:

> I have never written a Congressman before. In my travels around the country the past few years it has been my observation that little fellows like myself are afraid to

raise their voice for fear of reprisal. I would not even write this letter if I were not confident that you will keep it solely as a matter of information in confidence.

This merchant says that the newspapers have carried articles recently in which the OPA Administrator is alleged to have said that the 1942 price levels will be substantially the postwar ceiling prices for merchandise which necessarily will be produced with high-cost labor. He cites examples showing how unbelievable are such statements. My friend says that in 1942 he sold 1-gallon thermos jugs at $1.19 and $1.98, and 2-gallon thermos jugs for $3.98. He has just received a circular showing 2-gallon thermos jugs on which the postwar ceiling price is to be $7.40. He sold double-burner electric hotplates in 1942 at $3.59, and says that a proposed postwar burner of this same type, on which he has just received a circular, has a ceiling price of $22.90 upon it. He further says, "I could go on and give examples like this for pages."

It does not seem to make much difference whether it is the OPA, the WPB, or which New Deal bureau one approaches. The almost certain reply is that the overall picture demands thus and so, and that the regulations have been promulgated to protect those most vitally interested. When you pin these bureaucrats down, they admit that it is the producer, or the big concern, which has been favored. They say these are the ones most vitally interested. Only the big concerns can keep records, fill out questionnaires and approximate the requirements of the multitudinous regulations being turned out of the grist mills daily by these New Deal bureaus. The people are hungry for meat today primarily because of the bungling of the WFA, the OPA and others of their kind responsible for having messed up the production and transportation of meats. The same is true with reference to sugar, fats and many other necessities of life. The small independent packers have been almost completely put out of business. The small merchants are rapidly closing their doors because they cannot comply with all the regulations and, with shortage of help and labor, they do not even have time to read all the fine print that is published by those who, as a rule, never successfully operated a business for themselves, but think nevertheless that they can tell experienced businessmen how to conduct their businesses.

Recently I addressed this House showing the discrimination of the War Committee on Conventions which, over the signature of its secretary, informed me that between the producers of merchandise and the retailers of the same, they considered that the producers were more "vitally interested in this present restriction" (referring to the Dallas Market where our local merchants could more economically buy merchandise than make trips to centers of production in New York and the New England States) "than our local retailers." This same authority said that it is preferable under present conditions to leave it to the producer to apportion available products to the retailers than to let the retailers, who really represent the buying public, have a voice in the selection of the merchandise which you and I want.

This New Deal bureau representative continues: "In addition, the present question with reference to merchandise is not so much the purchaser's choice from a style or quality angle, because he will accept and dispose of, any merchandise that is available from his supplier."

In other words, let the public go hang, and take care of the producers. The author of this letter had the hardihood to request me not to give this information to the merchants of my district. Do you think your liberties are not endangered? Is it not time to call the bluff of the New Dealocrats? New Dealocracy is a snare and a delusion.

In connection with conventions and assemblies of the people, I wish to call attention to the fact that our people are not allowed to hold county fairs this year where exhibits are permitted from outside the county. Many other assemblies of a more serious nature are prohibited, such as essential groups for the purpose of furthering the war effort, discussion of peacetime problems in agriculture, industry, reemployment, public health, religion, veterans' assistance, education, and community problems. It is a serious thing when the American people are denied the right and freedom of assemblage for patriotic and religious purposes. Recently restrictions on horse racing were withdrawn and the ban lifted. If the situation were not so serious, it would be ludicrous. But it goes to the heart of our freedom and the continuation of our liberty.

I am aware that those who criticize the New Deal administration have been labeled as reactionaries and conservatives. We are told we are living in a changing world; that our Constitution and principles of Government are outmoded, that they belong to the horse-and-buggy days, and many more such statements calculated to influence the unthinking elements of our population. Let me say that principles are immutable. Character is permanent. The laws which have stood the tests of time, the principles that have endured throughout the history of the world, have never changed, and their righteousness will never change. The New Deal is not a new deal. It is an old form of deception practiced by Napoleon and other theorists and dictators of old and of modern Europe. It is merely a device to obtain the confidence of the people and to steal from them their liberties and freedoms. That is what has happened abroad, and it is what can happen here unless we are vigilant and throw off the yoke of oppressive bureaucracy foisted upon the American people by the New Dealocrats.

The letters to which I have referred above have been received by me within the past few weeks. Many others, with equally pertinent illustrations and examples of the disastrous effects of New Dealocracy, could be cited. This situation is a live and burning issue at this very hour. It should bestir within us all the resentment of our souls, and make us determine to insist upon our officials becoming our public servants, and not our dictators. This country may not have been taken over by the Communists nor the Nazis, nor by the Japs nor any other foreign power; but the influence of such foreignisms has been so deeply implanted into the body politic and into the thinking of our people during the past 12 years, that we are now in serious danger of becoming totalitarian. Totalitarianism, in whatever form manifested and by whatever name known, is based upon the conception that the individual is for the State. The American ideal, stemming as it does from the teachings of the lowly Nazarene, is based upon the theory that the State is for the individual—for the protection of his life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Any policy that does not withstand that test is un-American, and belongs to some outmoded and materialistic conception of government.

General Chennault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of July 16, 1945:

GENERAL CHENNAULT

The circumstances surrounding Major General Chennault's decision to resign as commander of the Fourteenth Air Force, return home, and retire from the Army strongly suggest disappointment and disagreement on his part over the recent reorganization making Lieutenant General Stratemeyer chief of all United States air forces in China—a move seen by some observers as reducing the Fourteenth to little more than a wing command.

Judgment on the wisdom of this change, as well as upon the charge that "military politics" dictated it and that it may adversely affect our relations with Chungking, must be reserved until more facts are made available to clarify the situation. As for General Chennault, himself, however, no reservations are necessary. Ever since he went to China 8 years ago to help Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek organize an air force, his record has been that of one of the outstanding commanders of the war, and both the American and Chinese people—particularly the latter—have long held him in the highest personal esteem, placing the fullest confidence in his work.

If a single phrase could summarize that work, it might be this: "Doing a great deal with woefully little." In 1937, as a retired Army officer serving as adviser to Generalissimo Chiang, Chennault found himself equipped with hopelessly antiquated planes and inexperienced Chinese personnel when Japan launched its all-out aggression in China. He then prevailed upon the Chiang government, which made him a brigadier general in 1941, to invite American civilian flyers to form a volunteer group against the Japanese. By July, 4 years ago, this group, which became world-famous as the "Flying Tigers" and which was merged with our Regular Army Air Forces after Pearl Harbor, was fully organized and soon was performing legendary feats in Burma and China.

Largely because of the logistical problem involved, General Chennault—who was re-

called to active duty in our own Army in April 1942, first as a colonel and then as a brigadier general—nearly always had to operate on a shoestring. He nevertheless made the most of his limited equipment and inflicted such terrible attrition on enemy planes—not to mention enemy shipping in Chinese coastal waters—that he is able to report now that Japan has already been conclusively beaten in the sky over China. Accordingly, whatever may be the full story behind his retirement (he himself suggests reasons of health), his leave taking must be regarded as a distinct loss. Certainly, history will remember him well for the great role he has played in laying the groundwork for victory in Asia.

Fraternal Order of Eagles Declares for a Guaranteed Annual Wage for American Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to the membership to learn that the Fraternal Order of Eagles, one of America's greatest fraternal organizations, is solidly behind organized labor's movement for a guaranteed annual wage.

In a statement recently released in the Capital by Mr. Eugene Kelly, the able and intelligent Washington representative of this great fraternity, Mr. John W. Young, national president, announced the position of the order in no uncertain terms, pledging, in the name of the order, the unstinted support of the more than 875,000 members of this mighty fraternal organization in the effort to stabilize wage worker income on an annual basis.

Though the announcement of the order's support of the principle of the guaranteed wage will be received by the membership of the Congress with gratification, it will, Mr. Speaker, occasion no surprise, for, indeed, this fraternal society has long been in the vanguard in all movements to improve the conditions of the workingman. To those who recall that it was the Eagles that led the fight for workman's compensation legislation, for safety appliance acts, for unemployment insurance laws, for old-age retirement measures, mother's pension provisions and innumerable other humanitarian proposals, most of which are now on the statute books, it is but natural that the Eagles should assume the leadership in the instant effort to stabilize wage income on an annual basis. That the espousal of the cause by this Nationwide fraternal organization presages an early success to the movement, none who know of its high influence for good will deny.

Because of its historical importance and in accordance with the unanimous consent of the membership of this body that it might be done, I am handing to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my instant remarks, a copy of National President John W. Young's most timely declaration of Eagle policy.

The statement to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. YOUNG, PRESIDENT OF THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES: A GUARANTEED ANNUAL WAGE

The Fraternal Order of Eagles, with a national membership of more than 875,000, is solidly behind organized labor's movement for a guaranteed annual wage.

In fact our organization is one of the leaders in this movement. The Fraternal Order of Eagles at its Cincinnati, Ohio, convention in August 1944 adopted a resolution approving the principle of the guaranteed annual wage.

The late President Roosevelt, a member of our organization, appointed a special committee to make a study of this problem. It is heartening to learn that his successor, President Truman, also a member of the Eagles, is going forward with this study.

This special committee, under Eric Johnston, President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, is now busily engaged in preparing a report on the more intricate phases of the program.

The guaranteed annual wage will encourage employment and assure workers a steady income. It will remove from the American worker the tantalizing uncertainty which arises out of not knowing what his income will be next week or next month. It will stabilize our economy as nothing else could. It will benefit the farmer and the so-called white-collar worker, as well as those who toil with their hands.

The guaranteed annual wage is not an empty, economic dream. It is a reality that has already been achieved by many large industries. The wage experience of these progressive industries can well serve as a model for other industries.

In the months to come the Fraternal Order of Eagles will work with labor, management and the Government in bringing home to the American people the imperative necessity for affirmative action on this vital issue.

Hon. D. Lane Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the New Jersey congressional delegation will miss greatly the comradeship and services of its distinguished, friendly, and able Member, Representative D. LANE POWERS, of Trenton, when he resigns shortly to become a member of our State's public utilities commission after completing close to 12 fruitful years in the House.

All of us were pleased immeasurably when Representatives CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, and JOHN TABER, of New York, chairman and ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee, took the floor recently to emphasize Representative POWERS' contributions to the cause of national defense as a member of the committee. They held that this New Jerseyan, who was a fighting lieutenant overseas in World War I, had contributed as much as a legislator in World War II as a combat captain in World War II.

Gen. "Hap" Arnold once called LANE POWERS "one of the best friends the Army has." Gen. Brehon B. Somervell has added his public thanks and I know our colleague treasures the letter he received some years back from former Democratic Representative Ross A. Collins, of Mississippi, long time chairman of the War Department appropriation subcommittee. The latter wrote that POWERS had seen with him more than 10 years ago the need of planes, tanks, submarines, and fast moving vehicles in modern warfare. "Our prophecies," he wrote, "have been vindicated."

I owe a personal debt of gratitude to LANE POWERS. He was exceedingly kind and helpful to my chief and predecessor, the late Representative George N. Seger, who was called away in 1940 near the end of his ninth term in the House. When the two were serving together on Capitol Hill, Mr. Seger was in his late sixties and early seventies. Mr. POWERS in his late thirties and early forties. They developed a close comradeship both on and off the floor. LANE POWERS has been equally kind and helpful to me and with his host of friends in the Congress and throughout the Capital generally, I wish him all success in his new endeavors. I wish him and his family that happiness they so richly deserve.

The Fighting Record of the Eighty-second Airborne Division, Commanded by Maj. Gen. James M. Gavin, of Mount Carmel, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the Mount Carmel (Pa.) Item, on June 20, carried an article under a Washington date line which was written by Oliver B. Lerch, lawyer-newspaperman, of Mount Carmel, which describes the great fighting record of the Eighty-second Airborne Division under the command of a great soldier, Maj. Gen. James M. Gavin, a boy who joined the Army as a land of 16 years out of Mount Carmel, Pa., in 1924.

As one of the youngest generals of the Army he has led his great fighting outfit, the Eighty-second Airborne Division, in some of the greatest battles in the recent European war. General Gavin has jumped with his men into some of the toughest battles of World War II. He has parachuted into action along with his paratroopers in the memorable campaign to conquer Italy by spearheading the invasion of Sicily, by participating in the Salerno beachhead operation, the Anzio beachhead, and by capturing Naples.

The gallant Eighty-second Airborne Division, which is known as the All-American Division, includes many men

from the great anthracite area of Pennsylvania which I have the honor to represent.

This top fighting outfit fought the Germans from the orchards of Normandy when they participated in the invasion of the continent by dropping onto the Cherbourg Peninsula. They fought the Hun in Holland during the memorable operation with the Sixth Airborne Division of the British Second Army.

When the Germans broke through in the epic battle of the bulge in Luxemburg and Belgium in December 1944, this crack fighting organization, the Eighty-second Airborne Division, parachuted into the thick of the fight in the Ardenne Forest area.

When the great battle of the bulge was over, the gallant Eighty-second Airborne Division was in the vanguard of the American-British forces fighting into Germany. It was at Ludwigslust, Germany, on May 2, 1945, that this ace airfighting unit captured the Twenty-first German Army, its commanding general, his staff, and 150,000 men.

Here is a fighting general in the fullest sense of the term, one who shares the risks and hardships of battle in the hot centers of battle operations. I am proud to number Maj. Gen. James M. Gavin among my constituents.

Mount Carmel, Pa., is proud of General Gavin and loves him for the modest, gentlemanly soldier that he is. Here is a general who has won the affection of his men because they have seen him share the perils of the battle with them. When this great leader talks of the Eighty-second Airborne Division it is "the boys" whom he gives unstinted praise for the outstanding fighting record of his outfit. Such a man is "Gentleman Jim" or "Slim Jim"—Maj. Gen. James M. Gavin, and such an outfit is the Eighty-second Airborne Division.

The splendid record of the Eighty-second Airborne Division is responsible for its selection as one of the United States Army units to serve as Army of Occupation forces in Germany. The Eighty-second Airborne Division will occupy the German capital—Berlin.

The accompanying article from the Mt. Carmel Item follows:

GENERAL GAVIN'S GREATEST THRILL WAS WHEN HIS UNIT CAPTURED TWENTY-FIRST NAZI UNIT

(By Oliver B. Lerch)

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 20.—Maj. Gen. James M. Gavin, commander of the 82d Airborne Division, one of the "fightingest" outfits of the Army, and ranking soldier-son of Mount Carmel, is coming home Thursday to sell war bonds, and not for a big welcome-home jamboree, he declared here today in an exclusive interview with the Item.

"I feel very deeply that I do not want anything out of this for myself. If it is any home-coming, it is merely as a representative of my outfit, the 82d Airborne Division which includes many fine soldiers from my home area of the hard-coal field, the bronzed battle-hardened Mount Carmelite declared. The tall, soft-spoken general, mentioned several Mount Carmel boys who soldiered with him, all first-class fighting men as he has found his fellow "hard coal crackers" to be, including Corporal Fred Martelli of West Second Street, and also "a fine Polish lad, a very courageous soldier," who fought with him throughout the epic Sicilian campaign.

In tip-top form, the rugged air commando chief explained that he flew back to the United States a week ago and proceeded to San Antonio, Tex., to participate in the mighty Seventh War Loan drive there. When he returned to Washington, he said, he told his chief, George Marshall, General of the Armies: "Since I am going to help sell bonds I would like to back up the bond selling drive in my home area in Pennsylvania," to which General Marshall readily agreed.

General Gavin will fly to the Sunbury, Pa., Airport from LaGuardia Airport, New York City, on Thursday afternoon, where he will be met by the Mount Carmel delegation and be escorted to his home town.

Gentleman Jim or Slim Jim, as he is also known, declared he will return to Europe around the end of the month to rejoin the boys and proceed to Berlin as a part of the United States Army Occupation Forces.

To illustrate how seriously the Army takes its bond buying, General Gavin told how, following the defeat of the German Army in the decisive battle of the bulge in the Ardenne Forest area of Germany late in December and early January, "We were on the go so much that our pay didn't catch up with us for 3 months. As soon as we came out of battle, the first thing we staged was a war-bond selling drive, and our soldiers purchased a terrific amount of bonds."

"Is there anything in particular you want to do in Mount Carmel?" I asked the general. "Yes," he said, "I want to visit old friends and see as many possible of the families of soldiers, especially of those soldiers in or associated with the Eighty-second Airborne Division."

"What do you think of hard-coal boys as soldiers?" "They can't be beat," he said, "when it comes to ruggedness, stamina, resourcefulness, and all-around ingenuity as fighting men."

"What has given you your greatest thrill to date as a soldier?" "Well," he said, hesitating and in a soft-spoken voice, "there have been so many exciting things which happened that it is difficult to center on one. I guess, however, it was when the Eighty-second Airborne Division captured the Twenty-first German Army. Their surrender to us at Ludwigslust, Germany, on May 2, 1945." General Gavin related how the Eighty-second Airborne Division, with about 15,000 men, captured the Twenty-first German Army, commanded by Lieutenant General Von Tippelskirch—"triple threat, as the boys called the kraut commander"—and consisting of 150,000 German soldiers. "That was about the most soul-satisfying experience I've had so far," he said.

General Gavin produced a photostatic copy of the unconditional surrender agreement signed by "Von Tippelskirch, General Der Infantrie," and himself as Commander of the Eighty-second Airborne Division, reading as follows:

"I, Lieutenant General Von Tippelskirch, commanding general of Twenty-first German Army, hereby unconditionally surrender the Twenty-first German Army, and all of its attachments, and equipment and appurtenances thereto, to the Commanding General of the Eighty-second Airborne Division, United States Army." The Mount Carmelite continued, "We certainly didn't coddle those boys. No hand-shaking and no fancy meals with all the trimmings. We simply told Lieutenant General Von Tippelskirch—'Old Triple Threat'—you are now a prisoner of war, and packed him off to a POW camp."

Spreading a captured German map of northern Africa and western Europe on the floor of his apartment, General Gavin sketched the extensive key operations in which his division participated in Sicily, Italy (Salerno beachhead area), in September 1943; the Normandy invasion of June 1944 and in Holland in September 1944. "We sure were glad to see the Allied barrage coincident with the invasion of Normandy when we jumped the Cherbourg Peninsula. When that came along we knew we were in the right place. Although the Eighty-second Airborne Division did not participate in the campaign in northern Africa, we were there later," General Gavin explained. The fighting they went through in Sicily, Italy, Normandy, and Holland constitutes one of the most extensive and diversified battle records of any Army unit, he stated.

"Landing at Casablanca in north Africa, May 19, 1943, we next moved to Oujda, French Morocco, and then to Kairouan, Tunisia, where we spearheaded the capture of Sicily. Returning to Kairouan we jumped off from there to the relief of the beachhead at Salerno, Italy. We also had a combat team, including various branches of our arms at the Anzio beachhead. The 82d Airborne Division captured Naples, October 1, 1943," General Gavin related. "We then went to a camp about 10 miles from Belfast, northern Ireland," the scion of the Dooley-Gavin clan from southern Ireland commented. "There we trained preparatory to moving into the staging area at Leicester in the English Midlands and trained some more to make ready for the big jump onto the Cherburg Peninsula in the all-star big-league invasion of the continent on June 6, 1944." Following the Normandy campaign the outfit returned to Leicester in mid-July where they reequipped, reorganized, and trained some more to get ready for the next jump—into Holland—on September 17, 1944. "That was quite a deal," General Gavin commented. (Indeed so all will agree who recall the fate of the companion unit of the British Second Army—the famous Red Devils—so named because they wear red berets—of the Sixth British Airborne unit, who were cut off by the Germans at Arnheim and lost many of their men.) His outfit was an integral part of that operation, the general explained. This was a perfect piece of military strategy which if it had succeeded would have ended the war by end-running the main German fortifications of the Siegfried line and would have provided access to the heart of Germany from the north. "We accomplished our mission and although cut off for some time the British 2d Army linked up with us after 3 days." He recalled the extreme difficulty of establishing and maintaining this contact. "Our job," he related, "was to secure the bridges across the Maas River and the Waal (Lower Rhine) River in Holland. We also had to secure the terrain, clear out the Krauts and hold until relieved. We did this, capturing the bridge across the mouth of the Rhine at Nijmegen where we linked up with the British 2d Army.

"Ours was the first American Army to cross the Rhine—and crossing the Rhine wasn't so hard after all." At this point General Gavin displayed a handsome brochure presented to his division by the grateful citizens of Nijmegen which, appropriately, included a picture of the fine bridge across the lower Rhine at that point.

"After the Holland job," General Gavin said, "we returned to France—in mid-November 1944, and when General von Rundstedt (whom General Eisenhower described as the finest German general) broke through in the Ardennes Forest on December 17, 1944, we got going on that show."

The fighting in the Ardennes Forest was described by General Gavin as among the toughest ever encountered by an American army with the hardships endured by the men comparable to those suffered by General Washington's forces at Valley Forge in the Revolutionary War. "We were thrown into the break-through area, and that battle proved the absolute fighting qualities of air-borne troops. Ours is one of the fightingest outfits in the Army and in the newest form of military technique. That fighting was the hardest fighting in United States

military history," the general observed. (He is a former West Point instructor in tactics and strategy.) "Our air-borne troops fought superbly as ground troops as was proved at Vielsalm, Chemeux, and Bastogne, Belgium," he declared.

"Following the Battle of the Bulge, we went back into action after a month's rest, and carried through the attack into Germany as a part of the British Second Army. That was the show where Old Triple Threat (Lieutenant General von Tippleskirch) surrendered. It was at Ludwigslust, Germany, where we linked up with the Russians who were hot on the neck of the krauts when they surrendered to us."

General Gavin expressed admiration for the fighting qualities of the Russian solders and related how famously he and his men got along with them. The tenacious fighting qualities of the Englishmen and Welshmen of the British forces also won his praise. He recalled how well they got on with the Russians, their accordion-playing soldier, dancing, etc., reminding him of the Russian, Polish, wedding parties he attended as a youngster back home in Mount Carmel. (He was only 16 when he joined the Army out of Mount Carmel in 1924.) The general feels that his wide acquaintance with the many nationalities making up his home town population is a decided asset in his business.

Lincoln Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago last Wednesday a group of high-minded citizens of the Republican Party faith met in Paterson, N. J., and organized the Lincoln Republican Club. Ever since this club has been a leader in civic activities promoting the cause of good government.

At the Lincoln Club's golden jubilee banquet Wednesday night Paterson's able Mayor William P. Furrey pointed to the fact there were 51 Lincolnians in the armed services out of a total male membership of 351. The club sold $500,000 in bonds in the Seventh War loan drive and it is not forgetting its fighting men. It sends each $2 monthly with an extra $5 at Christmas.

Paterson's Lincolnians will never forget the distinguished orator who came from Washington to be their principal speaker at their anniversary festivities. He was our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. Paterson's papers lauded his inspiring speech and club President George Small recorded it as an outstanding contribution to Lincoln Club history.

Representative CUNNINGHAM traced the history of the republic form of government from biblical days and insisted that it was only when a people sought one-man rule and regimentation, departing from the republic form, that enslavement and wars resulted. The people, he continued, never began wars. Describing the American Constitution as three written pages—one providing for the legislature, another the executive, and the third the judiciary—he emphasized there could be no merger without regimentation and dictatorship. Trends in America in recent years, he concluded, have been dangerously totalitarian and he exhorted his listeners to support an early return to the people of those powers provided them by the founding fathers in their devotion to the republic form of government.

Among those who heard Representative CUNNINGHAM was Thomas Rear, who has been a Lincolnian for 47 years. And another was Representative CUNNINGHAM's daughter-in-law, former marine Sergeant Florence Jelsma, whose father, Eli Jelsma, is chairman of the club's executive board. The Representative's son, Edward, gave his life fighting with the Marines at Saipan.

Address of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commencement address of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass., on June 13, 1945:

Your Excellency, our beloved Most Reverend Archbishop Cushing; Your Excellency, Most Reverend Bishop Yu Pin; right reverend, very reverend, and reverend fathers; very reverend father rector; and members of the faculty; Your Excellency, Governor Tobin; ladies and gentlemen, and members of the graduating class, as I stand under the towers of this magnificent institution, symbolic of our ancient and treasured faith and culture, and as I look out upon the broad view of our beloved Boston, I am truly grateful for the honor of this degree which brings us together as alumni of our dear alma mater, Boston College.

You are about to depart from a glorious institution of higher learning. You are ready to commence a life of full personal initiative in a world of turmoil and strife. You go forth well equipped to take the journey of life and to meet with confidence the challenge of the coming years. Yours has been the privilege of able guidance throughout the academic period by those competent in the arts, the sciences, and the wisdoms. Your teachers have sought to develop in you the intellectual and moral virtues. They have sought to convince you that the happiness and perfection of men and women are not found in the pursuit of wealth, fame, or power, but rather in the unselfish devotion to the highest ideals. You have been trained here to be leaders in Catholic thought and action—leaders in your communities—leaders in business and professional life—leaders in the service of God and country. That leadership will be a constructive one if you put into practice the fundamental principles and truths which you have learned here as students. Despite the temporary discomfort they may occasion and the consistency of conduct they may demand, if you fail to adhere to these first principles in your own life, your leadership will have lost its value.

As students of this great college you must have caught something of the spirit of the Jesuit teachers who have been your guide. That spirit might be summed up in one word—truth.

The message I hope to leave with you today is to apply those truths to the practical life that faces you—to become an apostle of truth. Adherence to truth is the road to earthly and eternal happiness.

It is because of that love which your teachers have for truth that they have waged an uncompromising battle against every form of error; against evil and sin; to prepare you for the future battle of life, and to bring earthly and eternal happiness to others. The lives of your teachers must serve as a challenge to you as in days to come you have memories—memories of the faith that must constantly be your guide—memories of the love of God that must ever drive you on to greater and greater heights—memories of the joy that can be yours when you put to work what you have stored in your minds and hearts.

In order to justify their faith in you, you must carry through their teachings and dedicate yourselves to personal perfection, to the common good of mankind and the glory of God.

Twice blessed by your rearing in the faith of Christ and in the traditions of a noble Commonwealth, it may be well to contemplate what Catholic teachings can mean for our country. The insistence of the Catholic Church upon the sacredness of personality has been responsible for the emergence of the ideals of our civilization.

Real democracy recognizes God and His natural law. The liberties of our own democracy are based upon and strengthened by the teachings of Christ. It is because our Government is based on His teachings that it occupies its position of power and prestige. As Christianity alone can explain the origin of our Republic, it alone can sustain it in being. Where shall we turn for that source of virtue requisite for a healthy democracy except to a religion fashioned by God Himself, able by reason of its divine origin to impart strength to the weak, fortitude to those in ordeal, courage to the faint-hearted; a religion able to lift to a high state of moral rectitude. Such a religion is ours.

You are about to graduate from this outstanding institution in one of the most trying periods of history. For we have seen the triumph of an American ideal of government under law and God over the titanic forces which would subjugate man and make him a slave of the state by the attempted banishment of God.

In achieving this victory Boston College has taken a notable and distinguished part. The sacrifices of all her sons can be evidenced by the heroic example of two of her sons—one a priest and the other a layman. Their sacrifices also emphasize the value, the importance, the necessity of the application of our religious truths to the solution of the problems of our everyday life.

For it was Father O'Callaghan, termed by his commanding officer, "the bravest man I ever saw," who said of his experience in one of the most frightful naval struggles of war, "I was not afraid. I was not brave. My courage was due to my religious training."

You will also remember it was the late Commander Shea who wrote a letter to his son which will be an epic in the annals of America. He summed up the education and the training he received, and which you have received, when he said, "Be a good Catholic and you can't help being a good American."

Father O'Callaghan and the late Commander Shea have given to the world the complete meaning of Catholic truth in action. The significant lesson that their deeds and utterances convey to us is that response to the law of God is the true guide of human conduct.

If some of you feel that the pioneering spirit is no longer needed, you are sadly mistaken. Those possessed of noble ideals must still try to eliminate the dark barriers

of hatred, suspicion, intolerance, and selfishness which have kept the human family divided. Who are better able to go forth and penetrate these barriers to the progress of mankind than you who have been educated to a way of life based upon truth, love, and sacrifice—you who recognize the worth of the individual and respect his God-given rights.

The experience of life should teach us that when men and women become indifferent to the dignity of humanity they soon begin to think that saving their physical existence means saving their dignity. When individuals and groups become indifferent to God, their spiritual values are no longer the driving force of their lives and life becomes a mad scramble to attain the false peak of economic stability. When people become indifferent to truth they are open targets for the shattering gun-fire of propaganda and emotionalism. It is then that the final goal ceases to be the center around which noble hopes and desires revolve. It is then when people grow weary of being human and pretend to shake off their humanity by wearing false faces.

The questions must be answered: "Will the heart of man be filled with peace or will it be empty"? "Will it harbor love or hate"? "Must the heart of man be shrivelled with selfishness"? Catholic education answers by filling the mind with truth, the truth about God, the truth about man, the truth about the sanctity of the home, and then insists that this truth, put to work in economic, domestic, social, and political life is the sole guaranty for good citizens. Your studies here at Boston College have made known to you that the really practical person must have principles, not principles stored in the mind alone, but principles that are put into constant use. It is these principles concerning God, man, and society which constitute the great traditional truths of our civilization.

For just a few minutes I ask you graduates to pause and allow your minds to reflect on these truths. Face to face with the material world the spontaneous question suggests itself as to the origin of the world. It is not merely a question of planets, continents, and oceans, but the picking up of a pin from the floor, the beat of a heart or the clasp of a hand that cries out for the existence of a first cause of all reality. Things take on meaning with the existence of a personal, loving, provident God. Creation may be likened to a great orchestra with thousands of instruments blending their various notes under the direction of the master leader who alone can produce the beautiful harmony in which heaven and earth declare the wisdom of their Maker.

If the world has raised eyebrows superciliously in the past, before we are through with this devastating war people will have to look to God for faith, hope, and love, or else plunge themselves into the depths of despair. Naturalistic education was to change the social order—it pulled down the pillars of religion and now nations lie prostrate amid the charred ruins of a world that forgot and rejected God. Religion with its creed puts graphically before the mind supernatural truths which uplift—irreligion obliterates these truths. Your task as graduates of this college will be to show others how irreligion has brought about a fourfold apostasy; apostasy from truth, the truth of God, apostasy from brotherhood, because neighbors have not been treated as brothers; apostasy from hope, for despair has seeped into men's souls; apostasy from freedom, because no nation can claim freedom for its citizens unless that freedom be recognized as coming from the Giver of gifts.

It requires no mental labor to perceive that man has both material and spiritual activities. By virtue of his ability to attain truth, man rises to a conception of God, to ideals of virtue, to the necessity of moral actions in accordance with his nature. The individual goal does not exclude but demands the principle of solidarity of the human race since all are destined for a future life of ceaseless activity based on the possession of God and overflowing with the depths of love, love of God and love of neighbor. When the goal of human living is viewed in this way, then the barriers of self-love, racial prejudices, class distinctions, extreme nationalism and other baser human influences are melted away. Sources of happiness are discovered other than those which spring from the well of sense satisfaction. Christian humanitarianism, the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, loyal patriotic devotion to country and to mankind are the echoes of hearts at peace. When caught up and interpreted in the light of the goodness and truth and beauty which is God, we catch a glimpse of a happiness possible to mankind.

No institution can resolve the issue in our country's favor in the postwar world more perfectly than the Christian home. How true it is that the family is the unit of society and no society can rise higher than its fundamental unit.

In our plans for peace we must recognize the place of the family. The Christian home is based on an absolute respect for law and order. It demands the virtue of parental authority and filial obedience. Its walls are solidified by religion, its atmosphere purified by morality. Obedience is the cardinal principle of its activities—obedience to God, obedience to church, obedience to state. There can be no valid nor virtuous citizenship where there is neither authority nor obedience to authority. The government of the Christian home furnishes the proper model for good citizenship. It is the enemy of anarchy and the supporter of authority. Peace and happiness are its products. No nation that has the slightest interest in its own preservation can afford to tamper with the sanctity of the home. The nation that facilitates divorce, that sanctions the pernicious doctrine of birth prevention, that fails to make the home the object of its finest legislation, is moving toward destruction.

What a glorious opportunity you graduates of Boston College have to impregnate Catholic principles in America today. Do not say, "I am but one person and what can I do against the rising tide?" Not all great things are done by tremendous movements with millions of followers. Some of the greatest achievements of history have been accomplished by the few acting courageously under the inspiration and guidance of God.

America has been called the land of opportunity. Conditions in other lands have changed the map of the world. Dictators have arrogated to themselves the position of supreme arbiters in human affairs. Is it any wonder that the torch in the upraised hands of the Lady of Liberty shines brighter than ever, giving light in this blackout of freedom? Yet we must admit there are lessons in truth and humility to be learned—that our progress has not always been in terms of what is best for human beings—that our freedom has not always been recognized as a spiritual gift. We may manufacture the best of everything, but the best in terms of human being must be the best in culture, and that culture is what your church and your college have taught you.

I have not attempted to discuss the important problems of today or of the postwar era. Rather, I have attempted to impress upon you, as you are about to enter the serious responsible part of your life—and I say this based upon my own experience and humble efforts in life—that adherence to the application of the spiritual truths you possess are the roads to true happiness and honorable success. These truths are not merely academic in nature, they are living, dynamic influences in life.

There is one specific subject of far-reaching importance which it is appropriate to discuss on this occasion, and that is the question of future permanent peace. That hope lies in the hearts and minds of all of us. It is born out of pain, suffering, sacrifice, destruction, and death.

During the past several years there has arisen the most terrible danger to the cause of freedom and the concept of individual human dignity and rights that has faced any generation for a number of centuries. We see mankind traveling the road of war. Within a generation we have experienced two terrible destructive conflicts. Why? Human greed, lust, and hate—a denial of God and His word. Unless some definite action is taken to block the road of war that mankind is traveling, it will be only a matter of time when another conflict, more terrible than the present one, will again engulf the peoples of the world. Based on the experiences of this and the last war, we know, or we ought to know, that a challenge to liberty anywhere is a challenge to liberty everywhere. Yes; if a blow is struck against human freedom in some very remote part of the world, we are likely to find out that we shall be eventually called upon again to defend our freedom.

At the present time in San Francisco a conference of the representatives of over 45 nations are meeting, trying to lay the foundation which will assure an enduring peace.

We all pray and hope that their efforts will be successful.

We all recognize that the efforts toward attaining this goal must be viewed with patience, tolerance, and understanding.

We all want our country to take its place as a leader among the nations of the world in a cooperative effort, based upon equity and justice to all nations, large and small, to bring about permanent peace.

In laying the foundation and building the structure of peace, all nations must make such contributions and sacrifices as are necessary to reach the common objective.

In order for a lasting peace to be established, it will be necessary that the moral law be recognized and obeyed.

The law of any nation—treaties made between nations—and any plan for permanent peace that does not conform to the natural law cannot be of a lasting nature. It will only be an armistice. If mankind is to lay the foundation for a structure of lasting peace, the cornerstone of that foundation must be truth—the truth given to mankind by God, Himself.

Having its source in God, Himself, the Catholic Church, down through the centuries, has championed the cause of peace; peace with justice.

Down through the centuries the supreme pontiffs of the Catholic Church have spoken out with vision and courage in the cause of peace. In this war-torn world Pope Pius XII and later in April of this year, the archbishops and bishops of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference of the United States have given to the world the pattern for an enduring peace.

All persons, without regard to creed, cannot fail to be impressed by the soundness of their pronouncements. I quote from the archbishops' and bishops' statement:

"Democracy is built on respect for the dignity of the human person with its God-given inviolable rights. It achieves unity and strength in the intelligent cooperation of all citizens for the common good under governments chosen and supported by the people. It will advance, expand, and develop our cul-

ture. It will maintain continuity with our Christian past. It will give security for our Christian future."

And quoting further:

"Democracy's bulwark is religion, and justice is its watchword. We entered this war to defend our democracy. It is our solemn responsibility, in the reconstruction, to use our full influence in safeguarding the freedoms of all peoples. This, we are convinced, is the only way to an enduring peace."

In the perplexities that confront us and the wide differences of opinion on many issues it is recognized that we must turn to God to find the basis for permanent peace. In our ancient faith, in the traditional teachings of Boston College, in the encyclicals of the vicars of Christ and the teachings of our hierarchy are to be found the truths, principles, and the true chart for the solution of the difficulties which beset individuals and nations.

Though we have long days of hardship ahead to achieve final victory, let us resolve now to give generously the sacrifices demanded of all to bring about a just and enduring peace—the hope of mankind.

Veterans' Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much discussion has been had within the past few days regarding the veterans' hospitals, the amendments to the GI bill of rights, and also respecting the veterans' preference in the future. May I say, at the very outset, that following service in World War I and following my activities in the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I have given much thought to the problems which confront the veterans of this war and of all wars. There are many and various problems which we must face respecting our veterans. I also desire to state that I will do all within my power to aid the veterans of this war, and of all wars, that they may be given an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves, insofar as possible, following their service in the armed forces of our country. They have won their right to all of the privileges which the Congress can reasonably and properly extend to them. They are our heroes, they have given material aid to our Nation, and they should be awarded all that a grateful Nation can extend to them.

On July 17, 1945, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] made certain statements respecting some remarks concerning some material I had extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on July 3, 1945, at pages A3507, A3508, and A3509, with reference to the care of our veterans. I have just discovered, Mr. Speaker, that the Stars and Stripes, in the issue of July 19, 1945, has a very lengthy editorial upon that very subject, which editorial I here insert that all may read its contents. The editorial to which I have referred is as follows:

VETERANS ARE WATCHING

Up on Capitol Hill 3 weeks ago, we were quite startled to hear an expression that was strangely reminiscent of another that had been made in 1933. Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, whom we know to be a friend of veterans, said: "We are going to have to go back to the policy we had in the twenties. * * * We then took care of service-connected disabilities plus constitutional diseases, such as tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric disorders. There is no reason why we should take care of every man who gets sick and happens once to have worn a uniform."

That is a direct quotation and, to the best of our ability to take it down, verbatim correct. In 1933, just after the vicious and wickedly conceived "Act to Maintain the Credit of the United States Government" was perpetrated upon a bewildered people, the then President of this Nation said in Chicago: "The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he (the veteran) can demand and receive from his Government a benefit which no other citizen receives. It does not mean that because a person served in the defense of his country, performed a basic obligation of citizenship, he should receive a pension from his Government because of a disability incurred after his service had terminated, and not connected with that service." That also is a direct quotation, and the veterans of this country recall with disdain, and now with some foreboding, that the infamous Economy Act for the space of a few months was a studied attempt to save the Government's credit at the expense alone of their disabled comrades. That act was the darkest blot ever to appear upon the national honor. To this day it has not been entirely erased. And now comes another dire threat that would further besmirch the service rendered to our countrymen by their saviors who have worn the uniform.

Being discussed by the Veterans' Committee at the time of RANKIN'S statement was the question of hospitalization for veterans. Veterans' Administration officials were offering testimony that in spite of frantic efforts, the hospital building program was not keeping pace with demands for beds for men being discharged with service-connected injuries and diseases. The demand to temporarily withhold existing hospitalization rights of non-service-connected disabled men seemed so logical that other Congressmen chimed in with the thought that, unpopular as it might be, realism must be shown and curtailments must be made in order to take care of our wounded. The whole demand is built upon another of those misconceptions that crucified veterans a dozen years ago, and unless the Veterans' Committee watches its step, it will be responsible for creating mischief that can never be condoned.

We can well afford to pass up the derelictions of the Veterans' Administration in not being farsighted enough to meet existing conditions. There has been a request for more and more beds annually by organized veterans who know, through their rehabilitation work, what the needs are and have been. For more than a year now there has been a half billion dollars authorized for such building, most of it unsought by the veterans' agency that has been hoping and expecting to inherit permanent Army installations for its own use. Priorities have been troublesome affairs and labor has been scarce, yet we can and do blame that agency for suggesting a remedy that would murder hundreds of men who fought for their country in time of war and who are entitled to proper consideration. Veterans will hold to account any Congressmen who fall into a new economy trap.

No member of this committee—in fact, few if any of Veterans' Administration officials—are capable of passing upon the question of service connection. Those constitutional-disease cases Representative RANKIN talks about were made pensionable and granted service-connected benefits back in the twenties by RANKIN'S own bill and for the very reason that they were presumably service-connected but could not prove it. There are many thousands of others just as deserving that do not come under that legislation. That is one reason why they are entitled to hospitalization. World War II, with all of its new war weapons, intensive fire action, its exacting combat pace, strange diseases emanating from the jungles of one part of the world and the deserts and snows of others, will bring new problems. Millions will not be able to prove service incurrence for troubles that will arise from the wearing of a uniform, and no member of any committee will be able to say otherwise.

But that is not the only angle to this question. Men who have worn and are wearing the uniform do not do it "just because." That does not just "happen." In most cases our veterans were compelled to don it. They fought for their country, not for Mississippi or for Kansas, not for Tupelo nor for Timbuctoo. Unlike our economy-minded enemies who hate to pay for the expense of a war once it is won, unlike those socialistically-minded do-gooders who would make veterans line up at a clinic along with local unfortunates, unlike the American Medical Association that has formed its trust in order to combat socialized medicine and has caught disabled veterans plumb in the middle, men who have worn the uniform have by that very act been placed by their Government in a class by themselves to be considered above all other classes, and as such the country has so considered them since its inception.

No action such as is contemplated is "temporarily." Like planned economy, some of it always sticks, and this congestion in hospital talk is mostly subterfuge. Every non-service-connected veteran under existing regulations must await his turn for a hospital bed. The service connected hold a positive priority. Nor must it be forgotten that men in uniform for the duration of a war are absolutely unable to save up for that rainy day when they must seek a hospital bed.

Service counts for everything. The wearing of a uniform is indeed a sacred duty. It is an equally sacred obligation of this Nation to remember and to reward such service, not question or mock it after it has been performed nor seek a pauper's oath in making what the thoughtless would term gracious exceptions. History has and can again repeat itself. Veterans are hopeful that those they have counted upon as their friends will not be bewildered by false arguments and by premeditated emergencies. They are watching the present situation closely.

Mr. Speaker, it will be well remembered that the Congress has already authorized the expenditure of $500,000,000 for the construction of veterans' hospitals. It has been my considered opinion that this work should have been pushed vigorously from the date of the enactment of that law. In many instances the question of the place of the location of the hospital has not yet been determined, and there has been very little, if any, of the actual work of construction begun at this date. The result has been that we have no adequate veterans' hospitals in our country within which to take and care for our disabled

veterans. This scarcity of hospitals is the chief cause of the alarm that is now rampant in our country as to who will be entitled to the relief afforded by the existing hospitals, and those which will be constructed under the congressional authorization made, as before referred to. Do we have the hospital facilities to care for the service-connected veterans and also the non-service-connected veterans who may need hospitalization? The answer must be in the negative. With the casualties of the present war growing well over the mark of 1,000,000, as compared with a much smaller number following World War I, our present hospital facilities will be wholly inadequate to take care of the service-connected cases which have developed in World War II, and the present hospital facilities are taxed at the moment with the veterans of World War I and of World War II—and only a very small number of the veterans of World War II are now being cared for in our present hospitals. The facilities are wholly inadequate to care for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the complaint I wish to register in this matter is this: We need more facilities for the care of our veterans. Under the present overcrowded condition of every veterans' hospital in our country, unless this condition is immediately remedied, there will have to be some distinction made. However, I want it distinctly understood that I want our veterans properly and adequately cared for—and I made no distinction between our veterans—but if the facilities are inadequate to properly care for all veterans, then, if there is to be any distinction made, it will have to be made between those having service-connected disabilities and those having non-service-connected disabilities.

May I say further, that this very critical situation should cause those in charge of this particular work to realize the great importance of the immediate construction of the necessary and needed additional veterans' hospitals in this country. We do not want our veterans of this or of any former war to be denied hospitalization. To the contrary we want them to have the opportunity of adequate hospitalization, and we want them to have all proper and adequate care such as it is within the power of the people of a grateful Nation to give to them.

Mr. Speaker, as we go forward into the future, the people of this Nation want our disabled veterans to have adequate opportunity of hospitalization; the people want our disabled veterans to have ample and proper medical care—and when the Congress grants authority for the construction of hospitals, and extends the opportunity to give that needed care—the people want that job done, and they want ample provision made for the boys who followed the flag in combat and who have suffered disability because of their loyalty to our country.

It is my hope that this problem will be met with promptness and with certainty, and that our Nation, the greatest of all, will not turn her back against those who faced the enemy bullets in combat.

The Story of Tungsten Carbide—Additional Argument for Patent Reform Legislation, H. R. 3462

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is no new statement to say that American production and American technology have been, next to the valor of the fighting men themselves, the most important factors in winning this war.

Technological production depends upon machine tools more perhaps than upon any other single factor. I am proud indeed of the outstanding contribution to America's war effort which has been made by one small business concern located in the district which I have the honor to represent. This company is known as the Tungtip Tools Co., and its moving spirit is Mr. John H. Grayson. The story of the contribution of this company and its tungsten carbide milling cutter to the success of America's war effort is better told in an article which appeared recently in the Monrovia (Calif.) News Post than I can tell it myself, and I therefore ask consent to include that article with my remarks herewith.

CUTTER SPEEDS UP PRODUCTION
(By Charles F. Davis)

The world's industrial-minded men have long looked upon America as the synonym for mass production.

But it took the shocking, treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor to inspire American inventive, engineering, and productive genius to new heights of resourcefulness.

In California, when the war came, was a man with an idea.

John H. Grayson, inventor of the Grayson thermostat, and with many heat and clock control patents to his credit, had sold out his business and had come to Monrovia to retire. He had built a home and adjoining it a model laboratory and machine shop.

Industrial-minded inventor Grayson's idea—speeding up and improvement in the production of metal alloy parts for war machines.

Mr. Grayson developed and perfected the tungsten carbide milling cutter.

But the battle was then only half won, for the tungsten carbide milling cutter is radical in design from the conventional tool steel milling cutter, and an entirely new operating technique had to be developed for a satisfactory performance.

Results were amazing. Today through the use of the Grayson-developed carbide milling cutter, production of metal alloy parts, for war, has been increased up to 1,000 percent without increase in manpower or machines.

Actually, when tungsten carbide cutters are in operation a continuous shower of metal chips literally fly through the air like wood shavings from a planing mill.

LIKE BULLET'S IMPACT

Tungsten carbide is diamond-hard, but less malleable, more fragile than the conventional tool steel, and at the comparatively slow speeds of the tool steel cutter will chip and crack.

But if the velocity is enough, the tornado will drive a straw into a tree trunk, a bullet through toughened steel armor plate. It is upon this principle, that of terrific speed, that the Grayson tungsten carbide milling cutters achieve their truly amazing results.

But let Mr. Grayson tell his own story. He says:

"During the early days of the war the tungsten carbide milling cutter was viewed with skepticism. To old-time machinists cutter speeds 10 times faster than the conventional were plain crazy. They did not want to be in the same room with anything moving so fast. And milling machines, unlike the lathe, are based on interrupted cuts, causing a plural rotary impact of the cutting teeth on the work. At conventional speeds the tungsten carbide teeth would break. Consequently terrifically high speeds were necessary to reduce the impact shock and consequent shatter on the same principle that the velocity of a bullet permits its piercing power."

FORTUNE DRAINED TO DREGS

Mr. Grayson and his associates had perfected their tool, and had developed a technique for its satisfying performance. But tough-minded makers of planes, tanks, and guns had to be shown. Says Mr. Grayson:

"The cost of demonstrations, free trial tests, and an engineering service to prospective users drained a modest fortune to the dregs. The Citizens Bank of Monrovia and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation came to our rescue. Prof. R. L. Daugherty, of Caltech, arranged for demonstrations with all the aircraft companies. The Aircraft War Production Council became enthusiastically and actively interested. The council, in turn, interested the WPB. Expensive research, Government-financed, is now being conducted at Caltech under the able direction of Ray O. Catland, F. M. Gabian, and George Humphrey all good men, who are carrying on. Sometime in May Caltech will announce open house for all production and tooling engineers interested in metal milling. Amazing demonstrations are in store for those invited."

PRAISE FROM WAR PLANTS

The old adage says: "The best advertisement is a satisfied customer." Here is what some eminent customers of Grayson's Tungtip tools have to say:

North American Aviation: "Only through the use of this (Tungtip) type of cutter can we maintain our production schedule on many of the components of the P-51 (Black Widow, world's most powerful pursuit plane)."

Northrop Aircraft: "Northrop tool engineers, with Tungtip cutters and counsel, have raised spar cap production from 4 per week to 20 per day with 1 machine. Tungtip Tools gave unstintingly of their time and effort."

Chrysler Corp.: "Tungtip cutters have enabled us to save many thousands of much-needed man-hours, produce a finer finish, closer tolerances and at a great reduction in tool costs."

Consolidated-Vultee: "By use of your cutters Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Corp., San Diego Division, has been able to materially increase production of vitally needed aircraft for the war effort."

Douglas Aircraft: "Tungtip Tools is now delivering approximately 98 percent of the tungsten carbide milling cutters for the tooling division which are vitally needed in aircraft manufacture."

CREDIT TO ASSOCIATES

Credit to the Government aid and to individuals who helped make his outstanding success possible is given by the founder of Tungtip Tools. "The largest signed order we ever received, for the B-29, we could not have accepted," declares Mr. Grayson, "had it not been for the prompt and efficient assistance of the Smaller War Plants Corporation."

Generous credit also is given by Mr. Grayson to his associates, among them his son,

Dick Grayson, who took the leading part in technique and development. He is chief coordinator and consultant when and where his services are required by tools and production engineers. Professors Watson and Dillon of U. C. L. A. selected Dick Grayson as tungsten carbide instructor for their war training classes. Such classes have been extended to Lockheed, two shifts, so Dick has his hands full.

Edward O. Lowell joined Mr. Grayson 2 years ago when the struggle for Tungtip recognition was compounded by the loss of Mr. Grayson's son, Lt. W. J. Grayson, at Guadalcanal. Mr. Lowell acts as chief administrator but his versatility, declares Mr. Grayson, is remarkable. The small cutter is a new Tungtip cutter of the inserted-tooth type, a patented improvement on Tungtip cutters by Mr. Lowell. The Lowell improvement permits replaceable teeth and variable tooth settings in very much smaller cutters.

Prof. R. L. Daugherty, head of the mechanical engineering department at Caltech, with Dick Grayson, was tl e first to demonstrate Tungtip cutters to members of the tooling panel of the Aircraft War Production Council on the west coast. Also as regional adviser, United States war training, Professor Daugherty brought Tungtip milling cutters to the attention of the War Production Board in Washington, which launched the tungsten carbide milling cutter into the pool of United States production achievements.

But behind them all stands John H. Grayson, the man with an idea he couldn't give up.

Mr. Speaker, a very large number of patents have been issued to Mr. Grayson by the United States Patent Office, and I have in my possession copies of all those patents which are numbered in the dozens. As the article above-quoted so clearly brings out, however, the most important contribution of this small company and this inventor to the war effort has been the tungsten carbide milling cutter. There was a time, however, in the history of our country when it would have been virtually impossible for either these cutters or any other product made of tungsten carbide to have been made available to American industry without the payment of the most fantastically exorbitant prices. I should like to quote here from an article by Thurman Arnold, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Antitrust Division and recently a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which appeared in the Reader's Digest for July 1941. This article read in part as follows:

Take tungsten carbide. It makes the hardest cutting tools known, except diamonds. Its use enormously speeds up production; machines can be run at greatly increased rates and need not be shut down so often for resharpening tools. In plants which have been retooled to use it, tungsten carbide has revolutionized methods. But experts tell us that the use of tungsten carbide in Germany is 20 times that of the United States. Why is this?

The Krupp interests of Germany and our own General Electric agreed to pool their patents and keep American prices up. When prices are artificially raised, production drops. Tungsten carbide prices skyrocketed in this country, as high as $453 a pound and never lower than $205. Manufacturing costs were about $25 a pound. But this wasn't all. There was added the same old agreement that the General Electric Co. would not sell in foreign markets and that the Krupp Co. would not compete here.

Now we are paying the price of these agreements. Gerald Firth, president of the Firth-Stirling Steel Co., stated in 1941:

"The control of the tungsten carbide patents by the General Electric Co. and the Krupp Co. has resulted in keeping the price at exorbitant levels. Now when the emergency has come industry has not learned how to use tungsten carbide and has not the machines, the skilled men, or the technique which it would have had if the material had been available at the low price at which it was available to German industries."

After an indictment of the General Electric Co. and the Krupp Co. by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, the price of tungsten carbide dropped from $205 to $48 a pound even though the emergency demand for machine tools has created a brisk market. But it will take at least a year to make up the loss caused by these German-dominated restraints of trade.

Thus it will be clear that but for the action of the United States Department of Justice in breaking up the patent pool and cartel monopoly on tungsten carbide, its cost would have undoubtedly continued to hover in the stratosphere beyond the reach of practically all American producers.

It is perfectly obvious how well the interests of Germany were served by this arrangement and it should be equally obvious to us that our patriotic duty is to resolve that such things will never be allowed to happen again. It will be noted that Judge Arnold quoted a statement by Mr. Gerald Firth, president of the Firth-Stirling Steel Co., regarding tungsten carbide. Another quotation from this same Mr. Firth, found on page 270 of a book entitled "Germany's Master Plan," by Borkin and Welch, reads as follows:

Please bear in mind that as I have said before the price in this country (of tungsten carbide) is from ten to fifteen times the German price and that is a difficult thing to justify now that industry in general is recognizing the value of our production.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously addressed the House and testified before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee in support of my bill, H. R. 97, now reintroduced in somewhat revised form as H. R. 3462, which bill seeks to amend the patent laws in such a way as to provide appropriate penalties against the abuse of the patent grant by any holder or licensee of a patent which involves the establishment of monopoly in violation of the laws of this Nation.

Today, I am not going to speak for my bill myself, but I am going to conclude my remarks here with a letter which I received from Mr. John H. Grayson, of the Tungtip Tools Co., Monrovia, Calif., in which he discusses this legislation and the problem of our patent laws generally. I earnestly urge the Members of the House to heed what Mr. Grayson has to say in this letter, since he speaks indeed out of a long and rich and, I am thankful to say, successful experience as an inventor, manufacturer, and proprietor of a typically American small business.

LOWELL & GRAYSON,
Monrovia, Calif., April 11, 1945.

The Honorable JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Abuses of patent rights.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reference to your pending bill H. R. 97 before Congress, I have the following comments based on my experience. Forty patents have been awarded to me by the United States Patent Office. Five times I have been in patent litigation and have won every case. I am now involved in an interference case in connection with the last patent awarded me, namely, the tungsten carbide milling cutter.

PATENT INCENTIVE

I have always looked upon a patent as an act of Congress, as an incentive to promote new, novel, and useful devices, processes, and formulas for the ultimate benefit of the entire Nation. The inventor's reward is 17 years' monopoly. The abuses of patent rights are seldom attributed to the inventor. It is the assignee who exploits the patent right by exorbitant prices, royalties, restriction of production and, in many incidences, refuses to produce the patented article, etc., and holds the patent dormant so as to prevent its interference or competition with some other device, etc., already in production.

ABUSES OF PATENT LAW

My first experience with the abuses of patent law was in 1920. The electrical spot welder was a big money saver over the use of punched holes and rivets. When the spot-welding apparatus was first introduced, it was purchased outright for $900. Suddenly the method of marketing changed. You could no longer buy a spot welder outright. The terms were $1,000 for the privilege of using a spot welder in your plant. Then a monthly royalty based on the number of spots welded. Although paying $1,000—$100 more than the original purchase price—the spot welder remained the property of the manufacturer. The result was infringement and the alleged infringer was supported by manufacturers using such spot welders, who believed they were being imposed upon. A large amount of money was raised among subscribers, which included Ford Motor Co., Willys-Overland, and others. I, at that time, subscribed to the fund because I had just bought a second-hand spot welder for $400 and it was an outright purchase. I was informed by a director of my company that I was buying a lawsuit, but I could not see paying $1,000 for something that would not belong to me. The final result was the courts invalidated the patent and those users who had acquiesced in the exorbitant terms were the losers along with the patentees.

In 1926 exactly the same circumstances and conditions were applied to the sand cutting machine, a power-driven machine for mixing molding sand to a uniform moisture and density. This sand cutter, which replaced the man with a shovel, did a much better job in far less time with less skill required, but the owners of the sand cutter patents, like the patentees of the electrical spot welder, wanted a perpetual revenue for the patents. In other words, they were following the example set by the United Shoe Machinery Co., who for several years preferred to rent their patented machinery rather than sell it outright.

PATENT CONDITION, SO-CALLED

Among manufacturers of patented devices and the legal profession specializing in patents, there is a term, highly significant, known as building up "a patent condition." For example, a manufacturer is enjoying a very profitable and comfortable business from the commercial success of a patented device. Constantly the patentee watches the issuance of new patents which may be a threat to his subject monopoly. Lots of these patents, termed "a nuisance value," are purchased from the inventor for all the way from $200 to $2,000. In most cases $500 or $1,000 will purchase so-called "nuisance value" patents. Furthermore, the patentee, in all probability, has a department engaged in experiments and developments. Such a department endeavors to develop and patent ideas having the same function, manner of functioning, and results produced, as the

patent enjoying commercial success. There is no intention on the part of said patentee to produce his own competitive device or to license anybody else to do so. The sole object in patenting further developments and buying the patents of others (nuisance values) is to protect the patent under which he is manufacturing profitably and comfortably because of the monopoly enjoyed. I, myself, have engaged in such practice. It is a common practice to sue an alleged infringer for infringement of a patent not being manufactured to protect a patent that is being manufactured. This condition arises from the fact that the same result may be obtained through a different function or manner of functioning and thus an alleged infringer, in case of litigation, can feel reasonably sure of a court decision for noninfringement.

THE SPIRIT OF PATENT LAW

Frequently, courts in patent cases base their findings on the spirit of the law. A case in point is the repeating rifle. The patentee and manufacturer diligently developed and produced said repeating rifles, and, without undue loss of time, they were in the hands of the shooting public. A farmer, seeing such rifles on the market, informed his attorney that the repeating rifle was his idea. He had thought of it long ago, and, to prove it, he took his attorney up into the attic and, from the shelf, brought down a dust-covered, crude model of a repeating rifle. Immediately the attorney saw a lucrative case against the manufacturer of the repeating rifle. A suit was filed and the case was heard. The opinion of the court was unique: "When Congress first passed the patent law, the object was to encourage creative faculty for the benefit of the public at large, and the incentive was a temporary exclusive right to the manufacture and sale of the patented article. Therefore, the question of diligence arises. If a man conceives an idea that is new, novel, and useful, he is in duty bound under the spirit of patent law to be diligent in placing the said article in the hands of the public. The plaintiff, having finished the first model and apparently abandoning it, did not comply with the spirit of patent law. In fact, it was the defendant's diligence that revived the interest of the plaintiff in his own alleged invention. Therefore, I feel in duty bound to decide this case in favor of the defendant" (the manufacturer of the repeating rifle).

As an inventor, I would willingly forego such a practice if it were law, and I further believe that any patentee abusing the patent right through exorbitant charges, curtailing production, or, in other words, any violation of the spirit of patent law, the subject patent should be held invalid.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours.

J. H. GRAYSON.

Carry On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting a very beautiful and moving poem written by Mack P. McCabe, engineer's mate, third class, of El Reno, Okla., after a visit to the graves of fallen marine heroes on Saipan. I am sure this poem carries a timely message for all of us.

The poem, which is entitled "Carry On," follows:

CARRY ON

On the grassy slope of a tropical isle,
Many miles across the sea,
Is a sacred spot where heroes sleep,
The sleep of eternity.

Beneath them lies the now quiet beach,
Where death fell in sheets like rain,
While above them rises the lofty heights,
Which they tried to reach in vain.

For them, the struggle is over,
But the cause for which they died
Is enshrined to the world forever
By small crosses, side by side.

But for those who remain it's not finished,
They must push forward until
The Stars and Stripes wave proudly
From the crest of the highest hill.

And in the evening, when day is closing,
Or in the first faint flashes of dawn,
Each cross seems to silently spread its arms
And pray, "Please, God, help them carry on."

—*M. P. McCabe.*

Coal Situation in Western Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the coal situation in western Pennsylvania at present is bad, and is growing worse. The terms of the wage scale agreed upon under the new coal operators' contract of April and approved by the War Labor Board are endangered by indecision in OPA. The OPA has arbitrarily set the price so that 25 percent of the mines in the Pittsburgh district will simply trade dollars or lose money. It should now be pointed out that the operators are necessarily laying off shifts and are closing mines currently. We are not getting full production. There is danger of safety precautions and upkeep being slighted in all western Pennsylvania mines.

Let me quote what the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on July 9 editorially says about the situation:

As Congressmen from the coal-producing areas warn that the country faces another coal shortage this winter unless the price is increased to meet the increased cost of production, a report from Washington says that the OPA, the Solid Fuels Administration, and the Office of Economic Stabilization are discussing the situation.

Briefly, this is reported to be the situation. The slight increase in the price of coal authorized by the OPA is not sufficient to meet the increased cost of production authorized by the WLB in raising the wages of miners. As a result, the fear has been expressed that coal production will suffer as operators reduce their labor costs by eliminating overtime work as much as possible.

If this is correct, the OPA or the Solid Fuels Administration or the Office of Economic Stabilization had better do something about it right away. The public does not expect producers to mine and sell coal at a loss. The public, which has more spending money than ever before, will have enough to buy coal next winter. And if coal is not obtainable, for love or money, shivering householders will not appreciate the fact that the stabilization program saved them a few cents a ton on the coal they cannot buy.

It is one thing to do without the essentials of life when they have to go into the war effort. It is something else again when Government agencies, which found a way to sidestep wartime regulations in raising mine wages, create an unnecessary shortage of coal by fixing the price below the cost.

Charles Baton, of Pittsburgh, chairman of the coal operators' committee of district No. 2, representing both the large and many small coal operators in western Pennsylvania, says:

There is no doubt that under current conditions, unless there is some price adjustment to meet the recent wage increase agreed upon between the miners and the operators, that there will be a definite trend to discontinue the more expensive production of coal, such as overtime work, night shifts for which extra pay is given, and it will be necessary to leave thin veins of coal unmined.

Unless such full production can be engaged in without loss, current stockpile shortages and shortages of domestic coal will grow more severe.

John P. Busarello, president of district 5, United Mine Workers of America, today has given me a fair and reasonable statement on the importance of the western Pennsylvania coal situation to the Nation, the war effort, and the miners and western Pennsylvania mining communities. He states:

The contract agreed upon between the United Mine Workers of America and the coal operators on April 11, 1945, was approved by the War Labor Board on April 24, 1945, and was put into effect when the OPA approved the recommended wage increase on April 30, 1945. This contract has been in force since that time with the expectation that the Office of Price Administration would grant a fair adjustment in the selling price of coal to meet the new contract obligation.

Because the OPA has failed to grant an adjustment in price sufficient to meet the cost in the production of coal, we miners know that the operators are compelled to lay off every man they possibly can, which is reducing the safety precautions to a minimum. As a result miners' lives are endangered in the mines, as the OPA regulations do not permit the operators to meet their obligation to the miners.

At a meeting in Washington recently the OPA admitted of its own free will and accord that in order to meet the demands of the new agreement, an adjustment of 22 cents per ton was required. In the face of the facts that there is a terrible shortage of coal in our Nation now and there will be people in homes at freezing temperatures this coming winter, many small mines are now working only 5 days a week as a result of this condition. And it looks very much like there will be a black market of coal in the Pittsburgh district unless this condition is alleviated in the very near future by the OPA.

Not only have production and safety suffered terribly in the mines in our district since the operators have been laying off men in order to reduce costs, but under conditions such as this, existing in our district mines, there can be no peace between the operators and the miners. The miners of western Pennsylvania want full production for the war effort, and want it to be obtained through cooperation and peaceful adjustment.

The operators are today cutting down on the agreement that they have signed only because of the fact that the OPA has not allowed them an increase to cover the cost of production.

This condition must be corrected and the public should know the above facts in order that they may fully understand the situation now existing in the coal industry in our district.

Your Congressman states for the RECORD now: We will have a great shortage of coal this fall and this action of the OPA is one of the considerable factors causing such result. I am afraid the OPA is using the old "kill-the-little-pig" formulas, which will cut production.

We will all suffer this winter and we must press the OPA to act now. Let the people of my good Thirty-first Congressional District of Pennsylvania be warned and get adequate winter coal where you can now. You will need it this winter for your family. Do not hesitate. If you cannot get it, wire or write OPA immediately.

G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, few legislative measures enacted by Congress have offered such promise to the men and women in the armed forces as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, popularly known as the G. I. bill of rights. However, weaknesses have developed in administration of this legislation and other faults have been found in the light of experience. One in particular has to do with setting price standards on a "reasonable normal value" at a time when conditions are far from normal.

Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, has written a most constructive appraisal of the G. I. bill of rights for the American magazine. He makes sound and practical suggestions as regards both administration of the law and changes that should be made by Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include the national commander's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of Members of Congress:

Cheered by the tremendous publicity that has been given the GI bill of rights, eager to accept the opportunities and security that this act of Congress promised veterans, thousands upon thousands of discharged servicemen are rolling up their sleeves, taking pens in hand, and preparing to fill out the forms that will give them the benefits pledged by a grateful government.

They're anxious to get education and vocational training, they want to borrow to buy a home or a farm or to set themselves up in business, and, according to the public prints and the radio and the morale-building movie shorts, this will be as easy as rolling into a fox hole.

But this is not the case. The measure is not fully effective, for many reasons. Inadequate administration, red tape, too narrow interpretations, and certain weaknesses found in the legislation through experience are among contributing factors to its ineffectiveness. Administration of the legislation has not been in keeping with the spirit and intent of Congress.

Regulations must be changed to eliminate masses of red tape that hog-tie the veteran, with liberalization of many of the provisions in the GI bill so he can get easily what he was promised by Congress. Every day the number of discharged veterans increases; every day hundreds are learning that not only do the regulations fail to fulfill the promise offered to them under the bill of rights, but in some cases they actually give veterans less than has already been provided by Congress for civilians.

Banks will lend on good will, but the GI bill won't recognize it. A veteran wanted to buy a bakery at a fair price, which took into account the location of the bakery and its long lines of constant customers—in other words, its goodwill. Since these intangible assets did not entitle him to Government aid, he bought the bakery with an ordinary 6-percent bank loan.

Another veteran, who had become a good pharmacist in the Navy, had a chance to buy a drug store at a bargain. It was well stocked and worth at least $8,000, and he could get it for $6,000. The bill of rights could not help him to buy the stock on the shelves; it could aid him only in buying the fixtures. A civilian bought the store and is doing fine.

A veteran wanted to buy a pressing and dry-cleaning business that had an income of $30,000 a year. He had some cash and collateral and got a regular loan from a bank, but he needed $4,000 more to close the deal, partly to buy cleaning fluids and clothes hangers. The Veterans' Administration refused to help because part of the money would be used for expendable material—the fluid would be used up and the hangers would be given away.

Veterans often find that banks will make business loans, at 6 percent, which the Veterans' Administration rejects, even though the most conservative bankers agree that the security offered is gilt-edged. Banks consider the character and ability of the man as an asset and lend on that, for working capital and inventory, and will lend so a man can stock and run a restaurant, a store, or a filling station. The Veterans' Administration won't lend for working capital or on inventory even when the veteran offers responsible cosigners—loans that a bank is eager to get.

The bill of rights was enacted on June 22, 1944, and the American Legion, with the aid of veterans who sought to use it, has kept a critical eye upon it as it has gone through its shake-down cruise. The machinery has been subjected to all the tests of trial-and-error, and while basically the design is sound, many bugs are showing up.

The major weaknesses in the bill are the provisions for education and vocational training and those that offer guarantees for loans. The injustices in the educational and training program can be corrected easily. The barrier of age should be lifted, so that many men over 25 who now are not eligible may take college or vocational courses, and arrangements should be made to pay more of the tuition for technical courses that are shorter and more expensive, per month, than the average college courses. The veteran, too, should be provided with more expert advice, to guide him to the courses for which he is best fitted and which will aid him most in his postscholastic life.

The educational provisions, even in today's imperfect form, are of substantial aid. After the bill of rights had been in operation for more than 11 months, and more than 1,500,000 men had been discharged, 35,907 veterans had been granted the school benefits, which pay up to $500 for a year's tuition of at least 32 weeks' duration, and give maintenance pay of $50 a month for single men and women and $75 for those with dependents.

However, the loan provision—a guaranty of up to $2,000—had been of almost no value to those 1,500,000 men. In the same 11-month period it aided 6,225 in buying homes, but—after all the promises that were made to the would-be farmers and would-be businessmen—only 137 farm loans were approved and only 335 veterans were able to use the bill of rights to set themselves up in business.

Red tape and the restrictions are barring thousands. Investigations show that time after time a veteran who wants to buy a small store or start a trucking service or a lunch counter, or who wants a farm of his own, has found the procedure so complicated and the terms so stiff that he has given up without ever filing an application. Some veterans returning from combat have found they can finance a home, a farm, or a business with less delay and red tape by direct application to agencies that are open to everybody.

The most startling examples appear when the returning veteran wants to buy a farm. He becomes amazed and apoplectic when he finds that the bill of rights does not offer a better deal than is available to every farmer qualified to borrow under the Bankhead-Jones Act, which puts the efficient civilian farmer into business and helps him succeed. The bill of rights has one advantage. The Government pays the first year's interest (not more than $80) on that part of the loan which it guarantees. But under the bill of rights the veteran must pay off the loan in 20 years and may have to furnish some capital. Under the Farm Tenant Act he will have 40 years in which to pay off, and he would be eligible in some instances where farmers could not qualify.

We know that thousands of veterans want to buy farms and that hundreds have made purchases and have negotiated loans. When the record shows that out of all these, in the first 11 months, only 137 were able to use the GI bill, it is obvious that we are giving infinitesimal advantages to the man who comes home from war with a longing for a farm of his own. No wonder he thinks he has been the victim of hollow promises.

In general the provisions of the bill of rights, regarding loans on farms, homes, and businesses, are these:

The qualified veteran who wants to buy a certain property arranges for a loan with a lending agency—such as a bank, Federal Housing, RFC, or the Farm Security Administration—in much the same manner as though he were a civilian, except that the Government guarantees the payment of 50 percent of the loan up to $2,000. The Government doesn't lend him that $2,000. It merely assures the lending agency that it will stand good for that amount and, as the loan is reduced, so, in proportion, is the guaranty.

If the veteran, for instance, wants to buy a $6,000 business, he may be able to get it with $1,000 of his own money and a loan of $5,000 from a bank, which gets a Government guaranty on $2,000 of that loan. If he wants to buy property worth $1,000 and needs a loan of $500, the Government guarantees only $250.

Take the case of a veteran who wanted to buy a home for $1,800. The owner had received an offer of $2,000 for it but was willing to knock $200 off the purchase price to help a veteran. However, the official appraiser reported that the "reasonable normal value" of the home was only $1,600 and that therefore the veteran was about to pay more than it was worth. So the Veterans' Administration refused to guarantee any part of the loan.

The local Veterans' Administration office had predicted that the loan would be approved. The veteran had moved into the house and had paid the first year's taxes when the bad news finally arrived from Washington. At last report all was confusion, and neither the veteran, the bank, nor the owner of the house knew what to do—but all were raising their voices in loud protest.

That phrase, "reasonable normal value," is the road block which is causing much of the trouble. Congress wants to protect veterans, to be sure that they do not pay more for a property than it is worth, and to protect the lending agency, too, so that if, in a few years, values fall, the loan will still be sound. So Congress stated that no GI loan can be guaranteed if the purchase price exceeds "the reasonable normal value," which means the value in normal times—and these are not normal times.

One veteran wrote, "The land bank appraisers tell me that this clause kills the whole bill, because nothing exists that can be bought at reasonable normal value today."

So strict is the Veterans' Administration that a loan was rejected when the appraiser reported that the veteran was going to pay $60 more than the value of the property. The rules of the Veterans' Administration will not allow the purchaser to make a payment on the side to lower the selling price to the appraiser's estimate. Otherwise, the veteran might have paid the seller the $60 difference and arranged the loan.

The reasonable normal value of almost any profitable business these days is far below its wartime current value. A veteran was willing to pay almost twice its normal value for a successful restaurant because, in these times, he would have an excellent chance to pay off his loan before any slump might come in the restaurant business. But he didn't even apply for aid, for he knew the appraiser would cite the normal value and the GI loan would be disapproved.

A veteran, an experienced farmer, had an opportunity to buy a good 240-acre farm for $4,800, but couldn't get his loan because the appraised normal value was $4,200.

"I could earn enough money in the next few years," he protested, "so I could make my regular payments and set aside enough money to carry me through any depression." But the Veterans' Administration pointed to the law. It couldn't help him unless he paid only the normal value.

Many veterans are prevented from buying businesses because the GI bill guarantees no loans on inventory or stock. The Veterans' Administration can help in the purchase of a truck for deliveries, or for fixtures in a store, but the purchase of goods that are to be sold must be financed elsewhere.

Recently a discharged major told this story: He was 52 years old, had served in both world wars, and in between had been a flier and a businessman. He wanted to buy for $7,000 a store that was stocked with second-hand furniture and to move it to a town that is certain to have a boom. Its factories are about to reopen as restrictions are lifted on material needed for the manufacture of civilian goods. The major was sure he had an excellent chance to make about $1,000 a month, but the Veterans' Administration could not guarantee a loan on stock—and there's not much but stock in a second-hand furniture store.

Farmers and businessmen often need a loan for working capital, in addition to the money for the purchase price, but the veteran gets no working capital under the GI bill. A banker reports, "We are always reluctant to make a loan, when working capital is lacking, so in many cases the veteran, lacking only a few hundred dollars to get himself started, finds himself defeated before he fills out a form."

The Veterans' Administration, properly, will not make a business loan unless the veteran has ability and experience and is reasonably sure to be successful in his undertaking. But sometimes the Government itself, through other agencies, prevents an experienced man from having any opportunity for success. In other words, even with a GI loan, the veteran desiring to go into business finds himself blocked by another branch of the Government. WPB, ODT, and OPA regulations are mostly to blame, in cases where—because a man has been away at war—he has no business record that entitles him to supplies of restricted commodities. The civilian, who stayed at home, gets the stuff.

Restrictions should be lifted in favor of veterans whether they are using the GI loan plan or not. We must not stand idly by while men and women home from war find that their service actually bars them from advantages that are available to civilians.

In Massachusetts a veteran, partly paralyzed, wanted to make and sell doughnuts, and he was all set to earn a living until the OPA decided that it couldn't give him the 250 pounds of sugar every month. Every effort was made to help him, but the OPA said, "He's a new industrial user," and, as such, the law says, "No sugar."

Fortunately, he was struck with a good idea. He joined forces with a man who owned a lunchroom and who had been making doughnuts for years, and he set up his machine as part of the lunchroom and now gets his sugar. It should be noted, however, that there has been some relaxation so far as industrial use of sugar, fats, and oils is concerned.

A photographer who sold all his equipment to the Signal Corps when he went into the Army was given a medical discharge after serving 2½ years. But the WPB will not give him the proper priorities, and he can't return to his old profession.

We have many such cases. Men who, before they went into the service, were coal dealers, tire recappers, electrical supply dealers, truckmen, and garment makers report that they cannot get priorities which will put them back in business. The owner of a plastics manufacturing company, forced to sell his plant at a loss when he went into the Army, is now discharged and eager to go back into business. He was given a priority, but it's not high enough to get the machines he needs. Of course, he may eventually get his machines, but the point is that he has been forced to wait while civilians had priority.

Protests come from all over the United States regarding delays and red tape. Generally it takes at least 2 weeks for the veteran to get from the Veterans' Administration a certificate that proves he is eligible for the loan. Certification of eligibility under the GI bill and other rights should be given the veteran automatically when he is discharged.

Another bad feature is that when the veteran is ready to apply for the loan he must fill out a multitude of forms and pay from $5 to $20 to an appraiser whose report on the "reasonable normal value" of the property may wreck all the proceedings. Even if he doesn't get the loan, he must pay the appraiser's fee in most cases; and sometimes veterans make deposits to hold property and lose the deposit when the Veterans' Administration refuses to O. K. the loan. One such veteran lost a deposit of $250, most of his mustering-out pay.

So complicated is the procedure that many men who have faced Germans and Japs without flinching throw up their hands and surrender. "I gave up in bewilderment and disgust," says one man, "after I had answered about a million questions and found I had about a million more to answer. It turns out that a businessman can borrow $100,000 from his bank with less red tape than is necessary for a serviceman to get a guaranty for $500."

No one wants the Government to guarantee poor loans, but I believe that new rules and new interpretations can be worked out which will assure that neither the Veterans' Administration nor the veteran himself is victimized. In many more cases, let's give the veteran the benefit of the doubt.

We are now asking for amendments to assure veterans the benefits intended by Congress, and to correct inequities, and demanding that the regulations of the Veterans' Administration be simplified and shortened so that the average veteran can understand his rights under the law and be able to obtain them upon reasonable application. Simultaneously, WPB, ODT, and OPA regulations must be amended so that supplies and equipment will be available to veterans, to the end that these wartime regulations will not block the GI bill of rights.

The term "reasonable normal value," in connection with GI loans, should give way to a more liberal term, such as "reasonable value" or "reasonable market value." If the appraised value is less than the seller's price, the veteran should be permitted to make up the difference by direct payment to the seller.

However, with the liberalizing of the law, care should be taken to protect the veteran for the "long pull," and expert counsel should be available at no cost to the veteran, so that he will not be the victim of bad bargains in homes, businesses, and farms.

Veterans should be granted priorities on materials necessary for the conduct of new businesses.

The Veterans' Administration should simplify its regulations and speed up its processes.

It should not be necessary for a veteran to make a deposit to hold property until the loan is arranged, and appraisal fees should be paid by the seller, the lending agency, or by the Government.

The regulations should be changed to permit sound loans on inventory and, under favorable circumstances, loans for working capital.

The farm-loan situation should be examined. In many cases the guaranty of $2,000 is not enough for the purchase of a good, well-equipped, and productive farm. Perhaps we could increase that guaranty with small risk of loss.

The proper kind of bill of rights will help our veterans become self-sufficient; it will increase employment and production. It is not a contribution to charity; it is a Government investment in manhood, womanhood, and democracy.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 15, 1945:

NEVERTHELESS WE NEED SEAWAY

It is reported that the anthracite industry is organized to defeat the St. Lawrence seaway. Some 50 members of the industry, assembled in Washington, were told that "construction of the seaway would deprive the railroads of about 20,000,000 tons of freight yearly, a large percentage of this being coal."

If so, shippers presumably would benefit by this shift of a 20,000,000 ton freight movement to water-borne rates. Consumers would benefit if the savings were passed along to them—by orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission or as the direct result of competition.

This is not to say that shippers, consumers, and the people as a whole do not need

the railroads. They do. The Nation must have them even if it has to resort to subsidy.

However, freight does not move on a waterway until it first has been hauled there. So the figures discussed by the anthracite industry need analysis. If some long overland hauls were curtailed by a seaway, to what degree would shorter overland hauls, to ports on that seaway, offset the losses to the railways?

And, if hydroelectric power instead of coal were used to produce cheaper electricity, would not that be in the public interest?

The seaway must be constructed regardless of its competitive effects on railroads, the coal industry, or other enterprises. Even if it seriously injures such businesses, the public benefits will greatly exceed those injuries. And if the public, for its own best protection, has to sustain one or a number of those industries despite their losses, then that will be a share of the cost of seaway benefits.

Service Records of Sons of Mrs. Ludie Elnora Winegar, of Redlands, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, during the impact of our wartime program, there have been many contributions made by the citizens of this Nation. I wish to take this opportunity of calling attention to the Members of the Congress and to the Nation as a whole the contributions that have been made by a most splendid mother, Mrs. Ludie Elnora Winegar, 225 Fourth Street, Redlands, Calif.

Mrs. Winegar has six sons in the service and the seventh left on June 11 for induction. The latter son has been employed in defense work awaiting his induction call. An eighth son who was in the Army for 3 months has an honorable physical discharge.

This splendid mother and all her children are stanch supporters of democratic processes. Mrs. Winegar has been a widow for 17 years but has successfully directed a course for her sons and daughters that has resulted in their being splendid citizens.

The military records of her sons are as follows:

John C. Winegar, chief machinist mate, San Diego, Calif., has been in the Navy 20 years and was in Pearl Harbor at the time of the attack. He is 39 years of age.

Wiley J. Winegar, ship fitter, first class, has been in the service since 1941, and participated in the invasion of Germany. He is now in South America. He is 37 years of age.

Henry J. Winegar, warrant officer, has been in the Navy since 1939. He has been in 18 major battles and is now in the South Pacific giving further service to his Nation. He is 26 years of age.

Arthur C. Winegar, machinist, first class, has been in the Navy since 1941 and is now serving his Nation in the South Pacific. He is 25 years of age.

Leonard F. Winegar, A. R. T., second class, has been in the Navy since 1943 and now is serving in Honolulu. He is 21 years of age.

Marion C. Winegar, seaman, first class, has been in the Navy since 1943 and is presently serving in the South Pacific. He is 20 years of age.

James W. Winegar was in the Army 3 months and has a physical discharge.

Donald P. Winegar, who has been in defense work, reported for induction on June 11.

Mrs. Winegar lost one son, Robert, about 8 years ago, but with all the difficulties that were encountered, this family has always responded in behalf of our country's welfare in a most splendid manner; and I take this opportunity of paying my compliments to every member of the family for the manner in which they have supported their Nation not only in military categories but in bond drives and other war activities as well.

Recognition of the Hebrew Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 18 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD correspondence between the secretary-general of UNCIO and the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation at the United States Conference in San Francisco.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE,
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION,
May 19, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. BERGSON: I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of May 1, 1945, on behalf of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation.

The Conference at San Francisco is a conference of governments rather than of groups, and its purpose is to draft a charter to provide the best possible organization for all peoples of the world regardless of race, language, religion, or sex. It is appreciated that the question of international security involves peoples everywhere irrespective of such differentiations. The interests of special groups are presumably represented by their own national delegations.

I hope you will understand the desirability of adhering to this policy in the interest of early agreement on the text of the charter.

Sincerely yours,
For the secretary general:
T. T. MCCROSKY,
Information Officer.

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF
NATIONAL LIBERATION,
San Francisco, Calif., May 24, 1945.

Mr. ALGER HISS,
Secretary General, United Nations Conference on International Organization.

DEAR MR. HISS: I beg to acknowledge receipt of two letters of May 19 and May 23 from your office over the signature of T. T. McCrosky.

Of course, we fully realize and fully agree that as the letters state, "the Conference at San Francisco is a conference of governments rather than of groups, and its purpose is to draft a charter to provide the best possible organization for all peoples of the world regardless of race, language, religion, or sex," and that "the interests of special groups are presumably represented by their own national delegations."

It is because we fully agree with that premise that in our letter of May 1 we take great pains to repeatedly clarify that we do not ask representation in behalf of the Jews who are citizens of the United States or of other countries. We stressed that our demand was to seat a Hebrew national delegation at the Conference which will represent the interests of the Hebrew nation, just as any one of the 49 other delegations represent the interests of their nations. No one of these delegations is either supposed or presumes to speak for the surviving 3,000,000 Hebrews of Europe and Palestine who are both de jure and de facto unrepresented at the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

I take the liberty, therefore, to refer you again to our letters and request that they be submitted to the appropriate commission, and to the delegates as a Conference document.

I beg to remain, sir,
Faithfully yours,
PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION,
June 7, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. BERGSON: I acknowledge your letter of May 24, 1945, in which you once more demand the seating of a Hebrew national delegation at the United Nations Conference, and again request that your letters "be submitted to the appropriate commission, and to the delegates as a Conference document."

I refer to our earlier replies under dates of May 19 and May 25 and reaffirm the position that the interests of special groups (or of peoples, if you prefer) are presumably represented by their respective national delegations, and that your request for distribution of your letters cannot under the circumstances be complied with.

I need not point out that under existing rules of international law the Hebrews do not constitute a state in the accepted legal sense of that term. Since such a state does not at this time exist, it follows that there is no Hebrew government that might appropriately be represented at the United Nations Conference.

It is therefore not anticipated that the subject to which your letters refer will be acted upon at San Francisco.

Sincerely yours,
ALGER HISS,
Secretary General.

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF
NATIONAL LIBERATION,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. HISS: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 7, in which you state that the "interests of special groups (or of peoples, if you prefer) are presumably represented by their respective national delegations," and in which you further state "that under existing rules of international law the Hebrews do not constitute a state in the accepted legal sense of that term. Since such a state does not at this time exist, it follows that there is no Hebrew government that might appropriately be represented at the United Nations Conference."

In reply may I point out that numerous United Nations conferences were held which were officially constituted not only of representatives of United Nations governments,

but also national authorities that were not recognized as governments. The Charter of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, for example, provides for membership of governments and national authorities, and was in fact signed by the French Committee of National Liberation as a national authority although it was very definitely not recognized as the Government of France. We maintain, therefore, that a Hebrew national delegation could have participated at the Conference on the same basis.

Since the opening of the United Nations Conference on International Organization four additional national delegations have been seated and in all four cases they represented governments that have never before been recognized by any of the United Nations. In fact, in the case of the Soviet Ukraine and Byelo Russia, they represent nations that have never before been recognized as such by accepted international law procedure or by any international conference.

In view of these facts, and in view of the national disaster that has befallen the Hebrew Nation, we felt the United Nations Conference on International Organization should be given an opportunity to study and decide as to whether the Hebrews be recognized as a fellow member of the United Nations. We asked, therefore, that the memorandum outlining the case for the seating of a Hebrew national delegation at the Conference should be circulated as a Conference document amongst all the member nations. It is with deep regret that we learned of your decision, which barred even the consideration of this grave problem by the Conference delegates.

We beg to reiterate once again the fact that though most Hebrews are adherents of the Jewish faith it by no means follows that all Jews the world over are Hebrew nationals. We do not speak, therefore, in the name of the Jewish citizens of the United States or Great Britain anymore than Catholic Spain is the spokesman for the Catholic citizens of the United States or Great Britain. Our demand for representation, therefore, was not on behalf of the people who were, as you state, "presumably represented by their national delegations." We sought representation for some 3,000,000 Hebrews who are not represented at this Conference in any way, directly or indirectly.

We fully appreciate the complexity of our situation, but as a nation that has suffered the most staggering toll of casualties in this war, as a nation that has contributed tens of thousands of guerrilla fighters, and tens of thousands of regulars who fought in their own units, under their own flag (under supreme British command), we felt the United Nations Conference should be willing to undertake the necessary action to accept us into the family of nations and deny us no longer the right of a normal and dignified existence.

Are the 700,000 Hebrews of Palestine represented at the United Nations Conference on International Organization? Are the 400,000 Hebrews of Rumania, and the 400,000 Hebrews of Hungary represented? Who spoke for the hundreds of thousands of the stateless Jews—the most abused and humiliated heroes of this war? Must the present situation continue in which these people and their sacred dead are regarded by the United Nations as Germans and Axis nationals, though the Axis has decimated their population, and but for the grace of God would have totally exterminated them? (Indeed, some Axis countries are already listing the hundreds of thousands of Hebrews murdered by them as part of their suffering during the war and as a medium of evoking the mercy of the United Nations.)

We know that this situation is not the result of ill will on the part of the leading United Nations statesmen, but rather of the confusion resulting from our abnormal existence to date.

The recognition by the United Nations Conference on International Organization of the Hebrews as a member of the United Nations would have brought to an end this discriminatory and humiliating situation. It would have paved the way for a solution of a problem which has already cost millions of innocent lives, and which has been repeatedly used by aggressor nations to shatter the peace of the world.

In view of the above we feel constrained to reiterate our request that our proposals be submitted to the appropriate commission of the delegates as a Conference document so that nations willing to take the initiative for action will be enabled to do so, and so that the wrong done by barring us from the United Nations Conference on International Organization may be eventually rectified by granting the Hebrew Nation a seat on the General Assembly.

Faithfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

Firm Hand Needed in Balkan Powder Keg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to call attention of the House to the alarming situation in the Balkans. The reactionary Greek Government installed by British bayonets is condoning terrorism by private bands of armed Fascist vigilantes. Participants in the struggle of the Greek people for democratic government, men and women who heroically resisted the Nazis and drove them from large areas of Greece, are being hunted down.

Newspaper stories have recounted a mass exodus of Macedonians and others across the border into Yugoslavia. In this connection, I would like to call the attention of the House to two articles, one from PM, Wednesday, July 18, 1945, being a statement by the Macedonian-American People's League, and the other a feature article in the Philadelphia Inquirer. The articles follow:

[From PM, New York, July 18, 1945]

MACEDONIANS HERE PROTEST GREEK ACTIONS—DELEGATION BEARING STATEMENT SNUBBED AT GREEK EMBASSY

(By Alexander H. Uhl)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—The Greek Embassy yesterday refused to receive a letter of protest against persecution of Macedonians in Greece presented to it by the Macedonian-American People's League.

A delegation of three—George Pirinsky, secretary of the league, Alexander Rizov, and Anatole Phillipoff, all of New York—went to the Embassy with their letter and were received by First Secretary Alexis S. Liatis. The Ambassador is in New York.

Liatis listened until they had finished the first paragraph and then declared that he would not listen further nor would he accept the protest. He said that it was based on Yugoslav information and was full of calumnies. The delegation finally left the letter on his desk and walked out.

The letter protested against activities of the Greek Army against Macedonians who have fled to Yugoslavia and asked that the protest be forwarded to Athens.

"The Macedonian-American People's League," the letter continued, "has always stood for friendship and close co-operation among the Balkan peoples. Greeks and Macedonians, fighting shoulder to shoulder with Yugoslav, Albanian, and Bulgarian partizans against Nazi oppressors and Bulgarian occupationists, cemented Balkan democratic unity.

"The policy and actions of the present Greek Government, however, greatly compromise the chances for harmonious collaboration in the Balkans."

In a statement issued to the press, the league also blames the reactionaries in Greece for the present troubles.

"The tragic civil war in Greece last December," the statement reads, "ended in the complete victory of reaction and fascism. The very same elements which had collaborated with the Germans, reinforced by discredited foreign agents, are today subjecting the whole Greek population to the most outrageous terror. According to neutral UNRRA sources, some 33,000 democrats are languishing in prison. General Ares, one of the outstanding heroes of the Greek liberation struggle, and hundreds of his followers have been brutally murdered. The Fascist regime of Metaxes has reappeared under a new name. Without foreign interference, these tragic developments would never have occurred."

The statement declares that in Macedonia 2 years ago Greeks, Yugoslavs, and Bulgars were fighting together in the guerilla movement and that today Macedonia once again is being filled with friction and discord. Then it adds:

"Why? For one reason only: because outside interests foreign to the welfare of the Balkan peoples imposed on the Greeks by armed force an unpopular regime which can only keep in power through stirring up mutual hatreds and antagonism in the Balkan Peninsula."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer]

MACEDONIA CALLED KEY TO BALKAN ISSUE

(By Alexander Kendrick)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—The Balkan powder keg, which has been exploding recently in the form of clashes on the Greek border with Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania has become a top item for discussion between Premier Josef Stalin and Prime Minister Winston Chruchill at the Potsdam Conference, it was learned today.

With President Truman playing the role of intensely interested observer, because the implementation of the Crimea agreement is concerned, the two heads of state of Russia and Great Britain are expected to reexamine their Balkan agreement made when Mr. Churchill visited Moscow last October.

The key to the Balkan question, as always, lies in Macedonia, that small former Turkish province which is about the size of West Virginia. Macedonia is important as a clue to the possibilities of a Slav federation in the Balkans.

Moscow is heartily in favor of such a federation, which would include Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, and perhaps Greece, not because of ethnic or geopolitical considerations, but because the Russians see in a democratic Balkans their own best means of security.

London, on the other hand, opposes such a federation because it may have too much impact on the whole Mediterranean area, which she considers vital to her interests.

The Macedonian question, which erupted into the news recently when Marshal Tito's forces skirmished with armed EDES troops of the Greek Government, was made an official issue today, on a small scale, when a Macedonian-American delegation handed Greek Ambassador Cimon Diamantopoulos a protest to be sent to the Athens Government.

The Macedonian-Americans, representing 30,000 of their compatriots in this country, charged that a state of terror exists in Greece "aimed at the extermination of the Macedonian Slavs in the Greek part of Macedonia."

On the level of international statesmanship, however, as exemplified by the Potsdam Conference, the situation is much more significant than a mere border clash.

It involves the question whether the three separate parts of Macedonia, one included in Bulgaria, one in Yugoslavia, and one in Greece, shall be permitted to come together again, as they were under Turkish rule.

If they do reunite, the autonomous Macedonia resulting will inevitably become a member of the Balkan federation envisioned by Marshal Tito. Greece would lose the important port of Salonika, and a pro-Russian influence would be sitting squarely on the Mediterranean.

Russia favors such a resu't; Britain opposes it. What Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin now face is the realization that hard-and-fast lines cannot be drawn between two spheres of influence, as they attempted to draw them in Moscow last fall.

Every year since 1941, an all-Slav congress has been held in Moscow. These meetings, participated in by democratic and trade-union leaders from all parts of the Balkans, have served to emphasize the difference between the old pan-Slav movement of the Czarist empire, which was a mask for imperial expansion, and the present all-Slav movement, which is based on democratic principles and the equality of its members.

At the present time pro-Russian Governments are functioning in Belgrade and Sofia. Albania also is predominantly pro-Russian, and so are the Macedonians in Greece. But this does not necessarily mean they all favor a Communist form of government.

Ties of blood and history and similarities of language and custom have convinced them that their best future lies in the Russian orbit rather than any other.

They remember that even the reactionary czarist regime was the principal liberating force in the Balkans, beginning with the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, which resulted in the freeing of Bulgaria.

There is one possible way out of this Balkan dilemma, and Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin will undoubtedly talk about it. In 1930 Britain promised the eventual autonomy of the strategic island of Cyprus. That promise has since been forgotten. But there is reason to believe that if the pledge is now implemented and the almost wholly Greek island is permitted to go back to Greece, a quid pro quo may be the granting of autonomy to Greek Macedonia.

That section of Macedonia would then join with the other two, form an independent state, aline itself with other Balkan states, and help create the Balkan federation, which would seem to be indispensable to the realization of the Yalta agreement.

Award of the British Distinguished Service Cross to Lt. John D. Gavan, of Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Monday afternoon of this week, the British Distinguished Service Cross, the third highest decoration of the United Kingdom, was presented in a special ceremony by the British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, to Navy Lt. John D. Gavan, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Lieutenant Gavan is already the holder of the American Distinguished Flying Cross and the Air Medal for heroism and extraordinary achievement while on fighter missions over Sabang, Soerabaja, and Madang, Java.

Lieutenant Gavan was a fighter pilot with the Fighting Twelve on the carrier, U. S. S. *Saratoga*. He is credited with having bombed a Jap ship which was about to ram an English submarine while the sub was surfaced near Sabang, an island off the coast of Sumatra, in the spring of 1944.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Lieutenant Gavan upon a job well done. His quick thinking and courage exemplifies the fine qualities of our fighting men in all services. Men like Lieutenant Gavan made possible our victory in Europe and are certain also to bring our enemy in the Pacific to its knees.

The Man About Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William P. Frank, from Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., of July 17, 1945:

THE MAN ABOUT TOWN
(By William P. Frank)

Nylon is a Du Pont Co. product but its uses are so varied, its applications so remarkable and its possibilities so unlimited that discussion of the product is not free publicity but rather public information.

Today we received in the mail from the Du Pont Co. a memo on nylon's lifesaving war jobs which are really remarkable—and which indicate the postwar uses of this chemical wonder.

From the sheerest of airy nettings and parachutes to the strongest duck, nylon shrugs off death-dealing flak, foils disease-bearing insects, wards off scalding jungle sun with a "light, cool hand," helps prevent mental black-out, throws out its strong coil to snatch wounded from certain jungle death, even sews up the wounds. Woven into a duck which is the strongest fabric for its weight ever made, nylon hangs in curtains in the interior of bombers to stop flak. The duck also is used in protective layers close to the body in the flak vest—keeps armor within the vest from piercing when hit by flak.

Specially constructed suits, which inflate at certain points when one of our high-speed planes pulls out of a sharp dive, keep our pilots from fainting or "blacking out," by controlling rush of blood through the system. The original suits were cumbersome and hot.

Now nylon makes them lightweight and usable.

Nylon rope, strong, lightweight, and elastic, is used in the new human pick-up device that makes it possible for a plane to swoop down and snatch up a wounded man without stopping and with no more shock than a motorcycle starting.

Enough nylon to make almost a thousand pairs of hose goes into a single tow rope (length 350 feet).

The old fairy-tale moral, "For the want of a nail" might be applied to the GI's shoelace.

So that he won't lose his boots at a critical moment, he is outfitted with nylon shoelaces that will stand up through jungle morass.

Many of these military applications of nylon suggest possible postwar uses.

Weaving of thousands of yards of nylon has given the textile industry valuable experience in handling the yarn.

Sheer nettings are not so different from sheer window curtains (that, incidentally can be given a permanent set so that they will keep their smoothness and shape when laundered—no stretchers).

The Fight for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NED R. HEALY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, the importance of congressional action along lines which will promote full employment cannot be overemphasized. In July issue of the Railroad Trainman there appeared an article by Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I concur with the views of Mr. Whitney and am placing this article in the RECORD so that it will be available to all Members of Congress.

The article follows:

PRESIDENT'S DEPARTMENT
(By A. F. Whitney)
THE FIGHT FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

There are unmistakable signs that appeasement elements within our national life are working to create economic and political chaos on the home front with dire consequences both to the prosecution of the war against Japan and to the development of an orderly reconversion program.

This reactionary offensive is conducted on a broad front.

There is the profiteers' selfish effort to destroy price control.

There is the stupid opposition to a planned and humanized reconversion program, that would include adequate unemployment insurance benefits, the only sensible alternative to the present trend of catering to the whims of the monopolists.

There is the Wall Street sniping at the vitally necessary Bretton Woods program.

There is the American Century school of imperialists who are moving heaven and earth, hell-bent on isolating the United States from effective world-wide cooperation.

There is the continued denial of suffrage to millions of citizens through the imposition of the iniquitous poll tax.

Finally—and I have by no means exhausted the list—there is the cynical policy of deliberately balking all efforts to plan for full employment in the reconversion and postwar period, the ultimate objective being to weaken the ranks of organized labor to the point of demoralization and perhaps destruction. This is the Berlin-to-Bagdad dream of the open-shoppers, whose most consistent spokesmen are to be found in the National Association of Manufacturers, which, to this day, has not accepted unionism as a permanent feature of American life.

It goes without saying that a failure to provide jobs for war veterans and reconverted war workers—on a basis of full employment and high purchasing power—would sink our hopes for a durable peace and postwar prosperity. Full employment, moreover, is not only necessary to the welfare of workers, but is just as vital for farmers, small businessmen, and other groups in our population; and, as far as the Government is concerned, it is only through full employment that it will be possible to liquidate the national debt and maintain the Nation's credit structure.

Therefore, it seems to me that this problem should receive primary consideration; otherwise we may, by default, witness such widespread disruption of our economy that only the most determined popular resistance could prevent fascist big business from seizing control of our Government, our lives, and our democratic heritage.

Already the battlelines are forming over this issue, and all signs point toward a rather sharp conflict centering on the full employment bill (S. 380). With hearings on this bill in the offing, it behooves all of us to whom the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is sacred, to unite our endeavors and the strength of our organizations, to secure the enactment of this legislation and all other measures necessary to the winning of the peace.

President Truman's pledge to continue along the path charted by his predecessor cannot but evoke our enthusiastic support. This support must be not only vocal, but on a practical level as well, for the opposition is well-organized and—shall I say—well-heeled. We do not have excess war profits at our disposal to finance extensive lobbying on Capitol Hill or to prepare for the crucial elections of 1946, but we do have the strength of numbers welded together by honest conviction in the justice and essential goodness of the liberal and progressive cause, which expressed itself most energetically under the New Deal.

In a very real sense, the mantle of Roosevelt has fallen upon each of us. Let us be worthy of a great legacy.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. KELLY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein an Associated Press dispatch from the Washington Star of July 11, 1945, quoting a commendation of UNRRA by Pope Pius XII:

UNRRA IS CHRIST-LIKE WORK, POPE TELLS LEHMAN, AIDES

Pope Pius XII told Director General Herbert H. Lehman and members of his staff in a special audience at the Vatican yesterday that the UNRRA is doing a truly Chirst-like work among the war-ravaged peoples of Europe.

"It is for the responsible leaders of political thought and government in all nations today to sustain these peoples, to encourage them in their efforts to rise from the ruins of an unhappy past to a new, a better, and more stable national life," the pontiff said in an address broadcast over the Vatican radio.

"Above all," the Pope said, "it must be made abundantly clear to them, even to national minorities, that they will enjoy complete and genuine liberty in what is dearest to them—their cultural and religious life.

"Your splendid organization is making a powerful and necessary contribution toward just this end, and Europe will never cease to bless you for it. May God strengthen your hands and give light and courage to the promptings of your hearts."

Peacetime Conscription for Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution urging President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, and the personal representative of the President on the United Nations Organization, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to begin immediately efforts to secure an agreement by the nations of the world to abandon peacetime conscription of youth for military service.

If a mutual understanding can be reached between nations and peoples that the policy of gigantic systems of universal compulsory military service should be eliminated, it would relieve the United States and all other nations of the necessity to assume this great new burden at a time when we must build, reconstruct, and readjust the world to peace.

The elimination of compulsory military service as a policy of nations would be the greatest single act of statesmanship that could be accomplished in the immediate present. The system which has long been the practice of European nations has never prevented war. It is always viewed with suspicion and fear by other countries, forcing them to adopt the same policy. It becomes an insupportable burden, a constant drain on the people of the world, and a further incentive to war.

In view of the world's hope of peace and the ultimate destruction of the military power of Germany and Japan, an effort to eliminate compulsory military service as a policy of all peoples cannot come too soon. A world-wide agreement toward that end is certainly a goal no reasonable person can object to.

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas the first concern of every American is the security of the Nation; and

Whereas the American people are determined that their Government shall henceforth make proper provision for the continuous maintenance of such security; and

Whereas in accordance with this firm determination, it has become necessary to consider a system of compulsory military service in the United States as a permanent part of our insurance against unpreparedness in the event of sudden war; and

Whereas compulsory military service would result in greater restrictions over the lives and activities of our people, would impose heavy burdens on them, causing greater taxes and profound changes in their way of life; and

Whereas compulsory military service has long been customary in many European States and elsewhere, but has been contrary to American tradition since the founding of our Republic; and

Whereas compulsory military service has never prevented war in Europe or elsewhere, but, on the contrary, causes suspicion and fears to grow between nations and inclines the rulers of men to war rather than to peace; and

Whereas 50 nations, having expressed their desire for peace, met at San Francisco and resolved to make greater efforts than ever before to abate the fear and likelihood of war in the years to come; and

Whereas the people of the United States and their leaders in all sections and parties have in good faith approved the San Francisco Charter and desire our President to take a leading part in fulfilling the great purposes for which it was formed; and

Whereas with the ultimate destruction of the military power of Germany and Japan there will never be a better time than now to secure international agreement looking to permanent peace; and

Whereas an agreement between the nations of the world to eliminate systems of compulsory military service would itself be greatly conducive to that restoration of peace which is so profoundly desired by all the plain peoples of the world, and would release their energies and resources for rebuilding their war-devastated countries; and

Whereas world-wide abolition of compulsory military service in no way precludes the maintenance of national or international military forces adequate for safeguarding national or collective security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That before the United States adopts compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the personal representative of the President on the United Nations Organization, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., be and hereby are urged to work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations.

Full Employment a National Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention of the House to a statement signed by nine Members on the subject of full employment.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] some time ago expressed his concern over postwar unemployment and his desire that prompt action be taken by Congress.

There are now two bills before us, H. R. 2202, and the Doughton bill, H. R. 3736. The first would provide a means of programing nationally the production and employment needs of the country. The Doughton bill is an emergency measure to cushion the working people of this country against large scale unemployment and to maintain their purchasing power so that retail businesses may not suddenly collapse while basic industries are retooling.

Without reference to either of these bills and before their introduction, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] circulated a statement pledging the Members of his State to work for the general objectives that are now incorporated in these specific bills.

I take great pleasure in introducing into the RECORD a copy of that statement with the names of nine additional Members who have signified their support of its objectives.

The undersigned Members of the House of Representatives believe that immediate steps should be taken to establish a national policy and program for assuring full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

We pledge our individual and united support for the enactment of legislation by the Seventy-ninth Congress which will establish such a national policy and program.

JOHN M. COFFEE, Sixth District of Washington; HUGH DE LACY, First District of Washington; CHARLES R. SAVAGE, Third District of Washington; J. W. TRIMBLE, Third District of Arkansas; HENRY M. JACKSON, J. M. COMBS, A. M. FERNANDEZ, and ALEXANDER J. RESA.

Providing Recreation With Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to have my remarks extended in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of Sunday, July 15, 1945:

PROVIDING RECREATION ALONG WITH FLOOD CONTROL

The Norfork Dam across the North Fork River in Baxter County, Ark., gives evidence of how valuable the proposed Bull Shoals Dam on the White River, in Marion and Baxter Counties, and the Table Rock Dam upstream in Taney County, Mo., would be in flood control and in the developing of the recreation industry. The Norfork Dam proved its worth in holding back flood water this spring, and there are indications of an increasing tourist business in this region. One morning recently there were cars from Louisiana and Kansas, as well as from Arkansas and Missouri, at one landing on Norfork Lake.

Congress in the flood-control act of August 18, 1941, authorized the building of the Bull Shoals and the Table Rock Dams, but has not appropriated funds for their construction. The cost of the structure at Bull Shoals has been estimated at $47,000,000, and that of the Table Rock Dam at $44,000,000. These estimates do not include the cost of power transmission lines. Though these dams would be built primarily for the controlling of flood waters, both would have hydroelectric power plants, as does the Norfork Dam.

The Little Rock district office of the United States Army Corps of Engineers has been making detailed plans for these proposed structures in order that work can be started without delay if necessary appropriations are made by Congress. The sites have been thoroughly investigated. The Bull Shoals Dam will be 2,350 feet long and 278 feet high—larger than the Norfork Dam, which is one of the 10 largest concrete dams in the United States. In the valley up-stream from Bull Shoals mountain the dam would form a reservoir of about 45,440 acres with an additional area of 41 feet above the normal lake level for the storing of flood waters. This 85-mile long lake would reduce the crests of the White River far downstream, and thus protect not only lands in the upper valley, but those along the river through the Gulf Coastal Plain where flood damages have been high.

In the regulating of streams, which cause heavy damage during floods, the reservoir dams pay for themselves. They help business by attracting tourists. There is good reason to believe that many more visitors will come to the Ozarks after the war. The reservoir dams on the White River will benefit all Arkansas through flood control and by stimulating more enterprises in the Ozarks.

Rocket Powder Tested by Use of Sound Waves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of today:

ROCKET POWDER TESTED BY USE OF SOUND WAVES—NEW DEVELOPMENT OF HERCULES RESEARCH ENGINEERS WILL EFFECT SAVING OF $5,500,000 IN VITAL PROGRAM

An improved method of examining rocket powder grains using high frequency sound waves has been developed by Hercules Powder Co. research engineers and will effect a saving of approximately $5,500,000 a year to the Nation's rocket-powder program in materials and an appreciable saving in man-hours, according to an announcement by company officials.

The examination of the interior of rocket powder grains for the presence of voids is one of the most important steps in the manufacture of rocket powder. Voids or air pockets in the powder grains adversely affect functioning of the rocket. The accuracy of the projectile would be affected and the rocket motor might even burst at the time it was fired endangering the lives of the men firing it.

Besides the substantial reduction in inspection costs, the new method simplifies the inspection of employees required in the examination procedure.

Supersonic waves of very high frequency generated by a crystal connected to a specially designed electronic circuit are passed through a rocket powder grain. These grains are from 5 inches to 5 feet long.

If the grain has a flaw, a minute air space, under the surface a certain percentage of the supersonic sound waves will be deflected from a known course. This deflection is recorded on a meter which is connected to a receiving crystal.

The human ear is capable of detecting sound waves with a top frequency of 15,000 cycles. It is necessary to use sound waves with much higher frequency in the examination of rocket powder to reveal flaws.

Before this new inspection method was perfected, large X-ray pictures were taken of each powder grain. However, the output of rocket powder increased so rapidly that in March 1944 it became apparent there would not be enough X-ray film produced in this country to supply the demand when production hit its peak.

The supersonic method reduces the number of operations required to inspect a rocket powder grain, is much less expensive to use, and is more sensitive in detecting flaws than the previous method. The amount of X-ray film used will be cut 90 percent, and the saving to the taxpayer from the new technique will be a very substantial sum each year in film and chemicals.

Hercules research engineers began investigation of the possibilities of using supersonic waves in March 1944, and after deciding the method was feasible, asked the Brush Development Co., Cleveland, Ohio, to build supersonic generating and receiving equipment.

Brush was selected because of their outstanding experience in the design and manufacture of electronic equipment of this type. After joint experimentation by Hercules and Brush engineers, equipment was perfected to handle powder inspection on a production basis.

The supersonic equipment has been officially approved by the Ordnance Department of the War Department and Navy Bureau of Ordnance, and is in use at Hercules-operated ordnance plants manufacturing rocket powder, including the Badger Ordnance Works, Baraboo, Wis.; Radford Ordnance Works, Radford, Va.; and Sunflower Ordnance Works, Lawrence, Kans. It will be used at other rocket-powder plants when they swing into production.

From Gen. George Washington to Gen. George Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. BUELL SNYDER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I here include the splendid and appropriate address delivered by Maj. Gen. George J. Richards, at Fort Necessity, Pa., July 1, 1945, at the annual patriotic service exercises where each year the nation-building spirit of George Washington is kept alive. Since Gen. George Marshall was born and reared within the shadow of Fort Necessity we can now link this national historical shrine from Gen. George Washington to Gen. George Marshall.

FORT NECESSITY

Mr. Chairman, Congressman SNYDER, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a signal honor and a great pleasure to be here to join with you in services at this historic spot. It has been my happy privilege as Budget Officer for the War Department, to work with your distinguished Congressman, Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER, in implementing budget programs for the war effort for the past few years. Our very close association has deepened the admiration and respect which I have always held for him. I am happy to be able to visit in his home district; the district which has returned him to Washington again and again as its Representative in Congress. His services to the Nation in the war effort have been so distinctive, so able, so unselfish, and so great, that in a large measure he belongs to the Nation.

Your custom of gathering at this historic spot each year to honor the departed heroes

who once fought here, is commendable. The custom is most appropriate; it shows that we appreciate what they did here. Let us hold sacred the memory of the brave deeds which were here performed. The little group of 400 men, under the command of Lt. Col. George Washington, made a valiant stand against a larger and better equipped army. They gave a mighty good account of themselves. They were fighting against a force of aggression. To the liberty-loving colonists, the acts of the French in building forts in the Ohio Valley were a threat to their peace and security, and therefore, to their very existence. These people had the same deep desire for liberty and freedom which has always been so deeply ingrained in the hearts of the American people. That same spirit a few years later carried them through the war for independence. The same spirit has won for this Nation other wars. The same spirit will win the war against Japan.

It was here that George Washington received his first baptism of fire and wrote to his brother Lawrence that he had heard the whine of bullets and liked the sound. It was here that Gen. George Washington received his first realistic schooling in the art of warfare; the schooling which later so admirably prepared him to lead his fellow patriots in their fight for independence.

This spot, hallowed by the blood of unrecorded heroes, marks the beginning of the French and Indian War. It was that war which made it necessary for England to levy heavy taxes on the colonists, that brought on the Revolutionary War and resulted in independence for the 13 Colonies. Since then, we have grown into a great and powerful Nation. We have since been engaged in many struggles to retain our freedom and independence. World War I was such a war. World War II is such a war. Those wars were thrust upon us by aggressors.

It is appropriate that we pause here and examine our situation in the light of present and future circumstances. For 3½ years, we, with our allies, have been engaged in a gigantic struggle, the outcome of which is to determine whether peace, liberty, and security or tyranny is to reign over the world. Victory in Europe over the outlaw forces of Italy and Germany, came to us only a short time ago. The struggle has been long and hard. It has been in every sense a total war. A war, in which the civilian population of our allies and our enemies were subjected to the rigors of the front-line fox hole. Our own civilian population has joined in the war effort in the same spirit as the military. This has been imperative. The Army has never felt or inferred that the war could be won without the whole-hearted support of the people at home. We have received that support. The Army is grateful for that support. Without it, defeat would have been certain.

The battles fought here at Fort Necessity were chiefly by men unschooled in the military procedures of today. Though they fought no less valiantly than our boys of today, they fought a different kind of war. Where they used the flint-lock rifle and a few but crude cannon, our boys are using airplanes, flame throwers, tanks, powerful long-range artillery, machine guns, and automatic rifles. These modern implements of warfare have been produced in mass for ourselves and for our allies. It has been necessary to transport our equipment and supplies over long distances. For every soldier who goes overseas, there mst go with him six tons of supplies; a ton must follow each month for his maintenance.

While aiding our allies with supplies and materials, we have raised and equipped over 8,000,000 men in arms; a formidable army indeed. The bulk of this army has been transported overseas through waters infested with enemy submarines. The task has not been easy. It has been expensive to our national economy. It has been necessary for Congress to appropriate large sums of money in order that we may carry out this task. At such a critical time the Nation has been fortunate in having a Congress wide awake to the dangers, and sympathetic to the difficulties entailed. No one knows better than I the debt of gratitude we owe to Congress for this cooperation. Especially are we indebted to Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER, who as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department in the House of Representatives, has labored so unselfishly and with such great understanding. Such labors have borne fruit of the sort that should be understood and appreciated by all Americans in the years to come.

It has been the guiding purpose in this war to make the best use of our arms and equipment to shield our fighting men. This has led to the use of more and more equipment and supplies and resulted in a decided decrease in the loss of life. This war has thoroughly demonstrated that the amount of available supplies is one of the most important single factors in determining the number of casualties in any military operation. This fact is thoroughly understood by the Army, but unfortunately it is not always understood by the public. Our objective has been to pay for victories with matériel rather than with the lives of our soldiers.

Now that victory has come in Europe, let us not be lulled into thinking that the struggle against the Japanese will be easy. The loss of life on Tarawa, Saipan, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa should serve to remind us that our certain victory against the Japanese will be costly in both loss of life and the expenditure of matériel. None of the boys who have fought against the Japanese say that victory will come easily. They know from experience that we face a tenacious and fanatical foe; one who hates our people with a passion. He is still a powerful and dangerous foe, who would use that power to destroy us. Though the task will be increasingly more difficult, with a greater expenditure of men and material as we approach closer to the home islands, we shall certainly attain complete victory. We must break the Japanese will to fight so that nation may never again embark upon a policy of aggression.

It is not given to us to say when peace will come in the Pacific. After the peace has been finally won it must be kept and guarded with the same zeal which has characterized the winning of the war. This may be a task more difficult than we now know. The whole world must be made to realize that America has no designs on the independence of other peoples and that we intend to maintain our own independence with any and whatever force required. We are a peace-loving people and it is against our nature to desire to maintain strong military might in times of peace. However, we must never again allow our military strength to depreciate to the point where aggressor nations would entertain hopes of conquering us. We have tried that policy and it has resulted in our involvement in two world wars. While the methods of fighting wars have changed radically since the time of George Washington, the instincts of human nature which cause one nation to desire to conquer and rule another, unfortunately have not changed.

While we may feel certain that the war could have been shortened or possibly prevented if we had been adequately prepared, it is a fact that the need for a strong defense is now greater than ever before. In the past we have been protected by the natural barriers of oceans and space. The development of rocket planes, buzz bombs, V bombs, guided missiles, and the improvement of undersea craft during this war have placed this Nation within reach of the weapons of war of the most powerful nations in the world. In the past we have been fortunate in that our attackers first attacked our allies who were able to hold out until we could prepare for battle. We cannot be assured that in the future our enemies will be so considerate.

In war the objective is to win the peace. In peace the objective is to keep the peace. We can set our minds against war and highly resolve never to fight again. In a large measure we have done that in the past. With speeches, editorials, and special articles we can dedicate ourselves to a policy of peace and good will toward other peoples, but at the same time we must not forget that there are other nations who will take advantage of unpreparedness on our part. Nations who are not imbued with the same worthy sentiments will surely aspire to take away our cherished freedom. The cowardly attack which took place at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, while Japanese emissaries in Washington were playing for time, should forever remind us that we can remain free only if we remain eternally vigilant and are prepared to protect ourselves.

A strong world organization dedicated to the purposes of maintaing peace is much desired. Giving full faith and credit to such an organization, we still need to remain alert and prepared. If such an organization is to function, it must back up its policies and determinations with sufficient force. We must participate in that force, but if such a world organization should for any reason cease to function, we must always be prepared to protect ourselves.

We have learned during this war that raising and maintaining modern armies is expensive. Yet we should be no less willing to sacrifice to maintain the peace than to win a war. In principle the two are the same. In his farewell address, George Washington wisely counseled "that timely disbursements to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it." The American people are not militaristic by nature; but universal military training appears to be a truly democratic way to supplement a regular force of reasonable permanent strength, so as to meet our national needs. That system would prove less expensive than a large permanent army. It would at the same time keep the public closer to the problem of national defense by keeping more people identified with it.

If George Washington were delivering his Farewell address in the light of present day knowledge and circumstance, he would surely even more strongly emphasize the need for a strong reserve for our armed forces. We would not be true to him and to the brave men who so bravely fought here if we conducted our national affairs in a manner which endangered the freedom they died to win. Let us rededicate ourselves to the purpose of keeping and cherishing that freedom for ourselves and for the generations to come.

The San Francisco Charter: Goals and Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following data on the San Francisco Charter:

THE SAN FRANCISCO CHARTER: GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Our joint study of authoritative Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant statements on a just world order entitled, "Goals for San Fran-

cisco," was made public on April 5, 1945. The first recommendation stressed the imperative need that the San Francisco Conference succeed and the security organization be established. The remaining nine agreements dealt with specific constructive recommendations for the United Nations Charter. What progress was made in San Francisco toward these nine goals? In order to provide the data upon which those who subscribe to the Goals for San Francisco may judge the progress made, we submit herewith the text of our nine recommendations and the corresponding provisions of the United Nations Charter. The text of the nine recommendations and the new provisions since written into the United Nations Charter follow.[1]

Rev. Richard M. Fagley,
Secretary, Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, Federal Counsel of the Churches of Christ in America.
Rabbi Ahron Opher,
Secretary, Committee on Peace, Synagogue Council of America.
Rev. Edward A. Conway, S. J.,
Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

PREAMBLE

The Charter of the United Nations Organization should acknowledge in its preamble that the actions of states are subject to the same moral principles as govern the conduct of individuals.

We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

And for these ends—

To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and

To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

To insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims. (Preamble.)

MEMBERSHIP

The Charter should specify that membership will be open to all States willing and able to fulfill the obligations of the Charter, so that membership may become universal.

Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving States *which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.* (Ch. II, art. 4, 1.)

INTERNATIONAL LAW

The Charter should provide for the codification and development of international law and for its impartial enforcement.

The purposes of the United Nations are: 1. To maintain international peace and security; and to that end * * * to bring about by peaceful means *and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law,* adjustment or settlement of international disputes. (Ch. I, art. 1.)

The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of * * * *encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification.* (Ch. IV, art. 13, 1.)

Each member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice. (Ch. XIV, art. 94, 1.)

If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment. (Ch. XIV, art. 94, 2.)

PEACEFUL CHANGE

The Charter should provide more explicitly for the revision of treaties and other agreements when such action is required by justice and the good of the world community.

Subject to the provisions (to refrain from making recommendations on a dispute while it is being dealt with by the Security Council) the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations. (Ch. IV, art. 14.)

SMALL NATIONS

The Charter should safeguard the economic and political rights of small nations and assure them an adequate share in shaping the policies of the organization.

The General Assembly shall receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; these reports shall include an account of the measures that the Security Council has decided upon or taken to maintain international peace and security. (Ch. IV, art. 15, 1.)

*When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations * * * invite that member, if the member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that member's armed forces.* (Ch. VII, art. 44.)

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations *based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples,* the United Nations shall promote: (a) *Higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development.* (Ch. IX, art. 55.)

DISARMAMENT

The Charter should provide a clear purpose and procedure for the limitation and control of national armaments, as collective security is established.

The General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation * * * including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, *and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the members or to the Security Council or both.* (Ch. IV, art. 11, 1.)

VOTING POWER

The Charter should provide that no one nation be allowed to veto judgment in any dispute covered by international law.

Yalta agreement. In decisions under chapter VI (Pacific settlement of disputes) and under the third sentence of paragraph 3 of article 52 (regional arrangements for peaceful settlement of disputes), *a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.* (Ch. V, art. 27, 3.)

HUMAN RIGHTS

The Charter should include an international bill of rights, and provide for a commission or commissions to protect and further the rights and liberties of the individual and of racial, religious, and cultural groups, especially those uprooted by war or oppression.

*The purposes of the United Nations are * * * to achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.* (Also made a responsibility of the United Nations (ch. IX, art. 55); of the General Assembly (ch. IV, art. 13); of the trusteeship system (ch. XII, art. 76).)—Chapter I, article 1.

The Economic and Social Council may * * * make recommendations *for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.* (Ch. X, art 62, 1 and 2.)

The Economic and Social Council shall set up commissions in economic and social fields *and for the promotion of human rights.* (Ch. X, art. 68.)

DEPENDENT PEOPLES

The Charter should provide for a commission to supervise the administration of mandated territories and to promote the advancement of non-self-governing peoples toward economic well-being, cultural development and political responsibility.

The purposes of the United Nations are: * * * 2. To develop friendly relations among nations *based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.* (Ch. I, art. 1.)

*Members of the United Nations * * * accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these (dependent) territories, and to this end: * * * To develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement.* (Ch. XI, art. 73.)

*The basic objectives of the trusteeship system * * * shall be: * * * (b) To promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self-government or independence* (Ch. XII, art. 76.)

*The trusteeship agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the trust territory will be administered and designate the authority which shall exercise the administration of the trust territory. Such authority * * * may be one or more states or the organization itself.* (Ch. XII, art. 81.)

The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may: A. Consider reports submitted by the administering authority; B. Accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority; C. Provide for periodic visits to the respective territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority; and D. Take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of the trusteeship agreements. (Ch. XIII, art. 87.)

Nothing in this Charter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which members of the United Nations may respectively be parties. (Ch. XI, art. 80.)

[1] Amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals adopted at the San Francisco Conference are italicized in this text.

Address by Associate Justice Black at Hollywood Bowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and challenging address delivered by Mr. Justice Hugo L. Black, of the Supreme Court of the United States, at Hollywood Bowl, on June 22, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My faith in the cause your organization represents, my great sympathy with Russian War Relief, has led me to accept your invitation. It is particularly fitting and appropriate that the theme of this meeting should be "A Tribute to World Unity." The unity of the United States has enabled us to gain the victory on the battlefields of Europe; and the preservation of that unity is the indispensable prerequisite to a lasting peace. We must learn to live together in peace, so that we shall not have to fight together in war.

When the Nazi menace first began to threaten world peace, a great Russian, Maxim Litvinoff, warned the world that peace is indivisible and can be maintained only by the united effort of peace-loving people everywhere. His words then fell on deaf ears.

America vainly sought to preserve peace for herself behind the shield of her neutrality laws.

Britain and France at Munich yielded to the futile hope that aggression could be appeased. The result was that China, unprepared for war, had to stand alone against Japan; Ethiopia was left to the wolves; and many people have wondered whether the situation in Spain was much different.

Russia finding her appeals for collective security rejected and fearing, rightly or wrongly, that those who would not unite with her in the maintenance of peace, would leave her to meet alone the deadly aggression of Nazi Germany and its Fascist allies, attempted to beg time by making a nonaggression pact with her enemies.

So the peace-loving nations of the world, because they were disunited, had to learn the hard way the truth of Maxim Litvinoff's great prophecy that peace is indivisible. Had the peace-loving peoples of the world stood united at the beginning of the Nazi-Fascist aggression, untold lives and untold treasure would have been saved.

The lives lost cannot be brought back; the treasure destroyed cannot be readily replaced. But we can and must see to it that these lives were not lost and this treasure was not destroyed in vain. That is the task and that is the duty of our generation. If we fail there may be no second chance.

Just as the destruction wrought by World War I seems small and insignificant compared with the destruction wrought by World War II, so the destruction wrought by World War III, if it comes, will make the destruction of the earlier wars seem as nothing. The engines of destruction now being developed by science are too deadly to be used in organized warfare if civilization is to survive. The advances of science can be used to destroy civilization or to enrich it. We must now determine whether we will join with other peace-loving nations and strive with all our mind and heart to see that the advances of science are used to bring the blessings of liberty, security, and a higher standard of life to the common people. We cannot be half-hearted in these cooperative efforts. For if we fail, we will not be able to prevent these scientific advances from being utilized to destroy all that is nearest and dearest to us. We cannot make this choice in isolation. In an interdependent world, men and nations must cooperate or perish. We must learn to live in peace together or we will, win or lose, destroy ourselves in war.

The peace-loving peoples of this world hate war. They know its sorrows and heartbreaks. They are prepared and eager to make the sacrifices necessary to outlaw war and to enforce a reign of law among nations. They are interested in results more than in reasons advanced by defeatists who magnify and exploit differences to destroy men's faith in peace and the outlawry of war. If the articulate leaders of public opinion in the United States, and throughout the world, keep faith with the people, there need be no more wars.

A good start toward peace has already been made. The Dumbarton Oaks Charter binds all states, both large and small, to refrain from the use of force in their international relations except in defense of the rule of law and to settle their dispues with one another by none but peaceful means. In the discussion of the mechanics of the charter there has been a tendency to gloss over these great principles which constitute the heart of the charter. There is no veto right which gives any state the right to act in violation of these great principles. Should any great state in violation of its covenants embark on a course of aggression, its right of veto could not make aggression nonaggression or take from the peace-loving nations their right to act together in defense of the rule of law. The right of the peace-loving nations so to act depends, as it should depend, not on the juggling of a few votes on the Council, but on the will and purpose of the peace-loving peoples of the world to maintain the rule of law among nations.

I say this because almost before the Dumbarton Oaks Charter has been put in final form at San Francisco some people are trying to treat that Charter, which represents the faith of peace-loving people everywhere, as a meaningless gesture. They are blithely talking of a next war before the present terrible war is over and they are dangerously suggesting that the great peace-loving American people and the great peace-loving United Nations who literally saved each other in this war must inevitably clash in mortal combat.

The time has come to bring this talk out into the open and expose it to the light of day. I have no doubt that some of the men and women who have engaged in this talk were honest and well-intentioned. But they do not realize that they are following the Hitler line and are making good the Hitler prophecy that even should he fail, the seeds that he had planted would live after him. It was Hitler's diabolic exploitation of the fear of "bolshevism" and plutocracy which kept the peace-loving nations divided within, and suspicious of one another, and enabled him to strike down by fear or by force one nation after another until he had brought within his orbit virtually the whole of western and central Europe.

Some particularly clamorous voices have been prophesying a war with Russia. Those voices do not represent the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the American people and those sentiments have no foundation in fact or in reason except, insofar as they breed hate and suspicion, they breed hostility which leads to war. Why, let us ask ourselves, should America and Russia clash? We have never had a war with Russia. In all the wars in which we have been engaged, Russia has been either a friendly neutral or active on our side. True our own record in Russian eyes has not been quite so good. At the end of the last war we had troops in Russia cooperating with Russian forces hostile to the revolution. For over a decade we refused to recognize the Soviet Government and treated Russia as an outlaw nation.

Of course, we have had differences in interests and in ideas with Russia but our common interests have always predominated. We had differences of interests in Alaska but these we adjusted by peaceful means. We never liked czarism and we always welcomed political refugees from Czarist Russia, but we never talked about war with Czarist Russia. And there is certainly less reason for us to talk about war with Soviet Russia.

There has in my judgment been much shallow thinking about Russia in this country. Some of this talk rests on the assumption that Russia is in a state of revolution. That is not correct. The Russian revolution is a matter of history. Soviet Russia, while the product of the Soviet revolution, is today a stable national government. Its concern is not revolution but the winning of the war, the improvement of the conditions of its own war-stricken people, and a natural desire that its next door neighbors should not be governed by Russia's mortal enemies. But certainly this country, dedicated to democracy and to freedom of expression, has nothing to fear from Russian ideology. Our safety rests in the good sense and loyalty of our people.

Viewing, as I think we must, Russia as a nation and not as a revolutionary movement, I see no reason why America and Russia cannot easily live at peace together. We covet none of their territory, nor do they covet any of ours. Our common interest in a peaceful world far outweigh any conceivable conflict of interest between us. Americans would not like to live under the Soviet system but I doubt very much whether the leaders of Soviet Russia and the Russian people are at all concerned whether we do or not so long as Americans do not attempt to dictate to the Russians what sort of system they should live under. I cannot myself escape the conviction that the aspects of the Russian system which strike the average Americans as most inconsistent with our own ideas of freedom have persisted because of Russia's fear of war and foreign aggression. I am convinced that recent actions of Russia which have caused the most misgivings in this country are not due to bad faith or aggressive designs but to the fear that other nations may again gang up against them. The too widespread talk of war with Russia only aggravates this situation. In their future relations the people of Russia and the people of America have nothing to fear but fear itself.

Russia is a war-ravaged and devastated country. Before the war her people were compelled to deprive themselves of many of the amenities of life in order to guard themselves from an attack which they had reason to fear would come. And when the attack came they had to endure unbelievable hardship and want. They had to bear losses greater probably than any other nation has ever borne without going down in defeat. I cannot believe that any people desire peace, prolonged peace, more than do the Russian people. No nation has greater need of peace to rebuild its devastated country and to improve the conditions of its people. I am convinced that the Russian people would like to look forward to our help and our friendship in their task of great reconstruction.

It is strange that at such time as this it should be necessary to plead for trust and understanding between the Russian people and the American people. Has the unconditional surrender of Nazi Germany made us forget by what a narrow margin we all escaped being slaves of the Nazi?

Have we forgotten that if the people of Britain had not with unbelievable courage stood out alone against the Nazis for a whole year, neither the Russians nor ourselves would have the time to prepare for a successful defense of our freedom?

Have we forgotten that when Hitler did launch his attack against Russia, our own intelligence officers and the British intelligence officers as well as the German General Staff believed Russia could not last more than 6 months?

What made their calculations go astray? It was because most of us underestimated the ability of the Russians to fight in defense of their land and their freedom. But that was not all. Russia no more than Britain could have stood indefinitely alone. Hitler's calculations went astray because he failed to take into account the vision and faith of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and of the common people of America who shared his vision and faith. It was President Roosevelt who, like Litvinoff, believing that peace is indivisible, promptly called for all-out aid to Soviet Russia as well as to Great Britain, and the American people generously and promptly responded to his call. I know the Russian people have not forgotten the aid that the American people under the leadership of President Roosevelt gave to them in the hour of their greatest need, and I am confident that they know full well that President Truman stands foursquare on the policies of President Roosevelt. Every American who hates war must do his part to see that the friendship and good will of the Russian people, which we have gained in this war, are not dissipated by the irresponsible talk of persons who have no real understanding of the common people of either Russia or America.

The common people of America are also aware of their great debt to the Russian people. We know how close to the margin of survival we came when in our turn we were attacked by the fascist powers. Had the Russian people faltered, had they hesitated to accept casualties and deprivations greater than any other people had ever borne, we today might be fighting for survival on our own soil.

Not since the days of 1776 have the American people been so conscious of the truth that "United we stand, divided we fall." And I am sure that the Russian people and the British people who came even nearer the shadows than we, are no less conscious of this truth. The Peace-loving peoples of this world have become keenly conscious of their common interest in the maintenance of peace. Our people have been willing to fight and to die to prevent their enslavement by the German Nazis, the Italian Fascists and the Japanese warlords. They are not willing to plunge us into a new war merely because another nation has an economic system different to ours. Our task and the task of statesmen the world over is to build the peace for which the common people of all lands are praying.

Compulsory Arbitration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the July Manufacturers Record, of Baltimore, Md.

The editorial follows:

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

The introduction of the Burton-Ball-Hatch bill in the Senate has led many a sincere man to ask himself a direct question, "Do I believe in compulsory arbitration for labor disputes?"

Let no man condemn compulsory arbitration in labor disputes without realizing that by so doing he condemns the underlying principle of the United Nations Charter.

Every man, in or out of public life, who does not bury his head in the sands of political expediency or cowardice, knows that the goal of every labor union is monopoly, and that the closed shop is monopoly. In February of this year we wrote, "The organization of any labor union constitutes a direct attempt at monopolistic control that affects the economic lives of all of us. The closed shop represents the consummation of that objective. It is absolute monopoly and can be called by no other name."

Let us assume, whether we believe it or not, that a labor union is a monopoly that results in the public good as do other monopolies such as railroads, telephone companies and public-service corporations. Granted this assumption, the union, as a monopoly, should be subjected to Government controls for the public good, just as other business organizations are subjected. To make this point even more clear, it is well to remember that organized labor is an integral working part of each such public utility.

An American, of his own free will, should be permitted to promote or join any organization that is not inimical to the general welfare. If he wants to become a member of the holy rollers, to join the American Labor Party, or the Liberty League, the Sons and Daughters or I Will Arise—a company to acquire the green-cheese-mining concession from the man in the moon—or a labor union, he should be free to do so. But when the acts of such an organization affect the welfare and happiness of others who are not its members, it becomes necessary that the potential possibility for such acts be circumscribed by Government, acting in the interest of and by the authority of all of the people.

A strike is an aggressive act aimed at a business partner who is erroneously considered to be a social antagonist. It attempts to gain, by coercion, a selfish end. It is declared in order to achieve a result that seemed impossible by the exercise of good will, reason, and common understanding. A strike not only affects the employer against whom it is called. It also interfers with the steady flow of goods or services that the public has a right to expect and demand.

The calling of a strike by a labor union is a declaration of economic war. A strike, no matter how peaceful, is economic war. As such it is wasteful and destructive. It is even more than that. It is dangerous because it contains a germ which if unchecked, can infect the body politic with the virus of rebellion. Communists are well aware of the potentiality of this germ.

If it is assumed that there is antagonism between labor as a class and management (and we are not willing to admit that labor is a class or that, even if it were, labor is management's opponent) the feeling of antagonism between them cannot possibly be as deep seated as that which the centuries have built up between nations with different languages, histories, and ideologies. Yet, at this moment, and with national unanimity, we look forward with hope to an era of peace between all nations under the international laws of the United Nations Charter.

We look forward with hope to world-wide peace because representatives of the nations of the world have completed the drafting of a Charter that contains bones, sinews, and muscles into which cooperative peace-loving generations can breathe perpetual life. This Charter not only writes international law, but it contains the power to enforce its law. It does not ignore the possibility of aggression. It plans to curb the aggressor. There is no place in the framework of the United Nations Charter for a warlike nation with ambitions of conquest. There is no place in it for the nation that plans to exploit another for its own selfish ends.

If the United Nations are to fulfill the hope of a strife-torn world for ultimate peace, each nation must sacrifice a portion of its sovereignty to protect the sovereignty of the integral parts of the whole.

If a fair and lasting peace can be achieved by law between nations it is logical to assume that internal peace can be attained between Americans striving "with malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for the information of my colleagues an amazing story on lend-lease, written by a person whom I know to be an able and reliable American citizen:

JULY 11, 1945.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: As requested by you I will do my best to cover briefly some of the experiences I had in the Middle East, with particular attention being paid to those things which I observed pertaining to lend-lease and its counterpart, reverse lend-lease. Upon my return to the United States after having spent over 2 years in the Middle East as a member of the United States Army, I went direct to Washington and reported to a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives substantially the same things that I am about to tell you now. The answer given me at that time was that the administration desired it that way and although many Members of Congress were becoming better informed on what was going on under lend-lease arrangements, still there was nothing that could be done as long as it was the administration's policy.

Again when I had the opportunity I gave a rather comprehensive 30-minute talk to my Rotary Club along the same line. However, up to this writing I do not believe I have sufficiently impressed anyone with my "tales" to have done any good.

While serving in the Army in the Middle East I had many opportunities to observe lend-lease in operation and in almost every instance it was a case of our giving everything and receiving nothing although the opportunity of reciprocity on the part of our lend-lease beneficiaries was ever present. Many trivial things stand out in my memory because I was a soldier and being such was impressed with the multitude of our goods being given away to foreign governments and their troops when we were doing without. As examples of this—when I was in Eritrea the Douglas Aircraft Corp., located at Gura, Eritrea, and the Johnson, Drake & Piper

Engineering Co. located at Asmara were supplied in American cigarettes, beer, and food, more than they could possibly use and as a result the British officers in Eritrea were furnished with many of these supplies when the American troops were receiving absolutely none of the above items, but were instead given a very poor quality British cigarette, Australian beer when available, and local foodstuffs. Again when in Egypt American troops were doing without American cigarettes and beer when there was an abundance of both being sold in practically all stores in Cairo and Alexandria.

But this is only the beginning of that which irritated American soldiers most. In Egypt in particular, where I was stationed for a long time, it was very obvious that American foods and other materials were being furnished to the Egyptian Government in great quantities and also to other governments in the Middle East and these American products in turn were then sold on the open market to those who were able to pay for them. The best quality canned goods, such as fruits and vegetables and bottled goods such as Heinz products were available in any decent grocery store in either Alexandria or Cairo and during my 2 years' stay in these parts I never noticed a shortage as we American soldiers quite often went to Cairo and Alexandria to buy these goods.

All governments in the Middle East are such that they are a monopoly of the king or his equivalent and his immediate following consists of a very small group. These are the people who benefit from American lend-lease. As far as the teeming millions of Arabs are concerned, they are still on the verge of starvation and have received none of the benefits of our lend-lease gratuities. In other words, from my observation it was very obvious that the American people through lend-lease were sending products which were badly needed at home to the people of other countries, thinking these products were being used by these people when actually they never got out of the channels of the immediate government to which they were sent and then only to those few people who were able to afford to buy them. I will estimate that less than 1 percent of the people in the Middle East actually received benefit from American lend-lease. This statement, of course, would not include armaments.

There were times when American ships manned by American crews hauling American cargoes would arrive in the Middle East with these cargoes destined as lend-lease to the British. On these occasions the British would make a charge against us for the docking of the ship, the use of the docks, and if there were any stevedoring charges or other charges they were also made. I can remember such a cargo of gasoline coming in when the gasoline was hauled away from the docks by American drivers in American trucks, and taken to a British gasoline dump and stored. After this was done the Americans ran out of gasoline and were required to pay cash for it at a much greater price than the British were "charged" under lend-lease.

Again from my viewpoint it seemed very silly for the United States Government to be paying the Suez Canal Co. fees for hauling American troops and products through the canal when these troops and products were destined to assist the British and other Allied Nations who control the canal. I was very pleased recently to note that we had at last awakened to this one fact at least and are now asking these governments for free passage under reverse lend-lease. In my opinion the millions that we have previously paid since the beginning of the war to the Suez Canal Co. should be refunded to us.

To anyone not familiar with the Middle East it is hard to realize the type governments they have. At best they are one-man governments, mostly controlled by the British. They have no armed forces to speak of and at best can offer only passive resistance to a flotilla of gunboats and a battalion of infantry. Less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the population of these countries live above a starvation level and there is absolutely no freedom of press. Therefore, the public health situation is such that about 1 out of every 6 children born live to be 5 years old and the average span of life is something less than 25 years. They live on practically nothing and have very little clothing and absolutely no education. The villages still have scribes who handle all written matters. These people make up 999/10 percent of the population and as stated above received no assistance from us through our lend-lease. The other one-tenth of 1 percent are filthy rich and rule with an iron hand. With this brief description in mind it is easy to see that those who benefit from our lend-lease need no help and further, they are always willing to sell out to the highest bidder in international affairs.

As an illustration of this, a radio commentator several nights ago told of the renewing in July 1942 of the treaty between England and Egypt, wherein English troops could use all of Egypt as a base. It so happens that I was an eyewitness to the immediate events before the signing of this treaty. The facts in the case are substantially as follows: The British had retreated into Egypt in May 1942 and King Farouk, thinking that the Germans were winning, had made arrangements to sail to a foreign port, presumably Italy, and had left instructions with the Prime Minister not to renew the British treaty, but to require the British to move all of their troops back in the Suez Canal vicinity, which of course was impossible from a British viewpoint at that time. The way that treaty was signed gives an insight into international politics in the Middle East. The British Minister went to the palace, which is known as the Queen's Palace, to renew the treaty but was refused entry into the palace grounds. He then called on the British Army for assistance and several tanks, a battery of artillery, and a few machine gunners stood outside the palace grounds and ordered the gates opened under threat of opening fire on the palace The Egyptians, seeing their plight to be a hopeless one, opened the gates and signed the treaty. As a result the next morning newspapers throughout the Middle East and throughout the world acclaimed the signing of the treaty as a great example of Egypt's willingness to help the Allied cause when the Allies needed them most.

The above is one of the many reasons why I also advocate a free world press as the American people certainly knew nothing of the true facts in this case and continued to send their products to the poor Egyptians who were about to be overrun by the big bad Germans, and who nevertheless, with their backs to the wall, gave their best to the Allied Nations.

I could recite, if only I could remember all that I saw, many more instances of international intrigue in the Middle East and many more examples of wasteful uses of our lend-lease to these Middle East countries.

The average European and the average Arab who has settled in the Arab states dislike the Americans very much and looks on us as a bunch of "suckers," which we certainly are. The storekeepers jokingly speak to the Americans, such as "Hello, U. S. A.—United Suckers of America."

In conclusion let me say that I hope I have given you some information which may be of use to you in stopping the ridiculous waste of American products and money throughout the Middle East, and from what I learned from other soldiers, throughout the world. I do not know how we are ever going to get any of this back, but certainly we should wake up and stop this throwing away of our natural resources and wealth.

Yours very truly.

We Won't Forget!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Sunday Herald, of Hartford, Conn., on July 8, 1945, in which a splendid and well-deserved tribute is paid to Miss Frances Perkins, our former Labor Secretary of the United States:

WE WON'T FORGET!

Among the minor incidents of the week was the quiet exit from office of Frances Perkins, after 12 long and tough years as Secretary of Labor. Her departure should afford great satisfaction to the fat boys, who stooped pretty low in their unending campaign to break her heart and force her to quit.

The Herald does not claim that Madam Perkins, the first feminine Cabinet officer, by the way, functioned without ever making mistakes. She made plenty of them, and she would be the last person in the world to deny making them.

But, as Miss Perkins doffs her tricornered hat for the last time, it might be well to remember that in occupying a key Government post through three administrations she had the following situations to contend with:

1. A tremendous program of social reform in which labor at last was given a halfway decent break.

2. Preserving an equitable balance between labor and capital while the country was fighting its way out of the depression.

3. Maintaining official neutrality while the CIO was making inroads on the AFL membership.

4. Superintending labor's win-the-war effort despite such irritants as John L. Lewis and the Little Steel formula.

I doubt very much if there was any man or woman in America big enough to ride through all the economic storms of the last 12 years with any more success than "Ma" Perkins had.

Miss Perkins retires from public office discouraged and broke. But she can rest content in the knowledge that, despite her mistakes, she was the first real Secretary of Labor that the United States ever had. The guy with the dinner pail will not soon forget Frances Perkins.

A. J.

On Removing Suspicion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial in the Baltimore Sun of yesterday, written by Mr. John W. Owens, entitled "On Removing Suspicion."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON REMOVING SUSPICION

(By John W. Owens)

Movements in major policy are occasionally revealed under minor headlines. As the cruiser *Augusta* drew near the shores of Europe, the Associated Press sent from the ship a simple message that President Truman would not consult with Prime Minister Churchill before the sessions of the Big Three in Potsdam. The dispatch explained that "the idea apparently is to assure Premier Stalin that the American President has no thought of making any independent agreements, even of a tentative nature. Nothing could have been less sensational. But that message, which obviously was authorized, showed that Mr. Truman and his advisers have moved ahead of much important American opinion in dealing with Russian-American relations.

The necessity of firm cooperation between the two vast nations, which now are in position to dominate most of the earth, has become an axiom. Plainly enough, the condition of firm co-operation is the removal or material reduction of suspicion. But a large body of important opinion in this country still lags in understanding of the fact that removal or reduction of suspicion is not a one-way movement. Russian suspicion of the United States (and of Britain) must be considered no less than American (and British) suspicion of Russia. The Russians understand quite well that influential groups here (and in Britain) despise and fear communism. They understand quite well that in the middle thirties the possibility of Hitler's turning eastward in conquest was regarded by these groups with complacency, if not hope. They understand quite well that, even while they were crushing Hitler's armies, in each of their diplomatic controversies these groups gave support automatically to Russia's opponent. Naturally, the Russians are on guard, but these influential groups here (and in Britain) seem unable to believe that any suspicion can exist save their own.

Mr. Truman has better balance. He sees that one-sided, unimaginative suspicion of Russia can only stimulate old Russian suspicion. He accepts the fact that Russia, too, can legitimately have suspicion. And, as the message from the *Augusta* shows, he takes the positive step that is possible at this time to demontrate to the Russians that the Government of the United States is not following the course which would be normal if anti-Russian suspicion ruled—it is not sitting in the conference at Potsdam as part of an Anglo-American bloc, with Russia on the other side of the table. Far from concentrating on suspicion of Russia, Mr. Truman seeks to reduce Russian suspicion of the United States (and Britain) as a means of laying foundations for broad accords.

He has all to gain and nothing to lose by following this course. The Russians have shown in war and in peace that more progress can be made in dealing with them as potential friends than as potential foes. Mr. Roosevelt's decision to aid them in 1941, regarded with fear by some of the same elements which now are ruled by anti-Russian suspicion, proved its value. Probability it shortened the war. Possibly it assured victory. Mr. Hull's direct approach at Moscow proved its value and, it may be noted he was as careful in that conference to avoid the appearance of an Anglo-American bloc as Mr. Truman was in the message from the Augusta. Mr. Roosevelt, at Tehran and at Yalta, had success with Mr. Stalin in approaching from the basis of friendship. He succeeded, despite his intimacy with Mr. Churchill, perhaps because his own record of aid to Russia outweighed in Russian eyes his record of intimacy with Mr. Churchill. Mr. Truman has equal reason to count upon profit from a policy which includes understanding of Russia's viewpoint as well as our own.

There is no reason whatever to expect gains from the opposite course. Russia will be able to counter any policy which seeks to drive her. The United States is not in position to drive her. The United States and Britain combined are not in position to drive her. In fact, one of the troublesome features of current international politics is the loose talk that occasionally is heard from superficial Britishers in conversation with worried Americans to the effect that no concern need be felt about Russia if the two English-speaking nations stand together. Russia, if she preserves her internal strength, can follow her own policy in her own orbit whatever the English-speaking nations, singly or jointly, think about it. And if she became convinced that the loose talk expressed the intent of the two nations she undoubtedly would follow her own policy more strongly than ever, with gravely adverse effects immediately on British interests in Europe and Asia and with terribly adverse effects on American life if the antagonism ever threatened to become hostility. For we would carry the burden on our side.

The wise course is to understand Russia—even her suspicion. That is the best hope of making the Charter and all other instruments of international law and order living realities. Mr. Truman serves his age when he moves ahead and provides leadership in that direction.

Argentina and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the July 9, 1945, issue of the Caledonian Record, of St. Johnsbury, Vt. This is a revealing editorial. It shows that the people have an intelligent understanding of some of the very complex problems of international relations which confront the Congress and the executive department of the Government.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARGENTINA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace was held at Mexico City from February 21 to March 8, 1945. A charter for the Americas was then framed, designed to recognize the unity of the peoples of the Americas as one and indivisible.

Certain resolutions were adopted at Mexico City bearing upon Argentina's participation in the Conference. One such resolution deplored "that the Argentine Nation has up to the present time not found it possible to take steps that would permit its participation in the Inter-American Conference." Another resolution of the Pan American Union expressed "its desire that the Argentine Nation may put itself in a position to express its conformity with and adherence to the principles and declarations resulting from the Conference of Mexico." A third resolution declared "that the Conference hopes that the Argentine Nation will cooperate with the other American Nations, identifying itself with the common policy these nations are pursuing and orienting its own policy so that it may achieve incorporation into the United Nations as a signatory to the Joint Declaration entered into by them."

On April 4, 1945, Argentina signed the Final Act of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace. But to this day she has not complied with the Mexican Declaration to the extent of becoming a member of the United Nations by signing the Joint Declaration. To the regret of all well-wishers for pan-American solidarity, Argentina has not complied with the essential point of putting herself in a condition to proceed along paths leading to fuller inter-American cooperation along democratic lines.

Less than a month ago, Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton submitted documents to a Senate committee summarizing results of a Department campaign to stamp out Axis spearheads in Latin America. Clayton disclosed that there were then 104 such Axis spearhads in Argentina "in which no action has been taken to date." The spearheads are declared to be "companies which are known centers of espionage or other aggressive activity." They can be eliminated only by seizure of such concerns, their operation by local South American governments, sale to non-Nazi interests, or by liquidation.

These facts constitute a severe indictment of the good faith of the Argentine Government. Compliance with the resolutions of the Mexico Conference has not been forthcoming by a signatory to the Final Act. Inter-American cooperation along democratic lines has not materialized and the conclusion may fairly be reached that in its association with the United Nations, Argentina is sailing under false colors.

Continued appeasement cannot be the order of the day so far as Argentina is concerned. Unless the knife of pan-American surgery is applied to the Nazi cancer still eating at the heart of Argentina, the nation will become the hot-bed of future Nazi intrigue. To permit such an eventuality to occur would endanger the security of all the Americas. There must be no foothold on the western hemisphere for Nazi economic penetration.

Under the prevailing circumstances of continuing Argentine disregard for the pledges evidenced by signature to the Final Act of the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City for future cooperation along democratic lines, the nations of the Americas are faced with a clear duty. Concerted action by the Pan American Union is indicated as the one measure designed to bring Argentina to her senses and induce compliance with the common policies which other American nations are pursuing.

The day of Argentina's testing is not far distant. The time has come when that nation must orient its policy with such entire good faith that it may achieve its incorporation into the United Nations as a signatory to the joint declaration entered into by them. Only when that status is achieved by Argentina, can the nations of the Americas relax their vigilance, confident that a source of potential danger in their midst has been removed. Only then will their charter contain all the implications of a genuine democratic fellowship.

The United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a stimulating discussion of the historical background of the United Nations Charter presented by a distinguished historian, Dr. Elmer Louis Kayser, dean of the George Washington University, in a radio address over Station WTOP, July 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The hearings on the San Francisco Charter recall, in vivid contrast, events in the Senate 26 years ago. On July 10, 1919, President Woodrow Wilson presented the Versailles Treaty to the Senate. The very heart of that treaty was the Covenant of the League of Nations.

It has frequently been stated that that treaty was never considered in the Senate purely upon its merits. That was due not only to the Senate but to the American people, as well. A quarter of a century has made a great change in the temper of our people.

Twenty-six years means that a new generation has come upon the scene. Historians have noted the changes that have occurred in our national life as each generation has registered the result of its varying background. The influence of the so-called hyphenated American was strong in our national life a quarter of a century ago. But in a generation, hyphens disappear and restricted immigration has prevented any large acquisition of new hyphens. Those large blocs of American opinion which 26 years ago reechoed continental animosities and prejudices and injected them into American politics have today largely disappeared. In our changing mores non-American activities would today be likely considered as un-American activities.

But opposition to the League came not only from those of foreign antecedents and sympathies, for in many parts of the country, rockribbed in a long American tradition opposition to the League was just as strong. If Europe was too near to some of our fellow countrymen, it was too far from some others.

Domestic affairs had been, since our independence, a dominant concern. We were rather suddenly precipitated into the affairs of the larger world. Less than 20 years before the First World War we had had our first large imperialistic ventures. Only then had we come to be generally recognized as a great power. Even then we had not realized fully what such recognition entailed. Suddenly we became aware of our world responsibility and played our role. But then almost as if scared by our own power and stunned by what it cost to exercise it, we recoiled.

Isolationism became the pattern in American life and in the construction of the postwar world we took no organized part. To ponder today over the question as to whether the Senate's action on the League implemented the desire of the American people is to be purely academic. It is definite enough that the people's desires never had a clear-cut test in the Senate's action of the treaty. For although slightly less than half were for the League as it stood, five-sixths of the Senators were for the League with or without reservations. Yet the League failed totally. This anomaly arose from the fact that when the two votes on ratification occurred only those in favor of the attached reservations voted for it while those who wanted the League without reservations and those who would not have it under any conditions voted against it. Hence the League in the Senate may be said to have been killed by its friends rather than by its enemies.

When in July 1919, the League reached the Senate, it landed in a hotbed of antagonism. Some Senators nursed a deep and undying hatred for the President and all his works. Some felt that the Senate's partnership in foreign affairs had been ignored in the constitution of the Peace Commission. Others felt that negotiation had been kept too exclusively within the sacred precincts of the Democratic Party. Some even professed to see in the treaty a Democratic campaign document for the coming 1920 elections. On top of it all, the Republicans, not the Democrats, controlled the Senate. While even some of the enemies of the treaty believed it could have been ratified had an early vote been permitted, the Committee on Foreign Relations kept the treaty for two long months while the opposition managed to document itself thoroughly in the hearings.

When the Presidential election did come, in spite of the pious observations of distinguished pro-League Republicans that it was not a vote against the League, the blatant fact did remain that the party whose leader was the architect of the League had been decisively defeated.

These incidents today all seem more distant than 26 years ago. They do serve to point a contrast between the handling of the Covenant and of the Charter. No doubt much of that difference can be ascribed to the enlarged experience of our people, to sounder leadership, and to the nature and genesis of the present war.

In spite of a characteristic abhorrence of war, the American people in the last decade have, in large numbers, been intellectually aware of the forces that were leading toward world conflagration. Japan's attack on China beginning with the conquest of Manchuria, Italy's seizure of Ethiopia and Albania, the Spanish Civil War, and Germany's rearmament—all of these pointed to the energy and the insolence of the totalitarian states and indicated the shape of things to come. The lot of Czechoslovakia, of Austria, and Poland were merely parts of a logical chain. Pearl Harbor, as far as the rank and file of America went, took all of these things out of the purely intellectual sphere and put them in an intensely personal one. Since war had come to America, it could no longer be viewed academically. The answer to the problem was action, not argument. As threatening as was victorious nazism, as inspiring as was the defense of England, as abysmal as was the fall of France, as pitiful as was the plight of Poland, none of these nor all of them could do for America what Pearl Harbor did. It ended isolationism—isolationism in thought and in action. All of history before and after December 1941 are a part of the experience of the Americans who wage this war and shape this peace.

It is not unimportant that, during the time these events have, for the most part, transpired, one political party has been in power and one leadership has been able to rise above the partisan in foreign affairs and in succession to educate, warn, prepare, and lead a united people.

The Charter now before the Senate has been long in formulation. The proposals of Dumbarton Oaks were before the American people and the rest of the world for months before the later consultations at San Francisco were held. World organization was considered as a preliminary and not an appendage to a peace. The prior issue was met on its own grounds and not complicated by the added bargainings of a peace conference.

Sound political judgment on both sides has saved the charter being either a campaign issue or a political pamphlet. Its creators were nonpartisan in spirit; its defenders are the same way.

Twenty-five years ago, many highly trained and public-spirited citizens who had devoted their lives and talents to the problems of world organization were forced to turn lobbyists and appear to try to sell the public a bill of goods. This time many of these men were in the drafter's seat, the servants of the people in implementing the public will.

Again a quarter of a century ago, there were titans in opposition hurling formidable shibboleths which, in sound at least, seemed to have some validity. Today, the voices in dissent are weak and highly individual, the voices of honest men, no doubt, but voices with neither a convincing evangel nor a formidable following.

The road of warfare has not yet been fully traversed. When this generation comes to the end of that road, the chance today seems fair that it may enter, at least, into the possibility of an ordered world. That would seem a reasonable hope, "two-thirds of the Senators present concurring."

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the same subject as the series of articles in the Washington Daily News there appeared in the Washington Post this morning a very able editorial entitled "Destructive Criticism," referring to the same bill. I ask that it be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESTRUCTIVE CRITICISM

An organized campaign seems to be under way to smear the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill for the promotion of industrial peace. To be sure, there has been some temperate criticism and analytical discussion of the measure. But these comments tend to be lost among the torrents of denunciation that have come from numerous spokesmen for organized labor. One labor leader has denounced it as "a bill to enslave labor." Another says it would be an instrument of "labor oppression." A third interested party asserts that it is "maliciously worded" and that it could easily be interpreted to "nullify all genuine collective bargaining." Such criticism is mere nonsense, of course, as an unbiased reading of the bill will show.

If there was ever a time when the best minds in and out of the labor movement ought to be seeking a sensible solution of the problems with which this bill deals, it is now. Industrial disputes, even in wartime, have mounted to formidable proportions. In spite of all the War Labor Board could do to iron out differences between employers and employees in 1944, we experienced the greatest number of strikes on record. The record in 1945, despite labor's no-strike pledge, promises to be still worse. After VJ-day, when the discipline of wartime is relaxed, there will be grave danger of industrial

paralysis unless some improved means of adjusting employer-employee disputes is made effective.

In these circumstances any thoughtful plan to induce negotiations instead of strikes and arbitrary discharges is entitled to a sympathetic hearing. Discussion in the public interest would be addressed to approval of the provisions of the bill that are considered sound, with criticism and proposals to amend those considered unsound. By this method weaknesses could be eliminated and shortcomings corrected. But mere resort to abuse leads nowhere—except to more industrial disturbances with resulting losses for employees and employers alike.

The Post has been critical of some provisions of the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill. We singled out especially its compulsory arbitration provision for the settlement of disputes involving public utilities or other industries that must be operated continuously to protect community health or well-being. Essential though it is to apply public pressure for the settlement of such disputes, we think that the application of forced arbitration as a matter of routine might seriously interfere with the vital mediation assignment that would be given to the proposed Federal Labor Relations Board. But we certainly do not think that this and other questionable provisions of the bill are an excuse for the attempt to destroy it.

What do those who are smearing the bill want? Do they object because it would make collective bargaining an obligation of labor as well as of employers? Do they actually prefer industrial warfare to orderly negotiation of collective bargaining agreements? The merely negative attitude that has been manifested toward the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill is certainly not conducive to a constructive solution of the problem it raises. We think it is time for labor groups to drop this obstructionist attitude and come forward with their own suggestion for amendment of this bill or with a substitute aimed at the weaknesses in our present methods of handling industrial disputes.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently there has appeared in the Washington Daily News a series of articles, six in number, entitled "What New Labor Bill Proposes." These articles are mere explanations and analyses of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 3, 1945]

WHAT NEW LABOR BILL PROPOSES

(NOTE.—Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL have proposed a new Federal Industrial Relations Act. The bill they have put before Congress is already a subject of wide discussion and heated controversy. In an effort to contribute to public understanding of this bill we have analyzed it in six brief articles. The first follows.)

The Hatch-Burton-Ball bill says that it shall be the policy of Congress to facilitate "prompt, peaceful and just settlement of all labor-relations controversies that may interrupt commerce among the several States or with foreign nations."

This policy would be carried out, the bill says, by: (1) Encouraging the making and maintaining of labor-management agreements; (2) helping to maintain the rights of employees and employers to be represented in collective bargaining by freely chosen representatives; (3) providing Federal settlement procedures for controversies that threaten substantial interruption of interstate or foreign commerce; (4) leaving all other labor relations controversies to be dealt with by States.

This policy's purpose, the bill says, shall be to promote continuous, regular employment, and to avoid interruptions of employment by strikes, lock-outs, or shut-downs or because employers or employees are unable to maintain satisfactory relations.

The bill would create a five-member Federal Labor Relations Board to replace the present National Labor Relations Board. The members, appointed by the President, would get $12,000 salaries. The FLRB would administer the act's procedure for settlement of all labor-management controversies in the Federal field, except those handled under the Railway Labor Act. Functions and personnel of the United States conciliation service would be transferred to the FLRB from the Department of Labor.

The bill also would create a separate, independent unfair labor practices tribunal—three members, appointed by the President, at $10,000 salaries, to enforce legal prohibitions against unfair practices by boss or worker.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 4, 1945]

WHAT NEW LABOR BILL PROPOSES

(Second of six articles analyzing the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill for a new Federal Industrial Relations Act.)

The proposed act would specifically exclude from jurisdiction of the Federal Labor Relations Board controversies arising from employment—

By Federal, State, or local governments; by an employer of fewer than 20 persons (unless a substantial interruption of commerce is threatened); by farmers or farm cooperatives in agricultural work; by labor organizations; in domestic service; in occupations covered by the Railway Labor Act.

It would leave controversies affecting fewer than 20 employees, and predominantly local controversies only indirectly affecting interstate or foreign commerce, to be dealt with by the States.

Controversies within the Federal Board's field would be separated into four classes: (1) Those over the representation of employees; (2) those over the making and maintaining of agreements; (3) those over grievances arising under agreements; (4) all others.

Employer-employee controversies could come before the Federal Board in two ways:

1. Any party to a controversy might ask for the Board's services. If the controversy concerned representation rights of employees or the making or maintaining of a union-management agreement, the Board would be required to take jurisdiction and start settlement procedure. It would not be required to take jurisdiction over grievance controversies arising under agreements unless it found them to threaten substantial interruption of commerce.

2. The Board might volunteer its services in any controversy if it found and announced publicly that a substantial interruption of commerce was threatened.

However, no party to a controversy could ask the Federal Board to take jurisdiction if an appropriate State agency had been attempting for more than 10 days and was still attempting to arrange settlement under State law.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 5, 1945]

WHAT NEW LABOR BILL PROPOSES

(Third of six articles analyzing the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill for a new Federal Industrial Relations Act.)

Employers and employees within the jurisdiction of the Federal Labor Relations Board which the proposed law would create would be charged with the following duties:

1. To exert "every reasonable effort" to make and maintain agreements.

2. To arrange prompt conferences between their representatives if controversies arise, and to exert "every reasonable effort" to settle the controversies.

3. To avoid any arbitrary, one-sided change of existing conditions (by strikes, lock-outs, etc.) while a controversy is going through the settlement procedure prescribed by the law or within 30 days after the possibilities of settlement by this procedure have been exhausted.

The bill says that individual employees would be free to quit their jobs at any time and that, except as provided in the proposed act, the right to strike would not be interfered with, impeded, or diminished.

It would be a violation of the act for any person to fail to perform these duties, or to incite or support such failure. The Federal board would be authorized to restrain violations by Federal court injunctions, or to deny aid to violators. Any person suffering loss by reason of a violation could bring a civil suit for damages.

In settling what the act would define as class 1 controversies—those over employees' representation rights—the proposed Federal board would proceed much as the National Labor Relations Board does now. It would investigate and certify, after a secret ballot of the employees concerned, if necessary, what union a majority desired as its collective-bargaining representative.

The Board's certificate would be reviewable and enforceable by the Federal courts, and the collective-bargaining agent certified would be the employees' exclusive representative for at least 1 year.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 6, 1945]

WHAT NEW LABOR BILL PROPOSES

(Fourth of six articles analyzing the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill for a new Federal Industrial Relations Act.)

The proposed act would subject class 2 controversies—those over the making of employer-employee agreements—to the following settlement steps:

1. Negotiations between representatives of the parties. 2. If negotiations fail, mediation by the United States Conciliation Service under the Federal Labor Relations Board. 3. If mediation fails, voluntary arbitration. 4. If arbitration is refused, determination by the FLRB as to whether the controversy threatens so substantial an interruption of commerce as to require further delay in exercise of the right to strike or otherwise change existing conditions, pending investigation and report by a special fact-finding commission.

If the FLRB determines to appoint a fact-finding commission, or ask the President to appoint one, it must at the same time determine whether a temporary compulsory settlement might become necessary to avoid severe public hardship.

If the fact-finding commission's report does not result in a settlement of a controversy or a submission to voluntary arbitration—and if the FLRB has found that a temporary compulsory settlement is necessary to avoid severe public hardship—the fact-finding commission then would become a compulsory arbitration board.

Class 3 controversies—those over the figuring of wage payments, discipline and other grievances would be submitted by the FLRB to bipartisan adjustment boards.

An adjustment board would be established by the parties to the controversy or, if they could not agree, appointed by the FLRB. If an adjustment board deadlocked, the FLRB would appoint an impartial referee to break the tie.

Adjustment board awards would be reviewable and enforceable by Federal courts.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 7, 1945]

WHAT NEW LABOR BILL PROPOSES

(Fifth of six articles analyzing the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill for a new Federal Industrial Relations Act.)

The three-member unfair labor practices tribunal which the proposed act would create would have the duty to enforce legal prohibitions against such practices by employers or employees. (The present National Labor Relations Act forbids unfair practices only by employers.)

The Hatch-Burton-Ball bill defines unfair labor practices as follows:

1. Interfering with free choice of collective-bargaining representatives.

2. Spying on workers or employers.

3. Bribing any associate or representative of workers or employers.

4. Discriminating against workers or employers because of any lawful activity in support of their interests.

5. Participating in strikes, lock-outs, etc., in violation of a written agreement, of the Federal Industrial Relations Act, or any legal requirement.

6. Interference with a labor organization by an employer, or with an employer organization by employees.

7. Giving financial aid to a labor organization by an employer, or to an employer organization by employees.

8. (Concerns closed-shop agreement, and will be discussed in next article.)

9. Violating agreements by interrupting, disorganizing, or delaying work in order to compel immediate adjustment of controversies, prevent enforcement of managerial policies or hamper exercise of normal managerial authority.

10. Refusing to meet and deal with authorized representatives of employers or workers at times and in manners provided by agreements or Federal Labor Relations Board regulations.

11. Discharging or otherwise discriminating against an employee, or discriminating against an employer, because he has complained to the tribunal or exercised other legal rights.

The tribunal would have power to consider complaints, hold hearings, and take action. It could order reinstatement of employees, and could award damages to employees or employers. The tribunal's orders would be enforceable and reviewable in the Federal courts.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 9, 1945]

WHAT NEW LABOR BILL PROPOSES

(Last of six articles analyzing the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill for a new Federal Industrial Relations Act.)

The proposed law would permit union-employer agreements for the closed shop and for check-off of union dues, but would require unions making or maintaining such agreements to meet certain conditions.

The Unfair Labor Practices Tribunal, which the bill would create, would be authorized to declare a closed-shop agreement unlawful if, having investigated as the result of a complaint or its own volition, it found the union concerned to be violating one or more of the following requirements:

1. That the union must be the freely chosen representative of, and shall include in its membership, at least 75 percent of the employees covered by the agreement.

2. That the agreement must be ratified by 60 percent of such employees, voting by secret ballot.

3. That any person employed or seeking employment by the employer concerned shall be admitted to union membership on terms and with advantages substantially equivalent to those enjoyed by at least a majority of the existing membership.

4. That no union member shall be deprived of his membership, thereby losing his job, except on written charges and after a fair hearing.

Maintaining a closed shop without meeting these requirements would be an unfair labor practice, and the tribunal could award damages to persons who proved they had suffered loss because of it.

The tribunal would be directed to investigate and report to Congress as to whether further legislation is needed to assume "democratic control and operation" of labor and employer organizations engaged in collective bargaining.

Proposed National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, speaking of criticism, yesterday the Washington Daily News carried an editorial entitled "Constructive Critic" and printed the first of two articles by Mr. William M. Leiserson regarding the proposed National Labor Relations Act. The article criticizes the bill, but it does so in a constructive way. I ask that both the editorial and the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITIC

William M. Leiserson is one of this country's top authorities on labor relations. We asked his opinion of the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill proposing a new Federal Industrial Relations Act. He has given it in two articles, the first of which follows.

Dr. Leiserson's opinion is unfavorable. He believes that the bill is more bad than good. He is especially critical of the proposal for compulsory arbitration of certain types of labor-management disputes. Crediting the measure's sponsors with good motives, he disagrees with them that it would promote industrial peace.

We are for the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill's stated objectives. But we know that the bill needs constructive criticism. That is what Dr. Leiserson has given it. What he says is more effective, and far more useful, than the violent attacks by some labor leaders on the bill and its sponsors.

Introduction of a measure in Congress is a starting point, not a destination. The three Senators who introduced this bill, and the citizens who helped to draft it, do not contend that it is perfect. They have invited discussion of it. We believe that calm discussion, as in Dr. Leiserson's articles, has high value. It can help to shape sound legislation that will promote the public interest in industrial peace without endangering the necessary rights of workers and employers. That is the sort of legislation we want.

BAD OUTWEIGHS GOOD IN PROPOSED LABOR BILL

(By William M. Leiserson)

No one will be enlightened by wholesale approval or condemnation of the Hatch-Burton-Ball labor-relations bill. What is needed is clear understanding of the specific provisions of the bill, and whether these may reasonably be expected to accomplish the high purposes claimed for them.

Some of its provisions are good, others are quite bad and likely to increase industrial strife rather than promote peaceful labor relations. A thorough study of the bill has convinced me that the bad in it outweighs the good.

A good feature of the bill is its classification of different types of labor disputes, with appropriate methods and procedures for handling each type.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

But in dealing with fact-finding boards it introduces compulsory arbitration, which is foreign to the whole spirit and method of the Railway Labor Act. This compulsory feature is more likely to stimulate than prevent industrial strife. It will make ineffective the provisions for settlement of disputes by mutual agreement.

The completely voluntary mediation, arbitration, and fact finding of the Railway Act were able to prevent practically all rail and air-line strikes during the war period, until Government authorities tried to impose compulsory methods on procedures of the act.

Despite the compulsory decisions of the War Labor Board, backed by the President's war powers and the Smith-Connally Act, we had in 1944 the greatest number of strikes on record, with 1945 promising to be worse still.

In the light of this record, it is hard to understand the predilection of the bill's authors for compulsory arbitration.

Except for ignoring the Department of Labor, no one can justifiably quarrel with the bill insofar as it proposes to reorganize and centralize mediation, arbitration, and other labor-adjustment agencies of the Government. But the bill also rewrites the National Labor Relations Act. In doing this it puts monkey wrenches into its own proposed machinery for peaceful adjustment of labor disputes.

The Wagner Act is not merely amended to fix some features that the authors think have not worked well in practice; it is rewritten with entirely new words.

RELATIONSHIP CHANGED

This means that the whole legal relationship between employers and employees is changed, redefined. The change itself, and the many years of litigation that will be required for courts to decide what the new definitions means, will inject new uncertainties, new causes of unrest and industrial strife in an already tense labor situation.

But this is not all. The new concepts of legal relationships are interwoven with those sections of the bill which provide for settlement of controversies by voluntary methods. Unwittingly, perhaps, the announced purpose of the sponsoring Senators—"complete sepa-

ration of the Government's mediation function from its quasi-judicial function"—is thus defeated.

The National Labor Relations Board is to be replaced by a Federal Labor Relations Board. But the NLRB is a quasi-judicial body, while the proposed FLRB purports to be a mediation board. Nevertheless, all the judicial functions connected with determining bargaining units are made duties of the FLRB.

Also the FLRB is authorized to suspend prosecution of violation of the law against unfair labor practices, while it tries to settle the cases by mediation or arbitration.

Still more serious are the confused concepts written into the bill of what is meant by an appropriate bargaining unit. On the one hand the FLRB, to avoid multiple representation, is given authority to decide that a single unit with one representative for all employees having a common interest is appropriate; on the other, the language is such as to authorize any group of employees to designate an exclusive representative.

PLENTY OF TROUBLE

Further, any group or individual employee may settle with the employer disputes growing out of collective contracts without consulting the certified representative that made the contract. Incidentally this reverses an important Supreme Court decision.

The NLRB has had plenty of trouble determining bargaining units with the simple language of the Wagner Act. Now it is proposed to throw overboard the hundreds of decisions by which the NLRB has gradually hammered out policies with respect to bargaining units.

In place of this judicial process, a mediation board—FLRB—is authorized to start all over again and make final and binding decisions on this inflammatory issue. Similarly, the whole question of what constitutes interstate commerce is to be reopened by a new definition, and court decisions are to be reversed which have settled issues about labor in the processing of agricultural and dairy products.

Proposed Federal Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, earlier today I inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Bad Outweighs Good in Proposed Labor Bill" by Mr. Leiserson, published in the Washington Daily News. I have before me now the second of his articles critical of the bill which certain of us have introduced relating to labor legislation. I ask unanimous consent to insert the second article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am sorry to say, Mr. President, however, that I cannot call the article one of constructive criticism. I regret very much that such an able man would, in the last paragraph of his article, write these words:

Before attempting to draft legislation, the authors would have been better advised had they also provided for an investigation to find out whether it is really necessary and desirable to tear the Wagner Act to bits.

Mr. President, I see the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is present in the Senate Chamber. Our proposed legislation would not tear the Wagner Act to bits. I do not like such generalities which are not based upon fact or upon law either.

Mr. Leiserson continues:

To change the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law.

The proposed legislation would not change that law.

To multiply lawsuits.

Mr. President, the very purpose of the bill is not to multiply but to prevent lawsuits.

To destroy foremen's unions and to restrict wage-earners in their union activities because their elected officers, like public officers, sometimes abuse their powers.

Mr. President, I have a very high regard for the writer of this article. I think he is one of the outstanding men in the United States in the labor field, but I am very sorry he resorts to that kind of argument.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IT NECESSARY TO TEAR WAGNER ACT APART?

(By William M. Leiserson)

Section 12 of the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill authorizes the proposed Federal Labor Relations Board, functioning as a mediation board, to refuse to recognize or certify any representative either of employers or of unions who do not perform certain duties in connection with mediation or arbitration.

With whom then will the Government mediators deal and arrange for settlement of labor controversies?

A dispute at Montgomery Ward's can hardly be settled without recognizing Sewell Avery, nor a musicians' dispute without Joseph Petrillo. And how are coal mining disputes to be mediated by refusing to recognize the operators' association or the miners' union?

ADJUSTING SYSTEM

This is an example of the bizarre results that come from mixing a voluntary system of adjusting labor disputes with compulsory judicial or law enforcement powers lodged in the mediation agency.

Naive faith in the effectiveness of compulsion in human relations also leads the drafters of the bill to provide for civil actions in the courts, both by the Mediation Board and by individuals, against any party to a labor dispute who fails to perform duties in connecton with mediation. Nothing could more effectively stop efforts to settle disputes by mutual agreements than the mere threat of such lawsuits.

The Wagner Act defines in clear terms five unfair practices of employers that interfere with legal rights of employees.

UNFAIR PRACTICES

These are discarded in the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill, and in their place 11 unfair practices are substituted which are unrealistically assumed to be applicable to employers and workers alike. Many are in vague language and not limited to interference with legal rights. Some are purely economic practices which all elements of our population are free to engage in.

Thus the wording is such as to prohibit employees, like employers, from inducing other employees to join, or not to join, a labor organization.

Union members, apparently, may not discriminate against nonmembers to encourage membership in a union; they may not favor their fellow members. Unions and workers may not enforce or assist in collecting dues or other financial obligations to their organizations. A union bank could not make loans to employers to help meet pay rolls and to keep union members employed. And presumably workers could not postpone taking their pay for any period in order to aid a distressed employer.

VAGUE LANGUAGE

There is vague language also making it an unfair practice "to hamper or embarrass an employer, his representatives, or supervisory employees in exercising their normal and reasonable authority of management." This sort of thing can only add more confusion to an already chaotic labor situation.

And just why are supervisory employees not entitled to equal treatment with employers and workers? Why should they have no rights and be pushed around?

Great as is my admiration of the ability and public services of Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL, I think they are mistaken if they believe this bill can be the basis of a fair and sound labor policy to promote industrial peace. The fantastic results of the Smith-Connally Act should be a warning.

The authors obviously did not have enough factual information on which to base legislation that would approximate really equal treatment of employers and all classes of employees. Section 32 provides for "an investigation as to whether legislation is necessary or desirable for assuring democratic control of labor organizations and employers' organizations."

Before attempting to draft legislation, the authors would have been better advised had they also provided for an investigation to find out whether it is really necessary and desirable to tear the Wagner Act to bits, to change the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law, to multiply lawsuits as a means of adjusting labor relations, to destroy foremen's unions, and to restrict wage earners in their union activities because their elected officers, like public officers, sometimes abuse their powers.

Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, what we say here will have little effect upon the future of this country, but there are today some few men among us whose records stand as eloquent tributes to the struggle for mastery over the forces of evil.

Such a man is the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War. Few men in American history have rendered more true, honest, and steadfast service to their country. I think it is well to call the attention of America to the splendid record of this man, so that the confidence of those who serve and of those who wait may be strengthened.

Judge Patterson is able, honest, and has a deep sense of loyalty to his country. His heart and mind are bent on victory over the forces of aggression, and his is the prayer of every man on the front lines today, a prayer for a decent and peaceful world.

I am proud of his record of service, not only as Under Secretary, but as a soldier, and as one of the country's most distinguished jurists.

Born at Glen Falls, N. Y., on February 12, 1891, he attended Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., graduating with a bachelor of arts degree in 1912. Subsequently, he went to Harvard University where he received his bachelor of laws degree in 1915. He was admitted to the New York bar in 1915, and except for service in the Army, practiced law in New York City until his appointment by President Hoover as judge of the United States District Court, Southern New York District, in 1930.

In 1939 he was promoted by President Roosevelt to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, where he served until his appointment as Assistant Secretary of War on July 31, 1940. Upon aproval of the act creating the office of Under Secretary of War, he at once was chosen for this position and was confirmed on December 19, 1940.

His military service began in 1915, when he enlisted in Company I, Seventh Infantry, New York National Guard. He was mustered into Federal service for border patrol duty on June 26, 1916, as a private in that organization. After several months on the border, he was mustered out of Federal service on December 2, 1916. He was commissioned a second lieutenant, Infantry section, Officers' Reserve Corps, on May 15, 1917, and placed on active duty at the Reserve Officers' Training Camp, Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y. Promoted to captain in August 1917 he was assigned to the One Hundred and Fifty-second Depot Brigade at Camp Upton, N. Y. He was transferred to Headquarters Company, Three Hundred and Sixth Infantry, on January 15, 1918, and left the United States for service in France with his organization on April 13, 1918.

In July 1918 he was transferred to Company F, Three Hundred and Sixth Infantry. He served in the Baccarat, Vesle, and Foret-d'Argonne defensive sectors, and in the Oise-Aisne and Meuse-Argonne offensives. He was wounded in action on August 16, 1918, and on March 26, 1919, he was promoted to major and assigned to command the Second Battalion, Three Hundred and Sixth Infantry. He returned to the United States in April 1919, and in May of that year he was honorably discharged from the military service, subsequently serving as a major of Infantry in the Officers' Reserve Corps.

And what kind of a soldier is he? The records show that he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross in 1918 for extraordinary heroism. Accompanied by two noncommissioned officers, he made a daring daylight reconnaissance into the enemy lines. He surprised an enemy outpost of superior numbers and personally destroyed the outpost. Later he again had an encounter with another outpost, during which several of the enemy were killed or wounded and one member of his patrol was wounded. The enemy advanced to their outposts, and Captain Patterson covered the retreat of his patrol, during which he dropped into a depression and feigned being killed in order to escape to his lines under cover of darkness.

In August 1918 he again proved himself the kind of leader under whom any soldier would want to serve. During a relief his company suddenly came under heavy shell fire of the enemy. Captain Patterson calmly walked up and down in front of his company, indicating to individual men where each could best seek shelter. Throughout this critical time he showed utter disregard for personal danger. That is the kind of leadership this country needs today, even more than it was needed in 1918.

He proved his courage again in September of that year when he led his men with complete efficiency and coolness under an intense concentration of artillery and machine-gun fire in the offensive through the Argonne Forests. His courage and coolness were officially recognized as responsible for the successful attack made by his company.

In 1943 Judge Patterson returned to the battle fronts, completing a 30,000-mile trip to Hawaii and through the South Pacific and Southwest Pacific, where he inspected United States troops. Last year he made a similar inspection of the European theater, including north Africa, England, and the battle fronts of Italy and France.

Let him whose record surpasses or even equals that of the Under Secretary of War offer the first criticism of an outstanding American.

Which Way, America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following statement—Which Way, America?—by a member of the Washington staff of a national news magazine:

WHICH WAY, AMERICA?

As the United Nations Security Conference concluded its work in San Francisco, the Woodrum (House) Committee on Postwar Military Policy opened hearings on compulsory, universal military training, in Washington. Thus in unique chronological sequence, the United States is facing a critical problem, one which is, unfortunately, not widely recognized, the problem of which direction this Nation is going to lead the world.

In the popular mind there is nothing necessarily incongruous about the two events. The second is simply "insurance" in case the first fails. This convenient division of policies might actually prevail were it not for the fact that they are diametrically opposed and that there is likely to be interrelation between the two.

At San Francisco the United States has taken leadership in the advocacy of peace through collective security; in Washington it is debating a question which can only amount to this: "Shall America, which once was the leading nation in the espousal of disarmament, become the leader of the next world arms race?"

There is no way of escaping the conclusion that this will mean a new arms race. It is proposed under the bill introduced by Representative ANDREW J. MAY, Kentucky, and Senator CHAN GURNEY, South Dakota, and under the policy being debated by the Woodrum committee, to train approximately 1,000,000 boys each year. While it is only proposed that they be held in the organized reserve for 5 years, thus giving the United States Army a reserve strength of between four and five million men, the present draft ages of 18 to 38 suggest that ultimately this country will have ready for the purposes of war a trained reserve of fifteen to eighteen million men. This would be the largest reserve army in the history of the world and, when coupled with the largest fleet in world history, the largest naval reserve, and the largest air force, would give the other nations of the globe a good idea of which was the most armament-minded nation in the world.

AN EXTRAORDINARY INSURANCE POLICY

Should the nations interpret this extraordinary "insurance policy" of the United States to be the evidence of our faith in the peace now being constructed, the path of America's leadership will be all too plain. If powerful America, with her favorable geographic position, finds it necessary to carry an "insurance policy" against the outbreak of hostilities or a resurgence of international aggression, how much more necessary it is, they will tell themselves, that the lesser powers, with their land boundaries so vulnerable, also carry heavy "insurance."

The next arms race will be on. There are already discouraging indications that it can easily get under way. Russia is keeping her Red Army intact for the time being, and, according to Moscow, is sending it on extensive "field maneuvers" this summer. Czechoslovakia announces that she is raising a new army which will be trained by Russian officers. General de Gaulle has been berated for holding an alleged "guns instead of butter" philosophy in his haste to rebuild the French Army and Navy before the task of rebuilding France and feeding her people has even fairly begun. There are indications that the frontiers of the lesser states in Europe may everywhere be kept militarized, among them the Rumanian-Hungarian boundary, the Czech-Polish frontier, the Yugoslav-Austrian and the Greek-Bulgarian boundaries. Europe is once more headed toward becoming an armed camp.

THIS IS NOT THE DIRECTION

Surely this is not the direction in which the United States should be leading the world. Yet for this Nation to proclaim peacetime conscription as its permanent policy would almost certainly have that effect. There is powerful agitation for the same course to be pursued in Great Britain. If the United States adopts it, the British almost certainly will. And if Britain and the United States are thus arming, it would be foolish to expect the Russians to do otherwise. As the realistic Kremlin views the present debate in America, it is likely that Russia will ask, "Against whom are they seeking to arm? Against whom do they plan to fight?"

As for the smaller nations, a member of the Canadian delegation at San Francisco told a representative of an American peace group, "If Britain and the United States both adopt peacetime conscription, where does it place Canada? What other course can we follow?"

SOME TRY TO FIND COMMON GROUND

There are some who try to find common ground between the opposing policies of national armament and collective security by

insisting that peacetime training is necessary in order to implement the projected Security Council with adequate force. This raises the question of how much force a security organization needs in order to maintain the peace. Obviously, the more force which individual nations, who may be potential aggressors, maintain the greater will be the amount of force required by the Security Council.

A peace which requires that every young man in all the major nations be trained for at least 1 year in the art of war would be an unstable peace, indeed. It would not be likely to be a just and enduring one, a peace of the type which would reward the sacrifices humanity has made in this war. Huge armaments breed jealousy, suspicion, and national self-assuredness. They would make a poor foundation for any successful world council to work upon.

Further, a police force can operate successfully only in a relatively unarmed community. A world-security organization cannot function effectively in a world armed to the teeth any more than an American city police force could operate if every citizen carried a machine gun, which he would threaten to use in case of a personal emergency without calling in the police, or even use in opposition to the police. Other citizens might carry machine guns to help the police, but the result would scarcely be a peaceful society. Eventually serious violence, perhaps attended by a show-down battle to the death between opposing factions, could be expected in such a community. Thus it is with the world and the easy path it can take to a third world war.

But what if America takes a position of leadership in the opposite direction? What are the prospects of this Nation returning to the place of leadership in the reduction of armaments which it held from 1922 to 1932?

NEVER A MORE OPPORTUNE TIME

The time has never been more opportune for the United States to take the lead toward securing universal limitation of armaments. Only three nations are emerging from this war with large armed forces, the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. Four other nations will have second-rate armies, France, China, Turkey, and Yugoslavia, while most of the rest of the nations will have very meager armed forces. The aggressive nations, our late enemies, will be unarmed.

All that is needed is an agreement among the Big Three Powers as to the minimum amount of armed force necessary to uphold the new Security Organization and a rigid adherence to that volume of armament, with a frank invitation to other nations to join them in such a policy.

Compared with the complex situation which confronted President Harding when he called the Washington Arms Conference in 1922, the current situation is almost ideal. In Harding's time the United States was attempting to persuade the nations of the world to adopt disarmament without giving them anything to substitute for the security which it was felt that large armed forces provided. The United States would not even become a member of the League of Nations, which was attempting to provide collective security. Considering the multitude of other factors which must go into the making of a true state of peace, it is little wonder that disarmament, unaccompanied by other actions toward peace building, failed miserably.

THE MACHINERY IS AT HAND

But today there is the growing and hopeful United Nations Organization which can provide the machinery of collective security. There are other potential agencies, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, the proposed Bretton Woods Stabilization Bank, and the International Labor Organization, which can tackle the economic problems related to the establishment of genuine peace. The machinery needed to accompany effective disarmament appears to be at hand.

TALK AT SAN FRANCISCO

Talk of calling another world conference to deal with the problem of the size and limitation of armaments has been reported among the delegates at the San Francisco Conference. Real hope is entertained that the two interrelated policies of the establishment of collective security and a reduction in the dependence of nations upon strong armed forces can be brought together. At last, it is felt, the world is ready to take this important step in the construction of an enduring international society, is ready to cease preparing for new wars before the blood of old battles has dried.

What should be the position of the United States toward the movement for this arms conference? Can the United States conscientiously take the leadership in it if it has adopted a permanent policy of peacetime conscription for itself?

CONSCRIPTION IS THE EVIL ROOT

"Conscription is the taproot of militarism," Jan Christiaan Smuts has said. Without it modern mass armies which threaten the peace of the world cannot be built. As a keystone to successful operation of the new world council, a convention against conscription, such as was contained in Woodrow Wilson's first draft of the League of Nations, is imperative.

Yet how can American lead the United Nations toward the abolition of compulsory, world-wide training of 18-year-old boys for war, if this Nation itself proclaims the necessity of such a policy? If the United States lags grudgingly behind in this movement, even offers opposition to it, what nation will take the lead? How is the world going to complete its transition from the paths which lead to war to the path which leads to peace?

All of these questions are bound up in the decision which the American people are going to have to make shortly on compulsory-training legislation. It has grave international implications which must be recognized.

"America's leadership in world affairs would be easier for the other nations to follow," one of our delegates to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference recently observed, "if this Nation could only make up its mind in which direction it is going to lead."

The New Challenge to Educational Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 1945, Commissioner Paul A. Walker, of the Federal Communications Commission delivered a speech entitled "The New Challenge to Educational Broadcasters" before the First Educational FM-Station Workshop at the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

FM broadcasting opens up new spaces in the radio spectrum and, in my judgment, will play a most important part in the future of our educational institutions so far as broadcasting is concerned.

Commissioner Walker's speech is very illuminating, as well as challenging. As a part of my remarks, I desire to include his speech:

On June 27, 1945, the Federal Communications Commission made its final report regarding the allocation of frequencies above 25 megacycles to the various radio services. Educators had requested not less than 15 channels for noncommercial frequency-modulation broadcasting. The Commission, realizing the importance of educational radio, assigned to them a band of 20 channels immediately adjacent to the regular frequency-modulation band now open for commercial broadcasting. Thus the Commission has opened up a new campus in the ether for the educational institutions of America.

In the early days of broadcasting, many of the stations were owned and operated by educational institutions. In 1925, licenses to operate stations had been issued to various educational groups. A large number of these stations started with a burst of enthusiasm, but soon lost interest. Some had difficulty keeping their equipment in repair and providing talent for their programs. Many had to operate on small and inadequate budgets.

With the development of commercial radio and the competition for frequencies, one by one, schools gave up their stations. By 1936, there were only 38 educational stations in the country. Today there are only 22 noncommercial educational standard broadcast stations in operation out of a total of more than 900 stations.

Education now has its second chance in the broadcasting field. Frequency modulation opens up new spaces in the radio spectrum. Frequency modulation is better able to avoid static, possesses high fidelity and is well suited for educational broadcasting. Alien atmospheric and electrical noises, often damaging to standard broadcasts, do not mar the quality of frequency-modulation reception.

What will educators do about these new opportunities? Indications are that they will not make the same mistake they did in regard to amplitude-modulation broadcasting. More than 30 States are now making plans for State-wide frequency-modulation educational networks. Twenty-nine of these are considering the establishment of coordinated systems with central-control committees. This may mean that a large number of schools in the States may be hooked up with networks which will provide State-wide and perhaps Nation-wide coverage.

It also is encouraging to note that 18 States already have their planning committees organized and at work. One State just recently appropriated more than $70,000 to be used for the construction of the first station in its network. Five States definitely have engineering surveys under way and others, no doubt, will soon start such surveys.

There are 6 noncommercial educational FM stations already in operation, 6 under construction, and 23 applications on file with the Federal Communications Commission. It is expected that others will come in soon.

One of the most heartening things about the present FM educational developments is the fact that school administrators, methods, and curriculum specialists, special-subject supervisors, and classroom teachers are active. The interest is not limited merely to engineers as was largely the case when AM first started. Educators on all levels who are in a position to initiate and carry out broadcasting plans are taking the lead.

At a recent meeting in Washington called by the United States Commissioner of Education at the request of the Surplus Property Board and held under the auspices of the

Federal Communications Commission, school representatives from different parts of the country discussed plans for the use of surplus radio and electronic equipment. The group envisioned an eventual system of more than 800 broadcasting stations devoted exclusively to educational pursuits. A number of institutions are already making plans to apply for the purchase of radio equipment as soon as the Surplus Property Board makes it available.

While there are many encouraging signs, I should point out that the radio spectrum is limited. No doubt, there will be keen competition for frequencies, once manpower and construction materials are available. This is evidenced by the fact that there are more than 400 applications for commercial FM stations on file with the Commission. If educators do not make prompt and effective use of the channels which have been assigned to them, the pressure will become increasingly strong to assign them to those who will. What I am saying is that action should follow talking and planning. School authorities should be ready to move full speed ahead when materials are available.

I hope that you attending this meeting will do all you can to impress upon school administrators the importance of radio and see to it that sufficient money is appropriated to maintain high standards of operation. The best equipment and the most competent staffs should be provided to insure the best in educational broadcasting.

The applications now on file with the Commission suggest that educators are alert to the need for sound equipment standards, but that personnel standards are not so well understood. After all, no station can rise above the level of the ability of its staff. The quality and success of a station is inevitably a reflection of the ability, talent, or even genius of its director and his associates. For this reason, it seems to me imperative that the position of broadcast station directors in our school systems and on college campuses should carry with it remuneration, prestige, and tenure advantages high enough to attract to this important field men of outstanding ability. It is only by placing equipment in the hands of truly qualified staffs that an educational station, and the institution which supports it, can achieve the high role in the community which educational FM makes possible.

There is one school of thought which holds that the true role of the educational FM station will be to serve specific educational needs and leave programs of general interest to commercial stations. Some go so far as to say that it will be futile for noncommercial stations to attempt to compete with network programs in terms of quality and entertainment value. I do not agree with this view. In addition to serving specific educational needs, the educational station, I believe, has the duty to provide some high quality programs which will appeal to the community at large. Some standard educational stations have been able to compete very successfully with commercial broadcasters. For example, Station WOI at Iowa State College, in competition with all networks and several clear channel stations, was shown by a 1941 survey to be the most popular station in two Iowa counties and runner-up in 25 other counties, despite the fact that it operated with only regional power and during the daylight hours only. It was shown that a program of classical music over WOI was more popular than the programs with which it was competing in Iowa.

I think the experience of several educational stations now on the air—WNAD, WHA, WOSU, WOI, and others—shows that it is possible for them to put on high-quality programs which have general appeal. I think I am safe in saying that many of their programs are more popular than, say, some of the soap operas which flood the airways during the morning and afternoon hours.

The educational stations, of course, will have a wonderful opportunity to do a good job of in-school broadcasts closely correlated with the work of the teachers. But they can do more. They can provide high-class musical shows, community forums, literary and dramatic programs, which have general public appeal. Such programs may very well compete with some present commercial broadcasts, which are frequently interrupted by spot announcements advertising deodorants, cosmetics, beer, breakfast foods, and cigarettes.

By the wider use of FM stations in schools after the war, the American people can have increased opportunities to talk about their common problems. It can provide outlets for the discussion of local problems, and the expression of facts and opinions, so essential to a healthy democracy.

The educational station has a real opportunity to contribute to the intellectual and cultural growth of community and State life. It has the duty, I believe, to provide information and instruction in such matters as local health needs and conservation of natural resources, and can stimulate interest and pride in local traditions and institutions.

I can think of no program that would be more informative and entertaining for the people of my own State of Oklahoma for example than one put on by an educational network which would portray in a dramatic and effective manner the important episodes in the history of the State. Each State and locality similarly has a rich history—a story which, if told effectively, can elicit the interest of a large audience. This is only one example of the type of program that the educational station is well adapted to present in the interest of educating the community.

Schools which are licensed to operate stations will, of course, be obligated to see that no single social, educational, or political philosophy is allowed to dominate the broadcasts. The school station must serve the community at large and not become a medium for institutional propaganda.

A great responsibility will rest upon schools in the postwar world. They not only will have the task of maintaining a large number of FM stations, but will have the job of training engineers, program directors, station managers, and speakers for commercial as well as non-commercial broadcasting. It has been estimated that there may be as many as 5,000 FM stations operating in this country 5 years after the war. These will be scattered in many communities over the country. Many trained operators, technicians, speakers, and performers will be needed. Training programs such as that offered by Ohio State University will be essential. Many radio courses, I understand, are available here. Courses in education, journalism, advertising, speech and drama, music, and other fine arts, are offered. The training program is aided by a radio station which implements the instruction for the students in the university and serves as a medium for public enlightenment and entertainment. All of this work is integrated under a director of radio education and definite objectives are set forth and achieved. As other institutions are licensed to operate stations, they may very well follow your example in providing effective training.

No doubt out of our colleges and universities will come graduates whose training will equip them for important positions in Hollywood and New York. But far more important, it seems to me, will be the fact that you can train a large number of young men and women who can go back to their communities to set up or serve local stations. The country or small town newspaper performs a valuable democratic function in America. The local FM station can serve an equally valuable purpose.

In every training program the stress should be on the public interest aspect of broadcasting. Congress has declared that the ether belongs to the people and licenses should be issued only to those who are willing to operate stations in the public interest. Those who plan to enter the field of commercial broadcasting should guard against the temptation to measure service solely in terms of the dollar. We have been concerned over what appears to be overcommercialism in radio. For example, the forty-one 50-kilowatt, full-time, clear-channel stations in the United States had total revenues in 1943 of over $40,000,000. Their program expenses amounted to less than 26 percent of this figure. The broadcast income for each of these stations before the Federal income tax averaged over $400,000 for the year. Each of these stations could have spent $200,000 more that year for educational broadcasting and other public services, and still could have earned returns in excess of 100 percent on its investment. In 1944 these same stations had considerably more income. It amounted to more than $47,000,000, and the broadcast income before Federal income tax for each station averaged approximately $500,000. The broadcasting industry in general had its most profitable year in 1944. The total broadcast income for 836 standard broadcast stations reporting to the Federal Communications Commission showed an increase of more than $22,000,000 over the total income in 1943.

While any commercial station has a right to make a reasonable profit, this should not be the only criterion of success. Service to the community is the real test. Educational institutions can train students to a full appreciation of the social significance of radio and a willingness to discharge full responsibility to the community. The need for properly trained personnel to manage and operate the 5,000 FM stations which are likely to come after the war, will place a heavy responsibility upon you and your colleagues in the educational world.

As a final thought, the radio expansion of the future can be a great constructive force in our democracy, or, if allowed to become the tool of selfish interest, could destroy it. Goebbels and his sinister gang did the broadcasting in Germany. The average citizen had no access to the microphone, and had no freedom to listen except to those broadcasts which emanated from the propaganda transmitters of the Nazi supermen. This was a death blow to the creative and critical thought of the mass of the German people. Totalitarianism, with all the evil and atrocities which attend it, was the inevitable result.

If we are to avoid similar perils, it is essential that we keep the channels of communication open and free in America. We should guard against all censorship whether it be economic, political, or social. With thousands of radio stations in the United States and the rest of the world broadcasting information and truth, humanity can be safe from the exploitation and cruelty of the dictators.

My appeal to you attending this workshop is to take immediate advantage of the opportunities for FM broadcasting. The schools of tomorrow will be derelict in their duty unless they serve through the invisible as well as the visible campus. I hope you will do your part to see that stations are established and that the available frequencies are effectively utilized. Also I hope that you will provide proper training so those who operate the stations of the future

will be prepared to operate them in the public interest and to make radio a powerful force for the building of democratic institutions in America and the world.

Prompt Action by All Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Hartford (Conn.) Times on June 20, 1945, in reference to the succession to the Presidency of the United States:

PROMPT ACTION BY ALL MEANS

President Truman has done well, on every count, to ask the Congress to make a different arrangement than exists about the succession to the Presidency when a Vice President has become President.

His action is the more commendable because he has taken it so promptly, not awaiting agitation of the question in and out of Congress. If that is an indication of a forthright willingness of the President to deal with problems before they become issues so much the better.

Whether the particular plan suggested by the President should be adopted is beside the point. Certainly, as he says, a better system should be devised and it should be done promptly.

It has already been pointed out that Mr. Roosevelt traveled to north Africa, to Teheran, and to Yalta and Egypt in the midst of war, and Mr. Truman himself has just flown from Washington to the Pacific coast, our first President to make such a flight. Obviously these are hazards which cannot be ignored.

As Mr. Truman says, when a Vice President becomes President he gains the power to name his own successor through the appointment of a Secretary of State, who is next in line. The thought that a President might thus designate his successor, without consulting them, will, of course, be intolerable to the American people, if they stop to think about the matter at all. It could even be that a man would be named Secretary of State who would be ineligible for the Presidency. Then there would be further complications.

Of course, the people do not want an appointed President. They never have had one yet who has not been before them as a candidate for their suffrage. They would prefer that the beneficiary of a succession plan should have been before at least a segment of them as a candidate.

Mr. Truman proposed the Speaker of the House as next in line to the Vice President, with the President pro tempore of the Senate following, either to serve only ad interim until the next congressional elections, when a new President would be chosen. Former Postmaster General James A. Farley recently recommended the appointment of a commission to suggest a plan. The Rochester Times-Union proposes an election by the House of Representatives in the emergency described, the poll being of members as individuals rather than each State having one vote.

Thus there is no paucity of ideas, with unity on one point, that a new plan is needed.

The present system is a makeshift. It was devised in 1886 by political leaders to escape a situation they wished to avoid.

Congress should proceed forthwith, as the legislative expression has it, to devise a better plan.

Good for Man or Beast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of July 18, entitled "Good for Man or Beast," relative to the Bretton Woods proposal:

GOOD FOR MAN OR BEAST

On Monday the Senate took up the bill providing for adherence of the United States to the Bretton Woods financial program. Senator WAGNER, of New York, made a sponsoring speech and according to the text of a press release he said among other things:

"The Monetary Fund cannot lose from the depreciation of any currency. All of the currencies held by the Fund bear a gold value guarantee. In the event of depreciation of a currency, that country must pay an additional amount of currency to maintain the gold value of the Fund's holdings."

Mr. Micawber believed that if one defaulted his note, everything would be all right if another note was signed. What Senator WAGNER said is not quite that bad. Neither is it very much better. There may be some safeguard in requiring a country whose currency has depreciated to put up more currency. That is not what Senator WAGNER said. He said the "Fund cannot lose." Of course, it can lose. A rotting currency can become valueless and it makes no difference how much one has, for a trillion times nothing is still nothing.

Senator WAGNER claimed the Fund would eliminate the necessity for exchange controls such as plagued the world before the war and then he said:

"A member may not make net use of the Fund's resources to meet a large or sustained outflow of capital and the Fund may request a member to exercise controls to prevent such use of the resources of the Fund."

Here is something to do away with controls which, under certain circumstances, may request controls. The circumstances are a threatened flight of capital. Are we to infer that controls will apply to capital export but not to transmission of funds for ordinary commercial transactions? How does one go about that? What is the distinguishing mark between the two? How do you control one transaction and not the other when one may become the other in a matter of 10 seconds? If you control both, what becomes of the claim that the Fund will eliminate controls? Controls are controls, whether they are imposed by a Nazi government or at the request of some international institution. When they come in, free exchange of goods goes out the window.

Flights of capital such as we saw in the 1930's are not due to the whim of selfish people. The outbreak of the war and the revelation of political and economic weakness over much of Europe revealed their cause. If that condition recurs, the capital flights will recur and no Gestapo wearing the pious mask of international cooperation will stop them.

The medicine peddler who hawked his concoction with the claim that it would cure baldness, fallen arches, and all ills that assailed the anatomy between those two extremities had sons and grandsons. It seems plausible that they inherited some ability to mak- extravagant claims with a straight face. So "step right up, gents. It's dirt cheap at the price and good for man or beast."

Better Control Than OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of July 18, entitled "Better Control Than OPA," being in defense of free competitive enterprise:

BETTER CONTROL THAN OPA

With certain of Price Administrator Bowles' expressed opinions concerning the near future of commodity and merchandise prices this newspaper is in accord. For example, we agree that the danger of a destructive price inflation increases as the Global War nears its finish and will remain threatening thereafter unless prevented by wise action on the part of both Government and people. Also, we accept his statement that "The final answer to the inflationary dangers which confront us is production and more production," except that we would strike out the word "final." Production is not merely the final out is likewise the immediate regulator of prices.

Mr. Bowles says again that "controls" must be dropped just as rapidly as they can be and that no group is quite so anxious to drop them as OPA. Nevertheless he insists that prices on basic commodities must be "kept from shooting upward," lest wage rates be forced higher by cost of living. But as Price Administrator he has previously adopted the profits on production of a pre-war year as his guide in taxing present and future increases in production costs upon producers. In this base period some industries, and many units in most industries, were operating at a loss. His formula for determining ceiling prices on manufactured goods denies too many producers the incentive of possible profits.

Mr. Bowles seems to be convinced that only the OPA can insure that prices for "items which are now going into peacetime production for the first time in 3 or 4 years" will be "fair to the public and fair to the manufacturer." The only tolerable determinant of peacetime fair prices under our system of Government is open competition among producers free to serve and profit according to their varying degrees of energy and efficiency. Much as it may wish to do so the OPA is inherently unable to release the driving force of free competitive enterprise. It was set up as an agency of repression and such an agency it remains.

Mr. Bowles seems to assume that cost of living is the only or at least the principal influence pressing the wage level upward. Apparently he leaves out of account the expressed determination of labor unionists to obtain the same (or a higher) weekly wage for 40 hours work on civilian goods as has heretofore been paid for 48 hours' work on the engines of war. And the Senate committee on labor has just asked Congress to order the War Labor Board to declare 65 cents an hour the national minimum wage rate, an increase of 18.1 percent over the

55-cent minimum the Board has only recently established. The Senate committee's proposal is that the Board minimum, below which a wage rate may be declared substandard and raised, regardless of the commercial value of the services in question, be raised above the existing statutory minimum of the Fair Labor Standards Act by not less than 62.5 percent.

We are much less apprehensive than is Mr. Bowles that civilian goods now or soon coming into production for the first time in several years are going to be priced out of due proportion to present-day production costs Consumers who have learned to make it do or to do without will not be bilked so very easily. They have in their own hands a better defense against exorbitant prices than OPA can offer, and one much less likely to hamper production.

For they will be willing to pay what they think an item is worth to them and no more.

United Nations Charter and United States Territories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to offer for the RECORD an exchange of letters between Under Secretary of the Interior Abe Fortas and myself which offer further information than has been available heretofore regarding the trusteeship system of the United Nations Charter as it relates to the Territories of the United States:

JULY 16, 1945.

Hon. ABE FORTAS,
Under Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORTAS: There seems to be some misunderstanding as to the applicability of the trusteeship chapters of the proposed United Nations Charter to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. In particular, the question has been raised as to the applicability of the reporting provisions of those chapters to these Territories.

I should appreciate your advising me of your interpretation of these matters, and of your estimate of the effect of the applicable provisions of the charter upon the administration of the United States Territories which are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,
E. L. BARTLETT, *Delegate.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 18, 1945.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BARTLETT: I have your letter of July 14 inquiring concerning the effect of the proposed United Nations Charter upon territories of the United States which are administered by the United States Department of the Interior.

The relevant provisions of the charter are chapters XI, XII, and XIII. Chapters XII and XIII relate to the trusteeship system. Chapter XI sets forth a "Declaration regarding non-self-governing territories."

It should be clearly understood that chapters XII and XIII do not apply to any territory to which the United States now has title. Specifically, the trusteeship system does not include any of the territories of the United States administered by this Department: i. e., it does not apply to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the United States Virgin Islands. Chapter XII does provide, however, that any territory (including those named) may be voluntarily placed under the system by the states responsible for their administration. In other words, it is theoretically possible for the United States by its completely voluntary act to place a territory under the trusteeship system. Needless to say, no such action is contemplated or foreseeable. I believe that it is safe to say that this provision was inserted in the charter in accordance with the Yalta agreement, merely to make it possible for any administering nation to place a territory under the trusteeship system if special circumstances should exist which made that course of action seem desirable to the administering state.

In order to clear up any possible misapprehension, I want to repeat with emphasis that no provision of chapter XII or XIII, and that no feature of the trusteeship system, applies to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands. It follows, therefore, that the reporting provisions which are a part of the trusteeship system, and which appear in article 88 of chapter XIII, do not apply to any of these territories.

On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that chapter XI, the "Declaration regarding non-self-governing territories," does apply to all of the named territories. By its terms, it is applicable to "territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government." Although Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico have a very large measure of self-government, and although steady progress toward self-government has been made in the Virgin Islands, it cannot be said that any of these territories has yet attained "a full measure of self-government." The Governor in each of these Territories is still appointed by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate; laws enacted by local legislatures are subject to veto by the Governors so appointed; and all laws enacted by the territorial governments are subject to being overridden by the Congress of the United States. For these and other reasons, it is clear that the named Territories are within the scope of chapter XI of the proposed charter. Their inclusion, however, in no way implies that the inhabitants of these areas are regarded as dependent peoples in the usual sense, nor can it, in the slightest degree, impede progress toward the final resolution of their status by joint action of the people of the Territories and the Congress of the United States.

However, the provisions of chapter XI may fairly be said to be based upon the traditional and current policy of this Government with respect to territorial administration. The chapter requires the administering states to insure the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the peoples of the Territories, with due respect for their culture; to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the development of free political institutions; to further international peace and security; and to promote research and cooperative endeavor. Certainly, neither the United States nor the people of any of the Territories would dissent from these provisions, and in my opinion the United States may take pride in the fact that, in the administration of its Territories, it has provided world leadership in all of these respects.

The chapter also requires that each administering state should transmit regularly to the Secretary General of the United Nations Organization "statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the Territories." This provision is subject to "such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require." It is also expressly provided that these technical data are transmitted to the Secretary General only "for information purposes."

The type of information called for by this provision is most restrictive. It is by no means as comprehensive as the information which this Department publishes each year in its annual report, which is a public document. Indeed, much of the information called for would be available in handbooks and reference sources.

The United States has always pursued the policy that its Territorial administration is an open book. We have never indulged in or permitted practices in our Territories which would give us any reason for concealing facts relating to the economic, social, and educational conditions of the inhabitants of our Territories, and we have freely permitted and even encouraged publication of such facts, whether based upon studies made by Government officials or by others.

In summary, then, the reporting provisions of chapter XI (but not of the trusteeship chapters) are, in my opinion, applicable to the Territories administered by this Department, including Alaska and Hawaii. But these reporting provisions cannot possibly cause any difficulty or embarrassment to this Nation or to the Territories themselves. On the contrary, the reporting provisions seem to me to be a most desirable step forward because they indicate that other nations of the world will adopt the traditional practice of the United States Government in respect of the publication of information concerning the administration of Territories which are not completely self-governing. Since the quality of the administration of certain territories under the sovereignty of other nations affects the welfare of the United States, it seems to me clear that we should welcome and applaud this constructive action which may be considerable benefit not only to the peoples of the Territories but to the United States itself.

Sincerely yours,
ABE FORTAS,
Under Secretary.

Amendment of the Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT J. McGLINCHEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. McGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, about a month ago I introduced in the House an amendment to the Price Control Act which, if enacted, would ban all evictions in defense areas during the period of the emergency except for three reasons—first, for the failure of the tenant to pay the rent when due; second, for the commission or maintenance by the tenant or occupant of a nuisance in or about the premises; and, third, to enable the person who was the owner at the beginning of such occupancy by the tenant to occupy the premises as his own home.

It is a well-known fact that an acute housing shortage exists in defense areas throughout the entire country. Absence of a price ceiling on real estate has encouraged speculation and brought about serious tendencies toward inflation. Thousands of families are being

evicted from their homes—which in many instances they have occupied over a long period of time—and compelled to seek new quarters. To find suitable accommodations for rent is practically impossible, and those who buy are forced to pay exorbitant prices for inferior properties. The fact that hundreds of these evicted families are those of war workers, and servicemen who are or have been overseas fighting for their country, intensifies the problem and in my opinion, makes remedial action by Congress obligatory. Last Thursday, July 16, the following article appeared in the Washington Daily News:

HAIL, THE CONQUERING HERO IS HOMELESS

Only a "miracle" before Monday can save a battle-worn veteran of General Patton's Third Army dash to Germany—Lt. Walter P. O'Rourke—and his wife and three children from eviction from their modest home at 802 Easley Street, Silver Spring.

Since Lieutenant O'Rourke got the order from the Silver Spring magistrate's court to move by July 16 he and his wife have made a fruitless search for another house.

The 38-year-old Army officer, who landed on Omaha Beach on D-day and fought to within sight of Metz, was invalided home in January only to find the three-room and attic dwelling he is renting for $75 a month had been sold and the new owner, M. W. Farnor, demanding possession.

After hearing the story, Representative HERBERT J. MCGLINCHEY (Democrat, Pennsylvania), sponsor of a bill to ban evictions, went to bat for the officer, now on duty in the Army Quartermaster General's Office. Legal aides of OPA Director Chester Bowles are looking into the possibility that the present law will stay evictions for 6 months.

However, the Congressman said Bowles informed him that the survey will not be completed for 2 weeks.

Lieutenant O'Rourke was hospitalized after the Third Army's drive to Metz, France, for trench foot and arthritis, and shipped home.

He told the News that Silver Spring real-estate dealers value the property at 802 Easley Street at $4,500. His two boys, Daniel Patrick, 12, and Walter Paul, 15, and his 10-year-old daughter, Mary Gertrude, sleep in two improvised rooms in the attic. He and his wife occupy the only bedroom. A living room and kitchen complete the house that rents for $75 a month.

When he first moved into the house, Lieutenant O'Rourke said he paid $55 a month, but when the house was sold the rent was jumped to $75, and an appeal to the OPA office in Silver Spring failed to bring any reduction.

The publication of this story was followed by the receipt of numerous telephone calls at my office from persons in similar circumstances. One soldier, still in the hospital, had learned that his wife and family were to be evicted. He had obtained a week's furlough to come to their assistance. In an apologetic tone he inquired "whether there was a possibility of that bill going through any time soon." When he learned that there was no prospect of immediate enactment of the bill because of the congressional recess, his keen disappointment was evident.

Another call was from the wife of a business executive loaned to the Government for the duration. She and her husband and two children had been evicted twice and finally had gone to live in the gardener's house on an estate in Virginia for which the owner demanded a rental of $125 per month. Upon investigation by the Office of Price Administration the amount was reduced to $90. This resulted in an unpleasant situation and in all probability this family again will be obliged to seek living quarters.

These are typical examples of the morale-shattering experiences through which the families of our servicemen and war workers, as well as those in other groups, are passing. The enactment of my bill would correct this distressing situation and provide the protection to which these people are beyond question entitled.

Use of German Prisoners of War in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable apprehension in Alaska arising from newspaper accounts that the War Department intends to send German prisoners of war to Excursion Inlet, Alaska, to remove installations from the subport at Excursion Inlet. I I am informed that this is the first contemplated use of prisoners of war outside the continental limits of the United States. If, as we are told, there is a desperate shortage of farm labor in the States, it would seem to be the height of folly to divert sorely needed shipping to transport these prisoners to Alaska, especially in view of the fact that after the close of the fishing season there will be a surplus of American labor available in the Territory. There have been enough mistakes already in connection with Excursion Inlet. They should not be added too. The views of Alaskans are admirably set forth in an editorial appearing in the Alaska Weekly for July 13:

WE DON'T LIKE SLAVE LABOR

We are informed that a thousand German prisoners of war will shortly be shipped to Alaska to salvage whatever can be saved from the colossal blunder of the shipping transfer point of Excursion Inlet.

It was recently announced that unless more help was made available at the huge Army warehouse at Auburn, Wash., Nazi prisoners of war would be put to work there.

Thus far the only protest we have seen came from Dave Beck, and for once we find ourselves in hearty agreement with him. Slave labor doesn't fit in the American picture. We found the ships in which to bring these prisoners of war all the way to America for no reason within the comprehension of the common man, and we should find the ships in which to ship them back—the sooner the better.

We do not venture to pass on the urgency of an emergency which could arise at an active Army warehouse which might conceivably justify the employment of prisoner labor, but no emergency exists at Excursion Inlet which could possibly justify the contemplated course of action. Such projects can very well wait the day when a good many thousands of discharged servicemen are looking for jobs.

By the way, will some better informed person tell us how long a prisoner of war remains a prisoner of war after the war is over? We still have work battalions of Italian war prisoners in Seattle.

Increase of Pensions of Widows of Veterans of the Spanish-American War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H. R. 3499, a bill in the interest of widows of Spanish War veterans.

This bill, if enacted into law, will give widows of Spanish-American War veterans a flat pension of $50 a month. Under the present law the pensions received by these widows vary with their ages and the time of their marriage. A widow under 65 now gets $30 a month; one over 65 gets $40 a month, while the widow of a Spanish War veteran who was married to him during the tenure of his service, gets $50 a month.

Mr. Speaker, the Spanish-American War was fought at the turn of the century. As in this war, comparatively few of the boys who fought it were married. The young men who volunteered for service in Cuba and the Philippines—and mind you, this was an Army of volunteers—were not married until their return from service. We, therefore, penalize the widows of these men who married them during the period of their readjustment to civil life, and who lived rightful lives with their husbands.

As we now measure armies, not many men fought in the Spanish-American War, but they fought a war—an intensive war. The enemy had strange but powerful allies in the form of diseases, tropical fever, graft, cupidity, and ignorance. There were no agencies looking after the morale or welfare of the men—no rescuers.

More men died of tropical fever during the Spanish-American War than were killed by bullets; and proportionately more men carried lasting disabilities into civil life, such as fever-wracked bodies, amoebic dysentery, and like diseases that will come out of the great Pacific war we now fight.

The widows of these men are all rapidly approaching the statutory age when their pensions would automatically be adjusted upward. The present law is cumbersome to administer and costly to administer. It is fraught with red tape. Widows of honored veterans are called upon to furnish positive information as to their ages, dates, and marriages, which is often impossible to obtain.

Equalizing the pension at $50 a month would be humane, economical, and would expedite administration.

The decreased administrative cost under this bill will materially help pay the slight increase in pensions given the beneficiaries under it; and between paying money to administer a law and making gratuities to those entitled to it, I much prefer to be generous with the widows of men who served their country. Remember, "rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind."

Postwar Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times of July 6, 1945:

POSTWAR TRAINING

By a majority vote of sixteen of its twenty-two members—sixteen approving, five abstaining and only one opposing—the Postwar Military Policy Committee of the House of Representatives has endorsed the "broad principle" of universal military training in peacetime. Moreover, the committee has recommended that Congress adopt legislation at the present session to put this program into effect. The committee's statement follows hearings at which Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gen. George C. Marshall, Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, Acting Secretary of State Grew, Secretary of War Stimson, and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal warmly endorsed this program. We welcome the committee's decision and applaud its proposal for prompt action.

The essential argument for a system of postwar military training rests upon the military implications of the responsibility for helping maintain international law and order which the United States will accept as one of the five great powers in the new United Nations Organization. On the assumption—now clearly unwarranted—that this country intended to return once more to the ways of isolation, it could be argued that we might attempt to build up an adequate system of defense without such training, even though we could not be certain that in the event of another war we would again be granted a period of grace, for training an army of our own, by the valiant efforts of our allies. But if, as is now certain, the United States intends to enter the new world organization for maintaining peace, and if we are to share, as we shall share, a moral responsibility to use force for the purpose of preserving order, then we cannot plan next time to stay within our defenses while building up an army; we must be prepared to join a war, even though we have not been attacked, in order to do our part in preventing or restraining aggression. To do this effectively, with the least cost and the least delay, we shall need a system of universal military training; for there is no other military system which in peacetime, before a war starts, will build up a large reserve for the ground forces which it would be our responsibility to help provide.

As for the appropriate time to take action: We believe that the adoption now, and at this session, of a plan for postwar military training would serve as evidence both to our present allies and to our present and recent enemies of our intention to take seriously our new obligations as a peace-enforcing power. It would put the final seal of action on the abandonment of isolation.

IN THE NATION—A MODEL INQUIRY ON COMPULSORY SERVICE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 5.—It has been only 2 weeks since a group in Congress presented to the Nation the results of an investigation of a public problem, the orderly settlement of labor disputes. The inquiry was conducted with that painstaking fairness and concentration on the objective which have won admiration for many reports of British royal commissions.

Though leaders of organized labor have since violently attacked both the investigation and the proposals that grew out of it, and Senators BURTON, BALL, and HATCH, the sponsors, the episode demonstrated that congressional groups can attain as high a plane of study as any other.

Today another such group presented as dispassionately and constructively the fruits of another model congressional inquiry. Reporting to the House and the country for a majority of the members of a select committee, Representative WOODRUM, of Virginia, offered an impressive and well-founded series of reasons in favor of compulsory, universal military training in the postwar period. Many who have been on the fence while this proposal was being debated will find in this document the answers to their doubts, these doubts growing out of the argument that compulsory military training would be the antithesis of democracy, would be a discrimination against the right of American youth to make a career as early as possible, and would sow the seed of fascism.

The committee majority, after listening to eminent counsel on both sides, decided that none of these fears is well-founded. And, quite as important, the committee listed the other steps it believes necessary to "respectable military posture for our Nation in the postwar period."

These, while endorsed by the Army and Navy, have been largely lost sight of in the vigorous discussion of enforced military training; continuing scientific research in and development of the instruments of armed defense; maintenance of means by which industry can quickly be reconverted to military production; and a highly trained, permanent ground, air, and naval force, small but sufficient to enforce our diplomatic position and carry out our commitments in the new world league to keep the peace.

POWER TO BACK IDEALS

The committee in its report stressed a new factor produced by the latest World War and the leadership the United States has assumed, including the pledge—only awaiting Senate approval—to join its force with that of other United Nations to keep the peace. To make good on this, said the committee, a people must have "balanced elements of greatness," and indispensable in these is "commensurate military power." Our future security, wrote the Woodrum group, depends on both willingness and ability to "protect, by force if necessary, the principles and ideals which inspired the formation of the World Security Organization."

The words "principles and ideals" are important. Implicit in them is a warning that these principles and ideals may be threatened in various parts of the world by members of the United Nations themselves as well as by our recent and present enemies. In that event, they must be allowed to go by the board or this country must insist that, however powerful the violator, the violation must cease. If the American people intend to give such notice, and that it shall have sufficient power behind it to be respected, then they must be in a military position to supply that power.

The alternatives are official silence, or diplomatic note writing for the purposes of the record only. Either of these alternatives would mean a progressive state of importance for the United Nations Organization, or our withdrawal, which would put an end to the most recent great experiment to bring international peace and justice.

AS RUSSIAN INFLUENCE GROWS

This is an inescapable conclusion from the text of the report, especially that passage in which the committee based our "future security as a sovereign nation," not only on maintaining sufficient military power to enforce the decisions of the United Nations Organization, but on holding the organization to its stated (and our own) "principles and ideals" if need be. That is an argument for all the recommendations of the group on postwar military policy, including the compulsory training of American youth, which is seldom voiced, and even the committee left it to be read between the lines.

The counsel should be borne in mind by those who dislike in principle the veto granted the Big Five in the Security Council in the Charter of San Francisco; by those who are apprehensive of the postwar program of Soviet Russia and see in today's official recognition of the Warsaw Government another extension of Russian influence in Europe that is now strong in Finland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia, and is spreading elsewhere; and also by those who not fearing Russian policy, agree that Moscow's respect for any nation is in proportion to the latter's military strength and its ability to call a trained youth quickly to service.

In its outline of policy the committee emphasizes that the year should be wholly training, under the regular military establishments, with a minimum of interference to education and private career. As one of those who has been on the fence, this correspondent believes that the Woodrum group has disposed of all reasonable fears that democracy would be lost or endangered, and has given conclusive reasons for the disputed proposal.

Veterans' Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the New York Times:

BRADLEY FACES HARD JOB IN THE VETERANS' AGENCY—HE WILL DEAL WITH SUCH PROBLEMS AS MEDICAL CARE AND PENSIONS FOR 15,000,000

(By Charles Hurd)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—Few men will have positions more complex in responsibility in the next few years than Gen. Omar N. Bradley in his new job as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. President Truman's surprise announcement Thursday that the commander of the Twelfth Army Group would succeed Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines within the next 60 days places General Bradley in the position of supreme responsibility for the welfare of potentially 14,000,000 or 15,000,000 veterans.

He will enter his office under orders to modernize an organization that already ex-

pects the need for 100,000 people to handle its "housekeeping," and that will spend billions of dollars to carry out the promises already written into law for the veterans.

Authorities compute that the Veterans' Administration will finance the schooling of as many as 1,000,000 younger veterans within the first 5 years after the war. It will have full supervision and control over the vocational rehabilitation of hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans. In its more far-reaching responsibilities, the agency is expected to reach the peak of requirements for hospitalization of veterans about 1975.

GREATEST SURETY "FIRM"

In the meantime, as other parts of its routine, the Veterans' Administration already is operating the greatest insurance business in the world by handling national service life insurance for all men under arms—insurance that can be converted into standard peacetime policies. It does a pension business that affects all disabled veterans; that will carry over to the widows and children of these men and that will apply in many instances to men who suffered no disability in the service. The agency also is largely in the banking business under a law that directs it to guarantee partly private loans authorized for veterans to purchase homes, businesses, or farms.

In announcing General Bradley's appointment, Mr. Truman said that the streamlining program would be announced when the general takes over. He did not indicate what it would be.

There have been many demands that the Veterans' Administration—long under fire by many critics—be broken apart and its various activities turned over to separate operating bureaus. However efficient that plan might be, it nevertheless should be recalled that the agency grew out of the need discovered in the years after the last war to coordinate policy and activity under a single head. It appears more likely, therefore, that General Bradley will find himself with the same if not more, rather than less, responsibilities than have been carried by General Hines.

SET UP IN 1930

To review briefly, the Veterans' Administration was set up in 1930 by an act of Congress. It combined the old Veterans' Bureau, which had been headed by General Hines since 1923; the Bureau of Pensions, formerly under the Secretary of the Interior; and the National Homes Service. Since that time the Administrator of Veterans Affairs has been responsible for the control, direction, and management of all laws relating to pensions, insurance, hospitals, vocational rehabilitation, and education as they affect veterans.

The present agency, with 53 branch offices, today also works hand in hand with the United States Employment Service and the Selective Service System in assisting veterans, now totaling about 1,500,000, to rehabilitate themselves and find jobs in civilian life.

The greatest attention has been focused recently on alleged inefficiency and maladministration in the hospital facilities operated by the Administration. This condition currently is the subject of a stormy investigation by the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. This group, headed by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, has developed most of the legislation which in the last 15 years had guided the agency.

OUT OF STEP

The charge has been made frequently that Mr. RANKIN and General Hines have been out of step with the greatly enlarged demands now made, both on the legislative and the administrative structures, in handling a greatly multiplied program of veterans' benefits.

Some of the laws affecting veterans seem to the laymen to be absurd. One, for instance, permits a veteran with a non-service-connected disability to enter a veterans' hospital for an indefinite period of treatment, but which forbids the Veterans' Administration to give clinical treatment to any veterans except those with service-connected disabilities.

On the administrative side the biggest complaint is about the delay encountered by veterans in having their claims adjudicated and by the relatives of deceased soldiers in collecting the war risk insurance. The Veterans' Administration argues that the manpower shortage has crippled all of its operations. Against this claim its critics contend that a large share of blame for the bottleneck rests on excessive details in the handling of paper work built up by the agency itself.

FRESH POINT OF VIEW

General Bradley, bringing a fresh point of view and considerable executive experience into the position of Administrator, undoubtedly will make sweeping changes. It would be unrealistic, however, to expect that these changes will be broad.

The criticism leveled at General Hines has been aimed at him as the figurehead of a system, and not personally. He has been one of the best-liked officials in Federal service, and it was notable that the President, long active in veterans' affairs and a genuine combat veteran of the last war, went considerably beyond the normal polite requirements to express his affection for General Hines and appreciation of his service.

The President put his finger on the basic reason for change when he took pains to point out that the veterans of World War II deserve to have their affairs supervised by a soldier of the war in which they fought.

The change in chiefs will give a new confidence in the Veterans' Administration to the millions of men and women who soon will be its principal clients. Any critical change in legislation and administration probably will require, however, detailed study before it becomes manifest.

THE VETERAN—BETTER NURSING CARE FOR WOUNDED IS HELD LIKELY AFTER RECENT ATTACKS

(By Charles Hurd)

WASHINGTON, June 16—The condemnation of the quality of care given to veterans in the Veterans' Administration hospitals, that was made in the past week by the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, promises to raise some standards before Gen. Omar N. Bradley takes over as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. In rapid echo to these criticisms, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, retiring Administrator, has raised the classification salaries for nurses, dietitians, social workers and a few other types of key employees.

Gratification at this prompt action is tempered among veterans only by the question why such steps were not taken 2 or 3 years ago. If they can be done now so expeditiously they could have been done earlier.

The next question is: Will the Veterans' Administration, now that it is in a position to employ persons of higher caliber, be as prompt in firing the unfit and inefficient, and often arrogant, workers who have been cited time after time in the reports by the veterans' organizations?

LEGISLATION NOT CURE-ALL

Most conversation about improvement in the care of veterans deals with speculation about necessary legislation. But legislation is not the cure-all for this situation, in which the legion states that veterans' hospitals rate no higher in general service than the average public charity institution. The laws relating to veterans, passed since 1944 fill a 733-volume printed in small type. Many of these are grants of general authority that leave discretion in operation up to the Veterans' Administration; others set up standards in detail that make administration a headache.

However, if the Veterans' Administration has ever asked for legislation to effect reforms, it has got it. It can still get it.

The recent testimony before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has shown that the deficiencies that exist are due to mushroom growth in programs, an apparent inability to think of veterans as people rather than as statistics, and a lack of appreciation of the need for discipline and supervision in the ranks of the Veterans' Administration. The machinery is creaky.

It would seem inconceivable that a congressional committee should have to hear testimony as that given on Thursday by Col. Louis Verdel, manager of the Neuropsychiatric Hospital at Northport, N. Y., where enlisted personnel were court-martialed for mistreating patients and several former civilian personnel are under indictment. Colonel Verdel said that he had no authority over the soldiers, although he managed the hospital, because the soldiers were accountable only to an Army captain commanding them.

The Legion and the VFW united in condemning the type of medical personnel currently assigned to the Veterans' Administration facilities by the Army, citing numerous instances of doctors who are unsuited to this work, unfit, and disinterested.

These are not matters of law, but of organization and arrangement. If the Army and Navy are going to supply some of the medical personnel for the Veterans' Administration, they have just as great responsibility toward the veterans as they have to maintain the high standards set for men in service.

The armed services, of course, supply only a fraction of the personnel. The thousands of nurses, dietitians, and social workers in the hospitals are civilian employees of the Veterans' Administration. The pay increases supplied for them supplied two distinct surprises to veterans and other interested persons.

On the one hand they are excessively great, with nurses being jumped to a minimum of $2,000 and a maximum of $4,600; dietitians from $1,800–$2,600 to the bracket of $2,000–$3,800, and social workers from $2,000–$2,300 to $2,600–$3,800.

But the biggest surprise is to read in the Veterans' Administration announcement that the new classification for nurses will "place nurses in the Veterans' Administration service on a parity with Army, Navy, and Public Health nurses."

Little point is served now by asking why in the name of common sense veterans have not been granted heretofore nursing service as good as that supplied to soldiers and sailors or to ordinary civilians by the Public Health Service. But one can ask in the name of all veterans that whatever similar difficulties exist will be quickly corrected.

It will be interesting to watch also how fast the Veterans' Administration acts to weed out the incompetents cited by the critical reports. This watching cannot be done in Washington, where all the activities blur into a mass picture, but can be well and easily done by citizen groups in the cities adjacent to veterans' facilities or State and county medical organizations.

LEGISLATION MAY BE NEEDED

A good start in improvement has been made on paper and results presumably will show in the near future. Nevertheless, these reforms operate only at the lowest level. Legislation may be necessary to bring about the really important administrative reforms, particularly an establishment of a bureau of

medicine within the Veterans' Administration with a chief who sits at the side of the Administrator.

No legislation need be enacted to speed up the work of the Veterans' Administration. Administrative action alone can simplify the paper work which has clogged all channels. As a rule the laws relating to payment of insurance benefits, guaranteeing of loans, and adjudication of pension claims state only that such things shall be done.

The veterans' benefits laws are rather generous and all-inclusive. Some small changes are indicated, an example being the possible extension of time for the filing of applications for loans, educational assistance and unemployment compensation provided in the GI bill of rights.

It is not, however, a matter in this instance of needing more benefits. Most veterans would be well staisfied if they could get the benefits they rate in a simple, businesslike procedure. If they do not, the inevitable reaction will be a piling up of demands for more benefits, leading to an endless chain of demands, promises, and delays.

ARMY TO CHANGE HELP AT HOSPITAL—GENERAL TERRY ACTS ON REPORT OF INCOMPETENCE AT MENTAL UNIT FOR VETERANS

Acting on reports that incompetent and dissatisfied soldiers assigned to duty at the Neuropsychiatric Hospital at Northport, Long Island, a Veterans' Administration facility, had been chiefly responsible for mistreatment of patients, Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Terry, commanding general of the Second Service Command, visited the hospital yesterday and assured Col. Louis Verdel, manager, that any Army personnal regarded as unsatisfactory would be replaced.

Colonel Verdel was told also that he could screen out soldiers sent as replacements whom he regarded as unsuitable for the work.

At a press conference at 90 Church Street, General Terry said he had been accompanied to the hospital by Maj. Gen. Joe N. Dalton, deputy director of personnel, Army Service Forces, who had come up from Washington. General Dalton and Col. D. G. Hall, Chief of Personnel Service, Office of the Surgeon General, Washington, took part in the press conference.

General Terry and General Dalton both emphasized that the Army's responsibility over soldier personnel assigned to veterans' hospitals extended to discipline, equipment, and pay and that training of the men for care of patients and assignment of the men to duties were the responsibility of the hospital authorities.

They pointed out that the Army had agreed to assign soldiers for work in the hospitals only after the Veterans' Administration had requested help early in 1943 to relieve the manpower shortage. They said the Army's main difficulty was to find as many "top-notch" men as were needed for the special work. As sources the Army has only inductees not regarded as suitable for overseas combat duty, recaptured personnel from hospitals and men returned from overseas with low point scores for discharges.

The Army has provided 1,965 officers and 6,305 enlisted men to veterans' hospitals. It has authorized a maximum of 7,850 enlisted men. Most of the officers are Medical Corps officers, mostly civilian doctors in the hospitals who have been commissioned. There are 650 Army Medical Corps officers and some Army Dental Corps officers. At the Northport Hospital are 386 enlisted men under the command of Capt. Richard F. Bierne, Jr.

Regarding the reported mistreatment of patients at Northport, General Terry said evidence involving some of the soldier attendants had been turned over to him this year by the Veterans' Administration, following its own investigation. The evidence was checked by Col. Daniel Torrey, deputy chief of staff, and Col. Paul Jones, judge advocate, both of the Second Service Command. Charges were preferred against 10 soldiers, 6 of whom were convicted and 4 acquitted, in a trial last month.

None of the charges involved an intentional attack, General Terry said, but all grew out of efforts by the soldiers to subdue violent patients. Three months' confinement with a fine of $10 a month was the heaviest sentence, he said.

The fact that the soldiers court-martialed were all Negroes was because all the contingent at that time were Negroes, he said.

Ellison DuRant Smith

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ELLISON DURANT SMITH, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the death of the late distinguished Senator ELLISON DURANT SMITH, from South Carolina, came while he was still a member of the United States Senate. He had just passed through a gruelling campaign for reelection which witnessed his defeat and interrupted the longest tenure of office in the history of the Senate.

"COTTON ED," as all South Carolinians knew him, was a fighter, and he went into his campaign with every vigor at his command. However, his advanced years had taken their toll and his former stalwart frame was unable to stand the terrible ordeal of the campaign through which he had just passed.

Without pain and without notice on November 17, 1944, he suddenly passed away in his home at Lynchburg, S. C., the home he loved so well. At home with his family and his friends, his departure came in the manner and at the place he would have liked it to come.

The high and the mighty, the meek and the lowly came to his last resting place to pay him reverence. The eye of the humble Negro, who tilled the soil of his farm, grew dim with tears as his friend was lowered into the soil he loved so dearly. Statesman and scholar alike were hushed as his stilled voice would no longer be raised in defense of States' rights.

Mr. Speaker, no more colorful character ever served his State or Nation than "COTTON ED" SMITH. A passionate believer in the right of the States to handle their own affairs, he was relentless in his fight against centralized government. In the specter of a strong Government at Washington, he could perceive the danger of the dignity of the common man. "COTTON ED" SMITH believed that "the best governed people are the least governed people." He believed that the Government was made to protect the people and not the people to serve the Government.

In his death the Senate lost its most colorful character. In his death South Carolina lost its most loyal friend. We bid him fond adieu. He stands on the other shore waiting to greet us and bid us enter the house of many mansions to continue the love so rudely broken.

To his loved ones, we offer our solace and comfort. To him we say:

Sleep on, dear friend, such lives as thine
Have not been lived in vain,
But shed an influence rare, divine,
On lives that still remain.

An Internationalist Drive Against American Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a sovereign people of 130,000,000 persons are being regimented physically and mentally by rules, regulations, and directives. By means of the radio, the movies, and other propaganda agencies paid for by the taxpayers the people are also being regimented emotionally. The internationalists behind the scenes of the New Deal are gradually weakening our domestic structure, especially small businesses, which after all should be strengthened and made the potential, as well as actual bulwark of a developing free enterprise system.

But now the international saboteurs of free enterprise are directing a drive to regiment and control American industry to the end that only a favored few can engage in export business; thus by a process of proposed regimentation and strangulation foreign business and industrial favorites will be able to live, thrive, and supplant American industry. Under leave to extend I am inserting information which shows the extent to which the Red internationalists are operating within the structure of our Government. I wish that instead of a vacation, the Congress would remain in session and devote its time during the next 3 months to rooting out the subversive element now operating to undermine our Government, as indicated by the material I am including as a part of my remarks:

A PLAN FOR GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED FOREIGN TRADE

I. ECONOMIC EXPERTS URGE SUPER-SALES AGENCY FOR POSTWAR EXPORTS

(By William Parker, staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, July 24, 1944)

The Government is adapting its wartime foreign-trade machinery to control America's overseas commerce for an indefinite time after the fall of Germany * * *.

The real problem which American international traders will face in their reentry into world markets will be the controls now being prepared by other nations, the governmental planners believe. They foresee centralized buying, control of credits, import and export licenses as only a few of the barriers that United States businessmen will have to buck * * *.

As their answer to this conception of early postwar world trade conditions, some Washington officials are proposing a single United

States super-sales agency through which American business could operate * * *.

Best candidate for handling this proposed transition trade job is the U. S. Commercial Company, a subsidiary agency of the Foreign Economic Administration. For more than 2 years the USCC has been busy buying strategic materials for the Government on a global scale. Only minor adaptations would be needed, officials say, to transform this agency * * *.

Since the spring of 1942, USCC has been operating in the markets of practically every nation, and more recently has acted as agent for American importers in areas barred to private traders. This year, the Company's purchases are expected to total about a billion dollars * * *.

In addition to its background of world trade experience, USCC has a globe-girdling organization * * *.

* * * When USCC recently selected a representative for Belgium—M. S. Szymczak, a governor of the Federal Reserve Board—it made a significant departure from the pattern it had been following. Other agents have been chosen to do Government purchasing and to handle lend-lease details. But since Belgium has figured little, if at all, in either of these programs, this appointment has been interpreted to indicate the USCC is organizing to act as the foreign trade organization of American business * * *.

Plans now under discussion in Washington do not specifically contemplate the barring of individual manufacturers' representatives from foreign soil. However, they would be encouraged to work with the FEA and the USCC. In some cases, it is believed, controls planned by foreign nations may prevent such individual agents from operating within specific countries. * * *

* * * Present indications are that * * * Groupement or a similar and perhaps stronger agency under the provisional government will be expanded to handle all the foreign trade of France. An American exporter trying to sell in France would do business with this agency or not at all. * * *

United States Government experts who handle wartime foreign commerce see Groupement as a forerunner of what is likely to be almost universal * * * Arthur Paul, a top official in the Foreign Economic Administration, recently told the Industry and Commerce Association in New York: "I am worried by the picture of what I see ahead in the way of difficulties for private foreign trade caused by the trend toward full control in other lands, which trend is increasing, not decreasing. * * *

At this stage it appears that substantial parts of Government and the foreign-trade industry agree that actions of other countries to control their world trade will force this Nation to take counter measures.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF FOREIGN COMMERCE—AMTORG SYSTEM PLANNED FOR UNITED STATES

(By William La Varre, director of the American Foreign Service Council, delivered at Export Managers' Club luncheon, New York, N. Y., September 12, 1944)

When I went in with the Secretary of Commerce to organize an inter-American Division * * * we were charged, by an act of Congress with an appropriation from Congress, to protect American trade and to give information. That was in January 1941.

We no sooner started to operate * * * to get ready for the coming war, and to set up what would be a counterpart of the British Board of Trade, the Economic Warfare Division, than in July 1941 the President established something which initially was called EDB—Economic Defense Board.

Into this office came a great many * * * Army men * * *. The State Department had nothing to do or to say about it. The Commerce Department had nothing to say * * *.

For some reason * * * they changed the name shortly to the BED, which was the Board of Economic Defense. In September 1941, this Board had taken on the job of requiring American exporters to file licenses and to get applications for export permits. In September of 1941, I found that throughout the country people were getting rejected applications wholesale. * * * There were no reasons given why the applications for exports to Latin America were denied.

* * * At that time * * * Latin America was the only part that was left for free trade and free enterprise. So, in controlling the export licenses to Latin America, the man who controlled those licenses could control the foreign commerce at that time—the private enterprise of the United States. * * *

* * * With the assistance of Mr. Welles and some of the other people in the State Department, and Mr. Jesse Jones, we persuaded the President to issue a directive that * * * (a) returned * * * application for an export license, would have * * * on it the reason why it was returned. We had that in writing—but, they picked out some reason that didn't mean anything and usually would send back the application with that particular reason stated on it. * * *

* * * that office gave $5,000,000 worth of licenses to one pharmaceutical house * * * turned down all the others—this being a German firm. I raised quite a to-do about it. * * *

* * * there was another merger that put SPAB in charge and did away with the Economic Defense Board and brought in the Vice President as Chairman. * * * They met for 2 weeks and never had another meeting, but they began taking on a great many people. We discovered that in all SPAB had six or seven hundred people.

In December of 1941 the BED was killed and SPAB was split up. The BEW came out of that shuffle with the Vice President * * * and a number of other people still in the same offices but using different letterheads. * * *

At that time the Commerce and State Departments were operating under congressional appropriations. They could not get any more money until the year was over. But the BEW was able to obtain all the funds it needed from the White House without going to Congress.

In January 1942 * * * I finally was told that an Executive order had been drawn up which was going to be announced by the President, prohibiting the advertising or use of any private brand for the duration of the war. Everything from that time on would be made under the label of a victory label. There was quite a campaign ready to be released to the newspapers telling the people why they ought to go in for victory labels and why they ought to give up their own trade-marks, as the document said, "for the duration of the war." This was a plan that was created by Mr. Leon Henderson and Mr. Milo Perkins, with the permission of the Vice President. The directive which was supposed to be put into effect was on the President's desk.

You may faintly remember that we came out suddenly with an editorial on the front page of Foreign Commerce Weekly, announcing that the Department of Commerce was in favor of retaining all brand names throughout Latin America and the rest of the world. (We did not say why we were making that statement at that time.)

We were able * * * to kill that * * *. As soon as we were able to kill their wrecking of * * * private brand names for the duration, they then created another executive directive which prohibited, if it had been signed, any further advertising, either in the United States or outside of the United States, of any product if you mentioned a brand name * * *.

* * * That started during March, April, and May of 1942—and it took until July 17 to get in writing from the Secretary of the Treasury (O. K.'d by the President), a letter which made it possible for American businesses to continue advertising brand names, to spend money in advertising, and to have that expense considered in filing income tax. * * *

Well, the BEW was still in charge, and the next thing that came to our attention was that they had taken on a great number of people, some of whom could not speak English, called labor consultants. They had been sent to Latin America without the knowledge of any United States Ambassador in Latin America. They began to go around among American businessmen and mining people. They told them among other things, that if they did not sign closed-shop labor agreements with labor in their communities they would not be granted export licenses from the United States. Gradually the ambassadors heard about it and when they did hear about it we had a very long fight in Washington behind the scenes, to try to prohibit anyone from going to any Latin-American country and threatening a buyer of our products that unless he signed a closed-shop agreement with one of the labor movements in Latin America his applications for export licenses for machinery, for example, would not be granted. We finally won that * * *. It was never announced but the main friction that created it was the * * * development of the BEW and giving the Vice President full authority without consulting either the State or Commerce Departments, for making known directives. The President delegated the authority to the Vice President * * *.

In July, 1943, the thing came to a head through the insistence by the Vice President that he would insist on labor clauses before he would give any export licenses. He insisted also that each of the Latin-American countries must set up what was to be known as a development corporation. * * * This corporation would take over a monopoly of all resources, all commerce, all industries, all transportation, all communications * * *. These corporations would be controlled 51 percent by the United States Government and 49 percent by the other Government. Each corporation would have a Latin-American president, but a board of directors of the United States Government.

* * * They almost got that through. At this time they had men suggesting that each of the Latin-American countries would form not only this corporation, but another corporation which would have a monopoly over all exports and imports. When they explained it to me they said they wanted the Latin-American countries to start this first, and then if they had a monopoly of exports and imports through a Latin-American corporation we in Washington would have to do the same thing. We killed that, except in Chile. * * * The idea was to put every agent of an American product down there out of business and to set up a corporation that would do all the business. * * *

That situation came to a head because Mr. Sumner Welles agreed in writing that this was contrary to the policy of the United States; that we didn't want to take over the sovereign rights of these other countries. It brought on trouble in the rubber industry because all the people down in the Amazon Valley who were deprived of business in rubber were furious at having been put out of business by a corporation which took away their trading from them. Finally, in July of 1943 it blew up in a statement which Mr. Jesse Jones made about the Vice President—and which resulted in both of them getting fired. * * *

When Mr. Wallace went back to Congress * * * Mr. Leo Crowley was appointed. The BEW was out, and there was set up the Foreign Economic Administration * * * Mr. Crowley * * * had also been the Alien Property Custodian * * * people had been in my office to push alien exports against an American brand name in Latin America. * * *

* * * I made a signed report which was delivered to the Senate and read in the Senate by Senator BYRD on February 9, 1944. Ten days later the President accepted Mr. Crowley's resignation as Alien Property Custodian. * * * Mr. Crowley continued then as the Foreign Economic Administrator and took over lend-lease, the Export-Import Bank—all of the activities outside of the United States.

* * * Sometimes people say * * * they cannot understand why a certain thing is done. It is just one more mosaic in a large plan. The plan was published recently in the Wall Street Journal. The heading was "Super-sales agency for postwar trade," by a very clever reporter who talked to a gentleman in the FEA * * * and published this article. * * *

* * * There have been three agreements made of which the American people have no knowledge. I am quite certain that American businessmen have no knowledge of them. * * * These agrements have been made by officials sent from Washington to London, and they have been made with the British Government. These agrements are as follows:

1. "Certain consuming areas of the wold have been 'reserved' for the export industries—factory and labor—of Great Britain. Neither American factories nor American labor will be able to participate, for instance, in the profits of foreign trade with India, most of Africa, and with many nations of the Far East.

2. "No American citizen—representative of an American factory or service—will receive a passport entitling him to travel into certain areas of the world or even in transit through British territory until his application for passport has been presented through Washington to the British Board of Trade in London for the Brtish Board of Trade's approval.

3. "Censorship intercepts—from the foreign mail of American business and citizens—will be regularly routed to his Majesty's censors in Washington and New York."

No. I am going to give you the high lights of a plan which exists. I don't know whether you will like it or not. It is up to the people of this country to decide each man for himself whether he likes it. In any event this is a fact:

1. The present administration has a plan under which a corporation, established by an agency of the United States Government, will summarily—when the signal is given—be issued a monopoly directive over all the foreign commerce of the United States. This Federal corporation will purchase, at special discounts, products of American factories—many of which must be produced according to this corporation's specifiations and priorities, for export and sale in foreign markets. No private corporation or citizen in the United States will be permitted to engage independently or directly in any export or import business.

To this Washington corporation, rather than to private industries throughout the United States, must go all orders from foreign customers for products made in American factories or for services to be rendered abroad by American citizens. This Washington corporation will attempt to retain the right of deciding which brand or trade-mark the foreign customer must accept in lieu, when desired, of any specified brand name. It may also insist upon the manufacture of products for export under new trade-marks or brand names which will be the property of the United States Government.

Just before I left Washington I was able to see a comment which had been sent to the President, attempting to answer the fact that this was too harsh a plan and that no American citizen would put up with it. This is a comment by one of the President's advisers, who said:

"'As a step toward Government control the corporation authorized to engage foreign commerce or services can have common and preferred stock. The Government will purchase the preferred stock of the corporation. By limiting the profits to be made by the private interests running such a corporation, and through the appointment of Government directors on the board of such corporation, the Government will be able to determine all policies of the corporation, and undertake what would be tantamount to a quasi-governmental control, which would result in our Government itself having the same general position in the rest of the world as the government monopolies the other countries—Russia, England, France, Holland, and China—would possess."

I have been long enough in Washington * * * to know that there is only one opportunity to kill a program for setting up in the United States a Russian Amtorg. * * *

* * * If we win this war and then end up in 1945 with this corporation, we shall have lost everything we fought this war to win.

Address of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, few men know the Filipino people as well as General of the Army Douglas MacArthur knows my people. Certainly none can surpass him in his demonstrated love for the Philippines.

Now that victory is approaching, and certain doubts begin to blur the perspective of some, it is inspiring to hear from a soldier-statesman an impartial appraisal of the Filipino nation, and a reiteration of the American faith in our ability to live a life of our own choosing. Under unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks, I include therein the speech delivered by General MacArthur before the Congress of the Philippines on July 9, 1945:

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Congress of the Philippines, it is cause for profound satisfaction to see this legislative body, instrument of democratic expression, restored to the people.

You convene at a time when we are still locked in mortal combat with an enemy who vigorously seeks to exploit racial prejudice and to suppress human freedom as the ideology of mankind. Since the beginning of time men have crusaded for freedom and for equality. It was this passion for liberty which inspired the architects of my own Government to proclaim so immutably and so beautifully that "all men are created equal" and "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. On such rights rests our basic concept of human freedom, in defense of which we have fought and still continue to fight on the battlefields of the world. These rights are the very antithesis to the totalitarian doctrine which seeks to regiment the people and control the human will as the price for presumed efficiency in government. The recent collapse of one people after another, dedicated to this totalitarian theory of government, offers complete and eloquent proof that the enduring strength of a body politic arises from the degree of freedom accorded its individual members, and not from any seeming efficiency gained at the sacrifice of that freedom. It behooves you therefore to safeguard these sacred rights no less zealously in Peace than you have defended them in War.

You convene at a time when you are soon to realize your long-sought political independence. Prior to the start of hostilities in the present war those who opposed your independence did so on the ground that you yet lacked the stature as a race essential to self-government; that you lacked the economic stability to sustain self-government; and that you lacked the resources essential to defend self-government. All these contentions are untenable.

Yours is a culture which for 400 years has progressively become a blend between the culture of the East and the culture of the West, with resulting racial character influenced by the best of each. Your combat record on Bataan and the magnificent spiritual and physical resistance of the great masses of your people to the enemy efforts at pacification have given to the world the true measure of the strength of your character and established your undisputed spiritual capacity for self-government under any standards.

That strength of character has been manifested time and again when your people were brought under the extreme test of enemy brutality and otherwise subjected to the horrors of War. During the battle for Manila I have seen mothers anguished of soul for their dead children—I have seen fathers bereft of all whom they held dear and with all material possessions gone—I have seen a continuous line of refugees from south Manila slowly trudging north over the pontoon bridge on the Pasig—without food, water, or shelter, and knowing not whither to go in search of sanctuary—but through stark terror and tragedy of it all there is one thing I have never heard, one thing I have never seen. I have never heard a whimper; I have never seen a tear. It is just that courage and fortitude and resiliency of your people that has permitted this city of Manila to rise above the destruction of February last, without starvation, without food riots or other disorder, and without epidemic. There, was exemplified the strength of the Filipino character—the height of your stature as a race—adequate answer to those who would question your spiritual capacity for self-government.

Those who would say that the economy of the country will not sustain a free and independent nation would appear to anticipate arbitrary tariff barriers to drastically restrict or eliminate your trade with the United States. I am fully confident that the American people will extend to you the full measure of trade advocated by your late great President Manuel Quezon, and do everything else within their power to assist you along the road to your national destiny.

Prior to this great war the question of national defense offered the most serious obstacle to the reality of your political independence. Altered world conditions resulting from the war have removed this obstacle. Defense is no longer national, it has become

international. No nation however powerful may in the future with safety rely exclusively upon its own defense potentiality—but must resort to international defense in concert with other nations. This does not mean that you may with impunity fail to take such defensive dispositions as are reasonably within your power, but rather that in addition to such dispositions you must bring yourself into such international alinement that offers best hope for the preservation of future peace in the Pacific basin.

You convene at a time when not only must your people rededicate themselves and all that is within them to the task of waging total war against our yet unconquered enemy, but at a time when many of your cities and towns lie ravished in the wake of that brutal enemy's retreat, with many thousands of your countrymen prostrate and in want. Thus the burdens upon you are heavy. It is absolutely essential that you operate without undue friction. Petty jealousy, selfish ambition, and unnecessary misunderstanding must not be permitted to impede progress and rend your country. The success of your joint venture with America offers the one great hope for solution to the conflicting problems of the east and west. Now more than at any other time in your history you must realize the vision of the magnificent goal toward which you strive. Only by united action can you attain fruition. In every other major step in which you have succeeded you have done so through the strength of unity. Do not fail now.

To assist you the Army will progressively give you all the aid in reconstruction which the military situation will permit and the appropriate civil agencies of the United States will do all that lies within their power—but such assistance is not enough if it be without the full support and willing toil of your own people. It is therefore of utmost importance both in the successful prosecution of the war and the reconstruction of your country that this legislative body in constructive collaboration with the coordinate branches of government—executive and judicial—provide the people with a vigorous, inspiring, impartial, and discerning leadership on a course realistically charted to serve those great national purposes.

In the 46 years of my military service, large parts of which have been dedicated to the interests of the Filipino people, no honors that I have received have moved me more deeply than those this Congress has recently bestowed upon me. I accept them with a full heart as a tribute to the historic part my country has played in the progress of your people. I accept them and throughout life shall treasure them in token of the mutual understanding, faith, and affection which binds us, the one to the other.

The relations between the American and Filipino people are sanctified by the blood of both nobly and selflessly shed upon Philippine soil. From north to south, from east to west, the stark, white crosses dot your landscape where we laid our mutual dead to sleep forever. Their sacrifice lives as a flaming torch to fire the will and steel the hearts of freemen to resist likewise if need be unto death, all efforts, however devious the means, to compromise that freedom for which they died.

God grant that your people may with the same fortitude and determination that has permitted them with unyielding spirits to rise above the stern realities of the past, face the future with Faith and Hope, erect and unafraid; God grant that under your leadership they may march proudly forward to high destiny of honor and dignity among all of the peoples of the earth. That will be my prayer always.

My Conception of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following eloquent statement by Alex Kanter, commander, Minneapolis Post, Jewish War Veterans of the United States. The statement is reprinted from the Minnesota Legionnaire:

MY CONCEPTION OF LIBERTY

(By Alex Kanter, commander, Minneapolis Post, Jewish War Veterans of the United States)

Some of us have chosen America as the land of our adoption; the rest have come from those who did the same.

Regardless whether your ancestors are the early Pilgrim fathers who landed at Plymouth Rock, the Quakers in Philadelphia, the Baptists in Rhode Island, the Catholics in Maryland, or whether they are Protestant, Catholic, or Jew they came for one purpose: they sought liberty; freedom from oppression, freedom from want, freedom to be themselves.

What do we mean when we say that first of all we seek liberty? I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws, and upon courts. These are false hopes; believe me, these are false hopes. Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there no constitution, no law, no court can save it.

And what is this liberty which must lie in the hearts of men and women? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten.

American liberty is a religion; it is a thing of the spirit. It is an inspiration on the part of the people for not alone a free life but a better life. The belief in the four freedoms of common humanity; the belief in man created free, in the image of God, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—is the crucial difference between ourselves and the enemies we face today. In it lies the absolute unity of our alliance, opposed to the oneness of the evil we hate.

In America, men and women of varying religious, racial, and national groups must live together as members of a family. Where bonds of understanding and mutual appreciation hold a family together, it cannot be disrupted by influences from without. But when there is hatred or suspicion among its members, a hostile stranger can disintegrate the family and destroy it.

America knows neither Protestant, Catholic or Jew as such, it knows them only as free men and women, free to worship their God as they may choose, free to have their opinions with the right to state them freely subject to the laws created for the common good.

America has been immortalized as the land of the free. It must be kept so for in America we are not interested in what a man believes, but what other people think about him and do to him because of what he believes. Here there is no sanction to bigotry. For when we lose the right to be different, we lose the right to be free.

River channels can be diverted, desert lands irrigated, minerals brought forth from the bowels of the earth to the surface because they be things concrete, but no law can change the state of mind. Mind is of the abstract. Things in the abstract cannot be altered by legislation, but only altered by education, education to the effect that all men and all women have the right to live as free men and women.

The freedoms of common humanity are as much elements of man's needs as air and sunlight, bread and salt. Deprive him of all these freedoms and he dies; deprive him of a part of them and a part of him withers. Give them to him in full and abundant measures and he will cross the threshold of a new age—the greatest age of man.

These freedoms are the rights of man of every creed and every race wherever they live.

The essence of this Nation—the one thing that more than any other has made us great in the eyes of mankind—is the principle of individual liberty—the dignity and the equal status of man that underlies our entire political and social structure. Men unrelated in racial origin, drawn from every corner of the earth, and professing every known religious creed, combined their talents and their efforts to create a new world. They brought with them few material possessions, but they did import many cultural heritages from the old world which have greatly enriched our national life. They came to the New World to shake off rather than transplant the animosities of Europe. This was the goal of those divers peoples who fled to these shores from the oppression, the bigotry, and the hatreds of the Old World.

This deathless heritage was what the fathers sought to perpetuate when they declared in the Declaration of Independence that all men were created equal and were endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This was what they strove to protect when they wrote into the Constitution the guaranties of freedom of speech and press and religion, and of equality before the law.

The Jews, like all other groups, have made notable contributions to our greatness. They, like the other groups, have their heroes in today's war of freedom.

The rising movement for American independence found a source of inspiration in the Bible. The colonists had crossed the Atlantic as the Israelites had traversed the Red Sea. They had fought the Indians as the Twelve Tribes had struggled against the Canaanites. From the very beginning of the rift between the Colonies and England, Jews were active in the patriotic causes.

What wonder, then, that the great Declaration by the founders of this Republic should have touched the innermost heart of Jews? What wonder that the banner of freedom of conscience and human equality should have found so deep a response among those seeking sanctuary from religious persecution?

Col. Isaac Franks, of Philadelphia, was aide-de-camp to Washington.

Benjamin Nones was a French Jew fired by the same sentiments that enlisted Lafayette.

Maym Solomon, a Polish immigrant Jew, was one of the chief financial supporters of the Continental Armies.

In the War of 1812, Judah Tuors, of Louisiana, volunteered under Andrew Jackson, and it was his own generosity that made it possible to complete the erection of the monument to commemorate the Battle of Bunker Hill.

In the War Between the States, 10,000 Jews served with distinction and honor in both the northern and southern armies.

The Jewish Cemetery at Richmond, Va., one of the cemeteries where lie buried Confederate soldiers of our faith who were killed

in action, bears mute but eloquent testimony of their loyal and heroic devotion.

In the Spanish-American War many thousands of Jews answered the call; among the first Americans who fell in the charge on Manila was a Jew.

In the World War II, American Jews, comprising a phalanx 500,000 strong, battled for the Stars and Stripes on land and sea and in the air, forming about 3 percent of the population, they contributed nearly 5 percent of the fighting forces.

The Jew of France is, if anything, more intensely French than Jewish, having settled in Burgundy and Tourran in the fifth century. The Jew of Germany was as much imbued with the patriotic ideals which has made the German Empire as any subject who yielded his blood to form the cement of the Imperial Empire fabric.

I cannot believe that it is our destiny to hate one another. In the heart of each normal human being there is a great yearning for the brotherhood of man. That goal is not impossible if we but conscientiously strive to be that which is within the reach of all good neighbors and friends with all our fellow men. Let us then look to the future, not as members of nations confined in a spiritual and intellectual strait-jacket of arcism, but as a free people imbued with a respect for the dignity of each individual. Each one of us can be a better Jew, a better Protestant, a better Catholic, or a better citizen, whatever his faith may be. Then we shall be on the right road and the promise of a great free nation will not then have been shattered. America will be, instead, a stronger Nation morally and spiritually, a Nation wisely prepared to defend itself and able to play its manly part in world affairs with an intelligent and robust sense of justice.

Gripped in this great world struggle, let us ask ourselves, "Why pour out this blood if not to emerge a nation enriched in our own way of life?" Why all this agony, if not to bring forth an America and a world unravished by the hates and lusts of another day, that it will be a just power as well as a great one.

Let us hope that it will be so. Let us work together to see that it shall be. And when the task is done, let us walk among men, proud less of our power, than of our respect for the rights of all mankind.

Hon. Brooks Fletcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the many Members of this House who served with him are saddened to learn of the passing of that distinguished Ohioan, Hon. Brooks Fletcher, who was for a number of terms a Member of this body.

Mr. Fletcher was born and grew to young manhood in Carroll County, Ohio, near a village called Mechanicstown. His parents were highly respected members of their community, but were not, however, people of wealth. Brooks was a young fellow with great ambition and left home at an early age determined to secure a college education. He did what most people of this day would regard as unreasonably heavy work in a mill, but he finally triumphed in his struggle for a higher education and graduated from Mount Union College at Alliance, Ohio. He then engaged in the newspaper business, first at Alliance, Ohio, and later at Marion, Ohio. The work to which he was most devoted, however, and in which he was very successful, was lecturing. He devoted himself most painstakingly to the preparation of his lectures. Not only did he exercise great care in regard to the substance of his lectures but he studied thoroughly and observed strictly all the rules in regard to the delivery of lectures. The result of this earnest devotion to his work placed him in the front rank of lecturers of his day. Calls for his services came from all parts of the country, and it was most gratifying for him to know that he did not fail to satisfy his audiences to an unusual degree. By his earnest and intense efforts he succeeded in placing himself among the leaders of his chosen profession.

He will be missed by his host of admirers. I know that the sympathy of all who served with Mr. Fletcher in this House is with his bereaved family in their loss.

Hampton Pitts Fulmer

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HAMPTON PITTS FULMER late a Representative from the State of South Carolina

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the death of the late HAMPTON PITTS FULMER came to the Nation and to his beloved State of South Carolina as most shocking news. Suddenly, and without warning, this great statesman collapsed in his apartment in Washington, on October 19, 1944.

"UNCLE HAMP," as we affectionately knew him, was a farmer and a banker. Many years ago, he discontinued his interest in banking and devoted his entire time to the interest of agriculture. Being the owner of the extensive farming lands of his native county of Orangeburg, he knew at first hand the perplexing problems which confronted him who tills the soil. After his many years of illustrious service in the House and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, he became its chairman, and it befell his honor to steer innumerable pieces of legislation through the Congress designed to protect and dignify American agriculture forever.

No man has ever served in the Congress of these United States who was better known to the American farmer. No man has ever served in the Congress of these United States who was better loved by the farmer than HAMPTON PITTS FULMER. No man ever served in the Congress of these United States who was better loved by his native State of South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER knew that his death could come at any time because he had had numerous heart attacks from which he recovered. In spite of this, he stayed at his post to serve his beloved State and Nation. Of him it could be said,

Serene, I fold my hands and wait,
Nor care for wind, or tide, or sea.
I rave no more 'gainst time or fate,
For, Lo! my own shall come to me.

I stay my haste, I make delays,
For what avails this eager pace?
I stand amid the eternal ways
And what is mine shall know my face.

Asleep, awake, by night or day,
The friends I seek are seeking me;
No wind can drive my bark astray,
Nor change the tide of destiny.

What matter if I stand alone?
I wait with joy the future years.
My heart shall reap where it hath sown,
And garner up its fruit of tears.

The stars come nightly to the sky,
The tidal wave unto the sea;
Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high,
Can keep my own away from me.

Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *June 5, 1945.*

Mr. TOM WALLACE,
Editor, Louisville Times,
Louisville, Ky.

DEAR TOM: I wish to comment on the editorial in the issue of the Times for May 30, entitled "Stop, Look, Listen" because I believe that the writer of the editorial does not understand the situation.

One starts with the proposition that it is absolutely necessary in order to comply with the Interstate Commerce Act for the railroads to establish just and reasonable joint rates and through routes and, of course, two or more railroads cannot establish such joint rates and through routes without conferences with each other. It is true that in the past there have been many instances of abuses arising out of these joint conferences in what are called rate committees. The Department of Justice has instituted suits to enjoin the railroads from engaging in such conferences on the ground that same are in violation of the antitrust laws. Should injunctions be granted that would prohibit the railroads from so conferring, it is difficult to see how they could function in the establishment of through routes and joint rates.

The bill to which you refer, known as the Bulwinkle bill, has been drafted as a result of conferences between the shippers and the railroads with a view to improving this situation. Under its provisions, the railroad conferences in the future will be subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that body is charged with the duty of establishing rules and regulations governing such conferences. The bill has not only been endorsed by many shipper organizations, but also the legislative committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission has endorsed it in principle and suggested certain amendments which would clarify the powers granted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for supervision and regulation.

Unless some such legislation is passed, the successful prosecution of the suit instituted by the Department of Justice would result in chaos because the railroads would be, on the one hand, required to establish through routes and joint rates and, on the other hand, prohibited from conferring so as to agree upon the establishment of such through routes and joint rates. I assure you that the proposed legislation could not possibly "undo part or all of the rate victory which the South won from the Interstate Commerce Commission after a long, hard battle." In fact, this decision of the Commission requires the carriers to "collectively" prepare and submit a uniform classification for application throughout the United States, and this cannot possibly be done without extended conferences and agreements.

Very truly yours,

J. V. NORMAN.

Appropriations, Seventy-ninth Congress, First Session, and Funds for War Activities and Nonwar Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in presenting this appropriation résumé for the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I shall include with it an accounting for the war program and a rather comprehensive report upon nonwar expenditures, which should be of more than usual interest at this time.

War appropriations continue to bulk large, even though one of the enemy powers has unconditionally surrendered. Until Japan is brought to terms, war outlays may be expected to continue to run into large figures. It is true there will be a numerically smaller military force and there will be less production with one enemy beaten. On the other hand, the remoteness of the Pacific theaters of operation and the amphibious phases of the war entail logistical considerations which occasion expenses that offset to an appreciable extent lessened demands consequent upon the elimination of Germany.

For the session just closing, appropriation measures have carried amounts aggregating $58,921,422,229.76. Such sum excludes the so-called permanent appropriations, which total $7,978,874,874.08. These are appropriations which occur automatically pursuant to former legislative enactments and embrace a multitude of items. The major portion of the sum indicated, however, is for these four objects:

Interest on the public debt	$4,500,000,000
Refund of internal-revenue collections	1,641,760,000
Excess-profits tax refund bonds	1,068,000,000
Cumulative sinking fund	587,561,230

Omitting the permanent appropriations, the total appropriations for the session — $58,921,422,229.76 — compares with a total of $60,782,443,260.64, appropriated over the same period a year ago. While not a marked reduction, it is a reduction of $1,861,021,030.88, and is indicative of the downward trend which may be expected from now on. While the prosecution of the Japanese war will continue to impose heavy demands it is reasonable to expect a falling off of appropriations for the armed services, and we may expect to see lessening budgets for war purposes by civilian agencies which have had a part in the war program. Lend-lease, for example, for which over $30,000,000,000 have been directly appropriated, is on the way out. As against $3,538,869,000 made available for the current fiscal year, the appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 is $2,475,000,000. The distinguished Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, Leo T. Crowley, made this statement to the committee on June 13, 1945:

Insofar as lend-lease is concerned, other than to countries that are directly associated with the redeployment and occupation activities of our forces in Europe and with the Japanese war, lend-lease is practically on the verge of being wound up.

Of course, all entertain the hope that the Japanese war may be brought to an early close. It is difficult to believe that the people of Japan can long survive the terrific bombings by our growing air forces operating from bases in the Marianas, the Philippines, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and from numbers of naval carriers. Overpowering air might was the undoing of Germany, and it should be as effective against Japan. When that happens the committee immediately will launch upon a program to recapture every dollar not needed for demobilization and readjustment to peacetime conditions. Much that has been appropriated for war, therefore, may be recovered. Recoveries have been effected thus far, pursuant to committee action, of $3,192,119,000 of prior appropriations and of $1,165,000,000 of contractual authorizations. While that may appear to be a small amount in relation to war appropriation totals, the combined amount represents a very considerable percentage of what we may expect as a postwar annual budget. Irrespective of the progress of the war, the committee plans to review appropriations for war purposes in mid fiscal year with the view to recapturing any amounts which then may appear to be unnecessary.

BUDGET ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS

There follows a tabulation comparing Budget estimates and new direct appropriations made during the current session:

Comparison of amounts of direct appropriations carried in appropriation bills, 79th Cong., 1st sess., compared with Budget estimates for such bills

Bill	Amount of Budget estimate	Amount of appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriations compared with estimates
REGULAR ANNUAL BILLS, 1946			
Department of Agriculture	$428,599,050.00	$589,931,520.00	+$161,332,470
District of Columbia	67,244,205.00	65,635,660.00	−1,608,545
Independent offices	3,295,169,718.00	3,121,900,230.00	−173,269,488
Interior Department	143,839,147.00	111,690,258.00	−32,148,889
Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies:			
Labor, Department of	70,529,300.00	69,128,884.00	−1,400,416
Federal Security Agency	660,734,490.00	661,885,179.00	+1,150,689
Related agencies	399,575,775.00	384,603,193.00	−14,972,582
Total	1,130,839,565.00	1,115,617,256.00	−15,222,309
Legislative branch	50,482,070.66	50,994,481.66	+512,411
Military	21,963,093,400.00	21,496,902,030.00	−466,191,370
Navy	23,899,153,050.00	23,601,136,064.00	−298,016,986
State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and Judiciary:			
State	77,988,900.00	73,754,400.00	−4,234,500
Justice	92,322,500.00	93,768,900.00	+1,446,400
Commerce	[1]81,931,000.00	83,608,000.00	+1,677,000
The Judiciary	15,152,400.00	14,390,400.00	−762,000
Total	267,394,800.00	265,521,700.00	−1,873,100
Treasury and Post Office Departments:			
Treasury Department	296,512,100.00	285,771,300.00	−10,740,800
Post Office Department	1,065,535,720.00	1,057,186,805.00	−8,348,915
Total	1,362,047,820.00	1,342,958,105.00	−19,089,715
War Department—Civil functions	104,263,240.00	112,450,940.00	+8,187,700
Total, regular annual bills	52,712,126,065.66	51,874,738,244.66	−837,387,821
SUPPLEMENTAL, DEFICIENCY AND MISCELLANEOUS BILLS			
First deficiency bill, 1945	2,413,220,528.31	2,373,837,128.31	−39,383,400
Second deficiency bill, 1945	3,184,499,549.79	3,636,203,476.79	+451,703,927
Second supplemental bill, 1945	18,433,000.00		−18,433,000
National War Agencies, 1946	882,176,500.00	769,364,850.00	−112,811,650
Miscellaneous (House joint resolutions)	255,386,480.00	267,278,530.00	+11,892,050
Total, supplemental, deficiency, and miscellaneous	6,753,716,058.10	7,046,683,985.10	+292,967,927
Permanent annual appropriations	7,978,874,874.08	7,978,874,874.08	
Grand total	67,444,716,997.84	66,900,297,103.84	−544,419,894

[1] $5,335,000 transferred to second supplemental bill, 1945.

The preceding table excludes reappropriations and contractual authorizations. Both have a tendency to confuse when drawing comparisons with prior fiscal years, since amounts reappropriated previously have been charged to the fiscal years for which originally appropriated, and contractual authorizations may or may not be availed of. True, added to new appropriations, they give the aggregate of obligational availability, for whatever that may be worth, but, aside from authorized commitments which are availed of, thereby requiring future appropriations for their liquidation, there is no addition to the public debt which previously has not been taken into account. Contractual authorizations during the past session aggregate $1,399,008,413, the great bulk of which pertains to the Navy. Reappropriations aggregate an amount upward of $17,000,000,000, and $17,000,000,000 plus of that amount is made up of unused Army funds, heretofore reported and charged as appropriated funds, though not obligated prior to July 1, 1945.

All in all, as previously stated, the trend is downward and all signs point to its being markedly downward henceforward.

THE WAR PROGRAM

It has been the practice to use June 1940 as the starting time for measuring the cost of the war program. There was a marked acceleration from that point on until the war declarations in December 1941, when the appropriations for the armed services and supporting defense activities began to be written virtually in the amounts advocated by those upon whom the Nation has relied to lead us to victory. Results, I submit, attest the wisdom of our faith and confidence in their judgment. The total to date has been, as disclosed in the table which follows, $416,628,032,989.

Summary of appropriations and contract authorizations for war activities, as of July 17, 1945

Particulars	Army	Navy	U. S. Maritime Commission	Executive Office of the President	Other agencies	Total
Appropriations enacted	$222,793,724,227	$127,796,366,706	$15,900,148,227	$39,456,216,914	$6,000,975,992	$411,947,432,066
Less: Appropriations used to liquidate prior contract authorizations	−169,304,488	−58,087,100	−240,481,258			−467,872,846
Net total appropriations	222,624,419,739	127,738,279,606	15,659,666,969	39,456,216,914	6,000,975,992	411,479,559,220
Less: Appropriations repealed by Congress		−7,500,000	−3,100,000,000	−53,622,000	−28,432,000	−3,189,554,000
Unliquidated contract authorizations		7,659,803,907	43,168,574	612,655,288	22,400,000	8,338,027,769
Total war activities	222,624,419,739	135,390,583,513	12,602,835,543	40,015,250,202	5,994,943,992	416,628,032,989

The war cost has been appalling, both in treasure and lives lost and wrecked. The consequent debt becomes a challenge as to how best to proceed with its liquidation and at the same time promote the general welfare. It is a matter of transcending importance and should not await victory. We have been slow in making plans for a peace economy and in working out procedures for effectuating such plans.

We have confronting us the liquidation of the public debt and the payment annually of a huge rate of interest thereon. The latter will be an annually recurring expense and must be met from current revenues. How much, in addition, should be allocated from current revenues for public-debt retirement? Is retirement to proceed along a programmed course, or depend upon such surpluses as may be left each year after satisfying other obligations?

We have also confronting us our obligations to the veterans. Veterans' aid and care may run between three and five billion dollars annually, perhaps more. That likewise will be an annually recurring expense chargeable to current revenues.

The annual cost of our postwar defense establishments is now anybody's guess. It might and very well could be $5,000,000,000 or more, and that would be further annually recurring expense chargeable to current revenues.

Then, there will be the annual cost of other phases of Government—activities administered by the several executive departments and agencies, some of which are controllable and some of which consist of fixed commitments authorized by law. Both are costs chargeable to current revenues.

The total of all of these will not be much if any under $25,000,000,000 annually, with no allowance for public-debt retirement. To meet the bill means taxes far beyond any levies made prior to the war, magnified to the extent occasioned by a fixed-debt-retirement program.

This summation should be sufficient to demonstrate the importance of doing some planning, and of doing it now. A spending psychology has grown up in Government and further authorizing legislation is continually advocated. Every such bill involves further commitments either by regular governmental agencies or corporations. That inevitably involves expansion of the public debt or postwar annual budgets, which as I have indicated, will require burdensome taxes to finance without adding to them additional items of expense.

NONWAR EXPENDITURES

For each of the last 2 years I have reported to the House on the subject of wartime trends in nonwar expenditures. At this time I am again rendering such an over-all report which incorporates actual nonwar expenditures for the fiscal year 1945 just ended and also presents estimates of expenditures in the fiscal year 1946, revised in the light of the new appropriation measures which we have voted in recent weeks. As I remarked earlier, this data should be of particular interest now as we are looking ahead to postwar fiscal programs and policies.

War expenditures now constitute nearly 90 cents of every Federal dollar of expenditure. Interest on the public debt takes less than 4 cents. Hence, expenditures for so-called nonwar purposes amount to but 7 cents per dollar of expenditure.

As to the nonwar expenditures, the accompanying table shows the trends in important categories of relatively fixed and relatively controllable items of nonwar expenditures during the fiscal years 1939 through 1946. I shall discuss the main aspects of this table in some detail, but let me first present four broad general conclusions:

First. The total of nonwar expenditures was cut sharply and steadily from a peak of $6,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939 to a low of $4,100,000,000 in 1944. It is estimated at $9,000,000,000 in the current fiscal year, 1946.

Second. The rise in the nonwar total since 1944 results mainly from the recent large increase in expenditures for relatively fixed commitments—commitments which cannot be substantially changed without revision of basic legislation. Such fixed commitments were only 24 percent of nonwar expenditures in fiscal 1939. Now they are more than 70 percent.

Third. Of the $9,000,000,000 total of nonwar expenditures in the current fiscal year, two major types of fixed commitments will alone exceed $5,000,000,000—10 times the comparable expenditures in 1939. These are commitments for veterans' services and for refunds of revenue. All other fixed commitments will total $1,300,000,000—one-third more than in 1939.

Fourth. Those nonwar expenditures which do not represent fixed commitments have been greatly curtailed. The total of $2,400,000,000 estimated for the fiscal year 1946 is less than half the comparable prewar totals, even though each dollar bought more goods and services before the war. The estimate for 1946 contemplates some increase in these expenditures, mainly to cover overhead costs of the expanding veterans' services, the rising expense of wartime fiscal administration, and preparations for reconversion of the national economy and the Government to peacetime status.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES, WAR AND NONWAR

Federal Government expenditures have been divided during these war years into three main categories—war, interest on the public debt, and nonwar expenditures. In the fiscal year which ended June 30, the total of Federal Government expenditures—excluding Government corporations and trust accounts—was $100,405,000,000. Of this great sum, $90,000,000,000—89.7 percent—was for military and other na-

tional defense purposes. Expenditures for war are expected to decline during the current fiscal year, to a total of $70,000,000,000.

Because of the tremendous amount of public borrowing necessitated by the war, interest on the public debt has been increasing by about a billion dollars a year. In the last fiscal year interest payments were $3,600,000,000—3.6 percent of all Federal expenditure. For the current year, interest payments are estimated at $4,600,000,000.

All remaining items—designated as nonwar—made up only 6.7 percent of Federal Government expenditures in the fiscal year 1945. They were $6,800,000,000 last year; they are estimated at $9,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year. The tabulation relates only to these nonwar items.

These three main categories of expenditure are in accord with the classification which has been used since the beginning of the national defense program in 1940. In both the table and this discussion I am using expenditure figures, rather than appropriations, for the reason that expenditures can be summarized in terms of transactions completed in a particular fiscal year, whereas a single appropriation frequently provides for transactions in more than one fiscal year. The Committee on Appropriations has available for Members of the Congress and other interested persons separate copies of this table, with charts presenting the same information in a more graphic form than can be included in the RECORD.

Federal nonwar expenditures (excluding interest on public debt, Government corporations and trust accounts), for fiscal years 1939–46

[In millions of dollars]

Classification	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946 [1]
RELATIVELY FIXED COMMITMENTS								
Refunds:								
Excess-profits-tax refund bonds						134.0	893.7	[2] 1,032.0
Internal revenue, customs, and renegotiation refunds	67.9	91.1	89.6	94.4	79.1	132.7	821.2	[2] 1,594.0
Total refunds	67.9	91.1	89.6	94.4	79.1	266.7	1,714.9	2,626.0
Veterans' pensions and insurance:								
Pensions and readjustment benefits	417.9	429.9	443.5	431.5	442.6	495.1	745.3	1,370.2
Insurance	39.1	19.6	15.8	16.5	45.4	113.3	1,137.0	[3] 1,318.4
Total veterans' pensions and insurance	457.0	449.5	459.3	448.0	488.0	608.4	1,882.3	2,688.6
Social-security and highway grants:								
Social-security grants	324.8	359.5	418.5	471.2	471.3	486.3	451.8	493.5
Highway grants	160.0	153.3	165.9	149.1	86.0	47.0	34.2	67.7
Total, social-security and highway grants	484.8	512.8	584.4	620.3	557.3	533.3	486.0	561.2
Other fixed commitments:								
Railroad retirement—payment to trust account	107.1	120.7	124.4	140.8	214.8	262.7	308.8	291.9
Government employees' retirement funds—United States share	75.1	87.2	92.7	102.9	107.3	177.4	196.8	247.3
Permanent appropriations:								
Customs earmarked to encourage agricultural consumption and export (sec. 32, act of Aug. 24, 1935)	210.5	73.0	93.8	85.2	55.6	96.5	69.4	85.8
Other permanent appropriations	25.8	30.5	38.7	36.3	39.2	49.8	50.0	48.3
Miscellaneous grants and contributions	110.2	95.5	106.6	96.5	103.8	101.2	69.9	73.6
Total other fixed commitments	528.7	406.9	456.2	461.7	520.7	687.6	694.9	746.9
Total relatively fixed commitments	1,538.4	1,460.3	1,589.5	1,624.4	1,645.1	2,096.0	4,778.1	6,622.7
RELATIVELY CONTROLLABLE ITEMS								
Work relief and aids to youth:								
Work relief	2,612.5	1,861.4	1,438.2	937.3	317.4	23.0	1.8	15.0
Aids to youth	368.5	377.8	347.3	250.5	17.9	.2		
Total work relief and aids to youth	2,981.0	2,239.2	1,785.5	1,187.8	335.3	23.2	1.8	15.0
Aids to agriculture (excluding fixed commitments):								
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	477.9	605.1	465.1	473.7	391.1	394.9	281.2	320.0
Parity payments		215.0	183.9	191.0	202.7	163.0	.1	
Other aids to agriculture	252.4	398.7	[4] −84.8	267.5	307.3	31.9	205.0	54.4
Total aids to agriculture	730.3	1,218.8	564.2	932.2	901.1	589.8	486.3	374.4
General public works (excluding highway grants):								
Rivers and harbors work and flood control	181.7	207.2	210.9	182.3	190.9	168.1	140.6	156.2
TVA, Bonneville, and Reclamation	90.4	130.1	146.6	239.6	192.9	126.3	75.3	102.4
Other public works	85.7	95.5	95.0	78.0	52.7	35.7	41.8	90.8
Total general public works	357.8	432.8	452.5	499.9	436.5	330.1	257.7	349.4
Establishments and agencies (not included above):								
Legislative establishment	22.0	23.1	24.2	27.3	26.7	28.8	28.9	31.0
The Judiciary	9.4	11.0	11.4	11.5	12.0	13.1	13.0	14.7
Executive Office of the President	2.4	2.7	2.9	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.4	3.2
Independent establishments:								
Veterans' Administration	93.5	101.2	100.0	103.9	111.8	116.7	161.3	263.1
Federal Security Agency	63.7	67.2	71.5	79.0	84.9	91.6	97.9	119.1
Federal Works Agency	51.4	34.8	25.5	31.8	37.1	68.5	64.4	90.4
Other independent establishments	55.6	52.8	52.1	63.8	62.1	68.7	118.8	129.0
District of Columbia—United States share	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Total establishments and agencies	303.0	298.8	293.6	325.6	343.2	395.8	492.7	656.5
Cabinet departments (not included above):								
Department of Agriculture	180.2	176.6	185.5	126.5	119.8	136.2	150.7	184.0
Department of Commerce	51.4	69.9	71.5	57.6	61.2	76.9	91.5	127.1
Department of the Interior	127.9	82.4	70.3	63.7	54.6	63.0	63.2	78.4
Department of Justice	46.9	52.6	56.7	64.0	63.2	71.0	68.0	80.2
Department of Labor	6.0	9.9	12.6	11.5	10.8	10.6	10.4	12.1
Department of State	16.8	21.8	20.4	26.3	31.8	37.3	51.6	68.5
Treasury Department	112.8	111.9	133.7	151.2	220.6	277.0	298.0	366.7
War Department—Nonmilitary functions	23.8	29.9	32.8	37.0	30.0	11.1	8.4	38.5
Post Office Department—General fund expenditures	39.6	42.0	30.1	17.7	8.6	[5] −22.2	.4	
Total Cabinet departments	605.4	597.0	613.6	555.5	600.6	660.9	742.2	955.5
Total relatively controllable items	4,977.5	4,786.6	3,709.4	3,501.0	2,616.7	1,999.8	1,980.7	2,350.8
Total nonwar expenditures	6,515.9	6,246.9	5,298.9	5,125.4	4,261.8	4,095.8	[6] 6,758.8	8,973.5

[1] Includes estimates of cost of Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106).
[2] These estimates will be reduced under the pending Tax Adjustment Act of 1945.
[3] Includes estimated expenditures from anticipated supplemental appropriations.
[4] Minus item due to return of $315 million of surplus funds by Government corporations.
[5] Minus item due to return of $29 million of prior advances for anticipated deficiencies.
[6] Actual total; some details are estimated.

NOTE.—This is a revision of the tabulation presented in past years by the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of July 7, 1944, and Nov. 4, 1943.)

THE NONWAR CATEGORY

As has often been observed, the label nonwar is to some extent inaccurate since all Federal activities have been reoriented as far as possible to the war effort. Nevertheless, the distinction is convenient and I have followed it. The nonwar category therefore includes all expenditures from appropriations which are not labeled national defense in the law or not obviously made for war purposes. It excludes interest on the public debt. The expenditures of every Federal agency has been classified on a war and nonwar basis as closely as it is possible to do so without subdividing appropriation items themselves.

Two main categories of nonwar expenditures are distinguished in the detailed table—those for relatively fixed commitments and those for relatively controllable items. The following summary brings out the extent to which each category and the nonwar total has changed since 1939:

Category	Fiscal year 1939 (actual)	Fiscal year 1946 (estimated)
Relatively fixed commitments	$1,538,400,000	$6,622,700,000
Relatively controllable items	4,977,500,000	2,350,800,000
Total nonwar expenditures	6,515,900,000	8,973,500,000

Relatively fixed commitments have quadrupled since 1939. Relatively controllable items have been cut in half. The fixed commitments now dominate the nonwar total, showing an increase over the period 1939–46.

This increase did not begin until the fiscal year 1945, when expenditures for tax refunds and for veterans' insurance and services rose sharply. Previously the annual totals of nonwar expenditures had shown a steady decline from the fiscal year 1939 through 1944—in spite of the wartime rise in personnel costs and in the prices paid for other services and goods. If we exclude the two largest fixed commitments—those for tax refunds and veterans, both of which are directly associated with the war—it becomes apparent that the decline in other nonwar expenditures continued through the fiscal year 1945 to a new low of $3,162,000,000—about half the comparable total of $5,991,000,000 expended in 1939.

RELATIVELY FIXED COMMITMENTS

As I stated in my report to the House on June 23, 1944, the reduction in the total nonwar expenditure since 1939 has been achieved in spite of a large and growing volume of expenditures for relatively fixed prior commitments. Most of these commitments are governed by fixed statutory formulas or contractual arrangements and are not subject to substantial reduction through current administrative control or even through congressional action on appropriations. Substantial reduction would require substantial legislation which, in many cases, would have to revise moral, if not legal, obligations of the Government. This will be apparent as the separate items are reviewed.

Refunds: Refunds of internal revenue and customs collections were comparatively small a few years ago—$67,800,000 in 1939. They rose to $1,715,000,000 in the fiscal year 1945 because of excessive withholdings from individuals under the Current Tax Payment Act and the issuance of bonds for corporate excess-profits tax refundable after the war. The estimate for the current fiscal year is $2,626,000,000 on the basis of existing law; this will be reduced by about $500,000,000 under the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 which has just been approved by the Congress. Refunds paid from the Treasury are treated as an expenditure item, although in measuring over-all trends of Government finance they could perhaps more logically be deducted from revenue. If refunds were so deducted, total nonwar expenditures as now estimated for the fiscal year 1946 would be no higher than in 1939, in spite of the great increase of other fixed commitments.

Veterans: Although all expenditures of the Veterans' Administration could be considered relatively fixed commitments, those for administrative expense and for operating veterans' facilities are classified among controllable items.

There has been, of course, a rapid rise in expenditures for military insurance and for veterans' pensions and readjustment benefits. The expenditure of $1,882,000,000 for these fixed commitments in the fiscal year 1945 was more than four times the average for the 3 prewar fiscal years, 1939–41. The estimate for the current fiscal year is $2,689,000,000.

The expenditure for military insurance represents premiums paid by the Government over and above the amounts paid in by insured servicemen. The Government contribution covers the extra hazards of war. Readjustment benefits extended to veterans include the costs of the educational program, readjustment allowances, and loan guaranties under the GI bill of rights. Pensions include payments on account of earlier wars, but already those arising out of World War II are more than half of the total pension payments.

Social security and highway grants: Expenditures for social-security grants to the States have been running recently from 40 to 50 percent above the 1939 level. With Federal aid, the States have raised by 50 percent their average payments to beneficiaries of old-age assistance programs. Moreover, the number of beneficiaries is one-sixth higher than in 1939, despite a marked decline in the last 3 years. In the programs of aid to dependent children and to the blind, recent reductions in the number of beneficiaries have been outweighed by increases in the average payments. The resulting increase in Federal grants to help the States pay these direct benefits to individuals has been offset somewhat in the grants for administering unemployment compensation, which have been reduced because of improved employment conditions.

Grants for highways have been made during the war only for work necessary to facilitate war transportation. Expenditures for such grants last year reached a new low of $34,000,000, only one-fifth of the prewar level. An increase to $68,000,000 is estimated for the current fiscal year.

Other fixed commitments: The rise in the remaining fixed commitments has been brought about by increased appropriations to retirement trust funds.

Two kinds of retirement funds are included, those for railroad employees and those for Government employees. Since payments by the Government into the railroad retirement fund are offset by special taxes levied upon the carriers and their employees, this item might logically be excluded altogether in measuring budgetary expenditures.

Contributions to the Government employees' retirement funds, on the other hand, are financed from general revenues. They augment the payments which the employees themselves make directly into the trust fund through deductions from pay. The recent increase in the Government contribution largely represents the gradual payment of a previously accumulated obligation to this trust fund. To some extent the increase reflects also the fact that, because of the war, many empolyees have continued in service long enough to acquire retirement rights.

Fixed commitments include various permanent appropriations which continue in effect until revised or repealed by the Congress. One of these appropriations earmarks 30 percent of customs revenue for programs to encourage consumption and exportation of agricultural commodities—programs which during the war have emphasized consumption among low-income groups and the leveling off of seasonal or local gluts of the market for various commodities. It also includes the school-lunch program. The amount available for expenditure under this appropriation varies with customs collections.

The other permanent appropriations comprise a variety of items, such as grants for vocational education, grants for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, and payments to States and counties from public land revenues.

Certain grants and contributions subject to annual appropriation are also included among relatively fixed commitments, for example, payments to sugar producers under the Sugar Act of 1937, annual contributions of the Federal Public Housing Authority to local housing authorities, and the Employees' Compensation Fund.

RELATIVELY CONTROLLABLE ITEMS

I turn now to the relatively controllable category of nonwar expenditures. It is in this area that the wartime curtailment has been effected.

In the fiscal year 1939 the expenditures for relatively controllable items totaled $5,000,000,000. In 1944 and 1945 they were less than $2,000,000,000. This reduction of 60 percent over a period of 5 years is unparalleled in the annals of our Federal Government. It was accomplished in the face of increasing costs for general Government administration.

The estimate of $2,351,000,000 for the current fiscal year contemplates increased expenditures for the relatively controllable items under the Veterans'

Administration, the Treasury Department, and general public works.

Work relief and aids to youth: Programs of work relief and aids to youth, which occasioned expenditures of nearly $3,000,000,000 in 1939, were rapidly curtailed with the start of the defense effort. The expenditures under this heading, amounting to $1,800,000 in the fiscal year 1945, were largely for accident compensation payments related to former work-relief programs. The estimate of $15,000,000 for the current year is the amount that might be required to fulfill uncompleted loan and grant agreements of the former Public Works Administration if building materials for nonwar purposes become available before next June 30; it is a nonrecurring expenditure that has been postponed from year to year.

Aids to agriculture: The major programs of assistance to farmers—particularly those involving direct payments—are grouped as relatively controllable items under the heading "Aids to agriculture." Expenditures for various research and service programs are grouped with administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture, also among relatively controllable items, but under Cabinet departments. Only a few elements of the farm program are included among fixed commitments.

The controllable items for agricultural aid rose to a peak exceeding $1,200,000,000 in the fiscal year 1940. Parity payments became unnecessary and were suspended after the fiscal year 1944. Payments for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources and for miscellaneous aids have been reduced sharply. As a result, expenditures for aids to agriculture were cut to $486,000,000 last year, including $257,000,000 for restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The present estimate for the fiscal year 1946 is $374,000,000.

General public works: Many Federal construction projects which were suspended early in the war to release critical materials and labor had to be resumed later in order to provide additional hydroelectric power, arable land, and navigable waterways in aid of the war program. Nevertheless, general public works expenditures of $258,000,000 in the fiscal year 1945 were half the total in the peak fiscal year, 1942. An estimated total of $349,000,000 in the current fiscal year anticipates some relaxation of wartime controls over construction and some detailed planning and site acquisition for postwar public works. It includes $50,000,000 for hospitals and domiciliary facilities for war veterans.

Establishments and agencies: Expenditures of the legislative establishment, the judiciary, the Executive Office of the President, and the independent establishments, except for those included in the preceding items, are grouped under the general heading, "Establishments and agencies." The independent establishments account for most of the expenditures.

Legislative establishment: Expenditures of the legislative establishment are classified entirely in the nonwar category. This includes the Government Printing Office, Library of Congress, and Architect of the Capitol, as well as the two Houses of the Congress itself. The increase during the war years has been mainly in legislative printing costs of the Government Printing Office.

Independent establishments: Expenditure increases among the independent establishments are directly related to the war effort. For example, expenditures of the Veterans' Bureau for relatively controllable items, chiefly hospital and administrative costs, were $68,000,000 more in the fiscal year 1945 than in 1939, and an additional increase of $102,000,000 is estimated for 1946. Similarly, the Federal Security Agency expenditures in the current fiscal year are estimated $55,000,000 above the total of 1939 mainly because of wartime demands upon the Public Health Service and increased payments to the States for vocational rehabilitation of disabled civilians. A rise of $39,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency in the same period reflects increased expenditures for operating Government buildings—including those housing Federal war agencies—all over the country; in addition, it includes a new item of expenditure, estimated at $17,000,000 in the current year, to aid State and local governments in the advance planning of their public works, to help assure a smooth transition from war to peacetime conditions. Other independent establishments show a 7-year increase of $73,000,000, concentrated in the following agencies which have important functions of war administration: The General Accounting Office, Civil Service Commission, and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Part of the 1946 increase for the NACA, however, is for promoting civilian aviation.

Cabinet departments: Total nonwar expenditures of Cabinet departments—exclusive of items classified under other headings in the table—were about $600,000,000 a year during 1939–1943. They are rising to an estimated total of $955,000,000 in the fiscal year 1946. Half of the 7-year increase is occasioned by payments for overtime work, which was unnecessary in the easier labor market of 1939, and by the base pay increases recently provided for personnel in the classified service. Major increases were in departmental expenditures of the Treasury, State, Commerce, and Justice Departments.

In the Treasury, the tax collection and fiscal services have had to expand vastly the scale of their operations in order to carry wartime responsibilities. Thus, the Bureau of Internal Revenue now collects eight times as much revenue as in 1939 from a great many more taxpayers, collects much of it currently as the liability accrues, makes millions of audits and refunds to adjust individual accounts, and must deal with the innumerable complications which the war has added to tax administration—for example, special treatment of servicemen, accelerated depreciation of manufacturing facilities, and new sources of unlawful income. Because of these complexities, its administrative costs have nearly trebled since 1939. The accounting and other fiscal services of the Treasury have had a ninefold increase in expenditures since 1939, most of it associated with the administration and management of the public debt, particularly with wide sale of bonds in small denominations. Foreign Funds Control, which cost the Treasury Department nearly $5,700,000 in the fiscal year 1943 and will cost about $2,000,000 in the current year, is an example of a totally new "nonwar" activity that did not exist before the war. Throughout the "nonwar" operations of the Government there are other special wartime services of a similar character.

State Department expenditures, already several times their prewar level, are expected to increase sharply in the current fiscal year with further expansion of the staff to meet greatly increased burdens of this Government in the field of international relations. To a considerable extent, the expansion of the Department represents a drawing together into this peacetime agency of numerous services which, earlier in the war, were provided by emergency agencies or the military authorities. In addition, the Department has had increasing responsibilities for policy coordination among all the various Federal Government agencies operating abroad. Most of the expenditure increase is, of course, for the Foreign Service, but a substantial part is for international conferences and organizations and the program of cooperation with the other American republics.

The Commerce Department increase since 1939 is nearly all accounted for by the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics and the Weather Bureau, which have had their work multiplied by the great wartime increase in air traffic. In the Justice Department, much of the increase in expenditures has been for registration of aliens, detention or surveillance of alien enemies, war-connected law-enforcement activities of the FBI, and general provision of legal services for a Government greatly expanded to handle the war effort. The Labor Department increase over 1939 expenditures is mainly in the wage and hour division. However, this division and the Department as a whole have reduced their nonwar spending since 1941. War Department expenditures for nonmilitary functions, exclusive of general public works, have shown considerable variation from year to year; the current increase over 1939 is largely, if not entirely, associated with operation of the Panama Canal on a wartime basis.

The major reduction in Cabinet department expenditures has been in Interior, for which nonwar expenditures in this fiscal year, excluding general public works, are estimated at 60 percent of the comparable total for 1939. The net reduction of $50,000,000 in this Department reflects sharp curtailments in the Park Service, Indian Service, and Bureau of Reclamation, and some counterbalancing war-related increases for the Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey.

The Post Office deficiency has been eliminated; a small expenditure for this item in the fiscal year 1945 related to deficiencies of prior years. Department of Agriculture expenditures, exclusive of

aids to agriculture, are estimated at about the same amount this year as in 1939; during 1942–45 they were materially below the prewar level.

WAR ASPECTS OF NONWAR EXPENDITURES

The preceding sections cover all categories of expenditures shown in the detailed table. Earlier I mentioned that the label "nonwar" is to some extent inaccurate. The fact is that a very large part of these so-called nonwar expenditures is for major items closely and obviously related to the war. In the current fiscal year well over $5,000,000,000 are in that category of war-related items, out of the total of less than $9,000,000,000 of nonwar expenditures. Corresponding items totaled about $2,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1945. The largest items are reviewed here.

Although the Veterans' Administration expenditures are classified in their entirety as nonwar, actually about $1,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1945, and more than $2,300,000,000 estimated for 1946, have been occasioned directly by the European and Pacific wars. These estimates include the large payments by the Government into the national service life insurance fund, Army and Navy pensions in cases arising out of the present war, readjustment benefits for veterans, and the wartime increase in administrative and hospital costs.

Treasury Department expenditures have been greatly increased by wartime developments, chiefly in the form of tax and other refunds exceeding $2,500,000,000 in 1946, but also in terms of administrative costs for tax collection, debt flotation and management, and other fiscal operations. These war-increased administrative costs in the current fiscal year are estimated at more than $200,000,000 above the prewar level.

The Department of State has had to add nearly $50,000,000 to its expenditures. The greatly increased auditing load of the General Accounting Office in connection with war transactions has caused its expenditures to increase to 7 or 8 times the prewar amount. Expenditures of the Public Buildings Administration for rental and operation of building space have more than doubled during the war; such expenditures are classified as "nonwar" even when incurred on behalf of war agencies. Payments to the railroad retirement trust fund have nearly trebled under wartime conditions.

The items enumerated, with several smaller ones of the same general character, accounted for more than one-third of all the so-called nonwar expenditures in the fiscal year 1945. They account for more than 60 percent of the total this year.

These increases or new items are for activities clearly related to the war. They do not include the numerous instances in which the nonwar expenditures for particular services have been cut below prewar levels and the remaining services redirected wholly or predominantly to the objective of winning the war. For example, War Department nonmilitary expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control (classified as nonwar general public works) have not only been curtailed; they have been to a considerable extent concentrated on waterways of special importance to the war effort. These improved waterways have made it possible to build on inland lakes and even on dry land some of the vessels destined for overseas use. Similarly, the expenditures of the National Park Service were reduced sharply; several of the parks have been used for military convalescents and for camping and other activities which have aided the war program.

CONCLUSION

The war expenditures of a single recent year exceed the nonwar expenditures of a decade. These vast payments for war we have been compelled to make as the irreducible price of freedom. But under the pressure of war, we have been able to reduce the nonwar expenditures. The controllable items have been cut by more than half—a percentage reduction larger than ever before recorded in the history of the United States. The increases which have taken place in the fixed commitments are directly associated with war developments and war needs. Those continuing programs and overhead operations which were of a peacetime character were either greatly curtailed or converted largely to war work even though their expenditures are still classified as nonwar.

In-Plant Feeding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is generally agreed that if the productivity of our industrial workers is to be kept at the highest level of efficiency, if industrial accidents are to be kept down to the lowest minimum, and if their health is to be fully protected, they must be afforded nourishing food at reasonable cost and in desirable surroundings. The in-plant feeding movement, however, has been slow in coming. With the advent of the war, it became apparent that such system of feeding would have to be accelerated, if the thousands of ships and guns and planes and all other war matériel were to be produced in time to defeat our enemies. In-plant feeding, therefore, became a national problem, and in many hundreds of plants throughout the Nation, management, labor, and the Government have been cooperating in an endeavor to supply the millions of industrial workers with nourishing food on the premises. This has helped us outproduce the enemies; it has helped to shorten the war, to save countless thousands of American and United Nations lives, as well as to lessen the costs of the conflict.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a paper read by the eminent food-service consultant, Mr. William R. Davis, at the in-plant feeding conference held under the auspices of the Economic Policies Council on March 21, 1945, dealing with this vital problem.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN-PLANT FEEDING

Food management should offer more than the serving of food to the worker. It has been definitely proven by governmental and other surveys that the service of food in industrial plants has been directly related to increased production. This, in spite of the fantastic growth of in-plant feeding since Pearl Harbor and the handicaps springing from hastily conceived and executed plans for it, both on the part of food management and plant management.

In looking at the postwar picture, it is apparent that employee morale, fostering industrial harmony with the final objective of increased production, will be a definite must if industrial companies are to succeed in the postwar competition. In-plant feeding can be one of the major factors in accomplishing this. However, to gain the utmost from a program, two things are necessary: First, the food management must be as well administered and scientifically controlled as any other industrial business; second, plant management and food management must work together on the entire program, as applied to a specific location.

Competent food management should be engaged to work with plant engineers in the first planning of a feeding program, or of any revision of it. When this is done, definite operating economies and, what is more important, better food and service will be provided. Each plant has different problems, such as transportation facilities and markets due to location, sex of employees, types, ages, eating habits, etc., all of which affect, in one way or another, the feeding set-up.

Then, in the planning of the installation or revision, consultation with competent food management is important. I have surveyed many operations where, if more time and thought had been devoted to them by plant management and food management, far more efficient results would have been obtained. I very recently had occasion to look over an installation where a series of cafeterias had been built, having counters over 100 feet long. With 5 cashiers working, they were passing through no more than 12 per minute. When I tell you that an efficient operation having a 32-foot counter using 1 cashier, can put through better than 12 per minute, it can be seen what a tremendous waste in operating expense exists there. Not only that, but the people using the facilities are delayed to the point where the feeding of that particular group is actually a cause of employee unrest. Those counters were one continuous bottleneck. In another installation increased operating cost was caused by the lockers for the restaurant employees being on another floor. It will be apparent that this simple detail was the cause of many lost man-hours in this operation and, furthermore, did not encourage cleanliness on the part of the restaurant employees.

There are many other illustrations which I could give, but the important point is this: The restaurant is a manufacturing as well as a retail service department and the same thought should be given in planning it as is given to the setting up of a production line or a manufacturing process in the plant. This cooperation between plant and food management should go right down the line, even to the selection of proper tables and chairs for comfort and relaxation and the colors for the dining rooms. These and other apparently minor things all contribute something to the objectives to be accomplished through employee feeding.

The all-over restaurant policies should then be determined. Here, food management should be of great value. The restaurant department, no matter who operates it, must conform to plant standards along certain lines. For instance, the plant personnel department should exercise its influence over the restaurant, so that the restaurant personnel will be in line with plant standards, etc.

When these are established, it is the function of food management to take over, and one of its important responsibilities is to keep restaurant headaches from plant management, which is concerned with the production of its particular product and that is a full-time job. If it is a new operation and the operator has no organization, time must be taken for training of employees and the establishment of an organization and system. If it is to be handled by a food-management company, key people may be brought in from other similar units who are already familiar with its methods and the breaking-in period would be greatly shortened. In an established going restaurant the food management takes over and starts to revise the standards and methods. In either case, food management must have a system of operation and control and should immediately establish scientific methods of purchasing, production, labor control, etc., based on experience and knowledge of the business, but made to apply specifically to the particular unit.

It has been the experience of most of the major industrial companies that a food-service company can give best results to all concerned in the food problem.

In any case, the food management should have control figures showing:

1. That purchasing is controlled and that the operation is receiving the best possible prices from the vendors. This is a simple record of competitive quotations on all merchandise purchased. A record of goods received with invoice records. These, with a set of standards, provide a means of checking the purchasing.

2. That costs of production are being controlled by having a break-down of the items purchased by commodity groups showing the merchandise used.

3. A departmental break-down of departmental labor costs. These are all established for the business on a percentage basis, so a comparison is easy, even to someone not familiar with the business. These records should be open to plant management and would be understandable to any authorized person designated to inspect them.

The plant restaurant should be a place of relaxation and constant interest to the plant workers. There are many ways in which this interest and diversion may be promoted in connection with the regular feedings. For instance, St. Patrick's Day, Valentine Day, etc., offer opportunities for special decorations which can be used to give a lift to the people patronizing the restaurant.

Industrial feeding has done a wonderful job during this war, under unfavorable conditions, and if used to its full advantage will contribute more to the morale, health, and productivity of the American worker in the postwar days.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Worth M. Tippy, secretary emeritus, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 10, 1945.*

I have reversed my point of view about the equal rights amendment, which reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." I held to a widespread opinion that the amendment would break down protective legislation safeguarding women employed outside the home.

Time and the present war have completely changed my mind. Women should have wide open doors to employment. Wartime industries have shown that they are equal to any jobs for which they are fitted by aptitude and training. Full employment must include women workers outside the home; also equal opportunities for night and day work, equal pay for equal work, equal opportunity for advancement, and equal protection of health, safety, and seniority. These rights, as also to property, to their own children, and to democracy in the home, should have this final legal status in the Constitution of the United States. That this should be an issue and should be necessary is a humiliating revelation of our social lag.

While not involved in the equal rights amendment, the time must come when the homemaker shall have equal recognition and honor in public thinking with the so-called employed woman, and equal rights with her husband in property and income.

WORTH M. TIPPY,
Secretary Emeritus, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Overseas Men Desire Freedom to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, my bill to guarantee to our returning servicemen the first freedom, that is the freedom to work without paying tribute, is now pending before the House. I wish it were possible to get it up and pass it today; but that seems impossible, under the circumstances.

I voted against the recess resolution. I think Congress ought to stay here and do something for these ex-servicemen who have risked their all in this war. We should not only guarantee them the right to work for a living without paying tribute or being regimented into subjugation, but we should also pass the bill which I have introduced to pay them readjustment compensation of $20 a week for 1 year.

While we are spending billions of dollars on foreign countries through what we call UNRRA we can afford to spend a reasonable amount of money on "INRA" to take care of our returning servicemen. Certainly, we can afford to pass my bill to protect these returning servicemen in the right to work for their daily bread.

I am receiving many letters from overseas veterans, as well as returning veterans, urging the passage of this measure.

I received this one this morning:

DEAR SIR: Our press today contained the following item "A new push this week for legislation to exempt returning veterans from compulsory union membership or dues paying was promised Sunday by Representative RANKIN. The legislation, which RANKIN said would 'break defense plant strikes,' was approved Friday by the House Veterans' Committee which he heads. RANKIN's next move will be a request for the Rules Committee to clear it for a House vote before the forthcoming summer recess. Labeled as an amendment to the GI bill of rights, RANKIN's bill would permit honorably discharged war veterans to work anywhere they could get a job, and would waive in the cases on closed or union shops normal requirements that they join a union or pay union dues."

Wartime strikes, which hinder production of materials vital to the survival and effectiveness of our armed forces, have made the unions and leaders concerned most unpopular with servicemen of my acquaintance.

To return and have to pay tribute (called dues) to those who valued a few extra dollars in their pocket above our lives, is not an attractive prospect.

The place where I was formerly employed has since been taken over by a union and made a closed shop.

Not long ago I received a form letter from a union official saying that his organization was willing to "share" with veterans the postwar work to be had.

His attitude that his confederates were to martyr themselves so that those of us that left home, endured military rule, and risked our lives could support ourselves and families irked me beyond words.

Hence this note of appreciation to you, one of our champions.

Here is another letter from an overseas veteran to the editor of the Detroit Free Press, which appeared in the daily paper a few days ago:

To the EDITOR: What the hell is the matter with the people of the city of Detroit and vicinity? The average veteran feels that the people at home, and especially those in the Detroit area, don't realize there is still a war going on out here in the Pacific.

We are lying in a hospital ward on Saipan, due to wounds received on Okinawa. In the hospital wards we have radios, and each time the news of the world is broadcast we hear that the people of Detroit who are employed in vital war industries are on strike. Either for more money or because their lunches are not what they expect. How would they like to eat C rations from the can for 70 or 80 days in combat?

We men—and we are the men who are fighting for the freedom of the American people and their allies—never quit or think to strike, or debate over who should do the job.

We fight while the people of Detroit strike for a few pennies more. These people make at least $50 a week, while we soldiers sweat and shed our blood for $50 a month and never as much as say boo about what we make.

It is rough and tough on us, and yet still we can smile.

Now what would happen if we men of the armed forces lay down our arms to talk and cry for a few cents more per hour? Would the public care for that?

We hope you will print this in your paper for the benefit of the people who still persist in striking. We mean the civilian war workers.

WOUNDED VETERANS
OF THE PACIFIC WAR.

While these boys are fighting to protect American institutions abroad, it is our duty to protect them at home; and when they return, as they are returning now, by the hundreds of thousands, it is our duty to see that they are given an opportunity to adjust themselves back

into their usual vocations, and that they do not go hungry while they are doing it.

But, above all things, it is our duty to see that they enjoy the freedom to work in order to support themselves and their dependents.

I shall renew my efforts to secure the passage of this legislation when Congress reconvenes.

Lagniappe Comes Back to Louisiana—This Time to Our Veterans at La Garde Hospital—Thanks to Walter Williams, Ace Radio Commentator, and Commanding Officers and Their Excellent Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, many years ago in Louisiana every child knew the word "lagniappe" perhaps better than any other, because it meant a little something extra. It was a universal custom among all people in Louisiana and especially the merchants. When a little child went to the store to get the groceries or something for mom or pop, the storekeeper always gave the child a stick of candy or a cookie, or a little something extra—this was lagniappe.

LAGNIAPPE AT LA GARDE HOSPITAL

And so at La Garde Hospital, one of the finest and best operated Army hospitals in our Nation, our wounded and beloved heroes get lagniappe too, that little something extra that means so much to those fellows who gave so much that our country should continue to be great and free.

And lagniappe it is at La Garde Hospital, where those little extras count so much. Thousands of phonograph records have been donated, a golf course, tickets to football games (for those able to attend), tickets to the most popular air-conditioned bowling alleys, as well as extra equipment for the physical-therapy room.

Many boys have not funds to phone their families or wives or sweethearts at distant points, but this lagniappe, or extra fund, gives each soldier that opportunity and pleasure. Over 200 phone calls alone were made last Christmas.

WHERE LAGNIAPPE COMES FROM

This all came about through the efforts of one Walter Williams, public-spirited ace radio commentator—whose wife and daughter are both serving in the WAC's—who, aside from being chairman of the Young Men's Business Club Committee, set about to secure funds for La Garde Hospital to provide the wounded heroes with those "extras" that mean so much. Three hundred dollars from the Elks Club each month is one of the many sources of much appreciated funds. Walter Williams, the radio man, and he is known far and wide in Louisiana, with energy and determination achieved great success in his lagniappe program. In his modest way he gives Col. Alfred P. Upshur, commanding officer, most of the credit. "Why without his wonderful cooperation none of this could be possible," says Walter.

COLONEL UPSHUR ONE OF THE BEST

La Garde Hospital is a typical example of what the Army is trying to do to take care of all wounded veterans brought back from the battle fronts all over the world. The hospital is ideally located in New Orleans on the shores of beautiful Lake Pontchartrain.

After visiting this hospital personally sometime ago—and I just dropped out there unexpectedly without any advance warning or invitation—I was astounded at the amazing efficiency in its operation. I talked with many of the boys, some almost normal while others were in bad shape, but all of them had high praise for the way they were treated and how kind everyone from Colonel Upshur and every other officer on down the line were to them. The colonel is typical, strictly Army, but the superb efficiency and excellent operation of the hospital is a tribute and testimonial of his amazing ability.

BOYS LIKE THE COLONEL

Sure we like Colonel Upshur—

Chimed in one soldier—

he's done everything humanly possible to help all of us. Why he even visits with practically every patient in the hospital each month—who wouldn't like a guy like that? But don't for heaven's sake let on that I called him a guy instead of Colonel Upshur.

To me, as a Congressman here in the Nation's Capital, I cannot help but feel that, whereas I am sure all the Army hospitals are doing a great job, that La Garde Hospital as a result of Colonel Upshur, Capt. T. F. Reece, the entire staff and personnel, and the efforts of Walter Williams offer many suggestions and improvements and is a great step in the right direction in the caring for our wounded heroes. Let us always bear in mind and work to that end "our heroes deserve the best."

Kent Ellsworth Keller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Kent Ellsworth Keller, recently appointed by the Department of State a special assistant to the United States Ambassador to Mexico and now on his way to take up his new duties in Mexico City, was elected to the Seventy-second Congress in 1930, from the Twenty-fifth District in Illinois. He was reelected in 1932, 1934, 1936, and 1938, serving a total of 10 years as a Member of the House.

In his first election campaign, before the candidacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt and before the term "New Deal" had been heard of, he ran for office upon the slogan of "A job for every man and woman who wants to work." His program of public works as a means of relieving unemployment was criticized as visionary at the time; later it was to be adopted by the administration and by Congress as the principal weapon against hardships of depression.

Mr. Keller was born on a farm near Ava, Ill., attended public schools, was graduated by Southern Illinois State Normal University at Carbondale, and later studied economics, philosophy, and Roman law in Heidelberg University, Germany. He returned to his home county, taught school, edited a newspaper, completed his education for the law in St. Louis Law School, and was admitted to the bar in Illinois.

Afflicted with tuberculosis soon afterward, he went to Mexico to recover his health, and during 12 years of residence in that country not only mastered the language but also Mexican law. He represented several important United States interests before the Supreme Court of Mexico. On the day after the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson as President in March 1913, he was summoned to the White House by the President for consultation upon the troubled state of relations with Mexico, which was then torn by revolution.

During his long period of service as a Member of Congress he became the original sponsor of the Railroad Pension Act, the old-age pension provisions of the Social Security Act, and the firm supporter of many other social reforms.

His exceptional knowledge of Mexican language, history, and personalities; his practical experience as a Member of Congress; his scholarship and ability acknowledged by the many who have served with him in this House, make him a most suitable choice for the important post to which he has been assigned. Former colleagues of the House have reason to be gratified by this wise appointment by the Secretary of State and extend their best wishes to Mr. Keller in his new sphere of public service.

Plans for a Peaceful World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution which is intended to supplement and to increase the potential effectiveness of a resolution that was introduced a few days ago by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, the minority leader of the House.

Mr. MARTIN'S resolution urged the President and the Secretary of State and the representative of the President on the United Nations Organiation, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., "to work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military

service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations."

My resolution reaffirms the splendid resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and in addition urges the same officials also "to work unceasingly for an international agreement whereby every nation will bind itself to submit the question of participation in wars to a decision of its people in a national referendum."

I believe that in Mr. MARTIN's resolution, and my addition to it, the peace-loving people of America and of the world will find a proposal that merits their utmost consideration, now, when we are so anxiously exploring means to make a better world.

The text of my resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That before the United States adopts compulsory military service, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the personal representative of the President on the United Nations Organization, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., be and hereby are urged to work unceasingly for an immediate international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the policies and practices of all nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and the personal representative of the President on the United Nations Organization, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., be and hereby are urged to work unceasingly for an international agreement whereby every nation will bind itself to submit the question of participation in wars to a decision of its people in a national referendum.

In explanation of my resolution I have given the following statement to the newspapers:

With all my heart and soul I am for the resolution introduced by Representative JOE MARTIN urging the President, the Secretary of State, and Edward R. Stettinius, the representative of this country on the United Nations Organization, to work unceasingly for an international agreement whereby compulsory military service shall be wholly eliminated from the practices and policies of all nations.

I believe Mr. MARTIN is absolutely right when he says that the elimination of compulsory military training would be a great act of statesmanship, and that it would bring an immense feeling of relief to the entire world.

The resolution I have introduced goes a step farther than the resolution by Mr. MARTIN. It urges the same officials also to work unceasingly for an international agreement that before any nation goes to war it will submit the decision as to war or peace to a referendum of its people.

The point most incessantly urged against a war referendum for this country alone is that it might place America at a disadvantage in dealing with other countries. If all nations should agree on the referendum principle that objection would be entirely eliminated. No nation would have an advantage over any other.

Wars are not made by peoples, but by tyrannical rulers. The people want peace. While we are planning for a peaceful world we should make our plans thorough and complete. I believe the successful consummation of the objectives sought by Mr. MARTIN and myself in the resolution I am introducing would do more to prevent wars and to insure the permanent peace and happiness of the world than anything else it is humanly possible to do.

Igoe Court Officer Aided in Transit Suit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. LINK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun of July 1, 1945:

IGOE COURT OFFICER AIDED IN TRANSIT SUIT—ACTION SET STAGE FOR BANKRUPTCY OF SURFACE LINES

(By J. M. Klein)

Inquiry by the Chicago Sun has disclosed that a United States district court officer under Judge Michael L. Igoe was cosponsor of the lawsuits which gave Igoe the legal apparatus for throwing the Chicago Surface Lines into bankruptcy.

The bankruptcy proceedings had the effect of delaying action on the city's municipal-ownership plan last fall and served to tighten Federal-court control of the streetcar system, which had been tied up for the preceding 17 years in Federal court receivership.

MASTER JOINS IN SUIT

Court records show that Warren Canaday, appointed master in chancery by Judge Igoe in June 1939, joined with Joseph A. Struett, attorney, in filing bankruptcy petitions against the trolley lines 5 months later, November 27, 1939, on behalf of three bondholders.

Canaday, who subsequently got some fees out of the traction litigation through his service under Igoe, withdrew as attorney for the bankruptcy petitioners in May 1940, about the time that Igoe took over control of the transit cases from Judge James H. Wilkerson, now retired.

ASSOCIATE CARRIES ON

But his erstwhile associate, Struett, carried on, to win the decision rendered by Judge Igoe last September 18 which booted the Surface Lines out of equity receivership into bankruptcy.

Struett is one of the attorneys who last week injected into the case a new threat to the pending public transit ownership program in the form of a suggested plan for private reorganization.

Traction experts contend that defeat or delay of the public-ownership plan would tend to prolong court control of the traction muddle at the expense of the public.

The Sun previously has disclosed, in its continuing investigation of the traction litigation, that high-paying jobs in the Surface Lines have been handed out to friends and political associates of Judge Igoe since he acquired control of the case from Judge Wilkerson in 1940.

Canaday had been first assistant United States Attorney under Igoe when the latter was Federal prosecutor here from 1935 until his elevation to the bench in November, 1938. Previously Canaday and Struett had been associated as assistants in the United States District Attorney's office.

STRUETT DISMISSED

Struett was dismissed from that office without explanation in 1934 on orders from Washington, while Canaday remained to serve under Igoe. After Igoe became Federal judge, he took Canaday out of the prosecutor's office and made him his master in chancery.

About a year after Canaday withdrew as Struett's associate counsel in the bankruptcy proceedings against the trolley lines, Judge Igoe appointed him to hear minor phases of the traction case as special master for the court.

For this service, Igoe has awarded Canaday fees totaling $10,740 thus far.

CANADAY REMAINS IGOE'S AID

Canaday still serves under Igoe as master in chancery.

Questioned about his association with Struett in the bankruptcy action against the streetcar system, Canaday said he wasn't active in that case but had permitted Struett to use his name on the petitions.

"Later I decided I didn't want to be in the case and asked Struett to withdraw my name as co-counsel," Canaday told the Sun. "Struett has been the guiding genius in this matter; I had no active part in it."

Asked why he withdrew, Canaday replied, "I don't remember the circumstances."

Fair Treatment for Cadet Nurses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the country was very concerned because there was a shortage of nurses for our armed forces. If the Government of the United States would treat the nurses and the nursing profession with the respect and fairness it deserves, there never would have been any shortage of nurses.

Let us take the case of cadet nurses in the training courses throughout the country today. They work long hours and study hard for a measly $15 to $20 per month. In spite of the fact that they are training to take care of the armed forces, they are not allowed even the free postage privilege or furlough rates.

I think it is very sad that this Congress does not pass legislation to give the cadet nurses the same privileges that we give other men and women in service. For a Government that squanders billions everywhere, it certainly would not bankrupt us to give these cadet nurses the treatment that is due them.

To give an idea of how unfairly this Government is treating the cadet nurses, I just want to read a letter I received today which is one of many I have received in the past few months. After reading this letter, I hope that the Members of Congress will take immediate action to do only the human and decent thing for these brave and gallant women.

LAKE NEBAGAMON, WIS., *July 16, 1945.*

Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. O'KONSKI: I am writing you, hoping you can or will try to do something of interest, not only to myself and daughter, but also to thousands of others in our same position.

This is in the interest of thousands of girls all over these United States, in the service of our country, but who are not considered as such, namely, the cadet nurses.

I have a daughter in this service, and who, though wearing the uniform of our country as much as any boy in service and putting in long hours of study and duty to patients, yet, when offered a few days of leave, cannot get furlough rates to go home, or even have

free postage, such as afforded all the other boys and girls in service.

My daughter is in training at the famous city of Rochester, Minn., and over 200 miles from home. You can realize that in a city like Rochester, where the shortage of nurses is more acute than in many other places, they are really put through some strenuous studies and on-duty hours, day and night, also subject to call for emergency operations at any time during the night, each at her own turn, with such service. My daughter's husband is also in the service of this country, in the Navy, and now stationed in Virginia. With her first vacation due next month, and, I might add, her first vacation in 14 months of duty, she now finds herself without sufficient funds to make a trip to Virginia to be with her husband for this short time, but which, if allowed furlough rates, as other service people are, she could easily manage it.

It seems to me that a cadet nurse, working for $15 and $20 a month, which is less than a WAC or WAVE receives, that they should at least be accorded the same privileges. I know you have done much for different things and organizations, and perhaps by calling this to your attention you might be able to do something, however small, for the girls in the corps, and for which they would be very grateful. I should like to hear if you think there is a chance of these girls getting the same consideration as other girls in service. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. H. E. NICHOLS.

Impressions of California Received by Delegates to the United Nations Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the natural pride of a Member of Congress in his home State can be excused, and therefore I ask consent to include herewith the text of an article appearing in the Los Angeles Daily News on Thursday, June 21, and written by Mr. George Polk.

This article concerns the impressions of California received by the delegates to the United Nations Conference.

THE "SO GREAT" COUNTRY

(By George Polk)

SAN FRANCISCO, June 20.—Ever since the start of the World Security Conference 8 weeks ago the United Nations delegates have been in complete agreement on one point—that California is a great place.

They have seen a lot of the State.

Many traveled through the Southland to reach the Conference. And they've made trips to Yosemite Park, the Shasta Dam reclamation project, California shipyards, steel plants, and factories.

Never before have so many distinguished and influential foreigners seen so much of the natural resources and industrial facilities that enrich California.

Iraq delegate Fadhil Al-Jamali told Frank Kittredge, head ranger at Yosemite, "The Bible and our Iraq legends say that the fabled land is here and you're its keeper."

Many statesmen believe President Roosevelt selected California as the place for the World Security Conference because delegates, traveling to and from the meeting, would see so much of the United States.

Many delegates are almost flabbergasted at what they've seen.

A Yugoslav official told Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, Conference Army attaché, that America is the "so great country."

"We have never seen anything like this before," the Yugoslav added. "In Europe we would have crossed many nations, many boundaries, many customs, and, oh, so many passports. Now we realize what America is."

Without exception the delegates predict a great future for Pacific coast trade with the Far East. They believe a new industrial empire west of the Sierra Nevadas is coming into being.

An interesting manifestation of this sentiment is the map that now hangs in the Conference building. When the meeting began, a conventional chart of the world was displayed—a Mercator projection of the world drawn with St. Louis as the center.

But, in compliance with suggestions, Conference officials have replaced this original map with a new one. It is one of the great circle airship navigation projections that shows clearly the close interdependence of the west coast and Orient.

And the new map is drawn within the central Pacific.

Nothing could illustrate better the thinking and planning of United Nations. The Pacific has become the world of tomorrow and California is advantageously situated on the trade routes.

Already the impact of California and the rest of the United States on the delegates has had its effects. Two days ago India's representatives disclosed that 1,500 Indian students would come to America to study in graduate schools and work in industries.

India, China, Australia, and Saudi Arabia have sent officials to study Central Valley reclamation projects. The system in use there may be copied by these nations to meet their irrigation problems.

There also are reports that Henry J. Kaiser may engineer a tremendous hydroelectric dam on China's Yangtze River at Ichang. Such a structure would provide power for industrializing the river's valley and eventually create employment for millions of Chinese.

Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov visited Kaiser's shipyards at Richmond. After inspecting mass-production methods for turning out ships, Molotov asked Kaiser what his social program was.

Without a moment's hesitation Kaiser shot back, "Production!"

The accomplishments of the World Security Conference envisage a similar program for the United Nations.

The new league will be founded on improved economic and social conditions as much as on the strength of political and military agreements.

This is a new idea for the protection of peace and creation of a better world.

California has an important part in this future.

Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter recently received by me from Lt. Sid Yelle.

In this letter, Lieutenant Yelle outlines some of the work being done by the military government in Germany, and I felt that it was of sufficient importance and interest to merit the attention of my colleagues and the public at large.

POSSNECK 1, THURINGA, *June 19, 1945.*

DEAR WALT: I thought you might like to have some first-hand information on military government as it is being applied in the American zone of occupation. Our location will eventually be taken over by the Russians, but we are proceeding in our work as if we were going to occupy this area permanently. Even though we know that we will not stay here, we are trying to administer our affairs the best we know how and will attempt to make the most progress possible. It would be a sad commentary on American activity in the field of military government if we left the Russians an unorganized mess. We trust the Russians will realize what we have tried to do here.

The division I am assigned to is the Thirtieth Infantry Division. It fought from the beachheads of Normandy and has one of the proudest records of any unit in the ETO. We were always the spearhead infantry, working largely with the Second Armored Division. Our record in combat has few equals and we have applied the same resources to our work in military government. I have seldom seen an organization which is so keenly interested in the right way of doing things. From the commanding general down to the platoon leader, we have had nothing but the finest cooperation and help in any request we have made for aid in this big job of government. We have made a lot of mistakes and have done many things which are not just according to the book, but I can truly say that we have tried to do the right thing, and I believe the Thirtieth Division solution is as good as can be found.

The military government staff of a division is small. Our chief is Maj. Shirley Marsh, former assistant attorney general from Olympia. I am the deputy to Marsh and we have three majors, one with each regiment. We have five enlisted men—clerks, drivers, etc. This is a small group to accept the responsibility for governing about 10,000 square miles, but it can and is being done.

Here is the way we accomplish our mission. Our area comprises six landkreise—roughly equivalent to a United States county. In each landkreise we have a military government detachment composed of from three to six trained military government officers. They have a full complement of enlisted men and the necessary transportation. Their authority is absolute in their own area. Each officer and most of the enlisted men are specialists in some branch of government—administration, public works, education, finance, trade, and industry, etc. The mission of the American concept of military government is to supervise and not to administer. That means we throw the burden of government directly upon the local officials whom we have installed in office, in keeping with the spirit of denazification. Our officials are given a free hand to organize and administer under the watchful eyes of the detachment.

At the division level we coordinate and render help and assistance where it is needed. There are many things which a division can do which a detachment cannot. Military government remains a command function of the Army, and as such it requires the resources of the troops to insure adequate supervision and aid. Before government can become effective it must be widespread and

be administered from high level. Our corps, which at the present time comprises six divisions, has supervision over the entire Province of Thuringia, which is a very large area and is roughly equivalent to the State of Washington in functions. Corps has activated the provincial government under some very high-type German citizens who were career men before Hitler.

Sitting alongside each government official at the provincial level is an American officer who is the opposite number of the German. While the German takes the initiative he cannot make a decision without the approval of the officer to whom he is responsible. In this way we think the Germans will step into government and will soon have our area very well organized. There are no politics, and as a matter of fact there is no expressed desire on the part of the populace for any such activity. So far we have had no political activity in our area whatsoever. The municipal and provincial officials are interested in doing a good job and we can say that it appears as if they have the approval and backing of the people.

Food rationing and the repatriation of displaced persons is our biggest job. The Germans handle the rationing themselves, for they have had many years of stern training under the total warfare principle. They understand the necessity. Each farmer or producer is required to declare and to deliver to the proper authority a certain quota of eggs, milk, vegetables, and meat. He is not permitted to use cream or to make butter on his own farm. Butter is manufactured in creameries under supervision and is sold to retailers. Every food item is strictly accounted for, so that the producer does not become fat at the expense of the city dweller.

The repatriation of displaced persons is so huge that the Army itself handles the movements. We have large displaced persons camps where the different nationals are assembled and fed pending shipment to their home countries. Our average day sees about 1,500 men, women, and children loaded onto trucks or trains and headed for home. The German authorities supply the food, for we feel they are responsible. They must share their already short rations with the unfortunate people who were brought here against their wishes. The German people we have talked to seem reconciled to short rations and I find no hint of bitterness. They seem to realize they have made a tremendous mistake in following Hitler's policy and are now just beginning to understand what crimes they have committed against the rest of the world.

We are trying to reactivate industry, internal trade, and normal business as fast as we can. Until someone comes along with a solution as to what we should do with Germany, I feel that we cannot allow a vacuum to exist and expand. We must keep the Germans busy at the business they know how to conduct. Idleness is the worst possible thing for these people, who are used to working long hard hours.

The Germans are generally obedient and cooperative. We have had no cases of civil servants not doing their work—in fact, they are inclined to be more severe with the Nazi elements than we are ourselves. We allow the landrat (county supervisor) to appoint and discipline the local mayors and believe me, they do a good job. This is in keeping with our policy of allowing the responsible German authorities as much freedom as possible. Of course, no man is acceptable to us until he has been cleared by our counter-intelligence. The system works well, and I think it is a good one.

We see newspaper clippings from home commenting on American military government policies as being "soft," "pampering," and "not stern enough." Most of the writing concerns isolated cases, but implies that the over-all policy of America is not in keeping with what a conquering army should be doing. The thing that we must avoid at all costs, I think, is the spirit of revenge. My mind is confused, for I realize that wars usually start from injustices or imagined injustices. I suppose it would be easy for a newspaperman with preconceived ideas to make a flying visit into the area and find all sorts of things to comment upon. However, I have never known any of them to come into this or corps headquarters to inquire about area policy. If the folks at home are ever to understand they should have the benefit of hearing from the source. What we are trying to do is to avoid another war. I am not anxious to stay over here any longer than is absolutely necessary, for I love and miss my home and family. But I would feel that my trip to Europe had been in vain if I had not done everything in my power to stop another conflict.

It could very well happen here again, Walt. The age-old hates and fears of Europe are still apparent. The French dislike the Dutch; the Germans hate and fear the Russians; the Czechs cry for recognition and revenge; the Poles are bewildered; the Belgians scorn the effete French—and so it goes. Where does Uncle Sam stand? Has he got the guts and the strength to show these people that they must, somehow, get along with each other? Can he display to them some of the fundamental rights and truths of Christian government? Or will he become weary of international intrigue and go away to leave sick Europe to its own devices?

For as the war was fought by the United Nations in a magnificent display of cooperation and team-work so we must keep the same spirit alive in peace. The Russians, the British, and ourselves have different ideas as to military government and that is not good. The Germans should and must feel that all the world is united against them in the same way. There should be no difference in policy and treatment. Already, we see trends of the times. Terrified Germans are working their way into the American zone to the south, hoping to flee from the Russian occupation. Even the British zone is not so popular with the Germans. What is the answer to that? Is it because we pamper the Germans, or is it because they know that we will allow them certain human freedoms consistent with the reason why we went to war. The "four freedoms" have made a strong impression on those Germans who will have a lot to do with a new order here. They feel that if we stay on the job and permit no demagogery, that they will be able to struggle through with some kind of decent government.

There are only few men and women in Germany who have political ideals. The lower classes have no views on the subject. They will follow the lead of any strong man, another Hitler perhaps, or an honest humanitarian. It is up to us to see that the right man or men are allowed to emerge from the mass of doubt that shadows this land.

That is our concept of military government and I hope the people at home will be willing to listen to those of us who have been in the business from the start. Young America must accept responsibility for the peace of the world and must allow no nation to upset the principles for which we have fought. That is why we soldiers are looking to San Francisco for an indication as to what the future of the world holds for us and our families.

I hope this long letter will give you some idea as to what is going on in the minds of the men I work with and know so well. We don't want to see America lose the battle of diplomacy, for America is one of the last sources of good in this sad old world.

Sincerely,

SID.

Food Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of Congress, whether he represents an urban or rural district, is receiving letters complaining about the intolerable food situation that has been brought upon us by the utter stupidity or ignorance of Federal food officials. I know that I receive these letters in every mail and some of them eloquently present the facts.

I call to the attention of the Members of the House just such a letter which I have recently received from a man who operates a general merchandise store at an important cross-roads in my district. This man knows what he is writing about. He has been in business at that same location for 40 years. His knowledge is not based upon statistics and theories, but upon actual experience. Here is what he says:

Hon. T. A. JENKINS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: I have been thinking of writing you for quite a while about some of the conditions that we are confronting in regard to the Nation's food supplies. If something is not done in regard to these OPA regulations we all will be shorter in food supplies in 1946 than we are in 1945.

I want to mention the egg question first. The ceiling price on eggs is 34 cents, i. e. the price that I am to pay as a merchant; I cannot pay more. On the basis of this 34 cents price to the country poultry raisers, they are selling their flocks. We are all aware of the fact that poultry raisers cannot pay the present prices for egg mash, chick starter and grower, and put their eggs on the market at 34 cents per dozen. I am not getting enough eggs at the present time to supply my home customers, i. e., farmers who have sold their flocks and who are now buying their eggs for home consumption from the stores. There will be no chicks for next year. The chicken and egg production for 1946 will be worse than the present meat and lard supply. Can there not be something done with the ceiling price on eggs? During the last week I have only purchased in the neighborhood of eight dozen eggs. I have been in the general merchandise business for 40 years, dealing principally with farmers, but I have never experienced an egg shortage in all these 40 years of business.

Next, I mention the pork situation. A shortage of pigs in this section was never known before. You can now travel for miles without seeing a sow and pigs. Our mail carrier, who carries mail a distance of 18 miles, tells me that the sow and pigs that I myself have are the only pigs seen on his entire route. Where is our pork coming from for 1946? The price of feeds and the ceiling price on hogs will not justify breeders to raise them. There is only one male hog in this county that I know of. I have the only brood sow that I know of, and I do not intend to breed her any more. I had three but I put them to market. If I had kept them, bacon from them would have cost me 60 cents a pound. I have quit. So have others. There are no hogs in sight.

Next, I mention the sugar question. Fruits are ripe—berries, peaches, early apples—but there is no canning sugar to be had. No

one is canning. We are all aware of the fact that fruit canning without sugar is no good. I will venture to say that 50 percent of unsweetened fruits canned will spoil. Syrups are as scarce as sugar. If folks could get sugar and fill their cellars and basements we would not sell any canned fruits off our store shelves. In fact the canning factories could then sell all their output to meet Government needs as we merchants would have no use for canned goods. As long as canned goods can be purchased off the store shelves this canned fruit will be hoarded. Ceiling prices on it are fine but it is imposed on.

If something does not happen soon in regard to the above things, I fear we will face times that we have never faced before.

I want to mention the farming question. Farmers cannot pay the present price for farm labor and produce farm crops at the present prices. If I should operate my 80-acre farm and hire all the labor in raising grain, my harvest would not pay my men. I can take you at the present time—July 1945—to the northern part of our State and show you corn from the 1944 crop standing in the field unhusked, no good. Farmers lost their seed, lost their labor, and lost their crops. What encouragement has the farmer. Is there nothing that can be done? Old farmers are selling and leaving their farms. Fifty percent of the farms in this neighborhood are for sale. You are aware of the fact that the auditor of our county is selling farms at the present time for taxes. He is selling them daily at the courthouse. Farmers cannot produce enough grain and raise enough livestock at present prices and at the present cost of production to justify them to even try to farm any more. They cannot pay their taxes. There is nothing to do but let the farms go for taxes. If some action is not taken to relieve the present farming situation, no farming will be done.

Tom, if there is anything you can do to effect a change, it is high time now to strike. I am not overburdened with intelligence, but I have dealt with the public for 40 years in the general merchandise business. If you care to hear the attitude of folks in general, just visit a country store where folks gather or congregate and express opinions. Farming in the near future will be a thing of the past. High taxes, high labor, a poor season, low prices—all have discouraged the farming industry in this State.

You can make this public if you wish, but these are cold facts as they exist at this present time. Do something if you can.

Mr. Speaker, multiply this man's experience by tens of thousands of others, and you have an accurate picture of what we are facing. If the officials of OPA, WFA, and the other multitudinous Federal agencies having to do with food, would follow the counsels of men like this who face actual conditions every day of their lives, shortages of meat, sugar, lard, and laundry soap would be nonexistent.

A Most Creditable Journalistic Feat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, there was approving comment today among Members of Congress on a Victory Progress edition of the Indianapolis Recorder, copies of which they received here in the morning mail.

The Indianapolis Recorder is an outstanding Negro newspaper, published in my home city of Indianapolis. For many months it has had a capable staff engaged in collating from innumerable sources the material for this special edition. The result is an edition of monumental size and encyclopedic scope, which is a distinct credit to American journalism.

It was a pleasure to me to extend my congratulations to Marcus C. Stewart, editor of the Recorder, and I ask unanimous consent for the printing of my letter in the RECORD. It is as follows:

JULY 19, 1945.

MR. MARCUS C. STEWART,
Editor of the Indianapolis Recorder,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. STEWART: My eyes were given a genuine treat today when I received a copy of your "Victory Progress" edition. I had known, of course, that the Indianapolis Recorder was preparing to issue a notable special edition, but I had no idea of what the scope and magnitude of the finished product would be. As an old newspaperman I am, of course, familiar with special editions but I have never known a special edition which, in its conception and execution, surpassed the one you have just issued. It is a comprehensive and valuable compendium of information revealing the amazing progress of the Negro race and it is a credit to American achievement. Please accept my warm congratulations on this brilliant accomplishment.

Today I described your special edition to Dr. Luther H. Evans, the Librarian of Congress, and he said that if I will secure a copy for him he will add it to the permanent archives of the Library of Congress where it may be seen and consulted by the visitors to that great institution. If you will be so good as to send me another copy I will deliver it to Dr. Evans who will see that it is listed and catalogued among the Library's important collections.

With best wishes, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Memorial to the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial to the President of the United States:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Before the opening of the great conference where you will speak for the American people, we send you our best wishes and hopes for your success. We trust that the momentous questions facing the conference will be decided according to the principles of justice which you have eloquently expressed. In particular we refer to Poland.

Now that a new Polish Government has been organized in Moscow, it will be easy for the diplomats to say the issue is closed. We cannot take that view. In our opinion unless you exact concrete guaranties of truly free elections, the new Government will be no more independent than the Lublin regime, which was recognized as a puppet throughout the free world. The new Government contains 17 holdovers from that Lublin regime, with only 3 who belong to the London group, none of them being a member of the Polish Government which was our ally throughout the war.

By no stretch of the imagination can this be called an honest fulfillment even of the Yalta agreement, an agreement which was itself described by President Roosevelt as in some respects a disappointing compromise on the Polish question.

If Russia suceeds in imposing her will to this extent, despite the Yalta agreement, she will be encouraged to apply the same imperialistic methods to all central Europe and the Far East, with ultimate disaster to us all.

We are opposed to war with Russia. We have a profound respect for the Russian people and the military achievement of its army. We desperately hope that the San Francisco Charter will prove a success. But its objectives cannot be achieved if America closes its eyes to the destruction of the independence of a country which for 5 years fiercely resisted Nazi aggression. If we condone on the part of Russia what we condemned in Nazi Germany and Japan at the price of a million American casualties, the whole purpose of this war will have been lost.

Though Russia is a totalitarian state, there will be no war provided the leading democracies of the world are firm, united and just, in deeds as well as in words. But if they continue a foreign policy of weakness, hesitation and immoral compromise, despite our overwhelming power and prestige, then we fear for the future peace of the world and for democracy at home.

At the outset we wish to register a solemn protest against the so-called public trial of the 16 Polish patriots at Moscow. In our opinion the case of the 16 Poles involves a flagrant violation of human rights. As you said in San Francisco June 26: "The charter is dedicated to the observance of fundamental human rights and freedom. Unless we can obtain those objectives for all men everywhere—without regard to race, language, and religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security in the world." If the American Government remains silent when these rights are violated, we fear that the San Francisco Charter will become a hollow mockery.

Unlike the Lublin Poles, who were virtually unknown until the Russian occupation of Poland, these 16 Poles were leaders of the heroic Polish underground which fought German domination, and who now oppose Russian domination.

The identity of these Polish patriots, which the Gestapo had never been able to discover, was with their consent revealed by the Polish Government in London. Its purpose was the transmission of these names to the Soviet Government so that, in conformity with the pledges made at Yalta, the Russians could confer with bona fide leaders of the underground Polish political parties.

No better proof could have been offered of the desire of the democratic Poles, both inside and outside Poland, to negotiate an honest compromise than this voluntary disclosure of the underground leadership, at a time when the Soviet Government and its Lublin puppets were ruling Poland through terror and deporting patriots to Siberia. Charges of such deportations and executions have repeatedly been made, not only by the Polish underground but also by American and British prisoners of war returning from Nazi prison camps in Poland. In a fully documented article, the moderate London Economist of May 12 stated: "At the present time Poland is undergoing a process of virtual sovietization."

In inviting these 16 Polish leaders to confer with a representative of the Soviet high command, Colonel Pimenov, of the NKVD,

explicitly guaranteed their safe conduct. We quote from his letter:

"As an officer of the Red army who has been entrusted with such a highly important mission I guarantee to you on my word as an officer that from that moment your fate will be in my hands and that after your arrival at our quarters you will be absolutely safe."[1]

What followed is history. The mission disappeared. The Soviet Government refused all information about their fate. Not until May 3, 5 weeks after their disappearance, did Mr. Molotov, in response to urgent queries by Messrs. Stettinius and Eden in San Francisco, admit that they had been arrested for "diversionary activities against the Red Army."

As Foreign Minister Eden said at San Francisco: "Most of these men were just the type who should, in our view, have been consulted about the new National Government in Poland, if such a Government were to be truly representative of Polish democratic political life, in accordance with the Crimea decision."

These men were inaccessible to the Soviet authorities because of the wonderful organization of the Polish underground which, for 5 years, had defied the best efforts of the Gestapo to stamp it out. Hence it was necessary to lure them to a meeting.

We believe there is no reasonable doubt that these arrests and trials represent another in the long series of Soviet maneuvers to subjugate the Polish people by discrediting their leaders, if they cannot be deported or executed.

Whether these men were "processed" into confessing—as in the case of those who confessed at the Moscow trials of 1937 and 1938, we do not know. But we do know that after being held incommunicado for 2½ months, these Polish envoys were tried in the same courtroom, before the same judge and with the same legal procedures which were used in the famous purge trials. There was no jury and the defendants were not even allowed to call witnesses.

Another motive behind this trial is evidenced by its timing to coincide with a conference a few blocks away on broadening the Lublin Government, as required by the Yalta agreement. Obviously, the mere staging of this show trial made Mikolajczyk and Stanczyk, the London Poles who had come to negotiate, fear that unless they accepted the Russian terms in these negotiations, the 16 Polish compatriots would be shot.

How well this blackmail worked is indicated by the following facts: The ratio of the new Polish cabinet which emerged from these negotiations is 2 members of the London group, plus 1 adherent in Poland just released from a Russian jail, to 17 Lublinites. Mr. Thugutt, a leader of the Peasant Party in London, was appointed but refused to join the new government. Moreover, Mr. Stanczyk has been dismissed from the Socialist Party and Mr. Mikolajczyk is only second vice premier, not even a member of the presidential council. The only non-Lublin members of this council—Witos and Grabski—both in the high 70's, were too old and too ill even to participate in recent negotiations.

The new unity cabinet, therefore, represents only part of the Peasant Party plus the Communist Party, whose prewar strength in Poland was less than 2 percent of the vote. Hence this new government is bound to be just as much the prisoner of the Kremlin as are the imprisoned envoys, who should have been among its ministers—the more so because the civil servants are holdovers from the Lublin puppet regime and because the Russian Army still occupies Poland with the help of the Russian-officered Lublin Army.

Under these circumstances, what confidence can we have that the Yalta promise of "free, unfettered elections" in which "democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part" will be fulfilled. Almost anyone, in whatever country, who criticizes Russia's demands is branded as a Fascist by the Soviet press, so it is easy to believe that any such person would be disqualified from participation in the forthcoming election.

Moreover, to carry out the Yalta promise of free elections in Poland (or other liberated countries) without obtaining the return of the vast numbers who have been forcibly removed, would make these elections a tragic farce even if the elections when finally held were really free, an impossible hope unless there is joint Allied supervision in all of Poland.

If we fail to secure the right of political prisoners, deportees, and soldiers of the Polish Army to return, if they wish, with joint guaranties of personal safety, then this Polish "solution" will have put a premium on murder and terror. It will be an election won not by ballots but by bullets, hostages, and concentration camps.

It is too late now to restore the dead. But it is not too late to use every ounce and every penny of our diplomatic and economic power to save the lives and liberties of those in Poland we are pledged to protect, not only by the Atlantic Charter but at Yalta.

Consequently we respectfully urge the adoption of the following measures at the forthcoming conference, for only such measures will inspire confidence in either the justice or the permanence of the Polish solution:

1. The release of the 12 Poles convicted in the recent trials.

2. Big Three agreement as to the terms of a fair election law which would insure the members of all democratic parties the right to vote (including those deported or exiled from their country) which would guarantee freedom of speech and the press to the opposition parties, and which would provide for the international supervision of the next election.

3. The withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland before the election. If Russia is unwilling to do so, then the joint occupation of Poland by Russian, American, and British troops during the electoral period. This is in accordance with the Moscow declaration of November 1, 1943, which declared that the Big Three "after the termination of hostilities * * * will not employ their military forces within the territory of other states except for the purposes envisaged in this declaration and after joint consultation."

4. The right of correspondents, and representatives of the American Red Cross and other charitable organizations, freely to circulate in Poland and other Soviet-occupied territories upon the same terms as we allow Soviet journalists and other agents to circulate in countries under our control.

5. The application of such "concert" principles accepted in the Yalta declaration not only to Poland but to all other countries, such as Greece, where a single great power is in dominant control as a result of recent military operations.

We respectfully submit, Mr. President, that the friendship of the Soviet Union that we all seek in the interests of lasting peace cannot be obtained as long as getting along with Russia means concessions on trivial issues by Soviet Russia and concessions on basic issues by the United States. We believe in Big Three unity, but we are convinced that it can survive only on the basis of commonly accepted moral principles. They are the only principles which will remove the suspicion and fear of Russian policy which disturbs not only the peoples of Eastern Europe but the people of America.

With full appreciation of the heavy burden you bear, we, nevertheless, feel obliged to state our profound conviction, borne out by the tragic history of the past 10 years, that a policy of one-sided appeasement of totalitarianism can lead only to disillusionment, frustration, and grave peril to the American people.

Respectfully yours,

William Agar, ex-vice-president of Freedom House; Luigi Antonini, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; Lliiott V. Bell, New York State superintendent of banking; Robert R. Bradford, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts; Harvey W. Brown, president, International Association of Machanists; Raymond Leslie Buell, former chairman, Foreign Policy Association; John Chamberlain, author; George Creel; Frank R. Crosswaith, chairman of Negro Labor Committee; John Dewey; Christopher Emmet, commentator; Milton J. Ferguson, librarian, Brooklyn Library; Mrs. George Fitch, writer; the Reverend George B. Ford, Catholic chaplain, Columbia University; Varian Fry, editor of Common Sense; the Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., president of Fordham University; Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College; Emily Hahn, author; Ross Hoffman, professor of history, Fordham University; the Honorable Herbert Hoover; Katherine Gauss-Jackson, associate editor of Harper's; the Reverend John LaFarge, editor of America; Suzanne LaFollette, author and editor; Alfred M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas; Isaac Don Levine, author; Sol Levitas, the New Leader; Prof. Robert MacIver, Columbia University; Former Justice Jeremiah T. Mahoney; Sidney Moseley, commentator, Mutual Broadcasting System; Martin J. Quigley, publisher; A. Philipp Randolph, president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Burton Rascoe, drama critic, New York World-Telegram; the Reverend Sturgis Lee Riddle, the Churchman Associates; Justice Francis E. Rivers; Benjamin Stolberg, author; Oswald Garrison Villard; Louis Waldman, attorney; Michael Williams, special editor of The Commonweal; Matthew Wool, vice president of American Federation of Labor; W. E. Woodward, author of Tom Paine; William Green, president, American Federation of Labor; Hugh Gibson, former United States Ambassador to Poland; Ferdinand Pecora, judge, New York Court of Appeals; Harry Sherman, Book of the Month Club.

[1] The original of this letter is in the possession of the Polish Government in London.

The FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four short articles by Lowell Mellett, published on

different dates in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of July 3, 1945]

"ON THE OTHER HAND"—THINKS SOUTHERN STATESMEN SHOULD NOT LEAVE PROBLEM TO BILBOS AND EASTLANDS

(By Lowell Mellett)

In the course of a raw filibuster against taking any vote on the FEPC bill, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, made a frank effort the other day to indict the whole Negro race. He succeeded instead in indicting a whole section of the United States. That is to say, if the premise on which he sought to indict the American Negro were true, the Senator made a completely convincing case against the South's treatment of the Negro.

The Senator dwelt at length on what he called the history of the Negro soldier in the American Army. He reported that he had talked with "numerous high-ranking generals," whom he did not name, and that he found them to be in agreement with his opinion that as soldiers the Negroes are just no good. Composing as they do one-twelfth of the whole Army, that statement goes for them all, according to the Senator. The fact that General Eisenhower, who also, no doubt, has talked to numerous "high-ranking generals," holds an entirely different view was not mentioned by the Senator.

He established to his own satisfaction that the Negro soldiers "had no initiative, no sense of responsibility, very low intelligence, and were a failure." Whether he established this to the satisfaction of the two or three weary fellow Senators who composed his entire audience on the floor, there was no indication. But he obviously did not persuade the well-filled galleries, for a spontaneous outburst of laughter greeted his assertion, "I am not prejudiced against the Negro."

WHO'S TO BLAME

Assuming that Senator EASTLAND states the truth, that General Eisenhower does not, and that the Negro soldier has no initiative and no sense of responsibility, can the blame be placed entirely on that soldier? Can the South, which has determined to a large degree the conditions of the Negro's life, the extent to which he has been permitted to develop initiative and responsibility, escape a considerable share of the blame? Has not the Senator actually brought in an indictment against the manner in which he and his neighbors have handled the great problem that came to this country aboard the slave ships, a problem not solved by the bloodiest civil war in history?

And if this is so, is it not time that the best men in the South begin to recognize the fact, to recognize that the course that has been followed is not the one that will bring a solution? Southern statesmanship is not confined to the Bilbos and Eastlands, yet one might easily believe it is all of one piece if he reads the list of Senators voting to support the position taken by the Mississippi spokesmen.

Under the stress of war's necessity a small beginning has been made toward solving this problem, serious now and likely to become desperate soon. It was decreed at the war's outset that there should be no discrimination against any war worker because of his color or race or religion. One must believe either that this is right or that there should be discrimination. The Bilbos and Eastlands and other frightened little men definitely do believe there should be discrimination, but it is hard to conceive that this is true of the Georges, the Connally's and others who are, right at this time, contributing their full share to an enlightened world policy; hard to believe that they share in this wretched distortion of our own democratic ideal here at home.

TRAGIC PERIOD THREATENS

The most tragic period in American history was brought on by the stubborn conviction held by some people in the South that this Nation could exist half slave and half free. Another tragic period is bearing down upon us as surely as the sun rises and sets, unless southern statesmanship opens its mind to this problem.

If it will put in some of the same good thinking it has given recently to our world problems (and some of the same ingenuity) it has given to the circumvention of the United States Constitution during the past 80 years), southern statesmanship should be able to provide a solution that will forestall another period of bloody civil strife.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of July 5, 1945]

"ON THE OTHER HAND"—SAYS SENATE'S SUBMISSION TO FILIBUSTERS PUTS AUGUST BODY IN IGNOMINIOUS LIGHT

(By Lowell Mellett)

A filibuster or filibusterer, says the dictionary, is: 1, a freebooter or robber; 2, a military adventurer who engages in irregular warfare in a foreign country; 3, a member of a lawmaking body who intentionally delays legislation by dilatory tactics, especially by talking to consume time.

To make the definition complete, the dictionary says a freebooter is one who roves about for plunder or pillage unsanctioned by a declared state of war; a buccaneer or pirate.

The United States Senate submits ignominiously to the filibuster. Whenever a legislative freebooter, pirate, robber, or buccaneer, working alone or in a small band, chooses to make the Senate stand and deliver, the Senate stands and delivers. This craven spectacle was witnessed last week when the two Senators from Mississippi, BILBO and EASTLAND, undertook the pirate's role as a means of defeating the very small appropriation needed to carry on the work of the FEPC till the end of the war. The two Senators opposed the appropriation. A majority of the Senate favored it. Yet, the majority sat in seeming helplessness while the freebooters had their way.

SOMETHING PRECIOUS

Not a Member of the Senate but was aware of the humiliating nature of the proceedings; not a Member but know there was a way out of the situation if the Senate chose to take it. Under the Senate's own rules a limit can be put on the length of time any Member may talk on the subject under consideration. The votes of two-thirds of the Members, however, are required to invoke this rule and it is rare that that many votes can be found.

The reason given is that the Senators consider their general rule of unlimited debate to be something precious, something essential to the process of democratic government. The House has no such rule, nor does any other important parliamentary body in the world. Why the Senate clings to it is beyond the understanding of anybody not a Senator. It could be, of course, that, as little as he likes to see any other member obtain what he wants by making himself a nuisance, each Senator feels that he may on some future occasion desire to use the holdup weapon himself. But most Senators say they never would be guilty.

It can't be that they take any pride in the performance, which, after all, has about the same dignity as a determined little boy, kicking and screaming on the floor in the midst of a tea party, with mother pretending it is merely amusing and guests joining in the pretense while wishing mother would take the little boy outside and do the obvious.

LACK COURAGE

Yet, the Senate, calling itself the greatest deliberative body in the world, never has had the courage to reform its own method of operating, nor the courage to say that deliberation shall not become deliberate obstruction.

No Senator really has need for the rule of unlimited debate. No Senator is so full of wisdom on any conceivable subject that he cannot release it all in the course of a couple of hours, and certainly few are eloquent enough to hold the close attention of their colleagues for longer than that. And, in any event, it would always be possible for the Senate to grant a Member additional time, of its own volition, if it wished to hear more from him.

The rule of unlimited debate, the rule that permits one Member to make himself dictator for a day, the rule that defeats majority rule, simply does not make sense. If it ever did, it does not now with the amount of business of vital importance confronting the United States Senate, business that should not be left at any time to the mercy of any one or two obstinate obstructionists.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of July 7, 1945]

"ON THE OTHER HAND"—SAYS UNITED STATES SENATE SHOULD BE WATCHFUL WHEN UNFETTERED POLES GO TO THE POLLS

(By Lowell Mellett)

If it's agreeable to Senators BILBO and EASTLAND, the United States Senate should begin paying a little active attention to what is going on in Poland. The Poles, as you know, are operating at the moment under a makeshift government which is not satisfactory to all Members of our Senate. This state of affairs will end when there has been time to hold a "free and unfettered" election, under the watchful supervision of the Allied Governments, as provided by the Yalta agreement.

Our Senate should be more watchful than anybody. It should make certain that they don't get away with any undemocratic monkeyshines over there in Poland. This certainly is the desire of all Americans who wish to see the full beauty of our democratic system extended to less enlightened nations. Our Senators must not be satisfied with anything in Poland less perfect than we have here at home.

Already, however, the grapevine is carrying disquieting rumors from that newly liberated land, rumors indicating that the rights of minorities are not being properly protected. The center of complaint appears to be a province called Mississippsky. Certain of the Mississippskians have their own ideas concerning the kind of democracy they want and they are determined to have their way even if they have to fight the war all over again.

PROPOSE POLL TAX

For one thing, these Mississippskians intend that only members of the master race shall vote.

To make sure of this they propose that the ballot shall be given only to persons with light complexions and straight hair and, among these, only to those who have paid what they call a pole tax, which is very much like the poll or head tax used for the same purpose in some American provinces.

Anticipating that some citizens with dark complexious and curly hair may pay the Pole tax and show up at the voting places, the leaders of this movement for minority rights have devised further safeguards for the sancity of the ballot. Persons of the wrong complexion will be required to take what is called an education test. They will be asked to recite the new Polish constitution backwards. The fact that the constitution hasn't

yet been written, will give you some notion of the political genius possessed by the Mississippsky master race.

But that isn't all. If by some strange mischance one of the outlawed citizens should demonstrate his ability to recite the unwritten constitution backwards, then the election board will give him the grandfather test. That means simply that the would-be voter must prove that his grandfather had a right to vote. Since there wasn't any voting in grandfather's day, you can see how that will work.

LUNG POWER TICKET

Leading this battle for a better and brighter democracy in Mississippsky are said to be two probable candidates for the Polish senate, name of Bilblowoff and Eastwind. They will run on what is known as the Lung Power ticket.

Members of the United States Senate can readily see what an asset two men like Bilblowoff and Eastwind would be to the Polish senate. And they can appreciate the principle involved—the principle of the minority's right to make a mess of anything the majority may wish to do. Our Senate has nurtured this right so carefully and for so many years that its devotion to the principle cannot be mistaken. Along with every other good thing in our system they will wish to see the Poles have the benefit of the legislative filibuster, and Bilblowoff and Eastwind apparently are the men with the necessary lung power to make it work.

So it behooves our Senators to listen carefully to all the rumors that waft this way from Poland and to be prepared to start admonishing the people of that almost unfettered land if they show signs of becoming un-American. Any disposition on the part of the Poles to put majority rights on a par with minority rights should be stamped out before it becomes a habit.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of July 10, 1945]

"ON THE OTHER HAND"—HANNEGAN SEES A BIG DARK CLOUD ON POLITICAL HORIZON, SAYS WRITER

(By Lowell Mellett)

The one man watching present happenings on the Hill with greatest apprehension is Democratic National Chairman Hannegan. He is thinking of 1946 and beyond that, 1948. First, of course, comes '46; if the Democrats fail to hold their majority in Congress in that election their prospects for '48 are likely to be too slim to contemplate. Aside from the fact that the loss of the off-year election in the past has meant the loss of the following Presidential election, there is a special reason for expecting that result this time.

The Democrats will have been in office for 14 years. In that many years, many, many things will have been done by Government officials and agencies that offer opportunity for investigation. Conditions in this country before the war caused the development of Federal Government activities on an unprecedented scale and the war itself has multiplied those activities several times over. If Congress after '46 should be Republican, it will be an investigating Congress, devoting itself enthusiastically to shocking revelations calculated to create a national urge to throw the rascals out.

HANNEGAN UNDERSTANDS

Mr. Hannegan understands this. Being a practical politician, that is the line he would take if he were directing the Republican strategy and he expects nothing different from the Republican management in case it obtains control of Congress.

So Hannegan isn't viewing the situation on the Hill with any great happiness. There he can see one group of Democrats chopping away at its own party's prospects while the Republicans look on with carefully controlled pleasure. The group is the one which has set itself to destroy the Fair Employment Practice Committee, created by President Roosevelt to protect Negroes and other racial minorities against discrimination in wartime employment. The FEPC having succeeded fairly well, with nothing but moral authority behind it, Mr. Roosevelt sought to have it made a permanent, statutory agency. The same element now opposing the FEPC prevented the inclusion in the 1944 platform of a pledge to make it permanent—a pledge given in the Republican platform.

President Truman, a supporter of the FEPC as Senator, has continued his support as President. He has put considerable pressure, publicly and privately, on the rule-or-ruin group now barring the way to any action. The private pressure has been in Mr. Hannegan's hands.

DEBATABLE SUBJECT

Whether the Roosevelt-Truman ticket could have been elected last November without the votes of northern Negroes may be debatable, but Mr. Hannegan doesn't like to face the task of winning without those votes in 1946. That plus all the other uncertainties of an off-year election makes just too much. He wants to take the issue out of the coming campaign. But a stubborn majority in the House Rules Committee and a similar majority in the House Appropriations Committee has thus far refused to listen to reason. And over on the Senate side Mr. Hannegan finds an equal lack of comfort. Those Senators who filibustered the appropriation for FEPC into its present hapless shape, are keeping their lungs well oiled, prepared to repeat the performance.

Cheered by practically all other aspects of the political situation, confident that Truman can hold the popularity won by his obvious high purpose and his shrewd good sense, Mr. Hannegan's hopes slump as he considers the damage being done on the Hill. Against the otherwise bright political horizon he sees a dark cloud rising, a cloud much larger than a man's hand. He doesn't have to be told that in every congressional district containing Negro votes, a Republican rain-making machine is being fashioned to work on that cloud.

Sea-Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by me, published in the July number of Sea Power, entitled "Sea-Air Power."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEA-AIR POWER

(By DAVID I. WALSH, United States Senator from Massachusetts, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Naval Affairs)

Before we try to look ahead and visualize the world of the future, we should study the past and attempt to ascertain the basic errors made by the great civilizations of the past which disintegrated and disappeared. We should attempt to eliminate these errors in formulating our plans for the future welfare of our country.

From a military-naval point of view we should attempt to find answers to the following questions:

What armed forces should be maintained in the future to insure that our Nation will not be invaded or conquered by an alien foe?

What steps should be taken to establish and maintain our right to free competitive access to world markets and world sources of raw materials, in order that we may export the excess products of our mines, factories, and farms in exchange for essential raw materials which cannot be grown or produced economically within our own borders?

What should be the nature and structure of our Military Establishment to assist other peace-loving nations most effectively in preventing a third world war?

From the dawn of history to the present time, sea power has played a dominant role in the building up, and the perpetuation of, the great civilizations of the past. It was sea power that gave the Phoenicians command of the ancient maritime world. It was sea power that built up the far-flung empire of Carthage. Sea power made Athens ruler of vast territories and made ancient Rome master of the civilized world. When Spain had great sea power she dominated Christendom, and her decline began when storms and British seamanship wrecked the Great Armada. British sea power was an important element in building up the empire "upon which the sun never sets."

UNION OF POWERS

Air power has come of age quite recently, and an effective union of sea and air power has made possible our victories in the present war. It was British sea power which halted Hitler's legions at the channel ports, despite the overwhelming superiority of the Luftwaffe. It was British and American sea-air power which enabled our armed forces to land in Africa, on the beaches at Salerno and Normandy, to liberate Italy and France, and made it possible to supply our armies in their victorious march into Germany. It was American sea-air power which saved Australia, made possible the capture of Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and the landing of American troops in the Philippines. American cities have not been bombed and our industries destroyed because our enemies have not been able to control the sea or secure air bases located within bombing distance of our shores. Nearly everyone is agreed that it will be American and British sea-air power which will eventually enable us to defeat Japan.

An evaluation of these past experiences would seem to indicate that the prosperity and security of the United States in the postwar period will depend upon how effectively we are able to maintain and operate our sea-air power. It would seem also that one of the most effective contributions we can make to world peace is the maintenance of our sea-air forces in a modern and up-to-date condition.

Ships and planes are not the only elements in sea-air power. The striking power of our ships and planes can be multiplied many-fold by providing suitable bases where they may be repaired, resupplied with fuel and ammunition, and where the crews may obtain the necessary rest and recreation. To apply maximum power in a given area we must have bases in that area with auxiliary bases eading back to our main source of supply—our homeland. Without adequate bases in a given area, the strength of ships and planes, and the number available for active service, is seriously reduced. To maintain our strength, the building of ships and planes is not the entire answer—we must have adequate bases. In the postwar period it will be necessary to reduce radically our expenditures for military purposes. For greatest strength in proportion to money

available, we must strike a balance between our land forces and ships, planes, and bases.

At the end of the present war, each nation will face many unique problems. It is almost a certainty that Germany and Japan will be deprived of the means of accumulating the necessary raw materials to build up their armed forces. Their most pressing problems will be to supply themselves with food and reeducate themselves to become peace-abiding members of society.

Russia will face the problem of repairing the destruction suffered during the war. She has an abundance of raw materials and will undoubtedly continue her efforts to become more industrialized and self-contained. She has no great ice-free ports or outlets to the sea, although she may obtain additional outlets in the Baltic and the Far East. She will not be in a position to employ sea power effectively and is not particularly vulnerable to it. Her expanse of territory is so great and her industries so scattered that it would be almost impossible to do her great harm by strategical bombing. Her interests lie predominantly on the continent of Eurasia, and it seems probable that she will maintain large land armies to dominate this area.

Great Britain has not a large supply of raw materials in her homeland, although she has immense resources in her overseas colonies and possessions. She is extremely vulnerable to both sea and air power. She is able to exercise sea and air power effectively, as she has island bases strategically located all over the world. It is quite possible that she will continue to build up and trade with her overseas empire, and will use sea-air power to protect her interests. One of her most difficult problems will be to defend the British Isles against aircraft launched from the continent.

Our own situation today is not similar in all respects to that of any other nation. We are not menaced by large land armies from across our frontiers. Aircraft based upon the continents of Europe or Asia are not a serious menace. Our homes and industries are not subject to aircraft attack as long as we maintain command of the seas and control the necessary overseas bases. We are the greatest industrial nation in the world. We are almost, but not quite, self-sufficient in essential raw materials. If we consider differences, as well as similarities, we find that the United States is in a unique position today and the only major nation in the world which is in a position to rely chiefly upon sea-air power for defense.

A considerable number of people believe that aircraft have made all other weapons of war obsolete. The facts, as of today, are that a combination of sea power and air power, plus our industrial might, has made it possible for our armies to defeat Germany and will enable them to defeat Japan.

We need not adhere to a Maginot Line mentality and believe the facts will always remain the same. Instead we should realize that the only constant is change and that it is necessary to change our ideas, our plans, and the structure and organization of our armed forces to bring them into a correct relationship with emergency scientific developments and new methods. At some time in the future, the energy of the atom may become available for destructive purposes. Robot bombs or some other new weapon may revolutionize warfare, but that time has not yet arrived. In the meantime we should base our plans for the future on a correct evaluation of past experiences.

If we face the facts realistically, I am convinced that we need not adopt a totalitarian philosophy, import European ideas, and adopt alien methods. We need not regiment our peoples, maintain a large standing army, spend excessive funds on our military establishments, and eventually revert to some form of despotism as old as human history. If we face the facts realistically, I am convinced we can continue to make progress under our free democratic institutions and procedures, and attain security and prosperity by employing sea-air power not only in our own defense and interests but also to enforce any commitments which we may make to a world organization in an effort to maintain the peace.

Preservation of Freedom in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Salt Lake City Deseret News of June 29, 1945, commenting upon an address delivered in Salt Lake City by former Postmaster General James A. Farley.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHOING THE SENTIMENTS OF "BIG JIM"

The other day, a man made a speech in Salt Lake City. The event was noteworthy for several reasons.

First, the man was James A. Farley, who once was postmaster general and Democratic national chairman, and who still is a leader among party Democrats.

"Big Jim," as his thousands of friends call him, is still news. He is an affable character and has been termed by many observers as one of the best political organizers of our time.

What Farley said is another reason why the event was noteworthy. He made a new impassionate appeal to preserve freedom in America.

It has been said that this newspaper is pro-Republican and that only Republicans rate favorable comment in its editorial columns. But we agreed with what James Farley said the other day. We commend him for saying it. And we would have you remember that he is a Democrat, and that he is recognized as a leader in this party. It is what men do and say, not what party they belong to, that interests us.

Explaining that he has traveled often in every State of the Union, Mr. Farley set himself up as a competent witness of Americanism, and then said: "I believe it has been my privilege to have sensed the spirit which makes this land great."

In one word, the former Democratic chairman summed up all the definitions of Americanism and labeled the underlying force, the inner power, the spirit which is singular to our Nation. That word is "freedom."

"Freedom is the very breath of America, its very life * * * to me, freedom and Americanism are synonymous."

He credited our form of government as the source of the individual freedom "under which five generations of our people have leaped through stages of progress to achieve standards that have astonished the world."

He asked those who believe our progress is due to our natural resources to remember that South America, Russia, India, and Africa have as great, if not greater shares of the world's goods. He reminded those who believe that our progress is due to our national characteristics that recently we have come from all the nations of the world.

"I say to you as solemnly and sincerely as I know how that the roots of our phenomenal growth are due to the freedom upon which our forefathers built this Government * * * our freedom which, under God, all Americans must cherish jealously if we are to continue the growth that has been ours through the years and if we are to enjoy the blessings of peace," he insisted.

Answering those who argue that since the authoritarian government works so well in waging war, it should be employed to promote prosperity in peace, Mr. Farley quoted President Wilson, who just a few weeks after the last World War said:

"So far as our domestic affairs are concerned, the problem of our return to peace is a problem of economic and industrial readjustment * * * our people do not wait to be coached and led. They know their own business, are quick and resourceful at every readjustment, definite in purpose, and self-reliant in action. Any leading strings we might seek to put them in would speedily become hopelessly tangled because they would pay no attention to them and go on their own way."

Commenting, Mr. Farley said, "We could demonstrate no greater attachment to Americanism than to lend our support to that Wilsonian doctrine at the conclusion of this war." Then he concluded:

"You and I know that when our servicemen return, they will be in no mood to accept excuses. They will have seen totalitarianism at its worst; they will want to find Americanism at its best. Yes, they are going to want jobs and we shall provide them, but there is something dearer to the American serviceman. That is America itself, as he knew it and as he left it. In securing the first we must, therefore, not compromise the second. We must stay within the framework of democracy and its basic principles of liberty, justice, and equality for all."

East Indian Immigration Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials on East Indian immigration quotas:

[From the New York Times of February 10, 1944]

IN JUSTICE TO INDIA

One of the undeniable achievements of the present Congress was the repeal last year of the Chinese Exclusion Acts and the modification of other statutes prohibiting the immigration of Chinese and their admission to citizenship. The long heroism of the Chinese people, our comrades in war, prompted this retraction. * * *

Another ancient people, the people of India, is still subject to our taboo. Indian soldiers, mighty good soldiers too, have fought for us in Burma and north Africa. * * * In land operations against the Japanese in southeastern Asia their aid will be of great value. Are the Indians not entitled to ask, as they are asking, no longer to be excluded from entry into the United States and from American citizenship? * * *

The removal of a mark justly offensive to their pride and self-respect will be not merely testimony of our gratitude for their armed aid but a matter of justice and equality of treatment. We have lifted the bars for the Chinese. We can afford to do the same for

the Indians. We can't afford to do otherwise.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 14, 1945]

IN FAIRNESS TO AN ALLY

The House Immigration Committee yesterday completed its hearings upon the bill which would make nationals of India eligible for citizenship and thereby admit them as immigrants under the small Indian quota of about 100 a year. The bill has been introduced by statesmen as various as Senators BALL and CAPPER and Representatives CELLER and CLARE LUCE. It is supported by the State Department; President Roosevelt has sent a letter advocating it. * * *

Like the recent act in similar terms which removed the stigma of exclusion from our Chinese allies, this bill, without materially altering the structure of our immigration system, would recognize Indians as full partners in the great effort upon which all free nations are now embarked. It would help usefully to undermine Japanese pan-Asiatic propaganda.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 17, 1945]

JUSTICE TO AN ALLY

It is appropriate that reports of the part played by Indian soldiers in the current Allied successes in Burma should coincide with renewed efforts by President Roosevelt and members of Congress to obtain passage of legislation which would allow East Indians to enter the United States and become citizens. There always has been considerable doubt as to the justice of the law excluding Indian nationals from American shores. Now it actually is incongruous in view of the acceptance of India as an important ally.

India's troops, the largest volunteer army of any country, have fought on several fronts. Her navy, 20 times as strong as at the outset of the war, has been in action all over the Seven Seas. Her factories have been producing in quantity more than 45,000 different classes of articles required by the Allied armies. And her air force, risen from 200 to 27,000, has just had bestowed on it the title of Royal Indian Air Force in honor of its achievements.

Surely, the United States should remove the stigma it has placed on this ally, at least to the extent of admitting 75 East Indians a year, which would be about the number permitted under the quota system.

United Nations Conference on International Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, in the United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco, a great issue was fought and won. It was an issue in which the American people were vitally interested. Should the peace that we are securing under the San Francisco Charter be one that would freeze the political, social, and economic status of the depressed areas of the world? Or should it be a peace that would mean the dawn of a new day for 600,000,000 inarticulate people the world over? We fought for freedom. We won. Under unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks, I include therein the addresses I delivered during the deliberations of the Conference to show how the Philippine delegation, of which I had the honor to be the chairman, took its stand on this fundamental question:

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES AND CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, DELIVERED AT THE FOURTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE APRIL 28, 1945

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, let us make this floor the last battlefield.

We are here to determine whether the human race is going to exist or whether it is to be wiped out in another world holocaust. Those among us who have watched the death agony of great cities, those among us who come from the fox holes of battle fronts, have no illusions as to what another war will do to all men. This may be our last opportunity to achieve peace. We are here to fight for our lives.

As one from the troubled Pacific, let me impress upon you that unless all men of good will act now and together—unless we are determined in this Conference to achieve our goal—we are but preparing the setting for another world cataclysm. If we fail, we may find ourselves in another global war, with the Pacific as its maelstrom. Peace to be an actuality must be based on the recognition of the problems that affect human dignity. We have seen the ultimate achievement of aggression in the human bonfires of Manila and Essen. These living torches lighted the road back to savagery; no, beyond a savagery we never dreamed human beings could be capable of reaching. It is impossible for minds to grasp the monstrous agony of these things. The charred bones of men, women, and children that are now being shoveled under German and Philippine earth—they are war. They are what would be in these very streets if the advantage of Pearl Harbor had been pressed and the Rising Sun flew today over this building and this city.

We know how much is being unleashed against us who are seeking to achieve a decent medium of world existence without war. We are all aware that Japan and Germany are joined in their fears and their hopes for our failure, and that their skulking protagonists elsewhere are aiding their fears and their hopes that we may not succeed. They are the haters and the degraders, and they are willing us to fail. But why should we fail? Why should peace be impractical? Why should humanity again betray itself?

Words and ideas are more powerful than guns in the defense of human dignity. Treaties are stronger than armamented boundaries. The only impregnable line is that of human understanding.

We are well aware that international understanding must rest on practical security, and that the economic structure of the world must determine the balance between nations. But of more lasting importance is the spiritual structure.

Technicalities can be ironed out. The wise and the shrewd of all lands can come to an understanding. Business and commerce can agree, or let us say that they can be made to agree, but the human pattern cannot be forced, and its settlement cannot be delayed. For it must be determined or another war will wipe us and our bickerings and our misunderstandings from the face of the earth. Unless we can agree, we will return to the dust, for we have failed as men.

In every human being is the craving and the right for recognition. In every normal human is the longing for peace. One of the oldest prayers in the human heart is this: "Let us have peace." The mountain of man's progress is great and terrible, and they who climb must adjust their pace to the weakest or the entire chain of climbers will go down. Until the weakest link in our human chain is made safe, not one of us is safe. We must determine here and now this basic pattern of understanding that will insure world security.

We have seen in this way how effectively boundaries and nationalities and racial division have been forgotten while achieving a common stand against a common enemy. In the ultimate effort to save our lives it is the shared understanding that matters, and not the heritage of blood or country.

Today, 1,000,000,000 oriental faces are turned pleadingly toward us for recognition of their human rights. It is their hope and their prayer that the peace which this Conference is seeking to secure is one that will not neglect the uplift and development of all socially and economically depressed areas and peoples but one that will help raise them to a plane of living where they can become not merely bystanders but effective collaborators in the promotion of human welfare and advancement. Theirs is the plea, my fellow delegates, that such a peace may not be appropriated for the purpose of freezing the political, economic, and social order of that part of the world.

May I pause here to pay tribute to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the staunch defender of the human rights of these millions—a man who died an American, but whose grave is the world—the peerless leader who gave new meaning to our lives in the Far East because he was the champion not only of the forgotten man of his own Nation, but of the forgotten man everywhere in the world. We turn our reverential thoughts to him today with a very deep sense of loss, because to us of the United Nations he is the symbol of all the ideals for which we are fighting in this war; and his passing away at this time deprives us of his guidance and inspiration. We find consolation and strength in the assurance that in Harry S. Truman, his worthy successor, his spirit marches on.

Paramount in Asia today is the remembrance of past hopelessness. Sections of our world are festering with resentments that will obstruct the way to peace unless they are brought out into the open and cleared away. We must give ourselves tolerance. We must ask what gave birth to these resentments and hatreds. We must ask why they are there. And we must answer these questions frankly before we can wipe away these erosions of distrust.

This can and must be done. True, this is not a conference to frame a peace treaty. But our words and actions here can outline a future pattern that can serve for all the small nations of the world—a pattern that can be the working basis for world communal living—a pattern that will set the peace. In this plan, the terms under which the individual nations have set their manner of living must adjust themselves to the needs of the peace; power must become pliable. Each nation must be prepared to contribute its share of effort and its share of yielding. In this civilized family first one member and then another gives in or yields a little and by these small submissions they gain everything in pride and protection.

In this past war, heroic efforts have been spent in a nobility and sacrifice we pray may never be required again. Men of all nations have shown their ability to sacrifice and to die. Now—now—is the time to show our ability to sacrifice and to live. For without mutual sacrifice now, we will only live to die.

There is a pattern to study and dissect. It is one of the spirit, of what we must call the human soul. In our hands is the tremendous responsibility to preserve the

human race, or to condemn it to certain doom. Here—here—on this testing ground, cannot the victorious say: Let us come out of our strength and our power. Let us yield to these others; let us be prepared to share our power and our opinion that victory may be sure. Our aim must be tolerance, for victory can be preserved only with tolerance. We will sign here our death warrant for the future unless we show our willingness for giving and not for grasping, a capacity for understanding and not for clinging to the set determination that has undone the past, and the ability to meet on the common earth of understanding, the littlest nation and the littlest man.

This war has given us a new yardstick by which to judge the stature of nations. Nations are no longer judged by their size, by their wealth, or by their population. In the darkest hour for civilization in Europe, 8,000,000 Greeks, in number insignificant, their country, in size, inconsequential, because they refused to give in to the demands of Italy, because as worthy descendants of the heroes of Thermopylae they stood their ground and refused to surrender their principles and ideals, the Mediterranean Sea did not become a German sea.

Because of this stubborn Greek resistance, our Allied forces were able to invade North Africa from where German bombers could have been based to attack the Atlantic seaboard; the Greeks prevented the junction of the forces of Hitler and Mussolini, and thus they saved civilization in its blackest hour in Europe, for you as well as for me. That was in Europe.

In the Pacific, let us review the events of the recent past. Let us recall how nations in that section of the globe collapsed one after another before the Japanese onslaught. And it was desperate indeed for civilization in the Pacific. But a handful of 9,000 American soldiers—side by side with 75,000 loyal Filipino troops—stood their ground in Bataan, and they held at bay 300,000 Japanese troops and 500 Japanese planes that at that time could have been used for an outright invasion of Australia. We resisted in the Philippines. We held. We fought—18,000,000 loyal Filipinos. In the words of Chief of Staff George C. Marshall, of the United States Army, later confirmed and substantiated by that great Australian leader, Prime Minister Curtin, those 4 months that we resisted the Japanese in Bataan and Corregidor gave the United Nations time to prepare in Australia. When the fate of civilization in the Pacific was in the balance, 18,000,000 Filipinos, insignificant in number, their country a mere dot on the map, helped to save that civilization, for you as well as for me.

In Athens, the ancient Greeks sculptured the goddess who brought them victory as an angel with clipped wings (Nike Apteros) because they did not want her to fly away. They wanted to keep her safe with them with her feet on the ground. To them as to us, victory represented power, but they were willing to curtail that strength for they did not want to lose all that they had won. We can find no wiser formula for the lasting victory which will be the lasting peace. By yielding to the common good, by a civilized recognition of the mutual advantages that will be given to us all, by trimming the wings of power, we can hold to our victory, with her head so proudly among the stars, and her feet set firmly on our earth.

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, DELIVERED AT CIVIC AUDITORIUM, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., TUESDAY, MAY 8

Today finds us half-way up the peak of victory. At the peak waits Tokyo.

VE-day is victory against opponents so monstrous in their contempt for human rights that we may rightly consider ourselves the vanquishers of cannibalism. We have answered with death their challenge to death. We have met to question our own intent in the midst of the exaltation, and look back on what we have won and forward to all that remains to be accomplished.

This is the time to consider if the will to murder that came from their will to rule is thoroughly conquered in the minds of the defeated. We can see plainly in the official newsreels the obvious sneers on the faces of many of those—not all—who were forced by allied authorities to look on the mounds of human flesh, indiscernible as men and women because of mutilation and decay, for which, as members of a brutal nation, they stand responsible before God and man. If we have not vanquished that contempt for the weaker and the lesser and the undefended, how then can we render it impotent for further evil? This is a question to be considered by all men.

And while we ask this question, shall we not ask ourselves if the sense of superiority which gave birth to this dangerous contempt for human rights is cleansed from our own souls?

Victory is meaningless to the human offal of Manila and Maidenek. They are past all easement and all agony. The cities that saw their torments are now heaps of broken stones, but those stones scream out in warning to those of us who live.

In all places where men perished in this war, the earth is stained with a blood that is not of your race nor mine, but the sacramental blood of the common man, that nameless, voiceless, raceless, and deathless citizen for whom Christ died, and men like Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt, Quezon, have lived. The dead voices of these great humanitarians warn us on this day, for now, half way along the march to victory, we must determine the pattern for our future existence, or that future will indeed be dust returned to the dust. The human sacrifices of Manila and Maidenek know that last peace that we shall share with them unless we pool humanity and our valuation of the rights of men. Without world solidarity, there can be no victory.

We can achieve that solidarity when we have impressed an understanding of his brother's rights on every human heart. This will be the true victory.

Between VE-day and VJ-day is the time for the baring of souls and the opening of resentments that have never before been spoken. The festering wounds of international misunderstanding are being opened that these wounds may be healed.

It is now more than 3 years since I came into San Francisco still shaken by the horror of the fall of Bataan. I do not mind telling you now that I was in a state of terror that day that was not only for my family and my country that were in the hands of the Japanese, but also for everything that civilized man had earned and valued on this earth. There was no misunderstanding in the minds of those of us who survived Bataan as to what gentler nations might expect for the sin of being unprepared. I feared for the future of the Philippines and for America, and most of all I feared what at first impression I took to be the lethargy of America. During these past 3 years I have traveled all over the United States, and talked with America. I have seen this great good-natured, wonderful country roused to wreak terrifying vengeance upon the violators of world peace. Today, VE-day, is the triumphant end of that beginning.

This day is triumph for America and democracy and the entire world. It draws the end nearer, an end to our enemies on the battlefields, and an end to the violations and misconceptions that are responsible for the growth of enmities.

Victory alone can never be the end of war. Victory is a responsibility toward and a beginning of the peace. To be permanent, it must triumph over suspicion and misunderstanding and the arrogance that lurks in human hearts. It must be the universal recognition of human rights by the common man as well as by the world leaders. Only upon these solid foundations can we build the lasting victory that is every man's victory, a victory that is just and practical and sure, that will stand guard between more monstrous forms of yet uninvented death and our children's children forever. Amen.

MAY 30, 1945.

In the course of the deliberations on the trusteeship formula, Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, chairman of the Philippine delegation, issued the following press statement:

The trusteeship formula as originally drafted specifies: "To develop self-government in forms appropriate to the various circumstances of each territory." There is no mention of independence.

The smaller nations may through their representatives bow their heads to the will of the stronger in this matter that means so much to them. Independence is but a word to the larger powers. To us, it means the purpose for which this war was fought and this Conference is held. It is the only word that can mean freedom.

Why do the representatives of the small nations beg the usage of that word "independence" in place of the term "self-government"?

One may argue that they are synonymous The dictionary virtually holds them to be one and the same in meaning. (Webster's Unabridged, newest edition.) Let me assert again the difference in meaning is not to be found in books. It is to be read in the minds and hopes of those who ask the right to that word "independence," the word upon which was built the moral leadership of America. If at any time that moral authority should be asserted and vindicated, it is now. It can be by this word "independence."

What is this term "self-government" to those who have been dreaming of independence? It is not to be found under the word "government" in the dictionary. It is something set apart, it is different, and to most of the lovers of freedom it is new. "Government" is a proud word, and a great deal is written about it, while the term "self-government" merely carries the explanation to be self-governing or independent.

That may be, but it does not serve those who ask the magic formula of the hope of freedom.

"Government" is clearly defined: "To direct, to rule or restrain, to exercise authority." One does not find under the word "government" the definition closest to our desire—"to be independent; to be free."

This ruling or administration of a political body may be monarchic or democratic, depending upon the consolidation or distribution of government power. Let us see where this analysis may lead. Under a monarchy this expression is permissible: "The government do not approve."

Which is to say, "I do not approve. I am the state."

In the past this has been the language of despots, and it is still the recognized authoritative speech of kings.

In a democracy the grammatical construction is different: "The government does not approve."

There is our difference. We approve, or we do not approve. We, the people. We, the independent of thought and intent, the self-reliant, the free.

Even under the term "self-government" one finds no inkling of the definition "to be free."

That difference is infinitesimal, but it holds the space between two worlds. It is as big as the Pacific Ocean. What does a dictionary mean to the man in Indonesia and

Malaya? It is independence that has rung in his thoughts like the clarion notes of the Liberty Bell in America in 1776. It has the meaning of that bell to him. To him the word "government" means "to rule," and it has become a word of tragic connotation. He does not want rule. He does not want the sound of the word, for it is resonant in his mind with distrust.

He wants independence. The promise of freedom which America gave to the Filipinos.

To him that is the most glorious word in the world and there is no substitute.

Independence—America, 1776; independence, the Philippines, 1946—these are dates and words set on his heart.

While seemingly unimportant, this is no trifling matter. In yielding that word independence, America yields part of herself. By insisting upon its usage and preservation, America vindicates and preserves her moral authority in the eyes of all those millions of human beings who are watching, and hoping, that some day her example will make them free as the Philippines were made free.

Let America cling to the meaning of that word that is as much a part of her as are her Stars and Stripes. Let her not yield.

Independence has many meanings and all are bulwarks of human dignity. To be sovereign. To be not contingent or conditioned. Not to be dependent. To be uncontrolled, uncoerced, self-reliant. To be free.

The antithesis of independence is to be controlled and held subject.

Independence is the only word that can express America's share in mankind's march toward freedom. Let that word stand. It alone holds freedom's every definition.

STATEMENT OF THE STAND OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION ON THE TRUSTEESHIP FORMULA, AS EXPRESSED BY BRIG. GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION

We have before us the outlines of a practical program that can determine the future peace of the world. In providing for that peace, we provide for the future of the individual, that is, every man. He is the least, and he is the victor. He is the leader and the lost. And his future rests upon the terms in which we settle now the program of his experience, which is also our own.

The pattern we establish now must preserve the moral sanctities of the individual. There is a moral issue here that we cannot and dare not overlook. It may rest upon the inclusion or exclusion of a word that has come to mean much to a civilization grown more just and more humane under its gathering influence, and that has come to mean everything to the inarticulate peoples for whom this pattern is established. That word is "independence." To those peoples who will come under the chapter on non-self-governing peoples, whose future we are deciding now, the difference between the meaning of the word "independence" and the phrase "self-government" is as wide as the Pacific Ocean, and its space is as fraught with danger.

This chapter on non-self-governing peoples should link the complete and unequivocal promise of freedom to all men within its terms, for the peace of the future must be reckoned upon these terms, and no other. It rests on the usage of the word "independence." No other word will do. For no other word can mean so much to millions of fellow humans. I dare not assume to represent them. I am not presuming to speak for them. But I speak of them, because I am one of them, and know and feel their ideals and aspirations. I am part of their world.

If I do not speak now, I might never be able to forgive myself, for I know the peoples of whom I speak, and I know their chief concern to be peace and their chief dream to be equal and free, as it is the dream and ideal of all men. These millions will do much to determine the future of the world.

The trusteeship formula is as important to the smaller peoples as it is to the more powerful. For it must link all in solidarity. The pledge of independence is as important as trusteeship, and the peace of the future is held therein—in that one word.

Peace can be built only on mutual diligence and mutual confidence—and mutual confidence can be based only on mutual understanding. We must ask ourselves here, not what our words mean to us who are drafting this Charter, but to the peoples for whom this trusteeship formula is proposed. To the sovereign nations represented at this Conference, which for many years have enjoyed a full and complete measure of self-government, that term alone is enough. They are already full members of the family of nations; they bow their heads before no other. But to the millions of people for whom this truteeship formula is proposed, the term self-government is not enough. To them it stands only for a lesser degree of subservience. They feel that even with self-government they might still be dependent upon another, or remain part of a pattern imposed upon them against their will. To these waiting and voiceless people on the other side of the Pacific, self-government is a niggling, compromising word; it is not the word they are anxious to hear.

But the word independence to them means freedom, self-respect, dignity. It is what they have prayed for, dreamed of, some of them fought for. Do we dare ignore the danger that some of them may be ready to fight for it again? Dare we allow ourselves to be misunderstood, when misunderstanding hinges only on the lack of a single word?

Let me tell you now that if this one word "independence," or its spirit, is lacking, the hopes of millions will die. May I submit that their faith will die?

In the faces of these millions turned toward us now we can read their doubts and their dreams. Do we dare let them down? For their sakes? For our own?

Their dreams have been fired on the story of the struggle toward independence and its story has been fuel to that flame. Peace in the Pacific and in the entire world can be pledged only by the promise of eventual political, economic and spiritual independence in those areas that have existed too long under the ban of the inarticulate. They ask now but a word. They will be content with that word. For, through long years, that word has come to mean to them the sunlight of freedom and dignity.

We came here under the obligation of a moral code to prepare the way for international obligations and international rights. Now that we stand on the very threshold of enlightened internationalism, shall we risk all we have won on the loss of a word?

Gentlemen, the word "independence" or the concept of independence belongs here in this section A, subsection (ii), if this chapter on non-self-governing peoples is to insure peace and security for this world. For that formula cannot serve unless it is understood and accepted not only by the nations by whom it is prepared, but also by the peoples for whom it is prepared. Mutual confidence and mutual toleration is possible only between men or nations who meet on an equality or a promised equality.

The term "self-government" is not a substitute for the word "independence." For to the people to whom this formula applies, the term self-government has no meaning. Because they have not experienced it, they do not understand it.

The pattern of spiritual understanding underwriting our peace charter must cover the boundaries of all nations, for freedom is more than food to mankind, and unity between nations can only be based upon mutual respect.

We speak of the economic and political security, but we must not fail to consider the spiritual understanding that must also hold us to communal safety. In dealing with the Asiatic nations we must remember that beyond all else they hold as a paramount consideration their valuation of the human soul. A sophisticate may term this the ego. Whatever it is, he values it as much as they. In the peace pattern that shall include all men in its safety zones, we must allow for the privilege worthy of the spirit.

Social, economic, and political representation can only follow the recognition of the spiritual rights, and it is the right of every man to hold himself free.

Unity between nations can only be based upon this mutual spiritual respect.

In determining the formula of the future, we can take no approach other than the humane or spiritual. We dare not do otherwise. We have learned that there is no human problem we cannot solve provided we hold to the humane solution, which is consideration for the dignity of the human soul.

We cannot stress too often that victory to be true victory must be every man's victory, and freedom to be an actuality must be every man's freedom. Independence is not a gift that can be offered. It is the ultimate aim in communal living which is an expression of the social character of man. That character as expressed in the chapter on non-self-governing peoples must show the spiritual growth of mankind since his first dawning recognition of the rights of brothers began. Only the soul of this Charter is incomplete, needing but the inclusion of the word for which our nameless millions have died, and still may die, unless we see that it is there.

Let me re-echo the words spoken by the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt: "Training for independence is essential to the stability of independence in almost every part of the world. Some peoples need more extensive training, and longer years of it; others require far less training." And of that program of independence, he said: "It is a pattern of what men of good will will look forward to in the future—a pattern of a global civilization which recognizes no limitations of religion, of creed, or of race."

He was speaking of independence. He called it by no other name. It is the word that has turned suspicion to confidence and confidence to loyalty. It has served to hold nations together in mutual faith. Through the long ages, it is the word "independence" that has brightened the long, dark road of our way to freedom.

REMARKS OF GENERAL ROMULO BEFORE COMMITTEE 4, COMMISSION II, JUNE 18, 1945

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this subparagraph (b) of section A declaration, as proposed by Commander Stassen. You will remember, sir, Friday evening a week ago, Commander Stassen, who has earned our admiration and gratitude for the patience, tact, and consummate skill which he has displayed in drafting and redrafting the trusteeship formula, referred to the record of humanitarianism of that great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and of his country, the United States. I stand here today to bear witness to that record. My country is a beneficiary of that American humanitarianism.

Lord Cranborne, the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, who followed Commander Stassen, also referred to the humanitarian record of his country. Sir, no witness is needed to testify to that record. It speaks eloquently for itself. The freedom-loving peoples of the world will never forget the fundamental Bill of Rights which was born at Runnymede in 1215, nor the long months when England, alone on the edge of Europe, withstood the relentless attacks of

the evil forces of totalitarianism, and by her heroism, her blood, sweat, and tears, saved freedom for us in that dark hour.

Nor do the humanitarian records of the other nations here represented need substantiation, for they, too, speak for themselves. Russia, let it be said, stopped the forces of Hitler, pushed them and rolled them back, at a time when to have wavered would have been fatal to the cause of freedom. China pioneered in this fight, for the Chinese Nation took its stand against the forces of tyranny and aggression long before Europe was threatened. France's contribution to liberty is written large in the history of mankind from the days of the Bastille when the world heard the rallying cry of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Greece and Czechoslovakia. I can continue referring specifically to each of the nations here represented. Each one has given unsparingly of itself to the cause of freedom. But, Mr. Chairman, time does not permit my dwelling on all of them at length.

In the discussions before this committee last Friday evening, especially the proposals made by the distinguished representatives of Iraq, Egypt, and Syria, I noticed not so much a desire to curb the powers of the greater nations, but certain vague doubts and half-formed fears, which I believe are representative of the smaller nations, which, having suffered from the misused power of the totalitarian states, now cannot help distrusting power wherever it may be.

So when I read the trusteeship chapter that we had approved, and saw independence mentioned there, and did not see it in the chapter on non-self-governing peoples, I knew that if I made a plea to have it inserted also in the latter chapter, all the nations in this Conference would rally behind it because they stand on their humanitarian records in the past, and they cannot close an avenue of happiness for a people, such as independence.

Mr. Chairman, we want peace—peace for one humanity and one world. Such peace to be lasting must be predicated on the happiness of all peoples. As Commander Stassen very well said here the other evening, we cannot defend the rights of one without defending the rights of all. Can anyone here deny that in securing the peace of the world, we must also secure the ultimate in happiness for all peoples? And can anyone here deny that the ultimate of happiness differs for different peoples and different nations? We have only to look about us at this Conference to find proof of that. Fifty nations of the world are represented here—50 nations with different habits and customs, with different governmental machinery—yet all bound together in their love of freedom and their desire to maintain and protect that freedom and to insure the peace of the world. If, among the nations represented here, we do not find uniformity, but diversity, why should we insist on uniformity among the peoples to whom this chapter on non-self-governing territories applies? Why must we close to them one of the avenues that may lead to their content and well-being?

Admitted, as Chairman Fraser told me when I appeared before the drafting committee, that self-government is the ultimate in happiness for many of those sovereign nations now represented here which have enjoyed it for many years. But would it not be a tribute to the understanding and sympathy of those nations if they would concede that while self-government fulfills all their hopes and desires, other peoples may seek fulfillment in different ways? Why not grant to these other peoples a freedom of choice? Why insist that these other peoples must follow the same path?

In this subparagraph (b) of this declaration, as now proposed by Commander Stassen, we have self-government, and then we say: "To take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions." That encompasses what I feel will give a soul to this charter, because therein lies the spirit of independence and because here we are trying to secure peace for one world and one humanity. We cannot, sir, overlook the interests of millions of those who are not represented here. While I do not presume to speak for them because I have no authority to speak for them, I can speak of them, because I am one of them and I come from that part of the world.

I am happy to see that the sponsoring powers and Commander Stassen, who has worked tirelessly on this, have seen fit after getting my views on the matter to include: "To take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions." This I take to mean independence. Commander Stassen will bear me out in my interpretation. He assured me that is the intent of this provision, that independence is contained in it.

Mr. Chairman, let us look into the future. We are fighting this war not for today, but for tomorrow. We are framing this charter not for now but for the future. The essence of human progress is discontent. Peoples everywhere are on the move, because the hope of freedom has fired them with a new zeal and a new courage. I know that in the hearts of all of us here is the desire to encourage them, to assist them, to inspire them to move onward. How better can we do that than by giving them the freest possible choice, by opening to them all the avenues that can lead to what they consider their ultimate in national happiness?

Mr. Chairman, may I let that great poet laureate of England, Alfred Lord Tennyson, argue for me in his immortal words:

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfills himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

"And God fulfills himself in many ways, lest one good custom should corrupt the world." Can we do better here, sir, than heed those words?

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY BRIG. GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES AND CHAIRMAN, PHILIPPINE DELEGATION, BEFORE COMMISSION II (ON TRUSTEESHIP) OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, AT THE OPERA HOUSE, JUNE 20, 1945

Mr. President and fellow delegates, here, in the completed chapter that is submitted to this Commission, is really the proclaimed armistice of the future and for men of all lands.

Victory is in these lines as they are written now. Let us read the declaration:

"Declaration regarding non-self-governing territories

"Article 73

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and to this end:

"(a) to insure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

"(b) to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement."

Mr. Chairman, these words contain the answer to everything that those people who will come under this chapter have prayed for and so long desired. Here we have a charter for all the colonial peoples and for all peoples. For it is the charter of human liberty, and it is irrefutable proof that at last we have won the long fight, and that in winning the fight for freedom, we have won this war. Independence is the actual spirit of the chapter as it is now worded. It is here in the deed, if not in the word. For independence is, after all, more than a word; it is the political aspiration of a people. Herein the content is paramount. And while the word independence is not mentioned, actual independence is secured. For the longing millions to whom this pledge is made, freedom will no longer be a vain dream, but an attainable goal—a goal within their reach—that must be worked for to be achieved. They will know that they must use their bodies and their brains as never before to merit this pledge of respect. They must learn to walk as free men in this man's world.

Fundamentally, this is a human charter, promising freedom as the goal for all, for the colonial peoples and the mandated islands, for the Far East and its bewildered peoples. And it is also a victory for those who fought in many lands that freedom might not perish from this earth. This is victory for the whole world, not for one race, one nation, or one leader, but for all men.

In this chapter as now worded is the blueprint of the completed peace—not a subject peace achieved under the iron heel of authority, but a peace of mutual respect, designed by and for each member of the great family of mankind.

Subsection (b) of article 73 is in itself proof that the fight for freedom has been won. I read subsection (b) as redrafted:

"(b) to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples, and their varying stages of advancement."

This is an advance for mankind made possible by the authority of the civilized exponents of good will. This holds living proof of our world progress. There is no redundant play here on fine words, but a simple, iron-clad promise of good will. When such words as these are written in the statement of the declaration: "Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government, recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost the well-being of the inhabitants of such territories," these sovereign nations are not evading issues; they are accepting the full responsibility of their obligation to what is, indeed, a sacred trust.

And when in subsection (b) of this declaration, they enlarge upon the nature of this pledge of acceptance, and in the simplest of terms promise not only to develop self-government, but also "to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples," and, what is more important, "to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions," there is no possible way to underestimate the importance of this pledge. There can be no possible misunderstanding. The humblest, most bewildered human being must know what these words hold out to him. Here is the promise of independence; here is the pledge of his freedom.

But the sovereign nations do not only promise that freedom. They pledge themselves "to insure the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the peoples concerned, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses." All in all, this is a promise taken from that bill of spiritual rights for mankind, written on a ship off the coast of Newfoundland. Here is perpetuated the great premise of the Atlantic Charter. Those among us who were born free, and those who have achieved freedom, should recognize the full meaning of what these words will imply to the less fortunate and to the less free. I do not speak from the Philippine point of view nor the American, but from the point of view of six hundred millions who are hereby given a definite goal to strive for in this chapter as it is now worded.

Before this war broke out I toured the Asiatic territories, and I learned from the leaders and from the people of the flame of hope that swept the Far East when the Atlantic Charter was made known to the world. Everywhere these people asked the questions: Is the Atlantic Charter also for the Pacific? Is it for one side of the world and not for the other? For one race only and not for them too?

In this chapter of the charter that we are writing here is their answer. Had this answer been given earlier, before the Pacific became involved, it is possible that it might have shortened our world tragedy. It might have rendered impotent much of the evil power of Germany and Japan. For the Atlantic Charter is, in truth, a charter for the Pacific as well. And because we have learned through horror and sacrifice that we cannot divide a world by geography or by race. It is a formula to cover the entire earth and to provide for the spiritual world in which all thinking men must live. It will be the inspirer of respect because it pledges respect.

That is its victory. Its power lies in the pledge which millions not here represented have waited and asked for, or have, perhaps, been afraid to ask. In it, and it is their response, and also in the response of those who are proud and free, is victory over aggression, persecution, and fear. And without this victory there can no longer be freemen or proud men, and perhaps there may be no men at all in this threatened world.

This is a primary victory of independence as set forth in this formula. It is the world objective toward which the men of the United Nations have fought their way. Millions have died that this promise could be made. The death of millions is in these words. We can only say now, may God give strength to them, for they lead to the end for which man was designed. He was not intended as a human sacrifice or a political cannibal fattening on aggression. He was meant to be a man among men, with equal opportunities and equal rights and the chance to hold his own small place in this man's world. The men who have set down the words of this pledge did not write alone. They were aided in their work by the good and the wise of many lands—by George Washington, by William Pitt, by Sun Yat-sen, by Bolivar and San Martin, by Jose Rizal. They have but fitted the inspired dreams of the past to the harsh needs of the present.

The hand of the Man of Galilee is in this finished work.

Have we changed so much since His day that we do not need His words? We have seen progress and change in the past 2,000 years. Yes, in the past 3 years we have seen mechanical advances that would have seemed incredible a decade ago. But the human soul has not changed. Human weakness has not changed, nor human valiance, nor human brutality. For in this war we have seen bestiality unknown in Bible times, and Herod, Tiberius, and Genghis Khan have lost their crowns of infamy to the sleek monsters of Tokyo and Berchtesgaden.

When I saw in the ash heap that once was my garden the bayoneted human rubble that had been my neighbors and friends, when I saw other bodies criss-crossed through with bayonets—innocent bodies of young girls and babies and mothers, of priests and Red Cross nurses and doctors who had died trying to save lives—when I saw bodies that had been white and brown men, women, and children crammed into stone rooms and set on fire in the Manila where we had lived in such goodness of will and spirit, then I saw that we had not made progress in 2,000 years, nor could we in 2,000,000.

We cannot boast of advance. We need listen still to that gentle voice that cried out the eternal counsel of good will toward men.

We have need to listen, in this civilized world, this world that has not dared to sleep, that has covered the blind eyes and screaming mouths of its children with the ashes of its cities, this world set with the long, white rows of little crosses that should be men—crosses of the innocent millions murdered by the guilty few. This promise of protection and freedom as contained herein is the greatest tribute we can set against those crosses and those unmarked mounds. It is the eternal flame we can burn to their memory, the only wreath worthy of their sacrifice. So, in these words are the souls of men who died at El Alamein and in Italy, on a beachhead in Normandy or Borneo or Mindanao, in the skies over China. We have asked bitterly why they had to die, why their prayers for life were not heard.

Here is their reward and their answer. They were writing with their blood this pledge which we are sworn to keep for the eternal peace.

The brown man, who fought under the American flag on Bataan, who died under torture for sending information to General MacArthur that would save American lives—he helped to write this pledge of freedom.

A boy you knew, who died perhaps the other day, on Borneo, his tears and the blood of his body and the life he might have lived, are in these lines.

He wrote for victory, which is peace, and he is dead. But 20 years from today, a boy like him will again be on this earth and ripe for school and the future, not for death—he, too, helped write these lines. These are not dead words; they are alive with the lives of millions who fought to be free, and with the prayers of millions who must be free.

We have seen in these war years so much of patriotism and of courage, and the torrential tides of nobility that have poured over this devastated world have met here in San Francisco with the receding tides of oppression. In the crash of their meeting is this achievement—words with which we can spike the guns in the hands of the brutal and the dangerous, but not words that will cut off those hands at the wrist, as we cannot doubt that they would have done to ours if they had conquered.

Of course, this charter is no insurance of a millennium. It is not a divine manifestation. It is written by anxious, humble men of many lands, who have done their best to understand one another, that their sons may not fight one another on some future battlefield. There will be problems ahead, national and international, individual, racial, economic, governmental, and spiritual. The propagandists of hate have not surrendered. We have been frank in offering grist for their mills these past weeks. For we in this Conference have been open in our problems and understandings, and where there have been differences the men of the United Nations have not hesitated to let them be shown. This has been no secret session of the powerful. It has been a world meeting and a world agreement, and when we submit the completed charter, as we are now submitting to this Commission this fundamental chapter, the world can read how futile has been the attempt at planting new crops of suspicions on the graves of those who died to wipe suspicion and distrust from the earth. These, the violators of the dead, can read these words in this charter, and be silenced and ashamed.

To keep them silenced, to achieve these ends of the peace, we must watch day and night for the first signs of the breeding of danger abroad and at home, in our own houses and in our own hearts. For the danger before us now is the danger of failing to understand and to make allowances for our fellow men.

To this end, we have a job to do, and every man is a soldier in the new fight to hold the victory attained. The soldier and the defense worker who fought so heroically for that victory must fight toward it now with racial and international understanding, with good will toward men. This is victory before the fight is over, and we have a job to do as the man on Borneo or Okinawa today has his. Like his, it cannot wait, and we cannot let him down.

We must consecrate ourselves to the mighty principles proclaimed in this war wherein men of strange blood fought together, where primitive men who had never seen strangers before protected and guided lost soldiers from other hemispheres because they felt that these men brought the promise of the future. They knew, these simple savages, that the principles being fought for were for all.

We can know no more than that. We can ask for no more. We have stripped human responsibility at last to its primary and its ultimate terms and here it is in this charter for all our world. It must work. It must be made to work, and it is the job of every man to make it work because it is every man's victory and his chance to live. This charter for the human race is the only means of survival we have before us, the world recognition of one divine impulse, one world, and one victory.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES, AND CHAIRMAN, PHILIPPINE DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE, ON THE SIGNING OF THE CHARTER

We have reached an agreement. That, to me, is the great achievement of this Conference. It is not that we have set down on paper certain terms of agreement. They are transient. They appear to be workable today. They may not be tomorrow, and then we can again meet and agree to change them. But the fact of agreement—the fact that 50 nations, representing perhaps 50 basic divergencies of self-interest, could for once distill from those divergencies the purest essence of fundamental accord—that is permanent. That is the achievement.

And we of the smaller nations—to us this conference has given something we have not known before: the conviction not only that our voice has been heard, but that it has been listened to. Thus, when our Philippine delegation took the stand that, for dependent peoples, independence should be fixed as the goal, side by side with self-government, that stand was recognized; and because it was just, it was accepted. The great nations heard, and listened to, the voice of the little ones.

I have heard those who have guided this conference say that all we now need is the sincerity to carry out the tasks we have set ourselves. This is true; but more important, I feel, is the fact that we have established a code of ethics for the world to come, which,

because of the unassailability of its principles, will create a force of world public opinion so all-enveloping as to compel sincerity in the carrying out of those principles.

This, then, is our accomplishment: It is not an Atlantic Charter, nor a Pacific Charter. It is a World Charter. It is the spiritual bill of rights. It will embrace and protect, at the same time that it liberates, the human spirit.

(The Philippine delegation submitted 25 amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Of these, 4 were adopted in full in the new charter and 6 were adopted in part or in principle.)

General Chennault's Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., dated Monday, July 16, 1945, concerning the resignation of Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault. His retirement will be a distinct loss to both the United States and China as he contributed so magnificently toward the defeat of our common enemy, Japan, and he has accomplished so much with so little. He is our greatest tactical air soldier, a real American, and a true friend of China.

His statements, based on 8 years of personal, first-hand experience in China are worthy of our most serious consideration, and I bring this article to the attention of the House because it is more detailed and fuller than those which have appeared in our metropolitan papers back here. I especially commend to you his splendid statement about Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, commander of American forces in the China theater.

The article follows:

MAJ. GEN. CLAIRE CHENNAULT SAYS HE'S SHOCKED BY CRITICISM OF ARMIES, GOVERNMENT OF CHINA

KUNMING, CHINA, July 15.—Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, who has resigned as commander of the Fourteenth United States Air Force, said Sunday he had been shocked deeply by what he termed adverse criticism of the armies and Government of China "recently made by irresponsible persons at home."

"I think it's about time for Americans to cease to be so concerned by the mote in our neighbor's eye," he declared in a statement.

Chennault, former leader of the Flying Tigers, announced his resignation Saturday, saying he would remain until a new higher United States Air Force Command is installed in Chungking and then return to the United States and retire from the Army.

His statement said that China's armies and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's government were "no more faultless than any others."

"I have been a witness of 8 years of war in China, and I have the deepest admiration for the Generalissimo's courage, foresight, and unwavering loyalty to the cause we share," Chennault declared.

"I think it's time for us to remember that we owe China an immense debt."

Chennault said that Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, as commanding general of United States Army forces in China, had done a "great job," and that the Japanese now were being pushed back in retreat.

In his tribute to General Wedemeyer, Chennault said that the "war was at a low ebb here when he assumed command. I think I can claim not to be easily discouraged and even I was discouraged." He brought his splendid energy and determination to attack a most difficult situation.

"Imperial headquarters at Tokyo must have been pained by the way we got on the job in China under General Wedemeyer," Chennault continued. "Aided by American soldiers and airmen and the Chinese air force, the Chinese armies halted what seemed likely to be Japan's last offensive. A heavy defeat has been suffered by the Japanese, and they are being pushed back in retreat."

Chennault said that one of the most important factors in driving back the Japanese "has been the forging of a Sino-American team."

"All three elements of both nations—air, ground, and supply—are striving together for the great objective of pushing the Japanese from Chinese soil," he said.

"Under the leadership of the generalissimo and of General Wedemeyer the team is going to attain that objective. They are going to attain it sooner than some people think."

Asked about the state of his health, Chennault said that "the new command gives me an opportunity for which I have long hoped. Eight years ago I was retired from active duty because of my health. Most of those 8 years have been spent in China.

"I have led a small force, limited in resources, against a stronger enemy for more than 3 years," he continued. "The Japanese now have been defeated in the skies of China. In view of this I have asked General Wedemeyer to allow me to retire for a second time, keeping me here only as long as I am needed.

"I have received his consent," the general added, and then grinned and said: "I'm still deaf, you know."

Actually Chennault, 54, is not deaf but his hearing has been impaired for many years as a result of flying in open planes before the days when cockpits were covered.

A Black Coal Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the coal situation is becoming desperate. It is rapidly approaching a major crisis. If this problem is not met the consequences to civilians and to the war effort may prove ghastly. Is it wise to adjourn with such problems unsolved?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, New York, under date of July 19, 1945, which is clear and to the point on the coal shortage:

A BLACK COAL OUTLOOK

Labor evaporation in the coal industry has reached alarming proportions. Production of bituminous coal during the first half of 1945 consequently has dropped nearly 7 percent below the corresponding period of last year. Already a potential deficit of 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 tons of bituminous coal looms for the current year, and the industry warns that the shortage will be even greater unless manpower relief is forthcoming promptly.

The Bituminous Coal Institute is authority for the statement that the number of coal miners has dropped over 30,000 in the 3 months from February to April of this year. Indications are that the down trend is continuing. In addition, the average age of coal miners last year rose to 45, as compared with a prewar average of 32.

The labor drain of the industry has been due to two factors—a high rate of inductions into the armed services and migration of miners to other industrial fields. If the manpower problem of the coal industry is to be solved, it must be tackled at these two points. Repeated industry pleas to stop military inductions of miners thus far have not been successful as both the War Department and the War Manpower Commission have "refused to take any action designed to avoid or even to alleviate the present serious shortages of labor existing in the industry."

As a result, congressional support is now being sought for the labor pleas of the coal industry. A few days ago Senator KILGORE and Representative FLANNAGAN introduced identical resolutions in Congress for the specific purpose of putting both branches of the legislature on record as urging the War Department and the War Manpower Commission to discharge from the Army 10,000 former miners not automatically eligible for discharge under the point system and to provide furloughs for an additional 20,000 experienced miners serving within the territorial United States. It was also urged to halt recruitment of workers for other industries in coal-mining areas.

There can be little doubt that the maintenance of adequate coal supplies is rapidly becoming one of the most serious domestic and international supply problems. Industrial coal stocks in this country already are dangerously low. Liberated countries in Europe are faced with an extremely serious supply outlook for the coming winter.

Under these circumstances maintenance of coal production in the United States is of vital importance. Due consideration, therefore, should be given promptly to the manpower pleas of the industry.

Supplies for the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE W. ERVIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion, which we have heard in recent months, about the difficulty of obtaining supplies for the Veterans' Administration, I am confident that the public would like to read the evidence of Mr. Raymond C. Kidd, of the Washington office of the Veterans' Administration, before the Veterans' Committee, dealing with this subject. Mr. Kidd works under Col. George E. Ijams, assistant administrator in charge of medical care, construction, and supplies, who is a most capable and estimable gentleman.

Colonel Ijams has served American veterans for 26 years, having been the last Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau and having served as head of every division of the Veterans' Administration. He has served with great credit to himself and with great satisfaction to veterans and their friends. The testi-

mony, before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, clearly shows that he has at all times been diligent in presenting the needs of the veterans and he has at all times had the vision to anticipate, and to make urgent recommendations for the fulfillment of, the needs of veterans.

I have found Mr. Kidd to be a very fine public servant, and his views should be brought to the attention of the public. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including herein a copy of Mr. Kidd's prepared statement, in order that the public may have information which it contains.

Mr. Kidd's testimony was in part as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Supply Service of the Veterans' Administration is responsible for purchase, storage, and distribution of all supplies and equipment for all Veterans' Administration activities; accountability for all Government property, other than real estate, and auditing of property accounts; operation and management of supply depots; contracts, leases, and agreements for all Veterans' Administration activities except construction contracts; and traffic management. The director of this service is responsible to the Administrator through the Assistant Administrator in charge of medical and domiciliary care, construction, and supplies.

The Administrator has instructed that I prepare a statement for presentation to this committee, setting forth difficulties and obstacles with which the Supply Service has been confronted in the procurement of materials, supplies, and equipment during the war period.

We first established liaison with the War Production Board in January 1942. Initially the most difficult problem we had was to explain to those in authority the functions of the Veterans' Administration and to convince them that it was an agency of the United States Government. We came in contact with many officials who, while they had heard of the Veterans' Administration, were of the opinion that it was a service organization such as the American Legion, and they were entirely ignorant of its functions. After finally establishing the fact that we were an agency of the United States Government charged with the responsibility of providing hospitalization and domiciliary care for veterans, we were told that as far as the War Production Board was concerned we were in the same category as any civilian hospital and would be treated accordingly.

The first impact of the war required us early in 1942 to find substitutes for critical materials such as furnture steel, aluminum, corrosion resistant steel, brass, copper, and zinc. As a result, we revised our specifications to specify wood for such items as nurses' desks, instrument cabinets, and office furniture; enameledware for aluminum and corrosion-resistant steel; and galvanized iron for other items in which high-grade steel, brass, and copper had been used. The life of the commodities manufactured from these substitute materials is, of course, limited, and thousands of dollars will have to be expended later on for replacements. I don't know whether or not this is a fact, but it is reasonable to assume that had we, in the early days of the war, been declared to be a war agency we would have gotten more consideration from the War Production Board and would have been able to purchase better merchandise, thus obviating later replacements of inferior goods at great cost. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 became law June 22, 1944, and declared the Veterans' Administration to be an essential war agency and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities in personnel, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders, and regulations pertaining to priorities. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under date of July 5, 1944, directed a communication to the Chairman, War Production Board, requesting information as to what procedure would be adopted by the War Production Board to make effective the provisions of the act relating to priorities for equipment, supplies, and materials required by the Veterans' Administration. In response to this communication, the Chairman, War Production Board, advised of the assignment of a representative of the Institutions Branch, Government Division, WPB, to take up the matter with appropriate Veterans' Administration officials. Several meetings held between representatives of the WPB and the Veterans' Administration during the summer of 1944 resulted in the revision of many WPB "L" and "M" orders to include the Veterans' Administration as a "preferred agency," which in effect meant that applications for priorities filed by the Veterans' Administration would receive more favorable consideration or other WPB assistance in securing requirements. However, as far as we have been able to ascertain, the Veterans' Administration was not officially recognized by the War Production Board as an essential war agency until September 4, 1944, on which date Mr. J. A. Krug, Acting Chairman, War Production Board, issued the following memorandum to all Bureau and Division Directors:

"Under Section 100 of the 'GI bill of rights', approved June 22, 1944, the Veterans' Administration is declared to be an essential war agency and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities in personnel, equipment, supplies, and material under any laws, Executive orders and regulations pertaining to priorities. The provisions of this section as to priorities for material also apply to any State institution to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans.

"It is the desire of the War Production Board to recognize fully this section of the act, and to put it into effect, as far as consistent with the general scheme and purpose of priorities controls, in matters falling within the province of the Board. As you know, the Veterans' Administration is primarily engaged in constructing, equipping and maintaining hospitals. Accordingly, I have instructed the program vice chairman to communicate to you specific suggestions as to order amendments, procedural changes and other actions which appear appropriate to him to carry out the above expressed policy. Your cooperation in doing so is requested."

On September 5, 1944, Mr. S. W. Anderson, Program Vice Chairman, War Production Board, issued a memorandum to all bureau and division directors, reading in part as follows:

"Reference is made to Mr. Krug's memorandum of September 4, calling attention to the change of priority status of the Veterans' Administration created by section 100 of the act of June 22, 1944. It is necessary that prompt steps be taken in our orders, regulations and procedures for priority assistance to make this change of status effective.

"The statute states that Veterans' Administration is declared to be 'An essential war agency and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities * * *.' We take this to mean that in all cases where the direct or indirect essential requirements of the Army and the Navy will not be interfered with the Veterans' Administration should be given the same kind and degree of priority assistance given the Army and the Navy. Where the essential requirements of the Army and the Navy will be interfered with by such treatment for the Veterans' Administration, some lesser, but none the less adequate, assistance should be provided.

"It will be necessary to look at each order and product in order to determine the particular provision that should be made. Under some orders which give blanket exemptions for the Army and the Navy (sometimes together with the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, Lend-Lease, etc.), it would be appropriate, considering the supply of the material or product and the requirements of the Veterans' Administration, to include the Veterans' Administration in the exemption. In any case where a blanket exemption is given to some agency other than the Army and the Navy, a strong case will be necessary to justify the exclusion of the Veterans' Administration. This will apply to M orders as well as to L orders.

"In some cases the preferred status given the Army and the Navy is evidenced by special forms or processing instructions which simplify the paper work and otherwise expedite the delivery of the final product. Consideration should be given to providing this same procedure for the Veterans' Administration.

"It should be borne in mind that the Veterans' Administration is engaged primarily in building, equipping, and maintaining hospitals; the materials and equipment which are used in such operations and the time. Further, the Veterans' Administration operates on limited appropriations and its programs have received careful screening before they come to the War Production Board. Here they will be screened again by the Government division, the Requirements Committees and the Facilities Bureau. Its new construction programs are designed to care for the sick and disabled soldier returning from the present fighting as well as the veterans from our previous wars. Congress has recognized the urgency of these programs. We can and should do no less."

The failure of the War Production Board to accord the Veterans' Administration the status it rightfully deserved prior to the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 greatly handicapped our operations, and a few illustrative examples of delays in securing merchandise are as follows:

TEXTILES

A contract for material to be used in the manufacture of pajamas in occupational therapy projects in neuropsychiatric hospitals was awarded June 30, 1943, the contractor indicating that a rating of AA-5 would be required to effect delivery. After several personal contacts with WPB, who indicated no rating was required, formal application for a rating was made and finally approved September 10, 1943. The rating assigned, namely, AA-5, was extended to the contractor who then advised that because of the delay in securing the rating it would not be productive of results, and it was necessary to cancel the contract. A new contract was then awarded and this contractor was able to procure the material on an AA-5 rating. Had the War Production Board authorized the AA-5 rating originally requested, much delay in the procurement of the material would have been avoided and a saving of approximately $6,000 would have been effected.

Under date of September 11, 1943, a contract for supplying burial suits, used in connection with the burial of deceased veteran patients, was awarded and the WPB refused a priority, claiming material was available without rating. This proved to be not a fact and finally a rating was granted under date of February 21, 1944, but the rating authorized was too low to enable the contractor to procure sufficient material to complete his contract, and at this date a portion of the contract is unfilled.

Ratings, sufficiently high to enable manufacturers to procure material from which to manufacture flags within a reasonable time

to drape the caskets of deceased veterans, have been refused, which has caused long delays in procuring this commodity.

Failure to extend appropriate rating to permit procurement of sheeting required for essential activities has been a handicap and resulted in our being without this commodity for nearly 2 years, and when our need became desperate the WPB finally authorized a rating high enough to enable us to procure this product.

The War Production Board has been and is continually denying ratings to secure items of haberdashery, such as underwear and shirts, so essential for the comfort and welfare of veterans in our facilities.

The shortage of cotton clothing in various sections of the country has become so acute that it has been impossible for our facilities to procure clothing for mentally incompetent patients with funds, and as a result it has been necessary as an administrative necessity to authorize the sale of Government-owned merchandise to properly clothe these patients. Unless relief is forthcoming in the very near future, the stock of cotton clothing purchased by the Veterans' Administration for issue to patients without funds will become exhausted, in fact some sizes are already exhausted with no replenishment in sight. Apropos this matter, it is a well-known fact that cotton woven fabrics are being manufactured and exported for relief purposes. While it is not within my province to pass judgment upon this policy, the fact remains that the Veterans' Administration will be subjected to severe criticism, and properly so, if the time ever comes when the patients in its hospitals cannot be properly clothed.

MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

A few illustrations under this heading will suffice to indicate our difficulties.

Rating denied for electrocardiograph, and as a result approximately 150 days required to effect delivery when contractor could have made delivery in 30 days with an AA-1 rating.

WPB order L-259 prohibited the manufacture of short-wave diathermy machines except for Army and other preferred agencies. While equipment of this nature was urgently needed in our hospitals, the War Production Board would not waive the restrictions in the order to permit manufacture for the Veterans' Administration. To procure several machines most urgently needed, the office of the Surgeon General, United States Army, was good enough to procure them for the Veterans' Administration.

Long delays were encountered in the procurement of shock therapy apparatus because of the refusal of the War Production Board to grant appropriate priority ratings, and it was not until the Administrator made an appeal to the Chairman, War Production Board, that ratings to secure delivery were issued.

The War Production Board in one instance refused to issue a priority for the procurement of a steam jacketed disinfector to be used for sterilizing mattresses. The reason given for denying the application was that critical materials entering into the construction of the equipment were needed for more essential uses by the armed forces and suggested that in the absence of this type of equipment mattresses be sterilized by exposure to the sun and air.

The WPB did, however, issue certain orders and regulations which were beneficial to the Veterans' Administration, namely, CMP Regulation 5A, promulgated in November 1943 authorizing an AA-1 rating for maintenance and repair materials, Orders P140 and P-146 authorizing ratings to procure certain shipping containers, and P-43 and L-144 authorizing ratings to procure laboratory supplies and equipment. The ratings authorized under these orders were effective in procuring deliveries.

While much has been said in crticism of the War Production Board because of its treatment of the Veterans' Administration, I feel that we should not lose sight of the fact that the primary function of this Board was to take every step necessary to make materials available for the prosecution of the war. To do this, it was necessary that materials in every category be placed under control for diversion to the war effort. To accomplish this, it was no doubt necessary to deny materials to agencies other than those activities engaged in the prosecution of the war until such time as it could be determined that materials not required for this purpose would be available. Such a program naturally affected the Veterans' Administration, and there is some question in my mind as to whether priorities second only to the Army and Navy would have been of much assistance in the early days of the war, for the reason that there was only so much material of a given kind and Army and Navy orders were rated sufficiently high to enable them to get this material. A priority rating does not necessarily guarantee early delivery of a commodity; a priority simply is the means used for establishing the sequence in which rated orders will be delivered. Under a disrupted economy such as we have experienced in the last 4 years, many of the delays which have obtained in the procurement of materials and equipment could not, in my judgment, have been avoided.

FOOD

Sugar: The first item of food on which the impact of the war was felt was sugar. Under date of January 24, 1942, the War Production Board issued General Preference Order No. M-55 "to conserve the supply and direct the distribution of direct-consumption sugar." This order fixed the quotas for distributors and receivers of sugar but provided that it would not apply to "any person, for retail sale, on military or naval reservations or naval vessels, to military or naval personnel." This order also exempted from its provisions the War and Navy Departments. The Supply Service, immediately upon receipt of the order, took up with the War Production Board the matter of exempting the Veterans' Administration, and under date of February 3, 1942, was informed by letter from the War Production Board to the effect that it had been administratively determined that hospitals and homes for veterans of the last war and for disabled veterans of the present war come within the provision of the order exempting "any person, for retail sale, on military or naval reservation or naval vessels, to military or naval personnel." This interpretation of the order by the War Production Board was not questioned, although it was apparent that the provision in the order above quoted properly could not be interpreted to exempt the Veterans' Administration from the provisions of the general preference order.

Under date of April 4, 1942, the War Production Board advised that based upon a definition by the War Department of the term "military or naval reservation," the sugar requirements of the Veterans' Administration were not exempt from the provisions of the general preference order, and that the Veterans' Administration would no longer be entitled to purchase quota-exempt sugar without having explicit authority from the Director of Industry Operations, War Production Board. The Supply Service under date of April 11, 1942, requested an exemption and under date of April 24, 1942, the War Production Board advised as follows:

"Reference is made to your letter of April 11. As you may know, registration of institutional users of sugar will be conducted by the Office of Price Administration April 28 and 29. At that time we understand you will have an opportunity to explain your problem to your local OPA rationing board which should provide an equitable basis for analyzing your requirements.

"Since there is such a short time between now and the actual inauguration of the rationing program, it is not feasible for this office to make adjustments in the sugar allotments to the various classes of users.

"We therefore suggest that you follow the above procedure and address any further communication in this respect to the Office of Price Administration."

The above decision of the War Production Board meant that we would have to register with the OPA and procure our sugar in the same manner as civilian hospitals. However, we did not register at that time due to the fact that we had a good stock of sugar in our supply depots to meet our needs for a considerable period of time. If we had not exercised foresight in procuring this sugar, we would have faced an embarrassing situation.

The refusal of the OPA to classify the Veterans' Administration as an agency entitled to purchase quota-exempt sugar was brought to the attention of the Administrator under date of April 30, 1942, and as a consequence he issued the following instructions:

"I agree with you thoroughly that the close relationship of the Veterans' Administration to the war effort should entitle it to the same exemption from rationing as the Army and Navy and to that end will you please prepare for my signature a letter to Mr. Leon Henderson, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, asking for exemption and indicating the necessary close cooperation between the War and Navy Departments and the Veterans' Administration and the load of cases already coming to us from these sources requiring care and the progressive increase of this load."

A communication over the Administrator's signature was addressed to Mr. Leon Henderson under date of May 14, 1942, requesting that "Rationing Order No. 3—Sugar Rationing Regulations" be amended to authorize the Veterans' Administration to procure sugar under the same procedure as authorized for the Army and Navy. This letter was sent to Mr. Henderson by messenger and delivered to Mr. Henderson's secretary. No response was received and a follow-up over the Administrator's signature was mailed under date of June 18, 1942, to which no response was received. The matter was further pursued with the OPA in a further attempt to have the Veterans' Administration placed in the same category as Army and Navy, but without results. Finally on or about September 1, 1942, the OPA amended its regulations, placing the Veterans' Administration hospitals into two classes, namely, (1) those engaged in the care of patients who are acutely ill and who temporarily live within the hospital for medical or surgical care and (2) those principally treating chronic cases or mental illnesses and providing domiciliary care. Under date of September 15, 1942, these classifications were protested in letter to Mr. Henderson over the Administrator's signature without results. Finally as a last resort I appeared before the ration board for this area and registered for Veterans' Administration hospitals. We received our sugar allotments for the preparation for service and service of food for patients on the basis of 85 percent of the amount of sugar used for such purposes during the corresponding month of 1941 and for the preparation for service and the service of food for members (domiciliary) on the basis of 60 percent of the amount used for such purposes during the corresponding month of 1941. These allocations were insufficient and we had numerous complaints from hospitals, service organizations, and so forth, as to the lack of sugar. The problem relating to the procurement of sugar was not solved until the early part of 1943, at which time our requirements were allocated by the Department of Agriculture under the food allocation plan hereinafter discussed.

Coffee: The OPA issued an order rationing coffee for the period beginning November 22, 1942, and ending January 31, 1943. During this period our hospitals were not permitted

to receive more coffee than was used during September and October 1942. For the month of February 1943 the allotment was 40 percent of the quantity of coffee used during the base period, September and October 1942. Coffee rationing was finally lifted under date of July 29, 1943, but during the period of rationing we had many complaints because of insufficient quantities of coffee and we could not get any exemption for the Veterans' Administration.

Meats and fats and other foods: We did not encounter any particular difficulties in the procurement of meats and fats until the latter half of the calendar year 1942, when we began to feel the shortages in these commodities. Fortunately, the President, under date of December 5, 1942, issued Executive Order 9280 giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to control the distribution of food, including that required for military as well as other Governmental agencies. The Executive order also authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and procure food for such Federal agencies, and to such extent, as he shall determine necessary or desirable, and promulgate policies to govern the purchase and procurement of food by all other Federal agencies. The Executive order also instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint a committee to advise and consult with him in carrying out the provisions of the order. The contents of this Executive order were brought to the attention of the Administrator on December 18, 1942, recommending that the Veterans' Administration be permitted to designate a representative to serve on the committee provided by the Executive order.

The Administrator approved this recommendation and accordingly a communication was addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture under date of December 21, 1942. No response was received to this letter and finally the Administrator had a personal conference with the Secretary of Agriculture, who promised that he would give consideration to our being represented on the Advisory Committee. On January 16, 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture advised that certain committees to expedite and coordinate food procurement and allocation were being established, and asked the Administrator to designate representatives to serve on these committees. Col. George E. Ijams, Assistant Administrator, was designated as the regular member of these committees, and the Director of Supplies was designated to serve as alternate, in letter dated January 22, 1943, over the Administrator's signature to the Secretary of Agriculture. These officials attended the first meeting of the Inter-Agency Food Procurement Committee on January 28, 1943, and the minutes of this meeting report Colonel Ijams as having made the following comments:

"1. Col. G. E. Ijams of the Veterans' Administration indicated that the canned fruit and vegetable operations of last year were very successful and he saw no reason why they should not be applied to other commodities.

"Colonel Ijams said that this organization is having difficulty in getting certain foods for hospitals, particularly meats, butter, and eggs. Over 80,000 men are hospitalized in the hospitals of the Veterans' Administration. They must be supplied with proper food. As the war progresses, more food will be required inasmuch as veterans' hospitals take in men of a military liability character; that is, men who cannot be rehabilitated as fighting men. The Army and Navy take care of wounded men in the initial hospitalization period. Colonel Ijams indicated that his organization is getting increased production from its own farm operations, particularly on hogs."

Subsequent to the first meeting of the Inter-Agency Food Procurement Committee, Colonel Ijams and the Director of Supplies had conferences with representatives of the Department of Agriculture at which they insisted that the Veterans' Administration should be placed in the same category as the Army and Navy, which at first was refused but finally granted and under date of May 15, 1943, the Director, Food Administration Division, issued an order including the Veterans' Administration as an agency for which separate food allocations would be made in the same manner as for the Army and Navy. This promulgation of policy simplified food procurement in that it removed us from the category of civilian hospitals subject to OPA rationing regulations. Under this policy the Department of Agriculture certified our requirements of rationed food items to OPA and OPA issued ration currency to be handled by us through the ration-banking system.

Canned fruits and vegetables: Prior to the promulgation of the above-mentioned policy, through a cooperative arrangement sponsored by the War Production Board, our requirements for canned fruits and vegetables were pooled with those of the Army and Navy, and in 1942 were purchased by the Army. After the matter of determining food policies was transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture, a similar arrangement has been in effect and at the present time the Army is purchasing our canned fruits and vegetables. This job has been performed by the Army through General Hardigg to our entire satisfaction.

As the food situation became more critical, our hospitals found it more and more difficult to procure locally certain items of perishable food, particularly meats and poultry, and through an arrangement made with the Quartermaster Market Centers, functioning under General Hardigg, these centers have been most helpful in providing our needs for these scarce commodities and this arrangement is working to our entire satisfaction.

Set-aside orders: In order to provide the needs of the armed forces, it was necessary in the early part of 1943 for the Department of Agriculture to promulgate "set-aside order." These orders relate to certain scarce food commodities such as fresh meats, canned fish, butter, powdered skimmed milk, etc., and the Veterans' Administration is included in these set-aside orders along with the armed forces.

I wish to conclude my statement concerning food by paying tribute to the officials in the War Department and the War Food Administration who have cooperated to the fullest extent in our program, particularly General Hardigg of the Subsistence Branch, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, and Lieutenant Colonel Olmstead, Director, Office of Supply, War Food Administration. These officials have displayed an outstanding attitude of cooperation and understanding, and both have stated on several occasions that every essential need for food for veterans in our hospitals will be provided.

PREPARATION MADE IN ANTICIPATION OF INCREASED NEED FOR BEDS

In April 1941 the supply service, because trends indicated scarcity and long deliveries, instituted a procurement program to stockpile, within reason and availability of funds, textile products such as bathrobes, bedspreads, sheeting, towels, underwear, and outer clothing. This move proved to be a wise one for the reason that immediately after our stocks were procured, commodities of this character were in very short supply.

In the early part of January 1942, Colonel Ijams, assistant administrator, and the director of supplies conferred with the administrator and suggested that action be taken immediately to procure certain basic equipment for additional beds to be made available for emergency use, which he agreed should be done, and under date of January 17, 1942, it was recommended to the administrator that he authorize the procurement of sufficient basic equipment to provide 2,500 beds for general medical and surgical cases, and 3,000 beds for neuropsychiatric cases. Inasmuch as funds were not available at that time for the procurement of this equipment, the cost thereof was included in an emergency appropriation which was granted in May 1942, and the equipment in question was procured.

On May 28, 1942, Colonel Ijams recommended to the Administrator that he authorize procurement of sufficient basic equipment to provide an additional 7,500 beds at existing neuropsychiatric facilities at an estimated cost of approximately $600,000. This equipment was eventually authorized for procurement in the latter part of the fiscal year 1943, procurement not being made earlier because of lack of funds, and at no time during the national emergency has the supply service been unable to supply immediately basic equipment required to provide a bed.

For years after World War I the Veterans' Administration maintained a depot in the central manufacturing district of Chicago for storing and distributing supplies to facilities in the Middle West. This depot was located in the quartermaster supply depot under a revocable license issued by the Secretary of War. Soon after the establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps the Veterans' Administration was required by the War Department to relinquish part of this space which, to a certain extent, cramped our operations, but, notwithstanding, we got along fairly well. However, early in 1939, when it appeared that we could have no assurance of continuing occupancy of space in the quartermaster depot and in view of the preparations then being made for national defense, it was recommended to the Administrator that he favorably consider the construction of our own depot. This recommendation was approved, and future developments confirmed the wisdom of the decision. I have given these illustrations of advance planning made by the Veterans' Administration, for the purpose of indicating to the committee that those responsible for providing supplies foresaw and took action in advance of actual development of need. I would not, however, contend or attempt to leave you with the impression that we have not on occasions made mistakes or that there have been no delays in providing equipment and supplies. We have made mistakes, and there have been delays, but such things will happen in any organization in or out of the Government.

SPACE FOR EXPANSION

Section 101, title I, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, authorizes and directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs "to establish necessary regional offices, suboffices, branch offices, contact units, or other subordinate offices in centers of population where there is no Veterans' Administration facility or where such a facility is not readily available or accessible."

Many obstacles confront the Veterans' Administration in securing space to make effective the above cited legislation. Section 3769, Revised Statutes as amended, provides that no department of the Government shall expend in any 1 fiscal year any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations. Consequently the Veterans' Administration, in leasing property to be used for regional offices, branch offices and contact offices, may bind the Government only to the end of the fiscal year in which the leases are consummated, with an option of renewal from year to year for a specified number of years. Owners of property are reluctant to lease space under these conditions, particularly where the area is large or extensive alterations are required, as they have no assurance that the leases will be renewed. Many times the only space available in a locality and adequate for the purpose is offered upon the condition that the owner be given a firm

lease for a period of 5 years. In cases of this kind it is necessary for the Veterans' Administration to ask the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, to negotiate the lease as this agency has statutory authority to make a firm lease for 5 years. Such an arrangement, which requires the Veterans' Administration to acquire its needs through another agency, is not entirely satisfactory.

Section 322 of the Economy Act of June 30, 1932 (46 Stat. 412) provides that appropriations shall not be obligated or expended for the rental of any building or part of a building to be occupied for Government purposes "at a rental in excess of the per annum rate of 15 per centum of the fair market value of the rented premises at date of the lease under which the premises are to be occupied by the Government or for alterations, improvements, and repairs of the readied premises in excess of 25 per centum of the amount of the rent of the first year of the rental term or for the first rental term if for less than one year." The provisions of this section as applicable to rentals do not apply where the rental is not in excess of $2,000 per annum.

Many difficulties arise in establishing the fair market value of property and we are confronted repeatedly with cases where the rental asked for the only space available and adequate for our purposes exceeds the above limitation, or the information received regarding the fair market value is not supported by certification of a competent Government authority as required by the Comptroller General. Other cases arise where the cost of the extensive alterations required at Government expense to adapt the space to our needs is in excess of the limitation of the Economy Act. It is then necessary for the Veterans' Administration to request the War Department to issue a "Certificate of Necessity" under the provisions of the act of April 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 247) to permit the Veterans' Administration to proceed. The authority to issue said certificates is delegated only to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and their designates.

Appropriations of the Veterans' Administration are not available for the construction or the purchase of buildings for regional offices, branch offices, and contact units. Desirable buildings are sometimes offered for sale and not for lease, and the Veterans' Administration is handicapped in not being able to purchase such buildings.

Authority to take by the exercise of the right of eminent domain a lease-hold interest in property has not been extended by law to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Although the Veterans' Administration was declared to be an essential war agency by title I, section 100, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Veterans' Administration has no priority rights as affecting the acquisition of space. Some of our offices are now established, and have for some time been established, in federally owned buildings, and our expanded space requirements could be met by the removal from the buildings of other Federal agencies. With no priority rights this is a difficult matter, and although we have offered to pay the rental of certain agencies and the cost of removal of their office equipment to outside space, we have run into many difficulties, and we have not been highly successful in effecting the removal of other Federal agencies. At the present time the Veterans' Administration has been unable to find suitable space for regional office purposes in Nashville, Tenn.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Chicago, Ill.; Detroit, Mich.; Newark, N. J.; Portland, Oreg., and San Francisco, Calif.

Apropos the subject of supply, I wish to state that 10,000 or more commodities are used in the operation of Veterans' Administration hospitals and other activities. These supplies range in nature from pens and paper used by all employees, regardless of position, to highly technical equipment used by our professional personnel. During this war period there have been times when certain commodities were not available and this situation could not be avoided. Curtailment of production or the diversion of critical materials to war purposes mainly have been the cause of our inability to furnish certain commodities. However, on the whole, the Supply Service has been able to provide what has been needed by anticipating requirements and placing contracts long in advance of actual need. In many instances it has been necessary to anticipate requirements at least 1 year. No hospital has suffered for the lack of food, and while there have been instances when some of the hospitals could not procure the exact commodity desired, the hospitals have been able to maintain an adequate diet for the patients. As of this date the most difficult items of food to procure are fresh and cured meats, poultry, and eggs.

PERSONNEL

Although the personnel situation in Supply is now showing some improvement, until recently and for months approximately an average of 20 percent of our authorized positions were vacant, and since the early part of 1942, there has been an unusual turn-over in personnel. These vacancies and the turnover have prevented maximum production as supply work is more or less technical and inexperienced personnel are not productive of satisfactory results until they have been on the job a considerable period of time. Personnel conditions have, therefore, been a serious handicap in the performance of our functions.

Congress' Failure to Act on Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am seriously concerned about Congress' apathy, in failing to provide the necessary instruments to handle the conversion problems confronting the Nation now. Nothing must prevent us from taking definite, specific action upon our return. It is our individual responsibility, and the responsibility of the people, the representatives of labor, business, and the farmer to cause the legislative body to act as soon as possible. We face undreamed of economic and financial disaster if we do not act. We can prevent such failure of our economy, and we must.

We can start by passing the unemployment compensation measure, which provides pay for 26 weeks to those unemployed at a rate of $26 a week. I would like to see travel-home pay included in this measure. Some of our people have traveled across the United States with their families to work where they were most needed by the war effort. It will most likely be necessary to give these people financial assistance to get them home. Most of them cannot stay where they are, since many war industries are closing down; housing is lamentably short; and community facilities are strained to the breaking point under the pressure of huge war-born populations. In addition, we must think of our 11,000,000 service men and women who are already beginning to return.

It is seen, that in the employment phase of our immediate future alone, these are enough factors to throw us off balance. These must be cared for, and then we must go further. Business must be given the assurance that our economy will be sound enough to warrant expansion. Loans by the Government and private finance must be given to small business, which does not have the billions in reserve that big business possesses. Monopolistic practices must be cut to the minimum, or we'll have no small business. Foreign trade must be stimulated in order that our full production does not lie wasted in surplus stock piles. Plans must start at once for much needed great public works, such as the proposed seven TVA's, which will provide a large amount of employment. This will greatly increase the Nation's industrial potential, which in turn provides the key to long-term full employment. Health insurance measures must be passed, social security broadened, housing improved on a vast scale. There are many other imperative steps to be taken. Some legislation has already been introduced to prepare the way for these vital foundations for our post-war economy. There must be more.

To insure action by the Congress as a whole, the people of the United States must take a hand in getting their Representatives off the dime. They must help us to help ourselves, by becoming conscious of the dangers, and, more important, the remedies for the ills we are certain to have otherwise.

We do not need to have inflation or depression. I am determined to do my utmost to prevent either. We can have a flourishing, prosperous economy—a full life for all our citizens and we must. The majority of Representatives feel as I do, and the leadership of both the House and Senate, I am sure, will give first priority to such legislative measures as I have outlined, when Congress reconvenes in October. Then, and only then can we make up for the time we have lost in not completing our conversion program now. The people's job is to help us. I know they will have confidence in us to stabilize United States economy in the period ahead. We cannot let them down.

The Administrative Weaknesses of the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE W. ERVIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I only wish that the Meat Division of the Washington office of the Office of Price Administration were inspired and guided by the intelligence and understanding which is exhibited in the district office of the Office of Price Administration in Charlotte, N. C.

In view of the fact that the policies of the Meat Division of the OPA in Washington have justly earned the disrespect of the people of our country and have resulted in preferential treatment of the large packing houses at the expense of small slaughterers and abattoirs, I desire to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Charlotte Observer, of Charlotte, N. C., on July 11, 1945.

This editorial reads as follows:

UTTERLY DISCREDITED

National Price Administrator Bowles, of the OPA widely scatters a propagandish piece from this wartime agency to effect that the next 12 months will be the most critical yet experienced in preventing inflation.

Such it may be, but not entirely for the reasons Mr. Bowles assigns.

He would have the American public believe that as more civilian goods are returned to the markets, the people, with their excess of money reserves in hand, will start a stampede to buy at any price.

If, therefore, the stalwart defenses of the OPA controls break-down, the people will commit economic suicide.

It's all just as simple as that, and just as subtle as clever ballyhoo.

The OPA is only concerned, of course, with saving the people from themselves. Its chief do you imagine, is not at all interested in saving the OPA for its 325,000 job holders for another year to wax fat and greasy at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The fact of the matter is that whatever crisis the system of price controls faces in the Nation for the next 12 months is the fault of the administration of this agency itself which now stands thoroughly discredited for its incompetencies and inefficiencies in doing the job it was assigned to do more than 3 years ago.

The American people have lost faith, not in the essential wisdom and necessity of price control for the duration, but they have lost confidence in the capacity of the present national OPA set-up to administer the price-control system in a fair, above-board, intelligent and effective fashion.

There's the origin of whatever crisis can now be foreseen in this agency's operations.

Congress has probed into OPA's muddlings and mismanagements and has set the pace in denouncing its glaring defaults and defections.

And that body has moved to set up corrective checks upon the wild economic manias among its bookish and impractical quacks and charlatans which are responsible for the gargantuan mess in which the country finds itself in the pricing and rationing of goods and commodities.

Congress has not only vested in the new Secretary of Agriculture authority to review and pass upon the policies of the OPA, largely as a result of the startling food shortage investigations which the lawmakers conducted several weeks ago, but the present House food committee announces, through its chairman, that it will continue to "serve as watchdog of the Nation's food supplies."

In the Senate, also, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, once an appointee of the late President Roosevelt, has shouted the charge that Price Administrator Bowles has clearly demonstrated his incompetency, and has notified the upper Chamber that he will introduce a resolution calling for a special committee "to keep tab on the OPA as long as it is in existence."

It is vitally significant, also, that Congress is subjecting the OPA to investigation now as to its alleged un-American activities and propaganda.

The mericless bombardment of charges hurled upon the OPA by Members of Congress has issued up out of the minds and attitudes of the people generally of the country.

The public has grown not only weary with but nauseated over the ineptitudes in inefficiencies of OPA officials in Washington, many of whom are characterized by the Atlanta Constitution as being of "the pipsqueak variety."

Farmers, merchants, food dealers, manufacturers, processors of foods and goods—spokesmen of practically every conceivable and nameable line of business in America—have poured their diatribes upon the muddling and fumbling tactics and policies of the OPA.

And of more recent date the great body of the usually inarticulate consumers who at first were deluded by the agency's bombastic ballyhoo into thinking the OPA stood as the bulwark of defense for the preservation, has now also turned against it to heap bitter derision, scorn, and contempt upon its kindergarten mistakes and malpractices.

Even from the ranks of organized labor, one of the stanchest supporters of price control, are coming denunciations upon the agency's "career muddlers and nitwits," as the United Mine Workers Journal denominates them.

Verily, the crisis faced in the maintenance of an effective anti-inflation system is not that of a bad and unacceptable price-control law, but rather that of the bad administration of that law under the present dilettantes in the national set-up.

FEPC a Gestapo for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a very fine editorial, which appeared in the Metropolitan News of West Hartford, Conn., on May 17, 1945, which conclusively shows that the proposed permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee would be most undesirable legislation for the United States.

Under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of that editorial which reads as follows:

FEPC A GESTAPO FOR AMERICA

Legislation now pending in Congress, bill H. R. 2232, better known as the FEPC bill, is a well-meaning document, with intent commendable. It is, however, fraught with great danger to the very people who are working so hard for its passage. It seeks to set up in America a Gestapo, the like of which set the flames that started the conflagration that destroyed the German people and millions of innocent victims of Nazi rule.

The purposes of the Fair Employment Practice Act is to see that employers award jobs and opportunity to everyone without regard to their race or creed. From our observation, this is already being done in great measure.

House bill 2232 would set up a commission to see that the law was invoked against discrimination toward any individual who wished to make a complaint. It would be the Gestapo of America and fear would be its strongest weapon, to be picked up and used by any straggler that wished to use it.

The whole scheme smacks of communism and is contrary to our American way. When our forefathers gained their independence back in '76 they established here a Nation dedicated to the principles that all men were created equal. The Constitution guarantees us the right of free speech and our right to any religion we care to abide by. If we so please, we dont have to believe in any religion. The founding fathers, by past experience, knew exactly what they wanted, and no one has been able to improve on their working set of rules. If we consider ourselves a free people, and our sons have not died in vain, we should not seek to pass a law taking away our freedoms while our sons still living are away from home. This law seeks to foist a foreign bureaucracy upon the American scene while our guard is down.

To enumerate the various catch phrases of this bill would require too much time, but a glance at some of the features will give one an idea of its ramifications and dangers.

Under this bill it would be unfair to discharge any individual "because of such individual's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry." It stands to reason that if such a person had been hired, without regard to race or creed, there would be little sense in firing him, unless he wasn't performing his job in a satisfactory manner. The rub here is that the disgruntled employee could bring you up on charges by saying you fired him because he went to a different church than you did. The truth could be that you fired the man because he was no good. The charge against the employer amounts to conviction in the eyes of the public, and no amount of acquittal on the part of the Commission would be able to erase that blot against your good name and business.

Investigations of complaints could hog tie any employer and brand him a bigot. The employer would live in fear of each and every employee. Any slacker in a plant could hold this weapon over the head of the employer, no matter how unjust the charge would be.

There are plenty of bigots in this country and there are just as many individuals hiding behind their racial strain, willing to call everyone who doesn't agree with them "bigot." This is an entirely new phase in American life. Back in the old days, our forefathers pioneered and built up this new Nation out of brawn and faith in God. When things looked blackest during our revolution, George Washington borrowed money from Haym Saloman. It no doubt never occurred to either of these individuals to inquire of the other's religion during the transaction. The casualty lists are full of names that read like the roster of the Tower of Babel but no GI in a fox hole inquires the religion or minds the color of his buddy in the next firing pit.

When a concern needs help, they usually look around for someone qualified to do a certain job, the individual is usually hired on that basis, and if he turns out to be a lemon he is replaced. From our observation of this bill, the rules only apply to employer, which means anyone having in his employ, six or more individuals. The bill obviously discards small stores, etc. Again from our observation, it is in these closely knit smaller units where racial discretion is most apt to be used. Oftentimes, this can be laid to one individual trying to find a place for some member of his family or an immediate relative. If these smaller stores were to be included, which they may well be, any disgruntled employee could start walking up and down in front of the store with a placard telling the neighbors that the owner of the store was a bigot and a heel. Even if the storekeeper was entirely innocent, the damage would be done.

It's a simple matter for any minority group to get together and by slinking small talk put the onus on any individual who happens to mind his own business even though he may be outspoken on matters upon which all of us obviously can't agree.

One of the especially harmful intentions of this bill, would be its effect on the Veterans' Preference Law. When Congress passed the draft law, they entered into a pact with the fighting men to assure them that they would have preference in getting their old jobs back. Under this bill, at the discretion of a member of the FEPC any person displaced to make way for the veteran, could bring charges against the employer.

No law in the world has the power to make you love your neighbor, you cannot legislate this sort of thing. It would seem to be the better aim if we taught brotherly

love in the public school. Education, not legislation is in order.

Both New York and New Jersey, during the present year, have passed similar legislation to the bill now pending in Washington. In urging passage of the New York State act, it was readily seen that Governor Dewey sought to feather his political nest. If he did, he at least killed his future political career when he signed the measure.

This is a most dangerous piece of legislation in its present form. It should not be allowed to pass while millions of American youth are engaged against the enemy in the Pacific.

A Memorial Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proposal of the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce:

A MEMORIAL FOREST TO PERPETUATE THE MEMORY OF THOSE WHO SERVED IN WORLD WAR II

Nations have always, and rightfully, honored those who have given the last full measure of devotion. Memorials of an infinite variety may be found in every land.

Today, memorials should take on a new meaning. They should also include the living and they should have utility value.

Therefore, we suggest for consideration of all Americans a national memorial forest, which would have eight main objectives. It would serve as:

1. A living, perpetual memorial.
2. A recreation center.
3. A setting for a veterans' hospital.
4. A rehabilitation and vocational center.
5. A reforestation system.
6. A game preserve.
7. A conservation method.
8. A means of employment.

Each person who has served in the armed services would be represented by a tree with an appropriate marker. The various branches of the service might be identified by trees of different kinds. Those who have made the supreme sacrifice would be remembered by an evergreen.

The forest might be divided either by States or by branches of the service, or by a combination of each.

At an appropriate time, should any trees die or be felled for harvest, they would be replaced immediately, thus insuring a perpetual memorial.

If a veterans' hospital is located in conjunction with the memorial forest, a golf course, tennis courts, ball diamonds, and other recreational facilities should be provided. It might be well to have a tuberculosis hospital in connection with the veterans' hospital.

Great pilgrimages of those wishing to pay homage or to enjoy rest and recreation would be facilitated by a network of highways, nearby airports, and modern hotels.

Missouri might well build a memorial museum in connection with this forest area. Much additional space will be required when the souvenirs of this war are assembled for display, since there is insufficient space in the Capitol Building. The memorial forest would attract far greater numbers than the Capitol Building. A carillon, rising from the memorial museum, would be the focal point of the memorial forest.

Memorial parks could be established by cities of all sizes, or counties, in connection with needed park and recreational projects.

Within the memorial forest a natural amphitheater would provide an Ozark bowl for midwestern teams and a summer opera course.

Four proposed plans have been prepared for the financing of this memorial forest.

This proposed national memorial forest should be located in Missouri:

1. Missouri is near the geographical and population centers of the Nation.
2. Missouri is the logical focal point of East-West and North-South travel.
3. Missouri has the type of land and general topography required for such a project.
4. The climate in Missouri is particularly inviting.
5. Missouri's 16,434 miles of State-maintained highways, 6,800 miles of railways, and many landing fields make it readily accessible, as Missouri is but a matter of hours from any section of the Nation.
6. The proposed Veterans' Hospital and Convalescent Home could be located near the center of this forest.
7. In Missouri such a memorial forest could be located contiguous to a large body of water, where fishing, swimming, and boating could be enjoyed.
8. There are several national forest areas in the State of Missouri, one of which includes Fort Leonard Wood.

In Seville, Spain, one will find this inscription:

"Let us build a church so great that those who come after us may think us mad to have attempted it."

This church was once but a vision in the minds of a few people. A century and a half were required to build it. In America an entire continent was built in a comparable time.

We need the same kind of imagination today, coupled with a determination to "pay the price" for the achievement of our dreams.

Letters of endorsement have been received from leaders in congressional circles, high-ranking military officials in this country, the European theater, and the South Pacific theater of operations, several State chambers of commerce, and many local chambers of commerce. What do you and your organization think about it? Write and tell me.

H. C. RETHWISCH,
Executive Secretary,
Missouri State Chamber of Commerce,
Fayette, Mo.

In the Confusion of the Times We Have Forgotten the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, since the Seventy-ninth Congress convened, it has been generous with its appropriations. It has provided all of the money necessary to the Army, Navy, and war agencies for the proper conduct of the war.

It has appropriated money to carry on the regular function of Government.

It has granted the postal employees a long-delayed and much-deserved increase in pay.

It has adjusted the salaries of the classified employees of the Government by giving them increases in wages necessary to meet the rising cost of living.

It has passed a new tax bill for the relief of business.

Some time ago it made a substantial contribution to the land-grant railroads of the country by voluntarily abrogating the contracts with these railroads by which the Government was given preferential rates.

It has properly modified the GI bill of rights to make it more workable.

Through UNRRA it has made provision for the war poor and distressed of Europe, for which it should be applauded.

The Congress has done all of these generous things and many more. It has taken care of nearly all of the groups who came before it seeking relief—all but one—the old people of the country.

The Congress has failed to provide an adequate system of old-age pensions for our senior citizens. These senior citizens made the sacrifices that have made this country great. We of this generation reap the fruits of their labor—yet we have forgotten them.

I sincerely hope that when the Congress reconvenes in the fall, one of the "must" pieces of legislation will be the early passage of a bill such as H. R. 2229, the Business Employment and Security Act, referred to as the Townsend plan.

It should liberalize the provision of the old-age pension by reducing the age limit, stepping up the amount of the pension paid, and by simplifying administration.

Let me call your attention to the recent report by Judge Vinson to the President and the Congress entitled "The Road to Tokyo and Beyond," in which he stresses the necessity for maintaining high national income in order to sustain buying power. High national income means full employment; and full employment is the way to avoid hard times.

How can Government pump money into the economic blood stream more successfully than through adequate pensions to our aged citizens?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert at this point a statement made by Dr. Norman W. Pendleton, clergyman, humanitarian, and lecturer, an authority on this subject:

Through all the weary ages man has lived under an economy of scarcity. As long as man struggled to bring forth from the earth the necessities of life, with the aid of crude implements of agriculture, he could not produce enough to provide abundance for the children of men. Scarcity was a cold, hard fact. Men battled for control of that which was scarce.

The nineteenth century will be forever memorable for man's conquest of the cosmic forces. He captured that weird spirit called steam. He enslaved that mighty mystery called electricity. And by applying power to his mechanical inventions, has in less than 100 years, built up a high-geared, high-powered industrial civilization which has changed the face of the earth, and made possible "freedom from fear and want."

So, at long last we have solved the old, old problem of production. We can produce. We have the stuff. We have come over the Great Divide. Behind us lies the hard, dark-shadowed climb over the hills of scarcity. Ahead, the sunlit slopes of potential abundance.

We can produce. We can produce, almost without limit.

Yet, with the angel of potential abundance hovering over our fortunate land, the wolf of want threatens to camp, once again, on the doorsteps of millions of American homes.

For one thing most of us are still thinking in the pinched, miserly fear-crouched terms of scarcity. Until we learn to think in terms of abundance, all our thinking will be confusion and all our planning will end in frustration. Change your thinking for the democracy of abundance is at hand.

One of our great industrialists has recently set forth the problem, the danger, and the opportunity very vividly. Says he:

"We can produce. That is not a matter of debate. But, our production capacity is not necessarily an unmixed blessing. It may prove to be a terrible monument to a tragically unbalanced economy. That is an economy capable of producing on a high and almost limitless level, while unable to provide sufficient purchasing power to enable the people to buy what the system can produce and what the people need."

"Just to make things is no good," he continues. "The people must be able to buy what we produce or the wheels of industry will slow down. These facts are unanswerable."

Our problem, then, is to expand purchasing power to equal our productive power. We are soon to discover that it is more moral to spend like a prince than to pinch like a pauper.

We must strive for full employment.

We must seek to establish an annual guaranteed real wage.

But the complete answer is not there.

With so-called full employment, the purchase dollar does not equal the production dollar. For a slice is taken out of every wage dollar for saving and that portion is not used to buy that which has been produced. We must find a way to fill up that gap so that purchasing power will equal production. If we cannot do that, we are up a blind alley from which there is no escape. If we cannot buy that which is produced, the free-enterprise system is doomed. We must find a way—a truly American way. As I see it, the Townsend national recovery plan is that way. And as American as apple pie, coffee and sinkers, or Bunker Hill.

GI Joe will soon come marching home. He is coming home expecting. Having risked his life for the American way, he has a right to expect. To expect a job. A good job. A well-paid job. A job that will support a family in American decency. But GI Joe has two rivals—the marvelous machines of manufacture and agriculture which have been improved and multiplied during the war. Because of these machines fewer men will be required to maintain manufacture and to man the farms of the Nation.

What shall we do? Adopt the reactionary philosophy of Gandhi and sweep the machines into the sea? Impossible. What shall we do? Maintain GI Joe in frustrating idleness on a morale-shattering dole? Unthinkable. Too utterly stupid for this great America of ours. What shall we do? We must cede him the job now being held by his older relatives.

GI Joe has a second rival for a job. Alas, and tragically it's his own mother and dad and elder relatives. The very folks who, with 10,000,000 GI Joes overseas, have held productive jobs and during the war have turned out a production miracle, making America not only the "arsenal of Democracy" but also the bread basket of the United Nations.

GI Joe is coming home to take dad's and mom's jobs. What shall we do with mom and dad and uncle and aunt, who are getting old? Shall we cast them to the rubbish heap? Shall we make them a burden on GI Joe, who has his own children to raise? Shall we, under the guise of so-called social security, hand out a pittance and let them fritter out their blessed lives in the slow starvation and un-American shame?

No! Never in this great America, which has produced more wealth in the last 100 years than all the rest of the world produced in the preceding 1,800 years. Surely, not in a land dedicated to "the greatest good of the greatest number." This is America, not Europe. Had you forgotten that?

The Townsend national recovery plan is geared to do three imperatives:

1. Provide a permanent job and a good real wage for GI Joe and all his young friends by

2. Retiring mom and pop and their senior friends through a national insurance that will crown their lives with a dignity worthy of the American way of life, through

3. A national revolving fund raised by a simple, just, and universal tax of 3 percent, which the big boys cannot escape. This insurance (approximately $100 per month) will be paid directly to the retired senior citizens every 30 days and must be spent within 30 days, going directly into the stream of national circulation, and thus filling up the "gap" in purchasing power. Thus all of us, together, will be able to buy what GI Joe and all his young friends are able to produce with the aid of modern machinery. This will make our potential abundance available for use. It will pull the cork out of the horn of plenty.

Do you, or any of your friends, know of any other American plan that will do what must be done? Study this prosperity program. It is the only proposal that gives the promise of: Jobs for GI Joe and his friends; a dignified completion of life for mom and dad and their friends; expansion of purchasing power to equal production; saving the American "free enterprise" system from collapse. Thus, only, may we avoid a world-wide depression that will make the last depression look like a light opera as compared to a Wagnerian tragedy.

It is the Townsend national recovery plan or the biggest bust in history. If you love America, do not treat this lightly. Dedicated to the greatest good of the greatest number. This is America, not Europe. Have you forgotten that? We must solve GI Joe's problem and his mom's and dad's problem at one and the same time.

Indian Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles on the Indian immigration bill:

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 21, 1944]

There is a bill pending in Congress which would extend to natives of India the same concession of quota immigration and of naturalization recently extended to China. It seems worthy of adoption, for much the same reason as in the case of the Chinese—it would remove a discrimination against a people who are fighting hard side by side with American soldiers.

[From the Kansas City Star of March 11, 1944]

A GESTURE TO INDIA

Congress recently, with national approval, removed the restrictions which prevented Chinese from entering the United States except as temporary visitors, and from being eligible to citizenship. Only a handful of Chinese, 105, were involved. But the act was accepted as a gesture of good will and one calculated to remove a chronic source of irritation.

Now news comes from India that a feeling of resentment is growing because some similar gesture is not made to the people of India who remain under the old taboo. Indian troops have fought against our common enemies in Burma and north Africa. They are fighting beside American troops in Italy. There would seem to be no reason why we should not apply the quota principle to the Indians as well as to the Chinese. Only about 70 Indians would be permitted to enter every year under the quota. To make such a gesture would seem a warranted recognition of the part of the people of India in this war.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 22, 1944]

WHY NOT EQUAL STATUS FOR THE PEOPLE OF INDIA?

Back in December the bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts became law. Subject to quota restrictions, the Chinese now have the right of entry into the United States; and persons of Chinese origin may be admitted to citizenship.

The repeal of these restrictions on the citizens of one of the United Nations removed a piece of discrimination that had been a source of chronic irritation and was most certainly in conflict with the lofty declarations of the Atlantic Charter. But this repeal only serves to emphasize the continued existence of another restriction of similar character.

This is the restriction on the nationals of India, to which the full force of the Immigration Act of 1924 and the Nationality Act of 1940 still applies. Indians are denied entry into the United States, except as tourists, students, and so on; and persons of Indian origin may not be admitted to citizenship.

Now that the discriminations against the Chinese have been removed, it is difficult to find any reason for discriminating against the nationals of India. Their contributions to the war, in money, in materials, and in fighting men, have been substantial. Indians fought the Japanese in Burma, the Germans and Italians in Africa. Indian contingents are now fighting the Germans in Italy, alongside American troops. And the rebirth of nationalist sentiment among the people of India makes the continued existence of these discriminations a rich source of grievance and suspicion of our motives. If the motives which led to the repeal of our discriminations against the Chinese are sound, then the same motives apply in the case of India.

To repeal these exclusions would not of course, mean special status for the Indians. Quotas would apply to them, as to all other countries (and the Indian quota would allow the entry of about 70 Indians a year). But simple justice suggests that the least we do is to grant them the same status as the Chinese. Until this is done, the professions of scorn so often encountered in the United States in connection with the British treatment of India will sound very hollow.

This is the text of a dispatch sent to the India magazine, Trend, by its Washington correspondent, Serge Fliegers.

WASHINGTON.—Shortly after it reconvenes from its summer recess, the United States House of Representatives will be called upon to vote on what is known as the Indian immigration bill, designed to permit legal immigration and naturalization of men and women born in India.

The bill, introduced by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, has had a stormy passage through the House Immigration Committee and was at a certain point tabled by that

committee. However, energetic intervention by President Truman, former Ambassador Phillips, Representative Clare Boothe Luce, Committee Chairman Samuel Dickstein, of New York, and others managed to reverse the opinion of the committee and the bill was finally approved and sent to the House. Although it only provides for the annual immigration into the United States of less than 100 Indians, this legislation has raised a large amount of newspaper comment throughout the United States and in India.

Influential dailies, such as the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Christian Science Monitor and many others, have both in their news dispatches and editorial columns adopted a strong attitude of support.

Their main argument was that present legislation, excluding Indians from becoming citizens of the United States was discrimination of the worst nature against the people of a heroic ally. They pointed to the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, which removed the stigma from the gallant Chinese. The Indian quota, if this bill is passed, would be lower than the Chinese quota, but Indians are primarily interested in the moral principle of this idea rather than in the practical results. Supporters of the Celler bill have realized the deep significance the passage of this legislation will have. Its acceptance not only involves the friendship of India toward the United States. If Indian businessmen are finally allowed to enter the United States there is prospect of profitable trade between America and India, which is one of the eight most important industrial countries in the world.

Congressman SAMUEL DICKSTEIN has fully realized the importance of the legislation under his consideration. With bipartisan support, including the help of Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Republican of Connecticut, he has been able to convince a number of Representatives of the necessity of passing the Celler bill. Under his untiring efforts to make the people of the United States realize the importance of this measure, it is now held very likely that the House will go along with the majority of public opinion expressed on this subject and will approve the Celler bill when it comes up for discussion.

Favorable editorials on Indian immigration have appeared in the following newspapers:

New York Times, February 10, 1944.
Kansas City Star, March 11, 1944.
Baltimore Sun, February 22, 1944.
Los Angeles Times, March 21, 1944.
Washington News, May 4, 1944.
Baltimore Sun, March 7, 1944.
St. Louis Post Dispatch, May 15, 1944.

Favorable news dispatches appeared in:

The Christian Science Monitor of May 6, March 25, and September 13, 1944.
The New Leader.
The Advocate of Baton Rouge, La.
The Union Bulletin, Walla Walla, Wash.
The Morning Forum, Fargo, N. Dak.
The Review, Alliance, Oreg.
The Herald, Uniontown, Pa.
The Dispatch, Moline, Ill.
The Sentinel, Keene, N. H.
The Post, Birmingham, Ala.
The News, Dallas, Tex.
The Observer, Fayetteville, N. C.
The Record, Columbia, S. C.
The Express, Oklahoma.
The Tribune, Des Moines, Iowa.
The Courier, Evansville, Ohio.
The Reporter, Independence, Kans.
The Times, Indianapolis, Ind.
The Herald, Oskaloosa, Iowa.
The News Tribune, Duluth, Minn.
The Newsport News, Virginia.
The Times Leader, Ohio.
The Buffalo News, New York.
The Journal, Knoxville, Tenn.
The Montana Standard, Montana.
The Daily Advertiser, Lafayette, La.
The Presbyterian Tribune, Utica, N. Y.

Tidewater Oil Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 21 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, usually expresses himself with what I may call flavor. It is always interesting to me, and sometimes intriguing, to read or hear what the Secretary has to say.

There is something more to this, Mr. President, than mere interest. The Secretary of the Interior always speaks with a forthrightness which I consider most admirable in any public official. I happen to have in my possession copies of letters written by the Secretary to the attorney general of California concerning the troublesome and perplexing problem of tidewater lands and oil. The Secretary speaks plainly in these letters, which I do not think have been printed in the RECORD. Because he does, and shows his position so clearly, I ask unanimous consent that both letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 25, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT W. KENNY,
Attorney General of California,
Sacramento, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. KENNY: The second attack upon me in the last 10 days by such a noted progressive as yourself seriously disturbs my plans for my old age. I did hope to be able to have a climactic controversy in peace. However, as one liberal to another, I want to assure you that I will be able to bear this most unkindest cut of all with experienced fortitude and with a continuation of my high esteem for you.

I have noticed the statement made by you commenting on my letter to the House Judiciary Committee on June 20 regarding so-called tideland legislation. You have challenged my statement that the sole issue involved is "some specific valuable oil off the coast of California." You point out that, in your opinion, the recent suit filed by the Attorney General of the United States against the Pacific Western Oil Co. involves not only the small areas of oil-bearing lands off the coast of California but all submerged lands in the United States, both inland and offshore. You further challenge my statement that ports and harbors and inland waterways are not involved and point out that certain Government lawyers testified otherwise in 1939 at the hearings on the Nye resolution.

I want to make perfectly clear that my only interest in this matter is oil—the same oil in which the Navy has been so interested in all the previous discussions before congressional committees of submerged oil-bearing lands. During these past years I have had too much to do with the problem of filling the almost incredible demands for petroleum to meet the military and industrial needs of the war not to recognize the plain fact that petroleum reserves, above everything else, are vital to the future security of this country. A nation without oil is today defenseless. I would be grossly neglectful of the public interest were I a tacit witness to the reckless exploitation of a resource so critical to the Nation's welfare where substantial doubts exist as to its ownership.

I am no more willing than you seem to be that there should be any legal action that would raise the question of title to other than petroleum bearing lands and which would, therefore, be disturbing to State, municipal, or even to private interests. Accordingly, I am willing to support fuly and publicly a bill before the Congress to quitclaim to the States all submerged areas of the United States, both inland and off shore, excepting only the small areas of coastal submerged lands beyond the low watermark which contain petroleum deposits. If your principal objective is to quiet title to all submerged lands excepting only the title to off shore submerged oil lands, then I have no doubt that you will join with me immediately in proposing and sponsoring legislation to effectuate this purpose.

You and I seem to have another common objective. Quite naturally you do not like the idea that doubts as to the ownership even of the small areas of oil bearing lands shall exist while the case recently filed in the District Court of Southern California drags its weary way through the courts, by reason, perhaps, of the dilatory tactics of some of the litigants. My guess is that the Department of Justice feels the same way about this, although I do not want to be understood as speaking authoritatively for it. I recall that when this suit was filed you suggested that you would have welcomed its introduction as a legal action in the Supreme Court, as it could have been under our Constitution, so that there might be an early decision. I am willing to accept your suggestion and to join with you in a recommendation to the Attorney General that he dismiss the action in California and simultaneously file a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States to clear the title of the United States to these specific oil bearing lands. Such action by the Department of Justice would, I am sure, mitigate the alarm of most of the Attorneys General, although I recognize that the suit would still involve revenues to the State of California which would be of legitimate concern to you. Nevertheless, as you recognize, the interests of both the State and the Federal Government would be served by a prompt and final determination of this vexing question by that agency of the Government especially created by the Constitution to decide such questions. Should the Supreme Court uphold the claims of the United States to these oil lands, in accordance with the traditional policy of this Department, I would be prepared to recommend congressional action to convey the land itself to the State or appropriate municipality, reserving only the mineral deposits therein.

My suggestions would have these three results:

1. Any cloud that may exist as a result of the pending suit in the District Court of California would be immediately removed, except only as to those comparatively small areas off the coast of your State which are known to contain petroleum deposits;

2. Even as to the oil lands, the question would be resolved in a matter of some 10 months instead of 8 or 10 years as might happen under the pending litigation; and

3. No Member of Congress or, for that matter, administrative official like myself, would be put on the embarrassing spot of having to decide whether to yield to private interests what might amount to billions of dollars

of Federal revenues involving the irreplaceable sinews of national defense, that alluring viscosity in which so many political careers have been boiled—oil.

I have sought in this letter to clarify my position in view of my great interest in the petroleum resources available to the Nation. I might comment, in conclusion, on your assertion that in 1933 I was not prepared to challenge the squatter claims of the State of California to the submerged lands and their oil. As you no doubt remember, there were many other pressing problems in 1933 which demanded the attention of all of us. Be that as it may, I am content to claim the same privilege of changing my mind, which is frequently exercised even by courts of last resort, to say nothing of the attorneys general of all our States. Incidentally, unless my information is inaccurate, this is a privilege which the title companies have not indulged; they have consistently refused to insure titles to these lands deriving from the State of California.

With all kind regards and in a firm belief that we will yet be on the same side at Armageddon, I am

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 16, 1945.

Mr. ROBERT W. KENNY,
Attorney General of California,
State Building
San Francisco, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. KENNY: I have your letter of July 5. Of course, if the titles in question belong to the State of California and the Federal Government wants them, it should, as you suggest, either negotiate for the purchase of the lands involved or take by eminent domain. This is a legal question for the courts to decide and I cannot understand why there should be any hesitation in joining in a submission of the issue in such a way as to get the earliest possible authoritative opinion.

Accordingly, I renew my suggestion that you join with me in asking the Attorney General of the United States to file an original proceeding against the State of California in the Supreme Court of the United States. This thought is based upon a statement that you are quoted to have made when the suit in the District Court was started. The United States Supreme Court could pass upon this question in a period of 10 months or less and then the present doubts would be resolved.

I also suggested in my former letter to you that we join in supporting a bill in the Congress that would clear title to all lands supposed to be affected by the pending suit filed by the Attorney General of the United States excepting only lands known to be oil bearing.

It seems to me that both of my suggestions are in the interests of the affected States.

With personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

The Value of American Feature Films in Reeducating Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to protest the War Department's policy of refusing to permit the showing of American entertainment films in that portion of Germany under American control.

Experience has shown, even in the few weeks since VE-day, that the Germans are eager to see movies. They are now only able to see news reels and short subjects—documentaries. The Army has found that news reels have had an excellent effect upon the Germans; and that, for example, news reel pictures of German atrocity camps were extremely valuable to impress on German audiences a sense of guilt for the monstrous crimes which the Nazis committed.

Many of the documentary films—which deal with life in America, our ideals, and the power of America—have been valuable as part of the immense reeducation campaign with which our occupation forces are charged. The fact is, however, that the Germans have been subjected to such a barrage of out-and-out propaganda for 10 years that they have become immune to that technique. Army observers have discovered that the Germans are supercritical and that they are prone to scoff at documentary films which are not subtle enough in their presentation of our American ideals. It is obvious, therefore, that the documentary film is not enough. Entertainment films, feature films with fiction plots, are necessary.

One of our leading motion-picture producers recently pledged to President Truman that Hollywood would make special sequences for entertainment films to be shown in Germany. The War Department must permit us to take advantage of this pledge.

The majority of our picture makers realize the value of their product and the propaganda value inherent in them. I am certainly not the first to speak of the ability of our motion pictures to sell our American way of life. I have only to paraphrase words which were spoken on this floor by my predecessor now serving in the armed forces, Will Rogers, Jr., to the effect that our American movies were the best salesmen for America because they do not have the obvious purpose of selling America. Their purpose is, first, to entertain not only Americans but the people of all the world. This entertainment, which springs from the American life, is the best and certainly the most subtle propaganda for the American way.

Businessmen in the export trades have long realized that these films are important salesmen, that trade follows the movies. The military experts who are seeking to reorient the German people will equally find the movies helpful.

Our Soviet allies are already showing entertainment films in that portion of Germany under their administration. They are aware that the German people for 10 long years have been kept in ignorance of what is going on outside of Germany. That these people have a burning curiosity, a healthy curiosity, to learn what they can of life in other countries, is encouraging. The motion picture is the best means yet devised for satisfying such a curiosity. At the same time, the Russians recognize the universal appeal of a story. That is why they are exhibiting feature films with fiction plots in Germany.

Our American producers, whose economic well-being depends to great extent on the volume of their foreign markets, are properly concerned about this divergence in policy between the Soviet and American authorities. But, it is not because of trade advantages that I urge that Hollywood motion pictures be permitted in Germany. It is because of their proven value in winning friends for us that I recommend that the United States Army abandon its policy of keeping Hollywood feature films from the screens of conquered Germany.

I would like to suggest that our military authorities review the scores of outstanding films produced in this country during the past 10 years. I am sure they will find them not only beneficial, but most necessary to our purposes in the reeducation of Germany.

Resignation of General Chennault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 21 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three brief editorials, one entitled "General Chennault Resigns," published in the New Orleans States under date of July 16, 1945; the second, entitled "Chennault's Retirement," published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 16, 1945; and the third, entitled "Twentieth Century Witch Hunt?" published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of July 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans States of July 16, 1945]

GENERAL CHENNAULT RESIGNS

Louisianians learned with regret that Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault had resigned from the United States Army, and his command of the Fourteenth Air Force in China. He has been one of the most colorful figures in the war, and his activities long antedated our own entry into the conflict.

Though a native of Texas, he claimed Louisiana as his home and called himself a "Cajun from the Louisiana swamps." Born in 1890, he was educated at Louisiana State College and Louisiana State Normal and took up life as a country school teacher. A love of adventure took him into aviation and he became a first lieutenant in the United States Air Service Reserve Corps in 1917. But even that was too tame for his adventurous spirit and he became a stunt flier and leader of Three Men on a Flying Trapeze, whose breath-taking feats astounded the spectators.

In 1937 he was declared unfit for duty, and his commission in the reserve corps was withdrawn. He settled down to a quiet life in the little town of Water Proof with his wife and six sons and two daughters, until temptation again lured him off to far fields. He went to China with two of his old buddies of the Flying Trapeze to help Chiang Kai-shek, and with a few old crates as a nucleus, formed one of the most spectacular flying units in the world. They whipped the Japanese at every point, by a new technique developed by Chennault, until he claimed

that on the basis of results per plane, his force was the most destructive in the world.

When the United States entered the war, the Flying Tigers were succeeded by the Fourteenth Air Force and Chennault was made a brigadier general in the United States Army, and later promoted to major general. A few days ago, he was superseded by Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer as commander of all United States air forces in China, and this was followed by Chennault's resignation.

While no reason has been given for his retirement, it is not unlikely that General Chennault felt that his splendid work in China deserved more consideration than he received. His achievements will live long in the annals of aerial warfare, and in the hearts of the Chinese people, whom he served so long, so faithfully and so well.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of July 16, 1945]

CHENNAULT'S RETIREMENT

Americans who have watched the progress of the war in the Far East from the beginning will regret Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault's decision to resign his command in China and retire from active duty in the Army. But they will understand his reasons. Chennault, like the late Billy Mitchell, has been a military dissenter. Though he has proven his tactical theories in combat, and the admiration of his men is close to worship, the officers who determine military policy never have agreed with Chennault's strategical concepts. He has won all his battles with the Japs, but lost the battle to make his influence felt in Army councils.

An apostle of fighter planes back in prewar days when most high Army officers were concentrating on the development of heavy bombers, General Chennault was first retired in 1937. He promptly went to China, where he formed the famous "Flying Tigers" and lit into the Japs. With a handful of battered old P-40 pursuit planes, using the shrewd tactics Chennault taught them, his pilots knocked over Jap planes like sitting ducks, contained the whole Japanese air force, and kept China in the war.

When the "Flying Tigers" were absorbed into the (later the Fourteenth) Air Force, only eight of Chennault's pilots went with him. They did not relish serving under new commanders. From the first, Chennault was involved in a losing struggle to get more planes and more supplies for an allout offensive in the skies over China. It was his belief that with a big enough force to wrest control of the air from the Japs, Chinese troops, properly trained and equipped, could drive the invaders out of China. Planes and supplies were not forthcoming—partly because of the logistics problem of transporting them over the Himalayas, partly because the Army was committed to an offensive in Europe first.

Chennault lately reiterated his conviction that the quickest, most economical way to defeat the Jap is to equip the Chinese army and let them do the fighting. A day or two after Chennault gave his interview to the press, Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer was appointed over his head as commander of all United States Air Forces in China. Chennault promptly resigned.

It is unfortunate that relations have not been happier between this brilliant field commander and the high-ranking staff officers who direct Army policy. General Chennault is a superb tactician and a magnificent leader. Whether his strategical concepts are as sound as his tactics is another question. He has not been in a position to test them. Louisiana will welcome the general home with warm admiration for his victorious 8-year campaign in China, and with regret that his fine military talent cannot be employed for the last big push against Japan.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of Wednesday, July 18, 1945]

TWENTIETH CENTURY WITCH HUNT?

The congressional controversy over FEPC ends for the moment in compromise which continues its existence as a wartime agency for another year. The campaign to force its adoption as a permanent government weapon continues, however, and the attacks on those who dare question its wisdom and efficacy grow in bitterness.

Because of its belief that the country should concentrate upon the supremely important war effort, this newspaper has refrained from comment on this explosive minor question. But now it is evident that politicians and extremists are bent on using the war emergency to force the extension of governmental powers beyond the limits fixed by our Federal charter or dreamed of by the founding fathers.

"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly," thought Macaulay, "as when they discuss it freely." So the proposition of a permanent FEPC, powered to expel "prejudice" or "discrimination" from human minds overnight and by compulsion, ought to be discussed freely from both sides. People who do not believe in governmental dictation of employments in private business and industry are being passionately assailed. But freedom of opinion being not yet forbidden, they still have their right to hold and to express their convictions.

To quote Macaulay again: "Nothing is so galling to a people, not broken in from birth, as a paternal or, in other words, a meddling government * * * which tells them what to read and say and drink and wear." Recently we tried governmental dictation about what Americans should not drink—with such lamentable results that the people themselves ordered the experiment dropped.

Now Congress is urged to create a permanent agency to abridge freedom of thought and freedom of choice in the matter of private employments. That sort of meddling under the pretext of war necessity has generated dangerous pressures. Its adoption as a permanent govermental function will be more widely and more fiercely resented when the American people understand it. Witchhunting by a permanent FEPC clothed with inquisitorial and dictatorial powers over private employments not only would constitute a dangerous encroachment upon the individual freedom Americans have cherished throughout their national history, but in all human probability would defeat the ostensibly benevolent purpose for which it is demanded.

We cannot believe that majorities in either branch of Congress actually and sincerely believe this proposed new type of "force bill" is sound or consistent with the principles of individual liberty and free enterprise. Nor do we believe that the American majority will stand for it when they know the thing for what it is.

Free discussion from both sides and all angles will help bring about popular understanding of the real issue posed. That understanding should insure its right settlement.

Recognition of Italy as an Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs favorably reporting out my resolution, House Joint Resolution 204, requesting the President to use his good office to the end that the United Nations invite Italy to be a signatory to the United Nations agreement.

I earnestly hope that the President will, pursuant to this resolution, sponsor Italy's just claim to membership in the family of the United Nations. Italy has earned this right with the blood of her patriots and the suffering of her people.

REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO USE HIS GOOD OFFICES TO THE END THAT THE UNITED NATIONS INVITE ITALY TO BE A SIGNATORY TO THE UNITED NATIONS AGREEMENT

Mr. BLOOM, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) requesting the President to use his good offices to the end that the United Nations invite Italy to be a signatory to the United Nations agreement having considered the same, report favorably and unanimously thereon without amendment and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

For the information of the House, the following letter and statement addressed to the Honorable LUTHER A. JOHNSON, acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, by Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew, dated June 23, 1945, are included in this report:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 23, 1945.

The Honorable LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I refer to your letter of May 25, 1945, requesting the Department's comments on the joint resolutions introduced by Mr. MARCANTONIO, House Joint Resolution 204 and House Joint Resolution 205, which was acknowledged in my letter of May 31, 1945.

House Joint Resolution 205 requests the President to use his good offices to the end that the United Nations recognize Italy as a full and equal ally. Inasmuch as this Government has no alliances outside of its ties with the United Nations, to recognize Italy as a "full and equal ally" could only mean permitting her to become one of the United Nations. This step, however, is covered by House Joint Resolution 204 requesting the President to use his good offices "to the end that the United Nations invite Italy to be a signatory to the United Nations agreement of January 1942."

This Goverment's policy has been to encourage the new democratic Italy to regain full membership in the international community. Much progress has already been made, as witnessed by our present formal diplomatic relations with that country, and it is hoped that further progress will be made, especially now that all Italy has been liberated. You may be interested in the statement I made to the press concerning our Italian policy on May 31, a copy of which is attached for your convenience. I believe that the spirit of the resolutions in question is in keeping with the spirit of our policy as expressed in that statement.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
May 31, 1945.

For the press.

STATEMENT BY ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE JOSEPH C. GREW

Our policy toward Italy has from the beginning been based on the view that Italy

should be given every possible opportunity consonant with Allied military requirements to regain the respect of the world by proving that she is a democratic, cooperative, constructive element in Europe.

Since October 1943 the Italian people, their Government, and their armed forces and patriot bands have cooperated fully with the forces of the United Nations against the common enemy. Wholly united again, they will be able to cooperate effectively in the common tasks that lie ahead. In the past 20 months the Italian people have given substantial evidence of their love of freedom, attachment to democratic principles, and ability to rise above the shambles of fascism and ruins of war.

All Italy is now freed of the German yoke. There is no longer a division between an enemy-held north and a free south. The leaders of the various anti-Fascist parties throughout the country have been consulting on the formation of a new government representative of the whole country. That new government, as it comes to grips with the tremendous responsibilities facing it, will be able to give us the measure of Italian ability and determination to work together in rebuilding the country's economic and political structure and to work with the United Nations in the cause of world peace.

Loan to Elliott Roosevelt by John Hartford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 21 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent from the Senate at this time. At his request I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Elliott's Loans Belong in New Deal History," published in the Saturday Evening Post of July 21, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELLIOTT'S LOANS BELONG IN NEW DEAL HISTORY

By this time most Americans have made up their minds one way or another about the significance of the revelations published by Westbrook Pegler concerning a loan of $200,000 made in 1939 by John Hartford, a chain-store "economic royalist," to Elliott Roosevelt and liquidated in 1942 by "the Roosevelt family" at two cents on the dollar. According to Mr. Pegler, Elliott Roosevelt put the bite on Mr. Hartford and, to clinch the matter, called the late President at Warm Springs to introduce him to Mr. Hartford on the telephone. Still according to Pegler, the elder Roosevelt thanked Mr. Hartford, apparently in advance, for taking care of his son. The settlement of the $200,000 debt for $4,000 was made by Jesse Jones on behalf of the Roosevelt family.

Certainly there will be no disposition, even among those of us who found Mr. Roosevelt considerably less than perfect, to gloat over this evidence of grade C ethical standards in money matters. The fact that a President of the United States who was a millionaire in his own right should be content with such a settlement on behalf of his son is one of those mysteries which experts on the Roosevelt character must explain as they can. Franklin D. Roosevelt was a public figure who is understood to have had ambitious aspirations for a place in history. If in some matters his sensibilities left something to be desired, that has to go into the reckoning along with everything else, plus and minus. The rule of de mortuis nil nisi bonum cannot be invoked to prevent a full appraisal of the New Deal and its leading personalities. We cannot, as the neo-liberals used to remind us, escape history.

The ability of most of us to arrive at a dispassionate judgment of Mr. Roosevelt's place in history during his life was limited by the fact that for more than 12 years any American who undertook to criticize Mr. Roosevelt's policies or call into question any of his acts risked a barrage of abuse which was at times beyond belief. Tory, reactionary, Fascist, appeaser, Roosevelt-hater, and conspirator were words used indiscriminately to describe any citizen who might have his doubts on OPA or the bookkeeping of Lend-Lease. Mr. Roosevelt himself delivered pious lectures from which we were expected to conclude that the President's opponents were men of evil purpose and low morals, except when they were the fatuitous dupes of wicked malefactors. He was particularly contemptuous of those who played fast and loose with "other people's money."

Now, after President Roosevelt is dead, we find him tolerant of a transaction which almost any of his horse-and-buggy critics would have shunned, if only to avoid the appearance of evil. What explains it? Mr. Roosevelt's undaunted admirers, who are industriously making him into a legend, will laugh it off as the ill-considered act of an importunate youth. Don't we all have trouble with our boys? But that won't do. It doesn't explain the late President's failure to insist that his son should not involve the White House in such a transaction. Still less the Roosevelt family's failure to do as millions of Americans, more hard pressed than they, have done—pay the debt in full.

It seems to us that this episode dovetails with many others to illustrate the totalitarian phase of the New Deal, the theory that neither law nor principle matters as much as knowing the "right people" and having the necessary squeeze on vulnerable men. This was a tendency which alarmed many Americans long before Mr. Roosevelt's death. Because it is important that Americans should know all about the group which governed them so long and pretended to a monopoly of virtue, it is fortunate that the Elliott Roosevelt-John Hartford transaction was revealed.

Wartime Service and Treatment of Conscientious Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 21 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of its general public interest, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of a report entitled "The Experience of the American Friends Service Committee in Civilian Public Service." The summary has been prepared by the committee itself, and not by me. The committee undertook to participate in the administration of civilian public service at the suggestion of Dr. Clarence Dykstra when he was a Director of Selective Service.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WARTIME SERVICE AND TREATMENT OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS IN THE UNITED STATES

(A report of the American Friends Service Committee)

The service and treatment of conscientious objectors in the United States during the last 4 years of military conscription has been an important advance in the recognition of religious freedom over the First World War. Yet legal and administrative inadequacies have limited effective efforts of this minority in the service of the Nation, and have resulted in unjust discrimination out of keeping with the country's heritage of civil liberties.

Since 1941 the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) has, at the request of the United States Government, shared with other church agencies in financing and administering the work of conscientious objectors under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The committee believes it is in the public interest to treat conscientious objectors with equity and utilize their services with maximum efficiency. Accordingly the AFSC wishes to submit an evaluation of its experience in this program, known as Civilian Public Service (CPS), and to recommend improvements in the employment, compensation, and legal status of conscientious objectors.

THEY SERVE WITHOUT WEAPONS—AND WITHOUT PAY

Conscientious objectors in Civilian Public Service have unquestionably made an impressive and widely approved contribution to the national welfare during this war.

About 10,000 men of all religious faiths, classified IV–E (conscientiously opposed to all military service) have been assigned to alternative service under civilian direction instead of being confined in guardhouses or barracks of casual detachments as in the last war. These men have performed close to 5,000,000 man-days of labor for the Government in forest fire fighting and prevention, soil conservation, park maintenance, public health services, care of the mentally ill and mentally deficient, agricultural work, and in medical research where the men have volunteered as human guinea pigs.

At the minimum army rate of pay this work would be worth more than $10,000,000 in addition to the cost of maintaining the men. Actually the men have not been permitted to receive wages, and church agencies have paid more than $5,000,000 for maintenance expense and administration. The whole service of the men has been rendered practically without cost to the Government.

CONSIDERATE CARE FOR THE MENTALLY ILL

The services of Civilian Public Service men in mental institutions and as guinea pigs in scientific experiments has been particularly significant. Substantial improvements in standards of mental care are resulting from the work and concern of the 2,000 men who volunteered to help meet an acute shortage of adequate help in mental hospitals and training schools. For 8 to 12 hours a day, under depressing conditions and great physical and nervous strain, these men have fed, dressed, and washed patients, cleaned up after them, made their beds, given medications, assisted with shock therapy and heat treatments, scrubbed floors, operated hospital farms, tended the furnaces, and assisted in occupational and recreational therapy. At the initiative of Civilian Public Service men, first-hand information on the orientation and training of attendants has been collected and made available to hospital superintendents and other professionally interested individuals through The Attendant, the first regular periodical to deal particularly

with the methods and problems of attendant care of mental patients.

HUMAN GUINEA PIGS

Several hundred Civilian Public Service men have volunteered as experimental subjects in important medical research contributing to the control of wartime epidemics, especially of typhus, jaundice, malaria, and atypical pneumonia. Extensive projects in nutrition research are also using Civilian Public Service guinea pigs under conditions of prolonged starvation, thirst, extreme heat and cold, high and low altitudes, and shipwreck.

We are convinced both of the good faith, and the high ability of the large majority of the men in Civilian Public Service. Technical supervisors have commended their work and have been extremely reluctant to release men for other assignments, although a steady stream of requests for Civilian Public Service assignees has come from Government departments and public institutions throughout the country. Widespread public approval of the work of conscientious objectors has appeared in press and periodical comment and in reliable surveys of public opinion.

Notwithstanding this gratifying record of the conscientious objectors in Civilian Public Service, skilled manpower has been wasted upon projects of little immediate value to the Nation, administrative inefficiencies have hindered effective work, many sincere men have been excluded from rendering useful service, and Civilian Public Service men and their families have unjustly suffered financial discrimination and impoverishment.

1. WASTEFUL USE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

A large waste of manpower has occurred in Civilian Public Service; first, because much of the work has had no direct bearing on the wartime needs of the Nation; second, because the skills and training of many men have not been adequately utilized.

Fifty-two percent of the men are assigned to forest, park, and soil-conservation projects in former CCC camps, many of which could be deferred until after the war. Only a small percent of the work is of an emergency nature such as forest-fire fighting or flood control.

Over against these projects, Civilian Public Service men could be used to relieve the acute and crippling shortages of personnel in public health services, tuberculosis, sanatoria, and general hospitals, welfare agencies and war relief work. Five million rural homes need sanitary facilities—their absence directly causes hookworm, dysentery, and typhoid. Five thousand beds in tuberculosis sanatoria are now unused because of the lack of attendants, though many active cases are at large infecting our communities. Urgent requests for the service of Civilian Public Service men have come to us from 103 private and public welfare agencies stressing the demands imposed upon them by the influx of war workers into their communities and the great increase in juvenile delinquency.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS NEEDED FOR RELIEF

Of particular concern to the American Friends Service Committee is the desperate need for relief workers in war zones and recently liberated areas. We have been pressed by the Chinese Government and United States military authorities in China for the assignment of Civilian Public Service men to transport and distribute medical supplies and serve on surgical units. Similar requests have come from relief agencies in Italy, France, England, and India. Yet a rider to the Military Appropriations Act has prevented qualified relief workers from the ranks of Civilian Public Service to go abroad for war relief service even though the entire expense would be met by voluntary contributions.

LOSS OF SKILLED MANPOWER

Great waste and deterioration has resulted from the placing of highly trained and skilled men in the CCC camp pattern. Many of the 3,000 professional and industrially trained men in Civilian Public Service have been assigned to simple, manual tasks, requiring no particular skill or experience.

One of the country's leading physicists, an authority in electronic microscopy, cleared trails for over a year and is now a ward attendant in a mental hospital. An outstanding botanist whose services have been requested by the Smithsonian Institution runs the greenhouse at another hospital; an expert statistician, in demand by several Government agencies, is keeping records at a weather station; a relief worker with a knowledge of five languages and appointed for service with UNRRA has been pulling weeds in a nursery; a public health engineer, formerly with the United States Public Health Service, has been chopping trees and loading gravel.

Responsibility for the selection of work projects and the assignment of men rests with Selective Service. With few exceptions, it has declined to give men individual assignments according to their aptitudes and experience, and has generally ruled against assignments to private agencies, even though their need for personnel in serving the public may have been fully as imperative as that of the Government. Furthermore, Selective Service has refused to reduce the number of men in camps on the basis of comparative need or to eliminate admittedly unsatisfactory camp projects.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE INEFFICIENCIES

Cumbersome and inefficient Government administrative machinery has hindered the maximum service of men in civilian public service.

Inevitable administrative complications have arisen because the Selective Service System not only drafts, classifies, and assigns men, but in the case of the conscientious objector, has undertaken direct supervision and control of their whole service. The cooperating private agencies have found it very difficult to administer the program effectively where, despite the fact that they carry the major expense, they are largely denied responsibility for the selection of the project, the placement of the men, and the supervision of the conditions of their work.

National directives, which could not always take particular circumstances into account, have often restricted the judgments of well-qualified administrative staff. The reclassification of men physically or mentally unfit for civilian public service has been long delayed or sometimes denied, causing deterioration both of individual and of group morale. Especially serious has been the failure of some Government work supervisors to provide competent and imaginative leadership on the projects, and to treat their men with understanding and respect.

3. CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS EXCLUDED FROM SERVICE

The present law inadequately recognizes conscience and has therefore deprived the country of the service of many sincere men.

About 5,000 men, including about 3,500 Jehovah's Witnesses, have been sent to prison for terms aggregating 12,000 years because the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 fails to recognize nonreligious objectors, or to provide for those who are conscientiously opposed to the compulsory element in the service. Every sixth man in Federal prisons at the end of 1944 claimed conscientious grounds for refusing military service.

4. INADEQUATE FINANCIAL PROVISION

Congress has not made equitable provision for the financial needs of Civilian Public Service men and their families.

At the present time men engaged in Civilian Public Service receive neither the wages of other drafted men for their services nor compensation for injury suffered in performing their duties. Their dependents are ineligible for Government allotments under existing legislation.

Even payments made by farmers and other employers for the services of conscientious objectors assigned to them, cannot be used, either by the men personally or to meet dependency needs. Under a ruling of the Comptroller General, these payments, except for certain expenses directly connected with the Service, must be turned into a frozen account in the United States Treasury, pending appropriation by Congress. The fund now totals over $700,000.

The net result has been to reduce the morale of many of the men and impair their work performance, troubled as they are by increasing impoverishment and concern for the hardship of their families. An undue financial burden has been imposed upon relatives, and upon church and community welfare agencies which have had to pick up the cases of most urgent need.

We feel the Government should in all fairness face its liability in such cases. While our committee provides health and medical care for men in its camps, we cannot assume the liability for injuries or death. Care for Civilian Public Service dependents is clearly the responsibility of the Government. Since conscience is not a crime, why penalize the families of conscientious objectors?

The American Friends Service Committee is especially concerned over two unfortunate precedents implicit in the situation. While freedom of conscience has been given a large measure of legal recognition, the lack of wages, compensation for injury and dependency allotments constitutes financial discrimination against persons because of their religious belief. Secondly, by failing to pay men for service which it requires them to perform, the Government has in effect instituted a pattern of forced labor. Neither of these practices, we believe, can long continue without jeopardy to the health of our democracy. Equal respect and consideration by Government for the welfare of all its citizens should prevail if we are to maintain the foundation principles of our Nation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of this evaluation of the wartime service of conscientious objectors under our administration, we urge six improvements in the program:

1. That conscientious objectors be used on projects of unquestioned social value and urgency; and their services be made available to private as well as Government agencies, where the need for qualified personnel is known to be acute.

2. That conscientious objectors be assigned to foreign-relief projects.

3. That work assignments of conscientious objectors take into account special training and talents and be made on an individual as well as a group basis.

4. That a special civilian board be established to have full responsibility for the classification and assignment of men claiming to be conscientious objectors; and that each man assigned to Civilian Public Service be placed under the single direction and control of an employer or agency, public or private, which would make efficient use of his abilities and skills in the public interest.

5. That the law be revised to make sincerity rather than religious training and belief the test of conscience, and to permit men sincerely opposed to any form of conscripted service voluntarily to engage in services of national benefit.

6. That the Government provide pay for Civilian Public Service men working on Government projects, approximating the pay for other drafted men; and that Civilian Public Service men engaged on nongovernmental projects be entitled to receive pay; and that all drafted men assigned to civilian service receive adequate Government allowances for their dependents and compensation for injury or death incurred while in line of duty.

The Polish Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article relating to the Polish problem, that appeared in the Chicago Tribune on July 20, 1945:

UNITED STATES WILL SEEK FULL REPORT ON POLISH PROBLEM

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 19.—The State Department promised today to seek full publicity for the Polish situation and reiterated that it stands for self-determination for the Polish people.

Acting Secretary Grew stated the Department's position in response to a letter from Senator VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan), who said that to him and to millions of other people, the Polish settlement seemed "inadequate and unconvincing."

"There still seems to be no clear assurance," VANDENEERG wrote, "that the Polish people will themselves have the final opportunity of untrammeled self-determination under this new provisional government which is imposed upon them by Britain, Russia, and the United States, within Polish boundaries similarly dictated by these external powers."

SET UP BY POLES

Grew replied that the new Polish Government was set up by the Poles themselves, but indicated the United States would seek to keep close watch to see that actually free elections carry out the rest of the Yalta agreement on Poland.

"It is clear * * * that the creation of the new government does not alone discharge us from the responsibilities we assumed at Yalta," Grew wrote.

His letter stressed the proposed elections by numerous references, and pointed up continuing American interest by two separate mentions of the assignment of Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane to keep this Government "informed about the situation in Poland."

The questions raised by VANDENBERG and the replies given by Grew follow, in brief:

1. Will the Poles themselves have "the final opportunity of untrammeled self-determination under this new provisional government imposed upon them by Britain, Russia, and the United States?"

"NOT IMPOSED ON THEM"

Reply: Members of the Russian-sponsored Polish Government "and other Polish democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad" agreed on the new "government of national unity." Therefore, "The new government was not imposed upon the Polish people" by the Big Three.

2. Is American responsibility under the Yalta agreement "presumed to have been discharged by the creation of this new provisional government?"

Reply: No. The Yalta agreement provides that the Big Three ambassadors "shall keep their respective governments informed about the situation in Poland."

3. "Will the United States be permitted to send full diplomatic and consular representatives into Poland?"

SEEKS DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

Reply: The Polish Government has asked for diplomatic relations and Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane and aids "are making arrangements to proceed to Warsaw as soon as possible."

4. "Will the American press be permitted to send its uncensored correspondents into Poland?"

Reply: "The United States Government will use its full influence" to see to it that American correspondents "be permitted to enter Poland in order that the American public may be informed of the situation in that area." The Government likewise is pressing Russia for authorization for American correspondents to enter eastern and southeastern Europe in order to be in a position to report accurately to the American public on developments there."

5. Will the United States participate on an equal basis, in supervising free elections in Poland "to make certain they are free in fact as well as name"?

WANTS A FREE POLAND

Reply: The United States has been promised by the Polish Government that elections will conform with the Yalta decisions. This was one of the vital points of recognition. If it is decided to supervise the elections, the United States will "insist upon its right to participate on an equal basis with the other Powers."

Concluding, Grew said that President Truman, like the late President Roosevelt, has called for "a strong, free, and independent Polish state" as agreed on at Yalta, and American policy continued unequivocally on that base.

Letter of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herein a letter from the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, District Council, No. 4, in reply to a letter from Mr. H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy:

JULY 16, 1945.

Mr. H. STRUVE HENSEL,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENSEL: We have your letter of July 7, in which you state that you have decided not to intervene in the letting of the Navy contract for 40,000 morale radio sets on which Electronic Corp. of America, 45 West Eighteenth Street, New York City, was the low bidder by a substantial amount, met the specifications, but was not awarded the contract. Even before we received your letter we read an announcement in the trade press that another contractor, who was definitely not the low bidder, had been awarded this contract.

May I, therefore, call your attention to the following startling facts:

1. We regret that your letter contains an error of fact of such significance that we can only conclude that you have been misinformed. You state in your letter, "as indicated to you at our conference, the Electronic Corp. of America bid was originally rejected because of certain defects evident in the sample radio submitted with its bid by Electronic Corp.

We have ascertained that this is not true, and we are prepared to prove it. Since ECA definitely did meet the specifications and was the low bidder, we believe you should, in all fairness, reconsider the matter and award the contract to Electronic Corp. of America.

2. In your letter you state, "In the matter of resale items, the salability of the item is naturally of very great importance, and our judgment as to the salability of the several models, based on the appearance of the sample radio submitted by the bidders for the contract, must govern. Price is not the sole or even the most important matter to be considered in selecting an item for resale." Our only comment on this and we think it is pertinent, is that the specifications on the bid said nothing about the "attractiveness" of the set. When this issue was first raised at the conference which I attended in your office I heard the Washington representative of the Electronic Corporation of America state that he had informed the procurement officers that ECA would agree to match whatever cabinet work or other external features were preferred by the Navy Department at the same price. Your Department received such a guaranty in writing before you undertook to investigate this matter. And I further learned during this same discussion in your office, that at least one manufacturer had been given an opportunity to revise his product after the bids had been submitted. Why should anybody in the Navy Department have a special interest in giving this manufacturer such favored treatment and mind you this manufacturer was about the third or fourth lowest bidder.

In addition, it was perfectly clear from the discussion that the ECA set was an exceptional value at the price, and that any offering of the set would result in an immediate offer to purchase.

3. We recognize your personal integrity and good faith, but are forced to conclude that behind the misinformation given to you are dubious motives which should play no part in our Government's procurement program. We suggest that a hostile attitude toward the progressive labor policies of the Electronic Corporation of America is the reason why the low bidder, who met the specifications, was not awarded the contract.

The Electronic Corp. of America has consistently been one of the most decent employers of labor in the electronic industry. ECA not only pays higher wages than most companies, but provides it semployees with unusual benefits in the way of insurance, medical, dental and optical care, etc. Mr. S. J. Novick, president of the company, is the treasurer of the Electronic Manufacturers Association, and has been largely responsible for the harmonious relationships which exist between management and labor in our industry in the New York area.

The Electronic Corp. of America pioneered the successful development of the labor-management cooperation program in our industry. In return for the splendid attitude of management and as evidence of a mutual devotion to the war effort, our members in the plant increased their average productivity more than 200 percent on standard tasks during the war period. We believe that ECA, recipient of the Army and Navy E award, has been an efficient, low-cost producer.

4. This company, because of its cutstanding record for fair treatment of its employees, has been smeared by reactionaries who are making a determined effort to destroy any semblance of decency in the relationships between labor and management. The leaders of these attacks have been Westbrook Pegler and the Hearst press, and we suggest that their statements have fallen upon receptive ears in the Navy Department. What has occurred to date only confirms what Westbrook Pegler has been trying to achieve, and that is to have the Navy stop considering ECA for any contracts regardless of their meeting all requirements and being able to make the deliveries required.

5. On July 1 a large number of our members employed in the Electronic Corp. of

America plant had to be laid off. We have been informed that a considerably larger lay-off is due August 1 and that the working force will be almost completely dissipated within 2 months. Thus, loyal, patriotic, and deserving workers will be losing their jobs and their hopes for desirable postwar employment with ECA, one of the key plants these workers count upon most for the maintenance of decent labor conditions in the electronic industry.

We respectfully request that, on the basis of the error of fact which we have pointed out, you reconsider your decision not to intervene in the morale set contract. We further urge you to take whatever steps are necessary and proper to permit the continued operation of the Electronic Corp. of America plants.

We would request that you again meet with us, since the issues we raised of discrimination and favoritism have not been disposed of by your letter.

Very sincerely yours,

MARCEL SCHERER,
District Representative.

Veteran Gets First Personal Property Loan Under GI Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1945

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the fact that Galen Whinnery, residing at Eau Galle, in the district which I have the honor to represent, has the distinction of having been the first discharged veteran of World War II to be granted a personal property loan under the GI bill recently passed by Congress.

Veteran Whinnery will use the funds obtained from the loan to equip his farm of 320 acres in the town of Eau Galle.

He had the earnest assistance of A. R. Vogtsberger, executive vice president of the Bank of Menomonie, in filing his application, and that of the FSA advisory committee, consisting of Harry Dix, chairman, Al Vennes, of Wheeler, Carl Karnes, of Boyceville, and Orville Tilleson, of Menomonie. Two of the FSA committee are veterans of the First World War.

Mr. Whinnery will make good use of the funds in carrying on more extensive farming operation. I am pleased that he had the honor of being the first veteran of World War II to come under the loan provisions of the GI bill. Many other discharged veterans of Wisconsin's dairyland will also obtain loans for farm improvement purposes.

The following account of the closing of the loan to Veteran Whinnery was written by C. M. Russell, Menomonie correspondent of the Eau Claire Daily Leader:

MENOMONIE, WIS.—Galen R. Whinnery, route 2, Eau Galle, has the distinction of being the first discharged veteran of World War II to be granted a personal-property loan under the GI bill, it was disclosed here Tuesday. Washington officials stated Wednesday that as far as has been reported to them, the chattel loan to Whinnery is the first in the Nation, while a discharged veteran from Texas was the first to receive a farm loan. Whinnery, 23, will use the loan to equip a 320-acre farm in the town of Eau Galle, and will live there with his wife and 6-month-old son. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. E. E. Whinnery, route 4, Menomonie.

The $5,000 loan was made through the Bank of Menomonie after certification was made by a committee made up of Harry Dix, chairman, route 2, Menomonie; Alfred J. Vennes, Wheeler; Carl Karnes and Orville Tilleson, Menomonie.

Young Whinnery entered the service of the United States armed forces in 1942 and received a medical discharge in 1943.

Under the Service Readjustment Act of 1944, better known as the GI bill, the United State Government guarantees the payment of $2,000 of the loan.

W. G. Coapman, Milwaukee, secretary of the Wisconsin Bankers' Association, whose service committee helped secure the loan for Whinnery, said the Veterans' Administration assured him that the loan was the first of its type ever granted.

Whinnery, who served for a year in the Army before receiving a medical discharge, was raised on a Dunn County farm. His father made a down payment on a 320-acre farm for the son, his wife, and their 6-month-old son. Whinnery applied through the Bank of Menomonie for financial assistance to stock and equip the farm and the loan was approved by the local GI certifying committee and the Veterans' Administration.

Congressional Medals for Pershing and Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under date of June 21, I introduced H. R. 3541 and H. R. 3542, authorizing the President of the United States to award a Congressional Medal of Honor to General of the Armies John J. Pershing, United States Army, and to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, United States Army, commander of the American Expeditionary Forces and supreme Allied commander European theater of war.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion, and I feel that the majority of the people of the United States and our allies will agree, that both deserve this high honor.

General Pershing, as commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, exhibited heroic and extraordinary leadership in the defeat of Germany, and when the World War II began he immediately proffered his services to his Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, on December 10, 1941, who replied, "You are magnificent," and also stated that "under a wise law, you have never been placed on the retired list. You are very much on the active list, and your services will be of great value." Chief of Staff General Marshall and others constantly availed themselves of the experience and military genuis of General Pershing in carrying on World War II, and I think that it would be a fine recognition to General Pershing and a just reward for service to his country if this honor would be conferred on this distinguished military leader while he is living.

Mr. Speaker, the highest honors of England, France, Russia, and other countries have been bestowed upon our dearly beloved supreme Allied commander, General Eisenhower, and certainly his own country should likewise show its appreciation for his services to our country by a similar acknowledgment.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Military Affairs Committee of the House will give consideration to these two bills when the Congress reassembles, and I feel certain that the same will be enacted into law.

To Win the First Battle of the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio address given by Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, General Director of the United Nations Rehabilitation Relief Administration, entitled "To Win the First Battle of the Peace." I feel that it will serve to eliminate unnecessary criticisms of UNRRA, believing that Governor Lehman is making an honest and splendid effort to carry out the intent of Congress. The address is as follows:

I am speaking tonight in behalf of the liberated countries of Europe. I am leaving again within a day or two to visit many of them. The might of our armed forces and that of our allies has freed these countries forever from the monstrous yoke of Nazi Germany. In the great battles of the war we have been overwhelmingly victorious. But the first great battle of the peace is yet to be won.

That battle is the battle against want, hunger, and disease which are ravaging most of these countries to an extent that we of the Western Hemisphere can hardly grasp. General Eisenhower has stated that the first great need of Europe is food. Such food as the stricken Continent has been able to produce under the crushing weight of war and enemy occupation is pitifully inadequate to meet even its minimum needs. By late autumn, the harvests will have been largely exhausted. After that—and until the 1946 harvests are available—Europe must depend heavily upon food imported from abroad. The alternative is starvation.

Nor is starvation the only danger. For with famine must inevitably come pestilence, typhus, tuberculosis, diphtheria, malaria. Already some areas are in the grip of these dread scourges. Without strength-giving food to help the people combat them, they may well prove as devastating in their effect as some of the great plagues of the Middle Ages.

I am here on this program as a representative of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which many of you know under the simpler name of UNRRA. Through this organization, the nations which have not borne the brunt of actual invasion

have pledged their aid to those war-ridden countries which have consumed their entire foreign exchange resources in the fight against the Fascist menace. Our task is to meet the most pressing needs of these countries and to provide some of the means by which they may get squarely on their feet again—to help them to help themselves.

Up to now we have done what could be done toward redeeming this pledge. Into the devastated areas of Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Italy there has been shipped over a quarter of a billion dollars' worth of sorely needed supplies—food, clothing, medical supplies, farm and industrial equipment. Among the contributing nations are numbered Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and the United Kingdom.

In addition, we have organized and are administering a far-flung medical service to combat the spread of epidemic disease. And in cooperation with the military authorities, we have recruited a large army of trained workers, nearly 6,000 in number, to aid in the care and repatriation of those millions of displaced persons who were liberated in former enemy territory.

All this, however, is only the beginning. What we do—or fail to do—within the next critical 6 months will be the real test. But in this we are facing desperate problems—many of which are beyond our present control.

Basically, what we are up against is the problem of securing the actual supplies which must be shipped now, or within the next few months, if we are to meet Europe's fateful deadline. Let me make it clear: UNRRA cannot commandeer these needed supplies. We are completely dependent upon the willingness of the United Nations themselves to allocate a sufficient portion of their own resources to enable us to meet our schedules.

These schedules for the remaining 6 months of this year call for 3,895,000 metric tons of supplies, valued at over $900,000,000—or more than three times the amount that has already gone through our hands. To procure these supplies we are having to deal with deficiencies, some of them grave, in clothing, textiles, fuel, raw material, and transport. But our greatest concern is food.

So far only one thing is encouraging: We can probably get all the wheat that is needed. Provided we obtain enough shipping and port-reception capacity, it should be possible at an early date for the liberated countries to abolish or lessen the rationing of bread. But cereal is about the only food item now in abundant supply.

Man, however, cannot live by bread alone. He must have some measure of animal or vegetable fats and of animal proteins—meats, fish, dairy products, eggs. For the last half of 1945, we asked for 725,000,000 pounds of meat as the minimum requirements of those European countries receiving UNRRA's assistance. But what was the result? From Canada we were promised only 20,000,000 pounds of canned meat and 10,000,000 pounds of canned blood sausage. These were delivered. From the United States, we were promised 100,000,000 pounds of canned pork and 100,000,000 pounds of fat cuts of pork. But here we have received actual deliveries of less than 2,000,000 pounds of the former and 12,000,000 pounds of the latter. The remainder of the allocation has been canceled and we are now told we can have no more meat of any sort from the United States for the current quarter.

Forty-four million pounds of meat products so far granted, out of the minimum of 725,000,000 needed.

From all the supplying countries we asked for 235,000,000 pounds of canned fish to cover our needs for the year ending June 30, 1946. We have been granted only 59,000,000 pounds. We asked for the whole milk powder and dried eggs for babies and pregnant and nursing mothers. We were told we could have one of either of these essential items. For the third quarter of this year we asked for 12,500 tons of evaporated milk and got less than half of that amount. For the same period we asked for 14,000 tons of condensed milk and got only 1,134 tons.

Toward the minimum requirements of fats, for the last 6 months of 1945, we have not yet received the allocation of a single pound. Lately we have had renewed and most distressing appeals for shipments of fat to Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia. We have had to cable denials, because the supplying countries have made no fats available.

What is the answer? Without question, the people of the supplying countries are faced with unaccustomed shortages in food and other supplies. The first instinct is to guard jealously those supplies for their own people. But in actual fact they still have an abundance that to the famished people of liberated Europe must seem like the wildest sort of luxury.

Take dairy products alone. Here in the United States, for instance, we consume vast amounts of fluid, condensed and evaporated milk, and ice cream. Surely each of us could do without 1 pint of milk a month. If all of us would give up 1 pint a month of milk, UNRRA could meet its schedules for the critical last half of 1945. Yet millions of babies, young children, and mothers in Europe are denied this essential to their health and well-being.

A week ago, at San Francisco, the United Nations signed a great charter of international security. But that Charter is as yet only a promise. If the liberated countries of Europe fall prey to famine and pestilence, there can be no security for any of us. Our responsibility is clear. We of the United Nations, who have suffered least from the cataclysm of war, must take steps now to provide out of our resources the means to meet this desperate crisis. This requires supplies. Kindly expressions will not feed empty stomachs. You can't avert starvation without food.

To cope with starvation in the liberated lands, I submit that five actions should be taken, and taken now, by the uninvaded United Nations. They are:

1. Of the 40,000,000 cases of evaporated milk, now being consumed annually in the United States, at least 20 percent should be set aside for the underfed babies and children of all the liberated countries of war-torn Europe. Another 2,000,000 cases of condensed milk should be made available by cutting down the supplies now devoted to ice cream and other uses. Furthermore, the production of whole milk powder for liberated areas should be required in every country, like Canada and the United States, which has the equipment to produce it.

2. Several million heads of the expanded cattle population of the supplying countries should be put into tin cans for immediate export to hungry Europe.

3. A small decrease in the consumption of fats in each of the supplying countries should be initiated in order to turn the drab bread and potato diet of Europe into a tolerable one.

4. Soap rationing should be instituted to provide Europe with sufficient soap to combat filth and epidemic disease.

5. Each nation should adopt as part of its food policy the definite principle that it will contribute its fair share to the needs of the suffering peoples in the liberated lands, even though this will undoubtedly call for considerable sacrifice.

Only by such measures can we of the United Nations redeem our pledge to the liberated countries of Europe. Only by such means can we hope to win the first great battle of the peace.

The National Labor Relations Board and Jim Crow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board has in three recent decisions delivered a series of vicious attacks on the principle of industrial democracy. Concretely, the Board has held that a labor organization is entitled to certification under the National Labor Relations Act even though it excludes individuals on the basis of race or segregates them in Jim Crow locals. The Board justifies its decisions on the ground that it will not interfere with a union's membership practices as long as the union undertakes to represent everyone within the unit fairly. An agency of the United States Government has announced that it will lend the authority of the United States Government to a union which discriminates on the basis of race. The Board's decision, because it lends official sanction to discriminatory race practices, raises serious constitutional questions. Moreover, it is a cruel hoax on the Negro people as well as unsound in terms of trade-union realities.

The Board's assumption that a Negro who is barred from membership—hence barred from participation in such fundamental matters as the formation of policy, the election of union officers, participation in union conventions—can still hope to enjoy equal representation with the whites who are free of such handicaps is farfetched and fantastic. It is a fundamental principle of political democracy that fair representation for all citizens is insured by their right to participate in the election of officers and in the formulation of political policy. Where a political or trade-union representative is free of the responsibility for accounting to those whom he is under a duty to represent for the reason that they have no control over him, it is obvious that fair representation is impossible.

This is true not only in the situation in which a Negro is barred from trade union membership, but it is also true where he is segregated in his membership. Segregation violates the fundamental principle of the solidarity of the craft upon which effective collective bargaining is premised. It is not only offensive as a matter of simple democracy to place a Negro in a separate local, which is totally unrelated to any trade union objective, but it denies him the full benefits of collective bargaining which the National Labor Relations Act is supposed to promote.

The first of these three cases, General Motors Corp., Case No. 14–R–1149, and so forth, came up in this manner: The United Electrical Workers CIO, contended that the Board should not permit the IBEW and the IAM, the AFL unions, to be on the ballot in a proposed election

representing units composed of white and Negro employees on the ground that they did not take Negroes into membership. At the hearing the trial examiner excluded the evidence offered by the UE. After the close of the hearing the UE protested this action before the Board and filed a motion, which in effect renewed its request to have the evidence taken. The Board denied this request as follows:

The UE alleges that the IAM and the IBEW refuse to admit to membership Negroes employed by the company and therefore should not be permitted to participate in any election which the Board might order. The IAM and the IBEW has each stated on the record that "it has, does, and will represent all employees of the unit declared appropriate for collective bargaining" by the Board. We construe such representations as having been made in accordance with the constituents of the IAM and the IBEW which, as observed from provisions of these documents in numerous Board cases involving these organizations, do not sanction discrimination by reason of race, color, creed, or national origin. However, if the IAM and the IBEW are certified and it is later shown, upon appropriate motion, that either organization has denied adequate representation to any employee because of his race, color, creed, or national origin, we shall consider such discriminatory practice as grounds for rescinding the certification.

It is obvious, from the decision, that the Board considers it unnecessary for a union to take into membership all employees which the union represents by virtue of having been certified by the National Labor Relations Board. The fact that such exclusion is based on race or color is apparently immaterial to the Board.

The second of the three cases is the Atlanta Oak Flooring Co., Case No. 10–R–1464. In that case a petition was filed by white and colored locals of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, AFL. The contention was made to the Board that these two unions, one representing white employees, and the other colored employees could properly function in a single unit. The employer objected to this procedure on the ground, among others:

The "unions engage in illegal and discriminatory segregation of employees on the sole basis of race and color in contravention of the national policy as expressed by the President of the United States in Executive Orders 8802 and 9346, and in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

As to this argument, the Board concluded:

As to the second reason urged we are unable to agree that the segregation into separate locals is per se a form of racial discrimination in violation of the national policy and of the fifth amendment. In the Bethlehem-Alameda case we were confronted with a somewhat analogous situation. It there appeared that the nonwhite workers who came within the jurisdictional claims of the Boilermakers' Union, while not denied membership in that union, were, nevertheless, segregated into separate so-called auxiliary locals. Since the petition of Bay Cities Metal Trades Council, herein called the council, had not listed these auxiliary locals as among the affiliated locals represented by it in the proceeding, it was contended that the council's petition should be dismissed. After the hearing in that case the council moved and was granted permission to amend its petition by expressly adding the auxiliary locals to the other labor organizations named in its petition. We there refused to dismiss the petition on the ground that the alleged question of racial discrimination had "been made moot by the action since taken by the council." We are of the opinion that the Bethlehem-Alameda case is controlling here. Applying the criteria of that case, we are satisfied that the facts in the instant case present no question of racial discrimination in contravention of the act or in violation of either the national policy as expressed in Executive Order No. 9346, amending Executive Order No. 8802, or the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. We note further that it was represented in the instant case that the Carpenters does not now, never has, and never will discriminate against any race or creed, and that the Carpenters will provide equal representation to colored as well as white locals. We construe this representation to mean that local 52 is now, and will continue to be, accorded the same rights of affiliation and representation by the Carpenters as is accorded local 2281 and other affiliated locals. Accordingly, under all the circumstances, we conclude that there is no question of racial discrimination before us and the company's motion to dismiss the petition is hereby denied. We expect, however, that the Carpenters, as well as its locals, will comply with the national policy expressed in Executive Order No. 9346, amending Executive Order No. 8802, that there shall be no discrimination in war industries on racial grounds and that "it is the duty of all employees * * * and all organizations * * * to eliminate discrimination in regard to hire, tenure, terms of and conditions of employment or union membership because of race, creed, color, or national origin." Moreover, if it is later shown by appropriate motion that equal representation has been denied to any of the employees in the unit hereinafter found appropriate because of race, color, creed, or national origin, we will consider rescinding any certification which we may issue herein.

This case stands for the proposition that groups in one bargaining unit may be properly segregated into separate unions purely on the basis of their race or color. It is a clear departure from a long line of previous Board decisions, going back over many years which have taken a contrary position. It indicates a clear shift in the thinking of the Board which previously had insisted that bargaining on racial or color lines would not be countenanced by it. The previous position was emphasized in the first decision in the third the cases involving this problem, case No. 5–R–1413, Larus & Bro. Co., Inc. In its original decision the Board stated:

All parties are agreed that bargaining on the basis of racial units in the manufacturing plant should be abandoned, and, indeed, this Board is committed to the policy that the color or race of employees is an irrelevant and extraneous consideration in determining, in any case, the use appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining. (Citing *Matter of U. S. Bedding Company*, 52 NLRB 382.)

Following the original decision an election was held between an AFL union and a CIO union. The AFL union won the election. Immediately thereafter a separate union was organized for the Negroes, and, as found by the Board in its decision, Negro employees were compelled to join it if they desired union representation. The CIO union protested this action to the Board. A hearing was held and a report issued by a trial examiner, finding that the Negro employees had been discriminated against, resulting from this compulsory segregation. The Board, in effect, reversed the recommendations of the trial examiner and followed its decision in the Atlanta Oak Flooring case, to the effect that compulsory segrgation of Negroes into a separate union was proper.

The Board's supplemental decision in the Larus case quite clearly repudiates the language in the first decision quoted above and reinforces the doctrine laid down in the Atlanta Oak Flooring case. The decision means that, despite the fact that the Board found that there had been discrimination and that the AFL had violated the terms of the Board's previous decision, no action of any kind would be taken against the AFL's continued representation of Negro employees on the very same basis that the Board seems to find was violative of its decision. To the contrary, the Board clearly states that it does not consider compulsory segregation into white and colored unions a practice banned by the Board or the Wagner Act. Thus says the Board:

If the AFL desires to file a new petition it may do so in the name of Local 219 and 219–B as joint petitioners. This will bring the petition within the premises laid down in a recent decision in the Atlanta Oak Flooring case and within the views here expressed.

Consideration of the three cases, and particularly the General Motors case, makes it crystal clear that the AFL is no longer under the burden of even setting up segregated or Jim Crow locals for Negroes. Of course, if it so desires, it may set up segregated locals functioning jointly with white locals, as was done in the Atlanta Oak Flooring and Larus cases.

However, in view of the fact that the Board did not deem it necessary even to insist upon this requirement in the General Motors case, it would seem that it does not consider an offer of even class B membership necessary in order to entitle unions to represent all persons in the unit found appropriate by the Board.

These decisions of the Board not only depart from a long line of its own decisions, but are clearly inconsistent with constitutional guaranties to Negroes and other minority groups. The Supreme Court of the United States in recent decisions in the Steele, Tunstall and Railway Mail Association cases, has clearly indicated a trend definitely contrary to that of the Board. Undoubtedly an appropriate case, if presented to the Court, would result in an overturning of the Board's approval of class B status or no status at all for Negroes.

People of California Support Charter of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of California are over-

whelmingly in favor of having the United States sign the Charter of the United Nations, so far as I can tell from editorial opinions, from other similar sources, and from correspondence.

I do not mean by that statement that the people of California, nor their Representatives in the Congress so far as I know, think that we can reach perfection and peace in one short step, simply by a signature on a piece of paper. We have, however, a vital stake in the issue; we are realists, and we are readers of history.

We have a stake in this because California has a thousand miles of coast line. When the Japs hit Pearl Harbor, that was news to the people of the East, but to the people of the west coast, it was marked "personnel and urgent." We could have been the next stop, if it were even a stop. We know that friendship and peace with the Orient is a vital factor in world peace. So we welcome and approve any measures which lead, by the way of agreement, arbitration, and accord, toward that end.

We are realists. We believe that toward any goal, big or little, there must be a first step. The San Francisco Charter seems to be a long step. We are tremendously encouraged in that fact. We know that the success of the idea, and the possibilities of peace, rest with the nations themselves, not with the words of the charter, but we want the United States to assume the leadership in world affairs, and always and historically toward peace, to which we think this Nation is entitled. We think we should assume that leadership; it is our obligation, as well as our opportunity. We think signing the Charter is the first acceptance of this obligation, and that all the world is watching us.

We are readers of history. There was the same unrest and confusion in 1787 among the new colonies that there is now among the nations of the world. This is just on a bigger scale; there are definite similarities, and some marked differences. The latter require recognition, but do not necessarily spoil the similarities.

The people were fearful. There was inflation. Currency break-down was threatened. State's debts were unpaid. The machinery of government was broken down. Alexander Hamiliton suggested the calling of a convention to draft a constitution, based on stronger principles. There was then the same fear of central government. The convention met at Annapolis, in 1786. Five States sent delegates. A second convention met in Philadelphia in May 1787. The list of delegates was the list of the most prominent men of the Colonies, with some exceptions—Jefferson was in France; John Hancock was absent; Patrick Henry was suspicious, and did not attend.

That Convention wrote the Constitution of the United States of America. History has seemed to stress the differences of opinions. Actually the agreements, according to Beard in his Basic History, were more numerous than the dissensions and compromises.

That Constitution was ratified by the new "States" in 1788 and into 1790. Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey had ratified it in 1787. The big States had been fearful of the voting power of the smaller States, and the smaller States had been fearful of the powers given the larger States by the Constitution. All of them, however, signed hopefully.

You have already recognized the similarities with today. The machinery of governments has broken down; there is unrest and confusion. The people are fearful and are tired of war. There is inflation. Debts are not paid. Criticism and concern are rising.

Cordell Hull suggested the calling of a conference. This was Dumbarton Oaks in 1944. Forty-four nations sent representatives.

A second conference met in San Francisco in 1945. The list of delegates was a list of the prominent men of the nations of the world, with some exceptions. Churchill was in England; De Gaulle was absent; Stalin was suspicious, and almost refused to have Molotov attend. All were finally represented.

That conference wrote the Charter of the United Nations. Newspapers have seemed to stress the differences of opinions; actually, as in 1787, the agreements were more numerous than the dissensions and the compromises.

This is the Charter which now comes to the nations individually for ratification. I have tried to indicate why the people of California are interested, and overwhelmingly want it ratified. I have tried to suggest why it is that the California representatives in the Congres, in both Houses, almost without exception, support ratification, and support the President of the United States in his desire for ratification.

The Constitution of the United States was not perfect in 1787. If it had been, there would have been no immediate need for the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments. The Charter of the United Nations is off to a better start. Its future is now in the hands and hearts of the peace-loving peoples of the world, and in that group, and among these peoples, I want the United States, and I feel that California wants the United States, to take immediate leadership.

The Russophobes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter written by Mr. Charles W. Heard to the editor and published in the Chattanooga Times and six other leading newspapers. In this letter the writer comments on the price of failure of powers to work together and I feel it will be of interest to many people. The letter is, as follows:

Your Mr. Marquis Childs says that Senator HAWKES, of New Jersey, addressing an audience of American soldiers in Rome, asked: "How would you like to finish the war fighting Russia?"

There are none so blind as those who will not see.

Apparently, obsessed by economic or ideological idiocy, certain magazines, columnists, and commentators are parroting the Hitler-Goebbels line in an effort to create resentment in this country against Russia. In England the same elements are busy with the same objective in view.

Apparently they are determined that England and the United States shall go to war with Russia.

Anyone who understands the present world situation knows that England, the United States, and Russia, cooperating enthusiastically, will find it almost impossible to stabilize conditions and maintain peace in the world. And that failure to stabilize world conditions will force Europe and Asia, including India, Burma, and China, into the Russian orbit.

This would give Russia eventual economic and military control over 1,400,000,000 people, including 300,000,000 men of military age; a fact that should give pause to these self-inflated master race Anglo-American, anti-Russian propagandists—but will not. Madmen, fearing a mythical red peril, they do not see the actual Asiatic peril from which only fair dealing with the Orient and honest cooperation with Russia in building and maintaining peace can save and protect England and the United States from eventual destruction.

The evidence of this is so clear that only the ignorant or willful fail or refuse to see the inevitable consequences of our failure to cooperate with Russia.

Moscow is now 32 hours by air from Washington, and qualified experts say that within 5 years we shall fly through the stratosphere 100 miles above the earth at 1,000 miles an hour.

Taking off from Alaska, our planes can then reduce Russian cities to rubble in 1 to 6 hours. Also, taking off from Siberia, Russian planes can then reduce American cities, including Chattanooga, Washington, New York, and Boston, to rubble in 1 to 6 hours.

But, all the reliable evidence we can get indicates that Russia wants only peace and security, and is determined to get peace and security if it is humanly possible—despite difficulties created by her enemies here and abroad.

The Russians are intelligent, honorable men—not fools or knaves. In the name of common sense, shall we allow fanatics, professional red-baiters or career diplomats who are without understanding of the irresistible evolutionary forces that are changing the world, to deceive, confuse, and prevent us from cooperating with Russia in rebuilding civilization?

Russia's achievements, during the past 25 years, including her successful prosecution of the war, indicates her Government to be efficient. For 15 years every Russian boy has been taught to exercise initiative. That, plus efficient economic organization, is why Russia was able to save herself, save England, give the United States time in which to prepare for war, and chase Hitler into Sheol—or Spain.

Let him that hath an ear to hear, hear.

C. W. HEARD.

EAST CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Dr. Tugwell and the Sugar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial on Dr. Tugwell and the sugar shortage from the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 20, 1945:

NOBODY'S BUSINESS

Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, the doctrinaire of the early days of the New Deal revolution, explained a bit about the sugar shortage the other day. Dr. Tugwell is Governor of Puerto Rico, normally a major source of American sugar supplies. In 1942, when the U-boats were sinking a great number of ships in the Atlantic and Caribbean, Puerto Ricans and inhabitants of some of the other islands were cut off from their normal food imports. Dr. Tugwell and his associates of the Anglo-American Islands Commission, decided to do something about it.

They had a meeting at which they were informed through four New Deal departments that there were ample supplies of sugar in the United States and that no ships would be available to move sugar crops to this country. A little planning was indicated, and Dr. Tugwell is, if nothing, a planner.

The plan was to convert sugar acreage to food crops so that the islanders might eat. It went into effect in 1943, when the submarines had been brought under control. It was, on paper, a good plan, but it didn't work. The sugar acreage wasn't adapted to growing food crops, but Dr. Tugwell prefers to think that the failure was the result of "sabotage" by the big sugar producers.

"By the following year," explained the doctor, "the shipping shortage had eased and the submarine menace had largely passed. Full sugar production should then have been reestablished, but that wasn't the business of the Commission. Our work was done. Production should have been resumed, but that wasn't our business. As it turns out, it appears to have been nobody's business."

In any event, sugar stopped coming up from the islands in volume. Production has still to be resumed at full scale because of a shortage in fertilizer that should have been sent from the United States. That, said Dr. Tugwell, was the business of the AAA. Now that the fertilizer at last is being sent, it has been ordered rationed for next year on the basis of this year's short sugar crop. All Dr. Tugwell had to say about that was, "The regulations are made in Washington." The first of the New Deal planners seems to have been licked by planning.

Perhaps housewives who are being deprived of their canning sugar now and told that the sugar shortage may continue for another 5 years understand things a little bit better after hearing Dr. Tugwell's deposition. It certainly is a comfort to know that the problem is nobody's business.

Montana's Unexcelled Record in the Seventh War Loan Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as this Houses recesses for the summer months, I am both proud and happy to call to your attention the record made by Montana in the Seventh War Loan drive. I am inserting in the RECORD the final report of the Montana War Finance Committee covering this drive and also the names of the district, county, and Seventh War Loan chairmen who comprise its membership. To each and every one of them I extend my congratulations on a job well done and a spirit of Americanism unexcelled. They and all Montana have done their share in furnishing the men, the money, and the resources to carry this country onward to final victory:

MONTANA WAR FINANCE COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT

(Sales to July 7, 1945)

HELENA, *July 14, 1945.*

FELLOW BOND WORKERS: Montanans can take particular pride in the result of the Seventh War Loan, both State and National. We of the State committee deem it a privilege to send you this final message of appreciation along with the figures, analyses, and graphic maps. The national director, Ted R. Gamble, in his final Seventh War Loan message to State organizations declared:

"This amazing record in sales to individuals and the greatest sale of E bonds in history in the face of current conditions is thrilling testimony to the loyalty, perseverance, and courage of the War bond volunteers. Your splendid leadership and your fine organization are responsible for a performance that has reversed trends, battered down complacency, and turned a most probable failure into an overwhelming and smashing success. Such a victory cannot be fully understood by any who do not know our gang. We are proud beyond words. God bless you."

Montana was the first State to achieve the E bond quota, thus repeating the record of first in the Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth to make it five straight.

Montana was the first State to achieve all quotas.

Montana ranks first in E percentage with 119.8 percent, colsely followed by Iowa, Alabama, and Wyoming.

Montana E sales per capita were $40.80; national per capita, $30.51. (Oregon and probably Iowa and Nebraska will exceed Montana's figure.)

Montana's per-capita purchase of E bonds from the beginning of war finance, May 1, 1941, through the Seventh War Loan drive is $335, which ranks sixth among the 48 States; national total E per capita, $276.

The most outstanding result was that every county in Montana met and exceeded every quota. Montana's E bond sales alone represent 1,017,422 $25 bonds or 508,721 $50 bonds or 254,360 $75 bonds. This, more than anything else, is testimony that the 470,000 Montanans have, to quote Secretary Morgenthau, "fulfilled a covenant with our fighting men and reaffirmed your faith in American freedom."

Montana's total sales in the Seventh War Loan were:

	Quota	Sales	Percent
E bond	$16,000,000	$19,177,020	119.8
Other individual	9,000,000	11,449,282	127.2
Total individual	25,000,000	30,626,312	122.5
Corporation	10,000,000	30,874,768	308.7
Total, all investors	35,000,000	61,511,080	175.7

Men and women from Montana serving in the armed forces, largely those overseas, purchased through their military organizations for credit of Montana and their home counties $1,254,000 in E bonds, included in our figures.

All honor to the leaders of the national and Montana parade, the first three counties in the United States to reach their E quotas, Prairie, Daniels, and Powder River.

District, county, and Seventh War Loan chairmen, listed on the reverse side, provided brilliant leadership. Our special State chairmen—Mrs. J. H. Morrow, women's activities; J. A. English, theaters; O. H. Campbell, 16mm films, and P. W. Singer, retail merchants—have done outstanding promotional work.

Success can be chalked up, however, because of the tireless efforts of everyone of the 15,000 loyal war finance workers who personally contacted, solicited and sold the bonds. These workers who include bankers, postmasters, other issuing agents, the press and radio, merchants, and members of service, patriotic, business, civic, agricultural and labor organizations have by cooperative aciton set records which no other State can equal. We salute all of you, knowing full well that as long as the need exists Montanans will respond.

A. HIBBART,
Chairman.
FRED J. MARTIN,
Executive Director.
WM. H. BARTLEY,
Executive Vice Chairman.
R. B. RICHARDSON,
Vice Chairman.
ARTHUR NELSON,
Associate Director.
EUGENE W. SAVAGE,
Associate Director.

Montana War Finance Committee—District, county, and Seventh War Loan chairmen

County	County chairmen	Seventh War Loan chairmen	Address
DISTRICT I, GEORGE H. LEICK, HAVRE, CHAIRMAN			
Blaine	O. M. Johnson	D. J. Sias	Chinook.
Do	do	C. H. Dolven	Harlem.
Chouteau	H. F. Miller		Fort Benton.
Glacier	E. L. Anderson	W. B. Lee	Cut Bank.
Hill	C. B. Elwell	O. R. Rubie	Havre.
Liberty	Tom Wright	J. Torrence Harvey	Chester.
Pondera	E. B. Emrick	H. K. Newman	Conrad.
Do		Tom W. Noble	Do.
Toole	A. E. Crumley	Martin Chandler	Shelby.
DISTRICT II, AXEL NELSON, SIDNEY, CHAIRMAN			
Carter	H. B. Albert	Wm. M. Lambert	Ekalaka.
Custer	L. B. Foster	Claude R. Erickson	Miles City.
Dawson	Arthur Schrumpf		Glendive.
Fallon	L. K. Hills	Rev. George Meyer	Baker.
Garfield	Roy Alexander		Jordan.
McCone	A. W. Eynon	John Friedlund	Circle.
Powder River	A. W. Heidel	John Aye	Broadus.
Prairie	W. A. Brubaker	A. S. Brubaker	Terry.
Richland	Dr. C. O. Watkins	Frost W. Wilder	Sidney.
Wibaux	Norman Hazlewood	Paul A. Fischer	Wibaux.

Montana War Finance Committee—District, county, and Seventh War Loan chairmen—Con.

County	County chairmen	Seventh War Loan chairmen	Address
DISTRICT III, THEODORE JACOBS, MISSOULA, CHAIRMAN			
Flathead	Harry C. Keith	Arthur Overby	Kalispell.
Granite	George Mungas	B. G. Paige	Philipsburg.
Lake	H. E. Olsson	H. Irving Johnson	Polson.
Lincoln	Mrs. Jessie Fagerberg		Libby.
Mineral	W. A. Bestwick	Reuben Zieg	Alberton.
Missoula	Oakley Coffee	E. K. Taylor	Missoula.
Ravalli	C. H. Raymond	H. S. Thane	Hamilton.
Sanders	C. H. Rittenour	E. L. Johnson	Plains.
DISTRICT IV, GEORGE N. LUND, RESERVE CHAIRMAN			
Daniels	P. B. Murphy		Scobey.
Do		J. T. Sparling	Flaxville.
Phillips	R. G. Monroe	John Lesselyong	Malta.
Roosevelt	Carl Bull		Wolf Point.
Sheridan	Carl Holje	Don Tjossem	Plentywood.
Valley	J. P. Sternhagen	C. H. Brocksmith	Glasgow.
DISTRICT V, LEE M. FORD, GREAT FALLS, CHAIRMAN			
Broadwater	Mort Sperry	J. P. Kearns	Townsend.
Cascade	Leo C. Graybill	Karl Tomaschoff	Great Falls.
Fergus	C. G. Manning	Aaron Shull	Lewistown.
Golden Valley	Harry Henton		Ryegate.
Judith Basin	N. B. Matthews		Stanford.
Lewis and Clark	E. G. Toomey	Fred Heinecke	Helena.
Meagher	James Higgins		White Sulphur Springs.
Musselshell	John McPherson	J. A. Wier	Roundup.
Petroleum	George Waldrop		Winnett.
Teton	Arnold Hanusa	Bill Olsen	Choteau.
Wheatland	I. S. McQuitty		Harlowton.
DISTRICT VI, GEORGE U. HILL, BUTTE, CHAIRMAN			
Beaverhead	W. W. Hawkins		Dillon.
Deer Lodge	R. J. Daniels	O. B. Silvey	Anaconda.
Jefferson	Dan Osmundson		Clancy.
Do	do	Dr. Howard Griffin	Boulder.
Do	do	A. W. Robert	Whitehall.
Madison	Hugh Wakefield	William R. Kohls	Ennis.
Do	do	O. H. Junod	Sheridan.
Powell	Peter Pauly		Deer Lodge.
Silver Bow	Max Dean		Butte.
DISTRICT VII, B.M. HARRIS, COLUMBUS, CHAIRMAN			
Big Horn	J. J. Ping	Dan Maddox	Hardin.
Carbon	Mrs. H. C. Olcott		Red Lodge.
Gallatin	Mrs. Mabel Cruikshank		Boseman.
Park	Joseph Swindlehurst	J. T. Sykes	Livingston.
Do	do	T. J. Wegener	Do.
Rosebud	Charles Westphal		Forsyth.
Stillwater	Mike Davey		Columbus.
Sweet Grass	Dr. D. Claiborn	L. C. Olmstead	Big Timber.
Treasure	Ralph Sharp		Hysham.
Yellowstone	V. D. Clark	Arthur Lamey	Billings.

Promoting and Preserving the Health of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed for a long time by the fact that the President of the United States must attend to many arduous details which should be performed by someone else.

During Mr. Roosevelt's last day on earth he was busy signing appointments of postmasters. It is necessary for the President to fix the fees charged by fortune tellers in the area of the Panama Canal. Such minor details constitute a strain upon the President's health and necessarily interfere with his desire to attend to more important matters.

With these facts in mind, I have today introduced in the House a bill which would authorize the President to delegate the performance of such duties to any officer or officers of the United States who may be designated by him to perform such duties.

I realize that it might be better if the proposal which I am sponsoring could specifically designate the particular duties to be assigned and it may be that any bill which may be passed by the Congress and approved by the President may specify in detail the arduous duties which may be delegated by him to someone else. However, I think it is appropriate at this time to sponsor the general idea and that is my purpose in introducing the bill in question.

Illusory Women's Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 19, 1945:

ILLUSORY WOMEN'S RIGHTS

We have always had difficulty in taking seriously the campaign to secure equal rights for women by amending the Constitution. However, with both the Democratic and Republican Parties on record in favor of such an amendment and the present House Judiciary Committee approving the proposal, it is no longer possible to assume that common sense will save us from the folly of incorporating a meaningless and mischievous slogan into our basic law.

The proposed amendment has an attractively egalitarian ring that may commend it to the thoughtless because it proclaims that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." It is only when we undertake to find out just what this amendment would do for women that doubts arise. There is no denying that in some States women are subject to legal discriminations that should be abolished. But in contradistinction to such discriminatory laws, which are being whittled away year by year under the pressure of an increasingly enlightened public opinion, there is a vast body of legislation applicable to women that is primarily protective in character.

Most States limit the number of hours women may work, require minimum wages, and provide other forms of protection for their health and efficiency. Married women and widows also receive preferential treatment under State laws. The wife, for example, is entitled to support under State laws. That fact alone justifies differences in laws relating to the property rights of men and women.

Assuming that the proposed amendment might succeed in effecting complete equality of men and women before the law, women would soon find that they had a paid a heavy price for limited gains. For the effect would be to eliminate all the special legislation designed to safeguard women in industry and in the home along with the laws that are unfairly discriminatory. In short, the proponents of this equal rights amendment have set up standards for guidance that are utterly unrealistic, being based on the untenable assumption that women are in a position to make their way and fend for themselves quite as well as men. Nobody knows better than the working women how false that notion is.

The handicaps—physical and social—under which women, especially wage earners, labor are often formidable; many of them are purely physical handicaps that it would be sheer folly to ignore. Others are an outgrowth of prejudice and custom that legislation cannot alter. Only time, education, and slowly changing public opinion can assure women a perfectly fair deal in the competitive rough and tumble of modern life, even in those occupations for which they are by nature and training well fitted. Hence, it is not surprising to find major labor groups

and outstanding women leaders, such as former Secretary of Labor Perkins, who are intimately acquainted with labor problems, actively opposing the equal rights amendment. They realize that equality before the law is worse than an empty formula.

It is an invitation to oppression for the law to disregard differences between the sexes that affect earning capacity and to refuse to make allowance for the different social positions of men and women as members of family groups. As the minority members of the House Judiciary Committee said, "using the Constitution for a broom with which to sweep away indiscriminately the good with the bad is neither sound law nor sane behavior." Where State laws unjust to women exist, efforts should be directed toward their revision or elimination; that is, there should be "a separate bill for a separate ill."

The proposed amendment sets up no legislative standards to replace existing laws it would invalidate. It is purely negative and essentially destructive. Nor is it clear what is meant by the second paragraph of the amendment to the effect that "Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Conflicting interpretations and endless litigation would be the result of incorporating any such vague amendment into the fundamental law of the land. However, there appears to be general agreement on one point: the amendment would wipe out all the laws, State and Federal, that give special protection to women and would also make it impossible to provide for their protection in the future, without extending a like degree of protection to men who may not desire nor require it.

Admission of Italy to the United Nations as an Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I have received petitions signed by hundreds of citizens of Italian blood from my district asking that Italy be admitted to the United Nations as an ally. These petitions represent the feelings and aspirations of practically every American citizen of Italian blood or birth, and a statement of those aspirations is contained in a letter which I have recently received from Rev. Alfred D'Aliberti, of Steubenville, Ohio, who is Secretary of the Society for Recognition of Italy as an ally by the United Nations, as follows:

JULY 3, 1945.

Hon. EARL R. LEWIS,
Congressman from Ohio,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very sincerely for your personal interest in this noble aspiration of the large group of citizens of Steubenville and vicinity for whom we speak.

It does sound preposterous to ask the Government of the United States against whom Italy declared war to nonchalantly extend to that aggressor country the friendly hand of assistance. The right thing to do is to reduce her to a mere blot on the map by completely crushing her, and so render her absolutely incapable ever to attempt to strike again.

However, there is an element of such gross injustice in the above statement that even Italy's bitterest enemy cannot deny.

We do not want to make a case for Italy as a political entity. Italy has never had a good government, and fascism was simply a tyranny. Now, it seems, the bungling of the Allies is opening the doors to communism instead of permitting American democracy to enter.

We are not interested, as an organization, in any particular form of government which will be imposed upon the helpless population. I am simply interested in the helpless population, Italy's innocent victims of the ravages of this war, and the previous wars which led to it. These victims, poor, deceived, exploited and misguided, did not declare war on the United States. It was their tyrant who boastfully plunged them into the holocaust which is leaving so much sorrow and destruction in its wake. The megalomaniac did not represent the will of the people. He had not been elected by them. He was their self-appointed despot. He had gone into power by the use of brutal force, and some outside aid, and when he declared war on the Allies, he was biting, so to speak, the hand that fed him. But the people were innocent and against him. But they were helpless. Even the soldiers who were armed could not revolt because they were sent out of Italy where they did the only honorable thing they could do: Surrender to the Americans and to the English. The German soldiers were in control in Italy.

The Italian people would not declare war on the United States.

This country means so much to the people of Italy that it would be impossible to have a declaration of war and hatred from them as a people. There is actually a blood relation between America and Italy, and no one, in his right mind, would want to destroy his loved ones. The Italian people are not crazy, as they proved it so well in the way they disposed of their oppressor.

Maybe the hand of Providence took this means of ridding Italy of fascism as well as of the Duce. Had Mussolini not declared war on the Allies; had he played a dubious part in the conflict, he might still be governing Italy with his bloody hand.

Italy is now thoroughly purged. And if the people are given the opportunity they will mop up the country completely. But these people are starving. We are sending medicines, old clothing, and some food. We are pauperizing the people, we are not helping them to help themselves.

The Italian people are looking toward the east for food and salvation. The west is uncertain, is peeved, is revengeful.

We don't want to make the mistake of arriving too late with too little. We want to save Italy with American democracy, and the way to do it is to extend now, in the time of her extreme need, our hand of fellowship and help.

We can do it, and it will be to our interest.

Respectfully yours,

ALFRED D'ALIBERTI,
Secretary.

We Must Finish the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the transition period following the end of hostilities in Europe leaves nearly all of the countries of Europe in a chaotic state. A very thoughtful and informative editorial upon this subject appeared in the New York Times, pointing out that the battle against Germany was over, but the battle for Europe was still to be won, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

TO FINISH THE JOB

Every returning traveler and every report from Europe harps on the same theme. With increasing urgency they tell the grim story of an unfinished war.

From France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Greece, from every country the Allied armies have liberated, come disturbing accounts of hunger, stagnation, mass unemployment, incipient violence. The battle against Germany is decided, but in the struggle to loosen the grip of the octopus the productive power and the communication system of an entire continent were crippled or destroyed. The vital forces of the occupied nations were weakened by privation, spoliation, and terror. The hosts of deliverance have driven out and crushed the invaders, but so far they have not been able to cope with the immeasurable misery the fighting leaves behind. In many respects conditions today are not only worse than in the war years; they are worse than any crisis in the memory of Europe. Cool-minded observers warn us that the next 12 months are as crucial to victory as the last 12 months of the shooting war.

No one will question that it is as important to achieve the aims we fought for as to defeat the forces we fought against. The truth is that only the battle against Germany is over; the battle for Europe is still to be won. It is premature and unrealistic to talk of victory while the countries we have freed totter on the edge of chaos. We have spent the lives of our youth and poured out the wealth of our country without stint to restore civilization, freedom, peace, and faith in the future to the nations Germany overran and looted. It is unthinkable that we should abandon the battlefield before the elementary conditions of order are established. Starvation, idleness, and cold are poor leaders but great powers in the postwar world—greater powers than the Big Three—and if they are left to make policies and rule peoples, the result is a foregone conclusion. The end of desperation is anarchy in the first stage and a dictatorship of the extreme right or the extreme left in the second stage. By no conceivable process does it lead to a triumph of democracy.

It is reported that President Truman has succeeded in putting the Pacific war first on the agenda of the Potsdam Conference. Whether or not this is true, the necessity of pushing the Japanese campaign to a climax tends to overshadow the dangers in Europe. Yet we cannot afford to forget that we are still engaged in a war on two fronts, the military and the political, and that as far as Europe is concerned the phase we are now entering is as decisive as the all-out assault on Japan. The purpose of waging war is to attain peace, and to deliver knockout blows on either side of the globe for anything less than peace is to fight in vain.

Peace in Europe depends on recovery, and the process of recovery cannot be started without supplies of fuel, food, and machinery which Europe itself in its present state of destruction and disorganization cannot provide. Take the vital item of coal, for instance. Experts who have studied the situation on the ground estimate that the present capacity of the Ruhr, the Saar, and the French mines—greatly reduced by bombing, manpower shortage, and the debilitated condition of the miners—can supply only a fraction of the needs of western Europe in this critical year. And without coal trains cannot run, manufacturing cannot resume, the idle cannot find work, even the available food

cannot be transported. Reconstruction, in a word cannot begin without coal. It cannot begin unless the United States is able to squeeze some coal for export out of our own depleted stock. The same is true of food. We shall have to cut still further our diminished ration to help avert starvation. It is a hard choice, and it will hurt, but the alternative is the loss of what we have gained by the harder sacrifices we have already made.

What to do with Germany and the Germans is another question, depending altogether on how Germany can be organized to guarantee the peace and at the same time to serve the reconstruction of the Continent. The key fact is that Europe must be made stronger than Germany can ever be again. It must be made strong enough to resist the forces not only of conquest but of disintegration. This is not only in the interest of Europe but in the interest of the United States. Two costly wars starting in the disorder of Europe have given us a tremendous stake in the establishment and preservation or order on that Continent.

By order we do not mean the sullen quiet of an imposed status quo, but a reign of law in which men and nations feel safe and free to decide their own form of government and their own destiny. This points to a second and equally important aspect of our duty to the liberated and to our own fighting forces. This duty is to see that the decisions of the peace are not anticipated or foreclosed by acts of aggression and that the rights of the majority in every country are protected against seizures of power by a violent minority. This can be accomplished only by the visible manifestation of American power.

Europe is full of fevers and tensions—over boundaries, over transfers of populations, over purges, expropriations and continual crises of temporary governments. It is bristling with hidden arms and highly nationalistic groups ready to take what they want by force and confront the peacemakers with faits accomplis. The only way to hold this violence in check is to keep sufficient force on the ground to make possible the peaceful and gradual execution of the settlements agreed upon by the Allied Powers.

The obligation of the United States to maintain armies in Europe during the transition to peace is too clear to need arguing. The presence of a force that cannot be turned to party uses by divergent elements is a brake against aggression and a bridge between anarchy and lawful solutions of internal and external problems. The crisis over Trieste is a case in point. The attempt to seize territory by force, regardless of the rights involved and of Allied authority, would have undermined confidence in and respect for any orderly settlements had it been permitted to succeed. And it would have succeeded if the Allied protest had not had the backing of immediately available force.

The graves of our dead are scattered over all of western Europe, and it would be a tragic blunder and betrayal on our part to withdraw the living armies which proclaim our intention to finish the job for which they gave their lives. These armies are the sign that this time we will not go home until the conditions of peace and freedom are assured. Our commitments in San Francisco bind us to support an international insurance system against future wars. But our immediate duty and interest are to see that this conflict is won. It cannot be won unless we play our full part in helping the war-torn countries to economic, social, and political stability: First, by economic assistance in the stormy passage to peace, and, second, by keeping enough military force in Europe to prove that the postwar problems are our problems and that we are determined to pay whatever additional price is required to keep this war won.

The price will be small compared to the outlay already made. On the military side it will call for a period of service on the part of the troops who will replace those who have already served overseas. On the civilian side it will mean a little more and longer rationing. What American is not ready to pay this final installment on the cost of victory?

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the minority views and additional minority views relating to Report No. 907, the equal rights amendment:

MINORITY VIEWS

It is my opinion that the backfiring implications of this blanket bit of proposed legislation have not been thoroughly considered.

It is a mischief-breeding abstraction leading not to the desideratum, but to the blind alleys of confusion.

What are "equal rights"? How will "rights" be distinguished from "duties," and "duties" from "obligations"? Do "equal rights" mean accepting men's standards in everything? Or women's? Would the amendment itself abrogate existing laws? Will Congress have to legislate further so that the respective States conform to what the Federal notion of "equality of rights" may be? In that State where the age of consent to marriage is 12 for girls and 14 for boys, would the amendment increase the age for boys and girls to 14 or lower it to 12? A host of similar questions necessarily arises.

The proposed amendment would erase from the statute books laws relating to widows' pensions, the right of dependent wives and children to the support of the husband and father, alimony, and guardianship. Having washed away the protective legislation for wives, mothers, and widows, the so-called equal rights amendment offers no alternative safeguarding measures. Will the passage of the equal rights amendment offer any security to the illegitimate child for whom no support from the putative father can be claimed? Under the equal rights amendment cannot the male demand that the onus of support, of alimony, be borne equally by the female? Why not a widowers' pension? Or will such claims be denied both? In short, exactly what does the proposed amendment mean?

For example, in some States the husband's failure to support his wife is ground for divorce. Should the amendment provide ground for divorce by the husband if the wife did not support him? In some States the woman reaches the age of majority at 18. The man must wait until he is 21. Under the amendment, does the majority for a man become 18, or the majority for the woman 21?

In California and a number of other States there is what is known as community property, where a husband and wife own together whatever property may have been acquired during marriage. Would "equality of rights" mean that in another State where at present there is no such community property, if a wife bought some property in her own name, the husband would also own it with her? If not, then, what is meant by "equality of rights"? Take jury service. In some States women must serve on juries. In other States jury service for women is optional. There is a third class of States where jury service for women is prohibited. In a fourth class of States, women must serve, but are excused if they must take care of children. Which laws would be valid. They cannot all be valid under "equality of rights."

Moreover, it is important to note that the equal rights amendment is not supported by any major labor group nor by any organization having long experience in the field of industrial problems. Justly so, for it would destroy State wage-and-hour laws for women and bring back sweatshop employment standards for thousands of unorganized women who cannot secure better standards without the protection of these laws. It would destroy essential health legislation which safeguards the health of women and prevents strain and injuries harmful to mothers and pregnant women. The protection they afford will be acutely needed in the postwar world.

The opinion among women is by no means unanimous. Among those in firm opposition to the proposed amendment will be found the New York League of Women Voters, the Catholic Daughters of America, the National Consumers' League, the Congress of Women's Auxiliaries of the CIO, the National Board of Young Women's Christian Associations, the Girls' Friendly Society of the United States of America, the American Association of University Women, the National Council of Jewish Women, the Women's Auxiliary of the Newspaper Guild of New York, the Women's Trade Union League, the United Office and Professional Workers of America, the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, to mention but a few.

We cannot deny that discrimination against women is present. Some States still have laws which forbid women to serve on juries, to hold certain offices, to handle their property without the consent of their husbands, etc. It is not defense of these laws that makes for opposition to the proposed amendment. It is the method that is decried. Using the Constitution for a broom with which to sweep away indiscriminately the good with the bad is neither sound law nor sane behavior.

The earnest proponents point with conclusive argument to the success of the suffrage amendment. The analogy they seek to establish is, unfortunately for them, the revealing weakness in their logic. The nineteenth amendment met a specific ill with a specific remedy. It states that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. It did not attempt to legislate on the whole sphere of human endeavor.

The deceptive phrase of "equal rights" for women has earned for the amendment many adherents who do not see that such an amendment does not confer equal rights. It brings the dubious gift of confusion and will boomerang in the form of "unequal rights."

This is no time to bring up such a controversy. Many men and women are in the armed forces. Have they had an opportunity to pass upon the question? Are they not entitled to a voice? Why not wait until "Johnny comes marching home?"

This is the time for unity. Women should get together to correct whatever inequalities exist in the States, and where they do exist, act by specific remedy. These inequalities should be leveled off until if, as, and when they make for the best interests of all—both men and women.

EMANUEL CELLER.
THOMAS J. LANE.
MARTIN GORSKI.
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.
JOHN W. GWYNNE.

ADDITIONAL MINORITY VIEWS

Generally, I concur in the minority views of Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, THOMAS J. LANE, MARTIN GORSKI, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, and JOHN W. GWYNNE, but I beg to emphasize what I conceive to be two points of transcendent importance:

I. "Local self-government" was the ideal of the founding fathers of this Nation. In the Convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, it was freely expressed and generally recognized that centralization of power in the National Government would wreck it.

Every time we move any power away from the people, we weaken capacity to govern, both at home and in Washington. At home the people have less and less participation in government. This means eventual impotence. In Washington, the constitutional agencies of government become swamped by multiplicitous duties and are compelled to confess their incapacity by creating a "bureau crazy" wilderness in which both the people and their rights have become lost. Sheer vastness makes efficiency impossible, even though dictatorial powers have been granted the so-called "expert" bureaucrats, in the hope that thus the load might be borne. But there has been experienced black-outs of justice, and the Bill of Rights may become mere sounding brass or tinkling cymbals.

Therefore, it is with horror that Congress should contemplate this proposal, the adoption of which would mean further centralization of power in Washington and in a field that is almost sacred. The power here sought to be taken from the States is to regulate the home, the marriage relation, the welfare of children and parents, property rights of wives, widows, and orphans, and the health, happiness, and morals of most of the sovereign people.

II. It would wipe out the righteous preferences now granted women by many State laws.

This amendment would be self-executing. While it would give Congress and the several States power to enforce it by appropriate legislation, no legislation would ever be needed to accomplish its main purpose, to wit:

"Equality of rights under the laws shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

As Hon. Douglas B. Maggs, Solicitor, United States Department of Labor, writes:

"The amendment itself, without the aid of legislation enacted to enforce it, will strike down as unconstitutional and invalid all provisions in existing and future laws which, on the basis of assumed or accepted differences between the sexes, give men or women rights which are not accorded in equal degree to the other sex * * * in seeking to achieve an illusory equality it will result in women losing deserved advantage."

The 10 commandments of such preferences in favor of women usually found in the laws of States in which women now have equal rights plus, are:

1. The exclusive legal obligation of the husband to provide a home and to support his wife and children and care for their comfort and health, to the best of his financial ability.

2. Superior homestead rights.

3. The right of dower. Husbands have none. The husband's right of courtesy is far inferior.

4. Wife's preference in award of custody of children upon separation or divorce, especially those of tender years.

5. Wife may not become surety, nor give security, for her husband, nor for any debt of his.

6. Prohibition of profanity in the presence or hearing of any woman.

7. The laws against rape, seduction, carnal knowledge before reaching the age of consent apply only to women or girls.

8. Women are not required, as men are, to perform labor for road maintenance.

9. Labor laws requiring that seats be provided for women in their places of employment and prohibiting hard or hazardous employment, do not apply to men.

10. No State or Federal law has ever required absolute equality between the sexes in military service. This proposed amendment, if technically construed, and if women insist upon this right, would enjoin absolute equality with respect of this right.

These are but a few of the wise and beneficent laws favoring women over men which I would fight to retain, even if the States were considering making any changes therein. I am all the more opposed to such changes when they are dictated by Washington.

SAM HOBBS.

I join Representative HOBBS in this report and protest the passage of this resolution for the further reason that it would destroy many protective laws for the women which we have been a century in building and having enacted into laws, and for the further reason I am convinced it will be to the detriment of the family, home, community, and to the women themselves.

SAM M. RUSSELL.

Lend-Lease Grab Bag

REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an amazing story of the far-flung activities of lend-lease.

With Lend-Lease, UNRRA, the Export-Import Bank, Bretton Woods, and so forth, each competing with the others to spread Uncle Sam's generosity over the world, we are fast approaching that bewildering and confusing state in our international agencies that has been the history of domestic agencies under the New Deal.

The article Lend-lease Grab Bag by that well-known Washington writer, Lawrence Sullivan, appears in the July issue of Nation's Business. It follows:

LEND-LEASE GRAB BAG

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

With the war ended in Europe, our Federal agencies still have $21,500,000,000 of lend-lease authorizations available. Must United States businesses take second priorities on raw materials, fuel, tools, and machinery for reconversion and reconstruction while we rebuild Europe?

Lend-lease is in transition. President Truman has reported to Congress that "lend-lease and reverse lend-lease must continue as a military necessity" to win the war in the Pacific. But both war production and lend-lease, he added, now are subject to "adjustments and reductions * * * even as we and our allies throw augmented forces into the decisive offensive against the Japanese."

That's the new official policy—adjustments and reductions.

But that policy is being administered under the original lend-lease statute of March 1941, as renewed, amended, and extended by Congress in April 1945. The extension legislation was passed in both Houses while Franklin D. Roosevelt was President and became law under the signature of President Truman, about 3 weeks before the German capitulation.

Thus we are operating, basically, with a statute written under the stresses of two-front total war. But the war theater which took more than 80 percent of our wartime lend-lease expenditures now has folded.

Nevertheless, Europe's petitions for assistance in rebuilding her war-shattered industries are insistent. We already have negotiated postwar assistance arrangements with France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, on the ground that these nations are committed to real military cooperation in the Pacific. We are negotiating new agreements with England and Russia.

Congress thinks it detects in these new Executive agreements (they are not treaties subject to Senate ratification) a subtle twist of legal terminology which would permit continued lend-lease shipments for European reconstruction, in the guise of 20-year loans.

A SHORTAGE AT HOME

If this is the new program, domestic priorities and allocations must continue in force for perhaps 2 years longer; because experience has demonstrated since 1942 that we have neither the manpower, industrial capacity, nor transportation plant to carry simultaneously (a) the Pacific war, (b) domestic reconversion, and (c) European reconstruction. Something must give, and, obviously, our war needs in the Pacific will not be submerged.

Since March 11, 1941, we have authorized $64,192,498,000 for lend-lease. Through June 1945 total expenditures on lend-lease account were $42,653,684,000 (partially offset by $5,000,000,000 in reverse lend-lease). This leaves roughly $21,500,000,000 in lend-lease funds still available for the remaining year of operations. Under the legislation extending lend-lease authority to June 30, 1946, Congress set up a 3-year liquidation period. This means that all such operations must be terminated by June 30, 1949—more than 4 years after VE-day.

How will FEA dispose of this $21,500,000,000 in 12 months? In 1944, the peak year of operations, we delivered only $14,150,000,000 on all lend-lease accounts. Can we, in the next year, dispose of 50 percent more lend-lease in the Pacific war than was consigned to both Europe and the Pacific in 1944?

In his message to Congress June 4, President Truman asked for only $1,975,000,000 additional lend-lease funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; but that message also recommended that $2,400,000,000 left over from current allocations be carried over to the new fiscal year. This would appear to make available a total of only $4,375,000,000 for lend-lease in the new fiscal year.

But President Truman's message contained another significant passage. He asked for this new money "exclusive of aid authorized to be transferred by the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission." The message to Congress did not summarize the lend-lease funds authorized in these departmental appropriation bills. A general provision of all appropriations to the military services and the Maritime Commission is that any part of the total funds up to 10 percent, may be allocated for lend-lease account.

One further provision for postwar aid to Europe was mentioned by President Truman. Speaking of our recent agreements with France, Holland, and Belgium, he said that beyond lend-lease, "I purpose that these Allies be assisted in financing necessary equipment and supplies by the Export-Import Bank."

It is FEA's stated policy not to use this authority for European relief and reconstruction. Yet section 3c of the amended act authorizes continued lend-lease shipments to Europe after the war, at the discretion of the President, subject to long-term credits.

Under this clause we already have concluded an agreement to supply France with $2,500,000,000 worth of food, machinery, equipment, and supplies. A similar agreement has been made with Belgium. We have made a tentative commitment to supply England with $5,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease this year, a little more than we supplied in 1944. And Russia is negotiating for $6,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease this year

under the so-called credit provisions of paragraph 3c.

THIRTEEN BILLIONS IN EUROPE

If all these plans and agreements are consummated, we shall be pledged to ship at least $13,500,000,000 worth of lend-lease to Europe during the first year after the end of the European war. Out of appropriations now available, this still would leave $8,000,000,000 for Pacific lend-lease during the next year.

Thus far, the terms of only the French agreement have been published in detail. They call for $840,000,000 worth of raw materials, including metals, textiles, chemicals, rubber, and drugs; $185,000,000 in foods; $132,000,000 in petroleum; $250,000,000 in manufacturing equipment; $48,000,000 for food and clothing to French prisoners of war; $200,000,000 for locomotives; $120,000,000 for railway cars; $140,000,000 for merchant ships; $100,000,000 for metal working machinery; $100,000,000 for mining machinery; $150,000,000 for machine tools; and $90,000,000 for harbor craft and fishing vessels.

Whenever the President determines that these items are no longer necessary for the prosecution of the war, he may end the lend-lease shipments; nevertheless, we may thereafter continue to supply the goods enumerated in the agreement on a 20-year-credit program, payable with interest at 2⅜ percent a year.

"In other words," said Senator TAFT in debate, "we are making a loan to the French for postwar reconstruction, and that is the very purpose of the agreement."

But this whole program may be terminated at any time the President shall determine that the shipments do not serve American national defense. Then, another section of the agreement provides:

"The United States agrees to deliver the programed supplies to the French after this determination by the President, unless the President determines that it is not in our national interest to do so."

In net effect, the whole lend-lease system remains essentially a one-man operation, always subject to the discretion of the President. But the funds are available, agreements have been made with foreign nations, others are in process of negotiation. The probability is, therefore, that the whole fund will be spent on lend-lease, with most of it going to European reconstruction, rather than to war programs in the Pacific.

Now, this nest-egg of $21,500,000,000 in lend-lease funds is not the only export pool drawing on America's war restricted industrial capacity in direct competition with our own tremendous backlog of deferred replacements needs. We already have pledged $1,300,000,000 to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for postwar relief. We are urged to contribute $8,000,000,000 to the international funds contemplated in the Bretton Woods program. We already have increased the revolving fund of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $2,000,000,000. Legislation now before Congress would increase the working capital of the Export-Import Bank to $2,200,000,000.

When and if all these programs are consummated, the total of foreign gifts and credits available in the United States would build up to $33,000,000,000.

Chairman Marriner S. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, questions whether we could handle any such export volume without courting a runaway inflation. Far from making vast loans to foreign countries after the war, he suggested in his testimony before the Senate Banking Committee, we should limit exports, because for several years we will be unable to produce even the goods which our own people will want, in addition to the export volume which will be available through regular commercial channels from those countries which have built up enormous dollar balances during the war.

Mr. Eccles estimated that about $10,000,000,000 of cash and earmarked gold owned by foreign nations and their nationals is now in the United States, ready to be spent as soon as shipping controls are relaxed. Another $15,000,000,000 in foreign holdings ultimately will be released by the unfreezing of alien balances. These balances, plus the lend-lease funds and potential Government credits, would make a total export buying pool of approximately $58,000,000,000. It is not difficult to imagine what might happen in the way of inflation should this vast reservoir of foreign demand be unleashed on the American market simultaneously with a limited resumption of civilian production, which will call out an estimated $75,000,000,000 in dormant domestic buying power.

It is important to note that the things most insistently demanded abroad are precisely the items needed most urgently at home—trucks, railroad equipment, machine tools, mining machinery, agricultural machinery, petroleum, refining equipment, textiles, lumber, leather, paints and oils, building hardware and electrical equipment—all the more reason why American reconversion and full production should come first in our planning.

We began reconstruction of the French economy in October 1944. By March 1, 1945, we had supplied in the civilian categories 4,000 tractors, 650 road graders, 3,000 air compressors, 500 cranes, and 20,000 other items of construction equipment, making a total of 1,000,000 tons; also 125,000 tons of steel rails, 150,000 tons of bridge steel, and 30,000 tons of structural steel. We have also shipped to France 1,746 locomotives and 20,600 freight cars. Another consignment of 30,200 freight cars "have been disassembled for shipment," and are now being transported.

Before we started French industrial rehabilitation, we had restored the French military power to the tune of $700,000,000 up to January 31, 1945. This fund equipped 8 divisions of the French Army, plus 80 combat units in the new French air force. Last February we made commitments to equip 8 additional divisions, plus 60 more air units before the end of summer.

Since November 1942, the report says, we have spent "more than $200,000,000" to rebuild the French fleet.

HELP FOR THE FRENCH NAVY

To assist the French Navy, we overhauled and modernized 25 French combat ships in United States yards, and transferred to the De Gaulle government a few more than 200 small naval craft built in the United States. The official summary of lend-lease assistance to France continues:

"Operating in the Mediterranean are 3 heavy and 7 light cruisers, all with American equipment, and well over 100 other warships, including destroyer escorts, submarine chasers, patrol craft, and minesweepers, supported by the necessary harbor tugs and supply craft, all of which, except the cruisers, were built in the United States and given to France."

We have also assigned 26 merchant ships to carry civilian supplies exclusively for France.

Our military forces also have released $30,000,000 worth of civilian supplies in France. In addition, our Army engineers have repaired highways, railroads, ports, electric utilities, water works, and sewerage systems.

Also, through January 1945, we had given France 1,091 airplanes, plus $14,000,000 worth of spart parts; 1,100 armored tanks, 2,300 armored guns, 255,000 rifles, 20,000 cargo trucks, 14,000 trailers, 5,400 command cars, and 8,800 small trucks.

We also have pledged to France 2,600,000 military uniforms, 200,000 heavy duty truck tires, 200,000,000 board feet of lumber, 8,000,000 light bulbs, $10,000,000 worth of X-ray film, 500,000 drawing instruments, 90,000 tons of cement, and 100,000 gallons of paint.

In addition, we shipped to France in January this year these items classified as nonmilitary:

	Metric tons
Zinc	1,968
Sulfur	8,252
Jute bags	1,399
Rice	1,414
Lard	5,396
Milk	5,504
Cotton	5,000
Newsprint	1,115
Roofing	3,141
Medical supplies	500
Asbestos	880
Copper	5,750

These figures illustrate the practically limitless range of our reconstruction allocations under lend-lease. Yet all of these items fall within the $2,500,000,000 limit stipulated in the new French agreement—about 10 percent of the total fund available today.

Because of limitations on trans-Atlantic shipping space before VE-day, French requisitions were coming in faster than the goods could be moved. So new purchases of civilian items simply were stock-piled for French account in the United States after being cleared by the various Federal control agencies. Among such "authorized purchases" for French account as of early February (after the January shipments listed above) were: 30,000,000 feet gypsum wallboard, 25,000 tons of lard, 25,000 tons condensed milk, 36,000 tons cotton, 9,000 motortrucks, 12,000 tons copper, 5,000 tons lead, 2,000 tons zinc, 2,000 tons tin, 7,000 tons synthetic rubber, 2,500 tons carbon black, 15,000 tons ammonium nitrate, 3,000 tons asbestos, 1,000 tons tobacco, 3,000 tons horseshoes, 25 tons motion-picture film.

Although Italy does not qualify for lend-lease, the Allied Control Commission acts as clearing house for a vast relief and reconstruction program in that country. As in France, United States Army engineers in Italy have reconstructed hundreds of miles of railways and highways, have restored bridges, docks, and port facilities; have repaired and rebuilt public utilities in Rome, Naples, Palermo, and half a dozen lesser cities. To date, we have spent $6,280,000 for repair and maintenance of 3,832 miles of Italian highways.

Principally from American supplies, the Allied Control Commission already has landed in Italy, for civilian account, 1,100,000 tons of foodstuffs and 1,200,000 tons of other supplies. Since July 1943 we have given Italy 290,000 tons of coal, 29,000 tons of chemicals, 7,000 tons of textiles, 6,000 tons of newsprint, 7,000 tons of medicine, 4,000 tons of soap, and 10,000 tons of miscellaneous supplies—"for purely civilian purposes."

These supplies are in addition to those provided by other Allied Powers and by private sources, such as the American Red Cross.

In addition, UNRRA has made an allocation of $50,000,000 for Italian food supplies.

Over and above the food programs of the Army, UNRRA, and the Red Cross, the Control Commission also is supplying approximately $1,000,000 a month in vitamin concentrates and medical supplies.

HOUSES TO GO TO ENGLAND

The first reconstruction project for England under lend-lease calls for 30,000 prefabricated houses, at a cost of $50,000,000. Allocation of materials for this project was approved by WPB on February 9.

"The materials for these houses will come out of the allocations that would otherwise have been made to our own civilian economy, and will represent practically no impact upon the military effort," WPB explained. Shipments are scheduled to be completed before the end of the year.

With the opening of the Stilwell Road from India to China last February, we launched a program to rehabilitate internal transport in the Chungking area, beginning with an initial allocation of 15,000 motortrucks under lend-lease. About the same time we opened a 2,000-mile pipe line from Calcutta to China.

"An oil refinery provided by the United States, which already has reached India, and several power plants are included in the program. * * * American technicians already have arrived in China to organize the new transport system. They live in roadside shacks with the Chinese, whom they will train. * * * The first group of Chinese trainees—automotive mechanics, medical technicians, and railroad engineers—are about to start their studies in this country."

Before the opening of the Stilwell Road, we were moving an average of 30,000 tons monthly to China by air, over the Himalayan Hump. With the new pipe line and the new road, FEA hopes that we may now approach more nearly the lend-lease volume "actually needed by China."

During the first 4 years of our lend-lease operations, allocations to China and India were only 6.9 percent of the total, as compared with 43.6 percent for Great Britain, 28.7 for Russia, 13 for the Mediterranean area.

One of the heaviest burdens of our lend-lease operation to date has been a hidden item related to the British-American exchange stabilization program.

As a step to avoid unmanageable postwar disparities in dollar-pound exchange, all lend-lease arrivals are evaluated in Britain, for bookkeeping purposes, at the 1941 "stabilization" price level. But the actual cost of United States production, of course, has been anywhere from 25 to 40 percent above the 1941 level; in some foods, current prices are 50 percent above 1941.

LEND-LEASE AT CUT PRICES

But when the day comes for a final casting of accounts, all of these items will be credited to the United States at 1941 prices. By this involved—and generally unknown—process we have shipped to Great Britain approximately $18,000,000,000 in lend-lease goods and services since 1941, and have subsidized each dollar of lend-lease allocation with upward of another 25 percent through the stabilization price agreement.

In presenting arguments for extension of lend-lease through the reconstruction era, England insists that, by carrying her armament and defense load alone during 1940-41, she dug deep into her resources and manpower before America really got into the fight. For that reason, runs the London argument, America should sustain the Empire with lend-lease through a reasonable period of reconversion and reconstruction.

No legal arrangements exist today for relief and rehabilitation aid to Germany, save through direct military expenditures in the occupied areas. But FEA already has made thorough surveys within Germany in an attempt to estimate the postwar potential of the surviving German economy in those areas delegated to American control. These surveys indicate that the German economy now is functioning at only about 5 percent of wartime capacity.

American policy does not contemplate any considerable measures of reconstruction, but is interested in stimulating that degree of economic rehabilitation which will enable the German population to sustain both itself and the occupation forces. Whatever we may elect to call it—military expense, lend-lease, or relief—we face the necessity of restoring a subsistence economy in Germany if our occupation forces are to be given a reasonable chance of survival against disease and civil commotions.

A sharp demonstration of this type of compulsion came to light last month in Holland, where some sections of the population were found so far advanced in starvation they could no longer handle ordinary relief foods. We shipped several tons of vitamin concentrates by air, in an attempt to restore the digestive process.

Another item to get AA-1 priority in May was $176,000 worth of pipe and pumping equipment to help restore the water system of Athens.

EUROPE IS GETTING HELP

"We also have provided some quantities of textiles for clothing destitute populations," Krug continued. "One hundred and eighty additional locomotives have been scheduled for eastern European countries supplied by UNRRA, and the UNRRA freight-car schedules are now being developed in WPB. Some 11,000 commercial trucks have been allocated to liberated European areas during 1945."

Poland and Czechoslovakia also are receiving assistance mostly through UNRRA. In May UNRRA shipped 19,000 tons of food, clothing, seeds, and medical supplies to these two countries.

In short, the public record makes it clear that while the United States operates under a rather strongly stated national policy of not stretching lend-lease to purposes of postwar reconstruction and rehabilitation, we are, in fact, supplying such aid today to no less than nine European nations and making economic surveys of prospective needs in half a dozen other countries. In addition, a special congressional commission of inquiry has recommended an immediate appropriation of $100,000,000 for reconstruction and industrial rehabilitation in the Philippine Islands.

But since VE-day we have been striking at this whole problem of relief, reconstruction, and rehabilitation in haphazard fashion, doling out $1,000,000 here and $10,000,000 there as cases arose. We have no policy or program—and not the slightest idea what the total cost may be.

In the course of debate on the lend-lease extension last April, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, warned of precisely this development.

"I suggest that the administration should prepare for us an over-all estimate of the total commitments which it contemplates in the postwar field," he said. "Instead of a reckless and piecemeal process * * *, we should be able to judge each sector against the background of the whole. Otherwise we cannot act with prudence and foresight or with the elementary precaution which we owe to our own people."

Senator VANDENBERG inquired pointedly:

What will be asked of us for UNRRA?

What will be asked of us for relief in areas which UNRRA can't reach?

What will be asked of us in lend-lease hangover?

What will be asked of us under the Bretton Woods agreements?

What expenditures are contemplated in the name of pan-American cooperation?

What will be our financial stake in various other international organizations, present and prospective?

What will be our expenditures in the rehabilitation of the Philippines—a challenge which has a priority right-of-way?

What will be asked of us in respect of the expanded Export-Import Bank?

What is contemplated by way of direct Government postwar credits to our allies?

"This does not exhaust the list," he explained. "It merely exemplifies the problem. I submit it is high time we tested this total prospectus against the available American resources which—in the midst of our own terrific postwar necessities—we can commit to these external purposes.

"This is not only due to our own people; it is also due to the world, which otherwise may be misled into a reliance and expectation which it is physically and financially impossible for us to fulfill.

"Such ultimate disappointments, such ultimate disillusionments, shatter good will and damage international friendships."

Yes; America stands ready and willing to cooperate wholeheartedly in building a healthier, happier world.

But, as Senator VANDENBERG has put it so aptly, "we are neither big enough nor rich enough to become permanent almoner to the whole earth."

Maybe we should change the name, repeal the Johnson Act, and call all future allocations loans. But whatever the financial nomenclature, the drain on American resources will still be the same.

Unless some system of priorities is fixed clearly in our national policy, we likely shall see American business hanging on by its fingernails waiting for new equipment, new tools, new machinery, while the finest products of our miraculous industrial system float off over the seven seas to the nobler calling of world reconstruction.

The problem is a real one. Unless the American productive plant is maintained at maximum efficiency through adequate repair and renewal after its wartime starvation, there simply will not be sufficient industrial production during the next 2 or 3 years to sustain the world's economy at the subsistence level.

A New Solution for Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at a meeting recently held in Omaha, Nebr., under the auspices of the Central Western Shippers Advisory Board. The address, which is entitled "A New Solution for Agricultural Problems," was delivered at the meeting by Mr. J. L. Welsh, of Omaha, Nebr., vice president of the Farm Crops Processing Corp. and president of the Grain and Feed Dealers National Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW SOLUTION FOR AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I notice that I have taken on quite a job. I will do my best to try to stimulate your thinking along the lines we are endeavoring to work out scientifically as a solution to farm problems. I will try not to give you many statistics, but I shall explain my philosophy in determining these problems. After 35 years in the grain business, I have come to the conclusion that all of our prosperity in America goes back to the farmer, and when the farmer is not prosperous neither are we in industry or the Nation itself. To illustrate, if we produce a 3,000,000,000-bushel surplus grain here and it sells at $1 per bushel, this actually results in a $3,000,000,000 increase in our factory pay rolls in America. This has been proven for several years, and at the same time it multiplies seven times, or an increase of $21,000,000,000 in national income. So you can see how vitally interested you and I and everyone else are in the prosperity of the farmers. Prosperity of the

farmers and the price of farm products are entirely dependent upon the surplus. We have never had a farm problem develop in this or any other nation in the world except as a result of a surplus. Never as a result of scarcity. We are interested, all of us, in whether or not we are going to have a problem in surpluses after the present war.

Going back to World War I, we increased our production 5 percent, and we did it by seeding our marginal acreage. When prices went down after the war, those acres went out of production. Our problem was partially solved from that reduction in production. During the present war, World War II, we increased production 23 percent, and we did it on 5 percent less seeded acreage. The reason for that is that the farmer, whether he knows it or not, has profited by scientific developments, such as hybrid corn, improved machinery, better seed, and soil preparation, preservation of subsoil moisture, etc., until one farmer today can produce something like 3 bushels of grain where he produced 1 originally. When the war is over, we will shortly have a return of manpower to the farms in this Nation, and we will have all of the scientific developments that have come out of this war. In addition, the present Congress made an appropriation of $2,000,000,000 to maintain 90 percent of parity on farm products for 2 years after next January 1 following the close of the present war. So you see, we will have a combination of three things: ability to produce, the manpower to produce, and the guaranty of high prices.

After we get through the period of lend-lease, we are most certainly going to have a piling up of surpluses, greater than any we have known before. Naturally that will depress our prices. When we had surpluses in the past, the first thing we did was to try and dispose of these surpluses on the world market. When we moved our surplus into the markets of the world this added pressure on the world's market, lowered the world's level of prices. As that market price went down, it got to the point where we couldn't afford to sell our crops and maintain our economy. We, therefore, in this Nation hit upon a plan of subsidizing the movement of grain, in other words, pay our exporters to sell in the world market. This also resulted in other nations complaining that we were lowering their farm values to such a point where it became unprofitable to their farmers to produce, and they began to put up barriers against our grain coming into their nations. At one time, Italy had a 65-cents-a-bushel tariff on incoming grain for the purpose of maintaining a higher level of prices for their own farmers, and that they might thereby prosper. This thing progressed to such an extent that it is almost unbelievable. When we had our big surplus, there was a commission came here from China, when they were starving in China. The then Secretary of Agriculture Hyde offered to give this commission 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, loaded on board at the west coast free of charge to China, and they refused this 100,000,000 bushels of wheat. I am telling you this because I want you to realize how serious it is. We will produce in this country a surplus that cannot help but depreciate our prices domestically, and if we dump it on the world market, it will depreciate their prices.

There have already been stable money pacts signed by seven nations of Europe, together with England, France, Netherlands, and Belgium. It provides for the stabilization of currency exchange rates and the suspending of all trade barriers between the nations involved. In addition, this pact places a limitation on United States exports, except for essentials unobtainable elsewhere. Therefore, we will produce a surplus in this Nation, that will not be wanted, that cannot be sold, subsidized, or given away to any other nation in the world.

If we are going to produce these surpluses, which we are in the coming years, there are two things to do. One is what our friends in the New Deal did unsuccessfully, we think, in the last 10 or 12 years, and that is, stop production by paying farmers not to produce. This is what has brought about the tremendous increase in taxes we have had in this Nation during the past several years. The other way to solve this problem of surpluses is, to find means of using these surpluses domestically at home on a profitable basis.

During the last 2 years I have had the privilege of buying grain for the alcohol plant here in Omaha. I believe in industrial alcohol we do actually have the solution of the farm problem of America. It might not be convincing because the tale I will tell you is rather fantastic. You will have to accept my word for some of these things I am going to give, I can't give you the statistics. This industrial alcohol plant is here, just a few blocks from this hotel. I wish you all might have a chance to see it in operation before you get away. This plant is of vital concern to everyone in the Middle West. In the first place, I would like to have you get a very clear conception of this plant. The plant does not produce alcohol for liquor or beverage. We produce industrial alcohol, and the present owners never intend to produce alcohol for liquor for several reasons. One is that our plant is so large that if we entered the liquor or beverage business, we would wreck the entire industry. I will give you some facts about this plant of ours, how essential it is, and will be after the war to all of us in the Middle West.

The plant was constructed by private enterprise. We furnish the money to operate it, but the money to build the plant was furnished by the Defense Plant Corporation at a cost of $6,000,000, and it will take another million dollars to complete it, or $7,000,000. We intended when we built it that it should produce 50,000 gallons of industrial alcohol a day, 190-proof alcohol. I thought I had my neck out for a long time because I was making some of these talks and I recalled that there were 60 seconds in a minute, 60 minutes in an hour, 24 hours in a day, and 84,600 seconds in a day, and I predicted we would produce a gallon of industrial alcohol in this plant every second of the day. I found out how wrong I was when last week we produced 96,000 gallons in 1 day. Our scientists are handing things to us that are almost unbelievable as they are in every other line of industry, and we know now how we can produce in this plant 110,000 gallons of industrial alcohol per day.

I want to tell you, first, how we make alcohol, just very quickly, and in terms that you and I can understand. We take grain, corn, wheat, oats, rye, barley, sorghum grains, any kind of grain that contains starch, and practically all of them do, and in each bushel of grain there is approximately 30 pounds of starch—alcohol is made out of starch alone. We grind the grain—if it happens to be corn, and we have been using wet corn. We grind it and mix with water, cook for 6 minutes, then mix with yeast and barley malt, and that is left to ferment. After 48 hours' fermentation, it becomes crude beer. That crude beer contains 8-percent alcohol. In the distillation of alcohol from that beer, it is very much the same process as when you heat up the radiator in your car. First, there comes out the steam, and that steam is the alcohol you have in your car—alcohol turns to steam at a lower temperature than water and as the alcohol turns to steam, it goes off in that form and condenses back into liquid, which is 190-proof alcohol. Here is the pay-off. Out of a bushel of grain we distill 2¾ gallons of 190-proof alcohol. After we remove the starch from the grain, in the residue that is left—in the crude beer without the alcohol—remains all the food value originally in the bushel of grain. Through research, we have learned how to recover the entire value of that bushel of grain out of the residue. I will not go into that, but it is possible, and we are doing it. In a 20-pound package we recover by dehydration the entire value of that bushel of grain in the way of farm feed. This feed, mixed with yeast and barley malt, is a better feed than the farmer brought in originally.

To give you some idea about how large this plant is, if we were making liquor here or beverage alcohol, we could make 60 percent of all the alcohol that is drunk in the United States, and if we paid taxes at the rate which they have to pay on alcohol, our taxes from this plant would run about $1,350,000 a day.

In the United States there are some 300 known uses for industrial alcohol besides liquor, and they are 1,000 times more important than liquor. I am going to give you but a few of them. Some of these are smokeless powder, medicinals, anesthetics, plastics, synthetic rubber, dry ice, power, and fuel. It is almost unbelievable some of the things they are making out of industrial alcohol, which I don't have time to go into, but I believe those that I have mentioned suffice.

I spent a day at the Firestone plant at Akron, Ohio, last week. They are making synthetic rubber now that is actually better than any natural rubber that was ever made, regardless of what you might think about it. We have been getting the poorest synthetic rubber, and the best has been going to the military effort as it should.

In 1 bushel of grain we get 2¾ gallons of 190-proof alcohol. The product of 1 bushel of grain makes 6 pounds of butadiene. From that you make your plastics. There is an entirely new industry opening up in making plastics, of which no one could dream. Out of 1 bushel of grain we can get 2¾ gallons of industrial alcohol, which will make 6 pounds of synthetic rubber. Six pounds of synthetic rubber is the amount of rubber in an ordinary automobile tire (the ordinary automobile tire is 6 pounds of rubber and 12 pounds of fabric). From 1 bushel of corn we raise out here, out of the starch alone in that corn, we can produce enough rubber to make one automobile tire. Recently, I made this talk before a group at which William Jeffers was present. When I got through he concurred in everything I had said, and he went on to make the further statement that if it had not been for the synthetic rubber that was made out of alcohol, that was made from grain, there could not yet have been any invasion of France. That is how close we came to losing the war.

Prior to the war, our rubber requirements for this Nation were about 600,000 tons annually, which came from half way around the world, the East Indies, and so on. There are many varieties of rubber and we will have to use some natural rubber. But in the processing of those 600,000 tons of rubber, we would consume 200,000,000 bushels of our surplus grain. Having been in the grain business for all of these years, through depressions, and so on, I am certain if we had had a market for 200,000,000 bushels of grain here at home in synthetic rubber, we never would have had a farm problem in America. We never would have had the depressions that we have gone through. In view of the potentialities of solving our farm problems in that way, it is almost unbelievable that we have a faction at Washington who wants to scrap the synthetic-rubber program and go back to buying natural rubber from other nations.

I recently had the privilege of appearing before the Ways and Means Committee, where I testified how important it was, I thought, for the security of this Nation alone, notwithstanding its benefits toward agriculture, we should keep the synthetic-rubber industry. Of course, we have no personal interest in the use of synthetic rubber except as it would seem to be a solution for our farm problems. While I do not advocate subsidies in a general way, yet I think it is going to be necessary in some manner to subsidize the

synthetic-rubber industry, or protect it in some way under a tariff until it can get on its feet, and develop the research which I am telling you that is going on in the scientific laboratories to get everything that can be developed out of the residue. The recovery of these things from the residue is another way in which we can successfully lower the cost of alcohol. We have taken more than 50 percent off the original cost, and we can see how in a short time, with the research that is going on, how we can reach the point where we can compete with any rubber product produced anywhere. I advocated that they should protect this industry just as they protected the railroads until now we have the finest railroads in the world, as they are protecting the air lines and are making them the finest air lines in the world.

I am telling you about some of the things we are developing, that are on their way now. Some seem to think that alcohol is not power or fuel. That is far from true. Scientists know that straight alcohol made from grain, mixed 50–50 with water, makes a perfect fuel for automobiles. So as we develop the use of alcohol as a fuel, and if we consume in our gasoline bill 5 percent of that product from alcohol, it would consume another 200,000,000 bushels of grain. You can see if we go into the program of power and fuel with alcohol, which I have no doubt will come in the very near future, we will have problems of greater production in order to supply our domestic demands. If you question the fact of its being power or fuel, I call your attention to the V–2 bomb which came out of Germany. That V–2 bomb was piloted by industrial alcohol, just as we are making down here. Eight hundred gallons of alcohol were in every bomb that left Germany, with liquid air as the mixture, which shot it into England. Until recently it was a military secret, but there is being used in our B–29's and Hellcats a device known as a vitameter that sprays a mixture of 50–50 alcohol and water into the carburetor to give added power, and whether it will be used in trucks and automobiles, I dont know, but we are developing motors that we hope will consume water and alcohol as fuel.

Scientific research is going on in this Nation incessantly, in all parts of it, and this great surge of scientific knowledge that has been released as a result of the war is revolutionizing not only this Nation but the world. I recently had a visit with the president of the Western Union Telegraph Co. at New York. After I told him some of these things, he said, "Let me tell you some of the things that are happening with us. On top of the Western Union Building in New York we have a machine that starts a beam to Philadelphia, and on top of the building at Philadelphia we have another machine with a beam and those beams come together.

Of course, we have booster stations along the way as they go along on that one beam. It runs night and day, winter and summer, sleet and cold. Nothing will stop it. It transmits 500 messages at one time. He said, "I don't know whether you get the significance of that, but just as soon as this war is over we will have a beam from New York to San Francisco. That is the greatest load we carry. That beam will carry 500 messages at one time. Then you will see beginning to disappear from the highways of America our telegraph lines and telephone poles." That is going on in their industry, and there are many of these amazing reports coming from every angle.

At Midland, Mich., there is a product which is certainly not romantic. It is sand. They are working on ordinary sand, and out of it, believe it or not, they are producing the finest lubricating oil the world has ever known. They are also producing out of the ocean, out of salt water, things that are really unbelievable. It is fantastic that out of salt water they are manufacturing over 500 articles that are in general use today. The latest one developed by the Dow Chemical Co. is magnesium or metal. Dowmetal. It is lighter than aluminum, stronger than steel, and floats in the ocean—and in every cubic mile of ocean there are 10,000,000,000 pounds of magnesium floating in the water.

In addition to that, there is chlorine and some twenty different products taken out of the ocean.

We are beginning to unlock the secrets of nature that have been stored up for many, many years. The necessities of war have forced us to start developing these many things that scientists have known for many years. We are developing them now, and they will revolutionize industry. These things don't seem to come out until we get into war, and it is necessary for us to use them. The alcohol that we produce is shipped in tank cars to Wheeling, W. Va., where it is made into butadiene, and from that it is made into plastics, explosives, and synthetic rubber.

I don't know the answer to this. It seems to me that it is very plain development must come. Why shouldn't there be an alcohol plant in Omaha? Why shouldn't there be a butadiene plant in Omaha or the Middle West, and why shouldn't the plastic industry and the rubber industry develop in the Middle West? I am convinced this progress is beginning now. We are starting the moving of industry from the middle east to the central west. I presume a lot of you men in the traffic business read Kiplinger's recent letter in which he stated that the most economic development in years, except for war, was the change in the freight rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission. He pointed out that the industrial map of the United States will be remade in 5 or 10 years. The East will shrink industrially while the area west of the Mississippi will get new manufacturing, new distribution centers, and new population. I am firmly convinced, gentlemen, that we have down here the only plan in America, the production of alcohol made from our surplus grain, that will solve our farm problem. I think we have the beginning of a new industry so great that you and I can't dream of its possibility in years to come. Some of our leading scientists, who have studied the problem for many years, predict that the industrial alcohol industry will in the period of one generation be the greatest industry of all mankind. We don't have to resort to dreams, however, as we already have the known uses through synthetic rubber, plastic, power, and fuel uses. I am not trying to tell you that all of these things will happen tomorrow. I am sure they will not happen tomorrow. That isn't the way we develop as a nation. But this industry is opening up new fields far greater than we have ever known before in the Middle West. We talk about there being no more frontiers. Science is opening up frontiers that far surpass any opportunities of the frontiers of the past. We believe that a new era is coming. We have the beginning of a new industry in the Middle West, whose development depends upon all of us in this territory.

I also further say that the making of industrial alcohol a permanent industry after the war is more vital to the security and prosperity of this country than any other one thing in the Nation today. My only hope is that in the short period of time in which I have had the privilege of discussing this matter with you, I have stimulated your thinking along the lines of the necessity for us all to look to science and chemistry for the solution of our problems. I want to leave with you the idea that I am very optimistic about the future of the West, about the grain business, the railroad business, and so on, and if we can produce an additional billion bushels of grain as I made that statement before the Ways and Means Committee, we can use this surplus grain in the manufacture of industrial alcohol profitably here at home if we will work out these uses. That means prosperity for the railroads, for agriculture, and for everybody. I believe that the extent of our development is dependent upon you and me here in the Middle West. I thank you for your very kind and earnest attention, and I hope I have stimulated your thinking along these lines.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter emphasizing the need for early action by the House on the full-employment bill, H. R. 2202, when we reconvene next October, and also an up-to-date list of 103 coauthors and cosponsors of H. R. 2202.

The letter, from the Union for Democratic Action, which has done as much as any organization in the country to develop a better understanding of the need for the full-employment bill and of the bill's provisions, follows:

UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1945.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Here are two Associated Press dispatches of deep and tragic significance:

"NEW YORK, July 17.—Heavy liquidation today hit the stock market and toppled leaders $1 to more than $3 a share. Blame for the relapse was placed on thoughts the Japanese might surrender under the latest big Allied smash and thus upset domestic reconversion and economic programs."

"CHICAGO, July 18.—Continued bombardment of Japan and rumors of a possible early peace caused a sharp reaction in grain futures today, rye dropping as much as 4 cents a bushel at times before rallying in late trade. Wheat, oats, and barley also fell more than a cent at times."

You will agree, we are sure, that this Wall Street peace panic, communicating itself to the Chicago grain market, is shocking proof of our unpreparedness for peace.

It is undoubtedly accurate to say that our domestic reconversion and economic programs, such as they are, would be upset by early Japanese surrender, but more fundamental is the fact stated in the Murray-Truman report of December 18, 1944, that we did not have then—and do not have now—a practical program for changing over from full production for war to full production and employment for peace.

More than a year ago, the noted Swedish economist, Gunnar Myrdal, pointed out that what few plans the United States of America had for the transition rely heavily on continuance of the Japanese war for a considerable time after the end of the war in Europe. Myrdal concluded that, should the Japanese war end shortly after VE-day, our lack of planning and preparation would throw us into economic confusion. He remarked that, because of this fact, early Japanese surrender might be the shrewdest blow that a defeated fascism could strike at the United Nations. Resulting economic disaster in the United States of America could disrupt the world economy and make establishment of a United Nations Organization for lasting peace more difficult, if not impossible.

We fully recognize the hard and effective work you and other Members of the Congress have done in the past 6 months. The Congress is about to complete the laying of the foundations for world organization for peace. In doing so, it will have fulfilled one of the two principal pledges made to the American people in the last campaign by the candidates of both parties.

The other pledge was full employment. The full-employment bill has not moved since it was introduced 5 months ago. But you and others have promoted understanding of it by wide discussion. Already 103 House Members have elected to become cosponsors of the bill originally introduced by you.

Now that the challenges and problems of reconversion and postwar, race upon us as the tempo of the assault upon Japan increases, action on the full-employment bill becomes imperative. We urge you and all supporters of the bill to press for hearings and votes in both Houses at the earliest practicable date after Congress reconvenes next fall. Our Government must write a full-employment insurance policy under which industry, business, agriculture, labor, and professional people can face the prospect of peace with confidence instead of fear and can invest, employ, produce, spend, and consume in volumes that will insure full employment.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL SIFTON,
Director, Washington Bureau.

P. S.—Here is a subsequent Associated Press dispatch:

"NEW YORK, July 19.—Timid buyers returned to the stock market today and lifted favorites fractions to a point or so, but dealings were among the slowest of the year and losers plentiful.

"Spiking of Japanese peace rumors by Washington, more consideration of earnings and dividends, together with the belief the recent relapse had greatly improved the technical position of the list inspired such bidding as appeared."

The up-to-date list of coauthors and cosponsors of H. R. 2202, which I hope will be expanded to include a majority of the Members of this House, follows:

COAUTHORS AND COSPONSORS OF H. R. 2202

Alabama: PATRICK, LUTHER.

Arizona: MURDOCK, JOHN R.

California: DOUGLAS, HELEN GAHAGAN; DOYLE, CLYDE; HAVENNER, FRANCK R.; HEALY, NED R.; HOLIFIELD, CHET; MILLER, G. P.; OUTLAND, GEORGE E.; PATTERSON, E. E.; SHEPPARD, HARRY R.; TOLAND, JOHN H.; VOORHIS, JERRY; IZAC, ED. V.; WELCH, RICHARD J.; ENGLE, CLAIR; KING, CECIL R.

Connecticut: GEELAN, JAMES P.; KOPPELMANN, H. P.; RYTER, JOSEPH F.; WOODHOUSE, CHASE GOING; LUCE, CLARE BOOTH.

Delaware: TRAYNOR, PHILIP A.

Illinois: DOUGLAS, EMILY TAFT; GORDON, THOMAS S.; LINK, W. W.; O'BRIEN, THOMAS J.; PRICE, MELVIN; RESA, A. J.; ROWAN, W. A.; SABATH, A. J.; DAWSON, WM. L.; GORSKI, MARTIN; KELLY, EDWARD A.

Indiana: MADDEN, R. J.

Kentucky: BATES, JOE B.

Massachusetts: LANE, THOMAS J.

Michigan: DINGELL, JOHN D.; LESINSKI, JOHN; HOOK, FRANK E.; O'BRIEN, GEORGE D.; SADOWSKI, G. G.; RABAUT, LOUIS C.

Minnesota: GALLAGHER, WILLIAM J.; STARKEY, FRANK T.

Missouri: CARNAHAN, A. S. J.; COCHRAN, JOHN J.

Montana: MANSFIELD, MIKE.

New Jersey: NORTON, MARY T.; HART, E. J.; WOLVERTON, CHARLES A.

New York: BYRNE, WILLIAM T.; CELLER, EMANUEL; DELANEY, JAMES J.; DICKSTEIN, SAMUEL; MARCANTONIO, VITO; PFEIFER, JOSEPH L.; POWELL, ADAM C., Jr.; ROGERS, G. F.; RAYFIEL, LEO F.; ROONEY, JOHN J.; TORRENS, J. H; QUINN, PETER A.

Ohio: BREHM, WALTER E.; KIRWAN, MICHAEL J.; RAMEY, HOMER A.; BENDER, GEORGE H.; HUBER, WALTER B.; GARDNER, EDWARD J.

Oklahoma: STIGLER, W. G.; WICKERSHAM, VICTOR.

Oregon: ANGELL, HOMER D.

Pennsylvania: BARRETT, WILLIAM A.; EBERHARTER, HERMAN P.; GRANAHAN, WILLIAM T.; WEISS, SAMUEL A.; GREEN, WILLIAM J., Jr.; HOCH, DANIEL K.; GERLACH, CHAS. L.; KELLEY, AUGUSTINE B.; FLOOD, DANIEL J.; MCGLINCHEY, HERBERT J.; MURPHY, JOHN.

Rhode Island: FOGARTY, JOHN E.; FORAND, AIME J.

Tennessee: KEFAUVER, ESTES; PRIEST, J. PERCY.

Texas: PATMAN, WRIGHT; COMBS, J. M.

Utah: GRANGER, W. K.; ROBINSON, J. WILL.

Virginia: FLANNAGAN, JOHN W., Jr.

Washington: COFFEE, JOHN M.; DE LACY, HUGH D.; SAVAGE, CHARLES R.; JACKSON, HENRY M.

West Virginia: BAILEY, CLEVELAND M.; KEE, JOHN; HEDRICK, E. H.; NEELY, M. M.; RANDOLPH, JENNINGS.

Wisconsin: BIEMILLER, ANDREW J.; O'KONSKI, ALVIN E.

The Honorable GEORGE E. OUTLAND is chairman of the steering committee and any Member of the House desiring to become a member of this committee should communicate with Mr. OUTLAND.

The FEPC Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the RECORD the thoughtful editorial on the FEPC appropriation appearing in the Hartford Times on July 16, 1945:

THE FEPC APPROPRIATION

Inclusion in the war agencies bill of an item of $250,000 for the Fair Employment Practice Committee assures the continuance of this important board until the end of the next fiscal year. It is regrettable that such a legislative battle had to be fought as is in the record, because the appropriation was made. The purpose of the FEPC is merely to combat racial, religious, or nationalistic discrimination in employment in plants of services operating under Government contracts. When Congress established the Committee it said, in effect, that while the Constitution may be thwarted in some of the States, because of State and local prejudices, the fundamental law, nevertheless, applies to every nook and cranny of these United States and wherever United States money is being spent there shall be no racial discrimination.

Such a filibuster as Senator BILBO attempted and such racial discrimination as is openly advocated by Representatives from some of the Southern States belie our boasts that we are a free nation. We are not—we are only part free. We will not be the great ideal government we profess to be until we live up to the Constitution. That may be like saying that one cannot be a Christian, or a Jew, or a Moslem unless he lives up to the scriptures upon which the religions are based, but the statement suffers not the least by such a comparison.

Only half the amount asked for by the administration was granted by the Congress, and that amount might have been denied had it not been for the fact that support for it was strong enough to prevent appropriations for other war agencies if the FEPC was to be deprived.

Open disregard of the Constitution in the United States is a great handicap to our agencies abroad in their attempts to destroy fascism and its evils. What incentive does such racial discrimination give Soviet Russia to become a representative government instead of a socialistic oligarchy, or what good lesson can the liberated Nazis of Germany get from it?

We have a long way to go before we shall have the kind of government that the Constitution guarantees, but we are making steady progress toward it. Europe may not realize that we had a bloody war on the issue more than 80 years ago, in which our casualties were greater than in the war just ended in Europe, and that we still have not become truly a united nation. Europe must make allowances for us, and, by the same token, we may have to make allowances for things we do not like about Europe.

Tax Information Relative to Legislative Expense Account

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET O'NEAL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was sent to me on July 20, 1945, and I am including it in my extension of remarks as a matter of information for the Members of the House:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 20, 1945.

Hon. EMMET O'NEAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. O'NEAL: Further reference is made to your conference with the chief counsel and myself on June 29, 1945, and to your supplementary letters dated July 13, 1945, and July 14, 1945, regarding a ruling as to whether the expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to each Member of the House of Representatives, provided by the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1946, which became law on June 13, 1945, is subject to Federal income tax.

That act reads in part as follows:

"There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, $1,642,500, of which so much as is required to make such payments for the period from January 3, 1945, to June 30, 1945, both inclusive, shall be immediately available."

The report of the Committee on Appropriations (H. Rept. No. 509, 79th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 4–5) states inter alia:

"The bill includes an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum per Member. For many years Members of the Congress have been subjected to a myriad of expenses incidental to the efficient conduct of their respective offices. During the emergency period immediately prior to the war period and during the war period sessions of Congress have been almost continuous, with demand for service mounting. As a result, Members have been compelled to go to excessive expense which,

in any other department of the Government or in normal business administration, would be paid by the department or business which is beneficiary of such service. The expense has during the period of high war costs caused a heavy drain on the Members' personal finances, for matters not personal but directly incidental to public office. The committee, therefore, recommends that a reasonable average allowance for such pertinent expenses be made. The committee knows such action to be consistent with the public intent and welfare. Since this amount is entirely for expenses incidental to office it would not be income, therefore not taxable."

Analysis of the legislative history, particularly the committee hearings (see statement of Colin F. Stam, chief of staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, hearings before the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, May 17, 1945, pp. 2–30) and the discussions on the floor of the Congress (vol. 91, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4431–4457, 4945–4965, 5184–5213, 5724–5782; see particularly page 4452, where the chairman sustained your point of order on the ground that the expense allowance "in no sense of the word is a raise in salary"), leads to the conclusions that the purpose underlying this provision of the appropriations act was to provide an expense allowance to offset, in part, at least, the increased financial burden incident to the efficient performance of a Congressman's duties in a period of extraordinary emergency and enlarged demand for service. In this view, since allowances paid to Government officials for traveling, subsistence and other expenses constitute gross income (sec. 29.33 (a)–2, example (c), Treas. Reg. 111; T. D. 3101 (1920), 3 C. B. 191; O. D. 1135 (1921), 5 C. B. 174; I. T. 1380 (1922), C. B. 1–2, 88; I. T. 3022 (1936), C. B. XV–2, 76), it is held that the expense allowance of $2,500 per annum paid to each Member of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1946, must, for Federal income-tax purposes, be included in gross income.

Inasmuch as the term "trade or business", however, includes the performance of the functions of a public office (sec. 48 (d), Internal Revenue Code), in computing his net income a Congressman is entitled to deduct, among other things, expenses which he sustains as ordinary and necessary, within the purview of section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the code, to the performance of his official duties (O. D. 310 (1919), 1 C. B. 104; O. D. 865 (1921), 4 C. B. 312; I. T. 2721 (1935), C. B. XII–2, 38; I. T. 3474, C. B. 1941–1, 207; *D. C. Jackling* (1927), 9 B. T. A. 312, acq. (1928), C. B. VII–1, 16; *Edwin T. Pollock* (1929), 10 B. T. A. 297; *John J. Ide* (1941), 43 B. T. A. 799, acq. C. B. 1941–1, ?; see also vol. 91, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4954).

Consonant therewith, a Congressman will be permitted to claim the $2,500 expense allowance as a deduction from gross income by listing it as "fully expended in the performance of official duties", provided, however, that a Congressman, if so requested by the internal revenue agent examining his return, will, like any other taxpayer who receives an expense allowance from his employer, be required to substantiate the claimed deduction by showing that the entire $2,500 was used for expenses which are properly deductible under section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the code. Compare section 29.23 (a)–2, Treasury Regulation 111.

As stated above, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1946, does not provide for additional compensation but on the contrary provides specifically for an expense allowance. Accordingly, such expense allowance is not subject to the witholding provisions of the Individual Income Tax Act of 1944 (secs. 1621, et seq., Internal Revenue Code) as to the collection of income tax at the source on wages. Section 405.101 (c), Treasury Regulation 116.

Finally, since the expense allowance "in no sense of the word is a raise in salary" (vol. 91, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4452), but represents merely "a reasonable average allowance for * * * pertinent expenses * * *" (H. R. Rept. No. 509, supra), a Member of the House of Representatives who does not accept the allowance or any part thereof will not be required to include the unaccepted part of the allowance in gross income.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH D. NUNAN, Jr.,
Commissioner.

Reynolds' Nationalist Party Employs Joe McWilliams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I insert an article appearing in the Propaganda Battlefront entitled "Reynolds' Nationalist Party Employs Joe McWilliams," which bears on the remarks which I made yesterday with respect to the activities of the Nationalist Party. It is as follows:

REYNOLDS' NATIONALIST PARTY EMPLOYS JOE MCWILLIAMS

Joseph E. McWilliams, who used to say, "Adolf Hitler is the greatest leader in the history of the world," has turned fund raiser for Robert Rice Reynolds and the Nationalist Party.

Using Jack Williams as an alias, he called on Cleveland industrialists from mid-May until mid-June. With Victor Malone, Reynolds' "public relations director," McWilliams helped to visit or phone prominent men in nearly 30 Cleveland firms. Before going to Ohio, he worked Boston along with J. A. Forsland, another organizer and solicitor for Reynolds' party.

"Pretty Boy" McWilliams, also known as Joe McNazi, gained his principal notoriety by screaming for Jewish blood from New York street corners. In 1942, he, with 29 others, went on trial charged with conspiring to undermine the morale of the armed forces, but the trial was halted last December by the death of the presiding judge.

The sales kit of the Nationalist Party solicitors contains photostatic copies of several checks, including one for $2,500 alleged to be from the Republic Steel Corp. Republic Steel, however, says its books fail to disclose the record of any such check. According to A. F. Weber, one of the Cleveland industrialists, the sales talk of Reynolds' solicitors goes like this: "The Nationalists expect to get into office and help industry. They would do away with all business regulations, lower taxes, and make unions incorporate. The Nationalists would put an end to the Communists and the foreigners in this country."

Reynolds for years was the United States Senator from North Carolina, and he is married to Evelyn Walsh McLean, heiress to the Hope diamond and accompanying fortune.

A REPORT ON JOSEPH E. M'WILLIAMS

Joseph Ellsworth McWilliams, who currently is soliciting funds for Robert Rice Reynolds' Nationalist Party, stormily laid siege to New York from 1939 to 1941. "I'm 100 percent for Hitler," he yelled. And his followers called back, "Kill the Jews. Hang them from lampposts. Send them back in leaky boats." The Nazis used to say that he who controls the streets controls the city. McWilliams took it seriously. Night after night he stormed from soap boxes or the rear of a covered wagon. "All Jews are Communists," he lied. And "Let's make this country the paradise that Hitler has made Germany."

For a time he served as an apprentice—a speaker at rallies of the American Nationalist Party, the Crusaders for Americanism, and Father Coughlin's Christian Front. Although the Christian Front was primarily Catholic, McWilliams hung out with Catholic haters as well. In the summer of 1939, he and Edward James Smythe ran a Keep America out of the Jewish war rally. Smythe, an anti-Catholic of long standing, once said: "We, like Hitler, believe that the Roman Church should be driven out of our political life. * * * We will * * * destroy Romanism here."

Then the Christian Front, a la Coughlin, said that it was only against "bad Jews." McWilliams and followers thought that the Fronters were pussy footing—that all Jews were bad. So they split the movement and formed a militant organization of their own, the Christian Mobilizers. This new group was distinguished by the police records of its storm-trooper unit, the Mobilizer Guards. Commander of the guards was John Zitter, who once had served time in the penitentiary for burglary, and captain was John Olivo who earlier was sentenced for burglary and rape. Speakers and hangers-on at Mobilizer meetings had police records too. Edmund Vincent Burke was arrested in 1926 for illegally entering a jewlery store. Joseph Hartery pled guilty as a procurer in 1932, and later was sentenced to jail for threatening a man with a knife. Edwin Westphal in 1929 pled guilty to a burglary charge.

McWilliams' first big-time meeting came off in Innisfail Park, the Bronx, in August 1939. Speaking with him was George Deatherage, fuehrer of the Knights of the White Camelia and head of the American Nationalist Confederation, which openly called itself Fascist and used the swastika as its emblem. Kritz Kuhn was there; as were other "big shots" in the German-American Bund, James Wheeler-Hill, and Gustave Elmer. Seventy-five uniformed bundists, marching shoulder to shoulder with 30 members of the Mobilizer Guard unit, formed the guard of honor. This meeting was merely a forerunner of a second held in Innisfail Park in September 1939. This time Deatherage, McWilliams, and Kuhn addressed "17,000 patriots," or so the Christian Mobilizer reported.

It was also in September 1939, according to the Catholic publication, Wisdom, that McWilliams traveled to Atlanta, Ga., where he was elected to the National Supreme Council of the Ku Klux Klan. This caused some dissension in the predominantly Catholic Mobilizer circles. A few allegedly resigned in disgust, and even Father Charles E. Coughlin, who has never been choosy about his friends, refused a check from the Mobilizer fuehrer.

If McWilliams lost strength among the Coughlinites, he made up for it by drawing closer to the German-American Bund. The Christian Mobilizer for October 1939 ran an advertisement for the Deutscher Weckruf und Beobachter, Bund newspaper, and the following December Joe received a swastika-bedecked Christmas card saying: "The German-American Bunders wish you and your organization a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year."

It was in 1940 that McWilliams founded the American Destiny Party and sought the Republican congressional nomination from Yorkville, New York's predominantly German neighborhood. His platform began: "Adolf Hitler is the greatest leader in the history of the world." Wendell Willkie, Republican candidate for President, quickly repudiated McWilliams, and the Yorkville

rabble-rouser replied: "Willkie is a bum. I disown that Indiana fat boy."

McWilliams was defeated in the primaries, but the campaign had been heated. Donald Shea, who boasted of having credentials from Nazi propagandists in Hamburg, Germany, spoke for McWilliams, and Joe frequently was under arrest charged with disorderly conduct. Late in 1940, the court held that McWilliams showed a "lack of responsibility," and shipped him off to Bellevue Hospital for mental observation. Bellevue decided he was responsible, however, and Joe was back on the town.

McWilliams flirted briefly with Verne Marshall's Keep America Out of War Committee, with the America First Committee, and ran Mobilizer meetings in Queens during the summer of 1941. He dropped out of sight after that and presently showed up in Chicago as an elocution teacher for the Midwest Monetary Federation. With the backing of Alice Rand de Tarnowsky, he later concocted the serviceman's reconstruction plan. This was a ham-and-eggs scheme which would give each returning serviceman a bonus of $7,800. McWilliams entered wholeheartedly, too, into the nationalist life of Chicago. He attended Citizens U. S. A. Committee meetings and palled around with anti-Semites like Frederick Kister. In January 1944 McWilliams, with 29 others, was indicted for conspiracy to undermine the morale of the armed forces. The indictment against McWilliams is still valid.

Despite his unsavory record and the frequent exposés of him, McWilliams cannot be discounted as harmless. He is a smooth talker and a high-pressure salesman, as the Cleveland industrialists, whom he recently approached, have testified. Because of his candidly Fascist record, McWilliams' success in respectable circles is nothing short of miraculous. He talked his way into the George S. May Co. as an engineer in 1943 and into the Western Shade & Electric Co. in 1944. Both these companies held war contracts. He also convinced ex-Senator Robert Rice Reynolds, who hides behind a guise of respectability, that he would make a good salesman for the Nationalist Party. No doubt McWilliams could be still more successful with the ignorant, frustrated people to whom he formerly appealed. He may become an important regional rabble-rouser in the difficult postwar period.

Reemployment of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a proposal on the rehiring of veterans which local No. 265 of the UAW-CIO and the Briggs body plant of Evansville, Ind., are using as the basis of an attempt to solve the vexing problem of veteran rehiring. The proposal is explained in a clipping from Labor's Voice, a CIO publication in Evansville, Ind.:

UNIONS VERSUS VETERANS 194–?

(Prepared by UAW-CIO, Local 265, educational committee, William Milligan, chairman)

The public press has devoted much space in the past few weeks on the job rights of returning veterans. The arguments mostly settle around the interpretations of the Selective Service Act and are being made with the intention of building up public opinion to the extent of demanding congressional action.

International union leaders have adopted a policy of demanding full employment in the hope that all civilians as well as veterans will have work. This idea of full employment has our full endorsement, however, we do not agree that veterans should be frozen out of civilian jobs in order to force full-employment measures.

Under the policies of the international unions all civilians who have been employed since the start of war production should be called back to work before veterans are hired. The veterans' seniority committee of local 265 does not agree with this policy at all.

We sincerely believe that since all peoples are concerned with the winning of the war, the members of the armed forces who used the implements that were produced by civilians during wartime are entitled to equal opportunity in claiming peacetime jobs. Certainly there can be nothing unfair in such a program. If the war had not demanded production there would have been no jobs available Therefore it is fair and just to assume that all persons employed for the war effort, whether it be in the front lines or the production lines have jobs if and when they are available.

After much study the following veterans' seniority agreement was jointly negotiated between the company and the union locally. It has not been agreed on as yet, and is not intended as a complete solution to the problem. We feel that conditions will change from time to time and as a result many changes are going to be necessary. However, if the agreement is adopted, we will have laid the foundation for a peaceful postwar planning between the union, company, and veterans.

A. Honorably discharged veterans who had established seniority with the company before entering the armed forces will be given 1 year preferential seniority as per the provisions of the Selective Service Act. Their seniority date shall be November 11, 1942, or any prior date on which they establish seniority. We have selected November 11, 1942, because it is the date on which 1,340 persons have seniority rights. This number constituted our peak before Pearl Harbor.

B. Honorably discharged veterans who had worked for the company but who had not completed the 90-day probationary period and had not established seniority, will be given an opportunity to complete the probationary period. Upon successful completion of the probationary period, they will be given 1-year preferential seniority on the job they had before they left for the armed forces, or a similar job, and their seniority date shall be November 11, 1942, or any prior date of hire. The 1-year preferential seniority will start on the date of rehire.

C. In order to be able to hire honorably discharged veterans who had not previously worked for the company, we propose to hire them on the basis of November 11, 1942, seniority provided they apply within 90 days after discharge, or if disabled, within 90 days after disability has ended. They will then work the 90-day probationary period and if they satisfactorily complete the probationary period, they will be given November 11, 1942, seniority for hiring and layoff purposes only, subject to section E. They will not have preferential seniority.

SEC. C. Interpretation: It is the intent and purpose of this agreement to afford employment opportunities to veterans of this area who have no reemployment rights in this area. Primarily we are interested in giving employment to veterans who were former students in the schools in this area. It is not intended to offer seniority rights to veterans of this area who have reemployment rights with other industrial employers in this area.

Should a veteran be unable to exercise his reemployment rights with another employer in this area due to plant shut-down or curtailment, such veteran will be given the benefits of this agreement, should he be eligible otherwise for employment.

D. Honorably discharged veterans who were disabled in the service and who, despite their handicap, can perform a day's work on a selected job will be hired subject to section E of this agreement. Their seniority date shall be November 11, 1942, if not employed by us before.

SEC. E. On the basis of 15,000,000 men in the armed forces as against 146,000,000 persons total population of the United States, we arrive at a ratio of 1 member of the armed forces to 10 civilians. It is agreed and understood that 10 percent of the peak hourly rate employed on war work who have established seniority will be the limit on the number of veterans now working and to be hired who had not previously worked for the company.

On this basis these veterans will have November 11, 1942, seniority and when a layoff occurs which reaches that date, the veterans will be laid off by having the last one hired to be the first laid off and so on progressively.

Should a veteran apply for work at a time when the plant is down or being converted, his application will be dated and he will be employed later on the basis of the date of his application.

It is agreed and understood that these veterans will be absorbed at the ratio of three veterans to two civilian employees who have previously established seniority with the company subsequent to November 10, 1942.

It is further understood that should veterans not be available at the time of job openings the company will hire seniority employees on a temporary basis to be replaced as veterans apply for employment.

The chart below gives a fairly clear picture as to how the date of November 11, 1942, was reached.

May 1, 1940—pay roll, auto production	1,340
Employees with May 1, 1940, seniority	664
Salary employees transferred with May 1, 1940, seniority	125
Employees with May 1, 1940, seniority not working	88
Veterans with seniority established	160
Veterans with seniority not established	31
Veterans with seniority drafted while off pay roll	36
Employees obligated to	1,104
Pay roll of May 1, 1940	1,340
Less employees obligated to	1,104
	236
Seniority from May 2, 1940 to Jan. 1, 1941	47
Seniority from Jan. 1, 1941, to Jan. 1, 1942	2
Seniority from Jan. 1, 1942, to Nov. 10, 1942	214
	263

A veterans' proposal such as this one would give veterans as well as the civilians hired since the start of war production an equal chance for the peacetime jobs. Moreover the employees now working on war work who are held back while the ratio of veterans is being hired will not lose their seniority rights. Those actually displaced will always have a job opportunity because of the protection granted them under clause G.

The unions will be far better off in providing the veterans a chance of a job along with the civilians rather than to have action taken by Congress to eliminate all seniority accumulated during the war, which is what the large industries are hoping will happen and why they are spending huge sums to promote public pressure for such action.

If such action should ever be taken, then the next step would be to try to do away with all seniority rights, which will, of course, affect those who had seniority before the war as well.

Under the terms of this proposed agreement all persons who worked on automobile production are fully protected, also those who were called to service.

The new people hired in for war production are also protected for the 18 months after they are laid off and while the hiring of veterans and civilians alike is being carried out.

Employment at Briggs stands at around 5,000 now, and more will be hired yet. Even the most optimistic know that peacetime employment in this plant will not reach this figure. To force the company to freeze all veterans out of whatever peacetime jobs there are until the backlog of some 4,500 persons are hired back would certainly be a poor reward for the veterans who have been in service. We know that the company will not do this, and under the terms of the new contract they would not have to. With this proposal, however, the people hired since the start of the war program will have some protection.

As was stated at the beginning of this article, this program has not been fully agreed upon. We submit it to the rank-and-file members at this time because action will have to be taken in the near future and we wish to know what your feelings are on it.

And in conclusion we wish to express the opinion that neither the International Union nor Congress can write any complete veterans' agreement that can be made to work on a national basis. Such issues should and must be made locally and as individual problems. We hope that our international leaders will change their thinking on the issue and if necessary give a little in order that the unions will not have to fight with the veterans organizations as well as with the companies in the postwar era.

In addition to that, I have recently received a letter from Mr. Milligan, which was sent to me in response to my request for the above clipping which adds two further sections to the proposed agreement. I include the pertinent part of that letter:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA, (UAW-CIO), LOCAL NO. 265,
Evansville, Ind.

CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: The enclosed clipping contains the seniority clause we have worked out. Two more sections have been added to it. Section F states that the preferential seniority part of clause A will be subject to legal interpretations of the United States court. Section G states that employees who are displaced by hiring in the veterans will not lose their seniority rights at the end of 18 months, which is part of the master contract; in other words, if the employee should be displaced by a veteran, that person remains on the seniority list from now on until such time as they may be rehired.

Yours truly,

WM. H. MILLIGAN,
Recording Secretary.

I do not say, nor do I think Mr. Milligan claims, that this proposed agreement is necessarily perfect. But I am convinced that this problem will only be solved by people who have the courage to speak out, to offer proposals and attempt to work out a solution on that ground. I extend my compliments to the officers of this local and the management of Briggs, Indiana corporation, for their attempt to find a workable solution of this problem, suitable for the local plant.

I am particularly impressed by the last paragraph of the foregoing clipping, which I again repeat for the purpose of emphasis:

And in conclusion we wish to express the opinion that neither the international union or Congress can write any complete veterans' agreement that can be made to work on a national basis. Such issues should and must be made locally and as individual problems. We hope that our international leaders will change their thinking on the issue, and if necessary, give a little in order that the unions will not have to fight with the veterans' organizations as well as with the companies in the postwar era.

It seems to me that the Government, the international officers of all unions, and the members of veterans' organizations should give particular attention to the statement there made that the problem is very often a local one which can only be solved fairly after making a study of the number of people employed in the normal activities of a plant and those who were employed in the abnormal wartime activities of any particular plant. If a degree of flexibility, as recommended by this article, could be included in any agreement worked out by the veterans' organizations, the Veterans' Administration, and union representatives, or eventually in any law written by Congress, the probability of an equitable solution of the problems based upon local or plant conditions could be worked out amicably on a local basis, without injury to veterans or without completely destroying the principle of seniority rights which the unions have fought so strenuously to establish and maintain.

Hon. Fred M. Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday Hon. Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, will assume his duties as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. In this latest promotion of Mr. Vinson his colleagues from Kentucky in Congress and the people of Kentucky feel a great pride.

If there is one man in public life in America who has been tried by a multiplicity of offices and by various public duties, it is Fred M. Vinson. For 14 years he was a Member of the House of Representatives, where he became a conspicuous expert on tax matters. His knowledge and judgment and fine grasp of this subject were recognized by all his colleagues.

He resigned as a Member of the House to accept a judgeship of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and while he held that position was appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States as Chief Judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals. This latter position imposed upon him duties in addition to those of the judgeship of the circuit court of appeals.

He resigned these positions to become the Director of Economic Stabilization to which he was appointed by President Roosevelt; and after he had rendered able service in this most important position he was appointed Federal Loan Administrator in which position he administered all the lending agencies of the United States which included the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries with their immense resources.

He was then appointed by President Roosevelt as Director of War Mobilization where he again distinguished himself by his splendid administration of that agency upon which depends so greatly the stability of our institutions and the prosperity of our people.

President Truman has now appointed him Secretary of the Treasury and in the postwar period there is no more important administrative position in the Government. To that position he will bring fine natural ability, wide experience and good judgment which have characterized his extensive and divergent public service. The people of the United States can feel assured that the great duties and obligations imposed upon him will be discharged with ability, with fine judgment and to the best interest of our common country and its people. I doubt that any man in all the history of our country has held so many important positions and certainly no one has approached this record in the short space of time in which they have been held.

Ellison DuRant Smith

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1945

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. ELLISON DURANT SMITH, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the late Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, who so ably represented the State of South Carolina for 35 years, will be missed by every person in the State of South Carolina. He was a champion of States' rights and adhered strictly to the provisions of the Constitution as was outlined by our forefathers. Senator SMITH did more for agriculture than any other one man in the United States Senate and was never too busy to listen to the farmers' problem. As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee he sponsored important farm legislation which will prove to be a memorial to him in future years. I considered Senator SMITH an authority on agriculture problems and legislation. I always made an effort to secure his advice on important pending farm legislation. Senator SMITH

was strong in his convictions. His sterling character and ability could not be questioned. Senator SMITH owned and operated a large farm in my district and he never did forget that he was a dirt farmer and did not believe in all kinds of theories. I do not believe any Senator enjoyed the respect of every Member of the United States Senate as the late Senator SMITH. He was able with his personality and keen knowledge of legislation to have the Senate pass almost any bill that he sponsored. Senator SMITH has left a great record and it will be difficult to fill his place in the United States Senate and it will be a long time before the farmers will find another Senator that will champion their cause as Senator SMITH.

Pigs and Pork Versus OPA and Points

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the following comments taken from the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal for July 6, 1945, are worthy of sober thought:

IT WILL TAKE TIME

Hope is rising in the livestock and meat industry over the prospects of better Federal planning of the meat production program under new management in the months ahead. The reason for this hope is that more attention seems to be now focused on the real problem—lack of production. Heretofore, the planners have seemed to be more concerned over distributing dwindling supplies, black markets they themselves created, counterfeit red stamps, minor violations in legitimate channels based on technicalities, etc., than they were about the shrinking tonnage which was the real cause of all the trouble. However, the effects of these blunders cannot be offset for many weeks, months, and in some instances years.

There is no use in listening to all these happy stories coming out of Washington about more meat for civilians. This country is going to keep on feeding its boys in service better than any other country, and if it is necessary to take one pound away from the boys so a civilian can have it, we are sure that the civilian will not want it. Even if some of the meat bought for the armed services is wasted through spoilage because needs at some certain points were overestimated, people of the country would rather see that than to have the needs underestimated and be fearful that some of their sons or husbands went hungry for meat that they could have had.

If Federal requirements were lowered for the rest of this summer to allow the civilians more of current production it would not mean more tonnage for the civilian. In fact, it probably would mean less, because production is expected to fall again this month and again next month.

Had the Government not interfered with pig raising a couple of years ago, civilians could have had the entire current output of meat. It is hard to believe, but here is actually what the planners did to this country when they forced pig raising down: They destroyed an amount of pork which was greater than the meat needs of the entire American armed services. This year's pig raising will be about 35,000,000 head below the 1943 production. If these pigs had been raised to maturity they would have produced almost 7,000,000,000 extra pounds of pork, more than the meat tonnage used by the Army, Navy, and marines in an entire year.

Mr. Speaker, the preceding paragraph is worth a second look. When Government policies retard production in the face of vital need for increased supply, the result is bad no matter what the commodity involved, but the result is tragic when that commodity is food needed for sustaining life.

Rationing by the OPA is merely a device for spreading a thin supply. The solution to shortages is maximum production. That simple fact is obvious to most people and it should be obvious to those who have the power to make and administer the policies of our Government. Still, we are long on OPA and short on pigs; we have some points but no pork.

The Challenge of Peacetime Abundance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 23 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful and stimulating article which appeared in the New York Times Sunday Magazine of July 8, 1945, written by Hon. O. Max Gardner, former Governor of North Carolina and chairman of Advisory Board to Director of Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the title of the article being The Challenge of Peacetime Abundance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF PEACETIME ABUNDANCE—IN WAR WE SET WORLD PRODUCTION RECORDS, BUT CAN WE REPEAT THEM AFTER THE FIGHTING ENDS?

(By O. Max Gardner, chairman of Advisory Board to Director of Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion)

The American people are meeting the challenge of war. Can we meet the challenge of peace? This question is the subject of debate and discussion throughout America. The Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, together with Director Fred M. Vinson, chief of staff on reconversion, has been grappling with the issue days and nights. We realize that we still have a two-front war to win—against Japan on the Pacific front and against the threat of depression, unemployment, and hard times on the home front. It is our conviction that, if we meet the challenge of peace as we have been meeting the challenge of war, we can win the battle of the home front as certainly as we shall win the battle of Japan.

With this generalization I speak for myself. I believe that new conditions demand new measures. I do not believe that prewar concepts are adequate for postwar requirements of employment, production, wages, profits, or national income. I do not believe that 1929, our best prewar year, in which we had a national income around $83,000,000,000, is any basic criterion for evaluating the new world into which we shall move. Taking into consideration most of the postwar factors, a very important one being an annual revenue bill roughly three times as large as any before our entry into the war, I would guess that a national income in the neighborhood of $125,000,000,000 annually—roughly, 50 percent above 1929—will be necessary to keep the national economy from eventually running into very real difficulty.

Did you ever stop to think how long it has been since 1929? Actually it has been only 16 years; measured by historic change it has been a hundred. The attainment and maintenance of a $125,000,000,000 national annual income may seem to some to be out of this world. Yet, I am bold enough to offer some evidence to support the position that we can win the battle of peacetime abundance.

What have we done to win the war against Germany and Japan? We have amazed ourselves and the world with our ability to transform this Nation into the most powerful war-making force in world history. We have converted, we have expanded, we have built new plants, we have produced new tools—more machine tools during the past 5 years than in the previous 40.

What shall we do with this great productive capacity when peace comes? Shall we convert a part and allow the rest to be dismantled? Shall we drop back to the production level of, say, 1936–39, or maybe only to the level of 1929? Shall we consider again the economy of scarcity and revert to restricting output? Or shall we have courage to base our future on a bold economy of abundance? Must we not recognize that our power to produce is limited only by the brains and ingenuity of management and by the number of human beings able and willing to work, with ability to produce, and with income to buy the things they make?

About this the President of the United States is on record. Mr. Truman (then United States Senator) made a clear statement at Detroit on September 4, 1944, when he said:

"If this country can utilize all its manpower to make the engines of destruction with which to overwhelm our enemies, surely we can use that same manpower to improve our cities, build highways, erect decent homes, and provide every workingman with more of the good things of life. Surely, we can create a great foreign commerce advantageous to ourselves and all the nations of the world. We have proved our ability to produce in wartime. Now let us prove a similar ability to produce in peacetime."

This faith of the President, in my opinion, will have the substantial backing of our farsighted leadership in capital, labor, industry, and agriculture.

Having shattered the world's production record of abundance for war, having advanced science and research years ahead of its normal pace, we are moving now into a new and equally dangerous test of our democracy.

In my judgment, America is today far better prepared for peace than she was prepared for war on December 7, 1941. We could be this well prepared and still not be much. If we cannot be better prepared for peace than we were for war, our domestic Pearl Harbor would most probably occur in Detroit. We are the one Nation equipped by training, unimpaired by devastations of war, and endowed with the means, the ability, and the conscience to take the leadership of the world in peacetime production.

Reconversion is more than beating the physical sword of war into the plowshare of peace. It is more than retooling and the adaptation of war plants to peacetime purposes. The manner, the tempo, and the direction that we take in this transition from war to peace will mark and color the channel of our civilization for years to come.

Following the end of the Japanese war the demand of the American people, dammed up now for nearly 4 years, will exceed anything this country has ever known with its more than 150,000,000,000 accumulated savings. A recent survey by the War Production Board shows that the American people would like to buy right away nearly 6,000,000 refrigerators, three and a half million sewing machines, twelve and a half million alarm clocks, and hundreds of other needed consumer goods.

The new things that are in the making, so radical in their possibilities of changing our physical ways of living and of enjoyment, are suggested by such words as electronics, radar, fluorescence, octane, helicopter, alloys, gas turbines, polarization, jet propulsion. Hundreds of new things are coming from the chemistry laboratories. Then consider the opportunities in the heavy industries. These industries were able to operate at only a fraction of their capacity from the late 1920's until World War II.

The real key to prosperous peacetime abundance, however, lies in the fields of (a) food, (b) clothing, (c) housing and construction, and (d) transportation, together with their supporting services.

To illustrate, in 1941 the American people spent approximately $20,000,000,000 for food. Given a minimum of $2,000 annual cash income for urban and $1,200 for rural consumers, those same consumers, the Bureau of Labor Statistics finds, would spend $35,000,000,000.

Housing, together with fuel, lighting, and refrigeration, would jump from $12,000,000,000 to $17,500,000,000. The National Housing Agency estimates that during the first postwar decade an average yearly construction of 1,260,000 non-farm dwellings will be required.

Clothing expenditures would add $5,000,000,000. For the expanded use of cotton, wool, and especially rayon, research has worked out more new ideas in the past 5 years than in any comparable period in history.

The automobile industry with such full employment and consumer income could more than double its annual prewar volume. There is a pent-up demand for new automobiles estimated at more than 20,000,000 over the next few years.

The truth is, if we are to solve the problem of unemployment, we have no option but to utilize to a high degree our increased productive capacity. This change in our thinking—from scarcity to abundance—has been forced upon us by the logic of events. In no other way can we hope constructively to utilize the manpower in the armed forces and that which will be released from war industries with the coming of peace.

If we had maintained our 1929 production, employment, and prices during the thirties, we would have created $291,000,000,000 in additional wealth. That is more than the total cost of the war to this date. This is a startling statement and food for thought for those of us who are wondering what we will be able to do when our national debt reaches $300,000,000,000.

If we commit this Nation to an economy of abundance, we must greatly enlarge our peacetime markets both at home and abroad. A substantial part of our increased production can be consumed by raising the level of living for our 140,000,000 people, but this is not enough. We must trade with other nations. This Nation should exert every effort to produce in quantity many things we do not now have in order to be able eventually to be substantially self-contained.

We cannot barter in chaos. Trade does not flourish in confusion. If men are to buy and sell, there must be order. If credit is to be extended and debts retired, there must be stability. Logic then tells us that we must be interested in the economic and political health of other nations.

There is controversy in this country over the question of planning or not planning. I believe in the American free-enterprise system. I do not believe that the best interests of the Nation are served by regimentation in peacetime. At the same time, it seems to me that planning is just the common-sense approach to a constructive postwar economy. Our task is simplified and our chances of success are increased by the best planning we can provide. I mean planning by the Government to create a pattern of government and enterprise relationship in which individual industries, individual companies, and individuals will have a feeling of confidence and stability in making their own plans for their own operations.

Take a look at tax planning. No substantial tax reduction can take place until the war with Japan is over, but this does not mean that planning a postwar tax policy should not be undertaken sooner.

No one thing would be more beneficial to business and industry and to our over-all economy than for the tax committees to chart out fairly well the first level of reduction to which we ought to come down and to do so next fall or at least before next spring—even if the chart should have to be put in cold storage for another year and should have to be revised in part.

If we could explore the mind of the average American citizen today, I think we would find lying side by side two important desires. One is the wish that a world order may be established to prevent war. The other is the natural desire for a job that will bring with it individual well-being and security.

At first it may seem a bit odd to relate a spacious and grand design for a world order with the desire of the average American for a regular pay check. However, upon closer examination, we find that the two ideas are really different approaches to the same problem. The untutored thinking of the common man has stumbled upon and laid bare the core of the problem facing this Nation and the world. The common man, knowing little and caring less about fine-spun theories of sovereignty, international law, and economics, shows an intuitive understanding of world problems when he ties up in one bundle the desire for his daily bread and a chance for world peace. It may well be that we cannot long have our daily bread without world peace, and I am equally doubtful if we can long have world peace without our daily bread.

Proposed Investigation of German Optical-Goods Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, recently a joint committee of the optical manufacturers of this country and the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers Union, District No. 4, submitted to the Kilgore committee investigating German cartels, a statement asking for investigation of German optical-goods industries.

I should like to quote the following from the statement:

We feel that, outside of munitions themselves, optics and precision instruments are a nation's most vital weapons of war. We are handing Germany a dagger that may one day be aimed at our own throat if we assist in the revival of her once world-dominant optics industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ASKING FOR INVESTIGATION OF GERMAN OPTICAL GOODS INDUSTRIES REPORTED TO BE MANUFACTURING GOODS FOR THE AMERICAN ARMY SUBMITTED TO THE KILGORE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING GERMAN CARTELS, JUNE 29, 1945, BY JOINT COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE

Optical manufacturers: J. J. Shapiro, president, Universal Camera Co.; M. J. Mayer, Mayberg Optical Co.; Thornton Lewis, Jr., Rudolph Wendel, Inc.; R. L. Reich, E. Letiz, Inc.; Theodore R. Nathan, Ultima Optical Corp.

Union representatives: Thelma Ostrow, business agent, 1225, UERMWA; Marcel Scherer, district representative, district 4, UERMWA.

Before the outbreak of hostilities in the Second World War, the United States depended almost solely on Germany for its supply of precision optics. Their superiority, at that time, was unquestioned and very little progress had been made toward the development of an adequate American optical industry.

The shock of war brought an immediate concentration of our optical engineering facilities. They were weighed in the balance of conflict and found desperately wanting. The industry had been prevented from developing in this country through cartel agreements. These cartel agreements between German companies and American houses have provided the basis for an anti-trust action by our Department of Justice. At hearings on the question of cartels before a Senate committee, Government witnesses charged that the United States Navy designs for a special type of periscope had been turned over by an American company to a German company for study. Fortunately, the realization of optical and instrument shortcomings was followed by Government aid in the birth of small and moderate size plants within our own borders. These plants give "eyes" to Uncle Sam without which our armed forces could not have matched the fire-control devices of the enemy.

We broke the bottleneck of optics through the investment of vast sums for tooling and training. We broke it just in time by building an industry overnight where none had existed before. Are we going to abandon it now and permit German optical manufacture to resume at the point where it was interrupted by the bombs of our airmen? An outstanding contribution was made by small instrument and optical plants—American plants without foreign entanglements. A good section of these small plants are in New York.

Reports of trained observers disclose that, despite the widespread destruction of Germany from the air, much of her industrial strength remains intact. Enough plants and machinery have been left undamaged to enable Germany to regain a significant position in the manufacture of optics. This would not be desirable from either the economic or the military standpoint. And it can only come to pass if the occupation authorities permit the reemployment of German labor to reopen these centers that once placed us, optically speaking, at the mercy of the enemy.

If there be any doubt that we were, indeed, at their mercy, here are the words of the United States Ordnance Department report on optical glass in war:

"In industries of highly technical nature, such as the optical and instrument industry, the Germans had established such effective control that at the beginning of the war we were seriously embarrassed because we did not manufacture those commodities and did not know how to make them."

That kind of control and that kind of embarrassment might well have lost us the war. Optical arts and skills were acquired by Germany and closely guarded for decades.

It was an outstanding miracle of American industry, labor and government that plants were financed and tooled and that American labor learned so astonishingly swiftly the intricate skills required of optical craftsmen. It is a miracle that this was done in time.

In 1940, Fortune magazine stated that the Army considered the shortage in optical instruments as the fourth most serious bottleneck in our armament program. Today, in 1945, America's fledgling precision optical instrument industry has emerged victorious over an enemy whose optical ingenuity is legendary. Is the reward to be relegation to the scrap heap while the plants of Germany are solicitously propped up, perhaps for another blow against us in some future era?

Much rumor and some facts have seeped through from Europe, which indicate that the German optical industry has been given the "green light" by Allied occupation authorities. We hear, for example, that in Brunswick, Germany, they are producing 6 x 30 binoculars and that in other parts of Germany they are making the most important optical instruments of war—such as periscopes, bomb sights, gun sights, and aerial cameras. If this is true, it is a tragic blunder and we submit our recommendation that the matter be sifted thoroughly so that all of the facts are brought to light. Our own optical plants and instrument plants are laying off thousands of workers each week—workers who have developed valuable technical skills. They fought the war at the grinding, polishing, and precision assembly benches. There are more than 30,000 of them in America. Now that their part of the conflict is won, shall we reward them with the loss of their livelihood while German laborers are called back to reman the optical plants of Jena, Brunswick, and Strassburg. Are we to leave ourselves once again at the mercy of the cartels that had maneuvered us into a position where we in this country were without an optical industry?

Isn't this, in a way, reminiscent of how we scrapped our armaments after the last war while we helped our German "friends" get their house of hate in order?

We feel that no German should be employed to product optics or precision instruments in Germany while American optical workers are losing their jobs through contract terminations or cut-backs.

We feel that, outside of munitions themselves, optics and precision instruments are a nation's most vital weapons of war. We are handing Germany a dagger that may one day be aimed at our own throat if we assist in the revival of her once world-dominant optics industry.

We feel that American economic security and American military security demand that we maintain a strong, expanding native optical industry. The extent of cut-backs and curtailments in the industry are so great that we feel the entire industry is in danger of disappearing.

We feel that the resumption of German optical manufacture will prove a bitter fruit of sacrifice and victory to a laid-off American optical worker. His anguish and privation becomes the burden of hundreds of thousands of his dependents.

We ask that the facts be brought to light. We make the "eyes" through which our armed forces are looking ahead toward complete and final victory. We must go on making them to fortify us for the future. We must never be dependent on other lands for "eyes" through which we can aim our guns.

We may never need them; but let's be sure we have them. Let us never be blind; not now, most of all.

Government Spending

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in these closing days we have discussed a great many issues, and I think it would be well for all the Members of the House to just seriously think back over a lot of these things we have done, primarily, perhaps, the appropriation of moneys in a reckless manner. We have discussed subsidies in a big way and paid them recklessly. Everybody in this House knows how I feel about it and where I stand on it. I want to say to the Republican Members of the House that you will never lick the New Deal until you begin to fight the New Deal, and I hope that will soak in on the Republican side from the leadership down. I think the country is generally disgusted about a lot of things for which we have spent money and the weak opposition we presented. Every penny we wasted here our children will pay back a dime for.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter I received from a large farm operator proving that the OPA and other governmental agencies are hindering food production.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CHAMBERSBURG, PA., *July 19, 1945.*
Hon. CHESTER GROSS,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Was pleased to note your recent letter and await the copy of the speech you expect to make.

We are farming about 500 acres of land in a pretty well worked out plan of diversification. We felt and still feel that our war duty is food production. Like many others, we are getting so thoroughly disgusted with some of the regulations, troubles, restrictions, and everything that hinders farmers that we have about concluded to change our set-up, probably produces less needed food but not have quite so many troubles.

Specifically, some of the things that are uppermost in our minds are—

The effort now to unionize the farmer by compelling any truck driver except father or son to be a union member at a cost of $50 per year and annual dues of $48 per year. This seems to be in effect in Philadelphia.

The 5-day-per-week marketing of produce on the markets. This being an arrangement worked out by unions with the handlers of produce.

The ignoring of the law known as the disaster clause by the price-fixing agencies. This especially is of importance to this district having the smallest apple crop since 1921. The effort is to consider the national apple crop in the disaster clause rather than sections having reduced crops and lawfully entitled to the higher prices.

We have always fed some steers and hogs. The present set-up seems to offer no inducement for this feeding although it changes our whole farm set-up. In the York Springs section where we farm, five of the largest meat producers are either out of production or going out.

The inability to get repairs for machinery seems somewhat unnecessary if such inability is caused by the companies not getting enough of material. Or even there not being allowed help for the making of the needed repairs. We have waited over a month for a crank case for a sprayer engine of standard make. A power take-off mower, International make, has been out of service 10 days for want of a drive shaft. Just so many of these kind of delays makes you feel that there is some mismanagement some place along the line that could be so easily avoided.

These are just a few thoughts in my mind that are, I rather think, showing up pretty generally that it can only mean a reduction of farmer activities. The recent news seems to indicate that Washington has now finally discovered that there is a real food shortage in front of us.

Yours truly,

W. E. GROVE.

Correspondence Between Former Senator Robert L. Owen and Mr. Thomas B. Love, of Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere satisfaction that I have the honor to ask consent to include with my remarks an exchange of correspondence between former Senator Robert L. Owen and Mr. Thomas B. Love, of Dallas, Tex.

This correspondence deals with the testimony of Senator Owen before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee regarding the United Nations Charter and also with the Senator's proposal for a mechanism whereby English might be made a world language universally available to all people in all parts of the world.

In my judgment, Senator Owen not only rendered an outstanding service to his country in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but he is rendering an outstanding service to the entire world in this work which he is doing with regard to enabling people to communicate with one another readily regardless of their nation or native language.

DALLAS, TEX., *July 13, 1945.*
Senator ROBERT L. OWEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR OWEN: In view of our acquaintance and friendship since I first met you, just about 49 years ago, on a southbound M. K. & T. train, north of Muskogee, when I lived in Missouri and was making my first visit to Texas with a delegation of Missouri Democrats who attended the Democratic State Convention which selected the

delegates to the Democratic National Convention at Chicago, in the interest of Richard Parks Bland of Missouri, for whom the Texas delegates were instructed—I cannot refrain writing to heartily congratulate you and to sincerely thank you for your forthright and unanswerable argument, reported in the Dallas News of this morning, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on yesterday, and to thank you for it.

It is the best speech that has been made upon the subject. You are absolutely right in saying that war can and is being abolished, and you are right in saying that the Russian people will sustain the work of the United Nations Charter, and that Russia will carry through her end of the bargain, just as you were right in making the fight to put America in the League of Nations formed at Versailles under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson. If we had been in that League, there would have been no World War II.

And just as you were right in leading the fight for Federal insurance of bank deposits 20 years before this law was finally enacted and approved by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1933, which has put an end to losses of depositors in national banks. If you had been successful in your efforts in 1913, there would have been no Hoover panic, followed by the closing of all American banks at their own request.

As a citizen and as your friend, I sincerely thank you for the notable service you rendered on yesterday and have rendered throughout the past 50 years. Take care of yourself. With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. LOVE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 17, 1945.*

Mr. THOS. B. LOVE,
Republic Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

MY DEAR TOM: It gave me a sincere pleasure to realize your continued friendship and interest and your approval of my views on the United Nations Charter.

In my testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, on July 12, I submitted as exhibits to my comments the mechanism for making English a world language. This can be done without interference with existing languages by having at least one additional language for all the world, which all people can speak, write, print, and read with comparative ease, with high speed, and with negligible cost.

Such an advantage in international communications would be the soundest foundation for international intercourse contemplated by the United Nations Charter and by the monetary mechanism being set up under the Bretton Woods plan.

Moreover, the global alphabet can be employed in all English-speaking countries to completely eradicate illiteracy and open the doors of knowledge to every human being through an alphabet that can be learned in a very, very short time.

It has given me deep pleasure to see the reforms I have advocated established one after the other during my long public career, particularly the safeguards of democratic government. These safeguards are the initiative, referendum, and recall; the preferential ballot, the mandatory primary, the direct election of Senators, woman suffrage, the abatement of unsocial monopoly, and the regulation of the value of money.

And now let us give thanks to Heaven. The United Nations Charter and the Bretton Woods agreement will make these reforms world-wide.

Thanking you for your continued friendship, I remain, as ever

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

Correction of Statement Regarding Mr. R. E. McConnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my remarks in the House on July 20 I made reference to Mr. R. E. McConnell, Deputy Chief of the Economic Division of the American Group Control Council. I said that Mr. McConnell was an official of the General Aniline & Film Co. at the time it was taken over by the Office of the Alien Property Custodian. That statement was in accordance with information given me which I had every reason to consider reliable. But I now find it is not correct. Mr. McConnell was not connected with General Aniline & Film before the firm's assets were seized by the Alien Property Custodian, but, on the contrary, was appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury to be the head of the company and to administer it after it was taken over as alien property. Mr. McConnell continued in that capacity for approximately 2 years, during the course of which time the output of the plants was doubled.

I wish to take this opportunity to express publicly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my sincere regret for the injustice done to Mr. McConnell by the mistake which I made and to apologize to Mr. McConnell and to the House for not having been absolutely accurate, as I should have been in a matter of this kind.

In further justice to Mr. McConnell I wish to add that it was he who brought back to the United States from Germany after World War I the "know how" regarding certain processes for the production of explosives which has been of prime importance to the defense of this Nation.

Crowley Says Best Way To Aid in Financing of Small Business Is To Ameliorate Certain Basic Economic Problems—Says Enforcement of Fair Trade Practices, Proper Taxation, and Protection by Antitrust Laws Will Remove Major Financial Difficulties Facing Small Business

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the House Small Business Committee's recent hearings on the subject Financial Problems of Small Business, the committee sought written statements from the heads of certain Federal agencies whose testimony it was felt would be of value to the Members in their study of this vital subject.

Hon. Leo T. Crowley, in his capacity as Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, has just submitted a statement to the Small Business Committee which I consider noteworthy for its sound logic and clear thinking on the subject of small-business problems.

Mr. Crowley goes to the core of the small-business problem in his statement when he says:

> The best way to aid in the financing of small business is to ameliorate certain basic economic problems. If small business is properly protected by the antitrust laws and by enforcement of fair trade practices, if taxation is fair and proper, and if the necessary steps are taken to avoid major depressions, small business will have such good prospects that it will have little difficulty in being financed. Contrariwise, making additional funds available without attacking some of these basic problem will injure rather than aid small business.

I should like to commend the full text of Chairman Crowley's letter to the Members of the House for their serious consideration. The letter in full is as follows:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT
INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Washington.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are happy to respond to your request for a statement concerning the financial problems of small business. As the Nation approaches the momentous shifts involved in reconversion, it is appropriate that a committee of the Congress should be carefully considering the type of business organization which we desire to maintain in the postwar period. The work of your select committee indicates that you realize that reconversion will be difficult and that it will present serious economic problems, as well as great opportunities. We at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation come in daily contact with small- and medium-sized business since we examine over 6,500 banks, only a few of which can be regarded as large. In fact, we examine the great majority of the small banks of the Nation. These small banks have small businesses as their customers.

At best the period of reconversion will be a trying one and it would be a mistake for Congress to overlook any measures which promise to facilitate the change. Steps should be taken to assure that credit will be available wherever it is needed. However, in our enthusiasm to aid small business we should not make the mistake of advocating policies which will encourage business firms to assume debts which they cannot service. We all know of enterprises which were profitable as long as they were operated as small businesses, but which proved to be disappointing failures after they expanded.

The best way to aid in the financing of small business is to ameliorate certain basic economic problems. If small business is properly protected by the antitrust laws and by enforcement of fair-trade practices, if taxation is fair and proper, and if the necessary steps are taken to avoid major depressions, small busines will have such good prospects that it will have little difficulty in being financed. Contrariwise, making additional

funds available without attacking some of these basic problems will injure rather than aid small business.

In some respects the small business has exceptional advantages for financing itself. Its financing on a relatively direct and personal basis avoids most of the high cost and overhead which may be incident to the financing of large business. The partnership device is available for small business. Local capitalists are able to invest their funds in such enterprises upon a basis of personal knowledge. Likewise, local banks can extend credit based upon first-hand information. All these sources are available to finance small business whenever the basic conditions for confidence prevail. The primary role of the Federal Government is not directly in the financing of small business but rather in helping to provide the fundamental conditions for confidence. One of the chief contributions the Government can make in this connection is to avoid giving advantages to big business. The Government should be certain that it does not discriminate in favor of the big common carrier, the big bank, the big manufacturer, and the big retailer.

All this does not mean that there may never be a need for the Government to take positive action. In the depression of the 1930's when the confidence of investors was at a low ebb Government loans to business were most appropriate. If depression again comes upon us, the Congress should provide for such financing when and if necessity demands. Government should neither make loans nor guarantee loans to business so long as substantially full employment prevails and inflation potentialities are prevalent. To stimulate loans to business under such conditions would contribute to price inflation and add to the difficulties of rationing and allocation of scarce resources. It is our belief that businesses are in such a liquid condition that they would be harmed rather than aided by Government direct or guaranteed loans. Harm rather than good would result from extension of Government activity in this field at the present time. A disservice would be done to the businesses themselves. Only when a positive need arises for such Government activity at some time in the future should it be undertaken.

If depression does occur and Government support of the financing of business becomes necessary that support should take the form of direct loans rather than Government guarantee of loans. Our position was stated in the 1942 annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as follows:

"A method of transfer of risk frequently proposed is to insure various types of assets of the banks against loss. While certain classes of loans, particularly real-estate mortgages, readily lend themselves to this method of financing, the creation of a series of governmental corporations which would insure most bank loans has serious long-run implications to the free enterprise system. Since each corporation of this kind would of necessity be forced to supervise the extension of credit to avoid undue losses and since achievement of uniformity in regulations would be difficult, such a method of finance, if generally used, would impose additional restraints and interferences with the normal processes of business.

"Insurance of bank assets seeks to avoid, by a payment of a fee, the risk of extending credit. The insuring Federal agencies would be assuming the primary risk of less in the extension of credit while the profits would be received by banks which would not bear the risks that are the justification for profit-taking. Under such a general system of insurance of bank assets some of the most powerful incentives for sound banking practices would be lacking. One of the sound features of deposit insurance lies in the fact that the stockholders of a bank still bear the first risk of loss since they lose their entire stake in the business before the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation bears any loss. Self-interest, therefore, still provides the primary incentive for the sound management and operation of the bank and for prudence in the extension of credit."

There have been recurrent statements to the general effect that bank examiners have been exercising an unduly restrictive influence on the lending policy of banks. Some of this criticism, we understand, has been called to the attention of your committee. Naturally, these statements have prompted us to investigate the facts. We have been handicapped in our inquiries by the fact that these criticisms have been couched in vague and general terms, and specific instances have not been called to our attention. We have found no basis for these charges.

Our examiners are instructed not to attempt to take over managerial functions, and we believe that there is no confusion about this in the minds of most bankers, although some have a habit of blaming the examiner when they do not care to make or to continue to carry a loan. Of course, bank examiners classify loans as substandard which carry an undue amount of risk, and as long as examiners do their duty fearlessly we can expect some complaints. A certain amount of firmness will always be required if needed corrections are to be obtained. We hope the day will never come when our examining force will regard itself as a group of glad-hand artists whose function is to keep bankers in good humor, happily oblivious of their bad credits. We shall, however, continue to study this problem, and if we should learn that individual bank examiners are exercising a restrictive influence we shall take appropriate action. In this connection it should be mentioned that our examiners are instructed not to classify a loan as substandard because it is long-term, secured by real estate, a capital loan, or a loan to small business. Loans are classified because they do not have an adequate margin of protection or because they are not written in a form which meets the needs of the particular firm or bank.

The classification of bonds of small issuers presents different problems from those involved in classifying bonds of large issuers. The fact that small bond issues are typically not quoted on the security exchanges and are not rated by the rating agencies puts them in a different class from the bonds of large issuers. However, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has always believed that these factors should not discourage banks from investing in the bonds of small issuers provided that they have an adequate margin of protection.

In our instructions to examiners we have specifically called attention to the fact that bonds of small issuers may be prime investments if the enterprise is soundly managed. We have not only made special studies on methods of analyzing the credit quality of bonds of small obligors, but we have also set up facilities for preparing our own analyses. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation examiners never classify bonds as substandard merely because they are not rated by a rating agency.

In conclusion, we agree with you that small business as such should be encouraged. Small banks in particular should be encouraged because they are in a strategic position to meet the credit needs of local business. Banks are anxious at this time to acquire sound loans and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will support them in this without reservation. The supervisory activities of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in no way restrict the economically desirable role of the banks in financing business. Any extensions of credit which are classified substandard by the examiners of the Corporation are extensions which would not prove beneficial to the business or to the economic system.

If we can be of further assistance to the committee please call upon us.

Very truly yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY, *Chairman.*

Freedom of Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the subject Freedom of Communications, as it relates to the United Nations Charter, delivered by James Lawrence Fly, formerly Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. The speech was delivered at the round table discussion of the United Nations and the Organization of Peace and Security before the twenty-first institute of the Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation, at Chicago, Ill., July 9–13, 1945.

An estimate of the cost of printing the speech has been made. The cost will be $182.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are here today to discuss the field of ideas and in particular the need for freedom in the origination, transmission, and reception of this most precious of all commodities. We are not committed to Milton's idealistic thought that truth will win out in each and every battle, but we are committed as a matter of fundamental philosophy to the principle that the free exchange of ideas and information will ultimately achieve a large measure of common agreement. It is true that we want to believe, and I think logically we must believe, that the greatest degree of sympathetic uendrstanding between peoples affords one of the essential bases for the peace and security of the world. Balance of power does not long endure, and however strong this balanced force may be, there is inherent in such a structure an ominous frailty.

We must reject the philosophy of determinism which has already spread too broadly from the utterances of Hegel and more latterly from Marx and Engels. Just as we reject the theory of the balance of power, we must reject the theory that world-shaking events, whether based upon economic trends or other factors, are inevitable. We want to live in a world where there is an interplay of thought, where facts and ideas are cast into the market place in open competition for mankind's opinion. In this market place we rely upon freedom of choice and we cling to the belief that our choices of ideas and opinions will affect the so-called inevitable trends.

The greater the flow of information and ideas amongst the peoples of the world, the more soundly can we hold to this aspiration. Today we have a greater degree of communication of ideas than at any time in history. Yet there remain real impediments. And it is a stark fact that even today there are many dark spots on the face of the globe where lack of understanding of one

another remains as a breeding ground for suspicion and mistrust, e. g., witness India, Palestine, and the Middle East; indeed, note Russia and China. The need in this area, no less than in the field of economics and other more easily recognizable areas, is for international agreement and the establishment and concrete effectuation of wholesome principles on a world-wide scale. This involves the establishment and maintenance of an international agency. It also involves concrete action within the sovereign states effectuating policy agreements.

We have come a long way in the communication of ideas since we were dependent upon the town-hall session and Tom Paine's pamphleteering. Even assuming that Paine's method, in the light of his local environment, had some measure of adequacy, still even under those conditions it was inadequate. At any rate, the world today is clearly different and more complex. With the spread of populations have come the advances of science which have given us the facilities for a greater degree of communication. Most impressive, perhaps, is communication by electric impulse in its various forms, such as wire and radiotelegraph and radiotelephone, domestic and international broadcasting, and tomorrow domestic and international television broadcasting. The mails are more comprehensive and more rapid. The motion-picture industry in recent years has developed into a vital force in the communication of information. Books and pamphlets are extensively published and more effectively distributed over a broader area. Newspapers, though decreasing in number during recent decades, have achieved a tremendous and broad circulation. The news-gathering and distributing agencies work on an international scale. Travel is more rapid and more extensive. Through all of these means there is a great flow and counterflow of information. There has been a marked tendency toward greater, and at times a more sympathetic, acquaintanceship. No doubt something will be accomplished through these various methods. But the job cannot be done with any convincing degree of adequacy so long as the various impediments on a national and international scale survive.

When President Roosevelt defined the "four freedoms" on January 6, 1941, he said: "The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world."

Last summer both of our major political parties wrote into their platforms a solemn declaration that some international action was necessary to realize this principle. The Republicans declared: "All channels of news must be kept open with equality of access to information at the source. If agreement can be achieved with foreign nations to establish the same principles, it will be a valuable contribution to future peace."

The Democrats responded: "We believe in the world right of all men to write, send and publish news at uniform communication rates and without interference by governmental and private monopoly and that right should be protected by treaty."

On September 21, 1944, both Houses of Congress, by concurrent resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States expresses its belief in the world-wide right of interchange of news by news-gathering and distributing agencies, whether individual or associate, by any name, without discrimination as to sources, distribution, rates, or charges: and that this right should be protected by international compact."

Last March, at historic Chapultapec, the Inter-American Conference recommended:

"That the American Republics recognize their essential obligation to guarantee to their people free and impartial access to sources of information * * * that with this assurance in view they undertake, upon the conclusion of the war, the earliest possible abandonment of those measures of censorship and of control over the services of the press and radio which have been necessary in wartime to combat the subversive political tactics and espionage activities of Axis states."

These declarations were but the preliminary fruits of a campaign waged by many groups, all conscious of the need for freedom of communication and all aware that the time to act was at hand.

But the San Francisco Conference was the great citadel to be reduced. Little would come from this first freedom if it remained merely the subject matter of American pontification.

The memories of Versailles arose to warn us of what was at stake—as they do with so many of our problems. There the problem of world communications presented the world with the same choice that confronts us today. One way at that time was to keep on going as before, each nation scrambling for advantages, monopolies, facilities, each creating various barriers to the free flow of ideas. The other was to hammer out a comprehensive scheme of principles whereby the equal benefit of all might be furthered. Some Americans in 1919 were well aware that these were the alternatives and strove energetically to avoid the first; and strove to have the Versailles Conference adopt some scheme tending toward freedom of communication.

As a matter of fact President Wilson in Paris, in the spring of 1919, carried in his pocket a memorandum written by his chief communications adviser, Walter S. Rodgers, which envisaged both the practical problems and to a great extent the principles which hinged upon the establishment of this practical mechanism. For example, the memorandum emphasized the important part which the distribution of the President's addresses and other American news had played in bringing the war to a conclusion and in clearing the way for a common understanding. Mr. Rodgers pointed out plainly that when communication facilities are lacking the opportunity for growth of international misunderstanding is encouraged. He emphasized the need to avoid at all costs any extensive control of communications facilities by one nation which favors its own people and its own commerce. Mr. Rodgers asserted that the ideal is a world-wide freedom for news and the breaking down of existing barriers, chauvinism, or lack of vision. He called for adequate facilities, for the fair control thereof, and for the provision for the generous flow of intelligence in all directions, with the warning that there must be direct, unhampered communication lest suspicion lurks that intermediaries profit by information passing through their hands. There, at least, were both the idealistic kernel of the problem and the practical suggestions which would move toward the goal. But in the great scramble for power over a broad area of subject matters, the principles were neglected, and the ownership and control of communications went along imperialistic lines. To a great extent the United States was left, and it has been left to this good day, looking at the rest of the world through a bottleneck.

There was ground for hope that with the background of sound preliminary declarations coupled with Mr. Stettinius' promise to strive for the adoption of these principles—and no doubt he did strive—the world might avoid at San Francisco the fault of Versailles. In this we have been disappointed. In spite of the hopes generated at Chapultepec a study of the proposed United Nations Charter reveals an ominous silence on this basic freedom.

True, the preamble states that among the aims prompting the combination of nations are "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person," and "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom," and section 3 of article 1, chapter I, lists as a purpose "to achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

But while these great sentiments embrace the freedom we are now discussing, standing alone they do very little to make it a reality. An omnipresence can brood in the sky, but its descent to earth requires some concrete plan or mechanism, whether it be a court—as with Holmes—or some definite and specific international understanding—as is needed here.

Certain basic facts, therefore, must be faced:

First. That anything we, as a nation and as a member of the family of nations, propose to do about freedom of communication is still a job that remains to be done.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not attacking the United Nations Charter. I am not implying that it should be amended in the Senate. I think it represents a laudable first step on the long road to world peace and should be ratified at the earliest opportunity and given enthusiastic American support. But I am pointing out that it does not deal with "freedom of communication," a most vital pillar of world peace, a pillar which we must somehow provide—whether through the United Nations organization or independently of it—as by treaty or convention.

I should point out also that, although the Charter makes no provision for world freedom of communication, it does provide the Organization with power to initiate steps toward its realization.

Thus, chapter III, article 13, section 1 (b), provides that:

"The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of: * * *

"(b) Promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields and assisting in the realization of human rights and basic freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Chapter IX, article 55, provides that:

"With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote: * * *

"(c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms of all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Articles 62 and 68 of chapter X empower the Economic and Social Council to "set up commissions * * * for the promotion of human rights" and to "make recommendations" to the Assembly "for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all."

And the Charter even provides that "where appropriate" the Assembly can "initiate negotiations among the states concerned" to create a "specialized agency" to accomplish certain purposes, among them the respect for human rights and freedoms.

Read together, these various provisions seem to empower the United Nations to deal with the problem now under discussion, even to the extent of creating a specialized agency to administer the principles agreed to. But I think that, realistically, we had better not hold our breath until it does so. We all know that the new Organization will not be on an operating basis for quite some time to come.

More importantly the Organization is not committed to a specific program.

The second fact we must realize, in order to appreciate the urgency of some solution, is that "freedom of communication" is more than a human right or a freedom appropriate to the dignity of man. We are here concerned with world peace, and our concern here with freedom of communication is in its relation to world peace.

Other nations might say that we should be content to confine our conception of human rights to our own borders, and that they would do the same with theirs. In answer, we might, of course, indulge in the perennial philosophic duel as to whether or not such nationalistic conceptions of ethics and politics are tenable. But with respect to the problem of world peace, we need hardly do this. Whatever its relation to the individual needs of men, whether in terms of their personalities or their happiness, freedom of communications is demonstrably a world problem closely related to permanent peace and security and to a healthy life among nations.

There is, of course, the peace of the conqueror, a peace built on force, fear, and oppression. With all the ingenious—and even diabolical—weapons of modern war, who knows that such a "peace" could long endure? That is not the kind of peace we are here to discuss.

A genuine peace must rest upon mutual confidence and mutual respect, and must deal in a nonarbitrary manner with common differences and clashes of interest. Even such a peace has explosive forces latent within it. Each man wants to realize his own conception of his just deserts, while others always seem obstinate. It is the same with nations. It is easy to pick a fight. This tendency is profoundly aggravated by suspicion, fear and ignorance.

A world-wide boom, soon begun and long sustained, in news and knowledge, from every people to every other, about their ideals, their principles, their culture, their conditions and problems and fears, their virtues and vices, would be more powerful as a solvent of fear and suspicion than glittering pronunciamento of any morning-coated delegation.

World-wide news would, of course, be no bromide cure-all. We would not like all we see. But lurking troubles can be smoked out into the open daylight. With each nation aware of what is itching the other, with each cognizant of the relative values arrayed against each other, the chances for peace would seem vastly increased. Men at long last might have a chance to act collectively as rational animals.

Americans must be aware of the fears we may create in the rest of the world by talking about freedom of communication, and about truth winning out in the market place of ideas. Some of our British friends have already interpreted the American campaign for freedom of communication as a devious method of aiding the AP outcompete the rest of the world.

The Russians, on the other hand, do not appear to have accepted the market-place theory. The products of a capitalist press may be suspect. The Chinese, to take a last example, are all for freedom of communications so long as military matters are not affected. But almost everything seems to strike their industrious censors as a military matter.

These suspicions, differences, and fears are not obstacles easily overcome. Fundamental issues of politics are involved. Yet "freedom of communication" means pretty much what it says. There are no two ways about it; there can only be degrees of it.

Now, the important thing is not to quibble about slogans. The important problem here is to win the acquiescence of these countries to a set of principles which would open up the least understood portions of the world to the hungry eyes of the rest of us. We must approach the problem as a problem of peace. We must urge the principle of full information as a pillar of that peace. Above all, we must learn not to lose heart easily or to relegate to perdition all dissenters from our views.

Lasting peace depends upon the establishment of principles of international law binding on all nations. That objective can be accomplished only if there is mutual understanding and tolerance among all peoples. Such understanding depends upon the cutting through of as many points of view as possible. As Mr. Justice Holmes so well put it:

"When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out."

Actually, there is general agreement upon the abstract desirability of a free exchange of ideas. The difficulty arises over the methods by which that ideal is to be attained. Accordingly, we must consider some of the specific problems which inevitably arise.

Broadly speaking, freedom of communication involves, first, the communication of facts, data as to what is happening, where and how. But even facts tend to blend indiscernibly into interpretation on point of view. The product of this blending is the nebulous area called interpretation of facts, opinion, argument, or comment. Freedom of communication must be broad enough to include all these.

Hence, reporters should be free to roam the world—without restriction or impediment, and without even the normal visa or passport requirements. This might be achieved by granting accredited reporters a sort of diplomatic status. This freedom to roam must be a practical thing, something more than the unquestioned privilege of taking conducted tours. Freedom of movement within the borders of every land—with freedom to talk to anybody and to live anywhere—are what I mean. The freedom of inquiry must be broad enough to cover the serious study of the scholar and the scientist, as well as the work of the journalist. Such a freedom would involve the right to stay awhile, as well as to see anything, to talk to anyone, and to go anywhere.

With this freedom to search out information there must be combined the freedom to transmit that information, fully and uncensored, to any other part of the world. If we are to have common understanding and mutual confidence there must be freedom of speech and the press on the spot. It is not enough that news be exported to the far corners of the earth while the country immediately concerned is left in the dark.

Definite progress has already been made in this direction. The Associated Press and the United Press, in the course of decades, have done a commendable job in moving into many of the far reaches of the world in the search for news and in the insistent demand for the right to distribute that news. Not long since, world news was largely under the control of a combination of European agencies, such as Reuters, Havas, and Wolff. The world was divided into zones of control. We, ourselves, were bottlenecked in both directions: news about America to the rest of the world, including the Americas, had to be funnelled through the foreign agencies. News to America from the rest of the world was under similar control. As a result, neighboring countries came to look upon us as a Nation of idle rich, gangsters, and glamor gals, while the controlling nations built up their own countries to a high standing of responsibility and efficiency. Required reading in this connection is Kent Cooper's book Barriers Down. The struggle of the United Press is just as interesting and its success just as valid as the fight carried on by Cooper and the Associated Press. With the reporting of American news abroad to certain areas in American hands, we have succeeded in recent years in getting a much broader distribution. Needless to say, news of America has been more complete and of greater validity. Through such American agencies we have also succeeded in more widely tapping foreign news sources for the American public. Here again, however, much remains to be done. Only if freedom of communication becomes more than a symbol, only if concrete arrangements make possible the free, easy, complete, and nondiscriminatory gathering, transmission, and distribution of news, will the American news associations have the opportunity to make their greatest contribution to world information. Our Government should energetically work for such concrete arrangements. Of course, the freedom here must be freedom for all.

Going further, there must be the freedom to put the reporting and the observation into communicable form, whether by publication in newspapers, pamphlets, or books, or in motion pictures, or over the radio. The same absence of censorship or distribution restrictions must prevail.

In order to obtain the maximum benefit from such world-wide gathering and distribution of news uniform press rates must be established throughout the world at reasonable levels. To a great extent, this has been done by the British Empire. I think it is vitally important to our future postwar world that the same system be extended. It is idle to talk about a free press in terms of a well-informed world community where physical facilities are inadequate, or where they are throttled and controlled to serve selfish ends, or where the cost of service discourages less than the optimum usage.

Closely related to these problems of the free interchange of news is the task that remains to be done in permitting the exchange of ideas and opinions in the form of books, magazines, and pamphlets. Here there are certain concrete suggestions worthy of consideration. At present there are serious impediments in the form of tariff duties. All such duties on books and magazines should be removed. This step should be supplemented by a world-wide reduction of postal rates through the medium of the international postal convention. It is encouraging to note that the mechanism for accomplishing this has been in existence for many decades, has made notable progress generally, and that steps toward this particular, and have been recently taken among the American Republics.

A further relaxation of restrictions could be accomplished by eliminating all duplicate taxation on royalties and other income received from books and publications. Finally, adequate distribution is seriously impeded by the existing restrictions on the international flow of funds. The control of such flow should be relaxed in order that foreign countries can be placed in a position to pay for publications imported.

In the field of communications by electrical impulse, that vast sphere called international telecommunications, I have long advocated the adoption of certain basic principles as being necessary to vitalize these general principles of freedom.

The first of these is the establishment of a uniform rate for all messages throughout the world in all directions. All viewpoints must stand on the same footing in the market place of ideas. Otherwise, the truth we are seeking would tend to become tied to the dollar. There should be a universal policy of nondiscrimination.

The second principle regarding telecommunications reinforce the first—these rates must be low rates. They must be low to make the freedom a practical one. It does little good to be able to communicate between Chicago and Hong Kong if the cable rate or radiotelegraph rate or radiotelephone rate is excessive—as it is now. Such a freedom to communicate is something like Anatole France's famous story about the banker and the beggar—both had the freedom to sleep under a bridge—or like the present-day freedom to establish and operate a metropolitan newspaper.

The skeptics, of course, will say, "This is all well and good, but quite impossible—low rates are simply not feasible." But the history of rate making in communications confirms the principle of decrease in cost with increase in flow. The British, for example, have a uniform rate to any point within their far-flung empire which is considerably cheaper than the rates charged by carriers between the United States and similar points.

Our forward-looking postal administration has made the whole world a single postal district and letters flow throughout the world for a few cents. Yet their cost of operation bears a more direct relation to distance than in radiotelegraph, where cost does not vary with distance.

The third principle to be used as a guide is instantaneous radio communications between all important areas on the globe. The London bottleneck for messages to or from the Empire must be eliminated. The future rests largely upon radio. The strain on the principle may be the shortage of frequencies. But radio is just coming of age, and its engineers are continuing to produce important technical advances.

For example, 2 years ago I suggested that an electronic conveyor belt girdling the earth at the equatorial zone might have many advantages in overcoming certain undesirable natural phenomena which are disturbing in other latitudes and along other transmission paths. It was thought that main transmitting stations might be located in Puerto Rico, West Africa, Egypt, India, China, Guam, Hawaii, and Mexico. All important world points would then key into this belt for the instantaneous transmission and reception of intelligence, and full international use could be made of frequencies which are now useful only for short-range communication during particular hours of the day or seasons of the year. Thus a message from New York to Sydney would be put on the belt at Puerto Rico, automatically relayed via Mexico, Hawaii, and Guam, where it moves off the belt and down to Sydney. In this entire system relatively few frequencies would do the work of many. Of course, continuing international cooperation is essential as a basis for this or any comparable plan. So fast is the scientific pace in radio that our own military forces have already established a comparable system—and it is in operation today.

If this problem is approached on an international basis we can greatly reduce the existing odds against understanding and tolerance of diverse ideals and cultures.

Suppose, for example, one could tune in a Moscow news program, then a Chinese forum broadcast, then a London symphony, then an American program be beamed to Russia in Russian, then an American program beamed to the Far East in Chinese. Then remember that this exchange was going on every day, day in and day out. Surely the task of the United Nations would be easier, the maintenance of peace and security, advanced.

But, even if we assume that radio receivers will be widely distributed among the peoples of the world and that substantial local broadcasting will take place, we must still reckon with the problems of limited frequencies and time differences. The United States, for example, cannot assign one band of frequencies for international communications if the rest of the world assigns a different band. Stations at opposite ends of a circuit might be unable to communicate. Similarly, we cannot assign for domestic use a band of frequencies which other nations have assigned for international use. And programs beamed to certain areas must of course be broadcast when the people there are awake.

An international conference dealing with technical phases of international telecommunications is soon to be held, and these various technical problems will there be reviewed. I hope that the cause of freedom of communications will there be greatly advanced and be used as a frame of reference to solve the technical issues. But the real problem will still remain.

The opportunity missed at Versailles and again at San Francisco must not be missed again. For it will do mankind little ultimate good if we are technically astute in dividing up the spectrum or in arranging for world-wide communications systems if we fail to harness that astuteness to principles conducive to the common good.

In this connection, we should recognize the need for a unification of American international carriers—cable, radiotelegraph, and radiotelephone. Well-informed Government and industry circles have long advocated the merger, and a Senate committee is now investigating the problem, but it still remains an issue generally unknown to the public. Yet unification here is just as essential as it was with the telephone system—with duplication avoided and efficiency and economy promoted. The present fragmentation into several American companies serves only to enable the foreign monopolies, usually government-owned or subsidized, to create artificial barriers, to discriminate, and to keep rates high, in other words, to maintain the very restrictions that must be removed if freedom of communication is to be a practical possibility. A strong American company will be able to alleviate these inequities and bottlenecks.

And as a nucleus for this unified, world-wide system, we can use the vast, very modern, world-wide communications system now operated by our military forces. When its use as the nervous system of our war effort is over, its tremendous facilities all over the world must not be junked or scattered ineffectively. Hence, the importance of a clear conception of the need for a strong American company.

In the field of broadcasting "freedom of communication" must be coupled with the freedom to listen. During these war years we have seen how in the Axis-dominated nations the international exchange of ideas can be strangled by a government determined to supervise what its people hear.

As part of our war machine we now have a substantial system for international broadcasting. We should insist that that system be maintained so that physical facilities are adequate for the communication of ideas and opinions throughout the world. But above all we must insist that by international agreement all artificial restraints on the rights to listen, to assimilate, and to understand be removed. The development of television on an international scale will only serve to broaden and deepen the significance of broadcasting as a force in the modern world.

The field of motion pictures also presents peculiar problems relating to world-wide freedom of communication. Today the major American producers of motion pictures also control their distribution and exhibition. As a result, the distribution of foreign films is seriously limited.

The film industry is now hoping that the American Government will do something to overcome the quotas, restrictions, and censorship that American films must so often face abroad. At present 42 nations have quota laws of this type. For example, in England the importation and distribution of foreign films is geared to the number of films produced in England by the importing companies. Obviously we must find a way to relax such restraints. Could we not begin right here at home by finding a satisfactory way to open our markets? The American people would be the beneficiaries of the resulting variety of ideas. And I think the American motion-picture industry would also benefit. The freedom granted foreign films here would operate to induce freedom for American films abroad. Freedom, just like peace, must be a two-way street. And with free access to the theaters of the world the influence of American films can be nothing short of astounding. In this field the restrictive influence of cartels must be avoided. There are already indications of international arrangements seriously restricting the sources and quality of color films that can be produced and freely distributed. It is to be hoped that all governments by international cooperation will strive to prevent any private combinations from imposing such artificial restraints upon this international exchange.

I might mention that even a world stage has been suggested as a means for tearing down the barriers to world understanding. The drama is unquestionably a great art form in portraying many traits of human and national character, and some means for a wide presentation of plays in lands foreign to their origin would further that exchange of ideas which we can hope will be an unyielding pillar of peace.

The vistas opened up by this topic seem endless. Once we agree that freedom of communication is a weapon for lasting peace, our thoughts immediately extend to related fields. The role of great universities—such as Chicago—takes on new significance. Here the mountains of facts and of theories can be distilled into guiding principles and enlightening propositions. Being places where truth is pursued for its own sake, as your eminent chancelor has so often said, the universities can keep counteracting the nationalistic tendencies to distort, oversimplify, or obfuscate. To the unfolding panorama of events, the universities, their professors, exchange students, and the like can bring the keenness of insight and the awareness of dynamic social processes which the ordinary reporter or returning traveler all too often lacks. The anecdotal tomes now being palmed off on the public as expert treatises by men who have stayed brief periods in foreign lands are probably to be expected and are of some value at this stage in our world sophistication. But I think you will agree with me that they are not a form of intellectual endeavor that we should continue to regard as really serious.

In other words, freedom of communication is only an opportunity. By itself it is nothing. If we attain it and it results only in the world-wide diffusion of comic books or astrology reports or race-track dope sheets, we may well wonder whether the light was worth the candle. Freedom to communicate will begin to mean something impressive in human affairs only when the nations of the earth begin to have something significant to contribute.

Now by significant I would like to mean conducive to human welfare. That means that America should wield a powerful force through the exposition of facts as to the

day-to-day functioning of the bundle of ideals we call democracy.

But these vistas are still only that. The immediate battle is more hum-drum. We must tear down the barriers to the free flow of ideas, whatever the worth or significance of those ideas may be. Let them move into the market place. Some of the problems, as I have said, are technical. Others, such as the current issue as to whether or not America should unify its international telecommunications into one, strong operating company, involve questions of national policy. But all of these problems, and like problems, should be attacked now. And the freedom of communications I have been talking about—which is simply freedom of information everywhere in the world—is the principle that must give significance to the whole.

Given the United Nations Charter—providing at last for Tennyson's Parliament of Man—and given the freedom of communication to enable the peoples represented at that Parliament to have some faith in one another, we have some ground for the earnest hope that the best is not yet.

Adjustment of Labor in Reconversion Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System July 24, 1945, 10:30 p. m., from Washington, D. C., on the subject Adjustment of Labor in the Reconversion Period.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I told Mr. Wood, the director of the program, that I would speak on the subject assigned me only if he would allow me two sentences in regard to the subjects that are on my mind tonight.

First, I have just come from a celebration of Utah people in honor of what we call our Pioneer Day. The pioneers arrived in the Salt Lake Valley on the 24th of July 1847. The ideals of those pioneers who were convinced that they could build a better world are the ideals which guide me today. As I talk about labor adjustments in the reconversion period it will be in the spirit of those ideals and my own fundamental belief in America's destiny to advance the welfare of the average man.

The other subject, which is so much on my mind, is my part in our psychological warfare. I am attempting to convince the Japanese people that they are fighting a war against their best interests and that if they continue to follow their present government it will mean utter destruction for them. I am confident of bringing down the present Japanese Government, thus making the war in the Pacific shorter and saving thousands of our own boys' lives.

Now to the theme of the evening: The tendency of the American people to departmentalize their thinking and assume that labor has a special position in the reconversion program; that industry has a special position; that the Army has a special position; and that there is a peculiar and particular problem for veterans leads to improper thinking and, I am afraid, to immature plans for reconversion. We cannot remake America for labor, or for industry, or for the Army, or for the veterans. In fact, no American who is worth his salt thinks of himself as belonging to a particular group. The labor man is an American citizen first, a father, a son, or a brother, or a member of some fraternity or church. These are the things that make America great, not the particular, narrow, occupational affiliations. It is strange how when one meets with any of these groups, even upon a particular subject relating to their particular objective, when one once talks about American history and the fundamental theories upon which the American Government rests, one always has attention.

What we all want to do is to adjust in such a way that America and her position in the world will be the dominating thought. After all, every individual question hinges upon a larger one. If, for instance, Jeffersonian democracy is not what we thought it was, and if the dignity of the individual in the American political theory is not worthwhile, and if the great fundamentals relating to education, to free speech, to free aspiration, and a right to worship as we wish; if those things are not in the minds of all of us, we may divide our country up into economic factionalism, which is the worst thing that can happen to America. You see, America has gotten along for 150 years with uneconomic political parties. We are amateurs in politics. We do not have a labor party, nor a businessman's party. And those two facts are facts to glory over because if we become bound in our thoughts to support a given ideal for labor or industry we will soon drift into economic parties which result in class distinction.

The German Republic had a score of political parties, most of them based upon some economic practice. Unity on a guild basis is impossible. So, labor's position is not different from the position of anyone else in America in our reconversion period. That does not mean that I am implying that labor has not at times in our history been exploited. That does not mean that labor has not been in a position to be exploited. In America no class should be exploited or exploitable. I do not mean that we should forget our problems in glorifying our history or our ideals. Anyone who knows me and my work in Congress knows that I have been willing to devote my time to correcting ills which can be corrected by legislation. But all things that have been done have been done in accordance with the best of American ideals.

I was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor for a long time, more years in fact than most Senators act as chairman of a given committee and, during that period bills become laws which were thought to be and which probably were revolutionary in their nature. Still, these laws have been tested in our courts, and I am proud to be able to say that not one of the bills I sponsored or which came out of that committee under my leadership has ever been stricken down by the Supreme Court. Let us bring about our objectives within the structure of our great institutions.

Inflation would ruin wage earners because their savings, especially in war loans, are their only capital. The American ideal, its fundamental right to have and to hold, would cease to be. The adjustments, therefore, which I am thinking about are the adjustments which will result in the development of each individual as a citizen in this great commonwealth.

First of all, we have to realize that we cannot make a rule for stabilization so binding that it prevents a decent wage for millions of our people. I am still where I have been in the last 2 years, in favor of doing something for the 20,000,000 forgotten persons who have been caught by stabilization rules. Inflation will not come by raising the shop girls pay from $10 a week to $11 a week, and inflation will never come by raising the minimum under our wage-and-hour law from 40 cents an hour to 65 cents an hour. Inflation comes by the waste and excess profits on the other end which produce useless spending. Therefore, I have no sympathy for those persons who would keep low-range wages down on the theory of preserving stabilization.

I was one of the sponsors of the full employment resolution passed by the International Labor Organization Conference in Philadelphia a year ago last May. Over 50 nations accepted the theory of full employment as a national objective. I am one of the conferees who is responsible for making full employment an American national objective and for reading the idea into the surplus-property law.

Idleness is not good for any man. Unemployment dulls not only persons but families and whole communities. Full employment, therefore, must be a fundamental of any reconversion plan. A promise of continuing employment should be not only an objective but a consideration in the disposal of surplus war property. Since I am in favor of full employment and since I have always contended there was economic waste in nonwork, my industry-labor philosophy is better expressed in my own motion which I presented in 1941, right after Pearl Harbor, at the industry-labor conference and which motion was accepted unanimously by the representatives of industry and labor. That motion carried the idea that all industry-labor disputes should be settled by peaceful means and that there should be no strikes and no lockouts until all known agencies of settlement had been tried. This became the objective of the War Labor Board. This fundamental agreement between labor and industry represents the very acme of solution in the history of our industry-labor problems in America. Never before in our history and never since have we reached the high peak of idealistic endeavor than when that motion was unanimously accepted. Thousands and thousands of our employers and employees have lived up to the spirit of that motion. I regret that the effect of that voluntary agreement, to adjust differences by peaceful means, was ruined by legal action in the passage of the Smith-Connally Act, which, no matter how good the intentions were, has resulted in allowing the advantage-taker to call so many elections to take strike votes that confusion has been brought into our industry rather than peace. Something legally, therefore, has to be done in regard to the Smith-Connally Act or the very agency set up to administer labor law will be unable to function. Wise leadership, based upon real understanding, can do more than any other one thing.

America likes full employment, I am sure. I have been challenged in the last day or two in regard to the term. I have been asked what full employment means. Do you mean to maintain the wartime standards of employment? No; full employment for America does not mean that. Mothers should be back in their homes, children should be in their schools, youths and maidens should be in the colleges and universities. Leisure in America must not be crowded out or our civilization will go hang. Full employment never did mean and never can mean that everyone should work from the cradle to the grave. Full employment must be thought of in terms of our best ideals. Full employment can only be made possible when there is security for the sick, when there is early retirement, when there is compensation for those who have been thrown quickly out of employment. The full employment I want

is the type of full employment which keeps the wage earner in a position of being able to guarantee those who are dependent upon him, their education, their decent health, their leisure time, and their recreation. That is America's concept of full employment. The wage earner should work not only for himself but for his loved ones. He should work so that his children shall be properly trained and that there shall be a national aspiration for a more abundant life.

In the postwar period we must preserve for labor and for the underprivileged in our land each gain made as a result of legislation growing out of the depression and the war. The thoughtful person in America already condemns those legislators who killed our national planning organizations and who defeated my amendments calling for the completion of blueprints for works projects. As millions of soldier men and women are released almost at once and orders for war materials are canceled and great industries are stopped and huge armies of workers are thrown out of employment there will not be and cannot be time then for making blueprints and plans if Government action on a works program is to be used as a remedy. We are now not prepared because a narrow-sighted group lead by keen partisans killed the planning bills. If we enter into the reconversion period with a spirit of partisanship and a desire to gain political advantage, men, women, and children in our country are going to suffer when there is no need for their suffering.

Wealth is here; money is not scarce; investing capital is available. Why should it not be put to work? If men and women need work, why should not plans be ready that they may start upon a given project without waiting for the architect, the engineers, the bids and all of the red tape of governmental action? If we have won the war by cutting red tape and if the war will never be won unless the peace is won, who is hurt if we turn these great war techniques and improvements to the people in peacetime? No one is hurt. Perhaps I ought not to say that because the advantage-taker will be hurt, the exploiter will be hurt, the man who lives by his wits will be hurt, he who likes to make gains out of another's misery will be hurt; but the rank and file of the American men, women and children will not be hurt.

Some of our columnists are talking about the submerging of the New Dealers that the reconversion period must be a period where the practical shall lead us. That sounds very much like trying to go back to "normalcy" to me. You may want the glory of the "normal" periods of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover. Those periods of foolish investment and heart-breaking depression were more dulling to our national life than war itself. I do not think in terms of going back at all. If there is anyone in the Government of the United States who is ashamed of having attempted to bring about a more abundant life for the American people and who wants to revert to an advantage-taking era such persons may have their way, but I am not for it. I am not ashamed of idealism. I am not ashamed of using Government to increase the standards of living. I am not ashamed of any plan that will make life more abundant for all of our people. The kind of reconversion I want is reconversion that means conversion forward not backward, with the wealth we have produced used to the advantage of the American people and not to the advantage of the willful spender, the man who loves his expense accounts, likes his priorities, and enjoys his advantages and thinks never of another's rights.

Let us forget the "re" in reconversion. The "re" in latin means "back." Let us not admit that this war is not worth winning. Let us not accept the theory of any backward-looking person that labor and industry can go forward better in strife than they can go forward in mutuality. Keeping every social and economic gain for the average man is what is important. Do not ever belittle those who have kept their minds and their ideals on the attainment of a better and fuller life.

Compulsory Peacetime Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress magazine, and general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, of Washington, D. C., made an able statement at a hearing on Wednesday, June 13, 1945, before the Special House Committee on Postwar Military Policy, in which he opposed compulsory peacetime military training of American youth.

I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPULSORY MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Compulsory military conscription has an ominous sound. As an experiment, noble in purpose, it has been tried and found wanting. We need only look at Germany, where that policy has been in operation as in no other country, to witness its two crushing defeats within 25 years.

Nearly every country in history, from the days of Carthage and Rome to modern Germany, France, Italy, and Japan, that has built its security on the sword has each in turn suffered ignominious defeat. England, the one world power that has rejected that policy, has had fewer wars, and won more victories than them all, while America without it, has never suffered defeat. It still is true that "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

AN ARMED WORLD

Is the One World that we have been talking about, after World War II has been won by the United Nations and the Conference of Nations at San Francisco to promote peace has ended, to be an armed world? Not armed against Germany, a country we are told by the generals of the Allied Nations, is crushed beyond recuperation, to be stripped of military industries, and occupied by her conquerors indefinitely. Not armed against Japan which is to suffer extinction by more than twice the tonnage of bombs that crushed Germany. Certainly not armed against prostrate France and Italy or pacifist China. If we arm against Russia, Russia will assuredly arm against us.

THE BIG THREE

Our problem then is to employ the best means to protect ourselves in the future against our present friends, England and Russia. Would compulsory peacetime military training by America induce them to disarm?

Disregarding the stupendous financial burden, its effect upon ourselves, our youth, our homes, our schools, our churches, our future, and our good intention as a peace-loving Nation, we ask, Is compulsory military training of the Nation's youth the best way to win the confidence of our neighbors, our own security, and a just and durable peace?

We already have the answer of Russia to the announcement of the American plan. We say compulsory military training for 18-year-old boys; Russia responds with her proposal of compulsory military service for boys of 18 years and under, down to 14.

What will England say? Doubtless a Navy equal, if not superior, in tonnage and gunnage to the United States, and each nation will endeavor to secure preponderance of power in the air. Does that program spell peace?

It is the old plan of competitive armament, which has always resulted in war, usually the best armed taking the lead and suffering defeat.

NO SECURITY IN THE SWORD

Five thousand years of recorded history, and the armed civilizations that have perished in the march of time across the centuries have taught us there is no security in the sword. Even if it were true when nations were isolated, it is not true today when the world is one, and distance has been annihilated and oceanic frontiers have disappeared. Air power and not foot power will determine the outcome of future wars.

Twenty-five years ago the world engaged in a war that soaked its soil with tears and blood, at an uncounted cost in lives and material wealth, to end war, and since that time there have been 27 wars, not including World War II, the greatest war the earth has ever known.

EXPERT TESTIMONY

David Lloyd George said, "As long as the nations possess their weapons, and maintain great armies and build navies, there will be war." You cannot preserve peace by preparing for war. This is proven beyond question by a coverage of the history of the world for 3,250 years, during which time the nations have practiced preparedness for peace, or insurance against war, and have torn up 8,000 treaties of peace as reported by the Federal Bureau of Research.

Covering that period of 3,250 years we have had more than 3,000 years of war, and enjoyed only 236 years of purchased peace, under treaties of peace signed with a bayonet, as was the treaty of peace at Versailles, and the treaty of peace signed at Munich.

DEAF, DUMB, AND BLIND

Hitler said a few days before that surrender was signed, "I have built the greatest military machine in the history of the world; I will march on Saturday without further negotiations." Superarmaments made him arrogant. He marched without negotiation without a declaration of war. He did not extend the common courtesy of acknowledgment to the appeal for delay, for conference for peace made to him by the President, the Pope, the King of Belgium, the Queen of the Netherlands, Mussolini, and Gandhi.

MENACE OF MILITARISM

Hitler laughed them all to scorn. But no Nebuchadnezzar, no Belshazzar, no Caesar, no Alexander, no Napoleon, no Kaiser, and no Hitler ever laughed last. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh. The Lord shall have them in derision; for he seeth that their day is coming. * * * I will also laugh at their calamity and mock when their fear cometh."

Every one of them paid the price of preparedness for peace with weapons of war and their empires built upon bayonets and gun powder, perished. Militarism is not protection, it is provocation; it is not insurance, it is insanity; it is not security, it is suicide; it is not preparedness for peace, it is a guarantee of war. You cannot preserve peace by preparing for war.

PEACE PLAN PROPOSED

Is there any escape from this recurrent disaster? Is there any sure cure for the disease of war? "Behold, I show you a more excellent way." The Christ plan for peace, a cure without a crutch, a remedy without a relapse; a peace without a putsch; a treaty without a trench; security without a sword; a remedy that will cure the disease, as recorded in the Forty-sixth Psalm. "He maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth; he breaketh the bow, he cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still and know that I am God; I will be exalted among the nations, I will be exalted in the earth. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge."

THE CHRIST CURE

The Christ cure for war is by the destruction of the machinery of war. The Christ cure for war is universal disarmament by international agreement to become effective at one and the same time in justice to all. It is safe and sane, fair to all and exposes none. It is reasonable, sensible and practicable. It is a world remedy for a world disease, as Lincoln said, "a plaster as big as the sore."

If the nations can unite to make war they can unite to end war; if they can unite their armies to win wars, they can unite their interests to prevent war; if they can limit by agreement, they can end by agreement; if they can associate for war, they can federate for peace.

PUT UP THY SWORD

The Christ cure for war was stated in four words in the shadow of the cross. Surrounded by armed foes who came under the cover of night to take him, Simon Peter, suiting action to his word, exclaimed, "Lord shall we smite with the sword?" Swift came the answer, "Put up thy sword!" There will be found no other way, other foundation can no man lay; if the world would have peace it must obey the command of the Prince of Peace. It must choose between Christ and chaos, between disarmament and death.

Safety first among the nations demands that the sword be sheathed not sharpened. Huge standing armies, great munition factories, private profit in the manufacture of weapons of destruction and a trained war machine which grows impatient by inaction has only one ending—war, with the people to furnish the boys for slaughter and the survivors to suffer its terrors and pay the crushing bills that follow in its wake. Away with it! The war-ridden peoples of the world want no more of it. Our only world security is peace through the Prince of Peace. Compulsory peacetime military training of the nation's youth is not compatible with "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." Preparing boys for war does not make for good will among men.

MEN MADE BY FIAT

When and how does a boy become a man? He is not regarded as an adult with the right to vote until he has reached his majority. He cannot enter into binding legal contracts until he has reached 21.

Neither his parents, his associates, his buddies, his teachers, nor the community regard the male entering his eighteenth year as a man. Even the wars of ancient time, including those mentioned in the Old Testament between the armies of Israel and their heathen enemies, males were not inducted for military service until after they had reached 20.

But let a war break out between the most highly civilized peoples, professing to be Christian, and the boys of 18, by military fiat, have become men.

Millions of these boys have not outgrown their adolescence, their voices have not yet reached maturity, and they have scarcely reached the state of physical and mental accountability. They are boys.

If the plan is to send these 18-year-old boys from home for a year's training in military camps which encourage profanity, cigarette smoking, beer drinking, and sex promiscuity by supplying them with contraceptives when they leave camp, as is being done now, we are opposed to compulsory military training—even at the risk of defeat in battle. They might better die than be damned. We do not believe that polluted bodies, reprobate minds, and unregenerate souls are shot into heaven by the guns of the enemy, as is taught by pagan Japan, or that suicide is the key to the kingdom.

If we must have compulsory military training, leave the lads in school and at home, and conscript the youth above the Mosaic law: "And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, 'Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel every male from 20 years old and upward; all that are able to go forth to war in Israel.'"

THE CHURCH HAS A STAKE

Also it is important that the church considers the effect of such environment, training, and teaching, upon the Sunday schools which are the nursery of the church. Many of these boys subjected to their new military environment after a year of absence are unlikely to return to their Sunday schools and church attendance on their return home, even though they never see army service. Such examples are not wanting, and if the plan proposed is to become universal, the cost to the church is bound to be eternal.

We are not isolationists, we are not pacifists, but we do not believe in adopting compulsory peace-time military training for our 18-year-old boys, when 50 nations are cooperating to find some method of securing a just and durable peace. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." David prayed, "Scatter Thou the people that delight in war." We are unable to convince ourselves that the way to make peace is to prepare for war.

The National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the Reverend George G. Higgins of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference entitled "Somebody's Wrong About the Wagner Act" which appeared last week in his column, The Yardstick.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YARDSTICK—CATHOLIC TESTS OF A SOCIAL ORDER

(By the Reverend George G. Higgins, social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference)

SOMEBODY'S WRONG ABOUT THE WAGNER ACT

Students of industrial relations will value highly the farewell message of Dr. Harry Millis, written a few weeks ago as a family letter to his colleagues on the National Labor Relations Board on the occasion of his retirement to private life. Few men are better qualified than the retiring Chairman of the Board to speak with discernment and authority on the meaning and importance of the National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act) in American economic society. Dr. Millis writes against a background of academic and practical experience with labor relations which has extended over a long lifetime and has firmly established his reputation as an expert in the very best sense of the word.

His parting tribute to the immeasurable importance of this act—which celebrated its tenth birthday almost simultaneously with the publication of his letter—is reminiscent of an earlier tribute from the pen of another pioneer and another expert who belongs, roughly, to Millis' tradition, as well as to his generation—Msgr. John A. Ryan. "The National Labor Relations Act," Millis writes, "is without precedent in scope or promise in the history of our Nation. In fact, there has been no similar enactment on the statute books of any other country." In 1941, in his autobiography, Social Doctrine in Action, Monsignor Ryan had said substantially the same thing. "The National Labor Relations Act * * * is probably the most just, beneficent, and far-reaching piece of labor legislation ever enacted in the United States."

TOUCHES FUNDAMENTALS

The Wagner Act is deserving of such hyperbole for the simple reason that, more than any other piece of labor legislation in the history of the United States, it goes down to fundamentals. It assumes—in the face of the sterile cynicism of its ultra-conservative critics—that we cannot even begin to solve the economic problem until we have guaranteed to labor the free and untrammeled exercise of its most basic economic right, the right to organize into free trade unions of its own choosing. History will perceive, perhaps even more clearly than Dr. Millis, how essential the Wagner Act was, and is, in the process of constructing a thoroughly democratic society which will be worthy of Christian men and acceptable to the Christian conscience.

The act is important, of course, to labor, but by no means to labor alone. It has a meaning for society as a whole, a meaning which Dr. Millis has expressed as follows, with a clarity and a discernment which somehow have been denied to such a considerable section of American industrialists: "Unless collective bargaining is developed and is successful in industry, it is unlikely that the masses of the people will receive that training in discussion, patience, tolerance, and acceptance of majority decision necessary for the development of a stable and efficient representative government."

TAKE YOUR CHOICE

In the light of Dr. Millis' reasoned and experienced judgment, it comes as a shock to discover that a much-publicized movement is under way, which, if successful, will, in a measure at least, emasculate the Wagner Act and hamper its effectiveness. The so-called Ball-Burton-Hatch Federal Industrial Relations Act (B_2H) among other undesirable features, suggests that great numbers of workers who are now protected under the Wagner Act be withdrawn from its jurisdiction and left to fend for themselves. This it would do by exempting certain sizable industries and professions from coverage and by retreating to a narrow interpretation of "interstate commerce" which betrays a lamentable ignorance of the facts of American economic life.

Take your choice: Dr. Millis, Monsignor Ryan, and the vast majority of social scientists insists that economic democracy must be expanded in the scope of its functions and extended in its numerical coverage. B_2H, to the best of my understanding of its technical language, says just the opposite. Somebody's wrong.

Result of Gallup Poll on Questions of Interest to the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation described as the result of the Gallup poll on questions of interest to the Army.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESULT OF GALLUP POLL ON QUESTIONS OF INTEREST TO THE ARMY

1. Can you tell me what jobs the Army Service Forces do?

Sixty-three percent said they do not know. Fewer than one in five seem to have an even approximately right idea.

2. In general, would you rate the job that the Army has done in the following matters as excellent, good, or poor? How about providing the equipment, has the Army done an excellent, good, or poor job? Tables are arranged in order of enthusiasm.

	Excellent	Good	Poor	Don't know
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Providing proper medical care?	61	34	1	4
Providing the best equipment?	63	30	1	6
Seeing men get the right food and clothing?	40	50	4	6
Giving men proper basic training?	40	45	7	8
Being fair to soldiers who have broken rules or committed crimes?	28	44	7	21
Ordering the right amount of food and war materials?	30	49	12	29
Deciding which soldiers should be sent to fight Japan?	21	42	7	30
Disposing of material the Army doesn't need?	9	28	29	34

3. What is your guess as to how many men we should have? (To fight the war in the Pacific.)

Median guess, four and one-half to five million.

4. If Japan were to agree to move her troops out of China and the Pacific islands and stay in her own homeland, should we make peace with her or should we go on fighting although it may mean the loss of several hundred thousand American soldiers?

	Percent
Make peace	37
Go on fighting	56
No opinion	7

5. Should our troops invade the main Japanese homeland or should we wait until the Navy and Air Forces have beaten them down and starved them out?

	Percent
Invade	26
Wait	58
No opinion	16

6. Some people say that our Army leaders will try to run this country after the war. Do you believe this?

	Percent
Yes	9
No	74
Don't know	17

7. If war veterans get organized after this war into a strong political group, do you think that would be a good thing or a bad thing for the country?

	Percent
Good	44
Bad	30
Don't know	26

8. In general, do you have any criticism in the way the Army has handled men and material?

Seventy-eight percent had no criticism whatsoever.

Twenty-two percent mentioned various things headed by the general category of waste which represents 12 out of the 22 percent.

9. Do you think the point system for releasing men from the Army is fair?

	Percent
Yes	72
No	15
No opinion	13

Tentative conclusions:

1. Criticism of the manner in which the Army has handled men and material is encouragingly low.

2. The public is least critical about medical care and equipment; most critical about the disposal of material. In this connection, it is worth pointing out that the public generally thinks the Army disposes of material and doesn't know that this part of the job is handled by Government agencies.

3. By and large, no substantial differences were found amongst those persons who have an immediate member of their family in the service, those who have a relative in the service, and those who have no relative in the service.

4. Fear that Army leaders will try to run the country after the war is held by a small number of persons. In fact, there is some indication that the public hopes that veterans will take an important part in the affairs of the country after the war and that their influence will be good rather than bad.

5. There is a fairly substantial minority which believes that we should make peace with Japan if Japan agrees to move her troops out of China and Pacific islands and stay in her own homeland. This sentiment is undoubtedly higher than sentiment toward Germany at a comparable period of time.

Salt and Weeds as Cattle Feeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune entitled "Grangeville Farmer Lures Cattle to Graze on Weeds Which Have Been Lightly Salted to Provide Flavor." It strikes me it is an excellent plan to induce cattle to feed on salted weeds.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRANGEVILLE FARMER LURES CATTLE TO GRAZE ON WEEDS WHICH HAVE BEEN LIGHTLY SALTED TO PROVIDE FLAVOR

CRAIGMONT, July 11.—Sodium chloride (common table salt to most of us) has entered the picture as a possible weed eradicator, according to report from H. J. Lechner, agronomist for the Charles Lilly Seed Co. here.

Lechner bases his prediction partly on experiments conducted by Ben Baker, pioneer farmer of the Grangeville area, who saved himself a lot of hard work by flavoring teasel burdock and other weeds in a lightly pastured hillside with hay salt.

"My observations show the test to be a complete success," said the agronomist. "It seems that during the test a neighbor's cow, in the pasture at the time of the experiment, later went home to demonstrate her weed-eating reeducation to her owner.

"Mr. Baker applied a light salt treatment on the weeds to make them attractive to cattle appetites. He says he applies the salt when there is a slight dew so some of it clings to the plant. This is done when the plants are young. It occurs to me that a liquid application, if not put on too strong, may have some advantages."

GOAT WEED TESTED

Goat weed (St. John's wort) also might yield to such treatment Baker reported to Lechner. If applied in time the salt application might go a long way toward elimination of that pest although treatment would be difficult on rocky hillsides, Baker said. Lechner reported Baker's sidehill pasture demonstrated that the blue grass won out against goat weed this year. The treatment would be particularly successful where sheep are grazed, in the opinion of the Grangeville farmer.

"In my observation there was a better chance to see the success of the salt appetizer on the teasel," said Lechner. "This is a tall-growing weed which when ripe has long terminal burs. These burs once were used to produce the downy finish to blankets."

CATTLE LIKE SALTED WEEDS

"A fact that seems to deserve special emphasis is that the salt flavoring made the weeds a preferred diet to grazing cattle. Blue grass was plentiful while the young teasel plants were eaten down closely.

"Often deep concern has been expressed to me about this or that weed 'taking the country.' There is no mistaking the fact that there are some good grounds for such a fear, but there also is another side—a side that might indicate that such fears might better be replaced by a better understanding not only of control, but of nature's reasons for seemingly loading us up with this sort of trouble.

"We use weedicides to help in the battle against weeds; some of these are chemicals that poison the soil; others—some new ones—seem to be a matter of giving an excess hormone treatment with the idea of getting a kill by giving the plant too much of a good thing. Giving hormones to a plant may be good, if not done to excess."

The Peace We Want—A Continuing Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] entitled "The Peace We Want—A Continuing Peace," which was published in the magazine section of the New York Times of July 22, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEACE WE WANT—A CONTINUING PEACE

(By J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Senator from Arkansas)

WASHINGTON.—The destiny of a people is indeed strange and inscrutable. With no desire for it and without seeking it, America today finds herself under the heavy responsibility of leading the world, from the devastation of war, along the path of freedom and of peace. The genius of her people, who came to this New World to escape the turmoil and tyranny of the old, has relentless charged them with the obligation of redeeming that Old World. Perhaps it is just that this should be so.

One may well ask why it is that America has this responsibility. The short answer, in the words of a famous American, is that we no longer have a New and an Old World, we have one world.

America's responsibility to furnish leadership for this world springs from the fact that she has been the most fortunate Nation in recorded history. A great and rich land, unequaled in the wealth of its minerals and in the fertility of its soils, was nature's contribution to that good fortune. But of far greater importance than the soil itself was the character of the people who came to this land from the countries of the Old World, and the fact that they brought with them a civilization of the highest order. We must not forget that our language, our religion, our system of law, and our social institutions had their origin in these foreign lands. As a Nation, we are the beneficiary of countless centuries of struggle and suffering, by other peoples, for human freedom. In a real sense we are the heirs of western Christian civilization.

There is, I believe, a law of compensation in these matters, and the time has now arrived for us to make our great contribution to that civilization. We must make that contribution by supplying, in our turn, that vital spark of leadership indispensable to human progress. Progress in the affairs of mankind does not happen just by chance. It happens as the result of wise and enlightened leadership. Without such leadership there is stagnation and confusion such as we had in the Dark Ages. Without such leadership the world drifted into this war, in which only by the narrowest of margins have we avoided a return to the barbarism of those Dark Ages.

The civilization to which we must devote our leadership is not, as some suppose, a vague and idealistic formula. On the contrary it is the essence of our way of living, the only way worthy of a freeman. The basic concept of this way of life is the integrity and dignity of the individual human being. This concept is the core of our Declaration of Independence, it is the principal concern of our Bill of Rights, it is inherent in our system of justice, and it is the underlying purpose of our Government. It is not a mere coincidence that the dominant characteristic of the German Fascists is precisely the opposite. The heart of the Fascist doctrine is that the individual is of no consequence whatever, as an individual. That monstrous abstraction, called the state, is the principal object of their reverence. By means of this doctrine they sought, and succeeded in, the enslavement of their own people as well as of their neighbors. They resurrected the ancient and barbarous social order of master and slave, with the brutal Nazi as the master.

These distinctions in doctrine are not academic or theoretical, as so many seem to think. Organized warfare with all its suffering and death is but one of the fruits of fascism. The calculated starvation of millions of women and children, the practically universal spread of disease, the disruption of orderly economic life, and the destruction of irreplaceable natural resources like iron, zinc, copper, and oil; these effects are not mere theories, they are facts.

The corrosive effect of fascism upon the faith and moral standards of people, while more subtle than physical destruction, is even more dangerous to civilized life.

It is far easier to repopulate the world and to rebuild the cities than it is to re-create in the minds and hearts of men honesty, tolerance, and justice. If we value these things, if we desire freedom and decency for our children, if we want them to be men and women rather than numbers in a system, then we must exercise, to the fullest extent of our powers, the leadership which Providence has thrust upon us. There is no other way to avoid war. There is no other way to have a reasonable chance for peace and happiness for ourselves and our children. Surely it is no longer necessary to labor the point at this late date that America must and will exercise its leadership in world affairs. The question now is how should she exercise that leadership?

Already the initial steps have been taken. The successful sponsorship of Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco Conference is evidence of our intentions. There isn't the slightest doubt about the ratification of the Charter by the Senate. The danger, however, will then confront us that our people may conclude that peace has been established, that the job is done. So much publicity has been given to the Charter that we are likely to overestimate its powers.

The adoption of the Charter will not bring peace. The establishment and maintenance of peace is a process which must go on from year to year. It is a continuing process that will require the greatest wisdom and patience that man possesses. In that process there is no room for the prejudices and petty provincialism that we have nurtured through the years. It will be especially difficult for America to adjust its prejudices and its way of thinking about its relations with foreign peoples, largely because we have had so little to do with them in the past, and know so little about their culture and character. The very fact that as a nation we have been so successful in such a relatively short time tends to make us impatient with the weaknesses of other, less fortunate people.

An example of what I mean by "our way of thinking" is our conception of our aims in this war, and in the last war. We have felt that our only concern was to defend our country from attack. We had the defensive point of view. We had defense plants and we sold defense bonds. But before we achieved victory we had to give up that defensive strategy and had to carry the war to the enemy. For a like reason we must be aggressive in the cause of peace. We must have a positive, creative approach. We must focus our energies upon the task of creating a new conception of peace if we are to have a more decent world.

Peace is not a state of repose; it is a continuous process of achievement. The world is not a static organism, and it requires constant revision and new methods of adjustment, or it will periodically explode. If we approach the task of peace with this attitude and use our influence to create and promote a better world order, rather than to defend the status quo, I have no doubt that we may find the proper solution to our problem.

I do not suggest that everything about the status quo should be discarded. On the contrary, most of it is good. It is simply a question of general evolutionary development as opposed to violent and revolutionary change, which often as not is retrogressive rather than progressive, because violence rather than reason is the dominant force. It will be hard for Americans to be patient in such a process. By habit and taste we like to move far and fast.

In pursuing this evolutionary policy, we ought to recognize at the outset that events have decided, and we have recognized, that all nations are interdependent. This means that events and circumstances in all parts of the world are of interest to us and may concern our peace and safety. I do not mean that we should meddle in everyone's internal affairs. There is no rule of thumb, no easy way, to determine in advance exactly when our vital interests are endangered. Constantly with shrewd and penetrating minds, we must examine events all over the world. We must not forget that a shot fired in Serajevo and an incident at Peking were the sparks that set the world afire. We are, and must recognize the fact that we are, interested in the arrangements in the Dardanelles, in Iran, in Manchuria, and in Poland, just as we are in Mexico and Argentina. We cannot expect to obtain every time the exact settlements we wish, but always we should exert our influence positively on the side of, and in accord with, what we believe to be the right.

It has been a common fallacy that honesty and morality have no place in international relations. It is true that in this field there have, in the past, been few rules of conduct generally accepted by all the nations. But in our effort to establish such rules it is indispensable that we recognize the necessity for moral conduct, for nations as well as for individuals. We shall have many disappointments; but one thing is certain, and that is that no system can be built on cynicism.

We must, as a people, develop a foreign policy firmly based upon deep conviction on principles which we believe to have enduring validity. If we must compromise those principles it should be through necessity only, and not through pure opportunism. For example, we may have to do a limited amount of business with the colonels of Argentina through necessity, but I can see no excuse for taking them to our bosom and sponsoring them before the world as worthy of our respect and friendship. The same can be said of Franco. We need not expect perfection of our representatives, but we should not tolerate hypocrisy and pretense.

It has been said that the five big nations are hypocritical in insisting upon the veto power in the Security Council and, at the same time, professing devotion to democratic principles in the Charter.

The fault is not in the insistence upon the inequality of the veto power as between the large and small nations. The fault lies in the pretense that all nations regardless of power or any other circumstances are equally sovereign. Sovereignty is an uncertain and obsolete concept and very likely to make trouble when used in official documents. It is unfortunate that it is used in the San Francisco Charter as it will continue to cause confusion and misunderstanding. The common argument about the impairment of our sovereignty is a fruitless quibble.

In undertaking to exercise leadership in world affairs, all of us should recognize that we are abandoning our traditional policy of isolation, of nonintervention, of no alliances and practically no commitments. That was a simple policy to understand and to apply. The trouble with it is that it was ineffective, and disastrous to our own security. In order to discharge our new responsibility it is essential that we develop a long-term policy in accord with our long-term national interest so that our diplomats may be guided in their daily decisions.

An example of the indecision that results from an apparent lack of settled policy is our conduct toward Germany. For many months we have known that we must participate in the government of Germany, yet no practical plans were made and we seem to be confused and ineffective in our administration. We made excellent plans for the war in Germany but none for the peace.

It has been said, apparently with some truth, that our Government has no well-defined policy regarding this and many other

situations around the world. We cannot have a policy until we know what we want or what we are willing to accept and the nature of the desires of the other powers. The divergent views of the various nations must be known before they can be reconciled and understandings arrived at. Until we clarify our own mind, not only toward Germany and the other enemy countries, but also toward our allies, we cannot help solve the multitude of problems in Europe, in the Middle East, and in Asia.

In other words, it is time for us to apply our principles to specific cases. The longer we put off the decisions the more difficult they become and the more likely are we to be confronted with accomplished facts not of our making. Instead of leading, we shall be tagging along in the procession.

We may not obtain all that we desire in the settlements, even though we know what we want, but it is certain that we shall obtain no satisfaction if we are uncertain as to our own purposes. The time is here when we can no longer postpone fundamental decisions which will shape the future of the world for decades to come. The agreement in the Charter is a beginning, but it is only a skeleton machinery, and flesh and blood must be added rapidly if it is to be a living organism.

As a supplement to the Charter, treaties should be made with France, Great Britain, China, and Russia on all those subjects of vital importance to the preservation of peace which lie outside the purview of the Charter. It goes without saying that our policy must be based upon close and friendly cooperation with these great countries. This policy is no longer the balance of power, it is the preponderance of power organized upon a mutual cooperative basis. The principal danger to its permanence and success is our indecision about Germany. Even a demilitarized Germany will exert every effort toward the destruction of our alliances and the splitting of the United Nations. She will employ the same ruthlessness and thoroughness in this task as she did in the murder of her neighbors.

The only light that has been thrown on our policy toward Germany was Justice Jackson's report to President Truman on the trial of war criminals. This was an excellent document containing the most original and forward-looking doctrine on the outlawry of war thus far published. His thesis is that aggressive warfare is in itself an illegal act, a crime against human society and all those who instigate it are criminals per se.

If the doctrine therein developed is applied as a political matter, great progress will have been made. On the other hand, if the trials are conducted according to our customary court procedure, they are certain to bog down and become a farce. Positive and decisive action must be taken soon if it is to be effective. It is difficult for us to grasp the significance of the Nazi doctrine and to bring ourselves to the distasteful decision to destroy men, even though they deserve it. Our humanity causes us to hesitate to do what our intelligence tells us is necessary.

I have tried to indicate only a few of the problems involved in the exercise of leadership in world affairs. It is in effect a problem of translating into principles for the guidance of our representatives the same basic principles which we believe to be valid in domestic affairs. If we deal fairly and openly, with sincerity and firmness, I have no doubt that our influence will be respected. It is as foolish to be overgenerous as it is to be niggardly in our dealings. A reasonable and moderate course, in business or in charity, will be understood and appreciated by all in the course of time.

The issue of primary importance now, and in the future, is the attitude of the American people. They must never waver in their determination to prevent war. They cannot shrink from the necessity, and the probability, of drastic action of a preventive or anticipatory nature. Words and polite notes will not serve. Rapid shifts from participation to isolation will be disastrous. Our leadership in world affairs must be nonpartisan; it must have the persistent and wholehearted support of the majority of the American people if it is to succeed. It is a responsibility that we will neglect at our peril and the peril of all future generations.

The Northwest Needs a CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation of three articles appearing in the Nation under date of June 2, June 9, and June 23, 1945, by Carey McWilliams, entitled "The Northwest Needs a CVA." At one point in the articles Mr. McWilliams refers to the Reclamation Conference held at Denver in November of 1944, and he says that the private power interests were in control of that meeting. I want to back him up in that statement. I was present at the meeting. The people of the Northwest are very much interested in this proposition of a CVA, and I feel that having these articles printed in the RECORD will enable them more thoroughly to acquaint themselves with the subject.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTHWEST NEEDS A CVA

(By Carey McWilliams)

(A condensation of three articles appearing in the Nation of June 2, 9, and 23, 1945)

NEW JOBS NEEDED

At the end of the war the people of the Pacific Northwest face not a problem but an emergency of major proportions. In this region postwar adjustment will require a redistribution of population, a rapid development of resources, and a general reorganization of the economy. Other war-industry centers are concerned with shifting war workers to peacetime jobs; in the Northwest the problem is to create the jobs. The talk here is not of reconversion but of possible new industries, not of adjustment but of regional development.

Since the beginning of the war the labor force of the region has increased 50 percent—the interior areas have been drained of manpower by the war industries on the coast. The chief war industries are shipbuilding, aircraft manufacture, and light metals, in all of which severe cut-backs are clearly foreseeable. New jobs must somehow be found for 500,000 war workers and veterans. That means that the region will have to produce goods and services worth $8,000,000,000 a year and provide around 2,300,000 jobs of one kind or another. Since its resources are largely undeveloped, an enormous investment program will be required. And since the economy is already out of balance, there must be unified regional development. Both requirements demand a plan and a planning agency.

Plans for the task are in existence—on paper and in broad outline. The seven-point program calls for (1) preparing some two and a half million acres of land for development; (2) developing a river transportation system to provide the Inland Empire with cheap and easy access to the sea; (3) harnessing the region's vast sources of hydroelectric power; (4) exploring its untapped mineral wealth; (5) creating, in the Northwest, a power technology region in which the electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries of the West would be concentrated; (6) protecting and stabilizing the fishing and lumbering industries; and (7) exploiting the unlimited possibilities of the region as a tourist and recreational area. Each and every phase of this plan depends upon the unified development of the Columbia River and its tributaries; power is the key to the entire accomplishment. As Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, has said, the task is one of unification—involving the unified, balanced development of a river basin and its resources, envisioned in their entirety.

* * * * *

As a great river system, the Columbia calls for unified, organic development. All of the uses to which the river can be put should be considered in relation to the development of the region as a whole. A planning function of this kind cannot be ladled out, a little to this agency, a little to that. Yet the Federal agencies that are interested in some phase of the Columbia River are too numerous to mention. The aims of these agencies are not identical; their functions overlap, and with the exception of the Bonneville Power Administration they are operated from Washington as straight-line Government agencies. It is fantastic to assume that these various agencies, with a little gentle compulsion, can prepare a master plan for the region or that they could jointly execute a plan if one were prepared. The matter of soils, for example, is of interest to several agencies within the Department of Agriculture, but it is also of interest to the Bureau of Reclamation, the General Land Office, the Geological Survey, the Grazing Service, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. River development concerns the Bureau of Reclamation, the Geological Survey, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Army Engineers, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. Water and minerals concern a host of agencies. Underlying the whole problem, moreover, is the important question of enlisting the cooperation of State and local agencies. With whom are those agencies to cooperate?

To meet this general situation, Senator HUGH MITCHELL, of Washington, on February 4, 1945, introduced Senate bill No. 460 to creatae a public corporation to be known as the Columbia Valley Authority. The corporation would be governed by a board of three directors to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Within 2 years after its establishment the authority would be required to submit a master plan for the development of the region within certain policy objectives set forth in the act. The functions, facilities, and personnel of the Bonneville Power Administration would be completely absorbed in the new organization, and other Federal agencies would be authorized to participate in CVA activities on mutually agreeable terms. The CVA would have the right to acquire private power facilities, but it would be obliged to sell the distribution facilities so acquired as rapidly as possible to local public agencies. It could obtain the transfer, upon request, of other water-controlled projects. It would be authorized to dispose of surplus electric energy in accordance with established Federal policies. It would have broad powers in relation to power development, flood control, reclamation, and navigation. Whether Senator MITCHELL'S bill is preferable to the Murray bill or the Rankin bill may be debatable;

that it can be improved and clarified is altogether probable; but that some such authority is needed is indisputable.

* * * * *

The crucial question today is who is to control the distribution and utilization of the staggering power potential of the Columbia River system. At the present time Grand Coulee and Bonneville generate 1,350,000 kilowatts of power at the lowest wholesale rate in America—$17.50 per kilowatt-year. With the construction of the additional dams planned, this output will be increased by more than 1,000,000 kilowatts, and the Northwest will then have more hydroelectric power than was produced in the rest of the United States before the war.

That cheap Bonneville power will be attractive to municipally operated systems in the Northwest is illustrated by the experience of McMinnville, Oreg., a town of some 4,000 people, the center of a prosperous farming community. McMinnville has one of the oldest municipal power systems in Oregon. Since 1924, by using Diesel engines, it has been able to produce power more cheaply than it could buy it from the private utilities. It was compelled, however, to set aside 24 cents out of every revenue dollar for new equipment and repairs. When it obtains Bonneville power, the city will not only be relieved of this necessity but will be able to effect a 40-percent reduction in rates to commercial and a 20-percent reduction to residential consumers.

Other markets exist and can unquestionably be developed. The Northwest has long suffered from a lack of fuel. The development of space heating would find a large market and would greatly stimulate the service industries. Irrigation pumping, the use of electricity to generate steam for industrial processes, railroad electrification, the increased use of electricity in manufacturing and service industries, and the great possibilities of power on the farm, all promise to provide expanding markets. But the prompt and full development of these markets presupposes the existence of an agency equipped with more than the marketing function which is the only one that has been assigned to the BPA.

A rapid development of these markets must be forced, not only to prevent the waste of public power but to stimulate industrial expansion in the Northwest. The vast supply of cheap Government power must be used dynamically, as the key to unlock the resources of the area. Power can be made to pay the bill for improved navigation, for reclamation, for the stimulation of new industries (through pilot-plant operations), for the exploitation of mineral resources.

In support of their economy argument the private utility companies will contend that since the rates they charge for power are subject to regulation, it is really immaterial who distributes the power. There are many fallacies in this argument, but it will suffice here to point out that, given their present stock structure and bonded indebtedness, even the most efficiently operated private utilities cannot pass on to the public the benefits arising from an abundance of cheap public power. Nor are cheap rates the only issue. In a region like the Northwest the way in which power is used is probably as important as the rates charged; if properly used, power will act as a magnet to attract a healthy distribution of population and industry. The private utilities will also contend, of course, that lower Government rates merely reflect the fact that Government agencies enjoy tax exemption. But if the Bonneville Power Administration enjoys tax exemption, the concerns which its power has attracted to the Northwest do not. One site in the Spokane area on which an aluminum plant has been built paid only $42.05 in taxes in 1943; in 1944, with the plant installed, it paid $88,435.21.

The case for the immediate establishment of a regional authority in the Columbia Valley is so compelling that no special anxiety over the fate of the proposal would be justified if two important Federal agencies had not surreptitiously alined themselves with the utilities.

* * * * *

Though they are traditionally rival agencies, the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have formed an agreement to oppose the creation of river-valley authorities. Their chief purpose is to forestall a Missouri Valley Authority, but their opposition extends to one for the Columbia.

Both the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are old-established, highly centralized agencies, with powerful political connections formed over a period of years. Both regard their traditional policies and procedures with a semireligious veneration. Within the limitations of this attitude, both agencies are efficiently operated and can be credited with truly impressive accomplishments. Enduring examples of the great work they have done may be found throughout the West. In the past they have frequently clashed over matters of policy, but the opposition which they share to integrated regional authorities has effected a reconciliation. Both organizations are today conducting an under-cover campaign against the various proposals to create a Columbia Valley Authority, particularly Senator HUGH MITCHELL'S Senate bill No. 460. The Bureau of Reclamation has always regarded power development as incidental to reclamation; the Army engineers have always thought of it as incidental to navigation and flood control. It is quite natural that the two agencies should be critical of proposals fundamentally at variance with their respective philosophies. But their clandestine alliance with various special-interest groups constitutes a major public scandal.

The link between these agencies and the private interests that oppose a CVA is the National Reclamation Association and its State and regional affiliates. Since "reclamation" is a magic word in the West, the association provides the perfect front for the forces fighting river authorities. For many years the National Reclamation Association has been an arm—more accurately the "private lobby"—of the Bureau of Reclamation. Its officials have always worked in close collaboration with the Commissioner of Reclamation. Like the Bureau, the association is interested not in power development but in old-style, single-purpose reclamation projects. It was once a vital and progressive force, but the dirt farmers of the West have gradually withdrawn from membership, and today both the national association and its affiliates are dominated by the railroads and the private-power interests.

The campaign against the CVA was launched at the convention of the National Reclamation Association held at Denver in November 1944. It was apparent to the genuine reclamationists at this meeting that the private power interests were in control. Two basic themes were emphasized—opposition to regional authorities, including a CVA, and praise for the concordant between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Adoption at this meeting of a resolution opposing valley authorities and recommending river development by existing agencies was followed by the adoption of similar resolutions at meetings of the branch organizations.

At these State and regional meetings "the private power boys" were again much in evidence. The chairman of the resolutions committee at the Oregon Reclamation Congress, for example, was the attorney and principal lobbyist for the Pacific Power & Light Co. At a regional meeting held in Spokane a representative of the Washington Water Power Co. acted as page and doorkeeper, and the company supplied the stenographic service.

High-ranking officials of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation also attended the meetings. When called upon to present the point of view of the Bureau of Reclamation on river-valley authorities, one prominent official declined to speak on the ground that the issue was too hot. The Army engineers, however, unhampered by any connection with the Department of the Interior, have not hesitated to make known their views. At a recent meeting of the Montana Reclamation Association, Col. Conrad P. Hardy, district engineer, exclaimed: "While our young men are giving their lives in this war, are we going to let fascism be set up right in this country? Although river authorities are not Fascist in name, they are Fascist in character." The general strategy of the fight against a CVA was prepared at these meetings, and the delegates were repeatedly assured that "ample funds" would be forthcoming to finance the campaign. At the Oregon meeting speakers suggested that the Power Division of the Department of the Interior be abolished and its functions returned to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Next the various State legislatures were urged to go on record against a CVA. A memorial asking Congress to defeat "any bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority" was approved by the Oregon legislature after it had "studied" Senator HUGH MITCHELL'S bill for exactly 10 minutes. This memorial was introduced at the request of the Oregon Reclamation Association (Portland Oregonian, March 3). A regional meeting of the the reclamation association was held in Spokane on March 9 for the specific purpose of organizing a grass-roots campaign against a CVA. As a result, resolutions and petitions against Senator MITCHELL'S bill were adopted by civic groups, chambers of commerce, and similar organizations throughout the Northwest.

Thus a number of interests are lined up against the CVA; two old-line Government agencies, with many "friends" throughout the West; the private power interests and the railroads, working through the various reclamation associations; the reclamation associations themselves; the chamber of commerce; and many absentee-owned or controlled industries.

They stress the difference between the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia Valley. Admittedly such differences exist. Soil erosion and flood control were important considerations in the Tennessee Valley; neither is a major problem in the Northwest. Irrigation was not greatly needed in the Tennessee Valley; it is of paramount importance in the Columbia Basin. The development of domestic water supplies was a need in the Tennessee Valley; it is not particularly urgent in the Columbia Valley. Fishing and lumbering, minor factors in the Tennessee Valley, are major industries in the Northwest. There were no preexisting reclamation projects in the Tennessee as there are in the Columbia Valley, and the problem of Government lands was not involved. In considering the powers to be granted to a Columbia Valley Authority these differences should be carefully examined, but they should not be permitted to obscure the necessity for regional planning. It was required in the Tennessee Valley to rehabilitate an area; it is required in the Northwest to develop an area.

The really important difference between the two regions lies in the fact that existing Government agencies had confessed their inability to solve the problems of the Tennessee Valley. The TVA did not have to cope with the opposition of such powerful agencies as the Bureau of Reclamation and the Forestry Service. While Mr. Ickes, by his support of river-valley authorities, has indicated a commendable willingness to permit

the reorganization of the Department of the Interior, his subordinates will stubbornly resist such proposals.

Children's Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the reprint of an editorial entitled "Children's Museum," published in the Washington (D. C.) Post of Tuesday, July 17, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILDREN'S MUSEUM

In our opinion Norman M. Littell, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division of the Department of Justice, has made an impressive case against the legality of the sale of the Villa Rosa property on Massachusetts Avenue to Mr. and Mrs. Sam Eig. This property was taken over from the District government by the Defense Homes Corporation in exchange for a site in McLean Gardens believed more appropriate than the Villa Rosa site for the construction of a school. Even before title to the property had been obtained, it was sold, without advertising for bids, to a private real-estate promoter for purposes in no way connected with the wartime emergency.

Whether the Defense Homes Corporation be considered a subsidiary of the RFC or an entity deriving its authority from the Appropriations Act authorizing the President to expend emergency funds, Mr. Littell says, "a fundamental restriction on its activities remains." Philip M. Klutznick, president of the DHC, has admitted that its authority to purchase and sell real estate "may not be exercised except for the sole purpose of the national security and defense and the successful prosecution of the war." The executive committee of the RFC had pointed out that "the Massachusetts Avenue tract was not needed for any purpose of the Defense Homes Corporation." It would be foolish to assume that the sale of this property, now occupied by the Children's Museum, for private real estate development was in any way connected with the war effort.

In the circumstances it seems clear to us that the property should have been disposed of in the manner prescribed by law for the sale of any surplus property in the hands of the Government. It should have been opened for public sale through duly authorized bids. Certainly, the fact that it was sold privately after only a few bids had been received indicates rather gross disregard of the public interest by the Defense Homes Corporation. And that view is strengthened by the claim of the recent purchaser that it is now worth several times the $100,000 which he paid for it.

It seems to us that Defense Homes Corporation is under obligation to make a showing of its authority to sell this property as it did or, if no such authority exists, it had better cancel the transaction and recover possession of Villa Rosa. The fact that it is occupied by a constructive civic organization of outstanding value to the community should induce DHC officials, or the Department of Justice, to take every reasonable step to safeguard the property.

Address by Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach at Ship Launching at Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of Labor, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, at Superior, Wis., over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System, on July 21, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are two reasons why I appreciate this chance which the Butler Bros. have given to my wife and me to take part in this launching. The first is that it brings me back to the place where I was born. It is good for a man to return to the place of his birth. Sometimes it is necessary if he is to retain the proper perspective toward the problems he must meet. Keeping in touch with the roots from which he sprang helps one better to appraise the places which he now must visit. I have a tremendous responsibility ahead of me. My task will be to minimize the labor disturbances which inevitably will arise during the coming period. I know we live in a violent era. The time in which we live was not meant for those of timid hearts. This is a time when our lives go down into the depths. It is a time when we must think of our souls. I have no fear on the score of physical reconversion in America. What we must avoid are the dangers of mental reconversion. Bitterness, despair, frustration constitute our greatest dangers. If the souls of men can be brave no material problem need seriously challenge us.

Two months ago we released from a German prison camp Pastor Martin Niemoeller. He was one of the few Germans who understood nazism and the debasement and ruin it would bring to Germany and the entire world. He was one of the few Germans who had the courage to resist. He spent years in prison, during which time five of his seven children died. Probably he, more than any other German, had the right to become cynical and to despair of all hope for the future. I was interested to read the report of his first interview after his liberation. I quote from the descriptive comment of the interviewer:

"He is a man from whom fear forever has flown. He is boyishly slim, wiry, nervous, and disciplined. In full simplicity and humility, his brown eyes look steady as he speaks and his smile is alight with kindness and peace. He has become strengthened and purified to an incandescent faith and an unassailable inner freedom."

What Martin Niemoeller has done, we all must do. Up to now, almost a million of our young men have given their lives or parts of their bodies in order that certain ideas might live. Keeping faith with them requires that we shall maintain faith in ourselves. The stars in the heavens still shine. We must so cleanse and purify and strengthen our souls that we have the ability and courage to look up to them. The task of statesmanship and leadership today is to provide an answer to those who ask the question, "Who will show us any good?" I appreciate the opportunity to return here that I may help fit myself for that task.

The second reason I am glad is also a personal one. I want to pay tribute to a great man who lived here for many years. During a large part of those years you honored him by selecting him as your mayor and State senator. That man was my uncle, Fred Baxter. You all know what he did for the wage earners of Superior. I enter upon the duties of my new office with the hope and prayer that I may serve the wage earners of America as well as he served them here.

I present this discussion in no pessimistic mood. This Nation which, in 3 years, produced the greatest military machine the world has ever known is not going to be licked by difficulties and controversies which may arise at home. We must face the future, however, in a realistic mood. The tasks which we must meet will be complicated. There will be differences in thinking which will result in quarrels and dissensions. The quarrels must be settled. The differences must be composed. The dissensions must be eliminated. This can be done only if we have a common basis upon which to start.

It was demonstrated at San Francisco that men can agree even though they speak different languages. They cannot agree unless there is some common denominator in their thinking. There must be some measure of mutual confidence in their approach. When representatives of industry and labor meet at the bargaining table they cannot have that mutual confidence unless both believes that an agreement can be reached which is fair and just.

That is why justice is required in the solution of our industrial problems. It is the only yardstick which can be used in composing the differences between those who employ and those who are employed. A great man once said in discussing justice, "Human society, far from being an intercourse of assistance and good offices, would be no longer anything but a vast scene of robbery, if there were no respect of this virtue, which secures to everyone his own." Given a common basis of understanding of and respect for the principles of justice, there is no problem which, to intelligent and courageous men, is insoluble. I want today to discuss justice with you as it applies to labor-management relations.

In the first place, justice refuses to bow before any evil power. It recognizes the evil of power. It understands that men and governments and nations can be great and still be sparing in their use of power. Justice also knows that the unrestrained exercise of power has corroded and corrupted every man and every government that has indulged in it. Man's lust for power and his indiscriminate use of power have been the most defiling and deterring influences in the attempted advances of civilization.

Men who sit at the bargaining tables need have no fear if those on both sides of the table recognize the necessity for justice. This is so because justice demands equal treatment for all men. This for the reason that it recognizes the dignity of man because he is man. Justice requires that government know that man must be the ruler of government and not government the ruler of man. It must know that government exists to serve and protect man and that man was not created to serve government. Given an understanding of this principle and a sense of our responsibility to sustain it, we need have no fear of dictators who might force us to surrender our will to tyrannical government.

If management and labor are to arrive at just agreements the highest regard of integrity on the part of both is required. I use the word "integrity" in its broadest sense. It will not suffice to eliminate dishonesty and corruption. Integrity is required not only in government but in every segment of our national life. Justice requires that we no longer be confused and unclear as to ordered convictions about the principles of conduct under which we live. No longer can we be so busy gathering material wealth with

which to live that we forget what we live for. We must not be so proud of what we have that we take no pride in what we are. We applaud success and talk of American "know-how." The time has come when we must talk more of American "know-why." Justice requires that we abandon false concepts and return to a time when honest principles of living be recognized and lived up to through the deliberate effort of free men.

Justice and fair play can survive only in an atmosphere of liberty. Liberty demands that men seek to understand the requirements of other men and weigh their interests alongside their own interest without bias. Justice requires liberty and not unbridled freedom. It was Holmes who pointed out that freedom must be restricted when its unrestricted exercise would result in a near and present danger to the government which guaranteed it. A ruthless man might conceive himself to be freed of all commitments including the commitment for freedom itself. Such a man might deny liberty and seek its overthrow by claiming freedom only for himself and those who join his pack.

The justice needed in proper labor relations requires an atmosphere of free expression. This is the surest guarantee of orderly change and the surest protection against the forces of disorder. Nothing is so dangerous as the belief that any part of our political society should be beyond criticism. No one generation's judgment as to the essentials of good government can be unerring. The earth does move and it is the spirit of free inquiry, whether in science or in politics, which enables man to adjust himself to its movements.

Justice requires that we scrupulously maintain freedom of discussion if we are to develop our responsibilities as a people by choosing rationally the path we wish to follow. That is why freedom of thought and of speech and of the press, with the resulting duty of making up our minds honestly and courageously, is at the very heart of our faith in institutions necessary to protect the pathway of justice.

The government which assists management and labor in the settlement of their disputes must be governed by law—by rules which are known to both sides and not changed to meet each separate set of circumstances. A civilized community demands that all classes within it respect the law. If respect for law is to be maintained, the law must reflect the community sense of justice and not the demands of any class or group. If the law reflects the community sense of justice, no class or group may defy or set itself above or beyond the law without bringing upon itself the just resentment of the whole community. Justice demands patience and self-restraint from all people.

I have talked to you about justice and liberty and equality. They are old words, but we cannot improve upon or modernize them. We must be sufficiently stout of heart to dare proclaim them. Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry dared to use them when by their mere use the lives of those who uttered them were endangered. Lincoln dared to use them against the threat that, if he did, our union would be destroyed.

We cannot afford to use words of lesser ilk. I have no sympathy with those who would have us contrive substitutes for them. Anything less would be cheap, tawdry, and unworthy. Would any of you believe that the souls of those boys whose bodies lie on the ocean-swept beaches of Tarawa, Cassino, or Iwo Jima will find eternal peace if we accept less? How, in good conscience, can we who remain here in comfort dare to face our own futures if we bargain and settle for less?

We must find the path that leads to the peaceful settlement of all our disagreements. The Government, and both industry and labor must recognize the principle that justice requires a large measure of give and take in human relationships. Industrial peace, to be enduring, must be just. The approach to the tables at which the peace is written must be made with humility and tolerance if just decisions are to be reached. Only men of good will representing constituents of good will can succeed in this effort.

To you who have built this ship I extend my congratulations and thanks. I also want to thank you for the very fine record you have made during the period of the war. I have watched with interest the output of ships from Superior during these last few years. I know how faithfully you have worked. I think I know and can understand some of the problems which you are facing today. Many of you have come here from long distances in order that you might work in these yards. I know something of the dismay with which you face the future.

I want you to understand that your Government intends to do everything within its power to assist you in the difficult months ahead. I can tell you that the President himself understands these problems and is determined to give every possible help.

The reason I have said these things to you today is that I am extremely anxious on your behalf and on behalf of the welfare of the wage earners of the United States that none of the legislative gains which have been made in the last 10 years will be lost during this period of reconversion. Ten years ago this month the Congress adopted the statute aimed at the protection of your right to bargain collectively, through representatives of your own choosing, with your employers. Two years later we passed a statute by which we put a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours. Since then the courts of the United States have upheld these laws.

For long years prior to that the Congress and the courts lagged behind in their recognition of the rights of American wage earners. I want these important and substantial rights to be retained. On your behalf I fear they might be lost if out of industrial strife during this reconversion period the wage earners of the United States should lose their most effective weapon—the public opinion in the United States. Therefore, I conclude today as I did last week with this statement: This Nation now at war has adequate machinery available to settle peacefully any labor disputes. To advance any demand to the point of stopping production instead of using machinery available for peaceful settlement, is not in the national interest and will not be supported by public opinion.

As a representative of all the people, but particularly interested in promoting the real welfare of those who work, I urge labor to respect the no-strike pledge. I shall expect management to refrain from doing these things, thoughtlessly or purposefully, which provoke men, and tempt them to act first and reason later. We must place the interest of the whole Nation above the interest of any individual, or any group. Only then can we end this war in the shortest possible time and promote the best interests of all our people. I pledge you my best efforts and shall need your full cooperation.

Full Employment and Social Security Under a Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on Full Employment and Social Security Under a Free Enterprise System, delivered by me before the St. Louis chapter, Missouri Association for Social Welfare, and the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, during this past week, Americans everywhere have been thinking with a deeper intensity about the future of our country and of the world. We have lost a great leader at a time when mankind stands at the crossroads of decision. Part of the victory over the evil that threatened the world has been won. But all that we have gained thus far will come to less than nothing if we lose courage now and if we falter from an excess of caution where we should proceed with boldness. The greatest tribute we can pay to our late beloved President, Franklin Roosevelt, will be to push forward with renewed determination toward those goals of freedom, security and opportunity for all men everywhere which he so clearly saw and toward which so many of his policies were directed.

Franklin Roosevelt was guided by a great vision. He was clear in his mind, and gave clarity to the minds of tens of millions of people, that peace, freedom and security are not only compatible one with another but also are interdependent. He had read history with a discerning mind. He had learned the profound lesson that economic peace and security are essential for political peace and security. We are all grateful that it has fallen to the lot of a farsighted and courageous American, Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, to take up the reins of Government in this critical period and carry on the struggle for economic freedom.

The economic bill of rights presented by President Roosevelt stands as a new charter and a new goal, coequal with the Bill of Rights enacted by our forefathers. We pledge our support to President Truman in all his efforts to achieve this goal. We have full confidence in his ultimate success.

And so, today, I am glad to be talking to you about three related measures which will help carry us toward that goal—measures inspired by ideals which are common to all Americans but which have been given new meaning and new force over the past 12 years. Those measures relate to full employment, regional development, and social security.

I start with full employment because it is so comprehensive that it embraces the other two. Social security and regional development will be an essential contribution to full employment. Jobs for all is the best safeguard of freedom and security for the American people. At a high level of employment we can keep the economic hazards of unemployment, dependent old age, sickness, and dependency within manageable proportions. Similarly, the large and expanding market that accompanies full employment facilitates regional development of natural resources and creates the most favorable circumstances for progress on cooperative local, State, regional, and Federal projects. At a high level of employment at home, we are best equipped to be good neighbors and good friends abroad.

PREVENTION OR CONVALESCENCE?

Some of you may be wondering why there is so much concern over jobs. It is clear that during the war we have actually had full employment. The never-satiated demands of war have strained our reserves of manpower and womanpower to the very limit. And we are continually reminded by press, by radio, and by personal experience, that the end of hostilities throughout the world will release a vast backlog of civilian needs that necessarily have been pent up

during wartime. Even more significantly, many consumers will have piled up large amounts of savings with which to make these demands effective. So why are we worrying now about postwar markets and postwar employment opportunities?

We are worrying about markets and employment after this war, in part, because of our experiences after World War I. We had difficulties then, even though our mobilization for war was far less complete than it is in the present struggle. A much greater segment of our resources and productive capacity is now mobilized for war. More than twice the number of men have been drawn into the armed forces, and a far greater proportion of our population is now engaged in producing implements of war than in 1918.

The boys now fighting so valiantly in Europe know that their fathers who pounded the Germans on those same battlefields the last time found themselves pounding the pavement at home a few years later, or selling apples on the street corner. And they know that their own reinstatement rights on the old job, if they had one, will not amount to much if several other GI's have the same right to the same job, or if the boss does not have enough capital, materials, or confidence in the future to resume peacetime production.

Likewise, civilian war workers are fearful of the war's aftermath. Many millions of them face the prospect of at least several months of unemployment while war factories are being dismantled and reconverted. Farmers have had record earnings during the war, but they can see ahead to the inevitable shrinkage of foreign markets when liberated nations start feeding themselves once more. Businessmen are aware of these things, and the threat they will be to postwar markets.

It is one of the paradoxes of our modern world that we are also concerned because after the war fewer men will be needed to produce the same volume of goods and services we consumed before the war, and because there will be more people available for production. Under the stress of war our industrial efficiency has greatly increased. At the same time, partly as the result of the normal growth in population, our labor force has expanded and will undoubtedly remain larger after the war—even assuming that several million people now engaged in war production who are not regular workers will retire from the labor market when the fighting is over. It has been estimated that 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 people will be unemployed if our production after the war returns to the 1939 level. In order to provide employment for all who may be seeking work, we would have to produce about 60 percent more than in 1939.

The pent-up demand and the savings which have accumulated during the war, if released gradually and in step with the reconversion of industry, can be of help in achieving a high level of employment and production in the years immediately following the cessation of hostilities. They will not, however, be able to assure a continuous high level of demand in the more distant years ahead. Can we, then, maintain a high level of production and employment over the long period?

One thing we have learned since the last war is that the economy will not, if left to itself, automatically stay in balance and provide adequate job opportunities and steadily rising standards of living. Laissez faire had failed a long time ago; but the world did not have the courage and the understanding to disown it. Another thing we have learned—and this is much more important—is that we can, through the kind of cooperative action that we term governmental policy, deliberately undertake to keep the economy on an even keel and achieve those goals which the devastations of depression and war have made even more precious to us—namely, economic opportunity and security for all, and for each an ever-increasing share in the good things of life, within a democratic society based on private enterprise.

We have witnessed the vast extent of our productive capacity when management, labor, farmers, and the Government were mobilized for a single purpose—the successful prosecution of the war. I have a deep conviction that in peace Americans can put aside greed and selfishness and work together in preventing a recurrence of the tragic waste and demoralization of mass unemployment—that we can marshal our large productive capacities and resources for a high and expanding level of national well-being.

WHAT THE FULL-EMPLOYMENT BILL PROPOSES

To reach this goal we need first of all a periodic comprehensive inventory and forecast of significant economic trends for the Nation. Secondly, it is essential that legislative policies should be guided by this analysis of economic trends and directed toward specific measures which this stock-taking may indicate to be necessary for the attainment of our over-all goals.

These are the two basic steps embodied in the full employment bill, Senate bill 380, sponsored by Senator WAGNER, of New York; Senator THOMAS, of Utah; Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming; and myself, and House bill 2202 by Representative PATMAN, of Texas.

The bill places on the President, with the aid of his administrative agencies, the responsibility for putting together in an annual budget—which is described as the National Production and Employment Budget—the best available information for the coming year on the expected total volume of consumption and investment. This total is simply the summation of outlays planned by consumers, farmers, businessmen, and local, State, and Federal Governments—the outlays which taken together determine the level of production and employment for the coming year. The National Budget must give in addition an indication of how far the expected level of total outlays will go in achieving the full employment of our manpower, our capacity, and our resources. A comparison of the expected level of outlays and of the total outlays necessary to keep all would-be workers employed sets the Nation's economic problem before the administration, before the Congress, and before the American people.

The second part of the job is for Congress to decide what should be done if there is a danger of a significant gap between the expected and the required levels of total expenditures by consumers, producers, and governments. If the expected expenditures promise to be too great, anti-inflation measures will be needed. The other possibility is that the expected expenditures may be too small—equally serious because this would mean unemployment.

The bill does not prescribe the kind of legislation Congress should enact. It requires that the President shall make recommendations to the Congress on a program for full employment. The bill indicates the kind of measures which might be included in these recommendations—such as measures dealing with taxation, banking, and currency, monopoly and competition, foreign trade, agriculture, social security, the development of natural resources, and public works. The bill does not, however, make any commitments as to specific measures that should be proposed or adopted. It does not expand the functions of the Federal Government or prescribe any new economic controls. Nor does the bill grant the administration any blank checks to spend at its own discretion.

The bill does set forth in mistakably clear terms the final objective, the right of every individual who wants a job to have the opportunity to work. It constitutes a promise to the Nation that the Government will never lose sight of this goal. The bill emphasizes that competitive private enterprise should be strengthened and assisted in the achievement of full employment, and that the Government should do all in its power to encourage private enterprise to attain this goal. In deciding how to do this it will still be the responsibility of the Congress, as it always has been, to reflect and to reconcile the desires of the many interested groups throughout the country in such a way as best to promote the public welfare.

But—and this is the second new element—the bill requires that Congress should do this in a coordinated and informed fashion. Enlightenment would follow from the solid basis of information provided by the estimates in the President's annual message to the Congress. Coordination would follow from the provision that a joint committee from both Houses of Congress should study the President's message as a whole, and, on or before March 1 of each year, recommend to Congress how each of the various measures likely to come before it can be fitted in with the full employment goal.

The purpose of this program is not merely to fill a gap but to prevent one from occurring. In this way it proposes to prevent unemployment. It reaffirms that the strength and prosperity of a nation is in the health and productive work of its people.

POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The political implications of this approach go far beyond anything I have time to discuss at length. Let me just point out that it would make for a much more clear-cut relationship between the Executive and the Congress. The opportunity for constructive cooperation between the Federal and the State and local governments would also be increased. To illustrate, let me refer you to the full employment legislation which was recently introduced in California. This proposal is similar to the national full employment bill which my colleagues and I are sponsoring in Congress. It indicates a gratifying awareness of the important implementing role which will have to be played by State and local governments.

But no government action, at any level, will be of much avail unless backed by the cooperation of agriculture, labor, industry, business, and consumers. Our bill provides for an advisory council with representatives of business, labor, agriculture, and the public. Civic leaders like yourselves would have an important responsibility in making your interests and views known to Congress and to your local and State legislatures, and in helping thresh out a realistic and workable program.

As I said earlier, the full employment bill is based on the conviction that Americans can work together, through democratic mechanisms, to make our free enterprise system produce for all the people in peace as effectively as it produced the weapons of war. There can be few men whose imaginations have not been quickened by a vision of the new freedoms for the individual, the flowering of the human spirit, which can grow out of the vast productive potentialities of our modern economy. If the vision is to become a reality, it must be translated into specific goals; goals widely accepted and understood; goals for this year and next year and the year after; goals which will change and expand but will serve continuously to give focus and direction to our many diverse activities. The significance of our full employment bill is that it provides a method by which such specific goals can be developed and can be implemented through legislative action that will back up and reinforce the actual productive efforts of all private and public groups in our society.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

I wish I had time today to illustrate some of the different types of postwar projects, large and small, which are being planned both by private business and by local and State governments, but that is not possible. I would like, however, to comment on one proposed Federal project, which more than any other I know of, would implement the peacetime development of the States of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana. I refer, as you may have guessed, to the much-discussed Missouri Valley Authority.

It is hardly necessary for me to speak to a Missouri audience on the need for harnessing the Missouri River to work for the people and not against them. The unruly Missouri has been exacting a heavy toll through devastating floods and ruined farms. For more than 20 years the Missouri Valley States have been losing population despite their vast natural resources, despite their potential agricultural and other possibilities. This exodus from farm and town will continue unless the resources of the area can be mobilized to create new wealth in the form of increased productivity, better land values, and more and better job opportunities. The holding power and the drawing power of any area is directly related to the standard of living it will support.

For a century and a half the people of this country have been trying to cope with the problems of river control and river development, but never until the Tennessee Valley Authority Act have we seen fit to look upon a river as nature made her, namely, a single, undivided whole. Instead we have directed one agency to improve a river for navigation, another to build dams for reclamation, still others for flood control, or for power. We have been tampering with the Missouri for generations. We have spent millions of dollars on flood control and navigation alone. We have failed because we have not had the courage to treat one river as one problem.

Senate bill 555, which I introduced in February 1945, proposes the establishment of a single regional agency, the Missouri Valley Authority, to provide for unified water control and resource development of the Missouri Valley region. The bill does not propose to copy TVA; no two river valleys are alike. It does propose, however, to follow the principles and broad policies which have been tested and proved by the TVA in one of the most dramatic chapters of our economic and social history.

Briefly, the MVA bill would set up a regional corporate agency under a three-man board, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The agency would have headquarters in the region; it would be fully responsible to the President and the Congress.

Upon this corporation would rest the responsibility to establish and maintain a broad program of unified water control and resource development for the entire river, its tributaries, and watershed. To this end the agency would utilize to the fullest possible extent the advice, assistance, and cooperation of the people of the region, and their public and private organizations, local and State, as well as that of the operating agencies of the Federal Government.

The corporation is authorized to construct, operate, and carry out such projects as would best serve to control and prevent floods, to safeguard the navigable waters, to reclaim the public lands, to encourage irrigation, to promote family-type farming, to foster navigation and to generate electric power to whatever extent is consistent with its primary purposes.

The agency is charged with the duty of reconciling the conflicting demands of reclamation, flood control, navigation, and power—conflicting demands which have so long served only to plague and befuddle us. It is required to report to Congress within 2 years a unified plan for the development of the Missouri Valley, the plan to become effective only after Congress has had an opportunity to approve or reject it.

Admittedly this is a strong measure. A large and urgent problem, and a great need, call for a strong measure. Its very strength has been the target for the most concentrated fire from the opposition. With pious claims of agreement with end objectives, they nevertheless fall back on the age-old tactics of trying to defeat by division. They would perpetuate the patchwork approach, the competitive and contradictory agencies which have so long characterized our efforts to control the Missouri. We have acted on their advice in the past. We know how barren are the results. The floods have become more devastating; there has been a negligible development of industry; the productivity of 140,000,000 out of the 316,000,000 acres in the valley is threatened by erosion; 40,000,000 acres have eroded to a point where their use is no longer economically practical; there has been a steady decline in population and failure of business growth.

We cannot avoid the fact that this seeping away of population has been accelerated in the last 5 years, when it is estimated that some 1,000,000 persons have left the valley. How many of the war workers, the young men and women of the armed forces who have left may we expect to return to this area? What promise of future prosperity, of individual opportunity, has the Missouri Valley region to offer? In the vast richness of the river and the valley it traverses, we have the answer at hand if we can but find the courage and the determination to make it a reality.

I should like to repeat, I know of no single undertaking that has greater potentialities for sound postwar prosperity than a comprehensive program for the development of the Missouri. Nor can I think of one which would do more to revitalize a region, to encourage new business, or to create a setting more conducive to full and stable employment and to prosperity for an important part of the Nation. Through the MVA, the people of this area can be greatly strengthened in their opportunity to provide a high standard of living for themselves and to contribute in a large measure to our national prosperity.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Let us now shift our attention from problems of employment and regional development to some of the Nation-wide issues of social security. I know these are of equal interest to this audience.

One of the pointed lessons of the war years has been that jobs alone do not guarantee security for all American workers and their families. A program of "full employment" reaches only the employable; it does not meet the problem of the men and women who are no longer able to work. Nor do jobs, in and of themselves, guard against such hazards as illness and injury which, striking unexpectedly, may leave the worker disabled and his family dependent. We must look toward other measures for protection against the insecurity which results from these personal calamities; we must look to additional measures to rid people of the fears of insecurity.

I believe that the most equitable, and the most economical way of providing security for those who at any time cannot work is through a unified and comprehensive system of social insurance to cover the common risks of old-age, unemployment, sickness, and disability, and the costs of medical care. Under the Social Security Act, we have made a notable beginning in this direction. Almost 10 years of experience has proved that the principle of social insurance is sound when applied to the American system of free enterprise and cooperation. This experience has revealed limitations in our present programs, and it has indicated points at which extension and expansion are needed.

OLD-AGE INSURANCE COVERAGE

One of these is the extension of coverage under old-age and survivors' insurance. Large groups are still excluded. Among these are the self-employed (in commerce, industry, and on farms), wage workers in agriculture, domestic employees in private homes, and employees in nonprofit institutions and governmental agencies. The 1940 census showed some 20,000,000 persons in these types of employment. There is no justification for further delay in extending old-age protection to these groups. In fact, among this segment of the population are to be found some of the workers whose employment conditions are the most uncertain, whose pay is the lowest, and who in consequence are the least able, through individual effort, to safeguard themselves and their families against the risks of premature death or against dependency in old age.

These exclusions from coverage not only bar millions of workers from old-age protection, but they also reduce the size of the benefit to which many eligible workers are or will become entitled. Many workers, in the course of a working lifetime, shift back and forth between types of employment now covered and those not now covered. This results in disqualifying many from insurance benefits; it also reduces the earnings which can be credited toward benefits and thus lowers the amount of the payment to which the worker is entitled upon retiring, or to which his widow and orphans are entitled upon his death.

Furthermore, some change is needed in the benefit formula itself in order that payments will be more nearly adequate as a basic retirement income. The revised bill which Senator WAGNER and I plan shortly to introduce, based on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of the last Congress, will provide for substantial liberalization of benefit provisions as well as the numbers of people to be covered.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Changes are also needed in the present unemployment compensation program. Even if our goal of full employment is reached with maximum speed, some wage loss from temporary unemployment will be unavoidable. It is generally estimated that even in a fully active and smoothly functioning labor market about 2 to 4 percent of the civilian labor force is unemployed at any one time.

Because of its division into 51 separate State and Territorial systems, and because of existing inadequacies in amounts and duration of benefits, the present unemployment compensation program is not well adapted to the demands of Nation-wide reconversion or of full employment. During the past months some States have revised their unemployment compensation laws to make them somewhat more adequate for the tasks ahead. But the changes have been too limited. I am convinced that if we are not to jeopardize our efforts to achieve full employment, we must merge our present separate State systems into one national system, providing more adequate protection, and protection equally available, to workers in all parts of our country. We shall also need, during the reconversion period and afterward, a well-coordinated national system of employment offices to bring workers and jobs together, and to direct displaced war workers and veterans alike to job retraining and new work opportunities.

DISABILITY INSURANCE

I believe that the time has also come for expanding our social-security program to cover the risks of sickness and disability.

It is not necessary for me to describe to this audience the social and economic consequences of illness and disablement. Many of you know, better and in more detail than I, the deprivations and slow demoralization that follows illness, especially among low-income groups. You know, too, that aside from periods of mass unemployment, sickness and resultant disabilities are the major causes of dependency and poverty among American families. It is estimated that on an average day there are about 7,000,000 disabled persons in the United States, and that of these nearly one-half have disabilities that on that average day have already lasted for over 6 months. Such figures include all age groups and all types of illness. Even among the gainfully employed, however, disability rates are high, with one out of every two, three, or four workers experiencing some job interruption because of illness or injury in the course of a year.

In the main, disability is of two major types. It may be acute with early recovery probable; or it may be chronic and likely to continue for a long time or until death.

Of the temporary disabilities, the majority are caused by diseases or injuries which result in short periods of incapacity, and involve equally brief periods of wage loss. In this respect, temporary disability is similar to temporary unemployment. It seems reasonable, therefore, for temporary disability insurance to be geared into the program for unemployment insurance, with similar provisions as to amount and duration of benefits.

Long-term or permanent disability, on the other hand, very closely resembles old age in its effect on the earning capacity of the worker, for its frequently results in his permanent retirement from the labor market. The consequences for the family may be even more serious than in old age however, since premature disablement is likely to occur at a period when the worker's children are young, when family responsibilities are heaviest, and when the family has not had opportunity to accumulate substantial savings. Such disabilities often place a double strain on the household in which they occur. If the wage earner himself is incapacitated, family income is reduced or cut off at the time when the family is burdened with the additional expenses of necessary medical care. I propose, therefore, that permanent disability benefits similar in amount to old-age benefits be provided as part of a comprehensive social-insurance program.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE

I see the problem of providing economic security against the risks of illness and disability as two-fold, and I am convinced that it can be met only by a two-way attack. There is, first, the problem of wage loss during periods of disability, which I have just described. There is the further problem of pay for medical care if it is needed, when it is needed.

It happens that my personal interest in social security began through concern about the problem of health and medical care. In 1939, I was privileged to serve as chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor which was in charge of the hearings on Senator WAGNER'S health bill, S. 1620. I was shocked by the evidence which was presented to the subcommittee on the prevalence of poor health and of failure to obtain needed medical care. Many persons go entirely without care, because they cannot afford to pay for it at the time they need it. Many persons receive care no better than their grandfathers received, in spite of the spectacular advances of modern medicine.

Because the costs of medical care are uneven and unpredictable for the individual, the social-insurance method of paying those costs is particularly applicable. Workers can pay in advance and pay at an average rate. The pooled funds under such an insurance system are then available to pay doctors and hospitals and laboratories for all the services which may be needed by insured persons and their families when illness occurs.

In 1943, Senator WAGNER and I, in the Senate, and Representative DINGELL in the House, introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act which included, along with the other social-security measures we have been discussing this afternoon, a proposed plan of medical and hospitalizatio· insurance. This part of the bill has been the target of one of the most vitriolic attacks the American public has ever witnessed. The spearhead of the attack is the so-called National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Services, which boasts of the 15,000,000 pamphlets it has printed and the 12,000 releases it has sent out weekly to newspapers and magazines attacking our bill. This kind of campaign takes a lot of paper and a lot of money, and as I believe the American public knows, is not entirely motivated by concern for the public welfare.

A system of medical and hospitalization insurance, such as that proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill does not affect, nor does it attempt to affect the essential professional aspects of the practice of medicine. I say this advisedly and in contradiction of the hysterical prophecies of impending doom for American medicine which are coming almost daily from the leaders of the American Medical Association. Under medical care insurance, every eligible individual is guaranteed the right to choose his own doctor from among all those in the community who participate. Doctors remain free to accept or reject patients. The treatment of the patient is entirely the doctor's responsibility. And doctors can receive payment for their services according to the method they prefer. Where groups of doctors prefer to work together to give more competent and more economical service, they can do so under an insurance system more easily than today. Neither doctors nor hospitals would be regimented. Our new bill will make this even clearer, if possible, than the 1945 bill.

If we had medical hospitalization insurance, the medical care received by the American people would be vastly improved. Many people who now receive no care or who delay in going to the doctor because of the costs, would, under an insurance system, have paid in advance and be entitled to care when they need it. Many others who now get inadequate care would have thrown open to them all the benefits of specialists' services and of modern laboratory techniques. Doctors also would have the satisfaction of practicing better medicine, while earning, at the same time, more adequate and more assured incomes that most of them ever earned in peacetime. We are proposing a system of prepaid medical and hospital care, not something that the opposition vaguely calls "socialized medicine."

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Thus far I have talked only about the insurance aspects of a program of social security. I should like to point out, even though briefly, that no matter how adequate a social-insurance system may be, there will always be some families with special needs, and some needy persons who cannot work and do not qualify for insurance benefits. A comprehensive social-security program, consequently, must include provision for public assistance which is granted on the basis of individual need. We must expand the insurance system for those who work and earn an income; but we must also strengthen the existing public-assistance program. As I see it, one of the major needs in this area is to develop a unified assistance program which—in addition to present aid to the blind, the aged and to dependent children—would include provisions for Federal matching of funds for general relief. There is need, also, for revising the present equal matching provisions so as to give special Federal aid to States whose economic resources are small in relation to their assistance needs. Only through some such plan will it be possible to achieve more adequate grants to the needy individuals who are dependent on these programs for their maintenance.

SOCIAL-SECURITY FINANCES

Both our present social-security program and our newer proposals have been criticized on certain economic grounds. The general criticism that we cannot afford comprehensive social security is economic nonsense. We cannot afford to be without it. The costs involved already exist to a large extent in the form of the wage-loss suffered as a result of old age, unemployment, disability, and death, and of payments now being made individually for medical care and hospitalization. The contributions levied under social security represent, in the main, a method of distributing the burden of these already existing costs among all members of society through relatively small regular payments, rather than permitting the unfortunate families for whom risks actually occur to bear the whole loss.

Without sacrificing the advantages of the insurance method—the use of earmarked contributions and the payment of benefits as a right—we can assure that the rates of the pay-roll taxes are so adjusted that to the maximum extent possible, they work along with—and not at cross purposes with—other plans and other measures for a high-level economy and full employment. To these ends, we have been studying the problem very carefully. I believe that our revised society security bill will contain a satisfactory proposal.

A comprehensive program of social security can make many and valuable contributions toward a stable peacetime economy. It would aid greatly in maintaining labor mobility, an important requisite if we are to achieve our goal of full employment. A Nation-wide employment service would facilitate job placement, and would reduce the interval elapsing between jobs. An adequate system of benefit payments would make it possible for aged and disabled persons or mothers of dependent children to retire from the labor force if they wish to do so, thereby reducing some of the pressures on the labor market.

As the years pass, I am increasingly aware of the interrelations between social security and the basic stability of our economy. Social-security payments help to put a floor under the purchasing power of the Nation. They help to establish a minimum level of demand for the output of factories and mines and farms, and thus serve to check decline in consumption. Used as they are for current maintenance of many families who would otherwise be without income, their effect on consumer demand is immediate, and disproportionate to their size.

CONCLUSION

In spite of their seeming diversity, the matters I have spoken about stem from an all-important common denominator—the well-being of the people of this Nation. I see such well-being as having its foundation in a virile and stable economy in which there is an active market for goods and services, where people have the opportunity to work at rates of pay that will sustain a rising standard of living, where all gainfully employed persons have the facilities for pooling some of their funds for mutual protection against the more common risks to their security, and where the natural resources of the country are harnessed to work, not for the privileged few, but for the good of all the people.

A program of full employment and social security under a free enterprise system will not come to the United States full blown or of its own accord. If we want that program

and want it in operation, we have to plan it, work for it, fight for it. There is always powerful opposition to any change in our social and economic life. We were forced to fight for the protection of children from hazardous employment. We fought for a limitation of hours of labor and for workingmen's compensation laws. We fought for the right of labor to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. We carried on a long struggle for an equitable system of income taxes, for a program of social security, and for many other humane measures—the enactment and successful operation of which have contributed immeasurably to our present high standards of living and our national prosperity.

Let us go forward in this period and make democracy in America work to carry us through to a safer and better world. If you believe with me that all this is worth having, join with me in the work and the fight to achieve it.

Office of War Information Article Circulated in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Greater North Dakota Association, signed by M. J. Connolly, assistant secretary, in regard to an article in a publication by OWI for circulation in Russia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION,
Fargo, N. Dak., July 18, 1945.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of July 13 was read to the directors of the GNDA at a meeting held in Fargo, July 16, and the directors passed a resolution thanking you for the letter and for your efforts to furnish the OWI with accurate information to counteract the evil effects of the slanderous article written by the two young Russians in the OWI department and circulated in Russia.

The directors, I think, appreciated the apology of Elmer Davis for the error. However, this action is not sufficient to counteract the wrong impression created by the OWI article.

I am sending you some material which I hope will be helpful to you in presenting the facts about North Dakota to the OWI, including the January issue of the North Dakotan containing the twentieth annual economic review, which also lists production figures of the State for she past 10 years.

You know that North Dakota's population, according to the census of 1940, was 641,935, and this number has been decreased more than 100,000 by men who went to the armed services and to war industries in other States.

In lieu of the fact that North Dakota has but four-tenths of 1 percent of the population of the United States, consider these facts, Senator YOUNG:

North Dakota produced 94 percent of the Nation's durum; 48 percent of the spring wheat in the United States; 29 percent of all the flaxseed; 27 percent of all the rye; 20 percent of all the barley; 15 percent of all the wild hay; 6 percent of all the oats, potatoes, sweet clover seed, and turkeys; from 3 to 4 percent of the creamery butter; more than 2 percent of all the corn, alfalfa, chickens, eggs, and hogs raised in the United States.

North Dakota in 1944 produced more than a half billion in gross income from its 71,000 farms, or an average of more than $7,250 each.

In five of the war bond drives North Dakota led the Nation in the purchase of E bonds in relation to the quota.

In reply to the bank call of March, North Dakota banks reported $383,000,000 in deposits.

North Dakota, long noted as an area ideally suited for modern, mechanized, mass production, now has more than 70 percent of its farm area operated under scientific practices of the soil-conservation service.

Under the approved unified plan of the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation it is proposed to place more than a million acres of this State's rich farm land under irrigation to stabilize agriculture. The over-all plan calls for Federal expenditure in this State of $187,000,000 under the Sloan plan, with the building of the Garrison Dam (and a lake larger than the one at Fort Peck) to be constructed at a cost of $130,000,000 by the Army engineers.

The over-all plan covers irrigation, hydroelectric power, flood control, erosion abatement, improvement of the navigability of the Missouri River, wildlife conservation, and the creation of recreational opportunities.

Far greater than the resource wealth of the Ruhr district in Germany is the 600,000,000,000 tons of lignite coal underlying 28,000 square miles in western North Dakota. The surface has barely been scratched in the development of this great natural resource, but tremendous development may follow from the results of the $300,000 experiment being carried on at the University of North Dakota by the United States Bureau of Mines, with a commercial size pilot plant at Grand Forks. High hydrogen gas and water gas are being successfully extracted from lignite for use in beneficiating Minnesota iron ore for the making of sponge iron. From these same gases it is possible to extract motor fuel and oils, and various plastic materials, such as are now being extracted at the half-million-dollar plant of the Western Carbon Chemical, Inc., at Minot. Lignite briquettes, popular fuel with a high British-thermal-unit content, are being successfully manufactured by the Lehigh Briquetting Co. at Dickinson. Another indication of new development is the opening of a mammoth new mine at Hazen by the Truax-Traer Coal Co., which expects to produce 5,000,000 tons of high-grade lignite at this location.

At the general election in 1944 North Dakotans voted a $12,320,000 bond issue to match Federal funds in an extensive highway improvement program.

Under present plans rural electrification is being widely extended, and with the 10 percent reduction in freight rates for this section on August 30, and the low rate for electrical power, North Dakota is being assured of a rapid increase in industry to supplement an economy which in the past has been largely agricultural.

North Dakota, with fewer war industries than any other State, will have no postwar unemployment problems, according to the State committee for economic development. A survey conducted several months ago by GNDA indicated that more than 80 percent of farm boys in the armed services hope to return to farm homes in North Dakota.

There is a promise of several new packing plants to match the rapid progress in livestock development. An indication of the quality breeding of livestock is found in the purchase of a $10,000 herd sire by the Schultz Hereford Ranch at Towner. NDAC paid $5,000 for a young Hereford. An Aberdeen-Angus bull brought $3,000 at auction the past summer. Several other animals sold around the $2,000 mark, and an Aberdeen-Angus heifer brought $1,000.

Dehydration plants, a soybean mill, flax processing, potteries, cheese factories, automobile assembly plants, and other manufacturing plants are being established.

It is expected construction will be started within a year on the Heart Butte dam south of Gen Ullin, placing an additional 15,000 acres of land under irrigation and controlling the floods in the Mandan area and improving the water supply at Dickinson. Also authorized are four dams to be built by the Army Engineers in the Red River basin.

There will be a tremendous home-building program when men and material can be secured. In addition, many municipalities will build hospitals, install water systems and other public works.

Two Federal hospitals are being constructed in addition to smaller hospitals in many communities.

With the heavy bond investment and the high individual deposits in banks, North Dakota is a cash customer tapping on the counter, anxious to buy the most modern farm equipment and every manufactured article of utility.

The next census will show North Dakota with an unusually high percentage of home ownership with a minimum of mortgage indebtedness.

North Dakota has often been called the healthiest State, with the lowest percentage of deaths in comparison with births, the lowest maternal death rate, and the highest infant survival rate.

North Dakota, with more acres of certified fields, supplies many southern States and Caribbean countries with sturdy northern grown seed potatoes of first quality. North Dakota cereal seeds, with its hard wheat high in protein, and barley of malting quality, bring premium prices in the markets.

I suppose it was difficult for the young Russian journalists to imagine there could be real prosperity in a region with so little industrial development.

They could not, for instance, find records of heavy purchases of commercial fertilizer in North Dakota. Not having visited the famed Red River Valley, long known as the bread basket of the world, they would find it difficult to understand that tremendous grain crops have been produced annually for more than 60 years on much of this land without the use of phosphate fertilizer. They would have to visit this section to see a land more fertile, perhaps, than any in the world, with the possible exception of the annually renewed soils of the Nile Valley.

Had these young men visited North Dakota they might have visited with descendants from Russia, and with sons of pioneers from other countries of northern Europe, notably from the Scandinavian countries, who have become voting freemen, independent financially as they are in thought and action, forward looking as were their pioneering parents; sturdy, healthy and happy as are all the bronzed children of the prairies, who breathe the ozone-filled air in the wide-open spaces of the great Northwest.

And it is too bad the young writers, and the older ones, do not visit North Dakota, rather than writing about this section from long distances. They would find a welcome here among friendly people, the warmth of which has made famous the phrase, "Western Hospitality."

Tell them, Senator, to come out and see us sometime.

Sincerely,

M. J. CONNOLLY,
Assistant Secretary.

An Assurance of Good Will to President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there lives in my home city a very distinguished churchman, the Right Reverend Monsignor James H. Cotter. He has served the same parish for more than 56 years. Just recently he has been honored by having been elevated to the position of monsignor. Monsignor Cotter has been recognized as one of the literary lights of his church and because of his ability to discuss the most profound questions of the day, his writings have always been widely read.

I am glad to make one of his articles a part of my extension of remarks. The following article written by him appeared in the Irish World on July 21, 1945:

THOUGHTS

(Specially written for the Irish World by Rt. Rev. Msgr. James H. Cotter, LL. D., Litt. D.)

GOD PROTECT OUR PRESIDENT

Our President has gone overseas to meet England's Churchill and Russia's Stalin. His task is tremendous for on it depends the welfare, perhaps the destiny, of our Republic. Every word he speaks will have a powerful significance, every thought he shapes may chisel centuries, every act of his will touch intimately and indelibly the history of our Nation. And he meets men who juggle words so adroitly the while they hide the art so cleverly, that they can say tomorrow—"I never said that yesterday." Churchill will have England as his God. Stalin, ignoring God, will delight in communistic blasphemies. For a man like our President to deal with these two in order to reach a democratic conclusion, will be most difficult; for his simple truth will be met by words not having the same meaning, by implications hiding realities, by diplomacies veiling half truths. Everything our President says will plainly look for God's blessing, everything he has to experience in others will merit careful scrutiny, else deception may lead him from his honest purpose. He will have to strain himself to learn the full meaning of foreign thought dressed in friendly fashion. He will have to be ever on the alert—remembering the sincere declaration of Disraeli: "Nations are never neighbors." In the hearts of the two with whom he converses will be found no echo of his American sterling principles—one will begin and end in England, the other will end and begin in Russia. Both will be foreign to the simple, sincere belief in God that agitates the interests of the American President perpetuating the principles of Washington and Jefferson.

Our prayers to God then should follow President Truman and remain with him in his conferences giving his heart strength in the crucial time and brightening his mind, to entirely and properly compass his words and to cope with the words of others, for the meetings may have a meaning that overreaches their day and remains for all time. May God strengthen and protect President Truman in his rarely new and exceptionally care-laden obligations.

Mobilization of Scientific Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast over Station WMAL by Martin Agronsky, on July 20, relative to the bill I recently introduced providing for the mobilization of the country's scientific resources in the future.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Vannevar Bush's report to the President on using this country's scientific resources in the future has already caused a lot of talk here in the Capital and throughout the Nation. His proposal that the Congress establish a national research foundation needs a lot of talking about—the more the better—and then it needs acting on—the quicker the better.

Dr. Bush, who is the director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, is an eminent scientist in his own right, and in a position to know what he is talking about. In the First World War he had what he described to me this morning as a worm's eye view of our country's methods of handling its scientists and its scientific research. He was used by the Navy for submarine detection research. He was then a young unknown, in the field of science.

In his job he was able to see with his own eyes the shortcomings and difficulties experienced by our scientists when they were pulled abruptly out of the field of peaceful research and put to the business of learning how to make weapons that would kill and devices that would save our men from being killed.

In between this war and the last one, he served on various advisory councils which kept in touch with our armed forces in the field of military inventions. In this war he has headed up our country's scientific war effort. This experience naturally has given him about the most intimate and practical knowledge of our country's needs in the field of science that any working scientists in our country possesses.

This morning I had a long talk with Dr. Bush and he told me he doesn't regard his report as more than an outline of the Nation's needs—and as he pointed out the philosophy behind it, he thinks, is just as important and not as readily apparent. This philosophy is important to an understanding of why this country has not handled its scientists as well as it might have—and also to an understanding of how in the future it can handle them better.

Dr. Bush says it must be recognized that when we went to war, two fundamental principles immediately came into conflict in the American method of building a great army, as quickly as possible. The first principle was that all draft eligible men in the country must be made liable to induction on the democratic plan of no special privilege. At the same time the principle had to be set up that some men—otherwise eligible to the draft—had to be deferred for occupations essential to the war effort. These two principles are naturally in conflict. Many scientists believe that all scientists—no matter what their age—if they were regarded in their profession as useful in war research—should have been automatically deferred.

Yet, as Dr. Bush recognizes, to have done this would have caused an immediate and violent protest in this country that scientists were benefiting by an undeserved special privilege. In England, scientists were automatically deferred and their deferment was automatically and placidly accepted by the British people. In America, our people, just don't think that way. Accordingly, promising young scientists, medical students, inventors were drafted—in many cases they were wrongly placed by an Army placement service that was naturally overwhelmed with hundreds of thousands of men of all categories and talents—thus, probably hundreds of our best young scientific minds died on the field of battle—hundreds more were waster and are still being wasted in prosaic Army clerkships—and the Nation heedlessly dissipated some of its most promising brain material.

The American public that has never been properly educated to the scientific long range point of view—the Government and the Congress which has failed to recognize, itself, this point of view and educate people to it as other countries do—together share the blame for this waste as much as the Army.

One of the most profitable jobs which the recommended National Research Foundation could do—if Congress agrees to its establishment—would be to correct this point of view. That way it could make certain that this situation is not duplicated again if we are so unfortunate as to be forced again to fight a war. There is another extremely vital weakness in the American method of scientific research for national defense which does not appear in Dr. Bush's report but which is very close to the hearts of future-looking scientists in this country.

The men of science point out that in the last war—as in this one—when the generals and admirals needed machines of war quickly they turned to American science and industry and said "Get out as much stuff as you can as quickly as you can." Most of our first war production was built from prewar specifications. Though frantic attempts were made to utilize the new weapons reported by our observers abroad and lent to us by our allies—it was all a last-minute operation.

A good part of the first American war materials to come off the assembly lines was out dated almost before it reached the field of battle. American industrial and scientific know-how very quickly caught up this unfortunate gap. The point the scientists make is that this gap need never have existed. The first American weapons to be produced, in quantity, could have been from the start superior to those of our enemies. That is they could have been if there had existed in this country a constant contract between the top minds of the armed forces and the best brains of science and industry; if there existed, at the same time some kind of an agency—above politics—and quite unconcerned with civilian and military differences which constantly in the between war years would have provided a free exchange of ideas between the military mind on one side, and the scientific and industrial mind on the other.

America's top scientists believe that since modern war weapons are as rapidly destructive as they have proved—and since they give every promise of being able to strike even more quickly and devastatingly than they do today—that it is imperative to the safety of our country that such an agency be set up immediately.

The top military minds have also tended to see the weapons of the future in the terms of the weapons of the past. The rapid rate of development of far ranging and de-

structive modern weapons in this war indicates that if there be another world war it may be fought with weapons and along lines that the soldier, sailor, and airman of today might think inconceivable. It is not a criticism of the generals and admirals to say that they are incapable of visualizing the scientific changes of the future which can make obsolete all the modern technique of war. After all, it's not the business of military men to be visionary scientists. It's their business rather to put to the best use the weapons produced by the scientists and also to adapt their tactics to the changing needs of modern war.

It's the business of the scientists to keep abreast of the inventions in other countries which might make our own military weapons inadequate. It's the business of American industry then to make the needed weapons. Since the scientists haven't the same access to the changes in military weapons that the military intelligence service is supposed to have, the men of science can't do the job they must, unless the military keep them fully informed.

This complex pattern of information, invention, and ultimately production—in the field of national defense—is completely interdependent. Unless all three—the American military, the scientists, and the industrialists—keep in constant and intelligent touch, the one with the other, our country could be caught badly off base in a possible future war.

The best minds among our men of science believe the establishment of such an American defense council is imperative to America's security. The vision of the scientists deserves the most careful examination. Without such an agency our fortunate geographical position and our vast industrial and manpower resources may not be able to come into operation in time to save us if there is ever another war.

Tributes to Claude M. Dean, Clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the tributes which were paid by Senior Circuit Judge John J. Parker and United States District Judge Harry E. Watkins at Hot Springs, Va., on June 8, 1945, respecting the service rendered by Hon. Claude M. Dean, clerk of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Knowing Mr. Dean as I do, I believe he is worthy of everything that was said with reference to his 50 years of service in the United States court.

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Judge PARKER. A century is a long time. There have been less than 20 of them since the birth of the Savior. A half a century is a long time. It represents just about the average span of human life. At this conference we note that the clerk of our circuit court of appeals is rounding out a half a century of faithful and efficient service; and it is fitting that we take notice of the service that he has rendered.

The administration of justice involves a great deal more than the work of the judge. The clerks, the marshals, and the attorneys all have an important part in it; and justice will not be properly administered unless all do their duty in a fine and high way. As Lord Bacon has said:

"The place of justice is a hallowed place, and therefore, not only the bench but the footpiece and precincts and purprise thereof ought to be preserved without scandal or corruption."

For 50 years Claude Dean has served in the clerk's office faithfully, courteously, and efficiently. He has kept the records properly and neatly and has honestly handled the funds passing through the office, so that no breath of scandal or suspicion has attached to it. He has guided counsel in the details of procedure with which they were not familiar. With his long experience, his attention to what is taking place in the present and his recollection of what has gone before in the court, he has been of great assistance to the judges. To quote again from Lord Bacon:

"An ancient clerk, skilful in precedents, wary in proceedings and understanding in the business of the court, is an excellent finger of a court, and doth many times point the way to the judge himself."

I ask Judge Harry E. Watkins, in behalf of all the judges of the circuit, to present to Mr. Dean a token of their affection and esteem.

Judge WATKINS. Judge Parker, members, and guests of the conference, it is quite customary to felicitate a man upon his appointment to office, and rightly so, for he needs the good will and cooperation of his associates. But the man who most deserves this evidence of appreciation and kind regard is the one who has satisfactorily filled the position, has done his work well, and has won the esteem and respect of those who have been associated with him.

Hon. Claude M. Dean, the esteemed clerk of the circuit court of appeals, is this year celebrating his fiftieth anniversary as clerk of the court. In 1895 he became a deputy clerk, and since 1917 has served continuously as the clerk of that court. He has served under 46 circuit and district judges and under 5 Chief Justices of the Supreme Court.

On the table before me is a beautiful bouquet of yellow roses. Attached thereto is a card bearing the following inscription:

"Congratulations to Claude M. Dean, in recognition of 50 years of service.

"FEDERAL CLERKS ASSOCIATION."

(Deputy Clerk Mr. Williams hands flowers to Mr. Dean.)

In my hands I hold a beautiful watch, upon the back of which there is the following inscription:

"To Claude M. Dean, from United States judges, fourth circuit, in recognition of loyal service—1895-1945."

Mr. Dean, this watch carries with it many timely suggestions. It is of gold—not gold in its purest sense, because nothing durable could be fashioned out of so soft a metal. It contains, therefore, sufficient alloy to help you withstand the hard knocks of life.

It is jeweled. That means that hidden away from public gaze, like the innermost parts of your heart and mind, are those tiny, precious jewels, symbolic of your patience, friendliness, and kindness which, during these many years have prevented wear and tear and have insured endurance of the many friendships you have made.

Underneath the polished surface of this watch are wheels, and steel of strongest metal. Upon these we depend for service and accuracy. This suggests to us that you have given that same degree of service and accuracy in keeping the records of the circuit court and of this judicial conference.

This gift not only signifies that you have been honored by your associates and have risen high in their esteem, but indicates that you have rendered golden service to our courts. We have enjoyed the years of close association with you. We have respected your ability, and marveled at your industry.

In behalf of both the circuit and district judges of this conference, I have the honor to present to you this gold watch as an expression of our joy in your achievements, our hearty congratulations, and our sincere good wishes. We hope that you will carry it regularly in future years, that it may remind you every minute of every day of our high respect and esteem.

Mutual Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to me on the subject of mutual housing, by Mr. John Carson, director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League. For many years Mr. Carson has been an authority on cooperatives, and I feel that his views on mutual housing merit the attention of all Senators.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I have your letter of recent date in which you express interest in the testimony I gave to the Senate Postwar Subcommittee on Housing and in which you ask for further information relative to my argument in behalf of the mutual housing plan.

I assure you that I was not playing with words when I told the subcommittee that the mutual housing plan offered to us another REA plan which would be most effective in attacking our housing problem in cities and in rural areas. Incidentally, I think we have had developed for us in the REA experiment a method for the building of the soundest credit machinery that has been devised. It can be applied to housing and it can be applied to problems in other fields. I am just mentioning that fact and emphasizing it here because I notice that Senators are becoming concerned, as they should be, about the debt problem and all of its implications. When the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency begins its hearings on housing legislation, I would like to appear and present some facts and opinions relative to housing and to the debt problem.

Our cooperatives, those which are associated with the Cooperative League, United States of America, are consumer cooperative organizations. They are public in nature because everyone is a consumer and every consumer is invited to become a member-owner of a cooperative organization. They are open-membership organizations and there can be no restriction imposed against others because of class or creed or race. The Swiss have a saying that "consumer cooperatives incarnate the public interest," and they do just that. Therefore, in appearing before

the Senate committee, the representatives of the League are compelled to represent the public interest. I hope I justified that trust in this instance and that I shall continue to do so whenever appearing before Congress.

I was concerned, specifically, with the mutual housing plan in the testimony I gave but I was interested also in other phases of the problem. I endeavored to present testimony in support of the following proposals:

1. Amendment of the Federal Housing Administration Act to induce the administrators of FHA in regional offices and in the national office not to discriminate against cooperative housing projects.

2. Establishment in the National Housing Agency of a Mutual Housing Administration with rank equal to that of the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration, and the grant of authority to MHA to encourage mutual housing projects in a manner similar to that by which speculative-profit housing projects are encouraged through FHA.

3. Amendment of the laws, if that is necessary, to compel FHA and the proposed MHA to reduce the interest rates on mortgages which are guaranteed by the Government, or mortgages given by the Government, so that no profit will be made on loans for housing. These loans should equal only the cost of the money to the Government plus the small administrative cost.

Because there seems to be a woeful lack of interest in the rural housing problem, I want to emphasize again that we are concerned with rural housing also. If we are interested in the improvement of agriculture and of farm life, we must be concerned about the improvement of the home. Millions of farm families are member owners of the Cooperative League U. S. A. The mutual housing plan can be applied to farms just as it can be used in the cities.

I wish, Senator, that I could escape from the depression I had from listening to much of the testimony given to the subcommittee. It seemed to me that only the representatives of national housing arganizations which are interested in "slum clearance" and in "public housing" and the representatives of the organizations of labor had interest in a sound or true public interest approach to the problem. They were concerned with the social questions involved and with serving the common good. Other witnesses, it seemed to me, had a primary and a controlling interest in "adequate return on investments" and in "sound business principles," which was interpreted to mean "adequate profits" for the enterprise.

Our cooperatives will support every application of sound business principles to this and to every other problem. We begin with the soundest of all business principles, the avoidance of credit in every degree possible. But we know from experience that the soundest of business principles have their roots deep in the common good and that we must approach this problem through thinking, firstly, of the common good and of social welfare, and thereafter of "profits."

As I listened to the testimony, I wanted to find some method for presenting all-important questions to many of the witnesses, more than to the committee. I might sum them up here, as follows:

How can we expect to maintain and develop the strength of our society and our country unless we promote the welfare of family life through insuring to our people every reasonable opportunity to have adequate housing facilities?

How are we going to encourage and promote the welfare of the family unless we subordinate our interest in "profits from housing" and "financial investments in housing" to the common good or the social equations in housing?

How can we hope to develop a society of freemen, and hence make democracy possible, unless we enter upon an incessant war against the causes and conditions which promote tenancy and destroy the home, the anchor of family life, and the family itself?

"Responsibility is the great developer," was the gospel of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis. Even though he was never a pessimist, he always was concerned and alarmed by the factors in our national life which were encouraging irresponsibility because he realized that democracy and irresponsibility were completely incompatible.

Let's look for a moment at irresponsibility and the housing problem. Let's think of the millions of our families with incomes of $2,500 to $3,000 a year, and less—perhaps 80 percent to 90 percent of our families. Let's remember that the threat of unemployment always hangs over most of these families. If we encourage the family in the lower income groups to invest $500 to $1,000 as a down payment on a house, remembering that that amount constitutes the saving of several years of the average family in this group, do we not have an obligation to protect that investment to the uttermost limits of reasonability? We might put the question in another way. Have we any moral right to encourage an investment of this amount in a house by the average family in this income group unless we, as a society, insure the family with the opportunity to earn an income over a sufficiently long period—say 10 years to 20 years—to protect that investment? I do not think we have.

Those are questions which, I think, we must ponder very seriously if we are intelligently interested, and sincerely interested in the common good and in democracy and in the housing problem.

I know how interested you were in the proposals to develop the REA law and, of course, I have known throughout all the years of our association how interested you were, and are, in every proposal to assist the less fortunate to help themselves. Despite your interest in the REA law, however, I doubt that you know intimately of the work which went into the writing of that law and the development of REA and of the accidents which happened and became most influential in making the REA successful.

As you know, Senator George W. Norris was my very intimate friend for 25 years and I, because of that friendship, was somewhat involved in the development of the REA law. You know, of course, that the REA law merely provides the program and the authority for the Government to lend money to utility corporations, and to political subdivisions, and to cooperative associations for the construction and development of rural electric lines and other rural electric facilities.

When Senator Norris finished his work on the law, he told me a number of stories of personal experiences on the farms in Nebraska and of his dream that electricity would relieve the farmers—and even more than the farmers, the wives of the farmers, and the children of the farmers—of many burdens. He said that he was confident the power companies or utility companies would borrow the money from the Government and build the lines and thus gain control of rural electrification. Even though he feared that development, he said that he preferred to submit to it if it would bring electricity to the farms and if there were no other way to get them electric service. He said he hoped that some of the counties or townships in the country would form public utility districts and develop transmission lines, but he doubted that they would and, as for the cooperatives, in which he had paramount interest, he said there was no hope that they would develop and be of help.

The further fact is that the first Administrators of REA and their associates agreed with Senator Norris, and at the outset gave no encouragement to cooperatives. It was only when they were pressed to do so by our cooperative organizations that they opened the door to encourage cooperatives, as they were encouraging other organizations, to participate in the REA program. The result is history now. It is that more than 95 percent of the money loaned by the Government, and more than 95 percent of the lines constructed and the service given, was given through cooperative organizations. There is, I think, a lesson in this—and I tried to emphasize that point in testifying before the subcommittee. The lesson is that if we can escape from the absurd assumption that we can solve these problems for the people, and devote our energy to the development of methods which will free the people to help themselves—and to help themselves without bowing to those who would exploit them—they will solve their problems.

The mutual housing program offers us a method of attacking the housing problem such as we stumbled onto in developing the REA program. Through the mutual housing program, we would permit and encourage the people to organize their own associations democratically, to organize associations which would give our Government through them much of the benefit of the old town meeting. These associations would be encouraged to assume the burden of developing their housing programs and their housing plans in association with Government officials who would have responsibility for providing the credit through which the programs could be developed. The associations and their members would then have the responsibility for managing the development, and under a plan whereby they would begin to acquire ownership as the occupants of the houses paid a rental charge which would pay interest on the Government loan, the cost of management, depreciation charges, and also retire the Government's investment.

That is exactly your REA plan for rural electrification.

It should be obvious that there are a tremendous number of our people who are either going to do without houses or who are going to get housing facilities through some form of assistance from Government. Many are going to get housing facilities through what are known as housing authorities and what is known as public housing. There are a vast number of our people who have yearly incomes so low that they cannot acquire houses or housing facilities without public assistance. Certainly we have an obligation to those who have been bled white and beaten down in this ruthless economic order and who cannot now pay for decent housing. We have an obligation to provide every reasonable assurance of adequate housing to these people. We, incidentally, will help and protect ourselves when we do so. We are not opposed to public housing. We favor it where it is necessary. We are urging that the mutual housing program shall be adopted, also.

The mutual housing program is not an experiment. It was the program which was used in other countries, and used most successfully. It has already demonstrated its efficacy in this country, where mutual housing developments are being managed at a cost far less than the cost of other housing developments. In the Walnut Groves Mutual Housing Development in South Bend, the cost of maintenance and operation of a house is only $5.19 a month. The cost of maintenance and operation in the Greenmount Mutual Housing Development in Dayton is approximately $5.14. That low cost of management and operation is achieved because the people have organized to assume complete responsibility for their houses. They are watchful against waste and extravagance. Incidentally, they are thus building the fine character of responsibility which we must encourage if our democracy is to survive. If anyone can offer any objection to the mutual housing program, I would like to know what the objection is.

I proposed to your subcommittee that we should establish a Mutual Housing Admin-

istration in the National Housing Agency, and give to it a rank comparable to that had by the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration. We must do that and place the responsibility upon a distinct administrative group if mutual housing is to succeed. We know, from experience, that the mutual housing program must have the supervision of people who are responsible for it, and it alone. We know that it cannot be administered successfully through the Federal Housing Administration or the Public Housing Administration. We know, in short, that there must be a Mutual Housing Administration established if we are to be sincerely interested in the success of the proposal. Let us fix specific responsibility on one administrative group for this specific plan for housing.

I think that anyone who will study the housing problem as it concerns all of our people with incomes of $2,500 and less a year, and perhaps even for people with incomes up to $3,000 a year, will have to admit that we must have a plan which will provide for a source of credit from the public, or through public assistance. We may not need Government funds. We may develop this mutual housing program through a guarantee of mortgages, and thus make the projects available for private credit which would be offered if the mortgages were guaranteed. But, however it is done, we are going to have to have public assistance—just as we have it through Federal Housing Administration and through the Public Housing Administration. I think that everyone interested in democracy will be very friendly to a proposal which offers what the mutual housing proposal offers, and that is a proposal which establishes responsibility directly with and in the people concerned, and keeps that responsibility centered there, and encourages and inspires the people to assume the responsibility.

I am grateful for your inquiry and hope that you will help us in getting consideration for our proposal to have mortgages on cooperative housing projects eligible for guarantee by Federal Housing Administration, and also will assist in having this mutual housing program explored to the uttermost.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN CARSON,
Director, Washington Office, the Cooperative League of the United States of America.

The Flag of Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement dealing with the flag of liberation, together with letters and newspaper comment on the same subject.

There being no objection, the matter referred to, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FLAG OF LIBERATION

This is the story of the American flag which flew over the Capitol on the day that the United States declared a state of war to exist between the United States and Japan. This same flag flew over the Capitol when the United States took the same action against Germany and Italy.

Since then the flag flew on July 4, 1944, over Rome; it was taken to Algiers, Casablanca, and other places by the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. On July 20, 1945, President Truman raised this same historic flag over Berlin.

The story of how the flag was acquired by Maury Maverick is told here along with affidavits identifying the flag. The flag now is the property of the United States, being given to the late President Roosevelt and now is in the care of President Truman.

This flag—so proud in war—shall become a symbol of a nation united for peace. It may truly be called the flag of liberation.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 21, 1945.*

Concerning flag flown over Berlin on July 20 by President Truman.

Concerning this, the news referred to this as Maury Maverick's flag. It is not mine. I did get the original flag. However, I gave it to President Roosevelt as trustee.

He accepted it, and I spoke to him about it twice afterward. He was very much interested.

Following is—

1. The letter that I wrote the President;
2. Copies of his memorandum to me; and
3. The affidavits which show the flag flew over the Capitol when war was declared against Japan, Germany, and Italy.

MAURY MAVERICK.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION,
May 30, 1944.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When Pearl Harbor struck, I got the official flag that flew over the Capitol. It was there during the entire time that you addressed Congress for the declaration of war against Japan. Thereafter, it flew all day on December 11, 1941, when the United States declared war on Germany and Italy.

This I treasure very greatly, but I realize it should not be my personal possession. It should be the possession of the American people. I should like to give it to you, as trustee, so it may come to be known as the flag of liberation.

It would be fine for our friend Eisenhower to have wherever he goes; and finally when the armies of liberation march under the Arc de Tromphe in Paris. Being the flag of liberation, it would be a symbol that, once we declare war, we win that war, also that this flag really means liberation.

The original affidavits about getting the flag are attached. It is correctly identified.

This flag is of regulation size and could now be used at whatever headquarters we have in England. Later it could be transferred to the Continent, and eventually to Paris and, I hope, Berlin.

I want it understood that I don't want any credit. If there is any, I want you to have it. Then when the flag has gone through Europe and is returned, I think it should be hung under the Dome of the Capitol on a fairly high place, where for coming centuries it will symbolize freedom and liberty.

With best wishes for your health, I am,

Sincerely your friend,

MAURY MAVERICK,
Chairman and General Manager.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 5, 1944.

Memorandum for Hon. Maury Maverick:

I like that idea of yours of the flag of liberation. I am writing to General Marshall and will let you know what he says.

F. D. R.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1944.

Memorandum for Maury Maverick:

For your information.

F. D. R.

SUPREME HEADQUARTERS,
ALLIED EXPEDITIONARY FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SUPREME COMMANDER,
June 13, 1944.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received, through the Chief of Staff of the Army, the flag presented to you by Mr. Maverick.

I shall communicate with General Devers in the Mediterranean to see whether he would like the flag to fly in Rome, say on July 4. After that I hope, one day, to have the honor of flying it in one of the other European capitals.

With best wishes for your continued good health and with respectful regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C.

AFFIDAVIT OF HON. DAVID LYNN, CAPITOL ARCHITECT

CITY OF WASHINGTON,
District of Columbia, ss:

Before me, a notary public in and for Washington, D. C., on this 6th day of February A. D. 1942, there appeared David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol of the United States, who after being by me duly sworn, deposes and says:

That on the afternoon of December 8, 1941, the American flag which was then flying over the Capitol, which had been flying there for several weeks and during the time President Roosevelt addressed the Joint Session of Congress on that day, asking them for a declaration of war against Japan, and during the time the War Resolution was adopted by both the Senate and the House of Representatives, was taken down, and another official flag of the same size and quality which was purchased by Mr. Maverick was flown from the Capitol in its place.

The flag which was taken down was delivered to Mr. William B. Blanchet, representative of Mr. Maverick who was then present at the Capitol, who marked it for identification by printing the small letter "M" in the double-stitched canvas hem, opposite the first star of the first row. In addition on the rope hem in back of the flag opposite the bottom red and white stripes, but off the true field of the flag these words have been inked in:

"American flag owned by Maury Maverick, which flew over the United States Capitol, December 8, 1941, when the United States declared war on Japan, and later on December 11, 1941, when the United States declared war on Germany and Italy."

During the morning of December 11, 1941, Mr. Blanchet brought the same flag to the Capitol. This was the day on which the United States of America declared war on Germany and Italy. This flag was again flown over the Capitol over the east front by Sgt. Donald Murphy of the Capitol Police, accompanied by Mr. Blanchet. The flag was then returned to Mr. Maverick.

DAVID LYNN,
Architect of the Capitol of the United States.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of February A. D. 1942, to certify which I have hereunto subscribed my hand and affixed my official seal of office.

[SEAL] ARTHUR E. COOK,
Notary Public in and for Washington, D. C.

AFFIDAVIT OF MR. WILLIAM B. BLANCHET

CITY OF WASHINGTON,
District of Columbia, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day, personally appeared Mr. William B. Blanchet, who, after being by me duly sworn, did depose and say:

My name is William B. Blanchet. I am an assistant to the Honorable Maury Maverick, Washington, D. C.

On December 8, 1941, about 3 p. m., I went to the United States Capitol, Washington, D. C. I contacted Hon. David Lynn, Capitol Architect, and purchased a new United States flag and substituted it for the flag which was then flying over the east front of the Capitol and which had been flying there for several weeks. It was in very good condition but bore some marks of the weather, including coal dust.

The flag was taken down by Mr. George Keller, of the Capitol Police, and personally delivered to me for Mr. Maverick. It is a woolen flag 7½ by 14 feet in dimension, made by the Dettra Flag Co., of Philadelphia, Pa. This flag was then marked for identification by myself in the presence of Mr. Lynn. I printed the small letter "M" in the double-stitched canvas hem, opposite the first star of the first row. In addition, on the rope hem in back of the flag opposite the bottom red and white stripes but off the true field of the flag these words have been inked in:

"American flag owned by Maury Maverick, which flew over the United States Capitol, December 8, 1941, when the United States declared war on Japan, and later on December 11, 1941, when the United States declared war on Germany and Italy."

On December 11, 1941, the day that the United States of America declared war on Germany and Italy, I went to the United States Capitol and accompanied Sgt. Donald Murphy, of the Capitol Police, to the east front of the building, taking the identical flag that flew over the Capitol on December 8, 1941. This flag was flown during the day of war declaration against Germany and Italy, then lowered and returned to me. I then returned the flag to Mr. Maverick.

WILLIAM B. BLANCHET.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of February A. D. 1942, to certify which I have hereunto subscribed my hand and affixed my official seal of office.

[SEAL] ARTHUR E. COOK,
Notary Public in and for Washington, D. C.

AFFIDAVIT OF MR. GEORGE E. KELLER, CAPITOL POLICE

CITY OF WASHINGTON,
District of Columbia, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day, personally appeared, Mr. George E. Keller, who after being by me duly sworn, did depose and say:

My name is George E. Keller. I am a member of the Capitol Police, Washington, D. C. On December 8, 1941, the day President Roosevelt addressed a joint session of Congress asking for a declaration of war against Japan, which Congress then enacted by joint resolution. Mr. William B. Blanchet, a representative of Mr. Maury Maverick, came to the Capitol and personally delivered to him the flag which had been flying over the east front of the Capitol for several weeks and during the address of the President before the joint session of Congress, and the adoption of both Houses of the war resolution.

It is a woolen flag 7½ by 14 feet in dimension made by the Dettra Flag Co., of Philadelphia, Pa. The flag was then marked for identification by printing the small letter "M" in the double-stitched canvas hem, opposite the first star of the first row. In addition on the rope hem in back of the flag opposite the bottom red and white stripes, but off the true field of the flag these words have been inked in:

"American flag owned by Maury Maverick which flew over the United States Capitol, December 8, 1941, when the United States declared war on Japan, and later on December 11, 1941, when the United States declared war on Germany and Italy."

GEORGE E. KELLER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of February A. D. 1942, to certify which I have hereunto subscribed my hand and affixed my official seal of office.

[SEAL] ARTHUR E. COOK,
Notary Public in and for Washington, D. C.

AFFIDAVIT OF MR. DONALD MURPHY, CAPITOL POLICE

CITY OF WASHINGTON,
District of Columbia, ss:

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day, personally appeared Mr. Donald Murphy, who after being by me duly sworn, did depose and say:

My name is Donald Murphy. I am a member of the Capitol Police, Washington, D. C.

I took the flag belonging to Hon. Maury Maverick, identified as herein shown, on December 11, 1941, and flew it over the east front of the Capitol which was the same day war was declared against Germany and Italy.

It is a woolen flag 7½ by 14 feet in dimensions, made by the Dettra Flag Co., of Philadelphia, Pa. The flag has been marked for identification by printing the small letter "M" in the double-stitched canvas hem, opposite the first star of the first row. In addition, on the rope hem in back of the flag opposite the bottom red and white stripes, but off the true field of the flag, these words were inked in:

"American flag owned by Maury Maverick which flew over the United States Capitol, December 8, 1941, when the United States declared war on Japan, and later on December 11, 1941, when the United States declared war on Germany and Italy."

Mr. William B. Blanchet, representative of Mr. Maury Maverick, accompanied me, and then returned the flag to Mr. Maverick.

DONALD MURPHY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of February A. D. 1942, to certify which I have hereunto subscribed my hand and affixed my official seal of office.

[SEAL] HENRY S. THOMPSON,
Notary Public in and for Washington, D. C.
My commission expires January 15, 1944.

[From the Washington Post of July 21, 1915]

BERLIN FLOWN YANK FLAG COMING HERE

The American flag that flew over Berlin yesterday eventually is destined to hang in the United States Capitol dome as a "symbol of liberty for our friends and respect from our enemies."

Those are the words of Maury Maverick, former Texas Congressman and now Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, who owns it.

"When the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor, I was in a hospital with a heart attack," Maverick said yesterday.

"I called my office and told them to see Dave Lynn (Architect of the Capitol) early the next morning and remind him that I had reserved a place for the 'War Flag' more than a year before. I knew war was coming.

WITNESSED WAR VOTES

"The flag was flying there when we declared war on Japan December 8. It was back up there again on December 11 when we declared war on Germany and Italy.

"Then I wrote President Roosevelt a letter. I told him I would like to see it eventually hang in the Capitol dome as a 'flag of liberation,' as symbol of liberty for our friends and respect from our enemies. I asked him to take it on those trips he made."

ROOSEVELT "LIKED IDEA"

"The President wrote back, 'I like your idea of the flag of liberation.'

"Mr. Roosevelt took it to Algiers and Casablanca, other places. It flew over Rome. When it flies over Tokyo, that'll be wonderful."

[From the Washington Post of July 21, 1945]

UNITED STATES SEEKS NO TERRITORY, TROOPS TOLD BY TRUMAN—STARS AND STRIPES RAISED OVER BERLIN; PRESIDENT WARNS "WE FIGHT FOR PEACE"

(By Ernest B. Vaccaro)

BERLIN, July 20.—President Truman told the world today that the United States does not propose to trade its sacrifices in the bloodiest of wars for territorial conquest or monetary gain.

Speaking only a few miles from the former Kaiser's palace where he is working with Prime Minister Churchill and Generalissimo Stalin on a formula for preserving Europe against future war he declared pointedly:

"We are not fighting for conquest. There is not a piece of territory or one thing of a monetary nature we want out of this war."

The words were spoken at the historic occasion of the raising of the Stars and Stripes over the capital of Germany—our greatest adversary. Picked infantrymen from the Second (Hell on Wheels) Armored Division then heard this solemn warning:

"We must not forget that we are fighting for peace and for the welfare of mankind."

This was interpreted as an exposition of the American position, not only as relates to present negotiations for settlement of Europe's age-old territorial and other problems, but as new advice to the Japanese people that the war in the Pacific is not aimed at the people themselves.

"We want peace and we want to see the time come when we can do the things in peace that we have been able to do in war," the gray-haired Missourian assured the victorious outfit.

"If we can put this tremendous machine of ours which has made this victory possible to work for peace, we can look forward to the greatest age in the history of mankind.

"That," the President concluded firmly, "is what we propose to do."

Flanked by War Secretary Stimson, General Eisenhower, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Gen. George S. Patton, Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, and Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, the President spoke extemporaneously for about 2 minutes in the cobblestoned central court of what had been the headquarters of the German Air Force district commander.

He had hurried to the ceremony by automobile direct from formal discussions with Churchill and Stalin.

When the President concluded, the historic flag which flew over the Capitol at Washington the day the United States entered the war against the Axis and which will be taken to Tokyo was raised over the quarters of the American control forces occupying Berlin.

The flag, which belongs to Maury Maverick, of Texas and Washington, was previously raised as a sign of victory at Casablanca, Algiers, and Rome.

Mr. Truman reminded the troops it was being raised in the name of the people of the United States, who are "looking forward to a better world, a peaceful world, a world in which all the people will have an opportunity to enjoy the good things of life, and not just a few at the top."

Looking well and slightly heavier than when he left Washington on July 6, the President walked about 200 yards from his automobile to the ceremony.

President Truman's state dinner last night for Churchill and Stalin apparently was a big success, climaxed by the President playing Beethoven's Minuet in G on the piano at the joint request of his two top guests.

An American sergeant pianist, Eugene List, scored a complete triumph when he won two toasts from Stalin and a hearty handshake from Churchill. A violinist, Pvt. Stuart Canin, of the Bronx, shared the musical honors.

Later Stalin and Truman, speaking through an interpreter, talked animatedly over their respective preferences for folk music. At Churchill's request, List played the Missouri Waltz, theme of Truman's Vice Presidential campaign and one of his old favorites.

Official news was lacking on the progress of the Conference.

Steady progress was indicated by word that the foreign secretaries were going into a daily huddle and forwarding their recommendations to the leaders as fast as they complete their study of the various phases of the Conference.

The President also found time to talk with General Bradley, who soon is to take over as Veterans' Affairs Administrator in Washington. They discussed plans for modernizing the veterans' set-up.

[From the New York Times of July 21, 1945]

WASHINGTON, July 20.—The American flag that flew over Berlin today is destined to hang in the United States Capitol dome as "a symbol of liberty for our friends and respect from our enemies."

Those are the words of Maury Maverick, former Texas Representative and now chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, who owns it. Mr. Maverick told the story of the flag today.

"When the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor, I was in a hospital with a heart attack," he related. "I called my office and told them to see Dave Lynn [Architect of the Capitol] early the next morning and reminded him that I had reserved a place for the 'war flag' more than a year ago. I knew war was coming.

"My people took the flag up to the Capitol, saw it raised and stayed there on the roof all day. It was there when we declared war on Japan on December 8. It was back up there again on December 11 when we declared war on Germany and Italy. I have five affidavits to this.

"Then I wrote President Roosevelt a letter. I told him I would like to see it eventually hang in the Capitol dome as a 'flag of liberation,' as a symbol of liberty for our friends and respect from our enemies. I asked him to take it on those trips he made.

"The President wrote back, 'I like your idea of the flag of liberation.' I saw him, I think it was at his last church service, and he told me, 'This flag idea is working out all right and I want it to go on.'

"President Truman is the man with just the manhood and guts to see that it does go on."

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 21, 1945]

MAVERICK TELLS STORY BEHIND FAMED UNITED STATES FLAG

WASHINGTON, July 20.—The American flag that flew over Berlin today eventually is destined to hang in the United States Capitol dome as "a symbol of liberty for our friends and respect from our enemies."

Those are the words of Maury Maverick, former Texas Representative and now Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, who owns it.

Here is the story behind it as told by Maverick:

"When the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor I was in a hospital with a heart attack.

"I called my office and told them to see Dave Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, early the next morning and remind him that I had reserved a place for the war flag more than a year ago. I knew war was coming.

ROOSEVELT LIKED IDEA

"My people took the flag up to the Capitol, saw it raised.

"Then I wrote President Roosevelt. I told him I would like to see it eventually hang in the Capitol dome as a flag of liberation, as a symbol of liberty for our friends and respect from our enemies. I asked him to take it on these trips he made.

"The President wrote back: 'I like your idea of the flag of liberation.' I saw him, I think it was at his last church service, and he told me 'this flag idea is working out all right and I want it to go on.'

"Mr. Roosevelt took it to Algiers and Casablanca, other places. It flew over Rome. When it flies over Tokyo that'll be wonderful."

First Freedom for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday President Truman told the wounded soldiers in the Portland, Oreg., hospital that "we are going to try to give the veterans the treatment to which they are entitled."

I agree with that sentiment, as every other patriotic American does. One of our first duties is to see that these ex-servicemen enjoy the first freedom, that is, the freedom to work for their daily bread without paying tribute to anyone.

While these strikes in the war industries are continuing throughout the country, men who wore the uniform are being denied the right to work without paying tribute.

I have just received a letter from a veteran of World War II in Inglewood, Calif., in which he says:

The bill that you have proposed in the House on reemployment of veterans, with or without the necessity of joining a union, has more support than perhaps you know. It is an excellent piece of legislation—and for a veteran it is a guaranty of his American rights—mainly to join a union or not, depending on his own desire.

In this district, the Los Angeles section, you'll find that unions have become so powerful that they try to "boss" management. I can cite you several cases. In fact, the teamsters brought pressure against my company because I wouldn't join their group. To have done so would have penalized me in a lower classification, a cut in wages, and the payment of $3 per month dues. I believe it is my inalienable right as a citizen to choose whether to belong or not. As a veteran of this war I believe those of us who are in the front lines need some courageous Congressman to protect their interest and their rights.

If in the House you have some Members who try to dissuade you on the grounds that the veterans and soldiers don't want this law, I dare them to have the soldiers' newspaper take a poll on the subject, the Yank, which would cinch the argument. Frankly the boys overseas are fed up with unions and the way and manner they operate. Ask any of them.

Stick to your guns, sir; you have hit on a natural, and I am sure you would have the support of all the soldier boys. I sincerely trust you fight your bill through—you and I both know what obstacles and influence you would have to buck—but as an American, you'll do it.

I am not opposed to labor unions within their legitimate spheres, but when one of them degenerates into a racket, or permits any of its representatives to do so, then it is time to call a halt.

We must protect the rights of these ex-servicemen to work for a living without paying tribute to anyone, whether he be an employer, a politician, or a pretended representative, or a misrepresentative of a labor union.

While we are proposing to carry the "four freedoms" to the rest of the world, let us maintain this first and most sacred freedom for our own people, and especially for our ex-servicemen—the freedom to work for their daily bread without paying tribute.

Transocean Air Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Courant under date of July 14, 1945, entitled "Transocean Air Transport."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSOCEAN AIR TRANSPORT

With the approval of President Truman the Civil Aeronautics Board has authorized three commercial air-transport companies of recognized financial responsibility and experience to operate routes over the North Atlantic. The certificates of authorization are limited to 7 years, after which it may be desirable to review the records of the companies as to service and compliance with necessary regulations. In fact, civil aviation between nations must be fitted into the agreements reached at the international conference on aviation held in Chicago early last year.

Whether or not the Civil Aeronautics Board jumped the gun on Congress, before which is pending in committee the McCarran bill establishing a single air service for trans-Atlantic travel, is of little consequence. The issue boils down to a choice between the CAB's plan and the McCarran proposal, between the desirability of more than one line in operation, or just one under special enactment by Congress. In either case the Government will retain regulatory power, and prescribe certain minimum standards as it does for all common carriers.

The McCarran plan, embodying what is commonly designated the "chosen-instrument policy" is unique in that it would set up a billion-dollar corporation whose stock would be subscribed by existing commercial air transport companies. Mr. McCarran insists that this would not constitute a monopoly, and that behind this unified

system jointly owned by the companies would be "the power and force of the Government of the United States." Also a new agency, the Civil Aviation Authority would be created with power to fix rates, prescribe routes, the types of planes to be used, and types of service to be rendered, all in addition to the present powers relating to safety devices and traffic rules. The chosen instrument would be known as the All-American Flag Line. All of this adds up to either the "withering hand of monopoly" despite the Senator's protestation to the contrary, or to the blighting hand of Government in business.

It is argued by the proponents of this scheme that the type of competition in the international transport field demands some such Government-sponsored company—violating, as all but two of the air-transport companies have pointed out, the basic principles of American "free and open competition" and "private ownership and management." The opposition to the McCarran scheme points out that American inventive genius, spurred by competitive forces, licked the world in the production of automobiles, and that under the same conditions commercial aviation will be able to hold its own with foreign companies. In fact, as the dissenting companies assert, "the proposed legislation would destroy the very principles that have built this great air-transport system that has proved so valuable in war."

Following the CAB's announcement of the issuance of permits to three companies, the Montreal Gazette extolled the virtues of that policy in contrast with Canada's "closed air" policy of exclusive state monopoly. Trans-Canada Air Lines parallels closely the chosen instrument of the McCarran bill. The Gazette sees the triple-choice American services constantly spurred by competitive rivalry to maintain a high degree of efficiency, to improve service and to reduce costs." But in Canada there will be no such spur. In the long run the Canadian line will suffer, losing some travel to the United States lines.

If the time should come when our international air transport is endangered by subsidized foreign lines, even something more than the McCarran plan will then he required. Until then, we should reject a "closed air" or "chosen instrument" policy.

Statement by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, on Raising the Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me giving reasons why the Congress should enact S. 1349, amending the Thomas-Norton Fair Labor Standards Act by raising the minimum wage from 40 to 65 cents an hour.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Economists are in general agreement that the key to full production and employment is a high and sustained level of consumer purchasing power. There is also substantial agreement that if we are to provide productive jobs for all who seek employment in the years after the war—returning veterans as well as members of the present civilian labor force and the oncoming generation—the income of individuals must be maintained at least at the high levels attained at the peak of our war production program. This means that the postwar civilian economy must not only absorb all the millions of veterans and workers released from the manufacture of war products, but that it must also pay them wages high enough to maintain the total volume of consumer income at a level substantially above that which prevailed prior to the war.

Yet, the mounting cut-backs in war orders and lay-offs among war workers have already set in motion deflationary forces which, unless they are promptly checked, will render impossible of fulfillment our hopes for postwar prosperity and full employment.

For the past 3 years a large part of the energies of the Federal Government on the home front have been devoted to combatting the threat of inflation. That battle has been won, although it must be said that the cost of winning it has been borne largely by the working men and women of this country who have found that their wages have been stabilized to a much greater degree than the cost of the things they require for their subsistence.

Today the trend is in the other direction. Increasing unemployment, reduced hours of work, movement of workers from war jobs to lower paying civilian occupations and to lower paying industries, are exerting an increasing deflationary effect upon the economy.

The evidences of this trend are becoming more apparent from day to day. Industrial production has already fallen off substantially; the Federal Reserve Board index records a decline from a peak of 247 at the end of 1943 to 231 in April of this year. The munitions program for the current quarter is 23 percent below what it was in March of this year, and by the end of the year will have fallen off by one-third. In dollar terms this means a $20,000,000,000 reduction in munitions expenditures.

Employment has dropped off sharply. The employed labor force is down to about 51,000,000 as compared to a peak of 55,000,000 2 years ago. The number of wage earners in manufacturing industries is 1,333,000 below its wartime peak, most of the decline being in the durable goods industries.

On June 1 there were 1,000,000 unemployed. By August 1, according to the War Manpower Commission, there will be 2,000,000 out of work. In other words, unemployment has doubled in the last 2 months.

At the same time the earnings of American workers are falling sharply. The Department of Labor reports that almost 15,000,000 fewer hours were worked by factory wage earners in the midweek of April as compared with the midweek of March. The index of factory pay rolls was down to 326 in March of this year, compared to 354 at the peak of war production.

The Labor Department further reports that there has been a leveling off in the upward trend of wage rates during the past 6 months.

Thus the signs are unmistakable that our economy is starting to head down hill. It is likewise clear that this trend will not be automatically reversed and that it is incumbent upon the Government to take measures to forestall a deflationary spiral.

This means that the purchasing power of consumers must be maintained and increased. It is imperative that this be done through private channels, to the greatest extent possible, rather than through pump priming by the Federal Government.

For this reason I feel that it is extremely fortunate that S. 1349 has been introduced at this time. This bill, which would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to establish a minimum wage of 65 cents an hour and ultimately 75 cents at the end of 2 years, will go far toward bolstering the economy against the downward pressures, the evidences of which I have just cited, and which will become ever greater from now on.

What this bill will do is provide a firm foundation for the wage structure of American industry which, promptly adopted, will in itself go far toward counteracting the deflationary forces inherent in the process of reconversion to a peacetime economy.

Most people are agreed on the social desirability of higher wages, provided we can afford them and provided they will not be nullified by higher prices. There are a number of signs which indicate that wages can be raised substantially without at the same time setting off a round of price increases. For one thing, the reduction in weekly hours of work as industries return to peacetime operations will mean billions of dollars in savings to employers in the form of premiums now paid out for overtime work.

Another factor is labor productivity, which has been rising steadily throughout the war. If our experience after the last war is repeated, as it is reasonable to suppose will be the case, labor productivity will continue to increase, and with much greater rapidity, as the technological progress achieved during the war is adapted to the processes of civilian industry.

It is also important to bear in mind that prices have risen much more than wages during the war period and that it is this gap which is in large part responsible for the record-breaking profits of industry, which last year reached almost $25,000,000,000 before taxes and $10,000,000,000 after taxes. These profits have enabled industry to build up substantial reserves which will go far toward meeting any initial cost which may be occasioned by a 65-cent minimum wage. The substantial relief which Congress has provided employers in the revenue acts in the form of tax refunds and carry-backs will also cushion the impact of higher wages.

In this conection I call attention to a recent report from a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor appointed to examine Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, a resolution which would instruct the War Labor Board that the Congress considers any wage rate below 65 cents an hour to be substandard. After a careful examination of the evidence, this subcommittee concludes that a 65-cent minimum wage can be established without substantially affecting current profit levels and, in most instances, within the limits of existing price ceilings, and further concludes that such a move would not be inflationary.

It is my conclusion, that quite apart from the obvious social benefits which will follow from increasing the income of the lowest paid section of our population, the adoption of S. 1349 is essential to prevent deflation and unemployment during the reconversion, and as an aid to the achievement of full employment in the postwar period.

I, therefore, earnestly hope that every effort will be made to expedite the passage of this measure.

The United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release of the postwar world committee of

the Catholic Association for International Peace. The statement presents a scholarly appraisal of the United Nations Charter and recommends its adoption.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Senate ratification of the United Nations Charter and work by the American people for its effective operation and improvement are recommended by the postwar world committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace in a report entitled "The San Francisco Conference." The report was prepared by Thomas H. Mahony, of Boston, a vice president of the association and member of the committee.

Excerpts and summary of the report follow:

"The Senate should ratify the Charter of the United Nations, and on entering the organization the American people should work both for its success and for whatever amendments are necessary to make it a better instrument of world justice and peace.

"The earth can no longer live in anarchy; it must have a government and a law. For the earth is now a small neighborhood, and without government and law it has shown itself to be a neighborhood in which the neighbors feud among themselves with 10-ton bombs or worse.

"A world organization is an imperative necessity, and there can be no effective world organization without the membership of the United States. That lesson and many others have been learned from the failures of the League of Nations. It is true that on several counts the Charter of the United Nations is unsatisfactory, but so too was our own Constitution when it was written. Many amendments, a war between the States, and changes in interpretation have marked the history of the United States Constitution. Amendments will surely mark its future. So, too, new interpretations and amendments will be natural to the Charter, which will be the constitution of the United Nations—if the United Nations endures—and it must endure. The world must organize itself, however loosely and imperfectly at the beginning, for peace and justice.

"The Charter written through the joint efforts of 50 nations at San Francisco must be adopted because it has great strength in itself, because it can be amended and because there is no peaceful alternative available. However, it is not an automatic instrument of peace or of justice any more than is our own Constitution. The people of the United States and the peoples of the world must breathe life into the words of this document. By its very limitations the Charter presents to them an unparalleled opportunity and challenge for the effective exercise of responsive, informed, articulate public opinion."

The report calls attention to the fact that although major power and responsibility for the maintenance of peace still rests with the big powers, the numerous amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals incorporated in the Charter at San Francisco practically all increase the participation of the 45 nations other than the great powers, in the proposed United Nations Organization.

The successes of the San Francisco Conference are enumerated under the following heads:

1. Justice as a purpose and principle.
2. Individual rights.
3. International law.
4. The International Court of Justice.
5. The General Assembly.
6. The Social and Economic Council.
7. Policy regarding dependent territories.

The shortcomings of the Conference listed by the report deal mainly with the retention of the veto by the big powers and the failure to provide for adequate limitation on national sovereignty with respect to the good of the world community. The field for future effort to improve the Charter includes:

1. The recognition of the principle that no state is absolutely or unqualifiedly sovereign, that the moral law applies to the relations of states as it does to the relations of men.

2. The delegation to the General Assembly of power to legislate international law, if not upon all phases of international relations.

3. The establishment of compulsory jurisdiction in the International Court of Justice and the implementation of its decisions.

4. Limitations of the veto power exercised by the great powers.

5. Clarification of the relation or regional organization to the world organization.

The report concludes:

"These three great powers (the United States, Russia, and Great Britain) in conjunction with France and China and other states, have been and are working to establish an international organization for the maintenance of peace and collective security. At the same time, however, they have been acting independently and unilaterally to provide for their own national security in the event that the international organization does not come into existence or, if it does, that it will not work. In order to persuade these states to give up such unilateral actions, it is necessary to convince them that the international organization will furnish effective national and collective security and will, if supported, maintain peace. To accomplish this requires a fair, just, but firm attitude on the part of the United States with preference to Russia, Great Britain, France, China, and the other states. It means setting up a high standard of international morality for every state to comply with, the utmost patience in the attempt to reconcile conflicting views, the fostering of mutual confidence in the fairness and good faith of the member states, and above all, the constant exercise of the virtues of justice and charity. Probably never since the first Christmas has that angelic salutation meant so much: 'Peace on earth to men of good will.'"

The Presidential Succession—Why the Existing Statute of 1886 Was Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, several bills have been introduced relating to the Presidential succession, which have been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. As chairman of that committee I have appointed a special committee to consider these bills. I have collected a good deal of information on the subject, which has also been referred to that subcommittee.

A friend of mine, Mr. Charles Warren, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, an eminent lawyer and lecturer on legal topics, has written and sent me an article entitled "The Presidential Succession. Why the Existing Statute of 1886 Was Enacted." It is a historical survey, and very valuable in its collection of facts. I believe that it is of interest not only to the subcommittee considering these bills, and to the Congress, but also to the people of the United States, who to a certain extent have been misled by misinformation on this subject. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. Warren printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—WHY THE EXISTING STATUTE OF 1886 WAS ENACTED

(By Charles Warren)

The provision of the existing Presidential Succession Act of January 19, 1886, under which the Secretary of State may become President of the United States seems now to disturb some people—although it has been on the statute books for 59 years without arousing serious opposition. What brought about this act? It was no hastily devised measure. It had been the subject of over 4 years of thorough (and largely nonpartisan) consideration and debate in the Congress. Its final enactment was due to the serious inadequacy of previous legislation which, though frequently pointed out, had never been deeply realized until the assassination of President Garfield, when, in the summer of 1881, the country was confronted with a dangerous threat to the continuity of our Government. For it appeared that it was entirely possible that in case of the death of Vice President Arthur there might not be any person in existence empowered to act as President. The then controlling statute of March 1, 1792, designated as a successor, in case of the death of both the President and the Vice President, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. But on Garfield's death on September 19, 1881, neither the Senate nor the House had chosen any head. There had also been previous occasions when both Senate and House lacked a head. It was highly important, therefore, that some provision should be made by law that the Presidential succession should devolve on some official who should always be in existence and who should not mingle either legislative or judicial duties with the executive. Moreover, it was felt that the succeeding President should remain representative of the party which carried the Presidential election and which should not be deprived of its victory by the deaths of both of its elected candidates. Members of the Cabinet would, as a rule, be of the victorious party and seemed to be appropriate officials to succeed, whereas the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House might be, and often had been, of a different party from the elected candidate. It is true that some opposition was raised to any plan under which a President might, by appointing a Secretary of State, eventually happen to designate his successor; but the arguments in favor vastly outweighed this possible disadvantage and this method of succession (proposed first in 1881) seemed the best method of meeting the situation in the future. And so the act of 1886 came into being.

It is interesting to ask whether the interests of the United States would have in any way suffered if this act of 1886 had been in effect, not only since that year, but if it had been originally passed in 1792. Let us consider, therefore, what manner of men might have become President in the event of the death since 1792 of both President and Vice President during their terms of office. When we call the roll an extraordinary list appears.

Thus if Vice President Tyler had died after the death of President Harrison in 1841, the Secretaries of State who might have succeeded him—dependent on the date of his death—were: Daniel Webster, appointed by

Harrison and retained by Tyler for a year; Hugh S. Legare, of South Carolina, in 1842, former Attorney General of the United States; Abel P. Upshur, a talented jurist of Virginia, who was appointed on Legare's death in 1843; and John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, who was appointed on Upshur's death in 1844. If Vice President Fillmore had died after the death of President Taylor in 1850, the Secretaries of State who might have succeeded him—dependent on the date of his death—were: Daniel Webster, in 1850, and Edward Everett, in 1852. If Vice President Johnson had died after the death of President Lincoln in 1865, the Secretary of State who might have succeeded him was William H. Seward, of New York. If Vice President Arthur had died after the death of President Garfield in 1881, the Secretaries of State who might have succeeded him—dependent on the date of his death—were: James G. Blaine, appointed by Garfield and retained by Arthur, and Frederic T. Frelinghuysen, appointed in 1881. If Vice President Roosevelt had died after the death of President McKinley, the Secretary of State who might have succeeded him was John Hay, appointed by McKinley and retained by Roosevelt. If Vice President Coolidge had died after the death of President Harding, the Secretary of State who might have succeeded him was Charles E. Hughes, appointed by Harding and retained by Coolidge.

In addition to the seven Presidents who have died during their term of office, six Vice Presidents have died during the term of office of their President; and if the President, who survived, had died thereafter, the folfowing Secretaries of State might have succeeded to the office, had the statute been in existence. George Clinton died in 1812 when James Monroe was Secretary of State. Elbridge Gerry died in 1814 while James Madison was President and James Monroe was Secretary of State. John C. King died in 1853 when Franklin Pierce was President and William L. Marcy was Secretary of State. Vice President Henry Wilson died in 1875 when Ulysses S. Grant was President and Hamilton Fish was Secretary of State. Thomas A. Hendricks died in 1885 when Grover Cleveland was President and Thomas F. Bayard was Secretary of State. Garrett A. Hobart died in 1899 when William McKinley was President and John Hay was Secretary of State. James A. Sherman died in 1912 when William H. Taft was President and Philander C. Knox was Secretary of State.

It can hardly be said that the interests of the United States would in any way have been impaired by the succession to the Presidency of either Secretary of State Monroe, Webster, Legare, Upshur, Calhoun, Everett, Marcy, Seward, Fish, Blaine, Frelinghuysen, Bayard, Hay, Knox, or Hughes—even though the man who succeeded to the position had in fact been appointed to the office of Secretary of State by the President whom he succeeded. In fact, with a very few exceptions, the Secretary of State would seem to have been an abler man than the man whom he might have succeeded.

The act of 1886 was passed under the provision of the Constitution that "Congress may by law provide for the case of removal by death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected." When in 1792, Congress first exercised its power, thus given, it was only because of the personal political feud between Hamilton and Jefferson that it did not designate the Secretary of State as the official on whom the Presidency should devolve. He was the official favored for the succession by James Madison, and, in general, by the House of Representatives, when the matter was first debated in Congress in 1791 and 1792; though a few Congressmen favored the Chief Justice of the United States and others favored the President pro tempore of the Senate. The latter official was favored by the Senate, which prevailed over the House, after a close and bitter fight; and the act of March 1, 1792, was passed under which the succession went to the President pro tempore of the Senate and failing him, the Speaker of the House—with a provision for the calling of a special election on at least 2 months' notice. The decision, wrote James Madison, proceeded mainly if not exclusively from feelings of personal and political enmity to Thomas Jefferson. This statute, however, was long believed by many jurists and statesmen to be unconstitutional, for two reasons: First, because neither of the persons designated was "an official" of the United States, and only such an official could, under the Constitution, be designated by Congress; second, because Congress had no power under the Constitution to provide for a special election during the period of the regular 4-year Presidential term.

For 60 years, however, the question was academic, as there had never occurred any successive deaths of the President and Vice President. It seemed possible that Aedanus Burke, Congressman from South Carolina, might be correct in his prophecy, January 13, 1791, when he said that he "had consulted a gentleman skilled in the doctrine of chances who after considering the subject had informed him that there was an equal chance that such a contingency would not happen more than once in 840 years."

When, however, Vice President John C. King died in Franklin Pierce's Administration, Senator Crittenden, of Kentucky, called attention to the fact that if in the future the then President pro tempore of the Senate should not have been chosen, and if there should also be no Speaker of the House at the time (as frequently happened from March to December in case of a new Congress), there might, under the then existing statute, be a failure of succession. Accordingly, a bill was reported in the Senate in August 1856, by Senator Pierce Butler, of South Carolina, providing that the Presidency should devolve on the Chief Justice. No action was taken on this measure, as it seemed inappropriate thus to mix the judiciary with the executive.

In 1868, there was widespread apprehension at the possibility that Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio, the radical Republican who was then Senate President pro tempore, might become President of the United States, in case President Johnson should be impeached. Moreover, the impropriety of the succession to office by a Senate official who might vote (and did, in fact, vote) to impeach the man whom he might succeed was forcibly presented to the public mind. On March 5, 1868, when the Senators were to be sworn in as members of the Court of Impeachment, Senator Hendricks, of Indiana, raised formal objection to Wade's being sworn on the ground that as Wade was an interested party, "in view of his possible connection with the office in the result of the proceedings, he is not competent to sit as a member of the court." After an active debate, Hendricks withdrew his motion; but this serious defect in the provisions of the existing statute made a deep impression. The escape from such dangers revived interest in the succession in the early 1870's; and former Attorney General of the United States Ebenezer Rockwood Hoar made a speech in Congress advocating legislation containing the same provisions as the present act of 1886.

As stated above, it took the shooting of President Garfield in 1881 to rouse Americans to the grave danger of the situation; for it happened that on his death, September 19, 1881, the country was without a President pro tempore of the Senate, owing to the quarrel between Garfield and Senator Conkling; and there was no Speaker of the House. (The same condition had existed from March 17 to October 17, 1877, in President Hayes' administration, and from March to December 1845.) There was, therefore, no one on September 19, 1881, on whom the Presidency could devolve in case of the death of the Vice President, and there was no one who could call a special session of the Senate or of the House or of Congress for the purpose of taking any action under the Constitution to fill the Presidency. Accordingly, hurried measures were taken by Vice President Arthur to call a special session of the Senate on October 10; but that body when it met acted so as to increase the confusion of the situation, for it first elected the Democrat, Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware, President pro tempore of the Senate on October 10, and then on October 13 recalled its action and elected David Davis, of Illinois (whose politics were uncertain). The constitutional point was then raised that if Vice President Arthur had died before the Senate changed to Davis, Bayard would have been entitled to become President and the Senate could not have changed its President pro tempore so as to deprive Bayard of the office of President, when once it had devolved on him. This view of the case was supported by Senator Hoar and by William H. Seward, and others.

It became evident that something must be done to obviate another possible contest over the Presidency (only 5 years after the Tilden-Hayes struggle.) In November 1881, four articles by distinguished judges and lawyers appeared in the North American Review, no two presenting the same view. The question of new legislation was brought up in the Senate in December 1881, by Senators James B. Beck, of Kentucky; Samuel B. Maxey, of Texas; Henry B. Anthony, of Rhode Island; Charles W. Jones, of Florida; and Augustus H. Garland, of Arkansas, urging a bill providing for succession of Cabinet officers. In the Forty-seventh Congress, first session, George F. Hoar, Republican Senator from Massachusetts, reported on June 19, 1882, a bill which passed the Senate on January 19, 1883, but was not taken up by the House. In December 1883, the same bill passed the Senate again, but the House took no action.

After the Presidential election of 1884, a Democratic Senate and House were in power, and when Vice President Thomas A. Hendricks died within a few months after inauguration on November 25, 1885, there was no definite successor in case of the death of President Cleveland, since the Senate had adjourned in the previous April without choice of a head, and the House had not convened or elected a Speaker. Accordingly, in December 1885, Senator Hoar introduced once more his bill providing for the succession by the Cabinet officers. It was generally favored, especially by Senators Evarts, of New York, Maxey, of Texas, and Beck, of Kentucky (though opposed by Senators Edmunds and Taller), and was passed by a considerable majority. In the House, it was debated in January 1886. Andrew J. Caldwell, of Tennessee, stated that there were grave doubts in the minds of statesmen of both parties in all sections of the country as to the existing provisions for the succession and as to their constitutionality.

George S. Seney, of Ohio, said: "The party successful at the polls represents under our system the will of the people and this will ought to be assured, beyond the possibility of defeat, for the full 4 years. Under existing law, this cannot be done." (The then President pro tempore of the Senate not being a Democrat.) The bill was opposed by some Republicans including William McKinley, and Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, introduced party politics by asking whether the Republicans would prefer to have as President, Bayard, the Democratic Secretary of State, or John Sherman, the Republican Senate President pro tempore. The bill was passed, after an active debate, by a rather

nonpartisan vote of 186 to 72, and became the present act of January 19, 1886. It had seemed in general to the average politician that, under our political system, it was only fair that the party which had won the election should be entitled to the succession. And that is why there has been no great complaint for the past 58 years of the act of 1886. Any change in it now should recognize the general theory of fairness on which it was based.

Hitherto public discussion has centered chiefly on the provision for Presidential succession by Cabinet officers. There is another provision in the present law which, if acted upon on Congress, may cause great confusion in the operation of our Government which is based on and adjusted to a Presidential election held at a regular day every 4 years. The provision referred to, if acted upon by Congress, may also raise a grave constitutional question as to the power of Congress. This provision is the clause in the present act of 1886, adopted on suggestion of Senator Ingalls in 1883, eliminating Senator Hoar's provision in his original Senate bill to the effect that the term of the acting President should be the balance of the unexpired term. In its place, the Ingalls clause (which is now in the statute) provides that:

"Whenever the powers and duties of the office of President of the United States shall devolve upon any of the persons named herein, if Congress be not then in session, or if it would not meet within 20 days thereafter, it shall be the duty of the person upon whom said powers and duties shall devolve to issue a proclamation convening Congress in extraordinary session, giving 20 days' notice of the time of meeting."

Under this provision, Congress upon convening may take any action which it sees fit, changing the Presidential succession and not inconsistent with the Constitution. Clearly Congress cannot provide for an election of President by the Congress; for the Constitution now provides for such election only by State electors (except in the contingency that a candidate for the Presidency should not receive the votes of "a majority of the whole number of electors appointed."

Can Congress, however, provide for the holding of a special election by such electors? If it had the power and should decide on such a procedure to fill the vacancy in the Presidency, its action clearly must be embodied in an act of Congress; and the Acting President would have the same power to veto such an act that a regularly elected President would have had. Such a situation might be disturbing, even disastrous to the economic prosperity of the country and would change the whole political calendar and many parts of the governmental organization at an unexpected time. Under the Ingalls clause, also, the question would be presented which has been so vigorously argued from the outset: Could the Congress so specially convened pass a law calling for a new Presidential election prior to the expiration of the regular term? The weight of judicial, legal, and political opinion had long been adverse to such congressional power under the Constitution, though the intent of the framers in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 cannot be said to be entirely clear. At all events, it is certain that an attempt by Congress to exercise such a power would now meet with serious opposition, both legal and political; and if any other method of improving the provisions as to Presidential succession can be found, it should be adopted rather than a method which might lead to a possible challenge, on constitutional grounds, of a right of some future President to hold office.

The present suggestion that Congress designate the Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore of the Senate as the successor to the Presidency raises an even more serious constitutional question. Congress, under the Constitution, may only "declare what officer shall act as a President." It cannot declare or designate any person who is not an officer of the United States. It has been the decided opinion of the soundest jurists hitherto that neither the Speaker nor the President pro tempore of the Senate is an officer of the United States within the meaning of this clause of the Constitution. It is doubtful whether under our Supreme Court decision a Senator himself or a Representative himself is such an officer of the United States. And the Constitution does not require that the Speaker of the House should even be a Representative, nor does it require the President pro tempore of the Senate to be a Senator. It simply provides that each branch of Congress should elect its head, and other officers. Article 1, section 2, provides: "The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers." Article 1, section 3 provides: "The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided. The Senate shall choose their other officers and also President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President."

Are the other "officers" of the House and Senate "officers" of the United States?

Since there may be considerable doubt raised as to the constitutional validity of the present suggestion, it would seem wise that there should be no hasty legislation of a permanent character now. A temporary provision might be made; but the only satisfactory solution would be a constitutional amendment. There can be no doubt that the country at large now thoroughly realizes the problems and the situation and would speedily welcome and accept such a solution.

For Army-Navy Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as one who has long advocated the merger of the Army and the Navy, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial captioned "For Army-Navy merger," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for July 22, 1945.

There being no objection, the edtorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR ARMY-NAVY MERGER

We've learned something big from this war that we want to profit by as soon as possible. We've learned, as General Eisenhower said at his last press conference before leaving Europe, that "there is no such thing as a separate 'air' war, as a separate 'ground' war, and as a separate 'sea' war, or 'logistic' war, or any other branch."

We've finally found out—and the learning has cost us dearly—that all the armed forces belong under one department at home and under one command wherever they are fighting. Only the merger of Army and Navy into one department, with one head, one policy, and one program, can bring that about.

Our out-of-date administrative set-up has been compensated for, to some extent, by the scientific and production miracles that helped us get ready for war in a hurry, and to a greater extent by a few men like Eisenhower, who thinks and plan in terms of combined forces instead of separate forces.

"If I had my way," General Eisenhower said in his West Point speech, "they'd all be in the same uniform. Of course, I don't suppose Congress and the 'big brass' would ever agree to that." The last remark, made almost as an afterthought in homey, casual Kansas style, was tongue in cheek.

He knows that Congress is studying the question of an Army-Navy merger, that Secretary Stimson and Mr. Byrnes are urging it, and that President Truman came out for it in a magazine article last summer (reprinted in part today on this page). A bill providing for it is waiting now for action by the Senate. General Eisenhower knows, too, that most of the opposition comes from the Navy, which is jealous of its traditions, its high standards, its esprit de corps.

But many high naval officers have completely learned the lesson that modern warfare demands the erasure of distinctions among our fighting forces. In his book, Pacific Victory, 1945, Joseph Driscoll, telling of Admiral Halsey's insistence on teamwork, quotes him as saying to his men:

"Gentlemen, we are the South Pacific fighting force. I don't want anybody to be even thinking in terms of the Army, Navy, and Marines. Every man must understand it—and every blankety-blank so-and-so will understand it if I have to take off all uniforms, issue coveralls, and imprint the insignia, 'South Pacific fighting force,' on the seat of the pants."

None of the arguments against unification stand up under the evidence that demands it. Competition among the armed forces has hurt us, has caused us trouble, has wasted money, cost us lives and lost us time. Remember the competition between Army and Navy for manpower? Recruiting stations all over the country were operating like rival merchants. There was competition between Army and Navy that slowed up both of them in getting equipment, supplies, machinery; there was competitive bidding that forced prices up.

It was Army-Navy competition, as Mr. Truman recounts, that lost us five whole years in developing an assault boat. Perhaps competition cannot be blamed for our inferiority to Germany in some forms of aircraft, and in V-weapons like the stratospheric rocket and the robot bomb. But certainly, under a single defense department, we can set up a unified research program that will make better progress in planning for all possible uses of any weapon.

The real menace of competition shows up in the field. It resulted in the tragic lack of liaison between Army and Navy at Pearl Harbor and brought upon us the worst military disaster in our history. Censorship has blacked out hundreds of instances in which competition has lost both opportunities and lives, but we know of still others that were too glaring to be chalked up as mere "battle hazards."

For instance, there was deep bitterness over the trouble between Marine Gen. Holland Smith and Army Gen. Ralph Smith in the Saipan operation. Gen. Ralph Smith was removed after charges were made that the Army left a Marine flank mercilessly exposed.

Unfortunately, there aren't enough Eisenhowers—men who think with unity instead of partisanship—to go around. That's why there has to be merger not just at the top, but all the way down the line. The old Army-Navy game of competition not only delays our planning in Washington and in the field and forces us to fight several different wars with conflicting supply lines on any given front; it also makes separate teams of boys who, through the very nature of modern warfare, should be on the same team.

Not only must the Army, Navy, and the Air Forces, as Eisenhower said, "work as a unit." They must be a unit, part of an integrated program.

Trial of War Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to Field Marshal Jan Christiaan Smuts by Mr. Peter Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, during the San Francisco Conference. I believe that the contents of the letter contain very pertinent and valuable suggestions regarding the punishment of war criminals by trying them before an international court as international war criminals.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 22, 1945.

The Right Honorable Field Marshal,
JAN CHRISTIAAN SMUTS,
President of Commission II.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: We believe that the problem touched on in this communication is fundamental and imperative to the success of the momentous undertaking of the United Nations Conference on International Organization. We ask therefore that you as president of Commission II bring its contents to the attention of all members of the commission as a conference document.

The Hebrew Committee on National Liberation, as temporary Hebrew national authority, begs to submit for the consideration of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, the following proposals:

1. That the charter of the World Security Organization include provisions for the punishment of war criminals and those guilty of crimes against humanity and international order.

2. That there be established a permanent commission, under the authority of the General Assembly, with adequate powers to prosecute and punish persons guilty of international crimes.

The terms of reference of such a permanent commission should include a system of punitive and deterrent penalties for those having direct or indirect complicity in causing war; as well as for those implicated in the commission of atrocities—those who commit atrocities, those associated with them, those who order the atrocities committed.

The most urgent task awaiting such a commission is the punishment of the criminals involved in the present war; but their punisment should not be delayed 1 day for any reason. Pending the creation of an international crimes commission, therefore, each of the United Nations now in occupation of former Axis territory should deal with such criminals in the manner it considers most expeditious and summary.

(We suggest that the term "war crimes" is inadequate and falls far short of describing the situation as it exists today, and as it may exist in the future. We therefore suggest that those crimes now loosely referred to as "war crimes" or "atrocities" be henceforth regarded and referred to as "international crimes"; this is indeed what they are, and under the World Security Organization, international crimes should be dealt with in as routine a manner as civil crimes are prosecuted and punished in individual nations.)

It is our unqualified belief that unless the millions of German and other Axis nationals responsible for the atrocicus crimes of this war are adequately punished, there can be no sound foundation for a lasting world peace. We submit that so integral a part of any world-security program should not be ignored by the United Nations Conference on International Organization. We believe that the United Nations War Crimes Commission sitting in London, which represents only 16 out of the 49 members of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, and in which even some of the major European nations do not participate, is an inadequate substitue for a comprehensive body acting on behalf of all the United Nations and under the authority and direction of the World Security Organization.

Though our Nation has been most heavily afflicted and our population decimated by Axis beastiality, it is not vengeance that we seek. There can be no compensation, material or spiritual, for the five millions of lives we have lost in this war; but we owe it to ourselves, to our children, and to the world, to see to it that everything possible is done to prevent a recurrence. The punishment for atrocities and war crimes is therefore a matter of justice, whose purpose is not primarily punitive but deterrent.

There would be no logic to a system which executed a German who killed a man in an attempted hold-up, but permitted to go free Germans who thrust men into the furnaces of extermination camps. The fact that they number millions, or that their victims number millions should make greater the need for administering punishment.

To balk at the thought of executing German storm troopers or gestapo agents because they number hundreds of thousands would not be kindness or consideration, but another expression of the immorality and want of justice that seem to dominate the world today, and which made possible the war which has just cost some thirty millions of lives.

We believe it is not sufficient merely to devise ways and means of punishing aggressor nations. Aggression originates not with whole peoples but with individuals who commit nations to courses of action; the punishment of these individuals is therefore a prime necessity as a preventive measure. War must be outlawed, and the individual members of a government, and the general staffs of a nation which makes war should be considered international criminals subject to the death penalty.

The International Crimes Commission must have the right to condemn and execute international criminals just as there exists within each nation an authority which condemns and executes civil criminals.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation wishes to express its regret and disappointment that a Hebrew national delegation has not yet been admitted to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, and the Hebrew nation is not yet officially recognized as a fellow member of the United Nations. This has kept its spokesmen from contributing to the deliberations of the nations seeking the way to security and peace.

It was 5,000 years ago that the Hebrews first gave to the world its concept of morality and justice. It was then that they taught a world still largely inhabited by uncivilized peoples that the soul of man was created by God, and had not come from the beasts and stones which these peoples were then worshipping. The present world cataclysm is fraught with the danger that all the suffering and death have been in vain and that the world cannot avoid being once more plunged into war—a war much more horrible than the present one, and in which whole nations will be exterminated.

This mechanized and scientific neo-barbarism must not come to be. It is our deepest conviction that only a world organization functioning in accordance with morality and justice can prevent such a disaster. Therefore we cannot escape the painful duty of executing justice. The United Nations will have to find the moral courage to sign hundreds of thousands of death warrants for the Axis murderers or face the consequences of a new debacle.

Faithfully yours,
PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman, Hebrew Committee of National Liberation.

Relation Between Economic Conditions in United States and International Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of quotations from leading authorities on the relation between economic conditions in the United States and international economic problems.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTATIONS ON THE RELATION BETWEEN ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

From Goods and Dollars in World Trade, by Ernest G. Draper and Walter R. Gardner, Federal Reserve Bulletin, November 1944, pages 1052–1053: "It is apparent that a domestic program which carried reasonable assurance that unemployment would not again be permitted to develop on a substantial scale in this country would be of inestimable help in getting American farmers and businessmen to accept the sort of readjustments in our foreign trade that will be necessary if a sustained gold inflow is to be prevented. Once assured that the economic outlook is favorable, they might be ready to see our tariff duties steadily lowered and exchange rates placed at levels at which foreign enterprise could offer effective competition in the markets of the world. Moreover, a full production economy in the United States would directly swell our demand for foreign imports, since most of the commodities we import from the world are materials for further processing. From every point of view an adequate domestic program must remain the paramount need of the American people."

From American Foreign Trade and Investment, by Dr. Calvin B. Hoover, Postwar Goals and Economic Reconstruction, pages 288–291: "A second point to be emphasized is that the volume of imports and exports is itself more affected by cyclical fluctuations in the United States than it is affected by changes in our tariffs. That is another very interesting fact. As we follow the annual fluctuations in the amount of imports and exports, we find that the factor that determines the volume of trade is the volume of our own industrial production. If we have prosperity, then we have high imports and exports. If we have depression, the opposite is true. Now we cannot tell with certainty

about the effects of the tariff in all this, but we can make some sort of statistical analysis. We know, for instance, that the changes in volume of trade in commodities on which duties were raised during the Hoover administration were not so strikingly different from the changes in the volume of imports of other commodities upon which duties were not raised. Moreover, when we try to calculate the effect of lowering prices through tariff reduction on the quantity of goods imported into this country, we find that this effect is not likely to be as great as that due to changes in industrial activity, that is, due to shifts from depression to prosperity."

"In short, if we asked what would increase our exports and imports more than anything else, we would have to answer: 'Anything which would ensure a high level of employment in the United States.' Now that is a very interesting and striking thing, and it needs to be emphasized. The most important thing that would increase the volume of our foreign trade would be increasing the level of employment in the United States. We would increase trade not beyond what it is now but beyond what it was in the thirties during the period of the depression. Any policy that produces relatively full employment will have a salutary effect on our imports and exports, an effect more significant than changes in import duties.

"This brings me to another point. If foreign countries, particularly European countries, are to get along without the complicated maze of exchange controls, import quotas, bilateral agreements, and associated measures that they erected as barriers to free trade in the past, they must have reasonable assurance that they will be able to sell enough of their goods in other markets to enable them to buy the absolutely essential raw materials, food products, capital equipment, and so on, which they could produce at home only with difficulty or not at all.

"In a sense this is a correct picture. Most European states would like to be rescued but the rescuer has to offer something. Make no mistake about that. These exchange controls are a nuisance and require a very considerable bureaucracy to administer; nevertheless, they do enable a state to manage its economy. None of these countries would dare to remove those restrictions. Its economy could not stand such removal. It might find itself importing a whole lot of cosmetics and electric refrigerators and what not; but it might very well not be able to buy the grain and coal and whatever else it was that it had to import, unless it was it could sell enough of its own commodities in other markets, such as the United States, to enable it to pay for the really basic things needed. By means of the existing exchange controls and associated measures, such countries can at least assure their supply of basic commodities, although often in amounts less than they might be able to obtain if there were universal relaxation of trade barriers.

"Furthermore, these countries dare not give up the means of protecting their domestic economies unless they have reasonable assurance that most countries with which they trade are not likely to be confronted with large-scale unemployment. National measures against wholesale unemployment depend for their efficacy largely upon the ability to take such measures without danger of having them nullified by forces outside the nation's boundaries and beyond its control. A small country does not dare to attempt a policy of expansion of industrial production, which would be associated with a policy of credit expansion, if its neighbors, at the same time, were suffering from unemployment. Such a small country would find the purchasing power it had generated being drained off into the neighboring countries. But a country like the United States, fortunately, is not nearly so much in that position. We can expand credit without having to worry so much about that expansion being drained off into outside countries.

"Consequently, the removal of trade barriers, by European countries in particular, depends first upon the creation and the maintenance of something approaching full employment in the important countries of the world. Among all these countries the United States is the most important in that respect."

From the International Economic Outlook, by John Bell Conliffe, 1944 edition, pages 8–9: "It may be argued that the greater part of the vigorous economic activity which was so productive of social advancement in the latter half of the nineteenth century was national rather than international. This is true. Indeed, it has always been true and must be true in the future as in the past, if prosperity is to be restored. In particular it must be true for the United States which is now the greatest manufacturing country and therefore the greatest buyer of raw materials in the world.[1] Unless there is active production and employment, it is unlikely that this country can take an active part in organizing an effective system of international trade. If it does not do so the chances of such a system being organized are remote. Yet it is as unrealistic to consider national economic activity apart from its international repercussions as it is to draw a distinction today between the home front and the battle lines. The connection between domestic and international economic policy is so intimate that for any practical purposes they constitute a single entity. This paper is not primarily concerned with domestic economic policy either in the United States or in any other country; but it assumes that parallel action in all the great trading countries will need to be cleared through some effective international mechanism."

From an editorial in the London Times, November 24, 1944: "The critics contend, however, and are entitled to contend, that the Bretton Woods arrangement in the field of monetary relations can have the desired result of more regular and more expansive world commerce, larger world output, and higher standards of living only if certain conditions (about which, among other things, Lord Keynes has presumably been conferring recently in Washington) are fulfilled. These conditions include both an effective decision by the participating nations, and especially those possessing the largest industrial and financial resources, to keep their resources fully and continuously employed and a willingness, on the part of the same rich and powerful countries, to buy as well as to sell."

From Full Employment in a Free Society—A Summary by Sir William Beveridge, pages 37–38:

"Any plan for multilateral trading between any group of countries can be permanent and work smoothly only if each of the countries accepts three conditions: First, of pursuing at home a policy of full employment and avoiding severe fluctuations of employment; second, of taking or assenting to all the measures necessary to balance its accounts with the rest of the world, and avoiding want of balance whether by way of excess or deficiency; third, of displaying reasonable continuity and stability in commercial policy, that is, in regard to tariffs and other methods of regulating foreign trade.

"Whether or not a general multilateral system such as is contemplated by the Bretton Woods Conference is possible, depends upon whether all the important countries of the world are in fact able and willing to accept these three conditions of economic policy. If they are not, or if any important country is not able and willing to accept this, then rather than aim at general multilateral trade, it is better to aim at regional multilateral trade, that is to say trade between groups of countries which are able to accept all three conditions. If no group of countries sufficiently large can be found ready and able to accept these three conditions, then the last resort remains open to Britain, as to every other country, of ensuring its essential minimum of imports by bilateral arrangements.

"* * * But she should not enter into any arrangement for international currency which is doomed from the start, because one or more of the important countries concerned are unable or unwilling to adopt the three conditions named above: of themselves taking steps to avoid mass unemployment; of balancing their accounts with the rest of the world; of pursuing a stable commercial policy."

From The United States in the World Economy, United States Department of Commerce Economic Series, No. 23, pages 14, 15, 18, 37, and 39: "Past experience clearly indicates that the greatest contribution toward a large and stable flow in the supply of dollars—indeed, an indispensable one—lies in the maintenance of a high level of national income and production in the United States. Achievement of such a goal is desirable for reasons of internal stability and progress, in addition to international considerations. Moreover, as domestic factors appear to have been chiefly responsible for the violence of our economic fluctuations in the past, so the remedies must be found largely through the development of a sounder internal economic and financial structure. The causal relationship between internal and external stability, however, runs in both directions, since a large and flourishing export trade would greatly stimulate domestic business activity. In other words, a fuller and more orderly process of economic development in the United States would promote and, in turn, be facilitated by a greater degree of stability and prosperity in our international transactions.

"* * * Our imports consist chiefly of raw materials and semimanufactured goods imported in amounts varying closely with the course of industrial production. They are tied, so to speak, to the rate of domestic industrial activity.

"A low level of transactions between the United States and other countries would inevitably mean perpetuation of restrictive trade and financial controls abroad and further development of bilateral arrangements among foreign countries to the exclusion of the United States. Foreign demand will not be evenly spread over all our export goods but will be directed first toward types essential for carrying out programs of economic reconstruction and development. In the absence of a relatively plentiful supply of dollars permitting a greater measure of freedom, foreign governments will insist on exercising selective control over the uses to which the available amounts are put. Beyond this, they will have to promote their foreign trade generally without opening their doors to more goods from the United States than they can pay for.

"National income is the most comprehensive measure, in value terms, of basic economic conditions influencing the behavior of imports. The general similarity of movement in the two series is clearly brought out in chart 5, which traces their course from 1909 to 1939. While the general level of imports in relation to national income, as measured in the lower part of the chart, was about the same in the twenties as before 1914, or even slightly higher, the relationship was considerably less stable after the First World War. The value of imports was particularly high in 1919 and 1920 as compared

[1] Cf. Hal Lary and associates, The United States in the World Economy, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Economic Series No. 23, Washington, D. C., 1943.

with national income, but fell to an exceptionally low point during the great depression of the early thirties, from which it recovered only partially. In general, value of imports appeared to fluctuate more widely than national income, rising faster during an upturn in business and falling faster in times of depression. There was, moreover, a peculiarly large hump in imports in 1925 and 1926 that had no visible connection with the course of national income.

"The divergences between the trends in imports and national income are attributable primarily to the relatively greater variations in import prices than in domestic prices. When both imports and national income are expressed in terms of constant prices the relationship is remarkably close. An even closer association may be observed between imports at constant prices (or quantity of imports) and the physical volume of industrial production.

"One fact of paramount importance immediately emerges from these comparisons: The aggregate physical volume of United States imports was not affected to any marked degree by changes in prices. It might be expected, on general a priori grounds, that a relative decline in import prices would tend to stimulate purchases from other countries and that a rise in import prices would have the opposite effect. Such tendencies, however, are not apparent in the behavior of United States imports during the interwar period. The quantity of imports in the aggregate seems, rather, to have been directly determined by the trend in real economic activity in the United States as measured by the index of industrial production and to have been little influenced by relative changes in price." [2]

From Foreign Trade After the War, United States Department of Commerce Economic Series No. 28, pages 6–9: "The value of imports has also tended to follow changes in the gross national product, although here again the one has not been a constant percentage of the other. The ratio of imports to gross national product was as high as 4.4 percent in 1929 and 3.5 percent in 1937, both of which were relatively good years; but in 1932 and 1938, both years of sharp recession, the ratio was only 2.4 percent. This variation is largely due to the sensitiveness of import prices to the ups and downs of the business cycle. It is also influenced by the marginal nature of some imports. Where an important part of the supply is obtained from domestic sources, imports may virtually disappear in times of low business activity but increase rapidly when business is on the upswing. Unmanufactured wool is an outstanding example.

"Purely as a projection of the relationship between the gross national product and the value of imports over the 1929–39 period and without any attempt to make adjustments for the various factors which may change that relationship, an output of $175,000,000,000 in 1948 would probably mean an import total of slightly more than $7,000,000,000. Another way of expressing this relationship is that, in the experience of recent years, each increase (or decrease) of $10,000,000,000 in the gross national product has been associated with an increase (or decrease) of $500,000,000 in imports.

"Throughout the interwar period from 1919 to 1939, the physical volume of imports followed a path closely parallel to the index of industrial production. This is explained by the fact that more than 70 percent of all imports, by value, consist of materials for further fabrication. Another 8 or 9 percent is made up of fats and oils and fuels and lubricants, and about 10 or 11 percent consists of foodstuffs. Finished consumers' goods other than foodstuffs represent less than 6 percent of total imports. These percentages relate to the years 1935 to 1937, but the distribution in other years was similar.

"In Markets After the War the food bill of the American people was projected, on the basis of past relationships, from about $21,000,000,000 in 1940, to $34,000,000,000 in 1946. Such an increase would result not merely from larger quantities of good consumption but also, and perhaps more importantly, from higher prices and from a shift in eating habits to better and more expensive foods. Part of this assumed increase in outlays for food might well be spent on imports, both in larger purchases of such tropical products as bananas, coffee, and cocoa, and in supplementary imports of foods produced at home. Even a relatively small part so spent out of the total food bill could have extremely important effects on the aggregate volume of imports."

[2] This behavior also explains why the physical volume of United States imports was not appreciably stimulated by the depreciation of foreign currencies during the early stages of the great depression or curtailed by the subsequent depreciation of the dollar.

"Wholesome Sign"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the South Bend Tribune on June 25, entitled "Wholesome Sign." The editorial is as follows:

"WHOLESOME SIGN"

James A. Farley, former democratic national chairman, describes President Truman's message to Congress on the matter of Presidential succession as "a wholesome sign which every real American will cheer." In recommending to Congress that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, an elected public official, be designated to follow the Vice President in the Presidential succession line Mr. Truman really has done something encouraging to Americans fearful of expanding executive powers.

Although Vice Presidential nominations are supposed to be made in a "democratic" manner in national conventions the fact is that Presidential nominees are in a position to dictate. National convention delegates naturally would not insist on nominating for the Vice Presidency persons flatly unsatisfactory to the Presidential nominees. The Presidential nominees of the major parties, at least have not always been enthusiastic about their campaign running mates but where enthusiasm was lacking they invariably have been tolerant of the Vice Presidential nominees. In some instances, of course, the national conventions have merely ratified the positive Vice Presidential desires of Presidential nominees.

That system encourages selection of his first emergency successor to the Presidency by the Presidential nominee, if the latter has strong feeling in the matter. Furthermore, under the Presidential succession law of 1886 the President may also select his second emergency successor. Under that law the Secretary of State, a Presidential appointee, follows the Vice President in the succession line, President Truman, therefore, has urged Congress, in effect, to take an important power away from him. Mr. Farley remarks:

"So far as I know this is the first time since the last war that a President has sought voluntarily to relinquish a power conferred upon him."

Back in 1886, when the present succession line after the Vice Presidency was established by legislative action, and until Franklin D. Roosevelt became President, this matter seemed relatively unimportant. The various Presidents in that long period did not seek to expand Presidential powers or to exercise existing powers in ways suggesting destruction of the checks-and-balances system. Since the New Deal flowered, however, this has remained a major issue. Mr. Farley's evaluation of Mr. Truman's act on Presidential succession, therefore, is accurate.

A Bill of Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Bill of Duties," written by Mr. John Kirland Clark, a distinguished member of the bar who has long been interested in international problems. The article appeared in the May 1945 issue of the Bar Bulletin of the New York County Lawyers' Association, and I believe that it deserves the attention of all who are interested in peace and justice among nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BILL OF DUTIES—EGALITÉ OBLIGE

(By John Kirkland Clark, of the New York bar)

Rights! rights! rights! have been the subject of fights among men and nations since long before Magna Carta, as was pointed out in an editorial in these pages in January. Now we seek a world bill of rights, modeled after our National Bill of Rights and our State bill of rights. The great gathering at San Francisco, now in progress, it is hoped will bring about the creation and perhaps machinery to make effective a universal bill of rights.

Why not consider a "bill of duties"? Thoughtful analysis reveals that it is practically universally true that every "right" in a "bill of rights" carries with a corresponding "duty." One is therefore tempted to try to draw a rough outline of a "bill of duties"—in the hope that if everyone would as willingly and earnestly discharge the obligations imposed by a bill of duties as he fights for his rights, no one would ever have to worry about enforcing any "rights."

In ancient days, it was "noblesse oblige." Now that "nobility" is barred by our Constitution, and all are in equality, we should realize that, today, "egalité oblige."

The main difficulty seems to be that, when one is given a new right, no one thinks to instruct him as to the duties imposed by the possession of that right.

In framing the universal rights which should be possessed by all human beings, "freedom from want" implies that everyone should have the right to work and gain a

living. During the past 15 or 20 years in this country, we have made an effort to see that everyone had an opportunity to obtain a living from at least "having a job," even though the particular job frequently seemed not to involve any "work." There can be no doubt, however, that, if one is, by virtue of his existence, entitled to a job, he is under the duty, if physically and intellectually able to do so, to do a job that will justify and warrant his making a living. The unfortunate thing about so many WPA jobs was that, for the most part, the possessors of such jobs felt no obligation or duty to perform as efficiently as they were able, the tasks set before them. The philosophy or restricted production poisoned the stream to its sources and countless individuals were led either to believe or to profess a belief that it was necessary not to do their best and not to work as efficiently as they could, since to do so would defeat the limitation of production which was the desired goal.

The vice of this philosophy was that "loaf habits" are far more easily acquired than "work habits" and when, by virtue of the necessity of preparing rapidly for war, the philosophy of maximum production overthrew the practice of limited production, unfortunately hundreds of thousands, if not millions, who should have gone "all out" for full production, were still tainted with the fear that full production might more rapidly cost them their jobs, and "sit-downs," "feather-bedding," and "walk-outs" marked the protests against most efficient work.

Now that the philosophy of full production and efficiency in cooperation between managers and workers in industry is the order of the day, may we not hope that "the right to a job" will be coupled in the minds of all with a clearly implied duty to perform a full measure of work?

This only recently recognized right—the right to make a living wage—is one which should, a half century ago, have been recognized as creating a duty on the part of the great corporations which, instead, worked their laborers 12 hours a day 7 days a week for only a subsistence wage. When the home supply of men willing to work on that basis did not suffice, ignorant foreigners were imported, deluded by the vision of the promised land, and found themselves little better than slaves.

The "right" of "freedom of contract," which had been reasonably fair when it involved the relationship between two individuals, became utterly unfair when the representatives of mass ownership failed to recognize that that right created a duty on their part of reasonable treatment to the unorganized mass of workers. While the thirteenth amendment had abolished involuntary servitude, "big business," by rutheless exercise of freedom of contract, brought its workers into a state of servitude almost as hateful as slavery itself.

As a result, the mass organized and, having learned merely the lesson, which mass management had taught them, have now proceeded to enforce their "rights" with a similar entire lack of appreciation that the rights which they have attained impose a duty of fair dealing on their part.

While one may understand the lack of morality, in the highest sense of the word, in this attitude, since it is simply handing back to the managers of industry the converse of what they, from a half century to a quarter century ago, handed out to the laboring man, the duty of a fair return of work for wages paid is just as great today. If the right which the laboring man has gained fails to carry with it a realization and a fulfillment of the duty to give the best work for the best wages, suffering will result not only to management but ultimately to labor and, almost contemporaneously, to the public at large, for such an uneconomic development.

Since the foundation of our Government, in response to the clarion call of the Declaration of Independence, we have been taught that all men are created free and equal and are endowed by nature with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have enacted into the National Constitution provisions against discrimination because of race, color, or prevous condition of servitude, and New York has just enacted a statute forbidding discrimination in employment in industry.

The right to "life" is covered by the discussion of the right to have work which will sustain life and the duty of doing work which reasonably produces such sustenance. The right to "liberty," the great right of "freedom," for which our forefathers fought, in the days when our citizenry embraced a few millions, has, as the first century and a half of our Nation has passed, brought with it a keen realization that liberty and freedom of the individual, of the State, and of the Nation, involve the duty of curtailing our liberty, or freedom, imposed by the necessity of recognizing the right to liberty and freedom on the part of others.

The inconsistency of freedom to hold others in slavery was abolished by the thirteenth amendment. At the same time, the freedom which certain States of the Union deemed that they possessed was found, after a cruel war, not to have given the State a right to withdraw from the Union. To continue to be free, a State was under the duty of waiving its liberty to withdraw from the Union which had been created to protect freedom.

If we join a union of nations to see to it that peace is maintained throughout the world—to enforce the right to peaceful living of nations—it will be necessary to discharge the duty implicit in the pledge, which is that we must accept a determination made not solely by ourselves as to when measures for the enforcement of peace must be taken—in which we must presumably join. Technically, this will, no doubt, constitute an impairment of our sovereignty but, if we are to have the right to enforce peace through an international organization, we are going to be charged with the duty implicit in that right.

Then there is that vague intangible right—the right to the "pursuit of happiness"—how bound up with duties that right is. The right to happiness, to be treated by others as fellows, imposes the essential duty of being worthy of fellowship. People may feel that they have a right to be loved, but they cannot expect to exercise that right unless they discharge the duty of being lovable. No law forbidding discrimination is going to deprive the one who possesses the power to discriminate in its exercise against people who are not discharging this duty.

Thus it goes, all the way down through the list of rights contained in our famous Bill of Rights. The right to freedom of speech, that precious right, which is now proclaimed to be world-wide, has always been regarded as bound by a duty to use that right with a fair regard to the rights of others. While one, in the exercise of the right to freedom of speech, may be critical, may be forceful in argument, he is under a duty to refrain not only from scandalous, false accusations, but from inciting mob violence and from uttering traitorous attacks against the state.

One of the great rights set forth in the first amendment was the right to bear arms, yet, because of the well recognized danger of indiscriminate possession of firearms, the courts have for years upheld laws providing that, to exercise the right to bear arms, one must obtain a license establishing that right, and the possession of arms without a license was made a crime. In the international field, all nations have felt that they had the right to arm themselves as they saw fit, yet, by international agreement—unfortunately, not effectively carried out—the greatest nations of the world agreed, after the last war, to limit their armament. In the framing of a new world constitution, the unlimited right of nations to arm themselves unquestionably will be curtailed by the duty to create restrictions to avoid the economic disaster which continued unlimited armament would necessarily bring the world.

Perhaps the most striking illustration of the failure to recognize a duty imposed by the possession of a sight was made by our forefathers who sought the barren coasts of New England to exercise their right to worship God in their own way. They possessed that precious jewel of freedom, but for almost a century they failed to recognize the duty to respect the right of others to worship God as they choose. However unorthodox the other man's religion may be and however much we may feel moved and possess the right to endeavor to persuade him to orthodoxy, freedom of religion imposes upon us the duty of respecting his freedom.

The Atlantic Charter recognizes the rights of the various peoples of the world to choose their own form of government. We Americans believe that a federal union of states on democratic lines of universal citizenship is the best practicable government, and we naturally shall continue to insist upon our right to be thus governed—yet, if we are to recognize the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live, it will be our duty to recognize that those who choose an undemocratic system—even though it may be due to their ignorance or inability to express themselves freely in the selection of their government and their rulers—shall be permitted to live under what may seem to us a government of absolutism. If we have the right to preach the virtues of democracy as we know it to those whom we believe to be dominated by an absolute government, we shall be under a duty to recognize that missionary work by those who believe in one or another form of totalitarianism may entitle them to preach their gospel among us.

The problems thus created are by no means easy of solution. The theoretical right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live might lead some to argue that the group of natives on Iwo Jima have the right to determine what they shall do in the way of selecting a form of government. Yet, when we dealt with similar problems in Cuba and the Philippines, there was a universal recognition of the fact that the peoples in these countries were incapable of making an intelligent selection of their form of government without a long process of education and, for a longer or shorter period, the United States took over the management of these islands. One of the greatest problems which is to confront us and the other nations of the world will be the solution of when and how such a determination of a form of government shall be made by such groups as the peoples of India, the peoples of the Pacific islands, and the people of the occupied countries in Europe. The right of these peoples to select their own government imposes a heavy duty on the rest of the world for wise cooperation in accomplishing the result.

This bare outline of the main rights for which our ancestors and we have fought illustrates amply the soundness of the contention that the possession of a right carries with it the imposition of a duty. What is even more significant is that if everyone recognized and lived up to the requirements of the correlative duties, no one else would ever have to fight for any right. It was not a legal maxim nor was it a lawyer who spoke it, but the basic truth behind all this talk of rights and of duties is a simple rule of conduct, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Postwar Employment Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the subject of postwar employment policy, which was delivered by John H. G. Pierson, consultant on postwar employment policy, bureau of labor statistics, at the University of Michigan extension service meeting held on June 22, 1945.

Dr. Pierson is the author of the National Planning Association's labor committee report on fiscal policy for full employment, which, I understand, has received a great deal of favorable comment. Dr. Pierson offers a new approach to the problem of establishing and maintaining full employment. Essentially, it is the application of the insurance principle as the means of maintaining a full employment level of consumer income. While I have not studied the problem with sufficient care to express my own views on Dr. Pierson's thesis, I believe that his scholarly and interesting paper on a problem with which we are all concerned should be of interest to everyone.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate the honor of being asked to come out here and speak to the workers and citizens of Detroit. I am especially glad to come to Detroit because Detroit has a reputation of being full of ideas and giving a cordial welcome to ideas. But I am not going to talk tonight about your particular problems here in the heart of the automobile empire, because you know them better than I do and because I want to place before you for your consideration certain thoughts on the general problem of postwar full employment which is the problem of our country as a whole and not of any one part of our country.

Also I want to discuss this as a long-range or continuing problem and not go into the special questions that are starting to arise now with the cut-backs of armaments production and that will be with us throughout the demobilization period. Of course, I don't mean to minimize in the slightest the obvious importance and urgency of proper transitional measures, and I hope that what I have to say about the continuing problem may indirectly throw some light on transition requirements as well. But within the Federal Government responsibility for the formulation of policy for this period has been assigned by Congress to the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and the problems are so imminent that they should be discussed only by specifically authorized persons. I want to say also that, in talking about the longer-range problems, with respect to which policies have not been decided, I am not talking for the Government but am expressing my own views.

The subject you have chosen to consider here tonight is enormous. My time on this platform is pretty short. Let me get to the heart of the question.

The real issue as I see it is whether or not full employment opportunity should be guaranteed. If it is to be guaranteed then this must be done by the Federal Government. Obviously no one else can do it: No one business, no one industry, no one community, no one trade union—not even the auto workers. Well then, shall the Federal Government guarantee to maintain conditions in which everybody will have, and nobody will be denied, the chance to work?

Personally I think the answer should be "Yes." With this audience I am sure I do not need to go into the reasons why it is of fundamental importance that we make sure of employment opportunity for everybody. But I would like to point out that if we do not guarantee full employment, but merely agree to try for as much employment as possible, then that is nothing at all new, costs nothing, and may be entirely inadequate. I don't want in the least to belittle the efforts of businessmen and groups like the CED. It must be true that hard work, hard thinking, enthusiasm, and a sense of public responsibility are resulting in plans for business ventures—and hence for employment—that might otherwise be overlooked. But as much employment as is possible without invoking the powers of the Federal Government is not enough. Nor is there any reason to believe that it is easier to maintain a level of employment three or four millions less than full employment than it is to maintain full employment. If you have no arrangements for holding a flag at the masthead, is it any easier to hold it at some point lower down on the staff?

Now, some people are sincerely distrustful of specific employment goals and commitments. They view the idea of setting such goals with alarm. If told that specific goals were necessary, they would regard them as a necessary evil. I think that their view of the matter is entitled to respect. But I also think it can be said to such people that, however good the reasons for their point of view may be, they at least overlook one tremendously important fact—the fact that the right kind of goals and guaranties can in themselves have a great lifting power and make the solution of the employment problem much easier.

To get down to cases, here, in brief, is my suggestion. Please forgive my sketchiness—it is a huge subject and time is short. Also let me warn you at the start against thinking that my suggestion or any other could prevent reconversion unemployment during the transition. Although, as I said before, the inevitable dislocations of this immediate period are not what I came here to discuss, I don't want to leave the impression that there may be some formula by which our economy can swing back to peacetime production overnight or without causing a large number of people to go through short periods of unemployment. Undoubtedly we are going to have to lean heavily on our unemployment compensation systems at this stage of affairs, and undoubtedly also, as the President has said, these systems will have to be strengthened.

Now let me come back to full employment program in the broader sense, as distinguished from demobilization program. Three things seem to be to be needed. First, an insurance approach to the problem. Second, a number of basic national policies, including but certainly not limited to Government expenditure and tax policies. And, third, a balancing mechanism to make sure that we actually deliver on the employment commitment even before we have succeeded through our basic policies in bringing our economy into a natural balance. Let me take these three points up one at a time.

Number 1 is the insurance approach. This means the giving of commitments in advance. In other words it involves Government underwriting. There are, I think, two essential things involved. First, a guaranty of full employment itself, and second, a guaranty of the total national consumer market at a high level.

A guaranty of full employment itself would obviously assure us of a high national income. This would provide security to the worker, would stimulate confidence, and would prevent the kind of hoarding of money that grows out of fear of future depression. To carry it out, a national budgeting approach is needed, as recommended by the sponsors of the full-employment bill, with additional public jobs available as a last resort if other employment falls short.

But you don't want to put exclusive or even primary emphasis on Government jobs. You want all jobs—public and private—to result in worth-while products and you don't want to expose business to the risk that an unlimited number of jobs may have to be artificially created. Therefore, in addition to a guaranty of full employment as such, I think we need a further guaranty that total consumer spending will not fall below a specified high level. This would in particular provide confidence for private business because the consumer spending target would show that business itself could profitably provide the bulk of the number of jobs guaranteed so that public works would not have to be expended unduly.

This kind of guaranty would meet the oversaving problem head-on. The income paid out by full employment production does not necessarily yield an ample market for business because too much of this income may be saved and too little may be spent. The consumer market guaranty on the other hand would give to business the assurance that this unfortunate thing would not happen.

I want to stop for a moment to give additional emphasis to the importance of this insurance approach, as I see it, because it is a rather new idea and seems to have tremendous possibilities for cutting the Gordian knot in which our economy was tied for a number of years before the war. Its possibilities are such, for both labor and management, that the exploration of these possibilities would seem to offer a very promising new field for your cooperative action. Of course, without the support of management and labor no approach to your common problems is likely to get very far.

The first advantage of the insurance approach, you will notice, is that it provides security and confidence. Let me give you an analogy. Now that bank deposits are insured people are not very likely to start runs on banks. Similarly, if employment and markets were insured, businessmen would not be so likely to take their money and energies out of the economic game.

But this is not the only advantage. Besides promoting confidence the insurance approach would take a grievously heavy load of responsibility from those whose duty it is to prepare the best forecasts they can for the Government. It would, therefore, very much reduce the disputes about the necessity for Government action—disputes that are bound to arise when people disagree about the accuracy of the forecasts the Government is making.

Let me clarify this point. If employment and expenditure goals are set for the economy and then, because of deferred demand, accumulated war savings, or any other factor, these goals are met automatically by the unaided operation of the system, then in that case the Government, which is acting as underwriter, need not and should not take any additional action in behalf of expenditure and employment. But if, on the other hand, the goals as finally determined by Congress are not being met out of the unaided operation of the system, then clearly Government action will be called for, and it is hard to see how any dispute could arise over that.

Parenthetically I may say that most of the calculations made by the economists who have thoroughly studied this subject show that there is every likelihood that shortages of expenditures and employment will tend

to develop not long after the war if nothing is done to prevent it. There is therefore a strong probability that the Government, acting as underwriter, would have some gaps to fill. But the point is that, if we adopt the insurance approach, we don't need to waste an undue amount of time wrangling over just what we see in the future as each of us looks into his favorite crystal ball.

Notice further that a guaranteed total consumer market, by taking pressure off the public works device, would make guaranteed full employment entirely favorable from the standpoint of business, instead of partly favorable and partly a threat of competition from bigger and bigger Government operations. Also it would be a sure way of promoting high consumption—and nothing could be better than that either for standards of living throughout the country or for jobs right here in Detroit. Hence it would relieve us of the necessity of expanding investment, for the sake of employment, more than was really needed by any other standard. In fact, it would really free us from the piece-by-piece approach to full employment. If the various other places failed to add up to full employment, this would simply mean that general purchasing power would be expanded instead.

Thus, in the last analysis, this approach would relieve the haunting fear that we have become too productive in this country; that we are unable to consume as much as we are able to produce—a haunting fear that tends to drive us into a search for larger and larger export markets even if this finally goes beyond the bounds of common sense and of mutual advantage to ourselves and other nations.

So much for the insurance idea. Let me turn now to No. 2. The second thing we need is a series of basic governmental and private policies designed to make our economy balance as well as possible, so that the guaranties would be as nearly self-enforcing as possible without further Government action. Of course, if I had the whole evening just to talk about these basic policies, I would hardly get started on them. As it is, I have only a few minutes, and so I will merely try to review a few of the main ones for your further consideration. Please do not interpret this as an underestimation of their importance.

First of all I would point to the desirability from the economic point of view of having wages as high as productivity will allow. This is important, and hence collective bargaining is important, if for no other reason than because the wage stream largely goes into spending and adds very little to the oversaving problem.

Next I would point to the need for a low-price, high-output policy on the part of business. Such a policy should also be enforced through Government antitrust action when necessary, and through sound patent legislation, regulation of cartels and monopilies, aids to new and small businesses, etc.—all such measures being aimed at promoting competition and checking the restrictive practices of monopoly. This line needs to be taken in order to encourage new investment, dampen down oversaving, and make sure that an adequate market for goods and services really gets translated back into full production and full employment.

Thirdly, it seems to me essential that we do everything possible to eliminate substandard incomes in agriculture, and in whole regions such as the South. Quite aside from other considerations, this will help greatly to maintain the markets we need.

Fourthly, we need a permanently strong, efficient, and properly recognized nationally coordinated employment service, to help bring available workers and available jobs together.

Coming to those basic policies which are financial or fiscal in character, we have the whole question of taxes and Government expenditures. As to Government expenditures, the labor committee on national policy of the National Planning Association recently sponsored a report which in a preliminary way goes into our national needs in the fields of housing, health, education, and conservation and development of natural resources. In these fields alone and without including other important matters such as recreation, cultural programs, social services, research, rural electrification, etc., where the sums involved are much smaller, it was estimated that additional amounts of nearly $10,000,000,000 a year would need to be spent by Federal, State, and local government to attain adequate minimum standards of living and opportunity for the whole population. This amount does not allow for the possibility of national medical care insurance. Of course, there is little doubt that our social security system should be broadened in various ways and the benefits expanded. I believe it would also be desirable to finance these benefits in a less deflationary manner than at present by adopting the pay-as-you-go method and by contributing to the funds from general taxation.

Turning to taxation as a whole, the important thing here is to give fullest application to the principle of ability to pay while at the same time not discouraging genuine initiative and investment. Taxes should fall more heavily on those with large incomes than on those with small incomes because this is fair and because it will help to sustain mass buying power. This means that excises ought to be largely eliminated, gift and estate taxes strengthened, and heavy reliance placed on the individual income tax—but with higher exemptions to take the burden off subsistence incomes.

In the complicated matter of corporate income taxation, I think the best solution might be to set the rates where they will strike a level about half way between wartime and prewar corporate tax revenues. In this connection, everything that will help to remove discrimination against risk capital as compared with passive loan capital certainly ought to be done.

Now I want to get to my third main point, the need for a balancing mechanism. Let me repeat that the basic policies I have so lightly touched on are of the utmost importance. If they are given the attention they deserve this will very much reduce the necessity for running a Federal budget deficit in connection with maintaining full employment. It will also mean that we are going after fundamental problems like monopolistic restrictions and the distribution of income. Nevertheless we also need a balancing mechanism operating by means of fiscal policy, because it is totally unrealistic to act as though we had solved all the basic problems and got rid of oversaving any time before these things actually have been accomplished.

Following the lines of the guarantees I mentioned earlier, there are two parts to a well-rounded and practical balancing mechanism. The first is a public works reserve—an ample, diversified, and geographically distributed reserve shelf of construction and service projects. Construction should be carried out through private contractors unless for special reasons that proves impossible in a given case. I think it is important that jobs on the public-works reserve should pay prevailing rates of wages. The reserve, after all, would not in this setting be a relief proposition, but rather a part of the provision made to assure everyone the opportunity to have a real job. These supplementary public-employment projects, unlike the regularly budgeted items for schools, hospitals, and so forth which cannot afford to be postponed, would be shut down when private employers again had more jobs available. But I think that the readiness of government to shut them down as private employment opportunities expanded—this, and not substandard rates of pay—should be the safeguard against anyone's staying on the public pay roll too long.

The one thing that is always emphasized in connection with the public works reserve may as well be said here again, because it cannot be stressed too much or too often. This is the need for advance planning. I wish it were possible to feel that the Federal Government and the States and local communities were ready at this time to meet the demands for extra public works they are likely to encounter in the transition period. I do not know your situation here in Detroit in this regard, but I trust you are doing everything possible to adance the preparation of the necessary local plans.

The second part of the needed balancing mechanism lies at the point in our economy where money is spent for consumer goods and services. The Government keeps current records of the total rate of consumer spending. Having guaranteed a certain minimum rate, it would have to match the actual rate against this commitment. If the actual rate was falling short, the Government would have to promote additional consumer spending by some device that left or put more money in consumers' hands. One way of doing this would be to refund, suspend, or offset certain taxes that affect consumption. But it would be important, for the sake of avoiding a leakage into further excess savings, to offset the hidden or indirect taxes that affect the poor man and not merely reduce the withholding rate on the income tax which is paid by those who are better off.

A crucial point to note is that any such offset to taxes would be allowed only if and as long as current consumer spending tended to remain below the guaranteed rate. Hence the proposal is not in the least inflationary. In fact, on the contrary, I am sure that the commitment ought to set a ceiling over consumer spending as well as a floor underneath it. Many people with real justification are afraid that full employment may lead to price inflation. One of the best ways of ruling that out would be to set a maximum as well as a minimum limit to total consumer spending. If, then, in some period—for instance in the immediate transition period—consumer spending should threaten to go through this ceiling, a special tax or some other restraint would be brought into play temporarily. Possibly the best device for this particular contingency would be a graduated spendings tax. This could have generous exemptions at the bottom and would avoid the unjust and undesirable features of the sales tax, which has little to be said in its favor.

This brings my remarks to a close. I only want to try to sum up in as few words as possible the things that I think might be accomplished by the kind of a full employment program I have tried to sketch for you tonight. Let me check over some of the main possibilities.

First, insurance of our economy against depression. Second, a contribution to the safeguards we need against inflation. Third, a spotlight on the importance of getting ahead rapidly with our basic policies, while at the same time we do not postpone full employment until all the basic policy issues have been settled. Fourth, development of a sound relation between domestic and foreign markets, meaning by this the promotion of beneficial foreign trade and investment without the pressure to go to dangerous extremes in our dependence upon them. Fifth, creation of confidence based on job security and high markets—a state of confidence free of those conflicting emotions which might develop in the business community if it seems that full employment could only be maintained through a forced expansion of the Government's own operations. And finally, conditions in which opportunity could become real for everybody, regardless of race, sex, or any other consideration.

The American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating article on the American Indian, written by Mr. O. K. Armstrong, and published in the Reader's Digest for the month of August.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SET THE AMERICAN INDIANS FREE

(By O. K. Armstrong)

A young fullblood Indian, sergeant in the Army Air Corps, stood before his tribesmen on the Winnebago Reservation and told of his experiences on many fronts. Then he said: "I'm leaving again, to finish this war. When we Indian servicemen get back, we're going to see that our people are set free to live and act like American citizens."

There was silence. One by one the older men came forward and threw their arms about his shoulders, their faces tense with emotion. Then the younger men, among them two boys in Navy uniform, gathered about the sergeant in earnest talk. He had given voice to an unmistakable determination on the part of American Indians to demand full rights of citizenship.

Speaking with grim accents, this Winnebago told me: "We're tired of being treated like museum pieces. I'm a mechanic. I want a real job. They're not going to send me back to live in a shack and loaf around in a blanket."

Few know the shameful story of the present status of the Indians. By fire and sword the settlers drove them from their lands. Then, in 1824, the Government established a Bureau of Indian Affairs to "civilize and emancipate" the Indians. Reserved areas were set aside for the tribes, where they could live while they learned the white man's ways.

Today about 220,000 Indians still live upon 210 reservations. Legally they are free to come and go as they please, and to take up any work they choose. Actually most of them are tied to their reservations and to old tribal ways.

In three important respects they have never been emancipated. They are restricted in property rights; without consent of their superintendent they cannot own land on the reservation, or sell it, or mortgage it, or lease it. They live under conditions of racial segregation. And they are subject to special limitations and exemption because they are Indians.

In recent months I have visited many reservations. I talked with tribal chiefs, farmers, teachers, with Indians prominent in business and politics. I talked with agency superintendents and employees—able, conscientious men who are working tirelessly to better the lot of the Indian. All agreed that the Indian problem is a national reproach.

The great majority of the Members of Congress heartily applaud the stand of Representative WILLIAM G. STIGLER, of Oklahoma, himself a Choctaw-Chickasaw Indian. Speaking to the House last April, he said: "There should be an early and complete rehabilitation of the Indian so he may go forth in the world and take his place by his white brother, asking only an opportunity to prove his worth."

More than 22,000 Indians are serving with our fighting forces. Many have given their lives; many more have won decorations. There can be no doubt that all who return from the service will seek a greater share in America's freedom. About 45,000 other Indians from reservations have been working in war industries. Most of these have tasted economic opportunity for the first time, mastering skilled trades. They're not going to forget that they made a good living on their own.

Why aren't the Indians free? The policy of segregation and special treatment is deeply rooted in the past. Early reservations were concentration camps, where troops kept the inmates subdued. By the middle seventies, reservations had become centers of paternalistic control, where able-bodied Indians waited from week to week for the agents to distribute beef and clothing.

It became apparent that the reservation system was pauperizing these wards of the Government, so in 1887 an Allotment Act was passed, presenting individual Indians with tracts of land, usually 160 acres. The act provided that for 25 years title to the land would be held in trust by the Government, after which ownership would pass to the Indian and he would be a full citizen. The motive was good: To keep the Indian from being cheated out of his land by unscrupulous tribesmen or white men. But there was no sound program for educating the Indian to be self-supporting on his land or to be assimilated into industry.

When, in 1891, the act was amended to extend the 25-year trust period, other amendments closed the door to full citizenship. If the ambitious and industrious Indian left the reservation he risked losing his rights in tribal land and money. If he stayed, he could not own a farm or add to it by purchase. The policy of perpetual guardianship took firm root.

Although all native Indians were declared citizens of the United States by act of Congress in 1924, the act made no provision for the details of their emancipation. Today only Congress or the Great White Father, the Secretary of the Interior, can remove restrictions upon ownership of property. With their land held in trust by the Indian Office, Indians are in the anomalous position of being both citizens and wards of the Government. They cannot use funds owned by the tribe without consent of the Office, even for cooperative enterprises. Their money is not their own until the Superintendent doles it out for a specific purpose.

Young people in Indian schools, at ages when white children are taught self-reliance, are trained in dependency. They are required to ask superintendents for spending money and must get permission to purchase books, clothing, and personal effects. If an adult Indian secures a Government loan for purchase of livestock, machinery, or household goods, the agency assumes control of all such personal property. If the Indian farmer's cow produces a calf, he must not sell the calf without permission.

Lands held by reservation Indians—56,000,000 acres—are not subject to State, county or local taxes. Hence they cannot vote in Idaho, New Mexico and Washington, because of constitutional provisions forbidding suffrage to Indians not taxed. They cannot vote in Arizona because of a law denying the ballot to "persons under guardianship." North Carolina requires that voters be able to read and write to the satisfaction of the election registrar—and a Cherokee holding a master of arts degree from the University of North Carolina was told by an election judge: "You couldn't read or write to my satisfaction if you stayed here all day."

Surplus reservation lands not allotted to individual Indians have been opened by tribal councils for settlement by whites. Individual Indians can also lease part of their allotments. The Indians have found it more convenient to lease to whites than to farm for themselves under Government restrictions. Not more than 1 acre out of 4 on reservations is now used by the Indian.

Many Indians to whom land was allotted have died, but their lands could not be sold nor their estates settled without the Government's permission. Heirs were given "bookkeeping equities" in the original allotments. Continued dividing of the tracts has gone on until now the problem of "fractional heirships" has reached fantastic proportions. Some bits of land have as many as 200 heirs. The Indian Office must find them and get their consent before the land is leased. Thousands of acres of Indian lands lie idle because heirs cannot be found. I talked with a returned veteran who had tried to rent a 40-acre tract. "There are more than 100 heirs for that piece. Some are lost. We can't rent it," the supervisor finally informed him.

The latest Government efforts to meet the Indian problem have been in the wrong direction. In 1934 Congress passed the Indian Reorganization Act, by which the Department of the Interior was authorized to purchase land and hold it in perpetuity for tribal use. Further allotments to individual Indians and sale of Indian lands were banned. The act provided for organization of tribes into "corporations" and for "communal" use of land and machinery.

One effect of the Reorganization Act has been to force a collectivist system upon the Indians, with bigger doses of paternalism and regimentation. Under the plan, the tribal council is the ruling power, but since the council is completely dominated by agency officials, it actually functions only with the advice and consent of the Indian Office. The tribe assigns each member Indian the plat of ground he is to work, in true collectivist pattern.

Since the plan went into effect the Office has spent about $2,000,000 per year buying land—often for tribes that have more acres by far than they ever use. The Shoshones and Arapahoes at Wind River, Wyo., have 1,500,000 acres of land, 300,000 of which are not needed by the Indians and are rented to whites; yet the Indian Office has spent nearly half a million dollars to add ranch land and equipment to the tribal estates. For the Blackfeet tribe in Montana, $95,252 was spent for land, although the tribe has leased out 747,068 acres of its vast holdings.

In a recent report, Senators THOMAS, of Oklahoma, WHEELER, of Montana, CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, and SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, members of the Indian Affairs Committee, offered this stinging indictment:

"While the original aim of the Indian Service was to make the Indian a citizen, the present aim appear to be to keep the Indian an Indian and to make him satisfied with the limitations of primitive life. The Bureau has been concerned with segregating the Indian, condemning him to perpetual wardship, and making him the guinea pig for experimentation."

The most advanced tribes are those that have had the smallest connection with the Indian Office. The Choctaws, Chickasaws, Cherokees, Seminoles, and Creeks in Oklahoma show how our Indians, through freedom rather than restriction, may become an integral part of our national life. During the settlement of the Indian Territory, Indians mixed freely with the whites and adopted white ways. Lands were granted in fee to Indians individually.

In 1908 Congress gave full citizenship to 60,000 (about 80 percent) of these Oklahoma tribes. Their members helped found the State and have occupied high positions in business, education, and public affairs. Every Oklahoma Legislature has found Indians in positions of leadership. Former Senator Robert L. Owen is a Cherokee. Chief Justice Samuel E. Welch of the State supreme court is a Chickasaw. The late Will Rogers was a Cherokee. In the courthouse at Claremore (Rogers' home town) I asked J. C. Gipe, deputy sheriff, how many county

officials are Indians. Sixteen of the twenty proved to be of one-quarter blood, or more.

Yet every major policy of the Bureau in recent years has tended toward revival of tribal autonomy and ancient customs. Separate CCC camps were maintained for Indian youths. There were separate sewing rooms for Indian women and separate projects for Indian men under the WPA. Segregated hospitals are maintained on the reservations. A restricted Indian is not permitted a loan from the Farm Security Administration; he must deal with the special loan service of the Indian Office. Proposals have been made by Bureau officials that problems of Indian war veterans be handled by a special division of their office.

Tribal control and governmental regulations constantly remind the Indian of his inferior status. Indians loll about agency offices, waiting to ask permission on matters that a free farmer would decide in an instant. Congressmen from reservation States are familiar with letters such as this one from Charlie Red Shirt to Congressman FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota: "My oldest daughter receive Sioux benefits. She want to buy milk cows because we like dairying. But they want her to buy beef cattles and they make her feel bad. If they let her go and buy what she want in the first place she would have about 30 or 40 head of cattles by this time."

One Sioux farmer, disliking an old horse, sold him for $75 without permission and reported he had disappeared. The horse had to be found. The superintendent's report fills a small volume. Two field men after long search and the expenditure of about $2,500 of taxpayers' money settled the matter. The Indian was given a strong reprimand—and the horse.

Every agency official I talked with cried out against the bureaucratic red tape of the service. Nothing, it seems, can be done simply or promptly. Suppose Jack Muskrat wants to borrow money to plant a crop. He takes up the subject at the agency office. The matter must come before the tribal council. A farm plan must be worked out especially for Jack. The superintendent must approve. The credit unit must study and approve the plan. A loan agent showed me a stack of complicated forms, reports, letters, and printed instructions. "That's what it takes to get one Indian farmer a loan," he said. "No wonder they'd rather rent the land and loaf."

The cost of keeping Indians wards has risen year by year. In 1928 the appropriation for the Indian Office totaled $10,000,000, supporting 4,000 employees. Critics in Congress declared it was time to emancipate the Indians and let the office "work itself out of a job." Yet by last year the number of employees had increased to 7,383. And in the appropriation bill for 1946 the Indian Office requests $32,000,000 and 306 new positions.

For all the vast expenditure, how many Indians are there? Nobody knows.[1] In 1934 the number was put at 234,792, including 30,000 in Alaska. Now the Indian Office estimates a total of 419,970. Congressmen say that the figures are padded to obtain ever-increasing appropriations. Persons with no more than one-two hundred and fifty-sixth Indian blood help to swell the total.

Despite Government outlays, most reservation Indians live in poverty. Until war work came to their aid, not more than 2 percent of reservation families averaged more than $500 income a year. Living conditions are often extremely bad. Disease is prevalent and infant mortality is high.

[1] There is no official definition of what constitutes an Indian. Census Bureau enumerators in 1940 were directed to list as Indians "any person of mixed blood if one-quarter or more, or if the person is regarded as an Indian in the community in which he lives."

Two pressing tasks confront Congress and the Indian Service:

The first is to provide legislation that will remove restrictions from—and thus emancipate—every Indian who is able to manage his affairs.

The second is to chart a new course for the Office of Indian Affairs, whereby its efforts, during the time it remains in existence, are directed toward assisting all Indians to be self-supporting.

What Indians, now restricted, should be declared competent? Opinions vary, but agreement is possible on immediate emancipation of:

1. Honorably discharged veterans of the present war. This would be an act of simple justice for those who have fought for freedom.

2. All Indians born from this time forward.

3. All persons of less than one-quarter Indian blood.

4. Graduates from a standard high school or its equivalent.

5. All others who are competent to manage their affairs. Definite provisions should be made for determining competence. Any Indian should be permitted to apply. Veterans of past wars might automatically obtain removal of restrictions.

Ownership of real and personal property will bring responsibility for support of schools and other public services. It will furnish the same incentive for thrift and good management that are enjoyed by the Indians' white neighbors. I asked a young Indian farmer, plowing with a shaggy team, what he needed most. He replied, "Tractor. Not agency tractor. Mine!"

The assumption that most Indians are agricultural has been a tragic mistake. Many are skilled craftsmen. They are potential engineers, mechanics, and technical workers. Iroquois and Onondagas in industrial centers are recognized as among the best structural steel workers in the world. Navajos who have been trained off the reservation have become competent draftsmen, laboratory assistants and nurses. Indian girls from Haskell Institute in Kansas are noted as accurate stenographers and efficient secretaries. Graded on careful tests for mechanical aptitude, Indian youths from 15 to 22 years old at the Flandreau, S. Dak., school scored a higher average than white students of corresponding age in Detroit.

Frank Beaver, veteran leader of the Winnebago Tribe, told me: "Give our boys and girls training as Americans, and not as Indians, and they'll set themselves free!"

The words of Lincoln's Secretary of War now sound with new significance. To a Congressman seeking an interview for a bishop who protested conditions among the Indians, Mr. Stanton exclaimed: "The Government never reforms an evil until the people demand it. Tell the good bishop that when he reaches the heart of the American people the Indians will be saved."

It is time for the people to demand that this evil be reformed.

The Coal Shortage Threat Is More Menacing Than the Meat, Fats, Butter, and Sugar Shortage

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives adjourns today. I thought it would not be out of order to call to the attention of the Congress, other officials, and the country the critical situation in the coal industry and a great threat of a real coal shortage. Two or three weeks ago the officials and representatives of the eighth bituminous coal district, composed of parts of Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, and Tennessee, met with a group of members of the House and Senate from these States and presented to us pertinent facts relating to the bituminous coal situation in the eighth district and in the Nation. These Members of the House and Senate were so greatly impressed with the facts as presented, and the threat of a real coal shortage in the Nation, formed a committee and called before them representatives of the Manpower Commission, the War Department, the Solid Fuels, Selective Service, the OPA, and others, whereupon these same officers and representatives of the eighth district presented the facts to these high representatives of the various agencies of the Government, and they, too, were greatly impressed with the coal situation. They had a meeting of their own and later met with the representatives and officers of the eighth district coal producers, and these groups again met with Members of the House and Senate on two or more occasions.

It was made clear: (a) that there was a real decline in the production of bituminous coal and an increase in the demand, (b) that there was a shortage of manpower, (c) that there is need of additional machinery and equipment and that there was need of additional price as 40 percent of the coal was being produced at a loss and many mines were going out of production, (d) that there is a decline in the stock pile of coal. The production of bituminous coal in 1941 was 514,000,000 tons, and consumption 489,000,000 tons, with 63,000,000 tons in stock pile. In 1942 production was 580,000,000 tons, consumption 537,000,000 tons, with a stock pile of 86,000,000 tons. In 1943 production was 590,000,000 tons, consumption 623,000,000 tons, stock pile dropped to 56,000,000 tons. In 1944 production was 620,000,000 tons, consumption 619,000,000 tons, stock pile 57,000,000 tons. The estimate for 1945 is 585,000,000 tons production, consumption 621,000,000 tons and stock pile drop to 43,000,000 tons. The actual production for the first 4 months of 1945 show that the production was actually 14,000,000 less than the consumption and the stock pile had dropped to 43,000,000 tons. The demand for coal is greater in 1945 than it was in 1944, while production is on the decrease and there will be a deficit of at least 35,000,000 tons in production in 1945, and this may go to 75,000,000 tons for bituminous and anthracite coal.

It is a difficult matter in the hot summer months to impress upon the American people the fact that this shortage of coal means that millions of families will be short of coal in December and will suffer to a greater or less extent because of this shortage. The average family consumes approximately 5 tons annually. If you have a shortage of only 35,000,000

tons that will mean that 7,000,000 American families must go without any coal or there must be a substantial reduction in the amount of coal consumed by the American people generally. The authorities here in Washington realize that the country is faced with a real coal shortage and have already limited each family to 80 percent of the coal that the family unit consumed on the average last year.

COAL NO. 1 ESSENTIAL INDUSTRY

It is agreed by all those who are familiar with the facts that coal is No. 1 in priority among all of our essential industries. This shortage of coal is a real threat to our war effort as well as to the home front. District No. 8 produces more bituminous coal than any other district in the United States. It has a demand on it of 122,000,000 tons, but its supply at the best, perhaps, cannot reach 117,000,000 tons this year. This means a shortage in this one district alone of at least 5,000,000 tons, or the fuel for 1,000,000 houses.

Without coal the war plants making tanks, planes, guns, ships, munitions, chemicals, clothing, and so forth, cannot operate. Without an ample supply of coal the railroads will be greatly handicapped in moving Army and civilian supplies, our discharged veterans, and in redeploying and transporting veterans to the war fronts. The utilities cannot operate without coal. It will, of course, affect directly and seriously the dwellings, schools, retailers in all lines, and employment generally. One of the big problems that must be taken care of this coming winter and spring will be the reconversion of our plants from war production to peacetime production. Our great steel plants, so essential for the war as well as peacetime production of steel, can use no other heat material except coal. For instance, the United States Steel uses 33,000,000 tons annually. Consolidated-Edison Co. uses 8,200,000 tons for light and power. General Motors alone uses 1,250,000 tons annually. The railroads, of course, are the largest consumers of bituminous coal. Coal supplies provide 95 percent of the power of all railroad locomotives. It provides the base for 85 percent of all war plastics. It generates 55 percent of all our electricity. It supplies 55 percent of all United States mechanical energy. It provides the heat for 3,523,000 homes in apartment dwellings alone, and provides the heat for millions of private homes. Coal serves 60,000,000 customers annually. It can be seen at once that it is the No. 1 essential industry. All industries and all transportation must depend largely upon bituminous coal.

A shortage of coal is a real threat to our war effort, to all our industries of every kind and character in this country, and to the health of the American people. With a constant increase in consumption and a decrease in production bring the people and the Nation face to face with a situation that should alarm every American citizen, and call for the immediate and fullest cooperation from all manpower and production agencies of the Government. It is pointed out to encourage and increase production and to limit this shortage of bituminous coal to the greatest extent possible, those who know state that there must be an increase in manpower for the mines, and an increase of machinery and other mining equipment, and to fix such prices as will provide for the cost of production, the replacement of necessary equipment, and a fair and reasonable return on the investments. It is clearly shown by those who produce the coal that at least 40 percent of the mines in district No. 8 are being forced to operate at a loss, or to go out of business. The OPA, which fixes the prices on coal, state that only about 32 percent of the mines in district No. 8 are operating at a loss under the prices fixed by the OPA. In other words, according to the admissions of the OPA, nearly one-third of the 120,000,000 tons produced in this district are being produced at a loss. The prices fixed compel the operators to go out of business or to operate at a loss on this nearly one-third of the coal produced in district No. 8. Of course, other sections are also affected.

It was shown that 225 of the 432 mines in district No. 8, as of June 1, 1945, were operating at a loss. The losses of these 225 mines were as follows: 41, 5 cents or less per ton; 37, loss from 5 to 10 cents per ton; 27, loss from 10 to 15 cents per ton; 120, loss over 15 cents per ton. These mines represent 40 percent of the coal produced in district No. 8. Only 207 of the 432 mines in the district were being operated at a profit. The profit of 24 mines before taxes was less than 5 cents per ton; in 35 mines the profit before taxes ranged from 5 to 10 cents per ton; in 29 mines the profit before taxes ranged from 10 to 15 cents per ton; and in 119 mines the profit before taxes were at least 15 cents per ton. But it will be observed that the profits per ton set out above do not include Federal, State, county, or city taxes. When we consider the 225 of the 432 mines were operated at a loss ranging from less than 5 cents per ton to 15 cents or more per ton, we can see that many of the bituminous-coal producers have not received just and fair consideration; were forced out of business, and much of the decrease in production was reflected by reason of the OPA prices fixed on coal.

During 1944 the bituminous industry, America's most vital industry, showed a profit before taxes of less than $65,000,000, while General Motors for the same period before taxes showed a profit of nearly $500,000,000. Standard Oil of New Jersey, approximately $270,000,000; United States Steel, $126,000,000; Goodyear Tire nearly $72,000,000; Swift & Co. nearly $61,000,000. The bituminous-coal industry, of course, is much larger than any one of these companies. The coal industry is not subsidized. It does not have juicy cost-plus war contracts. Yet its earnings were less than any one of them. It is about one-seventh of General Motors, one-fourth of Standard Oil, one-half of United States Steel, and approximately the same as Swift & Co.

It costs more to produce coal in some mines than others. OPA prices may make some mines prosper and put others out of business.

The OPA declared that they were giving special attention to these nonprofit mines. I know personally they have given relief to some nonprofit mines in my congressional district. It was urged by the representatives of the coal producers that when the wage increase for the miners was up for consideration in April of 1945, it was ascertained that the wage increases to the miners would increase the cost of coal production 24 cents a ton. It was also asserted by the representatives of the coal producers that the representatives of the Government urged them to agree to the wage increases, and if they did agree to the wage increases they would be granted an additional increase of prices on their coal to cover this 24-cents-a-ton increase on the wages for the miners. The coal producers did agree, but they stated that after the wage matter was settled they were given an increase of only 15 cents a ton instead of 24 cents a ton. Nine cents a ton on the cost of production is a very big item in the coal industry, and this loss of 9 cents, the coal producers claim, is one of the causes of the 225 mines in district 8 operating at a loss or being forced to close down their mines. It was agreed by the representatives of the Government that the wage increase did add 24 cents a ton to the cost of production, and that the coal producers were only allowed 15 cents a ton. We cannot expect the coal people to operate their mines at a loss. Such a policy would so deplete their capital and resources and force many of them out of business. The OPA and other agencies of the Government should adjust these prices so as to cover the cost of production with reasonable allowances for depreciation and a reasonable return on the investment. All of the representatives of the Government at these meetings recognized the gravity of the situation and set about to bring substantial relief wherever possible except the War Department—Judge Patterson stated frankly under their policy no one would be discharged from the Army to engage in civilian employment. They would adhere to the point system. It was agreed in the future miners would be deferred under the draft. I am hopeful that such relief be granted as will insure the fullest production of American coal mines.

SHORTAGE OF MANPOWER

It is agreed on all sides that there is a critical shortage of manpower in the coal mines. This was brought about because tens of thousands of young men in the mines were inducted into the armed services. And through Government advertisements and urging tens of thousands of other experienced people and capable miners, were induced to leave the mines and find more profitable and more congenial employment in various defense plants in the country and they were given military exemptions by reason of their employment in these defense plants. The Government was responsible for these able and experienced miners going into the defense plants. Through the cost-plus policy of the Government, these plants paid better wages, the work was less dangerous and was much more congenial and these miners were given deferments from military service. Knowing the need of experienced miners

the employment agencies of the Government and those with defense plants, constantly filled the newspapers of the mining areas with most attractive advertisements, urging miners and others to seek employment in these defense plants. One hundred and thirty thousand to 140,000 were taken or left the mines since Pearl Harbor. Many of the older men that could not go into the armed services or defense plants have since died, become disabled, or retired. All of these efforts have brought about an acute shortage of manpower in the coal mines. Yet, the coal miners and management have made a wonderful showing.

A little over 400,000 bituminous coal miners produced in 1943–44, respectively, 623,000,000 and 620,000,000 tons of bituminous coal. This is the greatest record of all time. This represents, on an average, 6 tons per man per day. In 1944, 707,000 British coal miners produced 200,000,000 tons, which means an average of less than 1 ton per man per day. This is a most impressive record for management and labor in American bituminous coal mines. Because there are few replacements for those who have died, retired for age, been killed, or otherwise disabled, the manpower shortage in the mines will become more acute from day to day. All of the agencies of our Government that have to do with manpower should at once take active and effective steps to increase the manpower in the coal mines. After we have done our very best there is likely to be a shortage of bituminous coal amounting from 35,000,000 to 50,000,000 tons, and there will be an additional shortage in the anthracite coal fields, and we must bear in mind that the demand for coal is increasing while production is on the decrease. Unless this situation is relieved, this country is confronted with a serious disaster, even more acute than our meat fats and sugar shortages.

The production of coal has been and is greatly hampered by lack of adequate machinery and other equipment for the mines. Yet, we continue to send machinery needed in and about mines to foreign countries.

EXPORT WAR PRISONERS NOT COAL

We are advised that the administration has pledged that we mine and ship to Europe this fall and winter 6,000,000 tons of coal. I strongly protest against any such action. Unless we can greatly increase our coal production our war effort and our own home front will suffer greatly during the coming winter and spring. Furthermore, we do not have the transportation facilities to ship this amount of coal to Europe.

I was advised today by the War Department that we have 369,366 German war prisoners in this country. Also 11,000 more commissioned and noncommissioned German war prisoners. And about 600 German war prisoners in our hospitals. We have in all 49,794 Italian war prisoners. There is a great deal of coal in Europe, Germany, France, Great Britain, and some other countries. We have strongly urged that these war prisoners be sent back to Europe so they could be employed in producing coal for the people of Europe, and also in producing food and other supplies for the people of Europe. They could also be used in helping to rebuild their wrecked homes and cities of Europe. This Government has spent millions of dollars caring for these prisoners. The people of the United States are already carrying a tremendous load in helping to rehabilitate the devastated countries of Europe and to provide for millions of needy people. There are millions of German war prisoners in Europe. We are now helping to feed and provide for millions of war prisoners. The War Department, as I understand, claims that they plan to begin sending these war prisoners back by next October and have them all back in Europe by next spring. I sincerely trust that this plan may be modified so that we shall, within the next few weeks, begin to transfer these war prisoners to Europe where they may be used to help rehabilitate the devastated countries they helped to destroy and that they can produce coal and provide other commodities for their own people and the people of Europe. Our coal situation and shipping facilities are such that we cannot undertake at this time to send 6,000,000 tons of coal to Europe. When our own war effort and our own home front is being threatened by a shortage of coal and this shortage will become more acute through the coming fall, winter, and spring. We still have a great war to win in the Pacific and I regret to say that up to this time we are getting very little help from the people of Europe. Although Russia, Great Britain, France, Holland, and Belgium have greater interest in the Pacific than we have. The American people have made tremendous sacrifices in blood and in treasure with very little prospect of any substantial benefits coming to them out of the war or help against the Japs. We did not bring on the war in Europe. We must not so deplete our supply of coal and hinder our war effort, disrupt our industries, our transportation facilities, and bring suffering and disease to millions of loyal American citizens.

An Army Captain Deprecates Certain Trends of Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received a very unusual letter from a splendid Army officer of my home city, Indianapolis, and under unanimous consent, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

OKINAWA, JAPANESE EMPIRE,
May 18, 1945.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Representative, Indiana Congressional District No. 11, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been a constituent of yours during the entire length of your long service in Congress. I desire to bring to your attention my opinion and also the opinion of many level-headed servicemen, concerning pending legislation on veterans' benefits.

I feel that I have earned the right to express this opinion, written in the field here in Okinawa, by my own service record. Fifteen months in the First World War, a year of which was served in France and Germany, and 39 months in this war, the last 6 months in the Pacific. In all probability, I shall be out here some time to come.

Many of us regard with extreme disfavor, the tendencies of sundry legislators to try to more or less arrange to support the 12,000,000 service men and women for the rest of their lives. I do not feel that this is justified or at all feasible. In fact, I do not believe that the authors of such proposed legislation think so either, but are willing to saddle the country with staggering additional debt at the time when present contracted obligations have reached inconceivable figures. All in order to curry favor with the returning soldier vote.

I have always been obliged to live a life of economic self-sufficiency and I would again choose to do so. I want to be free within the limits of necessary economic and legal restriction to conduct my life as I choose. I take pride in my minor successes and have borne the pressure of difficult times with such fortitude as I could muster. I believe that no one owes me a living and that, as in the past, I will have to accomplish the good things of life by my own efforts.

Such a life is the only one possible under our type of government for the preservation of which we are all fighting and for which so many men have given their lives. If legislative pressure is allowed to run its extreme limit, we will end up defeated in the very thing we have fought for.

We all realize the extreme pressure which can be brought to bear on a legislator to approve such measures. Also how he can be made to appear unappreciative of the sacrifices made by service men and women, by his opposition. In spite of all this we, many of us, live in hopes that a sufficiently conscientious and unselfish majority is in Congress today, to defeat these things.

Most of us heartily approve the GI bill of rights, feel that the present discharge bonus is not exorbitant, but have heard rumors of all sorts of bills. These sound reminiscent of $60 a week at 60, $30 every Thursday, and other utopian ideas in vogue 10 or 15 years ago. All these were designed to let large numbers of people quit work and live at the expense of the rest. Too many men and women are in service today to make it possible to do such things, even if otherwise justifiable. War service cannot exempt any able-bodied man from the necessity of earning his own living after he returns to civilian life.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS E. ANDREW,
Captain, United States Army.

The Securities Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, without a security exchange the free enterprise system of America, including our corporate structures, and as a matter of fact mass production itself on an efficient basis, would all probably cease to function—at least from a practical standpoint.

It is, of course, generally known that during recent years Congress has enacted certain specific legislation in the form of the Securities Exchange Act and other laws to which we might refer, and all of which have to do with the relationship between investors, those who furnish risk capital, those who offer securities through the exchanges, and the operation of the securities exchanges themselves.

For some time there was in Government service an outstanding citizen by the name of Emil Schram. In due course he became the president of the New York Stock Exchange, and it is my frank opinion that since accepting this position he has participated in some exceedingly constructive programs, and I personally feel that his work as president of the Exchange has been of tremendous value to the private enterprise system, and to the American public in general. I sincerely hope that he may find it possible to remain in this position for some time to come, because I personally believe that in this capacity he can perform great service for the people of the United States.

Under date of June 28, 1945, he briefly addressed the Investors Fair Play League Clinic, which was held in New York at that time. For the RECORD, I enclose a copy of the remarks made by Mr. Schram. His statement follows:

I am indeed happy to be here and join with you in your discussion. I am glad to attend a meeting over which Mr. Forbes presides, he being an outstanding leader in the field of finance for many, many years. I am glad to appear on the same platform with him. I am also pleased to see Congressman CRAWFORD here today. I have known the Congressman for quite some time. In fact, it used to be my pleasant duty to appear before him and his committee when I was a Government employee, and I can assure you that you have a very able speaker here this afternoon. I learned quite some time ago that he can ask the most embarrassing and searching questions of anybody I ever met in my life. He can do it so graciously and fairly, however, that it is always a pleasure to appear before him. I am sure that you will enjoy his remarks this afternoon.

I am especially pleased to see meetings of this sort held. In the first place, I think too few people in our country know enough about the securities industry. I believe that the industry itself has many responsibilities to the public and to the stockholders of the corporations and companies. But I have also said and am saying at the same time that the stockholders have a great responsibility to the officers of the companies in which they own stock. I am glad to see discussions of this kind.

As head of the New York Stock Exchange, which I am sure you will agree is the greatest stock exchange in the world. I am glad to see you get together and discuss these problems. As the head of that institution, I am glad to reassure Mr. Forbes that I would like to continue to watch those "howevers" that he is going to bring up this afternoon, because it is the "howevers" and the "buts" that we have to worry about in the New York Stock Exchange; we are constantly aware of those problems, and I am sure that my colleague, Mr. Posner, who is the head of the New York Curb Exchange, is equally aware of them.

So, any discussion that will throw further light upon this great institution and its difficulties will certainly be welcomed by the institution itself. Our market really belongs to the investing public. We try constantly to keep that market from being abused. We realize that we will not have reached perfection in that respect, but we are going to try constantly. We feel that we have made some progress. We realize, too, that we have a great distance to travel yet, but we are going to point in that direction. We want the stockholders of those companies to be informed, to know what they are doing. We want to get away from unwise speculators—from uninformed speculation. We want people to stay out of the market who have no right to be there, and the people who are uninformed and cannot afford to assume the risk they undertake when they make a purchase.

It is your duty to advise the people properly, to disseminate information about the market and about the ownership and securities, and you are certainly in no conflict with the management of any of the exchanges and the people in this industry.

We recognize that whether we are going to progress is a very vital factor and a very delicate factor, and we can progress only by performing a proper service for the people who use our markets. It is a very delicate piece of machinery and it must not be lightly tampered with. As I have said a great many times, there is no place in the world where the hopes and the fears of the American people are registered as accurately as they are in our securities market. Today we see people with great hope for the future—you see that reflected in our market. Perhaps that hope can go too far. I don't know. It is the people of this country that make that market.

I am going to be very interested to hear that discussion this afternoon. I am going to read very carefully the complete digest of your entire meeting, and I am sure that you will find it very interesting, and I am also sure that I will find something in there that will be very helpful in the management of our institutions and in performing the proper service for the investors of this country.

Medicine and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Medicine and the War," published in the Journal of the American Medical Association on June 14, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICINE AND THE WAR

ARMY MEDICAL OFFICERS REQUEST ROTATION OF ASSIGNMENTS IN SERVICE

(NOTE.—The following communication received from five medical officers of the United States Army in Europe, including a major and four captains, is published so that it may receive consideration by the medical profession and by the officers in the Office of the Surgeon General. Contrary to our usual custom, the letter is printed without signature, since the officers specifically request that their signatures be not included. Certainly the point raised merits consideration.—Editor.)

To the EDITOR:

We are Army medical officers on active duty for varying lengths of time ranging from 32 months to 48 months at a fighter station in England since November 1943 and are now about to go to Germany in the Army of Occupation. When we shall be relieved is a matter of speculation. Frankly, we've been thinking lately about the lack of rotation for medical officers and naturally the question arises "Are there not sufficient doctors in the United States to meet our country's military demands?" We think there are.

There are many conflicting reports reaching us concerning the procurement of medical officers for military service, none of which, however, are of an official nature. In order to ease our minds, and to be sure they need easing, we medical officers would like some clarification of the subject if possible. We would like the following information answered:

(a) The number of medical officers on active Army service and naval service (excluding Veterans' Administration).

(b) The number of medical school graduates since 1941 and the percentage of these in Army service and naval service.

(c) The number of doctors under 45 years of age in civilian practice.

(d) The number of doctors being procured monthly for Army service and naval service.

(e) The actual strength of the Army and Navy Medical Corps and the proposed strength necessary to defeat Japan.

(f) The number of medical officers in the Army and Navy being discharged monthy exclusive of those discharged for incapacitating medical defects.

We medical officers, like thousands of other doctors, entered the service voluntarily with the sincere belief that it was our duty and with the further belief that it was our war. We further believe that it is the war of everybody in the United States and that equal responsibility exists for everyone to share in the conflict. In other words, from the view of the doctor in service, it is as much Dr. Jones' war as it is Dr. Smith's war. We are all familiar with the apparent ease with which many individuals escape military service and are of the opinion that the fault more often than not lies in our administering agencies. We feel that inefficient medical administration has gone far enough and that if it is permitted to continue unchecked it will affect not only the medical future of the physician but also that of the layman.

We doctors in the service consider it our duty and privilege to attend the sick and wounded and would continue to feel that way if we knew we were not being forgotten. Reports are now reaching us that many doctors coming out of internships are permitted to go on their merry way into residences, hospital appointments, and practice and that there are many men of our age and training still in our home towns, unmolested by our procurement agency. If this is correct and it appears so, what about us already in service? Are we to carry the whole burden? Or isn't it their war, too?

It appears now that officers are to be discharged on the point system; that is, all officers except medical officers—why? Are medical officers now in service to be penalized for taking the trouble and sacrifices to earn a medical education? We cannot help but believe that the procurement of

medical officers should go on strenuously as long as war exists and as long as doctors are needed in the service, so that a definite surplus should exist. In this way a discharge system could apply to the medical profession also, and no one doctor need worry that no relief is coming. In most cases rotation would go on in a most natural manner. The civilian supply of doctors would not be affected, for outgoing medical officers would take the place in civilian practice of newly "procured" doctors. Further, no one proportion of doctors would suffer degeneration of their medical knowledge and ability, as is the case now with tactical unit doctors whose main duty is holding sick call, treating colds, corns, epidermophytosis, and small lacerations. Any worth-while cases by reason of the Army medical set-up must be transferred to station or general hospitals many miles away for definitive treatment. As a result we see these patients only when they are transferred and then discharged to duty. As is readily seen, any professional ability we possessed on entrance into the Army is steadily deteriorating.

It is discouraging for us to see a War Department statement in the public press that the Army quota for medical officers is filled and that it is contemplated that the procurement of doctors is to relax. The quota should never be filled as long as war goes on. Any quota should include plans for release of medical officers long in the service. It is conceivable that every doctor in the United States, with certain exceptions for age, disability, and the like, would see military service if the war should last long enough, which is as it should be if our premise that it is everybody's country and everybody's war is correct. At this point it appears obviously to be correct. Should Dr. Smith go to war for his home and family? The answer is "yes." Furthermore, should he go to war also for Dr. Jones' home and family? The answer is "no." Let Dr. Jones go to war for his own family and home. For certain reasons they may not be able to go together or at the same time, but let them go consecutively. Are the newly graduated doctors to be permitted to engage in prolonged internships and even longer residencies, not to mention civilian practice, simply because it is expedient for the Army to solve the medical problem in this manner, or are these young doctors to be inducted into the service so that we who have already served three or more years may be released to take care of the country's civilian needs, not to mention the furtherance of our own medical education, which in most cases has been interrupted by our Army service.

There are many physicians of our own ages who have been declared so-called essential doctors simply because of circumstances placing them in such a position. Let us not forget that the fallacy of this premise lies in the fact that not the individual doctor is essential but that the position is essential. We feel that it is high time many of these men were inducted and replaced by medical officers with years of service, who will be only too eager to become essential in their stead.

We are submitting the foregoing plea for your consideration in the hope that our voices added to those of many other medical officers, who even though they have not made public their sentiments are of the same opinion, will bring about a change in the policy of the United States Army toward medical officers. We realize that this policy cannot be affected directly by you, but there is no question in our minds that the most potent organ for public feeling in medical circles is the American Medical Association and that if the minds of American medical men are expressed by the association the effect of its influence must certainly bring about changes in higher places.

Our only desire is "Let us be heard."

Assistance Afforded by Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, few organizations care for the welfare of their members better than the Missouri Farmers Association. In a recent article, H. E. Klinefelter, editor of that organization's newspaper, the Missouri Farmer, told in a very interesting and a very graphic way of the progress members of the organization had made under the aid of the Farm Security Administration. I would like to have that article printed in the RECORD for the benefit of those not so well versed in the activities of this worthwhile Government agency:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FSA HAS HELPED THOUSANDS OF MISSOURI FARMERS

(By H. E. Klinefelter, editor, the Missouri Farmer)

Born during the depression years, the Farm Security Administration was established by Congress for the purpose of rehabilitating distressed farm families and of helping farm families to help themselves so that they could keep off the relief rolls, and that it has competently performed its duty can be testified to by thousands of farm families.

Since the FSA program began on July 1, 1937, 33,279 Missouri farm families have been assisted with operating loans and 1,705 have been assisted in buying farms of their own. The sum of $32,731,263 was advanced to farm families to finance their farm operations, and up to March 31 this year these people had repaid $23,269,230 in principal and $3,093,593 in interest, which alone speaks volumes for these good farm people.

FSA also loaned $46,825,995 to families for farm ownership, the loans running for 40 years, and to date $25,302,616 in principal has been repaid along with $511,500 in interest. This looks good, indeed, when it is borne in mind that farmers cannot obtain a loan from FSA unless they are unable to get suitable credit elsewhere in their local communities. Of all the money loaned in Missouri by FSA, L. C. Carpenter, State administrator, states that 94½ percent of the principal either has been or will be collected, with the small percentage of loss more than offset by interest collections.

As farming conditions have improved during wartime, the need for FSA assistance has declined and the organization has, incidentally, contracted its operations accordingly. Only 11,190 families now have money borrowed from FSA at the present time. As soon as a family gets on its feet and is able to borrow money from a local bank or from Production Credit Association, FSA withdraws its services, and this is how Congress intended it. FSA borrowers have for the most part appreciated FSA assistance and are reluctant to give it up when the time comes.

If farm prices should remain relatively high and consumer demand should remain as it is today, FSA would doubtless pass out of the picture within a very few years because the need for it would finally disappear, but few people expect such conditions to prevail for a long period of time. It is not unlikely that a few years hence the need for FSA will increase materially, while even now some of the GI's who are returning and who are unable to obtain suitable credit under their bill of rights are coming to FSA for help, and Congress has placed the responsibility on FSA to work with the Veterans' Administration in this connection.

Just how has FSA helped farm families to help themselves, and has it all been worth while? There have, of course, been some failures, often caused by ill health and deaths, but in 95 percent of the cases these families, with just a little help they could not obtain anywhere else, have been able to carve out a home for themselves, become responsible and respected citizens of their respective communities. How much better this, than to have permitted them to hopelessly live on a dole out of the Public Treasury.

A typical example is the case of Henry J. Clark, 53, a lifetime farmer in Caldwell County, who, back in 1938, appealed to FSA in desperation for help. His financial affairs had been gradually drifting from bad to worse for 5 or 6 years. Liquidation of a closed bank finally brought him to an impasse. The bank liquidator, with $2,195 in Clark's personal notes, demanded that something be done. Five other creditors beclouded the picture, awaiting developments in various degrees of impatience. And then there was a National Farm Loan Association secretary waiting in the background with a $2,300 mortgage on Clark's 80-acre farm, and a payment was overdue. It all added up to a grand total of minus $1,680 for Clark.

Back in 1913 Clark had bought his farm for $3,000, and it was doubtless worth it, and he might have paid for it, but it needed a new house; he needed a furnace, a garage, a laying house for his pullets, a new brooder house, a corn crib, and other things—and these improvements which he felt he must have proved his undoing—toppling farm prices finally got him down.

Even with all these improvements, more money would soon have to be spent, for his barn was about to fall down, was actually propped up with poles. And there was painting to do, fences to be built, and declining soil fertility needed attention. He appealed to FSA for help.

The FSA supervisor called in the NFLA secretary and they visited the farm and diagnosed Clark's economic case. The outcome was that the land bank loan was reamortized, a total debt reduction from other creditors of $2,128 was secured, and an FSA loan was written to refinance the old debts, to purchase alfalfa, sweet clover, and lespedeza seed and feed. A pressure cooker was obtained for the family so that food could be preserved. Three brood sows and a horse were purchased. Somewhat less than $1,000 was needed for these purposes, and the Clark family entered the new year with restored confidence in its ability to succeed. Additional land, 160 acres in all, was rented.

The following year a new barn was erected, a pure-bred Hereford bull was purchased, and all of Clark's nondescript cattle (17 head) were sold except one milk cow, and replaced with 13 choice Hereford cows.

Each year since then the family's fortunes have been on the upgrade, and this year, when Clark sells his hogs, he will finish paying off all his debts, with his present worth amounting to $7,000.

Not long ago Mr. Clark told the county FSA supervisor that "When you folks came along I owed more money than I could ever hope to pay. I was about to lose the home I built for my family, and I had almost lost confidence in myself." After a moment of thought, he added, "I didn't even know good cattle from bad. But we're out of the woods now, and we want you to know we sure do appreciate it."

Another typical case is that of Churchill J. Haught, of Texas County, who for 10 years had been renting a run-down farm. In the spring of 1940 he obtained a 40-year loan at 3 percent from FSA to buy the farm, and with FSA guidance he will wind up this year with enough money to pay off all his indebtedness. Besides, he has a new barn, laying house, and other buildings, new fences, his fields nearly all limed and terraced, a fine herd of Jerseys, and an excellent bull (he sells milk to the Producers Creamery Co. at Cabool), has a flock of 300 leghorns, has installed REA electricity, will soon install a milking machine, owns some sheep, horses, and other property.

A hundred families in New Madrid County, 40 of them Negroes, have all obtained farms of their own, with equipment and livestock to go with them, and besides they own a cooperative gin and store, and are well on their way to independence. Their combined assets before the FSA appeared were only $28. These cases have been repeated over this State by the thousands, and it is surprising that there ever has been any criticism of the FSA program; however, most of it has come from people who did not understand what was being done.

Some of the criticisms have been leveled at FSA in the past because of the cooperative farm in New Madrid and Pettis Counties. But these were experiments, and no one ever seriously expected that the Government was intending to embark upon what some critics called a collective system of farming in America. Most of these farms have now been sold and the others will be sold very soon. The experiments have been worth while, for they have found the answers to some important questions. It may be that in the postwar years, if the predictions of economists come true, namely, that we have some 2,000,000 too many farmers, we shall find that cooperative action will be the means of enabling thousands of people to survive on the land.

It is true that in the early days of FSA, when the personnel was inexperienced and before a few crackpots were eliminated, a few cooperative marketing ventures were started that perhaps shouldn't have been. It must be said, however, that some of them, particularly in Arkansas, have succeeded and are doing a good job for all the farmers they serve, but the policies have since changed.

Probably the best feature about FSA has been its supervision, which some of its critics have mistakenly called dictatorship. This supervision has been worth more than the financial assistance. County supervisors have worked out farm plans for the borrowers, from time to time made helpful suggestions, have taught thousands of farmers what good dairy or beef sires mean to their herds, the importance of using fertilizers, taught them how to keep books on their operations, while the women supervisors have helped the farm women to learn what and how much fruit and vegetables to can to give the entire family an adequate, balanced diet, as well as other aids too numerous to mention.

During the past 10 years, after considerable experience, FSA has built up a fine personnel in Missouri. The county and district supervisors all appear to be top-notchers in their line of business. These men work closely with county committeemen and State comitteemen. The county committees, consisting of three outstanding farmers in each county, advise with the county supervisors, and pass on every loan after interviewing the family of each applicant. They help work out operating plans for the borrowers, give them advice, and spend a lot of their own time helping out. Their services have been of inestimable value to thousands of indigent farm families during the past several years.

Members of the State committee includes H. E. Slusher, president of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation; Homer Shride, master of the Missouri State Grange; J. W. Burch, director of the Missouri Extension Department; J. H. Foard, supervisor of Agricultural Education, Jefferson City; Stanley R. Crow, Lakenan; Ernest Moxley, Charleston; E. M. Poirot, Golden City; George Carlton, Cedar City; and the editor of the Missouri Farmer. This committee passes on all FSA policies as they relate to Missouri and like the county committeemen, these State committeemen are no mere "figureheads."

To the writer, it appears that the Farm Security Administration, after a number of trials and errors, has worked out a happy medium between Federal domination on the one extreme and strictly State action on the other. The relationship in this instance betwcen State and National Governments is a standard that other Federal agencies might well follow.

Corrected Testimony of Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin on the United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the corrected testimony on the United Nations Charter, given by Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin, of New York City, before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. BALDWIN. My name is Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin, 1245 Madison Avenue, New York City. I represent myself; an American woman, a mother, a grandmother.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mrs. BALDWIN. I am objecting to this Charter as given to us from San Francisco because it is in contradiction to our United States Constitution, which all of you Senators, and the President of the United States, and every man who holds office from the highest to the lowest, in this country, is sworn to uphold. If you sign this Charter you are signing away the sovereign rights of the people of this country, which you are not authorized to do. You are given specific instructions when you are sent here to represent us. Those authorities are clearly defined.

I do not concur with Senator VANDENBERG when he says we should accept this because it was agreed upon by President Roosevelt at Yalta—when we were told it was San Francisco.

The late Mr. Roosevelt is not here to speak for himself. And, furthermore, he had not the authority to promise anything in the name of the American people without the concurrence of two-thirds of this body—which has not been given.

This is, to my mind, a very direct attempt to sabotage the Constitution of the United States, to take away our sovereign rights.

It is not a new plan. It is one that has been going on for many, many years. Immediately after the last war the procession started. The highly financed propaganda permeated our schools, our colleges, our churches, in fact, every phase of our American life. Attempts have been made to destroy the Star-Spangled Banner—they are still going on. Our histories were rewritten so that you would not recognize American history.

Gentlemen, it is in fact the apex of the pyramid we are facing today. It is well known to the people throughout the length and breadth of this land. The women know what is going on, and we do not intend to stand by and see our sons sent again to fight another foreign war which is not of our making.

Under this Charter five men not elected, merely appointed, whom we do not know and whom we may not trust, are given the destiny of this country. It is a demagogic, oligarchic project. It is an instrument of war.

You say that this is an instrument for peace, but it is well known throughout the length and breadth of this land that World War III is in the making. That war will be with Russia. That war will be in the Middle East. We women are not willing to be silent and see our boys drafted again and sent to the four corners of the earth to fight and to give away our substance.

Under this Charter you say we will distribute the raw materials of the world. That is not new, either. You can find that in the 1893 edition of Andrew Carnegie's book, Triumphant Democracy, the last chapter, A Look Ahead, or the Reunion of Britain and America.

If you give away our raw materials, you will be trespassing on States' rights. If you give them away, you are sending the raw materials of this country to foreign powers who will manufacture them at the low European level, and the goods will be sent back here for us to buy. It clearly tells us that because England will control the seas she will supply the Atlantic States and the West, or Pacific States, and our manufacturers can supply the Middle States. We will not like it at first, they say, but we will soon find it is our duty to the mother country.

When you say that you will give away billions of dollars of our money to England, Russia, and the rest of the world, where are you going to get that money? Where is it coming from? Or are you banking on the capital-levy tax that is in the making?

Those are things the people of the United States should know.

I am willing to say that if, under due process of law, you submit this charter as an amendment to the Constitution, to the people of this country—and after a full and free and honest discussion of the merits and demerits of the matter—they vote to give away their sovereignty and their substance, then I have nothing further to say. But, until that is done, under the constitutional process of the United States, then I do object, and object strongly. I am not willing to have my sons or my grandsons drafted to be put under the authority of five men whom I do not know, or know anything about, or know what their idea of life is.

When the President of the United States went before your body, he did not tell you that this Charter guaranteed one single iota of anything. He simply told you it "seeks" to do this, it "seeks" to do this, it "seeks" to do this. It means nothing; nothing at all. You cannot go before the American electorate today with a lot of verbiage, and ask them to give away their substance.

This Charter guarantees nothing. But under the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights, I am guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Some of your colleagues- challenged—have admitted on the public platform that this is unconstitutional. If it is unconstitutional, I do not see how you can even discuss it here in the Senate.

Several of you Senators have admitted it. Some of you have said we must circumvent the Constitution.

There are groups in this country, highly financed pressure groups, who are doing very good propaganda work down here in Wash-

ington. But you are not hearing from the rank and file back home.

I wish you could be in my place. I go to market and stand perhaps 2 hours to see if I can get enough food for my family for the day. The people are very bitter; they talk to me. The colored, the white, the Christian, the Jew, and the Gentile. They say, "What does it all mean? Of course, we know war is in the making. They are not fooling us. What is the matter with the Senate down in Washington? What are they down there for?"

Gentlemen, the people of this country are slow to arouse. They know they have been betrayed. They have talked, but you turned a silent ear. There comes a time in the history of every country when the people's silence is very dangerous.

As in the Bible of old, it is said, "Put on the taxes. And the people grumbled. Put on more taxes. And the people grumbled. And so long as the people grumbled it was all right. But when they put on more taxes, and the people were silent, they knew it was the danger signal."

When I go to meetings of the highly financed pressure groups, as I went to that of the Women for Victory, or the Women's Action Committee, and I hear Anne O'Hare McCormick say, "We women put over prohibition in the last war while the boys were away; and we women will put over the world government while the boys are away in this war"; gentlemen, is that fair? Is that honest? Is that honorable? Is it American?

You will probably hear from them. I have seen some of their members here.

And when I go to the meeting of the Commission for the Organization of Peace, and I hear Mr. Shotwell say "The postwar world will not be governed by international financiers, but by international cartels," I say, gentlemen, under this Charter we are going to get international cartels, demagogic government by five men.

I am sure that you will agree with me that the honorable, honest way for the United States Senate to handle this matter is by constitutional means. No one can criticize you for that, when you go before your electorate and tell them the truth of what this document stands for and what it means.

Mr. CONNALLY, you, yourself, said it would be done by constitutional means. The Republican platform said it would be done by constitutional means. The Democratic platform said it would be done by constitutional means.

Mr. FULBRIGHT said it would be done by constitutional means; I heard Mr. FULBRIGHT, at the luncheon for the Commission for the Organization for Peace, say, "We freshmen Congressmen went to Congress pledged to the world government."

Gentlemen, did he forget that he took an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States, or does not an oath of office mean anything any more? If it does not, then it is time the American people knew it.

We are not children; we understand what is going on. We think it is just about time we got back to the founding fathers, and to the Constitution of the United States. I know that when you think of this in your serious moments you will not want to put yourselves in the position of having the people back home say that you were not true to your oaths.

I beg of you, gentlemen, before you put your names to this document, to weigh it carefully.

This is not a peace document; this is a document of force, of aggression, of grabbing—grabbing the raw materials of this country; grabbing our boys, grabbing our money.

We went to war in 1776 because of unfair taxes. What do you think we are going to do when you try to tax us to send billions of dollars to Europe and all over the world? Do you think we are going to stand for that? And where are you going to get it? These are the things you must weigh, and think of carefully. These are the things you must discuss. These are the things for which you must answer to the American people.

So, gentlemen, in all fairness, I, an American woman, a mother, and a grandmother, I beg you—do not go down in history as the betrayers of your country.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Baldwin.

Extract From Address by Hon. C. A. Berendsen, Minister of New Zealand to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extract from a talk which was given at the annual meeting of the City Club of Portland on Friday, June 29, 1945, by Hon. C. A. Berendsen, Minister of New Zealand to the United States.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

But I remind myself that I was invited to speak to you tonight on New Zealand and the Conference.

We have been interested in a system of collective security for many, many decades. We have held strong views and we believe we were entitled to express them. Now, if you agree, I intend, with your patience and indulgence, to analyze the Charter as we see it.

I want to be particularly careful of two things. If I give any offense at all—and I trust that I shall not—I beg you to believe that it is due to inadvertence or to clumsiness of language and not to intention. I ask you to recognize that what I say on this Charter is one complete whole and that portions should not be picked out for attack, and to remember this: That although this Charter is not what we wished, although in some important respects we believe it falls short of the necessities of the time, and, may I say, falls far short of what the man in the street, throughout the world, would have been willing to accept, nevertheless we concede at the outset that what was achieved in San Francisco is in fact the highest common factor that is attainable at this time.

And as for New Zealand—we signed that Charter. I signed it with my Prime Minister. We will keep that Charter. We will support that Charter, and, if the necessity should ever, unhappily, arise, we will fight for that Charter. [Applause.]

There are of course many differences between nations. There are marked differences between the larger members—the great powers—and I ask you to remember that there are substantial differences between the smaller powers, too. Some of those small nations have shown by their deeds that they will play their full part in maintaining and enforcing peace and justice, that they are entitled to be regarded as "security powers." There are others who are contented to stand on the sidelines and cheer. We in New Zealand, at all times, will be in there, with you, pitching, whether we like that Charter or not.

Now, may I analyze what we have got out of San Francisco? I should, perhaps, in the first place make it quite plain that while we expressed the New Zealand views and reservations and apprehensions, despite the fact that there were disputes and discussions and debates, nevertheless now that that is all over and finished with, we accept the decision and the Charter. That is the essence of democracy.

But it is a disservice to those who believe, as we profoundly believe, in the cause of peace, and to those who wish to see this Charter a success, it is a disservice not to recognize, not only its strength but its weaknesses. Nothing was ever gained by putting heads into the sand. Indeed, it is not physically possible for any man, bird, or beast to put his head into the sand without assuming a posture that invites a kick in another portion of his anatomy.

Now, to analyze the situation; if anyone does not agree, I beg him to make his own interjection and perhaps between all of us we can make something of it. It is a hopeful sign that if we can see the weaknesses of the Charter we may in time be able to remedy them.

I wish, in the first place, to show you how small it is, and then, expressing my own thoughts and my country's thoughts, how great it can be made; and finally how the terms of the Charter need not really matter at all.

On the negative side, what have we got? We have an organization which can operate only against a small power. We have an organization which cannot, by definition, operate against a great power. We have an organization which cannot operate against a small power if that small power is supported by a great power. That is the effect of the veto.

Now, we opposed the veto, root and branch, and we voted against it until it was plain that without the veto we would have no Charter. If that is the price we had to pay for a world organization, we were willing to pay it.

What does the veto mean? Any great power, any one of the five, can, at any time, exempt itself from any action whatsoever. The great powers, apart from certain unimpeachable and largely negative provisions of the preamble and principles, are subject to nothing, they pledge themselves to nothing. Each one of the great powers reserves to itself the right to say in each and every case, whether it will be bound and whether it will act. More than that—every great power reserves to itself the right to say whether the whole organization can operate or cannot operate. Unless each and all of the five great powers is agreeable the organization cannot operate at all. So the organization rests on the basis, which you may regard as precarious, of the continual and continuous ad hoc unanimous agreement of each and all of these five great powers.

Though all of the five, of course, are not of equal importance, nevertheless all of them have the veto. We were particularly opposed to this veto power insofar as it applied to what might be termed the conciliation activities of the organization. We thought it improper that any one of these five could come in and say, not that we won't go to war, not that we won't apply sanctions, but that we won't even consider a dispute; we won't even attempt to settle it by peaceful means.

We found it difficult to understand why this must be insisted upon. We thought it must be an error in drafting, but it was insisted upon, and remember in this connection that the Charter lays the obligation on any state, party to a dispute, or in any case where a situation arises threatening the peace of the world, to refer the matter to the Security Council, and then each one of those

five members of the Security Council has the right to say, "We will not consider that matter." We thought that was a real weakness.

And the veto applies also to the amendment of the Charter. It is an extremely rigid organization. The Charter can be amended only by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the organization, ratified by two-thirds of the members, including each of the five great powers. Therefore, this veto, which many do not approve, will, unless all the great powers agree to alter it, remain forever. We think that is another weakness.

Now, the great powers, with this extraordinary privilege—not bound to act in any case—each one of them able to exempt itself from any action—each one able to prohibit the organization from acting at all—occupy a very privileged position as compared with the small powers, and I speak for the small powers. These great powers which have this extraordinary privilege, demand of the small powers a monumental act of faith.

The small powers are invited to join, and my country will join and will play the game; I am explaining the situation; I am explaining the rules; we must see it in all its aspects—the small powers are invited to join that organization, and they are going to do so, on the condition that they bind themselves for all time to act, when called upon to do so by the great powers, even to send their sons to die—on a decision which will be made by the great powers, at an unknown time, by unknown men, in unknown circumstances, and on unknown principles, and, in that portentious decision the small powers, unless fortunate enough to be one of the six small-power representatives on the Security Council, have, incredible as it may sound, not only no vote, but no voice.

Now, let me analyze that, and remember all the time I am not attacking the proposition—we have accepted it and we will fight for it—I am showing you the weakness of it. My country stands pledged to the Charter and its application and is willing to fight and die to make a success of this Charter. I say we are pledged for all time, because the Charter cannot be amended without the consent of each of the great powers, and because there was no provision for withdrawal in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. However, that has been eased a little. There is still no provision, but it seems to have been accepted that a State is entitled to wthdraw only if it is plain that the organization is failing, or, if some amendment is made which is not agreed to by the party in question.

So, therefore, for all time we are now pledging ourselves to the leadership, to the orders, of the great powers.

Let no one misunderstand me on this. We in New Zealand freely concede that the great powers must have a predominant position in the organization. If it were not for the great powers we would not be dining here tonight; we would all be slaves. And the great powers must continue to play a predominant part or the Organization will not last—we will not preserve the peace. But there is an extraordinary differentiation between the great and the small, and remember that included among the small are some nations which in resources and potential power are themselves very great.

Now, the Covenant of the League of Nation—and may I remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that the Covenant was an American conception—one of the noblest conceptions ever to emanate from the mind of man—the Covenant of the League, under certain circumstances, provided that each member had the right of veto and thus each member could stultify any action of the League. But, in order to avoid that admitted weakness in the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the assembled nations in San Francisco have swung—in our view—far too far in the other direction.

In order to remove the difficulty under the Covenant that each member could, in certain circumstances, nullify the League, it is now provided that the smaller nations shall be deprived of all voice and all vote on any specific question of sanctions. I agree that this is not completely so, because of the fact that in the Security Council there are not only the five larger powers, but also representatives of the small powers elected by the other smaller nations, but all members are bound by the decisions made by the Security Council.

Nobody knows when this organization will be tested. We can only guess—maybe next month, perhaps next year, and perhaps 10 or even in 50 years ahead—when that organization will be tested. This is important because the decision will be made by unknown men. Democracy has been extremely fortunate in the type of leader it has thrown up to meet this great crisis in the affairs of man, and the whole world might well be prepared to commit itself to the benevolent leadership of the great men of the present day. But the leaders of today will pass away, and will be replaced by others; the problems of today will disappear and they in turn will be succeeded by other and no less perplexing problems. It is not to a Roosevelt or a Truman, a Churchill or an Eden, a Stalin or a Molotov, a Chiang Kai-shek or a Soong, a De Gaulle or a Bidault that the world is entrusting these great powers. Who knows what will be the responsibility, the integrity, the honesty, the determination of the men whom chance will throw up to operate this great machine, whether they will have the wisdom and the will to meet and face the new problems of the new world for which this Charter is pregnant for good or ill.

Each of us, I imagine, each one of us in his own mind can picture some leader of the past who, if he were to appear again and take his place on the Security Council, would kill that organization dead.

Now let me refer to principles.

We have a certain series of principles stated in the Charter. They are general and largely negative; they amount to little more than the impeccable provisions of the ill-fated Kellogg-Briand Pact. We agree to refrain from doing things. We agree to abide by certain principles, but nowhere at all do we agree to do the only thing which we, in New Zealand, regard as completely essential. We believe that the League of Nations did not fail for any mechanical reason. We believe that it did not fail because of any defect in the Covenant. It did not fail for any reason which can be eliminated by altering the form of the organization that is now to take its place.

It is our belief that it is within the grasp of man to banish war if man will but grasp, and that the very crux and kernel of any system of collective security is an undertaking by each member that whenever aggression rears its ugly head, it will be resisted and defeated by the combined might of all.

And we feel that this was the second of the two great weaknesses in this Charter; the first is the disparity between the paths charted for the great powers and for the small nations, and the second is the absence of any pledge against aggression—any automatic pledge against aggression—that explicitly and positively, the members of the Organization should pledge themselves collectively to resist any act of aggression against any member. This matter was brought before the San Francisco Conference in those words by an amendment proposed by the New Zealand delegation. It was argued at great length. It was opposed by the great powers. The arguments against it, we felt, were of small validity. In the first place it was said, "You cannot define aggression," to which we and those—and there were many—who thought as we did and said so, replied that we did not think it was impossible to define aggression. There are many definitions of aggression. President Roosevelt had made one definition of aggression and the American Republics in setting up a real system of collective security had defined aggression in the Act of Chapultepec. But we did not insist upon a definition. We were prepared to leave it to the Security Council to decide when and if there had been aggression, to leave it to the Security Council, of which all the great powers are members, each of them possessing the power of veto, each of them therefore essential to any decision that there had been aggression. We said it at the Conference, and we say it now—the small powers should be given this pledge. We asked of the Security Council that if there should be an act of aggression—if all the great powers agreed that there had been aggression—then there be a legal and moral obligation on all the members of the Organization, great and small, to meet that aggression, with force if necessary, and defeat it.

That was debated at considerable length. It was referred to a subcommittee. The great powers opposed it and it was defeated in the subcommittee. It was brought out again to the committee and debated for weeks, and it was actually carried by 26 to 18 votes—a substantial majority but insufficient to meet the two-thirds requirements before a resolution becomes effective. So, as my Prime Minister pointed out, 26 members of the organization firmly believed that it was essential and that if it is not incorporated in the organization, or if the organization is not going to act in just that way, then the organization will fail.

Well, I have said all I intend to say against this Charter. I repeat: Its struggles and disputes and debates are over. We lost. We were not able to carry our point of view. As true and good Democrats, we accept that decision. That Charter is now our Charter and we will operate it.

Now, let me tell you how you have got something at San Francisco. You have a common agreement of the five great powers and of all the United Nations that they will do their utmost to preserve the peace, to prevent war, to defeat the aggressor. If the golden gate of the Charter is not overwide, or not overhigh, it is at any rate, a gate through which we can proceed to the promised land of peace and order and justice. There is an organization established which will operate, and will operate successfully, just to the extent that the members of that Organization are determined that it will operate and a very great responsibility rests on all members, particularly on the great powers, without whose approval nothing can be done, but also upon the small powers.

Now, let me go on to the third aspect. It is this. That, after all, the text of the Charter need not matter very much. We believe that the failure of the League of Nations, that great and noble experiment of 1919, that great American conception, was a moral failure. The League of Nations had one great disadvantage from which this Organization is to be spared—the lack of full cooperation on the part of this great Republic. You are to be with us in this endeavor, and that is a great and promising step forward. But the League did not fail simply because this great Republic took no part in it. It failed for one reason only, a reason from which this new Organization will not be immune. The League of Nations failed because of a marked deterioration in international morality, because for far too many nations their pledged word was not their bond, because far too many nations preferred national interests, in a short-sighted view, to national honor, because far too many nations thought it was possible to protect and advance their own interests without regard to the interests of others, because, in short, of the false and pagan belief that it is possible to save our babies by throwing somebody else's babies to the wolves.

If the nations of San Francisco are determined to preserve the peace through a system of mutual insurance, if they are determined to meet lawless force with lawful force, whenever and wherever and for whatever cause or putative cause aggression arises, if potential aggressors can feel assured that aggression will certainly and always be resisted by force, then we can certainly preserve the peace, we can save civilization and our way of life. We can perpetuate this freedom of intercourse, this freedom from fear, this freedom from want which we all desire.

Everything will depend on the moral leadership of the five great powers, and particularly of the three of the greatest of those powers.

If, on the other hand, we again choose to follow the false prophet of self-interest, if we succumb again to the lures of that harlot expediency, that we will fail again, just as miserably and just as tragically as we did last time.

The Charter is adequate if there is the will to operate it. If that will disappears, then the most perfect instrument will not achieve the object that is so dear to all of us.

This world today is drenched with blood, liquid with tears and anguish; but blood congeals and tears evaporate and the memory of man is pitifully short. Twice in our generation we have been afforded an opportunity of disposing of this agonizing, insensate struggle of man with man. This generation is privileged, once again, to be entrusted with this high and onerous duty. During the next few years we hold in our fumbling hands nothing less than the fate of men.

We are, in the most real sense, trustees for our children, and our children's children, and for their children as far ahead as the mind can reach. It is for us to protect them from the horrors and the agonies and the wickedness of war.

Let us take heed lest for lack of faith, for lack of courage, for lack of conscience, for lack of sense, let us take heed lest once again we betray that sacred trust. [Applause.]

Relief for Our Allies and Necessity for World Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch two articles by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, one entitled "Urgency To Relieve Our Allies," and the other entitled "President Truman and the Republic of the World." I would like the Senate to have the opportunity to read these two timely and worthwhile articles, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URGENCY TO RELIEVE OUR ALLIES

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The peace we are fighting for is still in danger. Failure to relieve the misery of our western European allies can do more immediate harm to the world than failure to ratify the San Francisco Charter.

A top United States official recently back from Europe states relief for western Europe before winter is the No. 2 task of the United Nations.

Few Americans understand the full measure of Allied distress. Here are some of the facts:

Without the active aid of the occupied European peoples, the Big Three could not have won the war.

Semidestruction of these peoples was part of Hitler's master plan for German domination.

Liberation interrupted this process. But for the liberated peoples, the first year of liberation was physically worse than under the Nazis. Although allies, they had to get through their first awful winter without heating, fats of any kind, adequate food, and clothing. They subsisted literally on hope.

During a whole year's fighting in western Europe, these already destitute allies gave our armies more coal and more food than they received from us. Naturally, they expected that victory would bring relief.

The awful fact is the coming winter threatens to be worse than the last.

This it should be our business to prevent. If we wish, we Americans can, with the help of the British and the Canadians, start our allies on the upward grade with no substantial sacrifice to ourselves. They have the money to pay for what they need. They are convinced we can help them if we want to enough.

The chief cause of European distress is wholesale interruption of transportation. First the Nazis stole rolling stock and motortrucks. Then the United Nations bombed the bridges. Then the Germans during their retreat destroyed what they could. Then the Allied armies borrowed the greater part of the remaining rolling stock. Even when they give it back it will be insufficient to start things rolling again.

This can be done by only one thing—coal. Everything in western Europe waits on more coal. Norway and Denmark produce no coal. France had an annual coal deficit of 30,000,000 tons. The Netherlands and Belgium broke nearly even. But today Dutch, Belgium, and French mines are worn out and partly destroyed. Thousands of miners are dispersed or too underfed to work.

Coal to prime the stuck pump of western Europe must come chiefly from Germany.

Western Germany can easily supply all the coal that western Europe needs to get going. The relatively intact German rolling stock could ensure deliveries. Until Allied needs for coal are satisfied, Germany should go without. If German miners and railroads do not choose to work for foreigners, they should not eat.

Coal, well distributed, can save western Europe. One example, Denmark during this summer will produce a food surplus. If the Danes get coal, food can be processed and exported. If the French coal miners are better fed, their own output of coal will increase. French factories will begin to work again.

At the same time, the American commanders should be asked to turn over to our allies—not to the Germans—every gallon of gasoline and every pound of food our soldiers can do without. This is no time for hoarding or hesitance. The German danger lives on in the empty bellies of neglected Allied peoples. To fill this is a major war aim.

Ships to succor Europe can be found—provided we are willing temporarily to cut down on Spain and Latin America. Europe needs from the United States railroad equipment, motortrucks, machinery of various types, some raw materials like cotton, every available ounce of nonbulky food. It is a mistake to believe that Army trucks, soon to be abandoned in Europe, can satisfy civilian transportation needs. Army trucks are too heavy and not economical. The need is for commercial trucks.

The task of restarting western European economy is immense. No matter what we do, our allies there are in for a bad time. We can, if we will, take the curse off the coming winter. We can show the victim peoples that we wish to alleviate their misery. We can demonstrate that lofty expressions like "One World" and "United Nations" are not just talk. We can demonstrate the efficiency of American democracy.

Failure to do what we can would leave festering wounds.

Here is a task worthy of the President's personal attention.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE WORLD

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Speaking at Kansas City last Thursday night, President Harry S. Truman publicly cast in his lot with the advocates of real world organization. Departing from the prepared text of his speech, the President uttered a sentence that must have startled his listeners. He said:

"It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for you to get along with the Republic of the United States." He did not say it would be just as easy. He said it will be, like a man sure of what must come to pass. The context of his remarks strengthens this interpretation. For he prefaced his historical sentence with the words: "I am anxious to bring home to you that the world is no longer nation size; it is one world, as Wendell Willkie said. It is a world in which we must get along."

In other words, President Truman indicated that he does not expect the United Nations Organization to remain the loose vigilance committee outlined at San Francisco but to develop, gradually but surely, into the republic of the world.

Failure to notice and play up the President's historical declaration constitutes a conspicuous example of wretched reporting by the American press.

This amazing oversight can perhaps be traced to a less obvious fact, namely, the very real difference between the popular attitude toward the coming Organization and the attitude toward the old League of Nations. Then, in 1919–20, partisans of the League believed firmly that they were setting up a body able to keep the peace. This time it is different. This time practically all the experts, including the authors of the San Francisco Charter, are warning candid citizens not to expect too much. Many admit openly that the Organization they have planned will not in itself suffice to prevent future wars. For that several other things, they say, are necessary and primarily harmony between the Great Powers

Now it is obvious that if there is harmony between the Great Powers there cannot be any disharmony. Therefore, to say that the peace will be kept if there reigns harmony between the Great Powers is like saying that there will be peace if there is no war. What these people are really trying to express so far as one can make out is the following:

"Two great powers, the Soviet Union, and the United States, are unwilling to purchase peace at the price of real international authority. They value their sovereignty above peace. Therefore the kind of organization which they favor must remain purely voluntary for the five strongest countries. It will not dispense the major peoples from the necessity of spending vast fortunes on maintaining gigantic armies and navies and air fleets. They will maintain their precious sovereignty—and with it their national rivalries, complicated systems of defense, bases overseas, colonies for exploitation, etc. What the delegates at San Francisco did is (a) to create a framework within which the great

powers, if they so will, may more easily cooperate; (b) to create a new voluntary organization which may, if the peoples insist, ultiately develop into a real supergovernment truly capable of establishing "peace on earth."

At San Francisco this situation was plain. The majority of the delegates knew precisely the prerequisites of a war-proof organization. Witness the immense applause that greeted the plea of the Chinese Foreign Minister for general renunciation of some sovereignty.

This is exactly what was not done there. In defending the charter before the United States Senate Senator CONNALLY said with pride: "The rights and sovereignty of the United States are not imperiled." Senator VANDENBERG boasted that the veto power "guarantees our perpetual independence of international dictation. * * * We sacrifice none of our essential American sovereignty and none of our essential American rights."

President Truman was wiser than two Senators dizzy with pride of authorship. Instead of coming out for national sovereignty, the President followed the lead of those who see in the new organization the first step on the path of true internationalism. He directed the attention of his Kansas City listeners toward the republic of the world on the analogy of the Republic of the United States. In this latter, he implied, the component States, though still called "sovereign," enjoy no "perpetual independence of international dictation." In fact, they enjoy no independence at all save through the Union and every day they take dictation from the sovereign representatives of the Union, some of them Members of the same American Senate to which Messrs. CONNALLY and VANDENBERG have the honor to belong.

Instead of flattering isolationist and nationalist prejudice, the American President pointed to the only effective form of international organization.

Washington Water Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation of a series of articles on the Washington water lobby, written by Peter Edson and published in the Washington Daily News of July 16 to July 21, 1945.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WASHINGTON WATER LOBBY

(By Peter Edson)

(Series of articles which appeared in the Washington Daily News, July 16 to July 21, 1945)

A water lobby to fight the creation of more United States river valley authorities like TVA—the Tennessee Valley Authority—is now emerging as a potent pressure group on the Washington scene.

Most of the 31 national land and water organizations making up this lobby are not new. But their banding together for the avowed purpose of stopping the spread of the valley authority idea is highly significant.

While it would be natural to think that any opposition to the development of more TVA's would come from the old private electric power utilities' lobby, connection between the power lobby and the water lobby does not appear on the surface.

F. O. Hagie, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association, one of the five organizations whose Washington representatives make up the coordinating committee of the unofficial and unnamed water lobby, has a simple explanation for its existence. He says the 31 organizations are simply fighting against a change in the American form of government. Hagie contends that dividing the United States into nine regional authorities of three men each, as proposed by Mississippi Congressman JOHN RANKIN'S bill, would give these 27 men more political power than all the 48 Governors and State legislatures.

But the issue may not be that simple, either. For a better insight of what's behind this fight you have to appreciate what water is. Water isn't just stuff to drink and bathe in. Water is billions and billions of dollars.

To the farmer it is necessary food for livestock and crops. It is nursed in irrigation, fought in soil erosion. It is drainage. In flood time it must be controlled. Behind dams it generates electric power. All the trade associations depending on water therefore have a stake in this idea of river-valley development.

In almost all of the United States west of Omaha, water rights for irrigation are more valuable than land rights. Arid land is $1 an acre. Irrigate it and it's $200 an acre.

The disposition of billions of dollars' worth of lush "pork barrel" congressional appropriations is at stake in contracts for river and harbor improvement, flood-control projects, dam and canal construction and irrigation.

Control over the Government agencies now administering these matters is another factor not to be overlooked in this battle. War Department's Corps of Engineers, Interior's Bureau of Reclamation and public power projects, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Agriculture today share these responsibilities. While it is now claimed that the conflicts between these agencies were largely resolved by the Flood Control and rivers and harbors acts of 1944, rivalry still exists and each agency has its backers.

These are some of the reasons why the water lobby has been able to bring together such diverse interests as the New York State Waterways Association, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Florida Waterways Congress, Texas Water Conservation Association, California Water Council, American Merchant Marine Institute, Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, and a score more.

The coordinating committee now managing the affairs of the 31 organizations includes, besides F. O. Hagie, of the Reclamation Association:

William H. Webb, of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; Roy Miller, of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas; E. W. Rising, of the Water Conservation Conference; and Lachlan Macleay, of the Mississippi Valley Association, all of whom have Washington offices.

Formation of a new, joint "water lobby" to oppose creation of more "valley authorities" like TVA is credited to Fred D. Beneke of Memphis, Tenn. Beneke is a two-threat man. He is secretary-treasurer of both the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association.

Beneke called the first meeting of the heads of organizations interested in saving the country from the authorities. As a result of his efforts, in April some 20 associations which classify themselves as "land and water users' organizations" issued a four-page joint letter to Congress. It presented a strong case for letting well enough alone and preserving States' rights.

This letter was published just before the Senate Commerce subcommittee opened hearings on Montana Senator JAMES E. MURRAY'S bill to create a new Missouri Valley Authority. The committee reported against MVA. The letter wasn't the only cause, but it helped. Roy Miller, acting president of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, chairman of the water lobby's coordinating committee, was a star witness.

Flushed by its first success, the lobby expanded in preparation for further MVA hearings this fall. Eleven more land and water users' associations joined up, bringing the total to 31. The 31 have now issued a second blast, 60,000 copies of a pamphlet entitled, "The Authority Issue," written by Judge Clifford H. Stone of the National Reclamation Association. It is a blistering attack against the whole idea of river valley development under authorities, calling these regional corporations a change in the American form of government.

There is no known compilation of the membership or resources of the 31 organizations in this water lobby. But a close look at the list reveals not only its power, but some strange bedfellows.

Take the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, founded in 1901. It works for bigger and better congressional appropriations for river and harbor development and gets them. Its president is Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. Its four national vice presidents are Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana, and Congressmen WILLIAM H. WHITTINGTON, of Louisiana; HUGH PETERSON, of Georgia, and CHARLES R. CLASON, of Massachusetts. Chairman of the board is Congressman DEWEY SHORT of Missouri. Four other Congressmen and three ex-Congressmen are on the board of directors.

Take the National Reclamation Association. It was originally organized in 1898 and was responsible for passage of the act which created the United States Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior. The association was reorganized 13 years ago under the leadership of Gov. George H. Dern, former Secretary of War. Today it represents over 400 Western State water districts. National Reclamation Association is interested primarily in irrigation, secondarily in flood control, and not at all in the development of public power, except as a byproduct of the other two.

The Water Conservation Committee, continuing committee, came into being last September in Chicago. It was a conference called primarily by National Reclamation Association. Representatives from 28 States were assembled for the purpose of perfecting amendments to flood control and rivers and harbors legislation then pending before Congress.

These are probably the Big Three of the 31 organizations now grouped in the water lobby.

* * * * *

Their interests vary from irrigation in the desert to flood control in the lowlands, from the development of a United States ocean-going merchant marine to the piloting of some put-putting power boat on fresh water lakes far from the seaboard.

* * * * *

From the Mississippi River Basin are the Mississippi Valley Association, interested in river navigation from the Alleghenies to the Rockies; the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, organized back in 1912, now made up of the levy boards from six Southern States; the Upper Mississippi Waterways Association, promoting navigation above St. Louis; the Upper Mississippi and St. Croix River Improvement Association, promoting navigation above the Twin Cities; American Waterways, Inc., organized a year ago as a successor to the Mississippi River Carriers Association of barge-line operators.

In the Ohio Valley region are the Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, barge-line operators; Tri-State Authority of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio, promoting flood control, navigation, and antipollution in streams; Allegheny River Association, recently reorganized to promote shipping above Pittsburgh; the Ohio Valley Improvement Association of Cincinnati, which has been boosting river shipping from Pittsburgh to St. Louis for 30 years; and the Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress.

In the East are the Eastern States Conservation Conference of Boston, 80 years old, closely tied in with the New England Council through the existing State governments; the New York State Waterways Association, of canal and river shippers; the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River, unique in that it functions through identical legislation passed by the four State assemblies; the Upper Potomac River Board, interested in flood control; and the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association.

In the South are the Florida Waterways Congress, promoting ship canals; the Louisiana Department of Public Works; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas; Arkansas Basin Flood Control Association; Atlantic and Gulf Canals Association; Texas Water Conservation Association; and the Trinity River Association, these last two covering all the water interests of Texas.

Operating in the West are the California Water Council formed a year and a half ago to represent the interests of 47 irrigation districts in the Central Valley.

In the Missouri Valley proper are the Missouri Valley Development Association, less than a year old, and the Upper Missouri Valley Association, promoting navigation above Sioux City, Iowa.

First objective of the so-called water lobby in Congress is to fight the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. A bill to set up an MVA is now before Congress. It was introduced by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana. Hearings on the bill were held before a Senate Commerce subcommittee last April and in May a report was made opposing the project. Score round one for the 31 organizations making up the water lobby.

MURRAY'S MVA bill has two more chances in September, first before an Irrigation subcommittee, then before an agriculture subcommittee.

It must, of course, be understood that there is a strong lobby supporting MVA, but it is not as old and not as experienced and not as well coordinated as the water users' lobby in opposition. Included in the pro-MVA lobby are the National Farmers Union of tenant farmers and small landowners, the AFL, the CIO, the public power advocates, the supporters of the TVA who endlessly sing its praises as "the perfect state," and a number of new civic organizations recently formed in St. Louis and the Missouri Basin. In early July they all met at Omaha, formed the Missouri Valley Regional Committee for MVA and started out to get a million signatures on a petition for Congress to create an MVA. They hope to beat down the water lobby's entrenched position by mere force of numbers.

Most ambitious of the other authority proposals is Mississippi Congressman JOHN RANKIN'S bill to divide the whole United States into nine areas and put an authority over each one—Atlantic seaboard east of the Alleghenies; Great Lakes and Ohio Valley; Missouri, Columbia, Arkansas, Colorado Valleys; southwestern authority for the Desert States, and a California authority to function west of the Sierras. It is admittedly too far-reaching to have much of a chance.

Washington Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL proposes a Columbia Valley Authority, a CVA for the three Northwestern States.

Ohio Congressman EOB BENDER proposes an Ohio Valley Authority. OVA would cover most of Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia, with bites into west Pennsylvania, north Tennessee, southeast Illinois.

South Carolina Congressman BUTLER B. HARE proposes an SVA—Savannah Valley Authority—taking in narrow strips on the Carolina-Georgia line.

But these five bills by no means represent all the valley-authority thinking and planning being done in Washington.

Department of Interior's Bureau of Reclamation has studies under way to divide the entire West—roughly everything west of Kansas City—into some 20 valley developments—Rio Grande, Red, Arkansas, Colorado, Columbia, Central, Missouri, and so on.

Army engineers are in a similar fix. They have traditionally supervised flood control and navigable rivers. Under such an expanded valley-authority program as is now before Congress, all this supervision over navigable streams would be taken away from the War Department and given to the authorities.

The powerful water lobby, supporting both engineers and Bureau of Reclamation as established old-line agencies with whom they are accustomed to do business, is in there fighting to preserve these older Government agencies and to skip all this fancy, New Dealish valley authority stuff.

Principal argument being used by the water lobby in Washington is to build up a case that TVA, the Tennessee Valley Authority, is not the promised land and the beautiful success it is usually portrayed.

In trying to tear down TVA, the water lobby has a job on its hands. Anyone daring to criticize TVA profanes sacred dogma, according to the popular notion. Yet F. O. Hagie, of the National Reclamation Association, went through the Tennessee Valley recently and came back to report that there were plenty of people in the valley who don't like the TVA way of life. And Will H. Webb, executive vice president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, who comes from Tennessee himself, accuses TVA of all sorts of dreadful things, including even the opening up of the TVA power dams in floodtime, to drown poor people downstream.

Hagie and Webb are two of the prime movers on the five-member coordinating committee which manages the campaign of the 31 organizations making up the water lobby. If the lobby can convince enough Congressmen that TVA isn't the unmitigated good it is supposed to be, then here is a good chance of stopping extension of the authority idea to the Missouri, Columbia, and other river basins where such planning goes on.

Basis for the water lobby case against TVA is complex. The point that TVA represents a change in the American form of government has been mentioned previously in these dispatches. Hagie maintains that the three-man TVA board has never used all the political and economic power granted in the original legislation creating a Government corporation to develop resources of the region. Hagie says these powers might easily be abused, and points to this danger.

Judge Clifford H. Stone, of Denver, a National Reclamation Association legal director, says TVA has been granted many powers which were never surrendered to the Federal Government by the sovereign States. He makes a strong States' rights argument against the TVA idea.

Cheap power has of course been one of TVA's great talking points. The TVA experiment was intended to provide a yardstick for measuring rates in other parts of the country. But the water lobby claims it is a rubber yardstick not applicable to other parts of the country. The Tennessee River is 700 miles long against the Missouri's 2,500. The Tennessee Valley covers less than 3 percent of the United States, while the Missouri Valley covers 18 percent. While TVA may be easy to administer because it is small, administration of the Missouri Basin by a single authority would not be feasible.

All these are vicious charges, made by people who admittedly have other, conflicting interests. They must be balanced against what TVA says in its own defense.

Has the TVA experiment paid off? Or is it, as charged by the combined lobby of 31 land and water users' organizations, something which should not be repeated in other parts of the United States?

Only answer to that must come from TVA's own records. TVA's annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, is not yet completed. But taking the 1944 report and adding to it those figures which are available on recent operations, these facts stand out:

First the cost. Congress has appropriated $668,000,000. Bonds sold total $65,000,000. The net income from power operations after payment of all current expenses but before depreciation, is $75,000,000. In addition, TVA took over from the War Department the old Muscle Shoals and other World War I developments at a book value of $36,000,000. That makes the total cost to date $844,000,000.

Where has this money gone? Five hundred and sixty million dollars has been spent on the completed plant, and another $188,000,000 has been spent on construction work still in progress. Of these sums, approximately $460,000,000 is for power projects, the balance flood control and navigation. In addition, $47,000,000 has been spent for non-income-producing development of the Tennessee Valley. Two million dollars' worth of bonds have been retired and there is $41,000,000 in the TVA treasury. Loans to municipal power companies are $3,000,000. Inventory is put at $7,000,000. Depreciation of $4,000,000 balances the books at the above-mentioned $844,000,000 cost.

On the basis of operating experience up to the present, TVA estimates that its income from the sale of electric power will be sufficient to retire the entire investment within 60 years, without interest.

TVA's electric power generating system of 24 water and 11 steam plants has been greatly expanded for war production of aluminum and chemicals. Three-fourths of its present 2,200,000-kilowatt capacity goes to war plants.

In addition TVA furnished power to over half a million consumers through 130 locally owned municipal and co-op distribution systems. Over 20 percent of the consumers are rural. One of the big brags of TVA is that its average nonindustrial consumer uses twice as much electricity as the United States average, and the rates are only half as high as the United States average. The TVA yardstick has been used in many communities to force down rates.

TVA is charged with flood control. It has 19 water storage dams in operation. It flatly denies charges its flood-control operations have not benefited flood conditions on the lower Ohio and Mississippi. On the Tennessee River itself, TVA claims to have lowered flood crest levels at Chattanooga by over 6 feet.

TVA's chemical plant at Muscle Shoals has turned out a quarter of a million tons of fertilizer, shipped to 31,000 farms in 28 States.

TVA has promoted forestry, it has done research on minerals in this area, experimented with new uses of electricity on farms, new farm machinery, new methods of food processing. It has also worked for the control of stream pollution and malaria.

The whole list adds up to an inspiring record which the TVA enemies—who are out to stop the spread of the "authority" idea to other parts of the country—will have a hard time shouting down.

Thurman Arnold's Resignation From the Bench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thurman Arnold Goes Back to Fighting Front," published in the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, of July 25, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THURMAN ARNOLD GOES BACK TO FIGHTING FRONT

The recent resignation of Thurman Arnold from the bench of the United States Court of Appeals eliminates from the Government service an outstanding public servant. At the same time it throws a dismal light upon a disheartening situation which prevails in Washington.

Ten years ago Mr. Arnold was appointed as chief of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice. These 10 years constitute a glorious chapter in the life of Thurman Arnold but they hardly reflect credit upon the Federal administration.

As head of the Antitrust Division, Mr. Arnold attacked a problem which goes to the root of our life as a democratic Nation. Under his direction the antitrust law began to be enforced in earnest for the first time since its enactment over 50 years ago.

This law is aimed at cartels and monopolies which have succeeded in practically eliminating free competition and have made a mockery of free enterprise. It was Mr. Arnold's faith in American democracy and his concern over the welfare of the country that made him go after monopolistic combinations. He endeavored to enforce the Antitrust Act against all those who under the hypocritical appeal to freedom of enterprise have succeeded in shutting off access for the majority of the people to business opportunities and to our industrial and natural resources. It is this shutting off of opportunities that brought about the depression of the thirties and that is preparing a postwar economic catastrophe unless the Antitrust Act is enforced fearlessly and impartially.

In his rather brief career as Chief of the Antitrust Division, Mr. Arnold succeeded in impressing upon the public the significance of the antitrust work in the reconquest of democracy in this country despite the fact that he was interfered with in his work by powerful interests, by the hostility of many judges, and, in general, by all those who place their own interests or the interests of their class above the welfare of the common man.

Mr. Arnold resigned his post as Assistant Attorney General in 1943, when he was prevented from action against one of the most harmful monopolistic combinations of the country, the powerful railroad monopoly.

The Capital Times expressed regret at the time that Mr. Arnold accepted the appointment as judge of the United States court of appeals. We felt that the so-called elevation to the bench was depriving the country of the services of an ideal public servant, a rather unique example of a highly placed official who took democracy seriously and who insisted upon realizing in public life the ideals of Thomas Jefferson and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Arnold's resignation from the bench vindicates our faith in him. In his letter to the President he stated that his reason for returning to private practice was his desire to further the cause which was his chief interest in the Department of Justice. The information which we received subsequently shows that Mr. Arnold is already at work fighting in private practice for the ideals which he championed as Chief of the Antitrust Division.

We were also gratified to learn that he took with him as a partner Mr. Arne Wiprud, a former member of the Antitrust Division who has recently published a book Justice in Transportation, which contains valuable data and a comprehensive analysis of the transportation monopoly in this country.

The treatment which Mr. Arnold received from Washington officialdom constitutes a blot on our history. Washington can redeem itself to some extent by affording opportunities to the high minded and competent staff of the Antitrust Division that was built up by Mr. Arnold to continue its enforcement of are Antitrust Act, which under the present chief, Wendell Berge, is being administered in the spirit of Thurman Arnold.

It is rather late in the day. High sounding phrases about democracy must not be used to serve as a cover for thwarting the law. Unless competent and conscientious men are given an opportunity to apply their talents and their energy in public service, the American way of life will become a glorious memory.

An Impending Crisis at Home—Letter From a Soldier on the Race Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a soldier from Missouri in the army of occupation in Europe, dealing with an impending crisis at home. I think it will be good recess reading.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMY IN EUROPE,
July 1, 1945.

Senator THEODORE G. BILBO.

DEAR SIR: I am a soldier who has been serving over seas 2 years and a half, fighting for the principles of freedom and justice. Sometimes I have wondered if it is all worth while from the things I see of mankind in these countries I have passed through. I have seen good-looking white girls cheaping themselves by carrying on affairs with the Negro race and my heart has become sad and my stomach sick. Many times I have read of changes taking place back home that would encourage these things, and I wonder again and again why am I giving my life so people back home can make my beloved country into the filth of Europe. In Missouri, I read in the Stars and Stripes, a law is being introduced to consolidate colored and white schools into one. This means that my daughter and son will go to school with the Negro. What has come over people back home? There seems to be a planned campaign to get the white people and the black people to intermarry. Some of the churches are sponsoring speeches by people advocating this idea, and seems to have plenty of money behind them. It seems so radical, so un-American that we are hardly awaken to what is taking place.

I have talked with many fellow soldiers of what seems to be sweeping the country we love back home. We feel our people, our Senators, our Representatives are letting us down by not preserving the America we left and protecting our interest. It has been the common practice of the Army to mix the whites with the colored. This we don't like, but nevertheless can see the necessity in some few cases, but we will not tolerate mixing our daughters and sons so intermarriage will be encouraged. We believe in justice and freedom for the Negro but we cannot see why they do not wish to stay in their own circles, schools, and race.

We take our hats off to you, sir, and to anyone else who has foresight enough to see the crisis that has come out of the war. It is the great crisis that faces the American people and has more value than San Francisco. We pray to God that He will save our country, and give us more leaders and, yes, heroes of the war who have fortitude and courage, to awaken the easy-going American people to what is gradually slipping upon them. God bless you, and you can be sure there are millions of fellow soldiers behind you. There is one question that always, jars us back to our senses, "How would you feel if you saw your daughter of 6 years of age, going down the street hand in hand with a colored boy, from school or going to the show?" How would you feel if you knew your daughter, age 16 was out with a colored boy the night before. And may I add, with all honesty and sincerity, it has happened in the countries of Europe, where there are few morals. Will it happen to our United States, under the cloak of justice?

Looking to you for help and leadership.

Technical Sgt. ——— ———.

Testimony of John T. Flynn, Carl H. Mote, and Mrs. Florence Cafferatta on the United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony on the United Nations Charter, given before the Foreign Relations Committee by John T. Flynn, Carl H. Mote, and Mrs. Florence Cafferatta, representing the Catholic Mothers and Daughters of America.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN T. FLYNN, ECONOMIST AND JOURNALIST, NEW YORK, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. This is Mr. John T. Flynn, of New York, a very distinguished economist and journalist whom most of you know.

Proceed, Mr. Flynn.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I will have?

The CHAIRMAN. You will have what you requested.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, I do not represent any organization. I talk entirely for myself and nobody is responsible for what I say except myself.

Mr. Stettinius, in presenting this Charter to this committee, said that it had been prepared to preserve peace and advance human progress; and the signers of the Charter, in the very pretentious preamble say:

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small."

No man can possibly disagree with an enterprise the purpose of which is to preserve the peace of the world and to advance human progress; and if I believed that this Charter had been framed for that purpose, or that it accomplished that purpose or was a forward step in the direction of that purpose, I would be for it regardless of all its defects.

But I do not believe that it is a plan to prevent war or a plan to preserve human rights. I do not believe it will do any of these things.

Now, first, on the question of preventing war, after all, reasonable men who set about so vast an undertaking as that will begin by inquiring what are the causes of war. I think that here the framers of this Charter have proceeded on a theory which is not rational and which cannot be supported by the facts of history, and that is that Germany and Japan are the causes of war, and that if you can put down Germany and Japan and keep them disarmed, you can prevent war.

That theory will not stand the test of history. I am not defending Germany and Japan from the charge of being war makers. They are war makers, and the whole world knows it and knows of their guilt in this war.

What are the causes of war? Until you deal with those causes you will never prevent war, no matter what you write in the preamble of your Charter.

Prof. Quincy Wright has recently published a rather voluminous study of the origins of war, and in the first volume of that study he includes a group of tables prepared by the University of Chicago in a very extensive research into the number of wars fought in the last 400 years and the number of wars in which all of the nations of the world had been engaged. We need not worry about the old wars in the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth centuries, but we certainly must look at the wars of the nineteenth century, our own century, the century of enlightenment and of a modern world, and of the present century for the record of the war makers in the last 140 years of world history.

Here is the record as summarized by me from these voluminous tables, which I shall be glad to include in the record for the information of anybody who wishes to pursue this subject further.

In the nineteenth century, in 100 years Prussia was engaged in 5 wars; Austria in 9 wars; Russia in 10 wars; Spain in 13 wars; France in 23 wars, and Great Britain in 28 wars.

In the present century, the first 41 years of it, the record is, Spain three wars; Austria three wars; Germany five wars; France six wars; and Great Britain seven wars.

This does not acquit Germany. I am giving you the European record. It makes it perfectly clear that these great nations in Europe, the six of them which I have named, have been constantly engaged in wars, numerous wars, over and over again during the last 140 years.

But suppose that you have dealt with the aggressor nations and brought an end to the causes of war by subjugating Germany and Japan and disarming them, and then presenting to the world a great confederation for peace and justice on the theory that you are now ending war or trying to end war. It seems to me that that is a very shallow and superficial approach to the whole subject of war.

Why are these nations engaged in these wars? The causes of these wars have been pretty well classified in this study. The chief causes are put down as imperialism and balance of power, the latter arising out of the imperialistic ambitions of these nations. The fundamental cause of war is this: These big and powerful nations have economic and social troubles just as every other nation, racial, dynastic—all sorts of things that urge men to act; but because of their power they assert the right, when they have economic and social problems to be dealt with, to march across their frontiers and move into the lands of other peoples and seize their territory and exploit their resources and hold their bases and do whatever they believe to be necessary for safety or defense or for the solution of the economic problems of these aggressor nations.

You are right when you say that wars come from these aggressor nations; but they come from all the aggressor nations, and you do not deal with the cause of war when you eliminate two aggressors and establish others of these aggressors in control of the world. You have not touched the cause of war. You will never touch the cause of war until you have gotten these nations, all of them, to renounce the right to solve their economic and other problems by attacking and holding, conquering and exploiting other countries, whether those attacks and conquests are recent or old, as long as the lands and territories of these other peoples are being held against their will.

You have a council which is going to be in complete domination of this organization, so far as preserving the peace of the world is concerned, and it is in the complete control of four great nations. I eliminate China, because China is a poor and powerless nation at the moment. But the four great nations, the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia—every one of them, with the exception of our own country—must be numbered amongst the greatest aggressors in the history of mankind, and the recent history of mankind.

I am not going to make any point of the present guilt of these aggressors, of England and her Empire, of France and her Empire. They are indefensible, in my humble opinion. I am not talking about the British Commonwealth of Nations. I know it would be a difficult thing to ask those countries to demobilize those empires right away, but until they are willing to say before the world that they have no such rights as they are now asserting you cannot put them in control of a world organization and call it an organization for peace, except in the preamble for sales purposes.

How are you going to stop war with this Charter? Suppose this Charter had been in existence before the First World War. How did that war begin? It began with an attack by Austria on little Serbia. If your charter had been in existence then, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which was one of the great powers of the world, and one of the greatest war-making powers of the world, would most certainly have been a member of the Council; and when Austria undertook to take Serbia, what would have been the procedure? Serbia could have appealed to the Council, and when the matter came before the Council, Austria, as one of the great powers in the Council, would have vetoed any attempt to pronounce her an aggressor.

Then, if you wanted to stop the aggression by Austria, the first thing would have been to correct and destroy the charter—the charter which is organized for the purpose of restraining aggressors.

The only way in which you could restrain this aggressor would be to go outside the charter and correct the charter. And the same thing is true now.

Who are going to make wars in the future? The wars in the future are going to be made by these same aggressor states. They are not going to be made by little, bloodthirsty Finland or little Denmark or Belgium. They are going to be made by these great aggressor powers. How these wars will arise, no man can foresee. One thing is certain: We know that there are hundreds of millions of people now held under the dominion of these powers; and I do not believe, and I am sure you gentlemen do not believe, that these hundreds of millions of people in Europe, 115,000,000 people that Russia has seized directly or indirectly in the last few years, or the hundreds of millions of people in Asia, are going to cease to dream of this great objective of freedom which you are now holding up to the world as the object of this charter. They are going to find ways to intrigue and to work and to struggle for their release from these powers, and they will find allies amongst these great powers whose imperialistic systems are hostile, very often, and contradictory, and presently the friends of the two aggressors you have now put down will turn up amongst some of the present allies and you will have another war in another generation or less, out of the aspirations of the 500,000,000 or 600,000,000 or 700,000,000 people of the world who are held in subjection by these aggressors.

If any attempt is made to stop any of these aggressor nations taking whatever measures are necessary to protect their conquests and their imperialism, there is nothing you can do about it. You cannot stop them.

Practically everybody is restrained from making war, by this Charter, except the war makers; and if you try to stop them, they will veto your effort, and then the next thing you have to do is what you would have had to do in the First World War—correct the Charter as a means of getting the peace.

There is another aspect of this matter which I think cannot possibly be ignored. When does war begin? As soon as Germany crossed the borders of Poland, Russia went in with her. Now you have these two powerful dictatorships launching upon conquest in Europe. They are both dictatorships. During the war in Europe our psychological warfare necessities required us to soft pedal any discussion of the character of our great ally in Europe, Russia.

I am no "Red baiter." I favored years ago the recognition of Russia, and a great many people who now want to take Russia to their bosoms, were denouncing her.

I think the Russian people have a right to run their own affairs. They have lived under dictators and oppressors for centuries; they know no other form of life. The dictatorship they have now is not new; it is merely more complete than any they have ever had, for you have in Russia the most complete tyranny that the world has ever known, for the Russian Government is not only a state with totalitarian political powers to rule every human being within its borders, without limitation, but it is also the employer of every man, woman, and child within its borders; and a greater and more complete totalitarian tyranny you cannot possibly imagine. That is what it is; and it is a brutal tyranny, no less brutal than the one that we have just defeated.

I do not say this now for the purpose of baiting Russians, but because we have a decision to make about our own future, and we are bound to be realistic about it.

And let me quote to you what someone else has said about Russia:

"The Soviet Union, as a matter of practical fact, known to you and known to all the world, is a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world."

That was said by Franklin Delano Roosevelt before Germany crossed the borders of

Russia. But she is still the same ruthless dictatorship.

We are supposed to have liberated the little countries that were seized by Hitler. We have liberated a great many of them from under the heel of Hitler and transferred them to the heel of Stalin and Russia; and if you take Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and half of Poland, and now eastern Germany Yugoslavia, and practically all the Balkans, you have got over 115,000,000 of Europeans who are living now within the orbit of the authority of communism. Nothing in the world can stop them from being organized as communist states.

I do not know what we can do about that. I do not want to go to war with Russia to transfer Poland from under the heel of the Russian dictatorship, after having assisted in holding her there. But I do not want this Nation to collaborate in this infamy. That is what we are doing here, because this Charter that we are talking about now is not the whole of this foreign policy with which we are dealing. It is only a part, one section of the foreign policy. Other sections are to be found in the policies and in the commitments which we have made or are asked to make.

Thus, for instance, we are asked to put $2,500,000,000 into the international fund of the Bretton Woods agreement. We are asked to put $3,175,000,000 into the International Bank of that agreement. That is nearly $6,000,000,000. We have at present in lend-lease about $21,000,000,000 unexpended, and we have made agreements for postwar uses of this fund under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act which permits the President to make advances of funds out of lend-lease after the war is over, on a credit basis.

England wants $5,000,000,000 in the next year. I do not know how large a commitment she has. Russia wants $6,000,000,000. We have got some kind of an arrangement with Belgium under lend-lease. Every country in South America wants billions, and every country in Europe and Asia wants billions.

Without undertaking to add up all the hopes and expectations of all the world as to the billions they are to get, there is about $33,000,000,000 already more or less committed or in process of commitment, to be paid out to those foreign nations at the expiration of the war, and billions of it to Russia.

Now, to come back to my point, I say I do not want to go to war with Russia about these countries, and I do not want to refuse to recognize Russia or trade with her. But I do not want to pay the bills for Russia, for two purposes: One, to make her economic existence successful, and the other to enable her to hold faster and stronger upon the 115,000,000 people of Europe that she has taken under her heel.

That is what we will be doing. We are at the present moment in the midst of a great ideological struggle in this world. I do not see how any man can doubt that all of continental Europe has literally washed out of its life that system of economic life to which we are committed. Two-thirds of the populations of Europe and three-fourths of the land mass of Europe are under the dominion of Soviet Russia and communism. And what is left? France and Spain and Portugal. Spain is already Fascist. France is going to be Fascist. Who can stop it? She is on the road now to communism, and the only thing that will stop that will be a Fascist movement. Italy will probably continue to be Fascist, minus Mussolini. Fascism is only a vestibule or prologue to communism.

We have made Russia a successful military power. I am not detracting from her great courage and the magnificent fighting of her armies; but it was with American armament and American guns, American ammunition, planes, and tanks, that she was enabled to defeat Hitler. But today she stands between the free capitalism and fascism and communism in Europe, the only great, successful combatant, and she has become that successful combatant with the power of her internal Communist energies and with the supplementary power which came to her out of our capitalistic system. She enjoys this prestige of success, and if she can succeed, I am not willing to do anything to stop her. I do not consider myself wise enough to say that communism cannot be made to work if it is given a long enough time. I do not believe it can, but maybe it can; but I cannot see into the future far enough to know what will be the end of this.

I do not want to go into Russia and starve her or attack her. If that experiment is to succeed I want it to succeed on its own energy, and not on the energy of the capitalistic system which she is trying to destroy. I am not an apologist for the capitalistic system, with all of its shortcomings and faults and inconsistencies. I think it is the only system of life that has yet been devised by man under which he can live in freedom. I know of no other nation of the world where it has had a chance, save in America, and here it has produced a degree of well-being which has been equaled nowhere in the world. It has many faults and it has many defects; it has many defects which have been introduced into it by its own capitalist friends, and they must be eradicated if it is to be made to work.

But you have got to make it work, or it will go. It is on its way now, under planned economy. That is nothing in the world but communism. If that comes, it is only an interlude between the fall of free capitalism and the arrival of communism.

So, if you are interested in building this system, you owe it to yourselves to use all the energies you have, to make all the sacrifices you have to make, because you have a competitor on the other side of the ocean that is engaged in an experiment which will destroy your country and its economic system and its representative government if that experiment succeeds.

I do not propose to lend my voice to the paying out of billions of dollars, first, to enable that economic system to succeed, and, secondly, to go into an organization which will enable her to rivet her hold upon two-thirds of Europe. She will do it, because, after all, gentlemen, you have not lost, I hope, your sense of regret, to put it mildly, that those little countries on the Baltic, Christian countries—such as Lithuania, with 80 percent of her people Catholics—are now incorporated in the body of the Soviet Union. You have not lost your sympathy, I hope, for little Finland, or for the people of Poland.

But there is nothing you can do about it; it is too late to do anything about it. Certainly you have not lost the hope that those nations may one day regain their freedom; but they will never regain it until the Russian Empire breaks up. And as part of this whole scheme of power which is being fabricated here, the San Francisco Charter, the Bretton Woods agreement, the postwar lend-lease credit arrangements, the Export-Import Bank, and all sorts of arrangements, plus loans from this country to foreign governments, countless billions of our dollars go to Russia and to Russia's satellites to make that system work in competition with your own.

I am againt that. I am perfectly willing to go into an arrangement with Russia for peace. But this is not the whole story that we see in this charter. It is only one facet of a foreign policy which ignores this past experience.

There is one other aspect to this. I frankly confess that I find myself simply bewildered and appalled at the gay insouciance which I find here in Washington, even among businessmen, talking about handing around billions of dollars, not only in America, but to the world.

I recall, and so do you gentlemen, not so very many years ago, about 7 or 8 years ago, when we had a soldiers' bonus bill which involved a billion and a half dollars. I think I could go back and dig up some of the speeches that were made here about how this billion and a half dollars was going to bankrupt America; and the President of the United States said so in a message to the Congress.

Men were talking about that billion and a half, which was nothing more or less than redeeming an outstanding obligation, and how it would bankrupt us and cause inflation. Men who were opposing that think then are now talking about twenty-five billion, fifty billion, one hundred billion, two hundred billion, two hundred and fifty billion, and saying it is nothing. They are talking about these vast sums without batting an eye.

I do not know what this war has cost to date, but on July 2 the sum amounted to $259,000,000,000. We will have a debt of $300,000,000,000 before we are through, or $350,000,000,000. We have got plans in this country for vast outlays to the veterans, which you will have to meet, and about which men talk with apparent equanimity. We are talking about sending thirty or forty billion dollars' worth of goods abroad, apparently for the purpose of making their systems work and partly for the purpose of providing work here. Where is the money coming from? It has got to be borrowed. You cannot get it from taxation. From whom are you going to borrow it?

While you are busy remaking the world, in the coming year this Nation faces, without raising a single dollar of new money, meeting maturing obligations or possible maturing obligations of $85,000,000,000. You have got $45,000,000,000 in these lettered saving bonds, payable on demand, or 60 days after demand; a few of them 6 months after demand. The Government, in its great generosity, has said that all you have to do is to go to the bank window and ask for the money and you will get it.

No other government, as far as I know, in the history of this world has ever issued a demand bond of this kind. The people have been told that it would be a nest egg when the war was over. The bonds are in the hands of working men and women, and they will be out of jobs. They are in the hands of little businessmen, men of little means, millions of whom will be without income. They will be presenting those bonds to the Treasury for redemption the moment the war is over. They are beginning already.

In addition to that, you have got $40,000,000,000 of short-term Treasury obligations outstanding. You have got more than that. I speak of $40,000,000,000 due in the next 12 months. It must be funded in some way.

In addition to that, you have got hundreds and hundreds of millions and probably billions of dollars in the hands of people who have bought bonds to support this war: corporations, some of them. They have $200,000,000 in bonds. Corporations do not want them. They are buying them wholly to support the war, because after the war is over they have a more dynamic use to make of their money. They will want this money, and the only way to get it is to sell these bonds on the open market, so that in the next year a hundred billion dollars in bonds will be looking for buyers or redeemers.

I would like to ask you where you are going to get all this additional money, when all the people have been buying bonds and are trying to cash the ones they have got. You face a fiscal crisis in this country, and a fiscal crisis so great that you cannot afford to go into a group of commitments like this, which is full of meaningless platitudes about peace and preventing war, which forms a nice facade for Bretton Woods and the other agreements through—by which we are going to pass out all these billions to Europe.

Is anybody thinking about the United States? Is anybody thinking about our economic system and our representative form

of government? Is anybody thinking about what is ahead?

I hear a lot of people talking about the great purchasing power there will be because of savings. What savings? More than 80 percent are locked up in bonds, and the only way is to convert them into cash and any time you do that it will wreck the credit of the American Government. You gentlemen face this appalling and staggering future. God help the poor former Congressman who has just become Secretary of the Treasury.

We sit around talking about giving billions to Russia to make her system work, and billions to Fascist countries in Europe to make their systems work. I say we had better call a halt. I am for international cooperation. I would be for a world order for peace—a real one.

If, when the American Nation was organized, there had been a Big Four—New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Virginia—with permanent Members of the Senate while the others rotated membership, and they were allowed to pass on all the questions of war, with a Congress that was only a debating society, do you think the American Union would ever have been ratified by the States? Do you think it would have lasted? It would not have been a real union. It would not have been a real effort at peace on this continent.

This is what you have done. You have brought into existence a military alliance between four great powers, three of them great aggressors, and around that central core of the military alliance you have placed a halo of small nations without any power to do anything, selling it to the world as a great organization for peace.

I believe the American people have been sold this plan, Senator. It has been a grand job. As one who has been watching propaganda for a great many years, I take off my hat. You cannot turn on the radio at any hour of the day—morning, noon, or night—whether you lister to the Metropolitan Opera or to a horse opera, a hill-billy band, a commentator, or a newscaster that you do not hear a plug for this great instrument for peace.

Nobody knows what it is all about. Nobody has read it. Nobody knows what is in it. It is the kind of propaganda that Hitler taught the world so effectively—"Don't argue with the people. Just put your idea in a slogan or a phrase and repeat it a dozen times a day until they all take it for granted."

That process has been used with extraordinary success and sold to the American people. But the American people will find out about it, and they are going to be a little bit surprised when they find out that they are underwriting, amongst other things, the success of the Soviet experiment in Europe, and that they have become also the underwriters of the Soviet domination of the people which Russia has recently taken under her wing.

It seems to me that this thing might have been discussed a little bit longer, like we discussed the Court plan, Senator—you remember that. You and I were on the same side, then, Senator. That was all greased to go through the Senate like lightning. But we had some Senators who believed in our system of government, and who said, "No; we will keep discussing this until the people of the United States know something about it." Yes; Senator GEORGE, Senator CONNALLY, Senator WHEELER, Senator JOHNSON, Senator LA FOLLETTE, and a lot of other Senators. They kept on discussing it until the people suddenly discovered that there was something worse than a Court of "nine old men."

After that discussion the thing never even got reported out of the committee to the House.

I believe that if this document were to be discussed as that was, it would be gotten before the American people and the people would have had a chance to mull it over and hear the other side of the story, on the radio and in the press and in the movies, and they might begin to have a different attitude on this matter.

I contend that it is a dangerous thing to take the people into this thing unless they are really for it as it is, not as it is presented to them, for the reason that it seems to me that the discussion of this thing ought to be carried on long enough here and in the Senate until the people of the United States can know what it is about and hear the other side of the story.

I do not know how you can present it. You cannot get it on the radio.

Anyhow, it is a grand job, and I congratulate whoever did it.

Now, gentlemen, one more thought, and I am through. I have not gone into the structural defects of this Charter. I have extensive memoranda on that. I think there are many things in this charter that ought to be changed. I call your attention to one which comes to my mind now. I can think of others.

The Social and Economic Council is to have 18 members elected by the Assembly; but there is nothing in that that assures that America shall have any representative on that. I assume we will. We are a great power, too. It is conceivable that the Social and Economic Council, which will be making social and economic studies and recommendations, will be made up of a large majority of Fascists and Communist states which will be providing statistical information and exploiting the philosophy which is to guide this Charter. But I have not gone into the structural defects of it. I have merely been interested in details. I am primarily inspired by my apprehensions of the future of this country because of the economic jam into which we have gotten ourselves. We will need all our resources, all our power, all our sacrifice to pull ourselves out of this frightful hole. We will have no means of carrying out the commitments which we are about to make in connection with this Charter, and we put ourselves in the position perhaps of being one of the first of the members to "welsh" on the whole thing—which we cannot afford to do.

I do not mean that we should not take measures to protect ourselves against another war. I think Europe is headed for wars, ideological wars and wars of liberation; and the same thing is true of Asia. We are heading for our share without any more power to do anything about it than we have to do anything about the real issues involved in this one.

I think, therefore, that we should make up our minds to make a start in the direction of a federation of some kind that will work. No federation to preserve the peace will work unless every member renounces its authority and right to rule and control the lives of other people. I know of no other nation that can answer that description except here in this Western Hemisphere. There are some 22 nations which, whatever their faults in government, are at least not open to the criticism of being engaged in imperialistic ambitions of any kind. Of course, there have been a few boundary disputes in the past, but that is all.

It is possible to create in this hemisphere a great regional union to guarantee the peace and defense of this hemisphere. Europe can do the same thing if she has a mind to. If she has not a mind to do that, she certainly will be only a disturbing element in any world federation you have. After all, it is from Europe and your partners in this great design that all wars come.

If Europe wants peace in Europe, she can have it as we can have peace here. If she does not want peace in Europe, there is nothing that we can do to force her to have peace; and we ought not to be involved, by any treaty, in these disturbances.

I am for helping her in every possible way. I am for refusing money help to any of the Communist nations of Europe or the world. I am for cooperating with every nation in the interest of peace. I will go as far as they will go in any kind of a movement for peace. This is not a movement for peace. This is a movement to guarantee the present positions of aggression in the remaining aggressors. Beyond that I would not go.

I know there is no hope of bringing that view to the American people, because this thing has gone through too fast; and there is no way that I know of to change the minds of the Senators who have committed themselves to this. But I wanted at least to come here and sound this warning as to the future and as to the dark, dangerous waters into which we are sailing, and I want to raise my voice in protest against using any of the economic strength and any of the moral prestige of America to underwrite and guarantee the latest and most ruthless aggression that the world has known, which is now taking place in Europe, which is being carried on by one of the nations which has stepped in to rule over the world.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any matter that you want to put into the record?

Mr. FLYNN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to have any material that you would like to insert.

Are there any questions by Senators?

Senator TUNNELL. I did not quite understand the application. You spoke of the maturing obligations of the United States in the next year. They will mature just the same, whether we go into this organization or not, will they not?

Mr. FLYNN. That is correct, Senator.

Senator TUNNELL. Then it has no particular application to the ratification of this Charter.

Mr. FLYNN. Oh, I think it has.

Senator TUNNELL. What is the application?

Mr. FLYNN. My point is that this Charter is only part of the foreign policy of the Government at the present time, and the other parts involve the assumption of still vaster obligations in order to help out. I am not objecting to feeding them and doing everything we can do to mitigate the destruction resulting from the war. But there is no way in which we can carry out the Bretton Woods commitment of additional billions for the Export-Import Bank or lend-lease commitments except by borrowing more money from the people of the United States.

Senator TUNNELL. Are they not separate questions?

Mr. FLYNN. I do not think they are. I think this whole thing is a part of our foreign policy, and we have aroused in the minds of our partners in this enterprise the expectation of getting these billions, and we cannot supply them. We have got to borrow twenty-five or thirty billions of dollars on the open market at a moment when these other billions are maturing.

Senator TUNNELL. You said it was too late to prevent Russia from having control of two-thirds of the resources and three-fourths of the territory of Europe.

Mr. FLYNN. She has possession of them now.

Senator TUNNELL. You said it was to late to prevent that.

Mr. FLYNN. That time has passed.

Senator TUNNELL. When was that time?

Mr. FLYNN. Well, I do not know when the time was passed. I do not know how far any commitments which we might have gotten out of Russia as a condition to giving her help when she was on her knees would have been honored by Russia.

Senator TUNNELL. I was referring particularly to the fact that we have been getting some help from Russia.

Mr. FLYNN. No; I do not think we have. I think Russia was getting help from us, as all the nations in Europe were getting help from us, and they were helping us to help them.

Senator TUNNELL. Then your position is that Russia has not helped in this war?

Mr. FLYNN. I do not say that. I say she has helped herself in this war, and that as a

consequence of that our task was made easier. But it was not so much helping ourselves as helping them.

Senator TUNNELL. Do you not think that the net result has been that we have been helped?

Mr. FLYNN. I do not agree with that, but I am perfectly willing to assume that. That is no reason why we should go on helping her to hold successfully millions of people that she has seized by conquest.

Senator TUNNELL. I am taking your statement that the time has passed when we might have prevented Russia from having the control that she has in Europe.

Mr. FLYNN. Well, Senator, I am not prepared to say at what moment that time passed. I said before we got into the war that the war could have only one of two results—either Germany would win the war and dominate all the continent of Europe or we would win the war and Russia would dominate the continent of Europe.

Senator TUNNELL. Which did you think was the preferable one?

Mr. FLYNN. I have no preference between them. I think they were both brutal and abominable dictatorships, and I still think so.

Senator TUNNELL. You would have been just as satisfied if Germany had won?

Mr. FLYNN. I would not have been satisfied at all. I have no brief for Germany, but I do not see what is gained by spending our billions to take a man out of one prison and put him into another.

Senator TUNNELL. Do you think we are in just as bad a position as if we had not won the war?

Mr. FLYNN. No. Once we got into it we had to win it, regardless of consequences. But we are in a worse position than if we had not gone into the war.

Senator TUNNELL. Do you think we had a choice as to going in or not going in?

Mr. FLYNN. I most certainly do. We decided to go in when we began to involve ourselves voluntarily in it. There were a great many honest and decent people who believed we ought to involve ourselves. They said we ought to be in this war. There were a lot of other people that were not so honest that said we ought to go into the war in order to protect ourselves from being attacked. We went into it, and the moment we went into it, it could have only one result, namely, that we would win the war. But before we went into it I said, and I think the fact has now been demonstrated, that if Germany won the war Germany would dominate Europe, and if Germany lost the war, Russia would dominate it.

Senator TUNNELL. But if Germany had won, she would have dominated the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. FLYNN. That, of course, Senator, I never admitted and do not admit now. I think it is a fantastic and grotesque assumption.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Flynn. You can insert whatever you like in the records.

(The documents referred to and submitted by the witness are as follows:)

TABLE 37.—*List of wars, 1800–1825*

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Western Europe					Central Europe													Northern Europe			Southeastern Europe	Asia			
				France	Great Britain	Netherlands	Portugal	Spain	Austria	Baden	Bavaria	Hesse	Naples	North German States	Prussia	Saxony	Venice	Wirttemberg	Denmark	Russia	Sweden	Greece	India	Burma	Persia	Turkey
Tripoli, United States of America [3]	May 10, 1801	June 4, 1805	Tripoli	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Haitian Revolt [3]	Feb. 3, 1802	Nov. 19, 1803	Haut du Cap	*02*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
First Mahratta War [3]	Feb. 12, 1802	Jan. 15, 1804	Surge Angengaum	--	*03*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	03	--	--	--
Russo-Persian War [3]	1804	Dec. 10, 1813	Gulistan	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	04	--	--	--	04	--
Napoleonic Wars	Apr. 29, 1803	June 9, 1815	Vienna [4]	*03*	03	05	07	04	05	05	05	05	15	05	05	06	--	05	13	05	05	--	--	--	--	--
Third Coalition [5]	Oct. 6, 1805	Dec. 26, 1805	Pressburg	X	X	X	--	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--
Franco-Prussian	Oct. 9, 1806	July 9, 1807	Tilsit	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--
Peninsular War [6]	Nov. 30, 1807	July 20, 1814	Paris	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Anglo-Danish	July 24, 1807	Jan. 14, 1814	Keil	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Franco-Austrian	Apr. 6, 1809	Oct. 15, 1809	Schönbrun	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--
Russian Expedition	June 24, 1812	Jan. 10, 1813	(7)	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
War of Liberation	Mar. 27, 1813	May 30, 1814	Paris	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	X	--	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--
Hundred Days' War	Mar. 1, 1815	Nov. 20, 1815	....do	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--
Russo-Turkish	Dec. 30, 1806	Aug. 14, 1812	Bucharest	--	06	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*06*	--	--	--	--	--	--	06
Russo-Swedish	Feb. 22, 1808	Sept. 17, 1809	Frederikshavn	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	08	*08*	*08*	--	--	--	--	--
Latin-American revolt [3]	Apr. 19, 1810	Dec. 9, 1824	Capitulation of Ayachuco	--	--	--	*20*	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
War of 1812 [3 8]	June 18, 1812	Dec. 24, 1814	Ghent [8]	--	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Austria-Naples	Mar. 30, 1815	May 20, 1815	Calvi [10]	--	--	--	--	--	15	--	--	--	*15*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Algiers-U. S. A. [3]	Mar. 2, 1815	July 6, 1815	U. S. S. *Guerriere*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Second Mahratta War [3]	Nov. 6, 1817	Aug. 4, 1818		--	*17*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17	--	--	--	--
Spanish Civil War	Dec. 12, 1821	Oct. 1, 1823	(11)	21	--	--	--	*21*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Greek Revolt	March 1821	Feb. 3, 1830	London	*27*	*27*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*22*	--	--	*27*	--	*21*	--	--	--	*21*
Haiti-Santo Domingo [3]	1823	1823		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
First Central American [3]	1823	1823		--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Burmese War [3]	Mar. 5, 1824	Feb. 20, 1826	Ava	--	*24*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	24	--	--	--	--
La Plata War [3]	Mar. 27, 1825	Sept. 15, 1828	Rio de Janeiro	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Number wars participated in by each state.				4	7	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	5	2	1	2	1	1	2

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Africa, Barbary States	North America									South America									Number of participants among 43 states	Number of battles [1]	Type of war [2]
					Costa Rica	Guatemala	Haiti	Honduras	Mexico	Nicaragua	Salvador	Santo Domingo	United States	Argentina	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Ecuador	Paraguay	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela			
Tripoli, United States of America [3]	May 10, 1801	June 4, 1805	Tripoli	01	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*01*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	D
Haitian Revolt [3]	Feb. 3, 1802	Nov. 19, 1803	Haut du Cap	--	--	--	--	02	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	C
First Mahratta War [3]	Feb. 12, 1802	Jan. 15, 1804	Surge Angengaum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	I
Russo-Persian War [3]	1804	Dec. 10, 1813	Gulistan	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	I
Napoleonic wars	Apr. 29, 1803	June 9, 1815	Vienna [4]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17	332	B
Third Coalition [5]	Oct. 6, 1805	Dec. 26, 1805	Pressburg	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Franco-Prussian	Oct. 9, 1806	July 9, 1807	Tilsit	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Peninsular War [6]	Nov. 30, 1807	July 20, 1814	Paris	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Anglo-Danish	July 24, 1807	Jan. 14, 1814	Keil	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Franco-Austrian	Apr. 6, 1809	Oct. 15, 1809	Schönbrun	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Russian Expedition	June 24, 1812	Jan. 10, 1813	(7)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
War of Liberation	Mar. 27, 1813	May 30, 1814	Paris	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hundred Days' War	Mar. 1, 1815	Nov. 20, 1815	....do	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 37.—*List of wars, 1800–1825*—Continued

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Africa, Barbary States	North America: Costa Rica	Guatemala	Haiti	Honduras	Mexico	Nicaragua	Salvador	Santo Domingo	United States	South America: Argentina	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Ecuador	Paraguay	Peru	Uruguay	Venezuela	Number of participants among 43 states	Number of battles [1]	Type of war [2]
Russo-Turkish	Dec. 30, 1806	Aug. 14, 1812	Bucharest																					3	20	B
Russo-Swedish	Feb. 22, 1808	Sept. 17, 1809	Frederikshavn																					3	2	B
Latin-American revolt [3]	Apr. 10, 1810	Dec. 9, 1824	Capitulation of Ayachuco		*21*	*21*		*21*	*10*	*21*	*21*	*21*		*10*	*10*	*20*	*10*	*12*	*10*	*11*	*20*	*11*	*10*	19		C
War of 1812 [3] [8]	June 18, 1812	Dec. 24, 1814	Ghent [9]										*12*											2	3	B
Austria-Naples	Mar. 30, 1815	May 20, 1815	Calvi [10]																					2	4	B
Algiers-United States of America	Mar. 2, 1815	July 6, 1815	U. S. S. *Guerriere*	15									*15*											2		D
Second Mahratta War [3]	Nov. 6, 1817	Aug. 4, 1818																						2		I
Spanish Civil War	Dec. 12, 1821	Oct. 1, 1823	(11)																					2		C
Greek revolt	March 1821	Feb. 3, 1830	London	27																				7		C
Haiti-Santo Domingo [3]	1823	1823					*23*					*23*												2		B
First Central American [3]	1823	1823			*28*	*23*		*23*		*23*	*23*													5		B
Burmese War [3]	Mar. 5, 1824	Feb. 20, 1826	Ava																					2		I
La Plata War [3]	Mar. 27, 1825	Sept. 15, 1828	Rio de Janeiro											*24*		*25*						*25*		3		B
Number wars participated in by each state.				3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	79	361	

[1] See table 31.
[2] See table 31.
[3] Wars fought mainly outside Europe.
[4] The Final Act of Vienna War signed before the Battle of Waterloo (June 17, 1815).
[5] The first engagement on the Danube between Napoleon and Austria took place on Oct. 6, 1805, though mobilization had begun in August. Great Britain began naval hostilities against France in 1803 and made a naval attack on Spain on Oct. 5, 1804.
[6] On Nov. 30, 1807, the French under Junot entered Lisbon though war had been resolved upon by Oct. 22.
[7] Murat turned over his command at Posen on Jan. 10, 1813, and returned to Paris. The main body of Napoleon's army had crossed the Niemen at Kaunas in the middle of December 1812.
[8] The declaration of war on June 18, 1812, has been preceded by the affairs of the *Leopard* and *Chesapeake* (1807) and the *President* and *Little Belt* (1811) and by the Battle of Tippecanoe in which the United States had defeated Indians thought to be supported by the British in Indiana (1811).
[9] Hostilities including the Battle of New Orleans continued until Feb. 15, 1815.
[10] Representatives of the Neapolitan Army, the Austrian Army, and the British Admiralty signed a military convention near Calvi on May 20, 1815. Ferdinand IV returned to Naples on June 17.
[11] The King of Spain issued a decree declaring an end to the constitutional system of the Cortes on Oct. 1, 1823. The capitulations of Cadiz, Badojos, and Carthagena occurred at about the same time.

TABLE 38.—*List of wars, 1825–50*

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Western Europe: Belgium	France	Great Britain	Netherlands	Portugal	Spain	Central Europe: Austria	Hungary	N. German States	Prussia	Sardinia	Northern Europe: Denmark	Poland	Russia	Asia: Afghanistan	Central Asia	China	Persia	Turkey	Africa: Morocco	Egypt	North America: Costa Rica	Guatemala	Honduras	Mexico	Nicaragua	Salvador	Texas	United States	South America: Argentina	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Peru	Uruguay	Number of participants among 35 states	Number of battles [1]	Type of war [2]
Spanish-Portuguese	Nov. 22, 1826	1827				26		26	*26*																													3		B
Russo-Persian [3]	Sept. 28, 1826	Feb. 28, 1828	Iourk-Mantchai														*26*																					2		I
Russo-Turkish	Apr. 26, 1828	Sept. 14, 1829	Adrianople														*18*					28																2	13	B
Belgian Revolt	Aug. 25, 1830	1833	London [4]	*30*	*31*	*31*	30																															4		C
Algerian Conquest [3]	June 14, 1830	Dec. 23, 1847	Sidi Bralim [4]		*30*																																	2		I
Polish Insurrection	Nov. 29, 1830	Sept. 7, 1831	(5)													*30*	30																					2	7	C
Second Central American.		1845																							*31*	31	*31*		*31*	*31*								5		B
Carlist Revolt	Oct. 4, 1833	Sept. 2, 1847	(6)			33		34	*33*																													3		C
Egyptian Revolt [3]	Nov. —, 1931	Apr. 5, 1833	Kutalia																			31																2	4	C
Khivan Conquest [3]		1839															*39*		39																			2		I
Portuguese Revolution		1831																																				4	1	C
Peru-Bolivia [3]	July 7, 1835	June 7, 1842	Acora																															38	34		38	*34*		4		B
Texan Revolt [3]		1835																														35				*35*		2		C
		1836																																						
Chile-Argentine [3]		1836																															36				*36*		2		B
		1836																																						
First Afghan War [3]	Oct. 11, 1838	Sept. —, 1842	(7)			38												38																				2		I
Second La Plata War [3]	Sept. 2, 1839	Feb. 3, 1852	(8)																															*38*		52		38	3		B
Egyptian War [3]	June 8, 1839	Nov. 27, 1841	Alexandria [8]		40	40				40												39																5	2	I
First Opium War [3]	June 22, 1840	Aug. 29, 1842	Nanking		*44*	*40*														40			*39*															3		I
France-Morocco [3]	July 6, 1844	Sept. 10, 1844	Tangier		*40*																			40															2	1	I
Mexico-United States of America.	May 13, 1846	Feb. 2, 1848	Guadalupe Hidalgo.																									46				*46*							2	1	B
Denmark-Germany	Mar. 24, 1848	Jan. 11, 1851	(9)							*48*		*48*	*48*		*48*																								4	7	B
Austria-Sardinia	Mar. 19, 1848	Mar. 23, 1849	(10)		49					48			*48*																										3	12	B
Hungarian Insurrection.	Oct. 3, 1848	Sept. 13, 1849	Vilagosh [10]							48	*48*						48																						3	20	C
Number wars participated in by each state.				1	7	7	1	3	3	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	65	68	

[1] See table 31.
[2] See table 31.
[3] Wars fought mainly outside Europe.
[4] Belgium declared independence Oct. 4, 1830. A preliminary treaty among the great powers recognized this on June 26, 1831, but hostilities continued until 1833, and peace was finally made in the Treaty of London, Apr. 19, 1839.
[5] Warsaw fell Sept. 7, 1831. The Polish insurrectionary forces did not surrender to the Russians but crossed the frontier into Prussia.
[6] An amnesty for all Carlist political offenders was decreed on Sept. 2, 1847.
[7] The war seems to have come to an end with the British withdrawal from Afghanistan, in September 1842.
[8] Justo Jose de Urquiza, heading a coalition of Uruguayans, Brazilians, and Argentinians, defeated the Argentinian dictator Rosas at Caseros Feb. 3, 1852.
[9] The Stadtholders of the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein issued a proclamation on Jan. 11, 1851, at Kiel.
[10] The Sardinian King, Charles Albert, abdicated in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel, after the Sardinian defeat by the Austrians at Novara, Mar. 23, 1849.

TABLE 39.—*List of wars, 1850–75*

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Western Europe			Central Europe											Northern Europe			Southeastern Europe		Asia				
				France	Great Britain	Spain	Austria	Baden	Bavaria	Hannover	Hesse	Naples	North German States	Prussia	Sardinia (Italy)	Saxony	Württemberg	Denmark	Poland	Russia	Greece	Montenegro	Central Asia	China	India	Japan	Turkey
Third Central American.[2]	1849	1858																								
Taiping rebellion [2]	Aug. —, 1850	July 19, 1864	(3)																				50			
Conquest of Turkestan.[2]	July —, 1852	Jan. 31, 1864	Askabad [4]																	*52*		52				
Montenegran War	Feb. 12, 1853	Mar. 13, 1853																			*53*					53
Crimean War [5]	Oct. 23, 1853	Mar. 30, 1856	Paris	*54*	*54*										*54*					*53*						53
Second Haiti-Santo Domingo.[2]	1855	1856																								
Second Opium War [2]	Oct. 22, 1856	Oct. 24, 1860	Peking [6]	*56*	*56*																		56			
Sepoy rebellion [2]	May 10, 1857	July 8, 1859	(7)		57																			*57*		
Moroccan War [2]	Oct. 22, 1859	Apr. 27, 1860	Fez			*59*																				
Italian War	Apr. 23, 1859	Nov. 10, 1859	Zurich	*59*			59								*59*											
Peru-Ecuador [2]	1859	1859																								
Italian revolution	May 11, 1860	Feb. 13, 1861	(8)	60							60				*60*											
American Civil War [2]	Apr. 19, 1861	Apr. 2, 1866	(9)																							
Japanese Restoration [2]	Aug. 13, 1863	Apr. 17, 1869	(10)	*64*	*68*																				63	
Mexican Expedition [2 11]	Apr. 4, 1862	June 27, 1867	(12)	*62*	*62*	*62*																				
Fourth Central American War.[2]	Jan. 23, 1863	Nov. 15, 1863	(13)																							
Spain-Peru [2]	Sept. 25, 1865	May 9, 1866	Paris [14]			63																				
Polish Insurrection	Jan. 22, 1863	Aug. 1, 1864	(15)																63	63						
Germany-Denmark	Feb. 1, 1864	Oct. 30, 1864	Vienna				64						64	*64*		*64*		64								
Austro-Prussian	June 15, 1866	Aug. 23, 1866	Prague [18]	66			66	66	66	66	66		*66*	*66*	*66*	*66*	*66*									
Spanish Civil War	Jan. 3, 1866	Sept. 28, 1868	(19)			66																				
Cretan Revolt	Sept. 2, 1866	1869	(20)	*66*	*66*																*66*					66
Cuban Revolt [2]	Oct. 10, 1868	Feb. 10, 1878	Lanson			68																				
Franco-Prussian	July 19, 1870	May 10, 1871	Frankfort [21]	70				70	70				70	70		70	70									
Carlist War	Apr. 8, 1872	Feb. 28, 1876	(22)			72																				
Ashanti War [2]	Oct. 14, 1873	Feb. 13, 1874	Kumansi		74																					
Number wars participated in by each state.				9	7	6	3	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	4	3	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	3

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Africa		North America									South America									Number of participants	Number of battles among 45 states [1]	Type of war [1]
				Central Africa	North Africa	Costa Rica	Cuba	Guatemala	Haiti	Honduras	Mexico	Nicaragua	Santo Domingo	Salvador	United States	Argentina	Bolivia	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Ecuador	Paraguay	Peru	Uruguay			
Third Central American.[2]	1849	1858				*54*		49		*49*		59		*49*											5		B
Taiping Rebellion [2]	Aug. —, 1850	July 19, 1864	(3)																						1		C
Conquest of Turkestan.[2]	July —, 1852	Jan. 31, 1864	Askabad [4]																						2		1
Montenegran War	Feb. 12, 1853	Mar. 13, 1853																							2		C
Crimean War [5]	Oct. 23, 1853	Mar. 30, 1856	Paris																						5	12	B
Second Haiti-Santo Domingo.[2]	1855	1856							*55*				55												2		B
Second Opium War [2]	Oct. 22, 1856	Oct. 24, 1860	Peking [6]																						3		I
Sepoy Rebellion [2]	May 10, 1857	July 8, 1859	(7)																						2		I
Moroccan War [2]	Oct. 22, 1859	Apr. 27, 1860	Fez		59																				2		I
Italian War	Apr. 23, 1859	Nov. 10, 1859	Zurich																						3	5	C
Peru-Ecuador [2]	1859	1859																			59		*59*		2		B
Italian Revolution	May 11, 1860	Feb. 13, 1861	(8)																						3	5	C
American Civil War [2]	Apr. 19, 1861	Apr. 2, 1866	(9)												61										1	50	C
Japanese Restoration [2]	Aug. 13, 1863	Apr. 17, 1869	(10)																						3		C
Mexican Expedition.[2 11]	Apr. 4, 1862	June 27, 1867	(12)								62														4	1	B
Fourth Central American War.[2]	Jan. 23, 1863	Nov. 15, 1863	(13)					63		*63*		*63*		*63*											4		B
Colombia-Ecuador [2]	Oct. —, 1863	Dec. 30, 1863																		63	*63*				2		B
Spain-Peru [2]	Sept. 25, 1865	May 9, 1866	Paris [14]														64		64		64		63		5		B
Polish Insurrection	Jan. 22, 1863	Aug. 1, 1864	(15)																						2		C
Lopez War [2 16]	Apr. 14, 1865	Mar. 1, 1870	(17)													64		63				*63*		64	4		B
Germany Denmark	Feb. 1, 1864	Oct 30, 1864	Vienna																					4	5	4	B
Austro-Prussian	June 15, 1866	Aug. 23, 1866	Prague [18]																						11	19	B
Spanish Civil War	Jan. 3, 1866	Sept. 28, 1868	(19)																						1		C
Cretan Revolt	Sept. 2, 1866	1869	(20)																						4		C
Cuban Revolt [2]	Oct. 10, 1868	Feb. 10, 1878	Lanson				68																		2		C
Franco-Prussian	July 19, 1870	May 10, 1871	Frankfort [21]																						7	54	B
Carlist War	Apr. 8, 1872	Feb. 28, 1876	(22)																						1		C
Ashanti War [2]	Oct. 14, 1873	Feb. 13, 1874	Kumansi	74																					2		I
Number wars participated in by each state.				1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	90	150	

Footnotes on following page.

[1] See table 31.
[2] Wars fought mainly outside Europe.
[3] The Taiping rebellion ended with the killing of its leader in 1864, though desultory fighting occurred after that event.
[4] The conquest of Turkestan ended with an imperial ukase announcing Turkestan as a Russian province in 1864. This was followed by hostilities on the Afghan border involving Russian, British, and native troops.
[5] The Turkish ultimatum to Russia expired Oct. 23, 1853, but hostilities had taken place with the Russian invasion of Turkish territory, Jan. 2, 1853.
[6] The Treaty of Tientsin, 1858, intended to conclude peace, was not observed but was reaffirmed by the Treaty of Peking, 1860.
[7] The Mogul Emperor was captured and banished in September 1858, the Mogul Empire was declared at an end, and the Government of India transferred to the Crown, after which, on July 8, 1859, peace was proclaimed.
[8] The Italian Revolution ended when King Frances of Naples escaped from the country in a French vessel, Feb. 13, 1861.
[9] According to the Supreme Court in the case of the Protector (12 Wall. 79, 1871) the war began in the far South by the blockade proclamation of Apr. 19, 1861, and in North Carolina and Virginia by the blockade proclamation of Apr. 27, 1861, and ended by the proclamation of Apr. 2, 1866, except in Texas, where it ended by the proclamation of Aug. 20, 1866. Lee had surrendered at Appomattox on Apr. 9, 1865, and Johnston surrendered the last Confederate Army on Apr. 26, 1865.
[10] After the defeat of the supporters of the Shogunate, restoration of the Emperor's power was marked by grant of the Charter Oath on Apr. 17, 1869.
[11] Small French, British, and Spanish forces landed at Vera Cruz in December 1861, but hostilities did not begin until Apr. 4, 1862, when 30,000 French troops were landed.
[12] The Emperor Maximilian was shot on June 19, 1867, soon after withdrawal of French troops, and Mexico City was taken by Juarez on June 27, 1867. The Allies had made a treaty with Juarez at Solidad, Feb. 19, 1862, after which Great Britain and Spain had withdrawn from the expedition.
[13] The war came to an end when General Carrera of Gautemala defeated General Barrios of Salvador. With Barrios' escape, no legal government existed with which to sign a treaty of peace. Carrera appointed General Duenas acting president of Salvador and retired to Guatemala with his army on Nov. 15, 1863.
[14] Hostilities ended with departure of the Spanish fleet, May 9, 1866. A truce was arranged through mediation by the United States in 1871 and a formal treaty of peace was signed between Spain and Peru at Paris Aug. 14, 1879, and between Spain and Chile at Lima, June 12, 1883.
[15] The Polish insurrection ended with the hanging of the insurrectionary leaders at Warsaw in August of 1864.
[16] Lopez attacked the Argentine on Apr. 14, 1865, though hostilities had occurred on Aug. 26, 1964, between Brazil and Uruguay and on Nov. 13, 1864, between Paraguay and Brazil.
[17] When Lopez was killed, the war came to an end. The conditions of peace imposed on Paraguay were those decided on by the terms of the treaty of alliance signed May 1, 1865, by Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay.
[18] An armistice was signed at Nikolsburg, July 26, 1866. In addition to the Treaty of Prague with Prussia, Austria made separate treaties with Wurttemberg (Aug. 13), Baden (Aug. 17), Bavaria (Aug. 28), Hesse (Sept. 3), Saxony (Oct. 21), and Italy (Oct. 3) at Vienna. Venice was ceded to Italy and Prussia annexed Hanover.
[19] The insurgents defeated the royalists on Sept. 28, and the queen fled from Spain. The insurgent army entered Madrid on Oct. 3, and the provisional government of which it was the instrument was recognized by the powers on Oct. 25, 1868.
[20] The Cretan revolt ended in 1869 when hope for Greek intervention disappeared. Fighting of a sporadic nature continued until the end of that year.
[21] The Treaty of Frankfort was preceded by the Preliminary Peace of Versailles, signed Feb. 26, 1871.
[22] The Carlist rebellion came to an end with the withdrawal of the Carlist forces from Guipuzcon, Feb. 20, 1876. Don Carlos, its leader, left Spain on Feb. 28. On Mar. 4, 1877, a general amnesty was extended to the Carlists who had submitted by Mar. 15.

TABLE 40.—*List of wars, 1875–1900*

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Europe: France	Italy	Great Britain	Spain	Russia	Bulgaria	Crete	Greece	Montenegro	Serbia	Asia: Afghanistan	China	Japan	Philippines	Turkey	Africa: Central Africa	North Africa	South Africa	North America: Costa Rica	Cuba	Guatemala	Honduras	Nicaragua	Salvador	United States	South America: Bolivia	Chile	Peru	Number of participants among 28 states	Number of battles [1]	Type of war [1]
Russo-Turkish	May 3, 1877	July 13, 1878	Berlin [2]					77				76	76					77														4	38	B
War of the Pacific [3]	Apr. 5, 1879	Mar. 28, 1884	Ancon																									78	78	78	3		A
Zulu War [3]	Jan. 23, 1879	Sept. 1, 1879	Ulundi [4]			79														79											2		I
Second Afghan War [3]	Jan. 1, 1879	Oct. 3, 1881	(5)			79								79																	2		I
First Transvaal War [3]	Dec. 20, 1880	Aug. 8, 1881	Pretoria			80														80											2		I
Tunisian Expedition [3]	Mar. 31, 1881	Apr. 4, 1882	Kasar-el-Said	81																81											2		I
Egyptian War [3]	July 11, 1882	Sept. 7, 1882	(6)			82														82											2		I
Tonking War [3]	Dec. —, 1882	Aug. 9, 1885	Tientsin [7]	82											82																2		I
Fifth Central American War [3]	Mar. 18, 1884	Apr. 14, 1885	Acajulta																			84		84	84	84	84					5		B
Serbo-Bulgar War	Nov. 13, 1885	Mar. 3, 1886	Constantinople						85				85																			2	2	B
Guatemala-Salvador [3]	July 23, 1889	Nov. 15, 1889	Guatemala																					89			89					2		B
Chino-Japanese [3]	Aug. 1, 1894	Apr. 17, 1895	Shimonoseki												94	94																2	5	B
Madagascan Conquest [3]	Mar. 1, 1895	Aug. 8, 1896	(8)	95																95												2		I
Abyssinian War [3]	1896	Oct. 26, 1896	Addis-Ababa	96															96													2		I
Second Ashanti War [3]	Jan. —, 1896	Jan. 19, 1896	(9)			96													96													2		I
Cretan Revolt	May 24, 1896	Nov. 26, 1898	(10)							96	97																					2		C
Costa Rica-Nicaragua [3]	Mar. 20, 1897	Apr. 26, 1897	(11)																			97				97						2		B
Greco-Turkish War	Apr. 17, 1897	Dec. 4, 1897	Constantinople							97								97														2	1	B
Spanish-American War [3]	Apr. 21, 1898	Dec. 10, 1898	Paris [12]				98										98						98					98				4	4	B
Boer War [3]	Dec. 12, 1899	May 31, 1902	Vereeniging [13]		99															99												2	8	B
Number of wars participated in by each state.				3	1	6	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	4	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	48	58	

[1] See table 31.
[2] The Treaty of Berlin was preceded by the preliminary Peace of San Stefano, Mar. 3 1878, and followed by the definitive treaty of Constantinople, Feb. 8, 1879.
[3] Wars fought mainly outside Europe.
[4] Hostilities ended with the capture of Cetywayo, the Zulu king, on Aug. 29, 1879, followed by a British proclamation on Sept. 1.
[5] Amir Abdurrahman, who defeated Ayub Khan, conducted his campaign with British backing. The war came to an end with defeat of Ayub on Oct. 3, 1881.
[6] The war ended with the defeat of the rebel, Arabi, on Sept. 7, 1882. Sporadic hostilities in the Sudan did not end until the fall of Dongola to Kitchener on Sept. 23, 1896.
[7] Treaties were signed by France with Annam (June 6, 1884) and Cambodia (June 17 1884), but hostilities actually continued for a few months more.
[8] Queen Ranavale capitulated on Sept. 30, 1895, and on Oct. 1, 1895, accepted the protectorate treaty. Disturbances continued, and France declared the island annexed on Aug. 8, 1896.
[9] War ended without serious hostilities when the tribal king was taken prisoner by the British forces on their entry into Kumansi, Jan. 19, 1896.
[10] The Cretan Revolt continued after Greece had settled with Turkey and the concert of powers consisting of France, England, Russia, and Italy. Prince George, who had been given the post of high commissioner by the powers on Nov. 26, 1898, landed at Crete on Dec. 21, and hostilities ceased soon after Admiral Noel of the British Navy had hung the ringleaders of the revolt.
[11] A preliminary treaty of peace was signed after slight hostilities, Apr. 26, 1897, and the boundary question was settled by arbitration sponsored by the Greater Central American States.
[12] Preliminaries of peace were signed at Paris, Aug. 12, 1898, but hostilities continued against the Philippine insurgents until 1902.
[13] Great Britain proclaimed the annexation of South Africa on Sept. 1, 1900, but hostilities continued until the Peace of Vereeniging, signed at Pretoria, May 31, 1902.

TABLE 41.—*List of wars, 1900–1941*

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Western Europe: Belgium	France	Great Britain	Ireland	Luxemburg	Netherlands	Portugal	Spain	Central Europe: Austria	Czechoslovakia	Germany	Hungary	Italy	San Marino	Northern Europe: Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Latvia	Lithuania	Norway	Poland	Russia (USSR)	Southeastern Europe: Albania	Bulgaria	Greece	Montenegro	Rumania	Serbia (Yugoslavia)
Boxer Expedition [2]	June 17, 1900	Sept. 7, 1901	Peking	00	00	00			00		00	00		00		00									00						
Venezuelan War [2]	Dec. 11, 1902	Feb. 13, 1903	Washington			02								02		02															
Russo-Japanese War [2]	Feb. 6, 1904	Sept. 15, 1905	Portsmouth																						04						
Central American War [2]	July —, 1906	Dec. 20, 1907	Washington [2]																												
Mexican Revolution [2]	Nov. 20, 1910	Dec. 1, 1920	(4)																												
Italo Turkish War [2]	Sept. 29, 1911	Oct. 18, 1912	Lausanne													11															

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 41.—*List of wars, 1900–1941*—Continued

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Western Europe								Central Europe						Northern Europe									Southeastern Europe					
				Belgium	France	Great Britain	Ireland	Luxemburg	Netherlands	Portugal	Spain	Austria	Czechoslovakia	Germany	Hungary	Italy	San Marino	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	Latvia	Lithuania	Norway	Poland	Russia (USSR)	Albania	Bulgaria	Greece	Montenegro	Rumania	Serbia (Yugoslavia)
First Balkan War	Oct. 1, 1912	May 30, 1913	London	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*12*	*12*	*12*	--	*12*
Second Balkan War	June 30, 1912	Aug. 10, 1913	Bucharest [5]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*13*	*13*	--	*13*	*13*
World War I	July 28, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920	Versailles [6]	14	14	14	--	14	--	16	--	*14*	18	*14*	*14*	15	15	--	--	--	--	--	--	18	14	--	*15*	16	14	16	14
German War	Aug. 1, 1914	-----do-----	Versailles [7]	X	X	X	--	X	--	X	--	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X
Austrian War	July 28, 1914	July 16, 1920	St. Germain [8]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hungarian War	-----do-----	July 26, 1921	Trianon [8]	X	X	X	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X
Turkish War	Nov. 5, 1914	Aug. 6, 1924	Lausanne [9]	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	X	X	X	X
Bulgarian War	Oct. 15, 1915	Aug. 19, 1920	Neuilly [10]	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	X	X
Chinese civil wars [2]	Jan. 1, 1916	Dec. 25, 1936	Sian agreement [11]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Irish rebellion	Apr. 24, 1916	July 20, 1922	London [12]	--	--	--	*19*	*19*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Russian revolution	Nov. 15, 1917	Feb. —, 1920	(13)	--	--	*18*	*18*	--	--	--	--	--	*18*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17	--	--	--	--	--	--
Russo-Polish War	Apr. 16, 1919	Apr. 17, 1921	Riga [14]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*19*	19	--	--	--	--	--	--
Third Afghan War [2]	May 6, 1919	Aug. 18, 1919	Rawal Pindi	--	--	*19*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Vilna War	Apr. 8, 1920	Dec. 10, 1927	Geneva [15]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	19	--	*19*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Greco-Turkish War	Apr. —, 1921	Aug. 6, 1924	Lausanne [16]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21	--	--	--
Riffian War [2]	July —, 1921	May 30, 1925	----------	--	--	25	--	--	--	--	21	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chaco War [2 17]	Dec. 5, 1928	June 2, 1935	Buenos Aires	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Manchurian hostilities [2]	Sept. 18, 1931	May 31, 1933	Tangkū truce [18]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ethiopian War [2]	Oct. 3, 1935	July 9, 1936	Geneva [19]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*35*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Spanish revolution	July 17, 1936	Apr. 1, 1939	(20)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	36	--	--	*36*	--	*36*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chino-Japanese War [2]	July 7, 1937	----------	----------	--	--	40	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
World War II [21]	Aug. 30, 1939	----------	----------	40	39	39	--	40	40	--	--	39	39	*39*	*40*	*40*	--	40	40	41	40	40	40	39	41	40	*41*	40	--	*40*	41
Russo-Finnish War	Nov. 30, 1939	Mar. 12, 1940	Moscow	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	39	--	--	--	39	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Number of wars participated in by each state	----------	----------	----------	3	6	7	1	2	2	1	3	3	3	5	2	7	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	4	7	1	4	5	2	3	4

War	Date of beginning	Date of ending	Name of treaty of peace	Asia								Africa					South America				North America										Number of participants among 57 states	Number of battles [1]	Type of war [2]
				Afghanistan	Australia	China	Hejaz (Saudi Arabia)	India	Japan	New Zealand	Siam	Turkey	Egypt	Ethiopia	Liberia	Morocco	South Africa	Bolivia	Brazil	Paraguay	Venezuela	Canada	Costa Rica	Cuba	Guatemala	Haiti	Honduras	Mexico	Nicaragua	Panama	Salvador	United States		
Boxer expedition [2]	June 17, 1900	Sept. 7, 1901	Peking	--	--	*00*	--	--	00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	00	12	----	I
Venezuelan War [2]	Dec. 11, 1902	Feb. 13, 1903	Washington	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	02	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	----	B
Russo-Japanese War [2]	Feb. 6, 1904	Sept. 15, 1905	Portsmouth	--	--	--	--	--	*04*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	18	B
Central American War [3]	July —, 1906	Dec. 20, 1907	Washington [3]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	06	--	*06*	--	07	--	*06*	--	--	4	----	B
Mexican Revolution [2]	Nov. 20, 1910	Dec. 1, 1920	(4)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*10*	--	--	--	1	2	----	C
Italo-Turkish War [2]	Sept. 29, 1911	Oct. 18, 1912	Lausanne	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	10	I
First Balkan War	Oct. 1, 1912	May 30, 1913	London	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	13	B
Second Balkan War	June 30, 1912	Aug. 10, 1913	Bucharest [5]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*13*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	6	B
World War I	July 28, 1914	Jan. 10, 1920	Versailles [6]	--	14	17	17	14	14	14	17	*14*	--	--	17	--	14	--	17	--	--	14	18	17	18	17	18	--	18	17	--	17	38	615	B
German War	Aug. 1, 1914	-----do-----	Versailles [7]	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	--	--	X	--	X	--	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	X	X	--	X	X	--	X	----	----	----
Austrian War	July 28, 1914	July 16, 1920	St. Germain [8]	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	----	----	----
Hungarian War	-----do-----	July 16, 1921	Trianon [8]	--	X	X	--	--	X	X	X	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	X	--	X	----	----	----
Turkish War	Nov. 5, 1914	Aug. 6, 1924	Lausanne [9]	--	X	--	X	X	X	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	----	----
Bulgarian War	Oct. 15, 1915	Aug. 19, 1920	Neuilly [10]	--	X	--	--	--	X	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	----	----
Chinese Civil Wars [2]	Jan. 1, 1916	Dec. 25, 1936	Sian agreement [11]	--	--	16	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	----	C
Irish Rebellion	Apr. 24, 1916	July 20, 1922	London [12]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	----	C
Russian Revolution	Nov. 15, 1917	Feb. —, 1920	(13)	--	--	--	--	--	*18*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*18*	6	9	B
Russo-Polish War	Apr. 16, 1919	Apr. 17, 1921	Riga [14]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	21	B
Third Afghan War [2]	May 6, 1919	Aug. 18, 1919	Rawal Pindi	19	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	----	I
Vilna War	Apr. 8, 1920	Dec. 10, 1927	Geneva [15]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	----	B
Greco-Turkish War	Apr. —, 1921	Aug. 6, 1924	Lausanne [16]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*21*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	5	B
Riffian War [2]	July —, 1921	May 30, 1925	----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	*21*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	----	C
Chaco War [2 17]	Dec. 5, 1928	June 2, 1935	Buenos Aires	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	28	--	28	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	10	B
Manchurian hostilities [2]	Sept. 18, 1931	May 31, 1933	Tangkū truce [18]	--	--	31	--	--	*31*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	5	B
Ethiopian War [2]	Oct. 3, 1935	July 9, 1936	Geneva [19]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	35	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	8	I
Spanish Revolution	July 17, 1936	Apr. 1, 1939	(20)	--	--	37	--	--	37	--	*40*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	100	C
Chino-Japanese War [2]	July 7, 1937	----------	----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	50	B
World War II [21]	Aug. 30, 1939	----------	----------	--	39	41	--	39	*41*	39	41	--	40	40	--	--	39	--	--	--	--	39	41	41	41	41	41	--	41	41	41	41	42	120	B
Russo-Finnish War	Nov. 30, 1939	Mar. 12, 1940	Moscow	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	B
Number of wars participated in by each state	----------	----------	----------	1	2	6	1	2	7	2	3	5	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	--	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	2	2	5	151	992	

[1] See table 31.

[2] Wars fought mainly outside Europe.

[3] A peace treaty between Salvador and Honduras on the one hand and Guatemala on the other was signed on the United States warship *Marblehead* on July 20, 1906, but war was renewed by Nicaragua in February 1907. A treaty of peace between Nicaragua and Salvador was signed at Amapala on Apr. 23, 1907, a peace protocol between all 5 republics was signed at Washington, Sept. 17, 1907, and a definitive peace treaty was signed at that place Dec. 20, 1907. (See D. P. Myers, "The Central American League of Nations," World Peace Foundation Pamphlet Series, VII (February 1917), 110 ff.)

[4] The inauguration of President Obregon, who was generally recognized, is considered to have ended the revolution.

[5] Turkey made peace with Bulgaria in the Treaty of Constantinople, Sept. 29, 1913, and with Greece in the Treaty of Athens, Nov. 14, 1913.

[6] There were 5 wars ended by distinct treaties and 79 bilateral wars. Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria signed a treaty of peace with Russia at Brest-Litovsk on March 1918 and with Rumania at Bucharest on May 6, 1918.

[7] The Treaty of Versailles was signed June 28, 1919, but did not go into effect until Jan. 10, 1920. Russia, Montenegro, Costa Rica, and Luxemburg did not sign it, although they had been at war with Germany. The United States signed a separate peace with Germany at Berlin on Aug. 15, 1921, which antedated peace to July 2, 1921, and China signed a separate peace at Peking on May 20, 1921, which went into effect June 28, 1921. Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and Uruguay had broken relations with Germany and signed the Treaty of Versailles, though they had not been at war.

[8] Russia, Montenegro, and San Marino, though at war with Austria and Hungary, did not sign the treaties of St. Germain (signed June 10, 1919, in force July 16, 1920) and Trianon (signed June 4, 1920, in force July 26, 1921).

[9] Of the 9 powers at war with Turkey all but Russia and Hejaz signed the Treaty of Lausanne (signed July 24, 1923, in force Aug. 6, 1924). In addition to these 7, Armenia, Belgium, Hejaz, Poland, Portugal, and Czechoslovakia signed the abortive Treaty of Sevres, Aug. 10, 1920.

[10] In addition to the 6 powers at war with Bulgaria which (except for Russia) signed the Treaty of Neuilly (signed Nov. 27, 1919, in force Aug. 19, 1920), 10 other Allied and Associated Powers signed this treaty.

[11] Civil strife not recognized as a legal state of war was practically continuous in China from the republican opposition to Yuan Shi-kai's effort to reestablish monarchy in 1916, through the Tuchun wars from 1918 to 1925, through the nationalist advance in 1926–27.

to the termination of the anti-Communist wars by the Sian agreement following Chiang Kai-shek's capture by Chang Hsueh-liang, in 1936.

[12] Articles for a treaty recognizing the Dominion status of the Irish Free State were signed Dec. 6, 1921, and went into force July 20, 1922.

[13] The Russian Revolutionary War was not recognized as a war in the legal sense. During its course Great Britain, France, Poland, Japan, and the United States intervened with military forces.

[14] Signed Mar. 18, 1921, in force Apr. 17, 1921.

[15] Vilna was assigned to Poland by the Conference of Ambassadors, Mar. 15, 1923, but Lithuania regarded itself in a state of latent war with Poland until the two accepted a resolution of the League Council in December 1927.

[16] This treaty also ended World War I against Turkey. Thus in law the Greco-Turkish War was merely a part of World War I, but in fact the latter ended with signature of the abortive Treaty of Sevres. From the diplomatic and military points of view the Greco-Turkish War was therefore an independent incident.

[17] A truce was signed on Jan. 3, 1929, followed by efforts at conciliation. Diplomatic relations were broken July 5, 1931. Paraguay's declaration of war on May 10, 1933, is said to have been rescinded a few days later (Shepard and Scroggs, The United States in World Affairs, 1934-35, p. 131).

[18] There was no legal state of war between China and Japan and diplomatic relations were never broken, but actual hostilities were carried on before and even after the Tangku truce.

[19] The resolution of the League Assembly in July 1936 terminating sanctions may be regarded as terminating this war, although hostilities continued and the major powers did not recognize Italy's conquest until 1938.

[20] No legal state of war was recognized in Spain, but an agreement to prevent assistance to either faction was accepted by most of the European states on Aug. 26, 1936. In spite of this, some assistance continued to be given for a time by Portugal and the Soviet Union, and Italy and Germany intervened with official forces on the side of the rebel government, which they had recognized as the government of Spain.

[21] In addition to the 42 states listed, Danzig, Iceland, Iraq, and Iran had become involved in this war before the end of 1941.

STATEMENT OF CARL H. MOTE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

The CHAIRMAN. Please give your name and residence and state whom you represent.

Mr. MOTE. My name is Carl H. Mote, of 5685 Central Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind. I am president and general manager of the Northern Indiana Telephone Co. and Commonwealth Telephone Corp., president of the National Farmers Guild, and editor and publisher of America Preferred, a monthly magazine founded in April 1943.

I am appearing before your committee in opposition to the San Francisco Charter at the suggestion of and in cooperation with Gerald L. K. Smith. I represent and speak for the following organizations:

National Farmers Guild; America First Party; Nationalist Veterans of World War II; National Blue Star Mothers of Philadelphia; Christian Action Committee of Baltimore; Buffalo Economics Club; United Mothers of Cleveland; Truth and Liberty Committee of Minneapolis; American Mothers of Minnesota; Defenders of the Constitution, Milwaukee; Friends of the Constitution, Dayton; American Youths for Christ, St. Louis; Youths for Christ Committee, Denver; National Citizens Committee of Utah, Salt Lake City; California Pastors Committee; America First Committee, Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your authority for speaking for the veterans of World War II?

Mr. MOTE. Mr. Frederick Kister, the president, of Chicago, Ill.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of the veterans of World War II are not home yet. Does Mr. Kister speak for them in their absence?

Mr. MOTE. He is speaking for those who are home and those who are members of his organization, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Go ahead.

Mr. MOTE. I think your committee would agree with me that nothing founded upon misrepresentation can long endure.

I think we would have to agree that no instrument founded upon misrepresentation possibly could succeed, particularly if it had to do with amicable relations among men.

No deceptions or evasions, no jargon of cynical double meanings for different occasions and differernt peoples can have any permanence if its success depends upon the continued approval and cooperation of high-minded men. Thousands of years of human history accent this truth. Any commitment which lacks sincerity and forthrightness is doomed in advance to early repudiation.

The proposed San Francisco Charter is void of all moral basis. For this reason, it does not have and it cannot have the confidence and support of well-informed and upright men anywhere. The details of the Charter are unimportant since the instrument as a whole is utterly discredited because of its false foundations. The Charter is derived from misrepresentations of history and is so gravely at odds with current world realities and truth that it cannot be expected to endure.

I think it is going to be impossible, even by armed might, to enforce the decrees of a body that cannot command the slightest moral respect.

The San Francisco Charter is founded upon a notion that has originated in wartime propaganda; namely, that the present-day world is divided between two distinct kinds of nations. One kind, according to the propaganda, is peaceable, highly moral, constructive, democratic, devoted to human liberty, and eager to see all populations and groups governed by regimes of their own choice. The other kind of nations, according to the propaganda and the Charter, is the exact opposite—war-minded, bestial, despotic, destructive, and eager to enslave all others.

Of course, there are differences in the records of different nations. But these differences are neither of the kind nor extent represented in the propaganda and expressed in the Charter. In point of historical fact, every major nation today during the last 50 years has engaged in war upon extremely flimsy pretexts. The United States is no exception. This historical fact is important now for the simple reason that falsehoods are the order of the day and they greatly influence pending issues of far-reaching importance, particularly the Charter.

This Charter, consciously or unconsciously, has been designed to punish culprits selected in advance, to keep in servitude for many years to come one set of nations, allegedly because of their war records. None of the leading proponents of the charter, however, has sought to apply the same judicial standards to our allies, for example Soviet Russia whose territorial seizures lately have been enormous. Thus, the Charter advocates have forfeited all well-considered moral respect for it.

In his opening address at San Francisco, Molotov indulged in the mockery and pretense of saying, "You ought to know that as far as safeguarding the peace and security of nations is concerned, the Soviet Union can be relied upon."

Any instrument of justice which does not apply equilaterally becomes at once a device for vengeance and power politics. No amount of high-sounding phrases can long conceal the true character of any instrument, once it sets up exemptions on one side which it elects to punish with savage ostentation on the other. The San Francisco Charter is thus exposed to the ridicule of mankind, even before a single nation has signed it. Opponents, such as myself, are not responsible. Its own advocates by their words, deeds, and assertions of aims and methods have exposed the Charter.

I see nothing strange in the fact that some of us recoil in disgust when we contemplate the evil manifest in such hypocrisy and consider that our own country is about to become a party to such shame.

Proponents of the Charter appear to regard its injustices lightly because they assume its victims always will be the peoples they dislike. The power we are surrendering to this charter body, by some unforeseen political trick, some day may be used fatally against our own country. That is not a fantasy. It is a forbidding probability. I wonder if we will hear the same chortles of glee when we are the victims.

When we say that our enemies are war-minded and that our allies are peace-loving, we ought to remember that two of our allies have been guilty of "treachery" and "sneak attacks" in our own times. One was the surprise raid by the British on Johannesburg in 1895 when they were about to grab all of Dutch South Africa, and the other was the officially ordered massacre of foreigners by the Chinese in 1900.

Prior to our entry into World War II, the British seized Iceland and much of Iran. Soviet Russia had annexed outright 3 previously independent nations—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—and had seized a portion of Poland, part of Finland, part of Rumania, and part of Iran. It is a tragic and shameful fact that as many nations were victims of our allies as of our enemies when we entered World War II.

Does any thinking man really believe our allies are sincere in the face of their double talk?

Can anybody of intelligence read the biography of Winston Churchill or Joseph Stalin and believe in his word or his peacefulness?

Winston Churchill was in the British Cabinet which sought to get American into the war in 1916 on assurances that Britain had no material aims. After the war was over, this same Winston Churchill proudly told in his book, The World Crisis, how he personally had negotiated the secret treaty of 1915, arranging for division of the territorial spoils. Thus, at the very time of the no-material-aims pledge, the secret territorial division treaty had been in Churchill's files for a year. That is a sample of his lifelong career. During the present war he repudiated the Atlantic Charter pledges which he made to involve the United States on the side of Britain. He repudiated them after we were safely in and pretentions of high aims were no longer important. Recently, it was disclosed that Britain's past with Poland in 1939 carried a secret understanding that Britain was not obligated to aid Poland against Soviet aggression. That means the pretended grief of the British Foreign Office over Poland's frontiers in 1939 was callously insincere.

These facts are not trifles. They are not mere technicalities cited to discredit a worthy achievement. They control our entire estimate of our position under the charter. They reveal the kind of men and the kind of politics to which our country's future will be committed if the advocates of the charter have their way.

The program to halt aggression calls for having the foremost aggressor of this century, Soviet Russia, decide when aggression is to be resisted. If Britain gets the upper hand in the charter voting America will have to accept the hazards of war arising from British interests in countless corners of the globe. There is not the slightest evidence that our security will be improved by this proposed commitment. There is plenty of evidence that our security will be diminished. We shall accept war hazards far exceeding any that we face independently.

Publicity to stir up support for this preposterous commitment claims that our allies are the peace-loving nations. But there are no facts in their records to suggest that they abhor war. Britain's decision to go to war on Germany in 1939 was a policy decision, in no sense an act of self-defense under the accepted laws of nations. The then-proclaimed issue of sympathy for Poland later was proved fraudulent.

The majority of British wars, ancient and modern, have been for policy or for loot. Winston Churchill got his start in life in such a war—in Britain's assault upon the tiny, independent Dutch republics of South Africa a generation ago. I do know, in South Africa at the time he used to write fine letters stating the British position, which I at

that time sincerely believed. Young Churchill glorified this aggression in a series of enthusiastic newspaper articles.

In 1929 the Soviet Union invaded China and for months fought an undeclared war against Chinese forces on Chinese soil. Chinese Government appeals to the League of Nations and to Henry L. Stimson, then our Secretary of State, got an indifferent and even chilly reception.

Territorial seizures and other international offenses by Soviet Russia are not objected to by many of our commentators and columnists because these commentators and columnists are in numerous cases ardent Reds with known Communist program backgrounds. Dies committee files present total proof that innumerable OWI employees are supporters of one or another Red activity.

Note the individuals and organizations and newspapers that condone Stalin's territorial aggressions. They are the loudest advocates of America's subservience to the proposed San Francisco Charter. Under that Charter, Stalinist Red votes can call our country to war. We may definitely expect just that if we accept the Charter. Of course, there are various factions trying to get us under the Charter. But the loudest ones are those whose records show they place Soviet interests ahead of traditional American interests.

It is unfair to the American people to force a decision on this proposed Charter in wartime. Objections to it involve criticisms of the Roosevelt administration and of some of our allies Many Americans hesitate to express these criticisms in wartime. So the advocates of the Charter, which purports to serve democracy, defy the very esential of free government by seeking to jam it through without full, free discussion.

Many of the foremost champions of this proposed Charter, right up at the top among our ranking generals and Government officials, do not themselves believe in its security features. That is proved by their demand for a colossal, peacetime conscripted army for America, after this war. Since the so-called aggressor nations will then be crushed and permanently incapacitated, it is evident that the apprehensions of our generals and statesmen arise from their suspicions of our allies and fellow Charter members. That shows that many advocates of the Charter do not trust either the peacefulness of its members or trust the power of the Charter to protect us, in the event of a crisis.

Thus the Charter is not expected to protect us. It is not expected to protect the remaining smaller nations, apparently, in any situation where their assailant happens to be Stalin, their chief threat. Britain and France are reported to be making plans for tremendous postwar military establishments. So, obviously they do not expect much protection from the Charter. What, then, is it for?

When so many of the main advocates of the proposed Charter show they have no faith in it, distrust of it is not strange in the rest of us. But if the protection it offers is nil, even in the eyes of its advocates, the menace it offers is grave. It invites us to take on the war hazards of the two most warlike nations in the world—Britain and Soviet Russia. An evil so heinous can be publicly proposed only because our country has suffered a total moral debacle—a total obliteration of all normal moral sensibilities and moral perspective.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Mote.

Is Mr. Norman Thomas here?

This is Mr. Norman Thomas, gentlemen.

STATEMENT BY MRS. FLORENCE CAFFERATTA, REPRESENTING CATHOLIC MOTHERS AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA

The CHAIRMAN. I notice that you have an associate?

Mrs. CAFFERATTA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Cecile Keefe?

Mrs. CAFFERATTA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have allowed your organization 15 minutes. Do you want to divide your time with your associate?

Mrs. CAFFERATTA. Well, Mr. Chairman, she represents a different part of the city from what I do, and we have quite a few parishes represented in our organization, and since Mr. Eichelberger got time for his colleague we would appreciate that same courtesy.

The CHAIRMAN. We gave his colleague 3 minutes. We did not give him 15 minutes.

Mrs. CAFFERATTA. He was being questioned for some time, so naturally I was confused.

The CHAIRMAN. Questioning is not included. We will give you 18 minutes. You can divide that. You can take 15 and let your associate have 3 minutes. We are very crowded for time. We called you yesterday, and you were not here.

Mrs. CAFFERATTA. I beg your pardon. I can explain that.

The CHAIRMAN. Never mind the explanation; it just takes up time. It is all right.

Mrs. CAFFERATTA. She will explain it, then. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. You are opposed to the Charter, as I understand it?

Mrs. CAFFERATTA. Mr. Chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, as a representative of the Catholic Mothers and Daughters of America, an organization of Catholic laywomen, under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, we are dedicated to the promotion of a better understanding of the Christian principles underlying both the laws of our church and of our country as set forth in the Ten Commandments, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, and by this understanding to support actively a program for the preservation of these laws.

Our American Declaration of Independence has, since it was written, been regarded as the soul of our American Republic, even as the Constitution of the United States of America is the vehicle through which this spirit is kept alive.

We cannot restrict or separate these documents in any sense if we would preserve our American way of life.

My remarks will be restricted to the ways in which the United Nations Charter violates the spirit of truth, as enunciated by Jesus Christ and as set forth by our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

The pact is ineffective as a peace pact even now, else why has it not found a way to terminate our war with Japan? Perhaps it is because the so-called peace-loving nations had to declare war in order to become eligible to participate in the bringing forth of this Charter of chicanery.

If we cannot find the way to peace with Japan at present—and I am not saying that we can or cannot—surely we should not rush through legislation under the guise of a peace pact or in the middle of a war that has scattered our American boys over half the face of the earth.

When we have peace the boys will want to come home, and when we have peace and have the boys home, it will be time enough then for them to consider which way of life they would rather perpetuate, and they will have seen something of many ways of life and will be well qualified to form their own opinions regarding the future of this Nation, and whether they will choose to continue to be governed by laws of justice as set forth in our present instruments of government, or whether their sons and their sons' sons would have to perpetuate the hate and animosities of, let us say, three greedy old men who would have the power to inflict this on all youth for all time.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, I would like to read a copy of a resolution unanimously passed by our organization, as follows [reading]:

"Whereas the document signed by representatives of various nations at the close of the San Francisco Conference creating an international security organization must be presented to the Senate of the United States for ratification and approval before it becomes a part of the law of our land; and

"Whereas it is usual and customary for legislative proposals pending in the United States Senate to be considered first in committee before they are debated on the floor of the Senate; and

"Whereas the San Francisco Conference document will, in all probability, be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate for investigation and consideration and report: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Catholic Mothers and Daughters of America in regular meeting assembled this 25th day of June 1945 at the Hotel La Salle in Chicago, Ill.:

"1. That we call upon the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate to hold an unlimited public hearing on said San Francisco Conference document at which every American citizen desiring to be heard should be heard;

"2. That we call upon the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate to arrange for Nation-wide radio coverage for said hearing;

"3. That we call upon the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate to limit the proponents and opponents of said San Francisco document in their addresses to the interests of the United States alone;

"4. That we call upon the United States Senate in its consideration of and debate on the San Francisco Conference document to arrange for Nation-wide radio coverage for said debate; and be it further

"Resolved, That we call the attention of our United States Senators to the fact that we and they are citizens of the United States alone, and not world citizens; that they are servants of the American people alone and that the San Francisco Conference must be accepted or rejected on the grounds—

"1. That on the whole it benefits or injures the American people directly in its operation and not indirectly and as a result of some general world good or evil; and

"2. That in principle and in operation it follows or repudiates our American Declaration of Independence.

"Respectfully submitted.

"CATHOLIC MOTHERS AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA."

Inasmuch as Bretton Woods is not a separate thing to be reckoned with, in that it is part of the latest superstate that is to be erected, therefore, honorable gentlemen, we wish to record with you another resolution unanimously adopted by our organization, as follows [reading]:

"Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate legislation known as the Bretton Woods proposals; and

"Whereas the Bretton Woods proposals are part of a general scheme to tie the people of the United States and their wealth into an imperialistic world-governing organization outlined in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals now being considered in the God-ignoring San Francisco Conference; and

"Whereas the main nations involved in the Bretton Woods proposals, other than the United States, have records of debt defaulting and broken promises, which in the ordinary course of business dealing would deprive them of any consideration in applications for loans or the extension of credit; and

"Whereas the Bretton Woods proposals, instead of securing 'the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity,' as provided by the Constitution of the United States actually enslaves our people to Old World imperialism from which our Declaration of Independence recorded our freedom: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Catholic Mothers and Daughters of America—

"1. That we denounce the Bretton Woods proposals as being not only un-American, but anti-American;

"2. That we denounce the Bretton Woods proposals as being an immoral waste of the wealth and the earnings of the American people;

"3. That we denounce the proposers of the Bretton Woods proposals as being, in our opinion, enemies of our Republic and advocates of America last;

"4. That we call upon all God-loving people interested in the preservation of the only God-based government in the world and interested in the preservation and use of our wealth and earnings of our people for the benefit of our people first, to demand that their representatives in the United States Senate defeat ignominiously and deservedly those infamous Bretton Woods proposals."

In conclusion, gentlemen, deep rooted in experience that still continues to manifest its superiority, we of our organization feel that we have something fine and something wholesome to pass on to the rest of the world—and we do mean "pass on" to it, and not press on to it—our American Declaration of Independence, the most splendid document ever conceived by minds of men, and the Constitution of the United States, an instrument of government by laws rather than by men.

We beg of you, gentlemen, to stand by your oaths to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America, and to perpetuate our form of government in our country and to aid and abet for our good example the possibility that this same form of government will be freely chosen by free peoples all over the world.

Let us consider the great words of Abraham Lincoln, when he said:

"Continue to execute all the expressed provisions of our national federalized Constitution and the Union will endure forever, it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself."

That is Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. We warned the audience two or three times that they are not supposed to show approval or disapproval of a witness' testimony. I hope you will observe that admonition in the future.

We thank you, Mrs. Cafferatta, for your statement.

Testimony of Mrs. Elise French Johnston on the United Nations Charter

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the corrected testimony of Mrs. Elise French Johnston, of New York City, presented before the Committee on Foreign Relations during its consideration of the United Nations Charter.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Johnston, please give your name, residence, and whom you represent, for the record.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. My name is Mrs. Elise French Johnston. My residence is 60 East Sixty-seventh Street, New York City. I am here as a representative of the public of the United States, as a free-born American citizen exercising my right of appeal and protest, while we still have our sovereign rights as protected by the Bill of Rights of the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. Now, I am here——

The CHAIRMAN. Let us have order.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. This is not a laughing matter, Mr. Chairman. I am here——

The CHAIRMAN. That is why I am trying to get order and attention for you.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. Exactly. I appreciate the courtesy.

The CHAIRMAN. Be sure you use the amplifier; some of us are a little deaf.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. Surely. This room with its marble walls, has it also marble ears?

If anyone in the back of the room, Mr. Chairman, cannot hear me, will you ask them to raise their hands so that the instrument may be adjusted? It has worked very badly for the audience for the last 2 days.

The CHAIRMAN. I have consulted the expert, and he assures me it is in good order.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. The audience are having a very tough time back there.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. We shall do the best we can. If you will place the instrument close to you and speak into it, you should be heard.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. All right. This is the first time I have tried it, so I want the audience to check me.

I am here because after studying the Charter carefully I am convinced that it is not only in conflict with the Constitution of the United States but is in violation of the Constitution in many respects. My reasons for thinking so have been augmented by the sources of pressure which are being exerted to urge its passage. Groups and individuals who for many years have shown by their deliberate actions that they are unfriendly to our constitutional form of government are the present groups who are most eager to see us adopt this Charter. For that reason, I am suspicious of their motives, and I suggest you check the records of these organizations in the files of the FBI, the United States Military Intelligence and the Dies committee.

I question the constitutionality of this Charter because of the following passages in the Constitution of the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to read these sections of the Constitution by article and clause only, and at the end of my moments with you I expect some member of this committee of Senators to have looked them up in a copy of the Constitution and to give me a positive answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we have convened to hear you. You cannot compel Senators to answer questions unless they want to. So you go ahead.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. All right. These are the matters in the Constitution itself which I think should be clarified for the American public, because to be asked to sign something which is unconstitutional is not fair without a very frank discussion of the constitutionality of the provisions of the Charter by the elected representatives of the people. So far, the legality of the charter as being at issue with our own laws has not been frankly discussed.

The oath of office of the President of the United States is contained in article II, section 1, paragraph 8. I do not see how, under that oath, the President of the United States can delegate a representative to the world conference, because the Constitution only permits the election of officers; it does not permit the delegation of officers who will carry executive powers.

Now, another thing: We are to be obligated by the Assembly, in the Charter, to pay unknown sums for unspecified purposes, which will not be, according to the charter itself, publicly accounted for. How does that square with the obligation to publish reports of accounts and receipts of public moneys, as expressed in article I section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution? We are all feeling the pinch of our pocketbooks, and we are very much interested in the vagueness of that part of the Charter.

Now, again, in article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution, and under the Defense Act of 1920, which pertains to the raising of armed forces, we are required to appropriate moneys for that purpose each year. Then, how can you commit us for an indefinite period of time and commit indefiinite numbers of men and indefinite sums of money to helping armed forces of the world government? Is that or is that not constitutional?

Again, I want to make this very clear to you, gentlemen. Would I, in my own mind feeling this entire Charter to be in conflict with the Constitution—if I neglected my duty to protest and appeal to you elected representatives of the Constitution, would I not myself be guilty of misprision and of treason? I am here to take my own patriotic stand and to remind you of what we expect you to do.

Now, the power to establish tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court is clearly set forth in article I, section 8, clause 9; but I can find no place in the Constitution of the United States that permits the Congress to establish tribunals or to submit the people to tribunals superior to the Supreme Court.

The power to regulate commerce is given to Congress in section 8, article I, clause 3. But, gentlemen, where is the power given to delegate the trade, the commerce, and the finance of this country to an unknown, unpredictable group of men?

I just want these constitutional matters discussed and clarified for the American public.

The power to regulate the currency is clearly expressed in article I, section 8, clause 5. That power is given to the Congress. I do not see that the power to delegate that power is given to Congress.

Again, as regards this world police, in article II, section 2 of the Constitution, it is clearly stated that the President of the United States is to be the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States. How are we going to work that into this world police as outlined in the Charter?

Again, I would remind you that article VI of the Constitution clearly states that treaties—and some people call this charter a treaty—must obey the laws of the land. In other words, you yourselves by your own action cannot commit the people of this country to a program which in itself is unconstitutional. You may repudiate yourselves, but you cannot repudiate the Constitution.

Now, in fairness to yourselves, I realize that this country is in the grip of a gigantic conspiracy, that it has been well financed, and that you men are in a very uncomfortable spot, and I think that that is why you are trying to railroad this thing through.

The CHAIRMAN. Right at that point, we showed no disposition to railroad it through when we let you appear here to testify.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. It was announced in the newspapers that there was no opposition to this Charter. I have here a copy——

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is rather ungracious of you, after we have given you the time and the opportunity to place all you want in the record, to charge the committee with railroading the matter through. We are not railroading it; we are trying to give it consideration. So will you not kindly confine yourself to the merits of the matter and not to reflections on the committee?

Mrs. JOHNSTON. Certainly; I stand corrected. But I insist that the expression

"railroading" has been applied by many people. I do not want to be discourteous, but I think the speed is too great. The Connally resolution, the Fulbright resolution, the Mackinac resolution, the plank in the Democratic platform, and the plank in the Republican platform all have specified that constitutional processes would be used.

I insist that if the matter of how much alcohol we could have in a glass of beer had to be submitted in the form of an amendment, certainly if there is any question of the legality of this Charter or its lack of having constitutional status, then that must be submitted by amendment. Otherwise how can the decent, law-abiding citizens of this country feel bound by your unconstitutional acts?

Gentlemen, I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Johnston. You have several minutes yet.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. That is fine.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not want to railroad you through.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. I should very much like to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. If you are finished, of course, it is all right.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. No; I should like to make a very tangible suggestion for peace, since we are told we are very concerned about peace. Wars will be fought, gentlemen, as long as wars are profitable. In the last 200 years, wars have proved profitable to three groups: The politicians, the international bankers, and the ammunition makers. As far as we can see, this Charter is a very ingenious instrument for solidifying these special interests, who will then have all the power to make all the war they want to whenever they want to.

That is why the mothers of this country are bitter. We object to the fact that when you gentlemen undertake to sign the Charter, you sign a blank check with our names on it, because the Charter itself offers no limitation as to future changes or amendments nor to the amount of money that we would have to pay to support it.

Is my time up?

The CHAIRMAN. No; not quite. Do you want to go on?

Mrs. JOHNSTON. All right. There is something else that is bothering me. There was an awful hullabaloo a few years ago about providing pensions for Congressmen. In the Charter——

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think that has anything to do with this.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. Yes; it has, because in the charter, in the world court, they very carefully give themselves pensions and retirement fees. Do you think that is going to be popular with the American people? We do not like it for our own Congressmen. We are quite aware that since we are the richest Nation in the world today, we shall have to pay the major part of the bill.

There is another thing in the Charter which I think is difficult to understand. We are told that the charter will not interfere with the domestic affairs of any nation. Yet we know the charter confers the power of investigation of all affairs, whether social, economic, or, I think the other word is, cultural. What human activity could not be included under those terms? I object to selling out our birthright as a mess of pottage, and I certainly object to selling out our heritage to this mess of verbiage. It is the ambiguous wording of the Charter and its vagueness which infuriate the American people.

I regret to say that the reason why many people are not writing in to you about this is that they are so disgusted with it. They feel their letters are ignored, even as my telegram to the President was not given the courtesy of a form letter.

The charter is not well expressed. It is too vague, too ambiguous, and too unsatisfactory to be given serious consideration. I think a charter may be written in the future, but I refuse to accept this charter as an instrument for peace, because it will lead to chaos in the world and in our own country.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Senator TUNNELL. I should like to ask the lady a question, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Tunnell.

Senator TUNNELL. What is your theory as to this war being profitable to bankers?

Mrs. JOHNSTON. I think all wars are profitable to bankers.

Senator TUNNELL. Why do you think so? Are the interest rates too high?

Mrs. JOHNSTON. Well, I think the fact that Mr. Stettinius is with us today and that he is so happy about the whole thing——

The CHAIRMAN. Please do not be personal in your remarks. Mr. Stettinius is a guest of the committee, just as you are. We trust there will be no altercation between you.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. Well, I think that the records of the bankers for the last 200 years will bear out my statement. I would remind you that the Napoleonic wars were financed in England by the House of Rothschild; they were financed in France by the House of Rothschild in France; they were financed in Austria by the House of Rothschild of Austria.

All wars, including our own Revolutionary War, which was financed by Mr. Morris, have been financed by bankers for the last 200 years.

Senator TUNNELL. Is it not true that we have an immense amount of capital that cannot even be loaned at this time? The loans cannot be made. Why do the bankers want that situation?

Mrs. JOHNSTON. I do not know why they want it, because I am not an international banker. But I am aware of the fact that they have found——

Senator TUNNELL. You are not a man, either, but you are telling us about men's opinions.

Mrs. JOHNSTON. No. I am telling you about my opinions. That is my opinion, and I think that if you will look into the record you will find that the bank statements at the present time are quite favorable to the international bankers.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

You are excused, Mrs. Johnston. Thank you very much for your testimony. The committee is appreciative. We will observe your injunction not to railroad this matter at all.

Dear Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, not all my constituents find themselves in complete agreement with all my views on international matters. Many of those who do not find themselves in agreement, however, are among my closest friends, and I was greatly moved recently by an editorial which was printed in the Sherman County Journal by a great editor in our State, Mr. Giles French, who has been carrying on with me a very interesting correspondence as to the degree in which we may differ on some of these international questions. He is a great citizen of our State, one of those who lost a son in this war.

On June 1, 1945, he published an editorial in the form of a letter to his dead son. It is a moving editorial, a clear crystal presentation of his point of view. I was so moved by it that I asked him if I might have the honor of having it incorporated in the RECORD, because I think it is such a fine piece of writing that it ought to go into permanent archives. Hence, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this great editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sherman County Journal, Moro, Oreg., of June 1, 1945]

DEAR SON

MAY 30, 1945.

DEAR SON: This is Memorial Day. It has been 3 months and 3 days since you got that bit of shrapnel in your chest over there in Holland and died for your country.

A lot of things have happened since then and I know with your interest in public affairs you would like to know of them although they mean nothing to you now. The big push that started a day or two before you died was successful and Germany gave up early in May, but not until her armies and Berlin had been taken by Joe's men.

Had you gone on into Germany you would have seen some very shocking things, or so we are told. The Germans had treated those who disagreed with them very badly, starving them and overworking them.

We are hearing much about it because it makes good copy—and exciting pictures—and because it fits well into the general picture that is painted for us. It strengthens the propaganda that we were fighting to end all such cruelty, or, at least, the regime that did it.

I know that if you and Carl—who was killed 10 days after you were—had felt that you were fighting to end all governments that practiced cruelty, you would have had but momentary regret at the fatal results to you.

But you didn't feel that way. You had read too much history and knew that wars decide nothing except who shall live and who shall die. No ideology was ever destroyed by a war, but many have been strengthened thereby. You wouldn't have fought to make the Germans or anyone else accept our ideal of democracy, for you were too liberal for that.

I remember you saying that the young men you were going to fight against were probably about the same as you were in that they hoped they would come out of it alive and be able to go on living at some peaceful pursuit, raising a family, and making a place for them in the world. There was no hate in you. Maybe there was no hate in the fellow that shot you.

Had you believed all the idealistic propaganda of the wartime you would be surprised to learn that the Russians were marching German prisoners back to the Ukraine to rebuild that destroyed country. For a man who has lost his life for justice and freedom and democracy and the right of every man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that would have come as a shock. We of the democratic nations are doing a fine job of not letting our left hand know what our right is doing.

The man who sent you to war is dead too. His end came about a month before Germany's did. There is a conference being held at San Francisco to make up a plan for world order but no one has a lot of confidence in

it. Most people you meet think there will be another war in 20 or 25 years, and that any kind of order, good or bad, would last until a new crop of people grew up—and no longer. You see, we are pretty pessimistic.

The hills are green now although the spring has been cold and backward, the cattle are fat and sleek, and the grain is growing well since we had big rains the first of the month. There will be a good crop and big money again for the farmers. Everybody is doing well with the wages high and profits big because of the war.

This is your first Memorial Day as a memorialee instead of a memorialor. We had a program on the courthouse lawn and dedicated an honor roll with the names of all you boys on it. Those of you who have died have a place under a gold star. There will be many words said about you on future Memorial Days. I do hope, and I know you do, that something will have come from your death. I know you didn't expect it and neither do I. But you are never going to have to worry about it.

Your grave over there in the low hills of Holland seems pretty far away, son, especially on this day, and your mother and I would like to be able to stand beside it a few moments and think about you.

The high hopes we had that you had so far justified are there with you in foreign soil. The little men who yapped about the necessity for the war are quieter now as they contemplate the pictures of our overseas graveyards; the swaggering ones who glorify war will soon be in eclipse. What will persist forever and ever is the quietness, the silence of your brave young voices. What you could have done in the world will go undone, and the world has lost that. It has had another lesson on might, on the value of power.

The town is just the same. We, and the neighbors go about our tasks as before. There is nothing else to do. We stay in our habits of work and play. Our pleasures that the European war is over comes from the relief that no more will be shot, not from the hope that there will be a new world to live in

The simple things are what interest us: Life and death, food and shelter, hopes and fears. The wranglings of nations bring us misery more often than joy.

We'll be remembering you, son. And every day we can see you swing up the walk toward home in that long-legged stride you had. And your whistle sounds above the rattle of the job press when there is a moment of calm in the office.

So long, son.

DAD.

Complete Victory and Lasting and Just Peace—What Have the United States Put Into the War—Should Not Russia Help?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the action of yourself and the House in granting to me by unanimous consent time to discuss certain matters in the record that are apparently of great interest to the people of my district and to many persons throughout the Nation. During the last 2 or 3 weeks I have received a great many letters from people of my district and some outside the district desiring information about certain matters. They want to know what our national debt is, what amount of Federal taxes are paid annually, the amount that we have provided in the way of lend-lease to the Allied Nations, what percentage of the troops did our country furnish for the drive on the western front and what contribution in the way of manpower, equipment, and so forth, is our country furnishing in the Pacific war; what, if anything in this war, has Russia done against Japan and is Russia likely to enter the war against Japan; how many soldiers and sailors do we plan to use in the Japanese war in the Pacific, and how long will that war likely continue; what has this country done under UNRRA; that is, relief for foreign countries; what demands are being made on the United States for loans, and so forth, in the postwar period, and what commitments, if any, has our country made.

I have made from time to time investigations of the questions propounded, and I am taking this time to submit for the benefit of my constituents in the first instance and for those who may be interested throughout the country some observations on these matters as I see and find them. The gross national debt is more than $260,000,000,000. This does not include any contracts and other obligations in which our country has entered but which have not been completed and the money has not been paid. All of these obligations will likely increase our national debt to $300,000,000,000. It is quite likely that our national debt and obligations will go considerably beyond three hundred billion during the present fiscal year. The deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, was more than $50,000,000,000, and if the war continues against Japan into 1946 the deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, will be approximately $50,000,000,000.

There was collected from the American people in Federal taxes for the year ending June 30, 1945, more than $45,000,000,000. As our anual income will be less during this fiscal year, the Federal revenues may not exceed $42,000,000,000.

Congress has already voted more than $65,000,000,000 for lend-lease. When this matter was first up for consideration in 1941 and this policy was adopted by the administration, it was urged that lend-lease in no event would exceed $7,000,000,000. All of this money has not yet been spent. The British Empire has received approximately $30,000,000,000 in lend-lease; Russia has received between twelve billion and fifteen billion dollars. Billions of pounds of meat, lard and other fats, flour, bread, fruits, vegetables, and other foods have been sent to our allies, and all the countries of Central and South America, except Argentina, have received large sums of lend-lease, and so has China. Millions of shoes, clothing, blankets, boots, and so forth, have gone to our allies. Only a few of the countries that have received lend-lease have engaged in actual combat with the enemy.

It is claimed that about $6,000,000,000 has gone to Central and South America for lend-lease, but no country has sent any arms or armaments to fight except a small contingent from Brazil. At the same time we have bought at handsome prices the products of Central and South America. Great Britain and some other countries continue to receive lend-lease. Russia, since the war ended in Europe, has been allotted an additional $1,000,000,000, although there has not been a word or act indicating her purpose to aid us in the war with Japan.

In my opinion, none of these lend-lease commitments should have been made and this recent commitment to Russia and some other countries should not have been made except that they agree to cooperate with us in winning the Japanese war and aid in bringing about a just and lasting peace, and cooperate with us in creating an organization to prevent future wars. In addition to the lend-lease Russia is insisting and we are advised that our administration has promised to grant to Russia $1,000,000,000 under the so-called Import-Export Bank, and although Russia agreed as one of the 44 nations to contribute to the $2,000,000,000 relief fund for people in the occupied countries, she has not made good any part of her pledge, but is now insisting that she be granted $700,000,000 of the $2,000,000,000 constituting this fund. I might say that 44 nations, including the United States, pledged themselves to pay certain amounts to this $2,000,000,000 relief fund. Under that act the administration pledged that the United States would put up $1,350,000,000 of that fund. In other words, we put up 66⅔ percent of this amount. Forty-three other nations signed the same agreement and pledged that they would supply the other $650,000,000. According to a recent report of the UNRRA—the relief organization headed by ex-Governor Lehman, of New York—the following nations have come in and made contributions:

These are Costa Rica, Iceland, New Zealand, Panama, Canada, Brazil, Australia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Thirty-five other nations have now failed for more than a year to make any contribution or redeem their pledges. The United States, as a matter of fact, has paid in 72 percent of all the money that has been available for relief. This relief organization gives some evidence of why there is a shortage of lard and other fats in this country. We gave to this relief group 56,635,000 pounds of lard, 9,280,000 pounds of soybeans for oil; 1,235,000 pounds oleomargarine, 925,834 pounds soybean salad oil; 8,351,800 pounds of soap. Of course, there were other items making up the more than $800,000,000 that we have contributed to this relief program. Our Government has agreed since the war ceased in Europe to furnish to Russia this year 40,000,000 pounds of butter and an additional $1,000,000,000 under lend-lease.

Russia has gone through this war without creating a national debt to amount to anything. Yet our Government and the American people in one way or another have contributed to Russia as much as $15,000,000,000 in lend-lease and in

scores of other ways of relief that had been sent to Russia. She has not contributed one dollar to this relief fund, yet she is now insisting that we give her $700,000,000 out of this fund. Of course, she and the other 34 nations are failing to make any contribution. The most of this $700,000,000 will have been paid by American taxpayers, and our country with a national debt and national obligations approaching $300,000,000,000. I cannot approve of this action. The American taxpayers and the American consumers are entitled to some consideration.

Our armies in Europe have been granting supplies to the people of Italy that joined with Hitler and others to destroy our country as well as every other free country. The other day, through some arrangement, Italy declared war on Japan and we promptly agreed to furnish her $100,000,000 in relief supplies, and when the election was on last year and the administration was trying to make friends with the Italian people in this country, we gave to the Italians approximately $100,000,000 in supplies. It seems that foreign countries can get most anything they want from our Government. While Italy declared war on Japan, it does not mean anything because she has not and will not contribute to the fighting in the Pacific. We have done much to aid her since she was knocked out of the war. Lend-lease was authorized by Congress to provide aid to nations that were and would help us to win this war, but about a score of nations have been receiving lend-lease and relief and contributed little or nothing toward our war effort.

OVER 75 PERCENT OF MANPOWER ON WESTERN FRONT DRIVE

Secretary of War Stimson in his report recently stated that the United States furnished over 75 percent of the men for the drive on the western front. Our administration had agreed that we would furnish approximately 73 percent. As we were fighting on the soil of France, Holland, and Belgium, I thought it was unfair to require our country to agree to furnish 73 percent of the manpower, but, as a matter of fact, we furnished more than 75 percent, and a percentage that high or higher in the way of guns, planes, ships, and other war supplies. France, with 35,000,000 population, furnished one very small army. The British Empire, including Great Britain and Canada, furnished two armies. The brunt of that attack on the western front was borne by American troops and we had hundreds of thousands of casualties. We were urged by the British and others to concentrate our forces on the western front in defeating Italy and Germany, and that to look upon the war in the Pacific as a secondary matter, and after the war was won in Europe the Allies would join wholeheartedly in whipping Japan. Many of us objected to the neglect of our Pacific war, in that it would give the Japanese 2 or 3 years to dig in and exploit the country and greatly strengthen themselves. There was so much clamor in the Nation that the administration was forced to give some attention to the Pacific war—and what a glorious chapter American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have written in the Pacific—but our country was required to furnish about 90 percent or more of the men and materials in the Pacific fight.

Russia continued to renew her fishing contract rights with the Japanese and in that way furnish to them important food supplies. The war has now been over in Europe 2½ months. Russia has not done anything toward joining us in the war against Japan. Great Britain has done very little except to skit around her own possessions on the continent of Asia and in some islands and cities which were taken from her by the Japanese. France, the owner of Indo China, and Holland, the owner of practically all of the East Indies, and Belgium, with large holdings in Africa, have taken no steps whatsoever so far as we can learn to aid us in the fight in the Pacific. To my way of looking at it, this is very unfair. Russia, Great Britain, France, and Holland have greater possessions in the Pacific than we have. We no longer own the Philippine Islands where we have been fighting for a long time. Several years ago, through the efforts of the Administration, Congress voted for the independence of the Philippine Islands. These islands are to be turned over to the Filipinos not later than 1946. Many political leaders here in Washington desire that it be done this year, and that leaves us to own only two or three islands in the Pacific. The Japanese hold a lot of islands that were taken from Germany in World War I and turned over to the Japanese through the peace treaty. I think a very substantial majority of the American people want us to hold every island in the Pacific that has been taken from the Japanese through the blood and sacrifice of American fighting men on land, sea, and in the air, but President Truman announced the other day that the United States did not desire 1 foot of territory or any financial benefits out of this war. As one Member of Congress, I shall oppose any such policy. I want us to hold every island and every piece of ground in the Pacific that we fight and win that is necessary for the defense and protection of our country in the Pacific. If we do not secure these islands that we take from the Japanese, who will take them? Russia, Great Britain, or some lesser nations. If we must fight and protect the Pacific, let us have such territory and bases that are necessary to make our protection secure.

I cannot conceive why we should spend billions of dollars and sacrifice the lives and health of a half million or more American boys and then hand these islands over to Russia, Great Britain, or any other country. Why turn these possessions over to other countries that some time in the future may imperil our own security and liberties?

We know that Russia has not yet entered the war against Japan and neither has she shown any indication that she will enter the war against Japan, and whether she enters the war or not, when it is over, she will have a big slice of the territory involved in the Pacific war. North China is already communistic. She will likely have control of that part of China and also Manchukuo that is now in the control of the Japanese and she will have control of Korea, and she will get back the territory that Japan took away from her in 1904–05. She has more at stake in the Pacific than any other nation, and yet she is doing nothing to aid us in winning the war in the Pacific, and, at the same time, we are still pouring out to her lend-lease benefits. Does Russia propose to stand by and have our American boys to destroy the Japs and greatly strengthen Russia in the Pacific and she do nothing to aid us in that great struggle? Is that being a good neighbor? Is that showing such cooperation as will help to insure a long, enduring, and just peace?

All of this time Russia is busy grabbing territory in Europe. She has already absorbed a lot of Finland, all of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and a part of Poland. The freedom of these countries was made possible by the sacrifice of a lot of blood and treasure of the American people in World War I, and while we are fighting in the Pacific, our ally, Great Britain, is busy trying to maintain the monarchial governments of Spain, Italy, and some other countries, which have been the enemies of the Allies in this great world conflict.

Before we give away so much, it seems to me that we ought to have an understanding with Great Britain and Russia, if we propose to help maintain liberty and freedom for the people of the world. I had been very hopeful that Russia would declare war on Japan and that Great Britain would become more active in the Pacific.

WAR IN THE PACIFIC

It was announced some time ago by President Truman that we planned to put 7,000,000 soldiers and about 4,000,000 sailors fighting in the Pacific. In other words we are providing for more than 10,000,000 men in the armed services in the Pacific. Russia has not furnished a man and has made no plans so far as I have been able to learn to furnish any men or equipment. Holland and France have no men or equipment fighting in the Pacific, except a small contingent of Frenchmen in Indochina. Great Britain has furnished few men and not much equipment for the war in the Pacific. Her men and equipment have been in and about India, Burma, and the Malay Peninsula. Recently a part of the British Navy and Air Forces have been aiding in the Pacific. Prime Minister Churchill said the British people had been living off the bounty of the United States and was not doing her part in the Pacific war. We have and are still furnishing more than 90 percent of the men and equipment for the war in the Pacific. It is merely a guess as to when the war in the Pacific will end. Some informed persons think the war in the Pacific will end in 1945. A majority of those who claim to know say that it will not end until 1946. The Jap leaders recently asserted they would fight to the bitter end. That would indicate that we still have a tough and long fight before us in the Pacific. They must know they will be defeated and destroyed if they continue this fight. But Germany for a long time knew that

defeat was certain, yet they continued to fight until they were destroyed. In view of the long distance to transport men and supplies and the fanaticism of Japanese and the fact that there are approximately 80,000,000 to 100,000,000 Japs, if they do decide to fight to the end, we can expect a long and bloody war before us that will not likely terminate until some time in 1946.

Of course, Russia and Great Britain could ship their equipment if they would go all out against the Japs as our country has. In that event we ought to knock out Japan in 1945. I pointed out that Congress at the request of the administration had already voted $65,000,000,000 for lend-lease. Also, at the request of the administration, it voted $1,350,000,000 for relief of citizens in Allied countries. The administration has agreed to lend France $2,500,000,000, to be paid in 50 years, for postwar rehabilitation, and it is reported that we propose to lend Great Britain at least $4,000,000,000 for rehabilitation and development of her industries, and it is reported that the administration has proposed to lend to Russia $1,000,000,000 through the Export-Import Bank, and an additional sum of $5,000,000,000 under the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. China comes in for several billion, and other Allied countries are expecting loans from us. These several sums will likely reach $25,000,000,000. This money is intended to rehabilitate industries, railroads, utilities, and the developments of foreign markets and trade. It is claimed by some that in developing our competition that we will not benefit the United States. If the policies are followed that have been followed in Central and South America, Europe, Asia, Africa, and other countries for many years, very little, if any, of these vast sums will ever be repaid and the American taxpayers will have to shoulder the loss.

The administration recently sponsored what is known as the Bretton Woods agreement. This matter went through Congress recently. It was strongly urged by the administration. The set-up proposed two world agencies. One is an International Bank with a capital of $9,000,000,000. The other is for $8,800,000 to establish an International Stabilization Monetary Fund. Our country puts up about one-third of the money for this Bank and Fund. This Organization is open to all of the countries of the world except to Germany and Japan. The governors and boards of directors of this Bank and Fund are selected from the various subscribing nations. While we have a governor and director on these boards, foreign nations will have a majority of the stock and a majority of the governors and directors on the boards. It is the purpose of the Bank to loan money to the subscribing nations to aid in the reconstruction and development of these foreign countries. They can borrow money to build automobile factories, develop other factories and industries, build railroads and provide expansion of their world trade among nations by increasing productive capacity. While we will put up about one-third of the capital we will not be a borrower of the Bank. We are supposed to be rich and have plenty of resources. The Stabilization Fund is to be used to stabilize the currencies of France, China, Italy, and other subscribing nations. Here again we put up about one-third of the Fund but it will not be necessary to stabilize our currency but it will be our job to stabilize trillions of francs; the trillions of lire of Italy; the trillions of yen in China, and the currencies of other bankrupt countries. Where there is loss or displacement of the funds the United States can be called upon to contribute additional sums.

The feeling of many thoughtful people is that we would lose approximately $6,000,000,000. The French franc is now worth one-half cent, yet we are accepting it on a basis of 2 cents. We are accepting the Chinese dollar on the basis of 48 Chinese dollars to 1 American dollar, but the real ratio is 1,800 to 1. Unless these countries are willing to collect taxes, cut down expenses, and give real aid toward stabilization of their currencies, and restore their national credit, the United States stands to lose all that it will put into the International Bank or into the International Stabilization Fund. I think we are making national credits too easy for the 44 or more countries of the world. The United States has already spent more money on this war than all of the other Allied Nations put together. Our national debt is greater than the combined national debt of the British Empire, Russia, and all the other Allied countries combined. We are paying a higher rate of taxes than any of these countries. We not only furnish great quantities of lend-lease but we have furnished billions of supplies in the way of ships, planes, guns, tanks, and ammunition for the war, and today nearly 1,100,000 American boys have been reported killed, missing in action, wounded, or are prisoners of war, and there are many countries that have been and are today being denied the "four freedoms." Some of them have none of these freedoms for which we gave American lives and treasure.

May we urge that in the future before we make large commitments in the way of men, money, materials of war, and relief that we have some commitments from those with whom we are allied. Should they not be required to depend upon themselves and aid in this great undertaking to bring the war to an early end and a just and lasting peace and help to protect our country and other countries from future wars? Should not they be required to refrain from selfish grabbing of the territories and taking away the liberties of the smaller Allied Nations. France, until recently, when the American soldiers did such a heroic job to clear her country of invaders, sent her armies into Syria and Lebanon to grab territory and subject free peoples, and but for the protection of Great Britain and the United States would have provoked another war. We see Russia grabbing territory and spheres of influence and this is also true of Great Britain. The United States and her people propose to fight this war to an end and when it is over we want peace, a just and lasting peace, and a complete stoppage of aggressors and a complete stoppage of aggression in the world. These million and one-half American soldiers, sailors, and marines must not have fought, died, and received wounds and been incarcerated in prisons and lost their health in vain. We must not lost sight of the fact of the tremendous sacrifices of lives and health and the blood and tears put into this war by the American people who had no part or parcel in bringing about this war. It will take them a hundred years to liquidate the debts and obligations incurred in this war.

The Pepper Bill for Equal Pay for Equal Work for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt relative to Senate bill 1178, providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes. The article appeared in the Washington Daily News of July 10, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO LABOR QUESTIONS

(By Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK, Monday.—There are two labor situations to which I want to draw attention at the present time. One is embodied in a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER and referred to the Labor Committee. As far as I know it has not yet been introduced in the House, though I imagine Congresswoman MARY NORTON will eventually introduce it.

It is Senate bill 1178, and it provides "equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes." The first section presents the situation very well: "The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industry of differentials based on sex is an inequality in compensation standards which constitutes an unfair wage practice and (1) leads to labor disputes; (2) depresses wages and living standards of employees, male and female; (3) interferes with and prevents an adequate standard of living of such workers and the families depending on them for support; (4) in particular, has serious detrimental effects on the standards of living of families of deceased or disabled veterans; (5) prevents the maximum utilization of our labor resources and plant capacity essential for full production, in war and in peace; (6) endangers the national security and general welfare and thereby burdens and obstructs commerce."

That puts to whole thing in a nutshell. But basically there is no excuse for not paying an equal wage for equal work, and there never has been. This principle holds good, I think, in the professional field as well as in the field of industry, and it certainly should hold good in all the service fields.

Columbia Valley Agency—Letters and Newspaper Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of newspaper articles, editorials, and letters with regard to the Columbia Valley Agency.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THURSTON COUNTY YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
Olympia, Wash.

RESOLUTION ENDORSING SENATOR HUGH B. MITCHELL'S CVA BILL

Whereas the time is opportune for the citizens and home owners of the State of Washington to indicate their views and reasons for a project of the magnitude and the potentialities of an authority for the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest. Already manifest are mercenary interests who seek to destroy worth-while projects in order that their own selfish interests may be served and in most instances have heretofore opposed all progressive measures which the people of the State of Washington proposed and seek to divert their attention to schemes and arguments that would defeat the purposes for which they are intended;

Whereas we already have existing Government agencies in connection with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, the Forest Service, and other well-organized Government organizations which are paid by the Government and which will promote the project for the benefit of all who are served;

Whereas the tremendous potential volume of energy of the Columbia River and its tributaries are hard to appraise at this time, but which we know to have a supply of power that is tremendous and a vital asset to the whole people of this State; and

Whereas the resources of this particular part of the United States, such as timber and its byproducts, are rapidly being depleted and it is essential that we turn our attention to other sources of income and development which an authority offers to the citizens of our Pacific Northwest; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Thurston County Young Democratic Club favor a Columbia Valley Authority similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority and which redounds to the benefit not only of those directly affected, but the benefits are reflected in the adjacent territory and communities which the authority serves; and be it further

Resolved, That for the above reasons we herewith go on record as favoring the proposals sponsored by our Senators and Representatives to do all in their power to establish an equitable Columbia Valley Authority that the benefits will be available to all of the citizens and an equal opportunity may be had by all; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to President Harry S. Truman; Hon. Warren G. Magnuson and Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, United States Senators; Congressmen Hugh De Lacy, Henry M. Jackson, Charles Savage, and John M. Coffee; and Gov. Mon C. Wallgren.

Adopted this 29th day of June A. D. 1945.

THURSTON COUNTY YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
Olympia, Wash.
O. M. CASE, *President.*
JENNIE HUNTLEY, *Vice President.*
MARARET GRIBBLE, *Secretary.*

[From the Wenatchee (Wash.) World of June 22, 1945]

TRUMAN LIKES MITCHELL'S CVA

OLYMPIA.—President Truman endorsed yesterday a bill by Senator MITCHELL (Democrat, Washington) calling for the creation of a Columbia Valley Authority.

It is a good bill, he told a news conference here, and he is for it.

[From the Kent (Wash.) News-Journal of June 14, 1945]

CVA DESERVING OF COMPLETE STUDY

Evidence of a concerted drive in opposition to the proposed Columbia Valley Authority proposed by Senator Hugh MITCHELL is appearing in numerous places with emphasis on the dangers of setting up another "dangerous bureaucratic agency" similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Those who accept some of the popular misconceptions about the TVA should study the operation of that agency thcroughly before committing themselves to final judgment. There is ample evidence from those who live in the Tennessee Valley that the TVA has done an outstanding job in promoting the welfare of the Tennessee Valley area, and testimony to that fact is prompt and eloquent from those who are familiar with its operations.

Certainly there should be careful study and consideration of the proposal for a Columbia Valley Authority, and every safeguard should be given to provide a real measure of local autonomy if such a measure is enacted. The proposal is so vast in its conception, so far-reaching in its powers, as to vitally affect the future welfare of the entire Northwest. Intelligent and constructive leadership is an absolute necessity if a CVA is to operate for the ultimate benefit of the people of this State.

Before any snap judgments upon the merits of a CVA are made there should be a full and complete study of the proposed act, based on analytical research and dispassionate examination of its values.

APPROVE PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S STATEMENT

JUNE 21, 1945.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Governor's Mansion, Olympia, Wash.

Dear President TRUMAN: We have been greatly encouraged to learn of your support of the river valley authority idea, and in particular of your sympathetic interest in the Mitchell bill implementing this idea for the Pacific Northwest.

It is our observation that local opposition to this bill stems from a very narrow segment of society. It has been our encouraging experience that when a fair hearing has been given before businessmen in such groups as chambers of commerce, the conviction has been widely expressed that the CVA not only holds no threat to private enterprise—as the opposition maintains—but is in fact its chief hope of continued health and growth.

On the other hand we observe popular support to be building strongly behind the CVA idea. Three organizations have sprung up in recent months, the chief or only function of which is to educate the people of this region on the meaning and the possibilities of CVA. Other groups are also active, but these three perhaps focus the work. They are the Washington Resources Council, the Oregon Resources Council and the Columbia Valley Authority Information League with units in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. They are composed of hundreds of men and women, citizens of the region as well as accredited representatives of labor—CIO, AFL, and Railroad Brotherhoods—Grange, public power groups, and organizations long active in developing the Columbia Basin. They are undertaking to put on an educational campaign directed at every Northwest citizen, setting forth the need for an overall plan for regional development and the prospects for economic stability represented by the valley authority plan.

By the time hearings are held in this area, we believe you will find the people of the region well-informed on the facts and friendly to the idea of a CVA, eager and ready to cooperate with such an agency when it shall have been established.

Nothing, we know, will give the Mitchell bill such a favorable chance of passage as your own open and outright support of it. We congratulate you on the admirable impression you have made on the people of the Northwest by your public commitment to the CVA and to Mitchell's bill, reported in today's press. We are taking this opportunity of assuring you that you will find Northwest citizens solidly behind you in your continued pursuance of such statesmanly policies.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

Roy W. Atkinson, regional director, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Frank T. Bell, chairman board of directors, Columbia Valley Irrigation Districts; Grover Burrows, past president, Yakima Chamber of Commerce; Henry W. Carstensen, master, Washington State Grange; Fred Chamberlain, president, Public Power League of Washington; Paul Coughlin, attorney, Seattle; John S. Denise, legislative chairman, Council of Railroad Brotherhoods; Clarence C. Dill, member, Columbia Basin Commission; Harry H. Hudlow, manager, Big Bend Rural Electric Cooperative; Gus A. Jaspers, president, Washington Resources Council; H. K. Kendall, editor, Union Register; Neil V. Pardo, president, Labor's Joint Public Affairs Committee; O. A. Peters, president Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association; James A. Seavotto, president, Seattle City Council; Clifford A. Stone, member, Industrial District Lodge No. 751, Aeronautical Mechanics, Thomas D. Welborn, member, Washington Resources Council; Archie Zickler, president, Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association.

BENEFIT TO ECONOMY OF PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Care of MON C. WALLGREN,
Governor, Washington, State,
Olympia, Wash.

DEAR MR. TRUMAN: We are grateful to you for the firm position you took in favor of the Columbia Valley Authority. Enactment of this will greatly benefit the economy of the Pacific Northwest. It is essential to a well-integrated economy which will make for prosperity in this region.

Kirby Billingsley, President, Columbia River Development League; Henry Carstensen, Master, Washington State Grange; Tom Welborn, President, Methow Valley Chamber of Commerce; John

King, Washington State Grange; Frank Bell, Director, Columbia Basin district; C. E. Blinn, President Montana State REA Cooperative Association; A. H. Knutson, President Idaho State REA Cooperative Association; D. I. Hopkins, REA, St. John, Wash.; John Glenn, CIO Field Representative; Ross Lynch, Yakima; Emil Miller, Proprietor Columbia Hotel, Vice President of Columbia Development League; M. H. McGuire, McMinnville Water and Electric Utilites; and J. B. Whitehead, Manager, Benton County REA.

[From the Progressive of June 11, 1945]

STRUGGLE FOR A COLUMBIA BASIN AUTHORITY

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

In a 1,600-mile surge from the Canadian Rockies to the sea, the Columbia River booms the loudest power anthem on the North American Continent. This one stream, draining the Pacific Northwest, contains more than 40 percent of all the potential hydroelectricity in the United States. Grand Coulee Dam, a colossal fortress guarding the upper Columbia, is the greatest single source of power on earth. One of its 18 generators equals the output of many entire dams.

Inhabitants of the Pacific Northwest—people in crowded seaports and on lonely stump farms—are now demanding that the vast and rich resources of the Columbia River be consolidated in a regional agency patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Bill S. 460, introduced in the United States Senate by 38-year-old HUGH B. MITCHELL of the State of Washington, is the legislative vehicle by which the Columbia Basin Authority would be started on its journey.

The proposal for a Columbia Basin Authority has not aroused as much national attention as either the fight to continue the TVA or to establish a Missouri Valley Authority. Yet, in terms of resources and regional riches, the Columbia Basin Authority would be more extensive than both the other agencies combined.

Some Fear Progress

In Senator MITCHELL'S words, "short-sighted commercial interests" already have started to oppose the Columbia Basin Authority. These interests fear the spread of public ownership of electric power; they are afraid that low-cost navigation on the Columbia and its tributaries will jeopardize profitable railroad and trucking arrangements. But the people of the Northwest, speaking through their Granges and labor unions and civic organizations, have already indicated by resolutions and letters that they think the TVA type of agency should be established in their own region.

No section of America is more suited to a regional authority than the Columbia River Basin. It is a compact, homogeneous area. One stream dominates it, the Columbia. It is a comparatively new frontier. Much of it remains to be settled. Policies followed in the next few years may shape the future of the region for a century. The development of the river has just been started. Not until 1933 did the Federal Government commence to tap the power of the Columbia. Two dams have now been constructed, Bonneville and Grand Coulee. Eight other dams are planned.

Development of the Columbia encompasses many benefits. Power is not the only product. Although Grand Coulee is the biggest power project on earth, it was not for power alone that the great dam was built. In fact, power is not even its primary purpose. Grand Coulee was constructed principally to irrigate 1,250,000 acres of arid land in the Inland Empire. This land will provide 30,000 fertile farms for returning soldiers. Navigation is another phase of Columbia River development.

But these undertakings must be integrated. At the present time no less than three Federal agencies are concerned with the Columbia River development program. The United States Bureau of Reclamation handles the irrigation projects. The United States Army engineers operate all undertakings associated with navigation. The Bonneville Power Administration sells all hydroelectric energy. This is like having three kitchens in one hotel—one kitchen for desserts, another for meat dishes, still a third for soup and salads; it would take a long time to put a meal together under these circumstances.

For half a century the Pacific Northwest has survived economically through the exploitation of its raw materials, mainly lumber. But the trees are giving out. Sawmills and logging camps must penetrate ever deeper into the mountain ranges in search of standing timber. The region must develop new sources of employment and production. A Columbia Basin Authority, generating power and devising new means for using that power, would put thousands of people to work. The Northwest needs such a life-saver when the shipyards and airplane plants start to shut down.

Senator MITCHELL is aware of this. "The Pacific Northwest," he says, "cannot be allowed to relapse into a mere agricultural colony of the industrialized East. The function of the Columbia Basin Authority would be to plan the multiple-purpose resource projects of the region in such a way as to meet the challenge of the postwar period. Such an Authority is needed for the over-all development of this final American frontier."

No region is more susceptible to development than the Pacific Northwest. Twenty-five years ago a young New York State politician became aware of this fact. Riding down the Columbia River, he looked out the window of the Northern Pacific train taking him to Portland. That evening he told a crowd of 2,500 people, "Coming through today on the train has made me think pretty deeply. When you cross the Mountain States and that portion of the Coast States that lies well back from the ocean, you are impressed by those great stretches of physical territory now practically unused but destined some day to contain the homes of thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens like us, a territory to be developed by the Nation and for the Nation. As we were coming down the river today, I could not help thinking, as everyone does, of all that water running unchecked down to the sea."

The name of the politician who wrote these words was Franklin D. Roosevelt. Thus was the seed of the New Deal power policies planted.

The power policies of the Roosevelt administration begun by Roosevelt after Senator Norris, of Nebraska, had crusaded for public ownership for a generation, helped to make the Northwest power-conscious. Most of the average people in the region, now favor a Columbia Basin Authority. Supporters of the Mitchell bill include Republicans as well as Democrats. Rufus Woods, editor of the Wenatchee Daily World, life-long Republican and old friend of Col. Hugh Cooper, builder of the famous Dnieperstroy Dam, is conducting an intensive campaign for a Columbia Basin Authority.

Senator Mitchell a fighter

Many observers believe that the reappointment by President Truman of David E. Lilienthal as chairman of the TVA augurs well for the plans for both the MVA and CBA. Lilienthal has been the spiritual leader of the group seeking TVA-like agencies in other regions. His reappointment constitutes an important endorsement of his policies by the new President of the United States. Advocates of regional autonomy think that an organization patterned after the TVA should be set up as soon as possible in both the Missouri and Columbia Valleys.

Opponents of the Columbia Basin Authority claim that the agency would be a "superstate." Senator MITCHELL has wisely pointed out that the CBA would be precisely the opposite. It would decentralize power and sovereignty. Decisions would be reached in the Pacific Northwest and not in Washington, D. C., 3,000 miles away. MITCHELL faces a stiff battle, but he is a fighter. Like Senator JIM MURRAY, of Montana, proponent of MVA, the young Washington Senator is a liberal. He will not abandon bill S. 460 without putting up the struggle of his life.

GRANGE APPROVES S. 460—RESOLUTION FROM SEQUIM PRAIRIE GRANGE, NO. 1108

To the Honorable HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Whereas the interests of the people of the State of Washington demand that the power, reclamation, mineral, and industrial resources of the State be developed to the fullest possible extent and during the immediate postwar period, both the employment situation and the need for enlargement of the home market necessitate competent, early, and decisive action; and

Whereas the Federal Government has proven by progress in existing project development that only Federal resources are equal to successfully projecting such large enterprises; and realizing that neither State, local, or private agencies can provide the facilities necessary to this development, in order to coordinate the operations of existing agencies, and for the sake of unified and immediate action: Be it therefore

Resolved, That Sequim Prairie Grange, No. 1108, in regular session does endorse Senate bill 460 (Mitchell CVA bill) and urges its early passage, thus providing effective legal means for meeting this emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Washington delegation in Congress and to the Pamona Grange.

OSCAR L. NELSON, *Master.*
GEO. M. EBERLE, *Secretary.*

SEQUIM, WASH., *May 9, 1945.*

CVA HEARINGS ASKED

PORTLAND.—The Oregon State Grange committee on reclamation and irrigation has approved a resolution calling for congressional hearings in the Northwest before acting on plans for a Columbia Valley Authority.

Policies and Objectives of the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me giving an outline of the policies and objectives of the Disabled American Veterans' organization.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

(By Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, Senator, of Florida)

It is my privilege as a service disabled veteran of World War I to be a life member of

the Disabled American Veterans, and a member of its national legislative committee.

Recently, there was a meeting of the national legislative committee of the DAV, consisting of the Honorable Charles E. Pew, of Helena, Mont., an attorney at law, as chairman; Judge Robert S. Marx, of Cincinnati, Ohio, the first national commander of the DAV; the Honorable Jerry Voorhis, United States Representative from California; Dow V. Walker, of Newport, Oreg., chairman of the national finance committee of the DAV; and myself.

As a result of its deliberations, the DAV National Legislative Committee approved an outline of DAV policies and objectives, formulated by Millard W. Rice, national service director of the DAV, on the basis of the resolutions adopted at the organization's last national convention.

This outline emphasizes three principal points: (1) Preserve America and its freedoms; (2) promote welfare of dependents of service disabled; and (3) promote welfare of America's disabled defenders.

Under each of these principal points are a considerable number of specific objectives, after each of which there is indicated within parenthesis the identity of the legislative bill, if any, that has been introduced in Congress to accomplish such objectives.

A perusal of these objectives indicates the many glaring inadequacies, inequalities, and inequities which still exist in the laws pertaining to veterans, disabled veterans, and their dependents. Each of these objectives is of vast importance to those who would be affected by their fulfillment.

Too many of us in Congress have blandly assumed that the veteran laws in our statutes are already adequate to take care of their merited needs, but that apparently is not the case. May I make mention of the fact, for example, that no dependency allowances are provided for any of some 300,000 service-disabled veterans of World War I or for any of the pensioned veterans of World War II, as indicated in point III-D-1?

Enactment of all of the proposed legislation set forth in this outline of policies and objectives of the DAV should be a matter of first concern and consideration by Members of Congress.

We must not fail adequately to provide for those Americans who have sacrificed a part of their blood, or bodies, or health in the Nation's most hazardous employment in its armed forces during time of war.

The outline is here inserted, as follows:

"OUTLINE OF POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

"I. PRESERVE AMERICA AND ITS FREEDOMS

"A. Protect America:

"1. Collaborate with Allies to force, preserve peace.

"2. Maintain adequate specialized armed forces.

"3. Maintain a two-ocean Navy.

"4. Produce needed war matériel quickly.

"5. Mobilize America's manpower efficiently.

"6. One year training for all young men.

"B. Provide adequately for America's defenders and their dependents:

"1. Maintain adequate pay during service, supplemented by adequate postwar adjustments on an 'earned merits' basis. (H. R. 127, by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, now before the Committee on Ways and Means. Also H. R. 3537, by Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN and now before his Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.)

"2. Liberalize national service life insurance provisions. (H. R. 2359, by Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Referred to his committee. Also S. 650. R. 57, 62.)

"3. Establish Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Boards of Appeals and Reviews, with authority to revise discharge certificates. (Now in operation.)

"4. Medical records to be completely assembled before discharge.

"C. Eliminate excess profits from all-out war for freedom:

"1. Control purchasing power of United States money.

"2. Impose taxes in accordance with ability to pay.

"3. Regulate men, money, matériel, machines toward war victory.

"D. Perpetuate Americanism:

"1. Protect Americanism by its promotion.

"2. Promote workable representative democracy.

"3. Protect democratic institutions against subversive forces.

"(a) Have all persons fingerprinted, registered, and identified. (H. R. 601, by Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of Indiana. Referred to Committee on the Judiciary. A. 1.)

"(b) Issue certificates to all citizens. (H. R. 415, by Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN, of Minnesota. Referred to Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.)

"4. Extend citizenship to those who have faithfully served in our armed forces. (A. 2.)

"II. PROMOTE WELFARE OF DEPENDENTS OF SERVICE DISABLED

"A. Provide pension of $60 per month to widows of war veterans who have died by reason of service connected disability, or have suffered permanent total combat disability. (As to combat cases, H. R. 2047, by Mr. HAGEN (R. 72); as to service-connected cases, H. R. 328, by Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts (R. 19). Both bills now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.)

"B. Provide pension of $50 per month to widows of deceased war veterans who were suffering from service connected disability. (H. R. 3520, by Mrs. ROGERS, now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 73.)

"1. Eliminate 'needs' test. (H. R. 1496, by Hon. A. LEONARD ALLEN, of Louisiana; now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 33, 41.)

"C. Extend pensions to dependents of veterans who have suffered disabilities traceable to examinations, or hospital treatment, or vocational training. (H. R. 569, by Mr. RANKIN, and now before his Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 74.)

"D. Widows otherwise eligible for pensions to be eligible if married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death, or, if being married, she gave birth to a child by the veteran. (H. R. 2150, by Mr. HAGEN. Referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions. R. 34, 69.)

"E. Provide pensions to dependent parents of deceased service-connected disabled war veterans. (H. R. 2047, by Mr. HAGEN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 3732, by Mr. RANKIN, regardless of any other governmental income.)

"III. PROMOTE WELFARE OF AMERICA'S DISABLED DEFENDERS

"A. Keep Veterans' Administration primarily for disabled veterans and their dependents, and transfer other responsibilities to other agencies. R. 4, 18.)

"B. Extend Disabled American Veterans' services to all of America's disabled veterans and their dependents (N. S. Rept.):

"Through expended national and local service officers' set-up and by extensive educational publicity.

"C. Liberalize adjudication policies:

"1. Decentralize authority to readjudicate all claims, with right to sue after final denial. (H. R. 150 and H. J. Res. 192, by Hon. JERRY VOORHIS, of California, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also S. 1166, by Senator BUTLER before Senate Committee on Finance. R. 71.)

"2. Reinstate direct-service connections granted in 1933-34 by the President's Review Boards. (H. R. 559, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 2.)

"3. As to aggravations. (H. R. 1935, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 49, 65.)

"4. As to disability retirement benefits. (H. R. 1365, by Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana. Now before Committee on Military Affairs. R. 2, 67.)

"D. Increased monetary benefits for disabled defenders:

"1. Provide living-cost allowances for dependents of all compensated and pensioned disabled veterans. (H. R. 1872, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also S. 1031, by Senator ED JOHNSON. Now before Senate Committee on Finance. R. 17, 64.)

"2. Increase vocational-training pay. (H. R. 551 and H. R. 1872, by Mr. RANKIN. R. 64.)

"3. Increase compensation and pension payments by 10 percent for each 10 percent increase in the cost of living over 1940 figures. (H. R. 1291, by Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida. Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 14.)

"4. Extend 15 percent increase to statutory awards. (H. R. 1944, by Mr. RANKIN. Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 37.)

"5. Provide same compensation rates for World War II veterans as to World War I veterans. (H. R. 1936 and H. R. 3644, by Mr. RANKIN, and referred to his Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 2.)

"6. Provide minimum 10 percent rating for wounded or gassed veterans. (H. R. 138, by Mr. VOORHIS, and now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also S. 1164, by Senator HUGH BUTLER, referred to Committee on Finance. R. 1-5.)

"7. Increase basic ratings by 20 percent for each 5 years after age 40. (H. R. 1582, by Mr. VOORHIS. Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 16.)

"8. Restore full compensation to the so-called presumptives. (H. R. 575, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 18, 31.)

"9. Provide full compensation for single veterans while hospitalized. (H. R. 536, by Mr. PETERSON, and referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also H. R. 3712, by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, now before his Committee on Invalid Pensions. R. 23.)

"10. Increase pensions to war veterans with permanent total non-service-connected disabilities to $60 per month. (H. R. 1451, by Mr. VOORHIS, of California. Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 9.)

"1. Authorize payment of compensation for partial service-connected disability plus the percentage of pension for permanent total disability (nonservice) equal to the difference between 100 percent and his degree of service-connected disability. H. R. 555, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 13.)

"12. Increase pension to service-disabled regulars to 90 percent of wartime rates. (H. R. 279, by Mr. LESINSKI; referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. R. 2.)

"13. Increase attendant's allowance to $75 per month. (H. R. 1933, by Mr. RANKIN; now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 28.)

"E. Liberalize Veterans' Administration determinations:

"1. Facilitate and expedite adjudications of claims of disabled veterans. R. 5, 25.)

"2. Determine permanent and total disability on individual ability to follow any substantially gainful occupation. (H. R. 106, by Mr. VOORHIS; referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 10.)

"3. Eliminate statutory limitations as to applications for benefits. (H. R. 1365 and H. R. 3762 by Mr. BROOKS, as to disabled emer-

gency officers' retirement benefits; referred to Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1702, by Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, as to decorations, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1124, by Hon. FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, as to adjusted compensation. Now before the Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1932, by Mr. RANKIN, as to veterans' benefits and referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 67.)

"4. Limit misconduct bar to willful or felonious misconduct. (H. R. 560 by Mr. RANKIN, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 20.)

"5. Adjudicate claims retroactively according to facts. (H. R. 564, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 70.)

"6. Forfeit benefits only where evidence is clearly not sufficient, but subject those guilty of fraud to fine or imprisonment. (H. R. 500, by Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina. Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 22.)

"7. Extend time within which to make appeal from decisions of rating agencies. (H. R.695, by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 66.)

"8. Provide minimum rating of 1 percent for veterans noted as having some disability at time of discharge. (H. R. 1495, by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana; referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 12.)

"9. Reduce permanent ratings only for fraud or gross error. (H. R. 1579, by Mr. RANKIN, and referred to his Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 11.)

"F. Liberalize insurance benefits:

"1. Reduce interest on Government insurance policy loans to 3½ percent. (S. 447, by Senator BROOKS. Rept. 364, by Senate Committee on Finance after having passed Senate on June 21, now before House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 2.)

"2. Permit suit on any Government life-insurance policy at any time. (H. R. 1293, by Mr. PETERSON, and now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.)

"3. Insurance judgments to be binding upon Veterans' Administration until modified by court order. (H. R. 722, by Hon. JOHN S. GIBSON, of Georgia; referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 58.)

"4. Make Government life-insurance policies incontestable after 1 year and return premiums on cancelled policies. (H. R. 533, by Mr. RANKIN Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 2.)

"5. Continue permanent total disability insurance protection to veterans who have received 240 or more monthly installments of insurance benefits. (H. R. 554, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 59.)

"G. Facilitate suitable employment of service disabled:

"1. Require Veterans' Administration to reimburse all State Workmen's Compensation costs as to service-connected disabled veteran employees. (H. R. 1533, by Mr. RANKIN; referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. E. 6.)

"2. Extend effective preference for veterans, their wives, and widows, for all Government employment for which qualified. (H. R. 3256, as to disability retirement, by Mr. RAMSPECK. Passed by House on July 3, H. Rept. 757. Now before Senate Committee on Civil Service.)

"3. Extend full vocational training and suitable employment to all handicapped service veterans (H. R. 562, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. E. 3, 4, 5, 7.)

"4. Exempt disabled veterans deemed to be a risk to civil-service retirement fund from the provisions of such act, and then cover them into the social-security retirement provisions. (H. R. 314, by Mr. MCMILLAN; referred to Committee on Civil Service. E. 11.)

"5. Provide optional civil-service retirement after 25 years of Federal employment. (H. R. 74, by Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts. Now before Committee on Civil Service. E. 8, 9.)

"6. Credit vocational training for civil-service retirement. (H. R. 1893, by Hon. PAT CANNON, of Florida. Now before Committee on Civil Service. E. 10.)

"7. Extend preference and credit to war veterans as to purchase of surplus property. (L. 3.)

"8. Extend credit for time lost by reason of service-connected disability for railroad retirement purposes. L. 4.)

"H. Eliminate existing inequalities and inequities as among various similar groups of disabled veterans and their dependents, and uniformize administrative provisions. R. 2.)

"1. As to useless limbs. (H. R. 2254, by Mr. BROOKS. Referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

"2. Compensation and pension defined. (H. R. 1938, by Mr. RANKIN and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.)

"3. As to number of dependents. (H. R. 561, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.)

"4. As to children. (H. R. 582, by Mrs. ROGERS. Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.)

"5. As to parents. (H. R. 556, by Mr. RANKIN, and now before World War Veterans' Committee.)

"6. As to statutory awards. (H. R. 3644, by Mr. RANKIN, H. Rept. 934, by World War Veterans' Committee. Passed by House on July 20. Reported by Senate Committee on Finance, H. Rept. 549, on July 20, 1945.)

"I. Needed hospitalization, domiciliary care, and out-patient treatment to be available for all veterans with service-connected disabilities. (R. 26, 27.) S. 1203, by Senator JOHNSON.

"J. Additional Veterans' Administration facilities according to veteran population needs: (H. R. 1422, by Hon. JOE E. BATES, of Kentucky; now before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 2.)

"K. Liberalize adjunct treatments and dental treatment. (R. 30.)

"L. Provide miscellaneous benefits:

"1. Liberalize State laws and appropriations affecting veterans and their dependents and their organizations. (N. S. D. Rept.)

"2. September 8, 1939, beginning of World War II. (H. R. 1945, by Mr. RANKIN, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.)

"3. WAAC to have same status as WAC. (H. R. 1405, by Hon Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico. Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 3.)

"4. Extend adjusted compensation for World War I provisional officers. (H. R. 1161, by Mr. CARLSON, referred to Committee on Ways and Means. R. 21.)

"5. Issue new Adjusted Service Certificates for those not recoverable. (H. R. 1162, by Mr. CARLSON. Now before Committee on Ways and Means. R. 2.)

"6. Orthopedic appliances for all veterans who need them. (H. R. 1581, by Mr. RANKIN. Referred to Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 3.)

"7. National war memorial auditorium in the Nation's Capital. (H. R. 770, by Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California. Referred to Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. L. 2.)

"8. Increase burial allowance to $200. (H. R. 1939, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. R. 78.)

"9. National cemetery in every State. (H. R. 1273, by Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas. Referred to Committee on Military Affairs. L. 1.)

"10. Veterans' Administration to conduct research re tuberculosis and other ailments. (R. 34.)

"11. Liberalize eligibility for mustering-out payments. (H. R. 731, by Hon. BERNARD W. KEARNEY, of New York. Referred to Committee on Military Affairs. R. 36.)

"12. Chiropractic and osteopathic adjustments to be available for treatment of veterans. (R. 80.)

"13. Incompetents to be transferred with two attendants with all costs plus $5 per day per attendant. (R. 79.)

"14. Exempt allotments by servicemen, as well as Veterans' Administration pensions, as income for old-age assistance purposes. (L. 5.)"

This comprehensive, well-integrated program of policies and objectives of the Disabled American Veterans looks toward the best welfare of those who must continue for the rest of their lives to pay the price of patriotism—the Nation's war disabled veterans and their dependents, and the dependents of our war dead—and at the same time having in mind the best welfare of our country.

We help to protect, preserve, and promote America and the workability of its representative form of government in the final analysis by providing adequately for the welfare of America's disabled defenders.

To the end that deserving disabled veterans of all of America's wars, and their dependents, may be properly informed, advised, and assisted as to their rights, and as how technically to establish their entitlement to governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled, the DAV has long been maintaining the largest staff of any of the national veteran organizations of full-time nationally paid national service officers—located in most of the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

Its Nation-wide set-up of trained service officers is now being speedily expanded through its sponsorship of a specialized vocational training course, whereby handicapped disabled veterans of World War II are becoming full-time employees of the DAV as national service officers. This training program, under Public Law No. 16, consists of two 12-week semesters, with 1 week's vacation between semesters, at the American University, 1901 F Street NW., Washington D. C., followed up by on-the-job placement training—learning by doing—of up to 6 months under the supervision of each of three different experienced national DAV service officers located in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

During the course of this vocational training, the trainees receive monthly maintenance allowance from the Veterans' Administration of $92 per month, plus $11.50 for a wife, and plus $5.75 for each minor child or dependent parent—which the DAV is now trying to persuade Congress should be increased up to a basic training allowance of $115 per month, plus $25 for a wife, $15 for the first child, $12 for the second child, and $10 for each additional child or dependent parent, as per the provisions of S. 1301, introduced by Senator ED. JOHNSON, of Colorado and now before his subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, of the Senate Finance Committee.

While at the American University, the DAV supplements the Veterans' Administration allowance by an additional $25 per month, and increases that up to $50 per month after the trainees have started their placement training, with gradual increases thereafter according to their relative merits.

Four groups of trainees have so far been enrolled at the American University. The

next group will matriculate on August 20, and thereafter an additional group of up to 50 will enroll every 13 weeks, until 400 or more handicapped veterans of World War II have thus launched their career of service to the human aftermath of America's wars.

Every veteran of any of America's wars who has been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled, by reason of his active service in America's armed forces, or in the armed forces of one of its allies, during time of war, is eligible for membership in this exclusive congressionally chartered association, the Disabled American Veterans.

Every disabled war veteran ought to support the legislative and service activities of the DAV by becoming one of its paid-up active members, preferably as a life member. If born prior to January 1, 1902, an eligible may become a life member upon payment of $50, or, if born thereafter, $100, payable in cash, or by a down payment of $5, plus such installments as will complete its full payment by the end of the next succeeding fiscal year, which would now be June 30, 1947, after which there would be a carrying charge of $5 per year until the full amount had been paid.

About 40 percent of all of the members of the DAV, located in its some 900 chapters throughout the country, are fully paid or partially paid life members. Now, while jobs are still plentiful, is the advisable time for eligibles to become fully paid life members of the DAV so that their own organization can continue, during the lean years of the postwar peacetime reconversion period, to render all needed service to, for, and by America's disabled defenders.

Application and payment for DAV life membership should be sent to my good friend, Mr. Vivian D. Corbly, national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, 1423 E. McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio.

Revival of Silver Money Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, some time ago, as a result of negotiations with the Secretary of the Treasury, 300,000,000 ounces of Treasury free silver were monetized, or else they will be monetized as needed by the Treasury. I predicted on the floor of the Senate, when word of that fact came from the Treasury, that it would add prestige to silver as money throughout the entire world. I hold in my hand an Associated Press dispatch from London indicating that the British have taken cognizance of what has been done in the United States and are predicting a revival of silver money throughout the world. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of July 21, 1945]

LONDON SEES REVIVAL OF SILVER MONEY USE

LONDON, July 20.—The Financial News Friday forecast a revival of monetary use of silver during the next few years, but the newspaper added it seemed unlikely that this would mean adoption of bimetallism proper in many countries.

"To a large degree silver has been remonetized in the East and the trend of evolution in the near future points toward its partial remonetization also in the West," the News said.

"The decline of the gold reserve of the United States and expansion of credit have materially reduced the gold surplus and it would not be surprising to see a growing use of silver as a metallic reserve."

ADDITIONAL CURRENCY

The article cited the statement made in the United States Senate on July 18 that additional currency will be issued against 300,000,000 ounces of silver as a modest beginning which may be followed by arrangements covering larger amounts.

"In European liberated countries, too, there may be a good demand for silver currency," the News continued. The price of gold has reached prohibitive levels in black markets and the available gold supply even at such high prices is limited.

"Amid prevailing uncertainty and distrust, silver coins would be regarded as second best to gold coins and their issue would go some way to meet currency difficulties in continental countries."

Throughout the east and Middle East, "there is insatiable demand for silver as an alternative to gold," the paper added.

SILVER USE REVIVAL

"It seems reasonable to expect a revival of the monetary use of silver during the next few years," it said, but predicted that "it seems unlikely that any return to monetary use of silver would lead, in many countries, to adoption of bimetallism proper by way of a fixed ratio between gold and silver."

"There is much to be said for including silver in metallic reserves. The gold position will be none too easy during the coming years. If central banks were to accept imported silver freely at a market price, that would facilitate, to some extent, the problems of settling adverse trade balances."

United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials relating to the United Nations Charter—two from the New York Times, one from the Philadelphia Record, one from the Philadelphia Inquirer, one from the New York Herald Tribune, and one from the Chicago Sun.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 30, 1945]

ABROAD—TWO VOTES THAT REPRESENT REVERSALS OF POLICY

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The most striking feature of the British election was not the victory of labor. It was that no one had any idea what was going on in the mind of the electorate. The winning party was as stunned as the losers. Labor leaders admit they had no cabinet slate prepared because they had not thought beyond the campaign. The landslide was as much a surprise to Mr. Attlee as it was to Mr. Churchill. It astounded everybody—the pollers of public opinion, the political commentators, the outside world, the British themselves.

The voters cheered Churchill—and voted him out of office. Two Laborites who are now members of the cabinet told the writer early this year that political apathy was so profound in Britain they hoped there would be no election for at least a year after the war. "Then we are sure to win," they said, "but not before." Yet beneath that show of apathy a political revolution was brewing that swept out the war government—the government of victory—while the conflict is still on.

The politicians simply did not know the state of public opinion. And if this is true in England, where people are free to express themselves, where all the means for sampling sentiment are not only available but of vital concern to office seekers, how can anyone be sure how people feel in the rest of Europe?

AMERICA DEFINITELY COMMITTED

During the San Francisco Conference it was remarked that few of the delegations engaged in drafting the blueprint for a postwar security system had a direct or at least a recent mandate from the people. The exception was the United States, whose delegates spoke for a government that had been returned in a Nation-wide election 5 months before. Since that plebiscite was a decisive endorsement of Roosevelt's foreign policy, the Americans had a clear commission to carry out the work of organization the late President initated. As the all but unanimous approval of the Senate proves, the Charter expresses American policy; the Senate vote is merely a confirmation of the popular vote last November.

In San Francisco this Nation had a fresher, more definite commitment than any other to a program of international cooperation for peace, and the Senate has made that commitment as official as it can be made. The vote constitutes a reversal of American policy in foreign affairs quite as decisive as the reversal of British policy in the domestic field. As far as world policy is concerned, indeed, the Senate vote is more important than the English election, for while the latter may strengthen the left parties in Europe generally and weight British decisions in those international questions where the conflict is between right and left, the Senate action assures the world that American power is from now on a certain quantity in the balance. It means that the American point of view is a permanent factor in all the problems of world reorganization.

TRUMAN STRENGTHENED

This should strengthen President Truman's hand at Potsdam by enabling him to speak with authority not only on immediate issues out in charting plans for the future. Our attitude toward every settlement must be firmer and more far-sighted, and must also have more influence on others, when they and we are certain that we are responsible for carrying out these settlements over a long range of time. In San Francisco it did not matter much that the delegate represented holdover or precarious regimes, because they could also be sure that the most diverse elements in every nation were for a plan for world security. But when it comes to concrete solutions, Mr. Attlee can be surer of support at home than the 10-year-old government of Mr. Churchill. And though the Senate vote was pretty well known in advance, Mr. Truman no longer needs to counter arguments based on doubts that America will be there to maintain the decisions she supports.

Will the labor government increase Russian confidence in Britain? The answer will appear first in places where British and Soviet interests meet—Iran, Turkey, Greece—and where Russian distrust is most manifest. Will labor be more inclined to support Russian policy in central and eastern Europe? This is not so certain; the Socialist definition of democracy, freedom of information, human rights, is very different from the Soviet definition. Perhaps the Laborites will be more persuasive than the Conservatives in settling these differences.

The main question, however, is what kind of peace the peoples of the world will support. The British election strongly suggests that this is the unknown quantity in the great equation the Big Three are trying to work out. There is no doubt about popular backing for the United Nations Charter; no government, elected or not, would go against the tide by repudiating a scheme for security, especially a scheme sponsored by the United States, for most nations, if they could vote on it, would say what people in Europe are always saying to the Americans they meet: "We want the kind of peace you want."

This fact we cannot evade. The importance of the Senate ratification is that it puts American power not only behind the Charter but behind the peace settlements the security system is created to maintain. No one will believe that this action on our part does not strengthen our influence and therefore increase our responsibility for whatever decisions have been made at Potsdam or will be made hereafter.

[From the New York Times of July 30, 1945]

THE CHARTER

A great task begun by Woodrow Wilson and carried on by Franklin Roosevelt has now been brought to its completion. With the Senate's all but unanimous approval of the Charter of the United Nations, this country takes its place at last, after long years first of opposition, then of doubt, and finally of conversion, in the front ranks of a new international organization dedicated to enforce peace and uphold law and order. The vision of Wilson, the leadership of Roosevelt, and the steadfast faith of many of their countrymen that a day would come at last when the United States would be ready to assume the responsibilities that fall naturally to a great world power, are honored in the Senate vote.

That vote is all the more decisive, and the more reassuring, because it settles not only the question of American participation in the new league of nations but the question of how our participation is to be made effective. This was the only point in doubt in the debate. Ratification itself was certain, in view of the great popular support behind the Charter. But the question was raised whether this vote in the Senate would be the final and decisive test, or whether a new legislative battle would have to be fought at a later date, when the issue arose of making good on the enforcement provisions of the Charter embodied in articles 43 and 45.

Article 43 provides that all members of the United Nations shall "undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces * * * necessary for the purpose of maintaining peace and security." And article 45 provides, as a corollary, that all members "shall hold immediately available national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action." The question was raised in the Senate whether these agreements would have to take the form of treaties, to be ratified in each instance by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, which would give great powers of obstruction to a small minority and make our effective participation in the enforcement work of the new organization a matter of grave doubt; or whether, having ratified the Charter, and having promised to "undertake" to make armed forces "available" on call to the Security Council, we were therefore morally and, in fact, legally bound by this commitment—in which case all future agreements in this field should properly be handled, not as if they were new treaties but as if they were matters of domestic legislation, to be determined by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

All doubts on this point were removed by the message sent from Potsdam by President Truman on the last day of the debate and before the vote was taken. Noting that many Members of Congress had expressed the opinion that action on future military agreements under the Charter could be taken either by the treaty method or by the majority vote of both Houses, and noting further that many Members had agreed that the initiative in this choice rested with the President, Mr. Truman announced his own position in the matter. This was a clear declaration of his intention to submit any and all agreements of this nature to a majority vote of both Houses.

This intervention in the debate was a wise act of statesmanship. It made clear, in advance of the Senate's action, the purposes of the administration and its interpretation of the proper method of fulfilling American responsibilities under the Charter. It removed all possible ground for later doubts and accusations of double dealing. It told the Senate plainly that it was voting not only to ratify the Charter but to make it work. And it was after this plain notice had been given, and when the issue had been made unmistakably clear that the Senate cast its vote of 89 to 2.

The size of this vote, the promptness with which it was taken, and, above all, the fact that it followed the President's statement offer convincing evidence of the near unanimity of American opinion on the necessity of international action to keep the peace. A decision of immense importance has been firmly made. It redeems the promises of Wilson. It rewards the leadership of Roosevelt. It affirms, and does its best to safeguard, the deep interest of the American people in a lasting peace. It will give strength and encouragement to the friends of international cooperation all over the world.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of July 30, 1945]

THIS TIME AMERICA LEADS ON ROAD TO WORLD PEACE

From its very beginning our Nation has led the world in giving freedom to its citizens.

Our Constitution—particularly our Bill of Rights—has been the standard for judging the efforts of other nations to reach democratic self-government.

Now the United States takes the lead in moving toward world peace.

We have become the first of the Big Five to ratify the United Nations' Charter.

Only two small Central American nations, Nicaragua and El Salvador, preceded us. Britain, France, Russia, and China have yet to act. Their ratification is considered sure, but ours is the honor of being first.

The size of the vote in the Senate, traditional stronghold of isolation, will bring rejoicing in Potsdam. President Truman can turn to his Big Three conferees, Premier Stalin and Britain's new Prime Minister Attlee, and say:

"America has come through. Only two votes in our Senate were against the Charter, and 89 in favor. You can forget your fears now that we will retreat again into isolation."

Ratification by the Senate brings nearer to realization the dreams and planning of two of America's great Presidents.

Twenty-six years ago this month President Wilson returned from Paris with the League of Nations, which he called the only hope of mankind.

He asked the Senate: "Dare we reject it and break the heart of the world?"

We know the Senate, after 9 months of debate, did reject the League. We know what happened.

In June of last year President Roosevelt presented the American plan to keep the postwar world at peace through an international organization backed by force of arms, if necessary. It included an organization of all peace-loving nations and a world council of the Big Four and other nations.

That Roosevelt plan became the blueprint for Dumbarton Oaks later in the year. Dumbarton Oaks became the blueprint for the final drafting of the Charter at San Francisco this spring.

It was Roosevelt who told us, after his return from Yalta, where the Dumbarton plan was modified:

"Twenty-five years ago American fighting men looked to the statesmen of the world to finish the work of peace for which they fought and suffered. We failed them then. We cannot fail them again and expect the world again to survive."

That we have not failed our American fighting men is due in large part to Roosevelt's vision and to his political strategy in choosing congressional leaders for the delegates to San Francisco. Wilson had the vision. He lacked the political acumen.

President Truman has shown wisdom, too, in following the pattern set by Roosevelt.

And he made a brilliant move of his own in telling the Senate on Saturday—before the vote on ratification was taken—that military agreements to put teeth into the new Organization would be submitted to both Houses of Congress.

That means one-third of the Senate will not be permitted to defeat the will of the people by refusing to give the United Nations the force it must have.

The Senate isolationists were smoked out—all but two of them. Their plan of flank attack failed.

The price of world peace, like that of liberty at home, will be eternal vigilance.

Even when the new organization begins functioning, we have no panacea.

We have an organization stronger in some respects—as in having its own armed forces—than the old League. In some respects it is weaker—as in the veto power possessed by all of the Big Five.

But we do have an international organization in which for the first time all the major peace-loving powers are joined. We have made a start. We the peoples of the United Nations must make it work.

We are proud that the United States was the first to lift the torch, that the Statue of Liberty has become a symbol of bringing peace as well as liberty to the world.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of July 30, 1945]

CHARTER RATIFIED—NOW MAKE IT WORK

With ratification of the United Nations Charter by the Senate, July 28 has become a memorable date in our country's history.

Natural gratification over the fact that the United States is the first of the Big Five to take this forward step on the path to world peace is more than a merely sentimental feeling.

It is further and still stronger evidence than had yet been afforded of the long way America has come from its traditional disinclination to assume its full share of responsibility in world affairs and, specifically, in the most important duty of all: prevention of future wars.

It was also in July, in 1919, that President Wilson submitted the Versailles Treaty, with the League of Nations Covenant, to the Senate. More than 8 months later, after bitter debate, the Senate rejected the treaty.

This time it has taken the Senate less than a month to affix its seal of approval on America's wholehearted participation in an international organization to enforce peace.

A quarter of a century ago opposing Senators sought to attach four reservations and nearly twoscore amendments to the proposed treaty with its League of Nations appendage.

The country has just witnessed ratification of the United Nations Charter after only 6 days of debate, if such it could be called. The final vote, 89 to 2, not counting pairs or the announcement of 2 absentees that they would have voted aye if present, contrasts with the Senate vote of 49 to 35 in 1920, which constituted 7 less than the required two-thirds majority.

It is well to keep in mind that word "promising." No charter or treaty is worth more than the spirit in which its adherents subscribe to its provisions. It is an oversimplification of the contrast between our attitude in 1920 and in 1945 to say that then we were a "hermit Nation," indifferent to what might happen to others so long as we were let alone.

We are taking a broader view of our responsibilities today, but there is a vast difference between the basic organization of the old League of Nations and the new international set-up on which such high hopes are fixed.

The difference is largely between an organization with power to enforce peace through curbing would-be aggressors before they can get started and one whose fatal defect was its fundamental weakness.

Some critics of this new Organization have seemed to base their opposition on the contention that it is too strong in the powers accorded or to be assumed by a few big nations.

Such a suggestion evinces a lack of confidence in the purposes of the nations that have borne the brunt of the greatest war in history and are resolved that their people shall never again have to endure a like calamity.

It is to be recognized, of course, that our approval of the United Nations Charter, to be followed, it is to be hoped, by the other nations' early action, is only the first definite step along a path that may be beset with many obstacles.

What our Senate has done, speaking for the American people, is to give an earnest of our good intentions. The Charter itself is not self-acting. It does not guarantee world peace. To make it work there must be effective machinery, and even then everything will depend on the spirit which animates the subscribing members.

But America has hastened to show her good faith and now looks to the others to pledge their equal cooperation in promoting and insuring peace for all nations.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 30, 1945]

THE CHARTER IS RATIFIED

The all but unanimous vote with which the Senate on Saturday gave its solemn assent to the Charter of the United Nations is a measure of many things. It is a measure of the careful statesmanship which has from the beginning gone into the creation of this great international instrument. It is a measure of the skill and clarity with which the problem was early realized, reduced to its essentials and patiently developed through a long process of debate and conference to which Congress and public, the administration and its political opponents, our own Nation and our allies were all made full party. The American leaders from whom the strongest initial impulse came—President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull—shaped the negotiation with patience and realism; Allied statesmanship rose to high levels at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco in building the structure, and one has to study the Charter carefully to appreciate all the ingenuity, reasonable compromise, and hard thought which went into it.

Mistakes were doubtless made along the way, but in many respects the making of this document was a model in international action, and the Senate's vote is a measure of the technical excellence of the process. Undeniably, it is a measure, also, of the fact that the Charter deliberately refrains from attempting too much. The bitter controversies of 25 years ago have been avoided, in part, by eliminating controversial issues. This Charter assumes the world as it actually exists today rather than attempting to build a new one. At every point it safeguards the national sovereignty, the independence of action, the national interest and right of self-defense and of veto of the great powers as these things now exist; while even the pressures which it might put in fact upon the smaller sovereignties hardly differ from those to which they are in practice subject today. The Charter does not offer a new world; it offers simply a machinery and organization through which the nations may build one, gradually and firmly, if they so desire. The many difficult issues which that task must raise have been wisely left to the future, when they can be better attacked as they come; but it follows that one reason why the Charter itself has awakened so little opposition is the fact that there is so little in it to oppose.

Yet the Senate's overwhelming vote is a measure of something more than this—something more than either modesty of aim or skill in negotiation and drafting. It is a measure of the compelling power of the great lesson taught by the last 25 years of world history. It is a measure of the depth of the American people's conviction that a new international world, which will avert these vast, recurrent holocausts of humanity, must be built. It is a measure of the popular resolve that no trivial obstructions, no exaggerated fears, no remote or minor risks, must be allowed this time to confuse or halt the progress of the great work of peace. The Charter may be only a mechanism, but the Senate, in casting 89 votes for its ratification, was recording the tremendous strength of the popular determination not only to see such a mechanism established, but to accept the costs and risks of operating it. Because of that determination, the United States, which was never able to ratify the last great experiment in international order, becomes the first to ratify this new effort. It is a good augury of ultimate success in the arduous task to which we now pledge our faith as a people.

[From the Chicago Sun of July 27, 1945]

AN ASSIST BY LUCAS

To Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, fell the honor of retrieving a Connally bungle in the United Nations Charter debate.

Senator CONNALLY had allowed the impression to gain ground that future legislation placing American forces at the disposal of the Security Council must take the form of a treaty, and so be subject to defeat by one-third of the Senate plus one. John Foster Dulles, who is supposed to be a great legal expert, had reinforced the impression by representing the American delegation to San Francisco as backing the treaty viewpoint.

The form of legislation to implement the Charter cannot be fixed now, but it is important that nothing in the current debate prejudice that decision when the time comes to make it. Senator LUCAS kept the way open for passage of the implementing legislation by the proper method, majority vote of both Houses. He forced an admission from Mr. Dulles that this method is not excluded by any opinions of the delegation. He thereby demolished the claim that the Senate, in adopting the Charter, would automatically retain a one-third-plus-one veto over the enabling legislation.

The Senate now knows that this minority veto power is not implicit in future Charter legislation. It knows that adoption of the Charter represents a firm commitment to carry out its terms, which include the provision of armed forces to the Security Council. For making this point clear, Senator LUCAS deserves the country's thanks.

America in the Age of Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at Richmond, Ind., at the dedication of the airport there on July 4, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mayor Britten, officials of Richmond and Wayne Counties, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am proud and happy to be here today. Proud to be a part of this ceremony marking another epoch of progress for this section of Indiana. Happy to see and visit again with old Indiana friends and acquaintances and to clasp new hands in fellowship.

We are gathered here today to dedicate this new $1,000,000 Richmond Municipal Airport. We all have good reason to believe that this dedicatory ceremony is only the beginning of a more glorious and more prosperous future for this section; that, as time passes, this airport will become a mighty link in the chain of national air transportation.

It is difficult for us today to think—as we must—of peacetime aviation programs, of postwar plans, of building our personal and community fortunes, while out on Okinawa, out in the Philippines, out on lonely islands whose names we do not know, our sons and brothers and husbands and fathers are fighting bloody battles against a tenacious and determined foe.

Nor would we want to forget the tremendous price that has been paid by thousands of precious lives which have made this auspicious occasion possible.

We might strive to erase that vision from our minds, for a moment, but we all know—every man and woman among us—that we cannot forget them today, we will not forget them tomorrow.

I must first pay tribute to those Indianans—to those Americans—who are far from home and cannot be with us today to witness this mark of progress. We do it in their names—in the name of the soldiers of the Republic.

The American soldier is not animated by the hope of plunder or the love of conquest. He fights today to preserve this homestead of liberty and that his children might be free.

Our soldiers have relighted the torch of liberty and are filling the world again with light. They are, today, as they have been in every generation, the saviors of the Nation and the liberators of men.

And at what tremendous cost! On the day opening the Seventh War Loan drive, thousands of serious-minded people watched on the Capitol Plaza in Washington the reenactment by a squad of the same marines of the raising of the American flag on Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima. In the throng stood

two others who had been on Iwo Jima—sick, weary, and solemn. One of them turned and said to a bystander, "Woman, do you know it took a hell of a lot of dying to do that?"

I can never forget the picture of the carload after carload of strong young men—without arms or legs—who were in the motorcade of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on his triumphal tour through Washington recently, and I hope I may never forget the words General Eisenhower spoke with such feeling in his address to Congress: "The portion of humility must be great in a man who comes to such honor by the blood and sacrifice of so many friends and fellow men." I thought then—as I think now—that we can never do too much for men who have given so much for us.

Let us never forget all those who went out—the living and the dead, the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor—to prove that when freedom was an issue, the American people have never faltered, they have never failed.

Let us—as we dedicate this great airport—rededicate ourselves to those principles, to those ideals and ideas, for which our sons, our fathers, our brothers, and our husbands are risking their lives today.

It is of more significance than a mere coincidence of the calendar that this dedication is made on this great day in the history of our country. One hundred and sixty-nine years ago, a group of stalwart Americans signed the Declaration of Independence, proclaiming to all the world that here in this land of the great frontier, men would make secure their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Few there were, in other nations, who in those days felt that this representative government, formed so inconspicuously, with few factories, and with little material wealth, would long survive.

In other lands—in Athens and in Rome and in Jerusalem—men had dreamed the dream of establishing liberty and justice for all. But no representative government in recorded history has been able to survive both the storms of adversity and the sunshine of prosperity for long. The pages of history are littered with the records of broken governments formed by men trying to find a government that would satisfy both the selfish and the unselfish, the rich and the poor, the fearless and the fearful.

Yet, the seeds of that little Republic, formed 169 years ago in the dark and troublous seas of monarchies, dictatorships, and alliances, fell on fallow ground. That Republic founded of the people, by the people, and for the people expanded over this great land. As the years passed, as the decades rolled on, the words of Alexander Hamilton became a prophecy: "This country and this people were made for each other." Soon that Republic stretched, as we have sung many times, from sea to shining sea.

Again in a larger sense is this occasion fraught with great significance. The spirit of America soars today far beyond the borders set by the two great oceans. Because of the inventions born in this very section, because of the men who were nurtured in this very soil, America's spirit has taken wings.

Not many years ago, although the airplane had been invented in America, we were lagging in aviation development as a nation. Only 5 years ago today, Hitler's dreaded Stukas and his Heinkels and his Messerschmidts were pouring out lead and bombs on hapless England. France already had fallen beneath the onslaughts of the merciless German attack.

Then Americans took heed. They knew it was time to prepare. American industry, American workingmen, American farmers—working in an unbeatable team—began to unsheath the sword and to reveal the might of America. The dictators, as they always had in the past, overplayed their hand. They decided to take on America. Well did Winston Churchill, standing before our Congress, ask a question that still burns in my memory: "What manner of men do they think we are, anyway?"

In the years that have passed, the dictators have found out what manner of men we are. We turned out airplanes first by the dozens, then by the hundreds, then by the thousands and then by the tens of thousands. The world has never seen anything like it. Tomorrow's would-be dictators will long remember what America did when the test came.

America's mighty spirit took wing in 1942, when the vanguard of our air armadas swept across the skies of stricken France, pummelled the very heart of Germany. That day the first American airmen went into Germany, showing the arrogant Hitler and the dope-fiend Goering the potential strength of our industrial might—that day, the war was won against Germany. For that day, the American airmen figuratively had written over the skies of Berlin—"Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting."

We won that victory—as we will bring the Jap warlords to their knees—because of our American system. Let that truth impress itself on us today. Let every thoughtful person realize that the winning of this war began with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

The system of government organized under those documents made possible, in this country, the greatest moral and spiritual and material development ever witnessed in any nation in any period. That Constitution made possible, in a real sense, the invention of the modern airplane. It made possible the development and production of airplanes of such might and speed that Germany was destroyed and that will destroy Japan too if she persists in her mad folly of resistance. That constitution created and kept in existence the kind of a country that made men want to do new things—and let them try new things. Freedom and flight are interconnected. Men could not fly until they could dream and work to fly. They could not do creative work well unless they were free. Therefore, this great accomplishment in the realm of aviation is due as much to the charter of our liberty as it is to the blueprints of modern mechanical master minds.

Stalin, that enigmatical ruler of Soviet Russia, paid an unconscious tribute to our very freedom when, at Teheran, he uttered these words: "A toast to American production, without which our victories would not be possible." It was freedom, under the law, to work and strive together that made that production possible. It was the American industrialist, the American workingman, the American farmer working and fighting together—unbeaten and unbeatable—turning out a volume of war material never imagined possible even by the most fantastic dreamers.

Miracles have been performed in developments of new techniques both of production of airplanes and of performance in the planes themselves. But greatest of all has been the development of the wonderful skill of the thousands of American youths in their ability to pilot these great planes with unerring direction 35,000 feet in the stratosphere at a speed of 400 miles per hour. They symbolize the vision and daring of our youth for the America of tomorrow.

Now we know today, as the men knew who helped develop aviation here in Richmond to its present importance, that the airplane is destined to play a great part in peace as in war, in education, in science, in industry, as in travel, and in better understanding between peoples and nations.

Many, many years ago Quakers brought to Richmond—to Indiana—the first message of tolerance and good will. Is it too much to hope that airplanes from this very field—from every field in our Nation—will carry the same message of good will of America to all the world, and that we will not in our lifetime, and, it is to be fondly hoped, never again witness the ravages and horrors of a world war. It should be our prayer today that this field will be used as a symbolical nest for the doves of peace, not as a breeding place for the birds of war.

Alfred Tennyson, the great British poet and prophet, in Locksley Hall, said:

"I foresee—
* * * the heavens filled with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew,
From the nations' airy navies, grappling in the central blue;
Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging through the thunderstorm.
Till the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furled,
In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World."

We have encouragement today to believe that Tennyson saw clearly and indeed with a prophetic eye that the airplane would bring wars, then a "parliament of man," a "federation of the world." This present terrible war has impressed the civilized peoples of the world as never before of the dangers they incur by not working in peace to prevent war. Never have the people of this Nation been possessed of such a passion for enduring peace as has now laid hold on us.

We of the United States Senate are now, as you all know, charged with the mighty responsibility of passing judgment upon the Charter formed by delegates of fifty nations in deliberative assembly for several weeks at San Francisco. The Charter they formulated there is not perfect. It does represent the common denominator of the thinking of almost all of the peace-loving nations of the world. It may not be a long step but it is a step toward world cooperation for the solution of the problems which might lead to war. To reject it would be to return to the wilderness of international confusion and chaos. To accept it is to place ourselves on the pathway to understanding and peace. To reject it would be to falter along the way of fear, suspicion and hate. To accept it is to follow the beacon light of trust and hope and confidence.

This proposed Charter allows us freedom of action. It does not bind our Nation beyond the consent of its Government. American participation in such an organization might have come 25 years ago had it not been for the stubbornness of men who demanded total acquiescence with their ideas.

We all fervently pray that this Charter represents the beginning of an understanding and the basis for an organization through which the civilized nations of the world may work regularly for peace.

But I would be recreant to my duty if I did not charge you we must always remember that peace is developed not in charters, not in treaties, but in the minds and hearts and souls of men. There can be no real, just, and lasting peace until men learn to love peace and justice throughout the world. It is my hope that out of the transportation and commerce that belongs to the developing air age, which is hurried along by this very airport, will come increased love and understanding among all the peoples of the earth.

And let us remember that while we are going to strive to cooperate with the other nations of the world, while we are going to pray for the success of the new effort, our first responsibility to mankind is to keep America strong and invincible so that we

may be prepared for every responsibility in the dim and uncertain future. While we agree with other nations to labor for peace and justice in the world we must be ever mindful of our duty to preserve in America the freedom with which we have blessed the world. America must be strong in the air. There must be constant research for new improvements, and our planes must have secure bases in every far island to which our commitments require us to travel. America must be strong on the sea and, above all, in our own economic might. If we fail, this last great hope of mankind for freedom may pass from the earth.

And finally it is particularly fitting, I think, that Richmond should be a leader among small cities of the Nation in the development of airport facilities, as this airfield proves more eloquently than words. It was in this neighborhood, on a farm at Newcastle, that Wilbur Wright, coinventor of the airplane with his brother Orville, was born on April 16, 1867. Orville was born in Dayton, Ohio, on August 19, 1871, so both of these pioneers can be said to be children of this Middle Western soil.

The Reverend Milton Wright, father of the two inventors, went to Dayton originally from Hartsville, Ind., and the Wright family lived in Richmond from June 1881 to June 1884.

Fred C. Kelly, the noted biographer of the Wright boys, makes plain that it was in Richmond, Ind., where Wilbur and Orville Wright, particularly the latter, first through the study of kites, began the observations as boys that were to foreshadow the careful studies on the airplane they made as men.

Yes, this soil today is hallowed soil, for the two Wright brothers who once played around here were the same two men who, on December 17, 1903, were the first men to conquer the air.

With that brief flight of 12 unbelievable seconds for 120 incredible feet, from hardby Kill Devil Hill at Kitty Hawk, N. C., man was freed from the bonds that had held him close to Mother Earth from the beginning of time. He had glimpsed the realization of his oldest—his boldest—dream, the conquest of the air.

Now, 42 years later, Richmond and Indiana pay tribute to those same carefree boys by continuing the development they began.

It is a fitting occasion which draws this great crowd. Our high purpose does honor to Richmond, to Wayne County, to Indiana, and to the Nation.

We dedicate this airport as our testimonial to the bravery of American soldiers who have fought only for the safety of America and for the freedom of mankind.

We dedicate this airport on this Independence Day of 1945 as a symbol of the freedom which has made our wonderful development as a Nation possible.

We dedicate this airport to the patriotic devotion of the citizens of Indiana so splendidly typified in this community which today has reported a subscription of seven and a half million dollars to the Seventh War Loan, double its quota, and which has devoted itself unceasingly to a magnificent production of materials of war without a single workers' strike.

We dedicate this airport to the honor of the Wright brothers, one still living, who in this community learned the laws of aeronautics through which their genius and vision developed the modern airplane.

We dedicate this airport to the spirit of tolerance and brotherhood instituted by the early settlers of this community. We dedicate it with a prayer that this same spirit of good will may now be carried throughout the world and in the hope that peace and good will may long dwell on earth.

Who can foresee the destiny of tomorrow through freedom so magnificently typified by these great ships of the air?

Another Good Idea—Full Employment—Subjected to Misinterpretation and Derision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, apparently there are those today who are using the clever counsel of Voltaire to fight any ideas and suggestions they oppose more effectively by ridiculing them, much more than could possibly be done by opposing them with logical argument. If an idea is generally good, its opponents may have to distort and misinterpret it in order to find some ground of ridicule to apply to it. Ridicule is a powerful weapon against anything, good or bad. So in order to use this powerful weapon against a good idea, it must first be misinterpreted and misrepresented as something bad, so as to make it appear a fit subject of ridicule. Such are the tactics being used against the idea of full employment.

As an example, there is another expression, "planned economy," against which no reasonable human being can logically find any fault, which has for the past few years been misrepresented and subjected to ridicule in an effort to laugh it out of court. Of course, as a part of this ridicule, it has not been difficult to point to serious blunders on the part of those in office who advocate a planned economy. Certainly none have been overlooked. If examples were not found in abundance by the opponents, some were invented which were ludicrous enough to redden the face of any of the proponents. Then followed the expression—but not with pride—"They planned it that way." That derisive shout does the work psychologically in swatting anything that can be labeled "planned."

It does not matter that planning is at the basis of all economy and that proper planning is as imperative as effective action in accomplishment, and that planning must precede all effective action, a truism which even a simple-minded person can see and understand. The loudest opponents of planned economy are the greatest masters of it, with this difference—that they want the planning done by somebody else—namely, themselves. It is not the idea of economic planning to which these derisive opponents object, as their derision would lead one to believe, but it is the method of planning to which they most object—that is, planning by governmental officials in the public interest. However, they can mightily discourage planning by public officials in the public interest, if they can show or seem to show that such planning is done by long-haired theorists who as individuals have never operated a million-dollar business. Thus it is left to the "boiled shirts" of the business world and mighty captains of industry to plan without boasting, and they ought to know how to do it from much experience. I do have sincere respect for many of our industrial and business leaders, but in an emergency many are found to be "men of straw."

As one of the House sponsors of the full-employment postwar program, I am tremendously concerned that the public get the right conception of this movement and that the full meaning of it be made known. I do know that in the very brevity of our expression the proper concept of full employment may be easily misinterpreted. For illustration, an expression occurs in the Declaration of Independence, "All men are created equal," which has caused interminable controversy. Probably most of this controversy is over misinterpretation of what the fathers meant by "created equal." I cannot believe that the authors meant those two words to be interpreted literally that all men are created equal in all respects, which erroneous view some opponents of that idea have laughed to scorn. I would rather think the fathers meant, "Men are created equal in rights," or I would even be willing to interpret the phrase as implying that men should be equal in opportunity, which would be more logical than to assume the authors of the Declaration set down a statement contrary to fact.

The opponents of the full employment idea in America have attempted to laugh it off by pointing out that Hitler gave the German people full employment during the last several years and that Stalin is said to furnish it now for his people. Such a statement is usually followed by saying, "We want no such full employment in this country," and it always brings applause. Of course, we do not want any such employment as the full employment prevailing in a penitentiary. The advocates of full employment are not talking about or working for full employment of a prison population, nor any other such regimented society, nor forced employment of any totalitarian machine. We mean, by that expression, full employment opportunities for those who are able to work and who want to work. We believe it is the business of government to encourage and bring about such conditions as will afford full employment opportunities. This is not saying that all the opportunity for work and a job is to be given by and for the Government. On the contrary, if such opportunity is offered by other employers, the Government may be called upon to afford a very minimum of such employment, and the less the better.

During the political campaign of 1944, the national candidate who was the exponent of big business had a great deal to say about postwar employment, and almost invariably he said, in substance, "My party in charge of the Government would provide jobs by inducing a friendly economic climate calling for maximum employment." Thus he seemed to recognize that it was within the power of government to do that very thing and even suggested that it might be the duty of government, if he were administering it, to bring about that encouraging economic climate and other business conditions leading to maximum employment. At least here is an admission that gov-

ernment can do such a thing, and under the right leadership ought to do such a thing. This is one of the few instances in which I agree with that candidate in the last national campaign who was the spokesman for big business and America's industrial interests.

As a member of the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, I have listened to thousands of pages of testimony during the last 2 years, from dozens and scores of the brainiest men and acknowledged leaders of business, industry, government, and scientific thought in this country, on the proper plan to meet the postwar situation. I did not select these witnesses, but they were said to be leaders in their lines of American thought, and I listened to them with great care. Sometimes as I listened to them I trembled with fear of the possibilities of the future when I heard the staggering statistics and saw charts and diagrams picturing the situation as it existed during the following other wars and when I heard statistical predictions of a like pattern on a larger scale following this much larger and all-inclusive war. Sometimes during these hearings the greatest industrialists and men who head the greatest employing concerns of America seemed more optimistic than the cloistered student from a statistical laboratory. Yet everywhere and from all of them I got the impression that America must continue to have an expanding economy, because our salvation depended upon it.

Then it was that I was reminded of the ancient riddle propounded by the Sphinx at Thebes, the failure to answer which meant destruction. Today America is confronted by a fatal riddle. I verily believe that if it is not answered and this riddle solved, there will be no America such as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson knew, continuing throughout the coming years. This riddle is economic. The question is, "Can America, in view of the staggering indebtedness and all the other circumstances of our war-incurred obligations, achieve an expanding economy after the war with full employment opportunity for every normal adult who wants to work, and at the same time continue to have a political government responsive to the will of the American people?" I am positive that we cannot have either of the two last named conditions mentioned above alone and separately and unless we can have them combined, the riddle which the Sphinx of our day propounds will not be solved.

But why should I be too pessimistic about the outcome when I have heard from the lips of some of the biggest businessmen of America that they themselves are not too alarmed regarding the future? I know, of course, that we as a nation have other riddles so difficult that it would be easy for one to be pessimistic about right answers. Among others is the riddle of international cooperation to effect an enduring peace. The more pessimistic citizens think that that riddle cannot be solved. I do not take that gloomy view, and I think we have made a good start toward the solution of it. Nor am I pessimistic about the great riddle of economic stability of our internal structure, but I do believe that desired stability hinges on our ability to put into effect, by the cooperation of industry, business, government, and all such economic forces, a program of full employment opportunity for all our citizens. Let any Lord Haw Haw who laughs to scorn the popular slogan of "60,000,000 jobs" or perverts the concept of full employment opportunity into nation-wide regimented job slavery in his effort to thwart America's proper solution, be prepared himself with an answer to the riddle, under penalty of the extreme condition imposed.

The Trouble With Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of this devastating war the world is seeking permanent peace and amiable business relations. As a means to this end the nations are endeavoring to place business and commerce on a sound financial foundation. If the world is ever to have such sound financial basis the nations must return to the tried and proven monetary system based on the unlimited coinage of gold and silver under a system of bimetallism which is the only plan that will ever give the world a stable, adequate, workable money system.

Ever since the great American monetary invention came into use—the paper national bank note devised and made legal tender money by law during the emergency of the Civil War—there has been a sustained campaign against the use of silver as money which culminated in the demonetization of metal in 1873.

In the struggle that followed to restore silver to our monetary system from generation to generation, every pretext that could be thought of has been used as an argument against the use of silver as money. Many of the arguments which were accepted in all seriousness by the Congress and the American people at the time have by subsequent financial development been proven fallacious. The American people were told that it was impractical to have the bimetallic money standard—that one metal, gold, must be used in the measure of value—that by the inexorable force of Gresham's law the bad money, silver, would drive out of circulation the good money, gold—that if silver was remonetized, the United States would be deluged with cheap silver money and the American people and American business would be reduced to Chinese and Mexican standards—that the integrity of American money and American credit must be maintained on a gold-monometal basis or else the national credit would deteriorate.

Time and recent financial developments have disproven many of these arguments. Economic forces have upset the gold standard and gold is no longer used for money in this country. The American people now have in daily use circulating as money over $2,000,000,000 of silver in the form of silver dollars and silver certificates—money that is full legal tender and as good as gold in filling the functions of our domestic monetary needs.

Under the provisions of our Domestic Silver Purchase Act, domestic silver has been remonetized with a tremendous profit to the Federal Treasury, as revealed by the provisions of the existing law and the seigniorage tables in the United States Treasury Bulletin inserted here. The law provides:

SEC. 4. (a) Each United States coinage mint shall receive for coinage into standard silver dollars any silver which such mint, subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, is satisfied has been mined subsequently to July 1, 1939, from natural deposits in the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

(b) The Director of such mint with the consent of the owner shall deduct and retain of such silver so received 45 percent as seigniorage for services performed by the Government of the United States relative to the coinage and delivery of silver dollars. The balance of such silver so received, that is 55 percent, shall be coined into standard silver dollars and the same or any equal number of other standard silver dollars shall be delivered to the owner or depositor of such silver and no provisions of law taxing transfers of silver shall extend or apply to any delivery of silver to a United States mint under this section. The 45 percent of such silver so deducted shall be retained as bullion by the Treasury or coined into standard silver dollars and held or disposed of in the same manner as other bullion or silver dollars held in or belonging to the Treasury.

While the miner's share of the silver delivered to the mint under the provisions of this law has been returned to him as money and placed in circulation mostly in the form of paper silver certificates, the Government has elected to hold its share of silver out of use and store it in the form of bullion. While our Government has been doing this, the British Government to supply the money needs of England and the British dependencies has come to our Treasury and obtained a loan of 300,000,000 ounces of silver under a lend-lease arrangement. Practically all this loaned silver has been coined and is now in circulation in Great Britain with monetary value higher than the monetary value of the American dollar which is $1.29 per ounce here in the United States.

If the present-day use of silver under existing restrictions is so successful in wartime, what is the trouble with silver money? The answer is simple—it is the difference between the interest yield and the profits to the banks derived from the use of bank-note money and the use of silver money in the channels of trade and business. To determine this difference, it is necessary to compare the plan followed in creating and circulating these two kinds of money.

When the Government of the United States was established, it was necessary to provide a monetary system and a monetary unit with which to transact business. The Congress in the beginning

established a mint and decreed the dollar under the metric system to be the monetary unit and decreed by law that 27 grains of standard gold and 416 grains of standard silver was a dollar. The metal content of the dollar was changed by subsequent law to 25.8 grains of gold and 412½ grains of silver. There was no price set on gold and no price set on silver. The dollar minted from either of these two metals established by weight and fineness was made legal tender and the price of all services and commodities was adjusted to the value of the dollar.

The law provided that when the miner brought his gold to the mint it would be refined and minted into coin and handed back to him to do with as he pleased. He was charged with only the cost of refining and minting the metal. The miner could then spend this new gold money or keep it as he elected. Naturally, the business of handling gold became commercialized and the miner's gold dust and gold bullion was taken off his hands and supplied to the mint by merchants and brokers but the system of creating gold money remained the same.

In the case of silver, this was handled somewhat differently from the plan followed in minting gold. When the miner brought in his silver, he exchanged an equal weight of pure silver for the equivalent in weight in standard silver dollars which was composed of silver and 10 percent copper alloy. The difference of the weight of pure silver and the weight of the silver in the alloyed dollar which was delivered to the miner in exchange for the silver turned into the mint was taken by the Treasury as seigniorage which in the aggregate amounted to a substantial number of dollars. However, the plan of putting gold and silver dollars into circulation was the same. They were handed back to the producer who proceeded to put this new money in circulation by ordinary transaction and in everyday business. The collection of interest was not inherent with the creation and circulation of gold and silver money.

Passing over the difficulties, deficiencies, and losses sustained by the American people by the use of unregulated State bank note currency prior to the Civil War, occasioned by the unsound and fraudulent operation of State-controlled banks which gave rise to the term "wildcat currency"—bills that were simple promissory notes put out by State banks on engraved paper—money that lost all value when the issuing bank failed, we come to the emergency of the Civil War when the uncertainties of the fortunes of war and lack of confidence among the people caused hoarding and the depreciation of the value of the bonds of the Federal Government during the war emergency, thereby creating a financial condition that forced President Lincoln and his Cabinet to resort to the expedience of issuing United States Treasury notes which were made legal tender and noninterest bearing. The disfavor of the banks to this kind of money can be understood; apathy which created a financial condition in this national emergency that gave rise to a new financial invention of world-wide importance—national bank notes—a new kind of paper money which was devised and put into circulation with the passage of the National Bank Act. By this scheme a bank could obtain $50,000 in Government bonds—at any market price prevailing—and deposit the bonds with the Treasury, interest coupons attached and receive equivalent of 90 percent of the face value of the bonds in legal tender, national bank notes, paper money that was guaranteed as to payment by the Federal Government, paper money which could be loaned into circulation by the bank at current rates of interest while the banks at the same time received the interest on the Government bonds left on deposit as security with the Federal Treasury.

Here was a new kind of money circulating in our currency system—paper money convenient to handle and transport, safeguarded as to its value and integrity by the guaranty of the Federal Government, money whose circulation was entirely controlled by the issuing bank, money representing an investment that yields interest on the deposited bonds and interest on the money supported by the deposited bonds that was loaned into circulation. Naturally, the banks and financiers of this country wanted to increase their interest yield and monetary control by expanding the volume of national bank-note money in circulation at a time when silver was pouring into the mints to be coined into money and to flow out and circulate into channels of trade and business, in most cases without an interest yield to the bank. It is easy to understand that once silver was demonetized, it was good business on the part of the banks and financiers to prevent its remonetization and the return of this interest-free money to circulation and thereby restrict the use and circulation of their interest-yielding paper money.

The false propaganda that has been put out against silver presents the greatest campaign of misrepresentation that has ever prevailed in this country or anywhere else and the end is not yet.

The system of national bank currency was slightly changed by the establishment of the Federal Reserve Banking System, but the interest yield and money control of bank-note money remains the same. There is no way to determine the full cost and interest tribute that has been exacted from the American people by the banks having the concession to create and circulate bank-note currency, as it is impossible to separate the volume of ordinary loans of bank capital and accumulated bank money flowing in the channels of trade and business, from the volume of loans of new money created and issued by the banks that must be borrowed by business to supply the country's money need which under the present monetary system is obtainable from no other source. How much interest the American people have been forced to pay for the right to have money created and kept in circulation under this system is difficult to estimate but we do know that the interest on a bank-note dollar equivalent minted in 1879, kept in circulation yielded to the banks if interest is compounded at 6 percent, over $40, a fact established by a statement in a letter from the Federal Reserve bank inserted below:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, February 6, 1942.

Hon. C. I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is in reply to your telephone request today. The present value of $1 compounded at 3 percent annually from 1879 to date would amount to $6.44. Compounded at 6 percent, it would amount to $39.29.

Yours very truly,

WOODLIEF THOMAS,
Assistant Director,
Division of Research and Statistics.

This calculation was made in 1942. By bringing our interest computation up to date, we find this 1879 dollar and its interest earnings is now worth $46.79.

We do know by the monthly circulation statement of the Treasury that there is in circulation as of June 1 this year $23,485,462,010 in Federal Reserve notes. By calculating the interest on this amount of money at 3 percent, we find that American business and the United States Government between them must pay annually $704,563,860.30 for the privilege of keeping this volume of money in circulation. Is it any wonder that the current issue of the American Banker, headed as the only daily banking newspaper, headlines one of its new reports with "Twenty largest United States banks' assets double 1939"? But this is not all. When Secretary Mellon decided in 1929 to replace the large-size paper currency with bills of smaller dimension and recalled all the national-bank notes from circulation for exchange, the records disclose that for a long time there was over one-half billion dollars of these paper notes that never showed up, and today, as of June 1, 1945—16 years after these notes were recalled—there are $170,161,420 of this paper money that cannot be found—probably lost or destroyed, which has not been returned. Lost, this money represents profit to the bank and real money to the losers.

When we compare the cost to the people and the profits to the banks of circulating the two systems of money—national bank note currency and now Federal Reserve note currency—with the creation and the circulation of the silver dollar and silver certificates, it should not be difficult to understand the reasons and motives for the sustained campaign of misrepresentation of silver and its use as money.

Answering the question, What is the trouble with silver? Under the present money system silver money cannot compete with the bank-paper money in interest yield and extra profits to the banks realized from lost bank-note paper money and most important of all, silver money cannot be manipulated in monetary control as easily as bank notes are contracted and expanded as a means of inflating or deflating prices. But when it comes to supplying the money function to give the country a sound, workable, adequate money system, one based on the coinage of the precious metals, gold and

silver—money of ultimate redemption—and the other managed paper currency based on the creation and circulation of Federal Reserve bank notes dependent in a large measure for their creation and circulation on the confidence of the bankers and businessmen, these two currencies present contrasting pictures. It is an accepted financial principle that any money system to be stable in value must provide a dollar of unchangeable value. To have this, the volume of money must increase evenly with the growth of population and commerce which is estimated to be roughly 3 percent a year—statistics disclose that volume of gold over the years increases at the rate of 1 percent annually and that silver increases in volume at the rate of 2 percent annually. By taking these two metals together, for use as money we meet this 3 percent increase requirement of economic law.

The volume of paper money not only can be increased but it can be decreased by the bank by either extending or withholding loans—a movement that is influenced in a large measure by the mass psychology of the bankers having control of the creation and issuance of bank note currency. Under the present monetary system, it has been the general experience that when business and the banks are confident and new money and credit is needed the least—the banks are liberal with loans and money flows freely in the channels of trade and business but when business confidence is disturbed and money is needed most, bank loans and the creation of new money are curtailed and business depression ensues.

If experience has taught us anything, it has taught us that gold alone is insufficient as a monetary base and that a managed currency is unreliable and unsafe and too costly to operate. We have tried about every monetary scheme to supply the national money function that the bankers could suggest. Financial history discloses that bimetallism worked in this country from the establishment of the first mint in 1792 until silver was demonetized in 1873—81 years—and bimetallism worked for over 90 years in France and that later bimetallism was used successfully by France, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, and Greece under the provisions of a monetary convention of the Latin Union which standardized and made their money interchangeable for use in international transactions until the plan was broken down by the demonetization and manipulation of silver by Germany after the war of 1870.

When business is disturbed and the bankers lose confidence and their managed currency gets out of control and can no longer supply the money function, the financiers compare our money system to a pump and tell us that it must be primed. When this occurs with bank money insufficient and unobtainable, the Nation is forced by necessity to deficit financing to raise Government funds with money taken from the people by taxation to be poured out in wasteful schemes in an effort to raise the money and credit volume to a level that will put the bankers' financial pump back into operation.

We have reached a stage in world affairs when if our country is ever to have a sound, workable, adequate money system, we must accept the plan proposed by our national lawmakers when they wrote section 311 and section 313 into the United States statutes:

SEC. 311. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts.

SEC. 313. The provisions of sections 146, 313, 314, 320, 406, 408, 411, 429, 455, and 751 of this title and sections 51, 101, and 178 of title 12, Banks and Banking, are not intended to preclude the accomplishment of international bimetallism whenever conditions shall make it expedient and practicable to secure the same by concurrent action of the leading commercial nations of the world and at a ratio which shall insure permanence of relative value between gold and silver.

In closing, let me quote that great statesman and indefatigable leader, James G. Blaine, when he said:

If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of ordering it to be resumed. If it has been restricted, I am in favor of having it enlarged. The two metals have existed side by side in harmonious, honorable companionship as money ever since intelligent trade was known among men. It is well nigh 40 centuries since "Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth—400 shekels of silver current money with the merchant." Since that time nations have risen and fallen, races have disappeared, dialects and languages have been forgotten, arts have been lost, treasures have perished, continents have been discovered, islands have been sunk in the sea, and through all these ages and through all these changes silver and gold reigned supreme, as the representative of value, as the media of exchange. The dethronement of each has been attempted in turn and sometimes the dethronement of both, but always in vain, and here we are today, deliberating anew over the problem which comes down to us from Abraham's time—the weight of the silver—that shall be "current money with the merchant."

Columns taken from silver seigniorage table on page 83, United States Treasury Bulletin for July 1945:

Seigniorage on silver

(Cumulative from Jan. 1, 1934)

[In millions of dollars]

Seigniorage on coins (silver and minor), total, May 1, 1945	Total seigniorage on silver revalued, total, May 1, 1945	Potential seigniorage on silver bullion at cost in general fund, total, May 1, 1945
$394,000,000	$820,700,000	[1] $589,200,000

[1] NOTE.—The last column of the seigniorage table shows that the total sum of potential seigniorage has shrunk from $1,048,200,000 in 1944 to $589,200,000 in 1945, due to the disposal of the Treasury silver reserves.

The following is a partial schedule of gold prices prevailing at the last reports in foreign countries obtained from the United States Treasury:

The price for an ounce of gold in Bombay is roughly equivalent to $62.40.

The price for an ounce of gold in Baghdad is roughly equivalent to $89.

The price for an ounce of gold in Cairo is roughly equivalent to $88.50.

The price for an ounce of gold in Greece is $800.

The price for an ounce of gold in Argentina is $48.

The price for an ounce of gold in Chile is $48.

Russia and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, William H. Seward, Secretary of State for Abraham Lincoln, wrote in 1861:

Russia and the United States may remain good friends until, each having made a circuit of half the globe in opposite directions, they shall meet and greet each other in regions where civilization first began, and where, after so many ages, it has become now lethargic and helpless.

Both American and Russian flags now wave in the lands of the North Pacific. The Americans have pushed westward across the continent of North America while the Russian have pushed eastward across the continent of Asia. In 1639 Russia reached the Pacific; in 1741 Bering discovered Alaska; in 1812 Russian colonists were within 40 miles of San Francisco. On the other hand, the United States expanded to the Pacific by the Mexican cession in 1848; California was admitted to the Union in 1850; and Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867.

Sixty-two miles of open water separate the East Cape of the Soviet Union from the Alaska of the United States. Only 1½ miles of water remove Big Diomede Island, owned by the Soviets, from Little Diomede Island, owned by the Americans. On the shores of Anadyr Bay, south of the East Cape, is a Russian naval and air base, less than a hundred miles from Alaska. On the Komandorskie Islands, about 250 miles from Attu in the Aleutians, is a submarine base of the Soviet Union. Only 700 miles from Alaskan Territory is the Japanese naval base on Paramushiro Island in the Kuriles. The strategic picture of the North Pacific is complicated with Alaska and the Aleutians under the American flag, eastern Siberia, Kamchatka, and the Komandorskie Islands under the Soviet flag, and the Kuriles under the Japanese.

The Soviet Far East is a convenient term for the area that extend from Lake Baikal to the Pacific and from the Arctic to the Amur River. Lake Bikal may be considered a dividing line in Siberia. The allied military intervention in Siberia as a consequence of the First World War lasted for the longest time in this

area. From April 6, 1920, to November 14, 1922, the Far Eastern Republic embraced this territory. The Japanese expansionists have long sought to extend the new order in Greater East Asia to Lake Baikal.

All the Soviet Far East lies within the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. To the east of Lake Baikal is the Buriat-Mongol Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, giving recognition to the Buriat-Mongols. In the Lena River Basin is the Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, affording recognition to the Yakuts. Most of Irkutsk Oblast or region lies west of Lake Baikal. Between the Buriat-Mongol unit and the fertile Amur plain is the Chita Oblast or region. The Khabarovsk Territory contains most of the Pacific seaboard of the Soviet Union. This area includes the Amur Valley, the coast of the Sea of Okhotsk, the peninsula of Kamchatka, the northern part of the island of Sakhalin, and the Chukot Peninsula opposite Alaska. The Maritime Territory includes the southeasternmost part of the Soviet Union. This area forms a triangle with the apex at Vladivostok and one point of the base at Sovetskaia on the Sea of Japan and the other near Khabarovsk, where the Ussuri River meets the Amur.

The natural resources of the Soviet Far East are being rapidly developed. The timber reserves are extensive, especially in the basin of the Ussuri. The fish and fur industries have been greatly expanded in the last decade. The gold fields of the Lena Basin are very valuable and the discovery of the Aldan field has greatly increased the production of gold. The output of oil in Soviet Sakhalin amounted to 308,000 tons in 1936. New discoveries have been made in Kamchatka, near Lake Baikal, and in Yakutia. Coal is found near Vladivostok and in Sakhalin. Bureia coal, north of Birobidzhan, is increasing in importance. Iron is less plentiful than coal in the Soviet Far East. Low-grade deposits are found in the Little Khigan Mountains near the Bureia coal. Minor iron reserves are located on the lower Amur, near Vladivostok, in Yakutia, and in Buriat Mongolia. Some manganese, molybdenum, tungsten, tin, lead, zinc, and platinum are found. Along the Arctic coast oil, coal, and salt are known to occur.

By 1931 the Soviet Far East had recovered the prewar level of production. The major objective in Siberia of the first five-year plan from 1928–33 was the development of a metallurgical base in the Ural-Kuznetsk area to serve as a basis for further development in the Far East. Only 1.7 percent of the total investment of the first 5-year plan went to the Soviet Far East. In the second 5-year plan more emphasis was placed on this area. Four and fourteen one-hundredths percent of the total investment went to the Soviet Far East. The emphasis was first on transport, then on industry, and finally on agriculture.

With reference to the third 5-year plan Molotov stated that:

> The example of the Far East makes it particularly obvious that unless we have a comprehensive development of the principal economic centers of the country, we cannot safeguard our vital interests as a state. The Far East must produce locally all the requirements in fuel, and, as far as possible, metal, machinery, cement, lumber, and building materials in general, as well as most of the bulk freights of the food and light industries.

In the third 5-year plan 4 percent of all the funds went to the Khabarovsk and Maritime territories. A more self-sustaining economy was developed with regard to local food, fuel, and industrial supplies. A large railroad repair shop was built in Ulan Ude; shipbuilding yards grew in Vladivostok and Nikolaevsk; an oil refinery and machine shops appeared in Khabarovsk.

Certain industrial centers in the Soviet Far East stand out. The Vladivostok-Voroshilov-Spassk district and the Khabarovsk district are the largest industrial areas. Komsomolsk, the city of the Communist Youth, started in 1932, may become the Pittsburgh of the Soviet Far East. A possible future center of light industry for the area is Birobidzhan, the Jewish Autonomous Province. Ulan Ude, the center of the Buriat-Mongol unit, is acquiring importance. Okha is the center of the Sakhalin oil fields, Petropavlovsk of rich Kamchatka, Bodaibo of the Lena gold fields, and Magadan on the Okhotsk Sea of the Kolyma gold fields.

Agriculture in the Soviet Far East is complicated by problems relating to climate, soil, and the sparseness of population. The leading grains are the hardier varieties of wheat and oats. In the south rice and soya beans are grown. Truck-farming has been encouraged near industrial centers. Home-grown vegetables are even possible for the dwellers in the Arctic seaports. The river valley of the Kamchatka in the peninsula of Kamchatka is suitable for farming. In recent years nomadism in the stock industry has been practically ended and collectivization is nine-tenths complete. The Soviet Far East is now practically self-sufficient in meat while meat factories are located in places like Vladivostok, Ulan Ude, Khabarovsk, and Chita. The dairy industry is not so well developed.

The key problem in the Soviet Far East is transportation. The great railroad of the area is the Trans-Siberian, extending for 6,000 miles from European Russia to the Pacific Ocean. The Trans-Siberian Railroad has been double-tracked in recent years. The Ussuri Railroad from Khabarovsk to Vladivostok is now double-tracked The Volochaevka-Komsomolsk Railroad from Khabarovsk to Komsomolsk was completed in November 1936. One of the most significant railroads in the Soviet Far East will be the Baikal-Amur trunk line, extending north of Lake Baikal for some 1,500 miles in length to Komsomolsk and the Pacific. The railroad was provided in the second 5-year plan and was supposed to be completed during the third 5-year plan. This railroad will be highly strategic, serving as an alternative north of Lake Baikal to the Trans-Siberian. The route crosses the headwaters of the Lena River; it passes the Lena gold fields; it taps the newly opened Bureia coal and iron. The Ulan Ude-Kiakhta line of 150 miles was provided in the second 5-year plan. It will supplement motor, river, and air transport from Ulan Ude to Ulan Bator in Outer Mongolia.

The Soviet Far East has many navigable rivers but they are generally frozen for a major part of the year. Ocean transport along the northern route by the Arctic is increasing. Cargoes can be carried from Murmansk to Vladivostok for a short time of the year and it is quite possible that some lend-lease goods have reached Murmansk by way of the Arctic passage. The northern sea route might possibly become the Panama Canal of the Soviet Union. Russian shipping along the Pacific littoral has grown. Some of the leading harbors are Vladivostok, Sovetskaia Gavan, Nikolaevsk, Okha, Okhotsk, and Petropavlovsk. However, Russian harbors freeze in wintertime. Petropavlovsk, Vladivostok, and Sovetskaia Gavan have all been equipped with floating docks. Road construction has been encouraged in the Soviet Far East but motor transport is unlikely to achieve major importance in the whole area. Aviation is playing an increasingly important role. One air line parallels the Trans-Siberian; another links Irkutsk and Yakutsk; and another connects Ulan Ude and Ulan Bator. Air services to Sakhalin and Kamchatka are fairly regular considering the weather. Extensive use is made of aviation in the Arctic. In 1937 Soviet fliers flew from Moscow over the polar areas to California.

A great majority of the people of the Soviet Far East live along the Trans-Siberian or between the railroad and the Amur River. In January 1939 the population east of Lake Baikal was 5,700,000, in contrast to 4,400,000 in 1933. Almost 2,500,000 of the inhabitants live in urban areas. Vladivostok has a population of over 206,000, Khabarovsk has over 200,000, Ulan Ude over 130,000, and Komsomolsk over 70,000. The government has encouraged migration to the Far East. One source of colonists has been the Red Army and another has been the universities and technical schools.

Across the north Pacific from the Soviet Far East is the American outpost of Alaska. Secretary of State Seward realized the importance of Alaska in the north Pacific just as he saw the significance of Greenland and Iceland in the north Atlantic. The United States paid Russia the sum of $7,200,000 for Alaska in 1867. The present war in the Pacific has revealed the strategic importance of the territory. A ship going from Yokohama to San Francisco passes approximately within 300 miles of the Alaskan Aleutians on a Great Circle route. Americans in Alaska can deliver a flank attack on any enemy that seeks to strike at California, Oregon, or Washington. Alaska is just 700 miles north of Seattle, a very short distance in modern days. In the possible polar routes of future aviation, Alaska will occupy a key position. The late General Billy Mitchell stated:

> Alaska is the most central place in the world for aircraft. And that is true either of Europe, Asia, or North America, for in the future I think whoever holds Alaska will

hold the world, and I think it is the most important strategic place in the world.

I should like to say at this point that the Army Transport Command has recognized the value of Alaska from a military point of view and has sent from the port of Great Falls, Mont., to Fairbanks, Alaska, and from there to Siberia, over 6,000 planes and millions of pounds of war matériel. This sky road, developed in time of war, will be just as useful and necessary in the peaceful years to come. It will continue to expand, and should, not only bring Alaska closer to continental United States but also to bring about a closer degree of economic cooperation between our country and the U. S. S. R., but with all of East Asia as well. The age of the future is going to be in the air, and as this phase of transportation develops so will the economic importance of Alaska and the U. S. S. R. to us keep pace with it. The war has made General Mitchell's words prophetic; the peace should accentuate them.

Furthermore, naval and air operations in recent weeks indicate that continued heavy blows will be struck against Japan in her northern home island, Hokkaido, and in the Kurile chain. This means that Alaska, and particularly the Aleutian Islands, will continue to be highly important from a military point of view and will figure prominently in the operations yet to be carried out in bringing Japan to the final stage of subjugation.

The United States has been more interested in exploiting Alaska than in colonizing the area. The Territory in 1940 had a population of only 72,000. About 45,000 of the people were born in Alaska, and 32,000 of these were Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts. Alaska has an area of 586,000 square miles or one-fifth the size of continental United States. About 65,000 square miles are suitable for intensive cultivation, but very little farming is actually done. Wheat, barley, oats, carrots, peas, potatoes, and strawberries can be raised in Alaska. The production of dairy products is possible. The Matanuska colonization scheme has received considerable attention, but the pioneer farmer faces many problems.

However, Alaska is no longer a "Seward's Folly." Since 1867 more than three-fourths of a billion dollars in gold and other minerals have come from Alaska; more than a billion dollars' worth of fish have been taken from the waters; and many million dollars' worth of furs have been removed from seals and other animals. Alaska also has copper, molybdenum, antimony, nickel, tin, oil, and coal.

The Territory has a number of climates, each affecting the soil. The Pacific coast and islands have one climate; the Bering Sea coast and islands another; the Arctic coast a third; and the interior plateau a fourth. The last three conform to the general conception of Alaskan climate in the popular mind. However, the Pacific coast and islands have a mild climate for the latitude due to the warm Japanese Current and the prevailing westerly winds blowing over seas usually warmer than the land. In addition, Alaska has many types of land forms. Mountains lie along the coast and extend inland for some distance. Mount McKinley is the highest elevation in North America. Back of the mountains is a plateau drained by the Yukon, the third longest river in North America. Plains slope to the Arctic Ocean from the central tablelands.

American military, naval, and air preparations in Alaska are significant. Sitka, Kodiak, and Dutch Harbor are very important. A big naval air station and a submarine base have been established at Sitka, guarding the famous inland passage to Seattle. Kodiak Island is about 600 miles west of Sitka and about 2,800 miles north of Hawaii. The Navy has been building a large submarine base on Kodiak. Unalaska, or Dutch Harbor, has been the scene of much activity. Unalaska has a strategic location between the Pacific and the Bering Sea. A naval base and air and submarine base facilities have been built on this largest island of the Aleutians. The Army has developed a big base at Anchorage on the south coast and at Fairbanks in the heart of Alaska. Giant runways of 10,000 feet in length have been constructed. Other Army bases are at Metlakatla and Haines. Navy listening posts are located at Attu and Kiska while airfields are found at Point Barrow on the Arctic, at Nome in the Seward Peninsula, and probably near the Arctic coast of Canada. Pacific-Alaska Airways, a subsidiary of Pan American, has built landing fields in the Territory.

The Aleutian Islands extend southwest from the Alaska Peninsula. It is 1,500 miles from Attu in the western Aleutians to the base of the Alaska Peninsula. The Aleutians form an almost continuous breakwater across the northern neck of the Pacific. The islands are the home of the Aleutian low, the so-called weather factory of North America. Many of the cyclonic storms that cross the United States originate in the Aleutian low. Winds, fog, and rain are produced in this area. The Japanese current keeps the ice from forming in many of the Alaskan harbors. The Nipponese invaded the western Aleutians in June 1942, but were finally forced to give up their only conquests in North America.

Transportation is one of the great problems of Alaska. Climate, land forms, and a sparse population are responsible for the situation. The Alaskan Railway extends for 471 miles from Seward to Anchorage and Fairbanks. In 1937 there were 2,058 miles of road and tram road, of which 78 percent were suitable for autos in the summer. The leading road was the Richardson Highway from Valdez to Fairbanks. The Alaska Highway was constructed as a war measure. It extends from Edmonton in Alberta, to Fort St. John, White Horse, and Fairbanks. Most of the commerce of Alaska moves by the inland passage, a water highway of 1,033 miles, largely protected by islands blocking the Pacific from the mainland.

The events of the twentieth century have changed many of the geographic viewpoints of the average American citizen. For many years he has thouhgt of the Russia across the Atlantic in eastern Europe. The seat of American power has been in the east and the base of Russian power has been in the west. In the future the American citizen will have to pay more attention to the North Pacific where the Stars and Stripes and the Hammer and Sickle wave very closely to each other.

Ernie Rated Bradley Tops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the following article which appeared in the Washington News:

ERNIE RATED BRADLEY TOPS

(NOTE.—The late Ernie Pyle once told a fellow war reporter in London: "If I could pick any two men in the world for my father except my own dad, I would pick Gen. Omar Bradley or Gen. Ike Eisenhower. If I had a son I would like him to go to Bradley or Ike for advice." Herewith is Ernie's appraisal of the general.)

(By Ernie Pyle)

SOMEWHERE IN SICILY.—As all of you know, we have kept our pen pointed mainly at the common soldier—the well-known GI—for lo, these many months, and let the exalted high command shift for itself. But now we are going to reverse things and write about an American general.

This is because he is pretty important but not very well known to the public and because I thought you might feel a little better if you knew what kind of a man was in direct charge of your boys in Sicily.

The man I speak of is Lt. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley.

I am a tremendous admirer of General Bradley. I don't believe I have ever known a person to be so unanimously loved and respected by the men around and under him.

General Bradley came to Africa to join the front-line troops at Gafsa, in central Tunisia, during the bitter fighting at El Guettar. When he first showed up he hardly said a word for 2 weeks. He just worked around absorbing everything and getting acquainted, telling everybody to keep on doing his job just as he had been doing. He hasn't said very much up to this moment, yet before anyone was hardly aware of it he had his corps in the palm of his hand and every man in it would now go to hell and back for him.

Now and then you hear a correspondent remark: "Say, that Bradley is my man. I think he's an old fox." But he isn't an old fox at all. He is too direct to be a fox. If he has two outstanding traits, they are simplicity and honesty.

General Bradley is 50 (now 52). He is married and has a daughter who is the apple of his eye—Elizabeth, who is 19 and a student at Vassar. Mrs. Bradley is living at West Point for the duration. Each one of them writes to the general about three times a week. He writes back about twice a week, although during hard campaigns two or three weeks sometimes get by without his having time to write. He pecks out the letters on a portable typewriter.

The general is a tall man, who seems thin although he weighs 182 pounds. His legs are long and he is a terrific walker. He is a half inch under 6 feet.

He is deeply tanned and is getting bald on top. His head flares out above the ears

more than the average man's, giving him a "dome" and an air of erudition. He wears faintly tinted tortoise-rimmed glasses. It would be toying with the truth to call him handsome instead of good-looking.

The general doesn't smoke. He takes his cigaret rations and gives them away. He drinks and swears in moderation.

His voice is high and clear, but he speaks so gently you don't hear him very far away. His aides say they have never known him to speak harshly to anyone. He can be firm, terribly firm, but he is never gross, nor rude.

General Bradley has no idiosyncrasies, superstitions, or hobbies. He doesn't collect seashells or read Schopenhauer.

He seldom gets nervous and he is never excited. Once, here in Sicily, a sniper took a potshot at him as he was riding in a command car, whereupon the general and two enlisted men armed only with carbines got out of the car and started looking for the sniper. The sniper beat it and they couldn't find him.

General Bradley is notoriously good with a rifle. In his younger days he was very athletic. He was a second-string football man at West Point and a regular on the baseball team. He is a good golfer and likes bridge and poker. He keeps a "poker fund" so any losses can be paid out of that and not affect the family budget.

I said to him: "I never could be a general. I couldn't stand up under the responsibility of making a decision that would take human lives."

And he said: "Well, you don't sleep any too well from it. But we're in it now and we can't get out without some loss of life. I hate like the devil to order the bombing of a city and yet it sometimes simply has to be done."

Sugar Shortage and OPA Discussed by Ray Tucker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not pleasant to criticize or point out mistakes. However, the only way to remedy a bad situation is to find out what caused it and then get rid of the cause. We have a sugar shortage and Government officials are to blame for it. Instead of keeping some of these men who have made mistakes which have led to the sugar shortage, they ought to be discharged from public service and men of ability and capacity put in charge of the whole food problem. There are indications that such changes may be made. In fact, we have been led to believe that the new Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton P. Anderson, will have authority to take steps to increase available food and this, of course, includes sugar and other staple commodities.

Right now I feel that my constituents ought to have all the facts they can get as to who is responsible for the sugar shortage. Just so that they will not blame Congress, because it is popular to blame Congress for everything, I am submitting without comment an article by Ray Tucker which has appeared in many newspapers and which deals with the subject of sugar. I clipped this article from the Hibbing Daily Tribune, one of the leading newspapers in my district which ran Mr. Tucker's column on July 28, 1945, and which is as follows:

NEW DEAL IS BLAMED FOR SUGAR DEAL

(By Ray Tucker)

The basic reason for the current disappearance of sugar from family tables and corner grocery stores lies in the Roosevelt administration's fierce suspicion and hatred of the so-called Sugar Trust in the days when the reformers and ideologists were riding high at Washington. That industry ranked with the "economic royalists" and utilities and Wall Street on the black books at the White House.

Even now, while producers are negotiating with the bureaucrats for a higher price on offshore (Puerto Rican and Cuban) and domestic crops for the future, the ancient prejudice threatens to prolong the scarcity through 1947. Only President Truman, on his return from Europe, can cut the Gordian knot.

It was this New Deal distrust of eastern refiners which led Federal price fixers to deprive the growers of the financial incentive which might otherwise have induced them to produce enough for our present need. Incidentally the increased cost to the consumer would have been less than half a cent a pound.

Oddly enough, even when the approach of war and swollen pay envelopes of munitions workers foreshadowed the need of a larger supply, our economic, social, and agricultural experts adopted policies which resulted in a reduction of acreage on the mainland and in the islands.

In signing the Sugar Act of 1937, which provided that imports should enter the country in raw form and be processed along the Atlantic seaboard, the late President Roosevelt took a sideswipe at the alleged monopoly. He said that he okayed it only because House leaders had promised to revise the measure in favor of domestic beet and cane raisers.

"In view of these assurances," he continued, "I am approving the bill with what amounts to a gentleman's agreement that the unholy alliance between the cane and beet producers on the one hand, and the standard refining monopoly on the other, has been terminated by the growers."

Other enemies of the "unholy alliance" from whom F. D. R. took advice on this subject almost to the day of his death are Henry A. Wallace, former Secretary of Agriculture, Vice President and now Secretary of Commerce; Rexford Guy Tugwell, former Under Secretary of Agriculture and now Governor of Puerto Rico; Paul Appleby, then a Wallace aide and now with the State Department; Ernest Gruening, then Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of Territories and now Governor of Alaska; Leon Henderson, then economic adviser to Harry Hopkins.

Needless to say, these men shared the late Chief Executive's enthusiasm for "socking the interests." In fact, they were his inspiration for keeping the price so low that domestic growers turned to other crops, while the Cubans and Puerto Ricans left their lands fallow.

Mr. Wallace was author of another curious quirk partially responsible for today's lack of sweets. He regards himself as an authority on diet, and he has an obsession against sugar.

While he was Secretary of Agriculture, his nutrition experts conducted a public and private campaign against the consumption of this commodity. They maintained that the American people used too much of it.

And when they issued a formal list of seven basic foods as essential for the ideal menu of war workers, they did not include this energy-building and tasteful tidbit!

These policies and prejudices have already made it impossible to boost the sugar supply for the rest of this year and 1946 to any appreciable extent. But there are indications that present-day poobahs, unless overridden by President Truman, may enforce a price program which will continue the sugar shortage through 1947, possibly 1948.

A week ago Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson said that only the American farmer could provide an increase in the supply, although he muffed that one, for he forgot the Puerto Rican and Cuban growers. Anyway, in response to his suggestion, the beet producers came to Washington immediately to discuss the return they would receive for their 1947 crop.

They now get a dollar for a hundred pounds, and they want 30 cents more, or virtually a third of a cent a pound. There is some dispute about Mr. Anderson's attitude, but they went away with the impression that he sympathized with their request. The stumbling block appears to be Economic Stabilizer William H. Davis, who fears the effect of a higher consumer cost on the workers' pocketbooks. As former head of the War Labor Board, he was extremely partial to organized labor. He also distrusts the monopolies.

The Cubans and Puerto Ricans also want more cash. The former now get $3.45 a hundred pounds and are asking $4. The latter are now paid 65 cents a hundred pounds and insist on a dollar. (Subsidies and other financing arrangements cause the price discrepancy.) If both groups obtain sufficient inducement, our total sugar supply for 1947 should approximate 6,800,000 tons for civilians, or enough to carry us through. The 1944 consumption was about 5,000,000 tons, exclusive of Army-Navy purchases.

RAY TUCKER DISCUSSES OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

In connection with the food program, it is interesting to note Mr. Tucker's comment in the Mesabi Daily News, of Virginia, Minn., for Saturday, July 28, 1945. Here again I do not make this comment to be critical and to find fault. I just set forth what Mr. Tucker says because he does give facts. So there may be no misunderstanding, I am not directing my remarks at employees in the local OPA offices in my district or in any other district. I know that these local officials have to follow regulations from Washington and whether the regulations are good or bad the local officials carry them out.

My efforts are directed against the policy-making officials of the Office of Price Administration in Washington. These policy-making men believe in the doctrine of scarcity. They are entirely wrong about this. However, they will not learn, and in my opinion they will have to be eliminated and other people put in charge of the food problem, before we can get relief.

Mr. Tucker says:

Pettiness: The Office of Price Administration, however, still wins the prize for bureaucratic pettiness. When a citizen loses his gas or food coupons, as has happened in thousands of cases through unavoidable accidents, he or she must wait 30 days after applying for a new book before they are forthcoming.

In the meantime, this arbitrary regulation forces the victims to walk or starve. Actually, they are compelled to borrow from friends, which is a clear-cut violation of OPA provisions.

The theory behind the enforced delay and privation is, contrary to all Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, that an American citizen is a crook or a chiseler until proved innocent. It is one of those early Tugwell-Henderson hang-overs which the Truman administration has not yet had time to remedy.

White House Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, June 3, 1945:

WHITE HOUSE SUCCESSION

We hope that the pressure of other events will not divert attention from the vital issue of succession to the Presidency. The unvarnished fact is that neither the founding fathers nor the numerous Congresses that have sat since 1789 have given this problem the careful thought that it demands. In very large measure we have trusted to luck. Considering the enormous burden that now falls upon the President, that is an extremely dangerous course.

One has only to glance at the contingencies recommended for study by Congressman MONRONEY'S bill on this subject to realize that there are gaping holes in our present system of keeping the presidential chair occupied. Mr. MONRONEY proposes a Joint Commission on the Presidency to make an elaborate study of all problems connected with the succession to that office and election of the President and Vice President. The commission would be specially instructed to give attention to "(1) the case where by reason of death, resignation, removal, or inability, there is no individual to execute the office of President; (2) the method of ascertaining the periods during which the President or individual acting as President is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office; (3) the case where, after election, the President-elect or Vice President-elect, or both, die or fail to qualify; (4) the case where (before the election of presidential electors or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President) a candidate for the Presidency or Vice Presidency has died, refused to run, or been found ineligible to take office if elected."

The Constitution and present law offer no solution to these and various other problems. They leave our system in danger of a break-down by reason of having no clearly designated executive head. Indeed, there have been occasions, as during President Wilson's long illness, when the executive power has been dormant, with resulting peril to the Nation. It would be woefully short-sighted of us as a people to ignore these weaknesses in our system until another emergency is upon us.

It is no exaggeration to say that there is alarm in many hearts at present over the prospect of Secretary of State Stettinius becoming President if Mr. Truman should for any reason become incapacitated. Whatever may be said in Mr. Stettinius' favor, he has not been elected by the people. He is an appointee chosen for a particular task which is now soon to be wound up at San Francisco. It would be highly unreasonable to have a man elevated to the White House for several years by this set of circumstances. At best a cabinet officer could be expected to hold these reins of vast power only long enough to permit a new election. But at present there are no provisions for any special election to replace a man advancing from the Vice Presidency to the White House and then dying in office.

Mr. MONRONEY is certainly right in saying that the whole problem of succession to the Presidency should be investigated. Congress could go ahead and legislate now to patch up a number of weak points in the system by which our Presidents are chosen. But hasty action might create as many new problems as it would solve. A thorough study is clearly needed, whether undertaken by a commission appointed by the President, the Chief Justice, and congressional heads, as Mr. MONRONEY suggests, or by a major congressional committee. On the whole, it seems to us that the commission idea is most promising. Congress cannot act too quickly to get such a commission at work.

Rally in Defense of Poland and Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Rev. A. A. Skoniecki, at rally in defense of Poland and Europe, on Sunday, May 20, 1945, at the New York City Center, in New York, N. Y., under the joint auspices of the American-Polish Congress and the Coordinating Committee of American-Polish Associations in the East and with Americans of Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Finnish, Serbian, and Slovakian descent, represented by delegations, and also an address of Rev. John Balkunas on the same occasion:

ADDRESS BY REV. A. A. SKONIECKI, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN-POLISH ASSOCIATIONS IN THE EAST

Fellow Americans, for 6 years the Polish Nation is being exterminated. This began at the end of the war in Poland in 1939. Two of Poland's powerful neighbors—Germany and Russia—having the same objectives and the same methods, started this organized murder of the Poles. From the satanical ideas of Hitler and of the Soviets, originated concentration camps, deportations, and executions applied simultaneously by both the German and Russian side. For 1½ years the Soviets and Germany worked hand in hand. But even when Hitler attacked Russia, nothing could change the fact that Poles continued to be murdered. Although they were not exterminated jointly any longer, both Hitler and Stalin operated independently. One change took place when Germany attacked Russia. By force of events Russia apparently became our ally. What is still worse, in our United States many admirers of Russia were found who began to defend each and every Soviet step, even though they were defending open crime. We even reached such an absurd situation that when 10,000 Polish officers were murdered at Katyn, the democratic world did not worry about this atrocious crime, but rather reproached the Poles for trying to investigate the case and find the true perpetrators.

Our war alliance with Russia turned out to be an alliance with immorality. For many years it was concealed from the American people that the Soviets were committing one violence after another, and one crime after another. Everything that was going on in Russia was covered up with some kind of mystery and we were told that the chief thing in this war is to keep unity among the Allies. But what kind of unity? Unity for what purpose? Were we Americans to become partners in these sinister Soviet crimes? Are we to conceal all the crimes Russia is committing?

I know only one thing. For the sake of this false unity negotiations with the Soviets were conducted.

Diplomatic conferences and discussions went on. In 1943 the Moscow Conference too place and was hailed as a great triumph in diplomacy. What was the result of that Conference for Poland? The Poles continued to be murdered. The tragic conference at Tehran took place, in which Russia received whatever she wanted. What was the result for Poland? None other but further murdering of Poles. The Yalta Conference was arranged. We consider this Conference an assault on Poland's very existence. For the Poles the result is still the same. They continue to be murdered. The San Francisco Conference begins. Poland is absent from the Conference. But Mr. Molotoff announces that 16 representatives of democratic Poland were arrested by Russia. Now, Mr. Stalin tells us that this has nothing to do with the Polish question, and that he will settle the Polish problem himself in a Russian way. He forgot, however, to say that the Russian way means not only the disappearance of the 16 Poles, but the murder of Poles everyday by the hundreds and thousands.

My dear friends, we are fed up with all promises and empty words. We are through with conferences and diplomatic discussions and speeches which, instead of restoring law and order, lead only to the continuation of crime. Fellow citizens, there are plenty of reports in the files of our Government agencies on what is happening in Poland and other Soviet-occupied countries. These reports never saw the light of day. No one ever gave the American people this information regarding Soviet-occupied countries which our Government possesses. I am asking you: Why is the truth concealed and proof of it hidden in the files and archives? I am asking you: Is it right that the truth is concealed from the American people? We appeal to our Government to tell us the truth, and give us the facts. Our Government does not need to fear, for the American people are not afraid to look truth straight in the face. Only cowards and profiteers who want to do business with Russia are afraid of the truth.

Fellow citizens, our patience is close to exhaustion. In the news Friday we read that Polish war prisoners in Germany, who fell into Russian hands, disappeared. We do not want another Katyn. We do not want another Majdanek. We do not want another Oswiecim, and another Dachau. We sound the alarm. America must know the truth, because if concentration camps and bullets should act instead of law, our world will perish. Stalin told his story of the 16 yesterday; now let our Government give us the true story. Let the world know the real facts in our possession.

ADDRESS BY REV. JOHN BALKUNAS, REPRESENTING THE LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF SOCIETIES

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, I am an American-born son of Lithuanian parents who had sought freedom and pursuit of happiness in this free country of ours. Most of you or of your parents had left their ancestral homelands in order to escape persecution and oppression of their religion, their language, their God-given rights of human beings. Poles and Lithuanians, in coming to the shores of America, followed in the footsteps of Kosciusko and Pulaski, both loyal sons of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth who had fought for freedom on the continent. In World Wars I and II, sons of Polish and Lithuanian parents, together with millions of other American freemen, went back to Europe and other continents to preach and fight for American principles of justice, freedom, democracy, and

national self-determination. Each casualty list of our Army and Navy carries the names of boys with Polish, Lithuanian, Slovak, and other central European names alongside Anglo-Saxon names. In Europe, Poland, a belligerent, and neutral Lithuania, and other Baltic states, had suffered greater casualties than any other European peoples—roughly 30 percent of the population of Poland, more than 40 percent of the prewar population of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. This means that we, American, Polish, and Baltic peoples, had paid a heavy price in writing the victory in the field.

Americans of Lithuanian descent will never countenance, will never agree to any settlement which would in effect condemn the Lithuanian, Polish, or any other Christian nations to slavery and extermination at the hands of our former Russian allies in the war just concluded in Europe. Russia must face a choice between remaining our ally and collaborator in establishing a peace based on justice or act alone in forging her own unilateral order and prepare for the eventual retribution, and there will be a retribution. We may be fairly certain that our country's national honor will not be sullied by underwriting the subjugation of Christian peoples by Red Fascist Russia. However, a refusal to sanction is not enough: we must hold our Government to taking drastic action to fulfill the promises which accompanied our sons going forth to battle. We must write a peace based on justice, Atlantic Charter, "four freedoms," and democracy—by force of arms, if necessary. We have already made a heavy contribution to winning the war against black and brown fascisms, and we must not shrink from making additional sacrifices to eliminate the cause of wars, by curbing the sole remaining militant oppressor of Europe.

For two centuries Lithuania had blocked the Teutonic tide of conquest. In 1410 allied Lithuania and Poland put an end to Teutonic aggression at Tannenberg, and Russia benefiited thereby for centuries to come. Lithuania and Poland together protected Europe from hostile Mongol invasions. Thereafter, our ancestors had tried to become a bridge between western and eastern civilization—not a barrier between them. Our ancestors had been accustomed to democratic forms of government in a democracy of the gentry and the cities. Never in their long history had they tolerated tyrannical dictatorship.

In the eighteenth century the big three autocracies of the period—Austria, Russia, and Prussia—had ganged up in eliminating the beacon of freedom and liberalism by dismembering the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Thereafter each successive generation had paid a heavy price in blood and suffering in attempting to regain freedom—in 1794–95, 1812, 1830–31, 1863–64, 1915, 1917–20. Our ancestors suffered and bled in the home countries and in Siberian exile, and yet they found time to battle for freedom anywhere where freedom was menaced—in America, Hungary, Caucasus, Germany, Italy, Spain. Must each successive American generation now follow this road of bloodshed in this one world of ours? No. All of us believers in peace, justice, freedom and democracy must unite—to combat appeasement and subversion in our country, to encourage Washington to exercise American moral leadership, backed by American armed and economic might, to establish a just and permanent peace after this war. If Russia will insist on the policy of imperialism, subjugation, and extermination, let us tell the government that the American people are ready to keep on fighting in Europe. Long live the cause of freedom. Long live our newly found cooperation. Let us not abandon the civilized peoples of Christian Europe. Long live free and independent Poland, Lithuania, and other freedom-hungry peoples of Northern, central, eastern, and southern Europe.

What Every American Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1945

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the chaotic conditions in Europe today ought to cause every red-blooded American citizen to ask the question, "How long are the people going to permit allowing the United States of America to be the sucker for international do-gooders?" Critical times in Europe—worse now than before the War No. II started—should cause every real American to ask, "How long are we going to permit our American boys to bleed on foreign battlefields all over the world because of the greed and the stupidness of the international do-gooders who are leading America today?"

These international do-gooders already have blood on their hands but they are at it again. They want knowingly or unknowingly, that our boys should bleed again. These same international do-gooders who have manipulated us into this and every war want for certain to manipulate us into every war in the future so that business will always be good. If any nation does not possess the materials with which to wage war on us the international do-gooders want that America should give them the materials. The arguments used by these international do-gooders would be laughable if they were not so pitiful. The international do-gooders in America of today are no different from those of other days. These international do-gooders are taking us into a league with death and a covenant with hell.

Led by such international do-gooders like "Big Business" Baruch, they tell us something which they think is amazing. They tell those of us who oppose feeding and financing the world that we will be responsible for a third world war. In answer to so stupid a statement I wish to state that as long as I am a Member of Congress I am going to keep my self-respect. And as long as I am a Member of Congress there is going to be no blood on my hands, because I followed the treacherous path of the international do-gooders. As long as I am a Member of Congress I shall not vote to send any materials of war or any money to any nation whom I suspect might someday wage war on us.

I think I am of average American intelligence. Up to a few months ago I thought and believed that Hitler and Tojo, backed by America's international do-gooders, started this war in which our boys are bleeding all over the world. I still think so! But lo and behold, of late the international do-gooders are telling us that America started this war because we were isolationists and refused to play Santa Claus. These fakers now tell us that if we had been more of a Santa Claus that there would be no Hitler and Tojo to start a war. This propaganda is as vicious as it is stupid. But regretfully I must say many of our citizens are believing it; yes, even most Members in the halls of Congress. The very fact that the wars in Europe started even after we were already playing Santa Claus to the world does not even cause the international do-gooders to blush at their own arguments. The very fact that war in Asia broke out because we played Santa Claus causes international do-gooders little concern. History sadly teaches us that wars in the world since 1934 were directly proportioned to how big a Santa Claus America was. The more we played Santa Claus the more we had wars. The more we extended our Santa Claus attitude the wider the war spread.

It is high time that the bloody trail of the international do-gooders be exposed. America has already sacrificed a million of its best boys to satisfy the unending appetites of the international do-gooders. What I propose to do today is to prove conclusively that it was too much America's being a Santa Claus that has already cost us a million casualties of our own finest boys. More casualties are in the offing. America and America alone with its international do-gooders' foreign policy built Hitler's war machine that killed hundreds of thousands of our own boys. America and America alone with its international do-gooders' policy built Tojo's war machine, which has and will cost us a million more lives. Hitler and Tojo are not the only ones with blood on their hands. Right here in America the international do-gooders must be classed with them.

WHO HELPED JAPAN ATTACK US?

To be specific, let us take Japan. The international do-gooders told us that to be friends with them we must trade with them and give them money and materials. Listening to them, we stepped up our trade with Japan. The fact that Japan marched into China did not concern the international do-gooders. The fact that Japan broke the Kellogg Pact did not concern the international do-gooders. We must trade with Japan they told us. We must be Santa Claus. We must be good to the Japs so they will love us—is what we were told. The fact that Japan even broke the disarmament agreement did not even budge the international do-gooders. They still insisted that to keep the peace we must do business with Japan—we Americans must always be international do-gooders. Japan even went into Camrath Bay near the Philippines and attacked American lives and property, still the international do-gooders said we must play Santa Claus with them—in fact they said to be friends we must become a bigger Santa Claus. All the while Japan was getting ready to attack us the international do-gooders so eager to play Santa Claus insisted we help them prepare. The international do-gooders did not care what we shipped Japan as long as we could play Santa Claus and do business with them and make the Japs happy.

So what happened? Here in America we threw men and women out of work,

closed our toy factories and bought our toys from Japan—hundreds and millions of dollars worth. What did the international do-gooders send Japan in return for toys? Food? No. Clothing? No. We shipped them oil and gas and steel and scrap iron and money to help build her war machine. Japan sent us dolls and toys—we in turn sent Japan gas, iron, money, and bullets. The international do-gooders got America to buy gold from Japan at an inflated price which amounted to a cash grant of nearly a billion dollars so that she could pay for her war machine. We not only furnished Japan with the materials of war, we even gave her the money with which to start a war against us. Still the international do-gooders in America do not even blush. They are still at it but in a different way, in a stronger way, and on a much larger scale. At that time they dealt only in a few billions of dollars. Now they are dealing in hundreds of billions of dollars. Japan's sneak attack on America at Pearl Harbor was possible only because the international do-gooders who wanted to play Santa Claus in America gave Japan the materials and the money with which to do it. The international do-gooders in America must share the responsibility for murder equally with Japan.

Let us be specific about the ways of America's international do-gooders. Here are some interesting but disgusting figures taken from page 405 of the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee last year. When Japan attacked us at Pearl Harbor here is where her war materials came from:

Trucks, autos and parts, 91 percent given her by the United States of America.

Copper, 93 percent given her by the United States of America.

All oil, 60 percent given her by the United States of America.

Pig iron, 41 percent given her by the United States of America.

Scrap iron, 60 percent given her by the United States of America.

Machinery and engines, 48 percent given her by the United States of America.

High-octane gasoline, 100 percent given her by the United States of America.

From these figures we can see that the United States of America, following the advice of the international do-gooders, gave Japan an average of 75 percent of her materials of war. Without these materials Japan could never have started the war. In fact without these materials from the United States of America, Japan would never have dreamed of attacking us at Pearl Harbor. The international do-gooders did not change their ways one iota when the American boys had American scrap iron shot into their flesh by the Japanese. The international do-gooders will not change their ways even after a million of our boys are filled with scrap iron and materials we ourselves gave to Japan.

Here is how our international do-gooders gave Japan the tools to kill our boys:

Exports of iron and steel scrap from the United States to Japan 1926–41

Year	Amount (in long tons)	Value
1926	18,868	$478,276
1927	71,087	1,301,022
1928	160,427	2,460,099
1929	208,260	3,089,698
1930	168,186	2,945,761
1931	48,036	842,977
1932	164,001	1,325,464
1933	547,539	4,738,917
1934	1,168,496	12,427,799
1935	1,065,143	10,843,964
1936	1,009,767	11,896,627
1937 [1]	1,872,646	37,417,929
1938 [1]	1,365,921	21,685,100
1939 [1]	2,024,264	32,526,217
1940 [1]	958,778	16,971,450

[1] Jap war on China.

A study of the figures shows the nearer we came to war with Japan the more our international do-gooders sent to Japan to be sure Japan could put up a good fight. Look at the figures for 1939 for instance, when Japan was already butchering Chinese by the millions. At the same time we were sending China materials to fight Japan. We all remember the stab in the back at Pearl Harbor. That stab in the back was not by Japan alone—our international do-gooders share that stab in the back equally if not more so.

While we are on Pearl Harbor here is something very significant. It took a lot of Japanese planes to do the job. Likewise it took a lot of high-octane gasoline to fly those Japanese planes. Every American boy who lost his life at Pearl Harbor ought to know that every ounce of that high-octane gasoline which flew the Japanese bombs over Pearl Harbor was given to Japan by the international do-gooders and profiteers of the U. S. A. Without that high-octane gasoline Japan could never have attacked us at Pearl Harbor. Such is the bloody trail of the international do-gooders in the U. S. A. These same people now tell us that unless we feed and finance every country like we did Japan we will have a third world war. Leave it to them—they should know—should they not? Such statements reach the lowest depths of stupidity. If only the boys who died with American scrap iron in their bellies could talk. If only one of them could come to life and appear here to tell us the ways of America's international do-gooders.

During the period from 1937 to 1940 the international do-gooders gave Japan more than 8,000,000 tons of steel and scrap iron. We gave them so much steel and scrap iron that when we started our own preparedness program our own stocks of steel and scrap iron were almost completely depleted. The first thing we had to do was to wage a scrap-iron drive in our own country because we gave almost all we had in stock to Japan. The international do-gooders had us down to bare cupboards like old Mother Hubbard. Even as late as 1940 the international do-gooders gave Japan 776,499 barrels of high-octane grade aviation gasoline. Without any regard for our own needs and our own safety the international do-gooders were ready to hand over all we had to Japan. That is what they call being friendly. That is how the international do-gooders win friends and influence people. It is most regretful that innocent boys were killed at Pearl Harbor. It would have been better for America if the international do-gooders—those who want to play Santa Claus were there instead on December 7, 1941. Maybe then they would have mended their ways and they would not be here today to urge us into another league with death.

But in considering Japan and her help from our would-be Santa Clauses, I want to bring out that nothing was overlooked. Not only did the international do-gooders give Japan the materials to fight us but they even saw to it that they were real Santa Clauses by giving Japan the money to pay for a war against us. This they felt would certainly win friends and influence people and make Japan love us. So the international do-gooders got the United States of America to buy Japan's gold for $711,000,000 in good American cash. But that was not enough because a little later the price of gold was raised from $20 to $35 per ounce so we gave Japan a bonus of $226,000,000. Thus we gave Japan almost a billion dollars of good American money. Using Japan's low wages, this amounts to almost $20,000,000,000 in wages in Japan compared to the United States of America. So we gave Japan not only the materials but we also gave them the money so that she could attack us, but good. This is how the international do-gooders prevented a war with Japan. These are the same people who now tell us we must continue such a program with every nation or they will not like us and it will lead to a third world war. How stupid!

The blunt truth is Japan alone is not responsible for attacking America and stabbing us in the back. The international do-gooders of America are equally responsible. If it were not for America's international do-gooders Japan never could have and never would have been able to attack us. When Japan stabbed us in the back at Pearl Harbor they had enough gas, oil, planes, trucks, and iron from our own international do-gooders to wage a war for one whole year. In spite of this, these same international do-gooders want us now to continue to feed every country with war materials just as we fed Japan. The international do-gooders want every nation supplied with enough war materials so that all of them can attack us. The international do-gooders want to finance every nation as well as we financed Japan so that when Japan is licked our boys will be forced to die elsewhere. These greedy do-gooders have no scruples but one—and that is that we feed and finance every country except our own. America is of little concern to them. Business is business and all they want is business—the more war the more business. The international do-gooders never think of saving America or American lives—they think only about how much business they can get from another country, even if it means war. They think only of helping others and never about helping ourselves. They never think about making us

strong—they think only of making people of other countries richer and stronger. They would sacrifice America for the almighty dollar any time. Their game is trading American lives for foreign business. This is the true story of who helped Japan get ready to attack us.

WHO BUILT THE GERMAN WAR MACHINE?—NOBODY BUT AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL DO-GOODERS

Now let us see who helped Germany get ready to start another war. The United States of America suffered 800,000 casualties fighting Hitler. Hitler alone is not responsible for his crimes. Germany under Hitler is another example of the work of America's international do-gooders. If it had not been for America's international do-gooders, Hitler never could have made Germany strong enough to start a second world war. America's international do-gooders who wanted business above all else saw to it that Germany got enough money from us to make herself strong enough to start a second world war.

When the war ended in 1918 the world thought Germany was beaten. But Germany was beaten only for a few years because America's international do-gooders saw to it that Germany was not beaten. As early as 1923 the international do-gooders in America, who saw a lot of business and profit in Germany, started to rebuild Germany's war machine. Instead of murderers in World War I the international do-gooders now started to tell us how wonderful the German people really were. The international do-gooders now were telling us that America could not prosper unless Germany prospered. The international do-gooders were now criticizing Belgium and France for being too hard on Germany. This was only because the international do-gooders saw more business and profit in Germany than in either France or Belgium.

So in 1923 the international do-gooders in America got through the Dawes plan and the United States of America gave Germany a $200,000,000 loan plus a breathing spell of 4 years in which reparation payments for Germany's damage in World War I were reduced 40 percent. The international do-gooders said America must help the poor people of Germany. But the poor people of Germany did not get any help from the $200,000,000 loan in 1923. Ten million dollars of this loan was at once put into the Krupp munition works and as early as 1923 America's international do-gooders started Germany's war machine producing with American money and not German money. Another $12,000,000 of this first loan was given, not to help the poor people of Germany. It at once was given to Herr Thyssen, the man who made so much money with this loan from America that he made billions and this same Herr Thyssen is the man who financed Hitler. So here again it was American money and not German money that started Germany's war machine—the machine that 20 years later killed hundreds of thousands of our own American boys. If our boys who were killed in this war in Europe only knew that it was American money that was responsible for their death—international do-gooders never think of death—they think only about business and profit.

But this is just the beginning of the bloody trail of America's international do-gooders. Because in 1930 these greedy business manipulators said there is more business to be had from Germany if we would only make the German people more prosperous and happy. So in 1930 the international do-gooders put through the Young plan and America gave Germany another loan of $300,000,000. With this second loan from the U. S. A. the Krupp munition works got bigger and better and really started to turn out guns and gases. Herr Thysen got some more money from this second U. S. A. loan and made more billions with which he later financed Hitler.

During all this time that America's international do-gooders were shedding tears for the poor German people—German taxes were lower than those in U. S. A., France, Britain, or any other country of note. During this time when our international do-gooders were shedding tears for the poor German people, Germany built not one but seven stadiums in the world. U. S. A. could not afford even one for itself because our international do-gooders wanted it that way. Why worry about stadiums for America when the poor people of Germany needed our help. During this time Germany was building railroads that even U. S. A. and Britain could not afford. Still we, the suckers, were helping Germany with loans. To be exact, Germany's taxes at this time were one-fourth of those in Britain and one-half of those in the U. S. A. and still the international do-gooders said we must make Germany happy if we want to be happy. We were beginning to get breadlines in America at this time while the German people accumulated savings accounts of $3,000,000,000. Still our international do-gooders made suckers out of us by impoverishing us and feeding and financing the Germans. Business is business, and our international do-gooders think business is everything even if it means ultimate death for our boys. But even if they knew such business meant death to our boys they would still be for this shameful game, because when our boys are forced to bleed for their profit they are assured of a land office business—business gets better as wars get bigger.

This is the type of thing our international do-gooders like Baruch specialize in. Between 1918 to 1932 our international do-gooders, bleeding for the poor German people, got the U. S. A. to loan Germany $1,364,000,000. Besides this American businessmen invested $250,000,000 in Germany during the same time. During this time we also stepped up our exports to Germany to be sure Germany would not starve and that she had everything she wanted. This type of thing took place until 1937. During all this time our international do-gooders shed crocodile tears for Germany—poor Germany and its people. But in 1937 Hitler announced to the world that the sucker game was over. While we were taxing our people here in America—taking food and clothing and conveniences from them—millions of our own people here at home were already in bread lines. The international do-gooders said we must not turn our eyes from suffering in Germany—we must help them. Help them we did because in 1937 Hitler announced to the world that the sucker game was over because with financial help from America and Britain he was able to spend up to 1937 more than $40,000,000,000 rearming Germany and that Germany was now the greatest military power in the world.

Who made Hitler? Nobody but America's international do-gooders gave Hitler the money to mak the weapons that killed our boys. Still the international do-gooders did not even blush with shame. Business is business, and business is all they are interested in. The fact is that without America's help Hitler never could have become so powerful as he did. It was America's help that built Germany. It was American help that financed Germany's war machine. We were depriving ourselves of everything. But the international do-gooders said we cannot prosper unless Germany prospered. So we made Germany prosper so much that as a result 800,000 of our own boys paid with blood to destroy Germany again. That is the plot of international do-gooders. They want the business out of building up an enemy because they then get more business and profit out of destroying the enemy. American human lives to international do-gooders are merely a means of profit and doing business. The more wars the more business. The international do-gooders build enemies so that we can destroy them and build them up again. This way they get business from both sides. And the international do-gooders love business. They love business more than they do the lives of our own boys who must die to make more business for them—Baruch, Mellon, du Pont, Morgan, Rockefeller, and Morgenthau.

WHAT ARE AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL DO-GOODERS UP TO NOW?

Hang on to whatever you are holding when you read this because it sounds as fantastic as it is real. Germany is crushed. Morgenthau saw to it that nothing was left of it. The more Germany was crushed the more America could give away in building it up again. And there is a lot of business and profit in giving America away as long as taxpayers are suckers enough to furnish the dough. The more destruction the more we can give away in rebuilding—and how Morgenthau and company like to give America away. To make peace with Germany to save American lives was of no concern to Morgenthau and company. So Germany was forced to make peace with Stalin before America. To insist on this, Morgenthau and company were sure to see Germany completely destroyed. Now look at the business and profit there will be in rebuilding Germany. Look at how much Morgenthau and company can give away now at taxpayers' expense. Now they will call the rebuilding of Germany a humanitarian deed. They will not say anything about

how much business and profit and graft there will be in it.

Japan will be another case in our Santa Claus plan. The international do-gooders built up Japan from 1932–1941. Now they do not want to give Japan anything but unconditional surrender. They want to be sure that everything is destroyed in Japan. Then there will be another chance for the international do-gooders to give some more of America away in rebuilding Japan. Giving Japan better terms to save American lives does not concern the international do-gooders. These givers relish giving things away. When did they prosper more? When did they chisel and graft more than when money comes as easy as it does during war? Give—destroy—and give again, so that we can destroy again to give again—that is the stock in trade of America's international do-gooders. With such a circle operating they are assured of perpetual lifetime profits. They can always make big men of themselves by taking a dollar a year job to see that profits get into the right places.

HOW FAR WILL INTERNATIONAL DO-GOODERS GO?

The answer to this question is that they know no moral law and they have no shame. These international do-gooders will embrace anything and everything to keep going. Recently we have seen this crowd embrace and court the Communists. Because they love communism? Do not be silly. Communists do not like profiteers. But Communist Russia today is the most fertile field for international do-gooders to give America away. So all of a sudden America's international do-gooders and the Communists have fallen in love, and what a courtship it is.

The Communists see in this a chance to weaken America and strengthen Communist Russia so they are accepting the courtship. No longer do the Communists denounce profits and big business. They are sweethearts now. As long as anyone makes a profit feeding Communist Russia it is O. K. with the Communists. So get ready, U. S. A., because what you have seen is only a sample. Get ready to dish out because now you are to be taken to the cleaners for good.

WHAT'S COOKING NOW?

Well, it has come to a point already where nobody can say anything against Russia. The Russians can call the United States of America anything it feels like at the moment. But my, my, we must never say anything against the Russians because we might hurt their poor little feelings.

So the chief receiver from America's international do-gooders today is Communist Russia. We already gave Russia $10,000,000,000 of lend-lease. Russia is the only ally that didn't give us even one penny of reverse lend-lease. Russia gave us nothing except to call us names. But here is what we gave Russia:

Eight hundred thousand American casualties to save Russia from Hitler.

Fourteen thousand airplanes, America's best.

Four hundred and six thousand motor vehicles, America's best.

Seven thousand tanks, America's best.

Two thousand self-propelled guns, America's best.

One hundred and thirty-five thousand submachine guns, America's best.

Fifty thousand other big guns, America's best.

Thirteen thousand locomotives and cars, and so forth, America's best.

Notice, we gave Russia 14,000 airplanes. Yet, whoever heard of Russia bombing anything except Finland. American airplanes and flyers had to do the job in the rest of Europe, Africa, and Asia. We gave Russia four times more than we gave General MacArthur and our own boys up to January 1, 1945. Our own boys had to wait until Stalin's appetite was satisfied. In return for lend-lease, it should be pointed out that every country we helped gave us something in return—except Russia. We cannot even get one little base from her to help us fight the Japs.

Are we through giving things to Russia? We have not even begun. The war with Hitler is finished. Russia is not at war with Japan. Yet we are going to give Russia in the future even more than we gave her in the past.

Our international do-gooders now have the following plans to help Russia:

Lend-lease $22,000,000,000; three billion a year to Russia.

UNRRA, $2,000,000,000; half of it to Russia or sattelites.

Bretton Woods, $8,000,000,000; three billions to Russia.

Commodity Credit, $2,000,000,000; one-half to Russia.

Export-Import Bank, $2,000,000,000; one-half to Russia.

Besides this, the international do-gooders are planning a $10,000,000,000 loan to Russia. And besides that, the same givers want to wipe out the three billion Russia owes us from the last war. The combined total that these schemers want to give Russia in the next 5 years is about $20,000,000,000 of hard-earned American money.

One would think that with these gifts Stalin would fall in love with us for sure. But read Russia's papers and see how much they love us. Stalin will not even go outside Europe to talk to our President. Always our President must go to court Stalin and promise him more billions.

Ask any child what country in the world is the only country which could wage war on America. Any child will tell you there is only one country in all the world that could wage a war against us—that country is Russia. So the international do-gooders are doing to Russia today what we did to Japan from 1932 to 1941, and to Germany from 1923 to 1938. The United States of America is building up another potential enemy.

The arguments used by the international do-gooders are the same today as in the past. From 1932 to 1941 they said we must say nothing against Japan or they might get mad at us. During these years we were told that we must help the poor Japs. We must give them money and materials so that they will fall in love with us. So we were blackmailed until Japan, with our money and materials, got strong enough to attack us.

From 1933 to 1938 we were told that we must say nothing against Hitler because he might get mad at us. We were told that we must help Hitler to build stadiums and factories and give him money so that he will love us. We did all this until we made Hitler strong enough to start another war.

During all these years 13,000,000 Americans were on relief. During these years America's national debt and taxes were increasing. America meant nothing. The welfare of American people meant nothing. They were meant only to deprive themselves and build Japan and Hitler.

So today it is still the same. Now we are told we must say nothing against Russia. We should deprive ourselves and give—give—and give some more to Russia. So plans are to give Russia $20,000,000,000 in the next 5 years. No bonus for our soldiers—no increase in old-age pensions for our aged—just billions for Russia. So dig, Mr. Taxpayer, dig and dig some more. The international do-gooders are now giving Russia billions trying to buy Stalin's love. Russia must prosper. But America must wait and give until there is nothing left.

The U. S. A. built Hitler's war machine with U. S. A. money. The U. S. A. built Japan's war machine with U. S. A. money. The U. S. A. is now building Russia's war machine with U. S. A. money. The U. S. A. makes its own wars—bigger and better as the years flee by.

Safety in Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report to the President on the question of safety in travel, by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. This is a very informing and valuable contribution to the question of life saving and travel.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THE NATION-WIDE BRAKE EMPHASIS PROGRAM SPONSORED BY THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

"You're only a foot from trouble," the admonition to motorists in the IACP Nationwide brake emphasis program, conducted from April 15 to June 1, was revealed to be all too appropriate. Almost complete returns for the 6 weeks reveal that of 1,587,812 passenger cars checked in the United States and Canada, 229,822, or 14.5 percent, approximately one in seven, could not meet the simple requirement of the check.

THE WAR EFFORT AND TRAFFIC SAFETY

With gasoline and tire rationing and suspension of automobile manufacturing during the war, it might at first glance seem that the traffic problem should be vastly reduced. Such was not the case. The cars remaining in use have been aging and are now almost

twice as old on an average as was the case in prewar years. They are more susceptible to break-down. And, for thousands of war workers, they are the only means of transportation to and from vitally essential jobs. Loss of cars, with no replacements available, simply means fewer transportation units and a greater usage burden on those remaining. In 1944 there were 5,000,000 fewer cars registered in the United States than in 1941. Cars scrapped in 1943 included 250,000, or one-sixth of the total, which were traffic casualties.

The traffic toll has been costly to our war effort. In 1944 traffic accidents took 24,000 lives; half of them were workers. The cost in man-hours, personal injuries, and property damage was proportionately high.

THE BRAKE-CHECK PROGRAM

The police recognized the need for action. Coping with war-brought traffic problems, in the face of manpower shortages, and planning for expected postwar conditions had sharpened their understanding. It became apparent that unless the public also understood the problem and their responsibility in it, an unreasonably high traffic toll and the rapid disappearance of cars from our highways would seriously impede our war effort.

The brake-emphasis program was devised as a means of focusing public attention on the need for car conservation and greater caution in traffic—preventive maintenance to make cars last longer and preventive traffic law enforcement to prevent traffic casualties.

The program was sponsored by the International Association of Chiefs of Police and directed from headquarters of the IACP safety division. It was the first united police effort for traffic safety. Participating were State, city, and county police departments in the United States and the Provincial, municipal police departments of Canada, as well as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

THE BRAKE CHECK

Brakes were selected as the point of emphasis because of their logical and obvious relation to traffic safety. Motorist and pedestrian both know how often the ability to stop is all that stands between safety and tragedy in traffic.

The brake check used by the police was in no sense a comprehensive test of brake condition. It was a simple procedure, requiring only a minute of the officer's time and one which did not waste the motorist's time, tires, or gasoline. Developed with the assistance of automotive engineers to meet a wartime emergency, it was a means of screening out the obviously dangerous brakes.

To apply the check a 1-inch wooden block is placed on the floorboard under the brakes. If, when the brake pedal is pushed down, the brakes fail to grip before striking the block, it has been demonstrated that not enough pressure on the brake drums can be built up to stop a car in emergency conditions. Tests conducted with the cooperation of these engineers showed that cars failing to meet the 1-inch requirement usually could not stop in the legal distance (30 feet at 20 miles per hour in most States).

Before adoption of the program it was determined in conferences with Government war agencies and automotive parts and equipment manufacturers that parts and manpower would be available to make necessary repairs.

The police brake check was limited to passenger cars involved in moving traffic violations and in accidents, and to cars being operated in a manner indicating unsafe brakes, since under wartime conditions it would have been inadvisable, if not impossible, to check the brakes of all passenger cars. However, in many communities the program gained such widespread interest that countless motorists voluntarily had their brakes checked and cooperating agencies had the brakes checked on all vehicles under their control.

ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROGRAM

In each of the United States a State coordinator directed operation of the program, distributing information and materials, organizing activities on the State level and assisting local chiefs and sheriffs to plan and carry on the program in their communities. In many States and cities a proclamation by the Governor or mayor opened the program. Similarly in Canada, under a national coordinator, a coordinator for each Province directed the brake-check activity. Simultaneously more than 5,000 police chiefs and sheriffs were directing tens of thousands of traffic officers who made the brake check. During the program period the coordinators received and compiled the weekly reports from local chiefs and sheriffs and sent the results to the IACP safety division. From these the situation in the United States and Canada was revealed.

SPLENDID SUPPORT RECEIVED

The urgency of the program's purpose was attested by the enthusiastic support received from governmental agencies, national organizations, and public minded associations and companies. For whatever good this police activity achieves, much credit is due them for wholehearted assistance, given unstintingly, in degree according to the character of each.

The late President supplied the public motivation in calling on the IACP president, General Draper, "to mobilize the law enforcement agencies of the Nation to combat this threat (traffic accidents) to our war effort."

Gen. Brehon Somerville, of the Army Service Forces, spurred police to action by his commendation on their work in facilitating movement of men and supplies essential to the war, and extending his endorsement of the program and wishes for its success. The Navy, through its safety section, actively participated.

Prime Minister Mackenzie King, of Canada, made a public declaration of his opinion that such a program was timely and needed and that the police were to be congratulated for conducting it.

The police had the cooperation of the Office of War Information, the Office of Defense Transportation, associations of State and local officials concerned with highway transportation, service groups, farm groups, labor unions, civic clubs, insurance companies, motor clubs, and many others interested in safety. Altogether more than 100 national groups supported the program. In addition, much help was given by the automotive, parts and equipment, rubber, and petroleum industries. Staff assistance and materials were made available by the National Safety Council, the American Automobile Association, the National Conservation Bureau and the Automotive Safety Foundation. The brake-check program was officially supported by the National Committee for Traffic Safety, whose membership includes the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the four groups named above, and 43 other national organizations.

A MESSAGE TO MILLIONS

An estimated 5,000,000 posters, carrying the message, "You're only a foot from trouble—Check your brakes" were reproduced within the States from samples provided by the safety division. So, also, were approximately 30,000,000 small folders carrying the same message and telling the purpose of the program. Part of the materials were produced for their own use by State and local police agencies, millions also were provided by the hundreds of national and local service organizations and cooperating industries and companies.

Publicity was released from the program headquarters to newspapers and magazines and helpful publicity materials were provided for the use of the police in their own communities. Interest was quickly aroused and generous support of newspapers, magazines, and radio news commentators brought a tremendous volume of publicity. Supporting industrial associations and individual companies supported the police program through their house organs and in their billboard, direct mail, newspaper, and radio advertising. Altogether publicity was probably greater than a police traffic activity had ever before received.

THE RESULTS

The immediate result of 6 weeks of brake checking by the police was the revelation that, on an average, one car in seven on the highways of the United States and Canada has brakes in poor to dangerous condition. That the mechanical condition of our cars bears an important relation to traffic safety was brought home to millions of car users and, in addition, was called forcefully to the attention of the police themselves. The lesson has been stronger in some communities than in others for where a shockingly high percentage of cars failed to pass the brake check, already in some cases, something is being done about it.

To show by actual statistics that thousands of lives had been saved by the IACP Nation-wide brake emphasis program would indeed by a dramatic climax to an effort in which thousands of individuals had a part. Some reduction in fatalities nationally may be shown for the month of May, although figures are not yet available and no prediction can be made. In March and again in April traffic deaths were 3 percent higher than in the same months in 1944. Early information from several communities indicates that spectacular decreases in accidents have occurred during the period of the brake check. One State, which had an average of 12.8 deaths in May for 11 years, had only three traffic deaths in May 1945. In another State there were 47 percent fewer deaths in May of this year than in the same month last year. These are only two instances. When all reports are available, other States may show decreases which can be, in part at least, credited to their participation in the brake-check program.

But these immediate results cannot tell the whole story of what the brake-check program achieved, any more than an intensive 6-week effort can take the place of year-round, day-in-day-out traffic management by the police. Constant awareness on the part of the motorist, safe driving practices, and continued responsibility for keeping his car in good condition are required, not just between April 15 and June 1, 1945, but as long as each of us values his life, his property, and the lives and property of others.

If it could be estimated that this program had permanently impressed upon all of us our obligation to drive only with skill and care, to cooperate with the police in preventive traffic law enforcement, and to maintain our cars always in good operating condition—then it could be said to have attained ultimate success. But the program sprang from a long-growing need which by no means ended June 1, and such an absolute goal is obstructed by both human and physical factors.

Long lasting benefit, the association believes, will be derived from the program because of the widespread interest aroused, and because a valuable impetus has been given to cooperation among agencies concerned with traffic safety and to public understanding of this urgent problem.

THE JOB AHEAD

There are four major factors which combined have caused law-enforcement officials and traffic-safety authorities to agree that never in the history of highway transportation have conditions been so conducive to an increase in traffic accidents.

The passenger car itself is old—nearly twice as old today on the average as it was before the war. It is more susceptible to break down and to accident. Its tires are worn, and yet there is not a sufficient supply in sight to make any appreciable change in the average car's safety.

Passenger cars are dwindling, with accidents a major cause. In 1944, it is estimated, 250,000 were smashed beyond repair. As the supply of cars falls off, more intense usage is made of those that remain. New car production scheduled for this and next year will barely hold the line against scrappage.

From a peak of 9,300 miles of travel per car in 1941, travel for the average vehicle dropped to some 6,000 miles in 1943, and 6,600 miles in 1944. Relaxation of gasoline rationing is expected to increase the 1945 mileage to more than 8,000 miles. Old cars, old tires, traveling more miles. More accident exposure, more deaths and injuries are on the horizon.

Another factor is the highway, which likewise is a casualty of the war. During the war construction of roads and streets virtually ceased, except for essential roads for military uses. Construction, and even maintenance, were curtailed to apply manpower, materials, and equipment where most needed. Years will be required to bring roads and streets back to their prewar condition.

The driver, with his old equipment, assumes a new importance in the accident-prevention picture. Innumerable civilians who have not been driving during the war and millions of returning servicemen will be taking to the open road again in war-worn cars. It is only logical to expect that some time will be required before large numbers regain driving efficiency and carefulness. In many States and communities driver licensing has been abandoned during the war, and in some cases age limits have been lowered. Here again time will be needed to restore regulations of proven desirability.

Law enforcement, too, has felt the pressure of war. Police personnel has been depleted by war demands, with many capable officers in the armed services. Developments indicate that traffic volumes and accident potentials will increase before police departments in many communities can establish themselves to meet the enlarged demands. In many instances, car inspection has laid aside during the war, thus increasing enforcement problems.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

Public and private agencies concerned with traffic safety realize that they must redouble their efforts in all possible ways. Continued publicity must be given the increased dangers on our roads and streets. Emphasis must be placed on the fact that the war has weakened the highway travel structure—that there are many unsafe roads and streets, that old cars are more likely to have accidents, that many drivers are inexpert, that law enforcement must be built up to meet the ever-increasing demands, and that necessary legislation must be enacted promptly, including provisions for better licensing of drivers and vehicle inspection.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police pledges itself to continue effort for ever greater highway safety—not only for today but for tomorrow as well, when peace is attained and our highways once again swarm with traffic with all the familiar implications of freedom, convenience, and danger.

Indianapolis on World Air Map

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Indianapolis on World Air Map," published in the Indianapolis Star of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS ON WORLD AIR MAP

Even the most optimistic visionary could not have guessed what would be the development of aviation when Lindbergh made his solo flight across the Atlantic 18 years ago. We all know that trips to the most distant parts of the globe are routine affairs today. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers and tens of thousands of wounded are carried overseas in planes. There are processions of bombers and other craft crossing the Atlantic and Pacific every day.

It is gratifying to Indianapolis to have two of the lines that serve this city included in the three recently designated by the Civil Aeronautics Board to share in the development of foreign routes that are being assigned. The American Airlines, which controls the American Export Airlines, and the TWA have received permits for overseas air service. The former will provide service to Ireland, England, Berlin, Helsinki, Warsaw, and Moscow. The latter's routes will include Lisbon, Madrid, Rome, Cairo, and other points. The third, Pan American, will serve European stops as it now does those in Latin America.

Air transport is no untried innovation to those lines. Pan American has been going up and down the coasts of Central and South America for years. The American and TWA lines have figured prominently in the overseas war traffic of our Government. The American, for example, has made more than 7,000 crossings of the Atlantic in less than 3 years. War experience is assurance of what may be expected in the early progress of civilian air transportation, in which Indianapolis will be fortunately and strategically placed.

Messages to the People of Japan by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD some of the latest messages I composed for broadcasting to the people of Japan.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-SIXTH MONTHLY MESSAGE OF HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH, TO THE PEOPLE OF JAPAN, FEBRUARY 7, 1944

ANNOUNCER. For the twenty-sixth time since the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor the voice of America presents the monthly message of Senator ELBERT THOMAS to the people of Japan. Senator THOMAS is a leading figure in American public life and currently is chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor. He is also an authority on Far Eastern affairs. His years of residence in Japan and his continuing interest in the people and problems of the Far East have helped him to advise the United States in its foreign policies. Before Japan made war on America Senator THOMAS was chosen to participate in the conference between the representatives of the United States State Department and the envoys of Japan. Today, more than 2 years after the beginning of the global war, he again addresses the Japanese people.

Senator THOMAS. In all important matters there is a time for reflection. There is a time to pause and consider the future in the light of the present and the past. There is a time for self-appraisal; can any occasions be more suitable for this than those which commemorate beginnings?

Since the attack on Pearl Harbor I have spoken to you many times. I have tried to convey to you, the people of Japan, some idea of the situation which confronts you, as it appears to those who stand outside the wall of thought control. I have spoken to you directly, prompted by the ghost of what was once our friendship. Today I am reminded that only a few days remain until the great festival of Kigensetsu, when all Japan will celebrate the accession of the first Emperor. On this occasion, as you consider the past centuries of Japan's history, would it not be well to reflect seriously upon the present and the future?

Seventy-six years ago Japan emerged from the shadows of medieval militarism to enter the community of civilized nations. The outward policy of isolation was discarded. Western learning and western science were introduced. On the day of Kigensetsu, in 1839, the imperial constitution was promulgated, and a parliamentary government was established. The prosperity and the peaceful prestige of Japan grew with the decades.

Only 76 years have passed. Yet where does Japan stand today? Once again Japan is governed by the sword. Once again, Japan is isolated. The imperial constitution and the Imperial Diet have become a mere mask for arbitrary power. The peaceful prestige of Japan has been sacrificed in an alliance with barbarians, and a revolt against civilization.

Do you, the people of Japan, know the true situation which confronts you? Twelve and a half years have passed since your military extremists invaded the northeastern provinces of China in open defiance of your government and of international law. Six and a half years have passed since they started their bloody and indecisive campaign of aggression against China proper. More than 2 years have passed since they completed their usurpation of all power within Japan, and brought you into a war against the most powerful coalition of military and industrial strength that the world has ever seen.

What have they accomplished? Like Hitler and Mussolini, they have earned the contempt and hatred of the civilized world. Brutally, they have seized lands and resources which they have not even been able to exploit. In attempting to gratify their lust for conquest and arbitrary power, they have wasted the fruit of decades of patient

labor and undermined the economy upon which Japan's prosperity was founded.

You, the people of Japan, will not need to be told of the terrible depletion of your navy and your merchant marine. You will not need to be told of the depletion of your natural resources. You will not need to be told of the inadequacy of your war industries. You will learn of these. The great offensives planned at the Cairo Conference will tighten the circle of United Nations power around Japan just as it has been tightened around doomed Germany. Shortages of food and fuel and medicines will speak eloquently, of your sunken merchant vessels. The overwhelming war production of the United Nations will be reflected in the increased appeals of your militarists for one more gun, and one more ship and even one more plane. You, the people of Japan, will not need to be told of privation and bereavement and useless death.

For over a year your militarists have brought only disaster and defeat upon Japan. For over a year, Japan has been on the defensive militarily, industrially, and politically. Each empty boast of victory has been followed by the loss of another island bastion in your overextended Pacific defensive line. The constantly increasing scope of United Nations offensive operations has revealed the growth of United Nations land, sea, and air supremacy.

You, the people of Japan, perhaps are not aware that your armed forces have faced only part of the total strength of the United Nations. Perhaps you are not aware of the might of the forces which now are concentrated for the final blows against encircled Germany. Do you not realize that this is the year of doom for Germany, the Germany upon whose promised victory the militarists gambled your nation's destiny? Do you understand the power of the forces which will concentrate against Japan when Germany has fallen? Do you realize what has happened to Berlin and Hamburg, Essen and Cologne, and a score of Germany's other great industrial cities?

In a few days, Japan will celebrate the great festival of Kigensetsu, commemorating the accession of the first Emperor. Could there be a better occasion for considering the future in the light of the present and the past? You, the people of Japan, have a long and unfortunate tradition of subservience to military usurpation. Do you believe that Japan was given a constitution and parliamentary government only as a screen for a government-by-the-sword similar to that which the Emperor Meiji called, "The disgrace of the middle and succeeding ages"?

(NOTE.—Imperial rescript to soldiers and sailors.)

During the 1930's, you, the people of Japan, were faced with a choice between two ways. One was the way of progress and peaceful prestige and parliamentary government. The other was the way of submission to the arbitrary power of the military extremists. It was the way of the aggressor. It was the way of Hitler and Mussolini.

During the 1930's, the choice was made for you. It was made by the assassination of progressive statesmen. It was made by terrorism and open mutiny. It was made by oppressive thought-control measures. Today, in Europe, you can behold the fate of those who followed that way before you.

Today you, the people of Japan, again face a choice. It is a choice between an eventual return to a peaceful greatness and utter disaster and defeat. I sincerely hope that, before it is too late, you may abandon the way which the militarists have chosen for you. It is the way of disgrace and death.

ANNOUNCER. From the United States of America we have presented a special message to the people of Japan. On this day in every month since January 1941, Senator ELBERT THOMAS, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, has addressed a special message to the people in whom he has taken a deep interest for nearly 40 years. Senator THOMAS spent a number of years in Japan, where he earned the respect and confidence of those with whom he came in contact. Since that time, he has been active in far-eastern affairs, and has known and worked with many Japanese leaders.

MONTHLY MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF JAPAN BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH, ON THE 7TH OF EACH MONTH, DELIVERED MAY 7, 1944

ANNOUNCER. Today marks the twenty-ninth month since the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor while they were at peace with the United States, and attempted at one stroke to destroy most of the American Navy in the Pacific. As has been his custom on the 7th day of each month since that time, United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS today addresses a special message to the people of Japan. Senator THOMAS is the chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor and a noted authority on the Far East. He has been ever since his first visit to Japan many years ago a friend of the Japanese people. His monthly messages present frankly the problems that beset the people of Japan because of their betrayal by their war lords. You will now hear the special message to the Japanese people by United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS.

Senator THOMAS. To the people of Japan: It is spring in Washington. The great carpet of grass that lies between the Capitol, the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial is again green and growing rich and thick. The tender young leaves of the trees are bright with the new life of spring.

The evenings are again long and warm and filled with the song of birds. It is the season when the literary men of Japan once found delight in writing those essays which they called zuihitsu—I repeat zuihitsu. I suppose in America we would call them rambling essays, but the American term does not have the same feeling as the Japanese term. "Zuihitsu" is a word which is rich with the feeling that Japan does not know today. It grew up in a time when the Japanese had the leisure of peace, when men could turn their eyes inward, and when they could write out of the deep, rich experiences of men who knew how to enjoy their fellow men, who knew how to value the deep emotion, that arose out of their relation to the natural world around them.

Not long ago I read in the New York Times that vegetables were to be grown on the Imperial Palace grounds and that carp were to be raised in the moat surrounding the Imperial Palace. I remembered the great plaza in front of the palace grounds. How like beautiful green silk the grass was in the spring.

I remembered the willow trees that trailed their fresh green leaves in the waters of the moat. I wonder if the plaza is being plowed up for vegetables. I wonder what new rites will have to be developed for those who will be given the privilege of fishing the carp from the moat. Even the beauty of the palace grounds has been ravaged by the men who told the Emperor that war and not peace was the way of Japan.

In Washington the cherry blossoms were beautiful this year. But their beauty was even more fleeting than usual. A strong wind swept them away just after they reached their greatest glory. I remembered my friends in Japan who told me when we went to view the cherry blossoms that man's life was as fleeting as the cherry blossoms that were scattered by the wind. It was a beautiful thought in those days years ago. That was before the lives of the Japanese people were made cheap. In those days the comparison between man's life and the cherry blossom was a beautiful thought rising out of the Japanese aesthetic feeling. It had not yet been made a soulless excuse for throwing away the lives of young men in order that the evil schemes of evil men could drive Japan's friends away and turn her away from the ancient traditions of beauty that once were held in such high esteem.

I remembered the beautiful cherry trees of Kyoto. And I recalled the lovely rolling hills that loomed so softly in the morning light. Suddenly I recalled that thousands of young men who knew that scene far better than I and to whom it meant much more were now hopelessly wandering in the jungles on the islands of the Southwest Pacific and in the hills of Burma. There was no reason why I should think of such suffering. There was no reason why the memory of past natural beauty should recall the ugly reality of present human suffering.

Those soldiers of Japan are wandering in jungles, and their minds must be equally confused. They who were born and raised on Japan's soil must remember it so much more clearly than I who merely lived there. They must remember the beauty of Japan in the springtime. They must contrast it with their present evil plight. They must remember the fun and laughter of their trips to the famous places of Japan with their friends when they were little school children. They must remember the weariness that overtook them when they walked so many miles to see so many famous sights. But that was the weariness of childhood, a weariness that was soon conquered, a weariness that was scarcely felt because there were so many new and fascinating sights to see. But today they are burdened with a different weariness. It is the weariness brought on by hopelessness, by utter physical exhaustion, by illness, by hunger, by sleeplessness.

When they were young they were eager for life because all experience was before them. Now they are desperately clinging to life because escape is the only hope they have. They must wonder, if they have news from home, about the lives of their children and their little brothers and sisters. Today young children cannot travel to famous places because of the congestion on the trains. Today they cannot enjoy the spring for they must work in factories or in the shops set up in the schools. Today they cannot eat the lunches that were once prepared by their mothers; they must eat the fare prepared in the schools in order that they do not go hungry. These thoughts and many more must run through the minds of the men in the jungles.

Perhaps that is one reason why General MacArthur's headquarters was able to report the other day that Japanese soldiers are coming out of the jungles near Hollandia in order to surrender to the Americans there. Perhaps they realize the great gap that lies between their past peaceful life and the suffering that has been forced upon them by the war that the evil men of Japan brought on the country. They know now that they will receive good treatment in American hands—better treatment as American prisoners than they ever knew as slaves under the domination of the Japanese militarists. Perhaps they realize that life today means another spring to enjoy.

The people of Japan today can see the spring, but they cannot enjoy it, they cannot appreciate it as they could in peaceful days. Their souls have been imprisoned, like their bodies and their minds, by the evil men who drove Japan into war. Perhaps the Japanese people will be free again when the Japanese militarists are utterly beaten, when they can no longer oppress their own people or those of other lands. This spring the Japanese people can have only a deep and secret hope for a return to the peace and content of other years. In future springs they may be able to look back at this one as the dark before the dawn of their liberation.

ANNOUNCER. From the United States of America we have presented a special message to the people of Japan. On this day in every

month since January 1941, Senator ELBERT THOMAS, chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, has addressed a special message to the people in whom he has taken a deep interest for nearly 40 years. Senator THOMAS spent a number of years in Japan, where he earned the respect and confidence of those with whom he came in contact. Since that time, he has been active in far eastern affairs, and has known and worked with many Japanese leaders.

MONTHLY MESSAGE OF HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH, TO THE JAPANESE PEOPLE ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF PEARL HARBOR, DECEMBER 7, 1944

The B–29 raids on Tokyo are bringing the war home to the Japanese people as nothing has done in the past. They are now beginning to learn the full consequences of the policies of militarism and aggression which have been forced on them by Japan's militaristic leaders.

The raids have demonstrated to the people of Japan that for the past year the Japanese Army and Navy have been in steady retreat. Japanese defeats at Tarawa, Kwajalein, Guam, Saipan, New Guinea, the Solomons, Peleliu, the Philippines and other places have paved the way for the raids on Tokyo. The Japanese naval defeats in the Philippine Seas have forced the Japanese Navy so far back on the defensive that it cannot hope to strike effectively at our great B–29 bases in the Marianas Islands.

This whole series of defeats has been a new experience for the fighting forces of Japan. The past year of the war in the Pacific Ocean has given the Japanese people no cause for rejoicing. As they enter the fourth year of their war against the United Nations they can look forward only to an intensification of the unfavorable situation that has been forced on Japan by the weapons, the fighting spirit, and the ingenuity of the United Nations.

Some of the most stirring pages in Japanese naval and military history were written in the first year of the war. But since then a long series of defeats has forced the Japanese Army and Navy more and more on the defensive and now they are fighting, not to conquer the world as they once boasted, but to prevent their bases in Japan itself from being overwhelmed.

The Japanese people surely have been watching the battle for Leyte with anxious eyes. There has been little cause for optimism. The American forces have been fighting victoriously for more than 6 weeks and have been pushing the Japanese forces back on the defensive. The Japanese Navy has not threatened the American beachhead since the great battles at the end of October. Had Japan's claims of damage inflicted on the American Navy been true, the American forces on Leyte would long since have been driven into the sea.

What must be particularly disturbing to the Japanese people is the way in which Japanese forces have been senselessly sacrificed in an attempt to hold Japanese positions far from Japan itself. They must know that every Japanese soldier who dies in the Philippine Islands today will not be in a position to fight for the defense of Japan when that crucial battle is begun. Thousands of Japanese have died in recent weeks when their convoys were sunk by American planes, submarines, and light surface craft. Literally thousands of Japanese have died at the cost of a few dozen American lives in these attacks on Japanese convoys.

It is not comforting to the Japanese people to recollect that this seems to be distressingly similar to the pattern of Guadalcanal 2 years ago. At that time the Japanese high command sacrificed one convoy after another in an attempt to reinforce their men on Guadalcanal. Additional thousands of Japanese lives were sacrificed in those attempts, but the high command was unable to stem the American advance. All the Japanese know now what the consequences of that defeat have been. Who among them can fail to see what the consequences of the present battles in the Philippines will be?

Thousands of young Japanese men are dying today without advantage to their country. Many of them believe that when they die in the waters of the Philippines, they are dying for their country. Others must wonder whether they are or not. They know that they are dying without firing a shot. They know that they shall not be fighting for Japan in the hour of greatest need. They must be questioning the motives and the wisdom of the Japanese high command.

Thousands of young Japanese must have realized in their last moments that what the militarists called "spiritual superiority" is simply a phrase devised by them to persuade their men to do the impossible. The militarists failed to arm and equip the Japanese soldier to fight a modern war. They had studied the West and the West's weapons. They knew that Japan could not be armed with weapons as good and as plentiful. But they also realized that they could not achieve their ambitions at home or abroad unless they made the Japanese people fight against the world, regardless of the odds.

As a result of this, the militarists told their fighting men and their families that Japanese "spiritual superiority" would prevail over the weapons of the West. At one time the Japanese people may have believed this propaganda. Today they must be questioning it. They had told them about the superiority of Japanese planes and men. They read of Japanese soldiers dying in far places. They have not yet been told of the thousands of Japanese who have died in sinking ships without even fighting against the enemy.

The Japanese people must be wondering what the war holds in store for them. Seven and a half years of war with China and 3 years of war against most of the rest of the world have failed to bring victory to Japan. Once the Japanese people may have thought that the Japanese Army and Navy were invincible. Today they must be questioning this. When they begin to question the invincibility of the armed forces, then they may begin to question the right of the militarists to rule them. As the militarists look into the future it is indeed dark. Overwhelming might and superior fighting qualities face them on the battlefield. At home the people are beginning to doubt them.

MONTHLY MESSAGE OF HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH, DELIVERED JANUARY 7, 1945

The other day I read a reporter's story in an American magazine about an incident on Tinian Island concerning a number of Japanese civilians and a small group of American marines.

The marines, on a patrol after the hard fighting had ended, came upon a narrow canyon in which a number of Japanese civilians had taken refuge. Eventually almost 800 men, women, and children emerged from their hiding places. Many of them, in true Japanese fashion, bowed low to the marines who were rescuing them. They continued to bow. The marines were greatly embarrassed by this display of what they regarded as servility. One of them even appealed to his officer to tell the Japanese to stop bowing.

The story was short and to many it would appear to be insignificant and without meaning. Really, however, it contains a political lesson of great importance to the people of America and to the people of Japan. The Japanese were reacting to the symbol of authority as represented by the American marines who were taking charge of them. The Japanese were being as servile to American authority as they would have been expected to be to Japanese authority. The Americans, on the other hand, having grown up in an atmosphere of freedom and of equality were made acutely uncomfortable by the servile actions of the Japanese which had been trained into them.

The Japanese had been taught from childhood to be subservient to all authority. The Americans had been taught from childhood to challenge authority whenever it might appear to infringe upon their rights as individuals. In addition, they were taught never to respect authority merely for its own sake.

These basic attitudes of the two peoples were not only revealed in this one instance but have been shown in many other situations during the war. The American soldier has shown a flexibility in his tactics and an ability to think and act under fire in new and trying situations. These qualities have not yet been matched by the Japanese soldier, who has shown himself in other respects to be a brave fighting man. This American ability has grown out of American emphasis on the development of individual initiative and on the ability of the individual to think for himself.

The Japanese Government, on the other hand, has tried to make all Japanese citizens accept unquestioningly the orders that are issued by persons of authority. Some Japanese on Tinian undoubtedly committed suicide merely because they were told to do so by their superiors. They did not think about their futures as individuals, as members of a family, or as Japanese who might some day return to Japan to live again in peace.

If the American marines had been trained as Japanese and German soldiers are trained, they would have accepted the Japanese servility as their just due. They would have demanded that the Japanese civilians bow to them and acknowledge their inferiority. But they have been taught that all human beings are entitled to respect as individuals and also have been taught that no man has the right to demand from other men the blind acceptance of his authority.

As long as the Japanese authorities demand subservience and as long as the Japanese people are willing to give it, Japan will be an unhappy nation. The real basis of Japan's involvement in the war, of Japan's inability to live in peace with her neighbors in all the world, of Japan's inability to appeal to the understanding of other peoples, is Japan's insistence on the ruthless imposition of authority on not only her own people but on others with whom she comes into contact.

When will the Japanese people be willing to discard their blind worship of authority? When will they be able to look upon themselves as individuals who have the right to live with each other and with the rest of the world on a footing of equality? Perhaps the loss of the war, which is inevitable, will succeed in disillusioning the Japanese people with the false ideals of the men, now representing ruthless authority in Japan, who have led them into war. If that happens, the Japanese people will be less willing to follow their leaders blindly into dangerous paths. When the iron grasp of authority is finally removed from the Japanese people they will be in a position for the first time to act as free individuals in a world where real international cooperation will be possible.

It will be difficult for the Japanese people to change. Perhaps they can do it. The same story about the civilians on Tinian contains another little anecdote. The correspondent writes: "A boy of about 4 sidled up to me and timidly touched my dungarees, then slowly inspected my carbine, my cartridge belt, and my helmet. He smiled warily. I smiled at him, and he grinned."

Perhaps it will be the children of Japan, those whose minds have not yet been warped by the rulers of Japan, who will be the first to learn of and to welcome the ideas from

the outside world which will allow the Japanese people once again to live as friends with the rest of the world.

The Japanese civilians on Tinian and on other islands in the Pacific today have lived through a terrible experience. But they are alive today and are going about their work in much the same way as they did before the war came to them, but they are living in a freer atmosphere. Perhaps the people in Japan itself will undergo the same type of experience and emerge in a different world where they can live as men who know more freedom than the people of Japan have ever before known.

MONTHLY STATEMENT TO THE PEOPLE OF JAPAN BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH, MARCH 7, 1945

The month that has passed since my last message to you has seen great and significant developments in the war against the Nazis of Germany and the militarists of Japan.

The great Russian offensive in the east has continued to press with ever greater weight on the Nazis. The Allied offensive in the west under General Eisenhower has reached the Rhine on a wide front. The doom of the Nazis and of the German General Staff is coming closer.

In the war in the Pacific the militarists of Japan had reasons to see that their fate will be the same as that of their German allies. Manila has been freed from their domination. Military installations in Formosa have been bombed almost daily. Carrier planes and surface vessels have bombed and bombarded the Ryuku Islands. Carrier planes have twice delivered great raids on military targets in the Tokyo area. B–29's have rained bombs on military targets in the Tokyo area. And American marines with aid of great fleets of ships and planes have landed on Iwo Jima and are winning one of the greatest victories in their long and glorious history. These are only the most spectacular events in the great offensive that is pressing more and more heavily on the Japanese militarists in the Pacific and on the Asiatic continent.

These things have frightened the Nazis of Germany and the militarists of Japan. But even more frightening have been the report of the Crimea Conference and President Roosevelt's report to the American Congress on the Crimea Conference. These have been more frightening because they have pointed out the manner in which the ambitions of the German and Japanese allies will be forever ended and the Japanese and German people will be encouraged to seek the ways of peace.

President Roosevelt declared that the war against Germany will continue until unconditional surrender. He added, "The German people, as well as the German soldier, must realize the sooner they give up and surrender, surrender by groups or by individuals, the sooner their present agony will be over. They must realize that only with complete surrender can they begin to reestablish themselves as people whom the world might accept as decent neighbors." The Japanese people should remember President Roosevelt's words.

The President also said, "We made it clear again at Yalta—and I now repeat—that unconditional surrender does not mean the destruction or the enslavement of the German people." The President pointed out that German propaganda had declared that the Yalta declaration means "slavery and destruction" for the German people, but he added "that is how the Nazis hope to save their own skins, how to deceive their people into continued and useless resistance." All free people know that the President's words described a true situation. They know that the Nazis hoped to remain in power only by keeping their own people ignorant.

The people of the United Nations know that German nazism and militarism must be wiped out. They know that President Roosevelt spoke for them when he said, "But the unconditional surrender of Japan is as essential as the defeat of Germany. I say that advisedly, with the thought in mind that that is especially true if our plans for world peace are to succeed. For Japanese militarism must be wiped out as thoroughly as German militarism."

The United Nations are looking forward to a peace that will cover the world. They are not interested in merely demanding the surrender of people against whom they are now fighting. They recognize that their true enemy is the ideology of militarism, of aggression, and of totalitarianism that are at the basis of German and Japanese militarism.

All over the world the peoples of the United Nations are fighting against German and Japanese militarism. They know that these two types of militarism, although they might seem to differ greatly on the surface, are really the same for they both seek not only to enslave their own people, but also to extend that slavery over the rest of the world.

The peoples of the United Nations, the Americans, the British, the Russians, the Chinese, and those of many other countries, are fighting and suffering and dying in order to rid the world of the ideologies of German and Japanese militarism. It is because they are willing to fight these ideologies today that they can plan for a peaceful world in the future.

The battle along the Rhine and the battle on Iwo Jima are a part of the same war—the war against Japanese and German ideology. The Nazis know that the war of the United Nations against them is a war against their ideology—that is why they say that it is a war against the German people. They know that if the German people are once freed of the ideology that has been forced on them that the power of the Nazis over the people's minds will end. That is why they are trying to deceive their people into believing that all the United Nations are fighting for is to exterminate or to enslave the German people.

The Germans and the Japanese have never learned what freedom is. Because they have never valued it, they have sought to take it from others, because they were told to do so by the militaristic masters. When the Nazis of Germany and the militarists of Japan are defeated and when their ideologies have disappeared, the peoples of Germany and Japan may learn to know and to cherish freedom. When they do that, they may be in a position to establish themselves "as people whom the world might accept as decent neighbors."

MONTHLY STATEMENT TO THE PEOPLE OF JAPAN BY HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH, JUNE 8, 1945

June has been a month of victory for the armed forces of the United Nations in their war against Japanese militarists. In spite of all the efforts that the militarists exerted on Okinawa, we have concentrated overwhelming force upon that island until now we are securely established there. But that is not all that we have done. At the same time that we were fighting on Okinawa, we have won still more victories in the Philippines; we have raided the Japanese homeland and have carried the warfare deep into waters that Japan once controlled. Resistance will continue there for a time, and there is much hard work to be done, but the result is beyond doubt. We are certain of victory. Everyone must know this in his heart who has followed upon a map the steady advance of the forces of the United Nations.

This war will continue until your military masters confess that they are beaten. Hostilities can end only with their unconditional surrender. President Harry S. Truman has made it clear that we will consider no other outcome. Listen to his words:

"Our military policy for the defeat of Japan calls for:

"1. Pinning down the Japanese forces where they now are and keeping them divided so that they can be destroyed piece by piece.

"2. Concentrating overwhelming power in each segment where we attack.

"3. Using ships, aircraft, armor, artillery, and all other material in massive concentration to gain victory with the smallest possible loss of life.

"4. Applying relentless and increasing pressure to the enemy by sea, air, and on the land so that he cannot reorganize or regroup his battered forces or dwinding supplies to meet our next attack."

As long, therefore, as your miltary masters insist on fighting a hopeless war we will attack strategic areas and we will destroy those people who further the ambition of the militarists.

As President Truman further says:

"Our blows will not cease until the Japanese military and naval forces lay down their arms in unconditional surrender."

What will unconditional surrender mean for the Japanese people? It means the end of the war. It means the ending of the influence of those military leaders who have brought disaster upon Japan. It means that we shall not prolong the present agony and suffering of the Japanese in their vain hope of victory.

Some of your militarist leaders, frightened by the certainty of their defeat, have tried to terrify you by saying that unconditional surrender will mean the ruin of Japan. That is not true. President Truman has clearly stated the American position on this matter:

"Unconditional surrender does not mean the extermination or enslavement of the Japanese people."

Thousands of people on Okinawa who have ceased resistance or who, as civilians, have come under American control know that President Truman's words are true. They have found that it is senseless to suffer uselessly for the benefit of Japanese war lords. They have seen that the greedy militarists are willing to throw away Japanese blood and treasure for their own selfish interests. Many of them, bypassed on the bloody islands of the South Seas where they can be of no possible help to Japan in its hour of need, have wakened to the realization that they have been callously deserted by their militarist leaders and so they, too, have turned to more peaceful ways of living. Wherever United Nations troops have landed, they have found that Japanese soldiers are listening to the truth about the war.

In Okinawa, as elsewhere, those who have ceased resistance have found that Americans treat them with humanity, that we observe the international agreements signed at Geneva by all civilized people, that we heal the sick and that we treat captives with courtesy and with respect. Thousands of men and women, therefore, on Okinawa, as well as on other islands, are cooperating with us faithfully in the rebuilding and restoration of their homes. Thus they are serving the best interests of Japan and of the world.

They have seen, as you in Japan must soon agree, that it is wiser to cease resistance than to continue this war to an inevitable disastrous defeat. They know, to quote President Truman once more, that the United Nations are "resolute in our determination to see the fight through to a complete and victorious finish."

JULY 7 MESSAGE OF HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH, TO THE PEOPLE OF JAPAN

Today is double seventh day. It marks the close of the ninety-sixth month since, on the seventh day of the seventh month in 1937, Japan's military leaders opened unprovoked war upon the Chinese people at the Marco Polo Bridge. It marks the end of the

forty-third month since the attack upon Pearl Harbor.

Let us look back upon what has happened in those long years of war.

For 8 years China has fought tenaciously to drive away the Japanese war lords. The Chinese have lost heavily in blood and treasure and they have sacrificed much territory, but the Chinese spirit is unbroken. After 8 years of what the militarists tried in vain to dismiss as a mere incident, the Japanese warmongers are still very far from victory.

Do you remember what your leaders told you when the war broke out? All eastern Asia, they said, welcomed Japanese aggression. Do you not see now that throughout all Asia the only people who side with your militarists are those with bayonets at their breasts? Even where invading armies operate, your militarists control no territory beyond the range of their rifles.

You were told, you will remember, that the United States was soft and decadent, that the American Navy had been sunk, and that the democratic peoples lacked fighting spirit. Former Premier Tojo, you will recall, promised that Japan could never be bombed. Look around you and check the accuracy of that prediction. Do you remember that, on June 23, 1943, the Tokyo radio announced, "This year, 1943, will be decisive; it will show whether Japan will win or lose this war"? Did the official radio speak the truth? Within 6 weeks your war leaders lost Munda, which they had called impregnable; soon after they also lost New Guinea, the Solomons, and Attu. Again they said, in 1944, "This year will be decisive," but they lost again—vital Iwo and the great Saipan base, which fell a year ago today. On double seventh in 1943 the Tokyo radio blasted as ridiculous the rumor that Americans would ever return to the Philippines, but now Leyte, Luzon, Mindanao, and Mindoro are in American possession, and General MacArthur has reported, just this week, that 23 Japanese divisions, with hundreds of thousands of troops which Japan sorely needs, have been practically annihilated.

Once more, in 1945, the militarists again talked big: "This year, 1945," they said, "will surely be decisive." On May 9, "Soho" Tokutomi wrote, "Okinawa is no mere local battle; it will decide the destiny of the Japanese Empire." Minister of War Toyoda demanded, 2 months ago, that Japan hold Okinawa at all costs. But Okinawa is today a thriving base for new American operations.

American fleets and armies move ever closer to the homeland of Japan. Our planes range widely over Kyushu and Shikoku, and over what were once the largest cities of Japan. This very week we have raided in the Sea of Okhotsk; our submarines patrol the Japan Sea and we have shelled Karafuto.

Do your military spokesmen speak the truth? Can you trust them now? Do you recall their glowing promises of loot and food and military power to be won from conquered areas in Asia and the South Pacific?

Where is that food? As you stand in long queues at the market places, do you see huge piles of South Sea island products? Is Burma rice now plentiful? Once upon a time your ships brought cargoes of Formosan sugar; do you now enjoy all the sugar you had before that fatal Double Seventh at the Marco Polo Bridge? Where, indeed, are the ships? And where, in Kobe, Yokohama, Nagoya, or Osaka could they dock?

How much longer will you permit those selfish leaders to sacrifice your lives in futile war against the world? They know they cannot win but they lack the courage and the honesty to admit what every thinking person knows is true. They insist that the people fight and die but they themselves lack true sincerity. Why should you die to save the faces of those who have deceived you?

The Impact of Reconversion on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely address by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], delivered on Monday, July 30, and broadcast from Station WOL, in Washington, on the Congressional Record on the Air program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. REPAID. Good evening ladies and gentlemen. As we speak with you tonight, we begin to see the glimmer of peace. Yes; the Japs seem to be in their final stages of resistance. With every bomb dropped on the Nipponese Empire, and thousands of them are being dropped daily, we come nearer the time when the cycle of peace to war and war to peace will be completed. What then? What about business, small business we mean, those thousands of little fellows who are now in war production. Will they suffer through reconversion as they did 5 years ago when our country went into a war economy? We believe we can give you some answers to those questions tonight for with us in the studio is one of the real champions of small business. Our guest is the chairman of the Small Business Committee of the Senate. And it is a privilege to present him to you now. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

Senator MURRAY. Now that Germany has been defeated, and we can concentrate our military efforts in the Pacific, it becomes possible to release some facilities and materials from war production and convert them to the manufacture of civilian goods.

Many needed civilian items have not been in production during the past 3 or 4 years, and it is important now to provide consumers with these scarce goods and materials and at the same time provide jobs for the workers no longer needed in the manufacture of guns, ships, planes, and tanks.

Many of these displaced workers will find jobs in our larger factories and plants, but a substantial proportion must find employment in the smaller plants and businesses of the country. For this reason, it is essential that small business should be given protection and assistance during the reconversion period. Although the large business concerns of the country have a vital place in our economy, we must not sit idly by and permit a further concentration of our productive resources in the hands of a small number of monopolistic concerns. Collectivism in industry in the United States has already proceeded so far as to create serious problems. Our country today is not only the richest nation in the world but it has the greatest inequality of wealth and the most centralized ownership and control of any country in the world.

If that concentration of ownership mounts higher and small business continues to dwindle, it will threaten our form of government.

The postwar industrial pattern of the United States is now being fashioned. We must act to preserve democracy in industry and our democratic form of government as well.

The Senate Small Business Committee believes that if we are to succeed we must preserve the small business system of our country. As chairman of this committee, I have just submitted a report to the United States Senate which analyzes this situation and points to the need of great care in carrying out the reconversion program that we do not permit a wholesale destruction of the small business plants of the Nation.

At the present moment, the signs point to the danger of a wild and disorderly scramble among the Nation's plants as the cutbacks and terminations continue. The small concerns obviously are at a great disadvantage under such conditions. Unless the War Production Board carefully plans a reconversion program which will protect small business enterprise during this period, the country is likely to see a tremendous liquidation of small plants. The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which was established by the Congress, has been charged with very definite responsibilities during the reconversion period. The act creating that Office placed a definite responsibility on that agency to see to it that small business would have a fair proportion of scarce materials as they became available for civilian production, and would be given fair and reasonable treatment by all Government agencies concerned with reconversion.

It is true that the War Production Board has granted some preferential treatment to small firms in connection with the procurement of materials, but it is evident that the steps taken by the War Production Board are totally inadequate to meet the requirements imposed by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act.

For example, under the requirements issued by the War Production Board, it is intended to give preferential treatment to all small concerns doing less than $50,000 per quarter. Of course, there is a vast area of small business having production much greater than this and unless some provision is made for that segment of small business it will be in danger of destruction.

In an effort to meet these conditions, the Small Business Committee of the Senate has requested the War Production Board to establish definite rules which will prevent suppliers of materials from discriminating against small plants.

The War Production Board has been asked to draft a program which will assure small firms a proportionate share of scarce materials for civilian production. It is proposed by the committee that the War Production Board should make this plan definite and that it should operate in such manner as to afford these smaller firms information as to what their future supplies of various materials will be so that they may be able to plan future production.

During wartime it was found that small business made a tremendous contribution to production. Despite the fact that procurement officers turned to large producers during the early war period, through the persistent efforts of the Small Business Committee the small plants of the Nation were finally mobilized in the war production program and played a conspicuous part in the war production program. It was that program more than anything else which made it possible for the Allied Nations to overcome the initial superiority of the enemy.

There is a parallel to this situation in reconversion. Small business in this country employs a total of 9,000,000 factory workers, while big business employs only 6,000,000. Thus it becomes obvious that we can never reach and maintain that degree of employment which is necessary for the well being of the country as a whole, unless small business can be protected and expanded.

Mr. REPAID. Senator, you mentioned that small producers were the last to get war contracts. Do you think that these same producers will be among the last to get materials for civilian production?

Senator MURRAY. That is just what the Senate Small Business Committee is trying to prevent. Through no fault of its own, small business was not used on any appreciable scale for war production until a year after the war had started. When it was used it proved to be a most effective agency in war production.

Now, as we go into the reconversion period, small business is entitled to its fair share of the materials which are available for civilian production. If Government permits large business to buy the major share of the materials which are available for civilian production, then small business will be seriously handicapped in resuming manufacture of civilian goods. The Senate Small Business Committee is seeking to prevent this.

Mr. REPAID. You mentioned steps which have been taken by the War Production Board to aid small business and indicated that the Senate Small Business Committee does not believe they are adequate. Can you amplify this?

Senator MURRAY. Yes. The War Production Board has provided that small firms which do less than $50,000 of business a quarter, that is, $200,000 a year, may use preference ratings for the purchase of materials and parts which they need for reconversion. Now the committee believes that many small business firms do more than $200,000 worth of business a year, and it feels that assistance should be granted to them.

Furthermore, the assistance which the War Production Board has granted to small business will expire on the first of next year. After that, small firms will receive no preferential treatment, and the committee does not believe that materials for production of civilian goods will be in sufficient supply to meet all demands by that time. Thus, there is a grave danger that smaller plants will fail to get all of the materials and parts they need for their operations, unless the existing War Production Board program is modified. The committee has recommended that this be done.

Mr. REPAID. Senator, how many plants in the United States employ less than 500 persons?

Senator MURRAY. According to Department of Commerce figures, there are approximately 190,000 plants throughout the country which employ from one to five hundred persons. These plants employ approximately 9,000,000 persons. There are approximately 3,000 firms which employ more than 500 persons and they account for 6,000,000 jobs.

Mr. REPAID. Senator MURRAY, do you believe that small firms need any particular tax concessions during the reconversion period?

Senator MURRAY. The answer to that question in my opinion depends upon whether or not small firms are able to get enough materials to carry on civilian production at reasonable rates. If they are unable to get such quantities of materials, I believe that it is most important that they receive special concessions.

Mr. REPAID. Senator, what do you think of the future of small business, provided the materials are made available to it?

Senator MURRAY. If materials are made available to small business for reconversion, and they are granted fair treatment in taxation, I believe that we will witness an expansion in the number of small firms in the United States. Wartime experience has proved that small plants can produce quality products at low cost and meet delivery schedules.

As a result of this experience, it is my opinion that large business will tend to rely on smaller plants for many of their supplies which formerly were obtained only from other large firms.

Furthermore, I believe that the consuming public will come to rely more and more on smaller business firms for the consumer goods because they are more directly in contact with them in the various cities of the country.

For this reason, I believe that the Senate Small Business Committee must continue its efforts to assure that small business is given equitable treatment during the reconversion period. The main consideration is that by the prevention of monopolistic growth and the maintenance of small business enterprise, we are saving our system of free enterprise and democracy.

Unconditional Surrender by Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a lieutenant in the Army of the United States who is serving in the Pacific area. I am not going to give his name because I do not want to involve him in any way, but he has written to me one of the most forthright and vigorous letters I have received from anyone in a long time. In the letter he protests against a negotiated peace with Japan, or any softening of our attitude toward Japan. I think it would be well worth while for Senators to read the letter. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUESDAY, JULY 25, 1945.

Hon. Senator A. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: What manner of Americans are these that stand in the highest legislative body of our Nation and dare to suggest that we accept less than unconditional surrender from the Jap! I, for one, am ashamed to read daily of our losses in the Pacific in one column and find that in the neighboring column of that paper some elected servant of the men who are dying for an ideal demand that this ideal be quietly shelved for a negotiated peace! Anything to stop the war—they seem to cry! Yet what of the men who have already died, suffering in the belief that they have given their lives so that the enemy will not rise to strike again!

If we in uniform were asked—and we are usually not consulted—whether we would negotiate a peace, I do not sincerely believe there would be one honest man among us who, after searching our souls, would say that we were willing to accept less from the Jap than unconditional surrender! We are anxious to be done with war and bloodshed and suffering—yes—but not to place this uniform in moth balls to be used again another day for the same purpose! And what good is the peace if we must try the uniform on our children for size!

Who are these so-called Americans who would shed American blood for naught save perhaps a reelection platform! Are they the same men who would have made a peace with the "paperhanger"; that called "foul" when we bombed Berlin; that fought lend-lease—the peacetime draft—the building of a two-ocean Navy; that scream of Communists in our War Department and treachery on the fields of battle; that, even now, are denouncing the honest efforts of honest men who strive to give to the world a structure of permanent peace! Are these the men who would seek to prevent full and earnest cooperation with Soviet Russia by using the old, shopworn red herring argument!

Who are these men that would forget Pearl Harbor, north Africa, the Philippines, Sicily, Anzio, Guadalcanal, Saipan, Wake, Normandy, Okinawa, and a thousand more, not to mention the men who have gone down in ships in both oceans and almost every sea of the world! Are these the same men who will easily forget the dead and the incapacitated; who stand for business as usual and back to the good old days of backing the Nazi as a buffer state in Europe and the selling of more scrap metal to the Jap! How do they hold public office—high office in our Government of, for, and by the people! Perhaps the 10,000,000 men and women whose actions have spoken louder than twisted words will see fit to clean house at home politically, as they have so ably and nobly done so physically on the battlefronts of the world. I pray to God that they will!

Letter From Hon. Theodore G. Bilbo, of Mississippi, to Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, having been honored as the most recent victim of the Nation's premier slandermonger, nationally recognized as the Nation's greatest mud slinger, Walter Winchell, as evidenced by the defamatory and scurrilous attack on me over the radio last Sunday night, I have found it necessary in self-defense, having no other medium, to answer Mr. Winchell by letter, dated July 29, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 29, 1945.

Mr. WALTER WINCHELL,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have just heard this Sunday night's broadcast by you, the most limicolous liar and notorious scandalizing kike radio commentator of today, and I want to thank you for doing me the great honor of listing me among your victims of hate. You are one of those who think you can spew your venom and hate and if anybody calls your hand you immediately try to hide behind your race and yell "persecution."

You know nothing about the rules of fair play, otherwise you would have read the in-

sulting letter by Josephine Piccolo addressed to me, in which she boasted of the fact that she was neither a Jew nor a Negro—evidently she puts the two in the same class. You were not fair enough to even report the entire salutation of the letter in question written by me. When she told me she was neither a Jew nor a Negro, I addressed her as "My Dear Dago," and as a part of the salutation I said, "If I am mistaken in this please correct me."

But it would not have served your purpose to tell all the truth and you know a half-truth is worse than a lie. You could have repeated the splendid things I have said about the \merican Italians and the loyalty to their adopted country that was shown in this war, but that did not serve your purpose. You are like all rabble-rousing, strife-breeding Communists which I verily believe you to be regardless of how strong you may deny it. Your episode in trying to parade your patriotism by strutting around a while in a Navy uniform did not fool the American people.

You are just a dirty scandalmonger kike, regardless of what you pretend to be. I would say more, but I realize no matter how much Jergen's lotion I might use, I could not keep white and clean by messing with you—you are too dirty and filthy.

Read the entire correspondence concerning the Piccolo matter as contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, and you will know what I think of the American Italians and their loyalty to America when their fatherland was making war against the United States and killing our boys on the battlefields of north Africa and Italy.

Could it be that you are so busy peeping into other people's keyholes that you do not have the time to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, just as evidently you were recently so busy prying into other people's business that you did not have time to keep informed as to what was going on behind your own keyholes.

Be a good sport, if you can, and read this letter on your radio broadcast.

Yours truly,

THEO. G. BILBO,
United States Senator.

Value of Arkansas Raw Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a compilation of figures which I have had prepared regarding the value of Arkansas raw materials and the value of Arkansas minerals. In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to state that the figures with respect to agricultural products were obtained from the Department of Agriculture. Those relating to forestry products were obtained from the State Forestry Commission of Arkansas. Those relating to mineral products were obtained from the State Geologist of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Value of Arkansas raw materials

Agriculture, 1944	Total value of production, all purposes	Value of cash sales
Cotton	$145,078,000	$145,078,000
Corn	42,959,000	3,643,000
Dairy products	41,616,000	12,522,000
Hogs	32,157,000	21,947,000
Cottonseed	28,904,000	26,159,000
Cattle and calves	28,359,000	28,240,000
Hay (all hays)	26,297,000	2,635,000
Rice	24,163,000	22,764,000
Eggs	19,684,000	13,953,000
Poultry	10,393,000	7,403,000
Broilers	9,072,000	9,072,000
Oats	8,747,000	1,487,000
Soybeans	7,766,000	6,897,000
Peaches	6,880,000	5,528,000
Irish potatoes	5,546,000	4,526,000
Sweetpotatoes	4,027,000	661,000
Strawberries (fresh for market)	2,533,000	2,533,000
Snap beans (for canning)	1,692,000	1,692,000
Spinach (for canning)	1,437,000	1,437,000
Apples	1,329,000	1,170,000
Sorghum (for sirup)	1,305,000	613,000
Tomatoes (for canning)	1,284,000	1,284,000
Peanuts	1,279,000	226,000
Tomatoes (fresh for market)	1,102,000	1,102,000
Pecans	974,000	811,000
Wheat	829,000	389,000
Grapes	787,000	664,000
Cowpeas	710,000	128,000
Lespedeza seed	561,000	404,000
Sheep and lambs	392,000	385,000
Pears	388,000	252,000
Watermelons (fresh for market)	364,000	364,000
Barley	211,000	32,000
Cantaloupes (for market)	204,000	204,000
Sorghum (grain)	167,000	12,000
Snap beans (fresh for market)	166,000	166,000
Sugarcane (for sirup)	142,000	68,000
Spinach (fresh for market)	124,000	124,000
Cucumbers (fresh for market)	107,000	107,000
Cabbage (fresh for market)	23,000	23,000
Total	459,758,000	336,705,000

Value of cash sales

Agricultural products not regularly reported, 1944:	
Furs, fish, pearls, etc. (estimated)	$6,000,000
Other miscellaneous farm sales (estimated)	5,000,000
Nursery stocks (estimated)	1,200,000
Cut flowers produced (estimated)	700,000
Honey and beeswax (estimated)	150,000
Total	13,050,000

Value cash sales at processing stages comparable to agricultural products placed on market

Forest products, 1944:	
Rough lumber (including laths and shingles)	$60,000,000
Cooperage, veneers, and handles	21,000,000
Pulp woods	13,800,000
Poles and piling	225,000
Posts, fencing	7,600,000
Cross ties	2,450,000
Fuel and chemical wood	10,000,000
Total	115,075,000

Value of Arkansas minerals

Minerals, 1943:	
Bauxite	$32,723,000
Petroleum (crude)	27,250,000
Coal	6,937,000
Gravel	2,732,000
Natural gasoline	1,375,000
Natural gas	1,140,000
Sandstone	859,000
Barite	853,000
Sand (building)	565,000
Limestone	483,000
Mercury	299,000

Value of Arkansas minerals—Continued

Minerals, 1943—Continued.	
Rutile	$244,000
Sand (glass)	194,000
Novaculite (whetstones)	158,000
Manganese	149,000
Butane gas	99,000
Clays (raw)	86,000
Novaculite (crushed)	54,000
Gypsum	52,000
Dolomite	40,000
Sand (molding)	31,000
Marble	13,000
Zinc	9,600
Tripoli	7,600
Slate	2,500
Lignite	500
Quartz crystals	300
Total	76,356,500
Agriculture, 1944	336,705,000
Agricultural products not regularly reported, 1944	13,050,000
Forest products, 1944	115,075,000
Minerals, 1943	76,356,500
Grand total yearly cash sales Arkansas raw materials	541,186,500

Preservation of American Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Jim H. Brady appearing in his column, entitled "Inside Washington." Since we have ratified the Charter for the new world organization it seems to me to be appropriate to consider the interest displayed by the veterans of this terrible conflict in that subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Jim H. Brady)

Frank Mecurio stopped by this week. He is a 22-year-old veteran who has become tremendously interested in his Government. Frank believes all people should study civics and take an interest in world affairs because, as he puts it, that's why we have a democracy—"so everyone can take part even if it's just casting a vote in elections."

Most fellows Frank's age don't take world affairs so seriously. However, Frankie has a right to participate in law and treaty making. When he was on Salerno, he lost both legs. You would never know it. He can walk as good as any of us, and you never see the fellow without a broad smile on his face.

Sometimes Frank's smile becomes grim. His face shows determination and confidence in our democracy when he talks about peace and security. This boy knows the meaning of conflict. He has seen fellow comrades shot down at his side. Frank realizes what another war will mean.

In order to preserve our form of government, it is the duty of every American to become interested in the functions of the world organization, and the activities of our own States. It is certainly clear that we in America owe a debt to the boys who are lost or disabled in this war.

Only by preserving peace and economic security can we repay those who have given their all for the cause of democracy. Frank Mecurio is just one of thousands of fellows who have fought and bled to save the world from enslavement. We at home must see that the efforts of our doughboys and sailors were not in vain.

Frank is a member of the Disabled American Veterans. He is taking a special career course at the American University here to become a national service officer. When Frank graduates from his 12-week course he will go over the country helping other veterans who need care and advice. The university course is directed by Dean Harry W. Ketchum, director of the undergraduate division of the institution.

Overseas Christmas Mailing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, Acting The Adjutant General of the Army, recently made a speech in New York at a most unique luncheon, termed a "Christmas in July" event under the auspices of the greeting card industry.

The speech of General Witsell contains some interesting and valuable information concerning the overseas Christmas mailing program of the War Department, and I ask permission to insert it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is indeed a delightful occasion. I can think of no better way in which to focus the attention of the Nation on the overseas Christmas mailing period than through such a medium as "Christmas in July."

Today in the presence of this distinguished group of newspaper, magazine, radio, newsreel, advertising, and public relations personages, we are launching the 1945 overseas Christmas mailing campaign.

In addressing my remarks to this gathering I am fully cognizant of the fact that it is you men and women who spread the news. It is you who mold public opinion. It is to you the public, and more particularly at this time, the mailing public looks for guidance and information.

It is my purpose to discuss with you briefly the necessity for this year's Christmas mail campaign, together with some of the mail problems which are peculiar to the redeployment of hundreds of thousands of soldiers which is now in full swing.

We all know what mail means to our armed forces. I like to look upon the receipt of mail from home by our fighting forces as mental ammunition. Of its importance, I can tell you that in the Army we consider it the most important of all morale factors.

This is why we have an Army Postal Service which operates wherever our troops are stationed or fighting. It is why the Army goes to such great extremes in its efforts to provide our overseas soldiers with the best possible mail service under any and all circumstances. Lastly, it is the reason why each year we make special provisions for the handling of the Christmas mails.

As most of you know, the numbers of Army personnel overseas and the fact that parcels take much valuable shipping space have made it necessary for the past 2½ years to restrict the mailing of packages to soldiers outside the United States.

This restriction brought about the request requirement whereby a soldier must request in writing a package before it can be mailed to him at an overseas address. However, in order that the Christmas customs and the widespread American practice of exchanging gifts at Christmas time might be carried out, we have made provisions the past 3 years for the mailing of packages throughout the 30-day Christmas mailing period without the usual request requirement which is in effect throughout the remaining 11 months of the year.

As you can well imagine, this has resulted in record mailings during this period each year, climaxed by last year's record volume of 62,000,000 individual 5-pound packages mailed to Army personnel alone between September 15 and October 15, 1944.

This year we find ourselves faced with a mail-handling problem which I think it is safe to state is the most complex and difficult ever to confront any postal organization, civilian or military.

I have reference, of course, to the fact that this year's 30-day mailing period, September 15 to October 15, inclusive, comes in the midst of the greatest mass movement of personnel in history. Never before have so many men been on the move betwen continents, across the seas, within the theaters of operation. Some of these men will return to the United States for discharges under the point system. Others will be redeployed to the Pacific. Some of this latter group will go direct, others will return through the United States and receive interim 30-day furloughs.

In any event, all categories of personnel involved in this record redeployment operation will pose a particular and individual problem for the Army Postal Service. Multiply these by hundreds of thousands, yes, several million, and you will have an idea of the magnitude of our problem.

By way of a concrete illustration and comparison with what it means in terms of a layman, let me give you an illustration. Suppose our good friend Postmaster Albert Goldman, of New York City, were to come down to his office some morning to be informed that the entire population of Manhattan had moved and left no forwarding addresses. Later he learned that some had gone to Indiana, others to Colorado, a few to North Dakota, some more to Texas, still others to Alaska, South America, Australia, and a thousand other points throughout this country and the world at large. It does not take the seventh son of a seventh son to comprehend the chaos which would ensue in the handling of mails through the New York post office.

With a single exception that is precisely with what we are faced in the Army in connection with the handling of mails as they pertain to our redeployed troops. That exception is the advanced planning and preparations which were made many long months ago. But as so often happens with an undertaking of this size, there are many obstacles and difficulties to overcome while in the midst of carrying out the best-laid plans.

We made such advanced plans and in the main they are working well. We are delivering mail to men fresh off the returning boats from Europe; we are intercepting them for mail delivery as they pass through the Panama Canal en route to the Pacific. We are delivering their mail at the reassembly stations, to cite a few of the ways in which we are endeavoring to keep abreast of this tremendous task.

What we seek this year in our overseas mailing period is the cooperation of the American mailing public. With their cooperation we can keep the mails moving, we can maintain some resemblance of schedules, and we can make a mighty contribution to the individual morale of every soldier who receives a package, a card, or a letter from home.

This year, as in the past, we want every soldier to receive a remembrance from home at Christmas time, but in order to do this we must have the whole-hearted support of each and every individual using the Army mails.

Today I want to urge that you spread the message of the dates of the mailing period itself, namely September 15 to October 15 inclusive; that you stress the importance of correctly and completely addressing every package to the latest address furnished by the addressee; that you likewise stress the vital necessity of carefully packing and wrapping these gift parcels in order that they may stand the rigorous overseas mail handling and the extremes in weather conditions and temperatures through which they will pass.

Careful selection of gifts this year is more important than ever before. A wise selection and limitation of gifts to practical, useful items is most essential.

This year we are asking that the public limit their mailings to one parcel per soldier and that in every case where the sender has reason to believe that the soldier is on his way home or that he will soon be departing for home from overseas that they refrain from mailing an overseas gift parcel. The reason for this is obvious. If the soldier is to be home prior to December 25 hold the package and give it to him in person. By so doing you will be carrying out the holiday custom firsthand while at the same time you will be doing your part to alleviate the gigantic directory problem which is to be occasioned this year by the necessity of returning thousands of packages to the United States in those cases where they arrive at the overseas Army post offices following the return of the soldier to the United States.

How am I to know when the soldier is returning you may well ask? It is the present policy of the Army to make public large-scale movements of units and organizations to the United States and these are given wide publicity in the Nation's press and on the radio.

In many instances you will thus be able to have information weeks and months in advance with respect to the approximate date on which the soldier will return to the United States, either for redeployment, reassignment, or ultimate discharge.

Owing to their bulk, packages are the most difficult of all classes of mail to handle. In those cases where you cannot find a suitable gift for the soldier you can remember him with a Christmas greeting card or personal note which goes as first-class mail.

The greeting card or personal message provides the same link with the soldier that the package does and from our standpoint they are much easier to handle.

You representatives of the Nation's news, picture, and radio outlets assembled here today are the focal point of our campaign. With your help we can put our message across to the public. In so doing you will have the satisfaction of knowing that you have made an important morale contribution to America's fighting men. What greater reward could one ask?

In closing I want to thank our very gracious host, Mr. Shannon, for a most enjoyable and I might say appropriate luncheon. To the press, the magazine, the radio, the news-reel, the advertising groups, I want to

convey the gratitude of the War Department for your assistance. Particularly do I want to thank the War Advertising Council and the greeting card industry for their contributions to this year's campaign which will be carried out under the direction of the War and Navy Departments in conjunction with the Office of War Information and the Post Office Department.

The San Francisco Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last week, during the debate on the United Nations Charter, I asked unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding the San Francisco Charter by the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, archbishop of Chicago. In some way the statement was overlooked, and I now renew my request.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, July 13.—"Allowing for certain undeniable defects, the San Francisco Charter remains the only promise the world has that international anarchy will not be permitted to return," the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, told a congregation attending the observance of the Fourth Slav Church Unity Day in Holy Name Cathedral.

"The people of the United States," the archbishop said, "must assume responsibility in international affairs and repudiate the traditions of political and economic isolationism. America must participate in an international organization.

"We assumed a great responsibility when we went into the war. We have broken with our past tradition of isolationism and we have done so rightly. We are the most powerful Nation in the world, but by that very fact we have much to give the world and an obligation to do so."

NOTES IMPERFECTIONS

The archbishop pointed out that, while there are imperfections in the San Francisco Charter, much of what the Conference accomplished was undeniably good and the deficiencies in the Charter's framework can be eliminated so that the rights of all nations, regardless of size or race, can be respected.

"At least in principle, the days when great nations could victimize the small nations are gone," he said.

He warned against the dangers of exaggerated nationalism, the tragic effects and results of which have occurred in our times.

VARIETY OF CULTURES

"Within the unity of the human race," the archbishop said, "ther is a variety of characteristics and of cultures among the separate nations. These must be preserved, and the rights of these nations must be respected in justice and charity.

"Our Saviour Jesus Christ made no distinctions among peoples as He hung on the cross. His love and the sacrifice of His life extended to all men. Christ's commission to teach all men was likewise directed to all nations and to all cultures. The mass, then, is one sacrifice, whatever approved form it may take, and is intended for all races and cultures."

The Constitution and the Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on Monday I received from Prof. Edward S. Corwin, professor of politics at Princeton University, a copy of an address which he recently delivered before the Institute of Government at the University of Washington, in Seattle. The address is entitled "The Constitution and the Charter," and is an exposition of certain constitutional aspects of the new United Nations Charter, and particularly the constitutional status of our delegate on the Security Council.

This is a most timely discussion, in light of the recent ratification of the Charter by the United States Senate, and I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the article will make four and one-quarter pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and will cost $221 to print.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a student of American constitutional law and theory I have been especially struck by one great difference between the reception given at Washington, and more particularly in the Senate, to the United Nations Charter and that which was given a quarter of a century ago to the League of Nations covenant. The covenant instantly stirred up in the bosoms of many all kinds of doubts as to the constitutional competence of the treaty-making authority to put the United States into such an organization. The Charter has provoked no such reactions even in the Senate, although certain constitutional difficulties touching the implementation of the Charter have been raised, notably by Senators TAFT and BUSHFIELD. I shall deal with these later.

The question is provoked, Why this difference? Are United States Senators bigger and better than they used to be? It is possible, for certainly there was room for improvement. However that may be, another explanation of the difference is to be found in those enlarged conceptions of the constitutional powers of the National Government which are one result of the New Deal, and, even more, in an enlarged conception of the adaptability of the Constitution to problems of government in the modern era. Finally, it is important to note that in the period which lies between the covenant and the Charter, official theory—that is to say, Supreme Court theory—of the nature and scope of the powers of the National Government in the field of foreign relations has undergone reformulation in terms which automatically eliminate many of the constitutional objections to the covenant. I have in mind particularly Justice Sutherland's words for the Court in the case of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation*, which was decided in 1936:

"A political society cannot endure without a supreme will somewhere. Sovereignty is never held in suspense. When, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect to the colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union. * * *

"It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as a necessary concomitant of nationality."

Thus, the power of the National Government in the field of international relationship is not a complexus of particular enumerated powers, but is an inherent power—one which is attributed to the National Government on the ground solely of its belonging to the American people as a sovereign political entity at international law. It follows that silence on the part of the Constitution as to the power of the National Government to adopt any particular measure in relation to other nations is not a denial of such power, as it would be if the doctrine of enumerated powers applied, but is, on the contrary, an affirmance of power.

In brief, therefore, whatever may have been the case originally, the Government of the United States is today in theory just as sovereign as is, for instance, the Government of Great Britain in the field of foreign relations, both those of war and those of peace, and if Great Britain can enter the type of international organization projected by the Charter, then so can we. The treaty-making power wielded by the President and Senate is entirely competent to covenant for the United States the responsibilities of membership in such an organization. In fact, if we were to regard our entrance in 1934 into the International Labor Office as a precedent, Congress could by joint resolution authorize the President to accept membership for the United States in the United Nations without consulting the Senate in its treaty-making capacity.

It is when we turn to the matter of implementing the Charter that such constitutional problems as arise present themselves. The great point is, That while the power of the National Government is complete, or sufficiently so, in the field of foreign relations, yet this complete power is shared by the President and Congress (that is, the national legislative power) and also to some extent by the treaty-making authority, and that this division of power is a circumstance which must necessarily determine in greater or less measure the procedures by which our Government would discharge its contractual duties to any international organization of which it became a member.

First and foremost of the purposes of the United Nations is, in the words of the Charter, this one: "To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the suppression and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

In short, it is the outstanding purpose of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security by peaceful means if possible, by coercive means if necessary. And it is in connection with the employment of coercive means by the United Nations that the division of power between the President and the Congress becomes of special importance for its possible effect on our ability to perform our part in the organization with efficiency. Yet without at the same time impairing the democratic character of our own institutions. For that is a price which we should be reluctant to pay even for international peace and security. Indeed one of the chief arguments, to my mind, for our joining with other nations in an effort to maintain international peace consists in the recognition that war on the scale we are waging it today puts a strain on our democratic institutions from the warping effects of which they

will be slow to recover. Manifestly, then, the maintenance of peace through an international organization ought not to invite the same danger if such a consequence can be in any way avoided or minimized.

Now, of course, the business end of the United Nations, when it comes to exercising coercion in the maintenance of international peace and security is the Security Council. Let us, then, imagine a situation which, in the opinion of the Council, constitutes a threat to international peace and security, and which obstinately resists every peaceable solution. It is at this point that the extraordinary powers of the Council come into play. In the first place, the Council has the right to designate an aggressor nation. Then it has the right to call upon the members of the organization to sever all relations, diplomatic, economic, and otherwise, with such aggressor nation. But if even these measures prove inadequate in the judgment of the Council, it is then empowered, in the words of the Charter, to "take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations."

The Charter then continues: "All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance and facilities * * * necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

"Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

"The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and member states or between the Security Council and groups of member states and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes."

Also, "in order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures members shall hold immediately available national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements * * * by the Security Council with the assistance of the military staff committee"—a body which is provided for elsewhere in the Charter.

Now, it is out of these provisions that the constitutional problems to which I have referred arise. But briefly, they are these two: First, who is the representative of the United States on the Security Council really to be—in other words, whose orders is he to take—the President's or Congress's; or, as has been at times suggested, is he to be autonomous? Secondly, who is to determine for the United States what armed forces our Government is to put at the disposal of the Security Council—is the President alone to do this, or is Congress also entitled to have its say in the matter? Let me first consider the matter of the American delegate.

The practical values involved, the values which must be reconciled if possible, I have just indicated. On the one hand is the obvious need for prompt action by the Security Council in the face of an impending aggression, and that need can be met only if the representatives of the member nations can make known their positions with a minimum delay; on the other hand is the need for avoiding autocracy, secret diplomacy, the fait accompli—something from which our diplomacy has been by no means altogether free even in the past. The first of these values would in all probability be best furthered by making the American delegate the President's representative, or by making him completely autonomous and hence free to make up his mind on the spot without dictation from Washington. The second value argues, equally without question, for some participation by Congress in the guidance of the American delegate.

Some of my audience may recall at this point that the late President Roosevelt dealt with this very subject in his address before the New York Foreign Policy Association October 22 last. Referring to the Security Council as sketched in the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, which on this point are reproduced in detail in the Charter, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"Peace, like war, can succeed only where there is a will to enforce it, and where there is available power to enforce it.

"The Council of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force, if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the town hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

"It is clear that, if the world organization is to have any reality at all, our representative must be endowed in advance by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives in the Congress, with authority to act.

"If we do not catch the international felon when we have our hands on him, if we let him get away with his loot because the town council has not passed an ordinance authorizing his arrest, then we are not doing our share to prevent another world war. The people of the Nation want their Government to act, and not merely talk, whenever and wherever there is a threat to world peace."

The parable is engaging, but shares the fault common to parables. It substitutes a misleading simplification of the problem to be met for a solution of it. For one thing, what is the identifying mark of an international felon? We have today a pretty definite idea as to the identity of one or two of them both past and present, but will the question always be so easy to answer? International felons are not likely to have had their fingerprints recorded or their pictures displayed in a rogues' gallery. What, indeed, is an international felon? The truth is that your international policeman is going to be required to act as lawmaker as well as law enforcer under the United Nations Charter—that is, as both town meeting and policeman. Moreover, the arrest of a common felon is not likely to create quite such a ruction in the community as the arrest, or attempted arrest, of an international felon is likely to—as witness the current war we are still waging. Yet what all this means is that the decisions of the Security Council will frequently involve political considerations and consequences of the most serious nature; and, this being so, it is most improbable, despite the late President's implication to the contrary, that the American delegate on the Council will be permitted to act without constant guidance from Washington. So the question remains, guidance from what quarter—the President or Congress?

In fact, I surmise that Mr. Roosevelt would soon have come to realize this, and would, when the time came, have asked Congress to make the American delegate subject to orders from the President. At any rate, it is interesting to consider another statement of his in the course of the same speech. Describing the origins of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, Mr. Roosevelt said: "The American people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with the Constitution of the United States and know that we cannot commit this Nation to any secret treaties or any secret guaranties which are in violation of that Constitution." My comment is that the reassurance here intended was much too dependent on transitory personal factors to be acceptable at face value. Not long afterward Mr. Hull to all intents and purposes disappeared from the scene; and while Mr. Roosevelt no doubt knew that the Constitution frowns on secret guaranties, yet not all Presidents have been equally well instructed. The first Roosevelt certainly was not. In the words of Dr. Norman Small in his excellent book, Presidential Interpretations of the Presidency: "His [Theodore Roosevelt's] intervention in the Venezuelan financial disturbance, his proffered assistance in the settlement of the Russo-Japanese War, and his subsequent participation in the Algeciras Conference, all presented a single issue; namely, whether it is permissible for a constitutional executive to indulge in secret diplomacy and to threaten to use the armed forces of the United States for the support of a foreign nation in distress." And, after all, the 50-destroyer deal was not exactly an "open covenant openly arrived at," if you recall; nor is Yalta exactly a symbol of unbosoming candor.

But to return for an instant to the late President's suggestion of an independent, autonomous, undirected representative on the Security Council, it is impossible to take the idea at all seriously. All questions of Congress' powers aside, still the fact is that from the first the President has exercised an indefinite initiative in the direction of our foreign affairs simply from the necessities of the case. So what the suggestion proposes is that the direction of our foreign policy should be divided between the President and our delegate on the Security Council, which is simply preposterous. Can anybody imagine that Messrs. Churchill and Stalin—Messrs. Attlee and Stalin—will have that kind of a representative there, one who is able to thumb his nose at them? No; the idea will definitely not wash.

Yet this does not signify that Presidential direction of the American delegate ought not to be brought under some degree of surveillance and control at this end of the line. That is another matter entirely, and let me add a domestic matter and one which should be determined by domestic legislation. The United Nations Charter is, in fact, entirely silent on the subject and quite properly so. The proposal therefore of Senators TAFT, BUSHFIELD, et al., that Senate approval of the Charter ought to be accompanied by some sort of reservation dealing with the powers of our delegate is a complete irrelevancy, yet a mischievous one from the suspicions it would be calculated to foster on the part of other governments.

Let me now shift the spotlight to the provision in chapter VII of the Charter, that each member nation of the international organization shall, by an agreement, to be ratified "by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes," contribute a definite quota of armed forces to be put at the disposal of the Security Council.

The constitutional question evoked by this proposal is really a three-pronged one; first, could the President, simply by virtue of his powers as Commander in Chief and organ of foreign relations, enter into such an agreement without invading Congress' power to declare war; secondly, if not, could he nevertheless do so on the score of executing the Charter which will be, in some sense of the term, "law of the land"; or, thirdly, if not, yet could Congress authorize him to do so without making an unconstitutional delegation of its war-declaring power? For if all these questions have to be answered "no," then fresh recourse must be had to Congress every time the United States is called upon by the Security Council to contribute armed forces to be employed against an aggressor, assuming such employment to be tanta-

mount to an act of war. I find it advantageous to take these three aspects of the constitutional questions up in 1, 3, 2 order.

There are those who seem to be quite clear in their minds that practice under the Constitution has established for the President, by virtue of his capacity as Commander in Chief and organ of foreign relations, the right to put any forces of the United States that he may wish to at the disposal of the Security Council, by it to be used as it may determine, whether with or without the backing of a treaty.[1] They point out that from an early date Presidents, invoking their dual role as organ of foreign relations and as Commander in Chief, have employed armed forces of the United States, especially naval forces, to protect against impending violence the lives and property of American citizens abroad, and sometimes wider interests; that such forces have landed on foreign soil to the derogation of the local sovereignty again and again, and have even fought pitched battles and conducted elections there—and all without Congress having had any voice in the matter. And they say—some of them, at any rate—that, in view of the great number of such incidents—over 80 of them are listed for the period 1811 to 1941[2]—the war-declaring power of Congress must be regarded as having become today little more than the power to announce formally to the world that the United States is at war, a logical inference from which is that it sets no limit to the President's power to put American armed forces at the command of the Security Council for the purpose of repressing an aggressor nation; or, in more general terms, that it sets no limit to the President's power even in time of peace to dispose the armed forces of the Nation in any way that he judges will best advance American interests, whether he thereby runs the risk of precipitating war or not.

Such reasoning, however, seems to me to represent a pretty one-sided view of the matter; for while it has some force, it hasn't as much as those who advance it assume that it has. The vast proportion of the incidents referred to comprised, as just indicated, efforts to protect definite rights of persons and property against impending violence, and were defended on that ground as not amounting to acts of war.

The United States was itself on one famous occasion the scene of a very similar act of intervention by Great Britain. This occurred in 1837, when there was a rebellion in Upper Canada, as it was then called, against the mother country. American sympathizers were permitted by our Government, despite repeated protests by the British, to furnish the rebels with arms, many of which were shipped across the Niagara River in a small steamer called the *Caroline*. At last the exasperated British commander, taking the law into his own hands, sent a small party across the river, which was then frozen, and these people cut the *Caroline* out of the ice and sank it. The American Government of course demanded an apology and reparations from Great Britain, but without avail. Some years later, when, as Secretary of State, he was carrying on the negotiations which led to the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, Daniel Webster defined the issue raised by the *Caroline* incident as follows: if the danger confronting the British authorities was instant, overwhelming, admitting of no delay, then their action was a justifiable act of self-defense and not an act of war or a legitimate cause for reparations. Impaled on that "if" the issue was permitted to shrivel up and blow away.[3]

To be sure, such acts of self-defense have sometimes exceeded this pattern. In 1854 an American gunboat shelled Greytown, Nicaragua, not for the purpose of preventing an act of violence to American interests, but to secure reparations therefor. But the bombardment had no ulterior political purpose, and was later sustained by a United States court in a suit brought against the American commander, on the ground that he must be deemed to have acted by authorization of the President in the discharge of the latter's duty as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief to protect American lives and property abroad.[4] Then in 1900 President McKinley, without consulting Congress, contributed a considerable American contingent to the forces which went to the relief of the foreign legations in Peking against the Boxers; but again the measure was, so far as the United States was concerned, purely defensive in character and without any ulterior political advantage in view; and the Chinese Imperial Government itself agreed with the American Government that it did not constitute war.[5]

Some, however, of the episodes relied upon by the supporters of Presidential prerogative were undoubtedly politically motivated—were genuine acts of "political intervention," to utilize Prof. John Bassett Moore's rubric for them; but it must be said that for the most part at least they have always been regarded by many Americans as something to be apologized for. One of these was Polk's action early in 1846 in sending American troops into territory in dispute between Mexico and the United States, with the deliberate purpose and with the result of precipitating war with that country.[6] Another was President Grant's similar enterprise in 1870 in Santo Domingo, which failed of its purpose because of congressional opposition. Another was the first Roosevelt's coup in 1903 when, in his words, he "took Panama." We later paid a handsome douceur to Colombia for this transaction, and at the time the President's official defenders were not a little put to it to defend it. There is a story to the effect that when the matter was brought before the Cabinet, Attorney General Knox suggested that perhaps he had better prepare an opinion upholding the President's action, but Secretary of War Root protested. "No, no," Mr. Root exclaimed, "let's not have it said that this beautiful achievement was marred by the least taint of legality."

And from T. R.'s "big stick" policy and the succeeding "dollar diplomacy" of Taft and Wilson issued a number of interventions of a more or less political and warlike character in the Caribbean area, which were undertaken without Congress being consulted. The biggest batch of such episodes occurred between 1910 and 1927. In the latter year, in fact, President Coolidge had over 5,000 troops in Nicaragua waging what some folks called a private war. Mr. Coolidge, himself, heatedly rejected this characterization of what he was doing. "We are not making war on Nicaragua," he asserted piously, "any more than a policeman is making war on passers-by."[7] In other words, our armed forces had just as much right to be on Nicaraguan soil as a policeman has to appear on the streets of his home town. Stretch that idea to cover the earth and you get something closely approximating the President's parable of the policeman and the international felon.

Well now, what weight are we to give such precedents? I should say in the first place that the countries about the Caribbean had come to constitute a rather special case even before the Civil War. Also, we may fairly note that precedents created by dollar diplomacy have been latterly pretty much discredited by good-neighbor policy. They are today under a good deal of a cloud. Finally, this sampling of the entire array of precedents is not altogether representative; for there are also certain counter-precedents, so to speak. I mean cases in which Presidents asked Congress in its capacity as the war-declaring power for authority to employ the armed forces for the protection of American interests abroad in situations which they judged might provoke hostile reactions. President Buchanan, in striking contrast to T. R.'s course more than 40 years later, repeatedly—and vainly—besought Congress for authority to employ the armed forces to protect Americans passing by the Panama, Nicaragua, and Tehauntapec routes on their way to the gold fields of California. But Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Lincoln, Grant, McKinley, Taft, Wilson, and F. D. R. too are on record for similar gestures of deference to Congress' power to declare war, not to mention a number of Secretaries of State.[8] Thus Mr. Roosevelt was careful to qualify the promises of aid in his utmost sympathy message to France of June 14, 1940, with the warning, "These statements carry with them no implication of military commitments. Only Congress can make such commitments." What happened to this warning 2 months later we shall see in a moment.

Stated in the most favorable terms possible for Presidential pretensions, the question boils down to this: Would an order of the President putting armed forces of the United

---

[1] See, for instance, a communication in the New York Times of November 5, 1944, signed by Messrs. John W. Davis, W. W. Grant, Philip C. Jessup, George Rublee, James T. Shotwell, and Quincy Wright; also the excellent article by Harry Wilmer Jones entitled "The President, Congress, and Foreign Relations," California Law Review (July 1941), vol. 29, pp. 565–585. Senator VANDENBERG may be of this school.

[2] See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (March 6, 1941), p. 1955 (unofficial paging). Most of the incidents for 1811 to 1911 are analyzed in Mr. J. Reuben Clark's memorandum as Solicitor for the Department of State entitled "Right To Protect Citizens in Foreign Countries by Landing Forces" (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1912, 1929). A revised and extended edition was issued by the State Department in 1934 but has not been widely circulated. More than half the landings listed by Clark in 1912 were for "the simple protection of American citizens located in disturbed areas," and only about a third of these involved belligerent action. In 12 instances American forces were landed in cooperation with those of other powers for the protection of American and foreign nationals. The list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does not include, of course, President Roosevelt's emergency measures from May 27, 1941, for getting lend-lease materials through the German submarine pack.

[3] See John Bassett Moore, A Digest of International Law (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1906), vol. II, pp. 24, 409; vol. VI, p. 261; vol. VII, p. 919.

[4] *Durand* v. *Hollins* (4 Blatchford 451, 454 (1859)). See also James D. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents (published by authority of Congress, 1898), vol. V, p. 284.

[5] Moore, Digest, V, pp. 476–517, but especially pp. 478, 479, 482, 500, 502, 507, 508, 510.

[6] See the Supreme Court's view of the war with Mexico, in *Fleming* v. *Page*, "Self-defense" is a word possessing great virtue, in both senses of "virtue."

[7] Thomas A. Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the United States (Crofts, New York, 1940), pp. 711–712.

[8] Most of the Presidential utterances referred to are conveniently assembled in Albert H. Putney's article on Executive Assumption of the War Making Power, National University Law Review (May 1927), pp. 1–41. See also Moore, VII, pp. 162–168. That the power of Congress comprises the power to "declare a general war" and also the power to "wage a limited war," was asserted by the Supreme Court in *Bas* v. *Tingy*, 4 Dall. 37 (1800) and *Talbot* v. *Seeman*, 1 Cr., 28 (1801). The language of the justices in these early cases implies any act of war, to be entitled to judicial recognition as such, must be ascribed to congressional authorization.

States at the disposition of the Security Council for the purpose of preventing or repressing an act of aggression by another state or states against a third state be an act of political intervention or an act of self-defense? It seems to me clear that by the test yielded by the vast bulk of the precedents we have just been sampling, it would be an act of political intervention. At the same time, it can hardly be denied that both the scope given the ideal of self-defense in some of these precedents and, on the other hand, the daily observed facts of total war make the distinction a tenuous one nowadays.

Moreover, there is one precedent, the creation of the late President himself, which supports automatically almost any act that a President of the United States can be conceived of doing with the armed forces of the United States. I refer to the 50-destroyer deal again, by which, in August 1940, the President handed 50 overage vessels of the United States Navy over to Great Britain in return for certain sites for American naval bases in British West Atlantic possessions. The transaction was justified by Attorney General Jackson—now Justice Jackson—as resting on the power of the President as Commander in Chief to "dispose" the armed forces of the United States, which he ingeniously, if not quite ingeniously, transmuted into the power to dispose of them. The trouble is that the precedent is just a bit too good, since the President's action violated at least two statutes and maybe more.[9] The only sound view to take of the destroyer deal, as I see it, is that it was rendered legal and constitutional ex post facto when Congress appropriated money to build the bases the sites for which were thus acquired, and by its subsequent enactment of the Lend-Lease Act, which is a kind of extension of the destroyer deal.

But what of the suggestion that Congress might empower the President to allocate American forces to the use of the Security Council? In other words, what of the constitutional objection that such action by Congress would amount to an unconstitutional delegation of its war-declaring power to the President?[10] Let us turn to this phase of the subject.

The doctrine that Congress cannot delegate its powers in order to exercise them more efficiently and more effectively is today a pretty frail reliance even in the field of domestic legislation, and in the realm of foreign relations appears to have been dismissed by the Court altogether in recent cases.[11] The truth is that in the latter field the "cognate powers" of the two departments, to use the Supreme Court's expression, are so broad, so indefinite, so overlapping, that the Court could not if it wished to, disentangle them, which, however, it would be necessary for it to do if it were to attempt to say whether Congress had or had not delegated power in a particular instance. And it is also true that Congress has from the beginning repeatedly delegated powers to the President to assist him in carrying out a foreign policy, whether his own or Congress'. By the act of June 4, 1794, President Washington was forthwith "authorized," "whenever in his opinion the public safety shall require," to lay an embargo upon all vessels both American and foreign in the ports of the United States, and to continue or revoke the same "whenever he shall think proper." If that was not a delegation of power, what would one look like? But only, it may be objected, of Congress' power over commerce. Conceding the point, yet why should Congress' power to declare war be so much more sacrosanct than its power over commerce? And this early act has been followed by a whole series of similar ones.

It is pertinent, too, to mention the act of March 3, 1819, by which the President was "authorized to instruct the commanders of the public armed vessels of the United States to subdue, seize, take," etc., any armed vessel "which shall have attempted or committed any piratical aggression * * * upon any vessel of the United States, or of the citizens thereof, or upon any other vessel." This measure, still on the statute books, testifies both to the theory prevalent at that date regarding the relative powers of Congress and the President over the armed forces in peacetime and to Congress' right to delegate its power to the President.[12]

But the most recent precedent is the most sweeping one. I refer to the afore-mentioned Lend-Lease Act of March 11, 1941, which authorized the President for something over 2 years (it has since been renewed) to manufacture or otherwise procure defense articles—meaning thereby anything from butter to battleships—and lend, lease, exchange, or otherwise dispose of them on terms deemed satisfactory by himself to any person or persons recognized as constituting a government, if he believed that by so doing he could aid the defense of the United States. In the course of the debate on the measure in the Senate, Senator TAFT summed it up in these words: "This bill is intended to give the President of the United States the right to carry on an undeclared war against Hitler through all the countries of the world that we can subsidize. * * * It would even permit the President * * * to stimulate wars in other parts of the world." That statement was not exaggerative; the act did authorize the President to fight wars by deputy at his discretion. If that was not delegating war-declaring power, what would be?

So I come, thirdly, to my second question, which is whether the treaty-making authority can add dimensions to Presidential power; and, in general, I answer this question, "No." The treaty-making power can undoubtedly create additional occasions for the exercise of Presidential power; but it cannot, I hold, augment the power itself. To illustrate, it is undoubtedly within the competence of the treaty-making power to assume for the United States the obligations of a guaranty treaty. (The very first treaty the United States ever entered into, the alliance of 1778 with France, was a guaranty treaty.) Nevertheless, if the fulfillment of such obligations entails action tantamount to war, Congress, and not the President, is the department of Government which must first be resorted to, unless we treat as established the broad-gage view of the President's control of the forces; and if we do that, then no treaty is needed to piece out Presidential prerogative.

Thus, notwithstanding a number of ill-considered judicial dicta to the effect that a treaty repeals conflicting provisions of earlier acts of Congress, I do not know of a single case in which this has actually occurred, or even been attempted. For the rest, it is the clear and unmistakable verdict of practice and opinion under the Constitution, first, that no treaty provision which deals with subject matter falling to the jurisdiction of Congress by virtue of its enumerated powers can have the force of law of the land unless Congress has first authorized it or later adopts legislation to give it that effect; and, secondly, that while Congress is ordinarily bound by the precepts of international law and good faith to adopt such legislation, it is not obliged constitutionally to do so, inasmuch as constitutionally Congress is free to repeal or abrogate any treaty provision whatsoever so far as it is law of the land.[13]

In short, it is my contention that Congress may constitutionally lend its powers to the President with the end in view of enabling our Government to discharge efficiently and effectively the obligations we shall incur as a member of the United Nations; that, in other words, we ought to regard the business as one calling for departmental collaboration rather than departmental rivalry. And certainly if we can't get President and Congress to collaborate, we can hardly hope that the sovereign members of the United Nations will do so very long.

Now, at the risk of retraveling some of the territory already covered, I wish to sum up the constitutional problem from a somewhat different angle. The President by virtue of being a single individual and always Johnny-on-the-spot, by virtue of the constantly recurrent pressure of emergencies that would not admit of delay, by virtue of certain theories of Executive power, first formulated by Alexander Hamilton in 1793 in the famous Letters of Pacificus, and by virtue of Lincoln's discovery nearly 70 years later of the Commander-in-Chief clause—owing to all these factors, added to the creative power of aggressive personalities—the President has come to claim, and has often been able to make the claim good, a quite indefinite prerogative in the sphere of foreign relations. But Congress, too, has great powers which are capable of determining the direction of foreign policy (as witness the naval war with France in 1798, the War of 1812, the War With Spain in 1898, the annexation of Hawaii the same year, the Panama Tolls Act of 1913, the neutrality acts of 1935 and 1937, and so on). For Congress is the body which lays and collects taxes for the common defense, which creates armies and maintains navies, though it does not direct them in wartime, which pledges the public credit, which declares war, which defines offenses against the law of nations; and it has the further power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper"—that is, which it deems to be such—not only for carrying into execution its own powers but all the powers

---

[9] See my letter in the New York Times (Oct. 23, 1940), editorial section, for a detailed justification of this statement.

[10] It was partially on this ground that Congress refused to grant Buchanan the authority to employ armed forces to protect American citizens passing in transit across the isthmian routes to California and American vessels in the ports of certain Latin-American countries. He combatted the argument vigorously. Richardson, Messages and Papers, vol. V, pp. 569–570. "This great power [of declaring war] * * * cannot be delegated or surrendered to the Executive." J. Nelson, dissenting in the *Prize cases*, 2 Bl. 635, 693 (1863). The majority in that case held, however, that the validating act of August 6, 1861, had "operated to perfectly cure" any possible defect of power in the President to do the acts whose validity was in question before the Court. *Ibid.*, p. 671.

[11] See *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan*, 293 U. S. 388, 422 (1935); *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.*, 299 U. S. 304, 322–328 (1936).

[12] U. S. C., 33, sec. 382. "In the distribution of political power between the great departments of Government, there is such a wide difference between the power conferred on the President of the United States and the authority and sovereignty which belong to the English Crown, that it would be altogether unsafe to reason from any supposed resemblance between them, either as regard conquest in war or any other subject where the rights and powers of the executive arm of the Government are brought into question." C. J. Taney for the Court in *Fleming* v. *Page*, 9 How. 603, 618 (1850). It is interesting to compare this language with that of Justice Sutherland at some points of his opinion in the Curtiss-Wright case, cited in the preceding note.

[13] On the first point see especially S. B. Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement (John Byrne & Co., Washington, D. C., 1916), 2d ed., chaps. XI–XIII.

"of the Government of the United States and of any department and officer thereof." Finally, its laws made in pursuance of these vast powers are "supreme law of the land," and the President is bound constitutionally to "take care that" they "be faithfully executed."

So we find the constitutional landscape—the portion of it we are interested in, anyway—dominated not by a single monolithic power, but by two massive conglomerates of power. At any rate, it is clear that the problem of determining which department of the Government shall implement American obligations to an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, is not one for logician's hocus-pocus but one for the statemen's art—the art of compromise.

But, I can imagine you asking, what compromise—what are the details? To commit myself to such an extent is rather more than I had figured on doing at the outset. For it's one thing to review precedents and elucidate principles—another thing to furnish the specifications of a plan of action. I'm not a statesman, not even a politician, only "an authority"; and as I was once admonished by a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, when I was testifying before that distinguished body, "Professors should be on tap, not on top." However that may be, here is my budget of suggestions: The United States having become a member of the United Nations through the Senate's approval and the President's final ratification of the Charter, the next step should be for Congress to pass an act authorizing the President to put a definite quota of armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council, to be used by it for the prevention and repression of what it determines to be, by the agreed method of decision, an act of international aggression; or if it is deemed preferable, the size of the quota should be left to determination by the President, subject to the condition that he periodically report his orders for this purpose to Congress, as under the Lend-Lease Act, and that they should be subject as under that act to disallowance by Congress by concurrent resolution. In this way any remaining doubt as to Congress' power to make to the President a qualified delegation of its war-declaring power would be dissipated. It is doubtful, however, if any such authorization by Congress ought to run beyond the 2-year period to which appropriations for the Army are constitutionally limited. Such a limitation, too, would substantially follow the pattern set by the Lend-Lease Act.

The question may arise in your minds whether the above proposal accords with the position taken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in its report to the Senate on the United Nations Charter. I'm sorry to say that I have not been able as yet to obtain a copy of that document, and so must rely on the brief and rather ambiguous account given by the Associated Press (Tuesday, July 17). I quote: "The Senate Foreign Relations Committee declared today that a congressional limitation on the use of American military forces under the proposed World Security Council 'unquestionably' would force renegotiation of the United Nations Charter.

"In a formal, favorable report on the 50-nation agreement, a 21-member majority asserted that any attempt—either by reservation or by subsequent legislation—to restrict the use of United States troops by requiring that Congress pass on each individual case 'would clearly violate the spirit of one of the most important provisions of the Charter.

"This interpretation, written by State Department aids and subscribed to by the majority in approving the report, appeared to forecast strong opposition to any subsequent move to limit the authority of the American representative on the power-wielding Security Council."

So far as this statement challenges the right of the Senate to attach reservations to its approval of the Charter, I agree with it thoroughly. It is the Senate's business to approve the Charter as it stands—any qualified approval would be disapproval and would force renegotiation. On the other hand, I do not agree that it would be a violation of our obligations under the Charter, either in letter or in spirit, for Congress to refuse to permit the Pesident to put the entire Army, Navy, and air force—not to mention the war industry that supports these—at the unqualified disposal of the Security Council. If that is what the Senate committee means to imply, then I say the State Department has taken it into camp. The implementation of the Charter is to be effected by each member of the organization in harmony with its particular constitution. We must make our own participation in the United Nations as effective and helpful as possible without undue risks to our constitutional structure. We should eschew extreme measures.

But to return to my own program—I suggest, in the second place, that the office of the American representative in the Security Council be created by another act of Congress. The incumbent thereof should be appointed with the consent of the Senate and subject to the President's orders, but also required to report at stated intervals to a congressional committee, the make-up of which constitutes my third proposal. The delegate, in short, should not be the mere personal emissary of the President.

Thirdly, then, the two Houses ought by concurrent resolution create a small joint committee on which both major parties should be represented, and to which should be referred automatically all communications from the American representative and from the President regarding our foreign relations. This committee would, of course, render the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee superfluous. But not only would such a committee greatly facilitate the association of Congress with the President in the conduct of our foreign relations, but its creation would mark a signal step in that reorganization of Congress which its most friendly critics today agree must soon come about if Congress is to recover its due importance in our constitutional system.

Finally, the Senate must radically reform its rules of procedure for the handling of matters brought before it by its section of the joint committee. The Senate still answers to Woodrow Wilson's description of it in 1917, as "the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready to act." In this connection I noticed recently an Associated Press despatch from Washington quoting an attack by the House Judiciary Committee on the two-thirds rule for Senate approval of treaties. The point was made that this rule had forced Presidents "to enter into executive agreements regarding important foreign affairs." The maintenance of the rule, the report continued, "instead of working to maintain a great power in the Senate is actually taking that power away from the Senate." While this contention has a great deal of force to it, yet the Senate's chosen mode of doing business by unanimous consent is open to still more serious criticism as conducing to executive agreements and to secret diplomacy, of which one type of executive agreement is an ever-available instrument. In the field of domestic legislation the unanimous-consent procedure—faintly watered down today by the right of two-thirds of the Senators to invoke by petition the previous question—provides a sort of antidote to its own poison. For every Senator is well aware that he will wish sooner or later to get some pet measure of his own enacted, and so cannot afford to stand in the way of similar enterprises of his colleagues being voted on. But in the field of foreign policy no such automatic check operates. It took the Senate 21 years to get around to consent to the treaty receding to Cuba the Isle of Pines; and that fiasco was due far more to the practice of doing business by unanimous consent than to the two-thirds rule.

Well, there is my program for striking a compromise between highflying ideas of Presidential prerogative and equally highflying ideas of congressional supremacy; also, between the cause of open diplomacy and the cause of effective participation in the United Nations.

However, suppose—what is not wildly improbable—that Congress and the Senate fail to put their respective Houses in order so that they can make their due contribution to the cause of international peace and security—what then? Assuming that American public opinion regarding the United Nations remains fairly stable, then I should say that the thing most likely to happen is the thing that has happened so often in the past, and especially in recent years. The people will turn to the President, and dismissing the question of secret diplomacy as secondary, will attribute to him the power to act effectively for the carrying out of our obligations to the United Nations, without awaiting the aid or consent of Congress further than that can be coerced by successive fait accompli. The supporting constitutional doctrine will be forthcoming, never fear. The premises for it I have pretty well indicated in this paper.

Yet such an outcome would, to my mind, be definitely disappointing. For it would sacrifice the opportunity which our entrance into the United Nations affords to bring Congress into the constitutional picture in the formulation of foreign policy, a development which might conceivably have several advantages. First, it would be educative not only of Congress but of American public opinion in this vastly important realm of governmental action; secondly, it could be educative, also, of world opinion in the possibilities of open diplomacy; thirdly, it could operate to render American foreign policy less autocratic in its inception at home and in its effectuation abroad; again, it could favor the concept of the rights of small nations, and in so doing promote the erection of legal and institutional controls upon the superpowers; finally, it could aid—at least, it would not frustrate—the establishment of a closer and more dependable cooperation between the President and Congress in this field and also in domestic policy.

For 75 years—from 1823 to 1898—the Monroe Doctrine kept Presidential adventuring in the diplomatic field in leading strings, and by so doing curtailed aggrandizement of the Presidential office. The trusteeship which we shall assume for world peace and security by entering the United Nations furnishes the point of departure for a foreign policy leading to a comparable result, provided our implementation of the Charter proceeds along right lines; provided, in other words, it does not trust everything to the casually instructed judgment of one individual, but invokes the active interest of Congress and the American public.

Revolution Down South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Revolution Down South," by Gov. Ellis Arnall,

of Georgia, which was printed in Collier's.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVOLUTION DOWN SOUTH

(By Ellis Arnall, Governor of Georgia)

(Georgia's brilliant young Governor speaks out bluntly on the economic evils and political absurdities that have plagued his native Southland, and presents an aggressive plan for getting rid of them.)

The South has lived too much in the past. It's time she rejoined the Union. She is entitled to be back in the house of her fathers. For her political and economic reverie the South has been paying a huge price. We have been content to blame many of our woes on the rest of our country, particularly the North, the "damyankee." Gentle warnings, subdued alarms, polite suggestions have failed to awaken the rest of the Nation to the fact that here is a great economic frontier, crying for development. Growing pains have not yet awakened all of our own populace here in the South to our great potentials. It's time to make a rude noise.

The narcotic that has been keeping the South in her twilight sleep is poverty. Her evasion of reality, her self-pity, her inertia have given her bad government, filled many of her important political offices with demagogues and incompetents. Here and there thieves who went into office penniless emerged millionaires—even went to prison for their racketeering.

Since the War Between the States (the Civil War to the cold bread country), the South has at times given the rest of the country reason to think of some of her governors as clowns and of some of her legislatures as dominated by charlatans and scalawags. The South has sometimes elected to office noisy quacks and fantastic scatterbrains. Able men have had difficulty in being heard or seen in the burlesque played by some of our leaders.

To these latter misrepresentatives of the people of the South, her poverty and the ignorance begotten of poverty have been political capital. Men as mentally and spiritually benighted as the meanest illiterate voting for them have won and held office on no other issue than race and religious prejudice. Intelligent and liberal minds in the South have gone about proclaiming all this for years. They have named education as its cure—education and then more education. This education they say would close public office to the prancing demagogue. It would open the purblind eyes of those of our electorate who have been unconscious of the awful truth that they are being denied the benefits of a democracy for which they are called upon now and then to die.

But thus far, few forthright, aggressive moves have been made to attack the source of Southern poverty which in turn is responsible for all the ills afflicting our people. The ennui, the mental inertia, the unawareness of many of the voters and bigotry have, on occasions, flowed into State capitols, into legislatures and county and municipal offices, because our people have shunned the rigors of hard reality, have done the very human thing; sacrificed possible gains to immediate peace.

What they got was not what they wanted. It was—well, what they got. As governor of Georgia I shall cite my evidence in Georgia, ask you to listen to the people of my State. Not that this is Georgia's story alone. What Georgia has been, what she has had forced upon her, what she wants, will come to all the Southern States. So let's look at Georgia back in 1942. And it won't be unprofitable for Southerners to superimpose the picture on their own States—try it on for fit, say.

Georgia was ruled by a dictator whose chief ambition was self-perpetuation in office. The State was being pictured in the theater, in literature, in classrooms as Tobacco Road. Georgia to the outsider meant chain gangs, peonage, pardon racketeering, Ku-Klux, crackerism, race prejudice and bankruptcy. It was a gross libel on the people, but only an overblown picture of their government. With undeveloped resources and wealth reaching out begging for cultivation, Georgia, in financial ruin, had a State debt of $36,000,000. Within the next 12 months this debt will have been paid in full.

A great part of this absurd debt was of a current or floating character. The legislature had surrendered all control of State finances to the Governor, who was—believe it or not—authorized to spend the entire revenue of the State in any manner he chose. The governor, who never lost an opportunity to demonstrate his unfitness for such power, had become a member of almost every State board or commission, or had been given arbitrary power to veto all decisions of such boards and rewrite them to suit his own personal convenience. Even a competent governor has no right to such absolutism. And no man can exercise such power without presently accomplishing his own ruin.

It was my predecessor's bigoted efforts to impose his personal prejudices on Georgia's State school system that finally awakened the people to the fact that he was their enemy, not their friend. Awakened, they began to take stock. And having taken stock, they removed him from office. These people are still awake. My predecessor was more than anything else a rabble rouser. And he discovered that there was no rabble to arouse—anyway, less rabble than he had thought.

A HOUSE CLEANING IN GEORGIA

Overnight an aroused public took inventory of itself, its financial plight, its government, and Governor. College students, their parents, school faculties, newspaper editors who saw this Governor dictator's efforts to abolish academic freedom a direct attack on freedom of thought and speech, all entered the campaign of 1942 with an unprecedented energy.

And then the man who had held Georgia's destiny in the hollow of his hand, shrewd to see portents of political doom, dragged forth that last resort of so many misrepresentatives of the southern people—race prejudice. Georgia, stung to swift action, gave her answer to this demagog and to a skeptical Nation. Government from Tobacco Road, by Tobacco Road, was overwhelmingly defeated.

Swiftly, too, the new legislature divested the governorship of dictatorial powers. Only a few old-school politicians failed to understand what was happening. In my campaign I said that to the best of my ability I'd be Governor, not a dispenser of political preferment, a creator of a personal political machine. I'd be Governor in the Governor's office. The Governor's mansion, my home while in office, would be just that—my home and not a political sideshow. But one morning after my election there stood a group of politicians at the front door of the mansion. I reminded them of my campaign promise—to run the office of Governor at the Governor's office, in complete publicity. They went away. But some of those gentlemen do not yet understand.

Then they came to me with requests for favor, for acceptance of their candidates for certain appointive offices. They told me that they had helped make me Governor and that they would presently send me to the United States Senate. I told them that I had no political ambitions further than to lead my States as best I could out of her political disorder; that I didn't want to go to the Senate; that I didn't want even to succeed myself as Governor, that all I wanted to do was to restore democratic order in a governmental set-up that was most indulgently called chaos. But some of these gentlemen are having trouble understanding this, too.

In the 24 days immediately after I took office, Georgia's Legislature broke all emancipation records. They are days of which Georgia boasts, which would honor the annals of any State in the Union. Without a dissenting vote it purged the Governor's office of personal control of the State's finances. It removed from a Governor's political whim and prejudice the management of the State's university and public-school system. It killed the pardon racket, creating a prison and parole board of competent men independent of any future Governor's dictation. It reformed Georgia's infamous prison system. It adopted an amendment to the constitution giving the right to vote to 18-year-olds, and the people in the following elections accepted it.

The legislature appointed a commission to write a modern constitution. Then it ordered an honest inventory of the State's resources and responsibilities. The result of this latter was that today Georgia as a people's commonwealth is divided into seven well-managed panels—agriculture, education, government, health, industry, public works and trade, commerce and business. Thus the State was given back to its people. Thus, too, Georgia has become thoroughly acquainted with itself, knows its weaknesses, its shortcomings, its potential strength, and awaits the postwar days with confidence. It knows what it has to do if it is to free itself of its enemy—poverty—and all poverty's ill-begotten brood.

Tobacco Road may not become an Eden. Every share-cropper hovel may not be transformed into an enchanted cottage. Long neglected and eroded farms may not blossom like the rose. The important thing is that at last Georgia is admitting that her social and economic as well as political sinkholes have existed and still exist. And she proposes to do something vigorously remedial about them. The whole South must do the same or be content with exploitation, poverty, and lazy government.

The South has suffered with inferiority. She has been humbly grateful for the crumbs from the North's table. The average American annual income at the time of Pearl Harbor was $604. In the South it was $314. The average Negro income was considerably lower. No plan to cure the South of its ills will succeed which does not make that differential its first order of business. As long as a large segment of our population is so far down the economic scale, the South will not thrive.

The so-called race question is an economic one, not social. Pay the Negro good wages for his work, give him the opportunity to demonstrate his own capacity to learn, work and earn, give him his constitutional rights and you have solved this distorted so-called race problem. Only the demagog tries to make political capital of social equality, of racial intermarriage. Let us not confuse ourselves and the issue with such absurdities. And let's make very sure that those who for one reason and another try to confuse us with such claptrap do not stop us of the South in the job that lies immediately ahead.

The South can help herself. She can and will when she finally refuses to be exploited and to exploit. For years, the South, through her Governors Conference, has petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission to rewrite the freight-rate structure which prevents her from industrial competition with the North, which gives Northern capital almost complete domination over the South through absentee ownership.

Under this unfair, collusive, and unconstitutional setup, a few southerners have grown rich but the people as a whole have grown poorer and poorer. Largely due to freight-rate discrimination are the South's public-school deficiencies, the ill-health of her underprivileged, her lack of adequate housing, and, in brief, her lopsided economy.

Annually the South made her plea for relief. The records in the ICC offices took on

great bulk. But that's as far as it got. The ICC did nothing. Our officials shrugged their shoulders, exhibited the palms of their empty hands and in too many instances went back to their dozings, saying that there was nothing to be done about it.

Lazy government. Had nobody thought of going into the courts, charging that their people were being deprived of their constitutional and legal rights by the railroads? Apparently not. Or, if they had thought of it, what or who interfered with their doing so? Was it politically expedient and profitable to subside after a few futile gestures?

I shan't attempt to answer these questions. I am much too busy preparing to argue Georgia's case (and thereby the South's) in the United States Supreme Court. That body has agreed to my request that it sit as a jury listening to the State of Georgia argue that injury is being done to her citizens by reason of these industry-benumbing freight-rate differentials, conspiracies, and discriminations.

AN EXAMPLE OF DISCRIMINATION

I shall take the chance that you may have grown tired of hearing about these discriminations. Very briefly, I shall give you a few examples. In general, the northern and eastern manufacturer pays a freight rate 39 percent less than the southern manufacturer. This differential was decided upon by the railroads who found it more profitable to do business with the East and the North. There was more trackage outside the South. Northern capital had interlocked northern industry and northern railroads. The South, it was agreed, was to remain a raw-materials source, nothing more. If she were to develop industries, she would consume much of her own raw materials, thereby upsetting the northern scheme of things. That this meant poverty and bad government in the South was—well, none of the railroads' affair.

Georgia (and thereby the South) is asking the Supreme Court whether or not an injury is being done her citizens when an Atlanta shoe manufacturer must pay the same freight rate to ship his product to Chicago—a distance of 728 miles—as it charges a Boston manufacturer who is 977 miles from Chicago? Why should it cost 50 percent more to ship, say a storage battery from Jacksonville to Washington than from Chicago to Washington, 6 miles farther? The Interstate Commerce Commission suddenly admits that the set-up is unfair. Suddenly, after all these years, it rules that beginning August 30, rates for the South shall drop 10 percent, and rates for the North increase 10 percent. Why? At last we are awake, fighting.

The South has no exaggerated illusions about her future. She does not ask for industrial development, for example, at the expense of any other section of the country. She agrees with those in our Federal Government who say that there can be no international peace unless the peoples of war-ruined countries are reestablished commercially and industrially. She merely asks that in the meantime she is not denied the right to balance her economy, reduce her poverty, enjoy the prosperity that the world at large is entitled to.

We know that many of the South's war-born industries will close when the war ends. We know that we must avoid sudden post-war booms. We want no industries unsuited to the section. We understand the dangers of the inflation of values that follow such illogical movements.

But with the elimination of unfair and discriminatory freight rates, certain industries will inevitably come to the South—woolens, wood pulp, ceramics, plastics, metallurgy.

This is not the outcry of the professional booster. No informed southerner looks to increased sectional industrialization to solve all the South's social and economic problems. But gradually, with individual incomes of the workers on a parity with the rest of the country, with the opportunity to work and earn present, State governments will decrease their tendency to be one-ring and sometimes one-man circuses. The days when a new governor's first activity was to build himself a fishpond with State funds, to substitute fish fries for public hearings on welfare programs, to build his political fortunes on hatreds, prejudice, and ignorance—such days are fading out.

Georgia's new constitution will write into her fundamental law the prohibition against the already discarded poll tax. It will place but two qualifications upon the right of all Georgians to vote: that they shall be at least 18 years old, and that they be literate enough to be able to understand what they're voting on and about.

Much of the bad government that we've had in the South can be traced to bigotry and intolerance, in office and out. In any society plagued by poverty there are those living at a bare subsistence level whose antipathies can be fanned into flaming hatred of those of another race, whom they see as competitors.

The entire racial problem in the South is economic at its roots. "The Race Problem," spelled with capitals, is something else again. It is an invention of unscrupulous demagogs, usually scalawags serving nonresident masters bent on exploiting southern resources and southern workers.

Make the South genuinely prosperous, so that there is economic opportunity for every citizen, white and black, and the two races will live on friendly terms. The low income of the South is responsible for the squalid housing, the inadequate diet, the disease, and high mortality rate of the Negro citizen. The 10,000,000 Negro citizens of the South are not a special, separate problem any more than they are a special and separate resource. They are part of the South, and their economic welfare is a part of the section's economic welfare. They are entitled to decent housing, decent clothing, good schools, economic opportunity, and justice. With every increase in the prosperity of the section, the friction between the races diminishes. Wipe out poverty, and the friction will become negligible. And the demagog will be robbed of his chief stock in trade.

Looking around the South, you can see a number of rather sorry results of demagogic government. Here in Georgia's Governor's mansion there is a small symbol. On the sideboard is a magnificent silver service, given by the State of Georgia many years ago to the battleship *Georgia*, now decommissioned. When the ship was broken up, that silver service was returned to the State. On taking office, I found that it had never been paid for, and the 1943 assembly, a generation late, voted the money to be paid to heirs of a silversmith who was driven almost into bankruptcy by the something-for-nothing methods of the demagogs.

IT'S NOT GOOD—IT'S BAD

It isn't good to see a State plundered openly by a political mob, the Governor going to the penitentiary as a common thief, presently to be welcomed back on his release with a testimonial dinner. It isn't good to hear the screams against abolishing the poll tax coming from politicians who are afraid that the men overseas fighting for their right to scream may vote them out of sinecures. It isn't good to hear people talking about States' rights without any mention of States' responsibilities to their citizens and to our common country.

But the South is waking up. We like the sweet smell of magnolia blossoms and honeysuckle and gardenia, and the song of the mocking bird, but the new South regards them as pleasures, not as opiates. We like the dreams of stately manor houses, of heroes, of incorruptible gallantry wooing women of melting beauty, while the banjos strum happy, haunting, plaintive melodies from the snow-white cotton fields. They are nice dreams to while away the hours between making the turbines turn or terracing the new pastures. But the new South is waking up and is going to work in a world of reality to achieve her proper destiny.

The rest of the country is slow to realize this new emotional maturity of the South. We are still greatly misunderstood. We can't expect not to be, perhaps, but we are telling you.

England Will Aid Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the New York Times of July 24, 1945, entitled "England Will Aid Small Business." The subheading is "Corporation formed for postwar developments comparable to SWPC here."

I particularly call attention to this article because it is in line with proposed legislation which I have introduced today which is designed to aid small business in the postwar era, and I hope that this article in the New York Times concerning the action of the organization in Great Britain similar to our Smaller War Plants Corporation, will attract attention. I think it is important that the Congress turn its attention to providing peacetime functions for the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the purpose of aiding the small businessman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ENGLAND WILL AID SMALL BUSINESS—CORPORATION FORMED FOR POSTWAR DEVELOPMENTS COMPARABLE TO THE SWPC HERE

LONDON, July 23.—Britain's equivalent of the Smaller War Plants Corporation dedicated to helping small business in the postwar era, will be ready to function within a short time, it was announced here today. With a capital of $60,000,000 and power to borrow up to $180,000,000, the corporation will supply financing for small companies, particularly in cases where the existing facilities provided by the banks are not readily or easily available to the applicants.

Known as the Industrial and Commercial Finance Corporation, Ltd., it is headed by William Pieroy, widely known British businessman. Other members of the Government corporation's directorate, according to the formal announcement, were selected for their experience in business and investment. The board is of a business rather than a banking complexion, it was added.

It was made clear that the new company will supplant but not supersede the activities of other lenders and financial institutions. Precise lines on which the company will operate will be developed from experience gained by the company. For that reason its character has purposely been sketched out broadly in order to admit of smooth adjustment to meet conditions.

While there has been pioneer work done to aid small business in Britain during the war, it was added, nothing on the scale contemplated in meeting postwar needs of small and medium size enterprises has been tried before.

Sometime ago the Government set up the Finance Corporation for Industry, Ltd., to help larger companies in postwar reconstruction. It was announced at that time that plans were under way to organize a company to assist medium and small business.

Air-Transport Battle Looming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Air-Transport Battle Looming," from the Wichita Beacon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR-TRANSPORT BATTLE LOOMING

America is headed for an all-out fight for freedom of the air that will make the railroad scraps of a few decades ago seem like child's play, and unless official and public cognizance of the fact is taken by Wichita this city may find itself in the unenviable position of an aviation outpost.

The fight is on in Congress now. There will be a lot of talk in the next few weeks and a lot of discussion about a "chosen instrument." Don't let that phrase fool you. What it means literally is "one over-all air line," a monopoly, if you please.

This McCarran bill temporarily was tabled over the week end by a 10 to 10 tie vote in the Senate Commerce Committee. But it is back in circulation after proponents of the measure succeeded in getting it placed on the floor of the Senate. It is a dangerous proposition, not only for air-minded Wichita but for the entire Nation.

The bill if made a law would completely eliminate the principal factor which has brought us reasonable freight rates—competition. It would place in the hands of one company the right to control all American international air commerce.

The McCarran measure, if passed, will supersede the Civil Aeronautics Board allocation of international air routes to TWA, American Export Airlines and Pan American Airways. It would, in effect, give all of those routes and others to one air line.

Wichita is vitally interested in the air routes which have been granted by the CAB. Wichita is one of the cities on the TWA system which would have direct connections with foreign commerce under the CAB allocations. Every country in Europe would be at our doorstep and there would be the possibility of this city becoming an international terminal.

Wichita has no direct connections with Pan American, or any other of the present international air lines. Braniff serves us in Mexico, however.

The implications of a "chosen instrument" for foreign commerce are great. There is no assurance, however, that after such a system is established internationally it would not be created within the boundaries of America, for a monopolistic domestic system of air transportation.

There is no assurance either that under the one-air-line system our foreign air commerce would survive. The degeneration of our merchant marine after the last war is a good example.

Competition is going to be the making of foreign trade after this war. A subsidized "chosen instrument" is not the answer to the competition which will be offered by Britain, France, Russia, and the other states that are vitally interested in grabbing the rein on foreign commerce.

Every ounce of energy this community possesses should be thrown into this fight. The assistance of other cities of the Midwest which stand to lose their potential role in international air commerce should be solicited.

Contribution of Theaters in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, theater people who are or have been in service, realizing the tremendous part the theater and its people have played in total mobilization for war, have set themselves to find a method by which the theater can be of equal service in contributing to the national well-being, happiness, and cultural enrichment during peacetime.

Two of these GI's from the theater, Sgt. Robert Breen and Cpl. Robert Porterfield, in collaboration with Wilva Davis, have evolved a very concrete and provocative plan for establishment of a decentralized, professional theater in America. I feel that their planning for postwar America in the particular field that they know deserves the greatest encouragement, cooperation, and serious consideration from those in a position to help.

I am therefore inserting a summary of this plan in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and hope that we of the United States will, in some way, show our appreciation and gratitude to those people of the theater who have worked so diligently toward the successful campaigns for money-raising for war-funds, Red Cross and Bond drives over the United States. I doubt that any of us realize exactly how many millions and millions of dollars have been raised by these people of the theater.

I see in this plan a hope and an opportunity that the people in the 48 States, my people in Utah, may some day have some of the cultural advantages of the professional theater available in the places where they live—whereas now, at least 90 percent of them have never seen it.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD this plan, and a statement about it.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ABOUT A NATIONAL THEATER SYSTEM FOR THIS COUNTRY?

Only the needs and desires of audiences create theater, and only when the theater reaches the greater portion of that 90 percent of America heretofore denied its share of theater will there be a national theater in the true American sense.

Working with some of the best minds in the theater, we have arrived at a general principle, and around that principle have formulated a plan which we believe will serve the purpose—to make the best in theater available to those living in communities which have no theater at prices the average man can afford.

Here are some of the pertinent facts and steps in reasoning which led to the formulation of this plan:

1. The governments of 40 other countries have financed national theaters which are a source of great national pride and considered as heritages of the peoples. Why hasn't the United States a national theater?

2. Because no plan has been attempted which takes into account two basic factors:

A. The great size of our country and its myriad smaller communities with their diverse needs.

B. Our traditional American spirit of individual enterprise calling for a system which stimulates private initiative.

3. Outside of 30 major cities, there is little or no professional theater.

4. The only way to bring theater to the citizens living in other communities is through action on a national scale. That is a national theater system.

5. The great size of this country makes it obvious that no one theater or shrine can serve as a national theater. Therefore a true national theater for America must be a system of companies throughout the land, decentralized professional theater.

WHAT IS THE PLAN?

The U. S. Public Theater Foundation, as we call it, is to be set up to make grants or loans to qualified individuals, groups, companies, organizations, or institutions for the purpose of play production on the following bases:

1. The quality and standard of the plays to be presented.

2. The need of the community or territory where they are to be presented.

3. The soundness of the functioning plan.

4. The artistic and business integrity of the personnel submitting application.

A central board composed of seven highly qualified theater people will administer this fund.

Any qualified individual or group may submit a plan for a touring or a permanent company to the central board.

Moneys for this fund may be derived from all available sources, including:

Individual gifts, legacies, bequests.

Grants from industry.

Humanitarian foundations.

Allocations from county, city, State, and national governments.

Operation of this plan allows financial arrangements between the foundation and applicants to vary from that of limited-guaranties-against-loss to short and long-term loans. Such moneys to be repaid to the foundation out of future profits, with the proviso that additional profits are either reinvested in the theater organization, or made available for the advance of other similar units which apply to the central board.

PRECEDENT?

In structure and operation, the foundation plan closely resembles England's CEMA (Council for Encouragement of Music and the Arts), instituted in 1940 by a monetary gift from an American, Mr. Edward Harkness, and which has been functioning most successfully since 1942 with financial support from the British Treasury.

It is also of pertinent interest that Berthold Viertel has requested the use of this plan as a basis for democratic rehabilitation of theater systems in Austria and Germany.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATER AND ACADEMY

A group of distinguished citizens in 1935 thought well enough of a similar idea to apply for and receive a Federal charter from the Congress (S. 2642), under the title of the American National Theater and Academy. We propose that this organization be the agency to operate the Theater Foundation program.

Should Congress see fit to make a grant to the United States Public Theater Foundation, without Government control of policy or operation, as is the case with England's CEMA, such action would be in keeping with the principle of Federal grants for libraries, museums, and educational institutions for purposes of cultural enrichment.

WHY NOW?

One of the first duties of the central board of the Theater Foundation will be to formulate plans in the interest of national public service, to extend the life of such organizations as USO Camp-Shows. For public support will turn to other interests as the national emergency decreases, while the actual need for entertainment of soldiers stationed abroad and in convalescent and rehabilitation centers in the United States is increasing and will continue to do so.

If this type of theater plan is activated now, it can have great meaning for the country as a whole, besides preventing the rise of general unemployment within the profession. If nothing is done now, the Government may be forced later to quickly set up a relief program—solely for the purpose of relief—as was the late Federal Theater. And that would be a "sad sack."

The time has come when the people in any given field, including the theater, must work out methods of contributing to full use of our national resources, by stimulating and encouraging increased opportunities through private initiative and individual enterprise.

Because after the war the need and desire will be greater than ever before. Returning GIs will want the better things of life they've been fighting for right in their home towns, for themselves, their families, and their friends. The ever-growing mechanical and functional aspects of life will increase leisure hours, but unless the cultural aspects keep pace with this change, restlessness will ensue.

Respectfully submitted.

Sgt. ROBERT BREEN,
Corp. ROBERT PORTERFIELD,
Army Air Forces.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Atlantic Air Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atlantic Air Routes," from the New York Times of July 7, last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC AIR ROUTES

Broad extension of American-flag air transportation, not only in the north Atlantic area but to Russia, the Middle East and India, will result from the long-awaited decision handed down by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The decision upholds the principle of regulated competition, advocated by 17 air lines, as opposed to the unified company thesis urged by Pan American Airways System and United Air Lines. At the same time, however, it preserves for Pan American, which has pioneered our international air service over both major oceans, in Latin America and Alaska, its existing Atlantic routes and extends them through Europe and the Near East to Calcutta.

The decision, which limits the route grants to a term of 7 years "in order that the operations thereunder, after a reasonable period, may be reviewed," will, we believe, be widely approved. At the same time, the CAB approved the proposed purchase of 51 percent of the stock of American Export Airlines by American Airlines, providing, however, that the ocean-flying company shall not lose its corporate identity. This factor in the decision will allow through bookings to points on its wide network of domestic lines, coast to coast, by American Airlines to Britain and to Moscow by way of Iceland over Scandinavia, or by way of Newfoundland over the Low Countries and Germany on the routes granted to Export.

Routes granted to TWA under the decision authorize this carrier to operate over a northern route by way of Newfoundland to points as far east as Bombay and over a southern route by way of Lisbon and Rome to African points and Cairo. Thus the house flags of three companies will bring American wings not only to the home lands of the two Big Three partners, Britain and Russia, but to France, to both shores of the Mediterranean, to Egypt and the far cities of India. There remain some necessary permits to be obtained from the countries involved, although some of these already are in hand, and there remain, of course, problems of additional equipment. All the lines affected by the decision have placed orders for new planes to augment liners they now have in service, or are negotiating for new planes.

Knowledge gained from war experience gives assurance that planes far swifter and more comfortable than even the liners of today will be available. The operations of all three lines as peace- and war-time carriers assure the know-how of Atlantic flying. American Airlines alone, for the Army Air Transport Command, made more than 7,000 Atlantic crossings between October 1942 and May 31, 1945. Technically we have long been prepared for extended international services. What was lacking was a determination of policy and allocation of routes. The CAB decision cuts that knot. Our commercial air transport takes a long stride ahead.

Women's Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication from Anna Kelton Wiley, editor of the Equal Rights Magazine, which was published in the Washington Post of July 24, 1945.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

A COMMUNICATION

In reply to your editorial of July 19, "Illusory Women's Rights," which states that "it is no longer possible to assume that common sense will save us from the folly of incorporating a meaningless and mischievous slogan into our basic law," there is no more "folly" in believing in the principle of equality of rights between men and women, than in believing in equality of rights between individual men. It is inconceivable that anyone who believes in a democracy could object to any group of citizens in that democracy having an equal share in it.

Examining the Constitution of the United States, the Magna Carta of American liberty, not a word in it states that its guaranties of rights apply to men and women. It states specifically that it is established by "We, the People," to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Certainly "posterity," "people," "citizens," such words mean just what the words says—"men and women," because they embrace both.

How did women get out of the Constitution? Assuredly women are out except through the nineteenth amendment which guarantees them the right to vote.

The courts, early in the history of the country, began distorting the plain terms of the Constitution—ruling that it was not intended to cover women. Judges ruled that the words of the Constitution did not mean what they said under certain circumstances—and that "people," "citizens"—such terms, meant "men only." The only way to recover the rights of which women have been robbed by court rulings down through the years is in the same way that women got the vote, namely by a constitutional amendment. Therefore for 22 years an ever increasing number of women, in 31 national organizations have been asking for an amendment to the Constitution reading:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification."

No new principle is being asked to be added to the supreme law of the land. A clarification of the Constitution is being asked for, stating in specific terms that women as well as men are people and are included in its guaranties.

The main objection in The Post editorial to the equal-rights amendment seems to be that it will do away with protective laws for women only. The editorial seems to ignore the fact that the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 provides a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour and a maximum workweek of 40 hours a week (suspended during the war) for all men and women engaged in interstate commerce. The Supreme Court on February 3, 1941, handed down a decision in the Darby Lumber Mills case upholding the constitutionality of the Fair Labor Standards Act and stating "the statute is not objectionable because applied alike to both men and women."

It is entirely possible during the time of ratification of the amendment, or during the 3 years following its enactment, to have 48 State wage-and-hour laws passed in the 48 States. The equal-rights amendment would require that all industrial laws such as seats in stores, prohibition of occupations, prohibitions of night work, and all other laws to improve conditions for the worker should apply to men and women alike, but the standards would be left to the States. Industrial laws when applying to women and not to men are among the gravest discriminations against women. They close many doors of opportunity to women seeking employment, while women thrown out of work by their passage are invariably forced into harder and more poorly paid work.

The equal-rights amendment would not interfere with social legislation such as children's allowances or maternity legislation. But the Post editorial speaks of the amendment as doing a way with support. Now the old common-law rule of the responsibility of the husband for the support of his wife was to be expected. Since the old common law gave the husband control over his wife's property and ownership of all that she would inherit, it would have been absurd to make her liable with him for their family expenses. With the extension of the property rights and the legal powers of married women, the common-law rule of liability for support has changed in many States. Husband and wife have been jointly or separately liable for family expenses.

The law now makes no distinction in some States between a husband and wife with regard to the right to receive support from each other after having been divorced. Husband and wife, according to Senate Document 270 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, page 134, when divorced may be required to contribute to the support of the other in 13 States, the Territories, and the Virgin Islands.

A new day is dawning for the world as a result of this terrible war, and one of the most important new developments will be justice for women.

ANNA KELTON WILEY,
Editor, Equal Rights Magazine.

WASHINGTON, *July 20.*

Child Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a great editorial entitled "Child Health," published in the Washington Post of this day.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILD HEALTH

The Maternal and Child Welfare Act, introduced in the closing days of the Senate session by Senator PEPPER, with sponsorship by nearly a dozen colleagues of both parties, seeks a solution for one of the most profound of our national problems. Nothing more intimately concerns our future as a nation than the health of our children. The Pepper bill would make Federal financial aid to the extent of $100,000,000 available to the States for the purpose of providing medical care and health services for mothers and children and child-welfare service for emotionally sick and insecure children and for children without parental care or supervision. This program would be administered through State health departments and would assure patients free choice among voluntarily participating doctors, hospitals, and clinics.

The program follows the carefully thought-out recommendations of the National Commission on Children in Wartime. "The health of children, no less than their education," says the report of this Commission, "is a public responsibility. If during the coming decades children are to grow to maturity physically and mentally fit, if they are to be able to take advantage of the educational opportunities offered to them, and if they are to assume their position as responsible members of society when they are mature, they must be assured of healthy bodies and healthy minds when they are young."

We have not done very much for child health in the past. The Children's Bureau, which would administer the allocation of funds under the proposed law, has been receiving a mere $1,500,000 to assist all 48 States in developing child-welfare services. On this budget only 400 of our 3,000 counties can be served in any one year. There are not even sufficient funds to take care of our orthopedically crippled children or of the half million youngsters under 18 suffering from rheumatic fever or of the 70,000 under 16 with cerebral palsy who could be educated if skilled care were provided for them.

And infants in this country, with its vaunted standard of living, have to take their chances—which differ very widely from State to State. In the country as a whole, 40 out of every 1,000 babies born alive die before their first birthday. The infant mortality rate per thousand varies from 30 in Connecticut to as high as 91.6 in New Mexico. If the record in every State were as good as in Connecticut—certainly not an unattainable goal—we could save 31,000 babies every year. "Even in the relative good year of 1940," Senator Pepper points out, "about half our children were living in families with incomes of less than $20 a week. Good maternity care cannot be purchased with leftovers from $20 a week after food, clothing, and shelter for a family are paid for."

There has been an admirable test for the national program proposed by Senator PEPPER in the wartime emergency maternity and infant care program for servicemen's wives and babies. It has been a boon to young mothers and to infants. And it has strengthened, without in any way impinging upon, the system of private medicine. Its values have been far too great to be abandoned with the end of the emergency. It should be extended so that good medical care can be made available to mothers and children wherever they live and whatever their economic circumstances. As a Nation, we could make no wiser investment.

Gold Star Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem from a Gold Star Mother entitled "Gold Star Mother," with a letter from the same lady.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD STAR MOTHER

Oh Mothers of the Gold Star,
Go forth with pride in your hearts,
To know you have borne so noble a son,
To die so others may live.

He went when the time was at hand,
To a cause that he thought was just,
He suffered in silence, each hardship he bore,
To right each wrong that was done.

So wear your pins proudly dear Mothers,
And live courageously on,
Then valiantly live each day that is given,
That some day you may meet him in Heaven.

—*Lizette Marie Graeber.*

FEBRUARY 1945.

DEAR SENATOR MEAD: You may be interested in knowing how many of us feel concerning this war, even if we have a loss, we must think of our friends who have dear ones in the continued conflict.

I wrote Gold Star Mother that it would bring comfort to bereaved mothers. It has.

It was read on the radio on Mother's Day and at the Gold Star Mothers' Auxiliary teas.

You may wish to have it published so it will continue to help mothers reflect the courage of their hero sons.

Thanking you for any courtesy,
Sincerely,

LIZETTE MARIE GRAEBER.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Scientific Preparedness for War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I received a letter this morning from my good friend, the former Secretary of the Navy and later Governor of New Jersey, Hon. Charles Edison, in which he called to my attention and sent to me an important editorial entitled "Scientific Preparedness," which appeared in the Asbury Park (N. J.) Evening Press of July 26. This editorial has to do with postwar military preparedness, and universal military training. With this editorial Mr. Edison also sent me a memorandum written by his distinguished father, the late Thomas A. Edison, shortly after World War I, on the same subject which is evidence of the great inventor's wisdom and vision.

I ask unanmious consent to have the editorial and Mr. Thomas A. Edison's memorandum published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Asbury Park (N. J.) Evening Press of July 26, 1945]

SCIENTIFIC PREPAREDNESS

The delay in voting upon peacetime military conscription is not being wasted. On the contrary, the comparatively slow process of democracy is again proving its value in permitting the consideration and discussion necessary for an improved program.

The mad rush toward making a soldier out of every boy by taking a year out of his life for military training has been halted and plans for the national defense are being refined with more suitable proposals.

One program calls for combining military instruction with the general education program, possibly along the lines of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps as constituted in numerous colleges. Senators KILGORE and JOHNSON have gone even further in proposing a national science foundation to foster research facilities of value to the national defense. Mr. KILGORE contends that "research is the key to military success," while Mr. JOHNSON astutely observes that "another war will be won in the laboratory, not on the drill fields." Their views are supported by the obvious fact that the modern armed force is largely comprised of improved weapons and especially trained men rather than in the masses of foot soldiers who have learned only to drill and shoot and raise tents such as would emerge from a program of universal military training.

In this connection the views of one of the greatest minds this country ever produced, that of Thomas A. Edison, are of vital interest. As chairman of the first Naval Research Board the eminent inventor studied the course America should pursue after the First World War, and his advice is as pertinent today as it was then. Mr. Edison prepared a memorandum in which he emphasized the need for constantly improving the quality of our weapons and for maintaining a large force of officers and drill sergeants equipped to train an army on short notice. During both World Wars one of the major handicaps we faced was a lack of trained men qualified to train others. Dangerous but not disastrous delays were encountered in procuring the facilities and personnel needed to mobilize and train a first-class army. Under Mr. Edison's program all of the physical properties of war, from airplanes and ships to improved artillery, would be maintained and improved in large quantity. A sizable army of men prepared to instruct others in the operation of these weapons would be produced by "at least two military academies in addition to West Point," with subsidiary schools training drill sergeants and specialists. The result would be a nation adequately prepared not only to defend itself but to defend its interests across the seas, without sacrificing the time and general education of every able-bodied boy in the country for a year of mass military training.

Not until the Nation has thoroughly digested such suggestions as those offered by Mr. Edison and Senators KILGORE and JOHNSON will it be ready to adopt a military training program. Its deliberations have already taught it that mass conscription and the low standards that will result may reduce rather than enhance our basic strength. Now, it seems determined to devise a scientifically sound program of preparedness, adapted to the technical nature of modern warfare, and calculated not to impose damaging sacrifices upon our educational and economic system. We cannot afford to be stampeded into anything less.

MEMORANDUM WRITTEN BY MR. THOMAS A. EDISON

The present war has proven that man is still a predatory animal, selfish and grasping; wearing the mask of civilization to hide his natural characteristics. This statement is proven by the death of 2,000,000 men, on the firing line.

In cities, the police curb him, and the General Government performs the same function for the larger units.

As to nations, there is no curbing them. There is no international authority to coerce nations; therefore, we should take precautions.

Nearly every nation is predatory more or less, except the United States.

The United States is a rich prize for a predatory nation or combination of nations.

The United States should prepare to defend itself against any possible invasion.

It should start now.

Organize for national defense a general staff of the best military officers in connection with a civilian staff of our best engineers, together with a staff composed of men of great executive ability who organize and direct our great business affairs, and who can hustle and get things done quickly. Adopt the methods so laboriously worked out by the Germans for tabulation and coordination of all the factors.

It is not necessary to have conscription or any great permanent army when a nation acts on the defensive. Men will always fight for the invaded land where their property is, where their children were born, and in which they have decided always to live, no matter from what land they originated.

What we need is plenty of officers and drill sergeants—and trained experts. We should have at least two military academies in addition to West Point. We should add to these academies schools for instruction of drill sergeants, artillerists, submarinists, and signal men. In other words, we should have the brain of a great army ready on the drop of the hat, but no professional soldiers much above what we now have.

Thus we should have probably the best led Army in the world with very little annual expense.

We should have a large Navy of extremely rapid ships of the highest power; also an excessive number of high-speed mine-laying boats, laid up in fresh-water rivers and kept in good condition; an excessive number of mines; also several hundred submarines—most of them kept in storage on the land. Crews for submarines should be thoroughly trained and then put back into private life with a small monthly allowance to retain their services when wanted. The same procedure should be carried out with aeroplanes and signaling appliances. All of the apparatus that we might ever require should be kept in stock and constantly renewed to keep it up to date.

All the harbor defenses should be fully supplied with the most powerful armaments.

We should have several complete plants for manufacture of explosives in different parts of the country. These plants should be of very great capacity. The combined capacity should exceed twice that which under the most unfavorable conditions we could imagine would be necessary. The ammunition plants should make their own acids. They should carry an enormous stock of raw materials. These plants should not be operated in times of peace, the Government depending on private concerns.

Regarding artillery, I think we should have more artillery per capita than any other nation. I think we should carry in stock at least half as much as is now used on the firing line of the French, and a large number of forgings, rough turned and bored ready for quick finishing, with accessories.

Our wireless and field electric signaling system should be greatly extended. Apparatus for full war footing should be kept in stock and men taught and relegated back to private life with a small monthly retainer.

The Government should adopt a system of military roads along the seaboard, taking charge of all roads having strategic value, put them and keep them in fine condition, reduce the grades and in places widen them, and strengthen the bridges for artillery trucks.

There should be a commandeering law passed whereby the Government, by payment of a certain sum, should have the right of commandeering any article necessary.

Should we be invaded, good military roads and the automobiles will permit the shifting of a million men 200 miles in 24 hours, and with large auto trucks shift our supplies and artillery as well. The railway cannot compare with good roads and automobiles for rapid movement of men and materials.

In other words, I would have the United States permanently on a war footing only against invasion and only so far as machinery, supplies, and officers are concerned, trusting entirely to volunteers and the spirit which men have when defending their home land, as we see in Belgium and France.

In this way we avoid being a military nation, our people will all be working and a small percent of the wealth they will create will pay for all of this machinery and the salaries of the experts.

Predatory nations are masters of espionage. They will know, and this preparedness will be a deterrent. It is time democracy should become efficient like the autocracies, and the present is the most propitious time to try the experiment.

Postwar International Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Postwar International Aviation," published in the New Haven (Conn.) Journal-Courier of July 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

POSTWAR INTERNATIONAL AVIATION

One thing, at least, has been decided in the question of United States competition for postwar international air traffic. By granting licenses to fly the Atlantic to Pan-American, American Export Lines and Transcontinental and Western, the Civil Aeronautics Board with the President's approval has determined that competition, rather than the "chosen instrument" idea, shall be the American policy.

Wide differences of opinion have existed as to the best procedure in developing the postwar interests of the United States in fields of commercial international aviation.

However, there can be no disagreement with the fact that, if the United States intends to make the most of the opportunities in international aviation, it must get busy. The competition in those fields is sure to be keen. Great Britain already is active and probably has made more progress than is generally realized. Russia, France and probably a good many other nations are sure to be competitors.

Thus, if the start now authorized for the United States is not late already, it certainly has been made none too soon. The establishment of international aviation lines is a time-taking job, and those which have received the new authorizations probably will need every minute now allowed them to prepare for the competition they must meet.

Most Americans, we think, will regard as sound the decisions of the CAB to put our participation in the race for air traffic on a competitive basis among our own companies, as it will inevitably be in keen competition with foreign lines. Competitive business is a traditional American principle. Theoretically, any American air line could participate in international business by the "chosen instrument" method as embodied in the pending McCarran bill, by acquiring stock in the one authorized corporation. But the minimum amount required is large and it is thought that only two or three existing air lines could qualify.

The aviation subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee disapproved the McCarran plan by a vote of 7 to 2. The objections to it were well expressed in a letter from Cordell Hull last August to Senator BAILEY, chairman of the Commerce Committee. "The experience of most other countries," Hull said, "which have adopted the monopoly or 'chosen instrument' policy has been that such a policy, either intentionally or by sheer force of gravity, led to a Government-owned system, or else to a system so completely Government-controlled as to have all the qualities of Government ownership. In the cases of Great Britain, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, and Japan, the air lines started out as private ventures but were subsequently taken over by the state."

The main argument put forward by Pan-American, chief advocate of the "chosen instrument" plan, was that the probable volume of international traffic would support one big company but not several companies whose competition among themselves would be ruinous. In the American domestic field, quality of service and financial success have both reached a peak not surpassed anywhere, under the competitive system. The rapid growth of aviation, aside from the tremendous war stimulus, and the ability Americans have demonstrated to meet all comers in other fields of business, both indicate that the CAB has not gone wrong in licensing three American contenders for postwar international air traffic.

Price Control Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Mr. Chester Bowles a few days ago in regard to the policy of the Office of Price Administration respecting pricing, and also with regard to various matters which pertain to the administration of the price and stabilization act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1945.

Memorandum to: Members of the Congress.
From: Chester Bowles, Price Administrator.

SOME PERSONAL COMMENTS ON THE OUTLOOK FOR PRICE CONTROL DURING THE COMING YEAR

As it was approved by the Congress on June 30, the Revised Price Control Act is, I believe, an excellent piece of legislation. While the bill was up for consideration I made it a special point to study each suggested amendment in the light of its possible effect on the President's order to hold the line.

It was certain obvious that many people thought the act should have been changed in many major respects. And I know that many of those who made such suggestions were just as sincere in their beliefs as those who could not agree that these major changes should be made. In addition, there were, I know, a few groups intent on securing some special benefits for themselves regardless of what the effect would have been on the whole price-control program. All in all, I think Congress did a grand job.

I am particularly pleased at the selection of your colleague Clinton Anderson as Secretary of Agriculture. I had a splendid talk with him earlier this week and we are working on a close program of day to day cooperation. I have assured him of the complete support and cooperation of the entire OPA organization in the difficult task which confronts him. He gave me similar assurance as to the Department of Agriculture.

OPA from the beginning has had a difficult and thankless task. Some people have told me that in their opinion our job from the beginning was theoretically impossible. It was their belief that inflation was an inevitable consequence of war, and there was little that could be done in a practical way to prevent it.

The fact remains that inflation has been controlled in the face of the greatest inflationary pressure that this country has ever seen. We have maintained a relatively stable price level and a sound and healthy economy through 3½ years of all-out war.

But the real test will be in the next 12 months. It was just at this time that we lost the fight against inflation in World War I. Today with more than $300,000,000,000 in liquid assets threatening our economic stability, we will need all our courage and good judgment if we are to come through safely.

Our problems are made tougher by the fact that the Nation as a whole has grown somewhat weary of war and the regulations and red tape that go with war. We are tired of Government regimentation and weary of bureaucrats. As I see it, we have four major tasks ahead:

1. We must make sure that the prices on basic commodities which go to make up the cost of living are kept from shooting upward. That means rents, clothing, food, and other essentials. If these prices move upward, wages must certainly follow, and an ever-increasing inflationary spiral will most certainly result.

2. We must establish prices on items which are now going into peacetime production for the first time in 3 or 4 years. We have to make certain that these prices are fair to the public and fair to the manufacturer. Equally important, these prices must be established promptly so that there will be a minimum of delays and inconvenience.

The final answer to the inflationary dangers which confront us is production and more production. There will be inevitable bottlenecks in the process of reconversion. I would like to assure you again that the OPA will not be one of them.

I must say, however, that, regardless of how fair the prices set by OPA may be, or how promptly they are established, there will be some few groups which will use every possible means to force OPA to give prices which are completely out of line with the costs. Regardless of the prices which we establish, there will be some who will claim that these prices are unfair. They will make demagogic appeals to public opinion to force still further increases.

I have discussed this point with responsible business leaders. It is their feeling and mine that our best defense against this group will be the overpowering force of responsible business and public opinion standing firmly behind our efforts.

We are particularly concerned that small business receives all possible consideration. That is why we have allowed all reconverting firms under $200,000 annual volume to set their own ceiling prices according to a formula which we are giving them. These firms make up 75 percent of all the firms which will be reconverting.

3. We must maintain the firmest possible grip on the black-market situation. Black markets, as you know, are the inevitable consequence of war shortages in all countries throughout the world. The fact that they have been a lesser problem in the United States so far is a real tribute to our people.

During the past year we have eliminated a dangerous black-market situation in gasoline. During that last 2 months we have substantially reduced the black market in meat, with some 2,700 cases already brought before the Federal courts since the middle of May. More that 9,000 black-market slaughterers have been put out of business in the last 6 weeks.

However, our enforcement task is perhaps the greatest ever undertaken by a Federal agency, and the staff available to us is small. I do not believe there is any more patriotic and hard-working group of people in the United States than the OPA enforcement organization. I believe we can count on them to do more than their share in protecting honest businessmen and the general public against the wartime chiseler and the profiteer. Our efforts will have the full backing of the Treasury Department and other Federal agencies.

Regardless of our best efforts, however, the final test on whether the black market will be kept under control or whether they will grow to dangerous proportions rests with the general public itself. The final complete answer to our black markets will come from the righteous indignation of our businessmen and from the general public.

4. We must drop controls just as rapidly as we can, and let me say right here with emphasis that there is no group which is quite so anxious to drop them as we in OPA are.

As our peacetime production is stepped up, supplies will gradually come in balance with demand, first in one field then another. As quickly as this occurs price controls in that area will be eliminated. Rent control will be dropped area by area as rapidly as circumstances permit. It is my belief that during the coming year you will see price control eliminated on many products. During the last few months of the fiscal year, you will probably see these controls dropped at a faster and faster rate.

Let me repeat that in my opinion the next 12 months will constitute one of the greatest tests that we have ever faced. We are now on the last important stage as far as price control is concerned. In this last stage the final victory over wartime inflation can be either won or lost.

I wish I could promise you that rationing and price control could be made free from all irritation, and free from all possibility of hardship or inequity. Unfortunately, I can't. Our wartime economy is extremely complex. A lot of great forces are always exerting terrific pressures on that economy. If we push on it at one spot we're pretty sure to get a bulge or two at some other spot. Frequently, those of us who have responsibility for this vast program are forced to choose between relative evils rather than between clear-cut alternatives or right and wrong.

I can assure you, however, that we will do our utmost. I can assure you that our approach will be one of flexibility and good sense, and that our procedures will be changed promptly to fit changing conditions.

But again I must repeat that we cannot do the job alone. Without the full support of the great majority of the people in business, labor, on our farms and in Congress, and backed up by the general public's acceptance and determination that inflation "will not happen here," our own best efforts will be helpless to stem the flood.

Prejudice: Roadblock to Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Army Talk on the subject Prejudice: Roadblock to Progress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREJUDICE: ROADBLOCK TO PROGRESS

Practically everyone of us has prejudices. Some of us may shudder at the idea of eat-

ing frogs and other foods we've never tasted but which other people enjoy. Or we may be prejudiced against bow ties or purple shirts. But these are meaningless prejudices which don't hurt us. There are other prejudices, however, which affect our lives very much. A prejudice against a necktie because of its color is harmless—but a prejudice against a person because of his color, race, nationality, or religion can do plenty of damage.

A prejudice is an opinion or emotional feeling which isn't based on fact or on reason. It is an attitude in a closed mind. Prejudice has been used by the Germans and the Japanese to split nations wide open with hate and confusion. Recognizing how powerful is this weapon in the Axis arsenal, ASF Manual M5, issued October 1944, declares:

"Enemy attempts to cause confusion in the United States through the spread of racial doctrines have made it particularly necessary that there be frank and objective discussion of this subject during the present war. The doctrine of Aryan superiority has become one of the dominant factors in the present world struggle. Hitler has made this doctrine the 'reason' for untold aggression and devastation.

"Likewise, on the other side of the world," the Manual continues, "the Japanese have been trying to demonstrate their inherent superiority."

The magic of race prejudice, the Japanese discovered, had performed miracles in Europe. It had enabled the Nazis to get away with murder. If Hitler could seize Germany and disrupt Europe with the help of race hate, the Japanese saw no reason why they couldn't do the same thing in Asia.

About a week after Pearl Harbor, the Japanese were broadcasting: "How can America be fighting for racial equality when it does not exist in America?" During the 1943 race riots in Detroit, the Japanese propagandists had a field day broadcasting the news to hundreds of millions of nonwhites in Asia and throughout the world.

Japan's championing of the Negroes in the United States has only one purpose—to divide us. Negroes, forming as they do about one-tenth of the American population, are an important minority, and Hitler has shown how minority problems can be exploited to the advantage of fascism.

"The man who spreads rumors," ASF Manual M5 declares, "particularly race rumors, about any group—racial, religious, or national—is doing Hitler's or Tojo's work. The Nazis assumed that in this country they would find antagonistic groups who would spend their time fighting each other instead of the German armies. Goebbels said to one of his confidants: 'Nothing will be easier than to produce a bloody revolution in America. No other country has so many social and racial tensions. We shall be able to play on many strings there.' "

Any American who "plays on these strings" by spreading prejudices against minorities—Catholics, Jews, Negroes, foreign-born, and others—is, whether he knows it or not, playing the Axis game.

HOW PREJUDICES DEVELOP

1. How do we get our prejudices?

All of us inherit certain characteristics such as the color of our skin and the shape of our head. But we do not inherit our prejudices. When we are born we have only the capacity to develop love and hate and the other human emotions.

Whom we learn to like or dislike, love or hate, depends on our experiences—in our home, in our school, in our neighborhood—and the effect these experiences have upon us. The language we learn, our religion, ideas, feelings, and attitudes, our manners and prejudices—all these come from our environment.

As children, we imitate not only activities of those around us, especially our parents, but also feelings, attitudes, and opinions. Prejudices, too, are absorbed unconsciously from our parents and other people in our environment.

By the time we have grown up we already have "pictures in our mind" of many people with whom we've had little or no contact. We may have a stereotyped picture of Negroes as lazy, stupid, happy-go-lucky; of Jews or Scots as stingy and money-mad; of Irishmen as hot-tempered, brawling, whisky-loving. These stereotypes are being constantly reinforced through newspapers, movies, conversations and jokes, books and radio. A single story, comic strip, or movie may not make too deep an impression. However, when time after time the Negro is presented as a crap-shooting, shiftless character; the Latin as a gangster or racketeer; the oriental as a slinking, mysterious, and crafty person—then deep and lasting impressions are made which go to form attitudes and prejudices.

ERRORS OF GENERALIZING

There is another way that we get false ideas about whole groups of people. As youngsters we may have played games with boys in the neighborhood, and one of them, perhaps a Pole or an Italian, may have cheated. We then conclude that all Poles or all Italians cheat, and we carry this idea with us all through life. We conclude that because one member of a group acted in a certain way all members of that racial, religious, or national group will act the same way. We usually make these false generalizations about any group but our own. If we're Protestant and a member of our group lies, we don't condemn all Protestants. If we're Catholic and one of our members steals, we don't say all Catholics are thieves. If we're Jewish and one of our group commits a crime, we don't say all Jews are criminals.

It is only natural and human to be curious about things or people about whom we know very little. Curiosity is wholesome, and when it leads a man to investigate honestly the thing that arouses his curiosity, he often finds something new and interesting. However, when he does not make the effort to look honestly into the thing that first called forth curiosity—when, instead, he lets the matter dwell and go unanswered—he closes his mind to healthy thinking, and trouble begins. Curiosity gives way to suspicion—suspicion quickly converts itself to fear—and fear grows into hate. One fears the thing he suspects, and hates that which makes him afraid. This fear of the strange and unfamiliar is called by a high-sounding name—xenophobia. Primitive tribes usually feared and therefore hated a neighboring tribe because they didn't know them. Unenlightened people today have that same fear and suspicion of the unknown. Only when we've lived and worked with people of different races, cultures, and backgrounds, and learned to know them, can we really overcome these primitive fears.

INSECURITY BREEDS PREJUDICE

Prejudices develop, too, from a feeling of insecurity or frustration. We may feel uncertain about our ability or prestige. We may feel insecure in our job or our social position. To strengthen our own confidence and feeling of self-importance, we often search for someone to look down upon as "inferior" or some group to blame for our failure and misfortune. That is why there is more prejudice in times of social stress and economic depression. Depression brings insecurity—and insecure people begin looking around for someone or some group on whom they can pin the blame.

Prejudices are often deliberately exploited by some people to further their own purposes. The Germans used the "hate" technique to divide opposition, to confuse the real issues, to blame national or international ills on innocent scapegoats, and to gain a following by a common hate. "Hate the Jews," they yelled. "Hate the Poles." "Hate the Russians." "Hate the Negroes." "Hate the Catholics." Hate them for their color, their religion, their politics, their nationality. Hate them for any reason—or for no reason—but hate them. For hate meant power—to the Nazis.

WHAT IS A MINORITY?

2. What do we mean by a minority?

The dictionary defines a minority as less than half. But that doesn't quite explain the kind of minorities to which you and I and everyone in America belongs. If you're a Catholic, you're part of a minority, because Catholics don't number more than half of the people in this country. If you're a Negro, a foreign-born, a Jew, you're a member of a minority.

Now, if you're a Protestant, you're a member of a majority group in America—but Protestants include Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and scores of other minorities. And while a Protestant may be part of a majority group in one locality in the United States, he may be in a numerical minority in another locality.

America, like the rest of the world, is made up of minorities—religious, racial, and national. Let us remember that a minority group, like the Poles or the Negroes in America, may be a majority group elsewhere (say in Poland, or Africa), and that a majority group today may become a minority group tomorrow—or vice versa.

ALL HAVE BEEN "SCAPEGOATS"

In ancient days many people believed that their guilt and sins could be transferred to some other person, animal, or object. During rituals performed by a leader of the tribe, a goat was often chosen by lot and the sins of the tribe passed on to the animal. The goat was then driven into the wilderness or destroyed.

Today, when people blame their troubles or woes on innocent people, we call this unjust persecution "scapegoating."

3. Have all minority groups been "scapegoated"?

At one time or another, every minority group has been used as a scapegoat and has suffered from prejudice and persecution. If we go back deep into history, we find powerful leaders who covered up their own selfish motives by inciting people's emotions against "troublemaking" minorities. In the days of the Romans, Christians were blamed for all the troubles of the Roman Empire—including the burning of Rome—and for years they were persecuted.

Christians, in turn, have persecuted Jews. During the Black Death in the Middle Ages, when bubonic plague killed off one-fourth of Europe's population, responsibility was laid to the Jews who were tortured and oppressed, even though Jews were dying off as rapidly as Christians. In Spain, monarchists rode to power against the Jews. The autocratic empire of the Czars blamed the Jews for the abuses of the Russian feudal regime and massacred thousands of them.

In the eighteenth century, a large colony of French Huguenots lived in England. They were accused of being dirty, of reducing the standard of living, of depriving Englishmen of the jobs, and of reducing their wages. A flood of pamphlets issued against these Huguenots was reprinted a hundred years later with the word "Jew" substituted for "Huguenot."

In Hitler's Germany the Nazis began by persecuting the Jews, but eventually they turned upon Catholics, Protestants, Czechs, Poles—and the entire world.

PERSECUTION IN AMERICA

4. How about America? Has our own history been free of scapegoating?

America, too, has its shameful pages of persecution of minorities. Many of our early

settlers who came here to escape religious prejudices and persecution denied religious freedom to others. Massachusetts expelled dissenters like Roger Williams, while in Salem hysterical witch hunts were pursued. In one colony or another, Catholics, Quakers, Jews, Lutherans, Moravians, Presbyterians, Baptists, deists, atheists, were deprived of political and religious rights.

In the nineteenth century, earlier immigrant groups began to discriminate against the "newer" immigrants. Feeling ran high the "invasion" of the Irish who arrived in large numbers after Ireland's potato famine of 1846. Riots broke out against them in Philadelphia, Boston, and New York. They were accused of introducing slums, crime, and of depriving Americans of jobs.

In 1850, the "Know Nothing" Party was formed to fight the Irish and Catholic immigrants, and the party remained a political force until the Civil War. They and their prejudiced successors yelled about "the flood of immigration sweeping its millions of foreign Roman Catholics over the land."

Eventually, most of this discrimination was turned against later immigrant groups—the Poles, Italians, Slavs, Jews, and Russians. When immigration was restricted to annual quotas for each nationality after World War I, preference was given to earlier immigrant groups. (Quotas were based on the census of 1910, then of 1890, then on the national origin of the white population of 1920.)

What many seem to forget is that we are all immigrants or the children of immigrants. No one has a right to complain about "foreigners" unless it be the American Indian. "Americanism," said our late President Roosevelt, "is not and never was a matter of race and ancestry. Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart."

TRUE DEMOCRACY GAINING

5. Are there any signs that prejudices and discrimination are decreasing in America?

While the democratic ideals expressed by the founding fathers, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution have not always been practiced, nevertheless, the liberties and freedoms which we share and which bind this Nation together are one of the glorious chapters in human history. We have gone further in the direction of equality of opportunities than have the people of most other countries, and we are continuing our progress in that direction. Through the years there has been a sustained effort to abolish discriminations and prejudices which deny a person his fundamental rights as a citizen in a democracy. Discriminations and prejudices are not products of—but rather challenges to—the American way of life. And each of us has a personal responsibility to see to it that the American way of life prevails.

From the time of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation to the present time, laws have been passed to carry forward the democratic principle "that all men are created equal."

When the Negroes were freed, 90 percent of them could neither read nor write. In 1940, according to the Federal census, 18 of every 20 Negroes could read and write. Many States have already moved far toward equalization of educational opportunity for Negroes and whites. In a 25-year period, the registration of Negro college students showed an increase of 2,400 percent.

A great advance was made in June 1941 when President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802 and declared: "It is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the national-defense program by all citizens of the United States regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin," The order requires that in all war contracts there is no discrimination "because of race, creed, or national origin" and sets up the Fair Employment Practice Committee to enforce this provision.

At the same time, many Americans are beginning to realize that racial and religious prejudices menace our war effort and our hopes for world peace. More and more Americans are becoming convinced that every person, regardless of his race, religion, or national origin, should be judged on the basis of his own merit. They are beginning to see that much straight thinking is needed on the problems of minorities and that the solution of these problems has a great deal to do with the welfare of our Nation as well as our own and our children's welfare. Many are learning that democracy cannot work for some unless it works for all.

SIX DANGERS OF PREJUDICE

6. Why is religious and racial prejudice a threat to all of us?

A. Prejudice is contagious: History has taught us that when we discriminate against one segment of the people, we set a pattern that may be used against other groups. Hitler's persecution of the Jews, trade unionists, Communists, and Socialists was later directed against Catholics, Protestants, liberals, and eventually the people of the world.

In 1855 Abraham Lincoln understood this when he said: "As a nation we began by declaring all men are created equal. We now read it 'All men are created equal except Negroes.' When the Know Nothings get control, it will read 'All men are created equal except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics'."

Consideration for the Negro, the Jew, the Catholic, the foreign born, or for any other minority group rests not merely on the grounds of humanity and justice; it rests on the solid base of self-interest.

B. Prejudice makes all of us poorer: We can't have an enlightened democracy with minority groups living in ignorance. We can't have a prosperous democracy with minority groups so poor that they can't afford to buy the goods America produces.

If a minority is kept at a low wage scale in the same field or area in which we work, eventually our own wages will be reduced because of a smaller demand for consumer goods and the competition of cheap labor. Conversely, a higher standard of living for any group increases the demands for consumer goods and makes for a more prosperous country. Aside from the fact that it is Christian and democratic, it is also to our own selfish interest to help secure better housing, clothing, and nutrition for all our people.

As Eric A. Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, recently declared: "Whenever we erect barriers on the grounds of race or religion, or of occupational or professional status, we hamper the fullest expansion of our economic security. Prejudice doesn't pay. Discrimination is destructive."

C. Prejudice robs us of minority talents: Prejudice often prevents minority groups from developing their abilities and skills. It limits their achievements and deprives the Nation of their genius. We are all poorer in America today because discrimination prevents members of some minorities from rising to their greatest possible achievements, thus lessening their potential contributions to the general wealth and welfare of America.

D. Prejudice blinds us to real situation: Prejudice makes impossible any real solution of economic, social, or personal difficulties. When we blame war or social and economic troubles on some innocent minority group, we are diverting our attention from the real causes. By blaming and hating some scapegoat for our misfortunes, we intensify rather than remove the difficulties. Social ills can only be remedied by all members of society accepting their share of responsibility and cooperating through democratic means to solve their common problems.

E. Prejudice endangers victory: Prejudice means disunity, and disunity plays into the hands of the enemies of democracy. National unity is just as essential to victory as battleships and flying fortresses. America can't give its maximum to the war effort unless we conquer the disrupting effects of prejudice on the fighting front and the production front.

The War Department—in ASF Manual M 5—recognizes that "discrimination on the basis of race or color" is "fatal to military efficiency." And War Department pamphlet 20-3 states: "To contribute by act or word toward the increase of misunderstanding, suspicion, and tension between peoples of different racial or national origin in this country or among our allies is to help the enemy."

The Detroit race riot of June 1943 and the Philadelphia transport strike of August 1944 offer two isolated but dramatic instances of the disruptive effects of discrimination on the production front.

The walk out of 6,000 employees of the Philadelphia Transportation Co., precipitated by the assignment of 8 Negroes to jobs as streetcar operators, paralyzed the city's vast transportation system. The 6-day traffic tie-up kept thousands of war workers from their jobs, and 4,000,000 man-hours of vital war production were lost.

The 2-day Detroit race riot cut war production 15 to 50 percent in some plants, and absenteeism ranged from 20 to 90 percent. A million hours of labor were lost.

F. Prejudice endangers world peace: Even more disastrous is the effect which news of race riots and discrimination against minorities has upon the morale of our fighting men abroad, and on the millions of people throughout the world, white and colored, whose loyalty and help are so vital to the Allied cause. It has been powerful ammunition for the propagandists of the Axis in Europe, Africa, the Near East, and particularly the Far East.

Three-fourths of the people of the world are what we call "colored." These people naturally look to the treatment of our American Negroes to see what we really mean when we speak of democracy. Racial and religious prejudice alienates the confidence of the vast non-white populations as well as other peoples, thwarts their hopes and our hopes of peace and freedom, and ultimately creates the conditions from which future global wars can develop.

How we treat minorities is, therefore, more than a matter of mere domestic concern. Almost 13,000,000 people in the United States were born in Europe, and 27,000,000 have parents born in Europe. The mistreatment of some Mexicans in the United States echoes throughout North and South America; a race riot provokes discussions and resentments in Africa, the Philippines, and among the 800,000,000 non-white people in China and India.

Throughout the world there are millions of people convinced that this is a total war against fascism and Fascist ideas. Their concept of peace includes the hope—even the determination—that when this war is won, there will be no such thing as "superior" and "inferior" peoples anywhere in the world.

STORY OF AMERICA PROVES IT

The story of America is proof that there are no "superior" or "inferior" people. Our country has been made great by people who came from every land under the sun—people with names like Carnegie, Sikorsky, Toscanini, Einstein, Osler—and thousands more. But it isn't only the big names, the Hall of Fame names, who have made America—any more than it is only the big names who are winning the war. We know that the biggest part of this war is being fought and won by the little names, by the millions of Joe Doakes who may never make tomorrow's headlines.

The men who built and are building America—who clear her forests, span her rivers, dig her coal, plow her fields, work her machines—the men who made America strong and free—and are fighting and dying

to preserve that freedom on battlefields all over the world—are men of every race, color, religion, and nationality. Listen to their names at roll call. Read their names in casualty lists—like these from the New York Times of March 29, 1945; Agostinello, Cohen, Curran, Grunwald, Hrubec, Ivanoski, Kuzian, Marshall, Thomas, Warblanski.

Were any of these "inferior"?

President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in Jim Brady's column Inside Washington. This news item paints a clear picture of the man at the White House.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE WASHINGTON
(By Jim H. Brady)
KNOW YOUR PRESIDENT

Most of us love and respect a man who is just like the rest of us. That's Harry Truman to a "T." The President is so sincere and has an unusual respect for those who work for him. President Truman is just a typical American. An honest, law-abiding citizen who has strong confidence in our form of government and faith in our people.

Today this writer talked with a close friend of President Truman. She is the wife of one of President Truman's personal aides. The lady with whom I talked is one of the outstanding wives of White House association.

Probably the most outstanding trait of President Truman is the confidence and appreciation he shows people associated with him. President Truman is never too busy to show a personal courtesy to any individual, regardless of rank or position.

Recently one of his aides had a speech to make before a civic organization here. The title of the talk was Know Your President. The civic group had taken particular pains in planning the program and seeing that a large crowd was present to hear an off-the-record account of President Truman's daily activities at the White House.

It so happened that day the President suddenly decided that a trip down the Potomac would do his staff good. He wanted to discuss the results of the San Francisco Conference. So he informed the people he wanted to take that they should be ready to go early the next day.

This made it impossible for the President's aide to appear before the civic group. Desperate for a person to fill in space for him, the aide contacted other White House associates with the hope of finding another personal friend of the President to appear before the group. His efforts were in vain.

However, President Truman received word of the aide's plight. He immediately summoned him and said the group would wait until after the function to make the journey. The Presidential yacht went down the river to a point in Virginia and waited until the civic meeting was over. The aide joined the party there and they proceeded down the river to conduct their important discussions on the San Francisco Conference.

This writer has the honor of being a close friend of President Truman. Very few men have been as nice and respectful to newsmen as Mr. Truman. During his time in the Senate and his tour of duty as Vice President, a newsman wouldn't want a better contact or desire to interview a nicer fellow.

He is always plain and remembers his friends. President Truman is so typically American that he forgets himself and devotes much of his time to helping others. He is awfully bashful and doesn't like to be in the spotlight.

At the concert at the White House the other day, President Truman walked out on the lawn where close friends awaited him. When they stood up in respect of his Presidential rank, Mr. Truman gave them a boyish grin. He's real American and a real man—what more would we want in the highest office of our land.

Full Employment—The First Objective of Domestic Policy
A Program for the Reconversion and the Postwar Period
The Need for S. 1274 Providing for Emergency Unemployment Compensation
The Need for S. 1297 Providing for a National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 1, 1945

FULL EMPLOYMENT—THE FIRST OBJECTIVE OF DOMESTIC POLICY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in the week of August 6, the pace of world events was dramatically accelerated first by the use of the most deadly weapon known to man, the atomic bomb, and secondly, by Russia joining her allies in the war against Japan. These two developments made imminent the end of World War II. We can no longer afford any delay in putting our house in order either for political and military security throughout the world or for economic security at home.

Congress and the Executive have already taken some major steps for achieving international security. The development of the atomic bomb demands that these steps be implemented rapidly since the consequences of war have become incredibly devastating.

On the domestic front little progress has been made toward achieving economic security. Piecemeal measures have been taken both by the executive and legislative. But the pressing task of achieving a smooth transition to a stable postwar economy of full employment has hardly been begun. The fate of the American economy, and in fact of world peace, depends on whether we in the United States move forward rapidly into full employment and economic security. Upon Congress rests the responsibility of enacting a legislative program which will insure our progress toward this goal.

In order to formulate and carry out such a legislative program, we must appraise the current status of our economy and recognize the magnitude of the economic tasks ahead. The American economy has never provided stable full employment under modern conditions of high labor productivity and mass production. A review of economic conditions between the First and Second World War makes this clear. The First World War ended with an unstable price structure, followed by a disorganization of agriculture. By 1926, when many thought economic conditions were booming, the great construction industries began to decline and within 3 years the steady depression of these industries was followed by a cataclysmic crisis which engulfed the whole economy. Even during the depression, new industrial developments and an expanding labor force continued to raise the level of output needed for full employment. Thus in 1939, although we reached the production level of 1929, there were 7,000,000 more unemployed. Although the problems of a stable peacetime full employment economy remained unsolved between the two world wars, we were learning more and more about the workings of our economic system and the techniques of stabilizing it. During this war, we have learned about the great capacity of our economy during the impact of Government action and national necessity.

Today we are faced with the task of creating millions of new job opportunities and of substituting a large consumer market for the huge war purchases of the Federal Government. Over 9,000,000 veterans must be absorbed into peacetime production. An additional 9,000,000 war workers directly engaged in munitions industries also must find peacetime employment. Steel, coal, agriculture, and other basic industries not engaged in the production of munitions, face depression and unemployment unless thriving construction and consumer goods industries replace munitions industries. Ever rising industrial productivity and an expanding labor force have set much higher the levels of production at which full employment can be achieved. If full employment is to be attained in the postwar period, production will have to be at least two-thirds higher than it was in 1929 or 1939, and 15,000,000 more jobs will have to be provided than were provided in the last prewar year of 1939.

There are some of short memory who today urge on the Federal Government a "do nothing" policy toward insuring full employment. Such a policy would ignore the accumulated problems which were not solved between the First and Second World Wars and the lessons derived from this war. Within 5 years such a policy—or lack of policy—would confront this country with an economic crisis far more severe than all previous ones. Such a crisis would not only jeopardize internal economic stability but might well threaten world peace if the most powerful of all industrial nations faltered and went into an economic tailspin.

Extensive Federal action is essential at this time: First, to meet the Federal Government's responsibility in recognized areas of public interest, such as

social security, health, education, housing, and community services; but, even more, to assure job opportunities through flourishing business activity. This may involve many new measures, but represents no break with the heritage which made us a great nation. It is an American tradition that the Government, representing all the people, takes the economic steps necessary for the country to fulfill its destiny as a growing and prosperous nation. This tradition dates back to the first commerce acts after the Revolution, the homestead acts of the reconstruction period, the great banking and antitrust acts at the turn of this century, and the agricultural, financial, labor, and social-security legislation of the 1930's.

THE ECONOMIC BILL OF RIGHTS AS SET FORTH BY THE LATE PRESIDENT, FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

No one better recognized and understood the Government's fundamental responsibility for the welfare of its citizens than our late President. On January 11, 1944, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, applying the best of our heritage to the time when the duties and sacrifices of war would be ended and the Nation could return to the pursuit of peacetime prosperity and well-being, set forth a postwar economic policy:

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed.

Among these are—

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

The right of every family to a decent home.

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

In the election campaign of 1944, the leaders of both parties reaffirmed the obligation of the Federal Government as the instrument of all the people to guarantee postwar domestic prosperity and economic security.

AN ECONOMIC PROGRAM FOR THE RECONVERSION AND POSTWAR PERIOD

In an endeavor to define an over-all program which would implement the economic bill of rights and meet the immediate economic problems of the reconversion and postwar period, Senator PEPPER joined me in outlining a series of fundamental steps. We then consulted with many of our Senate colleagues—in fact, over two dozen—who welcomed this program and made valuable suggestions for its improvement. A number of them endorsed it in detail; others gave their wholehearted approval to its general objectives and expressed interest in further study of its details. Some of these discussions have been publicized widely and sympathetically in the press in reports which have covered partially the points of the proposed legislative program.

The outline presented here, which is based on the original outline prepared by Senator PEPPER and myself and which embodies many subsequent suggestions, has the full approval of many of our colleagues. Because the recess made it impossible to consult with the many other Senators who previously indicated their interest in this type of program, I have not attempted at this time to list the names of those who have studied and approved it. This outline is put forward as a suggestion of the types of Federal action which will be needed to provide the prosperity and economic security which are our goals. It is my hope that it will be a contribution to the urgent public discussions and that it will, in some appropriate form, be carried out by the Congress when it reconvenes.

First. Clearly establish the responsibility of the Federal Government for guaranteeing the economic bill of rights to all Americans. In addition to declaring this responsibility, provide for the development and collection of economic data basic to the formulation of full employment programs, including a continuing census of employment and business opportunities.

Second. Guaranty equal opportunity to all Americans. Assure that Americans shall not be discriminated against because of race, color, political or religious creed in exercising their political and economic rights.

Third. Provide war veterans with full security, training, medical care, and job opportunities. The soundest guaranty of jobs for veterans is a successful national full employment program. In addition, increase veterans' maintenance, training, and unemployment compensation. Make special provision for improving veterans' medical care, social security, housing, and so forth, in all major economic and social legislation. Strengthen Federal executive and legislative bodies concerned with veterans' problems and provide continuous scrutiny of such problems.

Fourth. Provide emergency reconversion measures geared to full employment. Through the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, dovetail completed or curtailed war contracts with the release of men, materials, and facilities for peacetime production, including needed community and resource development for which funds should be appropriated at once. Facilitate absorption of war veterans and movement of workers to peacetime production by an improved United States Employment Service and payment of transportation costs to migrant workers. Protect returning veterans and war workers and maintain high national purchasing power through price control, emergency unemployment compensation, and wage rates increased through free collective bargaining to offset loss of pay from return to the normal workweek.

Fifth. Continue a stable and profitable agriculture at high production levels. Continue into peacetime wartime production guaranties and minimum price guarantees. Provide rural communities with adequate health, education, and other facilities and help farmers adopt the most advanced production techniques. Provide programs of loans and other assistance to small farmers and make provision for farm tenants and laborers displaced by mechanization.

Sixth. Create expanded opportunities for business. Assure adequate credit facilities and so dispose of surplus goods as to expand production and in particular assist small business and local industry; also strengthen other Federal activities concerned with small business and local industry. Provide expanded technical and informational services for business. Stimulate business activity by freeing it from the restrictive effects of cartels and monopolies.

Seventh. Guarantee a high level of scientific research activity in the interests of all the people. Provide for continued and expanded Federal support of research in national defense, health and medical care, basic science, and all other programs in the public interest which are not being carried out by commercial and nonprofit institutions. Provide for democratic control of all Federal research programs, by having the men in charge full-time Government employees directly responsible to the President and the Congress. Through free publication and Government ownership of patents, guarantee that the results of federally financed research will not be perverted to private ends by monopolies and other interests at the expense of the common good.

Eighth. Promote a high wage level insuring the continued expansion of industrial and agricultural production. Centralize Federal activities concerned with labor welfare. Do not weaken any present guaranties of collective bargaining rights. Raise minimum wage-hour standards and broaden their coverage and through collective bargaining promote adoption of the annual wage.

Ninth. Expand foreign trade to provide jobs and an increasingly high standard of living at home and abroad. Expand our commercial and agricultural foreign trade service, and initiate a system of insured private capital loans and investments abroad. In addition to Bretton Woods and Export-Import Bank programs, provide long-term loans for foreign rehabilitation and industrial development leading to increased trade with the United States.

Tenth. Institute a national-housing program insuring a large and sustained volume of private and public construction. Provide large annual construction of housing to eliminate slums and make available low-cost homes to middle-income groups whose needs have not hitherto been adequately met by public or private construction.

Eleventh. Stabilize at high levels construction of community facilities. Public construction should not be considered as compensatory for, nor dependent and following upon, failure of private employment in various industries, but should be appraised as a necessary continuing aspect of full employment and national welfare. Therefore provide funds immediately and formulate programs for health centers, hospitals, schools, libraries, roads, airports, river and harbor development, etc.

Twelfth. Establish a national health program and broaden the social security system. Provide adequate medical care and protect all Americans from the financial loss and hardships incident to illness, accident, unemployment, old age, and death.

Thirteenth. Create additional educational and training opportunities for all Americans. Provide Federal aid to education, as well as scholarships and fellowships designed to expand the Nation's scientific and medical personnel.

Fourteenth. Promote the development and balanced use of natural resources with a view to expanding industrial, agricultural, and employment opportunities. Establish coordinated regional resource development programs, and programs developing and stabilizing at high levels coal and other minerals production. Give immediate financial support to resource improvements already planned.

Fifteenth. Adopt a fiscal policy geared to full employment. Pass tax measures which will be genuine incentives to business expansion rather than to mere profit accumulation, promote purchasing power of the lowest income groups through exemptions, and reduce the great concentration of wealth which has been accelerated during the war.

LEGISLATIVE IMPLEMENTATION

Such an over-all legislative program should be implemented and put into effect within 1 year after VJ-day if Congress is to discharge fully its responsibility with respect to our domestic and international security. Certain features of this program are immediately urgent; in fact, they are behind schedule, as for example provision for the human aspects of reconversion. For some features of the program, no legislation has as yet been drafted. A major task lies ahead for the Congress.

I will not attempt to discuss here the various bills already introduced which relate to phases of the over-all program, such as health and social-security legislation, proposals for a national housing program, or amendments to the minimum-wage law. I am summarizing, however, two bills in which I have taken especial interest and which I believe are indispensable features of the postwar economic program.

The first, S. 1274, introduced by Senators MURRAY, WAGNER, GUFFEY, THOMAS of Utah, PEPPER, and myself, embodies measures necessary to assure that the minimum human needs of reconversion are met. It is designed to carry out the program recommended to Congress by President Truman and previously recommended by the late President Roosevelt on a number of occasions.

The second, S. 1297, introduced by Senators JOHNSON of Colorado, PEPPER, and myself, is designed to promote and protect the national interest in the development of science. Although formulated as a result of a 3-year study of prewar and wartime Federal research programs, it takes on added significance because of the tremendously new scientific developments which have been revealed in the last few days with the use of the atomic bomb on Japan.

THE NEED FOR S. 1274 PROVIDING FOR EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

As of this date, Congress has defaulted in its obligation to provide for the human aspects of reconversion. As far back as May 1944 Senate leaders of both parties firmly promised to enact legislation directed to this problem. Despite this declaration, nothing has since been enacted for the benefit of the mass of the people and returning veterans who face the reconversion from war to peace. By contrast, the Congress has passed all the measures demanded by business. The revenue acts and in particular the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 guarantee corporations vast postwar tax refunds at the same time that they have permitted industry to build up tremendous reserves in themselves sufficient to weather reconversion disturbances. Amortization of plants has been accelerated, permitting industry to pay out of war profits the full cost of new plant facilities before payment of taxes. A liberal Contract Settlement Act provides for speedy termination of war contracts and makes available additional funds to companies engaged in war production. And Congress has passed laws dealing with the disposition of surplus property and with the removal of Government property from the plants of private contractors.

While steps safeguarding the profits of industry are necessary to a smooth reconversion to peace, domestic prosperity cannot be attained and world peace secured unless Congress gives equal attention to finding and creating employment for war veterans and released war workers and to maintaining the purchasing power of the Nation at the high levels needed for a full production-full employment economy. With this in mind, Senators MURRAY, WAGNER, GUFFEY, THOMAS, PEPPER, and I have introduced an emergency unemployment compensation bill which will protect the living standards of veterans and war workers and protect the national purchasing power from impairment during the temporary dislocations of the reconversion period. Such an emergency measure is necessary because of the inadequacies of the existing system of unemployment compensation both as to its coverage and its rates of payment.

S. 1274 seeks to remedy these deficiencies by amending the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act for 1944 to provide supplementary unemployment compensation payable under State laws, as requested by President Truman in his message to Congress of May 28, 1945.

In detail, the bill provides:

First. Supplementation, out of Federal funds, of benefits payable to workers now covered under State unemployment compensation laws so that every eligible unemployed worker will be entitled to 26 weeks of benefits, in an amount, based on past wages, up to a ceiling of $25. In States which provide that an individual's unemployment benefit is computed at one-half of wages, only persons earning $50 per week or more would be eligible to receive the $25 ceiling payment. A $40 per week worker would receive only $20; a $30 per week worker would still receive only $15 in benefits.

Second. Financing similar benefits to Federal workers, maritime workers, agricultural processing workers, and workers employed by small firms who are not now covered by State laws.

Third. Payment of the supplementary benefits outlined under (1) and (2) by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, if a State does not elect to do so.

Fourth. Supplementation out of Federal funds, to workers not now covered under State laws, and to liberalize payments up to two-thirds of wages—but not more than $25—if a State so elects.

Fifth. Payment of traveling allowances to workers referred to employment in another city by the United States Employment Service.

Sixth. Amendment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—the GI bill of rights—so that every eligible unemployed serviceman will be entitled to 52 weeks of benefits at $25 per week for a single person and $30 per week for a person with dependents. Under the existing law, servicemen are entitled to $20 per week irrespective of whether they have dependents or not, and are only entitled to 52 weeks of benefits if they have been in the armed forces 9½ months or more. Thus under the present law a serviceman who is discharged after 90 days of service is entitled not to 52 weeks if unemployed that long, but to only 24 weeks of benefits. The amendment provided by this bill would enable every serviceman with 90 days of service to be entitled to the full 52 weeks of benefits if he remained unemployed that long.

The life of the bill, except for the amendment to the GI bill of rights, runs only until June 30, 1947, the date on which the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 expires.

I should like to make clear what the bill does not do. It does not give $25 every Thursday to everyone. An applicant must be ready, able, and willing to work as now required under State law, and he must have earned wages high enough so that the percentage rate yields at least this figure. The bill does not federalize the unemployment compensation system. It leaves the administration of unemployment compensation in the hands of the States and allows them to administer the supplementary benefits if they so choose. On an emergency basis it expands the present system, whose principles remain unchanged, in order to meet pressing reconversion problems. Finally the bill does not take the place of permanent amendments to the unemployment compensation system which are now being studied by the Congress.

A typical example of the effect of enactment into law of S. 1274 is found in

my own State of West Virginia. The maximum weekly benefit amount in West Virginia is now $20 based on annual earnings of $1,800 or more. The average benefit amount paid for total unemployment is currently about $15. S. 1274 would raise the maximum to $25 for workers with annual earnings of $2,700 or more while the average would go up to about $20. Workers with annual earnings of $300 or more are eligible for benefits in West Virginia for duration up to 21 weeks. S. 1274 would give every eligible worker the right to five more weeks of benefits if he remained unemployed that long.

About 10,000 Federal workers in West Virginia who now have no protection against unemployment would be covered as well as about 50,000 workers in firms with less than eight workers who are now excluded but who could be protected under the optional agreements provisions of S. 1274.

In addition, returning war veterans would be entitled for a week of total unemployment to $25 if single and $30 if they had dependents. This compares with a weekly amount of $20 now provided by law.

Those who oppose emergency unemployment compensation legislation take the position that present State laws provide adequate protection to workers during the reconversion period. An analysis of the State laws, however, shows that, although they have been adjusted from time to time, on the whole they have not kept pace with war conditions. Commenting on the supposed adequacy of existing State laws an outstanding labor authority on social insurance stated:

> The inadequacy of the State unemployment insurance programs—especially in light of the needs of postwar readjustment—is revealed in the small benefit payments being made. During the first quarter of 1945 there were two States where the weekly benefits averaged less than $10. One of these was in the North and one in the South. In 33 States the benefits averaged less than $15 per week and in only 6 did they average above $18 per week. In no State did they average as high as $20 per week. Nor was the average weekly benefit in any single State equal to 50 percent of the average weekly earnings of covered employees, whereas 60 percent of previous earnings is the usually accepted standard for sound unemployment insurance payments. (NELSON H. CRUIKSHANK, American Federationist, August 1945.)

That this opinion is not confined to labor is evidenced by the following statement by the editors of Business Week on April 28, 1945:

> At any continuous level of unemployment, drains on reserve funds will decline during the first few years as workers exhaust benefits. So, with 6,000,000 unemployed, present aggregate reserves of over $6,000,000,000 would last almost indefinitely. As many as 9,000,000 unemployed year after year would drain reserve funds in 10 years or a little less. But, as we said 5 years ago, "It was never contemplated that funds would be built up to take care of workers during a severe depression. At best unemployment insurance was looked upon as a stopgap—a temporary economic alleviator."
>
> And as a stopgap the system today hardly measures up, for, with the average beneficiary receiving little more than one-third or so of his former weekly wages, and with, at most, two-thirds of the eligibles on the rolls at any one time, less than 25 percent of the income of laid-off insured workers would be maintained.

Hearings on S. 1274 have been announced by the Senate Postwar Committee. I trust that the testimony of witnesses before the committee will enable the committee to perfect the bill speedily and that it will thereafter be enacted into law promptly by the Congress.

THE NEED FOR S. 1297 PROVIDING FOR A NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The atomic bomb, by shortening the war, has demonstrated the immense value of the Government's wartime investment in scientific research. At the same time it has presented in sharp perspective the whole problem of public responsibility for scientific research.

Just as during the war we have striven to make full use of our scientific and industrial resources in order to gain a speedy and decisive military victory, so also, in the coming years of peace, we must continue to have a high level of research activity in order to gain peacetime prosperity and permanent security. These are the new objectives—prosperity and security—toward which we must now direct our scientific and technical personnel and facilities.

Research, as the war has shown so dramatically, is a great national resource. It is the key to the unlocking of our vast industrial potentials and the opening up of an endless array of new opportunities for business and labor. It is the means whereby we can be sure of a continually rising standard of living—new products, new services, new jobs—for all our people.

Never before in the history of our country has this national resource been so highly developed. Our scientists and technicians, under the overwhelming necessities of a national emergency, have been mobilized into a working unity and a singleness of purpose which is unparalleled. Through Government-aided research for new weapons and countermeasures, for health and medical care, and for other items of national security, an extraordinary scientific momentum has been gained. This momentum must not be lost now. It must be converted to the new needs of peace—to the creation of new business and employment opportunities and to the further safeguarding of our national security.

Because scientific research is so decisive, both in war and in peace, we must continue to provide for it systematically within the regular framework of the Government. In doing so, we must make sure that we answer some immediate basic questions:

First. What safeguards are needed to guarantee that the federally financed wartime research developments, like radar and atomic energy, will not be controlled by a few privileged monopolies at the expense of the interests of the entire American people?

Second. How extensively should the Federal Government participate in research in the postwar period?

Third. How best can the Government's own research activities be organized and new programs needed in the public interest be formulated?

Fourth. How can the greatest good for the Nation be derived from the results of federally financed research?

The dramatic development of the atomic bomb reinforces the need for a legislative program which will answer these questions. Over the past 3 years the Senate Military Affairs Committee has been making an intensive study of the Government's research activities. Our recommendations are embodied in a bill (S. 1297) sponsored jointly by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, Senator PEPPER of Florida, and myself. Hearings on this bill will be held by the Military Affairs Committee beginning September 12.

The bill establishes a central scientific agency of the Federal Government, to be known as the National Science Foundation, and authorizes appropriations for a central fund which would be used to promote and finance scientific research that is in the national interest, particularly in national defense in public health and the medical sciences, and in the basic sciences. It also authorizes fellowships for advanced training in science.

The proposed legislation underscores certain principles crucial to any long-term Government research program:

First. Powers are vested in full-time Government officials who are directly responsible to the President and Congress. The director is assisted by an advisory board composed partly of Government officials concerned with research and partly of public members appointed by the President.

Second. The foundation would utilize the existing facilities of Federal, State, and local governments, educational institutions, research foundations, and private industrial organizations. At least half the funds would be spent through nonprofit research laboratories. All work would be done under specific research contracts, and individual scientists would have full freedom to use their own research procedures.

Third. All inventions and discoveries resulting from Government-financed research are to be under public control and cannot become the monopoly of any private interests. It is a national scandal that in the absence of a unified national policy on research a large part of the wartime scientific developments paid for by the American taxpayer will fall under the control of a few large institutions and corporations.

Problems Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 1, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement made by me as chairman of the Republican steering committee, by way of comment on and reply to the statement made by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, on Wednesday, August 1.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No Congress has done more work in 7 months or work of more outstanding importance than the Congress which has just adjourned. But in our absorption in foreign affairs and foreign nations we have almost completely neglected the vital domestic interests of the people of the United States. When Congress returns it should undertake a systematic, planned legislative program designed to bring about progress, prosperity, and substantially full employment in the United States. Fortunately, the backlog of savings and pent-up demand may come to our assistance and prevent bad results from our delay.

There are at least five major subjects for consideration:

First. Maximum employment and maximum business activity: This can only be secured by employment in private enterprise. At best, Government pay rolls could only put 5,000,000 men to work and we wish to employ more than 50,000,000. A 10-percent increase in private employment would remove the necessity for any public-works program.

The most necessary step to restoring prosperity is to restore freedom to individuals and business. You can't expect free enterprise to work unless it is free.

(a) We should force the OPA to adopt a much more liberal policy for the reconversion period, eliminating entirely nonessential articles, providing adequate prices for essential articles which will bring thousands of new small concerns into the business of manufacturing needed goods and providing employment. I believe that all controls should be removed from wages early in 1946. In spite of a lot of nice talk the OPA is clinging to every power and imposing even more rigid controls on legitimate business while black-market operators increasingly flourish.

(b) The WPB should be required to relax every control possible. They are inclined to do so, but are continually hampered by the unreasonable demands of the Army and Navy. Unless controls are relaxed we can never get started on new housing, farm machinery, reconversion machinery or hundreds of basic materials required if men are to be put to work when they come out of the Army. Incidentally, the British are months ahead of us in reconversion.

(c) The drafting of new men, and particularly men who are essential in industry between 26 and 30, should be immediately forbidden. The Army should be forced to release essential men, like the coal miners requested by Secretary Ickes. The stupid, stubborn policy of the War Department in maintaining an Army as big as it was on VE-day should be overruled. It is impossible to see how even 7,000,000 men can be used in the war against Japan, and we still have about 8,300,000. The Army actually spent $400,000,000 more in the first 28 days of July than they spent in the same period in 1944. We have an opportunity to demobilize men gradually and absorb them in industry. If millions are released in a few months when the Japanese war ends we face serious problems of unemployment and perhaps temporary depression.

(d) Most of the War Manpower regulations should be abolished so that anyone can get a job from anyone else, and the employment agencies should become service agencies under State control, coordinated by the Federal Government.

(e) The OWI and many other agencies should be abolished except to the extent that Nimitz and MacArthur want them for use against Japan.

(f) After some freedom of action is restored, the next essential step toward prosperity is to establish a sound fiscal policy, stop the rapid increase of debt, and enact a reconversion tax bill fixing definite reduced rates for the reconversion period. It is necessary that both individuals and corporations know at once what their taxes are going to be in 1947. The present estimate of a $46,280,000,000 deficit (which does not count $2,000,000,000 of subsidy payments and $1,800,000,000 of more lending by the Export-Import Bank) is discouraging and unnecessary. With those additions it is within $5,000,000,000 of the record deficit of last year when we were conducting a two-front war. There is no use for an 8,000,000-man Army today.

A reconversion budget should be formulated by Congress and should not exceed $20,000,000,000 a year in addition to the temporary aftermath-of-war expenses. If it goes to $25,000,000,000, as the spenders want, we can hardly allow any reduction in the present choking tax rates.

(g) Congress should create a joint committee and an executive commission to make both the fiscal budget and a national budget. Every effort must be made to avoid the recurrence of economic depression in the United States with its attendant misery and hardship. Such a committee or commission must cover the whole ground of economic forces, and not confine itself to huge Government spending as the panacea for every ill, as does the Wagner so-called full employment bill. In concerning ourselves with employment, we must see that veterans have the priority necessary to recompense them for the set-back they have received from Army service.

Second. Social welfare: We should concern ourselves with sound measures to improve the social welfare of those whose income cannot provide it. A long list of uncoordinated and inconsistent proposals have been introduced in both Houses. A program should be formed of the most meritorious proposals with a total expense within reasonable limits. I believe such a program should consist of the following:

(a) A bill to stimulate construction of homes, extend the public housing program, and establish a limited urban redevelopment plan.

(b) Bills to extend Federal aid to assist States to develop a comprehensive health program through public and private agencies, to build hospitals, extend public health service, supply medical aid to the low-income groups, and establish medical inspection and physical education in the schools. This program should not be based on socialized medicine or on any over-all compulsory insurance plan as proposed in the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill.

(c) A bill to provide Federal aid to enable the poorer States to provide a minimum education for every child.

(d) A bill to extend the old-age pension system to all groups not now covered, and improve the present system of contributory insurance.

(e) A bill to extend unemployment compensation to all groups not now covered. This should definitely be left with the State and not federalized as Mr. Altmeyer insists.

This social-welfare program should place the initiative and operation in every case in the State and local governments so that these activities are not federalized. It should avoid delegation of power to Federal administrative agencies by prescribing definite standards and directions in the statutes. It should be based on intelligent cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and local government and of civic groups, and should not require unreasonable outlay of Federal money.

Third. Public works: There should be a coordinated program of public works. Highways are alread provided for. There should be reasonable aid to construct airports, appropriations for flood control already authorized, provision to assist States and local governments to remove pollution from the rivers and other public works which are economically justifiable. There should be some control which will permit the Government to proceed more rapidly when there is less private activity and less rapidly when times are prosperous. But only those public works should be authorized which are economically justifiable. The theory that public works are justified because they make jobs, or that they afford any solution of serious unemployment is a fallacy.

Fourth. Agriculture: We should enact a definite postwar policy for agriculture to assure fair prices. We should provide a method of getting rid of the present subsidy program. We should provide the means for keeping our promise that agricultural prices be maintained at parity or close to it for 2 years after the war. For years legislation relating to agricultural policy has been hit or miss.

Fifth. Labor: We should study and provide a just program to assure industrial peace after the war, and enact such measures as can bring about that result.

There are many other important matters to be dealt with, notably the enactment of legislation to determine our postwar policy in the fields of international aviation, of international communication, of surplus property, of reorganization of the Government, and of financing small business. There is hardly a domestic subject which does not require study and action. The next session of Congress is in for some hard work.

Plan for Surplus Disposal Being Given Serious Consideration by Surplus Property Board—Small Wholesalers and Retailers From Many States Express Approval of 25 Point Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 21 I addressed the House on the need for prompt action by the Surplus Property Board to bring about a more orderly and equitable distribution of the ever-growing accumulation of Government-owned surplus goods. I pointed out that, in my opinion, the interests of the Nation's smaller distribution firms were not being adequately looked out for in surplus disposal programs now under way.

So that I would not seem to be offering vigorous criticism with no constructive program of my own to submit in place of present programs I took the liberty of appending a list of 25 specific affirmative recommendations to my speech of the 21st. I proposed that the Surplus Property Board give its consideration to my recommendations.

Since making my speech on this vital subject I have received a considerable volume of mail from businessmen all over the Nation. With your permission I should like to place in the RECORD a few of these letters from wholesalers and retailers located in representative States, as follows:

HARPER & MCINTIRE CO.,
Ottumwa, Iowa, June 1, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just read your speech to the House on government-owned surplus property, consumer's goods, in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to drop you a note expressing my appreciation of the splendid work you are doing as Chairman of the Small Business Committee.

People all over the country are following your work on the committee and we feel more secure by the fact that we have a champion of your ability in Washington. I only hope that we who are vitally interested, will all give you the proper support.

We, as a small wholesale hardware business, covering the State of Iowa and northern Missouri, believe that we can efficiently distribute surplus property goods in an economical and efficient manner. We believe that we can move these goods to the hands of the consumer more economically than any other form of distribution.

Please accept our thanks for the good work you are doing in Congress.

Yours very truly,
SAM H. HARPER, *President.*

ISAAC WALKER HARDWARE CO.,
Peoria, Ill., June 1, 1945.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I have just read from pages 4832, 4833, and 4834 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by you on Government-owned surplus property consumer goods.

We feel this was a most excellent speech; and if it could be carried through, our merchants would find that it would make a very orderly way of dispensing Government-owned surplus merchandise.

The dispensing of surplus property has been a great worry, I think, to all the merchants in the United States. We feel that if the property is not sold as it should be, there may be chaos throughout the country.

Please accept my most sincere congratulations on your ideas. We think they are sound and hope that it will be possible for the Surplus Property Board to act in this way.

Most sincerely yours,
WARD WALKER.

WICKEBURY, LTD.,
New York, N. Y., June 4, 1945.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We agree completely with the comments you have made regarding the short time allowed in some cases for the filing of bids on Government surplus.

On May 12, for instance, Surplus Reporter was issued, listing on page 3, 36,600 yards of silk cloth. The copy of the Reporter was received by us on May 15, and noticed on page 2 indicated that the bids might be open on May 21, for the statement read "no bids would be open before May 21, 1945."

Although the warning is always sounded to businessmen that they see the merchandise before bidding on it, it is obvious that there was little time to still make this survey and still enter a bid. At least 2 weeks should be allowed, especially since the locations of surplus items are likely to be remote from many places of business.

One difficulty we encounter is getting descriptions of merchandise that is offered. For instance, the Army Air Forces convalescent hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., recently advertised for bids on invitation No. 15-070-S-45-11, and listed among other items 220 pounds of shirts and trousers, cotton khaki, as well as 135 pounds of cotton socks. We wrote, asking whether or not this merchandise was unserviceable, inasmuch as the quantity was quoted in pounds, but no answer was given to our question.

We similarly asked for information regarding some yarn that was quoted for sale by a Government depot in Tennessee recently. The advertisement for the bid simply stated that 4,500 pounds of yarn were available, but gave no information regarding its weight, color, finish, etc. We asked for further information, but it was not forthcoming.

A little better description of the merchandise available will be helpful to businessmen, especially small ones who do not have agencies in various parts of the country, and cannot afford to make trips from place to place to see the nature of the surplus offered for sale.

Very truly yours,
JOHN M. CONNOLLY.

THE EMERY-WATERHOUSE CO.,
Portland, Maine, May 31, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Texas is a long way from Maine, but I have frequently said, and believe, if there are any two sections of the United States that really stand for the same thing and think alike, it is New England and the South, and yet, unfortunately, politically we do often seem to be on opposite sides of the fence.

Through the courtesy of a friend I have received a copy of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regard House bill S. 502 on Government surplus property. May I extend my congratulations and approval for your ideas and express the hope that distribution can be accomplished on the lines outlined by you. Your program makes sense to a "down east" Yankee, and I am thinking of this from a point of view of the Government, even more than from the point of view of a distributor.

Sincerely yours,
C. L. HILDRETH,
President.

THE SALT LAKE HARDWARE CO.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, June 1, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has just been my privilege to read pages 4832, 4833, and 4923 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, presenting your speech regarding the disposal of Government surpluses, and want to take this opportunity to congratulate you upon your 25-point program, which would go a long way toward correcting the present confusion and unsatisfactory efforts being made to dispose of this material.

As a representative hardware wholesaler, with a long-established policy of close cooperation with the independent retailer, I would call your attention to some additional facts that are pertinent to the case.

As was ably stated by you, this is the greatest merchandising job in history, but, as such, it requires the same practical, workable technique as the lesser merchandising jobs of the past which have made America great.

So far as hardware lines are concerned—and these, indeed, represent a very sizable chunk of present and probable future surpluses—these items, regardless of quantity, can and should be sold through regular established channels of trade. By this I mean sold either back to the manufacturer, so that he may channel them through his regular sales organization, or sold direct to the wholesaler, who, in turn, distributes through the retailer, and, of course, we all know that the retailer does the best possible job of distributing the individual items to the consuming public. All units of this manufacturer-wholesaler-retailer method are already set up and functioning and fully qualified to do the job well and most economically.

The one great fear which all of us have is that these huge quantities of individual items may be dumped on the market faster than they can be properly absorbed without disrupting current manufacturing production, which is so essential to full or even partial employment.

So long as this merchandise is already being well cared for in Government warehouses, it seems only elementary that it be released intelligently in such quantities as can be absorbed into normal channels of trade without upsetting the market or similar current production. What difference does it make if it requires 10 years, or even longer, to dispose of certain huge surpluses in an orderly manner?

I am sure I voice the sentiment of a great majority of the substantial wholesalers and retailers of America when I say we have no desire to benefit by excessive profits from the sale of this material. Our principal interest is to channel it through normal avenues of trade along with current production so that it can be painlessly absorbed in the most orderly and useful way.

Some speculators will attempt to corner these surplus items, especially the more desirable merchandise, then use it to their own selfish ends for profits, regardless of its effect on existing units of distribution. Also, national chain operators will attempt to use their usual bludgeon tactics to obtain a low price so that they can undersell the independent retailer. Both of these methods spell chaos, if not serious disruption of business and loss to the wholesaler and retailer who are the backbone of the Nation and who, incidentally, carry a heavy share of present tax burdens—then too, if these huge surpluses are released to these "master mass merchandisers,' as they like to call themselves, then the manufacturer will suffer because current production will be set back just to that extent and unemployment and endless confusion are bound to result.

While it is indeed the biggest merchandising job in history, so far as hardware items are concerned, the wholesalers of America, cooperating with the independent retailers, can do the job better than any newfangled bureau that can be set up. It's nothing new to us in the hardware industry to handle huge quantities in an orderly manner, and we would appreciate your influence to this end.

What is true of hard goods is equally true of other commodities. In other words, use the facilities we already have and feed this surplus merchandise into these established channels of trade in an orderly manner and you will be amazed at the way it will be absorbed and, incidentally, the Government will unquestionably realize far more dollars from it than through the present bid system of selling to the highest bidder, regardless of his methods of distribution.

If this suggestion seems to have merit, I am sure the wholesale hardware industry would get squarely back of such a program.

Yours very truly,
CHARLES L. WHEELER,
President and General Manager.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 25, 1945.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I had the pleasure of reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 21, and came across your remarks on surplus war property, which I read with a great deal of interest, and I wish to compliment you on presenting a most constructive outline of necessary changes in order to make the disposal program more workable. I am especially in hearty accord with your criticism of the "delegation of disposal responsibility to a number of separate Federal agencies" and your recommendation for a centralized disposal agency.

The half-dozen disposal agencies each have created new personnel, new organizations and in many cases compete for the same experts and advisers, each operating separate branch offices in districts or zones, creating confusion

and overlapping of authority and activity and undoubtedly building up a total personnel of all the disposal agencies which could probably be reduced 50 percent if they operated through a centralized organization with one disposal agency in each district.

A very disturbing situation in this disposal program is wherein the War Department reconversion officers and the surplus-disposal agencies, possibly through confusion or through lack of definite responsibility or coordination, have stored hundreds of millions of dollars worth of surplus war materials and warehouses are bursting with materials required for other war contracts; materials have been stored at a time when they should have been sold, when the markets could absorb it. Disposal officials now realize the seriousness of this tremendous inventory, a condition that I criticized in a public address back in January. Unless the disposal of these materials is speeded up, the consequences will be serious as the quantities of surplus war material will now start coming out in great volume and will be tremendous after VJ-day, and it is then that we may require these warehouses for surplus materials that will be difficult to sell.

Congress should realize the seriousness of this situation and take proper steps to eliminate the obstacles that apparently exist in the surplus-disposal program. If the Surplus Property Act requires amending, Congress should take immediate steps to do so as many of the present criticisms of surplus-property disposal have been based on the fact that the act passed by Congress has made it impossible for orderly liquidation. Our postwar planning requires a more realistic approach to our surplus-war-material disposal program.

Cordially yours,

CHARLES H. LIPSETT.

RICE & MILLER CO.,
Bangor, Maine, June 1, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It was with a great deal of interest that I read your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to the disposal of surplus property.

This certainly is a merchandise job of the greatest magnitude. To obtain orderly distribution deserves most careful planning by capable men.

The firm with whom I am associated is a unit in the small-business world. Our function is the distribution of hardware and kindred lines to retail dealers in southern and northern Maine.

We naturally are keenly interested in seeing surplus materials reach the consumer in the most economical and practical manner.

Time has proved that the wholesaler-to-dealer-to-consumer method is by far the most efficient one.

Your remarks are very constructive. It is apparent that you have given this subject a great deal of study and thought.

I sincerely hope your very fine suggestions will be given the consideration they deserve.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. CROCKETT.

MOORE GROCERY CO.,
Tyler, Tex., May 30, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: I want to compliment you on the fight you continue to make for small business. Your recent protest regarding the method of disposition of surplus commodities is correct according to my view of the situation, especially your protest regarding special price concession to chains and mail-order houses.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

H. D. SHUFORD.

SKINNER & KENNEDY STATIONERY CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., June 2, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Representative, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: You are to be congratulated on the serious thought you are giving to the welfare of the little businessman, and to the recommendation that has been made regarding the handling of the surplus property.

Several of your suggestions, if adopted, will certainly simplify distribution of surplus goods in the proper channels. We have noted in the Surplus Reporter the descriptions furnished on some items offered are very incomplete, and furthermore, it would be a big step forward on the part of the Government to permit buyers to order merchandise on their own order blanks instead of the complicated Government forms. If the disposal agency would pack and ship the goods purchased, it would encourage many of us to buy this material, as otherwise we have no way of getting the material packed and shipped from the warehouse held by the Government agency.

Your thought that no price concessions should be allowed on unusual large purchases, and that the buyers claiming trade discount should be required to prove that they are entitled to it, is a splendid one.

You can be assured that the efforts you are putting forth on behalf of the little businessman are sincerely appreciated by each and every one of us. We are,

Yours very truly,

H. D. ALEXANDER,
Manager, Stationery Department.

ECONOMY AUTO STORES, INC.,
Atlanta, Ga., June 1, 1945.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: You have no doubt seen the May 25 issue of Biddle Survey which outlines your ideas of how to handle the disposition of surplus war materials.

Your ideas are, to our thinking, the only way the Government will ever get a reasonable distribution or return from the disposal of the surpluses, without being a party to black-market operations involving OPA ceiling violations and very unfair competition.

Don't you think it would be much more practical, if the items offered were offered at a certain price, in dollars and cents, which price could be established by close cooperation between OPA, the Department of Commerce, and the industry? Minimum quantities could be established to fit the circumstances and orders (as outlined in Biddle Survey) could be handled on a first-come, first-handled basis.

Under the present system I have personally spent many hours preparing bids, certified checks, and so forth, and canceling the certified checks. To date we have been most unsuccessful—always a little too low—although we have bid about the market value on all our bids. Frankly, we are through with surpluses until the system is corrected.

I think you would do well to extend your efforts in the direction indicated by your ideas.

Yours truly,

CHAS. L. PENNY.

RICHMOND HARDWARE CO.,
Richmond, Va., May 31, 1945.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has been my privilege to read your speech as recorded on pages 4921, 4922, and 4923 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which bears on disposition of Government surplus property—consumer goods.

To my mind you have reasoned this out on a constructive and practical basis, to which we subscribe, and feel you have presented a very splendid program.

Our thinking is that if this property were disposed of to wholesale distributors, that each could allot it among the small retail dealers in their respective territories, which would give a wide and equitable distribution to the small dealer, giving all an opportunity to participate.

We believe that if such a program could be carried through the wholesale distributor would certainly measure up in taking care of the small dealer in an adequate and fair manner.

Yours truly,

W. D. STUART,
President.

Freight Rates—History of the Congressional Effort To Equalize Freight Rates

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under the authority given me to extend my remarks, I wish to recite briefly the history of the effort made by Members of Congress to bring about a fairer system of freight rates in the United States.

Early in 1939 a bill was introduced in the House by myself for this purpose, and a companion bill was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. HILL.

On January 18, 1939, I called a meeting of Members of the House representing the Northwest, Pacific coast, Middle West, and South for the purpose of organizing to secure legislation providing fairer rates on freight in those respective sections of the country. The meeting was held in the Ways and Means Committee room of the new House Office Building on January 20. A copy of that letter follows this statement.

At this meeting a resolution was adopted providing for an organization to conduct the campaign. A copy of that resolution follows.

Also at this meeting a resolution was adopted expressing the sentiment of the Members present in regard to the matter of freight rates. This resolution follows.

Following this statement also is a list of the officers, executive committee, and a list of the Members who attended and took part in this movement.

On January 26, 1939, a second meeting of the group was called to be held on January 27. A copy of that notice follows.

On February 2, 1939, as chairman of the group, I issued a statement advising the members of the group and the public that Chairman LEA, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee had assured us that his committee would hold hearings dealing with the subject in which we were interested and for which we had organized, the hearings to begin on February 28. A copy of that statement follows.

In its report to the House urging the adoption of the Transportation Act of 1939, Chairman LEA, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, stated that the bill embodied the Ramspeck resolution directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation into the rates on manufactured products between the rate-making territories. He also called attention to the fact that the basic Interstate Commerce Act had been amended so as to include regions, districts, and territories among the locations against which discriminations are prohibited. A copy of this part of the report follows.

As finally passed, the Transportation Act of 1940 amended section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to include the words "region," "district," and "territory" as among its areas which should not be discriminated against.

In response to the mandate of the Congress as contained in the Transportation Act of 1940, the Interstate Commerce Commission did investigate the rates on manufactured products and has rendered a decision holding that the present rates, in some respect, do discriminate against certain regions, districts, and territories.

Excerpts from this decision follow and are made a part of this statement.

My purpose in inserting this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is only to keep the record straight. The decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission is directly attributable to the action of the Congress in, first, amending the basic act and, second, directing the Commission to make the investigation.

The decision of the Commission indicates that the combined efforts of the Members of Congress who were interested in this matter resulted in the decision recently made.

I wish to make it plain that without the cooperation of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the chairman of the House committee, and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Senate committee, we could not have achieved this victory. Senator HILL, of Alabama, and other Senators are also entitled to great credit. However, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay particular tribute to the Members of the House who joined me in this organized effort to equalize the freight rates charged throughout the Nation. While we have not yet achieved complete victory, we have taken the first step and the Interstate Commerce Commission now holds that under the law as it was amended in 1940, it is unlawful to discriminate between regions, districts, and territories.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1939.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The freight rate system, if it can be called a system, now in use is unfair to the States in the Northwest, on the Pacific coast, in the Middle West, and in the South.

For the purpose of organizing a movement to secure a careful and searching study of this vital matter, you are cordially invited to meet with others in the Ways and Means Committee room, street floor, New House Office Building, Friday, January 20, at 10:30 a. m.

If you are interested in this question please be on hand promptly.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT RAMSPECK.

Resolved, That during the Seventy-sixth Congress those interested in a more equitable system of freight rates join together in maintaining a Freight Rate Committee; that we elect a chairman, a vice chairman, and a secretary; that the chairman appoint a steering committee to be composed of the officers and 15 members.

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that:

1. The present railroad freight rates are unfair to certain geographic sections of our country;

2. That such rates retard the free flow of commerce;

3. That such rates tend to reduce the volume of freight tonnage available to the railroads;

4. That such rates tend to increase the cost to the consumer of agricultural and manufactured products; and

5. That for the purpose of devising a more just and equitable rate structure, we request the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hold hearings and to make a searching study of the interterritorial freight rates and to report thereon so that legislation to correct the situation may be considered at this session of Congress.

FREIGHT EQUALIZATION GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PERMANENT OFFICERS

President: Hon. Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia.

Vice President: Hon. David D. Terry, of Arkansas.

Secretary: Hon. Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Honorable Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; John W. Gwynne, Iowa; James W. Mott, Oregon; Francis H. Case, South Dakota; Melvin J. Maas, Minnesota; Monrad C. Wallgren, Washington; Frank H. Buck, California; Mervin Jones, Texas; Jed Johnson, Oklahoma; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin; Richard M. Duncan, Missouri; Jere Cooper, Tennessee; Rene L. DeRouen, Louisiana; Lindsay C. Warren, North Carolina; Robert Ramspeck, Georgia; David D. Terry, Arkansas; Charles F. McLaughlin, Nebraska.

Georgia: The Honorable Robert Ramspeck, E. E. Cox, Paul Brown, Carl Vinson, E. M. Owen, M. C. Tarver, B. Frank Whelchel.

Arkansas: The Honorable David D. Terry, Wade H. Kitchen, W. D. Mills, Clyde T. Ellis, E. C. Gathings.

Nebraska: The Honorable Charles F. McLaughlin, Carl T. Curtis.

Virginia: The Honorable T. G. Burch, Howard W. Smith, Colgate Darden, Otis Bland.

Mississippi: The Honorable A. F. Ford, Dan R. McGehee, John E. Rankin, William Colmer.

South Carolina: The Honorable H. P. Fulmer, Joseph Bryson, Butler B. Hare, James Prioleau Richards.

Florida: The Honorable Millard F. Caldwell, James Hardin Peterson.

Tennessee: The Honorable Albert Gore, Jere Cooper, Walter Chandler, Herron Pearson, Joseph W. Byrns.

Alabama: The Honorable Joe Starnes, Pete Jarman, Sam S. Hobbs, George Grant.

Texas: The Honorable Ewing Thomason, Clyde L. Garrett, Wright Patman, Ed Gossett, W. R. Poage, Lyndon B. Johnson, Nat Patton, Charles L. South, Marvin Jones, Luther A. Johnson, Lindley Beckworth, Martin Dies, Albert Thomas.

North Carolina: The Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, W. O. Burgin, Carl T. Durham, A. D. Folger, Graham Arthur Barden.

Washington: The Honorable Knute Hill, Monrad C. Wallgren.

Oklahoma: The Honorable Mike Monroney.

Kentucky: The Honorable Brent Spence, Virgil Chapman, B. M. Vincent, Noble J. Gregory.

Iowa: The Honorable Vincent Harrington, W. S. Jacobsen.

California: The Honorable Frank H. Buck, H. Jerry Voorhis.

Louisiana: The Honorable A. Leonard Allen, Overton Brooks, Rene L. DeRouen.

Wisconsin: The Honorable Merlin Hull.

Arizona: The Honorable John R. Murdock.

Utah: The Honorable Abe Murdock.

Missouri: The Honorable Richard Duncan.

Minnesota: The Honorable Richard Thompson Buckler, Oscar Youngdahl, H. Carl Andersen, William Alvin Pittenger, Harold Knutson.

New Mexico: The Honorable Jack Dempsey.

Kansas: The Honorable Frank Carlson.

Oregon: The Honorable Homer D. Angell.

South Dakota: The Honorable Karl E. Mundt.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1939.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The second meeting of our freight-rate equalization group will be held Friday, January 27, at 10:30 a. m., in the caucus room, Old House Office Building.

The executive committee is as follows:

Ramspeck, chairman; Terry, vice chairman; McLaughlin, secretary; Wallgren; Buck; Hope; Jones of Texas; Johnson of Oklahoma; Maas; Hull; Duncan; Case; Cooper; Gwynne; DeRouen; Warren; Bland; Mott.

Please attend if possible and help us get your entire delegation to come.

Sincerely,

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1939.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN RAMSPECK, CHAIRMAN, WESTERN AND SOUTHERN FREIGHT RATE EQUALIZATION COMMITTEE

Chairman LEA, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, this afternoon advised me that he had granted the request of our group for hearings in regard to the interterritorial freight-rate problem as a part of the hearings now being conducted on the general subject of rehabilitation of the railroads and reorganization of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. LEA advised me that the hearings will begin on February 28. It is our purpose to bring a number of experts from the West and South before the committee for the purpose of portraying the discriminations which the present freight-rate structure imposes upon these sections.

[From report of Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee]

TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1939

RATE DIFFERENTIALS

The substitute bill embodies the Ramspeck resolution directing the Commission to make an investigation into the rates on manufactured products between points in one classification territory and another, and to rates within such territories, for the purpose of determining if such rates are unjust and unreasonable. The resolution authorizes the Commission to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness found to exist.

The present section against discriminations is amended so as to include regions, districts, and territories among the locations against which discriminations are prohibited.

The provisions would authorize an investigation and a correction of rate differentials found to be unjust or discriminatory.

TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940

AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 3

SEC. 5. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (which prohibits the giving of undue or unreasonable preferences or advantages by carriers subject to part I), is amended to read as follows:

"(1) It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this part to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic, in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever: *Provided, however,* That this paragraph shall not be construed to apply to discrimination, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any other carrier of whatever description.

* * * * *

"(b) The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to institute an investigation into the rates on manufactured products, agricultural commodities, and raw materials, between points in one classification territory and points in another such territory, and into like rates within any of such territories, maintained by common carriers by rail or water subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, for the purpose of determining whether said rates are unjust and unreasonable or unlawful in any other respect in and of themselves or in their relation to each other, and to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness which may be found to exist: *Provided,* That the Commission in its discretion may confine its investigation to such manufactured products, agricultural commodities, and raw materials, and the rates thereon as shippers thereof may specifically request be included in such investigation."

EXCERPTS FROM DECISION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, DOCKETS NOS. 28300 AND 28310

PART II. HISTORY OF PROCEEDING AND ISSUES

Section 5 (b) of the Transportation Act of 1940 authorized and directed us to institute an investigation into the rates on manufactured products, agricultural commodities, and raw materials, between points in one classification territory and points in another such territory, and into like rates within any of such territories, maintained by common carriers by rail or water subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, for the purpose of determining whether such rates are unjust and unreasonable or unlawful in any other respect. In our annual report, 1940, we said, at page 30:

"The extensive class-rate and classification investigations above discussed may, we think, very properly be regarded as a highly important first step in this general investigation which Congress has directed us to institute."

The purpose of the investigation is to determine whether the rates and charges in issue, or any of them, are unjust, unreasonable, unduly prejudicial, unduly preferential, or otherwise unlawful, and to make such findings and order or orders as may be proper.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND ULTIMATE FINDINGS

Recent amendments of the act

While the rates in issue in this proceeding are to be tested by all pertinent provisions of the act it is important to give particular attention to certain amendatory legislation which Congress has recently enacted. By the Transportation Act of 1940, section 3 (1) of the act was amended by the addition of the words "region, district, territory." Coupled with that amendment was a provision designated as section 5 (b) of the amendatory act of 1940. It authorized and directed us to investigate the rates on manufactured products, agricultural commodities, and raw materials between and within classification territories for the purpose of determining whether such rates are unjust and unreasonable or unlawful in any other respect in and of themselves or in their relation to each other, and to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness found to exist. As previously explained herein, we have advised Congress that it might consider the instant proceeding as an investigation under this special legislation.

Another new provision was attached to the Transportation Act of 1940 and designated as the "National Transportation Policy." In general terms, Congress undertook to express the policy which it had in mind in providing for the regulation of all modes of transportation and required that all provisions of the act shall be administered and enforced with a view of carrying out that policy. One of the declared purposes in this declaration of policy is "to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices."

Have these amendments to the act added any new inhibitions against discrimination or enlarged the power of the Commission over this subject? In seeking an answer to this question it is pertinent and helpful to review briefly the legislative background of these amendments.

Unjust discrimination in various forms was the principal evil aimed at in the original Act to Regulate Commerce. *Louisville & Nashville R. Co.* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 740). The major antidiscrimination provisions of the act, sections 2 and 3, were modeled upon the English Railways Act of 1854. *Import Rate case* (162 U. S. 197). The United States Supreme Court declared in the *Shreveport case* (234 U. S. 342), referring particularly to section 3 which had remained unchanged up to that time since its original enactment, that the language "is certainly sweeping enough to embrace all the discriminations of the sort described which it was within the power of Congress to condemn." As originally enacted and as it remained until 1940, section 3 did not in terms specifically prohibit discrimination against a region, district, or territory. It specified, after the amendment of 1935 hereinafter discussed, only a person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, or particular description of traffic. The only word in that series that refers to a geographical unit (other than any one of those in the subseries concerning the special subject of ports and other gateways, not here apposite) is "locality." This word can apply to a region, district, or territory only in a plural sense. When used in that sense, however, the meaning is not as appropriate as that denoted by the more exact words added in 1940, since an aggregation or plurality of localities is not the same thing as a region, district, or territory. The same observation might be made also as to the other objects mentioned in this section—person, company, firm, corporation, or association. Assuming that those words are sufficient to comprehend all shippers and receivers of freight in any given region, district, or territory—and they undoubtedly are—they do not have the same significance as the latter group of words. A region, district, or territory usually imports a definite entity, geographically, economically, and socially, and the word "territory" as applied to rate-making has come to have a special meaning of its own, indicating a separate and distinct rate structure. The legislative history of the amendment of 1940 discloses quite clearly that Congress was aware of that special transportation significance.

The amendment of 1935 was the result of a decision of the Supreme Court in *Texas & Pacific Ry. Co.* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 627) holding that the word "locality" did not include a port or port district. Congress corrected this deficiency by an act approved August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 607), in which "port, port district, gateway, transit point" were added to section 3 (1). We had occasion to pass upon the effect of this amendment in *Albany Port District Comm.* v. *Ahnapee & W. Ry. Co.* (219 I. C. C. 151). The Albany port district, by complaint before us, had contended that the existing adjustment of rates on export, import, coastwise, and intercoastal traffic precluded its development as a port district, inasmuch as lower rates on similar traffic applied to and from other North Atlantic ports. The defendants, relying upon the decision of the Supreme Court in *Texas & Pacific Ry. Co.* v. *United States,* supra, and other cases, contended that they could not be held liable for undue prejudice against the port of Albany, the traffic through that port, or shippers of such traffic, because there was no common source of discrimination and because no one carrier or group of carriers could remedy the situation under an alternative order issued in conformity with section 3 (1) of the act. In answer to that contention we first examined the rate structure which caused the complaint of the Albany port district and found that it was not a "loose aggregation of separately established rates, but a single entity composed of interrelated rates bound together by the port differentials." Then, after tracing the legislative history of the amendment, we declared that it was intended to cover just such situations. The description of the rates of which the Albany port district complained—that is, that they are not a loose aggregation of separately established rates but a single entity composed of interrelated rates—is particularly apropos of the territorial and interterritorial rate structures with which we are concerned in this proceeding.

Considering the breadth of the language used in the amendments here under consideration, the evils sought to be cured by this legislation, the history of the times when the law was amended, as well as the statements of the legislators as to the purposes of the amendments,[1] all proper aids of

---

[1] The amendment enacted in 1940 to section 3 (1) of the act was contained in a Senate bill designated S. 2009. That bill was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in Report No. 433, 76th Cong., 1st sess., which was presented to the Senate by Chairman Wheeler of that committee on May 16, 1939. At page 11 of this report, the committee stated with respect to section 3 (1): "There has been no substantial change therein, except that the words 'region, district, and territory' appearing in lines 20 and 23 on page 26 have been inserted." In explanation of this amendment, Chairman WHEELER said to the Senate on May 22, 1939: "The previous provision with regard to 'discrimination' simply referred to discrimination as to 'locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point' without specifying the region, district, or territory. So we felt that by broadening the language we would at least take away that excuse, and we would provide expressly that the Commission should not discriminate in its rate structures." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5889, vol. 84, part 6, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

This bill was debated further in the Senate on May 24, 1939. With respect to another amendment for the removal of rate discriminations between territories that had been proposed by Senator MILLER, of Arkansas, Chairman WHEELER said: "The amendment, in my judgment, would not do what the Senator from Arkansas wants to do with reference to discrimination. Let me say to the

statutory interpretation, it is clear that the main purpose which Congress had in mind was to bring about a greater degree of equalization, harmony, and uniformity in the different regional or territorial-rate structures of the country. The method employed to accomplish this purpose is equally plain. By the amendment to the substantive antidiscrimination provisions of section 3 (1) all discriminations in the form of undue or unreasonable preference or advantage, or undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage, as between regions, districts, or territories, viewed as separate entities, were brought directly within the purview of the act along with all the other inhibitions previously included. We were then authorized and directed by the other provisions mentioned to remove any such discriminations found to exist in a proper proceeding. This means that such discriminations as those mentioned which result from differences in the methods of distributing the general rate burden in the several rate-making territories, or from any other cause, if not justified upon proper consideration of recognized elements of rate-making applied in the light of the amended law are unlawful and should be corrected.

* * * * *

Ultimate findings

Upon the record, therefore, we ultimately find:

* * * * *

3. That the relation between the interterritorial class rates applicable from southern, southwestern, and western trunk-line territories to official and Illinois territories, on the one hand, and the intraterritorial class rates applicable within official and Illinois territories, on the other hand, makes, gives, or causes, and for the future will make, give, or cause, undue and unreasonable preference and advantage to official and Illinois territories as a whole and the shippers and receivers of freight located therein, and subjects and for the future will subject, southern, southwestern, and western trunk-line territories as a whole and the shippers and receivers of freight located therein to undue and unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage, in violation of sections 3 (1) of the act.

Senator that the amendments we have already put into the bill go much further toward accomplishing the purpose the Senator has in mind than would this amendment. I am in thorough accord with the statements made by the Senator from Arkansas with reference to discriminations. I think they ought to be stopped, and if the Commission pursues the investigation and follows what we have laid down in this bill, many of the discriminations between territories will be eliminated. A great many are absolutely arbitrary, and it seems to me without any justification." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 6071 and 6072, vol. 84, part 6.) Thereupon Senator GEORGE commented as follows: "I am glad to hear the distinguished Senator make that statement, because it seems to me to be more important, and I dare say it is more important, as the coming days of the Congress must demonstrate, that we establish just and nondiscriminatory rates between the various regions than to continue even a rate that may not be justified in a particular region." On the same page of the RECORD (6072) is found this question directed by Senator GEORGE to Senator WHEELER with respect to the amendment of section 3 (1) of the act: "The Senator thinks that it will make toward the equalization of rates in the various regions?" To this question, Senator WHEELER replied: "I do not think there is any doubt about that at all, because that is the purpose of the bill; it is the intention of the bill."

This bill (S. 2009) passed the Senate on May 25, 1939, and was sent to the House. After consideration of the bill by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Chairman LEA of that committee reported it to the House without appreciable change in the amendment to section 3 (1) of the act that had been approved by the Senate. With reference to this amendment and the provision coupled with it (known in the House as the Ramspeck resolution) which directed us to investigate interterritorial and intraterritorial rates, Chairman LEA said to the House on July 21, 1939: "Now I want to refer for a moment to the Ramspeck resolution, that is embodied in this bill. It directs the Interstate Commerce Commission to make an investigation of certain freight differentials, and then to make the orders that are necessary to remove the unlawfulness of rates found to be unlawful. It further provides, in the provisions prohibiting discriminations, the protection of territories and districts. In my judgment that resolution is directed at what is one of the most important situations in rate structure. It points to a place in our rate structure where the greatest opportunity to help our transportation system on an economic basis lies. The correction of that condition would serve the interests of shippers and carriers alike." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 9705, vol. 84, pt. 9, 76th Cong., 1st sess.)

On July 26, 1939, the House passed this bill as amended, and sent it to conference with the Senate. After the conference report had been adopted by the Senate, Senator HILL, chairman of a subcommittee that had held hearings on the measure, stated to the Senate on September 9, 1940, with respect to the amendments here considered: "Under these amendments any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage of one region, district, or territory over another region, district, or territory is made unlawful and prohibited and the Interstate Commerce Commission is directed to investigate immediately and upon finding such undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to exist to enter such orders as may be necessary for the removal of same. Under these amendments now to become the law of the land the unjust and unfair discriminations between sections in freight rates should be removed and all sections of our country permitted to enjoy that development and prosperity to which the character and genius of their people and their natural resources entitled them." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5553, Appendix, vol. 86, pt. 17, 76th Cong., 3d sess.)

As an Idaho Wheat Farmer Sees the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, there is inserted herewith a letter received from Joseph Kaschmitter, a prominent wheat farmer, located on the productive and beautiful Camas Prairie section of Idaho:

COTTONWOOD, IDAHO, *July 21, 1945.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMPTON: * * * I trust that what I say may prove of some interest to COMPTON WHITE, Member of Congress, and so here goes:

Some 6 years ago, before the outbreak of the present world-wide conflict, Pope Pius XII pleaded with the nations of the world not to go to war, but to settle their differences in a peaceful manner. He said, "In peace nothing is lost; in war all may be lost."

But the leaders of nations turned a deaf ear to the pleadings of the Pope. The world went to war. And the world has brought horrible destruction upon itself. Perhaps never can all the spiritual values and all the magnificent masterpieces of culture and art which this war has destroyed be replaced, restored, or rebuilt.

It is said this war has already cost the United States some $275,000,000,000, or more than twice the value of all the factories, mines, railroads, homes, farms, buildings, highways, and ships of prewar Germany.

Add to this the estimated cost thus far to the Allies: In lives, service men and women killed, 2,600,000; civilians killed, 9,000,000; service men and women wounded or missing, 9,500,000; civilians wounded or missing, 7,000,000; prisoners of war or slave labor, 15,000,000.

The combined cost in cash to all participants is said to be more than $1,000,000,000,000, or $1,250 for every adult in all the world. And the end is not yet.

A few weeks ago, according to the RECORD, President Truman told the Congress that 10,000,000 men will be sent to fight Japan. Forty-five percent of the marines who conquered Iwo Jima were killed or wounded.

How many more lives will be taken? How many more men and women will be wounded or crippled or mentally deranged? How many more fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters and husbands and wives and sweethearts will be heartsore and torn with grief and anguish when they sustain the loss of one or two or three or more of their precious loved ones? How many more innocent, helpless children will become orphans and be deprived of the loving care of father or mother, or both?

How many more sacrifices must be made to the insatiable greed of the gods of war; how many more offerings must be placed on those altars before this horrible struggle ceases? How many more tears and how much blood must yet be shed until mankind comes to its senses and ceases this horrible orgy of mutual destruction?

How much longer will this terrible conflagration be permitted to consume the vitals of mankind and of the earth? Pius XII warned, "In war all may be lost." How truly great was the prophetic wisdom of, and how very accurate were, those inspired words in their description of the results of war.

On August 14, 1941, two of the world's great leaders met on the high seas to draw up a new gospel, a new doctrine, a new promise of freedom for all minkind. All the world pinned its hopes on the provisions of that Atlantic Charter drawn up by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. In all the world men hailed this charter as an instrument whereby nations and peoples would mutually bind themselves to comply—to the fullest extent—with their duties toward other nations, and to respect the rights of all nations, great or small.

These promises were reiterated in the "four freedoms," attainable in our time, which set forth as their aim and objective: First. Freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. Second. Freedom for every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. Third. Freedom from want—which means a healthy peacetime life for the inhabitants of all nations—everywhere in the world. Fourth. Freedom from fear of aggression perpetrated against a nation by any other nation—everywhere in the world.

Upon these documents, the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," attainable in our time, did a shaking, quaking world pin its hopes for a peace to last for centuries.

Then came Quebec, Casablanca, Moscow, Teheran, Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, Mexico City, and lastly, San Francisco. And after each of these conferences it appeared that the duration of the peace hoped for became shorter and shorter.

Greed and power politics were again the mainspring and the prompting motives of too many of the great nations—even as greed and power politics dictated the peace terms at the Versailles Conference, following World War I.

Let us hope that the deliberations of delegates representing some 50 nations at the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco may bear fruit, and that, that Conference, held in the beautiful city at the Golden Gate, may, in reality, prove to be the golden gate leading to a new world, a brighter and a happier world, a world in which peace, true peace, may reign supreme. Yes, let us hope for that. But why did the peace-loving nations fail to invite to the Conference such nations as Ireland and Switzerland, nations which proved that they know how to keep out of war and who could and did keep out of war? Perhaps it was not possible for the United States to keep out of war, but if the peace-loving nations really want peace, then why were these countries not invited to the Conference? And why was the Franco Government of Spain refused membership in the new World Security Organization?

Could it be that certain of our noble allies have not yet forgotten that the Franco forces defeated the efforts of communistic influences, and their aims and objectives during the time of the Civil War in Spain? If Franco were more friendly toward Communism, would he have been invited to San Francisco?

Do such tactics on the part of the Conference give promise of a just, and a durable and lasting peace?

Why did General Patton deem it necessary—even before the close of the San Francisco Conference—to tell a group of Sunday school children in Los Angeles that they "will be the nurses and the soldiers and sailors in the next war"? Why? Why? Why?

It was said Franco Spain was barred from membership in the new World Organization of Nations because Franco received and accepted aid from Hitler and Mussolini. Why should it, on the one hand, be so terribly wrong for Franco to accept outside help from Germany and Italy to help defeat communism in Spain, while on the other hand it appears we permit Russia to gobble up hundreds of thousands of square miles of territory in Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, etc. Why do we permit Russia to set up puppet governments in these and other countries, while we so loudly condemned such tactics when practiced by the Germans? Why did England and the United States permit Russia to take over some 75,000 or 80,000 square miles of Poland?

Why are these things done in direct and flagrant violation of the Atlantic Charter and "the four freedoms"?

Why was it agreed at Teheran and Yalta that Rumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Austria, Hungary, and a large part of Germany should now be under Soviet control or affiliated with Russia, when Russia itself has an area nearly three times that of the United States?

We condemned Germany, Italy, and Japan as aggressor nations and went to war against those countries to prevent them from carrying out their plans of expansion. But why should Russia then be permitted to take over control of additional hundreds of thousands of square miles? Why should she be permitted to set up puppet governments in all the small countries adjoining her when we went to war to keep Germany from doing exactly the same thing? On June 2, 1945, Pope Pius XII in a world broadcast defended the rights of small nations "to take their destinies in their own hands." He said future "harmonious relations between men" was threatened by mobs of "dispossessed, disillusioned, disappointed, and hopeless men who are going to swell the ranks of revolution in the pay of a tyranny no less despotic than those for whose overthrow men planned."

Apparently referring to the San Francisco Conference then being held, the Pope said the whole of mankind follows the progress of a new peace organization.

"What a bitter disillusionment it would be if it were to fail," he said, "if so many years of suffering and self-sacrifice were to be made in vain by permitting again to prevail that spirit of oppression from which the world hoped to see itself at last freed once and for all."

Compton, that was not merely a casual statement made by a prominent man who resides in the city of Rome. Rather it was a cry of anguish wrung from the lips of the loving father of Christendom as he views the terrible misery and sufferings, the horrible destruction and the ruin and havoc and chaos which a poor, deluded, conceited, and misguided mankind has brought upon itself, and still persists in further bringing upon itself.

But in spite of all the horrors of the past 5 or 6 years, and in spite of all the conferences which have been held, and are still being held, many of the nations are again today engaged in the same damnable game of power politics in which they engaged after World War I, and which was a basic and fundamental cause of the present war.

In our own country the militarists are doing everything in their power to bring about the enactment of legislation providing for postwar compulsory military training.

All this despite the fact that in its first point the authors of the Atlantic Charter say their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third, they respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

In the eighth point they say, "they believe that all the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of force. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving people the crushing burden of armaments." Nice phrases, but oh, how very, very different is the actuality and reality.

Throughout all our history we condemned militarism and the resorting to force. In the Atlantic Charter President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, in behalf of their respective countries, declared themselves as being convinced of the need for disarmament as the way to true peace. Since that time conference has followed upon conference. Yet today there are those who would foist upon this country that which we have always so vociferously condemned and which is so diametrically opposed to every principle enunciated in the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms," and to the avowed aim, objective, and purpose of every conference held.

We accused Germany, Italy, and Japan of being aggressors. We charged them with proceeding on the theory that "might makes right."

We have an area of some 3,000,000 square miles, with a population of some 135,000,000 people.

Japan has a population nearly two-thirds as large as that of the United States cooped up on an area of a few hundred thousand square miles. We insist on having "defense bases," or are they "offense bases," in the far waters of the Pacific. We sold millions of tons of scrap iron and immense quantities of oil to Japan. Then came Pearl Harbor, and since then many of us would like to drive the Japs back on their islands—and then sink the islands.

If we insist on having possessions some 7,000 or 8,000 miles from our mainland in order to maintain "defense bases," then how can we consistently and logically condemn other nations who wish to expand their holdings? It has been proposed that the United States keep all the islands we are now taking from the Japs and that they be used by us as defense bases? Is it to protect those bases that we must now have compulsory military training to maintain, forever, a vast army of millions of men, and is it in this way we plan to provide the 60,000,000 jobs of which so much was written and spoken during recent months? And if other nations also insist on having vast standing armies, then how in heaven's name can there be any hope for peace?

Much has been said of peace-loving nations. Of course, every nation wants peace, but what kind of peace? Uncle Joe Stalin, too, wants peace, but he wants peace on terms and conditions under which he can dominate all of Europe and a great part of Asia while also spreading communistic doctrine in other parts of the world. But what about other nations? Can they accept such peace?

And have not we, through lend-lease and other help given her, placed Russia in a position which enables her to carry out her domineering policies?

Have we defeated nazism and fascism only to clear the way for world-wide communism?

Have we driven out the devils of nazism and fascism through Beelzebub (communism), the prince of devils? If so, then, indeed, the last things may well be worse than the first.

My wife and I have 10 children—6 girls and 4 boys. We have tried to rear our family in the fear and love of God. We have tried to make of them good Christians and good, useful, and law-abiding Americans.

One of our daughters is a good practical nurse who is away from home much of the time taking care of the sick. * * * One daughter is a cadet nurse in training. It is quite likely that soon she will be called to help care for our wounded men.

Our oldest son has been in the armed forces of the Nation since October 15, 1942. He is now in the Pacific theater of war. Our second son, age 22, is in I–A and has been ordered to go to Spokane on July 19 for his physical examination. He took and passed such examination last November and, most likely, would now be in the service were it not for the fact that in December I had to go to the hospital for an operation. Our third son, 18, was inducted in the service on July 1. Besides these three, I have a younger son, 12 years old.

About 10 days ago I spoke to members of the local draft board and asked that my 22-year-old son be excused from taking his physical at this busy time, and that he be spared me to operate the farm. The result? I was told the board could do nothing for me, my son would have to take his physical, and, they said, after harvest every farm boy within the age limits who is physically fit will be taken "unless you farmers raise so much hell that Congress will do something about the matter."

I am farming 680 acres of which 580 acres is good tillable land. Have 500 acres in crop this year. We usually have about 35 head of cattle and raise, annually, some 140 head of hogs. I am 58 years old, have worked hard all my life, and am nearly worn out.

Now I ask: How will it be possible for me to operate this farm and take care of the livestock if my 22-year-old son is taken into the Army. That would leave only the 12-year-old boy and a 14-year-old girl with me and my wife on the farm. Both these children are still attending school. I am writing this to "raise hell" with you because I feel you have an understanding and sympathetic view of the situation confronting us farmers. But I am writing to ask and to urge that you and other Members of both Houses of

the National Congress do something—if at all possible—to remedy the situation.

The United States cannot carry on the war without food, and it will be utterly impossible for us farmers to produce that so vitally necessary food if all our help is to be taken from us. We, who have large families were ridiculed and laughed at and held in contempt by the so-called enlightened better class.

But now those same large families can provide the men to fight the battles to save the hides and carcasses of those who refused to have a family.

Thinking men and women in all walks of life have often deplored the widespread irreligion in the world today. They hold, and rightly so, that this is the fundamental cause of all the war and turmoil of our day.

Many of the men and women in the armed forces are members of churches which maintain private or parochial schools in order to teach religion to the children.

These men—in the armed forces—are good enough to suffer and fight and bleed and die for their country, but it appears that all too often their younger brothers and sisters—attending other than a public school—are not good enough to ride in a bus providing transportation for children attending the public schools. We may talk of democracy and religious freedom all we want. To my way of thinking that is not true democracy and it is not true religious freedom.

Compton, I have written to you at some length and have tried to express my views on a number of different matters. I love my country and hope and pray that ever may it continue to live and grow and prosper, and that those things which are not as they should be, be corrected to the end that our beloved United States become in truth, a haven of justice to all.

A great American statesman has said: "My country, right or wrong; if right to be kept right and if wrong to be set right."

I have tried to write in an honest, straightforward manner, and hope the letter has not tired or bored you.

Again asking you to do your utmost to relieve the farm labor situation and to defeat the bills providing for postwar compulsory military training on which we wrote you a few days ago.

Very truly and sincerely yours,

JOSEPH KASCHMITTER.

Our $300,000,000,000 Headache, as Discussed by Administration Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question arises every day, Can we pay off the national debt? Should we? If so, how?

These questions are discussed by the Honorable Harold D. Smith, Director, United States Bureau of the Budget, in an article appearing in the June issue of the American magazine. It is so interesting and instructive that it is being inserted herewith.

It is as follows:

OUR $300,000,000,000 HEADACHE

(By Harold D. Smith, Director, U. S. Bureau of the Budget)

The man who sat opposite me at luncheon in a Washington hotel the other day took a deep breath. "I am," he said, "scared to death."

He's an old friend from Kansas, owner of a small store. He went on, "I was figuring last night on this $300,000,000,000 national debt that we're going to owe after the war. It breaks down to more than $2,000 for every American man, woman, and child, the average family of four will owe nearly $9,000."

"But that way of figuring," I began, "is all wrong. You——"

"Because I earn more than the average," he interrupted in a dismal tone, "my share will be larger. So I'll owe $15,000 or more, perhaps more than twice my annual income."

"Look," I said. "Let me show you where——"

"It makes my hair stand on end," he persisted. "What kind of financial turmoil will my boys come home to after the war? What's going to happen to all of us? If any man's business was in the kind of jam that the Government appears to be in, his creditors would take everything he owns and he'd have to go on relief. How can this Nation possibly pay off this debt without completely impoverishing every citizen through ruinous taxation? Three hundred billion dollars. Holy mackerel."

"Before you get too excited, why don't you stop to think just how and when we'll pay the debt?" I asked. "Of course, each year we'll pay the interest on it. How much of the interest on the national debt will my family pay? A family of four with an annual income of $2,500 will pay about $25 a year in taxes, including both income and excise taxes, for its share of the national debt service. A family of four with a $10,000 income will pay about $400."

"Say that again," he asked, wide-eyed.

I repeated it.

"You mean," he said, amazed, "that we can just laugh it off?"

"You can't laugh off $300,000,000,000," I warned him. "Our debt is the most serious financial problem this Nation has ever faced. But my own reasoning, after digesting all the theories and surveying all the facts, cheering and depressing, leads me to the firm conclusion that the national debt, properly controlled and managed, will in no way cause anything that even approaches an economic disaster.

"If the President's program for full employment and a high national income is carried out," I went on, "the burden of the debt will not be difficult to carry. As a matter of fact, proper debt management will help in such a program. The debt certainly is nothing to be happy about, but it is nothing to scare you to death."

We discussed it for an hour, and finally my friend said, "I begin to see some light, I'm not so jittery any longer. Why don't you write that, so millions can learn what you have told me?"

So here it is, for the readers of the American magazine:

"Most persons who attempt to follow the thinking of the economists about the national debt have to give up, completely baffled. The opinions of the experts range from predictions that the debt will completely destroy us to the pleasant convictions that a huge debt is a delightful dish and that we ought to have more of it. If we take an average of all the opinions, I believe we strike close to the truth.

"By June 1946, we probably shall have spent $360,000,000,000 on the war; how much more it will cost, we do not know. We do know that hundreds of thousands of families will have suffered terribly. It is fatuous to compare the loss of a fortune to the loss of a son or a husband. As our casualties mount, we look with loathing upon any man or woman who, safe at home and prospering, is unwilling to make sacrifices in money to help pay for munitions, hospital care, and dependency benefits for our fighting men. When the war ends and we survey the monstrous destruction in the lands of our friends and Allies, which we were spared, few of us will be so mentally warped as to complain about paying his share of our cost, even though it hurts.

"To those few unreasoning hopefuls who expect to return quickly to low taxes of before-the-war I bring the bad news that it is going to hurt, for Federal taxes in the postwar period will remain well above prewar rates. There is no easy way to pay for war. We have fought a war for survival, the most expensive the world has ever known, and we cannot live the same sort of economic life after the war as we did before.

"However, to the gloomy millions who have been persuaded by the prophets of doom, I bring assurance that we can live comfortable lives, continuing the highest standard of living in the world, if we work together, all for one and one for all.

"It is of vital importance that persons who are 'scared to death' do some straight thinking on the subject. Only a nation whose people have confidence in its economy will take risks in business, make new investments, expand, and help furnish the jobs necessary to our economic health. Only citizens who know that their savings are safe and that a fair future income is secure will spend the money that keeps the farms and factories busy. The people must not be frightened by any thought of inevitable economic collapse. They must realize that their Government plans to use all policies at its command to stimulate, rather than to hamper, economic activity and employment.

"There is some danger, however, that some groups may attempt to shift the burden of debt to others—to those who are less organized, such as the white-collar workers.

"If we grant undeserved favors, such as lower taxes, to certain groups, we weaken the entire structure, for the less fortunate groups must then carry more than their share of taxation, and their purchasing power will be lessened. The people must make plain to all and sundry—big and little business, labor, agriculture, and what not—that they will not tolerate selfish pressure groups who want to gain special favors and appropriations which endanger the welfare of the Nation as a whole. There must be just one pressure group—the millions who will strive for the common welfare. If that group succeeds, it will cure the $300,000,000,000 headache. * * *

"Now let's look at the debt and see why it isn't the bugaboo many persons think. Economists, like doctors who describe symptoms in technical language, write about it in a vernacular unintelligible to the layman, even using calculus and geometry to prove their points. As a result, about all the average man knows is that, as an American citizen, he is partly responsible for an enormous amount of money, a figure so large he can't comprehend it. There have been about a billion minutes since the birth of Christ; 300,000,000,000 paper dollars would pave a highway 250 feet wide around the globe at the equator. But those comparisons don't alarm him as much as the utterly false conclusion that the share owed by his baby will be $2,000, and some day must be paid. The Government debt is so different from private debt that there should be a different term to describe it. As a debtor, the Government is in an entirely different position from the man whose mortgage is about to come due or who is in debt to a finance company.

"The Government controls interest rates and pays what it thinks is best for the country. It now pays an average rate of less than 2 percent, and about one-third of that is returned to the Government in income taxes. The citizen who borrows must furnish security. The Government's promise to pay—backed by the Nation's productive capacity—is all the security that anyone needs.

"When a citizen borrows $10,000, he pays $400 or more in annual interest, and must make payments on the principal on certain

dates or face disaster, for he may not be able to negotiate a new loan to pay off the old one. It is the inevitable arrival of the stormy day of reckoning that makes men fear debt.

"The Government never faces foreclosure. When debts come due it can borrow 100 percent of the amount, pay off the creditors, and continue in business as usual. A citizen's loans are likely to be called just when he is least able to pay—when times are bad. The Government can make payments on the principal at any time it sees fit.

"If a citizen were in the same position as the Government, he could borrow $10,000 on his mere promise to pay, and, at the cost of less than $200 a year, he and his heirs could continue to use that amount of money forever. He could borrow more, if he needed it. His limit would be only his ability to pay the interest on the debt, without destroying his standard of living, and since the Government is made up of the citizens, that is exactly what they are doing as they pay for the war and for the cost of government. As for the principal, we pay off only when times are good and incomes are high.

"Now, let's take another look at that baby in the cradle, who supposedly, over his lifetime, has to pay $2,000—his share of the $300,000,000,000 national debt. First of all, if it is true that our children have a share in the national debt as a liability, then it is also true that they have a share in the national debt as an asset in the form of bonds owned by the people and their institutions. Furthermore, the individual won't have to pay all of that $2,000 during his lifetime. He will pay for the interest, but only in proportion to his capacity to pay. While money for the debt service must come from the people, the Government does not collect in equal amounts from all people.

"Lest you begin now to consider the situation too lightly, I want to point out, at the risk of criticism from some optimistic economists, that I believe it is oversimplification to state that, "There is nothing to worry about, for we owe the debt to ourselves." To be sure, that state of affairs helps immeasurably. The money does go 'round and 'round as we collect taxes from the people and then pay them interest on their Government securities. Taxation to pay interest on the national debt affects individuals for better or for worse, but it doesn't make a nation poorer. However, unfortunately, neither does the payment of interest with borrowed funds make a nation richer.

"It has been said that we will pay the annual interest of $6,000,000,000 by taking the money out of our left-hand pocket and putting it into our right. There is, however, a limit to the application of this very consoling theory. Somewhere along the way you are forced to change your figure of speech and realize that if your Nation becomes financially ill, and in need of a blood transfusion, you don't do the patient any good by transferring blood from the left arm to the right. The life of the Government is dependent upon production of new wealth by its people. That's the new blood which will keep it alive.

"Only careful planning can insure a steady supply of that new blood which comes through constant full employment and the prevention of deflation as well as inflation.

"The debt hasn't many good qualities, but one of them is that the collection of taxes for the payment of interest and the refinancing and payment of principal can be managed so as to help our financial condition.

"If a runaway boom threatens, that is the time to tax heavily, in order to reduce the debt, for such taxation not only collects money when people can afford to pay and lays up Government wealth to use in less prosperous times, but, in drawing money into the United States Treasury, inflation is smothered.

"I believe that if the Government had collected much higher taxes in the middle twenties, the inflation of those days and the deflation that followed would have been mitigated. I also believe that we should have taxed ourselves more heavily during the war. We would have fewer difficulties with our program of economic stabilization.

"If deflation and slowing down in production should appear to be at hand, if men and women begin to lose their jobs, a lowering of taxes and speeding up of Government programs will help to restore the financial equilibrium.

"I hear you exclaim, 'More Government spending. With a $300,000,000,000 debt?'

"Government spending in peacetime will be justifiable if the money is invested so it will bring definite returns and if the investments would not be made by private business. We have made such investments in the past. They are a tiny part of the national debt, and will continue to be. They include such projects as the profitable Tennessee Valley Authority, productive loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and money spent for public roads that produce additional gasoline taxes.

"Foreign loans used to buy American goods may also come in this category. Appropriations for flood control, for the eradication of the boll weevil, for the preservation and development of our forests and other such projects, in the long run increase the wealth of the Nation and make it better able to pay taxes. For such productive investments a corporation would be justified in issuing stock or borrowing money. So it is with the Government. * * *

"Now, what about our Government expenditures and income after the war? When can we begin to balance the Budget?

"Estimates regarding Government expenses for the postwar years vary from about fifteen billion a year to above thirty billion, including the interest on the public debt.

"The Government's revenue last year was $44,000,000,000, and it spent ninety-five billion. This year the income will be about forty-five billion, and we shall spend about one hundred billion. Obviously, if we could continue to collect wartime taxes after the war and spend, say, only twenty billion a year, we could, indeed, pay off a large part of the national debt in a single year. But, of course, we can't expect these 'if's' to come true.

"To meet Government postwar expenses we must collect from our citizens more money than a peacetime America has ever paid before. In addition to payment of the wartime debt, expenditures for the care of veterans, such as hospitalization, mustering-out pay, and education, will be large. Prior to 1941 our best year for receipts was 1920, when the Government collected approximately $7,000,000,000. Obviously, taxes must bring in several times that amount for a great many years.

"What Congress will decide as to taxation after the war and when the Budget will be balanced, I do not know, but we are sure that we must keep a watchful eye on Government budgets so as to obtain that balance as soon as possible.

"We know that many sources of wartime taxes will not be available in peacetime, such as the enormous excess-profits taxes. It is generally agreed that our tax policy should be so designed as to encourage business to expand and consumers to buy. For a few years after the war the factories will hum as they produce motorcars, refrigerators, stockings, toasters and hundreds of other items that the public is eager to buy with its wartime savings. But we must look ahead and make certain that business be assured of sufficient markets in the postwar period.

"The crux of the situation is this: To collect the highest peacetime taxes that have ever been assessed in the United States, and to assure continuing freedom from fear and freedom from want, we must maintain the highest peacetime national income that the United States has ever produced.

"Today our national income is about $160,000,000,000. In 1941 it was about $97,000,000,000. If, after the war, our national income should fall to that low figure, we would need 6 percent of it to pay the $6,000,000,000 in interest on the national debt, and that amount, added to the other costs of government, would cause severe financial suffering. If we could maintain the postwar income at $150,000,000,000, the interest cost would be a little less than 4 percent, which we could pay without hardship. If it develops that Government action will be needed to sustain a $150,000,000,000 national income, we must be sure that the Government is prepared to prevent any threatening slack. Then the debt service will certainly be bearable.

"For comparison Great Britain today is paying about 5 percent of its national income for interest on its debt, and that percentage will be higher after the war. In 1818, after the Napoleonic wars, Great Britain paid about 8 percent of its income for debt interest, and after the first World War it paid 7 percent. Those high payments of the past, which we shall in no way approach, did not prevent the expansion of the British economy.

"The President has declared that, through the assurance of full employment, 'we can maintain a national income high enough to provide for an orderly retirement of the public debt, along with reasonable tax reduction.'

"That promise is backed by facts. The gloomy prediction that 'it can't be done, because we never have done it,' is made by persons who do not understand that this is a new Nation. We are a new Nation in vision an accomplishment. Our productive capacity has grown and we have learned to use it.

"We have come to understand much about our economy. We have made rapid advances in the art of government and we have mastered vast national problems. Our Members of Congress, our Government executives, our businessmen, and our labor leaders have been in two wars, they have experienced the boom of 1929 and the terrible depression years that followed. Today, as they attempt to solve the greatest manpower shortage we have ever known, they can remember the terrible days when former servicemen sold apples on street corners. They have seen almost everything; they know from bitter experience what mistakes have been made, what remedies have been successful, and they have learned how to prevent disaster in the future. By trial and error we have become a wiser, more mature Nation.

"Nearly every citizen owns war bonds and pays taxes. Never before has the Government in numerous ways come so close to the daily life of each citizen in each community. We all have learned that our Government has come to play a role, a positive role, in our lives. I believe the people expect their Government to take such steps as will be needed to keep our economy on an even keel, and to assure opportunities for jobs and a high standard of living.

"The people know they're going to suffer a financial headache. Once they thoroughly understand the situation they will realize that it can be cured by the proper prescriptions. United, they will demand effective governmental programs, the elimination of waste, the use of all our resources without deflation or inflation, and an orderly reduction of the debt as soon as possible. The people of the United States, with the help of their Government, will continue to strive for the 'four freedoms' for which our boys are dying.

"Our fighting men will come home to opportunities for a full and meaningful life—not to a bankrupt Nation. As the President has said, 'There is nothing to fear but fear itself.'"

Some of the Things We Are Fighting For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 23, 1945

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to learn from an article published in the United States News some of the things which we are fighting for. In condensing the article for publication here I have taken the liberty of supplying the subheadings to certain paragraphs.

In considering this reported program the parents and relatives of the fallen may get some consolation from the fact that at least one Member of the Congress advocates that our country should retain the island of Okinawa gained at such terrible sacrifice.

RETAKING THE CONTROL AND WEALTH OF THE EAST RESERVED FOR ENGLAND AND THE DUTCH

Blueprints now have been drawn for the drive to regain the riches that are waiting to be tapped in the East Indies. These are riches that can go far to restore to civilians some of the commodities that they now miss most. The task of reopening this part of the world falls to British Empire forces and to the Dutch.

THE BRUNT OF THE FIGHTING IN THE INVASION AND DEFEAT OF JAPAN PROPER RESERVED FOR UNITED STATES MILITARY FORCES

Perhaps shortly before United States forces invade Japan itself. British forces in Burma have not had the supplies and equipment that United States forces have in such abundance. Until these handicaps can be overcome, action by British forces is limited. But the prizes that wait to be taken, when the time to move does come, are immensely rich.

Before the war, Malaya and the Netherlands East Indies together supplied the world with 90 percent of its rubber, 65 percent of its tin, 85 percent of the pepper, 30 percent of the copra, 30 percent of natural resins and 17 percent of petroleum By 1939, when war seemed inevitable, the United States was buying 30 percent of East Indies exports, was building up stock piles in these products

These resources were cut off by the Japanese in 2 months. Almost 4 years of war, of all-out production for United States and other allied forces, now have depleted stock piles to dangerous levels. Tin imports from other regions are 25 percent short of consumption. Rubber stock piles by the end of this year are expected to drop to 61,000 tons. The sugar shortage is to grow more acute. Vegetable oils are needed by liberated countries. And United States petroleum resources are being used up at an alarming rate.

In Malaya, target of the first British attack, are found tin, rubber, and palm oil. Tin production before the war averaged 50,000 tons per year. Rubber exports reached 350,000 tons. Ten percent of the world demand for palm oil was supplied by Malaya.

On Sumatra are found petroleum, rubber, tin, rice, palm oil, fibers, and some coal. The Japanese made one of their few air-borne attacks against Sumatra's oil refineries at Palembang in order to capture them undamaged. Oil production in 1939 reached 5,320,000 tons, out of the total of 8,000,000 tons produced in the Netherlands East Indies. The islands of Bangka and Billiton of eastern Sumatra supplied 49,000 tons of tin in 1940. Coal mines near Palembang produced 1,200,000 tons. And most of the 600,000 tons of rubber grown in the Netherlands East Indies came from Sumatra. With the help of this country, Dutch officials have ready almost $15,000,000 in equipment and supplies needed to resume rubber output immediately following invasion. Experts expect that 200,000 tons of crude rubber may have been hidden from the Japanese by natives.

On Java, richest island in the Indies, are crowded 50,000,000 persons who turn out sugar, rice, kapok, palm oil, petroleum, minerals, and other products. In prewar years, sugar production reached 3,000,000 tons, or 60 percent of the amount available to United States civilians this year. Rice is harvested from 10,000,000 acres. And production of palm oils in Java and other islands reached 265,000 tons.

On Borneo, mostly along the coast, are found petroleum, rubber, and some coal. The oil-producing areas at Tarakan, Balikpapan, and Brunei have been recaptured by Australian and Dutch forces under General MacArthur's command. Borneo in 1939 produced 1,680,000 tons of oil.

On Celebes and the other islands are grown principally sago, resins, coconuts, vegetable oils, and spices. Pepper is expected to be abundantly available when the islands are opened up. Launches to gather these products and interisland vessels to bring them out already have been built in large numbers.

British naval units have bombarded coastal points within 200 miles of Singapore, and now are reported to have landed on an island halfway between Rangoon, their operations base, and Singapore. But the most decisive action against Japanese forces in the Indies has been the cutting of their supply line to Japan by United States naval and air forces.

Admiral Mountbatten is expected to be given command over forces now operating in Borneo under General MacArthur, but will continue to receive aid from American forces.

Once Singapore is captured or neutralized, landings on Sumatra, Java, and other islands can be made more easily. British policy is to land with a strong concentration of forces that can kill the maximum number of Japanese in the shortest time.

WHEN UNITED STATES DEFEATS JAPAN, GREAT BRITAIN AND HOLLAND WILL COME BACK INTO THEIR OWN

United States forces will not be needed for such clean-up operations. These will be left to the British and Dutch who own the territories involved. But until the Indies are liberated, it will be impossible to resume all-out production of rubber, tin, sugar, and other critical products.

If the war against Japan drags on through 1946, the resources of the Indies will be needed by the military. For this reason, the British now are being pressed to speed up their war against the Japanese in Malaya and the East Indies.

What the British Elections Mean to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there are, of course, limitations to the load even the most powerful man can carry.

All thoughtful persons recognize the greatness of Winston Churchill and the monumental contribution he has made to Great Britain and to the democratic form of government the world over. Verily, he rolled back the tide of tyranny in freedom's darkest hour; held aloft the flaming torch of freedom when all round the night was dark as jet. The British election was not a personal rebuke for Churchill.

No fair-minded person would deny him high credit; but the masses of the people, after years of Tory rule, dreamed and prayed for a more liberal administration, an administration that would not continue to be controlled by those who, although they had, with united help, carried on the great war effort successfully, were not in step with overdue social legislation. The common men of Great Britain felt they were not being accorded the merited opportunities that would improve their living conditions. Consequently they turned to the Labor Party, at whose hands they hope to realize the improved conditions—higher wages and better living conditions—so long denied.

Superficially the British election may seem an evidence of ingratitude, but it has its counterpart in several historic instances; notably the unmerited defeat of the great Woodrow Wilson when he was in fact at the crest of his monumental achievements in influencing the formation of the League of Nations. If any man still denies to Wilson an attribute of prophetic foresight and fame, let him contemplate the record of the last 6 years the world over, our recent action at San Francisco and the recent action of the United States Senate.

What are the lessons and admonitions of the recent British election for this country?

The United States today stands as the last citadel of free enterprise among the great powers. Let us hope it will remain such, that it may slowly lead the world back to that system which, properly operated, is the best yet devised.

It is my belief that the free enterprise system will survive or fall in America in precisely the measure that Americans

are willing to profit from the lessons and admonitions of the British election.

One fact we know—we are going forward. Our Nation is not going to stand still. To fail to progress is to go backward. Our people are not static. There is one lesson that Britain gives us. We doubt whether any one factor hurt Churchill more than his effort to foist discredited monarchs upon other Nations whose people did not want them.

The British election tells us something else, namely, that we have a choice which, practically speaking, the British people did not have.

Britons, with little faith in the weakened, discredited Liberal Party, knew it was a choice between the extreme Tory right or the extreme socialist left. Faced with that choice they voted as they have; but it is doubtless accurate to say that the result was a vote against toryism rather than a vote against Churchill or for socialism.

America has a middle way, and under the wise leadership of President Truman we are well on that way.

Unfortunately we have a small but vocal group in the United States who, like the Tories of Great Britain, have been led astray by selfish, shrewd Hitler propaganda in favor of ancient prejudices and modern Fascist and Nazi ideologies.

Although since the dastardly attack by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor they have withheld overt antagonism and opposition to the late President Roosevelt and the New Deal, with its progressive, humanitarian aims, there are still some who covertly continue their opposition to all legislation for the common good. That element, though small, is none the less powerful and influential, being buttressed by a monopolistic section of the press and radio who constantly label and designate all progressive measures as socialistic or communistic. They fear that such proposed legislation would arrest the march of their avaricious, selfish policies, and would remove the fear they seek to create in the American businessmen in connection with efforts to improve the lot of the underprivileged and underpaid of our Nation.

These advocates of policies which solely benefit special interests immediately heralded the Labor Party victory as dangerous to a capitalistic and democratic form of government, and they aimed to mislead the rank and file of loyal American citizens into believing it was a Communist victory. They willfully and deliberately concealed the well-known fact that the British Labor Party is not Communist controlled; in fact it is just as much opposed to communism as we are in this country. Its record of leadership and of administration as part of Churchill's coalition government in recent years unmistakably controverts that sinister allegation.

The fact that of 644 members of the House of Commons only 2 are Communists further proves that Britain's new government is not communistic and is in no sense or degree a threat to stabilization of the troubled world of today. This is simply a case of bad shepherds screening themselves from the light.

It must be acknowledged by all fair-minded people that this recent British election bids fair to effect a more just, equitable, and liberal treatment of the common men of the British Commonwealth. These new leaders are already pitching in with new-broom vigor in immediately justifying their selection as custodians of British interests in the trying times ahead.

Furthermore, this election justifies the claim of many well-informed students of government that in domestic affairs the Tory regime has been unfair in dealing with the substrata of its people who fought with such zealous fervor for liberty, carried the heavy burden in the heat of the day, and now aim to create and perpetuate a free and liberal administration of government, which ambition has been thwarted by policies of the party in power during the last 8 years.

The enduring help of the Tories to repulsive and decadent Spain and to the reactionary forces in Greece, Yugoslavia, Turkey, and elsewhere was strongly resented by the British masses and was an additional reason for the defeat of the Tories.

I am strongly of the opinion that we and the world have nothing to fear from the new British Government, as most of its leaders, from Attlee down, cooperated as coalitionists during the war to the fullest extent with the then prevailing Government.

They are proved, intelligent, able, experienced gentlemen and I, for one, have the utmost confidence that they will carry out their pre-election pledges, promises and assurances given to the people of Great Britain and the world by striving in every way to improve the lot of the wage-earners and others in Britain who have been so long denied maximum opportunity in a just world, and that they will honor all pledges, promises, and assurances that have been made or implied in international relations, including the Balfour declaration, removing immigration restrictions to Palestine and establishment of a Jewish homeland.

The election in Great Britain should have a wholesome effect on us in this country; and it is my hope that many of the reactionaries, the backward-inclined, the great financiers and industrialists, may at least to some degree, if they would not imitate an ostrich, desist from their untenable opposition to fair and humanitarian legislation which is intended for the benefit not only of the underpaid manual wage-earners but for nearly 20,000,000 others of our citizens—white collar workers, teachers, ministers, pensioners, the unorganized—whose static earnings are less than $1,300 each a year, at a time when the cost of living has increased from 30 to 60 percent in the last 3 or 4 years. Obviously this condition makes it impossible for them to maintain themselves and their families befittingly in this, the greatest, richest, and most prosperous Nation under the sun. There must be, necessarily a genuine improvement in social standards, which will automatically effect an improvement in moral standards, which is, of course, highly desirable in the ideal state.

I feel that it will be in the interest of the common good that laws be passed and conditions effected that will to an appreciable degree really and especially improve the lot of these 20,000,000 worthy but defenseless unorganized citizens.

At the same time I seriously invite attention to the urgent necessity for an effective curbing of control by various trusts, predatory combinations, and cartels that are part and parcel of them, which have for their purpose restriction of fair competition, and which by various dubious devices and methods are used to increase their profits unconscionably at the distressful expense of the consumers and small businessmen.

For years and years I have observed that every effort to improve living conditions and safeguard the lives and wholesome interests of the American people, especially those of the workers, has been opposed by the predatory groups. Going back to 1892 we find the bitterly contested A. R. U. strike; later the Pullman strike; still later, in 1898, the unionization of the coal miners. All workers who participated in those stirring, pioneering events know, with sorrow, what I am talking about. In those hectic days management wanted to be patriarch, straw-boss, and referee and pay a worker $1 for 12 hours work.

And all students will remember the adamant opposition of the railroads to the law requiring automatic couplers that have reduced from battalions to nil the number of workers injured in coupling cars. The railroads at first asserted that such a law meant bankruptcy to them, and they obtained at least 3 deferments of the effective date of that law.

Again, prior to 1903 the railroads gave more attention to having their motive power employed 20 of 24 hours, which meant bigger dividends, than they thought of adequately protecting the lives and limbs of employees, who were required or urged to remain on duty or on emergency call as long as 36 consecutive hours without rest. So disastrous to railroad employees, and the traveling public, did this practice become that Congress enacted a 16-hour law for railroad employees and later an 8-hour law for all workers. Behold the beneficent results of all these corrective legal measures.

Returning to recent events, we all recall that only a few short years ago legislation was pending to separate the baneful, destructive, powerful utility holding companies from their operating subsidiaries, which they claimed was a death sentence to the industry. Those companies, under the leadership of the convicted swindler Hopson, spent more than $3,000,000 for deceptive, untenable propaganda in an unsuccessful effort to defeat that proposed legislation, wholesome and beneficial as it was. But they did not prevail. That much-needed legislation reached the statute books, to our everlasting benefit. The Security and Exchange Commission, by wise administration, grants delays in effecting dissolutions under this law, with the result that no honest, well-intentioned person or concern is injured, while the public as a whole is immeasurably benefited.

In fact such paid propaganda through the press and by highly paid lobbyists has been utilized against every piece of proposed progressive legislation. But, thanks to the impartial radio and other means of wide and fair dissemination, and such bastions of democracy as the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the most popular and persuasive speaker of his generation and with the tongue of the prophets, these distraught anxieties of our citizens were dissipated, and, notwithstanding this nefarious propaganda, a great deal of this much-needed remedial legislation has been enacted to immeasurably improve the general conditions of the American people.

Although great progress has been attained during this administration, still greater opportunity should be effected to improve the mode of living of and accord fairer returns to the producers of our wealth and those who make possible the great prosperity we are now enjoying.

Here we have the dual message for America to read into the results of the British election:

A harbinger of hope for the great mass of our citizens who rightfully seek an improvement in their standards of living and at the same time a warning to the privileged profiteering interests that unless they voluntarily join in measures designed to that end they will provoke adoption of even more radical governmental policies than those of which they now complain.

Since dictating the above remarks two other world-shaking events, the joint American-British completion of the atomic bombs and the Russian declaration of war against Japan, have served further to illustrate the danger that lies in repeating the errors of past unjustified criticisms of our allies.

These events also demonstrate with what great wisdom the late, venerated President Franklin D. Roosevelt laid the foundations for early victory and peace and it is to be hoped that his able successor, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, continues to carry on the Roosevelt policies, including the foundation already laid for cooperation with Russia.

You will recall it was my prediction, often repeated on the floor of this House, that Russia would ultimately join us in the war against Japan.

Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, China, Japan, and the Soviet Union are primarily interested in the Mongolia-Sinkiang region of inner Asia. The collapse of the Japanese Empire will still leave many problems for China and the Soviet Union to consider in Mongolia and Sinkiang. In these vast areas of inner Asia many events of the past have led to great repercussions in the world. Migrations have begun in the arid interior of Asia, moving west to Europe and south to China. The fluctuating rainfall of outer China is responsible for many of the great events of history.

The Great Wall of China was an effort to establish a dividing line between the farmer and the shepherd. When the rainfall outside the Great Wall increased to the extent that crops could be grown, colonists from China pressed into Mongolia for more than a hundred miles and the nomads retreated to the interior. On the other hand, when the rains failed, the farmers retreated to the south and the nomads invaded the area inside the Great Wall.

Mongolia, covering an area of almost a million square miles, has been divided into Inner and Outer Mongolia by the Gobi Desert. Inner Mongolia since 1911 has been organized into Ningsia, Suiyuan, Chahar, and Jehol. Japan has created an autonomous Mongol state southwest of Manchukuo in a large part of Inner Mongolia. Outer Mongolia has been practically independent of China since 1913. This area is divided into the Mongolian People's Republic and the Tuvinian People's Republic both under the control of the Soviet Union. However, China still possesses sovereignty in name over all of Mongolia. Sinkiang or Chinese Turkestan has been one of the Chinese provinces since 1878. The new dominion has been greatly influenced by the Soviet Union.

All life in Mongolia depends upon grass. In the central part of the Gobi Desert the surface is almost barren. In the steppes around the margins of the real desert is the home of the nomad. More rainfall occurs in the northwest due to the higher elevation. Camels and horses, sheep and cattle live on the grassland. The sheep provide food and clothing while the horses and camels afford transport.

The Mongolian people live chiefly in three places: Western Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, and Outer Mongolia. The population of Inner Mongolia is over 7,000,000, the majority of whom are Chinese colonists. The Chinese are a negligible factor in the population of Outer Mongolia, which is below 1,000,000. The capital city of Outer Mongolia is Urga, or Ulan Bator, as it is now called. It has a population of 70,000. The Mongols generally believe in the Lama form of Buddhism. The monasteries are leading centers of permanent settlement.

Mongolia occupies a strategic position in the arena between Japan and the Soviet Union. The Japanese have constructed railroads in northern Manchuria to cut the Trans-Siberian Railway in the event of war. The Soviet representatives in Mongolia have been interested in a possible push across central Manchuria to Korea in the event of hostilities. A Japanese drive across all of Inner Mongolia into Kansu and Sinkiang might have brought about the fall of Free China.

Before the Chinese Revolution of 1911 the Mongols were divided into banners and confederacies. There were 4 confederacies in Outer Mongolia and 24 in Inner Mongolia. Although the Mongols were vassals of the Manchu dynasty of China, they were actually ruled by a priesthood under a Living Buddha in Urga. With the fall of the Manchus in 1911, the Mongols claimed their independence. The revolt in Outer Mongolia was aided by the czarist Russians. In 1915 at Kiakhta, on the border of Siberia and Mongolia, representatives of Russia, China, and Mongolia made a tripartite agreement in which the Mongolians received autonomy under Chinese sovereignty. After the Russian Revolution in 1917 a Chinese expedition was sent to Urga to reassert sovereignty over the area. Later the Chinese were driven out by the Mongol princes, aided by a White Russian unit under Baron Ungern von Sternberg. The Japanese supported the Russian General Semenov, who tried to organize a regime under Nipponese influence.

The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party was organized in March 1921. In July the Red Army and Mongolian partisans captured Urga and order was eventually restored to Outer Mongolia. Toward the end of the year a Mongolian People's Government was functioning at Urga. In a treaty of friendship between the Mongols and the Russians in November 1921 former Russian privileges in Outer Mongolia were ended, the Mongolian People's Government was recognized, and diplomatic relations were established. When the Living Buddha died in 1924, the Mongol People's Republic was organized.

Soviet troops were withdrawn from Outer Mongolia in 1925, yet military experts were sent to train the local troops. Military equipment was supplied without cost to the Mongols and loans were advanced without security or interest for commercial purposes. Efforts were made to introduce handicraft industries and to improve sheep raising. Young Mongols were trained for political positions and schools were established for the public. A road was constructed from Urga north to the Trans-Siberian Railway and another south to Kalgan and North China.

The Russians were careful to maintain the formal fiction of Chinese sovereignty. In the Russo-Chinese treaty of 1924 the Soviets continued to recognize the sovereignty of China over the area. The agreement states:

> The Government of the U. S. S. R. recognizes Outer Mongolia as an integral part of the Chinese Republic and respects the sovereignty of China over it.

The Soviet Government in Moscow has never deviated from this policy. On the other hand, the Mongol People's Republic is for all practical purposes both independent of China and subject to the Soviet Union.

In 1931 Japan entrenched herself in Manchuria, creating the puppet state of Manchukuo. The long border between Outer Mongolia and Manchukuo led to many disputes over a number of years. The outbreak of friction in 1935 in the area of Lake Buir Nor led the Japanese to urge the abandonment of the isolation policy of Outer Mongolio toward Japan. On July 24 the Japanese spokesman for the Foreign Office said:

> Manchukuo is knocking at the door as Commander Perry 80 years ago knocked at the door of Japan.

In an interview on March 1, 1936, Stalin is reported to have said:

If Japan should venture to attack the Mongolian People's Republic and encroach upon its independence, we will have to help the Mongolian People's Republic.

On March 12, 1936, a mutual assistance pact was signed between the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic. If any country attacked either one, the other would go to the aid of its ally. Under the present treaty relations, Russian instructors may train the Mongolian Army, Russian propagandists may work in the country, Russian concessionaires may monopolize the industrial, railroad, and commercial development of Mongolia, and Russian troops may enter the country as long as danger exists.

Friction continued after the pact along the Manchukuo-Mongolian border. From May to mid-September 1939 the fighting between the Soviet-Mongolians and the Japanese-Manchukuo troops in the Nomonhan area near Buir Nor and the Khalka River was very severe. At the beginning of September the Soviet-Mongolians defeated the Japanese-Manchukuo forces due to the better mechanical equipment of the former. Over 200,000 troops were engaged, and casualties exceeded 30,000. In the fighting, tanks, planes, artillery, and armored cars were used. After the outbreak of the European war in September 1939 an armistice was concluded in the Nomonhan area on September 15. An agreement was reached on June 10, 1940, on the demarcation of the frontier between Outer Mongolia and Manchukuo. On April 13, 1941, the Pact of Neutrality was signed between the Soviet Union and Japan. In a joint declaration Japan recognized the "territorial integrity and inviolability" of Outer Mongolia and the Soviet Union recognized the "territorial integrity and inviolability" of Manchukuo. In April 1945 the Soviet Union denounced the Pact of Neutrality with Japan.

Outer Mongolia and the Soviet Union are also united by bonds of trade. Almost all of the trade of Outer Mongolia is with the Soviet Union. The trade is conducted on a basis similar to that with Tannu Tuva and Sinkiang. Russian imports from Mongolia have been wool, hides, and livestock, while Russian exports to Mongolia have been textiles, flour, sugar, tobacco, and metal products.

The domestic policy of the Mongolian People's Republic has changed since 1930. From 1930–32 the Government favored complete collectivization, pursued an administrative campaign against the Lama church, and tried to effect a state monopoly of internal trade. Following uprisings against the policies of the Government, a change was made in 1932. Individual enterprise would remain, but the trend would be toward eventual socialism.

In the northwestern part of Mongolia is Tannu Tuva, or the Tuvinian People's Republic, under Soviet influence. The area occupies an enclosed basin of the Yenisei valley. The population is about 60,000. The people are not pure Mongols but represent a Finno-Turki stock. Some of the inhabitants are nomads and others are forest dwellers. The capital of Tannu Tuva is Kyzyl.

The New Dominion of China is Sinkiang. This vast province commands the low-level routes in Inner Asia between the East and the West. Sinkiang has been called the geographic center of gravity between the Atlantic and the Pacific, the Arctic and the Indian Oceans. Trucks, carrying supplies from the Soviet Union to China, followed the 3,000-mile route from the Turk-Sib Railway in Soviet Central Asia to Chungking in Free China. The route passes the capital city of Urumchi, or Tihwa, as it is now called, Hami, and Lanchow in Kansu. The leading trade routes in Sinkiang itself from the Soviet Union are fourfold: first, from South Kirgizia to Kashgar; second, from Alma Ata to Kuldja; third, by the Ili River to Kuldja; and, fourth, south from Sergiopol on the Turk-Sib Railway to Chuguchak. The development of river transportation on the Ili River is growing.

Political Sinkiang has an area of 600,000 square miles and a population of 4,360,000 people. Most of the people are Turki, while no more than 10 percent are Chinese. Mohammedanism is the prevailing religion in the area. As far back as the 1300's Mohammedanism replaced Buddhism. Sinkiang is a land of oases and most of the plains are too arid for grazing. Irrigation is practiced wherever possible. Leading populated areas are oases like Yarkand, with a population of 60,000; Khotan, with 26,000; and Kashgar, with 35,000. Some wheat, millet, kaoliang, beans, rice, fruit, tobacco, and cotton are produced.

China's historic relations with Sinkiang have been political—not linguistic or racial. Sinkiang has been under general Chinese rule off and on since 200 B. C. The Chinese are traders at the oases—not settlers. Sinkiang is now held by a Chinese army which is anti-Japanese since many of the men are exiles from Manchuria.

When Sheng Shih-ts'ai began directing the destinies of this province in 1933 he discarded the old-fashioned policies which were then still in vogue. He attempted to do this within the limits of nominal control of the Chinese Republic, but whenever he felt it to be in the interests of Sinkiang he went beyond the powers given him by the Republic. Many foreign imperialist interests and conservative Chinese have been hurt by the introduction of radical ideas into this backward area, but Sheng's success in awakening Sinkiang has been great.

In 1930 the Moslems revolted against the rulers of Sinkiang. Sheng Shih-ts'ai, after a few reverses, successfully took the offensive, but Shin Shu-jen, who was Provincial Chairman and head of the government, nevertheless fled from the Province. In 1933 Sheng was named provisional border defense commander and has until recently headed the government. After his appointment two armies still opposed him, and had it not been for the men and material sent him by Russia, his control of Sinkiang might have ended rather abruptly. Russia supported Sheng for numerous reasons.

The importance of Sinkiang greatly increased after Japan conquered Manchuria in 1932 and overran Jehol in 1933. If Japan had also succeeded in its attempts to gain the support of the powerful Moslem minorities in Northwest China, Russia would have been cut off from China and would have also been prevented from sending the latter much needed supplies in its war with Japan. To counter these Japanese moves, Russia supported the faction in the Sinkiang civil war which was militarily most competent and politically the most legitimate successor to the former government. This happened to be Sheng's group. Besides sending tanks, planes, and voluntary troops, the Altai volunteers, Russia permitted Chinese troops interned in Siberia after their withdrawal from Manchuria to be repatriated to Sinkiang to aid Sheng. Sheng was a Manchurian by birth and therefore capable of handling these soldiers. Thus a nucleus upon which to build a powerful army was afforded him. These Manchurian soldiers, it was believed, would also reinforce his loyalty to China, as their primary object was to return to their homes and not remain in Sinkiang. This meant that in a few years they would again be fighting the Japanese and this fighting would strengthen the Russian position by keeping the Japanese busy.

Sheng's army was composed mainly of Kirgizes, Turkis, Torguts, Tranchis, and White Russians. Added to these were many volunteers from the Soviet; and no friction arose between them and the White Russians. This has been explained by stating that when men are fighting to attain the same objectives they can work in harmony.

The eight-point proclamation issued by Sheng shortly after he became the head of the government set the early keynote for his conduct in this position. These eight points were: Establishment of racial equality, guaranty of religious freedom, equitable distribution of agricultural and rural relief, reform of government finance, the cleaning up of government administration, the expansion of education, the promotion of self-government, and the improvement of the judiciary. This program was very practicable as each point was a grievance that one or more of the racial groups had against the former government. In this way Sheng was able to garner the support of all the groups in Sinkiang and thereby make it possible to effect needed reforms.

With internal rebellion eliminated, unity attained, and government firmly established, Sheng invoked his six great policies. These guaranteed his eight-point proclamation and have been the basis of all his reforms. These six great policies are in order of importance: (1) Anti-imperialism; (2) kinship to Sovietism; (3) racial equality; (4) clean government; (5) peace; and (6) reconstruction. The proclamation and policies include nearly all the points mentioned in the Atlantic Charter and they were proclaimed 7 years before the latter.

Through its policy of "anti-imperialism" Sinkiang has attempted to thwart the British, Russians, Japanese, and Chinese themselves, from dividing and conquering this province and putting the

people at the mercy of any or all of these nations. Sheng desired to unite the people in order that they might benefit from such cooperation. The trade routes leading to Russian Central Asia are much shorter and easier to traverse than those leading to British India. Thus Sinkiang trade can more easily be turned in favor of the former. During the Czarist regime trade and transportation was increased greatly and the Soviets have continued this policy and have also aided Sheng politically and economically, as has been noted elsewhere. Some claim that this is Soviet imperialism, but others claim that since anti-imperialism comes before kinship to Sovietism among the six policies, the former is just as great a warning to Russia as to the other nations.

"Kinship to Sovietism" has come into being because of the contiguity of the borders of Sinkiang and Russia, their close trade connections, and the help which Russia has given Sinkiang in its reconstruction program—its 3-year plans. The friendship began before this policy was announced in 1933, as the Chinese consulates in the Soviet from Western China—Sinkiang—stated that they desired to maintain their friendly relations with Russia and were not in agreement with Central China's oppostion to the Soviets and Chiang Kai-shek's war against the Chinese Communists in 1927. The reasons for the Soviet backing Sheng have already been partially listed. The completion of the new Turkestan-Siberian Railway on the Russian side permitted that country to send goods to Sinkiang in greater quantity and with greater speed than other countries. Also, the rapid and modern development of Sinkiang was a logical move if Russia was to protect her Asiatic interests in Mongolia, the Soviet Maritime Province, and Northwestern and Central Asia.

In return for Russian aid Sinkiang wholeheartedly supported Russia's actions in the West and also China's resistance to Japan. This enabled Tihwa—capital of Sinkiang—to play a more important role than previously as the middleman between Moscow and Chungking. The Russo-Japanese Non-Aggression Pact of April 15, 1941, ostensibly did not mention Sinkiang, thus allowing both nations a free hand in that territory without their breaking any treaty. Because of this Sinkiang since then has been moving closer to the Chinese Nationalist Government in order to be assured ample support in case any difficulty arises. In 1943 Russia withdrew her soldiers and matériel from Sinkiang under an amicable agreement with the latter. This culminated the trend, begun in 1941, toward Sinkiang's moving fully into the orbit of China. This amply demonstrates that "Kinship to Sovietism" means friendship with, not political domination by, the "Bear."

"Racial equality" stands for exactly that. Prior to 1933 the various racial groups were not afforded equality and this led to great discontent and strife among them. Sheng realized that if support for his program was to be had from all groups they must be accorded equal treatment, thus he instituted this policy throughout the province. The many races living in Sinkiang and their qualities, interests, etc., are listed below.

The Moslems—Turkic-Alpine—speak a relatively pure eastern Turki, and are sincere and strict believers in Mohammedanism. The vast majority of them live in the south, but large colonies are also found in most of the northern cities. They are honest, law-abiding, truthful, and on good terms with the Chinese. On the other hand, however, they are timid, pleasure-loving, indolent, not reliable in an emergency, and content to allow life to pass as it pleases. They rarely master the Chinese language, and thus in the past they have been exploited by many of the tax collectors and other government employees. In the opinion of Aitchen K. Wu, the Moslems would be much more contented if the language difficulty were overcome. This would also lead to greater happiness and prosperity for the whole of Sinkiang, as the Moslems comprise 80 percent of the total population.

The "Han" or "Ruling" Chinese number approximately 10 percent of Sinkiang's population and live primarily in the north, although there are scattered Chinese throughout the province. Many settled here either as merchants and traders or criminal exiles, and are the type of Chinese usually seen in the Occident. The vast majority, however, came with the appointment of a leading official from their home region. The whole prosperity of the province depends upon them, for they are everywhere by virtue of their abilities accepted as the ruling class. They are the soldiers, administrators, traders, businessmen, and shopkeepers. For the most part they are located in the larger cities, but with the influx from other parts of China they are moving to settle on the land. This will have a stabilizing effect on the colonization of Sinkiang.

The Chinese Moslems had only their Mohammedan faith in common with the Turkic-Alpine group until unity of all peoples was achieved to oppose the Japanese. These people belong, for the most part, to the Han Chinese and are located mainly throughout the northwest. Since the civil war began in 1931 they have also begun to settle in the south.

The Manchu Bannermen were sent to fortify the Turkestan frontier during the period of the Manchu dynasty. Here they settled on the land and colonized in a resolute way. They have learned to farm the lands given them and have become skilled breeders of cattle. Aside from their having maintained the Manchu language, they are completely Chinese in sympathy and in the fundamental mode of life. They number only about 20,000 and live mainly in Hwei-Yuan and Ning-Yuan along the Russo-Sinkiang border.

Manchurians entered Sinkiang with the advent of Sheng to power and served partially as middlemen between Sinkiang and the rest of China. Today they hold a prominent place in the life and administration of Sinkiang even though their numbers are small.

The Mongolians represent approximately 5 percent of Sinkiang's present population. For the most part they are rough, unkempt, and devil-may-care in their attitude. Although nomads, their roaming is localized and they have settled in the northern part of Sinkiang. Their principal occupation is herding. They are not a progressive group and their customs have remained the same for nearly a thousand years.

The Kirghiz are nomadic in their habits, although a few have turned to agriculture for a livelihood. They are born plunderers, good fighters, bad neighbors, and a source of trouble to all authority, as they refuse to pay taxes and obey laws. They center around Kashgar in the southwest part of Sinkiang. They are not very devout Mohammedans and are not a closely knit group as they have split into many small units. At present they are a problem to the Sinkiang Government because of their lawlessness and their knack of moving rapidly from one place to another.

The Kazakhs are similar to the Kirghiz in that they are not strict Mohammedans, are notorious raiders and superb horsemen. Their only occupation is herding and when winter comes they turn to plundering and the like for livelihood. They intensely dislike cities and always cause trouble when they enter one, if even only for a fair. They live mostly in the north, but the changing boundaries between the Russians and Chinese there have caused them to be treated rather harshly at times by the former. They are therefore slowly migrating southward, causing grazing lands in that section to become somewhat crowded.

The Tungans live a life similar to the Chinese, except that their Mohammedan beliefs and customs prevent them from doing certain things. They are very religious and intolerant. These characteristics bring them into conflict not only with members of their own sect, but with believers in other religions. They live in the north and number between three and four hundred thousand. Most of these people are merchants and farmers, and as a whole they are a prosperous and industrious folk. Although warlike, conservatism and isolation is traditional among them and they hold aloof from their fellow men.

The White Russians came to Sinkiang in the early years of the Russian Revolution and were mostly exiles and followers of the White Russian General Annenkov. Those not soldiers were merchants who fled with what they could and have continued their businesses as best they could in Sinkiang. The White Russians number only between fifty and one hundred thousand. Their good fighting ability has been of great aid to Sheng, especially during his trouble with Moslems around 1931. No difficulty has arisen between the Soviet Russians stationed in Sinkiang and the White Russians. In fact they have worked and fought together with whole-hearted cooperation when called upon to do so.

The Tadjiks inhabit the mountainous region of Pu-li, which controls the trade route to India. The vast majority are nomads, but there are increasing signs that they are beginning to take up agri-

culture. They are a peaceful clan and practice a form of Mohammedanism. They have always been friendly with the ruling Chinese and are completely trusted by the latter.

The Tartars have come to Sinkiang only since the Russian Revolution. They are few in number, but in the cities where they have settled they are already prominent in commerce and many have entered the government service. They are clever, industrious people with considerable artistic sense. They are not very devout Mohammedans and their standard of living is much higher than that of either the Moslems or the Kazakhs.

The clean-government policy was promulgated by Sheng in order to thwart the corruptness which had marked the previous administrations. Prior to 1933, the officials were interested in officiating, not working, and their officiating was only bent in the direction of making money. Tax collectors were hired and fired upon the basis of how much money they could raise from taxes, and all the evils of inefficient and rotten government were present. The new government has greatly, although not completely, eradicated excessive taxes and rid itself of the poorer quality officials. Records of all public money, received and expended, were kept in Sheng's office. Salaries are no longer lavish.

The province is governed under a committee system, with said committee appointed by the Chinese National Government. It is part of China and adheres to the latter's laws. However, when Sheng believed it was to the advantage of Sinkiang to sign a treaty or carry out a policy which was not strictly in adherence with the laws and policies of the Chungking Government he ignored the latter. These deviations have been overlooked, for the most part, by the National Government as the latter is more interested in gaining and maintaining Sinkiang's wholehearted support during and after the war than in punishing the province for any slight infractions of the law.

Wars, civil strife, and looting were not uncommon before Sheng's government came into power. The peace policy for awhile brought harmony and cooperation within the province, and this, more than anything else, permitted Sinkiang to begin a new life based upon the other five of the "six great policies." The slogan "peace" was more than welcomed by the people as they had become tired of the earlier conflicts ravaging up and down the province.

The reconstruction policy had its real beginning in 1937, when the first of two 3-year plans was instituted with aid and under the guidance of Russia. The second 3-year plan was inaugurated in 1941. The Foreign Trade Co. and the Local Resources Co. have carried on most of Sinkiang's business, and, on a profit for the province basis, have dealt with and for a network of local cooperatives. A Sinkiang commercial bank monopolizes all provincial banking and together with a reconstruction commission form the core of the new economy.

The number of schools and educational facilities have greatly increased under this program and the students of all schools are aided financially by the provincial government. Sinkiang is still not solvent financially, but today her dollar has increased in value and the danger of inflation has been thwarted. This has primarily been achieved because of Soviet loans and financial backing and Sinkiang's protected geographical position at the rear of the Sino-Japanese War. This has spared her the effects of the blockade and consequently a scarcity of goods and has also allowed Sheng to institute reforms which otherwise could not have been effected.

An increase in the acreage under cultivation has been made possible by improvement of irrigation facilities. The province's main products are wheat, corn, rice, melons and other fruits, and cotton. Animal husbandry has been greatly aided, and one-fourth of the population is engaged in this occupation. Herding is concentrated in the northern part of the province as this section is most suitable for grazing. Field stations have been established throughout the province, providing veterinary hospitals, farm machinery, otherwise unavailable, forestry offices, and weather bureaus.

In this respect it might be well to point out that the American Army maintains a number of weather observation stations in different parts of Asia because storms sweeping eastward from the Central Asian Plateau many times have an effect on what happens the next day or next week in the Pacific and consequently this is an important and necessary war job. We have at the present time in China a weather squadron under the command of Col. Richard E. Ellsworth, whose operations cover a large part of Asia, the Pacific and the Indian Oceans and which operates more than 100 stations in an area 3,000 miles deep and 4,000 miles wide. The weather squadron stations are located in some of the most unknown spots in the world and one of them is at Tihwa in Sinkiang.

While in Chungking last November I met Maj. Harry (Tex) Albaugh, of San Antonio, Tex., who, with Maj. Joseph Dillow, had just returned from Sinkiang. They had flown from northwest India across the highest part of the Himalayas direct to Sinkiang and that was the first time such a flight had ever been made. Later in December of that year I rode with Major Albaugh and Colonel Ellsworth from Chengtu to Kunming. I found out then that Major Albaugh was the pilot who had spotted the 31,000-foot peak—higher than Mt. Everest—that I had heard so much about, in either Tibet or Sinkiang. He located it as being somewhere between 96° and 100° longitude and 30° and 32° latitude but is not positive due to poor maps for that part of the world to check on.

Since the war Sinkiang has opened its doors to the outside world, including China, to a much greater extent than was previously the case when only the Soviet was made welcome. Today the Chinese Government is aiding Sinkiang as Russia previously did and is allocating money in order that settlers from other regions of China can start anew without the ravages of war again affecting them. Land, tools, and capital are being provided the peasants, just as the United States allotted land to the homesteaders in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

The Sinkiang supply routes for allied shipping of war materials to China was, until Russia's entry into the Pacific war, the long way around. When American naval power was at a low ebb, the routes through Siberia and India into Sinkiang and then China would have been invaluable if the great powers had agreed upon the quantity to be shipped and the ways of distributing the goods. Now, with our naval power continually increasing, the Burma Road reopened, and our air power growing rapidly, Sinkiang's present importance to the United Nations as a supply route has decreased, but the entry of Russia into the war plus the continued discussions by Molotov and T. V. Soong will undoubtedly make this supply route a valuable one in the final stages of the war in Asia.

At present a revolt is in progress in Sinkiang and has been for sometime. It is a rather difficult situation to really understand but evidently the Chinese provincial forces are having an extremely hard time in stamping it out. At first the White Russians—fairly numerous there—were blamed. Since then the Kazakhs, the Kirghiz, and finally the Soviets have been accused of fomenting strife. The Kazakhs—who seem to be carrying the brunt of the rebellion—are nomadic tribesmen who are hard to combat except with airplanes. There have been many reports of torture connected with the present rebellion and the fact that it has lasted for so many months indicates that Chungking's control is, in reality, very slight. When we compare this with China's status in Outer Monogolia, Tibet, and even some provinces in China proper, we begin to understand the problems confronting China in her endeavor to become a great and united nation. There is so much that is going on in Sinkiang and so much that we do not know—due to strict censorship—that it is hard to get accurate information. On this basis it is quite difficult to draw a really accurate picture of what is happening there. Latest reports indicate the revolution in Sinkiang is still continuing and that the revolutionists have captured several towns—some quite close to Tihwa, and there is some talk that this situation is receiving serious attention in the Soong-Molotov discussions now occurring.

The present revolution has been in progress for the past 2 years. In April 1943 planes with red stars—possibly Outer Mongolian—came in from Outer Mongolia and strafed Chinese fighter planes which were attacking fleeing Kazakhs. The reason for this strafing lay in a protest filed by Outer Mongolia with Sinkiang in which Outer Mongolia stated that Sheng's planes had bombed its territory in their pursuit of the rebellious Kazakhs. Sheng, who had by this time terminated his friendly relations with the U. S. S. R., had dispatched troops and planes against the Kazakhs with no protest from the Soviet mission in Sinkiang then on the verge of leaving that country and returning to the U. S. S. R. However, the Mongol air force,

which uses the red star on its planes, was able to force the troops of Sheng back into Sinkiang.

During the spring of 1944 a truce was arranged between the opposing factions in Sinkiang so that hostilities could be terminated during the visit of Vice President Henry Wallace to the Outer Dominion. Fighting has, however, continued intermittently since that time.

General Sheng was recalled to Chungking and given the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry until replaced on July 30, 1945. This replacement of General Sheng from the political scene coincided with a rebuke administered by the People's Political Council at Chungking which characterized him as unfit to hold public office. It is quite possible, also, that he was forced out of office because of his quarrels with the U. S. S. R. while governor of Sinkiang, the result of which may have been a serious impediment to Chungking-Moscow relations.

General Sheng was succeeded as civil governor of Sinkiang by Wu Chung-shin, who resigned after a few months. The directing head of affairs in Sinkiang at the present time is Gen. Chu Shao-liang, commander of the Eighth War Zone, with headquarters at Lanchow.

Just what the attitude of Yenan and Moscow is to Sinkiang at present no one knows, but certainly it is to be assumed that on the basis of geographical propinquity and her entry into the war Russia will continue to have a practical interest in what develops there.

Summing up our study of Sinkiang and Outer Mongolia, a contrast in Soviet policy is now apparent. The Russians in Sinkiang aided the Chinese in crushing the separatist insurrection in the 1930's. On the other hand, the Soviets have supported the separatist movement in Outer Mongolia. However, Russian influence in Sinkiang is still very strong. The Russian Turk-Sib railroad, exchanging the wheat of Siberia for the cotton of Central Asia, is a magnet for Sinkiang. In the New Dominion the prices of Russian goods are lower than those of Japanese or Indian goods. Several commercial agreements have presumably been made between Soviet trading units and local administrative authorities. Considerable progress has occurred in Sinkiang. In 1939, 330,000 students were in school, stations to supervise agriculture and animal husbandry had been established, communications had been improved, and mining and industry had been better developed. Although the Russians have aided in the reconstruction of the area, no attempt has been made to communize the province.

In 1943 the Russians withdrew their military forces from Sinkiang. For a number of years they had kept an armored motorized unit in Sinkiang at or near Hami near the eastern border that guards the approach from Kansu. The Russians may have been afraid of a successful Japanese motorized dash through Ningsia and Kansu into Sinkiang, cutting the supply routes from the Soviet Union to China and threatening Chiang Kai-shek from the rear. When the Russians no longer considered the Japanese capable of taking such a bold step, Moscow may have decided to withdraw the Russian forces from Sinkiang. In the same year Governor Sheng Shih-ts'ai of Sinkiang in a visit to Chungking promised complete participation in the war against Japan.

Perhaps some of you are wondering why Sinkiang and Outer Mongolia should be discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States. In my opinion it is a worth-while subject because it gives us a better understanding of the difficulties China has faced in the past and will in the future in becoming a united nation. There is more to China than just the Kuomintang and Communist parties and to know China we must comprehend the difficulties which she faces. This must not be done in too critical a way but rather in a spirit of tolerance and understanding. Furthermore, the supply route—the Northwest Caravan Road—through Sinkiang will become of greater importance as the result of the negotiations carried on between Premier T. V. Soong and Joseph Stalin, which undoubtedly were concerned with the situations in Sinkiang and Outer Mongolia and also by Russia's declaration of war against Japan. It is well to note that during the course of these negotiations Marshal Kharloin Choibalsan, Premier of the Mongolian People's Republic—Outer Mongolia—was called to Moscow where he was met by Molotov and had a personal conference with Stalin. It is safe to assume that he went there on business which the Sino-Russian conferees discussed and that this business centered on the use of his country in the war against Japan. While the questions of Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang are primarily to be settled by Russia and China it is worth remembering that the peace of Asia may be vitally affected by the final results obtained. It is our hope that an amicable agreement has been reached by the two powers concerning the problems affecting both and that this settlement will give to China and Russia the peace and security so necessary to each in that part of the world.

The events of the Second World War have had repercussions in Inner Asia. Soviet interest in Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang in recent years has been greatly influenced by Japanese aggression on the Asiatic mainland. The removal of Japan from the councils of the world powers will leave the future of Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang squarely up to China and the Soviet Union. There is no real reason—strategic, economic, or political—why China and the Soviet Union should not get along in inner Asia.

The next few days will undoubtedly bring forth the results of the Russo-Chinese discussions in Moscow and it is reasonably safe to assume that agreements covering all the territories on the Russian frontier have already been arrived at—at least in principle. With Russia now an active partner of China and the United States in the war against Japan the significance of Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang will be brought more forcefully to our attention.

The National Tribute Grove

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1945

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Nation was recently drawn to the giant redwoods of California when the delegates to the United Nations Conference met in Muir Woods National Monument to pay tribute to the memory of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Again these redwoods have gained widespread attention through the action of the California State Park Commission in establishing a section of these forests as a public park to be known as the National Tribute Grove.

This National Tribute Grove is being preserved to honor the men and women who have served or are serving in the armed forces of the United States in World War II, to those who live as well as those who have given their lives. The Save-the-Redwoods League, the Garden Club of America, and many organizations concerned with perpetuating the beauty and grandeur of those primeval forests are cooperating to establish this grove which will symbolize "the eternal gratitude of the Nation eternally expressed." Citizens throughout the United States are joining with the California Park authorities in assuring the acquisition and preservation of these mighty trees. The forest selected is that of the Mill Creek redwoods, near Crescent City, California, and will be a part of the California State Park System.

When completed by private contributions and State funds the National Tribute Grove will contain more than 5,000 acres of some of the finest redwood forest. Some 1,400 acres, at a cost of $260,000, are yet to be acquired under a purchase agreement with the timber owners. Not only will the grove be a symbol of gratitude to all who served in the armed forces, but there will also be opportunity for contributors to record the names of specific members of these forces in The Golden Book, which is to be a permanent volume enshrined both in Washington, D. C., and in California.

A national committee of sponsors has been formed, with Hon. Joseph C. Grew, of Washington, D. C., as chairman, and Dr. Robert G. Sproul, president of the University of California, as treasurer. The sponsors form a distinguished group, representative of our great Nation.

The trees in the National Tribute Grove are coast redwoods, the Sequoia sempervirens. With the exception of Muir Woods National Monument, near San Francisco, a gift to the Nation by the late William Kent, former member of Congress, the forests of this species are being preserved in a splendid system of State parks. The companion species, the Sequoia gigantea of the Sierra, has been preserved for posterity by the Federal Government in Sequoia, Kings

Canyon, and Yosemite National Parks. These two species of trees are unique—a relic of the virgin forests of a bygone era, now making their last stand on the western edge of the continent. The Sequoia gigantea is the older and more massive; the Sequoia sempervirens is the tallest of all trees.

In the National Tribute Grove forest are hundreds of redwoods which are around 350 feet high. Many are from 12 to 17 feet in diameter, measured 5 feet above the ground. It is known that some are more than 2,000 years old. Many were upstanding young trees at the time of Christ, giants when Columbus came to America. Having survived through the tragic yet hopeful era of World War II, they and their companions of the forest shall continue to thrive, on and on, through the centuries, living monuments of beauty, honoring the members of our armed forces.

Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for years the Roosevelt and democracy haters viciously and unfairly assailed and criticized Russia and Premier Stalin. Within the last 2 years they have especially insinuated that Russia would make a separate peace with Germany; that Russia's refusal to permit the establishment of United States strategic air bases in Russia could only be regarded as unfriendly to the United States; and of late continuous criticism of Russia in not declaring war against Japan.

Ever since 1935 I have urged friendly relations with Russia and opposed any restrictions with respect to the shipping of machinery and supplies to Russia which were purchased and paid for in this country. It was claimed that such shipments would be diverted to Germany. That was especially stressed when Russia, playing for time, entered into a nonaggression treaty with Germany. I then maintained that that action on the part of Russia was done for the same reason that we were obliged, due to our unpreparedness, to ship oil and other materials to Japan as a conciliatory gesture and to delay Japan from declaring war upon the United States perhaps a year or two years before the dastardly Pearl Harbor attack. Russia was in the same state of unpreparedness that we were and especially was her position more dangerous by reason of the fact that if Japan had declared war against her, it would have been necessary for Russia to maintain a war on two fronts. The fact is that by reason of the nonaggression pact with Japan she was able to concentrate her tremendous forces on the eastern front and as subsequent events proved made it possible to hold the German hordes until the American forces were able to invade and establish a western battle front.

I have consistently maintained that individuals, organizations, or the press in the United States should not unfairly or unjustly criticize Russia or Stalin, having the utmost confidence that when the time came Russia would keep faith with the Allied Nations, abrogate its treaty with Japan, and declare war against that country. I have always contended that Russia would not forget Japan's attack upon her without notice in 1904.

Today naturally I am overjoyed that Russia, as I had every reason to believe, due to the understanding it had with our country and Great Britain, would act in good faith and cooperate at the proper time. Her action in declaring war against Japan and her general conduct during the war, and especially during the time of negotiations with our late President Roosevelt and now with President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee, has been such that her bitterest and most vicious critics should be shamed into silence. I feel that they should wholly cease in their unfriendly attacks and admit the error of their ways and manfully admit their wrongful misgivings and charges. Although I have been assailed and criticized for my persistent advocacy that friendly relations with Russia be furthered and maintained, I have never ceased in my efforts in that direction, firmly believing that it would inure to our country's best interests. I am happy in the realization that my confidence was not misdirected.

The information is now forthcoming that long weeks before our use of the atomic bomb, Premier Stalin had given assurances to President Truman that shortly Russia would—and I presume in accordance with the agreement as to date—declare war on Japan and be ready to attack the Japanese.

Russia's great sacrifices and efforts to bring about the defeat of the Nazis and their continuous wholehearted cooperation should, to my mind, silence all those maligners of Russian sincerity. By this time it must be realized and recognized why the Potsdam Conference could not be conducted in open session—why it was necessary and prudent that the negotiations at Potsdam could not be divulged to the press or to the general public; nor can Russia be charged for refusing the American press that freedom in view of the unfriendly attitude and misrepresentation taken by some of those who were so extremely hostile in every conceivable way to Russia and have wilfully and deliberately endeavored to destroy the friendly relationship with our country as well as with Great Britain.

I consider it unfortunate that even now some individuals question Russia's promise of cooperation in asserting that she did not declare war against Japan until the atomic bomb was hurled on Hiroshima. The facts are that she gave assurance months ago and was preparing to attack Japan at the opportune time, having long ago notified Japan that she would not renew the nonaggression pact. Both the American and British military and naval authorities in the Pacific were in contact with the Russian forces and as stated only yesterday by several of our high generals in that fighting zone they knew when the Russian armies would time their attack against the Japanese in Manchuria. Still there are some diehards that try to detract and minimize Russia's action. Do they not realize that within a few hours of the declaration of war the Russian armies started to penetrate Manchuria. Is that not proof that they were preparing months ago to join with the United States and Great Britain in fighting our enemy? Any sane or fair-minded person will acknowledge that the drives of the Russian armies in several sectors required a long-planned scale of operations and the fact that the penetrations in enemy territory have ranged from 25 to 105 miles shows the magnitude of the preparations, which must have taken months, to bring about that favorable result.

The atomic bomb and the declaration of war by Russia will be the death knell of Japan and should bring about the friendly cooperation of all nations, that freedom and contentment will be enjoyed by the people not only in our country but throughout the nations of the world, and that real democracy will be adopted and prevail in all countries.

The Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren on the reorganization bill before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, September 5, 1945:

Gentlemen of the committee, I want to make clear at the outset that I strongly favor and recommend legislation such as that you are now considering. When I say so I speak not only as the Comptroller General, the servant and adviser of Congress, but also personally and as a one-time Member of the House. The last general reorganization bill (aside from the present War Powers Act) came out in 1939, after nearly 2 years of hard work and long study by the Congress. I am happy to recall that through the courtesy of Chairman JOHN COCHRAN I was in charge of that part of the original bill which became the Reorganization Act. If I may say so, I think that legislation was a creditable piece of work; what I would like to say now is that another act, reviving that same authority, with certain changes is even more necessary than ever before.

First. You need, I am sure, no blueprint of reasons calling for some reorganizing to be undertaken by somebody. Every President since the turn of the century has advocated it strongly. Generally it has been approached with a bipartisan fairness, supported on both sides of the aisle. Substantially this same bill became law in 1932 and again in 1939. The late President told us in

1937 that the Government had become a higgledy-piggledy patchwork, and you need only leaf through the current appropriation acts to see that, sadly enough, it still is true. The former Reorganization Act had been law only a few months when the emergency was declared arising from the outbreak of World War II. That was 6 years ago, almost to the day. The impossibly complex nature of total war has pushed us into new activities—and thus a hodge-podge of new agencies was required. By the same token, other agencies have acquired new functions while the reorganizing and realining of old ones largely had to be postponed. But now, the fighting is over. The Government that ballooned out must now deflate. When "the tumult and the shouting dies, the captains and the kings depart." Never could there be a better time, while getting rid entirely of the clearly temporary war agencies, to study, too, each and every other activity which can claim some basis for permanent existence and fit it into the peacetime groove where it can operate most efficiently. An unsegregated, sprawling crop of Government functions and functionaries cannot hope to operate efficiently or to do well the job the taxpayers are paying for unless someone can assume the burden of putting like functions together, to make only one or two grow where dozens grew before.

Second. The specific job to be done.

I want strongly to emphasize that what is said here consists of suggestions only as to where duplications may exist and I do not intend to critize the organizations now existing or to announce a conclusion that any particular permanent organization should be abolished until there has been completed a thorough and detached study of what it does, how it does it, and why. But when it is evident that two or a dozen separate undertakings involve the same general results it is time to pause and inquire whether one of them could not do the whole job better and, inevitably, with a saving of money. Studies of that character can always be undertaken, for example, the President always has such authority; what is needed now is a legislative direction that such studies be made and that firm and definite and complete action be taken to achieve results.

When the previous bill was before you in 1939 Senator BYRD found the following patent examples of overlapping and duplication:

	Number of agencies
Lending Government funds	29
Insuring deposits and loans	3
Acquisition of land	34
Wildlife preservation	16
Government construction	10
Credit and finance	9
Home and community planning	12
Materials of construction	10

And others. To which I added four more—

	Number of agencies
Welfare matters	28
Forestry matters	14
Examination of banks	4
Gathering statistics	65

A great deal was accomplished in the five reorganization plans adopted in 1939 and 1940, and some temporary changes have been made under the First War Powers Act. But after only a brief and cursory survey, I can say an infinitely bigger job remains.

I give you the following as illustrative of the fields requiring study. These are only a few—they merely example, they do not pretend to list the inquiries the President could profitably and effectively undertake under this bill.

Take, first, the transportation field. Seventy-five bureaus, divisions, and agencies of this Government—not seven, I say, but 75—have an important connection with that business. In the last dozen years there have been at least nine important committees appointed to recommend policies and outline action to solve the transportation puzzle. Almost as important to the Treasury is the lack of coordination and efficiency in the Government's role as a shipper and customer of the carriers, for we paid last year for transportation alone nearly as much as it cost to run the whole Government 30 years ago. Some businesslike centralization in our dealings with carriers is called for if we are going to demand fair rates and charges for the Government's business.

PUBLIC HOUSING

For some time whenever anyone is talking about reorganization, it has been customary to point the finger first at Public Housing. In fact, it was not long ago at a hearing before one of the committees of the Senate that the question was asked in all seriousness whether anyone had taken a census lately of the agencies dealing in public housing, or could anyone give an estimate in round numbers. Since then the National Housing Agency has been formed with the purpose of gathering in most of that line of activity, but the organization was formed under the authority of the First War Powers Act, and unless something is done along the lines of the suggested legislation, everything will go back again 6 months after the war. The Administrator himself has said very frankly that their emphasis so far has had to be the working out of the war program rather than the consolidation of functions, and he has himself reported that housing projects financed in whole or in part by Federal funds have been developed by at least 15 agencies.

LABOR

You need no bill of particulars from me to show that the field of labor relations is spread around the Government without rhyme or reason. I have a list of eight departments and agencies having a direct bearing in that field. Certainly this is a field for study under any reorganizing authority. It is reported that some efforts along that line already are under way, but nothing of real value and permanence can be accomplished unless we have a law such as here suggested to make it effective.

FEDERAL LANDS

The Congress has been told that one-fifth of the entire land area of the United States is owned by the Government, but nowhere is there a central record inventorying this enormous resource. New lands are bought by some departments while other lands are declared surplus by others or lie unused. The administration of the vast areas requires the conflicting and overlapping services of nearly a dozen bureaus and several departments. I mention it especially because it was the subject of a study and report submitted by me to the Congress 2 years ago, and it serves now as an illustration of the real need of legislation such as this since, so far as I have learned, no action has been taken either to carry out the suggestions made in that report or to adopt other suggestions or to reject them entirely. If we have in mind economy, let us not overlook this obvious example, right here at home, that costly studies and investigations come to naught because there is no practical machinery to put them into effect.

PUBLIC WELFARE

A great deal has been done to coordinate public-welfare activities in the Federal Security Agency but there are still other similar activities to be considered in any reorganization study. For example, there are eight bureaus and agencies concerned in the field of vocational rehabilitation and education, half a dozen at least working on nutrition programs and research in that field, and three or four having a function of greater or lesser importance in connection with juvenile delinquency. In the matter of aid to the States for the care of dependent children, there is, on the surface at least, a rather obvious conflict between the functions of the Department of Labor, Children's Bureau, and of the Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board's Bureau of Public Assistance, not to mention in this connection child-care programs of the Federal Works Agency, Bureau of Community Facilities. Also, in the field of venereal disease prevention or treatment, the appropriations committee recently observed a useless spread of authority, some, but not all, of which later was corrected.

Now to mention a few other subject matters rather briefly:

Take the field of customs dutics. I had always supposed that the Bureau of Customs was the place to go to get a customs refund or to claim a drawback, but I found at least two Government corporations, Commodity Credit and the former Defense Supplies Corporation, doing a thriving customs business, collecting duties, liquidating refunds due, and accepting claims for drawbacks.

Let us mention briefly the subject of retirement of Government employees. We all know there is a retirement act and we would suppose that the Civil Service Commission administers retirement. But, in fact, there are at least a dozen Federal retirement systems, each with its own rules, authorities, and funds and what-not.

Turning, next, to a recent report on the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad, did you know, for example, that you, as the Congress of the United States, are responsible for establishing and running an ordinary commercial hotel in one of our sister republics of the Western Hemisphere? While nominally under the Canal administration, it is administered by the Panama Railroad, an affiliated Government-owned corporation which still is not required to come before this or any other congressional committee for a review or approval of its budget and operating programs, which in fact are so widespread as to take in an unimaginable list of different functions.

In the field of Indian affairs the reports of the last 2 years of the Senate subcommittee are enough to demand that we pause and inquire whether we are justified in spending nearly three times as much each year in the care of the Indians as we appropriated 20 years ago and whether we are justified in having the Office of Indian Affairs handle every variety of project, such as education, hospitalization, forestry, agriculture, and others, instead of turning such works over to the bureaus normally specializing therein.

Merely as an example of the care that is needed one can refer to the work being done both by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor and by the Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, in compiling necessary statistical data on the economic facts concerning the working population of the United States. A recent bulletin of the Department of Labor describes the activities of both agencies to some extent, but points out a basic difference in the source of material investigated—the one collects information from the individuals constituting the labor force, the other (B. L. S.) collects the data from the employers. On its face that establishes a situation requiring study as to whether both approaches are needed, as to whether one source could not more economically and just as effectively provide all the necessary data, and, if so found, to take action accordingly.

As I have said, these are only a few examples of the field for study—all of us know that there is a wide and fertile field for reorganizational studies throughout the Government.

That is why I say the Government should, at the outset, as a necessary and essential part of the reconversion program, put its own house in order.

That is why I say the present set-up is a hodge-podge and crazy-quilt of duplications,

overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with their attendant extravagance. It is probably an ideal system for the tax eaters and those who wish to keep themselves perpetually attached to the public teat, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill.

Third. How shall the job be done?

I would like to think Congress could do this job. No man believes in the legislative process more than I do. During most of my public life, both in North Carolina and in the National Capital, I have been a Member of the legislative branch. Even now, although heading a great agency, it is an agency of the Congress, and I am an agent of the Congress.

In fact, it is to the reports of Congress itself to which I turn for evidence that the task is not one which the members should be expected to accomplish without aid. Here is what a House committee said:

"The committee soon found that, without a total abandonment of their other representative duties, it would be impossible during the present session to examine all the departments in a satisfactory manner. * * * The public interest demands a rigid and more general investigation. * * * Economy does not consist in withholding supplies which the public safety demands, but in limiting the appropriation of public money to proper objects, and in insuring that it is disbursed with fidelity."

That was not not from the reports that came with the 1939 act, or the 1932 act, or any of the many other reports in the last 100 years. It was from a select committee named in 1841 to work out a means of reducing the civil list, either by rearrangement of duties or otherwise. After 11 months of hard work the committee reported what I have just read—that they could not complete a satisfactory examination. And believe it or not, they estimated the whole departmental force employed in the capital as around 600 persons—hardly more than a respectable section of a single division of a single bureau of a single department today!

Coming down to our own times, the real, practical reason for accomplishing this business by means of the aid of the President, subject to Congressional review, was expressed by Senator, now Secretary Byrnes, speaking in favor of the bill that became law in 1939, and describing why this method had been adopted in the 1932 act. This is what he said:

"I have yet to talk with reference to reorganization to one man in the Government service who did not make this answer: 'Of course, it should be done. I know it should be done, but'—and then, when he joins the great old order of 'butters,' you will find that he says, 'but do not touch my department.' He is in favor of reorganization, 'but do not touch my department; do not touch my bureau; do not touch my division.' If there is the slightest chance that it will be touched you have a strenuously active man, you have an efficient man, opposing it, for when we talk about the lobbyists who come to Washington and go before the departments we must remember that the man in the department has the advantage of seeing all these lobbyists and he adopts the most improved method. He is the best of all of them. He profits by experience. As a result we determined that there was no way to accomplish reorganization except to give to the President the power."

Finally, may I reiterate here my own statement on the same bill made on the floor of the House in 1937:

"The House committee knew that it could consider this matter from now until doomsday with all of its various ramifications, and that we would inevitably come back to the proposition presented to you in the bill now under consideration. We know from past experience, indeed from sad experience here in this body, that the Congress will never of its own accord and of its own initiative reorganize the Government of the Nation. Time after time it has been tried, and time after time it has met with failure. Every agency down the street will say that there ought to be a reorganization, but every agency will immediately step up and say, 'It is good for the other fellow but not for us.' "

Upon that point, right now let me say this: My own agency, the General Accounting Office, is exempted by the terms of the pending bill not because it is sacrosanct or any more angelic than the rest, but in recognition that it is the creature and agent of Congress. I would invite—not oppose—any studies and legislation undertaken by the Congress looking toward improvement of the General Accounting Office. Any time it cannot justify its worth by its accomplishments in the opinion of Congress it ought to be abolished or drastically changed.

Aside from those considerations is it not clear that the President is in the best position to have the over-all picture of the Government and its ramifications that is really needed? If it be called a delegation of power, I call to attention that for some years now the power to establish new agencies has been delegated from time to time—what is here proposed is the power to abolish and get rid of those whose time of useful life has passed. But when you consider the two great safeguards in the bill—and a third which I will suggest—it is not such a great delegation after all.

The first and greatest safeguard lies in the congressional review and veto provided by section 6. I believe, and have suggested in my letter of June 13 to your committee, that the section should be changed to call for a concurrent resolution of disapproval by both Houses of Congress, and in either case I urge the adoption of the cloture provisions which were tested and worked out to perfection in 1939. Certainly, no legislative powers can be said to have been abdicated when the two legislative bodies reserve to themselves alone the plenary power to stay the effect of any proposal.

The second safeguard is the careful list of limitations, restrictions, and exemptions in section 4, which prevent, for example, the abolition of any entire executive department or the creation of a new one. The matter of exemptions, if any, to be specified is a real problem. I believe in a reasonable concentration under heads responsible to the Executive, who can hold them strictly accountable. Exemptions, of course, are a matter of policy for the Congress to determine, but any wholesale exemptions from the provisions of the bill will make any real reorganization ineffective.

The third safeguard lies in the very carefully drawn set of legislative purposes and standards and the requirement of a definite finding that a proposed plan will carry out one or more of those standards.

The fourth safeguard is the one I suggested in my written report to this committee. The present bill is set up as a permanent law, and might even be used to abolish an agency created hereafter by Congress. In that report I said:

"This might be objectionable in some quarters on the ground that the grant of authority should be limited to the term of an Executive already in office as to whom the Congress would have an opportunity to consider how he might exercise the authority, and should not be extended as permanent legislation to future Presidents to some of whom Congress might not be willing to extend such authority."

Indeed, I think this feature of the bill is objectionable, and I add the further thought that it may be advisable for subsequent Executives to come to Congress for similar grants of authority.

In summary, Congress just cannot be expected to like to do such an unpleasant job, and it is, perhaps, an unfair burden to be thrust upon the individual members of any committee. Rather, Congress can give the taxpayers their first break in a long time by giving the President the authority he asks for.

As to amendments, there are a few other suggestions not so controversial in nature, which I hope you will have opportunity to consider when you take up the report I sent you on the bill on June 13. But there is one suggestion I would like to make to you as strongly as I can. The bill should provide for abolition of functions, not just their transfer. Only that will make real economy. We ought to have a survey—and who can make it better than the President—to determine just what bureaus or agencies are either worthless, outmoded, or could be discontinued with no injurious effect. Certainly, all of us know of some who have no earthly reason for further existence. Any bureau can put up a case, at least to suit itself, why it should be retained. Congress can set up a bureau for the edification of the Three Blind Mice or for the rehabilitation of Humpty Dumpty, and within a year those who head them can come in with glowing accounts of their work.

I don't advocate abolition of anything that is proper or necessary, although with a $300,000,000,000 debt I hope I am not to be considered as too old-fashioned if I say it is time we draw in our belts; to see that the Government at least gets value for its huge expenditures, and to weed out inefficiencies and hold those in charge with a responsibility that cannot be dodged or evaded.

Finally—and here is where I start on the unpleasant things—already the whispering campaign is on against this bill. I fully recognize the right of any agency head to oppose this measure, but is it too much to hope that those who eat the bread of public office through appointment by the President or hold office by his sufferance should come before this commitee and express their views rather than try to scuttle it with whispers, to undermine it while giving no opportunity to answer?

You will hear all sorts of far-fetched rumors of the transfer of this or that important function or of some other getting the knife. Arguments by what I call the method of imaginary horribles. Nobody is going to abolish the veterans' facilities established to care for him who has "borne the brunt of the battle." What we must be after is this monstrous Frankenstein, created under the name of bureaucracy or anything else you please, but already in some instances becoming bigger than Congress, its creator.

As I testified a few months ago, at times it arrogantly snaps its fingers in the face of Congress and openly defies it. And a real test will arise when agencies that are not one whit quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial, but belong only under the President, come seeking and demanding an exemption from this very bill. I say we should return to the ideals of Jefferson, who had this to say about a reorganization plan away back in 1802:

"Our predecessors have endeavored by intricacies of system and shuffling the investigator over from one officer to another, to cover everything from detection. I hope we shall go in the contrary direction, and that by our honest and judicious reformations, we may be able, within the limits of our time, to bring things back to that simple and intelligible system on which they should have been organized at first.

"Let us deserve well of our country by making her interests the end of all our plans and not our own pomp, patronage, and irresponsibility."

I have said nothing about the war agencies because, as you know, a great deal is already being done toward liquidating them. Here and there some isolated activity or branch may require continuation for a time; this bill would help to transfer such activity to the organization where it will operate best. As to the rest, their job is done. Before

somebody starts seeking an excuse to make them permanent, they should be wound up quickly. We should adopt the auctioneer's chant "going, going, gone."

But the real need for this bill is to revise the set-up of permanent agencies. I hope you will give the President a chance to do the job. I am confident he will do it thoroughly and fearlessly.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address I made Tuesday night, September 4, 1945, at 10:30 p. m. over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System:

Good evening everybody, I hope you all are as comfortable as we are here in Washington today, while we proceed to discuss this warmly debated proposal to increase pay for the unemployed.

It isn't such a deep or complicated subject. But it is important particularly to two groups of citizens—the taxpayers who must pay for it and the prospective unemployed who might benefit from it.

Let's clear the decks a little. We all know that unemployment insurance is not new. All States have such insurance in operation. The new proposals are not the beginning; they seek to increase unemployed pay to a national level of $25 weekly. Let's not get involved now with the additional proposals tacked onto the bill giving other benefits such as funds to transport war workers to new locations and to greatly expand social security. Let's talk simply to the point of increased unemployment pay by the Federal Government.

We most sincerely urge your suggestions in this matter, and these should be made promptly because the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, are at this time conducting hearings on the proposals. The show-down of votes in Congress may not be far distant.

Those who favor increased unemployment pay are contending—

1. That the State unemployment benefits now in effect are insufficient in the amount of pay and in the number of weeks of unemployment pay allowed.

2. That the Nation faces large scale unemployment.

3. That higher unemployment compensation will bolster purchasing power and invigorate the national economy.

Those who question the advisability of this legislation are raising these points—

1. That if the Federal Government undertakes to contribute to State unemployment, it will insist on the direction and control of the State agencies and will deprive the States of control over the local situation.

2. That the States themselves are better judges of the wage structure and unemployment needs in localities than are the bureaus in Washington. In other words, will it be possible to apply unemployment benefits fairly on a national scale. Does $25 buy the same amount of groceries and rent for the unemployed in every locality? Again, should the apple growers of Oregon pay higher taxes if South Carolina's mills quit producing—or vice versa?

3. That any Federal payments would have to be made from a treasury already overloaded by a prospective $300,000,000,000 Federal debt. Wouldn't it be wiser to leave unemployment problems to the States, which have accumulated a reserve of $7,000,000,000 for unemployment insurance?

On these points, the whole issue over increased unemployment pay appears to be resolved.

If, as we are told, we are facing temporary unemployment for millions until war plants become peace plants, then it is no time to become panicky and thoughtlessly jeopardize our financial strength. And it certainly is no time for defeatism which admits we can't make democracy work.

It is indeed a critical moment to be charting the nation's financial course, and it demands, in all patriotism, the most sober calculations.

So, let's consider the bill from the standpoint of the unemployed. We should be deeply concerned with the problems of unemployment and the dislocations of labor, and I think we all are agreed that some agency must provide assistance to relieve hardships.

What does this unemployment increase provide?

It does not increase all unemployment compensation to $25 weekly, though this misconception is widespread.

Actually, only a portion of displaced workers would receive increases.

Perhaps it is not so well understood that these unemployment benefits will be distributed under the State laws, and the State laws are quite variable.

For instance, in the majority of the States, the unemployed worker is allowed one-half of the basic wage he drew when on the job—up to $20 a week maximum or more. Thus, if his wage was $20 a week, his unemployment pay would be $10 a week. He wouldn't get any $25 a week, or any increase at all under the must provisions of the new unemployment bill.

In order to get the $25 a week in a majority of the States, this unemployed worker must have been displaced from a job paying twice that amount—$50 or more per week.

Thus, it is obvious that those who would benefit most from this bill are the displaced war workers who had the previous benefit of extremely high wages.

What if Congress doesn't enact any increase—what will happen?

The States will operate under their current provisions for unemployment. This means that 90 percent of all workers now covered by unemployment insurance could get $18 a week or more. That is the law in 38 States. That 80 percent of them could receive these benefits for a maximum of 20 weeks. That's the law in 33 States.

In this respect, too, the war worker will be favored. The anticipated unemployment from closed war plants will be generally in States where maximum benefits for a maximum number of weeks are provided.

In my own State of Kansas, the legislature this year increased maximum payments by one-third, and at the same time extended the duration of payments from 16 to 20 weeks.

And if you will pardon another personal illustration, I should like to ask in all fairness: Who is better able to determine the unemployment needs of Kansas than a legislature composed of elected representatives of the people of Kansas?

If this is true of Kansas, isn't it true of Maine and Michigan, New York and Iowa?

Aren't we playing with an economic atom bomb if we standardize benefits without regard to wages or living costs?

Why can't we plan for employment instead of unemployment? With deep anxiety for the welfare of the Nation, let's have a plan for expediting reconversion rather than an attempt to subsidize unemployment.

The worker wants a job. The war-weakened Nation needs his production and the moral fiber of a working, independent people. Any other attitude on the part of the Federal Government seems pure defeatism and endless debt.

I contend that the several States are better informed and incomparably better able financially than the Federal Government to increase unemployment benefits if they find it necessary. Kansas did.

How would increased benefits affect the labor markets?

The expansion of war industries drew workers from rural areas, others not normally employed, others came from home duties and retirement.

The displaced worker from the farm, the housewife, or the aging or the handicapped cannot reasonably expect to find reemployment at wartime wages. Adjustment to new wage scales must be anticipated, but their unemployment compensation rates and duration of payments will be based on high earning levels of wartime.

Suppose more unemployment pay for a longer period of time is voted by Congress. The obvious result will be to delay the readjustment and the resumption of useful employment of displaced workers.

This is particularly true of the workers recruited from rural areas. The farm hand back in Kansas won't find the same pay he got for building planes in California. But he can't be blamed for trying, and as long as the money lasts, he'll try.

But the rural areas need the help of those who have left, and here is one place we might hope to take up slack in unemployment. If unemployment compensation benefits are too high in relation to peacetime wage levels, the adjustment of surplus labor will be delayed in every rural State of the Nation. Don't forget, the world needs food.

What will be the cost of the increased unemployment pay to the Federal Treasury? The New Deal sponsors of these proposals admit that they would cost upward of two billion dollars.

Any cost, of course, is a cost to you as a taxpayer—it buys no production, since it is for unemployment. Shouldn't we then seriously search for a way to spend these sums, if they must be spent, in other ways? Shouldn't we take into consideration the substantial benefits for unemployment already afforded by the States?

The $7,000,000,000 in State treasuries, which is ready to help the unemployed over the trying hurdle of reconversion and readjustment of personal lives, has already been collected from a combined Federal and State tax on payrolls.

In the aggregate, this is a 3-percent tax, and is paid by the employer; 10 percent of this tax is earmarked for administration and 90 percent into the trust fund for payment of jobless benefits under State supervision.

Every State fund is solvent. Every fund is large enough to care for any demand that could possibly be made for unemployment insurance. Congress has approved legislation which would give temporary backing to State unemployment trust funds if they become overburdened. Every worker is assured that his unemployment is "as good as the Government."

Now if Congress increases the benefits, it will be necessary to raise the necessary funds through Federal taxation or the sale of bonds.

The Treasury already is about $300,000,000,000 in the red. Don't minimize the amount of that debt, Mr. Citizen. Don't scoff and say: "They told us for years we couldn't have a debt that big; but look at us."

Every citizen should know that this Nation hasn't actually carried any debt since 1930. You are not carrying your debts so long as you are creating bigger ones.

The increasing of unemployment pay means either more taxes or more debt in the form of more Government bond sales. Treas-

ury officials are planning a victory bond drive for next November. What a hollow victory program for a victorious nation and its victorious veterans in being asked to furnish money for an expanded unemployment benefit program.

Are we going to be asked to buy unemployment bonds when the States already have the funds and are satisfactorily operating unemployment agencies?

Let's consider what will be the future of State unemployment insurance if the Federal Government steps into the picture. Last year most State legislatures increased unemployment benefits, and the increases were based on high, wartime wage scales. There is every indication that the States will keep pace with any trend of higher wage levels. After all, the State is much more sensitive to its needs and is more quick to react to them than the Federal Government. The entry of the Federal Government into this matter would destroy the insurance feature of State laws and make it a relief program.

But why should any State be interested in protecting the welfare of its citizens if the Federal Government insists on handing them a dole? This policy will discourage further action on the part of the States.

It is only logical to expect the Federal Government to assume direction and control of every State unemployment agency if it makes direct contributions to State unemployment funds.

Surely we have given up the once fashionable belief that Federal control is the cheapest and most efficient solution to any problem, and that in some mysterious way Federal spending doesn't cost anybody anything.

As we have painfully discovered during the era of rigid wartime Government controls, the bureaucratic direction from Washington is so remote as to be almost indifferent and unresponsible.

So far I have discussed benefits for workers already covered under State laws. The forgotten workers are those Federal employees in shipyards, arsenals, and on the ships at sea who are now excluded. I will look with favor in this emergency to the extension of benefits to these groups on a basis comparable with State laws. It is my hope that Congress will in the near future give further study to proposals for extended coverage as proposed elsewhere in pending bills and for which there is no pressing need.

Now, what shall we do with this No. 1 problem of the reconversion—a problem I prefer to call the employment program:

1. The Federal responsibility should be to establish an atmosphere of encouragement to labor, business, and agriculture. Let's have a speedy adjustment of war tax rates and other financial burdens which are hindering the operation of individual investments and many types of expansion. This is the only way to a productive progress. The farmer doesn't plan on crop failures; the businessman doesn't plan for bankruptcy, and the worker doesn't plan on idleness.

2. Let us give free rein to our traditional aggressiveness in the American economy and build our future on a speedy reconversion and the rapid expansion of pay rolls. Give the responsibility of reemployment to employers. There never were so many consumers waiting for the products of farm and factory. American business has a responsibility to both the job holder and the consumer. Let's give business all the responsibility the market will bear.

3. From the little chicken ranches on the coasts and in urban centers, to the big open spaces out West, you will find agriculture ready to absorb great numbers of returning veterans and war workers. The world and they that dwell therein must eat and be clothed. The destitute, war-torn nations appeal to us. Never has the farm looked more inviting. There are more gadgets and machinery for the fuller, abundant life on a farm today than ever graced a B–29. Heating and lighting of farm homes; frozen lockers, power machinery, fertilizers and seeds which do miracles, processes and patents, techniques in livestock raising and poultry raising—all are waiting for the return of peaceful living.

4. The workingman should not be stampeded into accepting a Federal dole as the substitute for a sound program of good jobs and high wages. He has much more interest in a job program than in unemployment benefits. In one way or another, the workingman takes from his own pockets every dollar the Government spends. It may be direct taxation, it may be the purchase of bonds, it may be, negatively, the loss of a job or of increased pay because of restrictions on his production. I am sure those who continue employed will give their idle brothers more real help with a minimum of waste and abuse through State-administered unemployment funds.

We all want to see every idle man and woman who really wants a job given all the help we can give them. My position, and I hope it is clear, is that we can give our jobless the best help by promoting jobs. This can come through a coordinated effort of labor, business, agriculture, and Government.

And thus I contend we must avoid setting up a temporary Federal program which will impair, rather than aid, reemployment.

State trust funds are bulging with billions for unemployment. To me it seems a folly to further risk the burdened Nation's credit by additional borrowing or taxation to the delay of reemployment.

The States can administer unemployment pay most fairly; federally, justice would be impossible.

I do not agree with the unemployment compensation bill either in principle or philosophy. Government is not perpetual motion, hoisting itself by its own shoe strings.

Labor Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on Labor Day at Shrewsbury, Mass., at the outing of the Worcester County Industrial Council of the CIO:

Fellow Americans, it is a high honor and genuine pleasure for me to join with the members of this great and militant organization of the CIO in celebrating Labor Day. First, let me congratulate your officers upon the excellent arrangements for this outstanding meeting and let me also congratulate and thank each and everyone here present for your attendance by which you are giving evidence of your true devotion to the cause of labor than which there is none greater, none more noble or more worthy in the Nation.

It is always most appropriate for Americans to pause on this great day every year which is especially dedicated by law and respected custom to recognizing the achievements of working men and women. This year our commemoration holds an even deeper significance than usual. For at last after months and months of deeper anxiety than our Nation has ever known, after pain and toil and sacrifice and bloodshed, after heroic deeds by our beloved sons that have never been excelled, after unsurpassed loyalty and striving on the part of all our people, we have finally arrived at the long-awaited and cherished goal of victory. We have finally recorded another glorious chapter to the history of our beloved country.

It is most befitting today, as we commemorate Labor's historic traditional day, that the whole American people, thankful for the gallantry of our noble sons, should particularly recognize that in the titanic struggle of arms and resources that we have just brought to a victorious conclusion, in the very vanguard of those whose faith and devotion made victory possible, stood the millions of patriotic, industrious, and self-sacrificing laboring people of the country whose mighty contributions played such a vital part in the final result.

As we express our unbounded appreciation for the united efforts of our gallant boys, our workers, our managers, our farmers, our scientists, indeed all the great masses of our people, we should recall with special pride and gratitude the unstinted labors of the army of the home front who throughout the greatest war of history rendered such conspicuous service to the perpetuity of our American Nation and our American institutions, because it is a fact that without the loyal cooperation and mighty contributions of those who forged the weapons and sinews of war in the factories, shops, and farms of America, we never should have been able to bring our tyrannical enemies to complete and unconditional surrender.

I think I know something of the temper of our people and I am very confident that they have nothing but feelings of deepest gratitude and appreciation, I repeat, for the magnificent contribution of labor to our common war effort. Our achievements, your achievements, during the war have demonstrated more vividly than words ever could the mighty power of inspired free men and women and inspired brave men and women once they marshal their energies to preserve and protect the cherished institutions of democracy, freedom, and justice under which they live.

Hail to American labor. Hail to the millions of men and women throughout the length and breadth of the land, both organized and unorganized, who so loyally stood by their country in the hour of its greatest peril and gave the world, and especially our ruthless enemies, such a stirring example of the mght and strength of a free people mobilized for war.

Now that we have won the war, let us win the peace. There will be difficult problems ahead but surely none that the intelligence, resourcefulness, skill, and determination of our statesmen and our people cannot solve. During the war we have enjoyed full employment and high standards and there is no reason on earth why we cannot enjoy full employment and high standards in the years of peace. We live in the greatest country on earth. It is a country of power and abundance and wealth and capacity for doing great things. There must and will be work, high wages, reasonable hours, and decent conditions for all who are willing and able to work. There must be opportunities for advancement for even the humblest worker because that is what we mean by freedom of opportunity and free enterprise. There must be adequate security safeguards in old age and sickness, in mishap and accident for the veterans of American industry, in a sense, just as we provide these safeguards for our fighting men. The health of all our people must be protected and improved and every man, woman, and child who lives under the Government of the United States must be accorded the opportunity to work out his or her destiny under our free way of life and under decent

standards of comfort and well-being. The door of American opportunity must be kept open for all those who are willing to strive and aspire to education and self-advancement. There is no reason whatever why we cannot apply some of the same energy, vigor, and resolution to the problems of social betterment that we have so wholeheartedly devoted to the winning of the war. We must and will do it in the name of humanity and justice.

Labor must be secure not only in the advances that it has made in the past, but it must be militantly protected against the aims of reactionaries, Fascists, Communists, and other un-American groups who seek to undermine its high standards or regiment it into radical, bureaucratically controlled bondage. One of the first things we must do in the immediate days ahead is to insure that American labor is to continue to be free and unfettered either from the attacks of selfish special interests, or the restraints of an arbitrary and undemocratic economic superstate. We must translate into actuality in peacetime the freedom, individual dignity, and democratic rights and privileges which we have fought for so valiantly in war, and we must never permit the advocates of radical social change to lure us away by false promises, by subtle infiltration, or by any other means from the established paths of democracy and free enterprise by which our Nation has come to a power, prosperity, and happiness never equalled in the history of all mankind.

As we acknowledge the mighty contributions of labor in peace and in war, as we pay our humble tribute to those who have labored long and faithfully to make and keep this country what it is, we must resolve at any cost to retain the dignity, the freedom, the high standards, and the opportunities of all our workers and all our people. Let us turn our eyes toward the future with confidence that we can and will continue to progress along sound lines in order that free American labor, the finest, the best, and the most productive in all the world will be given its full measure of recognition and remuneration.

Let us strive for a dynamic expanding economy that will spread prosperity, abundance, health, and happiness throughout the whole Nation. Let us drive out the apostles of doubt and cynicism. Let us banish fear and apprehension. Let us repudiate racial and religious prejudice which casts a stigma upon true Americanism. In short, let us tackle the problems of peace with full assurance that we intend to have and will have under democracy and free enterprise an industrial system and an economy that will adequately fulfill the social needs of every worthy person who lives under the American flag.

As labor achieves these rights, these privileges, these higher standards of living and opportunity which social justice dictates, I have every expectation that the leadership of labor will assume its full share of responsibility for preventing social disorder and promoting the public good. Every right carries with it a corresponding duty and I declare the faith that in the days ahead, the laboring classes and labor leadership of this country will be true to the best traditions of the past and strive to uphold our Government and our business system and repudiate those who would discard and destroy the governmental and economic instrumentalities and patterns that have made our Nation great.

Our people are war-tired and anxious to resume the ways of peace. But before we can do this completely, we must make sure that our enemies are demilitarized. We must make sure that they will not be able to wage war again, and we must be ready to join, whenever it is necessary, with other peace-loving nations of the world to suppress greedy, power-crazed despots whenever they appear who would, in the name of tyrannical political cults, enslave other nations and destroy our civilization.

We must have in mind that future wars will be fought in the scientific laboratories as well as on land, on sea, and in the air. They will be fought with weapons and devices so horrible and terrifying as to escape the imagination and may commence with the speed of lightning. If continued for long, future wars will lay the whole structure of civilization in ruins and shambles. Realism compels that we recognize these potentialities and give our full efforts to preventing those frictions and misunderstandings which produce war.

We must never abandon the cause of small, weak nations seeking to regain or achieve their freedom, because history conclusively proves that tyranny by the strong over the weak inevitably breeds war.

To implement and expedite reconversion and full employment as a national policy, we should as soon as practicable suspend the Selective Service System and stop the drafting of our young men. We have over 11,000,000 men under arms, and since we do not desire or intend to have a militaristic or imperialistic government, it is clear that out of this large force we can provide adequate armies of occupation to collaborate with our allies in demilitarizing our recent enemies and thus permit release of long-service veterans.

As soon as it possibly can be arranged, these occupational forces should be comprised of members of the Regular Army and Navy, and all the rest of our boys by the millions, wherever they are situated throughout the world, should be returned to their homes and families to resume their civilian careers of education or constructive peacetime employment. In my opinion, this program of suspending the Selective Service System and returning our boys to their homes as soon as is reasonably consistent with the needs of our armies of occupation and the national interest can and should be instituted at a very early date.

The Congress should also move at once, in conjunction with the President, to pass a concurrent resolution by law declaring the war to be at an end and abrogating the emergency wartime powers that have been conferred upon the executive branch of the Government, thus reestablishing our constitutional system.

We can never adequately thank those who gave their lives, spilled their blood, and offered their all to America. To our gallant fighting forces we have greatest obligations of gratitude that no material reward could ever measure. But we can and must make sure that the wounded and disabled are properly cared for and their returning comrades are given every aid, assistance, and consideration which a truly grateful nation can bestow.

If these things are done and done promptly, as promptly as may be—and I believe an overwhelming portion of the American people want them to be done—we can start with fullest vigor to tackle and solve the problems of peace. With our great Government restored to its constitutional balance, with our loyal people relieved of the annoyances and evils of wartime bureaucracy, with our gallant boys returned to their homes we can march forward with confidence and faith that liberal leadership and progressive policies, which we will insist upon, will lead us with relative rapidity into an era of domestic tranquillity, full employment, prosperity, opportunity, happiness, and freedom for all our American people.

Hail again on this hallowed day to the great and noble laboring classes of our Nation who have built it, who have fought for it, and who will preserve it under God to the end of time.

Labor Day Address of President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of participating in the memorial services held on Labor Day for Peter J. McGuire, the father of Labor Day, at his grave in Arlington Cemetery, Camden, N. J. President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, delivered his annual Labor Day address as part of these exercises. It was a splendid address, and under the unanimous consent which I have received, I am presenting it for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope every Member of the House will read it, as I think it is worthy of the attention of us all:

Every generation produces a man with wisdom far beyond his times, whose imagination lights a beacon along the road which humanity must travel in the future. Such a man was Peter J. McGuire, the father of Labor Day, whose memory we honor today. Sixty-three years ago he conceived the idea of a truly American national holiday to pay homage to the toilers of the earth who from raw nature "have delved and carved all the grandeur we behold." This struggling carpenter glimpsed the nobility of the common man and his work and sought to give it power and expression by joining with Samuel Gompers and other pioneers to form the American Federation of Labor. He became an official of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, one of the oldest trade unions in the Nation. Through the Carpenters' Union and the American Federation of Labor, of which it is a part, he won his campaign for Labor Day. There were other holidays, he said, representative of the religious, civic, and military spirit, but none representative of the industrial spirit, which he regarded as the "great vital force of the Nation." He asked that Labor Day be dedicated "to peace, civilization, and the triumphs of industry."

Standing beside Peter J. McGuire's grave, 51 years after Congress declared Labor Day a national holiday, we can find inspiration for our own future in that dedication.

For America has just won a war against war and is even now striving to forge a union of nations for the preservation of world peace.

Our country holds in its hands a secret force which can destroy all civilization if war ever again afflicts mankind, but we hope and pray that atomic power will be employed by the arts of science to lighten the burdens of humanity and usher in a new and brighter era of civilization.

The triumphs of industry which we have glorified in the past will fade into insignificance if we but capture the opportunities for peaceful expansion and development which now present themselves. We stand at the threshold of a new industrial revolution, perhaps more sweeping in its effects than the advent of the machine age and electric power. Even in our own day and with existing facilities, we can and we must raise American standards of living by at least 50 percent. Let us proclaim our determination on this Labor Day to achieve that immediate goal.

I know there are prophets of gloom who see nothing but discouragement and failure ahead. They point to the undeniable fact that America was not prepared for peace, that reconversion is proceeding too slowly, that unemployment may reach the alarming total of seven or eight million by next spring, and that Congress has not taken any steps to provide for human needs during the transition period from war to peace. On the basis of these adverse conditions, they foresee a major postwar depression.

The American Federation of Labor does not share these pessimistic views. We do not believe in crying "Fire!" in a crowded theater. We do not intend to stampede the Nation into panic.

On the contrary, we have faith in America and the American people. When danger threatens, it is not the time to quit. It is the time to rally and work and fight for what we want and believe in. Just as we won the war, we will win the peace. Let that be our challenge to the future. Let us remember the inspired words of Franklin D. Roosevelt back in 1932, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." American labor will not be overcome by fear now.

The 7,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor, a confident, resolute, and closely knit army of workers, have set their faces forward and are marching ahead in solid phalanx for the achievement of labor's own program which will lift the Nation out of its present temporary difficulties and establish a progressive and prosperous postwar economy in America.

First of all, we call upon private industry in America to speed up the reconversion process and we urge the Government to give reconversion the highest priority. If that is done, as it must be done, transitional unemployment will be held to a minimum and will be of brief duration. The tremendous backlog of unfilled orders for the things the American people need and were unable to obtain during wartime should soon bring about wide expansion of peacetime production and provide a plentiful supply of jobs.

At the same time, in order to keep production going at high levels and to provide a market for consumption to match it, the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor intend to seek immediate increases in wage rates. Such action is necessary to fortify the purchasing power of the American people, which was weakened by increased living costs, by the wartime wage freeze and by postwar losses of overtime pay and incentive bonuses. There is no better market for American industry than the full pay envelope of the great masses of American workers.

Third, in order to restore collective bargaining and establish peaceful and stable labor-management relations, the American Federation of Labor intends to seek a national accord with industry at a conference to be called by President Truman in the next few weeks.

Fourth, as soon as conditions settle down and we are able to take stock of the Nation's long-range needs, the American Federation of Labor is determined to resume its drive for the shorter workweek, which will spread available employment and give the Nation's workers and their families the opportunities for healthful recreation and education which our modern civilization affords.

Fifth, the American Federation of Labor will exert all its influence when Congress returns from its vacation tomorrow, for the enactment of a "must" legislative program which we drafted and for which we have received the hearty endorsement of President Truman and all forward-looking national leaders.

This legislative program calls for the immediate passage of the Kilgore bill broadening the coverage of unemployment insurance and supplementing the inadequate compensation now offered by the States with Federal funds to provide as much as $25 a week for at least 26 weeks in any one year. Such a law is vitally necessary to tide over workers who have lost their war jobs until new peacetime employment is available.

Another point in our legislative program is the full-employment bill, which would set up an annual, national job budget, provide encouragement to business to meet that budget and obligate the Government to stimulate employment through useful and necessary public works if private industry falls short of the goal.

Also, we demand immediate adoption of the Wagner postwar housing bill, which would create millions of new jobs through a 10-year program of urgently needed home construction to be carried on almost entirely by private initiative.

To correct substandard conditions which are a blight on the national economy, the American Federation of Labor calls upon Congress to enact pending legislation which would lift minimum-wage levels immediately to a rock-bottom of 65 cents an hour and establish a 75-cent floor for hourly rates of pay in interstate industry at the end of 3 years.

Finally, we renew our appeals to Congress for action on the long-delayed Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill which would bring a stronger measure of social security to the American people by broadening the coverage of old age and survivors insurance, placing unemployment compensation on a uniform, national basis and offering the humane benefits of health insurance to the great masses of our people for the first time.

It is only to be expected that Congress may balk at some of the measures in this program. We still have too many elected representatives in our law-making body who believe this is the best of all possible worlds and nothing should be done to change it. They profess to be concerned about the preservation of the free-enterprise system but don't wish to lift a finger to save it. The American Federation of Labor is wedded to the free-enterprise system, too, for labor as well as for industry, but we regard it as a dynamic way of life, not as a static road block in the path of human progress. The American Federation of Labor's legislative program would not endanger free enterprise but would protect it from its own shortcomings.

We hope that private industry will face the facts as realistically as labor does. We hope that American businessmen will measure up to their own responsibility for preserving the free enterprise system by being truly enterprising, by looking forward instead of backward. A return to the "good old days" will not satisfy the American people. We want better days. America has the resources, the know-how, and the productive capacity to raise living standards progressively higher. Production problems have been solved. What we must do next is to master the problem of distribution. Labor points the way. By sustaining full employment at high wages, private industry can put enough purchasing power into the hands of the American people to buy the necessities and comforts of life which they need and which industry can produce. That is the only sure way private industry can save itself and the free enterprise system.

After winning a terrible war to safeguard the American way of life from external enemies, we do not believe the American people are in any mood to lose it by default to such internal enemies as hunger, unemployment, and insecurity, which always provide fertile soil for revolution.

We suggest that Congress take notice of what is happening in the wake of war in Europe and in Asia. Perhaps those developments will awaken the stand-patters to a realization that the American Government must be a government with a conscience and with a responsibility for the well-being of its citizens. Also, we hope that the prospect of going before the American people next year for reelection will spur Congress into favorable action now on the program advanced by the American Federation of Labor.

This is the first peacetime Labor Day in America in 4 years. The relief and thanksgiving we all feel, now that the devastating waste of human life and nature's resources is over, knows no bounds. Labor is entitled to celebrate the victory because the men and women of labor earned it—the hard way.

We are particularly proud of the record made by the million and a half young members of the American Federation of Labor who laid down their tools, answered their country's call, and served so gloriously in our armed forces.

We can't help boasting about the many high honors and decorations of valor bestowed by a grateful nation on our fighting fellow union members and the sons of American trade-unionists.

Especially outstanding was the record made by the Seabees, made up almost entirely of American Federation of Labor building-trades and metal-trades members. They were the miracle men of this war, fighting as they worked under fire, feared by the enemy and respected by other branches of our own armed forces. Also deserving of the highest commendation were the 300,000 railroad workers, serving in special battalions, who kept munitions and supplies moving efficiently only a few miles behind our invasion armies. And let us not forget the seamen of our merchant marine, members of the Seafarers' International Union, who did not serve in uniform but risked their lives in transporting vitally needed war equipment across submarine infested seas.

But labor's greatest war service was performed right here at home on the production lines. Make no mistake about it—the tremendous, record-breaking volume of war production in American factories by American workers proved the decisive factor in victory. Their sweat, strain, and exhaustive effort, their skill and adaptability to new tasks and methods of production, increased the output of munitions to a peak of five and a half billion dollars' worth a month, 11 times higher than it was when the war began. Efficiency of workers increased 72 percent despite long hours and distressing living conditions in congested industrial centers. These achievements were accomplished by a voluntary army of workers—the only labor force of any nation in the war functioning without a compulsory labor draft. And they were accomplished with a minimum of interruption or delay due to strikes. Time lost due to strikes during the war amounted to only a fraction of 1 percent of the total time worked and was more than made up by extra hours put in by workers on national holidays when they remained on the job. This is the first Labor Day in 4 years which the Nation's workers have been able to celebrate in the good old way—at leisure.

Perhaps I can best illustrate labor's contribution toward ending the war sooner by telling you the dramatic story of the atomic bomb. When the scientists first perfected that new and unbelievably destructive explosive, Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson called me to the War Department for a confidential meeting. He told me that the Army had developed a new, secret weapon, the nature of which could not even be whispered, and that it was of the highest importance to get that weapon into production before any enemy power could beat us to the punch. He said two brand new plants would have to be constructed in record time, one in Tennessee and the other in the State of Washington, to produce the secret explosive. He asked whether the American Federation of Labor could supply thousands of

skilled workers to go out to those remote spots to do the job.

I assured him that we could and would. Our unions, mobilized for just such war emergencies, recruited many thousands of skilled craftsmen and sent them to the sites of the two biggest construction projects in history. Through their unremitting efforts and through the cooperation of American Federation of Labor unions, which sacrificed long-standing conditions of work to expedite the job, the plants were completed on schedule. Then we supplied additional thousands of workers to produce the bombs. When those bombs hit Japan the war ended in a few days. And the War Department, in grateful recognition of labor's vital role in the success of the atomic bomb, extended official commendation to the 18 American Federation of Labor unions whose members did the work and kept the secret.

During the last meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor in Chicago I received the following telegram from Under Secretary of War Patterson:

"Through you I want to thank all the officers and members of your building and metal trades unions who helped build and man the plants in which our atomic bombs are made. You recruited skilled mechanics from thousands of miles away to work on these projects even though we could not tell you what they were making. Now you have the reward of knowing that their efforts are making an important contribution to final victory.

"ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
"Under Secretary of War."

Now that the war has ended the American Federation of Labor is determined that atomic bombs must never be used again for the wholesale slaughter of human beings. The impact of those bombs was heard around the world and struck terror into the hearts of human beings everywhere. All thinking people now realize that mankind faces the alternative of total peace or total destruction. If ever a dictator should rise to power again and threaten to engulf the world anew in aggression and war it is unthinkable that his people would not strike him down rather than face certain annihilation.

Let it be our supreme purpose then to cement the bonds of the United Nations organization and to carry out to the fullest extent the peaceful procedure for settlement of international disputes contained in the San Francisco Charter.

And let us make the most of peace by cultivating its rich opportunities and enjoying its fruits. We have the resources and the skill and the facilities with which to build a standard of living in our land far surpassing any that ever existed on earth.

It is our solemn duty to the honored dead who gave their lives to win the victory and our obligation to the living who bear on their bodies or in their hearts the scars inflicted by war, to redeem the sacrifices of suffering mankind and to make good the pledges which were so freely given in the heat of conflict.

The American Federation of Labor extends a welcoming hand to the servicemen who are now returning home from overseas and will soon be resuming civilian life. We will do everything within our power to help them obtain good jobs and make a new start in life.

The brave men and women who served in uniform during the war will find that labor will support their economic and legislative aims just as consistently and effectively as we backed them up on the fighting fronts. Anyone who tries to divide labor and the veterans and set them against each other is an enemy of American democracy. For it is just as essential for labor and the veterans to stand together and work together to win the peace as it was to win the war.

The American Federation of Labor has emerged from the vicissitudes of war stronger in organization and in spirit than ever before in history. We do not intend to relinquish a single one of the gains we have won for the Nation's workers. On the contrary, we are determined to press ever forward, to complete the task of organizing the unorganized, and to weld the forces of American labor into a single, united whole. With your help and the assistance of the other 7,000,000 members of our great movement, we can do our part toward establishing a far richer and a far more abundant way of life here in America for all our people.

The earnest attention you have given this discussion of the grave problems confronting our country and the world convinces me of your willingness to enlist in the drive for a worth-while peace. And now, for the balance of this traditional Labor Day, let's go out and celebrate the victory of the present and the promise of the future.

Taxes on Industries Flowing From Atomic Energy Should Be Applied to the National Debt; Letter to President Truman Sets Forth Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have today forwarded to the President, and which suggests a possible policy in connection with the taxing of atomic energy developments:

SEPTEMBER 5, 1945.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You plan, according to my information, to submit to Congress recommendations regarding the future possible use and control of the atomic bomb.

I wish to direct your attention to the following proposal which I placed yesterday, in letter form, before Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee:

"There is merit, I believe, in the adoption of the policy that any Federal taxes levied on industries arising from new scientific inventions and discoveries be used solely for the purpose of reducing the principal of the national debt.

"Consideration of such a tax policy at this time is important, since the development of atomic energy appears likely to create new industries and revolutionize our use of power. If taxes levied on such new industries, were turned to the reduction of the national debt, the result would represent a constructive solution of the problem.

"Under such a policy, taxes levied on individuals and existing industries would be adjusted so as to cover current operating expenses of the Government, including the interest on the national debt, and no more. This would make the tax burden as light as possible on the business economy and individual incomes.

"New industries arising from scientific inventions and discoveries, such as those arising from the discovery of atomic energy, might be tax free in the initial stages of their development, and, as these industries become established, taxes could be levied in proportion to their ability to pay. The returns from such taxes would be set aside exclusively for the purpose of retiring the national debt.

"Such a policy might at first appear to be complicated to administer, but the use of gasoline taxes exclusively for the purpose of building roads is an outstanding example of what can be done.

"Perhaps you would like to consider suggesting such a policy as this for adoption by the Congress. If so, I shall be glad to assist you in any way in which I may be useful."

Respectfully yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Congressman Pittenger Renews Fight for St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House of Representatives are familiar with the activities of my colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. For identification just refer to the badge he wears, namely the seaway button intended to picture the enormous transportation which will come when this project is completed.

Congressman PITTENGER's record for persistent and consistent work in favor of this great improvement is well known to all of us and a résumé of his activities is set forth in a newspaper item in the Watertown Daily Times of Watertown, N. Y., on September 1, 1945, which is as follows:

MINNESOTAN RENEWS FIGHT FOR THE SEAWAY—CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM A. PITTENGER RETURNING TO WASHINGTON SEPTEMBER 5 TO URGE PROJECT

WASHINGTON, September 1.—Representative WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, Republican, of the Duluth (Eighth), Minn., district, author of the pending House bill to authorize the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, will return to Washington September 5 to resume the fight for that measure.

The Minnesota Congressman represents the district at the head of navigation on the Great Lakes, in which the port of Duluth in peacetime has handled a volume of tonnage in some years exceeding that of the port of New York. Iron ore and coal comprise the bulk of the Duluth commerce. With the opening of the seaway, the port is expected to share with Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, Cleveland, Buffalo, and other Great Lakes harbors in an expansion of intercoastal commerce with eastern, Gulf, and Pacific ports and in foreign trade.

After spending the summer recess in his home district, Representative PITTENGER will return to the National Capital fresh from a series of conferences with seaway supporters in several cities of the upper Lakes.

The Congressman is the author of the pending St. Lawrence seaway and power project bill (H. R. 671), which confirms the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, to complete the entire Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development for navigation and power.

The Pittenger bill also authorizes the President to implement the Federal-State accord of 1933 and 1941, under which the State of New York is to take over the power development in that State, by an agreement subject to the approval of Congress and the State.

Representative PITTENGER introduced the St. Lawrence bill in the Seventy-eighth Congress and again January 4, 1945, in the Seventy-ninth Congress. The Pittenger bill incorporates the terms of the Mansfield bill, approved after public hearings in 1941 before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and endorsed by all Federal and State agencies concerned with the development.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate over the same period by Senators AIKEN, Republican, Vermont; SHIPSTEAD, Republican, Minnesota; FERGUSON, Republican, Michigan; and LANGER, Republican, North Dakota. The pending Senate bill, S. 1331, introduced July 28, 1945, by Senator LANGER, closely follows the provisions of the Aiken-Pittenger bill of the Seventy-eighth Congress and the pending Pittenger bill, H. R. 671.

The late President Roosevelt endorsed an identical measure, and it received the vote of President Truman December 12, 1944, when he was in the Senate.

In the defense emergency of 1940–41 and through the war years, Representative PITTENGER has been the most vigorous advocate in Congress of the St. Lawrence development and an outspoken critic of delay and obstruction against the improvement. At public hearings in 1941, Representative PITTENGER and the late Representative Francis D. Culkin, of Oswego, N. Y., led the fight for approval of the St. Lawrence project bill, as high-ranking Republican members of the House committee.

Representative PITTENGER has advised colleagues at Washington during the recess that he will take up the fight for the St. Lawrence bill where he left off in July and will continue to oppose any program for indefinite delay, such as developed after the Seventy-ninth Congress convened.

In a series of speeches in th House early in 1945, Representative PITTENGER emphasized the need for postwar development and employment and forecast the harmful results of delay in the case of such projects as the St. Lawrence improvement.

"For a long time," Representative PITTENGER said in the House, May 9, following VE-day, "there has been talk about postwar planning and postwar construction projects which would furnish employment not only for soldiers who have been discharged from Army service, but for men in this country who will soon be out of jobs when the war factories close down. The time for talk has passed.

"In the Seventy-seventh Congress they used the argument that we should not undertake the St. Lawrence project while the war was in progress. * * *

"The announcement yesterday of unconditional surrender of Germany puts an end to this argument that we must delay the project on account of the war.

"I believe that we should have postwar planning and that it should include worthwhile projects, those that will create wealth and improve the welfare of the American people and remain a permanent asset to the national defense of this country. For that reason, within 24 hours after the house convened on January 4, 1945, I introduced H. R. 671, a bill to confirm the United States-Canadian agreement of March 19, 1941, and to authorize a postwar construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. * * *

"We do not want another depression, and unemployment, and other economic disasters such as followed World War No. 1. The way to prevent such conditions is to provide worth-while employment so that American labor will have an income from useful work. This can and will be spent for the products of factories and the farm so as to create and maintain a high level of production and income.

"The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is ready to go now. It has been approved by the Departments of War, Navy, Commerce, and every other department which has anything to do with this development. It has been approved after public hearings by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of this House. Moreover, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, which has made such a magnificent record in this war, has prepared plans and specifications now available for use. The seaway project has already been completed over 90 percent of the distance from Duluth to the open sea. This is not a new project. Let us take action now to finish this job as the No. 1 postwar project on the North American Continent."

VJ-Day Address by Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., on VJ-day, Sunday, September 2, 1945:

A short time after the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, when most of our battlewagons were sunk or crippled, a certain admiral named Yamamoto said: "I am looking forward to dictating peace to the United States in the White House at Washington."

Peace has been dictated—in the White House at Washington—with a slight correction. The peace has been won and its terms were unconditional surrender. It was expressed by President Truman, who spoke for you and me for the will of the American Nation.

A few years before, the late Herr Hitler said that the two ways of life—the democratic one and his own—could not exist together. One of the two must disappear.

In a way he could not foresee, he was right. One of the two had to prevail, but it was not fascism and its enslavement, but democracy and its liberation that has won. The entire world has been saved from the foul doctrine that force shall govern mankind.

In Lawrence, Boston, San Francisco, Washington, in every village and home, we rejoice. But there is more to it than this. In all nations of the world there is happiness today, yes, even in the hearts of a few intelligent Japanese. For we are not going backward into the darkness of tyranny but forward into the light of a new and challenging day. Everywhere, mankind looks upward with new hope in the vision of a better world.

The war-lords of aggression said we couldn't do it. They thought we were a quarrelsome people, weakened and divided among ourselves. They thought we were ripe for the picking. And so they picked. The first plums were pretty good. They took the Philippines, Wake, and Guam. They riddled our fleet at Pearl Harbor. There was a time when we had only two capital ships—one battleship and one aircraft carrier—to cover the wide Pacific. They even took, for a moment, our courage and decision. The future for us, was desperate. The force of material power seemed more than man could bear.

Then, when all seemed hopeless and our enemies thought we were senseless to fight on, we rallied. The peaceful people of America awoke and went to work. There was no time for irresponsible living before the great urgency that challenged us. The steel fingers of giant cranes sprang up along our coasts, lifting the huge steel plates which were welded to make thousands of ships. War plants mushroomed from the earth. Training camps were built almost overnight for the millions of men who were being called into service. The women of America, true to their heritage, sent their men off with the courage of their love; and even though their hearts were breaking, they left their homes and took up the tools which their men had laid aside to forge for them the implements to fight and win. The older people, after a hard day's work, went out again to give their time to civilian defense services. Even this was not enough. The people of America gave their blood to replace the blood of sons, brothers, and fathers that was being sacrificed for the soul of man on battlefields thousands of miles from home. The heart and hands and money and blood of America was at work as it had never worked before. The mind of the Nation was at work too—in the drafting rooms and the scientific laboratories and the councils of our leaders. Truly, all America was fighting, as the great energy of a free people was revealed. All this went out to support the gallant men and women who were bearing our arms. Guadalcanal, Africa, Sicily, Casino, Normandy, the Siegfried line, Iwo Jima, Saipan, Okinawa, these were but a few of the terrible milestones that marked the road from defeat to the victory we now celebrate. This is the rosary of pain and effort and sublime courage, the rosary of faith that has brought us to this fulfillment.

And the kids in our own homes and the kids next door, some of whom seemed hardly more than children when they went away, these became the men and women who saved us. Through mud, misery, fear, exhaustion, and homesickness they have set the example for us. They did not quit, and neither can we in the great responsibilities of American citizenship in the days ahead. The men who have fought and the men who have died must ever remind us of our unforgettable duty to them. The agony of war is over, the great task of peace has just begun. But peace must be preserved. We can maintain this peace only if we give to it the same heart and mind and courage that our fighting men have set before us. They rightly expect that we shall not fail them. In this hour of triumph let us pray for the high faith that is their's.

As we look back over the hard road we have traveled, we are amazed by the things we have done. This young Nation, under the spur of necessity has become the strongest power in the long history of man. The reason lies not in the power itself but the faith that built it. Today as never before, we believe in those values which underscore our way of life. Once we wise-cracked about them as we would about some legend which had lost its meaning in the present. "Democracy," "rights of man," "human dignity," "equality of race, creed, color, and opportunity," these were phrases dimly remembered from our schooldays. Under the impact of war these half-forgotten values took on new life and meaning. We were suddenly aware that they were good, that they were at work in America, and that they were menaced from without. As freemen, we stood ready to die, if need be, to save them for ourselves and our posterity. We knew that democracy when fully awake was capable of solving the many crises which challenge the progress of man.

Let us keep it so. The splendid unity which now is ours may dissipate before the internal problems which will follow the war. But if we keep ever in mind the difficulties we overcame in war, the demands of peace will not divide us. The spirit of enterprise, moderated by fair play will see us through the adjustments which we now face.

We must remember that patriotism is demanded in peace no less than in time of war.

The urge to work together is not as compelling as the need to fight together, but it is no less important. As we look back over the carelessness that marked the generation of uncertain peace that preceded this war, we know that an elert citizenship during peace might have avoided the horrors of war. Bearing that in mind, we must not take the coming of peace as a reason to abandon our obligations to others in our community and our Nation.

In the war just concluded, we had a common energy. There was no room for selfishness. The scattered human units got together and worked for the national welfare. We sacrificed for the common good, knowing our dependence upon each other. To the peace we must bring equivalent values or we shall be split up by the conflict of our personal interests. The self-imposed discipline of war is needed to bring normal and steady living. In our celebrations we must remember that this is no time to throw off all restraints. We are still members of a community, enjoying equal rights but subject to equal responsibilities.

When the war came we were not ready for it. By great exertion, we rose to the occasion and pulled victory out of initial defeats. The war is over and we are celebrating, but the peace is already here demanding great changes. Already, some of the restrictions on our living have been lifted. There is a great sense of relief. After being cooped up for 4 years, there is the urge to rush out the open door and indulge ourselves to the limit. By doing so we can easily lose, and lose quickly, much that we have saved for ourselves and our Nation over years of stern effort. We have won the war, but are we ready for the peace?

Even at this moment, your government is worried. Gasoline rationing has been lifted. Many other restrictions will soon disappear. The Government knows that it is only human and right that you should wish for the conveniences which the demands of war would not permit. But the Government also knows that if you all rush out to buy these things before a real supply is available, there will be economic disaster.

This is no academic question. It happened before and it can happen again. In a moment of jubiliation people are apt to forget this fact to their own sorrow. I say to you in all earnestness, have your fun but don't lose your heads. Please remember that inflation, or a swift increase in prices, took place after the war was over—in 1919. We are faced with the same emergency today, and I mean today. From that other and disastrous experience let us learn to be prudent at once.

Let us take a few samples of the way prices skyrocketed after the last war. Potatoes went from 3 to 10 cents a pound; sugar from 10 to 26 cents a pound; coal from $11 to $16 a ton. After the prices ran wild there was a collapse. The reduced earnings of corporations led to unemployment and a curtailment of purchasing power. Over 100,000 businesses failed. Hundreds of thousands of mortgages on homes and farms were foreclosed. The pay rolls of factory workers shrank 44 percent. For those who managed to keep their jobs, the take-home pay dropped from $27 to $20. The cost of that war, which we are still paying for, doubled. All this was due to inflation, or run-away prices, that took place after the war was over.

This was caused by you and me. The war was over and we gave no thought to anything else. We felt suddenly free and reckless with our purchasing power so we all went out to splurge at the same time. There was a shortage of civilian goods but we had plenty of money and so we bid against each other and pushed the prices up. To satisfy our personal indulgence we forgot the national welfare, and we all suffered because of it. We don't want that to happen again.

What can you as an individual do to prevent a repetition of this collapse? Everything. You are the buyers of the Nation. If you buy wisely and in moderation, never paying more than the ceiling price no matter how much you may want the commodity, you will be continuing your patriotism in peace. You will be cooperating with other people to prevent economic chaos. You will be winning the peace as well as the war. The Government could not and would not force you to do this. The responsibility lies entirely in your own hands, as mature and understanding citizens of our democracy. You are the government.

You have in your power, through your war bonds and your savings, the greatest volume of purchasing power that the world has ever seen. You need and want many peacetime goods, but the farms and factories cannot produce these for you all at once. This mass of buying power competing for a scarcity of civilian goods will push prices sky high unless you do your civilian duty. Hold on to your war bonds and your savings and by all means observe ceiling prices and never pay more.

Let us celebrate the victory without losing the peace. Let us think of the millions in uniform and what we owe to them. Many of them have dependents, living on Government allotments which will not increase though prices may. They will be the real sufferers from our carelessness.

We thank God for the safety of our fighting men. We want them home as soon as possible to a Nation that is worthy of them. They deserve no less. It remains in our power—yours and mine—to do this for them. So, as we celebrate, let us think also of a practical way of showing our gratitude to them. Let us keep the home front secure against inflation for their return.

This is the first, the very first, step toward the winning of the peace. It must start today in every home in this Nation. For peace has its victories to win no less imperative than those of war. They can be won only by common effort and unselfishness. So let up pledge ourselves this night to win the battle against inflation for ourselves and our returning servicemen.

La Verne Parrish, Montana's Fourth Congressional Medal of Honor Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and sadness that I bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to La Verne Parrish, of Montana. My pride is in the fact that Sergeant Parrish is the fourth man from Montana to so distinguish himself as to receive this highest of awards, and my sadness is due to the fact that in the winning of the Medal of Honor he gave his life for his country. His gallantry saved the lives of many of his comrades and his deep devotion to duty played its part in our successful war against Japan. He has joined distinguished company and he has created an obligation on the part of those of us who remain to carry on in the traditions he upheld so nobly. Montana is grateful to him and we all join in appreciation of what he and his comrades have done for us. Montana, with four Congressional Medal of Honor winners, leads the Nation in this respect on the basis of population. To La Verne Parrish, of Pablo; Leo J. Powers, of Alder; Henry Schaaer, of Scobey; and William Galt, of Great Falls, we express our thanks for what you have done, and to your families we say, God bless and keep you.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Butte (Mont.) Standard of August 3, 1945, covering the award of the Medal of Honor to La Verne Parrish:

MEDAL OF HONOR GIVEN STATE YOUTH'S PARENTS — LA VERNE PARRISH, WHO DIED ON LUZON, IS HONORED

RONAN, August 2.—The fourth Congressional Medal of Honor by a Montanan in World War II was presented to Mr. and Mrs. Cletious Parrish, of Pablo, Thursday night for their son, T/4 La Verne Parrish, who died on Luzon, in the Philippines, carrying out his duties as a medical aid man.

Col. A. M. Weyand, commanding officer of the United States disciplinary barracks at Fort Missoula, made the presentation at the local high-school stadium by authorization from President Truman.

In solemn, simple ceremony the colonel presented the Nation's highest military award to the aid man's parents, describing briefly the indomitable spirit which drove the soldier to save the lives of so many of his wounded comrades at the price of his own.

Only when Lt. Col. F. E. Bierstadt, public relations officer of Fort Missoula, read the citation accompanying the President's notification of award of the Medal of Honor was the great bravery and spirit of the Montanan brought into sharp contrast.

In part, Colonel Bierstadt read:

"The President of the United States takes pride in awarding the Medal of Honor posthumously to T/4 La Verne Parrish, medical detachment, One Hundred and Sixty-first Infantry, for services as follows:

"Sergeant Parrish was a medical aid man with Company C during the fighting on Luzon, Philippine Islands, on January 18 to 24, 1945. On the 18th he observed two wounded men under enemy fire and immediately went to their rescue. After moving one to cover he crossed 25 yards of open ground to administer aid to the second. In the early hours of the 24th his company, crossing an open field at San Manuel, encountered intense enemy fire and was ordered to withdraw to the cover of a ditch.

"While treating the casualties, Sergeant Parrish observed two wounded still in the field. Without hesitation, he left the ditch, crawled forward under enemy fire, and in two successive trips he then brought both men to safety. He next administered aid to 12 casualties in the same field, crossing and recrossing the open area in hostile fire. Making successive trips, he then brought three wounded in under fire.

"After treating 37 casualties suffered in his company, he was mortally wounded by mortar fire and shortly after was killed by more Japanese fire. The indomitable spirit, gallantry, and bravery of Sergeant Parrish saved many lives at the cost of his own."

That was the tribute from the President of the United States.

These three Montanans also have received the Nation's highest military recognition:

Pfc. Leo J. Powers, of Alder, for his mad one-man attack against the Germans at Cassino; Sgt. Henry Schaaer, of Scobey, for liquidating 17 Germans in as many minutes at Anzio, and Capt. William Wylie Galt, of Great Falls, for his sensational display of

bravery at Villa Crocetta, Italy, in killing 40 Germans and stiffening a weakening American position by mounting a tank destroyer and manning its machine guns until the Germans were routed and an important Allied breach plugged.

Postwar Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the important and pressing postwar problems, I am glad Congress convened earlier than anticipated.

Like all other Members, my office is being swamped with mail, telephone calls, and personal visits of the families of servicemen, urging their release. It is easy to understand these requests, for I know that these men and their families went all out to do a job that had to be done in winning the war, with surprisingly few complaints, and to all intents and purposes that job has been completed. However, we all know that we cannot stop a war, with all the responsibilities of victory, any quicker than we prepared for it, and in the period immediately following, we will have to keep our troops in certain zones in order to insure our future peace and prosperity. Who these troops will be is the question that must be decided, and it will be as difficult to determine this as it would be for a mother who has an 18-year-old boy ready for college, a son who has had several years of combat, and another married son with children who has been in the service for several years. A decision will have to be made. Men who have been in prison camps, and those who have had long overseas service should be relieved, rehabilitated, and returned to their homes. Since the beginning of selective service, thousands of our young men have been uprooted from their homes, careers, and education, and it is only because the job has been so well done that the war has not been continued for another 2 or 3 years. Whoever goes out to these zones can go now in peace, by virtue of the tough, hard years put in by these war-weary men.

For many reasons, I supported induction in time of war, as opposed to the theory of voluntary enlistments. It will be necessary to continue selective service for a while in order to prevent a collapse in the functioning of our Army and Navy, but I hope that the War and Navy Departments and the Congress will quickly effect regulations and laws in regard to enlistments, such as, first, giving mustering-out pay on enlistments, which I understand is given now only upon separation from the service; and, second, by shortening the minimum enlistment period from the existing 3 years to 1 or 2 years.

The policy to be followed in occupying conquered countries will have a material effect upon the number of troops to be used for that purpose. After the troops have entered Japan and the surrender terms have been completed, I feel that rather than make a futile attempt to fundamentally change the Japanese people, we should cut them off from minerals, ore, oils, and other strategic materials, with which they might again build up a war machine, and arise as a military power. This could be done with our Navy supported by our bases in the Pacific, with a minimum occupational force, and thereby expedite discharges and reduce inductions. An opposed policy of attempting to individually police every Japanese hamlet would require a vast occupational force over a period of many years, which would probably be lengthened by incidents which would arise from time to time.

Anyone who has given any thought to this subject knows that the safety of America and the peace of the world are dependent upon a strong American Navy and Air Force, with a readily expandable Army, and I believe, by following a proper and careful course, we can maintain the necessary strength of these forces, after this immediate transition period, by making careers in the Army and Navy sufficiently attractive so as to encourage enlistments.

Bombing of Germany Spelled Nazi Defeat, Says Noted Aviation Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there will be a demand, proper in most instances, to slash drastically governmental expenditures. It is my hope that funds, vital to our continued security, be appropriated by Congress. In this expenditure we must, in my opinion, provide adequate sums for the Air Forces of the United States. I feel my colleagues will profit by reading the hard-hitting article by Wayne Parrish, publisher of American Aviation. It is carried in the September 1, 1945, issue of the magazine to which I have referred. In looking ahead it will be important to look back that we not forget the facts of victory. The material follows:

GREATEST DRAMA OF WAR WAS BOMBING OF GERMANY—UNITED STATES PRESS HAS FAILED TO TELL IT, EDITOR SAYS

(By Wayne W. Parrish)

The atomic bomb has overshadowed all other air-power developments in the world.

But the greatest air-power story of the world until the atomic bomb has largely gone untold in the United States press, and the American citizen has only the slightest conception of how air power paralyzed a nation and laid its cities to waste.

Somehow the great drama of Germany hasn't been transmitted to the people of the United States. There have been a few photos in newspapers and magazines, and a few stories. But the American public has been misled into thinking that Germany wasn't bombed to defeat and that her industry is 75 percent intact and that night clubs are the big features of German cities.

Time magazine, which has done one of the greatest journalistic jobs of all time in covering the historic developments during the war, fell down badly on reporting on Germany after the troops moved in. The New York Times magazine a few weeks ago carried an utterly ridiculous article featuring night clubs and all the extraneous angles of what is the terribly bombed city of Berlin.

Even Wendell Berge as Assistant Attorney General of the United States made a simply asinine statement late in June that "probably three-fourths, if not more of the industrial power with which Germany waged this war, remains relatively intact."

Then some Senator made the statement that even the huge Volkswagen factory at Brunswick, Germany, was "back in operation." He should see the factory.

Since returning to the United States of America early in August, I have been able to judge just how much is known back here about our strategic bombing of Germany by the questions asked. I, myself, was not prepared to witness the vast extent of destruction in Germany. The press services, special correspondents, newsreels, and picture services have failed utterly to get the greatest story in the world across—the greatest aside from the atomic bomb.

NO INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY

Germany was a great industrial nation. To think that it is recovering industrially is ludicrous. Even if there were machines and equipment, the Russians have moved all of them out of the Russian territory. And in the American and British zones, all you have to do is to fly over every German city, circling at low tree-top altitude, or wander by jeep through the endless miles of destruction, to realize that Germany was knocked for a loop from which it won't recover for decades.

Hamburg is a good illustration. The population is reduced from 1,600,000 to 1,200,000, with half of that gap at least having perished in bomb raids. For 20 miles along the docks of the great harbor there is nothing today but utter destruction. In the big residential area east of the business section, the rubble hasn't been touched since the blitz of July 1943, and how many tens of thousands of German civilians are still buried under the rubble is anyone's guess. A vast area is utterly dead. And what one sees in Hamburg can be repeated in virtually every other city.

Berlin itself is a fantastic sight. There were 1,500,000 dwelling units in Berlin in 1939. As of late summer of 1944, 800,000 of these had been completely destroyed—uninhabitable. Only 300,000 remained whole or largely whole. Since late summer 1944, tremendous devastation was caused by Russian artillery and from the air. If there are 100,000 fully habitable dwellings left in Berlin, it is a miracle. Yet the newspapers talk of night clubs—shabby affairs catering to Russian and American soldiers, and not in the slightest typical of the tremendous devastation that is Berlin today.

NO MAIL OR COMMUNICATIONS

There is no postal or communications service in Germany. There is no transport for Germans except bicycles, walking, some streetcars in most of the cities, and parts of the subway in Berlin. What few trains are operating are for military use. It is impossible to transport enough food into the German cities to provide Germans with what they used to get in prewar days (not that I am advocating it), and there will be no coal for heating this winter. There is nothing in the shops.

But the most impressive thing about Germany is the almost hopelessness of rebuilding what was destroyed by bombing. Even if the Berliners have the manpower, materials, and

equipment, 20 years will be required merely to rebuild the houses. And this estimate does not include public buildings, transport, or industry.

Far from trying to work up sympathy for the Germans, I'd like to get some enthusiasm for the superb work of the RAF and United States strategic bombers which paralyzed the industrial capacity of Germany. The fact that we had to whip a well-equipped German Army in France has beclouded the fact that Germany itself was rapidly becoming an industrial shell, and that when we crossed the Rhine, there was no chance of organized opposition.

Perhaps one reason for the lack of analytical press articles from Germany is that our American correspondents have concentrated on moving up forward with the ground armies and have been covering the political events. Few American correspondents have seen more than a few German cities. And from the ground one can miss a whale of a lot of damage.

Somehow the AAF has missed the boat on its public relations and I strongly suspect it is the fault of USSTAF, United States Strategic Air Forces, with headquarters in London and Paris. The dozen aviation writers, of which I was one, were treated to ineptness of epochal proportions as far as USSTAF was concerned, and if this treatment is typical of the American public relations in Europe, it is no wonder that the American people have no idea of what air power did to win the European war.

What the bombers did to German transport, industry, and civilian life is the greatest single drama in the world today. There has never been anything like it. It is more dramatic than the defeat of Japan, for Germany has been an age-old nation of great industrial reputation. Its cities were old and well organized. It is more dramatic than the political fusses of today because there have always been political fusses in Europe. What the American people would like to know (I think) are the answers to the questions I have heard. Just what is a bombed city like? How do people live? What are they doing? The general public is not getting the story in the general press.

If Germany were to recover in a year, then there wouldn't be a big story. But what happened to Germany is as historical as anything in the past hundred or so years—outside of the atomic bomb.

It is obvious that the Germans endeavored to clean up the rubble and make repairs when the bomb raids first started. But the bombing continued at an accelerated pace. It was impossible to repair the damage. Finally the bombing became overwhelming. Today the cities are jagged broken walls, hollow shells, twisted and burned out factories, and the people are living under the ruins or out in the suburbs in shacks.

The Senator who said the Volkswagen plant at Brunswick was back in operation should see the plant. It was one of the largest factories in the world. It was the pride of Germany. But it was knocked out. There are portions which are relatively undamaged, but any idea that this factory can be put back in operation except after very extensive and major repairs is "nuts." It is true that down at one far end, in a part of the plant that would represent about one medium-sized automobile garage in Toledo, Ohio, the American Army is directing the assembly of German jeeps from material that was on hand. When those jeeps are assembled, the assembly line is "kaput." There won't be any more. The operation is "peanuts." It has no relation to the fact that our bombers knocked the plant out of operation, and it will stay out for a long time.

If Wendell Berge thinks that three-fourths of German industry is relatively intact, he ought to see it. It is intact, all right, in twisted, burned, and blasted out ruins. Of course there are some factories that were untouched—but you won't find more than a handful of factories untouched that were building essential war materials.

VERY POOR PUBLIC RELATIONS

The AAF can well be proud of its job on Germany. So can the RAF. But whoever "muffed the ball" on public relations isn't any friend of air power, for air power needs friends and the American people still need to be shown and told the story. They should be told the story of wrecked industrial plants running for miles on end, of hundreds of thousands of Germans still buried under the rubble, of the utter lack of transport at the end of the war, of the complete economic paralysis of the country. Because in so knowing about it, there won't be any more question about air power. It was air power that gave the decisive touch. Germany was a shell before the ground armies moved in. If you don't believe, go see for yourself—you'll get the most appalling shock of a lifetime.

The So-Called Ultimatum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an editorial appearing in the New York Times on Saturday, September 1, 1945:

THE SO-CALLED ULTIMATUM

In whatever future consideration the Pearl Harbor reports receive, whether official or unofficial, it will be an excellent thing for all concerned if the word "ultimatum" is dropped, once and for all, as a description of Secretary Hull's now famous note of November 26, 1941. "Ultimatum" is the term that has been used time and again in the last few days to describe this message. The official Army Board report speaks of it as "the document that touched the button that started the war." In the light of all this a visitor from Mars might be forgiven if he drew the conclusion that the Government of the United States had deliberately provoked Japan into war with a high-handed and arbitrary challenge, and that Japan had made the only possible answer to this ultimatum by hitting us at Pearl Harbor.

For the sake of restoring some perspective to this fantastic picture, let us recall the circumstances and the character of the Hull note which has prompted all this talk about an ultimatum.

Diplomatic conversations were held in Washington with emissaries of the Japanese Government in November 1941, with a view to considering the critical problems which had arisen between that Government and our own. What was the situation at that time? Japan had just invaded Indochina. Great Japanese armies had been landed there. Great Japanese naval forces had assembled in Cam Ranh Bay. They were obviously on their way either to the Philippines or Singapore. Other great Japanese armies were still ravaging and pillaging China, to the maintenance of whose territorial integrity the United States had pledged itself by solemn treaty. Still other great Japanese armies were massed on Russia's eastern frontier. German armies had driven deep into Russia from the west. At this moment they stood at the very gates of Moscow. And Japan had just concluded, with Germany and Italy, an offensive-and-defensive military alliance which made her a full-fledged member of the Axis triumvirate that had as it clear goal the destruction of British and American power and the conquest of the world.

What was the proposal made by the Japanese emissaries in Washington, at this critical juncture, as a means of improving the relations between Japan and the United States?

In a note addressed to our Government on November 20 the Japanese offered to change none of the policies which were threatening the peace of the Orient and the security of the United States. Instead, they proposed that the United States agree forthwith to supply Japan with as much oil as she wanted. And they demanded simultaneously that the United States cease giving any aid to China.

This was the note to which Secretary Hull sent his now famous reply of November 26. In it he did what any self-respecting American would have done. He refused to be bullied into the abject humiliation of his country and the complete betrayal of its ally, China. He told the Japanese that they could not have their oil and that we would not turn quitters on our promises to China. But he did not slam the door on further discussions. He did not threaten the Japanese with war. He did not threaten them with anything save the further loss of American respect and friendship if they persisted in the bare-faced aggression on which they had embarked. And, as a means of keeping alive at least some hope of a peaceful settlement, he offered the Japanese a program which contained a restatement of principles which had long been basic in this country's foreign policies, with the request that "further effort be made to resolve our divergences of views in regard to the practical application of these fundamental principles."

Was this an ultimatum? It was an ultimatum if it is an ultimatum for a man with a pistol at his head to say no when a thug demands his pocketbook. It was an ultimatum if that term properly describes the unwillingness of a nation to desert a loyal friend. It was an ultimatum if this is a good way of reporting the refusal of the directly responsible statesman of a great and free and powerful republic to get down on his knees and grovel in the dust at the direction of an international bully.

This was the famous note of November 26. As for the question whether knowledge of the policy behind it was shared with responsible officials of the Army and Navy, Mr. Hull's own letter to Secretary Stimson of September 28, 1944, notes that on November 25, 1941, the day before this answer of his was given to the Japanese, "at a meeting of the war council, at which the highest officers of the Army and Navy were present, I reviewed the situation and I indicated that the question of our national defense from that point on should be especially the concern of the Army and the Navy."

Policing the Far East Job for Allied Nations Not America Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, the belief is prevalent in America that the Far East, namely, Japan and the islands adjacent thereto, is not a white man's country. This belief is based on the fact that our men in the armed forces who have been

there for a longer period than 1 year have returned in many cases with some form of tropical disease from which they may never fully recover.

The proposal of leaders of our armed forces that American soldiers do the entire policing of Japan presents a most interesting situation. That the Far East is not a white man's country is today accepted everywhere and that white men alone should be required to do police work there is indefensible. The nations with whom we have been allied in the war and all of whom, with the exception of the United States of America, will gain materially by the winning of the war, which winning was made possible by the valor of America in the armed forces plus the ingenuity and inventive genius of Americans plus their money in the development of the atomic bomb is generally accepted as being responsible for the success achieved by the Allies in the Far East.

The Chinese Nation, who have been conducting war against the Japanese with extremely limited resources and with little aid until the last year, have displayed a fortitude and courage seldom equaled in the history of the world. They have witnessed the destruction of their cities and towns, places of worship, and educational institutions, the killing and maiming of their defenseless women and children and the raping of their females without regard to age from 8 to 80 and yet have fought on uncomplainingly.

I can imagine no higher degree of poetic justice than for those who have suffered most, namely the Chinese to do the policing of Japan, with the standing Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard representing the regulars of the United States armed forces acting in a supervisory capacity and recruiting an army of 500,000 Chinese soldiery to do the bulk of the work it should be possible to release the majority of our forces in the Far East. It appears a gross injustice to require that those men who have survived the campaign against Germany be sent out for an indefinite period in a weakened physical condition to a country that is not conducive to longevity. In the event that a sufficient number of the Chinese forces are not interested in performing this work, it should be possible to arrange for the assignment of a large force of Russians who have a natural hatred for the Japanese based on a similar sneak attack to Pearl Harbor, namely, the Port Arthur attack in 1905 to join with the Chinese forces in reconstructing an army of such size as may be deemed necessary by the leaders of our armed forces.

I can think of no single act that may be performed by our Government that would meet with more universal approval than the return of those boys under 21 years of age who are being assigned to this duty, or who are already there, plus those in the armed forces who have rendered such exceptional service elsewhere and are now being selected for such duty.

I have an appreciation of the complex character of the problems involved with the settlement of the war; I realize that in a sense the proposal here made would be regarded as audacious and unjustifiable but to my mind it represents the sound views of the majority of the American people.

Radio Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
New Post Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Attention: Hon. Paul A. Porter, Chairman.

GENTLEMEN: FM and television will indeed offer your Commission a splendid opportunity to take the "bugs" out of radio. Because of the complaints leveled against the general operations of the industry, I have given the entire subject deep and earnest though and firmly believe that in order to eliminate further criticism when considering future applications for frequencies or renewals, your honorable Commission should consider the following proposals:

1. No radio station has the privilege, in perpetuity, of using the frequency assigned to it.

2. In the evaluation of any application or renewal of application, the Commission shall not sanction the depreciation of the radio into a medium maintained exclusively for the selling of merchandise and for the popularizing of services.

3. Any legitimate organization, entity, or individual, conforming to existing regulations promulgated by the Commission, shall be permitted to buy time.

4. Definite segments of the daily radio cycle must be given over to sustaining programs and such broadcasts should be of an educational, cultural, and forensic nature.

5. Periodic financial statements must be required from the broadcasting companies and should contain a statement of operations and set forth complete details as to profit and loss.

6. The Federal Communications Commission should pass upon the selling price of any radio station.

Accompanying this letter is a statement elaborating the reasons for the outlined proposals.

I shall indeed appreciate your communicating with me after your consideration of same.

Thanking you, I am,
Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

IS THE AIR REALLY FREE?

(Statement of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York)

With the discovery and development of frequency modulation, familiarly called FM, and with the perfection of television technique, it becomes necessary to revalue radio as we know it today—the modernized and expanded radio as opposed to amplitude modulation. Prior to the enactment of the Congressional Enabling Act of 1934, the ether wheezed along rather haphazardly, a prey to amateurs in a new field and beset by the problems of a hit-and-miss affair.

After 1934, radio in general was placed under the supervision of a new entity entitled "Federal Communications Commission." The underlying purpose of the act which resulted in the establishment of this Commission was to bring order out of the chaos which this fascinating new medium evoked. But of paramount importance was the congressional intent, which has been expressed as follows:

"The ether is a public medium, and its use must be for public benefit. The use of radio channels is justified only if there is public benefit. The dominant element for consideration in the radio field is, and always will be, the great body of the listening public, millions in number, country-wide in distribution."

This is regarded as the public medium philosophy laid down by Herbert Hoover in 1925 when he was Secretary of Commerce. If anyone will take the trouble to read the debates in the House and Senate during the consideration of the act and its subsequent amendments, he will find that the above quotation embodies very succinctly the basic philosophy for the regulation of radio as elaborated by Members of Congress.

As proof positive that it was the intent of Congress to incorporate this philosophy into the statute, you will note further that the act of 1934 expressly reserved to the people of the United States title to all radio channels. Congressional enactment provided that licenses were only to be granted to applicants who clearly demonstrated that they intended to use such a franchise in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity," and that their qualifications, talents, and abilities would measure up to such "public interest, convenience, and necessity." To make assurance doubly sure, Congress ruled that the privilege of using a radio channel could, in no sense, be regarded as perpetual. Broadcasting licenses were limited to a period not longer than 3 years and every application for a renewal of license was to be limited to and governed by the same considerations and practices which affected the granting of original applications. Under congressional fiat, every licensee has to sign a waiver of any claim to the use of the air waves "as against the regulatory power of the United States."

Unfortunately, during the more than one decade which followed the adoption of the Federal Communications Commission Act in 1934, the Commission has failed to utilize completely its immense powers. The Commission, by a form of nocuous desuetude, has permitted the main springs of its authority to become atrophied, so that today it may be questioned whether radio stations are being operated fully in the public interest.

The question might well be asked: Is the air really free?

If free, is it really free in the sense that we enjoy freedom of speech? Or is it freedom for the broadcasting networks to carry on their business without Government interference? Congress intended that freedom of the air for the people in general. Congress unequivocally determined that the air waves were to remain in the public domain and that the ether was not to be so dominated by the owners of radio stations and chains, by large advertising agencies and by large manufacturers, as to encompass only their freedom. It was never contemplated that the latter were to be the sole determining factors as to what constituted a broadcast. Freedom of the air was intended to mean and it should still mean that John Q. Public shall have the right and the opportunity to be given information and ideas from all sources; that such right and opportunity shall not be restricted by the broadcasters, the network chains, the advertising agencies, and the large industrialists. In order to retard an evil that is well-nigh full grown and to prevent its further spread in the realm of FM and television, I submit the following suggestions to the Federal Communications Commission. I am convinced that the basic

act is sufficiently broad and liberal to provide the Commission with power to carry out my suggestions without any further legislation.

1. No radio station has the privilege, in perpetuity, of using the frequency assigned to it. Therefore, upon application for a renewal of a license, as is implicit in the act, the Commission shall be limited to and governed by the same considerations and practices which affect the granting of original applications.

At its inception, the Commission renewed licenses every 6 months. This period was gradually extended until finelly it reached the 3-year maximum permitted by the law. Personally, I have no quarrel with this procedure but I do inveigh against the custom which has unfortunately arisen whereby the Commission regards, apparently, a renewal application as purely perfunctory. Each renewal should be subjected to rigid investigation and any citizen who wishes to do so should be allowed to raise his voice in opposition or register his complaint. Furthermore, any person or entity desiring to function on the wave length involved should have the right to appear and present their case. If they can demonstrate their ability to operate the station to a greater degree in the public interest, renewal of the application to the current licensee should be refused and the privilege should be granted the new applicant. Such a requirement, I am convinced, would galvanize all station owners into conducting and supervising the activities of their station or network in a manner that will be truly consistent with the public medium philosophy indicated by Congress when it carefully considered the FCC Act of 1934.

2. In the evaluation of any application or renewal of application, the Commission shall not sanction the depreciation of the radio into a medium maintained exclusively for the selling of merchandise and for the popularizing of services. The radio may and should be used, in part, for publicizing goods and services, but it must also be utilized to encourage and serve as an intermediary for the expression of local talent generously available in all communities. "It must be the vehicle whereby the cultural, moral, and entertainment resources of the entire Nation may be tapped for the education and entertainment of the entire public." It must be the instrument for conveying to the people additional town hall meetings and discussion of public questions and issues must be given the widest dissemination. The income derived from the station's operations must not be the sole motivating consideration. The radio industry has so manipulated freedom of the air that it has become a bookkeeping entry on their profit sheets, the latter growing increasingly during the last decade. These have been the lush years and FM and television should give impetus and courage to a complete reorientation and lead the way to needed reforms. The function of the Commission and its control over the radio spectrum shall not deteriorate into a mere engineering job of settling disputes between radio operators or protecting the broadcasting companies from interfering with radio signals or other companies.

3. Any legitimate organization, entity, or individual, conforming to existing regulations promulgated by the Commission, shall be permitted to buy time. "He who controls the pocketbook controls the man." This statement was quoted by Mr. Niles Trammell, president of the National Broadcasting Co., before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in December 1943. Apparently this is the thought that has been animating most of the broadcasters. It undoubtedly had a direct influence upon some of the provisions of the code of the National Association of Broadcasters because labor, as represented by the railroad brotherhoods, the A. F. of L., and the CIO, found itself effectively barred from the use of radio. That code forbade the sale of radio time for so-called controversial issues and the NAB stated that labor in and of itself constituted a controversial issue and, therefore, could not buy time on the air, no matter what its program. The president of a large network testified before the Federal Communications Commission in February 1943 that his network even refused to sell time to the A. F. of L. for a symphony program. But organized industry had no trouble whatsoever in securing time to present its views and opinions. NAB probably reasoned that presenting labor's side was not good business. Why ruffle the feathers of big business?

Hundreds of programs over the networks and the local stations have been sponsored and paid for by industry. Antilabor commentators such as Fulton Lewis, Jr., and Upton Close were given the freest reign, yet labor found itself in the anomalous position of being unable to buy time to reply. As a result of this edict making labor verboten on the air, a bitter controversy ensued and labor, determined to hold the radio industry accountable, presented its claim to the FCC. Hearings were held on the renewal of a certain station and as a result of a consent decree adhered to by the Communications Commission, the station, although a member of the NAB and bound by its code, agreed to sell time to labor and to permit it to get its message across to the public. Thus, as a result of a militant public opinion developed by the fight of the labor interests, that particular prohibitive plank in the platform of the NAB's code was voided. Now the remarks of a commentator sponsored by a business concerned are not urged of controversiality merely by virtue of such sponsorship. Labor now has the right to reply. It did not have the right previously.

In a series of illuminating articles by Dixon Wecter in recent issues of the Atlantic Monthly entitled "Hearing Is Believing," we have a splendid comment on the code of the NAB. He says that "A code which forbids the sale of time for the discussion of controversial issues would be well enough, if unsold time during good listening hours were available in reasonable quantities. But when commercially sponsored commentators use their quarter hours week after week to vent highly debatable opinions, and when unsold quarter-hours are so few and far between, the code wears thin."

But the NAB may develop other quirks, shall we say, and ban sponsors for reasons equally arbitrary. What then?

It is not my purpose to endow the Government with the power to instruct the broadcasters as to what the public may or may not hear. On the other hand, the broadcasters shall not have the untrammeled right to monopolize the air with what they decide the public is qualified to hear. The practice of treating the listening public as so many unguided adolescents should no longer prevail. The broadcasters shall have freedom from State censorship but such freedom shall not carry with it the right to exercise censorship, except to protect themselves against libel and slander suits, safeguard against profanity and obscenity and discrimination among political candidates during their campaigns for public office.

4. Definite segments of the daily radio cycle must be given over to sustaining programs and such broadcasts should be of an educational, cultural, and forensic nature. Such sustaining programs shall not be assigned to the so-called graveyard hours, but rather timed for the convenience of the largest number of radio fans, preferably during the evening hours—between 7 and 11. These are the maximum income-producing hours, the more coveted hours, the hours that are now rigidly under the control of the various advertising agencies jockeying the ether to the best interests of their clients. The same essential should govern the Saturday and Sunday hours.

It might be well to point out here that we have not bestowed on the broadcasting companies the right to exploit. Their paramount duty is a public service, to be rendered to the people, and this must not be construed as applying exclusively to the patrons of the national advertising agencies.

Radio has passed the diaper and romper stage and it is now on the road to full maturity. In 1927, the gross time sales of all broadcasters in this country, including the networks, was less than $5,000,000. In 1943, the figure had reached an all-time high of over $307,000,000. It will run far beyond that figure for 1945. But take note of the tremendous concentration of advertising over the networks. Although 70 percent of all newspaper advertising revenue emanates from local business concerns, and only 30 percent from national and regional advertisers, in the case of radio broadcasting, we have the opposite extreme. In 1943, over 70 percent of all the broadcasting stations, independent and chain, came from national and regional advertisers. The conclusion is inescapable—that broadcasting has become, primarily, an instrument of Nationwide business concerns. The cost of a single hour of full network coverage runs as high as $25,000. Obviously only top-notch national concerns can afford this de luxe form of advertising. In 1943, 144 advertisers provided 97.2 percent of the national network's revenue. For example, one-eighth of the entire advertising business of the National Broadcasting Co. has come from one advertiser and two advertisers provide almost one-fourth of its business. Ten advertisers account for another 6 percent of its revenue. Is such a complete stranglehold by advertising a baneful influence? At this crossroads in the industry, such crucial factors must give us pause for thought.

There are more than 900 standard broadcasting stations, more than 600 of which are affiliated with one or more of the four national networks. These more than 600 stations utilize 95 percent of the nighttime broadcasting power and over 53 percent of the day broadcasting time is taken by national network programs. About 40 percent of the entire revenue of the affiliated stations comes from the national networks; thus, the latter have a tremendous potency in molding public opinion. Little does the Nation realize how Gargantuan is this power over the spoken word. Busy people may not read, but if they are within the vicinity of a radio receiving set that is tuned in on any program, it may be assumed that they will absorb something of what comes over. Such power might well give direction to the Nation's economic life—or death. Should this power be more diversified? Should this concentration be permitted to continue, to expand and to solidify? These are questions which require answers in the not far distant future.

5. Periodic financial statements must be required from the broadcasting companies and should contain a statement of operations and set forth complete details as to profit and loss. Radio stations have sold for more than one million dollars recently. Such a sum cannot be justified where the quid pro quo is primarily that which not only belongs to the people of the United States but the tremendous potential of which has been created by the people. There are more than 900 stations at the present time, each holding a modified monopoly created by the people. Permission to own and operate a radio station and an assigned frequency is only a temporary privilege, subject to recall.

6. The Federal Communications Commission should pass upon the selling price of any radio station. The huge prices that are being paid for the stations actually cover the frequency—not the transmitter or other equipment, or office furniture, etc. What greatly needs stressing is the fact that the

listening public is being sold in the astronomical financial transactions. The Commission must crack down hard on these rapid transfers for increasingly higher amounts. If this practice is not eliminated or controlled, we will be faced with this very serious situation. Only the wealthiest individuals or companies will have what it takes to control a station.

There are several unpleasant straws in the wind.

The Aviation Corporation of America,[1] at this writing, through one of its affiliates, has asked for permission to have transferred to it one of the largest and most powerful stations in the United States.

Many of the influential newspapers own stations. With this medium of communication in the control of the financial aristocracy it is to be expected that they shall see to it that in many instances information, opinion, news casts, analyses of world events, and résumés of domestic and international affairs are slanted according to their own political ideology.

Frequently such individuals and entities unabashedly sponsor reaction and make every concerted effort to jeopardize progressive legislation.

If further encouragement is given to the payment of these gigantic fees for the sale of stations, the Nation will then find itself in an economic vise. Radio will be available only to those advertisers who are in a position to pay well for the privilege. The higher the capital investment for the purchase of the station the higher amount it will be necessary to charge for the radio service and smaller businessmen will find themselves precluded. The profit motive being a "natural," efforts will be made to squeeze every possible dollar out of the advertisers to sustain the great capital outlay. The "public medium" philosophy will thus degenerate to the "balance sheet" philosophy.

In December 1942 the FCC approved the transfer of the control of the so-called Yankee Network, Inc., licensee of four standard broadcasting stations, four relay stations, two experimental stations, and two high-frequency stations. The General Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio, was the successful vendee. Over $1,240,000 was paid for the transfer. The application was granted without even a hearing, and the applicant did not bother to produce any convincing facts that the public interest would be served by the transfer. Two members of the Commission objected to the transfer without at least holding a hearing.

Such inflated purchase prices, with consequent emphasis upon the profit that can be extracted from operations, will eventually force aff the radio spectrum all sustaining hours. It will make radio a purely materialistic affair, denied all artistic, esthetic, scientific, and cultural values, except those arbitrarily contrived by the broadcasters and those agencies preparing programs.

Here I desire to raise another point about which I have reached no exact determination at the present time. It concerns the question of absentee ownership and control. In the case of the Yankee Network aforesaid, be it understood that the stations involved were all located in New England. The transferee was an Ohio company with its principal place of business in Akron, Ohio, to wit, the General Tire and Rubber Co., with all but one of its officers and directors residing in Ohio. With the exception of two brokerage houses in New York City, all the stockholders owning 1 percent or more of the capital stock were residents of Ohio. There was no proof that the transferee and those who were to control the station had any familiarity with or interest in the problems of the New England area. These factors should have been carefully canvassed inasmuch as an examination and investigation would determine whether the station would be operated in the public interest. Similar investigations should accompany other transfers of license. In this case, the transferee is a manufacturer of tires and rubber and by the transfer it obtains a very important adjunct to its private business operations, namely, broadcasting stations servicing the greater part of the New England area. The issue presented is not whether interests engaged in other lines of business should be prevented from acquiring broadcasting facilities but, rather, the extent to which they should be permitted to enter the radio field. This is the problem which has given Commissioner Durr of the Federal Communications Commission so much concern. I, too, incline to the view that some limitation must be imposed, otherwise manufacturing companies, department stores, newspapers may be enabled to embark upon a program of this type of expansion, forcing their competitors to seek the same sort of advantage. If such a tendency should remain unchecked, radio broadcasting would become a mere adjunct of private commercial enterprises and in such a denouement the public interest could hardly be served.

The picture, however, is not entirely black, although it is rather spotted. The radio industry has been spectacularly alert to the possibilities of the medium, has explored them thoroughly, and has been most receptive to scientific improvements, expending sizable sums for new equipment and in constructive experimentation. Considerable credit is due the industry for the advancements, particularly when one compares our radio fare with the Government-controlled soporific, the British Broadcasting Co. Yet deserved approbation should not blind us to some of radio's more blatant defects. In Stevenson's phrase, it is "full of imperfect virtues." The programs have been slowly but steadily improving in quality, but we are still plagued by too much unadulterated "corn" and commercials which, in many instances, seem designed to appeal only to morons. Some of the "soap opera" programs are nought but sugared pills. Some of the boogie-woogie programs are ear-splitting caterwaulings. According to the broadcasting companies, such programs bring in the shekels. So they respond, "So what?" An illuminating comment was made recently by the famed violinist, Jascha Heifetz, who flew to America after completing his third trip for USO camp shows. He returned more convinced than ever, he said, that thousands of Americans whom he met are hungry for good music and would become devotees of the classics if they could hear more of them.

Radio in this country, Mr. Heifetz asserted, has been making mistakes, "playing down to its listeners when it should be doing the opposite, especially in music. There is still too much junk on the air; sponsored programs are horribly overadvertised, and very badly so, too."

One radio writer, fed up with this situation, commented in the New York Times recently, as follows: "Most of radio writing is polemic or melodrama when it is not entirely nonsense. Radio writing as it is now developed is simply an adjunct of advertising. The word is fitted to the product. The product is God. The word is the interval between the announcements of God. This is hardly a condition for literature. It is a rat race. Let us have a wider outlet for noncommercial radio drama. I mean a half-hour each week on each network for a program of original radio plays in poetry or prose. It might well usher in a renaissance in radio drama. How about it, NBC, CBS, American, and Mutual? Put up or shut up, or forever hold your pronouncements about radio coming of age. We are nearing the middle of the twentieth century. Shall the singing commercial and the Lone Ranger inherit the earth?" The disgusted correspondent in this instance was Norman Rosten.

In his article, Hearing Is Believing, Dixon Wecter, in the August issue of the Atlantic Monthly, writes: "Under the guise of news of news comment, a great variety of fare is handed out by the networks and stations. Some is brilliant reporting or mature, well-balanced analysis. But a very large volume is hearsay, petulance, tattling, and the fluid emotionalism which even at its best has little place in the presentation of news or guidance of rational public opinion."

Suggestions made herein will undoubtedly flutter the dovecotes. Once in a while, such a disturbance is needed, inasmuch as it usually presages an airing and a house cleaning. I wish to emphasize that my personal relations with the various chains and stations have been most pleasant to date, and I have never been refused a request for time. On many occasions time has been offered to me. I have no personal ax to grind and these suggestions are made entirely in the public interest.

It may be that many of the irritating thorns may be plucked with the adoption of FM and television and that the additional outlets on the air may make for a wider diversity in programs. The supplemental channels created by FM will give us many more stations than the total now operating in the standard broadcasting band.

Opportunity knocks once more. We are being offered another chance to restore radio broadcasting as a genuine instrument of public service, as Congress originally intended. The other alternative would underscore and consolidate the present trend—it would confine radio to a role as the most effective commercial medium in existence today. Shall we permit the same commercial groups that now dominate our present system to continue to command the new field? Or shall we insure the future by allowing the new owners of the expanded frequencies provided by FM to accept the challenge now thrust upon them to give us free discussions, better entertainment, and a broader means of education?

This is certain: The announced intention of the Federal Communications Commission to reserve at least five new FM radio channels for educational use and for educational institutions must not be abandoned.

As to the remaining FM stations that will be available, the Commission must ever remember that the radio must at all times be an unhampered outlet for the free expression of the people, by the people, and for the people. Only on the anvil of free discussion can the truth be forged.

AUGUST 7, 1945.

[1] Since dictating the above the Commission has approved the transfer by a vote of 4 to 3.

Some Veterans' Legislation Reported by a Committee and Ready for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, at the time the vote was taken for Congress to recess in July to the 8th of October I was both doubtful and hopeful. I was hopeful that the war would end before we had any reason to expect it to end, and I was very doubtful whether the country would be as well prepared for taking care of veterans and war workers as it should be in case victory came while the Congress was in recess. And now, Mr. Speaker, we are

called from our vacations, and very rightfully called back, for it is later than we think in regard to adequate preparation for reconversion, demobilization, and peacetime adjustments.

I know, of course, that it will take some time to get legislation shaped up for action on the floor of either House. Committees are at work, and we must not be too impatient during the next few days. I know, of course, that the members of some of the more important committees have been at work here in Washington since VJ-day, working on this more important legislation, doing the preliminary shaping behind the scenes, of which the public can have scant knowledge. I do hope that some of those more important bills are about ready for committee approval so that legislative action may be taken rather promptly in the House or Senate, resulting in early enactment. The Congress was not behind time, and it was not niggardly, in passing legislation and in appropriating money to get the country ready to wage this war. The war Congresses have done their part. I hope Congress will not be behind time and will not be niggardly in waging the peace which must follow this war.

The House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has all of the committee work done on an important bill which is now eligible for action by the House at the earliest parliamentary opportunity. This bill has been reported unanimously by the committee before the recess and should have been passed already by the House had it not been caught in the jam during the closing days before the recess last July. This is a bill which lays the foundation for a much needed postwar program affecting thousands of discharged servicemen and also thousands of former war workers. The bill to which I refer is H. R. 520. Its report is No. 688.

This bill extends a 90-day preference to veterans of all wars on any newly irrigated lands reclaimed by the Bureau of Reclamation in the 17 Western States. Of course, only a few hundred thousand people instead of several million would be offered employment by the enactment of this measure, and of course only a few hundred thousand veterans would be given the opportunity of home ownership instead of the twelve or fourteen million who have recently worn the uniform, but in this critical economic period I feel that jobs afforded four or five hundred thousand and opportunity for home ownership furnished half that number of veterans is not to be sneezed at. This is a very significant bill in the future economic development of our country.

In regard to jobs, I am far more interested in seeing that jobs in constructive work where wages are earned are much more important than any unemployment insurance payments could possibly be. Also, I am of the opinion that an opportunity to become owner of a piece of land on which a veteran can make a home and a living is one of the most important rewards that could be offered any of the Nation's defenders. While this bill, H. R. 520, will reach a comparatively few of those whom we want to give consideration, it is a very worthy and justified piece of legislation in spite of the relatively small number it may benefit. Therefore I trust Congress may give early consideration to this particular bill—as well as numerous others urgently needed—on which the committee work has been completed.

The Problems of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it will be recorded that this Congress which reconvenes today is perhaps the most important Congress that has met in a long time. The problem of winning the war brought many difficult legislative programs before us for consideration. The history of what Congress accomplished during the past trying years has been written.

Today the legislative task is different and entirely new. One of our colleagues has very pointedly said in substance today the war ended when the atomic bomb exploded and that if proper procedure is followed there will be peace in the world for a long time to come. The Congress which meets today deals with reconversion problems.

THE LAWMAKING BODY

Contrary to popular impression, Congress is the lawmaking body. The executive branch of the Government has to do with the administration of Government agencies and the running and operation of the Government. When legislation is needed, administration leaders in Congress respond to messages from the Executive. This is what is known as the party system of Government. There is a loud outcry just now from certain elements because certain legislation which is considered proper has not been enacted by Congress. This criticism of Congress follows the old procedure which has been in vogue ever since we had a Congress. You have to blame somebody, so blame Congress for everything that happens. A columnist recently expressed the idea in the following language:

> The Nazis and Japs are defeated, leaving nobody left to yell at but Congress. And Congressmen are even better targets than baseball umpires. You can call them names without paying for a seat in the grandstand and getting mustard on your best pair of gloves.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEGISLATIVE DELAY RESTS UPON THE ADMINISTRATION

Just to keep dates and events in correct order, let us observe that the Seventy-ninth Congress convened on January 3, 1945, and administration leaders had some 6 or 7 months in which to prepare and enact whatever legislation was deemed necessary when the war was over, and it became necessary to convert our wartime economy into a peacetime economy. The administration did make progress in this direction but just now it is popular to point out a number of matters which require legislative action. It is also popular to blame Congress because legislative proposals have not been considered. I just make the foregoing comment, not because Congress needs any defense, but because the facts are that responsibility for present conditions do not rest upon Congress.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM IS NEEDED

We do need a legislative program. Congress is willing to pass whatever laws are required to assist the executive branch of the Government in this transition period when our war industries are no longer needed, when factories are being closed, and people are finding it necessary to seek other employment. Under our party system of government, the party leadership in the House is expected to bring out of the various committees legislation having to do with the problem of employment, legislation having to do with unemployment compensation, legislation having to do with disposal of surplus property and war materials, and legislation dealing with revision of our tax laws and other domestic problems.

Let it be noted that Congress is here in the Nation's Capital, ready to meet the emergency which even the administration did not foresee with the sudden collapse of Japan, and it will not be necessary for irresponsible opportunists to charge up the hardships that result from the sudden ending of the war to the Members of Congress, on the theory that if Congress were in session, everything would be in proper order.

DEMOBILIZATION OF OUR ARMED FORCES

When events of World War II are written into history, the sacrifice which the American people have made in building up a vast war machine will challenge admiration. Sons and daughters, husbands and fathers all were put into the Army or the Navy and the manpower of this country was mobilized regardless of any other consideration. Now that the war is over, the folks back home are demanding that this vast war machine be demobilized and that the men and women in our armed forces come back home to resume their places in civilian life, some to take back the jobs which they left when they entered the armed forces, others to go to school, and others to find a place in the economic life of America. The Army and the Navy will do well to heed the demands of the American people for a speedy demobilization and a return of the sons and husbands and daughters to their homes and communities.

DELAY IN DEMOBILIZATION?

In connection with the discharge of those in our armed forces, we just as well reckon with the fact that statements have been made that the administration does not want to release soldiers and sailors and send them home because it might create an unemployment problem. In other words, in order to avoid the possiblity of an economic break-down and large numbers of people out of employment, the charge has been made that political leaders want to keep the men in the Army and Navy for an indefinite period of time. Then, there is another statement that I hear quite often—high salaried officials in the Army and the

Navy don't want to demobilize the Army or the Navy because if they discharge the soldiers and sailors, they will be out of a job. Their concern is to keep a large Army and Navy, based on a purely selfish interest. I do not subscribe to either of these rumors or charges. I do know that they are being made. The test as to whether or not they are correct is squarely up to the administration leaders and the Army and Navy officials. If they are going to delay, under one pretext or another, the discharge of our soldiers and sailors, now that this war is over, and has been won by these men, then there is every reason to believe these charges are true.

IN CONCLUSION

If the administration officials and Army and Navy officials do not take steps to cope with the problems that follow as an aftermath of victory on August 14 when the people of this country celebrated enthusiastically VJ-day, then Congress will have to set up some other agency to carry out the will of the American people.

Certainly the problems that follow any war are difficult and far reaching. There are hardships which sometimes cannot be avoided. But any measures that are taken to meet these conditions must be taken by administrative officials. Congress can and will pass needed legislation. Only foul-mouthed demagogs will say to people that are unemployed that Congress and our American system of Government are to blame for such conditions.

For Posterity—The Story of the Surrender of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the record the story of the surrender of Japan, as reported by the United Press, and published in the Beaumont Enterprise, Beaumont, Tex., on Sunday, September 2, 1945. The story follows:

JAPAN BOWS TO ALLIED VICTORY—DOCUMENT SIGNED ON U. S. S. "MISSOURI" MARKS WAR'S END—NIPPONESE ARE STRIPPED OF POWER AS EMPEROR'S REPRESENTATIVES FIX NAMES TO HISTORIC PAPER

ABOARD THE UNITED STATES BATTLESHIP "MISSOURI" IN TOKYO BAY, Sunday, September 2.—Japan surrendered formally, finally, and unconditionally to the United States and its Allied Powers today. On the starboard bow deck of this battleship in Tokyo Bay, her representatives signed a surrender document which made her 80,000,000 people from Emperor Hirohito down subject to the authority of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the supreme Allied commander.

At the moment of signing Japan was reduced to her four main islands and such minor islands as the Allies grant her. Her people, her government, her demigod emperor, her industry, her very life came under Allied military rule and will remain there until the day when she is deemed to have for the first time in the 2,605 years of history a democratic, peacefully inclined government and thus is worthy of rejoining the family of nations.

Japan's representatives, MacArthur, Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Gen. Hsu Yung-chang for China, Admiral Sir Bruce Fraser for Great Britain, Lt. Gen. Kuzma Derevyanko for Russia, Gen. Sir Thomas Blamey for Australia, Gen. Jasques Leclerc for France, Lt. Gen. L. H. Van Oyen for Holland, signed the short surrender document at a ceremony which was almost religious in its solemnity.

PROCLAIMS SURRENDER TO ALLIES

The document said:

"We hereby proclaim the unconditional surrender to the Allied Powers of the Japanese imperial general headquarters and of all Japanese armed forces under Japanese control wherever situated.

"The authority of the Emperor and the Japanese Government to rule the state shall be subject to the supreme commander for the Allied Powers who will take such steps as he deems proper to effectuate these terms of surrender."

All Japanese civil, military, and naval officials were commanded to obey, to enforce all MacArthur's orders, to continue their noncombatant duties unless specifically relieved by him.

DOCUMENT BASED ON POTSDAM PAPER

The document was based on the Allied Potsdam declaration of July 25. Japan undertook in the name of the emperor and the present and future governments to carry out its provisions and all of MacArthur's orders.

Simultaneously with the signing Emperor Hirohito and imperial headquarters issued their first instructions to the Japanese people and armed forces at the personal order of MacArthur as master of Japan.

Hirohito said he had ordered his government and headquarters to sign the surrender and obey MacArthur's orders. He now ordered, he added, that the Japanese people themselves were to stop hostilities forthwith and carry out the provisions both of the surrender instrument and the instructions of imperial headquarters.

These instructions were contained in Japanese general order No. 1, issued at MacArthur's direction.

SURRENDER ZONES ARE DEFINED

Giving orders to principal Japanese commanders to surrender, it disclosed for the first time the exact definition of Pacific island surrender zones.

Admiral Nimitz will take the surrender in all Japanese mandated islands, the Ryukyus, the Bonins, and other Pacific islands.

Great Britain and Australia take the surrender in the Bismarck and Solomon islands and all territories to the west including the Netherlands East Indies.

Other zones had been made known previously—China, Formosa, and Indo-China north of the 16th degree of latitude to China, Manchuria, Korea north of 38 degrees of latitude and Japan's half of Sakhalin island to Russia, Korea south of 38 degress to the United States.

ARMS PUT UNDER MAC ARTHUR CONTROL

Under this order all Japanese arms, equipment, shipping and war factories come at once under MacArthur's control along with defenses and bases.

MacArthur opened the surrender ceremony with a speech. The war was over, he said, its issues determined on the battlefields of the world. Its issues were not for discussion here, he said, and he added:

"Nor is it for us here to meet * * * in a spirit of distrust, malice, or hatred."

Rather, he said, it was for victors and vanquished to rise to a higher dignity and commit all their peoples to carry out faithfully and without reserve the terms of the surrender. It was his hope, MacArthur said, that out of the war would emerge a world founded on faith and understanding, a world dedicated to the dignity of man, to freedom, tolerance, and justice.

"The terms and conditions upon which the surrender of the Japanese imperial forces is here to be given and accepted are contained in the instrument of surrender now before you," MacArthur said.

TERMS COMPLIED WITH

"As supreme commander for the Allied Powers, I announce that it is my firm purpose, in the tradition of the countries I represent, to proceed in the discharge of my responsibilities with justice and tolerance, while taking all necessary dispositions to insure that the terms of surrender are fully, promptly, and faithfully complied with.

"I now invite the representatives of the Emperor of Japan and the Japanese Government, and the Japanese imperial headquarters, to sign the surrender instrument at the places indicated."

In a second speech concluding the ceremony MacArthur reported by radio to his fellow Americans and the Allied world.

"MEN WALK UPRIGHT"

The victory had been won, he said, the guns were silent—"men everywhere walk upright in the sunlight. The entire world lives quietly at peace. The holy mission has been completed. * * *"

MacArthur said he was speaking in the name of the American dead and the American living, "the unnamed brave millions homeward bound to take up the challenge of that future which they did so much to salvage from the brink of disaster."

The destructiveness of war, MacArthur said, had brought a new era. Man has sought peace, he said, but his means have failed—alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, "all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible war.

"HAD LAST CHANCE"

"The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative," he continued. "We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system Armageddon will be at our door."

The problem was theological he said, and called for an improvement in the character of men themselves to match their 2,000-year advances in sciences, art, literature, and all material and cultural fields.

"It must be of the spirit," he said, "if we are to save the flesh."

Commodore Perry 90 years ago tried to take enlightenment to Japan. But, he continued, the knowledge Japan acquired by emerging from isolation was turned to oppression and enslavement.

FREEDOM DENIED

"Freedom of expression, freedom of action, even freedom of thought were denied through the suppression of liberal education, through appeal to superstition and through the application of force," he said.

"We are committed by the Potsdam declaration * * * to see that the Japanese people are liberated from this condition of slavery."

"It is my purpose to implement this commitment just as rapidly as the armed forces are demobilized and other essential steps taken to neutralize the war potential.

TALENTS OF RACE

"If the talents of the race are turned into constructive channels the country can lift itself from its present deplorable state into a position of dignity.

"And so, my fellow countrymen, today I report to you that your sons and daughters have served you well and faithfully * * * their spiritual strength and power has brought us through to victory. They are homeward bound—take care of them."

Nimitz spoke also—briefly and bluntly.

He had walked around an American cemetery in Guam, he said, and seen the names on the headstones—"Culpepper, Tomaino, Sweeney, Bromberg, Depew, Melloy, Ponziani."

"SOLEMN OBLIGATION

"To them we have a solemn obligation," he said, "the obligation to insure that their sacrifice will help to make this a better and safer world in which to live.

"To achieve this, it will be necessary for the United Nations to enforce rigidly the peace terms which will be imposed upon Japan. It will also be necessary to maintain our national strength at a level which will discourage future acts of aggression aimed at the destruction of our way of life."

Generous as were MacArthur's statements, his surrender terms were specific, all-embracing, and forceful.

Not only was the emperor put under him, along with all his people, but Japanese general order No. 7 said at the end:

PROMPTLY OBEYED

"This and all subsequent instructions issued by the supreme commander for the Allied forces or other Allied military authorities will be scrupulously and promptly obeyed by Japanese and Japanese-controlled military and civil officials and private persons.

"Any delay or failure to comply with the provisions of this or subsequent orders, and any action which the supreme commander for the Allied Powers determines to be detrimental to the Allied Powers, will incur drastic and summary punishment at the hands of Allied military authorities and the Japanese Government."

This order specified that the orders issued by general headquarters to commanding officers were for unconditional surrender.

MINUTE DETAIL

The instructions were specific and in minute detail.

They called for lists to be given MacArthur of the strength of armed forces, quantity and type of weapons of all sorts, Japanese and Japanese-controlled war and merchant vessels, obstacles to ocean traffic, military installations and establishments of every sort.

Lists are to be provided of factories, plants, shops, research institutions, laboratories, testing stations, technical data, patents, plans, drawings, and inventions used in the Japanese war effort. Manufacture of arms and ammunition is to cease at once.

Allied prisoners and internees are to be safeguarded.

Finally, Japanese officials are to be prepared on instruction to collect and deliver all arms held by civilians.

Our Tribute to a Colleague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial entitled, "Our Tribute to a Colleague," which appeared in the Sunday Item, Lawrence, Mass., August 26, 1945:

OUR TRIBUTE TO A COLLEAGUE

In the recent hospital drive that soared to such a victorious and breath-taking conclusion last week no single individual carried a greater part of the burden more signally to the brilliant consummation of that wholehearted public outpouring than Irving E. Rogers, aggressive, civic-minded publisher of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune.

Unstinting in the use of his papers and radio station for publicity, unflagging in his interest in the campaign's progress, in addition he not only contributed the magnificent sum of $7,200, but in his ardent zeal for the success of the drive he later almost doubled his original contribution.

By his splendid and constant cooperation he served as a public example of the social tolerance and Christian charity that Bon Secour Sisters plan to bring into the friendliest city in the United States. Present at the birth of Lawrences' Catholic hospital, this Protestant gentleman exemplified for those of all faiths what kindly help means.

In a day when too many with access to the public's ear abuse their sacred privileges to serve truth by inflaming classes and creeds against each other, Irving Rogers has shown himself a real American and an exponent of democracy in the finest meaning of those glorious words.

Two weeks ago from the most exalted Catholic of the Old Bay State, Archbishop Cushing of Boston, came glowing words of thanks to Mr. Rogers. This week from the humblest Catholic in the diocese (and Mr. Rogers' fellow townsman) come these words of grateful tribute for a great and glorious work. And so from the highest to lowest with one accord the Catholic population wishes Irving E. Rogers God's blessing for many fruitful years."

Palestine and the Labor Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over Station WJZ, New York, August 17, 1945:

The British Labor Party at its forty-third annual conference in London last year, in no uncertain terms went on record to help in every way possible the Jewish cause in Palestine. Its Palestine plank reads as follows:

"Here we have halted halfway, irresolute between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home, unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish to, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistable case now after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe.

"Here too in Palestine is the case on human grounds, and to promote a stable settlement for the transfer of populations, let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organized and generously financed.

"The Arab has many wide territories of his own they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area—Palestine—less than the size of Wales.

"Indeed, we should reexamine also the possibility of extending the present boundaries by agreement with Egypt, Syria, or Transjordan. Moreover, we should seek to win the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments for the execution of this Palestine policy."

The Labor Party has repeatedly challenged and chided the Chamberlain and Churchill governments for their dereliction in Palestine and bitterly condemned these governments for their perfidy and for their failure to redeem their pledges repeatedly given to the Jews and to the world; to wit, that England would keep open the gates of Palestine for untrammeled immigration and land ownership to the end that the Government might facilitate the establishment therein of a national homeland for the Jewish people. Time and again, the leading members of the Labor Party have expressed themselves in favor of the Zionist aspirations in Palestine. In fact, the British Labor Party has been pro-Zionist for a quarter of a century.

Maj. Clement Attlee, the 62-year-old British party leader and now Britain's Prime Minister, while a member of the British delegation to the World Security Conference at San Francisco, reassured labor friends of Palestine that he was fully in accord with his party's program on Palestine. In 1935, he expressed gratitude to the Jews in Palestine for the part they played in the rescue of the first Jewish victims of nazism. He rose in his seat in Parliament and declared that the political and economic reconstruction of Palestine had become an "imperative duty", particularly in face of the tragedy of the German Jews. He said that the Jews were "bearing the burdens of other people's sins."

It is very significant that Prime Minister Attlee has placed in important positions in his Cabinet, numerous of his colleagues who are not only sympathetic to the Zionist cause but who have openly and courageously denounced the efforts on the part of the British Government to sabotage and scuttle the struggles of the Jews to develop their homeland in Palestine, the only haven left for the harassed Jews in the whole world.

George Alfred Isaacs, Minister of Labor and National Services, in 1936, proposed as a resolution, an appeal from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, calling oin the British Trade Union Congress to use its influence in preventing suspension of Jewish immigration to Palestine.

Miss Ellen Wilkinson, newly appointed Minister of Education, continually spoke against the so-called Malcolm MacDonald white paper and voted against its passage in 1939. Likewise, Tom Williams, First Parliamentary Secretary of Agriculture and Fisheries, in 1940 denounced the white paper land restrictions and the illegal imprisonment of Palestinian Jews for possession of arms for defense against marauding Arabs. George Henry Hall, Secretary of State for the Colonies; Emanuel Shinwell, Minister for Fuel and Power; and Philip John Noel Baker, Minister of State, have all plainly indicated their friendliness to the Jews of Palestine.

Lastly, Herbert Stanley Morrison, Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons, was one of the principal opponents of the promulgation of the nefarious white paper, which limited and now prevents entirely Jewish immigration into Palestine. On the floor of the House of Commons in May 1939, when the white paper came up for passage, he stated: "We regard this white paper and the policy in it as a cynical breach of pledges given to the Jews and the world, including America. This policy will do us no good in the United States, where we need to be done good and where we need the good will of the great American people. It comes at a time of tragedy and apprehension for the Jewish race throughout the world, and it ought not to be approved by the House today. * * * If we do this thing today we shall have done a thing which is dishonorable to our good name, which is discreditable to our capacity to govern, and which is dangerous to British security, to peace, and to the economic interest of the world in general and of our own country."

Addressing the majority party, he said, "I ask them to remember the sufferings of these Jewish people all over the world. I ask them to remember that Palestine, of all the places in the world, was certainly the place where they had some right to expect not to suffer or to have restrictions imposed upon them. Look at the extent of the country—this little patch of territory. Transjordan has been taken away. The rest of the Arabian countries released from Turkish rule as a result of the war have an enormous area. This tiny patch, Palestine, about the size of Wales, is left and we are to stop these people from going there. I appeal to honorable Members opposite to take their courage in both hands, to put the honor of their country before the narrow claims of party."

So here again we have the outpouring of words, words of compassion as well as words of logic. We are faced with the question whether they will have any more meaning than the torrents of words that poured forth before, while million upon million of Jews were being slaughtered and with no country of sufficient humanity to make them welcome. Palestine, though pledged and repledged to the Jews, was likewise forbidden them.

Now what? The eyes of the world are on the Labor Government in England. Its every move is watched with critical sympathy. What will it do with regards to its pledges given to the Jews? How will it discharge the obligations England assumed when she bid for and was given the mandate over Palestine? The Labor Government seeks and needs the good will of the United States. The United States has made clear its stand on Palestine. We embraced the principles of the Balfour Declaration in a congressional resolution in 1922 and reaffirmed it in the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924. Nor have we hesitated to declare our disapproval of Britain's repudiation of her pledge and her unilateral breach of the treaty and the terms of the Palestine mandate. Both major parties, in the last election, adopted Palestine planks in their platforms, favoring the abrogation of the white paper of 1939 and favoring the ultimate establishment in Palestine of a democratic Jewish commonwealth. Both candidates for the Presidency, the late President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey, publicly and strongly endorsed these planks.

Yesterday, at a news conference, President Truman disclosed that he made a plea at Potsdam for the setting up of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine and for the opening of the doors of the Holy Land. He did, however, to my amazement, raise the old smoke screen of the absorptive capacity of Palestine. I remind the President of the expert opinion given by Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk of our Department of Agriculture and well-known conservationist who unequivocally stated that with the proper harnessing of the waters of the Jordan and development of hydroelectricity, Palestine could properly receive 4,000,000 more persons. He also made mention of the need to work out a solution with the British and the Arabs. The Arab objection is the weapon that the British Foreign Office has so adroitly used. However, after the death of the late lamented President Roosevelt, President Truman told me personally at the White House that he stood four square behind President Roosevelt's declaration and that he would not budge from the provisions of the Palestine Plank of the Democratic platform.

Thirty States through their governors recently petitioned President Truman to adhere to those principles. Over 400 Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress called for free mass immigration of the Jewish people into Palestine and for an eventual democratic Jewish commonwealth therein.

On the Palestine issue, at least verbally, the United States and the Labor Government in Britain see eye to eye. But will the Labor Government like the previous governments under Chamberlain and Churchill crawl backwards like a crab into 18th century imperialism, or will it forthrightly and honorably go forward to redeem its pledges?

It must indeed recognize that the Chamberlain government gave the world two dreadful and dreaded papers—one was the Munich Pact with its false "peace in our time," the other was the MacDonald White Paper which in the cruelest and most uncomprehending manner, and with grossest irresponsibility to human lives, slammed shut the doors of Palestine. That paper, too, must be scrapped.

Churchill, while on the opposition bench, called this MacDonald white paper a "breach of faith" and "the filing of a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy." He ascended to premiership but conveniently descended into a noxious desuetude as far as keeping his pledges on Palestine was concerned. Rest assured, however, his words often came back to plague him. Churchill was friend before he wore the ermine. Let it not be said of Clement Attlee: "A friend in power is a friend lost."

When the program of the Labor Government was set forth by King George VI in Parliament the day before yesterday, we were dismayed at the silence regarding Palestine. There were hopeful words on India but none such on Palestine. We cherish the hope that this omission was not an ominous sign.

Every manner of excuse, shabby as they were in the face of human suffering, has been used to keep the Jews out of Palestine. Military necessity, lack of transportation facilities, the inability of Jews to escape, all these were given in reply long after they had lost even the sound of reasonableness. One, Lord Devonshire, sitting in comfort and safety in the House of Lords, presumed to say the stateless Jews did not want to go to Palestine. How could you know, Lord Devonshire? Were they given a chance?

I ask my radio audience, Where can displaced Jews go? Every country has its immigration bars. We in the United States in our strength and power were magnanimous, were we not, in permitting a thousand Jews to enter our shores outside of the quota. We placed them in a camp at Oswego as if they were a special breed and imposed conditions and restrictions upon them as if they had been guilty of a crime against society instead of the victims they were of the most callous crime in history against them. Thousands upon thousands of Jews are now wandering homeless over Europe. Those Jews who have returned to the countries from which they have been driven find that a military victory did not wipe out antisemitism. The Nazi propaganda machine had done its work well. The antagonism is sharpened by job and property entanglements. No people with a land of their own could have been subjected to such continued indignities.

There is need for haste. The British Labor Party must create a revolution in the thinking of its colonial office; its barrack room ballad days are over. It must be stripped naked of its outmoded and outvoted imperialism. The Toryism of Churchill, Eden, and Halifax, we hope, are buried deep beneath an avalanche of labor ballots.

Over the years, we on the Zionist side have spoken softly, nor did we carry the big stick. Now Zionists demands are streamlined as through a megaphone, and the sound is amplified by justice and impatience.

Fulfill your pledges, Major Attlee, and those of England, lest the sound become more than a roar. Resultant fury may lead to something more than beer and skittles. Great danger is choked up in Palestine. It had better be uncorked carefully lest havoc and tragedy be spread.

Unless the nefarious Malcolm MacDonald white paper, stopping immigration of Jews, is abrogated immediately, trouble awaits. Unless humanity and fidelity to her promise shape her course in Palestine, England will not be the winner. Her dominion and her honor will be lost to her.

The Arabian world is vast; there is no lack of space for the Arabs. They cannot with justice claim that the 10,000 square miles that are Palestine is the one stumbling block to a unified Arabia. At the Pan Arabian Conference, the representatives of the Arabian world could not agree on any one social program that would lift their people out of feudalism; they could not agree on an educational plan; they could not agree to relinquish a mite of their respective sovereignty in the interest of unity; they could not even agree to lower trade barriers between the countries. The one thing they did agree on is that the tiny bit of land of Palestine is the only impediment to their way of harmony. It is thus obvious to even the most politically inastute that Palestine is to be used as the pawn for international bargaining. They do not, of course, point to the fact that the Arab in Palestine has the highest standard of living in the Middle East; that he has schools and hospitals; that rampant diseases have been checked; that far from being displaced by the Jews, the Palestinian Arab has doubled his population in the past 10 years. Nor does Arab propaganda make any mention of the amazing cultivation of a once barren soil or the rapid industrialization which served the war needs in the Levantine. Were the Arabian propagandists concerned for the welfare of the Arab peasant, they would change their tune.

Should the Labor Government fail to redeem its pledge on Palestine, a loss of faith in its entire program would follow. If it slips in one direction, it needs must slip in another will be the thought of the watching world. Honor and faith are sorely needed in the war-scorched earth. Its leaders dare not fail its peoples again.

Let's Return Our Service Men and Women to Civilian Life at Earliest Moment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the sudden ending of actual conflict in the World War has brought to the front many problems which will require immediate solution in order to prevent hardship and injustice. One of the greatest of these is to bring from overseas the men and women in uniform who responded to the call of their country, burning their bridges behind them and at great sacrifice to themselves, and carried on during these momentous war years. Many at almost equal sacrifice have, upon the demand of their Government, performed equally meritorious service in continental United States. All of these men and women should be honorably mustered out from the service at the earliest date so that they may return to their families and rehabilitate themselves in civilian life.

Those who have families should without delay be permitted to rejoin their families and provide for the maintenance and education of their children and other

loved ones. There would seem to be many more enlisted men in the services who want to remain than will be required to provide the men necessary for military service, both at home and abroad without further call upon the manpower of our country. Without doubt there will be a sufficient number of those in the service who will desire to continue in the service as a career and will do so voluntarily. We should make it possible for men with families to come home and for young men whose schooling has been interrupted to resume their studies and for those who are subject to the draft to be permitted to finish their school work, and at the same time provide for ample replacements in our forces overseas without interfering with the release from the service of those who are entitled to immediate discharge.

Mr. Speaker, while this whole problem has been thrust upon the military authorities and the Congress almost overnight with the surrender of Japan, considerable headway has already been made in drafting legislation and the issuance of military orders to commence this demobilization. It is apparent that some of the orders already made are defective and are resulting in great hardship and are working inequalities as between different groups in the services. I include as part of my remarks some excerpts from the Washington Post of September 5, 1945, on this subject:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION WILL JOIN FIGHT TO LIBERALIZE SCHOOL AID IN BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Sam Stavisky)

Veterans' Administration will be in the forefront of a drive to liberalize the education provisions of the so-called GI bill of rights at the forthcoming session of Congress, it was learned yesterday.

Several national organizations have drawn up their own amendments to the bill of rights, but are expected to join forces with Veterans' Administration in obtaining more generous assistance for GI's who wish to get increased schooling when they get out of the service.

Currently 22,349 veterans (out of more than 2,000,000 who have been demobilized thus far) are taking advantage of the education features of the bill of rights.

The American Bar Association, American Institute of Accountants, and American Institute of Banking have agreed to five liberalizing amendments which, it is understood, is similar to the educational program to be sought by Veterans' Administration.

The proposed amendment of the three national associations would:

1. Provide adequate subsistence and travel allowances for veterans taking intensive refresher courses away from home.

2. Permit instruction by correspondence, "especially by approved educational institutions which have not hitherto conducted correspondence courses."

3. Provide for VA to pay for books and materials used for home study.

4. Permit payment for instruction given by schools outside the State in which they are organized.

5. Permit payment of tuition for short intensive postgraduate or vocational courses at a higher rate than the $16.67 per week now allowed by VA.

HOUSE TOOK ACTION

Before the recent recess of Congress, the House already had taken a step in direction of liberalizing the GI bill of rights.

The House measure raises from 2 to 4 years after the termination of the war the time in which the veteran may begin his education or training; extends the time for completing education from 7 to 9 years after the war.

It also includes correspondence schools within the meaning of "educational or training institutions", raises monthly subsistence allowances for the veteran from $50 to $60 a month if the veteran has no dependent, from $75 to $85 if he has one or more dependents; and provides for short intensive courses of less than 30 weeks at "fair and reasonable" payment.

Under terms of the GI bill of rights an honorably discharged veteran of at least 90 days' active service can obtain from 1 to 4 years of schooling, with the Federal Government paying for his tuition and school expenses up to $500 for a school year. But if he was over 25 at the time he entered the service, his postwar schooling is limited to 1 year.

Both the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars want to do away with the age limit, a stand also taken by a special conference of the National Education Association.

VFW wants to raise the subsistence benefit for a single veteran to $70, and for a veteran with dependents to $90.

The National Education Association conference would set up the following schedule of subsistence for veterans going to school; no dependents, $50 a month; one dependent, $75; two dependents, $100; three dependents, $125.

BILL TO INDUCE VOLUNTEERS INTO ARMY MAY GO TO CONGRESS

(By Mary Spargo)

Congress probably will be asked to vote next week on a measure to bring more volunteers into the armed services by granting additional inducements, members of the House Military Affairs Committee said yesterday.

Strong congressional criticism arose yesterday, meanwhile, over the realization that the Army's new regulation giving automatic discharges to 35-year-olds with at least 2 years of honorable military service discriminates against pre-Pearl Harbor fathers drafted comparatively late in the war.

Pre-Pearl Harbor fathers taken in the draft cannot now win discharges under the new regulation, if they are between the ages of 35 and 38, although bachelors and post-Pearl Harbor fathers are eligible.

DONE OVER PROTESTS

It was not until October 1, 1943, that the national headquarters of Selective Service rescinded an order banning the draft of men who had become fathers prior to Pearl Harbor. The order was made in the face of bitter congressional protest.

It took until December 1943 for the local boards to begin to trickle the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers into the armed services. The early months of 1944 saw many more going in.

Pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, therefore, have not had an opportunity for the two full years of military service.

In one military outfit located near Washington, a 35-year-old bachelor with 2½ years of military service can win his discharge, but a 36-year-old father of two children, both born before Pearl Harbor, is several months short of the requisite years of service for his release.

Representative JOHN J. SPARKMAN (Democrat, Alabama) a member of the House Military Affairs Committee, declared yesterday.

"This means they're keeping in the very ones we don't want them to."

He indicated he thought the demobilization plans were not yet final and that changes would be made.

DEPARTMENT STANDS PAT

War Department officials, however, despite rising congressional demand for greater consideration of fathers in connection with discharges, declared that there was no serious proposal in the War Department to change the point system to give more weight to fatherhood.

Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, Republican, of West Virginia, a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, declared yesterday:

"If the effect of the War Department's new regulation is to discriminate against pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, it must definitely be revised as it would work a great hardship."

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, called the order the work of "miscalculators in the Army" and said the matter should be straightened out.

ARMY SPARES 665,000 MEN FROM SERVICE OVERSEAS—45 POINTERS, THOSE OVER 37 STAY HOME; NEW CRITICAL SCORE TO FREE 1,100,000

(By George Connery)

The Army yesterday assured 665,000 soldiers they won't be sent overseas and announced that an additional 1,100,000 have become eligible for discharge at home and abroad.

In the future, no enlisted man will be shipped out who:

1. Had 45 or more discharge points as of May 12, 1945, or

2. Is 37 years of age or older, or

3. Is 34 to 36 inclusive, and has had a year or more of honorable service.

STAY ON DUTY IN UNITED STATES

The 665,000 will continue on duty in this country until qualified for discharge by points, age, or such other factors as hardship considerations or physical condition.

The 1,100,000 moved into the separation line, the War Department said, under its new critical score of 80 (41 for WAC's) announced Sunday. Ahead of them in the pipe lines are 400,000 veterans virtually all overseas or en route home, who had 85 or more points (WAC's 44) on May 12, 1945.

Under the new policy, points earned between May 12 and VJ-day are counted toward discharge. However, the original figures will be used for overseas eligibility until a recomputation can be completed, when a new screening score will be announced.

VOLUNTEERS CAN GO

The arbitrary readjustment was made possible because occupation of Japan is proceeding according to schedule, and forces required there will not exceed earlier estimates.

Effective immediately, men in the three categories will be screened out of all units scheduled for shipment to the Pacific or Europe, and none will go as individual replacements. However, men who volunteer for foreign service will not be required to stay in this country.

Otherwise, there are only three exceptions, affecting relatively insignificant numbers of men. Exceptions are civil affairs units trained for immediate duty in Japan and scheduled for early departure and the 700 men assigned to Seventh and Eighteenth Corps headquarters companies and about to be shipped.

SIXTY-POINT SCORE

With these groups, the same age factors are used for screening, but 60 points rather than 45 is the critical figure.

Enlisted men currently eligible for discharge may not be retained by their commanders for more than 90 days after receipt of their application. The only exceptions to this rule are the 1,000 or fewer men with three rare skill classifications, who may be kept in for an additional 6 months.

Men now in Europe will be affected by the new screening score and ages only to the extent that those in the three groups will not be sent to the Pacific. Their discharge will depend on their point scores.

A War Department spokesman noted that the new discharge ages will delay further reduction of the critical or discharge score, dropped from 85 to 80 on Sunday. However, he said it would be lowered progressively and whenever necessary to keep the flow of discharges at the highest possible level.

As soon as the pool of discharge-eligible men gets low, the critical score will be reduced to put more men into the pipe lines.

It was pointed out that the new screening will result in a comparative increase in soldiers stationed in this country. The spokesman said many of these, now ineligible for overseas duty, will be used to replace high-point men and that "there won't be a lot of men sitting around doing nothing."

Men of the Eighty-sixth Infantry Division will not benefit from the new policy it was learned. They are now on their way to Japan, thus in line for foreign service until qualified for discharge on the basis of their points.

One battalion of the Ninety-seventh Division still in this country will be screened before it leaves, as will all of the Ninety-fifth.

All other outfits scheduled for future shipments will be screened according to points and age, so that in general no men will get overseas unless they have at least a year's service remaining.

DISCHARGE STATUS OF ENLISTEES, MEN AND WOMEN, IN THE ARMY

The following summary explains the discharge status of all Army enlisted men and women, with the exception of a special group of several thousand.

Exceptions are those in civil affairs units scheduled for early departure for the Pacific, the 700 men attached to headquarters companies of the Seventh and Eighteenth Corps, also scheduled for immediate departure, and the fewer than 1,000 men who have certain rare technical skills.

An enlisted man is eligible for discharge if:

1. He has 80 or more points under the recomputation as of September 2, 1945, or

2. He is 38 years or over, or

3. He is 35, 36, or 37 and has had a minimum of 2 years of honorable military service.

An enlisted man will not be sent overseas, but will be retained on active duty in the continental United States, if:

1. He is 34, 35, or 36 and has had over 1 year of honorable military service, or

2. He is 37, or

3. He has 45 or more points under the May 12 computation.

An enlisted man can be sent overseas only if:

1. He is below 34 and has less than 45 points under the May 12 computation, or

2. He is 34, 35, or 36 and has less than 1 year of service and less than 45 points under the May 12 computation, or

3. He is one of the excepted units (Civil Affairs or Headquarters of the VII or XVIII Corps), or

4. He volunteers or enlists.

An enlisted woman is eligible for discharge if:

1. She has 41 or more points under the September 2 computation of points.

2. She is 38 or over.

3. She is 35, 36, or 37 and has had a minimum of 2 years of honorable military service.

4. She is the wife of a member of the military forces who has been discharged.

No additional members of the Women's Army Corps are being sent overseas.

Mr. Speaker, there also appeared in today's Post an article by Marquis Childs under the heading "Washington Calling" in which he discussed some of the problems which will arise in connection with the development by our scientists of the atomic bomb. While it is true that many of the underlying principles of this great discovery were known to science for years, it remained for our scientific experts to develop the scientific principles essential to put it to use as an instrument of warfare. As we all know, it is the most destructive force ever called out of the great wealth of science for destructive purposes. It would seem that this great liberty-loving country which has contributed so much in lives and property for the preservation of freedom and the eradication of dictatorial control of the peoples of the earth, should keep locked within its own secret vaults this great discovery, so that it may never be made available to some future dictator who may set out on a course of blood and carnage in an endeavor to again destroy civilization.

The article by Mr. Childs to which I refer is as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

ATOMS VERSUS HUMANS

Congress is coming back to a new world. Six weeks ago, House and Senate recessed for what the Members hoped would be a restful vacation. In that interval, great black headlines marched across the press heralding changes so overwhelming that no man can see the end.

The first atomic bomb was dropped a month ago. That date of August 6 is the dividing line between the old world and the new.

In view of the gravity of the decisions to be taken, President Truman apparently felt he had to wait for Congress before acting on the future of atomic power. Anyhow, no action has been taken.

The United States is still the sole possessor of the secret of how the bomb was made. Each day that that is true increases by so much the mortal peril to the human race. Each day that goes by makes it more likely that atomic fission will become a matter of competition for future wars.

Scientists connected with the project have made it unmistakably clear that, with our present technical and industrial knowledge, a bomb of sufficient size could be constructed to destroy the atmosphere of the earth. In other words, one explosion could wipe out every man, woman, and child living and breathing today. The bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were small.

Consider for a moment the reaction of our allies in this war to the bomb. Take Russia first.

The Russians were told at Potsdam that we had a powerful new weapon which we proposed to loose against Japan if the surrender ultimatum failed. We did not tell them what it was.

Two days after the bomb fell, the newspaper Pravda carried a small story on page three to the effect that the United States had used a new weapon against Japan which we said was an atomic bomb. That was all.

The use of the bomb, with all that it meant in concentrated research and technology, coincided more or less with another event. The Russians observed in June the jubilee two hundred and twentieth anniversary of their Academy of Sciences. To celebrate this event, they invited leading scientists from all over the world.

It was an occasion of great national pride. Soviet Russia's very advanced science was displayed for British, French, and American visitors. While some of those visitors were still in Russia the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima. It seemed to dwarf the Russian achievement. American physicists returning from Moscow say it will be a matter of only 2 to 5 years before Russia can also produce an atomic bomb, since they have the essential scientific background.

One other item is significant. The New York Times reported from Paris that an atomic expert, discovered in Yugoslavia, was flown by special plane to Moscow. And the rest, as Hamlet said, is silence.

In England, Parliament met not long after the Hiroshima bomb to debate and ratify the United Nations Charter. That debate was dominated by the atomic bomb, with a great many members suggesting that the new league had been blown sky high along with Hiroshima. The following question, put by a Labor member to the government, gives the tone of the discussion:

"Are you aware of the statement that the United States proposes to retain exclusive possession of this secret; and do you realize that exclusive knowledge and exclusive use in the sole discretion of one power of overwhelming destructive force of this kind would make nonsense of the whole conception of collective security?"

Prime Minister Attlee announced the appointment of a committee of high government officials and distinguished scientists to advise the government on atomic power. As the London Daily Telegraph reported it, the committee will deal with the international treatment of atomic power and its further development in this country, whether for industrial or military purposes.

The next move, if any, must come from us. The choice we faced on August 6 is the same choice. It is death and destruction, or life and world unity. But the odds lengthen each day against what Bert L. Taylor in the old Chicago Tribune always referred to as the so-called human race.

Pearl Harbor: Challenge to the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are demanding the truth about Pearl Harbor. The reasons why this truth must be given them are brilliantly and succinctly set forth in an article in the Progressive, by Charles A. Beard, eminent American historian:

PEARL HARBOR: CHALLENGE TO THE REPUBLIC

(By Charles A. Beard)

Now that the murderous Japanese war lords are brought to doom, the American people confront problems of peace that will try their abilities and powers to the uttermost. These problems include all issues of government by constitutional means, the conduct of foreign affairs, and the preparation of our democracy for informed and efficient action in realizing the ideals to which it is dedicated by its heritage and its faith.

Among these urgent problems none is more important than the determination of the responsibility for the American catastrophe at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Lest this claim respecting Pearl Harbor be dismissed as extravagant or as raising academic curiosities that had better be left to dust-sifting historians of coming generations, let the features and implications of the Pearl Harbor case be clearly stated:

1. The conduct of foreign affairs under constitutional government in correlation with military preparations for all diplomatic contingencies.

2. The relations of the Chief Executive of the United States, in shaping foreign policies and conducting foreign affairs, to the Congress, which is charged with providing the

armed forces of the United States and deciding upon declarations of war.

3. The best means of assuring efficiency in the equipment, management, and use of the armed forces.

4. The relations between the Army and the Navy and the proposal to consolidate the two branches of the armed services in the interest of efficiency in action and of economy in blood and treasure.

5. The reorganization of Congress, now under consideration, for the more effective management of its own business and its relations to the Executive in the conduct of domestic and foreign affairs.

6. Effective methods for keeping the American people properly informed on foreign policies and affairs, and alert for eventualities likely to follow from diplomatic decisions by the President and the Department of State. (See ch. I, the Fateful Decade, in Peace and War, 1931–41, Department of State, publication, July 1943).

7. The relations between the civilian government and the armed forces of the country, so crucial in the history of the long struggle for popular government and civil liberty.

8. Last but not least, justice to Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Gen. Walter C. Short, the two commanders at Hawaii when the disaster occurred at Pearl Harbor, whose honor and devotion to duty have been under a cloud for more than three long years, while they have been denied the right to be heard on the grave charges announced to the public by the Roberts Commission on January 23, 1942.

Under the sixth amendment to the Constitution, the worst criminal indicted for the meanest offense is guaranteed a speedy and impartial trial. While the war was raging and the fortunes of America hung trembling in the balance, the necessities of national unity and war could be urged as warranting delay in the hearing of the two commanders, even to the point of injustice to the two men who, whatever their rights or wrongs, were after all merely two men in a world on fire. But now the war has come to a victorious end and they are entitled to their day in court immediately and without prejudice, in accordance with the first principles of that justice which is the safety and pride of the American people under their Constitution.

For these reasons, which, I submit, are self-evident, all Americans who cherish constitutional government with safeguards for liberty, who want to see the Government of the United States competent to deal with the issues of foreign and domestic affairs, will now demand that the Congress as a whole or the Senate or the House of Representatives appoint a special committee to investigate without fear or favor the facts of the Pearl Harbor case, accord a full and free hearing to Admiral Kimmel and General Short, and present to this Nation a comprehensive and accurate report on every phase of the subject and a considered judgment in the matter of responsibility for the disaster. It would be well if, in creating the committee, there be associated with it two or more private citizens distinguished for their character and their judicial qualities.

It will be wise for Congress to act on its own motion, and immediately, for such an inquiry will be forced upon that honorable body if it delays too long in meeting a challenge surging up from the people.

What is the warrant for this categorical assertion?

As a student of American history and government, I have been keeping, since December 7, 1941, a record of speeches, newspaper editorials, comments of columnists, articles, congressional debates, official reports, congressional inquiries into related subjects, and other materials—official and unofficial—bearing on the Pearl Harbor case, down to the latest hour.

I have watched closely the development of public interest and opinion as reflected in these materials. And I append the following brief and bare outline in support of the proposition that the Congress as a whole, or the Senate or the House of Representatives must assure to the American people, as well as to Admiral Kimmel and General Short, a full and judicial inquiry into the Pearl Harbor catastrophe.

By an Executive order of December 18, 1941, President Roosevelt created a commission, headed by Justice Owen J. Roberts, and specifically instructed it to inquire into the facts of the Pearl Harbor attack and to report on them for the purpose of providing "bases for sound decisions whether any derelictions of duty or errors of judgment on the part of United States Army or Navy personnel contributed to such successes as were achieved by the enemy on the occasion mentioned; and, if so, what these derelictions or errors were, and who were responsible therefor."

On January 23, 1942, the Roberts Commission's report was presented to the public. Besides finding Admiral Kimmel and General Short guilty of certain derelictions and errors of judgment, the commission furnished to the people a large amount of astonishing information about events and decisions preceding the disaster—information hitherto unknown to the people.

Furthermore, the Commission added so many qualifications, discounts, and linguistic involutions to its conclusions on the responsibility of the two commanders that the most careful reader of the report was put to his wits' end in trying to discover whether the Commission actually thought the admiral and the general were more responsible for the catastrophe than other parties to the calamity.

One startling fact, as yet unknown to the general public, was recorded in the Roberts report, section XI, namely, that high authorities in Washington had news of a coming break in diplomatic relations with Japan 2 hours or more before the Japanese attack and failed to get a warning message through to the Hawaiian commanders until after the Japanese blow had fallen.

It could scarcely be maintained by any fair-minded student that the Roberts report settled any primary questions of the responsibility. Indeed, it raised such issues instead of settling them.

In the summer of 1942 Forrest Davis and Ernest K. Lindley, two journalists enjoying special favors at the White House, published How War Came: An American White Paper, on the basis of inside information from high officials in charge of foreign affairs at Washington. Davis and Lindley dismissed the report of the President's Commission on Pearl Harbor as giving only surface reasons for the Pearl Harbor disaster, and laid the fundamental responsibility for it on the ignorance, smugness, and indifference of the American people, particularly isolationists (pp. 316–317). If this judgment did, in fact, represent the administration's view of the catastrophe, it, like the Roberts report, fell short of the whole truth of the business and raised still bigger issues; for example, How had the American people fallen into such an evil state of mind and morals?

On January 2, 1943, the State Department released to the press a publication called Peace and War—a preliminary to the larger volume published in July of that year. This document gave to the public startling information: Secretary Hull had warned "high officials of this Government" on November 25, 1941, and on November 28, 1941, that the diplomatic negotiations with Japan had then come "practically" to an impasse and that the Japanese were likely to break out at any time with new acts of conquest by force, making the element of "surprise" a central point of their strategy. On November 29 Secretary Hull also informed the British Ambassador that "the diplomatic part of our relations with Japan was virtually over and that the matter will now go to the officials of the Army and the Navy" (p. 138).

Since this was official information, it was natural for readers of Secretary Hull's statement to wonder why a war order calling for nothing less than a high tension alert (alert No. 3) had not been sent to the Hawaiian commanders at least a week before the Japanese attack and why any "high officials" in Washington were "surprised" when the attack came.

In June 1944 the question of extending time for granting trials by courts martial to Admiral Kimmel and General Short automatically came up in Congress for debate and the subject of responsibility for Pearl Harbor was drawn into question. By its act, signed June 13, 1944, Congress provided for an extension of time and displayed a resolve to find out more about the matter of responsibility. It ordered the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to conduct new inquiries into the facts of Pearl Harbor and present new reports as to "persons," if any, found guilty of offenses in connection with the catastrophe.

In August 1944 Senator Harry Truman cast reflections on Admiral Kimmel and General Short in the course of an article in Collier's magazine. Admiral Kimmel replied in an open letter to Senator Truman that his "innuendo" was "not true"; the admiral also asserted that the real story of Pearl Harbor had not been told and expressed a desire to have a hearing so that he could tell the truth. Senator Truman's response was a statement that he had evidence to support his charges.

The fat was then in the fire, burning and smelling. In September 1944, the question of Pearl Harbor flared up in the House of Representatives and charges were made by Republicans, which, if substantiated, would place the real responsibility for the catastrophe on the Roosevelt administration in Washington. Now confusion was confounded.

In the autumn of 1944 it was rumored that some directors of Governor Thomas Dewey's campaign for President were in possession of official documents showing that high authorities in Washington had secret advance notice of the coming Japanese attack on Hawaii many hours, perhaps 3 days, before it came, and failed to put the Hawaiian commanders on a war tension alert. But, so the rumor ran, the Republicans declined to break this news, for two reasons: A resolve not to interfere with national unity for war and awareness that the possessors of these documents could be prosecuted as criminals under Federal law (see the United States News of August 24, 1944, as quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 6, 1944, p. 7575, and Arthur Crock's column, New York Times, December 5, 1944).

On December 1, 1944, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy released to the press brief reports on Pearl Harbor, based on findings by special boards appointed under the act of the previous June, which had directed new investigations. In effect the two Secretaries announced that much evidence must remain secret on grounds of national security, but that up to date no evidence had been found which warranted bringing to trial any person in the Army and Navy for anything done in connection with the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor.

Thus, Admiral Kimmel and General Short, accused of derelictions of duty and errors of judgment (justifying courts martial) by the President's Commission in January 1942, were apparently cleared of the charges at last.

Were they in fact? Some said "Yes"; others said "No"; still others said, "Not yet."

There, as far as official action is concerned, the case rests.

But thousands of American citizens—Democrats, Republicans, Progressives, and Independents—are concerned about the honor and fortunes of this Republic and are looking to their Senators and Representatives in Congress to do their full duty at once in respect of the Pearl Harbor tragedy.

Address Delivered by Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, at the Essex County Democratic Outing of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by me at the Essex County Democratic Outing of Massachusetts at Salisbury Beach, Mass., on August 26, 1945:

I am happy to see the Democrats of Essex County mobilized for peace as they were for war.

The county has always been the seat of Republican power, what there is left of it, and it is noteworthy that you have recognized that fact, and are organizing to remedy this situation in one of the strongest counties of this Commonwealth.

It has become a habit of our fellow Americans to call upon the Democratic Party in times of great national emergency such as depressions and wars to save the country from the ruinous effects of previous Republican administrations. Much as we appreciate the people's confidence in the ability of the Democratic Party to save the ship, we go further than this. We believe that if we represent the people during the so-called periods of normalcy that the wars and depressions born of Republican short-sightedness will not have a chance to plague our Nation again.

In this swiftly changing world, what was good enough for our fathers is not quite good enough for us. The Democratic Party faces this realistic fact; it does not turn its back upon it. We are facing and solving the new problems of the present with courageous and intelligent leadership. We know that they cannot be solved by the outmoded techniques of yesterday. Our Republican brothers, in spite of our efforts to educate them, are unwilling to admit this fact of life.

And so, they try to cheer themselves with memories of yesterday, while the Democratic Party, truly reflecting the progressive will of the people, goes forward.

We do not intend to have the Republican Party sabotage the economic democracy which the American people are shaping for themselves through Democratic leadership. This meeting today indicates that we are not going to take a vacation and allow the Republicans to slip in. It is a sign that we are here to stay.

This, the county, is the last surviving remnant of discredited Republican power and policy. It is from the rural areas of the county that Republicans are elected to the State legislature, there to snipe at every effort by an up-to-date Democratic governor to administer the affairs of our Commonwealth, not in behalf of any privileged group, but for the total welfare of our citizens.

It was here, in Essex County, that the word "gerrymander" originated. It was here that the county's borders were changed in such an unfair and unnatural way that the county then assumed a dragon-shaped outline. This was done away back in 1812, in order to deprive the people of true representation. In the monopoly which the Republicans have enjoyed in our State legislature, this gerrymandering has been going on ever since. They have repeatedly revised the legislative districts in order to swallow up the growing Democratic vote.

Too long have we been indifferent to the representation that has been denied us in the State legislature. For with more Democratic senators and representatives from this county the party will be strengthened, not only in the State but in the Nation as well. For the State legislators are the work horses of the party.

In our campaigns we Democrats have been highly individualistic, perhaps too much so at times. Each candidate has worked his head off for his own cause, on the general assumption that the party would be helped by the votes which he could bring out. This is partly true. In off years, however, when our party does not have the advantage of powerful personalities or dramatic issues, this is not enough.

In our times we have seen a Democrat lose the governorship by a mere margin of some 5,000 votes. That victory for the opposition was determined by organized teamwork in registering and getting out the vote.

Under the leadership of State Chairman Cahill and County Chairman Carter, we are at last on the way to such an organization. This, in turn, implies the need for financial help to those nominees who are trying to break the Republican grip on the rural and suburban areas. With organization this can be done.

Many workers in the mills and factories of the cities now live in the country, traveling back and forth to work. Perhaps many of these Democrats neglected to register when they changed residence. Moreover, I believe that many of our Republican friends, being workers themselves, can be converted to the Democratic cause. An effective organization in each town and village, encouraged and aided by the State and county committees, can bring this about. Furthermore, organization helps to solve that age-old political question of who did the work or who didn't.

This is a victory celebration of Essex County Democrats. The long war is over. We are glad that our way of life has been saved and that our men and women are coming home. We now face the task of making the peace among nations and the task of extending and improving opportunities for every citizen in our own country. The bill for full employment, a democratic measure, is being prepared in committee hearings for congressional action.

I have every confidence that our Nation, in the long run, will come into the greatest period of true prosperity that the world has ever known. The last major barrier to that prosperity is the reconversion period directly ahead of us. How we conduct ourselves during this interim period will determine, in large measure, the success or failure of our future.

Today, in celebrating the victory of the Nation, we also mark a step forward in political democracy, the organization of our party in a manner that will give greater voice to the people. This is the instrument of our future, but that instrument must have a purpose to serve.

In the name of the 250,000 Americans who have died and the uncounted thousands disabled for life, all that we might gather freely as we do this day, let us pause and take stock.

Our Nation has the greatest material resources of any nation in all of history. Our people, awakened to the need, have within them the mind and conscience to direct these resources for the greater good of all.

This is the responsibility that is ours.

And so, as we organize to strengthen and develop our lines, let us not lose sight of our true goal. Let us go forward in greater unity and with finer purpose, to justify that faith which the majority of Americans have in the progressive policies of our Democratic Party.

Postwar Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a radio broadcast which I delivered on August 25, 1945, over Station WIND on the subject of postwar employment:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. When an invitation was extended to me some time ago to participate in this radio program the topic assigned was Postwar Employment.

Since that time many great events have occurred in this fast-moving world, including the surrender of Japan.

The time for theoretical discussion has passed; what we need now is action to gear the economic machinery of the Nation so that the change-over is made with the least possible disturbance to the normal life of our people.

I feel sure that when the Congress reconvenes it will be fully prepared to do its share in solving the problems of readjustment. But legislation alone is not the solution to the problems of maintaining employment prosperity and a high standard of living for the American people. A large share of the responsibility for this task rests upon private industry.

It is one of the strange quirks of politics that the leaders of industry—those who cry loudest for free enterprise and against Government control and regulations—are always the first to oppose legislation and lay the blame for economic ills at the doorstep of government.

Today industry has an opportunity to prove its thesis that private enterprise can give jobs to all who want to work. The controls over materials, price ceilings, and other restrictions necessarily imposed during the emergency are being lifted.

There is a vast reservoir of demand to be filled for consumer goods, for farm machinery, for automobiles, trucks, household equipment and appliances, radios, and hundreds of other products which were unavailable during the war.

The savings accumulated by people during these last few years are ready to be expended.

From the standpoint of heavy industry for instance, the needs of the railroads and for new rolling stock is great.

Construction of new highways must be resumed on a large scale.

Millions of new homes are in demand.

Above and beyond all this a tremendous field of potential foreign markets has opened up to the manufacturers and exporters of the United States.

After the last war, Great Britain, Sweden—yes, even Germany and Japan—beat us to the punch.

But this time we emerge from conflict not only the military but the economic leader of the world and in a better position to compete for our share of trade and commerce.

That is the golden opportunity which is presented to this Nation but it will slip from

our grasp if we do not act wisely—if we fail to heed the great lesson of the Harding and the Hoover depressions of 1920 and 1930 with their bread-lines and bonus army and the tragedy of unemployed veterans selling apples on the street corners.

It should scarcely be necessary to recall details of that dark era when the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, of revered memory, stepped into office bringing the light of his spirit and the courage of his actions to lead us from the wilderness of despair.

In a score of ways he revived agriculture and industry; put money into circulation and generally restored the confidence of a panic-stricken Nation.

The great lesson of that period, pointing the way to the solution of our problem today, is that purchasing power is the key to prosperity; that unless the mass of the population are employed at decent wages they cannot buy the products of industry.

And we have learned, too, that you cannot have real prosperity if there is poverty at the bottom of the economic ladder, even though there are great profits at the top.

There are nearly 20,000,000 people in the United States today whose earnings or income is less than $1,300 a year. These are usually the first to feel the pinch in a recession.

I feel strongly that it will be in the interest of the common good of all that laws be passed and conditions brought about that will raise the living standards and generally improve the lot of these millions of worthy but defenseless and unorganized citizens.

I am sure the majority of Congressmen stand ready to reenforce the efforts of private industry by adopting measures to avoid widescale unemployment.

Such a program is not entirely new but was conceived and initiated in large part by the late President Roosevelt as long as a year and a half ago and its principles are supported and being urged by his able successor, President Truman, today.

Preliminary hearings are being held during the recess and when Congress returns legislative machinery will be speeded up to enact the program without unnecessary delay.

First. Unemployment compensation benefits should be extended to allow $25 a week for as long as 26 weeks.

Second. Is legislation to provide full employment. This is nothing more or less than a simple device to maintain the national income at a figure which assures general economic well-being of the whole country.

Third. The so-called GI bill of rights must be liberalized.

Fourth. Revision downward of income-tax rates, both personal and corporate, but particularly in the low-income groups.

Fifth. There should be administrative action, already permissible under law, to place a floor under wages by establishing a minimum of 65 cents an hour for American workers.

Sixth. There should be legislation to provide financial aid to small business and to protect and encourage it in the development of numerous new fields opened up by wartime research and scientific progress.

Seventh. The Social Security Act must be extended to include many worthy groups now excluded from participation in the benefits of that law.

Eighth. And finally there is needed legislation to create a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. Such an agency, wisely administered, will make for more harmonious relations and better understanding among all the groups comprising America.

This is part of a large program, but not impossible of achievement.

I, for one, think it can be done. I am not greatly concerned by the calamity-howlers—by the extremists.

I am confident that the fears expressed as to the extent of unemployment during the period of reconversion are greatly exaggerated, on both sides.

Actually the period of recession is likely to be short.

Most of the expressions of concern over a dark future are unwarranted and unjustified.

I am making this statement because I cannot believe the reports that many of the industrial leaders under the leadership of the National Association of Manufacturers are rejecting orders in an endeavor to delay production with a view of increasing unemployment.

I recall the program adopted by the association in New York the latter part of 1936 of cutting down production to create unemployment, and I call upon them to desist in repeating it at this time. Furthermore, I understand that the association has not taken a stand or steps in advocating the legislation urged and recommended by the President in the interest of eliminating unemployment and to bring about a real understanding between industry and labor.

When we take into consideration that the number of billion-dollar corporations in the last 3 years has increased to 43 and that their resources has reached the fabulous sum of $100,000,000,000, and that hundreds and hundreds of other corporations have doubled and trebled their resources in the last 4 years, surely it will be to their interest to cooperate with the Government which is desirous of cooperating with them and with private industry. Can it be that they contemplate a sit-down strike in an attempt to force lower wages?

However, it is generally recognized that most industries began reconverting months ago. And this because of the fact that they have been able to charge reconversion costs to the costs of production of war materials.

Time does not permit me to quote from many newspapers showing that in most of the big cities there is no let-up in the want ads, and that hundreds upon hundreds of plants are already in production in the manufacture of civilian products, and that shortage of labor actually exists in many places.

Many additional hundreds of plants are ready to begin operations and in this connection I quote from the Business Week Magazine, which states:

"Business as a whole is well-heeled with cash to finance reconversion and programs for postwar expansion."

After putting aside money for taxes and large debt retirements, a $20,000,000,000 nest-egg was accumulated in 1942, 1943, and 1944; another fat addition will be made in 1945.

The National City Bank of New York reported on August 1 that the earnings of 320 industrial companies show a combined net income of about $633,000,000 for the period.

Sales and net earnings of almost two out of every three companies were above the same period last year.

On August 13 the Scripps-Howard newspapers reported:

"Steel, backbone of industry, has no reconversion problem. The furnaces and rolling mills that produced ingots, sheets, and plates for war will produce the same things for peace. Little readjustment will be required."

In the light of all these facts it does not seem probable that the unemployment crisis will be either as grave or last as long as some corporation experts would have us believe.

Yet even such a program as I have presented—to take up the slack and cushion the shock of readjustment—is opposed by those same selfish interests who have always fought progressive and humanitarian legislation.

This is indeed a short-sighted policy, especially when they have seen the possible alternative they face.

They must have noted that a great majority of the English people have renounced the recationary Tory Government and voted the Labor Party in power.

Would it not be the better part of wisdom to support measures, such as the full-employment bill, which is after all merely an effort to guarantee the country against depression by assuring that even the least among us shares in the national income?

So peace presents us not only with new problems but with a golden opportunity which is at the same time a challenge, to make the United States—the land we love—the home of the happiest and most prosperous people on earth.

That is the challenge to democracy:

To demonstrate that we, who worked and fought together in wartime, can only learn to live together in peace; to prove that we can apply the same energy in initiative and, above all, the same spirit of unity to our every-day life.

As the Secretary of State and others have stated—world peace depends on full employment.

Future of the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the personal representative of the President on the United Nations Organization, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., be, and hereby are, urged to exert their utmost efforts to secure a definite postwar agreement by the United Nations to ban the atomic bomb forever as an instrument of war.

The war with Japan is at its end. Repression and tyranny, we hope, also will be at an end, and the way will at last be open to lay the foundations of a new world based on democracy and justice and the principles of Christianity. What will be done with the astounding new discovery will now be an appropriate question for United Nations consideration, for the United Nations have in their keeping the future of mankind. The United States alone cannot ban the atomic bomb as an instrument of war, and we cannot safely undertake to do so, even though at present we hold the secret of its manufacture. The only way it can be banned is by multilateral action of all the United Nations, acting in perfect agreement, followed by permanent policing of conquered countries to make certain they do not undertake to manufacture the bomb surreptitiously. Atomic energy may be used to bring inestimable and never-dreamed-of blessings to mankind if applied wisely to the arts of peace, or, if improperly used, it may mean the wrecking of the world and the annihilation of civilization. It may become the greatest blessing or the greatest curse mankind has ever known in all of the tide of times. If the United Nations agree that it shall be banned forever as an instrument of war, it will be banned; for the United Nations are strong enough to hold in leash any minor conquered nations which might seek to resort to it. Unless the United Nations move along the line I suggest, there will be no real

peace in the world, for human beings everywhere will be eternally terrorized by the thought of what might happen. The agreement referred to would be a contribution of inestimable value to insure a peaceful and tranquil postwar world.

Since I announced on July 15 my intention to introduce this resolution, I have received letters from all over the United States approving it, and I have had some rather caustic communications from persons who say that we should keep the bomb formula as a perpetual secret and as insurance that no nation will ever attack us. These critics seem to think that with the bomb secret tucked away in our national bosom, so to speak, America would be sitting on top of the world.

Just as if such a thing were possible. If all the leading nations of the world do not already know the bomb secret, they are bound to learn it later. We could no more keep the bomb secret than we could turn back the flow of Niagara.

This resolution does not deal directly or by implication with the use of the atomic bomb on the Japanese. It only raises the question of what will be done with it in the future. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. The world finds itself with a Frankenstein on its hands, and I think it is a fair statement that it does not know what to do with it. In this situation, the only security for all nations is to hang together. If they do not, they are likely to hang separately.

I have never said or believed that the United States alone should undertake to outlaw the atomic bomb, but I do say and believe that all of the United Nations must join in outlawing it as an instrument of war and keep their pledge, or there will never be any peace and security in the world again.

We have heard much in recent years about the necessity of unity among the United Nations, but the invention of the atomic bomb calls for a degree of unity not heretofore dreamed of. The highest and most important act of unity the United Nations can now perform is to unite in barring the atom bomb forever as an instrument of war and in so perfecting their controls over bad-actor nations that those nations can never manufacture the weapon, much less use it.

I think it is true that the atomic bomb shortened the war with Japan, but that is beside the point now. It is also lamentably true that it may shorten our existence as a nation if some country with an atomic-bomb plant manages to get the drop on us. What kind of a "one world" would this be if every nation had an atomic-bomb plant ready to get the drop on any nation it suspects of trying to get the drop on it? Knowing what it would mean to be on the receiving end of the bomb, every nation would realize the importance of getting the drop first, and the people everywhere would live in an inferno of fear. The only security against this disturbing picture must be a collective security—the security of a collective agreement by all of the United Nations not to use the bomb in waging war—and I think the President, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Stettinius will be doing mankind an inestimable service if they will move to make this matter first on the United Nations agenda.

America, which did so much to make the atomic bomb a reality, and which made effective use of it in destroying the last bastion of tyranny by forcing the surrender of Japan, now has a great opportunity to take the leadership in directing the future use of the discovery so that it will become the benefactor, and not the destroyer, of civilization.

In my opinion, the address made by Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur when Japan surrendered is a literary classic comparable with Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg Address. Future generations will marvel over the depths of its spiritual profundity. He pointed out that modern scientific discoveries have ushered in a new era which puts an end to the old era when nations settled their differences in the crucible of war. Solemnly he warned: "The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the last 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Where there is no vision, the people perish. The vision of MacArthur illumines in characters of living light the road humanity must follow in order to be saved.

Nothing truer, nothing grander, nothing more inspiring could have been said by our commander on that historic occasion. After all of the suffering and travail the world has gone through, no peace will be acceptable except a peace of the ages, and there can be no peace of the ages that is not founded on principles of Christian faith. The first step toward the establishment of the Christian peace for which the world is hoping and praying should be an agreement by the United Nations to ban the atomic bomb as an instrument of war.

The Sterling Bloc Pool and Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the luncheon of the international trade section of the New York Board of Trade at 12:30 p. m., Friday, July 27, 1945, in the Georgian Room of the Hotel Pennsylvania:

One thing is certain, Uncle Sam is not big enough or wealthy enough to be permanent "almoner to the world."

Since March 11, 1941, we have authorized $64,192,498,000 for lend-lease. Through June 1945, total expenditures on the lend-lease account were $42,633,684,000 (partially offset by $5,000,000,000 in reverse lend-lease), making a net lend-lease expenditure of over $37,000,000,000. Roughly, this still leaves $21,500,000,000 in lend-lease funds available for the remaining year of operations.

Plans call for making ready in addition $1,300,000,000 to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. We are pledged to pay $2,750,000,000 into the Bretton Woods International Monetary Fund; that is, 31 percent of the total to be contributed by 44 nations, which will be a capital of $8,800,000,000. We are pledged to contribute to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development 34.8 percent of its capital of $9,100,000,000 or $3,175,000,000. Our stake in the Bretton Woods monetary set-up will thus be almost $6,000,000,000.

Recently Congress increased the lending power of the Export-Import Bank from $700,000,000 to $3,500,000,000. Armed with congressional authority, the President will be in a position, through the Export-Import, to offer reconstruction loans to Russia, France, Belgium, Holland, and England, as postwar assurance that the United States is prepared to launch a program of world cooperation. This aid will give the President a strong leverage in influencing political settlements. It also means that as lend-lease aid will shrink, the Export-Import Bank loans will cushion the shock.

These figures are hard to comprehend. They are astronomical.

If and when all of these programs are consummated, the total of foreign gifts and credits still available to foreign lands and peoples would break down as follows:

Lend-lease	$21,500,000,000
UNRRA	1,300,000,000
Bretton Woods	6,000,000,000
Increase capital Export-Import Bank	2,800,000,000
Total	31,600,000,000

It is high time we evaluated these sums against our own available American resources. Can we stand the gaff? And the aforesaid aid to Europe and Asia may not be sufficient. There will also be needed direct Government postwar credits to our allies. The Johnson Act will be repealed and private loans will be made to foreign municipalities and commercial entities.

Is our well of relief and rehabilitation inexhaustible? Can we really, without danger to our economy, yield to all these requests and importunities for aid? Can we offer our breast to feed and nurture the world? The problem is a vexatious one. You traders must help solve it.

We may not be able to square off actual aid with all these commitments. We want to cooperate wholeheartedly in building a healthier and happier world. We have the will. Have we the power and illimitable resources, however, to become the permanent almoner to all and sundry who apply? Have we the means to stand the strain and drain? Remember, meanwhile, we fight in the Pacific—with its tremendous cost of life and limb, goods, products, and services.

Then, too, if we cannot carry out our promise to France, England, Holland, Italy, China, Russia, Greece, Czechoslovakia, and others, in the midst of our war and postwar necessities, after leading them into a mood of reliance and expectation then we created disillusion, disappointment, and shattering of good will.

It is time to measure and yardstick our productivity, not only against our role as almoner but against our own needs.

Must we not look a bit to our own house. There is an old saying, "Love your neighbor, yet pull not down your hedge." Of course, our attitude should not be one of heedless selfishness. That would be not only bad

morals but bad economics. The happy medium would be a reasonable self-interest. We must conserve our energies and strength in order to help our neighbors in want and distress.

We cannot so supply raiment for all, to the point where we make ourselves naked. We, too, can suffer cold.

We dare not lavish sustenance on all who appeal for food and allow ourselves to starve. We, too, can feel hunger.

I'm sure we all desire our benevolence to continue, that we want to bring balm to a shaken and suffering world. Such action might even be deemed self-interest, inasmuch as we cannot prosper unless others in the world—our potential customers—grow strong and prosper.

We require the channels of trade between ourselves to be not only reopened but widened, deepened, and maintained.

Thus, in addition to the expansion of the lending facilities of the Export-Import Bank, we passed the reciprocal-trade bill, providing for wider tariff cuts, thereby making possible increased foreign trade. Due to the increase in its capital, the Export-Import Bank will be in a position to provide financing. In this way, we enable war-devastated countries to begin the immense task of reconstruction—we help the wounded nations to bind up their wounds and walk again—to trade again—to return to prosperity.

But in all this enlightened generosity have we not the right to expect a recognition in return? For instance, is it fair dealing for Britain to exact, from the start of the war to January 1945, $11,345,390 as Suez Canal tolls on American ships redeploying fighting men and equipment to the Pacific? During the same period the United States lend-leased $9,000,000 in Panama Canal charges on British ships. That is certainly taking a nip out of the hand that feeds one. The excuse offered by Britain is lamentably weak. She seeks to exculpate by saying that the Canal is owned by a French company but she fails to state that Britain is the principal stockholder. A slight oversight. She begs off also by saying that the tolls must be paid in Egyptian pounds and she lacks such currency, an excuse which won't wash when one recalls, as it is inevitable, that England owns Egypt, body and soul. She could easily procure the Egyptian pounds through the sterling bloc pool.

My remarks may cause quite a fluttering in the dove-cotes, but I shall not be ruffled. I am reminded of Samuel Butler's remark, when criticized for his random passages: "I have left unsaid much that I am sorry I did not say, but I have said little that I am sorry for having said—and I am pretty well on the whole, thank you!" I feel the air should be cleared if we are to reach an understanding. I may be accused by some as being an Anglophobe, but I shall dismiss that as an absurdity. England will come out of this holocaust maimed physically and greatly weakened economically. She alone realizes how narrow was the survival. The whole world, including the United States, will be the poorer if England cannot play her full part in the task of the world's reconstruction. Because she has been shaken to her very foundations, she needs and must have our help. But such condition should not blind us to shortcomings and faults and preclude honest criticism.

Lord Vansittart recently—July 18—in the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail, spoke of Anglo-American relations and said: "There is something more than sentiment in common between the 'users of our sweet English tongue'." That is indeed "sweet." But it would be well for Lord Vansittart to caution his country to lessen his counting-house approach.

England has insisted that all lend-lease shipments be evaluated at a 1941 stabilization price level, although the goods may reach England in 1945. The actual cost of lend-lease goods has gone up from 25 to 40 percent since the 1941 period. In some food instances, the advance is 50 percent. Nevertheless, on the 18 billions of lend-lease goods and services we supplied England since 1941, we are out the increase in cost. Thus, we have subsidized each dollar of those 18 billions with upwards of another 25 cents or more per dollar, presenting Great Britain, on a silver platter, as it were, over $4,500,000,000.

Someone once said Britain, in a football match, plays courageously and fairly, but she always has her eye on the box-office receipts. It is high time we, too, kept at least one eye on the box-office receipts.

The time is drawing near for settling lend-lease accounts. What are we going to get for the billions of goods shipped to our allies? The cost of lend-lease to date is about 15 percent of the war's total cost. Before VJ-day, lend-lease may amount to over 45 billions. Much of it has been shot away, destroyed, or consumed, but portions remain intact and will have potential peacetime value. The value of lend-leased machine tools to date has been 675 million. The United Kingdom received 200 million thereof. Their use will have a marked effect upon our future exports. We still have title to them and the right to reclaim what remains, or ask for compensation.

How much of lend-lease accounts will have to be canceled? That is a burning question. England desires, naturally, to cancel as much as possible. Payment for explosives, planes, tanks, and jeeps that have disappeared and for food that has been consumed in the war's process will be liquidated and charged off the books as a war casualty. This might reach as high as 80 percent. What of the remaining 20 percent? The English are famed as shrew traders. This 20 percent consists of industrial machinery and materials that will compete finally with American industry. It includes, for example, locomotives and transportation equipment, and planes that can be converted to civilian uses. Some 58,000 tools were sent to Britain under lend-lease. They were later sold outright to that country at a discount and under circumstances that caused quite an outcry in Washington. The Kilgore committee has expressed marked disapproval, because it has been discovered that for a cash payment of $31,500,000, Great Britain secured these machine tools which cost $166,000,000. England found the dollars for this purchase with amazing alacrity.

In many instances, England's behavior bears a remarkable resemblance to Dickens' famous character, Scrooge. Her tactics hardly put us in a frame of mind to be lenient when it comes to settlement of lend-lease. Frankly, England is not following the admonition of a great East Indian sage, "Never poke your finger into your paper lantern." But maybe I'm talking through my hat about settlement. Some cynics say no payment whatsoever will be made for lend-lease, and that it will just be a colossal bookkeeping fiasco. Some say it is better to give than to lend, it costs about the same.

But, sticking in the eye of the American traders like a cinder is the British sterling-area dollar pool.

On the surface it seems a legitimate arrangement. But the temptation to use it as a petard to hoist British trade to the discrimination of American legitimate trading interests is too strong to resist. I have protested some of the abuses of this British Empire dollar pool to our State Department. In part, the reply received from Assistant Secretary of State Clayton is as follows:

"The so-called sterling-area dollar pool came into operation in June and July 1940 after the defeat of France in order to conserve United States dollars (and other hard currencies) as they became available so that the dollars would be available for the purchase of military and essential civilian goods. All British countries except Canada and Newfoundland instituted foreign exchange controls requiring that all hard currencies acquired in excess of the quantities required for imports of military and essential goods be surrendered to centralized control in Britain. Some countries in the sterling area because of their gold production, our purchases there, or the expenditures of our troops there, or for some other reason, have had supplies of dollars exceeding their essential wartime needs. Other countries in the area have had to make essential purchases in the United States in excess of their supplies of dollars. The British Treasury has accordingly transferred the dollars from surplus areas to deficit areas.

"The operation of the sterling area dollar pool has, necessarily reduced the supply of dollars available to businessmen in certain sterling area countries for purchase in the United States of goods deemed nonessential and has reduced the sales which American exporters might otherwise have made in those particular places. It has, of course, increased our sales to other places in the sterling area. This practice has not reduced the total purchases of American goods by all the sterling area countries taken as a group, but it has made possible the allocation of dollars to sterling area countries on the basis of relative need and has facilitated the conservation of dollars for the importation of military and essential civilian needs. The practice has therefore reduced the burden of lend-lease aid on the American taxpayer.

* * * * *

"You ask what the position of the State Department is with reference to this pool. The State Department regards the general form and purpose of these sterling area exchange controls as approximate and necessary to the successful prosecution of the war. Dollars in the sterling area are scarce, and they have had to be allocated to the war uses like any other scarce commodity. That allocation has undoubtedly prevented waste and has reduced the drain of lend lease on the Treasury of the United States. For the postwar period it is part of our commercial policy to see restored the right of foreign buyers to select their sources of supply, so that private industry can thrive and American goods and American exporters can compete around the world upon the basis of the excellence and price of their goods. We believe that exchange controls on current transactions, however necessary in wartime, are restrictive of free competition on the basis of commercial values and therefore restrictive of free enterprise, and that they tend to create international ill-will. We want to see them ended as soon as practicable. How soon that can be done no one can say at this time. The fundamental problem is the scarcity of dollars in the hands of foreign owners. In some countries, which have more dollars than ever before, this will not be a problem. But in others—and Great Britain is one of them—the probability is that the supply of dollars will be considerably less than total needs for a considerable time. Whenever dollars are short we may expect continuance of some foreign governmental control of trade."

I have great admiration for Will Clayton. He is doing a good job but he is a tyro at it as yet. I hope he realizes, however, that the British Foreign Office is adept in offering explanations. They are the Houdinis of the diplomatic world, and I fear me our State Department may not prove a match for their wanglings and their talented sophistry.

Let us face facts. I shall take conditions confronting our exporters in two countries; India and the Union of South Africa.

In my protest to the State Department, I gave a list of imports and exports passing between India and our own country between the years 1926 and 1940. Imports from the United States amounted to approximately

$625,400,000, and exports to the United States amounted to approximately $1,327,500,000. The trade balance in favor of India up to 1940 was $702,100,000 and constituted the dollar surplus on normal trading. I was unable to cite the figures for the years following 1940, because after that year, England took the surplus dollars due India and placed them in the British Imperial Pool. In other words, the dollars owed to India by us were deliberately seized by England and placed under her control. England then gave India credit in pounds and then froze those pounds. In the reply sent to me by Mr. Clayton, I was given the additional figures on the international trade balance with India for the years 1941 and 1942, but I was refused the figures for the years 1943 and 1944, "because security regulations prohibit their publication." One would imagine that the Japanese intelligence office was fast asleep. How in thunder the 1941 and 1942 figures can be given and not the 1943 and 1944 figures is quite beyond my comprehension. However, these 2 years, '41 and '42, add to India's surplus dollars—57,021,000—making a grand surplus of dollars as of the end of 1942 of $759,121,000. It is also impossible to secure any accounting of the dollar balances due India on her trade balance with us after 1942 from British authorities.

India has been selling and shipping us in the last few years jute, mica, manganese, and other strategic war materials. These latter shipments to us may run up an additional surplus of over two hundred millions. The total credit balance due India has, in all likelihood, mounted up to one billion by this time. It is difficult for any country, such as India, to support an international trade so slanted. The result has been to emphasize and underscore the inflationary movement rampant in India today due to shortages of goods of all kinds. India needs American products and needs them badly but India has been deprived of the dollar with which to buy American productivity. England, having given India credit in pounds for the dollars and then having frozen those pounds, forces India to deal well nigh exclusively—for practical purposes—in British goods, if they can get them. Britain has not the wherewithal to supply either consumer or capital goods needed in India. She thus plays dog in the manger. She says to India, "We won't let you buy American goods and we haven't the goods with which to supply you—so therefore do without." I don't know the rate of exchange between the dollar due India and the English pound but it is likely that England turned a neat profit on that part of the transaction as well. Incidentally, England expects India to accept for the pounds thus frozen a long term credit at a low rate of interest.

Prior to the war, Japan was a large reservoir upon which India could draw for goods, merchandise, and all sorts of supplies. Now that we are systematically pounding Japan to pieces, America might well step into the breach and act as a substitute for that source of supply after the war. But, should the sterling-bloc pool continue, as sure as you're a foot high, American trade with India will be stymied and that market effectively closed to us.

Britain has not openly announced her trade policy for the present or even the postwar period, except that Prime Minister Churchill, in referring to British postwar trade, has said: "Everything will be done to promote international trade, but Britain will not give up its rights to safeguard our balance of payments by whatever means are necessary." Apparently, no holds will be barred in the struggle for foreign trade. It is safe to assume, then, that should the Prime Minister be reelected, vigilance will not be relaxed over the operations of the sterling bloc pool.

Lord Keynes, in a memorandum to Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, in October last, said that the sterling bloc pool should be maintained for at least 3 years after the war with Japan. His thoughts seem to be entirely in accord with the Prime Minister's.

Furthermore, there is an oft-neglected section of the Bretton Woods pact which would give England a transition period of 3 to 5 years in which new bilateral exchange agreements would be permissible outside and beyond Bretton Woods machinery. In other words, she can keep her sterling bloc pool arrangements up to 5 years. As time is figured these days of swiftly moving events, that is a long period in which to keep us out of India and other countries congealed within the sterling area pool.

What are you exporters going to do meanwhile? Will you sit there quietly chewing your nails? As a trade diet, you will find them most inadequate.

In fact, Bretton Woods in general is quite inconsistent with the sterling bloc pool. Its purpose, primarily, is to break up artificial currencies and trade-restraint controls. England should not be permitted to take advantage of Bretton Woods facilities and maintain the sterling area bloc pool at one and the same time. She would be likened to one who eats her cake and wants to hoard it too.

Undoubtedly, England will apply for a direct loan to our Export-Import Bank, and the sum may run up to $1,000,000,000.

To the exporters of the United States this will be their cue for action. In a thunderous voice you must make known to the administration that it dare not implement the loan unless and until appropriate revisions to your advantage are immediately effected in the sterling bloc pool.

To cite another example, let us look at the trading situation of the Union of South Africa. It has always been a fertile market for American goods. We buy little—yet we sell much—and the Union has always had the means of payment. It has no external debt, and it is the largest producer of gold. In 1939 the Union of South Africa produced 33.2 percent of the world's gold. No figures are available for following years. Authoritative sources indicate that production was even greater in percentage during those years. South Africa can easily pay in gold for anything she needs, but she is within the sphere of the sterling bloc pool. Trade there is regulated by the South African import controllers, who are, in turn, supervised and curbed by the British. Some time ago it was difficult to trade with South Africa because of the dearth of ships. That difficulty no longer presents itself, as there is now enough cargo space, and after August 1 all shipping applications will be unnecessary. Control by the War Shipping Administration will be abandoned and direct contact will be made with the shipping companies. The War Shipping Administration will allocate ships, but not the space on those ships. Now what is happening to our trade with the Union of South Africa? Roughly there are two categories of goods that we can send to her. There are goods under general license, which includes noncritical, nonessential goods such as crockery, plastics, glassware, cosmetics, aluminum, jewelry, hand bags, etc. No export licenses are required for such items.

Then there is a category of goods involving critical or priority materials where allocations are made to various countries under license here. They involve materials where there are shortages or where the supplies are critical. As to the first category of goods which are plentiful in this country, the Union of South Africa controllers, under the domination of the British, exercise rigid control. Why? Why should the Union of South Africa be forced to say to American traders, at the behest of England, "You can't export to us, as much as we need your available civilian goods." Let's take the handbag situation as an instance. We have more than we need in this country. But the women of South Africa are in need of such articles. Therefore, although South Africa has plenty of gold with which to pay for such handbags, and she may have the dollar credit with which to do so, yet she cannot afford to do so for the amount of dollars that England doles out to her for purchases in a foreign market. South Africa may only buy from us what England permits her to buy. You might be curious and ask what happens to the gold. Most of it is earmarked for or shipped to England and the Union of South Africa is given sterling credit. Thus Britain manipulates the buying power of the Union of South Africa as she sees fit or as fits her needs. Churchill's statement, quoted previously, "But Britain will not give up its rights to safeguard our balance of payments by whatever means are necessary" becomes much clearer. It is likely that Britain will buy raw materials, such as metals and leather, and make handbags to be shipped to South Africa. She will thus monopolize the South African market. South Africa, meanwhile, is compelled to wait until England is in a position to supply her and is not permitted to avail herself of the American handbags already manufactured. As we can readily see, under such operation, until England is able to process and manufacture civilian goods for export to her commonwealths and the dominions, such as South Africa, all United States exports, in this instance to South Africa, are blocked for all practical purposes, or descend to a mere trickle of goods.

Lack of goods in South Africa and the unwillingness of England to allow those needs to be supplied causes inflation. I have been speaking to some large South African importers. They complain bitterly, as you complain. One said to me the other day, "What can I do? The Controller says 'No'. He refuses to give me an import license and that is the end of it. If I continue to gripe, he will turn the screws on me in several other ways." Thus the fear of reprisals causes the South African importer to take it and like it. But that is no reason why a gag should be put in your mouth.

What I have said with reference to India and South Africa is applicable to Australia, New Zealand, Rhodesia, Palestine, Egypt, British East Africa, etc.

Can it be argued that the Union of South Africa desires to protect South African industry by keeping out American goods? The answer to that one is "No." In many instances, such as in the field of plastics and cosmetics, there is no competition.

The conclusion seems inescapable—the whole scheme is to protect England's general dollar outgo. Britain takes South African gold and gives in its place an IOU and then translates the gold into dollars and uses the latter in any way that is necessary, including discrimination against American traders.

Meanwhile, our exports shrink. I say this despite the conclusion in the letter received from the State Department. It boils itself down to this—within the imperial sphere of the sterling bloc, together with so-called imperial preferences, England controls our trade with many countries and thus succeeds in limiting it and throttling it. We deemed it unsporting to murmur during the European war because the pool then appeared to be a legitimate shield against exploitation and a device to conserve England's war energies. But, thank the Lord, VE-day has taken its place in history and VJ-day will follow it soon, we hope. At this point, I feel the exporters in the United States are entitled to yell like stuck pigs. I earnestly recommend that your association and others similar conduct immediate and complete investigations into the operations of the sterling bloc pool and its effect as a barrier to United States trade.

Emile Z. Weinberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, there will be many encomiums delivered in praise of those unselfish citizens who rushed to the aid of their Government following December 7, 1941. Many other people had enlisted in the civilian efforts to strengthen the defenses of the country prior to that date. In Brooklyn we had an outstanding example of the type of service to which I refer in the Brooklyn District Office of the War Production Board. This office during its entire existence was under the able management of Emile Z. Weinberg aided by a competent and congenial staff of assistants who have written an inspiring chapter in the industrial life of our great community. The contribution of the Brooklyn District Office will ever be remembered by untold thousands.

Equally inspiring was the willingness of the district manager and his staff to terminate their activities as soon as possible. The office will close on October 1, 1945. Mr. Weinberg is returning to the private business he so willingly left in order to serve his Government. He will resume his public relations office at 57 William Street, New York City.

The saga of Brooklyn in the war is well and succinctly told by the following exchange of letters:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *August 27, 1945.*

Mr. LEWIS S. GREENLEAF, Jr.,
Regional Director,
War Production Board,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR LEW: In September 1941 I was asked by Mr. Floyd Odlum to open a Brooklyn office for the Office of Production Management, Contract Distribution Branch, to get Brooklyn industry to work for our national defense. With the treacherous advent of Pearl Harbor we became a district office of the War Production Board.

For the past 4 years I have been serving as the district manager directing the war production in Brooklyn. I am happy and proud to have served here in Brooklyn with its 3,000,000 population and approximately 800 war plants, also its magnificent production records—for warships built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, with a total employment of 65,000 war workers. The now history-making battleship, the U. S. S. *Missouri* was built here along with aircraft carriers and other craft. Also Brooklyn is to be congratulated for its record of production of many other ships of all types in private yards, and its magnificent job of voyage repairs, and the conversion of freighters to troop-carrying vessels. This borough also produced parts for the atom bomb, radio and radar, and many other critical items too numerable to mention. It is interesting to point out that not one strike occurred here during my tenure of office.

Now that the job has been done and victory is ours, I feel that I would like to go back to my public relations office at 57 William Street, New York, N. Y. I am, therefore, asking you to accept my resignation effective October 1, 1945. In the interim I will do my utmost to help Brooklyn industry reconvert within the limit of War Production Board directives.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

EMILE Z. WEINBERG,
District Manager, Brooklyn District Office.

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVE, REGION II,
New York, N. Y., August 27, 1945.

Mr. EMILE WEINBERG,
District Manager, War Production Board, Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WEINBERG: I have been advised by Washington headquarters that WPB and WMC have directed their field organizations to dissolve all regional and area PUC's and MPC's effective at once and that, correspondingly, the ASF regional and area labor supply organizations will be dissolved immediately. All officers of the ASF regional organization are being notified that this War Department program has been discontinued and that they are relieved of further duty with respect to that organization.

May I take this opportunity on behalf of all members of the ASF organization to congratulate you upon your fine work and to thank you most sincerely for the never-failing cooperation which you extended to our organization.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART E. REIMEL,
Brigadier General, Ordnance Department, ASF Regional Representative, Region II.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., August 28, 1945.

Mr. EMILE Z. WEINBERG,
District Manager, War Production Board, Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR EMILE: This will acknowledge your letter of August 27 tendering your resignation as district manager of our Brooklyn office. I presume you are submitting this resignation direct to Mr. Greenleaf who will have to make the decision as to the date on which your services may be spared.

You may well take pride in the job which you and the Brooklyn office have done as part of the tremendous production record made by this country. Brooklyn has indeed contributed a major share to our country's armaments and the smoothness with which this production has been achieved in Brooklyn must, in large measure, be credited to your efforts.

I am glad to have had the opportunity of having associated with you and hope that our paths will cross again in the future.

With personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. FOLGER,
Vice Chairman for Field Operations.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
New York, N. Y., August 30, 1945.

Mr. EMILE WEINBERG,
District Manager, Brooklyn District Office, Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR EMILE: I have your letter of August 27, and in view of your desire to return to your own business, and in view of the fact that, as outlined in my letter to you of August 23, the work of our Brooklyn office is drawing nearly to a close, I accept your resignation as of the close of business September 30. This will provide sufficient time for you to see that your remaining functions are wound up or transferred in an orderly manner.

In accepting your resignation I would like to take the opportunity of expressing to you my keen appreciation of the services that you have rendered over a long period of time to the war effort, and the most efficient and faithful way in which you have done so. I wish that in releasing men like yourself from the service we could present you with something like an honorable discharge certificate. Lacking that, I hope you will accept this letter in its stead.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS S. GREENLEAF, Jr.,
Regional Director.

As one of the Representatives of Brooklyn, I am pleased to extend my congratulations to Mr. Weinberg and the War Production Board in Brooklyn and to wish to him and them a happy and successful future.

Let's Return to Standard Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, now that the war is over so far as actual combat is concerned, the time has arrived to repeal the legislation providing so-called daylight saving time, and return to standard time as it prevailed throughout the United States prior to the passage of this war measure. This innovation in interfering with the established standards of time has resulted in great inconvenience to many groups of our people, particularly those who live in the rural areas, and has resulted in confusion, hardship, and uncertainty. We should, without delay, pass legislation to repeal Public Law 403 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, so that standard time may again be established throughout our country. With this end in view I am introducing a concurrent resolution reading as follows, which I trust will receive prompt approval of both the House and Senate and of the President:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Public Law 403, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "An act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time" be, and the same is hereby, repealed and shall cease to be in effect at 2 o'clock a. m of the last Sunday in the calendar month following the calendar month during which this concurrent resolution is adopted, and that beginning at 2 o'clock a. m. of said last Sunday in the calendar month following the calendar month during which this concurrent resolution is adopted, the standard time of each zone established pursuant to the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended, shall be returned to the mean astronomical time of the degree of longitude governing the standard time for such zone as provided in such act of March 19, 1918, as amended.

Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there can be no reconversion that will enable free enterprise to furnish jobs to the unemployed under the present tax structure. This has been obvious to the rank and file of the people for many months. It seems imperative, therefore, that we as Representatives of the American people, should now make it our first business to enact a tax law that will induce such reconversion.

It was to remove from the tax law the hindrances to peacetime reconversion that I introduced H. R. 2801 on March 27, 1945, and to further meet the need for tax relief as soon as hostilities ceased in Europe and in Japan. Here is what I proposed as a first tax relief step 6 months ago: A reduction to 60 percent in the excess profits tax rate, now 95 percent, after the defeat of Germany and outright repeal of the excess profits tax after the defeat of Japan; it also provided that corporations should be given a $30,000 exemption in lieu of the present $10,000 exemption to stimulate small business concerns, which in the aggregate furnish in normal peacetimes 90 percent of the jobs of the country. I also provided in H. R. 2801 for the tax relief of individuals following the cessation of major hostilities with Japan. The relief to individuals carried in the bill amounted to a 20-percent horizontal cut. The relief extended to corporations was to enable their executives to plan for the future, not only existing corporations, but promoters of new enterprises, which if encouraged to enter peacetime production would insure hundreds of thousands of jobs to those released from the Army, Navy, Air Force and other branches of military activity as well as the displaced war workers.

The proposed horizontal cut of 20 percent in individual income taxes called for in my bill of March 27, 1945, at the conclusion of the war with Japan, would have given encouragement to hundreds of thousands of men and women to reenter the line of business which they left to engage in war activities. The stimulation of enterprise, the creation of new enterprises, the rebuilding of business establishments suspended for the duration are necessary to provide new jobs and to produce a greater volume of revenue. Moreover, the relaxation of wartime taxation as proposed in H. R. 2801, had it been acted upon, would be in operation now, thus encouraging a greater volume of production of goods, a definite cure for inflation of prices now caused by the shortage of goods.

These tax proposals are in accord with the views of the Republican Postwar Tax Study Committee after a careful survey of the views of groups of citizens throughout the country. It is the aim of our committee to keep in constant touch with public opinion relating to tax problems as they may affect individuals, labor, agriculture, industry, and the white-collar groups.

I realize that under the present New Deal administration, its loose fiscal policies for each year, long prior to the war, so increased the tax load that new revenue bills had to come with great rapidity. Unless this program of the New Deal to spend and tax and tax and spend is halted, and tax relief and retrenchment brought about, the postwar period will invite a major disaster.

Since 1933, when the New Deal came into power, we have had an endless succession of tax bills—17 in all—which have been piled one on top of the other until the ablest tax experts disagree as to the meaning of the provisions of this tax hodgepodge. There can be no stable reconversion until relief is assured to those who venture their capital with some hope of return for the risk they take.

The Washington Times-Herald of September 4, 1945, referring to an address delivered by Hon. Fred M. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury, would indicate that the unrestrained New Deal spending program is to be continued, which, if persisted in, will mean no relief for the taxpayer whether individual or corporate.

I insert, unde. leave to extend, the article to which reference has been made:

VINSON DASHES TAX-CUT HOPES—SAYS HIGH FEDERAL OUTLAY WILL CONTINUE

PEORIA, ILL., September 3.—Congressional predictions of sweeping tax reductions next year were refuted tonight by Secretary of the Treasury Vinson who said that some cuts may be possible but that taxes must remain high to pay war costs and interest on the national debt.

Addressing a Labor Day rally, he warned that with much of the war bill unpaid, Government expenses will remain around $25,000,000,000 a year for a long time to come.

But he did promise a streamlined tax structure that will eliminate inequities, simplify payment schedules, and stimulate business expansion.

Last week in Washington, Representative DOUGHTON, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the tax-drafting House Ways and Means Committee, said he thought there would be tax reductions next year. At the same time, Representative KNUTSON of Minnesota, ranking Republican on the committee, predicted that Congress would put through a 20-percent-across-the-board tax cut.

Keep the Faith—Senator Magnuson, Senator Chandler, and Representative Celler Ask the Labor Government to Keep Pledges on Palestine and the Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Senator from Washington; Hon. ALBERT B. CHANDLER, Senator from Kentucky, and Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, Representative in Congress from New York:

To the Right Honorable CLEMENT R. ATTLEE, C. H. M. P., Prime Minister, First Lord of the Treasury, and Minister of Defense.

The Right Honorable ERNEST BEVIN, M. P., Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The Right Honorable HERBERT STANLEY MORRISON, M. P., Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons.

The Right Honorable GEORGE HENRY HALL, M. P., Secretary of State for the Colonies.

GENTLEMEN: On the 23d of May 1939, in the House of Commons the Right Honorable Herbert S. Morrison, now President of the Council of the Labor Government, bitterly assailed the Chamberlain government for presenting the white paper, curbing entry of Jews into Palestine and said: "The Jews, already victims of other races as a minority in certain countries, are now to be made a permanent minority in the country that has been promised to them as the Jewish national home in Palestine."

He chided Chamberlain with perfidy and recalled his words of 1935: "You may be assured that it is the policy of the Government to carry out in the letter and in the spirit the mandate for Palestine. They will discharge without fear or favor their obligations under that mandate; and while safeguarding the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities will continue to facilitate the establishment of a national home in Palestine for the Jewish people."

The forty-third annual conference of the Labor Party in London announced its party platform (1944) on Palestine. It reads as follows:

"PALESTINE

"Here we have halted halfway, irresolute between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home, unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish to, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistable case now after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe.

"Here, too, in Palestine is the case on human grounds, and to promote a stable settlement for the transfer of populations. Let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organized and generously financed.

"The Arab has many wide territories of his own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area—Palestine—less than the size of Wales.

"Indeed, we should reexamine also the possibility of extending the present boundaries by agreement with Egypt, Syria, or Transjordan. Moreover, we should seek to win the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments for the execution of this Palestinian policy.

"Will you implement your preachment with action or will you slay your idealism with cowardly inaction?

"Delay is costly. Thousands of hopeless and homeless Jews wander across the face of Europe. The fires of anti-Semitism still burn fiercely. They seek balm in Gilead—in Palestine. They would make the trek, perils notwithstanding. Award the necessary immigriation certificates. Do now what common humanity dictates, not what political opportunism demands.

"British inaction will be just as tragic as was Nazi positive action.

"The British Labor Party must create a revolution in the thinking of the Colonial Office, its barrack-room ballad days are over. It must be stripped naked of its eighteenth century imperialism. The Toryism of Churchill, Eden, and Halifax, we hope, are buried deep beneath an avalanche of labor ballots.

"Over the years we on the Zionist side have spoken softly, nor did we 'carry the big stick.' Now Zionist demands are streamlined as through a megaphone and the sound is amplified by justice and impatience.

"Fulfill your pledges, lest that sound be come more than a roar. Resultant fury may lead to something more than beer and skittles, we assure you. Great effervescent danger is choked up in Palestine. It had better be uncorked carefully lest great havoc and tragedy be spread.

"Unless the nefarious Malcolm MacDonald white paper, stopping immigration of Jews, is abrogated, with promptitude, trouble awaits. Unless humanity and fidelity to her promise shape her course in Palestine, England will not be the winner. Her dominion, or honor, or both, will be lost to her.

"Churchill, whilst on the opposition benches called this MacDonald white paper (strangely named for the son of a distinguished Laborite), a 'breach of faith' and the 'filing of a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy.' He ascended to Premiership but conveniently descended into a noxious desuetede as far as keeping his pledges on Palestine was concerned. His words often came back to plague him, however. Churchill was friend before he wore the ermine. Let it not be said of Clement R. Attlee: 'A friend in power is a friend lost.'

"America is vastly concerned about the labor government's attitude toward Palestine. Hundreds of its Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, scores of Governors of States, as well as State legislatures, have sounded the tocsin, warning England that the solemn pledges involved in the mandate and the Balfour Declaration must be kept. Both Democratic and Republican Party platforms demanded untrammeled immigration of Jews into their homeland and called for the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish democratic commonwealth. Both President Roosevelt, then leader of the national Democratic Party, and Governor Dewey, head of the national Republican Party, during the Presidential campaign, and President Truman since, have all urged that the Jews can no longer live in a ghetto in Palestine and that Palestine shall not be an Arab state with a Jewish minority.

"England's future well-being lies vis-à-vis America. Lend-Lease aid, loans for rehabilitation and reconstruction impend. Continued flouting of American public opinion favorable to Jewish aspirations in Palestine will discourage the cordiality and amity necessary for such aid.

"All talk of Arab intransigence and revolt is balderdash. It is a fake as a mirage in the Arabian desert.

"Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party, said in a dispatch by cable from London to New York, July 27, 1945:

" 'It (Labor's victory) must make that pan-Arabism, so carefully cultivated since 1939, understand decisively that the tragic remnant of European Jewry will not be sacrificed to make a holiday for Arab effendi in any part of the Middle East.'

"Failure to keep the promises of the Labor Party and disregard of its candidates' declarations frankly is 'not cricket.' It would mean the platform of your party is something merely to get in on and not to stand upon.

"A Prime Minister of England, Peele, once said: 'Honor, the spur that pricks the princely mind.' "

Respectfully yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator from Washington.
ALBERT B. CHANDLER,
United States Senator from Kentucky.
EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative in Congress from New York.

Shall We Join the World-Wide March Toward Socialism by Nationalizing All Jobs in the United States Through the Medium of a Permanent FEPC?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE W. ERVIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

WORLD-WIDE TREND TOWARD SOCIALISM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk for a few minutes about the world-wide trend toward socialism.

In view of the recent election in England, now seems to be the proper time for Americans to pause and contemplate certain well-known facts.

There has been a world-wide trend toward socialism in recent years.

Russia adopted communism by a bloody revolution in 1918.

Germany adopted national socialism, or fascism, with the rise to power of Adolf Hitler in 1933.

England adopted partial socialism in the general election of 1945. The most disturbing thing about the recent English election is that the majority party in England is pledged to "eventually nationalize land."

MANIFESTATIONS OF SOCIALISM

There are many badges of socialism. Some of them are easily recognized while others cannot be easily recognized.

Socialism manifests itself by socializing and nationalizing land, industries, jobs, and professions.

Russia communized all Russian people, Russian lands, and Russion jobs.

Germany Hitlerized or socialized almost everything in Germany.

The majority party in England is pledged to a partial nationalization of English industry and to the eventual nationalization of land.

There is now pending in the United States Congress a proposal to nationalize all jobs. While this legislation purports to have been designed for another purpose, it would unquestionably nationalize every job in business, industry, and in Government. I refer to the pending proposal to create a permanent FEPC.

NATIONALIZATION OF ALL JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES

To what extent would the proposed FEPC nationalize all jobs? The answer is simple. It would nationalize all jobs completely and thoroughly. The purpose of this analysis is to disclose how all jobs would be nationalized, under the pending proposal.

While the pending proposal would authorize certain bureaucrats to prevent discrimination in employment, they could only prevent discrimination by exercising their power to select employees for the jobs involved. Therefore, we see that the proposal is somewhat like a double-barreled shotgun. One barrel is supposed to prevent discrimination while the other barrel would certainly nationalize all jobs.

SOCIALISM IS A CREED

The proposal to create a permanent FEPC would prevent any employer from discriminating against any applicant for a job by reason of the applicant's creed.

We must remember that there are good creeds and bad creeds. Socialism and communism are creeds. I do not know how many Communists there are in the United States. Mr. David Lawrence, editor of the United States News, recently said that there are 100,000 Communists in the United States. I do know, however, that there are plenty of Socialists in the United States, even though they do not always designate themselves as Socialists.

I do not think that all persons who favor a permanent FEPC are Socialists, but I do say that all of the Communists and Socialists are advocating a permanent FEPC, because they know that it would nationalize all jobs.

If the Congress should create a permanent FEPC, do you have any doubt that Socialists and Communists would attempt to seek to control the FEPC agency and, by operating the agency itself, seek to put other Communists and Socialists and fellow travelers in key positions in Government, business, and industry?

If the FEPC proposal should be enacted into law, and if you fail to oppose it, you will get exactly what you deserve.

WHAT JOBS WOULD BE NATIONALIZED?

If the FEPC legislation should be enacted and should be declared constitutional, the bureaucrats who would be appointed pursuant to this proposed legislation would be authorized to select employees for the following:

First. All employers—with five or more employees—engaged in interstate commerce or in business affecting interstate commerce—subsection 1 of section 7 (a) of H. R. 2232;

Second. All agencies and instrumentalities of the United States and of its territories and possessions—subsection 3 of section 7 (a) of H. R. 2232;

Third. All Government contractors—subsection 2 of section 7 (a) of H. R. 2232;

Fourth. All Government subcontractors—subsection 2 of section 7 (a) of H. R. 2232;

Fifth. All States—section 4 of H. R. 2232;

Sixth. All instrumentalities of the several States—section 4 of H. R. 2232; and

Seventh. All creatures of the several States—section 4 of H. R. 2232.

1. EMPLOYEES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Congress has legislated so much to regulate persons, firms, and corporations engaged in interstate commerce that all of us have a fairly good idea of the persons, firms, and corporations engaged in interstate commerce.

The phrase "employers in interstate commerce" includes practically everybody. It certainly includes all transportation companies and all manufacturing plants. However, in considering the proposed FEPC legislation, we should remember that all newspapers, radio stations, and all motion-picture producers and motion-picture theaters are engaged in interstate commerce. Consequently, the proposed permanent FEPC would have authority to select all managers and employees of newspapers, radio stations, motion-picture producers, and motion-picture theaters, when such positions and jobs become vacant. Do you suppose it is possible that we might wake up some day and have a Socialist bureau of propaganda and public enlightenment?

Furthermore, your favorite banker and your favorite merchant are engaged in interstate commerce. Also, your church and your fraternal order are engaged in interstate commerce in taking subscriptions for church and fraternal order publications.

Every magazine and every periodical is engaged in interstate commerce. Is there any sound reason why we should authorize anybody to select employees for everybody engaged in interstate commerce?

2. WHO ARE THE EMPLOYEES OF THE AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF THE UNITED STATES?

What are the agencies and instrumentalities of the United States whose employees would be selected under this proposal? Necessarily, an agency or instrumentality is any agency or person who transacts Government business. What is the business of the Federal Government? The Federal Government has three kinds of businesses, as follows:

a. The executive business;
b. The legislative business; and
c. The judicial business.

The scope and limits of the judicial business and legislative business are well known. Consequently, we have no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the FEPC would have authority to select all employees of the Government who attend to its legislative and judicial business, except those whose manner of appointment is provided for in the Constitution. Therefore, the inferior officers and attachés of our Federal courts could be selected by the FEPC, because they help attend to the judicial business of the Government. Likewise, secretaries and stenographers of Members of the Senate and Members of the House, as well as the clerks of all committees in the Senate and House, could be selected by the FEPC, because they are helping to attend to the legislative business of the Government.

We can, without difficulty, think of many agencies and instrumentalities of the executive branch of our Government.

Necessarily, the FEPC would have authority to select all or practically all of the employees at the White House, as well as all or practically all of the employees in the various departments, establishments, agencies, and corporations of the Federal Government. Even a Cabinet officer would have less authority, in selecting the inferior officers and employees of his department, than would the FEPC.

Even the members of our armed forces are employees of the War and Navy Departments, and as such could be selected by the FEPC. Do you suppose it is possible we might have some Socialist "storm troopers" some day?

The Federal Government has many instrumentalities which are not readily recognized as such. We have seen that any person or agency who attends to the Federal business is an instrumentality of the Gederal Government. One of the principal businesses of the Federal Government seems to be the expenditure of money. Therefore the FEPC would have authority to select employees for anyone who spends money for the Federal Government.

Your home State, your home county, and your home town spend money for the Federal Government in the construction and repair of highways, in the promotion of agriculture, forestry, health, public welfare, old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, unemployment compensation, vocational education, in furnishing board and room to Federal prisoners in local jails, and in the maintenance of the National Guard and the State Guard, as well as in the promotion of other programs too numerous to mention. Consequently, in expending money for the Federal Government, your State, county, and town are instrumentalities of the Federal Government and their employees who perform these Federal functions could be selected by the FEPC.

Your farmer friends are instrumentalities of the Federal Government, because they spend Federal funds for the rebuilding of soil, and thereby their employees could be selected by a permanent FEPC.

3. WHO ARE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS?

Of course, the term "Government contractors" would include contractors engaged in construction work and contractors engaged in furnishing materials and supplies. Furthermore, when your State, county, and town accept Federal funds for the construction and repair of highways and for the other purposes hereinbefore enumerated, they thereby become Government contractors, because there is necessarily an implied or statutory contract that they will spend the money according to the terms of the Federal statute. Consequently, the proposed FEPC would have authority to select employees for your State, county, and city under the contractors' clause of the pending FEPC proposal.

4. WHO ARE GOVERNMENT SUBCONTRACTORS?

The words "Government subcontractors" do not merely include persons who are engaged in performing a subcontract on a construction job or in furnishing materials and supplied to the Federal Government. The term "subcontractor" includes many other persons not ordinarily thought to be contractors.

All persons who must perform any work in furnishing labor or materials to any Government contractor would be a subcontractor. Consequently, the term "subcontractor" would include all of the business houses in your home town, because all of them furnish, or would like to furnish, supplies and materials to those agencies of your State, county, and city which spend Federal funds. To illustrate, all of the business houses and many of the farmers in your county are Government subcontractors in that they furnish machinery, cement, asphalt, lumber, hammers, nails, shovels, and other hardware, food, medicine, wearing apparel, and other supplies to those agencies of your State, county, and town which promote agriculture, highways, forestry, health, public welfare, old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, unemployment compensation, vocational education, and furnish board and room to Federal prisoners in local jails.

5 AND 6. EMPLOYEES OF STATES, COUNTIES, CITIES, AND TOWNS

If constitutional, section 4 of the proposed FEPC legislation would authorize certain Washington bureaucrats to select all employees for your States, counties, cities, and towns. While this statement may seem to be amazing, it is not nearly as amazing as the bill itself when properly analyzed.

Section 4 specifically says that no State can abridge the right of any person to seek and obtain work and that no instrumentality of any State may abridge that right; and the bureaucrats would be authorized, by section 10, to make rules and regulations to enforce such rights.

Subsection C of section 2 declares that it is the policy of the Congress to protect such right to the fullest extent permitted by the Constitution and that the act shall be construed to effectuate such policy. If all of this language means anything—and the courts always hold that all legislative language is intended to mean something—it simply means that the FEPC would have authority to select all employees for your State, as well as for your county, city, and town, for the reason that counties, cities, and towns are instrumentalities of the State.

We must not forget that this would include all school teachers, all policemen, all firemen, and all local election officials, as well as many other employees of your State, county, city, and town.

7. WHAT ARE CREATUEES OF THE SEVERAL STATES?

Under section 4 of the proposed bill, the FEPC would have authority to select employees for any creature of any State.

A "creature" of any State necessarily means anything created by the State or pursuant to State law.

Every local corporation engaged in purely local or intrastate business is a

creature of the State, because it was created pursuant to State law. Consequently, the proposed FEPC would have authority to select all employees of every little corporation doing a purely local or intrastate business.

ILLUSTRATION OF COMPLETE NATIONALIZATION OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT JOBS UNDER FEPC

The proposed permanent FEPC would have power to select all employees of the highway commissions and departments of various States, counties, cities, and towns, for several reasons, as follows:

(a) All highway departments are engaged in interstate commerce, in the construction and repair of highways;

(b) All highway departments are instrumentalities of the Federal Government, in that they spend Federal funds for the construction and repair of highways;

(c) All highway departments are government contractors, because there is an implied or statutory contract that they will spend government funds as provided by statute; and

(d) All highway departments are instrumentalities of the State.

IF ALL JOBS SHOULD BE NATIONALIZED, WOULD THE FEPC EXERCISE ALL OF ITS JURISDICTION?

Of course, I do not know how much jurisdiction the FEPC would exercise if all jobs were nationalized. However, I have my ideas, because the bureaucrats who are in charge of it are crusaders. I think that they would exercise it in such a manner as would put the clutching hand of bureaucracy at the throat of private enterprise and local governments. It would be like a creeping paralysis, although it would creep rapidly instead of slowly.

We can get some idea of the speed with which the FEPC would exercise its jurisdiction by considering the application of another Federal statute which uses the same language, in part.

Under the Hatch Act, which was passed by Congress a few years ago to prevent Government employees from participating in the mangement of a political campaign, it was declared to be a felony for any person employed by any agency of the Federal Government to participate in the management of a political campaign.

Within the last few weeks, the chairman of the State highway commission of the State of Oklahoma was convicted in the Federal Court of violating the Hatch Act, simply because he participated in the management of a political campaign. While serving as chairman of the State Highway Commission of Oklahoma, his only connection with the Federal Government was that the State highway commission of Oklahoma spends Federal funds and was thereby declared by the court to be an agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

The Hatch Act is administered by people with legal and judicial minds. It took only a few years, after the passage of the Hatch Act, to convict the chairman of the State highway commission of Oklahoma of violating the Hatch Act. How long would it take the FEPC personnel, who are crusaders, to select the chairman of the State highway commission of your State or the employees of the street and highway commission of your town?

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the following facts clearly appear:

First. There is a world-wide trend toward socialism;

Second. Socialism manifests itself by nationalizing and socializing land, industries, jobs, and professions;

Third. There is now pending, in the Congress of the United States, a proposal to nationalize all jobs;

Fourth. This proposal to nationalize all jobs in the United States is far-reaching and complete, in that all jobs would in fact be nationalized; and

Fifth. The bureaucrats who would be in charge of the proposed permanent FEPC would doubtless exercise their jurisdiction rapidly in such manner as to clutch at the throat of local governments and private enterprise.

The Day of Victory Over Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night, August 14, it was my privilege to address my constituents of the Fourth South Carolina District over radio station WFBC, Greenville, S. C. I spoke, as follows:

Ladies, gentlemen, and fellow citizens, it will be recalled by those now in middle life that at the end of the last war the outburst of enthusiasm was so spontaneous, so overwhelming, that all accepted restrictions for the regulation of conduct under normal conditions instantaneously disappeared. Men and women had spent four long, weary years doing without material things, all wanted but could not get, or at least could get only in small amounts and those often of inferior quality at exorbitant prices. And still worse, others faced the loss of loved ones on battlefields or the return of loved ones crippled for life. Their feelings were indeed vastly different from those not so burdened with sorrow. The wife who has been widowed by the ravages of war, with the responsibility of rearing one or more children, is not likely to feel too frivolous.

The churchmen will want to turn the new Armistice Day into a solemn day of prayer and worship. That, too, will be in the American tradition. Then, there will be those who have never given much heed to ecclesiastical preachments and will desire to spend the day in frivolity. This, too, is their legal right and must be respected the same as the rights of those who elect somber ways of celebrating the day.

There are factors present this time that were not present in the Armistice Day of 1918. To begin with, America has grown more mature in the intervening years and the point of view of the country has changed in many ways, and this is quite likely to give people generally a feeling of solemnity rather than of gaiety. During the Battle of Santiago in the Spanish-American War, when one of the enemy battleships was sinking and its sailors were drowning, it will be recalled that the American admiral exclaimed: "Don't cheer, boys; the poor devils are dying."

Joshua 5: 14 reads: "And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship." It was V-day in Israel. The people of Israel had waited 40 years for this day, but at last it had arrived. God gave Joshua instructions for taking the land of Canaan. As Joshua realized the greatness of his task, he fell down on his face to the earth and worshiped God.

Today we are celebrating complete victory over our enemies. We can learn some lessons from Joshua that might be helpful to us today.

The attitude of Joshua was that of humility. The very posture of the man indicated humility. He bowed down to the earth before God.

Humility has always been pleasing to God. The publican in the temple was humble, and he went home justified. Abraham in pleading for the city of Sodom cried, "I, who am but dust and ashes, have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord." His prayer breathes the spirit of humility, and it was heard at the throne of God. When the Hebrews went into Canaan, they were warned lest they become puffed up with pride over their achievements and forget God. "Lord God of Hosts be with us yet! Lest we forget! Lest we forget!"

But today, we are already puffed with pride over our achievements. We are feeling that we knew all the time that Italy and Germany and Japan could not stand up against American might, once it was organized. We prayed for victory, and we are prone to say, "Just look at our achievements." We must be humble if we expect the continued blessing of God.

In that day of victory, Joshua did not forget to worship God. The Scriptures say that Joshua fell down at the feet of this heavenly messenger and worshiped.

This is a place for a happy celebration of peace. But there is no place for celebrating this victory that has cost precious life and dollars without number, as the pagans of the earth might celebrate it. There will be no place for drunkenness and debauchery on the part of a people who dared to ask God for victory. Like Joshua, we need to get down on our knees before God in humility, confessing our sins, thanking Him for His blessings, and rededicating ourselves to Him. In the spirit of Joshua, let us celebrate this day of final victory.

Eleven months almost to the day from the time we landed on D-day, the Allies recaptured France, Luxemburg, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland Austria, Rumania, Yugoslavia and others. Denmark, Holland and Norway had been liberated. Germany had unconditionally surrendered.

Never before in our history has there been such a demonstration of the truism that "he who lives by the sword, shall perish by the sword."

But the cost has been without parallel in world history. Disregarding the exaggerated claims on both sides, it has been estimated that over 12,000,000 men have been killed; that Poland alone, suffered fatalities of over 3,000,000 men; Germany probably about the same number and Russia, around 4,000,000. This country has, by comparison, escaped easily, although our total casualties aggregate a million. There have, of course, been many more wounded than killed and it has been estimated that over 11,000,000 men were taken prisoners. Those killed, wounded and taken prisoners may well total around 42,000,000.

It has been estimated that over, $2,000,000,000,000 has been expended in the prosecution of the war. This country emerges with a national indebtedness unprecedented. It was less than 10 years ago when the late President Roosevelt said he had been informed by bankers that this Nation could stand a national indebtedness of $75,000,000,000. We now have an indebtedness of four times that amount. This means a national indebtedness of nearly $3,500 for every man, women and child in this country. Assuming an average family to be composed of five persons, this would be enough to build and pay for a $17,500 home for every family in this land—something which most families never own.

This is a day for prayer and thanksgiving—for the opportunities for loved ones to come home and be able to sleep away from the blood of battle. We pay homage at this time to those who have borne the battle and express our gratitude to our Heavenly Father for the safe deliverance of those who return.

We must dedicate ourselves to bringing economic order out of world chaos if we are not to see world starvation. At the best, we can expect that millions and millions of people will go hungry.

If economic order is to be restored in this country and in the world, we must learn, in the spirit of the Master, to be tolerant and fair with each other and work as brothers for the common good of all. This country and the world needs a renaissance of goodwill, and an end to political demagoguery by extremists on both sides.

Classifying people as liberals and conservatives or otherwise is always dangerous. Some people who parade as great liberals are liberals only in the sense that they are liberal with other people's money—under the guise of governmental forms they profligately spend money earned by sweat and saved by privation. Others, who in the jargon of the day are sometimes improperly characterized as reactionaries, are those who would preserve for this country some of the most enduring liberal principles upon which this country is founded—the right through industry and hard work to get ahead in the world; the right through the exercise of our talents and property to acquire new talents and property; the right to order our own lives free from unnecessary interference of Government; the right to live under a government of laws which apply alike to all men, rather than under a government of men who in the exercise of the powers conferred upon them can favor their friends and punish their enemies. In the exercise of governmental functions, the rich have no right to take advantage of the poor, but neither have the poor the right to confiscate the property of the rich.

No greater disservice can be done to our country by any man than to array class against class. There is no more room for a labor government in this country than there is for a government representing vested wealth. Representatives in Congress should represent all of their constituents, not merely those who voted for them.

There can be no greater menace to our country than the doctrine preached by some in high places—that our country owes us a living. If that doctrine be accepted by the majority of our people, we are in greater danger as a Nation. While the Government should work for the people, that does not mean it should support the people, for to the extent it does the other people in turn become the slaves of the Government.

The postulate of Jefferson that that government governs best which governs least is still entitled to some place in our political affairs.

The awful slaughter and destruction has ended.

We have won another chance to achieve a world in which men and nations can find satisfaction and joy in themselves and in each other.

Profound as are gratification and gratitude for the end of the fighting in Europe, there can be no frivolous, irresponsible rejoicing.

Our first thoughts, even now, must be for those who have died in this cause and for those who grieve for them.

Even now, we cannot forget the grave prospect still confronting the world.

Millions of men, including tens of thousands of our own, have died for a world of justice, decency and peace. The duty they leave with the rest of us cannot be forgotten—not even in this moment.

It is a terrific responsibility still imposed upon us. Surely, no one can believe that we can now simply return to old, easy-going ways. We face a world still stricken with horror, still subject to intense hatreds, and hunger, facing complex problems.

We must not suffer the delusion that all is now well. We must not break faith with those who have made possible this new opportunity. This is a time for solemn rededication. So far, we are victorious. But awful dangers remain. If we fail to fight on against them, all that we have won can still be lost.

I have, with never-failing interest, observed the courage and valor with which our boys have gone to war.

I have also glowed with pride when our gallant men were properly recognized and cited for their valiant deeds of bravery.

My heart has bled with yours in deep and profound sympathy on receiving the shocking news that many loved ones that gave their lives that democracy may live—yes, who gave their lives that we may be spared the horrors and tortures experienced by innocent men, women, and children in the nations of Europe and Japan.

I pray that you will never have cause to feel your sons have died in vain; that you will never have cause to feel that your sacrifices for freedom and liberty have been forgotten.

God grant this time we may reap the rewards of victory; that nazism, fascism, or any other phalange may never again rise to threaten the peace and safety of the world. That peace on earth, good will toward men may ever be the beacon light that guides men's souls to bring the "four freedoms" to suffering humanity everywhere.

To achieve these objects, these aims and ideals, not only victory but lasting peace, let us dedicate the remainder of our lives.

In this land freedom made its home. It is your duty and mine to see to it that it shall not be banished from these shores. I claim no ability to walk with unstumbling feet the uncertain paths of prophecy, but I make bold to predict that when the smoke of this war's battles shall have cleared away, it will clearly be seen that Old Glory, unstained and untorn, will yet be waving over this land, still the land of the free and the home of the brave; that when the constitutional infidels and saboteurs, the liberty thieves and freedom's foes are dead and in their forgotten graves, the Constitution, unaltered and unchanged, will be the supreme law of this land, and the liberty-loving, God-fearing men and women of this Nation, unashamed and unafraid, will still put their unfaltering trust and unfailing faith in that Constitution and pay undivided allegiance and unstinted tribute to that flag. May God grant it so.

Looking to the Prince of Peace, we pray that there may be built, on the sacrifices of America's sons and daughters, a monument in the form of enduring peace, strong enough to equal their valor.

Such is the meaning of VJ-day to you and to me.

Inter-American Decoration for Mr. Sumner Welles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound joy that I attended a dinner in the Statler Hotel, June 14, 1945, in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Sumner Welles. It was on this occasion that the first award of the newly created inter-American decoration was announced by a national panel of Protestants, Jews, and Catholics, whose members, by a substantial majority, voted that the Honorable Sumner Welles had made the best contribution to the spiritual unity of the Americas during 1945. Among the guests who gathered to pay honor to Mr. and Mrs. Welles were citizens from all parts of the United States, high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy, university professors, business leaders, labor representatives, members of the United States Congress, including Senators and Representatives, Federal officials, prominent figures in capital society, and, as might well be expected, diplomats from the other America Republics and Canada. Since the speeches made on this occasion indicate the nature of the inter-American decoration and the reasons which inspired the judges to confer this award, for the first time in history, upon the Honorable Sumner Welles, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of this event in the Washington Post and the text of these addresses, beginning with the opening statement of the chairman, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, special lecturer on sociology in the Catholic University of Chile and honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil:

ADDRESS OF DR. THORNING

Ladies and gentlemen, in honoring Mr. and Mrs. Sumner Welles, we are paying a tribute of admiration and affection not only to the guests of honor this evening, but also to all our friends in the other American republics and Canada. In the New World and the Old, there is general recognition of the fact that the good-neighbor policy, although inseparably connected with the name of our late President, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, had as its intellectual author and real architect the gentleman to whom we show homage tonight. With a modesty and a loyalty that are both worthy of this cause, Sumner Welles has always insisted that his chief receive full credit for an achievement that will shine in history for ages to come. Nevertheless, we know and our good neighbors realize that, in adopting a policy of sincere, practical inter-American friendship as the cornerstone of his foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere, President Roosevelt was acting upon the suggestion of his trusted Under Secretary of State. How wise was the decision and how wide the vision we are now beginning to appreciate. Consequently, it is not premature, but rather a simple act of justice to call attention on a

national and international scale to the labors, zeal, and success of a leader who raised on high a standard to which men and women of good will, whether Protestant, Jew, or Catholic, could repair with the assurance that they could contribute something precious and, with God's grace something lasting to the peace and security of this hemisphere and the world.

It happens that, among the guests who have assembled to display their esteem for Mr. and Mrs. Sumner Welles this evening, there are two scholars, whose traditions and achievements entitle them to special respect. They are the Reverend Dr. Roderick Wheeler, O. F. M., managing editor of the Americas, a quarterly dedicated to the cultural history of this hemisphere; and the Very Reverend Herbert Gallagher, rector of Holy Name College, Washington, D. C. Both these scholars are members of the Franciscan Order, whose good works and missions, especially in the Southwest and Far West, are part of the glorious record of pioneer activity in North America.

Recently millions of our fellow citizens were thrilled to read, in the pages of a national digest, the story of the sons of St. Francis of Assisi, who brought the sweet message of Christ to the natives of what is now California. Led by Fra Junipero Serra, whose statue rises in Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, these gallant apostles of good will introduced the first carpenters, farmers, and blacksmiths to the rich resources of the Pacific coast. They were the living embodiment of the Good Samaritan of the Gospel. They came among the Indians to give, not to receive. The mere mention of their missionary foundations sounds like an outline of the geography and the history of the Golden State. San Diego (which the Spanish civil governor was prepared to abandon), San Juan Capistrano, San Gabriel, Ventura, Monterey, San Luis, and San Francisco itself, now the symbol of humanity's fresh hopes, constitute a vital litany, whose invocations continue to give praise to God.

Obviously, the Franciscans and the Academy of American Franciscan History, through its organ, The Americas, would expect to have a voice in the chorus of commendation that rises in honor of Sumner Welles and his charming wife. It is particularly appropriate that the managing editor of The Americas should be called upon the speak in this distinguished gathering, where we are pleased to note the presence of representatives of the American Republics and Canada, of the United States Supreme Court, of Mrs. Patrick J. Hurley, wife of the United States Ambassador to China, officers of the United States Army and Navy, Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, university professors, and champions of the good-neighbor policy from all quarters of the Republic.

At this point, I may be permitted to announce that, prior to his departure for Boston, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the United States House of Representatives and cochairman, together with Congressman HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, of the inter-American panel making this award, asked me to communicate to you his vote for Mr. Sumner Welles and his conviction that the latter's talents had been most advantageously utilized for the welfare of our country. Indeed, Majority Leader MCCORMACK expressly authorized me to state that, in his name, "everything complimentary to Sumner Welles could be placed on record." A more generous testimony than this it would be difficult to imagine.

It is, therefore, entirely consistent with what has been said, as well as with the original purpose of this dinner, for me to call upon the Reverend Dr. Roderick Wheeler to share his knowledge with this audience.

RESPONSE OF THE HONORABLE SUMNER WELLES

It would be difficult for me duly to express the full measure of my gratitude in the name of my wife and of myself for the generous words which Dr. Thorning has just spoken and for the privilege we have been afforded of being present at this dinner tonight.

I appreciate profoundly the reference he has made to the opportunity I was afforded during the past years of contributing in some part to the elaboration and to the consecration of the policy of the good neighbor, so wisely initiated and so firmly laid down by President Roosevelt.

We have every reason to believe that the United Nations Organization now agreed upon at San Francisco is going to succeed. The people of the United States have every right to be confident that with the passage of the years it will consolidate and perfect that universal world of order which it is called upon to establish. But the years that lie ahead are necessarily years which will be filled with difficulties and uncertainties. From every standpoint it is prudent and wise for the people of the United States to do their utmost to strengthen the ties of friendship and of common interest between the sovereign republics of the Americas as an essential measure of security in the Western Hemisphere. And we can be certain that the overwhelming majority of the other American Republics are insistent that this be done.

And if this task is successfully to be accomplished, the people of the United States must take the initiative in seeing to it that the political and economic ties between this greatest of the American Republics and the other 20 members of the American family of nations be ties which are founded upon just and practical political, economic, and cultural bases.

We tend too much, perhaps, to stress those foundations which are political and economic. They are, of course, indispensable. But we must not minimize the overwhelming importance of the ties of religion, of the arts, and of spiritual values. And I am glad to have this opportunity of saying here tonight that I have regarded during these past years with ever-increasing admiration the successful efforts which so many leaders of the Catholic Church in the United States have made to develop more intimate and more understanding relations between the peoples of the New World. Many outstanding figures in the church have taken part in this high endeavor, and among them Dr. Thorning and his associates have rendered signal service in this great cooperative enterprise. For they have not only made it clear that we, the people of the United States, have much of value in the cultural field to offer to our American neighbors; they have made it equally clear that we, the people of the United States, have much of cultural value to learn from our neighbors in the American Continent. And above all else, they have stressed the essential truth that there is no higher and no more solid basis of fellowship than the basis of a common faith and of a common religion.

I earnestly hope that these endeavors will prosper and will increase as the years go by, because I believe that in this way a tremendous contribution will be made to that kind of inter-American relationship which we all uphold.

[From the Washington Post of June 15, 1945]

SUMNER WELLES TO GET HEMISPHERE UNITY DECORATION

Creation of a decoration for the best 1945 North American contribution to the spiritual unity of the Americas, and its award to Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, was announced last night.

The award, first inter-American decoration, was announced by the board of editors of the Americas, quarterly publication of the Academy of American Franciscan History. Selection of Welles as the first recipient was made by a hemisphere panel of judges, comprised of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.

The citation conferring the decoration was read at a dinner at the Hotel Statler honoring Mr. and Mrs. Welles and attended by many representatives of countries in the Americas.

Actual presentation of the decoration will be made next autumn.

Simultaneously, the Reverend Dr. Roderick Wheeler, managing editor of the publication, announced a comparable award will be voted to the Latin-American citizen who made an outstanding contribution to the unity of the Americas in 1945.

The citation termed Mr. Welles' contribution to the unity "an honorable part of the history of the new world." Lauding his initiative in furthering the crusade for inter-American friendship, the citation was read by the Very Reverend Herbert Gallagher, rector of Holy Name College.

Among those attending the dinner were members of the diplomatic set from a number of Latin-American countries; representatives of the United States Supreme Court, State Department, and the Senate. Numerous universities, colleges, and learned societies also were represented.

Waste and Incompetency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting the following article by Frank R. Kent which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of August 31, 1945:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—RETRENCHMENT, FORGOTTEN, MUST COME TO HALT ECONOMIC CHAOS, SAYS OBSERVER

(By Frank R. Kent)

No one ought to be surprised that the peace period on which we have now entered is not free from turbulence, turmoil, irritations and appalling difficulties. It is absurd to think the world can go through so terrible an experience without paying a terrific price.

We are better off than any of our allies—first, because we are the richest and strongest; second, because no enemy invaded our homeland. But this is only relative.

The British confessedly broke, are confronted with economic problems so acute that some doubt of the ability of the nation to survive. In Russia the loss of life is upward of 5,000,000 and the destruction wrought by the Germans very great. China, for years devastated by the Japanese, and in the agonies of a terrible inflation, is now threatened with a ruinous civil war.

But, because we are the richest and the strongest the requests for aid are enormous. To grant all asked of us in money and material is impossible.

If we try fully to satisfy the demands—if we attempt unaided (and we will be unaided) the economic reconstruction of all the world we will find ourselves just as bankrupt as the rest of them.

Through the UNRRA, which is probably the most overmanned, inefficient, and wasteful of all war agencies, we are pouring our billions for relief in the liberated countries. No one denies the need for this is very great and few contend it is not to our advantage to keep these stricken nations from going under.

COSTLY INCOMPETENCE

Nevertheless there is no excuse for the costly incompetence with which we are handling this job, nor for failure to appreciate that, unless we exercise some sort of discipline in expenditures; we are neither rich enough nor strong enough to avert a financial collapse, the disastrous effect of which would be second only to defeat in battle.

The only way to escape this is adequately to meet our commitments, but at the same time ruthlessly cut out all unnecessary expense. Our impetus is all toward going beyond our commitments and to exceed the necessary increases, without any corresponding zeal to eliminate waste and abolish duplication.

The biggest expense item, in the future as in the past, will be our obligations to the veterans and the cost of maintaining our armed forces. Back in 1933 the pension burden, then well over a billion dollars, was considered too great for the taxpayers to bear. It seemed a menace to fiscal equilibrium. President Roosevelt succeeded in slicing it by over 50 percent and was justly applauded.

Within less than 3 years all of this saving had been wiped out and the pensions totaled more than before. As a result of the great war now ended, veteran pensions and compensations of one kind or another will mount to undreamed-of heights.

We will have to shoulder that just as we will have to shoulder the cost of a peacetime Army and Navy much greater than ever contemplated before.

The atomic bomb has by no means lessened the demand for big military forces. The Navy wants from 750,000 to 1,000,000 men. The Army and Air Forces insist that 1,500,000 are required for occupation work alone. A home force of 1,000,000 is regarded as essential. That is a minimum of 3,250,000.

SADDLED FOR GENERATIONS

Thus until the world has settled down to a peace which, if not permanent, at least will be prolonged for generations, we are certain to be saddled with a very costly military establishment. It is notable, indeed, that prior to the San Francisco Conference, during the Conference, since the Conference and in all the debates about permanent peace, the word "disarmament" has never figured. If it was mentioned at all, no one paid attention. The whole disarmament idea seems forgotten.

Yet it used to be inseparably linked with the international cooperative peace proposals. After the creation of the League of Nations there followed the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921. Groaning under the great armament burdens, all the victorious nations were anxious to—and did—reduce.

And this would have been fine but for our own stupidity in not joining the League of Nations and the inexcusable action of France and England in allowing Germany to rearm.

Now, with the League's successor vastly strengthened by the membership of Russia and ourselves; with the aggressor nations completely crushed and disarmed; and with our lessons presumably learned, it does seem reasonable to contemplate some degree of disarmament in the not too distant future.

If that is not true, then the permanent peace idea does not make much sense. If every member of the United Nations has to maintain indefinitely a great armed force, then the thing becomes ridiculous. Yet, if any statesman, here or anywhere else, has mentioned the word "disarmament" or favors disarmament as an ultimate goal, he has been extremely quiet about it.

Apparently for the next few years large armies and navies are essential. So far as we are concerned, this means greatly increased peacetime costs. It may be tiresome to harp on the subject of retrenchment in other directions, but at the rate we are going, unless some serious attention is given this subject, some day there easily may be a sag in Government credit followed by economic devastation comparable to that caused by the atomic bombs dropped in Japan.

Peace Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this great legislative body reconvenes this day under epochal circumstances. When we last sat in session our major objective necessarily was that the war be won at the earliest practical date. The Nazis had but recently given up and militaristic Japan was yet to be taught that democracy at work wins wars, as well as makes men of character and resourcefulness, as well as men who know no limit to their resources in defense of principle.

Now the world is not a global battlefield, but a world seeking to find a way to enduring peace and prosperity. In our own San Francisco a world charter was born, giving life and vitality to a new birth of freedom for the world.

Yet, this era of freedom from world war will not come nor will it remain if the emphasis upon the necessity of a world at peace is lessened.

During the war we majored to win the war so that we could have peace. Our prayers, our work, our legislation, our human relationships were all geared up to the absolute need of winning the war to save human lives; to save money; to save civilization itself. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we viewed our legislative intent through the eyes of victory in war. And that was good. It was necessary. It was common sense.

Today we begin legislative intent for peace. What shall that intent be? What shall the ultimate objective of peacetime legislation be? Why can we not put away trivial things in peacetime legislation as we did in wartime?

Is not the major objective of peacetime legislation that people shall so live and have opportunity to make an honest, honorable living, that the causes of war shall not have fertile soil in which to grow and bear fruit?

This old world of material wealth and physical things is only worth much because the human race is here to use this wealth creatively. Then material things are of value because men make use of them for the happiness of mankind. Things are made for the happiness of men; men are not made to be exploited to make more things.

As we enter our work therefore, let us view it through the test of whether or not it will make for an enduring world peace in which humankind—folks—are made richer in the things which cannot be destroyed by the ravages of war, to wit: spirit, ambition, patriotism, loyalty, love, industry, and freedom.

It is these and similar values which are indestructible. These are the imperishables of legislation. Legislation which fails to ultimately sound in these and similar everlasting and enduring qualities will not meet the needs of a world at peace. And, if the needs of a world at peace are not met by us in the field of legislative intent so far as we are responsible for it, then by that failure on our part, we will sow the seed of another global conflict.

God forbid.

Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of my broadcasts sent out by the Office of War Information to Japan during the month of August 1945, and in addition a copy of a release which tells something of our psychological warfare as carried on by the OWI, and the persons who have taken part in it.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

AUGUST 7, 1944.—The following special message to the people of Japan was issued today by United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Democrat of Utah, at his forty-fourth monthly address to the Japanese since the attack upon Pearl Harbor. Senator THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, is a former resident of Japan and is one of the Senate's foremost authorities upon far eastern affairs:

"A single bomb has dropped on Hiroshima.

"One bomb!

"You know what happened when that new type of missile, an atomic bomb carrying destructive power as great as 2,000 of the heaviest bombs hitherto known, fell on Hiroshima. The blow was not that delivered by a great flight of heavy B-29s, carrying tons of high explosives, such as struck Tarumi. It was not a broadside from a concentration of warships such as bombarded the coast towns of Honshu. It was one bomb only, one bomb, that sent up from Hiroshima an impenetrable cloud of dust and smoke.

"The United States has three huge munition plans devoting all their efforts to the manufacture of many more bombs of the same type that dropped on Hiroshima.

"These are the bombs that loose the force from which the sun draws its power. These

bombs harness the basic power of the universe against Japan.

"Twelve days ago, the Postdam Proclamation was issued so that you, the Japanese people, might be spared the terrible fate that has befallen Hiroshima. Had your leaders promptly accepted that declaration Hiroshima would have been intact. All those who died as the result of Hiroshima's catastrophe would have remained alive to work for the welfare of a free Japan.

"How long will you allow your leaders to bring destruction to Japan?

"Unless Japan accepts promptly the terms of the Potsdam Proclamation offering Japan peace without enslavement, more atomic bombs will rain down from the skies. You know from your experience that Allied planes command the skies above you and that the air force of Japan cannot prevent new raids. Think now that every plane that flies overhead may carry more atomic bombs like that which fell on Hiroshima. Remember those three huge war plants in the United States where thousands of skilled workers are turning out atomic bombs in steady streams.

"If Japan accepts the Potsdam Proclamation those devastating bombs will no longer be dropped upon you. If the leaders do not accept, however, a rain of ruin follows, the like of which has never yet been seen upon this earth.

"Which is your choice?

"The Twentieth American Air Force has already listed cities which are next upon the list to be attacked. The obvious military targets, cities like Tokyo and Osaka, Nagoya and Kobe, Yokohama and Nagasaki need not be mentioned here; they need no warning of their fate. Soon comes the turn now of Yawata, Saga, Miyakonojo, Imabari, Tottori, Iwakuni, Takayama, Urawa, Fukushima, Hachinohe, Akita, and Otaru. Some days ago warnings went out to Koriyama, Kurume, Hakodate, Maebashi, Nagano, Fukuyama, Otsu, Maizuri, and Nishinomiya-Mikage.

"Stay away from these towns and from all other places where there are military installations or factories producing war goods. Leave the cities that are marked for destruction. Why die when you can live for the future of Japan?

"See what has happened at Hiroshima. Think of the great Allied air fleets bearing more atomic bombs to crush your military strength.

"America and Britain and their associates in this war have offered terms which insure Japan her sovereign existence. Neither President Truman nor Prime Minister Attlee seek to enslave the Japanese nor do they wish to devastate the land. Only the Japanese war clique stands in the way of Japan's future. As long as your leaders continue to wage war, as long as they refuse to accept the Potsdam Proclamation, the bombs must fall. But why should you die in a vain struggle against 'the forces of the sun' and the 'power of the universe'?

"Stay away from war plants. Shun the military centers. Leave the threatened cities and all other places which are legitimate military objectives. Why die when you can live for the future of Japan?"

AUGUST 9, 1945.—The following is a regular weekly message to the people of Japan prepared especially for OWI's overseas use by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS:

"The source from which the sun draws its strength has now been launched against Japan. Atomic bombs that harness the power of the universe have fallen on both Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

"More ruin will rain from the skies unless you cease resistance. The American Twentieth Air Force has announced a list of other military targets soon to be attacked. When you look at what is left of Hiroshima and Nagasaki you cannot doubt the deadliness of the Allied determination.

"Stay away from military objectives; shun all mines and factories where war goods are produced. Why die when you can live for the future of Japan? Two weeks ago, at Potsdam, the United States, China and Great Britain offered you an opportunity to end the war. Because that offer has not yet been accepted, Japan has paid a heavy price. Had your leaders promptly accepted the Potsdam proclamation, Hiroshima would have been spared the stunning blow that levelled 60 percent of its area when one bomb fell upon it, Nagasaki would have been spared, Yawata and Jukuyama would not have felt the recent strike by 400 Superforts. All the heavy losses you have suffered since July 26 have been the tragic result of your leaders' delay in accepting the Potsdam proclamation. All future blows that may befall you can be laid directly to your leaders' slowness. They sacrifice your safety.

"How much longer will you permit your leaders to destroy you?

"Japanese military chiefs who have so often blundered in the past, promise that somehow they will develop a defense against the strength of the sun and the power of the universe.

"Do you believe them? Do you not recall how they made futile promises in the past? Do you not remember their solemn promises to hold Attu, Guadalcanal, Munda, Saipan, Iwo, the Philippines, Okinawa, and all the other places that the victorious Allies have captured in an irresistible advance up to the very gates of Tokyo? Do you recall the boasts that Japan could not and would not be bombed?

"Your leaders continue to misquote you. Barely 7 hours before Russia joined the war, their voices on the radio assured Asia of 'the unshakeable friendship of the Soviet Union toward Japan.'

"Can you trust your leaders now when they promise you that Japan can resist the might and spirit of the foremost military nations of the world carrying bombs that loose the force from which the sun draws its power?

"Seven million victorious American troops are deploying for final campaigns against Japan. The whole strength of Great Britain is committed to fight against the militarism of Japan. Chinese armies which your inept leaders could not quell in nine bloody years of battle are gaining new equipment for a continuing war. Massed Allied fleets of warships command the sea. Look above you at the steady stream of bombers which your ineffective air defenses cannot keep away.

"And now the mighty Soviet Union, whose unconquerable spirit was but a few days ago so highly praised upon the Tokyo radio, has joined with the United States, China, and Great Britain in the war against injustice. Russian veterans, heroes of the struggle against Nazi Germany, are taking the field against the forces of Japan.

"Thus blasted into smoke and dust, along with wide areas of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, go Japan's last desperate hopes that somehow a rift might split apart the sturdy Allies of the war against the Nazis. The United States, Great Britain, China, and Russia stand as firm against aggression in the Far East as they stood against totalitarian Germany. The end cannot be doubted.

"With atomic bombs ravaging your cities and with the Russians joining the Allied march against you even the notion of long-continued resistance grows fantastic.

"Now is the time for thoughtful Japanese to consider whether it is wise to allow the same sort of inept leadership to continue. The terms of the Potsdam Proclamation offer Japan peace and security, peace to develop the nation and security against the irresistible might of the atomic bombs.

"Consider what has happened in the past few weeks. Okinawa, which your military leaders called the bastion of Japan, has fallen. Battleships of the Imperial Navy have been blasted and crippled in their hiding places. Powerful B–29s have wrecked scores of essential military installations and the Anglo-American fleet has cruised unchallenged up and down your coast, shelling your cities as they willed. Now come the atomic bombs that harness the power of the universe.

"You have an opportunity to put an end to all this tragedy. Accept the terms of the Potsdam Proclamation. Cast aside those leaders who condemn you to die in a war you cannot win."

AUGUST 17, 1945.—The following is the regular weekly commentary on the Far East, prepared especially for OWI's overseas use by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS:

"With Japan's decision to surrender, the failure of Thailand's weak war effort, and the subjection of the Nanking puppets to the central Chinese authority, organized military activity in the Japanese interest has ceased. The fighting spirit of the United Nations, so clearly demonstrated in their unity of action, has won a mighty victory for the cause of liberty and justice. Perhaps in sporadic instances resistance may occasionally flare up in isolated regions, but large-scale conflicts is at an end. No minor riots can long disturb the hard-won peace.

"The road now lies open for the people of Japan to work toward those freedoms which liberty-loving people so deeply cherish. Free from the domination of selfish war lords who so long deceived and misled them, the Japanese may look forward to opportunity of speaking and thinking as they please, of worshiping as they desire, and of enjoying the fundamental human rights of all free peoples.

"The road which Japan has taken has been troublous and her course has been disastrous. The loss of men which Japan has suffered has been serious, but, in the absence of official Japanese statistics, no numbers can be definitely cited. We do know, however, from official Allied statements, that no less than 1,128 combat ships have been sunk since Pearl Harbor, with 803 more probably destroyed, and no less than 2,320 damaged. On noncombatant ships we know for a certainty that 3,653 have been sunk or probably destroyed, and that 2,240 more have been damaged.

"These have not been the only Japanese losses. During the last 20 months alone no fewer than 12,000 planes have been destroyed, with thousands more seriously damaged.

"Since the issuance of the Potsdam Proclamation on July 26, at least 138 additional Japanese ships were sunk before the war lords decided to accept the terms offered them by President Truman, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and Prime Minister Churchill. Plane losses during that period of waiting were also heavy.

"Cold statistics on ship and plane losses, while convincing and final, do not, however, show the full extent of the armed might of the United Nations in their war against aggression. The fact that Japan's army lost in every battle where it faced the forces of freedom, that many of her best men lay dead or stood helpless on bypassed islands, that increasing numbers of them were confined within Allied prison compounds, and that Japan's proud navy swung inactive at its anchorages while Admirals Nimitz and Halsey ranged up and down the coast of the homeland, testified to the superior skill and strategy of the Allied leaders, to their determination, and to their military ability.

"It was the end that had already come to Germany, the nation once so admired by Japan's militarists. It was the inevitable end for all aggressors whose entire country is geared for unjust war. Tyranny spells destruction and death to those who seek to enslave a world.

"The pattern begun in Manchuria in 1931 and carried through consistently by Japa-

nese war lords thereafter will not be copied hereafter by those who understand the lessons of history. Certainly peoples who contrast the policies of the Japanese military clique with those of the United Nations who come not to enslave and not to destroy the Japanese people but to weed out the selfish groups who have misled the people of Japan, will not hereafter choose to follow the war lords' evil ways.

"The world has now the opportunity for a lasting peace. The cooperation already begun by the United Nations at San Francisco, and shown so clearly in the statements issued by the heads of state at Potsdam will bear fruit in the continued cooperation yet to come."

AUGUST 23, 1945.—The following is the regular weekly commentary on the Far East, prepared especially for OWI's overseas use by United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS.

"Seventeen years ago, in 1928, more than a dozen nations, among whom was Japan, signed a formal agreement professing their intention of settling international disputes by peaceful means.

"How happy all the world would have been had Japan chosen to abide by that Kellogg Treaty instead of taking the path of military adventure!

"August is the month of anniversaries. Not only was the Kellogg Treaty signed that month but so, in other Augusts, less happy actions have been taken. It was in August 1894 that Japan made war on China, a conflict ending in the taking of Formosa from that injured country. It was in August 1910 that Japan, in violation of her previous published commitments, annexed Korea. Both these aggressions are soon to be rectified. It was in August 1935 that Colonel Aizawa violated peace and order by showing the arrogance of the younger officers in murdering the superior officer placed over him, and it was in August 1937 that Japanese militarists launched the battle of Shanghai. In other Augusts, 1942 and 1943, the strength of Japan's navy gave way before the valor and spirit of American seamen in the Battle of the Eastern Solomons and in the Aleutians.

"Other Augusts, however, have been happier for Japan. In this month, in 1549, a devoted religious leader, Francis Xavier, came to Kagoshima bearing Europe's offer of humanitarianism and of world association in religion. Almost a century ago, in August 1856, Townsend Harris, first American consul resident in Japan, held out the promise of trade and of peaceful cooperation in world affairs. Only a year ago, in August 1944, conversations at Dumbarton Oaks, near Washington, sought to establish guaranties of world-wide friendliness and mutual trade relations among the United Nations, with the hope that some day Japan, too, would also share in these benefits.

"In future years, no doubt, Japan will look back upon August 1945 as the month in which Japan slammed the door on outworn concepts. In August 1871, Emperor Meiji, by imperial rescript, formally abolished feudalism; in August 1945, military influence will end, and Japan may embark upon new ways of peace.

"That war began with Japan's decision to lay down her arms and to cease the futile struggle against the United Nations, who had swept away her sea force and her air power. With the formal signing of surrender documents next week, the self-willed militaristic advisers whose unintelligent calculations brought Japan to the very threshold of annihilation can no longer mislead the nation. There will be ended for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest. Irresponsible militarism shall be forever eliminated from Japan.

"The victorious Allies who so smashed the Japanese Army, Navy, and Air Force that during the last 3 years no Japanese major victory was won, do not intend to enslave the Japanese as a race nor to destroy them as a nation, but they do intend to mete out stern justice to all war criminals and to those who visited cruelties upon helpless war prisoners. To the end that Japan may enjoy as speedily as possible a peacefully inclined and responsible government and that the people may live peaceful and productive lives, the occupation forces of the victorious Allies expect complete and exact compliance with the terms to which the Imperial Japanese Government has agreed.

"Peace, security, and justice for the future depends upon a speedy establishment among the people of Japan of the essential freedoms cherished in all liberty-loving countries. These freedoms include the right to speak freely, to think as one wishes, and to profess whatever religion may be most desired; respect for fundamental human rights must also be assured. To this end the Chiefs of the Governments of the United Nations stated in their Potsdam Proclamation their desire that democratic tendencies should be strengthened among the Japanese people.

"A great beginning toward the accomplishment of these desirable goals will be made next week when the surrender documents receive their formal signatures. This ceremony will itself win for August 1945 a major place among the historic events that have occurred in Japan. Through the results that flow therefrom will come to Japan the realization of the values of peace and of free institutions."

AUGUST 30, 1945.—The following is the regular weekly commentary on the Far East prepared especially for OWI's overseas use by United States Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS:

"Within the next week will fall two anniversaries of events important in the history of Japan.

"Anniversaries are highly significant. They keep alive the memory of the past. Often they point a guide to future conduct. The tragic anniversaries this week provide fitting material upon which Japan may ponder deeply.

"Many of my former acquaintances in Japan remember vividly the earthquake of September 1, 1923, which leveled great tracts of Tokyo and Yokohama, causing heavy loss of life and property. That disaster was unavoidable, what lawyers term an act of God. The lives and treasure thus lost were not sacrificed for human greed but were the toll paid because man had not learned to control the stupendous force of nature.

"Recently, Japan has felt blows even more devastating than those dealt by the earthquake of 1923. Through the arrogance of a clique of militarists, thousands of human beings died in Japan in a war that could have been avoided had Japan's false leaders considered the welfare of the people. The best resources of Japan were thrown away by the avarice of those who sought to gratify selfish militarist ambitions.

"The great lesson to be learned for the future is that Japan must not again repeat the crime of seeking power through military force. Natural calamity may be unavoidable, as was the earthquake of 1923, but when Japan suffered in that catastrophe, the nations of the world rushed to her assistance with food and medicine and relief supplies. When, however, Japan brought disaster upon herself, through her aggressive actions toward her neighbors, the world looked coldly on her as a menace to mankind.

"So, too, the Treaty of Portsmouth, signed on September 3, 1905, at the close of the first great Russo-Japanese War, provides an anniversary that should stir serious thought. By the provisions of that treaty, Japan fed an appetite for land upon the continent of Asia to which she had no legitimate right. At the expense of her helpless neighbors, Japan swelled her possessions but she lost the friendship of her fellows. The Treaty of Portsmouth seemed, at the time, to benefit Japan, yet its aftermath was tragic. Because it was an unjust peace, it led to future wars; because it was an unfair peace, it cost Japan the confidence of many people who might have been her friends.

"Today, after a long series of aggressive militarist adventures rising out of that treaty, Japan has nothing to show for her efforts. Under the conditions of the Potsdam proclamation which Japan has agreed to accept, she will lose all title to her illegal gains. The terms of the surrender papers to be signed on Sunday are not yet public information but certainly China will regain her lost sovereignty over Manchuria, while Korea will prepare for the liberty that is her eventual due. Japan must leave the lands to which she has no legal right.

"The peace which is to follow Japan's surrender has no such drawbacks as had the Treaty of Portsmouth. It is not a happy experience to lose a war but often a defeat may pave the way for betterment. Such is the case today. The best efforts of Japan's Army and Navy, aided by her air force, could not resist the power and spirit of Allied armies determined to destroy injustice and oppression. Japan suffered such heavy defeats that she won no major victory against Anglo-American forces during the last 3 years of war. At the time of the promulgation of the Potsdam Proclamation, on July 26, it was recignized throughout the world that Japan's doom was sealed.

"But Japan is now emancipated from the military caste which once oppressed her. She has agreed to follow peaceful ways with a government pledged to promote freedom of speech, religion, and thought, as well as to guarantee the fundamental rights of liberty-loving people.

"These will be great gains when they are at last achieved. The liquidation of militarism and the coming of full political freedom will be evidence that Japan no longer intends to rely upon crude chauvinism of brute force but that she desires a proper position within the circle of modern nations."

[Press release of August 9, 1945]

Articles in 50,000,000 daily newspaper issues and radio talks in twoscore languages to at least a hundred million people broke the back of Japanese world propaganda in the greatest psychological warfare campaign in history.

High praise for aid rendered the Allied cause by Senator Elbert D. Thomas, chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, former naval commander in chief in the Far East; Raymond Swing, widely known commentator; and Maj. George Fielding Eliot, military analyst, was voiced yesterday by Edward L. Barrett, Chief of the Overseas Bureau of the Office of War Information.

"Throughout the entire war period these men have voiced the spirit of America," Mr. Barrett declared. "One of our most difficult tasks was to awaken interest in the Pacific war to distant peoples who had little first-hand knowledge of that area. These men succeeded so admirably in presenting the American point of view that they won the battle of publicity. Their chief weapon was a clear, calm analysis of the situation, written in always reliable terms from an objective point of view. Because they relied solely upon truth, conservatively presented, their writings and speeches gained acceptance where the more highly colored Japanese propaganda was rejected."

The psychological warfare work conducted by these commentators was carefully selected. As a naval expert, Admiral Yarnell discussed developments in the field in which he was expert, with Major Eliot, one of the more highly regarded columnists, specializing

on military affairs, and Raymond Swing discussing general political and social trends. These men wrote articles which were dispatched by cable and wireless to all parts of the world, including points as far distant as Baghdad and Reykjavik; their radio broadcasts were translated into such unusual languages as Urdu and Afrikaans.

Because of his intimate acquaintance with the Japanese, gained during his 7 years' residence in that country as a missionary, Senator THOMAS was particularly qualified to appeal directly to the people of that country. On the seventh day of each month, the day of the Pearl Harbor attack, Senator THOMAS spoke directly to the Japanese, urging them to return to constitutional government, to reject their war lords, and to follow the ideals laid down for them 60 years ago by Emperor Meiji when he issued his famous rescript on government.

More recently, when the collapse of Japan seemed imminent, Senator THOMAS stepped up his schedule to the delivery of a speech weekly instead of monthly. His last address, made the day before the first surrender offer, was an eloquent plea for Japan to quit the conflict before the war lords doomed the nation to destruction.

Senator THOMAS' speeches also reached a wide audience within the United States. At the appearance of each of the 44 monthly broadcasts and with the delivery of the four weekly commentaries which have recently appeared, senatorial colleagues who admired the effectiveness of his work inserted the text of the speeches into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that his contributions reached every section of the United States.

Probably no single orator in world history has ever reached so wide an audience as has heard and read his speeches.

OWI officials estimate that the commentaries of the four men were extremely important in causing Italy to throw in her lot against the Japanese.

"Certainly," said Mr. Barrett, "the words of the commentators contributed an overwhelming psychological power for the United Nations cause."

The activities found useful during wartime will be, he explained, continued during the postwar adjustment period. In Japan itself, a vital problem exists in smoothing the way for cooperation between the defeated people and the army of occupation. Without careful interpretation of the problems that will arise, the task of the Allied forces will be difficult. He believes, however, that through the aid of such commentators as Senator THOMAS, the Japanese may be induced to work more harmoniously with the troops under General MacArthur than would otherwise be the case.

"These commentators, together with others who may be persuaded to assist us," says Mr. Barrett, "will help solve this difficult problem of adjustment by presenting the American point of view clearly and convincingly. Thus they will combat the previous indoctrination of the Japanese and will promote interracial understanding. It is possible, also, that they may be called upon occasionally by the military government to publicize and, perhaps, to clarify, official statements so that they may be widespread throughout the occupied area."

[Press release of August 13, 1945]

Because of numerous inquiries from press correspondents and news associations concerning the type of material broadcast to Japan relative to the effect of the new atomic bomb, the Office of War Information is releasing the attached broadcast script written by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah.

Senator THOMAS has issued a monthly statement to the Japanese people on the seventh of each month since the attack on Pearl Harbor. The attached script, therefore, is the forty-fourth in the monthly series.

In addition, Senator THOMAS has recently undertaken a weekly broadcast to Japan, on the assumption that with the stepping up of the war effort in the Pacific, the final stages of the conflict may be approaching.

Senator THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, is in a special position which makes his broadcasts more effective. As a former missionary to Japan, living in that country over a 7-year period, he learned the language and came to know many of the leaders of the country. He has written three books in Japanese. He hopes that spontaneous action by the people of Japan will undermine the usurpation of the present military clique and that Japan can return to orderly constitutional government.

The Senator THOMAS scripts are only one of the programs beamed to Japan under the auspices of the OWI. Other commentaries are written by Raymond Swing, Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, and Maj. George Fielding Eliot. Each of them has been issued over a period of many months.

Labor Day Sermon by Rev. Benjamin L. Masse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very remarkable sermon delivered by the Reverend Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., associate editor of America, and executive editor of the Catholic Mind, at a Labor Day mass held at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Blessed are they who hunger and thirst for justice, for they shall be satisfied." (St. Matthew 3:6.) It is eminently fitting that we have come here this morning to sanctify Labor Day by offering together the holy sacrifice of the mass. It is fitting that on this day dedicated to the working men and women of America, organized labor should go to the Divine Carpenter of Nazareth for courage and inspiration to continue its gallant struggle for social justice; that it should kneel, so to speak, at His feet and there learn those great truths of human dignity and brotherly solidarity which are the heart and soul of the labor movement.

Our Blessed Lord knew what it meant to earn His daily bread in the sweat of His brow. He knew how it felt to come home at night dead tired, and to turn out in the morning, still tired, to begin another day's work. He knew poverty and insecurity, and all the other crosses which workers frequently bear. If there is one place, therefore, in all the world where workers can expect sympathy and understanding, it is in the Church of Jesus Christ.

It is not necessary, then, to say that you are welcome here. Long before there was a Railway Labor Act, almost half a century before the Congress of the United States passed the National Labor Relations Act, Pope Leo XIII thundered from the Vatican that workers had a God-given right to organize freely for the purpose of collective bargaining, and he called upon management to respect that right, and upon the heads of states to guarantee and protect it.

Since that time other Popes have written in defense of labor, and their words have been echoed and developed and applied by bishops and priests all over the world. Those of you who live in this archdiocese and know what has been done here, and is being done, to secure justice for workingmen and workingwomen do not have to be reminded of this. The church's solicitude for labor has, indeed, been so pronounced that she is sometimes accused of being prolabor, of taking sides in that incessant struggle between workers and employers which has been the curse of the modern industrial system. If there is any truth in this charge, it lies in the fact that the church stands, and must stand, for justice; and standing for justice, she has had, on many occasions, to defend the cause of the workers, since they, more often than employers, have been the victims of criminal injustice.

The church has no desire to deepen the discords in modern society; she does not wish to stir the witch's brew of class warfare. The church was founded to save the souls of all men, rich and poor, not by preaching hatred, but through love of Him who died for all of us on the Cross. The church wants labor and management to work together in harmony and mutual respect, for their own good and for the good of society, but she knows that this will never happen so long as the working class is denied its just place in modern industrial society. In striving to elevate the position of workers, to win for them a fair share of the products they make and distribute, to vindicate their sacred rights, the church is not promoting social discord; rather is she preparing the way for an economic order more in accord with Christian ideals than is the present one.

We are living today in very critical times, a period in which the possibilities for good and evil are enormous, and are equally great. There is abroad in the world a burning hope that the suffering of this war—the breaking of hearts and of homes, the ruinous destruction and the copious spilling of blood—will not have been in vain. A few weeks ago, even while the war still raged, our country ratified a charter designed to preserve peace among nations. We all pray that despite its imperfections the United Nations Charter will be truly a new Magna Charta, a promise of freedom from fear and war.

But we cannot stop here. There will never be peace among nations until there is also peace within nations. "International equilibrium and harmony," said our holy father, Pope Pius XII, in his splendid address on Christmas Eve, 1942, "depend on the internal equilibrium and development of the individual states in the material, social, and intellectual sphere." And he continued: "It is only, then, by striving for an integral peace, a peace in both fields, that people will be freed from the cruel nightmare of war."

One wonders sometimes whether we are preparing for this "integral peace"; whether, that is to say, we are putting forth the same intense effort to assure domestic peace in the postwar world that we are devoting to international peace. Some close observers of the industrial scene in the United States are freely predicting a wave of strikes and lock-outs after the war that will exceed in extent and bitterness anything we have experienced before. Certainly, there is today a great deal of unrest among workers, unrest born partly, perhaps, of fatigue, but mostly of fear—fear of a further rise in living costs, fear of cut-backs, fear of a reduction in earnings through loss of overtime, fear of unemployment, and the return of breadlines. There is a feeling, also, that in too many cases management has taken advantage of labor's no-strike pledge, and by refusing to settle grievances has goaded the workers into unpopular strikes.

On the other hand, management is persuaded that it is the workers who have taken advantage of the war emergency and have forced concessions which would never have been granted in normal times. These concessions some employers are determined to revoke the minute the war is over, even if this should lead to serious trouble.

This situation ought to be a cause of grave concern to all of us. We ought to realize that we cannot permit a period of industrial strife after the war and at the same time to enjoy the blessed fruits of peace. Unless, therefore, we wish to betray the aspirations of a war-weary people, we must give to this problem now the calm, serious deliberation it deserves.

There are today two paths open to the American people, one calculated to lead to domestic peace and cooperation among the economic groups in our society; the other, to industrial warfare and civil strife. Let us call these two paths the way of affirmation and the way of denial.

The way of denial is based on the belief that the gains which organized labor has made for itself, and for all workers, during the past decade must be checked, and even whittled down. There are even a few who, in order to accomplish this objective, would be willing to set the returning veterans against the unions, and thus raise a barrier of enmity and distrust between soldiers and civilians. Obviously, this is not the path to a sound and prosperous social order. It is a formula for class hatred and warfare.

The way of affirmation, on the other hand, is grounded on the conviction that the gains of labor must be consolidated and expanded in the postwar era. It believes that the workers of America, through their trade unions, must be given a new and creative role in trade and industry. It looks forward to the time when the wage contract will be perfected by some form of partnership, when workers will be given a share in profits, in management, and in ownership, when, in a word, workers will have the same incentive to produce and the same sense of their dignity and importance in the economic system which management now enjoys and which we like to believe are a part of our American heritage. This new condition of workers will not be an overnight development, but it should be the goal toward which we constantly strive. It is a goal that commends itself equally to our Christian and democratic conscience, and to our economic good sense. It is a goal which will help us to make certain that this war, unlike the last one, has not been fought in vain.

On this Labor Day 1945, it is impossible to say which path, the path of affirmation or the path of denial, this Nation will follow. That decision rests with employers, with the Government, on the general public. But it rests with the workers themselves, too. Our trade unions have made a great contribution to this country, in peace and in war, but, like all institutions, they are human and have their imperfections. These imperfections, it is true, have been vastly exaggerated, as the reams of publicity on wartime strikes testify. It might come as a great surprise to many otherwise well-informed persons to know that the hours voluntarily worked on a single holiday—the last Fourth of July—more than made up for all the time lost through strikes since Pearl Harbor. Sin, it appears, is much more newsworthy than virtue.

However, even when allowance has been made for exaggeration, it remains unfortunately true that organized labor has a good deal of soiled wash to hang on the line. It is the duty of workers to remove these imperfections; to drive from positions of power those leaders who, by reason of their dishonesty or their disloyalty to our country, have proved unfaithful to their trust; to abolish all those racial and religious discriminations which are at once a betrayal of democracy and a denial of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. In no other way can labor convince the American public that it is worthy of a new and higher responsibility. In no other way can it maintain its self-respect.

Labor Day, then, should be a day of dedication. It should be a day when workers consecrate their unions anew to the noble ideals which witnessed their birth. Conceived in a holy desire to stop the exploitation of workers in modern industry, unions were early consecrated to justice in a spirit of brotherly love. The day unions lose their thirst for justice and their sense of brotherhood, the day they become as cold and mercenary as some of our corporations, they will have lost their souls. They will wither and die. It is the right and duty of the church to remind them of this; to teach the solid principles of true moral conduct; to hold up before them the example of Jesus Christ, who, by His own life, dignified the lives of all workers.

Now as the mass continues, let us pray that God may bless the labor movement of this country; that He may inspire its leaders and its members with noble, generous ideals; that such evils as afflict it from within may be removed, and that the short-sighted and selfish enemies that attack it from without may be confounded; that it may bring to the working people of this country that material well-being which, as Pope Pius XI said, is not a hindrance but an aid to the salvation of their immortal souls.

Let us pray, finally, for a new era in industry, an era in which labor and management, inspired by religious motives, will build together an economic order founded on social justice and love for their fellow men, an economic order that will respect the dignity of the individual and the sanctity of family life, an economic order, in short, that will reflect our sacred belief in God and our determination to make the spirit of Christ supreme even in the market place.

Resolution of Italian-American Citizens' League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted on July 29, 1945, by the Italian-American Citizens' League, of Warren, Ohio.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a meeting of the Italian-American Citizens' League held on the 29th day of July 1945 the following resolutions were offered and unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it has just been publicly revealed that THEODORE G. BILBO, United States Senator from Mississippi, recently received a letter from an American citizen named Josephine Piccolo, a war worker in Brooklyn, N. Y., one of whose brothers died as a soldier of America upon the battlefields of Germany, and whose two remaining brothers are still valiantly serving our country in its armies, in which letter she criticized in respectful terms his effort to defeat the FEPC measure in the United States Senate by filibustering tactics; and

"Whereas Senator BILBO in reply wrote a letter to Miss Piccolo in which he addressed her as "My dear Dago," which is an epithet of derision applied to persons of Italian origin: Now, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Italian-American Citizens' League, composed of an organization having a membership of 500 American citizens, do hereby place on record the following sentiments with respect to Senator BILBO's act:

"He has, by his sneering words, gratuitously insulted not only a young woman of character but also the many millions of God-fearing, law-abiding American citizens of Italian origin who, through the years, by their loyalty, industry, brain, and brawn, have consistently and in substantial measure contributed to the might and majesty of America, and over 1,400,000 of whose sons are serving our country as members of its armed forces.

"He has desecrated the grave of that heroic marine, Sgt. John Basilone, who for his valor far beyond the call of duty was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, and who finally yielded his life on the bloody slopes of Iwo Jima while leading his command in a charge upon America's foes.

"He has traduced the memory of the many thousands of other fighting Americans of Italian origin who, like their Comrade Basilone, have throughout the war placed their lives as sacrifices upon the altar of our country's freedom and integrity.

"He has defied the immortal spirit of the Declaration of Independence with its proud proclamation that 'all men are created equal.'

"He has trampled upon the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees equality before the law to all persons, regardless of race, color, or creed, despite his oath as a Senator to support and defend that Constitution.

"He has violated the basic divine precepts to love God and to love our neighbor: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That while we condemn his act as utterly devoid of common courtesy, we also pity and deplore his ignorance of the fundamental principles of decency, democracy, and Christianity: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Honorable ROBERT TAFT and to the Honorable HAROLD H. BURTON, United States Senators from Ohio, with the request that they cause them to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the end that the sentiments herein expressed may find permanent lodgment in the proceedings of their august body."

Carloadings of Grain and Grain Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release by the Office of Defense Transportation dealing with carloadings of grain and grain products, a most interesting statement.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the first 34 weeks of 1945 the country's railroads carried more grain and grain products than during any similar period on record, the Office of Defense Transportation announced today.

Carloadings of grain and grain products for the 34 weeks ending August 25, 1945, totaled 1,748,248, records showed.

The total compares with 1,648,935 for the first 34 weeks of 1944, an increase of 99,313 cars, or 6 percent. It tops the previous high of 1,691,450 cars in the same 34-week period of 1943, and the prewar high of 1,605,640 attained in 1929.

The number of carloads of grain and grain products shipped during the week ending August 25 was 66,768 as compared with 49,327 for the same week in 1944, an increase of 17,441 cars, or 35.4 percent.

In the western districts grain loadings for the week ending August 25 were 47,226 cars, an increase of 12,394 cars, or 35.6 percent over the corresponding week of 1944. Western districts carloadings for the first 34 weeks of 1945 were 1,189,305 compared with 1,119,977 for the same period of 1944—an increase of 69,328 cars, or 6.2 percent.

Pearl Harbor Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very illuminating article entitled "Pearl Harbor Questions," written by Mr. Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of September 4. The action taken by the Senate today regarding Pearl Harbor is in line with Mr. Krock's suggestions contained in this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR QUESTIONS—CONGRESS IS LIKELY TO SEEK MORE LIGHT THAN REPORTS AND OFFICIALS' COMMENT CONTAINED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 3.—No period in the history of the United States and the world has been more momentous than the brief one that has elapsed since Congress recessed. Yet, despite the tumultuous rush of current events into the clouds that overhang the future, none is more likely to command the attention and action of Congress than that set forth on the confused and shabby page from the American past which contains the Pearl Harbor reports of the Army and the Navy and the comment of those who passed them officially on to the President and the public.

There are more reasons for this prospect than the obvious one—that the reports reveal disorganization and inefficiency in the top tiers of the services and the civil government at the beginning of the war with Japan which Congress and other observers in Washington had long suspected but were denied the opportunity to establish. The other factors which undoubtedly will attract Congress include the following:

1. While the Secretaries of War and Navy found nothing to criticize in the over-all direction of these Departments during the critical period before the Japanese attack, and Mr. Stimson extended this absolution to the Secretary of State (whom the Army report had accused of certain errors of omission), both Mr. Stimson and Mr. Forrestal took exception to major findings of their own boards of inquiry. This leaves important conclusions in suspension, only to be brought to rest by congressional investigation and courts martial of those few officers who are left to bear the brunt of the blame assigned.

2. The reports stop discreetly on the threshold of the White House, though that was the clearing point in those days of all the military and diplomatic activities of the Government and President Roosevelt was publicly stressing his responsibility as Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

STIMSON'S DIARY IS QUOTED

Mr. Stimson's diary and certain other material are quoted as proof that Mr. Roosevelt sagaciously predicted a sudden Japanese attack well before the event, and in a newspaper column Mrs. Roosevelt reported this same state of the President's mind at the time, leaving the inference that the inclusion of Pearl Harbor in the Japanese pattern of assault was no surprise to him either.

Yet the Army and Navy boards are firm in the conclusion that official Washington did not expect Pearl Harbor to enter the pattern at the outset. And in their account of how war came, gleaned from obviously intimate and august sources, E. K. Lindley and Forrest Davis represented Mr. Roosevelt as taking the day off and being so astonished at the news of Pearl Harbor that he uttered an incredulous exclamation, "No!"

3. The Navy report informs that, because of the high policy decision to protect Britain's Atlantic life line, the Pacific Fleet was split in May 1941; also, that massing the remaining battleships of that fleet in Pearl Harbor on December 7 was merely a coincidence. There was strong opposition in the Navy to the policy decision of May, and one of the chief faults ascribed to Admiral Kimmel has been that his fleet was thus concentrated. Yet the Navy report does not mention that opposition, and, in the list of blameworthy acts attributed to Admiral Kimmel, palliates this one.

Congress is not likely to accept without question these particular passages, especially when read in conjunction with the drastic action taken against Admiral Stark by Secretary Forrestal, on recommendation of Admiral King (but not the board), since it has always been understood that Admiral Stark was one of the biggest opponents of splitting the fleet and thereby came into Presidential disfavor. He was also reported, when the matter came up of transferring the over-age destroyers to Great Britain, until the quid pro quo of the Atlantic bases was provided, to have said that the gathering Pacific situation made the transfer perilous and inadvisable.

STARK MAY SEEK TRIAL

Admiral Stark may seek a court martial, but, whether he does or not, his surprising emergence in the topmost ranks of those accused (after having been designated as our chief naval officer in Europe for years after Pearl Harbor) will undoubtedly give Congress the same appetite for more information that it has given to other readers of the reports. Why, for example, did Admiral Stark not transmit to Admiral Kimmel the information of advancing crisis which came to him between November 26 and December 7, when he had been so sedulous a correspondent before? This perplexity, and the harsh sentences of Stark and Kimmel, stand out strongly in the report and the endorsements.

4. Then there is that passage in Mr. Stimson's comment on the Army report which states a philosophy he applied to the criticisms of General Marshall, Secretary Hull, and his own direction of the War Department, but distinctly did not extend to Lieutenant General Short and Mr. Forrestal and Admiral King, and distinctly excluded it from their judgments of Admirals Stark and Kimmel. The passage reads:

"At all times it must be borne in mind, however, that it is easy to criticize individuals in the light of hindsight, and very difficult to re-create fairly the entire situation and information with which the officers were required at the time of the event."

In view of the derelictions and disorganizations, high to low, revealed in the reports, this paragraph might have been the guide to all action taken, or inaction agreed to, until inquiries could be made outside the Army-Navy stockades. But the guide was followed in some instances and not in others, and Congress can hardly find sufficient explanation for this in the reports.

INTELLIGENCE SERVICES NOT CREDITED

5. It may be that in the passages deleted for security the full stories are to be found of the parts played prior to Pearl Harbor by the intelligence division of the Army and the Navy—G–2 and ONI, as they were then known. That these activities shine like good deeds in a naughty world is implicit in the reports, though the handsome acknowledgment that might have been expected did not reveal itself to the careful search of this correspondent.

Therefore, by courts martial or congressional inquiry, or both, these stories can be supplied in such detail for publication as security may then permit. Brig. Gen. Sherman Miles was acting head of G–2, to which then Brigadier General Gerow's War Plans Division failed to deliver that November 27 reply of Lieutenant General Short's which, if it had been delivered might have saved a thousand lives and many vessels at Pearl Harbor. General Miles, whose duty clearly was extremely well done, got another star but was shelved for the war's duration in Boston. General Gerow, however, got a second, then a third, star and a high field command which by all reports he has more than justified Admiral Wilkinson, head of ONI, with another high record of performance at the time, had no such misadventures with Navy war plans and went on his way to three stars and a high combat record.

Congress and courts martial could doubtless fill in many of the vacant spots in the reports, and possibly bring about a reappraisal of the harsh sentences imposed on the few officers among the many, by opening as much of the records of the intelligence services as will bear on the competence and policy of others.

Labor Day Sermon by Bishop Michael J. Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent sermon delivered on Labor Day, September 3, 1945, at St. Joseph's Cathedral by the Most Reverend Michael J. Ready, Bishop of Columbus.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This holiday dedicated to labor is a national profession of faith in man's dignity. The consciousness of man's dignity rests in man's origin as a creature of God and man's destiny in the Kingdom of Heaven. The

recognition of man's dignity immediately suggests a relationship of brotherhood, a brotherhood consecrated in the redemption of Jesus Christ and commanded for His disciples in the law of Christian charity which holds every man as a neighbor: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Throughout the centuries the Church of Christ has fostered such an understanding of spiritual relations among men. The church's institutions of learning and benevolence are a practical interpretation of those relations in terms of mercy and human service.

It is especially fitting that on this day our citizens should make grateful acknowledgment to God for the blessings of liberty guaranteed by the institutions of this Republic. The constitutional recognition of man's inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness protects the citizen from the serfdom of both economic and Government power and thus defends man's dignity. Here in this venerable cathedral on Labor Day 1945 we kneel at the altar of Christ's undying sacrifice to express thanksgiving for the victory which was won under His mercy by the valor and labor of our citizens. Here we repeat our prayerful petition for a world peace based on justice. Here we commend to the mercy of God the brave souls of America's youth who fought and died to defend our institutions of freedom.

With fervent gratitude we here recall the service of the men and women of the armed forces who did their best duty for their country on land, on sea, and in the air.

All these we remember today while we pray God to bless the men and women of the industries, the farms, and the professions who toiled at their tasks to give to our armies and the armies of our allies the resources of victory. We praise God that our country was saved the destruction and death which devastated the lands of Europe and Asia. It should now be our strong resolution in gratitude to God for victory to share with our suffering brethren the means of rising from the wretchedness and want which blight their lives.

In welcoming you on this occasion I wish to express in behalf of our citizens in this community sentiments of hearty congratulations to the men and women of industry on the great patriotic job done in winning the war. I offer my congratulations and gratitude to all in industry, to management and to labor, for it was a job done by all in a spirit of unity and cooperation. The example of that service is today the best evidence of what we can expect and should expect during the present critical period of industrial conversion.

The immediate national concern of all citizens and particularly of all wage earners is the question of jobs. Practically overnight the Government stopped spending $8,000,000,000 a month, and that cease-spending order was felt directly in the homes of our land. Soon there will be a great demand for peacetime goods of all kinds. The estimated $100,000,000,000 accumulated individual savings will cushion the immediate future for some families. Private and Government spending will provide a great many jobs, but the process of industrial transition from war to peace is bound to be filled with grave hardships. Certainly, there is no reason to assume a Pollyanna attitude of stupid indifference to the seriousness of the employment situation. But neither is it necessary at this time to lament with deep pessimism after the manner of some prophets of despair who seize every occasion to sound the alarm of disaster for our national institutions. We are just within 2 weeks of the announcement of peace. We are standing the first shock of the end of a war economy. But even in these few days we are encouraged to note the quick and efficient manner in which the agencies of Government, the management of industry, and the leaders of labor have moved to correct the grave situation. We may not be convinced that their plans are sufficient. We may criticize the present inadequacy of our laws to meet the situation. We may be among those who are sponsoring certain legislative and economic programs which promise a better and faster solution of the jobs situation. The proportions of the task ahead offer all of us an opportunity for further important service of our country. In this task the workers of the Nation through their unions and their elected representatives must play a very important part. Unemployment principally affects the workers, and, first of all, the unskilled, low-wage workers, who are least able to stand the shock of a payless week.

The present reconversion task should be the occasion to advance wider labor representation and participation in management. This, too, it seems to me, is the time for labor to have equal representation with management on all local, national, and international bodies for the study and cure of economic problems and for the advancement of better social conditions among workers and their families. Both management and labor in fulfilling this joint task should have the guidance and aid of the various governments at their own proper level. I have no hesitancy in standing for this greater recognition of the workers and their unions. If it were ever necessary for labor to prove its right to a larger and more important share in directing the economic life of our Nation, that proof was given in production records during the war and in the patriotic policies adopted and adhered to by the unions. When the records of labor relations of the late war are written, the situations that will reflect most credit on the labor movement will not be those involving the selfish, autocratic, poorly led groups who violated their no-strike pledge but that great army of workers who kept their contracts and lived up to their pledge of patriotic service when it was hard and unbelievably hard to do so.

I refuse to believe that the men and women of America, who witnessed the suffering and despair of the cruel depression years, will permit a similar situation to endanger the very structure of our national life. A nation whose people suffered, sacrificed, and died to defend its institutions of freedom and which spent $270,000,000,000 to wage war against the vicious forces which threatened our liberties will not—cannot—let its citizens in the time of victory languish in a wilderness of economic or political confusion. We have the ability and the wealth and the spirit of justice to provide for our citizens the land, the homes, the job, the education, the culture, the recreation, and the simple joys of family and children which God planned as the heritage of free men on their earthly pilgrimage to the kingdom of heaven. The lives and the welfare of citizens have the highest priority on the wealth and resources of a nation.

I speak to you according to the age-old teaching of the Catholic Church. This is not a new doctrine fashioned by the exigencies of the present crisis. This is the doctrine of man's dignity and of human brotherhood and of social justice expounded by Christ and developed in precise principles and formulas in the great Social Encylicals of Leo XIII, Pius XI, and of the great pontiff whose burning zeal and indomitable courage have captured the admiration and affection of the whole suffering world, Pius XII. Men who feared and hated religion have for generations sneered at and condemned this social teaching of the church, some because it went too far and others because it seemed to them not to go far enough.

This is the revolutionary teaching of justice and charity, of unity and brotherhood, which materialists call reactionary and social obscurantists name radical.

Almost 1 year ago to this very day, September 2, 1944, Pius XII spoke to the world on the fifth anniversary of the war. His words now seem prophetic because of their trenchant analysis of what we face in this September 1945. Pius XII spoke in defense of the right of private property, but he put his finger on the pulse of present-day economic problems. He defended the right of private property in the clearest language, but he hastened to add that private property must be subordinated to the needs of the common good. Listen to his exact words:

"Indeed, we see an ever-increasing mass of workers come up against those effective concentrations of economic wealth, often hidden under anonymous forms, that succeed in evading their social duties, thereby preventing the worker from building up his own effective property. We see small and medium property owners compelled to wage a defensive struggle increasingly arduous and without hope of success.

"On the one hand, we see vast wealth dominate the private and public economy and often civic life. On the other, we see innumerable multitudes of those who, deprived of any direct or indirect security in their lives, take no further interest in the values of spirit, abandon their aspirations toward true freedom and blindly serve any political party, slaves of anyone who can somehow promise them bread and security. Experience has shown how much tyranny mankind is capable of under such conditions, even in the present time"

Pius XII's conclusion here is that we must flight not only against the evil of unemployment but also against the evil which unemployment breeds—the slave mind, which is always the raw material for tyranny and dictatorship, be it Communist or Fascist, left or right.

All groups of citizens must work cooperatively for the elimination of the dangers of unemployment. In this matter, workers and employers and investors and the public generally are all in the same boat of prosperity or all in the same deep, black sea of depression.

The surest cure for unemployment is the establishment of a just social order. Recurring unemployment or the danger of unemployment is a symptom of the out-of-balance condition of our economic system. Pius XII at Christmas last year (1944) spoke of the peoples of the world being awakened by the sinister, flashing lightning of the war which encompassed them. He described them as people awakened from a long torpid, heavy sleep. And in their awakened condition the Pontiff states that they have assumed a new attitude toward the state and toward those who govern it, an attitude that questions and criticizes. This is the fever of reform among free peoples and the revolutionary spirit of revolt among slave peoples. We must continue to make progressive strides toward a better organization of our social life in order to achieve a peaceful, sane reform of conditions which threaten economic disaster. Labor unionists and workers generally have no monopoly in this desire for peaceful reform and correction of social evils. Industrialists, businessmen, farmers, and professional men generally will support reform measures if presented in relation to our common American traditions. But workers through their unions usually must be the leaders in proposing and promoting wider social benefits for wage-dependent citizens. I believe all citizens can accept the following social objectives as worth working for in our national economy:

1. Full employment—to achieve economic justice for all people.

2. Comprehensive social security—giving protection against unemployment, disability, old age, sickness, and dependency. Such social security should be provided by contributions from employers, employees, self-employed, and government in fair proportions.

3. A guaranteed annual wage—to provide for an increased stabilization of family life.

4. Family allowances—so that parents with large families and inadequate income may get a definite subsidy besides an offset in income taxes. Such a graduated income subsidy is justified not only on the basis of child welfare, but on the basis of national prosperity.

5. Workers' fair participation with management in industry. Direct union-management cooperation enables the laborer to become a citizen, not just a subject of industry. It also places greater social responsibilities on labor and removes the strike as a common method of settling grievances.

6. Both unions and management must develop a great social consciousness and a higher regard for community relations and responsibilities.

7. Fair employment practice—so that legally no individual otherwise qualified can be discriminated against in filling a job or position because of race, color, or religion. This goes for labor as well as business.

8. An equilibrium between wages and prices, and between agricultural prices and industrial prices.

Naturally, this is by no means a complete catalog of social objectives either in form or in content. It is a statement of objectives which all citizens should be thinking about in order to achieve a better national society in which men can live with dignity becoming the children of God.

A truly just and noble human society cannot be based merely on the economics of full production, fair wages, and collective bargaining. Life is more than food and drink. Men are greater than the mere chemical properties which constitute their bodies.

Our Saviour, Jesus Christ, toiled in honorable labor at the humble carpenter's bench in Nazareth. We think of Him today as Christ, the worker, the living ideal of all noble men. Hear His words of wisdom as He spoke to the men and women engaged in the tasks of business and industry; of fishing and farming: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice." Be not solicitous, He tells them, for what you shall eat nor what you will drink, nor what you shall wear. After all these material things the heathen seek. You are wiser than heathen who do not know God's truth. You are men of great spiritual powers. You are men who can conceive great inventions by the spiritual processes of human intelligence. You are men who can master your own problems by the powers of your spiritual will. You are men—dim miniatures of Greatness Infinite. Seek ye then first the things of the spirit, the truths and graces which make you rise above earth and lead you to the Kingdom of God and His justice.

The very power of unionism is based on the spiritual character of brotherhood, worker with worker, man with man, joined in the union of fraternity to win justice. Before there can be a reconstruction of the social order there must be a conversion of men's hearts and minds to the things of the spirit. That is why the church has championed the rights of the worker and why she has so painstakingly, by encyclical writings, expressed the true principles of social economic life. In both labor and management, the things that count are essentially human elements. They are all based on the realization that man's greatest powers and truest happiness are spiritual, not material. The objectives men seek, the motives that inspire them, the standards they set in honesty and justice and consideration for others, their willingness to work for the observance of these standards in whatever part they play in industrial life—all these great values are based ultimately in man's spiritual powers.

I think it is highly significant that the country which first established social security (1880), is the first modern and industrialized nation to vanish from the map of progressive countries. Germany is the shining example of the fate which befalls a country that has fulfilled the needs of material man and has completely neglected, indeed perverted, the needs of spiritual man.

I believe that the greatest single contribution that could now be made to peace among nations would be the strong loyal international support of religion by the great free labor organizations of the United States. Nothing, in my opinion, could so quickly convince the workers of the world of America's greatness as for American labor to stand openly and positively in defense of the rights of religion everywhere in the world.

Thank God that today no one seriously questions the right of workers to organize freely in their own unions and to bargain collectively with employers for just wages and other decent conditions of work. Ten years ago those were questions of hot debate among citizens. Workers must now regard this changed condition of affairs in the light of a great responsibility to lead in the betterment of social conditions affecting the lives and homes of all the citizens. Workers must regard their unions not as selfish, partisan instruments for power and aggrandizement. Employers often are hostile to unions because of their experience with unrepresentative nagging agitators sent to management as union labor organizers. Workers must rather regard their unions as well-disciplined armies working for the organization of a just economic system for all.

Let us think of the glory that is ours in serving the greatness of our country. Here we are blessed by institutions founded on real democracy. Americans lately have proved their love for those institutions from Bataan and Guadalcanal and the beaches of Normandy, all the way to Berlin and Tokyo. They will not be deceived by doctrinaire agitators and Communist propagandists who try to palm off on American workers a spurious brand of democracy. But we who love our country and its institutions must be ready to pay the high price of decent, honest, just citizenship which democracy demands. Here are words of wisdom which were spoken at the end of the last war and which I now commend to your consideration: "It is one of history's plainest lessons that democracy is based on self-control; that a people cannot remain free unless its members will voluntarily use their freedom for the purpose of the community under a system of moral law." (President Hadley, Yale University, June 15, 1919.)

Keep in your memory, my beloved brethren, the words self-control and moral law. There can be no democracy without them. They are necessary guides for groups as well as individuals. They are the power which groups and individuals use to refrain from acting against others even though it means putting aside an advantage. They are the power which holds people back from doing what would be harmful to others. They are the spiritual power which helps us to think of man's dignity and of his eternal destiny. They are of the great spiritual forces within us which help us to seek out first the Kingdom of God and His justice and thereby to save the soul of humanity.

OPA and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "OPA and Agriculture," printed in the Prairie Farmer for August 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPA AND AGRICULTURE

It must be plain to Prairie Farmer readers that we think the administration of the price control is something short of perfection.

We wonder whether any of our readers assume that we therefore favor wiping price control off the books.

We do not. We think that farmers are better off under price control in this war than they were in the last war. Moreover, we think that when the adjustment to peace is made, farmers will fare many times better because of price control than farmers did in 1918–20.

It is our job to point out OPA policies that seem to us to be mistakes and which arouse the antagonism of farmers.

It is also our job, our duty, to remind our readers that OPA works to the advantage of agriculture in many ways.

There is the general advantage to be gained from price control. Yes, it holds down the price of specific products. But it also holds down the inflation spiral.

Farmers often say wages in war plants are too high. They would be much higher without price control over what the city worker pays for food.

Consider rent control. Without restrictions, rents would have shot skyward and city workers would have less to spend for food.

Consider the price of things farmers buy. In 1942, for the first time in 22 years, a balance was restored between prices farmers pay and the prices they receive.

True, Prairie Farmer has argued for an increased price ceiling for poultry. To argue that certain prices should go up is not to argue that OPA should be abolished.

The great value of the OPA will be apparent when the war is over. After World War I, inflation reached its peak in 1920. Wholesale food prices then dropped 44 percent in 19 months. Some farm products dropped 50 percent that year between planting and harvest.

It would be easy these days for a farm newspaper to seek cheap applause by attacking the whole principle of price control. But we remember too clearly the fact that 500,000 farmers lost their homes by foreclosure in the first 5 years after World War I. We remember the heartaches of the long depression of the 1930's.

Agriculture has had benefits from price control, along with the irritating restrictions. It will have even greater benefits from it in the months ahead. That is why Prairie Farmer seeks to improve the OPA, not to abolish it.

Marshall Critics Called Unjust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, published in the Washington Post in an issue of recent date. The article is entitled "Marshall Critics Called Unjust,"

and refers to General of the Army George C. Marshall.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL CRITICS CALLED UNJUST

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

The ingratitude of republics to their faithful servants, and the stupid glee of the little man in seeing mud flung upon the reputation of the great, are so well known as to have passed into the proverbs of our race.

But usually a little time elapses between the accomplishments which have justly earned the recognition of the people and the moment of their fading from the public memory.

Such has not been the fortune of General of the Army George C. Marshall. In the very moment of victories which he has done more than any other living American to win, he finds himself attacked—even vilified—for his part in the tragic disaster at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

I do not for a moment contend that the facts about Pearl Harbor should not be published. I am not attempting to assess the truth or error of the strictures passed upon General Marshall by the Army's Court of Inquiry. My quarrel is with the press and radio comment, the headlines: "Marshall accused of Pearl Harbor guilt." And the almost total lack of voices raised to point out the tremendous services that George C. Marshall has subsequently rendered to the people of the United States.

All generals, said Napoleon, make mistakes; victory goes to him who makes the fewest.

Judged by that standard, General Marshall ranks high among the generals of all time, certainly very high among those of America.

He had first to create, train, and organize the greatest army that this country ever set in the field. Then he had to participate in the decisions as to how that army should be used—as to how, indeed, all the armed forces of the United States and the British Commonwealth should be used to reach across the seas and bring down in ruin the mighty military machines of Germany and Japan.

It would be untrue, and unfair to other distinguished officers, to say that General Marshall dominated the agency set up for this purpose—the combined chiefs of staff. But no one who knows anything of how that agency operated could choose any other name than General Marshall's if asked who was the most influential member.

Patiently, firmly, with a wisdom, a courage, and a clear vision and purpose which has rarely been combined in a single man, General Marshall pursued the task set for him by his country. Perhaps his greatest gift was his ability to win the confidence of all who came in contact with him. To command the respect of his superiors and the undying loyalty of his subordinates. He is a just man, who plays no favorites. He is selfless beyond the common run of great soldiers, thinking never of himself, always of his duty. His choice of leaders for the American Army in this war has sometimes been ruthless, but it has given us the best-commanded army we have ever had and has saved countless American lives.

When the history of this war comes to be written after the passage of time enables that task to be undertaken objectively and in the clear light of truth revealed, the impartial historians must say that of all those who have worn the uniform of the United States, it was George C. Marshall who made the greatest contribution to our present victory. Whether in the field of organization, of strategic decision, of firmness under adversity, or of relentless pressure in the hour of success, whether in the conviction which his words carried to his political superiors or in the welding through the power of a great and unselfish personality of a conglomerate mass of 8,000,000 civilians into the greatest army of all time—regard him as you may, General Marshall is the chief architect of victory.

Must it be ever true that republics are ungrateful?

The Draft and the Manpower Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of August 28, 1945, one entitled "Enough Is Enough," and the other "Waste of Manpower." These editorials were written by Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during Woodrow Wilson's administration and also more recently Ambassador to Mexico. I think they accurately sum up the sentiments of the people with reference to discharging the soldiers and discontinuing the draft.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

President Truman yesterday wrote the chairmen of House and Senate Military Affairs Committees in advocacy of retaining the draft of young men, from 18 to 26, for an indefinite period.

The President stressed two considerations on which an overwhelming majority of Americans are in complete agreement:

1. Men who have borne the heat and burden of battle in foreign lands ought to be brought home and discharged at the earliest possible moment.

2. The Army should not be reduced to such a point that there will not be sufficient men to furnish needed armies of occupation.

The President has evidently been convinced by his military advisers that continuation of the draft on a limited scale is necessary for attainment of these objectives, which are universally desired.

But the country will not be convinced of the necessity unless it is given information which has not yet been furnished to the general public.

In the first place, the Army has not yet disclosed any plans for demobilization which would reduce the Army at any time in the near future (without any additional men being secured) below the number needed for occupation purposes and to supply the occupation armies.

Moreover, no real attempt has been made to secure needed men by voluntary enlistments. If the terms of Army service are made attractive and assurances are given of opportunity for promotion, the number of men who will voluntarily assume foreign service in the Army should be much higher than the 300,000 mentioned by President Truman as a maximum.

But if the Army can show (and it should be required to show it) that it is prepared to return men now in the Army and discharge them at a rate which would reduce the Army below the number needed for occupation; and if the Army can show (and it should be required to show it) that the necessary replacements cannot be secured by voluntary methods, then two steps should be taken by Congress. The Army should be required to obtain such replacements as may be necessary (if any at all are necessary) from two sources: men already in the Army who have not yet seen foreign service, and men over 20 years of age. The Congress reduced the draft age below 20 most reluctantly and did so only because of the stern necessity of war. Now the war is over, the draft should end for all, if possible. If that is not possible young men should not be taken from their homes and schools to perform duties of occupation for which youths below 20 are not as well fitted as older men.

Everybody sympathizes with the desire to get men who have seen combat duty home as rapidly as possible, but if there are not ships and planes enough to bring them home in less than a year there is little point in replacing them until the ships and planes are available.

No American wants to see the Army reduced to a danger point. But if the Army is to be kept at a large figure for a year or longer, there is certainly no need for replacements in larger numbers than can be secured by voluntary methods.

The Congress should require that the need be shown for continuation of the draft. If the need is shown, and the News and Observer does not believe it will be, the need should be filled by men over 20.

WASTE OF MANPOWER

The latest news from Washington has two disturbing statements:

1. The Army wants 50,000 men each month despite war's end.

2. The Army expects to release 5,000,000 men within a year.

The Army has now far more men than it needs. The draft should end on Labor Day.

The Army should release 5,000,000 men by Thanksgiving Day, 1945, and not "within a year."

These statements recall what Oliver Twist said: "Please, sir, I want some more." But he didn't get more. Neither should the Army.

Let's Keep America American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a current article by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. This article appears in the September 1945 issue of the magazine National Republic and is entitled "Let's Keep America American."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S KEEP AMERICA AMERICAN

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

The proud word "American" has come to symbolize many great things to our own and to all other peoples of the world.

The word "American" implies more than a citizen of a mighty nation. It connotes a constitutional republic of checks and balances. It brings to the mind's eye the scenes of a land overflowing in blessings—spiritual

and material. It represents a life of opportunity, of reward for honest and diligent effort, a life of fellowship, of freedom and of freely accepted obligations. The word "American" is rich and true in meaning.

We want to keep America American. We do not want this Nation to go European. We do not want our country to fall heir to the tragic, historic hates and conflicts—national, economic, political, social—of the Old World.

That is why we must act, not merely speak and write, for true constitutional Americanism.

As my humble contribution to this goal, I have introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress Senate Resolution 165. This resolution would create a Special Committee on the Promotion of American Activities.

This new committee would be the Senate counterpart of the permanent House Committee on Un-American Activities. But as the name implies, the Senate committee would concentrate on advancing the patriotic pro-American, pro-Constitution activities of our Government and citizenry.

The Senate committee would be empowered to recommend legislation aimed at strengthening our American form of government, American ideals, and American institutions against the encroachment of subversive and un-American propaganda.

The committee would concentrate on advancing straight-thinking Americanism as opposed to crooked and synthetic-thinking foreign "isms." It would dynamically focus on patriotic activities in our schools, our homes, our forums.

This new committee would, of course, cooperate with the House committee for the purpose of ferreting out the un-American moles who have been boring from within the structure of American life. There would be no more duplication between these two committees than there need be between the Senate and the House Military Affairs Committees. Is not the cause of the Republic worthy of one Americanism committee apiece in each of our two great legislative Chambers?

The reasons for the creation of this new Senate committee are all too apparent. The reasons are obviously to protect America from what Lincoln spoke of as the "menace from within," to preserve our way of life for the millions of our fighting men who have risked their all for that way of life, and to preserve that way for the generations still to come.

Obviously, there are ever-deepening menaces to our American way. These menaces, unlike Congress, do not recess for the summer. These menaces must be counteracted, and this committee would be one instrumentality for doing so.

Now, specifically, what are the menaces?

1. For 12 years, we have been impacted with imported, totalitarian doctrines. These doctrines have been officially and semiofficially preached from the rooftop of almost every Government building in Washington, D. C. These false doctrines have extolled centralization, regimentation, bureaucracy, deficit-spending, and other evils of European dictatorships.

These doctrines and the doctrinaire "thinkers" behind them have besmirched Congress and the courts. They have vilified the system of private enterprise which made America great. They have sneered at the grassroot genius of America and have sought to undermine the will of local communities to rule themselves and help themselves. These insidious doctrines have derided love of our country itself.

It is unfortunate, but it is true, that these doctrines have taken firm hold in the minds of many of our people. It will not be easy to shake these doctrines loose. But it must be done.

This, then, is the first reason for the Special Committee to Promote American Activities.

2. The American Communists, long in an unholy alliance with the Democratic Party and with scattered third parties, have now resumed their activities in their own independent political party.

That party has rededicated itself to class warfare and the revolutionary overthrow of the American form of government.

The turnabout in Communist policy resulted from an article written by a French Communist, Jacques Duclos, who had previously conferred with Premier Stalin. The article denounced the collaborationist policies which Earl Browder, general secretary of the party, had fostered between the "reds" and the "pinks." As a result, a convention recently held in New York behind closed doors gave the boot to Browder. He was replaced by a long-time open exponent of revolution, William Z. Foster.

Lest we forget it might be noted here that the official program of the Communist Party has read:

"Communism repudiates parliamentarianism as the form of the future; its aim is to destroy parliamentarianism; therefore the deep hatred against all parliaments in the revolutionary proletariat is perfectly justified.

"The Communist Party enters such institutions not for the purpose of organization work but in order to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the parliament itself from within."

Former Attorney General Francis Biddle (certainly no great enemy of the leftists), declared that organized communism "believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

This, then, is what is behind the American Communists' resumption of their revolutionary tactics. Their action is a part of the world-wide resurgence of revolutionary communism.

This poses grave problems in our foreign as well as in our domestic affairs. Domestically the Communists' action will affect our friendly relations with Soviet Russia.

It is probable that millions of Americans will become aroused and indignant at this anti-God, anti-Constitution, un-American movement in our midst. As a result, these righteous Americans may turn their wrath on Russia, the home of world communism.

Ordinarily, these Americans have the greatest admiration for Russia's proven valor, the greatest respect for the Russians' love of their native land, the greatest sympathy with Russia's war suffering.

But unless Russia absolutely repudiates in fact and in word the revolutionary Communist parties throughout the democratic world, unless Russia completely disassociates herself from them, she will cause vast friction and ill-will from her allies.

Americans will not be silent or inactive against outside meddling and revolutionary agitation in our affairs. We will not be deluded by insincere denials coupled with secret continuation of such outside meddling and agitation.

And so this is a second reason for a special Senate Committee to Promote American Activities.

3. The CIO's Political Action Committee is out to capture the next Congress.

Let us remember that the House Committee on Un-American Activities long ago documented the interlocking directorates and memberships between individuals prominent in: (a) Communist "front" and "transmission belt" organizations, and (b) the CIO and its Political Action Committee.

This is no mere conjecture. This is a hard, grim fact—that the Communists are "pulling strings" in innumerable CIO unions and PAC chapters.

If the PAC should take over the Eightieth and/or succeeding Congresses, would this remain a Government of, by, and for the people? What are we going to do to counteract the PAC poison? Thus, we have a third reason for the special Senate committee.

4. We are heading into a reconversion period of vast difficulties, of great adjustments between management and labor. Obviously, there will be many opportunities for agitators and troublemakers to foment strife, discord, hate, economic warfare, mental unbalance. This may do incalculable harm to our efforts to restore normalcy. Certainly, in the period up ahead it may cause industrial chaos.

R. J. Thomas, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, United Automobile Workers, speaking in Minneapolis on July 13, said that as soon as VJ-day comes "there will be a lot of strikes. We will authorize strikes in every plant where a present grievance continues to exist."

What will this mean? It could mean that unless we meet this menace head-on, unless we checkmate the Communist attempt "to blow up the whole bourgeois machinery and the parliament from within," unless we counteract the PAC's activities and the premeditated wave of strikes, there will be in the near future: (a) Unemployment of returning veterans and former war workers, (b) falling off of private investment, (c) inability to meet the postwar demand for materials, (d) inability to pay interest on our vast Federal indebtedness, inability to pay off the principal on the Federal debt, inability to pay taxes.

As a result, the Government deficit will grow, the Government bureaucracy will remain, and the private enterprise system as we have known it for generations will be dealt still more blows. These dangers constitute a fourth compelling reason for a special committee to promote American activities.

We have been told that "for lack of vision, the people perish." Obviously what we need is the kind of vision which would be promoted by this committee.

Let no one falsely cry "witch-hunting" or "Red-baiting" over this proposal. This committee would be dedicated to the preservation of our civil liberties from the very forces which would destroy them.

The constitutional rights of our citizens to advance ideas will remain unimpaired. But the revolutionary minorities which seek to destroy civil liberties for all, will be fearlessly exposed. Their revolutionary disciples within the Government service will be expelled.

Too long have we legislated in a "segmentist" fashion—for small segments of our population. It is time that the rights of the public became our chief concern.

During the war, we have reached out for millions of youths, placed them in the armed forces and told them to do battle for something. That something we have characterized as a free America. Can America remain free if we permit groups willfully to disorganize our economy?

And so, this suggested committee would have many functions: To build up our American system, to weed out the forces which would destroy that system, and to recommend legislation to those ends.

This committee would be one of the two congressional arms which would fight for the very existence and integrity of the Congress itself.

It is evident to wide-awake thinkers that for a number of years now the Communist doctrine of getting rid of parliament (and that is the Congress of the United States) has been widely propagandized. Congress has deliberately been belittled and smeared. That is part of the Red technique. Of late, the American people have awakened from some of this mesmeric dope. But the indoctrination against the Constitution will start again soon, and it is well for us to know the sources whence it comes.

We know that through writers, many of whom have been paid by Government, the Communist doctrine has infiltrated into our institutions and our homes. When Congress

is sabotaged, you can generally trace it to someone who believes in the Communist doctrine—to do away with parliaments. Just ask yourself what would be the result if this should happen, and the answer must be: a repetition of the ghastly misfortune which befell Europe.

The pattern that made America great must not be discarded.

But, let no one be mistaken—the establishment of this new committee would not take away the obligations of each citizen to look after the American way in his own individual manner. On the contrary, this committee would encourage the citizen to translate those obligations into action. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. The citizen may prove his vigilance by—

a. Remaining ever alert to disruptive forces within his own community, recognizing Communist and Fascist methods and leadership and recognizing what those methods and leadership brought about in Europe.

b. Participating in constructive action on behalf of our form of government. This means making sure that public servants stand for those measures which will maintain America American. It means casting ballots which will put into public office responsible men to replace any officials who fail to regard public office as a public trust, who throw away the people's values instead of guarding them, and husbanding them, who create conditions which give rise to scandal and malfeasance in office (and thus give the Communist case material with which to poison the thinking of others against our way of life).

By these and other means, all of us, working together as an American team, will help to insure that within our lives and the lives of our children's children the word "American" will have ever-brighter, ever-prouder, ever-unfolding meaning to mankind.

Japanese Brutality to American War Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the report of the State Department on Japanese mistreatment of American war prisoners.

It reveals a series of the most brutal, beastly, inhuman, sadistic abuse of helpless white men and women ever perpetrated by a group of savage apes in all the history of warfare.

Anyone who reads it carefully will feel impelled to agree with the contention of the Koreans that Hirohito, who exercised supreme power over every Japanese soldier and civilian, as well as every one of the sadistic brutes who personally engaged in the perpetration of these atrocities, should receive the extreme penalty, and that never again should such a government headed by such a gang be admitted to the society of civilized nations.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF STATE DEPARTMENT REPORT ON PROTESTS AGAINST ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY JAPANESE

With the signing of the surrender terms by the Japanese Government the Department of State is now in a position to give the American public information about the Department's activities in behalf of American prisoners of war and civilian internees held by the Japanese. During hostilities it was not possible to release much of this information because the Japanese Government was quick to construe official releases regarding conditions in camps in Japan and regarding Japanese atrocities as "atrocity campaigns." On several occasions officials of the Japanese Government informed the protecting power representatives in Tokyo that "atrocity campaigns" by American authorities made conditions unfavorable for concluding negotiations for the shipment of relief supplies to Americans held in the Far East or for concluding arrangements for the repatriation of Americans.

Thus, before releasing information about the treatment of Americans by the Japanese it was always necessary for the American authorities to give consideration to the possible consequences of such releases upon negotiations pending with the Japanese Government for sending relief supplies to Americans in the Far East or for arranging for their exchange. The decisions as to whether or not to release official information about Japanese atrocities were made after consultation between the American military authorities, the State Department, and other interested Allied governments. The American public has, of course, been acquainted with conditions under which American prisoners of war were held by the Japanese by reason of the personal accounts which have been given by Americans who escaped from Japanese captivity.

MADE REPEATED DEMANDS

From the outbreak of war until the capitulation of the Japanese the Department of State has striven to keep as well informed as possible concerning the conditions under which prisoners of war and civilian internees were held in the Far East. On the basis of this knowledge it has endeavored to better conditions of their captivity. It has sought unceasingly to obtain Japanese consent for visits to all prisoner of war and civilian internee camps.

It has repeatedly demanded that the names of all Americans held by the Japanese be reported promptly. It has supervised the spending of large sums of money to provide food and clothing for Americans held by the Japanese. With the help of the military authorities and the Post Office Department it has arranged for the transmission of mail to and from the Far East. It has protested energetically all breaches of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention, which have come to its attention.

Protests drafted by the State Department in collaboration with the American military authorities and given to the Japanese Government through the intermediary of the Swiss Government, which protected American interests in the Far East, have served in many instances to improve the treatment of American nationals. The protests put the Japanese Government and officials on notice of their responsibility and accountability for the mistreatment of Americans. The protests served to point out to the Japanese Government the standard of treatment which the United States Government expected the Japanese Government to accord to American prisoners of war and civilian internees.

SWISS SUPPLIED INFORMATION

The information upon which many of this Government's protests were based was received through the protecting power (the Swiss Government) and the International Red Cross Committee. Some reports on conditions in camps in the Far East were received from American prisoners of war who escaped from captivity. The restrictions which the Japanese Government placed upon the activities of representatives of the protecting power and the International Red Cross Committee, despite vigorous protests, made it difficult for the American authorities to have a full and accurate picture of the conditions under which many Americans were held by the Japanese. Thus practically nothing was known of the whereabouts or welfare of the many American airmen who were shot down in recent months in action over Japan. Moreover, nearly 10,000 American prisoners of war were held in camps which the Japanese did not permit neutral representatives to visit. Most civilian internees, on the other hand, were held in camps which were visited by neutral representatives.

The communications addressed to the Japanese Government by the Department of State concerning the treatment of American prisoners of war and civilian internees total approximately 240 since the beginning of hostilities. A press release covering 89 of these cases was issued by the Department of State on January 31, 1944 (release No. 36). Since that time approximately 150 communications have been addressed to the Japanese. These communications have concerned the extension of financial assistance to Americans, the shipment of relief supplies to them, mail communications, and camp conditions or atrocities in which American nationals were involved.

CIVILIANS PUT TO DEATH

Protests regarding the treatment of Americans have related to reports of the putting to death of American civilians; the mistreatment, torture, and execution of American air personnel; the use of American prisoners of war in war-related projects and forcing of officer personnel to perform labor, both contrary to the provisions of the Geneva Convention; the corporal punishment of prisoners of war and their subjection to starvation rations; orders issued by the Japanese military authorities for the murder of persons surrendering or captured in the Philippine Islands; as well as to other breaches of the standards of treatment established by the Geneva Convention.

The full account of the extent to which the Japanese Government failed to honor the obligations of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention which it agreed to apply not only to prisoners of war but to civilian internees insofar as adaptable and the extent to which treatment accorded by Japanese authorities fell below international standards for the treatment of captives, will not be known until those Americans who have survived years of Japanese captivity have returned to their homeland and until American officials representing the military authorities and the State Department have learned from the prisoners themselves the full account of their captivity.

With the termination of the war, the atrocities that have been committed by the Japanese, their violations of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention and international law are matters which will be dealt with by the properly constituted authorities. The Department of State has in the past furnished to the appropriate authorities all information that can be used in bringing to justice the person or persons responsible for known violations and will continue in the future to make available such information as the prosecution of war criminals in the Far East will demand.

TEXT OF PROTESTS GIVEN

The full text of certain of the protests made by the State Department follows:

JUNE 21, 1944.

AMLEGATION,

Bern:

Request the Swiss Government to express to Gorge (the Swiss Minister at Tokyo) the thanks of the United States Government for having pointed out to the Japanese Government that Japan's adversaries naturally conclude from its persistent refusal to permit Swiss representatives to visit camps

in Japanese-occupied territory that conditions prevailing in the unvisited camps are not as they should be.

The Government of the United States has noted with interest Shigemitsu's (Japanese Foreign Minister) statement that he is endeavoring to bring about an improvement in the conditions under which American nationals are held in Japan and Japanese-occupied territories, and that the question of permitting visits to camps in occupied territories is being given consideration. Note has also been taken of Shigemitsu's characterization of the release of reports of the neglect and cruel treatment of Americans in Japanese custody as an atrocity campaign intended to discredit Japan.

The Government of the United States emphasizes, and desires Gorge so to inform the Japanese Government, that the published reports to which Shigemitsu objects are accounts of the sufferings of American nationals in Japanese-occupied territories that came into the hand of the American Government agencies from reliable sources. To end the publication of such accounts Japan has only to remove the conditions giving rise to such accounts and permit Swiss representatives so to inform the United States Government.

The Government of the United States is obliged to inform its citizens of the condition of its nationals in enemy custody. The continued refusals of the Japanese Government to permit visits by representatives of the protecting power to camps in Japanese-occupied territories leads naturally to the conclusion that conditions in these areas continue to remain unsatisfactory and such as to make Japan ashamed to have them observed by neutrals.

In giving reality to its numerous professions of its intent to apply humanitarian considerations in its treatment of prisoners of war and civilian internees and in making the improvement promised by Shigemitsu, the Japanese Government has at its command the most effective method of removing the causes of unfavorable reports and thereby preventing the future publication of such reports. When the Japanese Government accords to American nationals the humanitarian treatment it has promised and when it permits representatives of the Swiss Government to visit all places where American nationals are held, and to verify and confirm that their treatment is in accordance with promises of the Japanese Government, the United States Government will be in a position to reassure the relatives and friends of American nationals held by Japan with regard to their condition and treatment.

The United States Government hopes that the Japanese Government will be persuaded without further delay to enable the Swiss representatives to visit all detained nationals of the United States wherever detained. There would seem to be no reason why the Japanese Government should not permit such visits without prejudice to the juridical position taken by Japan on the question of representation of enemy interests.

HULL.

EXECUTION OF AIRMEN REPORTED

AMLEGATION, JULY 17, 1944.

Bern:

Please request Swiss to inform Gorge (Swiss Minister Tokyo) that a somewhat garbled broadcast by the Singapore radio station has been heard here which raises fears that American airmen who were engaged in a recent raid on Kyushu Island have been executed or are in danger of being executed. In the event that this report has not come to Gorge's attention previously or that he has not taken the matter up with the Japanese authorities, please request that he endeavor to learn the names of any American aviators who may have fallen into Japanese hands during recent operations over Japan, the nature of any charges against them, and whether any physical action against their persons has been taken or is about to be taken, and the nature thereof.

HULL.

POOR DIET PROTESTED

AMLEGATION, AUGUST.

Bern:

Request Swiss to inform the Japanese Government that this Government on the basis of reliable reports is gravely concerned with regard to the treatment being accorded American civilians in the camps in China, particularly the inadequacy of food, clothing, and medical supplies, and the failure of the authorities to provide for the maintenance of hygienic and sanitary conditions.

It has been reported that the diet provided by the Japanese authorities amounts to from 1,600 to 1,850 calories per day, that it is seriously lacking in protein, fats, and citrus fruits, and that the food situation is steadily deteriorating. Most of the internees are actively engaged in camp labor, yet the caloric value of the food supplied is considerably lower than the internationally established minimum standard. As a result, complaints of hunger are not confined to a few malcontents but are widespread throughout the camps.

In many instances the food is not only inadequate in quantity but the condition in which it is supplied is dangerous to the health of the community. The meat ration in all camps has been cut 30 percent and the form in which the meat is delivered makes it not only unpleasant to handle but difficult to prepare. Under normal conditions and by pure-food standards, the meat would be condemned as unsuitable for human consumption. Bread is often delivered to the camps in Shanghai coated with dust, in uncovered containers, a potentially dangerous state of affairs where enteric diseases (dysentery, typhoid, et cetera) are a major problem.

Lack of medical supplies

Lack of medical supplies exposes the internees to great risks. Through gifts of absolutely essential drugs, the internees were formerly able to overcome in some degree the negligence of the Japanese authorities. Gifts are no longer available and the internees are now in the position of being compelled to rely on the authorities in this vital matter. Occasionally, and not necessarily in correlation with their needs, the camps have received certain medical supplies from the authorities. Urgently needed drugs are, however, often long delayed in delivery and are in other instances never delivered at all. Much of the medicine, drugs, and equipment has been available locally. It would appear that the authorities, if they were so inclined, could arrange to deliver these supplies when they are needed and in the amounts required and without delay.

With much labor and considerable ingenuity, the internees have managed in most camps to establish limited hospital facilities, but failure on the part of the authorities to furnish adequate foodstuffs for invalid diets has made it impossible to take advantage of the full use of these facilities. With regard to hospitalization, the Japanese authorities in Shanghai have not facilitated but have even obstructed the efforts of the International Red Cross Committee and the Swiss consulate general by refusing in a number of instances to grant permission for hospitalization and to authorize payment for the cost involved.

The Japanese Government has also failed in its obligation to provide needed clothing and footwear. Many of the adult internees have worn out their shoes and the children have outgrown theirs. No provision has been made for replacement or repair. The clothing which the internees brought with them is wearing out and the authorities are not making adequate provision for replacements. Last winter when the camp buildings were but slightly heated, the authorities made no effort to supply warm clothing to those who were in need. The approach of another winter heightens the distress of the internees and gives urgency to the obligation of the Japanese authorities to furnish the internees with necessary clothing before the cold weather sets in.

A grave condition exists with regard to the sanitary situation. Cleanliness is a first line of defense against disease where sanitary facilities are as primitive as those which exist in the camps, but cleanliness cannot be maintained where adequate materials and equipment are not provided. The appeal of the internees for such supplies as buckets, shovels, brushes, mops, drain-pipe cleaners, rat poison, soap, and disinfectant is evidence of the extent of the failure of the authorities to provide the essentials. The Japanese Government must be aware that the lives of thousands of people are involved in its failure to make available the tools and supplies needed for maintaining the hygiene and cleanliness of the camps.

Sick and aged interned

The internment of the sick and aged at Chung Shan University is totally at variance with the humanitarian professions of the Japanese Government. Many of the internees were receiving regular medical treatment prior to their internment but this was ordered discontinued while at the same time no adequate provision was made for proper medical care in the camp. No attempt was made to furnish persons suffering from sprue, stomach ulcers, etc., with any form of special diet. No steps had been taken or preparations made before the internment of these people to make habitable the quarters assigned to them. Most of the rooms were in an unclean condition and the buildings in a state of disrepair.

Although the rooms of the Japanese guards were suitably heated, no heat was provided in the internees' quarters. No laundry facilities were provided and washroom facilities were inadequate. The lavatories were primitive and in an unsanitary condition. Adequate equipment by means of which it might have been possible to bring about an improvement in the sanitary condition of the camp was lacking. The poor quality and insufficiency of the food and the cold dampness of unheated rooms, combined with the dirt of their surroundings, caused severe suffering to the aged and ailing persons interned in this camp. Although a letter pointing out the deficiencies of the camp was submitted to the commandant, no steps were taken to remedy the situation.

Failure to make provision for essential needs and negligence in maintaining proper standards in the treatment of American nationals held in Japanese custody in China constitute grave transgressions and are serious violations not only of the letter but of the spirit of the Geneva Convention, the humanitarian provisions of which the Japanese Government has voluntarily undertaken to apply. The United States Government continues to expect that the Japanese Government will honor its commitments to observe the humanitarian provisions of the Geneva Convention and will give effect to its professions that it is according humane treatment to the American nationals in its custody.

Department desires to be informed of date of delivery of this communication to the Japanese Government, and thereafter to receive report of steps taken by Japanese Government to remedy situation and degree of amelioration accomplished.

HULL.

EVIDENCE OF TORTURE

The following protest was dispatched to the Japanese Government in August 1944:

"The Government of the United States has received conclusive evidence of the torture and decapitation of an American airman captured by the Japanese in the Aitape area, New Guinea. The airman was decapitated on March 24, 1944, by a Japanese civilian in the presence of an officer of the Japanese Army and 15 Japanese soldiers. The United States Government protests vigorously against the wanton, inhumane, and barbarous methods employed by the Japanese who participated in this base deed.

"It has been ascertained that the American airman in question parachuted to earth near Aitape on March 23, 1944, landed in the water and swam ashore. He was taken captive about 9 a. m. by Japanese troops near the mouth of the Waimegol Creek, approximately 12 miles east of Aitape. The flier had discarded all equipment except a notebook and a small knife and was wearing only a pair of trousers, belt, and socks when he swam ashore. Upon capturing the American flier the Japanese confiscated the prisoner's notebook and knife and bound his hands behind his back and commenced beating him with sticks. This beating continued until the afternoon of March 23 at which time the prisoner was taken to the quarters of the Aitape garrison commander, Kurita, at Korako village. Here beating was again resumed and continued throughout the night. At 7 o'clock the following morning the prisoner was taken back to the place of capture by Lieutenant Seto and a Japanese civilian named Inouye. There the American was again subjected to relentless beating until 3 o'clock in the afternoon at which time he was decapitated by Inouye with six slashes of the saber. The loud shouts of joy which emanated from the Japanese troops during the torture of the American flier indicate the sadistic character of his tormentors and executioners."

Names Japanese in killing

"The United States Government hereby charges that the following Japanese are guilty for the wanton murder of the American flier:

"First Lieutenant Kurita, commanding officer, Twenty-sixth Air Construction Unit.

"First Lieutenant Seto, second in command, Twenty-sixth Air Construction Unit. Lieutenant Seto was present at the time the American flier was decapitated.

"First Lieutenant Watanabe, third in command, Twenty-sixth Air Construction Unit.

"Inouye, the Japanese civilian who performed the decapitation. Inouye was the Japanese overseer of coolie laborers in the area in question at the time it was held by the Japanese armed forces.

"The United States Government holds the Japanese Government responsible for the perpetration of this crime and expects the prompt receipt of assurances from the Japanese Government that—

"1. All participants have been punished severely; and that

"2. Necessary steps to prevent the recurrence of such inhuman treatment of prisoners of war have been taken."

HULL.

SEGREGATION OF PRISONERS

AMLEGATION, SEPTEMBER 15, 1944.

Bern:

Request the Swiss Government to have Gorge deliver the following communication textually to the Japanese Government:

"The United States Government has been informed of an order issued on February 11, 1944, to the Japanese armed forces in Siam by the command of the One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Infantry Regiment, Thirty-first Division of the Japanese Imperial Army, to the effect that captured enemy air personnel are not to be treated as prisoners of war, that they are to be separated from other prisoners, that after being searched they are to be handed over the gendarmerie, and that they are to be severely punished, excepting those who can be put to some special use.

"The United States Government protests against this violation of the internationally agreed rules of warfare which guarantee to all captured personnel of belligerent forces the rights of prisoners of war. The United States Government insists that the Japanese Government fulfill its undertaking to apply the humane provisions of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention to the treatment of captured personnel without exception. The United States Government calls upon the Japanese Government to rescind the order in question and to restore to any captured American airmen who may have been deprived of them the full rights to which as prisoners of war they are entitled. By the international obligations it has undertaken, the Japanese Government may not declare these rights abolished or suspended."

HULL.

CIVILIAN'S HEALTH NEGLECTED

AMLEGATION, DECEMBER 4, 1944.

Bern:

Request Swiss Government to inform the Japanese Government that this Government is deeply concerned with regard to the condition of American civilians interned at Urawa, Futatabi, Kanagawa, and Koishikawaku.

It has been reliably reported that at Urawa the majority of internees are ill with stomach and intestinal ailments and all suffer from weakness and fatigue. The general debility of the group has been induced by a diet composed primarily of potatoes, rice and noodles and one in which oils, fats, proteins, sugar, and salt are badly needed. The building in which the American nationals are housed is only dimly lighted and no heat is provided. The Japanese Government has not replaced clothing which as long ago as January 1944 was worn and shabby. In addition, in violation of the primary rules of cleanliness and sanitation, the Japanese have neglected to furnish implements and materials necessary to keep the toilets constantly clean.

At Futatabi the disregard of the rudimentary laws of hygiene exposes the internees, who are losing weight and recover slowly from any illness, to grave risk. The Japanese authorities did not fumigate the camp buildings which are infested with vermin, bugs and lice; they have neglected the repair of broken or unserviceable sanitary installations and pay no heed to the urgent requirements of the internees for soap as well as for cleaning and disinfecting materials; they ignore the importance to the camp of an adequate and pure supply of water; they fail to issue warm clothing to the needy and the food, from which proteins and fats especially are lacking, is often spoiled and insects are found in it. It is evident that men living under such conditions cannot escape illness. The Japanese authorities, satisfied by routine medical visits every 3 or 4 weeks, rarely call a physician. His arrival is generally belated as access to the camp is difficult. Internees can only obtain medicaments and dental treatment if they have the money with which to pay for them.

Buildings unheated

At Kanagawa, where in winter the temperature drops to below zero, American nationals were installed in unheated buildings badly in need of repair and built only for summer use. Representations that the premises be made weatherproof have been refused although another winter is beginning. To add to the plight of the internees the Japanese authorities have failed to issue warm, suitable clothing and appropriate footgear. Rations, which in the beginning were not too inadequate, have dwindled to such an extent that the internees are losing weight and their constitutions are undermined. Hunger is prevalent. Nevertheless, the Japanese Government has rescinded permission, now that it is desperately needed, for the internees to purchase foodstuffs from outside at their own expense and no longer allow friends and relatives to bring food into camp.

At Koishikawaku the Japanese Government has not deemed it necessary to supply any soap for over a period of months and has disregarded wash basins that are out of order. The lighting is insufficient and, as in other camps where American civilians are interned, there is no infirmary and any dental work is at the expense of the internees.

Article 10 of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention provides that all prisoners shall be lodged in buildings or in barracks affording all possible guaranties of hygiene and healthfulness, and that quarters must be sufficiently heated and lighted. Article 11 provides that a sufficiency of potable water shall be furnished. Article 12 states that clothing, linen and footwear shall be furnished by the detaining power, that replacement and repairing of these effects must be assured regularly and that canteens shall be installed where food products and ordinary objects may be obtained at market price. Article 13 provides that all sanitary measures necessary shall be taken to assure the cleanliness and healthfulness of camps, and to prevent epidemics and also that prisoners shall have at their disposal installations conforming to sanitary rules and constantly maintained in a state of cleanliness. Article 14 provides that every camp shall have an infirmary to furnish every kind of attention needed and that expense of treatment shall be borne by the detaining power.

As conditions in civilian internment camps in Japan transgress in part or in totality the provisions cited above and as the Japanese Government voluntarily undertook to apply the humanitarian provisions of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention to civilian internees, the American Government expects that a prompt investigation be made of these matters and further expects that the Japanese Government will undertake to bring about an improvement to provide for the essential needs of the internees and to maintain proper standards in the treatment of American nationals held in Japanese custody.

STETTINIUS.

JANUARY 23, 1945.

AMLEGATION, *Bern:*

Request Swiss Government to have Gorge deliver the following message textually to the Japanese Government:

"The United States Government is gravely concerned with the treatment accorded to the American prisoners of war detained at Prisoner-of-War Camp, Kawasaki, No. 2. The treatment to which they are subjected is in distinct contravention to the internationally established humane standards of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention which the Japanese Government has repeatedly maintained it is applying to the treatment of prisoners of war.

"This Government has been reliably informed that the buildings in which the prisoners are housed are not only inadequately heated but that the windows of the buildings have been partially covered with boards so that both illumination and ventilation have been cut off. Article 10 specifies that prisoners shall be lodged in buildings affording all possible guaranties of hygiene and healthfulness and that their quarters must be sufficiently heated and lighted.

"This Government has also been informed that medicaments, anesthetics, bandages, and plaster which are essential for the treatment

of the sick are not sufficient and that necessary surgical instruments are lacking. In view of the necessity for treating the seriously ill and accident casualties at the camp, the lack of medicines and surgical equipment seriously endangers the lives of the men. Article 14 stipulates that every camp must have an infirmary where prisoners of war shall receive every kind of attention they need.

"This Government has been further informed that days of rest are accorded most irregularly to the prisoners of war. Article 30 states clearly that prisoners of war shall be allowed a rest of 24 consecutive hours every week.

"And, finally, this Government has been informed that before an impartial investigation establishes guilt, punishments are inflicted upon prisoners of war, and these punishments are severe and drastic. Article 46 expressly forbids corporal punishment. Aggravation of the conditions of labor by disciplinary measures is forbidden in article 32. By the provisions of article 59, disciplinary punishment may be ordered only by an officer provided with disciplinary powers in his capacity as a commander of the camp.

"The United States Government protests against the treatment of American prisoners of war herein set forth and demands that immediate steps be taken to remedy the situation. It further demands that a report of the action taken to right these wrongs be despatched to this Government."

Please request the Swiss Government to visit this camp again in the near future and report any improvement.

GREW.

CRUEL AND INHUMAN TREATMENT

AMLEGATION, MARCH 10, 1945.

Bern:

Request Swiss Government to communicate the following textually to the Japanese Government:

"American prisoners of war who survived the sinking on September 7, 1944, of a Japanese freighter on which they were being transported off the coast of Mindanao, Philippine Islands, have made comprehensive reports to the United States Government of the conditions under which American prisoners were held in the Philippines. These reports further corroborate the reports made earlier that the treatment accorded to prisoners of war in the Philippines has been consistently cruel and inhumane.

"In the present instance the United States Government protests vigorously with regard to the conditions of captivity under which 650 prisoners were held at the Lasang Air Field and the abuses to which they were systematically subjected. The United States Government charges that the Japanese authorities have violated the Japanese Government's commitment to apply to prisoners of war the provisions of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention, and to observe the basic principles of the Hague Convention.

"(1) Six hundred and fifty American prisoners of war were compelled to work on the Lasang Air Field, a known military installation.

"(2) Officer prisoners were forced to perform labor and noncommissioned officers were compelled to perform labor other than of a supervisory nature.

"(3) Officer prisoners were forced to perform menial and degrading tasks. In an effort to humiliate them they were forced to wash the clothes of the enlisted men.

"(4) Corporal punishment of utmost severity was inflicted. Upon one occasion Lieutenant Hosida forced prisoners to kneel for a long period with their shinbones on the sharp edge of railroad tracks in such a position that most of the weight of their bodies was carried by their shinbones. Afterward, the men were compelled to run barefooted on sharp coral gravel for several kilometers. On other occasions, individual prisoners returned to camp covered with blood as a result of having been beaten and kicked by Lieutenant Hosimoto.

"(5) The prisoners were forced to subsist on starvation rations. Food furnished to the prisoners was neither equal in quantity or quality to that given Japanese soldiers. Half the vegetable issue was usually delivered spoiled and unfit for human consumption. Meat and fish were rarely furnished. At times a carabao was butchered, but only the head and ribs were supplied to the 650 prisoners, the meat being retained by the 200 Japanese guards.

"(6) The latrines provided for the prisoners of war defied all established rules of sanitation. As the original placement of the latrines behind the prisoners' barracks proved offensive to the Japanese officers, the latrines were moved to a position close to and between the prisoners' barracks where they polluted the wells from which the prisoners' drinking water was drawn.

"(7) Prisoners were deprived of their shoes. On March 2, 1944, new shoes were issued to the prisoners from Red Cross supplies furnished by this Government. On or about April 8, 1944, the Japanese authorities compelled the prisoners to surrender their shoes and did not return them until August 20, 1944. Although the men repeatedly requested that their shoes be returned or that at least sandals be issued, their requests were ignored with the result that their feet became severely lacerated from the sharp coral on which they were forced to work.

"The abusive, cruel, and inhumane treatment which has characterized the administration of prisoner-of-war camps in the Philippines is affirmed unanimously by prisoners who have escaped from those camps.

"The United States Government demands that, in fulfillment of the obligations assumed to the Japanese Government with regard to Americans taken prisoner of war by Japan, that government take steps effectively to prevent the continuation in all Japanese prisoner-of-war camps of the inhumane practices that have disgraced Japan in its administration of prisoner-of-war camps in the Philippines."

GREW.

MARCH 10, 1945.

AMLEGATION,

Bern:

Request Swiss Government to communicate following message textually to the Japanese Government:

"On September 7, 1944, a Japanese freighter carrying 750 American prisoners of war formerly held at the Davao Penal Colony was torpedoed and sunk off Liley, Sindangan Point, Zamboanga Province, Mindanao, Philippine Islands.

"On the basis of irrefutable testimony furnished by prisoner-survivors of the sunken vessel the United States Government emphatically protests the cruel, inhumane treatment to which these prisoners were subjected by their Japanese captors, the inhuman conditions under which they were transported and the outrages committed against them.

"(1) On August 20, 1944, when the prisoners were first embarked at Tabunco pier, 400 men were crowded into one hold and 350 into another. In these accommodations it was impossible for the men to lie down and barely possible for them to sit upright.

"(2) The hatches were almost continually battened down. Innumerable men fell unconscious in the fetid and stifling atmosphere of the unventilated holds and all were reduced to a state of complete exhaustion. The appeals made to the Japanese authorities that more air be admitted to the holds were maliciously ignored.

"(3) Drinking water furnished to the prisoners was grossly insufficient with the result that the men suffered severe dehydration.

"(4) The prisoners' rations were at a starvation level. The food consisted of a meager portion of rice and a small quantity of soup made from spoiled vegetables.

"(5) The prisoners were confined under these conditions for 15 consecutive days, 10 of which were spent in the harbor at Zamboanga.

"(6) On September 4 the prisoners were transferred at Zamboanga to another ship where 500 men were crowded into one hold and 150 into another. The conditions under which they were confined on the second ship were even more intolerable than those on the first one.

"(7) The Japanese authorities failed to provide sufficient flotation equipment and safety devices to safeguard the lives of the men who were being transported."

Prisoners Machine-Gunned

"(8) The behavior of the Japanese officers after the vessel was torpedoed was savage. Under the orders of Lieutenant Hosimoto the guards machine-gunned prisoners in the sea, fired upon and threw grenades upon those hopelessly trapped in the holds, and after seizing the lifeboats for themselves continued firing upon prisoners struggling in the water.

"(9) Twenty-nine prisoners were recaptured from the sea by the Japanese, taken to another vessel where they were individually shot and their bodies thrown into the sea. This massacre was carried out under the order of Lieutenant Hosimoto.

"These most gross and shocking violations of elementary human decency are wholly inconsistent with the numerous professions of the Japanese Government that it is according humanitarian treatment to prisoners of war. The Japanese Government has stated in justification of other violations of its undertakings and of common decency that the United States Government has based its protests on misunderstandings of the facts. The United States Government has not misunderstood the facts. The persons who reported these outrages themselves suffered them. These incidents do not involve exceptions to Japan's undertakings in respect of the Geneva Convention that may be excusable on grounds of military necessity.

"On the contrary, they involve unnecessary derogations arising from wilfull disregard by Japanese officers of the undertakings and reputation of their country.

"The United States demands that the Japanese Government take effective measures to insure against the recurrence of similar violations of its undertakings to apply the humane standards of the Geneva Convention to American prisoners of war and mete out fitting punishment to Lieutenant Hosimoto and other violators of this undertaking. The United States Government expects that the Japanese Government will communicate to it at the earliest opportunity the steps which it has taken to prevent further incidents of this kind and the punishment that it has inflicted upon those guilty of the grave offenses cited.

"In contrast to the matters protested in this communication, there stands out conspicuously the exemplary behavior displayed by a Japanese doctor aboard the vessel. The humane and compassionate conduct of this doctor who, while aiding his own countrymen, benevolently assisted American prisoners of war from the holds in which they were trapped has won the commendation of the survivors as it must of all humane men."

GREW.

DECAPITATION OF AN AIRMAN

AMLEGATION, MARCH 31, 1945.

Bern:

Request Swiss Government to communicate verbatim to Japanese Government the following message:

"The United States Government has been informed of the message from the Japanese

Foreign Minister that he could not admit the charges of the American Government with regard to the capture and decapitation by the Japanese forces of an American airman on March 24, 1944, in the Aitape area, New Guinea. It has been informed that the Japanese Foreign Minister stated that investigation of this incident revealed that no Japanese forces corresponding to the description furnished in the United States Government's protest were stationed in the region of Aitape.

"The United States Government finds inacceptable the reply made by the Japanese Government."

The full names of the three Japanese officers who were in the Aitape area and who the United States Government charges as guilty in the perpetration of the murder of the American flier are as follows: First Lt. Takea Kurita, First Lt. Kosaku Seto, and First Lt. Kiehel Watanabe. The unit to which these officers were assigned at the time of the offense was the Fourth Air Construction Unit.

The reply made by the Japanese Foreign Minister in no way diminishes the responsibility of the Japanese Government for this deed. The United States Government therefore expects that assurances will be forthcoming from the Japanese Government that this crime is being further investigated and that necessary steps to prevent the recurrence of such inhuman treatment of prisoners of war have been taken. The United States Government expects to receive from the Japanese Government assurances that all participants, including officers, enlisted men, and the Japanese civilian Inouye, have been punished severely and to be informed of the punishment inflicted.

STETTINIUS.

MURDER OF FOUR AMERICANS

AMLEGATION, APRIL 6, 1945.
Bern:

Request Swiss Government to communicate the following message to Gorge to be delivered textually to the Japanese Government:

"The United States Government has received conclusive evidence of the murder by the Japanese authorities of four American citizens, Carroll Calkins Grinnell, Alfred Francis Duggleby, Ernest Emil Johnson, and Clifford Lawrence Larson, civilian internees in Santo Tomas Internment Camp, Manila. Mr. Grinnell was the spokesman of the Santo Tomas Internment Camp.

"These four American nationals were arrested and imprisoned within the Santo Tomas Internment Camp by the Japanese military police on December 23, 1944. No information was ever given to the camp authorities with respect to the charges for which these men were held. Mr. Johnson was removed from the camp on or about December 24, 1944. Messrs. Grinnell, Duggleby, and Larson were removed from the camp on January 5, 1945. On December 31, 1944, Mr. Johnson was seen at the military police station at the corner of Corbabitarte and A. Mabini Streets. The other three men were never again seen alive. Their bodies together with 10 unidentified corpses were found buried in a field near the headquarters of the Japanese military police. The 14 bodies were wired together in groups of a few each. A medical examination of the bodies determined that death had occurred on or about January 15, 1945.

"In view of the fact that the Japanese Government undertook to apply the provisions of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention to civilian internees insofar as those provisions are adaptable, the murder of these American citizens constitutes a flagrant violation of the obligations undertaken by the Japanese Government.

"The United States Government demands that the unwarranted and despotic action of the Japanes authorities concerned be immediately investigated, that those who ordered and committed the acts herein reported shall be brought to full account for their crimes, and that the findings of the investigation and the date of the punishments shall be sent to this Government. The United States Government further demands that the Japanese Government shall take all steps necessary to prevent in any territory under Japanese control a repetition of such barbarous and arbitrary deeds which are in utter disregard of the Japanese Government's commitment to apply the humanitarian standards of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention to interned American nationals in its custody."

ACHESON.

PROTEST OVER PRISONERS' WORK

In May 1945, the following telegram was sent to the American Legation at Bern:

"The Swiss Government should be asked to have its Minister in Tokyo deliver a strong protest to the Japanese Government on the following lines:

"Reliable information received by the United States Government indicate that American prisoners of war held by the Japanese must work for long hours on work which has a direct connection with the war. At the naval docks on Tokyo Bay in the vicinity of the Shinagawa station they are compelled to work. They must also work inside the fortifications at Shinagawa. At Osaka and at Tokyo the prisoners are subject to a harsh and rigid regime causing them physical suffering and involving humiliation. Guards are permitted to beat them.

"The United States Government vigorously protests against the treatment given American prisoners of war by the Japanese Government. American prisoners of war are given treatment widely at variance with the Geneva Convention which the Japanese Government undertook to apply to Americans in its hands. Treatment is also at variance with the provisions of The Hague Convention of 1907 which the Japanese Government ratified. Moreover, the Japanse Government in a memorandum of May 3, 1944, delivered to the United States Government through the Spanish Embassy, stated that it applies The Hague Convention in the treatment of prisoners of war and civilian internees.

"Article 31 of the Geneva Convention provides that no direct relation with war operations shall be involved in labor which prisoners of war are compelled to do. Article 6 of the Hague Convention states that the work on which prisoners are employed must not be excessive and shall not be connected with the operation of the war. Article 4 of the Hague Convention as well as article 2 of the Geneva Convention provides that prisoners of war are not in the power of the individuals or the corps who have effected their capture but are in the power of the hostile government, and they must be given humane treatment.

"The United States Government warns the Japanese Government that the Japanese Government and individuals concerned with the treatment of prisoners of war will be held responsible for their treatment and for failure to comply with the provisions of the Hague Convention and the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention. The United States Government demands that the conditions described in this telegram be immediately rectified."

GREW.

SOME CAMPS NOT INSPECTED

MAY 7, 1945.

AMLEGATION,
Bern:

The Department has received no reports of visits since 1943 by representatives either of the protecting power or of the International Red Cross committee to the following camps in Japan: Kobe City Camp, Hirohata Divisional Camp, Chikko Camp, Kanagawa-Yokohama Camp, Yokohama City Camp, and Hiraoka Camp.

No reports of visits later than those on the dates listed herewith have been received on the following camps: Fukuoka Camps Nos. 12 and 17, April 24–25, 1944; Hakodate Main and Sub Camps, April 28, 1944, Nigata, May 9, 1944; Osaka Sub Camp, No. 11, July 6, 1944; Kawasaki Nos. 2 and 5, July 10, 1944; and Kobe Military Hospital, October 4, 1944.

Judging from reports received, only Omori Camp and Shinagawa Hospital have been visited in 1945.

It is believed that in the Tokyo-Yokohama group, in the Kobe-Osaka group, in the Zentzuji group, in the Fuguoka group, and in the Hakodate group there are prisoners-of-war camps that have never been officially reported by the Japanese authorities and which therefore have never been visited.

Request Swiss Government to have Gorge make strong representations for protecting power and international Red Cross Committee representatives to be permitted to visit and to report at once upon all camps in Japan where American prisoners of war may be held. Department is seriously concerned that so many camps have not been visited for a year and also that apparently camps exist in Japan which have never once been visited.

GREW.

PRISONERS TRANSFERRED

MAY 7, 1945.

AMLEGATION,
Bern:

It was reported to this Government that on October 14, 1944, 18 high-ranking officers and 2 sergeants of the United States Army were transferred from Formosa to Mukden. It was further reported that on November 14, 1944, 127 officers and 36 sergeants and privates were transferred from Formosa to Mukden. The report of the Intercross visit to the Mukden prisoner of war camp on December 6, 1944, makes no mention of these men and the number of American officers reported to be in the camp at that time is 15. It is evident, therefore, that the officers from Formosa are not at the prisoner of war camp in Mukden which the Japanese Government officially reported to this Government. The United States Government urgently desires to know if there is a second prisoner of war camp in Mukden. If such a camp exists, request Gorge to make strong representations to obtain authorization for an immediate visit. If there is not a second prisoner of war camp in Mukden, the United States Government desires to know the whereabouts of the American officers and men mentioned above.

Request Swiss Government to have Gorge protest most emphatically to the Japanese Government regarding the welfare and whereabouts of the above officer-prisoners of war and demand that an immediate report be made concerning them.

GREW.

MURDER OF MEN WHO SURRENDERED

In May 1945 the Department dispatched the following message to the American Legation at Bern:

"Please inform the Swiss Government that the United States Government requests that Gorge transmit to the Japanese Government the following protest:

"In the possession of the United States Government are orders which were issued by the Japanese military authorities. These orders call for the coldly calculated murder in the Philippine Islands of individuals surrendering to or captured by the Japanese military or naval forces. The method and proper time for the execution of these deeds is described. The orders, issued by the Kaki Force Headquarters and Fourteenth Army Headquarters attached to the Ishibashi unit, bear official seals and are dated January 12 to March 4, 1944. The Ninth Infantry Regiment of the Kaki 6554 Force have reproduced these instructions which enjoin secrecy; the importance of suppressing all proof of the preconceived crimes is emphasized.

"By order of the Japanese military authorities surrendered personnel and captured prisoners of war, with the exception of individuals needed for minute investigation, are to be put to death on the field of battle. Their remains are to be counted with those of soldiers killed in combat.

"It is also explicitly stated in the orders that when it is necessary to take surrendered personnel or prisoners of war into custody for questioning, the local inhabitants must not be aware of it and that the victims are to be put to death at some isolated spot when questioning and investigations have been completed. Adequate measures are to be taken to guarantee absence of police or civilian witnesses and the utmost precautions used to prevent any evidence of the crime. When liquidation has taken place, it will appear that the victims have been sent to some distant area. In order not to arouse popular sentiment this deception is necessary, the order states callously.

"The United States Government also has in its possession an order of the Doi Unit Headquarters. This order is dated March 1944. In it are instructions to the effect that the divisional commander has ordered prisoners to be liquidated but from March 1944 onward they are to be transferred to regimental headquarters. They will be dealt with there.

"For these inhuman and barbarous orders which Japanese military authorities have issued and which flagrantly violate the rules of land warfare accepted among civilized nations, the Japanese Government is held responsible by the Government of the United States. Only with the deepest horror can civilized people of the world comprehend a deliberately thought-out policy of such brutality as the orders portray. It is demanded by the United States Government that the Japanese Government undertake to revoke immediately all such orders. Furthermore, the United States Government demands that the Japanese Government give effective guarantees that all prisoners now held by the Japanese and all who may be taken at any future date shall be shielded from injury and adequately protected and shall at no time be exposed to the perils of such brutish treatment as these orders enjoin.

"The evil of the officials and of the men, not only those who issued but also those who carried out these orders, is condemned by the United States Government. This Government announces its fixed intention to see that all officers and men as well as all other individuals of whatsoever rank or service who have participated in these inhuman and wicked measures are brought to judgment.

"The Japanese Government is solemnly warned that, if the Japanese military authorities persist in performing the outrages ordered in the instructions, which violate civilization's common laws, or, in violation of the solemn commitments of the Japanese Government, cause helpless prisoners of war to endure other criminally barbarous acts, the American Government will also hold responsible, personally as well as officially, officers and men who engaged therein. They shall be brought to complete and full punishment at the appropriate time."

GREW.

MASSACRE OF 150 PRISONERS

MAY 19, 1945.

AMLEGATION, *Bern:*

Please request Swiss to transmit verbatim to Japanese Government following message:

"The brutal massacre on December 14, 1944, of 150 American prisoners of war at Puerto Princesa, Palawan, Philippine Islands, by the personnel of the Ogawa Tai Construction Corps has profoundly shocked the Government and the people of the United States.

"At noon of that day the prisoners who had been detailed to work on a nearby airfield were recalled to camp. Following upon a series of air-raid alarms the Japanese guards forced the prisoners into air-raid shelters within the camp compound. The shelters were tunnels some 75 feet long with openings at each end. About 2 o'clock in the afternoon 50 to 60 Japanese guards armed with rifles and machine guns, and carrying buckets of gasoline and lighted torches, approached the shelters. They emptied the gasoline into the openings of the tunnels and hurled the blazing torches after it. Violent explosions followed. The victims, enveloped in flames and screaming in agony, swarmed from the shelters only to be mowed down by machine guns or attacked with bayonets. Four officers who had sought shelter elsewhere suffered a similar fate. One of them, emerging in flames from his retreat, approached a Japanese officer and pled that the carnage be stopped. He was ruthlessly shot down. In order to insure that no living prisoners remained in the shelters, the guards fired the tunnels with dynamite charges.

"About 40 prisoners succeeded in escaping from the compound by throwing themselves over a 50-foot cliff onto the beach below. Landing barges patrolling the bay and sentries on the shore fired upon them. Many moaning in agony were buried alive by their captors. One, who had reached the water and struck out to sea, was recaptured and brought back to land which Japanese soldiers, prodding him with bayonets, forced him to walk along the beach. A Japanese guard poured gasoline upon the prisoner's foot and set fire to it. Ignoring his entreaties that he be shot, the Japanese soldiers deliberately set fire to his other foot and to both his hands. They mocked and derided him in his suffering and then bayoneted him until he collapsed. Thereupon they poured gasoline over his body and watched the flames devour it.

"Such barbaric behavior on the part of the Japanese armed forces is an offense to all civilized people. The Japanese Government cannot escape responsibility for this crime. The United States Government demands that appropriate punishment be inflicted on all those who directed or participated in it. It expects to receive from the Japanese Government notification that such punishment has been inflicted. The United States Government further demands that the Japanese Government take such action as may be necessary to forestall the repetition of offenses of so heinous a nature and assure the United States Government that such outrages will not again be inflicted upon American prisoners in Japanese custody."

GREW.

SUMMARY EXECUTION PROTESTED

MAY 19, 1945.

AMLEGATION,

Bern:

Please request Swiss Legation to transmit following textually to Japanese Government:

"The United States Government charges the Japanese Government with the wanton murder of George J. Louis at the Los Banos Internment Camp, Philippine Islands, on January 28, 1945.

"Mr. Louis, having left the camp to purchase food was shot, but not (repeat not) fatally, at 6:55 a. m. on January 28 as he was returning to camp. An appeal by internees to remove Mr. Louis to the camp hospital was denied by the Japanese authorities. At 7:10 a. m. three internees were summoned to the office of Major Iwanaka, the camp commandant, and informed by him that Mr. Louis' execution must be completed, since he had ordered that guards shoot until they kill any person violating the camp boundaries.

"A committee of internees interceded with the camp commandant to stay the execution of Mr. Louis but the commandant was adamant. Mr. Louis, still alive, was carried by guards on an improvised stretcher to a clump of bamboo outside the camp grounds and shot through the head.

"The United States Government most vigorously protests the arbitrary action of Major Iwanaka in carrying out the execution of Mr. Louis as being in direct violation of articles 47, 50, 51, 52, and 60 through 67 of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention and a repudiation of the humanitarian standards which the Japanese Government has professed it is maintaining in its treatment of American nationals in its custody.

"In the early dawn it might be conceivable that the guard could not discern that Mr. Louis was returning to the camp and that the guard fired the first shot believing he was preventing a possible escape. There is no justification, however, for the summary and cold-blooded execution of Mr. Louis an hour and a half later.

"The United States Government demands that Major Iwanaka be brought to full account for this crime and expects that the Japanese Government will notify it of the punishment inflicted upon him."

GREW.

GUARD BROKE PRISONERS' ARMS

MAY 24, 1945.

AMLEGATION,

Bern:

Please request Swiss Government to have Gorge deliver textually to Japanese Government the following message:

"The United States Government refers to its protest regarding the massacre of 150 prisoners of war at Puerto Princesa, Palawan, Philippine Islands, and further charges that the Japanes Government in its administration of that camp has most shamefully violated its commitment to apply to American prisoners of war in its custody the humanitarian standards of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention. During their incarceration in the camp the prisoners were subjected to the following mistreatment:

"1. The prisoners were given only the most meager rations. Those foodstuffs which they did receive were often scarcely edible. Despite the inadequacy of their diet, the prisoners were not permitted to pick fruits and coconuts on the trees surrounding the camp.

"2. When two prisoners, to allay their hunger, picked a papaya from a tree whose branches hung within the camp compound, the Japanese Mess Sergeant Nishitone broke the left arm of each man with an iron bar.

"3. On another occasion, when a prisoner complained of the food furnished, Nishitoni threw boiling tea at him, inflicting third degree burns on his feet. The prisoner received no medical attention.

"4. In December 1942, for the minor offense of rifling a small quantity of food, six prisoners were forced to stand with their arms around tree trunks while the Japanese guard beat them in the small of the back, first with a small iron whip and then with a heavy pole. They were further mauled and beaten by Sergeant Major Tomiko until they became unconscious. The six prisoners were later sent to Manila for trial. No record of the trial was ever communicated to the United States Government.

"5. Japanese guards commonly employed brutal means to exact the greater possible work of the men. On one occasion a Japanese guard struck a prisoner of war on the head with a pickax handle when he could not meet the unreasonable work demands made upon him.

"6. American prisoners of war were forced to work on the construction of a military airfield from August 1942 to December 14, 1944, and during bombing raids on this military objective were compelled to continue their work.

"7. From the American Red Cross medical supplies received at the camp in January 1944 the prisoners of war received only adhesive tape, gauze, and sulfa drugs. All other drugs

and medicines were pilfered by the Japanese guards and officers.

"8. Two prisoners who attempted to escape in June 1943 were severely beaten, then taken away and never seen again. The Japanese commanding officer of the camp issued an order that for every successful escape by a prisoner of war others would be shot.

"9. During an air raid on November 29, 1944, a prisoner suffered severe concussion of the brain and became paralyzed. The Japanese authorities provided only a handful of cotton in treatment. At the time of the air-raid alarm on December 14, 1944, his fellow prisoners carried him on a litter to an air-raid shelter where he with the other Americans was massacred.

"The United States Government repeats that it expects the Japanese Government to impose upon those responsible for the maltreatment of American prisoners of war the punishment which their criminal behavior merits and demands that the Japanese Government take all necessary steps to compel its subjects to fulfill the obligations assumed by it to accord humane treatment to prisoners of war.

"The United States Government expects an early reply by the Japanese Government as to the action taken by it to punish the individuals responsible for the brutal acts described herein and the measures it has taken to prevent similar acts of cruelty in camps in which American nationals are detained."

GREW.

JUNE 8, 1945.

AMLEGATION,
Bern:

Request Gorge to deliver the following message textually to the Japanese Government and to inform the Department of the date of its delivery:

"The United States Government has been reliably informed that the civilian internees in the Shanghai civilian assembly centers are in grave danger of starvation. It is reported that the Japanese Government has from the beginning of the year steadily decreased the food deliveries to the centers. It is reported the internees receive 1 meal daily consisting of approximately 1 ounce of meat, occasionally substituted by fish or powdered eggs, 3 to 4 ounces of vegetable, 1 medium-size potato, 1 small beet, and 12 ounces of black bread. The internees receive neither tea nor other beverages nor any other food products than those above-mentioned.

"The failure of the Japanese Government to furnish the internees with sufficient food cannot be attributed to food shortages since the supplies of foodstuffs controlled by the Japanese authorities in Shanghai remain plentiful. The Japanese Government, were it so inclined, could arrange to deliver foodstuffs in the amounts required and without delay. Urgent representations have resulted in no improvements by the local Japanese authorities who openly admit the inadequacy of the credits made available by the Japanese Government for provisioning the camps.

"The Japanese Government entered into a solemn obligation by agreement with the Government of the United States to observe the humane standards of the Geneva Convention in the treatment of civilian internees and prisoners of war in its custody. By its refusal to permit the repatriation of American nationals it has further obligated itself to safeguard them from starvation and death.

"The Government of the United States calls again upon the Japanese Government to carry out its agreement to observe the humane standards of the Geneva Convention and to give effect to its many public and solemn declarations to the nations and peoples of the world that it is according humane treatment to the civilian internees and prisoners of war in its custody.

"The United States Government demands that the Japanese Government without delay put forth exceptional efforts to remedy the grave food situation in the civilian assembly centers at Shanghai and in any other civilian or prisoners-of-war camps where these conditions may prevail, at present unknown to this Government. The United States Government demands the Japanese Government's solemn assurance that this has been done.

"Should the Japanese Government continue to deprive civilian internees and prisoners of war in its custody of the food necessary to safeguard them from starvation and maintain them in health, the United States Government hereby solemnly declares that it will hold personally and officially responsible for this crime all of the officials of the Japanese Government, regardless of position or status, who have participated therein either through neglect or from willful intent and will in due course bring them to judgment. It solemnly declares that it will visit upon all such individuals the punishment which is their due."

GREW.

To substantiate the foregoing statements, I submit an article which appeared in today's New York Times, and which reads as follows:

DOOLITTLE FLIERS DESCRIBE "HELL" OF 40 MONTHS AS WAR PRISONERS—THREE OR FOUR RESCUED ACCOUNT FOR ALL BUT THREE OF ORIGINAL TOKYO RAIDERS—LAST SAW COMRADES DURING TRIAL FOR LIFE

(By Sidney Shalett)

WASHINGTON, September 5.—Three of the original "Doolittle raiders," who first bombed Tokyo on April 18, 1942, told here today of their nearly 40 months of hell in solitary confinement at a Japanese prison camp from which they were rescued 15 days ago. Their gaunt and prematurely aged faces bore silent witness to the suffering and privation they endured.

A fourth member of the liberated party was left in a Chinese hospital, too weak to travel. This leaves only three of Lt. Gen. (then Lt. Col.) James H. Doolittle's original party of 80 unaccounted for.

The three men unaccounted for are First Lt. William Glover Farrows, of Washington, D. C.; First Lt. Dean Hallmark, of Dallas, Tex., and Sgt. Harold A. Spatz, of Lebo, Kans.

Whether any or all of these men are the ones that President Roosevelt revealed in April 1943 had been executed by the Japanese still has not been made known. All other members of the Doolittle party, however, either have returned to safety or are known to be dead from other causes.

The liberated trio said today that they last saw the three missing men in a Tokyo courtroom on August 28, 1942.

Appearing at a War Department press conference today were Capt. Robert L. Hite, 25 years old, of Earth, Tex.; Capt. Cay Nielsen, 28, of Hyrum, Utah, and Sgt. Jacob D. Deshazer, 32, of Salem, Oreg. The two captains had been first lieutenants until they went in to see Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, deputy commanding general of the Army Air Forces, before their press conference. He gave them an extra bar on the spot and also an extra stripe for the sergeant.

DENY WITNESSING EXECUTION

All three men explicitly denied that they had any knowledge whatsoever of any execution of their colleagues by the Japanese. A Washington Post story this morning alleged that they had been forced to witness the execution of some of their colleagues by a Japanese firing squad.

The liberated men cleared up the fate of several of the Doolittle fliers on whom exact information previously was unknown. Second Lt. George Barr, of Madison, Wis., who was rescued with them, is in a Chungking hospital suffering from beriberi caused by insufficient diet. First Lt. Robert J. Meder, of Lakewood, Ohio, who had been imprisoned with them, died last December. He had been reduced to a mere skeleton by the starvation diet in the Japanese prison camp, but his last known words on the day he died were:

"I still am strong enough to lick this whole guard force around us."

Sgt. William J. Dieter, of Tule Lake, Calif., and Corp. Donald E. Fitzmaurice, of Lincoln, Nebr., previously reported as missing in action, are dead, Captain Nielsen said. They rode on the bomber of which he was navigator and he saw their bodies on the China shore where they were washed up.

Captain Hite was the copilot of a B-25 that left the deck of the old carrier *Hornet* to participate in the audacious raid of April 1942. Sergeant Deshazer was his bombardier. Captain Nielsen was navigator on another bomber.

ALL BEATEN AND TORTURED

All were captured following harrowing experiences after having bailed out in China. They were taken to Tokyo the same month and for nearly 2 months were questioned by the Japanese, who wanted principally to know what bases they had flown from.

"All were beaten and tortured by their Japanese interrogators," a War Department statement said.

The three men told of these beatings at the press conference today. All three had close-cropped prison haircuts; they still are underweight; their faces are drawn and they have distinct creases in their foreheads. The eyes of Captain Hite and Sergeant Deshazer were sunken, while Captain Nielsen's dark eyes had an almost feverish appearance. All three of the men seemed shaken and far from alert; their responses to questions were slow.

This is another reason why America should retain the secrets of the atomic bomb, as well as the supply of these bombs now on hand, keep the machinery for manufacturing them oiled and in order, maintain the strongest air force in the world, and a navy second to none, in order that we may be able to more easily help to maintain peace among the nations of the earth, and guarantee that our glorious young men who gave their lives in this conflict did not die in vain.

This Is the Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "This Is the Victory," prepared by the Chaplain of the Senate and published in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE VICTORY

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Chaplain, United States Senate; minister, Foundry Methodist Church)

Flashing around this torn and tortured world is the great glad tidings for which anguished hearts have eagerly waited—victory. The victory symbolized for threatened or enslaved multitudes by two fingers held high,

shaped as a V. That conquering sign has spelled victory in darkest days, across all barriers and in all languages. That victory for which free men have agonized through ghastly years of blood and sweat and tears is here—the victory for which valiant young knights by the millions have dared the skies and seas, stormed the beaches and gallantly marched into the jaws of death.

At awful cost, it is a victory both total and complete. The irresistible might of Allied arms has forced the unconditional surrender of the barbarous powers of darkness whose symbols were a twisted cross and a rising sun.

It is over, over there, across both the Atlantic and the Pacific, and the embattled youth—those for whom blue stars have not changed to gold—are coming home.

Of course, the first ecstatic note is jubilation. Dated today seem the words of the ancient prophet to those who boasted that they were safely barricaded behind a lie: "Your covenant with death shall be annulled, your agreement with hell shall not stand, your refuge of lies shall be swept away—you shall be trodden down. The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

More people, under all skies, will rejoice at the carrying out of that righteous sentence than ever before have found their cup of grateful joy so filled to the brim since the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God clapped their hands for joy.

But after jubilation another mood must capture our hearts, if this is indeed to be the victory. It is contrition. For not by our own merit and strength have we gotten us the victory. To thy knees, O Israel! For God's is the kingdom and the power and the glory.

Victory is a holy and solemn hour in which to prostrate ourselves in the dust of our own unworthiness and bow meekly at the altar of confession.

This is the victory—that we be given the grace of penitence. For we have missed the shining mark. We have denied and betrayed the very principles we profess. We have played Judas to democracy. Our ragged pride and our senseless prejudice have been megaphones through which we thanked God that we are not as others.

If we are to survive our own triumph, here is God's recipe for enduring peace: "If my people shall humble themselves and pray, and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear and will forgive their sins and will heal their land."

Then out of contrition must spring a dedication which will answer the one vital question: What shall we as victors do with this victory? What of the future for the United Nations, for the defeated nations with their warped minds, and for the uprooted multitudes groping blindly across old divisions and frontiers, feeling their way in the dark with two fingers in the air? What is the victory to mean?

Victory brings us not to Utopia's golden goal, but to the crossroads of destiny and to a cross of vicarious sacrifice. We must choose now, for ourselves and our civilization, life or death, the blessing or the curse. Only moral and spiritual resources now can save us from national and global suicide.

If we go on with conscience split from science and morals split from knowledge, then the split atom in the hands of godless men may yet blow our world to bits.

We must take sides with that which is morally excellent rather than with that which is politically expedient. When great ideas whose hour has struck beckon us to be their servant we must give ourselves not to the dead past but to the living future, when in the shared plenty of the good earth, social and industrial relations shall lose their hard antagonisms and become the hallowed cooperation of comrades for the weal of all. For if this really is the victory, it must prove itself at last to have been victory not only for the united and overrun nations, but for all the peoples of the earth.

So may it be fulfilled that this is the victory that overcomes not just the Japanese and the Germans, but overcomes the world, even our faith in the vision for which brave men have died.

Thus may we bear our full part in freedom's crowning hour that we may tell our children's children, who will live in the light of the new day that we shall not see at its zenith, "I saw the powers of darkness put to flight. I saw the morning break."

AUGUST 27, 1945.

The FEPC—Correspondence Between Hon. Theodore G. Bilbo, of Mississippi, and Miss Flora J. Cooke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Chicago Sun for August 24, 1945. The article relates to correspondence between the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and Miss Flora J. Cooke, of Chicago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTED EDUCATOR GIVES SENATOR POINTERS ON HISTORY AND CHIVALRY

(By John McGrath)

Miss Flora J. Cooke, long retired after nearly a half century of teaching, went back to the schoolhouse recently to teach a lesson in chivalry and Americanism to THEODORE G. BILBO, United States Senator from Mississippi.

She took her books, her chalk, her pointer and her heart with her. They served her well.

Miss Cooke, who taught at the Chicago Teachers College from 1889 to 1899 and who was principal of the Francis W. Parker (private) school from 1901 to 1934, is the grand old lady of education not only in Chicago but across the Nation, as well. She is 80 years old.

On July 5 last she wrote Senator BILBO saying that "with many others" she felt "very indignant" about, and wanted to make a "vigorous protest" against, his 3-day filibuster in connection with the Fair Employment Practice Committee (FEPC) appropriation then before Congress.

She got back the following letter from BILBO, dated July 6, written on the stationery of the United States Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, of which the Senator is chairman:

"I have read your letter of July 5, and I must say it is interesting. I have read the Declaration of Independence, and I have also read the Constitution, but did you know that all delegates who wrote and adopted the Declaration of Independence and all the delegates who wrote the Constitution of 1787 owned slaves?

"George Washington, 'the Father of Our Country,' had some white slaves at the time he presided over the Convention, and how you Negroes can get it in your heads that any part of the Declaration or the Constitution covered your case is beyond me.

"Your home is in West Africa, and I am making arrangements so you can go over and settle down for life—so you can be in a land where you won't get so damnably indignant at a white man who is doing his duty for his country."

The letter closes with the flourishing signature of the Senator, doubly underlined.

Declaring in her 8-page typewritten reply that she had "never before seen so many venomous misstatements of fact and so much pomposity packed into three short paragraphs," Miss Cooke said:

"Your first mistake, Mr. Bilbo, was the least important one. You assumed that I was a Negro and therefore you were called upon ruthlessly and insultingly to put me in my place. As it happens, I am a white woman. Nevertheless, I am just as rightfully, or, in your words, just as 'damnably indignant' as if I were a Negro."

Being white, she said, "gives me the same right—no more, no less—that any loyal Negro citizen possesses to question and protest unfair acts performed even by a Congressman who is a duly elected public servant of our Government, especially charged to promote the general welfare."

That out of the way, Miss Cooke proceeded:

"I doubt, Mr. Bilbo, that you will threaten to send me back to England where my people came from several centuries ago. Yet you have as much right to do that as to try to send Negro Americans to Africa. You say, thinking me to be Negro:

" 'Your home is in west Africa and I am making arrangements so that you can go over and settle down for life'—

"That would be an interesting statement if true. But, Mr. Bilbo, who gave you authority to make these 'arrangements'? One wonders with whom you have made them." She added:

"I believe that, if I decide to make your letter public (which I am urged to by good citizens to do) containing the statement above over your signature, Uncle Sam and a large majority of American citizens will consider it a most stimulating and revealing news item of national interest, which you might well be called upon to explain and prove, or to retract.

"Perhaps there is still time for you to change your attitude and acquaint yourself with the changing conditions, which without doubt would make you more alert to your responsibility as a Senator pledged to work for the best interests of all Americans. Certainly there is clear handwriting on the wall which 'he who runs may read.'

"You say you are 'a white man who is doing his duty for his country.'

"That has a familiar sound, doesn't it, Mr. Bilbo? Do you remember a recently defeated dictator who proclaimed vociferously on all occasions, 'I am an Aryan doing my duty to my country'? Of course, your influence is in no way so far reaching and you may escape his fate:

"Do you realize that if 1 ounce of your blood, 1 ounce of a Negro's blood, and 1 ounce of Chinese blood were taken into a laboratory, the greatest scientist on earth could not tell which was the blood of the white man?

"And surely you know that it has been demonstrated over and over again that no race has a corner on human intellectual capacity or upon artistic talent, or upon the depth and quality of spiritual insight."

Commenting on the Senator's statement that all delegates who wrote and adopted the Declaration of Independence and all who wrote the Constitution of 1787 owned slaves, she said:

"Surely you did not mean to say 'all.' The Declaration of Independence had 54 signers. What about the Adamses? John Hancock? I am checking the names of all signers as to their slave ownership and I advise you to do the same before you again make such a sweeping statement."

She noted that it would be also worth the Senator's while to check the slave-owning status of the authors of the Constitution of

1787, 19 of whom, she said were from nonslave States.

Asking the Senator if he had ever read the fourteenth amendment, Miss Cooke said:

"Its clear statement of civil rights might well be studied by you and your State, Mr. BILBO."

Replying to the Senator's statement, namely, "how you Negroes can get it in your heads that any part of the Declaration or the Constitution covered your case is beyond me." Miss Cooke said:

"Mr. BILBO, I will quote the fifteenth amendment for you here, lest you haven't time to look it up. It is as follows: 'The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or creed.'"

That statement, she said, "is not beyond the understanding of any intelligent Negro. Perhaps 'abridgement' does not indicate clearly enough 'no money bar' or 'no poll tax,' but is the meaning beyond you, a Senator of the United States? I think not."

She asked for "chapter and verse" to substantiate the Senator's charge that George Washington owned "white slaves."

"I am enclosing a stamped envelope for your reply."

No reply so far has been received.

The biggest blot on America, she said, is its treatment of minorities: "The Indians, the sharecroppers; today the American-born Japanese; and worst of all the Negroes, first in the South, more recently in the North, and at present growing apace in the West.

"On the encouraging side, Mr. BILBO, there are now new signs and portents everywhere of an awakening—50 nations meeting in our land (the San Francisco Conference) and agreeing to begin together the long slow climb to higher levels of thought and cooperative action, pledging themselves to work for the good of all mankind." She continued:

"Fifty nations signing a Charter which is well out in front to beckon them on. And we can hope that the spirit of that Charter will push them beyond its present form and limitations to an instrument as inspiring to high endeavor in the world as the Constitution has been to understanding Americans."

It is worth remembering, she said, that the principles of the golden rule and the Sermon on the mount are not yet widely practiced in daily living. "But who has not felt their influence?" she asked.

The 80-year-old Miss Cooke closed her letter with this paragraph:

"There is a stiff climb ahead, Mr. BILBO, but it promises to invigorate the mind and soul of man, and it's never too late. We are on our way toward the goal, and we take time to invite you to join us."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, South Chicago Aerie No. 1358, Fraternal Order of Eagles, has joined with many groups and individuals throughout the United States in advocating that the anniversary of the birth of the late President Roosevelt be made a national holiday. South Chicago Aerie No. 1358, Fraternal Order of Eagles, went on record to this effect at its last meeting by unanimously adopting the following resolution:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO DESIGNATE THE BIRTHDAY OF THE LATE PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States from March 4, 1932, until his untimely death on April 12, 1945, having been elected to four successive terms and having become the first American President honored by his fellow citizens with more than the traditional two terms;

Whereas President Roosevelt assumed office during the depression, one of the great domestic crises in the Nation's history, and by wise, courageous, and humanitarian leadership restored confidence and faith in America;

Whereas President Roosevelt championed the cause of the workingmen of America and ushered in a new era of consideration for the rights of labor and the common man;

Whereas President Roosevelt espoused and signed the National Social Security Act generally recognized as the greatest social measure in American history, climaxing a 14-year educational campaign by the Fraternal Order of Eagles in behalf of State and Federal old-age security legislation;

Whereas President Roosevelt awakened our Nation to the menace of fascism to our free institutions and our very existence as a free people, and led America and its allies, the United Nations, in the mightiest world struggle for human freedom, culminating in the unconditional surrender of Germany and in decisive victories over Japan;

Whereas President Roosevelt charted a course for preventing future wars, by means of a permanent world peace organization, economic cooperation and international good will, thereby embodying during the most critical period in modern history the hopes, the aspirations and the ideals of his fellow countrymen, and the oppressed peoples of the entire world.

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt is assured an immortal place in world history, and will earn the gratitude of American generations yet to come, and the esteem and affection of free peoples in all lands; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That South Chicago Aerie, No. 1358, Fraternal Order of Eagles, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to designate January 31, the birth date of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a national holiday: and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from this State and the Congressman of this district.

WALTER HANSEN, *Secretary*.

Requirements of the Postwar Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Americans everywhere are anxiously awaiting the day that their sons will not be inducted into the armed forces for peacetime service, and they are looking forward to the return to civil life of the citizen soldier. However, to insure the peace, occupation forces must be maintained. On August 29, 1945, President Truman sent a letter to the Committee on Military Affairs, of the House, in which he outlined the requirements for the postwar Army. He indicated that if we are to eliminate the draft, legislation is immediately necessary, to provide the inducements to raise and maintain an Army, by the volunteer method.

In this connection, yesterday, I introduced H. R. 3935 which would permit all Army enlisted men to retire after 20 years' service with retired pay at the rate of 65 percent of their active-duty pay at the time of retirement. The bill was prepared in collaboration with Mr. Jack Kyle, associate editor of Veterans Outlook and past national commander of the Regular Veterans Association. Mr. Kyle, a veteran of this war, was also a veterans' legislative representative for a number of years before the war.

The bill would permit all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men to retire after 20 years' service in the highest rank or grade in which they served during World War II. It will be noted that the bill does not alter or molest any existing retirement law, and an enlisted man would retire after 20 years' service only upon his own application, but if he so elects he may remain in the service for 30 years and retire with higher retired pay. It also allows all foreign service and sea duty performed during the war to be counted double on retirement. The bill, H. R. 3935, reads as follows:

That whenever any enlisted man on the active list of the Regular Army, or the Philippine Scouts, shall have completed not less than 20 years' active service he shall upon his own application be retired with monthly pay equal to 65 percent of his active-duty pay, and after 30 years' service with monthly pay equal to 75 percent of his active-duty pay at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That the number of years of service to be credited in computing the right to all retirement and retirement pay under this act shall include all active service now or hereafter authorized by law to be credited for active-duty pay and all periods of active service in any component of the armed forces of the United States while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the department concerned or on duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska between December 6, 1941, and the date of termination of World War II shall be counted double for retirement purposes, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more to be counted as a complete year.

SEC. 2. That after 20 years' service any commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, chief warrant officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, who served honorably as a commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, chief warrant officer, warrant officer, or noncommissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, at any time between September 6, 1941, and the date of the termination of World War II, unless entitled to retire in a higher rank or grade, shall upon his own application be retired in the highest commissioned, warrant, or noncommissioned rank or grade in which he served during the war and shall be entitled to receive monthly retired pay equal to 75 percent of his active-duty pay at the time of retirement.

SEC. 3. That any commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, chief warrant officer, or enlisted man who was retired prior to the enactment of this act and who completed not less than 20 years' service before retirement and who was retired in a lower rank or grade than the highest in which he served between December 6, 1941, and the

date of the termination of World War II shall, upon his own application, be promoted to the higher rank or grade on the retired list and shall receive the retired pay authorized in section 3 of this act.

SEC. 4. All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed except that the provisions of Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "Retirement Act of 1945."

The proposed rates of retired pay for each grade under H. R. 3935 are shown in the comparative table below:

Comparative pay table, enlisted men only

	Monthly rate [1] [2]—Grade						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Active-duty pay after 30 years' service [3]	$207.00	$171.00	$144.00	$117.00	$99.00	$81.00	$75.00
Retired pay after 30 years' service	155.25	128.25	108.00	87.75	74.25	60.75	56.25
Active-duty pay after 20 years' service [3]	179.40	148.20	124.80	101.40	85.80	70.20	65.00
Retired pay for disability after 20 years' service [4]	134.55	111.15	93.60	76.05	64.35	52.65	48.75
Retired pay after 20 years' service under H. R. 3935	116.61	96.33	81.12	65.91	55.77	45.63	42.25

[1] Does not include additional pay for foreign service, sea duty, submarine duty, flying time, parachute duty, for participation in glider flights, or for qualification in arms.
[2] Includes pay for longevity.
[3] Does not include allowances.
[4] Under Public Law 140, 77th Cong.

NOTE.—To determine monthly rates of retired pay for any year, after 20 years' service, multiply the monthly active duty rate by 65 percent.

We can offer no better inducement to our soldiers than an attractive service career with a liberal retirement program. I feel that if H. R. 3935 is enacted into law many World War II veterans will reenlist in the Regular Army on a service career.

Mr. Rockefeller's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, after years of exceptionally good work in the State Department of useful service to his country as Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics, has retired to private life. His was the extremely difficult task of effectuating the "good neighbor" policy that has done so much to increase the ties of friendship and understanding which exist between the American Republics. As a Delegate to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, I want to commend Mr. Rockefeller for the great work he did in San Francisco in bringing about the unanimous approval of the South American countries for the United Nations Charter. I also subscribe most heartily to the sentiments expressed in the following editorial from the New York Times of Friday, August 31, 1945, entitled "Mr. Rockefeller's Service":

MR. ROCKEFELLER'S SERVICE

The resignation of Nelson Rockefeller as Assistant Secretary of State for American Republic Affairs surely brings only to a temporary end a 5-year record of disinterested and useful service to his country. It was in August of 1940 that President Roosevelt called Mr. Rockefeller to Washington, gave him the jaw-breaking title of Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics and the difficult task of carrying out in terms the South Americans could understand the good-neighbor policy. The record of inter-American affairs of the last 5 years is all the proof that is needed of his success.

Since the San Francisco Conference Mr. Rockefeller has been under unceasing and ill-formed criticism because of his part in forcing through an invitation of participation for Argentina. His address at Boston last Friday night should provide the answer as to his own personal attitude toward the Argentine Government. Until then he had accepted without answer the entire criticism for the San Francisco action.

Mr. Rockefeller would be the first to admit that he has made mistakes in his work as Coordinator and with the State Department. Who has a perfect batting record? But no one can conscientiously charge him with a lack of sincerity or of good attentions, accompanied by a high percentage of achievement. He is respected and, what is more important, well liked everywhere in South America. It is hoped he will carry on unofficially as an ambassador of good will to the Latin-American countries, as he has told friends he intends to do. This country could not have a better one.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Honorable James A. Farley which appeared in the Reader's Digest of July 1945 entitled "The Very Breath of America":

THE VERY BREATH OF AMERICA

(Condensed from an address by James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States)

I have been in every State in the Union, not once but often. I know hundreds of people in every State. And I think that, out of that vast accumulation of contacts with fellow Americans, I can qualify as a witness on Americanism. I believe it has been my privilege to have sensed the spirit which makes this land great.

Under our freedom, five generations of our people have leaped through stages of progress to achieve standards that have astonished the world. Our form of government, which has given us our freedom, was a new light enkindled in a world dark with monarchy. Not since the cave man found fire has mankind received anything more warming than the protection of a government dedicated to man's development with a minimum of hampering laws and a maximum of individual spiritual strength.

Under this freedom, which I insist was not paterned on any in history, we paced the world materially and spiritually. Our men of science have led their world brethren in transmitting our resources to new uses. Our manufacturers have produced amazingly. Our men of religion, our teachers, philosophers, authors and poets have breathed upon our better natures to inspire us to even greater efforts. Truly, ours has been a fruitful and even happy blend of labor, management and genius, for are we not supplying the whole world with food and manufactured materials?

There are those who will tell you our progress is due to our natural resources. They forget that South America, Russia, India, and Africa have as great, if not greater, shares of the world's goods. There are others who will tell you that our progress is due to our national characteristics. These forget that we have come comparatively recently from all the nations in the world, which are the reservoirs of these characteristics. I say to you as solemnly and sincerely as I know how that the roots of our phenomenal growth are due to the freedom upon which our forefathers built this Government—our freedom, which all Americans must cherish jealously if we are to continue the growth that has been ours through the years and if we are to enjoy the blessings of peace.

Freedom is a dynamic, liberating force. One need walk no farther than the nearest playground or college athletic field to discover why we are winning this war. Beyond question we are the greatest competitors in the world. I do not advance that as an American boast, but rather as a manifestation of the liberating force of freedom.

The American knows no limit of achievement, because no limit exists in America. Our children sense it at an early age, because freedom is inborn in them. Our youth think in terms of winning whatever they attempt. Victory is the image before them; defeat is almost impossible for them to conjure. Considered alone we call it the competitive spirit; actually it is a chief product of freedom. It, more than anything else, accounts for American ingenuity in the field of production and victory on the field of battle. No American is ever too old to win. His age may be that of a Marshall, a King, an Eisenhower, or a MacArthur, or his youth may be that of a Bulkeley, a Kelly, a Bong, or a Basilone, but his competitive spirit is unquenchable.

Countless manifestations of freedom surround us. There is tolerance for each other's thoughts, for each other's religion, for each other's race. There is the demand for justice, for equal treatment under law. There is the conviction that opportunity is unlimited for everyone.

The list is endless, but there is one manifestation of freedom that is often overlooked. Despite our highly developed will to win, Americans love to see the underdog triumph. Paradoxical as that may see, it is one of the deepest roots of Americanism.

What American has not experienced the thrill of seeing a highly touted competitor overcome by some little fellow who was not supposed to have a chance to win? It sets American crowds on fire with enthusiasm, and it explains a great deal more than we think. It explains why we have never conceived might to be right, why we have never worshiped might as an end in itself.

When our servicemen return they will have seen totalitarianism at its worst; they will want to find Americanism at its best—with liberty, justice, and equality for all.

Freedom and Americanism are synonymous. Freedom is the very breath of America, its very life. It is the underlying force, the inner power, the spirit which is singular to our Nation. Let us cherish it.

Airports for Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is reprinted from the Southeast Economist, published in Chicago:

There is no doubt of Chicago's need for adequate airport facilities for the landing and taking off of international airplanes.

Whether this city will actually be the hub of air transportation within the United States depends upon how well we equip ourselves to become one of the major airplane manufacturing centers as well, if that growing industry could be reasonably sure that, upon locating its plants here, it would not be promptly plagued with difficulties discouraging to its expansion.

However, the proper preparation of Chicago to become an international port of airplane travel is within the control of the city government and the public and, as we have repeatedly pointed out here, no time should be lost in achieving the desired end.

We have but one city airport today. It is the municipal airport at Sixty-third Street and Cicero Avenue, a very busy place every day of the week.

We long ago took the stand, in the interests of the great southwest side, that this airport must never be abandoned as a major airport for passenger airplanes. That is still our position. We have also taken a stand against the idea of building a man-made island in Lake Michigan to serve as an airplane terminal. This latter proposal is utterly ridiculous on a variety of counts. Not only would such an artificial landing field cost a tremendous amount of money to build, but its very existence at the edge of the skyscraper Loop and under the fog of the lake shore would offer a constant peril to airplane traffic. In addition to this, such an island would constantly have to be enlarged at great expense to the taxpayers in order to accommodate the ever-increasing size of airplanes, or it would eventually have to be abandoned because of being outgrown.

On the other hand, we are aware of the need for more airport facilities in Chicago. We do not assume that the municipal airport of the southwest side can forever be large enough to accommodate all the daily schedules of national and international plane arrivals and departures that should eventually take place in this city. There is talk of the city taking over the airport facilities already existent at the Douglas airplane factory on the far northwest side. There is talk, too, of constructing a series of large and small municipal airports that would ring the city from Calumet Harbor on the far southeast side to the war northwest side.

The latter program, we believe, has some merit. The Douglas Airport could very properly be one of the major units in the chain of landing fields. The construction of another major landing field in the industrial area of Calumet Harbor is likewise of obvious importance.

But we are unalterably opposed to any program that would lessen the importance and use of the established airport of Southtown which is actually the cradle of air transport in this city. A major airport will some day have great commercial and industrial significance to the community near which it is located.

We want to keep our municipal airport a busy place. We want it to continue for all time as a place humming with the arrival and departure of national and international passenger flights, and we want adequate facilities there or nearby for the arrival and departure of the freight planes that are bound to be in use in future years. Furthermore, we want a safe, high-speed highway to be established between our airport and the downtown district for the convenience of travelers.

We have stated these convictions here on numerous occasions in the past.

Resolutions of New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include five resolutions adopted by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation at its annual executive conference held August 16, 1945, under the chairmanship of Hon. Harold C. Ostertag, as follows:

Resolution 1

AVIATION

Whereas Congress, when it reconvenes, will consider bills intended to establish a system of airports and to provide Federal aid for their construction; and

Whereas these bills, particularly Senate 2 and House 3615, establish an entirely new method of Federal-State-local cooperation by providing for direct Federal grants to political subdivisions of the States; and

Whereas for more than 30 years the States have developed and administered effectively a Federal-State-local cooperative pattern for the construction and operation of public works and for the administration of public services in the fields of agriculture, highways, public health, vocational education, and social security, which pattern, without exception, has been based upon cooperation and participation on the part of all levels of government; and

Whereas the new governmental system contemplated in the pending legislation would duplicate existing State organizations and agencies in the field of aviation, would require enormous expansion in the Federal agency and the employment of thousands of additional Federal officials and agents, would be both ineffective and uneconomical in operation, and would establish an entirely new system of intergovernmental operation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation hereby urges the Congress of the United States, in the development of a national airport system to follow the long-established and effectively operated pattern of channeling aid to local communities exclusively through the respective State governments; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the New York delegation in Congress and that the members of this committee be urged to confer with their Congressmen in regard to this important matter.

Resolution 2

EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

Whereas the President of the United States, in December 1941, requested the several States, as an emergency measure, to loan their employment offices to the National Government in order to facilitate the fullest use of all of our manpower for war; and

Whereas all of the States agreed to this emergency measure, with the understanding that at the proper time the employment offices would be returned to the States; and

Whereas the war has ended victoriously and the original emergency is now at an end; and

Whereas employment can be handled effectively only by correlating the States' employment services with their unemployment compensation systems; and

Whereas continued separation of administration of these two interlocking services may cause needless hardship among workers during the period of reconversion; and

Whereas there is already an increasing amount of reconversion unemployment throughout the country: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the State employment services taken over during the national emergency by the Federal Government be returned to the States as quickly as arrangements for such transfer can be made; and be it further

Resolved, That the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation join with the Governors' Conference in urging such immediate return of the State employment agencies.

Resolution 3

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Whereas each of the 48 States has established, through legislative and administrative action, an effective veterans' agency to coordinate the efforts of State and local, public and private, veterans' agencies with the United States Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas information and assistance of all types should be made easily accessible to the veteran in order that he may promptly obtain all benefits and rights to which he is entitled; and

Whereas the 48 State agencies are now successfully administering State laws pertaining to veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Veterans' Administration, through its new Administrator, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, be urged to make use of the State veterans' agencies in its administration of all programs of benefit to the veteran to the end that the mechanics of such assistance programs be simplified and to avoid unnecessary, aggravating, and expensive confusion, conflict, and duplication.

Resolution 12

Whereas the several States have in effect systems of unemployment compensation for the protection of their citizens; and

Whereas the maritime States in the country have now, or are about to enact, coverage of maritime employees under their unemployment-insurance systems by means of reciprocal arrangements as among the States; and

Whereas in the opinion of the committee it would be confusing to the maritime industry and a duplication in services to cause the enactment of a separate and distinct system under Federal auspices; and any plan which proposes to assess the cost of financing a single industry plan upon the taxpayers of the country as a whole through subsidization is undesirable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation go on record as opposed to that part of Senate bill No. 1274, introduced by Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE and now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, dealing with the unemployment coverage of maritime employees.

Resolution 13

Whereas the several States, under the auspices of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, have agreed upon a reciprocal arrangement for the coverage by the States of maritime employees; and

Whereas the principal maritime States in the country are now prepared to execute such an agreement to effectuate a plan which will provide complete service to both the employers and employees in this field; and

Whereas the laws at the present time in certain of the States make no special provision for coverage of maritime employees and depend upon congressional authorization for obtaining such jurisdiction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation urge the adoption of enabling Federal legislation, as embodied in H. R. 2564, introduced by Congressman WALTER LYNCH, of New York, in order that the State plan for coverage may be more effectively administered.

Test for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, Thomas L. Stokes in the Washington Daily News last night gave the following résumé of the congressional session which has just convened:

TEST FOR CONGRESSMEN

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The Congress which is settling down rather sluggishly to its work after its interrupted vacation, struggling in slowly from home constituencies and abroad, faces a responsibility that will tax its stamina to the utmost.

This is intensified by a number of circumstances.

One is that Congress assembles under tremendous pressures for a quick and easy return to what President Harding after the last war called normalcy. There are insistent and conflicting pleas that the boys be brought back home at once and that the draft be suspended despite the need for occupation forces abroad; clamor for dropping price, wage, and other controls that protect against inflation; demands for prompt reduction of taxes.

Congress truly is on the hot seat—and primary elections begin only a few months hence.

Its most difficult job—and it will take iron wills—is to resist the let-down tendency, the drag of inertia.

This is all the harder because the Member of Congress is a human being, too. He, too, has felt the strain of war and would like to relax a little now that the fighting is over. Yet he faces really the toughest part of the job now when he is tired of it all. He is like a man who has worked all day and goes home tired, then is suddenly called back to a job that will take nearly all night.

And there is no excitement in the job now, no urgency of war, only routine and drudgery of day-to-day problems.

After the last war both the administration and Congress did take the easy way and let down. War controls were quickly scuttled. Inflation set in. There was a temporary depression. But what was most dangerous was the insidious psychology of the let-down which infected the whole body politic. Neither recurring administrations nor Congress stopped to take stock at home and abroad as the seemingly easy and prosperous twenties rolled along. They neglected to make necessary adjustments to meet the constant changes of an increasingly complex civilization. Whoop came the big depression 10 years after the war.

Congress cannot afford to let down this time. To fight this tendency will take a stern determination that is not too common in the average politician's makeup. It can be called up in an emergency, and this is an emergency.

Its task would be much less difficult if the public, itself, would try to control the let-down impulse, would consider the over-all problem of Congress rather than private, selfish whims, would not indulge in a letter-writing spree crying for this and that thoughtlessly. Patience is needed. Congress is due some consideration. Its job is hard enough as it is.

Congress comes back, too, with its responsibility increased manifold by other circumstances. One is the sudden end of the war which caught us all short. Another is the emergence of the United States from the war to a position of acknowledged world leadership which it cannot shirk this time. This will require judgment and less of the demagoguery of careless foreign-baiting which seems to come so easily to some Members of Congress.

Howard Bruce Awarded D. S. M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Baltimore Sun:

HOWARD BRUCE IS DECORATED BY PRESIDENT—HE AND HARRY HOPKINS ARE GIVEN ARMY'S D. S. M. AWARD

(By Joseph H. Short)

WASHINGTON, September 5.—Howard Bruce, Baltimore banker, industrialist, and civic leader, received from President Truman today the Army's Distinguished Service Medal for his major role in keeping supply lines open to the battle fronts.

Citing Mr. Bruce for "exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service" as Director of Matériel, Army Service Forces, the Chief Executive pinned the blue and gold medal, dangling from its red, white, and blue ribbon, on the Baltimorean's breast at ceremonies in the White House gardens.

Harry L. Hopkins, long-time adviser to President Roosevelt, was awarded the same honor at the same time. Mr. Hopkins was cited for "lightening the burden of the Commander in Chief" and for other war functions, including the chairmanship of the Munitions Assignment Board.

WON BY FOUR CIVILIANS

The two of them thus joined a very small group of civilians who have won the D. S. M. As the Army's highest decoration for those who do not actually shoot guns, it usually is reserved for high-ranking military officers. Only four civilians have received the medal for services in World War II and an informed authority said there would be no more.

The other two Distinguished Service Medal awards to civilians by Mr. Truman were to Stephen Early, secretary to President Roosevelt, and James F. Byrnes for his work as Director of War Mobilization. Civilians honored in the future will receive the Medal of Merit, a decoration exclusively for civilians.

GENERAL WITHOUT RANK

Disposing of technicalities, Mr. Bruce won the medal for military service. He was a general without rank and uniform. As Director of Matériel, he was successor to Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, now head of civilian government in the American sector of Germany, and all of his coequals in the War Department wore general's stars.

The Bruce citation, telling briefly of his war service, beginning in July 1942 and ending last Friday, was read by the President to the gathering of military and civilian notables who turned out to join in honoring the recipients. It stated:

"Mr. Howard Bruce is hereby awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the War Department in the performance of duties of great responsibility in the assistance he has given in the development and management of the greatest military procurement program in the history of the world; for his brilliant performance in a series of difficult and highly responsible positions on the staff of the Commanding General, Army Service Forces, and particularly for the exceptional initiative and resourcefulness he displayed as Director of Matériel, Army Service Forces, during one of the most critical periods of the war."

DEVELOPED SUPPLY CONTROL

"The leading role Mr. Bruce occupied in conceiving and developing the supply-control system has immeasurably improved Army procurement methods. His early endeavors in developing an orderly and effective program for the conservation of critical and short materials aided subsequently in alleviating a difficult supply situation. His efforts in removing obstacles to production which at one time endangered many segments of the Army procurement program resulted in immediate and lasting improvement.

"With unusual persevering devotion to duty he has contributed his energy and ability to the prosecution of the war. His accomplishments reflect great credit both upon himself and the military service."

Assembled near the President and the recipients were Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War; Artemus Gates, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Jesse H. Jones, former Secretary of Commerce.

PRESENT AT CEREMONY

The uniformed group included Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Staff to the President; General of the Army George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff; Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, commander in chief of the fleet and Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, commanding Army Service Forces, and as such, Mr. Bruce's immediate superior.

Mrs. Bruce and three daughters came over from Elkridge to witness the ceremony. The daughters are Mrs. H. Alexander Smith, Jr., Mrs. Tilton Dobbin, and Miss Rosalie Bruce. They were accompanied by Senator H. Adam Smith (Republican, New Jersey), father-in-law of Mr. Bruce's daughter.

On three sides were several hundred invited guests, and former White House associates of Mr. Hopkins.

DECLINED COMMISSION

Mr. Bruce went to Washington in July 1942 as chief of the conservation branch, Army Service Forces. He declined to accept a commission, because he preferred to keep the "inalienable right to look anyone in the face and tell him to go to the devil."

In November 1942 he was appointed chief of the production service branch, production division, Headquarters Army Service Forces.

Later, in succession, he was shifted to the posts of deputy director of the production division, director of production scheduling, director of procurement and deputy director of material. He also aided in the reorganization of the procurement system for the Transportation Corps.

ACE TROUBLE-SHOOTER

During the early months of the war, when the United States was working at a white heat to build up a supply of matériel for a global campaign, Mr. Bruce's role was that of an ace trouble-shooter. His assignments included the conservation of critical materials, elimination of production bottlenecks, and management of the procurement program.

He was chairman of a committee for postwar planning and demobilization and cochairman of the Army-Navy Electronics Production Agency Advisory Committee. He still retains his membership on the production executive committee of the War Production Board.

BORN IN RICHMOND

Born in Richmond, Va., in 1879, Mr. Bruce went to Baltimore in 1907. He had attended the Virginia Military Institute, from which he received a bachelor of science degree. Before his twenty-first birthday he had been promoted from cadet engineer to assistant superintendent of the East River Gas Co. in New York.

He went to Baltimore at the request of the late Thomas J. Hayward, of the Bartlett Hayward Co., and was made general manager and vice president of that corporation when it was formed.

This company, prepared with years of experience in building machinery for sugar mills, salt plants, and gas-manufacturing industries, helped to make the first ordnance supplies for the American Expeditionary Forces in France in the First World War.

DIRECTOR DISTRICT RESERVE BANK

Mr. Bruce was appointed a class C director of the Fifth District Federal Reserve Bank during that war. He later was named chief of the Baltimore Ordnance District of the Army Ordnance Department, in which capacity he served for 13 years.

When Mr. Bruce last week announced his resignation as director of matériel, Army Services Forces, he indicated that he would return to private business interests, including the chairmanship of the board of the Baltimore National Bank. In addition, he is a member of the board of the Bartlett Hayward Co., a director of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the Glenn L. Martin Co. and other corporations.

An adviser to the late Governor Ritchie, Mr. Bruce was Democratic national committeeman for Maryland for 15 years. He was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Senator in 1940.

Active in community and social groups, Mr. Bruce is a member of the Bachelors Cotillion, Baltimore Country Club, the Elkridge Kennels, Green Spring Valley Hunt Club, the Metropolitan Club, Maryland Club, and Merchants Club.

OWNER OF BILLY BARTON

His interests include fox hunting and the breeding of thoroughbred horses, the most famous of which was Billy Barton, second in the Grand National at Aintree in 1926.

Mr. Bruce's home at Elkridge, Belmont, is considered one of the most beautiful in the State.

He married Mary Graham Bowdoin on October 26, 1912.

Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of American Republics Affairs, at a dinner of the Pan American Society of Massachusetts and Northern New England, Boston, Mass., Friday, August 24, 1945.

I am very happy to appear again before the Pan American Society of Massachusetts and northern New England, which deserves so much credit for the great contribution it has made toward the understanding of the problems of the Americas—an understanding which has been so vital to us during the war period and which will be even more important in the days that lie ahead.

With the ending of the global war, we enter an age in which friendship between nations is to become the paramount concern of all of us. World peace is dependent upon the capacity for friendship which each nation, large or small, can and must develop. Every germ of unrest that could possibly lead to another war, either local, regional, or worldwide, must be eradicated. This means that more than ever before we must come to understand the basic causes of friction between governments and between peoples.

In this hemisphere we have said in effect through the acts of Chapultepec that the nations of the Americas understand their mutual obligations and responsibilities, and that they will work together for the maintenance of peace.

But while new machinery of collaboration has been provided, the problems are not new. The essence of friendship between peoples is understanding of each other's problems, true motives, and wishes.

Not infrequently the motives of the United States have been misunderstood by its neighbors to the south. Over the span of years we have at times appeared to our neighbors as the "Colossus of the North," ready to grab territory, ready to exploit, and ready to impair the independence of sovereign peoples. If we are honest with ourselves we will concede that some of the inconsistencies of the past have given rise to such misunderstandings because of policies that did not seem to be in keeping with the unwavering desire of the American people to see fulfilled in this hemisphere the basic principles of the American Revolution, namely, that all persons are born free and equal and that governments must rest upon the consent of the governed.

Despite, however, inconsistencies in the early days of our growth, American policy has matured.

When President Roosevelt came into office he gave instant attention to the relations between the countries of this hemisphere. He promulgated what has come to be known as the good-neighbor policy. The essence of that policy is that might does not make right, that mutual forbearance is the keystone to understanding, and that in adjusting controversies or disputes in this hemisphere the rule of reason and justice rather than the rule of force should prevail.

How successful that policy has been all the world knows. When the Second World War broke out, it was apparent that attempts would be made to violate the independence and territorial integrity of the American nations, and that the Axis Powers would seek to undermine governments throughout this hemisphere in an attempt to establish their hegemony here. They sought to build up in South America, among other things, a system of strategic communication by air from Europe via the African coast to the countries to the south of us. They sought various means of sowing seeds of friction and a means, in fact, of ultimately penetrating by economic instruments into the very life and sovereignty of the American Republics.

This threat was met promptly by the Department of State under the farsighted leadership of Secretary Cordell Hull who called upon all the American countries to recognize the menace that was looming up on the horizon.

To the everlasting credit of the statesmen of the other Americas, they, too, saw the peril immediately. United and common action became inevitable. In conference after conference the principles of consultation and joint action were emphasized. The American nations pledged themselves to act together as against any threats from abroad. At last we did not stand alone in the defense of the Monroe Doctrine. We stood together fully aware of the vicious forces loose in Europe and Asia that could get a foothold in this hemisphere and threaten us all.

But the Axis Powers were not to be halted by resolutions alone. They plotted through the activities of their well-organized nationals, their schools and business firms in Central and South America to reach into the political administrations of various countries. They sought to stir up revolutions. They particularly tried to stir up feeling against the United States, against our institutions, and against our ambassadors. We were not unmindful of the fact that many former residents of and citizens of the Axis Powers had emigrated to the countries of this hemisphere and had acquired positions of economic power and influence.

We endeavored through the blacklist, fund freezing, and other measures to reach those enemies of pan-American solidarity. We received the effective cooperation of all but one of the countries to the south.

The Argentine Government alone stood apart as we fought the Axis throughout the world. We knew from the beginning that the majority of the Argentine people were pro-United Nations. They cherished in their hearts the same sentiments of freedom as did we and the other democracies. Thousands of their sons had enlisted and were fighting in Allied armies. For generations Argentina had been active in pan-American affairs.

But the people of Argentina had been rendered temporarily powerless when their constitutional government was overthrown by force. Laws and decrees comparable to those of Germany and Italy were imposed on the Argentine people. All the hateful methods of fascism began to show themselves in Argentina. The other American Republics perceived this turn of events as inimical to the prosecution of the war and the security and welfare of all other nations of the hemisphere. There grew up a feeling that the Argentine people must be made fully conscious of what their neighbors were thinking in order that there might arise a sufficient understanding within Argentina of the effects of the mistaken policies of her new rulers.

In Mexico City last March there was an opportunity to deal with this problem in a framework in which there lay a real hope for

success—in mutual consultation—on the basis that the concern of one nation is the concern of all—that the only lasting remedy is a joint remedy.

The 20 American Republics concluding the Mexico City Conference addressed a message to Argentina. This was an exceptional message. It expressed regret that the Argentine Nation could not be represented at the conference; the fact that the people of the Americas are indivisible; the hope that Argentina would put herself in a position to rejoin the American family of nations and would qualify herself among the United Nations.

The message was as firm and clear about the international obligations, the fulfillment of which was asked of the Argentine Government, as it was solemnly mindful of the stature of the Argentine people and their nation.

All of the delegates were conscious of Argentina's proud traditions, of her historic fight for independence and freedom, her generous contributions in aiding her neighbors to gain their own independence, the settlement of her frontiers by arbitration, and her accomplishments of the past in international law, statesmanship, science, and journalism.

The collective character of the message deserves repeated emphasis. All of the 20 countries regarded it as a carefully considered, joint expression.

Two weeks later, by decree, the Argentine Government declared war on Japan and Germany. This same decree ordered the taking of all emergency measures incident to the state of belligerency, as well as those necessary to prevent and repress activities which could endanger the war effort of the United Nations or threaten the peace, welfare, or security of the American nations.

A start was made immediately by the Argentine Government to carry out the terms set forth in this decree and shortly afterward it signed the final act of the Mexico City Conference, which provided for liquidation of Axis properties, stamping out of Axis espionage and making it impossible for the Americas to become a safe haven for Axis war criminals. The act calls for freedom of the press, the fulfillment of the democratic aspirations of the people, and the protection of their individual liberties.

At this point the American Republics after consultation jointly took cognizance of Argentina's action and decided to return their ambassadors to Buenos Aires. Upon my recommendation, the United States sent forth one of its ablest Ambassadors, Spruille Braden, with instructions to make it clear that the United States expected the Argentine Government to carry out in good faith the letter and the spirit of the commitments which it had undertaken.

All of us admire the way in which Ambassador Braden has represented the United States in Argentina. He reestablished our contacts with an unmistakable message. He has, as much as any one man could, accurately reflected in his conduct the attitude and point of view of the United States.

I think his personal democracy has particularly endeared him to the Argentine people. Nothing could better demonstrate that than the tributes which came to Ambassador Braden from all walks of Argentine life—labor, industry, agriculture, and the professions—in repudiation of the slander and vilification with which some anonymous elements sought to smear him last month.

Clearly the willingness of the United States and the other American republics in sending their ambassadors back to Buenos Aires to work with the Argentine Nation presupposed that the Argentine Government would reciprocate in good faith.

It was just 3 weeks after Argentina's signature of the Final Act of Mexico that we met at San Francisco. There we had the choice of whether to reject Argentina's declaration of war and the steps she had taken, or to accept them at their face value, making it clear—as we did—that we expected full performance.

We accepted them because we had confidence that the Argentine people would see to it that their national commitments would be carried out.

Since this chapter in inter-American affairs began to unfold several months have elapsed.

We are here to face up to the facts—to look squarely at the record. Axis funds in Argentina have been blocked in about 130 intervened firms and receivers or control commissions have been placed in charge of 53 of these Axis firms, but over 90 still remain untouched. However, to date Axis interests have been completely eliminated from only 2 of the 130 commercial firms intervened. The two German banks and six Axis insurance companies are in process of liquidation. Assets of 11 Axis spearhead firms and subsidiaries have been advertised for public auction. As to the others, no affirmative action has yet been taken.

Of the 15 Japanese and 223 other persons investigated for Axis espionage, only 70 German agents are under arrest. There still is very little, if any, control over the directors and officers of Axis firms and associations, and practically no progress has been made in seeking out Axis individuals and assets which may be seeking refuge in Argentina and whose existence is, therefore, concealed.

Although 3 Japanese, 7 German, and 3 pro-Axis Hungarian newspapers were suspended, 2 Japanese and 2 pro-Nazi German papers have been allowed to resume publication in Spanish.

Japanese schools and organizations are operating without restrictions although we have protested repeatedly. The same is true of German schools. The majority of the other German organizations continue to operate although a few have been closed.

Some prodemocratic newspaper have been suspended along with pro-Axis papers and Government censorship of the press has many times worked against the cause of the United Nations.

However, recently the state of siege has been lifted and restoration of freedom of the press announced. Numbers of political prisoners still are being held by the Government.

Popular demonstrations to celebrate the fall of Berlin and the surrender of Germany were prohibited and extraordinary measures were taken to prevent them. Such demonstrations, on the other hand, were permitted in connection with the surrender of Japan but later were repressed by police measures in such a manner as to provoke nation-wide protests from the Argentine people.

On July 8 President Farrell announced the calling of completely free elections. Notwithstanding this fact, as yet no date has been set and high authorities of his own government have made declarations and tolerated activities which are contrary to the Mexico City commitments relating to individual liberties and human rights, the respect of which is indispensable to an effective democratic election in the form announced by the President.

This record shows that while steps have been taken toward carrying out the commitments, there are many important failures which have serious implications. Too often the action has appeared to be reluctant. Too often steps have been begun or promised and not carried through to completion. The fact remains that many vital commitments in which Argentina joined with her American neighbors still remain unfulfilled by her Government.

That the people are not in agreement with such a policy has been manifest in many ways. Their opposition to the lack of compliance to the Act of Chapultepec was shown by pronouncements from all the political parties, the press, the large commercial, industrial, and production associations, professional associations, professors and students, and by labor. Unquestionably, it is labor that suffers most the consequences of this situation. This is particularly lamentable in view of the progressive attitude and maturity of the labor movement in Argentina which has so effectively participated in the democratic and civic progress of the country.

We cannot presume to speak for the Argentine people, but it would be unjust not to let them speak for themselves.

By their own words they have shown that they share the same ideals held by the people of the other American Republics.

That is clearly the meaning of the message of complete sympathy and fraternity which the representatives of 12 Argentine labor unions recently conveyed to the people of the United States through Ambassador Braden.

That is demonstrated again and again in spontaneous manifestos.

Let me refer to a declaration on July 17 by 83 leading professional and cultural organizations within and outside Buenos Aires. The statement described an atmosphere of "uncertainty and fear" which it said had arisen in the past 2 years since the revolution of June 4, 1943, and went on to declare:

"It is urgent to emerge by the one road which guarantees the tranquility and progress of the country, namely, that is the immediate return to constitutional rule, with the full juridical regulation which that implies."

The statement continued—and I am quoting again the words of the Argentine organizations:

"This eagerness has been repeatedly expressed in one form or another throughout the Republic, by the ideas of the most representative institutions, such as universities, political parties, youth centers, professional institutes, trade union, labor-management committees, various groups so that it may be affirmed without exaggeration that this eagerness expressed the thought and deeply felt desire of the people of the nation, who contemplate in anguish the uncertainty of the future and aspire to the return of the confidence, security, and liberty which have been lost.

"The present situation benefits neither the people, the Government, nor the armed forces which support it. It will produce a division among Argentines such as has never existed before. It has separated the country from the Government, in terms which demand immediate solution in order to avoid irreparable evils. It provokes a lamentable confusion and an atmosphere of animosity in relations between capital and labor, which would find pacific solution to their differences under a regime of liberty and free discussion. It impedes fulfillment of international commitments, causing frictions which affect our prestige."

That is the end of the quotation.

With increasing courage the Argentine people have made known their will to live in freedom, to enjoy free institutions, and to be governed by democratic processes. They have expressed their abhorrence of tyranny and of dictatorships.

The sentiment of the people of the United States and other American Republics has rallied sympathetically to this fervent aspiration of the Argentine people to realize their democratic ideals. In the great charters adopted by the American Republics at Mexico City and by the United Nations at San Francisco the conscience of mankind found permanent expression in terms of freedom and the human rights of peoples, and in a determination to resist any fanatics who may try to succeed where Hitler and his kind have failed. These historic declarations have no grounds for exception in favor of any individual, any group, or any country.

The experiences of this war have proven that people can become overnight the victims

of unscrupulous groups or cliques who successfully seize the reins of power only because the citizens are not alert, or because they are indifferent to the patently destructive influences of the selfish and the ambitious.

In the words of President Truman, "Our victory was more than a victory of arms. It was a victory of an ideal founded on the rights of the common man, on the dignity of the human being, and on the conception of the state as the servant—not the master—of its people. A free people showed that it was able to defeat professional soldiers whose only moral arms were obedience and worship of force."

The good-neighbor policy is built upon understanding and mutual tolerance. It is built upon the theory that by threats or intimidation and the use of military power, we cannot hope to win the confidence of other peoples. It is built upon the foundation of frank and free discussion in which we may, without fear of misunderstanding, point out to each other the mistakes we are making. We do this in the firm belief that the processes of democracy will in time vindicate themselves.

The ultimate triumph of a democratic people is inevitable. Political administrations of selfish and self-seeking men may come and go, but the will of a free people never changes.

The voice of the people of Argentina is being heard—heard not only in the streets and in the provinces of that nation—but in the hearts of neighboring peoples throughout this hemisphere. Their voice and their action are giving the people of the Americas the assurance that they will see to it that their nation will live up to its commitments.

Resolution Adopted by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation at the Annual Executive Conference Held at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, August 15–16, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation at the annual executive conference held at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, August 15–16, 1945:

Whereas the several States under the auspices of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies have agreed upon a reciprocal arrangement for the coverage by the States of maritime employees; and

Whereas the principal maritime States in the country are now prepared to execute such an agreemnt to effectuate a plan which will provide complete service to both the employers and employees in this field; and

Whereas the laws at the present time in certain of the States make no special provision for coverage of maritime employees and depend upon congressional authorization for obtaining such jurisdiction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Committee on Interstate Cooperation urge the adoption of enabling Federal legislation as embodied in H. R. 2564 introduced by Congressman WALTER LYNCH, of New York, in order that the State plan for coverage may be more effectively administered.

VJ-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a radio address which I delivered over Station WLLH, Lawrence, Mass., on the program sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary. I was introduced by Mrs. Katherine Harty, director of the program:

Thank God for this.

Our Christian democracy has survived its greatest test. From the dark days of 1941, when our very way of life was at stake, we have struggled against up-hill odds to this day of vindication. A heavy burden has been lifted from the minds and hearts of all of us. We know how close we came to disaster. We know the price we have paid to ward off tyranny. Today we are justly proud of the faith and the strength that have enabled us to travel over that dark and difficult road. Today we are free.

You and I rejoice as freemen everywhere rejoice that the long and terrible night of war has passed. We like to think of our fine young men and women, far from home, who have made this victory possible. We are happy as we think of them and of the joy that must be theirs. It is over, and now they can look forward to their reunion with us. This day above all, belongs to them. And so we offer a prayer of thanksgiving for their safety and with that prayer goes the humble gratitude of a nation.

It is a day of prayer and rejoicing. It is but natural that we feel this way, for it means "Peace on earth, good will toward men." We are grateful to God for the courage of our fighting men and the decencies for which they fought. We are thankful for the great efforts put forward by the people at home; for the labor of our workers, for the skill of our leaders, for the example set by men and women who bore up so nobly under fear and loneliness and bereavement. There was silent suffering and personal shock but never despair. For that we are grateful to God who gave us the spirit to see this agony through.

After 4 years of pent-up emotion, of fear and worry and self-denial, it is only human that we escape from the terrible and unrelenting tensions which have gripped us. To celebrate this day is to let off the safety valve for dangerous pressures. We want to laugh, we want to be happy, and that is good. We have crushed the evil which sought to enslave us. In doing this we have had to strain every nerve and muscle, to call upon every resource of faith that was in us, as few generations of men have ever been called upon to do. The job has been exhausting. It has been a dirty and a difficult job but it is done and the danger is past. A great weight has been lifted from our minds and hearts and with that relief we want to celebrate. This great day is the reward for all that we have endured. We are gathering with friends, relatives, neighbors—even strangers—to share the joy we feel as we come into the sunlight of peace. For there are no strangers in America today. In varying degrees we have all helped to win this victory. We are proud and happy that the teamwork of free men has brought us through our sternest crisis. America means more to us than it ever did before. We celebrate not as irresponsible children but as men and women who know that even the best things in life must be had in moderation. Even in our rejoicing we are still Americans who believe in fair play. Just as we took our lickings without a whimper so we can take this victory without losing our self-control. This day we celebrate as Americans.

The wine of victory is heady and in our exultation we are apt to forget the team mates who gave so much to win that victory. It behooves all of us to give some thought to them. They are forever silent while we celebrate. But in their giving is a meaning we must never, never forget. They have made this triumph possible. Without them, it could never be. Their sacrifices impose on us the duty, the ineseapable duty of outlawing war, of making certain that aggression never runs loose in the world again.

Just 1 week before victory, came the atomic bomb. All of us were stunned by the news that man had learned the secret of nature's tremendous power. Even before victory, we had left one world behind us and were standing on the threshold of a new and challenging one. The long and patient work of a few brilliant men has unlocked the door to a source of power so tremendous that it defies the imagination. That power was applied in war to save us. At the command of a Hitler—and it nearly came to him first—it could easily destroy us and all of civilization. This giant power can either work for man or against him. Controlled it can become one of man's greatest blessings. Uncontrolled it can wipe him from the face of the earth. The decision rests with you.

How? While things and the power of things have been growing by leaps and bounds, man within himself, has developed slowly. As citizens of a democracy, it is we, the people, who must govern power. But, as the instruments of power become stronger and stronger, we must develop also or be left behind and become enslaved. Never before have we faced a greater challenge or a greater responsibility. Each one of us must develop his mind to a greater awareness of what is going on in the world and must develop his character to control that knowledge. Only in this way can we measure up to that which is required of us in the new world that is dawning.

The whole world now looks to the United States for leadership. We did not seek this role but it is ours and we cannot fail it. We have great problems at home to solve, problems of reconversion and reemployment as we set our house in order. Beyond that lies the problem of the world, the one and indivisible society, and we are the leaders of it as we go forward into the atomic age. There is no turning backward. Only slaves avoid responsibility. Freemen welcome it.

Today we relax, celebrate, and have fun because our trial by war is over. Today we also think of the men who died, giving into our hands the direction of the new world they died to create. We shall pray that we may be worthy of their faith in us. Tomorrow we shall start on our new job, one demanding more than our minds and hearts have ever given before as we strive to catch up with and control the vast material power that has outstripped us. The shaping of that tomorrow lies with us and there can be no delay.

For that is the meaning of our victory.

Nazi Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an

article entitled "The Biggest Lie of All," written by me and published in the August 1945 issue of the Reader's Scope.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIGGEST LIE OF ALL

(By Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, United States Senator from Utah)

Early last winter I held in my hand a child's shoe—and shuddered. It was small and worn, the heels and toes scuffed. It was an ordinary shoe. But it came from a place which in November 1944 still had a strange ring to its name—a place called Maidanek. A war correspondent brought the pathetic little witness back with him, to show America. He had taken it from a mountain of some 800,000 pairs of shoes accumulated by the Nazi keepers of the Maidanek murder factory. Near it, said the correspondent, he had seen another mountain—of human ashes. The world is now familiar with the name Maidanek. It is equally familiar with such mountains.

I remember, that as I held that little shoe, I thought, What does murder really mean? How does mass murder look? I did not doubt the veracity of the reports from Maidanek. They rank horrifyingly true. It was simply difficult for the mind to grasp the monstrous concept of mass murder.

Now I have seen it. I have seen the mountains of charred bones and ashes and shriveled corpses. I have seen the even more terrible living dead wandering among them.

Most Americans, by now, have seen it too. Newspapers and magazines across the country have carried photographs taken at Ohrdruf and Buchenwald and Dachau. Films, unfortunately less widely shown, have carried American audiences directly to the scene of Nazidom's unspeakable atrocities. I can fully endorse and solemnly repeat what General Eisenhower said in his invitation to our congressional investigating committee:

"I can state unequivocally that all written statements up to now do not paint the full horrors."

I do not think it is necessary to repeat here what we saw at Dachau or any of the other concentration camps, where we witnessed the depths of human cruelty and human depravity. I think, however, that it is of the utmost importance to examine the meaning of what we saw. Our committee has reported to the Congress:

"The concentration camps for political prisoners are precisely what the name implies. They are places of incarceration, punishment, and liquidation of civilians who were opposed to, or who were suspected of being opposed to, the Hitler regime. A number of them were established at the beginning of that regime."

I think that the full meaning of what I saw is contained in the last sentence. The concentration camp is an integral part of nazism and fascism. It cannot be isolated from that vast conspiracy against all mankind which included poisoning the minds of men against each other, seeking to penetrate every corner of the globe with lying "theories" of racial and religious hatreds, while stealthily organizing a military juggernaut for world conquest. But most especially the frightful banner under which the Dachaus flourished must be remembered—the banner on which was inscribed the greatest lie of all—that all of this was being done to save the world from "the menace of Bolshevismus—international Jewish Bolshevismus."

That is what the German industrialists and financiers paid for, what the Gestapo spread its reign of terror to uphold, what the butchers at Buchenwald and Oscweicim and Lidice put into bloody practice.

And that is what I think thoughtful Americans must remember today. That we are outraged by the murder that was done is indisputable. That we are horrified by the unspeakable proportions it reached is clear. That those guilty of these crimes must be severely punished, is the profound determination of every decent human being.

The proper agencies are compiling the totals—4,000,000 at Oscweicim, over a million and a half at Maidanek, hundreds of thousands at Buchenwald and Dachau. So many Poles, so many Greeks, Germans. So many Jews, Americans, so many Russians. Yes, especially so many Russians. Everywhere we went we found it to be the same.

We found that a diabolical system ran through the regime of these camps. We were not seeing the deeds of isolated, bloodcrazed minds. It was apparent that this colossal scheme of extermination, carried out by methodically constructed devices of torture, followed a pattern whose precision was as coldblooded and ruthless as it was thorough.

Why—the sane and simple mind asks itself—why was it necessary, in order to save the world from the menace of Bolshevism, to murder the child who wore the shoe from Maidanek, to drain the blood of Hungarian children near Riga, to exterminate the population of French villages, to torture innocent Jews, to starve to death German, Czech, Polish intellectuals and professors? The answer is harshly simple—opposition to Hitlerism and all it stood for had to be stifled, lest decent humanity, hearing the truth, gang-up to stifle Hitlerism and its anti-Bolshevik lie. The blinded Nazi would-be rulers of the world had to believe that the dead would remain silent.

They were wrong. As wrong as Hitler's intuitive generalship. As wrong as they were at Stalingrad and in the Ardennes Forest. The dead speak. The voices they strangled cry eloquently for justice.

Our Committee told the Congress:

"It is the opinion of your Committee that these practices constituted no less than organized crime against civilization and humanity and that those who were responsible should have meted out to them swift, certain and adequate punishment."

But is that enough? Will that be sufficient payment to the dead, will it be "the last full measure of devotion" which we the living can offer them? Whether they were killed by torture at Buchenwald or under the bombs of the Luftwaffe at Coventry or beneath the blazing guns of Nazi tanks near Orel or in Normandy? Not unless the banner, as well as those who carried it, is rejected by men who will not be ruled by fear. Fear of a bogeyman called Bolshevism must be as completely routed from the earth as the military might of its creators has been crushed by the armed coalition of the three great allies.

For if any vestige of Hitlerism, from its grave in the ruins of Germany, can survive this most terrible of wars, then Hitler's dream of "Tomorrow the world" will still not have been an empty one.

The Wehrmacht general staff, in its death rattle, hoarsely tried to carry on the Fuehrer's divisive tactics. It vainly tried to win the last political skirmish—to surrender to the western allies alone. By the hundreds of thousands Germans rushed toward our lines. What did they hope to find there?

Leniency, softness, stupidity? Yes; all these things.

Chiefly they hoped to find there fertile soil for their destructive message of fear and hatred of the Russians.

Our investigating committee has expressed the hope that its findings in the Nazi murder camps will help increase the determination of the American people that it shall not happen again—anywhere. And to bring to them the firmer realization that men of all nations and all tongues must resist encroachments of every theory and every ideology that debases mankind.

The United Nations Organization is the repository of the hopes of mankind that war and aggression as instruments of national policy shall become a memory of the past; that "peace in our time" shall no longer be the deceitful praise brought back from Munich in 1938. To achieve this hope the vast majority of our people know that the Great Powers must continue in peace the mighty coalition with which, united, they defeated the greatest enemy of peace and decency.

But wishes and pious hopes are not enough. Only a little over a year ago I wrote:

"Now that Russia has shown herself the strongest country in Europe, the only one on the Continent that has stood up to Hitler and beaten him at his own game, how does she stand with us? It is not easy to say, but I feel certain that the anti-Russian forces throughout the world are still strong and they will make every effort to throw doubt on her motives and intentions, and to make Americans, especially, believe that Russia is the most to be feared of all powers. * * * They would make us believe that the Russians have deep-laid plans to rule the world, to change all governments by force, to absorb all Europe. They will stop at nothing to prevent our working out an agreement with her and all the people of the world for a solution of the problems of peace. * * *"

Only 3 months ago the war in Europe ended. Our gallant GIs and the magnificent GIs of the Red Army met at Torgau and sealed in the enduring understanding of victorious comrades in arms their deep mutual regard and affection. Yet some sections of our press already shrilly discuss war with Russia, impugn Russia's motives in eastern Europe, sow the seeds of discord.

The dead at Dachau come before my eyes when I read such words. The little shoe from Maidanek mutely appeals: "How can they do it?"

They can and will unless we repudiate them and the forces which inspire them as decisively as we repudiated the murderous deeds of the master criminals of nazism.

As the committee stood in the infamous gas chamber of Dachau, and later at one of its three execution grounds where prisoners knelt to be shot through the back of the head—a considerable amount of blood was still visible on that ground—the committee heard the hideous echos of Hitler's voice screaming for "Lebensraum," shouting hatred and bigotry, appealing to man's basest fears, conceived in ignorance and nurtured by hysteria.

But then I heard the stilled voice of our great commander-in-chief buoyantly, gallantly telling us, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." I remembered that at Tehran, Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill had unmistakably informed Hitler and an applauding world, "We leave here friends in purpose."

In that continued and implemented friendship lies the only hope for enduring peace. In the firm and unshakable partnership of the two strongest nations on earth—the USA and the USSR—lies the only guaranty of justice for the victims of Nazi atrocities. I always like to recall that the doctrines of our own American Revolution were condemned by the same kind of little minds as seek today to utilize the spectre of "Red Russia." Thomas Jefferson was called a "subversive agent." But with him I like to believe that the world profited by our example and our vigorous defense of the proposition that free men are better off than slaves. And in this one world, drawn closer in the holocaust of war and led back to peace by a coalition sealed in the blood of martyrs from every Nazi murder factory, we can well repeat with Jefferson:

"I will not believe that our labors are lost. I shall not die without a hope that light and liberty are on a steady advance * * * the flames kindled on the 4th of July, 1776, have spread over too much of the globe to by extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them."

GI Joe, GI Pat, and GI Abe Pay Tribute to a Hero Priest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no intolerance on the battlefield. This fact was emphasized in an address delivered by Col. Julius Klein, commanding officer, Five Hundred and Twenty-third Quartermaster Group, somewhere in the Pacific on July 23, 1945, at memorial services for Rev. Fr. (Chaplain) Lawrence E. Lynch, One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry.

Although Colonel Klein is not a member of the same religious domination that Father Lynch represented among the fighting men in the Philippines, he expressed the opinion of all members, Protestant, Jew, and Catholic, when he addressed his command and told of the life, the work and the heroism of this chaplain who was killed in action.

Following is the address of Col. Julius Klein:

Fellow officers and men, it is with a sad heart that I speak to you today. I am not addressing you as your commanding officer alone who, like you, had the privilege of serving with our late departed buddy, Father Lynch, but I am speaking to you today as one who has been his intimate friend; as one whose life has been enriched because he received spiritual guidance and comfort from Father Lynch during hectic days. I am speaking to you also as his personal friend and one who had the honor to meet his mother only a few months ago.

I was searching my mind and racking my brain to find adequate words of tribute to fittingly commemorate the memory of this great and true Christian soldier who sacrificed his life in the truest sense for God and country so that others might live; and as I was looking for the proper tribute I found an address which most of you heard at our last station in the South Pacific on last year's Memorial Day when we honored those buddies of ours, members of our command who like Father Lynch had given their all above and beyond the call of duty.

I am sure you remember that impressive ceremony in that improvised amphitheater that once was a cave. Christian and Jewish chaplains alike joined in those memorial services.

In my address last year I told you that the memory of those services would remain with you the rest of your lives. Today you will realize why. I finally found the proper and fitting words that would pay this tribute to the memory and great deeds of our departed comrade, Father Lynch. I have to read these words from a manuscript. You may be a little surprised as you know I never read from a prepared copy when I address you. But I want you to get every word of this tribute which read as follows:

"Today, Memorial Day, is not just a day of memory, a mere recollection of things past and gone-by, but this is the day we dedicate to a definite memorial, which is the undying life-work of immortal men.

"There is no path in all the world but is a cross-road, a road beside which stands a silent sentinel of a snow-white cross whose arms lift up the noble name of an American who fought and fell to make that point a farther outpost of real liberty.

"We honor our brothers who pushed back the limits of a continent and gave America to all the world, because America is not so much a land, as it is a people, our people—ourselves the people; and the things we people feel and think and value and love, like brotherhood, equality, and liberty.

"They are our brothers, sons of our people, who gave their lives for America, our America, whose rich earth fed us, whose lovely lakes and rivers slaked our thirst, whose countless western herds clothed and shod us, and whose towering forests built us castles of freedom we call home, whose climbing mountains gave us rock and stone to build the paths of friendship from our doors to all the roads of all the world and all the bloody trails of deadly deserts and withering blizzards and twisty jungle ways and ambushed avenues of cities of the universe—until all these paths and ways and roads are highways, express speedways for liberty to travel out to other peoples on, for all roads now lead to America.

"Today all American hearts wander these ways to kneel beside a simple grave where a brother gave his life but did not die, because he lives in our lives and loves.

"In geography we talk of an imaginary belt around the world called an equator, but in American history we know there is a real equator, a white shining equator around the whole world, which is the chain of shining white crosses that milestone the path of liberty around the earth; and forever under Heaven's blue these white crosses mark the spot baptized in your red blood of America, a spiritual transfusion that has filled the heart veins of all other nations with the hope and laughter that is America. The white sticks are stakes that liberty has marked the earth with, so that freedom can at last homestead on another land to become another America.

"That cross marks the spot where one of us shoved off. All these new crosses tell us they have left the young world in their own smiling and inquiring youths, but someday, soon or late, we too shall follow them and all units at home, the land of our eternal freedom where they wait for us."

Do you know and do you remember who uttered those fine, deep, and impressive words—do you know who it was? This was the memorial address delivered by none other than our own Father Lawrence Lynch. You know now why I had to read those words. It is the tribute Father Lynch paid to our buddies of our command. Can you think of a more fitting tribute and epitaph for him than his own sermon of last year? Father Lynch knew; Father Lynch had no fear because he was a true servant of God. I have always compared Father Lynch with Father Duffy of the last war. He administered to Jew and Gentile and unbeliever alike. I can see him now in my headquarters as if it was yesterday, pleading the case of this or that soldier and usually getting what he wanted for them. All men of all faiths owed a debt to Father Lynch.

When as port commander at APO 502 it was my duty to supervise the rescue work when the Liberty ship *Elihu Thompson* was hit by a mine, it was Father Lynch who was first on the scene. He went out with me in a small crash boat in a very choppy sea, and, as the dead and injured were brought to the surface or to safety, Father Lynch administered the last rites or gave them words of comfort. He looked at their dog tags and he was able to give the prayers of each and every faith; he was the only chaplain with me. He had a great sense of humor. As one of the soldiers was pulled on board, suffering from exposure, he said to him, smiling, "What you need, my son, is a prayer and a good drink," and he got the medical officer to give the lad a shot of whisky.

All of you remember when the Twenty-fifth Division shoved off for Luzon. It was early in December, and these lads were singing carols by candlelight. I told this story to my buddy, Chaplain Lynch. I asked him how he would interpret or explain their emotions or my emotions. His answer was simple, and it was the priest and soldier speaking when he said, "Colonel, that's what we are fighting for. That is the reason why the chaplain feels that his war is just as much a struggle to preserve our faith, our trust in God, and our right to worship in our own way. Now we know that God is on our side. The enemy is singing songs of war and hate. Let our boys sing their Christmas carols or folk songs or family songs because when they return home that's all they want to remember of the horrors of war."

The last letter I received from Father Lynch from the bloody Okinawa battlefield was written a month or so before he was killed in action. Let me read a few lines from what he had to say.

"I do hope you had a moment to visit my home when you passed through New York. I came up to the new outfit rested and ready to do a big job, and I soon had gotten acquainted with every man and officer by name. The idea of eating in the men's mess is still amazing to them, but they like it and so do I. We immediately got all the priests together and I arranged a huge 3-day division mission. I preached and led the singing. You would have loved it. It kept raining like Niagara every minute of it, but it kept no one away, and in 3 nights we had almost 15,000 men attending and at the solemn mass Wednesday at 5:30 a. m., 3,000 appeared and 1,400 went to communion. Imagine it was the first mission ever given in the Twenty-seventh Division, and I went down to two small outfits and talked to 2,818 men, so you see I am getting to meet the entire island so that by now it is almost like Noumea—everyone so friendly, knowing everyone and working with them."

He had the confidence and respect of our beloved commanding general, Major General Gilbreath, to whom he came with many requests for better conditions for the enlisted men, and you all know with what good results.

Do you remember when the theater commander, General Richardson, visited us? He immediately spotted Father Lynch and went with him into a corner as General Richardson, who always had the welfare of the enlisted men at heart, was anxious to speak with one so well qualified.

Father Lynch pleaded for fresh meat and food for us and, as you know, a few weeks later General Gilbreath, through the cooperation of General Richardson, was able to accomplish this for us.

It was therefore only proper that when the congressional delegation called, Father Lynch visited them with the idea of impressing on them the obligations of the Congress toward GI Joe. Father Lynch never pulled his punches, and let me read to you a few lines that Congressman ROWAN, from Illinois, uttered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

While I was in the South Pacific, Father Lawrence E. Lynch, of Brooklyn, an Army chaplain, said the following about GI Joe: "Within the ranks of our young soldiers of today are our leaders of tomorrow, each boy is an important personage to us, someone very important, he is an American and represents great things. He is a future pillar of America. He is important enough to fight for America and he deserves all the care and help which he can get now. He brought his religion into the Army with him and I am sure that he will leave the Army stronger in the beliefs of his faith.

"And so I say, 'yes, Father Lynch is right.' Our boys and girls in uniform are assurance for a greater and better America. After this most interesting trip of my life I can tell you, my colleagues, my constituents, and the people of America that we have every reason to be proud of our sons and daughters in the service and that the flower of America's youth is in trusted hands.

"Some day in the future, great writers, great composers, great artists will appear whose

dramatic skill may bring home eloquently to the American people the drama of the South Pacific. While history is being made we can watch and hope that the America of the future will cherish the gains which Johnny Doughboy's sacrifices have won."

Father Lynch was a typical Brooklyn boy. His parents had raised more than 10 children I believe, and his devotion to all of them knew no bounds. When he spoke of them as sister or brother he was just a simple GI like you and I.

When I was in the United States a few months ago on a special mission for the theater commander I made it a point to visit New York in order to meet the great lady whom Father Lynch called his mom, and when I spoke to her I found her the typical American mother. Her simplicity and charm were those of Whistler's great painting of his mother. She spoke with pride of Father Lawrence as she called him. She was prepared to take what came even unto the sacrifice of her son on the altar of freedom. She told me that his desire to go into combat was known to her and she respected his wishes and his courage. I admired her spirit. I can see her as if it were only yesterday. I can hear her typical Irish brogue. She was a mother like yours and mine. I knew then where Father Lynch got his fine qualities. A rabbi was calling that day as I was there. In her neighborhood she is a friend of the poor of all faiths, she and her husband beloved by all. The rabbi, like many others, was an old friend and frequent visitor to the Lynch household. Yes, she is a typical mother as any other, who longs to hear how her boy looked, how he felt and what he was doing from "my boy's colonel" as she graciously called me.

That this great courage and spirit never left her is evidenced in a letter to my wife in which she announced the death of her son:

"Since I met you in New York, I had intended every day to write you and tell you how much I enjoyed my visit with you and the colonel, but time slides so. I hope you and your good husband are well and everything going well. Not so with us. Father Lawrence was killed in action in Okinawa, the 27th of April, it was slaughter. He wrote and said he had given over 4,000 communions to the men in a few weeks. He was so happy. He said all the Catholic officers and men made their Easter duty and at dusk he visited the fox holes and slit trenches and blessed all the men and all used to wait for him. He was killed near one of the fox holes. His work must be finished and God called him home. We mourn and rejoice at the same time. He did his best and gave all for his brothers in combat. So God have mercy on his soul. Goodby now for awhile and say a little prayer for him.

"Sincerely,

"MRS. LYNCH."

What more can I say or add to that simple tribute of a great American mother? My mind goes first to the bereaved family telling them that to us Father Lynch was far more than a minister. He was a great inspiration and we shall cherish and honor his memory until the day when we ourselves answer the last roll call.

America and the world will be a better place because of the sacrifices made by Father Lynch and the Chaplain's Corps. Yet, Father Lynch is sleeping now where he fell. A simple white cross on his grave, the dog tag nailed to its white arm. He sleeps amongst his buddies of all faiths whom he served so well.

Again let me repeat the last paragraph of Father Lynch's own Memorial Day message:

"That cross marks the spot where one of us shoved off. All these new crosses tell us they have left the young world in their own smiling and inquiring youths, but someday, soon or late, we too shall follow them and all units at home, the land of our eternal freedom, where they wait for us."

So here we are on liberated soil that is drenched with the blood of our buddies who like our comrade, Father Lynch, gave their all. We turn in our mind toward Okinawa, where Father Lynch followed his great commander, General Buckner, and the other GI Joes, GI Pats, and GI Abes.

Let me therefore conclude these services with the same prayer we said for our buddies in that memorial service, the prayer I so often offered when paying the last tribute to one of our fallen comrades:

"Let us pray: Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in whose hands are the living and the dead; we give Thee thanks for all men, particularly our comrades who have given their lives in the service of our country. Grant to them Thy mercy and the light of Thy presence, that the good work which Thou hast begun in them may be perfected. Bless and comfort their loved ones. Amen."

A Memorandum on the Political Status of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum of the Association for Independence of Puerto Rico, of New York, an affiliate of the Congress for Independence of Puerto Rico:

A MEMORANDUM ON THE POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

The President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, has publicly disclosed that the American people is conscious of the right of Puerto Rico to self-determination as a compensation for its contribution to victory. Furthermore, President Truman will soon deliver a message to Congress in which he will refer specifically to the solution of the political status of Puerto Rico. The Association for Independence of Puerto Rico of New York, an affiliate of the Congress for Independence of Puerto Rico, deems it advisable in this historic hour to lay before the elected representatives of the American people the true solution to the problem and respectfully begs you to act accordingly.

To the President of the United States and to the Honorable Senators and Representatives of Congress:

1. The problem of Puerto Rico has no solution other than independence.

2. The dynamics of history, both from the Puerto Rican and American perspective, points toward this as the only solution.

3. United States is solemnly committed by the Atlantic Charter, the agreements of Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and by the United Nations Charter to receive in the family of democratic states such a nation as Puerto Rico, which along centuries has waged a tremendous struggle for democracy and independence. If Congress confirms these commitments, it would be fulfilling the obligations subscribed to by United States in the Treaty of Paris, by which Puerto Rico became an American colony.

4. All suggested alternatives to independence run against the felings of the majority of the Puerto Rican people. (See attached memorandum to the Committee on Insular Affairs issued by the Congress for Puerto Rican Independence.)

5. Questions of military strategy and economic relations should be decided by treaty between the sovereign Republic of Puerto Rico and the Republic of the United States.

6. The recognition of Puerto Rican independence would raise to a new and higher level the moral prestige of the United States in world affairs, rallying the colonial peoples around its leadership. From the standpoint of hemispheric relations it would ease inter-American tensions and strengthen inter-American solidarity based on the equality of national sovereignties and democratic principles.

7. A friendly and independent Puerto Rico would develop fully its national resources, becoming thus a richer market for United States products.

8. Any solution different from independence will be perpetually a source of trouble within Puerto Rico, the Caribbean region, and the Spanish-American world.

The Puerto Rican patriots who incarnate the purest and best traditions of Puerto Rican history and culture are determined never to falter in the struggle for their ideal of freedom. A free Puerto Rico in a free world will be the best friend of a free United States.

ASSOCIATION FOR INDEPENDENCE OF PUERTO RICO,
ARTURO JIMÉNEZ, *President.*
ALBERTO CIBES VIADÉ, *Secretary.*
NEW YORK, N. Y.

OPPOSITION OF THE PUERTO RICO PRO-INDEPENDENCE CONGRESS TO S. 1002

The Congress for the Independence of Puerto Rico hereby makes known its formal and most energetic opposition to the Senate bill 1002, presented and defended by the Legislative Commission of Puerto Rico. Our opposition is based on the following:

1. In spite of the fact that the bill offers three different formulas for the solution of the political problem of Puerto Rico, none of these alternatives satisfies the wishes of our people, who desire the final termination of the colonial regime. The bill does not satisfy the wishes of our people because the solution of statehood, intended to satisfy the small sector which claims to favor that solution, is a statehood with privileges which are almost completely impossible under the Constitution of the United States, in which all States have equality of rights. Although it is known that statehood for Puerto Rico has not a chance of support in Congress, the inclusion of such economic privileges as are proposed in Senate bill 1002 makes such support even less likely.

2. With regard to the solution of independence, offered to satisfy the demands of the great majority of our people, the form which has been given to it in the bill cannot be considered acceptable because that solution is framed with fundamental restrictions which imply the negation of independence. We refer to the condition whereby free trade would be maintained indefinitely, subject to change only in the event that the United States were to give its assent. The result would be that although Puerto Rico would be politically independent, it would remain as a perpetual economic colony of the United States.

3. It is also a negation of independence because the bill would commit the people of Puerto Rico to a perpetual military alliance with the United States, under which our soldiers would be obliged to fight by the side of the American soldiers in any future war in which the United States might be engaged, even if such war were, from our point of view, unjust. Such a condition is not reasonable for Puerto Rico, nor is it fair to the good name of the United States to include such an onerous provision as a condition for our liberty.

4. The form in which the independence status has been drafted is also negative because it places the Territory of Puerto Rico

completely at the disposition of the Government of the United States in order that the latter may use its own judgment regarding the establishment of military and naval bases and the passage of American troops at any place and in any directions, without limitation and without the necessity of previous consultation with the people of Puerto Rico. All of this signifies that if such conditions were approved, there would be established permanent military subjection, repugnant to our self respect, in violation of our sovereignty, and prejudicial to the prestige of the United States as a democratic nation. Under such conditions our people would be obliged to vote against such a formula of independence defined in the plebiscite bill. Although the highest degree of military cooperation is both desirable and necessary for the two countries, and we have not the least doubt that the people of Puerto Rico are unanimously willing to give such cooperation, the dignity of our people and the good name of the United States need not be harmed by such condition precedent when agreements between both countries can secure the best results.

5. The formula of dominion status is not only objectionable, but also receives our determined censure. Such a formula, in addition to not being a solution to our political problem, because it would maintain our country deprived of its sovereignty, has no support whatever from public opinion in Puerto Rico except for a limited number of individuals tied to vested interests and who desire to see the colonial system retained. These individuals, not being able to defend the colonial system before a public opinion which rejects it, wrap themselves in a new colonial cloak with the name dominion, commonwealth, free state, and others.

6. The formula of dominion as proposed in Senate bill 1002 contains clauses and provisions which are impossible within the elemental principles of international law. The bill establishes the legal absurdity of requesting other nations to recognize the sovereignty of Puerto Rico, without Puerto Rico's having beforehand achieved such sovereignty. Moreover, the proposed dominion status would carry with it essential restrictions in our economic relations with the United States, that would prevent our industrial development, so necessary to raise our standard of living. These restrictions would maintain Puerto Rico in the same economic servitude which it now suffers, not to mention the military subjection which is included and which we have already discussed.

7. With regard to the economic guaranties proposed in the bill by the legislative commission, we base our opposition to them on the fact that they are impossible under statehood, and harmful to Puerto Rico and the United States under independence or the so-called dominion status. The proposed economic measures imply the maintenance of an inflexible system of trade relations between our two countries. Although it is suggested that that system would be modified later by mutual agreements between Puerto Rico and the United States, unless provision is made now to facilitate these changes as soon as possible, it would imply that the present economic relations, in the minds of our representatives on the legislative commission are the best that can be obtained, when the truth is that Puerto Rico needs it political sovereignty precisely in order to attain a greater degree of authority in the regulation and control of its economic life.

8. For the purpose of making adjustments in the economic relations between the United States and the independent Puerto Rico, it is only reasonable to establish beforehand the bases or legal foundations for such adjustments. If this is not done, Puerto Rico would have no guarantee during its period of readjustment, since the economically most powerful party (the United States) would always be in a position to impose its own conditions on the economically weakest party to the agreements (Puerto Rico). It is not difficult to predict that if these foundations are not provided for, Puerto Rico would invariably be bested in the agreements or treaties made after our political sovereignty is recognized.

9. The Congress for Independence has drafted amendments to the bill presented by Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS which are designed to protect Puerto Rico against this disadvantage discussed above, and at the same time to assure a maximum of justice in the relations, both to Puerto Rico and the United States. We object to the bill drafted by the legislative commission because, instead of including measures which would guarantee the economic welfare of Puerto Rico, it only reaffirms the economic subjection from which we now suffer. That is unjust for Puerto Rico and morally inacceptable for the good name of the United States.

10. The legislative commission, in presenting this bill, has given the impression that it is acting in the name of the people of Puerto Rico. It is our duty to rectify that impression. The legislative commission had no mandate, either from the people or the legislature, to present any solution or formula of political status. Not even the Popular Democratic Party, which received a majority of the votes in the last election, has conferred any power to present in the name of the people proposals for the solution of the political status. On the contrary, and in marked contrast with the position of the legislative commission, the majority of the senators and representatives of our legislature had already indicated their support of the Tydings independence bill with amendments followed by the support of the majority of the mayors of the towns of Puerto Rico expressed in cables sent to Senator TYDINGS. Although neither legislators nor mayors had received a mandate in this respect their actions were more legitimate and direct than the representations of the legislative commission.

In reaffirming our support to the Tydings bill for Puerto Rican independence and to the amendments already submitted by this organization, we submit with this brief summary of objections a copy of the public statement issued by the Congress for Independence, in which these objections to Senate bill 1002 are more fully documented and explained.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, CONGRESS FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF PUERTO RICO,
ANTONIO SANTAELLA,
Acting President.
JESUS BORDONADA, *Secretary.*
SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, *June 26, 1945.*

Resolution Adopted by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation at the Annual Executive Conference held at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, August 15-16, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation at the annual executive conference held at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, August 15-16, 1945.

Whereas Congress, when it reconvenes, will consider bills intended to establish a system of airports and to provide Federal aid for their construction; and

Whereas these bills, particularly S. 2 and H. R. 3615, establish an entirely new method of Federal-State-local cooperation by providing for direct Federal grants to political subdivisions of the States; and

Whereas for more than 30 years the States have developed and administered effectively a Federal-State-local cooperative pattern for the construction and operation of public works and for the administration of public services in the fields of agriculture, highways, public health, vocational education and social security, which pattern, without exception, has been based upon cooperation and participation on the part of all levels of government; and

Whereas the new governmental system contemplated in the pending legislation would duplicate existing State organizations and agencies in the field of aviation, would require enormous expansion in the Federal agency and the employment of thousands of additional Federal officials and agents, would be both ineffective and uneconomical in operation, and would establish an entirely new system of intergovernmental operation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York joint legislative committee on interstate cooperation hereby urges the Congress of the United States, in the development of a national airport system to follow the long-established and effectively operated pattern of channeling aid to local communities exclusively through the respective State governments; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the New York delegation in Congress and that the members of this committee be urged to confer with their Congressmen in regard to this important matter.

Ernie Pyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the following little poem on Ernie Pyle has come to my attention. As a friend of the Infantry, I take off my hat to this noble pal and friend of the Infantry:

ERNIE PYLE

From a small Indiana town
Came a man who gained renown,
From the Wabash to the Nile.
All who knew—loved Ernie Pyle.

He was small, he loved not splendor;
Was the humble man's defender;
Trekked far and wide to entertain,
By train and ship and airplane.

In years agone, wrote to amuse,
Pleasing folks with all the news.
But then came fever of wanderlust,
And off to war in God to trust.

To aid morale to our fighting boys,
Ne'er shirked from danger amid the noise;
But kept the pace mid fearful fire,
Thoughtless of comfort or attire.

But in his ardor, mid battle's hell,
Was stricken down by bursting shell.
A real pal unto the end,
A prayer we say for the Nation's friend.

Few men have lived, were loved so well,
As Dana's son whom we all called swell,
He sought not fame or palace grand,
Just to live and lend a hand.

He gave his life, a martyr true;
Now lies asleep o'er ocean blue.
And as he rests on far off isle,
Let's not forget in the afterwhile,
The noble life of Ernie Pyle.

—*H. V. Hesselman.*

Army Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a letter from a soldier:

BAD SOODEN, GERMANY.

Recognizing that military needs must be served first, nevertheless the men in this country bitterly resent the most recent of the strange announcements that have emanated from the War Department. The latest intelligence is to the effect that the score will remain at 85; so that we in this battalion having been in the service for 3½ years; having earned 5 battle stars, the Meritorious Service Plaque, and having been overseas for more than a year and a half, now can look forward to a year at the very minimum, of boredom and dry runs. Ninety percent of us lack 1 to 7 points of the coveted 85 and since most of us are childless, we have earned these points the hard way.

We being good soldiers and citizens of a country where a man's word is his bond, fully believed the War Department when they said the score would be lowered. The many postponements of the date aroused suspicions, but we were confident that our Government would not let us down. However, last night as the radio tore our morale to shreds, the silence in the day room where most of us heard our sentence, was appalling. We couldn't absorb this new blow; surely it was a joke by pranksters of the AFN. But quickly the reports arrived from other sources; this was the grim truth. We, who had not hid behind the cloak of a defense job or had rode the sick book to have ourselves declared essential only to SCU units now were being told that we're suckers first class. Sickening is hardly the word.

So we rot away in the ETO or await the PTO; standing inspections, drilling, pitching pup tents, doing road marches; movements that were old and tiresome to use 3 years ago. The men over 30 who have endured 4 years at an age that only a few years ago the War Department declared that these men made very poor risks for the Army. There must be a fair way of dealing with men's lives. If it was our pocketbooks, which, of course, for most of us have been badly dented, we wouldn't mind, but this is our destiny and at this writing it is definite that we were born not only to be forgotten but to be the most bitter and disillusioned men in the history of our Republic.

An increasing fear that the United States will not or never will be industrially prepared for us is noted among our personnel. Naturally we want jobs, but jobs or not, we can make our way if only given a chance. It is not necessary to mask the true position and cause the soldier to become politically conscious by retaining him in the service. All we want is a fair shake of the dice.

The education program a laugh—only men with 85 points eligible. The vast entertainment program—another joke—quotas of 25 men out of 170. The food worse and worse by the week.

What hurts most of all is that we used to belong to a democracy where all men are equal, that is except the ETO veterans who will be kicked around until they limp home in 1947, beaten men ready to sidle into the allotted place in the bread line or perhaps by that time they will have brooded long enough not to want to go home. Some of them have discovered that Germany isn't such a bad place to live in.

A grand, ironical, finale to this war of liberation: myriads of Yank soldiers elect to remain with the Fascists.

The Question of Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the matter of discharge of our men and women who are still serving in the armed forces of this country is sufficiently important to warrant early consideration of this subject by the House.

There will be presented shortly a bill which has for its purpose the augmenting of our armed forces by placing a premium on reenlistment. To some extent the passage of this bill would be helpful. Perhaps there will be other meritorious legislation presented that will fill the gap between the number of men and women necessary for occupational and other duties and the number who rightly should be discharged.

Brawn will soon take the place of might and the opportunity will soon present itself to thousands of willing men, who were formerly classified as IV–F's, to lend themselves to educational and other pursuits in foreign countries if now permitted to do so. Thousands of men of keen intellect and great capacity, because of physical disqualifications, were not permitted to participate in World War II. These men are good and patriotic American citizens who were and are willing to serve their country. Their intelligence and abilities could now be put to excellent use in carrying out the problems of occupation. Actually they are needed far more now than fighting men are needed. They can fill part of the gap in our requirements.

In any event, it is high time that Congress took it upon itself to insist that in the handling of this problem of discharges the military conform to the principles of good sense, and regard the fundamental principle that family life in America has always been the sustaining force of this great democracy. Family fires must be rekindled. Our boys and girls must be brought home as quickly as necessity for their presence in foreign lands ceases to exist.

In the European theater there are at present about 2,500,000 men. Estimated needs for occupation purposes of Germany by our troops is placed at about 500,000 men and women. But, what about the contributions of our former Allies? The number of troops to be supplied for occupational purposes is unknown, but assuming that all of the United Nations intend to participate in some equitable manner for the occupation of Japan and Germany, a fair guess as to the number of troops to be supplied by the United Nations on the basis of General Eisenhower's estimate of the number of American soldiers needed for the purpose would run well into 1,500,000. Common sense tells us that such a force to occupy the lands of these defeated countries is grossly in exaggeration of the need.

The situation in Japan is admittedly different than the situation which exists in Germany. Large forces must occupy a country of bestial, hating people whose habits and ideologies do not even remotely parallel our own. When the Japanese people become aware of the might of our forces in their own land, conflict with these forces will greatly subside. Until subsidence the United Nations should be called upon to equally supply the necessary occupational forces, and not rely so entirely upon the United States to bear the full weight of the burden. England, France, and Russia should be called upon to participate in the occupation of both Germany and Japan and lend-lease a proportionate share of their troops for that purpose. For a time at least these countries should indulge in the principles outlined in the United Nations conferences and cease casting covetous eyes on sections of the world that they seem so desirous of occupying—alone.

America is not thinking of what she can acquire. Her intentions are purely altruistic, but in justice to herself she should now insist upon calling upon the United Nations of the world to play Santa Claus with her for a while. Good faith on the part of those nations, particularly those that have been hurt the least, can best be expressed by their willingness to join with the United States in the occupancy and supervision of Germany and Japan to the end that our entire fighting forces can for the most part be relieved.

Congress can do its part by enacting whatever legislation is necessary to permit early release of these forces, but the military must also do its part to accomplish the desired result. The mechanics involved would be simple if Congress could be told how many troops would be necessary to occupy Germany and Japan. On the basis of those figures could be later ascertained the contributions in troops to be assessed against each participating nation.

In this country it is hoped that voluntary enlistments will supply our share of occupational troops. In the event that they do not, other methods could be devised to fill the gap, and, if necessary, those who have not served should in fairness to those now serving, be called upon now to act in relief.

At any rate let us begin to solve the problem by starting out with the premise that the war as well as the peace is everybody's job, and let the warriors return to peacetime pursuits, while those who are necessary to do the policing of the world take up where the warriors left off. Our men and women in the fighting forces are entitled now to equitable treatment, and they can receive this treatment if Congress and the military will meet the problem with complete cooperation by both.

Surrender of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 6, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by General MacArthur on the occasion of the surrender of Japan, appearing in the New York Sunday Times of September 2, 1945:

MACARTHUR'S REMARKS

We are gathered here, representative of the major warring powers, to conclude a solemn agreement whereby peace may be restored. The issues, involving divergent ideals and ideologies, have been determined on the battlefields of the world and hence are not for our discussion or debate. Nor is it for us here to meet, representing, as we do, a majority of the peoples of the earth, in a spirit of distrust, malice, or hatred. But, rather, it is for us, both victors and vanquished, to rise to that higher dignity which alone benefits the sacred purposes we are about to serve, committing all of our peoples, unreservedly to faithful compliance with the undertakings they are here formally to assume.

It is my earnest hope and indeed the hope of all mankind that from this solemn occasion a better world shall emerge out of the blood and carnage of the past—a world founded upon faith and understanding, a world dedicated to the dignity of man and the fulfillment of his most cherished wish—for freedom, tolerance, and justice.

The terms and conditions upon which the surrender of the Japanese imperial forces is here to be given and accepted are contained in the instrument of surrender now before you.

PROMISES FULL JUSTICE

As Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, I announce it my firm purpose, in the tradition of the countries I represent, to proceed in the discharge of my responsibilities with justice and tolerance, while taking all necessary dispositions to insure that the terms of surrender are fully, promptly, and faithfully complied with.

I now invite the representatives of the Emperor of Japan and the Japanese Government and the Japanese Imperial General Headquarters to sign the instrument of surrender at the places indicated.

The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers will now sign on behalf of the nations at war with Japan.

The representatives of the United States of America will sign now.

The representatives of the Republic of China will now sign.

The representative of the United Kingdom will now sign.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will now sign.

The representative of Australia will now sign.

The representative of Canada will now sign.

The representative of France will now sign.

The representative of the Netherlands will now sign.

The representative of New Zealand will now sign.

Let us pray that peace be now restored to the world, and that God will preserve it always. These proceedings are closed.

Labor Day Address by Hon. Elmer Thomas of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on Labor Day at Summit Beach Park, Akron, Ohio, as reported in the Summit County Labor News under date of September 7, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

This is Labor Day.

This is the first day in six long years when all the peoples of all the nations have been at peace.

On the battleship *Missouri*, in Tokyo Bay, the representatives of Japan have just signed an order of unconditional surrender.

On yesterday the last of the outlaw nations surrendered, and today the world is again at peace.

Hence it is a coincidence that—today is a holiday in Akron.

This is a holiday in every city and in all our States and Territories.

Today our sons are on every land and on every sea; hence, this, the first Monday in September, is a holiday wherever waves the American flag.

On this national holiday well may we rejoice and celebrate the part that labor played in winning the most terrible war in history.

Many times the question will be asked: "Who won this great military victory?"

The answer:

No man, no group, and no party can claim all the glory that has come to the United States of America.

Our farmers produced the food.

Our wage earners produced and transported the equipment for war, and our citizen soldiers and sailors struck the blows that felled our enemies.

With respect to the part labor played in this greatest of all wars, let me be more specific:

Wage earners and workers designated as labor, cut the timber and processed the lumber necessary for the war effort.

Labor dug the ores and minerals from mines and processed the lead, zinc, copper, iron and steel into weapons of destruction.

Labor dug the coal necessary for the production of heat and power.

Labor drilled the wells and produced the oil necessary for the trucks, tanks, and planes.

Labor converted the raw materials into finished products.

Labor fabricated and constructed trucks, tanks, and planes and the thousands of items necessary to wage a successful war.

Without the machinery produced by labor, farmers could not have produced the food necessary for our armed forces.

Without the implements of war our soldiers and sailors could not have successfully met the challenge of the enemy.

Without railway equipment, supplies could not have been transported on land and without ships, neither military personnel nor military supplies could have been transported across the seven seas.

Here in Akron—the rubber capital of the world—let me observe that without the tires produced by the citizens of this community, the war would still be consuming the blood and treasure of America and the world.

Without the products of labor we could not have even started to win the war.

Let me remind you that the two atomic bombs which brought the Japs to their knees and to their senses were produced by labor.

Yet, this is not all that labor has contributed to the war.

Millions of boys in army and navy uniforms are from homes presided over by patriotic fathers and mothers working in defense industries.

For almost 4 years our people have been engaged in a life and death struggle, and labor has saved our lives.

Today wage earners—labor—the largest massed group in America, is entitled to this holiday on which to celebrate our greatest victory.

In Washington, our Nation's capital, I hear it charged that labor has become too active and too powerful.

I hear it said that labor has too much to say about the policies of our Government.

Why should not the wage earners, the largest group of our citizens, have something to say about the kind of laws under which they are to live?

Why should not the men and women who perform the work have a voice and a hand in shaping our political and economic policies?

Today I am glad to report to you, here in this great rubber and labor center, that you have a voice—a loud and convincing voice, in the Congress and in the administration at Washington.

Now a word about the day we celebrate.

Labor Day—a day for the glorification of those who toil—originated in New York in 1882.

The first celebration was sponsored by the Knights of Labor and took the form of a picnic and parade.

In the early days of our Republic, labor legislation was sponsored, as a rule, by the opponents of those who work, hence the legislation enacted was against the interests of the wage earners of our country.

Later labor legislation took the form of laws for the improvement of the lot of the workers of the propertyless and the common man.

While all goals have not yet been attained, yet it is gratifying to know that working men and women have moved forward since the early days of our Republic.

Let me mention just a few of the benefits that labor has attained.

Industrial compensation.

Unemployment insurance.

Industrial codes for fair labor standards.

National Labor Relations Act.

Social Security Act, providing for old-age assistance.

A law regulating the hours of labor.

In 1934 I introduced in the United States Senate a bill providing a 40-hour workweek, with increased pay for overtime, and such bill was promptly passed and became the law of the land.

In these few years this law has become the basis, or cornerstone, of practically all contracts in private as well as public employment.

This bill was introduced and sponsored by Federal workers in our Navy yards and at the Panama Canal.

It was not long until the workers in private industry demanded the benefits provided by this law.

Later, the railway brotherhoods accepted the principles of the law and today labor contracts between the brotherhoods and railway management are based upon the 40-hour workweek law, and more recently the provisions of the law have been extended to civil-service employees working in the various branches of the Federal Government.

Already all departments of the Federal Government, save the Veterans' Administration, have accepted the principles set forth in the workweek of 40 hours.

At this time let me make another observation.

Of all the many groups it is my conviction that labor is the most efficiently represented before the Congress and the administrative departments of the Government.

Your chosen representatives stationed at Washington know exactly what they want and are most efficient and successful in having your proposals accepted by the Government and enacted into law.

Another matter of interest to labor:

At this time the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is holding hearings on the Murray-Wagner full employment bill.

The hearings should be completed and the bill should be before the Senate for consideration and action within the next few days.

This bill has for its purpose the organization and correlation of industry, agriculture, labor, and local, State, and Federal Government activities, to the end that full employment of all Americans may be provided.

While we recognize the principle and necessity of free enterprise, yet in order to have all our people employed, it is mandatory that our whole domestic economy should be so correlated, as to secure a maximum sound national income.

A maximum sound national income is not only desirable, but because of the size of the national debt and the annual budget necessary to service such debt, such maximum income is not only necessary but is absolutely mandatory.

In addition to meeting the interest on a national debt of some $275,000,000,000, we must raise funds through taxation to maintain a proper military establishment.

Also, we must take proper care of our millions of returning veterans as well as veterans of former wars, and this will cost a sizable sum.

All of these war expenses will be over and above the necessary costs of the various branches of the Federal Government and for a few years, at least, will total over $20,000,000,000 annually.

Such an annual budget cannot be met on part employment and on low wage schedules.

At this point let me remind you that so long as wage earners have good jobs at fair wages, depressions cannot develop and, on the other hand, when labor is unemployed, bankruptcies and panics stalk throughout the land.

Let me remind you further that today you live in and are a part of the strongest, the richest, and the most influential nation of the earth.

Premier Stalin has said that without our aid the war would have been lost.

A few days ago Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of the British Empire, made the statement that the United States stands at the summit of the world.

What does the winning of the war mean to the United States?

It means that your Government, our Government, your country and our country, is now the leading nation of all the earth.

The United States stands at that point which Italy, Germany, and Japan gave their men, their treasure, their reputation, and their national existence to attain.

Not only did these once great nations commit national suicide, but for a moment reflect upon what happened to their respective leaders.

What happened to Mussolini, the leader of Italy?

By his own people he was captured, clubbed and stoned to death, then hung up by his feet in the public square, where his countrymen passed by and spat upon his lifeless form.

What happened to Hitler, the leader of Germany?

To avoid the public fate of Mussolini, Hitler disappeared, presumably killed and the remains destroyed by the desperate and enraged people of Berlin.

What happened to the Emperor and the god of Japan?

With his cities destroyed, with his navy and air power annihilated, the Japanese god is now taking orders from a citizen of the United States.

Throughout all history such has been the end of dictators and tyrants.

What would it have meant to our people had we lost the war?

The answer:

Our land would have been invaded.

Our people would have been disarmed.

Our banks would have been taken over.

Our gold and silver and our money would have been confiscated.

We would have lost our Navy and our merchant ships.

Our factories would have been seized.

Our churches, our schools, our lodges, and our unions would have been closed and our people would have been reduced to economic slavery.

The fate of France, under German control, and the fate of Korea and Manchuria under Japanese rule would have been the fate of the people of the United States.

Now that the war is over, whatever we have left is just that much saved.

Today the world is looking to the United States for leadership.

This responsibility now rests upon the shoulders of all the people of our common country.

This is a responsibility we cannot escape.

If we shirk or falter, chaos may prevail and civilization itself may lapse into another period comparable to the Dark Ages.

Uncle Sam is now the big strong boy on the world's sand lot.

Will he have the intelligence, the sound judgment and the courage to avoid becoming known as the world's bully?

This is the challenge which confronts us at this hour.

In assuming the leadership which has come to us, we have already taken steps to carry forward the program which has been outlined and agreed upon.

In this matter of leadership let me make it definite and plain that I am not boasting of our position in world affairs and I am not claiming undue credit for any group, class or party.

During the war, that is now a costly memory, all groups, classes and all political parties, representing all our people, worked harmoniously to win the contest.

Very briefly I call your attention to a few of the steps we have already taken.

Before the war was over we called the representatives of the free nations of the world to meet at San Francisco to develop a plan for the prevention of future wars.

The conference was held, a plan was agreed upon and we were the first nation to accept and ratify the United Nations Charter.

There are 96 Members of the United States Senate, and on the final vote 91 Members were present.

Of that number 89 voted for ratification and 2 voted against.

One absent Senator sent word that he was opposed to ratification, and the other absent Senators sent word that if they could have been present they would have voted for the Charter.

The war affected every country on earth, and as a result world trade and national finances have been disturbed.

In an effort to readjust and stabilize the monetary units of the several countries, our Government called a Conference at Bretton Woods, N. H.

This Conference agreed upon a plan proposing the development of two world organizations.

One, the fund, to adjust and stabilize world monetary units, and the other the bank, to assist the devastated nations to rehabilitate themselves.

A third conference to assist agriculture was called and held at Hot Springs, Va.

Trade agreements have been perfected and extended in an effort to help expand our commerce with the other nations of the world.

We are now expanding our good-neighbor policy by suggesting and developing educational agreements between and among the nations of the world.

In a sincere effort to help every group and class of our people, the President has announced that he will soon call another world conference for the expressed purpose of promoting the interests of labor.

Today the people of the United States, in purpose and in action, are more united than they have been in generations.

The national polls taken throughout the States show that our new President is the most popular official since President Monroe.

If we may continue to think and act together, we have the intelligence, the sound judgment, and the intestinal fortitude to assist in leading the liberty-loving peoples of the world back to lasting peace and sound prosperity.

In this new responsibility, with God's help, we shall not fail.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the credit for writing the longest message to be submitted to the Congress in my time must go to Mr. Truman. It consisted of 17,000 words and required almost 2 hours in reading. Space will not permit of my commenting in detail upon the document but offhand it would be fair to say that it was a mixture of good, fair, and bad, and must have given considerable comfort to the left wingers. It held out little hope for tax reductions and even less for the early termination of the draft.

As the message may be considered the blueprint for this administration perhaps we should analyze it a bit. The proposal to increase unemployment benefits up to $25 a week for 26 weeks would, without doubt, retard recovery and destroy incentive for the displaced to seek new jobs so long as they could draw unemployment benefits, and unnecessarily

increase the national debt. Minnesota already pays up to $20 per week for 20 weeks and any man who cannot find a suitable job in 20 weeks with the present shortage of labor does not need much sympathy.

MINIMUM PAY

I am inclined to agree with him that we must have a substantial increase in the now obsolete 40-cent minimum-wage because it is going to be necessary to maintain the very highest possible level in national income if deficit spending is to be avoided. However, I would write in a provision exempting apprentices from such increase in order to encourage employers to train young people in skilled trades—something that has not been done since the New Deal came into power. I believe it would be fatal to our economy if we were to return to the '41 wage and price levels. Some of my readers will say that this in inflation. Yes, but it is only through controlled inflation that we will be able to carry the huge load that has been placed upon us by the New Deal.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

For one, I fail to see how the Government can possibly guarantee full employment to all employables because there are too many seasonal activities that only operate a few weeks or months in the year. Mr. Truman's proposal would call for spoon-fed regimentation.

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

It is regretted that the President has fallen for the fair-employment practice agitation, which means that every employer would be compelled to hire the first applicant who comes along, and failing to do so could be compelled to pay full time from the time the application was made until final settlement. Few employers are going to permit the Federal Government or any individual to tell them whom they must hire. That is their sole right under the Constitution.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The President's request for a continuation of selective service is disappointing. With proper encouragement our military needs can be met by the volunteer system.

HOUSING

The President is on sound ground in advocating a broad and comprehensive program to help private enterprise build ten to fifteen million new homes in the next decade. All are quite generally agreed that active building and construction is a prerequisite to prosperity.

PUBLIC WORKS

His proposal for a multibillion dollar program for public works and the development of natural resources and grants to States and municipalities may be sound if it is not proposed as another WPA in disguise.

FOREIGN FINANCING

The President's reference to loans to foreign countries is quite broad and would open up new avenues for tapping the Federal Treasury. Certainly the Congress should oppose grants to foreign nations to be used for social experimentation such as is now being embarked upon in the United Kingdom. I do not know why the American people should finance Britain's program to acquire all coal mines, railroads, heavy industries, and banking system, and providing greater assistance for their aged. It would seem to me that Britain should look to Moscow for such financing. We have millions of aged in this country who are living from hand to mouth. With present prices, their assistance is wholly inadequate, and it is my contention that we should look after our own aged first. Indeed, this must be done without further delay.

CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

The President's proposal to increase congressional salaries to $20,000 a year leaves one cold. With a drained Federal Treasury, this is no time to double salaries of public officials, whether they be elective or appointive.

SOME PERSONAL IDEAS

Had I been permitted to write President Truman's message, I would have submitted to the Congress the following recommendations:

Immediate discharge of all men from Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who have had 1 or more years of service, including young men and women whose educations have not been completed, also husbands and fathers, upon application.

Suspend the draft law and give the American system of volunteer enlistments a fair trial.

Simplify GI bill of rights to make it workable.

Armies of occupation to be made up of volunteers.

Give every possible aid to rapid reconversion of industry.

Immediate declaration by Congress of termination of war.

Parity prices for agriculture.

Highest possible wage and price levels to maintain high national income sufficient to our needs.

Raise old-age assistance benefits to meet greatly increased cost of living.

Repeal daylight saving.

Horizontal reductions in all income taxes and terminate war taxes to maintain profit incentive and encourage risk capital.

Demand immediate return to balanced budget through rigid economy.

No grants of money or credits to any country to be used for socialization of their economy.

Retention of such bases captured by American forces as are deemed necessary to our future national security.

No cancellation of lend-lease loans without first submitting proposal to the Congress.

Retention of atomic bomb secret at least till international atmosphere has clarified.

Remove all unnecessary Government restrictions on our lives and business activities. Substitute the law of supply and demand for rationing.

Demand for full accounting of all expenditures during past 5 years.

Appointment of committees by Congress to recover for the Treasury the billions improperly diverted.

Give every encouragement to voluntary decentralization of industry in order to eliminate bottlenecks and slums, and at the same time provide work for our youth nearer home.

Return to States immediately full control of employment offices.

Why Does the Army Penalize American War Prisoners?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of Congress, and particularly of the members of the Military Affairs Committee, to a letter which I have received from a Federal circuit judge concerning the case of a young man in the Army, one of my constituents, who was a prisoner of war in Germany. After a frightful experience in a German prison camp, he was recaptured and brought back to his home in this country, broken in health and in spirit. Now, instead of being permitted to resume his education and endeavor to rehabilitate himself, physically and spiritually, he is confronted with the necessity of returning to the Army for overseas duty, because the War Department allows him no points for the time he spent in a German prison camp.

In order to save this young man from any embarrassment, I have omitted his name from the judge's letter, and referred to him merely as John Doe.

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAVENNER: Herewith is a simple statement of the Army record of young John Doe, Jr., concerning whom I promised to write to you.

This youth is the only child of Mr. and Mrs. John Doe, Sr., who are your constituents.

In November last the parents of young Doe were notified by the War Department that their son was missing in action. You can well imagine what a blow this was to his parents who were almost beside themselves with grief and worry. After heart-breaking months of anxious waiting during which they had all but given up hope, they at last received word through the Red Cross that the boy was alive but in a prison camp in Germany.

I have known the Does for more than 12 years. They are our nearest neighbors, so I speak from first-hand knowledge. This young man had for this day and age an unusually careful bringing up in a home of culture and refinement, and, as can readily be understood, the hardship of capture, imprisonment, and privation in Germany left its terrible impress upon him.

I saw him when he left for the Army, then a lad of 18, 6 feet tall, rosy cheeks, bright eyes, and very handsome—a perfect specimen of American manhood. I saw him when he returned, broken in health, emaciated figure, the light gone from his eyes, the color from his cheeks, and altogether a pathetically nervous individual.

As you will notice in the brief outline of his Army service, he has acquired 41 points. It is singular that the Army allows no extra points for time undergone in the terrible tortures of prison camps. Everyone I have spoken to, including yourself, find the lack of some provision for points for prison time almost unbelievable. The manner in which those who have been subjected to prison life are treated everywhere upon their return by civilians and even by the leaders of the Army, as illustrated by General MacArthur's treatment of General Wainwright and the other officers liberated by him in the Asiatic area, would indicate that these men who have passed through such bitter experience should be entitled to receive more points than if they had spent this time in this country.

As young Doe's record will also show, he voluntarily entered the Army upon completing his high-school education.

From discussions had in Congress and over the radio it is quite evident that the policy and intent of Congress is that these youths be returned to high-school and college as soon as may be. It is imperative in order to achieve the most desirable end and to accomplish the purpose in mind that speedy action must be taken. Any delay in restoring these youths to the status of students will greatly hamper their careers in after life to the detriment of our country, which will need well-educated young men to carry on. This, in general, applies to all young men similarly situated as is young Doe, but for the moment we are particularly interested in him and his future.

The Army regulations governing discharges seem to undergo very frequent changes. Only this morning I read that yesterday a new regulation had been made to the effect that those in the Army who had been overseas or had spent some time as prisoners, if they had 45 points, they would not be required to go overseas again. An examination of Doe's record shows that if he had four additional points he would come under this new regulation.

It seems to me that the Army "higher-ups" should allow something additional in points for actually being in enemy prison camps. So, if young Doe received only four more points for his imprisonment in Germany, he then would come under the new regulation. I hope that something can be done about it.

Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Reconversion, delivered on Tuesday, August 28, 1945, by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and broadcast over a coast-to-coast network of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With the surrender of Japan, the bloodiest and costliest war in all history has ended. Yet, as the result of our great victory, we face an uncertain and difficult future at home.

As we enter the period of reconversion and readjustment, however, let us constantly bear in mind that it was private initiative and private enterprise that made the total victory of our arms possible. It was not the wisdom of a few in Washington. It was the fact that millions of Americans took off their coats, spit on their hands, worked hard, and with unsurpassed inventive genius and manufacturing know-how outproduced the enemy.

The time has now come when we must remove the many complicated and often unnecessary controls and restrictions that have governed our economy during the wartime period.

We must not create a new set of unworkable industrial controls that will retard the rapid reconversion of industry. And, above all, we must not permit the establishment of a pattern of regimentation for peacetime production. Many may argue plausibly that such regimentation is necessary. Don't you believe it. However good the intention may be, such regimentation would have the very strong tendency of becoming permanent.

While investigating American supplies in Europe, I was continually asked what the United States Government was going to do about conditions. I was asked: What will your Government do and what will our Government do?

In the last 2 weeks our Senate hearings on reconversion have taken me from the Atlantic to the Pacific and I hear the same chorus in our own country. Whenever reconversion is mentioned, the question is asked: What is the Government going to do?

This dependency on Government is contrary to our American way—Government must release control. The people must do the reconverting.

If we allow the unnatural damming up and holding back of production, with controls that hamper mass production, the difficulties and delays that will be experienced before such controls can be eliminated will cause tremendous damage to industry and hardships for our workers.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor more than 50 percent of our productive capacity was devoted to war. War plants were given preference on everything. Cost of operations was of secondary importance. Wages, including overtime, were paid out in record amounts. It was speed that counted because we desperately needed planes, tanks, ships, and guns to defeat the Axis Powers.

The events of the past few weeks have changed all this. With the surrender of Japan we no longer require large-scale production of the implements of war. Already more than $35,000,000,000 in war contracts have been canceled.

In contrast to the upward swing before and during the war, we are now experiencing a downward trend. This should not confuse us—but stimulate us all to greater efforts.

Moreover, while many raw materials needed for quick reconversion are now in plentiful supply, others like textiles, lumber, tin, paper, and natural rubber will continue to be scarce for some months. In addition, industry now finds itself back in competitive harness and must now watch the cost of operations very carefully. Costs are no longer subordinated to speed. The Government is not now footing the bill. Consumer goods must be produced at a price that the consumer will buy them.

It is industry's job to reverse the downward trend, and I believe industry can do it in short order. I would like to emphasize that I personally do not believe all this talk about the dire effects of the quick surrender of Japan. This country is far too resourceful and intelligent to fail now after its tremendous accomplishments in war. Moreover, we have mastered many new skills during the war. We have enormously increased our capacity to produce materials and we have developed new ways of utilizing them. With respect to light metals, like magnesium and aluminum, for example, we have discovered processes permitting us to use these metals in ways we never thought possible before. The same is true on plastic and plywood products.

For another thing, there is now an enormous market for all types of consumer goods. Most of the prewar goods are worn out, and it will take years to satisfy the buying public's appetite. And the money is available.

We know the cardinal principle that made America great and gave her the highest standards of living:

Produce, that others may consume.

Consume, that others may produce.

Since the workers of America are the greatest consumers, the necessity for high wages is obvious.

If the worker cannot afford a house, houses will not be built.

If the worker cannot afford an automobile, automobiles will not be built.

If the worker cannot afford consumers goods, consumers goods will not be built.

If the farmer cannot afford farm machinery, farm machinery will not be built.

And the Nation will suffer for food, houses, automobiles, consumer goods, and we will have a lower standard of living.

But let me repeat again—Government controls must be eliminated. I suggest only one simple restriction, such as holding manufacturers down to, say, 30 to 60 days inventory of scarcer materials, should be retained, and this only for a short time. It is not the Government's place to tell industry what it can make and what it cannot make. I am confident that the public demand will let industry know what the public wants. I also feel certain that, for the most part, those who produce raw materials components will distribute them fairly among all of their customers and will not favor any special group. Competition, aided by the vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, should be the backbone of our postwar economy and should make unnecessary any other Government direction and regulation of business.

We must not permit the excesses and mistakes of the twenties to take place again. On the other hand, we are headed for trouble under our system the minute the Government tries to determine the proper behavior for this manufacturer or that one. Industry needs positive help, not hindrance, from the Government.

For instance, the small and intermediate businesses, when buying surplus tools and machinery, war plants or when building new ones, should get tax credit for depreciation purposes over a short period of years. This would be only fair, since such tax aid was allowed to some plants during the war-production period. In this same connection I believe thought should be given to the possibility of granting tax concessions to those building homes in local communities. Such relief should be extended for a few years, as was done after the last war, as a means of stimulating building. Excess-profits tax must be abolished and a new peacetime tax structure built to aid rather than hinder business and labor.

I have just returned from holding Senate hearings on reconversion. Let me give you some facts:

Without exception, all condemned OPA regulation of price-control on manufactured articles. It cannot and will not work. One new plastic producer had been 11 months trying to get a price on a new article. Yes, there was an 11-month wait.

Will that produce jobs?

Another had been many weeks trying to get a price fixed on a new aluminum clothespin, and he could not produce them because OPA had not given him a price at which he could make it.

Others told of how the price fixed after weeks of negotiation from the local office

to district office to regional office to Washington, D. C., and around the circle, had fixed the price at less than the cost of manufacture, only to have the manufacturer look for something else to do.

No; you cannot make a job or have a good standard of living in that way.

Washington does not have the wisdom or the inclination to do this job.

In brief, the Government should help—not in regulating industry—but in opening up the bottlenecks of speeding cut-backs, of speeding clearance of inventory, of speeding contract settlements, and in general, clearing the path for industry to come in and do the job it is so capable of performing.

From a longer-range point of view, the Government should very definitely foster public-works construction. New roads, new parks, reforestation, and better schools are all required and will add greatly to the general welfare of our people. Such projects are of secondary importance when compared to those of private industry for making consumer goods. But they can serve to provide jobs until private industry gets into full production. Moreover, such projects should, for the most part, be fostered by the separate States and local governments. In any event, under no circumstances must we again tolerate a gigantic boondoggling WPA, where millions in Federal funds are pumped out in waste and mismanagement.

With respect to the enormous supplies of surplus supplies and equipment built up during the war, the Government must also set up a decisive and intelligent program. These were all paid for by the American taxpayers' money. These surplus items not only represent a huge investment; they represent a source of immense good if we are intelligent enough and resourceful enough to lay down policies that make sense and are in the best interest of the United States.

At home we must give instant attention to the disposal of surpluses, particularly surplus plants. Many corporations now want to acquire these plants for civilian production. The Government must be prepared to lease or sell these facilities, bearing in mind their true value to those interested in buying them. If the Government tries to charge too much for them, private business will not be in a position to buy. This would both add to the cost of the war and would deny returning servicemen and war workers the opportunity of working in superbly modern and productive factories.

Many of our workers have been in the armed services. The citizens in the armed services must be returned to civilian life as soon as transportation can return them. Our fighting men should be given the opportunities now facing all of our citizens in jobs, and business in the new peacetime Nation. They should have an even start. The armies of occupation should be made up of volunteers and not taken from our armies of draftees.

The Government might attempt to value the plants for civilian use and sell them on a basis whereby the corporation would make annual payments.

Above all else, clear thinking and direct action is now required. A sound, healthy economy must be erected along the new lines drawn as the result of our war experience. Private business must be unfettered and the Government must assist in building the structure of our economy so that it can freely produce for the good of all of our citizens.

Let us stop talking in pessimistic terms. Of course, there will be repercussions and maladjustments as a result of the war's end. But the problems are there where we can see them. By meeting them head-on, we can solve them. This, I am confident, we will do and soon we should enter a great era of peace and prosperity—the era we have worked and waited for so long.

Drafting 18-Year-Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 5, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely, and I think very sound, editorial from one of the country's leading newspapers, the Indianapolis News, on the subject of drafting boys of teen age for foreign military service:

DRAFTING 18-YEAR-OLDS

[From the Indianapolis News of August 29, 1945]

President Truman's recommendation for the continued induction of men from 18 to 25 years old for the armies of occupation should be examined carefully before it is enacted by Congress.

It is clear that sizable armies must be maintained in both Germany and Japan for some time to come. And in all fairness, the men who have served 3 or 4 years, and particularly those who have been overseas and in combat, should be offered discharges. They have done their part, and their places should be taken by others if they wish to return to civilian life.

But there is a serious question whether drafting youths of 18 to 20 should be continued in peacetime. Inclusion of these age brackets was advocated originally purely as a war necessity. Army leaders stressed the fact that younger men were more adaptable to combat, more able to stand the strain of modern war.

The resiliency and fire of youth may be desirable in battle, but these qualities are not so necessary for occupation duties. Here the emphasis should be upon balance and maturity of judgment. If the Nation drafts lads in their teens, and admittedly immature, it may pay a fearful price in the years to come. Not only will the education of many promising youngsters be interrupted but it is doubtful whether army life, particularly the monotony of foreign service, is particularly wholesome for a boy just out of high school and still in a formative stage.

It would seem better, if the Army's need for more manpower continues, to make volunteering attractive and to draft men between the ages, say, of 21 to 30. If those in these age brackets who have been deferred because of minor defects or occupational reasons should have to serve for no more than 2 years, it would be no more than fair; they are the ones who have reaped most of the benefits of war prosperity.

The Jewish New Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rosh Hashanah," dealing with the celebration of the Jewish New Year, published in the Washington Evening Star of September 8, 1945, and a statement which I made on the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 8, 1945]

ROSH HASHANAH

The celebration of the Jewish New Year on the present occasion takes place under benign conditions which are unparalleled in the experience of the Jewish people. Six years of war have ended in a victory for human freedom in which the Jews have a valid interest. They contributed to the triumph of the United Nations over the Axis Powers and thus are entitled to share in the fruits of that vast achievement. But it is not merely the defeat of the Nazis and their allies that the Jews have helped to accomplish. They also have participated in the laying of the foundations of a new world-wide community. And that community, let it clearly be understood, is endowed with the spiritual principle of the Mosaic law.

In other words, the ordeal of the Jewish people has terminated in a universal vindication of the religion and the ethics which through centuries of dispersion, struggle, and persecution have sustained their existence. Their faith in the Covenant between the Lord and Abraham has been justified. God has been their shield, and their "exceeding great reward" now at long last is in sight. Not for the Jews alone, however, are the times ahead to be peaceful and prosperous under Providence. The divine promise was that: "All the nations of the earth be blessed." Through obedience to the commandments of Sinai the pledge may be fulfilled. What is wanted is a common realization of the proved fact that civilization cannot prevail without righteousness. The frightful agony through which all humanity has passed to its present opportunity developed from futile attempts to defy elemental justice. If the future is to be worth living, it must be correlated to fellowship in equity.

The Jews have known that for ages. Their neighbors having been learning it in a difficult school. Millions must hope and pray that the lesson never again will require to be repeated. At Rosh Hashanah 5706, Americans of all philosophies are united as never before in the determination to translate their ideals into deeds. The Jews will do their part, and so will the gentiles of every household.

JEWISH NEW YEAR—A TIME FOR REDEDICATION TO MORAL PURPOSES AND THE IDEALS FOR WHICH WE FOUGHT

(Statement of Hon. JAMES M. MEAD, Member, United States Senate, New York)

Traditionally, the Jewish new year is an occasion not for rejoicing but for rededication to inspiring moral purposes. This month, as our Jewish fellow-citizens mark their new year, that spirit of rededication must surely be the attitude of all of us. For what we have won by the triumph of our arms is not victory but opportunity—the opportunity to shape a future in which all people may live in dignity and without despair, in freedom and without fear.

Unconditional surrender was the war aim we set and the war aim we achieved. Unconditional peace must similarly be the peace aim we set and the peace aim we achieve. A peace that will deny to some people or groups or classes the benefits it confers on others, a peace that gives to any people anything less than its just claims will be a conditional and partial peace. And such a peace will be a dangerous and unstable peace.

Suffering cannot be measured with precision. But weighed in terms either of casualties or the nature of the tortures, the suffering of no people can have been greater during the reign of tyranny just ended than

that of the Jews. No people therefore have a greater claim on the United Nations for a full and unconditional peace than the Jewish people. Recognition of their rights as citizens everywhere; effective establishment of Palestine as the Jewish homeland; restitution for loss and suffering; generous help in rebuilding the shattered structure of Jewish life in Europe; all these are the elements of a total peace for the Jewish people. All these the United Nations must make living and genuine realities.

Our Jewish fellow citizens are marking their first new year in more than a decade in which their brethren are free from the immediate threat of tyranny. They can enter on that year armed with the knowledge that our goals in peace will be no less unconditional than our purpose in war. They can derive equal strength from the conviction that the claims of justice for those who have endured so much and contributed still more, no less than the needs of world stability and security, overwhelmingly demand the grant of full and total peace for the Jewish people the world over.

Obstruction of Private Enterprise in the Building Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Putting Ring in the Noses of Free People" from the Charlotte Observer of September 6, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUTTING RING IN THE NOSES OF FREE PEOPLE

The Federal Government announces that it is "leading off" in postwar construction with a hundred million dollars to be spent for homes at low cost. This hundred million is, of course, American taxpayers' money it will spend.

No fault, however, is to be found with this program if it is the aim and intention of the Government to rid the land of its miserable and dirty slum districts and, further, if it is the only agency either interested in or financially able to undertake a program to provide better housing for the classes of our people who live in such unfit quarters.

We wonder, however, in the light of recent agitations among the Federal bureaucrats in Washington, whether the National Government is being moved to promote such a program out of its high-minded humanitarian impulses or from an intelligent social and economic instinct, or, or the contrary, it may be inspired to obstruct the free energies of private enterprise in the building industry.

If the Government is of such a mind, it could sound the doom of the private-enterprise principle in this particular business. It has all the advantage of power and authority and money it takes in taxes from the people to give itself the green light in such a national undertaking by the very simple process of exercising priority for itself in the procurement of all materials necessary for the building of new homes.

The common-sense view to be taken is that the Federal Government should encourage private capital to invest in the construction of such new low-cost houses as would meet the needs of those who now are slum dwellers and only enter this field, in such instances, where private capital fails or refuses to engage in such an investment undertaking.

Insofar as other types of homes are concerned, it is even more of a common-sense policy for the Government to withdraw all controls, both over the materials necessary and the costs of new homes which individuals or corporations may elect to construct on their own initiative and with their own capital.

However, this is not the way the bureaucrats view the matter.

They propose that all regulations which have been imposed during the war be removed from all types of construction except that of homes.

They will allow a man to build a factory of any dimensions he might desire and at any cost which he might choose, but these self-appointed guardians of the free people of this country are saying that no American citizen should be allowed to have the materials with which to build himself a house in which to live until the Government tycoons look at his plans, his estimated costs and decide whether or not, in their own wise judgment, such a citizen has sense enough to attend to his own business.

These high and mighty Federal overlords insist that sales prices on homes be controlled. Of course, if they are Federally controlled, these behemoths of Government bureaus will have some excuse for holding their jobs and for maintaining their sprawling and high-salaried staffs of underlings and hirelings who fawn about them in order that they, too, may hang on to the Federal pap.

Furthermore these same power-drunk Federal agency heads in Washington are seriously proposing that a permit system for building houses must be worked out and installed which would make it imperative that every individual in the United States secure a Government license to build his own house.

They would require that every homebuilder submit architect's plans to them and the estimates of the costs by constructors, how many rooms any given home would have, whether the bathroom is upstairs or down, and every other minutia of detail incident to the construction of a private home passed upon by these swivel-chair professors and beardless economists.

This is an illustration of the insatiate greed for continued power among some Washington bureaucrats.

Particularly it is the program of the OPA, sanctioned by the CIO, both of whose economic ideas, as well as whose social purposes, seem to run hand in hand on many policies which would destroy the fundamental rights of the individual citizens of this country.

The Office of Price Administration has made bold to announce through its Director, Chester Bowles, that "we are going to establish far more effective controls in building materials and housing construction to help make more than daydreams the housing plans of millions of home-loving families."

As a matter of fact, the OPA already has devised a plan by which its own infallible wisdom will guide the benighted American citizen in his quest for a new home of his own.

This plan provides that the OPA, through its national, regional, and field offices, shall put into effect a permanent peacetime control of construction.

Orders have gone out from this agency to its thousands of field forces "to initiate an area pricing program on new construction" and "to develop techniques for pricing completed houses."

After all of this rigmarole shall have been done by these bureaucratic meddlers, further orders include the extension of "coverage of area pricing orders on home improvements and new construction services."

The OPA means business. It is going to see that just as many as possible of its 62,000 paid employees who have been engaged in rationing and price control during the war are to hang on to their jobs during peacetime as well as to cling desperately and as permanently as they can to their wartime authority even though the war is over.

The whole OPA plan is to tell you, the free citizen, of this supposedly free country, what you can and cannot do if you want to build yourself a new home.

It sets up for you dollars-and-cents ceilings on building materials and construction services and imposes a scheme of bossing you around that is so confusing and involved with red tape wormishness that even its own high-priced platoons of lawyers wouldn't be able to give you an intelligent explanation of their complicated deluge of directives by which they propose to Hitlerize American freemen.

If such unlimited authority is left with the OPA and its left-wing economists and ignorant academicians to interfere with the rights of the individual citizens of this country in the matter of building homes for themselves, this Federal agency will extend its control far beyond the arbitrary limits which it exercised over the people of this country during the emergency of the war.

President Truman and the Congress should either give back to the American people some of the basic liberties in individual action and enterprise of which they were necessarily deprived during the war, or come out and tell them plainly that in their judgment, they, the individual citizens of America, are too idiotic to be left to run at large without a Government ring in their nose.

Federal Industrial Relations Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] entitled "Senator HATCH Rebuts Critics of B-H-B Labor Bill," being Senate bill 1171, introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and myself. The article appears in today's issue of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HATCH REBUTTS CRITICS OF B-H-B LABOR BILL

(By Senator CARL A. HATCH)

It can hardly be said that the Federal Industrial Relations Act introduced by Senators BURTON, BALL, and myself has received unanimous, enthusiastic approval.

Hoping to clarify just what the bill actually provides, I had intended to discuss all the criticisms of certain partisan groups. A careful study of every objection raised has been made. That study revealed a striking similarity in the criticisms. That clearly apparent design indicates an attitude on the part of some, which does not auger well for the adoption of any law setting up machinery for the peaceful adjustment of disputes.

IT WAS LAMBASTED

Leaders of different labor organizations attacked the bill with almost frenzied condem-

nation. Vituperative phrases were not neglected. It was called "a bill to strait-jacket labor," "to make the rich richer and the poor poorer," and to "enslave labor." Such generalizations contribute little, if anything, to a discussion of the grave issues posed by the bill, and certainly present no answer to the problems which confront not only labor and management but the whole country as well.

The outstanding objections, which appear in nearly every criticism are: (1) That the measure requires compulsory arbitration; (2) that it repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act; and (3) that it freezes the status quo and thereby benefits management and injures labor.

CHARGES DENIED

If those objections as they are stated were true, not one of the authors of the bill would vote for it. That they do not correctly present the picture goes without saying. Partly true, they carry implications far beyond any provision of the bill, and grossly exaggerate its terms.

For instance, while the measure does contain one provision for compulsory arbitration, that provision is restricted and applies only to the most extreme cases—cases where the health, safety, or welfare of an entire community or communities would be affected. It applies only where the rights of the public clearly transcend the rights of both labor and management. Necessarily these instances would be exceedingly rare, such as the cessation or the interruption of service in a great public industry, utility, coal, milk, etc.; something upon which the safety, health, or welfare of human beings actually depend.

The plain truth is the bill requires arbitration only in instances so extreme and vital that responsible authority would adopt far more stringent forms of compulsion, such as calling out the troops, taking over properties, or using other strong means to prevent injury to the public. Compulsory arbitration in such cases is far better, wiser, fairer. Certainly it would be better for both labor and management than the use of strong-arm methods which would be the inevitable result where the safety or health of men, women, and children are involved.

As to repealing the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which prohibits individuals from obtaining injunctions in labor-management disputes, we flatly deny that the bill repeals that wise law. Our bill does permit the appropriate agency of government to obtain an injunction to prevent either management or labor from violating the law. Existing law is not changed by this provision, for the highest court has held that the Government's right to injunction is not impaired by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The pending bill does not permit private employers to obtain an injunction prohibiting laboring people from using the only weapon they used to have to advance the cause of labor or to prevent exploitation. Happily, those days are gone forever.

MORE DISAGREEMENT

It is claimed the bill freezes the status quo pending the exhaustion of the conciliation and mediation remedies for which the measure provides. It is said this operates to the detriment of labor. Here again there is sharp disagreement. It is true that if an increase in wages should be requested and a dipute were thereby occasioned, the wage scale existing at the time the request was made would continue throughout the period of peaceful negotiation. At first glance, this may seem unfair. But should a loss occur, pending peaceful settlement, would it not be better for labor to suffer a temporary loss than to have strikes or shut-downs and thereby suffer a far greater loss?

Nevertheless, the bill in this regard is evenly balanced. Suppose management attempted to reduce wages and a dispute resulted from such action by the employer. The very provision now so vigorously opposed would be an advantage to labor itself. For, pending the peaceful adjustment, the workman would receive the higher wage which existed at the time the attempt to cut wages was made.

AUTHORS' STAND

Later, as opportunity is presented, the authors of the bill shall gladly take up all the objections. The issue is too important to be clouded by extreme and violent criticism such as has been heaped upon this measure. The authors and sponsors seek only to find the best method of providing legal machinery for the fair and just settlement of labor-management disputes and to substitute that machinery for the rule of force.

A study of the objections seemed to reveal a strong intent to defeat any similar legislation. Else, why would responsible leaders declare that the measure is so bad no attempt to amend or improve it will be made and that all resourses will be mustered to bring about its complete defeat, and that Members of Congress who vote for it will be politically dead. Does this attitude mean that only partisan, one-sided measures may be considered?

GOVERNMENT SIDE

That would deny the Government the right to play any part or to provide any legal machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes in which the public as a whole has a great stake, and upon which the welfare of all the people may depend. Without power, without authority, without law, possibly without influence, is Government to play only a weak, helpless, impotent and futile role in this gravest of all domestic problems which now confront the Nation in the postwar era?

Government is constantly importuned to enact legislation conferring special benefits on both management and labor. Tariffs, reduced taxes, immediate removal of wartime controls, unemployment compensation, full-employment bills, higher wages, shorter hours, are right now being sought. Will Government be urged to exercise its great power in these special cases, but its right and duty to safeguard the interests of all the people by legislation requiring some measure of responsibility from employer and employee be denied?

Earnestly, it is hoped that both labor and management will devote their energies and all the wisdom and strength of their great organizations to aid in securing the passage of just and fair legislation which will promote and require peace in industrial relations.

Jobless Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Jobless Aid," dealing with the provisions of the Kilgore bill to supplement and extend payments under State unemployment compensation laws, published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBLESS AID

The Kilgore bill to supplement and extend payments under State unemployment compensation laws is meeting with such determined opposition inside and outside Congress that the odds are now against its passage except in a severely truncated form. We confess to a feeling of dismay over the misrepresentations which have been put forward about the nature and purpose of this temporary measure.

Critics have intimated that the measure assures the payment of $25 weekly to every unemployed worker for half a year, thereby putting a premium on loafing. Of course, it does nothing of the sort. The maximum payments permissible could not exceed two-thirds of a man's or woman's previous weekly earnings, while $25 would be the maximum payable under any conditions. Thus there is nothing in the proposed legislation to force a national wage standard upon the States, as is sometimes charged. Nor is it reasonable to suppose that men and women who have served their country so well during the war are going to revel in idleness on a fraction of their former earnings when they lose their war jobs. In point of fact, they would not be permitted to do so, if the State unemployment insurance agencies function halfway adequately, since an insured worker must accept any suitable job offered him in order to be eligible for benefits.

The issue of States' rights has been raised by the suggestion that the bill looks toward federalization of the unemployment insurance system. This is entirely unwarranted. The Kilgore bill leans over backward to permit Federal supplementary benefits to be paid through the State agencies, with a minimum amount of interference with existing provisions of State laws. It even authorizes the States, acting as agents of the Federal Government, to pay unemployment compensation to civilian employees of the Federal Government who are not now covered. In short, the proposal bears throughout the marks of a purely temporary arrangement designed to cope with emergency unemployment resulting from the sudden end of the war. That is a type of unemployment problem that insurance systems developed to serve the needs of peacetime are not equipped to handle. It is only common sense, therefore, to make special provision for a national emergency such as now confronts us. And the responsibility for taking action plainly rests upon the Federal Government.

Millions of workers have moved about the country at the urging of the Government to engage in war work. They have been praised for their energy and applauded for their patriotism by that same Government. Are they now to be left inadequately provided for, if their wanderings happen to have taken them to States that pay only meager unemployment benefits for limited periods of time? Is nothing to be done to aid many other displaced civilian workers in private employment not covered by insurance? Finally, does the Federal Government propose to let its own dismissed employees who have worked in arsenals, munitions plants, and navy yards shift for themselves? They will have to unless action is taken promptly to extend unemployment-insurance coverage to civilian employees of the Federal Government. Neither will it go down well with the public if officers and men of the merchant marine, once lauded to the skies for their bravery in defying torpedoes and burning oil, are turned out to search for new jobs without the benefit of unemployment compensation. The States do not insure these maritime workers, because it is obvious that a national program is required to take care of them.

There is another item in the Kilgore bill that Congress cannot afford to forget; i. e., the provision for payment of travel expenses to facilitate placement of workers in jobs at

distant points. If reconversion employment is to proceed rapidly, it is most important to shift idle workers from congested war centers to locations where workers are needed. The director of the Washington State Unemployment Compensation Commission made a very telling appeal to the Senate Finance Committee for travel allowances. "We have had a terrific importation of workmen to do armament jobs in Washington in the shipyards and aircraft plants," he said. "Some of them are not going home; some of them are unable to go due to the lack of finances."

Some of the opponents of the Kilgore bill seem to care nothing about the claims of displaced war workers to fair and humane treatment. However, they cannot afford to ignore President Truman's reminder that it is a "matter of sound business" to tide these workers over the transition period in order to prevent a widespread cessation of buying that would have a most harmful impact upon our economy. We think that it would also be a matter of sound politics for Congress to give timely attention to the needs of dismissed workers on the home front as well as to the needs of discharged veterans.

Still Playing Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Evening Telegram, of Rocky Mount, N. C., of Friday, August 10, 1945, entitled "Still Playing Politics." This editorial corrects the misleading and erroneous statements contained in the May issue of the Rural Electrification News discussing the rural-electrification situation in Johnston County, N. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL PLAYING POLITICS

There would really be no reason for the reopening of a controversy which was decided 8 years ago if there were not officials in high places who insist that the powers that be are not playing politics with rural electrification and if the May issue of the Rural Electrification News had not been printed and circulated. In that issue the neighboring county of Johnston is much maligned, the Carolina Power & Light Co. more maligned, and the public-spirited citizens who wanted electric service in the rural areas held up as double-crossing reprobates.

And there is certainly a demand for an answer when the article is illustrated with a map of the State in which every county is lily white except Johnston where black is the contrast. Libelous statements are made about the men who sold out to the power company and throttled the growth of electric service to rural areas.

If the authorship of the article was sponsored with the name of any individual, and if it had not been published with dollars belonging to the public, the case would not be so bad. However, the Rural Electrification News is a Government organ, and of course the Government cannot be sued. As typical of many of the erroneous statements in the article, the anonymous author alleges that there remains pledged but not constructed after 8 years "a hundred miles of a 295-mile project and that 400 farmers who would have gotten service are still without it because of the traitorous acts of their neighbors."

Especially does this stand in bold relief when the acts are that after fighting all the hobbles the rural electrification folks in Washington could invoke in the State courts, and after the State rural electrification authority had tried for a year to get the cooperative under way but could get no money from Washington, the power company had, prior to the end of 1939, constructed 382 miles of rural lines in Johnston County. By the time of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor the power company had constructed 480 miles of line and was serving 2,600 customers.

Actually, the Carolina Power & Light Co. had built more rural lines in Johnston County than had been provided by any cooperative effort in any other county in the State. But for the war they would have completed an additional 270 miles of line which has already been surveyed and approved and which is now awaiting materials and labor.

Instead of the mourning black, Johnston County should have been shown on the map in such sharp relief that the color might indicate the true status of that county as the best rural electrified county in North Carolina. Folks in that county are satisfied. They know the State authority had them first on the list and did all possible to get a part of that first hundred million allotted to the rural-electrification effort to build lines in Johnston County. They know that the hundred million dollars went to the doubtful States like Pennsylvania, Iowa, and Senator Norris' State of Nebraska.

The Government spent sizable sums through the Federal rural-electrification group trying to discredit the State group of public-spirited citizens. The State supreme court afforded a couple of decisions, each time against the Washington bureaucracy, on the basis of the facts before them. The Washington oligarchy has changed faces, but we are convinced they are still playing politics, as the recent issue of their magazine indicates, and it's a great pity when rural electrification is a wonderful idea and could mean so much to the rural life of every State.

First Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "First Peace Conference," published in the New York Times of this date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST PEACE CONFERENCE

Another international conference dedicated to the task of converting victory into peace will begin in London tomorrow, when the Council of Foreign Ministers representing the Big Five—the United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, and China—assembles for its opening session. Though it meets without any of the fanfare that accompanied the opening of the Versailles Peace Conference, this Council, established by the Potsdam Conference of the Big Three, and to be enlarged as occasion demands by representatives of other states in matters affecting them, will be the first real peace conference to follow the war just ended.

For its "immediate important task," as set down by the Potsdam Declaration, is to draw up treaties of peace with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland, and to prepare a peace settlement with Germany against the time when Germany shall have a government authorized to sign it. These treaties are then to be submitted to the United Nations, which means primarily the powers that forced these enemies to surrender. But once the treaties are drawn up, a change in them will be more than difficult, and for all practical purposes the word of the new Conference will be just as final for the nations affected as was that of the Peace Conferences following the last war.

At the same time, the new Council will be also, in effect, a re-creation of the Allied Supreme Council and the Ambassadors' Conference which ruled Europe after the last war. For the Council shall also consider all such "other matters" as the member governments may refer to it. That Europe is full of such "other matters," ranging from elections in the Balkans to the displacement of many millions and the supervision of Europe's waterways, is evidenced by every day's dispatches from that troubled Continent. And the decisions of the Council in these "other matters" will be no less vital than the peace treaties it produces.

In other words, the Council of Foreign Ministers has now been charged with the duty and the responsibility of creating the peace for which the United Nations fought and bled. In that task the Council will undoubtedly become the arena for many a hard-fought diplomatic battle, as has every peace conference after every war. And the general conditions of the peace have already been determined for it by the numerous previous conferences, from the original United Nations assembly in Washington which subscribed to the Atlantic Charter, through Tehran, Moscow, and Yalta, to the victory conference of Potsdam. But the practical details which must give meaning to the general terms are still to be fixed, and these details are no less important than the general terms themselves.

Under these circumstances it behooves the Council to keep ever before its eyes the high principles for which the United Nations fought the war. This is all the more necessary because, under the exigencies of the war itself, these principles have been progressively compromised by each successive conference. And since the United States is the most impartial party in the Council, the leadership in the fight for these principles will inevitably fall to the United States, which, in defending them, also defends its own highest interests.

In this struggle the two former State Secretaries Hull and Stettinius have already set the pattern for American policy. Mr. Hull in his VJ-statement again called for both a restoration and a raising of the standards of political, moral, social, and economic conduct of nations and individuals. It must be assumed that Mr. Byrnes, as he indicated in his statement regarding Japan, proposes to pursue a like policy, in which he will have the great advantage of a freer hand and greater power at his disposal than his predecessors could count on during the war itself. As the aftermath of the last war proved, peace is impossible without power, and power for the maintenance of peace has already been provided in the United Nations organization. But history likewise shows that peace based on power alone is equally illusory, and that the only peace that endures is that which is based on a decent respect for the opinion and conscience of mankind.

Hiram Johnson, the Man Who Could Have Been President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great inspirations of my life was derived from the close association which I was privileged to enjoy, over a period of many years, with Hiram W. Johnson.

When I first met him he was engaged in a crusading campaign against corrupt corporate control of the government of California, and the fiery eloquence of his speeches stirred up in my youthful spirit an enthusiasm for good government such as I had never known before. Throughout that spectacular campaign I read or heard his every public utterance with intense interest, and when he was elected Governor I said to myself: Here is a man of Godlike stature.

Then, as a newspaper reporter, I had the opportunity to observe at close range his administration as the chief executive of my State. And my admiration for the man increased steadily. He fulfilled every promise made during his campaign. Literally, he kicked out of politics the powerful railroad machine which had dominated the official life of California for generations, ever since the driving of the golden spike signalized the completion of the first transcontinental rail line. As the effective instrument to fulfill this major promise he created, by constitutional amendment and legislative enactment, a new State railroad commission with broad and practical powers to regulate the railroads and all other public utilities, and made those utilities, so long as he was Governor, the servants instead of the masters of the people.

He surrounded himself with men of vision, ability, and high purpose. Demonstrating a rare capacity to cooperate with the State legislature, he sponsored and obtained the passage of a great program of liberal laws which made California one of the outstanding progressive States of our Nation. Labor, which in the beginning had stood aloof, watching his career, soon acclaimed him as the author of a new magna carta for the toiling masses of western America. Business, fighting furiously at first against regulative measures which Johnson advocated, admitted at the end of his initial term as Governor that it could not afford to urge the repeal of any of the important laws which had been enacted under his leadership.

And so Hiram Johnson became the only California Governor to be elected twice to that high office during the present century. Two years after his reelection as Governor he ran for the United States Senate and won.

His career as a Member of the Upper House of Congress is familiar to you all, and I shall comment upon it only briefly.

Soon after he took his seat in the Senate he invited me to become his private secretary, and I was delighted to accept. In this new relationship I had obviously a better opportunity to know the man Hiram Johnson than ever before. His keen steel-like mind and the strength of his purpose made a deep impression at once up on the American public, just as those qualities had already won the confidence and support of the people of California, and within the short space of 3 years he became the candidate of a majority of the progressive Republicans of America for President of the United States.

If the wish of the rank and file of the voters, as expressed by their ballots in a majority of the States where primary elections were held, had prevailed, Hiram Johnson would have been elected President in 1920. If so, in the years immediately following, this Nation would have been spared one of the darkest chapters in its executive history. But in 1920 the men in charge of the Republican Party adopted the slogan: "We can win with a yellow dog." Hiram Johnson did not fit that bill, and the GOP leaders would not permit him to be the Presidential nominee of their national convention.

To my personal knowledge, Hiram Johnson was offered three other opportunities by leaders of the Republican Party that year, acceptance of any one of which would have resulted in his eventual elevation to the Presidency. Senator Boise Penrose, of Pennsylvania, then the acknowledged boss of the Republican Party, repeatedly proposed that the GOP convention ticket of 1920 should be: Philander C. Knox for President and Hiram Johnson for Vice President. This proposal was urgently submitted to Johnson on a number of occasions in my presence by representatives of Penrose, who was then ill, but Johnson, although Senator Knox was his seat mate and close personal friend in the Senate, always refused to consider it because he, Johnson, was the candidate of the progressive groups in the Republican Party, while Knox was a recognized conservative.

Later, while the 1920 convention was in progress, Gen. Leonard Wood, a leading candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, walked into the Johnson headquarters in the Auditorium Hotel in Chicago and asked me to arrange an immediate conference between him and Senator Johnson in order to discuss a consolidation of their voting strength in the convention, whereby through agreement one or the other might be nominated for President and the other for Vice President. This proposal was made at a crucial period in the national convention balloting, when Wood and Johnson together still had sufficient votes, if combined, to control the nomination. I was unable to present General Wood's proposal to Senator Johnson until after the landslide to Harding had begun, so it was never seriously considered.

After Harding was nominated, he personally called upon Senator Johnson and invited him to be the Republican Party candidate for Vice President. Johnson declined.

Knox, Wood, and Harding all died long before the next Presidential term of 4 years expired. If Hiram Johnson had accepted any one of the proposals which I have recited he would almost certainly have become President.

In my opinion, had fate decreed otherwise, the course of American history would have been radically changed. Although I have not agreed with Senator Johnson's attitude on foreign policy and some domestic issues in recent years, I shall always regard him as one of the ablest men California has ever sent to our National Legislature, and will be grateful to him for emancipating our State from a condition of political slavery and for his invaluable contribution to the cause of liberalism in the West.

From a personal standpoint, his memory will always be affectionately and devotedly enshrined in my heart.

About That House

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received telegrams as follows:

From Mr. D. A. Gathmann, president of the Jackson County (Mich.) Realty Board:

Urge L–41 be lifted completely from home building and that cost and price controls in OPA be immediately removed. This is one sure way to combat unemployment and provide urgently needed housing through private enterprise. We also urge that the 6-month possession requirements for occupancy of existing property be revoked immediately. Returning veterans must not be penalized in this way. The least we can do for those who have done so much for us is to provide adequate housing as rapidly as possible.

From the Ypsilanti (Mich.) Board of Realtors:

We request immediate lifting of L–41 building controls. Also protest extension of eviction time to 6-month period. OPA promised easing controls after war. Appears property owners are to have increased control.

From Mr. L. H. Stockford, of the Adrian (Mich.) Construction Co.:

Imperative support be given construction industry as outlined in letter to the President by national association and wire to you by Detroit Builders' Association.

From the Monroe (Mich.) Real Estate Board:

This board favors that L–41 be completely lifted and that all cost and price contracts be removed. Will appreciate your cooperation.

In addition, I received 41 similar telegrams from individual constituents residing in the district which I represent in Congress.

Our people are vitally interested in preventing unemployment, and this can only be done if free enterprise is permitted to function in a sound, businesslike way. It may be necessary eventually, for the Government to intervene in

order that there may be jobs for all. However, certainly the Government will be compelled to furnish the jobs if by rules, regulations, edicts, and fiats, people are not permitted to build homes they are ready and willing to build and pay for, and if private initiative is prevented from securing the material necessary for home construction.

Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to essential regulation on the part of the Government, but those residing in my district who are familiar with regulation L–41, and those qualified to speak concerning home construction, insist that this regulation should be cancelled at once if the home construction industry is to produce homes and absorb labor now.

In yesterday's Washington Times-Herald there appeared an article bearing on this subject which I am including in these remarks, and which is as follows:

ABOUT THAT HOUSE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The hottest undercover fight in the Government at this moment—on the domestic front anyhow—is about houses. The automobile was the big thing at the end of World War I and made America's fortune for 20 years thereafter. Now the new big thing is housing. Judging from the evidence, at least half the people in the United States of America want to buy a house or build a new one.

The building industry is almost hysterical with excitement and worry. The customers right at this moment are eager to do business and have pocketfuls of cash. Banks all over the country report lines at the windows where war bonds are cashed.

A lot of that was saving toward a home, and if deals can be made right now, most of it will go for same. But you know how it is with money. It gets very hot in the pocket.

You would think that with the customers ready to buy and the builders burning to take their orders there would be nothing but joy.

If materials are still not available, at least contracts could be made and specifications agreed on. But not so.

The OPA we still have with us. It still controls rents, which in turn affect prices for buyers.

And the WPB we also still have with us. The National Housing Authority has a directive from WPB limiting the cost of new construction. It is pegged at $8,000.

You can't build much of a house for $8,000 today, what with the going wages of carpenters, bricklayers, and plasterers. Not to mention the prices of housing materials driven up by war and completely uncertain in most departments for 1946.

There is no clear line in the Government as to what anybody can expect. On the one hand, WPB says vaguely that it will withdraw its controls "as soon as possible."

On the other hand, OPA says that it wants to control costs of residential construction on into an unspecified future.

And you know what that means. Experience with Government has proved, down through year and years, that once a control is clamped on, getting it off is a problem.

The operatives of that wing in our Government which wants to control American life down to the last detail all know the potential power over our total economy lies inside power over the boom in residential housing.

Housing really looks like the throttle and governor for prosperity. So they are going to be hard to shake loose.

Opposed to their plan for absolute domination of the building trade is another governmental proposition to:

1. Eliminate controls over new residential building entirely and let that spark maximum general production.

2. Discourage speculative building and buying by requiring a 35 percent or 40 percent down payment on houses costing more than $8,000. That would put a check on inflationary explosions of true values.

3. Quit worrying about insane overexpansion of the housing market, anyhow. The builders will have trouble enough getting together labor, materials and supplies for the next year to knock off any real overdoing.

That makes sense to plenty of people. After all, the Government has to get out of business if it is to follow out the reconversion program laid down in 1944 by B. M. Baruch and John Hancock and adopted as a national aim.

Now let's see that general aim pointed straight at an important target.

This morning I called the attention of the proper authority in the WPB to the necessity of removing this regulation L–41, and am advised that the whole matter is being surveyed, and that we may expect some information very shortly. These controls are being lifted in many instances, and I am convinced that careful survey by the various Government agencies involved will result in giving relief to the homebuilding construction. Time is of the essence in this matter. Some people are almost homeless. Many people are out of employment. These people are not asking for financial aid from the Government. They are asking for permission to spend their own money and provide employment now, I said now, not months from now.

What Must We Give Up To Get Full Employment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Must We Give Up To Get Full Employment?" appearing in today's Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MUST WE GIVE UP TO GET FULL EMPLOYMENT?

Senator TAFT's proposed changes in the so-called full-employment bill remind one of what a very wise American of an older generation said about reform: "To know what you want and why you think that * * * a [given] measure will help it is the first, but by no means the last, step toward intelligent * * * reform. The other and more difficult one is to realize what you must give up to get it and to consider whether you are ready to pay the price."

In effect, what Senator TAFT does is suggest that the backers of the full employment bill are not telling us about one substantial part of the "price." They iterate and reiterate that we won't have to give up private enterprise to get their full employment goal. All right, then, says Senator TAFT; here are several things that must be done to preserve private enterprise. Since you want to preserve private enterprise, let's just write these things into the bill.

The Taft proposals have been met at once with ferocious outcries from the backers of the bill. Mr. TAFT is out to cripple their plan, they insist. And that may well be true—which is just the point. For the Senator's critics do not say how they are going to maintain private enterprise in a full-employment policy enforced by the Government without accepting safeguards either identical with those proposed by Senator TAFT or, if some of the Taft proposals are fallacious in method, then safeguards identical in purpose with the Taft proposals.

Indeed, the general fact about the backers of the full employment plan is that they have not yet supplied us with an itemized statement of what we will have to give up for it—the "price" not merely in money but in considerations less tangible and more precious. No one can read the discussion of "full employment" in Britain without noting how much more candid the British full-employment people are than their followers and counterparts in the United States.

For instance, as suggested, Senators WAGNER and MURRAY protest that they want to maintain private enterprise. But Sir William Beveridge, inventor of the whole full employment idea, makes no bones about striking from his list of essential liberties the right "of a private citizen to own means of production and to employ other citizens in operating them at a wage." Again, Sir William is quite frank about accepting Lord Keynes' notion that "the duty of ordering the current volume of investments cannot safely be left in private hands."

And if Sir William is thus cavalier in threatening the very bases of private enterprise in his design for the future, he is only less bold in stating how he proposes to narrow labor's rights. However softly he puts it, Sir William is for what he calls organized mobility of labor. Again, he professes his heartfelt determination to continue labor's freedom to bargain about wages; except, of course, that "irresponsible sectional wage bargaining" must be prevented—he has no clear idea how—in order to escape inflationary developments.

But what does organized mobility of labor mean? It might mean that if people discharged from high-wage jobs in Baltimore war plants wouldn't take jobs in the low-wage postwar cannery plants, then the Government, in the interest of full employment, would force them into such jobs. What does control of "irresponsible sectional wage bargaining" mean? It means that if, say, Mr. John L. Lewis makes wage demands out of line with full-employment needs then Mr. John L. Lewis—not the coal-mine owners, note—must somehow be steamrollered into line with overriding public policy.

One wonders what British commenators would be saying if their own people were as mum as ours on the price labor may have to pay for full employment. For Americans will note with unalloyed astonishment that despite Sir William Beveridge's relative honesty on this all-important point, the London Economist speaks very harshly of his tendency to "omit entirely or gloss over the implications for labor policy of the program he advocates." Yet, says the Economist, "the implications are profound, since they involve nothing less than a transformation of the whole basis of the trade-union movement."

The Economist then goes on to suggest in explicit terms that one of the things British workingmen may have to give up under full employment is union protectionism as they have known it for 75 years. Do our full-employment zealots have any detailed rebuttal of this argument? If so, they ought to reveal it to the public. That is one way they

could parry Dr. William A. Berridge's suspicion that here and elsewhere they may "deliberately blur and withhold large segments of the truth, hoping and preferring to get the program started through mere loose, broad, and emotional appeal."

Discharge of Servicemen

REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the gentleman who preceded me and others that I have been and am as much interested as they are in the return and discharge of our service men and women. In that connection I have conferred with the President on the subject and later addressed a letter to him giving him my views and those of many thousands of people who have appealed to me. I take the privilege of inserting the letter for the information of the membership and wish to say that it is the desire of the President to bring about the discharge of our service men and women as soon as conditions will permit. The letter which I addressed to the President is as follows:

AUGUST 31, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the past few weeks I have received hundreds of letters relative to the discharge of members of our armed forces. After carefully weighing and considering the views expressed in these communications I have come to the conclusion that:

1. All married men over the age of 26, with families, who have seen foreign service, should be released.

2. All married men, with families, who have been in the service over 2 years, should be released.

3. All men who were attending school immediately prior to their entry into the service (under 20 years of age) shall be discharged upon submission of proper evidence that they intend to complete their schooling.

4. Men formerly holding key positions in essential business whose services are vitally needed in reconversion to civilian production, the heads of essential businesses—owners, part owners, officers, or in supervisory positions, including professional men who are actually needed to relieve shortages in given professions, shall be discharged with a view of expediting increased reemployment.

5. Discharge all men in limited service, here and abroad, except those who are serving in administrative capacities in separation centers whose services are imperatively required. Married men with families in this category to be replaced as promptly as possible with men who are not otherwise eligible for discharge.

6. Every effort should be made to return expeditiously as many men from overseas as is possible.

7. Every effort should be made to obtain voluntary enlistments and to that end a recruiting drive should be effected among those still in the service and those who have been discharged. To serve as an inducement to enlistment for 2 or 3 years increased pay should be offered, with further increased pay in occupational zones.

8. Should voluntary enlistments fail to reach the required number and it becomes necessary to draft sufficient personnel, only men between the ages of 20 and 26 should be drafted, with exemption to married men with families;

9. It is the observation of many writers of communications addressed to me (and I agree with them) that only an American supervisory force should serve in such occupational zones taken over by the United States and that Great Britain, France, China, and Russia, and other allied nations, should furnish the rank and file of occupational forces—with limited States Army and Navy officers and a minimum of needed noncommissioned and enlisted personnel to supervise the compliance of conditions of occupation in conformity with the Potsdam agreement.

10. It would be understood that the point system would continue to prevail with respect to the discharge of combat veterans.

It is my opinion that the above views cover the observations of a vast majority of the people in every section of our country. I feel that if the various departments of the Government will undertake discharges on the basis of the reasons outlined the people of the country will understand that the Government has adopted a discharge plan fairest to all servicemen concerned and it will serve to eliminate much of the present criticism.

Thanking you for the consideration of my suggestions, I am, with kind regards,

Sincerely yours.

Abuse of Air Troopers

REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, our airborne troops made an outstanding record of achievement and are entitled not only to praise but rest and safety.

But it seems the Army is using them for entertainment of European dignitaries, and I include a newspaper item covering such use of our gallant airborne troops:

SLAIN TO MAKE A RUSSIAN HOLIDAY

An American parachutist was killed, another sustained a broken neck, and three others were seriously injured in an exhibition flight over the Tempelhof Airdrome near Berlin the other day.

They were members of the famous Eighty-second Airborne Division of the United States Army.

It was the first fatality in the division since its combat jump at Nijmegen, Holland.

It occurred, according to the press report: "During a formal review and air drop in honor of Marshal Georgi Zhukov."

Why are our American boys still being required to risk and lose their lives in useless and purposeless exhibitions, now that the war is over?

It is time to stop slaughtering our American boys for any purpose, but particularly for the purpose of making a Russian holiday.

The responsible officers of the American Army in Europe should have a higher concept of their responsibility than to needlessly and recklessly endanger the lives of our young heroes who fought and won the war.

If these officers must "show off" for the honor and edification of Russian generals and visiting American Congressmen in a manner involving the risk and loss of American lives, why do not they take the risks and do the dying instead of assigning American soldiers to the hazardous and futile task?

Let some of the American generals jump out of airplanes with parachutes for exhibition purposes if they want to, but let them stop playing with the lives of our American boys.

If there is no more important work for our boys in Europe than this, let them send the boys home.

There are already too many dead American heroes in Europe.

Why should more of them be killed and maimed, just to impress dignitaries sitting comfortably in safe places?

If this is what "occupation" means, let us have as little of it as possible and get it over as quickly as possible.

The American people want their boys brought home alive, and not put up for further slaughter.

The parents of America gave their sons to save America. They did not give them to die for the entertainment of dignitaries.

Congress did not give the Army authority to use the lives of young Americans for entertainment.

Mr. Speaker, I demand that the Army stop at once such use and the killing of young American boys for entertainment.

Amendment of the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the President of the United States:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have today introduced a bill to raise the age limit of young men for military or naval service, fixing the minimum age limit at the age of 21 years and, in the same bill, I have also exempted from military or naval service married men with a family of one or more children.

I have come to my conclusions in respect to these changes in our Selective Service and Training Act after much investigation, particularly in my own congressional district, and it is my firm belief after giving very serious thought and study to the matter that we should not continue, now that the war is over, to take these young boys for the armies of occupation to be used in Europe as well as in the Orient.

Recently while back in my congressional district and after talking with educators in a number of our colleges and higher institutions of learning in Oklahoma, I was amazed to find out from surveys they had been making as to the very small percentage of boys who had just finished high school and had contemplated a college career and by reason of the necessities of war were called into the military service, who do not now intend to go to college—even with the additional benefits that Congress has provided for those who want to go to school.

I was also alarmed after talking with district judges and members of the bar in my section of Oklahoma as to the increased

number of divorce cases. Of course, I can understand that many of these marriages were hasty, as is usually the case in time of war. On the other hand, long periods of separation do something to family ties and, even though we have been liberal with allotments and allowances to men with families, to my way of thinking we should now stop the severance of family ties. I am firmly convinced that, under our training program, we can get plenty of personnel to meet our Army and Navy strength without reaching into the families of our land.

I am hopeful as expressed in your message to Congress last week, that we can shortly keep up replacements in the Army and Navy by a volunteer system but if the continuance of the Draft Act is necessary I am still quite certain that we can get the necessary personnel from the categories remaining and that the exemption of men up to 21 years or married men with families will not seriously hamper our efforts to obtain adequate and sufficient personnel for both the Army and Navy.

Pending the enactment of legislation along the lines suggested, I respectfully request and urge that under and by virtue of the authority vested in you as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and by virtue of authority contained in War Powers Acts that you immediately, by Presidential proclamation, suspend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to all young men who have not yet reached their twenty-first birthday and to all married men having a dependent child or children, and that the various boards throughout the country administering the Selective Service Act be immediately notified to suspend the operation of the act to all persons coming within the abovenamed categories.

Yours very truly,

ROSS RIZLEY,
Member of Congress.

First Test Explosion of the Atomic Bomb in New Mexico

REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read in yesterday's Washington Post the announcement by the Secretary of the Interior that the site of the first explosion of the atomic bomb in New Mexico will be preserved as a national monument. This is in full accord with the intent of the act of June 8, 1906, authorizing the President to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks and other objects of historic and scientific interest as national monuments under the direction of the National Park Service.

In this same release of yesterday the Secretary reported that an attorney in the Department of the Interior was being awarded $100 for submitting the suggestion to the Department. I am glad the Secretary thought so well of the idea that he singled it out as of special merit. But it was first publicly advanced by the Chambers of Commerce of Alamogordo and Tularosa, N. Mex., and the press carried the suggestion in the State several weeks ago. Upon my return to my office this morning I found several letters from citizens of New Mexico endorsing the recommendation. I presume it was entirely proper to give the attorney a cash award, if for no other reason than that he evidently reads the papers from my State and recognizes a good suggestion when he sees one, even though it comes from plain Mr. Citizen and not from some professor or bureaucrat in Washington.

The Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce wrote to the Director of the National Park Service on August 11, requesting that this site be made a national monument. I ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD copy of their letter, and also the item appearing in the Washington Post of yesterday, which read as follows:

ALAMOGORDO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
August 11, 1945.

The DIRECTOR OF UNITED STATES PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The explosion of the atomic bomb is a great historical and world-shaking event. The fields of the Alamogordo Air Field at which place this first explosion occurred will always be of historical interest. This spot of earth, being as renowned as it already is and will be much more so in the years to come, we feel should have worthy recognition. People will want to see the spot where this great event occurred bringing in a new era the same as they have wanted to see the spot where the first Pilgrim set foot on this continent. It is also our opinion that no department of the United States Government could do justice to this as well as your own department of National Park Service. The recognition your National Park Service has given other places of great historical interest has proved to be quite worthwhile. Therefore, we the Chamber of Commerce of Alamogordo, N. Mex., do petition your department to declare the atomic bomb proving ground a national monument or historic site.

Due to the fact that this spot is within the confines of the vast Alamogordo Bombing Range we realize it can only be a postwar project, but we believe that your department should now officially mark and secure the place for future use.

We trust you will give this request your most favorable attention and we will be glad to give any assistance we can at any time. This organization is most anxious to do its part in any way to have this place marked as a place of interest for the years to come.

Sincerely yours,

A. P. GRIDER, *President.*
FRITZ HEILBRONN, *Secretary.*

[From Washington Post of September 9, 1945]

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS AWARD GIVEN ARLINGTON MAN FOR SUGGESTION

Joseph H. Stratton, 2304 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, an attorney for the Interior Department, has been awarded $100 by the Department for his suggestion that the site of the first test explosion of the atomic bomb in New Mexico be made a new national monument.

Interior Secretary Harold Ickes, in announcing the award, said yesterday that the Commissioner of the General Land Office has been instructed to reserve the land for creation of such a monument, to "commemorate that great historic and scientific event."

Stratton's suggestion was submitted under the Interior Department's employee suggestion program, and earned the Arlington resident award for excellence, in addition to the cash award.

Proposed Department of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article entitled "A Department of Peace for the American Government," which was written by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for the September 1945 issue of the magazine Free World.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEPARTMENT OF PEACE FOR THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

From the Golden Gate of San Francisco has come an epochal, 10,000-word document, beginning with the words:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations."

To this document of 19 chapters and 111 articles, there were affixed on June 26, 1945, the signatures of the representatives of 50 nations.

It is my own humble but earnest opinion that this United Nations Charter is a far better mechanism for handling international difficulties than it is generally conceded to be. It is the result of 9 weeks of diligent labor by the conferees and of immeasurable prior preparation by the leading diplomats of the world.

It represents vast progress over the League of Nations Covenant. It contains entirely new instrumentalities for the achievement of international social and economic progress. It provides adequately for peace enforcement, for a "fire department" that will put all world fires out before they start.

The very fact that half a hundred nations could meet and speedily iron out their differences in a democratic give-and-take is in itself an encouraging omen of a new dawn in world affairs.

A word of reasonable caution is, however, in order. It is the consensus that neither this Charter nor any other instrument can, of itself, bring about international harmony, peace and plenty.

No treaty, covenant, or other mechanism, however perfect, even if it had the Sermon on the Mount and the Ten Commandments written into it, can actually achieve high objectives unless there is back of the spoken and written pledge the active and continuing will, intent and purpose of the contracting parties to live up to their obligations.

We are grateful that the peoples of the earth are now awake to that crucial fact, for they have not always been aware of it.

For a time after October 7, 1944, when the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals first came out, many individuals repeated the error of emphasis on the instrument alone which was made so disastrously after Versailles in 1919 and many times before that.

A vast emotional wave of overoptimistic thinking engulfed the proposals and burst out in thousands of letters and telegrams to Congress, in magazine articles and newspaper columns.

It is understandable why war-weary persons should have become enthused over the agreement reached in Dumbarton Oaks by the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, and China. But many persons swung

to an extreme and became mesmerized with the proposals. It is not exaggerating to say they seemed to think the proposals were some magic formula which "presto chango" would wipe out the world's historic troubles.

Time and events sobered these persons' judgment and put their feet back on the ground. It is well that, after the end of the war in Europe, these overoptimistic thinkers came to see realistically the chaotic condition in which the world still finds itself. They came to see the physical devastation, the human suffering, the economic want, the political and social fear, the national bitterness. They came to see the many still unsettled disagreements among the Allies, and how these conditions could be specifically corrected.

These miserable world conditions of today are no grounds for defeatism or negativism, but rather for realism and reinforced resolution to improve the conditions. There is no inconsistency between idealism and practicality—if idealism gives inspiration and direction, and if practicality gives a sound appraisal of conditions as they are and a working guide as to how those conditions may be improved.

At this present stage, every thinking person realizes that as Marshal Jan Christiaan Smuts has said: "The San Francisco Conference is only the beginning of a monumental task to rebuild a sad and disillusioned world."

My colleague, Senator VANDENBERG, has stated that the United Nations Charter is only an acorn with the potentialities of a great oak. President Truman has spoken of it as one step forward.

If we are to be adequate to the challenges of this period indicated by these three great statesmen, we must cultivate our vision, our faith, and our understanding. We must recognize that this is no time for pygmy thinking. We must raise our sights so that we will see the world of tomorrow as it will be if we succeed and if we fail.

If the United Nations follow the way which the Charter literally and spiritually charts, if those nations succeed in maintaining their unity and in progressing economically, politically, and socially together, our world will be saved.

If we fail, if the Charter becomes one more historic scap of paper, then war will come again and again to this ever-contracting world of deadlier and deadlier inventions. Our sons and grandsons will continue to shed their lifeblood until the nations learn the lesson of the need for unity.

War is man-made. Peace must be man-made, made in action, not merely in promises, and certainly not in lip service. As Horace Mann once said: "I have never heard much of the resolutions of the Apostles, but a great deal about their Acts." We must, therefore, activate the Charter. We must breathe the spirit of life into it.

As one humble, specific contribution to bringing this about, I have introduced in the Senate, bill 1237. This bill would create in the United States Government a Department of Peace. The Department would be headed by a Secretary of Peace, a man of Cabinet rank.

His job would be to specialize and concentrate on the maintenance of world peace, on the elimination of sources of friction and misunderstanding between peoples.

He would be assisted by an Under Secretary of Peace and by a small group of experts. With this staff he would cooperate with every other Cabinet department—the Department of State, the Treasury Department, the Commerce Department, and so on.

He would also cooperate with every other international peace-making group—private and governmental. For the Secretary of Peace would be ex-officio the American representative on the United Nations Security Council and the chairman of America's five-man delegation in the General Assembly.

Thus, if Senate bill 1237 were passed, it would restore Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to the Cabinet alongside plain-speaking straight-shooting James F. Byrnes, his successor as Secretary of State. It would serve to round out the Cabinet "family" of our President, Harry S. Truman, who, to our good fortune, is also a plain, frank, businesslike individual.

What do I consider would be the advantages of setting up a new Cabinet post for peace? Here they are as I see them:

1. It would be the most significant possible manner by which we could confer prestige upon the United States representative on the Security Council. It would thereby encourage other nations to send their highest diplomatic representatives to the new world organization.

2. It would signify our recognition of the supreme necessity of preventing war from coming to our own and all other lands.

It would indicate that we recognize that the maintenance of peace through a Cabinet Department exclusively devoted to that purpose is as essential as the preparation for war and the prosecution of war through Cabinet Departments War and Navy, exclusively devoted to those purposes.

It would prove that we realize that the Department of State, with its day-to-day diplomatic chores, cannot be relied upon exclusively for so vast a job as the maintenance of peace.

3. Most important, our "blazing of the trail" with this Department of Peace would serve to reinforce, in the eyes of the world, America's appropriate position of leadership.

It would reassert to all the world that this time America means business, that she is going all-out in her support of the plan to insure a peaceful world and that she expects the other nations to do the same.

One evening recently, I was thrilled to hear the Chief Justice of Norway and leader of the Norse home-front resistance during the war, 72-year-old Paal Berg, say, in response to a toast: "* * * It was the American Declaration of Independence, your Constitution, and your Bill of Rights which contributed much to the strengthening of the liberty-loving concepts of the Norwegian people."

Of course, it is history that the great ideas imbedded in our "American Charter," which consists of the aforementioned documents, encircled the globe. These ideas swept through nations like a beneficial flame, and thrones and dynasties fell. A century afterward the peoples of earth were the richer in liberty and freedom because our American pioneers, our founding fathers, had dared to put into operation, under the Constitution, a new form of government, a government of checks and balances.

But after the last World War a period of retrogression set in, and the ideas which were enunciated in our fundamental law lost ground. A new set of ideas, those of nazism, which actually consisted of the modernization of age-old concepts of slavery, took control of men's minds. Even in our own land, Nazi economics, Nazi politics, the Nazi social credo, had many and high exponents. The American flame was dying out.

Then the war came upon us, and we rediscovered ourselves, and today we find the old flame burning brighter than ever. The nations of earth are turning to us for our share of leadership.

Now, I ask this question: "Will this new United Nations Charter be to the nations of the earth what our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution were 150 and more years ago?"

The answer to that is: "Yes; if the peoples of earth will to make the Charter so and express that will by vitalizing that document."

It is our hope and prayer that the United Nations Organization will become another lighthouse on the shore of time. Then, perhaps, 50 years from now, another Gladstone will arise and, speaking of the Charter, as that great Prime Minister spoke in 1887 of our Constitution, will call it:"The most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect."

The Treasury Enforcement Agencies' Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include as part of my remarks a statement issued by the Treasury Department, reviewing in part the work of enforcement agencies during the last fiscal year. It is extremely interesting and in my opinion worthy of wide circulation. It follows:

With totals swelled in the closing months by the Treasury's intensified drive against tax evaders, additional taxes and penalties recommended for assessment by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the 1945 fiscal year reached a record total of $885,000,000. Of this amount, $700,000,000 was based on delinquencies in income and excess-profits taxes, and the remainder consisted of excise and other miscellaneous taxes.

Commissioner Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., said the figures represent potential revenue over and above initial returns filed by taxpayers. For the 1944 fiscal year the grand total of such assessments was $730,000,000; and for the 1943 period, $566,000,000.

Mr. Nunan said that, as the new fiscal year began, millions of additional dollars were being paid into the Bureau by taxpayers who, prompted by publicity given the campaign against evasion, are anxious to square their accounts by voluntary disclosures.

Treasury officials have estimated that the record 1945 potential recovery of revenue will be topped substantially in the present fiscal year as results of the recently instituted drive are felt through recruitment and assignment of 10,000 additional personnel.

Elmer L. Irey, Coordinator of Law Enforcement Agencies, in a review of the fiscal year's work, said that the Intelligence Unit, headed by W. H. Woolf, with an average investigative personnel of only 330 agents, accounted for $123,000,000 of the 1945 total of additional taxes recommended, a record for the unit also. The unit handles cases that involve deliberate fraud, and in which criminal penalties usually are sought.

This force is being built up to 1,400 special agents, which, with the additional revenue agents, deputy collectors, and clerical and other employees, will give the Bureau a potent army in the field against wartime chiselers.

Other highlights of Mr. Irey's report were:

Frank J. Wilson, Chief of the United States Secret Service, reported that money counterfeiting again this last year was of negligible proportions, but that theft and forgery of Government checks continued to be a serious enforcement problem. Similar offenses against holders of Government bonds assumed sizeable proportions.

DRUG SEIZURES MOUNT

Seizure of drugs at ports and borders by customs and in the interior traffic by narcotic

agents increased sharply, but remained below the volume of prewar years. Iran, India, and Mexico were the principal sources for drugs intended for illicit use. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, reported a wholesale round-up of eastern distributors of a major California-New York drug ring, following conviction last year of the west coast principals of the traffic.

E. J. Shamhart, Deputy Commissioner of Customs, reported a decline in seizures of commodities other than narcotics, due principally to a sharp drop in liquor smuggling as the supply situation in this country improved.

The Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue continued its successful prosecution of black-market-liquor racketeers, and reported seizures indicating a 22-percent increase in illicit distilling operations, made possible largely by illegal diversion of sugar. This latter offense is being combatted jointly by the unit and the Office of Price Administration. Stewart Berkshire, Deputy Commissioner, head of the unit, said the quantity of mash destroyed still was 57 percent less than in the prerationing year 1941.

The Foreign Funds Compliance Section continued to ferret out and establish control over unreported or unblocked funds of nationals of enemy or enemy looted countries, one case involving $420,000, money which apparently was transferred from France to Switzerland, to Portugal, and finally to the United States.

MORE CONVICTIONS REPORTED

The six Treasury agencies, with an average of 1,885 investigators employed during the fiscal year, provided evidence upon which Federal court convictions of 11,535 violators of laws within Treasury jurisdiction were obtained. The convictions total compare with 10,518 in the 1944 fiscal period.

Mr. Woolf reported that, while the expansion of personnel was just getting under way, the Intelligence Unit had made notable progress in combatting felonious evasion of taxes, with scores of major cases being prepared for early presentation to Federal grand juries, some carrying claims for taxes and penalties of from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000.

He pointed out that the type of cases referred to the unit frequently requires long and arduous investigative work. Indictments were obtained against 86 individuals during the year, 70 persons were brought to trial, and 65 were convicted.

Among outstanding cases closed was that involving John Memolo, Scranton, Pa., attorney, given a 3-year term for tax evasion. It was charged that he failed to report fully fees received in a Federal court receivership case. Evidence presented in the Memolo trial was brought before a judiciary subcommittee of the House of Representatives in Washington, which investigated conduct in office of Albert W. Johnson, former Federal judge in that district.

INVESTIGATION IN KANSAS

As the fiscal year closed, 10 persons were indicted on various charges growing out of a grand jury investigation at Wichita, Kans., into tax liabilities of various individuals allegedly engaged in illicit liquor and gambling operations.

At Chicago, a Federal jury on June 28, indicted Harry E. Jacoby, president, and the Amazon Hose & Rubber Co., on charges of attempted evasion of taxes. The indictment charged that only negligible amounts of war-contract earnings of $400,000 in a 3-year period were reported for tax purposes. Also indicted at Chicago, just after the fiscal year closed, was Bert K. Naster, owner of an electrical equipment company, on charges of evading $221,000 in taxes.

Louis S. Berkhoff, Milwaukee, was sentenced in June to a 4-year prison term for filing false financial statements with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. He allegedly concealed his wealth in some 250 banking and other financial accounts.

Despite the record flow of Government checks to the public, which, swelled by allowance, allotment and discharge compensation for servicemen, is at the rate of 1,000,000 each working day, the number of checks reported for investigation by the Secret Service during the 1945 fiscal year actually declined from 18,168 in 1944, to 16,380. The Service has conducted a Nation-wide program to educate recipients and cashers of these checks in means of foiling the forger. With some 85,000,000 persons now owning Government bonds, potentialities for theft and fraudulent negotiation increased, and 241 arrests were made for this crime. Agents found the victim of one such theft had been forced into a charity home.

FORGERY ARRESTS INCREASE

The number of arrests for check theft and forgery increased from 1,691 in the 1944 fiscal year, to 1,722, of whom 706, or 41 percent, were under 21 years of age, pointing up the seriousness of these offenses as factors contributing to juvenile delinquency.

In New York City, one gang of 31 juvenile forgers was broken up by arrests. At Newark, N. J., officers rounded up 13 teen-age girls, who called themselves the Jacket Club (from the window envelopes in which the Treasury checks they stole were mailed). It is to merchants such as those who cashed the checks stolen and forged by these youngsters that the Secret Service directs its "Know Your Endorser" campaign. The merchants lose their money in such cases.

The Secret Service smashed quickly two elaborate counterfeit Treasury check enterprises, with Edwin D. Long, Oklahoma City printer, drawing a 3-year prison term—his twelfth since 1924. For a similar offense, Frank Garrett, who has spent 35 of his 55 years in prison for forgery, was given a 3-year term at Dallas, Tex.

COUNTERFEIT LOSSES SMALL

No major money counterfeiting activities developed during the year, and the loss to the public from counterfeit bills and coins was only $28,852, a new low. The Service seized two large lots of long-cached counterfeit bills, the product of criminal gangs which, for all practical purposes, was smashed years ago.

One lot of $13,400 in counterfeit $100 bills was captured at Cudahy, Wis. Five traffickers in these notes drew long prison terms. The other catch was that of 50 $5 silver certificates seized at Philadelphia, which resulted in the conviction of Anthony Peter Campanaro.

Chief Wilson said the only actively circulating counterfeit at this time is a crude $1 bill being passed regularly in the New York area. Believed to be a lone-wolf operator, this counterfeiter has eluded capture since 1938. A reward is offered for information leading to his arrest and conviction. The bills, some 40 or 50 of which are passed each month, all bear the serial number K7002536A. Submerged as he is in New York City's millions, the passer's one-at-a-time technique, and the $1 denomination make interception extremely difficult.

Total seizures of narcotic drugs during the 1945 fiscal year by Narcotics and Customs were 9,831 ounces, compared to 4,542 ounces in 1944. Marihuana seizures were 12,381 ounces bulk, and 15,388 cigarettes, compared with 7,651 ounces bulk in 1944, and 24,196 cigarettes. New York City appeared to be the focal point for internal traffic in marihuana.

ILLICIT DRUG PRICES HIGH

Relative scarcity and extremely high prices for narcotic drugs in the illicit trade continued, and numerous thefts from legitimate stocks and illegal diversions through fraudulent prescriptions resulted from frantic efforts of peddlers and addicts to get supplies.

Despite vigorous efforts by the Mexican Government to eradicate clandestine plantings of opium in remote mountain regions, sizeable seizures of the drug from these sources were made. Additional large seizures were made aboard ships arriving at United States ports, particularly those from Iran and India. One such seizure made at Baltimore consisted of 63½ pounds, which, in the New York illicit market would have brought $63,000. The smuggler, crewman on a Chinese vessel, said he purchased the lot in India for $1,000.

Customs seizures of all types of smuggled goods dropped from 17,815 in 1944 to 16,400 in 1945. Liquor seizures, small lot stuff, dropped from 7,098 in 1944 to 4,200 in 1945.

Among important seizures of smuggled merchandise was a lot of 600 watches and 200 watch movements found cleverly concealed in sleeping compartments on a Montreal train. The find was made at Rouses Point, New York, and two men were arrested. At New Orleans, agents broke up an attempted illegal exportation as ship's stores, of nearly 2,000,000 cigarettes.

GOLD SMUGGLING CHECKED

Working with the United States Secret Service and with Canadian officers, Customs helped break up a large scale smuggling of gold from this country and Canada to North Africa. Royal Air Force Transport Command pilots were involved in the erstwhile highly profitable venture.

Customs officers continued to devote major attention to war services such as control of merchant shipping, of imports and exports, and of persons arriving and leaving the United States.

Evidence gathered by Alcohol Tax agents during the successful 1944 drive to smash the black market in liquor resulted in further indictment during the 1945 period of 351 persons, while 422 persons were convicted on various charges. On of the most important of these cases involved Robert Gould, Cincinnati broker, who was given a 6-year prison sentence and fined, with one of his companies, $240,000.

The Unit produced potential additional revenue to the Government of nearly $2,000,000 from investigation of floor tax evasion, and in compromise settlement by a large group of breweries charged with illegally subsidizing retail outlets. Property value at another $2,000,000 was seized in connection with liquor law violations. Illicit still seizures in 1945 were 8,346, against 6,801 in 1944. Arrests made by the Unit totaled 11,104, compared to 11,525 in 1944.

Investigation of Pearl Harbor Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Joseph Leib, service officer of the Vincent B. Costello Post of the American Legion and, also, a resolution adopted by that post:

In adopting the following resolution, Costello Post reached back into history and recalled the grimly prophetic words and the subsequent court martial of Col. William L. Mitchell a decade ago.

"Billy" Mitchell was commander of Costello Post in 1927.

During World War I, Mitchell was Assistant Chief of the Army Air Service, with the rank of brigadier general. After the peace he crusaded vigorously and with very little regard for whose toes he stepped on to induce the Government of the United States to set up a powerful air force.

Because of his great courage and blunt words of wisdom, he was demoted to colonel and exiled to an obscure post in Texas. After the dirigible Shenandoah was wrecked in 1925, Mitchell accused high War Department officials of stupidity and gross negligence.

He was promptly court-martialed and later found guilty of conduct "to the prejudice of good order and military discipline." It was the brass hats' stupid answer to a progressive, honest, and forthright officer who had the interest of his country at heart. He was sentenced to forfeit rank, duties, pay, and allowances for 5 years. He resigned from the Army in 1926.

In 1935, 1 year before he passed away, heartbroken, and 6 years before Pearl Harbor, he wrote these prophetic words:

"Reconnaissance from the air is the only means of warning Hawaii and the Philippines of the sneaking approach of our mortal enemy in the Pacific. * * * The fighter plane and bomber, ever on the alert and in scattered formation when resting on their bases, furnish the only hope of defense of Pearl Harbor. If our warships there were to be found bottled up in a surprise attack from the air, and our airplanes destroyed on the ground, nothing but a miracle would help us to hold our Far East possessions."

It seems that we will never learn, will we?

This is the stand Costello Post took on September 4, 1945:

"INVESTIGATION OF PEARL HARBOR ATTACK RESOLUTION

"Whereas it is our contention that the American people are entitled to know the true facts regarding the Pearl Harbor disaster.

"Whereas because of the cessation of hostilities with Japan the explanation of military expediency can no longer be used as an excuse for keeping the incident secret: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Vincent B. Costello Post, the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, does not see any justification for further delay and suggests that the Congress be requested to either set up a joint committee of both houses of Congress to investigate said incident or to use its good offices to induce the President of the United States to authorize an immediate court martial of the accused officers of the Army and of the Navy so that the American people can be fully apprised of the conditions and factors that caused the Pearl Harbor debacle.

"WILLIAM BARRINGTON, *Commander.*
"JOSEPH LEIB, *Service Officer.*"

Establishment of Naval Academy in Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 20, 1945.

GREETINGS: At the meeting of the Council of the City of Los Angeles held August 20, 1945, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the Secretary of the Navy has been requested to give consideration to the establishment of a Naval Academy in southern California, in accordance with H. R. 1371, introduced on January 11, 1945, by Hon. Congressman GORDON L. McDONOUGH; and

"Whereas the creation and maintenance of a two-ocean Navy is receiving careful consideration of the proper Government officials; and

"Whereas it is generally agreed that the present limited naval training facilities on the east coast of the United States are inadequate for the training of an increased Navy personnel; and

"Whereas southern California offers many necessary facilities, including a favorable all-year-round climate; and

"Whereas there is located within the area of southern California adequate harbor, shipbuilding, and ship-repair facilities for Navy craft: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the City Council of the City of Los Angeles respectfully urge favorable action by the House of Representatives on H. R. 1371; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy of the United States, to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives elected in the counties of San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, Orange, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, Kern, San Luis Obispo, Inyo, Tulare, and Kings."

Very truly yours,

WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.

Extract From Sixth Annual Address by President Woodrow Wilson to Joint Session of Congress, December 2, 1918

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from the sixth annual address by President Woodrow Wilson to joint session of Congress, December 2, 1918:

[From pp. 8640–8643, vol. XVIII, Messages and Papers of the Presidents]

So far as our domestic affairs are concerned, the problem of our return to peace is a problem of economic and industrial readjustment. That problem is less serious for us than it may turn out to be for the nations which have suffered the disarrangements and the losses of war longer than we. Our people, moreover, do not wait to be coached and led. They know their own business, are quick and resourceful at every readjustment, definite in purpose, and self-reliant in action. Any leading strings we might seek to put them in would speedily become hopelessly tangled because they would pay no attention to them and go their own way. All that we can do as their legislative and executive servants is to mediate the process of change here, there, and elsewhere as we may.

I have heard much counsel as to the plans that should be formed and personally conducted to a happy consummation, but from no quarter have I seen any general scheme of reconstruction emerge which I thought it likely we could force our spirited businessmen and self-reliant laborers to accept with due pliancy and obedience.

While the war lasted we set up many agencies by which to direct the industries of the country in the services it was necessary for them to render, by which to make sure of an abundant supply of the materials needed, by which to check undertakings that could for the time be dispensed with and stimulate those that were most serviceable in war, by which to gain for the purchasing departments of the Government a certain control over the prices of essential articles and materials, by which to restrain trade with alien enemies, make the most of the available shipping, and systematize financial transactions, both public and private, so that there would be no unnecessary conflict or confusion, by which, in short, to put every material energy of the country in harness to draw the common load and make of us one team in the accomplishment of a great task. But the moment we knew the armistice to have been signed we took the harness off.

Raw materials, upon which the Government had kept its hand for fear there should not be enough for the industries that supplied the armies, have been released and put into the general market again. Great industrial plants whose whole output and machinery had been taken over for the uses of the Government have been set free to return to the uses to which they were put before the war. It has not been possible to remove so readily or so quickly the control of foodstuffs and of shipping, because the world has still to be fed from our granaries and the ships are still needed to send supplies to our men overseas and to bring the men back as fast as the disturbed conditions on the other side of the water permit, but even there restraints are being relaxed as much as possible and more and more as the weeks go by.

Never before have there been agencies in existence in this country which knew so much of the field of supply, of labor, and of industry as the War Industries Board, the War Trade Board, the Labor Department, the Food Administration, and the Fuel Administration have known since their labors became thoroughly systematized; and they have not been isolated agencies, they have been directed by men who represented the permanent departments of the Government and so have been the centers of unified and cooperative action.

It has been the policy of the Executive, therefore, since the armistice was assured (which is in effect a complete submission of the enemy) to put the knowledge of these bodies at the disposal of the businessmen of the country and to offer their intelligent mediation at every point and in every matter where it was desired.

It is surprising how fast the process of return to a peace footing has moved in the 3 weeks since the fighting stopped. It promises to outrun any inquiry that may be instituted and any aid that may be offered. It will not be easy to direct it any better than it will direct itself. The American businessman is of quick initiative. * * *

For the steadying and facilitation of our own domestic business readjustments nothing is more important than the immediate determination of the taxes that are to be levied for 1918, 1919, and 1920. As much of the burden of taxation must be lifted from business as sound methods of financing the Government will permit, and those who conduct the great essential industries of the country must be told as exactly as possible what obligations to the Government they will be expected to meet in the years immediately ahead of them. It will be of serious consequence to the country to delay removing all uncertainties in this matter a single day longer than the right processes of debate

justify. It is idle to talk of successful and confident business reconstruction before those uncertainties are resolved.

Poem in Tribute to the Late Senator Johnson, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle in tribute to the late Senator Johnson, of California.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA

S–enator Johnson, revered by us all,
E–veryone's friend and nobody's foe,
N–ow is no more—he's heard the last call,
A–nd has gone on, for he could not say "No."
T–ho he was loath from the earth to depart,
O–ften he felt, of late years, in his heart,
R–eady, whenever the call came, to go.

J–ustly and humbly he walks with his God—
O–ver his State and his Nation a pall
H–angs, but a halo of hope shrouds the sod
N–ow where he sleeps, in response to the call,
S–ent from above kindly to him to come
O–n and be welcomed in his Father's home.
N–obly he lived till death ended it all.

R–ight, sacred honor, and justice, and truth
E–ver stood uppermost in his great mind—
V–erily these, from the days of his youth,
E–ver more strongly became intertwined
R–ound the great life that he purposed to live—
E–ven when wronged, he knew how to forgive—
D–eep in his heart of hearts "God" was enshrined.

B–right was his hope when the shadows grew dark—
Y–onder, in glory, he saw the true light—

U–nder this light he, prepared to embark,
S–ilently passed thru the shades of the night—

A–nd his pure spirit is now far away,
L–iving anew, where the Great Perfect Day,
L–ighted with love, will shine on, clear and bright.

W–e shall long miss him—on down thru the years,
E–ven tho they, with their passing, may bring

S–weet recollections, when gone are our tears—
H–owever sweetly to these we may cling,
A–s we grow older, and draw near the end,
L–ife's passing years take us nearer our friend,
L–iving today in God's eternal spring.

M–ercy and Peace, methinks, each other kissed,
I–n the calm moment, when Mercy said "Come,"
S–oftly, and Peace, which he could not resist,
S–aid to him, "God's calling from the Blue Dome."

H–appy is he, with the angelic bands,
I–n the blest Mansion, not builded with hands,
M–errily sing, anew, "Home, Sweet Home."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Elimination of Pauper Oath Hospitalization Requirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in regard to pauper-oath resolution as authorized by Vincent B. Costello Post No. 15, of the American Legion:

LEGION NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ADOPTS PAUPER OATH RESOLUTION AUTHORED BY COSTELLO POST

(By Joseph Leib)

During the National Executive Committee meeting of the American Legion held at Indianapolis, Ind., July 28, 1945 the campaign launched by Costello Post, Washington, D. C. to discontinue the obnoxious pauper oath hospitalization requirement won recognition when this group adopted its resolution.

This campaign was started last year when the Costello Post expression was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 7, 1944. Because of the bitter opposition of Gen. Frank T. Hines, recently ousted Veterans' Administrator, the District of Columbia, Department of the American Legion was high-pressured not to support the Costello Post resolution.

We fought back by appealing to Legion Posts throughout the United States mailing out over 5,000 copies of the resolution.

Several months later the Harold A. Taylor Post No. 47 of Chicago, Ill., picked up the Costello Post resolution adopted it word for word, referred it through channels to the Sixth Illinois District Committee where it was approved. The resolution was then transmitted to the National Executive Committee where it was passed.

Of further significance John Steele, who represented Illinois at the National Executive Committee meeting, did yeoman work in getting the pauper oath expression approved. Mr. Steele, former Governor of Illinois, is slated to be the next national commander of the American Legion. (Both resolutions, the Costello Post and the one from the Taylor Post appear in this statement exactly as passed for comparison purpose.)

In the meantime, however, the original Costello Post declaration which the Taylor Post used verbatim became out-moded when the Veterans' Administration undertook last December to revise its hospitalization form P–10 in a belated attempt to modify some of the objections cited in the resolution. Before the criticism began the hospitalization form was four pages long. Now it consists of only one and a half pages.

It is apparent that only Congress can correct this great injustice to veterans. There are six pieces of legislation calling for the elimination of the pauper-oath requirement. Costello Post insists on the deletion of notation under question 4, as follows: "Where application is for condition for which applicant was discharged for disability in line of duty, or held service-connected by veterans Administration, questions 5, 6, and 7 need not be answered," also the removal of question No. 6, from Veterans' Administration Form P–10 "Application for hospital treatment or domiciliary care" revised December, 1944, otherwise known as the pauper-oath clause.

In this connection it is of interest to note the manner in which General Hines was able to influence certain high Legion officials to do his bidding. General Hines worked through his bosom friend Watson B. Miller, rehabilitation director of the American Legion (now on leave) in getting the assistant rehabilitation officer T. O. Kraabel to oppose the adoption of the pauper oath resolution. When Costello Post sought the support of Edward Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, the matter was referred to Kraabel for consideration but who immediately took it upon himself to ask the District of Columbia department commander to "call off the dogs." When this tactic failed the department commander in the name of T. O. Kraabel wrote Costello Post the following letter. Incidentally, before I quote the communication I would like to point out that Edward Hays 1933 Legion national commander denounced General Hines as a traitor of the veterans and refused to invite him to attend the national convention but Watson B. Miller rushed to Hines' defense. When the recent scandal of veterans' hospitals came to the surface during which time it was proven that veterans under General Hines were "treated like dogs" in Government institutions it was T. O. Kraabel who defended the ousted Veterans' Administrator. Yet it was Kraabel's responsibility as rehabilitation director and as nominal head of the national field service of the American Legion to watch over the veterans' hospitals.

Here is the D. C. department commander letter, in part:

"DECEMBER 2, 1944.

"I am in receipt of a letter dated November 29, 1944, from T. O. Kraabel, national director of the national rehabilitation committee, relative to a letter sent to national commander by Joseph Leib, vice commander of your post in regard to certain requirements as to information to be supplied on the application form for hospital treatment in a Veterans' Administration facility. The points raised by your post and submitted in the form of a resolution, according to T. O., have been the subject of attack on the part of the Legion for a number of years. While the present form to be filled out is not all that the Legion desires, T. O. indicated that some progress has been made since the original terms were in vogue in the old form. National headquarters has stated it is not their desire to neutralize the expressed desires of Costello Post."

With the assistance of a number of Congressmen and the National Tribune, Stars and Stripes, Costello Post brought about the revision of the P–10 veterans hospitalization form. Immediately after the revision was announced the national headquarters of the American Legion grabbed credit for this accomplishment although it did not lift a finger to help bring it about.

At a subsequent date the part played by General Hines and T. O. Kraabel in the artificial-limb scandal will be told.

The following includes the Costello Post resolution as it originally appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Taylor Post declaration as passed by the national executive committee of the American Legion:

"MUST A VETERAN IN NEED OF HOSPITALIZATION SWEAR TO A PAUPER'S OATH

"(Extension of remarks by Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, of Indiana, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, September 7, 1944)

"Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker I wish to have inserted in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, the largest American Legion Post in the District of Columbia and one of the largest in the Nation. The resolution is worthy of consideration by every Member of Congress:

"'*Be it resolved*, That the existing and written method of interrogation for admission to veteran hospitalization, as nonservice con-

nected patients or as service-connected patients seeking treatment for ailment other than cause of discharge—either emergency or extensive cases—is un-American, degrading, and in addition clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of the world wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant or antagonistic governmental bureaucrats.

" 'Whereas that the membership of this post respectfully suggests that Veterans' Administration officials be requested to authorize and institute a more democratic and more appropriate procedure of ascertaining and determining the financial status of an applicant or his or her eligibility for hospital treatment.

" 'Whereas that these pleadings are not submitted for the intention of removing proper or necessary restrictions and safeguards for hospital admittance but to eliminate the apprehension of being stigmatized, in official records by a so-called act of pauperism, and to remove the contingency of being coerced or threatened by overzealous public officials: Therefore be it

" '*Resolved*, That the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, is authorized and directed to recommend for the consideration by the delegates of the national convention of the American Legion to be assembled at Chicago, Ill., September 18–20, 1944, the deletion of questions Nos. 5 and 9, respectively from Veterans' Administration Form P–10—Application for Hospital Treatment or Domiciliary Care, otherwise known as the pauper's oath.

" 'Approved:

" 'THOMAS COSTELLO, *Commander.*

" 'JOSEPH LEIB, *Vice Commander.*' "

"RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., JULY 26–28, 1945.

"*Be it resolved*, That the existing and written method of interrogation for admission to veteran hospitalization, as non-service connected patients or as service-connected patients seeking treatment for ailment other than cause of discharge—either emergency or extensive cases—is un-American, degrading, and in addition clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of the World Wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant and antagonistic Government bureaucrats,

"Whereas the membership of Harold A. Taylor Post No. 47, The American Legion, Department of Illinois, respectfully suggests that Veterans' Administration officials be requested to authorize and institute a more democratic and more appropriate procedure of ascertaining and determining the financial status of an applicant or his or her eligibility for hospital treatment,

"Whereas these pleadings are not submitted for the intention of removing proper or necessary restrictions and safeguards for hospital admittance but to eliminate the apprehension of being stigmatized in official records by a so-called act of pauperism, and to remove the contingency of being coerced or threatened by overzealous public officials; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Harold T. Taylor Post, No. 47, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, is authorized and directed to recommend for consideration the deletion of questions Nos. 5 and 9, respectively, from Veterans' Administration Form P–10, Application for Hospital Treatment or Domiciliary Care, otherwise known as the pauper's oath; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded through proper channels to the Sixth District and Cook County Council, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, for appropriate and further action."

Flash the Green Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, why speak about unemployment? Why theorize upon problems of unemployment? Why not employ the unemployed? Employment is a sure solution to unemployment.

If the heavy hand of government is lifted from business, free enterprise will employ a large percentage of the employables. Construction and manufacturing of all types is ready to proceed as soon as bureaucratic control is released.

Requests are coming in daily to almost all Members of Congress insisting upon the lifting of Regulation L–41, applicable to the building and construction trade. The bureaus, headed up at the White House, offer the excuse that materials are scarce and in some instances not immediately available. Hence, they say that there must be an equitable distribution and allocation according to some bureaucratic fine-spun theory of distribution. Why attempt to control distribution and output of material? Why not let materials be used as far as they are available and as far as they become available? Supply and demand will take care of the situation. When the materials run out and insofar as they are not being produced rapidly enough to take care of the demand, the program will be slowed down to its normal rate of speed. There is only a limited number of materials now available they say, and these can be used as fast as they are available and without regimentation. But this would cost a lot of bureaucrats their jobs, and bureaucracy is apparently determined to hold tenaciously to the idea of telling somebody and everybody what they can do and when they can move in a certain direction. Why not give the green light to private enterprise?

As a further illustration of the poor example being set by those who hold the power and the purse strings, those who can flash the green light or keep it red, let us see what the President and Congress are doing. Not only should controls be released by the executive and legislative departments of our Government insofar as they are applicable to private enterprise, but the administration might well set the example by flashing the green light on some of its own projects heretofore authorized and approved. For example, in my district the construction of the Hulah Reservoir project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and the construction of the Fort Gibson Dam and Reservoir project on the Grand River was authorized by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Other similar projects were authorized several years ago, and the actual construction of all was properly withheld and delayed pending the conclusion of the war.

But the war is now over and why delay further the construction of these heretofore authorized and approved projects? All that is necessary is for Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to finance these projects for the remainder of the current fiscal year. I am told by the United States Army engineers that if such action is taken by Congress work can be begun on each of these projects within 30 days after the appropriations are available. In one instance all of the land for the dam site has been acquired and 75 percent of the land included in the reservoir has been acquired by the Government. I am further reliably informed that as many as 10 contractors engaged in this type of construction work are anxiously waiting to bid on these projects.

When the green light is flashed on these projects, hundreds of men will be put to work immediately. Those who have been working in the defense industries in the regions of these projects will have immediate employment which will likely last for approximately 2 years. The labor is available and the material can be made available if red tape and regimentation is eliminated, and the appropriation is made by Congress. I repeat, that the best way to solve unemployment is to employ, and the Government should set the example in these and many other instances where the projects have already been approved by Congress.

Accordingly, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill providing for appropriation of adequate funds to commence each of the two projects above named and enable the work to progress until the end of the present fiscal year. The best way for the administration to convince private enterprise and the public of its sincerity and desire to avoid unemployment is to flash the green light both as to private and already approved public construction work.

The Republican Valley Conservation Association Opposes MVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a resolution passed by the Republican Valley Conservation Association at McCook, Nebr., on August 22, 1945.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Republican Valley Conservation Association, representing the residents and landowners in the 25,000-square-mile area of the Republican River Valley, and dedicated to the correction of a flood menace which in 1935 took 122 lives; and

Whereas the association has been able to work out with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Army Engineers, and the United States Department of Agriculture, a unified over-all program by which flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, and forestation, might properly be accomplished throughout

this entire basin under existing Federal agencies whose techniques have been tried and tested; and

Whereas water codes in western States have developed around the philosophy that sovereign States possess jurisdiction over the flow of streams within their boundaries, many of these rights having been incorporated into the State constitutions subsequently ratified by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican Valley Conservation Association does hereby state its firm opposition to the creation of any Missouri Valley Authority by statutory or administrative directive, since such Authority would impede the orderly processes of tried and tested technical construction agencies of the Government, and would contravene the sovereign powers of the Western States.

Approved by motion of Board of Directors of Republican Valley Conservation Association in formal meeting, McCook, Neb., August 22, 1945.

Certified by:

H. D. STRUNK,
President, Republican Valley Conservation Association.

Resolutions of the Wisconsin Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin:

Assembly Joint Resolution 98

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress and the Navy to investigate the advantages of wintering naval craft at Marinette, Sturgeon Bay, and other Wisconsin ports on Lake Michigan

Whereas after the war the United States Navy intends to winter a large number of naval craft of the PT, SC, PC and other small types at ports on Lake Michigan; and

Whereas it is understood that Lake Michigan ports south of the Wisconsin State line are being given consideration for this purpose; and

Whereas the cities of Marinette and Sturgeon Bay offer completely sheltered harbors with year-round open channels, dry docks, dock storage facilities, repair equipment, and adequate low-cost housing facilities for naval personnel; and

Whereas Wisconsin lake ports have already demonstrated their year round usefulness by the fact that winter deliveries have been made by them every year since the war shipbuilding program was inaugurated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature hereby memorializes the Congress and the Navy Department to investigate the advantages offered by Marinette, Sturgeon Bay, and other Wisconsin ports on Lake Michigan for the wintering of small naval craft; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of each House of the Congress, to each Wisconsin Member thereof, and to the Secretary of the Navy.

DONALD C. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Assembly Joint Resolution 64

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation clarifying the rights and privileges of returning veterans to their former positions of civilian employment

Whereas it has been reported that War Mobilizer James F. Byrnes, in his report to Congress, declared he is "convinced the section of the Selective Training and Service Act which provides reemployment rights for veterans will require some clarification"; and

Whereas Mr. Byrnes has been "told by representatives of management and labor that provisions of an absolute job guarantee to those veterans who do have reemployment rights may create serious industrial relations problems unless certain principles are fully agreed upon beforehand"; and

Whereas the two major labor organizations have requested a reexamination and reinterpretation of such reemployment provisions and that there be a continuing council of representatives of management, labor, veterans organizations, and the interested governmental agencies to develop sound employment policies and practices; and

Whereas there are many problems and questions arising as to the specific application of such law for certain situations which are vexatious and productive of disrupting and disturbing labor forces; and

Whereas it is respectfully requested that in view of the disastrous consequences that may be afforded to veterans by breaking faith on a guaranty of reemployment, and to industry and labor by forcing upon them an unworkable and unintelligible act, that the welfare and well-being of all parties and the general public will be substantially promoted by clarifying such law to specifically interpret the rights and privileges of all parties involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact further legislation that will clarify the rights and privileges of returning veterans to their former positions of civil employment with such degree of conciseness that the right of labor, of industry, of veterans groups, and of government will be adequately and properly safeguarded; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion Fred M. Vinson, and Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, the President, and to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

DONALD C. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Assembly Joint Resolution 53

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to abolish the party convention system of nominating and the electoral college method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States and to enact law providing for nomination and election of the President and Vice President by popular vote

Whereas our present party convention system of nominating and electoral college method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States was intended by the framers of the Constitution to provide a means of selection by deliberative bodies of able representatives of the people, which in fact has never been the case since 1800; and

Whereas the electoral college is unfair and unjust as a method of election in that smaller States are over represented; large doubtful States are given undue importance; public interest in Presidential campaigns in many States is discouraged; and the popular will is thereby frequently thwarted; and

Whereas in 1824 Jackson had a popular plurality of 50 percent over his nearest opponent yet was defeated when the election was decided by the House of Representatives; in 1876 Hayes was declared elected although Tilden had a popular plurality of over 250,000 and an actual majority of over 78,000 votes; in 1888 Harrison was elected although Cleveland had a plurality of almost 100,000; and in about half of the elections in the past 50 years a minority of the popular votes have elected the President and Vice President; and the minority vote in each State is entirely disregarded and cast away; and

Whereas nomination and election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote is in accord with modern ideas of popular government, will remove the useless encumbrance between voters and the election, will make a substantial saving in the cost of elections, will make such nominations and elections truly representative and fair and will lead to the election of more able Presidents and Vice Presidents and render them more responsible to the people; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress two proposed amendments to the Constitution, the Langer proposal to elect the President by direct numerical vote, and the Celler-Guffey proposal to divide the electoral vote in each State in proportion to the popular vote cast for each candidate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to take necessary steps to abolish the convention system of nominating the President and to adopt either the proposed Langer amendment or the proposed Celler-Guffey amendment to the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

DONALD C. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Assembly Joint Resolution 51

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the feasibility of converting the ordnance plant at Milwaukee into a veterans' hospital

Whereas there will be a great need for veterans' hospitals after World War II; and

Whereas the Federal Government owns an ordnance plant in the city of Milwaukee, being used during the war by the Signal Battery Co., which will be vacant and unused soon after the cessation of hostilities; and

Whereas said plant, together with its spacious grounds, is ideally suited and well located for use as a veterans' hospital: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States, and especially the Wisconsin Members thereof, to investigate the feasibility of transferring said ordnance plant to the State of Wisconsin to be converted into a hospital for veterans of World War II under the supervision of the veterans' recognition board; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the clerk

of each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

DONALD C. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
OSCAR RENNEBOHN,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Assembly Joint Resolution 76

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the proper Federal agency to prescribe and recommend uniform traffic signals and other safety devices on the highways

Whereas there is a lack of uniformity in the laws of the various States pertaining to rural and urban highway marking, traffic signals and codes, highway engineering with reference to the facilitation of traffic and promotion of safety, and the establishment of uniform markings, signals, and appliances; and

Whereas such lack of uniformity and uncertainty of regulation and application has been productive of hazards to all the users of the highways; and

Whereas this lack of uniformity of traffic signals, markings, and other safety codes and regulations of the States is restrictive of free movement and productive of hazards to the safety of the traveling public; and

Whereas there is a universal need and demand that such difficulties be eliminated by the establishment of uniform traffic markings, signals, safety devices, and codes for all highways to be prescribed and recommended by the Congress of the United States to direct the proper Federal agency thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the Senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to direct the proper Federal agency thereof, to prescribe and recommend uniform traffic signals, markings, codes, and safety devices for the highways of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

DONALD C. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Assembly Joint Resolution 55

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation requiring prompt deportation after the war of imported war prisoners, foreign labor battalions, and refugees, and barring further immigration to the United States until our returning war veterans are afforded an opportunity for gainful employment and the number of our unemployed is reduced to a minimum

Whereas our returning war veterans and other American citizens should at all times be afforded the opportunity for gainful employment; and

Whereas if foreign labor battalions, refugees, and imported war prisoners are not promptly returned to the lands of their origin and immigration to this country is not abated after the war opportunity for gainful employment of our citizenry will be seriously jeopardized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which in substance shall provide:

1. That any foreign-born resident who avoids the obligation of military service or who fails to declare his intention to become a citizen of the United States within 3 years from the date of his entry into this country shall be automatically subject to deportation;

2. That immigrants shall be barred from this country from and after the date of cessation of hostilities of the present war until such time as (a) the number of unemployed in the United States is reduced to less than 1,000,000; (b) all war veterans have been afforded the opportunity of gainful employment; (c) members of imported foreign labor battalions, refugees, war prisoners, and those given temporary sanctuary, employment, or haven during the present war, are returned to the lands of their origin; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of this legislature that such legislation should not apply to the foreign-born spouse or children of any person who served in the armed forces of the United States while at war or performed services for or on behalf of the United States in connection with the prosecution of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

DONALD C. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
CONRAD SHEARER,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Assembly Joint Resolution 80

Joint resolution requesting Harold L. Ickes, Solid Fuels Administrator for War, to relax the restriction on the sale of solid fuel imposed by SFAW Regulation 26

Whereas on March 14, 1945, Solid Fuels Administrator for War, Harold L. Ickes, issued a directive April 1, 1945, providing among other things that consumers be allotted only 80 percent of their normal annual yearly requirements of scarcer solid fuel from April 1, 1945, to March 31, 1946; that the retail dealer cannot deliver to a consumer more than 50 percent of his annual yearly normal requirements of solid fuel before August 31, 1945; that solid-fuel dealers shall be required by the regulation to verify consumers' normal annual requirements of solid fuel; and that retail solid-fuel dealers are frozen to old contracts which they previously served and are not permitted to accept any new business with schools, municipal buildings, government agencies, and farmers; and

Whereas 80 percent of the consumers' normal annual requirements is not sufficient solid fuel to properly insure sufficient heat and to assure healthful conditions during the long winter months encountered in Wisconsin particularly in view of the fact that firewood is not available in sufficient quantities which can be used for heating purposes due to the fact that pulpwood is selling at such a price; that labor is exceedingly scarce so that the usual supply of firewood cannot be cut and as a result more farmers are demanding coal for fuel; and

Whereas because of the severity of the weather conditions in the State of Wisconsin causing bad road conditions due to snow, storm, and blockade, which prohibit wintertime delivering and because of the necessity of providing fuel to the farms, rural schools, industry, and homes, a sufficient stock must be on hand to provide enough fuel to supply this area and therefore the restriction that the retail dealer cannot deliver to a consumer more than 50 percent of his annual yearly normal requirements of solid fuel before August 31, 1935, is not only impractical but is bound to cause severe hardship; and

Whereas the provision contained in SFAW Regulation 26 prohibits dealers from contracting to supply new patrons during the heating season from April 1, 1945, to March 31, 1946, is unconstitutional and by the provisions of the regulation creates an abnormal distribution of solid fuels in the State of Wisconsin and places certain consumers in a position where they may not be able to obtain solid fuels without great inconvenience and unnecessary delay and whereas the provisions contained in the regulation have been given serious study and consideration. It appears to those who are acquainted with the weather conditions in Wisconsin, the manpower shortage, the lack of equipment and other burdensome wartime delivery restrictions will make the regulation impossible of performance without creating great hardship and suffering on the part of the people. Compliance with SFAW Regulation 26 will create a shortage which will result in severe hardship on the consuming public and retail coal dealers, creating a backlog of solid fuels orders during the winter months: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes Harold L. Ickes, Solid Fuels Adminstrator for War, to relax the provisions of SFAW Regulation 26 so as to permit greater amount of coal to flow into rural areas of Wisconsin, to eliminate the provision pertaining to limiting the fuel supply allocated to the coal consuming public to 80 percent, and to eliminate the restriction providing that only 50 percent of the consumer normal annual requirements can be delivered before August 31, 1945; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President, to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, to the clerk of each House of the Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

DONALD C. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
CONRAD SHEARER,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Full Employment a Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much recently, both before the cessation of hostilities and after the war ended, of what has been referred to as the "full employment bill."

Full employment of labor is only a dream. Under no system of economy has such a condition ever existed. The nearest approach to full employment of all available labor would be under a strict totalitarian form of government. It would necessarily involve a dictatorship of the most rigid form, where labor would be regimented and controlled to the *n*th degree. Wages would be fixed and no latitude for variations would be left to either employer or employee. The hours of labor would be controlled and determined. The type of work that each would be required to do would be left to coordinators and directors, who might become very tyrannical and oppressive. Under such a system, those in authority would determine, and with finality, the

number of hours per day a laborer must work and the pay he should receive. The dictator might decide that an emergency existed which would require shorter hours and more pay. At another time the same dictator might determine that the emergency suggested longer hours and less pay. The rule could work either way and would depend largely upon the whim of the one in authority. In the end this would mean veritable slave labor. Free labor should oppose any legislation that could possibly so result.

I am in receipt of a letter from Morris M. Blair, professor of economics in the School of Commerce, of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, at Stillwater, dealing with this measure, and I am pleased to quote from Professor Blair's letter as follows:

I wish to urge the defeat of the so-called full-employment bill, S. 380, the Wagner-Murray, etc., bill. This bill is misnamed. It is all high-sounding preamble with no body or substance. It was so purposely designed. It is an entering wedge—a camel's nose in the tent—to openly commit Congress to the vagaries of so-called full employment and unlimited deficit spending.

After it is passed, additional pressure from the same pressure groups—Socialists, Communists, PAC, radical labor, Federal spending deficit groups—will continually press for more Federal spending until our Nation is bankrupt and ruined. The camel's nose must be gotten out of the Federal tent now if private industry is to survive.

It is the shrewdest and most dangerous political move of the radicals in a generation, because so-called full employment seems so desirable to most persons.

There is no such thing as full employment and never has been. The nearest we ever came to it was in the boom years 1922-29. We did not have full employment during World War II as some assert. During this war, 11,000,000 of our best workers were taken out of employment and production and isolated in the work of destruction—some 5,000,000 of them outside the country. They were not employed in industry.

It is not the function of the Federal Government to guarantee full employment. Any protracted effort to do so will turn the United States into a socialistic dictatorship. That is precisely what the radical leaders wish. Millions of loyal Americans who would recoil from this perilous program if they understood it are now supporting it because they have not thought it through.

We who do see its deadly long-end results are counting on men like you in Congress to kill it now. Nine-tenths of all Americans would oppose it if they understood its end results. It cannot prevent unemployment. It is promoted for sinister political influences only. May we count on your full support against it?

One of my constituents refers to the proposed full-employment bill now pending as socialistic and backed by a left-wing press, and urges my opposition to the bill.

Scores of other constituents have written me and almost all of them are bitterly opposed to the passage of such legislation. Of course, it goes without saying that all consider a system of economy ideal where every person able to work would be provided with a job. This would be a utopia. But it is not possible of fulfillment and realization under any system of economy. Neither can it be closely approximated. It is only a dream, a day dream. It is merely a catchword calculated to lure those who will not think for themselves. It is a beautiful theory, but not workable. It sounds nice, but it is not sound. Moreover, everyone who cherishes the American ideals of free enterprise and free labor is against drifting into any form of dictatorship or totalitarianism. If we are to save our American system of free enterprise, we cannot afford to take chances of going totalitarian. We cannot afford to place the power in any man or set of men which will enable them to inaugurate a system of slave labor, or communistic regimentation.

Labor Day and VJ-Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an address which I delivered before the citizens of my home city of Royal Oak, Mich., on Labor Day and VJ-day, Monday evening, September 3, 1945:

This is Labor Day. This meeting and our presence here this evening is to serve a double purpose. One in recognition of labor and to pay tribute and respect to the dignity and accomplishment of labor.

Secondly, we have come together to celebrate, not with exultation, but with gratitude and satisfaction, the end of the most cruel tragedy in the history of the human race.

Tonight the guns are silent; they remain only to preserve peace and order in a sad and distressed world. Everywhere on earth where people believe in the Christian faith and in the guidance of a just God, they are lifting their prayers and giving thanks that the world is again at peace. God grant that it may be permanent.

An old era has come to an end. A new era of the world begins. With it a great responsibility falls upon us of the United States to make as great a contribution to the preservation of justice and decency as we made to the destruction of evil and brute force. With the help of the Great Architect of the Universe, who has never forsaken this favored land, America will not fail. Civilization is now on trial. The forces of science and invention in another war would destroy it.

To American labor and industry history must forever record the tremendous part they played in bringing victory to our armed forces and those of our allies, and peace on earth. Let all nations take note what free men and free women can do when their freedom is endangered by the forces of aggression. The laboring men and women of this country and our industrial genius, with hearts and minds, judgments and consciences unfettered and free, have left a record of achievement that must and will forever stand as one of the miracles of our age.

To the brave men and women, living and dead, everywhere, who wielded the weapons of righteousness, civilization owes an eternal debt, and a tear-drenched world eternal gratitude, for the sacrifices they made that liberty and justice should not perish from the earth.

As a Nation we have paid a fearful price to preserve our way of life. Only when one is privileged to stand in the presence of the white crosses—27,000 of them in one burial lot outside of Paris—beneath every one a son of freedom, does one realize the awful cost in life, in blood and tears, which America yielded upon the altar of freedom. We told them it was to preserve the land of liberty and self-government, and for that they died. Upon us, the living, rests the task to guard well that for which they yielded life itself, that they shall not have died in vain.

They met and destroyed, with the aid of our brave allies, the greatest and most powerful war machine ever assembled on this earth. The purpose of that machine of the Nazis and Japan was world domination and power. As I viewed the defenses of war built by the Germans, much with slave labor, in southern France, along the coast of the Atlantic, the English Channel, the North Sea, and the Baltic, one came to but one conclusion—that Hitler and his regime had but one purpose—they had come to stay for world control. Billions of dollars in materials were wasted in erecting the works of war. Not even the brick pavements in the Hague (a city of a half million people) were spared by the ruthless hand of the invader. They were taken up and used to build forts by the Germans. Grass and weeds meet the eye of the visitor as he looks down some of the most populous streets of that city. The only crime committed by the people of Holland was that their country stood in the path of Hitler's objective.

One of the mysteries in the minds of some of our military leaders in Europe is why a nation of 80,000,000 people, which had everything known to modern civilization, gambled it for world domination and lost. The German Nation and the German Government in the hands of an insane leader and his henchmen will forever stand as an example of what can happen to a people when they forget God and surrender their conscience, their judgment, and their spirit to threat, intimidation and fear and "go along" as we say in our language, with a leadership that knows neither humanity nor justice. They had everything and lost it all, because a paperhanger quit hanging paper.

In talking with many Germans, in their language, both young and old, as to why they followed their leader blindly into the most terrible war in history, I received but one answer—they "had to go along" or go to a concentration camp and death. With the exception of small villages and rural sections, Germany is destroyed. Her government no longer exists; her capital, Berlin, is a heap of rubble. Only 10 percent of that once beautiful city of four and a half million souls remains. The once powerful German Army of millions of men has been utterly and completely routed and destroyed. Nothing remains. A once proud people are dazed and punch drunk from the most powerful and devastating might ever created in history. Starvation and death faces helpless millions in Europe this coming winter. This applies to the innocent and guilty alike. May the world never again see the complete destruction of the work and toil of centuries. That is the condition of Europe today and all because a people "went along."

If the time ever comes in this land when our people are willing to surrender their judgment, their consciences, and the principles of justice, freedom, and self-government under which we live and "go along" with a leader or leaders who seek to rule through fear and intimidation, then this Nation, now viewed by nearly every country in Europe as the hope of the world, may very probably meet the same fate and the same doom as that race and nation which believed it was the superpeople of the earth.

Everyone desires and hopes that our armed forces will be returned home at the earliest possible date. I share that desire and hope, but we must also realize that to withdraw all our forces from either Europe or Japan now, would mean chaos and the loss of that cause for which they fought and died.

Let us on this day, on which we pay tribute to labor, and celebrate with thankful hearts the victory of truth and righteousness over darkness and brutality approach our task of turning to the ways of peace and the building of a better world.

Democracy Flowering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the House having granted permission, it gives me great pleasure to include herein an article which appeared in the Tallassee Tribune of Tallassee, Ala., of August 23, 1945.

So outstanding is this achievement, redounding as it does to the credit of every man and woman who compose the splendid personnel of Tallassee mills, that I feel their magnificent loyalty, patriotism, and unselfishness ought to be recognized by every American.

The article follows:

FIFTH E AWARD PRESENTED TO TALLASSEE MILLS PEOPLE

"This Army-Navy E Flag with its four stars is your symbol of achievement at your mill, and the Government's symbol of appreciation to you in behalf of all the people of the United States and the members of our armed forces," Lt. Col. Henry A. Johnson of the United States Army told the personnel of Tallassee Mills at a meeting held Tuesday afternoon in the assembly room at the filter plant.

The officer was speaking to members of the safety committees who officially represented all men and women of Tallassee mills in accepting a fifth renewal of the Army-Navy E. The flag, symbolic of excellence in war production, was originally awarded to our mills in April 1943. Three stars were added at intervals. Recently the Army and Navy authorized the award of a fourth star as a testimonial of continued excellence. In announcing the award 2 weeks ago, before war's end, the armed services said that the award would extend over a 12-month period.

Colonel Johnson, himself a veteran of 11 months overseas, asserted that the E award is the highest honor that can come to soldiers on the production front and that our Government authorized these awards in just the same manner as she rewards heroes of battle for their valorous performance in war.

Superintendent T. Holmes Floyd accepted the awards in behalf of the personnel, stating that all people of the mill appreciated it. "It has been a real pleasure for us to do our part," he said, "and we all expect to carry our work during the reconversion period to make an even bigger contribution than during the war."

Agent B. G. Stumberg presented Colonel Thompson and expressed appreciation for his visit to our community. The officer, now stationed at Atlanta, served in Europe, being in charge of one of the largest subdepots on the continent following the invasion.

He spoke to the safety committee quite informally, and answered a number of questions put to him by his listeners. He pictured the tremendous devastation inflicted upon German cities by the Allies, and in the war-torn regions of France and other countries invaded by the Germans.

"You live in the greatest country in the world," he explained, as he contrasted the comforts, the safety and the joys of life in America with that in other lands.

Colonel Thompson, formerly connected with Alabama Power Co. and the Dixie Construction Co., was no stranger to Tallassee. He worked here, years ago, on some construction projects undertaken by the Dixie Co. The officer was tremendously impressed with the progress made by Tallassee since he last saw this community.

He had three sons in the service, one of whom is a Gold Star hero. This son, Capt. Henry W. Johnson, of the Second Armored Division, is buried in a military cemetery in Holland. This young man twice received the Purple Heart and won Presidential unit citation and silver and bronze stars.

The other two sons in service are Lt. Joseph S. Johnson, with the Eighth Air Force, winner of the Distinguished Flying Cross, Presidential unit citation, and three oak leaf clusters; and Aviation Cadet Horace A. Johnson, now in training.

Brooklyn's Industrial War Record Is Unexcelled in Whole Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of Tuesday, September 4, 1945:

BROOKLYN'S INDUSTRIAL WAR RECORD IS UNEXCELLED IN WHOLE NATION

In accepting the resignation of Emil Zola Weinberg, district manager of the Brooklyn office of the War Production Board, which is closing October 1, its job well done, his Washington superior wrote him: "You may well take pride in the job which you and the Brooklyn office have done as part of the tremendous production record made by this country. Brooklyn has indeed contributed a major share to our country's armaments and the smoothness with which this production has been achieved in Brooklyn must, in large measure, be credited to your efforts."

We feel that his point is well taken. Mr. Weinberg was influential in having the Brooklyn office set up in the first place, and then he went to bat for it in order to give it the authority necessary to make it an autonomous agency, instead of one that had to scurry to Manhattan to complete its business. This time saving (and frequently the efforts of Mr. Weinberg and his colleagues avoided needless trips to Washington, too) coupled with the desire of the local office to get production rolling without too much slavish obeisance to red tape and regulations was of inestimable help in expediting borough production. And that production—well over $3,500,000,000 worth of war goods exclusive of what was produced in the Brooklyn Navy Yard—is something to be proud of.

As Mr. Weinberg pointed out the other day in his final report on the office's operations, Brooklyn had the largest percentage of Army and Navy E awards in the country. All kinds of ships, including the history-making *Missouri*, were turned out in its yards, to say nothing of radio and radar equipment, shells, torpedoes, uniforms, penicillin, rockets, litters, wire cargo nets, and hundreds of other war necessities, not excluding parts for the terrible atomic bomb.

We would like to add our congratulations to those of Mr. Weinberg's superior and wish him the best of luck in his new civilian endeavors.

Twilight of a Behemoth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Daily News for Friday, August 10, and written by Manchester Boddy, the able editor of that paper, is deserving of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It deals with the problem of monopoly in American industry, which is certainly one of the crucial problems which we shall have to face if economic freedom is to live in this country:

TWILIGHT OF A BEHEMOTH?

Here is an editorial I have printed over and over in various forms for the past 7 years. It appears once more for the same reasons it has appeared previously—so we may think clearly about why certain events are beginning to take form.

On this occasion I refer to the victory of the British Labor Party and its announced intention to socialize major British industry. For many years I have contended that America's great corporations have no right to appoint themselves as symbols of private initiative and private enterprise. They are beyond that and have been for a long time. Their fate rests largely in their own hands.

Here is the reprint of a reprint:

Rummaging through past issues of the Daily News I opened a volume at the place where the news of Wednesday, March 23, 1938, is buried. There, in huge but faded letters, was the astonishing headline:

"U. S. trusts plan self-annihilation"—and the subheads: "Policy would change path of civilization, says William Fielding Ogburn"—"Held 'Inconceivably great' "—"Big monopolies declared driving Government closer to totalitarianism."

The Daily News, I recalled, was the only newspaper in the United States that printed such a story. It was based upon an editorial—by Fortune magazine—the first that magazine of big business had ever printed. It came to me in the form of a reprint from the national industrial conference board, an organization representing the most firmly entrenched big industries in the United States. The reprint was embellished with lush praise from leaders of big business.

A short time later additional reprints came from the ultraconservative, arch Republican Union League Club, of Chicago.

You will understand why I thought the Fortune editorial, given wide circulation by big business, rated page 1, when you read what it said in these opening paragraphs:

"In the progress of mankind, there was a time for the dark ages, another for a renaissance, another for an industrial revolution. There was a time for the building of America, for creation of bigger markets and bigger pay rolls, and, inevitably, bigger industrial units. And that is our time.

"In our time men have been conditioned to the idea of bigness; they believe that to grow big is almost of necessity to progress. They believe the expansion of American enterprise necessarily involves the corporate expansion of its units, and they are taught the corporate expansion of the units should result in bigger profits.

"But it is possible to question this; not that our time has been wrong, but that it may be the time for something else. It may be time to reexamine our ideas of progress in the light of where we wish to go. It may be time to weigh the notion that there is some

necessary connection between economic expansion and corporate bigness. And it may be time to wonder whether profits and the national income would not be bigger if the corporate units of industry were not so large.

"American business was founded upon the principle of free competition maintained through free markets. But during the era of bigness the units of business became so big that they developed a fear of price wars; they dared not compete against themselves, and no one dared to compete against them. There consequently emerged the super-units—well-defined industrial groups whose members act in concert and whose aim is not price competition but, on the contrary, price stabilization.

"Now, this technique of bigness, involving the artificial control of prices and other basic factors, is a collectivist technique. And the operation of the collectivist technique has created for business a precarious situation. Business has carried collectivism so far in its private affairs that its affairs are no longer private, but by the bigness of their impact, public.

"It is untenable, for example, to suppose that the policies of the steel industry with regard to prices, production, and employment are strictly 'private' matters. These policies involve directly 570,000 employees, $976,000,000 of annual pay rolls, and a $5,000,000,000 investment. They have repercussions throughout most of business, affecting at least remotely millions of people and eventually the entire economy.

"But, inasmuch as these policies impinge upon and invade the sphere of public welfare, they impinge upon and invade the functions of government. By its very office, government must intervene. And the method of intervention which is easiest and most obvious, and which was encouraged during NIRA days by businessmen themselves is the method of direct regulation—of price, for instance, of production, of profit itself.

"Thus collectivism in industry begets collectivism in government. And if this is not collectivism as practiced in the so-called collectivist states, it is only a couple of theoretical steps removed from it. Carried to its extreme, it means the downfall of the economy upon which American business has been reared; the perversion of the democratic order; the destruction of the right to risk-and-profit; and—all too easily—the loss of those civil liberties that are at present based upon the principle of the limitation of governmental power."

The editorial went on to explain how big business could unmerge and thus restore economic democracy to the United States.

Our page 1 treatment must have scared the living daylights out of everyone connected with the printing and distribution of the editorial. Fortune closed like a clam. The Union League Club disclaimed any connection with the distribution of reprints. The national industrial conference board dived for the nearest fox hole—and the story went into the morgue—where its pale, faded form slowly crumbles on its way to oblivion.

Yet only yesterday a worried man of big business sent me a letter urging that "all good citizens unite to save the Nation from collectivism in government." He pleaded in the name of free enterprise for organized resistance to growing totalitarianism in Washington.

As I read his letter I seemed to hear from the morgue these mocking words:

"Thus collectivism in industry begets collectivism in government. And if this is not collectivism as practiced in the so-called collectivist states, it is only a couple of theoretical steps removed from it. Carried to its extreme, it means the downfall of the economy upon which American business has been reared; the perversion of the democratic order; the destruction of the right to risk-and-profit; and—all too easily—the loss of those civil liberties that are at present based upon the principle of the limitation of governmental power."

Big business has a choice. It can either restore economic democracy, private enterprise, and initiative through voluntary decentralization, or it can be absorbed by government.

It won't always have the choice.

MANCHESTER BODDY.

AUGUST 10, 1945.

"Gravy Train" Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial printed in the Miles City Daily Star of September 2, 1945:

"GRAVY TRAIN" FRIENDS

Do you, gentle reader, recall the disastrous drought years of 1934 and 1936—particularly 1934, when it became the unwanted job of the Federal Government to shoot cattle and sheep on the ranges of the great Middle West to relieve them of a slower death by thirst and starvation? Do you recall how countless cattle and sheep men teetered on the verge of bankruptcy when the Government paid them a few dollars per head for their hitherto carefully produced and upgraded livestock—before the shooting took place? Do you remember the following years when we, the residents of the drought area, struggled to build dams, conserve water, reseed ranges, replenish livestock herds, and reestablish ourselves economically?

In all of those years did you ever hear of James G. Patton, now the dapper head of the left-wing political organization—misnamed and miscalled "The Farmers Union"—uttering one solitary word about our situation?

Did the people of the upper Missouri Valley read one single editorial in that great city paper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—that paper of inherited wealth with the recent socialistic turn of mind—urging the conservation of water, the development of power, or the irrigation of vast acreages in the upper basin States, so that we might rehabilitate our land economically and reestablish our livestock herds?

Did the people of the Great Plains area ever hear of Raymond Tucker in those drought years; Mr. Tucker who was the former "smoke" commissioner of St. Louis, and who now goes gadding up and down the valley, telling the hardfisted farmers and salt-of-the-earth livestock men "what they must do to be saved"; Mr. Tucker who heads up the recently formed MVA Association as second fiddle to our own deposed Montana supreme court justice, Leif Erickson?

For that matter, where was brother Erickson in those days? Apparently still in his swaddling clothes over in McKenzie County, N. Dak., where his father is reported to be the present secretary of the Farmers Union.

As a matter of fact, did anyone ever hear—in those days—of any of those who are now trying to foist off the totalitarian scheme of "authorities" on us? In that list we include Marshall Field 3d, of Chicago, who has since erupted into the newspaper publishing business on the hundred million 100-cent dollars poured into his lap from the estate of a hard-working and nonsocialistic-minded grandfather; David Lilienthal, head of the TVA, who writes books forward and backward on the wonders of that socialistic experiment; one Jerome E. Walsh, a Kansas City attorney, who recently held forth in an Omaha pro-MVA yellfest on the wonders of Senator MURRAY's proposal to hand the Missouri Valley over to three more or less lame-duck politicians; one S. R. Finley, of Chattanooga, now holding down a soft berth as superintendent of the Electric Power Board of that city by and because of the advent of the socialistic TVA; State Senator Claude B. Ricketts, of St. Louis, who fathered a junketing trip out of the Missouri State Legislature to the TVA and who is therefore convinced that the TVA is not "a socialistic movement engaged in folk dancing"; and, last and probably least, one Mrs. Arthur Jones, of Lincoln, Nebr., who comes to us, full of great knowledge on the Missouri River situation and as president of the Nebraska League of Women Voters. All of these who would save us, with the exception of Patton, Marshall Field of the third handle, and Lilienthal bounce into the picture with their great fund of knowledge, straight from a grand and glorious back-slapping meeting held in Omaha recently. There we have it—all the way from our deposed ex-justice, Erickson, down to the president of the Nebraska League of Women Voters. Quite a knitting society we'd say; quite an outfit to "save" us now that the gravy train is about to run again.

But where was all this outfit of "savers" back in 1934 and 1936? Where was the "boss farmer" of all the farmers—Brother Patton—in those days when the gravy train wasn't running in the Missouri Valley? Where was Marshall Field, one, two, three, and the seventy million bucks he had inherited up to that time? Where was even Mrs. Jones?

Truly we have a fine bunch of gravy train friends trailing us now.

And then there is that upstart outfit in Chicago that recently got out the pamphlet entitled "Let's Create Markets!" all splashed over a big brown MVA background. Since this upstart pamphlet is copyrighted by the General Transformer Corp., we are not permitted to quote anything therefrom for you. Not that we would, because it is the same silly, nonsensical charts of dots and dashes and claptrap statements for which the TVA smokescreeners have long been noted. In fact the foreword to the thing profusely thanks the TVA (plus our own Senator MURRAY and Senator HILL of Alabama) for the material in it. That ought to be enough for anyone.

Now this outfit which wants to create markets with the water in your back yard seems to lay claim to the right to advise you what to do with that water, by reason of the fact that it makes "Snippie—electric scissor toy." "Ain't" that something? Yes sireee, these Snippie lads know all the answers as to how to "create markets" because they make a "toy." We thought that was what was wrong with some of the thinking of most of the socialistic-minded element seeking to destroy the American way of life. They want to "toy" with the idea, and like the atomic bomb, if it blows up the country, then it isn't a "toy." But by that time it will be too late to find out we are not playing with toys when we let these crackpots control the very life of the people of America through their power over the use of water.

By the way, we see the "Snippie" corporation is already starting to create markets, but for the "Snippies." This pamphlet—printed without a union label—may be had without cost for "a few additional copies." But—and it's really "but"—"larger quantities furnished at cost." Well, the "cost" of this nonunion label pamphlet ought to be considerably less than that of a union label product, but whatever the cost it will spell out the "take" on "Snippies" until the toy market opens up again.

The Conservation and Development of Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, the Conservation and Development of Our Natural Resources, delivered by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], at the National Governors' Conference at Mackinac Island, July 3, 1945. I ask that there follow the address an article entitled "Our Natural Resources and Our Free Way of Life," from the Chicago Herald-American of August 20, 1945, containing extracts from the address.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. E. P. CARVILLE, OF NEVADA

Mr. Chairman, fellow Governors, ladies, and gentlemen, first, I should like to say that I regard it an honor to address this group of leaders of the States of our Nation, and to say simply, but deeply, that I appreciate the honor.

My topic for discussion is the conservation and development of our natural resources. This subject concerns the tremendous stores of Nature's gifts which contribute to the cause of human welfare, and is so broad it would be difficult to deal with except in a general way in this discussion.

Through the course of ages Nature has produced many things which inure to the benefit of mankind. These materials, when captured and used in a sensible and judicious manner, redound to the great benefit and advancement of the human race. Sources of these materials cannot be created or duplicated by man, they come only by the natural process. Some materials are in overabundance, others are in scarcity. The list extends from rare elements to common wood, from precious oil to building stone, from gems to iron ore, from minerals and metals to growing crops, from water to desert soil, from seafood to wildlife. These are some of our natural resources, which by the grace of God, we have been given and have developed for our physical and spiritual good.

Our entire concept of life depends upon the intelligent use of the basic materials which Nature affords. Take away one or more of them and our modern civilization crumbles and reverts to the primitive. Our entire economic and social structure is destroyed.

During the existence of our Nation, and in its cycle of development, we have been like a spendthrift who came into a fortune and squandered it recklessly. As a result of the boundless resources which came with the settlement of our Nation, we acquired wasteful habits as regards this wealth. We took from Nature's stores what we wanted and shoved aside valuable assets which were in our way, giving little concern to the needs of future generations. Lands were laid waste and soils depleted through careless methods, forests were destroyed through reckless lumbering and as a result of disastrous fires, game and animal life have been heedlessly slaughtered, minerals and metals were mined and used without mature thought of future replenishment.

This waste and destruction continued until the young Nation of the United States of America became known as the most wasteful nation in the world. The use and destruction of our natural resources have advanced to the point where we begin to realize there may be an end to these boundless materials; that in the not too distant future, our wealth of natural resources will be greatly depleted, if not dissipated. Now we are face to face with the problem of how to conserve and develop what remains, so that the greatest amount of good will accrue in the most permanent manner. We begin to realize this keenly because we see examples in the older nations of the world, in whose land there occurs much scarcity through depletion of their natural resources. We must pause and note well these examples and profit by them.

Our cycle of settlement began along the Atlantic seaboard not many years ago. There the first citizens found raw materials in abundance. As population increased and industries of the Nation expanded, greater call was made upon the resources which lay to the west. Through the years this development continued and there was a constant movement westward. It was only during the middle of the last century that the present boundary outlines of our Nation became stable and fixed.

In this great migration of American citizens from the eastern to the western part of the Nation, there was an outstanding objective of the human tide which made the hazardous journey. Those migrating Americans sought new natural resources, beyond their fondest dreams; seemingly, all that mankind could want or use. These were indeed a welcome addition to the assets of the Nation.

Later in the course of progress the Nation emerged from the era of the hand plow, the mud road, and the covered wagon and entered the speedier motorcar stage with paved highways. Transcontinental rail lines, telephones, and other mechanical devices were developed for general use of our citizens. These revolutionary changes brought intensified demands upon our raw materials for the fabrication of new devices. Civilization took a great step forward and as a consequence of these inventions the people were brought closer together, the Nation became more solidly unified and the economic and social structure strengthened.

Science developed into an important adjunct of our national life and made the luxuries of yesterday the necessities of today. Science pointed the way and demonstrated its high role in research and improvements. It brought the airplane era and made our contact with foreign nations closer, thereby accelerating international trade.

Our two world wars intensified and enormously increased the drain upon our resources. Implements of war were required, and these implements had to be fashioned from the raw materials of our land. We have drawn upon our natural resources as never before for our own use as well as for our allies and for suffering nations. We haven't really had time to pause and take stock to see what remains.

Every drop of oil taken from the underground reserves means that much less supply available; every mine from which ore has been extracted is that much nearer exhaustion; every stick of lumber taken from our forest has reduced their potentiality.

These things cannot be returned to earth once they have been utilized. They are gone forever. This brings us to the necessity of considering ways and means for other adaptations, replacements, or new discoveries which will fill the voids created through this terrific drain. Our sphere of thought, our understanding of economy, and the fields of science must be extended to replace these natural resources or create artificial ones in order that the greatest amount of good will accrue in the most permanent manner for future generations.

Greater programs for the replenishment of the forest by replanting are necessary, so that our annual timber cut will be brought more nearly in balance to our replenishment efforts. It is estimated by experts that at the present rate of use without reforestation our forests will be depleted in 150 years.

Methods of seeking and treating basic and strategic minerals and metals have to be expanded with the help of scientific research and adaptation. In this manner new and larger deposits of some metals will become available for future use. The contribution of mining to the building of our Nation has been paramount. Our Western States lead in the production of many minerals and have supplied tremendous quantities for the war effort. Copper, lead, and zinc have been in the greatest demand.

The drain upon the supply of these three vital metals has been heavy. Mr. Elmer W. Pherson, Chief of the Economics and Statistics Branch of the United States Bureau of Mines, sums up the position in this way: "Copper, lead, and zinc occupy a significant position among the minerals of secondary importance to the basic national economy. The United States long had virtual self-sufficiency in these metals. However, our resources are unequal to the demands of this war, and large imports recently have been acquired. That depletion is well advanced in these industries is an inescapable conclusion from the record and present knowledge of remaining resources."

From the warnings given us by the Bureau of Mines, we know that depletion of known coal resources is approaching the danger point.

I believe stock piling is essential to the conservation of our minerals, as well as contributing to the future security of our economic structure. It would serve to stabilize the production and marketing of metals and also to maintain a reserve for future emergency.

Conservation of the soil is needed to obtain greater productivity from the acres under cultivation and also to expand the area of tillable and usable lands. In our western country we depend, in a large measure, upon the public lands for grazing of food animals—cattle, sheep, and hogs. Our herds have increased during the past several years, but to offset this the Nation's population has increased, and the ranges have lost, in proportion, their potentiality. The West supplies a great part of the Nation's animal foodstuffs, and unless these ranges are conserved and properly developed we cannot expect to meet the increased demands.

Methods of reseeding the ranges so that the more favorable grasses of the most nutritious kinds can be developed is a great step in the right direction. The broadest application of reseeding will forestall any danger of immediate future depletion of this important natural resource. Such grasses as crested wheat, brome, and other hardy species have been tried to a limited extent on our western ranges with favorable results.

Reclamation of our semiarid lands is a necessary adjunct to conservation. Our people already have inaugurated many worthy projects and carried out this objective in a large measure, and some remarkable structures are noteworthy. At Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, the Great Sacramento Valley, Tennessee Valley, and in many other places these projects have been worth their investment and have brought to cultivation hundreds of thousands of new acres, of new land. The future need, however, should see this activity continued and expanded so that all sections of the Nation will derive benefits.

Individual projects might seem insignificant and small. Nevertheless they serve important regions, and the aggregate of these smaller units has a distinct bearing upon the structure as a whole.

The subject of underground water exploration, as an important allied natural resource, concerns our entire Nation. To the arid and semiarid West, it carries great import. These underground water reserves are often of large extent and capable of serving vast areas. This phase of agricultural conservation has great merit and should be carried on in a broader field.

Science has likewise worked wonders with the oil we recover from beneath the surface and through intense and constant research has found new ways of bringing greater efficiency out of every drop of oil used in our modern mechanical structure. These horizons of vision can extend even beyond that in capturing more oil from each individual pool, or enlarging the scope of the recovered oil. Geophysical research has already proven a great aid in discovering new sources of oil and it can materially help in staving off depletion of our underground oil reserves.

In our country we have numerous mountains of oil shale awaiting future development. These, in a large measure, constitute our oil reserves of the future. To reclaim them, science must develop economic processes of recovery and treatment.

The waters of our rivers, in many instances, waste away to the sea, and often in their floods bring devastation to cities, stripping of the soil of valuable agricultural lands, and frequently cause destruction of life. Remarkable progress has been made in the conservation and development of water for public use. Through the great dams and hydroelectric projects all over the nation, conservation has been carried forward to a commendable degree. These projects can be expanded to embrace entire river basins, such as Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, the Columbia, the Hudson, and many other streams, of navigational importance as well as agricultural potentiality. Through hydroelectric development a dual purpose is saving of coal. Indirectly this will advance the permanency of our coal deposits for future generations.

In the realm of our wild-life resources there is likewise a field for expansion and development. Conservation has been conducted through protective laws in the Nation and the States to preserve our wildlife. The individual States can cooperate in this field to a greater degree so that there will be a minimum of conflict of authority and operation, and the greatest good result from application of the splendid laws already in force.

The same activity can be applied to the great commercial fishing industries along our Atlantic and Pacific seaboards, along the Gulf and in the Great Lakes, and the innumerable rivers and small streams of the Nation.

This conservation will bring much good to our citizens and in a more limited way broaden the possibilities of our recreational resources. This in turn will be reflected in the improved health of the Nation, for in the good health of a nation lies its strength.

In all of these activities, where projects are regional in character, it is my conviction that the burden of responsibility and obligation of cost and future maintenance should be, principally, absorbed by those States and their citizens who share the greater benefits. While many projects redound directly to the welfare of the Nation, the adjacent territories have priority on service and benefits and to these units should go the greater burden of sharing the future amortization and liquidation.

Furthermore, as far as is practicable, the State units bordering on these projects should be given the authority and responsibility of consummating the projects themselves.

At present there are a number of our States which lack the administrative units to carry out successfully such projects, and it may not be inappropriate to suggest that with State departments of conservation working together, the agencies could better be coordinated, work concentrated, and greater results achieved.

I am a great believer in individual initiative and private enterprise. It was through this system that our Nation began and reached its present state of development. I believe the Nation can attain even greater heights of success if private enterprise is given encouragement, with a minimum of obstacles. It was through this system, that our great mines have been discovered and developed in the West. I do not know of any human character who would symbolize private enterprise more closely than that of the prospector. He faces hardships, he goes into the rugged hills alone, except probably for a trusty burro and dog, stays for weeks at a time, often with inadequate food and supplies, to search for his fortune. If and when he finds a new deposit, and it turns out well, his personal gain reflects benefit to the entire community. If he doesn't find it, he goes out and tries again. The prospector doesn't know what failure means.

It behooves us well to employ every possible means and pursue every practical step to conserve and intelligently develop our seemingly boundless natural resources. If that be done, we of the present generation may reap the greatest benefits, and at the same time retain a heritage in permanency for our progeny. It is just common sense to do so.

I do not believe we have reached the danger point as yet. We have not reached the state of a "have not" Nation, and we do not want to reach that stage. Currently we have ample resources to carry on for some years to come, but let us take heed.

In this light, it would be a constructive and progressive step for each State to effectuate a systematic method of checking, or taking stock, of its natural resources in all their categories. Let us survey the various fields and know definitely what supplies are visible, what are potential supplies, and what prospects we should have for newly found supplies.

One important step leading to the development of a program of conservation should be immediate action to overcome the serious handicap caused by the lack of adequate maps of those regions containing our natural resources. Few people realize that the greater part of this country is inadequately mapped; and in the Western States especially, vast areas have never been properly charted.

We should promote a program to complete the mapping of this country at an early date; for until this is done, it will not be possible for us to inventory and catalog our resources and plan for their efficient use. At present there is a great deal of activity in many of the States to develop a Nation-wide mapping program, and this work should be encouraged.

When we have gained the knowledge of our potential supplies, we can then adopt a sensible policy of serving our natural resources and conserving them in the most efficient manner. Old methods of discovery were adequate in their day, but the new day calls for improved methods. Science has many of the answers. We must look strongly in that direction for our light and guidance.

In evaluating our physical resources we must not lose sight of other resources which are equally important to our national existence. I speak of the need for a strong moral determination to keep alive our greatest of all resources—the democratic way of life. As Americans we must strive to bring our Government back to the people, first, by insisting upon a decentralization of power now lodged in the national administration; and second, by arousing our people to the realization that they are a part of, rather than an adjunct to, their Government. Our great natural resources form the very fiber of our Government—our spirit of freedom motivates the soul.

We must instill in our children the need for believing that government is, after all, only the people who live within the Nation's borders. We must encourage this thought in our educational system. We must practice it ourselves as leaders of present-day government. It has been my experience in public life that the average citizen who makes up America's millions is proud to take part in the affairs of government, but is reluctant to do so because of a fallacious belief that his help is not wanted.

Democracy is an all-inclusive word. It is the symbol of the industrialist just as it is the beacon light for the man in the street.

Democracy is our greatest asset because everyone can share in its benefactions. It is our duty to lay the groundwork for a postwar world which will see a rebirth of human resources, as well as a continuation of the assets of material wealth we now enjoy. The spirit and moral fiber of the Nation must be strengthened and developed just as much, if not more so, than the conservation of our physical natural resources. If we adopt this course, future generations of Americans will praise our foresight and commend our wisdom.

[From the Chicago Herald-American of August 20, 1945]

Our Natural Resources and Our Free Way of Life

(By Hon. E. P. Carville, United States Senator from Nevada)

(At the recent annual Conference of Governors, at Mackinac Island, Mich., the subject of The Conservation and Development of Our Natural Resources was assigned to Governor Carville, of Nevada. Following are selected extracts from his discussion of this theme. Since delivering the address he has resigned as Governor, and has been appointed to fill a vacancy, to the United States Senate.)

During the existence of our Nation, and in its cycle of development, we have been like a spendthrift who came into a fortune and squandered it recklessly.

As a result of the boundless resources which came with the settlement of our Nation, we acquired wasteful habits as regards this wealth. We took from nature's stores what we wanted and shoved aside valuable assets which were in our way giving little concern to the needs of future generations.

This waste and destruction continued until the young Nation of the United States of America became known as the most wasteful nation in the world.

The use and destruction of our national resources have advanced to the point where we begin to realize there may be an end to these boundless materials; that in the not too distant future, our wealth of natural resources will be greatly depleted, if not dissipated. Now we are face to face with the problem of how to conserve and develop what remains, so that the greatest amount of good will accrue in the most permanent manner.

* * * * *

In the great migration of American citizens from the eastern to the western part of the Nation, there was an outstanding objective of the human tide which made the hazardous journey. Those migrating Americans sought new natural resources.

Our two world wars intensified and enormously increased the drain upon our resources. Implements of war were required, and these implements had to be fashioned from the raw materials of our land.

We have drawn upon our natural resources as never before for our own use as well as for our allies and for suffering nations.

Every drop of oil taken from the underground reserves means that much less supply available; every mine from which ore has been extracted is that much nearer exhaustion; every stick of timber taken from our forests has reduced their potentiality.

These things cannot be returned to earth once they have been utilized. They are gone forever. This brings us to the necessity of considering ways and means for other adaptations, replacements, or new discoveries which will fill the voids created through this terrific drain.

Methods of seeking and treating basic and strategic mines and metals have to be expanded with the help of scientific research and adaptation.

Our Western States lead in the production of many minerals and have supplied tremendous quantities for the war effort. Copper, lead, and zinc have been in the greatest demand.

From the warnings given us by the Bureau of Mines we know that depletion of known coal resources is approaching the danger point.

I believe stock-piling is essential to the conservation of our minerals as well as contributing to the future security of our economic structure. It would serve to stabilize the production and marketing of metals and also to maintain a reserve for future emergency.

* * * * *

Conservation of the soil is needed to obtain greater productivity from the acres under cultivation, and also to expand the area of tillable and usable lands.

In our western country we depend, in a large measure, upon the public lands for grazing of food animals—cattle, sheep, and hogs. Our herds have increased during the past several years but to offset this the Nation's population has increased, and the ranges have lost, in proportion, their potentiality.

The West supplies a great part of the Nation's animal foodstuffs and unless these ranges are conserved and properly developed we cannot expect to meet the increased demands.

Methods of reseeding the ranges, so that the more favorable grasses of the most nutritious kinds can be developed, is a great step in the right direction.

Reclamation of our semiarid lands is a necessary adjunct to conservation.

At Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, the great Sacramento Valley, Tennessee Valley, and in many other places, these projects have been worth their investment and have brought to cultivation hundreds of thousands of acres of new land.

The future need, however, should see this activity continued and expanded so that all sections of the Nation will derive benefits.

The subject of underground water exploration, as an important allied natural resource, concerns our entire Nation. To the arid and semiarid West, it carries great import.

These underground water reserves are often of large extent and capable of serving vast areas. This phase of agricultural conservation has great merit and should be carried on in a broader field.

Science has likewise worked wonders with the oil we recover from beneath the surface and through intense and constant research has found new ways of bringing greater efficiency out of every drop of oil used in our modern mechanical structure.

In evaluating our physical resources we must not lose sight of other resources which are equally important to our national existence. I speak of the need for a strong moral determination to keep alive our greatest of all resources—the democratic way of life.

As Americans we must strive to bring our Government back to the people, first, by insisting upon a decentralization of power now lodged in the national administration, and second, by arousing our people to the realization that they are a part of, rather than an adjunct to, their Government.

Our great natural resources form the very fiber of our Government—our spirit of freedom motivates the soul.

The Problems of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, on the Baruch report:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICE,
September 5, 1945.

Following is a statement made by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, on the Baruch report released today:

"I have received Mr. Baruch's letter and have had an opportunity to read it and consult with him. I agree with his statement that the solution of veterans' problems cannot proceed alone. These problems are not separate and distinct from other problems facing the Nation. They cannot be solved by any one agency or even by the Government alone.

"The problems of veterans are part of the post-war readjustment which involves millions of displaced workers as well as veterans. Any solution must consider all elements and rests squarely on the shoulders of every one of 135,000,000 people who make up this Nation.

"Jobs cannot be found for veterans if they are not also found for other workers. Any attempt to provide full employment for one group at the expense of others would and should be destined for failure. Were such a solution forced on the Nation, the only possible result would be cleavages and group struggles.

"The men who have borne the burden of the war are entitled to advantages and to employment privileges that will assure them equal opportunity with those who stayed at home and bettered themselves in civilian jobs. This is only fair.

"Since the veterans are again civilians, they are primarily citizens and I believe they desire to take up their obligations as citizens to build a strong Nation.

"Mr. Baruch has also made many specific recommendations for operation and reorganization within the Veterans' Administration. These are the result of some 18 months of study on his part.

"I have been here a little more than 2 weeks. That is hardly time enough for me to be in a position to make specific comments on his findings. I can say, however, that many of the conclusions I have reached closely parallel the recommendations made by Mr. Baruch.

"Committees similar to the ones he suggested are already at work investigating and reporting on operations within the Administration. These committees are made up of men with whom I have worked for a long time and whose judgments I have learned to respect. They are men who are specialists and experts in their various fields. They have been temporarily assigned to me by the War Department that they may investigate and make recommendations to improve operations within the Veterans' Administration.

"After they have had an opportunity to complete their reports, I hope to be in a better position to comment on changes in policy and in operation."

Sixty Million Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 11 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in last Sunday's New York Times Book Review by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] with reference to a recent book entitled "Sixty Million Jobs," written by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Wallace.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator agree to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD also the other review of the book which appeared in the New York Times Book Review?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I anticipated that might be suggested, and I am more than happy to have it included.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MR. WALLACE'S OWN PLANS CAN ONLY LEAD TO ANOTHER VERY ARTIFICIAL BOOM FOLLOWED BY THE DEPRESSION AND THE UNEMPLOYMENT HE IS TRYING TO AVOID

(By ROBERT A. TAFT, United States Senator from Ohio)

This book is first a statement of the yearnings of Henry Wallace for a better world, a better America, more abundance, new horizons, a fuller life, and utopia in general, with which we all sympathize and agree. The ideals are well stated though not new. Second, it maintains the thesis that to secure this fuller life the Government must guarantee in peacetime 60,000,000 jobs and a national production of goods and services valued at $200,000,000,000 a year, equal to the production at the very height of war activity. Third, it is a partisan political document on which the Political Action Committee hopes to run the author for President—if necessary.

With regard to the political aspect we can identify all the usual technique of the New Deal propaganda of the last 10 years. Strawmen are first set up to provide a target. We read of the wicked men who desire unemployment "to keep wages down and profits up," of the many practical business leaders "staking their chance of survival on high prices, low wages, and a subnormal volume of business"; of those who say that we cannot have full employment under free enterprise, of "the loud but limited group that seemingly believes it is the devil's own sin to make any plans whatever." There may be such people, though I don't happen to know or hear them. But the implication is that if you disagree with them you are in logic bound to be for Henry Wallace.

Then there is the technique of smearing the past to prove that all good things began in 1933. "Dollar diplomacy" is derided, though it is exactly the policy of Government aid to our exporters which Mr. Wallace himself advocates to develop foreign trade, except that it did not involve our lending abroad the money to pay for all our exports. The bonus army issue is revived. The "Twenties" are always referred to as a dreadful example of wicked policy, though we had full employment at good wages for years without any increase in the cost of living. Even though we produced more homes in the 20's than in all of the 30's, Mr. Wallace says they were the wrong kind of homes. Mr. Wallace overlooks the fact that he and his friends had 8 years in which to cure unemployment, without success.

Mr. Wallace slaps the pressure groups on the wrist, and says they must cooperate for the common good or we cannot succeed, but in the course of his book he comes out for nearly every measure the pressure groups are supporting, except perhaps those supported by business groups.

The book is supposed to be one of economic policy, but every phase of political policy is brought in, whether it has any effect, or even an adverse effect, on full employment. Thus, the author comes out for the minimum wage and the annual wage, which probably reduce the number of employed, for veterans in general, for the extreme form of the FEPC bill, for labor-industry committees, for every social-welfare plan, for high wages and high farm prices, and for love of Russia. These policies may be good or bad, but it is hard to see what they have to do with full employment unless the fact that most of them result in Government spending of the taxpayers' money can be said to inflate income and employment.

The political character of the whole book throws some doubt on the soundness of the argument for the new political "60,000,000 jobs" slogan. But Mr. Wallace certainly does make a case for Government economic planning. He shows that statistics are now available to show just what current economic conditions are. He points out that a high state of economic prosperity and employment is necessary as the basis for all the things we desire. He emphasizes the fact that if the free-enterprise system results again in a prolonged period when millions are unemployed the people are likely to turn to some other plan of life. Certainly we should have a unified thinking apparatus in our Government to determine whether various proposed measures really work toward a stable economic prosperity or whether they make it impossible.

But planning has its dangers and should not be presented to the people as a panacea bound to produce prosperity. Economics is still not a science, and there are many differences among the experts on fundamental principles. The success of the planning will depend on the intelligence and sincerity of the planners. After all, governments have been trying to produce and hold prosperity for years. Government planning is not new. We hope we are better equipped to succeed; we are not so sure of the wisdom of planning if it is done by men selected by Mr. Wallace, or by men who really want to set up a socialistic state in the United States.

Mr. Wallace's own plan to bring about and maintain a national production of $200,000,000,000 in goods and services (equivalent to approximately $160,000,000,000 of national income) and 60,000,000 jobs is somewhat difficult to extract from the maze of Government activity in every field under the sun which he advocates. Mr. Wallace shies away from talking of direct Government expenditure in large sums—because he is afraid the public has not been sold on the theory that we can spend ourselves into prosperity by running a large deficit every year. But inevitable Government spending lies behind his whole idea of "balancing the Nation's Budget," as is admitted in the Wagner full employment bill, where it is clearly stated that "it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment." Mr. Wallace stresses the assistance to, and cooperation of, private industry, and many of his proposals are reasonable. But, as he points out, they have all been tried before, and they have not eliminated depressions.

He suggests that the tax system be revised to encourage industry, but he wants to raise $25,000,000,000 a year and take most of the taxes off the lower income groups. Of course, lowering the taxes unduly will create a deficit just as much as more Government spending. He suggests credit incentives and restrictions. The Government has always exercised some control over credit, but those exercising it have often guessed wrong. I do believe we should give more power to exercise such control. But our past experience leads me to believe that the greatest control over credit will prevent neither a dangerous boom nor a dangerous depression.

Otherwise, Mr. Wallace's proposals come down to Government spending or Government lending. Public works, insurance against risks (equivalent to making questionable loans), aids in marketing at home or abroad (Government loans or grants to purchasers), all mean an outpouring of taxpayers' money sooner or later.

Government spending leads to a constant increase in the public debt. That debt will be $320,000,000,000 by the end of the reconversion period. This program might increase it by $30,000,000,000 in a single year, as Mr. Wallace's alternative budget so clearly shows. It is easy to say that the Federal Government will spend money in hard times and not spend it in good times. But once the Federal Government develops a new line of activity we know how impossible it is to stop it, and it goes on long after the need has disappeared.

This spending not only increases the debt, but it increases tremendously Federal centralized power, for if the Federal Government spends the money, it controls whatever private interest or local government is dependent on that money. The Government cannot help going into business itself.

Mr. Wallace's book is full of pious reverence for private enterprise as an institution, but scorn for most businessmen. But, on page after page, he introduces Government enterprise on a scale that will destroy free enterprise. One cannot escape the conclusion that Mr. Wallace, the CIO Political Action Committee, and even the Communists are skillfully yielding to the popularity of free enterprise, and then stating a goal impossible to attain, in order that when it is not attained they may blame the failure on free enterprise and pass on more frankly to a socialistic state.

For it is doubtful whether any sincere or intelligent planner should base his national budget on $200,000,000,000 of national product or 60,000,000 jobs. At the very height of war activity, when the Government spent $100,000,000,000 a year, the civilian population still lived well. It is hard to see how careful civilian spending can be expected to replace a falling off of seventy-five billion of reckless Government expense. If the goal planned is too high, and we engage in artificial stimulation to reach it, then we create an inflationary boom from which must result deflation and unemployment. We destroy all stability and defeat our own ends.

Henry Wallace's fallacy is his belief that the private-enterprise machine can be run simply by pouring in more gasoline while you drop monkey wrenches into the machinery trying to adjust and repair it. As a matter of fact, this vast operation in the United States, dealing with 140,000,000 people, is an infinitely complex machine—and its success depends on a lot of delicate adjustments unrelated to Federal spending.

If, for instance, you build too many office buildings, theaters, and hotels (as we did in the twenties), then you have none to build for 10 years thereafter and there is a depression in the whole building industry. If too much money is spent on consumers' goods, then there is not enough capital to build new industries. If too much money is saved there is not enough consumer purchasing or the construction of capital improvements is overdone. Prices and wages must be kept in proper adjustment. If prices are too high, millions are unable to buy and all business activity falls off. If wages are too high compared to prices, there is no incentive on the part of anyone to start new businesses or take the risks of increased production. Farm prices must be properly related to industrial prices. There are a dozen economic forces which may throw the whole machinery out of balance, and many of them are brought into play by the various pressure-group proposals sponsored by Mr. Wallace.

Undoubtedly, Government spending has a place, but it is only one factor and not the most important factor. It is a dangerous drug. An overdose of it can destroy our commercial system and our democratic form of government. Our planning organization must base its goal on facts and not on dreams, or it will drive us off the road. But Mr. Wallace, when he gets down to definite estimates, nearly always picks out of the air a figure 50 percent too high. If we built the homes he asks for we would have a building boom for 10 years—and depression and unemployment in the construction industry for 10 years thereafter. No one could possibly itemize the nine billions a year of imports which he assumes. His estimate of fifty billion of useful public works in the five immediate postwar years is double any sound program, and would again leave the construction industry in complete collapse thereafter.

His very estimate of 60,000,000 jobs is doubtful. What is the magic in so many jobs? Our aim should be to provide the highest standard of living that the world has ever seen. But it is not at all clear that this would be produced by encouraging 60,000,000 people to go to work. For years we have been steadily reducing the number of people working and the hours which they have to work. We have abolished child labor. In many places we forbid children working until they are 18. We are retiring those older people who are better off if they do not have to work. As against 60,000,000 jobs there are only 33,000,000 families in the United States, plus perhaps 9,000,000 individual workers, so we are asked to provide two jobs apiece for some 18,000,000 families. Perhaps we would be better off if the wives and minors had to work in only 8,000,000 families. Fifty million jobs, in other words, may provide a higher standard of living than 60,000,000.

In fact, Mr. Wallace—while condemning the propsperity of the twenties because it was inflationary—is now proposing a bigger and better inflation. In 1929 I was assured by some of the best qualified men, who then no doubt would have been sitting on a planning board if there had been one, that there was no inflation, that we were at a normal state of business activity and that we were in a new era which had solved the problems of prosperity and employment. Commodity prices had not risen—everyone had a job. But by the use of private credit we had inflated our export trades, we had inflated stock values, we had inflated the construction of buildings and other capital goods. We had warped the whole machine out of adjustment. Now Mr. Wallace proposes to do the same thing over again by the use of Government credit.

Mr. Wallace states well the ideal conditions which we would all like to see brought about in America. His book stimulates thought and study to find the right way to obtain them. But his own plans can only lead to another very artificial boom followed by the depression and unemployment he is trying to avoid. In his failure he is likely to destroy the whole American system of freedom which has made this people the most powerful Nation the world has ever seen, and already with the highest standard of living and prosperity.

THOSE ANXIOUS TO FIND THE ROAD TO SERFDOM IN ECONOMIC PLANNING OF THIS KIND SHOULD LOOK TO THE UNPLANNED DEPRESSION FOR THE ROOT CAUSES OF FASCISM

(By CLAUDE PEPPER, United States Senator from Florida)

Henry Wallace's book, Sixty Million Jobs, promises to be a publishing event comparable to the appearance of Wendell Willkie's One World. Its publication a few weeks after the end of World War II finds the eyes of the entire country focused upon the dislocation of employment and the importance of providing jobs for all.

Mr. Wallace anticipated the need of full employment while the whole world was at work for war. He saw the danger of postwar unemployment and the need for planning a program to provide jobs for all those desiring the right to work. He assimilated the experiences of the prewar depression and the wartime boom and wove their lessons into the fabric of a program for postwar policy.

In this book Mr. Wallace meets the problem squarely and says it can be done. He has succeeded the late Franklin D. Roosevelt in leadership of the campaign of jobs for all. To quote the telegram he dispatched to Mr. Roosevelt the night of his Soldier Field speech in Chicago last October, "Your goal of 60,000,000 jobs is perhaps high, but I glory in your daring, and as you say America can do the seemingly impossible." Mr. Wallace's fundamental belief in the democratic process, his faith in the common voter to give guidance to national policy, and his adherence to the tradition that has made the United States a symbol of individual freedom and individual opportunity, assure this book a warm welcome among men of good will everywhere. He has sometimes been called a visionary by those who fear the vision of social justice and economic progress, but this book is a monument to his practicality.

The leaders of the Republican Party have admitted the importance of full employment. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, in the course of the last campaign, stated, "Republicans all agree that full employment should be the first objective of Government policy." Senator ROBERT TAFT, chairman of the Republican steering committee, in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate on February 19, 1945, said, "I agree with full employment whatever that may mean." Yet these leaders are the first to say it cannot be done.

It recalls the short-sighted attitude displayed by these same pessimists when the war clouds were gathering on a gloomy horizon. To again quote Senator TAFT in August of 1940, "There is at least a temporary alinement of Germany, Italy, and Japan. I do not think any of these nations will attack the United States." To quote Governor Dewey in May 1940, "But what is the good of talking about 50,000 planes unless we know what we are talking about?" To quote former President Herbert Hoover in June 1941, "Does any sane person believe that by military means we can defeat two-thirds of the military power of the whole world in years and years? It would be a children's crusade."

These are the same people who will attack Mr. Wallace's book because they will say it means Government control and interference. They will say it is communistic and socialistic. They will say it will lead to inflation, national bankruptcy, and a totalitarian state. They will advance these same arguments which they have been using to intimidate the American people and obstruct progressive legislation of the past 12 years. And they will offer nothing constructive save ambiguous phrases and speeches. They will display the attitude of defeatism and do-nothingness that has characterized the anti-New Deal forces since 1933.

Henry Wallace says it must be done in order to insure the future prosperity of America and that it can be done by Americans. This is the spirit that made America great. Let those who say full employment is important show—as Mr. Wallace has—how they propose we shall achieve and maintain jobs for all. With the implications of the British elections and the atomic bomb fresh in our minds, Mr. Wallace appears as a realist and a conservative. We will either preserve our way of life by the means he charts or it will just not be saved.

Mr. Wallace shows clearly and simply the magnitude of and need for postwar full employment. The goal of 60,000,000 jobs is based upon careful analysis of known facts and historical trends and population of labor forces. It presents a careful estimate of the number of persons who will be able and willing to work after allowing for the inevitable margin for unemployment due to temporary illness, persons changing jobs and similar factors.

As census statistics show, by 1950 our population of 14 years of age and over will be 110,000,000 persons. By taking the trends of the number in school, the number retired, and the number of housewives, it is easily calculated that about 62,000,000 persons will be in the labor market, available and looking for work. When allowance is made for minimum unemployment of one and one-half to two million, it appears that about 60,000,000 jobs will be needed to provide full employment. These 60,000,000 jobs in 1950 would bear the same relation to our population of working ages at that time as did the 49,000,000 persons at work in 1929 bear to the population of that time.

In both instances, of course, the total number of jobs includes jobs of all kinds, including members of the armed forces, professional people, corporate executives, self-employed businessmen and farmers. Mr. Wallace recognizes that the estimate of 60,000,000 jobs may turn out to be a little high or a little low. But he makes it abundantly clear that to plan for 50,000,000 jobs, as some have suggested, would be to plan for large-scale unemployment and a depression.

If we review the high cost of economic depression, we can best understand the need for full employment. Mr. Wallace knows these costs in terms of human suffering, neglected and undernourished children, and the hopeless feeling that comes from not having a useful role to play in economic society. But even in terms of dollars and cents, the staggering cost of depression, he makes clear that unemployment between the years 1929–41 meant a loss in goods and services to the Nation of about $350,000,000,000. This amount is more than double the capital stock of all the corporations in the United States. It is enough to build 350 river valley developments the size of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is enough to pay in full for 70,000,000 homes at $5,000 each, more than three times as many as would be necessary to eliminate all the slums in the United States, both urban and rural.

Mr. Wallace emphasizes that full employment benefits all. When labor is unemployed and pay rolls are low, business faces shrinking markets and losses. On the farms, agricultural surpluses pile up and prices decline. The levels of farm income and business profits during the war, when compared with prewar depression levels, demonstrate that all elements in the economic process are interdependent and rise and fall together. As for the veterans of this war, Mr. Wallace recognizes that special treatment and special legislation are necessary. But he knows that only the expanding opportunities of a full employment economy will enable us to give the veteran his due.

Beyond the strictly economic costs, continuous unemployment endangers our social institutions and threatens social and economic unrest and international inflation. Without the stability of full employment there can be no stability to peace.

But Mr. Wallace does more than examine the goal and paint the consequences of failure. He undertakes to outline ways and means for reaching and maintaining postwar full employment. Government, he says, must assume responsibility for maintaining the total flow of expenditures in the economic system because a continuous flow of buying power means continuous production, which, in turn, means continuous employment. He does not seek a planned economy where all the activities of labor and industry are specified in detail, nor does he call for Government production in competition with business. He foresees general planning of the over-all direction of economic activity and providing the incentive and stimulus to business for the full use of our economic resources. Those who are so anxious to find the "road to serfdom" in economic planning of this kind would do better to look to the unplanned German inflation and the ravages of the unplanned depression for the root causes of fascism.

The instrument that must be used to make broad Government planning explicit is the National Employment and Production Budget used by President Roosevelt in his last Budget message to Congress. Mr. Wallace explains the Nation's Budget in terms that every voter can understand. He shows its use during the war to plan our gigantic war-production program and to meet the needs of the consumer and prevent the scourge of inflation that always accompanied wars in the past. He shows how it can be used after the war to define the full-employment problem and to reveal the alternative choice in economic policy so that the general public and the Congress can make rational decisions. The National Production and Employment Budget is one of the main features of the full-employment bill introduced into the Congress by Senators MURRAY and WAGNER and now very much in public discussion. Mr. Wallace has performed a real service in presenting the idea in a nontechnical manner.

Of course, planning the Nation's budget is not enough. We must implement and stimulate the flow of total expenditures whenever consumers and business are not able to do the job unassisted. In an admirable section of his book, New Frontiers of Abundance, Mr. Wallace surveys the areas of our unsatisfied needs in which Government support and stimulation of greater production could be used to provide full employment for all—and, at the same time, to make an immeasurable contribution to our standard of living. This is no luxurious standard that Mr. Wallace suggests, but merely the minimum essential for decent living.

To make up the backlog of needs in health, housing, and education and to explore the great frontiers in river valley development, land conservation, rural electrification, and reforestation is a huge job. The automotive and aviation industries have their frontiers, which Government can advance by providing the roads and airport facilities. Vast opportunities for expanding trade with the rest of the world could be made real by adequate Government, machinery and financing. Mr. Wallace emphasizes, as did Wendell Willkie, trade with the undeveloped areas in Asia and the great boon of that trade to our Western States. And, above all, he urges the opportunities of our own undeveloped areas in

the Southern States, where promoting the industrialization of this region can contribute to the welfare of the entire Nation.

Mr. Wallace, who believes that the financial resources of Federal Government must be used when necessary to maintain full production and full employment, does not advocate continuous increase in the national debt. He says that cooperation of all groups and initiative and responsibility at the grass roots will maintain the Nation's production and employment budget at high levels. Business, agriculture, labor, and local governments all must cooperate and recognize how their individual decisions affect the national economy. For those who fear that Government leadership may increase the national debt Mr. Wallace includes a telling quotation from Lord Macaulay. Every increase in the British national debt throughout its long history was looked upon, said Macaulay, as the beginning of disaster by fearful financial bigwigs. But instead the nation became even more prosperous, because production and national income grew as the debt grew.

While stressing material prosperity as essential in the postwar period, Mr. Wallace holds that this is not enough and without broader objectives and deeper purposes we will not have the ability to obtain even our material goals. His own words show the spirit that lies behind his economic philosophy.

This is both the challenge and the dilemma of democracy—namely, how to get full production, preserve the fundamental freedoms, and then go forward toward objectives which are worthy of man's spirit. In all this there can be no compulsion except that which comes from the earnest search of man's spirit to discover the divine purpose of the universe. Full employment with abundance for all is good; but by itself it is not enough. Peace is good, but not enough. The rights of man are essential; but by themselves they are not enough. We cannot attain abundance, peace, and freedom without recognizing one thing even more basic. And that one thing is the fatherhood of God and the fundamental decency of man.

Missouri Basin Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement of policy and recommendations of the Missouri River States Committee, and an expression of the same committee on Senate bill 555, which was approved at a meeting in Omaha, Nebr., on August 15, 1945.

The Missouri River States Committee is composed of the governors and other selected members of the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of Pierre, S. Dak., is the chairman and George S. Knapp, of Topeka, Kans., is the secretary-treasurer.

This program eliminates any need for a Missouri Valley Authority. In my opinion the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority would delay action on a program that has already been outlined and planned by our Federal engineers. Let us cooperate with the agencies we already have instead of devoting our efforts to the discussion of the Missouri Valley Authority.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE

The Missouri River States Committee, representing 10 member States, meeting in Omaha, Nebr., August 15, 1945, commends the progress made on the Missouri Basin program since its last session of April 5, 1945, reaffirms support of the unified development plans established by the Flood Control Act of 1944 and offers the engineering plans now nearing completion as a constructive works program for the Missouri Basin in the immediate postwar era.

Under the authority of the 1944 act, Congress appropriated funds for planning and both the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation now have designs of dams and work programs practically ready for the contract stage, so that with the war at an end, actual construction can begin when funds are appropriated therefor.

Further following out the policy declared in the 1944 act, an inter-agency committee has been created with State participation and is now meeting regularly to expedite a coordinated program satisfactory to the Federal Government and the people of the 10 member States.

The Missouri River States Committee recommends:

1. That appropriations for projects ready for construction now be made in accordance with existing congressional authorization in sufficient amount as will measure up to available materials and man power, thereby making a contribution to postwar employment while obtaining for an area comprising one-fifth of the Nation, the permanent benefits of the over-all Missouri Basin plan.

2. A continuing adjustment of all the detailed specifications of engineers as they appear in the day-by-day preparations for building individual projects, to the end that each project may make the greatest possible contribution to the comprehensive basin-wide development.

3. That continuing efforts be made through existing agencies in cooperation with the States for land and water use policies that will bring development advantageous to the regions affected, with differing benefits to each area through the irrigation or drainage of land, the control of floods, assistance to navigation, production of power, and all other community, industrial, or domestic beneficial uses and conservation of these resources, all in the national interest.

4. We continue to urge, as heretofore, that during the planning, construction, and operation of these facilities in the Missouri River watershed, that Congress respect the lawful rights of the States as well as safeguard their economic interests and the general welfare of the resident people.

In conclusion, this committee of Governors and their advisers, with constantly increasing interest, pledges State cooperation at all times in making and executing programs for the development of the land and water resources of the 10 States; and in view of the policy announced in the Flood Control Act of 1944, and the progress made thereunder for a unified, basin-wide development, state our belief that the interests of all the people will be best advanced by supporting the coordinated plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers

STATEMENT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE CONCERNING FORTHCOMING CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL, S. 555

The committee continues to oppose the delegation of authority to any commission, board, agency, or authority, by whatever name that would function, with unchecked powers in the control of natural resources. Therefore, we endorse the adverse report of the Senate Commerce Committee on a proposal to create a valley authority and recommend against any legislation which would have that effect.

We urge that each and every member State of the Missouri River States Committee continue its vigorous representation before any and all congressional committees considering S. 555, to the end that the efforts thus far made be not relaxed but rather strengthened in order that our position may be continuously before the Congress so long as this measure is being considered.

Representative Celler Inquires of State Department Concerning Reported Overtures of Loan of From Three to Five Billions to Great Britain—State Department Replies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

JULY 3, 1945.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I noticed under date of June 29 an item from London in the New York Times to the effect that some legislation will be sought to approve a three to five billion dollar credit for Great Britain. There is no information given to us in the news item as to what purpose this credit will be devoted.

Some business circles maintain that the money will be used to release funds for the purchase by Britain of American goods and also would make dollars available to members of the sterling bloc who need "hard money" to make purchases outside the restricted monetary area.

One version of the talk among British businessmen (according to the news item) is that it will be used "to bail Britain out of her uncomfortable sterling debt position" by making it possible for her to allocate a percentage of dollars to Argentina, Brazil, Australia, South Africa, and others who have large sterling balances at the present time.

Please let me have all possible information that will shed light on this statement as it appeared in the New York Times.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am,

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

JULY 25, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. CELLER: I refer to your letter of July 3 inquiring with respect to the recent report in the New York Times that legislation will be sought to approve a three to five billion dollar credit for Great Britain. Reports of this character have been circulating rather widely in recent weeks, perhaps because of public suggestions that it would be advisable for this country to make a large credit to the British rather than to subscribe to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

It is desirable to make clear at the outset that the British Government has not approached the Department concerning a loan. Nor have we any present plans for requesting legislation to authorize such a credit.

You are generally familiar with the financial problem which must be alleviated if Great Britain is to cooperate with full effectiveness in the restoration of convertible currencies and expanded international trade on a multilateral basis. British export trade has fallen very sharply during the war and must be substantially expanded to permit the balancing of her postwar international current accounts. At the same time Britain will emerge from the war with very large sterling indebtedness, which aggravates her problem of restoring international equilibrium. The Department believes that we should assist in all reasonable ways in efforts to solve this difficult financial problem, in order to restore sound international economic conditions within the shortest possible time.

The extension of the Trade Agreements Act and the adoption of the Bretton Woods agreements, both of which the Department has strongly supported, are, it should be noted, fundamental steps toward this end. The strengthened Trade Agreements Act will help expand international trade on a multilateral basis and thereby assist Britain in balancing her international accounts without the use of restrictive trade policies. The monetary fund will provide the countries of the world, including Great Britain, with additional liquid reserves when required, to assist in maintaining stable currencies without restrictive exchange practices. The International Bank should play an important role in expanding world trade through stimulus to sound international investment. The bank could also extend direct credits to Britain should Britain choose to avail herself of its facilities.

Beyond these measures the Department believes that serious consideration should be given any request the British might make for credit on a proper scale and appropriate terms. We would not, of course, favor a credit designed merely "to bail Britain out of her uncomfortable sterling debt position," as is implied in the news item you cite. Nor would we feel it advisable to grant large credits to Britain merely to make dollars available to members of the sterling bloc who may lack dollars to make purchases outside the sterling area. We feel that any credit granted by this country to Great Britain should be accompanied by satisfactory arrangements with respect to the timely relaxation of the restrictive financial and trade practices which have grown up of necessity during the war.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

Why I Voted "Yes" on a Congressional Pearl Harbor Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on the second roll call vote today, which was on the final passage of the resolution before the House, I voted "Yes" in favor of a further investigation of the Pearl Harbor tragedy by a joint congressional committee. I feel the American people would like to know and ought to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in regard to the tragic circumstances which happened on that fateful Sunday morning of December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor. True, we have already had some official reports, and it may be that there is relatively little more of factual information which may be obtained. However, what more there may be gotten should be obtained and spread upon the records of Congress in imperishable print for all the present and future to know.

I voted "No," as the record will show, on the Martin amendment which would have changed the Senate resolution, thrown aside House rules, and contravened all of our parliamentary procedure of a hundred and fifty-six years by authorizing a congressional committee made up of equal membership from the two major parties in Congress having unequal membership in both House and Senate. I can understand how a resolution calling for such an investigation, if supported by a majority of the members of both parties, may be properly called a nonpartisan matter. Truly this weighty investigation should be a nonpartisan matter. However, I cannot understand how a proposal such as the Martin amendment to depart from the Rules of the House and all our customary parliamentary procedure in the appointment of such a committee, when the move is supported purely by the minority party and opposed purely by the majority party, can by any stretch of the imagination be called a nonpartisan suggestion. Indeed, the very offering of that amendment injected party politics into the vote and thereby made it a partisan issue, or so at least it seems to me.

Even if there is relatively little more of information to be obtained in regard to the Pearl Harbor tragedy, I would like that additional information obtained and the already recorded facts repeated by an official congressional investigation. I want this to be done immediately now that the war has closed and the doing of it will no longer interfere with the war effort, and I want the full and true record of it to be established so that the historian of the future will have these facts from which he will write his account and on which he will base his conclusion. As a student of history, I have often praised the impartiality and justice with which the pen of the historian records the facts of the past for the contemplation of the ages following. Yet I am not so blind, nor yet so ignorant, as to fail to understand that not all history, so called, is a true and correct narrative of past events. In order that we may have that true and correct narrative in regard to Pearl Harbor, I want a wealth of official information as source material for the historian who is going to tell my grandchildren and their offspring about Pearl Harbor.

I have read some biography, and I know that a great man, or a so-called great man, has his place in the future determined very largely by his biographers. Many a second-rate man has been magnified by a glorifying biography. More rarely a really great man has been dwarfed and given a distorted picture to all the future by a vindictive biographer. My suggestion to any great man, or would-be great man, who wants a glorified and secure place in the future is to be careful to select his biographer, for it is certainly true that biographers can make or break the life they portray.

As a student of history, I have delved a little into archives, and I know something about the source material which the Muse of History collects and inspects in writing her narratives. Newspapers and current accounts, and even political literature of the times under study, may be used and are used by historians, and I approve of such, but I want something in addition to the current literature of these times—something of an official and authoritative nature—against which to check the great volume of controversial writings so that the absolute truth may be known. This wealth of material is desirable as the historical background for any momentous event, but this is particularly true for the background of Pearl Harbor. Therefore, I want the historian to have this wealth of material, and I want him to have possession of known facts, sworn to and recorded with all the fidelity and justice of a court trial. Such is the explanation of my vote today.

Gen. Billy Mitchell Warned America of Pearl Harbor Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by Joseph Leib, vice commander of Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

While investigating the Pearl Harbor sneak attack now pending before Congress it may be well to go back into history and study Billy Mitchell's own account of his trial and court martial in which he thoroughly discusses the Hawaiian situation and prophesied the December 7 calamity.

How right Billy Mitchell was back in 1935, we now know.

On September 10, 1945, Representative BROWN of Ohio placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by Costello Post requesting an investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster. In an accompanying statement I referred to Billy Mitchell and his piercing admonishment of what was in store for this great Republic in the near future. I did not quote him directly. Now, read for yourself the conclusions and predictions made by this great war general written in 1935, 6 years before Pearl Harbor. Billy Mitchell was court-martialed because he dared to tell the truth and because he loved his country and fellow men above and beyond his own personal security and welfare. I am proud that Billy Mitchell was a member of Costello Post as well as its commander in 1927.

The following are Mitchell's own words. Confirmation can be found in the book Billy Mitchell, by Emile Gauvreau, pages 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, and 178. Said he:

"It was my purpose during my court martial to let the Nation know what I had discovered during my 4-year tour of inspection

of our air defenses as assistant chief of the Air Corps. In this capacity I had been as far away from my country as the Philippines and Hawaii. These facts, which I had submitted to my superiors, were thrown aside. Most of them were flung into the waste basket before I was demoted.

"I remember a gasp from the court-martial board when my counsel, referring to the report of my tour of Pearl Harbor and our Hawaiian defenses, announced:

" 'We propose to prove that when Mitchell inspected the Hawaiian services he found not one single airplane equipped with armament, bomb racks, bomb sights, or any accessories necessary to the effective operation of pursuit or observation planes. In the case of the Philippines we will prove an even worse condition. It will be proved that the War Department has been guilty of almost treasonable administration.'

"As I write this a decade later, during the year 1935, which will soon be ebbed out, my latest information from Hawaii indicates that the condition of our air force stationed at that post has not been improved to the extent that would be expected in 10 years' time. We are vulnerable there because of a criminal disregard of coordination. Our air service in Hawaii has been for years nothing but a football kicked about between the Army and Navy, with an utter lack of cooperation between the military and naval commands in charge. I presented these discoveries to the War Department long ago, but even to this date the reports I receive from my friends are more than disquieting. Good Christ, if people only knew! The bickerings of insect authority, the conflicting orders from Washington, the jealousies, the late hours of social life, the white uniforms in the moonlight, the gold braid, the romantic women, the caressing climate are all part of an existence to lull our men into threadbare society. The true picture of Hawaii, now full of crawling spies, does not add any reassurance to well-informed Americans who are acquainted with Japanese cunning and treachery. Military Hawaii lives under a tradition handed down from one commanding officer to another, to be discussed years later, with soothing nostalgia, when one returns home to the soft chairs of the Army and Navy clubs, the head resting back, the eyes closed, the jowled face smiling, the paunch expanded, the tinkling glass in hand, the toasts to Mahan. Ah, those good old days in Hawaii! Planes? Why, the Navy could clean up those little yellowbellies before dinner time!

"That talk will go on until we have been sent reeling from a blow delivered by our own ignored invention in the hands of our enemies, sold to them by our own betraying manufacturers, wearing the decorations of the governments who would destroy us. The airplane is the seeing eye of our outposts. Reconnaissance from the air is the only means of warning Hawaii and the Philippines of the sneaking approach of our mortal enemy in the Pacific. We should have built underground bases for planes at those strategic points 10 years ago.

"A secretary for air, freed of the doddering Winfield Scotts of the War Department would have seen to all this. The fighting plane and the bomber, ever on the alert and in scattered formation when resting on their bases furnish the only hope of defense for Pearl Harbor. If our warships there were to be bottled up in a surprise attack from the air and our airplanes destroyed on the ground nothing but a miracle would help us to hold our Far East possessions. It would break our backs.

"Japan has known this for 10 years, if we don't; and if we have to learn our lesson by such a tragedy our last battleship will have been built in less than a year after the Japanese have sprung at us. Warships will be useless without aircraft to protect them as a sky blanket.

"My Hawaiian discoveries were brushed aside angrily by the men who were trying me. All they cared to establish was whether I had been guilty of breaking their gag-ruled discipline. I was bursting with my information, but I never would have broken through the entrenched forces of the embalmed heads of our Army and Navy had I not shouted it out to the public. When will these martinets ever learn that they are in charge of the people's army?"

Believe it or not—this was penned in 1935—a year before Billy Mitchell passed away—and 6 years before the Jap attack on our Pacific outpost.

United States Urged To Hold Fast to Huge Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an article entitled "United States Urged To Hold Fast to Huge Merchant Marine," by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Sunday Star of September 2, 1945:

UNITED STATES URGED TO HOLD FAST TO HUGE MERCHANT MARINE—ADMIRAL LAND SAYS SECURITY REQUIRES FIFTEEN TO TWENTY MILLION TONS IN SERVICE WITH 21,000,000 MORE KEPT IN RESERVE

(By Gould Lincoln)

The American people, after two breath-takingly costly wars in 25 years, have learned the need of international collaboration for peace. There are two other lessons of great importance which should have been learned, too, but whether they have is still to be demonstrated. The first is that the United States must remain strong on land and sea and in the air—militarily. The second is that a big merchant marine must be maintained—for national defense and for the protection and expansion of American commerce.

It is not a question of building an American merchant fleet—but of keeping one. At an expense of from 18 to 20 billions of dollars, this country has built the greatest merchant marine the world has even seen, during the war now ending. Vice Adm. E. S. Land, United States Navy, retired, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administrator, estimates our completed wartime building program at 56,500,000 dead-weight tons. To this he adds 11,500,000 dead-weight tons—the American merchant marine in 1939 before the war started—making a total of 68,000,000 tons. The losses estimated, he places at 6,500,000.

Clearly the American people can have a big merchant marine in operation and in reserve if they want one, and provided they do not allow foreign propagandists and unsound economists in this country to pull the wool over their eyes. Obviously it would be impossible to keep in operation the complete, huge tonnage. But Admiral Land believes that there should be kept in service from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons, divided as follows: 3,500,000 tons for the Great Lakes, 2,500,000 tons for the rivers, 3,800,000 tons for coastal and intercoastal traffic and 7,500,000 in foreign trade. For the rest of the tonnage he proposes that there be a national defense "reserve" (in sanctuary) of 21,500,000 tons, that 10,000,000 tons be sold to foreign nations, that 6,000,000 tons be assigned to military service and 7,000,000 tons be scrapped for old age.

OTHER IDEAS ADVANCED

These are estimates of what may be done with this great tonnage. There are other ideas of what should be done. One is that ships should not be sold to foreign maritime nations to be used in competition with us. But we have a surplus and other nations will either build or buy ships elsewhere if they cannot become customers for American ships now. Despite all the war losses, the available world tonnage today is estimated at approximately 20,000,000 tons more than when the war began in 1939. And this is due to the great building program carried on in the United States.

Without this building program, the war could not have been won and might well have been lost. Vital war supplies of all kinds could neither have been carried to our own fighting forces in the Pacific and in Europe and Africa, nor to our allies. Admiral Ernest J. King, commander in chief of the United States Navy Fleet, has given his testimony about the value of the merchant fleet.

"An inadequate merchant marine was one of our prewar weaknesses," he said. "After the last war, we dissipated our store of merchant shipping. We compounded the error by not maintaining our shipbuilding capacity. Consequently, at the outbreak of this war, we found it necessary to construct swiftly what has come to be a stupendous tonnage of cargo ships."

A NIP-AND-TUCK AFFAIR

"For many anxious months, it was a nip-and-tuck affair trying to fulfill the shipping needs and at the same time attempting to meet the requirements for offensive and protective operations both in the Atlantic and the Pacific." Admiral King asked, too, a pertinent question: "How long can the United States afford to continue a cycle of fighting and building and winning and giving away—only to fight and build and win and give again?"

One argument advanced by a school of thought which holds that a great merchant fleet is not essential to this country is that we can depend on the merchant ships of British, French, and other western European countries in case of war. The answer to this is simply that in two great wars we have found these foreign ships could not be relied upon, either to take care of our commerce before we were drawn into the wars or to carry essential military supplies and troops after we were in the wars. It is idle, therefore, to argue that we can save money by not building and operating our own merchant ships. It is far better, and far less costly, to maintain and operate a big merchant fleet than to wait until we are in the grip of war and seek to build up the necessary fleet. We put $3,000,000,000 into our merchant fleet during the First World War, and more than six times that amount into the fleet we now have. Construction and operating subsidies, even over a long period of years, fade into insignificance compared to such costs.

MAY NOT HAVE TIME AGAIN

Further, unless this country maintains an adequate merchant fleet, for national defense as well as for our commerce, we may not have time to build another in the event of a third world war. This country might be the first attacked. Also other nations' shipping might be destroyed from the air. Or they might be captured and used against the United States.

Not only is it necessary to keep our merchant ships in large numbers, but it is also necessary to maintain shipyards, capable of building replacements, making repairs, and constantly improving the types of merchant ships. It is necessary to keep up a sufficient

trained personnel, both officers and men, to operate a large merchant marine. When this country tackled the job of building a merchant fleet for this last war, the direction of the job was given to Admiral Land, head of the Maritime Commission. The record of accomplishent has been amazing.

Ten private shipyards, containing 46 ways and employing 60,000 workers, were available. Shipbuilding facilities have been expanded to 81 yards with 300 ways, and with 1,300,000 workers. It is not feasible, of course, to keep all the shipbuilding facilities in operation, or to continue to employ all these workers and crews. But it is possible to retain a sizable portion of all three. A proper nucleus of trained shipbuilders, both for the merchant marine and for the Navy, should be maintained Some of the shipyards are being converted now to repair yards.

There will be plenty of employment for the merchant marine personnel for from 6 months to 3 years after the surrender of Japan. American ships will be busy bringing troops home, rotating others, supplying occupied areas, returning prisoners of war, carrying relief material to foreign countries—and carrying an expanding American trade. The rest of the world will rely upon this country for masses of goods and material for a long time to come. Eventually, however, this employment will fall off.

MUST CONTINUE TRAINING

Something will have to be done to keep on training, recruiting personnel and manning the merchant fleet of the future. Kings Point Academy has been the great training school for the merchant marine. It and some of the other training institutions should be retained, although reduced to peacetime size.

Despite the fact that without this great merchant fleet his country could not have won the war, could not have carried the fight to the enemy, economic appeasers are likely to arise, saying that shipping is an expensive luxury to the United States. They will add that shipping earns the daily bread of the martime nations of Europe—of Britain, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, France, Italy and so on. They will charge that to maintain an adequate American merchant marine will cost this country many, many millions of dollars in operating and other subsidies. They will urge that European ships will carry our goods cheaper and better. They will add that unless foreigners are allowed to carry our goods and American passengers they will not be able to purchase goods from the United States, because they earn a good proportion of the money to pay for American exports by selling transportation services to us.

Examined one by one these arguments turn out to be questionable. Huge sums of money are not paid for operating and construction subsidies to the shipping companies and shipyards. The subsidies make good the difference in costs between operation of ships under our flag and under foreign flags, and the difference in costs of building ships in this country and elsewhere.

HIGHER WAGES PAID

We pay higher wages all along the line. The operator gets this difference in cost and nothing more from subsidies. Obviously he could not afford to compete constantly for the carrying trade at a loss. Further, this money, this differential in cost does not go into the pockets of the operators but into those of American workmen and crews. Admiral Land put the case succinctly when he said: "When the uninformed talk as they do of huge operating subsidies, just remember this—if our 1939 merchant fleet were doubled, the maximum annual cost for both operating and construction subsidies would not be greater than 44 cents per capita per year—less than the cost of a movie."

The Treasury is not robbed for ship-operating subsidies—$10,000,000 per year was the gross payment of operating subsidies up to 1942 when subsidies were temporarily suspended. If American ship operators make anything over a minimum profit this subsidy must be repaid to the Government. This war has been costing us $250,000,000 a day. If a merchant marine will help us avoid another such war, the subsidies will have been well spent, if for no other reason.

Foreign nations have not hesitated to subsidize their shipping, directly or indirectly. Discriminations in regulations and charges against American ships have played part of the same game for the foreigners. And we have done practically nothing about such practices except ignore them.

SHIPPING BALANCE LOW

The argument that their dollar earnings from carrying out trade enables England and other foreign nations to purchase our exports and that if we operate an adequate merchant marine, our exports will be drastically reduced is just another myth. Statistics show that in 20 years from 1919 through 1938, American exports averaged $4,052,000,000 a year. In the same period foreign countries had a net favorable transportation balance averaging $44,000,000 a year, and actually considerably lower if rail traffic were omitted. The net transportation balance against this country in 1938 was $36,000,000, when about one-fourth of the foreign trade of the country was carried in American ships. This is according to the balance of payments reports of the Department of Commerce.

Now, then, it is clear that these foreign countries, engaged in the carrying trade, earned in net usable dollars from transporting our goods and passengers only 1 percent of the value of our annual exports in the 20-year period before the outbreak of the war now ending. To argue that these countries will have to reduce drastically their purchases of our goods if this country expands its carrying trade to one-half of our foreign commerce is, to put it mildly, the bunk. That is the goal which Admiral Land and American shipping companies have in mind—just the handling of one-half of our foreign commerce.

We are anxious to build up our foreign trade. What could be more helpful than an American merchant marine, giving good service to our customers? American shipping in the past has sought with much success to build up our trade, particularly in Latin America. American ships are efficient, despite stories told of foreign efficiency. Ship losses due to nonwar causes, such as accidents, inefficiencies of crews and officers, show an average loss for American shipping of 0.34 percent, while that of Great Britain was 0.39, for British Dominions 0.63, for Japan 0.62, for Norway 0.62 during the years 1927–36.

The war is leaving Germany, Japan, and Italy practically without merchant shipping. Whatever happens in regard to Italy, the chances are that neither Germany nor Japan will be allowed much merchant marine on the ground that merchant marine is a potential war weapon and a builder-up of war supplies. The carrying trade of these countries with other countries, therefore, is open to the nations which seize the opportunity. There is every reason why the United States should take over a large part of the Japanese carrying trade.

The huge problem of disposing of our surplus merchant vessels needs attending to without delay. A ship sales bill has already been reported favorably to the House by its Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and awaits action. There should be no delay, for if ships are to be sold, now is the time, when the carrying trade is still at its peak and likely to continue high for a long period. This bill sets up a scale of prices for which merchant vessels may be sold—55 percent of prewar domestic construction costs, except in the case of unsubsidized operators when the price may be 50 percent of such costs, and in the case of tankers, where the price is fixed on the basis of 75 percent of the prewar domestic cost.

The bill should have prompt action. Definitely, it places the responsibility on Congress, where it should be, for prices at which these ships are offered for sale. Admiral Land is proposing that there be a national-defense reserve (in sanctuary) of 21,500,000 tons. Eventually this tonnage can be cared for by a scrapping program, year by year, when it becomes obsolete or of no further use.

PRIVATE OPERATION FAVORED

One way in which the carrying trade of American merchant ships may be aided is by having the transport service for the Army and Navy turned over to private American ship operators. All the ships of the American merchant marine during the war have been operated by private operators, as a matter of fact, for the Government, and the operators have been allowed compensation for their services. That is to be changed now, however, that the war is over. Ships are to go back to private ownership and operation.

There has been some talk that this country is obligated, morally or otherwise, to replace the shipping losses of our Allies and the British in particular. At present we are obligated to replace lost Brazilian ships and no others; this was the condition necessary to get Brazilian ships lend-leased for our use. This country has furnished the British with millions of tons of merchant and naval vessels. It repaired British ships under lease-lend agreements. It has received no tonnage from the British except some ships from Canada for which cash was paid. If the British wish to buy tonnage that is another thing. Admiral Land's program calls for selling 10,000,000 tons to foreign nations. But latest reports are to the effect that the British merchant marine today, through its own building program and through acquisition of ships from others, is as large in tonnage as before the war, notwithstanding heavy losses.

The Veterans' Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted, I am including an article on the veterans' plight, by Joseph Leib, third vice commander of the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, Inc., of Washington, D. C., as follows:

THE VETERANS' PLIGHT

(By Joseph Leib)

On November 16, 1944, pages A4422–A4423, Representative SPRINGER placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by this writer entitled "Urgent Need for Veterans' Hospitals and Beds" in which I proved the great need for new facilities to adequately care for the veterans not only of this war but also of the last world conflagration.

As I pointed out then, I now repeat, that although our Government is allocating and

spending billions of dollars for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of other nations, it has shown little constructive interest in the welfare of our own veterans as far as hospital accommodations are concerned. At the same time I charged that hospital construction was being held up by red tape and by selfish groups.

Now I desire to call to the attention of the Nation the unfortunate situation as it stands today. I cite the hearings held before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, House of Representatives, in connection with the bill to provide for an Administrator of Surplus Property. Dated August 28, 1945, pages 37 and 38, we find this amazing testimony, which I quote without further comment:

"Representative GOSSETT. The hospital problem is arising all over the country.

"Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, sir.

"Representative COCHRAN. That is our own fault. We authorized the Veterans' Administration to construct hospitals all over the United States and we did no give them a dime. They had plans and specifications to build, but we did not give them a dime when we authorized it. I know as a fact that the Bureau of the Budget has had the plans and specifications from the Veterans' Administration for new construction in present facilities and the Veterans' Administration has not had 5 cents to go ahead and construct them, because all we did in the GI bill was to give them the authorization. There is upward of $700,000,000 I think needed to go ahead and build additional hospitals and enlarge the present ones.

"Representative JUDD. Will the gentleman yield for a comment?

"I cannot let the statement of the gentleman from Missouri about the Veterans' Administration stand without some comment. It is true that we authorized he appropriation of several hundred millions of dollars for hospitals, but in March and April when we actually appropriated seventy or eighty million dollars, as I recall, some of us said we were going to need more hospitals for the veterans. At that time General Hines said that Congress has never failed to give the Veterans' Administration whatever it asked for. I cannot see that the present need was the fault of Congress, when we appropriated all the money for hospitals that the Veterans' Administration asked for.

"Representative COCHRAN. The Veterans' Administration made a mistake in not coming down and asking for more appropriations.

"Representative JUDD. Some of us went down and talked the matter over with General Hines and told him that he had a bigger problem than in the last war. However, Congress gave him every dime he asked.

"Representative COCHRAN. The Army today has thousands upon thousands of men who are ready to be turned over to the Veterans' Administration, but they cannot discharge them because the Veterans' Administration has no place to put them and they still must be hospitalized by the Army although they have received the maximum treatment by the Army; and that applies to the Navy.

"Representative JUDD. We tried to correct it but did not succeed.

"Representative ERVIN. The Army cannot discharge them until they are physically able to be discharged, but when they are discharged they will be turned over to the Veterans' Administration.

"Representative COCHRAN. And the Veterans' Administration has no place to put them.

"Representative ERVIN. And I think that is why the President appointed a new head for the Veterans' Administration.

"The CHAIRMAN. Have you any questions?

"Representative ERVIN. No; that is all."

Our Trade Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on the Congressional Record on the Air program, Station WOL, Monday, September 1, 1945:

ANNOUNCER. From the Nation's Capital you are about the hear the one hundred and fourteenth broadcast of Congressional Record on the Air This public-service feature brings you each week a well-known Member of Congress in a discussion of national interest. Our guest this evening is a Member of the House of Representatives. He will be introduced to you now by Billy Repaid, the noted news commentator.

Mr. REPAID. Thank you, Ed Studney. And good evening, ladies and gentlemen. All of our enemies have now submitted to unconditional surrender. The world is at peace again. But all is not quiet and serene. Wars leave scars, and the bigger the war the deeper the wound. In the wake of World War II, the most costly of all wars, every country is tossed and shaken with a multitude of problems, human problems of adjustment, political problems of ideology, and economic problems of reconversion and trade. Tonight, we on the Congressional Record on the Air program are concerned with the problem of trade, specifically, trade with Britain. To discuss this question with you, we have invited as our guest Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York. Mr. CELLER has given a great deal of study to this problem. He has been in Congress since 1923 and is ranking member of the important Judiciary Committee of the House, and at this time we call upon Mr. CELLER to give us his views on trade with Britain.

Mr. CELLER. England is paying the price of empire. For scores of years she drained her far-flung dominions of their raw materials which she manufactured and reaped huge profits in selling the finished products back to the original producers. Lancaster and London and other British ruling families flourished.

The war came. It was costly enough to defend the heart of the empire, England. But the cost of defending India, Egypt, Hong Kong, Singapore, Iraq, Gibraltar, Malta, and so forth, was beyond compare. The figures became astronomical. England is now a debtor nation. But she has saved the empire and she means to hold it, "come sleet, snow, or rain." But she is holding a lion by the tail.

Exclusive of lend lease she has incurred an external debt of over $14,000,000,000. She also drew down capital assets of $8,000,000,000. She is stone broke. She will be forgiven lend-lease indebtedness to us of approximately $18,000,000,000.

We can recall it took us a long time after the last war to realize we were not going to collect the $11,000,000,000 we lent our allies, largely in the form of goods. Of course, we will again talk settlement. Lord Halifax and Lord Keynes are now in Washington to do some more talking. We are having a repetition of the stewing around and palaver we had the last time. The debt will not be paid in full. Have no doubts on that score. As a mad wag put it, "It's better to give than to lend. It costs the same in the end."

England needs American help, but is too proud to admit it. She covets American dollars and/or goods. Call it lend-lease, Export-Import shekels, or Bretton Woods timber, it is all the same. But with England, under Tory or Labor government, it is only take with no give.

She needs to earn money to pay off her staggering external war debt—her empire debt. To obtain the money she must export and continue to export. That would be O. K. But England would elbow and jostle America off the sidewalk of international commerce. She would stop our exports entering her far-flung dominions, condominions, protectorates, mandated territories, and colonies. She warns that trading with America in those lands is verboten. They have dollars or gold (as in the case of South Africa). But Mother England corrals these dollars and that gold and says to her children "Don't touch." Then she freezes those dollars and changes them into pounds. Finally she says, "Children, you must buy only from Mother England with your new toys (sterling pounds). You can't play with those Americans."

This new international financial wizardry is called the sterling area bloc pool. It has become bigger than Bretton Woods itself. It is more formidable than any international bank of settlement that Bretton Woods envisages because locked up in this pool are probably sixteen or seventeen billion dollars and other currencies. It is a mighty weapon and Britain is using to to block American traders.

American traders find Indian, South African, Iraqi, Egyptian, and many other markets closed to them. Our export trade suffers.

Mr. REPAID. Have you heard from American businessmen directly?

Mr. CELLER. Recently an American trader came to me. He represented well-established American manufacturers. He had obtained an American passport to go to various countries in the Levant for the sale of American goods. He applied to the British for a visa and was flatly turned down with the curt remark that the people of Syria, Palestine, Lebanon, Iraq, and Trans Jordan can buy English produced goods. "There is no need for you there," he was told.

I cite another example. A very well known American perfumer complained bitterly about his inability to trade in Surinam and in Jamaica. Every possible restriction is placed in the way of the exchange of money such as the impossibility of getting paid in dollars, or pounds, for that matter, which are frozen. But no such restrictions are placed in the way of an English perfumer doing business in those places.

An American manufacturer received from his agent in British Honduras a large order for buttons. The British authorities intervened and flatly told the American he would not be paid in dollars and could only be paid in British pounds which would be frozen in London, and that he could only use those pounds for the purchase of British goods. Thus, the button manufacturer is placed in the anomalous position of being forced to take British goods for his buttons. This is the type of barter indulged in by Schacht in Nazi Germany. The American properly refused to abide by such conditions.

In these ways England may eventually free herself of debt—at our expense. Shall we supinely gaze at the spectacle?

She cannot go through with her grandiose performance of a sudden. She needs time. The curtain falls upon a tragic note after the first act, as it were. Uncle Sam withdraws lend-lease. The second act must develop intense sympathy. Churchill and Attlee wring their hands. There cannot remain a dry eye in the audience. The atmosphere of anguish must be maintained. Uncle

Sam relents and offers loans. The interest is low and the duration is as long as 30 years. But England calls him Shylock, nonetheless, because he demands, she says a pound of flesh. But all Uncle Sam wants is that Britain as a condition for the loans break up the sterling-area pool and permit free flow of trade to allow American goods to go to Empire and sterling countries. The play is now in rehearsal. Whether the play will actually end that way depends upon the administration. But is must end that way, else it will be a flop to any full-blooded American audience. Otherwise, England could say, "Heads I win, tails you lose."

Furthermore England has other cards up her sleeve. She has her imperial preference trade barriers which stymie our exporters. By imperial preference, each British area mutually gives to each other lower tariff rates than those imposed on American goods. It is a swanky club from which Americans are barred. Of course, these British trade manipulations are not new. The sharp trading practices of the England of George VI are no different from those of the England of George III.

Mr. REPAID. How does Bretton Woods fit into the picture?

Mr. CELLER. We set up the Bretton Woods currency stabilization fund as the quickest way to international financial stability. We want a firm relation between the dollar and the krone, between the peso and the rupee, between the drachma and the guilder, the lira and the franc. But England now does not want that stable relation between the dollar and the pound sterling.

Apparently England's chauvinism and selfish imperial interests lie in cheap and increasingly cheaper money. If she refuses to stabilize her currency, she kicks the idea of Bretton Woods in the slats. Bretton Woods was her idea first. We embraced it. But now she may jilt it.

Surely, it is difficult to satisfy all the demands of England. She is like the maladjusted crochety old gentleman who has had a very heavy lend-lease meal with much port, but refuses not only to pay for the food and the wine, but won't even pay for the bicarbonate of soda.

Mr. REPAID. Will you explain in more detail the sterling-bloc pool?

Mr. CELLER. I think by giving you a concrete example the operation of the sterling-bloc pool will be more readily understood. India, for instance, has been selling and shipping to us jute, mica, manganese, and other strategic war materials. India's excess exports to the United States over imports has resulted in a net dollar balance in India's favor to over a billion dollars. England took the surplus dollars due India and placed them in the sterling-bloc pool. In other words, the surplus dollars were placed absolutely under British control. Britain then gave India credit in pounds and then froze such pounds. For example, an Indian merchant sells a shipment of jute to a United States firm. It is paid for by dollar draft on a New York bank. The Indian merchant turns the dollars over to his bank in India, which then turns the dollars over to the British Treasury. Now, for instance, another Indian merchant wants to buy goods from the United States; he must apply for an import license permitting him to make payment in dollars. This license will not be granted by the British. This precludes India from buying American goods.

Mr. REPAID. Should we offer help to the English?

Mr CELLER. By all means we must offer and give help to the English, but that help must be with enlightened self-interest. There is an old saying, "Love your neighbor, yet pull not down your hedge." We have a right to expect England to break up the sterling-bloc pool and to dissolve imperial preference before she partakes of our largess.

Frankly, the abrupt announcement by President Truman of the cancellation of the $42,000,000,000 lend-lease debt was generous but was far from adroit. At one fell swoop we cast away tremendous bargaining power. Our babes-in-the-woods attitude must have made the realistic Churchill and Attlee rub their hands in glee.

We must find foreign customers to buy the products of our vast industrial machine. Ten percent of our goods must be exported; otherwise we face ruinous unemployment. We cannot do so unless the trade barriers erected against us by England and others are levelled down. England has made bilateral trade-barter agreements with Argentina, Portugal, Denmark, Sweden, and other countries, and has thereby stymied many of our exporters. She deliberately forestalls our exporters in her colonies and protectorates. These possessions and countries have sufficient dollars, but England has frozen them through the medium of the sterling bloc pool. This pool was proper during the war but we are now at peace. It is as fake as the Indian rope trick.

Mr. REPAID. What do you conclude from all this?

Mr. CELLER. If conditions continue, our foreign commerce will melt away. It is silly to talk of full employment if our exporting is hamstrung. Now, with President Truman's announcement, England knows our game and can checkmate us. Our pawns are gone. The administration should have known the shrewdness of the English as traders. It has been said they play the game fairly and squarely but always have their eyes on the box-office receipts.

Artificial trade barriers must go.

Pensions for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
LINCOLN POST NO. 82,
Fort Wayne, Ind., August 22, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

Lincoln Post, No. 82, at a regular meeting held on Wednesday night, August 22, unanimously passed the following resolution and recommends its passage at the district, State, and national conventions:

"Whereas all veterans of wars prior to World War I are now entitled to a general pension; and

"Whereas the United States Government recognizes the age of 60 years for eligibility for old-age pensions; and

"Whereas veterans of World War I who have attained the age of 60 years or over are not eligible for a general pension.

"Therefore Lincoln Post, No. 82, of the American Legion, Department of Indiana, recommends the immediate provision in the pension laws that 60 years of age shall constitute total disability and that any honorably discharged veteran of any war, upon reaching the age of 60 years, shall be entitled to a general pension."

P. T. HAAS,
Membership Chairman.

America's Long-Term Objective in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an Associated Press dispatch reporting a speech delivered in Aberdeen, Md., September 4, by Senator MILLARD H. TYDINGS, chairman of the Senate Insular Affairs Committee, and an editorial published in the Saturday Evening Post of August 11, 1945. I wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to both because it is important that this Congress, which will soon be called upon to decide important problems affecting the Phillippines, should have the correct perspective on what future relationship will exist between the American and Filipino peoples. I wish to commend to the attention of the representatives of the American people the Post's approach to the problems now facing the Philippines and the United States in the hope that whatever action this Congress will take regarding the Philippines will serve to enhance, and not impair, what, in the eloquent words of Senator TYDINGS, is "a huge reservoir of good will toward America throughout the world, and especially in Asia, as a result of our treatment of the Philippines." As one who believes in America, it is my confident hope that this body will always so act toward my country that the American people will continue to deserve these felicitous words of the worthy Senator of Maryland:

Other nations trust us because of what we have done in the islands.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 5, 1945]

TYDINGS SAYS TREATMENT OF FILIPINOS BENEFITS UNITED STATES

ABERDEEN, MD., September 5.—Senator TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, holds that "we must now think of the Philippines as a great staging area for trade and political goodwill as we once thought of it as an essential staging area during the war."

Senator TYDINGS, who is chairman of the Senate's Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, made that statement during an address yesterday before a group of Philippine and United States officers attending the ordnance school of the Aberdeen Proving Ground.

"Before the war," he said, "the Philippines were our sixth largest customer, and American jobs depend upon their rehabilitation."

The Maryland Senator, who returned recently from an inspection tour of the Philippines, declared that "we have built up a huge reservoir of good will toward America throughout the world, and especially in Asia, as a result of our treatment of the Philippines.

"Other nations trust us because of what we have done in the islands," he said.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of August 11, 1945]

THE LITTLE BROWN BROTHER HAS EARNED A BREAK

Upon his return from a tour of inspection of the Philippines, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, gave the Senate a moving account of the destruction which war had brought to the islands, the sufferings and privations of the people and, more than everything, their unflinching loyalty to the United States. Despite temptation and torture, there is not, the Senator declared, "a single reported case where there was any treachery, even though induced by Japanese bribery, on the part of the Filipino people against any American soldier or civilian. Quite frequently Filipinos were tortured and sometimes shot, but not once did they give away any American."

Senator TYDINGS is right in attributing this extraordinary record, in part at least, to the manner in which the United States has carried out its self-imposed mandate in the far Pacific. It is not merely that we have promised the Filipinos political freedom and kept our promise. In the light of recent experience some Filipinos are less certain than they used to be that independence is what they want. The important thing is that throughout our relation with the Philippines we have constantly sought to improve the standard of living of the people, educate them to a continuously higher level of achievement, and protect the ordinary man in his private rights and dignities. The Filipinos know the difference between their status and that of peoples of the same racial origins whose destinies have been controlled by other western nations. Their loyalty is a tribute to a colonial policy which has in the main been wise and just.

In view of the importance of economic opportunity as an outstanding American contribution to Philippine development, it is disappointing to find Senator TYDINGS apparently recommending that in the future we attach to political independence the penalty of economic restriction. The Senator does not want to kill off Philippine industry all at once. He proposes that we start off by being relatively generous toward Philippine products and that later "we should gradually proceed upward from that tariff level over a period of years until the Philippines are in the same status as that which is the lot of other free and independent nations. We can never make the Filipinos free and independent if their economy is to be linked to ours indefinitely. That means that, like France or Britain, Peru or Bolivia, China or Australia, they must stand on their own feet."

The trouble with that argument is that the Philippines cannot stand on their own feet, either economically or militarily, or be in the relation to us that Britain, China, or France is in. We intend to retain air and naval bases on the islands and a certain control over Philippine foreign policy. That being the case, it would seem a little fantastic to leave the islands economically at the mercy of other nations able and willing to buy their sugar, hemp, and other products. To our way of thinking the long-term objective is a closer rather than a more remote trade relation with the Philippines. They have much that we need and, as Philippine living standards improve, we shall find wider markets for our manufactured products. At any rate, that is what was going on before certain interests in the United States decided to regard Philippine production as a menace rather than a blessing. Our interest in Philippine independence could well be purged of the desire to exclude Philippine products from our market.

Although Senator TYDINGS is right in believing that it would be a mistake to create a boom in the islands which could be crushed by a future Congress, the goal should be a higher level of trade with the islands, as with any other country which grows or manufactures things that we want, and which can afford to buy American goods in exchange. All our past experience with the Philippines supports the belief that trade with the United States, as well as the educational advantages and other appurtenances of American control, accounts for the splendid record which the Filipinos made in support of American democracy against Japanese imperialism.

Walter Winchell in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Daily Mirror of July 27, 1945:

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

INTERDEPENDENCE FOR AMERICANS

(By Mr. Justice Frank Murphy of the United States Supreme Court)

Moral epidemics tend to spread as physical epidemics do. Even now we Americans have to defend ourselves against contamination by Nazi ideology and emotion. Nazi and Fascist agents have united with American fanatics in planting and spreading the germs of racial, cultural, and religious hatred. It becomes our duty to be forewarned. None of us wants to embrace the cult of Nazi and Fascist slogans and phrases. Our boys have not offered up their lives to provide safe haven at home to intolerance and persecution.

When an anti-Christ like Hitler arises, we are reawakened to our common religious ideals. Not only are Catholic and Protestant joined in a defense of their common Christianity; they are recalled to renewed awareness of their incalculable debt to Judaism and the Jews. When Hitler was making anti-Semitism an instrument of international power politics by raising his cry of "Aryans and anti-Semites of all nations united in the struggle against the Jewish race," the Pope declared: "Anti-Semitism * * * is a movement on which we Christians can have no part whatsoever. * * * Anti-Semitism is unacceptable. Spiritually we are Semites."

Yet there are still some among us, calling themselves Christians, who follow the Nazi line of anti-Semitism and fail to see that in attacking the Jews, they undermine the basic tenets of Christianity, that they are attacking all that is fine and decent in all men of all creeds, and that they are waging war against the civilized life which has been built up so painfully from the the slime of prehistoric hates through thousands of years.

Some modern philosophers do not subscribe to the doctrines of any established church or religion. But they and the great American iconoclasts share with the great religious leaders a faith in the potentialities of all human beings to achieve the full dignity of a mature, self-respecting individual who respects the rights of others. They share in the Christian faith that every human being, irrespective of color, creed or class, is entitled to lead his own life free from coercion and oppression by others and is capable of socially beneficial action if only given the proper opportunities. They, too, believe in democracy as that way of life in which people of all kinds can live together through friendly cooperation and free competition in ideas and values.

When the Germans took over direct rule of northern Italy and Rome and began to imprison and deport Jews to Poland for extermination, the Catholic Church and the Italian people went into action. An underground organization under the leadership of the Capuchin monk, Pater Benedetto, provided the legal facilities, the food, and shelter and protection needed to save some 40,000 Jews from deportation and death.

After the American troops finally liberated Rome, the main synagog was reopened with a solemn thanksgiving service. The place of honor was occupied by Pater Benedetto. "And when the rabbi, a member of the English Army and in uniform, deeply moved, thanked the Catholic Church for all she had done in the deepest fulfillment of the command, 'Love thy neighbor,' and when he, while saying this, pointed to Pater Benedetto, the silence of the house of God was broken by a storm of applause, which threatened never to cease."

Other examples of aid given by members of one faith to another—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—can be given from our own history, past and present. Every American community can supply its own dramatic confirmation of the teamwork and sacrifices our American servicemen of different faiths display in action against the enemies of all religions and all tolerance.

But the interdependence of all Americans is not confined to religion, which I have chosen to emphasize. The Nazis called themselves the master race and scorned the so-called inferior races, the Slavs, Jews, Negroes, Mongolians, and all other groups that their fraudulent Nazi race scientists could usefully label and libel. Actually they divided humanity into two races: the Nordic race and the human race with themselves as the masters and all the rest of us as their slaves.

Fortunately, our military victories have crushed the power to do harm, if not the inflated and insane egotism, of the Fascists. We still have to mount guard, however, against those in our own midst who have been nurtured on the myths of the superior and inferior races, and who practice discrimination against fellow-Americans because of the color of their skins or some other arbitrary racial sign.

The lofty phrases of the Declaration of Independence "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—these cynics ridicule as glittering generalities. They remind us that when the Declaration was written numbers of men were held in slavery in our land. That was a falling off from our basic principles that we as a nation ended 80 years ago, and it in no way weakens the validity of those principles set forth in our original articles of faith.

Instead of clinging to group prejudices that shut us off from our fellowmen, we must keep a firm hold on the magnetic chain of humanity. We must open our hearts and our minds and our way of living to individuals of all groups.

The day is dark. But in every dark night a kind providence has never deserted man. Somehow man's destiny always lifts him to his feet again no matter how bitter the struggle. God made us brothers. Let us while remaining strong as a Nation recapture tenderness and kindness—precious qualities of the human spirit. They are the imperishable splendors of life. Baffling problems confront us but in seeking their solution let us remember the debt each of us owes to each other and remain good neighbors and kind friends.

National Executive Committee of American Legion Adopts Costello Post Resolution on Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to learn that the American Legion has adopted the free press resolution sponsored by the Costello Post, of Washington, D. C. On March 21, 1945, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of this resolution. As I said then, I repeat again, that a democratic country which permits government control of its press to exist cannot long remain free, and an organization of nations to maintain peace would have little chance for fulfillment of its purposes if the truth and information essential to an understanding of each other were withheld from the people in those nations.

Here is the resolution:

[From National Division of Public Relations, the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., August 28, 1945.—Supporting President Harry S. Truman in his stand for a world-wide free press as one of the essentials of an enduring peace, the national executive committee of the American Legion at its meeting here July 28, adopted a resolution endorsing the free flow of world news.

Originating with the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of Washington, D. C., the resolution stated:

"Whereas it is our contention that the adoption of the principle of a free press flow of world news would be instrumental in paving the way toward a more permanent peace; and

"Whereas recognizing that international exchange of truthful, unbiased news throughout the world, free from any government or private control and unhampered by greed or prejudice, is in part essential to the maintenance of peace and universal cooperation; and

"Whereas both great political parties have embodied said theory in party platforms, and in a concurrent resolution recently adopted by the Congress of the United States, with the one exception that the said free flow not be allowed to transcend the limits of liberty: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the national executive committee of the American Legion enthusiastically support the principle herein involved."

I desire to include here copies of two newspaper clippings and also copy of the original Costello Post resolution:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader of March 2, 1945]

LEGION URGED TO ENDORSE NEWS FLOW

WASHINGTON, March 2.—American Legion posts throughout the country are being urged to endorse the principle of a free flow of world news as an essential to establishment of permanent peace.

Members of the Vincent B. Costello Post of Washington are seeking Nation-wide support of their pledged "efforts toward the incorporation of a charter of freedom of news and communications in the forthcoming peace settlements."

Officials of the post, largest in the District of Columbia, today mailed to 500 Legion organizations copies of a resolution expressing enthusiastic approval of the free-press principles advocated by Mr. Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press.

Joseph Leib, of Arlington, Va., vice commander of the post and author of the resolution, said he thought "every veteran should consider this proposal seriously."

"It is of vital concern to every one of them," he told a reporter. "We know that the press of Europe has always been controlled, and the people of that continent knew and read in their newspapers only what the war lords wanted them to see. This must not happen again.

"The membership of the American Legion should be wholeheartedly behind this great objective of a world-free press. I sincerely hope that Legion posts throughout America will push the Associated Press proposal to a successful conclusion."

[From the New York Times of March 18, 1945]

STETTINIUS ENDORSES FREE WORLD NEWS

WASHINGTON, March 17.—Secretary Stettinius earnestly hopes that the principle of free exchange of news will be included in international peace plans adopted by the United Nations at San Francisco in April.

He declared in a letter made public today by Joseph Leib, of Arlington, Va., that international acceptance of the idea would be an important contribution toward lasting peace.

Mr. Leib, vice commander of the Vincent B. Costello Post of the American Legion, sponsored a resolution urging that "free press principles advocated by Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press," be included in the peace treaty. Mr. Leib, who made public Mr. Stettinius' comment, had sent the Secretary a copy of the resolution. Mr. Stettinius' reply said:

"The whole question of freedom of information has been under study in the Department of State for some time. It is our view that the acceptance by the United Nations of the principle of free access to and free exchange of information would be an important contribution toward establishing a permanent peace."

Recalling that the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City adopted a resolution calling for free exchange of information, the Secretary added:

"I think you will agree that the acceptance of the principles urged by the United States delegation at this Conference is a long step forward."

[From the Costello News of March 1, 1945]

FREE PRESS

A resolution endorsing the principles of free press as adopted by our post at its February 6 meeting:

"Whereas it is our contention that the adoption of the principle of a free flow of world news would be instrumental in paving the way toward a more permanent peace; and

"Whereas recognizing that international exchange of truthful, unbiased news throughout the world, free from any government or private control and unhampered by greed or prejudice, is in part essential to the maintenance of peace and universal cooperation; and

"Whereas both great political parties have embodied said theory in party platforms and in a concurrent resolution recently adopted by the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, is authorized and directed to express its enthusiastic approval of the free-press principle advocated by Mr. Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press, and pledge our efforts toward the incorporation of a charter of freedom of news and communications in the forthcoming peace settlements."

THOMAS COSTELLO,
Commander.
DAVID E. MILLER,
Adjutant.

We Must for a Time Continue Inductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, from the very moment when Japan quit fighting, there have been loud demands that further inductions into the armed forces under the Selective Training and Service Act be suspended. I have been shocked by the apparent favor with which these demands have been received in certain quarters, including even some of my fellow Members in Congress.

America has won a great victory over her enemies. It is right and proper that we all feel a solemn pride in that victory. But now comes the time for the prudent man to take stock of the cost and of the opportunities which that cost has provided to our Nation.

The cost has been terrible. It is felt, and felt keenly, in almost every American home. We all know it in our hearts and in our lives. Our chief concern now must be to safeguard, with every means in our possession, the opportunities which the expenditure of American blood and American treasure has bought for us.

After the last war, Clemenceau wrote of the grandeur and of the misery of victory. When war has been forced by aggressors on a peace-loving nation, there is a moral grandeur in that nation winning by the sword the opportunity to establish the principles of justice and freedom and truth by which she lives in the lands of her defeated aggressors. But there is equally a danger of misery in that victory, if that nation fails to take full advantage of the opportunities for good which the victory has brought to her.

In this World War II, we have won the beachhead. But, as yet, we have not secured the stable peace for which we fought. As the President said in his message last week, America has charted the course; but the course still remains to be sailed.

Free people do not go to war merely to win a victory at arms and to march in a parade with flags. Free people fight, when they must, to establish a condition out of which no further wars can grow. Our vanquished foes remain as they were before, peoples who took up the sword to enslave the world. By an armed occupation of their lands, we have the opportunity to see to it that our principles, our beliefs, our freedoms shall prevail

as those defeated peoples begin again to build up their homelands. We are committed to such a course. The national integrity and the national honor are pledged to its fulfillment. We have by our triumphant victory sowed the seeds of lasting peace in those alien lands. Now we must stand by for a time, in Germany and in Japan, to see that those seeds grow as our dead soldiers and sailors have a right to expect, and blossom forth and bear fruit.

The Congress is now faced with a decision which it cannot defer. We must provide the means to maintain a substantial measure of our land, sea, and air power for some time to come, at a strength sufficient to carry out the armed occupation of enemy lands, to man our overseas bases, to maintain our installations overseas. We must also man the essential military and naval installations within the continental United States, providing sufficient manpower to assure the orderly and rapid demobilization of our Army and Navy down to, but not below, the level of the strength required to fill these needs.

The measure of the immediate military needs of the United States, to which I have generally referred, are carefully stated in the report of the Committee on Military Affairs, from which I quote—Report No. 943, to accompany H. R. 3951, page 3:

> In the days immediately following Japan's capitulation, General MacArthur and General Eisenhower, and our other commanders overseas, advised the War Department, on the basis of first-hand information obtained by them on the spot, that their estimated requirements for military personnel for all purposes at July 1, 1946, would not exceed 1,400,000—roughly divided between the Pacific sphere (900,000) and the Atlantic sphere (500,000). The great bulk of this personnel represents the requirements of General MacArthur and General Eisenhower. These overseas requirements cover anticipated needs for occupation forces in enemy lands; for personnel to man our installations at the Panama Canal, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, and at other bases overseas; for personnel to do the job of closing out our vast military establishments in foreign lands; and also the number of personnel in transit and in hospital. * * *
>
> It is certain that military personnel requirements additional to these overseas needs will exist at July 1, 1946. These additional requirements will include military personnel to serve in this country for the purpose of supplying our overseas forces, of training replacements, and of manning our necessary military installations within the continental United States, and also for the purpose of providing an effective striking force, ready at a moment's notice for strategic use if the need for such use should arise.

How shall we provide the military and naval manpower for these immediate postwar requirements?

There are three possible sources:

First. We can ask those already in the service—veterans with two, three, four, or even more years in uniform—to serve for still more extended periods.

Second. We can undertake to raise an army of volunteers, in sufficient numbers to replace long-service veterans in our diminished land, sea, and air forces.

Third. We can continue inducting young men who have not yet served under arms, until we are sure that enough recruits have volunteered to enable us to bring back home every veteran who has been in service as long as 2 years.

Let us examine these proposals, separately.

I can scarcely imagine a less democratic or more offensive suggestion than that America should require a further sacrifice of her veterans who have borne the brunt of war service. It is repugnant to me. It will meet with similar repugnance in each American home that has a father or a husband or a son who has already done his share. Our plain duty is not to continue these veterans in service, but to replace them.

I quote again from the committee's report on H. R. 3951:

> If no more men after today were to be brought into the Army, all Army personnel at July 1, 1946—except 800,000—would have had more than 2 years' military service. This group of 800,000 would be comprised of those inducted between August 1944 and August 1945. Thus the military requirements after July 1, 1946, would have to be met by large numbers of veterans, a majority of whom would have served beyond 2 years, unless before that time replacements for them are secured and adequately trained to take their places. * * * Furthermore, commencing in August 1946 persons in the 800,000 group noted above will complete their 2 years of service in the Army at the rate of 70,000 each month. Additional replacements must also be provided for these veterans, unless they are to be called upon for a longer sacrifice than 2 years. Failure to provide sufficient replacements will inevitably prolong the return to civil life of many veterans beyond the time when they could otherwise have been released from service.

The committee bill, H. R. 3951, seeks to provide the necessary replacements by stimulating recruiting of volunteers for the Regular Army and Navy. It follows the second of the two courses which I referred to earlier. I subscribe to the principle of a volunteer army. Everyone who has had military service would so subscribe. Every commander is glad to have men under him who have volunteered for service. To the extent that H. R. 3951 goes, it is a good bill. But it does not go far enough.

The committee bill is not the "broad and realistic appraisal" for which the President called in his message. It is a step in the right direction; but it is a step taken by a man who has put blinders on.

History has taught every one with eyes to see and ears to hear that in time of peace you cannot get enough men to volunteer in the Regular Army. Unless we are going to let our veterans "carry the bag," as the saying goes, we must continue selective service as a sure way of underwriting the success of the campaigns for volunteers. We must, for still a time to come, ask young men who have not yet served a tour of duty in the armed forces to lend a hand in finishing the job.

In short, then, we must assure the speedy return to their homes of our long-service veterans by drawing upon both the second and third sources of manpower to which I have referred. For it is as certain as night follows day, as President Truman said in his message—

> Either we retain men now in the service for further indefinite periods, or we provide replacements by further inductions.

This is no time for the Congress to beat about the bush. This is a time for plain speaking. The veterans and their families understand plain speaking. They will not stand for double-talk.

On whose behalf is it that we are so loudly counseled to suspend further inductions? On behalf of the father "sweating out" his third year on the Rhine? On behalf of the husband who in those three incredible years wrenched Hirohito's whole empire from his grasp? On behalf of the son who went away a boy in 1942 and now in combat has become a man? This father, this husband, this son, have a right to rely on Congress surely to provide their replacements. We cannot gamble with that right in the hope that volunteers will somehow be available. Only when volunteers have come forward in sufficient numbers, can we, with honesty and decency and fair-dealing, decide to terminate the draft. For only then will the debt be paid, the debt to those who gave their lives and lie in foreign graves and the debt to those who still survive but who yearn to be home in their native land, released at last from their long and honorable service.

War as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of August 31, 1945, entitled "War as Usual," with respect to continued restrictions on home building. I believe that unrestricted residence building will be a tremendous aid in preventing unemployment, and one of the worst bottlenecks in reconversion of the construction industry is the shortage of draftsmen. It is understood that architects are considering an appeal to the President to see if some of the draftsmen now in service can be released in order to meet this emergency:

WAR AS USUAL

Generally speaking, Washington has shown a commendable disposition to get the great hulk of Government out of the way of a return to peacetime life and business procedure. However, the "war as usual" contingent is still in there trying and their latest thrust comes in an attempt to retain—furthermore extend—the Government control over housing.

The plan now reported under discussion would force the builder of a home to get a Federal permit and it would limit the amount that could be spent, $8,000 being the probable top figure. The Government would fix the purchase price of a house already built,

which would be an extension of war powers. Only those building programs which, in the judgment of Washington, met a community's needs would be approved.

All of this would be done in the fair name of restraining inflation, the theory being that the witless citizen unless guided by superior intelligence will lay out his life savings for the first dilapidated old shack offered. Of course, there are some other implications that the sponsors do not take much pains to conceal. They know—at least that is their story—what kind of houses Americans want to live in. Also they are not averse to borrowing a leaf from Mr. Stalin's book and doing what is known in the land of the Soviet as "social engineering," which includes telling people where they can live and under what conditions. This latter would be accomplished by permitting building in one place and restraining it in another.

And in passing it is significant that while the "war as usual" boys want to restrain private building, they also are keen for Government public works.

The War Production Board wants to lift all restrictions and we hope that the President and Congress will support that view. If they do not, the American people, dating from their colonial days, have shown that they know how to deal with absurd "orders in council."

Message From the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, after touring the seventh district during the congressional recess, I found that the people of Indiana have a message for all Members of Congress. Hoosiers realize that there is plenty of work ahead for us to do. They expect us to do some sane thinking and wise planning. They believe the honeymoon is over for handouts to foreign countries. Above all, they want their boys home and they want jobs—not doles—for them. They want the opportunity for all to work and save to prevent another WPA. These are some of the things they want us to do:

First. No time should be wasted in bringing our boys back home. They should be replaced by volunteers when we make the service attractive enough for enlistments. The period of enlistment should be shortened and the pay increased. The drafting of our teen-age boys will not be necessary. The emergency has passed and the principle of force and conscription should be scrapped.

Second. Return foreign prisoners of war as soon as transportation is available so they can rebuild their own countries. If they are allowed to remain in this country they will seek jobs and deprive Americans of employment.

Third. Returning servicemen must have an opportunity to return to their prewar jobs.

Fourth. While lend-lease is terminated the administration has found other avenues to make loans to foreign countries. Everyone is tired of having America play the role of Santa Claus to foreign nations. The shipment of scarce items such as sugar, meat, and coal must not be allowed but we are willing to aid the starving nations by sending to them our surplus food.

Fifth. Substitute the law of supply and demand for rationing. By eliminating rationing we can rid the country of black markets.

Sixth. Remove the needless Federal bureaus and unnecessary Federal workers by cutting the appropriation of each Government department at least 25 percent.

Seventh. Abolish the AAA and subsidies and establish a floor on farm prices to avoid the bottom from falling out of farm prices as they did after World War I.

Eighth. Maintain necessary air bases vital for American protection.

Ninth. Remove all possible wartime controls and give industry the "green light."

Tenth. The United States must control the atomic bomb.

Eleventh. Repeal war taxes, including the auto use tax.

Twelfth. Simplify the GI bill of rights.

Thirteenth. Restore standard time.

Fourteenth. Stop all Government competition with private enterprise.

Fifteenth. Provide adequate old-age assistance for our elders.

Sixteenth. Keep unemployment compensation under State jurisdiction.

Seventeenth. Provide jobs, not doles, if we expect to avoid another depression.

Eighteenth. Decentralized industry will give every community an opportunity to furnish jobs to their own people.

Nineteenth. Establish some incentive for investment capital.

The Rise of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 11 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Rise of the United States," appearing in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE RISE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thanks to those who gave their lives, and to all who have suffered and toiled, the United States has been delivered from its most dangerous enemies and has been raised to a leading place of power and influence throughout the world. Their achievement is clear and unmistakable amidst all the complications and difficulties of the demobilization and the pacification in the wake of so great a war.

Never before have the young men of any American generation had spread out before them such a prospect of a long peace within which there is so much they can do that is useful and fascinating. There never was a better time than this to be an American and to be young, nor a more interesting one in which to be alive. The time to come is peculiarly their own because they have themselves earned it and done so much to make it possible. They are not merely the heirs of stronger and more resolute forefathers but they are once again, a generation of explorers, discoverers, and pioneers, who can become the founders of good and enduring things. The opportunity can, of course, be stupidly and lazily missed. But if it is used, as it can be, there is no reason to doubt that this cycle of twentieth century wars is over, and that Americans have at their disposal all that they need in order to take a foremost part in inaugurating an age that mankind will long remember gratefully.

Great works are not for the faint-hearted who doubt themselves. Yet only with that humility which opens men's minds to wisdom, can greatness be understood. We have much that we must learn to understand. When a nation rises as suddenly as we have risen in the world, it needs above all to measure its power in the scheme of things. For it is easier to develop great power than it is to know how to use it well. Wisdom always lags behind power, and for the newcomer, which is what we are, the lag is bound to be greater than in an old established state where the exercise of world power is a matter of long experience and settled habit.

Even more than the Soviet Union, which is now resuming its connection with Russia's past, the United States is the newest world power. We have never been a world power before, and we might say that in relation to the world we are just now at the end of our colonial experience and at the beginning of the time when all great affairs are as a matter of course American affairs. For isolationism, as it has persisted in our day, is in essence the view of the colonial who feels that the great affairs of history are not for the likes of him, and that he must live in a world which is rule mysteriously from afar by others, who are shrewder if less righteous than he is.

An awareness that the great power we now possess is newly acquired is the best antidote we can carry about with us against our moral and political immaturity. There is no more difficult art than to exercise great power well: All the serious military, diplomatic, and economic decisions we have now to take will depend on how correctly we measure our power, how truly we see its possibilities within its limitations. That is what Germany and Japan, which also rose suddenly, did not do; those two mighty empires are in ruins because their leaders and their people misjudged their newly acquired power, and so misused it.

Our own position in the world is fully realized, and our real interests are such that they need never be hidden. But there are many pitfalls for a nation which is not yet accustomed to the exercise of great power We can be honest with ourselves, then, and recognize that nothing is so tempting as to overestimate one's own influence and to underestimate one's own responsibilities, to be more interested in the rights than in the duties of a powerful state, and like so many of the newly rich and just-arrived to be jealously fearful of losing privileges which, in fact, can in the long run be retained only by using them well. Nothing is easier, too, than to dissipate influence by exerting it for trivial or private ends, or to forget that power is not given once and forever, but that it has to be replenished continually by the effort which created it in the first place. The wisdom which may make great power beneficent can be found only with humility, and also the good manners and courtesy of the soul which alone can make great power acceptable to others.

Great as it is, American power is limited. Within its limits, it will be greater or less depending on the ends for which it is used. It is, for example, although beyond the limits of any power we possess to dictate to any one of our allies, even the smallest, how it must organize its social and economic order. We can preserve our own order if we improve so that it produces progressively that greater freedom and plenty which we believe it can produce. By proving the results, not by declaiming generalities and making threats, we can offer an example which others may wish to follow if and as they have the means to do so.

In regard to our military power, including the atomic bomb, we must have no illusions whatsoever. It is sufficient, if properly maintained, to make the United States invulnerable to conquest by any other nation. But no military power we can conceivably muster can keep us secure if we dissolve our alliances, if we provoke or permit the other great states to combine against us. Friendly and reliable neighbors on both sides of our ocean frontiers are indispensable to our security and to our peace of mind. It would be as childish as it is churlish to think that because of the atomic bomb, or the prodigious size of our industry, we can now dismiss the friends with whom we fought the good fight side by side.

Nor must we fall into the trap of imagining that the devastating power we brought to bear upon our enemies can be used to enforce our arguments with our allies. Our influence is great, perhaps leading, but it is not commensurate with the alleged fact that we possess a weapon which could theoretically kill several hundred thousand people without notice and at one blow. If we are intelligent, we shall never entertain such a monstrous delusion. We could no more use such a weapon in such a way than we could hire thugs to assassinate foreign statesmen with whom we disagreed. But if we allowed fools among us to brandish the atomic bomb with the idea that it is a political argument, we shall certainly end by convincing the rest of the world that their own safety and dignity compel them to unite against us.

Our power and influence will endure only if we measure them truly and use them for the ends that we have always avowed and can proclaim with pride. We are the latest great power developed by and committed to the tradition of the West. We are among the bearers of this tradition, and we are numbered now among its proudest defenders. That is the polestar by which we must set our course. At the center of that tradition resides the conviction that man's dignity rises from his ability to reason and thus to choose freely the good in preference to evil. We may claim without offense that this inner principle of the western tradition is not local, tribal, or national, but universal, and insofar as we are its faithful servants we shall, in learning how to use our power, win the consent of mankind.

"The Earliest Lincoln"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, in the edition of the New York Herald Tribune of May 20, 1945, appears an article on The Earliest Lincoln by Eric Underwood.

This article refers not only to Lincoln but to another great President—George Washington. In each case, the references are to places and buildings in England where relatives of the two American Presidents formerly resided.

I am told that the information concerning the ancestors of President Lincoln appears for the first time in an American publication in this particular article.

For those who are interested in the history of the Washington and Lincoln families, this article will be of particular value. I am, therefore, glad to include it with my remarks today:

"THE EARLIEST LINCOLN"—NEW MEMORIALS REPORTED IN ENGLAND OF THE ANCESTRY OF TWO GREAT PRESIDENTS

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

Ceremonies which have recently taken place in England in connection with two great Presidents of the United States and of which I have seen no account in the American press will, I think, be of interest to many readers of your great newspaper.

The first was the celebration of the anniversary of George Washington's birthday at the village of Washington, County of Durham, which has associations with the first President's ancestors. The American Ambassador was officially represented, also the United States and British Armies. Colonel Grover, of the United States Army, in his speech said: "We know what Washington would have done if he had been living today: He would have been in favor of a lasting union between the two nations."

On the same day at Durham Cathedral, a few miles away, a plaque was unveiled in the cloisters, the inscription on which runs: "Remember in these cloisters, which were finished in his day, John Washington, of this county, prior to this cathedral, 1416–1446, whose family won an everlasting name in lands to him unknown."

The second was the presentation of a deed of land transfer, executed 349 years ago, to the governors of the Sulgrave Manor Board on the lawn of George Washington's ancestral home. Attached to the deed are two seals of Robert and Laurence Washington, bearing the family coat of arms (the origin of the American national emblems), the five-pointed stars above and the red and white stripes below, and the eagle with outstretched pinions as crest. An inscription on the deed stated that it was: "Presented by members of the American armed forces in gratitude for happy and memorable visits to Sulgrave Manor as guests of the Northamptonshire Friendship Committee in cooperation with the American Red Cross."

Many thousands of American soldiers and sailors have spent their periods of leave in Northamptonshire in the last 3 years, and tours to Sulgrave Manor, personally conducted by the chief citizen of the county, have been one of the main attractions. Brig. Gen. Richard G. Tindall, military attaché to the American Embassy, presented the deed to Lord Spencer, chairman of the governors of Sulgrave Manor Board, who, in his reply, said:

"Of many great men that the Midland counties have produced, men wo have made their mark upon history, there is none of whom we are prouder than the Washingtons. They lived at Sulgrave for nearly 100 years, and, then, having unfortunately lost their money, had to sell, and one of my own ancestors, also a cousin of the Washingtons, gave them a house in the village of Brington. It was from Brington that George's great-grandfather, John Washington, emigrated to Virginia in 1657."

The third, and perhaps most interesting, in that it relates to an entirely new discovery in connection with the ancestry of Abraham Lincoln, was the presentation at the American Embassy in London of the title deeds to the ground in the village of Swanton Morley, on which once stood the house of the earliest known Lincoln. Until recently very little was known of the origins of the Lincolns. Colonel Leslie, the donor of this land, has traced a link between the Lincoln family and the Pastons, of the famous Paston Letters.

Toward the end of the fifteenth century Agnes Paston is recorded to have offered a living to Richard Lincoln. He was a grandfather of Samuel Lincoln, an apprentice to a Norwich weaver, who, in 1637, desiring to worship God in his own way and not Archbishop Laud's, took the youth to New England. There Samuel Lincoln founded the American Lincolns, who after two centuries' peregrinations in Virginia, Kentucky, and elsewhere, produced Abraham Lincoln.

The house at Swarton Morley was demolished in 1892, but its site, on which it is hoped to erect a memorial, has been definitely established by one who occupied it at the time. All that remains, two doors, have been saved from a scrap heap, and these, the only known relics of the earliest known Lincoln, will be incorporated in the memorial.

ERIC UNDERWOOD.

WILMINGTON, DEL., *May 14, 1945.*

Your AAF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the wonderful accomplishment of the Army Air Force's official radio program, Your AAF, heard at 10:30 p. m. over the American Broadcasting Co., and its network outlets, Thursdays.

Previously known as The Fighting AAF, the program consisted of a half hour presentation during which the American public was allowed to mentally go on actual bomber- and fighter-plane missions over Berlin and Tokyo. This was accomplished by having 10 teams of AAF combat reporters on the world's war fronts. These teams were equipped with Army wire-recording machines and the teams flew on actual bomber and fighter missions recording the actual sound and description of these missions as they occurred. Immediately thereafter, the recordings were flown back to the United States or short-waved here and presented on the program. This gave Americans a first-hand view of the aerial warfare carried on against the enemy. It not only familiarized them more with the job our fighting Army Air Forces had to accomplish but must have been responsible in no small way for bond sales and for the public's taking part with full heart in so many of our vital war-necessary campaigns of paper salvage, conservation of foods, contribution of blood, and so forth. This important contribution toward morale and victory is a result of the AAF's all-out effort in bringing the real picture of the war home to the public. That it was well done is attested by the fact that a silver plaque awarded the program by This Month, a national digest magazine, proclaimed Your AAF "the best and most

original radio program to come to the networks during World War II."

Now that the fighting is over and the victory won, the program has a new and equally important mission. It is dedicating itself to keeping Americans informed about our occupational Air Forces in Germany and in Japan. It is also telling the story of the maintenance and development of our postwar Air Force which is to play such a vital part in guarding and keeping the peace. I feel that the Army Air Forces deserve commendation for the manner in which they are carrying on this radio work. General of the Army H. H. Arnold and his efficient staff deserve the praise of this body for not only the excellent accomplishment of the Army Air Forces during the war—and in the era to come when they will play the more important role of guardians of the peace, but also for seeing to it that those at home are kept in touch—in this unique and original manner, with their loved ones who did the fighting and who now are in occupational capacities overseas. In addition to the aforementioned, the program has come to be considered of such importance that recordings of it are now on file in the National Archives, Washington, D. C., as a permanent record for posterity. Included among them are the voices of Generals Eisenhower, MacArthur, Arnold, Spaatz, Doolittle, and others, as well as the first broadcast from a jet plane in flight, the first from a helicopter in flight, the flier who made the final combat flight over Berlin on VE-day, the crew of the ship which released the historic atom bomb, and others of similar importance.

Again, I salute the program "Your AAF" and the persons responsible for it.

Legislative Program of the A. F. of L.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day 1945 President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, made a splendid address in Camden, N. J. In that speech President Green outlined the legislative program of the American Federation of Labor and also paid deserved tribute to the splendid record of members of organized labor both in the armed forces and in our war plants.

I believe every Member of Congress will be interested in President's Green's remarks and, hence, am inserting it in the RECORD:

Every generation produces a man with wisdom far beyond his times, whose imagination lights a beacon along the road which humanity must travel in the future. Such a man was Peter J. McGuire, the father of Labor Day, whose memory we honor today. Sixty-three years ago he conceived the idea of a truly American national holiday to pay homage to the toilers of the earth who from raw nature "have delved and carved all the grandeur we behold." This struggling carpenter glimpsed the nobility of the common man and his work, and sought to give it power and expression by joining with Samuel Gompers and other pioneers to form the American Federation of Labor. He became an official of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, one of the oldest trade unions in the Nation. Through the carpenters' union and the American Federation of Labor, of which it is a part, he won his campaign for Labor Day. There were other holidays, he said, representative of the religious, civic, and military spirit, but none representative of the industrial spirit, which he regarded as the "great vital force of the Nation." He asked that Labor Day be dedicated "to peace, civilization, and the triumphs of industry."

Standing beside Peter J. McGuire's grave, 51 years after Congress declared Labor Day a national holiday, we can find inspiration for our own future in that dedication.

For America has just won a war against war and is even now striving to forge a union of nations for the preservation of world peace.

Our country holds in its hands a secret force which can destroy all civilization if war ever again afflicts mankind, but we hope and pray that atomic power will be employed by the arts of science to lighten the burdens of humanity and usher in a new and brighter era of civilization.

The triumphs of industry which we have glorified in the past will fade into insignificance if we but capture the opportunities for peaceful expansion and development which now present themselves. We stand at the threshold of a new industrial revolution, perhaps more sweeping in its effects than the advent of the machine age and electric power. Even in our own day and with existing facilities, we can and we must raise American standards of living by at least 50 percent. Let us proclaim our determination on this Labor Day to achieve that immediate goal.

I know there are prophets of gloom who see nothing but discouragement and failure ahead. They point to the undeniable fact that America was not prepared for peace, that reconversion is proceeding too slowly, that unemployment may reach the alarming total of seven or eight million by next spring, and that Congress has not taken any steps to provide for human needs during the transition period from war to peace. On the basis of these adverse conditions, they foresee a major postwar depression.

The American Federation of Labor does not share these pessimistic views. We do not believe in crying "Fire" in a crowded theater. We do not intend to stampede the Nation into panic.

On the contrary, we have faith in America and the American people. When danger threatens, it is not the time to quit. It is the time to rally and work and fight for what we want and believe in. Just as we won the war, we will win the peace. Let that be our challenge to the future. Let us remember the inspired words of Franklin D. Roosevelt back in 1932, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." American labor will not be overcome by fear now.

The 7,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor, a confident, resolute and closely knit army of workers, have set their faces forward and are marching ahead in solid phalanx for the achievement of labor's own program which will lift the Nation out of its present, temporary difficulties and establish a progressive and prosperous postwar economy in America.

First of all, we call upon private industry in America to speed up the reconversion process and we urge the Government to give reconversion the highest priority. If that is done, as it must be done, transitional unemployment will be held to a minimum and will be of brief duration. The tremendous backlog of unfilled orders for the things the American people need and were unable to obtain during wartime should soon bring about wide expansion of peacetime production and provide a plentiful supply of jobs.

At the same time, in order to keep production going at high levels and to provide a market for consumption to match it, the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor intend to seek immediate increases in wage rates. Such action is necessary to fortify the purchasing power of the American people, which was weakened by increased living costs, by the wartime wage freeze and by postwar losses of overtime pay and incentive bonuses. There is no better market for American industry than the full pay envelope of the great masses of American workers.

Third. In order to restore collective bargaining and establish peaceful and stable labor-management relations, the American Federation of Labor intends to seek a national accord with industry at a conference to be called by President Truman in the next few weeks.

Fourth. As soon as conditions settle down and we are able to take stock of the Nation's long-range needs, the American Federation of Labor is determined to resume its drive for the shorter workweek, which will spread available employment and give the Nation's workers and their families the opportunities for healthful recreation and education which our modern civilization affords.

Fifth. The American Federation of Labor will exert all its influence when Congress returns from its vacation tomorrow, for the enactment of a "must" legislative program which we drafted and for which we have received the hearty endorsement of President Truman and all forward-looking national leaders.

This legislative program calls for the immediate passage of the Kilgore bill broadening the coverage of unemployment insurance and supplementing the inadequate compensation now offered by the States with Federal funds to provide as much as $25 a week for at least 26 weeks in any 1 year. Such a law is vitally necessary to tide over workers who have lost their war jobs until new peacetime employment is available.

Another point in our legislative program is the full-employment bill, which would set up an annual, national job budget, provide encouragement to business to meet that budget and obligate the Government to stimulate employment through useful and necessary public works if private industry falls short of the goal.

Also, we demand immediate adoption of the Wagner postwar housing bill, which would create millions of new jobs through a 10-year program of urgently needed home construction to be carried on almost entirely by private initiative.

To correct substandard conditions which are a blight on the national economy, the American Federation of Labor calls upon Congress to enact pending legislation which would lift minimum wage levels immediately to a rock bottom of 65 cents an hour and establish a 75-cent floor for hourly rates of pay in interstate industry at the end of 3 years.

Finally, we renew our appeals to Congress for action on the long-delayed Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill which would bring a stronger measure of social security to the American people by broadening the coverage of old age and survivors insurance, placing unemployment compensation on a uniform, national basis and offering the humane benefits of health insurance to the great masses of our people for the first time.

It is only to be expected that Congress may balk at some of the measures in this program. We still have too many elected representatives in our law-making body who believe this is the best of all possible worlds and nothing should be done to change it.

They profess to be concerned about the preservation of the free enterprise system but don't wish to lift a finger to save it. The American Federation of Labor is wedded to the free enterprise system too, for labor as well as for industry, but we regard it as a dynamic way of life, not as a static road block in the path of human progress. The American Federation of Labor's legislative program would not endanger free enterprise but would protect it from its own shortcomings.

We hope that private industry will face the facts as realistically as labor does. We hope that American businessmen will measure up to their own responsibility for preserving the free enterprise system by being truly enterprising, by looking forward instead of backward. A return to the good old days will not satisfy the American people. We want better days. America has the resources, the know-how, and the productive capacity to raise living standards progressively higher. Production problems have been solved. What we must do next is to master the problem of distribution. Labor points the way. By sustaining full employment at high wages, private industry can put enough purchasing power into the hands of the American people to buy the necessities and comforts of life which they need and which industry can produce. That is the only sure way private industry can save itself and the free enterprise system.

After winning a terrible war to safeguard the American way of life from external enemies, we do not believe the American people are in any mood to lose it by default to such internal enemies as hunger, unemployment, and insecurity, which always provide fertile soil for revolution.

We suggest that Congress take notice of what is happening in the wake of war in Europe and in Asia. Perhaps those developments will awaken the stand-patters to a realization that the American Government must be a government with a conscience and with a responsibility for the well-being of its citizens. Also, we hope that the prospect of going before the American people next year for reelection will spur Congress into favorable action now on the program advanced by the American Federation of Labor.

This is the first peacetime Labor Day in America in 4 years. The relief and thanksgiving we all feel, now that the devastating waste of human life and nature's resources is over, knows no bounds. Labor is entitled to celebrate the victory because the men and women of labor earned it—the hard way.

We are particularly proud of the record made by the million and a half young members of the American Federation of Labor who laid down their tools, answered their country's call, and served so gloriously in our armed forces.

We can't help boasting about the many high honors and decorations of valor bestowed by a grateful nation on our fighting fellow union members and the sons of American trade-unionists.

Especially outstanding was the record made by the Seabees, made up almost entirely of American Federation of Labor building trades and metal trades members. They were the miracle men of this war, fighting as they worked under fire, feared by the enemy and respected by other branches of our own armed forces. Also deserving of the highest commendation were the 300,000 railroad workers, serving in special battalions, who kept munitions and supplies moving efficiently only a few miles behind our invasion armies. And let us not forget the seamen of our merchant marine, members of the Seafarers International Union, who did not serve in uniform but risked their lives in transporting vitally needed war equipment across submarine infested seas.

But labor's greatest war service was performed right here at home on the production lines. Make no mistake about it—the tremendous, record-breaking volume of war production in American factories by American workers proved the decisive factor in victory. Their sweat, strain, and exhaustive effort, their skill and adaptability to new tasks and methods of production, increased the output of munitions to a peak of five and a half billion dollars worth a month, 11 times higher than it was when the war began. Efficiency of workers increased 72 percent, despite long hours and distressing living conditions in congested industrial centers. These achievements were accomplished by a voluntary army of workers—the only labor force of any nation in the war functioning without a compulsory labor draft. And they were accomplished with a minimum of interruption or delay due to strikes. Time lost due to strikes during the war amounted to only a fraction of 1 percent of the total time worked and was more than made up by extra hours put in by workers on national holidays when they remained on the job. This is the first Labor Day in 4 years which the Nation's workers have been able to celebrate in the good old way—at leisure.

Perhaps I can best illustrate labor's contribution toward ending the war sooner by telling you the dramatic story of the atomic bomb. When the scientists first perfected that new and unbelievably destructive explosive, Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson called me to the War Department for a confidential meeting. He told me that the Army had developed a new, secret weapon, the nature of which could not even be whispered, and that it was of the highest importance to get that weapon into production before any enemy power could beat us to the punch. He said two brand new plants would have to be constructed in record time, one in Tennessee and the other in the State of Washington, to produce the secret explosive. He asked whether the American Federation of Labor could supply thousands of skilled workers to go out to those remote spots to do the job.

I assured him that we could and would. Our unions, mobilized for just such war emergencies, recruited many thousands of skilled craftsmen and sent them to the sites of the two biggest construction projects in history. Through their unremitting efforts and through the cooperation of American Federation of Labor unions, which sacrificed long-standing conditions of work to expedite the job, the plants were completed on schedule. Then we supplied additional thousands of workers to produce the bombs. When those bombs hit Japan, the war ended in a few days. And the War Department, in grateful recognition of labor's vital role in the success of the atomic bomb, extended official commendation to the 18 American Federation of Labor unions whose members did the work and kept the secret.

During the last meeting of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor in Chicago, I received the following telegram from Under Secretary of War Patterson:

"Through you I want to thank all the officers and members of your building and metal trades unions who helped build and man the plants in which our atomic bombs are made. You recruited skilled mechanics from thousands of miles away to work on these projects even though we could not tell you what they were making. Now you have the reward of knowing that their efforts are making an important contribution to final victory.

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
"Under Secretary of War."

Now that the war has ended, the American Federation of Labor is determined that atomic bombs must never be used again for the wholesale slaughter of human beings. The impact of those bombs was heard around the world and struck terror into the hearts of human beings everywhere. All thinking people now realize that mankind faces the alternative of total peace or total destruction. If ever a dictator should rise to power again and threaten to engulf the world anew in aggression and war, it is unthinkable that his people would not strike him down rather than face certain annihilation.

Let it be our supreme purpose, then, to cement the bonds of the United Nations Organization and to carry out to the fullest extent the peaceful procedure for settlement of international disputes contained in the San Francisco Charter.

And let us make the most of peace by cultivating its rich opportunities and enjoying its fruits. We have the resources and the skill and the facilities with which to build a standard of living in our land far surpassing any that ever existed on earth.

It is our solemn duty to the honored dead who gave their lives to win the victory and our obligation to the living who bear on their bodies or in their hearts the scars inflicted by war to redeem the sacrifices of suffering mankind and to make good the pledges which were so freely given in the heat of conflict.

The American Federation of Labor extends a welcoming hand to the servicemen who are now returning home from overseas and will soon be resuming civilian life. We will do everything within our power to help them obtain good jobs and make a new start in life.

The brave men and women who served in uniform during the war will find that labor will support their economic and legislative aims just as consistently and effectively as we backed them up on the fighting fronts. Anyone who tries to divide labor and the veterans and set them against each other is an enemy of American democracy. For it is just as essential for labor and the veterans to stand together and work together to win the peace as it was to win the war.

The American Federation of Labor has emerged from the vicissitudes of war stronger in organization and in spirit than ever before in history. We do not intend to relinquish a single one of the gains we have won for the Nation's workers. On the contrary, we are determined to press ever forward, to complete the task of organizing the unorganized and to weld the forces of American labor into a single united whole. With your help and the assistance of the other 7,000,000 members of our great movement, we can do our part toward establishing a far richer and a far more abundant way of life here in America for all our people.

The earnest attention you have given this discussion of the grave problems confronting our country and the world convinces me of your willingness to enlist in the drive for a worth-while peace. And now, for the balance of this traditional Labor Day, let's go out and celebrate the victory of the present and the promise of the future.

Notes on Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of conferring with the owner of one of our great American textile and clothing manufacturing industries regarding the problems of reconversion. I am convinced that this man, Mr. Milton Erlinger, of the BVD Corp., views the problem of reconversion in a logical, practical, common-sense manner. While I do not agree with Mr. Erlinger on a few minor details, I find

myself in agreement on most of the important principles which he sets forth. I commend to my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following compilation, Notes on Reconversion, by Mr. Milton Erlinger, owner of the BVD Corp. of America:

I endorse the principle of the Murray full employment bill. I believe that Secretary Wallace, as usual, is correct in his over-all progressive point of view. The criticism of the NAM should be considered and industry's suggestions followed wherever possible, and certainly whenever advisable.

The amendment of one labor leader who suggests that current prevailing wages and minimum standards be required by law, and that there be no infringement on basic rights constituting economic freedom, is certainly commendable.

I believe that the principles of the full employment bill should be explored, provided we beware of the pitfalls that bring on inflation followed by deflation, and finally an enveloping interfering collectivism. Any effort that now breaks the determination to "hold the line" of the cost of living, that increases the basic current wage level, or that discourages risk capital and the modernization and rehabilitation of America's productive capacity will be fatal in its economic and political results.

So that labor does not lose its current gains especially during this period of high living costs, it is essential that the present legal or statutory minimum wage of 40 cents per hour be raised to 50 cents, the minimum established by the National War Labor Board for the cotton garment industry. The minimum wage of the great textile industry is generally 55 cents per hour and as soon as possible the ceiling prices of those industries based on the 50-cent minimum wage should be raised enough to permit the legal minimum wage to become 55 cents.

This assumes the continuance, for as long as necessary, of the Government to channel cheap materials into essential end use. If a pricing formula is used that permits the 5 cents per hour labor increase, and at the same time permits industry merely the same dollar mark-up experienced in 1943, the resulting increase in ceiling prices will be nominal and will occur at the time production starts to increase.

With war industries closing down the production of textiles and apparel of all kinds will grow, and in time the present threat of inflation in these lines will be held in check and finally mastered; until then, the War Production Board and Office of Price Administration cannot be eliminated with safety.

Every effort should be made to run as many shifts of 40 hours as possible. Work must not be spread in competitive or private industry. In time of depression or unemployment, it is particularly necessary to reduce costs and increase efficiency. The fortunate industries capable of operating on their own should be given the opportunity to help dispel depression and help bring on prosperity for all.

The Government can do much to assist in increasing exports and in helping to develop the domestic markets by making it possible to open up new rural communities, and by tax reform that induces producers to modernize their productive facilities which will lower costs. At the same time, public works and activities not suited to private industry should be started; wherever possible, private industry should be encouraged if it can furnish jobs at prevailing wage rates. Whenever necessary, private industry could be assisted somewhat in the same way that the cost of foodstuffs have been kept down by means of subsidy. In any event public works or activities should proceed provided the basis of operation is efficient.

Where war plants are shut down, the workers, if they wish it, should be transported promptly at Government expense (charged to the war effort) to peace industries that need labor.

America must have a Spartan-like view on industry.

Private industry or public works or activities must be operated competitively, efficiently, and at the lowest cost, provided the standard of living of the workers is not lowered.

Labor and industry must constantly cooperate so that their disputes are adjudicated fairly and settled without the waste of strikes, lock-outs, or violence.

In considering the problems of reconversion, I classify four kinds of production:

a. Private businesses that are able to keep a full complement of workers and succeed through their own efforts.

b. Private businesses situated the same as a but capable and desircus of immediate expansion if machinery, supplies, or credit were available.

c. Private businesses unable to run fully and take on additional labor. Assuming the industry were making or could make essential peacetime products which are in demand and were willing to operate fully without loss or adequate profit during the emergency, the Government could by subsidy assist, provided:

1. Labor be given full employment at prevailing wage rates.

2. During the emergency period no dividends on common stock nor a bonus or salaries to management not previously in existence were paid, and all profits over 2 percent or 3 percent be paid back to Government. This plan must be voluntary and should be adopted only for an industry constantly striving for lower costs and one that is, or would be, efficiently operated. Any form of subsidy is dangerous and should be adopted only after much study.

d. Public works or activities not belonging to the sphere usually operated by private capital. This comprises municipal buildings, roads, reforestation, developments like Tennessee Valley Authority or Boulder Dam, land conservation, opening up inland waterways for navigation, etc. Whenever public activities compete with private industry already operating, such as low-cost housing, private industry should be given the opportunity to do the work, provided it can meet the requirements. If private industry is unwilling or unable to proceed, then public operation should be started immediately.

Whenever the type of public work does not interfere with private business such as street paving, which previously had been done by the municipality, the work should be started promptly without reference to private industry. All workers in public works should clear through United States Employment Service.

Government-owned factory buildings and sites which cannot be sold at fair prices or leased on a fair basis to private industry for production or use should be held and used for public activities wherever possible. Where practical, they should be altered for public service and, whenever advisable, used for research or welfare projects. Altered factory buildings could be used for hospitals, convalescent homes, schools, armories, rest camps, cheap housing, etc.

The efforts of labor leaders, Senator WAGNER, and other politicians who advocate at this time higher than current wages and who may demand shorter hours in order to spread work will not only feed inflation now but will force a much greater deflation. Just as soon as America enters into commercial competition with other producing nations, unit costs will undoubtedly be so high that private industry will be unable to produce at prices low enough to compete in the world's markets. The result will force upon the United States of America a form of collectivism with Government planning which, in the end, will probably force down the standard of living of all Americans and irreparably injure our economic system.

We are at the crossroads. The alternative is the quick expansion of public works to construct long-needed public improvements and at the same time encourage and assist private industry to produce at as low a cost as possible. At the same time the selling prices of the necessities of life must be held down. Every effort should be made to plan for expanding markets for American low-unit-cost production.

To prevent inflation now, and later a disastrous deflation, we Americans must now pull in another notch in our belts, get down to work and produce in an efficient manner which will permit our expanding and holding international trade in the postwar markets of the world long after the present international economic instability has been eliminated. Any public work which cannot effectively and efficiently be performed by private industry should be immediately started by the Government to furnish jobs, and be run as efficiently as possible, and any loss therefrom charged against the war effort. Let us not prevent private industry from blazing the way for a permanent high standard of living in America, which can only be done on an ever-increasing scale by risk capital backing private industry.

Private industry, supported by private capital, cannot survive with collectivism that forces high costs and inefficient production. Private industry, when efficient and permitted to expand, can live alongside of public works, constructing needed improvements which will be helpful to a higher standard of living, and at the same time give employment at prevailing wages to those workers who cannot, at the time, be absorbed into private industry.

Technology, modern machinery, and low-cost production will be able to lead America "to the land of Canaan." Private industry cannot do it alone. The Government must assist, and labor and the farmer cooperate.

The success of the United Nations in the development of currency stabilization, minimum labor standards, freedom of the seas and air lanes, and, if possible, the flexible reciprocal customs tariff would help bring on world prosperity over a long period, in which America would participate.

It is desirable during the emergency that the WPB issue priorities so that reconversion projects cooperating to make jobs may obtain materials and machinery with the least delay. Loans carrying low interest rates should be available.

In summary, at the risk of being repetitious, I suggest that all who have the economic welfare of this country at heart to:

1. Request Congress to raise the present minimum wage from 40 cents to the current minimum wage of 50 cents as established by the NWLB in the cotton garment industry.

2. Request Congress to increase the minimum to not over 55 cents within 12 months.

3. Request that Congress instruct OPA to permit ceiling increases to absorb the 5 cents per hour increase in industries heretofore operated on the 50-cent minimum.

4. Hold firmly against further price increases. Hold the line until the production of essentials increases. Within 12 months the current acute threat of inflation will be relieved.

5. Leave maximum hours at 40 hours with time and one-half for overtime. Any "spread the work" philosophy is defeatist, creates high costs, and is inflationary and advances economic suicide.

6. Insist on continuance of WPB and OPA efforts until production increases to assure the breaking of the current threat of higher living costs, provided only those controls continue that channel materials to the lower and most essential end use price lines, and

by means of priorities permit the manufacturer of essential items to obtain these materials. The ceiling price of such essentials must be held firm during the change to the 50-cent minimum wage base and later adjusted to the 50-cent base.

7. Back efforts to push research and to reduce the costs by scientific means and by the improvement of technology.

8. Back efforts to adjust taxes to induce risk capital to invest in new industry and to encourage industry to modernize their productive capacity.

9. Back efforts to increase consumer markets, the utilization and colonization of waste lands, the continuation of soil conservation, the opening of river navigation, the harnessing of our great water systems, the continuance of reforestation, and the controls thereof, the building up of farm communities and small business, and the continuance of more developments like TVA and Boulder Dam.

10. Back efforts to obtain export markets with special emphasis on a proper philosophy with regard to tariff, having in mind the post-emergency period when the supply has caught up with the world demand, and modern machinery production has developed in other nations whose standards of living will probably remain proportionately lower than the American standards.

11. Finally, back the philosophy of cooperation of industry and labor in a system of modern and enlightened capitalism where fair profits are desired and the Federal Government is in the center as mediator of disputes and where there is an agreed-upon code of management and labor rights established and where both management and labor recognize that the public welfare is paramount.

I have just read the newspaper report of an eminent labor leader who is reported proposing that work hours should be shortened in industry whenever technological improvements make it appear that production might outstrip workers' ability to buy what they had helped produce. If no effort were made to win increased markets made possible by lower costs, or build up new and additional domestic and international consumer markets which can be done in various ways, I would agree; but in agreement, I would recognize that the evolution of our economic system had stopped, that progess were at an end, and that without progress only economic backsliding and a lower standard of living would occur, with the probable result that we would have forced upon us a form of collectivism which would rob us of our liberty of action and freedom from governmental bureaucracy which all Americans who are not "fellow travelers" hate.

The Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 9, 1945:

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

The first demand in the President's 21-point program as laid down to Congress is that the Murray-Patman Full Employment Act be passed. The President does not, to be sure, mention the bill by name. He merely calls for full employment legislation. His past utterances, however, make it clear that he had the Murray-Patman measure in mind.

Just what does this bill, now in committee, provide? Just how far does it go to guarantee employment for 60,000,000 workers, or for any other number?

The answer is that the Murray-Patman bill does not provide directly for any jobs at all. It merely declares a national policy and provides for the preparation of an annual national budget of employment and production. It provides for an annual report on the state of the Nation's business, which may give to Congress the basis for legislation, constructive or otherwise, to bolster employment if the need arises.

The bill declares that it is "the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise" and to assure sufficient employment opportunities to all Americans able to work and seeking work. To the end that Congress may know conditions, it provides for a periodic inventory and forecast of the Nation's economic trends. The annual report must estimate the total number of persons seeking work, must figure what it will take in capital and production to provide full employment, and must predict to what extent private enterprise will, unaided and undirected, provide employment.

After Congress has received the report, what Congress shall do is absolutely up to Congress. There is no suggestion in the bill of a pattern for Congress to follow. There is no suggestion of how a single job can be created in the event the estimates indicate probable unemployment.

Reaction to the bill has been varied, even among persons with like backgrounds. Some support it as a complete answer to the Nation's work problem. Others support it as merely the basis on which something they hope will be sound can be based. Some object to it as the beginning of a "government in business." Others object to it because it provides for nothing but statistics.

Separated from its political implications, the bill seems to be merely an honest attempt to provide for continuing reports on the state of employment opportunities, provided in much the same fashion (and with many of the same risks) that government has long used in its crop forecasts and similar statistical material.

That the President believes the bill would be the basis for meeting postwar unemployment is evident when he not only puts it at the top of his program but writes "must" after it.

WPB Chemicals Head Pays Tribute to Industry—Letter by Dr. Whitman to Distillers at War's End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Walter G. Whitman, Director, Basic Chemicals Division, War Production Board:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1945.

GENTLEMEN: Victory over Japan completes the war job of supplying industrial alcohol and advances the date when order M-69 can be revoked. We are now planning to cancel this order at the end of August.

Barring unforeseen contingencies, the War Production Board will cease its control over the facilities of registered distilleries after August 31. Such amounts of industrial alcohol as may be needed thereafter from registered distilleries by the Office of Defense Supplies can be secured under voluntary contracts between the distillers and Defense Supplies.

It is fitting to note at this time the vital contribution which you and your personnel have made to victory. From Pearl Harbor to VJ-day registered distillers will have supplied to Government about 750,000,000 gallons of 190 proof alcohol. Most of this alcohol has been used for rubber. Some has been sent to our war allies and some has been used for the production of smokeless powder and other direct war material.

Synthetic rubber production did not start in any significant volume until the spring of 1943. By that time it had been possible to accumulate over 100,000,000 gallons of alcohol in Government stocks in preparation against any contingency. Fortunately for the war program, the new Government butadiene plants operated by Carbide and Carbon Chemicals at Institute and Louisville and by Koppers at Kobuta, proved highly successful and produced consistently at 180 percent of rated capacity when required. Fortunately also, the alcohol for their operation at these unexpectedly high rates was always fully available. Although the predicted alcohol usage for rubber had originally been only 200,000,000 gallons per year, 330,000,000 gallons were consumed in 1944, and for the 4 months of May, June, July, and August 1944 more than a million gallons a day were used by the rubber program. The total alcohol for rubber by the end of this month will be about 640,000,000 gallons, corresponding to the production of about 900,000 long tons of Buna S type synthetic rubber.

It will be recalled that production of butadiene for Buna S by petroleum processes, which was originally scheduled to carry the lion's share of the load, was much less than planned, partly because plant completions were delayed and partly because the tremendous requirement for aviation gasoline took raw materials which were needed for rubber. Alcohol-butadiene without doubt saved the rubber program from disaster in the critical years of 1943 and 1944. And success in producing synthetic rubber was essential to victory.

I want to express sincere appreciation, both personally and for the War Production Board, for your magnificent accomplishments in the service of the Nation in its time of peril.

Sincerely,

WALTER G. WHITMAN,
Director, Basic Chemicals Division.

Stop the Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the latest slogan on Capitol Hill is "There will always be an America if we don't give it away." I understand we have already given $29,000,000,000 in lend-lease to Britain since 1941; Russia, $10,000,000,000; France, $510,000,000; China, $362,000,000. The administration is now proposing an UNRRA program to take the place of lend-lease. It is time to call a halt on these hand-outs to foreign coun-

tries. Only surplus food stocks should be given to the starving nations abroad.

I have just received a letter from a private who is stationed in Calcutta, India, which describes some of the waste going on in India:

CALCUTTA, INDIA *September 1, 1945.*

Representative LANDIS: Enclosed find clipping of July 17, as well as snapshot of yourself and item in regard to misuse and waste to which much of the equipment of war is being put. I noted especially what you said about these 148 trucks and the fact that the country was badly in need of trucks for civilian activity. Well, sir, for your information this is only a very small part of the waste of Government property, particularly trucks, vehicles, tires, and many items needed at home. There is right here in this city well over 20,000 trucks of all sizes, lying in piles, unassembled and rotting in the crates. In spite of this, since August 15th, the date of Jap surrender, trucks, vehicles, tires and heavy engineering equipment have been continually unloaded in a constant stream. All warehouses are full, and still the material is being unloaded. I ask you, sir, Why this should be? Particularly in view of the fact, as we have been informed, very little of this material is scheduled for return to the States. Some of it will be sold over here, it is true, but the buying power of this country (civilian and government) is not such as to pay any value for them. Further, there are few roads on which to use them. In fact, it is freely expressed by many that they will be destroyed on the spot or sold as junk. For the benefit of our country, it would be advisable that our Congress stop this waste of our American equipment and have as much of it as possible returned to our country for use at home, where we need it. If nothing else can be done with them, I'm sure most veterans would be very glad to accept one as a gift on discharge. In fact, you can put me down for a 3-ton job. Thanking you for the interest shown in this matter and wishing you success in obtaining good results, I am

Yours respectfully,

_____.

P. S.—This is only a small lot of equipment. Look around. There is lots more. Notice tires (for civilians) are same as August rations. There are warehouses full here and elsewhere.

Return of Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, yesterday before 500,000 people on Monument Grounds on the occasion of the triumphal return of Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, the hero of Corregidor, Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, who was in Bataan and Corregidor with General Wainwright, delivered the address of welcome. Today's Washington Post, reporting the speech, said:

Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines and himself a veteran of Bataan and Corregidor, told, in a voice taut with emotion, the travail of the defenders of the Manila fortress. His vivid word picture of American fighting men and their leader trapped in hopeless isolation on Corregidor, brought lumps to the throats of the audience and tears to the eyes of Mrs. Wainwright.

In respectful silence the crowd listened as ROMULO said:

"No chief of any command ever faced greater tragedy. He was the emblem of our defeat."

The New York Times said:

Mrs. Wainwright broke down and sobbed as Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, who was with General Wainwright on "The Rock," vividly described how Wainwright conducted himself during the terrible days before the Japanese overwhelmed him.

The New York Herald Tribune said:

Mrs. Wainwright, who had remained composed throughout the earlier proceedings, wept openly when Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, made a highly moving address. Referring to General Wainwright as the "emblem of our defeat," he said, "This man, this American eagle taken captive, is now our emblem of unceasing watchfulness and our standard for the eternal battle for universal peace and security." General Romulo pointed out that through "surrender, he won this war—through his delaying action on Bataan, he speeded forward the coming of VJ-day."

General ROMULO's speech, which expresses the feeling of every Member of this House, follows:

We who last saw General Wainwright within the tunnel of Corregidor saw a leader bent under the tragedy of impending doom, a man left holding in his helpless hand the honor of America.

He could not hold.

No chief of any command ever faced greater tragedy. General Wainwright surrendered in the name of the greatest, the richest, the most powerful, the freest nation in all the world and in all history, because that nation was equally helpless to aid him.

He was the emblem then of our defeat.

This man, this American eagle taken captive, is now our emblem of unceasing watchfulness and our standard for the eternal battle for universal peace and security. Let us thus remember him for the rest of our human history as the symbol of vigilance and of victory.

Without his sacrifice we could not have been stimulated toward so glorious and swift an end. Without that haunting picture of a heroic man bent under grief in a rock tunnel in the Philippines, under a single swinging electric bulb that lighted the damp walls, and his bleak look that saw so much ahead of horror and hopelessness, we would not have shared his struggle with so high a sense of dedication.

Do not doubt that even then he saw ahead this inevitable victory of justice. He was an American officer in that hour that was the blackest in the history of the United States, he was patriot and soldier, and he refused rescue and liberty to make that last stand on Corregidor and share torture with his men, knowing what it meant for himself in personal suffering but knowing, too, what his sacrifice would teach Americans who were safe and secure when they learned the full story of that tragedy of Corregidor.

Through surrender he won this war. Through his delaying action on Bataan he speeded forward the coming of VJ-day, the last day of the earth's longest and most terrifying struggle for freedom.

Bataan was his heroism, and his martyrdom was Corregidor. Heroism and martyrdom are combined in the person of this single man.

General Wainwright could not hold Corregidor, but he could hold fast to the standards of American decency, American honor, and American courage. Not once did he let the standards down; not even under Japanese torture did he let America down. Without his personal suffering, our victory would be less satisfying and less triumphant. He was America on that bitter rock in Manila Bay. Now in this hour of flying flags and triumphant drums, he is the vindication of our democracy. He is your America and my America set free.

A $25 Maximum for Jobless Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 8, 1945:

A $25 MAXIMUM FOR JOBLESS PAY?

The President, in his 21-point program to speed recovery, asks that the maximum of unemployment compensation be raised to $25 a week for the whole country, that the period of eligibility be everywhere 26 weeks and that employment offices, formerly under State jurisdiction, remain under Federal control until June 30, 1947. He feels that all this is necessary to prevent want during the reconversion period. So far as the raise in jobless pay is concerned, he has enthusiastic support from labor.

Congress has been cool to these proposals and with good reason. It is true, of course, that weekly compensation maximums now vary from State to State but, at least to a degree, these variations correspond with local needs. Here in Wisconsin, for example, the maximum is $20 for 20 weeks. After January 1, it will be $20 for 23 weeks.

When it is realized that Wisconsin set up unemployment compensation purely as a transitional aid for unavoidable idleness in going from one job to another, both the amount and the period seem adequate. Wisconsin has felt all along, and rightly, that if unemployment is of long duration or if the family situation is unusual, the problem is one of relief and not one of compensation.

The Federal idea inclines toward making compensation a substitute for relief. The danger in that idea is that, if the compensation approaches the subsistence level, many will choose to continue unemployed for the maximum possible period.

A major problem at this time is to reconvert to peacetime production as rapidly as possible. To meet that problem, both industry and labor must cooperate. Any development which would encourage choosiness among workmen must slow down the makeover of plants to the new order.

Increase in unemployment pay maximums and lengthening of the period of coverage might well lead hundreds of thousands of idle employees to stay idle to the moment when hardship appears, which might be 3 or 5 or 6 months from now.

The Federal Government, it would seem, has plenty to do to take care of veterans and its own employees during the transition period. It had best leave unemployment compensation for those now covered to the several States, which have approached the matter with realism if not always with absolute justice.

Also, the Government had best return employment offices to the States, which are in a position to meet local conditions far better than the central government, and which can presumably be depended on to cooperate with the Federal people in meeting interstate problems.

Community Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 10, 1945

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of the unanimous consent granted by the House, it gives me great pleasure to include herein an article that appeared in the Prattville Progress, of Prattville, Ala., of August 16, 1945.

This article tells only part of the story. While it commends the superintendent and his official family, each of whom is deserving of the commendation, space limitations of the paper forbid giving credit to all of those who have made this achievement possible by their cooperation, loyalty, and patriotic service.

What has beer accomplished at Prattville redounds to the credit of the individual men and women who compose the splendid personnel of the Prattville Gin Co.—officials as well as the rank and file.

WAR PRODUCTION RECORD PRATTVILLE PLANT AMONG BEST IN ENTIRE NATION

All of Prattville and Autauga County are proud of the record made by the Prattville plant of the Continental Gin Co. in war production during the years when America went "all out" for the war effort.

Following a request from the War Department, the Continental Gin Co. lost no time in converting approximately 75 percent of the maximum production of their local plant to production of bombs for both the Navy and the Army.

On critical items the local plant consistently exceeded its quota, and, during 1 month of the past year, led the entire Nation on percentage of production on contract by the larger industries. Since the first of the year, with the War Department not permitting production over the amount of contract, the local plant has reached its quota every month.

Among the "packages from heaven" which helped bring victory to the Allies were Prattville-made bombs, including more than 2,000,000 fragmentation or antipersonnel bombs, close to half a million 100-pound chemical bombs, and 100,000 rocket bombs.

And, in addition to producing these bombs, the local plant has taken care of the emergency needs of the thousands of owners of Continental Gin machinery.

One especially gratifying feature of production in the local plant is the smoothness with which labor and management have worked together. There have been no serious differences, or at least those differences have been settled without a public airing of grievances.

Another advantage enjoyed by the Prattville plant is that many of its operatives were born and reared in Prattville, have been with the gin plant for years, and that the plant superintendent, Mr. Alpheus Powell, grew up with those who work in the plant. Notwithstanding the fact that he is called Alpheus by many gin-plant workers who've known him all his life, he has the admiration and respect of every worker, and his ability and tireless energy have meant much to the success of the plant.

Another advantage of the local organization was the fact that men, trained by years of experience in the plant, and known and respected by the operatives, were in charge of these various departments. These foremen are as follows: Mr. J. W. Rice, general foreman; Mr. Gordon Vinson, plant engineer; Mr. Jasper Buckner, assistant to superintendent; Mr. A. C. Anderson, foreman, machine shop; Mr. F. O. Garthright, foreman, tool room; Mr. A. B. Colley, foreman, sheet-metal department; Mr. J. D. Anderson, foreman, millwright; Mr. C. M. Carwile, foreman, bomb assembly; Mr. T. J. Hinton, foreman, assembly; Mr. W. J. Johnson, foreman, assembly; Mr. W. M. McHarg, foreman, assembly; Mr. J. G. McCrary, foreman, painting and crating; Mr. S. J. Weldon, foreman, saw department; Mr. J. H. Narramore, foreman, pattern shop; Mr. W. H. Hunt, foreman, shipping; Mr. Herbert Powell, foreman, fabricating; Mr. Floyd Smith, chief inspector; Mr. H. D. Murphree, inspector.

For a Palestine State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of August 18, 1945:

FOR A PALESTINE STATE

President Truman advocated to Britain's representatives at the Potsdam Conference the establishment of a Jewish national state in British-mandated Palestine. He urged the resettlement there of as many Jews as is consistent with the maintenance of civil peace. This is the first forthright enunciation of policy by this Government on that controversial question. For though the late President Roosevelt made clear that the United States did not approve the British white paper of 1939, which limited and ultimately stopped Jewish immigration to Palestine, his administration refrained from any definite policy. The State Department held that the matter must be treated during the war on the basis of military expediency.

The President's stand, now publicly announced, looking to the fulfillment of the Balfour Declaration's promise of a Jewish national state, is the only one which Americans, in all conscience, could approve. The consensus here is, we believe, that the white paper was wrong, was an expedient of appeasement, and should now be corrected. This is the time to correct it. This Nation, moreover, is directly concerned because of its adherence to the Balfour Declaration embodied in the mandate granted to Great Britian by the League of Nations in 1917, an adherence specifically backed by congressional resolution. The fact that its fulfillment has been delayed and, in the turmoil of the last few years, jeopardized has dismayed men of good will here as elsewhere.

The Palestinian problem is not just a British or a British and Jewish and Arab concern. It is a problem for the United Nations. No settlement of the peace can be complete without a decision on the future of Palestine. The trusteeship system projected by the United Nations organization would seem to provide both the agreement on principle and the machinery for a decision that can be acceptable both to the Jews and to the Arabs. The problem is not insoluble. The pressure of Jewish millions which frightens the Arab people may well be a chimera; for to many of even the uprooted refugees of Europe the call back home will doubtless prove stronger than the call of a strange and unfamiliar land.

It is both hopeful and healthful that the President has posed the issue and clarified this Nation's stand upon it.

What Real Americans Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of Congress, one of the greatest pleasures I enjoyed was attending the fiftieth wedding anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. Ad V. Coppedge, of Grove, Okla. Mr. Coppedge was for many years a district judge in my congressional district. He has been a resident of the community in which he lives for more than half a century. He is a lawyer of more than ordinary ability. He has always enjoyed the reputation of being honest and fearless and, as district judge, he bore a most enviable reputation and the admiration of the bar and the public generally.

Judge Coppedge is a life-long Democrat, but has always impressed me as one who placed patriotism and his love for American ideals above partisanship. His philosophy of life is homely, but always fundamentally sound and American.

I am just in receipt of a letter from Judge Coppedge, which is characteristic of his thinking. It coincides with the thinking of literally hundreds of others in our part of the country and expresses sentiments which I heard spoken by my constituents while I was home during the month of August. It states what real Americans think. I am honored to present the same as a noble expression of that which more of us should be thinking and saying. Judge Coppedge's letter follows:

GROVE, OKLA., *August 28, 1945.*
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I hold no official position at this time except member of the tire rationing board for 3 years—just a private citizen and a country lawyer. My opinion and my judgment may not be worth anything at all to you or anybody else. You are my Congressman and I am your constituent, and most humbly crave your pardon for trespassing upon your time. To use a slang expression, "I want to get it out of my system."

Many questions are to come before Congress and before the American people for determination and solution. Recently I read an excerpt from the English statesman Burke, wherein he was discussing the position of a representative under a democratic government. Years ago I had occasion to study that question and reached the conclusion, the same conclusion that Burke has reached, that finally the representative should use his own judgment and abide by his own conscience rather than yield to any kind of pressure group.

The danger to this Government of ours, if it is ever destroyed, will not come from outside enemies but as a result of our own mismanagement and miscalculations, and I believe the greatest menace at the moment might be called pressure groups, you know what that means.

One of the evident things coming up is that everybody who is on the payroll wants to stay on and a lot of folks not on the pay roll want to get on it. All of them, maybe I

should not say all, but the greater percent want their pay and salary increased. This applies to the old-age group, to the union labor organization, and others, which also, of course, would apply to great business corporations who want to secure more money for their products. In my judgment instead of trying to keep everybody on the pay roll and increase their salary or wages, it looks to me as though the problem there is to reduce the number of people holding Government jobs and to hold the compensation down to its present level or even lower it in many instances. This is a vicious circle. Labor organizations demanding more pay and the employers demanding more for their products and using the increased costs as one of the arguments and the employees want more pay because the price of the products has been raised. To yield to this vociferous demand, in my opinion, means a wild period of inflation with depreciation in value of property and the breaking of thousands of men and women who have a small amount of property and a modest income. I cannot follow all the New Deal. Most of these things have been tried elsewhere, probably hundreds of years ago. There is merit in a substantial portion of these so called New Deal measures.

Speaking generally and broadly, I cannot approve of the doctrine of scarcity, restricted production, either on the farms or in the factories; I believe in a doctrine of abundance. In the last 30 years there has grown up an expression of overproduction. I doubt if there is such an animal. The world needs many, many things. The fault lies not with so-called overproduction but with the poor distribution. I cannot see any overproduction for many years to come, and to hamper and limit and restrict activity, in my opinion, is a grave mistake. Nor can I approve the paying of people not to work, but to remain idle. Even a great country cannot forever go into this without disaster. I have fought poverty and debt for 50 years, and it is evident that one cannot get out of debt by going in more all the time. This finally registered in my mind, and I liquidated my indebtedness as of the last 2 years, and had but little left—this is personal and you may ignore this part of the letter.

If we are to learn anything from history, all history demonstrates one vital principle, and that principle may be expressed in two words, "Avoid extremes," and yet men in the House of Representatives and in the Senate and even Presidents and leaders in Government and elsewhere apparently have never learned that principle. I can illustrate what I mean by a crude statement. In the old days when the doctors used whisky for the treatment of sick people—I knew an old boy who suggested to the doctor that he probably should prescribe whisky for him—I heard the story of a doctor being called upon to treat a sick woman; he left a pint of whisky and told the husband to administer it sparingly, a teaspoon every 2 or 3 hours as a stimulant. The night of that day—it was in the old "horse and buggy" days—the husband came with a lathered horse to the doctor's house to get him to go back and see his wife, that she was about to die. The doctor did, and inquired of the husband what went with the whisky, and he said, "Doctor, it is my idea that if a little whisky scattered along did some good, a lot of whisky would be a better thing, and I gave her the whole bottle." What the country needs is moderation and toleration and men with nerve and courage enough to buck these pressure groups.

There is much to-do about the returning soldier. I have a son and a grandson, just a baby 18 years old, in the Navy and has been for a year. My older boy, 49, is an expert in a certain line of work and actually wanted to get into the Navy and did. Where either a man or woman is crippled or their health becomes impaired by reason of their military service, there is no argument, that is a Government obligation but just why a man 21, 22, 25, or 30 years old, 6 feet 1 inch, weighing 180 pounds, in splendid health should be paid for doing nothing, I cannot follow that line of reason.

One more proposition and I will close this rather sketchy letter. Some years ago I was talking to a close friend of mine who was really radical—sure enough radical. I made this statement in substance, that any young man and woman, married, can do what our forefathers did—go out into the woods in any county in Oklahoma or elsewhere, get hold of a piece of land and make the grade if they are willing to undergo the necessary hardships. My father and mother did that, hundreds and thousands of them did it. He could not answer the question; the only thing he could say was that they did not have the land to start with. Understand, Congressman, I am not advocating that, just using it as an illustration, to meet the continuous discussion about everybody is entitled to a job. There is no scarcity of work, there is plenty to do, always has been and always will be, and when a man says he cannot find anything to do, he means that he cannot find a job that exactly suits him and with as much pay as he wants. That is another delusion about this proposition of work.

Thirty years ago President Taft, not a popular President but I had great admiration for him, made a public address and in the address made a statement that instead of the citizenry making demands of the Government, they should contribute to the support of the Government. I am inclined to the view that there is a lot of merit in that philosophy.

With all good wishes,

Truly yours,

AD V. COPPEDGE.

Socializing Real Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial entitled "Socializing Real Estate," which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., Wednesday, September 5, 1945:

SOCIALIZING REAL ESTATE

Why in the name of all that is logical and sound, Federal officials should stubbornly refuse to give the green light to home building when so many other wartime controls are being lifted is beyond the comprehension of the ordinary observer.

It is proposed in Washington that L-41, the War Production Board regulation which rations materials, be lifted for practically all types of construction except housing. The bureaucrats profess to see inflation if Americans are given back their inherent and time-honored right to build themselves homes in which they and their families can live in comfort and security.

One would think that housing would have been the first field in which the go-ahead order would be given after the end of the war. We have been told repeatedly of the great marvels that the postwar home would have, but now it appears that we are to have the marvels and no place to put them.

The housing shortage in the United States is tremendous and dismaying. The public tolerated it during the war because housing materials and construction labor were needed for war purposes, but now that need is ended.

The bureaucrats, for reasons of their own, do not want to encourage the building of homes. It is suspected that they want to hold all wartime controls over housing production, plus some new ones that will give the Government a firmer grip on the private lives of American citizens. Not only is a primary need of the Nation being shunted aside, but it is even proposed that sales prices on houses be controlled and that a new type of permit system for building houses shall be installed which would require a Federal permit from Washington for every single house built in the United States. Plans for every house would be submitted to bureaucrats in Washington or in the field and the exact sales price of the house would be determined by the Federal Government.

The result, obviously, would be chaos in the real-estate field and the judgment of local experts, who have given the greater part of their lives to the real estate profession, would be subordinated to that of some callow chair-warmer in a Washington office.

A deluge of telegrams to President Truman, John W. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and to the Massachusetts Members of Congress might help to bring a little common sense into the situation. As matters stand now, there isn't any.

Just How Much Sugar Was Allocated to the Distilled Spirits Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I assume that most Members of Congress received letters of protest against the allocation of sugar to the distilled-spirits industry, especially in the canning season when sugar was in short supply. Pamphlets and circulars reached my desk, indicating that huge amounts of sugar, running into millions of pounds, had been allocated for this purpose. Accordingly, to ascertain the facts about this matter I addressed the following letter to the Secretary of Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1945.

Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have received many letters, circulars, and pamphlets protesting the allocation of sugar to the distilled-spirits industry at a time when sugar is in such short supply for domestic canning, and other industrial uses.

Can you advise me what allocations of sugar, if any, have been made to the distilled-spirits industry for beverage purposes?

Sincerely,

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

On July 24, 1945, I received the following reply:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 24, 1945.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DIRKSEN: This is in reply to your letter of July 11, 1945, relative to the allocation of sugar to the distilled-spirits industry.

No sugar has been allocated to distillers of industrial alcohol for the manufacture of beverage alcohol in connection with the July

liquor holiday. No sugar was allocated previously for this use during August 1944 and January 1945 when adequate stocks of industrial alcohol made possible the release of these facilities for the production of beverage alcohol.

Producers of other alcoholic beverages, such as wines, are permitted to use sugar only if they used it in 1941. Allotments of sugar for this use have been sharply reduced by the Office of Price Administration. During the third quarter of 1945 their allotments will be approximately 37 percent smaller than in the third quarter of 1944, and equal to 50 percent of their 1941 use.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON ANDERSON,
Secretary.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an article from the Louisville Times, dated July 21, 1945, which contains a direct quotation from Mr. Stewart Berkshire, Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, on this subject and which also contains authoritative figures on the use of grain in the distilling industry:

OFFICIAL REFUTES CLAIM SUGAR USED IN WHISKY

(By Lorenzo Martin)

WASHINGTON, July 21.—"Sugar is not used in distillation of any kind of whisky and Federal regulations provide that whisky must be made of grains without any other ingredient," Stewart Berkshire, Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue with supervision over the Alcohol Tax Unit, advised the Times today.

This statement was obtained from the Federal authority having direct supervision over all licensed production of distilled spirits as reports were in circulation at the Capitol of a concerted Nation-wide drive by a secret prohibition group allegedly seeking to capitalize on the sugar and corn shortages by circulating reports that the beverage distilling industry is largely responsible for the inadequate supply of these products.

"Complaints against licensed whisky distillers on the ground that they consume sugar are without foundation, as they do not use it, and never have used it," said Berkshire. He pointed out that distillates manufactured from fruits must be designated as brandies; distillates from molasses or sugar as rum; and distillates of grains as whisky.

Figures obtained from the Internal Revenue Bureau today show the grain and grain products used at registered distilleries during the last fiscal years. These figures show that during the 1944 fiscal year, less than 2,733,000 bushels of corn were used in all of the Nation's registered distilleries, out of a total corn crop during the 1944 calendar year of 3,228,361,000 bushels. Corn used by distilleries, in other words, represented considerably less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the crop.

During the 1943 fiscal year, however, the largest amount of corn used at registered distilleries during more than a decade was recorded, and yet that figure was only 42,917,254 bushels as compared with a total 1943 corn crop of 3,076,159,000 bushels, and represented only one-seventieth of that year's crop.

None of this corn, moreover, was used in production of whisky, as all beverage distilling had been suspended throughout that fiscal year and all registered distilleries had turned their entire facilities over to production of war alcohol.

The corn used in manufacture of war alcohol during the 1943 fiscal year came chiefly from the Commodity Credit Corporation and was regarded as surplus or more urgently needed for war alcohol than for any other purpose.

During the 9 years prior to United States entry in the present war, the average consumption of corn by registered distilleries was 21,088,000 bushels annually, while the country's average corn crop during the same 9-year period was 1,733,000,000 bushels, or more than 82 times the amount consumed by distilleries. During some of these years, moreover, there were large surpluses in the corn crop, and the use of corn in distillation of whisky provided an additional market which was welcomed by growers and economic authorities.

Following are official figures showing by years the amount of corn used by registered distilleries and the Nation's total corn crop: 7,835,666 bushels used at registered distilleries out of a total crop of 1,448,920,000 bushels in 1934; 18,222,666 out of 2,299,363,000 in 1935; 29,288,115 out of 1,505,689,000 in 1936; 32,698,074 out of 2,642,978,000 in 1937; 16,448,145 out of 2,548,753,000 in 1938; 15,289,599 out of 2,580,912,000 in 1939; 16,467,918 out of 2,462,320,000 in 1940; 20,279,224 out of 2,675,790,000 in 1941; 33,554,884 out of 3,131,518,000 in 1942; 42,917,255 (all for war alcohol) out of 3,076,159,000 in 1943; and 2,732,226 out of 3,228,361,000 in 1944.

An Information Section in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the State Department intends to create within itself an Information Section recognizes a need which has long been apparent to many responsible American military and diplomatic representatives overseas.

The dynamic participation of the United States in the affairs of the world, which is an inevitable and essential consequence of victory and peace, can be richly aided through the facilities of such an organization.

The policies, foreign and domestic, of the United States, which are the foundation of our participation in the affairs of the world, must be projected to, and comprehended by, the peoples of the world in order to make our participation fully effective. Frictions, which often are caused by misunderstandings and which lead to war, can be avoided, or lessened, by an understanding abroad of America.

The projection of such American policies and American ideals, unless professionally conducted by an organization devoting its full time and energy to this task, is subject to the hazards of local distortion by other governments—or groups—pursuing their own national destinies. Commercial news agencies, which collect and distribute news for profit, should not, in the interest of maintaining a free press, be expected or required to serve as an organ of this Government for such a purpose. Nor is the device of attaching press secretaries to our embassies and legations adequate in view of the vastly expanded requirements for world-wide projection of America.

Members of the Congress certainly believe that a truthful understanding of the mind and soul of America by the peoples of the world will greatly contribute to the maintenance of world peace and will work toward the ultimate good of all mankind. In that belief, the Congress should support the creation of this new organization and should appropriate the required funds for its proper operation. Although this new organization is an administrative function within the State Department, the Congress may very properly take cognizance of its personnel and policies. As an organ of this Government it is accountable to the people and to the Congress of the United States.

No one should be indifferent to the dangers of creating such an organization. Many of the mistakes made by the former Office of War Information will serve as examples of such dangers so that those same mistakes need not be repeated in the future. Proper choice of personnel for the new agency will avoid many of the faults of that wartime bureau. Constant supervision by the public and the Congress of the policies of the agency will go far to prevent new errors. It should be clear, however, that the greatest danger lies not in any minor mistakes which may be made by such an organ, but in the lack of having any organ through which, officially and accurately, this Government may inform the world effectively and constantly exactly where the United States stands on any international question, and what are its determined policies.

Celebration of Army Air Force Day at Scott Field, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 11, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to have been a guest at the celebration of Army Air Force Day at Scott Field, Ill., on August 1, 1945. I was deeply impressed with the program arranged for the occasion.

I was also impressed with the spirit of cooperation by the military authorities at Scott Field and local authorities in the surrounding communities. The commanding officer at Scott Field, Col. Neal Creighton, in a few months has done much to promote this splendid spirit.

His work has created considerable good will among the community officials to the extent that there has been many testimonials from them in tribute to Colonel Creighton's efforts.

I herewith include with my remarks a resolution adopted by the Belleville Rotary Club and letters addressed to Colonel Creighton by the Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois; the Hon-

orable John T. Connors, mayor of East St. Louis, Ill.; and the Honorable O. W. Wright, mayor of Centralia, Ill.:

Whereas at a regular meeting of the Belleville Rotary Club held on Tuesday July 31, 1945, our vice president, Fred R. Friedewald, made the following remarks, "President Twitch, since tomorrow marks the anniversary of the United States Army Air Forces, I think it is a very opportune time to recognize the outstanding work which our honorary member, Col. Neal Creighton, has done in promoting the feeling of good will between Scott Field and the surrounding communities. I feel very safe in saying that Colonel Creighton during the short time of his assignment as commanding officer of Scott Field, has done more toward creating closer cooperation and good will between these communities and Scott Field than any of, yes, perhaps all, the commanding officers who preceded him. Colonel Creighton, we of the Belleville Rotary Club want you to know that we appreciate the excellent job you are doing and we also want you to know that we, too, are more than anxious to do our part of the job. We are in back of you 100 percent, Colonel Creighton, and in behalf of our club and the people of these communities, may I say 'well done'," and

Whereas these remarks so aptly expressed the opinion of the entire membership of the Belleville Rotary Club: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the officers and board of directors, acting in behalf of the entire membership of the Belleville Rotary Club as authorized by the constitution and bylaws, hereby unanimously endorse these remarks; and be it further

Resolved, That the original of this resolution be presented to Col. Neal Creighton with our best wishes and a copy be filed with the secretary and recorded in the minutes.

Adopted August 7, 1945.

T. E. MENTZER,
President.

Attest:

CYRIL A. ARNOLD,
Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, August 7, 1945.

Col. NEAL CREIGHTON,
The Commandant,
Scott Field, Ill.

DEAR COLONEL CREIGHTON: I appreciated receiving your letter of August 4 relative to the celebration of Army Air Force Day at Scott Field on August 1.

The program which you arranged was indeed impressive, and I thoroughly enjoyed my own part in it. The officers and men of the post made an excellent and inspiring appearance, and you are to be congratulated for their obviously high morale.

I feel sure that your program at Scott Field served admirably to impress upon the thousands who attended something of the magnitude and the accomplishments of the Army Air Forces.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT H. GREEN,
Governor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
City of East St. Louis, Ill.,
August 8, 1945.

Col. NEAL CREIGHTON,
The Commandant,
Scott Field, Ill.

DEAR COLONEL CREIGHTON: The city council and I appreciated your personal invitation to be present at the celebration of Army Air Force Day at Scott Field on August 1.

Commissioner Ganschinietz and I enjoyed the program which you arranged for the people of this area.

You are to be congratulated on the splendid performance and appearance of your men on this day.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNORS,
Mayor.

CITY OF CENTRALIA, ILL.,
August 11, 1945.

Col. NEAL CREIGHTON,
Commanding Officer,
Scott Field, Ill.

DEAR COLONEL CREIGHTON: On behalf of the citizens of Centralia and the members of the city council, I want to thank you for the many courtesies that were shown to our people during the recent air show at Scott Field.

It was a wonderful demonstration and we all enjoyed it very much.

We do feel a special interest in Scott Field and the fine boys who visit us from time to time. They have never given us the slightest worry and we are always proud to have them in our city. We want to cooperate at all times with the authorities of the field and we hope you will feel free to call on us any time we can be of help.

Again thanking you, I am

Very respectfully,

O. W. WRIGHT, *Mayor.*

The Black Dragon Society

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are told by the press today that the notorious Black Dragon Society in Japan has been ordered abolished by General MacArthur.

That is one of the most dangerous and far-reaching un-American organizations that has ever been used to disturb the tranquillity of the American people. It has been organized throughout the country and its tentacles have reached into every community in the South to stir up hatred for the white race. It is based on hatred for the white peoples of the world, and its aim is to organize the colored races under the leadership of Japan.

I hope General MacArthur seizes the records of this notorious outfit. If he does it will help us greatly in stamping out this evil.

We are starting an investigation of this organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities that will probably bring to light conditions in this country that will shock the American people.

We must put a stop to these gangs of cutthroats from other countries working through organizations of this kind to stir up race trouble in this country while trying to wreck our Government.

The following article, which appeared in the Reader's Digest for January 1945, will give you an idea of what this vicious organization means:

TO UNDERSTAND JAPAN CONSIDER TOYAMA

(By George Creel)

There is no shorter cut to an understanding of Japan and the Japanese people than the life story of Mitsuru Toyama,* so great a power and so much an idol that he was long recognized as his country's unofficial Emperor. It is exactly as though the head of Murder, Incorporated, were to be hailed by Americans as unofficial President.

Yet, from earliest youth, Toyama plied the trade of assassin, openly and without the slightest pretense of concealment. The scores of organizations he formed, while using patriotism as a mask, have made assassination their business. At his beck were thousands of young fanatics, ready to go forth and kill at their master's order. Eventually the militarists took him under their protection, and began their terrorization of all who stood for peace and modern ideas. Even Hideki Tojo did not dare oppose Toyama's will.

It is not possible to imagine some junior officer walking into the office of Secretary Hull or Secretary Stimson, and either killing him outright or menacing with a dagger until promise was gained to change a policy. Yet that is the way Toyama ran Japan for a full 40 years. At his command, cabinet officers, generals, and admirals were stabbed or shot. And not once in that long stretch of time did the authorities dare lay hands on him, or on his killers.

Toyama helped mightily to bring about war with China in 1894, and again with Russia in 1904. Now rich by reason of valuable mining concessions that were his part of the loot in these campaigns, he organized the dreaded Black Dragon Society and spread it throughout the empire. Other "patriotic" organizations burst into being, and soon Toyama had his hatchetmen in every city and village.

A spirit of democratization swept Japan as an aftermath of the first World War, and there was a while when it seemed that the country was on its way to civilization. The Liberals, however, had only ideas; the militarists had Toyama and his assassins. In 1930, Premier Hamaguchi was shot down at his desk, and one year later the Army marched into Manchuria.

A peace party still persisted, and so, in 1932, Toyama struck again, murdering Prime Minister Inukai, Finance Minister Inouye and Baron Takuma Dan, head of the House of Mitsui.

In 1935, Japanese forces invaded China, making war inevitable. When sane statesmen rallied to curb the power of the militarists, the Black Dragon's representatives in the army assassinated on an even greater scale. Four cabinet members were killed, and the Prime Minister escaped only because the killers shot his brother-in-law by mistake. At Toyama's behest, the supreme court applauded the assassins as "patriots."

Toyama now proceeded to speak for the nation. Sounding a call for the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, he announced that the white "barbarians" must go. A pact with Germany and Italy was demanded as the first step toward war against the United States and Great Britain. Premier Konoye and Home Secretary Hiranuma argued that Japan had all she could handle in China. Whereupon, a Toyama fanatic walked into Hiranuma's office and attempted his assassination. A bulletproof vest saved the old

---

*Toyama died last October at the age of 90.

man's life, but a shattered jaw and perforated throat put him out of commission. Konoye, openly warned by Toyama that he was next on the list, promptly resigned, giving way to Hideki Tojo, Toyama's man. This done, the Master Murderer sat down with the admirals and generals to lay the plans for Pearl Harbor.

There, then, is the story of Mitsuru Toyama. A lifetime given over to cowardly, cold-blooded murder. And yet he was the best loved and most revered man in all Japan. What more terrible indictment of a people? What more convincing proof that they are still creatures of the jungle?

Atomic Bomb Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Atomic Bomb Responsibilities," written by Hanson W. Baldwin and published in the New York Times of September 12, 1945. Mr. Baldwin is recognized as one of the most competent writers in the United States on foreign policy. The article deals with conditions in Europe, and the necessity for making changes in the provisions of the so-called San Francisco Charter if there is to be any hope of peace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC BOMB RESPONSIBILITIES—RESOLVING OF PROBLEM IN RELATION TO PEACE IS LINKED TO MORAL LEADERSHIP OF AMERICA

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Five weeks ago the first atomic bomb ever used in warfare was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan.

In that 5 weeks the war has ended, reconversion is well started, troops are pouring back from overseas, some political problems—international and domestic—have been at least tentatively resolved, and the American public is gradually readjusting itself to the new dynamics of peace.

But nothing has been done about the atomic bomb.

The great surge of public awe, of overwhelming interest, and international concentration has slackened; the iron of public opinion, which was malleable, is settling now into the cold mold of the old order. What was needed to accompany the atomic bomb was some action in the political and moral and psychological fields as dramatic and as tremendous as the achievement of atomic fission. That no such action has yet been taken is the world's loss—and America's loss.

For the truth is that the United States has sacrificed its moral leadership of the world. Actually the first use of the atomic bomb did not mark the end—it is to be hoped the temporary end—of that leadership. The mass bombing of European cities, miscalled "precision" bombing but actually area bombing in its effects, was just as terrible for the civilian men, women, and children killed and wounded as for those blasted by the atomic bomb.

The fire attacks upon Japanese cities burned people to death fully as irrevocably as did the atomic bomb. The atomic bomb had a quantitative advantage in death and annihilation; more people were killed, more burned, more homes destroyed, but actually the moral principle involved in its use was no different from that established a thousand times before in the war.

MORAL ASPECT STRESSED

It may be argued with perfect validity that the Germans and the Japanese started the evil practices, and that there is no crime worse than war itself. It may also be argued that it is futile to try to make war moral; in fact, that there is a certain humanity about trying to make it so horrible that it will be ended quickly—thus saving many lives at the expense of a relative few, as in the case of Japan—or in the ultimate case by making war so annihilating and terrible that it will be made impossible.

Regardless of the validity of these arguments, in the mind of many foreigners and of a considerable number of Americans, the atomic bomb was not only a tremendous scientific achievement; it marked the end of the moral leadership of America.

It is possible that this is a mistaken conclusion; certainly our leaders are earnest men who pondered long and seriously the terrible alternatives with which the bomb confronted them. But it is certain that the United States, which has won by far the material supremacy of the world, which today is incomparably the world's most powerful nation, is not equally the world leader in the moral, political, and psychological fields.

We have, it is true, pressed the cause for international collaboration. But this is not enough; since San Francisco the atomic bomb has changed the world as we knew it. We helped to achieve, with the atomic bomb, the aim of winning the war, but we did not go beyond the war to enlist atomic fission in the winning of the peace.

The first great psychological surge of mixed fear and hope—fear that man had at last created a Frankenstein monster, hope that at last wars might be ended—has passed, and, therefore, the key moment gone, but it is not perhaps too late to enunciate a statement of principles and desires to be pressed and fought for.

We have, maybe, 3 to 5 years—perhaps more, perhaps less—before the secret of the manufacture of the atomic bomb becomes more or less world-wide. They should be years wisely used, for the opportunity will not knock again.

PROGRAM IS SUGGESTED

As a start, the program that might guide some of our international actions might include:

1. Retention for the time being—at least for several years—of the secrets of the atomic bomb, pending the strengthening of the United Nations Organization, better political stabilization of the world, determination of some of the outstanding problems left from the war and progressive steps for the world-wide limitation of armaments.

2. Immediate proposals for the world-wide abolition of conscription.

3. Immediate proposals for the world-wide limitations, even at high levels, of national armies, navies, and air forces.

4. Rapid determination of the size of the armed forces to be made available to the United Nations Organization and determination of the exact role of the military staff committee; the strengthening of both and a progressive internationalization of both as rapidly as possible; and the opening of the armed forces at the disposal of the United Nations to international enlistment.

5. Elimination of the veto power in the voting procedure of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization.

6. Eventual proposals for the outlawing of the atomic bomb. These proposals might embody a mutual agreement on the part of all signatories not to utilize atomic fission for war purposes except in retaliation. When such an agreement has been made, and when and if the United Nations Organization has been strengthened and the above program realized, at least in part, the secret of the manufacture of the atomic bomb might be transmitted to the United Nations Organization.

Any such program as the above is fraught with difficulties so great that no easy accomplishment can be possible and our best efforts may be doomed to failure. But we must make those efforts nevertheless if the United States is to compensate for what in the eyes of much of the world is its decline in moral leadership.

We must make those efforts, too, for the interest of man. Not to prevent man's annihilation, or the end of civilization, for neither is impending, but to prevent man's reversion to the Dark Ages and the spiritual, mental, and political loss of all that our material progress has made possible.

The Japanese Attack on Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "John T. Flynn Charges Government Knew Jap Cabinet Intended To Break Relations," from the Chicago Tribune of September 2 last. I have an estimate from the Public Printer stating that it will cost $239.20 to print the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN T. FLYNN CHARGES GOVERNMENT KNEW JAP CABINET INTENDED TO BREAK RELATIONS

(John T. Flynn, investigator and publicist, author of The Truth About Pearl Harbor, has written a second sensational article on the catastrophe. He discloses new and startling information that was in the possession of the United States high command during the final days and hours before the great Pacific base was attacked by the Japanese on December 7, 1941. In this inclusive treatise, he fixes the blame for the disaster squarely upon Franklin D. Roosevelt, then President of the United States.)

At 9 o'clock Saturday, December 6, 1941—the night before Pearl Harbor—the American Government was in possession of the full text of a note which the Japanese Government had sent to its diplomats in Washington. It was the fatal note which formally broke off relations between the United States and Japan and was the signal for the first blow.

The United States Government had somehow come into possession of this most sensational piece of information which was to surprise Government leaders so much the next day. The hour at which the Japanese were to present the note was not then known. The envoys were to present it to Secretary of State Hull. They did, in fact, present it on the next day.

In his official statement last week, Secretary of War Stimson said his Department received information on December 6 as to what

the Japanese reply to the settlement overtures of the United States would be and that this reply indicated an immediate severance of diplomatic relations.

TEXT ON ROOSEVELT'S DESK

At 10 p. m. of December 6 the message was on the desk of Franklin D. Roosevelt, then President. The late Navy Secretary Knox read it around 10 p. m.

Knox telephoned to Hull, who called a conference for the next morning, December 7, at 10 a. m. He asked Knox, Stimson, Lieutenant Commander Kramer, and Lieutenant Colonel Bratton to attend.

Consider the situation that night. The President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of State not only knew that relations with the United States were about to be severed by Japan but they had the full text of the Japanese note in hand 16 hours before it was presented. Yet the note or news of it was not given to General Marshall, Chief of Staff, nor to Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations.

Stimson in his report said evidence showed that a subordinate officer in G–2 who had received the message on December 6 did not deliver it to the secretary of the General Staff for the Chief of Staff, the executive officer for the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, until after 9 o'clock on the morning of December 7.

CONFERENCE IS CALLED

A conference was called for the morning of December 7. But neither Marshall nor Stark was asked to attend it. Still stranger, Lieutenant Commander Kramer, asked to attend the conference next day, was told not to give Stark his copy of the critical message until morning. There still were no orders to change the alert (preparations against sabotage) which was in force at Pearl Harbor.

The President and his secretaries knew everything now—everything save the hour at which the fateful note meaning war would be presented. They knew that must come swiftly. Yet they withheld the information from the chiefs of the Army and Navy. Would you not suppose they would be the first to be told and that the information would be hurried by the quickest means to Hawaii and the Philippines?

CRIES "THIS MEANS WAR"

The next morning—Sunday—Admiral Stark, because of the tense situation, went to his office. There he found the now completed copy of the Japanese note.

"My God," he cried, "this means war! I must get word to Kimmel (Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, Navy commander at Hawaii) at once." For some reason that word did not go "at once" or at all. Then at 10:20 a. m. our intelligence service knew the hour at which the Japanese note would be presented—1 p. m. that day Washington time. All this was hurried to Knox and the President. It was in the hands of Hull's conference at 11 a. m. The bombs would not fall on Pearl Harbor for another 2¾ hours.

Lieutenant Commander Kramer gave a memorandum to Secretary Knox of transcendent importance. The memorandum pointed out that 1 p. m. Washington time was sunrise over Honolulu and dark night at Manila. Sunrise would be the moment for air attack. As a surprise attack was indicated, the hour of presenting the dispatch indicated an air attack on Pearl Harbor. In other words, we faced an air attack on Pearl Harbor in a little over 2 hours.

Can we believe that, thus warned, the high command in Washington, on the edge of such a precipice, would not with whatever speed science had yet devised get this tremendous news and its implication to the commanders in Hawaii? Instead the three aging Secretaries [Stimson, Hull, and Knox] sat down to a conference.

General Marshall did not get the news until 11 a. m. At noon he sent a warning message to General Short. There was yet an hour and three-quarters before the explosion. The most precious hour and three-quarters the War Department had ever lived through. There was time to get many of the ships in motion, time to get every available man mobilized, time to get every available plane off the ground.

USES COMMERCIAL RADIO

He had also the Navy's powerful short-wave transmitter, as well as a scrambler telephone on which he could have talked directly to Pearl Harbor. Instead of using these he sent the message to General Short by commercial radio at or near 12:18 p. m. Washington time. That would be 6:48 a. m. Honolulu time. It reached Honolulu at 7:33 a. m. The Japanese planes were at that moment winging to their kill. The message was sent through the streets as the bombs were falling. Thus delayed, it reached the Army intelligence office at 11:45 a. m. to be decoded. It was delivered to General Short at 2:58 p. m., hours after the great base had been destroyed.

Why did not General Marshall use the Government's short-wave apparatus? Why did he not use his scrambler phone which would have put this information in the hands of Short from two and a half to an hour and a half before the attack? His explanation to the Roberts commission was that he was afraid it might be intercepted. What difference? If intercepted the Japs would merely know what they knew already. But Short would have known it also.

Now let us go back and review the entire case. I propose to set forth the whole background and point out the figures who should be blamed for the disaster.

EARLIER HISTORY

The findings of the two Army and Navy boards given out by President Truman last Wednesday distributed the guilt for the historic disaster at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, among all the top commanders of the Army and Navy—all except one.

The Roberts commission, immediately after the terrible defeat, blamed Rear Admiral Kimmel and Major General Short. The two boards have stretched the list to include General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff; Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations at the time of the Japanese attack; former State Secretary Hull, plus various lesser commanders.

FULL STORY NOT TOLD

But the greatest commander of all is left out—the Commander in Chief, who was running the whole show. In the 130,000 words of these findings and comments the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt stands out in almost monumental conspicuousness by its absence.

The findings were released and published as telling at last the story of Pearl Harbor. But the final story of that appalling collection of blunders has not yet been told—and it will never be told officially in full until the Congress of the United States takes the whole squalid mess out of the hands of the Army and Navy and turns the light of day upon it in a full and fearless congressional investigation.

When Congress does this it will then reveal to the world the solemn truth that, whatever minor mistakes were made here and there in this incredible chapter of military history, the man who was responsible for the central and controlling blunder was Franklin D. Roosevelt, for whose part in the tragedy these reports are a whitewash.

THE TRUTH IS KNOWN

But if the two boards named by Mr. Roosevelt's appointees—Stimson and Knox—have not given us the whole story, that story is known. And here, therefore, as far as I know it, I propose to tell it. If Congress wants all the facts it has only to summon the chief actors still living, including the three sets of judges, along with the documents and exhibits which they examined, and it will get the whole truth. For it must be remembered that while Stimson and Navy Secretary Forrestal have given out the voluminous findings of the Army and Navy boards, the testimony on which they are based is still hidden from the public. Here, in general outline, is what the people will learn.

While the American public was still stunned by the news of the Pearl Harbor attack three ideas were promptly fed to the people by the Government. One was that the damage was slight. The second was that Kimmel and Short were responsible. The third was that the President was taken completely by surprise.

Knox, after a quick visit to Hawaii, returned and told us we had lost one battleship, the *Arizona;* three destroyers, a mine layer, and an old target ship. Some others were damaged. But the balance of the fleet, he said, including battleships, carriers, heavy and light cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, was at sea seeking contact with the enemy. Newspapers praised his frankness and the President for making good on his promise of full information. But this statement was a carefully phrased falsehood, the Secretary juggled with the word "lost." Few ships, indeed, were permanently lost beyond ultimate salvage. But they were lost utterly so far as having any striking power against the enemy was concerned.

FLEET PUT OUT OF ACTION

The majestic Pacific Fleet had been put out of action as an effective sea weapon. We had eight battleships in Pearl Harbor. The *Arizona* was blown up. The *Nevada,* with a hole in her side, was settled in the mud. The *California* lay on her side. The *West Virginia,* torpedoed six times, rested on the bottom. The *Pennsylvania* and *Maryland* were badly bombed. The *Oklahoma* sank on her side in the shallow water. Three cruisers were badly bombed. Three destroyers were sunk. A large drydock was destroyed. The *Utah* and the *Ogallala* were sunk.

The Army and Navy had had nearly 5,000 casualties. They lost 197 planes. In time, nearly all of these vessels were reclaimed. A few were out in a month. But generally the damage had not been repaired until the Japanese had completed the conquest of the Philippines, Malaya, and Singapore, and much of the rich Indies of the British and Dutch and stood at the gateway to Australia.

Why had Knox lied? To deceive the Japanese? Hide from them the extent of our losses? The Japanese knew them only too well. He lied to deceive the American people who had been led to believe the Japanese would be a push-over and who, had they known the full extent of the losses, would have been more clamorous for the heads of the guilty.

Not only was it necessary to conceal the losses. It was necessary to find a scapegoat. Somebody had committed a blunder of historic dimensions. Was it the commanders? Or was it the high command in Washington? Or was it an even more eminent personage? Of course, there had to be an investigation. It was important, therefore, that the investigation be controlled. Congress was clamoring for a congressional inquiry. The administration blocked that. The President and Knox, along with the commanders, were, pending inquiry, equally suspected. But the President named Knox to do the investigating.

MUD BEGINS TO FLY—KNOX RETURNS WITH REPORT AND CHARGES THAT THE ARMY AND NAVY WERE "NOT ON ALERT"

Meantime the mud began to fly at Kimmel and Short. Congressman DINGELL, New Deal stalwart, let fly in the House. Knowing nothing of the facts, he demanded that Kimmel and Short be court-martialed. New Deal newspapers took up the cry. Stories were told

of how most of the sailors and marines were ashore after a Saturday night drunk, how all the officers were sleeping off the fatigue of late Saturday night parties, how Short and Kimmel themselves were at late parties and of how the two commanders, divided by professional jealousies, seldom spoke to each other and conferred but little about the defense of the island.

In 5 days Knox was back with the inevitable "report." Of course, Knox pointed no accusing finger at either himself or the President. He said: "The United States services were not on alert against the surprise attack. The fact calls for a full investigation, which will be initiated immediately by the President."

An indignant outcry broke out against the smeared officers in Congress. Then came the investigation. The President named a five-man commission. Four were officers who could be depended on not to blame the War and Naval Secretaries or the President. But Justice Roberts was a Republican. This was a master stroke. What the public overlooked was that Roberts had been one of the most clamorous among those screaming for an open declaration of war. He had doffed his robes, taken to the platform in his frantic apprehensions, and demanded that we immediately unite with Great Britain in a single nation.

The Pearl Harbor incident had given him what he had been yelling for—America's entrance into the war. On the war issue he was one of the President's most impressive allies. Now he had his wish. He could be depended on not to cast any stain upon it in its infancy.

DOCUMENTS CONCEALED—KIMMEL AND SHORT FORBIDDEN TO MAKE STATEMENTS IN DEFENSE OF THEIR ACTIONS

His commission went to Pearl Harbor and investigated. But it was specifically enjoined from investigating the other segments of the story in Washington. Certain essential documents were deliberately concealed from it. It came up with the expected indictment—putting the blame on Kimmel and Short. The officers were found derelict in duty. That fixed the black spot on the commanders. They were relieved of their posts. They were forbidden to make any statement or enter into any discussion of their innocence. And it was then announced there would be no court martial. The black spot was fastened on the two helpless victims to stay. The White House took over the management of the whole affair. Army and naval officials, when asked for statements, said:

"The White House is doing the talking." And it did none. It wanted to forget the case. It said: "Let's get on with the war."

DEMAND FORMAL INQUIRY

From time to time voices rose in Congress to ask some degree of justice for the accused men. Finally Congress, by resolution, ordered the Army and Navy to make formal inquiry of the indicted officers. Boards were named in each service and the inquiries were made. The boards reported to their Army and Navy Secretaries on dates fixed in the resolution.

These reports were made last November. They were promptly suppressed by Mr. Roosevelt. Why? Stimson and Forrestal merely said the facts did not warrant a court martial of Kimmel and Short, and that they would be further studied. They remained suppressed until President Truman released them last Wednesday.

The third bead in the bracelet of defense of the administration has been that the Army and Navy and the President himself were taken completely by surprise. While they look upon this as a defense for themselves, they apparently do not think it a defense for Kimmel and Short. The theory, endlessly repeated by radio and press, is that we were at peace, that we were actually negotiating for a peaceful settlement, and that the President was waiting in complete security for the Japanese answer to his last proposal for peace when, out of a clear sky, the bombs began to fall on Pearl Harbor.

Here is the whole case. Our Government, while trying to induce Japan to enter upon a peaceful settlement, was taken by carefully studied surprise. But, notwithstanding the surprise, that Government had adequately warned Kimmel and Short of the attack which it did not expect; the admiral and general did not put their commands on the alert required, and as a consequence the great naval base was exposed to the full fury of the Japanese treachery.

WHY PAIR WERE "CRUCIFIED"

I believe that the facts that I am now about to divulge will completely clear up this entire story and that it will fix definitely the responsibility for the disaster which cost us in a single day the use of a great fleet, the sacrifice of the Philippines, and 3½ years of savage warfare to recover for ourselves and our Allies possession of the vast empire which literally slipped from their hands after the initial blow at Pearl Harbor and the Philippines. We shall see now why Admiral Kimmel and General Short were crucified. And who was the real culprit whose colossal blundering has been hidden from the world by blackening the names of two honorable men?

THE FICTION OF PEACE—UNITED STATES SENDS ARMS, AMMUNITION, DESTROYERS, AND PLANES TO BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND CHINA

There is a story of profound importance yet to be told about the state of peace so far as America was concerned before Pearl Harbor. Certainly we had not declared war. But we had sent an army across the sea to Iceland to join the British Army there; we had been sending arms, ammunition, and destroyers and planes as a gift to Britain and France and China. We had been with our warships hunting down German submarines for British planes and even bombing them.

On November 23 W. Averill Harriman, the President's agent in London, said: "The United States Navy is shooting the Germans—German submarines and aircraft at sea." And on September 20, 1941, a dispatch from Hyde Park reported that "more than half of the United States Navy is forced to remain in the Pacific at a time when the United States is operating against German and Italian submarines and air raiders in the Atlantic." In the Pacific we had cut off all shipments and trade of essential materials with Japan and frozen and seized here $130,000,000 of her funds, which Walter Lippmann called "a declaration of economic warfare."

"LET ME BABY HER ALONG"

We had sent an American military mission to China and an American economic adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. We had sent General Chennault with a large number of American Army flyers to China to fight with Chiang's Army. At the Atlantic Charter meeting Churchill had urged Roosevelt to send an ultimatum to Japan at once. He had replied, saying: "Let me baby her along for another 3 months."

Mr. Grew, our Ambassador to Tokyo, had advised Roosevelt in December 1940, that the hope of peace had vanished in the east and that it was no longer a question of whether we would have war with Japan, but when. The United States must decide whether it should be later or now. And he, Grew, was for now. To this on January 21, 1941, Roosevelt replied that he completely agreed with Grew, and a few weeks later Admiral Stark notified Admiral Kimmel that "war with Japan is no longer a question of whether but of when."

There is no room here to discuss these interesting features of what is now a section of history. I do not wish to enter into any consideration here of whether the warlike acts of the President listed above were wise or not. Certainly he was supported in them by large and important groups. I recall them now merely to supply certain features of the international scenery in which the events I am about to describe took place. Indeed, what has gone before is chiefly to set the stage for the momentous incidents which, after September or October, seemed to spring up out of the soil under the immense human pressures which had been generated and which were slowly passing out of the control of any human hand. There remains one more scene to be set—the coming battlefield.

The commander of all our military forces was General Marshall, Chief of Staff. The commander of the navy was Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations. Both, of course, were subject to the President, who had by now got into the habit of referring to himself as the Commander in Chief. This was not a mere peccadillo. He was already performing directly that function, issuing orders to Stark which the Secretary of the Navy knew nothing of and issuing orders to Marshall without consulting the Secretary of War.

His intrusions into the operations of the Navy were more frequent because, while Roosevelt had, under the influence of flatterers who surrounded him, come to think of himself as a master of diplomacy, an expert in political economy, an adept in political manipulation, a wizard in public finance, a profound student of foreign affairs, and a military strategist of large dimensions, he regarded himself as little less than a genius in naval organization and direction. This obsession led to the habit of secrecy to avoid the annoyance of hostile advice upon projects he wished to manage.

Thus, in June, when he directed the transfer of naval vessels from the Pacific to the Atlantic, the Secretary of the Navy heard about it first from the Secretary of War. Later, when Hull was asked what had happened to the proposals submitted by the Japanese Premier directly to the President, he said: "I am wondering myself."

UNABLE TO LEARN PLANS

Later we shall see that the chief of naval operations could not find out what our plans for the Pacific war were and an American admiral first learned of certain plans of our Government in his theater from a British admiral. Here we are about to see this headstrong man, surrounded by subservient and obsequious courtiers like Harry Hopkins, Henry Wallace, Sam Rosenman, and others, playing secretly the devious game of diplomacy with the Japs and running, often behind the backs of his admirals and generals, segments of a rapidly developing war in two vast oceans.

A SWITCH IN COMMAND—ADMIRAL RICHARDSON'S REFUSAL TO BERTH FLEET IN PEARL HARBOR IS DISCLOSED

The point upon which all the forces we have been examining were converging was the small island of Oahu and, in particular, its great naval base near Honolulu—Pearl Harbor. It was supposed to be one of the strongest in the world. The commander of the military establishment in Hawaii was General Short. The Pacific Fleet was based at Pearl Harbor and it was under the command of Admiral Kimmel. Responsibility for the defense of the island was in the hands of General Short. Admiral Kimmel was expected to give whatever assistance was required from the Navy. But Admiral Kimmel's area of operations extended over the whole Pacific. Farther to the west was the Asiatic Fleet based on the Philippines and under the command of Admiral Thomas C. Hart.

RICHARDSON IN COMMAND

Here we must note a fact of great importance. The Pacific Fleet had always been based on our west coast. Pearl Harbor was a supply and repair base in event of operations in the mid-Pacific. It was Roosevelt who forced the change of bringing the Fleet into

Pearl Harbor. In January 1940, Admiral Richardson was made commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet. He was one of the Navy's foremost figures. Since his earliest days, after leaving Annapolis, he had made the study of Japanese warfare his life work. He was beyond question the Navy's outstanding authority upon Pacific naval warfare and Japanese strategy. He was the logical man for the post. As the war clouds darkened over the Pacific he was in the spot for which his whole professional life had been a training.

Richardson was ordered to berth the Pacific Fleet in Pearl Harbor. This he refused to do—an act no one but a very distinguished officer could risk. He was ordered a second time and again refused. It was Richardson's belief—and indeed generally supported by the Navy—that the fleet should never be berthed inside Pearl Harbor where it would be a mark for attack. This was particularly true in such troubled times when the airways of the East were hot with rumors of approaching conflict. What is more Richardson held the belief that Pearl Harbor was the logical first point of attack for the Japanese high command, wedded as it was to the theory of undeclared and surprise warfare. But Richardson was overruled by Roosevelt, the amateur admiral. Whether Richardson was relieved of his command or resigned in protest I do not know. Certainly he departed from it.

At this point Admiral Kimmel was placed in command. What his views were on the berthing of the fleet in Pearl Harbor I do not know. But in time he came to look upon the harbor as extremely vulnerable. He arrived at the conclusion that the fleet should not be held in Pearl Harbor, that it was a mistake to keep it there for political rather than naval reasons and that the longer it was kept there for political reasons the more difficult it would be to withdraw it without creating further international political repercussions. His advice on this was disregarded, as was Richardson's. He soon learned that neither he nor the Navy command was running the United States Navy. This was the first terrible blunder responsible for the tragedy at Pearl Harbor.

TRANSFERS WAR VESSELS

In November 1941, just before the battle, the United States had in its Navy 216 major surface combat ships. The Pacific had always been the home of the greater portion of these vessels. But as the menace grew in Asia where the President looked upon war as certain, he began transferring war vessels to the Atlantic. By June there were 114 major surface combat vessels in the Atlantic and only 102 in the Pacific. Moreover by this time the President had given away 50 destroyers to the British and these were desperately needed by Kimmel as the crisis neared.

While some of our pulp-paper generals and statesmen were telling the people that Japan was a push-over, the United States, Britain, and the Dutch combined had in the Pacific 152 major combat vessels against Japan's 180—perhaps more. The advantage of surprise lay with her and the battlefield was thousands of miles closer to her shores than to ours. I should add that nearly 40 of the vessels we had were laid up for repairs.

Much of the trained personnel had been taken away for service in the Atlantic, leaving the Pacific Fleet manned heavily by raw recruits. These required constant training. Admiral Kimmel wrote to the Navy begging to be kept informed of the international situation so that he could know when to convert from training to service routines.

PROTEST WITHOUT AVAIL

Despite all this, while the President was ordering Kimmel to "keep ships popping up here and there to worry the Japanese" and Stark was instructing him to make plans for bombing inflammable targets in Japan, the President in May transferred from the Pacific to the Atlantic 3 battleships, 6 cruisers, 18 destroyers, 6 transports with all the trained marines on the west coast. The commanders in the Pacific protested without avail. Then in June the President ordered the transfer of three more battleships, four more cruisers, and two squadrons of destroyers to the Atlantic. The naval defenses of the Pacific were being stripped by the President. Stark protested in vain. Then Kimmel went directly to the President and succeeded in dissuading him from this last raid upon his fleet.

By this time the President's chief adviser on such matters—where he wanted advice—was Harry Hopkins, whose carefully taken policy was to always please the President. On one occasion a distinguished admiral had to go to Mr. Hopkins' bedroom where Hopkins, reclining in his pajamas, gave him a curt "No" to his appeal not to take away any further vessels from his area.

Next, Admiral King demanded the transfer of more ships from the Pacific to his Atlantic command. Knox was agreeable. It was prevented by Stark's resistance.

The island's inadequacy in planes was deplorable. The Navy was responsible for long distance reconnaissance. This meant observations 800 miles all around from Oahu. To do this properly Kimmel would need 180 to 270 long distance patrol planes. He had only 69 patrol planes. He had two carriers—both out on reconnaissance fortunately. A third was up for repairs.

The Army was much worse off. If the Navy were called away the Army would have to take over long distance reconnaisance. It should have had 180 B–17's for long distance patrol. It had six. It had had 12, but was forced to dismantle 6 to keep the other 6 supplied with parts for flying. It should have had at least 200 fighter planes. It had a few old P–36's, not suitable for combat, 10 A–20's, good for 600 miles flight—300 miles out and back—and a bunch of old B–18's which could not be used against an enemy without inviting suicide.

GET OLD GUNBOAT—APPEAL FOR GREATER DEFENSE OF PEARL HARBOR BY LEADERS IN DECEMEER 1940

Back in December 1940, Admiral Richardson and General Herron—predecessors of Kimmel and Short, reported that Pearl Harbor was inadequately defended and that the fleet could not resist a hostile attack. They appealed for a large list of ships, planes, guns, radar equipment, and so forth. By October 17, 1941—7 weeks before Pearl Harbor—Admiral Bloch wrote to Stark saying all they had gotten was an old gunboat.

Less than 10 days before Pearl Harbor the Army and Navy proposed to ship 50 planes from Hawaii to Wake and Midway and a similar movement of marines and Army personnel. It would have depleted the Army's already pitiful fighter strength by 40 percent. General Short continually begged for more planes, more men, more detection equipment. Instead of getting reinforcement in the imminent peril of war, the two men had to fight continually to hold what they had. Kimmel, too, had protested frequently. He advised against "backing into war. If we have decided on war, it would be better to take direct defensive action."

The stripping of the naval and airplane and military defenses of Hawaii—particularly of the naval defenses—was the second great cause of the disaster at Pearl Harbor. And this was done by the amateur Commander in Chief over the advice and protests of his military and naval advisers and of Admiral Kimmel and General Short.

JAPS DECIDE ON WAR—PRIVATE APARTMENT OF HULL BECOMES A BATTLEFIELD; NOMURA CALLS FREQUENTLY

There was another battlefield. It was mostly in Hull's private apartment, to which the Japanese Ambassador Nomura paid many calls between April and December of 1941. Japan's ruthless policy of conquest had brought her into deep waters. The United States, Britain, and the Dutch East Indies had cut off all trade with her. Without the iron, oil, cotton, rubber, and other critical materials from these sources she could not continue the war in China.

The situation became desperate. One party—the militarists—was for seizing the Dutch East Indies which would solve the supply problem. But that would mean war with England and—almost certainly—with the United States. The counselor of the American Embassy in Tokyo had so informed the Japanese Foreign Office. Nevertheless the extremists were for the desperate try. The other party—the moderates, led by the Japanese Premier Konoye—was for making the best terms possible with the United States and getting out of the China affair as best they could. Admiral Nomura was sent to the United States as Ambassador to see what could be done.

Konoye begged the President to meet him in the mid-Pacific, where, he promised, he would make concessions on such a scale that Roosevelt could not reject them. Grew urged the President to try this. But Roosevelt refused.

From April to the end, Nomura sat with Hull, a few times with the President. They argued endlessly. Then on November 16 he was joined by Ambassador Kurusu to assist in the delicate crisis.

PRESSES FOR ACTION

There is no space here to follow these conferences. If you will read the official reports of them, you will see that as the situation in Japan became more and more desperate, the existing Government was willing to make more and more concessions. And the war party became more and more pressing at home for action. It was a race between the moderates to get an agreement in Washington and the warrior agitators to produce a crisis in Japan. You will see also that President Roosevelt was not going to make any agreement that the Japanese could accept. The talks got nowhere.

Then, on October 14, the moderates lost in Japan. The warmongers won. The Konoye ministry fell, and General Tojo became Premier. The President knew that would happen, and he knew there could be only one result—a Japanese attack on the Dutch Indies. But there was also the possibility—even probability—that Japan would attempt to deal with England first—would try to reduce Singapore and perhaps attack us in the Philippines. He knew, as he steadfastly refused to hasten the negotiations, that he was producing a situation that could end only with an attack by Japan. Why did he want Japan to attack?

By skillful maneuvers and impossible promises, he had brought the country far toward war. From benevolent neutrality, selling to the Allies for cash, he had moved to aid-short-of-war, then to the aid-at-the-risk-of-war frame of mind. By October the once aid-short-of-war group was publishing full-page ads demanding an immediate declaration of war.

READY FOR FINAL ACT

Senator PEPPER, a White House spokesman, said the President had drawn a line and that when Japan moved over it he would start shooting. The President was ready for the final act—the act of open war. Two influences restrained him. His generals and admirals told him we were not ready. Most important was the promise he had made to the American people—solemnly given and repeated—not to send their sons into foreign wars unless attacked. He did not mind violating that pledge. He merely feared the political effect of the violation. Alsop and Kintner, White House columnist pets, had

written a short time before that "he [Roosevelt] does not feel he can openly violate them [his pledges]. But he can get around them the smart way." They explained this meant getting the Germans to shoot first. Then he could shoot back. But it was now clear to him that the Germans were not going to shoot first. But now the Japanese were about to do so. If they could be provoked to attack, his problem would be solved. He would then be in the war safely, not only against Japan but "all the way," as he triumphantly announced in his speech to Congress after the attack.

JAPS IN A HURRY—MILITARY LEADERS DISSUADE F. D. R. FROM SENDING FORCES TO HELP CHINA

In Japan the warmakers were in a desperate hurry. In the United States, Roosevelt, for some reason, became impatient of delay. So much so that he actually considered sometime before November 14 an invasion of China which would have put us at war with Japan. He proposed it to the Army and Navy staffs. They dissuaded him because we were not ready. So he waited a little longer—babying the Japanese along, but making it plain that they would get no agreement save by an abject surrender—terms which he knew no Japanese government would dare accept. He did not have long to wait. By November 14 the sands were running fast, as Grew had warned. Something had happened which put the play irrevocably in Roosevelt's hands. This is the event or series of events which have remained locked up in the keeping of the very inner circle of the White House. When you read of these you will know why the White House has concealed the truth from the world.

PLANS FOR WAR MADE

The hour of fate had arrived in Tokyo. But the bedeviled ministers seemed terrified at the appalling folly they were being driven to commit by the violent opinion makers of Japan. The Japanese high command began to move its war machine into position. Its plans were made. The Japs had to have the great Dutch islands. That meant they had to paralyze Britain. But that in turn meant they must, if possible, strike a crushing blow at the United States before she could throw her weight into the struggle. The blow was obvious. This country's naval strength—all the battleships which were the core of her Pacific sea power—were tied up at Pearl Harbor. Some madman had done that surely, they must have thought. But there were the great ships like ducks on a pond waiting for the hunter. Everything depended on the United States leaving the rich target there for the Jap hunters.

It was a giant gamble. But a safe one, as we now know, because in the White House sat a President who was satisfied that he knew it all. He had a plan, too. And he had made sure, as we shall see, that those battleships and their auxiliary ships would remain quite still and immobilized in the great shooting gallery. But while the Japanese prepared for this gamble, frightened at the peril of waking the still awkward and stupidly led giant America into action, they sent the astute Kurusu to Washington to join Nomura in a last effort to get a settlement. Kurusu arrived in Washington on November 16. But by that time the die was cast.

But now a gift from the gods had been put into Roosevelt's hands. The reports of the Army and Navy boards speak of secret information which came to the Government about this time which they could not even discuss while the war was actually going on. Where they were getting this information we need not trouble ourselves to inquire.

All governments, if they are sensible, in such a crisis provide themselves with an organization to learn what the enemy is doing. They pick up intelligence from many sources. Our Government and the British did the same. This is the stuff out of which movie thrillers are made. I now propose to tell what our Government knew and this forms the gravest part of this story. Roosevelt knew much that the Japanese were doing. Even as early as November 4 he knew the Japs would yield no more than they had already offered and that he could give them an ultimatum with the assurance that they would reject it.

He knew that Tokyo had told some of its foreign ambassadors there could be no more compromises. And he knew also that Tokyo had instructed its envoys in Washington that any treaties with the United States must be signed by November 25.

JAPS' LAST CARD—UNITED STATES WAR COUNCIL WARNED JAPANESE MIGHT "ACT BY NEXT MONDAY"

When Kurusu left Japan to come here, our Government knew the Japanese had just about given up hope on continuing negotiations. Therefore, on November 6, Roosevelt knew the Japanese were playing their last card and that, in event of failure, the very date for action was set—November 25. They later changed this date to November 29 and they told their ambassadors that after that date something would happen. That is why Roosevelt told his war council that the Japanese might act "by next Monday."

What was going to happen? All this information was in the hands of Hull and Roosevelt. Nothing that could happen could surprise them—save, undoubtedly, the point of the first assault.

After being dissuaded from the Chinese invasion project, and seeing the posture of affairs in Japan, the President decided to bring matters to a head. He did not know where the Japanese would launch their attack. It might be on Singapore or some Dutch or British island. In that case he had committed himself—though no one knew it—to join the British in the war on Japan. But that was not an ideal arrangement. His opponents could still insist the United States was not attacked. He was apprehensive about the political implications. He had just won a battle to junk the Neutrality Act. But it was a tremendous battle and he won by a very narrow majority. The enemies of a war declaration were powerful.

DECIDES ON ULTIMATUM

What was needed was an outright attack on an American possession. Roosevelt decided, therefore, to issue an ultimatum to the Japanese of such a character that America could not possibly be excluded from the coming assault. He had been discussing it since mid-November. Then—probably on November 25—he showed either an ultimatum or a proposed draft to General Marshall and Admiral Stark. Both said: "For God's sake, don't send it. We are not ready." This may have been on the 24th.

In any case their advice was disregarded, and on November 26 the ultimatum was delivered to the two Japanese envoys. It took the form of a proposed agreement. But the core of it was that (1) Japan must evacuate Indo-China, (2) get out of China, and (3) repudiate her treaty with the Axis. Had the Japanese Government been willing to do these things, it could not have done so in compliance with so brash a demand. No government there would dare propose it for acceptance in this way. Roosevelt knew that. And when Hull handed that ultimatum to the Japanese envoys both he and they knew it was all over. Roosevelt knew this meant the Japanese would act on November 29, and he had an idea that Guam or the Philippines would be included in the attack, although the Philippines were far more helpless than Hawaii.

GET NO INFORMATION

What of our two commanders at Pearl Harbor, inadequately prepared, and in the dark? It is important to remember that Pearl Harbor was 3,500 miles from the points at which the Japanese were preparing their blow. The reconnaissance of the Government on these preparations was not in the hands of Short or Kimmel. Other agencies were responsible for that. These agencies reported to Washington. Kimmel and Short had to depend on Washington entirely for their information about the international negotiations and the physical preparation of the Japanese for an attack.

They were not getting information. Here is an example. As far back as July 26 Kimmel wrote Stark asking to be informed of the plans of the Government if the Japanese attack the maritime provinces and England declares war on her. On July 31 Stark wrote another naval officer, making an amazing confession. He—Chief of Naval Operations, charged with the plans for eventual war—wrote that he could not get an answer to Kimmel's question, that when he advances it to Roosevelt all he gets is a "smile, or 'Betty, please don't ask me that.'"

As late as October Kimmel has not yet been able to get an answer to his question. There is no answer until November 14, when the fuze is already lighted. Then Admiral Stark wrote him, saying: "Just what we will do in the Far East remains to be seen." He was never informed what the United States would do in case of war between Japan and Britain in the Pacific.

STARK NOTIFIES KIMMEL

On November 25, after Stark knew an ultimatum would be sent, that the war was only a few days off, he notified Kimmel that the possibility Kimmel had been worrying about was now about to happen—that the Japanese were about to advance in Indochina, Thailand, and the Burma Road, most likely. But as to what we will do, he writes a sentence almost beyond belief, unparalleled in the annals of grand strategy: "I will be damned if I know what the United States will do—anything or nothing."

AN INSULT TO JAPAN—ASSERTS GOVERNMENT KNEW THAT WAR WITH JAPAN WOULD BREAK OUT ANY MINUTE

From secret sources our Government knew on November 28 that the Japanese had notified their foreign representatives that conversations had broken off, that the Hull ultimatum was an insult to Japan, but that Nomura and Kurusu were not to give the impression that negotiations were off.

On November 30 the Japanese Government directed their ambassador in Berlin to notify the German Government that United States-Japanese relations are ruptured, that war may break out with a clash, and that it may come quicker than anyone dreams with the Anglo-Saxon Powers. Our Government knew of this. The following day the British informed our Government that the Japanese carriers had left the home waters.

What were the commanders told of all this? Literally nothing they could not have gotten from the newspapers. Admiral Stark on November 27 wired Kimmel: "This dispatch is to be considered a war warning. Negotiations with Japan * * * have ceased and an aggressive move is expected within the next few days."

MARSHALL WIRES SHORT

General Marshall wired General Short: "Negotiations with Japan appear to be terminated. * * * Japanese action unpredictable, but hostile action possible any moment." But the Honolulu Advertiser, on Sunday, November 30, had printed a dispatch saying: "The National Broadcasting Co. picked up a dispatch which said, 'The United States, presenting its terms practically as an ultimatum, has spoken the last word. * * * Japan, for the sake of her national honor, cannot accept them.'" A dispatch from London said: "United States and Japan on brink of war." A huge headline read: "Kurusu bluntly warned Nation ready to battle."

Neither Short nor Kimmel were ever told the United States had delivered an ultimatum to Japan; nor were they told any of the other facts known to the Government. As to where the war would start, dispatch after dispatch went to Kimmel and Short saying that all the Government's intelligence indicated a possible attack on Thailand, Burma, Singapore, Dutch East Indies, and perhaps Guam or the Philippines. All these were points from 2,500 to 3,500 miles away from Pearl Harbor. The commanders were practically assured that no attack on Pearl Harbor was in the making.

They were told to take necessary measures against sabotage and internal disorders. Both Kimmel and Short were warned under no circumstances to do anything that would cause alarm or apprehension to the civilian population. The fleet was moored in the harbor at the orders of Roosevelt. And Kimmel was by his instructions prohibited from moving it. The President was determined to give the appearance before the world of not starting the trouble. Marshall warned Short: "If hostilities cannot be avoided, the United States desires that Japan commit the first overt act."

GET READY FOR ATTACK

The Army board has tried to dismiss this with the statement that "this was merely embodied in our well known policy of not initiating war." Of course, the feebleness of that explanation is evident when we remember that not long before the President had made a fiery speech in reference to Germany in which he had announced that we "will shoot first." The ultimatum was delivered to provoke war. It was successful. The Japanese were getting ready to attack.

Roosevelt knew it. He wanted to be sure that our Navy and Army commanders remained quiet, unsuspicious, and unaggressive—so that there could be no doubt about who fired the first shot in the Pacific. Had Kimmel taken his fleet out he would have disobeyed Roosevelt's orders.

Short, who was the responsible officer, put into effect what was known as alert No. 1, which was against sabotage. He notified Washington, describing in full precisely the measures he had taken, and Washington approved them. All these messages are a matter of public record. In the light of this, Knox's first report that "the services were not alerted against the surprise attack" and that "this called for investigation" amounted to a base falsehood to condemn the commanders in Pearl Harbor for complying with the orders of their superiors in Washington, who in turn were controlled in what they did by their Commander in Chief. And he, having ordered the ultimatum sent to Japan, went off to Warm Springs to enjoy the Thanksgiving holiday.

NIGHT BEFORE PEARL HARBOR

We now come to the night before Pearl Harbor in Washington. The President had returned from Warm Springs because of the crisis. The Japanese envoys had held during the week several meaningless sessions with the State Department. But the formal answer of the Japanese Government to the ultimatum had not come. But Roosevelt knew what it would be. The stage is all set for the attack on British or, better still, British and American territory in the Pacific.

The scenery is beautifully arranged. The President is widely advertised as seeking peace. That night at 9 o'clock he sends a dramatic message to Hirohito appealing for peace. He knows this to be as futile as the breeze around the White House grounds. The Japanese fleet has put to sea; Japanese troops are pouring southward.

The Army-Navy plans for Hawaii called for three different alerts. Alert No. 1 was preparation against sabotage. No. 2 was mobilization against surface, submarine, or aircraft attack. Alert No. 3 called for maximum battle mobilization. Short, obeying orders, set up alert No. 1. Why was the ominous news in possession of the Government withheld from him? Why was he not ordered to go to at least alert No. 2?

TRAGEDY OF BLUNDERS—DECLARES ROOSEVELT BY JANUARY 1, 1941, HAD TO GO TO WAR WITH JAPAN

The American people have been presented with the picture of Mr. Roosevelt sitting quietly in the White House on December 7 playing with his stamp collection, with only his friend, Harry Hopkins, with him; the doors closed to all visitors so that the President could have a few peaceful moments, even the telephone disconnected; Mrs. Roosevelt in another quarter of the mansion with one of innumerable little groups. Suddenly, out of the blue, came a request by the Japanese envoys for an appointment with Hull at 1 p. m.

Hull had telephoned this information to Roosevelt. What in the world do the Japanese want on this peaceful Sunday morning? Then, before the envoys, arriving a little late to tell the United States of their nation's stand, comes the news of the bombing.

This pathetic tragedy of blunders may be summed up as follows:

1. By January 1, 1941, Roosevelt had decided to go to war with Japan.

2. But he had solemnly pledged the people he would not take their sons to foreign wars unless attacked. Hence he dared not attack and so decided to provoke the Japanese to do so.

3. He kept all this a secret from the Army and Navy.

4. He felt the moment to provoke the attack had come by November. He ended negotiations abruptly November 26 by handing the Japanese an ultimatum which he knew they dared not comply with.

5. Immediately he knew his ruse would succeed, that the Japanese looked upon relations as ended and were preparing for the assault. He knew this from the intelligence reports.

COMMITS SELF TO BRITISH

6. He was certain the attack would be against British territory, at Singapore perhaps, and perhaps on the Philippines or Guam. If on the Philippines or Guam he would have his desired attack. But if only British territory were attacked could he safely start shooting? He decided he could and committed himself to the British Government. But he never revealed this to his naval chief.

7. He did not order Short to change his alert (preparations against sabotage) and he did not order Kimmel to take his fleet out of Pearl Harbor, out where it could defend itself, because he wanted to create the appearance of being completely at peace and surprised when the Japs started shooting. Hence he ordered Kimmel and Short not to do anything to cause alarm or suspicion. He was completely sure the Japs would not strike at Pearl Harbor.

8. Thus he completely miscalculated. He disregarded the advice of men who always held that Pearl Harbor would be first attacked. He disregarded the warning concerning the hour chosen for attack and which had been called to Knox's attention. He disregarded the advice of his chiefs that we were unprepared.

APPALLED AND FRIGHTENED

9. When the attack came he was appalled and frightened. He dared not give the facts to the country. To save himself he maneuvered to lay the blame upon Kimmel and Short. To prevent them from proving their innocence he refused them a trial. When the case was investigated by two naval and Army boards, he suppressed the reports. He threatened prosecution to any man who would tell the truth.

Now, if there is a shred of decency left in the American people they will demand that Congress open the whole ugly business to the light of day.

Resolutions Adopted by Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein resolutions unanimously adopted by the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans, Boston, September 8, 1945:

Whereas there has been established throughout this Nation, under the Lanham Act (for recreational and educational purposes), nurseries to care for the children of men in the Armed forces; and

Whereas the United States Government, under this act, contributes 60 percent of the funds, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts 40 percent of the funds for the support of 53 nurseries in Massachusetts; and

Whereas, it is the intention of the United States Government to discontinue the contribution of the 60 percent of these funds not later than September 30 of this year, claiming it is only a wartime provision; and

Whereas such action is untimely, in view of the fact the fathers of these children are still in the armed forces, and will be for some time, and that these children will suffer seriously as the result of the discontinuance of these nurseries at such an early date: Be it

Resolved, That the Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans go on record for the continuance of these nurseries, either through the use of the executive power of the President of the United States; by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts assuming the total expense, through its department of education, similar to what has already been done by the State of California; or by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the 13 cities and towns in which the 53 nurseries are operating at present, jointly assuming this expense; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts, the Governor of Massachusetts, the national headquarters and national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, the mayors or board of selectmen of the cities or towns wherein these nurseries are operating, and the press of Massachusetts.

Passed by unanimous vote this 8th day of September 1945, at Boston, Mass., by the executive committee, Department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans in regular session.

FRANCIS J. ROCHE,
Department Commander.
LEON CHASE WAITE,
Department Adjutant.

Whereas it is now the policy of the Army and Navy Departments to discharge from the military and naval service men or women whose immediate families have lost two or more members of the family, including fathers, mothers, sons, daughters, brothers, or sisters through death, while serving in the armed forces during this war; and

Whereas it is equally causing severe mental strain, suffering and collapse of some of the members of families throughout the Nation who have lost through death one member of the family while serving in the armed forces; and

Whereas the necessity of further retaining these above-named persons in the military or naval service has been greatly lessened through the results attained by our armed forces: Be it

Resolved, That the executive committee, department of Massachusetts, Disabled American Veterans in meeting assembled in Boston, Mass., this 8th day of September, 1945 respectfully petition the President of the United States and the heads of the Army and Navy Departments to discharge forthwith any person now in the armed forces who has suffered the loss of a father, mother, son, daughter, brother, or sister through death, while serving in the armed forces; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States and the national headquarters of the Disabled American Veterans for immediate appropriate action, and further, that copies of this resolution be furnished to the press of Massachusetts.

Passed by unanimous vote this 8th day of September 1945, in Boston, Mass.

FRANCIS J. ROCHE,
Department Commander.
LEON CHASE WAITE,
Department Adjutant.

We Can Control Forest Fires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, my native State of Oregon has again this summer suffered a devastating forest fire. Millions of dollars in forest products have gone up in flame. Much of this timber is owned by the Federal Government. A few years ago we suffered from the great Tillamook fire, which destroyed timber exceeding $400,000,000 present value which can never be replaced. Every precaution should be taken, and every agency—Federal, State, and local—should cooperate to devise ways and means of preventing these great forest fires. The Timber Operators Association in the Northwest has discussed this subject in an article which is well worth the consideration of all of us. The article is as follows:

The Timber Operators Association has a plan for controlling our forest fires. Like most good plans, this one contains nothing new or startling. It is a practical method of solving a problem with means that can be made available. The plan in brief is this:

The Federal Government will grant to the States in this forest area (namely, Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, and Montana) approximately 40,000 used Army trucks and 5,000 bulldozers, together with trucks and trailers on which to move them. The States will then convert the trucks into forest-fire trucks which will be made available to operators at a price varying from $50 to $200, depending upon the size of the truck. The operator will keep the truck, which will remain the property of the State, in good working order and available at all times in case of fire. As, under such an arrangement, it would be within the means of every operator to have one or more of these trucks, it should be made mandatory that one of these trucks be a part of every operation. The bulldozers and moving trucks would remain the property of the State and be stationed throughout the forest areas, to be used in building fire trails and fighting fire only.

The justification for putting this plan into effect at once is this:

1. We now have many fires in the States mentioned above which are out of control or are in need of greater control.

2. Many of these fires are in Federal and State timber, justifying immediate Federal and State action.

3. The trucks, bulldozers, and moving trailers are now available as surplus property.

4. It is a very simple matter to convert the steel bodies of the trucks into steel water tanks and thereby make fire trucks of them.

5. There is no more effective way to control fires than to trail them with bulldozers and get to them quickly with sufficient water to put them out.

6. This plan will for the first time place within the means of the thousands of small operators adequate fire protection.

7. It will relieve our fire-control program of that age-old curse recently expressed as "too little, too late."

8. The conversion of the trucks to fire trucks would make excellent gainful employment for many war workers who would otherwise have to rely on unemployment insurance during the next few months.

9. No doubt the steel and pipe fittings necessary to convert these trucks to fire trucks could be taken from surplus war property inventories here in the Pacific Northwest.

10. In 20 hours on August 24 and 25, 1933, one fire in Oregon burned over 270,000 acres of land, destroying approximately 10,000,000,000 feet of timber. This converted into lumber today would be worth no less than $400,000,000, which somewhat explains the wealth involved and justifies the action we propose.

11. This program will make possible the only possible means of controlling our forest fires which is to put them out before they become so large they are beyond the control of man.

12. The new uses and demand for wood make it more essential that we save our forests from fire.

13. The recognized need for lumber and employment in the future justifies the carrying out of this program.

14. This season 10 years of forest growth have been destroyed by fires, most of which are still burning. This plan, if carried out, would place at the disposal of industry and fire control agencies for the first time sufficient equipment to cope with the fire situation that must be controlled if this major industry is to survive.

Inside Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD one of Jim Brady's recent columns, Inside Washington, which deals with reconversion and touches on some of the vast problems of inflation, deflation, and economic chaos which lie before us. His column follows:

INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Jim H. Brady)

FROM HERE ON

Had the Japanese war lasted for several more months, fewer war workers would need to be absorbed into peactime occupations. Today, more than 45 percent of American energies are concentrated on war and war-supporting activities.

What are the problems from here on out? We see them sixfold. (1) Contract cancellations and terminations; (2) plant clearance; (3) handling of surpluses; (4) mustering our 12,000,000 veterans out of service; (5) handling unemployment claims; and (6) dropping governmental controls which have been imposed during the war.

REMOVAL OF CONTROLS

VJ-day was the signal to remove most wartime controls. However, several regulations imposed upon labor and management must be continued, at least for the time being, to prevent inflation.

One of the most important problems before us is the maintenance of proper production, distribution, and prices on consumer goods.

When the Japanese war ended it brought a sharp contraction in munitions employment. Workers have been and will be discharged from plants making planes, shells, tanks, guns, and ships. Also, overtime is a thing of the past. This will result in a drop in the income and, hence, in the purchases of those workers concerned.

DEFLATION

Many workers have built up savings during the war, or at least the wise people have. In addition, unemployment compensation benefits will tide them over the unemployment period before us. But liberal unemployment benefits offered by the Government are low compared with wages and families whose incomes drop will not be able to buy as much food, and many workers will have to postpone buying clothing until a job is before them again.

Such curtailment of expenditures could bring about secondary unemployment—in retail stores, in textile production, and others.

This condition is known as deflation.

INFLATION

Economic history might repeat itself and prices might rise above their present high pitch when controls are lifted. This would bring inflation. Money would be next to worthless if such an economic condition appears. This type of a national condition could lead to the repetition of the 1919–20 boom and later collapse.

GOVERNMENT OBLIGATION

There will be dislocation and unemployment for labor during the coming months. Hundreds of thousands of war workers will be looking for work in a peacetime industry. The reconversion of such industrial facilities will require time. Workers will have to be patient. The restoration of our economy to a workable peacetime function will require the cooperation of all citizens. The Government has planned projects. States and local areas have worked out plans for road construction and other public improvements.

DEPENDS ON PEOPLE

Although the Government can and probably will do all these things, a real job in achieving a swift transition from this type economy will require cooperation. It will fall upon industry, labor, and agriculture—on the businesses, farmers, and workers who comprise the American economy.

Although the Government can facilitate reconversion and take positive measures to support income or prevent inflation—to work out these problems will require the resourcefulness, imagination, and know how of all of us.

The World's Debt to Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the days and weeks pass the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt is growing ever greater in the minds and hearts of the American people. The contemptible attacks upon him which have continued even after his death are simply one more indication of his greatness.

One of the finest tributes to him which I have yet seen was written by Mr. Ronald D. Scofield in the Santa Barbara News-Press on August 19, 1945. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am including here Mr. Scofield's outstanding editorial about the most outstanding American of the past hundred years:

THE WORLD'S DEBT TO FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

(By Ronald D. Scofield)

The full extent of the world's debt to Franklin Delano Roosevelt may not be known for another decade—or some future date when qualified scholars have studied many state papers and personal memoranda to learn all the significant decisions by means of which the United States and the United Nations were enabled to whip the two great menaces to civilization—Nazi Germany and Imperialist Japan.

But even today, enough is known to statesmen and peoples of the world to enshrine President Roosevelt among the great men of all time—a world leader of great vision, courage, and ability who wielded overwhelming power, and used it for the benefit of mankind.

At the opening of the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, delegate after delegate arose to voice his country's tribute to the inspiring leadership of our late President. Former Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Marshal Stalin, colleagues in the Big Three conferences which charted the grand strategy of the war, have expressed their great admiration for the man whom they regarded as their leader and moderator.

Statesmen in his own country, of all parties and factions, joined in heartfelt statements of tribute to his war leadership—even though many of them had fought bitterly some of his domestic projects.

When the final victory over Japan was won, the thought was in millions of minds—"How good it would be if President Roosevelt could have lived to see this day." And the faith was strong in many hearts that somehow, somewhere, he must be aware of the final triumph of all he had worked for.

TRAGIC IRONY

It was one of fate's most tragic ironies that Franklin Roosevelt should have been cast in the role of the supreme leader of the most powerful Nation the world had ever known, engaged in the most tremendous war in history. For he was a man who loved peace, who sought for his countrymen and his fellowmen of other nations peace, prosperity, brotherhood, and freedom.

"I hate war," he told his fellow citizens, back in the days of his second administration, when Italy and Japan and Nazi Germany were becoming recognized as threats to civilization itself, instead of local troublemakers and gangsters. "I hate war," he repeated, with all the vigor and fervor which he was able to project into the microphone. "I have seen war, at first hand; have seen what it does to the bodies and minds of young men."

And he assured the parents of America—"Your boys are not going to be sent into foreign wars." It was a pledge that was hurled back at him later, by the ignorant or uninformed, when the expansion of Fascist and imperialist aggression made it clear to him that these "foreign wars" were, inevitably, by their very nature, only the first stages of a war to conquer and enslave our own country, as well as the rest of the world.

But stronger than his hatred for war was his love of country, his love of liberty, his belief in the brotherhood of man, and his hatred of tyranny and terrorism.

At his first inaugural he had told a frightened Nation: "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." Accepting his second term nomination he had said: "Today we have conquered fear." And "freedom from fear" was one of the Four Freedoms he proclaimed as fundamental to perpetual harmony among nations. This, too, forms an important part of the basis for the United Nations Organization—whose major purpose is to free the peoples of the world from want and fear.

WAR FOR SURVIVAL

Later than some, earlier than most, President Roosevelt saw the tide of human events turning irrevocably toward a world-wide conflict—a "war for survival" as he later described it, between the champions of ruthless force and suppression, and the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

He sought at first to persuade or cajole the aggressors, then to appeal to public opinion in the aggressor countries, then to resort to the legal force of treaties and guaranties, then, in despair, to "quarantine" the aggressor nations, and so seek to isolate war itself.

As these measures proved ineffective, he began prodding Congress and preparing public opinion for preparedness. But he faced subborn opposition from public and political opinion still influenced by the disillusionment of Versailles, of reparations and war debt repudiations, and of the recurring pattern of European power politics.

But when full-scale war broke out in Europe in 1939 and the Axis ran roughshod over country after country, stopping only at the English Channel while Britain lay almost defenseless across the narrow water barrier—Roosevelt soft-pedaled no longer.

Opposition groups in this country, gambling that there would be no Second World War, charged him with "war mongering," but he demanded the quarantining of aggressor nations; he urged repeal of the neutrality law that banned shipment of arms to any warring nation (even a potential ally), and in January 1939 he called for "measures, short of war" to defeat the aggressors.

Roosevelt supporters in Congress succeeded in remodeling the neutrality act to permit cash and carry purchases of arms by Britain and her allies.

ATOMIC BOMB STUDIED

It was in 1939 that the possibilities of the atomic bomb were brought to the President's attention, and he named a committee to investigate the fantastic new secret weapon.

After the Nazis swarmed through Holland and Belgium in 1940, Roosevelt set up a billion dollar emergency arms program and a National Defense Advisory Commission which turned later into the War Production Board. Despite some criticism in Congress, he traded 50 old destroyers to Britain for naval and air-base sites, working on the theory that the preservation of Britain and the British Navy were essential to American safety.

A month later, selective service was enacted by Congress, and the building of a new Army was begun. Naval and air programs were accelerated, industry put on a war basis, and America became, in Roosevelt's words, "the arsenal of democracy."

By March 1941, America's stake in the outcome of the war was apparent enough so that the furnishing of arms to our future Allies was taken off the business basis, and the multibillion-dollar lend-lease program was instituted. And in May, a few months after his third inaugural, President Roosevelt declared an "unlimited national emergency."

It was in August of that same year, 1941, that the Chief Executive met Prime Minister Churchill aboard warships anchored off the Newfoundland coast, and there drew up the Atlantic Charter, voicing the principles for which the two nations would jointly work, and eventually jointly fight. This meeting laid the ground work for the close military, economic, and political collaboration between the two national leaders, which contributed so much to the successful prosecution of the Global War.

SHIFT TO WAR BASIS

Two weeks after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor catapulted this Nation into a fighting war, Churchill visited Roosevelt in Washington, and together they drew the rough plans for all-out conquest of Nazi, Fascist, Japanese aggressors. The President turned out a profusion of proclamations and Executive orders, which shifted the Nation to a war basis. Congress gasped when Roosevelt proposed a 2-year production of 185,000 planes, 120,000 tanks, 55,000 antiaircraft guns, and 18,000,000 tons of shipping.

With Churchill, the President roughed out plans for the first offensive action, to turn the tide of aggression—the invasion of north Africa almost a year hence. They set up joint Anglo-American strategy and supply boards. And on New Year's Day, 1942, they promulgated the declaration by the United Nations, in which each signatory subscribed to the principle of the Atlantic Charter, pledged the use of its full resources against the Axis, and promised not to make a separate peace.

According to Churchill, the north African invasion was Roosevelt's own project. Had it failed, there would have been a very immediate threat to the Western Hemisphere, and there might have been dangerous reactions in Russia, which had been insisting on a second front in Europe.

TWO-BILLION-DOLLAR CHANCE

But while the uncertainty of this gamble was still unresolved, the President had the courage to take another chance—a tremendous one under the circumstances. He received the report on the atomic bomb, and gave the word to go ahead with the 3-year, $2,000,000,000 experimental development which paid off with the most awesome detonations ever caused by man, on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Drew Pearson declared in a recent column:

"Though a lot of people deserve credit for developing the new atomic bomb, one man stood above them all as the greatest single factor in its development—Franklin D. Roosevelt. * * *

"When he finally decided to pour $2,000,000,000 of the Nation's resources into hundreds of miles of Government-owned factories certain to consume the energies of half a million critically needed workers at the peak of the war, he was gambling not only the Nation's resources but his own name in history.

"Had the project failed, Roosevelt would have been the goat. The vast plants in Tennessee and Washington State would have been scoffed at as 'Roosevelt's greatest white elephant.' Political opponents could have used it to keep the Democratic Party out of power for a decade.

"Roosevelt, however, never flinched."

This courage to dare the consequences of possible failure was not the boldness of a moment; it continued through nearly 3 years—years during which every item of material, scientific skill, manpower, and money was needed desperately for all the orthodox, accepted weapons and supplies and agencies of the all-out war.

AS GOOD SOLDIERS

Despite the fears of those who bitterly opposed a fourth term for any President, most Americans today, as they learn bit by bit of the tremendous enterprises, problems, negotiations, and strategic plans which were at Roosevelt's fingertips, are ready to accept at face value his statement that he would accept "reluctantly, but as a good soldier," the fourth-term nomination which was tendered him in 1944. He felt the responsibility of his decisions, his terrific gambles, his commitments, so keenly that despite his weariness he was willing to continue to serve to the end of the war if the people wanted him.

On this day, which President Truman has asked be dedicated to honoring the memory of those who have given their lives to make possible our victory, let us bear particularly in mind the late Commander in Chief, who surely gave that last measure of devotion so that this Nation and the hope of the United Nations should not perish from this earth.

Labor's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Labor's Opportunity," published in the Labor Day edition of Trade Union Courier, on September 3, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR'S OPPORTUNITY

(By Senator HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio)

Labor Day 1945 celebrates the return of peace.

Labor—organized productive labor—thrives on peace. Labor is opposed to war. Laboring men and their families pay heavily for war. War casualties cut deeply into the ranks of labor and into the families of laboring men. War's destruction necessarily lowers the standards of living for laboring men below what those standards could have been if the same effort had gone into the production of useful goods as did go into the destruction of those goods and of the means of producing them. The debts of war are paid from taxes that weigh heavily on labor, while the profits of war rarely reach the laboring men. Even the temporarily inflated wages of wartime, when matched against the temporarily inflated cost of living, are often worth less than the lower wages of peace matched with the lower prices of peace. Labor, therefore, is for peace and rightly so.

Organized productive labor wants a just, as well as a lasting peace. American labor threw its full force into the fight to defend America against the attempt of the Axis to enslave the world under a dictatorship of force. This fight was won by laboring men and women of the United Nations in overalls as well as by those in uniform. Labor deserves a large credit for the victory and deserves a just peace worthy of the high price the world paid for it.

Organized productive labor favors economic progress. This calls for progress evidenced by ever-rising standards of living. Such progress can come from steadily increasing production, improved distribution, and fairness in the compensation of those who make the progress possible. Such progress calls for: (1) Sound financing that attracts the capital of both large and small investors; (2) intelligent management; (3) fair labor relations, including fair wages, reasonable hours, and good working conditions; (4) good salesmanship; (5) skillful distribution; (6) freedom from unnecessary governmental restrictions; (7) freedom on the one hand from unfair competition and on the other prohibition of enervating monopoly or governmental ownership, and (8) taxes designed to encourage increased production and low prices. In these days when the mobilization of scientific knowledge and inventive genius has been accomplished on a more effective scale than ever before, economic progress is receiving the cordial encouragement of labor in improving its product and reducing the cost of production.

Organized productive labor will find its greatest opportunity first in the promotion of scientific advances and second in even-handed justice in all industrial relations.

While historically some workers have opposed labor-saving devices and thus have opposed the making of new products contributing to the advancement of standards of living, this is not the policy of labor today. Resistance to labor-saving devices originated naturally enough from a fear of immediate loss of employment by the producers of the superseded articles, followed by long delay in securing new employment. Today, however, labor's greatest friends and leaders advocate practically unlimited scientific research and progress, including governmental support of it. The increased interdependence of the world today has made it clear that labor itself gains much from reductions in the cost of production of articles which contribute to the cost of living. Labor itself buys the new products or shares in the benefits from reduced prices for old products. But more than this, labor is now in a better position than ever before to see to it that the benefits from labor-saving devices are fairly distributed in wages so as to give to the labor that produces them a full share of the savings made. Labor has thus become one of the most effective promoters of labor-saving devices and of all kinds of scientific developments that may contribute to the welfare of mankind.

Labor has seen the automobile replace the horse and buggy with tremendous benefit to labor. Today there are millions more and better paid automobile, tire, and garage workers than ever worked in livery stables or blacksmith shops. Labor has seen the standards of living and the productive capacity of practically everyone in America rise to new heights with the help of the family automobile, delivery truck, and farm tractor. Labor today sees infinite benefits not only for the world but for labor itself from the steadily increasing capacity of man to produce new things. There is prosperity for the world and for organized productive labor in countless new fields, such as for example, those of aviation, radio, television, radar, plastics, plywood, fiber glass, magnesium, electric welding, improved heat treating of metals, centrifugal casting, metal spinning, metal spraying, electronic inspection and counting, processed foods, new medicines such as penicillin and sulfa drugs, gas turbines, and even atomic power. A recent report on the wartime technological developments of 1942 and 1943 lists some 1,400 new materials, methods, and products. In such progress lies one of labor's greatest opportunities. The more rapid and widespread these advances are the less delay and loss will result from the abandonment of the old for the new. Labor will enjoy the increased standards to be derived from the product, labor will share in the savings made by improved production methods and labor will be needed to meet the ever-increasing demand for new industries to produce, sell, and distribute the new products. Where a few men once were needed to produce a few things, in the future many will be needed to produce many things.

Labor's second great opportunity is that of insistence upon even-handed justice in all industrial relations. Labor's vision rises above differences of nationality, race, sex, or religion. Labor's interest in justice is as broad as that of humanity itself. Through its world-wide community of interest, labor has a special opportunity for service to mankind and to the lasting peace of the world. Justice in industrial relations will lead to peace and improved standards of living both at home and abroad. Even-handed justice is the firmest foundation for progress. Even-handed justice will be of more advantage to labor than could be any special but undeserved advantage, even if it be temporarily in favor of labor. The interest of American labor is in the American system of even-handed justice for all, in contrast to the dictatorship or special advantage of one class over another. Attempts to gain the power of dictation for any class over another is but a form of war and when gained can be maintained only by force. It is only in even-handed justice that there is the natural stability and balance that provides a dependable basis for lasting peace and prosperity.

In America, one of labor's greatest opportunities is to help put an end to economic discrimination in favor of or against anyone because of national origin, race, sex, or religion.

A part of labor's opportunity is the maintenance of adequate Federal industrial relations machinery for the prompt and fair disposition of industrial controversies. Such machinery will not only serve the best interests of the parties to the controversies but will command the respect and confidence of the public, which is fundamental to the success of governmental processes and which alone can give the sanction of law to any public agency.

While the present machinery of industrial relations is far better than it was a generation ago, it, like all other human machinery, needs revision and improvement from time to time. To this end and in the common interest of all concerned, especially in the turbulent reconversion period ahead of us, labor can render a great service to the public and to itself by cooperating in the public interest, without prejudice or bitterness, in the establishment and maintenance of industrial relations on a basis of special privilege to none and even-handed justice to all.

The Resistance Movement in Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the war's greatest epics of dauntless courage and heroism is the story of the resist-

ance movement in Norway. The Norwegians had even less warning before the Germans struck than we had before Pearl Harbor. After the inevitable shock and confusion at first, there soon reappeared the sturdy, unconquerable spirit which has been the characteristic of the Norsemen for at least a thousand years of which we have historical knowledge. Most reports from Norway agree that the Germans were blocked more than anything else by the indomitable leaders and members of the Christian church in Norway, led by Bishop Eivind Berggrav, primate of the Norwegian Lutheran Church. Most of these leaders were imprisoned by the Germans and their Quisling puppet government, but the resistance movement still was inspired and directed by them even though in confinement.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including a report of an interview with Bishop Berggrav by one of our Minneapolis reporters of Norwegian ancestry, along with his introductory paragraph. These appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of September 9, 1945.

THE BISHOP SPEAKS FROM HIS HEART

(By E. Hjalmar Bjornson)

When I was told that I might have about 45 minutes with Bishop Berggrav I took the streetcar out to the Oslo Bispegard with nervous fears uppermost.

When I came into Bishop Berggrav's office and he welcomed me with his warm smile and handclasp and we began to visit about friends we had in common, all feeling of anxiety was gone. I sat in a chair opopsite the bishop and studied his face. It spoke of the peace that lives in his soul yet it suggests also the suffering that he and his people have gone through in the last 5 years.

BISHOP REVEALS HOW NORSE MET NAZI TYRANNY

(By Bishop Eivind Berggrav, as told to E. Hjalmar Bjornson)

OSLO.—When was I imprisoned? I was taken on April 2, 1942, accused of high treason. I was tried before Minister Jonas Lie and Minister Riisnes. Their plan was to sentence me within 3 days. My trial lasted only 2 or 3 hours.

The crisis point in the church fight against Nazi domination arrived when all pastors had agreed to lay down their offices. In a document read in all churches we declared that Nazism represented a tyrannical state and that we could not work under it.

I was asked by the Quisling court whether I had been responsible for this document. I replied that I was the responsible person but pointed out such things do not grow in one man alone. We held these views in common and had discussed the document.

HEARD NOTHING MORE

After my trial I heard nothing until the Quisling lawyer appointed to defend me came to me in prison with the information that the court had refused to sentence me. I was told I was free on April 16, but at the prison gate I was taken by the Nazi police and brought to my summer cottage in Asker about 25 kilometers outside Oslo.

There I was put, the door shut behind me, and told I could see no one. I was to be free, however, to do what I wanted within my house.

There I sat for 3 years to the day. On April 16, 1945, I felt it necessary to find a safer place. I guessed then that the crisis for the whole Axis system was very near. Among my six Norwegian police guards were men I could trust. One of them, the chief of the Quisling guard, had been here for a year and a half. I knew him well and my impression was that he was now out of the Nasjonal Samling—at least his heart was out of it. Secretly I got some home-front men in the neighborhood to overpower my guards at night.

I knew the guards and their chief would make no resistance. This was an important point for me, because I would not have any shooting or the risking of lives for my sake. Yet the risk for the home front men was great because Gestapo members were not far away and most anything might happen.

WENT INTO HIDING

But the home front men succeeded without mishap. I went into hiding in the center of Oslo until May 8, 1945, when our liberation came. Mine had been a special concentration camp. The Quislings did not succeed in getting me locked up because Quisling saw in me, as he once put it, his "foe No. 1." When Quisling questioned me before my trial in the presence of all his ministers in the king's palace he threatened me.

He said I was responsible for all the trouble and should be "beheaded 100 times." Nevertheless, Quisling feared the church very much because its foundation was the word of God, and the conscience directed by it. These were forces which he had no possibility of overthrowing.

During all my imprisonment I had my reporters in the home front, among them my wife. She lived with her sister-in-law, the wife of Dr. Seip of the university, who was in a concentration camp in Germany. Our wives spent the years of German occupation together in Oslo.

STOOD BEHIND BISHOPS

Practically the entire Norwegian clergy stood behind their bishops and the document of April 1942 as one man, except a few who had become Quislings. Professor Skanke, as minister of church and education in the Quisling cabinet, had been a professor in a technical college. He had no religious background, yet he would be chief of the church. Under the Quisling order we would be allowed to work in peace only if we would be loyal to Nasjonal Samling. Our answer to them was that we were bound to loyalty to the confession of our church and nobody could tell us how to behave in matters spiritual.

This was a very earnest time. The Quislings had all power and could take, and often did, everything from us. Some of the clergy were tortured and one died after such cruel exercise. Another died in a concentration camp in Germany.

Somewhere between 10 and 15 percent of the 1,000 clergymen in Norway were imprisoned in Norway or deported to Germany. There was a special concentration camp for clergy in Norway where 50 of our number were incarcerated, among them four bishops—Bishop Helle, Bishop Maroni, Bishop Skagestad, and Bishop Krohn-Hanson.

Two leading laymen in our church, Hope and Hallesby, who were leaders of the church front after my imprisonment were finally arrested and sent to the concentration camp at Grini. In our struggle the laymen and the clergy were united in common unity stronger than anything before in our history. There had been tension between them before, but now there was only unity.

CLOSE COOPERATION

There was close cooperation between the church and the underground from first to last. The clergy took an active part in the work of the underground. Many of them helped in getting people out of the country. They were also deeply involved in military operations. All other detail fronts helped us. As a matter of fact, there was only one single front in Norway—not many separate fronts. There was not just a school front or a church front as a military front. They all worked together as one. Our common purpose was not one of opposition only.

It was more than simply a negative opposition. It was a positive burning faith in justice, in the rights of man, and in a free conscience in obedience to God. We stood for something, and therefore we stood against.

I was very busy during my 3 years of confinement, but I felt it was too dangerous to keep a diary. I was subject to a house investigation without notice. I did not keep one, but I did translate St. Paul's letter to the Philippians from the Greek into Norwegian. One reason I chose the Epistle to the Philippians was that Paul wrote it while he himself was in prison. It had a message for me and to my own people in my imprisonment.

I have carried this little New Testament, badly worn as you can see, in my breast pocket always. Before trials I took it out and read it over and over again. I read perhaps most frequently the epistles of Paul. The whole book has given me "frimodighet" (frankness and fearlessness of mind).

Yes, I exercised a certain amount of influence in directing the home-front resistance, but perhaps my greatest influence was exercised indirectly. We had become one soul. The people treated me as symbol during the years we cooperated so closely.

I have always had a direct connection with the people and the home front. Members of the home front asked me if I would give them my opinion in connection with the conduct of the resistance and this I did. I could sneak out into the woods from my house and there I met representatives of the home front for conferences.

On several occasions I met with some of the German opposition to the Nazi regime who came up to Norway from Berlin. Sometimes I would go at night in disguise to Oslo for these conferences. Most of them were German Lutheran army officers.

ONE GERMAN LIQUIDATED

One of them, Count von Moltke, was a member of the German Supreme Command in Berlin. He was liquidated in 1944. He flew up here to meet with his colleagues in the German resistance movement within the Nazi army stationed in Norway. I met with him on some of his trips here. Then there was another German officer, Steltzer, by name, also stationed in Norway, who gave us very important information about German military affairs. Such information we sent to London.

Steltzer was rescued at the last moment and is alive in Berlin today. It is to him, I think, that I owe that I was not liquidated in 1942.

He was a Christian and we had become friends through common work in the underground. He was in a German uniform but in our secret meetings he wore civilian dress.

HAD ETERNAL VALUES

What was the influence of the church in unifying the resistance front? I would not say that the church as such was the unifying element. The eternal values and rights for which the church stands however, indeed were. This was the inspiring force. Many among us who were not directly Christian used to say "This is a spiritual war and ours is spiritual warfare." All through the country schoolmasters, physicians, lawyers, professional people, personnel in the post and telegraph and other Government offices were with us. The Government administration was Quisling but individuals working in it made sabotage and in their hearts were strongly patriotic.

Yes, I think there has been a deepening of life and outlook upon it of the part of people during the war. But I do think that we should look for results particularly from that source.

Unless we acknowledge that moral values are supreme, and that technical efficiency comes second, we will not succeed in building the new world we promise ourselves.

READ OF AMERICA

I was highly interested during my imprisonment in reading books about America and was deeply impressed and very happy to see that we may expect from America not only technical equipment but most valuable moral help. As far as I can see very much depends upon a more open air in the relations between the people of the United States and the common man in our European countries.

I don't think the governments alone will be able to activate these forces. Governments do not have the means—they are too political, too formal in approach, to do it.

Governments feel themselves that they alone are without the means for this task. There must be a big awakening of the common people all over the world, starting perhaps in the United States. We experienced a deep sorrow in the loss of Franklin D. Roosevelt, but we are happy that his successor was a personality like President Truman.

I want to send my particular greetings to the people of Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, the Dakotas, where there are so many bound closer to us by ties of kinship. I would tell them that we in Norway shall not give up hope in the present situation of vacuum in which people do not seem to know, at the moment, just what they aim at. We shall activate the moral powers of our Christian tradition.

I would also like to express our deep gratitude to all friends in these United States and thank them for every prayer they have offered and for the many gifts they have made to Norway.

Quite particularly I want to be remembered to Bishop Aasgaard, in Minneapolis, whom every Norwegian knows, respects, and loves. He was here in August 1939, just before the war broke out, to take part in our northern bishopric conference.

We in Norway put very much hope for reconstructing and rebuilding the church edifices that have been destroyed here with the help that has been outlined to us from Lutherans all over the United States. The damage to our churches, particularly in the north, has been very great.

In Finnmark, for instance, over 50 percent of all churches were burned by the Germans as they retreated. Of the 48 churches once in Finnmark some 26 have been destroyed, and elsewhere many churches have been destroyed or damaged. We shall need about $3,000,000 if we are to be able to resume this important work among the people in these devastated areas. My desire to see these churches rebuilt has a personal note, for without the Bible and its help I cannot see how I could have gone through these last few years.

Coal to Kilowatts on the Main Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger from the Sunday Oregonian of September 2, 1945:

COAL TO KILOWATTS ON THE MAIN LINE—ELECTRIFICATION OF RAILROADS HERALDED AS POSTWAR ANSWER TO WEST'S PROBLEMS OF SURPLUS WATER POWER, UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

CHAPTER 1

Early on an autumn morning 8 years ago, two men sat in the last car of a long steel train on the Union Pacific siding at Bonneville, Oreg. Dew still clung to the grass along the right-of-way, and the sun had yet to tint the broken lava cliffs which frowned down on the railroad tracks.

One of the men in the little parlor at the back of the train was rotund and ruddy, with a forester's calm eyes. He looked out the window in the direction of the Columbia River, where spray rose in a gentle haze above a massive concrete rampart.

"Well, Mr. President," he said, "this is the day you dedicate the dam."

"This is the day, J. D.," said the other man.

"This will always be a big day in the history of the Northwest, Mr. President."

"I hope so, J. D."

The other man looked down toward the fortresslike bulwark barricading the swift mountain waterway. "J. D.," he asked, "what are you going to do with all the power generated here and at Coulee and the other sites along the river?"

Current promises jobs, conserves oil

The chunky man answered with assurance. "Well, Mr. President," he said, "I think some day we'll use it to move this train—and all the other trains out West, too."

The other man looked at him and smiled. "That's an idea, J. D. Be sure to look into it," he said. Then the secret-service man came with the President's braces and the conversation was interrupted.

Both Franklin Delano Roosevelt and James Delmage Ross, whom he appointed as the first Columbia River power Administrator, are dead now, but the proposition which they had in mind, as they sat in the President's private car, "Roald Amundsen," on the Bonneville siding in 1937, is certain to be one of the main postwar issues in the vast American region between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Ocean.

Indeed, it may well be the main issue, for it touches the three principal questions confronting the far West. Those questions are:

1. Employment of men formerly engaged in war industries, particularly shipbuilding and airplane manufacturing.

2. Conservation of basic resources now threatened with exhaustion or, at the least, grave depletion.

3. Utilization of the greatest supply of hydroelectric energy yet developed anywhere in the world.

Dr. Paul J. Raver, the present power Administrator of Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, believes that electrification of the main-line railroads of the West is a major step in the solution of these problems. And he adds that he and his staff are "fast reaching the point where he will want to discuss this matter directly with top American railroad executives."

By electrification Dr. Raver does not mean any such piecemeal project as the 70 miles of New Haven track between New York City and New Haven, nor the Great Northern's 72 spectacular miles over the Cascade Range, nor even the 650 mountain miles of the Milwaukee Line, which to date covers a longer stretch of territory than any other railroad electrification in the world.

These are important undertakings, but the power administrator conceives of a project that would be the greatest single railroad-construction development since the transcontinentals were originally thrust westward.

Eleven States on electric-line drafting boards

Dr. Raver believes that hydroelectricity should move all the trains that cross the Continental Divide and roll down to the ports of the Pacific coast. His staff is studying the problems related to the electrification of main-line railroads in the Pacific Northwest and is reviewing the possibilities in the other 11 Western States. The route miles involved in these States—Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, California, Oregon, and Washington—would exceed the combined total of all previous railroad electrifications anywhere on earth.

"The use of oil and coal for railroad prime movers in a region so abundantly supplied with inexhaustible low-price electric power as the west is paradoxical," claims Dr. Raver. "For example, our direct interest in railroad electrification is predicated on the idea that western hydroelectric power should be used to help conserve exhaustible natural resources, provide opportunities for the sound investment of private capital and, similarly, to provide opportunities for the full employment of labor. In addition, electrification would improve the actual operation of the railroads of the West."

Seven lines make tough pull across the Rockies

Seven of America's principal lines would be involved in this scheme. They are Union Pacific, Great Northern, Santa Fe, Southern Pacific, Northern Pacific, Denver & Rio Grande Western, and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific. All trains arriving at the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains would change to electricity for the upland journey across what railroaders call the big hump of the Continental Divide and on to the Pacific seaboard. A total of 8,000 miles of main line would be put under the catenary of overhead trolley wires.

J. D. Ross called Bonneville Dam "an oil well that will never run dry, a coal mine that will never thin out." This is one of the basic ideas behind the railroad electrification scheme. Power can be produced on the Columbia River as long as snow melts in the Canadian Rockies and water flows downhill. No drop of oil nor lump of coal is needed for this process. Oil reserves are another matter. Locomotives now burn vast quantities of bunker C fuel oil, hauling trains across the main mountain ranges of the North American Continent.

Hugh B. Mitchell, United States Senator from Washington and a member of the Senate War Investigating Committee, who was in Portland recently, announced his support this past week of the railroad electrification proposal.

"Those of us," announced Senator Mitchell, "who have watched the electrification development of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the two Virginia coal-hauling railroads, realize the advantages of this type of motive power in securing greater traffic volume at higher speeds and lower costs.

"Electrification," continued Mitchell, "has its greatest fields of usefulness under conditions of high traffic density or steep grades, like those encountered in crossing the Rockies and Cascades. Electrification permits regeneration on down grades, thus making possible the most effective use of power.

Cost biggest barrier to new program

"As I see it, there is only one barrier to complete electrification, and that is financing. This can be solved if the electric manufacturers are willing to approach the problem in the same manner that General Motors approached the marketing problem of the Diesel streamliners.

"The advantages are so marked and the needs so great," the Washington Senator concluded, "that railroad electrification in the Northwest is bound to come into its own like it has in the mountainous countries of Europe. Future conservation of fuels will require moving trains with power from falling water."

Six years ago the national resources committee announced that the country's oil supply "must be considered as strictly limited." The committee foresaw the eventual exhaustion of America's "natural reservoir of oil," with the Nation then turning to "high-cost" substitutes. The situation is more serious today after the steady drain of war and lend-lease. Benjamin T. Brooks, noted petroleum technologist, believes that the United States faces the immediate prospect of changing from "an oil-exporting

Nation to an oil-importing Nation." He adds that "damage to producing fields by overproduction will accentuate the shortage after the war and increase the oil deficiencies which we shall have to make up by imports."

Costs less to operate with kilowatts

On Dr. Raver's desk is a memorandum showing the posibility of saving 200,000,000 gallons of oil annually. This is the plan for electrifying 8,000 miles of main-line railroad in the far West. The project would cost approximately $440,000,000, divided as follows:

Trolley system	$160,000,000
Power conversion and trackside substations	120,000,000
Electric locomotives	160,000,000
Total	440,000,000

Once this outlay had been made, no expendable resource would have to be used to move a main-line train in the intermountain or Pacific coast regions. "From a western point of view," declares Ivan Bloch, Chief of Bonneville's Industrial Development Division, "one must consider the obvious necessity of reserving limited oil supplies for ocean and air transportation purposes, both as a wise commercial move as well as for purposes of national defense. Certainly the abundant sources of inexhaustible hydroelectric power in the West should be used in railway transportation."

For the past year a young 38-year-old engineer named T. M. C. Martin has been adding up columns of figures and analyzing railroad operating costs in an obscure corner of the Bonneville-Grand Coulee Power Administration. He went to Yale on a fellowship endowed by Lord Strathcona, builder of the Canadian Pacific, and there he decided that trains could be operated efficiently in only one way. When Tom Martin glimpses a big 4-8-8-4 freight locomotive wrestling with the grades of the Blue Mountains or Continental Divide his heart does not thrill. Instead, he forgets the snorting monster before him and in his mind's eye sees a trim electric locomotive, hooked to all the surging energy of the Columbia River, handling 125 loaded boxcars as though they were toys.

Martin drew up the estimate of $440,000,000 for electrifying all main lines from the eastern edge of the Rockies on westward. By completely standardizing equipment, so that locomotives and other facilities can be turned out by mass production methods, he believes that the cost can be reduced to the neighborhood of $300,000,000. As an example, he points out that the Pennsylvania Railroad paid less than $350,000 per engine when it purchased 100 electric locomotives. The Great Northern bought two electric locomotives and paid about $500,000 apiece.

Herbert Hoover, when he was Secretary of Commerce in the Coolidge Cabinet, said that "simplification of standards" would hasten the electrification of railroads in the United States. Should all the lines of the far West electrify under a coordinated program, Martin contends that the capital investment will be reduced materially. He thinks, for example, that the cost of the locomotives would drop from $160,000,000 to $110,000,000. The price of the trolley wires would descend correspondingly, he declares. "The ideal situation from the standpoint of economy and efficiency," says the Bonneville railroad expert, "would be for all the main lines of the West to use the same type of current, the same kind of locomotives, the same sort of catenary equipment, the same substation equipment, since they have, generally speaking, the same operating requirements."

The first outlays are substantial, but Martin is certain that railroad electrification eventually will pay for itself. He does not even regard the steam locomotive as a competitor any more. The steep grades of western lines are gradually bringing the Diesel engine to supremacy over steam, in his opinion, "Through the arid upland desert of the intermountain region," he claims, "the shortage of suitable water for boilers is sufficient alone to dictate a change away from steam operation." So he considers the Diesel engine as the sole alternative to electrification.

Diesel differs from electric engine in one detail

Between a modern Diesel and an electric locomotive there is only one primary difference. This difference is the catenary wire strung above the tracks. The Diesel engine operates with electricity generated by its own mobile power plant. It carries its generators on wheels. The electric locomotive picks up its energy by a diamond-shaped pantograph which slides along the trolley wire. The Diesel engine burns oil to produce its power. The electric lomotive draws on the juice generated at a hydroelectric project on some mountain river.

Martin and his associates have just completed an extensive analysis for electrification of a typical division on a main-line railroad in the Pacific Northwest. The division is 180 miles in length and crosses the inland empire. In preparing this survey, Martin worked with Carl C. Long, chief of Bonneville's system-development section. Long has made studies of railroad electrification in the mountains of Switzerland and Italy. He and Martin compared Diesel and electric locomotives on this 180-mile Pacific Northwest division, both from the standpoint of capital investment and annual operating expenses. This is the result of their survey:

Capital investment

	Diesel	Electric
Trolley and distribution system	----------	$4,250,000
Power supply substations	----------	1,750,000
Communication and signal changes	----------	800,000
Diesel service stations	$100,000	----------
Locomotives	4,900,000	3,200,000
Totals	5,000,000	10,000,000

One look at this end and the electric locomotive, despite the fact that it does not deplete dwindling oil reserves, is out of the running. But the ledger has another page. This page is headed:

Annual expenses

	Diesel	Electric
Maintenance of way	----------	$30,000
Maintenance of locomotives	$350,000	175,000
Engine crew expense	600,000	450,000
Depreciation — fixed property	----------	140,000
Depreciation — locomotives	800,000	130,000
Total	1,250,000	925,000

"In the annual operating expenses no charges are shown either for Diesel fuel or electric energy," says Martin. "This has been necessary because although the price of electric energy can be predicted with certainty, no one can say with any real assurance what price should be assumed for Diesel oil over the next 5 years."

Martin believes power will be cheaper

Martin adds that he declines to make any guesses as to oil prices. "Let's just assume," he continues, "that the costs of Diesel fuel and water power cancel one another. Let's say they are equal. We can put power from the big dams on the locomotives now to compete with the Diesel engines in operation, and before another 10 years we may find that electricity can be put on the locomotives much cheaper relatively than that produced with Diesel oil." Thus it would cost $5,000,000 more to electrify this 180-mile division than to install Diesels. However, it would cost $325,000 a year less to operate the line under electricity. Thus, the investment would pay off eventually, with 15 years as the probable period. But there are other considerations at stake. Two in particular involve the national interest: (1) postwar employment, and (2) conservation of petroleum reserves.

In view of these factors Martin foresees a possible policy under which the Federal Government might share with the western railroads the first cost of installing electrification facilities. The railroads would be expected to provide the locomotives and the trolley lines. The Government would build the substations and other electrical equipment necessary to deliver power directly to the wire suspended over the railroad track. In the case of the typical Pacific Northwest division studied, this would knock $1,750,000 off the capital investment required of the railroad. Then the Columbia River power administration would ultimately recover its outlay in the power rate charged the railroad.

Dr. Raver believes some such sharing of the costs must be worked out. "In our appraisal of the western railroad electrification problem," he says, "we recognize the burden of the large initial investment which the railroads would have to make in so-called trackside facilities for power delivery—that is, from our transmission lines to the trolley wires. We are giving study to the extent to which the Bonneville Power Administration may provide portions of the trackside facilities by carrying, perhaps within the power rate, amortization elements which would permit the railroads and the Government, together with manufacturers of electrical equipment, to extend the period of financing over as long a period of years as practicable."

Break for the Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, apropos of discussions on the streamlining of the Congress and other branches of the Government, it strikes me the following editorial from the Washington Star of September 10, 1945, is very worthy of consideration:

Of all the advocates of Government reorganization who so far have testified in favor of that highly essential undertaking, Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren should have the prize for calling a spade a spade.

Here is his salty description of the executive branch of our Government: "A hodgepodge and crazy-quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies, with their attendant extravagance. It is probably an ideal system for the tax eaters and those who wish to keep themselves perpetually attached to the public teat, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill."

Continuing in this delightful vein, he adds: "With nearly three hundred billion debt, I hope I am not to be considered as too old fashioned if I say it is time to draw in our belts; to see that the Government at least gets value for its huge expenditures, and to weed out inefficiencies and hold those in charge with a responsibility that cannot be dodged or evaded. One of the necessary and essential parts of the reconversion program is that the Government put its own house in order."

By way of illustration, Mr. Warren has furnished the following data: The transportation field is divided between 75 bureaus, divisions, and agencies; public housing is financed by 15 agencies; 8 departments and agencies have their fingers in the pie of labor relations; 8 bureaus and agencies have something to do with vocational education and rehabilitation; 6 agencies are concerned with nutrition and research in that field; 3 or 4 agencies are doing something about juvenile delinquency; the Children's Bureau, the Federal Security Agency; the Social Security Board's Bureau of Public Assistance, together with programs of the Federal Works Agency Bureau of Community Facilities are involved in aid to the States in care of dependent children.

This indictment of confusion comes from a man who heads an agency directly responsible to Congress, rather than to the Executive, who spent years in the House of Representatives and is as jealous as anybody of Congressional control. But with other reasonable men he favors handing the problem of Government reorganization over to the President and letting him go ahead in the abolition of functions, creation of new departments, amalgamations, and anything else he chooses to do—with the right of veto of any particular plan reserved to Congress by concurrent resolution within a specified time limit.

That is the only way in which effective reorganization can be brought about. In Mr. Warren's excellent language, "Congress can give the taxpayers their first break in a long time by giving the President the authority he asks for."

Proposed Medical-Service and Hospital Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as a contribution to the current discussion of medical service and health, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Dr. Harry C. Guess, which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News magazine August 18 last.

Dr. Guess proposes a combined medical-service and hospital plan. In this particular plan he would have each county medical society, the hospitals in each county, industry, labor unions, granges, savings banks, and Blue Cross hospitals included in the operation and maintenance of the proposed plan.

Dr. Guess, the author of the article, is a well-known Buffalo physician; past president of the Medical Society of Erie County; a member of the executive committee of the Blue Cross, a voluntary hospital plan; and a member of the board of trustees of the Western New York Medical Plan, of which he has been called the father. He was president of the staff of the Millard Fillmore Hospital for 3 years.

This is a very interesting plan, and while I have not looked with complete favor upon any particular plan, I think this adds to the discussion, and I hope the article will be read by all those concerned with medical care.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. GUESS PROPOSES COMBINED MEDICAL SERVICE AND HOSPITAL PLAN

(By Dr. Harry C. Guess)

(Dr. Harry C. Guess, author of this article, is a well-known Buffalo physician, past president of the Medical Society of Erie County, member of the executive committee of the Blue Cross (voluntary hospital plan), and a member of the board of trustees of the Western New York Medical Plan, of which he has been called the father. He was president of the staff of the Millard Fillmore Hospital for 3 years. However, he writes in none of these capacities—only on the basis of his experience in the last 6 years with prepaid medical and hospital plans. He presents his plan, not as an utopia, but as a practical suggestion and solution to the problem of adequate medical care for all the people. Dr. Guess' suggestions are in answer to an editorial in the Buffalo Evening News which pointed out the need for increased public health services and said the public is looking to the medical fraternity to lead the way.)

With the introduction of the second Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill and presentation of plans by the Pepper committee and the United States Public Health Service there has come into the open again the subject of adequate medical care. Everybody agrees that it is necessary to do something for the sick by methods different from those to which we have been accustomed. Organized medicine admits there are areas which do not receive adequate medical care.

Every plan submitted to date has been with Government subsidy, though it has been proved that this is not the method preferred by those who have had experience in care of the sick. There must be some plans that will provide medical care for all—medical, home and office, obstetrical, surgical, and hospital care. It is therefore up to the medical profession to offer a workable plan to give medical care without subsidy.

Care of our people should rest with the medical profession, hospitals, organized labor, and industry. The medical profession and hospitals have always pioneered in the care of the sick. They are stanch advocates of budget plan health assurance. They have made and are making efforts to offer prepaid health assurance plans.

SHOULD SHARE EXPENSE

Industry has been awakened to the care of its personnel through compensation insurance and many industries have gone a step further. This is their obligation and their program should be advanced. Labor unions, notably the AFL and the CIO, have contributed much to care of their members, and they, too, must go much further.

The four groups above can offer health assurance to all by sharing the expense for care of the sick in community areas. The Blue Cross hospitalization plan has proved that properly managed nonprofit medical organizations can have a substantial surplus each year. Hospitals are, as a result of efficient methods and financial trends, increasing their funds. A few medical complete-service plans that are functioning are operating at a loss. The rates for health service are high, but those for hospitalization or surgical plans permit a profit. It is, therefore, necessary that each community prepare the plans necessary for complete medical, surgical, and hospital care.

Indemnity insurance is not the answer. The cheap-money paradise in which we are now basking will not continue indefinitely. Therefore, this is the time to form plans for all who need medical care, and plans to pay for that service by budgeting and planning.

START HAS BEEN MADE

In 1938, as president of the Erie County Medical Society, I appointed a committee consisting of Dr. Harvey Hoffman, afterward president of the Western New York Medical Plan, and Dr. James Borrel, afterward president of the New York State Medical Association, to formulate a medical-service plan. As a result, the Western New York Medical Service Plan received a State charter in 1940 to operate as a nonprofit corporation for the care of the sick. Preventive medicine was included.

Actuarial figures were not available. We made mistakes; we learned many lessons. The doctors underwrote the plan and accepted the losses. We then entered the present history-making era and our problems were many. Indemnity is now sold exclusively, but a few service policies still are in force.

Surgical indemnity was started to attempt to write off losses; services to doctors were reduced. The officers' road was not easy. As the Blue Shield medical plan continued, the losses continued. The Blue Cross hospitalization plan continued to prosper in leaps and bounds. Today the assets of the hospital plan are 10 times greater than those of the medical plan. This is true probably in all places where medical service has been tried by nonprofit organizations in competition with indemnity companies.

FOUR BASES FOR PLAN

In the last 6 months the western New York plan has progressed somewhat better, however, probably due to the fact that money has been plentiful, and intensive drives have been made to sell indemnity policies. However, unemployment looms and we must prepare to meet possible problems.

My plan is predicated on the fact that there is professional medical service in every county in every State of the Union. Blue Cross hospital plans are operating in 33 States, and spreading rapidly. Industry is spread all over the country as are hospitals, labor unions, granges, and savings banks. These comprise the basic organization for this health-assurance-for-all plan.

Each county medical society is the basic point and next the hospital, the Blue Cross, industry, labor unions, the Grange, and banks. Nonprofit medical groups would be established in each community. The same organization follows for Blue Cross plans, hospitals, industry, and labor.

UNDER CONTROL BOARD

In each county or group of counties there would be an executive committee composed as follows:

Four doctors: Two general practitioners from an existing medical plan, and two specialists of the county medical society; two trustees of the existing Blue Cross Hospital Plan; three members chosen by industry; one AFL representative; one CIO representative; two hospital administrators; two hospital trustees.

These 15 would be the nonprofit executive holding corporation.

Each group would hire a secretary to carry out detail work.

In rural communities grange and bank representatives would be substituted for industry and labor representatives.

The holding corporation would have all assets of the Blue Cross plan and medical plans and would pay the Blue Cross plans for their administration and clerical work.

TWO-PART POLICY

If no Blue Cross plan or medical plan were functioning, the executive committee would get members from groups underwriting the plan.

Each group would be chartered under the laws of the State in which it operated and be under supervision of the State's insurance and banking departments. The executive committee would be bonded and responsible to the various regulatory laws.

The policy to be sold would consist of two parts: (1) That for complete hospital care;

(2) that for medical, obstetrical, and surgical care in office, home, and hospital.

This would be classified as a universal, all-inclusive policy, with each group fulfilling its duties and not infringing on the rights of the other.

The fees for doctors' services and hospital charges would be commensurate with those charged in other areas, based upon compensation insurance rates. In States that do not have compensation insurance, average rates would have to be established by the executive holding corporation. This committee would meet monthly, its officers elected for 2 years. The medical and hospital plans would have trustees, and officers would be elected each year. Officers from each group would meet every 3 months, and also meet with the holding corporation.

FEE 13 CENTS A DAY

Group medicine advocated by many could be a reality when necessary without full-time salaried doctors and could be so ordered by the committee discussing cases and fees and the conditions diagnosed. This plan is also flexible enough to cover the field of dentistry and drugs after medical, surgical, and hospital care have been established.

The cost of hospital, medical and surgical, and obstetrical care will be approximately 13 cents a day. Compared to some existing plans at 7 cents a day, 13 cents will seem high, but there will be no connection with compensation insurance nor will any compensation companies be contributing to this plan which will be entirely divorced from compensible conditions.

Chronic illness will be cared for with limitations by the executive committee's decision after all facts have been presented by the various committees.

All existing institutions will be used in each community, thereby eliminating a great expense for new hospitals and facilities.

EIGHTY-PERCENT COVERAGE

Municipal employees also would be covered, with each municipal unit paying the share equivalent to industry and labor unions. Municipal and State employees would receive $30 toward their policies if not in a union. If in a union, the public employer would pay $12, the union $12, and the worker $24. The latter would be a payroll deduction of $2 a week for 12 weeks.

Coverage of all public industrial workers would give approximately 80 percent of our population ample medical protection.

There are surplus funds in virtually every State that could be used as a bonus of $12 or $18 for workers.

The public must budget for sickness. Each worker who receives more than $300 a year would have to have, under this plan, a health policy. This health policy would cost $48 annually. It would be written for single and married workers with bona fide dependents. Industry would purchase the policy for every worker, deducting $2 a week from his salary for 12 weeks. Industry would pay $12 toward the policy, and in the case of a member of a labor union, that union would contribute $12 toward the policy. If the worker is nonunion, the $12 would be divided equally between industry and the worker for payment. The executive committee of the medical and hospital surgical plan will receive the full amount for the policy in advance.

PROVIDES FOR DEFICIENCIES

Should there be a deficiency it could be divided four ways—among doctors, hospitals, industry, and labor unions. Should there be profits, the policy holders would receive the benefits after the second year. With this assurance, large surpluses will not be needed. Win or lose we have adequate medical care. This is a plan by all and for all without profit to anyone. Straight-life-insurance companies, if they preferred, could sell this coverage.

There will be close to 20,000,000 veterans and dependents who will have a right to look to the Government for care when needed. After the last war it cost the Government $120,000,000 a month for veterans' hospital care. A plan run on the community basis would save much money in Federal taxes. The work on pay roll deductions would be minimized. Industry could borrow the money, if necessary, and the worker would be protected medically for 1 year. This would make him a better worker with that assurance. Should he become unemployed, he would still be cared for on that year's policy.

NO LUXURY CARE

To protect the physician a ceiling for services to a single worker, without dependents, would be set at $1,800 a year; single with dependents, $2,400 a year. For a married man, with or without children, the ceiling would be $2,400 a year providing he is the sole support of his wife.

Doctors would have to see that there is no unnecessary or luxury care. Doctors' committees would have to cooperate with the executive committee in arriving at fee decisions and settling other subjects.

Chiseling would probably play a small part, and would have to be dealt with severely by committees selected at intervals by the executive committee from the various divisions.

Experience has shown us in this part of the State that these infringements are few compared to what they were when the Western New York group practice was started.

This plan could be worked for medical and social indigents and could be purchased on the same basis as it would in industry. Taxpayers again would be protected, welfare administration expenses would be minimized, and each community would be caring for its own without aid from the Federal Government.

EDUCATION NEEDED

Preventive medicine could become a reality.

The fear by the doctors of Blue Cross plans dominating medicine would be eliminated. Profits would be evenly distributed. All would carry the expense proportionately. Money placed in capital surplus or contributed to charity by industry could be used by industry to care for its workers. Greater protection would be maintained by better health. The good-neighbor policy between labor and industry would be promulgated. The money collected by labor unions could be used for bettering the conditions of their own members.

No doubt much education will be needed by some of the medical profession to accept this type of assurance for all, but the days of isolationism in medicine are getting fewer and the idealist who believes he is different from the profession in his ability and possibilities must see a new order, or accept a bad order in the form of State or Government medicine, surgery, and hospitalization. Under the plan we would have adequate medical, surgical, and hospital care without fear or favor, and the free choice of a physician, which has proved the best policy for civilian care.

COOPERATIVE HEALTH PLAN OUTLINED

Who would operate the plan

1. Each county medical society.
2. Hospitals in each community.
3. Industry.
4. Labor unions.
5. Granges.
6. Savings banks.
7. Blue Cross hospital plans.

Services offered

Part 1. Combined medical house and office; surgical office, house and hospital; specialist's service. General practitioner's service.

Part 2. Complete hospitalization.

Cost of policy

Combined, all-inclusive coverage, $48 a year.

Method of payment

Employer advances cost of policy for each worker.

Employer's share of cost, $12 or $18.

Worker repays employer $24 or $30.

Labor union repays employer $12 for each member.

Worker's share deducted $2 a week for 12 or 15 weeks.

If nonunion, worker pays $30, and employer $18.

Plan operates on same basis for civil and industrial workers.

The executive committee of the plan receives payment for policy at beginning of each fiscal year or at each quarter in advance for a 1-year policy.

Ceiling on paid-out benefits

Single worker without dependents, $1,800 a year.

Single worker, bona fide dependent, $2,400 a year.

Married worker, wife and children or no children, $2,400 a year.

Married man and wife, both workers, $2,400 a year.

Proposed Site for Permanent Headquarters of the United Nations Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring before the House of Representatives the following resolution adopted by the Poughkeepsie Kiwanis Club, of Dutchess County, N. Y., which is in the Thirtieth District represented by me here in the Congress, offering a suitable site at Hyde Park, N. Y., for the establishment of permanent headquarters for the United Nations government:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE POUGHKEEPSIE KIWANIS CLUB, AUGUST 28, 1945

Whereas the United Nations are now giving consideration to a site for the permanent headquarters of the United Nations Government with a site in the United States considered probable; and

Whereas it is desirable that such site be spacious enough to afford room for the many structures and services essential to such a project; and the site be convenient to international lines of communication and transportation; and that such site have a background of natural beauty conducive to the high purposes of world peace and prosperity; and

Whereas Dutchess County has such a site, situate at Hyde Park, N. Y., where the United States has title to extensive and adequate lands for such a purpose; and

Whereas Hyde Park as the home and burial place of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has a special sentimental appeal to most of the United Nations—many of their representatives having visited there in recent years—and the people of those United Nations knew Franklin D. Roosevelt as the symbol of United States good will and material aid; and

Whereas the selection of such site would honor the memory of a man who by virtue of his leadership of this Nation through most of the war period, contributed outstandingly to a United Nations victory and the formation of a United Nations Organization for World Peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kiwanis Club of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., does respectfully urge upon the President and Congress of the United States to offer a suitable site at Hyde Park, N. Y., to the United Nations for a permanent headquarters; and be it further

Resolved, That all individuals, legislators, and organizations of every nature who approve such proposal are hereby invited to endorse such plan and work for its attainment in such manner as they see fit.

Resolution offered by:

FREDERIC A. SMITH.

AUGUST 28, 1945.

Scoop From the Bilge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean.

The editorial follows:

SCOOP FROM THE BILGE

For 12 long and, to the Chicago Tribune, excruciating years the hatchetmen of Col. Bertie McCormick chopped at the stature of Franklin D. Roosevelt. They wore out their hatchets. Roosevelt living was too much for them.

Roosevelt died just before the Nation he had led in peace and in war planted its flag in victory on the crushed schemes of the enemies of mankind. Hatred of this great American President still gnaws like a fox at Colonel Bertie's vitals. His men have been sent out with new hatchets to hew at the good name of a good man gone to his grave.

The Chicago Tribune is the newspaper to which the American people would not hearken, for which Colonel Bertie will not forgive them. Had they so hearkened they would have sat on their hands while Germany and Japan gobbled up the rest of the world. There would have been no VE-day in Berlin, no VJ-day at Tokyo. Hitler and Hirohito now would be debating whether the American surrender papers should be signed in Washington or San Francisco, or at both places at once.

This is the newspaper that used to scream every day before elections that the defeat of Roosevelt was essential to the preservation of America, that the reelection of Roosevelt would set up a dictatorship. In its campaigns against Roosevelt living there was no vileness to which the Tribune would not stoop.

In its continuing thrusts at Roosevelt dead it has contrived to stoop even lower. Using the Pearl Harbor reports as a pretext, it has scooped from the bilges of its own hate-poisoned liver the stagnant residue of its bilious spleen to cast after the memory of the man the American people, oft-judging him, loved and respected.

And still will love and respect despite the Tribune's slimy charges that our Pacific Fleet was caught flatfooted and sunk in the mud of Pearl Harbor because Roosevelt planned it that way. For the American people will remember that in those anxious years when the totalitarian war machine rumbled about the conquest of the world it was Franklin Roosevelt who pleaded with his countrymen to prepare to defend their liberty, but the Chicago Tribune, loudest voice of the isolationists, which scoffed at the plea and denounced the leader.

Comes now this discredited newspaper to keep echoing the voice of Radio Tokyo which brave American soldiers have fought across 3,000 miles of ocean to still; innocent Japan wanted only to keep the peace, America forced her into war. The Japanese war lords had no thought of striking America (an event they had planned for generations), it was the bloodthirsty Roosevelt who left them no choice.

Colonel Bertie's Hatchetman Flynn labors this Japanese thesis through 10,000 words of alleged "proof"—and succeeds in proving that the Chicago Tribune still hates Roosevelt. The rest of his purported evidence is drawn from Japanese sources (Flynn's surprise piece is an "intercepted code message" from Tokyo to Berlin a week before Pearl Harbor saying that United States-Japanese relations are ruptured) and obiter dicta lifted from past files of the Chicago Tribune. These "statements of fact" were merely the editorial opinions of the Tribune itself. They are: that Roosevelt was playing the British game, that he had engaged himself to bring the United States into war with Japan, that he deliberately provoked the Japanese to attack us.

Upon them Flynn erects a case of contradictions and absurdities. Roosevelt maliciously weakened the fleet in the Pacific to invite the Japanese to have at us; but Roosevelt massed the fleet at Pearl Harbor to excite the Japanese. He arrange the fleet to be in Pearl Harbor like sitting ducks as bait for a Japanese attack; but he was certain the attack would be against British territory, at Singapore perhaps, and perhaps on the Philippines or Guam. Roosevelt knew the attack was coming, he had set the stage for it—the scenery is beautifully arranged; but when the attack came he was appalled and frightened.

Colonel Bertie's hatchetman paints the late President as a two-faced, arrogant know-it-all. Yet he elaborately plotted Pearl Harbor just to keep his word to the American people that their sons would not go to war unless the Nation were attacked. Because plainly the President could not have worked out this dark and fantastic plot alone, Flynn is compelled to bring into it the high-ranking military and administrative figures around him: Cordell Hull necessarily would have to have been a party, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy must have known—or have been dolts. Flynn explains it all on political grounds.

Supreme Court Justice Roberts headed a commission that investigated Pearl Harbor promptly after the attack. Roberts was a Republican. But, pontificates Flynn, "This was the master stroke." Roberts had himself advocated "an open declaration of war. * * * Now he had his war. He could be depended upon not to cast any stain upon its infancy."

To the Chicago Tribune there were no decent Americans—who disagreed with the Tribune's isolationism.

The Tribune has spun its preposterous yarn. Its picture of Franklin Roosevelt, happily aware that the "war he desired" was about to break, waiting at the White House on December 7, "playing with his stamp collection, with only his friend, Harry Hopkins, with him" is quite on par with a thousand other fabrications aimed at the same man by the same newspaper in its incessant and futile assaults upon his prestige.

Roosevelt himself would have delighted either to ignore or to overturn this latest traduction. Since he no longer can speak, millions of American citizens who before now have had no difficulty in choosing between him and Colonel McCormick will have no difficulty in knowing now where lies the truth and where the false witness.

As for the Tribune itself, no one expects it to change its spots, even for decency—or perhaps last of all for decency. But since it appears to be so thoroughly persuaded that "Roosevelt did it" and leans so heavily in this persuasion upon the testimony of the enemy, it must have given prominence to the assertion made yesterday in Japan by Rear Admiral M. Kanazawa, commander of the once great naval base of Kure.

"Japan," the admiral assured Clark Lee, of INS, "made very many strategical mistakes, but the biggest mistake of all was starting the war."

Perhaps Colonel Bertie and his hatchet men will undertake to put the admiral right.

Sixth Anniversary of the Attack on Poland by Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., of Saturday, September 1, 1945:

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ATTACK ON POLAND BY GERMANY

Six years ago at 5 o'clock in the morning the Nazis unleashed their hordes for conquest, starting the second war. Though unprepared for the attack, Poland resisted valiantly—though disarmed, terrorized and subjected to unbelieveable and fiendish tortures, Poland fought on—the only occupied country without a Quisling. For 5½ years within the borders of their motherland, the Poles have waged a desperate and relentless struggle. Poland has paid a terrible price for this struggle. Hundreds of thousands of hostages were hung or shot, and hundreds of villages have met the fate of Lidice in reprisal. The Polish underground Army has kept over 500,000 Nazi soldiers immobilized and about 60,000 Gestapo agents busy.

Outside of Poland, the Polish troops fought for Narvik, the Battle of Britain, Tobruk, Monte Cassino, in Italy, France, Holland, on the sea and in the air over Europe, and the 63-day battle of their underground army in Warsaw with the Nazis, proving again to the world that no sacrifice of blood or suffering is too great for the Polish nation.

POLAND WAS PROMISED BY DECLARATIONS MADE

By President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

On October 14, 1939:

"Historic devotion of the peoples both of Poland and of the United States to the cause of liberty."

On January 6, 1941:

"We were committed never to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers."

On July 5, 1941:

"The Polish struggle—an inspiration * * * to liberty-loving people everywhere."

On August 21, 1941:

"A message to the Congress of the United States containing the text of the Atlantic Charter;

"Second. No territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third. The right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live: Sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Sixth. That all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

On July 9, 1943:

"The Polish people may be certain that their sufferings and unceasing contributions to our common cause will not be forgotten when their hour of liberation strikes."

On August 31, 1943:

"Restoration of a rule of justice."

On May 3, 1944:

"It was Poland who first defied the Nazi hordes."

In June, 1944:

"Poland shall reassume her rightful place among the free nations of the world."

By the Secretary of State Cordell Hull:

On September 28, 1939:

"Agreement signed in Moscow between the Government of Germany and of Soviet Russia, disposing of the territory of the Polish Republic, is an illegal act in direct violation of existing treaties and international law." (The Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement.)

On March 21, 1944:

"All nations, large and small * * * are entitled to freedom from outside interference."

By Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles:

On July 27, 1940:

"The people of the United States are opposed * * * to any form of intervention in the domestic concerns of any sovereign state."

On July 31, 1941:

"United States does not recognize any changes in Poland."

By the Assistant Secretary Adolph A. Berle:

On September 1, 1942:

"Restitution of freedom to the deathless Poland.—An emblem of our victory."

By the Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.:

On December 18, 1944:

"The United States Government stands unequivocally for a strong, free, and independent Polish State with the untrammeled right of the Polish people to order their internal existence as they see fit."

WHAT REWARD POLAND RECEIVED FOR BEING A STEADFAST LOYAL ALLY?

1. One-half of Poland given to Soviet Russia.

2. The remaining half of Poland dominated by Soviet Russia.

3. A Moscow-made new government for Poland composed of Russian Communists.

4. Polish Army numbering over 250,000 soldiers, who fought at the side of American and English Armies, dare not to return to Poland in fear of arrest, deportation, or even execution.

5. Liberated Polish workers that were forced to work in Germany and prisoners of war, dare not to return to their motherland in fear of arrest, deportation, or even execution.

6. The only legal Polish Government in exile in London, which was recognized as such by the United States and 41 other United Nations for 5½ years, was not consulted even once as to the affairs of its people in Poland.

In the name of 10,000 Americans of Polish ancestry we appeal to all of our fellow citizens, Americans of good will.

Protest against the new partition of Poland which was approved by the United States.

Protest against depriving Poland of her full freedom, independence, and integrity by the Russian-made new Polish Government composed of Russian citizens with the approval of the United States.

Defend Poland—for in defending her you defend truth and equity, right and justice—you defend collective security of the world and the individual security of our country, the United States of America.

COUNCIL OF THE POLISH SOCIETIES AND CLUBS IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE, MEMBER OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS.

Sale of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ANTLERS, OKLA., *September 9, 1945.*

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
Congressman, Third District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: I have just received your communication from the Petroleum Administration for War relative to the release of butane equipment which we were interested in. As you no doubt recall, the subject of our interest was why they would or could release equipment for installation in homes here by a firm in Oklahoma City and at the same time deny our applications for installations on farms in the county that were and are producing food products and could, therefore, be classed as essential users.

In further connection with the above letter, I note that Mr. Webber goes to great length to explain the part butane played in the war effort, but he reverted to the old Army game of just passing the buck and/or plain avoiding the issue, namely, why our applications were denied and the ones from the "big boys" approved. Of course, the restrictions have been removed now and so he evidently feels that that should clear up everything.

With the removal of restrictions on quite a number of items for civilian users comes another problem that I would like to call to your mind in connection with the GI bill of rights. I note with no little concern that certain parts of the bill are to be studied with the end to ironing out portions that make it entirely unworkable to the veteran as it now stands.

Along these lines I should like to relate some of the difficulties I am experiencing in the attempt to set up and operate my newly established business. You know my background; that for years I managed a sizable retail store here before joining a large wholesale concern in Dallas. You know my experience, and I believe you would consider me competent to recognize and combat any ordinary obstacle that might arise in the normal operation of a business.

The GI bill of rights as it is set up is supposed to provide assistance to the returning veteran in establishing his own business, if he should so desire. Certain priorities were supposed to be established for the purchase of scarce items from surplus commodities and the Smaller War Plants Corporation was assigned the function to carry out this phase and to arrange financial assistance should it be required. Any value this service might have intended is defeated before it gets started because a later clause plainly stipulates that should any purchases be made the items cannot be resold. Now I ask you, how in the name of the Almighty can a man profit from buying merchandise that he is not allowed to resell? Incidentally, these purchases are arranged through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the surplus commodities agencies that will sell to any individual on a bid basis anyway. Yet if the sale is made for a GI through the bill of rights, he is not permitted to offer these goods for resale.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty I am encountering is the fact that mine is a newly formed business and the wholesalers and factories plainly state that they are going to take care of their old customers before they supply any new ones. One manufacturer has told me that he has 3,400 butane tanks made up but that he cannot accept my order until his earlier orders to his old customers are filled. Of course, these old customers are the ones who stayed here at home and have had advantage of wartime business and profits and I am just one of several other GI Joes who have given a few years to making it possible for those old customers and that same manufacturer to enjoy their business. This same manufacturer performed Government contracts in the manufacture of shell casings. Of course, the first argument in his favor is that he was also doing his patriotic service. Sure he was, but so was the GI and on a nonprofit basis, except maybe for a little stray metal he might collect—in his body.

The above situation is typical of every wholesaler contacted in my efforts to purchase goods for my store. Now it seems to me that if Congress and the President really want to give some assistance to the veteran who is trying to rehabilitate himself through the establishment of a little business, the solution is very simple. Just empower the Smaller War Plants Corporation or a like agency to, when the GI has located a source of supply, simply "freeze" that manufacturer or wholesaler's stocks until that GI has been permitted to make the purchase of his requirements. His purchases would, of course, have to be limited to quantities based on the size of his establishment or it might end up with a lot of GI establishments merely operating as "fronts" for some big retailer.

Paul, I think I am like most of the other fellows will be; we don't want Uncle Sam to give us anything. We just want an even break with the boys who have stayed behind.

Again thanking you for your concern, I am,

Your friend,

TOM BUTLER.

Address by Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt as published in the Wesleyan Methodist of August 15, 1945:

Slogans are as essential in fighting modern wars as men, ships, airplanes, weapons, ammunition, and food. During World War I such slogans as "the war to end war" and "to make the world safe for democracy" inspired us to speed up the war effort.

The outstanding slogan for World War II has been the "preservation of the American way of life." Presumably the power in this slogan is derived from the fear in the average American's heart that life will not be the same in our country if we lose the war. In other words, the slogan conveys the impression that loss of the war means that "the American way of life" will be supplanted by a German or Japanese way of life.

Although the war with Germany ended 3 months ago in a decisive victory for the United Nations, the danger of losing the American way of life is greater than ever. Despite the fact that Germany is a broken, bankrupt, and defeated nation, policed today by American, British, French, and Russian troops, the teachings of Bismarck and Hitler have spread to America and are strong enough to threaten the overthrow of the

American way of life in favor of the Prussian way of life, otherwise known as compulsory peacetime military training.

Early in June a special House Postwar Military Policy Committee conducted extensive hearings on the general proposition that there should be some sort of universal military training following World War II. With few exceptions, the only supporters of compulsory peacetime military training were War Department attachés, Army officers, and others likely to benefit from the establishment of militarism as a national policy. A great array of church, educational, farm, and labor leaders appeared and registered their protests against any form of peacetime military training as being bureaucratic, despotic, and undemocratic.

DOES THIS ACCOUNT FOR IT?

The Army attitude can best be understood by fact there are 1,600 generals, many of them lieutenant colonels and captains before Pearl Harbor, who are not enthusiastic about retiring or being placed on the inactive list. These men will need a large peacetime army to preserve their status and salary rating.

The House Postwar Military Committee by a vote of 16 to 6 favored the adoption of a broad policy of universal military training to be conducted in such a manner and on such a basis as to cause the least interference with normal education and careers consistent with the effectiveness of the training program. Now that the House Postwar Military Committee has spoken, it is up to the House Military Affairs Committee, of which Representative ANDREW J. MAY, of Kentucky, is chairman, to announce when hearings will be held on Mr. MAY's bill, H. R. 515, which provides for compulsory peacetime military training.

When a powerful Nation like the United States adopts the policy of universal conscription it must be because of danger from attack by an equally powerful nation. The nations charged with bringing on World War II are Germany and Japan, but they will be powerless to attempt another world conquest for many years to come, if ever. Therefore, in the words of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, on the international horizon "there is nothing to fear but fear."

TALKING PEACE, THINKING WAR

On the other hand, the only nations capable of waging large-scale warfare are England and Russia. With these nations we are entering into a world peace organization, which Commander Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota and recently an American delegate to the San Francisco United Nations Conference, says will postpone World War III for at least 50 years. Then, in the name of common sense, why put the nation on a permanent military basis when the young men to be trained within the next few years will, if still living, be well past 50 at the start of the next global war? Surely, it cannot be that we have no faith whatever in the good intentions of England and Russia. It is difficult to conceive how our mighty allies can be less interested in maintaining peace than we are. Certainly their losses in the present war have far exceeded our own, great as they have been.

As we see it, compulsory peacetime military training can mean only that our statesmen have very little faith that the San Francisco Charter can prevent future wars. When we start training millions of young men, the movement to militarize the entire world will be under way. Because America has adopted universal conscription and launched a mighty military machine to go with it, every nation upon the earth, small and great, will feel compelled to fall in line and be ready to go to war on a moment's notice. There can be but one result: All the peoples of the earth reduced to slavery by the frightful cost of the armament race we have precipitated.

WHO WILL BENEFIT MOST?

Moreover, the adoption of compulsory peacetime military training will cause great rejoicing among the brewers and distillers. The close link between the Army and the brewers throughout World War II indicates that 17- and 18-year-old boys will be given every possible inducement to cultivate the drink habit while receiving their allotted training. By this test, universal conscription may be regarded as the biggest blow yet aimed at the temperance cause in America.

Any bill proposing even the mildest form of compulsory peacetime military training constitutes a grave threat to the American way of life. Once enacted into law, it will be possible of amendment over and over again until there would be nothing lacking to make our system comparable to the detestable Prussian system at the height of its infamy. When that time comes, which God forbid, there will no longer be any American democracy. Freedom will have given way to bureaucratic dictation with our people told where and when to work as effectively as under the military systems of Germany and Japan.

People who believe in preserving the American way of life have no time to lose. They must write and wire their United States Senators and Representatives at once demanding that they work and vote against any bill proposing compulsory peacetime military training in any form whatsoever. Democracy must be preserved! Hitlerism must be crushed in the United States as well as in Germany!

Truman Swings Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of September 11, 1945:

TRUMAN SWINGS LEFT

All lingering doubts about whether President Truman plans a "middle of the road" course vanished with his official message.

In that message the President swung far to the left.

His program is as radical as any ever expressed by President Roosevelt, and has none of those occasional bursts of caution which made the original New Dealer describe himself as only "a little left of center."

By his 21 recommendations, President Truman seeks objectives almost identical with those of the new Labor Party administration in Great Britain, now openly committed to state socialism.

The American version is galloping communism financed by creeping inflation.

In the 16,000-word message, some lip service was paid to private enterprise initiative, and some reference made to our overmortgaged national economy; but there was no realistic facing of two facts; first, that we can have "free enterprise" only by freeing it, and second, that our finances are so depleted anything less than drastic economy spells collapse, bankruptcy and ruin.

To a nation overspent and overtaxed, stagnating and inert at the threshold of great opportunity, President Truman offers more deficit spending and little tax relief.

To a people tangled and immobilized by administrative red tape, he recommends vast new communistic delegations of power to himself and to his bureaucratic friends.

To an industrial and commercial economy, the wheels of which have been locked by the overbreaking of OPA, he offers further rigid controls which deny the facts of economic life under free government.

Unprecedented new peacetime powers which he seeks for his executive department include:

The Nation's first peacetime conscription.

Dictatorship in the White House over millions of public employees.

Vast arbitrary power to subsidize favored groups in industry and agriculture.

Preliminary steps to a government credit monopoly.

Authority to gamble virtually without limit in industrial and agricultural activities under the guise of buying "stock piles."

Potential monopoly of Government in the forthcoming building and housing programs.

The unquestioned right to play international poker with billions of dollars of taxmoneys.

The matters just listed are those which augment the President's powers at the expense of the Nation's safeguards of freedom. In many other items, he proposes new thrusts at private initiative just as deadly to freedom—and just as thoroughly saturated in the doctrines of Marx and Lenin.

He backs, for example, thinly disguised national "closed shop" program under the misnomer of "full employment." He proposes a new scheme of "general inventory controls" which would inject the hand of bureaucracy into even industrial, commercial, and business house in the Nation. He supports to the hilt the "scissors play" squeeze being operated by OPA against private enterprise through the two blades of, first, inviting wage increases, and second, freezing prices.

Mention of the President's love for "free enterprise" and desire for balanced national finances, in the midst of such a program, is as convincing as a bespectacled Japanese ambassador bowing and smiling at those he plans to destroy.

The program is communism and national socialism in false whiskers. It would make a joke of the American Constitution, and finish the New Deal master project of overturning the American form of government.

Congress is asked to vote itself out of office—to retire on higher pay from its constitutional duties and rights.

Exactly the objectives which the Socialist Labor Party in England is seeking openly would be attained here by indirection. Where the British plan to nationalize the Bank of England, we would drive private credit out of existence by a Government monopoly. Where Attlee expects to buy up basic industries, Truman and the OPA would squeeze the life out of them by bureaucratic controls, and then take them over. Where the Laborites of England plan the direct nationalization of land, this would be accomplished here by the more roundabout but equally certain process of endless subsidies, regimentation, interference, restriction, and, of course, though not mentioned in the Truman message, the final unionization of farmers and farm employees.

The death of small business is spelled in a few words. Here they are: The public, said the President, is "entitled to buy * * * products at prices based on our traditional system of high output and low-unit costs. The promise of good profits for businessmen must not be based on small initial volume."

To those who know their history, all this has a familiar ring. In detail after detail the program is that by which Adolf Hitler sold the German people the idea of letting him be their dictator.

The keynote is the same old New Deal doctrine of fear and planned scarcities, superspending, and ever-rising bureaucracy.

The fact that Truman himself is wobbly on many of the points is little comfort. He backs down somewhat on cancellation of lend-lease, pulls in his horns a bit on the peacetime draft, tries to straddle on taxes, dodges the real issue at the labor union-war veteran tug of war, ducks the question of a national audit, and runs for cover in such matters as the Wagner health bill, the social-security extension, and certain current war subsidies.

But liberty and free government need only one wound to die—not many. The Truman program is deadly to them both.

And for all this vast extension of government authority and spending, which would crucify both freedom and resources of the American people, which would plunge us inextricably into the heart of the inflation mire in which we have been wading, what is the excuse?

Admittedly there is none; we have resources, manpower, machinery, materials, and markets. Under true free enterprise, success would be assured.

But there must be some semblance of an excuse to turn our back on the principles which made America the greatest Nation on earth.

What is it?

President Truman begs Congress and a Nation eager to tread the paths of freedom to invent the only emergency he can think of—to pretend that the war isn't over.

Tribute to the Late President Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying article by Winifred Brand, editor of the Detroit Westward:

THE DETROIT WESTWARD,
Detroit, Mich., September 6, 1945.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Member of Congress,
Dearborn, Mich.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Inasmuch as we have failed to see in any other newspaper in Detroit or elsewhere any mention of tribute or gratitude to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt for the victory we have won, we are taking the liberty of sending you under separate cover a copy of the August 24 edition of the Detroit Westward.

On the front page of this publication you will notice an article, Give Thanks Where It Really Belongs, written by our editor, Winifred Brand, in which we have expressed tribute to the men whose foresight and courage laid the foundations for the final victory.

I think you will agree that it in no way casts any reflection on our current President, nor does it seek to minimize the great work he is doing.

However, inasmuch as we believe this is the only newspaper article of its kind to have been run, and considering the support this newspaper has always given the administration, war loans, publicity for all Government and service organizations, and the space it has devoted to morale-building material of any kind, we believe that you might consider the publication of the afore-mentioned article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As far as the war bond drives held in the past few years, we have aided both financially and through the medium of our newspaper, to sell over $7,000,000 worth of bonds.

Trusting you will consider this suggestion, I am,

Very truly yours,
ALEX G. HACKENBERG, *Manager.*

GIVE THANKS WHERE IT REALLY BELONGS

To President Truman, who came into power on the eve of victory, came the plaudits of the Nation for our celebration of VJ-day.

In not one newspaper have we seen any article, any printed word, giving the credit where it really is due, on the lid of a casket sealed in May.

To our late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt should go at least a prayerful, grateful memoriam for this, our greatest victory. It was for this he worked, and to this end he died.

Long before we knew there was such a thing in the offing as the powerful atomic bomb, which decided the final outcome of the war with Japan, Roosevelt knew it, and in spite of opposition and criticism, gave the scientists the green light on experimentation.

While the Nation was seething in indignation against the President, demanding, in its ignorance, "Why don't we take our strength away from Germany and fight Japan first?" when critics and the anti-British were sneering and accusing Roosevelt of pulling Britain's chestnuts out of the fire while we let our own scorch, he knew, and he was one of the very few who knew, that Germany, too, was working night and day to perfect that terrible weapon, the atomic bomb.

Throughout this long and hard term of office, President Roosevelt poured the last full measure into the cup of the working man. He was accused of extravagance, playing politics, wanting to be a dictator, and through it all he kept the poor from starvation, made work for the unemployed, and pushed a protesting Nation into a position where it could swing into war production when it was necessary. For this, too, he was called a warmonger. He was sneered at, derided, and insulted.

But through it all the late President Roosevelt looked further ahead than any of his critics He was a big man who did not stoop to even recognize small things or small people.

At the time of his death, on the eve of victory over Germany, Roosevelt knew what was ahead. He knew we would have the atomic bomb for our final victory. He knew what he was doing when he took 99-year leases on strategic islands. He had looked ahead into the future for America, a future which he knew he would not be here to share.

At the height of our victory today, let us give all the credit that is due President Truman, but let us not forget, too, to lay at least a wreath of grateful remembrance on the still form of our fallen Chief.

It was for this he lived, and it was to this end that he died. Thoughtless, ungrateful, and stupid though mankind be, let us at least be big enough to recognize his part in the victory today and not leave it for our grandchildren to do, poring over the pages of history books a generation hence.

The Neuropsychiatric Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest and most difficult problems the Veterans' Administration and the country as a whole will have to deal with in the months ahead is the problem of the so-called neuropsychiatric veteran, of whom there are literally hundreds of thousands. I have just received a most thoughtful contribution to the study of the problem from a friend of mine who is working with it every day. He has a high military rank and occupies a very eminent position among neuropsychiatrists in this country. His letter, of which I include a portion, makes clear the difficulty of giving successful treatment to a psychiatric patient in the Army when much of his difficulty may be an inner rebellion against the whole military set-up because of experiences in battle or otherwise which are inevitably associated in his mind with the Army.

I believe the position is valid that neuropsychiatrists are going to be more needed and will be far more effective in giving treatment to veterans after they are returned to civilian life than while they are still in military service; and that the Army and Navy should speed drastically the discharge of many of the neuropsychiatrists still being retained in the service as well as of the milder borderline neuropsychiatric cases. I am bringing this to the attention of the appropriate Army and Navy officials and also of the Veterans' Administration:

CONVALESCENT AND REGIONAL HOSPITAL,
September 2, 1945.

Dr. WALTER JUDD,
Representative from Minnesota, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: The end of the war having arrived, we seem to be in the place of trying to determine how many doctors need remain to take care of physical and mental casualties, assist in demobilization, etc., and how many can be permitted to return to civilian life.

Since I am a neuropsychiatrist, I can give you more information regarding this field than any other. We commonly hear that neuropsychiatrists are essential for rehabilitation of the soldier, that psychiatric casualties are tremendous, etc., etc.

The truth of the matter is the following: The military psychiatrist can at best have only a small part in the rehabilitation of the soldiers, since he is an officer as well as a psychiatrist, and the average soldier is actively hostile to the Army and to any symbol of Army authority. Thus the psychiatrist is unable to establish a rapport with most patients at this stage—that is since the cessation of hostilities—and can accomplish little unless he can promise the patient a quick discharge, in which case the discharge usually cures the patient. In addition, the number of hospital admissions for psychiatric reasons has fallen off sharply since the cessation of hostilities, since the motivation to escape overseas duty and combat is now gone. Most so-called psychiatric cases need some experience of civilian living which cannot be given in an Army atmosphere. Civilian psychiatrists can help them to some extent—Army psychiatrists cannot. Thus statistics dating to the era before the cessation of hostilities are now usless, and should not be taken as indicating a great need for psychiatrists.

The veteran's bureau stated recently that they were not ready to aid psychiatric casualties. May I ask why they are not ready? The civilian physicians are the only ones who can establish a rapport with psychiatric casualties of war, who now react markedly to the military atmosphere and military doctors.

The statement that there is a great shortage of neuropsychiatrists is without foundation. There are actually plenty of them but they

are tied up in small station hospitals all over the country which have few or no patients, and are kept open to pad the rolls so as to show a need for Army doctors where no need actually exists. Most of these station hospitals at small bases could be closed and the same work done by a dispensary, freeing thousands of doctors and permitting the patients to obtain better care in general and regional hospitals.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Demobilization—When?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, when will the American men and women get out of military service? The answer to that question will depend upon who answers the question.

Ask the Army? The answer is, the point score is too high to let very many out within a year or more. Each change in the point system made by the Army has been more of a camouflage than a reality in providing for speedy demobilization. Each news report setting forth changes proposed invariably states that 12 or more months will be required to let most of the boys and girls out, and that is the rub. The same old story every time—12 months or more.

Ask the Navy? Precisely the same story as with the Army.

It all leads to the inescapable conclusion that neither the Army nor Navy ever intended up to the present time to have a very speedy demobilization. Point scores have been purposely made too high to let very many out. If that were not the case the total number of points required would have been fixed much lower. Let us place the responsibility exactly where it belongs—on the high Army and Navy authorities that do make the plans for demobilization.

Ask the American people? Never to my knowledge has the great majority of the American people been so aroused and so worked up as they are now since the war, they say, is over. Is the war over? Unconditional surrender terms have been signed by all enemy countries. Does not that mean the war is over? Why does the Army and Navy high authorities not act to show the American people that the war is over by immediately modifying the point system—if they must have a point system—so that many millions of men and women in the Army and Navy who are not now needed for occupation of conquered territory may be immediately released?

Ask Congress? The individual Members of the House and Senate in their speeches that can be read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have given expression to intense disappointment toward the slow way demobilization is going on. In fact, that expression, intense disappointment, is not nearly strong enough.

The American people are justly proud of the great victory brought about by magnificent leadership and valiant fighting. They want to love their Army and Navy high commands. But if those high commands are not wise enough to sense the intense feeling of the American people against the keeping of unnecessary millions in service, they themselves will be responsible for completely changing a great admiration.

May we respectfully urge those in the Army and Navy responsible for the point system to see the black clouds rising before the lightning strikes, and make immediate reasonable changes to let millions out who are now needed.

Conserve Childhood Values as Well as Property Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I briefly spoke in support of the need of continued Federal aid and assistance to child-care centers in my native State of California for a period of 6 months at least. I am informed that about one-fifth of all the child-care centers of the Nation are in the State of California and that about 47 percent of the children in such child-care centers in California are from homes in which the father is still in uniform and the mother is still at work. I am also informed that this average of 47 percent is distinctive for California and brought about by the centralization of war effort in California. The fact is that the percentage in other parts of the Nation is only 35 percent. There are about 21,000 children in the child-care centers in California, about 10,000 of whom are school age, and I recognize that these must be back at school; but that leaves over 12,000, and more than half of whom are in Los Angeles County, of preschool age. The city of Los Angeles alone has 91 centers for preschool children with an attendance of almost thirty-five hundred. My home city of Long Beach has 31 centers for about eleven hundred children.

Children in the Nation having fathers still in uniform and mothers still at work present, I believe, a definite Federal obligation which should cause the proper authorities to more seriously consider terminating this worthy child-care program on October 31. I believe it should not be terminated on that date, but should be extended for a period of at least 6 months, for during that period many important adjustments will be made in home life as well as in industrial life. In the Eighteenth District of California, which I represent, there have been mass meetings, committee meetings, meetings of parents and school leaders on this problem which the welcome surrender of Japan has brought suddenly to the foreground. I have dozens of letters and telegrams on the subject since Japan surrendered. The child-care centers in my district have sent out notices to the parents that their child will no longer have care after October 31. At the end of my remarks I set forth copies of six of the dozens of letters I have received. September 7 I sent the following telegram to Virling Kirsey, superintendent of schools, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Have received dozens of letters from Los Angeles County mothers of children of fathers still in uniform, and also not in uniform, demanding continuance of child-care centers for both groups of children, but primarily for preschool children. Please advise me fully immediately California present provisions and whether yet definite what California will promptly do if anything. Thanks. And also advise me your judgment relative further Federal assistance and program necessary and to what extent. Thanks.

And I received the following answer:

Public funds cannot be spent for preschool education in California. Numerous groups petitioning Governor to have laws changed at emergency session of legislature anticipated for near future. Matter to be discussed by Assembly Education Interim Committee, September 25. Gardner Johnson, chairman. No assurance of what may occur. Federal assistance should continue until permanent place of program is determined. Program should be provided to care at least for children of war widows, disabled veterans, and mothers with husbands still in service, and families of deceased war workers until readjustment is completed.

On September 6 I received a wire from Ruth Forbes Sherry urging support of continued child care centers and giving me notice of mass meeting. I replied to her wire as follows:

Answering your wire just received informing me mass meeting, September 6, re nurseries for children of workingwomen, and asking my position on same. Will gladly agree. Strongly favor same. Am advised about 60 percent of mothers having children in child care centers in California are servicemen's wives, while national average is about 35 percent; that California on July 31 had about 21,000 children between 2 and 14 years of age; that city of Los Angeles had about 5,400 and Long Beach about 1,100; that large percentage of mothers and servicemen's wives was not known at time Lanham Act money was asked for. Have talked personally with General Fleming and Mr. Field of FWA and definite feelings were that Federal Government had different obligation to children and wives of men still in service than to other children and President Truman has asked General Fleming to report situation to Lanham committee immediately and ask extension of program for only children of working mothers of men still in uniform, if possible, as Lanham Act limited to war emergency needs. No other present Federal legislation permitting extension or expenditures for such child care services. Reports were also that California State has not yet adequately entered the picture. Have wired Doctor Dexter, director of education, Sacramento, and Virling Kirsey, of Los Angeles, asking information. Federal basis of Lanham Act was largely that mothers were needed in wartime industries during war and that need now eliminated and that, therefore, mothers of children should return to homes and care for their children.

After speaking with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriation Committee and with the distinguished author of the Lanham Act and with others having the responsibility of determining this matter, I sent the following telegram

September 12 to Gov. Earl Warren, Sacramento, Calif.:

Will your call for emergency or special session of legislature include matter of child care or preschool education? Reason for my inquiry is that present information here is California laws do not now permit such care and present discussion here also is that Federal fund should not be available in any event longer than necessary to enable California to meet California problem. No present assurance here Federal funds available after October 31, but if you assure your call will include this subject bare present possibility of obtaining extension of time to 6 months for Federal program. Petitions, letters, telegrams arrive in here by hundreds from California and your immediate assurance of problems included in your emergency call will materially aid California Congressmen in immediately present stronger case before committees which will meet within the next few days. Thanks in advance for your immediate advices in the premises.

The following letters will indicate the strain and stress the problems being presented by the proposed sudden termination on October 31. They deal with these valuable child-care centers in California:

WELFARE COUNCIL
OF METROPOLITAN LOS ANGELES,
COMMUNITY WELFARE FEDERATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 17, 1945.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE:

Because of your concern over the child-care problem, you will be interested in the meeting held here last night, September 6, under the auspices of our emergency child-care committee. Talks were made by three assemblymen, including Speaker Lyons, by several mothers with children in the centers, by representatives of organized labor, both A. F. of L. and CIO, by an industrialist familiar with the problem, by Dr. Trillingham, by our president, Mrs. Sumner Spaulding, and others.

Some 1,400 or 1,500 people were present, including not less than 1,200 mothers of children using the child-care centers, and there certainly was a great feeling of urgency that the child-care program should not be terminated.

There was a great deal of sentiment that the State of California should do something about this and much reason to believe that the State of California will do something.

The trouble, of course, is that the Federal Works Agency has been too precipitant in announcing the termination of Federal funds. We were all greatly heartened by the special story in the Daily News last night telling of the efforts of yourself and other southern California Congressmen to enact legislation continuing Federal aid.

That is all very encouraging, but we were wondering if in the meantime the Los Angeles County delegation might not bring all the pressure they can to get the FWA to extend its closing date from October 31 (September 30 in many places) for another 2 or 3 months, so as to avoid the actual shutting down of these centers on the announced dates. What we are afraid of is that before any new legislation can be enacted, either State or Federal, the centers will be closed out. Personnel is rapidly leaving now and a pretty severe and chaotic condition will result if the actual closing takes place.

With our sincere appreciation for your interest in this serious problem, we are,

Cordially yours,

C. W. PFEIFFER,
Executive Secretary.

BELLFLOWER, CALIF., *September 4, 1945.*

CONGRESSMAN CLYDE DOYLE:

May this be added to the many appeals from women throughout the United States for the continuance of Federal aid that the child-care centers can remain open?

We, whose children have benefited from this wise plan, are deeply appreciative of your efforts in the past concerning this and feel we can count on your continued interest and support.

Sincerely yours,

VERA BRAHAM.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *September 4, 1945.*

CONGRESSMAN CLYDE DOYLE:

I am writing you in regard to the child-care program. I am told this is to be discontinued. As I am a widow with two boys—ages 8 and 5—it is necessary for me to continue working. I have no other source of income.

I know there are other mothers under similar circumstances, and if the child-care program is discontinued it will probably mean some children being left alone and will lead to more juvenile delinquency. I feel we have too much of this already and should prevent it as much as possible. The child-care program is good training for the children, and I know my boys have been getting excellent care and I have been able to work knowing they are well cared for.

If you can do anything to help keep this program going it will be greatly appreciated by myself and many others I am sure.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. FAY G. MORGAN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *August 23, 1945.*

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE:

I am a serviceman's wife and I have two little children in the day nursery. I am working in a restaurant and as I have a large doctor bill to pay, I must continue to work. The day nurseries are to be closed soon now, I have been told. Please, can't you help some way to keep them open for the mothers that have to work?

I am trying so hard to get these bills paid before my husband is out of the service so he won't have to come back to civilian life with debts to pay off.

I haven't any idea how long it will be before he will be released from the service.

Thanks for anything you can do to help in this problem.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. OLIVIA MAY HARTUP.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *August 25, 1945.*

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE:

I have a pre-school-age child in the Poly-Hi Nursery in Long Beach. I understand that these nurseries are to be discontinued.

I am writing to you to ask your help in trying to keep this public service in effect by some ways or means. I am in favor of a reasonable higher weekly fee, if necessary, in order for their continuance. It has been a great advantage to me, as well as many other working mothers. It has also given our children great opportunities for educational advancements. Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated. Thanking you.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. JAMES L. RENO.

COMPTON, CALIF., *August 25, 1945.*

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE:

I am writing in regard to the expectant closing of the Compton, Calif., child-care program. I was informed that the nursery school will be closed by September 22, 1945, due to the lack of funds to continue the operations of these schools. In writing to you, I hope to point out what this would mean to me as well as to the thousands of other mothers just like me.

I have three small sons; twin boys 3 years old. Billy is 6.

The nursery to them has been home for some time. They have had the proper food, rest, and play that a growing child must have. They have had the love and patient care of mothers at the nursery, that made them realize that their own mother had to work while dad was in the Army or wherever he might have to be. Most of all to we mothers that had to work to keep our home fires burning until our husbands and fathers were home. The nursery was a place that we knew that our minds could be free from worrying if they were playing in the street, or if they were fed, or all the other things that the nursery has done for them.

Representative DOYLE, the war may be over for some, but to hundreds and thousands of young mothers like myself, whose husbands have been gone for several years and lots of them will not be coming home at all, the big fight is still to come. We still have to make a living for them. We still have to educate them to the best of our ability. Most of all we still have to be both mom and dad to them. We young Americans can and we will do this, if you will only give us a little support to carry on the work our husbands left undone when they gave their lives that you and I and our children might have a free country to live in. Please do what you can to see that my boys and others like them don't have to be neglected by closing the Compton nursery schools. Thank you.

MRS. RENA BURNS.

American Women's Voluntary Services, Santa Barbara, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and yet one of the least publicized services performed on the home front during the war was that of the American Women's Voluntary Services. In the city of Santa Barbara the local chapter was especially active and its work at Welcome House was a tremendous contribution to the well-being of the entire community and of especial value to the service men and women and their families. I was so impressed by the achievements of this organization when I was in Santa Barbara last month that I requested the local chairman to draw up for me a brief statement of the services performed. This statement of genuine service I am proud to include as a portion of my extension of remarks:

AMERICAN WOMEN'S
VOLUNTARY SERVICES,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

WELCOME HOUSE

In the spring of 1943, it became apparent that the wives and families of servicemen stationed in and near Santa Barbara were beginning to follow them here in considerable numbers. Many had difficulty in locating themselves in the town, and the offices of organizations like the USO which were equipped to deal with servicemen, but not with their families, were constantly being besieged for a type of assistance they were unable to give. Therefore, in May 1943, the

American Women's Voluntary Services decided to open Welcome House.

A small house was found next to the bus terminal and an office, sitting room, kitchen and completely equipped nursery were assembled. The families of servicemen immediately began to come to us for help in finding places to live and for information and advice of all kinds. The newspapers and the radio gave publicity to the problem and pointed out the need. This caused home- and apartment-house owners to cooperate by notifying us whenever they had any space they were willing to rent. Our files soon contained between 1,200 and 1,400 listings. As quickly as a vacancy was telephoned to us, we made it available to a service family, and, of course, these 1,400 listings have been transferred and retransferred many times from one tenant to another.

Welcome House also collected data that is kept on hand in constantly revised form so that information can be given instantly regarding bus schedules, churches, hospitals, hotels, nurseries and nursery schools, recreation, rest and convalescent homes, service clubs, train schedules, visiting nurses, etc.

Our staff of volunteer workers has performed many varied services. They have kept a watchful eye on babies put to sleep in the nursery crib while the mother went to look at a house or a room. On occasion they have heated bottles and fed a crying baby. They have helped agitated servicemen and their newly arrived fiancees find a license clerk and arrange their wedding. They have calmed and given shelter to overwrought young wives whose husbands were not on hand to meet them on arrival, as arranged. After a long bus trip across country things have often started off better because the family of a serviceman has had a chance to bathe and rest at Welcome House before the long-anticipated reunion with their serviceman.

Many of the service wives were eager to obtain work and the American Women's Voluntary Services employment guidance service was added to Welcome House, where it has met a real need.

Living space has become increasingly difficult to find since the Army took over three hotels for an Army redistribution center. More and more troops have come here en route to the Pacific. Sometimes when the need was greatest there seemed to be absolutely no places available; consequently, another offshoot of Welcome House has been the opening of Mission Hill, the home of the late Miss Caroline Hazard, formerly president of Wellesley College. At Mission Hill, in case of emergency, service families—especially those with children—can find shelter in delightful surroundings for a 2-week period until they are are able to obtain permanent homes for themselves.

During the 2 years and 4 months that it has been in existence, 30,766 persons have come to Welcome House for assistance of one kind or another. This total may be analyzed as follows:

Fourteen thousand three hundred and forty-four service wives; 2,101 children; 11,908 servicemen; 2,284 civilians, mostly servicemen's parents and relatives; 129 veterans.

A staff of volunteer workers have given more than 15,000 hours of their time to this public service.

The end of the war has so far brought no decrease here in the number of servicemen's and veterans' families, nor any lessening of the acuteness of the housing problem they face, so while the need exists in Santa Barbara, Welcome House will continue to render its service.

ELSA MULHAUSER
(Mrs. Frank Mulhauser),
Chairman, American Women's Voluntary Services Welcome House.

The Facts of Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued to all Members of Congress by the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Marshall:

THE FACTS OF DEMOBILIZATION

THE PROBLEM

When Germany surrendered the Army had 5,500,000 men overseas. Of this number, 3,500,000 were in Europe, the British Isles, Africa, and the Middle East. It was then imperative to move hundreds of thousands of these men with the greatest possible speed to the Pacific to end the Japanese war without a single bloody and costly day of delay. Although Japan was already desperate under our air and sea attacks and the atomic bomb was in the last stages of experiment, it would have been criminal to risk Japan's not fighting to a suicidal finish and therefore to delay movement of our men toward the Pacific. If the Japanese continued to fight to the death as they did on the Pacific islands, these troops would be needed critically for a fighting invasion of the Japanese islands. But Japan surrendered, and it became urgent to demobilize the armed forces as quickly and fairly as possible.

At the same time, having won the war, it was just as critical to secure the peace. This required among other things that effective occupation forces be maintained both in Europe and the Japanese Empire in addition to garrisons needed for our overseas bases. There were, when the fighting stopped, more than 8,000,000 men and women in the Army. The War Department estimated that with an intake of 500,000 new men from selective-service inductions in the 12 months ahead it could immediately begin to demobilize 6,050,000 of those who had already served their country. This is being done with the greatest possible speed and will be completed in the next 10 months.

THE COMPLICATIONS

The difficulties involved in returning more than 4,000,000 men and women thousands of miles from overseas are tremendous. Plans must be laid carefully if this job is to be done quickly and efficiently and our shipping is to be used to the fullest possible extent. Fairness to and understanding of the right of the individual must be considered carefully. The quickest way to demobilize this many men and women would be to load units nearest the ports into the ships as fast as they arrive. This, however, would be unfair. In Europe and in the Pacific there are hundreds of thousands of men who have been fighting for their country for long periods. Many of them have endured month after month of bitter combat. Many of them have been wounded. If whole units were returned to the United States for discharge it would result in allowing many men who have been in the Army only a short time and who have had little or no combat to get out while those who have fought the longest and hardest had to wait behind. Even if we were to select the veteran combat units who have been overseas the longest, this injustice would still result. The personnel of combat divisions and air groups has changed many times because of casualties in the heavy fighting and extreme exposure to weather and disease. In most veteran units there were thousands of men who had just joined the Army and who had just arrived overseas when the war ended. If these units were returned and discharged, the newcomers would get out while the veterans of years of service overseas and long combat in other units waited behind. Fairness demanded, therefore, that men be selected on the basis of their individual service for return to this country and discharge.

It would have been simpler to concentrate first on the demobilization of the forces in the European theater rather than to carry it out on an equal basis throughout the world, but this would have discriminated against soldiers who have fought for years in the Pacific and would have been so damaging to their morale that the task of securing the surrender of Japan's completely equipped armies of 7,000,000 men would have been seriously jeopardized. Likewise all soldiers on duty in the United States could not be discharged even though these men are already here and do not place a burden on the shipping, for many of them are needed to man the camps and installations in the United States being used for the discharge of troops returning from overseas. Unless soldiers are to be discharged without exact records of their service, physical examinations, complete hospitalization, and a guaranty that all of their prerogatives under the GI bill of rights have been protected, it is necessary to keep on duty at the demobilization centers sufficient numbers of highly trained personnel.

A similar example is the case of the Air Transport Service. The big transport planes which span the oceans are very complicated pieces of machinery. The lives of many men are at stake when these planes are in the air over unbroken stretches of water. It takes a long time, at least a year, to train already qualified combat pilots to operate safely these large transocean transports. But most of these crews which have already been trained have been in service a long time and are anxious to be discharged like any other veteran. If they all were discharged immediately there would be no one to take their places and therefore the planes would not fly. This would, of course, delay the return of thousands more men overseas who are now returning by air transport. These are just a few of the conflicting problems of fair and speedy demobilization. There are many more, but these give the idea of what a job it is.

THE DISCHARGE SYSTEM

In developing a plan to return millions of men from foreign countries to the United States and discharge them from the Army, both speedily and fairly, it is impossible to find a solution which pleases everybody.

The War Department decided that the men themselves should be given the chance to say how the system which affects their individual lives should operate. Survey teams similar to those used by the well-known public-opinion polls in this country were sent to every theater to ask the troops. The survey was conducted for an entire year. From it was developed the now well-known point system.

Points take into consideration the length of service both in this country and overseas, the amount of combat a man has had, and the size of the immediate family which is dependent upon him. The soldier receives 1 point for each month in the Army, 1 additional point for each month overseas, 5 points for each decoration or battle participation star, and 12 points for each dependent child up to a total of 3. The point scores were originally computed on May 12, after the defeat of Germany. They were recomputed as of September 2, and throughout the de-

mobilization the point score necessary for discharge will be lowered again and again until the temporary forces have all been returned to civilian life.

At first, because of the critical job of moving troops from Europe to the Pacific in case they were needed to fight Japan, there were a number of highly technical skills which were so essential to the operations of the Army that enlisted men in those classifications were retained in the Army regardless of their point score. By September the list of skills had been reduced from 19 to 3. There are only a few men with the listed critical skills in the Army. Nevertheless, the War Department has ruled that even though an enlisted man has one of these skills he cannot be held in the Army for more than 6 months after he has become eligible for release under the point system.

Some officers, similarly, may be retained for a maximum of 6 months even after they become eligible for release under the point scores because of their critical abilities in the handling of the transportation system on which speedy demobilization depends or in government of occupied enemy countries.

There are several ways other than by age or point score in which officers and enlisted men may be discharged. These have been established to cover necessary exceptions to general policy and to prevent undue hardships to families or retarding of the Nation's effort to restore its peacetime way of life.

Officers and enlisted men who are not eligible for release under the age or point system may be discharged if their families are so dependent on their earning ability or family leadership that undue hardships would result if they were retained in service.

A hardship discharge application must be accompanied by affidavits of two or more persons other than members of the applicant's immediate family attesting the situation in the man's home. The decision is left to the designated senior commanders in the field without reference to the War Department. If a soldier is overseas, his family may submit the request for discharge to The Adjutant General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C., in affidavit form, accompanied by the two affidavits from persons other than members of the family.

The standards of hardship discharge have been made as liberal as possible. Applications for discharge because of special importance to national health, safety, and interest in the reconversion effort must be made by officers and enlisted men themselves to their immediate commanding officer, whether in this country or overseas, together with appropriate supporting statements or data. The decision again is made by field commanders without reference to the War Department.

REPLACEMENTS FOR OCCUPATIONAL FORCES

Even though the point system of demobilization will temporarily leave behind low-point men for occupation duty, it will be necessary to send overseas replacements for these forces for two reasons: In the first place, the low-point men now overseas will, as their service continues, also become eligible for discharge. Secondly, the occupation forces will continue to need men to replace those who must be returned because of illness or family hardship or similar reasons.

It is the policy of the War Department to send overseas as replacements all officers and men who have not already had such service and who are not eligible for discharge or who will not become eligible until well into next year.

It is planned that many of these replacements will be derived from continuation of Selective Service inductions of young men who have not as yet served their country.

So that the occupation forces and such other forces as may be needed overseas are made up as soon as possible of volunteers, the War Department has initiated a program to obtain Regular Army personnel and temporary officers and men who request further service. Officers eligible for discharge who desire to be retained on active duty may sign up for the duration of the emergency and 6 months. Men may enlist in the Regular Army or volunteer for continued service in the temporary forces either at home or overseas.

I Sponsor the Repeal of Daylight-Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to support H. R. 3974, to repeal daylight-saving time, effective at 2 o'clock a. m. on Sunday, September 30, 1945. As the report on the bill shows, I introduced the first measure on this subject in the Seventy-ninth Congress. On January 3, 1945, the first day of the session, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 1 to restore standard time. On that day I addressed the House giving in some detail my reasons for suggesting such action. Since that time a great many similar measures have been introduced. All of these were pigeonholed for months in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce despite public clamor for their passage. Now I am glad to see the committee reverse its position in the matter and at this late date sponsor repeal of this legislation which has done so much to upset the country and with so little good purpose. Let us hope that, profiting by the failure of this experiment, it will never be repeated.

GET THE BOYS BACK HOME

I am pleased to see this movement in which I have so long been interested now succeed. There are some other laws and restrictions which need to be repealed. Let us hope that this will be the first and not the last such repealer. As we now go into the era of peace, which we hope will last forever, let us do it without unnecessary Government interference with the freedoms and natural laws which made America great. Among those freedoms was the right to stay out of the armed forces in peacetime when security of the Nation was not threatened. The most pressing problem before us now is to get the boys back home and to stop the stalling of the brass hats who do not want them out of the service, and the interference from the civil officials, who are unprepared to face and are afraid of the problems of peace. These people apparently agree with the Director of Selective Service, who stated last year it was easier and cheaper to furnish the unemployed with jobs in uniform. Americans have no use for this alien philosophy being practiced by the administration.

BURNING THE CANDLE AT THE WRONG END

When I initiated the movement for repeal of daylight-saving time on the opening day of the session I summarized my arguments made at that time as follows:

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have requested that I introduce legislation to abolish Roosevelt's time and restore God's time. I am today, therefore, introducing a concurrent resolution to restore standard time. The daylight-saving, war time, fast time, or Roosevelt time, which was inflicted upon us has been one of the most ridiculous, infamous, and diabolical of all the curses we have had to bear under the cloak of war-time necessity. It has wasted manpower on the farm. It has encouraged absenteeism in the factory. It has increased consumption of power, light, and fuel in every home and place of business. It has contributed to juvenile delinquency. It has interfered with school attendance. It has increased crime, especially assaults upon women workers who must go forth upon the streets at the unholy hours dictated by daylight-saving time. It has increased traffic accidents on darkened highways and increased the wear on motor vehicles. It has deprived many of needed sleep for nobody wants to go to bed in daylight and get up in the dark. It has increased the death and illness rate due to the exposure it necessitates when laborers, school children, and others must go forth to the day's work long before sunrise and often wait for busses and street cars on cold and darkened streets and highways. It has added turmoil and distress to the war situation. It has shortened tempers and broken homes. It has added to confusion because many citizens refuse to change their clocks to accord with the mandate from Washington. Some people keep two clocks, one to run the radio by and one to work by. It interferes with evening church services because it forces them to be so early in the day folks will not come or if they are set for an hour after dark they run too late for those who have to get up and off to work early. It is about as sensible as if you wanted to lengthen a skirt and to do so cut off the top and sewed it on the bottom. It has not helped war industries because most of them are on a 24-hour schedule. The cows and chickens on the farm do not understand this new time and do not abide by it, all of which adds to the farmer's woes. In short, except as an aid to golfers, it has failed to accomplish the salutary effects prophesied for it by the Washington bureaucrats who fancy themselves as modern Joshuas, who can command the sun in its course. They sit around with their feet in the waste basket, hands in the public trough, and their heads in the clouds trying to dream up new ways to regiment the people, interfere with the laws of nature and the customs of generations.

Defender's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on Defenders' Day, September 12, 1945, at the rededication of the service honor roll and memorial at Hampden, Baltimore, Md.:

We are gathered here tonight as free men and women to pay honor once more to those brave ones who in this war and in our other wars have won the right to be called our defenders.

This day, set aside and called Defenders' Day, was originally in honor of those who repelled the invader in the War of 1812. The battles of North Point, and of Fort McHenry, where our national anthem was born, were the turning points in that conflict.

The brave defenders of this country, many of whom gave their lives in those and other battles, are never to be forgotten.

How many of you present now will remember that the bloody victory won by those defenders came after our National Capitol had been sacked and burned to the ground?

The War of 1812 is but one of the wars this country has been called upon to fight in the struggle for liberty and for the freedoms we enjoy.

In every crisis we have faced, our people have stood fast by the faith of our fathers. We have met this country's enemies and in each conflict, our defenders have been victorious.

We are now emerging victoriously from the greatest and most dreadful war the world has ever known.

As we stand here before this memorial, which bears the names of the defenders of our freedoms in this war from this community, we are reminded that in the years that have passed, Defenders' Day has come to mean much more to us than originally.

We now regard this day as the day to give, with deep humility, our thanks to those men and women living and dead who have been the defenders of our flag and all that it represents in all of the wars in which the United States of America has had a part.

One year ago, I had the honor to stand on this same ground and to participate in the dedication of the memorial to those, who, from this community of Hampden, went forth to fight our country's battles on the far-flung battle fronts of this war. It was inspiring then to have even a small part in such a tribute.

Today we meet to rededicate this memorial. In the year that has intervened, events have transpired to cover many pages of history. We witnessed the passing of a great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Tragically enough, he was called home on the eve of the collapse of the Nazis and the surrender of the Japanese.

We are seeing now the construction of a world organization, which, under God, will bring to the world lasting peace, and an order which will insure the dignity of man and the freedoms for which our men and women have fought through the years.

This is an occasion for solemn joy. We have triumphed. To those whose loved ones have given that last supreme measure of devotion, we offer the deep love and appreciation of our great Nation. To those, whose boys and girls have come home, or are coming home, we tender the same sentiments.

Let us all on this day now, and in the years to come, mark it and set it aside—not as a holiday but as a day of honor and appreciation for our defenders, and let not the years dim their glory or lessen our remembrance of their sacrifices.

Rational Demobilization of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in order to answer, wholesale, the inquiries made of me with respect to what I told the newspaper correspondents about rational demobilization of the Navy, I am putting into the RECORD a verbatim copy of my statement, which follows:

Representative PLUMLEY, of Vermont, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, says he finds on investigation that a straight-line demobilization of naval personnel—314,358 regular and reserve officers and men to 56,000 regular officers and 3,000,000 regular and reserve enlisted to 500,000 regular enlisted by September 1 next year, with accompanying periodic changes in points required for discharge—is excellent as a general guide to the intentions of the Department for demobilization. However, PLUMLEY says it does not meet the over-all practical requirements for demobilization. Adjustments must be made by common-sense administrative action by the Secretary of the Navy to meet special conditions that pertain.

The naval organizations, both at sea and ashore, must come down together, and this must be done without having reserve personnel scurrying around from fleet to shore or shore to fleet, or even from one shore billet to another, when in 2 or 3 months they will have the requisite points to get demobilized. This costs large sums of money, and causes justified discontent. Congress is in a better position to know this than anyone else.

There are thousands of specialist officers and men in the Navy, and there are a particularly great number in the Navy Department in all sorts of categories—experts in transportation, electronics, and other engineering lines, business, law, research, accounting, and statistics—who have never been qualified or trained for any other duties than their specialty. Many of them are now sitting around in jobs the necessity for which has ceased to exist; and most of them have a place in civil life which they wish to resume, as they have obligations in a business way, and dependents. They are part of the team which will help win the postwar battle for the full employment of labor. They should not be left around doing nothing on account of any theoretical formula when they have nothing to do and are not qualified for any other duties. Particularly they should not be sent around from one job to another, using up Government money, as those jobs are about closed up or already defunct. The Department itself has excess personnel keeping administrative functions running which have ceased to carry useful functions, and which are carried along by their own weight. Officers and enlisted men are helping other officers and enlisted men to perform useless functions. The tap is still open and the water will run until someone turns it off. The Navy Department cannot satisfy Congress, which has obligations to its constituents, unless it decentralizes from a continental status for demobilization of specialized personnel who have no place in the postwar Navy.

The Missouri River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, today I shall give you some information concerning the Missouri River Basin development project, a project too long neglected, but now, at long last, realized.

The Nation has become water conscious. Floods and droughts alternately have challenged the ingenuity of Congress. For years floodwaters destroyed human lives and millions of dollars' worth of property in their mad rush to the ocean. Yet for every dollar lost by floods there was a $100 loss by drought. These destructive floodwaters should long ago have been harnessed and conserved for irrigation, power, and other domestic uses. Now, at last, Congress has approved the Missouri River Basin development project—the largest project ever undertaken by the Federal Government.

After many hearings and debates in Congress, the consolidated plan, Public Law No. 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, was adopted. It provides that the Bureau of Reclamation shall have control over irrigation, power, and other domestic uses of the waters of the Missouri and its tributaries, and the Army engineers over flood control and navigation.

This plan gives priority to irrigation, power, and domestic uses. For this purpose Congress appropriated $3,200,000 to the Bureau of Reclamation, and a similar amount to the Army Engineering Corps. This is just a beginning. The project will cost a billion and a half, but it will add billions of new wealth to the Nation. Most of this will be repaid to the Government directly by the users of the water for irrigation, and by the sale of electrical energy for power and light. All of it, and many times more, will be repaid by increased taxes due to the wealth created by this project.

Power plants will be located at all feasible points. The principal one will be at Garrison, N. Dak. The height of the Garrison Dam has now been agreed upon by the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation engineers, and concurred in by the Department of Agriculture, together with the Governors of Missouri River Basin States. It will be 1,850 feet above sea level.

It was understood, however, that the water should not be raised over 1,830 feet above sea level unless the Fort Peck-Crosby diversion, to refill Devils Lake, proves insufficient. In that event, all existing irrigation projects were to be protected by dykes and all additional land flooded, amply compensated for. Smaller dams will be built on all of the principal Missouri tributaries.

When completed, the entire Missouri River Basin multiple-purpose dams will develop 4,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. They will develop all of the electrical power possible to be developed from the Missouri and its tributaries. The Bureau of Reclamation will distribute this power over a wide area by transmission lines to the REA, to farmers, co-ops, and municipalities. It will do this just as it is doing now on other similar projects—the same as on the Coulee and Boulder Dam projects. Remember that to date this Bureau has distributed more electrical energy for power and light and at a less cost than the TVA.

In North Dakota, this project will make possible the irrigation of 1,350,000 acres. This will raise the annual income of the 1,350,000 acres, when irrigated, from $6 to $30 per acre. It will increase the farm population in western North Dakota by cutting down the family-size farm from 600 to 100 irrigated acres. The entire Missouri River Basin irrigated area will cover 4,700,000 acres. This project will reverse the downward trend in population that has taken place in the Missouri River Basin States since 1930.

Since every farm family supports two additional city families, it will greatly increase the city population in the basin. In addition, the electrical power will multiply the activities of the Missouri River Basin States. It will produce new industries and give new life in many different fields. Again, since every dollar additional agricultural income adds $7 to the national income, it will increase our national income by several billion each year. In fact, it is impossible for anyone to see how many, and what benefits this long-neglected project will furnish to the future of each of the basin States and the Nation.

This project, in addition to providing water for irrigation and domestic uses in the Basin States, will also restore their water levels. Do you know that ground waters and water levels in these States have fallen from 10 to 48 feet since 1878. At that time Devils Lake, located in my State, was 35 feet deep and covered over 135 square miles. It was some 60 miles long, with a steamboat running from Devils Lake to Minnewaukan—two country seats. Today it is less than 8 feet deep and covers less than 8 square miles.

In North Dakota it will refill Devils Lake, Stump, and other connecting lakes. It will furnish abundant water to the James, Cheyenne, and Red Rivers for domestic uses. Under the Bureau of Reclamation-Army plan, worked out pursuant to Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, the water will be fed to Devils Lake, and to the Red River Valley, through canals from Fort Peck via Crosby and Kenmare to the Souris River. Then fed to Buffalo Coulee on the Cheyenne River. It will be distributed to Devils Lake, the James and Red Rivers through the Souris and Cheyenne Rivers.

More than 20 years ago the North Dakota Legislature made an appropriation for a survey to ascertain whether Devils Lake could be refilled by diverting floodwaters of the Missouri. The matter was brought to the attention of the Army engineers. They reported, not once but several times, that the project was not financially feasible. The fight for the project continued. Finally, Colonel Pick, in his report, found the project not only feasible but highly desirable. He found that it had been altogether too long neglected. He pointed out the multiple uses that the development of this basin could be put to.

Then the fight whether navigation or irrigation and domestic use should have priority took place here in Congress. Everybody realized that flood control and irrigation went hand in hand. But there was a group here that wished to give navigation prior rights to all the waters. This fight continued in three congressional committees—the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the Flood Control Committee, and the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

After a close contest in the House, those favoring navigation won by a narrow margin of six votes. The contest then went to the Senate. Here the House Members, who believed that irrigation power, and domestic uses should have priority over navigation, joined hands with the Senators from the Missouri River States. Then, after many hearings, followed by debates on the Senate floor, Senator O'MAHONEY'S amendment to the flood-control bill, giving priority to irrigation, power, and domestic uses was adopted.

The result was Public Law No. 534 and Senate Document No. 247 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. These give priority to irrigation, power, flood control, and domestic uses. After that comes navigation. Thus, the hopes and dreams of our people are finally realized. The work on this project is under way, but will naturally be slow until war's readjustment because of a lack of necessary manpower and materials.

Some have asked Congress to support the MVA bill, but there happens to be at least five MVA bills. These people undoubtedly have reference to Senator MURRAY'S MVA bill, but that bill was unanimously ditched after hearings by the Senate Commerce Committee. This bill has been proclaimed and advertised as similar to the TVA Act, but examination shows that it goes far beyond the TVA Act in regimentation and autocratic control. One of its provisions provides that unless Congress within 4 months affirmatively repudiates any rule or regulation of the MVA triumvirate, it would have the force of law.

The Missouri River Basin development is now an accomplished fact. It has been a law since last December. The work on the project has started. Just why should Congress create a new bureau when we already have the Bureau of Reclamation that has had 44 years' experience, and has added billions of new wealth to the Nation—a bureau that is less tainted with politics than any other bureau in Washington. A bureau that is more democratically controlled than any other bureau. A bureau in which the local irrigation districts manage their own local affairs—a bureau with which its patrons are satisfied.

Why create another bureau when we already have the Army Engineer Corps, with over 44 years' experience in the construction of dams for power, irrigation, and flood control. These engineers have constructed one of the world's most famous dams, Fort Peck. Why should we create a new bureau when we already have 209 big ones, and 2,171 little ones—when we already have too many? Even Secretary Ickes now admits that we have too many Federal agencies and bureaus for the good of the Nation.

Why create another bureau when President Truman has asked Congress to permit him to reorganize the existing bureaus—to eliminate many of them—to eliminate those that serve no useful purpose?

Would you consider it wise, if you had an experienced man who knew how to handle a tractor and a combine, to replace him with an inexperienced person who just wanted a job? Would you consider it wise, if you had a man who knew all about livestock, poultry, and farming operations, to replace him with a man who had no experience just because he wanted the job? Would you consider it wise, if you had an experienced clerk, an experienced carpenter, an experienced mechanic, or an experienced engineer, to replace him with one without experience? This, especially, if he asked you to agree that anything he did, if you did not affirmatively repudiate it within 4 months, would become permanently binding upon you.

Why create another bureau, when the House just passed a bill to audit all the bureaus, with a view to eliminate those that are just squandering the taxpayers' money. Surely no one, who has the best welfare of this Nation at heart, wants more bureaus. The people want more efficiency and less bureaucracy. The producers of wealth, and that means the farmer and the laborer, want less bureaus. They are the ones that ultimately earn and pay all taxes, because taxes must ultimately be paid out of production. They cannot be paid out of consumption.

It seems to me that that just does not make common horse sense. Surely the Missouri River Basin development should not be made a partisan issue. The time has arrived to give this project serious consideration and unity of action and support. I am sure the average person, in my and other Missouri Valley States, prefer the welfare of their State and Nation rather than partisan politics. This project has not to date, and will not with my consent, be permitted to become a partisan issue.

It is said that the MVA would furnish the farmer with electrical energy for power and light. Well—as we have seen—the Bureau of Reclamation has generated more electrical energy, and sold it for power and light cheaper than the TVA.

The records show that in 1944 the Bureau of Reclamation sold 13,677,802,399 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy. That the average rate was 1.38 mills per kilowatt. The records also show that during the same year, the TVA sold only 9,710,370,790, and that the average rate was 3.86 mills per killowatt, or three times as much per kilowatt as that of the Bureau of Reclamation.

There may be a good reason for some of this difference. The Bureau wholesaled most of its electrical energy to municipalities, towns, and villages, to Federal and State Governments—as well as to public authorities, irrigation districts, and private concerns.

But, making all possible allowances, the fact remains that the Bureau can generate and distribute electrical energy at a price as low, if not lower, than the TVA. This because the power use—the development of electrical energy—of the water of the Missouri will not conflict with the use of the water for irrigation. The development of this power will be but a byproduct of irrigation.

This project, when completed, will benefit an area of 530,000 square miles as compared with TVA's 43,000 miles. The original cost of its construction will be about $3 per acre as against $30 per acre for the TVA. In other words, the TVA cost ten times as much as this project will per acre, and we repeat, in addition, the farmers and municipalities will get as cheap, if not cheaper, light and power.

In conjunction with the Missouri River Basin development, Congress has made provision for the further extension of rural electrification. It has made ample appropriation for this extension, and will continue to supply more funds as needed. Here again, because of temporary lack of material and manpower, the extension has been slow, but there will be ample electrical energy for light and power for rural electrification when this project is completed. The time is not distant when night will become almost as bright as day. The latent and wasted energy of the interior of the United States will be utilized for our benefit and not for our destruction.

I have supported this class of legislation ever since I have been a Member of Congress. I shall continue that support. It is true that some politicians who had nothing to do with this legislation in 1936 when it was passed are now attempting to monopolize all the credit. They insult our intelligence by telling us that they got the REA for us. The REA, the same as the Basin Development, is the work of many years, and not of any one individual, but of all of us. The leaders in this class of legislation were Senator Norris and Representative RANKIN.

Remember that only a few years ago one-fourth of the livestock in the Missouri River Basin States was either sold or died of thirst and starvation because of a lack of water and moisture. People had to haul water 10, 20, and 30 miles for household use and for livestock. Thousands of cattle, horses, and sheep died because they ate the dust-covered grass. Human beings not only choked in dust storms but died because they inhaled the dust.

In 1934, during the drought, I introduced the first comprehensive water-conservation bill. This bill provided for an annual standing appropriation of $500,000,000 for the purpose of impounding, storing, conserving, and making use of the unappropriated waters falling or emanating within the United States. This bill was reported favorably, but failed to reach the floor in the closing days of Congress.

Now, in its place we have the Missouri River development project. We rejoice that the preliminary work on this project has started. If in the future it should develop that we need a new bureau, or that complete authority of the Missouri should be transferred to one of the existing bureaus, you may rest assured that Congress will do it. We finally got what we were after for over a generation. Let us not throw a monkey wrench into the machinery. The people want this project completed. They are not interested in more bureaus and regimentation.

Popular Demand for Release of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to the President of the United States which embodies the ideas expressed to me by many hundreds of people during the past 60 days. I am told that these and similar ideas have been passed on to other Members of Congress. The people are most anxious for prompt action by those in authority, and if what they believe they are entitled to request is not granted, they are insisting that Congress take the necessary steps to relieve the men in the service who have won our wars and are entitled to a discharge from the service. They look to us as their Representatives to obtain fair play and a square deal. They feel that we are their only refuge in this hour of peril.

Many of these boys are doing menial tasks in uniforms, and they and their parents are anxious that they be relieved from cleaning up Europe and the islands in the Pacific and Japan and that they be permitted to come home and take up where they left off in school, in the shop, or on the farm. We have sacrificed while they were away. They have made tremendous sacrifices and their appeals and the appeals of their families are entitled to the utmost consideration at our hands.

The letter which I have addressed to the President follows:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the recent recess of Congress and while I was at home among my constituents, perhaps as many as a thousand mothers, fathers, wives, and other relatives of men in the armed forces appealed to me personally, by telephone, and through the mail on behalf of their relatives in the service. From what my colleagues have told me since my return, I am sure that my experience was only typical of the appeals that were made in untold numbers by the respective constituents of other Congressmen.

Many pointed out instances, which, if true, amounted to nothing less than unfair, arbitrary, and un-American treatment of the servicemen by their commanding officers. At least the appeals of the men did not receive the sympathetic consideration to which they were entitled and deserved. It is a well-known fact that many promises were made and inducements offered to the boys at the time they enlisted or were drafted. Many of these promises were made without authority and, of course, have not been kept. Nevertheless, the boys went into the service and have done a good job. Comparatively few of them asked for a discharge while the hostilities continued. But, since the war is over, unofficially if not officially, the boys have begun to register their complaints against being forced into the great armies of occupation and continued service in the various branches of the Army and Navy.

Many of them were sent directly from the European theater to the Pacific against their wishes, and without being allowed a furlough to visit their families, while tens of thousands who were qualified for combat service have never left the shores of this country, and other multiplied thousands had never been inducted into any branch of the service but have taken refuge and enjoyed immunity from service in some defense plant or other work for which they have been well compensated. These inequities have been a sufficient justification for the resentment recently manifested by the men in the service who have been so harshly discriminated against.

I have letters from men in the service who have said they were instructed by their commanding officers not to write or to communicate with their Congressmen. But when these boys came back from Europe and once they had an opportunity to confer with their families, the representatives of the people were contacted and we were told of the high-handed methods that the boys say were employed by the military authorities to the utter dismay of the servicemen.

Now when we appeal for the discharge of individual men in the service, we are told by those in authority that our servicemen know that "the present plan is based upon the expressed views of the soldiers themselves that priority of release from the Army should be governed by four factors; namely, length of service, length of overseas service, combat awards, and the number of dependent children. Although length of service is considered as one of the factors for release under the plan, the soldiers themselves said it should not be controlling. Further, only 3 percent of those interviewed expressed the belief that age should be taken into account in determining priority for release." I have talked personally to more than 100 men on furlough, or who have been discharged from the service during the past 60 days, and not one has admitted to me that he ever had referred to him or heard of the present point system of discharge, or anything like it, until after it was already in force. Many of my colleagues have told me that they have had the same experience, and we do not believe that any general referendum was ever submitted to the servicemen. It is extremely unfortunate that the servicemen should now be blamed for the unpopularity of the point system in use, or that, by insinuation, they should be criticized and condemned for not being satisfied with the employment of this method and system of discharge. It is grossly unfair to charge our men with the approval of a plan that I am morally sure was never submitted to them and accuse them of not being willing to abide by its consequences.

The administration of military affairs should be based upon the same high plane of integrity and fair dealing as that of any other transaction in life or the administration of any other department of Government,

and nothing less will satisfy young Americans, and particularly our servicemen who are tired of having promises made which were unauthorized and not fulfilled.

Mr. President, the people do not believe that we need the present large standing Army. The boys in the service are convinced that it is unnecessary and improper. It will take a great deal of evidence which has not yet been submitted, to convince the American people that it is either necessary or proper to retain in the service any large portion of the present armed forces of this country. Hence, the popular demand for the release and discharge from the service of a vast majority of those now in uniform.

I have given this matter a great deal of study. I am personally interested. I am interested not only on behalf of my four sons in the service, but on behalf of every other boy in the service who is entitled on the basis of fair play to be discharged. Hence, I suggest, without attempting to assign elaborate reasons, all of which have been too frequently brought to your attention, the following categories of men who should be considered seriously for and entitled to discharge from the service:

1. Discharge upon their application, immediately, or as soon as practicable, of all men in the service who were married prior to Pearl Harbor.

2. Discharge upon their application, of all men in the service who have not yet completed their scholastic courses, including high school and college. Such discharge shall be granted as a temporary discharge for 1 year, and, upon submission of satisfactory evidence from the school attended that passing grades have been made for the first year's work, a complete and final discharge shall be issued.

3. Discharge upon their application, of all men in the service who can furnish satisfactory evidence of economic security and independence, showing that they have a business or profession of their own or other gainful employment, reasonably tending to show that they will not become a part of the army of the unemployed.

4. An Executive order should be issued to the effect that no serviceman who has served in the armed forces outside of the continental United States shall be required to serve as a part of the army of occupation anywhere outside of the continental United States.

5. An Executive order should be issued that no boy should be drafted into the service who is now in school and desires to continue his school work, and deferments should be issued until his scholastic education is finished.

There may be other situations which should be comprehended in Executive orders, but I am confident that the public is overwhelmingly demanding action along the lines above suggested, and I respectfully request your earnest and prompt consideration of these ideas and demands of the people, and that they be put into operation as rapidly as conditions will permit.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress.

Statement of Maxwell Field Air Cadets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I refer to the following statement received from the Army air cadets at Maxwell Field, Ala., which indicates a situation that demands clarification. Why it is necessary for men to remain in the service under the conditions indicated is beyond rhyme or reason, especially in view of the Army Air Corps attitude toward these men who were willing to sacrifice in time of national emergency. The situation seems to be general throughout the entire Air Corps program and is one that demands immediate reconsideration by those in authority.

The statement follows:

Dear SIR: This letter is one of 1,000 being sent to leading educators and educational institutions throughout the country.

We are soliciting your personal aid because we are the men who are vitally interested in returning to the colleges to complete our education.

The group of men requesting your aid number 2,000 at this particular field alone, and are in a category known as Aviation Cadets.

For the most part these men include the following groups:

1. ERC, Enlisted Reservists who were called to active duty while attending college.

2. Men who left college by reason of draft or voluntary enlistment.

3. Those whose transition from High School to College was interrupted by draft or enlistment.

The number of men included in this overall category range upward of 20,000 and represents the product of the Army's most discriminating screening tests. These are the men who will comprise the greatest movement of any group of Army personnel returning to college.

The following is a case history of our tenure in the Army:

Every man in this group is a volunteer for air crew training leading to a commission in the air forces as a pilot, bombadier, or navigator and was a party to a contract with the Government for said specific training. Normally this training should be completed in the span of 9 to 10 months. However, we are forced to mark time in a stepchild status for periods ranging up to 22 months before training was even begun. Most men, after a period of time, realize this static condition would boomerang in the final evaluation of discharge credits and attempted to volunteer for oversees duty in various other capacities which would relieve them of that condition. In almost all cases such requests were discouraged or denied on the basis that we were essential in that capacity.

We were recently admitted to air crew training and appointed aviation cadets.

The conclusion of the war with Japan finds cadets placed in a nonessential bracket and faced with an ultimatum from the air forces to either agree to remain in the postwar Army indefinitely, on which basis they may continue their training, or be eliminated from training, revert to enlisted status, and await accumulation of points necessary for discharge. We are too far behind now to hope for an accumulation of discharge credits in any reasonable length of time.

We believe the War Department and the Army have demonstrated bad faith throughout their dealings with us as exemplified in the alternatives stated above, our call to duty before completion of our college program as promised, and the many glowing promises made to us that we would be allowed to complete our training.

Inasmuch as we were held previously with the argument that we were essential and thus denied the opportunity for service elsewhere—which would give us a greater number of credits toward discharge—why, now that we are classed nonessential, can we not be separated from the service in order that we may continue our education?

There is much discussion in the newspapers relative to the dire consequences attendant to the drafting of 18-year-olds, causing probably a 2-year interruption in their education. The point is well taken, but what of those of us who have already had our education interrupted for 2 years or more and face a prolongation of the same condition?

We do not deny the priority rating of overseas personnel, but with the conclusion of the war, it is obvious the point system is grossly unfair in evaluating the discharge credits of aviation cadets.

We therefore solicit your active and immediate aid in this issue, because we feel the future of this country is irrevocably dependent upon the system of education, of which we are an essential part.

Respectfully yours,

THE MAXWELL FIELD CADETS.
MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Financial Aid for Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, since several Republicans made themselves a field day yesterday on the House floor by making a few careless misstatements about loans which are being requested by England, and criticized England for her inability to pay her previous war debts, at the same time criticizing her for changing her government to some extent so that she might be in a position to pay her debts at this time, these misstatements are answered better than I can answer them by an editorial from today's Washington Post.

I therefore wish to include with my statement the following:

SILLY CONCLUSION

The kind of reasoning that starts with an assumption that financial aid from the United States to Britain would lend support to socialism is bound to reach what President Truman aptly termed "a perfectly silly conclusion." The President's mild language is an understatement. For the further conclusion, expressed by some Members of Congress, that we should not extend aid to Britain because the British people have elected a labor government is a good deal worse than silly. It is a mischievous prescription for international ill will.

British representatives are in Washington at the present time to discuss the financial position of their country with American officials. Proposals which they may make, or which may be made to them, for loans from this country are abundantly justified by our own vital interest in world reconstruction. The revival of Britain's ability to produce goods for export and in turn to purchase goods produced in the United States is an important factor in our economic welfare. And it is an important factor, too, in the promotion of world security. We need a healthy, stable, and secure Britain as a customer and as an ally.

Representative KNUTSON declared on the House floor Tuesday that "the American

people are being asked to finance the socialization of the United Kingdom through the forcible acquisition of business and industry." Of course, the American people are not being asked to do anything of the sort. The British people need not, and will not, make the shaping of their internal policies dependent upon financial aid from the United States. It requires no dollars for the British Government to expropriate British property, if it wishes to do so. The power of eminent domain is quite independent of foreign finance, and, as Mr. Truman observed, Great Britain is entitled to the sort of government her people want, and their choice in the matter is none of our affair.

Mr. KNUTSON and others of his way of thinking might take note, however, of the lively possibility that socialization of the United Kingdom is likely to be made much more rapid and drastic than the labor government has any intention of making it if Britain is left isolated, impoverished, and incapable of participating in a revival of world trade. Closed economies are the progenitors of regimentation. If Britain is forced to cling to bilateral bargaining and the other stultifying forms of economic aggression so prevalent before the war, we are likely to be forced into similar practices ourselves, and the outcome may be socialization at home as well as in Britain. The alternative is to enable Britain and our other allies as well to exchange goods with us freely in an expanding world economy. That will be the real purpose of any financial aid that may be proposed.

Organized Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me on Labor Day:

Friends of the radio audience, if I were to suggest a topic for today—this being the day dedicated to organized labor—it would perhaps be best summed up in the words "the contribution of organized labor to the serenity and security of the American home and of the promotion of patriotism and solidarity in the land itself." This is indeed a day of triumph for organized labor. Little did the handful dream or visualize even by the broadest stretch of the imagination some 60 years ago when organized labor came into existence, that through their efforts and as a consequence of their contribution there would be created in this Nation of ours what really represents not only an adjunct to government but a part of government itself. The theory of our Government has always been that there should be three separate divisions—the executive, judicial, and the legislative. But without the contribution of organized labor I sometimes wonder, and I feel you'll agree with me, just what would be the lot of the ordinary worker in the United States of America were it not for organized labor and what would be the conditions that might obtain in the land itself. Organized labor for more than half a century has striven to better the condition of the worker in America and through bettering the condition of the worker in America has made life more pleasant and more wholesome for every family in the entire Nation.

In the early brave days, theirs was indeed a hard lot, not only obliged to contend with the power and force of money, but what was known in those days as company unions—and required in addition to combat the forces that money can always arraign against any cause which represents social advancement and the promotion of the welfare of the individual worker so that they were required to combat with limited funds venal legislatures, corrupt judges, corrupt public officials, and the not infrequently paid emissaries in the ranks of labor itself. It remained for a clear message like the one our own State received today from His Grace Archbishop Cushing. A message from the seat of christian morality at a critical period more than half a century ago gave to organized labor the dignity and the character and the place in the sun, that a movement of this nature required in order to succeed in the encyclical delivered by Pope Leo XIII more than a half century ago in which was pointed out the obligation of the employer as well as the obligation of the employee. In those grave early days there was no limitation except the exhaustion of the individual which governed of the number of hours the worker was required to work. Likewise, there was no general system of remuneration for the labor performed by the individual so that a 12-hour day, and a daily wage of $1.25 for 12 hours for a laborer, and employment then only when weather permitted was usually the lot of the worker in America. It was little better than the system of serfdom which obtained prior to 1865 in the United States and throughout the world. I sometimes wonder if the life was as desirable for the worker in America as actual slavery, where the mind was free but the body never free. In the old days a slave represented a potential value. It was an obligation and a duty as well as a good business investment for the owner of the slave to see not only that he was properly fed and properly clothed and properly housed, but to receive medical attention when it was deemed necessary.

On the other hand, the worker rarely lived under conditions that made life inviting, or that were in conformity with an honest or clear interpretation of the constitutional guarantee of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness on the part of every individual living under the American flag. There was little of life—there was little of liberty and an extremely limited amount of opportunity. But organized labor proceeded with its task and changed the 12-hour day to an 11-hour day, the 11-hour day to a 10-hour day, the 10-hour day to a 9-hour day, and the 9-hour day to an 8-hour day, and now an almost universal Saturday half holiday. There was no provisions made in the early days, not even 30 years ago, for the protection of the worker in industry. I can very well recall many years ago as a Member of Congress upon another occasion making many visits to the Bureau of Standards in Washington, then presided over by Doctor Straton, later head of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and discussing with him on many occasions various devices for the protection of the limbs and not infrequently the life of the worker. I worked in the piano business in the old days, running a machine, and I know what the loss of an arm or the loss of a hand meant to the worker, for there was no provision for the protection of the worker in industry.

Then began the movement in America and throughout the world for the conservation of the limbs and the life of the worker in industry. It was only a little over 30 years ago, it seems only yesterday. Then came the Workmen's Compensation Act and later the Maternity Benefit Act, adopted, however, by this Nation of ours only in 1913 by a majority of States and while in operation in nearly all States at the present time, still not in operation in every State. It seems difficult to realize that with liberty and equality and the right to vote that we should wait so long to provide protection for the mother who has suffered the loss of the head of the household in industry. Organized labor has made definite progress and at the present time we are beginning to think in a little different terms of our responsibility, not only to the worker, but our responsibility to every element of society. And perhaps no individual not then at least has made a more potential contribution to the thought as well as the duty of the individual to his neighbor than organized labor.

Of course we are all familiar with the Second Divine Commandment which sets forth that we should love our neighbor as ourself, and we are likewise familiar with the old Biblical saying, "I am my brother's keeper." But there has been little of our brother's keeper and little of the brotherly love evidenced in the treatment of the worker, and if it were not for the work of organized labor, I question very much if any of these humane laws we love to conjure with now, and of which we take real pride at the present time would ever have been placed on the statute books of any State of the entire Union. What a sorry spectacle this Nation would make today were it not for the contributions of organized labor, enforcing the adoption of the humanitarian legislation that is such a blessing and benefit to the entire Nation.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt summed up the situation and its application in his message to Congress on June 8, 1934, in which he set forth, I quote:

"Our task of reconstruction does not require the creation of new and strange value. It is rather the finding of the way once more to known but to some degree forgotten ideals and values. If the means and details are in some instances new, the objectives are as permanent as human nature. Among our objectives, I place security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first. This security for the individual, for the family, concerns itself primarily with three factors. First, people want decent homes to live in; second, they want to locate them where they can engage in productive work; and third, they want some safeguard against misfortunes which cannot be wholely eliminated in this man-made world of ours."

It is of interest to note what President Roosevelt has said and to read in the day's paper the views taken by that able and capable great American who is now serving as President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. President Truman says: "Six years ago the workers of the United States and the world awoke to a Labor Day in a world at war. The democracies of western Europe had just accepted the challenge of totalitarianism. We, in the United States had 2 years of grace, but the issue was squarely joined at that hour. Today we stand on the threshold of a new world. We must do our part in making this world what it should be; the world in which the bigotries of race and creed shall not be permitted to warp the souls of men. We enter upon an era of great problems, but to live is to face problems. Our men and women did not falter in the task of saving freedom—they will not falter now in the task of making freedom secure. And high in the ranks of these men and women as a grateful world will always remember are the workers of all free nations who produced the vast equipment with which the victory was won. The tasks ahead are great, the opportunities equally great."

We recognize the importance and dignity of labor—we recognize the right of every American citizen to a wage that will permit him and his dependents to maintain a decent standard of living. That is the position taken by the President of the United States. It is a challenge to every forward-looking American with any regard for the welfare of his fellow men. Subsequently a message by President Roosevelt created a committee on economics and social security. This committee, after interviewing many hundreds of citizens, including representative organiza-

tions in all parts of the country, disclosed the following existing conditions. I quote, "In 1935 there were 18,000,000 people including children and aged who were dependent upon emergency relief for their sustenance and approximately 10,000,000 workers out of employment, other than relief workers. Many millions had lost their entire savings and there had occurred a very great decrease in earnings. The ravages of probably the worst depression of all times have been emphasized by greater urbanization with a total dependence of a majority of our people on their earnings in industry."

In the slack year of 1933, 14,500 persons were fatally injured in American industry. Fifty-five thousand sustained some permanent injury. Each year about one-eighth of all workers suffer one or more illnesses which disables them for a week, and the percentage of the family with some member seriously ill is a good deal longer. Now in our Commonwealth, we have had what is known as a 70-year-old assistance act in operation. Under the provisions of that act $7,000,000 was expended in 1935. I have always felt that 70 years of age was too old for old-age assistance. It really is in the nature of a contribution to the undertaker, rather than to the individual whom it was aimed to serve, when we consider that less than 5 percent of all the people in America arrive at 65 years of age with sufficient means or friends to keep them out of the poorhouse. When we consider on the other hand that in this, the richest nation in the world, the wealth of the Nation represents the productive contribution of the labor and brains of men and women in America. They created the wealth of the world. They're entitled to some measure of protection.

All forward-looking individuals in America have seriously been considering a reduction in the age limit under the Old-Age Assistance Act. Here in Massachusetts it gave me great pleasure as Governor of the Commonwealth to sign a measure in 1936 making provisions for a reduction in the Old-Age Assistance Act from 70 years to 65 years. That we may have the choice of either reducing the age limit to 50 or 55 years, requiring a tremendous expenditure by the Federal Government, or we will change our economic structure in America to supply opportunities and employment to persons over 45 years of age, for the dead line is growing larger in industry today at 45 years. No large concern in the State of any character will employ new help that is over 45 years of age today. Then, of course, the Workingmen's Compensation Act, with all its values, benefits, and blessings, still has the requirements of physical examination before the employment of a new hand. When we close the door of private industry to a woman or man of 45, then it becomes clearly the duty of government itself in order to preserve the sanity and security of the people to open the door for those against whom the door has been closed. If there are 48,000,000 men in America able and willing to work, and an opportunity for employment of only 36,000,000 of the 48,000,000, we must be continually confronted with not only 12,000,000 unemployed in America but with the constantly increasing number of persons unemployed in America. So that on this Labor Day I rejoice in the accomplishment made possible through the perseverance and through the courage of men and women and their vision who founded organized labor; the world rejoices at the move into the present and looks forward to still greater accomplishments in the future. Rich and poor alike, we must all do our part for the promotion of an economic program to make a larger measure of happiness for all the people of America. The sooner we come to realize our obligation to the aged, the crippled, the sick, and the unemployed, the better it will be for every individual in the United States of America.

In my earliest days in public life, I've championed the cause of labor. I served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1902 and 1903. At the end of my service the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor listed my legislative record on labor measures in which they were vitally interested. I was recorded as having voted favorably for labor 14 times. Of those unfavorable to labor, JAMES MICHAEL CURLEY was recorded a large zero. In other words, by organized labor summarization, I was given the record of 100 percent. I haven't changed. Serving in the Congress of the United States in 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1914 I was again given an unblemished record from a labor standpoint. Record mention was made of my vote of the Children's Bureau bill, the Clayton contempt bill, and the Workmen's Compensation Act. These were highly meritorious measures that meant so much to organized labor. My contribution to labor during the years in which I served as mayor of Boston are too well known to require lengthy description by me. I made the lot of city employees far happier and more lucrative than it has ever been. I increased wages and shortened hours of employment. Gave them all—teachers, firemen, policemen, mechanics, and laborers—a measure of justice to which they were justly entitled but had never received, until JAMES M. CURLEY became mayor of Boston. I'm not going to bore you with the detailed account of my labor record as Governor of Massachusetts in 1935 and 1936. At the peak of the depression, I succeeded in giving work and wages on necessary public improvements to more than 26,000 unemployed men and women. I put through humane legislation for a 48-hour week for institutional employees of the Commonwealth who prior to that time were forced to work 60 and 70 hours each week. This measure made necessary the employment of some 2,500 men and women. There was scarcely a month went by but some decent old mother in one of our institutions was scalded to death or some male inmate beaten to death. The hours of labor were so long that when Saturday night came around it was difficult for the attendants to keep awake, with consequent suffering to the people in those institutions. And one of the real pleasures I've had in the last 5 years was to read that 3 years after the adoption of this legislation by Massachusetts that a convention was held in England representing 30 countries and all 30 countries adopted the Curley system for all institutions. It applied to the nurses, orderlies, interns, and all employees. I obtained new amendments to workingmen's compensation laws, one of which marked an end of the atrocious practice of discontinuing payments to persons permanently incapacitated at the end of 5 years, and making provisions for payment during the lifetime of the individual.

Do you realize what that means? Some person working in an industry suffers the loss of both arms or the loss of both eyes, permanently incapacitated. Before CURLEY became Governor it was customary to throw him on the social heap of scrap, let him become an object of charity. At the end of 5 years CURLEY passed the provision which compelled the payment of wages to that individual as long as he lived, for the protection of his family. As a matter of fact, nearly two score of measures of benefit to labor were placed in the statute books of Massachusetts, upon my recommendation during these 2 years. They were busy years but they were good years for the workingmen and women. One of my outstanding achievements was the adoption of the State unemployment compensation law. In the years that have followed it has proved to be a godsend to many thousands of unemployed women and men and their suffering families. When I concluded my services as Governor of Massachusetts I received a commendation which I value most highly. I believe that when Senator WALSH gave me the title of "Mayor of the Poor" which is to be found in the Boston City Hospital waiting room, I thought I received the highest encomium that any man could ever receive. But when William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor made the following public declaration—I quote—"More progressive constructive liberal laws were enacted under CURLEY in 2 years than under all previous administrations in any 10-year period in the history of the State." For these words I'm deeply grateful. Yes, my friends of the radio audience, JAMES M. CURLEY has been the friend and champion of labor. I shall continue to be whether in or out of office. I am leaving Boston on Tuesday night to return to my duties in Washington as a Member of Congress. I said when they first elected me 3 years ago that I would devote my efforts and energy to the support of the administration and to such measures as would make possible an early ending of the war, and a speedy return of the boys. I am going over now to devote my efforts and energy to the speedy return of the boys and make possible that for which men have dreamed and prayed throughout the centuries—for a permanent peace. No longer the mothers of America or of the world will be required to look forward to that day of sorrow and desolation and tears and sadness, when the boy that they went down in the valley of the shadow of death to bring into being, when he comes to manhood, shall be stripped from her side to go out and kill someone against whom he has no grievance. I believe the time has come to make possible a permanent peace when the slaughter of the innocent will end. A new form of warfare obtains in the present war—a warfare that disregards women and children, a warfare that makes common targets of women and children, destroys towns and cities, and leaves maimed and crippled in the numbers of millions.

We want no more of wars, and unless we end them through the atomic bomb, or through the Atlantic Charter with its promise of justice for all people and the right to self-government, there can be scant hope for humanity. So over in Washington I'll be busy and I'm going to ask you to be busy here in my behalf. If you believe that the most essential and most valued thing in public life is experience and that there is no substitute for it, you have no course open other than to support JAMES M. CURLEY for mayor, who has been foursquare at all times and loyal to the people of the city that he loves, and of the State that has honored him and of the Nation that has treated him so generously.

Postwar Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. MALONEY
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an interesting statement made by Mr. Ben J. Williams, of New Orleans, La., relating to postwar problems:

THE FUTURE OF COTTON IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Scientists, recognized as conservative, have issued a solemn warning that the atomic bomb ushers in an entirely new world era; that this greatest discovery of history offers either unlimited advantages for universal progress and happiness or the annihilation of life and property of entire nations; that in the future the use of the atomic bomb in warfare would leave no area of the world safe from utter destruction.

The final days of the Pacific war eliminate all doubt as to the truthfulness of these assertions.

The United States has the responsibility of world leadership and must do all which is necessary to safeguard civilization against misuse of this startling accomplishment which embraces the domination by man of the heat and the power of the sun.

The world must not conclude 15 or 20 years hence, as it did after the First World War, that the terms of peace, established while unbridled bitterness dominated the atmosphere of international relations, were, in the extremest degree, economically unsound.

The vanquished cannot be looked to for leadership in the elimination of deep-rooted nationalistic hatred. Only the victors can vanish the development of organized ambition for revenge.

Unless the many millions of people who have been victims of faulty political leadership are offered a real opportunity to embrace constitutional government with its guaranty of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the seed of a future conflict will unquestionably germinate.

The present power of the United States, if intelligently exercised, is capable of demanding decisions which respect logic and of preventing economic developments which would breed tyranny.

There will be no lasting peace and civilization will face final doom if political justice—the meting out of appropriate penalties to all individuals who have wronged civilization—is confused with economic justice for every nation, including the vanquished.

If tariffs, cartels, and kindred barriers to trade are removed, so that goods and services may flow without interference over all frontiers, giving without discrimination each and every nation a just opportunity to exchange on equitable terms what it has to offer for what it must acquire, the motivating cause of war will be absent and man's dominance over the force and fire of the sun will not be an occasion for fear—and cotton wherever grown will find ready markets at prices yielding a satisfactory standard of living to those engaged in its production.

The Atlantic Charter recognizes economic dislocations in the world as the root-cause of political clashes. If its promises are put into effect, people of all nations will be able to sleep without nightmare in this atomic age.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted me, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the well-known fact that a leopard cannot change its spots. The OPA is carrying on with its usual policy of discourteous treatment to patriotic citizens.

In Asbury Park, N. J., one of the largest cities in my district, a faithful and patriotic ration board has given unselfish service during the war. Recently a number of these citizens, feeling that their efforts were no longer needed, resigned from the board. In accepting their resignations the district information executive in Trenton totally ignored their contribution to the war effort—and I may add that their service was without pay—and by innuendo criticized their action.

This action has roused the community, and the Asbury Park Press, which enjoys the largest daily circulation in Monmouth County, wrote an editorial entitled "That Bungling OPA." Discourtesy on the part of public servants is inexcusable, and the least that the bureaucratic agencies can do is to show their appreciation for the unselfish and devoted patriotism of the citizens who have served. The editorial follows:

THAT BUNGLING OPA

The OPA maintained its customary indifferent standard when the Trenton district information executive announced at a meeting at Red Bank last week the resignations of 22 members of the Asbury Park War Price and Rationing Board would be accepted and then voiced praise for the "three loyal members" who did not resign from the board.

We were pleased to hear the praise of the three remaining members, for they have proved themselves avid workers. But we resent the innuendo aimed at the members who resigned, because of their distaste for the methods followed by the OPA. It is painful to us to hear a professional bureaucrat euphemistically called an "information executive," whatever that is, designate three members as "loyal" and thereby impute disloyalty to members who after months and years of conscientious service, for which they were not paid, devotedly waited until the end of the war before resigning as a protest against undemocratic and un-American conditions within the OPA.

Chairman Goddard and the other 21 members of the Asbury Park Board who resigned are entitled to high praise for their loyalty, their unselfish devotion to something of a thankless task, and their honesty in resigning from a job that required them to use methods copied from the Gestapo. Similarly the three members who chose not to resign are entitled to a vote of appreciation for continuing in an unselfish fashion to apply policies to which they presumably subscribe.

But it is shameful that a representative of the OPA representing the paid bureaucracy that ranges from Washington to Trenton and dozens of other cities should dismiss the services of 22 conscientious ration board members with a bland acceptance of their resignation without thanking them for their services and with an awkward attack on their loyalty. We have learned to expect little civility from professional bureaucrats, but in their desperate struggle to continue eating out of the public trough they might at least make a pretense of courtesy to citizens who have given, rather than bartered, their services to the public.

United States Public Opinion Urges Aid to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks, I insert therein excerpts of typical editorials recently published by American newspapers chosen at random from all over the United States expressing the views of the various sectors of public opinion in this country about the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

It is regrettable that the limitation of space forbids my inserting all the hundreds of editorials and articles written on the subject. I wish to make of record my gratitude and that of my people to all these editors and writers who show such a sympathetic understanding of the needs of the Filipinos and who, by their writings, give us an earnest of that American sense of justice which has endeared the American people to us and has won our abiding friendship and loyalty. Anyone who reads these editorials—and they come from all sections of the United States—will see that there is here a clearly crystallized sentiment among the rank and file of the American people in favor of extending help to the Philippines in a manner that will show that the American people are not only cognizant but also have a deep sense of appreciation of the sacrifices made by my people in the terrible war just ended.

On board the U. S. S. *Missouri*, at the conclusion of the historic occasion marking the surrender of the Japanese, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in his closing address, made a statement which for its cogency should be engraved in every American heart. He said:

To the Pacific basin has come the vista of a new emancipated world. Today, freedom is on the offensive, democracy is on the march. Today, in Asia as well as in Europe, unshackled peoples are tasting the full sweetness of liberty, the relief from fear.

In the Philippines, America has evolved a model for this new free world of Asia. In the Philippines, America has demonstrated that peoples of the East and peoples of the West may walk side by side in mutual respect and with mutual benefit. The history of our sovereignty there has now the full confidence of the East.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude reflected by the newspaper editorials which I am here inserting shows that that confidence is fully deserved. It is my expectation that when the time comes this Congress will act, as it always has in the past, in accordance with the dictates of true Americanism so faithfully portrayed by these expressions of American public opinion toward my country.

EXCERPTS FROM EDITORIALS ALL OVER THE UNITED STATES ON THE SUBJECT OF AMERICAN AID FOR THE REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PHILIPPINES

"AID FOR PHILIPPINES

"A war correspondent, recently returned from the Philippines, described the almost child-like faith the Filipino people have in the United States. As he walked through the streets of shattered Manila, he was followed by young Filipinos who told him of their future hopes and aspirations now that the hated Japanese have been driven out. They told him they knew they could achieve their ambitions to amount to something under the American influence, and with American help. It was for that reason principally, they said, that they refused to be conquered by the Japs, formed their underground movement, helped the American guerrillas, and rejected the purring Japanese blandishments about a new order for Asia.

"* * * A strong and continued loyal and friendly Philippines must be a cornerstone of the Nation's future policy in the Pacific. It is more than a question of gratitude that the Filipinos be given every con-

sideration in helping them to establish a free government and a sound economy." (Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, June 9, 1945.)

"AID FOR THE FILIPINOS

"Senator TYDINGS should have no trouble in getting congressional support for his suggestion that we rush assistance to the stricken Filipinos.

"* * * They were for us, and we should do our duty by them in their present predicament.

"Senator TYDINGS, who has just returned from a tour of inspection, says the devastation in Manila is far beyond description. The city was laid flat before the despoilers left it. The Senator asks that governmental red tape be cut that we may provide prompt and ample assistance to the stricken people. Congress will have popular support in going to the aid of the Filipinos." (Auburn (Ind.) Star, June 5, 1945.)

"OUR OBLIGATION TO THE FILIPINOS

"Senator TYDINGS has informed President Truman that there is immediate need for the United States to render large scale assistance to the Philippines, where suffering and devastation are widespread in the wake of our campaign to drive the Japanese from the islands.

"He found that 600,000 Filipinos were dependent upon our army for food and clothing, that war damage will prevent the production of a sugar crop for 3 years, and that Manila has suffered destruction on a scale surpassed by no European city, not even Berlin. Hardly a house in the Philippine capital is standing.

"Senator TYDINGS has urged the President to extend large scale loans and gifts to the Filipinos for relief and reconstruction. Certainly the people of this country will favor everything that can be done to relieve the plight of the islanders. We have embarked upon a world-wide program of relief and rehabilitation through UNRRA, the Lend-Lease Administration, and other agencies for the benefit of lands which have no claim upon our sympathy comparable to that of the Philippines. The islands are, indeed, our peculiar responsibility.

"The population of the Philippines shared with this country the risks and trials of war. Filipinos fought with us in the dark days of Bataan and they were loyal to us through adversity. The relations between them and us are those of friendship and trust.

"The Filipinos are our friends and they know from past performance that this country can be trusted to prove sympathetic and generous. We must not disappoint their expectations. The Tribune is proud to recall that this is not the first time it has expressed these sentiments." (Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, June 6, 1945.)

"LET'S HELP THE FILIPINOS NOW

"We can take a long leap over thousands of miles of Pacific, specifically to the far-off Philippines, and still be at home in the sense of finding a population of 16,000,000 racially different but at heart our own true brethren.

"The Dutch, the Belgians, the Greeks, and the rest have our genuine sympathy, and we will assist them as much as we can toward present relief and long-term rehabilitation. But our responsibility to the Filipinos is greater. It must have first call on our resources.

"Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, a longtime friend of the Philippines, recently traveled there as the head of a committee of inquiry. What he saw was shocking, like the worse scenes of devastation in Europe.

"Similar reports from Europe arouse lively sympathy. What, then, should be the reaction when the story of tragedy is from territory hallowed by America's own flag? These people are our country's wards. They fought the good fight and kept the good faith. Under years of oppression and atrocity, they stood firm. Their indomitable guerrilla bands paved the way for American reconquest.

"The Philippines have richly earned whatever we can give. Senator TYDINGS proposes an immediate large loan to the Filipino government for relief, plus a substantial gift for permanent reconstruction. We urge White House and Congress both to be lavish in this cause—and to be quick." (Bronx (N. Y.) Home News, June 6, 1945.)

"HELP FOR THE PHILIPPINES

"A statesmanlike solution of the problem, and one we believe most Americans will agree the Filipinos have earned, would be to expedite a trade agreement that would soften at least a major part of the economic impact of complete abrogation of their preferential trade position and give them their independence on or before the date promised. The far-reaching beneficial consequences of such an action by us now on our future relations in the Pacific and in Asia hardly can be overestimated. Certainly they should be far greater than any present or future benefits to a few sugar-beet growers, or any other industry, in this country.

"* * * Privation is a hard exigency of war that Filipinos have learned to understand in 3½ years of Japanese occupation. They will not so readily understand any delay by Congress in quickly and generously giving them a hope for the future by amending the tariff provisions of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, and doing this in time to permit the grant of independence at the earliest possible moment, before July 4, 1946, if possible." (New York (N. Y.) Times, June 6, 1945.)

"SUCCOR THE PHILIPPINES NOW

"'Pitiable' is the word Senator TYDINGS used to describe the plight of the people. He recommended to President Truman that immediate measures be taken for an extensive policy of generous treatment, an immediate large scale public purpose loan to the Philippines government and generous Federal aid to the islands for reconstruction work under the direction of Army and Navy engineers. 'If we could give millions for the relief of the Tokyo earthquake,' he said, 'we ought to be able to help with many more millions a people that have been fighting by our side.'

"* * * The Filipinos deserve well at our hands.

"The Filipinos are our wards. We lost the ability to protect them. Yet they remained steadfast in their loyalty to us. No welcome could have been more heartfelt than that which they gave our troops upon their reconquest of the islands.

"Our treatment of the Filipinos has been an example for other nations to follow. We should make our response to their extremity now an even further and greater example, not only for the sake of that, but more importantly for reasons of humanity and because they richly deserve the best we can do for them." (Hartford (Conn.) Times, June 6, 1945.)

"THE PLIGHT OF THE FILIPINOS

"Senator TYDINGS has cut short his mission of inquiry in the Philippines and returned to Washington to report directly to President Truman on conditions which he characterizes as 'indescribable' and 'pitiable.'

"What the Senator emphasizes is the urgency of the situation. * * * His program includes a gift of funds to permit Army and Navy engineers to undertake rebuilding as soon as war conditions permit, a loan of sufficient size to finance further reconstruction by Philippine authorities, strict compliance with legislation calling for Philippine independence and a generous attitude toward expediting a return to normal conditions.

"Senator TYDINGS could not have a more popular cause to plead. The loyalty of the Filipinos during the dark days of Bataan and their heroic share in the defense of the islands, their continued loyalty during the long years of Japanese occupation, and their sincere welcome upon our return are vivid in the public consciousness." (Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 6, 1945.)

"NO STRINGS

"It is possible for the Filipinos to enjoy a full measure of political independence and at the same time permit a powerful friend to maintain bases on their territory—bases for the defense of the islands as well as for the interests of this country. And that is what the status of Philippine independence is expected to be." (Greenville (S. C.) News, June 2, 1945.)

"AID FOR THE PHILIPPINES

"Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, cut short his mission there and hurried back to Washington to make his report to President Truman. 'Conditions in Manila,' he told the President, 'are beyond description.' And he added:

"'I can only say that we found Manila almost completely wrecked, hardly a house habitable, without water, without transport, without food and with almost nothing with which to look after a suffering population.'

"The Senator recommended immediate measures for generous treatment of the Filipinos, no change in the United States policy for Philippine independence, an immediate large-scale loan to the Philippine Government and generous Federal aid to the islands for permanent reconstruction under direction of Army and Navy engineers.

"He makes a strong case for Philippine aid, and because the people of the islands have set an example of loyalty far better than any others in the Pacific we owe it to them to go the limit in helping them to restore their homeland after the ravages of war and bestial Japanese occupation. Even though they have won the right to self-government, in the broadest sense the Filipinos are our wards. A heavy obligation rests upon this Nation to succor them in their distress." (Wilmington (N. C.) Star, June 8, 1945.)

"FILIPINOS BLED WHITE, BUT NEVER COMPLAINED

"There are many bright pages in the history of this war. One of the brightest of these is the record that the Filipinos have written. They made a desperate stand under General MacArthur before the fall of Corregidor. They gave freely and nobly of their men and supplies to help the Americans in their effort.

"* * * The organization of guerrillas in the islands is a masterful episode. They have been bled white, but they have never complained. They believed with us in democracy." (Durham (N. C.) Herald, June 5, 1945.)

"THE FILIPINO BILL

"The people of the Philippines have served and served well the cause of the United Nations in this war. They never surrendered to the enemy nor lost their faith in the United States. Throughout the Japanese occupation of the islands, they kept in touch with the Allies, furnishing them priceless information of Jap military movements and installations, and many of them suffered dearly for their loyalty to the Allied cause. The valuable aid provided the Allies by Filipino guerrillas is well known to all familiar with the war in the Philippines.

"This kind of loyalty merits reward." (Manchester (N. H.) Leader, June 5, 1945.)

"HELP THE FILIPINOS

"Senator TYDINGS has cut short his visit to the Philippines and hurried home because the conditions he found there would not permit delaying his report.

"He has gone straight to President Truman with a plea for immediate aid in great volume to restore the completely disorganized life of the islands. He urges large-scale relief, a

public-purposes loan, and reiteration of our present policy for independence.

"We have relief organizations for every country under the sun. But nobody seems interested in relief for these people who fought at our side and under our flag.

"The Senator expects to report fully to the Senate. If that does not bring prompt official action, a Nation-wide private drive for relief should be started at once." (Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union, June 6, 1945.)

"TREATMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES

"The Philippine Islands cannot be left in the condition of a semitropical slum, if the native population is to be kept friendly to the United States and thus made a substantial reinforcement of America's military power or moral influence in the Orient." (Springfield (Mass.) Republican, June 9, 1945.)

"PHILIPPINES IN SORRY PLIGHT

"Uncle Sam has too big a stake in the islands to ignore the plight of the Philippines. We need strong bases in the Pacific to provide security against future attacks by the Japanese or any other aggressor nation. The Filipinos are anxious to grant military bases in return for any economic help given them in rebuilding their country. We simply cannot afford to risk the consequences of withholding aid." (Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune, June 9, 1945.)

"THE PHILIPPINES NEED MORE THAN FREEDOM

"Unless we thus aid and protect the Philippines, as well as granting them political independence, the world will be justified in holding against us forever the shabby trick of claiming credit for a noble action while actually condemning its beneficiary to beggary. And the American people, who have learned a deep admiration for their Filipino partners and neighbors, are not likely ever to countenance such a trick. If it remains for the people to decide, the Tydings program is as good as adopted, however much tariff-minded Senators may seem disposed to hedge." (Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, June 9, 1945.)

"HELP THE FILIPINOS

"If there is one people in the world the American Government should help it is the Filipinos. Loyally, in their darkest hour, they stood faithful to the American war cause in the Pacific. Big business interests in the United States should not be permitted to thwart adequate rehabilitation assistance to the Philippines." (Scranton (Pa.) Tribune, June 9, 1945.)

"FILIPINO CASE DESPERATE

"The heart-rending conditions in the Philippines appeal to the sympathies of the American people in a universal way." (Detroit (Mich.) News, June 10, 1945.)

"AIDING THE FILIPINO PEOPLE

"But irrespective of the motives behind offering freedom to the Philippines, it has been guaranteed and the people should be given their liberty at the scheduled time. But freedom without certain assistance would be morally wrong and short-sighted. The loyalty and services of the Filipino people helped speed the return of MacArthur's forces and aided in saving countless American lives, and will continue to be of untold benefit to the Allied cause as long as the Japs are in the Philippines.

"As a result of the ravages of war, the Philippines are in economic distress. * * * And the financial organization of the country is disrupted. The Philippines need help and must look to the United States for it.

"We should follow through with the independence bargain, and give a helping hand in addition." (Kansas City-Topeka Daily Capitol (Mo.-Kans.), June 10, 1945.)

"FILIPINOS OUR NO. 1 PRIORITY

"We heartily second Senator TYDINGS' sentiments expressed at Manila. He said the Philippines should have priority over Europe on American economic aid because they have fought and died with us under our flag.

"Too many of our world fixers like to sit and moon about vast areas of the world which are beyond fixing by us in any permanent sense. But the Philippines form a relatively ponderable problem within our capacity.

"The Filipinos are our comrades in a very real sense. Their priorities on everything we have to offer should be No. 1." (Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Journal, June 11, 1945.)

"DESTRUCTION ON UNITED STATES SOIL

"Occasionally you hear it said that the United States was fortunate to escape destruction in this war of the sort experienced by England, France, and Germany. This is not strictly correct. The Philippines are still United States soil. The destruction there is little known to the public.

"The plight of the Philippines is our responsibility. This is our soil until the Filipinos receive their independence. The suffering is on our hands. This is a gigantic task, big enough to engage our resources and effort for sometime, without undertaking the conquest, subjugation, and liberation of other lands in the Pacific." (Rock Island (Ill.) Argus, June 12, 1945.)

"AID TO PHILIPPINES

"All accounts of the fighting in the Philippines agree in commending the assistance given by the Filipinos to the American Army. There is plenty of evidence that the attempt of the Japanese invaders to win over the natives by favors to cooperate in a government directed from Tokyo has made little progress. The desire for freedom, together with recognition of just dealings between them and the United States during the years under American control, has held them steadfast in their alliance with this country." (Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News, June 12, 1945.)

"THE PHILIPPINES NEED HELP

"The Philippines and their people have earned a new respect from this country by reason of their courageous resistance against the Japanese. Whether or not they are ready for the independence which, by act of Congress, was set to go into effect in 1946, they will need a helping hand for some time. They will need markets for their goods, particularly sugar and hemp. In the acid test of war they have chosen America and democracy rather than the blandishments of their fellow orientals—the Japanese. We must see to it that their faith is justified." (Wellsville (N. Y.) Reporter, June 13, 1945.)

"OUR OBLIGATION TO THE FILIPINOS

"Senator TYDINGS has urged the President to extend large-scale loans and gifts to the Filipinos for relief and reconstruction. Certainly the people of this country will favor everything that can be done to relieve the plight of the islanders. We have embarked upon a world-wide program of relief and rehabilitation through UNRRA, the lend-lease administration, and other agencies for the benefit of lands which have no claim upon our sympathy comparable to that of the Philippines. The islands are, indeed, our peculiar responsibility.

"The Filipinos are our friends and they know from past performance that this country can be trusted to prove sympathetic and generous. We must not disappoint their expectations." (Marion (Ind.) Chronicle, June 13, 1945.)

FILIPINO OUTLOOK IS DARK UNLESS AMERICA HELPS

"In our plans for helping the little nations of Europe once more get on their feet, Americans must also keep in mind their own wards in the Pacific, that their just claims upon our bounty shall not be overlooked." (Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, June 13, 1945.)

"OUR FRIENDS, THE FILIPINOS

"The News a few days ago discussed the problems facing the devastated and ruined Philippine Islands and took the view that the United States 'has an obligation to restore the Philippine economy which it failed to protect from the Japanese aggressors'. The News added, further that this might not only prove to be good business, but that 'it is good national policy'. This attitude has now been strongly supported in the Senate speech of Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, who headed an important mission to the Philippines recently.

"It is difficult to imagine the United States not taking some such advanced step to relieve the fledgling republic, and there seems no reason to doubt about the adoption of some such proposal as that submitted by Senator TYDINGS." (Indianapolis (Ind.) News, June 15, 1945.)

"SENATOR TYDINGS MAKES HIS REPORT ON THE PHILIPPINES

"The gift of $100,000,000 is not likely to raise objections while the debt we owe to the Filipinos is so vivid in our minds. The chief difficulty here lies in getting the necessary material and supplies, on which the money will be spent, to the islands under wartime conditions. Nor should there be any barriers in the way of arranging loans. Independence already has been promised, so that the only question here is choice of a date." (Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 15, 1945.)

"PHILIPPINES AID

"The Tydings program would help get the Philippines started on their long road back. But it wouldn't do much for Manila. In the final battle for the capital city, the Japs, knowing their defeat was imminent, blasted and fired the beautiful metropolis until hardly a building was left. * * * Would it be too much to ask Americans individually to contribute to a fund that would enable the island people to rebuild their beautiful city out of American generosity?" (Monroe (Mich.) News, June 16, 1945.)

"SUFFERING IN PHILIPPINES

"Senator TYDINGS, reporting all this and much more, submitted to the President a four-point proposal.

"It is difficult to imagine the United States not taking some such advanced step to relieve the fledgling republic, and there seems no reason to doubt about the adoption of some such proposal as that submitted by Senator TYDINGS." (Auburn (Ind.) Star, June 16, 1945.)

"PLIGHT OF THE PHILIPPINES

"The moral obligation behind these proposals is to be found in one of Senator TYDINGS' observations: That throughout the war there is not one recorded instance of treachery on the part of the Filipinos against any American fighting man or civilian, despite Japanese readiness to use bribes, threats, or murder as a means of pressure." (New York (N. Y.) Sun, June 16, 1945.)

"NOT APPLAUSE, BUT ACTION

"If hearty applause were a sure prelude to specific action, we could welcome the Senate's ovation to Senator TYDINGS' speech on the Philippines last week. * * *

"But what the Philippines need is not so much applause as action. The Senator stated the immediate need of the Islands as a $100,000,000 gift for reconstruction and rehabilitation under direction of Army and Navy engineers. In addition they would need loans for a more extended program. And certainly they deserve and have earned their independence, which has already been promised. They will need, further, continued low tariffs until they get on their feet again.

"Our competing interests in the United States should be willing, in view of the Filipinos' admirable record in this war, to make concessions required to provide a richly deserved opportunity to get an economic

footing as a basis for a successfully working independence." (Springfield (Mass.) Union (morning), June 19, 1945.)

"PHILIPPINES FIRST

"Senator TYDINGS' comments seem to be sound, and if there is anyone we should take care of first it should be people of our possessions." (Faribault (Minn.) Daily News, June 19, 1945.)

"FILIPINOS IN DISTRESS

"Although the Filipinos stood loyal to the United States to the end of Japanese occupation and suffered terribly as a consequence, and although American prestige in the Far East is closely concerned with what this country does to help its allies rehabilitate themselves, there is some doubt over what will be done. Paradoxically, what TYDINGS proposes may be opposed by the same groups that in the first instance were the leaders of the movement to give the islands their freedom.

"We have done a good deal of back-slapping among ourselves because of our 'superior' treatment of the Filipinos. Now what?" (Middletown (Conn.) Press, June 11, 1945.)

"PHILIPPINES GET FIRST CALL

"While the immediate task is to feed and clothe a people distressed by 3 years of Japanese occupation, the principal job is to build the Filipinos to self-sufficiency." (Colorado Springs (Colo.) Gazette, April 3, 1945.)

"WOULD BE A STUNNING BLOW

"(By William Philip Simms)

"Failure of the United States to live up to the letter and the spirit of its pledges to the Filipino people would be disastrous to its prestige. It would prove a tragic disillusionment to the hundreds of millions of subject peoples throughout the Far East and the rest of the world.

"* * * Not everybody, even today, believes the United States means what it says to the Filipinos. They simply cannot comprehend that a great power, perfectly capable of holding on to a rich colonial possession, would voluntarily set it free after shedding blood in its behalf. That is something we still have to prove, and failure now would be a stunning blow to budding confidence clear around the globe." (New York (N. Y.) World-Telegram, September 8, 1945.)

"WE MUST HELP THE PHILIPPINES

"Impartial observers express the opinion that it would be foolish indeed to have spent the money and lives involved in the recent campaign of liberation if the opportunity is not given the Philippines to exist as a free country. Such a course would simply mean replacement of Japanese domination with economic strangulation.

"Senator TYDINGS has suggested free trade relationship be extended only for a period of 3 to 5 years after independence is granted, contending that the Filipinos never can be free and independent if their economy is to be linked to ours indefinitely.

"What the Filipinos desire, and support for their view is gaining ground here, is a 20-year period of free trade between the two countries.

"It is important that the decision as to how far we are willing to cooperate with the Philippines economically be reached without further delay. The lack of policy is holding up the move toward rehabilitation since industry and capital are unable to decide how to prepare for postwar world trade relations.

"Further, it is necessary to decide upon the economic phase before independence is granted, first, because of the uniform clause in most of the reciprocal trade agreements we have outstanding which exempts any concessions the United States may grant to the Philippines, and secondly, because the new political structure of the islands and its prospects of success will depend heavily on the economic foundations which are to be provided." (New York Journal of Commerce, July 30, 1945.)

Tax Revision Essential in Reconversion From Wartime to Peacetime Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 13, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, equal in importance to almost every other pending legislative proposal before this Congress at this time is the question of changes in our tax laws. This has been discussed for some time. Tax legislation should have attention as quickly as possible. Under our procedure, of course, the Ways and Means Committee of this House will present a bill to the House for consideration.

WARTIME TAX LEGISLATION

Our present tax laws are wartime measures. Profits and incomes are taxed to the vanishing point, and the incentive to expand in business, create new industries, and furnish employment, and develop a peacetime prosperity does not exist. This legislation was based on the theory that no one should make a profit out of war. Then there were those who held that the way to prevent speculation and inflation as a result of war prosperity was to take money from people of ordinary incomes by lowering the exemptions, and increasing the tax rates, not only on single people but on married ones with children, as well. Those of you who pay income taxes know what I mean. You are feeling the pinch.

Then, again, the Government had to have revenue to pay the expenses, in part only, of the war operations. That argument, of course, was paramount in framing tax legislation. So the Treasury Department experts devised ways to nick the taxpayers here and there with nuisance taxes, and so forth. Then there are the taxes on annuities and pensions, so unfair. Another well-known example is the $5 stamp tax that has to be paid annually if you are going to use your automobile.

PEOPLE DEMAND TAX CHANGES

From time to time people in my district write me and call attention to the changes that ought to be made in existing tax law. They call attention to the $5 tax on automobiles and ask that it be abolished. They point out the need to increase the tax exemptions. They say that the small businessman and the man with a small factory should be allowed to make a profit so that he will expand business and employ more people. One letter I just recently received from a well-known citizen in my community contains this challenging statement:

I think if there is any downward revision of the Federal income-tax laws, as everybody hopes for and many seem to expect, there should be restored and liberalized the old earned-income credit. Not to make any distinction between the earned income and unearned income seems to me to disregard entirely the factor of ability to pay and to be very unfair to those who earn their living by their hands or their brains.

I could set forth extracts from many other letters which discuss the tax problem as it affects their individual cases. All of it adds up to the fact that the people want tax revision, and they feel it should be done now.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN RECOGNIZES NEED FOR TAX REVISION

In his message to Congress on September 6, 1945, President Truman discussed, in part, the tax question, as follows:

Taxes will play a vital role in attaining a prosperous peace. I recommend that a transitional tax bill be enacted as soon as possible to provide limited tax reductions for the calendar year 1946. Like the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945, the new bill should aim principally at removing barriers to speedy reconversion and to the expansion of our peacetime economy.

We would do well, Mr. Speaker, to follow the President's suggestions. The quicker we remove what he calls existing barriers to getting industry moving on a peacetime basis, just that much earlier will peacetime jobs be available for those who are no longer employed in wartime industry.

Address by Hon. Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, Before Meeting of Congress of Industrial Organizations, Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] before a mass meeting of the Congress of Industrial Organizations held in Convention Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on September 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Americans, today in the hour of the victory which they won on the home front while their sons and brothers fought on the war fronts, the working men and women of this city and of our commonwealth face the gravest danger. Governor Martin and a few selfish men, including Pew, Grundy, and his manufacturers' association—and these selfish men control and dictate to the Governor—are plotting to turn the victory over Germany and Japan into a program for enslaving labor and reducing American workers to the level of serfs.

Here in Pennsylvania, it is up to all of us, no matter what our political party, to drive from office the leadership and the gang who are deliberately turning victory abroad into reaction at home.

It is up to all of us, as decent Americans, to turn our eyes on Harrisburg and Philadelphia and get rid of Gov. Edward Martin and all his cronies who cooperate with him here in your city. It is a matter of self-preservation for you workers.

On August 31, Governor Martin appeared before the Finance Committee of the United States Senate and testified in opposition to the Kilgore bill. This bill would accept as part of the war costs of the National Government an obligation to pay unemployment compensation to all the war workers, many of whom, such as workers in Government-owned plants and crews of merchant ships, are not covered by the State social-security laws. The simple justice of such a measure is obvious. Its imperative necessity is great. The proposal is to use the State social-security agencies as a means of meeting this obligation during the reconversion period.

The most that any unemployed worker could receive under this system is $25 a week, and the longest period would be 26 weeks.

Governor Martin testified against the plan and stated that the maximum of $20 a week for a maximum of 20 weeks, provided by the Pennsylvania social-security laws, is enough for any Pennsylvania worker.

Governor Martin receives a salary of $18,000 a year—or more than $300 a week—paid by the taxes collected from the very workers who must not, he says, be allowed more than $20 a week.

Governor Martin, in addition to his $18,000 a year salary, gets a fine mansion, completely furnished, and a fine automobile, paid for by the taxes collected from the very workers who must not, he says, be allowed more than $20 a week.

Governor Martin also gets a large staff of domestic servants, flunkies, chauffeurs, and other personal aides and attendants, all paid for by the taxes collected from the very people who must not, he says, be allowed more than $20 a week.

Here you have a man, who, himself, nicely paid and comfortable, is opposed to letting the Federal Government use its own funds to supplement the paltry social-security allowances ordained by a Martin-dominated State legislature at Harrisburg. Governor Martin thinks that $20 a week is enough for any Pennsylvanian. I'd like to see him try to live for 20 weeks on $20 a week. Perhaps he wouldn't be so sure as he is of the average Pennsylvanian's ability to support a family on that sum.

Governor Martin, in expressing the personal conviction that the Federal Government ought not to meet its obligations to the war, is either foolish or a tool of the Grundys, the Pews, and their ilk.

Governor Martin is not foolish. He is one of the smartest, most ruthless politicians the Pennsylvania Republican Party has ever produced. In trying to block additional emergency Federal-unemployment pay during the reconversion period, Governor Martin is playing both national and local politics.

Let's not kid ourselves. If, by reactionary control at Harrisburg and other State capitals, millions of Americans can be thrown into and kept on breadlines, two things might happen. First, wage rates could be beaten down, union organization disrupted, the returning veterans forced to struggle for jobs against the displaced war workers, and the big manufacturers, who support men like Edward Martin, could destroy collective bargaining, unionism, and the rights and dignity of labor. Second, a Nation-wide wave of depression, if prolonged into 1946, might develop a protest vote which would tend to turn against the Democratic administration at Washington.

No, I don't think that Governor Martin is foolish when he lends his support to policies which threaten the welfare and security of American workers and their families. I think he is being shrewd and ruthless.

According to Governor Martin, he opposes the Kilgore bill as being in some way an attack on the so-called integrity of State unemployment-compensation funds. The Pennsylvania reserve for that purpose is now $600,000,000. Governor Martin feels that this money would be tainted if in any way it was supplemented by Federal funds.

Let's see how he really feels about the integrity of this fund. If the State system has any meaning, it is as a contributory system in which the individual worker has a stake measured by his own contributions. These contributions are deducted from his pay.

On August 30, 1945, Philip Murray, in a letter to Governor Martin, pointed out that under the present system the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment and Unemployment Compensation was depriving Pennsylvania workers of their own money. Mr. Murray wrote that, in order to qualify for benefits, an applicant must be willing and able to accept a suitable job. Applicants are being offered work entirely alien to their previous earnings, their skill, vocation, and the working conditions to which they are accustomed. If such offers are rejected, the person is disqualified and receives no unemployment benefits.

In other words, Governor Martin uses the very money a worker has contributed to insure himself against unemployment as a means of defrauding him in the interest of low-wage concerns and sweatshop methods in Pennsylvania industry.

No; I don't think that Governor Martin is foolish when he insists that $20 a week must be top pay for unemployment compensation in Pennsylvania. I think he wants to make $20 top pay for all industrial employment in Pennsylvania.

Edward Martin is not foolish. In my opinion, he is a tool of the Grundys, the Pews, and their ilk. He is not even a wise conservative. Wise conservatives and practical progressives quarrel a little. Take, for example, this statement by Frank W. Pierce, a director of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. Fred Perkins, of the United Press, recently quoted Pierce as saying: "In view of the socialistic tendencies showing up in various parts of the world, private enterprise in the United States must see to it that the individual worker is assured of more security." That is wise conservatism speaking, and we, as practical liberals, will not quarrel with the motive so long as the result is obtained.

But Governor Martin and men like him are not wise conservatives. God knows what they are. They behave like the German magnates who built up Hitler, like the Italian landlords who supported Mussolini, like the Bourbons who made the French Revolution, and like the Tories who made the American Revolution.

Governor Martin is not only flatly opposed to the payment of unemployment compensation at $25 a week for 26 weeks, by and with the cooperation of the Federal Government, but he has also declared against full employment for all men and women able and willing to work. Pew and Grundy don't want it. They don't believe in it.

The Governor is opposed to a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. Pew, Grundy, and other overlords of employment want a reservoir of cheap, oppressed, anxious labor, both white and colored.

The Governor is against any Pennsylvania help to returning veterans through rehabilitation, education, maintenance, and decent treatment. While he professes to be a soldier, and only recently hurried off to New England to greet the Twenty-eighth Division upon its return to this country—which division, by the way, is no more like the division it was when Martin had it than night is like day—he and his cohorts did not even permit the consideration of a veterans' GI bill in the last session of the legislature.

I say get them out of Harrisburg and Philadelphia. Keep them out of Washington. Break their grip in State courts and local administrations. They may have a place, but they certainly don't belong in public life.

Let us, as progressive Pennsylvanians and patriotic Americans, do our part to relegate Ed Martin to private life where he may have plenty of time to try to convince himself, without any urging from the Grundys, the Pews, and their ilk, that $20 a week is enough for any Pennsylvania worker.

Some Aspects of Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Some Aspects of Foreign Commerce," delivered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] before the New Haven (Conn.) Junior Chamber of Commerce on September 10, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some time ago, when our war machine was building up, there was a rather high-level Navy Department conference concerning procurement problems at that time. One of the conferees was a former vice president of one of the large chain-store companies, a man of long experience in that field, who was highly valuable to the Navy Department over a considerable period.

During the conference Mr. Folsom expressed satisfaction with the way war materials were being turned out of the factories, and then went on to show that the least satisfactory angle lay in distribution; that is, in too many failures to get the products distributed in the proper amounts at the correct times and places. He made quite a little speech about it and amply proved the case, after which various naval officers thanked him and expressed admiration. His rejoinder to that was:

"You Navy men are all right on procurement, and you no doubt will learn to distribute the product; but don't think you will know it all then. To be fully developed, you would also have to learn to sell." (Selling anything, of course, is about as far removed from the naval officers' field as any activity can possibly be.)

Those are the three parts of commerce—producing, distributing, and selling. We of this State have, during many years of peace as well as during these crucial years of war, amply demonstrated that we know how to produce—how to get the stuff out of our factories. The future worry will be disposing of our production; and we are all thinking over the foreign field as one of our vital outlets.

Over the years behind us we have been in the habit of consuming, roughly, 90 percent of our own production, and foreign markets have taken something like 10 percent of it. Of course, our domestic markets are the most important ones, but they have not been big enough; and they will probably consume a smaller percentage of our total capacity in the future than they have in the past. Therefore, that 10 percent, that 20 percent, or whatever it may be in our various industrial fields, will be important.

We will deal tonight more with distribution—that is, overseas transportation—than with selling. However, those two activities do have to be rather closely meshed if we

are to be successful in competing in foreign markets.

It is quite natural that in the past our domestic markets should have absorbed most of our energies, attention, and study. Since this has been true for several generations, it can only be expected that we are inexperienced in foreign trade as compared with certain of the great trading nations whose history is filled with that kind of commercial competition.

Quite recently we have been hearing of certain organizations being built up in this country as trading corporations, preparing to venture into the field of foreign commerce. Those organizations have various ambitions—some of them small, but some rather large—and they are beginning a rather great adventure with much hope that in a rather short time they will become powerful in the world's marts as trading corporations. I certainly share that hope, because I think such growth is highly important to our future. We must not fail to improve the prospects; and in this connection we can well study the past.

There were similar commercial ventures after World War I. One company of that day can serve as an illustration. That firm was incorporated as Gaston, Williams & Wigmore. Those were good names, one at least having a foreign tang, and the company floated a stock issue of considerable size. They plunged in without knowing enough about what they were headed for, set themselves up with a heavy overhead in agencies, in foreign ports as well as at home—and went very broke in a rather short time.

While building up the organization, Gaston, Williams & Wigmore hired a man out of the Navy, who was the best all-around man of his time in that profession, and sent him out in charge of all the company's affairs in the Far East. Bankruptcy came on very soon after he arrived at Shanghai, and he was then employed by the receivers to straighten out the mess. He was successful in that, and has continued to be a success in commercial life ever since. Despite the handicap of little previous business experience, his aptitude was such that he has made the grade.

There was wonderment in the action of that firm, Gaston, Williams & Wigmore, in choosing a man with only naval training to head one of their most important agencies. Therein lies the point of all this: for such work outside this country, the field of choice is limited to a relatively few men who not only know how to cope with competitors of other nationalities but who are willing to live outside this country.

We have over, say, the last 30 or 40 years, been sending more and more men outside our borders, charged with handling the Nation's commercial and industrial affairs in foreign fields. However, Americans like to live at home and don't wish to enter into anything which will make them more or less expatriates for life. That is quite natural, for we all agree that this is the best country in the world in which to live. Men of the same class in other countries also prefer to live at home; but the difference is that they can't all make a good living at home. As a result, they do go out and spread themselves over the earth.

Should any of us drop in on some large foreign cities, take Buenos Aires for example, he would find a certain number of Americans representing, in addition to our Government, quite a number of our firms which manufacture for export and decidedly need the foreign market. It is rare to find an American who is not there for just a short time and who does not look forward primarily to the time when his contract is up, so that he may return to us.

On the other side, we would find Germans, Scandinavians, Hollanders, British, etc., in rather large numbers. The great difference in attitude is that a great many of those representatives and employees from Europe will have settled in Buenos Aires to stay. Some of them—notably the Germans—frequently seek to ally themselves with their new home by marriage. Those circumstances have obtained in the past and are likely to prove one of the difficulties we face as we promote the expansion of our commerce into foreign fields.

Now, no matter how able our men may be in handling our foreign trade, they naturally will do best in that world-wide competition if they are supported by a set-up which brings into play all the advantages which can be given them. In that respect, our current laws, methods, and arrangements are not too good. It is easiest to illustrate the point by a comparison which lies in the history of the experiences of other trading nations.

For such example, suppose we take the British. We can do so without a spirit of criticism or finding fault with a people with whom we hope and expect to work very closely. We can find that, during the heyday of what we knew as the British Empire, there grew up what amounted to a full national organization to foster and promote the Empire's foreign trade from every conceivable angle. That extensive and intricate machine was built up around British shipping, in the first instance, and as the United Kingdom became so highly industrialized, the machine was simply extended into the selling field.

Many agencies comprised the machine—and still do. The various Government departments, such as the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office, which with others include a large number of high-grade civil-service personnel, educated and experienced in economic and sociological affairs all over the earth, are important parts of the machine. We also know of the British Board of Trade as a semi-official but extremely powerful organization. There are also the various trade associations which have been a part of the economic and commercial fabric of the British Empire for a long period. At present those associations in the United Kingdom head up in the Federation of British Industries.

The important fact in all that is the close interlock of the strictly official, the semi-official, and the wholly unofficial organizations, all of which are closely tied in; thereby, while preserving a certain amount of competition among themselves, the British face all foreign distribution and selling competition pretty much as a unit. There are practically no legal restrictions against monopoly, so-called restraint of trade, and so forth, which in any way hamper that united front in the foreign commercial field. That whole subject presents a very interesting study which cannot be attempted here. Anyone who is called upon to take action in either the official or in the strictly commercial field of foreign trade would do well to spend some time in such a study.

Our own commercial and economic development has been quite different. The practices and institutions which have grown up with us are primarily based upon domestic industry and commerce, rather than with the foreign field in view as, for example, has been the case with the British. In our domestic field we have quite properly depended for health largely upon home competition. In production per se, just that factor alone, when added to various advantages which have lain in our hands, has put us ahead of the rest of the world. With that accomplishment in the background, many of us think that exactly the same methods, organization and general set-up will likewise enable us to excel in the field of foreign commerce. That is, based upon our results in competing within our own borders, we tend to jump to the conclusion that just the same methods and customs will bring us success all over the world. If it is too widely held, that concept can be rather disastrous to our future.

We have a considerable mass of restrictive laws intended to prevent monopoly and various competitive practices which are generally agreed to have no proper place in our own domestic economy. When those same laws and restrictions hamper our competition in the field of foreign trade, they may amount to a handicap which cannot be surmounted. In the foreign field we will be competing with someone else—other peoples who are quite unhampered by any laws similar to our own.

To become somewhat more concrete, let us narrow down to the simpler field of distribution, as already mentioned. That means primarily the transportation of goods outside our own continental borders. We all know enough of the history of our surface shipping, the success of which has ranged from top places in the international scheme of things to one of the very lowest. We have now achieved a certain degree of national organization of American-flag shipping, after various trials, errors and developments going back to the First World War. The financial subsidy, paid out of the Federal Treasury, is part of that picture, but probably not at all the most important part. We do have a certain amount of unity and some legal machinery, by which and around which we can and do present something of a united front in the world-wide competition involving carrying trade on the sea.

The latest element to come on the stage is trans-oceanic transportation by air. To my mind, we seem to be just entering into the throes of a process which, I hope, will result in a healthy development, but which is not getting off to a good start. Within the last few weeks, much has been said and written concerning the one-company idea for commercial overseas air transport as against what some call the competitive and unrestrained private initiative concept.

Again let us look at the record thus far, as indicating what it is with which our air lines will really be competing. Again the British supply the example which lies closest at hand.

Following the lines which have been successful in the past, the British are adopting the one-company method, despite what they say about regional division. Further than that, our British cousins are tying in with their overseas air transport activities the vast commercial machine which has already been built up around their shipping and their foreign trade representatives and organizations, which are so well distributed all over the world. There will be the same, or perhaps even greater, Governmental control, but always arranged both in theory and in practice to aid directly in the competition against the rest of the world. That is, our own overseas air transportation will face the competition of a rather complete machine, closely integrated over, and into, all those parts of the world which will be of commercial importance, in the view of providing the best possible support to those who venture into that new field. Now the British are only one, and there will be other nations who will do the same thing. We have no ground for objections—there is nothing unfair about it.

Organization of a large overseas air establishment is still a new subject with us and there is a good deal of controversy about it. One school wholeheartedly believes in the one-company idea as applied to setting up and operating air transport lines to various points abroad. The proponents of it never got so far as to consider seriously tying their own business in with other activities already established—such as surface shipping lines, for instance. It is not at all sure that they would have progressed that far themselves, even if their one-company project had not been received with so much opposition, particularly by our continental air lines, which have been so successful and have gone so far out ahead of the rest of the world.

The opponents of the one-company proposal have put forward various arguments,

one of which is that to follow such a principle is too likely to lead to Government ownership. Personally, I think that would be an extremely valid argument if it had a good foundation. I don't think it has, because if the people of this country ever become convinced that Government ownership of all our external airways is a good thing, it will be done whether one or several transoceanic air companies are involved.

The opponents very often use the word monopoly in their arguments, supposedly because they think that monopoly in any part of the foreign commercial field is just as bad as it would be at home. That word "monopoly" immediately brings us to the other word, "competition"; and the facts in the case are that we will most definitely be competing against monopolistic organizations of other nations.

Naturally, the opponents of the one-company idea also represent that without competition any commercial organization goes to seed, rots, root and branch, and eventually falls out of the running. The basis of all those beliefs lies in our domestic rather than in our foreign economic theories.

Our transoceanic air lines will have competition quite severe enough to prevent any slacking up on the part of those engaged in that field. We stand today well ahead of the rest of the world in the technical excellence of our aircraft and in our operational methods, as built up within our own borders. We have a head start over the rest of the world in that respect; and, if we do not assume too many handicaps as we go into the field of foreign transport, we may be able to maintain our position.

However, it should be remembered that other nations can catch up with us in the strictly technical and operational fields, without nearly as much time and effort as we shall have to employ to build up air organizations, with essential connections, which can compete with foreign one-company organizations which also will be striving for supremacy in the same parts of the world, under the strongest support.

To repeat, the one-company idea is still a controversial question. I happen to be one of those who believes in it and who would wish to support it by all the available integration and cooperation which can conceivably be brought into the picture. It will be a catastrophe of no small proportion if our transoceanic air transportation should have the same experiences as our surface shipping has had in the past, and with the same results. That would mean a small representation in the oceanic airways, as we have too often had on the surface shipping routes of the various oceans. That would be not only undesirable but dangerous to the future welfare of the Nation.

As matters stand at present, three of our four domestic air lines are going into the transoceanic field, where they will be competing with each other for the traffic. As their officials state the case, they are largely motivated by the experience in our own domestic airways only. One of the four companies is not making the try because, as its officials frankly state, it would be entering a field which is too far removed from its other experiences, and they would not know enough about what they might be heading into.

So much for just a mention of some aspects of a subject which is both intricate and broad in scope. It is presented with hope rather than defeatism, but with a deep feeling that we must be realistic and understand the difficulties which face us.

There is lack of that understanding, primarily, I think, because public opinion with us has not so developed that we accept the necessity of increased foreign trade as a part of our national economy. Our industrial, commercial, financial, and political structure is built around our domestic economy, with scant consideration of either foreign policy or foreign trade. The emphasis must be brought into better balance. Then, it is to be hoped, we can achieve those Nation-wide organizations, arrangements, and understandings which are so necessary for our success in foreign trade.

Now, commerce is a two-way street. We know that only mass production enables us to compete in the world's markets. We must do our best so to cultivate them that our products, as adapted to foreign use, will be in greater and greater demand. At the same time we must increase our own imports in order that the balance of trade will become as healthy as is humanly possible. To that end we can well go so far as to cultivate the taste of our own people for various foreign products. We can't have a strictly one-way commercial street for very long.

We stand today in a generally better state than most of the rest of the world. We strive to help much of the war-stricken world back to health and our sympathies are great. However, sympathy with the position of other nations or an appreciation of their need for our help should not blind us to the necessity of looking out for our own interests and of assuring that the benefits and rewards which accrue to us shall be entirely commensurate with the contribution which we make to reconstruction, rehabilitation, the creation of freer trade among nations, and the development of a greater world prosperity and stability. Neither sympathy nor idealism should obscure the necessity of guarding and improving our own economic security, so essential to the protection of the world against economic chaos in this period of reconstruction. Whatever we do must be done in a thoroughly practical way and on the basis of sound business. We must maintain the strength and integrity of our national wealth, whether it be measured in gold, in credit, in resources, in initiative, or in energy. To abandon or neglect in any degree our own interests and so weaken our own structure would be a disservice not only to ourselves but to all other nations and to mankind.

What We Are Up Against in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by me entitled "What We Are Up Against In Asia," which appeared in several American newspapers as a contribution from the American Newspaper Alliance and which appeared in the Washington Star of July 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE ARE UP AGAINST IN ASIA

(By Senator ELBERT L. THOMAS, of Utah)

It is a strange position we are in across the Pacific. We are doing most of the fighting against Japan, though we have less in the way of tangible interests than half a dozen other nations, less than China, Russia, France, Great Britain, Holland, or several other states. Our purpose in Asia since 1898, when we went to the Philippines and opposed the partitioning of China by European powers, has been the promotion of peace, but we find ourselves engaged in the most violent war ever fought. Our object is to defeat the Japanese so thoroughly that they will never again become an aggressor nation, but the aggressions of others are still an unsolved problem, and Asiatic peoples other than the Japanese are asking whether aggression is right for only the white man.

We are leading the nations of the world in laying plans for ending war but face a situation seething with strife in Asia even more than in Europe. Though we are rejoicing over the signing of the San Francisco Charter by the representatives of 50 nations, we are not deceiving ourselves about the dangers ahead. The President, the Secretary of State and the delegates of both our political parties have been careful to point out that the Charter is only the machinery for peace which cannot operate by itself. After being started it could be stopped at any time by failure of one of the chief engineers to cooperate or might be by one of the others throwing a monkey wrench into the works. While this is no time for pessimism, it is not too soon to face the fact that we have entered into a colossal undertaking. It is a long-term problem replete with potential disturbances; it is not a local and temporary issue. When we have beaten the Japanese we will only have begun to play a part in the affairs of Asia. We will only have cut a wart, so to speak, off the side of a continent distressed with a series of deep-seated diseases.

The European holdings in Asia are only one of the causes of disturbance. The European powers were able to enter the domain of the East because of the disunion among the peoples and their superior development in weapons of war and organization. They were always inferior in numbers to the people over whom they took control. But the peoples of Asia were not always disunited or less well armed. They have been so strong at times that they entered Europe. The Mohammedans drove their way as far as the gates of Vienna and across North Africa up into Spain; and the Chinese once dominated Asia as far as the Black Sea. While the Japanese have been the only Asiatic people to unite and arm themselves in the modern manner, their example could be followed by others who are more numerous and better endowed with territory and resources.

Beside the problem of Asia that of Europe is minor. Asia is the largest of the continents in both area and population. It has a population of fifteen hundred millions. The people of China alone outnumber all of those of Europe, 450,000,000 compared with three hundred and fifty. If the Chinese leaders had not waged war among themselves after the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty and the proclamation of the republic, if they had pooled their armies and devoted their efforts to modernizing the state, it would have been strong enough to defy invasion by any aggressor. They had 20 years in which to unite and prepare for their defense against a nation of only eighty or ninety million people, inhabiting a group of islands off the coast. The population of Japan is only a fifth of that of China and only 6 percent of that of Asia.

Their islands are not much larger than the Philippines, and, being mostly mountainous, only about a quarter of the land is arable. They contain no supply of oil, very little iron and not much coal. The British, French, and Dutch possessions are each much larger and richer in resources. The story would be different, of course, if the Japanese had succeeded in consolidating their conquests, but now they have no chance of doing this. We have seen to it that they shall not and that they will not again be the major problem in eastern Asia.

But by crushing Japan's power we do not solve the problem of Asia. If we should wipe every Japanese out of existence it would hardly make a dent on the enormous continent. Vast areas would hardly feel the difference. The sooner, therefore, we stop thinking of the problem of war or peace in terms

of doing to Japan what has been done to Germany, the sooner we shall become realistic about the huge, sprawling, turbulent, hungered, and harassed continent that has always had in it the seeds of war. We would do well to consider not only what we are going to do for Asia but also what Asia is likely to do to us.

Across that entire continent, beginning in China and extending through India and Persia to Turkey and Arabia, there are caldrons of conflict sure to boil over sooner or later. Our occupation of Japan will have little or no effect upon them. They are entirely apart from the problem there. Deep-seated resentments, long-held suspicions, and age-old enmities rumble beneath the surface. Besides hostility to white domination there are internal dissensions. Even in China, in spite of the invasion by Japan, there are forces, notably Gen. Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang faction and the Communist group, in arms against each other; while in India there are high-pitched racial and religious disagreements, and in the Arab states there are unending disputes between Mohammedans and Christians and Jews.

With the elimination of Japan the powers with the greatest influence in Asia will be France, Britain, and Russia, because of their territorial holdings, and the United States because of our interest in maintaining the peace. Holland, though her possessions are a quarter of the size of the United States, is dependent upon the British and ourselves for defense. The Dutch have no adequate military or naval power of their own. Russia is the strongest of the powers in Asia because she occupies the entire northern blanket of the continent, an area larger than all North America combined and by no means only cold Siberian wastes. Much of it is temperate and productive land. The Soviet Union has the important advantage of invulnerable size, an efficient and experienced army, and an unequaled strategic position. Her frontiers extend along the length of the Chinese Empire, the border states of India, and also Persia and Turkey. They extend, in fact, across the center of Europe and Asia, from the Baltic to the Sea of Japan.

For nearly a century the British opposed the entry of Russia into southern Europe and Asia. In the Crimean War of 1854 they and the French fought in alliance with Turkey, to prevent the Russia of the Czars getting an outlet to the Mediterranean. In 1878 they threatened war for the same purpose. Later they opposed Russian dominance in Persia, in order to prevent her obtaining an outlet to the Persian Gulf. In 1902 they entered into alliance with the Japanese in order to enable them to fight the Russians in Manchuria, which they did 2 years later. Striving always to obtain outlets to warm waters the Russians were long opposed by the British. Now they have to change that policy or face the prospect of Third World War. Both in Asia itself and over European policies in Asia the potentialities of conflict exist, and the part we Americans will play is not a matter for haphazard or temporary expedients.

We are faced with a tragic problem and cannot recognize and deal with it too soon. Great wars cannot be stopped a year or two before they begin. By that time suspicions have run too high and preparations gone too far. The possibility of their coming must be foreseen in advance and measures taken to avoid them before distrusts and ill-feelings have been aroused. We Americans have got the job of looking ahead and using our good offices as we have never done before.

Meantime, the war between the United States and Japan has become the most violent ever waged. On the Japanese side it is the most desperate and on ours the most deadly. Never before have men deliberately sacrificed themselves in such numbers as the Japanese, and never before have weapons been used which are as destructive as ours. From experience in fighting the Germans we have increased the size, range, and carrying capacity of our bombers and made the loads they drop on Japanese cities more devastating. Tokyo was made a rubble heap in far less time than it took to wreck Berlin, and all the other great industrial centers and seaports have been blasted. The Japanese military leaders have been more successful than the Germans in getting their people to stand and die. The German armies finally ignored Hitler's command and surrendered by the hundreds of thousands. The numbers of Japanese who have done this have been, so far, but a few hundreds or at most a few thousands at a time. A probable reason is that the Japanese dread what we will do to them if they submit to our demand for unconditional surrender.

President Truman has said that we have no intention of destroying or enslaving the Japanese people, and he has repeated the statement of President Roosevelt that the "four freedoms" are intended for all peoples. But it is hard for a nation which has been worked up to the pitch required for modern war to put faith in the promises of enemy leaders. The Japanese know what has happened to Hitler, Himmler, and Goebbels, and what is going to happen to Goering, Hess, and Ribbentrop, and they might think that we will include their Emperor in our list of war criminals.

Contrary to President Truman's reassurances, some of us have been saying that the Japanese ought to be "exterminated." We did not say this about the Germans as a race and the expression is unfortunate. It may mean the loss of a greater number of American lives. It has been too widely circulated to escape the attention of the Japanese. They have diplomatic representatives in European capitals, including Moscow, and have access through them to what is printed in our papers. Their leaders are also able to listen to our domestic radio broadcasts, just as we are able to listen to theirs. From these sources they do not read or hear of much mercy we intend to show them, and even if they did it would not be rebroadcast to the masses of the people. Only a few men at the top would know of any such attitude on our part. So, it may be that they will do what they say, fight on their beaches, in the ruins of their cities, and in the fastnesses of their mountains, as the British were preparing to do when threatened with invasion by the Germans in 1940. It may be that many of the Japs will have to be ferreted out of a system of caves far more extensive than those on Saipan, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa.

In time of war the great majority of the people of a nation hear but one side of the story. The outrages and atrocities committed by their own troops are told neither by newspapers nor over radio, while those committed by enemy forces are amplified. There can be little doubt, for example, that few Japanese know anything about Bataan, but all know of the unfortunate sinking of the *Awa Maru* by an American submarine, and regard it as evidence of American perfidy. The Japanese ship had been on a mission to the South Seas, by agreement with our Government, delivering Red Cross supplies at camps of American prisoners, and was returning to Japan with Japanese refugees when sighted and sunk, with the loss of every life but one. As the Japanese Government, through Switzerland, openly charged us with treachery, they must have used the case as evidence to their people that the promises of our Government cannot be trusted. There have also been charges circulated among the Japanese that we take no prisoners or treat them cruelly if they surrender.

On many occasions in the past their fighting men when hopelessly outnumbered have not only committed harakiri but also killed their women and children or taken them to die in final last stands on battlefields. On the other hand they have made conspicuous capitulations. The most notable of these was when they agreed, on the demand of our Government, in 1854, that they open their country to foreign intercourse. Like many other oriental peoples, they had long refused to let occidentals land on their shores, and some of the clans opposed the entry even after the Shogunate, then the Central Government, agreed. But after only two or three of their cities were bombarded the whole Nation fell in line, permitting the nationals of western powers not only to enter the country but to govern themselves under extraterritorial privileges. They submitted to superior force. At that time, however, the promises of assistance, made particularly by Americans and Britons, influenced them. Now the English-speaking nations, being their principal assailants, are dreaded and distrusted. In the earlier case it was only the few defiant seaports that were bombarded; now it is all their cities, and their desperation and resentment run much higher. While the fault is dominantly with the Japanese leaders, the alarm nevertheless exists and has to be taken into account.

We have not yet engaged one of their major armies. We have not yet landed in China or Japan, where those armies number several millions. The largest force we have yet met in any one place has been in the Philippines, where there were in all 400,000, it is said. Our troops have shown themselves superior to the Japanese, man for man and regiment for regiment. In a number of places the Jap casualties have been ten or more to our one. Even at Okinawa, where they put up their best defense, their losses were five to our one. We can, therefore, expect their casualties to be higher than ours when the war is carried to their home islands. But while the proportions will be in our favor our losses will not be small. The Japanese may be able to arm as many as 10,000,000 men, women, and boys, and if we succeed in killing or wounding them at the rate of 10 to 1, our casualties will still run high. We are able and willing to pay this price if they persist, but here is a matter for us to consider in our own interest: When we have beaten them into submission we will not have solved the problem of Asia. We will have defeated only one of the minor oriental countries.

Is it worth our while to fight a long war, occupy their country and attempt to change their line of thinking? Have we not enough other problems on our hands, in Europe, Asia, and even here at home in the United States? We have already attained what should be our major objective. We have beaten the Japanese so thoroughly that they cannot revive and become again an aggressor power. To prevent this, we are in a position to keep pressure on them indefinitely. We have destroyed their navy, and much of their merchant marine, and we have all but driven their air force out of the skies. They can barely exist on their crowded islands without importations of food, and we are in a position to prevent the entry of much of this. With hardly enough food to keep the population in health and with no prospect of obtaining the essentials for reequipment from abroad, they will not be able to rearm for attack upon even China another time. We can prevent them reconstructing a navy or the transports necessary to take an army even to the nearby continent. We can keep them confined to their homeland islands as long as we like.

We are going to take a part in Asiatic affairs anyway. We are going to hold naval bases off the coast of Asia and close in the vicinity of their islands. We will have the power to keep them permanently in check. Is there, then, the need for us to carry the conflict through to the bitter end? Would it be the part of wisdom? Would it be to our own

selfish interest or of moral value to ourselves or to the general peace which we are striving to promote? Complete victory with the least loss of life is our aim; therefore, should we not support to the utmost our present psychological warfare and bring the Japanese forces to sense the hopelessness of their situation and thus cause them to surrender on a grand scale, saving thereby our own boys' lives?

Palestine: England's Responsibility and Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered over the radio on September 11, 1945, on the subject, Palestine: England's Responsibility and Ours.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, the war is over, and the American people are ready for the tasks of peace.

We are inspired by the recent message of President Truman to the Congress. It assures us that we will continue the principles and programs which Franklin Roosevelt commenced. President Truman is a worthy successor to the great departed leader.

At home, here in America, these principles mean economic security, decent housing, good standards of living, and full employment—all under our system of democracy and freedom of initiative.

But these principles also have a meaning in our dealings with the rest of the world. The "four freedoms," which Roosevelt declared, were of universal application. America has a high responsibility to play its part in justice throughout the world, for without justice throughout the world there can be no permanent justice in America.

No suffering during the war has been more intense, more extreme, more unmerited than that of the Jewish people of Europe. First, they were made the scapegoats for the fanatical program of Hitler. The Jews of Germany first lost their rights, then their homes and property, and then their lives. Of more than 600,000 of them, but a fragment remains. They saved nothing but their honor and their tradition.

When the Nazi Army swept over Europe, the Jews of Poland, of Holland, of France, of Italy, of parts of Russia, and of other countries were treated to a horrible fate. While the other victims of Nazi oppression were subjected to slave labor, the Jews in larger degree were subjected to torture and death. It is estimated—and the estimate is low—that more than four and a half million of them have been killed.

It is true that no person of any particular race and faith is of more human value than a person of any other race or faith. I say this as part of my faith as a Christian. But at the same time, we must admit that the Jews have been affected to a unique degree, in view of the fact that there are only a few million of them throughout the world.

Every fair-minded person knows that, throughout the ages, the Jews have contributed, out of all proportion to their numbers, to medicine, to science, to literature, and to the ethical foundation of our religion and our laws. Though they are regarded as a people of the East, they are in the stream of western civilization; and our western culture would never have been the same without their contribution.

For these reasons, the whole world is irretrievably the loser because of the literal wiping out of so large a portion of the Jews. We can prophesy that civilization a century from now, with all the progress that we hope for, will not be quite so rich in culture or achievements because of this loss.

In view of the disasters which the Jews have suffered, in view of what this means to all the free people of the world, the free peoples of the world owe themselves an obligation to seek the maximum of justice for the Jews.

I use the word "justice" deliberately. The Jews have never asked for gifts or for special considerations or even for mercy. They have always preached the gospel of justice—and all they have asked for is justice from their fellow men.

At the core of the whole question of justice toward the Jew is the land of Palestine. Palestine not only represents a tradition—both national and religious—it represents also the sweat and blood with which the modern Jew has sought to save himself. In Palestine the Jewish people have laid the foundations of an ideal modern state. They have established agriculture, industry, and trade. They have built institutions of higher learning. When the war came they threw all their strength and all their nerve into the fight against fascism.

Even if no solemn promise had been made to the Jews before the war, every dictate of humanity and decency would require that their aims and aspirations for Palestine receive the support of mankind.

But how much greater is this obligation, how much more solemn is this responsibility, when we realize that the great powers committed themselves to the cause of Palestine long before this war—yes; even before the end of the last war, more than a quarter of a century ago.

It is more than a quarter of a century ago that the British Government made its pledge to Palestine. The British Government promised the Jews, and promised the world, that in Palestine there would be established the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth, that the entry of the Jews into Palestine would be facilitated and that Jews would be encouraged to purchase and settle on the land.

I say, and the world knows, that the British Government has been faithless to that promise. When Britain was in mortal danger, that faithlessness was extenuated on the grounds of expediency. Even then, Britain should have remembered that it was not expediency, but rather her role in the cause of freedom, which, in the words of Churchill, brought the New World to the rescue and restoration of the Old. But whatever the situation may have been a few years ago, that situation no longer exists. There is no longer any danger, no longer any expediency, no longer any political necessity, to justify the continuation of that British breach of faith.

I do not appeal to the British Government—but rather to the British people. The British people are not only a just and honorable people, but also a far-sighted and practical people.

And I say this to the British people: If Britain is to retain her high place in world affairs in the years ahead, it will not be through the traditional devices of navies, or diplomacy, or financial preeminence, or colonial possessions. The only possible way that Britain can obtain her place of world importance will be through shining as an example of freedom, of democracy and of fair dealing.

The Jewish people are not strong enough, and will never be strong enough, to bring retribution upon Britain if her faith toward Palestine is not restored. But as surely as there is a tide in world affairs, Britain will suffer if her present policies toward Palestine continue—because these present policies do not commend themselves in the century of the common man. On the other hand, Britain will strengthen her position immeasurably by reverting to the Balfour Declaration of promise for Palestine, bringing it up to date, and carrying it forward.

I therefore urge and request that the British Government immediately take all necessary steps so that Palestine may be the kind of Jewish homeland which the Jews have worked and sacrificed to make it.

This obligation is not only a British obligation. It is also an American obligation. We all know that the Congress of the United States has by resolution declared the sense and feeling of the American people with respect to Palestine. But even if there had been no such resolution, the sense and feeling of the American people with respect to Palestine could be exerted in only one direction—the direction of doing what is right. I believe that the Congress should adopt another resolution, stronger and more positive than the first, toward the same end. I believe that we should make every feasible representation to the British Government in exactly that same direction.

We in America have just as great a stake as Britain in what is done about Palestine. We have that stake because the Jews whose faces are turned toward Palestine as their only hope are the brethren of the Jews of America. We have that stake because this Nation, more than any other, has benefited by the contribution of the Jews toward modern civilization and toward the whole theory and practice of democracy. We have that stake because America, no less than Britain, can exert world leadership only by standing as a symbol of righteousness in international affairs. We have that stake because our whole American history would be betrayed if we did not range ourselves on the side of liberty and freedom which Palestine represents.

Even less than Britain can we set up any plea of expediency.

The views of President Roosevelt with respect to Palestine were well known and frequently expressed. It will take more than the fabrications of some Arab chieftain to make the American people doubt the intentions of Franklin Roosevelt.

The spirit in which Roosevelt mobilized the conscience of mankind must be continued. Under President Truman, I know that it will be continued. We have an obligation toward Palestine which must be met in full—and it must be met now.

Disposal of Surplus Potatoes—Recommendations of White Potato Industry Advisory Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have just come from a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture, where the recommendations of the committee representing the potato growers of all sections of the United States, dealing with the problem of disposal of sur-

pluses, were presented. I ask unanimous consent to have the recommendations of the White Potato Industry Advisory Committee printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in order to inform the country of this proposal of the committee dealing with one of our pressing problems. There is an estimated surplus of fifty or sixty million bushels. Whether or not our foreign friends will eat those potatoes or demand a billion dollars to feed them with meat and other products is a question which this body will shortly have to consider.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUS DISPOSAL

It is the considered judgment of the National White Potato Industry Advisory Committee that the surplus supply from the 1945 crop of potatoes is the result of requested production to insure ample food to help aid the war. The industry is proud of its wartime production contribution, and the excess must be considered in the light of a war surplus. The Government assured potato producers through the Steagall amendment, 90 percent of the parity price and this obligation should be fulfilled in spirit and fact. We point out that the cost of this program will be very small in comparison with other adjustments being made in disposing of war surpluses of planes, ships, munitions, and other war materials.

In view of the production as indicated by crop reports there is an estimated surplus of fifty to sixty million bushels. We believe the Government should inaugurate immediately a strong, aggressive, and effective price support program which will result in the potato growers of this country being protected in accordance with commitments made by the Government when increased production was requested. At the present time the confidence of potato growers is being destroyed because the price support and surplus removal programs have not been effective. In this connection we report that it is the considered judgment of this committee that the loan program is inadequate to effectively support prices, as (1) an immediate and very acute problem is occasioned by large surpluses of intermediate potatoes for which there is no market and which are not being acquired because of the restrictions of the purchase program; (2) a large surplus of late potatoes for which there is no adequate frost-proof storage.

Therefore, the National White Potato Industry Advisory Committee recommends that the Government immediately inaugurate the following programs:

I. That it is a humanitarian act to utilize this surplus of potatoes in fresh or processed form as rapidly as possible to meet the need for food in those foreign countries which are now in great distress, or in which shortages of food are impending. The furnishing of potatoes to these peoples will result in better international relations, obtain the thanks and gratitude of all those who are the beneficiaries and will certainly meet with the approval of the American public. We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture obtain the cooperation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Army, Foreign Economic Administration, State Department, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and foreign governments and any other agency dealing with the furnishing of foodstuffs to hungry peoples in making our potato surplus available to them. In the event that this cannot be done, the committee recommends:

II. a. The Government to buy at support levels immediately all surplus potatoes as rapidly as offered and divert them to starch, flour, glucose, feed, alcohol, and other industrial products.

b. That any surplus beyond the amount diverted in the above manner, where storage is not available, should be purchased by the Government at support prices to be stored in pits in the area of production with the understanding that such potatoes will not find their way back into regular channels of trade unless extreme weather or other conditions justify so doing. If supplies still exceed demand the excess should be put into diversion channels throughout the season, in such a way that potato prices will be maintained to growers throughout the country at support levels.

c. That Government, in cooperation with States and the industry, continue and enlarge the aggressive campaign for consumer education and sales promotion that has been started.

d. That provisions should be made wherever possible through marketing agreements, purchase contracts, or other methods to prohibit the sale of culls. The committee believes that industry will cooperate and support this recommendation.

III. The importation of potatoes in face of the second largest crop requires that action be taken in order to correlate the importation of potatoes with our price support program, therefore, we recommend that:

1. The Govenment proceed immediately to confer with the Canadian Government for the purpose of—

a. Securing an orderly movement of all potatoes imported from Canada. It is suggested that a weekly prorated basis of shipments be established to avoid gluts and reduce concentration of shipments to metropolitan areas as Boston and New York City.

b. Developing arrangements whereby imported potatoes are not sold below United States support prices at the port of entry.

2. The committee requests that the Secretary of Agriculture instruct the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and request the State Department to consult with the industry affected prior to renewal of reciprocal trade agreements.

In submitting the above recommendations we have dealt only in principles, feeling that the committee cannot and should not attempt to work out details of operation. However, this committee requests governmental employees responsible for the carrying out of this program to work out details in such a manner that all growers and all areas will be adequately protected and so that the program will accomplish not only the letter of the law but the spirit of the law and be made sufficiently effective to give growers full and adequate price support as has been promised.

In conclusion, the committee emphasizes the need for immediate and effective action to clean up existing gluts and prevent their recurrence.

The Future of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, in the future the farmer and the workingman must cooperate very closely. Our farmers in recent years have proved their ability to produce tremendous quantities of the products of their farms. This continued production, if not to be wasted to some extent at least, must be consumed largely in the populated cities. City population consumption is tied to consumer prosperity.

I ask unanimous consent that a short article entitled "The Future of Farmers," published in the Farmers Defender of August 1945, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF FARMERS

The end of the farm machinery shortage is in sight. Steel is no longer a problem. But the ending of that problem will bring others, and worse ones, almost immediately.

We are in a period of great farm changes. It was not so long ago that a farmer could get along with three or four hundred dollars' worth of machinery. On a 20-cow farm a hired man was a year-around necessity. Today milking machines are common and 20 cows are milked and the barn chores done in an hour and a half by one man. It used to be a big spring's work to get in 20 acres. Now that much is done in a couple of days, and it is not uncommon for farmers to have 60 or 70 acres of spring's work. Tractors and doodlebugs have replaced horses. The walking plows and drags our fathers used are museum pieces, and there is no end in sight.

Farm advertising these days is filled with pictures of field hay balers, combines, and field ensilage cutters, all of which will be common after the war. The time is in sight when a 50-acre haying will be done in 3 days and a couple of silos filled in as many days, without half the neighborhood crowding into the kitchen for an overworked farm wife to feed. A lot of back-breaking work is going out of the window and a lot of headaches are coming in. The average family-type dairy farm is going to require from five to six thousands of dollars' worth of machinery. Its size will increase to something over 300 acres. Thirty or more cows will be kept for each worker. More stuff, much more stuff, is going to be produced. This stuff will have to be moved.

Even now weather, machinery, work, and ability are no longer the controlling factors in successful farm operation. We have to have steady outlets for the stuff we produce. Without such outlets we get into prompt trouble and without such outlets in the future our farm operations will simply collapse. We cannot fall back on a self-contained farm operation and let the world go by as our fathers could. It can't be done; our thousands of dollars' worth of machinery, our overhead, will eat us up. Our stuff has to move into consumption promptly and at living prices.

The complement of rural food production is city food consumption. That consumption in turn is tied to consumer prosperity, the ability to buy, opportunities for employment, and the maintenance of industrial wage and salary schedules.

The farmer from now on is as much dependent upon consumer prosperity as he is upon the weather.

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

and a letter by Dr. Morris E. Garnsey, chairman of the department of economics, political science, sociology, and anthropology at the University of Colorado, published in the Rocky Mountain Union Farmer for May 1945. Appreciating his responsibility as an educator, Dr. Garnsey spent some time in the Tennessee Valley in order to study the achievements of the TVA and thereby be all the more prepared to enlighten others on the vital question of creating a Missouri Valley Authority. This article is the first of a series.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA IDEAS: UNITY AND INTEGRATION PAY OFF—PEOPLE UNITED IN ONE CAUSE, AID SERVES ALL

(By Morris E. Garnsey, chairman, department of economics, political science, and sociology, University of Colorado)

The great importance of the TVA is the ideas which it has developed while looking for a solution to the problem of improving the prosperity and well-being of the people of the Tennessee Valley and the United States.

There are three basic ideas which today are guiding the thinking of nearly every man, woman, and child in the valley. There are, (1) the idea of unity and integration, (2) the idea of service to the people through science in translation, and (3) the ideas of grassroots democracy and decentralization of responsibility.

These ideas are not mere academic abstractions. In the Tennessee Valley they are the living, working foundation for concrete action; and while the words you hear different people using may be different, the ideas are generally understood and generally accepted.

UNITY MOST IMPORTANT

The idea of unity and integration is perhaps the broadest and most fundamental of the TVA concepts. Briefly stated, the TVA recognizes that while men tend to think of themselves as farmers, workers, manufacturers, etc., they all actually are also united in a common endeavor—the struggle to harness and control the forces of nature and put them to work for man's benefit. Everyone, no matter what his particular occupation, has to deal with the same problem—to convert energy into forces useful to man. This common purpose is the basis for a common and unified attack on the problem of improving economic welfare.

This idea has several important applications. First, it actually helps people to work together for mutual benefit. The Tennessee Valley is not paradise, but the selfish attempts of individuals and groups to get ahead at the expense of others are not nearly so noticeable there as in other parts of the United States. The TVA itself serves as the central, unifying force, helping groups to pull together rather than against each other.

A second application of the unity idea is much more concrete. A major source of energy from which we can gain a living is the power of falling water. But falling water in the shape of rain and running rivers is not a simple thing. It is complex and a source of evil as well as good. The unified approach to the use of falling water is the TVA program of multiple-purpose water control—flood control, navigation, electric power generation, irrigation, and the use of rivers and lakes to improve opportunities for recreation and wild life development.

THEY GO TOGETHER

The TVA has proved conclusively that these various uses of water are not antagonistic, but complementary. The fruitful and sensible way to utilize the energy of falling water is to take into account the multiple purposes to which water resources can be put. The short-sighted way is to think only in terms of navigation or power generation or irrigation. Unfortunately, the segmented character of our Federal Government with its multiplicity of separate and independent bureaus and agencies makes the single-purpose approach almost inevitable. The Valley Authority idea, however, is based on the multiple-purpose concept and carries out the one river-one program plan of unified development. This is one of the basic contributions of TVA to our social and political life. It is a great experience to visit the Tennessee Valley and see the idea of unity in resource development in action. It convinces you that it can be done and done successfully.

UNITY ON THE LAND

A third application of the unity concept is the relationship between the different forms of energy. Man can get nitrogen from the air. He also can get it from plants—clover, alfalfa, etc. The plant method is cheaper and more efficient than the mechanical method, therefore, the TVA encourages farmers to grow soil-enriching crops and these crops generate more energy than all of the TVA dams put together. Thus agriculture and industry are brought together in a common program. TVA manufactures phosphate fertilizer. Farmers grow nitrogen. TVA-developed machinery dries the hay and converts it into animal feeds. Animals provide milk and meat for human energy. Thus you come full circle with a busy, prosperous, well-nourished people—a people united in a common purpose and working toward a common goal. This is the TVA idea of unity.

TVA–MVA BENEFITS CAN BE SEEN BY ANYONE WHO WILL LOOK, GARNSEY SAYS

(Dr. Morris E. Garnsey, chairman of the department of economics, political science, sociology, and anthropology at the University of Colorado, has recently returned from a 2-week trip in the Tennessee Valley devoted to a study of the operations of that agency. He has agreed to write four or five articles on what he saw for Rocky Mountain Union Farmer, but his letter accepting the assignment so forcefully states the typical reaction of people who see TVA in operation we reprint it below in full.)

BOULDER, COLO., *May 17, 1945.*

EDITOR, ROCKY MOUNTAIN UNION FARMER:

I am very glad to accept your invitation to tell your readers something about my trip to the TVA. As you know, I have been studying the problem of regional development for several years, and have long been interested in the work of the TVA. Now that there is a possibility of our having an MVA in our own region, I wanted particularly to see for myself how the TVA program was working out.

When I went down there I felt that I knew something about the TVA, having read a great deal of what is written about it, but I soon saw that there was much more to be learned. After studying the program on the ground, I came away an enthusiastic believer in the TVA approach. I only wish that the people who today are shouting so loudly against MVA could spend 2 weeks in the Tennessee Valley. I am sure that they would soon see that their objections are unfounded, and that the TVA really has something to offer.

As I sat down to write this letter I glanced at the daily quotation on my calendar pad, and I saw these words: "Ideas control the world." Nothing could have been more apt; for what I want to say in these three or four brief articles is that the most important thing about TVA is not its magnificent dams and power plants, but the ideas that lie behind them. The TVA's way of looking at the problem of human welfare has proved to be of great significance to us all. The ideas are universal and the TVA idea is not confined to the watershed of the Tennessee River. The valley authority idea can be as much at home in the Missouri Valley, or on the Yangtze in China as it is in the Tennessee Valley. The critics of MVA are wrong when they say or imply that TVA experience won't work on the Missouri where physical conditions are different. Or, indeed, they may even be trying to drag out an old red herring to turn our attention away from the vital fact of TVA's unique success in developing a new and fresh approach to the problem of economic well-being.

The fact that this approach has paid real dividends is visible to anyone who cares to look. My trains in Kansas and Missouri were rerouted and ran hours late because of floods that had destroyed bridges and tracks and embankments. For miles we limped along with floodwater within inches of our wheels. I saw houses and barns window-sill high in water and mud, crops washed out and highways wrecked. In Knoxville, by contrast, it rained 1.25 inches in a few hours one evening, but there were no floods. Instead barges plied the placid Tennessee and immense war factories hummed with power costing a fraction of a cent per kilowatt-hour. People were busy and prosperous in the Tennessee Valley.

But I must stop before this letter turns into a full-length article. I only hope that your readers will find one-tenth the pleasure and interest in my articles that I have had in acquiring the information and ideas in them.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS E. GARNSEY.

Peace and a New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, while the current discussion of atomic energy is at its height I think it is appropriate to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article by Walter J. Murphy, appearing in Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, published by the American Chemical Society. The article is entitled "Peace and a New World." It refers throughout to the developments and the effects and the opportunities in the atomic field of energy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE AND A NEW WORLD

(By Walter J. Murphy)

The cataclysmic explosions in man's thinking and reasoning which followed the indescribable destruction of two Japanese cities by atomic bombs far transcend the physical havoc wrought by the initial application of atomic energy. Never in the long march of history down through the ages has man witnessed and experienced such a bewildering succession of events as those which occurred between August 5 and August 14 and culminated in the total surrender of Japan. One breath-taking climax followed another with such rapidity that man's capacity to comprehend and evaluate was subjected to tremendous stresses and strains.

Our Nation, benign and generous in days of friendship, proved once again that it grasps the sword only to defend the rights of all mankind. The same nation, to which we extended aid and succor when struck by a devastating earthquake, was made to feel the righteous anger and might of an aroused people.

But in fighting and winning the most terrible and horrible of all wars, we did not forget our single objective. To our enemies who would have destroyed and enslaved us if they had prevailed, we now offer help and guidance. We seek not vengeance. Our primer of democracy and freedom is theirs if their peoples will but indicate a sincere and honest interest. Should the same destructive forces of Nature again be turned upon them, our wrath would become charity, the injured cared for, and the homeless provided with shelter. America wants peace, it needs peace, but a sick and troubled world now half destroyed needs peace even more and the whole trembling system needs democracy and America.

Today we are in the long-dreamed-of brave new world. The postwar now is a reality, it is here, and our dreams, ideas, expectations, and desires can and should be satisfied. But it is "we the people" who must cut the pattern. Realization of the goals we seek depends upon expending great effort; otherwise the new world will never come to fruition. The battle-weary veteran may soon be safely home, the hand of Mars stayed once more, but, unless we ccurageously wage the peace as we did the war, the mute mounds of earth, the final resting places of the mortal remains of our immortal dead, will be but a grim reminder that once more the living have failed in their appointed task and that millions again have but died in vain.

Peace must be nourished with zeal; it must be protected; it must be recognized as one of the most precious blessings we possess; and to continue to possess it we must wholeheartedly dedicate ourselves and our Nation to the task of preserving it in perpetuity. Once the frontiers of this Nation, in a military sense, were the oceans that wash our shores. Today the world, in a military sense, has no frontiers other than those of a scientific character, no natural barriers to guard it against an aggressor nation, large or small.

The frail flower of peace is now susceptible to a neutron. The world of science has brought to the world at large a strange and almost incredible power. It can kill, it can destroy the very civilization that made possible its unleashing, or it can be to that same civilization the gift of the ages, the veritable key to the universe. Utter annihilation or untold benefits can flow from man's unlocking of the force of atomic energy.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Of all the events of those fateful 10 days of August, the one with the greatest effect on the future course of the world was the demonstrated ability of scientists to harness the power of the atom. Unquestionably the defeat of Japan would have been achieved in time and accompanied by great loss of lives of Allied soldiers, but her defeat was assured. Of that there could be no doubt.

Thus we were in a sense expecting the Japanese collapse, but the news of the bombing of Hiroshima with an atomic bomb was numbing, even though we knew that thousands of American, British, and Canadian chemists, physicists, engineers, and other scientists in many varied fields of research and development were straining every ounce of energy, and employing every known scientific means in a desperate race with German scientists. It is well to remember now, and it will be doubly important to recall years hence, that the future of civilization depended upon the outcome of this titanic scientific struggle.

Unreal as it might seem even to those who knew some of the facts and suspected a great many more, the age of atomic power was at long last announced to a startled world, a scientific dream had moved upward through years of experimentation to accomplishment. The stark reality of this achievement when finally assimilated beggars description.

Unfortunately, the brave promise of atomic energy, the tool that was expected to relieve man from drudgery, was first employed in destruction. Like the fixation of nitrogen, success came faster because science was pressed to make weapons of destruction. This is a fact that many recognize, but do not evaluate properly. Science and scientists first thought of the fixation of nitrogen and the harnessing of the latent energy locked in the atom as benefits to humanity. Because the atomic bomb was used in war, because nitrogen was snatched from the air to make deadly explosives, because the airplane had its major advances during war, or because jet propulsion first reacted in the same cauldron, is no reason to castigate the men and women of science. Yet thousands of thoughtless people will condemn scientists, forgetting that it is not science that begets war but the selfishness and willful desires of individuals and even whole nations. In every war in which mankind has engaged, the fruits of scientific minds have been employed as destructive forces. The men and women of science are largely powerless to prevent this prostitution until mankind generally learns to live without resorting to the sword as a means of adjudicating or resolving differences.

Many outcries have been registered against the inhumanity of the new weapon. It is inhumane, but so are all weapons and wars. Winston Churchill provided one of the most striking answers to the critics, at this writing more numerous in Great Britain than in the United States:

"There were those who considered that the atomic bomb should never have been used at all. I cannot associate myself with such ideas. Six years of total war have convinced most people that had the Germans or the Japanese discovered this new weapon they would have used it upon us to our complete destruction with the most alacrity.

"I am surprised that very worthy people—but people who in most cases had no intention of proceeding to the Japanese front themselves—should adopt the position that rather than throw this bomb we should have sacrificed a million American and a quarter of a million British lives in the desperate battles and massacres of an invasion of Japan. Future generations will judge this dire decision, and I believe if they find themselves in a happier world from which war has been banished and where freedom reigns, they will not condemn those who struggled for the benefits amid the horrors and miseries of this grim and ferocious epoch.

"The bomb brought peace, but man alone can keep that peace."

Or perhaps the Irish novelist, St. John Ervine, in replying to those who criticized the use of the atomic bomb, provided the most pertinent remark of all when he stated that he "would rather be killed by an atomic bomb than by a rusty bayonet thrust into my intestines." We would ask those who object on the grounds that the bomb was needlessly cruel to pick out a really kind and humane method of eliminating an enemy in war.

History will record the efforts of the United States and Great Britain to prevent the indiscriminate killing of civilians. When the results of the first successful atomic bomb test made in the New Mexico desert were revealed to the Potsdam Conference, the now famous ultimatum was promulgated in order to give Japan a clear and definite understanding of the term "unconditional surrender." She was warned to yield or suffer the dire consequences of continuing a one-sided and entirely hopeless struggle. Citizens of the leading cities were told to evacuate the areas. Such warnings were in sharp contrast to the tactics of the nation guilty of the infamous sneak attack on Pearl Harbor and the sacking and rape of Nanking.

THE FUTURE OF ATOMIC ENERGY

It appears likely that this new tool of man will remain under strict Government control. President Truman has announced that he will recommend that the Congress of the United States consider promptly the establishment of an appropriate commission to control the production and use of atomic energy within the United States and will also make further recommendations as to how atomic energy can become a powerful and forceful influence toward the maintenance of world peace.

A stunned and very much bewildered world is now asking "What is the future of atomic energy?" The brilliant success of a relatively small band of scientists, and in this noted group were many chemists, and chemical engineers, demonstrates the definite opportunity now before us of gradually developing a nuclear industry with many and varied ramifications. When the age of atoms in every home will come, no one can foresee. Research will go forward at an ever-increasing pace, and practical results, we are confident from the record of scientists and science in the past, will inevitably follow. As scientists, however, let us eschew the role of the prophet. Soberly reflecting what has been achieved so far, we must honestly inform an expectant and impatient public that we have but crossed the threshold of an entirely new and revolutionary storehouse of energy. Let us not in our boundless confidence and enthusiasm over the future permit the lay public to assume that any radical decline in the importance of present energy sources, such as coal and oil, will occur for some time, perhaps even for several generations. Scientists at the moment simply are accepting still another opportunity to serve mankind.

With respect to the future of atomic energy, the viewpoint of the Army on secrecy is interesting. The release which accompanied the H. D. Smyth report of the record of the development of the atomic bomb stated that, "the best interests of the United States require the utmost cooperation by all concerned in keeping secret now and for all time in the future all scientific and technical information not given in this report or other official releases of information by the War Department."

If we read and interpret this statement correctly, it is the intention of the Army to become the sole censoring authority of all research information and data on nuclear physics. We earnestly hope that no such authority is vested permanently in our Army officials, and that future research is not directed and controlled by the Army. Certainly a high command which forced thousands and thousands of scientists into the armed forces instead of retaining them in research and production, a high command that has denuded our colleges and universities of teachers and bona fide students in scientific courses, a high command that has robbed America of a whole generation of future scientists, and one that has steadily refused support of the aims and purposes of the McDonough bill, has demonstrated that it should not be entrusted with any such authority or power over postwar developments in atomic energy.

In view of the widespread knowledge of nuclear physics, we cannot expect that scientists of other nations will not ultimately discover the processes by which the atomic bomb was produced and detonated. Indeed, we should expect that they not only will make such discoveries independently, but will improve upon them. Thus we must not

depend alone upon secrecy enforced by the military. We must make certain that our research in the field of atomic energy will surpass that of any other nation on earth. Direction and control of this program should rest with a body of highly qualified individuals, independent of Army domination and responsible to the people as a whole. Otherwise Army influence will inevitably throttle research, and release of research accomplishments of use to industry and mankind will be withheld or delayed on the plea of an Army officialdom which thinks largely, if not entirely, of research as a military weapon and therefore necessarily secret information.

The effects of the development of atomic energy on a huge scale upon industry, economic laws, and the social structure of the entire world are unfathomable. The forces of the atom in the hands of a government can become the greatest monopoly ever to spawn upon this earth. A state may easily become a very sinister force for evil. Incorrect use of such power will lead to the same end in the age of atomic energy as it did in the age of coal and oil. Only an alert, enlightened attitude of all the peoples of the earth determined that there shall be no more wars will save mankind from destruction.

FUTURE OF RESEARCH

One of the most profound repercussions of the solution of man's greatest riddle, the unlocking of the energy contained in the atom, will be in the future pattern of research organization in this country. Even before the sensational news of August 5 was released, several bills were before Congress designed to provide government with varying degrees of control and supervision over future research activities in the United States. The atomic bombs dropped over Japan have made it clear beyond all doubt, even to the layman, that scientific research is absolutely essential to national security. We who are directly engaged in research should be doubly concerned with the form in which government participates.

To inform the members of the American Chemical Society and chemists and chemical engineers generally of the proposals now before Congress, Chemical and Engineering News published in the August 25 issue the essential portions of the report to Vannevar Bush to the President, Science—The Endless Frontier, and is summarizing in the September 10 issue various bills affecting research and industrial development which Congress will consider in the near future. Every scientist should study with care the Bush report and the proposed measures. Three of these bills are identical and embody the basic proposals of the Bush report. Others go much further in the degree of control, direction, and supervision of research given to government and contain a very different type of philosophy on the relationship of government, research, industry, science, and scientists. It is the duty of chemists and chemical engineers to express to their Senators and Congressmen their considered opinions on a program that represents in many ways a decided departure from the past and that will have a profound effect on the whole future of research. Can we afford to remain silent when not only the future of our country is at stake but the future of every scientist is involved? Now is the time and the opportunity of demonstrating to Congress and to America that scientists can be a potent constructive force to be considered seriously when legislation affecting the future welfare of our country hangs in the balance.

SCIENTISTS AND THE FUTURE

In all of the millions and millions of printed and spoken words employed by the press and radio in acquainting America with the discovery of the ways and means of utilizing atomic energy, we believe none were employed to suggest that scientists be given a direct role in the shaping of the world that is to be. Praise, to be sure, was heaped upon those who pioneered in their roles as scientists, yet few venture the opinion that scientists be invited to participate in the control of the use of atomic energy. Why?

Some will say that this refusal comes from a lack of sufficient publicity for the men and women of science. But is this really so? Scientists receive tremendous amounts of publicity, but almost universally that publicity is solely based on outstanding scientific achievements. When the men and women of science come out of their laboratories and in large numbers activly participate in the affairs of the world, when they contribute to the shaping of social, cultural, governmental, and international policies in common with other professions and groups and with the same force and conviction, then they will be publicized, not only for their scientific achivements, but also for their roles as molders of public opinion. Until we as individuals and in large numbers are willing to divide our time and energy between scientific pursuits and the affairs of government and of the world, we will continue to be largely ignored. We have a moral responsibility to mankind to assist it in so governing itself that the forces we release are reserved for good, not for evil. No one man, no small group can perform this service. It is the responsibility of every individual who rightfully calls himself a scientist and he cannot delegate that personal responsibility to others.

There is a pressing need in our new world for still closer cooperation between scientists of all nations. Science recognizes no geographical boundaries, and those who unlock the wonders of the universe should and must assume leadership in the creation of a new spirit of cooperation and understanding at an international level.

THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

The need of the hour, the year, the generation, and the century is intelligent understanding of the forces that have been unleashed, an unflagging determination on the part of every man, woman, and child to share the moral responsibility of seeing that the new power which man has at long last achieved is used solely for the advancement of mankind—not its annihiliation.

Now, if ever, the principles and philosophy of the Golden Rule must be accepted, must triumph in man's mind, and must govern his actions. It is civilization's last chance.

Scott Field Celebrates Japs' Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include the program presented over the Mutual Broadcasting System, originating through radio station KWK, in St. Louis, Mo., on the day of the surrender of the Japanese military forces to the United Nations, August 14, 1945:

ANNOUNCER. Radio station KWK takes you to Scott Field, Illinois, parent radio school of the Army Air Forces Training Command, for special messages from Col. Neal Creighton, commanding officer of that important air base near St. Louis, and members of his chaplain staff.

Scott Field, which has been training all of Uncle Sam's combat radio operators for those Flying Fortresses and B-24's you've been reading about, is not celebrating the end of war with riotous demonstrations. There is a certain note of happiness here. And why not? The war is over, the big job is done. But these men here, thousands of whom have personally engaged the enemy in combat, know that there is still a big job to be done—winning the peace and preserving the ideals for which so many of their buddies have fought and died. In the studio tonight to speak for the men in his command is Col. Neal Creighton, Scott Field's commanding officer, who returned not long ago from 27 months of duty with the Eighth Air Force and the Strategic Air Force in Europe. Colonel Creighton.

Colonel CREIGHTON. Today will go down as the most joyous in the history of man. The most brutal war the world has ever known is over. Japan is beaten, crushed to its knees, by the most devastating force ever to be unfurled by military might. The lights have come on, and hope is born again all over the world. Millions are freed from bondage.

Everyone has congratulated the Army Air Forces, and the other components of the Army and Navy, for its stirring accomplishments, and praise has been heaped upon those of us who played a role in this war for freedom.

Tonight, however, we of the Army Air Forces want to congratulate the American people.

Yes; it was the American people who won this war. Without them, there would have been no Air Force, no Infantry, no Navy.

History cannot record a greater effort than made by America on the home front, with its industrial accomplishments, its unflinching spirit to win.

It was the spirit of the American people that rode with destiny over Japan, as war factory after war factory went up in flames. And it will be the spirit of America, and the United Nations, which will win the peace.

We of the Army Air Forces will never forget the superb accomplishments of our civilian brothers-in-arms. It has been this spirit of cooperation between the civilians and the military, of all Allied nations, which rid the world of tyranny, and which will keynote the peace.

Now that the war is won, we are returning to peacetime pursuits, but we cannot return to the world we knew before this conflict started. This war has demonstrated that the nation which controls the air controls its own fate. If that nation's prime objective is a peaceful world—and that is certainly the goal of this country—an Air Force is an instrument of the first importance. We must maintain the strength to enforce the peace which has now arrived.

We must have trained personnel adequate for rapid expansion, a continuing search for the best equipment in the world, strong industry capable of rapid expansion, and bases—springboards from which we can take the offensive to prevent devastation to our homeland and win any war on enemy shores.

Air power is the only component of our military machine capable of inflicting instant deadly blows at the heart of any aggressor anywhere in the world, not after our first line of defense has been fatally injured, but immediately. The atom bomb, rockets, and radar have proven that in this war.

The past is dead. The future is here. We cannot think of ourselves, alone. We must think of our neighbors, our community, our Nation, and our allies. Let us resolve today, tomorrow, and always that we will never forget the ideals for which we fought, and for which so many have died.

We have the most glorious birthright anyone anywhere can own—that of being an American. Let us work to preserve our Nation and its ideals, and earn that birthright, so that our children's children—and, yes, their children's children—will never have to endure the agony which has seared the world these many years.

ANNOUNCER: Scott Field will hail the end of the war, in its own way, when VJ-day is officially proclaimed by President Truman, with a huge garrison parade, all men passing in review on the flying line. Citizens of the neighboring communities are invited to attend the festivities. All chapels, on the base, however, have been open since notification that the war was officially over. Special services are being held by chaplains of all denominations, and will continue throughout the evening. We have with us in Scott Field's radio theater this evening chaplains of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths. They have a message for soldiers, everywhere, and for their wives, mothers, and sweethearts. It is now my privilege to present Chaplain Henry J. H. Ellzey.

Chaplain ELLZEY. "Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations be glad and sing for joy." (Psalms 67: 3-4.) Yes; our hearts are flooded with joy and thanksgiving as the full force of the news of the victory sweeps over us.

In city and village and on land and sea, in remote jungles, and in the air above, millions of us are smiling and singing in our gladness. Our eyes are lighted with new hope, with glorious anticipation of peaceful living, and it is good. With the peace, we stand on the threshold of a new era. We have just entered a strategic time in history. World policies are now being molded. They will crystalize in the years ahead, bringing either peace and prosperity and good living or destruction.

Yes; man steps into the new era holding within his hand the potential forces of the atom. Those forces have been put to destructive use in the past few days, and they have hastened the victory. In themselves, they are nonmoral; neither good nor evil. The determining factor of goodness or evilness lies in the ways man uses those forces or, more correctly, lies within man himself. It is man who is either good or bad. He can wield this great power of the universe either to build a civilization on this world as rich and prosperous as his fondest dreams, or he can use it to destroy himself. For years now, religious leaders and others have been telling us that we, as moral, social, and spiritual beings, have not kept pace with the development of science. With the blessings that come with the advancement of science, there comes an equal weight of responsibility. Our responsibility is to see that bigotry, selfishness, greed, and hatred do not allow us to use scientific inventions to destroy ourselves. Our responsibility is also to use this strategic time to positively work for good and for humanity. In the words of the psalmist, we would "seek peace, and pursue it." Let us rejoice today, but let us finish the tasks we now have, the sustaining of peace.

ANNOUNCER. Now we present Chaplain Joseph Levenson.

Chaplain LEVENSON. Our first thought now that the terrible conflict is over is one of rejoicing and thanksgiving. We thank God that this sudden turn of events has saved countless lives which a continuation of man's inhumanity to man would have claimed. All of us turn anxiously to thoughts of home. Some of us may become impatient as the immediate tasks prevent speedy demobilization. Nevertheless, the realization that death no longer rains from the sky nor lurks behind every tree and mound should soothe our nerves and stay our petulance.

As the time goes by and we reflect more deeply upon the significance of this moment, we will become appalled by the magnitude and far-reaching implications of the victory of the democratic powers. Had we failed, there would have been no opportunity to restore ground lost to the forces of evil nor to rebuild a "new heaven and a new earth." Yet, never did the thought of possible defeat enter the mind of anyone on our side. All Americans, indeed all citizens of the United Nations worked unhesitatingly and unstintingly until final victory was achieved. In America and Great Britain we even found time to hold national elections.

Now our task is to construct an unbreakable peace. This is a job that will require as much ingenuity, as much effort and sacrifice, as much unity and mutuality of consideration, as did the winning of the war. As our President has stated, we must be on the alert for the tricks of the enemy to divide us and wrest from us and from generations to come, the fruits of righteous victory which are, in the words of the prophet, "peace, quietness, and confidence forever." All the ideals for which we fought, all the goals we hope to attain can be achieved if we remain united in determination and action.

ANNOUNCER. For a final radio prayer to America, Scott Field presents Chaplain Joseph Boggins.

Chaplain BOGGINS. We hail this day of victory with gratitude to God. It means peace, and in countless American homes, long overhung with dread, this day is one of thanksgiving.

Our victory speaks for itself. The deeds of American seaman, soldiers, and airmen cannot be enhanced by words we speak at home. They did the impossible. They were backed by American production which also accomplished the impossible. The victory was an achievement of a whole people. The sacrifices of this Nation have been enormous. The devotion of Americans to their country has been matchless. Men who worked in the factories, men who tilled the land, men who investigated in the laboratories, all contributed to the power of the fighting forces.

May God grant that in the days that follow this peace all of us may march together in the same spirit and make these United States even greater in the sight of God and man.

Investigation of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a progress report of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation investigation of the Veterans' Administration.

The matter referred to follows:

INVESTIGATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION WITH A PARTICULAR VIEW TO DETERMINING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 192, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, SEPTEMBER 14, 1945

Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, Seventy-ninth Congress

John E. Rankin, Mississippi, chairman; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; John S. Gibson, Georgia; James Domengeaux, Louisiana; Clair Engle, California; William G. Stigler, Oklahoma; Joe W. Ervin, North Carolina; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Tom Pickett, Texas; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Leo F. Rayfiel, New York; Walter B. Huber, Ohio; Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Bernard W. Kearney, New York; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio; Ida Rowan, clerk; Joe W. McQueen, counsel.

INTRODUCTION

In recent months, this committee as a whole, and in subcommittees, has made extensive investigations into the conditions of veterans' hospitals and the treatment of veterans. The newly appointed Administrator is also visiting these hospitals. Inasmuch as these investigations have not been completed, reports relating thereto will be made at a later date. Therefore, this report is intended only as a progress report of this committee. It is made in the belief that it may be helpful to the Administration in preparing the ground for the vast job which confronts the Administrator in reorganizing the Veterans' Administration.

House Resolution 192, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, was a mandate to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to determine the efficiency and operation of the Veterans' Administration in Washington and in the field.

This progress report relates only to adequate space and personnel. Reports on other subjects will be issued at a later date.

Official cooperation

With the great volume of work which would come to the Veterans' Administration on account of the claims, insurance, and hospitalization of the greatest fighting force this country has ever put into the field, the former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, made an exhaustive report to this committee asking that this committee investigate all veterans' facilities throughout the United States, as well as the central office in Washington.

The Veterans' Administration as such has been called upon in many ways to assist this committee and has responded, although pressed for time and personnel, to every call made by the committee. Many department heads, their assistants, and the former Administrator have been before the committee. The testimony has been most helpful.

Speeding up service

As the inquiry progressed, many things were brought to the attention of the committee. Throughout all of the testimony which the committee has heard from witnesses either condemning or those praising the work of the Veterans' Administration, there has been brought to the attention of this committee some matters which we feel should merit the publishing of this progress report.

If those disabled in our national defense could await relief until Government agencies should become normal, adjustments would ultimately be made, but this is not the case. The crisis is here and should be met. The wife or mother of a person killed in action may be told that weeks or months of delay is due to shortage of office space or personnel. This will not meet her desperate needs, and the veteran whose mind or body was injured in combat should not be expected to stand by for months for the Government to redeem its pledge to him.

The records of the investigation show that repeated efforts of the former Administrator to convince Government agencies dealing with office space and personnel of the imperative need of priority in each of these fields have failed to produce the desired results. Now, with the successful conclusion of hostilities, a more vigorous and insistent course without delay must be pursued to forestall any rightful criticism. There is now ample authority for renting, leasing, purchasing, and even condemning buildings to provide space. If additional authority is needed this committee stands ready to act.

In Washington alone there are today thousands of Federal employees who have occupied acres of office space in work essential to the general war effort during hostilities. In a

lesser degree comparable conditions exist in many other places throughout the country. This committee feels that the emergency agencies that have served their purpose should be forced to remove, close, or consolidate, if for no other purpose than to release office space and personnel to the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration must have the choice of location, the amount of space, and the number of personnel needed to properly serve the veteran and his dependent. Personnel must be selected from those qualified for assignment. Personnel unsatisfactory in one agency would no doubt be equally useless in another. Many men and women trained in the Army and Navy will desire employment upon their discharge. Many have ability now much in need and desired in the Veterans' Administration.

Very shortly after Pearl Harbor more than 7,000 trained employees of the Veterans' Administration, professional and clerical, were called to the colors. Some of these places were taken by inexperienced personnel but the manpower shortage caused many of these positions to remain vacant, both in the central office and in the field.

In the drive to speed the solution of the veteran's problem there has been a great deal said about the time required by medical personnel used in paper work. It is obvious that because of the very nature of the Veterans' Administration more careful preparation of elaborate reports is indispensable in fairness to the veteran as well as to the Government. While the private physician, the municipal, county, and State hospitals take and maintain certain data on each patient, there is little comparison to the time used in paper work of the physician employed by the Veterans' Administration.

Every veteran examined or treated is an actual or potential claimant for other benefits. The patient's record, diagnosis, degree of disability, service connection, dependent allowance, insurance, and eligibility for other features of relief provided by Congress may depend upon the correctness of the patient's record and the manner in which it is recorded in his medical history. While every effort should be made to reduce this form of work by the professional personnel, it is an accepted fact that a real necessity exists to have as complete a record as possible for the protection of the veteran, his dependents, and the Government which he has served.

In view of the necessity of accuracy in medical reports and the frequent use of highly technical language, the Administrator in the study of salaries should obtain from the Civil Service Commission authority to place the clerks handling such work in attractive grades.

The committee believes that the Veterans' Administration should look to the employment of such personnel at the earliest possible moment and to obtain all necessary personnel to relieve the professional personnel of performing clerical tasks, in order that they may devote the fullest possible attention to strictly professional duties.

On the threshold of the task for the care of the veteran who has acted in the defense of his country, and his dependents, there must be provided, first, adequate space for his contact and care for his dependents; and, second, adequate, courteous, and competent personnel, properly trained under the law and regulations to give service to the veteran and his dependents, promptly and efficiently, both in the central office and throughout the field.

Regardless of any changes planned for the future to improve service, acquiring of proper space and personnel is the immediate problem before the Administrator. Any program must have employees to carry it out, and these employees must have necessary office space in which to perform their duties. Veterans and their families cannot wait, and should not be asked to wait, months for the benefits which have accrued or the employment to which they are entitled. In addition to the general statement on this problem for space and personnel, the committee offers the following recommendations to meet the immediate demand.

1. Included in the thousands of women who are a part of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps are large numbers who should be valuable additions to the forces of the Veterans' Administration. A high percentage of these women are no longer needed in uniform. The Veterans' Administration should carefully review these records. These women have priority for Federal positions and if employed by the Veterans' Administration at once they would not only assist the relief of veterans but be so placed that they would not later be classed as unemployed.

2. The flower of American manhood is being released from military service in increasing numbers. The Veterans' Administration, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, should see to it that as demobilization progresses no veteran equipped for a Veterans' Administration position should fail to be appointed to existing vacancies.

It is because of the extreme emergency of the matter of inadequate space and personnel which brings the committee to present this preliminary report. Other progress reports will follow.

Roosevelt: Man and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 12 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, many articles have been written about the late President Roosevelt since his death, I think none finer than an article in the September 8 issue of Liberty Magazine, by Mr. Jonathan Daniels, one of the late President's secretaries. I ask unanimous consent that this most interesting and fine portrayal of President Roosevelt be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I find that the article will exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule and, according to the estimate, will require two and a half pages at a cost of $130. Notwithstanding this, however, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT: MAN AND STATESMAN

(By Jonathan Daniels)

(History, in due time, will measure the greatness of Franklin Roosevelt. But here, while his memory is fresh, is an estimate of the man and his works by one who worked closely with him—plus several hitherto unrevealed anecdotes.)

History, being written generally by men with neat minds, will undoubtedly divide the 12 years of Franklin D. Roosevelt into the two periods of war and peace—war and reform. In a sense, he himself once so divided it in one of the lighthearted parables in which he liked to dress serious concerns.

He spoke of two entirely different gentlemen: Old Doc New Deal and Dr. Win-the-War. I doubt that there were any such different doctors. Indeed, I believe that there was only one doctor, only one disease, and that in the whole 12 years the one remedy steadily applied was a determination to make democracy effective for the security and in the defense of freemen. It worked almost to scientific demonstration that there are no limits to the powers and the possibilities of democracy gallantly led and confidently following.

Certainly only a person precise to the point of insanity would date the war service of President Roosevelt from 1:47 p. m. eastern war time, December 7, 1941. Then he received the first news almost accidentally in a picked-up message of first alarm to naval personel in Hawaiian waters, that the Japs were bombing Pearl Harbor. No sensible person had talked with a true sense of security in peace since Hitler marched into Poland in September 1939. It was a strange item in history that Hitler, who believed in stars, came into power just 5 weeks before Franklin Roosevelt and on Franklin Roosevelt's birthday. The stars may not have been fixed, but tragedy and destiny already had fallen into shape for mankind.

Twelve years later it somehow seems more than a coincidence that Roosevelt died in April, as Lincoln died. The lilacs of the Lincoln legend were in bloom again. When Lincoln fell, Lee had surrendered; but a mourning nation had to wait 11 days beyond his death before Johnston ended his fighting with Sherman. Roosevelt saw the Americans across the Rhine. All that remained for victory in Europe were the signed and dated documents for the unconditional surrender he had demanded. The proclamation of victory which his successor read on May 8 had already been written before Roosevelt died.

American carriers, built under Roosevelt's devoted direction of the Navy, had stood in the roadsteads less than 50 miles off Tokyo and sent their planes with implacably increasing destruction upon the Japs. Iwo Jima had fallen. Okinawa had been invaded. In the rubble of Berlin, Adolf Hitler survived. But he survived only as the malefactor condemned by the American who paralleled his period and prevented by effective democratic leadership his fulfillment of purpose against human freedom.

It was a triumphant time for a great man to die. And it was clear, before the bugles sounded last inside the hemlock hedges at Hyde Park, that he was not merely a great man dead, but that he stood already as the symbol of the American destiny in his time.

Better than any other man he understood that destiny. He was no solemn statesman in a plug hat. He had been wearing a pull-over sweater when he began his confident direction of the war as Commander in Chief on Pearl Harbor Sunday. Afterward war workers and soldiers, sailors and statesmen saw him in a flannel shirt, old hat, and casually knotted bow tie. He was a shirt-sleeves man in an informal America and he spoke its language to its understanding in great matters and small. And because he believed in the dignity of the American, he was never afraid to ask or expect America's courage.

He was speaking of war in the world and democracy at home as two inseparable parts of his work and his time, in 1936 at Philadelphia when he declared that this generation of Americans had a rendezvous with destiny. He repeated it in January 1939, when the imminence of war was obvious to all but the most blind of those Americans who sought to exorcise war by denying its danger.

"Once I prophesied," he told the Congress, "that this generation of Americans had a rendezvous with destiny. That prophecy comes true. To us much is given; more is expected.

"This generation will nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

When he died, the chance of salvation was certain, but certain only because of the great

burdens he had seemed almost gaily to bear until the day he died under the long weariness of his load.

It is difficult to remember any great American who was so belabored in his lifetime and so beloved by so many at the same time. He did not come to the storm of war from a cloudless America. The fighting at home continued straight up to the war—and beyond. But it was the same fighting for Roosevelt. He believed that democracy must be effective to survive.

It was no accident that he chose the occasion of the dedication of a bridge, one of the public works built by his administration for the peaceful convenience of a creative people, for his famous quarantine speech in Chicago on October 5, 1937. He did not mention "Doc New Deal" or "Dr. Win-the-War" then, but he did use the metaphor of medicine when he spoke of the plague of international lawlessness already apparent in the world. It did not please the dictators. Some Americans did not like it. But he made clear his warning that if the disease were permitted to spread, "let no one imagine that America would escape."

He understood that warning as the man first responsible for its meaning in America. He was grim as he spoke it—grim as he could be, with his great shoulders forward, his eyes hard blue. He looked young still. He was 55, in vigorous middle life, son of a mother still living at 93 and a father who had lived to be 72. The paralysis which had steeled his mind seemed to have strengthened his body also. He seemed even a bigger man above his useless legs.

He had reason to be confident. The year before, he had received the greatest vote any President had ever received in a contested election. No President had ever come to the White House in the midst of such domestic crisis as he did, save only Lincoln. In 4 years he had given America long pent-up and long blindly resisted social and economic safeguards essential to the vitality of its democracy. True enough, he had been halted in some of his plans; not every reform had worked perfectly, but he had won the overwhelming confidence of people who wanted democracy to work. There were more fights to make for them. Then, at 55, in the fullness of his powers and the powers of America for its people, he knew that forces grew in ruthlessness whose patent purpose was to see democracy destroyed.

It is a very easy thing to note now that the war began less than 2 years later. It is less easy to remember those ghostly symbols of world security, the Maginot Line, the French Army, the strange powers attributed to and expected from the British Fleet. In terms of the crackpots who have persisted, it is not easy to recall the respectability of rigid isolationism in the years before the war—and after it, before Pearl Harbor. Not many people remember that in the summer before Hitler marched into Poland the Congress declined to modify the Neutrality Act of 1935 which bound the President's hands and made it impossible for American industrial power to stand with the French Army and the British Fleet as potentials against German aggression.

Roosevelt hoped for peace for America, but he did not mean that America should idly allow the dictatorships to destroy the democracies. When war came, he made a point of describing the peculiar quality of our neutrality by his statement that "even a neutral has a right to take account of facts. Even a neutral cannot be asked to close his mind or his conscience." He moved immediately—and successfully this time—to secure such change in the Neutrality Act as would make it possible for American industry to supply French and British fighting forces. It was "cash and carry" then, but only the Allies could come and get it.

Some historians given to labels have called America's part before Pearl Harbor America's "soft" war. After the fall of France, it became quickly tougher in Presidential utterance as well as Presidential act. The whole surplus store of American arms went by fast freighters to a Britain left unarmed after Dunkirk. By September the President had found a way to let Britain have 50 destroyers in a deal for bases in this hemisphere. Already, then, war production in the United States was growing to the possibility of the President's invention of the great American war weapon of lend-lease.

In September also—and in the midst of a national election campaign—he secured the Selective Training and Service Act providing the first draft of men in peacetime in American history. In peacetime, too, he secured the right to seize industrial plants not cooperating on defense orders. Camps grew, ships rose on the ways, new American fleets took the seas. Production began to answer the incredulity that had greeted the President's goal of 50,000 planes. In the archives in Washington there are memos bearing the scrawl of approval and injunction, "Work Fast—FDR."

The Japanese solved the problem of American isolation. And solved it on a Sunday afternoon while the President relaxing for a little in the oval study at the White House and nursing the sinuses that plagued him all his life, was working at his stamp book. Before he went late to bed, almost every major participant in the defense effort had been with him on the first day of war. The attack, which had come under the mask of negotiations still under way in Washington when the bombs dropped, was surprise and naval disaster, but it found Washington in full stride of preparation for the greatest war ever undertaken.

That day the Commander in Chief gave orders like a commander on the bridge of a ship. One who watched him work has spoken of his genius in disorder and said that his command on that crowded seventh of December was to be compared only with his confident leadership on his first days in the White House when the national economy seemed tottering. The crowds which had heard the news gathered outside the White House fence. The Cabinet members, the generals, and the admirals came in. They found a leadership which did not relax while he lived.

Nobody knows yet how to count or measure such a war. The greatest war we had ever fought before was concerned with only a single European land front and the Atlantic Ocean. Roosevelt's leadership in this war concerned men on every continent and every sea. In what we had called the World War before, we were engaged for only 19 months, and only for part of that time were large American forces engaged. This war began with men dying and the fighting had gone on for 3 years and 5 months when Roosevelt died.

In this war lend-lease to our allies alone has cost more in dollars than our total spending before. For this war American industrial production is more than three times as great as in 1918, and nearly half of the total national production has been for war purposes, a proportion twice as great as that in the peak year of the last war. The arsenal of democracy was working as the arsenal of destruction.

All this production and power and treasure was to be under the direction of one man. He took the direction and held it. He called tough old Admiral William D. Leahy to the White House as his personal chief of staff, and through him kept in close touch with both the joint (United States) Chiefs of Staff and the combined (Anglo-American) Chiefs of Staff. On the ground floor of the White House a specially guarded and staffed map-room was set up where messages were received about the progress of our forces everywhere. On the maps he watched the war of men and supplies, of strategy and logistics, of heroism and death and victory.

It was a dark story at first—Guam and Wake and Midway and Bataan. Then slowly the men and production and ships and planes which were his concern became his concern also in Coral Sea, Midway again, Komandorskie Straits, Guadalcanal, Attu, Kiska, Bougainville, Tarawa, Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Hollandia, Saipan, Guam again, the Palaus and Leyte, on toward Japan. The first great secret enterprise came at last to other maps: Casablanca, Oran, Algiers, Tunis, Kasserine Pass, and on to Gela, Salerno, Messina, bloody Anzio, tough Cassino, to Rome. Rome somehow seemed the signal for the greatest secret and toughest job of all, Normandy. The President had been sick, but he was gay that June day.

"What are you fellows grinning about?" he wanted to know, grinning wide and happy himself.

Within 5 months the Americans alone sent more fighting men to France—men fully equipped—than the entire expeditionary force of the last war. And yet, within the same period at the other side of the world, we landed a force sufficient to insure the liberation of the Philippines. We were clearly already on the victory road.

Under Roosevelt's direction, we built a navy greater than the combined navies of all our allies and enemies. No greater army ever marched under the American flag, or in equipment and quality under any other. The air power we built broke Germany and shatters Japan. These are the parts of victory certainly, but only a part of the evidence of leadership which Roosevelt provided in this war. In the faith he created among the three great Allies and all the United Nations he was a force for victory in himself.

A whole decade before he met the monolithic Stalin in Teheran, he had extended the first hand of recognition to the almost pariah Russians in 1933. Our full safety and solidarity in the Western Hemisphere grew straight from the good-neighbor policy and its observance, which proved not merely to the Americas but also to the world our international good intentions. Roosevelt's ardent and early aid to Britain made the simplest Briton as well as its first statesman regard him as friend. In a whole world in trouble he seemed the man men everywhere believed they could trust.

Such faith is not to be counted in terms of divisions or battleships. It meant much at home in terms of production. He was a man as well as a commander to our fighting men. In America his train moved to war plants and military camps. His friendship for Churchill, formally begun on the foggy seas of the Newfoundland bight where they bound their purpose to freedom in the Atlantic Charter, was a good affection warmed by many meetings. The President was not bothered by Churchill's occasional intellectual arrogance. He was not unduly impressed on a visit to his Maryland hideaway when Churchill recited the whole of Barbara Fritchie and then turned in casual erudition to the nonsense verse of Edward Lear. He was sometimes amused by Churchill's Tory fears. I had a feeling, as he talked of him, that he liked to bait him a little, even to tease him in the dead-pan presence of Stalin, who, he discovered, could laugh. The President had a deep respect for Stalin. I remember once his speaking of a plan for the solution of some problem he had outlined to the Marshal. He mimicked Stalin's brief, decisive thoughtfulness.

"I had not thought of it," he quoted the Marshal as saying. "It is a good idea. I will sign."

And that was that. It was very different with Churchill at that time. Describing him and imitating him, the President put his hands up defensively. "Churchill is acting now as if he is always afraid of getting hit."

The nature of the differences of the Marshal and the Prime Minister placed Roosevelt between them. In the deepest sense he had the trust of both. It was not accident that at Yalta, by general consent, he served as

the chairman of the last great conference of his life.

There can have been few greater moments in history than that time at Yalta. Victory in Europe was clearly before them. They reached decisions which the happiness of the world cannot allow to disintegrate. It was a great time—and a happy one as well.

But it was not a happy voyage home. Before the cruiser *Quincy* turned toward home they knew that "Pa" Watson was dying. Gen. Edwin Watson was a good deal more than the President's secretary and military aide. He was an arm upon whom the President literally leaned when he undertook to walk in his steel braces. More than anybody else, perhaps, he was the President's "tonic." It was his job to protect the President from overlong and overtalkative appointments. It was his gift and grace that he had warmth and charm and great good laughter. Also, he loved the President very much. And somewhere between Gibraltar and the Azores he died—of a cerebral hemorrhage.

The President came home to the piled mass of the details of his leadership which included more work and worry than exaltation. His report on Yalta was received with acclaim. But there were complaints on the home front. There was politics still. Politics had never abated for one moment. When it was worst it pretended to a greater patriotism than the President's. Fortunately, sometimes it amused him. Indeed, nothing seemed as eternal about him as his full-bodied laughter. It was one of the qualities which made him seem almost a man designed by nature to survive the strain of the American Presidency in such a war as this.

His gaiety was like Lincoln's humor—the releasing levity of a deeply serious man. Certainly as he grew older and more weary, he was not the debonair Roosevelt of the first crowded days in the White House. But he seemed in conversation still the self-confident, laughing, sometimes outrageous Roosevelt who used humor as a tool and a weapon and a release. It was not the humor of an easygoing man. It could arm indignation, as he showed, a year before he died, in his famous speech to the teamsters. Humor was a part of his famous characteristic of reducing the most serious things to simplicity: lend-lease was a garden hose lent to a neighbor whose house was on fire.

He loved to tell the story of the origin of the name "United Nations" during Churchill's first swift visit to Washington after Pearl Harbor. They had struggled over combinations of fine words for a name for their league of belligerents. None of them seemed satisfactory. "United Nations" came to F. D. R. at night. Next morning he rolled into Churchill's bedroom. The Prime Minister was bathing. The President waited, and Churchill came out of the bathroom without a stitch of clothing on.

"He looked like a fat cherub," the President recalled.

But that morning he said, "Winston, I have found the name, 'United Nations.'"

The naked Churchill considered it solemnly and gave it his approval. Only after he had indicated his agreement did he seem to be aware of his nakedness.

"Later," said the President, "he told the King about it: 'Your Majesty, you are the only King of England whose Prime Minister has been received by the Chief of a State while completely nude.'"

Some people with neat little minds sometimes found the easy ranging mind of Roosevelt disorderly. They were shocked by his humorous memories of solemn occasions. It could, of course, be disconcerting to call about a job and spend your time talking stamps, or the venereal-disease rate in Liberia, or a plan for the reforestation of the shores of the Persian Gulf. Conversation could be a defense with him as laughter was. But he could, in the first years of the war, turn easily to diversion for its own sake.

Much will be written about his collection of books, stamps, prints. His greatest collecting was not tangible: Everywhere he went—Casablanca, Tehran, Yalta even—he collected an amazing amount of nonessential but lively details about life and people. His interest in geography was never limited to maps. He even collected such evanescent things as bird calls. I know that during the earliest and most jittery days of the war he disturbed the Secret Service detail by a strange postmidnight sortie. His companions were some learned ornithologists who had come to join him in a contest as to which of them could identify the greatest number of night sounds made by Dutchess County birds. He was proud of his long-standing membership in the Union of Ornithologists, but enjoyed claiming that that membership had greatly befuddled investigators of the Dies committee when they were looking for left-wing organizations. "They couldn't tell," he said, "whether it was AFL or CIO."

He collected also, or invented—for private conversation and for his speaking to millions—parables to show his problems and make his points. And there was the proverb he brought back from Casablanca for those New Dealers, old friends and supporters, who had grown more worried as the war went on. They became very worried about American dealings in the conquest of north Africa with the Vichy French. I think he had been waiting a long time to give them his precise answer.

The President had faith in people as well as affection for them, but he was a realist about people also. Sometimes he was too kind to people upon whose affection and loyalty he knew he could depend even though their abilities were limited. Also, he used some people who were simple enough to think they were using him. He did not feel called upon to explain himself to his friends. He himself was confident of his goals. He attributed the proverb which he brought back from Casablanca to one of the Balkan countries, but it always sounded pure Roosevelt to me:

"In time of trouble, my children, it is given to you that you may go with the devil as far as the bridge."

He never would have asked for patience directly, but the request was there. He had a war to fight. Nothing seemed to him so important as winning it with the least loss of American lives and in such a way as to assure the continuance of democracy in security for all Americans. Somehow nobody ever seemed to recall he had four boys in that war—none of them in safety zones. For them, for other Americans, for himself, victory meant making democracy work for men, women, and children.

The steps he took in building power for war were accompanied all the way by the clearest insistence upon the purpose of the war as the protection and fulfillment of the possibilities of democracy. That insistence was the essence of the "four freedoms" attached to the lend-lease proposal of 1941. The same essential freedoms were fixed in the fighting purposes of Britain and America in the Atlantic Charter in 1941. In 1944 he advanced from freedoms to rights in the economic bill of rights which he embodied in his January message to Congress on the state of the Union. He repeated that bill of rights in his speech at Soldier Field at Chicago in October. It is worth remembering now:

The right of a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops, or farms, or mines of the Nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home and abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

"All these rights," the President said, "spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward in the implementation of these rights to new goals of human happiness and well-being."

He understood the opposition to such ideals. He knew better than most Americans that there were men who regarded the war as a new phase, a new turning to the right—away from the program he and the great mass of Americans who had four times elected him had worked out together.

Just a week before he died he wrote again his determination and his faith to an old political friend:

"I am sure that Americans who have done so much in the winning of the war have no doubt that we can give victory the rich meaning of full employment in the United States and of assistance to other nations in their reconstruction. Victory, without the use for abundance of the powers we have developed in production for war, would be, indeed, a hollow victory. We must plan security and abundance together. Such a stronger American economy will be essential to carry out the responsibilities that lie in plans made at Bretton Woods, Hot Springs, and Dumbarton Oaks. Similarly, abundance at home depends upon organization for order and security in the world."

He was tired then, but not changed. He understood the American destiny of which he had been both the prophet and the leader. It had not altered. But, better than anybody else, he knew how weary he was, how suddenly, quickly, the war had made him old. He could see the wavering signature where so recently the bold scrawl had been. He was not fooled. But others were—some who loved him most. The spark of humor and liveliness never left his face, and somehow I think that misled his friends, as people who saw only the photographed image were not misled.

Well, perhaps he died right for history. We can say that easily, remembering the abortive tragedy of Wilson, who had no historic right to live after he was stricken at Wichita. He not only failed to get peace; he lingered in its dissolution. Somehow there seems no tragedy now about Lincoln's dying. He departed in fitness with victory. But we forget much about Lincoln; we remember the funeral train and Walt Whitman's lilacs and forget that death interrupted his devotion to freedom for people. And peace and people made the joint heritage Roosevelt left us. He knew that peace and freedom are inseparable and that there can be no enduring peace except upon a decent earth.

We shall have to wait to know his full greatness—and our own.

Roosevelt's Legacy to America and the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 14 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me entitled "Roosevelt's Legacy to America and the World," which appeared in the India Quarterly in its issue of July 1945. India Quarterly is published in New Delhi, India.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT'S LEGACY TO AMERICA AND THE WORLD

(By Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah)

INTRODUCTION

Franklin Delano Roosevelt first captured the imagination of the American people by literally swooping down from the skies. On being notified 13 years ago that he had received the nomination of the Democratic Party for the Presidency, he boarded an airplane and made the initial flight of the long series which eventually carried him almost over the world.

In this case, his flight was from New York to Chicago, where the party's national convention was meeting. It was unprecedented and breath-taking to do such a thing in those days. It was considered undignified, hazardous, melodramatic—and the American people were delighted. They felt it entirely appropriate when upon his arrival he stood before the convention and uttered these simple but immensely significant words:

"I pledge you—I pledge myself—to a new deal for the American people. Let us all here assembled constitute ourselves prophets of a new order of competence and of courage. This is more than a political campaign. It is a call to arms. Give me your help, not to win votes alone but to win in this crusade to restore America to its own people."

In thinking of all that has happened in and to the United States since that time—July 2, 1932—the immediate issues of those days seem both remote as a previous century and fresh as today's newspaper. Chiefly, what has happened is an expanding of the crusade to the whole world. Thus it is that Roosevelt's own unforgettable summary of those issues not only takes us back to the economic cataclysm in the United States which made his first election possible but presents a need that is today worldlike. Speaking in April 1932, he said:

"These unhappy times call for the building of plans that rest upon the forgotten, the unorganized but the indispensable units of economic power, for plans that build from the bottom up and not from the top down, that put their faith once more in the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid."

And in another address a month later, he added: "The millions who are in want will not stand by silently forever while the things to satisfy their needs are within easy reach." But the words, of all those used by Roosevelt over the years, which best describe the era from 1932 to today are these, from the same address:

"We need enthusiasm, imagination, and the ability to face facts, even unpleasant ones, bravely."

That is the essence of what Roosevelt called for, fought for, and eventually died for. It is the essence of what happened in the United States during his Presidency. The task of carrying forward the job of facing facts bravely was his legacy to the world.

THE WORLD OF CANDIDATE ROOSEVELT

It is impossible to understand the United States of today or the events of the past 12 years without going back to the conditions that existed at the time he was first running for election as President of the United States. The Nation was solemnly and somewhat grandiloquently celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, who led the armed forces in the American Revolution and later was the first President of the young country. In the Nation's Capital, named after him, veterans of the First World War, having marched across the now-mature country, were demanding relief from conditions of unemployment and starvation, and were being forcibly ejected from the city by troops. Banks and business firms were failing. Government spokesmen everywhere were assuring everyone that prosperity was just around the corner. Riots of farmers and of industrial workers were taking place. Homeless men and women trod the streets of cities looking for jobs, for food, for shelter. Farm owners and workers were suffering from foreclosures of their habitations and resisted demands to move out with rifles and clubs. One of the oldest democracies in the world, the strongest and most prosperous nation in history, quivered with alarms, fears, reassurances, hunger.

The United States was not alone in its troubles. Almost everywhere on the globe there were parallel or worse conditions. By far the greatest part of the 2,000,000,000 inhabitants of the world were living in misery, as most of the people in the world have lived throughout human history. The most significant part of it all was the ferment of protests, the growing realization that such conditions were not necessary, the spreading belief that human beings can live an abundant life if they insist on it. This gave opportunity for budding tyrants like Hitler to offer their followers false programs concealing savage and barbaric measures to afford themselves power by the age-old doctrines of human slavery, to distort the longings of people for peace and work into acceptance of exactly the same formulas which have always produced and prolonged human misery.

In the United States, the chief trouble was not the financial depression. It was instead the fact that illusions of a major character had arisen and had effected the thinking of the people of the United States to the extent that—in the face of the facts—they were unaware of the realities of the situation in which they found themselves. It is probably the most remarkable fact of this period that during the years 1930–32, much of the illusion of national prosperity and well-being continued, and that those who used the word "depression" were condemned as unpatriotic by many national leaders.

It was under these conditions that Roosevelt traveled up and down the United States calling on the Nation to become aware of its realities, its needs and its opportunities. On becoming President on March 4, 1933, he told the Nation:

"This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. * * * Let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

THE BASIC NEW DEAL PROGRAM

Roosevelt was a man of many words, but also of even swifter and more decisive actions. Immediately after his inauguration, he proclaimed a nation-wide holiday closing all banks while action was taken to remedy their shaky condition. Then he called a special session of Congress and began to formulate the most startling program of national measures in American history up to that time. During its first hundred days this Congress gave him 77 distinct grants of sweeping Executive power.

The basic New Deal program called for direct participation by the National Government in providing for the welfare of the people. It depended on private enterprise as the mainstay of the national economy, but took drastic steps to regulate it in order to protect investments and homes, prevent fraud, assure the rights of labor to fair wages and working conditions and of farmers to fair profits. In addition, it supplemented private enterprise by large public works projects and job programs for the unemployed, and instituted social security measures to ameliorate the effects of old age, unemployment, disability and the like.

Not all this was effected during Roosevelt's first term, but long strides were taken. An emergency act brought gradual stability to the banks. Sales of securities were regulated. Holding companies were curbed. Bank deposits were insured. The dollar was devalued. The National Recovery Administration regulated wages and hours in industry. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration controlled agricultural production and regulated price and income levels, all by means of voluntary cooperation. The Federal Housing Administration and other agencies made possible the saving of homes and farms foreclosures and the purchase of others on long-term, low-interest mortgages.

Besides this regulatory type of aid, the National Government operated vast public works and conservation programs. The Tennessee Valley Authority began to develop and sell cheaply electricity made from publicly owned dams as it did an over-all job of rebuilding the valley's economy. The Public Works Administration supervised construction of billions of dollars' worth of bridges, dams, school buildings and similar structures. Three successive agencies—the Civil Works Administration, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and the Works Progress Administration—gave direct employment to millions of jobless men and women in a variety of public projects. The Civilian Conservation Corps provided work training on conservation projects for 2,500,000 young men between 18 and 25, and later was supplemented by the National Youth Administration, which gave employment and training to several hundred thousand boys and girls in their late teens and early twenties.

Merely to enumerate the agencies and activities of the Government would require many pages. An account as brief as this necessarily omits large areas of activity. But even this makes it clear that much was attempted and that much was done.

ACTIONS OF THE OPPOSITION

It must not be imagined that the New Deal was created and that it operated without opposition. From the first, both its philosophy and its specific proposals were fought bitterly and relentlessly, and its opponents made up a great proportion of the American population. The highest percentage of the national vote that Roosevelt ever received was 59.6 in 1936, which means that 40 percent of Americans who were able and willing to vote were opposed to his continuation as President, and these included many powerful and influential leaders of finance, industry and public opinion. It does not mean, however, that all New Deal measures were opposed in this degree. Indeed, the opposition embraced many of these measures as time passed, until in the 1944 campaign Governor Dewey endorsed substantially all the measures of the preceding 11 years, basing his attacks on alleged faulty administration of them.

But the opposition to New Deal policies did a great deal to affect their implementation. A fundamental cleavage developed within the Democratic Party itself, so that its Representatives in Congress formed two groups which differed almost as widely in their views as did the New Dealers and the Republicans. The large, even overwhelming, Democratic majority in the Senate and House lost its apparent significance. Since 1936, Congress for practical purposes has been almost equally divided on domestic policies, and in order to attain its purposes at all, the Roosevelt administration found it necessary to accede to compromises of various kinds.

Moreover, opposition arose from a new and powerful source, the Supreme Court of the

United States. The United States Constitution makes it necessary that all legislation passed by Congress be in pursuance of the Constitution in order to be valid; to use the popular phrase in the United States, all laws must be constitutional. Almost from the time of the establishment of the National Government, the Supreme Court has acted as the final arbiter of the constitutionality of laws. If, when a case is brought before it, it decides that the law on which the case is based is unconstitutional, the law is automatically considered null and void, and in effect repealed. The only way to remedy the situation in such an event is to amend the Constitution itself, or to hope that in the future the Supreme Court will reverse its former decision, which has happened not infrequently.

Because the Constitution is largely worded in general terms, there is wide latitude for differences in interpretation of its provisions—so wide that in a majority of cases in which the constitutionality of a law is involved, the Supreme Court Justices disagree with one another. A majority vote, however, decides the matter officially.

Thus the personal and political viewpoints of the Supreme Court Justices inevitably play a large part in forming their decisions. In the years from 1933 to 1937, the majority of the Justices believed that various New Deal measures were unconstitutional and so decided. In the two most notable cases, the National Recovery Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration were decided to be operating under basically unconstitutional laws, so that the first was in effect abolished and the second shorn of its most important functions. This was a body blow to the New Deal which deprived it of the mainstays of its operation.

As Roosevelt neared the end of his first term, therefore, he was faced with baffling problems. The measures of the early years had not ended the depression entirely, but had brought renewed stability to finance and industry, increased incomes to farmers and workers, jobs to millions of the formerly unemployed, a measure of economic security for those who had none. But now apparently his hands were tied by the Supreme Court.

More than this, the American people generally had not grasped fully the implications of the injunction to face facts, even unpleasant ones, bravely. In 1922, the immediate facts of imminent total economic collapse could not be escaped, but now that the danger seemed over, the deep-rooted ills that had caused it and that still existed were easy to ignore. The great illusion existed that the whole Nation was prosperous because it had many millionaires and scores of millions of citizens living in comfort. The poverty and the hunger of the others became obscured.

THE SECOND GREAT TASK

None has loved the United States, its people and its form of government more than did Roosevelt. In the midst of cries that he was trying to violate American ideals, of Court decisions that his proposals violated the Constitution, he cherished with passionate faith all that is symbolized in the Lincolnian phrase, "government of the people, by the people, for the people." He believed that the greed of a few and the indifference of many had brought about an unfair and disastrous distribution of wealth and income, the deprivation to millions of the opportunity for an abundant life for millions and an economic system which forgot the common man and spelled certain ruin.

In this spirit he cheerfully faced the task of making his fellowmen see the realities and making it possible for their representatives to enact laws that would accomplish the ends of democracy. When in 1936 he accepted his renomination for the Presidency, he said:

"There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. Of other generations must is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny. * * * We are fighting to save a great and precious form of government for ourselves and for the world."

Nor did he wait to act decisively. Triumphantly reelected after a campaign during which he boldly asked citizens to consider their own experiences during the preceding 3 years, and if they found themselves better off to vote for him, and if not, to vote for his opponent; he did not rest on past accomplishments. In his second inauguration address he plunged to the heart of the conditions he was trying to make real to all Americans. He attacked the illusion of Nation-wide prosperity and well-being in these words:

"I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished. * * * It is not in despair that I paint you that picture. I paint it for you in hope—because the Nation, seeing and understanding the injustice of it, proposes to paint it out. * * * If I know aught of the will of our people * * * they will demand a nation uncorrupted by cancer of injustice and, therefore, strong among the nations in its example of the will to peace."

The address caused an enormous sensation. Never before had a President of the United States claimed conditions to be as bad as this, or anywhere near it. Millions whose illusions had kept them from knowing the facts were inexpressibly shocked by the admission of widespread poverty and suffering.

But a greater shock was to come, for within a month Roosevelt sent a message to Congress demanding that something drastic be done about the Supreme Court and its power to nullify legislation. He told Congress that the American people would not tolerate frustration of their rights to help themselves and to build a truly prosperous country.

The step he advocated was indirect. It was to enlarge the Court from its current membership of 9 to 15 and to induce retirement of Justices at the age of 70. But its effect would not be indirect, for it was clear that the new appointees would be believers in the New Deal philosophy and that their interpretations of the constitutionality of laws would differ from those of the existing majority.

The conflict that followed was one of the most bitter in American history. The effects of the months of agitation and recrimination, the effects of which did not disappear for years. Technically, Roosevelt lost the battle, for the measure he advocated did not pass. The Supreme Court retained a membership of nine. But through deaths and retirements and new appointments the real purpose of the battle was attained. The majority shifted to a position of constitutional interpretation that approved the validity of important New Deal laws.

During the second term, therefore, much legislation passed previously survived Supreme Court tests. The Social Security Board, now part of the Federal Security Agency, admistered social-security benefits affecting scores of millions of people. The National Labor Relations Board began administering laws that assured labor rights of collective bargaining. A law establishing minimum wages and maximum hours of work became a reality. Many other steps followed the same trend.

Even with the approaching danger of war and the eventual concentration of the national economy on war production, Roosevelt did not neglect carrying out as far as possible the steps which had been planned for years. In his annual message to Congress in 1944 he made a definite statement of the aims of his program, and this he repeated on January 6, 1945, only 3 months before his death. His 1944 message said:

"We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. Necessitous men are not free men. People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

"In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted so to speak a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all regardless of station, race, or creed. Among these are: The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation; the right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation; the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living; the right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home and abroad; the right of every family to a decent home; the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment; the right to a good education. All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward in the implementation of these rights to new goals of human happiness and well-being. America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part upon how fully these and similar rights have been carried into practice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world."

THE THIRD AND FOURTH GREAT TASKS

Even in 1932, when Roosevelt was formulating the domestic program of recovery and reform which occupied him for many years, there were rumblings from both Europe and Asia of the storms to come. Japan had struck at China, invading Manchuria. Hitler was gradually gaining the ascendancy in Germany. The financial depression in the United States was equaled in many other countries. From the very first, the foreign policy of the United States received careful attention from Roosevelt and his advisers.

The first bold move made by Roosevelt in 1933 was the announcement of the good-neighbor policy, followed by the enactment of reciprocal trade agreements with many nations, principally in Latin America.

By the time of the second term, conditions abroad had grown much worse. Mussolini had conquered Ethiopia. The Franco revolt against the Republic of Spain was beginning. Japan, on July 7, 1937, opened its full-scale war against China, which is still continuing. Hitler's projected conquest of the world was in its preparatory stages.

In spite of these events, the people of the United States largely suffered from an illusion as great as that which Roosevelt had fought regarding the domestic situation. The majority of Americans firmly believed that the United States was by its geographical position free from any danger of invasion and that it should not concern itself with the troubles of other countries. It became the task of the Roosevelt administration to begin a third battle for the facing of realities, this time the realities of world interdependence and the menace of fascism.

How well this task was accomplished is written in the pages of recent history for all to read. It is not possible to relate here the many and complex phases of the battle. It is important to realize, however, that the complete shifting of the American attitude by the time the United States entered the war was as important to final victory as was the actual fighting of the war. The many prewar steps taken to convert the Nation into an arsenal of democracy played a large part in the later victories of the United Nations.

Thus, when war came, the United States was more nearly ready than at any time in its history and was already operating on what amounted to a wartime economy.

But even before our entry into the war Roosevelt was beginning his fourth and final task of bringing realities home to the American people. This was the reality that the nations of the world must combine to establish an enduring peace, must associate themselves with one another intimately in this purpose, must cooperate with one another in all areas of human endeavor. The United Nations took shape, and as the years have passed the basis for association of nations and for international cooperative organizations in many fields has been laid.

Today the United States is conscious as never before of its international responsibilities and opportunities and it goes forward with a sense of deep understanding of world needs.

President Roosevelt is gone. As I have said, the task of carrying forward the job of facing facts bravely was his legacy to the world. Probably no man in history has been missed by so many people as has Roosevelt since he died. But he served his Nation not by ruling it, not by miraculous formulas, but instead of inspiring his fellowmen to face realities for themselves and to shoulder their responsibilities fearlessly. He expressed this less than 6 months before his death in these words:

"The creed of our democracy is that liberty is acquired and kept by men and women who are strong and self-reliant, and possessed of such wisdom as God gives to mankind—men and women who are just and understanding and generous to others—men and women who are capable of disciplining themselves—for they are the rulers and they must rule themselves."

In this faith the people of the United States go forward.

Our Demobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I am discouraged and impatient with the War and Navy Departments in their talk about a demobilization plan. These two Departments paint a rosy and well-organized picture, but in practice it is very far from the reality.

So far as getting the job done is concerned, there is no working plan and less demobilization, just confusion and inactivity.

The Army method of handling all their affairs through what they call channels is all right, except that the channel to discharge is much too long, too deep, and too sluggish for the thousands of boys that have been these years in combat, deprived of the privileges of normal life.

Now that their task has been successfully accomplished, they merit a better and more expeditious system of action toward immediate discharge.

We recognize that a considerable army must be maintained for purposes of occupying the conquered countries. That may mean even 2,000,000 men, but it does not mean 10,000,000, and simple justice demands that a fair and equitable system operate, and operate quickly, to discharge the other 8,000,000. The War and Navy Departments were able to move fast enough bringing men into the service, and we have a right to expect them to be just as speedy and efficient in relieving those men from the service.

If we wait on the Military Establishments in their present methods, age and infirmity will overtake our soldier youth sooner than the War or Navy Departments' action can reach them. Unless the Army and Navy act now and speedily, the Congress must of necessity institute and execute a plan of its own that will get the job done.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an article written by me concerning the equal rights amendment, which appeared in the Union Times, New Haven, Conn., July 21, 1945:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The campaign which has brought this proposed amendment to the floor of the Senate and as far as the Rules Committee in the House is a tribute to a slogan. Equal rights for women? Of course you're for it. But will this so-called equal rights amendment give women equal rights? If Congress will just pass the amendment and the States ratify it will women have equal job opportunities, will they get the same pay for the same work, will they have the same chances for promotion as men?

The answer in every case is "No." All these questions turn on tradition, on custom, or prejudice, if you will. You can't fight tradition with a constitutional amendment.

WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

But what of equality in law? It is unfortunately true that certain States do still have laws which discriminate against women. However, other States, of which Connecticut is one, with minor exceptions treat men and women as equals. It should be possible to amend the laws which still discriminate against women.

What does the amendment really mean? Under it no act of Congress, no State legislation, no city ordinance can make any distinction between men and women. There can be no discrimination against women and no discrimination in their favor.

In Connecticut the following legislation would be in question if the so-called equal-rights amendment were ratified:

For protection of the family: (1) the husband's primary responsibility for family support; (2) the allowance of household goods and other property exempt from the husband's debts when his personal property is insufficient to satisfy creditors' claims; (3) employment before and after childbirth. Some lawyers hold that since motherhood is a condition and not a status these laws would not be affected.

For the protection of working women: (1) hours of work; (2) night work; (3) prohibition of work in any tavern unless wife or daughter of proprietor; (4) industrial home work; (5) providing seats.

There will also be question concerning laws protecting women against sexual offenses, questions of alimony and divorce, questions of minimum wages and laws regulating occupational hazards.

Under Federal law the rights of widows under social-security acts might well be questioned.

CHANGE IDEAS ON FAMILY?

Unless we mean to change our ideas of the family as our basic social unit, as long as our present economic system holds, the law will have to enforce different obligations upon the husband and father than upon the wife and mother.

As to protective legislation for women, proponents of the so-called equal-rights amendment admit it would be abolished upon ratification of the amendment, but gaily state they would substitute new legislation which would protect both men and women. Excellent. But how long would it take? And are men and women identical?

Women cannot lift as heavy weights as can men without bodily injury; they are more subject to harm from certain industrial poisons and occupational diseases; they are more likely to be permanently harmed by certain moral hazards.

When the war end thousands of women now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act will go back into intrastate industries and service occupations where they will require the protection of State labor laws.

STRONG UNIONS WILL HELP

Typically women are not the primary breadwinners, and in order to supplement the family income will work for a lower wage than men. Strong unions might do away with the need for certain protective legislation but in too many cases the women who need the protection most are the ones in the type of work most unfavorable to organization.

Endless litigation would be the first outcome of the ratification of the amendment. For example, what is a right? What is a duty? Under the amendment could Selective Service legally make a distinction between men and women? Would women be drafted? George Gordon Battle, New York attorney, in a memorandum submitted to a Senate subcommittee in favor of the amendment wrote: "Our answer is that they could and should be so drafted. Women are citizens. They have property, they owe the same obligations to the State that is owed by men. They should be drafted to protect the State in case of war."

The difficulties of interpretation of this seemingly simple amendment with its appealing name are legion.

EQUALITY FOR WOMEN—YES

Of course we want equality for women. Of course one has to admit there are still State laws which discriminate against women. One must also admit that some protective legislation has hampered women—very seldom, however, the women in industry. Certain professional women, such as the window display artist, have been hampered by night work hours in some States. But such laws can and have been amended.

The woman in industry still needs protection. For her union organization is the real answer but it may take time. For all women education against outmoded customs, conventions, and prejudices is basic. The so-called equal rights amendment won't give the school teacher an equal chance at advancement to principal or superintendent; it won't give the woman in the shop a chance to be foreman. Education will do the job

with some help from specific legislation such as the teachers' equal pay bill passed by the current Connecticut Legislature, and the equal pay bill recently introduced into the Senate.

EQUAL RIGHTS AND PAST GAINS

Equal rights by all means. But equal rights and all our past gains, too. There is no substitute for hard work. There is no magic formula. Equal rights, real and lasting, can come only through education, State by State campaigns against laws discriminating against women, union organization of women, and above all, full employment.

Request To Investigate NLRB Mishandling of Motion-Picture Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, for 6 months now, a strike has been in effect in the motion-picture industry. For 6 months now people have been out of work. For 6 months I and my colleagues from southern California have demanded that the National Labor Relations Board take action which would terminate the strike. We must not wait another 6 months for that Board to act.

I have never at any time taken sides in the dispute, which is one involving two locals of the same international organization; however, I have been adamant on the subject of getting the workers back on their jobs as quickly as possible. The longer the case dragged on, the more complicated the entire situation became, and I accuse the Government agencies of causing the delay, through their bungling failure to handle their work in the most expeditious manner. The United States Government can be accused of keeping thousands of people out of work for half a year.

I would like to call on the President to direct the NLRB to speed up its function in this case and come to an immediate decision, as has been asked for 17 weeks now by Members of this House. I would also like to seek a congressional investigating committee appointed to look into the handling of the entire case, to ascertain the reason for the completely unprecedented delay in settling the matter.

We cannot allow another labor dispute to tie up a industry as long as this docket has. The motion-picture industry has contributed greatly to the national unity which helped us prosecute this war. In fairness to this great industry I feel that we must look into and locate the causes for the disruption of its production. The manufacture of films for entertainment is a business, and must be thought of as such. We would certainly not allow conditions like this to go on in any other business, without investigating the trouble. I feel that we must seriously examine the disorder here and make recommendations if we find that the responsibility for the trouble lies within the operation of any governmental agency.

L-41 Stifles Housing in Tulsa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from the president of the Tulsa Real Estate Board enclosing a resolution adopted by his board on August 24, 1945. A copy of this resolution follows these introductory remarks.

The communication states that the Tulsa builders and realtors have attempted in every way possible to cooperate with all the rules and regulations that have been promulgated relative to building and rent controls. The Douglas bomber plant has been closed and employees are being laid off in a number of other war plants and industries at Tulsa, and it is estimated that approximately 24,000 war workers have been released from Tulsa war industries. Apparently, most of these people have decided to make their permanent homes in Tulsa, and the veterans are returning to reestablish their homes and make new homes for their families. This has caused a great congestion.

The president of the Tulsa Real Estate Board states:

We firmly believe that it is to the best interest of our community and to the country that bureaucratic control of our industry be ceased, and that it be permitted to take its place competitively. Restrictions have been removed from the automobile industry, the oil business, and most other lines, and we urgently beseech your aid in releasing us for action.

Mr. Speaker, many other cities and towns in northeastern Oklahoma are facing similar embarrasing situations due to the fact that L-41 has been promulgated and is allowed to remain in force. I am informed that this order has been modified with reference to certain types of buildings, but the modifications do not apply to restrictions on construction of dwellings.

I am also informed that the order is to remain in force until Mr. John W. Snyder, Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, returns from Europe, which his office suggests may be about October 1. In the meantime, the American public must suffer. Time is an important factor in construction, for it is apparent that no relief will be granted until after October 1. Then the season of uncertain and inclement weather is upon us, and construction work may be retarded to the point that people will actually suffer because of such delay during the winter months that are ahead.

Why should bureaucracy be permitted such a strangle-hold upon the people of a free country? Why not lift the heavy hand of government, that is now being exercised by the bureaucrats, and let the people take care of their needs? Business wants to be released. The people want relief, and Congress should afford this relief. Let us abolish the bureaus and drive the bureaucrats out of Washington and divorce them from the Federal Government. This does not mean that these bureaus and their functions and the power to continue their regimentation should be merely shifted to some authorized department of government. The people will not be satisfied with the placing of these functions under Cabinet Members, or as functioning agencies of some duly constituted department of our Government. What the people want is that these bureaus and their functions be entirely eliminated. They want to get rid of them absolutely and will not be satisfied with the idea that is being expressed here in Washington in some quarters that they be integrated int some of the older established departments. I am sure that the Members of Congress will agree that while they were at home during the recent recess of Congress, they heard on every hand such expressions from the people. We are merely their Representatives and should heed sound counsel and the demands of the people. Americans look forward to our getting rid of bureaucracy in whatever form it appears in the administration of the affiairs of the Federal Government.

The resolution referred to follows:

The Tulsa Real Estate Board has been an active organization for over 25 years serving the city and county of Tulsa, Okla. It is a member of the Oklahoma Real Estate Association and the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and during its existence has cooperated with other similar organizations in this State and Nation. For many years this board has been a great factor in the building and developing of the city of Tulsa and has at all times endeavored to promote civic, commercial, and industrial expansion in the city of Tulsa. During the war years this board has set up a postwar planning committee, which has carefully considered and studied the present and future needs of this city with reference to real-estate matters, and as a result thereof reports that certain factors now exist which should be given immediate consideration and definite action should result therefrom. From this study it has been found that—

Whereas the immediate cessation of hostilities and the termination of the war is now a fact and simultaneously war contracts are being canceled in the city of Tulsa and vicinity which will result in a large amount of unemployment, and the need for reemployment is of utmost urgency; and

Whereas the War Department is speeding up the discharge of soldiers and sailors and will continue to do so in the immediate future, and as a result a large number of veterans will be seeking employment, and it is of the utmost importance that consideration be given to this important factor now; and

Whereas there is a dire need of housing, industrial, commercial, and private, including all types of housing and building and construction work in the city of Tulsa and vicinity, which need has been occasioned by the wartime recess of construction and governmental restrictions placed thereon; and

Whereas a removal of the governmental restrictions on the building and sale of real estate will enable private enterprises to immediately proceed to employ the returning veterans and unemployed war workers in carrying forward this housing and industrial construction program so much needed in the city of Tulsa and vicinity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Tulsa Real Estate Board does hereby re-

quest the proper governmental authorities to remove all Government restrictions on the building, sale, and management of real estate so that private enterprise can proceed forthwith to employ the war veterans and unemployed war workers to their full capacity, thus helping to fulfill existing needs in relation to employment and housing, both commercial and private, so critically needed at this time and in the immediate future in the city of Tulsa and vicinity.

AUGUST 24, 1945.

J. W. Hanes Points Out Part Played by Russia in German Mark's Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of the United States are being made the victims of a great international swindle. It is a deliberate fraud, the result of a conspiracy not yet fully revealed. The extent to which our taxpayers are to be bled and swindled cannot now be estimated, but high and reputable authority places the eventual loss in terms of billions. Is it not time for the people to demand a show-down from those who are defrauding our citizens of billions of dollars by a vicious international intrigue so arrogant and unconscionable that it challenges the credulity of all honest men?

The facts revealed in the Baltimore News-Post, Thursday, September 13, 1945, ought to arouse the indignation of every patriotic American. Just so long as the Congress yields to the demands upon our Treasury made by international beggars, aided and abetted by unscrupulous American financial houses acting as agents for foreign nations in promoting these international loans, I say the American people will become the taxpaying slaves of foreign countries, because these loans will not be repaid.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the article to which I have referred:

GERMAN MARK'S INFLATION—J. W. HANES POINTS OUT PART PLAYED BY RUSSIA

NEW YORK, September 13.—The new Army ruling forbidding Amercan soldiers in Germany from swapping Soviet-issued occupation marks for United States dollars is a palliative and not a cure, former Under Secretary of the Treasury John W. Hanes had warned today.

Mr. Hanes said:

"Such a move is comparable to attempting to bail out a lake with a fork. It does not halt the Russians from inflating the German mark to their hearts content nor does it stem the floodtide of marks now rolling from Soviet printing presses and filling Germany with paper which America is pledged to redeem."

It was Mr. Hanes who, when he returned from Europe last week with Richard E. Berlin, president of the Hearst Corp., exposed the fact that the Americans had turned over to the Russians the plates from which the occupation marks are being printed.

PLATES SURRENDERED

At the time he warned that United States citizens stand to be bled of unestimated billions because of the "stupidity" in surrendering the plates to the Reds who have flatly refused to exchange the marks for their own currency, while America trades for them at the rate of 10 to $1.

As a result of Mr. Hanes' disclosures, the United States Group Council's finance division in Berlin quickly issued the order prohibiting American soldiers from exchanging the Soviet-printed marks for American dollars.

"The American taxpayer has been getting hooked," said Col. Bernard Bernstein, division chief, in announcing the new regulation.

"I'll say he is getting hooked." commented Mr. Hanes. "And he won't realize how much he really is hooked until the German economy is flattened under the steam-roller of an inflation inspired by the Russians."

PERTINENT QUERY

"I'm still asking—how did the Russians get the plates to print the marks, and why? Why wasn't the amount of currency Russia can float controlled?"

One of the primary interests of American occupation forces in Germany, Mr. Hanes pointed out, is the stabilization of the economy there.

He declared:

"But after the German currency has been ruinously inflated the British and the United States will have to put up to gain stabilization and from the talks now going on in Washington we, and we alone, will be left holding the bag.

"We had better look forward to the time when America is going to have to clean up the mess."

BRITAIN'S TROUBLES

Mr. Hanes apparently referred to the growing realization in this country that Britain will have a difficult time controlling her own economy, let alone trying to bolster that of another nation.

Regarded as one of the country's outstanding financial experts, Mr. Hanes considered the following statement seriously before he uttered it.

Then he said:

"My feeling is that we can stay in Germany and do a good job. We should stay there and do a good job. But if we are going to stay and end in a debacle, I think we should get out."

MONETARY CONFUSION

There is no one today who can estimate the billions of marks which have been floated in the Reich, Mr. Hanes said. This stems from the evil, he added, of two parties printing money with neither one knowing what the other is printing.

Mr. Hanes recalled the German inflationary era after World War I, when a German had to have a basketful of marks to buy one egg. Now Germany appears to be headed in the same direction, only this time the United States stands to foot the bill and all because we turned our money-making machinery over to a country which refuses to recognize the currency it turns out.

Elimination of Needless Government Bureaus, Commissions, and Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, one problem which confronts Congress and ought to have its prompt attention deals with the enormous number of Government bureaus, commissions, and departments. Some of these have been created as war agencies and others have been in existence for a long time. We hear a lot of talk about reduction of expenses, and all of it is very much in point in view of the heavy burden of debt which hangs over the American people. One of my friends commented a few days ago to the effect that the best means of reducing taxes is have reduced spending. The elimination of Federal bureaus and agencies which are not necessary in the conduct of Federal business is a good place to make a beginning.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN REQUESTS AUTHORITY TO ABOLISH AND CONSOLIDATE BUREAUS

In a message to Congress by President Truman on May 24, 1945, authority to reorganize the executive branch of the Government was requested by President Truman. He points out in his message that this is a job that has to be done by some one man with absolute authority to take proper steps to bring about a real reform in order to eliminate a great many bureaus, commissions, and departments which are not needed and which serve only as a burden and an expense on the taxpayers of America.

The President's message is found on page 5015 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 24, 1945, and is well worth careful consideration. I know that the transfer of unlimited power in connection with this problem makes it possible for the man in charge of the work to abuse his power. That objection has been available in connection with all wartime emergency legislation. The answer to the objection is that somebody has to be trusted with this job. Congress must delegate the power and the authority and, in my opinion, there should be no limitations. If that power and authority are abused or used for political purposes, Congress can abolish the same. I am willing to take the President at his word, and I believe that he will do a business-like and efficient job if legislation is passed, giving him that power to do it.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL LINDSAY C. WARREN POINTS OUT NEED FOR LEGISLATION

In support of my position in this matter, I want to quote from Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren who has made it his business to go into this question of reorganization of Government agencies very carefully. Many of us know Mr. Warren as a former Member of the House of Representatives. He was rated as one of our most valuable and active and efficient legislators. He never made much noise, but his work was effective and worth while, and the House of Representatives suffered a great loss when he resigned in order to accept the position of Comptroller General of the United States. His argument in favor of giving the President authority to abolish unnecessary bureaus is well put and I don't think it can be improved upon, and I hope that the House Expenditures Committee will follow Mr. Warren's suggestions.

Comptroller General Warren's testimony before the House committee favors legislation.

The following news item from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., of September 5, 1945, gives a summary of Mr. Warren's testimony and every bit of it is directly in point. It is as follows:

WARREN URGES HOUSE CLEANING OF UNITED STATES SET-UP—TELLS HOUSE GROUP OF DUPLICATIONS BY UNITED STATES AGENCIES

Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren today told a congressional committee the present Government set-up is a "hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlapping, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies."

Testifying before the House Expenditures Committee in support of President Truman's plea for broad powers to reorganize Government agencies, Mr. Warren told Congress it cannot be expected to remedy the situation and asked instead that the President be given authority to clean house.

"The present system is probably an ideal one for the tax-eaters and those who wish to keep themselves perpetually attached to the pay roll, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill," Mr. Warren declared.

PICTURES OVERLAPPING

Mr. Warren gave this picture of some Federal establishments:

1. The transportation field is divided among 75 bureaus, divisions, and agencies. The Government's travel and freight bill is as much as it cost to run the whole Federal establishment 30 years ago.

2. The Labor Department collects the statistics from the individuals constituting the labor force while the Commerce Department collects the data from the employers.

3. There are at least 12 Federal retirement systems, each with its own rules.

4. Public housing is financed by 15 agencies.

5. Labor relations are spread over eight departments and agencies.

6. A dozen bureaus and departments are involved in administration of public land.

"AN OBVIOUS CONFLICT"

7. There is "an obvious conflict" between the functions of various agencies concerning aid to the States in care of dependent children.

8. Two Government corporations "are doing a thriving customs business" in addition to the Bureau of Customs.

Mr. Warren said the instances cited "are merely a drop in the bucket of things which the President should be empowered to look into and remedy."

"I don't advocate abolition of anything that is proper or necessary," Mr. Warren said, adding, "although, with a $300,000,000,000 debt, I am not to be considered as too old-fashioned if I say it is time we draw in our belts; to see that the Government at least gets value for its huge expenditures, and to weed out inefficiencies and to hold those in charge to a responsibility that cannot be dodged or evaded."

BACKS PLEA FOR REVISION

"Congress can give the taxpayers their first break in a long time by giving the President authority he asks for," Mr. Warren declared.

Mr. Warren said the legislation should provide for abolition of agency functions instead of just their transfer. Only that will make for real economy, he said. He also recommended that reorganization authority be given to President Truman only for the length of his term.

IN CONCLUSION

It is perfectly clear to anyone that there is a real job to be done in getting rid of these different agencies, one of which duplicates the work of another and contributes both to inefficiency and to the expenditure of large sums of money that serves no good purpose. We ought to give the taxpayers a break. We must make it possible to reorganize these different branches of the Government. I am willing to go the whole way and I would not exempt any single executive agency from the power conferred upon the President in making proper reorganization.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Gazette under date of August 9, 1945, on the matter of the Missouri Valley Authority:

MISSOURI RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Every citizen of South Dakota has an interest, whether he realizes it or not, in Missouri River development. For many years the potentialities of the river have been matched against its destructive tendencies and an effort made to capitalize the former and remedy the latter. Now, through the efforts of the governors of States bordering the river or traversed by it, congressional representatives of those States, and other groups and individuals, an appropriation has been made for just the thing for which Missouri Valley citizens have been working so long.

And what are we doing about it? Dissipating the energy which ought to be centered in capitalizing on our successful effort to accomplishing the thing so long desired. The personal pronoun "we" means the folks in the valley who should be pulling together, instead of dividing their forces.

After many years of effort for river development, the Government put Army engineers on the job of investigating Missouri River transportation, irrigation, power, and flood-control possibilities. That committee reported favorably on all four possibilities, and suggested to Congress what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan of development. It was on the strength of this report and of the engineer's recommendation, that Congress finally made the appropriation. Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Power Commission, and the Soil Conservation Service are actually on the job, paving the way for this great beneficial effort, and every day brings river development under the Pick-Sloan plan closer to fruition.

As hope for Missouri River development began to blossom into reality, there was created a group of advocates of a Missouri Valley Authority (MVA), patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). While advocating river development, and going all out in its effort to convince the residents of the valley of its benefits, the MVA supporters, headed in South Dakota by the State Farmers Union, are insisting that the development effort be placed under the same type of federally controlled authority as the TVA. The South Dakota Reclamation Association officials and other advocates of early development declare this would upset the foundation so well established on the recommendation of Army engineers in the advocacy of the Pick-Sloan plan.

It is the privilege of the South Dakota Farmers Union to advocate anything it cares to, whether related to MVA or any other Government-control scheme, but it is now putting itself in the position of delaying river development, rather than assisting that development. Beyond this, if the addresss of James Patton, national president of the Farmers Union, may be taken as a criterion, they are not giving those whom they would attract to the MVA a complete picture. Patton's address at the Farmers Union meeting here several weeks ago left the uninformed in his audience with the opinion that it must be MVA or nothing; that to oppose MVA was to oppose the whole development program. He didn't say it in so many exact words, but willfully or otherwise, that is the impression he gave his audience on that occasion; and reliable information from other sources indicates that "MVA or nothing" is the theme on which MVA advocates are building their effort to gain recruits. This, of course, is not right, and the South Dakota Farmers Union will not be doing itself any credit if in its zeal for the MVA it attempts to convince its members and other citizens that the only route to proper development of the river and the valley through which it flows is by creating a counterpart of the TVA. That organization or any other will not be giving the whole development program a fair hearing if it tells only of the apparent successes of the TVA and fails to reveal its many shortcomings and unadaptability to the Missouri Rivery Valley situation.

That the TVA has not only failed to accomplish what its supporters claim for it, but would in even lesser degree meet the fourfold expectations of the larger Missouri Valley project, is the opinion of many careful students of the TVA. Those opinions should be weighed against those of the MVA backers.

The Gazette believes that South Dakota should go along with the Pick-Sloan plan and shall, on occasion, give additional reason for that belief.

In the meantime, we suggest that advocates of the Pick-Sloan plan, already in operation as far as preliminary effort is concerned, and those supporting the MVA, handle with care one of the biggest golden eggs that has been dropped into South Dakota's nest since statehood, lest it be scrambled in the rough handling given it by both groups.

Survey of Pacific Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

SURVEY OF PACIFIC AREAS

(Report to the chairmen of the Naval Affairs Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee)

Four members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Mr. BONNER of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Mr. PATTERSON of California, and Mr. FARRINGTON of the Territory of Hawaii, have recently accompanied the subcommittee on Post-War Use of Pacific Bases appointed by the Chairman of the House of Representatives' Committee on Naval Affairs on a comprehensive inspection of United States naval bases in the Pacific. The primary purpose of this

survey was to determine which of the Pacific islands occupied by our armed forces should be retained by the United States after the war as naval bases. A complete report concerning this inspection, and recommendations as to the future disposition of these islands, has been made by the aforementioned subcommittee of the Comittee on Naval Affairs. With that report and its conclusions, the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee participating in this survey are in complete agreement and accord; we concur in its recommendations. The report here made is intended only as a supplement to that report and deals only with those aspects of the merchant marine, the fisheries, and the United States Coast Guard which are normally within the jurisdiction of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

This report is divided into two parts: Part I deals with the potential importance of these island bases to the American merchant marine and the American fishing industry, while part II deals with the present activities of the United States Coast Guard in the Pacific.

PART I

In determining which islands should be retained as naval and military bases, strategic consideration must be the controlling factor. By reason of their location, available sheltered anchorage, weather conditions, land area, and other factors, some of these Pacific islands have a greater actual potential protection value to the United States than do others. While some may have greater economic possibilities that consideration must be secondary; our first consideration must be to insure that the United States is adequately protected from future attack through the Pacific. So far as is necessary to accomplish that purpose, bases must be retained in all areas of that ocean irrespective of cost, as such protection is a comparatively inexpensive form of national insurance. But while strategic factors must control the selection of these bases, their economic possibilities should not be neglected. Substantial sums of money will be required for their construction and upkeep. The survey made by the participating members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has indicated that they may also provide a substantial commercial income which, in part at least, will compensate for their cost.

So far, the economic possibilities of many of these Pacific islands have not been exploited except by the Japanese. Prior to the war, American interest in the Pacific was limited. Our commercial relations with these islands consisted only in the work of a few trading vessels. The islands under Japanese mandate, consisting of most of those north of the equator, were subject to a policy of strict exclusion of Americans and Europeans, enforced by the Japanese to prevent discovery of the fortifications being erected by them contrary to the terms of their mandate under the Treaty of Versailles.

Since our occupation of these islands, the requirements of warfare in the Pacific have precluded any thorough investigation of their commercial possibilities. The survey by the participating members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was hindered by the fact that the Japanese still hold many of these islands. Recently representatives of the Foreign Economic Administration have begun limited surveys of the economic resources and potentialities of some of these areas. As soon as war requirements and conditions will permit, thorough inspections of the economic possibilities of these areas, and perhaps Government assistance in their development, appears to be both advisable and necessary. The members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who join in this report suggest that such surveys be undertaken as soon as possible.

From their inspection, study, and conversations both with Army and Navy officers and with natives, these members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee are of the opinion that the commercial possibilities of these island bases are sufficient to warrant the prediction that they can be made to pay in large part the cost of their maintenance for naval and military purposes, providing they are subject to an administration that is alert to their economic possibilities and willing to adopt policies that will permit their commercial development.

The commercial importance of these island areas is:

(a) as stepping stones in trans-Pacific sea and air commerce

(b) as tremendous sources of fish and other marine products

(c) as sources of tropical products, such as copra, fruits, and medicinal plants

(d) as sources of minerals

(e) as points of interest to tourists, scientists, educators, and those interested in native life, and

(f) as sources of native handicraft and trade with the natives of these islands.

These factors are discussed below:

(a) Aids to American trans-Pacific trade and commerce

Trade with China and other parts of the Orient, Australia, New Zealand, the Dutch East Indies, and with many islands of the Pacific will unquestionably develop and expand during the postwar era. These areas not only offer many markets for American products, but are substantial producers of raw materials useful to our economy.

Our merchant marine and our commercial firms should be given the opportunity to take over a large porttion of that trade formerly handled by the Japanese and their vessels. The Japanese merchant marine should be limited to only such vessels as may be required to handle trade among the Japanese home islands. All other commerce formerly carried by Japanese ships should now be handled in ships of the United Nations. To handle this job, the number of American vessels operating in the Pacific trade will have to be substantially increased.

Because of the vast distances involved in the Pacific area, these vessels will require harbor facilities where supplies of fuel and foodstuffs can be replenished. Bases strategically located for Navy purposes can well supply this need. In addition, the local products discussed below will enable such vessels to increase their revenue by taking on and discharging cargo at these islands.

It is suggested that as soon as possible the Maritime Commission survey routes to and through the Pacific islands in order to determine which routes are essential to the development of the American merchant marine as provided by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and to determine which of such routes shall be entitled to an operating differential subsidy and the other benefits specified in that statute.

It is in air commerce, however, that these islands assume their greatest importance. From San Francisco to Manila is a distance of over 8,000 miles. From our west coast to Singapore is over 10,000 miles. The distances to other portions of the vast Pacific are proportionately great. Almost all of these distances are over open water. To engage successfully in air commerce across the Pacific and to carry adequate pay loads, landing fields must be sufficiently close to permit refueling, rest for crews and passengers, and as refuges against inclement weather. Increased use of land planes for over water routes, because of their greater efficiency, further stresses the need for these landing spots. As military and naval needs require the maintenance of airfields and flight strips upon such islands, these can be used by American commercial airplanes with a minimum of duplication and a resultant lessening of operating costs. It may be advisable to require such air lines to bear a portion of the cost required for the maintenance of these airfields. But whether the full cost is borne by the Government or shared by airline operators, it is our opinion that our possession of the Pacific islands as bases will be a tremendous aid and impetus to American trans-Pacific commercial air transportation.

(b) Fisheries

Probably the greatest sources of wealth of these Pacific islands are the superabundant supplies of fish found in their vicinity. Areas surrounding these islands and atolls are the feeding grounds of untold millions of fish of all varieties. Tuna, mullet, swordfish, bonito, and shark are but a few of the types of fish which can be taken in these waters in enormous quantities. On one small island, a few sailors fishing for recreation have been able to supply a large garrison of men with many times more fish than can be consumed. As one officer interviewed stated, "All you have to do is drop a hook and pull up a fish. They are so numerous you don't even have to use bait."

Prior to the war, Japanese fishing vessels extensively used these waters. During 1937, the last year for which records are available, Japanese commercial fishermen took from the waters of the Japanese-mandated islands alone over 35,000 metric tons of edible fish having a value of almost 7,000,000 yen (not including the value of shellfish and miscellaneous marine products). In addition to their usual fishing methods, the Japanese were also beginning to use floating canneries on a large scale, which would have further increased their fishing revenues. Today, with the development of refrigeration and quick-freeze methods, and through the use of these floating canneries, the fisheries surrounding these Pacific islands can be used by American fishing vessels to supply great quantities of this necessary and vital food, and to provide a substantial income for many thousands of American fishermen. It appears to the members of this committee that it would be advisable to place a definite limitation upon the number of merchant vessels and fishing craft which the Japanese should be permitted to use after the war. American merchant ships and fishing vessels should be used to replace them.

It is suggested that as soon as military conditions permit, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior conduct a thorough survey of the waters surrounding these Pacific islands in order to inform American fishing men of the opportunities which they offer, and to discover the spawning and living grounds of these fish. It is further suggested that the Congress appropriate whatever funds may be necessary for such a survey, as such expenditure should return substantial future dividends.

(c) Trade in copra, fruits, and other tropical products

Prior to the war, large quantities of copra and some tropical fruits were exported from the Pacific islands. During the prewar years, falling prices lowered the volume of such products, particularly copra, which were exported. Whether these can be profitably produced in the postwar era will depend on world market prices. If they can be profitably exported, they will supply substantial additional cargo for American merchant ships stopping at these islands.

Demands for tropical fruits have been increasing in recent years. With this expanding market, it is possible that additional cargoes of these products may also be attained.

(d) Possible mineral resources

Prior to the war, the Japanese extracted large amounts of phosphate from their Pacific mandates. Mining of aluminum ore, particularly at Babelthaup in the Palau group, had also been begun by the Japanese who evidently had found rich deposits. New Caledonia, a French possession, is one of the world's largest producers of nickel and a veritable treasure house of other mineral resources. So far, no exploration for mineral deposits has been conducted by American interests. It would appear, however, that on the islands taken from the Japanese additional mineral deposits may well be found. In any event, large cargoes of phosphate and bauxite will be available for American ships.

(e) Tourist trade

The distance of the various Pacific islands from large centers of population has in part been negatived by the increased speed of recent transportation improvements, so that their development as tourist resorts may be possible. While many of these islands are not the tropical paradises of fiction and motion picture, they offer in many cases unexcelled beaches, superlative deep-sea fishing, and an opportunity to see authentic native life. Although many are not subject to independent development as tourist resorts, their use as stopping places for planes and ships carrying passengers to the Orient, Australia, and other points in the Pacific is necessary, and in that manner they should attract substantial numbers of these persons as visitors. Reciprocally, the attractions of these islands should tend to increase the number of persons to use our ships and airplanes as vacationers.

(f) Native trade

Handicraft work by natives of these islands, particularly woven articles, is extremely fine and is readily salable. On one small atoll, the naval officer in charge of governing the natives has already developed a trade in these articles of over $15,000 a month. Natives of these islands require cloth, tools, and some foods, which must be imported by them. Some additional cargo should therefore result for American merchant ships from these sources.

If these naval bases are so incorporated into the United States as to have the advantage of favorable tariff conditions, trade with these islands and the carrying of our cargoes to them by our merchant ships would probably be further increased.

During its tour, the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee visited the Territory of Hawaii, Midway, the Marshall Islands (Kwajalein, Eniwetok and Marjuro), the Marianas Islands (Saipan and Guam), Iwo Jima, the Philippine Islands, Okinawa, the Palau Islands (Pelilieu), the Admiralty Islands (Manus and Los Negros), the Solomon Islands, the New Hebrides, New Caledonia, the Fiji Islands, American Samoa, and Palmyra. As New Caledonia is a French possession, the Fiji, Solomon, and Admiralty Islands British possessions, and the New Hebrides under a condominium (British and French), no discussion is here given as to their potentialities. But the commercial and fishing possibilities of each of the other islands was looked into as closely as conditions there existing, particularly the proximity of the Japanese on neighboring islands and the limitations of time allowed for this survey, would permit. The following is a brief summary of our conclusions concerning the possible future economic development of each island or island group as it affects American operators of merchant vessels and fishing craft.

Territory of Hawaii

Being the gateway to the western Pacific, the Hawaiian Islands are of great strategic importance. The development of air transportation has enhanced their value beyond that envisioned when the United States accepted sovereignty over these islands in 1898 as requested by the citizens and residents of the then Republic of Hawaii. In 1900 Congress made the Hawaiian Islands a Territory, an integral part of the United States. In consequence of their natural resources and favorable climate, the abilities of those living in these islands, and the generous measure of self-government granted these people by Congress, these islands have advanced beyond those in other parts of the Pacific. They constitute an economic, political, and military asset of enormous value.

In recent years, trade between the Territory of Hawaii and the mainland has grown to such proportions that a report concerning it is beyond the scope of this paper. It is our opinion, however, that trade between the continental United States and these islands will continue to expand in postwar years. Particularly should this be true of the tourist trade as the attractions of these islands become more widely known. With this increase in freight and passenger traffic, both by water and by air, a great number of American ships and aircraft will be required. As Hawaii is a Territory of the United States, this trade between these islands and the American mainland should continue to be limited to vessels operating under the American flag.

While in Hawaii members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee discussed the future of the fishing industry in Hawaiian waters with local authorities, visited the cannery facilities in the islands, inspected fish ponds used to raise mullet, and made an air survey of the Hawaiian fishing grounds. It is our opinion that there is the basis here for the development of a highly valued fishing industry, both to supply the local market and to provide an additional source of export revenue. At the present time fishing vessels are unable to supply even the local demand. But that is a result of the lack of sufficient vessels rather than from any deficiency in the number of available fish. At such time as a greater number of vessels are released by the Navy for use for fishing, and as soon as security restrictions are relaxed, an ample supply of fish could be caught both for local needs and for export. Increasing the supply of fish for local consumption would, moreover, reduce the volume of wartime shipping space presently required for food shipments to these islands.

The number of fishing vessels presently operating in Hawaiian waters has been substantially limited by the Navy's continuing to hold such vessels for its use and by security regulations which impede present operations by fishermen. As the war fronts have now moved many thousands of miles away from Hawaii, these security regulations should be reexamined by naval authorities to determine whether they can be further relaxed. Moreover, it is suggested that, as the unprecedented building program of the Navy has now produced thousands of small vessels particularly suited for purposes intended, that the fishing vessels now held by the Navy be promptly returned to their owners for use in the fishing trade.

One cannery is now in operation in Oahu. It is believed that this type of activity can be expanded with profit as soon as a greater number of fishing vessels can be used. Raising of fish in fish ponds has also been developed and promises a supply in addition to that caught by usual fishing methods. Operators of fishing craft should find operations in Hawaiian waters highly productive.

The committee found among officials of the Territorial government, members of the staff of the University of Hawaii, and private citizens, an intelligent and enthusiastic interest in exploiting the resources of the Pacific islands and especially the resources in fish life.

The participating members of the Committee suggest that a study be made regarding the establishment in Hawaii of an experimental station for exploring the fish resources of the Pacific. In view of the willingness of the Territory to assume part of the financial responsibility for this activity and its aggressive interest in this field, the committee thinks this is probably the logical point at which to begin this work.

Midway

Midway Island is ideally located as a landing spot for commercial aircraft, being approximately 1,200 miles to the west of Hawaii. As the northernmost of our Pacific islands, it is on the most direct route to the northern Pacific areas. Prior to the war, this island was used by Pan-American Airways as a stopover and refuelling point. A small hotel was constructed by that company for its passengers and company personnel. Postwar use of this island for such purposes will most likely be continued. It is believed that the retention of this island, and maintenance of its air strips, is essential to the efficiency of American airline operations.

Dean Albion of Princeton has recently predicted the future development of Midway as a tourist resort. Members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, however, find it difficult to concur in this opinion. Although while swimming is excellent and sport fishing is unexcelled, the unappealing terrain and distance from population centers would appear to mitigate against this possibility. The attractions of the island might be availed of, however, in connection with its use as a stopover for commercial aircraft.

No industrial or commercial development of this island seems probable, as its area is small, the soil is poor, and its only natural occupants are hundreds of thousands of birds. But its fisheries appear to be unexcelled. All types of fish—tuna, bonita, shark, and many others—are found in abundance. Prior to the war, Japanese fishermen and floating canneries made great use of these waters. Surrounded by reefs and shoals, which make good fishing grounds, great quantities of fish have been and can be taken. Because of the comparatively cold waters surrounding this island, a fine quality fish is obtained.

Myriads of fish can be seen just by looking into the clear water surrounding this island. Hundreds of terns, albatross, and other birds based on Midway rely upon fish as the sole item of their diet. The abundance of these birds attests to the huge capacity of these fishing grounds. The Supply Officer of the Naval base informed the committee that sailors fishing for recreation, and without any specialized equipment, had caught the second and third largest tuna ever recorded.

Marshall Islands (Kwajalein, Eniwetok, and Majuro)

As the other islands in this group were still held by the Japanese, our inspection of the Marshall Islands was limited to Kwajalein, Eniwetok, and Majuro. By far the largest industry in these islands is the production of copra, and an average of 5,000 tons of this product was annually exported to Japan. The possibility of future exports of copra will depend upon its world price, which in recent years has dropped to below the cost-of-production level. If price conditions warrant, this cargo could be exported in American bottoms.

Fishing is the second industry of these islands, and Japan developed commercial fisheries in this area since 1916. Tuna, turtle, mackerel, bonito, perch, and other products were exported from these islands by the Japanese, with dried bonito being the most important fishery product. It should be noted, however, that Japanese fishing activities in the waters surrounding these islands were substantially less than that in other island areas, and the survey made by the committee indicates that the fish in these waters are in

lesser volume than those found in other island groups.

Marianas Islands (Guam, Saipan, and Tinian)

Guam, Saipan, and Tinian are the three islands of the Marianas group visited by the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It was found that the principal export commodities of these islands were sugar and its related products of alcohol and molasses, which constituted over 50 percent of the islands' export. However, during 1938, almost 50,000 metric tons of phosphate were taken from these islands by the Japanese, while additional large quantities of limestone were also extracted. These should provide cargoes for American merchant ships in the postwar period.

In recent years, the Japanese developed a considerable commercial fishing industry in the Marianas. In 1937, bonito to the value of over 380,000 yen was caught by the Japanese, with 785 Japanese fishermen being engaged in this work. While certain difficulties are placed in the way of the fishermen by the presence of certain varieties of poisonous fish and other marine life, this development by the Japanese indicates that these waters offer substantial potentialities for commercial fishing.

Iwo Jima

Iwo Jima is a small island largely composed of lava ash. The only commercial possibility of this island would appear to be the sulfur which can be found in large quantities, but which apparently was not commercially developed in the past by the Japanese. No information could be furnished from American officers now on that island as to its possibilities as a fishing center. Lack of good anchorage even for small boats would appear to preclude such use of this island. However, the Izus, Bonins, and Volcano Islands have provided substantial amounts of fish for the Japanese market in the past. In 1936, 825 Japanese fishing vessels used these waters, while the following year between 1,500 and 1,600 fishing craft were used. At such time as these islands come under American control, their use by American fishermen will probably be profitable.

Philippine Islands

Trade with the Philippine Islands reached substantial proportions prior to the war, and large cargoes were carried by American merchant vessels. Postwar trade with the Philippines will depend, however, upon the tariff policies invoked at such time as the Philippine Islands are given their independence. Because of the assistance furnished by the natives of these islands in the fight against Japan, it is recommended that tariff concessions be made to their products. In return and in the absence of any Philippine merchant marine, it is suggested that products offered such tarif" preferences should be required to be carried in American vessels.

Fish are plentiful in Philippine waters, and fish traps are to be seen in almost every inlet. Sport fishing is particularly good. Any commercial fish developments will probably be conducted in the future by Filipinos, however, so that no further report as to the possibility of development of the Philippine fisheries is here made.

Okinawa

While the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee visited the island of Okinawa, existing military operations precluded any extensive economic survey. Accordingly, no report is submitted concerning the commercial possibilities of this newly conquered island.

Palmyra

Like Midway, Palmyra is a low, coral atoll with little vegetation and no economic potentialities. Fishing in the surrounding waters, however, is good. Because of its proximity to Hawaii and its comparative proximity to the mainland, these fisheries may be profitably used by American fishing vessels. A more extensive survey, however, will first be required.

Caroline Islands (Palau group)

Because of occupation by the Japanese, the only islands in the Carolines visited by the committee were those in the Palau group. Prior to the war substantial exports of phosphates were taken from the Palaus by the Japanese, and prior to that time by the Germans. Unmined deposits of phosphate in the western Carolines have been estimated as between two and one-half to three and one-half million tons, located mainly on Angaur Island. Recently alumina ore has been exploited by the Japanese and large quantities of bauxite of high aluminum content is said to exist on Babelthaup Island. Japanese reports stated that in the year 1939 they expected to mine a hundred thousand tons of the ore on that island, and anticipated a yield of 25,000 tons of aluminum.

Commercial fishing constituted the leading industry in the western Carolines and was widely exploited by the Japanese. This fishing is centered in the Palau group, with over 14,000 metric tons of commercial fish being taken from that area in 1937. Almost 2,000 Japanese engaged in commercial fishing in the Palau group and used modern power fishing equipment. Commercial use of this island by American fishermen should be feasible after the cessation of military operations.

PART II. COAST GUARD ACTIVITIES IN THE PACIFIC

In addition to its jurisdiction over the merchant marine and the fisheries, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries also deals with legislation concerning the United States Coast Guard. Accordingly, during its inspection of the Pacific areas the members of that committee investigated Coast Guard activities in Pacific waters, seeing and hearing evidence of the fine work which that organization, operating as part of the Navy during wartime, has been doing. All with whom members of the committee spoke were high in their praise of the work now being done by the Coast Guard in this theater.

Approximately one-third of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard are now engaged in the Pacific, and this percentage is being steadily increased. In the war against Japan the Coast Guard has been manning Army and Navy ships as well as its own. Today over 40,000 Coast Guardsmen are manning a fleet of over 500 vessels operating in Pacific waters, ranging in size from huge 23,000-ton troop transports down to tiny 83-foot patrol cutters.

Among the ships being manned by the Coast Guard are the APA's (assault troop transports), which have spearheaded the invasion of many Pacific islands, and the AKA's (attack cargo transports) which bring to the invasion beaches the vehicles and armor required by the first waves of troops. Many LST's (landing ship tank) are also handled by the Coast Guard and carry in the assault troops. In almost every invasion Coast Guard landing craft have been among the first to hit the beaches. The heroism and expert seamanship exhibited by members of the Coast Guard in these invasions have been highly praised by Navy, Army, and Marine Corps officers in this theater.

In addition to the attack craft, the Coast Guard also has been manning ordinary troop transports (AP's) carrying thousands of troops from one base to another and the large cargo transports (AK) which bring the vital material of war to the forward areas. Huge oil and gasoline tankers (IX's), which are necessary to bring this lifeblood of the modern war machine to the various fronts, are also Coast Guard manned, while smaller tankers handled by Coast Guardsmen ply between the more advanced bases and supply the forward airfields. Other Coast Guard manned vessels include the LCI's (landing craft infantry), now used for general utility work, patrol frigates (PF's), destroyer escorts (DE's), and 83-foot cutters which maintain constant vigil against Japanese subs and planes. Hundreds of small Army ships used to carry supply and freight between the advanced islands are also manned by Coast Guard personnel. One further class of Coast Guard vessel doing outstanding work in advanced areas are the buoy tenders (AGL), whose vital work is to mark and buoy the sea roads to Japan, often under difficult and dangerous conditions.

Other little publicized jobs of the Coast Guard in the Pacific areas, which have been performed with the fine tradition of that service, have also come to our attention. First is the servicing of aids to navigation. At almost all of these advanced bases formations of coral and the general topography create serious hazards to vessels operating in these waters. To insure their safety the Coast Guard has placed buoys, lights, and other markers in the channels and danger areas, and continues to service these aids despite difficult conditions and enemy action.

In addition to these visual aids to navigation, coast guardsmen have installed, usually just behind the first wave of invading troops, long-range aids to navigation. Not only are these used to assist vessels in navigating these waters, but they have been of inestimable assistance to air navigation over the broad Pacific. Pilots required to fly over that broad expanse of water are now able to fix their position immediately and without recourse to celestial navigation, and they have been high in their praise of the value of this service.

Because of the highly confidential nature of this work, no further details can be given concerning it. But from the cold Aleutians down to the south Pacific, these small Coast Guard outposts have been doing great service toward advancing the war effort against the Japanese. The success of these aids to air and sea navigation during wartime indicates their future importance in furthering the postwar development of safe commercial aviation and merchant shipping in the Pacific waters. We suggest that this activity be continued by the Coast Guard during the postwar period to the extent necessary to insure the safest possible operation of our merchant marine and commercial air transportation. Moreover, we further suggest that the functions now being performed by the Coast Guard relating to general matters of safety at sea continue to be performed by that organization after the war, and that the wartime assignment of these functions to the Coast Guard by the President be made permanent.

At all principal Pacific ports the Coast Guard has also established merchant marine hearing units, whose function is to inspect, supervise, and maintain a high standard of safety aboard vessels of the American merchant marine. Each vessel entering a major Pacific port is now boarded by Coast Guard officers, the vessel is examined, all complaints are heard, and all necessary action is taken promptly, efficaciously, and without delaying the vessel's sailing. This function, too, has been so successful as to warrant the suggestion that it be continued by the Coast Guard in all major ports after the war.

Among the other miscellaneous Coast Guard activities of which the committee learned are the operation of air-sea rescue planes in some parts of the Pacific. Knowing of the outstanding work which the Coast Guard has accomplished in performing rescues at sea, and the fine record which it has made in recent months in perfecting air-sea rescue techniques, the participating members of the committee were disappointed to

learn of the comparatively small scale on which Coast Guard officers, men, and airplanes were being used for this purpose in the Pacific. As the need for Coast Guard air-sea rescue personnel off the east and west coasts of the United States has diminished with the defeat of the enemy's submarine warfare, it is our suggestion that the men engaged in this work be transferred to the forward Pacific areas where their training and experience can be utilized for the purpose of effecting rescues of our airmen forced down at sea.

In the Philippines, the Territory of Hawaii, and the Marianas, Coast Guardsmen are now manning fire boats used to protect our vital shipping and water-front military and naval installations. Even Coast Guard dogs have played a role, being used as an aid in protecting our supply lines in forward areas. Because of the large quantities of explosives required by modern warfare, it has become necessary to load vast quantities aboard supply vessels. Among the more dangerous jobs of the war are those which supervise the loading of these explosives, which function is largely handled by specially trained Coast Guard personnel. All of these tasks, well performed, have been of substantial assistance to the other armed services.

The members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who participated in this survey were impressed not only by the important contributions made by these Coast Guard efforts, but by the extremely cordial relationships which have been developed with the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. Examples of this close cooperation were seen in the posts held by Coast Guard officers. A Coast Guard commander is the key officer for air-sea rescue work in the Marianas, while other Coast Guard officers occupy important assignments in the Far Eastern Air Force. The cargo operations officer for the tremendously enlarged naval base of Guam is a commander in the Coast Guard. Navy officers and enlisted men are found aboard Coast Guard manned vessels, and vice versa. Cooperation of the services in the Pacific has shown a complete dovetailing of effort, a forgetfulness of self, and the complete cooperation of all branches of the armed forces in their joint effort to defeat the Japanese as quickly as is humanly possible.

HERBERT C. BONNER.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
ELLIS E. PATTERSON.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a tribute recently paid our late leader, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by our former colleague Hon. Usher L. Burdick, of North Dakota, one of the ablest and most courageous Members of this body that I have served with:

Any attempt on the part of anyone to draw a word picture of the greatness of our late President would fail, unless that person had the gift of superb imagination and was endowed with uncanny prophecy. It is too early to attempt any appraisement. At least my contribution can only sketch meager outlines of his greatness. No one has even seen the pyramids who was too close to them. I served in the Congress for 10 years during the Roosevelt administration, and knew the President personally, both before and during the administration.

I knew Mr. Roosevelt long before he had any idea of being President and at a time when he was vigorous and strong, and before he was stricken with paralysis. He was then a perfect type of our best athletes, and anyone would say then that if he put his mind to it there was no place which he could not reach. After his body was shattered and almost destroyed he made the phenomenal progress that in 1932 made him the only man in America who could have led the people of this country from chaos to a condition of peace and happiness. Few people realize that in the closing days of the preceding administration that the people of the United States in very large numbers had completely lost faith in our form of government.

Roosevelt made a vigorous campaign and met the people in every part of the country. He frankly admitted that the Government had failed to do its part in the depression and promised a new deal. His smile inspired confidence and his words carried conviction. He was swept into office when the election was held and no President of this Republic had a bigger job ahead of him than that facing the new President. Business everywhere was paralyzed, 12,000,000 people were tramping the streets for a job, and yet these millions, jobless as they were, believed in Roosevelt. The President kept faith with these people and when private industry failed to provide a job the New Deal made jobs, and the millions began to eat again. If Franklin D. Roosevelt had made no further contribution than that of meeting the unemployment problem and solving it, he did enough to give him a place in our history as one of our great Presidents. He restored that which was lost—confidence in the Government. He made every man understand that this Government was an instrumentality organized to protect the people and that every man, no matter what his position, was a member of that Government.

From the restoration of this confidence the President did not rest, but proposed a program to Congress which would prevent such a catastrophe in the future. He stayed on the job until this program was enacted. Today is there a man in the United States who would want to repeal the guarantee of bank deposits? Today is there a man in the United States who would want the Securities Commission abolished and have billion dollars in questionable bonds turned loose annually on the unsuspecting public?

Upon entering office the new President found thousands of farmers out in the highway headed for towns and cities. Their lands had been foreclosed and their homes destroyed. Crops were being raised the same as ever but the prices received made it impossible for the farmer to pay his debts and maintain his family. Remedial legislation was enacted at the request of the President and prices of the farmers' crops rose. As soon as the farmers received a reasonable price for their crops, business began to function from factory back to the farm. Is there a man in the United States who wants to return to the days of 26-cent wheat and 3-cent cattle?

I give this picture to point out that the President saw the situation as it was and went about immediately to correct it. He had vision, courage, and endurance.

During all this period of recovery, the great Midwest was wallowing in a Dust Bowl. Rains failed and the crops, including grass, disappeared. Fierce windstorms filled the air with dirt and sand and in areas where 50 bushels of wheat to the acre have since been raised, there was nothing left except drifts of sand and dirt.

The farmers had two dreaded enemies to contend with: The depression and the Dust Bowl. They had to have help. At one time 60 percent of the farmers in the Dust Bowl were on relief. Roosevelt met that situation and organized a relief program. The farmers were carried through and today the Dust Bowl has more rich farmers than can be found anywhere else in the United States. Roosevelt saw to it that they were fed. Now the Federal money used for that purpose has been largely repaid. Roosevelt not only met the challenge of the ravages of the Dust Bowl but put in motion legislation and regulations to hereafter prevent, to a large degree, the recurrence of another Dust Bowl. I cite this to show the new President had vision, courage, and endurance.

Just as we were emerging from all of the domestic scourges that had beset the country, the war clouds in Asia and Europe could be seen rolling up on the horizon. We were at peace and did not believe in war. We were totally unprepared for even a primary self-defense. We had no Army, no Navy, and no Air Force. We had no guns, no ammunition, and above all else, we were not defense minded. We believed, or a great many people believed that we were a favored country and being situated where we were with the Pacific on one side, the Atlantic on the other, would protect us if we did not meddle with the fire of war. Roosevelt, however, had vision, courage, and endurance. He repeatedly asked Congress to provide a system of draft, for appropriations to build battleships, airplanes, and munition plants. He insisted on our being prepared to defend ourselves. Congress did not share the same vision, and weeks, months, and years rolled past before Congress woke up and began to act. Had it not been for the treachery of Japan, it is doubtful if we would have realized our position. If we had not prepared, then the battle of Berlin and Okinawa would have been fought on the borderline of Texas, and our coast line on the Pacific. The President had the vision, the courage, and the endurance.

The action of the President in preparing this country for defense and in condemning the aggressor nations, brought hope to millions throughout the world. Those in bondage, those starving by inches, endured their misery without flinching, because they knew their deliverer lived. Roosevelt became a world figure and the symbol of this great Republic. We wanted no land from any country, we wanted no tribute—we merely wanted the people everywhere to live in peace and happiness.

Like Moses of old, Roosevelt was not permitted to see the Promised Land. Had the President been permitted to live just a short period more he would have witnessed the downfall of the aggressors and the liberation of enslaved people. He would have witnessed the execution of a world program to keep the peace of the world.

Like Lincoln, he passed from us before his task was completed, but the force of his mind and character lives on. His aims and hopes are daily being realized by the people of the world. His hopes and his prayers now belong to the people of the earth. No one can say that Franklin Delano Roosevelt is dead. When the scroll of time is unfolded a thousand years from now, no name in all the temporal hostory of the world will command more respect and more reverance and more hope than the name of the 32d President of the United States.

Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Needs a Foreign-Trade Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, with the end of hostilities and the coming of

reconversion to peacetime industry and commerce, the possibilities of free-trade zones, frequently referred to as free ports, once again can be considered by the great port cities of the United States.

In southern California the cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach share harbor facilities that provide a gateway for the constant flow of raw and processed materials from South and Central America. This harbor is situated more than 300 miles closer to the source of these materials than any other major shipping port.

The foreign-trade zone is not a new project in world trade though it is a recent introduction into the United States. The first free port under definite administration as such was established in Europe in 1888. The European nations, ever mindful of opportunities to advance foreign trade, increased the number of such zones until prior to the war some 43 free ports were functioning there.

Proposals to establish free ports were made in the United States before the First World War, but no foreign-trade zone appeared in this country until 1937. At that time New York City opened up the first foreign-trade zone in America on Staten Island under authorization of an act of Congress passed in 1934.

The development of that port has been tremendous. In 1937 only 11,000 tons of cargo were received in the zone, but by 1938 this tonnage had more than trebled and in 1941 137,000 tons of cargo were received. The value of this cargo soared from $1,170,000 in 1937 to $89,000,000 in 1941. Foreign merchandise handled there for reexport, amounting to only 742 tons and valued at $60,000 in 1937, reached a peak of 24,200 tons and $10,000,000 value in 1941. And customs payments in revenue to the United States Treasury have risen from $30,000 in 1937 to $2,868,000 in 1941.

The benefits to business and industry are unlimited. The small importer can draw upon a stored reserve as his sales permit thus controlling payments of duties by making them over a longer period of time. The manufacturer of an article such as watchcases can bring them into the foreign-trade zone and there fit Swiss watch movements into them and ship the completed product on to other foreign ports without passing the Swiss parts through customs. Savings to the American importer on live storage commodities where shrinkage or other losses occur are also assured by foreign-trade zones through checking which eliminates payment of duty on evaporation or leakage.

The Los Angeles-Long Beach area can, through establishment of a free port, offer a special inducement to the countries of Central and South America to trade through the foreign-trade zone. Materials that enter this country under quota can flow freely into the zone to be stored until quota allowances are available. Through such stock-piling facilities the South American producer is aided in marketing his goods and the American manufacturer is given access to raw materials.

The foreign trade of the United States would now be greatly assisted by the creation of additional foreign-trade zones. Los Angeles is ready to go ahead with plans for the establishment of a free port in the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor area, and the Los Angeles City Council and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors have passed resolutions approving such a step. Presentation of a formal application to the proper authorities will be made in the near future.

Benjamin Harrison Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I present for printing in the RECORD a statement I made September 13, 1945, to the House Committee on the Library, of which Hon. DONALD L. O'TOOLE is chairman, on H. R. 4006, a bill I have introduced to establish a permanent memorial to President Benjamin Harrison. The statement follows:

Of all of the Presidents of the United States, the twenty-third, Benjamin Harrison, has perhaps been the least recognized by those visual remembrances which are usually identified as tokens of the country's gratitude for its eminent departed sons. I do not recollect ever having seen a bust or even a painting of President Harrison in the Capital of the Nation, although the Capital City abounds with paintings and statuary commemorating those with lesser claims to distinction. In the Capitol Building where Mr. Harrison served his State and country with great credit as a United States Senator, there is no bust or painting to honor him, and his name appears on no tablet or commemorative scroll. To many of our countrymen, especially to those of us in Indiana who had the honor of a personal acquaintanceship with the twenty-third President and who knew his sterling worth, it has seemed there was something a bit tragic in the failure of Congress to recognize this distinguished man in some appropriate way.

In my long career as a newspaper writer it has been my fortune to know, rather intimately I think, all of the Presidents of the United States from Harrison to Truman. Harrison lived in a peaceful era and for that reason some of the Presidents I have known, Wilson and Roosevelt, for instance, will stand out more in the solemn history of the world, because they were Presidents in eras of world strife, but I believe that if Harrison had been put to the crucible as they were, he would have given an equally good accounting of himself, for I never knew a man who had more sheer strength of character than General Harrison. He was a Christian statesman, a constructive builder of sound foundations of peace and prosperity.

Feeling as I did about President Harrison, it was with genuine pleasure and enthusiasm that I responded to a call from a notable group of his friends by introducing on March 8, 1939, a resolution to empower the President to appoint a Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission to formulate plans to construct a permanent memorial to the memory of Benjamin Harrison. The resolution became a law on August 9, 1939, and President Roosevelt appointed as chairman of the Commission Stephen C. Noland, editor of the Indianapolis News, a very able and public-spirited citizen. The other members named by the President were J. Russell Townsend, Jr., an Indianapolis businessman; Dr. Ross F. Lockridge, of Indiana University; Thomas McCullough, of Anderson, Ind.; and Mrs. William H. Schlosser, of Franklin, Ind., a leader among Indiana women. The Commission, universally recognized as one of outstanding ability, entered upon its duties with zest, held many meetings, and considered with extreme care all of the many proposals that were submitted. It had the benefit of expert advisers and especially helpful among these counselors was Rudolph H. Grabow, in charge of the regional office of the United States Forest Service at Bedford, Ind.

On February 1, 1941, the Commission submitted its report to Congress. Its recommendations were wholly novel and yet were most fitting in the opinion of all who knew Mr. Harrison, his deepest interests, his humanitarian ideals of service, and the motivating purposes of his life. The Commission knew that a memorial of cold and lifeless marble, however imposing, would be repellent to one of General Harrison's warm sympathies for humanity, so they decided to create a living memorial based on his interest in forestry which had induced him during his administration as President to create in 1890 the forest reserves, resulting in the establishment of the United States Forest Service. I quote from the report:

"While the Commission's study of the principal events of Benjamin Harrison's administration revealed several measures of noteworthy importance to the country's development, including the Sherman antitrust law, tariff acts, and the Pan-American Conference, out of which grew the Pan American Union, it was decided that the most far reaching of all his achievements was the creation of forest reserves and the impetus that he gave to the movement for conservation of the country's national resources. His communication to Congress on the subject dated January 20, 1890, sustaining the recommendation of a committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science is regarded by the Commission as the real beginning of American forest conservation. It resulted in the law of March 3, 1891, authorizing the President to set aside forest reserves by proclamation. The United States Forest Service and the national forests grew out of Harrison's interest in public forestry."

One of the greatest menaces facing our Nation today is the depletion of once fertile areas by erosion. Millions of acres that once blossomed as the rose have become sterile by this wasteful process. The only way this menace can be combated is by a carefully planned campaign of reforestation. The conception of the Commission as to the best plan to commemorate the memory of Harrison is to revitalize the spirit that made him the leader of forestry of his day, so that Harrison, though dead, will still live in the good works that will make him a perpetual benefactor of mankind. That, they believe, is the kind of a memorial he would like most of all. If the creation of this memorial starts the country on an effective plan of soil conservation it will be worth many times what it will cost.

I introduced on yesterday the bill (H. R. 4006) that embodies the findings of the Commission. Its major feature is the creation of the Benjamin Harrison national forest, embracing some 700,000 acres of land in southern Indiana, much of which is badly eroded but still capable of being reclaimed. As a contributory feature of this forest enterprise it is proposed to establish in Indianapolis the Benjamin Harrison Forest Institute and to install there the most competent personnel that can be gathered together and the most modern equipment for experimentation in combating the nation's erosion problem through scientific methods of reforestation. A third and subordinate feature of the plan is to be the purchase of the Benjamin Harrison home at 1230 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, and its upkeep as

a national shrine. Like thousands of others I join in congratulating the Benjamin Harrison Memorial Commission on the vision and good sense it has displayed by the form of memorial it has selected to honor the memory of a great man who deserved well of his country. I hope that Congress, representing the Nation that General Harrison served so well, will place its stamp of approval on this plan.

International Cooperation

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked two questions of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. These questions were, first, Does he know or does anyone know any Member of this House who is an internationalist, and, second, Does he know or does anyone know any Member of this House who does not want the men to get out of the Army and the Navy faster than their present program?

There are some Members of this House that have the view of the isolationists and the America Firsters to a great extent, and any man who believes in international cooperation is labeled as an internationalist. Wilson was not a warrior. He was criticized very severely for saying that there is such a thing as being too proud to fight, such a thing as being so right that it is not necessary to fight. But when Germany asked that she be able to inspect every ship that left our shores, and that we put a yellow stripe around their middle, war was on.

Bureaucrats Still Fight for Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress the efforts of a dying bureaucratic agency to perpetuate themselves on the people, and who continue to try to place on business autocratic and unreasonable controls to try to justify their continuance and existence.

I have received many complaints from my constituents in regard to this latest major program to control the costs of residential construction, and ask that the following letter from one of my constituents on the subject be printed in full as follows:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *September 13, 1945.*
Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

There is a great deal more being engineered at Washington in this OPA-NHA program than appears on the surface.

In spite of lip service repeated over and over, private industry in home building is undergoing socialization and not being given a chance to solve its own problems and make jobs for war workers and veterans.

We call on Congress to save us from bureaucracy.

We ask that discrimination against the home-building industry be stopped.

We ask for and demand a four-point program as follows:

1. L-41 has fully served its purpose as a war measure. It has never been very effective, is today being flagrantly violated and without industry's support, which it no longer has, it is out of the picture. So remove L-41 and all its limitations on home construction the same as limitations have been removed on industrial construction, automobiles, washers, refrigerators, etc.

2. Give the green light to this industry as has been done to those above mentioned by placing the responsibility of rationing lumber and building materials on the mills, the manufacturers, the jobbers, and the retail outlets where it rightfully belongs.

3. Keep reasonable price ceilings on building materials as they now are until such time as supply and demand equalize, then remove them completely.

4. Give private industry a chance to fulfill its obligations in home building before replacing it with NHA and its socialization reforms.

This program the industry advocates and will support.

The present proposal as outlined by the OPA entitled "A Major Program—Controlling the Costs of Residential Construction," is fantastic and unworkable and is simply a huge network of bureaucratic controls to surround and suffocate private industry. It could not possibly work and will neither have the favor nor the support of the industry if attempted.

Please contact President Truman, John W. Snyder, William E. Davis, Hugh Potter, and his entire advisory committee and so inform them as coming from your constituents.

KRAUSE & MANAGAN, INC.,
GILBERT E. DEROUEN, *Secretary.*

Reemployment of Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, there is a universal demand in this House for the earliest possible return to their homes of the young men and women of our armed forces. It is right that we seek to prevent any undue delays. But I wish to remind my colleagues that our efforts in behalf of prompt demobilization are only the beginning of our task.

Our concern over the veteran's early return would be the sheerest kind of hypocrisy unless we also do everything within our constitutional power to provide the fullest opportunities for gainful employment—not only for the veteran, but for every other man and woman needing work and seeking work.

As an overseas veteran of the last war, I have given considerable thought to the problem of employment for veterans returning from this war. And I am sure they clearly appreciate this one basic fact: There can be no mass employment of veterans if the people as a whole suffer again from mass unemployment.

To guard against this danger, I am supporting the full employment bill of 1945. For only with Federal assurance of full employment will the whole of the Nation prosper. And only then will the veteran prosper.

The veteran knows that a planless government never could have won the war; he will expect, and has every right to expect and demand, that his Government plan with equal care to win a prosperous peace.

The GI bill of rights is good—as far as it goes. But it is not enough to say that the veteran can have his old job back. He has a right to a chance for a better job—and he will exercise that right. Nor is it enough to provide him with the means for further education to equip him for advancement—unless, at the same time, we assure continuing opportunities for that advancement.

The veteran wants no job hand-out at the expense of a displaced war worker—perhaps his brother or his father. He wants an equal chance—and he knows there will not be any real chance for him unless there is a chance for all.

As a nation, we failed to meet the challenge of peace after World War I. We dare not risk blundering again.

Locate World Capital in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House membership to an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star on July 28, 1945, urging the location of the world capital in Missouri's Jackson County, the home county of President Truman.

Senator THOMAS of Utah has already expressed himself publicly in favor of the location of the world capital in Jackson County, centrally located in the United States and far removed from the stresses of power politics and international intrigue.

The editorial reads as follows:

JACKSON COUNTY

The suggestion that Jackson County, Mo., be made the seat of the headquarters of the United Nations comes with especial force from a United States Senator, and a United States Senator not from Missouri, but from Utah. Senator THOMAS, who made the proposal in the Senate, yesterday, is a man of broad education, a doctor of philosophy of the University of California, a former professor of

political science, a member of various international organizations, and an author of books on public questions. Mr. THOMAS has been in the Senate for 12 years, and is a well-known and influential Member of that body.

His suggestion followed a report in Washington that three of the Big Five nations on the security council, Russia, France, and China, favored putting the headquarters in the United States. Senator THOMAS pointed out that if this was done, Jackson County in the very center of the country, the home county of President Truman, would be an appropriate site.

The location of the headquarters of the League of Nations at Geneva, Switzerland, seemed ideal at the end of the First World War. But the developments of warfare have changed conditions. Geneva is under the guns of modern weapons and while we all hope that hereafter wars will be stopped before they get started, nevertheless, until the peace organization is thoroughly tested over the years there will be danger in any European site for the headquarters.

From this standpoint, the United States offers the ideal location. It is remote from the stresses of Europe—as remote, that is, as any country can be in this rapidly shrinking world. It is safe from any fierce attack that might be secretly prepared. It provides an atmosphere of peace and good will.

These advantages are concentrated in Jackson County, in the center of the continent. It is far from the peculiar atmosphere of Washington. It is in the valley of democracy. It contains a city with the cultural advantages of urban life, yet a city that has not grown so big as to be remote from the soil. At the same time, Kansas City, a great rail center, is readily accessible by air from any quarter of the world.

With Senator THOMAS' introduction of Jackson County it may be assumed the preparatory commission of the United Nations to meet in London next month will give serious consideration to the propsal. Needless to say, it will find western hospitality in Independence and in what President Truman calls its suburb, Kansas City.

General MacArthur Speaks on Demobilization Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the termination of hostilities on August 14 we have had a lot of official statements and information promulgated by military experts and high ranking Army and Navy officers on the subject of demobilization. They have attempted to give the American people the impression that this process had to be a long and slow one, but that they were doing the best they could to hurry it along. I do not need to relate in detail now the various cases that have come up, and the various incidents which have convinced almost everybody that something was wrong with our present demobilization plan.

We have legislation pending to extend the present draft law, and Congress is now debating a bill having to do with voluntary enlistments. Now comes a rather unusual statement from Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the effect that he expects to demobilize the armed forces in the Pacific theater of war within 6 months. At the end of that time he desires no draftees to be in uniform in his theater of operations, contending that 200,000 Regular Army troops will be adequate to do the job.

In this connection it is hard to reconcile statements and figures submitted from the European theater of war. In the light of this it might be wise for Congress and military authorities to reconsider the entire problem of demobilization. It may be discovered that conditions have changed sufficiently, as indicated by General MacArthur's statement as to the Far East, so that all draftees, in all theaters of operations, could be returned to civilian life within a matter of months. In that case, it would seem an error at this time to be drafting additional men from the civilian ranks.

Let us not forget that married men with children and young men whose school work and educational programs were interrupted and discontinued when they were called into the armed forces ought to be returned to civilian life as soon as possible if our domestic economy is to function efficiently.

We must also realize that there is a problem remaining for the military authorities and under no circumstances must we do anything here in Congress which will jeopardize the victories which our armies and navies have won. We do not want to interfere with those military and naval leaders who are responsible for successfully working out the problems which have followed the victories not only in Europe but in the Pacific.

While Congress stands ready to cooperate to the fullest extent with the heads of the armed forces, these men must also be willing to cooperate with the problems of Congress and the people on the domestic front. Apparently General MacArthur realizes the responsibility of his leadership. He very appropriately says in his statement, in part:

> Within 6 months the occupational force—unless unseen factors arise—will probably number not more than 200,000 men.
>
> This size probably is within the framework of our projected Regular Establishment and will permit the complete demobilization of our civilian Pacific forces which fought so long and so nobly through to victory.

Disposal of Pipe Lines

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the Surplus Property Act Congress provided that no pipe lines and facilities used for transporting oil which cost the Government in excess of $5,000,000 should be disposed of by the Government unless and until a report concerning such facilities had been submitted to Congress for its examination. The only exception to this is to allow the Surplus Property Board to lease any such property for a term of not more than 5 years. And yet we read that the RFC has already decided that the Little Big Inch and the Big Inch pipe lines which cost, respectively, $67,000,000 and $78,000,000 are at a very early date going to be drained and sealed and that bids upon them will be asked almost immediately.

There are some questions about this matter which I think need very much to be asked by Congress.

In the first place, has consideration been given to the fact that under the Surplus Property Act these pipe lines cannot be disposed of except by 5-year lease until the report has been made to Congress?

In the second place, can the action of draining and sealing these lines be justified in view of the fact that it will require in all probability approximately $14,000,000 of new investment for anyone purchasing the lines to refill them before such an agency would be in a position to realize anything on its investment?

In the third place, what about the public's interest in these lines, the desirability that the Cole Act be amended so as to make it possible for these great pipe lines to become true common carriers for the benefit of the small and independent producers on the one hand and the consumers on the other?

Considerably more than a year ago, on May 8 to be exact, I stated in the House that consideration was going on in the Petroleum Industry War Council of ways and means of abandoning the Big Inch. It is, of course, well known that control of oil pipe lines has been the very key to the power of the major companies over the independents through the years. I cannot help asking, therefore, why there should be haste to drain and seal the Big Inch and try to get rid of it as quickly as possible?

Does the RFC have any idea whether as a matter of fact any bids at all will be made upon it? Do they have any idea who might purchase it? Certain it is no one except one of the very biggest oil companies in the whole country, or a combination of such major companies, could conceivably buy it.

If the line is to be abandoned, what steps will be taken to protect the people's investment thereafter? I know some of the arguments that will be advanced, such as the possibility of a loss due to the mixture of different kinds of crude in the Big Inch and the contamination of different kinds of products by one another in the Little Big Inch. But this is no different from what the situation has been all through the war period, except that better grades of gasoline are now coming on the market.

We are told also that the cost of pipeline transportation will be greater than the cost of transportation by some of the new type superfast tankers built by the Government at Government expense during the war. But while this might be true as to transportation from one end of these pipe lines to the other extreme end, what about their use for transporting petroleum products to and from interior points in the country? A

good many at least of these new-type tankers have been sold to large oil companies by the War Shipping Administration and old-type tankers have been taken in trade for them. In at least some cases the allowance for these old-type tankers is almost as large as the amount paid to the Government for these old tankers by those same oil companies 20 years ago.

At the very least, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this haste in abandoning these pipe lines and putting them up for sale is a questionable policy, particularly when we know that this is precisely the kind of action which those interests which most bitterly oppose any kind of true common carrier for petroleum products would like to see taken. I repeat that I have been told by practically every person who has studied the oil industry that the key to the monopolistic power of the major companies lies in their control of pipe lines. Therefore the one thing they fear most is the existence of true common carrier pipe lines in this country.

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, nearly every family in the United States is deeply interested in some boy in the armed services and eager for his prompt discharge and return home to resume a normal American life. Our ideas on the priority of discharge are governed very largely by the status of the boys who are nearest and dearest to us. That is human and understandable.

No discharge program could possibly be devised that would meet the desires and the opinions of the families of young men who wish to resume their education, or who have jobs awaiting them, or whose specialized services are no longer needed, or who have wives and children to support, or who have been languishing in hospitals or prison camps, or who have had 3 or 4 years of service, or who have endured the hardships and suffering of real combat.

The rate at which men can be discharged is controlled by the needs of the forces of occupation and the transportation facilities available for bringing our boys home. We must all be patient.

I probably have a selfish viewpoint, but I think it would be grossly unfair to compel the boys who have given several years of their young lives for service in the war, to police the enemy countries they have helped to conquer. Let a younger group, or the young men who have been deferred for one reason or another and have lived in comfort and security during the war, take their places.

The Selective Service Act should be modified and extended, and the men necessary to replace those who have made the real sacrifices of the war should be trained for occupational duty until demobilization is complete and voluntary enlistment provides adequate forces.

I think that hereafter every boy should be permitted to finish his fourth year of high school before induction and should not be required to serve more than 2 years. Parents of the younger boys are opposed to inducting them at all but I am thinking of the 18-year-olds who were inducted and served during the perils and misery of war. They have a better claim for further education than their young brothers. Those who happened to be within a certain age group between 1941 and 1945 ought not to be required to carry the whole burden of the war and its aftermath.

The impression is widespread that there are thousands of officers holding high temporary rank who can keep their postions—and the salaries which go with them—only if we maintain an unnecessarily large Army and Navy, and that they are exerting considerable influence in maintaining greater forces than are reasonably required. There is some justification for this belief. I know of one theater board in Europe which has a membership of 30 general officers.

I appreciate the magnitude of the task our military leaders have performed and which still lies before them. But now that victory has been won they must respect public opinion as reflected by the representatives of the people in Congress. We are many men of many minds but we are agreed that the Army and Navy should be demobilized with the utmost speed, that their numbers should be reduced to bare requirements, that recruitment in the Regular Army and Navy should be stimulated by making the service more attractive, that a more liberal system of giving furloughs should be inaugurated so that surplus officers and men can await discharge at home rather than at an army camp or on an idle ship, and that every effort should be made to reduce unnecessary travel and paper work in connection with discharging men from the services. Many people have the impression that discharges are obtained through political influence. I personally know of no such cases. Let there be none.

These are things the people of the country demand, as any Member of Congress can testify.

As I said a moment ago we are not in agreement on the point system because of our differing individual interests. I do not believe, however, that many would oppose giving preferential treatment to American prisoners of war. These men returning from enemy prison camps have suffered intolerable indignities, hardships, and brutalities. Give them the highest priority for discharge. In this connection, I append a resolution unanimously adopted by the board of supervisors of my home county:

At a meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County, N. Y., held at their official chambers in the city of Syracuse, N. Y., on the 4th day of September 1945, a quorum being present, the following was adopted:

"Resolution 239

"Resolution of discharge of American war prisoners

"Whereas large numbers of American prisoners of war have been and are being released from various enemy prison camps, and further numbers will be released in the near future from Japanese prison camps and hospitals; and

"Whereas in many instances, such released war prisoners have required and will require hospital and medical care as a result of treatment received during the period of such confinement; and

"Whereas the health, physical well-being, and welfare of these men is of primary concern to their families, relatives, friends, and to the whole American people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County do hereby unanimously recommend to the President, the Congress of the United States, the War and Navy Departments, and to such other Federal departments, bureaus, or agencies as may have jurisdiction in the matter of the discharge of American servicemen and servicewomen, that all American prisoners of war heretofore released and to be released hereafter be given an honorable discharge from their respective branches of service as soon as conveniently practicable without the requirement of further military service; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the board be and he hereby is directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, to Onondaga County's Representative in the Congress and to the War and Navy Departments."

I hereby certify that the foregoing was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County, N. Y., at the time and place and in the manner above specified. Witness my hand and the seal of said board this 5th day of September 1945.

JULIAN W. EDGCOMB,
[SEAL] *Clerk, Board of Supervisors.*
ONONDAGA COUNTY, N. Y.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the question that is uppermost in the minds of the young men in the armed forces, scattered all over the world, is how soon are they going to be able to get back home and take up life where they left off when they shouldered arms in the defense of their country. That last boy taken from the farm wants to get back and help his widowed mother or aged father harvest present year's crop. Fathers that have given years of their lives to war want to get back to the child they have never seen. Boys taken from high schools and colleges want to get back and finish their education in order that they may have some show in the competitive contests that lie ahead of them. Fathers and mothers want their sons with them. They feel that they have done their part. Wives and children want and need their husbands and fathers and it is our responsibility to help speed up the job of giving these defenders of the country back to their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, this question of demobilization was well and intelligently discussed in a letter that a young soldier

friend wrote to a prominent citizen of my county. It is typical of hundreds of letters that come to me. The letter is as follows:

SOISSONS, FRANCE, *August 26, 1945.*

MR. FRED HAND,
Pelham, Ga.

DEAR MR. FRED: This letter I trust, won't find itself in the same spot as most letters of its type—gathering dust in some forgotten pigeonhole in some desk. But, knowing you as I feel I do, I firmly believe it will gain your utmost consideration.

No doubt you have been assailed with many questions concerning the demobilization of the armed forces, and I know this topic must be a favorite in all conversational circles. There are too many people back home who have sons, husbands, and other loved ones in the service, so that this question must be uppermost in everyone's mind.

To millions of people back home, the cessation of hostilities all over the world means one thing: "The Boys" are coming home. Their thoughts are good, and they are absolutely correct in their assumption. But, what happens? What is happening right now, and what will continue to happen for the next 2 years unless enough pressure is brought to bear upon the Army? I can tell you, and my statements are based upon hard facts and personal experience.

A word or two of explanation: The Army is set up according to a prescribed table of organization, just as any regiment, battalion, company, or section within the Army. By this table of organization, it takes a certain number of officers, from general down to second lieutenant, to control a certain number of enlisted men and perform a given mission, which, by the way, is all well and good, but only so long as that given mission is in existence.

The Army through its speedy and tremendous growth, has, almost overnight, produced hundreds of thousands of officers from field grade through general officers. Aside from the small minority of Regular Army officers included in this huge figure, the remainder are merely civilians in uniform who attained their rank during the emergency when there was a job to do. How many of these "uniformed civilian" officers ever attained a financial position in civilian life to equal that of their Army status? Very, very, few is the only answer. I exclude Regular Army officers from this category because they were professional soldiers long before the war began, and will, with very few exceptions, remain in the Regular Army until they are retired. I also exclude company grade officers because they are, in most cases, victims of circumstance right along with the enlisted men.

Now, according to the Army's way of thinking, what will happen if within 1 year from now the Army is reduced by six or seven million men? Their answer is this: Most of the officers mentioned above will be "out of a job," so to speak, because if they don't have the men they can't have a table of organization. Therefore, these hundreds of thousands of officers will have to be declared unessential—will revert to civilian life, and a status of living that can't begin to compare with that of their military status. They will lose not only many, many dollars (the difference between their civilian and military earnings) but also their prestige. This again, according to the Army, can't be allowed to happen. This train of thought is not mine alone. It has been suggested by many people, some of them generals of the Army, according to items contained in some of the world's outstanding newspapers.

Why, may I ask, should several million men be forced to suffer by being retained in the Army just so these officers can continue drawing fabulous salaries and retain their so-called prestige? Let me state here that I'm not criticizing this group of officers but am merely trying to point out the reason for the Army adopting such a policy.

The intent of the foregoing has been to show that the Army is hoodwinking the public (through the channels of press and radio) by saying that a huge army is still needed, although the mission and purpose has been accomplished. The only way to force the Army to release six or seven million men within 1 year is through public opinion. If the public can be shown (and this can only be done through the soldier with the aid of his representatives) how it is being "soft scaped" by the Army, the great surge of protest will mean only one thing: That we will all get home much sooner, and that is all that counts now.

The few hundred thousand men the Army plans to release within the next year are solely for the purpose of partially pacifying you people back home. When you look around and see Smith and Jones are out of the Army, you are apt to say, "Well, the boys will all be home soon," and tend to let the matter of speedy demobilization slip from your mind. That is exactly what I and millions of others like me sincerely trust you won't do. Because if this happens, it means that all of us sweating out the army of occupation in the ETO and the CBI will within 1 year become "the forgotten ones." And I can assure you there isn't one single ounce of pleasure to be derived from being stuck in a foreign land thousands of miles from home and the ones we love.

There is also the matter of the Army claiming that certain men or classifications of men are essential to the functioning of the Army. I heartily disagree with this policy and any GI will confirm it. There isn't one single person in this Army who is absolutely essential. If there should happen to be one, there can always be replacements from those who don't have as much as 2 years' service. And if this fails, what is wrong with training a replacement from among those newly drafted?

I propose the following, and feel that it is the only just plan for the speedy demobilization of the Army: Pass legislation that all men who have served 2 years or more be released immediately, regardless of where that service has been performed. This would leave an Army sufficient in size to perform all occupational duties as well as duties in the zone of the interior. Did I hear someone say "no" to that? Well, how about that 50,000 men who are being drafted every month? Give them 3 to 6 months' training in the States and send them to the ETO and the CBI to relieve those of us who have been unfortunate enough to get stuck here. A period of 1 year overseas would be sufficient, but if any men desired to remain longer, so much the better. After 1 year overseas let these men be sent back home for discharge, thereby making them serve only 2 years or less.

As to the point system as a basis for discharge: It is one farce seldom ever equaled in any function so large as the Army. It is claimed this system is based on the "vote and desire" of the majority of soldiers questioned. As long as I have been in the Army, I have yet to meet the first soldier who has ever had anyone question him along that line or has ever heard of any poll of opinion being made concerning said system. I have 2½ years' service behind me, and the thought of sweating out enough time to accumulate enough points for discharge is a hell of a thing to think about.

What do you think of a "2 years and out" campaign? It is all up to you and the rest of the people back home to see that something is done to speed our return. Don't let the Army baffle you with double talk, as they are trying to do. We men overseas want to come home, and fast.

It is hoped that this letter will tend to start the ball rolling and keep it rolling fast and furious. As I said before, public opinion is the only weapon we soldiers have, and it is up to the people to voice that opinion.

With kindest regards, I remain,
Yours sincerely,

——— ———.

United States Should Offer Abandoned Military Plants to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Norman (Okla.) Transcript of September 2, 1945:

UNITED STATES SHOULD OFFER ABANDONED MILITARY PLANTS TO THE STATES

Public officials and citizens generally of Oklahoma might well start a movement to induce Congress to make available to the various states such military installations within their borders as the Army and Navy plan to completely abandon and which the States can use to good advantage.

Practically every State has some of these installations, and most of the States need more State institutions of one kind or another than they now have.

If the Government attempts to dispose of the installations, chances are they will be sold to speculators or large salvage concerns at 10 to 15 cents on the dollar. That means a loss of 85 to 90 percent for taxpayers generally.

It would be far better for citizens as Federal taxpayers to lose 100 percent and as State taxpayers get back 85 to 90 percent of some the plants than to get back only 10 to 15 percent of all of them.

Oklahoma has a considerable number of these installations, including the two Navy bases here and one each near Clinton and Purcell, Army flying fields at Oklahoma City, Enid, Altus, Frederick, Woodward, and Ardmore, and Camp Gruber near Muskogee. To what extent any of these will be continued is not known now, but a majority of them probably will be completely abandoned sooner or later.

The State of Oklahoma could use possibly a half dozen of these plants to good advantage. The university could use the naval air station for its department of aeronautical engineering, as a training center for ROTC and NROTC flying cadets, and as an airport open to the public. The university also could use part of the naval air technical training center to good advantage.

The State needs another tubercular hospital, a hospital for old harmless inmates of hospitals for the insane, a vocational school for mentally deficient children, and possibly other institutions. One of these military installations possibly could be used to advantage as the nucleus for the new Federal veterans' hospital for psychiatric cases, which seems assured for western Oklahoma. The flying fields at Clinton and Altus might be considered for that.

Most of these installations are compact institutions with complete facilities for housing, feeding, recreation, and health. Their personnel capacities range from a few hundred to 15,000 or more, and their use could be adjusted to their size.

Members of the Oklahoma State Board of Public Affairs and representatives of the University Hospital, Central State Hospital, and the university have already inspected the Naval Air Gunners School near Purcell and have found it could easily be converted into

one of several types of badly needed State institutions.

If Congress should make such plants available to the States, and the States could not use all of the facilities, those left over might well be offered to the adjacent cities at nominal prices for use as recreational and park facilities.

Norman, for example, badly needs a community swimming pool, a recreation building, and a large public auditorium. Both the naval air station and NATTC have such facilities. It is unthinkable that the Government should sell parts of those plants to salvage concerns and that Norman should then vote big bond issues to buy land and construct similar facilities. The same situation undoubtedly exists in many other communities.

The only objections that can be raised against State or municipal use of any of these facilities is that the buildings are of frame construction and some of them are located considerable distances from cities or large towns. Certain types of State institutions could operate satisfactorily away from towns, since the bases all have every modern convenience.

As to the frame construction, all of the plants have efficient fire-fighting equipment, and automatic sprinkler systems could easily be installed in all buildings. That would lessen fire hazards, and if bedridden patients were kept on ground floors, the fire hazards would not be great. Also the buildings could gradually be converted into semi-fireproof structures at far less expense than the cost of building new institutions that are needed.

If Oklahoma should start such a movement and give wide publicity to it in Washington and throughout the country, national sentiment probably would develop against the sale of all military installations to salvage concerns and in favor of making them available to State and municipal use where needed.

The Government is going to give away a large part of its equity in these plants to someone if it sells them, and it would be far better to give it all to the States and other units of government. Offhand it appears that taxpayers would lose far less under that plan.

Postwar Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the postwar period there are many problems of a very serious nature that confronts the people of this Nation. One of the very serious problems that now confronts the people in the Nation is the demobilization of the Army and the reduction of the Navy so the boys may be returned to their homes and take their places with their wives and families, so many of them may proceed with their education, so the doctors may proceed with their profession and the lawyers may assume their places in society in their home communities, and so that the farm boys may proceed with the production of the food which is now so essential, and that those who are engaged in business may again take up that avocation in civil life. All these are highly important matters. Our own economy in our own Nation is of the greatest importance. It appears that many of the brass hats of the Army and the gold braid of the Navy want to keep the Army and Navy at its peak so their promotions, easily made during this war, may be retained and that their rank and grade may not be reduced to the prewar status. In my humble opinion, that is one of the very selfish motives underlying the bungling and the very slow process of discharging the men from both the Army and the Navy. It does not appear that those regular officers give any consideration to the future lives of our boys—nor do they appear to consider that our boys must proceed in the arts and trades of civil life before it is too late—and they apparently fail to give any sober consideration to the problems of farmers, businessmen, or industry in our own country—they have, from all indications, the one thought of keeping the Army and Navy as large as possible in order to assure their promotion status and to retain their present rank and grade. That attitude must be entirely changed, in the interest of our own country and the people, and if the War and Navy Departments fail to stop their bungling and their dilatory methods in granting releases and discharges, then it is the duty of the Congress to take a part in this solution of this highly important problem.

Mr. Speaker, at the moment the inductions into the Army are almost equal to the discharges granted to the boys serving therein. While I was at home, I witnessed in many counties very large groups of boys leaving for the induction centers, where they were inducted into the Army. Those leaving for the service, although the war was over, equaled in number those who were being discharged and were returning home. With that policy continued, we will not reduce our Army materially—but we will be maintaining a huge Army, after the war is over, without any need or necessity therefor. For my part—and I am confident I express the general view of the Members in the House—we want the Army and the Navy to proceed with the demobilization of this Army and Navy as rapidly as possible. We want the boys to be returned to their homes, and to their jobs, as quickly as possible. Any delays in this demobilization will rest entirely with the War Department and the Navy Department, and with the administration now in power, and the people will so determine. While the essential troops retained, for occupational duty, can easily be secured by and through the consent or voluntary basis from among those now in the service, and from those who may desire to remain in the various branches of the service and make that service a profession, but the men and boys, of every walk in life, who desire to come home should be granted that privilege immediately, and they should be discharged and sent to their homes. This is one of the first and most important problems before the people of this Nation—and they demand that something be done at once to relieve this situation. With their view, I am in full accord.

Mr. Speaker, another problem of great importance is the maintenance of the war powers in the hands of the Chief Executive, after the war is over. The vast number of agencies, boards, and bureaus which were created very largely by Executive order and decree, with a large personnel of employees, are practically all continued—even though the war is over, and there is very little, if any, necessity for their continuance. If there is any duty yet to be performed by any of these wartime agencies, that duty can be transferred to some permanent agency of government, and such agency can discharge any duty which might yet rest upon such war agencies. We have a heavy burden before us, and with the stupenduous debt, with the daily accumulation of interest, and with our duty to be discharged to the disabled veterans of this war, and of all wars, every unnecessary agency and the pay roll attending the same, should be abolished immediately. We must get down to the business of paying, now—and there should be no delay in abolishing every agency, which is unnecessary, and which costs money.

There is another very important item, Mr. Speaker, and the people are aroused because there is a continued limitation, since the end of this war, respecting the allocation of building materials throughout the country. These building restrictions should all be removed at once. Regulation L-41, which is now maintained, constitutes a barrier against those who desire to proceed with the building of homes from obtaining the necessary materials for that purpose. While the War Production Board apears to desire that these wartime restrictions be removed, yet the Office of Price Administration, and the National Housing Agency, both agencies of our Government, want to make some slight revision of those regulations and to continue the regulations, and the resulting control over the people. The people are demanding that these restrictive regulations be abolished at once. It is my considered judgment that these regulations, which entirely restrict and control the allocation of building materials and thereby prevent the people from proceeding with the business of building and establishing homes, should be entirely removed. People want jobs, and if the building of homes cannot be accomplished because of these restrictive regulations which are now entirely unnecessary, those jobs cannot be made available. It raises a very serious question in the minds of the people, when any agency of government desires to prevent, without justification therefor, the ordinary progress of its people in building and establishing their homes. It is my hope that Mr. Snyder, Director of Reconversion, will remove these restrictive regulations at once and give the people a chance to go forward again.

On this question, a very enlightening editorial appeared quite recently in the Washington News, which I ask under the unanimous-consent rule that it be printed as a part of my remarks, which editorial is as follows:

LET HOME BUILDERS BUILD

Wartime restrictions were imposed on home building to save materials and labor. Some folks in Washington seem determined to con-

tinue them, long after the war, as an economic weapon.

Home building is one of the basic hopes for high postwar employment. And certainly the country needs millions of new houses.

If continuing the restrictions discourages new building, inflates the prices of homes already built, and creates a black market in housing, we can't see what good purpose—economic or otherwise—will be served. And that's just what men in the home-building industry say the restrictions are now doing, and will do increasingly, unless lifted.

Reports from over the country lead us to believe the industry men are correct.

Because builders who want to put up many houses are allowed by Government to put up only a few, costs are kept high. Mass construction economies are lost.

Housing shortages in many cities invite dangerously inflated prices for present homes—especially for those occupied by owners who can give quick possession.

The $8,000 Government-fixed maximum price on new homes causes homes worth only $6,000 or $7,000 to be bought for $8,000, the demand for housing being so great. And, in many cases, side-payment deals get above-ceiling prices.

The War Production Board, which imposed and enforced the wartime restrictions, wants to lift them promptly. The Office of Price Administration and the National Housing Agency want to revise and continue them.

If they're still needed to conserve materials and labor, then why are restraints being removed from industrial and commercial building? If public housing advocates doubt that private industry can or will build enough homes at fair prices unless bossed by Washington bureaus, it's their privilege to doubt. But those whose business is home building, and whose chance to prosper at it depends on reaching high volume at reasonable prices, ought to have a fair chance to show what they can do before the Government takes the job over.

The decision—to retain or remove wartime home-building restrictions—is up to Reconversion Director Snyder. We think it should be to remove, quickly.

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN LEGION,
FEY-EN-HEYE POST, NO. 46,
Antlers, Okla., September 14, 1945.

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There are already definite signs that have been noted by recently discharged veterans and members of this post, that the veteran is getting the old run-around as regards the surplus property at the disposal of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The appalling thing about the situation is the fact that this condition is not only prevalent locally, but seems to be on a national scale. Since the percentage of veterans who have returned home and are seeking to establish themselves in various enterprises are decidedly small when compared to the total strength of our armed forces, it is indeed a sad barometer to face the millions yet to be discharged.

It is generally agreed among the veterans who have talked to me, that the district offices of the SWPC is doing a commendable job in its handling of applications for surplus property and directing the veteran to the place of inspection. The trouble seems to be that the only merchandise they have to list, generally speaking, is old and obsolete types that the veteran cannot use or does not want. The merchandise that he does want may be seen at the same warehouse or in the same motor pool, but for some reason it has not been cataloged or is not for sale for various other reasons. Neither is he allowed to earmark or have frozen for him the desirable merchandise until such time that it is for sale, the result, of course, is that he never sees that particular item again. Just where it goes nobody seems to know.

The property not cataloged or ready for sale, according to one officer in charge that I talked to at Camp Howzie, cannot be frozen in order to give every veteran an even chance in getting the choice items. They go to so much detail to see that every veteran gets an even break that in the final analysis he gets nothing.

If the above condition exists generally, and we have every reason to believe that it does, the SWPC is evidently not getting a true and accurate listing of surplus property with the result that the veteran does not have an actual priority. In the general case he has only access to property that is being offered for sale every day to the regular civilian trade.

You may have noticed a news item in your paper a few days ago concerning the sale of a quantity of jeeps to the Mexican Government for $300 each. At the same time a local veteran was given a purchase order to buy a jeep at a Government warehouse for $1,099. We are mindful that there was possibly some difference in the condition of the jeeps. At the same time we are also mindful there is quite a difference in $300 and $1,099.

I am confident that each veteran and his family in your district would be very grateful to you and to every other member of the Congress to uncover and remedy the malfunction of any agency pertaining to his rights as a veteran, his rehabilitation, and his reestablishment into the normal channels of business and society.

Yours very truly,

EARL B. ISBELL,
Commander.

Tax Relief Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has decided to frame a relief tax bill which, on account of time limitations, must be limited in scope and on account of revenue needs, must be limited in its effect. To enable the Treasury Department to print and distribute over 50,000,000 income report blanks action on any new tax bill should be completed in the next 2 months. To protect the confidence of investors in Government securities revenue receipts for fiscal 1947 should be kept within speaking distance of disbursements. The most fatal mistake that could be made with respect to fiscal affairs is to assume that because we have survived deficit spending for the past 15 years the ultimate balancing of the Budget has ceased to become a major concern.

The deficit for the current fiscal year is now estimated at $30,000,000,000. In estimating the measure of relief that can be safely given to individuals and corporations for the next fiscal year, assumptions as to the national income for 1946, the revenue to be derived from existing rates on such an income and the size of the Budget for fiscal 1947 must necessarily be made since all three lie beyond the realm of positive knowledge.

In offering tentative suggestions for tax relief, I am making the following assumptions:

First. That the produced national income in 1946 will not fall below $130,000,000,000.

Second. That revenue from existing rates in that year would not be less than $28,000,000,000.

Third. That the budget for fiscal 1947 will be limited to essential expenses and will not exceed $22,000,000,000. On the basis of those assumptions, I suggest the elimination of the 3 percent normal tax on personal incomes and the elimination of the excess profits tax on corporations.

The elimination of the 3 percent normal tax on personal incomes is desirable for the following reasons:

First. It was imposed on all net income over $500 as a necessary war measure to distribute the unavoidable burden of war taxes and without regard to the fundamental peactime policy of ability to pay.

Second. Its elimination would help to sustain purchasing power in 1946 during a period of falling national income.

Third. Its elimination would provide relief to all on the same percentage basis but the measure of actual relief would be greatest where the need is greatest as illustrated by the following example: A married person with two dependents with a net income of $2,500 will get relief in the sum of $52.50 on a total tax liability of $102.50, whereas if his income were $25,000 his relief would be $750 on a total tax liability of $9,395. If relief be given by means of a 20-percent credit against total tax liability, which would cost the Treasury more than the elimination of the normal tax, the relief in the first instance would be only $20.50, whereas in the second it would be $1,879.

Fourth. Elimination of this tax would further simplify returns made on Form 1040, leaving only the exemption in multiples of $500 on the long form for computation of the full tax. On the short form the tax would be shown in the printed table. It would likewise eliminate much clerical work incident to the collection of the withholding tax—a welcome relief from some of the free paper work business has been doing for the Government.

Fifth. Any plan to give relief on personal income taxes by increasing personal exemptions now based on $500 and multiples thereof would destroy the foundation upon which the simplicity of Form 1040 now rests, unless the same ratio in some new multple be substituted. To raised the $500 credit for each dependent above that figure would involve much revenue loss.

The elimination of the excess-profits tax on corporations, adjusted for equality of treatment between calendar and fiscal

years, is desirable for the following reasons:

First. It was imposed as a war tax to control the profits on war contracts and was never intended to be a permanent part of our taxing system.

Second. The law is unscientific and inequalities are inevitable.

Third. If continued it will stifle postwar expansion, curtail opportunities for private employment, and prevent the establishment of new enterprises that could successfully compete with established enterprises enjoying a favorable capital structure or favorable earnings in the base period.

It is generally agreed that the $5 use tax on automobiles will be eliminated, as the revenue loss involved will be relatively small, while the psychological gain from the elimination of a tax that irritates will be large.

A tax relief bill covering the items I have mentioned can be written in three brief paragraphs, action on the House side can be completed within 1 month, and it would give about $2,000,000,000 of relief to individuals and about the same amount to corporations, and in each instance the relief would facilitate reconversion to a peacetime economy.

Demobilization: When?—Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, repeating the question which I asked September 12 in the extension of my remarks, When will the American men and women get out of military service? I desire to emphasize an answer to that question. It will be many, many months before a considerable number will have been discharged unless the Congress moves in right now and passes appropriate legislation to provide for an immediate discharge of millions not now needed in the armed forces.

Does anyone dare deny the truth of that statement? There is sufficient evidence to support it. Point scores have been and are so high that all newspaper reports quoted those responsible for making the point system as saying it will take a year or more to demobilize. Only September 13, according to Washington newspaper reports, Secretary Patterson is said to have stated to a Senate committee that only a little more than 600,000 had been discharged since VJ-day. He is quoted as saying further that 6,000,000 will have been discharged by the Army by July 1, about 1 year, same old story, entirely too slow a rate! More recently we are told in the press that a large number of doctors and some classes of professional men will be discharged—but again, by July 1. Each change made thus far apparently to liberalize the point system has been so small that you couldn't see it with a microscope. Is it not perfectly clear, therefore, that there is no intention on the part of the Army and Navy high commands to demobilize with any reasonable speed?

An item in September 13's Washington Post, quoting again from Secretary Patterson, states that the bottleneck will be broken in the demobilization program by making an additional number of separation centers. This should help some. But in my opinion that is not the bottleneck at all. The bottleneck is the intention and purpose of the Army and Navy authorities to keep as many men in the Army as long as they can. The only way to break that bottleneck is to pass a law for speedy and immediate demobilization. This Congress should act—not next month and not later on—but now.

It was all fitting and proper to support the Army and Navy high commands during the war and let them have their way then. But now in peacetime let their masters, the American people, have their way. The American people want the men and women out that are not needed in the armed forces and that literally constitutes millions. Tens of thousands of letters on the desks of Members of the Senate and the House from fathers, mothers, and soldiers in service show conclusively that the American people do want demobilization now and that they are terribly dissatisfied with present slow procedures.

The only way the American people can have its way is by having its will expressed through legislation made by the American Congress that they elect and that represents them. Shall this Congress by inaction be interpreted by the American people to represent only the Army and Navy high commands? Or will it act so as to be interpreted to represent and do the will of the American people.

Let us demonstrate by action now to the Army and Navy high commands that in the last analysis the American people is their real commander in chief, and must have its wishes complied with and made a reality. A failure to act may cause the people to begin to conclude that we now have peacetime compulsory military service without their approval since the war is over.

Let us speed up and pass legislation now to hasten demobilization to conform to the wish of the large majority of the American people.

Matter of Fair Dealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News of August 27, 1945. I commend the reading of the article to the membership of Congress:

MATTER OF FAIR DEALING

President Truman announces that, though lend-lease will be stopped in accordance with statutory provision, a plan for some form of aid to Great Britain and other countries will be worked out. Just what the terms will be is not definitely stated except that there will be more specific provision for payment or for mutually recognized credit extension. What these terms will be may depend upon a great many things—and it might be added that England could do a great many things to make the terms more favorable.

After all, international relationships must be a matter of give-and-take with each country having many advantages that it is logically in position to give and many that it is logically in a position to take. The people of this country used to think that we could have all the advantages—do all the selling, all the banking, all the shipping, and, in fact, maintain all the cash trade balances in our favor. But we learned differently. The British, who have had much experience in such matters, should profit by their learning.

Take the matter of newsprint paper, for example. The War Production Board has removed restrictions on practically all other classes of paper. But the demand for newsprint still far out-balances the supply. The facts are that the same interests supply 80 percent of the Canadian newsprint sold in the United States and control a good deal of the production on this side of the border. Prices are now about 55 percent above those of 10 or 12 years ago and 20 percent above those prevailing at the beginning of the war. And a suggestion is made that there be another upward adjustment of about 20 percent looking to a permanent peacetime basis. There are evidences that the scarcity of newsprint will prevail until the adjustment is made, though there are other evidences that it could be manufactured profitably at present prices.

Of course, the permanent solution of this problem is the manufacture of a larger supply of newsprint within our own boundaries. It has been demonstrated that we have both the raw materials and the processes for doing so down here in our Southern Pine Belt. But that will take time. In the meantime, some action should be taken to break up the monopoly and cartel system which the Dominion Government connives at, or even participates in. Newsprint is more than the need of a large branch of American industry. It is the raw material for the principal part of the free press that the democratic countries of the world are now struggling to maintain. It ought to be always a commodity of a free flowing commerce.

Raise for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Raleigh Register, Beckley, W. Va., under date of September 13, 1945, entitled "Raise for Congressmen":

RAISE FOR CONGRESSMEN

We doubt that Congress can afford to vote 100 percent increase in Senators and Representatives' salaries without bringing down on itself an avalanche of condemnation.

Yet it appears that $10,000 a year is inadequate remuneration for a Congressman who does the conscientious thing by his constituents. Some Congressmen would be overpaid at $5,000 a year, but their number will

not be decreased by low pay. It will be increased.

President Truman asked the 100 percent increase, lifting salaries for Senators and Representatives from $10,000 to $20,000 annually. He also asked for retirement pensions for Congressmen.

Congress got its fingers burned on this matter before; it is likely to do so again, if it doesn't approach the matter with horse sense. It can't vote to double its pay, while the rest of the country doesn't enjoy the same privilege, without incurring the consequences. The public, we believe, is tolerant of a reasonable raise for its representatives in the Federal legislative body but not to the extent of doubling their salaries.

As for the pension for Congressmen, it still is without a sound leg to stand on. The people retire Senators and Representatives at the polls. Congressmen aren't supposed to make a career of being in Congress; they are allowed to remain there as long as they satisfactorily represent the voters, which may be one term or a dozen. There are no such things as career Senators and career Representatives. They are bankers, lawyers, farmers, businessmen, etc., called on by the people of their State or district to represent them in Washington. It would be just as logical to pension sheriffs, State legislators, governors, mayors, etc.

Statement of Principles by the Republican Majorities in the Sixty-third Missouri General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1945, the Republican majorities in the Missouri State Senate and House of Representatives adopted and made public a statement of principles, putting their peacetime goals in black and white. To my knowledge, this is the only State legislature in the Union to take such action. The progressive Republican Legislature of Missouri points the way to an era of peace, prosperity, and freedom, and clearly marks the signposts.

Unanimous consent having been granted by the House, I extend as part of my remarks the statement to which I refer. It speaks for itself:

There is one vital question facing the people of the United States of America today:

Shall the Federal Government be the servant of the people and jealously guard and preserve the economic freedom of the individual, or,

Shall the Federal Government continue to be all powerful and take away from the people their individual economic freedom and give in return a doubtful security of some sort for which the individuals will be forced to pay?

The answer to this question must be given by individual citizens at the polls in the congressional and legislative elections of 1946, and again in the Presidential election of 1948. It is indeed a crucial hour in the history of our Nation.

It is a time when sincere Americans should carefully examine the principles of the major political parties and determine for themselves those principles that more nearly satisfy their ideas of good government for our Nation.

It is no time for voting for a party label, or voting for a party because your grandfathers or fathers belonged to that party. It is time for serious and constructive thinking. For by your ballots next year and in 1948 you will decide whether or not we will keep the system of government under which we have risen to be the greatest Nation on earth.

Because of this great problem facing the electorate of Missouri, we, the Republican members of the sixty-third general assembly, wish to make this statement of principles to aid the voters in deciding this vital question. We find the Federal Government has encroached to such an extent upon State rights within the past 12 years that Federal and State problems are closely related.

We believe the Federal Government, State government, and all subdivisions thereof should exist as servants of the people, working for their benefit and for the preservation of individual economic freedom.

We reaffirm our belief in the Bill of Rights as written in our Federal and State constitutions, and believe that any attempt to nullify them and their guaranties should be vigorously and immediately stopped.

We believe that all Federal bureaus created to aid in the war effort should be abolished; that powers delegated to the executive department of our Government should be returned to Congress. We firmly believe in government of checks and balances—the executive, legislative, and judicial—each with constitutionally defined powers—and we are opposed to the continued encroachment by the executive on the powers of the legislative branch. We recognize that war emergencies require extreme centralization of authority in executive, but these powers should be divested immediately upon the termination of the war emergency.

We hold that Federal taxes should be reduced immediately, yet we realize that a substantial reduction in taxes at the present time will be difficult. But with the abolition of all useless Federal bureaus and immediate discharging of all unneeded Federal employees—many of whom are merly on the pay roll to influence votes—a great burden could be lifted from the already overburdened taxpayer.

We stand for strict enforcement of the laws of the United States and of the State of Missouri, as enacted by Congress and the legislature. We decry and are firmly opposed to the attempts of the Federal bureaucratic agencies to hold their directives above the laws passed by the legally constituted branches of our Government. We firmly believe that such governmental bureaus that remain should be stripped of their questionable quasi-legislative powers and be forced to live up to the letter to the laws enacted by our Congress.

We believe in the inalienable rights of both capital and labor: The right of capital to its place in our economic system, and the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively for the protection and advancement of its individual members.

We are of the firm opinion that practically all of the differences between capital and labor could be settled amiably through the good old American custom of round-table discussions. We believe that much of the strife between capital and labor has been caused by self-seeking politicians and so-called labor leaders who have used the Hitlerian method to divide and conquer. We oppose any efforts of politicians or anyone else to start class warfare, either economic or physical, in this Nation, which is founded and has prospered on the belief that all men are created free and equal.

We hold that under the principles on which this Nation was founded that all men and women should have an equal opportunity to employment, regardless of race, creed, or color, and that any attempt to differentiate between the citizens of this Nation because of race or creed or color is definitely un-American and has no place in our way of life. We condemn any attempt by so-called liberals to stir up strife between citizens of different colors, creeds, and races for political advantage.

We are in favor of maintaining a large standing army and navy for the preservation of those principles for which we fought the Second World War, and for the maintenance of the peace in the future. We favor maintaining this army and navy on a strictly voluntary basis.

We believe in a strong ROTC system in our schools and colleges and a strong National Guard. We believe that a strong ROTC system is far better than any forced military training. Such a system would keep the youth of our Nation in physical perfection for a number of years and at the same time make them cognizant of the technological advancements in military science and keep them from any danger of having militarism or totalitarianism inculcated in their minds as would be possible under a forced system of military training. We believe the dangers of such a system are too great for any doubtful benefits that may be derived. We are now faced with the task of re-educating the Hitler Youth of Germany, who in their formative years at camps and through forced military training were inoculated with the poisons of totalitarianism; we believe that vicious elements seeking to further the trend of the Federal Government toward national socialism would use a forced military-training system to inculcate their ideas into the malleable minds of the youth who would be forced to submit to such training.

We firmly believe that our men in the armed services should be discharged and returned to their homes in the shortest time possible. We are absolutely against holding large numbers of soldiers, sailors, and marines in the armed services for political or economic purposes.

We believe in a large Army and Navy as a guaranty against aggression, but we believe that it should be made up of volunteers rather than draftees.

One of the greatest crimes, to our way of thinking, that has been insidiously perpetrated upon our people by those who would change our way of Government to a form closely resembling national socialism, is the more or less successful killing of individual initiative by the handing out of subsidies and doles. We believe that the aged, infirm, and physically and metally incapacitated persons should be cared for where necessary. But we strongly condemn the past and present acts of the Federal Government that, which through the giving of subsidies, payments, and leaf-raking jobs, have tended to rob our citizens, especially the young and impressionable youth, of the American initiative and caused them to believe that the Government owes them a living. This trend toward totalitarianism must be stopped. Subsidies, which under the guise of holding the price line, are actually paid by the individual citizen through higher taxes, must be done away with.

We believe in an economy of full production, as against the economy of scarcity. We hold that the present food shortage, as well as other economic ills of this Nation is the direct results of bureaucratic bungling in Washington, caused by attempts on the part of the administration to force upon the United States a paternal form of government alien to the principles of civic and economic liberty.

The theory of destroying commodities or withholding land from production artificially to force prices upward is clearly against all economic laws. Full production and better distribution is the answer to the farm problem.

Not only do we believe that all men are created equal, but we believe that all men

should have an equal chance at gainful occupations to support themselves and their families, to this end; we believe that private enterprise, untrammeled by governmental interference is the only means of securing full employment. Therefore, we advocate the repeal of all Federal laws that seek to dominate and destroy private enterprise. We also advocate the withdrawal of government from all businesses. We believe that government should not engage in business, but should govern—with the consent of the governed.

We believe the natural resources of our Nation should be developed but not squandered. Included in these resources are the soil and protential water power. We strongly advocate a carefully worked out program of flood control.

We advocate the development of the potential water power of our streams. But we are opposed to any over-all authority, set up by the Federal Government, for any socialistic handling of such development and sale of hydroelectric power. We believe that sovereign states should control any development within their borders. We hold that any attempt to take over the rights of the States on the part of the Federal Government is a step further along the road to totalitarianism and socialism. While we urge the development of our water resources with the aid of the Federal Government, the management and control of such developments should be lodged with the various States in which the developments are located.

We believe the State should recognize its responsibility to the serviceman and his family and advocate passage of legislation that will give them help in obtaining full benefits under the Federal GI bill of rights.

Cognizant of the fact that juvenile delinquency is now a major problem and may become greater during this postwar period, we urge the immediate appointment of a commission to study the problem and advise with the general assembly in connection with the revision of a children's code. We deem this of vital necessity in order to safeguard the welfare and happiness of future citizens of Missouri.

We advocate the formulation immediately of a program of needed public works within the State—repairs, enlargements, and betterments of eleemosynary and medical institutions that are State owned. Due to wartime shortages of materials and manpower, much of this work of necessity had to be postponed. If such a building and repair program is instituted at once, it will create jobs, thereby cutting down unemployment during the reconversion period, and will put the State institutions in excellent physical condition.

We believe the State parks and public recreation centers should be properly maintained and supervised to provide wholesome playgrounds for our citizens as well as to attract visitors to our State. We advocate legislation to put into effect a program that will make recompense for the serious neglect the State parks and recreational centers now suffer.

Firmly believing that the commercial lifeblood of a nation in the era ahead will flow through the arteries of the airways, we advocate adequate legislation to encourage the development of the aviation industry in Missouri. Since it is our belief that the aviation industry in the State will be developed through feeder lines, we believe legislation to encourage the establishment of such lines by franchise protection, airport development, and safety regulations should be adopted at this session of the general assembly.

In order that the citizens of the State shall be adequately represented, both in the legislative halls of Missouri and in Congress, we urge a complete redistricting of the State.

Realizing that the taxpayer of the State of Missouri has been terribly burdened with taxes of various kinds, we believe a further reduction of taxes should be made by the sixty-third general assembly. Already we have started our tax-reduction program through bills designed to reduce the State property tax levy by 40 percent. We firmly believe that other tax reductions should be made, and that every effort should be exerted by all State departments to economize and save the taxpayers' money.

If it is necessary during the reconversion period, for the State of Missouri and the Federal Government to become involved in a large program of public works to provide jobs for the unemployed, we believe the sixty-third general assembly should adopt the plan of the board of visitors of the University of Missouri as the basis of such a program of public works. This plan involves the expenditure of $40,000,000 for repairs, betterments, and enlargements on the schools, colleges, and universities of the State, projects which are worth while and of a permanent nature. We stand opposed to all make-believe jobs of leaf-raking and the like which would waste the taxpayers' money under the guise of providing employment.

We urge passage of legislation to set up a State department of public buildings, which would have complete supervision over all State buildings and property. Such a department, if set up now, would be of invaluable help to the general assembly in its job of setting up the postwar building program. Such a department would possess at all times complete information as to the needs for repairs, enlargements or betterments of all State buildings, and would furnish such information to the legislature or other qualified State officials.

We believe the general assembly should rewrite the laws of Missouri as nearly as humanly possible to the letter and spirit of the new State constitution. While many of the members of the sixty-third general assembly do not agree with many of the provisions of the new Charter, it was adopted by the people and therefore is the supreme law of the State. Therefore, we pledge ourselves to follow it as closely as possible and fight all attempts of the Executive or others to nullify or bypass any of its provisions.

Surplus Dental Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1945:

DENTISTS OPPOSE NEW POLICY ON SURPLUSES

The Nation's dentists will insist that the 22,000 dental officers now in the armed services be given first opportunity to buy surplus dental supplies owned by the Government.

That was decided today at a closed meeting of the American Dental Association's War Service and Postwar Planning Committee in the Mayflower Hotel.

Anticipating that efforts might be made to change a regulation recently issued by the Surplus Property Board giving veteran dental officers priority in surplus purchases, the committee went on record opposing any step which would weaken the regulation.

The committee, of which Dr. C. Willard Camalier, Washington, is chairman, also took up other problems of returning dental officers, including opportunities for postwar education and relocation.

Among Washington area residents attending were Dr. Sterling V. Mead, president-elect of the American Dental Association; Maj. Gen. Robert H. Mills, Chief of the Army Dental Division; Rear Adm. William T. Wright, jr., Assistant Surgeon General in charge of Public Health Service Dental Division; Capt. Francis G. Eulen, United States Navy; Isadore Altman, Dr. John P. Burke, Dr. Milburn M. Fowler, Dr. Harold B. Hertford, Dr. Joseph A. Madden, G. St. John Perrot, Col. L. H. Renfrow, Dr. Henry A. Swanson, all of Washington, and Dr. William N. Hodgkin, Warrenton, Va., and Maj. Marion W. McCrea, Arlington, Va.

Last Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Palmer Hoyt, publisher, the Oregonian, August 7, 1945, before the Portland Rotary Club:

Monday, August 6, 1945, is a day that will live forever in the history of civilization. For it was the day that we officially entered the atomic age. This age holds at once the greatest hope and the greatest menace for civilization.

When President Harry S. Truman told the world that the atomic bomb had been dropped on the city of Hiroshima, he officially recorded the most important development in the history of mankind since man's hoarse gutturals found meaning and became language and since man learned to use fire.

The simple announcement of the controlled splitting of the atom dwarfed the greatest war in the history of the world into relative insignificance. The use of the atomic bomb brought sharply to mankind the necessity of making a choice. Man could choose from the alternatives—life or death. For the first time in man's long and varied history he had in his hands the potential power to destroy the civilization which he has so patiently built through the long centuries.

Thus it is in this new age that the United Nations in general, the United States in particular, and more specifically Harry S. Truman, have a tremendous responsibility. With this in mind, I therefore respectfully suggest that the President of the United States call the leaders of the United Nations together and that they undertake to write a peace charter based on the peoples' right to know. Such a Magna Carta would have as its foundation the fact that in this new era of man the world cannot continue to exist half informed and half uninformed. This Magna Carta would be in itself assurance of the elimination of political censorships and the international distribution of objective news and information. It would also cover the free exchange of magazines, books, and motion pictures to all the peoples of the earth.

In this new world—the atomic age—an adequate rule book is necessary—as streamlined as the age itself—and unless it is provided quickly, this new world is not likely to long endure. I cannot believe that the leaders of the generations now alive will choose the risk of self-immolation rather than the best guaranty of peace obtainable. Old World diplomacy, with all of its out-of-date ramifications, won at Potsdam; New World ideas in keeping with the atomic age must now motivate international relations.

It is most difficult for us to realize that we here were present at the birth of an age. It is most difficult for us to realize that under our very nose an age died and an age was born. I suppose that when some pre-Neanderthal man saw the first blade of grass spring up as the glaciers started to recede to end the ice age he did not say, "The ice age has come to an end." Perhaps he said only, "Glub, slub, dub" (meaning "the grass is green and the chlorophyl will be good for my gingivitis").

It is hard for us to understand that this world today is a different world than we have known before. It is a world, for example, in which the discussion of a third war is equivalent to discussion of race suicide. We can certainly all agree that another war could result only in one of two things—a world dictatorship or the destruction of civilization. The destructive force represented in the control of the smashed atom is beyond our immediate power to grasp. The best illustration of its complete potential that I have seen is in a report made by Dr. Irving Langmuir, of the board of directors of the General Electric Co., several years ago:

"We can also count the electrons in atoms. Each atom of the various chemical elements contains from 1 to 92 electrons. About one-third of the particles of which all atoms are constructed are electrons. If we should take the other two particles—the protons and the neutrons—from the atoms of oxygen and hydrogen in a quart of water, leaving only the electrons, the tremendously powerful electrical repulsive forces they exert on one another would produce an explosion equal to that which would be produced by a gigantically vast cube of TNT, the powerful war explosive, 600 miles on each edge. The edge of such a cube would reach almost from London to Berlin and would be 300 times as high as the Alps."

If we think in terms of the cube of TNT described by Dr. Langmuir, it is obvious that such an explosion would blow the world to bits. Undoubtedly this was what Dr. Joseph Goebbels referred to a year ago when he said that Germany would destroy the world in fact before it would accept the peace.

The Allied High Command, according to William H. Stoneman, writing for the Chicago Daily News a month before we used the atomic bomb, was fearful that the Germans would use the smashed atom before they could control it with the possible destruction of civilization from such usage.

As we enter the atomic age, it becomes not only important but vital that the peoples of the earth be given the immediate opportunity to understand each other through the medium of the world-wide flow of free information. There is only one thing that can save civilization, and that is unhampered release of objective news—American style—between the nations.

If no longer will be possible for part of the world to be informed and part of the world to be kept in ignorance. The atomic bomb is a fact. Its destructive force is as yet not fully reported. But its potential is obviously beyond our present powers to conceive. There is talk currently of a jet plane capable of 4,000 miles an hour. After the startling developments of recent days, this seems entirely reasonable. Such a combination would link all the nations of the earth in the most awful network of destruction ever conceived. Even with the planes now available, the chain of death is little less than immediate in its implications.

Nor can we hope forever to keep the secret of the atomic bomb from the other nations of the earth. Sir James Chadwick, chief British scientist in the atomic-bomb project, declared the other day that the atomic bomb is not strictly a British-American secret, declaring that any nation can learn the answers in about 5 years of experimentation, provided it has access to the necessary raw materials. "I think," said Sir James, "that this is a very serious point."

I agree entirely with the British scientist. It is a very serious point and brings clearly to mind a statement made last September by Lord Van Sittart speaking over an international hook-up when he said, "The next world war may well start with the destruction of civilization over night."

There can, therefore, be but one adequate prophylactic. The mutual exchange of all types of information unhampered by political censorships and unrestricted by artificial boundaries of tariffs or customs. For example, it is now essential that we know what the Russians are doing and what they are thinking about and that the Russians be informed what we are doing and what we are thinking about. Otherwise, the peace will not be kept and if the peace is not kept, the peoples of the earth face dangers as yet barely imagined.

In this new age many of the arguments of yesterday seem substantially less important. It matters less now whether or not England used enough men in Europe or whether or not the Russians are still entitled to lend-lease. It is no longer of great moment that some of our left wing liberals fear Yankee imperialism so great that they would have us surrender all of our Pacific bases to the control of the United Nations. Nor is it particularly consequential that some right wing conservatives might still like to revert to a status of narrow nationalism. It is much more to the point to ponder the fact that three-fourths of the world and three-fourths of the peoples of the earth are still "blacked-out."

It is increasingly vital that we consider, for example, the Facist heirarchy, now being built up in the Argentine and the freedom of expression and of the press have again gone out of existence in that great land. It is more than important for us to realize that Russia, civilization's latest giant, is "blacked-out" as far as ordinary news and information are concerned, in the sense that we understand them.

It is obvious that our whole thinking has to be reworked. How important now is peacetime conscription? It was true that even through the terrific blitzes of Europe, bringing Germany to her knees, that the infantry was still the Queen of Battles. No matter how terrific the bombing from the air, lands to be conquered had to be seized and occupied. However, with atomic destruction a reality, it is doubtful that the infantry will be the Queen of Battles again save on the parade ground. By the use of atomic energy, entire divisions obviously can be destroyed and returned to the atomic state from which they originally came. Which is another way of saying that war has gone into the laboratories and shut the door behind it.

Providence has placed in the hands of the President of the United States the most powerful weapon to enforce the peace yet conceived. But it is quite apparent that the rule book written at Quebec, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam is outmoded: New agreements must be reached, new concepts achieved, if we are going to keep the peace that promises our only salvation.

The moral leadership that America must exert on the world was shaken at Teheran, slipped badly at Yalta, and apparently vanished at Potsdam. America, free from ambitions of world domination, has the opportunity today to reassert it.

It is significant to note that not at Quebec or Teheran or Yalta or Potsdam was there more than the barest discussion of the only thing that can guarantee peace—world-wide freedom of news and information. In fact, it now appears probable that new and drastic restrictions against such procedures were at least tacitly there agreed upon.

In the atomic age national boundaries as we have known them no longer exist. It is very interesting to remember in this connection that Dr. A. H. Compton, one of America's greatest scientists, writing in 1931 about the possibility of smashing the atom, said when it is finally accomplished national boundaries will cease to have their present importance.

The best adjustment we can hope for of this certain change would seem to be the voluntary union of neighboring nations. I would suggest that this job be done by the United Nations before it is done by a single power. This job can best be done by creating a community of common interest based on common knowledge and appreciation of common vital problems that concern existence itself.

Great strides already have been made in selling the idea of international freedom of information under the leadership of Kent Cooper of the Associated Press, Hugh Baillie of the United Press, and the American Society of Editors.

Recently three very able men, Wilbur Forrest, of the New York Herald Tribune, Carl Ackerman, of Columbia University; and Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution, made a world-wide tour in the interests of free-flowing news.

Their main objective was to have included in forthcoming peace treaties the pledges of governments "not to censor news at the source, not to use the press as an instrument of national policy; and to permit a free flow of news in and out of signatory countries."

One of the revealing incidents of their trip came in their visit to Moscow, where they found "an expression of willingness to seek a common ground in the matter of freer exchange of news and more fair and adequate mutual writing and reporting."

But, our American representatives also discovered that Russian editors feel that their government-directed newspapers represent the real free press rather than the private publications of America. As the late Constantine Oumanski once said in effect, "our press is absolutely free—we print only what the government wants."

In many ways the world-girdling trip was discouraging. But at least a start was made that should have far reaching benefits. One of them is the proposed international conference in Australia on press freedom. For it should ever be borne in mind what the St. Louis Post Dispatch said recently in this connection—"It is the first act of dictators to seize press and radio and thus control men's minds. By the same token, it should be the first act of a free world to liberate press and radio that men be informed. As Thomas Jefferson said, "When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe."

As I said before, great strides have already been made in selling the idea of unshackling news. But these strides are not enough. History has made the accomplishment of the objective essential. Generally speaking the press, radio, and motion-picture leaders of America and of the British Commonwealth of Nations have not accepted the leadership in this vital program. It is imperative that they do not shirk their vital responsibility.

It is also imperative that our leaders and those of the other United Nations come to the clear realization that an uninformed world has neither the right nor the opportunity for a continued existence.

I believe entirely that this world cannot stand another war. But I believe as completely that this world is headed for such a war and destruction unless immediate steps are taken to insure the beginning at least of freedom of news—American style—between the peoples of the earth. A civilization that is not informed cannot be free and a world that is not free cannot endure.

Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by me on September 14, 1945, at 8:15 p. m. over the Mutual Broadcasting System's network WOL in the time of Mr. Richard Eaton, noted commentator, on the subject of full employment. The address is as follows:

This is a report on the full employment bill—H. R. 2202 in the House and S. 380 in the Senate—which Senator MURRAY and I introduced back in February and which now has the sponsorship of four Democratic Senators, four Republican Senators, and 105 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

You have heard and read a lot of discussion on this far-reaching measure in the newspapers and on the air. I think it is time to take stock of where we stand on this. The issues are really very simple. The full employment bill does three main things:

1. It recognizes that every American able and willing to work has the right to a chance to earn a living.

2. It recognizes that it is the responsibility and the duty of the United States Government, acting for the people of the United States, to assure the existence of opportunities to exercise the right to earn a living.

3. The bill sets up a procedure for doing this job—a procedure for developing coordinated programs that will assure opportunities for all Americans able and willing to work.

Let me touch briefly on these three basic provisions.

Every American able and willing to work has the right to a chance to earn a living, says the bill. In good Christian common sense, how can we deny this? To quote Bishop Sheil, of Chicago, in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, "It is futile to speak of the right to life, if the means to that life are not present. * * * If a man has the right to life, then he has the right to the means of life."

Next, it is the responsibility and the duty of the United States Government, acting for and in the name of the people of the United States, to assure opportunities to exercise the right to earn a living. Is this the responsibility of the United States Government? I say, yes. Who else can carry this responsibility?

Now, should the Federal Government, in order to meet this responsibility, assure opportunities for full employment, or can it merely promote or encourage or use some other weasel word? Let me ask you who else can provide this necessary assurance? No other agency of government, no private agency or group of individuals is strong enough to do the job. I say definitely, yes, we must assure—we must do whatever is necessary to discharge our responsibility.

Businessmen need confidence—that they will have customers. Customers need confidence—that they will have jobs, and therefore incomes. Now there is just one way that I know of whereby this confidence can be maintained—and that is by the assurance that the Federal Government will do what is necessary to justify this confidence.

To this end, the full employment bill pledges that the United States Government will direct its functions and its resources to the creation of employment opportunities—primarily through private enterprise and State and local governments, but the bill backs up this pledge by a commitment to provide, if needed, Federal support adequate to do the job.

I think the American people will not be satisfied with less. They don't want doles. They don't want made-work. They want jobs at useful work. They have the right to earn a decent living.

So much for these basic propositions—the expression today of the great American tradition. What about the procedures set up in the bill to make it possible for the Federal Government to do this job?

Very simply the provisions of the bill would coordinate the activities of the Executive and of the Congress toward the objective of full employment opportunity in a free competitive economy. By "coordinate" we simply mean that the programs of the President and the various separate legislation by the Congress must be worked out so that they will lead in the same direction instead of at cross-purposes as so often in the past. Everybody recognizes the urgent need for better coordination. Books have been written about it for years. The Federal Government, whether we like it or not, is just too big to operate haphazardly without a plan. Both the expenditures and the revenues are now necessarily so huge that they will affect the economic life of the entire nation whether we coordinate them or not.

So the bill calls on the President to produce such a plan or program. The President transmits this National Budget to Congress and there we would set up a Joint Committee of the Senate and the House to go to work on this national program.

This joint committee would take the President's message, modify and revise the program in the light of their joint wisdom and finally report back to the Senate and the House. Out of this coordinated consideration we can get and will get a real national program that will do the job.

There in broad outline are the basic provisions of the full employment bill. Let me note and emphasize that we need this assurance, this confidence in ourselves—now. Reconversion and dislocation are already upon us. Plans of business provide for quick changeovers to peacetime production; there can be and should be—must be—a strong recovery in the spring. But there won't be unless business and workers alike have confidence that they are reconverting to steady prosperity, and not to the dismal stagnation of the thirties on the one hand or to a sequence of boom and bust like the twenties on the other.

Nothing can build so powerfully toward this all-important confidence as the honest, all-out commitment of the full employment bill—the commitment by the Government of the United States for the people of the United States that these things will be done.

Now, after the general debate and hearings of the last few weeks, who seems to be against the full employment bill?

Well, nobody really wants to admit he is against it. No, they are trying instead to weaken it, to amend it, to water it down. The same people, when the bill is passed, will go to work against the annual program just as we can see them going to work on the world program for peace and security under the San Francisco Charter.

Let us analyze the opposition as it has shown its hand so far.

First, some people actually don't want full employment. They prefer a waiting line outside the hiring gate. But this group no longer dares to admit this openly.

In the second place, I think some people are simply afraid of any new thing at all. Such people have opposed every progressive, constructive action that we have taken since the birth of the Republic. They never have realized in the past that the world keeps changing anyhow. These people really would like to turn the clock back; but turning backward is not the American way. Instead we go forward and meet the dangers and the opportunities of the new frontier.

Finally, there are people who just don't think this bill would work. They feel that programs adopted under the bill would not be effective, or would lead to paralyzing Government control, or would cost too much and bankrupt this rich Nation.

This amounts, of course, to doubting the effectiveness and the competence of responsible representative government. There were those who felt the same way about the war. How could this sprawling, muddle-headed democracy, they said, possibly defeat the strong, efficient, single-purposed dictators? * * * Well, we did defeat the dictators, and we didn't lose our cherished individual liberties and we didn't bankrupt ourselves either.

So the battle lines are drawn and the great debate begins. Arrayed against the bill are the forces of greed, and fear, and cynicism. They either don't want democracy to work, or they think it cannot work. Arrayed in favor of positive action by the people, speaking through their Federal Government, are the forces of tolerance and growth, or progress and improvement—the people who intend to make democracy work.

As we talk and think about the full employment bill, it is heartening to realize that we are in the grand tradition of the American spirit. We march with the men and women of the past and present who carved this country out of the wilderness and made it great.

We are in the company of the forward-looking businessmen—the practical, progressive, bold creators who are not afraid of change and whose initiative produces change; the kind of enterprisers that cleared the forests and plowed the plains and built the railroads and created our immense industrial power out of untried dreams. I have championed these men for years. They are the real backbone of American free enterprise. Shoulder to shoulder with these men and with us march the working people and the independent farmers and the ranchers in their millions.

We are in the company of the statesmen of the past and the present who take seriously their sworn duty to guard the public interest and promote the public welfare. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt—they would be with us if they were here today.

So let us go ahead. Let us get this good strong full employment bill enacted and then go to work on programs for positive action to make good our commitment. Let us listen to the counsels of courage, not fear—of generosity, not greed—of progress, not stagnation.

This is the way for men of good will to get together and stay together—marching steadily upward and onward in the spirit of America itself.

Postwar Loans by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

entitled "Postwar Loans by Our Government," delivered by former President Herbert Hoover in Chicago yesterday, September 17. In my opinion this is a very important contribution to the subject of postwar loans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall respond to the invitation of your members that I should discuss the proposals for large postwar loans or financial aid from our Government for relief and reconstruction of our former allies. I refer to proposed direct aid from our Government over and above our indirect commitments already made through Bretton Woods, the Import-Export bank, and UNRRA.

Let me say at the outset that I favor such financial assistance under safeguards and limitations.

Never in human history has there been such imperative need for wisdom and imagination in facing the common problems of mankind. They call for concepts of great generosity and tolerance that faith may be restored to the earth.

We in America can let no child, woman, or man starve—whether friend or enemy—as long as we have an ounce of surplus. When it comes to financial assistance for postwar reconstruction, if we act without wisdom and without regard to experience, far from curing the ills of the world we will make them worse.

It is therefore the safeguards and limitations with which I am concerned. These are serious and if properly imposed will require great official frankness, courage, and boldness of leadership.

Upon this problem I speak as the sole surviving American official from World War I who combined the functions of authority over a portion of the loans made during and after the First World War; who as a member of the Debt Commission renegotiated these loans, and who subsequently had to deal with the earlier efforts at their repudiation by the debtors. Knowing the conclusions of my many eminent colleagues of those times who can no longer speak imposes an even more specific duty upon me.

The world had little experience in lending huge sums by governments before World War I. There were mistakes made at that time, but whatever the mistakes, they were the mistakes of pioneers in unknown lands. There will be greater mistakes and losses in handling the problem from World War II unless heed is taken to lessons of World War I.

To follow experience in these matters is the hard way. But if we would promote the ultimate recovery of America and of a demoralized world, if we would promote long-view good feeling, we shall require much more realism than the easy road of starry-eyed sentimentalism.

In order to make the subject clear I will first relate some history; then I will appraise some economic matters which surround us in this field; and, finally, I will offer some suggestions.

SOME HISTORY

During World War I, our Government loaned about 7 billions to foreign countries for war purposes prior to the armistice and about 3½ billions after the armistice for relief and reconstruction. This did not include private loans which I am not here discussing. These Government loans were made to 19 different countries. To make these loans the United States Government sold bonds to our own people, and it was agreed by the foreign governments that they would pay principal interest in such a fashion as to equal the principal and interest which would fall upon the American taxpayer for the bonds issued.

After the war, it became evident that the borrowers could not raise and pay the annual amount this would require. And the world was in better condition to pay then than it is now.

The World War Debt Commission was created by Congress to renegotiate the loans. The Commission set up the thesis that the settlements should be based upon the annual capacity of each individual nation to pay. While the principal sum of the debt was never theoretically diminished, yet deferments, interest rates, and the period of repayment were so manipulated that the loans to the different countries were reduced all the way from 30 percent to 75 percent to adjust them to capacity to pay. The aggregate annual payments of the combined debtors on all loans were reduced about 70 percent and never exceeded $250,000,000 per annum up until their repudiation in 1933. These annual payments represented less than 5 percent of the tax income or foreign trade of each country. This amount did not represent any insuperable economic difficulty either in paying or receiving in normal economic times.

However, when the hurricane of the great depression started in Europe in 1931 the annual payments on intergovernmental debts between other nations, added to the payments to us, became a stifling burden upon the stability of exchanges and currency of the world. You may recollect at that time I secured an 18-month moratorium on intergovernmental debts all over the world. I further urged upon the Congress in 1932 that the Debt Commission be authorized to again renegotiate the debts to us to determine if the payments to us for the future seemed more than the capacity of any debtor to meet and at the same time make its own internal recovery.

In any event, every nation except Finland repudiated or, more euphoniously, ceased payment on their debts in 1933. How much Congress contributed to this by refusing my request for renegotiation no one can tell. I was always of the opinion that had Mr. Roosevelt secured that authority from Congress, he might have saved something. And this was more possible as by devaluation of the dollar he, in effect, reduced the debt payments by about a further 50 percent.

Up to the cease-payment signal, the actual sum paid upon the original principal of ten and one-half billion was less than 4½ percent. The interest payments amounted to only about 20 percent of what our taxpayers had paid out on the American bonds issued to make these loans.

At this point I wish to call your attention to the fact that this repudiation covered not only war loans, the equivalent of lend-lease during the present war, but it included also the three and one-half billion of relief and reconstruction loans made by the American Government after the war was over. If you conceive that all the payments on principal made by Europeans were applicable to the reconstruction advances, then only about 13 percent of this segment was repaid with interest. No nation except Britain paid more than 10 percent of the postwar loans, if all payments be applied to those alone. Britain paid an amount equal to principal and interest on postwar loans of about $600,000,000 and a small amount of interest on the war loans of about $3,300,000,000.

Here enter two great lessons from experience. That is, the moral and emotional coloring matter which comes into these war and postwar financial transactions between governments and certain economic phenomena which lie in them.

The color of the majority American view of the First World War was that we had no part in its origins; that we were in no danger of invasion; that we entered it to save the western democracies from defeat by Germany after Russia deserted them. When it came to the peace we waived any part of the indemnities to which we were entitled or any part of the territory nearly as large as the United States which the Allies acquired. Americans felt we had made great sacrifices to save our allies and we had continued these sacrifices in the debt settlements.

The coloring matter of the European view was that they had saved us from destruction by Kaiser Wilhelm; that they held the line alone for 2 years defending us; that our sacrifice of blood and treasure was much less than theirs; that, therefore, we still owed them something.

Statesmen and demagogs in every debtor country at once appealed for votes on platforms of repudiation of our claims with these justifications. Foreign taxpayers naturally took to the idea of getting rid of taxes to pay us. Thereby, in the European view, our national visage had changed from a great idealistic Nation, crusading for the right, to that of Uncle Shylock. And a host of domestic fellow travelers echoed these cries.

I make this point at length because this question of who saved who enters into these postwar financial transactions with great force. Nor is this history confined to the aftermath of the last war. As late as 3 weeks ago the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, protesting against our stoppage of lend-lease, accused us of a rough and harsh manner to a faithful ally who held the fort alone for 2 years. And propaganda has again begun that we are delinquent in our contributions to World War II, although we have spent far more per capita and incurred more casualties than any other ally.

But aside from these emotional questions there is an economic question of first importance involved in the lending and repayment of these great sums between governments. Outside of some proportionately small movement of gold and services, these sums must in the end be translated into movement of commodities. Whatever we may loan in the future will in reality be goods. Whatever we get back will be goods. And here comes in a vast difference between ourselves and the European borrowers. Our economy is so self-contained that we normally import roughly under 7 percent of the goods we consume and we normally export about the same percentage of what we produce. Any great imports and exports beyond certain limits tend to create unemployment in the United States by displacing our own workmen on one hand or overdraining our resources on the other. The borrowing nations, however, normally depend all the way from 20 percent to 60 percent upon imports. Thus they can take far larger amounts of goods on loan without damaging their employment than we can take on repayment. Aside from the economic difficulties involved they naturally consider any opposition by us to receiving any of their goods in repayment as justification for repudiation.

I am fully aware that some of our economists disagree with this and contend that if we make loans to foreign governments we can secure full payment in goods provided we lower our tariffs and greatly increase our imports. I may suggest, however, that there is a serious danger to our national defense if we abandon our self-sufficiency in many of our products. I am not going to discuss the merits or demerits of free trade and protection. I may suggest also a little experience. Indeed, Old Man Statistics enters here with sardonic humor.

In the 4 years from 1926 to 1930 prior to the depression the goods we imported annually averaged $33.60 per capita with our exports a bit larger at $39.10 per capita. In the 4 years from 1936 to 1940, after Mr. Hull's systematic lowering of American tariffs, our annual imports averaged only $18.79 per capita and our exports dropped to $24.40 per capita. Put on a quantity basis, the showing is even worse. On an index number of 1913 equaling 100, our per capita imports before

taking the lowered tariffs stood at 142, whereas after taking, they stood at 127. The indexes for exports were respectively 115 and 92. Apparently this medicine does not work. And none of this takes into account the painful and politically potent remarks that our labor and farmers might make on this subject.

The economic reality is that the volume of goods we could supply, and the volume of goods we could absorb in turn, are so much less than the movement which these gigantic sums imply that we simply cannot be repaid in full tariff or no tariff.

I might also emphasize that advances of money or credit by our Government did not seem to stimulate international good will. Our greatest failure was Italy, where our Government made over a billion of war loans and eight hundred million of postwar loans for reconstruction. She repaid less than 4 percent of the reconstruction loans alone and ultimately declared war on us.

All this experience with emotional and moral coloring and economics certainly should be of some guidance, as human nature is still about the same.

There are two positive lessons from all this. First, when our Government postwar loans exceed a few tens of millions they are going to be only partly repaid at best.

Second. Loaning money is a poor road to international friendship.

Despite all this, there is one overriding necessity. We want our allies to recover. We want within our capacities to help them.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

Europe is much more greatly impoverished by this war than the last one. But Europe should not ignore the fact that we also are far more greatly impoverished by this war than the last one. American recovery and financial stability is the first need of the world. Unless we recover no one will recover. There is a limit to the aid 30,000,000 American families can give to the 300,000,000 families abroad who are hoping for postwar help.

While we must provide some postwar credits, yet sooner or later most of these credits will come from our taxpayers. The burdens upon them are already gigantic. Even after the transition period our Federal expenses for many years will require from twenty to twenty-five billions annually. Such Federal taxes alone, spread over our 30,000,000 families, comes to from $600 to $800 annually per family. It is nonsense to claim that taxes are paid by the rich. A tax of 100 percent on all personal incomes over the level of a United States Senator would yield only about 20 percent of our future budget. It is foolish to believe that corporation taxes are not in the end passed on to all the people as a whole. Thus it is those who toil and those who produce who will pay these taxes.

We have already pledged billions of postwar aid to foreign countries through the International Bank, the Stabilization Fund, and the Export-Import Bank. We have rightly assumed great burdens to feed the hungry all over the world through UNRRA.

Even if all these already made postwar commitments are assumed to be repayable, yet our Government will have to increase our national debt by borrowing from the American people by just that much. That limits our own capital for conversion and puts that much more strain on our governmental financial structure.

SOME LIMITATIONS AND SAFEGUARDS

In the light of all this there are certain policies, certain safeguards, certain limitations we should observe in making any further commitments.

First. I should like to make a suggestion to dispose of the lend-lease and other war-period debts. Although I do not believe we shall be repaid much, if anything, from our forty billions of lend-lease, yet we should not cancel it now. We should instead propose a world-wide moratorium on all intergovernmental war debts, and 5 years hence when the shape of the world is more clear we should join our allies in settling the disposition of all such debts. This should include the debt relations of mother countries with dominions, including our own relations with the Philippines. In the meantime, we should demand that all the weapons we have sent on lend-lease should be destroyed.

Second. As to further postwar advances, loans or financial aid from our Government, we should remember that peace is not yet a month old. We do not know how our own reconversion will go. We cannot for a year hence appraise either our domestic situation or the effect of the great foreign commitments we have already made. These new demands will come not from one foreign government but from many. We must in the interest of our recovery take time to consider how much further burdens we can assume in aid to others, remain solvent, and recover.

Third. Both we and our Allies need time to find out the actual needs of borrowing countries. Some of the western European countries still have very considerable balances and assets in the United States. We cannot expect to open credits until these resources are exhausted. There is also a considerable amount of refugee assets in the United States. These things should be made known in order to enable us to appraise the situation.

Fourth. We cannot afford to just make general loans or give unrestricted financial aid as our Government did in part after the last war. We cannot today afford having our resources used to keep up armies, to engage in nonproductive enterprises, to pay debts to other countries, to subsidize social experiments, to go into business abroad in competition with us or to pay for propaganda to upset our Government.

Fifth. In the meantime there are certain commodities in all nations where there is a surplus that is needed by other nations. We have a surplus of wheat, cotton, machinery, some metals, etc. The British Empire has rubber, tin, etc. The Russians have manganese and pulp. The Dutch have rubber and tin. Exchange of these surpluses at once are in obvious mutual interest.

Sixth. All loans or credits should be reduced to terms of commodities. We should open a credit to the particular nation and that credit should be available to purchase commodities in the United States which we approve. This will assure the employment for our own people in producing these commodities.

The borrowing nations will be exporting goods to the United States in the ordinary course and will secure some needed supplies this way. A wise policy for the present should be to fill in deficiencies. Until we can see more clearly it is the part of wisdom to limit our credits to sums that would pay for temporary programs of commodities. Such a method will also determine the exact purpose to which our sacrifices are applied.

Certainly, we should lower the sights as to size of these credits a long way from the current newspaper discussion of billions. Four hundred million dollars' worth of peacetime commodities beyond the natural result of trade is a lot of commodities. It is more than any one country took from us before the war in any one year.

Seventh. When the Allied Governments receive cotton or other commodities as a result of credit from us they will necessarily sell them to their people and thereby get cash in their own currencies equal to the amount of our credits. They should be credited to our account. While that cash possibly cannot be turned at once into dollars, it will purchase in their countries certain commodities which can be shipped to us without disturbing the economic situation of either side.

Obviously, the amount of these goods needed by the United States which we could possibly obtain will be much less than we will be called upon to give.

Eighth. The whole world food and fuel program for next winter cries for organization that would abolish its horrid inefficiency and power politics.

Ninth. As we are going to get only a part of any advances for relief and reconstruction back, there are some indirect benefits which we could receive. We should insist that there be no quotas against us, no discriminatory tariffs against us, no dumping of goods upon us, no cartel operations against us.

Quotas and discriminatory tariffs are not equal opportunity. Dumping is selling below cost to the injury of our workmen and farmers. Cartels are monopolies for the purpose of fixing prices and driving free enterprise from business. We must have some protection from socialized foreign trade. Such trade contains both the essence of dumping and cartelization. There should also be agreement of no trade discriminations in spheres of influence against us in favor of the dominant power.

Tenth. There should be agreement that no propaganda against the American system of life will be carried on. Such agitation creates uncertainty in a free-enterprise system that undermines domestic confidence in our own stability and lessens our ability to help.

Eleventh. If we would avoid the ill will which will arise among our respective peoples from the emotional and moral coloring of these transactions, it should be agreed on both sides that at the end of 10 years we will reconsider the situation of these postwar credits by governments which may have been opened on all sides. That should prevent propaganda of hate against us for cancellation.

Twelfth. While I am not here discussing private loans from our bankers and others to foreigners, yet they must be regulated so as to prevent their being applied to any other than directly reproductive enterprise. Otherwise American investors will not get their money back.

Again, I repeat, we must help. We should use common sense; we should limit our help to what our taxpayers can afford; we should consider our own employment situation; we should limit our aid to the minimum necessary; we should limit it to the direct purpose of restoring their domestic needs through commodities; we should organize it so as to minimize the ill will over repayment. We should do it with the knowledge that we are doing it at a loss to ourselves, but to aid mankind to recover from the greatest disaster of all history.

Pearl Harbor Explodes Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article by me which will shortly appear in the October issue of the magazine, the Washington News Digest. The article is entitled, "Pearl Harbor Ex-

plodes Again," and its publication at this time in the RECORD, at the invitation of the publisher, may, I believe, be of some value in our consideration of the Pearl Harbor investigation which is about to commence.

The Washington News Digest, as all Senators know, is published under the editorship of Hon. John J. O'Connor, former chairman of the House Rules Committee. This magazine is published both nationally and internationally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR EXPLODES AGAIN

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again."

The truth about Pearl Harbor is not only rising; it is exploding in the faces of those who sought to suppress or distort it. That truth can, indeed, make us free. It can liberate us from the awful possibility of a future Pearl Harbor, of infinitely worse proportion, occurring.

Five separate and successive investigations have failed to reveal the whole truth about that most shocking military catastrophe in America's history. Now, at last, Congress' own investigation, if it is fearless and nonpartisan, may burst the whole story wide open. It may lay bare in all its ghastly detail, the whole bungling mess that needlessly cost over 3,300 American lives outright in the attack, and countless other lives in later come-back operations.

At 7:54 a. m., December 7, 1941, America's Pacific Fleet was in the harbor sitting like defenseless ducks in a shooting gallery. At 7:55 a. m. about 250 Jap fighter, bomber, and torpedo planes began simultaneously to attack Pearl Harbor and the adjacent air bases and airfields on Oahu. Long before 11 a. m. when the attack was over and our installations and fleet lay in shambles, we had learned some bitter lessons—the hard way—about American complacency and Jap infamy.

Now, we may expect to learn even more lessons through Congress' investigation. And when we do learn them, when we have implanted them in the fiber of our own being and that of our leaders, then we shall be well on our way to insuring that a Pearl Harbor shall never again befall our Nation!

But two general facts stand out even now—the first, with regard to the handling of the Pearl Harbor story and the second, with regard to the major teaching of that story.

The first is this, and it is an old but refreshing fact:

1. Americans do not stomach smears, scapegoats, or whitewashes.

With the inherent sense of fair play of our people, they simply would not tolerate the buck-passing and incomplete reports previously issued about Pearl Harbor as the last word on that terrible chapter in our history.

Americans would not stand to have themselves unjustly accused or their Congress unjustly accused of the responsibility for the disaster.

Those accusations were unjust because:

A. Our people know that the defense of Pearl Harbor was a military responsibility and that the military bungled the job. The details about the military's ineptitude, its stupidity, its blindness were almost incredible. Take, for example, these two instances: The failure of the Navy to report to the Commanding General at Pearl Harbor the sinking of a Jap midget submarine in outer Pearl Harbor a full hour before the final attack (although the mere presence of the sub was a sure sign of the imminence of that attack); and the failure of Coast Artillery ordnance to issue ammunition in the period before the attack because they did not want to get it dirty and to have to renovate it.

B. The people note that the most incomplete part of the official Army report was chapter 4 dealing with "Responsibilities in Washington." But the people note the several crucial failures which that chapter did reveal—the failures on the part of Capital officials adequately to advise the officers at Pearl Harbor of the dangers of attack. Washington practically dared and invited the Japs to attack and then turned its back to the prospective onslaught.

C. The people note that the whole tone of the Army and Navy reports was defeatist. Those reports signify that even had our fleet spotted the approaching Japs and gone out to meet them, our ships would have taken a fearful licking. Our battleships were too slow to have brought the Jap vessels under gunfire and the remainder of our fleet would have suffered severe damage if not defeat by reason of the great enemy superiority in the air. The people wonder why this should have been so, considering all the billions which had been poured into America's preparedness and considering that our officials should long previously have learned about the use of air power from the aerial blitzkreigs in Europe.

D. The people remember that between 1935 and 1941 our late President's Bureau of the Budget slashed Army and Navy appropriations every single year and Congress restored more than 43 percent of the cuts.

E. Moreover, the people remember that neither Congress nor the people were ever advised as to the true situation in the Far East or as to the imminence of war. In February 1941, 10 months before Pearl Harbor, I introduced in the Senate a resolution asking the Secretary of State to report to the Senate in closed executive session on the danger in the Pacific. I asked at that time what condition our fleet air arm was in. Again in March 1941, speaking on the resolution to have the Secretary report to the Senate on the status of our forces in the Far East, I asked in the Senate:

"What is the condition of our fleet, especially its coordinating air arm? Is it like the Russian Fleet was in the Japanese war?"

My questions went unanswered and my resolution was quashed by the administration.

F. The people remember that in the 4 years after Pearl Harbor, the administration never let a peep out in favor of gleaning the whole truth about that disaster. But when the cover-up could no longer work because popular protest had assumed deafening proportions, the administration hastily brought forth its resolution for an investigation by Congress.

The second general fact already obvious is this:

2. Neither America's defense or attack dare be static.

Pearl Harbor was a tea party compared to what may be expected in the next war. Then, without notice, after split seconds, "push button" commanders may let loose barrages of city-destroying guided missiles containing atomic force. The people remember that first "baby" atomic bomb in history dropped by a superfortress on August 6, 1945, over Hiroshima, a city of 343,000, killed 126,000, wounded 118,000, and leveled 4 square miles, 60 percent of the city's area.

We know that we must not reveal the secrets of the atomic bomb any more than we would place a stick of dynamite with a lighted fuse in the hands of a child.

The people know that we dare not allow our brass hats to cling to obsolete weapons and antiquated strategy and tactics of warfare. We remember that it was rut-minded brass hats who crucified that great aviation martyr, Wisconsin-born Gen. Billy Mitchell, who warned us of the dangers in the Far East.

We must have a single Cabinet Department for the Armed Forces, headed by a Secretary for the Armed Forces. I proposed this 3 years ago. We must have under secretaries for the Army, for the Navy, for Air, and for research and technology. We must have a new West Point of the air and a new West Point of science and technology joining our two present national academies—West Point and Annapolis. All these academies must train alert young officers in the newest techniques of military, naval, aerial, and technological science.

Moreover, we must have a new, peerless international intelligence service headed by the kind of man as J. Edgar Hoover.

These are but a few of the general lessons and steps we already know, must bear in mind, and must act upon. These are the lessons born of the truth, which, having answer, must so fill our minds, hearts and consciousness that we shall forevermore be a vigilant America!

Aid for Surviving Hebrews of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on August 1, 1945, a most distinguished American, Guy M. Gillette, former Senator from Iowa, made an important statement on the occasion of his becoming president of the American League for a Free Palestine and chief political adviser for the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am aware that many people will regard it as unusual that I have chosen to decline the gracious offers of a Government position by the President and to dedicate myself to the effort of achieving a solution to the Hebrew problem in Europe and Palestine, particularly since it is a non-Hebrew and non-Jew who has undertaken this task. But I believe that this surprise is chiefly due to the general misunderstanding of what we have come to call the Jewish problem. For it is commonly and universally accepted that the persecution, the homelessness, the enslavement, and the extermination of the Hebrew people is solely a Jewish question and that only Jews need to participate in the various movements that seek to end this tragedy.

I do not share this attitude. I have decided to accept my present task not because I have become a Jew, nor because I intend to settle in Palestine, nor because my love or sympathy for the Jews is in any degree greater than that of the average American. Indeed, I have undertaken this step only as an American who seeks to live up to the traditions and the principles of our Nation. For I consider the so-called Jewish problem, not as a Jewish or a Hebrew question, but as an urgent problem of the United Nations and of the decent portion of mankind.

Because some governments did not share this view, all of mankind has paid very dearly in the casualties of our sons and brothers on all the battlefields of the world. I do not consider this problem the most important on

the agenda of the United Nations, but I do consider it one of the problems which must be on that agenda. Since America, through the war, through the Atlantic Charter, and through other international relations culminating in the San Francisco agreement has become international in attitude and international in purpose, she cannot and should not fail at this important point either.

I have personally shared the desire for international cooperation, international decency and justice, of the American people. I have given practical expression to that before I became a Member of Congress and throughout the 12 years of my service in the House and Senate, and I come to this task with the conviction that unless this particular problem is permanently and effectively solved, it will again be exploited by the forces of reaction to recreate fascism and world war.

Until this war broke out, my interest and my knowledge of this so-called Jewish problem was general and vague. I must confess that even in the first years of the war I shared with other Americans the skepticism about the persecution and the extermination suffered by the Hebrew people, the truth of which we have now been forced to believe by incontrovertible evidence. It did not seem possible that in this era of vaunted civilization anyone could be guilty of the savage barbarism and of the bestial crimes that were charged against the leaders of the Fascist countries. We have now learned that the facts brought to our attention by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation and the American groups that supported the committee in 1943 were understated rather than exaggerated.

I am happy and grateful that through the efforts of my present colleagues, I became vitally interested in the plight of the Hebrews in Europe and Palestine and was in some degree instrumental in the congressional action that resulted in a few concrete measures, such as the creation of the War Refugee Board, for the alleviation of this tragedy and the rescue of a few thousand individuals from the extermination camps of Central Europe.

What we found in Europe after the end of hostilities there has indeed surpassed our worst fears. The bestiality and ruthlessness of the Germans in the wholesale extermination of the Hebrew people staggers human comprehension. But somehow, miraculously, some 2,000,000 Hebrews have survived it and the great question is, What now?

Are we simply to forget the 5,000,000 dead? Are we to ignore the horrible suffering of the survivors and their present plight? Are we to leave them in their present miserable condition, roaming the Continent of Europe as "refugees," as "displaced persons," as "stateless Jews," as unwanted, second-rate human beings on God's earth? Or are we, the United Nations, now that the enemy has been beaten and now that we are in position to act if we really want to do so, to give meaning to our oft-repeated expressions of horror and sympathy? Are we to make a real effort to be of assistance to them, to let them rehabilitate themselves and thus defeat the German scheme to exterminate them? Let us then restore them to life and human dignity by recognizing them as a fellow-member of the United Nations, entitled to equal rights with the other 50 member nations, and by letting their representatives and statesmen sit on the councils of the United Nations and secure an adequate solution to their national problems, just as we are endeavoring similarly to settle numerous other problems within the United Nations.

And here let me make it quite clear that when I speak of national recognition for the Hebrews of Europe and Palestine, I mean precisely that and not recognition of the Jews as a nation, for Hebrews and Jews should not be regarded as synonymous terms.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation in coming into existence as a temporary Hebrew national authority has taken a step of historical consequence. In drawing the distinction between the Jewish religion, on the one hand, and the Hebrew nation, on the other, they have solved a question which has, consciously or subconsciously, been bothering most of us and which has probably been the greatest single stumbling block toward the solution of the so-called Jewish problem in Europe and the deadlock surrounding the Palestinian problem.

On the basis of this distinction the position of these people can be simply and easily understood. There exists a Hebrew nation whose national territory is Palestine, just as Holland is the national territory of the Dutch. Quite apart from the Hebrew nation, there are people of the Jewish faith practically all over the world. Just as the fact that most Irish are Catholics does not make every Catholic an Irishman, the fact that most Hebrews are Jews does not make every Jew a Hebrew. Here in America, for instance, we have Americans of Hebrew descent and of the Jewish faith, even as there are Americans of French origin and of the Catholic faith, or of English descent and of the Potestant faith. I stress these definitions for I believe them to be of the utmost importance. In the course of centuries of abnormal existence, the Hebrew national problem and the Jewish problem have become much too involved and the solution lies in simplification and normalization.

I have decided to dedicate my efforts to the best of my ability and knowledge to see whether, once and for all, an end can be put to this age-long abnormal and intolerable existence of a great and ancient people who have contributed so much to the progress of the world and who have been so ill repaid.

Within the course of the next few weeks after additional consultation and work with the Hebrew committee and my colleagues on the American League for a Free Palestine, we shall make public the full details of our program of action. Meanwhile, I should like to state the main objective as I see it, an objective which I believe is attainable if our own Government and the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union will exercise their good will.

I believe it to be the elementary dictate of human decency that we must not prolong for one more day the suffering existence of the surviving Hebrews in Europe today. We believe therefore that the Allied Control Commissions in Europe ought to recognize the Hebrew national status and permit every so-called stateless Jew, displaced person, or "Axis-Jew" the elementary right of self-determination in order that they may decide of their own free will whether they are Hebrew nationals or whether they want to remain "stateless" or to become once again German or Rumanian or Hungarian nationals. The present policy which regards and treats the greatest victims and enemies of the Germans as Germans, subject to all the laws and regulations imposed upon the barbaric and defeated foe, is a gross injustice and must evoke laughter in hell. To offset this policy, the following steps should be taken:

1. All Hebrews are to be freed from their Axis concentration camps in which hundreds of thousands of them are still retained.

2. A commission composed of those Hebrews should be recognized by the occupying authorities and be charged by them with the handling and representation of all Hebrew affairs.

3. UNRRA should immediately extend its relief operations to the Balkan countries where hundreds of thousands of Hebrews, in Rumania and Hungary particularly, are starving and destitute, and have to date not received one ounce of UNRRA aid.

4. Hebrew representatives should be added to the United Nations War Crimes Commission in order to secure the prosecution and trial of the tens of thousands of known criminals who have participated in and carried out the wholesale slaughter of some five million Hebrews and who are today at large with little prosepct of being prosecuted.

5. The Reparations Commission in Moscow should consider the claims and rights of the surviving Hebrews and include in the reparations to be given to United Nations also compensation for the losses suffered by the Hebrew people.

These are emergency measures necessary in view of the destruction and chaos of present-day Europe in which over a million Hebrews find themselves without status, without national or legal protection, without representatives to take action on their behalf.

What is of even greater importance are the following steps which we believe essential for the commencement of a solution of the entire program:

1. The British Government should proclaim the right of every Hebrew in Europe to apply to the nearest British consulate and receive his first papers of Palestine citizenship.

2. An Anglo-American-Russian commission should be set up immediately and given adequate powers to effectuate the repatriation in the speediest manner of all such applicants to Palestine.

Now that a new government has come to power in Great Britain which is publicly and officially committed to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper under which Palestine is administered, Britain's sin of having kept Palestine closed to the martyred Hebrews of Europe at a time of their greatest ordeal and need should be immediately ended. Similarly, the new Government must annul immediately the discriminatory laws against the Hebrews in Palestine that were the product of the Munich and Nuremberg era.

Many words of grief, many resolutions of sympathy, many speeches of protest have been made in our own and other countries. I do not for a moment doubt the sincerity and the noble emotions which have prompted them, but I say in all earnestness, for God's sake, these people have suffered enough. Their age-old and continuous persecution has ended with a national disaster. It is time for action—action now. I, for one, am going to take all the action within my power and spare no effort. I shall knock on every door and go through every channel to see to it that the action is taken and taken immediately.

I feel confident of the success of our undertaking because I know that the heart and soul of Americans, irrespective of the national origin or religion, is with us. From the length and breadth of this land genuine human sympathy, understanding, and desire to be of help has been repeatedly and magnificently demonstrated. The will of the American people in this task, adequately expressed, must compel our Government to take appropriate action. For such democratic principles we have fought this war; it is for this that governments are elected and put in power: to express and act on the will of the people.

To the surviving Hebrews of Europe (and I hope my word reaches them) I want to say this: Do not despair; do not believe the world is all darkness; humanity is not dead, and the human soul is not all base. The people of this land, engaged as they are in a desperate and bloody struggle against the remaining Axis tyranny, are coming to your aid. Your emissaries and servants of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation here have not faltered in their task of raising their voice in your behalf. And as for myself, I consider it a great opportunity and honor to lend a helping hand and to serve a cause the solution of which is in the deepest interests of all the United Nations

and which has such great appeal to the traditions and the principles that make America.

Appeal for Food for Starving Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday a group of people representing 48 national organizations called on President Truman for the purpose of presenting an appeal for greater effort toward providing food for those nations whose people are now in distress and in imminent danger of epidemic and death resulting from malnutrition and food shortage.

We must not lose sight of the fact, Mr. President, that a stable and prosperous world will depend largely upon the ability of the people of war-torn nations to restore sound governments and a healthy economy. They look to the United States as the one great nation that has the means to aid them in their fight for rehabilitation. They look to us especially for the food which will enable them to withstand the next few dreary months.

It is to the interest of the United States to help them to the fullest extent. We all know that a lasting peace cannot be maintained in a hungry world.

I ask leave to have the appeal which was presented to the President by Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow on behalf of these 48 national organizations printed in the RECORD, and I express the hope and belief that the appeal will not go unheeded.

There being no objection, the appeal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appeal submitted by Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, on behalf of 48 national organizations, September 17, 1945.

Mr. President, the people of the nations who fought side by side with us now face death from starvation and cold. The survival of thousands of men, women, and children depends upon the decision to relieve the suffering caused by the devastation of war. The American people have made that decision.

You spoke the mind of America on August 9 when you said: "We must help to the limit of our strength. And we will." This decision America must carry out by swift and sure action. It is our moral obligation to those who bore the brunt of the war when we were unprepared. It is our promise—reaffirmed in your message to Congress—and we must make it good. So far it is evident from conditions in Europe that we have not done so. Only by keeping this promise can we build toward a future of peace and democracy.

We ask that you direct the Secretary of Agriculture to set aside the maximum amount of food we can send to our friends overseas so they can sooner take care of themselves.

We ask that when these allocations are made they be regarded as firm commitments and be given priority to insure delivery of the amounts promised.

We ask for the continuation of food rationing as long as necessary to provide fair distribution at home and at the same time the largest possible shipments of food to reduce starvation abroad.

We ask that the essential foods released by Army cut-backs be used to fulfill our promises of help before they are allowed to flow into the rapidly increasing domestic supply.

We ask for your continued support for the UNRRA appropriations including our second installment of 1 percent of our 1943 national income which you said "is fully justified."

We ask for the fullest public information on the need and on what the Government is doing to meet it so that we can do our part through support of our Government and through voluntary effort.

We realize that in less than 80 days the hunger-stricken people of Europe will be winterbound and face imminent death. Therefore, we ask, above all, for speed.

William Emerson, president, the American Association for the United Nations; Dr. Helen C. White, president, the American Association of University Women; Dr. Joseph P. Chamberlain, chairman, the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service; William Green, president, the American Federation of Labor; Joseph F. Landis, president, the American Federation of Teachers; Rufus M. Jones, chairman, the American Friends' Service Committee; Dr. Dora S. Lewis, president, the American Home Economics Association; Joseph M. Proskauer, president, the American Jewish Committee; I. L. Kenen, executive secretary, the American Jewish Conference; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, president, the American Jewish Congress; Charles W. Riley, executive director, American Relief for Czechoslovakia; Leo Krzycki, president, the American Slav Congress; Rev. Frederick May Eliot, president, the American Unitarian Association; Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, president, Americans United for World Organization; Charles G. Bolte, chairman, the American Veterans Committee; Dr. W. O. Lewis, executive secretary, the Baptist World Alliance; A. F. Whitney, president, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Martha F. Allen, national executive, the Camp Fire Girls; Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, general secretary, the Church Peace Union; Ray Gibbons, executive secretary, Congregational Christian Churches (Council for Social Action); Philip Murray, president, the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Colston E. Warne, president, the Consumers Union; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Clarence Streit, president, the Federal Union; Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, president, Food For Freedom; Dr. L. M. Birkhead, executive director, Friends of Democracy; Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president, the General Federation of Women's Clubs; Oscar Broneer, executive vice president, Greek War Relief Association; Dr. Stephen Duggan, director, the Institute of International Education; Thelma Stevens, executive secretary, the Methodist Church—Woman's Division of Christian Service; Walter White, secretary, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mrs. William A. Hastings, president, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Elizabeth Magee, director, the National Consumers League; Edward J. Heffron, executive secretary, National Council of Catholic Men; Ruth Craven, executive secretary, National Council of Catholic Women; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, president, the National Council of Jewish Women; Mary McLeod Bethune, president, the National Council of Negro Women; Willard E. Givens, executive secretary, National Education Association; James G. Patton, president, the National Farmers Union; Margaret A. Hickey, president, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; Anna Lord Strauss, president, the National League of Women Voters; Elisabeth Christman, executive secretary, the National Women's Trade Union League; Paul Sifton, Union for Democratic Action; Dr. Samuel Nirenstein, president, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; Mrs. Harper Sibley, president, the United Council of Church Women; Mrs. Norman deR. Whitehouse, president, Women's Action Committee for Victory and Lasting Peace; Mrs. Naomi Finkelstein, president, the Women's American Ort; Mrs. J. B. Calkins, president, Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States of America.

Our John Is Comin' Home, Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on April 12 last I asked to have inserted in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Greater Nebraskan entitled "Mother an' Me." I now have a follow up, written by the same editor, entitled "Our John Is Comin' Home, Tomorrow," which appeared in a recent issue of the Greater Nebraskan. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTHER AN' ME—"OUR JOHN IS COMIN' HOME, TOMORROW"

(By Mark M. Shaw)

Lord, this is just another of our family gatherings. We've been comin' to you with our cares and our anxieties. Tellin' you of that constant fear that haunted our doorsteps. That something dreadful might happen to our John. To the whole world, a soldier—a man. To mother an' me, a big, strong, kindly, loving boy—our baby. Even more than that, he was to be our mainstay in the years ahead, that come to us all. Around him and his future we built our own future in the declining years which are a part of life. Lord, You'll forgive us, You will pardon our doubts and fears, if in times of distress, we seemed to lack that perfect faith in Your great care and love. Now we see how weak and ungrateful we were. Lord, for this, mother an' me ask Your forgiveness.

Lord, today, the sun is shinin', all nature seems to exhale a great feelin' of joyous expectancy. The birds are singin' songs of love and happiness, the roses, the snowballs,

and the great white hydrangea blooms nod to each other as they whisper the glad news—"Our John Is Comin' Home, Tomorrow." Mother is again sittin' at the window lookin' down the street where she last saw our John marching away to war; there is no longer a feelin' of heartbreak—that is all taken away. In its place there is a deep feelin' of "Thank God" for a visible demonstration of your love, care, and kindness, in bringing our John safely home.

We are lookin' forward with hearts filled with happiness. We can soon take up our life's plans, where we laid them down when John bravely marched away to defend our America.

Lord, mother an' me are not only happy for blessings bestowed upon us, but we want to thank You for the joy You are bringing a million other fathers and mothers all over this Nation. Their John and their Mary are comin' home too, just as dear to them as our John is to us. But please, dear Lord, in your great love and compassion, won't You extend a very special blessing to those fathers and mothers whose loved ones will not come home—to those whose lives were offered as the price of a world of freedom and liberty?

Lord, all over this great Nation there are homes where the son's room is now a hallowed shrine, where high school and college pennants still flaunt their colors, where mothers still fold and carefully lay away the clothing that will never again be worn.

Lord, to those mothers and fathers will You not be a special and personal source of comfort and means of soothing their aching hearts? They need You so much—right now.

Dear Lord, let a full moon cast a halo of light and sympathy over the resting place of our soldier boys, who are sleeping tonight in graves on far-flung battlefields all over the world, for we know and feel that they are under your special care and protection.

Lord, we are comin' back to thank You, again and again. John will be with us then and join in talkin' things over with You as we have done in all years gone by. And until we four, You and John and mother an' me, can visit again, it's not "goodbye," it's not "amen," it is only "goodnight" from us to You.

Return of Servicemen to Their Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, in these hectic days when Americans are anxious to return to their homes, their families, and their jobs, it seems that the officials of our Army, who are already bungling the task of reconversion, should at least realize the rights of the people. Certainly every effort should be made to speed up separation from the Army of all men with families, and of the lads who desire to enter school, and no longer should we tear the young men away from their homes for military training while they are in the formative stages of their lives.

Just today I have a letter from a GI Missourian who is in the service, and who has been commanded not to write his Senator or his Representative about his rights. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that history may record the fact that American lads who fought and died for the "four freedoms" were denied one of these freedoms before the sound of the shots was silenced.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1945.

Hon. FRANK BRIGGS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a sergeant in the Army. I have been in the service for over 2 years, and have served overseas in Germany, and have a total of 44 points.

In expressing my viewpoints in this letter, I am also expressing the viewpoints of my friends who have served with me overseas.

We believe it possible to occupy Japan and Germany without having to send men to these countries who have already served overseas. Also, we feel that it is unfair to those who have already served, to cancel the drafting of men, and resort to voluntary enlistments. We feel it of the utmost importance to drastically reduce the size of the Army as quickly as possible. Married men, especially, who have served their country, and have been away from their loved ones, can no longer see the need for an Army larger than 2,000,000 men. We believe that the discharge rate can be stepped up considerably, and many of us are convinced that the high-ranking men of the Army are doing everything in their power to keep the Army large.

I bitterly regret that I cannot exercise one of the rights I fought for, and sign my name to this letter. We of the United States Second Army here at Fort Jackson, S. C., have received direct orders to the effect that we cannot write our Congressmen and express our viewpoints Furthermore, we were told that disobedience of this order would result in court martial of the guilty parties. We would like to know if this type of Nazi-like treatment is what we have been fighting for, and if this is the way our Army officers are allowed to treat us. It is apparent that these same high-ranking officers are the ones that are fighting to keep the Army large, and aren't expediting the discharge of eligible men. There are a large number of men in our company with over 90 discharge points, all wondering when they will be discharged.

I, as well as many of my friends, feel it our right to let our Senators and Representatives know that we want a fair deal as far as discharges are concerned.

We wish to take this opportunity to thank all of you who have so gallantly pleaded the complaints of the servicemen, and we feel proud to be able to see results already of our writing to you. We believe that if enough of us express the same opinion, that something will be done about it. Again I sincerely say I regret I cannot sign my name like an American should be able to do.

A GI.

Prepayment of Estate Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Felix Kahn, 200 Financial Center Building, San Francisco, Calif., who is one of the best known businessmen on the Pacific coast. During the war his firm, McDonald & Kahn, handled contracts for the Government aggregating many hundreds of millions of dollars. He has prepared a very interesting thesis on the prepayment of estate taxes in which he suggests the creation and sale of estate tax bonds by the Federal Government which would be acceptable at par at the death of the owner in payment of taxes on his estate. I think that Mr. Kahn's studious proposal is worthy of the attention of Congress and I have therefore asked permission to publish his thesis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The thesis follows:

PREPAYING ESTATE TAXES

It would be in the national interest for the Federal Government to create an estate tax bond, such security to be accepted at par at the death of the owner in payment of taxes on the estate, but not to be included in the estate for the purpose of computing the tax except to the extent that the bonds held exceed the tax payable. This bond would bear no interest until after it had been held for 20 years, but would be redeemable at the option of the owner at any time on reasonable notice. It would be nonnegotiable, nontransferable, and not acceptable as collateral. After 20 years, interest would start to accrue at the annual rate of 2 percent, but would be payable only into the estate at death. If cashed in prior to the death of the owner there would be no interest accrual regardless of the length of time held.

Under this system the man who possesses some capital would have in inducement (the reduction in the over-all estate tax) to prepay his estate tax and would then have an incentive to rebuild his estate again to the original level through earnings, insurance, etc. Moreover, this prepayment provision, in effect reducing the top brackets of the estate tax, will lessen the amounts of tax saving gifts and legacies and thus produce larger estates and consequently higher revenue to the Federal Government. It will also reduce the demand for tax-exempt municipal bonds, for a large part of the funds which will go into the purchase of estate bonds otherwise would be invested in tax-exempts.

Ignoring the probability that the availability of such a bond would increase the size of the estates left, thus offsetting revenue losses, the Treasury still would not stand to lose a material amount of revenue through this proposal. The prepayment of estate taxes would give the Treasury use of the money years in advance of the time it would otherwise be available. This would reduce the amount of money which the Treasury would have to borrow in the open market and result in a substantial interest saving. In the attached table I the mathematics are worked out.

Column I represents the net estate before deducting the $60,000 exemption allowed under the law as amended by the 1942 act. Column II represents the tax payable on such estates not giving effect to State taxes. The exemption allowed for State taxes would reduce the Federal tax somewhat in most States. Column III represents the amount of the tax if estate tax rates did not apply to that part of the estate used for paying taxes, that is, the amount of the proposed bonds that would satisfy tax requirements. For example, $4,068 represents the tax on a net estate of $95,932; together the two sums total $100,000. The purchase of $4,068 of the proposed bonds out of a $100,000 estate would satisfy estate-tax requirements. Similarly, the tax liability of a $200,000 estate would

be extinguished by the cancellation of $25,154 of bonds included therein.

Column IV shows the percentage of the tax in column III (extinguishment by bonds) to the present cash tax shown in column II. Thus, in the case of a $100,000 estate the face amount of bonds necessary to be included in the estate to clear the tax charge is 84.7 percent of the amount of the tax under existing law. Column V shows for just what period of time the Government would have to have the use of the money (considering money to cost the Government 2½ percent) to make the bond settlement the equivalent of the present cash settlement. Thus, the purchase of $25,154 of estate bonds by the owner of a $200,000 fortune would be the equivalent of the Government receiving $32,700 (the present cash tax on such an estate) 10 years and 7 months later, considering the money to be worth 2½ percent to the Treasury.

Columns VI, VII, VIII, IX, and X approach the matter from the other angle, figuring just what rate of interest the Treasury is in effect paying for this prepaid settlement if the money is received 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, 20 years, or 25 years, prior to the time it would otherwise be received. Except for the very large estates, the Government would be getting a fair deal if the average prepayment were 15 years. By limiting the purchase of estate bonds to $2,000,000 for any one estate, the plan could be made equitable.

The problem next arises as to what the life expectancy may be of the probable purchasers of estate bonds. This is dependent upon two unknowns: The ages of individuals who have worth-while estates and the relative appeal of this security to the middle-aged as compared with the elderly.

Table II makes an attempt to suggest the distribution by age groups of sizable estates. Column XII represents by age groups the heads of families where the family income in 1939 exceeded $5,000 per year but did not contain as much as $50 of income from other than salaries and wages. Column XIII shows the distribution among such families where outside income did exceed $50. Column XIV, an attempt to picture the distribution of estates, is built up by adjusting column XIII by the elimination of the distribution in column XII, which should give a rough picture of the distribution of above average incomes as contributed by earning assets rather than personal services. Column XV is the life expectancy of the middle age of the various groups as built up from insurance mortality tables.

If our assumptions as to the distribution of estates by age groups are roughly correct, the bulk of them are held by family heads aged 40 to 64 with life expectancy of from 13 to 28 years. Perhaps estate bonds should not be sold to persons aged over 67, for then the life expectancy would be less than 10 years. With this proviso the proposition should be equitable to the Treasury.

It should be remembered, when considering the life expectancy figures, that estates are given a year after valuation is determined to meet the estate tax. This is equivalent to adding about 2 years on the mortality figure to determine the period for which the Treasury receives prepayment.

The final problem is to make the proposition attractive to the middle-aged person, for as set up there is no incentive other than the possibility of an untimely death to spur the purchase. For this reason the purchases might be rather heavily weighted with holdings of elderly men. An offset would be the requirement that the bonds be purchased a year (or perhaps two) before death to be excludable from the estate.

In the final analysis this proposal will restore some incentive to use capital along productive lines.

TABLE I

Net estate	Maximum existing tax	Bonds necessary to clear tax	Ratio of bond tax to existing tax	Time in years and months bonds must be held to be equivalent of actual tax if money worth 2½ percent	Equivalent in tax-exempt interest rate if bonds are held— 5 years	10 years	15 years	20 years	25 years
I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
			Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$100,000	$4,800	$4,068	84.7	6 years, 8 months	3.35	1.66	1.11	0.84	0.99
$200,000	32,700	25,154	76.9	10 years, 7 months	5.32	2.65	1.76	1.32	1.35
$300,000	62,700	48,231	76.9	do	5.32	2.65	1.76	1.32	1.35
$500,000	126,500	95,833	75.7	11 years, 2 months	5.65	2.89	1.87	1.40	1.48
$1,000,000	303,500	222,000	73.1	12 years, 7 months	6.37	3.16	2.10	1.57	1.55
$2,000,000	726,200	502,113	69.1	14 years, 11 months	7.53	3.74	2.48	1.86	1.77
$5,000,000	2,430,400	1,506,154	62.0	19 years, 3 months	9.80	4.85	3.21	2.40	2.16
$10,000,000	6,042,600	3,468,353	57.4	24 years, 5 months	11.42	5.62	3.74	2.79	2.45
$30,000,000	21,442,000	12,114,124	56.5	25 years, 2 months	11.75	5.75	3.84	2.87	2.51

TABLE II

Age group (years)	Distribution of large incomes from salaries and wages only	Distribution of large incomes, including some non-salary income	Estimated distribution of estates	Average life expectancy of middle age of group
XI	XII	XIII	XIV	XV
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Years*
Under 25	0.4	0.2		43
25 to 29	1.9	1.0	.1	40
30 to 34	7.2	4.3	1.4	36
35 to 39	12.1	8.5	4.9	32
40 to 44	16.0	14.1	12.2	28
45 to 49	18.1	17.0	15.9	24
50 to 54	16.8	18.1	19.4	20
55 to 59	12.5	14.3	16.1	16
60 to 64	7.9	10.5	13.1	13
65 to 69	3.0	5.1	7.2	10
70 to 74	2.0	3.4	4.8	8
75 and over	2.1	3.5	4.9	5
Total	100	100	100	

Unemployment Claims Filed Against the State of Colorado

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to read to the House a report given to me by the Manufacturers Association of Colorado, as follows:

At the moment we are in the reconversion phase of the postwar period of the atomic era—and from the report on unemployment claims filed against the State of Colorado during the past 4 weeks, it would appear that much of this talk and worry about the human side of reconversion is just so much hot air.

Here are the actual figures:

Week of August 18: 26 new Colorado claims filed, 19 new interstate claims filed, 81 Colorado unemployment claims paid.

Week of August 25: 500 new Colorado claims filed, 104 new interstate claims filed, 114 Colorado unemployment claims paid.

Week of September 1: 487 new Colorado claims filed, 153 new interstate claims filed, 99 Colorado unemployment claims paid.

Week of September 8: 297 new Colorado claims filed, 105 new interstate claims filed, 103 Colorado unemployment claims paid.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE COLORADO WAR WORKERS WHOSE JOBS ENDED WITH CONTRACT TERMINATIONS?

The Winter-Weiss Co. who had 207 employees affected by contract termination between August 15 and August 22 made a survey of their affected personnel and because their findings were most interesting, we are passing them along to you.

Here they are:

Males who were part-time workers and will probably remain so in a civilian economy, 13.

Women who were working because their men were in the service and who under normal conditions will not be in the labor market, 21.

Males under 18 returning to school, 6.

Employees who already had other jobs to go to, 29.

Employees who returned to their previous occupation on other jobs, 9.

Employees who were referred by the Winter-Weiss Co. to another job that was open, 38.

Employees who lived outside of Denver and were returning to their homes, 8.

Employees who had no definite plans about the future—except to take a rest, 1.

Women employees who definitely plan to stay home now that the war is over, 8.

Women employees who took jobs in war work at the Winter-Weiss Co. and might be available in the civilian labor market, 29.

Employees who are either too old to work or so inefficient that they would not be recommended to potential employers by the Winter-Weiss Co., 40.

Employees who will return to their own businesses, 5.

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that claims for unemployment compensation in Colorado are not on the increase.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Hebrews in Germany

REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, having recently returned from an extensive tour of the inhuman concentration camps of the Nazi barbarians, where I saw evidence of the unspeakable bestiality practiced by the Nazis, I feel it is my duty to voice my sentiments on the present situation of the first victims of Hitler—the Hebrew people.

Now, some 4 months after VE-day, the Hebrews in Germany are still behind barbed-wire fences in the same concentration camps, while the enemy has reopened its opera house.

These facts are too bitter for the tongue. They smack of Cain. But this situation exists only because these people have no recognized spokesmen to see that their plight is alleviated.

In lieu of such a spokesman, it has been gratifying for me to see the efforts of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, a group of Palestinians who are working in this country on behalf of their people in Europe today.

Mr. Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew committee, has proposed several immediate steps which must be taken to give his people today the very minimum of decent treatment.

In a letter to our President dated September 8, Mr. Bergson suggests that the Hebrew people be immediately released from their concentration camps and allowed to leave the land of their murderers.

An official report by our own Government has shown that 90 percent of them want to leave immediately for Palestine.

In my recent trip to Palestine I found the people there pleading to take care of these Hebrew people—some of them their own near kin.

Mr. Bergson's suggestions are today receiving national editorial support in the press of our country. There is no civilized person in the world who can be against this act of liberation.

We must back this effort to give to the Hebrew people of Europe at long last the good will which they so deeply deserve. Not only because of our gratefulness for their 10-year fight against our ruthless enemy, but also to pay homage to the 5 million honored casualties they have suffered.

Mr. Bergson has proposed that the United States Government take the following program as its own in dealing with the Jewish problem in Europe:

First. All Hebrews now in German concentration camps who have expressed their determination to go to Palestine should no longer be regarded as Germans, Poles, Hungarians, or Rumanian displaced persons, but as Palestinians.

Second. The United States Government give full assistance to the immediate repatriation of all the above-named Palestinians and that an ad hoc American commission be established to take charge of this program and to begin executing this program in the American zone of occupied Europe.

Third. A commission composed of Hebrews from concentration camps should be appointed and recognized by the United Nations as charged with the handling of the affairs of all displaced Hebrews.

Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with Mr. Bergson's suggestions and feel that their adoption will do much toward alleviating the horrible suffering that the Hebrew nation has endured at the hands of the most unspeakable monsters in all history.

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF
NATIONAL LIBERATION,
Washington, D. C., September 7, 1945.

His Excellency HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President, United States of America,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I take the liberty, on behalf of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, to address to you the following appeal in the interest of the surviving Hebrews of Europe, particularly those who still find themselves in the sordid and violent surroundings of the concentration camps into which they were placed by the German barbarians.

Today, September 7, it is 4 months to the day since Germany's military might was broken and the United Nations have completed the occupation of Europe. To the Hebrews there VE-day was a glorious dream and a miracle come true, but today, 4 months later, some 200,000 Hebrews in Germany and Austria still find themselves virtually in the same position in which they were prior to VE-day. To be sure the United Nations have not continued the operation of the murder factories but little else has changed. The same notorious camps, the same bunks, the same German hideous prison clothes, the same barbed wire and armed sentries watching outside, only it is an American, British or Russian soldier that stands guard now and this, if anything, makes it even more painful.

To date the leading United Nations have done virtually nothing to bring solace and encouragement to our martyred brethren that fell to their charge.

During these 4 months the genius and might of the three great powers have shuffled across Europe some 5,000,000 displaced persons of various nationalities, but when it comes to the fate of 200,000 Hebrews the obstacles suddenly seem insurmountable.

The United Nations during these months have amicably settled some basic and major differences of opinion on a score of issues. The boundaries of many countries have been shifted around and the destination of numerous nations determined. Thus, everywhere people are feverishly laboring for their rehabilitation and reconstruction and are returning to life and liberty. But when it comes to the small land of the Hebrews—the territory of Palestine—United Nations statesmen suddenly become timid and helpless and permit a disastrous deadlock to continue which has already cost millions of innocent human lives.

Mr. President, during these months in which Providence has thrust upon you the leadership of the greatest and mightiest nation on earth, the whole world has come to admire your leadership. Your forthright human approach and great ability has guided and is guiding your Nation and, indeed, the whole world, through history's greatest era of upheaval and reconstruction.

That during these momentous months you have found several occasions on which to concern yourself and speak of the problems of our people has been of great encouragement and gratification to us. The time has now come, Mr. President, when we feel constrained to appeal to you for direct intervention and action, for the power of endurance and the patience of our martyred people in Europe have been strained to the limit.

We request, therefore, Mr. President, that you take appropriate action to bring an end to the shameful situation which forcibly relegates thousands of Hebrews to a continued existence of humiliation and misery in German concentration camps. We request, Mr. President, your assistance to enable every Hebrew in Germany who so desires to proceed immediately to Palestine where a thriving young nation is eager and able to receive them and restore them to dignified national life.

Palestine is not a British territory. It has been placed under British mandate by international authority. The present leading position of the United States amongst the United Nations puts direct responsibility upon it for the Palestinian situation. We believe that the United States should intervene and put a stop to the callous and arbitrary action by which the British Government prevents with force of arms these martyred Hebrews from returning to their own national home.

The administration of the internationally mandated territory of Palestine is a direct American responsibility. Now, when America actively participates in the supervision of elections in Greece and Bulgaria, when it takes an official hand in the establishment of a new Roumanian Government, we submit, Mr. President, that America should no longer hesitate to take an official and vigorous stand on this grave and urgent problem.

Mr. President, give the order and the hideous concentration camps will be abolished and within 2 months not a single Hebrew will remain on the polluted soil of Germany against his will. Only the will is needed and the first large step of solace and rehabilitation will be under way and will teach the peoples of Europe the meaning of American ideals of freedom, equality, and humanity for all. Today anti-Semitism is rampant and is steadily increasing in Europe. The passivity and inaction of the Allied occupation armies have been misconstrued by the peoples of Europe as an endorsement by the great democracies of the anti-Semitic doctrine. Pogroms and persecution are still the prevailing order in Europe.

In view of all the above, we respectfully propose that the following steps for a complete solution of this problem be immediately undertaken:

1. All Hebrews now in German concentration camps who have expressed their determination to go to Palestine should no longer be regarded as German, Hungarian, or Roumanian displaced persons, but as Palestinians.

2. The United States Government give full assistance to the immediate repatriation of all the above-mentioned Palestinians and that an ad hoc American commission be established to take charge of this program and begin its execution within the American zone.

3. A commission composed of Hebrews from the concentration camps should be recognized by the occupying authorities and be charged by them with the handling and representation of all Hebrew affairs.

It is reliably estimated that there are no more than some 100,000 such Hebrews in the American and British zones of occupation. If 10 Liberty ships were assigned for this task, carrying 2,500 passengers per ship, they could transfer 50,000 people a month and complete the entire evacuation within 2 months.

Surplus army trucks, as well as the German railroad system, could be used to transfer these people to Mediterranean ports. The expense would be approximately thirty or forty dollars per person. From a practical

point of view it will constitute a saving, for today the maintenance of the concentration camps, their food rations and heating, are mostly the burden of the American Army which could be freed of this responsibility and expense once the people are moved to Palestine.

Mr. President, the Hebrew nation has been disastrously afflicted in this war. The number of our casualties has been staggering and has exceeded manyfold those of the world's greatest nations. No self-respecting Hebrew will ever forget what the German barbarians have done to us. That is why virtually no Hebrew wishes to remain on German soil; the United Nations arms, forged to smash Germany and free the world, should not be used to keep them there.

Mr. President, to you more to any other human being in the world we turn our hopes for humane and immediate action. We pray that your answer to our plea will be given with the warm-heartedness and zeal that are so typical of your magnificent Nation.

I have the honor to remain, Your Excellency,

Most respectfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on September 17 the editors of Newsweek published an article on the atomic bomb. In my opinion, they deserve public thanks for calling the attention of the American people to the international danger which now faces us as a result of the development of the atomic bomb. Every patriotic American would do well to read and ponder the article in Newsweek, assembling facts gathered by Henry Paynter, in the September 17 issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FAT BOY" ATOM BOMB HIT NAGASAKI; "BIG BOY" WAS READY—WILL THIS PANDORA'S BOX OF ENERGY TURN US INTO A SUN?

(The atomic bomb continues to make front-page news even in a world at peace. Newsweek herewith presents a number of hitherto unpublished facts about the development of the bomb and its past and future use. These facts were gathered by Henry Paynter, of Newsweek's Washington bureau, from a wide variety of congressional, diplomatic, scientific, and neutral and allied military sources. The conclusions drawn are speculative and not attributable to official Government sources. Although there is currently no censorship affecting publication of information about the atomic bomb, Newsweek has deliberately withheld a considerable part of the data so that no foreign power might secure information otherwise unobtainable.)

Reports from the Pacific theater and from civilians and Allied officials just returned indicate the following:

The first (Hiroshima) bomb was called "Little Boy"; the second (Nagasaki), "Fat Boy"; and another, which might have been used had the war continued, "Big Boy."

The two bombs used were of different weights. Estimates varied from hundreds to thousands of pounds, but the essential explosive materials weighed only a few pounds.

Gossip persistently indicates that scientists have learned how to disintegrate at least one other atom, possibly a lighter one.

Analysis of bombing reports of the past 6 months indicates that the Air Forces may have "saved" a considerable number of key Jap industrial cities for instantaneous obliteration by single atomic bombs.

The men who handled the bombs were not sure they would work until they exploded; but had they been duds the Japs would still have learned nothing because the bombs contained very heavy contact demolition charges.

Some observers reported seeing a visible air-shock wave, identifying it in relation to photographs made of air-shock waves in Ordnance and Air Forces research into supersonic speeds.

One flyer who had removed his special glasses was temporarily blinded and suffered permanent injury to his sight although he was not looking at the explosion and was screened from any direct light rays.

THE KNOW-HOW, THE DANGER

The basic discoveries of Frédéric Joliot-Curie, son-in-law of the famous Curies, were widely disseminated before the war began. This information includes the theoretical knowledge that it is possible to disintegrate—as distinguished from merely splitting in two (fission)—a considerable number (possibly but not probably all) of the 94 elements. It is theoretically possible to disintegrate such common elements as hydrogen, oxygen, and even carbon, found in the air, water, and ordinary topsoil. (But the uranium method which allied scientists have perfected and used could not be employed with any commonly occuring element or compound.) Most, if not all, of Joliot-Curie's findings are definitely known to be in possession of Russia, the only power in the world—aside from the Anglo-American group possessing the present formulas—capable now of duplicating atomic fission in large quantity by use of uranium and its isotopes.

In addition to the British Empire and the United States, four nations are known to have the scientific brains, technical know-how, electric energy, and wealth to develop atomic fission or disintegration for strategic purposes by means other than use of uranium (and thorium, which has been mentioned in published information about early efforts to split the atom). These are France, Sweden, Switzerland, and Russia. (Only Russia is known to have mineral resources available to use the uranium method, and/or thorium.)

Russia theoretically could duplicate the Anglo-American methods in slightly more than 2 years, provided it concentrated all available top scientists and all other needed resources in the effort. Informed scientific opinion estimates it would take from 5 years to a generation or more for any of the nations mentioned to perfect a method of atomic fission or disintegration using any other element. Some experts believe splitting the hydrogen atom is the most likely new method—and the most dangerous—since theoretically it is possible that disintegration of the hydrogen atom in masses large enough to be strategically effective might touch off incendiary disintegration of the planet (some theorists believe this is what happened on the sun, millions of years ago, turning it into a near-perpetual ball of fire).

At one time Allied scientists and intelligence officers feared Germany would succeed in its efforts and possibly win the war. Later Anglo-American scientists proved, reputedly to their own satisfaction, that the German method would never succeed—a fact Hitler may not have learned until too late. During the last year of war, according to diplomatic gossip, German scientists were concentrated in a laboratory near Oranienburg, near Berlin. The laboratory was made a top-priority target for destruction by heroic Allied sabotage agents, and the building, instruments, vital supplies, and records were wiped out in a blistering AAF attack last February, these sources say. (The atomic-research laboratory near Santa Fe, N. Mex., was protected more thoroughly from enemy air or sabotage attack than the White House, the Capitol, or key machine-tool plants.)

THE MOST POWERFUL MAN

Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, chief of the Manhattan engineering project which developed and directed the successful use of the atomic bomb, was given greater powers than any American in history to get the men, ideas, materials, and real property he needed, and to protect them from enemy espionage, sabotage, or direct attack. His methods were outstandingly successful. Groves at all times sought to weave together the scientific, technical, skilled labor, and military and civilian talents necessary.

Published reports approved by the now-defunct Office of Censorship indicate the method of atom splitting finally adopted was based on the fact that the "atomic-explosive power" of the activated uranium atom takes effect only when a sufficiently large amount is detonated Therefore two or more chunks of the uranium isotopes used, which would be stable by themselves, would explode (by instantaneous atomic-chain disintegration) upon being merged physically into a single larger mass. This theory was published as early as 1939. Authorized publications since the launching of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs have mentioned two methods of achieving the physical union of two or more chunks: (1) by a small gun in the bomb which fires a cartridge (consisting of a chunk of uranium) into one or more other masses; (2) by methods involving the principle used by small boys in snowball fights of "squeezing the outer snow hard against the internal ice core."

THE MOST POWERFUL BOMB

Newsweek last winter published exclusively news of a new fuse used with sensational success in Army gunfire against German troops, which had been developed from an earlier Navy fuse. Allied diplomatic sources and returned veterans subsequently indicated the Army fuse used was one that resulted in the explosion of an antipersonnel shell at a specified altitude above troops, regardless of the contour of terrain. Recently published diagrams showing the operation of radar as a method of positive altitude determination indicate one obvious means of detonating a bomb at a specific altitude above the ground. If such a method was used, obviously no parachutes on the atomic bomb would be necessary and it is therefore possible the parachutes described by Jap survivors supported scientific instruments for making observations on the force of the explosion, such as intensity of light, sound, air-shock wave, and so on. Some scientists said the mushroom-shaped upper cloud resulting from the atomic raids probably contained most of the radio-active elements, and the dark cylindrical lower cloud contained powdered bodies and houses.

It is theoretically unlikely that the explosion of uranium atoms in bombs of the types used would set off chain disintegration of the earth. It is remotely possible that very much larger concentrations might, however, produce unanticipated reactions which could accomplish the destruction of the earth's ability to support human life. It is quite possible that other processes

which are theoretically possible, such as disintegration of the hydrogen atom, might under certain circumstances, destroy the present balance of elements in and around the earth, making it unable to support human life. Among reliable scientific sources there is currently, also, considerable difference of opinion as to the long-range effect upon human beings of radio-active substances released by explosion of the atomic bomb.

NOW AND TOMORROW

In a future war, should a sneak attack be launched against an unsuspecting nation (against machine-tool plants and other key installations) it is possible that the ability of a nation to wage war might be eliminated at the outset if a sufficient number of atomic bombs were used in guided missiles. Although no present defense exists against such a weapon, present knowledge beyond the experimental state indicates the possibility of a joint use of radar and guided missiles to seek out and explode atomic bombs in guided missiles before they reach their targets.

Published statements would indicate that the United States is vigorously pursuing not only increased efficiency and greater production of already proved atomic-bomb types, but is simultaneously pushing research in utilization of common substances (such as air, water, topsoil, kitchen soda, and table salt) as basic ingredients for disintegration of other atoms for strategic purposes. With the head start gained, it is a fair presumption this country has at least a 2-year start on other nations.

Without exception, every government, civil, and military official having direct knowledge of atomic power warns in the gravest terms that this leadership is only "temporary"—that the United States may be presumed to have not more than 5 years in which to make its decisions, possibly less.

Poem in Tribute to the Late President Roosevelt by Judge Fred E. Mueller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, in St. Louis County, Mo., we have a judge, a good judge, even though his political faith and the faith of the majority in the Senate differ. When he learned of the passing of the great leader of Americans, Franklin D. Roosevelt, he penned a poem which I feel should be printed in the RECORD as a permanent memorial to this great man, and as a testimony that in times of strife and grief, politics are laid aside and men become friendly and understanding. The poem was written by Judge Fred E. Mueller, and published in the St. Louis County Leader. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(By Circuit Judge Fred E. Mueller)

Sleep on, thou valiant one
Who feared nought else than fear;
For you the task is done,
For us the way is clear.

Sleep on, you blazed the trail
Through shadows dark and dense.
Now all the earth shall hail
The knell of ignorance.

Sleep on, your steady hand
Has raised the flaming torch
That lights the course you planned
Through freedom's triumphal arch.

Sleep on, thou valiant one,
Sleep on, we'll meet the test.
For you the victory's won;
You've earned a hero's rest.

Research and Development of Artificial Arms and Legs

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced two bills, one for the Veterans' Administration and one for the War Department, authorizing those departments to expend money for research and the development of artificial arms and legs.

In speaking with the Navy Department this morning I find that Admiral McIntyre and his assistants would be very glad if such a bill were introduced on behalf of the Navy Department. I am therefore introducing such a bill for the Navy today. Admiral McIntyre tells me he is not satisfied with the artificial leg, although it is of plastic material, has very few break-downs, and does not get cold in the wintertime.

Mr. VINSON, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, has already promised me to hold hearings on the bill. He is not at all satisfied with what has been done in the matter of the development and research and perfection of artificial arms and hands. I am delighted with his enthusiastic and realistic approach to the whole subject of continuing and improving the care of our service men and women. My bill provides that money shall be given to private industry in order that private industry may go on developing satisfactory prosthesis for the men who certainly ought to be made so nearly whole again as possible.

The bill I intend to introduce is as follows:

A bill to aid in the development and manufacture of improved prosthetic appliances

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed (1) to cause to be conducted by the appropriate agency or agencies in the Navy Department experimentation, studies, and research for the purpose of aiding in the rapid development and prompt manufacture of more adequate and efficient prosthetic appliances and parts of such appliances, and (2) to allocate from time to time, from funds appropriated under authority of this act, to such corporations and business firms as he deems best qualified, such sums as he deems necessary to be expended by such corporations and business firms in conducting experimentation, studies, and research for such purpose.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Captain Kruez' statement follows:

THE AMPUTATION PROGRAM OF THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT, UNITED STATES NAVY

In response to a letter from the staff director of your committee, the Surgeon General has directed me to discuss the program for the care of the amputees in the naval service. In this discussion, I will describe the program as I have observed it in operation, but my views are not to be considered necessarily those of the Navy Department.

The Navy's program for amputees is based upon its general policy for the care of all casualties, namely, prevention, immediate emergency medical attention in the battle areas, expeditious evacuation, and expert definitive treatment in special hospitals designated for the various types of casualties.

In cases requiring amputation of an extremity, early treatment and prompt evacuation, together with the use of such treatment measures as the sulfa drugs, penicillin, serum albumin, plasma and whole blood, has been a factor in saving not only many limbs but many lives as well. It is also probably the case that many more limbs were preserved by the institution of a policy governing the indications and operative procedure for amputations under field conditions. This policy for the Medical Department of the Navy was published following the International Conference on Amputations and Artificial Limbs at Toronto and Ottawa, Canada, on February 14–17, 1944, where the problems of amputations and artificial limbs were fully discussed by military and naval surgeons of this country and our allies. The operation adopted in the naval service was one which could be safely and satisfactorily performed under field conditions, and which would preserve the maximum amount of vital tissues.

Early evacuation is as important for the amputee as it is for other major casualties. Thousands of casualties of all types were evacuated by air from the battle areas, many of them reaching a base hospital within a few hours after they had received their injuries. When the patient could not be safely transported to a hospital, the hospital was sent to the patient. Hospital ships staffed and equipped to handle all types of casualties were at hand to treat these patients at or near the battle area. Many smaller ships were also equipped to offer essential emergency services.

In 1942, there were only seven patients invalided from the naval service because of amputation of an extremity. In 1943, this number increased to 41, and in 1944, to 155. At the present time, there are approximately 1,000 amputees under treatment in the two naval amputation centers.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, the Surgeon General placed in operation at the United States naval hospital, Mare Island, Calif., an artificial limb shop equipped to manufacture artificial limbs, and staffed the hospital with medical officers experienced in the surgical technique involved in amputations. Experimental work was begun on materials as well as engineering and fitting procedures. As experience was gained and production methods improved, the limbs provided by the hospital limb shop became the joint product of the orthopedic surgeon, limb maker and limb fitter. This team, in cooperation with the patient, has made it possible for the Navy to provide the individual patient with the maximum service as soon as his stump was ready for it, and facilitated minor adjustments until a perfect fit could be obtained.

As the tempo of the war in the Pacific increased early in 1944, it became evident that the facilities of the amputation center at Mare Island would not be adequate to care for the anticipated number of amputees. The Surgeon General, therefore, early in

March, established a second amputation center in the naval hospital at Philadelphia, Pa. This hospital was also especially equipped to manufacture artificial limbs and staffed with specialists in the surgical, limb-making, and limb-fitting fields. The experience gained at Mare Island was used to advantage in establishing this center. The production rate in each center at present is about 50 limbs per month, which is sufficient to insure that each patient receives a limb as soon as he is ready for it. Before the recent capitulation of Japan, planes were already in operation for the establishment of two additional amputation centers, and personnel were being trained at Mare Island and Philadelphia to staff them. However, these plans were abandoned because the present facilities are considered adequate to care for the number of amputees in the Naval Service. Since Pearl Harbor, there have been approximately 2,200 amputations of an extremity among personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

The surgical management of the amputee is only part of the treatment. It is necessary that the amputee receive the artificial limb best suited for him, that the prosthesis be accurately fitted and comfortable, and that he be properly trained in its use. There is also an added and equally great responsibility—that of preparing the amputee, physically, mentally, and socially for the fullest possible adjustment to civilian life. This responsibility is equally important in all types of casualties.

It was with this in mind that the Surgeon General, in April 1944, established the rehabilitation program of the Medical Department of the Navy. In his preface to the manual on rehabilitation, he stated, in part: "The Medical Department of the Navy has a third task which is even more important than the other two, for upon its ability to solve the variety of problems of rehabilitation depends the future of hundreds of thousands of the youth of our Nation."

The rehabilitation program concerns itself with the individual, realizing that each has his different problems, aspirations, and ambitions, and each is endowed with different assets and abilities. The program is not peculiar to the amputee; it encompasses all patients. However, the nature of the disability in the case of the amputee indicates the need for a special approach to his problem.

The individual who has lost an extremity suffers a type of mental shock quite different from that due to other types of injuries. His immediate depression concerns itself with a variety of questions: What's going to happen to me? What does an artificial arm or leg look like? What will it do? Will I be able to use it? What can I do with it? Will I be able to dance? Drive a car? Get around? Eat? Take care of myself? Will I ever be able to do the ordinary things necessary to lead a normal life? Will people stare at me and regard me as a cripple? How will my sweetheart react? These and many other questions the amputee will want to have answered.

Wisely administered, rehabilitation will answer these questions for the amputee as soon as possible after the accident—in the base or field hospitals or hospital ships. The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, therefore, initiated the production of a motion picture entitled "The Road Ahead," to answer these questions for the amputee and prepare him for the important rehabilitation services available at the amputation centers.

Amputees as a group are most appreciative and cooperative. They ask for understanding and reassurance—not sympathy. They soon become adjusted to their disabilities—especially in amputation centers where they come into contact with other amputees with whom they can share their problems. Mutual assistance predominates and the new arrival soon becomes imbued with a new spirit. The amputee, too, is characteristically friendly and loyal to those who understand him. He wants to be accepted as a normal human being—and not as a cripple. His artificial limb should be accepted as an emblem of distinction rather than an object of horror. If this were done, there would be no reason to hide the fact of amputation, and the greatest problem facing the amputee—that of becoming quietly and inconspicuously assimilated into society—would be close to solution.

It is essential, too, that the amputee regain his self-confidence, and that he be convinced that a man is only as good as he thinks he is.

Material rehabilitation must go along with the psychological. By means of the various physical medicine procedures, the stump is made ready for the prosthesis, and contractures are eliminated. The muscles of the amputated extremity are reeducated and developed to produce maximum efficiency in the use of the artificial limb, and the other muscles of the body are retrained and developed to compensate for the missing member. Specially qualified personnel train the amputee in the use of his prosthesis and, before being discharged, he must have demonstrated proficiency in various things, such as walking up and down stairs, on level and irregular surfaces, using regular eating utensils, tie his shoes, dress himself, and attend to the normal activities of daily life. He also is taught how to drive an automobile equipped with standard accessories, and to qualify for a driver's license.

While the amputee is in the hospital, the Educational Services Department, by means of educational and vocational guidance, helps him select the best course to follow after he leaves the hospital. Correspondence and other courses are available to those who desire them. Prevocational training in many trades is also available under proper educational guidance.

The civil readjustment officer gives a personalized interview to every patient prior to discharge, in which the rights and privileges under existing laws is explained.

Representatives of the United States Employment Service and of civil service have data available to aid the patient in selecting a job, and there are many other services, such as those provided by the legal assistance officer, the Red Cross, the chaplain, and the Veterans' Administration, all designed to help the patient prepare in the best possible way for his future life as a civilian.

A large percentage of amputees have procured positions, even before their discharge. Others prepare themselves for continued schooling, and still others desire only to return to their former jobs. It is the patient who is the final judge. Rehabilitation merely helps him to help himself.

The Medical Department of the Navy has been engaged in research in the development and improvement of artificial limbs since the opening of the artificial limb shop at the Mare Island Naval Hospital in 1941, and later this research was extended to the National Naval Medical Center, at Bethesda, Md., and the amputation center at Philadelphia.

The Medical Department of the Navy began using plastics as the basic material for the manufacture of artificial limbs in 1941 and has since employed two techniques—one using a thermal setting plastic, and the other a cold setting plastic. Both have proved highly satisfactory to date.

In the artificial-limb shops of our amputation centers, plastics have been successfully bonded to both wood and metal, and the method of manufacture organized on assembly-line methods, so as to speed production and increase the efficiency of the individual steps required.

At the United States Naval Hospital, Mare Island, a fine-grained basswood has been found to be a satisfactory and practical substitute for willow in the manufacture of thigh pieces for above-knee amputations. This thigh piece is fashioned from strips of this type of wood, mitered and glued together to form a hollowed tapered hexagon, which is then shaped into final form.

The amputation center at Mare Island is cooperating with the engineering department of the University of California in a study of forces acting in artificial limbs. The hospital performs clinical tests, while the theoretical studies are carried on in the laboratories of the university. The purpose of these studies is to obtain definitive engineering data for the design and construction of artificial limbs.

Mare Island is experimenting with two types of articulated mechanical hands which have unique finger action; one of them is pneumatically controlled, the pneumatic pressure being derived from a small air compressor worn on a harness which encircles the chest. Both of these mechanized hands are in the developmental stage, but they are considered by the medical officer in command to show promise.

At the United States Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, work in the manufacture of plastic artificial limbs has also been in progress. Improvements in manufacturing procedures have developed to a stage where 60 limbs, both arm and leg, are manufacture per month by a force of 25 Hospital Corps men and one officer in charge of the limb shop. Improvements in the joint mechanisms have been made, especially in the knee joint for above-knee amputations. The kick-strap has been eliminated by the introduction of a spring and brake mechanism, which is incorporated in the joint. A bronze oilite bearing has also been developed to replace the cloth or leather brake lining in the knee mechanism. In cases of amputation through the knee, the incorporation of a knee friction mechanism in the joint itself has decreased the bulkiness of this type of end-bearing prosthesis. An improved type of prosthesis for amputations through the ankle joint has also been made. Generally speaking, the prostheses for amputations through the ankle joint have not been entirely satisfactory due to their weight, bulk, and joint mechanism. The United States Naval Hospital at Philadelphia, however, has developed a lighter, less bulky prosthesis, which contains a standard but more satisfactory ankle mechanism. This hospital has also developed a prosthesis for amputation through the wrist joint. The prosthesis does not extend above the elbow. When the forearm is pronated or rotated inwardly the fingers automatically close. In this way, the patient is able to grasp objects by merely rotating his forearm. The mechanism involved is simple and compact and eliminates the usual objection to such prosthesis.

The Philadelphia amputation center has also developed a cosmetic hand made of latex and a plastic dress hand, which are offered to amputees who desire them. This cosmetic hand is reasonably lifelike, and the fingers can be bent to assume a fixed position. It can be attached to the regular artificial arms, interchangeably with the hook and regular dress hand, which are furnished to every amputee. Since latex is subject to deterioration, other materials, giving promise of greater durability, such as the vinyl resins, are being studied.

In both centers the regular dress hand is usually purchased on the open market, including the so-called miracle or Henning hand, the Becker hand, and others. However, Philadelphia has also produced a type of light plastic dress hand, which the patient may choose if he desires.

At the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda a research project is in progress on the development of a cosmetic plastic hand made of a vinyl resin. This plastic has promise of being more durable and more lifelike in appearance than any material previously used for artificial hands. The plastic

hand is made over a lightweight metal mechanism which permits motion of the index and middle fingers, the thumb being rigid. While it is probable that this hand may prove to be a combination utility and cosmetic hand, it is not intended to replace the standard utility hook. This hand has not as yet been perfected, and experiments in its development are still in progress.

It is appropriate at this time to mention the excellent work of the Committee on Prosthetic Devices of the National Research Council in its study and research in artificial limbs. The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery is represented on this committee, and many beneficial and worth-while suggestions have been obtained through it by which the Navy amputation program has greatly benefited. The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery has not received many specific criticisms or complaints regarding the limbs supplied by the Navy amputation centers. Most of the causes for criticisms and complaints made of artificial limbs are to be found in all prostheses. Some of them are:

Appearance: There is general agreement that the so-called hook for the arm prosthesis is not pleasing to the casual uninitiated observer. Those who have become accustomed to it and its over-all value have, however, assumed an entirly different attitude toward it. As a matter of fact, most amputees who have been properly trained in its use consider it indispensable because it has proved to be the most generally useful thing yet devised. The so-called dress or cosmetic hands developed to date, upon close inspection are really not lifelike, and, although recent research developments give promise of a satisfactory combination utility and cosmetic hand, it is conservative to predict that even such a prosthesis will hardly suffice to fully replace the normal member for which there is no substitute.

Utility: The movements of a normal extremity are so complex and varied that it is unreasonable to suppose that any artificial member could substitute for it. However, with proper training, the average individual can be taught to use an artificial limb to a point where he is able to perform the tasks required for a normal life.

Weight: Among the bill of complaints against artificial limbs is the weight. It is difficult to say how light an artificial limb may be made and still be able to withstand the stresses, strains, and torques to which it is subjected in ordinary wear. It is even more difficult to estimate to what extent an artificial member should withstand abnormal or accidental forces. One should not be willing to sacrifice strength to gain a small benefit in weight. On the contrary, it is better to concentrate on the development of the remaining muscles and of the entire body, so as to make an additional small amount of weight unimportant. The present plastic artificial limbs manufactured by the naval amputation centers compare favorably with the lightest limbs, but this advantage is not deemed too important when viewed in the light of comfort, durability, and service. Experimental studies are in progress to lighten the prosthesis, from structural materials to shoes and hands.

Durability: Like any other mechanical device, an artificial limb will sometimes give way. It is weakest at the joint hinges and the parts to which these hinges are applied. Much depends upon the construction of the limb and the points at which stresses and strains are applied in ordinary and extraordinary wear. But much more depends upon the use to which the artificial limb is subjected. Amputees are cautioned that an artificial limb requires the same care as any other mechanical device, such as one's car, or watch, or gun. Even the strongest limb will not withstand all stresses and pressures that may be applied to it. However, present research in improvement of joint hinges, the use of plastics, the successful bonding of plastic to wood and metal, and the improvement in design and fitting of artificial limbs suggest the eventual development of a stronger, lighter, and more comfortable member.

Noise: The noise factor in artificial limbs has been largely eliminated, especially by the use of rubber bumpers and plastics. Certain joint mechanisms such as the elbow, however, where flexion and extension are controlled by a locking device, are still rather noisy; but present experimental work offers hope for elimination of this objection.

Texture: Another complaint pertaining to all artificial limbs is that the wearer is often embarrassed because the prosthesis is not soft and lifelike to the touch. It is believed that this objection is less important than many of the others. It is a matter, however, that can be properly studied along with more important projects. An ideal artificial limb should, of course, approach the body in temperature, as well as in texture.

And, finally, there is something more important than the artificial limb itself, and that is the attitude of the amputee toward his disability and his prosthesis, and the attitude of the public toward him. Unless the amputee has received the proper reassurance and understanding of his problem, and unless he has become properly adjusted to his disability and understands the limitations that are inherent in an artificial limb, and that no prosthesis can ever be expected to fully substitute for his normal member, and unless the attitude of the public toward him and his prosthesis is one of understanding and willingness to accept such physically handicapped individual into the normal social and economic order, no mechanical aid alone can be expected to rehabilitate him.

A Living Tribute to War Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 18 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Hon. John M. Quarles, of Helena, Ark., has suggested a living tribute to our war heroes. I ask unanimous consent that a brief article from the Helena World containing this suggestion be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVING TRIBUTE TO HEROES, FINE IDEA

(By John M. Quarles)

Your editorial Can Useful Memorial Truly Pay Tribute? brings this thought to mind. I will say yes to your question and offer a plan to make a memorial that would be a lasting and a living and a life-saving memorial for the future generations.

I would say establish two research hospitals, one for tuberculosis and one for cancer with the money for science to make all the research and experiments to find a cure for these two plagues that take their yearly toll of life.

This would be a living tribute to our dead heroes "that the living may still live." Our Government spent $2,000,000,000 for a bomb to destroy life and now how much can or should we spend to save life?

HELENA, ARK.

Child-Welfare Centers

REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the retention of child-welfare centers beyond October 31, 1945, is so great that, in keeping with my statement on September 12, page 8554 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter received by me from the Honorable Roger D. Lapham, mayor of the city and county of San Francisco, together with his communication to the President of the United States referred to therein, and a letter to me from the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, with the resolution enclosed therewith, dealing with this humanitarian problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the documents to which I referred are, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
San Francisco, September 13, 1945.

The Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH,
Congressman, Fifth District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter I have addressed today to President Truman, outlining reasons why San Francisco would like to have Lanham Act funds available for child-care centers beyond October 31, 1945, the scheduled date of termination of moneys for this purpose. Anything which you may do to assure continuance of the funds would be appreciated.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, on September 4, 1945, adopted a resolution memorializing the President, and copy of that resolution, together with the board's letter of transmittal, also is enclosed herewith.

Sincerely,

ROGER D. LAPHAM, *Mayor.*

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
San Francisco, September 13, 9145.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Announcement by the Federal Works Agency that funds available for the child-care centers, under authority of the Lanham Act, will be discontinued in San Francisco, effective October 31, 1945, has created considerable reaction here with the result that the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, on September 4, passed a resolution memorializing you to continue this Federal aid. Copy of the resolution, together with a letter of trans-

mittal from the board of supervisors, is attached hereto.

While I am on record as not being a strong advocate of the school favoring use of Federal or State funds for local projects, I feel that in this case there is justification for the Federal Government continuing the child-care-center program in San Francisco, in view of the fact that while hostilities have ceased the war actually is not over in this great Pacific coast harbor city and probably will not be for quite a few months to come.

San Francisco still has an emergency employment problem which requires the services of working mothers. These employments include such Federal activities as those under the Navy Department and in other fields of Federal activity, despite certain curtailments already ordered.

Our board of education informs me that a survey just completed of working mothers shows that 99.3 percent expect to remain in San Francisco and that 98.4 percent of them say they need to continue working to support their families. A survey of their employers indicates, according to the board of education, that 91.2 percent of the jobs now filled by these women will continue to be available to them and that 88.7 percent of the working mothers will be unable to make arrangements for the care of their children if Federal funds no longer are available. War time, of course, brings an increase in juvenile delinquency and San Francisco has had its share of that increase. These reasons are highlights of a situation which unquestionably was created in San Francisco because of a Federal problem, namely, the war against the Axis.

You will note in the resolution passed by the board of supervisors that funds from local sources cannot legally be made available for the child care centers such as have been operated with Lanham Act moneys.

I believe, Mr. President, the reasons enumerated above constitute logical, economic, and social bases on which you could act to insure a continuance of Lanham Act appropriations for child-care centers in this area until postwar period of emergency has subsided.

Trusting this petition will receive your favorable consideration and with my kind personal regards, I remain

Sincerely,

ROGER D. LAPHAM, *Mayor.*

Copies to Hon. Sheridan Downey, United States Senator, California; Hon. William Knowland, United States Senator, California; Hon. Richard J. Welch, Congressman, Fifth District; Hon. Franck R. Havenner, Congressman, Fourth District; Board of Education (Dr. Curtis E. Warren); press.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
September 13, 1945.

The Honorable RICHARD J. WELCH,
Congressman, Fifth District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is respectfully called to the attached Resolution No. 4908, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco on September 4, 1945, urging continuance of Federal aid for maintenance of child care centers in the city and county of San Francisco.

Very truly yours,

DAVID A. BARRY,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors.

Resolution 4908

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States to continue Federal aid for maintenance of child care centers in the city and county of San Francisco

Whereas the Lanham Act, passed by Congress in 1941, provided among other matters, that certain sums might be appropriated for the establishment, particularly in the centers of war industry, of child care centers, where proper supervision and care would be provided throughout the day for the children of working mothers, and

Whereas pursuant to the Lanham Act, Congress has appropriated certain sums of money for the maintenance of child care centers and this service has proved a valuable asset in the recruitment of personnel necessary to the war effort; and

Whereas the Federal Works Agency, which has jurisdiction over such funds as are made available for child care centers by appropriation pursuant to authority of the Lanham Act, has notified the San Francisco United School District that, effective October 31, 1945, no further funds will be forthcoming for maintenance of child care centers; and

Whereas because San Francisco, the hub of home-front operations for war in the Pacific, must now assist efficiently and without interruption in those services necessary to transition from war to peace, it is vital that the employment structure which has been perfected in this area be not disturbed and that continued maintenance of facilities be assured for the care of children of those working mothers who constitute a most important part of that structure; and

Whereas because funds from local sources cannot legally be made available for such a purpose, continuance of this activity can only be assured through Federal subvention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors cognizant of the continuing necessity for the services of working mothers, wives, and widows of servicemen, and as a consequence the maintenance of child care centers until such time as the services of working mothers may be dispensed, does hereby memorialize His Excellency the President of the United States and does urge, if legally permissible, that by Executive order the Federal Works Agency be directed to continue to provide for the maintenance of child care centers in the city and county of San Francisco; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board be and is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to His Excellency the President of the United States, as well as to Senators DOWNEY and KNOWLAND and Congressmen WELCH and HAVENNER, with the request, if the purposes of this resolution be impossible of accomplishment by Executive order, that such legislative procedure be instituted and prosecuted as will effect the objective herein proposed.

Adopted, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 4, 1945.

The United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Capt. John D. Bosler which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 14, 1945:

CAN'T OMIT MERCHANT MARINE

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The cartoon on the editorial page of the Herald Tribune, September 5, 1945, is splendid. It indicates a very high morale among the members of the respective armed forces. However, I wish to state that the armed forces would have been completely without offensive power had it not been for the tremendous transport job performed by the merchant ships of the War Shipping Administration and the merchant marine crews, all of whom were volunteers. The great majority of the merchant seamen who sailed our ships were not qualified seamen prior to December 7, 1941. They were average citizens from all walks of life who were recruited and trained for merchant ship duty by the United States Maritime Service. They were the muscle behind the fist of the armed forces.

JOHN D. BOSLER.

NEW YORK, *September 10, 1945.*

Concerning the Sugar Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore on this floor made speeches discussing the food and sugar shortage. Recently my warm friend, Mr. Frank Gervasi, associate editor of Collier's wrote some pertinent observations concerning the sugar shortage. In this connection, it is interesting to recall that in 1944, 100,000 tons of sugar were sent to Spain from our limited supply, but that in 1945, this quota for Franco Fascist Spain was reduced to 60,000 tons. Thus we are continuing to promote the interests of Fascism in Europe by underwriting in effect economically the Franco dictatorship in Spain.

I shall continue to denounce and oppose collaboration by the United States with Fascist Spain in any form. The Potsdam Declaration, the unanimous decision of UNCIO at San Francisco, the public statements of President Truman, the official declarations of the Labor Party, which is the majority party controlling the government of Great Britain—all join in repudiation of Franco Fascist Spain. Let us give more than lip service to world democracy. Actions speak louder than words.

Here is the clipping to which reference hereinabove has been made:

[From the Grand Junction (Colo.) Sentinel of August 30, 1945]

WHAT'S HAPPENING TO SUGAR

Moonshiners and Dictator Franco of Spain are two reasons for the current shortage of sugar; but if American housewives use sugar carefully there'll be enough available for canning, Frank Gervasi, associate editor of Collier's reveals in a signed article on the sugar shortage in the current issue of that national magazine.

OPA over-issued 800,000 tons of sugar in 1944, following a "popular outcry against rationing and a demand for more sugar," Gervasi declares, and much of it found its way into the hands of "moonshiners and wildcat candymakers at as much as $25 per 100-pound sack." He charges that chiseling consumers, who made falsified statements for canning sugar, got a good share of the excess sugar.

This was but one drain on our sugar stock pile, Gervasi reports. Franco's Spain is reported to have been allocated 60,000 tons "to

help pay for quantities of tungsten ore purchased from the Spaniards so that the Nazi wouldn't get it."

Gervasi declares that Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, has sliced the allotment of sugar for the Army and the liberated countries of Europe, but hasn't been able to stop the shipment of the 60,000 tons to Spain. Secretary Anderson "wouldn't give nations like Franco's Spain even a teaspoonful of sugar if he could help it." Gervasi asserts. He then characterizes Spain as a country that was neutral against us.

Gervasi reports that the profesisonal drys, knowing the value of a lie as did Adolf Hitler, are circulating reports that sugar is being diverted to distillers and brewers. He then adds, flatly, "no sugar is being used by whisky and beer makers."

As we all know, there is much discussion, many reports, true and untrue, concerning the sugar-shortage situation. Doubtless the above comments from the editor of Collier's are both accurate and based on a disposition to be fair. They are timely and pertinent.

MacArthur Tosses Atomic Bomb Into Peacetime Military Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur has done it again. Millions of mothers and fathers should be and I am sure are thanking God for the leadership of the general. He has literally thrown an atomic bomb into the peacetime plans of "an administration clique" of military "brass hats," who are attempting to put their personal welfare ahead of that of the country. This clique intends only to further its own security and maintain its rank and wartime controls over the biggest Army and Navy it can cram down the throats of the American people. It is into this military dream that the general has thrown his bombshell about needing only 200,000 men for the efficient occupation of Japan. MacArthur has chosen to tell the people the truth, which is an unusual action on the part of a high military authority. The general has always been prone to tell the people about our military needs long before this war and during the conflict, even when the truths he had to tell were discouraging, he has elected to take the people into his confidence. Therefore, we have no reason to doubt that MacArthur is adequately anticipating our present occupation forces needs in Japan.

No one can question the ability of MacArthur, the leader. No one questions the integrity or patriotism of MacArthur, the man, and MacArthur, the soldier, chooses to call a spade a spade. For five long years, the American Congress has literally given way to our military leadership, even though we were not at times representing the people whom we were chosen to represent. Now, the military war is over and MacArthur, along with some of the rest of us, realizes that there is a great battle yet confronting America—this time it is an economic war, and to win it we must increase the national income and decrease the national outgo. That will require that we decrease Federal expenditures wherever possible, and though our military groups will struggle to keep their big appropriations and power, our cuts in outgo must include the Army's expenditures, too.

No one anticipates that the Army should be kept at anywhere near the size it is today, and no one wants us to disarm to the 1939 levels. However, no one knows better than MacArthur the size Army which would be adequate for our peacetime job. Therefore, in view of MacArthur's statement about the number of men he will need to properly police Japan, it is the duty of the Congress to see that demobilization of manpower above that critical figure is expedited. We have a right to demand efficiency of our Army in war and peace, and our requirements in peace should be rigid and our check on military efficiency should be strict. America should demobilize to the point where we are not wasting the taxpayers' money in order to keep surplus manpower in the services, and thereby let thousands of brass hats retain their ranks and high incomes. It can now be told that instead of a political junket, as Congressmen's trips abroad have been called, I traveled throughout the European and Asiatic theaters of war last spring on Army Orders Nos. SO–111 and 300.4, issued respectively by Generals Hoag, Stowell, Booth, and Sultan.

While in those theaters of operations, I was determined to talk with the GI's more and with the brass hats less. I wanted to know what was on the minds of the men in the ranks; after all, this was a civilian Army we had mobilized. This is the information which came to me: "For every job in these parts"—wherever I was at the time—"there are a dozen men" and "for every hour's work to be done, there are 12 man-hours of manpower available." Ninety percent of the boys were idle most of their time, and were crying for work or transfers. They did not like to be kept there, away from their families, at the expense of the Government, doing nothing. Of course, it is the Army's policy to keep six men on hand for every job, and while there were approximately 12 men for every job in wartime, which might be tolerated or substantiated by the leaders, there is no excuse for keeping 6 men on hand for every Army job in peacetime. I can be more specific about what I mean.

Recently, I was talking to a commanding officer in regard to the negotiations of a small community for a utility which was being operated by the Army. I was told that the city could have the service of the utility if it would pay its share of the operating costs. Mind you, the city was not to pay any part of the cost of installation or of capital investment. The operating costs as quoted, under the management of the Army, were eleven times the operating costs of a nearby similar utility. I asked for an explanation for this tremendous difference and the only answer I got was that "it is due to the service given."

Now, you men who ever operated a business at a profit know that private enterprise cannot operate by paying 11 times as many men to do the job as is necessary. No private company could compete with similar industries under this kind of management. Then why should we permit the "brass hat" legions of the Army in peacetime to keep even six men in uniform at public expense for every essential job the Army undertakes?

It is up to Congress to take a strong hand in the demobilization program, and it is our job to do away with all conscription after offering suitable inducements to encourage volunteer enlistments into the armed services. Once we have leveled off to a standing army sufficient to our needs we should keep up our military power by the reward system to attract the necessary manpower.

I am unalterably opposed to peacetime conscription. The military bigwigs must not be permitted to mold the lives of our young men. That is the very thing we have been fighting against. Hitler and Hirohito had youth movements which were mainly under the control of the military authorities of their countries. Such action has no place in a democratic republic. If our American ways of living are to return to us, the men who have been away from their homes and families for as much as 1 year in this war should be and must be returned home as quickly as transportation can be arranged. It is up to Congress to see that legislation to this end is affected immediately.

It is my suggestion that every group of men who took part in this war and who performed military duties for as much as 1 year during the war period should be given immediate consideration for release. The older men, who were nearing their forties when inducted, should be given a chance, as quickly as possible, to pick up the broken threads of their civilian lives. The next age group, which were young married men, or those who were finishing their educations, should be returned to have the families and make the contributions to America's progress which they were prepared to make but were robbed of the chance to offer. The next group, the young, unmarried boys, whose educations were interrupted or who have had to start their families in the midst of the disrupting events of a global war should be brought back into the society of postwar America and their training finished, of their militarily developed talents put into peacetime uses. And of course those not-yet-dry-behind-the-ears youngsters who were snatched from the senior classes of our high schools should be made into useful citizens, and every attraction must be offered to them to coax them back into our colleges and universities where their mental growth can catch up to their physical maturity, and their military experience.

This leaves the Regular Army personnel to man our posts of leadership and

authority and by inducement offers, we can provide the men of the ranks in whatever numbers we find necessary.

Even in this inducement legislation, I do not favor a program which is overexpensive, because I favor the use of some of China's surplus manpower. We could feed, clothe, and teach thousands of China's unfortunates while they performed foot soldier assignments all over the world under our trained officer leadership and American discipline. That seems little enough to ask of China who never hesitates to ask so much of us. And France, is she to be forever an open, complaining empty mouth to feed? Let her send us a company or two each year to carry out our military occupation duties. Such men would be at least repaying in peacetime services some small part of what we have spent in money on France's welfare, not to mention our wartime contributions to such defeated nations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is no rhyme or reason for this Nation to continue a peacetime draft of manpower, and I recommend to this Congress the above suggestions for the solution of our military manpower problems. Legislation along these lines is called for, and I hope to see this body take action immediately.

Cordell Hull's Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on foreign affairs which appeared in the September 8, 1945, issue of the Army and Navy Journal:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The official state papers of the Japanese Government, which will be available on General MacArthur's direction, are expected to throw a flood of light on the controversial questions raised in the reports of the Army and Navy inquiries into the Pearl Harbor disaster. They will disclose whether the note of November 26, 1941, sent by the then Secretary of State Hull, "touched the button that started the war," as alleged by the Army Board, and provide exact knowledge of the date when the concentration of ships, including carriers, was begun for the projected attack upon our Hawaiian base on December 7, 1941.

The official reports of Ambassador Grew, quoted by the Board, show that the trend of the relations of the two countries during 1940 and 1941 was steadily downward, that on October 9 of the latter year he advised that the frozen-credit policy of the United States was driving Japan into national bankruptcy and she would be forced to act, a prediction emphasized by the appointment of General Tojo, of the Kwantung gang, as Premier on October 16 and by his warnings on November 3 that war was not only possible but probable and that Japan was preparing for hostilities with dangerous and dramatic suddenness. It was on the day of this latter warning that special Ambassador Kurusu left by plane for Washington, and his knowledge of Tojo's plans apparently was withheld even from Admiral Nomura, then Ambassador to the United States, as revealed by the latter in confidential conversation with friends. In any event, on November 17 Mr. Grew reiterated that we could expect a sudden Japan naval or military attack in regions not then involved. Meanwhile, as Nomura, with obvious trepidation, revealed to the Army and Navy Journal, there occurred in Tokyo a meeting of Tojo with the business representatives of Japan. This meeting he feared would support the military in their design for war, to which he was violently opposed, for, as he said, it would mean ruin for Japan and the weakening of the United States.

It was in the full light of Japanese temper and apprehended purpose that Secretary Hull prepared his note of November 26. That 10-point document did not threaten war or anything other than the loss of American confidence and respect, but was merely a restatement of our basic policy in the Far East. The Japanese chose to interpret the note as an ultimatum because, as it is fully expected their state papers will show, they were fixed in their determination so to cripple the United States Navy by a surprise attack that we would be unable to prevent them from solidifying their control of the East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, and because of our pacifism and unwillingness to war and paramount interest in the European struggle, dispose us to abandon the Far East, and make peace.

From the moment he assumed the office of Secretary of State, Mr. Hull was fully aware of Japan's ambitious design to gain the overlordship of all of East Asia. At that time, as he said to the Army and Navy Journal, he must speak with discretion to the Tokyo Government because we were not strong enough to compel it to abandon its policy of aggression. When our armed forces should attain sufficient strength, then he proposed to state emphatically the position of the United States, which position was in accord with the age-long policy of our Government, particularly with respect to the Hay principles of the integrity of China and the Open Door in that country. Throughout the years before Japan precipitated the war with us, the Secretary acted with the utmost care to preserve peace and yet persuade the Far Eastern Government to forego its dream of expansion, and as his representations met with new measures of aggression, he began the application of economic sanctions which he hoped would be effective. Throughout this period, he advised the War and Navy Department, and, of course, the President, of developments as they occurred. It was his view that diplomacy was the spearhead of our defense, and in execution of it he arranged for weekly conferences with the Secretaries of War and Navy at which the Army's Chief of Staff and the Navy's Chief of Operations, were in frequent attendance. When assailing the Army Board for criticizing Mr. Hull's policy toward Japan, a criticism held to be outside its province and unjustified by the facts, Secretary of State Byrnes said that he proposes in the future to arrange for complete coordination of all the intelligence agencies of the Government. It was in accordance with his recognition of the value of coordination of the three national defense departments that Mr. Hull repeatedly warned the military of the seriousness of our relations with Japan, that he deliberately withheld from his note of November 26 any suggestion of war, and indeed had in mind some kind of a modus vivendi, that on November 7, informing the Cabinet of the extremely critical situation, he referred to the imminent possibility that Japan might at any time start a new military movement of conquest by force, and that on November 26 he served notice that the matter of dealing with Japan was in the hands of the Army and Navy.

Thus our own record shows a persistent effort, first by argument and then by sanctions, to arrest the ambitious designs of Japan, and it shows further coordination of the State Department with the heads of the War and Navy Departments as the danger of war approached. The documents which will be obtained from the Japanese Foreign Office unquestionably will establish the former. To the officers of the Army and Navy, especially, it is clear that Japan could not have struck Pearl Harbor on December 7 without exact knowledge of our fleet weakened by withdrawals to the Atlantic, without information as to its location and distribution obtained in part from its spies and submarines in Hawaiian waters—one was sunk an hour before the attack and others were reported to have been within Pearl Harbor noting the exact berthing of our ships—and without thorough preparation in the way of the fueling of ships, provision of oil and gasoline for planes, concentration at the selected base for the operation, etc. All these things took time. Certainly they could not have been accomplished within the 11-day period between November 26 and December 7. From the Japanese papers we will get the facts, and they probably will show that from the time Tojo directed the attack until it was delivered, weeks were occupied in planning and preparation. That our intelligence failed in supplementing the forebodings of Ambassador Grew is evidenced by the statements in the reports of both the Army and Navy boards, the latter declaring it to be an established fact that no information of any sort was at any time, either forwarded or received from any source which would indicate that carriers or other ships were on their way to Hawaii during November or December 1941. Yet, this failure of intelligence is accreditable not to absence of efficiency on the part of responsible officers, but rather to the lack of prewar funds, the policy under which as Congress alone can declare war, no activity could be engaged in which might provoke Japan, and other measures taken by the Tokyo government to prevent the leakage of its plans or secrets.

Amendment of Clayton Antitrust Act in Interest of Small Business—Statement of C. W. Harder, President, National Federation of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, consolidations and mergers which limit the opportunities of small business are definitely against our principle of free enterprise and are antagonistic to the interest of small business. There is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House H. R. 2357, which will strengthen the Clayton Antitrust Act. The National Federation of Small Business, which is a progressive and enlightened organization, is supporting this

legislation. I am pleased to include copy of letter written to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House by C. W. Harder, president of this association. Mr. Harder is a forward-looking and capable advocate of legislation in the interest of small business. He and his organization are doing an excellent job in helping protect the interests of the little businessman.

The letter is as follows:

JUNE 27, 1945.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In the month of April 1945 our bulletin, The Mandate, No. 121, was forwarded to our membership for vote on various legislative issues. It included the issue:

"To strengthen the Clayton Antitrust Act. To strengthen the authority of the Federal Reserve Board in dealing with bank-holding companies. It would make it unlawful for bank-holding companies to acquire control of a competitor, thus creating a monopoly as is possible under the present law."

Within 30 days reports were received that showed our membership had voted 92 percent in favor of amending the Clayton Antitrust Act as quoted, 5 percent against, and 3 percent no vote.

The above information was derived from copies of tabulations prepared by reputable businessmen, who act as our district chairmen in the different communities in 65 percent of the States of our Nation. These district chairmen prepare the tabulations from actual ballots received from federation members in the local communities. The ballots and the original of the tabulations are forwarded directly to their respective Congressmen. The duplicate copy is forwarded to our office. From these copies the national summary is prepared that resulted in the above-mentioned figures with reference to the vote.

It is important to keep in mind that the ballots as checked by the independent business people over the Nation were submitted by the federation as quoted above; however, that the businessmen did their own checking and the federation in no way handled the ballots. This report gives the House Judiciary Committee absolutely bona fide opinions as to the desires of the independent business people of our Nation on this important issue with reference to strengthening the Clayton Antitrust Act as specified.

The desired change in this legislative issue is extremely important to those who desire reemployment of our people during the reconversion period. The facts are that independent business employs more people, will consume more postwar materials than any other group.

It can be said without fear of contradiction that if we hope to promote and protect our system of free enterprise, including the welfare of small business, certainly the proper place to start is by strengthening the Clayton Antitrust Act. After all, independent banking does play an extremely important part in promoting independent business.

A negative expression on this issue would be if bank-holding companies were allowed to continue their control of all independents, exactly what opportunity do we have to promote the welfare and prosperity of independent business? I trust that this large national vote that has come directly from the independent businessmen over the Nation directly to their Members of Congress will be given the proper consideration by your committee in bringing this issue before the entire Congress.

Sincerely,

C. W. HARDER, *President.*

The Strike Epidemic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, Americans stand appalled over the epidemic of strikes that has broken out in various parts of the country. There are many who believe that these strikes were inspired in the hope they will force the Government to take over industries and thereby bring about government ownership and operation. These strikes rest on no basis and have little if any justification.

The people are not disposed to criticize the rank and file of organized labor because they know full well that these strikes are caused by unwise and selfish leadership. Contrast the position of some labor leaders in this country with the position recently taken by Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the Council in Britain's new government, and which is commented upon by Wilbur J. Brons in the following article appearing in a recent issue of the Chicago Journal of Commerce. This article is being inserted in the RECORD in the hope that it will gain general circulation throughout the country, especially among the rank and file of labor.

The article follows:

THE ROUND TABLE

(By Wilbur J. Brons)

UNITED STATES PLANNERS COULD USE COPIES OF TALK TO BRITISH WORKERS

You can be sure that the recent speech of Herbert Morrison, lord president of the council of Britain's new government, will not be widely reprinted in the labor press in this country. Nevertheless, Mr Morrison's remarks deserve widespread circulation because they bear so directly upon our own major problem of the moment.

Morrison spoke at Leeds, England, before the National Conference of Labor Women. He received very little publicity from the American press associations, but several special correspondents, including one for whom the writer can vouch personally as a thoroughly objective reporter—cabled the substance of the speech.

The British Cabinet member addressed himself to a fallacy which is becoming even more popular in this country than it has been in England. This is the somewhat infantile argument that the biggest problem of the peace will be to increase industrial efficiency so that the individual worker can pass more hours loafing in the sun. With this delightful buncombe goes the corollary premise that the chief obstacle in the path toward Utopia is backward management. Millions of Americans seem to have swallowed this nonsense hook, line, and sinker.

Mr. Morrison came right out in the open with a challenge to his country's new labor government, of which he himself is a part. He told the unions that their restrictions on production would have to come off. He warned them that the tendency toward shorter hours will have to be reversed, adding that the unions were 100 percent wrong in assuming that management owned all the blame for laggard industrial efficiency in Great Britain.

Socialization alone, he said, is no magic cure. It won't be enough for people merely to depend upon the government to assure them larger participation in the fruits of production; workers themselves will have to produce the goods by which England hopes to raise her standard of living. In other words, if British workers have deluded themselves with the hope that a labor government means complete freedom from all industrial discipline, they are doomed to disappointment.

The speaker said as bluntly as he knew how that if the British people want more they will have to produce more, and he warned that the socialized segments of industry in Britain cannot live on the proceeds of taxation of unsocialized industry because to attempt to do so would kill all incentive to produce.

As we remarked at the beginning of this discussion, Morrison's remarks deserve wider circulation in this country than they are likely to get. Some of our own Government agencies, including the Department of Labor, would do well to write to London for a copy of the speech and refer to it frequently when they are about to make some profound statement about how to improve living standards in the United States.

Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire at this time, when the bill for voluntary enlistments is about to be considered in the House, to present for the benefit of the Members an editorial from the Stars and Stripes and a letter that appears in the same publication, written by a soldier overseas. At the same time I include the comment of a wife who has two children and who is attempting to operate a 224-acre farm while her husband is remaining in the armed services after 28 months on foreign soil.

[From the Stars and Stripes, Pacific edition, of September 8, 1945]

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

There has been much talk about halting the induction of men into the armed forces as soon as Congress reconvenes.

We have no intention of advising you as to what course of action to take, but we can tell you how the men in the Pacific feel about the idea.

They're pretty angry.

They can see no excuse for discontinuing the draft until enough men have been inducted to occupy Japan and Germany.

They're convinced that if we don't police the Nips and Nazis for a long time to come, for 2, 5, maybe 10 years, we'll have won a war only to lose it.

But GI's now overseas don't think they're the ones who should do the occupying for very long.

They've just won a war, and they believe they've earned the right to go home as soon as replacements can be obtained. In fact, they believe that the draft should be stepped up, rather than stopped, so that replacements can be shipped overseas in a hurry.

Mention has been made of releasing 5,000,000 of our 8,000,000-man Army in the next 12 months. That will leave 3,000,000 vets in service, hundreds of thousands of them still 3,000 to 10,000 miles from home a year after the war is over, while millions of others in the Nation will not have been asked even to approximate that sacrifice for a much shorter period.

Pacific soldiers feel that the only fair method of selecting the occupying forces is to choose those physically fit young men who have not been away from home for 1 to 4 years; who have not been forced to support families on meager Army pay; who have not had to postpone having children, getting married, or furthering careers.

GI's are aware that civilians will not accept induction happily now that the war is over. And they can sympathize with an unwillingness to make the harsh economic, domestic, and personal readjustments that climbing into a uniform requires.

They can sympathize because they've been through it.

If the people back home are determined to create the angriest group in our Nation's history, they can succeed by informing the men overseas the occupation job is theirs until it's finished.

In effect, they'll be telling them they're a lost generation, that they're trapped, and there's nothing they can do about it.

The same issue contained a letter written by an overseas soldier to the editor of Stars and Stripes:

DRAFT HALT

The Stars and Stripes:

Your recent news release of August 10 to the effect that congressional leaders expect to push through a bill terminating the draft by November 1 has created considerable discussion in this area.

If this is done, who will relieve the men who have been overseas for a considerable period already? It seems to me that the draft should continue, particularly in the case of 18-year-olds and that these men should be used to take the places of those who have put in their time and are impatient to return to their homes and responsibilities. Or could it be that Congress is more concerned with the home-front vote than with the potential vote of the GI? * * *

What about the great numbers of young men who have been deferred as essential to the war effort? With the conclusion of the war, their essentiality ceases. Why not extend an invitation to them to don a uniform and assume part of the responsibilities of policing the conquered nations? Granted that they worked hard and turned out the goods when it was needed, but in doing so they remained in contact with the pleasures of the home front, retained their feeling of independence to a large degree, and were reasonably reimbursed for their efforts. They would find it a broadening experience. What do you readers think?

DEAR SIR: This was sent to me by my husband, who has served overseas 28 months. We have two children and a 224-acre farm. There are lots of others like him. Their cause is justified, so I hope you'll give it your deepest consideration.

Respectfully,

MRS. RALPH ELDER.

DELTA, IOWA.

Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me I desire to insert in the RECORD an article, Political Parade, by the able, reliable, and well-known Washington correspondent, George Rothwell Brown, which appeared in a number of the leading papers throughout the country on September 16.

Mr. Brown is so well and favorably known to the membership of this House that anything I may say in his favor would be like gilding the lily. He is a sterling American who has never yet sold his pen to a cause in which he did not believe. He is most highly esteemed by his associates as well as by the membership of both Houses of Congress:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, September 15.—President Truman certainly comes off second best in his controversy with Representative KNUTSON in the matter of supplying money taken from American taxpayers to finance the new Socialist-Communist government of Great Britain.

Mr. KNUTSON'S remarks in the House were obviously embarrassing, since Lord Halifax and Lord Keynes happened at that moment to be in Washington to tell the United States Government the precise terms upon which His Majesty's Government would be willing to take some more Yankee dough, say from three to six billions.

But it was high time somebody spoke up in Congress, and Mr. Truman's off-hand remark that it was a "perfectly silly conclusion" that the United States should not finance the left-wing government at London because of its socialistic program cannot be laughed off so easily as that.

The President added, as what doubtless he thought was a "clincher," that Great Britain had a right to any form of government it desired. Under the circumstances we should not couple that up with a request for additional financing.

That is as much as to say that when a gentleman presents himself at a bank to negotiate a loan, it is no business of the banker whether the applicant is a conservative merchant or industrialist, or is known to have embarked upon a dazzling gambling project.

Well, we know mighty well what the banker would say. He would make a loan to the conservative merchant or industrialist, and he would politely bow the gambler out.

Britain at the last elections, when she threw out Winston Churchill, the man whose pluck, grit and energy won the war for England, embarked upon a great political gamble involving the socialization of her basic industries, which is but the first step toward complete socialization.

To whom does Britain turn for financial assistance as she launches this dazzling Marxian dream?

She turns not to Communist Russia, which also is looking to capitalistic America for financial assistance, but to the one remaining conservative people on earth, whose free enterprise system has made them today the only people who are still solvent.

We are asked; in effect, and that is what Mr. Knutson meant, to furnish the money to enable Great Britain to make a success of state socialism, and thus discredit the system of free enterprise in the eyes of the world.

We are suckers if we do it. But we have been suckers before! It is possible that we shall be suckers again?

Lord Keynes at his Washington press conference made it perfectly plain that Britain "is in no mood" to repeat the experiences "of last time's war debts."

What were those experiences, which Britain does not intend to repeat? After his election in 1920 President Harding sent Col. George Harvey to the Court of St. James as American ambassador and he negotiated a debt settlement with Britain.

The United States financed Europe, prewar and postarmistice, to the tune of $10,350,479,074.70. We are still holding the bag.

After the Hoover moratorium most of the debtor governments stopped payments on their installments to the United States. Britain made token payments through 1933, and then she quit. Only little Finland made good.

One gathers from Lord Keynes' remarks that Britain will not again commit the error of acknowledging a debt.

It is easier just to forget it!

But still that doesn't explain why it is silly to object to sending good free enterprise money to London to finance a socialistic regime which, if successful, would give the free enterprise system a black eye.

There is something silly here, but KNUTSON didn't say it!

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of yesterday.

ONLY CLOGS THE WHEELS

It is right for the American people to push Congress and Congress to push the armed forces for speedy and efficient turning of its demobilization machinery's wheels.

It is right for the people to urge Congress and Congress to urge the armed forces to liberalize and to correct any inequities in the basic formulas which determine eligibility for discharge.

It is right for the armed forces to insist that considerations of the Nation's military security, and of preserving general confidence in the impartiality of the discharge system weigh more heavily than individual convenience or even hardship.

It is not right, and it defeats its own purpose, for the people to overwhelm Congress and Congress to overwhelm the armed forces with requests for special action on individual cases.

Here is what the flood of such requests now pouring into Washington actually does: It clogs the administrative wheels of the armed forces so that discharges are slowed down instead of speeded up. It breaks down morale all through the ranks by giving the

impression that men with "pull" get favored treatment. And it turns Members of Congress into harried errand boys at a time when vital questions demand their time and their best abilities as statesmen.

Republican Platform, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Republican platform of 1944:

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, 1944

The tragedy of the war is upon our country as we meet to consider the problems of government and our people. We take this opportunity to render homage and enduring gratitude to those brave members of our armed forces who have already made the supreme sacrifice, and to those who stand ready to make the same sacrifice that the American course of life may be secure.

Mindful of this solemn hour and humbly conscious of our heavy responsibilities, the Republican Party in convention assembled presents herewith its principles and makes these covenants with the people of our Nation.

THE WAR AND THE PEACE

We pledge prosecution of the war to total victory against our enemies in full cooperation with the United Nations and all-out support of our armies and the maintenance of our Navy under the competent and trained direction of our general staff and office of naval operations without civilian interference and with every civilian resource. At the earliest possible time after the cessation of hostilities we will bring home all members of our armed forces who do not have unexpired enlistments and who do not volunteer for further overseas duty.

We declare our relentless aim to win the war against all our enemies: (1) for our own American security and welfare; (2) to make and keep the Axis Powers impotent to renew tyranny and attack; (3) for the attainment of peace and freedom based on justice and security.

We shall seek to achieve such aims through organized international cooperation and not by joining a world state.

We favor responsible participation by the United States in postwar cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

Such organization should develop effective cooperative means to direct peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression. Pending this, we pledge continuing collaboration with the United Nations to assure these ultimate objectives.

We believe, however, that peace and security do not depend upon the sanction of force alone, but should prevail by virtue of reciprocal interests and spiritual values recognized in these security agreements. The treaties of peace should be just; the nations which are the victims of aggression should be restored to sovereignty and self-government; and the organized cooperation of the nations should concern itself with basic causes of world disorder. It should promote a world opinion to influence the nations to right conduct, develop international law and maintain an international tribunal to deal with justiciable disputes.

We shall seek, in our relations with other nations, conditions calculated to promote world-wide economic stability, not only for the sake of the world, but also to the end that our own people may enjoy a high level of employment in an increasingly prosperous world.

We shall keep the American people informed concerning all agreements with foreign nations. In all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight. We shall sustain the Constitution of the United States in the attainment of our international aims; and pursuant to the Constitution of the United States any treaty or agreement to attain such aims made on behalf of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

We shall at all times protect the essential interests and resources of the United States.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE RELATIONS

We shall develop Pan-American solidarity. The citizens of our neighboring nations in the Western Hemisphere are, like ourselves, Americans. Cooperation with them shall be achieved through mutual agreement and without interference in the internal affairs of any nation. Our policy should be a genuine good neighbor policy commanding their respect, and not one based on the reckless squandering of American funds by overlapping agencies.

POSTWAR PREPAREDNESS

We favor the maintenance of postwar military forces and establishments of ample strength for the successful defense and the safety of the United States, its possessions and outposts, for the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, and for meeting any military commitments determined by Congress. We favor the peacetime maintenance and strengthening of the National Guards under State control with Federal training and equipment as now provided in the National Defense Act.

DOMESTIC POLICY

We shall devote ourselves to reestablishing liberty at home.

We shall adopt a program to put men to work in peace industry as promptly as possible and with special attention to those who have made sacrifice by serving in the armed forces. We shall take Government out of competition with private industry and terminate rationing, price fixing, and all other emergency powers. We shall promote the fullest stable employment through private enterprise.

The measures we propose shall avoid federalization of Government activities, to the end that our States, schools, and cities shall be free; shall avoid delegation of legislative and judicial power to administrative agencies, to the end that the people's representatives in Congress shall be independent and in full control of legislative policy; and shall avoid, subject to war necessities, detailed regulation of farmers, workers, businessmen, and consumers, to the end that the individual shall be free. The remedies we propose shall be based on intelligent cooperation between the Federal Government, the State and local government and the initiative of civic groups—not on the panacea of Federal cash.

Four years more of New Deal policy would centralize all power in the President, and would daily subject every act of every citizen to regulation by his henchmen; and this country could remain a Republic only in name. No problem exists which cannot be solved by American methods. We have no need of either the communistic or the fascist technique.

SECURITY

Our goal is to prevent hardship and poverty in America. That goal is attainable by reason of the productive ability of free American labor, industry and agriculture, if supplemented by a system of social security on sound principles.

We pledge our support of the following:

1. Extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered.

2. The return of the public employment-office system to the States at the earliest possible time, financed as before Pearl Harbor.

3. A careful study of Federal-State programs for maternal and child health, dependent children, and assistance to the blind, with a view to strengthening these programs.

4. The continuation of these and other programs relating to health, and the stimulation by Federal aid of State plans to make medical and hospital service available to those in need without disturbing doctor-patient relationships or socializing medicine.

5. The stimulation of State and local plans to provide decent low-cost housing properly financed by the Federal Housing Administration, or otherwise, when such housing cannot be supplied or financed by private sources.

LABOR

The Republican Party is the historical champion of free labor. Under Republican administrations American manufacturing developed and American workers attained the most progressive standards of living of any workers in the world. Now the Nation owes those workers a debt of gratitude for their magnificent productive effort in support of the war.

Regardless of the professed friendship of the New Deal for the workingman, the fact remains that under the New Deal American economic life is being destroyed.

The New Deal has usurped selfish and partisan control over the functions of Government agencies where labor relationships are concerned. The continued perversion of the Wagner Act by the New Deal menaces the purposes of the law and threatens to destroy collective bargaining completely and permanently.

The long series of Executive orders and bureaucratic decrees reveal a deliberate purpose to substitute for contractual agreements of employers and employees the political edicts of a New Deal bureaucracy. Labor would thus remain organized only for the convenience of the New Deal in enforcing its orders and inflicting its whims upon labor and industry.

We condemn the conversion of administrative boards, ostensibly set up to settle industrial disputes, into instruments for putting into effect the financial and economic theories of the New Deal.

We condemn the freezing of wage rates at arbitrary levels and the binding of men to their jobs as destructive to the advancement of a free people. We condemn the repeal by Executive order of the laws secured by the Republican Party to abolish "contract labor" and peonage. We condemn the gradual but effective creation of a labor front as but one of the New Deal's steps toward a totalitarian state.

We pledge an end to political trickery in the administration of labor laws and the handling of labor disputes; and equal benefits on the basis of equality to all labor in the administration of labor controls and laws, regardless of political affiliation.

The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal. Labor bureaus,

agencies, and committees are scattered far and wide, in Washington and throughout the country, and have no semblance of systematic or responsible organization. All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor. Such labor bureaus as are not performing a substantial and definite service in the interest of labor must be abolished.

The Secretary of Labor should be a representative of labor. The office of the Secretary of Labor was created under a Republican President, William Howard Taft. It was intended that a representative of labor should occupy this Cabinet office. The present administration is the first to disregard this intention.

The Republican Party accepts the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the Social Security Act, and all other Federal statutes designed to promote and protect the welfare of American working men and women, and we promise a fair and just administration of these laws.

American well-being is indivisible. Any national program which injures the national economy inevitably injures the wage earner. The American labor movement and the Republican Party, while continuously striving for the betterment of labor's status, reject the communistic and New Deal concept that a single group can benefit while the general economy suffers.

AGRICULTURE

We commend the American farmers, their wives and families for their magnificent job of wartime production and their contribution to the war effort, without which victory could not be assured. They have accomplished this in spite of labor shortages, a bungled and inexcusable machinery program and confused, unreliable, impractical price and production administration.

Abundant production is the best security against inflation. Governmental policies in war and in peace must be practical and efficient with freedom from regimentation by an impractical Washington bureaucracy in order to assure independence of operation and bountiful production, fair and equitable market prices for farm products, and a sound program for conservation and use of our soil and natural resources. Educational progress and the social and economic stability and well-being of the farm family must be a prime national purpose.

For the establishment of such a program we propose the following:

1. A Department of Agriculture under practical and experienced administration free from regimentation and confusing Government manipulation and control of farm programs.

2. An American market price to the American farmer and the protection of such price by means of support prices, commodity loans, or a combination thereof, together with such other economic means as will assure an income to agriculture that is fair and equitable in comparison with labor, business, and industry. We oppose subsidies as a substitute for fair markets.

3. Disposition of surplus war commodities in an orderly manner without destroying markets or continued production and without benefit to speculative profiteers.

4. The control and disposition of future surpluses by means of (a) new uses developed through constant research, (b) vigorous development of foreign markets, (c) efficient domestic distribution to meet all domestic requirements, and (d) arrangements which will enable farmers to make necessary adjustments in production of any given basic crop only if domestic surpluses should become abnormal and exceed manageable proportions.

5. Intensified research to discover new crops, and new and profitable uses for existing crops.

6. Support of the principle of bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperatives.

7. Consolidation of all Government farm credit under a nonpartisan board.

8. To make life more attractive on the family-type farm through development of rural roads, sound extension of rural electrification service to the farm and elimination of basic evils of tenancy wherever they exist.

9. Serious study of and search for a sound program of crop insurance with emphasis upon establishing a self-supporting program.

10. A comprehensive program of soil, forest, water and wildlife conservation and development, and sound irrigation projects, administered as far as possible at State and regional levels.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

We give assurance now to restore peacetime industry at the earliest possible time, using every care to avoid discrimination between different sections of the country, (a) by prompt settlement of war contracts with early payment of Government obligations and disposal of surplus inventories, and (b) by disposal of surplus Government plants, equipment and supplies, with due consideration to small buyers and with care to prevent monopoly and injury to existing agriculture and industry.

Small business is the basis of American enterprise. It must be preserved. If protected against discrimination and afforded equality of opportunity throughout the Nation, it will become the most potent factor in providing employment. It must also be aided by changes in taxation, by eliminating excessive and repressive regulation and Government competition, by the enforcement of laws against monopoly and unfair competition, and by providing simpler and cheaper methods for obtaining venture capital necessary for growth and expansion.

For the protection of the public, and for the security of millions of holders of policies of insurance in mutual and private companies, we insist upon strict and exclusive regulation and supervision of the business of insurance by the several States where local conditions are best known and where local needs can best be met.

We favor the reestablishment and maintenance, as early as military considerations will permit, of a sound and adequate American merchant marine under private ownership and management.

The Republican Party pledges itself to foster the development of such strong privately owned air transportation systems and communications systems as will best serve the interests of the American people.

The Federal Government should plan a program for flood control, inland waterways, and other economically justifiable public works, and prepare the necessary plans in advance so that construction may proceed rapidly in emergency and in times of reduced employment. We urge that States and local governments pursue the same policy with reference to highways and other public works within their jurisdiction.

TAXATION AND FINANCE

As soon as the war ends the present rates of taxation on individual incomes, on corporations, and on consumption should be reduced as far as is consistent with the payment of the normal expenditures of government in the postwar period. We reject the theory of restoring prosperity through Government spending and deficit financing.

We shall eliminate from the budget all wasteful and unnecessary expenditures and exercise the most rigid economy.

It is essential that Federal and State tax structures be more effectively coordinated to the end that State tax sources be not unduly impaired.

We shall maintain the value of the American dollar and regard the payment of Government debt as an obligation of honor which prohibits any policy leading to the depreciation of the currency. We shall reduce that debt as soon as economic conditions make such reduction possible.

Control of the currency must be restored to Congress by repeal of existing legislation which gives the President unnecessary and dangerous powers over our currency.

FOREIGN TRADE

We assure American farmers, livestock producers, workers, and industry that we will establish and maintain a fair protective tariff on competitive products so that the standards of living of our people shall not be impaired through the importation of commodities produced abroad by labor or producers functioning upon lower standards than our own.

If the postwar world is to be properly organized, a great extension of world trade will be necessary to repair the wastes of war and build an enduring peace. The Republican Party, always remembering that its primary obligation, which must be fulfilled, is to our own workers, our own farmers, and our own industry, pledges that it will join with others in leadership in every cooperative effort to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade. We will always bear in mind that the domestic market is America's greatest market and that tariffs which protect it against foreign competition should be modified only by reciprocal bilateral trade agreements approved by Congress.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

We favor the prompt extension of relief and emergency assistance to the peoples of the liberated countries without duplication and conflict between Government agencies.

We favor immediate feeding of the starving children of our allies and friends in the Nazi-dominated countries and we condemn the New Deal administration for its failure, in the face of humanitarian demands, to make any effort to do this.

We favor assistance by direct credits in reasonable amounts to liberated countries to enable them to buy from this country the goods necessary to revive their economic systems.

BUREAUCRACY

The national administration has become a sprawling, overlapping bureaucracy. It is undermined by Executive abuse of power, confused lines of authority, duplication of effort, inadequate fiscal control, loose personnel practices, and an attitude of arrogance previously unknown in our history.

The times cry out for the restoration of harmony in Government, for a balance of legislative and Executive responsibility, for efficiency and economy, for pruning and abolishing unnecessary agencies and personnel, for effective fiscal and personnel controls, and for an entirely new spirit in our Federal Government.

We pledge an administration wherein the President, acting in harmony with Congress, will effect these necessary reforms and raise the Federal service to a high level of efficiency and competence.

We insist that limitations must be placed upon spending by Government corporations of vast sums never appropriated by Congress but made available by directives, and that their accounts should be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office.

TWO-TERM LIMIT FOR PRESIDENT

We favor an amendment to the Constitution providing that no person shall be President of the United States for more than two terms of 4 years each.

EQUAL RIGHTS

We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women. We favor job opportunities in the postwar world open to men and women alike without discrimination in rate of pay because of sex.

VETERANS

The Republican Party has always supported suitable measures to reflect the Nation's gratitude and to discharge its duty toward the veterans of all wars.

We approve, have supported and have aided in the enactment of laws which provide for reemployment of veterans of this war in their old positions, for mustering-out pay, for pensions for widows and orphans of such veterans killed or disabled, for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, for temporary unemployment benefits, for education and vocational training, and for assisting veterans in acquiring homes and farms and in establishing themselves in business.

We shall be diligent in remedying defects in veterans legislation and shall insist upon efficient administration of all measures for the veteran's benefit.

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

We unreservedly condemn the injection into American life of appeals to racial or religious prejudice.

We pledge an immediate Congressional inquiry to ascertain the extent to which mistreatment, segregation and discrimination against Negroes who are in our armed forces are impairing morale and efficiency, and the adoption of corrective legislation.

We pledge the establishment by Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commisison.

ANTIPOLL TAX

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

ANTILYNCHING

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

INDIANS

We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation. We will take politics out of the administration of Indian affairs.

PROBLEMS OF THE WEST

We favor a comprehensive program of reclamation projects for our arid and semi-arid States, with recognition and full protection of the rights and interests of those States in the use and control of water for present and future irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses.

We favor (a) exclusion from this country of livestock and fresh and chilled meat from countries harboring foot and mouth disease or rinderpest; (b) full protection of our fisheries whether by domestic regulation or treaties; (c) consistent with military needs, the prompt return to private ownership of lands acquired for war purposes; (d) withdrawal or acquisition of lands for establishment of national parks, monuments, and wildlife refuges, only after due regard to local problems and under closer controls to be established by the Congress; (e) restoration of the long established public land policy which provides opportunity of ownership by citizens to promote the highest land use; (f) full development of our forests on the basis of cropping and sustained yield; cooperation with private owners for conservation and fire protection; (g) the prompt reopening of mines which can be operated by miners and workers not subject to military service and which have been closed by bureaucratic denial of labor or material; (h) adequate stock piling of war minerals and metals for possible future emergencies; (i) continuance, for tax purposes, of adequate depletion allowances on oil, gas, and minerals; (j) administration of laws relating to oil and gas on the public domain to encourage exploratory operations to meet the public need; (k) continuance of present Federal laws on mining claims on the public domain, good faith administration thereof, and we state our opposition to the plans of the Secretary of the Interior to substitute a leasing system; and (l) larger representation in the Federal Government of men and women especially familiar with western problems.

HAWAII

Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood; and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and in the application of all our national laws.

ALASKA

Alaska is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood.

PUERTO RICO

Statehood is a logical aspiration of the people of Puerto Rico, who were made citizens of the United States by Congress in 1917; legislation affecting Puerto Rico, insofar as feasible, should be in harmony with the realization of that aspiration.

PALESTINE

In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth. We condemn the failure of the President to insist that the mandatory of Palestine carry out the provision of the Balfour Declaration and of the mandate while he pretends to support them.

FREE PRESS AND RADIO

In times like these, when whole peoples have found themselves shackled by governments which denied the truth, or worse, dealt in half-truths or withheld the facts from the public, it is imperative to the maintenance of a free America that the press and radio be free and that full and complete information be available to Americans. There must be no censorship except to the extent required by war necessity.

We insistently condemn any tendency to regard the press or the radio as instruments of the administration and the use of government publicity agencies for partisan ends. We need a new radio law which will define, in clear and unmistakable language, the role of the Federal Communications Commission.

All channels of news must be kept open with equality of access to information at the source. If agreement can be achieved with foreign nations to establish the same principles, it will be a valuable contribution to future peace.

Vital facts must not be withheld.

We want no more Pearl Harbor reports.

GOOD FAITH

The acceptance of the nominations made by this convention carries with it, as a matter of private honor and public faith, an undertaking by each candidate to be true to the principles and program herein set forth.

CONCLUSION

The essential question at trial in this Nation is whether men can organize together in a highly industrialized society, succeed, and still be free. That is the essential question at trial throughout the world today.

In this time of confusion and strife, when moral values are being crushed on every side, we pledge ourselves to uphold with all our strength the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the law of the land. We so pledge ourselves that the American tradition may stand forever as the beacon light of civilization.

Bradley Revamps Veterans' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent very thoughtful and epochal article by Mr. Charles Hurd, of the New York Times, outlining General Bradley's plans for the modernized Veterans' Administration. The announcement of this proposed set-up shows clearly that the criticisms which I made of the Veterans' Administration last March have now been given official validity and recognition. I hope that there will be no further delay in reorganizing and modernizing this important agency which will have to serve so many millions of our boys in the time to come. It is urgent that hospital facilities be speedily enlarged and improved and that the quality and supply of medical and nursing services be enhanced at the earliest time possible.

First-rate men must have first-rate treatment and first-rate hospitals. Nothing less will satisfy the American people and I am sure that is the overwhelming sentiment of this House.

BRADLEY REVAMPS VETERANS' SERVICE—SWEEPING DECENTRALIZATION TO GIVE 13 DISTRICTS CONTROLS—HOSPITAL CHANGES PLANNED

(By Charles Hurd)

WASHINGTON, September 14.—The modernized Veterans' Administration ordered by President Truman took shape today when Gen. Omar N. Bradley, new Administrator, announced a decentralization program for the organization together with innovations in medical service designed to meet criticisms.

General Bradley made public his reorganization program less than 24 hours after it was reduced to tabular form cautioning reporters that for the most part it existed as yet only on paper. But he said he hoped to be able to show accomplishment soon.

"Don't get the idea," he said at a news conference, "that we think this plan will perform a miracle, or get things done right now. But we hope it will show definite improvement in the work of the Veterans' Administration."

General Bradley plans to:

1. Decentralize supervision and control over veterans' facilities into thirteen branch offices that will have absolute control over the facilities and offices in their areas.

2. Raise the medical establishment to rank equal to other departments, add a planning section and break insurance away from general finance.

3. Separate vocational training from other activities and make it a specialized project equal in importance to medical care.

4. Reform veterans' hospitals to ally them with the teaching institutions and where and when possible incorporate residencies and interneship in these hospitals.

5. Make each branch office a miniature duplicate of the central office in Washington.

6. Remove administration of insurance claims from the central office in New York and death claims from the single office here which handles them, giving the branch offices full authority to handle these claims.

NO BRANCH OFFICIAL CHOSEN

General Bradley said that no official had been chosen for any branch office and not even sites for these offices had been obtained. He listed personnel and space as the greatest problem in putting the program into effect.

The branch offices are scheduled for Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Dallas, Denver, Minneapolis, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington.

General Bradley created a new post of executive assistant administrator, which he likened to a "chief of staff," to be filled by Elden L. Bailey, for 17 years an official of the old Veterans' Administration and more recently a colonel in the Army. Mr. Bailey will be superior to all assistant administrators and act as General Bradley's right-hand man.

The Veterans' Administrator plans to strip his office of every detail and to hand it over to assistants organized much along the lines of an Army General Staff, with smaller but similar staffs serving in various corps areas.

At the same time the executive headquarters here will deputize the proposed branch offices to handle every detail of supervision, operation and organization instead of, as at present, the central office having some degree of responsibility in the running of every one of the 150 regional and local facilities and offices.

Thus in the new set-up in Washington there are 11 offices headed by assistant administrators or officials of that equivalent rank. These offices are: Board of appeals, solicitor, records, communication and contact, finance, personnel, vocational training, rehabilitation and education, claims, insurance, medicine and surgery, construction and supplies, and a division of special services headed by a director but cooperating with medicine and surgery.

Serving as direct adjuncts to the administrator's office will be a director of organization, planning and control, and a public relations office.

BRANCH OFFICES IN DISTRICTS

This complete set-up eventually is to be incorporated in the office of a deputy administrator in each of the branch offices. The branch offices will be in districts roughly corresponding to the Federal civil-service districts, although not exactly so in all cases.

For example, branch office No. 1 will handle New England's veterans' facilities, No. 2 will supervise all of New York State, while No. 3 will be responsible for New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

The branch offices will have direct responsibility for the operation of hospitals in their areas, instead of the central office controlling them. These branch offices will control policy and speed up all operations on claims filed with the regional offices.

General Bradley named as his assistant administrator for medicine and surgery, Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, former chief surgeon of the European theater, whom he borrowed when he took this office to be his medical adviser. General Hawley's appointment is temporary, since he, like all other Army officers except General Bradley, may be borrowed by the Veterans' Administration only until 6 months after the official end of the war.

Dr. Charles M. Griffith, heretofore administrator of the Administration's medical service, will serve as an assistant to General Hawley. Incidentally, General Bradley is retaining most of the former Veterans' Administration official staff, and in many instances is providing them with promotions by up-grading the jobs they have held for long periods in subsidiary positions.

HOSPITAL REFORMS PLANNED

As for the medical program, General Bradley and General Hawley described reforms that ranged the gamut from changing medical practice to abolition of concessionaires in the hospitals.

General Hawley said that he proposed to tie every veterans' hospital, where possible, to a teaching institution. General Bradley added that "we have to do that because of the extreme shortage of doctors in prospect for several years."

"If we can arrange it," General Bradley said, "there will be interneships and residences in the facilities."

"The best hospitals in the United States," General Hawley observed, "are teaching hospitals. We want the veterans' hospitals to be teaching hospitals."

General Bradley emphasized that he also wanted new hospitals constructed either in or close to centers of population, not in remote localities as so often has been done in the past. He said that the hospital construction program was being reviewed with change in mind.

The question of concessionaires has been a bitter one at some hospitals because of the practice of the Veterans' Administration in farming out the right to sell cigarettes, candy, and similar items. General Bradley said he had learned that some concession owners made profits of $900 or $1,000 a month.

Under the new plan, he said he hoped to duplicate the post-exchange idea used by the Army, with mass purchasing, and sales on a low-profit basis with the profits themselves being plowed back into a fund to provide comforts for hospital patients.

Monsignor Ryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks I include herein an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of September 17, 1945, on the death of a great churchman and a great American, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan.

As the editorial well said, "A very real power for good has gone out of the world with the death of Msgr. John Augustine Ryan." The late Monsignor Ryan richly deserved everything contained in the editorial and particularly that he was "above all a friend to struggling humanity."

Possessed of great talents, he devoted them throughout his constructive life to the salvation of souls; in fighting courageously—and most of his life against great odds under conditions that would have dimmed the vision and courage of one less determined—for the poor, the oppressed, the suffering, the exploited, and for the progress of mankind.

He stood for everything in mankind that was noble and uplifting. If we follow, even in a small way, the example Monsignor Ryan's life leaves us to follow, without regard to race, color, or creed, we will all be better persons for so doing.

MONSIGNOR RYAN

A very real power for good has gone out of the world with the death of Msgr. John Augustine Ryan. He was one of the notably influential clergymen of his generation. The force of his mind and spirit were limited to no single parish nor to any single branch of the universal church. He had friends and followers everywhere, and both directly, through his own endeavors, and indirectly, through those of the considerable number of his contemporaries who agreed with him, he left his mark upon the changing times in which he lived.

Dr. Ryan never was merely a liberal. A better word to apply to him is libertarian, yet even that more specific designation does not suffice. He was more definitely a social philosopher, a social logician. His contribution to mankind was an application of the mathematics of reason to human problems. To him two plus two always meant four. He objected to poverty because it is a contradiction of nature; he crusaded against greed and intolerance because they are a mockery of the Almighty Father of mankind; he labored for the Kingdom of God in this earth because any lesser civilization is a denial of the sacred office he served.

Thus a compelling simplicity was the foundation of Dr. Ryan's brave, efficient, and helpful life. He was a firm believer in the Revelation and his faith gave him the courage he needed for the work he had to do. His devotion to his calling made it possible for him to concentrate his effort on those issues which seemed to him most important. He won recognition for his talents early in his career, and his fame grew as his opportunities for service widened. When he reached the apex of his usefulness he certainly was unequaled in his field. Neither in America nor in any foreign country was there any priest who excelled him as a sociologist.

But Dr. Ryan's story is not told adequately through such acknowledgement of his major interest and toil. He was a teacher, a pastor, a counselor, an arbiter, a judge of a sort, a commentator, a critic, an appreciator of beauty and truth, above all a friend to struggling humanity. So his most durable monument will be in the hearts of all classes of men and women. He pointed a road ahead for a multitude, and in the role of prophet and pioneer gratefully will be remembered.

MacArthur's Speech at Surrender of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address of Gen. Douglas MacArthur delivered aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay September 2, 1945, during the ceremony attending the Japanese surrender.

It will go down in history as one of the greatest speeches ever delivered.

It reads as follows:

My fellow countrymen, today the guns are silent. A great tragedy has ended. A great victory has been won. The skies no longer rain death—the seas bear only commerce—men everywhere walk upright in the sunlight. The entire world lives quietly at peace. The holy mission has been completed, and in reporting this to you, the people, I speak for the thousands of silent lips, forever stilled among the jungles and the beaches and in the deep waters of the Pacific which marked the way. I speak for the unnamed brave millions homeward bound to take up the challenge of that future which they did so much to salvage from the brink of disaster.

As I look back on the long, tortuous trail from those grim days of Bataan and Corregidor, when an entire world lived in fear, when democracy was on the defensive everywhere, when modern civilization trembled in the balance, I thank a merciful God that He has given us the faith, the courage, and the power from which to mold victory. We have known the bitterness of defeat and the exultation of triumph, and from both we have learned there can be no turning back. We must go forward and preserve in peace what we won in war.

A new era is upon us. Even the lesson of victory itself brings with it profound concern, both for our future security and the survival of civilization. The destructiveness of the war potential, through progressive advances in scientific discovery, has in fact now reached a point which revises the traditional concept of war.

Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Various methods through the ages have been attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start, workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliance, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system Armageddon will be at our door.

The problem, basically, is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh.

We stand in Tokyo today reminiscent of our countryman, Commodore Perry, 92 years ago. His purpose was to bring to Japan an era of enlightenment and progress by lifting the veil of isolation to the friendship, trade, and commerce of the world. But alas, the knowledge thereby gained of western science was forged into an instrument of oppression and human enslavement.

Freedom of expression, freedom action, even freedom of thought were denied through suppression of liberal education, through appeal to superstition, and through the application of force. We are committed by the Potsdam Declaration of principles to see that the Japanese people are liberated from this condition of slavery. It is my purpose to implement this commitment just as rapidly as the armed forces are demobilized and other essential steps taken to neutralize the war potential.

The energy of the Japanese race, if properly directed, will enable expansion vertically rather than horizontally. If the talents of the race are turned into constructive channels, the country can lift itself from its present deplorable state into a position of dignity.

To the Pacific basin has come the vista of a new emancipated world. Today, freedom is on the offensive, democracy is on the march. Today, in Asia as well as in Europe, unshackled peoples are tasting the full sweetness of liberty, the relief from fear.

In the Philippines, America has evolved a model for this new free world of Asia. In the Philippines, America has demonstrated that peoples of the East and peoples of the West may walk side by side in mutual respect and with mutual benefit. The history of our sovereignty there has now the full confidence of the East.

And so, my fellow countrymen, today I report to you that your sons and daughters have served you well and faithfully with the calm, deliberate, determined fighting spirit of the American soldier and sailor, based upon a tradition of historical trait, as against the fanaticism of an enemy supported only by mythological fiction. Their spiritual strength and power has brought us through to victory. They are homeward bound—take care of them.

TVA Is Operating Efficiently—It Must Not Be Hamstrung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are interested in the continued success of the Tennessee Valley Authority should view with alarm the bills now pending in Congress which would impede its effective operation. If the TVA is to continue as a great asset to the people of the Valley, and of the Nation, it must remain as a regional agency where the day-by-day decisions can be made by the officials in the region.

Two recent editorials in the Chattanooga Times, entitled "The Valley's Duty" and "A Contract With Congress" very clearly presents the picture. They are included herewith:

THE VALLEY'S DUTY

The Tennessee Valley may have to put up another fight to save the Tennessee Valley Authority and its present system of regional control. Three bills in Congress are involved. One of them, the Whittington bill, was passed by the House of Representatives without a dissenting vote Wednesday.

It is satisfactory to the TVA and the public power agencies of the Valley. Recognizing that the TVA is essentially a regional instead of a Nation-wide Federal corporation and that satisfactory arrangements have already been made and practiced for auditing TVA accounts, the Whittington bill exempts the TVA.

The Byrd-Butler bill in the Senate has not yet been amended to make it conform to the Whittington bill in the House as regards TVA. Senator BYRD told the Times by telephone that he would study the Whittington bill before announcing whether he will accept it as a substitute for his own. The original Byrd-Butler bill would change the TVA budgetary and accounting procedures as provided for by the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

The third bill, the McKellar bill, is familiar to the valley because it, or one like it, has been fought before, and defeated.

The Times hopes that Senator BYRD will accept the exemption provided for in the Whittington bill. Senator BYRD is not unfriendly to the TVA idea. He has handled a multiplicity of governmental financial problems in his campaign to reduce governmental expenditures and is one of the busiest of all Senators. He may not be fully aware of the peculiar local issues involved in the TVA fight instituted by Senator MCKELLAR several years ago.

To show Senator BYRD that the TVA can serve best under its present regional control is the task which confronts the various civic bodies and organizations in the Tennessee Valley.

The leaders of the Chattanooga Public Power Board have already announced that they stand willing to wage just as earnest a fight to preserve the regional TVA control at the present time as they have in the past.

They will seek support of various other bodies and in the past fights this support has been forthcoming in great volume.

The Times believes that Senator BYRD would give these various bodies careful consideration and would listen earnestly to their arguments.

An especially important contribution at the present time could come from the various chambers of commerce in the valley. Their very functioning and "reason for being" is involved. Already some of the big industries are asking: "If we come to your valley, will present low costs of electricity continue, or will politics or Washington control, from a distance, of your regional development cut down the efficiency of the TVA?" This question faces every chamber of commerce in the valley, and certainly the guarantee of continued low-cost electricity must be given if our industrial expansion is to continue.

The essence of the TVA operations is not only to give this low-cost electricity, but to make it even lower as time goes on. But there have been some movements started to divert public utility revenues to the costs of running local governments—the Memphis plan for instance. This putting of TVA in politics could not fail to render less effective the present TVA Act, which gives these advantages to industries locating in the Valley.

We believe that these facts are recognized by most of the members of the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce.

Leaders of the public power board have asked for a hearing if the McKellar bill comes up. Should the McKellar bill or the Byrd-Butler bill, as originally drawn, pass the Senate there is reason to believe that the whole matter would die in conference between the two branches of Congress.

The House of Representatives on several occasions has shown that it insists upon the TVA being operated as the TVA Act provides that it shall be operated.

We believe that President Truman through his reappointment of David E. Lilienthal to the TVA board has shown satisfaction with the way the TVA has been operating and a determination to maintain that same system of operation.

These recurring year-by-year battles to continue the TVA system on the lines in which it has succeeded so notably in the past are expensive and time consuming.

The TVA is generally admitted to be the greatest asset gained by the South since the founding of the Republic. Certainly it is the duty of the people in the Tennessee Valley States to preserve that asset for the South's future and to pass it on undamaged.

We believe that if the case of the Tennessee Valley is presented this time to Senator BYRD as it has been presented in the past to committees of the Senate and the House, he will readily agree to the necessary changes in his bill to uphold the TVA Act.

A CONTRACT WITH CONGRESS

The Times can readily understand why a citizen—a layman—could think that all Government corporations are alike and that if

the others should be controlled by Congress then the TVA should be also controlled by Congress, but we cannot understand how a newspaper which has almost daily been brought into contact with the TVA question can take such an attitude.

The TVA is not like other Government corporation—it is like no other Government corporation that was ever established. Its every transaction is an open book to Congress. Its funds are regularly audited and every voucher is available for study by the Government.

But the TVA was established by Congress under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and the proposal to have Congress control every expenditure or transaction by the TVA would upset the explicit terms of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

Under the TVA Act, public power agencies, including the Chattanooga Public Power Board, have invested millions of dollars of public money in distributing systems. When Congress passed the TVA Act it, in effect, made a contract with local governments in the Tennessee Valley to sell them power through the TVA. Every one of the 130 or more power distributing agencies opposes the upsetting of the TVA Act as a step which would jeopardize the investment of millions of dollars of public money in the distributing systems. They hold that by changing the TVA Act, Congress, in effect, would be violating its own contract with the people.

Under the terms of the TVA Act some 550,000 consumers in the Tennessee Valley are now supplied with cheap electricity. Every one of them uses twice as much electricity as he used before the inauguration of the TVA.

The pending Senate legislation would take away the TVA's revolving fund. We quote section 26, of the TVA Act, and we have quoted the words which explain what the revolving fund is:

"SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, 'save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting and distributing electric energy, and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer ingredients.'"

There is the crux of the issue—whether TVA shall be operated as a business by the Board or whether the Board will have to go to Congress to get approval of its transactions. It is the same as if the managers and directors of a private corporation could make no decisions until they had secured the approval of the stockholders on each transaction. The millions invested by the people of the valley in the power-distributing agencies would never have been invested under any such arrangement, nor would bondholders have purchased the bonds. The stockholders of a corporation elect the directors (as Congress elects the directors of TVA) and hold them responsible, but the stockholders do not run the business. Nobody would invest in such a hamstrung business.

There may be a few down here among us who prostitute the term "private enterprise" to such an extent that they not only subscribe to the old saying, "the public be damned," but adopt as their attitude, in effect, the principle: "The Tennessee Valley be damned." But these are not many.

There are many sincere persons who think that the TVA should be controlled by Congress and we are not referring to them. Our remarks are addressed to those who misuse private enterprise, and who do private enterprise far more harm than good.

Control of the TVA by Congress in its every phase instead of by the board of directors on the ground, would deal a body blow to private enterprise in the Tennessee Valley.

As Mr. Hartley Grattan says in the current issue of Harper's magazine, "Let us keep firmly in mind that only if private capitalist enterprise does its stuff in the Valley can we hope to see TVA gain its objective in full measure."

Capitalists surely are not going to try to do their stuff in the Tennessee Valley if congressional politics and congressional direction of TVA from Washington becomes the policy.

Not to very many people, but to a few, it is the great success of the TVA which is galling. It is democracy at work and, as Senator Pope pointed out recently, in the TVA years between 1933 and 1940 the number of manufacturing establishments increased in the Tennessee Valley 53½ percent; in the country as a whole, 30 percent. The number of wage earners in manufacturing in the Valley increased in that period 42 percent; in the United States as a whole, 30 percent.

The amount of wages paid in manufacturing increased in the Tennessee Valley 68 percent; in the United States, 54 percent. Wholesale trade increased in the Valley 80 percent; in the United States, 46 percent. Retail trade increased in the valley 63½ percent, as compared to 46½ percent in the country.

We still have a far way to go to bring the Valley up to a proper standard. It is a job which only private enterprise can do and by wrecking the stage which has been set for a great development we would actually deal the greatest blow possible to the brilliant prospect for private enterprise in the Tennessee Valley.

We don't want Congress to run the TVA and we don't want any person in the Tennessee Valley to be fooled by the propaganda to the effect that "the TVA is just like all the other Government corporations."

Problems Raised by Unexpected Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, there is probably in the world today no finer military analyst and commentator than Hanson W. Baldwin.

The following article from the New York Times of Wednesday, August 22, is a penetrating summation of the immediate problems facing our country in the days ahead. Upon the solution of them depends our national security in the next few decades.

Until Congress and the President have solved the problems presented by Hanson W. Baldwin honestly and speedily, even though the war is technically over, there can be no certainty of preserving peace in our time.

PROBLEMS RAISED BY UNEXPECTED PEACE—MULTITUDE OF MILITARY, INDUSTRIAL, AND POLITICAL ISSUES NEED EARLY TREATMENT TO AVOID CRISIS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The sudden end of the war with Japan—months ahead of official expectation—leaves the Nation facing innumerable military problems, and complementary industrial and political problems.

The atomic bomb was never tested until mid-July, and no one knew what the effect would be until it was actually used. Russia had promised, and was expected, to enter the Pacific war about 3 months after VE-day, but the exact date set—August 15—was not known until the Potsdam Conference. The dropping of the atomic bomb apparently influenced the Russian Government to advance their entry by about 1 week.

Official calculations of the end of the war had to be based, therefore, on the assumption that actual physical invasion of Japan would be necessary. Full preparations for a first invasion, probably of Kyushu, by perhaps 12 to 16 divisions would not have been completed until late October or November, at the earliest, possibly not until January.

The main invasion of the Tokyo plain area, which was to follow the Kyushu invasion, if found necessary, could not have been undertaken until some time next year, possibly in June. A possible invasion of the Kuriles to open a seaway to Russia was also "in the cards." The official expectation was, therefore, that the war with Japan would not end until some time this fall at the earliest, perhaps not until next summer.

The sudden and early ending has created even more major problems than the unexpected lengthening of the war against Germany. They will be all the more difficult of solution because many of them have received piecemeal or scant attention in the past, and must now be considered hurriedly.

THE LEADING PROBLEMS

These problems are so many and so important that upon their solution much of the world's history for the next 10 years depends. They include:

(1) A complete reconsideration, in the light of the technological revolution in warfare, of all our national defense policies and organization. No comprehensive judicious, nonpartisan survey of this problem has been made. A civilian commission of the Nation's leading minds should be appointed immediately to formulate modernized defense policies, to accord with and support postwar foreign policies.

(2) Reconversion from wartime to peacetime production. The limited preparations heretofore made for this gigantic change will make large-scale unemployment unavoidable, though temporary. Of basic and long-term importance, however, to the defense picture, is the disposition—in the reconversion and surplus property disposal already started—of Government-financed factories like Willow Run, machine tools, shipbuilding yards, airfields, etc. Some of these should be kept and laid up, in a limited caretaking status, just as ships are laid up as part of the national insurance of national defense. The formulation of peacetime Government policy about the aircraft industry and about other defense plants is also vital.

(3) Occupation and garrison policies. Of vital importance to the foreign policy of the Nation and to the maintenance of peace are the policies followed by the United States in the occupation of Germany, Austria, and Japan, the garrisoning of overseas bases and the policing of troubled areas, such as Italy and China. The demand for the quick return of American troops will become compelling, but unless we provide for the adequate implementation of American policies overseas we shall risk all for which we have fought.

CRUCIAL TIME FOR EUROPE

This winter will be the crucial time in Europe; if Europe starves, chaos and political unrest will increase. Yet already people are fainting from hunger in certain areas of the Ruhr.

It is becoming more and more apparent that in many ways the first part of our occupation job in Germany has not been well done;

in some ways it has been bungled. Policies are divergent or nonexistent; too many in the control council and military government untrained or inadequate (many military government officials do not even speak German), red tape and "empire building" is rampant, and censorship at the source too restrictive.

Physically we have done a very good job; politically and psychologically the results are far more dubious. We are just confronting an ever more difficult situation in Japan, a situation complicated by our qualified agreement to retain the Emperor, with all that that means to the future structure of Japan. It seems very probable that in Europe and in Japan, the Army is beyond its depth, just as it is clear. domestically, that the Army's "honeymoon" with Congress is over. Civilian control of policy and of execution of that policy in Germany, through the control council, seems desirable.

Even so, armies of occupation—not perhaps as large as are now envisaged, but sizable—will be necessary to implement and enforce whatever decisions are made. Those armies cannot be composed indefinitely of the war-inducted personnel who now compose them. Either the United States must find replacements for the present members of the armies of occupation, or the public demand for return of the "boys" will be overwhelming and irresistible. To withdraw our forces prematurely is to sow the seeds of another war. Yet Congress already is planning quick and complete stoppage of the wartime draft law.

TARIFF ACTION NECESSARY

Immediate measures must be taken. They should take two forms: (1) Continuation of the present wartime draft on a limited basis, for a period of at least 12 months to 3 years; (2) encouragement, by extra pay, schooling, promotion possibilities, etc., of voluntary recruiting, calculated to appeal to veterans still in uniform and to civilians.

Some temporary personnel solution during this transition phase—probably a combination of the draft and of voluntary recruiting—must be found, pending a determination of our permanent, peacetime national defense policies. There can be no delay; this is perhaps the most pressing of our immediate problems.

Innumerable other problems, many of them subsidiary to and dependent upon the three outlined above, can only be itemized:

1. Organization of the armed forces: Shall there be a unified Department of Defense, or shall there be an additional Department of Air, or shall approximately the same organization that fought the war be continued? If the latter, what form shall changes, admittedly desirable, within the War and Navy Departments take?

2. Size of the armed forces: What shall be the permanent peacetime size and composition of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces? Shall they be raised by voluntary enlistment or conscription?

3. Research and development: What type of organization is best suited to rapid development of new weapons and how should it be administered?

PROBLEMS OF TRAINING

4. The military training and school system. What shall be the future roles of West Point and Annapolis? Shall the Naval Academy, which now desires to acquire the grounds of St. John's College in Annapolis, be expanded from its present site or shall there be another Naval Academy established on the west coast? What about the ROTC of both services and other military school systems?

5. What will be the future role of the National Guard and the Reserves? This has been tentatively decided—but this decision was based upon the assumption, probably not valid, that the Nation would have peacetime military training, and the decision was made before the atomic bomb was dropped. It must be reshaped now. The Navy, in particular, but the Army also, have not yet formulated a satisfactory, long-term Reserve Officer policy. The Navy may soon announce such a policy, but it is late to do so—2 years late.

6. Shall the WAC's and the WAVES be retained in peacetime? The answer is almost certainly "No"; the organizations are purely of wartime inception and utility, but the decision has yet to be made.

7. Digest and study of the lessons of this war and rectification of past errors. Many steps along this line already have been taken and the writing of the military and naval history of this war is well started. But there are many unanswered questions, which must be answered to public, as well as service, satisfaction.

Among these is the unfinished inquiry into the circumstances surrounding Pearl Harbor. The full report of the Roberts Commission and the full Army and Navy inquiry records should be published soon—and, if indicated, Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, United States Army, retired, and Rear Adm. Husband E. Kimmel, United States Navy, retired, should receive the justice of open court-martial or, at least, of full and public hearing.

The above list could be indefinitely extended.

The complexity and number of the problems of national defense that confront us exceed those of any prior period. Their solution will be complicated by the impending high command changes in the War and Navy Departments. Yet upon the solution of these problems depend not only American security and the economic well-being of the average taxpayer but also the peace of the world.

The Freedoms We Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some comment on freedoms which too many Americans have forgotten. We might do well in this country to take inventory of and restore to the people of this Nation the freedoms which have made this country the most favored land in the world.

THE FREEDOMS WE NEED TO REACTIVATE AMERICA

Freedom to live in an atmosphere of political liberty, untainted by the practices of dictatorship.

Freedom publicly to criticize the reactionary, freedom-destroying policies to totalitarian political parties and totalitarian governments.

Freedom to eradicate the un-American conniving of those who would foist alien isms upon America.

Freedom to invoke the established agencies of our Government in combating the collectivist threat to our American heritage.

Freedom to bring one's grievances to the elected representatives of the people, undominated by the executive branch of the Government.

Freedom to appeal to the courts of the Nation, assured of a reign of law rather than of personalities.

Freedom to plan one's own life with a minimum of Government dictation and control.

Freedom for businessmen to adventure, to expand enterprise, to compete so long as they do not injure their fellows.

Freedom to choose one's own job.

Freedom to own one's own home, farm, or business secure from governmental snooping.

Freedom to save for old age, for education, and for sickness, secure in the rights of private property ownership.

Freedom of those who uphold the rights of private ownership and of representative Government, to express their views.

Freedom, in an atmosphere of friendly Government encouragement, to unleash the inventive genius of America, under our proved system of fair profit.

Freedom for veterans of this war to exercise free choice, free will, and free judgment in rejoining the labor and management ranks of America.

Freedom to engage in free enterprise without competition from Government-owned business.

Start Home Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian of September 14, 1945:

START HOME BUILDING

A statement in the news from Washington that order L–41, under which all building materials that go into home construction are controlled, will be relaxed or revoked within a few weeks is a strong encouragement to hope for speedy return to peacetime economy.

Home building has been looked to as one of the main spearheads of general reconversion, and a lead absorber of labor released from war industries. For example the National Retail Lumber Dealers' Association calculates that construction of 300 average homes will create directly or indirectly more than 900 full-time jobs, for actual work on the home site produces off-site labor in transportation and transformation of raw materials, and produces new centers for stores, shops and service establishments and jobs therein.

It has been estimated that in Portland the first year of availability of materials and labor will result in construction of 4,000 new homes, the second, 4,500; the third, 3,500; the fourth, 3,000. These are estimates made by the Portland realty board, the Portland Homes Builders' Association and by experts representing Electric Bond & Share Co., who made a 3 months' survey for the information of public utilities.

As job-producers, the building of 4,000 new homes in Portland would make full-time employment for more than 12,000 workers, on the basis of the lumber dealers' figures. And the housing shortage is Nationwide. It is the estimated potential source of 9,500,000 postwar jobs.

Builders and home-planners are eager to begin work, and there has been vehement demand that Government agencies release control of materials. Letters and telegrams, have been sent to the construction coordinator, the reconversion director, the White House and to Members of Congress in number that defies estimate.

They have been inspired by a strong suspicion, fortified by known activities, that

the National Housing Agency and the OPA, backed by left-wing labor organizations, were planning a whole series of new controls over home building, including a permit system applying to every new house built in the United States, with supervision of costs and regulation of material prices. It was argued that new controls were necessary to prevent inflation.

It is reported that the Construction Coordinator, Hugh Potter, has recommended relinquishment of all controls, and has pointed out that material and labor supplies will keep ahead of current needs for new construction; that new building volume will "dampen" high prices for existing homes; that consequently unrestrained home building will combat rather than promote inflation. The Potter recommendations go to the Reconversion Director, John W. Snyder, who, as indicated, will act within a few days. But so strong is bureaucratic and other pressure that the issue may go to the White House for settlement.

Real-estate men report that the housing situation in Portland has been made acute by desire of occupants of Federal housing projects to get out of them and into something else, and by returned servicemen seeking living quarters for their families. There is a complete lack of houses for rent that suit their wants. So, in addition to the job-creating factor, home building in Portland would relieve discomfort, even hardship, endured by a considerable part of Portland's enlarged population. Free enterprise would move faster and more efficiently than Government-supervised enterprise. It wants the go-ahead signal, and it ought to have it for the common benefit.

Demobilization Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that demobilization is such a problem that legislation would be too unwieldly and too inflexible to adequately meet the numerous and changing conditions. For that reason any improvements in the methods employed to release our troops, in my judgment, must result from administrative action.

I desire to call to the attention of the House some suggestions I have submitted to the War Department in a letter to the Honorable Robert P. Patterson:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 15, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: It is quite natural that demobilization of the armed forces is today's paramount challenge to our Government's top men. Because I am conscious of your deep concern and interest in assisting the Government in making intelligent and sound decisions, I am imposing upon your time with a few suggestions.

It is impossib for anyone who has not recently been subjected to the regimentation, segregation, discipline, and weariness of service in the armed forces to fully appreciate the desire of most men in service for one thing: That is release and return to the status of a civilian. Nothing else matters. It may seem unreasonable to some, but it is the most reasonable thought in the world to the serviceman. The how, why, and wherefore are not important.

In this regard, I am thinking as a soldier, for I know how restless and perhaps unreasonable and bitter I would be if I were still in service and did not feel that every effort was being made to return me immediately to my family and my future.

Let us, therefore, not reason, but immediately devise a prompt and efficient method whereby our soldiers can have what they want—return to normal life. They have earned it.

I have no criticism of the Army's efforts except to say that they are not satisfactory to either the armed forces or to the American public in general.

I am informed that the following figures are approximately accurate as to the length of service of men in the Army. I do not have available figures with reference to men in the Navy:

Less than 1 year	1,000,000
1 to 2 years	1,450,000
2 to 3 years	3,600,000
3 to 4 years	1,200,000
Over 4 years	800,000

It therefore appears on the face of it that the Army can immediately discharge men with 25 months or more of service and still retain the desired 2,500,000 men (which figure I understand is being disputed).

The simple thing, that is, everybody go home, is impossible. I do suggest, however, that the following be given consideration:

1. That all men with 25 or more months of service, who are outside the United States, be returned by the first available transportation, except those who have volunteered to remain in service.

2. That all men with 25 or more months of service be processed and separated from service with the least possible delay, using the point system as the basis of priority.

3. That all men with 25 or more months of service, not certified by their immediate commanding officers as essential to either the demobilization plan or the maintenance of the various installations, be furloughed upon request until such time as they can be properly processed and separated from service.

4. That where one or more members of a family have been killed, have died as the result of wounds, accident, or disease, or have been captured or reported missing in action in the present war, the remaining member or members of the family still serving in the Army be immediately discharged.

5. That the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys be immediately discontinued, and that the drafting of single men of 20 to 25 years of age be continued, service not to exceed 2 years, with the proviso that those drafted who are students will continue to have acceptable and accredited training, equivalent to 2 years of college work, under the supervision of the Army

6. That the possibility of the lease of foreign troops, particularly Chinese, French, Polish, and Italian, to serve under United States leadership as occupational forces be investigated and, where possible, utilized.

7. That as many civilians as can be recruited and efficiently utilized be employed in the demobilization of our armed forces.

8. That all men not eligible for discharge under this plan, whose education has been disrupted, be permitted, where possible, to have acceptable and accredited training under the supervision of the Army.

9. That the armed forces immediately discontinue the practice of giving hazardous training to all men subject to discharge or who will be subject to discharge within 6 months. (This applies particularly to the air branches of the Army and Navy.)

It must never be forgotten that the desire of the soldier to return to the status of a civilian is reasonable, compelling, and, in most cases, thoroughly justified.

I have every confidence that the leadership which has accomplished so much in the defeat of our enemies can most certainly devise an acceptable system of demobilization and can do it quickly and efficiently.

I sincerely believe that the discharge of our responsibilities for keeping this Nation strong in the future will depend in large measure upon the intelligence with which we handle this particular matter at this particular time.

Most respectfully submitted.

JOHN E. LYLE,
Member of Congress.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES GUARANTEE CO.,
Toledo, Ohio, September 14, 1945.

Hon. HOMER A. RAMEY,
Member of Congress, Ninth District of Ohio, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: News items state the atomic bomb used on Japan was only one-twenty thousandths efficient. For argument purposes, which is the practical fact, the efficiency of this bomb will be made one-hundredth efficient, in which case a 10-pound bomb will be far more destructive than the 400-pound bomb dropped on Japan.

If 10-pound bombs are so efficient, then the following is self-evident:

1. Can be carried in suit cases and the jingo Japs can carry them to the world's industrial centers and at a given date blow up the world's resistance.

2. Armies are of no further use, except policing.

3. Navies consisting of other than aircraft carriers are of no practical use, except to transport men to police and maintain order.

If the above is self-evident, why is not the following wisdom?

1. No induction of men for the Army and Navy is necessary. The small forces needed can be obtained voluntarily.

2. Junk all warships except those needed for escorts to aircraft carriers.

3. Stop all immigration and adopt the English system of watching every movement of visiting foreigners, and ban the employment of any foreign-born not already in the country.

4. Move all Japs to Japan, so they may rule and teach that country.

I am well aware that you will answer the above to the effect that the United States of America has the bomb and controls the raw materials used therein. My answer is that nothing one man has discovered cannot sooner or later be developed by another; and I am willing to wager the Germans will be able to make those bombs just as soon as they can set up machinery in some other country, and with say 10,000 jingo Japs to carry them in suit cases to the 10,000 industrial centers of the world, will on a given date blow up this world's resistance. It will take a Jap jingo to carry the sneak bomb, for no other person, except one who is mad, would in fact commit suicide. Therefore, I say we cannot trust any foreigners, least of all American Japs, who will be given the job of ruling this country, in which they would delight, for have they not been kicked

around since their dirty rat fathers sneaked into this country over the unwatched Mexican and Canadian borders?

I am writing you this long letter because I sincerely believe it to be for the best interests and safety of this Nation that you advocate the following:

1. No compulsory military service.
2. Limit Army to size needed for policing.
3. Limit Navy to aircraft carriers and escorts only.
4. Maintain a large and well-distributed Air Force.
5. Secret storage of a large supply of atomic bombs at widespread places available to the Air Forces.
6. Ban immigration and employment of any foreigner not already residing in the United States of America.
7. Deport all persons of Jap blood to their homeland to rule and educate that nation.

I know you will be depressed by this long letter, which I hope you find it possible to give this question the consideration it so urgently needs. Now is the time to either keep faith with our dead and the Nation or admit that we are unworthy of the victory we have been given.

Yours sincerely,

LUKE H. SPOONER.

Letter From Ex-Prisoners of War in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1945.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: We request your efforts in our endeavor to stir into action the Congress of the United States and the people for whom we fought and suffered. For your action in our behalf we, the forgotten men of our great Army, stand and salute you and all the men who follow your plea in our behalf.

This letter is the voice of experience of ex-prisoners of war of the German Nazi Government. While it is endorsed by but a few we know it is the feeling of thousands of others. We ex-prisoners who spent months of hell suffering in hunger, filth and lice-infested German prison camps want an explanation of why we are the forgotten men of this war. Why have we been pushed to the rear when the subject of deserving discharges is brought forward, and why all the publicity of our buddies-in-arms as to their mistreatment and suffering in Jap prison camps if nothing is to be done in their and our behalf? Where are great leaders when we need them? We fought in the European theater of operations and in various armies, and our generals proved themselves the best.

We had as our commander of all Allied forces the greatest military strategist this modern world will see. Now with VJ-day come and gone, why are we who withstood the ordeal of German and Jap prison horror just plain simply forgotten? Before VJ-day we realized when told that we must help to defeat the Jap and proudly we joined in. Now we sit back and ask each other if anybody gives a damn about us.

We firmly believe ourselves worthy of a belated statement as to our status now that the war is over. We the undersigned enclose this letter asking action in our behalf.

Perfectly Silly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of September 14, 1945:

President Truman opened a most interesting and important field of debate when he termed "perfectly silly" the charge recently made in Congress that the Labor Party in England is seeking American loans to finance the British program of national socialism.

The only thing silly about the situation is the picture of the President of the United States attempting to dismiss the matter with two words.

The facts are obvious and speak for themselves. The Labor Party had promised during the British elections to nationalize both the Bank of England and the basic British industries in the near future, and ultimately the land itself.

The method by which this was to be done was made entirely clear. It was not to be by confiscation as in Germany, Italy, and Russia, nor by using government restrictions to drive private ownership to bankruptcy, as appears to be the New Deal program in America.

British nationalization was to be done by outright purchase. The Government planned to buy up the underlying ownership of the billions of dollars' worth of property involved.

This is at least an honest and forthright method, but it would require a vast amount of money. The British Government is even more heavily mortgaged than our own.

Where would the money be found?

That's where Uncle Sam comes in.

The New Deal has been tossing billions of American resources about recklessly in foreign politics for a dozen years.

Why shouldn't we foot the bill of nationalizing British finance and industry?

Of course, no one in his right mind would expect the British Labor Party to ask for the money in exactly those terms.

The official distress of the nation's spokesmen at the abrupt termination of lend-lease might lead to the suspicion that they had hoped to use that form of gift to finance national socialism.

Now they are here seeking some other subsidization for their program.

They want American money—anywhere from $3,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 of it. They would prefer not having any nonsense about being expected to pay it back or even pay interest on it.

What they have in mind is a gift, not a loan; and it is not accurate to say they are asking it—demanding is the word.

In the flowery language of diplomacy a very direct threat is made about what they say they would do if the loan is refused.

They threaten a trade war with America.

The sterling bloc, the intricacies of foreign exchange, and tight discriminatory barriers against American exports would be the weapons of such a trade war.

On the other hand, they offer President Truman aid and comfort in realizing the New Deal dream of "global free trade" if he will only pony up the needed Yankee dollars. Even this proposal has a string to it—the time when they would tear down their own discriminations against American goods is pushed off into the far-distant future. The British are too realistic on the subject of tariff and other protections of their standards of living to be fooled by the illusions of our own State Department.

President Truman says it is "perfectly silly" to claim all this spells a request for America to finance British socialism.

But why is the charge silly?

True, the money would be used indirectly, not directly, for socialism—the loan would simply free other resources in Britain for such use.

It is precisely as if a child, wishing to buy a worthless toy with a quarter intended for a copybook, should demand another quarter—not for the toy, of course, but for the notebook.

A great deal of fancy language and argument is going to be advanced to try to defend the President's plan.

We will be told that, just as the New Dealers insist lend-lease was not a handout but an investment, so the new loans would be a further investment—this time not in victory but in peace.

The gifts would be an investment, of course—but an investment in communism.

How much of your money do you want used for such a purpose?

The amount suggested for British loans figures out to between $20 and $40 each for every man, woman, and child in America.

It will come out of the taxes you pay—will go to raise those taxes by the amount involved.

If you are the wage earner of a family of five, do you wish to pay $100 to $200 extra to the Government to help the British Labor Party keep its political promises?

President Truman's statement that the British have every right to adopt whatever form of government they wish is all right as far as it goes.

But why ask the American people to finance their blunders?

Radio Address of L. J. Melrose, Director of Publicity, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, there is herewith inserted a radio talk by L. J. Melrose, director of publicity, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. Melrose's talk is of particular value at this time because of its timeliness. It follows:

Raiding of the State unemployment compensation funds by former war plant workers who refuse to go back to work, is under full headway today, with thousands of dollars pouring out of the State treasury to idlers who refuse to take the fine jobs offered in practically all branches of industry. This deplorable situation is of especial interest to farmers, as it means that farm prices are bound to crash unless some influences can be set afoot that will compel these people to work rather than live on relief.

I have seen no estimate of what this situation will cost the producer of beef, pork, or dairy products, but the Tilden Produce Co. said that unless turkey processing plants could get help, growers would lose 5 cents a pound, or a dollar on a 20-pound bird, if turkeys cannot be dressed in time to compete for Government orders that may be withdrawn on October 1.

The alarming proportions of the raid by idlers on the State's unemployment com-

pensation funds is seen in the fact that checks will be mailed this week to 3,000 idlers, in amounts ranging from $7 to $20 a week. Meanwhile business is stagnating because of a shortage of help. Not only are the stockyards at South St. Paul tied hand and foot by the help shortage—the building trades, manufacturers of badly needed civilian goods, and retail stores are desperately short handed.

A great building boom could be under way right now if carpenters and other building tradesmen were willing to work, and there was anything for them to work with. But there is a shortage of concrete blocks, and lumber, and everything else needed in home building, because labor refuses to work in these industries.

These facts were brought out at a meeting of a large delegation of St. Paul men with Victor Christgau, director of the Minnesota Division of Employment and Security, and Dreng Bjornaara, State director of the War Manpower Commission.

Here is what Alfred D. Stedman wrote about the meeting for this morning's St. Paul Pioneer Press:

"Instead of the dreaded problem of peacetime unemployment, Minnesota is up against widespread shortages of labor that are delaying recovery and hampering the marketing of the Northwest's bumper farm production, State unemployment officials were told by Minnesota employers Thursday."

Livestock handlers at South St. Paul are advising farmers to hold back shipments of cattle, and poultry plants at many points in the State are turning away offerings of turkeys and chickens, it was said.

With the big movement of cattle and poultry still to come, the situation unless quickly remedied, will become very serious, the State officials were told. The permit system may have to be used to regulate cattle shipments, they learned. The labor shortages are so acute in the construction industries that they threaten to delay the postwar building boom very materially, it was said.

While these widespread labor shortages exist, 11,000 persons have applied for unemployment-benefits checks in Minnesota since VJ-day, and questions were raised whether there is a general tendency among workers leaving war plants to think that they can take a vacation at Minnesota's expense by applying for unemployment compensation.

The officials were asked and agreed to supply the facts as to the unemployment benefits being paid in this State. They reported that 32,000 workers have been laid off since VJ-day. Of these, 11,000 applied for unemployment benefits, leaving 21,000 that did not apply. A 2-weeks' waiting period is required before payment can begin. Only those are eligible who are able and willing to work and who have not refused any offer of "suitable employment"—the determination which is suitable being up to the State office. This week, the first that benefits can be sent to those becoming unemployed since VJ-day, checks carrying from $7 to $20 will be mailed to 3,000 persons among the 11,000 applicants.

The situation at South St. Paul has become so serious that commission men are asking farmers to hold back cattle now, and there is danger that the shipping permits system used 2 years ago to regulate the heavy movement of hogs will have to be invoked this year as to cattle, Edwin J. Gruber, general superintendent of the Union Stockyards Co., said. This would be similar to the situation that has developed in the Minneapolis grain markets. Prices of cattle will be affected unless it is avoided at South St. Paul, Superintendent Gruber said.

While this was going on here in Minnesota, captive Congressmen in Washington were putting up a strong fight for a Nation-wide program of so-called unemployment pay, running up to $35 a week for idlers. Fortunately a better type of people were able to be heard as well as the labor union operators and the chronic chiselers who think that the Government owes every Tom, Dick and Harry a living.

Farm organizations, including the Farm Bureau, have told their story and it seems that this proposed $35 a week bounty to idlers has been knocked down to a $25 figure, and thanks to the patriotism and energy of good citizens. Even this deal may not stick.

A dispute is on right now as to how many weeks of this bounty for idlers shall be given to the applicant. Meanwhile there is a growing sentiment throughout the Nation that the entire unemployment compensation scheme should be held in abeyance with no payments from it at all until there is unemployment in America, and no one even pretends to maintain that there aren't a dozen jobs for every willing applicant today.

Minnesota's Congressman, HAROLD KNUTSON is one of those who has taken a leading part in defending the people of this Nation from this $25 a week bonus to idlers, and from some of the compromise plans suggested by those who believe in this sort of thing.

Postwar Plan for Our Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a thoughtful and well-considered plan which will be of economic benefit to our veterans and which will furnish employment to millions of people. The program was prepared and put forward by C. E. Weddington, a prominent and capable businessman of Brownsville, Tenn. It was published in the States-Graphic of Brownsville on September 14, 1945. To the officials of various departments and Members of Congress vitally interested in the welfare of our returning servicemen, I earnestly call this program to your attention. The plan as published in the States-Graphic is included herein:

One of the greatest problems that confronts us today is the restoration of our soldiers to normal life.

We can never repay for the sacrifices they have made for us, but it is our obligation, our privilege to give them a new lease on life by furnishing them with security, contentment, opportunity for advancement. This cannot be accomplished by means of the bonus. The bonus plan needs a substitute. We have experienced its inadequacy, its futility.

Let's try something more stable and far-reaching than the bonus. Let's give the boys a deed to a home and land with stipulation not to be sold during the lifetime of the recipient. Such a plan can be worked out with Government land or land in any community wher location is desired. The Government now owns much land scattered throughout farming sections as well as the Government domain.

This plan would operate millions of small farms. The ideas will grow on you. Potential taxes from such properties would eventually wipe out our national debt. Our agricultural organization is already set up to help small farmers get on their feet and succeed. The AAA could help get the boys started. Our overseas boys have contacted small landowners in England, France, Belgium, and Germany, and they have learned something about intensive farming on small acreage and how it pays. This plan will force the land to be occupied and cultivated. Small farms are the life of the community and Nation. This plan will bring prosperity and happiness after the frightful calamity of war.

How can these lands be secured? Why, they already belong to Uncle Sam. Who will gainsay his right and power to take of his own and give it to his soldier boys who have achieved so well in this emergency? His right to requisition has not been canceled. Where the emergency exists he has power complete over our lives and property, and this emergency will not be over until our boys are brought back to their communities and given a fresh start in life.

Let Uncle Sam buy such lands and pay fair prices for them, either through voluntary cooperation with present landowners, or by requisition. Many of the boys would be willing to settle on Government lands, but most of them would want to locate in their own communities. It would be a big undertaking, but we are used to big things, now. Why not put over this wonderful plan for our boys who are ready and eager to establish and maintain homes of their own? Home is the aim and ambition of our boys right now. Let's see to it that they are situated in homes and farms of their own.

It may be argued that a great many boys would not want to go in farming as an occupation. Even so, let them rent out or manage this property under Government supervision from whatever they happen to locate. Indeed, it will be a delightful old-age prospect for them. Most all successful men have a yearning for farm life and farm experience.

But you may ask how are the products of these farms to be marketed. There will be plenty of demand for all the food and livestock, as well as poultry from such farms for years to come. Think of how badly Europe and other continents are in need of farm products now.

This property would belong to the boys to do as they pleased with as long as they live. After their death, the property should automatically revert to their wives during their lifetime, and then to the heirs to do with as they see fit.

Let Uncle Sam invest the equivalent of $10,000 in a home and farm for each soldier. Let the home be modern with bath fixtures and equipped with refrigeration and radio. The Government can purchase lumber, materials, and equipment on a large scale and all of the emergency buildings and equipment of this war can be utilized in this plan to make homes for the boys. Think of the employment such a plan would afford. Ten million houses will have to be built; 10,000,000 bathtubs, 10,000,000 refrigerators, 10,000,000 radios, will have to be manufactured, as well as millions of necessary farm implements. There would be no end to the stimulus, all industry, large and small, would receive in the establishment and maintenance of these homes. It would make the dream come true of "60,000,000 jobs."

Our leaders in both parties have been promising us in glowing terms that we are to have 60,000,000 jobs provided for us after the war. None of them, as far as we know, have offered a concrete plan to provide these jobs. This plan in taking care of our boys will do that very thing.

A building program for the entire Nation is imperative right now. There is a serious shortage of houses all over the country—in our cities, towns, villages, and on our farms. This plan would generate a building program on our farm lands alone that would extend from coast to coast and the cost of the whole plan would be absorbed by the increased taxation these vast improvements would contribute to our public treasuries in addition to taxes from incomes these farms would foster.

We have a tremendous public debt on our hands. It has got to be paid. How else can it be paid directly or indirectly from the soil? The possibilities of this plan from a standpoint of production, trade expansion, and housing staggers the imagination.

This plan affords the opportunity of linking the welfare and happiness of our soldiers with the welfare of our beloved country in this period of readjustment. There is a hue and cry for a big building program. Let's build for the soldiers. There is a reasonable demand for a more equitable distribution of property values. Let's use our soldiers as a basis and as beneficiaries of such an ideal.

We have drafted and used for our own protection 2, 3, 4, and 5 years of our boys' lives. They have saved our country. Think of the multiplied billions we would have lost if it had not been for them—not to speak of the abject slavery the future would have held in store for us. Indeed, we do appreciate our boys. Nothing is too good for them. Let us show our appreciation in this plan to give them a home and farm.

Our giant war-bond issues have been oversubscribed many times. Once this plan is thoroughly explained, a bond issue sufficient to cover this plan would be over-subscribed with great enthusiasm and fervor.

Who knows that this plan would go a long way toward the eventual "beating of swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks?"

Reconversion and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a radio address delivered by me over Station WBZA, Boston and Springfield, Mass., on the CIO Weekly Program, Sunday, September 16, 1945:

On August 6, 1945, the first atomic bomb was dropped and a revolution occurred in human society. The day before, seemed like a thousand years behind, in terms of the earth-shaking challenge to civilization. For man had found the secret of nature's energy and had used it with terrifying effect. Faced with the greatest crisis in the history of the human race, man wondered if he would be able to master the energies he had discovered or whether he would become their victim.

I believe that all of us soberly realized on that fateful day, how ill-prepared we were to govern this tremendous power. The time had come for all of us to grow up in our thinking, to develop our capacity for political, social, and economic adaptation, so that we might control this power for the good of all, or else be exterminated by it.

Today we know that our free society depends upon our human responsibility to each other. There can be no other way. The days of ruthless, predatory individualism are gone forever. The atomic age, which we have just entered, demands voluntary teamwork from all.

In the early days of our Nation, when private enterprise was on a small scale, a man could do as he pleased in business, without endangering the livelihood of his fellowmen. The industrial age and the development of mass production, however, changed the picture completely. Tens of thousands of workers now depended upon corporations for their very existence. With the coming of chain stores and monopolies, freedom of enterprise for the average American was being steadily constricted. Vast pools of economic power were channeled into the hands of a few men. Giant industrial empires grew up within the United States, with more direct, real power than that exercised by the government of the people. The abuses of this lawless system finally plunged the Nation into the most tragic depression of its history. There was no work for millions in the richest country in the world. Our whole economy was paralyzed by fear. It was at this grave crisis that a political revolution swept irresponsible leaders out of the Government. The people demanded a big government to curb the excesses of big business. This in turn posed other problems, for it was from the tyranny of government that our ancestors came to this country to found a society of free men. It was not simply a question of leaving the tyrannies of the Old World behind them. They wanted to make certain that no new tyranny, however disguised, would rise to plague them in the new. In the emergency of the 1930's the people called upon their Government to intervene in order to prevent chaos. Even as they did so, they knew that this could not be the final solution. Though other people surrendered to dictatorships, the American workers, with firm faith in democracy, looked for an instrument which would express the free will and intelligence of the millions who were striving for economic liberty. They found this representation in organized labor, which attracted followers in ever-increasing numbers.

Then war broke and Americans closed ranks. Government, labor, and industry worked together, amazing the world with the productive unity that is possible in our way of life. Having done this in time of war, we shall be satisfied with no less in time of peace. Before the threat from without, we worked together fairly. Before the threat from within we must do the same. For the American public will not tolerate extremists who may seek to profit by stirring up confusion or by putting the selfish interest of any individual or any group above the living needs of the people.

The sudden ending of the war resulted in mounting unemployment. More soldiers are being discharged each day and are coming home to try and find employment along with displaced war workers. Many of our citizens are worried as they view the future. To them, the word "reconversion" sounds like a slow and painful process.

They remember the chronic unemployment that bogged down our economy between the years 1929 and 1941. They know, from personal experience, the cost in suffering, in underprivileged children, and the dreariness of lives that are denied normal work fulfillment. They wonder how a Nation like the United States, with no excuse for poverty, allows 7,000,000 men to dangle, year after year, allowing them no opportunity to recover their self-respect.

It is not even good business. When labor is unemployed and pay rolls are at a minimum, industry suffers from shrunken markets and thinned-out demand. Farm surpluses pile up and prices decline. For all elements in the economic process either rise or fall together. No one can stand aside from this problem, believing himself untouched by it. Unemployment is a national problem and, if unsolved, becomes a drain on the whole economy.

If it becomes continuous, it weakens our social institutions and provokes a dangerous unrest. Without peace at home, we can make no contribution to the world peace upon which our civilization depends.

I have purposely sketched the consequences of failure in order to arouse in all of us an awareness of our responsibility in this matter. The problems of reconversion can be more difficult if we make them so. We must bear in mind that a shift from all-out production of war goods to an all-out production of peacetime goods cannot be achieved overnight. A certain measure of temporary unemployment is unavoidable. It is during this period that we must exercise patience and understanding so that the change-over may be effected without the delays caused by passion and prejudice.

To those who fear wide-spread unemployment, I would like to present certain encouraging facts. Only 7,000,000 persons out of 51,000,000 civilian employees were, or are, employed in plants or services which will make large permanent lay-offs or which will have major engineering problems of conversion. The rest are doing exactly the same job in peace as they did in war. Farming, textiles, railroading, papermaking, shoes, electric light and power, lumber, all these will go on as before with no mechanical changes required.

Look at yourself and your own home. Think of the goods you have needed and gone without for the 4 years during which production for war had top priority. You need clothes, shoes, irons, refrigerators, radios, and many other household items. Your living quarters are in need of repair work, painting, and decorating. Millions of Americans need new homes and new automobiles.

Six and a half million couples who married during the war have purchased little household equipment. Returning servicemen will swell the demand still further.

Business and industry, which have accumulated huge financial reserves, will be in the market for sizable purchases. Double-shift and three-shift operation has taken its toll of equipment. The Department of Commerce estimates that industry will spend $25,000,0000,000 on replacements and inventories.

Shortages of labor and materials have compelled local and State governments to cut maintenance to the bone. Much new construction of school buildings, hospitals, bridges, roads, water and sewerage systems was postponed during the war.

To this picture, duplicated all over the world, add the void left by war's destruction. The needs of the ravaged countries are enormous at the very time that their productive capacity has been whittled down. As a result, the United States stands to be the great supplier for world markets.

These are the needs. What about the purchasing power which converts need into active demand?

Never before in history has there been such a backlog of purchasing power such as exists in this Nation today. Sheer lack of civilian goods has compelled us to save well over $100,000,000,000. Most of this is in liquid assets, readily convertible into goods. Business has increased its holdings by more than forty billions since 1939. The cash and investments of State governments alone have increased about two and one-half times in that same period. Conservative estimates from all sources, indicate a total demand of $172,000,000,000 or seven billion more than the estimated output of 57,000,000 men at current efficiency. At this rate we can provide the 60,000,000 jobs which the late President Roosevelt and more recently Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace have declared to be the solution to America's economic ills.

This goal of full peacetime employment can be reached if the Government, as soon as possible, reduces taxation in order to encourage the risk capital which provides new jobs; to enable small business to expand and to give the lower-income consumer more purchasing power.

Most wartime controls will soon be a thing of the past but we must maintain some curb on prices to prevent a run-away inflation which could wreck our economy as it did after the First World War. For all our efforts toward full employment would be mocked

by a cost-of-living average that rose faster than wages.

Prices have gone up during the war so that the dollar of today, in terms of purchasing power, is worth less than 75 cents as compared with it's value in 1940.

To compensate for this, the Nation is determined that there shall be an upward revision of wages for all who labor. The wealth—the real wealth of the country—which means plants, skill, materials, capital and labor, is sufficient to provide a high standard of living for all who are able and willing to work. Only the shortcomings of human nature stand in the way.

There are hopeful signs that this bottleneck will soon be passed. Conflicting economic interests show symptoms of cooperation. They are beginning to realize that their separate interests are dependent upon the over-all national welfare. Just as employment, wages, and prices cannot be regarded separately but are at all parts of one economic process, so labor, industry, and government are members of the human team which makes our economy move.

The American way of life thrives on incentive. Industry cannot provide high employment at good wages unless it receives reasonable profits. Labor cannot buy the goods it produces unless it has jobs at good wages and unless prices are held at a safe ratio. Irresponsible strikes and lock-outs at this time would prejudice both parties in the eyes of the American public. The Government, through law, serves as the umpire in extreme cases in order to protect the Nation at large.

Nearly all Americans are agreed that our system of free enterprise, protected from monopolistic abuses, should continue. In our country we have all the things to make it work for the advancement of all and with exploitation of none. The one fly in the ointment is the widespread fear that industrial warfare may wreck reconversion.

That fear, in my opinion, is not justified.

For last spring, the president of the American Federation of Labor, the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, met to draw up and sign a code on labor-management relations. This was the first time that labor and management got together on a national scale to agree on fundamentals. This is a beginning from which much that is constructive may follow. Under this charter of industrial peace, labor recognizes the right of management to manage; management recognizes the right of labor to organize and engage in collective bargaining; both agree that the rights of private property and free choice of action must not be impaired; both unite in the belief that our system of private enterprise is the best foundation for a prosperous and progressive American economy.

In conclusion, the code objects to unnecessary and excessive Government interference in the field of labor-management relations.

This is as it should be. Labor is no longer the servant of capital, or the ward of the Government. It is a full-fledged partner of industry.

In a free-speaking democracy, disputes come out into the open to be settled before the bar of American public opinion. Industrial disputes can be settled without harm to the Nation, only if we maintain the teamwor' that was ours during the war.

The dynamic faith that united us then must continue through the days ahead. Fear and suspicion are the enemies we must now overcome. There is no material reason in the world why we should fail.

The atomic age, bringing with it the power that can make us or break us, demands a higher responsibility of thought and action from all of us. In a democracy men must develop side by side with the things they produce and constantly improve.

With confidence in each other and cooperation for the common good, I am sure that we shall weather the brief crisis of reconversion and go forward to a new and better life for all of our people.

The Bulwinkle Bill and Freight Rate Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the Nation-wide discussion of the ICC decision of May 19, 1945, and in view of the current campaign for the enactment of H. R. 2536, known as the Bulwinkle bill, I insert in the RECORD an article I wrote for the Southwest Review discussing these matters. This article has received widespread comment. Transportation problems are going to become more and more important to our national economy.

The article follows:

We have not won our war for economic equality in the Southwest; we have only won one battle.

On Sunday, May 20, a three-column head on the front page of the New York Times proclaimed, "Shippers of Southwest win freight-rate parity." A Texas daily on May 21 headed its editorial "End of economic serfdom." Other papers, particularly throughout the South, made similar comment on the historic decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission of May 19, 1945.

We had reason for rejoicing, but not for jubilation. Journalistic reports were generally misleading. Our victory may turn out to be largely one of principle. Even should this decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission eventually prevail against anticipated counterattacks, it will give only partial relief from discriminatory freight rates.

The ICC decision, however, shames some of our former critics; also, it has temporarily reddened the faces of numerous gentry who stanchly defended the status quo. For years those who have charged inequalities and inequities in the transportation set-up have been greeted with howls of derision from the railroad and rate-bureau lobbyists and experts. For the moment these scoffers have lost their most effective weapon of ridicule.

To the extent that transportation costs are actually equalized, everybody in the Southwest, including railroad labor and management, will benefit. Whether he knows it or not, every butcher, baker, and candlestick maker in our section is vitally affected by freight rates and transportation services.

Before proceeding further with this discussion, let us look again at the freight map of the country. The United States is divided roughly into five freight zones, with comparative rates as follows:

The eastern or official zone, composed of States east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio. This is the industrial Northeast, with a rate of 100.

The southern zone, made up of States east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio. Rate, 139.

The western trunk line zone, including the States north of Oklahoma and Arkansas, west of the Mississippi River, and east of Montana through the middle of Wyoming and Colorado. Rate, 147.

The southwestern zone, composed of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and a portion of New Mexico. Rate, 175.

Last, the mountain Pacific zone, composed of the States west of the two last named. Rate, 171.

The momentous decision of May 19 appears on the Interstate Commerce Commission docket as No. 28300, class rate investigation, and No. 28310, consolidated freight classifications. Both these proceedings were begun in 1939. The transcript in these consolidated cases is 6,808 pages long. There were offered in evidence 233 exhibits, some of them running into several volumes, and together amounting to a small library. The opinion itself is nearly 300 pages in length. The salient points of the ICC decision are:

First, the ICC made the significant and positive finding that present freight-rate classifications—class rates—are "unjust and unreasonable"; and that the zone differentials as above described are unfair, unnecessary, and prejudicial to areas outside the official zone. (The Mountain Pacific Zone was not in the case and is not included in the opinion.)

Second, the ICC ordered a removal of discriminatory differentials. It gave respondents 90 days to advise the Commission whether they would make the necessary adjustments or submit to equalization by the Commission itself.

Third, the ICC found the job of formulating a just and reasonable uniform classification of "such character and magnitude" as to require considerable time, estimated at from 2 to 5 years.

Fourth, in order to give partial and immediate relief, the Commission ordered, effective as of August 30, 1945, 10 percent reduction of railroad class rates within and between the southern, southwestern, and western trunk line territories, and between these territories and the eastern official rate territory. The Commission then directed a 10 percent increase to be made within the said eastern official territory.

In measuring our potential victory there are many things to consider. If the railroads cannot escape from the mandates of this decision, they naturally will take all the time allowed to make the required adjustments. The temporary relief afforded in the opinion does not remove existing differentials by a considerable percentage. If and when there is full compliance with the Commission's opinion, we may still lack a great deal of enjoying transportation equality. Less than 10 percent of the traffic moves by rates affected by the instant case. More than 90 percent of all freight moves under commodity rates or column rates or exceptions to classifications. Of course, class rates cover thousands of items; and their equalization, if not otherwise nullified, will stimulate extensive industrial growth throughout our section.

Years ago a prominent railroad official, in referring to railroad interests, meaning those primarily of the official zone, said, "The new policy of these connections is to build a rate wall at the Ohio and Potomac Rivers which will prevent or greatly curtail the movement of southern products into the official territory." We do not doubt the ability of these interests to carry out this policy in the future as they have in the past. As Justice Douglas says in the Georgia case, "discriminatory rates are but one form of trade barriers." Moreover, rates and preferences may be juggled and camouflaged with ease.

The banking, industrial, and business interests of the fabulous Northeast, allied with the railroads of that section, make up a mighty economic empire. We cannot forget the gigantic size and resourcefulness of the railroad dynasty from whom these concessions are sought. They will not easily surrender any of their advantages. Their weapons are many and varied. They maintain a monopolistic, rate-making technique

entirely outside and beyond the actual scope of ICC control. Rate bureaus, associations, and conventions, if unable to agree upon rates in accordance with the wishes and interests of the official zone, have the said rates imposed upon them from above.

The top layer in policy and rate fixing is, of course, the Association of American Railroads. The board of this association is composed of 17 railroad presidents. It is dominated completely by the interests of official territory. If not by frontal attack, then by indirection and circumvention they can perhaps nullify the benefits of the ICC decision.

The Interstate Commerce Act was passed and the Interstate Commerce Commission created to bring order out of the chacs in the transportation industry of the country. Cutthroat competition on the one hand, and uncontrolled monopoly on the other hand are alike detrimental to the public welfare. The law has protected railroads from cutthroat competitton, but has not prevented their growth into a tremendous monopoly. Efficient transportaiton is vital to the public, as was recognized in the early days of this country, when substantial parts of the public domain were given to the railroads for the building and maintenance of their lines. From the trnasportation industry of this country, our people are entitled to at least three things: Efficient service, reasonable rates, and equality of treatment. The huge transportation monopoly maintained by the Association of American Railroads seriously threatents all these rights.

Two important cases are now pending which seek to break up unreasonable railroad monopoly. The first of these grew out of hearings before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate on S. 942 in 1943. These hearings uncovered an extensive contract and agreement between numerous railroads and associates to restrain and monopolize transportation in the western area of the United States. This agreement, although in existence for 11 years, had not been filed with the ICC as required by law, but rather concealed from them. In August 1944, the Department of Justice filed suit in the Federal Court at Lincoln, Nebr., against 47 railroads and 90 railroad and banking officials who were parties to said agreement. This suit was brought in an effort to force the defendants to comply with the law and to prevent unreasonable monopoly and combinations in restraint of trade.

On March 26, 1945, in a case entitled "The State of Georgia, Complainant, against Pennsylvania Railroad et al., Defendants" the Supreme Court, in a five to four decision, took jurisdiction in a suit brought by the State of Georgia against certain railroads. The State of Georgia alleges a gigantic combination and conspiracy by the defendants against the manufacturers, shippers, and other interests of the State of Georgia.

Shortly after the Lincoln case was filed, in an effort to preclude and defeat the Lincoln case and others that might be filed, the railroads began one of their famous campaigns of propaganda. They caused to be introduced in the Congress of the United States H. R. 2536, known as the Bulwinkle bill, which seeks to exempt them from the provisions of the antitrust laws. They are now inspiring good citizens to write their Congressmen and enclose an ingenious bulletin published by the Association of American Railroads entitled "The Carriers Cannot Serve Two Masters." They again raise the old cry, "Let the ICC do it." They fail to mention the concealment of the so-called western agreement, out of which grows the Lincoln prosecution, or its cancellation soon after its discovery. They want nobody snooping in their business. They neglect to inform the public that 90 percent of all rates and regulations are never questioned before the ICC for the simple reason that, through devious means, rates are prevented from being questioned.

While the railroads on the whole have done a remarkable job of moving wartime traffic, they have done so at fabulous cost to the taxpayer. In hundreds of magazines and thousands of newspapers, over a period of many months, the Association of American Railroads has carried numerous half-page and full-page advertisements proclaiming their service and patriotism. These millions of dollars have been spent to purchase good will and to prepare the public mind for such propaganda as above mentioned. These millions are deducted from excess profits which would otherwise revert to the Treasury of the United States.

But this advertising money is small change. Some experts now claim that excessive freight rates on wartime traffic will exceed a billion dollars. This story is too long for an article of this scope. However, these excessive charges result mainly from a denial to the Government of "export rates" on millions of tons of freight shipped overseas. During World War I thousands of box cars piled up in our ports waiting to be unloaded. At the beginning of this war, to avoid this congestion, the Government built mammoth warehouses in port areas. Although the railroads benefitted greatly by this system, they imposed on this traffic the higher domestic rate rather than the lower export rate. Instead of paying less money on large volumes of freight moved with greater dispatch, the Government was compelled to pay more. This money, of course, comes from the pockets of the taxpayers.

To summarize, the ICC decision may turn out to be a moral victory only. If it lulls us into indifference or complacency, a feeling that all is well, it will be disastrous. We have not yet won economic justice and transportation equality, and may never do so. Real and complete victory in our fight for reasonable rates, efficient service, and transportation equality is going to require the aggressive cooperation of responsible Government agencies supported by enlightened public opinion.

Veterans Ought Not To Have To Take Pauper's Oath To Receive Medical Care at Veterans' Administration Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 17, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles appearing in the magazine Veterans Outlook, which present the problem of the admission of veterans to veterans' hospitals without requiring them to take an oath that they have no resources with which to pay for medical care.

The second article, by Mr. Edward E. Odom, presents the problem from the point of view of the Veterans' Administration. The first article, by Mr. Joseph Leib, vice commander of Costello Post, No. 15, American Legion, presents what in my judgment is a very strong case against this pauper's oath. They follow:

THE PAUPER'S OATH ISSUE

(By Joseph Leib, vice commander, American Legion, Costella Post No. 15)

Today the veteran is a hero, the toast of the land. But if tomorrow he should find himself ill and unable to pay for the medical care which he needs, he will be required to sign a statement stripping him of all dignity—the pauper's oath devised by the Veterans' Administration.

Legally speaking, the pauper's oath (sometimes known by the fancy term "needs clause") is "a statement supported by oath that a person is without any available assets either personally owned or in expectation". In one form or another, it is often requested in charity and bankruptcy cases. Its stigma invariably has a degrading, disgracing effect. Originally conceived by VA with the idea that it would save the taxpayers money, it has actually worked in reverse.

A former official of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service in Washington, D. C., recently made the following statement: "the pauper's oath has caused more misery, anger, discontent—and expense to taxpayers than any other single thing I can think of. I have seen applicant after applicant come to our office for rehabilitation, be asked to take the pauper's oath, and indignantly refuse—preferring to continue to suffer with his disability and to remain a liability to his community for the rest of his life. Adequate medical care, given honestly and in a dignified manner, would make self-supporting citizens of many veterans".

The pauper's oath appears on VA Form P-10 in terms of the following statement: "Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care—Answer Yes or No". The answer must be acknowledged under oath before a notary public. On the same is an ominous warning that a false answer can be punished with a fine of up to $1,000, a year's imprisonment, or both.

In most cases there is no "Yes" or "No" answer to the pauper's oath. Whether or not an ex-serviceman is able to pay for hospital care is certainly open to considerable difference of opinion. What I consider "financially unable" another person might call "financially able." I may be earning $50 per week, but be so heavily burdened with expenses that I cannot afford to pay for medical care. So I take the pauper's oath and am given treatment at a VA hospital. But suppose an official comes along later and decides that I was able to pay—in that case I am conceivably subject to arrest and fine and/or imprisonment for having knowingly made a false affidavit. It is easy to see how such a situation can cause confusion, bitterness, and discontent.

NONSERVICE AILMENTS

True, not every veteran who needs medical care has to take the pauper's oath. Those who need treatment for service-connected disabilities or diseases may request such treatment without undergoing soul-searching self-analysis. But ex-servicemen with diseases or disabilities which are not clearly service-connected are up against the pauper's oath whether they like it or not.

An increasing number of World War I veterans are now in their fifties and sixties and very much susceptible to the ailments of that age group. More and more of them need medical care for illnesses or disabilities usually classified as nonservice connected. But who can be sure that the cold and wet of the trenches of 1918 could not result in rheumatism or a kidney ailment 25 years later? Who can say with certainty that the tension of a year's battle experience could not have anything to do with stomach ailments in later life?

Who has any way of being sure that a wound will affect only one part of a man's body and not eventually cause damage elsewhere? I know of a veteran who was wounded in his lower jaw while fighting in France. The other day he developed pains in his upper jaw and called upon a VA hospital for medical treatment. The officer in

charge refused to treat him because he could not prove that the trouble in his upper jaw was service connected.

Why in the world does the Veterans' Administration continue the pauper's oath despite all the objections that have been raised? In my opinion, the oath has been kept in force because: (1) VA has been reluctant to admit that the oath has had little, if any, justification; (2) VA has been much too susceptible to pressure from professional medical associations intent upon hamstringing any and all forms of public medical care.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

With regard to the second point, the American Medical Association made its position crystal clear in a letter of March 7, 1945, signed by its secretary, Dr. Olin West. Some of the more illuminating statements in this letter are quoted below.

"In 1934, the Committee on Legislative Activities of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association submitted a report in which reference was made to article 29, section 6, of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress. * * * It is provided in that section that the statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses. In the same report opposition to the Reed amendment was indicated and the opinion was expressed to the effect that any oath required in the law should be interpreted to mean that the veteran subscribing to such oath is in actual need."

In other words, the AMA was willing to have VA provide medical care in only those instances in which a veteran was in such dire straits that he couldn't possibly be able to pay the fee usually charged by a private physician. Here are other statements in Dr. West's letter:

"Objection has been offered by the AMA through the house of delegates to the general policy of provisions by the Federal Government of hospitalization and medical care for veterans for conditions not even remotely associated with military service. Some of the remarks supporting this opposition were offered in a memorandum filed with the Senate Committee on Appropriations in 1934 and reproduced in the printed hearings on H. R. 6663, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1935. * * * It was emphasized in the memo that nothing in it should be construed as directed in any degree against legislation to make adequate provisions for medical and hospital service for veterans suffering from disabilities, diseases, or defects of service origin. * * *

"In 1933, Dr. Lewis, as president-elect of the AMA, addressed the house of delegates, stating that almost 70 percent of the cases that were hospitalized in veterans' hospitals presented disabilities that had nothing to do with the service and did not have even presumptive service connection. * * *

"I think it is probably true that Dr. Lewis may have been concerned over the possibility that more hospitals for the service of veterans might be erected than the existing situation justified. * * *

"There may be a possibility that a hospital building program could be initiated and put into effect that might conceivably affect existing civilian hospitals unfavorably. Much would depend in my opinion, on the nature of the use that might be made of facilities provided by an unduly large number of Federal hospitals, which facilities might be readily available to a large segment of the population."

CONGRESS ACTS

Congress seems to have much less regard for the AMA than does the Veterans' Administration. In the past few months six individual bills have been presented to the national legislature for the purpose of killing the pauper's oath. The sponsors of these bills are Senator WILLIAM LANGER and Representatives SPRINGER, MORRISON, WICKERSHAM, MARTIN, and SASSCER. They deserve the support of every veteran.

VA officials have been quick to disclaim the implications or the seriousness of the oath by referring to it as a routine and meaningless matter. But if the oath is as unimportant as they say, then why is it being retained and criticisms of it resented so strongly?

FACTS AND FALLACIES ABOUT MEDICAL CARE—OFFICIAL VIEWS ON THE PAUPER'S OATH CONTROVERSY

(By Edward E. Odom, Solicitor, Veterans' Administration)

The subject of medical and hospital care for veterans is much in the public mind—particularly on Capitol Hill—and considerable misunderstanding, if not outright misinformation, seem current.

The problem is a broad, far reaching one. In addition to the fifteen or sixteen million men and women who will be the veterans of this war, there are some 4,000,000 veterans of prior wars and of peacetime service. Hence, approximately 20,000,000 will be in the picture during some part of the next 25 years.

Let it be understood at once that medical and hospital care for service-incurred or aggravated injuries and diseases is assured every veteran as his right. The Government's policy in this respect has been in effect throughout most of its history. After World War I, hospitalization for veterans took more concrete form. The more than 4,000,000 veterans of that war saw to it that one agency, the United States Veterans' Bureau, was created to administer all benefits for those who had served. Following the establishment of the Bureau in 1921, several public health, Army, and Navy hospitals were transferred to the Bureau and new hospitals were constructed.

At that time the law authorized medical and hospital care only for service-connected injuries and diseases. There were, in addition, homes for domiciliary care, including the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the Army and Navy homes in Washington, D. C., and Philadelphia.

By 1924 available hospital facilities were in excess of the needs of service-connected injuries and President Coolidge, upon recommendation of Gen. Frank T. Hines, Director of the Bureau, urged Congress to extend the right to hospitalization to veterans needing care, without regard to the origin of their diseases or disabilities. This was made possible by section 202 (10), World War Veterans' Act, June 7, 1924, which authorized hospital care for certain specified diseases and subject to the limits of available facilities—for any disability, with preference in admission to those "financially unable to pay for hospitalization and necessary traveling expenses."

It will be seen that as the laws existed from that time until 1933, ex-servicemen fell in three categories with respect to hospitalization:

1. Those needing treatment for service-incurred injury or disease;

2. Those requiring hospitalization for certain specified diseases (for example, neuropsychiatric or tubercular ailments and diseases, paralysis agitans, encephalitis lethargica, amoebic dysentery, and the loss of sight of both eyes).

3. Those requiring hospitalization for any disease or injury—subject, however, to availability of existing facilities and financial inability to pay for hospitalization and necessary travelling expenses.

All of these laws were repealed by the so-called Economy Act of 1933 (Public Law 2, 73d Cong.). Section 6 of this act (as amended by Public Law 312, 74th Cong., 38 U. S. C. 796) is the present authority for veteran hospital and medical care. In effect, this provision of the law says that any person discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty, any veteran in receipt of a pension for service-connected disability and any veteran of any war, is entitled to hospital care, domiciliary care and out-patient treatment for any service-connected disability as well as to hosiptal or domiciliary care for certain specified diseases and diseases which tend to aggravate a service-incurred disability. These benefits are a matter of right and may be claimed by any veteran meeting the conditions.

The act further specifies that any veteran of any war "who is in need of hospitalization or domiciliary care and is unable to defray the necessary expenses therefor * * * shall be furnished necessary hospitalization or domiciliary care (including transportation) in any Veterans' Administration facility, within the limitations existing in such facilities, irrespectve of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service." It will be noted that this right is conditioned upon the veteran's being "unable to defray the necessary expenses" of the hospitalization or domiciliary care desired. In order to make proof of such inability easy, Congress enacted the following:

"The statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses."

This is the so-called pauper's oath about which so much misinformation has been circulated. To anyone who can read plain English, it is apparent that this provision constitutes a mere rule of evidence binding upon the Veterans' Administration and leaving it within the conscience of the veteran as to whether he meets the provision of the law. In other words, the Veterans' Administration cannot look behind the applicant's own sworn statement as to his inability to pay for his hospitalization elsewhere.

PENALTIES

The fact that Congress has also enacted prescribed penalties for fraud or misrepresentation is generally beside the point. Few veterans can know with certainty in advance just what will be the cost of needed hospitalization; and in many instances the type of care available in Veterans' Administration facilities could not be received elsewhere at any price—or at best at prohibitive cost.

It is entirely possible that the Veterans' Administration inadvertently contributed to this misunderstanding inasmuch as, in an effort to save a multiplicity of forms, only one form was prescribed for the use of all veterans, including those who are not required by law to make any statement as to their ability to afford hospitalization as well as those who under the law must make a showing as to their inability to provide themselves with such care. This is the well-known form P-10 which must be executed by every applicant for hospitalization. However, only those who fall within the second category are required to answer the question as to inability to afford hospitalization. All others may execute the form without answering such questions. Conceivably it might be well to have two separate forms but in emergencies, when immediate hospitalization is vital, it is often impossible to determine instantly in which category the applicant may fall.

The oath is prescribed by the law, not by the Veterans' Administration. The only authority to remove it lies in the Congress. However, merely repealing that provision of the law respecting the oath would be of no

particular benefit to veterans unless the statute were also amended to remove the necessity for showing that the applicant "is unable to defray the necessary expenses" of hospitalization. The Veterans' Administration has recommended legislation intended to liberalize these provisions and such legislation is pending in the Congress at the present time (H. R. 3522, S. 1203).

What of the future? In the past 25 years more than 3,000,000 admissions have been made to veterans' hospitals out of a total veteran population of something over 5,000,000. On the same legal basis the next quarter century would see at least 12,000,000 admissions out of the veteran population of some 20,000,000.

The records also show that the average hospital stay is less than 50 days for general medical and surgical cases, approximately 200 day for tubercular cases and 400 for neuropsychiatric cases.

Psychotic cases, of course, necessitate the longest period of hospitalization or domiciliary care. The average per diem cost of hospitalization varies from approximately $3 per day for neuropsychiatric cases to slightly over $5 per day for others.

Just before Pearl Harbor, the Veterans' Administration, in conjunction with the Federal Board of Hospitalization, had under way a 10-year building program intended to provide a maximum of 100,000 beds by 1949, the estimated peak of World War I cases. Since Pearl Harbor this plan has been expedited to the extent that priorities would permit; and new, far-reaching plans call for at least 153,000 beds by 1947. In addition, plans are in the making to take over possibly as many as 100,000 beds from the Army and Navy; many of these have been built on the present Veterans' Administration sites.

During the past few years the anticipated increase in demand for hospitalization of World War I veterans has not been realized, doubtless because of economic factors. However, the total needs have increased because of discharged veterans of the present war. It is estimated that by 1975, under the present law, at least 300,000 beds will be needed and if the law is liberalized, as recommended, there may be required 400,000 beds.

KEY ISSUES

The question is whether the law should be liberalized further to authorize free hospital and medical care to every one of the 20,000,000 veterans; whether it should be restricted to treatment and care for service-connected disabilities only, which would include perhaps about 1,000,000 cases; or whether, as a middle ground, the present-needs clause in some form should be retained as to all except service-connected disabilities.

One Senate committee has advocated complete medical and hospital care for those veterans having service-connected injuries with no specific Federal aid for the many others. Possibly those who fear the extension of Governmental or "socialized" medicine may agree. On the other hand, the larger organizations of ex-servicemen have declared for free hospital care for every veteran throughout his life as a matter of earned right. A House committee has considered whether the Government obligation should extend so far, at least at the present time, when it is impossible to secure the personnel actually necessary to man the facilities being constructed.

It seems safe to suppose that the Government's policy in respect to veterans in the years ahead will continue on the same liberal plan. But in the last analysis it is the veterans themselves—who, with their immediate families, will constitute at least one-third, possibly one-half, of the tax-paying citizenry of the country during the next generation—who will have to determine for themselves what is reasonable and proper.

Drama of a 4-Day War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a special article written by James Morgan appearing in the Boston Globe of August 12, 1945, showing the important part our late leader, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, played in the great experiment that resulted in the atomic bomb. Also Mr. Morgan's reference to a 4-day war of nerves conducted by President Truman which brought about the early surrender of the Japs, thereby saving tens of thousands of American lives as well as countless of thousands of the other United Nations:

DRAMA OF A 4 DAYS' WAR—QUICK RESULTS FROM AN UNPARALLELED CAMPAIGN IN PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE AGAINST THE JAPANESE

(By James Morgan)

Let us look back over a bewildering week and piece together a fabulous story that pales the uneffectual fictions of Jules Verne and H. G. Wells. It began on Monday, when President Truman announced from the high seas the invention of an atomic bomb, which even then was being dropped on the town of Hiroshima. It was brought to a climax on Wednesday by the President's announcement that Russia was about to join forces with us and her western allies. It culminated on Friday, with the silly braggarts of Tokyo, who had threatened a hundred years war, crying quits from every antenna after a 4-day war of nerves. The criminals who plotted the assault on civilization had none of the savage fanaticism they instilled in the poor dupes they left to die for the Emperor by the hundreds of thousands on abandoned islands.

First in the story of this psychological warfare, we have the thrill of a close race between the Allies and the Axis, which our side won. Mr. Churchill says only by God's grace. President Truman sees it as the "Battle of the laboratories" * * * an invisible, inaudible battle fought in deepest secrecy on hidden fields. We can understand "the profound anxiety" Mr. Churchill tells us was felt by the few who were in the secret because, as he adds, "if the Germans had got ahead of us it might have altered the result of the war."

Hitler breathed dark threats of some strange, terrible weapon he was about to wield, the while hundreds of the foremost men in American and British science strained to beat German researchers into the greatest remaining mystery of the universe, concealed in a grain of sand, a pinch of dirt. His imagination fired by the quest, the late President Roosevelt proposed to Prime Minister Churchill in 1941—2 months before Pearl Harbor—that the two countries should go partners in the enterprise.

GREATEST GAMBLE IN HISTORY

Afterward it was decided to transfer the joint experiment entirely to the safety of the United States, as the island bastion of the Allies was in danger of invasion. "The whole burden of execution," Mr. Churchill reveals in ungrudging terms, "constitutes one of the greatest triumphs of America—or indeed human—genius of which there is record." The cost involved was a heart-shaking risk, which stands to "the everlasting honor of President Roosevelt and his advisers." We spent, as President Truman says, "$2,000,000,000 on the greatest gamble in history and won."

Immense manufacturing plants had to be built for what, in the Government code, was disguised under the term "Manhattan project." The Manpower Commission provided 175,000 workers who knew not the purpose of their work and only that they were engaged in a hush-hush job.

Wrapped up in the odds and ends of this story of the week is a detective tale as exciting as a best seller. While the FBI, guarding the Manhattan project from espionage, rounded up in 1941 the Duquesne ring of German agents who were trying to spy on our laboratories, the RAF scouted the sky for rival laboratories in Germany. A German plant, tucked away in the fastnesses of Norway, was the objective of bloody commando raids by British-Norwegian groups. Those raiders also found another, where they destroyed tons of what is unscientifically termed "heavy water," which is estimated to have cost the Germans nearly $200,000 to produce.

A NEW OLD LESSON

Incidentally we have been taught anew the old, old lesson of the revenges whirling time unfailingly brings upon racial persecution. Spain has not recovered in 450 years from her blood letting in the expulsion of the Moors and the Jews. The driving forth of the Huguenots was France's loss and a gain for the Low Countries, England, and the United States which gave them refuge.

Germany will do penance through many generations for thrusting out or killing those she branded as "non-Aryans." It may have lost her the "battle of the laboratories." Three who were exiled had been working on the atomic problem at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin and two of them brought the benefit of their experience to the aid of Anglo-American research. The third was Dr. Lize Meitner, counterpart of Mme. Curie, herself an exile in France from Russian Poland.

This Jewish physicist carried across the Danish frontier in her brain a valuable clue to the mystery of the atom. The Copenhagen physicist who welcomed her to his laboratory and collaborated with her proved the correctness of the clue. He communicated the results of their experiment by cable to his colleague, the eminent Nobel prize winner, Dr. Bohr, who was then on a visit to the United States.

That was in early 1939. Soon the idea was passed on to the War Department. Thus the Jewess Germany had driven out probably was the means of arousing the interest of President Roosevelt in the search.

Dr. Bohr returned to Denmark, but when, next year, the Germans invaded his country, he closed his laboratory. Refusing to aid them in developing a bomb for their robot attack on England, he escaped to Sweden in a fishing boat. The Gestapo followed him, and he was smuggled in the bomb bay of a mosquito plane to England, whence he came again to the United States. His Copenhagen laboratory was turned upside down in an unavailing search. He had left behind no trace of his findings. The services this Dane rendered the Allies but denied the enemy in the development of the atomic bomb are singled out for special mention by Secretary Stimson.

WAR OF NERVES

The D-day of our $2,000,000,000 gamble was July 16, only 4 weeks ago tomorrow. The test of the bomb could be risked only in some wide-open space, almost unpopulated. No better choice could have been made than a New Mexican desert down by the border of old Mexico, far from the busy haunts of men. I have heard the local boast that you can see farther and see less there than anywhere else in the United States.

That barren waste became the temporary campus for learned professors gathered from a score of universities, where they had all outdoors for a laboratory. While lying flat on the sterile earth, but at the respectful distance of between 8 and 9 miles from the steel tower where the bomb was to be exploded, anxiously they waited to learn whether they were loosing a monster as uncontrollable as Frankenstein's. So still wait we all.

Ten days after the blast that shook the desert dawn with the first release of the humanly unimaginable force which spins this earth like a boy's top, there came an echo across thousands of miles from Potsdam. The President of the United States, the British Prime Minister, and the Chinese Generalissimo jointly warned Japan to choose between immediate unconditional surrender and utter ruin. After a wait of 10 days more, another echo reverberated from as many thousand miles in the opposite direction, where a Japanese town, Hiroshima, was the target of a deadlier weapon than this warring world ever had known.

A campaign of psychological warfare beyond precedent was brought to a terrifying climax by President Truman's announcement on Wednesday that Russia was about to join us in the war on Japan. Cornered by the Russian bear, the Chinese dragon, the British lion, and the American eagle, the Japanese faced the grim choice of surrendering at once or committing hara-kari.

BETWEEN MOUNTS OF BLESSINGS AND CURSINGS

A Washington authority is quoted as saying that already we are equipped to shoot this bomb across the Atlantic to Europe. But, on a sobering reflection, that is no one-way street.

Those scientists in New Mexico opened on civilization one more Pandora's box. The most optimistic view to take is that old Mars now may blow himself up, that war may kill itself off.

Unlike nearly all other modern implements of warfare, this bomb was conceived for the purpose of destruction. The creative spirit of man usually has been enlisted for constructive ends.

Means for prevention of disease and for the conservation of health are among the great achievements of our time and have been wholly for the benefit of the race. But mechanical inventions—ships and airplanes, automobiles and radios, gasoline engines and even dynamite—that were contrived for peace we have quickly perverted to the uses of war.

Whether atomic energy can be as quickly converted to the service of peace, we do not know. But scientists discourage any day dreams that this magic may soon turn our wheels, light, heat, and cool our homes, offices, and stores and factories.

Humanity stands again between Gerizim and Ebal, those mounts of blessings and cursings. Are we civilized enough to meet the responsibility of the dread strange power we hold in our hands?

Resolution Adopted by Local 201, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following telegram I received from Alfred Coulthard, business agent, Local 201, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, Lynn, Mass., concerning wage increase program:

LYNN, MASS., *September 17, 1945.*
Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
Washington, D. C.

The officers and executive board of Local 201, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, representing over 20,000 workers in the Lynn, Mass., and Everett, Mass., plants of the General Electric, passed the following resolution which we respectfully submit to you:

"Whereas the American workers as a whole stuck to their jobs and produced the weapons of war for our gallant servicemen and those of our allies, which fact, coupled with good leadership, resulted in the defeat of our enemies; and

"Whereas we, the workers, bore the burden of long hours, high taxes, and an hourly wage freeze policy; and

"Whereas our weekly take-out has now been reduced by at least 25 percent due to the change from a 48-hour to a 40-hour week and in some cases more due to having to take lower rated jobs; and

"Whereas the resultant cut in our income will result in reducing our standard of living to the bare necessities of life; and

"Whereas it is imperative that the standard of living must be such and so maintained that the masses of the people are able to continually purchase the very things which we produced rather than merely a temporary spurt of purchasing power due to the immediate shortage of consumer goods; and

"Whereas the workers are fully aware of these facts and are respectfully petitioning their unions for action for wage increases; and

"Whereas our union has already petitioned our affected employer, the General Electric Co., that wages be increased; and

"Whereas the company position is basically and in effect that it will go along with the trend of the industries in the country and that it is a national question: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we petition President Truman, our Senators, and our Congressmen that steps be taken to effectuate an economic policy, including a wage-increase program, that will meet the situation, in order that reconversion will result in mass employment and mass purchasing power."

ALFRED COULTHARD,
Business Agent.

Occupation of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 19 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Occupation of Japan," written by Sumner Welles and published in the Washington Post of September 19, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCCUPATION OF JAPAN
(By Sumner Welles)

MUCH REMAINS TO BE DONE

The provisions of the Potsdam Declaration and of the surrender terms are sufficiently broad to enable the victorious powers to carry out any policy they consider most certain permanently to eliminate any new Japanese menace to the peace of the world. The sole reservation is that the Japanese people may retain their imperial form of government should they so desire.

The steps which we have so far taken do not necessarily indicate what our long-range occupation policy is to be. Military considerations must at first be paramount. But American public opinion should understand the full significance of these steps. For American security and world peace will be endangered should they in fact be indicative of our definite policy. The steps already taken will make it difficult to convince the Japanese people that their defeat is due to our naval, air and military superiority rather than to the atomic bomb alone. They will make it harder to make them understand the full measure of their national war guilt, and the nature and extent of the regeneration which they must undergo before they can once more be admitted into the family of nations.

Japan's attack in 1941 represented the final stage in the policy of conquest upon which Japan's leaders decided many decades ago.

The Army and the Navy were primarily responsible for the course which the Nation followed. But during the past generation the Japanese industrial and financial magnates have been working hand-in-glove with the Imperial High Command. From the time of Japan's first invasion of China, they have been joined by swarms of speculators and profiteers who throve on the military exploitation of occupied territories. In recent years the politicians have taken part in this gigantic racket.

Fascism admirably served the purposes of all of these diverse groups. It has penetrated deeply into Japanese life. The great mass of the Japanese people has blindly obeyed the directives issued from this corrupt veneer which tops the social structure. And corruption has eaten into every class in Japanese society.

Our present occupation policy seems designed to retain in continuing control precisely those elements which have been directly responsible for the course which brought on such immeasurable tragedy to the United States and its allies.

The present Emperor, whether or not he feebly deprecated the attack upon Pearl Harbor, sanctioned the war. As an individual he should not be regarded as divorced from his Government's policies, nor freed from responsibility for the hideous atrocities perpetrated by his military leaders. The question of the continuation of an imperial government has nothing to do with Hirohito's personal involvement. Our policy up to now has greatly strengthened the Emperor's individual authority. It has absolved him in the eyes of the Japanese people of all blame.

The Australian Government has made it clear, as we have not, that it refuses to treat with Japanese war lords as "honorable foes." We have as yet done nothing to make the Japanese Army and Navy lose face with their own people. The dissolution of the imperial general headquarters and the publication of the list of a few war criminals will not be sufficient.

Our incredible blunder in announcing that we would keep Japanese authorities in Korea in power—even for an hour—after our occupation unmeasurably strengthens the prestige of the Japanese Army with its own people.

General MacArthur's proclamation that Japan's economy will be subject to only nominal control has created the belief that Japan's industrial leaders will retain their privileged position.

The Japanese Diet is composed of totalitarian puppets. It is the war Diet. Yet it was permitted to assemble to prove to the

Japanese public that "unconditional surrender" constitutes a voluntary agreement on the part of the Japanese Government.

What is even more incomprehensible, the announcement has been made, with our consent, that national elections will shortly be held under the sole supervision of the present Japanese Government, composed as it is of individuals who all share in Japan's war guilt, so as to obtain an expression of the "popular will."

How can we imagine that democracy will suddenly spring to life in Japan when those influences which have so long dominated the Japanese masses, which have forced fascism upon them, and which have led them into war, are permitted to remain in control?

It was because of the same defects in Allied policy toward Germany in 1918 that the Second World War was rendered possible. Should a similar policy be pursued in the case of Japan, the consequences will be as grave.

The Japanese people will naturally cooperate for the time being, just as the German people did in the early 1920's because the dominating forces within Japan see that it is the only way in which they can hope to retain their own control.

Is it without significance that the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture has publicly announced arrangements for food distribution which make it possible for food to be withheld from all Japanese who do not follow the Government's policy?

Are we complacently to believe the blind assurance of Japan's generals that nothing is further from their thoughts than the creation of underground nationalistic military societies similar to those so efficiently organized in Germany in 1919?

There is no solution of the problem now presented other than an occupation policy which will eliminate from any position of real control every element responsible for Japan's course of conduct during the past generation. It must be a policy which will teach the Japanese people that war does not pay. It must be a policy which will create within Japan a basis upon which at least a rudimentary democracy can be built up.

That will be a policy which implies some years of intelligent, constructive, and expensive enterprise on our part. It is a policy which can never be carried out if this Government heeds the present outcry within the United States for an immediate reduction or replacement of our occupation forces, and for letting Japan stew in its own juice. But it is the only policy which spells future security for the American people.

The German Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 19 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on July 27 last I raised the question on the Senate floor whether by underwriting the provisions of the United Nations Charter we were not underwriting peace settlements which either had been or were being secretly arrived at, about which the common man would have nothing to say, and which our conscience would repudiate when they were bared to the world.

At that time I challenged any Senator to deny that these settlements, whatever they might be, would not again be imposed upon and affect for ill the vanquished, neutrals, and Allies alike.

Nothing has happened on the international scene since that time to cause me to change my mind. Indeed, events have only confirmed my fears. Because I believe that the present road we are traveling in international affairs is leading us only deeper into a labyrinth of war-breeding political and economic absurdities, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following grim warning to the western world coming from one of the most outstanding interpreters of international affairs in the British Commonwealth, the London Economist, which appears as the leading editorial in the United States News of September 14.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GERMAN SETTLEMENT

[BERLIN, August 28 (Associated Press).—Germany's reduction to a nation of small farmers, the future envisioned by the Big Three, was described today by British and American technical advisers as "a short-range political necessity but a long-range economic absurdity."

[Almost a month after the Big Three had decreed an agrarian role for the most highly industralized power on the Continent, the majority opinion of the men engaged in trying to effect this transformation is that it won't work. These experts cannot be quoted by name. But in off-the-record interviews they frankly expressed the view that the problem of Germany had not been solved in Berlin. It was, they said, merely consigned to several years of experimentation, at the end of which world opinion might demand a fresh approach.

[Statistics are cited by these British-American sources to show what the idea of a pastoral Germany means in actuality.

[The present Germany, as whittled down in the east by the Soviet Union and Poland to a frontier of the Oder and Neisse Rivers, is more than 20 percent smaller in area than pre-Munich Germany. Approximately 8,000,000 Germans have moved or presumably will move westward from the lost eastern provinces. In addition, at least 3,000,000 Germans are to be expelled from Czechoslovakia.

[Regardless of the scientific increasing of agricultural output by the Nazi regime to meet war needs Germany has supplied only 83 percent of her own food requirements. Large-scale mechanization and artificial fertilization were exploited almost to the limit.

[Veteran Allied agronomists see no chance of a miracle that would take Germany out of the class of an agricultural deficiency area by the application of more human labor, by the breaking up of large estates or by the conversion of forests to farms. "We wonder," a British expert said, "how long it may be before the United States and the British Commonwealth grow tired of shipping food into Germany, for nothing in return because, no matter how well our schemes go, somebody will have to send in food."]

FROM THE ECONOMIST, LONDON

It is an irony of history that the terms for Germany decided at Potsdam should have been published within 48 hours of the dropping of the first atomic bomb. One may wonder what future historians will make—in such a context—of the victorious statesmen's conception of security. If one bomb can annihilate Koenigsberg, do the Russians gain much by annexing it? What possible defensive importance can be attached to a frontier on the Oder—or anywhere else? Can the ban on German production of aircraft and sea-going vessels have any bearing on war-making power in the Atomic Age? Once again we are reminded of the appalling gap between man's adult scientific mind and his political infantilism. It is as though the victors, in the age of the tank, were making a peace of bows and arrows. It would, however, be grossly unfair to blame the statesmen at Potsdam for failing to arrange a settlement in keeping with scientific and strategic possibilities which the scientists themselves are not yet able to predict. The charge against them is not that they are making a bad peace in a new unpredictable scientific context. It is that they are making a peace that would be bad in any context.

It is not their aim to make a Carthaginian peace. The Potsdam Declaration makes this clear. A German community is to survive—decentralized, perhaps, but still a recognizable national unit with, eventually, a central government. Straight away, political parties and trade-union activity, the democratic freedoms, are to be restored, and the Allies state that their aim is "to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis and for eventual peaceful cooperation in international life by Germany."

The aim is unexceptionable; but how is it to be attained? A peace of no indemnities and no annexations is clearly impossible; after all that has happened, no risks of another German aggression can be run. But if there are to be safeguards and prohibitions, they must not completely contradict the final avowed purpose of reincorporating Germany in a peaceful Europe. Nor must they place too great a strain, physical or moral, upon the victors, for the worst peace of all is a peace that is first imposed and then is not enforced. In practice, the two problems merge. A political or economic control onerous and minute enough to drive the Germans into violent revulsion is likely to be so costly for the Allies to maintain in terms of manpower, and so difficult for them to defend in terms of their own public opinion—at least in the west—that they might be easily maneuvered and cajoled out of enforcing it. Ideally, the terms imposed on Germany ought, therefore, while offering a genuine safeguard against future war, to be such that the Allies are reasonably certain of enforcing them. They ought also, in their degree of severity, to be such as not to render hopeless the ultimate reconciliation of Germany.

Do the Potsdam terms fulfill these conditions? There can be only one answer. They do not. The political conditions may propose a return to democracy. The territorial and economic terms make it certain that this political objective will not be achieved. It is now as good as certain that in the east the German frontier will lie along the Oder and the western Neisse. Russia takes Koenigsberg and a large part of East Prussia. The rest of the territory is transferred to Poland to "administer" until the peace conference, when the final decision on the fate of these lands will be taken—a face-saving formula which does not mask the fact of annexation. The French claim to the left bank of the Rhine has been postponed, but will now be difficult to resist. Nothing is said in the Potsdam Declaration of the Czechs' claims. They too will be pressed all the more vigorously now. At the same time, the principle of mass expulsions of Germans from annexed territory or from neighboring states has been accepted. The Poles and the Czechs have been asked to halt in their expulsions—but only so that the work can be done in a more orderly manner. The final result of these sweeping changes of frontiers and populations will be to put between fifty and sixty million Germans to live in a territory not much bigger than Great Britain.

To sustain even a moderate standard of living for such a densely populated mass, the

Germans would require a high degree of industrialization. But the economic plans of Potsdam seem to point in the opposite direction. It is true that the terms permit to Germany "average living standards not exceeding the average standards of living of European countries (excluding the United Kingdom and the USSR)." But this is evidently to be an upper, not a lower, limit; nor is it made clear how this extremely vague level is to be reached. The Allies say that they will put "primary emphasis * * * on the development of agriculture and peaceful domestic industries * * * and control German industry and all economic and financial international transactions * * * with the aim of preventing Germany from developing a war potential."

The policy, be it noted, is not to prevent Germany from using its war potential, but to prevent it from having one. Since, in modern industry, it is almost impossible to distinguish between plant and processes of wartime value from those of purely peacetime use, this policy, literally interpreted, involves the large-scale deindustrialization of Germany.

This conclusion is borne out by the agreement reached on reparations. Apart from Germany's external assets, reparations are now to take one form only—the removal of industrial plant from Germany. The Russians will provide for the Poles out of their zone of occupation. In addition, they will receive 25 percent of any industrial capital removed from the western zones, although 15 percent is to be conditional on certain deliveries of food, coal, timber, and potash from the Russian zone. (It should be observed that this arrangement gives Russia a vested interest in the severity of the western powers' exactions; any moderation would be a blow at Russia.) The remaining 75 percent of the western deliveries will be shared out among the western Allies. The transfer is to be completed in 2 years. There will apparently be no reparations in money or in kind after that date.

The Germans will be allowed to keep only such plant as is necessary for their peacetime industry. The Reparations Commission is to decide how much this represents; the rest will be transferred, subject only to a final veto by the military governor in each zone.

Until the Reparations Commission has completed its survey, it is impossible to be dogmatic about the final effects of the economic settlement. Germany's present war industry is certainly overblown. If "munitions industries" are narrowly defined, a considerable transfer of plant from these industries might still, in theory, leave the Germans with sufficient industrial capacity to maintain a reasonable standard. But in practice, when the bomb damage and the Reparations Commission have done their work, there will be very little left. The economic clauses and the reparations clauses, taken in conjunction, amount to the policy associated with the name of Mr. Morgenthau, that of the deindustrialization and pastoralization of Germany.

If this is indeed the policy, then it must surely be obvious that it will not work. The German community will not be reconciled to it. An economic slum is not a suitable background for the growth of democracy and the peaceful mind. A hostile, resentful, and impoverished nation, 50,000,000 strong, even without arms, is a certain source of trouble. The settlement will therefore need to be rigidly and minutely enforced. The Allies apparently accept this fact. They appear to envisage a close control over every aspect of German industry. Not only are all "arms, ammunition, and implements of war * * * all types of aircraft and seagoing ships" to be banned, but "production of metals, chemicals, machinery, and other items that are directly necessary to a war economy shall be rigidly controlled and restricted to Germany's approved postwar peacetime needs."

It is almost impossible to picture the army of inspectors, accountants, bureaucrats, and technicians which would be necessary to achieve so searching a control. It would demand from the Allies precisely the kind of technical skill which is so urgently needed for reconstruction at home in all the Allied countries. It would place on the different Allies for a decade or more the responsibility of exporting their keenest officials to entirely unproductive work. The leaders at Potsdam appear to have seen this difficulty of manpower. In the most curious of all the curious sections in their declaration they state that German administrative machinery is to be established "to proclaim and assume administration of the economic controls established by the Control Council." Can the Allies seriously mean that they intend to rely upon Germans to supervise the impoverishment of Germany?

A system of economic control on the scale envisaged by the Potsdam Declaration is probably impossible under any conditions. It is certainly impossible as part of a treaty which public opinion in the Western World will find increasingly hard to defend. It might be possible to grow reconciled to annexations and uprootings if, in the end, the uprooted people were settling down to a reasonable standard of life. It might be possible to accept very much lower living standards in Germany if there were no unjust frontier settlements to add to public uneasiness. But the joining of a bad territorial and a bad economic settlement to a cumbrous and exacting system of Allied occupation and control seems precisely designed to create in a few years' time a revulsion of feeling in the west compared with which the revulsion against Versailles will be as nothing. Given such a revulsion, what hope would there be of maintaining the system of control which can alone perpetuate the rigid prohibitions under which Germany is to live? And once the process of relaxing the settlement had begun, in what fatal resurgence of German power might it not end? The Potsdam settlement will not last 10 years, and when it breaks down there will be nothing but the razor-edge balance of international anarchy between civilization and the atomic bomb.

If the only possible alternative to the Potsdam peace were to leave Germany uncontrolled and with an undiminished power of waging war, then naturally it would be necessary to try to attempt the impossible—the maintenance of a minute control over every aspect of Germany's industrial life. But there are other possibilities, other methods of achieving the necessary safeguards which would not violate the two basic principles of a workable settlement—that in 15 years' time a sufficient number of Germans, however grudgingly, would accept it and that, whether they do or not, the Allies would be as resolute and united in enforcing it as they were on VE-day itself. The essence of such an alternative would be to make the central control as simple, straighforward, and obvious as possible. The point has frequently been argued in the Economist. Here is need only be briefly repeated. The simplest control to run is a control on the end products of industry. Prohibit the Germans from producing any form of armaments, from V–2's to small-arms ammunition. If in 15 years' time the Allies are as resolute as ever in maintaining this prohibition, it will be sufficient. If they are not resolute enough even to forbid armaments, how can it be supposed that they will use force to prevent the rebuilding of a factory or the reconstruction of a blast furnace?

Concentration on the central issue—the enforcement of total and long-term disarmament—does not, of course, preclude other terms. Some frontier changes might be accepted by the Western Powers even in the long run as reasonable and necessary. Some transfer of industrial capacity from the inflated German war industries would be possible. So, if it is really necessary, would the assignment to reparations of a certain proportion of the products of German industry over a limited number of years.

There is, of course, no prospect of Russian agreement to any such course. But if we know it to be right, must Russian opposition condemn us to silent acquiescence in a course we know to be ruinous? Better by far to have the matter out now than to enter on a miserable course of endless quarrels over the enforcement of the unenforceable and the justification of the unjust. The Russians' determination to loot Germany may not be unconnected with their failure to obtain reconstruction credits in the western countries. Every possible means should be tried of getting them to change their attitude. But if they will not, then the pursuit of truth and justice is a surer guide than any calculations of future alliances. We may not be able to alter what happens in the Russian zone, but we can at least disclaim responsibility for it. And we can follow our own convictions in the west, where what is left of Germany can be given the prospect, in the fullness of time, of achieving liberty, equality, and prosperity within a western Europe that is conscious of its political and economic unity. There is no other cure for the German sore on the body of Europe than to heal it. The healing may be a long and difficult process, but let us not rub salt in the wound. Let us not now abandon the only hope of sometime escaping from an endless prospect of German wars.

The conviction that the peace proposed at Potsdam is a thoroughly bad peace is not based on any sentimental softening towards Germany. It is based on the belief that the system proposed is in the fullest sense unworkable. It offers no hope of ultimate German reconciliation. It offers little hope of the Allies maintaining its cumbrous controls beyond the first years of peace. Its methods of reparations reinforce autarchy in Russia and consummate the ruin not only of Germany, but of Europe. Above all, it has in it not a single constructive idea, not a single hopeful perspective for the postwar world. At the end of a mighty war fought to defeat Hitlerism, the Allies are making a Hitlerian peace. This is the real measure of their failure.

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, to the many statements which have already been made on the demobilization of the Army and Navy I should like to add my views.

Much has been said by the Army and Navy concerning demobilization but they do not appear to be getting ahead very fast. Since the Army and Navy high command seem to have failed in their responsibility to the people of the United States who willingly gave their sons to the cause of war, it is up to Congress to take over this responsibility and get the boys home. American families are anxious over the future life of these boys who were snatched away from home and

their civilian status at a time in their life when most of them were working to obtain an education or endeavoring to raise a family. Our bureaucrats have bungled the task of reconversion and if they are allowed to continue in their present form they will bungle demobilization. There are thousands of boys in the Army who wish to continue their education, which was interrupted in its most formative stage. Why should boys who have served in the Army 3½ years and had overseas service, but still not having enough points to be discharged, be kept around some Army post? These boys should be released and sent home to their families and allowed to return to school. There are known cases where boys feel so much time has elapsed since they left school they have become discouraged and decide against pursuing their former ambition. Any boy who has had as much as 6 months' service overseas deserves every consideration we can give him toward helping him become a civilian again.

It is up to Congress to back the people in their desire to return the boys home.

General MacArthur has announced his occupation of Japan is proceeding in an orderly manner and he will not require 500,000 men to occupy Japan. He has said his former estimate was too high and he felt the Regular Army could secure the necessary 200,000. I am convinced there are enough patriotic men and women in this country to raise these occupational forces through voluntary enlistments if there is as much merit to this proposition of our occupying the conquered nations as the country has been led to believe by their Commander in Chief and Army and Navy officials. If this Government cannot raise such occupational forces the country and the soldiers, especially, should be made to realize the full significance of this situation.

Another point I should like to make at this time concerns the men who were placed on limited service. A number of these men have two and three children, but nevertheless were drafted. Although they did not have the physical requirements usually required by the Army and Navy, still they were forced to take desk jobs and jobs as instructors, which they accepted without complaint. These men have served their country just as loyally and faithfully as the men overseas. Simply because their health did not permit them to go overseas is no fault of their own. Still these men are required to have as many points to be discharged as men who served overseas. Some special consideration should be given to the limited-service men. Most of them have completed their job in the Army and Navy and are anxious to return to their homes and their families but still they do not get discharged because their points are not sufficient for release. Many of my letters complain of this fact but even though it has been presented to the War Department a number of times nothing has been done for men in this category. It is my opinion men with families should be released as quickly as possible. The boys themselves use the example that it only took a day to get into the Army, why should it take 5 days to get out of a separation center. The War Department has not been able to give a satisfactory explanation of this fact.

Like many of our people, I am strongly suspicious there is a desire on the part of bureaucrats and Government planners to delay demobilization and to keep as many persons in the Army and Navy as is possible. Only recently General Hershey, Director, National Selective Service, publicly stated in Denver, it would be cheaper to keep men in the Army than it would to set up an agency to take care of them when they are released. It is my hope that the administration will step in and heed the pleas of the people and the Congress to return our boys to their homes and families.

End Meat Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the precisionist may claim that, technically, the war is not officially over. But the American people know otherwise. The shooting has stopped, and with it the need for many of the restrictions which have placed our American way of living in a strait-jacket.

Take meat rationing. Having outlived its emergency usefulness, it continues to harass millions of housewives and workers alike with a stubbornness that is symptomatic of totalitarian ways.

Long-suffering American stomachs cry out at this want—in the midst of plenty.

Look at the score. The Army and Navy no longer have to set aside priority reserves in anticipation of future needs. Even their current requirements are shrinking daily as men are released from the service.

War's destruction has ceased, the oceans are free for commerce, and vast reserves of beef-on-the-hoof exist in such countries as Canada, Argentina, and Australia—which in prewar days exported heavily.

Our own American ranges are stocked as they were never stocked before.

The OPA is laying off personnel right and left but meat remains on the list. A vexed and indignant public demands that meat be made ration free without any paper delays.

MacArthur's Statement on the Size of the Japanese Occupation Force

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some newspapers, in particular the Washington Post and the Communist Daily Worker, have attacked General MacArthur for his statement to the effect that within 6 months he would probably need not more than 200,000 men in Japan. None of the papers which attacked General MacArthur have published his full statement. I got hold of it last night and I am inserting it in the RECORD this morning. It is absolutely unanswerable.

If the American people have to go to the Communist Daily Worker or the Washington Post to get somebody to advise Gen. Douglas MacArthur, then we are in a "heck of a fix."

I note that President Truman agrees with General MacArthur, and I believe that 90 percent of the American people will agree with him when they read his statement and understand the situation.

This statement reads as follows:

The smooth progress of the occupation of Japan enabled a drastic cut in the number of troops originally estimated for that purpose. The unknown quantity in the original situation was the debatable question whether a military government would have to be set up to run the country during the early occupation. This might well have involved the employment of several million troops.

The entire structure below the political plane, involving hundreds of thousands of people on professional and lower levels, would have had to be reconstituted and replaced. This would have involved a force running into millions of our men and would have taken many years of additional time and untold billions of additional dollars.

By utilizing the Japanese Government structure to the extent necessary to prevent complete social disintegration, insure internal distribution, maintain labor, and prevent calamitous disease or wholesale starvation, the purposes of the surrender terms can be accomplished with only a small fraction of the men, time, and money originally projected.

This situation involved a grave initial risk, but successful penetration and subsequent progress of the operation now assure success of the venture.

No greater gamble has been taken in history than the initial landings, where our ground forces were outnumbered a thousand to one, but the stakes were worth it. As a consequence of the saving in men, the occupation forces originally believed essential are being drastically cut and troops will be returned to the United States as rapidly as ships can be made available.

Within 6 months the occupational force, unless unforeseen factors arise, will probably number not more than 200,000 men, a size probably within the framework of our projected Regular Establishment and which will permit complete demobilization of our citizen Pacific forces which fought so long and so nobly through to victory. Once Japan is disarmed, this force will be sufficiently strong to insure our will.

The questions involved in this matter are entirely independent of the future of the Japanese politico-governmental structure on a national and international plane. This problem is one the ultimate solution whereof necessarily awaits completion of military phases of the surrender.

It is one which unquestionably will be determined upon the highest diplomatic level of the United Nations and is one in which the answer cannot fail to be influenced by the incidence of events in the near and proximate future.

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled "Constitution Day," which appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, September 16, 1945:

CONSTITUTION DAY

Monday, September 17, the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution, has been declared by Congress as Constitution Day. It would be well to ponder now the meanings and value of this bulwark of that American way of life for the preservation of which so many of our young men have just fought and died so valiantly.

Knowledge of the principles set forth in this historic document has always been considered as essential to the granting of citizenship. Courts in almost unanimous instances have held that a person could not be attached to the principles of the Constitution if he did not know what that Constitution contained. And yet we wonder how many citizens, naturalized or born to that status, have a working understanding of the principles contained therein?

We know that we would fight to the death for the preservation of those rights guaranteed to us by the Constitution, yet too few of us know exactly or even sufficiently what those rights are.

The sacred rights which were embodied in the Constitution were formulated as pillars of American democracy by those immigrants who first came to these shores and they have been strengthened by the millions who have followed them.

These rights will continue to be upheld, as they have been in the past, only as long as they are recognized, not merely as privileges to be enjoyed, but as a trust to be maintained and defended.

Maintenance and defense of this trust challenges every American citizen to make a positive and continuing contribution to America. Lip loyalty is not enough. Repeating the American creed, or pledging allegiance to the flag, or singing songs become empty forms unless they are followed by activities which add to the individual and total happiness of our people.

Each citizen must do his part to make a democracy work for all, instead of expecting it to work for him alone. The Golden Rule must prevail and hate, with all its kindred evils, must be eliminated from the heart. Hate, prejudice, and bigotry, whether religious or racial, tear down and destroy, and they can have no place in our democracy.

Demobilization of the Armed Forces

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I am quite disturbed over the rules and regulations that have been promulgated by our military authorities for the discharge of our military personnel, and especially the inactivities of the operations of the regulations set-up.

This is a subject that should be approached and discussed broadly and with a charitable attitude toward the military, as I fully appreciate its magnitude and the many problems to be met through the progress of demobilization.

However, hostilities have ceased, and this body is the guardian of the rights of the people, and if we do not declare ourselves and demand a liberal and sane approach to this great task, to the extent of passing legislation to assure proper, fair, and just demobilization, then we will have failed our people in one of their greatest problems.

With due respect to the military, we must all admit that through the history of this Nation, and that of all other nations, the military has sought to envelop the civilian processes and authorities. Frankly, I must admit that this is more or less a natural attitude; one that could be expected even though not justified. The career man in the military service has from his youth had the importance of his position drilled into his very being, and properly so. It is further true that his function is one of importance to the life of our Nation—his position is respected by us—and it is necessary to let him practically run the Nation in a time of war. But definitely, this is not true in time of peace. It is now time that this Congress again take the reins of Government, and control the destiny of this Nation. If it were left to the "brass hats" not any of our boys would return to civilian life. This is our responsibility, not theirs, and to the fathers and mothers of this Nation we must answer.

This I do not know, but I have sufficient facts and circumstances to justify the conclusion that the CIO has stuck its filthy nose into the question of demobilization. They are so selfish that they do not want to give an inch on any gain made or any blessings that have befallen them while our boys were fighting, bleeding, and dying to save this country. Their strike record during this war, and their attitude since the termination of the war, stands as definite proof of this conclusion. They do not want to surrender the first job to the man who fought for them, and they want to keep them in the service to relieve additional unemployment.

General MacArthur has just released a sound, sensible, and realistic statement with regard to occupational problems. There seems to be a great amount of excitement about his statement in Washington. Naturally, this would be true, because this is the first sane approach to the problem by those now in authority. I may say to any who are alarmed over this statement that the surest proof of the statement's truth is the fact that MacArthur said it. Who will question the fact that MacArthur is the best authority we have on the Japanese Government and people and on the job that is ahead of him? When driven from the Philippines he said he would return, and this he did with few men and little fighting equipment until the very last of the conquest. However, from the very beginning he maintained a steady march back to the spot from whence he was driven and even into the heart of Tokyo.

It is plain to any thinking man that with some increased compensation and other benefits that a sufficient army can be maintained by voluntary enlistment to discharge all military duties including our occupational responsibilities. The CIO is running rampant to convince us that there will be in the immediate future millions of men idle to whom we should appropriate billions of dollars paid in by working taxpayers to maintain these millions in idleness—paying them $25 weekly to do only one thing and that one thing is exactly nothing. All this while the boys who have fought for years away from home, father, mother, wives, and children and friends at a base pay of $50 per month, must remain away at the same base pay when they could return home to their former jobs, their farms, businesses, and professions. Why not send these fellows who say they are going to be idle and who expect the Government to pay them better than $100 per month in such idleness and permit our boys who have completed the job of conquering the enemy to return home. This man that the CIO is picturing to you who is so faint of heart that he now sees himself too weak to stand alone and resting on the shoulder of the man who is working, already carrying a load, paying the taxes from whence he draws his dole—I believe could generate enough nerve and courage and energy to lean against a post and do police duty, and I further believe the boy who has done the fighting and whose place he takes would be willing to come back and work for a living in a land of free enterprise.

One complete inconsistency which is totally inexcusable is not arranging for the separation of the military personnel at some separation center at least in reasonable proximity of their respective homes. I have handled one case which will well illustrate the point I am making. A young man who had served nearly 3 years in the Pacific in most of the major conflicts, and who had not had a furlough or been home during his service was recently returned to continental United States and given a 30-day furlough at a point entirely across the continent from his home, a distance of around 3,000 miles. Before his furlough was out he received orders to return to that point for a discharge. After quite some effort and with the help of the Department here in Washington, who readily responded upon request, I was able to get his commanding officer to change his point of discharge to Charleston, S. C., which was reasonably near his home. This inconsistency and total disregard for efficiency would have consumed more than 2 weeks of this party's time in travel, several hundred dollars of the taxpayers' money for traveling and other expenses, and also have congested transportation facilities more at a time when travel conditions are bad. There is no justification for such bungling, and by all means the Department should at once take necessary steps to see that

these men are separated from the service at points at least within reasonable proximity of their respective homes.

My suggestion for a proper and sane discharge system would be to discharge without delay all who have seen combat, regardless of age, size, color, or other restriction or requirement, this, of course, to include all those who have been prisoners of the enemy. To discharge without delay all married men and especially those with children. Not only is this demanded from a standpoint of individual right and justice to these men and their families, but there are privates who are drawing between two and three hundred dollars per month when their family benefits are considered and why not let these men be discharged to be with their families, that the homes, the foundation of American Christianity and civilization, may be preserved. The base pay for volunteers could be raised and yet a saving of millions of dollars to the Government would be effected by letting these men with dependents out. Nothing is ever lost by doing right and this is fundamentally right.

From a national standpoint, I come now to the most important phase of this whole question. We are now fixing to enter the most trying period in our national life—an era in which the best minds, with the best training possible to receive, are going to find it hard to maintain the high position as a world power this Nation has occupied, to foster and promote the progress in civilization the potentialities science does and will offer. If we permit ourselves to meet this era with an uneducated generation, God pity our posterity. There are literally thousands of our boys who have been snatched from high schools and unfinished college courses, who are now in the service, some of whom have served more than 3 years that under present plans have no chance to get out for possibly 2 years. It is hard to measure the degree to which these boys have now matured, and every day they remain in the service that state of maturity is going to rapidly increase. If they are immediately released it is going to be shocking to see the small percentage that will return to school and complete their education, even with the liberal provisions we made for such completion of their education in the GI bill of rights, and with all the persuasion their parents can use.

We cannot afford by our failure of duty at this crucial time to bring this tragedy to a Nation whose history is as full of glory as is that of this commonwealth and one that faces today the opportunity and responsibility of world leadership our Nation faces. The fall of all nations is traceable to a lack of proper education. We cannot afford to permit this to be the fate of our blessed homeland.

Now, the remedy: If the military authorities will do this job and do it now, and quit bickering back and forth, well and good; if not, the duty and responsibility rests clearly on our shoulders, and let us not delay. Let us accept it and act, and prove worthy of the trust imposed in us by the fathers, mothers, and wives who furnished these boys.

Members of Armed Services Should Be Demobilized as Quickly as Possible—Passage of H. R. 3951 Is Worth While

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was impossible for me to be in attendance at the session of the House of Representatives on September 18, when H. R. 3951 was passed by a vote of 341 for, with none against. My absence was caused by official business in my congressional district at Morgantown, W. Va., where an important hearing was held in reference to the proposal for the erection of a necessary free highway bridge, the cost to be almost one-half million dollars, across the Monongahela River. I favor the legislation. I consider its passage vital to the over-all demobilization program, which has proven to be one of the most perplexing problems to face not only Members of Congress, but the American people, at this time. Its provisions encourage voluntary enlistments. It is my feeling that volunteers can do much of the occupation work in both the Pacific and European theaters. In this connection, I desire to place in the RECORD, at this point, the following news story which appeared in the Elkins (W. Va.) Inter-Mountain on Monday, September 17, 1945:

DISCHARGE OF TROOPS URGED—RANDOLPH SPEAKS AT CENTURY SUNDAY

"Members of our armed services with 2 years of duty should be released as quickly as an orderly demobilization can be effected," said Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH at services dedicating the honor roll and park at Century, W. Va., on Sunday (September 16).

ALL-DAY PROGRAM

The program, which lasted all day, was sponsored by Post No. 3116, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Local No. 4172, United Mine Workers.

"These men went into the Army and Navy for the purpose of winning this war and now that it is over they have the right to expect their return to civilian life in the shortest possible time," continued Mr. RANDOLPH.

MASSED TROOPS NOT NEEDED

"It is absolutely unnecessary to keep millions of men in uniform for occupation duty in Japan and Germany. These beaten countries can be 'kept in line' without massed troops. We can know what their people are doing with relatively small detachments and it is folly for any group to believe American youth wants patrol duty thousands of miles from their interests and families at home. It is the responsibility of military officials to keep troops constantly moving toward the United States. Their failure to do this will mean that the Congress, voicing the opinion of our citizens, will necessarily step into the picture to see that the job is done at once," he added.

TWO THOUSAND PRESENT

More than 2,000 persons heard the speaker declare that "if World War III is allowed to take place, not one or two nations would be destroyed, but mankind would literally be wiped from the earth."

John Baynard, representing the UMWA, of Fairmont, and Dennis Kane, State vice commander of the VFW, were among the speakers. Philippi and Grafton High School bands participated.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] that we must not be too impatient with the Army and Navy demobilization program. It is my earnest feeling, however, that a speedier demobilization of our troops is feasible and practical. It was with this thought in mind that I presented, on September 12, H. R. 340, a bill "to provide for the speedy return to civilian life of persons discharged from the Army by the establishment of a separation center in each State, wherever practicable." It was gratifying to learn that at approximately the time of the measure's presentation, the Army had greatly increased the number of these centers.

I received recently a letter from a veteran of World War I, in which he made the following suggestions:

Draft all IV-F's and men who have been deferred, 17-37 inclusive; release all men regardless of points when they have served 2 years, regardless if considered essential or not. They could offer inducements, such as promotions for those who want to enlist for a year or two more service after a 60-day furlough. There are thousands of IV-F's and others that could well serve in peacetimes and possibly would benefit by Army service.

For those boys who have their schooling to complete, it is most unwise to continue them in service too long. The leaders of 10 years from now will be these boys who are being deprived of the opportunity of completing their schooling. I am against the drafting of boys 17 and 18 who are in school.

Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving literally hundreds of letters from anxious fathers and mothers who are concerned for the return of their sons. They are loyal Americans, but it is understandable that they desire a speedy demobilization if it can be carried forward without robbing us of the gains which victory has wrought.

Loose Words About Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post of September 18, 1945:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

LOOSE WORDS ABOUT FULL EMPLOYMENT

In one important respect the Murray full-employment bill will have to be amended before it can be supported with candor and conviction. It says that "all Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment" and that it is the policy of the United States "to assure * * * at all times * * * opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling

and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right."

If these words are to be taken seriously, they raise expectations which the bill itself is not designed to satisfy. If they are meant to read loosely as political rhetoric, they do not belong in the most important domestic measure of the postwar period. Incidentally, the sentence as written is so carelessly and excitedly phrased that, read literally, it guarantees women who have to stay home part of the day to keep house a full-time job away from home.

Though this is no doubt a little slip of the pen, the whole statement is a big slip of the pen. It is derived from the celebrated passage in President Roosevelt's message of January 11, 1944, where he said that "we have accepted, so to speak, a second bill of rights," and it purports to establish as one item of a new legal bill of rights what Mr. Roosevelt described as "so to speak" a bill of rights.

Now there is a great difference between a legal bill of rights and a "so to speak" bill of rights. The difference, as Mr. Merlo Pusey pointed out so cogently last week in The Washington Post, is that under a real bill of rights a citizen who is denied his rights may carry his case to the courts. But "if a man is out of a job, can he go to court and force the Government to provide him with one?" The answer, of course, is "no." Under the Murray bill he will not be able to do this, and it is, therefore, not good faith to write into the law that all Americans "have a right" which no individual American has any legal means of enforcing.

What Mr. Roosevelt meant to say, what Mr. Truman meant when he adopted the formula, what the rest of the Murray bill is designed for, is to make the maintenance of full employment an objective of national policy. But it is one thing to commit the Federal Government to a policy which it must try to carry out. It is quite a different thing to make it a matter of right, which all Americans "have", that this policy shall provide each one of them, if he wants it, with a job which is "useful, remunerative, regular and full-time." If this were a genuine right in a genuine bill of rights, every American would have the right to start a lawsuit to determine whether there is a job open for him which is useful, remunerative, etc., etc.

Obviously, the authors of the bill do not mean that. Nor do they mean to put Congress and the executive branch in a position where individuals or groups can hold them accountable "at all times" for providing opportunities—that is jobs—"freely to exercise this right" to useful, remunerative, etc., etc. The true intent of the Murray bill is to see to it that in the Nation as a whole, not necessarily in each community nor in each kind of employment, the conditions are such that the demand for goods and services will be sufficient to prevent any prolonged involuntary mass unemployment.

From a reading of Senator TAFT's amendments, it is clear enough that though he is more than half converted to the purposes of the bill, he does not as yet believe in its basic doctrine. His objections can be debated when a perfected bill is reported out of the committee. But on the point which I have been discussing, he has offered an amendment which the committee ought to accept because it removes the worst defect of the bill.

Mr. TAFT wishes to strike out the dangerously ambiguous statement about "the right" of all Americans at all times, and he would substitute for it the declaration that "it is the policy of the United States to see that there is afforded to all Americans able and willing to work the opportunity to obtain useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment if they desire it." This is a much more accurate and sincere statement of the true intent and genuine possibilities of the bill. No one who has grasped its basic principles, and has realized how much we shall have to learn before we can hope to carry out the policy successfully, will wish to encumber the bill with big, loose promises that can lead only to disappointments and disputes.

From Coal to Kilowatts on the Main Lines of the Far West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger:

FROM COAL TO KILOWATTS ON THE MAIN LINES OF THE FAR WEST—STEAM SUPPORTERS LIKE TROLLEY TRAIN

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

CHAPTER II

Is railroad electrification going to come? Even some leading exponents of steam locomotives think that engines with trolleys may soon pull the trains which serve the Far West. J. E. Davenport is vice president of the American Locomotive Co., a manufacturer of steam locomotives, but he recently said: "It is also conceivable that considerations of national security may lead to a program of fuel conservation in which the uses to which coal, oil, and other fuels may be put will be prescribed by Government policy. In this connection, electric power will probably be obtainable in large blocks at very low rates in certain sections of the country, suggesting the use of this type of power in main-line haulage."

And Ralph K. Johnson, chief engineer of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, another builder of steam equipment, took a look at western water-power projects a year ago and made a similar prophecy: "The electric locomotive comes closer to a railroadman's ideal of motive power than any other engine, but unfortunately the capital investment required for substations, transmission lines and overhead wires makes its cost prohibitive except where density of traffic is very great. However, in certain parts of the country, where extensive Government projects have excess power available at low rates, railroads may find it profitable to reexamine this type of power for main-line hauling."

In the States of the far West this excess power is on hand. The Federal Government has constructed eight reclamation, power, and navigation projects of varying sizes. They range from the narrow Roosevelt Dam in Arizona with a capacity of only 15,400 kilowatts to Grand Coulee, largest electrical plant on earth. These projects satisfy Mr. Davenport's description of "electric power obtainable in large blocks at very low rates in certain sections of the country." Most important of all, in the opinion of Tom Martin, of Bonneville, is the fact that the dams are so located that they could transmit energy to most of the route mileage of the seven railroads involved in the proposed electrification plan. Here are the projects:

Dam, State—	*Ultimate cap. kw.*
Fort Peck, Mont.—Missouri River	111,900
Boulder, Ariz.-Nev.—Colorado	1,332,300
Shasta, Cal.—Sacramento	375,000
Bonneville, Oreg.-Wash. — Columbia	518,400
Roosevelt, Ariz.—Salt	15,400
Grand Coulee, Wash.—Columbia	1,980,000
Parker, Ariz.-Calif.—Colorado	90,000
Colorado Big Thompson, Colo.—Colorado River	181,600
Total	4,604,600

Martin's calculations figure that more than a fourth of all this potential power—1,250,000 kilowatts—would be used in operating the 8,000 miles of main-line railroad trackage in the Western States. This is the largest block of hydroelectricity produced anywhere in the world. Grand Coulee Dam alone equals the output of 22 projects in the Tennessee Valley Authority. And the rates set by the Federal Power Commission for Bonneville and Coulee are the lowest yet authorized. A rate of about 5 mills a kilowatt hour for railroad service has been proposed by the Bonneville administration. It would be the cheapest transportation fuel in the Nation. The Pennsylvania, New Haven and Milwaukee all pay at least 7 mills a kilowatt-hour for energy. When one considers that all the western lines would need nearly 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, the saving over previous railroad power charges is immense. Not even the celebrated TVA can match the Bonneville-Grand Coulee rates; an aluminum plant on the Columbia River pays only about 60 percent as much for juice as in the region of the TVA.

Dr. Raver explains schedule set for railroads

Surveying the power now available, K. F. Nystrom, assistant to the chief operating officer of the Milwaukee road, recently stated: "If we survey the recent developments in hydroelectric power and the still untapped possibilities for additional dams, it seems that an era of extensive electrification of American railroads would not only be within the realm of possibility but also of economy."

Dr. Raver says that "Bonneville has formulated a power schedule particularly designed to fit the problems of electric-railroad operations and still conform with the basic structure of Bonneville's wholesale power rates. This rate, when formally approved, should provide a real talking point between the Bonneville administration and the railroads involved."

"When the price of bunker C reaches $2, every railroad west of Denver will have to be hitched to electric power plants," said the president of one of the largest transcontinentals a few years ago. Bunker C fuel oil was then 85 cents a barrel. Bunker C is now $1.25 and the United States Petroleum Administrator has just recommended that the price be raised to $1.50. The threshold is being reached. Nor can the fact be overlooked that railroads are vital to national defense. They make possible what Ralph Budd, president of the Burlington, calls "the military and economic unity" of the Nation.

What if the prophecies of the national resources committee and Benjamin Brooks come true, and the United States becomes an oil-importing nation? And what if the imports of Diesel fuel and bunker C were cut off?

How about operating performance? Do electric locomotives deliver the goods? J. V. B. Duer, assistant to vice president, operation, Pennsylvania Railroad, recently said: "The electric motor when operating a train over a rolling profile, that is, uphill and down, has the ability to maintain uniform speed by drawing temporarily from the trolley large quantities of current on the upgrades because it has a rather high temporary overload rating. It can also accelerate a train out of stations and at other stops because of this same characteristic, which means that average speed can be increased without increasing maximum speed. The electric locomotive is a more reliable motive power unit, and freight trains can be run among passenger trains with greater assurance of noninterference with passenger trains."

A few months before the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor the Denver & Rio Grande railroad was considering electrification of its Moffat tunnel division in Colorado, highest main-line ascent of the Continental Divide. Engineers and technicians made extensive comparisons of electric, Diesel, and steam equipment.

Tests display electrics have most speed

They found that on the 2-percent grade below the tunnel, at a speed of 22 miles an hour, a 196-foot Diesel could haul 29 loaded freight cars, a 120-foot steam engine could haul 36 loaded freight cars and an 85-foot electric locomotive could haul 47 loaded freight cars.

Electric power is the most compact energy that rolls on rails. An electric locomotive this size has 6,000 horsepower, the larger steam 5,500 horsepower, and the still larger Diesel 5,400 horsepower.

If an identical train of 47 cars was adopted, the electric would average 22.1 miles an hour, the steam 18.5 miles an hour, and the Diesel 15.1 miles an hour.

Starting from the Denver & Rio Grande terminal at Denver, with 47 loaded freight cars apiece, the Diesel would arrive at the east portal of Moffat tunnel in 3 hours 10 minutes. The steam locomotive would cover the distance in 2 hours 31 minutes. The electric would reach the tunnel mouth in 2 hours 15 minutes.

This speed capacity also extends to acceleration. If each locomotive were pulling 66 cars and slowed to 25 miles an hour for a curve, how long would be required to gain back speed to 35 miles? The Diesel would take 6 minutes and 52 seconds. The steam engine would require 2 minutes and 20 seconds. The electric would be back up to 35 miles an hour in 59 seconds.

Electric locomotives require less maintenance and repair. "Let the river do the work instead of your equipment," an electrical engineer told the Denver & Rio Grande board. The survey indicated that, under the various types of power, 14 steam locomotives would be necessary to serve the Moffat tunnel division, 11 Diesels, or 8 electrics. The reason for the difference is principally that Diesels have to go over the roundhouse pit less than steam locomotives, and electrics require less service than Diesels. An electric engine can be in service almost constantly. The Milwaukee still crosses the Rockies and Cascades with its original electrics, put in service in 1919.

Program described as aid to job problem

The Pennsylvania Railroad operates passenger trains at 80 miles an hour between Washington and New York. These trains are hauled by comparatively light electric locomotives Within 3 minutes and 30 seconds after rumbling out of Washington's Union Station the 16 steel cars of the Congressional Limited are traveling 20 miles faster than a mile a minute. Modern Diesel locomotives use up 7 minutes and 40 seconds attaining this speed with an equivalent load. Diesels also have exhausts. While these are far from the choking smoke and stifling fumes of the old-fashioned steam engines, they still dirty cars, seep into pullmans, and cloud tunnels and terminals.

Much of the interest of the people of the West in this project stems from what Dr. Raver refers to as opportunity "for the full employment of labor." With 4 years of war at last at an end, the country's sundown seaboard looks uncertainly at its economic future. Employed in shipyards have been 74 percent of Portland's war workers, 53 percent of those in San Francisco, and 36 percent of Seattle's. Shipbuilding is now being cut back to a mere liquidation status. Where will the workers be absorbed? Rarely has a shipyard ever been converted to any other kind of industrial activity. Light-metal prospects in the Northwest are hopeful but the production of aluminum and allied metals hires few men.

Bonneville economists cite the electrification of western railroads as one of the two large projects which might employ a considerable number of workers during this postwar period. The other is the digging of canals, the installation of pumping plants and the preparation of land on the 1,250,000 arid acres to be irrigated at Grand Coulee. Stringing catenary wires above 8,000 miles of main line in the States of the far West would not ladle out pay checks according to wartime standards. Tom Martin calculates that 8,000 men would be employed on the job over a period of 4 years. The project would take that long because from November until April the heavy snows of the Rockies, Bitterroots, Sierras, and Cascades would preclude the erection of poles and the stringing of wire beside long stretches of track.

Eight thousand men are not many by comparison with shipyards where 20,000 are employed. Yet Grand Coulee Dam, greatest construction job of President Roosevelt's New Deal, hired only 8,000 workers at the peak, and the influence of Coulee expenditures was felt from Puget Sound to Butte. The money trickled down into ancillary activities such as concrete, trucking, and retail trade. Martin believes this would happen on the railroad project. Electrification of 8,000 miles of track would require 520,000 class A poles, each 45 feet in height. These would provide orders for logging camps and sawmills, yet at the same time the poles would be sufficiently small so that they could come from second growth and would not further deplete the Northwest's dwindling virgin forests.

Large numbers of servicemen now are coming home, looking for jobs. Martin believes that many of these soldiers have had experience in the armed forces which would benefit both them and the railroads in the construction of the catenary overhead trolley system. The United States Army Signal Corps strung countless miles of telephone line in Europe and north Africa. Enlisted men in the southwest Pacific cut poles and erected communication wires on their island outposts. Signal Corps units put up 1,600 miles of telephone line along the Alaska Highway in winter weather, blasting the frozen ground for poles at temperatures of 50° below zero. These soldiers would be ideally trained for the job of electrifying the railroads which cross the Divide and twist down to the Pacific's restless tides.

Bloch says western plants can build electrics

A large chunk of the railroads' investment would be spent for electric locomotives. Four hundred engines of 5,000 horsepower each would be necessary to operate main-line traffic on an electrified basis over the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Milwaukee, Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, Santa Fe, and Denver & Rio Grande systems in the 11 Western States. These locomotives probably would pick up alternating current at the trolley, to be converted into direct current for the traction motors; this electrical method is used on the Cascade tunnel division of the Great Northern. In all likelihood the locomotives would be manufactured in the vast electrical equipment industries of the East, such as Westinghouse or General Electric.

However, Ivan Bloch, of the Booneville administration, says he will not concede even this. He believes it is possible for so intricate a mechanism as a massive electric locomotive to be produced in many small industrial plants scattered throughout the far West and then assembled at a central place. If this could be done, employment prospects along the Pacific seaboard might be brightened. The West has scarcely any industries which in this postwar era will begin producing objects of thwarted desire such as refrigerators, radios, automobiles, and vacuum cleaners. This may make the crisis in employment worse on the Pacific side of the Rockies than elsewhere.

Is MacArthur Going to Suffer the Same Fate as Billy Mitchell?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the character assassins have ventured into the open, and from now on General MacArthur will be the victim. Why? Because he has dared to express his honest opinion with reference to the required number of men to occupy Japan, an estimate which is at variance with those who are opposed to the demobilization of our boys.

An editorial which appeared in the Washington Post under date of September 19, 1945, headed "MacArthur's Blind Spot" reveals the plot to tear down the heroic character and record of General MacArthur.

What crimes are now attributed to the distinguished general? The editorial states:

> It is sad and confidence-shaking to see General MacArthur mixing politics with statesmanship. This he did—

So the editorial proclaims—

in his statement from Tokyo on Monday.

What a crime, shades of Billy Mitchell, for General MacArthur to forecast that "within 6 months the occupation force—unless unforeseen factors arise—will probably number not more than 200,000 men."

The New Deal has repaired and sharpened the old guillotine blade which worked so well on Billy Mitchell, following his conviction by a court martial. What did Billy Mitchell say that so infuriated his persecutors in the days long prior to Pearl Harbor? Speaking of the conditions at Hawaii, Mitchell said:

> Our air service in Hawaii has been for years nothing but a football kicked about between the Army and the Navy with an utter lack of cooperation between the military and naval commands in charge. I presented these discoveries to the War Department long ago, but even to this date the reports I receive from my friends are more than disquieting. Good Christ, if people only knew. The bickerings of insect authority, the conflicting orders from Washington, the jealousies, the late hours of social life, the white uniforms in the moonlight, the gold braid, the romantic women, the caressing climate are all part of an existence to lull our men into thread-bare security.
>
> I know the human equation and I know the officers' temptations. The true picture of Hawaii, now full of crawling spies, does not add any reassurance to well-informed Americans who are acquainted with Japanese cunning and treachery.

Continuing, Billy Mitchell referred to the talk in the Army and Navy clubs; that "the Navy could clean up those little yellow-bellies before dinner time," a short-sighted estimate of the Japanese fighting qualities which would

bring its retribution. Bill Mitchell continued:

That talk will go on until we have been sent reeling from a blow delivered by our own ignored invention in the hands of our enemies, sold to them by our own betraying maufacturers wearing the decorations of the governments who would destroy us.

Listen to the summing up of the prosecutor in the court-martial trial of Billy Mitchell:

Fail to dismiss this man and you weaken the authority of every commissioned and noncommissioned officer in the service. Dismiss him as he deserves and you strengthen the arm of every single officer commanding a company from Marfa to Nogales; dismiss him for the sake of the young officers of the Army air service whose ideals he has shadowed and whose loyalty he has corrupted; dismiss him in the name of truth, under whose aegis he has sought protection, but whose face he does not know.

Then the prosecutor continues:

Is Mitchell a Moses? Is he a Moses fitted to lead the people out of a wilderness which is his own creation only? Is he the George Washington type as his counsel is trying to make us believe? Is he not—

Shouted the prosecutor—

rather of the all too familiar character and demagogue type—like Alcibiades, like Catiline, and, except for a decided difference in poise and mental powers in Burr's favor, like Aaron Burr?

Mr. Speaker, are slime throwers to be permitted to carry on a crusade of vilification against one of the most courageous, heroic, and able generals, as General MacArthur has proved himself to be in this war, until he stands pilloried before a court martial?

Let us analyze this Washington Post editorial and see the subtlety with which it is sought to poison the public mind against General MacArthur. The editorial referred to says:

We are forced to conclude that when he—

General MacArthur—

made his Monday statement General MacArthur's attention was elsewhere than in Japan. It appears to have been in Washington.

I say, what a crime if General MacArthur realized that the plan to force 500,000 men upon him when he needed only 200,000 would be an act of gross injustice which to prevent he felt in duty bound to tell the Government and the people the truth. Billy Mitchell was officially crucified for telling the truth.

This editorial claims that—

The conclusion is strengthened when one ponders the addendum to his 200,000 figure. This is, he said, a size probably within the framework of our projected Regular Establishment and which will permit complete demobilization of our citizen Pacific forces which fought so long and so nobly through to victory.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong about this statement of the truth by General MacArthur? Are not the soldiers, fathers, mothers, wives, interested in a quick and orderly demobilization based upon facts and upon truth as to the number of soldiers needed and the number which can be dispensed with? Imagine a publication charging in an editorial:

We have said the MacArthur statement was political. Actually it verged on the demagogic.

This editorial reveals the same character-destroying technique that was used so effectively and brutally by the enemies of Billy Mitchell in their diabolical diatribes of abuse heaped upon an officer whose character, vision, ability, and patriotism have been fully established by subsequent events.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert the editorial carried in the Washington Post, dated September 19, 1945:

M'ARTHUR'S BLIND SPOT

It is sad and confidence-shaking to see General MacArthur mixing politics with statesmanship. This he did in his statement from Tokyo on Monday. He forecast that within 6 months the occupation force, "unless unforeseen factors arise," will probably number not more than 200,000 men. No man who had a wholly objective regard for such a stupendous and imponderable task as MacArthur's would have ventured either to enumerate it or to put a term upon it. That task is just beginning. It is still as big a gamble as, to quote General MacArthur's own words about the initial landing, "has been taken in history." In these circumstances a supreme commander, if he had his eye only on his job, would not have sought to tie his own hands. Of course, he will get help from the Japanese, when they have figured out the meaning of what he said. But they will be encouraged to put up only a facade of compliance, so as to tear it down when General MacArthur is through.

We are forced to conclude that when he made his Monday statement General MacArthur's attention was elsewhere than in Japan. It appears to have been in Washington. The conclusion is strengthened when one ponders the addendum to his 200,000 figure. This is, he said, "a size probably within the framework of our projected Regular Establishment and which will permit complete demobilization of our citizen Pacific forces which fought so long and so nobly through to victory."

This addition was a purely gratuitous contribution by General MacArthur to the domestic debate on our military policy. Congress, as the supreme commander well knows, is seething over demobilization. It is difficult for a legislator, no matter how well-intentioned, to rise superior to the clamor which is coming to him from his constituents. Many of them are even grumbling that in this vital matter President Truman has not given them stronger leadership. MacArthur's testimony will simply aid the forces which are beating upon Congress to demoralize our demobilization policy. MacArthur likewise makes it harder for the administration to maintain the draft for the 18–25 group in our population. Finally, he puts difficulties in the way of evolving a sensible postwar military policy in conformity with our global responsibilities and commitments.

We have said the MacArthur statement was political. Actually it verged on the demagogic. Note, for instance, the use of "citizen" in the comment that the MacArthur estimate would "probably" permit "complete demobilization of our citizen Pacific forces."

Certainly the supreme commander has dropped many cubits in our estimation as a result of this excursion into our domestic politics. He knew the delicacy of the ground he was on. There is no policy as yet on the "projected military establishment," yet the supreme commander presumes to prejudge it. He knows that the draft and demobilization are all tangled up in popular emotions, yet he seeks to stoke up those emotions. It is disheartening that a man of MacArthur's stature and genius should thus seek to play politics with our occupation policy.

Nobody, as we have said several times, could have made a better start in his august role as supreme commander than MacArthur. He showed how deeply versed he is in Japanese psychology. He revealed himself capable of being a proconsul in the grand manner, and this is exactly what was needed to carry out the Potsdam terms. That record is now marred, and he has made the future in the Far East uncertain and ominous, since so much depends upon him. Evidently MacArthur could not resist the siren voice of the homeside politicos to whom he has occasionally lent an ear in the past. It was an unworthy and deplorable performance on the part of a man who is doing a job that belongs to world history and who seemed to be making himself a high place in it. The allusive MacArthur might be reminded of the wise words of an ancient writer: "Great things are maintained by the same means whereby they are created."

Full Employment and Free Enterprise

REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, to those who sincerely believe in free enterprise, it is heartening news that the Attorney General proposes that the Congress do something about America's No. 1 monopoly—the Aluminum Co. of America. Any progress that can be made in breaking down monopolistic prices and in expanding production will be a vital contribution toward full employment. Here is a direct challenge to those who, of late, have been paying lip service to free enterprise—but who, in reality, oppose the constructive legislation necessary to keep free enterprise free. It is a challenge to all to stand up and be counted where they really stand.

Let me stress, briefly, the other side of this proposition—the fact that full employment itself could be our most potent weapon against monopoly—more effective than antitrust laws or fair trade practice regulation or supervisory commissions.

We have evidence that monopolists are now fixing prices for another depression. Recent estimates released by the War Production Board for a representative group of industries show that quite a few are setting prices high enough to break even at one-third or less of capacity, with the average only slightly above 50 percent. Clearly, it is their intention to reap profits in a short-lived boom that will be large enough to carry them through the next bust-up at a fairly good average.

In short, such industrialists already anticipate that the bottom will fall out of the market—and they set their prices accordingly. None of our efforts to make such industrialists mend their

ways are likely to have much effect until and unless we provide a reasonable assurance that the over-all market will be adequate.

The full-employment bill proposes to give this assurance both to the big fellows—and to the new and small businessmen who offer them a competitive challenge. The high-volume, low-price formula is a splendid American tradition—but it will not be good practice without a steady and expanding market. There is no appeal in smaller margins on more units unless the demand for these more units is absolutely reliable. And only continuing full employment can provide this certainty.

Purging Philippine Collaborationists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herein a press statement that I made the other day as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States to clarify certain press reports about the so-called collaborationist issue in the Philippines:

President Sergio Osmeña, of the Philippines, today (Monday) cabled the following message regarding the collaborationist issue and Philippine elections to Resident Commissioner CARLOS P. ROMULO, in Washington, D. C.:

"The Philippine House of Representatives, even before receipt of Secretary Harold Ickes' statement on collaborationists, refused to seat Congressman José M. Veloso, setting the policy that no congressman lacking clearance by the United States Counter-Intelligence Corps and turned over to the Commonwealth for trial will be allowed to take his seat even though at liberty under bail.

"Speaker of the House José Zulueta, concurring completely with the views of Secretary Ickes of removing collaborationists from posts of political and economic influence, stated that the elections cannot be held and must be postponed until the task of investigation and trial of collaborators is finished to the mutual satisfaction of both the United States and the Philippines and that only then would the conduct of elections be free and untramelled."

President Osmeña's stand on Philippine-American collaboration was clearly and unmistakably stated in his recent broadcast from Manila September 8 over the Columbia Broadcasting System's national and trans-Pacific hook-up.

President Osmeña declared: "We must retain the confidence, the great and constructive sympathy which America has always shown toward us, and particularly during these last few years which have culminated in our liberation from Japanese tyranny. * * *

"The same policy which in the past won the confidence and good will of America in the joint enterprise of building our nation should be followed now and in the future."

The President emphasized that "our conduct must be such as to give no room for doubt regarding our adherences and loyalty. Nothing should be done to detract from the magnificent conception which America and the world have formed of our country in the war's role of honor. * * *

"It is evident that our allies in the great crusade against the forces of oppression will have the right to expect of us such conduct as is in keeping with the great ideals and principles for which so many lives have been sacrificed. In no other way can we continue to hold their friendship and respect." * * *

In conclusion the President said that Filipino-American collaboration is "not for 10, 20, or 50 years but for all time so long as there is such a thing as Filipino democracy, the fruition, on this side of the Pacific, of American democracy."

Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled "Need for More Housing Acute," which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, Boston, Mass., by Robert L. Norton, on September 16, 1945:

NEED FOR MORE HOUSING ACUTE—ESTIMATE 1,250,000 UNITS MUST BE BUILT ANNUALLY FOR THE NEXT 10 YEARS TO SATISFY DEMAND

(By Robert L. Norton)

President Truman in his first comprehensive message to the Congress stressed the need for a complete postwar housing program which would provide for the rapid postwar expansion of private investment, the employment of several million workers each year, and one which would secure a decent standard of housing for all.

This was in line with the recommendations of a subcommittee on housing and urban redevelopment of the Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of which Senator TAFT was the chairman. The committee approved a goal of 1,250,000 residential units a year for the next 10 years; the great bulk of these homes to be built by private enterprise. They also recognized the need for 500,000 more units in public housing to provide for those families unable to afford decent homes.

In its discussion of the background of a postwar housing policy, the Taft report says: "The subcommittee feels that the importance of a well conceived, comprehensive housing policy cannot be exaggerated. There is no problem before the American people with more varied aspects than that of housing, each of them important to the future welfare of the country.

"From the social point of view, a supply of good housing, sufficient to meet the needs of all families, is essential to a sound and stable democracy. Every family must have a decent home in which to live. The character of that home determines more than anything else the character of family life, the conditions in which children grow up, and the attitude of the people toward the community and the Government. From the point of view of industry and employment a large volume of residual construction would make a vital contribution to our postwar economy.

"Housing is long lived, and the improvement of housing conditions requires foresight and many years of planning and work. Housing is substantial and visible to all and determines a large part of the aspect of our cities and our countryside. Slums are not only a deterrent to the development of a sound citizenry, but they lower the people's desire for healthful and attractive surroundings and the hope of improving their conditions."

ISSUE MUST BE FACED

"We cannot safely face the difficult undertakings of the years ahead, with the burden of hardship and discontent that bad housing imposes upon us. The issue must be faced and the task assumed. It is a task which cannot be performed in 1 year, nor perhaps in a decade, but one which as a Nation we must devotedly pursue and accomplish as rapidly as proper use of our resources permits."

Senators WAGNER and ELLENDER have introduced a bill closely following the recommendations of this committee and the nonpartisan support for this legislation indicates favorable action by the Congress.

The average number of residential units built per year from 1919 to 1935 was about 500,000, and to reach a goal of 1,250,000 each year will require the production of a large and continuous volume of housing during the postwar period. To accomplish this the Wagner bill provides several means of encouragement both to private enterprise and the local communities. Certain features, such as urban redevelopment and yield insurance, are comparatively new and promise a greater security for investors in housing projects. The farmer has not been forgotten and aid has been promised him, too.

PROBLEM OF OBSOLESCENCE

The urban redevelopment provision attacks the problem of obsolescence and decentralization which is rapidly blighting most of our large cities. Even with the greatest effort on the part of private enterprise this cannot be remedied except with the assistance of Federal, State and local government. It is proposed that the Federal Government, working through local public agencies, provide annual contributions to local communities to cover the difference between the cost of acquiring and clearing land in substandard areas, and selling it at its use value for residential redevelopment by private companies. An appropriation of $50,000,000 each year for 5 years is to be made for loans to purchase land, and in addition the sum of $4,000,000 each year for 5 years to cover the annual contributions. Local contributions to the redevelopment project would also be required and must equal 50 percent of the Federal aid.

It is hoped that this will accomplish two things: First, the clearance of bad housing areas and secondly, by marking down the cost of the land to its use value would encourage the investment of private capital in housing projects.

Yield insurance is simply an extension of the mortgage insurance powers of the FHA. It would guarantee an annual return on investments in housing projects. This would apply only to middle-income housing and it is believed that this plan would provide rental housing at costs 25 percent below prevailing levels.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

On low-rent public housing the bill provides for contracts for Federal contributions to help achieve low rents at a rate of $22,000,000 per year for 4 years. This, it is estimated, would construct 500,000 additional units.

Housing conditions in the rural areas and on the farms are relatively much worse than in the urban areas. Recognizing this, the bill provides for help to the farmer or his worker in securing a home. Easy terms are offered in accordance with his ability to pay, and in addition, county housing authorities are offered assistance in providing group housing in rural areas.

It is estimated that if this program could be carried out, it would result in an opportunity for private capital to invest six to seven billion dollars annually. It would also stimulate a vast amount of business and employment in industries related to home equipment and materials.

NEW ENGLAND PROBLEM

Our own immediate problems here in New England, and particularly in Massachusetts, are concerned with increasing the total housing supply, encouragement of home ownership, rental housing for those who require it, replacement of slums and substandard housing, and the rehabilitation of our cities.

A special commission on real-estate taxation in the last session of the legislature compiled in its report some interesting facts on the decline in our cities. The following table is an example showing the trend in Boston in the 10 years before the war:

Population:	
1930	781,188
1940	748,060
Property tax valuation:	
1930	$1,972,148,200
1943	$1,445,668,300
Retail sales:	
1929	$672,760,000
1939	$487,744,000
Wholesale sales:	
1929	$2,357,016,000
1939	$1,634,748,000
Manufacturing wages:	
1929	$105,794,127
1939	$66,784,787
Manufacturing products:	
1929	$603,711,473
1939	$413,424,844
Buildings erected:	
1929	2,563
1939	602
Tax rate:	
1929	$28
1943	$41
Buildings demolished:	
1929	407
1939	1,383

Similar figures in respect to other Massachusetts cities contained in this report are even more depressing.

It is generally recognized that the decline can only be stopped by drastic measures. The sharp loss in valuations which most directly affects the city can only be arrested by preventing further decay of the parts of the city in which values have most sharply declined and by stopping the spread of the blighted areas.

RECENT LEGISLATION

Recent legislation passed at the last session of the general court providing for the redevelopment of decadent areas by housing corporations could, if taken advantage of, go a long way toward helping our cities.

Under the law private corporations financed by private capital, but subject to public regulation, are encouraged to undertake the redevelopment of slums and blighted areas. As a means of inducing them to undertake the work, certain privileges and concessions are granted. They have the power to take land by eminent domain since this work is considered a public purpose, and, in addition, they are given a tax concession. On the other hand, their profits are limited to 6-percent dividend on the stock and they are regulated and supervised by the State.

There is also a special provision in the law which permits insurance companies to engage in this work.

In each case the local government, in addition to the State board of housing, must approve the project. In the event that it is necessary to demolish houses the people occupying these houses must be assured that there are suitable housing accommodations elsewhere at rents they can afford.

MEET "WHITE-COLLAR NEEDS"

The housing provided under this law would meet the needs of the so-called white-collar group. A glance at the map of any of our cities would show many areas, now substandard, which, if redeveloped, would make extremely desirable places to live. It would be particularly advantageous in some of the smaller communities where a single new project could clean up an entire bad area.

Many other States have adopted similar laws in the past few years, but no construction has been possible on account of the wartime restrictions on building.

In New York City the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. is prepared to go ahead on Stuyvesant Village, costing over $35,000,000, and housing about 7,000 families, and have several other projects in the planning stage.

Since 1941 it has been almost impossible for many people to build or buy a new home. All available materials were allocated to war housing for the exclusive use of in-migrant war workers. By the end of the month most of these controls will be off and it will again be possible to start building. It will, however, be difficult to obtain certain materials, particularly lumber, and costs will be high. It is generally agreed that prices will be 35 to 40 percent above the 1939 level.

MORTGAGE MONEY PLENTIFUL

Mortgage money is plentiful and, benefiting by FHA insurance, the banks will be in a position to offer sound financing. Many people have been misled by the fantastic ads in the magazines depicting the house of the future. As a matter of fact, we will probably start where we left off in 1939 and the postwar home will be much the same, with the exception of more glass and a few new gadgets.

The low-rent public housing program which in the beginning met with stiff opposition has by now received general acceptance. This is shown by the fact that 19 cities and towns have established housing authorities.

Twenty-four projects have been built providing homes for 8,735 families. This is the group that private enterprise has been unable to build profitably for. Each family was taken from a substandard house and has been given safe, sanitary, and pleasant living accommodations at a rent that they can afford to pay.

SIZABLE PROGRAM

A shelf of postwar low-rent housing projects is being built up and already local housing authorities in 14 cities in Massachusetts have made applications for Federal funds to build projects to house over 16,000 families at a cost of approximately $80,000,000. This is a sizable program, but only a drop in the bucket when we consider the need. The last census showed that there were 262,000 substandard housing units in Massachusetts and this means that almost a million people were unproperly housed in this State.

Perhaps the most acute and difficult problem will be that of housing the returning veteran. In Massachusetts alone over 500,000 men have entered the service. Some have been able to maintain their homes, but many married men were forced to break up their homes and the wife and children went to double up with his or her parents. In addition, thousands were married after entering the service and never were able to establish a home. All of these men will return expecting to find a decent place to live.

Millions of war workers have migrated to the industrial centers and this has created a housing shortage. In many communities vacancies have reached the vanishing point and if one is found it is sure to be unfit to live in.

The difficulty lies in getting at the facts. How many veterans will require new homes, and to what extent will the in-migrant workers return to their former places of residence? It is almost impossible to arrive at the figures at this stage. It would seem that the only thing which we can do at this time to relieve the situation is to rehabilitate where possible any unfit housing, use all available surplus housing, and expedite the building of new homes.

In certain localities war housing projects which never have been fully occupied will provide some accommodations and in the low-rent housing projects veterans who are eligible will be given preference when vacancies occur.

Cooperation by the Federal, State, and local governments, together with private enterprise, in a housing program such as this would lead to progress toward better housing and better communities.

Perplexing Peace Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the war and the signing of the conditions of surrender on the battleship *Missouri* near Tokyo, Members of Congress have received many helpful suggestions concerning the problems of peace that are more perplexing and difficult to solve than even the problems of war. Among the many helpful and thought provoking letters I have received recently came to me from my old time friend, one of Oklahoma's leading educators who for many years has done a magnificent job as president of Oklahoma's Agricultural and Mechanical College at Stillwater, Dr. Henry G. Bennett.

The letter follows:

OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL
AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Stillwater, September 1, 1945.

Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JED: I want to earnestly congratulate you on the stand which you have taken with reference to public works as a basis for full employment which you released to the press a few days ago.

As I have meditated on the problems that are pressing upon us for solution and as I have become increasingly aware of how those problems are reflected in Oklahoma, I am more than ever thankful and pleased at the forthright position you have assumed on the matter of prompt and vigorous action to stem the rising tide of unemployment.

I see that estimated figures of eight or nine million unemployed by Christmas are emanating from both private and official sources. In Oklahoma we daily see the crowded employment offices and see the throngs of displaced war workers on the streets of Oklahoma City and the other cities and towns of the State. It is true perhaps that a certain amount of dislocation and inconvenience inevitably must occur as we shift over from a wartime to a peacetime economy. The fact that some tens of thousands in Oklahoma and several millions in the nation are temporarily idle are not facts which of

themselves should excite panic. The important thing is that this condition must not be permitted to continue or to become aggravated. Fear must not be permitted to gain headway through procrastination. I regard this consideration as vital.

In my time I have not seen a national administration which so completely has enjoyed the confidence of the people as this one. The early, dramatic and gloriously successful termination of the war has raised the morale of America to a very high pitch. The living rejoice that the issue has been won and that loved ones will soon be reunited in a peaceful and tolerable way of life. Those who have made the most costly sacrifices are solemnly and hopefully reconciled, feeling that the sacrifices have not been in vain. For all of this the nation is deeply appreciative of its leadership.

It would be unthinkably tragic now if leadership should fail in the domesitc problems of peace—if the great opportunity for a healthy and happy era for our country should be missed. And failure is so unnecessary. The lessons and triumphs of war, not only in the military phases, but in the fields of industrial and agricultural accomplishment, have revealed this Nation to itself. We now know, in a fuller sense than ever before, what we can do. We have the resources of nature, of things, and of men to fashion a better way of life and to provide useful and gainful employment for all who desire it in the fashioning. Break-down, frustration, and disillusionment can come only through inaction or timidity. I have faith that there will be no failure.

By your recent statements you have demonstrated how keenly attuned you are to the problems and opportunities of the hour and your friends in Oklahoma are immeasurably proud of you and are rallying to your support in the fight you are making for immediate appropriation of funds for a public-works program that will take up the slack of unemployment and go straight to the heart of the basic problems which must be solved.

I note from the press articles that you are particularly advocating that funds be provided for starting work on rivers, harbors, and flood-control projects, highways, rural electrification, and similar projects. In my opinion your judgment in these matters is excellent. All of these measures are appropriate and vital to Oklahoma. They also meet the sound basic standad that public works shall insofar s possible add to the national wealth and stimulate investment by private industry. The prosecution of these works will provide generous opportunities for employment.

You have well said that in this time "government only needs to do its duty." You are doing yours in a magnificent manner.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely your friend,

HENRY G. BENNETT.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

BOSTON'S TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT BY HON. CHARLES S. O'CONNOR, CLERK OF THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT, ON BOSTON COMMON, APRIL 19, 1945

Apart from the hum of industry and the laughter and gayety of the world, the city of Boston, birthplace of American liberty, on the hallowed soil of Boston Common, bids its citizens today to pay affectionate tribute to the memory of our late Commander in Chief, who gave his life for the salvation of his country and the preservation of human liberty. The hearts of the American people and those of other populations of the world where men are free, or seeking to be free, are centered today around a mound of earth wherein lie the mortal remains of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, honored in life as no other man of his time had ever been honored—honored and mourned and wept for in death as the brave and gallant leader in a world struggle for the right of peaceful peoples to live in peace.

Our fallen chieftain, the dead commander of our country's armed and civilian forces, with health and strength broken and shattered in the struggle, brought victory to our doorsteps and then laid down his life in the effort—the world's greatest casualty in the world's most devastating and cruelest of wars. He has left footprints that will remain indelible in the march of time. He died as he would have wished, with the cry of his country's victories echoing throughout the land he loved, and to which he had given the last full measure of sacrifice.

In a truer and purer sense Franklin Roosevelt is not dead. From out his resting place there comes an incessant rallying cry for total victory and permanent peace, that will reach and enthuse the hearts and souls of men, women, and children in every city, town, and hamlet of America. With the passage of the generations to come his spirit will live on and remain ever pure, fresh, and ever present. While boldness of view and courage of action find place in the minds and hearts of America, Roosevelt will still live. When our common humanity needs a friend to speak with the courage of a crusader, the voice of Roosevelt will still reach the souls of free men and those struggling to be free. When the monster of tyranny and oppression smites the souls of men in a distracted world, this brave and lovable figure will seem to rise from the tomb to strike again for human brotherhood.

God give rest to his tireless spirit and his gallant soul. Let us, and the generations of youth that will follow, thrill again to his triumphant courage. When weary or discouraged in the battle of life, we can gain new strength and courage from such a life lived and sacrificed for America.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Four times President of the greatest country on earth—we mourn with the world that respected and admired and esteemed you as their own—but as Americans who loved you, we, with greater reason, mourn alone. For all that you did and all that you dared and all that you hoped for America—God grant you rest and eternal peace!

How A. & P. Beat the Chain-Store Tax Bill—Now It Can Be Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an article from the NARD Journal, which is published by the National Association of Retail Druggists, written by former Gov. Theodore Christianson, of Minnesota, who is also a former Member of Congress, on Now It Can Be Told How A. & P. Beat the Chain-Store Tax Bill, which was introduced by me in 1940. It is a comprehensive statement of the facts, based on documentary evidence introduced in the trial of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., in Danville, Ill., in the United States district court for 3 months. The trial is scheduled to be resumed September 17 after a recess.

During the trial the Department of Justice has presented in evidence 4,445 exhibits, the greater preponderance of which were obtained from the files of this chain corporation. These exhibits show the unscrupulous methods employed to create a monopoly, destroy competition, and show how the company even resorted to short-changing, short-weighting, and price-boosting at the check-out counter.

TWENTY-ONE MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED AND FOURTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS FROM SHORT WEIGHTS, ETC.

On the floor of the House, on May 24, I presented definite figures showing how this company obtained $1,953,000 in 1941 through "stock gains," which in more understandable language is through short weights, overcharges, and price-boosting. The Government also charged, and produced evidence to that effect, that between 1935 and 1941 $21,714,000 was obtained from patrons of the A. & P. stores though such practices. Hundreds of letters from this company's files prove these charges, and all with the knowledge of the officials of the company of this practice, over a period of 10 years.

"Stock gains" are the creation of the chain-store system to promote fictitious profits. It is not possible, for instance, to get 100 pounds out of a sack of sugar, or 50 pounds out of a can of lard. There is heavy shrinkage and spoilage in fresh fruits and vegetables. These are all charged to stores at their full weight or retail value and naturally cause a loss. They are not taken into consideration, but are to be recovered through "stock gains." These are achieved in the following manner as charged by the Government in the criminal information against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.:

Grocery items are billed to the retail stores by the warehouse at the retail price. No allowance is made for shrinkage, spoilage, waste, etc. Any sums secured on the sale of these items over and above the price billed by the warehouse are "stock gains." They are secured by such practices in the retail stores as short-weighting, short-changing, boosting of prices at check-out counters, etc. Such gains become an integral part of the rate on which final net earnings of the total A. & P. system operations are based. "Stock gains" become a part of the integral rate which is manipulated as among different areas to produce lower gross-profit rates in favored areas.

In addition it obtained $6,400,000 through allowances from manufacturers despite the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act, after a cease and desist order had been issued by the Federal Trade Commission, which was upheld by the United States Supreme Court. Its stores, the record of the trial shows, were conducted with practically no profit but reliance is placed on subsidiary profits, allowances, and "stock gains."

STORES OPERATED AT A LOSS

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the outside profits, the store operations in 1941 would have been conducted at a loss of $4,199,347. Yet in that year the over-all profit was $26,125,000. Moreover, the court record proves from documents taken from A. & P. files, that 4,374 stores were operated during 1938 at a net loss, despite short-weighting, overcharging and allowances. In one division as much as 40 percent of th stores were operated in the red.

FAKE CONSUMERS TAX COMMISSION

The article from the NARD Journal, however, speaks in definite terms how H. R. 1 introduced by me was defeated by means of the use of money in entertaining witnesses, in preparing their speeches before the subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. Also, it shows how this chain corporation formed the National Consumers Tax Commission, conducted by women who were misled as to the real purpose to disclose hidden taxes, when in fact the company had hidden taxes of its own, by charging the consumer five points on sales to pay the expense of this so-called tax commission, which amounted to as much as $300,000 a year. Specific denial was made of any knowledge of this tax commission by those who organized, directed, and approved the expense bills.

The article written by Governor Christianson on How A. & P. Beat the Chain-Store Tax Bill is as follows:

Whatever the final outcome of the prosecution of The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., now under way at Danville, Ill., may be, one thing is certain—the evidence introduced by the Government and now of public record will make it impossible henceforth for that of any other national chain-store corporation to assume the mien of injured innocence when confronting a legislative committee.

The mask has been torn off. The defendant is seen to be what many have long thought it to be—an organization that does not allow squeamish sentiment to stand in the way of its accomplishment of any purpose that may contribute to its own aggrandizement or the elimination of its competitors.

Whether the jury finds the defendant guilty or not, whether the Government forces the corporation to unscramble, are of minor consequence as compared to the verdict the public will return once the facts have been made generally known.

CONCENTRATE ON CHAIN BILL

The whole record of deception and evasion, of circumvention of the Robinson-Patman law, of operating retail units at loss and depending on buying subsidiaries to provide the profits, of ruthless price wars waged to put competitors out of business, would fill a large book. So the scope of this article must be merely to summarize the methods used to prevent the passage of the bill to impose a Federal tax an chain stores.

It will be recalled that the bill was under consideration by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee in the early months of 1940. The proponents of the measure presented a powerful argument for its passage, buttressed by an unprecedented amount of factual evidence. The chain-store executives were alarmed. They summoned to Washington scores of witnesses, dragged the hearings on for weeks, and finally defeated the measure by a vote of 5 to 4. It was a narrow escape, but the threat was averted.

MANY HAD A REASON

Many of the witnesses who appeared for the chains were officers of corporations supplying these mass distributors, landlords leasing premises to them, men who were under obligation for favors extended or anticipated. It is not difficult to see how these witnesses could be induced or intimidated to pull the chains' chestnuts out of the fire.

But there were other types of witnesses—college professors and self-styled economists, representatives of consumer groups, officers of tax councils, spokesmen for labor and farm organizations, fruit growers and livestock men, producers of poultry and dairy products. These witnesses seemed to be impartial and unbiased, and their testimony must have impressed the committee.

It is not our purpose to impugn the motives of all of them. Doubtless many of them thought they were rendering a public service. They were the unwitting victims of persistent and insidious propaganda continued over a period of years and heavily financed by the chains. This the evidence in the A. & P. case now clearly shows.

DUMMY ORGANIZATIONS

The story, so far as this article is concerned, starts with the appointment of Carl A. Byoir, of New York, as public relations counsel for the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. Mr. Byoir was a high-powered publicity man, one of the most highly paid in the United States. He had important clients at home and abroad, among which, before our entry into the war, were German interests alleged to have been close to the Hitler regime. Mr. Byoir is now one of the defendants in Danville—he tried to avoid standing trial there but the court denied his motion.

One of the first acts of Carl Byoir in execution of his commission from A. & P. was to set up a corporation known as Business Organizations, Inc., through which to carry out the public-relations program of his client. The name was carefully selected. There was nothing in it to indicate that the corporation had any relationship to either Mr. Byoir or his principal. The public might assume that it was one set up to serve any business organization that sought its services. Business Organizations, however, in this case, included only the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co. and its affiliates.

ORGANIZE STUDY GROUPS

Business Organizations, Inc., in turn set up the National Consumers Tax Commission, ostensibly established to oppose all taxes affecting the cost of living but actually to fight chain-store taxes. The Tax Commission set up more than 6,000 "study groups" throughout the country, one-tenth of them in New England, headed by club leaders who, in most instances, did not know what the ultimate objective of their activity was. How many of these leaders were paid and how much they got, does not appear in the data at hand.

The Commission prepared a text book discussing taxes in general, and their impact on the cost of living—taxes on oils, gasoline, electricity, fire arms, liquor, tobaccos; manufacturers' excise taxes, State excises, corporate franchise and property taxes, taxes on transportation, unemployment and old-age benefit taxes, processing taxes, severance taxes, unjust enrichment taxes, stamp taxes, et cetera. The whole led up to chain-store taxes, the "evils" of which were fully set forth.

The sponsorship of this campaign against "hidden" taxes was hidden, too. It would not do to let it be known that A. & P. was paying the cost—which mounted to $300,000 in 1 year. Nor would it do to let the consumers in on the secret that they were footing the bill. The special fund was obtained by adding five points to the sales of each of the A. & P. divisions. The fund was designated, euphemistically, a "reserve for national advertising."

THEY DENY THEIR CHILDREN

The propagandists were not satisfied with keeping their A. & P. connection secret—they lied about it. Thus C. F. Small, who acted as liaison between A. & P. and Carl Byoir, told one inquirer that "we do not have anything to do with the operation of the National Consumers Tax Commission"—and that despite the fact that he was the individual who passed on its bills for salaries and expenses.

The National Consumers Tax Commission was not the only false front A. & P. adopted. Carl Byoir organized the Business Property Association, to induce the owners of property rented to chain stores to oppose all chain-store taxes and specifically the Patman bill. A group known as the National Grange Association was formed to influence the attitude of members of the oldest and one of the most respectable of farm organizations. A "labor news service" in Washington was paid $80,000 for distributing chain-store propaganda among workingmen.

Like the National Consumers Tax Commission, the Business Property Association sought to conceal its true character as an A. & P. instrumentality. "This organization is not connected with any chain or group of chains" wrote O. E. Dooley, its president, to an official of the First National Stores of Boston, "but is the result of a desire of chain-store renters to protect themselves."

KILL COMPETITION AT ANY COST

It is an interesting sidelight that at the very time the president of the Business Property Association was soliciting the support of First National Stores, a New England food chain, the A. & P. division managers in that area were under instructions from the Hartfords to operate their stores without profit in carrying on a price war against the First National and other competitors.

Now, with the scenery set, the Hartfords and Carl Byoir were ready for the great show at Washington. They certainly put on a grand act. The chains called in more than a hundred witnesses, representing almost every segment of the population. There presentation, dragging over many weeks and highly repetitious had all the appearance of a filibuster. The chains' plan seemed to be to awe the committee with numbers and to tire its members out. What the chains' advocates lacked in facts and sound argument, they more than made up in the voluminous record they built Some of the most impressive statements, we now know from the Government's case, were written in Carl Byoir's office. Perhaps the most notable instance is the argument by Daniel Bloomfield, representing the Boston Chamber of Commerce, which was prepared by George Feldman, counsel for the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

Elaborate plans were made for the entertainment of this army of witnesses. The nature of the entertainment and the lavishness of it were brought out in one of the exhibits of the Government's case. George W. Diehl, who is said to direct the buying of butter for the great food chain, wrote a letter to Charles W. Parr, an A. & P. official at the New York office, which lifts the curtain on what happened behind the scenes.

Butter manufacturers, shippers, and growers were coming in from all parts of the United States and it seemed the decent thing to do to entertain them in the approved butter-and-egg-man style. Mr. Diehl tells "Dear Chas." about the trials and tribulations of a host on such an occasion:

THE WITNESSES ARE ENTERTAINED

It has been the most strenuous 2 weeks I have ever put in and J. Brennan and (name of man since deceased) and E. French and Mr. Byoir must be on a ragged edge. We have had a constant stream of shippers, producers, manufacturers, politicians in and out.

These people were requested to be in Washington from 1 to 2 days before appearing, so they could receive help and advice on their written statements. W. A. Klepper, of Decatur, Ind., our big shipper, testified, without a prepared statement as he wanted to do it that way—and the Fort Wayne independents and wholesale grocers put in a boycott on his goods and the Kraft line and if it spreads throughout the United States of America Kraft will be in a fine mix-up.

Klepper's own company is owned by Kraft. He (Klepper) came in and went out the same day and did not do as I requested—that is, prepare a letter for the record. I had shippers on my hands all the time, starting with W. A. Gordon the day I left, Tuesday, April 23, and returning with Gus Mueller of Denver, Iowa, this week. About all any of my men paid was room rent in Washington and I paid that for one of them. All meals, taxi excursions, sightseeing, etc., entertainment, drinks, likewise I handled many Atlantic Com. Co. and others—flour men—sardine men, growers, etc. In short it was a steady 2 weeks of expense for us on my part.

Carl Byoir told me to get a parlor—but did not see need of it and could not get it when I tried because of so many conventions and people in Washington. The parlor would have been $15 to $20 a day. I assure you that I did try and be as careful as I could both on expense and account of my family and my health. I feel O. K. but terribly nervous and jittery from it all. Mrs. Diehl said I look O. K. but if she ever knew what I went through she would be out of my life, I am sure.

However, all these men gave up many days of their time from business and we should show them A. & P. appreciates their help and support under such an attack. This off the record and personal note so you will understand. I enjoyed (please destroy when you read) most of the shippers I met. The two "cowboys" from Texas ——— 61 years and ——— 41—a relative of (a prominent Texas politician) were the best drinkers, never stopped.

SHOWING A. & P.'S APPRECIATION

I had them to ball game and they were drunk then, even, and also killed a bottle the morning on the witness stand. Some wanted the other sex and had it, of course, because plenty available at all hours. It is funny now that I review happenings as when C. Byoir said D. stay on, I replied had better have Mrs. D. join me. He said no, don't do that. His advice was sound. (She would not like to see all that took place). At times our party were very numerous, as high as 12 people.

At any rate we had good support from all, A. & P. had come in. We have many good friends who think very highly of our company. Some will have some very sad moments if "independents" start retaliating, such as Kraft Co. The Mayflower meals expensive—very high as main dining room and room service ice cream 45 to 60 cents a portion, grapefruit 25 to 50 cents for half, etc. However, I did all I could to be decent and appreciative of those who came in for us, and I know our efforts were not in vain.

Please destroy, Charley, as this is only a personal note so you will know our problems. I would not care to write a business letter and explain such a trip to anyone. I am sure our executives realize that such a hearing and defense costs money.

HOW LAWS ARE KILLED

Such were the methods used to defeat the Patman chain-store tax bill in the early months of 1940. It does not appear that they were different from the methods used by the big chains whenever they wish to head off legislation designed to curb them. The procedure was expensive, as George Diehl complained, but they brought results, and only results count in the reckoning of big business.

Space limitations prevent covering the A. & P. case adequately. The daily newspapers should have covered it, for the trial at Danville has been real news. But the big newspaper are supported by A. & P. and other chain-store advertising and their publishers are not in the habit of biting the hand that feeds them.

Only one comprehensive coverage of the case has been given, and that has appeared in the Interstate Merchant published by George J. Schulte, one of the most effective witnesses in behalf of the Patman bill in the hearings 5 years ago. The testimony adduced by the Government at Danville has amply sustained the charges he then made and he stands fully vindicated.

Do Women Count?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Eve Garrette printed in This Week magazine of August 26, 1945:

DO WOMEN COUNT?

(By Eve Garrette)

When you see a woman with a ballot in her hand today, you don't brand her as a Jezebel. Yet this wasn't always so. Only 25 years ago, on August 26, 1920, women of this country won the right to vote through the nineteenth amendment to our Constitution.

It represented the end of a struggle begun long before the Civil War * * * the end of being mocked, mobbed, and sometimes jailed—which was part of the price women paid for suffrage.

Women wanted the vote for three primary reasons:

First, they wanted it on grounds of human justice. Second, because women have a vested interest in government and legislation directly affecting them and children. And third, they wanted to make a personal contribution to public service.

Therefore, on this amendment's silver jubilee day, it might be well for us to examine women's record of performance.

GOOD QUESTIONS

What has been woman's direct influence upon the political life of the Nation? Has the woman vote changed anything in politics? What have women achieved with their ballot? What progress have they made in public life?

These are pertinent questions, and we look back for the answers. It seems unbelievable now, but it is true, that before August 26, 1920, women were legally classified with children and idiots.

Even today, in 1945, serious discriminations against women exist in many States. It's a continuing struggle to put women on the same status with men—before the law.

Now, as voting citizens, women can point proudly to two political activities of the last quarter century: First, their continuing work for public welfare and child health; and, second, their self-education as voters.

PUSHED HEALTH STATUTES

Of course, women alone have not been responsible for our achievements in child welfare and public-health legislation during this period. Yet, behind the sensational decline in child death rates lies woman's steady work in preventing infected milk, insisting upon inoculations, quarantining contagious diseases, caring for expectant mothers, and fighting commercial exploiters of child labor. Thanks to the woman vote, we have welfare and public-health legislation on today's statute books.

On matters of political education, women were frank to admit that they were practically illiterate in 1920. They knew they needed to be intelligently informed if they were to get their ballot's worth.

Because women are bred in the old American tradition of the cultural club, they didn't like man's hit-and-miss method of political self-instruction. Reading the newspapers, attending political meetings, indulging in masculine argumentation and debate did not appeal to them.

Many women's cultural clubs flourished in 1920. Education in good citizenship became the business of every woman's club worthy of the name. To lead the way, the nonpartisan National League of Women Voters emerged. It, also, is celebrating a silver jubilee.

Thanks in a large part to the influence of women, our school and college curricula now include thorough courses in political education. Today, the young college-educated woman voter casts her first vote fortified with knowledge of which her mother and grandmother could only dream.

It's only natural that men have been influenced by the feminine preoccupation with the responsibilities of citizenship. Indeed, the entire trend toward sound political education in this country is a monument to our self-improving women voters—both organized and nonjoiner.

Has the woman vote changed anything in politics? "No," some say—we only have cleaner collars on ward heelers and cleaner language on politicians' tongues.

MORE WOMEN VOTERS

There is at least one thing the woman vote has changed—the balance of power at the polls. In 1940, for the first time since they won the vote, women cast 51 percent of the votes. In the last national elections they cast about 53 percent, although they were expected to cast up to 65 percent of the total. As a matter of fact, there has been an increase of about 7 percent since women began voting.

Critics sometimes complain because about half of the women never bother to vote at all. But thy neglect to point out that just about half of the men never bother to vote either.

The woman vote proves what every practical politician knows—that women are people. They react to the franchise privilege exactly as men react.

Women remain away from the polls for the same reasons as men. When they vote, they are influenced by the same arguments, swayed by the same emotions. They split over the same moral issues, swallow the same bunko, and are afflicted by the same prejudices and self-interest. When they are in office, the standards of their public conduct are just as dependent upon their personal standards.

Women crusade for their pet causes, yes. But their men crusade with them and vice versa. In politics there is no such thing as sex solidarity. Only what is called the human equation.

Some critics complain about the lack of woman's moral political influence. However, she seems scarcely in a position to exert it. The political world is still a man's world. The number of women who have obtained public office in 25 years corresponds neither to their ability, qualifications, nor proportionate voting strength.

For example, today there are only nine women Members of Congress, with no colleague in the Senate—exactly the situation

existing over a decade ago. In 1930–31, nine women sat in the House of Representatives, with no women in the Senate.

There are 435 Members of the House. At present, the ratio of men to women is 426 to 9. This is not impressive. Only 39 women have ever gone to Congress, whereas, since 1920, there have been 6,042 male congressional seats.

In high appointive places, during the last 25 years, there have only been two women ambassadors, one woman Cabinet member, a woman Assistant Attorney General, a woman Director of the Mint—and only the last named holds office now.

Former President Hoover sent the first woman to an international conference. She was Dr. Mary E. Woolley, then president of Mount Holyoke College, who attended the Geneva Disarmament Conference. President Roosevelt appointed Dr. Mabel E. Newcomber, of Vassar College, to Bretton Woods, and Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, of Barnard College, to San Francisco.

GAIN OVER 1940

Today, 234 women are members of 39 State legislatures, as compared with 33 women lawmakers who served in 1922. Sixteen of them are senators, while 218 serve in the lower house. This is a striking gain over 1940, when 140 women were elected to State legislatures.

True, many women serve in political offices in our State and local governments. But if the criterion were merit and equal representation, there would be many more.

Perhaps in another quarter century, society will recognize that in the field of good government service, there is no such thing as sex. Just adults, working together, building together, the finer things toward which the spirit of mankind has always been aspiring. They are just citizens doing themselves and their country honor.

The Sugar-Beet Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the sugar-beet labor situation in Montana is in the worst condition it has been in during the past 3 years. There are not enough Mexican nationals or prisoners of war in the State to take care of the crop at the present time. The possibility of getting additional Mexicans at the present time is not apparent and our only hope is to get additional prisoners of war to work in the beet fields. The War Department has informed me that prisoners of war originally allocated to Montana but loaned to other States will be returned to Montana by September 25 and that if the corn crop in the Midwest is completed by October 10 other prisoners of war will be available. This cuts the time very thin for their effective use. In view of the increased sugar-beet acreage in the State, the importance of sugar as a rationed commodity, and the shortness of the time left, I have appealed to the War Department for additional prisoners of war to work in the beet fields. It would be a tragedy if, at a time like that, when sugar is needed so badly, we should fall down on the labor supply for the beet fields. I am taking this time to call to the attention of the Congress the serious sugar-beet situation and the need for action now to save this vital crop.

Pass the Bill To Stimulate Volunteer Enlistments in the United States Regular Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time since the cessation of hostilities in the several theaters of war that any bill affecting the rights and treatment to be accorded to our soldier citizens has come before this Congress.

It is a good bill in its every general aspect. It will be a better bill before it leaves this House.

It does more than give incentive to resuming the volunteer system insofar as the future personnel of our Regular Army is concerned—it will render unnecessary the continuation of selective service with its attending enforced military service in these United States in peacetime—an object greatly desired by a vast majority of my constituency.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, it is an economy bill, fully in step with the tempo of the times. I, for one, am frank to say that I looked with alarm at the necessity of drafting a large Army to keep the peace, not that I feel that we have no need for a competent highly trained mobile Army and Navy at all times. I am strong for national defense.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we have achieved complete victory over our enemies and if the United Nations stand united in peace as in war, then why this talk of a peactime army of such gigantic size as to render the necessity of continuing to draft men into service.

Major General Edwards, in his testimony before the Military Affairs Committee some three short weeks ago, placed the requirement of our armed forces as of July 1, 1946, at 2,500,000 men. This he said made an allocation of 830,000 men to serve under the command of General MacArthur in the Pacific area. I was happy to read only last evening that General MacArthur yesterday reported that he could now handle the situation with a mere 200,000 men and to return all others to their homes as rapidly as ships are made available.

The Regular Army forces, the general went on to say, "will be able to maintain unaided the 200,000-man force," which he said will permit complete demobilization of our citizen—draftee—Pacific forces.

This is indeed good news, not alone to the men in the Pacific, but to their mothers, fathers, and families everywhere through the Nation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say it is a good bill; one designed to give a greater measure of recognition, pay, and other allowances to our armed forces and to continue those benefits to our peacetime Army.

I am all for this bill and urge its passage upon every Member of this House.

A Free World Republic—Atomic Power Brings Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter on the challenge which the discovery of atomic power presents to the whole civilized world appeared in the Washington Post of September 16.

The letter has been signed by a number of distinguished citizens. I feel that the problems which it presents to every thoughtful and patriotic citizen of our democracy must be squarely met, if our Nation is to avert catastrophe in the years ahead.

A FREE WORLD REPUBLIC—ATOMIC POWER BRINGS RESPONSIBILITY

The atomic bomb has given the American, British, and Canadian people a momentary opportunity and a momentous responsibility to secure individual liberty and peace.

The opportunity is brief, for we cannot hope to keep this secret more than a few years. The responsibility will endure. We shall be blamed to the last generation if we fail to deliver mankind from tyranny and war now that we have this opportunity. We who first used this bomb may then be remembered as we ourselves remember the Vandals of ancient time. To those surviving World War III our name may be a curse.

But who will begin that war? A free government when attacked will use these bombs, but its nature gives the strongest guaranty against its initiating aggression. Free men cannot possibly impose their individual liberty on others by force as dictators can impose slavery.

Providence released the secret of the atom to three free nations that give the strongest guaranties against dictatorship. How shall they solve the problem now facing them?

No solution that entrusts atomic power to a number of sovereign nations, however few or however leagued together, can possibly meet the needs of mankind now. The atomic bomb has made absolute national sovereignty danger No. 1 to individual life and liberty. Practically speaking, only a sovereign nation is likely to have the power to produce atomic bombs in secrecy, only a sovereign nation is likely to have the incentive to produce them, only the existence of other sovereign nations is likely to provide that incentive, and only a sovereign nation needs atomic bombs to coerce it. Where citizens instead of nations are the sovereign units of society, no such bombs are needed to coerce them.

To trust any league, alliance, association, or treaty among sovereign nations to outlaw the production or use of atomic bombs is to trust swamps to cease producing mosquitos. Such agreements really give the advantage to the governments most likely to violate them.

The probability of a nation concealing such violation is in direct ratio to its lack of individual liberty.

The sooner we begin to eliminate the sovereign nation as the unit in international relations and to reorganize these relations with the individual citizen as the governing and governed unit, the sooner we shall eliminate the prime producer of the atomic bomb and the only reason for producing it. The fastest progress that can be made in this direction by all the United Nations together in their present state of development will be too slow and uncertain. We have a fivefold task:

1. First of all, we must eliminate absolute national sovereignty among those nations that already know the secret of the atomic bomb, and establish governmental machinery whereby their citizens can determine and execute a common policy concerning it.

2. We must not lose our head start in atomic power by slackening our research work, or by divulging our knowledge to those nations or institutions that cannot, or do not, guarantee liberty to safeguard us against this power falling into the hands of dictators.

3. But we must not proceed so cautiously or delay so imprudently that we lose our present opportunity to unite mankind freely and effectively behind atomic power.

(4) We cannot force individual freedom on others, and yet we must contrive to extend it through the world and unite the free as we go, before foreign dictatorship masters the atomic bomb.

(5) At the same time we must safeguard freedom against domestic dictatorship rising from economic depression and totalitarian "cures" for unemployment.

Joint possession of the secret of atomic energy gives those who have it the common wealth they need to bind them together. They have now a resource to develop that is far richer than was the Northwest Territory when joint possession of it helped to create the nucleus of our present American Union. They face a new frontier fit to make the blood pound faster in the veins of pioneers.

To save themselves and everyone from the appalling dangers of World Depression II, dictatorship, and World War III, and to harness the power of the atom to the good of mankind, they must equal in the constitutional, social, and spiritual fields their tremendous achievements in science, engineering, production, and war. They can and they must do this now.

The atomic bomb has given the people of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada an enduring common responsibility that requires their united common sense and courage. This is only the latest and most urgent in a series of problems they have in common. But they have as yet no common machinery, responsible and responsive to them all, to unite their courage and their common sense democratically, effectively, and enduringly on any policy.

The first necessity is that their delegates should meet to constitute such machinery. Until this is done, the world's power to govern the atomic age in freedom will lack the beginning of the atom's power—a nucleus.

It is to be hoped that delegates of other peoples who also are experienced in the practice of individual liberty and have shown that they, too, deem such liberty their dearest heritage, would be invited to send delegates to meet with them. To organize government on a basis of individual liberty has proved so hard that all too few nations have succeeded in providing it even in their own territory for as long as 30 years—or one generation. It would therefore seem prudent to draw on the wisdom of all who have at least this much experience to contribute to the solution of the harder problem of organizing effective free government between nations.

The undersigned propose that the United States should take immediately the proper steps to convoke a convention to form a nuclear union on a free basis adequate to the exigencies of the atomic age, and functioning as a unit in the United Nations Organization.

We hold that the nucleus it creates should guarantee individual liberty as much, at least, as does the United States Constitution and give all the other guaranties the Federal system gives—fair representation, equal justice, defensive strength, effective central power, independent home rule, domestic tranquillity.

These are all guaranties against misuse of power, and the control of atomic power requires them all. To strengthen and extend them more and more, membership in the nucleus should be open from the start to any people that is able and willing to uphold these guaranties.

To offer any people that adequately guarantees individual liberty the protection of the nuclear union's atomic power, and all the other great advantages of full membership in it, would seem to be the swiftest, surest way to induce and to preserve real freedom everywhere. This policy would make the advantages of membership in the union ever greater, its territory ever vaster, its vital centers ever more dispersed, and its lead in the creative, defensive, and offensive development of atomic power ever more incalculably advanced.

Union of this nucleus a few years ago meant union of actual weakness but potential strength. Now it means union of both actual and potential power.

From the start there would be practically no possibility of overwhelming it by surprise or of resisting its power of reprisal, and these advantages would grow as it grew. At the same time, the guaranties it gave of individual freedom would be guaranteeing everyone more and more that its power would not be used aggressively. And so there would be neither hope of victory nor fear of attack to cause others to combine against it.

This union would give ever stronger practical assurance against dangerous armament racing developing during the interim period while it was growing to universality. From the start, attack on it would be suicidal for any dictator, even if he learned how to make atomic bombs before his people learned how to be free.

It is of the highest importance that the nucleus be constituted as only the most practical first step toward uniting all humanity, in good time and peacefully, in the one way that can secure life and liberty equally to everyone in this atomic age—a world republic of free men.

To get this policy adopted, the first essential is for those who believe it to be on the whole the best solution to say so. Obviously it is in the general interest to know what support this atomic policy has, and obviously there is no time to lose.

The Greeks had a name for heaven, and from it we got our name for uranium. Now uranium has given us the power to make of earth a heaven or hell. There is reasoned cause for hope, and none for despair.

Greater than the power of the atom is the power of man. For man has proved that he can govern the atom. It is much harder for men to govern themselves freely and equally than for them to govern atoms. Yet they had already proved in some long-tested experiments that they could do this, too.

Significantly, the nations of men who had governed themselves the longest were the first to govern atoms. This achievement is but the latest evidence of the power inherent in their principles of individual liberty and union.

With the faith and courage that such achivement gives, let us then begin to apply these principles now to unite all mankind.

Stringfellow Barr, Louis Bromfield, Mrs. Robert S. Brookings, Brig. Gen. Albert L. Cox, William H. Danforth, Forrest Davis, Henry S. Dennison, John Dewey, Walter Duranty, Clinton Golden, Marion Hedges, Norman Littell, Felix Morley, Harry B. Mitchell, David S. Muzzey, Elliott Nugent, Chandler Owen, A. J. G. Priest, Emil G. Sick, Clarence K. Streit, Robert J. Watt, Aubrey Williams, Corp. Harris L. Wofford, Jr., William B. Ziff.

WASHINGTON, *September 16.*

Are We Dozing Off for the Next Pearl Harbor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of permission duly granted, I extend my remarks for the purpose of having printed in the RECORD a timely rousing article by Mr. I. F. Stone, which appears in today's PM under the title "Are We Dozing Off for the Next Pearl Harbor?" In my opinion, this article deserves the unanimous approval of the American people. It is as follows:

ARE WE DOZING OFF FOR THE NEXT PEARL HARBOR?

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON.—The sneak attack of 1941 got no closer to the heart of the U. S. A. than Honolulu and did no more than knock the Pacific Fleet out of action. But a "sneak attack" by Japan in 1961, utilizing radar, the rocket, and the atomic bomb, might turn New York, Washington, and Detroit into a bloody shambles within a few minutes and cripple America's power to organize resistance.

It is this future possibility which must be kept in mind in shaping our policy toward Japan. And it is this future possibility which makes so welcome and so necessary the plain speaking in which RUSSELL, of Georgia, engaged on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

Senator RUSSELL sees no reason why we should be more lenient to Japan than to Germany, to Hirohito than to Hitler. We heartily agree.

RUSSELL introduced a resolution which would put Congress on record as favoring the trial of Hirohito as a war criminal. We think Hirohito fully as much a war criminal as the Kaiser was in the last war and we hope Congress will pass the resolution. Mere passage of the resolution will be helpful in stiffening the attitude of MacArthur, who seems to be following Teddy Roosevelt's famous advice in reverse. Ever since MacArthur landed, he has been walking noisily, but carrying a little twig.

AN EYE ON 1948

MacArthur's latest statement, forecasting a cut in occupation troops to 200,000, within 6 months, may be shrewdly calculated to put him in the running for the next Republican Presidential nomination. But it is hardly likely to make the Japanese ruling class feel

it need make any fundamental reforms at home. The whole drift of American occupation policy—if it can be called a policy—is playing directly into the hands of those Japanese interests which planned this war and, if given the chance, will plan the next.

Perhaps the most useful function to be performed by the Russell resolution will be to precipitate wider public discussion of our Japanese policy. We hope the Senator will insist on full hearings on his resolution before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And we hope he will insist on learning, and letting the public learn, through those hearings whether we have in the War Department or the State Department or MacArthur headquarters any but the most rudimentary and fragmentary policy toward Japan.

MENACE TO FUTURE

Use of the Emperor to bring about Japanese surrender was not policy in any long-range sense, but a bit of short-range strategy. It saved American lives and it was fully justified. But for every American life saved in the present there may be a hundred lives lost in the future unless we make sure that the Emperor does not use us to keep substantially intact the feudal, militarist, aristocratic, and monopolistic elements which dominate Japan and support the throne.

There is no evidence here that as of the date of the Japanese surrender any real program for the reform of Japan had been worked out either at the State Department or the War Department. There is no evidence that MacArthur had any but the most elementary guiding instructions from home when he set out for Japan. These instructions, though totally inadequate, already have set what may prove a fatal pattern. The instructions, from all that can be learned here, were to set up no military government and to govern through existing Japanese officials.

RULE BY GESTAPO

One need only imagine that we had arranged a German surrender through Hitler and proceeded to occupy Germany on such terms to see the criminal blindness of current Japanese policy. On paper, at Potsdam, we committed ourselves to bringing a democratic Japan into being. In actuality, our policy, from top to bottom, is designed to prevent a democratic Japan from emerging after the war. At the top we maintain the Emperor. At the bottom we are using the Japanese Gestapo, the notorious Kempei-tai, to help us maintain order. Imagine the Gestapo maintaining order in Germany and you easily can conceive how encouraging this policy must be to the democratic elements the secret police long hounded in Japan.

That the idea of a quick, easy, soft Japanese occupation is widely held in Washington as well as in MacArthur's headquarters may be seen from the authoritative account of Japanese occupation policy given in the reliable United States News for September 21. The historic horse-laugh in this account is its statement that "peaceful elements in Japan are to be encouraged. One possible leader of these elements is Prince Fumimaro Konoye, who, as Premier in 1941, proposed a personal meeting with President Roosevelt to find a basis for peace."

SUCKER MYTHOLOGY

This is some more of the sucker mythology the clever Japanese propagandists are developing for gullible American consumption. We recommend Andrew Roth's excellent new book, Dilemma in Japan, to understand Konoye's background and the whole context of the current drift toward a soft peace.

"Peaceful" Konoye, as Roth points out, was the Premier who started the war against China in 1937. Roosevelt refused to meet him in 1941, Roth correctly relates, because F. D. R. recognized "that the only basis for compromise would be American abandonment of the Chungking Government and recognition of Japanese conquests in China."

It was Konoye, a member of the present Japanese Cabinet, whose Government in 1937 launched nation-wide raids against liberal and antiwar Japanese critical of the attack on China. Konoye came back to the premiership after 1939 and laid the foundations for totalitarianism by abolishing the Japanese Federation of Labor and establishing a one-party system. It is Konoye who now gives interviews to the American press blaming "the military" for the war (New York Times, September 12) and is looked to by some Washington officials as a "peaceful" leader of a new "peaceful" Japan.

A democratic Japan cannot emerge under an emperor, especially an emperor surrounded by the same Fascist-minded type of men who ruled Japan in his name before the war. These are errors for which another generation of Americans may pay a price beyond reckoning. The Russell resolution, the coming debates and hearings on it, offer an opportunity to correct those errors before it is too late.

Return to Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an interesting and informative editorial from the Belleville Telescope by its editor, Mr. A. Q. Miller.

I think this editorial should be of interest to the Congress as well as the people of this country:

RETURN TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

(By A. Q. Miller)

As the time approaches for the special session of Congress there is every indication that there is going to be some plain speaking by Congressmen on the reconversion problem.

Already in published statements and interviews some Congressmen have stated rather bluntly that it is important for the country to return to constitutional government and begin giving serious consideration to civilian needs and the employment of labor in private industry. As one Congressman expressed it, we have for 4 years properly turned the affairs of the country over to military needs, giving the Army and Commander in Chief everything they have requested in men, money, and materials to fight the war, but now that the war is won we should as soon as practicable get rid of war controls and free private business so it can with confidence go ahead, expand, and employ labor.

The Army told Congress it was responsible for winning the war, did not want any interference and got everything it demanded—and in some instances much more than the Congress and the people believed it needed to win the war. Military policies prevailed, we won the war at a cost of more than a million casualties, fighting on every battlefield throughout the world, built up a public debt of $300,000,000,000 and have stock piles, surplus material and unused balances which some Congressmen have estimated as high as $100,000,000,000. However, there are still some voices crying for continued military authority and continued controls by boards, bureaus, and commissions—controls which virtually tell the people where to stand, where to sit, and what to think. This is not the American way. The American people, schooled in an atmosphere of liberty and personal freedom, want to maintain a partnership with their Government and want their public officials to be their servants and not their masters. These are fundamental principles interwoven into the fabric of our Constitution by our forefathers and it is time to return to that kind of Government.

One of the fruits of war is loose living, indifference, lower moral standards and ideals and in some instances down-right dishonesty. One is reminded of the age in history of Diogenes, who walked the streets of Athens in broad daylight with a lighted lantern, looking for an honest man. In all ages the world has been searching for the truth—and we have been told on high authority that if we know the truth, the truth will set us free. Yet who today can proclaim for a certainty what the truth is about our country, its politics, its philosophy, its aims and ideals and its sincere relationship between the Government and the people. If the people, in any degree, have become disillusioned and lost confidence in their Government what is the cause and what is the cure? In the babble of tongues, the confusion of bureaus and conflicts of edicts, the plain citizen on foot does not know where he stands or what his duty is.

As examples of confusion and conflict in authority, one bureau says one thing and another bureau another, each trying to maintain its authority and perpetuate its existence. People are told by those in authority that the draft will continue another year and also that it will be discontinued on VJ-day or when Congress meets. They are told that there is a shortage of gasoline and coal. They are told that it will be necessary to keep 8,000,000 men in uniform for a year for police duty and that it will take only 1,000,000 during the same time for police duty. We are told that we have won the war and made the world safe for democracy (the objective for which we fought) and at the same time we are told by others in authority that we did not win the war, that the peace treaty is no good, and that we must maintain in uniform millions of men and the greatest Army, Navy, and Air Force the world has ever seen if we are to have future peace—and one weak-voiced citizen ventures to inquire: "What did we fight the war for?" What are the people to believe with all this babble of voices? Secrecy has its proper place in time of war, but in time of peace secrecy between the Government and people has no proper place. Secrecy built up $50,000,000 worth of waste and $100,000,000,000 worth of stock piles and unexpended balances. Taxpayers have a right to know what becomes of their money. It's time now for Congress to take back its constitutional powers and give the Government back to the people.

A Plan for Universal Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a plan for universal military service will probably engage the attention of this body during the Seventy-ninth Congress. A very logical and excellent discussion of a plan is suggested in an editorial of the Fort Myers News-Press, of Fort Myers, Fla., written by Hon. Carl Hanton

who is one of the outstanding editorial writers of not only the State of Florida but of the South, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein this editorial on a plan for universal service, dated August 8, 1945:

A PLAN FOR UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Making the rounds of his district during the congressional vacation, Representative DWIGHT ROGERS is asking constituents what they think of universal military service; that is, continuing the draft for compulsory training of the Nation's youth during peacetime. When he adds up the score he will probably find that a whole lot of people favor it in principle while just as many—and sometimes the same ones—oppose it in practice.

Veterans of other wars and the boys in this one generally favor it as a system fair to all. It has long been a foremost American Legion policy to which newcomers now finishing their tour of duty will subscribe as wholeheartedly as did their comrades with previous experience. They feel that if the country is to be defended it should be defended by everyone and they know that it cannot be successfully done by men unprepared for the task.

That view being too sound to admit of valid dispute, the opposition takes the stand that it nevertheless isn't necessary; that the country doesn't need a large standing army and can maintain a sufficient force by relying on volunteers. Religious and educational groups are prominent in advancing that argument, backed up by what might be called the mother element—men and women who think somebody else's sons should do the soldiering.

Required to show military necessity, the advocates of compulsory training have a difficult case to prove. In the face of plans for world peace there doesn't, as a matter of fact, seem to be much necessity of drafting for the United States Army every youth who reaches the age of 18. Confronted with that, the answer is that you never can tell and anyway it won't do them any harm, probably a great deal of good.

However, there is some dispute about that. Mothers, and some fathers, don't like the idea of taking their young hopefuls away from home at the tender age of 18 and throwing them into an army camp among a lot of rough fellows. Educators feel that a year under a top sergeant is less profitable than a term at college and the churches are against it from every angle, principally the apprehension that when men are trained to fight they will be inclined to exercise their ability.

If a reasonable showing of necessity could be made, these objections might be overcome. But lack of necessity is the hurdle on which compulsory training is likely to trip. The Army, which strongly favors universal service in peacetime, isn't doing the cause any good by its policy of hanging onto more men than are now needed. It may be that 3,000,000 are not enough to defeat the Japanese but logistics, B–29's, the Navy, and atom bombs refute the contention that the war will last long enough to transport 7,000,000 men to the scene of action. In refusing to talk sense the military brass hats have done more to discredit universal service than the arguments of organized opponents.

As a result sponsors in Congress have about given up hope of passing a bill for a year's compulsory training. There is an opportunity, however, to work out a compromise that should be reasonably satisfactory to both sides. President Truman is represented as favoring an expanded National Guard as the mainstay of our peacetime Army. It would be feasible to have universal service in the National Guard with every youth upon reaching the age of 18 assigned to his hometown company or college regiment for the regulation 3 years of weekly drill and annual summer encampments. The boys would remain on their jobs or in school just as National Guard members always have done. In case of emergency the country would have some mighty good soldiers who would be ready, with a little hardening up and some intensive practice with their weapons, to take the field with the best of them.

That should do the business. Mothers would have their boys at home and Uncle Sam would have them on instant call. The National Guard has always fought as well as regulars and the country would be safe in its hands—provided it didn't have to enlist a lot of raw recruits when summoned for active duty.

Congressman ROGERS of Florida should ask what people think about this and when he gets back to Washington he may find that President Truman will welcome the idea as fully meeting the requirements.

Preference for Veterans Must Come First—Time Is of the Essence—Administrative Adjustments and Conflicts Can Be Straightened Out Later—Resolve Questions in Favor of the Veterans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, this debate on this bill is one of the most important yet occurring in this Seventy-ninth Congress. And it is more important now after the surrender of Japan than it would have been before. This is true because every Member of this House now knows that more veterans of this war will be home much sooner than possibly could have been the case had Japan not surrendered before this debate occurred. In other words, the decision we make today is in the immediate presence of an assured fact; which is that the veterans are now coming home at the rate of several thousands per month. Therefore, in the language of a legal phrase—to demonstrate there is no time to waste nor to lose, I respectfully say, "Time is of the essence in this legislation."

Having been present every minute since this debate started, and not being a member of either the Agriculture Committee or the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of this great House, from what members of these two distinguished committees have said this afternoon, it is apparent there is a sharp and sincere difference of opinion between the two committees as to which administrative department of the Government should perform these services and render the acts necessary to be done. Most members of the Agriculture Committee have said it should be in the Department of Agriculture, while most members of the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee have said it should be in the Department of the Interior.

In the presence of this conflict of opinion, what shall we do? The Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, admittedly has studied this subject for months and have held extended hearings. There is no such representation of such work on the part of the Agriculture Committee. Therefore, I must resolve any question I have as to jurisdiction in favor of the committee bill from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, if it is a fact that there will be a little duplication in the Departments on this bill, then that is an administrative matter and can be easily corrected. In the presence of the declaration of our great President that he intends to revise and reallocate functions between the Departments so as to save time and money and to increase efficiency, we can honestly anticipate that any conflict in functioning will reasonably be ironed out within a few months under the President's reorganization plan.

One or more of the gentlemen speaking this afternoon have mentioned that they did not favor giving any more jurisdiction to the Department over which Mr. Ickes presides; and likewise they have, inferentially at least, favored or objected to the bill because Mr. Anderson is Secretary of Agriculture.

Gentlemen, it seems to me that we should enact laws under fundamental merits and objectives of the proposed legislation rather than upon the issue of who is or who is not the head of a Department of Government. These Department heads change, but the objectives of meritorious legislation do not frequently change. Legislation which is sound in principle has spiritual power and place in material and factual need which determines its destiny; while legislation enacted because a man is or is not the head of a Department, in my judgment, fundamentally is weak, unsound, and fundamentally destructive of democratic processes.

Every gentleman who has heretofore spoken has practically said or inferred that he is interested in helping the returning veteran, if you please. No objection is made to the 90-day preference in section 1 of the bill. I should favor a longer period of preference—say 160 or 180 days, during which a veteran can exercise preferential right of purchase of these reclaimed and irrigated lands.

So, Mr. Speaker, we all agree that the bill is sound in principle and objectives as it applies to veterans, but there appears sincere difference of opinion beginning at section 2 on page 13 of the bill; on the grounds of claimed differences of jurisdiction, and as to these claims, the distinguished members of both the Agriculture and the Irrigation and Reclamation Committees do not agree. Shall we punish the veterans and deprive them of their rights for probably a long period of many months because of this difference of opinion? I am told that if this bill is emasculated by elimination of all of the bill beginning at section 2 on page 13 that the bill will be fundamentally noneffectual to the encouragement and aid and assistance of the veterans in claiming and proving up unreclaimed lands. Shall we make it harder for the veterans or practically eliminate aiding

and helping the veterans merely upon the grounds of jurisdictional conflict or such frivolous questions? Do we not have a right to expect that governmental departments will administer effectively, will iron out their administrative difficulties in the interest of efficiency and economy? I say we can trust our President and his aides to see that the governmental departments in peacetime are promptly rearranged in the interest of efficiency and economy.

Therefore, I say let us enact this legislation as reported by the committee and amended by the Barrett amendment. Let us resolve these apparently trivial differences in favor of the veteran who is the chief concern and objective of the bill itself. Time is of the essence of this legislation. The veterans are returning by the thousands, and we should enact this legislation immediately to the end that those distinguished boys of our armed forces who desire to return to agriculture or who desire to enter upon agricultural and farm pursuits for the first time, will have this legislation effective instead of just a promise thereof.

Now, as to the facetious remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania about the rattlesnakes and sagebrush of the West; and the likewise facetious warning that there is plenty of land in the eastern part of the United States—he specified east of the Mississippi—just let me, as a native son of the Golden West, state that the natural trend of population from the inception of the landings of the Pilgrims on our eastern shores, has been to the West. It will ever continue thus. Nothing can stop it. No, neither the refusal to enact legislation nor any artificial or unnatural barriers placed against the development of the West. The Eastern States are greater because of the Western States. There is increasingly an interdependence as between the East and the West and the North and the South. State boundaries are now almost eliminated for many purposes, and increasingly areas and regional boundaries will be erased by the natural course of events and by the movements of peoples between these areas and between these States. The peoples east of the Mississippi will prosper and progress only as the peoples west of the Mississippi do likewise. This applies to manufacture, industry, and agriculture, as well as to all phases of our national experience.

Therefore, I sincerely hope that the suggestion and inference of some in this debate, that there is no reason to develop lands of the West by reclamation so long as there is so much cheaper lands in the East, will fall on deaf ears.

My vote is for the bill as submitted by the committee and amended by the accepted Barrett amendment. By doing this, I resolve differences of opinion and questionable argument as between members of the two distinguished House committees—the Agriculture and the Irrigation and Reclamation Committees, respectively—in favor of the veteran. Time is of the essence of this legislation in the interest of the veteran. Let these incidentals and trivial matters take their natural course of elimination and adjustment. The veteran comes first.

General Marshall: A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. MAY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by B. M. McKelway, from the Washington Sunday Star of Sept. 16, 1945:

GENERAL MARSHALL: A GREAT AMERICAN—HIS STATESMANSHIP AND MILITARY GENIUS ASSURE HIS PLACE IN HISTORY

(By B. M. McKelway)

In the course of a dinner speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in February, 1943, James F. Byrnes said that his belief in ultimate Allied victory was based to a large extent on his personal confidence in "the statesmanship and military genius" of Gen. George C. Marshall.

It may be that when time and the historians, with access to all the records, have taken their measure of General Marshall these two attributes—statesmanship and military genius—will establish his place securely at the very top of those who led America to victory.

Those most closely associated with him have little doubt that there is where he belongs now. They look on him as the architect of the military part of our war effort. They wonder what might have happened had we lacked the driving force of his vigorous personality, his vision to see far ahead, the courage to take the lead and the eloquence of an advocate who derives his persuasive powers from a strikingly impersonal presentation of facts.

But General Marshall, after 6 years as Chief of Staff, is not well known among the people. They know him, to be sure, as a name and it is a name which carries a unique prestige. In a vague sort of way, they may understand that as Chief of Staff he is ranking officer of the United States Army.

But as a public personality, compared, say with MacArthur, Eisenhower, Halsey, or Patton, he is almost negative. Like his opposite number in the Navy, Admiral King, he makes few public appearances and few speeches. He is colorful and facile in extemporaneous speech. Yet relatively few have heard him at his best, for in public appearances he follows a prepared text. He gives no interviews. He makes no comments for publication. He is never quoted, by permission, unless he has written out what he is going to say. He never coins a pet phrase to adorn a headline.

When Mr. Byrnes, addressing some 250 editors of leading American newspapers 2½ years ago, paid his tribute to General Marshall the editors rose to their feet and cheered. The reason for so unusual a demonstration on their part was that they had met General Marshall for the first time the day before and under circumstances that most of them will remember for a long time to come.

They had come to Washington for a war meeting. General Marshall, to most of them, was merely the man who happened to be Chief of Staff. Few had ever seen him, nor did they know enough about him to form any estimate of what sort of man he was.

They were gathered in the Department of Labor auditorium for an off-the-record discussion. General Marshall was introduced from the platform. Instead of reading a prepared paper from the lectern, he left the platform and came down to the auditorium floor to stand among his audience. And then for over an hour, without consulting a note or pausing for a word, he gave his listeners an outline of the war, of our triumphs and our set-backs, our hopes and disappointments, illustrating his tale with anecdotes that would have made fascinating reading matter.

When he left, the newspaper editors were singing his praise as the outstanding personality in Washington. They could write nothing about him or what he said, but when the editors got back home to their offices and their typewriters the general's stature began to assume more definite proportions in the eyes of newspaper readers. He has had a consistently friendly press ever since. The editors might slam the War Department or the Army—but not General Marshall.

Perhaps the impression he made on the editors was not unlike his effect on his British military colleagues at a meeting in the board room of the Federal Reserve Building on Constitution Avenue in late December of 1941—a few weeks after Pearl Harbor. Winston Churchill had reached Washington December 23, bringing with him his top army, naval and air force commanders. The military men of newly allied Britain and America sat down and looked at each other across the long, shiny table, highly impressed by the elegant furniture used by the bankers. Parenthetically, it might be added that the meeting place later was changed to the Public Health Building, the board room of the Federal Reserve Building being abandoned, according to one explanation, on discovery that an accessible fresh-air vent at the ground level outside could make it possible for an imaginative Axis agent with a supply of poison gas to wipe out the top-ranking military men of two nations at one fell hiss.

At this meeting, General Marshall took the floor and spoke on the theme that victory would require unity of command. There must be not only a combined staff organization, but there must be a man at the top—one man to give the orders. Some of the men at the table probably looked coldly down their noses at this American Army officer, threatening to disturb the repose of a Drake, a Frobisher or a Nelson by voicing the unutterable thought that His Majesty's Navy might someday be taking orders from anybody save a British admiral and—perish the thought!—perhaps it would be an army officer. It is possible that some American Navy men shuddered at the same possibility. And as for the Royal Air Force—it was as independent as one of its pilots in the wide blue yonder. Was this independence to be jeopardized by making the Royal Air Force a part of command exercised by a ground forces or a naval man?

When General Marshall was through, one gathers from an account by an eyewitness that the applause, if any, was restrained. He left the room. At the top of the broad, marble stairway for the accommodation of ascending and descending bankers, the late Admiral Walter R. Sexton, then chairman of the Navy General Board, caught up with Marshall and put a hand on his shoulder. "You are dead right," he said. And halfway down the steps the late Field Marshall Sir John Dill grasped Marshall by the elbow. "You are on the right track," he said. "It's got to be done."

But it could not be done unless the President and the Prime Minister agreed. Harry Hopkins heard from someone else of Marshall's talk about unity of command. He requested Marshall to see Churchill the next morning—in Churchill's bedroom at the White House—and repeat the talk to Churchill that had been made to the military men. Unless General Marshall or Mr. Churchill is willing to tell the story some day, it will never be known what went on between these two men. Churchill apparently had expressed skepticism as to whether the British public would accept the idea of a supreme commander over British naval forces if the commander were not a navy man. But when they parted the Prime Minister

was agreeable. It was soon thereafter that there was organized a method for the strategical command and control of British and American military resources through the Combined Chiefs of Staff, acting under the direction of the civilian leaders on both sides of the Atlantic. This decision to set up the Combined Chiefs of Staff, with the unity of command which resulted and the selection of supreme commanders for theaters of war, exercised a more profound effect on the conduct of the war than any other single step.

One great advantage of the Combined Chiefs of Staff organization was that its creation established a buffer between strategic conceptions born in the fertile brains of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt and the execution of such conceptions by the armed services. Mr. Churchill might buck his own military men. He could not buck the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Nor could President Roosevelt. While the chiefs of state controlled the political decisions, the military decisions required the assent of the Combined Chiefs of Staff.

It was General Marshall who put it across. And one of his great accomplishments in this respect was the part he played in persuading President Roosevelt to select Admiral Leahy—able, wise, and trusted—as the President's own chief of staff and presiding officer of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff.

His powers as an advocate had been used before in one of the most dangerous periods affecting our national security.

In the spring and early summer of 1941 the Germans were overrunning vast portions of Russian territory while deploying strong divisions along the Channel coast across from the British Isles. The Italians were massing troops in Africa. The preparations in Japan indicated that Japan was going to get into the war soon—and on the wrong side.

In the United States there was tall talk on Capitol Hill about deferments from the draft and legislative action was approved by tremendous margins giving the President authority to grant deferments. It was pleasant and safe—politically if not from the standpoint of national security—to talk about deferments. But General Marshall was faced with the immediate prospect of seeing an Army of about 1,500,000 thrown together by the draft and then in the process of training and getting equipped, disintegrate into thin air. The draft law provided that men could be held in the armed forces only a year, unless Congress proclaimed a national emergency. The same situation applied to National Guard units and Reserve officers and the end of the first year was in sight.

It was obvious that unless the Draft Act could be amended or unless a national emergency could be proclaimed, we would have no Army within a few months. It was the Chief of Staff who stuck his neck out and took the rap by urging what was then a highly unpopular step. It was the War Department that was studying what to do with the draft, according to what the President told his press conference on June 17. It was the War Department that assumed the onus for preparing the legislation to keep the drafted men in service. It was the Chief of Staff who asked Congress to proclaim a state of emergency so that men could be kept in the service without any legislative changes in the Draft Act. In a special message, the President, on July 21, asked Congress to "acknowledge this national emergency." It was General Marshall who went to Capitol Hill and talked to the legislators behind closed doors. And while the Senate, on August 7, approved amendment of the Draft Act by a margin of 15 votes, the House approval on August 12—less than 4 months before Pearl Harbor—was by a single vote—203–202.

The victory was won by a small margin. But it was an important victory and it saved the Army. There are those who were in the thick of the fight at that time who attribute to General Marshall's own efforts the fact that it was won at all. A more complacent Chief of Staff might have sat tight and said nothing.

General Marshall played a leading role in our dealings with the British—one that far overshadowed the duties associated with the Chief of Staff. He seems to have won the confidence of Churchill and his ministers to an unusual degree. More than once he was sent abroad as an American ambassador without portfolio to the Prime Minister—at one time to guard our more impressionable Army commanders from the wily winsomeness of Mr. Churchill, who has a way with him.

In January 1942 the meetings which preceded formal establishment of the Combined Chiefs of Staff—on February 7—adopted basic conceptions of global strategy which guided the future conduct of the war. One of these concerned operations in northwest Africa, Morocco and Algiers, but at the time we lacked the necessary forces and supplies to support them.

In April General Marshall went to England for conferences with the Prime Minister, the War Cabinet, and the British Chiefs of Staff and it may have been in the course of that visit that he began advocating a cross-Channel operation later that year—1942—or early in the next.

In June the Prime Minister, accompanied by Gen. Sir Alan F. Brooke, Chief of the Imperial General Staff, came to Washington for conferences with the American Joint Chiefs of Staff and the cross-Channel operation was tentatively agreed to. But it was during these conferences—June 21—that Tobruk fell and it was General Marshall who brought the bad news to the White House and gave it to Churchill, who had to take it on the chin again.

The British retreat began toward the El Alamein line, and the situation in Egypt looked more desperate all the time. Here General Marshall did one of the things which brought down on his head the condemnation—because the facts could not be made known—of many of his own Army colleagues. We were just beginning to get our own divisions decently armed with full equipment. Some of our divisions were on maneuvers, equipped for the first time. They were robbed of armored equipment to send it to the British. The First Armored Division was waiting for embarkation, bound for north Ireland. Its equipment was already aboard ships, ready to sail. Some sailed, but they carried the equipment to Egypt. It was one thing that saved the day for the British. But there was plenty of grumbling from our own Army.

In July the President was notified by Mr. Churchill that the cross-Channel operation was off. General Marshall and Admiral King were sent to England to try to save the original invasion plan, of which Marshall was an unrelenting proponent. But the British feared a blood letting which would deplete, disastrously perhaps, their already shrunken manpower. General Marshall and Admiral King were unable to make the Channel plan stick, and the north African invasion, which took place in November, was adopted as an alternative. Some of his associates say General Marshall still believes the Channel invasion would have worked at that time and perhaps shortened the war.

The general and the Prime Minister evidently had some knock-down-and-drag-out fights, but they seemed to hit it off pretty well. General Marshall has been heard to say that Churchill would fight tooth and nail for some scheme he favored—such as the proposed invasion through the Balkans—but that it was characteristic of him and of the British staff that once a decision was reached there was no bitterness or resentment and nothing but the fullest cooperation.

In the early days of the war, General Marshall spoke impatiently more than once of the ability of the British to put their ideas over. He complained one time that an identical British plan which he had declined to accept was presented to him later on by members of his own staff. He would scent and deplore British influence in editorials or news stories. But such things were in the nature of minor irritations. When it came to the broad question of getting along with the British, he was insistent that there be no undercutting by carping criticism of our allies. He was always on the lookout for the source, within his own organization, of anti-British propaganda and woe to the officer found guilty of spreading anti-British gossip. As for himself, he used to speak with affectionate respect of Field Marshal Sir John Dill and Admiral Sir Andrew Cunningham because of the spirit as well as the efficiency of their team play.

The general also has a high respect for Harry Hopkins. Hopkins seems to have had an almost unique ability to talk turkey to Mr. Churchill and get away with it without disadvantage to himself or to his cause. There are some who believe that Marshall was Hopkins' choice as Chief of Staff even before he was the President's.

The British wanted Marshall as supreme commander. They wanted him to lead the north African and the European invasions. The decision apparently was reached, at one time, that he would go to London as supreme commander. Secretary Stimson favored it, but three Senators—AUSTIN, of Vermont, BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and GURNEY, of South Dakota—called on the Secretary to warn him that if Marshall left Washington there would be trouble in the Senate. They trusted Marshall and were skeptical as to his successor, whoever that might be. As for General Marshall's own desires—they never became known. Marshall could never have been as useful elsewhere as he was in running the war from Washington. No one in the Army could match his prestige, his ability to get along with the President and Congress and no one possessed his own knowledge of what we had in the Army and what we had to do with it. Nor has any Chief of Staff gotten along with the Navy as Marshall did, according to the opinion of some of those who ought to know.

General Marshall became Chief of Staff on September 1, 1939, the day the Germans rolled into Poland. The mere circumstance of survival in that post from the beginning to the end of the war would mark him as a great Chief of Staff. What makes him our greatest Chief of Staff and a great man is not that he survived, but that he was the dynamic force behind the training, equipping, and deployment on history's most far-flung fronts of the greatest Army in the world.

There are those in the Army who may criticize Marshall for mistakes they think he made, and there may be those who dislike him intensely. He was ruthless in getting rid of incompetent and over-age officers in rebuilding the Army for war, and broken hearts do not quickly mend. But one does not hear people in the Army speak disrespectfully of him, or attribute to him ulterior motives.

The men at the Pentagon think of him as an ideal boss. He does not fumble in instructions, is quick and positive in his decisions and possesses a detailed knowledge of what is going on. He does not put up with ineptitude. One associate said that no officer ever calls on the Chief of Staff to "build himself up," for the general can spot a four-flusher before he has begun to talk—a fact well known in the Army. His office, therefore, is never overrun by visitors. It is a quiet, calm sort of place. He delegates authority, and if it is misplaced, he tries somebody else. General Devers once said that Marshall gave him no instructions in making him commander of the armored forces early in the war—merely told him to take charge. The ability thus to delegate command is the

keystone of successful military-staff organization. It fails when authority is unwisely delegated. In such cases General Marshall gets somebody else. He was once asked if the President interfered with his running the Army. General Marshall answered that he, the Chief of Staff, made the selections for high command, and that if his selections were wrong, it was his fault alone.

He is soft spoken and conversational in his suggestions, and he prefers to suggest rather than to direct how things are to be done. He has that quality which marks a gentleman, never being intentionally rude. Somebody brought a story back to Washington that he had seen, with his own eyes, a message from General Marshall to General MacArthur which read: "Talk less and do more." The story was so positively told that a newspaperman asked Admiral Leahy if he thought it were true. Admiral Leahy said that Marshall would never send a message like that to anybody, much less to MacArthur. When Admiral Leahy, at the newspaperman's request, asked Marshall about it, the general laughed it off. Having served under MacArthur—whose abilities he respects—it is difficult for him not to regard MacArthur as a senior officer. General Eisenhower, of course, is one of his own boys. General Marshall never ordered MacArthur to do anything. Instructions to MacArthur from Washington went through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The same channels were used for instructions to Eisenhower, but General Marshall would supplement them, in the case of Eisenhower, with personal messages of his own. A member of Marshall's staff described Eisenhower's sentiments toward the Chief of Staff as those of a son to his father.

General Marshall is curiously sensitive to criticism of the Army, especially that type of criticism which indicates that the War Department does not know what it is doing. He contends that the War Department has put a lot more time and study into policies than the critics, which probably is true. His sensitiveness, however, is one reason for his promptness to initiate investigation of the cause for criticism, although he does not always think it worth while to correct a public impression based on incorrect statement of fact. Unless it is important, he is inclined to silence rather than explanation.

Only once has the general gotten himself involved in a public row, and that was when an "eminent American figure" (one of the terms employed to describe the anonymous spokesman) cut loose early in January of 1944 with sharp words to the effect that it was a damnable outrage against the people of the United States that the United States Army had been ordered to take over the railroads in the middle of a war. Those who heard the remark also witnessed a wholesomely genuine demonstration of righteous indignation.

But the point overlooked, in the uproar which followed, was that the "eminent American figure" was not criticizing the potential strikers—although organized labor spokesmen were quick so to interpret it. The "eminent American figure" was condemning the spectacle of the Army's being ordered to take over the railroads and the interpretation of that spectacle abroad. The incident was phenomenal, in that the "eminent American figure," though thinly clothed in anonymity, was generally identified as Marshall, and Marshall's words carried such weight that mere suggestion of their source made the statement a bombshell.

General Marshall never did admit that he was the "eminent American figure" and I am not saying he was.

Driving back from Leesburg one Sunday evening, General Marshall had to stop for gas. The filling station was crowded and there was some delay before the general, driving his own car and wearing civilian clothes, got near the pump. The car ahead delayed things further. It was occupied by two privates and their girl friends and they were having a lot of fun, deciding to fill themselves with soft drinks while the gas was going into the tank. After getting their gas the soldiers kept right on drinking cokes, holding up the Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

The Chief of Staff thereupon got out and respectfully asked the soldiers if they would mind moving to one side, so he could get some gas.

"Keep your shirt on, buddy," one of the soldiers replied—and kept on having a good time.

Whereupon the Chief of Staff of the United States Army retired meekly to his car and sat there, "keeping his shirt on" until the privates went on their way.

In addition to his statesmanship and his military genius, General Marshall's place in history is all the more secure because of his added ability, under the enormous pressures of the past 4 years, to "keep his shirt on."

Address by Clerk, Superior Civil Court, Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the Superior Civil Court, Boston, Mass., to the Knights of St. Finbar, at Cypress Hall, Cambridge, Mass., on Sunday, September 16, 1945:

It was interesting to read in a recent British publication of the amazing contribution made by Eire to the Allied cause. Although Eire, during the entire course of the war, maintained a strict neutrality, her citizens—always lovers of freedom and liberty—enlisted by the hundreds of thousands to fight for the United Nations. Eire was harpooned quite a little by some vicious propaganda during the war, but propaganda cannot defeat the actual record of what the sons of Eire accomplished. Up to November 1944 volunteers from Eire serving with the British forces had won 314 decorations for bravery. These included seven Victoria Crosses, and it must be remembered that this is the highest award given by the English Government and corresponds to our own Congressional Medal of Honor, won by:

Capt. Edward Stephen Fogarty Fegen, R. N., Ballinunty, County Tipperary, who in 1940 saved a convoy by attacking an enemy cruiser with his ship, the armed merchantman *Jervis Bay*. He went down with his ship. He was the third Irishman to win the Victoria Cross in this war.

Lt. Comdr. Eugene Esmonde, D. S. O., Drominagh, Lough Derg, killed in action in 1942 when challenging hopeless odds to attack the German battle cruisers *Scharnhorst, Gneisenau,* and the cruiser *Prinz Eugen*.

Maj. Harold Marcus Ervine-Andrews, East Lancs. Regiment. County Wexford. One of the first two Army Victoria Crosses of the war. Dunkerque, May 1940.

Capt. J. J. B. Jackman, Northumberland Fusiliers. Dun Laoghaire. El Duda, November 1941. Killed in action.

Lance Corp. John Patrick Keneally, Irish Guards. Tipperary. Tunisia 1943.

Pvt. Richard Kelliher, Australian military forces. Ballybeggan, Tralee. New Guinea, September 1943.

Flying Officer Donald Edward Garland, awarded the first Victoria Cross in the Royal Air Force. He was born at Ballinacor, Wicklow. France, June 1940.

Other decorations given to Irishmen in this war while serving in the British armed forces were: 1 George Cross, 5 Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire, 1 Commander of the Order of the British Empire, 30 Distinguished Service Order, 29 Officer of the Order of the British Empire, 15 Member of the Order of the British Empire, 2 Associate of the Royal Red Cross (first class), 5 Distinguished Service Cross, 41 Military Cross, 54 Distinguished Flying Cross, 9 Air Force Cross, 1 Associate of the Royal Red Cross (second class), 9 Distinguished Conduct Medal, 2 Conspicuous Gallantry Medal, 16 George Medal, 4 Distinguished Service Medal, 42 Military Medal, 27 Distinguished Flying Medal, 10 British Empire Medal, 2 Commended, 1 Norwegian Military Cross and Sword of King Haakon, and 1 Greek War Cross.

This courageous and remarkable record should merit the approval of all fair-minded people and should entitle Eire to a place as a United Nation—not a partitioned one. If we are sincere in advocating freedom, liberty, and justice for all nations, large or small, Eire's plight should have our complete sympathy.

It must be remembered that Eire paid dearly for the freedom she now enjoys and the fact that England divided Ireland was the worst blow she could have given to that freedom-loving nation. It should also be remembered, after reading the foregoing brilliant record of the sons of Eire in this war, that there was no conscription in Northern Ireland, even though they are loyal subjects of England's crown, nor was one Victoria Cross given to a North of Ireland man. This is one of the most paradoxical set of facts on record. The South of Ireland contributed so much, even though she was strictly neutral, to the cause of the United Nations and all she has received to date in recognition has been abuse and harpooning.

Now the guns have been silenced all over the world and the paramount question is, "What is the best way for us to keep the peace?" One fundamental thing to remember is that the Golden Rule is still the basic principle in diplomacy. Eire should have earned our respect and gratitude for her contributions to our cause. We owe them the right to stand before the world as a United Nation. Her partition by England will always be a black stain on history's page and it is up to England now to rectify that wrong if she is sincere about liberty, freedom, and justice for all.

Futures System Paced Advances Made by Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under previous permission given me to extend my remarks, I desire to call the attention of Members of the House to an article on the Futures Contract system written by C. T. Revere, of Laird, Bissell & Meeds, for the New York Journal of Commerce.

It follows:

FUTURES SYSTEM PACED ADVANCES MADE BY INDUSTRY—PRICE PROTECTION FOUND BETTER THAN SUPPORT OF GOVERNMENT

(By C. T. Revere, of Laird, Bissell & Meeds, New York)

Among the outstanding achievements of the last hundred years or so may be placed the adoption and development of the futures-contract system. On account of the problems it has aided in solving, its contribution to a free market economy, its utility in promoting relative price stability, it deserves a rating which never has been adequately recognized.

When one realizes that it has made these contributions with no sacrifice of individual freedom and has imposed no direct burden on Government or taxpayer, it may be credited with having rendered to society a service for which it would be difficult to find an equivalent. The exchange could be effected with a minimum of friction and succeed in taking the output of the producer and the passage of his output to the processor in relatively simple fashion. The middleman would play but a minor part in these exchanges.

TECHNOLOGICAL IMPROVEMENTS

However, with the dawn of the industrial revolution, with its expansion in the demand for food and raw materials, new and complicated conditions had to be faced. Among the factors responsible in cotton for the appearance of these complexities were the invention of the Whitney gin, budding technology, industrial growth, and food coming from more distant areas and in larger quantities. The simple methods of the past no longer sufficed to meet the more complex requirements. In the rapidly developing industrial communities, labor left the farms and migrated to towns and cities. Subsistence needs no longer could be met from local supplies, and as time went on food had to be obtained from more distant localities, gradually expanding to such volume that importations even from other countries became imperative.

In brief, as a result of the industrial revolution, the entire world economy underwent an amazing transformation. With the urbanizing, as well as the suburbanizing, of crop-producing fields, domestic agriculture no longer could provide sufficient food for the expanding industrial centers. It became necessary to seek sources of supply from increasingly distant areas, many of them overseas. The unprecedented growth in population intensified the gravity of the subsistence program.

Constantly broadening markets, the inevitable consequence of cheaper goods produced by the ever-improving mechanical equipment, made a clamorous call for the raw materials of manufacture. Almost insatiable requirements demanded volume supply, not only to meet current needs, but also to cover forward requirements which far-sighted industrialists quickly learned to incorporate in new productive profit policies. Then came the imperative corollary—the quest for new and larger sources of supply, and as history records often far afield, reaching out over continents and seas.

WHITNEY GIN SOLVES PROBLEM

Fortunately, owing to agricultural progress in the less industrialized parts of the world, it was possible to respond to this avid demand. The boundless acreage of the North American continent, Argentina, and Australia, together with India, Russia, and other countries promised a solution of the food problem. The Whitney saw gin and the expansion of the cotton growing industry in the American South gave guaranty that textile needs for that fiber would be adequately met.

Synchronizing with this miraculous, dovetailed progress came railroads, oceangoing steamships, the telegraph, cables linking hemispheres, all providing not only transportation and distribution of a vast tonnage, but serving commercial centers with lightninglike diffusion of essential information. What an amazing achievement. Almost it would seem the industrial and commercial world had rounded out a millennial cycle.

But here at this stage the risk problem raised its ugly head. Shot through and through with such multifold complexities, it soon revealed itself as an economic hydra. The flourishing industrial districts of Europe—Lancashire and Nottingham, Essen and Chemnitz and Munich, Roubaix and Tourcoing—discovered that their breadbaskets as well as their sources of material supplies were in distant lands. Mere prudence demanded forward provision for future needs. Business no longer was done on the spot. Time had entered the picture to plague Old World populations.

RISKS IN PRICE CHANGES

The merchants who bought wheat from the western farmers, or cotton from the southern grower, were faced by serious financial hazards, due to price changes in the period elapsing from the date of their purchases and their sales to importers or processing consumers. In sum, merchants confronted by such risk, as a result of price changes, found out that their very existence depended on devising a method of insurance against these hazards.

The task of devising a system to cope with these price changes had loomed before the merchant community for many years almost subconsciously, and with increasing anxiety it was recognized that the problem of insurance against these price risks must be met and solved. Planned economy offered no remedy for several reasons. In the first place, it had been tried in the past and found wanting. It is true that government could have stepped in and assumed the risk which merchants were unwilling, and in fact unable, to meet. Government previously had had a rather unsatisfactory experience, as witness the cases of Diecletian and latterly the break-down of Colbert's program in the reign of Louis XIV. In other words, there was still a modicum of financial caution among governments in this particular period.

They had not yet developed the miracle of deficit financing and still suffered from timidity. The specter of national insolvency resulting from paternalistic ventures may have acted as a deterrent to embarking on uncontrolled expenditures.

As a matter of fact, it was not until we discovered in World War I and World War II that such tremors represented merely the silly misgivings of timid and unprogressive souls. Prior to those days, such expedients as high protective loans and "buy programs" running into astronomical figures, would have been construed as lunatic extravagances. People had not yet learned that hundreds of billions of debt are but fly-specks on government financial ledgers, nor had they been educated up to the consolation of avoiding worry on such fiscal trivialities, for we owe it to ourselves, don't we?

So, we tried to work out our problem of price protection the hard way, and it took us a long time to do it. Too bad we didn't know any better, but we had not yet made the acquaintance of such financial geniuses as Lord Keynes, Professor Hansen, Professor Laski, et al, which includes a host of American acolytes.

We foolishly undertook the gigantic and puzzling task of trying to devise a system that would provide insurance against price changes. None of our previous experience with insurance offered the slightest clue for developing a method that would furnish such protection. No capital group, skilled in dealing with risks, would entertain for one moment the underwriting of a contract providing protection against price changes. In other types of insurance, it might be said that underwriters are dealing with factors relatively stable, and, one might say, even static. In markets, however, there is constant motion—conflicting factors and almost unpredictable contingencies.

ECONOMIC PRICE PROTECTION

As the search progressed, the merchant fraternity was forced to the conviction that its problem was not mathematical, as in the case of other forms of insurance, but largely economic, tinged with the element of human behaviorism.

Space limitations will not permit a detailed recital of the steps leading up to the development of the Futures Contract System. At all times it should be borne in mind that the objective of these efforts was not the invention of a speculative contrivance, but the working out of a system of insurance to avoid speculative risks. Speculation always had existed in some form or other, and in fact an attempt was made to run a corner in Liverpool in 1779, nearly a century before the New York Cotton Exchange was organized.

Time dealings of a crude character had their early beginning about 200 years ago. In the latter part of the eighteenth century it became the practice to sell for "forward delivery." These transactions called merely for delivery of a particular lot of goods, based on submitted samples, or having reference to an accepted standard. Early in the nineteeth century came sales of cotton "in transit" or "to arrive." In each case the seller sold something not in his possession, but which he felt he had reason to believe he could deliver.

GRADING SYSTEM INSTITUTE

With the adoption of the warrant system came another forward step. It was thus possible to transfer ownership of a commodity without involving a transfer of the commodity itself. This facilitated advances of capital and otherwise stimulated trade by making transactions less cumbersome. When the warrant system was applied to the metals market, the time contract began to approach a modern basis. Along with this, a grading system was instituted and the warrants, instead of calling for delivery of specific lots of metal, merely became transferable orders for a given amount of metal of stated grade.

About 1850, the practice of dealing in elevator receipts in Chicago had attained considerable volume. The elevators issued receipts showing the grade and quantity of grain which permitted the transfer of title when passed from hand to hand. Thus, after nearly two centuries of time dealings of one sort or another, the commercial world almost had evolved the modern type of futures contract. However, the scale of short selling for hedge protection was limited by the number of receipts obtainable—and indirectly by the amount of actual grain in storage.

The great problem finally was solved through the development of a set of standards to form the basis of the Futures Contract, and the term is used advisedly. It was a contract, a compact based on the confidence built up over ages of commercial dealing—the product of an ingrained conviction that free men live up to the obligations of a clearly stated agreement.

It might be said with affirmative finality that the Futures Contract was indeed a contract. It bore the guaranty of an organized commercial body, the Commodity Exchange. Its validity as an insurance safeguard was based not on mere actuarial experience, but on commercial honor—on faith in the proven integrity of private enterprise.

History has shown this faith never has been misplaced. The contract—say a hedge sale of bushels of wheat or bales of cotton—is just as sound an equity as the grain or cotton itself.

It is doubtful if such confidence can be reposed in the obligations of Government. Even now people are wondering what will be done about our staggering burden of debt. Will it rise to such proportions as to call for repudiation as has been unblushingly

suggested by some of the very politicians who assisted in piling up this burden, or will it shamelessly take the form of currency debasement?

This is the chief reason why the futures contract offers a firmer basis for price insurance and price protection than "buy programs," subsidies or other forms of Government intervention.

Monsignor Ryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, several days ago there died in the State of Minnesota one of the finest proponents of the American way of life who has ever lived. He was Monsignor John Augustine Ryan.

For many years Monsignor Ryan carried out in an orderly way a revolution similar to the political and military revolution inspired by Washington and the other American heroes of 1776. He understood the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and the effect of those documents on the coming generations of Americans.

Since his death much has been written about Monsignor Ryan. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Monsignor Ryan before the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor dealing with the consideration of Senate bill 2048, prohibiting discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. It was my good fortune to be chairman of that subcommittee.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and appearing in the American magazine for October 1945. The article is entitled "The Nazis Aren't Licked Yet," and it deals with matters which were close to the heart of Monsignor Ryan.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Monsignor Ryan," published in the Washington Post of Wednesday, September 19, 1945.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARINGS BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, UNITED STATES SENATE, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, ON S. 2048, A BILL TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF RACE, CREED, COLOR, NATIONAL ORIGIN, OR ANCESTRY

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C., August 31, 1944.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, in room 357, Senate Office Building, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators CHAVEZ and AIKEN.

Senator CHAVEZ. The committee will come to order. Monsignor Ryan.

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D., NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PERMANENT FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Senator CHAVEZ. Monsignor, I believe we sent you an invitation to appear before the committee to express your views on the pending legislation which is for a permanent FEPC.

Right Reverend RYAN. Yes.

Senator CHAVEZ. Will you kindly identify yourself for the record and then make your statement?

Right Reverend RYAN. I am Rt. Rev. John A. Ryan, D. D., professor of political science of Trinity College, and social ethics of the National Catholic School of Social Service, and I am representing the National Council for Permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

Senator CHAVEZ. Thank you. You may make your statement to the committee.

Right Reverend RYAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for the last 42 years, I have taught the principles and rules of morality to various groups of students, comprising priests, seminarians, nuns, laymen, and laywomen. It is from that point of view, the point of view of moral right and moral wrong, that I wish to advocate briefly the enactment of the bill which is the subject of this hearing.

Among the grievances suffered by certain minorities in our population the most grave and the most fundamental are those which we call economic. There are many occupations from which the Negro is excluded because of the color of his skin. Sometimes the offender is the employer, sometimes it is the employees. When an employer refuses to hire Negroes because he dislikes to have them in his presence or to come into constant contact with them, his reason is clearly racial, or if you prefer, psychological. When an employer excludes all Negroes because he has found some of them unreliable, his motive is economic, but he acts unfairly when he penalizes a whole group on account of the faults of individuals. When he refuses to employ Negroes because his white employees will not work beside them, his motive is economic, and in the circumstances it may be excusable. When his refusal is dictated by the assumption that Negroes should be kept in menial occupations, his conduct is uncharitable and contemptible.

In all these cases, the human dignity of the Negro is outraged and the virtues of justice or charity, or both, are violated. The Negro worker is not treated as a man possessing a natural right to reasonable intercourse with his fellows, nor as a brother having the same needs and claims as the white employer and the white employee.

Sometimes the Negro is excluded from certain occupations by the rules and practices of labor unions. This is even more reprehensible than exclusion by employers; for the wage earners have themselves been the victims of oppression by stronger economic classes. It must be noted, however, that the majority of those unions which refuse to admit Negroes are moved, not by racial prejudices, but by practical economics. The unions desire to keep the jobs for their own members or for their relatives and friends. This is clearly illustrated in the case of the 2,400 Negro firemen in the South who, through an agreement between the railroad managers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, have been denied promotion to the position of engine drivers.

Even the economic motive does not justify the exclusion of Negroes from employment. Job scarcity should be dealt with in some other way than through the exclusion of a whole class. The sooner the unions discard this practice, the sooner will they bring about a rational and ethical solution of this very real difficulty. My conclusion, then, is that those discriminations by the unions are nearly always against charity and frequently against justice.

The most recent and one of the most flagrant instances of job discrimination was perpetrated a few weeks ago on the lines of the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Co. Practically all the employees of that concern went out on strike against the promotion of less than 10 Negro employees to the position of motormen on the busses and streetcars. It was particularly flagrant because it deprived several hundred thousand citizens of transportation and prevented the production of an enormous amout of vital war materials. Apparently the responsibility for the strike was shared in a secondary degree by the officials of the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Co.

In passing I should like to bring to your attention a historical event that I think contains a lesson in this whole situation of racial and other intolerances, when 100 years ago, in the same city of Philadelphia, there occurred a much more deadly and devastating race conflict than the one that occurred in Philadelphia a few weeks ago. That conflict was carried on not against the Negroes but Irish Catholics. In the course of the rioting at least one Catholic Church and several Catholic convents were burned. Now, it is not certain but it may well be that two of the leaders of the recent strike, bearing distinctive Irish names, are descendants of persons, Irish Catholics, who suffered in that rioting in Philadelphia a century ago. At any rate, the thing contains a lesson, I think, for us in regard to all racial or other discriminations and intolerances.

Senator CHAVEZ. May I interrupt, Monsignor Ryan? What is to me extremely confusing is that people who have suffered intolerance do not themselves become tolerant. I am not saying that this is true in regard to all of them, but we all know that throughout the years the people of Ireland have suffered from intolerance, and many persons of Irish extraction left Ireland to come to the United States in order to get away from that intolerance, and I cannot understand why one who has suffered, or whose people have suffered intolerance, should come to the United States, accept the privileges that are afforded them here, and then practice intolerance themselves.

Right Reverend RYAN. Unfortunately, Senator, that seems to be human nature. It is manifested not only by the Irish who have come to this country, as you say, and have become intolerant to others, but that is manifested by the Czechs with regard to the Slovaks, and by the Poles with regard to the Lithuanians. It seems there is in all of us a strong sense of what a distinguished British economist, John A. Hobson, characterized many years ago as the "passion for distinction." If you haven't distinction generally in the community, you can find some group over which you can lord and you have that distinction.

Senator AIKEN. Monsignor Ryan, are you familiar enough with the Philadelphia situation to know whether the promotion of the 8 or 10 Negroes at this time was necessary to the orderly operation of the transit company's business or not?

Right Reverend RYAN. I think that is a matter of relative unimportance. The company did want more motormen and it was going to upgrade these men who were already employees in other capacities of the company, upgrade them to the position of motorman.

Senator AIKEN. I notice you do not hold the transit company wholly without blame in this matter.

Right Reverend RYAN. No.

Senator AIKEN. I was wondering whether the transit company promoted these Negroes

at this time, realizing that it would precipitate the labor crisis.

Right Reverend RYAN. I do not know. I should not like to say that. The immediate factor there was the order of the Persident's Fair Employment Practice Committee to the company to upgrade these men, to put them in the position of motorman.

Senator AIKEN. How would the company be partly to blame for the situation then?

Right Reverend RYAN. I said apparently, and the grand jury probably will report on that when it reports, but the reason for that assumption is that the company did not make very great effort to settle the strike, or certainly not to put other persons in the positions of the strikers, and it did provide the facilities in the barns, light, and so on, for the meetings of the strikers.

Senator AIKEN. The company had previously refused or neglected to advance Negroes?

Right Reverend RYAN. Well, it had not been doing it. I suppose it was the custom, as it is in many other places.

In passing, I should like to note that the street railways in Los Angeles only a few days ago decided to follow the directive, if that is what it is called, of the Fair Employment Practices Committee and employ Negroes as motormen. So that something has been done, but there is a lesson in this Philadelphia thing of 100 years ago. I heard that lesson drawn something over 50 years ago in a debate between a distinguished citizen of my own State, Ignacius Donnelly, and a Mr. Sims, who represented the A. P. A. The debate was over A. P. A. Donnelly, the man I am speaking of, was born in Philadelphia, he was brought up there, and he said to Sims at one debate, "I stood on the roof of my mother's house in Philadelphia and saw the sky red with the flames of burning Catholic churches and convents. No, Mr. Sims," he said, turning to Sims, "we don't want a revival of this religious prejudice."

Well, we can have the same things happening on account of economic discriminations, and this economic discrimination was prominent in the Philadelphia religious riot. The persons who started the rioting feared that these "ignorant Irish"—that is the way they looked upon them—would take their places in the economic scheme.

Senator AIKEN. Monsignor Ryan, do you anticipate that the condition will be aggravated as unemployment increases?

Right Rev. RYAN. Oh, I think there is no doubt about that.

Such discrimination, whether practiced by employees or by employers, is definitely immoral. It is immoral because it violates the moral precepts of charity and justice. The precept of charity is expressed in the command: "Thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself." This injunction is a part of the moral law of nature; it was proclaimed by God Himself to the ancient Hebrews; it was reaffirmed and perfected by Christ for all mankind. According to the teaching of Christ, the neighbor, whom we are commanded to love, comprises the whole human race. However, this precept does not bid us love the neighbor as much as we love ourselves. It commands us to love him in the same way as we love ourselves, as a fellow human being who possessed the same nature and needs; to love him as a person who has intrinsic worth, as a person who is our equal because, like us, he possesses an immortal soul. This is true of every human being, be his skin white, black, brown, yellow, or any combination or mixture of these colors.

The Christian precept of brotherly love is not satisfied by mere well-wishing, nor benevolent emotion, nor sentimental yearning. It requires action, action which assists the neighbor who is in need. Now, the need of a job or of a better job is as great in the case of a Negro or a Mexican as it is in the case of a white American. By the precept of brotherly love the white American is morally obliged to assist Negroes or Mexicans or any other minority group to get employment whenever he can do so without unreasonable or disproportionate inconvenience. That is, this obligation arises whenever there is a reasonable proportion between the need of the employee and the inconvenience, if any, that would be experienced by employer or fellow employees. Of course, no one is obliged to give up his own job to any other man, nor to provide him with employment at great personal sacrifice. Nothing of this sort is involved in the demand that the white employer or the white employee refrain from practices of discrimination; for the employer merely refrains from refusing to employ competent Negroes or Mexicans, while the employee merely works with them in the same shop or establishment. The inconvenience, or hardship, which this course would impose upon the former is so slight as to be negligible. The same man who sometimes refuses to hire Negroes in his store or factory willingly employs them in his kitchen and dining room. His discriminatory practices are entirely illogical. They are due to prejudice arising from irrational customs and traditions. In some cases the refusal of white employees to work beside Negroes derives from the same irrational and un-Christian prejudices. Insofar as their attitude arises from fear that Negroes will take their jobs, it is exaggerated or reflects a desire to maintain a selfish and unjust monopoly. This extends much further than the racial question. Unions have indulged in such practices. It is understandable, but we do not want a monopoly anywhere. In a word, neither employers nor employees are justified in practicing discrimination on the ground of disproportional or unreasonable inconvenience. Consequently, they violate the precept of charity or brotherly love. Their conduct is definitely immoral as if they committed theft or murder.

So much for the precept of charity. The economic discrimination of which I have been speaking is likewise contrary to the precept of justice. When God created the earth and commanded man to get a living therefrom by the "sweat of his brow," He did not exclude any race or group from either the benefits or the burdens of this arrangement. Hence every human being has a natural right of access to the bounty of Nature and the opportunity of getting a decent livelihood. This right is a necessary means to life and reasonable self-development. And it inheres equally in all the children of men. When, as is the case today, political and economic society is so organized that some men can enjoy this right only through contracts for the sale of their labor, then they have a right to obtain these contracts on reasonable terms. The employer who refuses such contracts to any group, when he could do so without unreasonable inconvenience to himself, definitely violates this right. The employee who refuses to work beside a member of any group, or excludes him from a labor union, likewise violates the right of his fellow men to access to the bounty of the earth on reasonable terms. As I have stated above, neither the employer nor the employee who discriminates against Negroes or Mexicans would suffer unreasonable or disproportionate inconvenience by refraining from such discrimination. When either of them is guilty of such conduct he violates not only charity but justice.

The foregoing argument may strike some of you as technical and metaphysical. It is that, but all moral arguments must ultimately rest upon such a foundation. While I do not belittle arguments which are drawn from the traditions associated with our Bill of Rights or from human sentiment or human sympathy, I maintain that the most solid and scientific arguments are those based upon the moral law.

The saddest feature of the situation is that the opposition to the pending bill derives, not from reason and knowledge, but from irrational custom, evil tradition, and palpable ignorance. It is asserted that the Negro "must be kept in his place," namely, in menial occupations and in a condition of servile dependence. This theory is based on the evil tradition which began in the days when the Negro was a human chattel. It has no warrant in either divine revelation or the law of Nature. The assertion that association with Negroes in work places would be distasteful and intolerable is refuted by the peaceful association of the two races in other relations of life; and by testimony before the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee to the effect that Negroes and whites do get along amicably together in many industrial establishments. Those who honestly maintain that the thing cannot be done are simply ignorant of the facts. They do not know what has been accomplished and they imagine difficulties that do not exist. Those who have had the experience of working with Negroes find that their previous fears and imaginings were without factual foundation.

The problem of white working side by side with Negroes is no more difficult than that involved in the association of the two races in the schoolroom. Some 10 years ago, I directed the members of my class in social ethics at the National Catholic School of Social Service to put down on paper their opinions concerning the proposed admission of Negro students to that institution. All the students of NCSSS are college graduates. A small minority of those who engaged in this exercise were unfavorable to the proposal, on the grounds that it was distasteful and would not work. A short time later Negro girls were admitted to the classes of NCSSS without any opposition or excitement on the part of the white students. If I were to assign a similar task to the students today, I doubt that even one of them would condemn the existing arrangement. For several years now, I have had three or more Negroes in my own class. I have seen white and Negro girls sitting side by side in the class room and associating in periods of recreation. There has been no friction, no tension, nor any avoidance nor attitude of superiority manifested by either group. Some of the Negro students are not Catholics. Yet the members of both races treat all their fellow students, without distinction of color according to the principles of Christianity, right reason, and genuine Americanism. There is no reason whatsoever why the same attitude and spirit should not prevail among members of the two races in the realm of industry.

Senator CHAVEZ. Monsignor Ryan, you have spoken of the divine right of the human, and you have spoken of several other rights that the human is entitled to, but, as I recall, you did not touch on the right under the law of the land.

Right Reverend RYAN. No.

Senator CHAVEZ. The Constituttion, as I recall it, does not differentiate as to who is an American when it comes to racial ancestry. It does not say that the American must be one whose ancestors came from England or Ireland or Mexico. It appears to me that the proposed legislation would be in keeping with the Constitution and the laws of the land.

Right Reverend RYAN. Oh, absolutely, but I do not think the Constitution, or the law of the land as now implemented, would cover this situation. May I say I read the bill with a great deal of interest and I think it is very ingenious, very well suited to obtain the ends sought, because it bases itself on the interestate commerce clause of the Constitution. That is clear.

Senator CHAVEZ. The Constitution defines certain rights, but those rights would have to be implemented by basic law.

Right Reverend RYAN. Surely.

Senator CHAVEZ. It was with that purpose in mind that the sponsors of the legislation drafted this bill.

Right Reverend RYAN. There is no doubt that the spirit of the Constitution and of general legislation throughout our history sponsors this kind of thing, but the definite implementation is wanting, and I think that is provided adequately in this bill.

Senator CHAVEZ. And it is also true that in times of emergency, a condition such as we are going through now, when the boys have to do some fighting either against the Japs, Germans, or any common enemy, this discrimination seems to fade away on the battlefield. Isn't that true, Monsignor?

Right Reverend RYAN. Oh, surely. I suppose those considerations are at the basis of the President's Fair Employment Practice Committee. You know better than I do that it has only limited authority, but that is what it is based upon, the emergency.

Senator CHAVEZ. I have a particular instance in mind. There lived in New Mexico a family by the name of Martinez. Due to circumstances they had to go to Colorado, to the beet fields. Well, the war came along, and John Martinez was one of the soldiers that landed at Attu, Aleutian Islands. He was killed. He was the first private to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor. But in the same State of Colorado his sister would be deprived of a job. He could be decorated or honored after he died, and the only decoration he has over his body is a white cross, but, nevertheless, through intolerance his sister would probably be deprived of even working in a restaurant. Those things do not seem to me to be American. Something should be done.

Right Reverend RYAN. Yes. Surprisingly few Americans realize the grievances suffered in this matter of job discrimination. That applies to a great many Mexicans and perhaps others of Spanish descent, and, as testified here yesterday, to Jews, but I confine myself mostly to Negroes. I remember at one of the first hearings by the Fair Employment Practice Committee, under the chairmanship of my friend and former pupil, Monsignor—now Bishop—Haas, a young man 18 or 19 years of age, who graduated from a high school in Nebraska, born in Nebraska, or at least born in the United States, testified that he could not get a job because he was a Mexican. Well, when Bill Jeffers, the president of the road, heard about that, he hit the ceiling. He said, "There will be no more of that on the Union Pacific Railroad," and it was on the Union Pacific Railroad that this man was seeking employment.

Senator CHAVEZ. There were several instances in connection with Irishmen on the same railroad, and I want to say right here that every time they came up the wrong has been rectified.

Do you have anything further today?

Right Reverend RYAN. Nothing further.

Senator CHAVEZ. Thank you.

[From the American Magazine of October 1945]

THE NAZIS AREN'T LICKED YET

(By Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America)

A few days ago my secretary called up a railroad ticket office to get me reservations from New York City to Washington.

"Is the bishop white or colored?" asked the clerk.

"White," she said. "Why do you ask?"

"Colored people," he explained, "can't ride in the parlor car."

When my secretary told me about it I simply said, "Well, all the Nazis haven't been licked yet. We've got them in America, too."

Now that Germany is destroyed and the vicious leaders of the Nazi Party dead or imprisoned, we contentedly imagine that nazism has perished from the face of the earth. I wish it were so.

But nazism is not merely a political philosophy or a system of government. It is a condition of the human heart, a state of mind. It is man's inhumanity to man masquerading in a brown or a black shirt, or even in the white collar of respectability. This state of mind breeds sin, bigotry, intolerance, selfishness, greed, cruelty, Godlessness. In Germany we saw nazism in full flower—a poisonous flower. We saw it in its organized form. In America we see only its little seedlings, here and there, unrecognized for what they are. Beware of them.

The man who excludes a Negro from any of the privileges of this democracy, who connives with a real-estate agent to exclude a Jew from a neighborhood, who sets up barriers against any human being because of his race or his creed, is a Nazi. He may cheer the returning troops, he may shout at the news reel when our guns blast a swastika from a German sports stadium, he may weep at the sight of Old Glory on the hill at Iwo Jima, but he is a Nazi just the same. He is an oppressor of peoples, an enemy of freedom, a bigot. He is laying the foundation for lynchings, riots, and the enslavement of his fellow man.

It was a limited thing, to begin with, in Germany—the persecution of a minority within the borders of one country. It ended with the attempted enslavement of virtually all the peoples on earth. The voice of that ticket agent on the telephone was just a whisper, a courteous inquiry for the protection of the respectability of the nice white people who ride parlor cars. A little whisper in the name of service: "Is the bishop white or colored?"

To me that voice was as loud as thunder, a noise vibrant with hate. Beware of it. You hear it in churches, in theaters, hotels, exclusive shops, clubs, and suburbs: "White or black? Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant?" That is Hitlerism, the voice of super race, religious intolerance, cruelty.

Some time ago, as a member of an arbitration panel of the War Labor Board, I was asked to help iron out a wage dispute between the employers and workers of a western mill. Before passing any judgment on the case I asked permission to visit the mill to appraise the human factors on the scene—find out what kind of men the employers were, how the workers lived, where their children went to school, the medical facilities, and so on. It was definitely a case for the workers; they were not receiving justice from their employer. And what made it worse was that the employer, who had been adamant in his neglect of the employees, hastened to assure me that he was a church member and a heavy contributor to the Methodist Church.

We have made great strides in this country toward political democracy. It is the freest land on earth. We have made some progress in late years toward economic democracy, too—a more liberal sharing of the abundance which our machines and workers are capable of producing. But we have a long way to go yet before we relieve the widespread poverty of our working people, improve housing, give security to the aged and incapacitated. That mill operator, like Hitler, was an enemy of economic democracy, an enemy of all good men who toil for us by the sweat of their brows.

No. The Nazis aren't all licked yet. They masquerade in Sunday-go-to-meeting coats as well as brown shirts.

I do not mean to imply by any means that all employers are guilty of hypocrisy and exploitation. American industry, even without the pressure of social legislation, has made a vast contribution to the wealth and comfort of the worker. In many cases the social enterprise of individual industrialists has provided a blueprint for progressive legislation in labor relationships. Nor do I suggest for a moment that organized workers themselves are faultless. Labor leaders or employers who exploit one another are both guilty of Hitlerism—of intolerance, coercion, group superiority. I do not care how hard they worked in their plants to defeat Germany; they are still keeping alive in this country the things they worked to destroy in the Reich.

I know the arguments against economic democracy which spring so easily from the lips of the rich and secure. "Out of economic struggle and suffering come strength and efficiency." But I do not know one of them who turns his children penniless upon the world to dig coal, hammer iron, clean streets, or sit hour upon hour in routine lever-pulling. Now and then one factory owner puts his son through various factory jobs "from the bottom up" to acquaint him with the plant, but the boy usually becomes a vice president the following year. But five thousand other men in the same plant stay at the bottom year after year, and will continue to do so as long as little Hitlers fail to repent of their sins and continue to wrest out the last drop of sweat from their workers for the lowest wage the Government forces them to pay. All too many employers pay the bare minimum wages, and this, in my judgment, is inadequate in most cases.

When I was in Germany recently, I met an army chaplain who, with the permission of the high command, had talked with 300 Germans in all walks of life. Some of them were army people, some civilians. Not one of the 300 had any personal sense of guilt for the atrocities committed by the Nazis—the torture camps, the rape of the neutral nations, the persecution of the Jews, the violation of the Geneva conventions, or the abrogation of treaties. The only regret they had was in losing the war. They saw nothing ethically wrong with Nazism. That, of course, is a characteristic of the Nazi—in Germany or America. He thinks he is right.

But how many citizens of the United States—a government of and by the people—have any sense of guilt for the evils and shortcomings of our own society, such as juvenile delinquency, race discrimination, bad housing, corrupt politics, religious intolerance; the momentous international decisions that are now being made and are yet to be made at the peace table? He who does not participate in the democracy does not believe in it. Like the Germans under Hitler, he is willing to let decisions be made elsewhere by others than himself. Apparently, he is willing for a group of leaders to take over and run his life for him.

Recently, on a tour of Europe as a representative of the General Commission on Army and Navy Chaplains, I talked with Pastor Martin Niemoller, German Confessional Church leader, after his liberation from 8 years of imprisonment in a Nazi concentration camp.

He spoke of the Nazi influence as "unhuman.". It first appeared in little ways, he said, until it seemed to pervade everything. "Then," he said, "it moved down upon us from above, a vast evil, dominant and hypnotic, until we were all in its control."

Why was it not stopped, to begin with, by men of good will? Too many of them winked at its little manifestations. Having winked once, it was easy to wink again. The acceptance of atrocity became a habit. That is why I relate nonparticipation in our society and government to the rise of Nazism in Germany. The man who devotes himself to his own selfish pursuits and ignores the community in which he lives invites disaster. He is the stuff from which Hitlerism is spun.

Every American, I believe, must take an active and personal interest in his society. He must have a personal sense of guilt for its failures; a personal pride in its good works. If nazism can come down upon a vast society

like an evil, all-permeating odor, so can goodness come down.

A few years ago when I was bishop of a western area of our church, the actors Lynn Fontanne and Alfred Lunt came to the city in which I lived to play Robert Sherwood's stirring indictment of war, Idiot's Delight. The mayor of the city arbitrarily decided it shouldn't be played. He thought some of the lines were too pungent for our community, and he didn't like the tone of the play, anyhow. So he banished it, the consensus of enlightened American opinion to the contrary notwithstanding.

I was incensed. I saw in the mayor's high-handed gesture not merely the censorship of a play, but an autocratic encroachment upon free speech and free press, an attack upon the freedom of our people.

I wrote a letter to the local papers denouncing the mayor's unwarranted act and suggested facetiously that his theme song well might be, "Every little damn-a must be taken from our drama." It wasn't a very good line, but it did its work well. Such a storm of protest was raised by the public that the mayor was forced to compromise. He said he would consider letting the play go on if Mr. and Mrs. Lunt would read him the script. They graciously consented, and the mayor spent a delightful hour with them.

He admitted the play wasn't so bad, after all. "If you'll strike out two words," he said, "you can put it on."

Lunt hardened. "Not one word," he said. "All or none."

That, to me, was a historic line. Freedom is like that—all or none. Grant anyone in this Nation one word or two words in attempts to dictate thought and expression, and you may end up granting the right to force a Mein Kampf down your throat, to burn the Bible and burn your histories. Let them tell you what plays to see, what books to read, and they will tell you where to work, how much to work for, whom to vote for, and whether you can walk the streets or sit in a concentration camp.

One of the churches in my area was dominated by the Ku Klux Klan some time ago. The Klan is nothing but a brown-shirt organization—a band of Nazis attempting to force their will upon a democracy. They are against freedom of worship and believe fanatically in race superiority. In the past they have been torturers and killers. To this one of my churches they had given a stained-glass window. The sight of it rankled. I wondered, every time I saw it, whether I as bishop had power enough to force them to remove that window. It was like a profanation. And then it occurred to me that the arbitrary exercise of my will against a community would be dictatorship.

What was the answer, then? Enlightenment, the changing of their hearts, repentance. All of the law and all of the force in the world will not change the human heart. That is where nazism dwells; that is where goodness dwells—in the heart where only God's law can reach. We can't defeat the Nazis in Germany by enslaving them at the point of a gun. We can lick them only by educating them, even if it takes a generation, of stern occupation by our armies.

But in victory, with the evangelism of the conquered nations on our minds, there is always the danger of complacency here at home. One cannot save a Nazi or a Japanese Fascist as long as his own heart is tinged with Hitlerism. We have laws against crime; these laws are enforced by policemen with guns. But there is no statute against meanness. That is something which is obliterated by repentance, by devoting oneself to the service of others.

The pretense of service is not adequate. Much of Hitler's Mein Kampf seems to express the noblest of social ideals—honest toil, health, joy through strength, service of the community. So wickedness masks itself in the words of goodness.

Hitler's philosophy was utilitarian and reasonable. He placed efficiency above personality, the state above the citizen. A chaplain in Germany told me recently that he had interviewed a surgeon in charge of a large German hospital, where euthanasia was practiced. The surgeon was so convinced of the justice of his acts that he had no sense of guilt.

"When a patient is useless to society," he said, "why keep him alive? Of what worth is an old man who cannot work, a soldier without arms or legs? He consumes the food and energy of others. So we simply destroy him."

That makes sense. It is reasonable. But it isn't good. When man turns from his own feelings and hardens his heart against the sacredness of human life, reason may lead him on to the torture camp, the rape of peoples, the sly renunciation of all that is holy. Believe me, logic can destroy the world if once the heart is hardened.

Logic is one of the principal weapons of the Nazi. By logic an American can reconstrue freedom and bring untold suffering upon his fellow men.

When I was a preacher in California I knew a Greek immigrant who reveled in the freedom of America. For the first time in his life he was free to make a good living. He was proud of the Constitution, the Stars and Stripes, his citizenship. He fulfilled his freedom by converting several little picturesque cottages, each built for one family, into apartment houses. They were beautiful on the outside, but within they were dark and cramped, because he had partitioned the space of each into four apartments.

There was a serious housing shortage in the community and he had no difficulty in renting each apartment for $20 a month, which gave him $80 monthly each for cottages that ordinarily rented for $30.

That was his interpretation of freedom. That is the interpretation of many other Americans, who place "free enterprise" above the economic freedom of individuals. I believe in free enterprise, but not when it is dictated by little Hitlers. I believe in free enterprise in the service of free people.

While that Greek was exploiting his fellowmen, a pneumonic plague broke out in the community. Under such congested living conditions, the epidemic moved swiftly and fatally. It finally became so menacing that the directors of a neighborhood social-service school removed all the teachers. One refused to leave. Her name was Nora Sterry.

"But you must," the chairman said sternly. "You will die here."

"All right then," she said. "Then I shall die. But I will not leave. These are the people I serve and save."

Throughout that dreadful plague, she lived on at the school, working day and night nursing and feeding the sick.

Nora Sterry believed in the Constitution, too. She loved America, the people in it, the suffering people who came to it.

The Nazis in America or in Germany will never be licked until they stand in the presence of God, repentant and transformed, saying, "You have liberated me. I accept the freedom to serve."

[From the Washington Post of September 19, 1945]

MONSIGNOR RYAN

It was not so long ago that the name of Msgr. John Augustine Ryan, now dead at the age of 76, caused almost as many apprehensive shudders in certain privileged places as the names of Lenin and Trotsky. His clerical status was considered, even by many of his coreligionists, as the disguise of a fanatical and dangerous revolutionist, and it was probably a matter of much concern, but of no great surprise to them, when Dr. Ryan was denounced by Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling as one of the principal agents of communism in the United States. The great mystery was why the ecclesiastical authorities tolerated this radical cleric who was so constantly and tirelessly stirring up trouble among the workers by telling them they had been defrauded of their rights, who openly served on strike committees, and openly approved the child labor amendment, in plain defiance of the statement by this bishop or that theologian that such legislation would undermine the sanctity of the home.

The answer to this, of course, was that Dr. Ryan was himself a moral theologian of much repute and thoroughly orthodox. There was no real disagreement between himself and other ecclesiastics as to the moral principles involved in the conflict of capital and labor. The right of the workers to a larger share of the general wealth, and in the ownership of the tools of production, and to organize themselves for the attainment of these rights, had been set forth by Pope Leo XIII in the famous labor encyclical Rerum Novarum. The question was how such principles could be applied in a highly organized industrial society like that of the United States. Dr. Ryan's answer was that industry itself must be reorganized on democratic principles and that an end must be made of the system of "industrial feudalism" by which the economic life of the country had been governed since the Civil War.

Most of the reforms demanded by Dr. Ryan have now been accomplished, and most of the causes he had championed have been won. The most radical of them, the principle of the minimum wage, has been for some years incorporated into law. And while many besides Monsignor Ryan shared in the battle for these things, there is no doubt that his zeal, his special position, and his increasing influence on the thought of the leaders of his own church were the means overcoming many an obstacle. All in all, he was one of the most effective as well as one of the most energetic champions of labor ever to arise in the United States.

Prayers for a Just Wage for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial entitled "Prayers for a Just Wage for All," published in a recent issue of the Madison (Wis.) Capital-Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYERS FOR A JUST WAGE FOR ALL

(By J. J. H.)

Forty million persons throughout the world, of whom more than 6,000,000 are in the United States, every day during September make a prayer offering to God, the particular intention of which is for "adequate employment at a just wage for all."

Many months ago Pope Pius XII designated that to be the particular intention of the daily September offering of members of the Apostleship of Prayer.

The Apostleship of Prayer is a society within the Catholic Church to promote the practice of prayer for the mutual intention of

the members in union with the intercession of Christ. These petitions cover fields as broad as is possible to the minds of men, but each month there is included a particular intention designated by the Pope. The Pope's intention is always directed to some world-wide need for the spiritual welfare of individuals, of the Church, or of society. Frequently, as in the present month, such intention is concerned with economic or social conditions. In praying for full employment at an adequate wage, the Church has concern not only for individuals but for advancing the betterment of homes throughout the world.

No exact statistics are presently available as to the world membership of this society. However, according to the Catholic Encyclopedia, in 1907 there were 25,000,000 of whom 4,000,000 were in the United States and the 1945 National Catholic Almanac gives the present membership in this country as over 6,000,000 in 13,282 branches of society.

The Apostleship of Prayer issues a monthly magazine, the Messenger of the Sacred Heart, at Fordham University in New York. The September issue has an illuminating article descriptive of the special prayer intention for this month, and how deeply it is rooted in the thought and action of the Popes. This article was written by Rev. Ralph A. Gallagher, S. J., very well known in Wisconsin social welfare circles, as he is regent of the school of social work at Loyola University in Chicago. Following is Father Gallagher's article:

"Peace is founded on security, and the Intention for this month might well be termed the formula of economic security for all the people of the world. During this month of September, which here in the United States might well be termed the month of labor, we are to petition the Sacred Heart of the Laboring Christ that men throughout the world will be given the chance to exercise their God-given right of making a living and receive in return a just recompense.

"The economists of the world have gathered and consulted, and have proposed plans and formulas for full employment and a standard adequate wage. Many of the plans proposed are good. But today we must do more than just plan and propose and make prescriptions. We must storm heaven with our prayers, asking the just and merciful Son of God to move the hearts of men that the sound prescriptions of economic security proposed at international conferences soon become actualities.

"In the United States of America our proud boast is that we have won the war by production that meant full employment and at least a raise in the incomes of many. We must now, with the help of God, convert that machinery of war into producing the products of peace.

"Following in the example of his great predecessors, particularly Leo XIII and Pius XI, our present reigning pontiff has spoken out in defense of the working class. He knows their suffering and he knows their needs. He looks upon the shambles of Europe and of the Orient. Men and nations have united in destruction, and now they must unite to rebuild. The dawn of peace is breaking over the world, but the dark clouds of insecurity, poverty, and hatred are beginning to gather again. The holy father knows full well that peace without security is a mockery. The seeds of conflict founded on false philosophies and ideologies are sown in days of need and depression. Security for all must be our watchword. This security must be founded on justice and charity. The foundation of this security is economic stability.

"During the days of this war period we in the United States have seen the meaning of full employment and we have a better appreciation of the significance of a just and adequate wage. But what will tomorrow bring? The task of reconversion is gigantic. Some of our leaders are hopeful and optimistic, but many others are afraid. Unemployment, and the vicious circle of nonconsumption and consequent nonproduction, are more than possible. We who have lived through a depression and a war know the meaning of this—and let us remember that we, during these past 2 decades, have been the fortunate children of God when compared with the rest of the world.

"Certainly the Intention of our Holy Father, 'adequate employment at a just wage for all,' is timely. Through this statement he has sounded the call for cooperation. 'Men must forget differences in this great fundamental program of permanent security. The laboring man and the industrialist must pool their planning and their efforts. The state must stand behind, giving aid to both. Selfishness and greed on the part of nations or individuals must be outlawed. The all-bountiful God has given to His children a world in which there is more than enough for all. He leaves it to the ingenuity of His creatures to work out the just distribution of His gifts. In the economy of His Divine plan most men will be happy with sufficient work to do and an adequate income to care for themselves and their families.

"Both Leo XIII and Pius XI, in their memorable letters Quadragesimo Anno and Rerum Novarum, have outined the proof of man's right to work and also of man's right to a living wage. The archbishops and bishops of the United States in their statements have developed these proofs. The term 'adequate employment,' used by the Holy Father expressing the Intention for this month, can well be translated to mean full employment. This specifically means that all men be given an opportunity of doing the work they are best fitted to do and doing that work under the best conditions for their physical, social, moral, and spiritual security.

"Full employment does not mean a return to slave conditions of long hours in sweatshops or mines, or on communal farms. Full emplyment means a just distribution of the work to be done and a participation in that work by all who are capable. Man's dignity and freedom must be guaranteed and protected in any program of full employment. But at the same time, the weak or underprivileged must be protected from the rapaciousness of selfish men who make use of other men for their own gain. The just intervention of the state, sometimes as proponent and sometimes as umpire, will at times be demanded.

"With a world to rebuild and with millions to feed, clothe, and house, adequate employment is not only possible but it is necessary. There is more than enough to do, and men must work out a plan of doing it.

"Again, the pontiffs and the bishops have given to the world ample definitions on what is meant by a just wage. Today more than ever, Catholic economists and moralists are interested in the full meaning of a living wage. Particularly are they interested in that recompense which will provide not alone for a man, but for his family.

"It must provide security and happiness for the father and for his wife and children. 'A wage,' as Pope Pius XI has so well said, 'is not an alms but is something due in justice.' Again, men and nations must unite in establishing some common standard of living. The wage level of the Chinese coolie and the sharecropper in the United States must be taken into consideration. The Pope's idea is for a just wage for all.

"Let us, then, beseech the Son of God through the love of His sacred heart that He ask the Father to send again the Paraclete, the Spirit of Wisdom, to those who are engaged in working out the plans of security and peace of the world. Security and peace depend upon the cooperation of men with God and men among themselves. But this cooperation is also a personal thing. You and I must cooperate by our prayers."

Retirement of Col. Edwin N. Hardy, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND
OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 20 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Colonel Hardy Retires," published in the Bisbee (Ariz.) Daily Review of September 4, 1945. The editorial deals with the record of Col. Edwin N. Hardy, who is retiring from the United States Army after long and honorable service.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONEL HARDY RETIRES

Arizona people, and particularly those of us who live in Cochise County, want to say a word about Col. Edwin N. Hardy, Cavalry, United States Army, who has just relinquished command at Fort Huachuca, and who will soon retire after long and honorable service.

We are glad that Colonel Hardy is permitted to take retirement while he is hale and hearty and in position to enjoy the relaxations of civil life. He has earned that privilege more than the ordinary Army officer, because he has completed one of the most difficult assignments ever given an officer, and his record is a remarkable one. Command at Huachuca since Colonel Hardy came has required not only high executive ability but extraordinary diplomacy as well. Few men possess this rare combination—Colonel Hardy demonstrated the fact that he was among that few.

His administration of the expanded facilities at Huachuca was always firm but fair, and the Government will find no breath of scandal during his administration. His relationships with combat troops training at the post were always cordial and fully cooperative and he commanded not only the respect but the warm friendship of the general officers, the line officers, and the thousands of men who received their training at Huachuca. He is a soldier, well grounded in the duties and privileges of the American soldier. He is a leader and his leadership is respected. He is an executive and men of all ranks admire his abilities.

But Colonel Hardy's greatest accomplishment at Fort Huachuca was his ability to coordinate the efforts of men of the colored race with those soldiers and civilians of the white race. His problem was greater than that of any post commander; he met it with intelligence, tolerance, sympathy, and understanding. And during his long tenure of command there was no untoward incident, because misunderstanding was met squarely and solved promptly. His country owes him a debt of gratitude for his outstanding accomplishment. Fort Huachuca trained two combat divisions, one going to the Pacific and one to the European theater, as well as many other colored outfits of lesser size. During this training period there was no race trouble because Colonel Hardy met every potential promptly, and with fairness and understanding and a tremendous amount of personal attention settled every situation before it reached the trouble stage.

When the history of American accomplishment during World War II is written, that chapter devoted to the accomplishments of

the Negro soldier should contain glowing reference to the activities of this colonel of Cavalry, United States Army, whose efforts prevented misunderstandings and established well the position of the Negro in the armed forces of this country. Certainly Colonel Hardy is entitled to a major portion of the credit for this satisfactory status.

Arizona people are glad that Colonel Hardy will continue to live among us. Such citizens are sought and prized by this growing State.

Government Policies and the Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 20 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a young soldier, Mr. Herschel Laskowitz, of Fargo, N. Dak., one of the outstanding young men of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PANAMA, *Thursday, August 30, 1945.*

DEAR FOLKS: After my last letter you people back there should have little doubt as to where I stand on certain issues. Since last week, little has happened to in any way alter my position. I still stand suspended in midair and everything seems veiled in uncertainty.

If only the atmosphere would be cleared by a direct statement of policy one could settle back momentarily.

At this moment great historical events are taking place. Tokyo is being occupied for the first time in its history by a conquering army. An empire in Asia is no more. The erstwhile nightmare that stalked the Orient in the form of the Japanese Empire has been dissolved. It has actually been ground into the dust by virtue of scientific miracles.

All the magic ever dreamed of by the evilest of sorcerers has been exceeded. The dissolution of Hiroshima and Nagasaki should cause even the most phlegmatic to quake with an awareness of man's realized potential. The secret of the universe might be at hand—and no apparent means of checkmating it.

Still—we are confronted by the everyday mundane problems of finding jobs for ex-clerks, factory and mill workers, miners, farmers, school teachers, and small entrepreneurs. Ironical to put it mildly. Science can harness the very universe's energy, and sociological problems are no nearer solution than they were 10 years ago. Thus we hear that, rather than risk unemployment, we retain a good portion of an army (and all armies are dated as of the dawn of the atomic era). So, meanwhile, the workers in war industries get in on the ground floor of reconversion, i. e., the lads who made munitions, tanks, planes, ships, etc., will now have first crack at the job of making autos, radios, refrigerators, etc. Please deny the patent logic which strikes me so directly—if you will.

Then, we face the realization that men over 26 years old are to be spared induction into the service, which raises the query: What of the lads over that "crucial" age who have given several hazardous years' service already? Enlighten me, if you will, because I am frankly nonplussed.

(Radio news: Japanese occupation proceeding according to plan.) Japan has shown the impracticability of aggressive imperialism. Now what of imperialism generally? Are the espoused ideals to have only unilateral meaning? Do the Chinese get Hong Kong and Manchuria? By the way—China shall undoubtedly emerge as a great nation, united.

And so this war weary world is gradually settling back into the picayune atmosphere of formal peace. Trying days are ahead. We must implement the victory of arms with the institutions of cooperation. Potentially, the United States is the balance wheel in world relations. We assured the victory in the Orient singlehanded; (the aid of other nations was supplementary rather than essential) and still we renounce territorial ambitions; we cancel lend-lease obligations; which should cut off future bickering on the subject; we feed Europe; we patronize Latin America. It is the United States that offers the way out, and we shall show the way by being a strong friend alongside of our strong allies. The way will be very discouraging often, yet we have ventured so far that turning back can be disastrous.

Regardless of all the wondrous news of late, and to personalize everything, everything, is disconcerting. The personal element is being lost sight of in the shuffle and the astronomic figures being blithely bandied has reduced the individual to a Lilliputian status. He is virtually impotent in determining his fortune. Ruthlessly, stealthily the inroads of totalitarian thought have washed away at the banks of personal strength. Everybody on the outside looks anxiously to the Government, whereas the serviceman (that lost sight of anomaly within the fold of our great armed services) thinks—yes thinks differently. He will take a rest and then tear down the stars. He will carve out his own little destiny—which will encompass no more than his own just deserts. He will have a hand in his own security—and will spurn any effort to harness him unduly.

These are humorless times. The void shall be painful. The transition period of war to peace shall have its share of heartbreak and hardship. Some of the unsmiling shall have need of more than a little regeneration. I have seen some lads, with a smile on their lips, who have undertones of surly impatience and psychic restlessness. They are weary lads and in no mood to be trifled with. They are uprooted and know it full well. They also know that those roots torn loose once don't necessarily take fast to their former soil. They are torn, damaged roots. Some fellows see no further than their separation from the service, and don't care to, since they realize the uncertainty ahead.

The harvest of grim cynicism is yet to be reaped—yet reaped it will be—as the economic conflict becomes fact in the brave tomorrow. All will vie for the same jobs, and all will reasonably expect their re-creation. No one who has been through this wants to be a wage slave.

And so it goes—in the ever deverishlike circle—with its crazy centrifugal reasoning getting us nowhere. Freedom is the common goal—freedom at the earliest moment. It is the dream, the goal, the hope, the schemed of, the plotted for, the prayed for, the ultimate design. We must hasten it.

The shape of the personal present is plainly lousy. And the blackness of the moment leads to the blackness of the next moment, and so on. Where can it only lead? Introspection is an ugly habit, and I suppose that if there were a bandwagon to scramble on that would be the thing to do. But, the sum of all personal actions today seem so chaotic as the gigantic job hunt is about to be launched.

Well, don't get any notions of materialism or altruism from the preceding. This letter is just the sounding board of one disconsolate, brokendown might-have-been who would like to jostle that line and hasten that great hallelujah day when yours truly once again dons the mufti. Pending that hour and minute the gloom settles in by the second. Please spare any patience-urging bromides. They land like a shell in a swamp.

So, until the next time that I dare muster the raw gumption to tell the plain truth (this is but half-truth) please care for yourselves.

Love,

HERSCHEL.

The So-Called Efficiency of the Boston Navy Yard

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the deplorable conditions existing in the Boston Navy Yard.

Here is a large Naval Establishment with the good fortune to be located in that part of our country where the finest mechanical skill and knowledge abound and where shipbuilding and repair have flourished for generations.

Here, too, is the section which has furnished our Nation with its immortal sea captains, who carried our flag and our commerce to every port in the world. And here, also, in our own day and in the crisis now past, we have fresh evidence of this inborn greatness, for it was New England's shipyards that outstripped the world in the production of every type of vessel and warship afloat.

The men and women whose unremitting toil, by day and night amid the most trying conditions imaginable, made this record possible, should have our everlasting gratitude.

With the victory now ours, their work is done. Today they are anxious to return to their peacetime pursuits, and as quickly as reconversion will permit.

In their desire to do this, the employees of the Boston Navy Yard now find themselves the victims of favoritism and abuse; even war veterans are recipients of the same type of unfair treatment and it must be stopped.

Probably the greatest cause of complaint is the so-called efficiency-rating system. This system is administered almost wholly by supervisors without proven qualifications for their present positions, being purely temporary appointees for the war emergency. Normally, these would be replaced by appointments from a civil-service list established by open competitive examination.

The flood of protests which I receive from this quarter asks only for justice and fair play. These men and women earnestly desire to leave their present Government jobs in good standing and with no blot on their records. And in view of what they have done, we can do no less for them.

With this in mind, I urge that our Committee on Civil Service widen its probe. Let there be a full-scale investigation in this matter that the guilty may be punished. I ask also, that the present efficiency-rating system be abolished forthwith and that the Civil Service Commission provide an open competitive examination for all supervisory ratings.

Private Enterprise

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, the only reason the country would even do away with our system of private enterprise would be if it failed to give our people an opportunity to earn a high standard of living. So it seems to me that anyone interested at all in maintaining this system would likewise be anxious to help make the system work.

I am advocating the passage of H. R. 2202 and S. 380, which adopt a new policy for the Federal Government in studying the employment situation of the Nation, and making recommendations to Congress. This bill does not actually provide full employment, but it sets the machinery in motion that will provide it. It will still have to go through the hands of Congress.

I am surprised that the opponents of the bill are the very people who are usually the strongest supporters for private enterprise. Those who block full employment and make our system work inefficiently against our people will have to accept the responsibility when and if our people adopt some more radical form of economic system. They are the ones who will be to blame should we lose our present system. The true friends of our economic system are the ones who are advocating the passage of the full employment bill, and those who are trying to make our system work for the interests of all the people.

No, I do not contend that the country owes a man a living, but it does owe him an opportunity to earn a living. We cannot constantly adopt new and more efficient labor-saving machinery, and continue to forget the individual. Our technological efficiency has developed to such an extent in the last 45 years that we have increased a worker's output, or the production of a worker, 330 percent from 1900 to 1940; and since 1940 during the war it has increased much more rapidly.

Right now we should give more attention than usual to the problem of employment because of the reconversion probems. We must, in order to pay our war debt without noticing too much of a tax burden, keep our national income high. It is actually a legitimate part of our war effort and the war cost to get our people back on a normal basis. The key to prosperity is full employment.

The other day Colonel Menninger, noted Army psychiatrist, told the Banking and Currency Committee that unemployment "will directly contribute to making many veterans into confirmed invalids. If there were assurance of sustained employment opportunities for all, this possibility would be of less concern." With our boys streaming in daily from overseas, that statement deserves serious consideration.

Depressions are man-made, and prosperity is also man-made. It is just a matter of choice. The people want Congress to do something about it. They do not want another depression like that which followed the last war. God pity Congress if it lets the people down after they have won the war. The people will support Congress in this move. Let us show the people that Congress has the courage to accept its responsibility.

Establishment of a Welfare Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post printed an editorial on Tuesday, September 18, 1945, asking for the establishment of a Welfare Department. This editorial should be of interest to Members of Congress who are engaged in studying reorganization authority. It is particularly interesting to me as a member of the Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped.

Our committee is at this time seeking to compile an account of the Federal Government's activities which relate to the problems of the physically handicapped. I do not know what we shall finally conclude as a result of the study we are doing. I can tell you that we have already heard in person witnesses from 31 Federal agencies. We have asked for reports from 41 others. I do not wish to leave the impression that each of these agencies has as its main responsibility some health or social service activity. However, we have found that each of them is responsible for some functions which have a bearing upon the health and the welfare of some section of our population. I certainly do not wish to leave the impression that there are 72 agencies of the Government which would lend themselves to consolidation in one department. I think, however, that these simple facts do clearly indicate that there must be a centering of authority beyond any point we have yet reached. Even though these agencies may be found to be doing excellent and worth-while things, the confusion and unevenness of the result in the States and in local communities is inescapable.

It is my hope that our Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped will be ready with some suggestions to the Congress in the very near future. I believe we shall be.

The following editorial from the Washington Post emphasizes, I think, the necessity for the work our subcommittee is engaged in:

WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Promotion of the general welfare is set forth as one of the primary purposes of the United States Constitution. It is a purpose which can be effectively advanced in so highly integrated a society as our own only through cooperation between the Federal Government and agencies operating at the State and local community level. To discharge the Federal portion of this cooperation, we urgently need a reorganization of the scattered, overlapping Government bureaus concerned with education, health, welfare, recreation, social insuranc, and related services. The creation of a Federal Department of Welfare which would embrace them all has been recommended in a thoughtful report prepared for the Woman's Foundation by its committee on reorganization of community services.

The recommendation comes opportunely and fits in well with President Truman's expressed desire to concentrate responsibility for Federal functions in the hands of Cabinet officials. The varied social-service activities of the Government need coordination under the direction of a Secretary with full Cabinet status. And all such activities should be brought within his jurisdiction, just as all labor activities ought to be brought under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor. Although the committee report avoided specific recommendations as to the agencies to be merged and suggested appointment of a Presidential commission for the study of this problem, it seems clear that the proposed new department should include the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau of the Labor Department and the Social Security Board, the Public Health Service, and the Office of Education now in the Federal Security Administration.

"Social needs change as the social and economic framework changes," the committee report points out. "In a highly complex industrial society, the welfare of one segment of the population is inevitably bound up with the welfare of every other segment, just as one region of our country is dependent upon others. The war has made this increasingly clear as we think and act in unison." This is why social welfare must be looked upon and dealt with as a national problem. It is why community efforts must be guided and assisted from Washington.

The real job of promoting welfare, however, must be done in the communities themselves through local leadership and effort. A Federal department can and should provide financial aid, planning, administrative standards and research. But local leadership, enlisting the full resources of the community and the energies of private as well as public bodies, must carry forward the actual work of improving standards of health, education, recreation, and security. There is, as the committee report asserts, a challenge to be found "in building a new democracy and hence a new citizenship through volunteer efforts in cooperation with government."

Outstanding Labor-Management Record in the Great Miami Valley of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the President's Committee on Labor-Management Policies is beginning

to operate and when the Department of Labor is faced with rapidy mounting industrial strife, I want to call the attention of this Congress and of these public officials to an outstanding record of industrial achievement in the Great Miami Valley of Ohio which comprises the entire Third Congressional District of Ohio.

In this congressional district labor and management have, during the war emergencies, achieved the most outstanding record in the United States. In the Great Miami Valley of Ohio, labor has a record of fewer strikes, fewer work stoppages, and fewer man-hours involved than any other congressional district of similar size in the United States. At the same time the cooperation of labor and management has resulted in the awarding of more Army and Navy E's than in any other congressional district of similar size.

This outstanding record of achievement is the result of constant cooperation between labor and management by the use of arbitration in all matters of dispute.

This record is the more remarkable because of the diversified industries that are represented in the area. In the Great Miami Valley of Ohio we take the raw iron ore and turn it into pig iron and steel. We are manufacturers of some of the largest machine tools in the world. We have a large Diesel-engine manufacturing project there. In the city of Dayton we have devoted all of our industrial capacity to the war effort.

Throughout this entire congressional district and area of the Great Miami Valley all labor elements are represented as bargaining agents. We have the A. F. of L., we have the CIO, and we have the independent unions. In all cases they have kept the no-strike pledge practically 100 percent. This has been possible through the constant arbitration of disputes between labor and management. Virtually all labor contracts carry what is known as the short clause of arbitration, which simply provides that all disputes of whatever nature should be arbitrated. There has been an attempt to include in the contracts, on the part of management, the so-called long arbitration clause, which sets up innumerable exceptions to the questions which may be arbitrated, and it is this long type of arbitration clause which is causing most of the trouble in the Detroit area.

I desire to call the attention of the Labor Department to this fact and ask that they do nothing that will disrupt the amicable relations now existing in the Great Miami Valley of Ohio.

Discharges From the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, my office is in receipt of literally hundreds of letters from GI's all over the world and in the States who desire separation from the Army or the Navy at the earliest possible moment.

The following letter was brought to my attention by my constituent, Mr. J. L. Ferguson, of Westport, Conn. Regardless of the breezy style of Mr. Ferguson's correspondent, it is very typical of the letters I am receiving daily from men who are part of the service troops who did not get sent overseas during hostilities.

I include, likewise, a letter from our able Governor, Raymond E. Baldwin, who is also subject to many appeals and pressures, and the letter he refers to me is also typical.

From my own files, I have selected typical examples of letters addressed directly to me by men now overseas in the European and Pacific theaters:

WESTPORT, CONN., *September 12, 1945.*

MY DEAR MRS. LUCE: The enclosed may be worthy of a place in your files on these matters. I am sure it is a voluminous one. The letter was written to me by ———, who is stationed in ———, Calif.

Two years ago he was drafted and he has not had an opportunity to accumulate sufficient points to be checked out of the Army. We need him here very badly, but that is not the point of this letter. I just thought you might be interested in reading ———'s point of view.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. FERGUSON.

AUGUST 29.

DEAR LARN: Most of my friends, the Big Moguls, shipped overseas before your convincing letter arrived. Those who remain are mostly Regular Army men and their opinion is that any man who wants a discharge is "teched." So on the basis of (1) "You don't want to leave this swell deal anyway" and (2) "Besides your business isn't essential" they have me cornered.

If the W. D. has its say, they will damn soon see that I do my overseas share, seein' as how I've been luckin' my way through this luxurious domestic garrison pitch for 31 months. The potshots, sniping, and "slacker" tone in some of the recent W. D. announcements would be insulting if they weren't so humorously ignorant. What they choose to ignore is that you went overseas and accumulated points if they ordered you to. Otherwise you stayed here and limited your accumulation to a surfeit of Army chicken, brass-hat variety. And you could sing "Mammy," "Sonny Boy" and the Aloha Island chant for days on end, and you still stayed if your name didn't get on an order. I know. For the very selfish reason that I was fed up with domestic nonsense and coveted a position on a Pacific Army daily, I began to plague various officers down here as far back as last December for a Pacific transfer. Always it was: "When they want you, they'll send for you." So I'm still here, but rapidly working out of the unwanted stages by virtue of the W. D.'s dictum: "All qualified men who haven't been overseas will do their share by seeing overseas service before being discharged."

Six solid days of work and four nights a week overtime may not constitute doing their "share" according to Washington, but that's what this silly soul has been wrapped up in for the past year, and prior to that there was a year and a half of occasional conscientious effort when circumstances permitted. But it was on this side, therefore, I probably wasn't doing my "share." At that, I'm not sorry for myself, I've become too fatalistic. But I'd like you to know why I'm going to develop a postwar inhibition to kick every Washington ex-Army bureaucrat on the seat of his mush-soaked, waterlogged brain.

Only sane guide to my future in-or-out status can be furnished by congressional action. The inviolate, uncompromising, stern policy of the War Department assuring at least 2 more years' detention if the draft is halted, can be averted only by congressional action cutting out conscription of wartime soldiers into the peacetime Army. (Have you also noted that the progressive imaginative War Department still insists that voluntary enlistments be for 3-year periods, just like the merrie old days?)

Well, I guess the moral of this one is: Write your Congressman. Tell him you know someone who wants to get just one thing out of this Army—himself. Tell him that at 32, a peculiar guy with some ambitions simply can't enthuse over a 2- or 3-year Army policing job. And tell him that the point system should take into some consideration the "accidents of order" which we yokels faithfully abided by during wartime.

Thus endeth today's sermon from here. What morals are being pointed up your way these days?

Regards to all,

——— ———.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, September 17, 1945.

Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE,
Congresswoman from Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LUCE: Many letters are coming to me requesting an early discharge from the armed forces. Appeals are made personally and by others in behalf of married men and young men who have just started their schooling and are now anxious to get back and go to college again.

I believe very firmly that here is a matter where no favoritism should be shown. We all appreciate that some plan, fair to all, must be operated in granting discharges from the service, just as a plan fair to all was carried out to induct men into the service. I am enclosing herewith a copy of a typical letter which comes to my desk.

I am writing thus to you, knowing that you have these matters uppermost in mind and believing that it might be helpful to you to know the course they are taking here and the urgency of finding a complete and satisfactory solution.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, *Governor.*

AMERICAN RED CROSS,
August 22, 1945.

Governor BALDWIN: I am a soldier overseas. The war is over, and my problem is one of getting home again.

I have a wife and son. I was drafted in November 1944. My son was born prior to Pearl Harbor. My total points for discharge total 31. My chances for early discharge appear to be very dim.

My wife tried living on her $80 per month allotment, and found it to be so difficult that she was finally forced to go to work.

We own our own home, with the exception of a mortgage, and all maintenance expenses fall on her unsteady shoulders.

During my absence she has been sick several times and my son was seriously ill quite often also. The worry and hard work since my induction has left a permanent mark on both of them. The worry of lonesome nights and the longing for companionship is ever present. Youthful years are being wasted away, they will never return.

I'm 26 years old. I've suffered and sacrificed, but a man can take these things. I worry for the welfare of my home and family. I worked long and hard to give them what they have today.

We were very happy. But the longer we are apart, the wider the gap between us will grow. Now that the war is over, what possible value can the Army place on me? I'm only a private.

Must I spend a year or two in the occupation of these God-forsaken countries? While my family is at home suffering and waiting for me to return? My brain cries out at the injustice of it all. Surely my son needs his father. My wife has sacrificed enough. They can't fight on with no incentive. Psychologists agree that after a year of separation, man and wife tend to drift dangerously apart. Cannot our short-sighted, light-thinking legislators see these problems? My wife is now holding down a job which some worthy veteran could have.

The Army delayed the drafting of fathers for many reasons. Why can't I obtain an early discharge for those same reasons? The Army doesn't care. They have me now. I'm a good soldier and they hate to let me go. What do they care about my problems?

My only hope is to appeal to you, to ask you to exert what influence you have, to relieve all us married men from the Army now.

I appeal to your clear thinking, to see the many problems which we married fathers face. We all vote—we all vote for good men. We vote for men that will help us when we need help.

I ask you to act on this request, to get married fathers out of the Army as quickly as possible.

My present worries include a tonsil operation for my son, my house needs painting very badly, my wife needs companionship and help, my son needs his daddy, plus the many problems of married life that need early solution.

The Red Cross is of no earthly help to me or my wife. They have been stalling my wife indefinitely about my son's tonsil operation.

Most sincerely,

———— ————.

RAIN AM LECH, GERMANY,
August 29, 1945.

The Honorable CLARE BOOTHE LUCE,
House Military Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LUCE: The men of this organization wish to congratulate, encourage, and back you of the House Military Affairs Committee for proposing more workable, democratic, and redtapeless plans for the discharge of veterans. We, the undersigned, heartily approve the plan for the release of all veterans of 2 years' service or more. Although the public was misled to believe that the existing point system was a fair method to discharge veterans—we know that a fair poll of soldiers' thought and opinion has never been taken.

It is our honest opinion that the point system would never have survived, let alone been considered, had a poll been taken. As one authority of this statement we refer to our overseas edition of the Stars and Stripes in which there has never been anything except complaints about that system. The Stars and Stripes is considered to be one of the few democratic outlets available for soldiers' opinion and therefore a fair cross-section of soldiers' thought.

The 2-year plan, which is much more practical, is the only rapid workable solution now that both wars have terminated. Any other plan of release would prove unworkable in so vast an organization where individual consideration would mean months of delay and typical Army red tape. We feel it is an improvement insofar as it does not give special credit to individuals but takes veterans as a group, the same method in which we were inducted.

Under the present point system, men with 2 years of service or more and actual combat would only be regarded with the indefinite assignment as troops of occupation, which adds to the continued lowering of our morale. A regard of this type makes it appear that our previous sacrifices are not appreciated by the folks back home. The 2-year plan is the first definite step taken to remedy this situation. We feel that this shows your appreciation and understanding.

It is agreed upon here that the army of occupation should be made up of volunteers and recent inductees. We who have served 2 years or more and risked our lives in combat feel it is most unjust to sacrifice the remaining years of our lives in the Army. If this requires the inducting of fathers, is it any more unjust to call on fathers to serve during peacetime than it was to subject them to the perils of an all-out war?

It is equally obvious that draft quotas should easily be met since one-time essential men in industry are a thing of the past. Those essential men who have enjoyed the comforts of home, security, and wartime prosperity are now free for active service in the armed forces probably for a shorter period of less hazardous service than ours.

When Representative PAUL W. SHAFER said that the point system of discharge "has not worked out and in many cases has been grossly unfair," we consider it a vast understatement.

It is our hope that the 2-year plan meets with the hearty approval of Congress and is put speedily into action.

Respectfully,

———— ————.

NOTE.—In addition we would like to present the following statistics:

a. Of the 162 men available out of a total of 184 enlisted men, 152 men agreed with the opinions and proposals of this letter.

	Percent
Yes	94
No	6

b. The signers' points ranged from low scores of 6 and 7 to the highest of 85 points. The average mean score is 55.

c. Out of all the signers 20 percent of the men have under 2 years' service at present.

This is certainly indicative as to how the most men feel about present methods and what they hope to bring about. We believe that if a poll were to be taken of the Army, this proposed plan would meet with the same enthusiasm as it has here. Another copy of this letter has been sent to Chairman MAY with the complete 152 signatures.

———

IN THE PACIFIC, 1945.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: I, as you, am from Connecticut. I miss my home and family.

The war had to be won, I know. But I also feel that I and others here with me should be able to see our people after giving more than 3 years of our time and energy to the prosecution of this great battle. Myself and more than 20 others from our great State of Connecticut have given our all in this mighty struggle. Still we are only human.

We do have feelings, even though the hardships we've been forced to endure have at times been almost too much to bear. This, I realize, you are thoroughly familiar with. Therefore, I shall be explicit and to the point.

We want to see and be with our loved ones. They also are greatly concerned as to the reason we have not been able to receive at least a furlough. As you know, furloughs have been authorized by the War Department after completion of two or more years of service overseas.

But, obviously, that was just another piece of paper for this unit. We have been given to understand that transportation and replacements are and have not been available to an extent great enough to allow more than an average of 5 men of a possible 225 to return per month. In the meantime we have made extensive inquiry of other organizations throughout the islands of much less strength. These units state that few men of said units, or rather no men of said units, have more than 30 or 32 months at most that are receiving furloughs. Why is it necessary to hold us who have done our duty and have no bad time? Remember, we have never been in our home State since we left home (the latest man was inducted May 8), and we now have 3 years overseas. None of us men has less than 39 months of service, and we are all service troops. But we also have been classified nonessential. Need I say more?

I trust you will give this your undivided attention.

Sincerely,

Pvt. ————,
Headquarters Detachment.

Postwar Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on July 27, 1945:

Friends and neighbors, those of you who have heard me speak on this program before will remember the many times I have stressed the importance of maintaining the highest possible level of employment after the war. I have repeatedly said that if this country is to achieve economic stability and security for its citizens, we must plan now for an economy which can support a working population of 60,000,000 people.

Not only must we have full production and full employment but we must have employment at decent living wages. A very one-sided picture of the wartime earnings of workers generally has been presented to the public. Of course it is true that wages now are relatively high in some industries and in some areas, but contrary to widespread belief, American workers are not, even today, on a silk-shirt budget.

I think it is safe to assume that there will be efforts made when the war emergency is over, and the labor market is not so tight, to scale down wage levels. Of course this will be resisted, and I hope successfully, by the labor unions.

One of the ways in which we can maintain a decent level of wages in general, is to put a reasonable floor under wages, to establish a reasonable minimum wage for those industries under the jurisdiction of Federal law. These are the great bulk of enterprises which engage in interstate commerce.

I do not believe we can ever achieve an economy of abundance, of full production, and full employment while millions of our working citizens are paid at substandard rates, or even at the rates of pay now recognized as legal minimums under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The number of employed persons who today are unable to maintain a decent standard of living on their present wages is not a small part of our total working population. Nor are these substandard wages confined to so-called backward or sweatshop industries, or to particular geographic areas. The number of impoverished, although employed, workers is a serious threat to our whole national economy.

More than 2,000,000 workers are now employed at rates below 40 cents an hour. More than 5,000,000 are earning less than 50 cents an hour, and 10,000,000 workers, more than one-third of all those in interstate commerce, earn less than 65 cents an hour.

These low rates have been a serious drag on the war effort. Their effect has been to drive workers away from such vital war industries as lumber, textiles, and apparel where a rate less than 65 cents an hour is paid to more than half the wage earners. Other war industries have had the same experience when high percentages of workers received wages too low to sustain them and their families.

In the year 1943—a year of relatively high wage rates—30 percent of families and employed single persons in the United States earned less than $1,500 a year. Research studies made by reliable private and public organizations show that a decent minimum standard of living for a family of 4 would require earnings of at least 75 cents an hour assuming year-round employment at 40 hours a week. From these figures you can see that a very significant proportion of our people must have been living under far less than what we like to think of as the American standard of living.

Let us assume that we will achieve the objective of 60,000,000 jobs after the country has weathered the period of reconversion. We will then have more people gainfully employed—contributing to the national welfare than at any time in our history. However, even at this high rate of employment, our national economy will not be running at prosperity speed if it is bogged down with a 30-percent de..dweight of wage earners who cannot pay their own way because they are underpaid.

Prosperity for the Nation is primarily dependent on one thing and that is purchasing power. If a large proportion of the consuming public is kept at a minimum level of purchasing power, earning only enough to keep alive, you just cannot have an expanding purchasing power. The ability to buy goods, the materials turned out by the machines that provide the jobs, has to be shared by all the people if we want to keep the machines running, if we want to have the jobs.

Fred Vinson, now Secretary of the Treasury, in his report to the President and Congress while he was serving as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, made this statement: "* * * As far as our national economy is concerned, it would be disastrous to go back, for we would be going back to the misery of mass unemployment."

He said that after the war, "the American economy must be dynamic, with expanding business, expanding markets, expanding employment and opportunity. The American people are in the pleasant predicament of having to learn to live 50 percent better than they have ever lived before."

And that is the inescapable fact. We have during the war years built a production that makes it impossible for us to go back to the good old days. If we want to maintain the machine we have built, to convert it to the ways of peace, we have got to go forward to a prosperity which increasingly embraces more and more people.

It is from this point of view that it is possible to gain an intelligent perspective on the problems of unemployment and low wages. An unemployed worker or an underpaid worker is a drain on the whole working force, a charge against the total national welfare.

Low wages, even during the war years have meant poverty, sickness, crime and unproductiveness for millions of American workers. Just as substandard wages have seriously weakened our war effort, they will threaten our chances of economic security after the war when we hope to profit from our war-learned lessons.

Maintaining a high wage level throughout the country is not so much a sentimental concern for the underprivileged worker or his family, as it is a vital concern for the total national welfare. We must maintain the highest possible level of purchasing power in order to oil the wheels of prosperity after the war, and it seems to me that this amendment, providing as it does for the gradual increase of minimum wages to 75 cents an hour, is a necessary first step toward creating a healthy base for the period after the war. I do not believe that the increase in these low rates would, even if adopted immediately, interfere in any way with the present stabilization program.

The workers who would be affected, and over a period of 2 years this might add up to about 10,000,000, are the workers who have had to bear the brunt of the increased cost of living during the war years. They have not had wage increases which in any degree compensated for the increased costs of food, clothing and other essentials during the war. They will face the period of reconversion and the postwar years with no backlog of savings.

If they remain, these millions of workers, in the same position of depressed earnings after the war as they now occupy in relation to the total working force, they will serve to weaken the national effort toward increased consumer production. Their low earnings will make it impossible for American workers generally "to learn to live 50 percent better" as Secretary Vinson pointed out they will have to after the war in order to make use of our expanded productive machinery.

The Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of September 19, 1945:

THE SECRETARY OF WAR

In midsummer of 1940, under pressure of German and Japanese aggression, the United States was moving swiftly, inevitably, and among a confusion of voices toward involvement in the most widespread and terrible war in history. There were some who saw this. There were many who did not. One who did read the future correctly was Henry L. Stimson, a lifelong Republican who probably disagreed with most things domestically President Roosevelt had ever done. On June 18, 1940, over the radio, Mr. Stimson warned his countrymen of what lay ahead and submitted a program of what he believed must be done to avoid catastrophe. The next day President Roosevelt offered him the Secretaryship of War. He accepted. Read out of his party as a political traitor but confirmed by the Senate as a patriot, he took office a few days later. Now, more than 5 years later, the war fought through to complete victory, on the eve of his seventy-eighth birthday, he finally relinquishes the job he has worked at so patiently and so successfully.

We are so close to the fact that it is difficult to appreciate the magnitude of the Military Establishment that has been fashioned by Mr. Stimson in his 5 years as Secretary of War. When he took office our Army totaled fewer than 200,000 men, poorly trained and poorly armed. A few weeks ago it reached a peak of 8,500,000 and was the best-trained and best-equipped Army in the world, or in the history of the world. Mr. Stimson directed the expenditure of more than half of the $300,000,000,000 which the war cost the United States. He was one of the key administrators in one of the outstanding mobilizations of a nation for war.

But Mr. Stimson's service to his country goes beyond that of the last 5 years, great as have been the accomplishments of that period. In every public office he has held, and they have been many—United States district attorney in New York, Secretary of War under President Taft, Governor General of the Philippines, and Secretary of State under President Hoover, to name only the major ones—he has made an outstanding record. Had all of the signatories of the Nine Power Pact strongly backed his condemnation of Japanese aggression in Manchuria in 1931, when he was Secretary of State, we might never have had to fight the war now ended, either in the Pacific or in Europe. It probably is little remembered that in 1935 he saw the Spanish civil war as a forerunner of things to come and condemned our embargo on weapons to the Spanish Government. Mr. Stimson has been a tower of strength to the American people in the continuing crises of these years. As Secretary of War he has made half of a magnificent team with General Marshall. He has run his Department with the ability that comes from immense experience and power to make decisions. Since December 1941 he has fixed his iron will on one purpose, and one purpose only—victory. The Nation owes him a debt of lasting gratitude.

It is impossible to think of Mr. Stimson as Secretary of War without thinking at the same time of his Under Secretary. Apparently one of the few conditions Mr. Stimson laid down in accepting the post from President Roosevelt was that he be allowed to select his own assistants. One of the first he picked was Federal Judge Robert P. Patterson, whom he called almost immediately from KP detail at Plattsburg, where Mr. Patterson was spending a vacation from the bench by preparing himself for a combat assignment in the war he too saw was inevitable. To him Mr. Stimson turned over the onerous job of making certain of the production of the weapons that would be needed.

For 5 years these two have worked together at the biggest military job ever given two civilian soldiers—both held combat commissions in France in the First World War—and it is as fitting an end to their association as could be devised for the aide now to succeed his chief. Like Mr. Stimson, the new Secretary never will leave anyone in doubt as to his position on any important question having to do with the Army. Like Mr. Stimson, Judge Patterson seems to have but one yardstick by which to measure any question; is it in the public interest?

Disagree, as many have and will, with both Mr. Stimson and his successor, on minor points, no one can say of either that he ever compromised with his conscience or ever let down his country on any important issue. Our country, and more than our country, the world, has been fortunate that during the last 5 years we have had Mr. Stimson as our Secretary of War. It is equally fortunate that there is at hand so tried and so able a successor. No men deserve better of their countrymen.

Serious Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, recently the OPA was obliged to extend the time of

an eviction notice from 3 to 6 months, because people so evicted found difficulty in finding housing accommodations.

This points graphically to our shelter problem.

The millions of returning veterans will further complicate this critical situation.

American democracy has its roots in the family and the home. Without this sound foundation all else is meaningless. Our workers need proper housing for their health. Our families need it for their comfort and happiness. And our Nation needs an environment that will encourage and inspire our people.

Millions of our citizens are forced to live in unhealthy, unsafe, and crime-breeding slums that were condemned as far back as 1885. They still exist in these overcrowded firetraps because there is no place else to go.

All this in the face of a construction industry that collapsed completely in 1929 and has never fully recovered. Among our mechanics, those in the building trades have suffered most severely.

Property values have declined, municipal financial problems have increased, industry has been scared away from many areas and this total neglect is breeding a domestic crisis of major proportions.

Speak Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lynn Perkins, from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph:

SPEAK UP, AMERICA

(By Lynn Perkins)

I believe in America, and I believe in the system of free enterprise which has built this country into the mightiest enterprise of freedom which the world has ever known.

There is certainly nothing newsworthy in my believing this. Millions of people have the same belief. The only unusual fact, in my case, is that I believe it and also happen to be young.

That combination is quite a rarity today.

The truth is that youth has lost its belief in free enterprise. Few are actually opposed—but few are in support. During the last 20 years the growing generation has been submitted to a constant barrage of propaganda which has discredited capitalism and private enterprise.

Even the huge mass-appeal mediums, whose very life depends upon capitalism, have taken part in laughing at private business.

Magazines, newspapers, movies, comic strips, the radio and most other mass-appeal mediums have, in a roundabout way, promoted the ridicule of private business and the businessman. Success has been consistently sneered at as bourgeois.

The same subtle sneers have been sandwiched into the teachings in schools. The net result is that the vast majority of youth is either neutral or in opposition to capitalism. Capitalism has to the minority become a monster—and the the majority a ridiculous fat man with the money bags.

Synchronized with this planned ridicule of private enterprise has been a wide-spread but little-seen machinery which has tirelessly worked in the promotion of socialism. It is known as liberalism to those who cannot or will not see it too clearly. To those who have wanted a more naked name, it is known bluntly as communism.

Communism has marched behind the banners of the progressives.

Talk to any young person of any intelligence and you will, 99 times out of 100, get the reaction that some more or less vague sort of socialism is progressive—that capitalism is reactionary.

Few are in favor of communism. But because they no longer believe in free enterprise, millions of young people are potential push-overs for the planner and promoters of alien ideology.

However, alien or not, this ideology has offered ideals and something to believe in. Because it has talked loudly and widely of improving the lot of the common man it has drawn to itself those millions of young people who naturally yearn for a forward-looking ideal.

Communism—and the socialisms and liberalisms which it uses as a smoke screen—talks so well of the wonderful things which it does for people; it has talked so much that liberals and progressives never think to ask for any proof. Doped with 25 years of devious propaganda the younger generation believes in a vague sort of way that socialism and planning will automatically bring about the prosperous conditions which communism has talked about * * * and which capitalism has brought about all around them, without their realizing it.

All the Communist writings from Marx and Engels to Harold Laski and Earl Browder have not a single fact or figure to show that communism has done anything to make life more interesting, more comfortable, or more amusing.

Communists talk of dialectic materialism and their whole ideology is based on material things. But all their writings and all their words are not one-thousandth as impressive as a single page torn from the classified telephone directory of any town in the United States.

For there, in black and white, are goods and services which stagger the imagination.

Unless capitalism can regain the faith of young America, it will inevitably be defeated by totalitarian socialism. All the strength and power and wonder of free enterprise will avail it nothing if it has lost the belief of thinking Americans under the age of 30.

How fantastic it seems that the American commies could take over the country. And how fantastic it seemed, 12 years ago, that a funny little man with a tooth-brush mustache could take over Europe.

Capitalism has got to stop laughing at itself, has got to stop apologizing.

Using its whole giant machinery of persuasion, capitalism must sell the truth to the Nation's youth.

Capitalism must create an ideology to tell its story and its purpose—an ideology as attractive and progressive as socialism seems.

Youth must be shown that through its own lack of faith in a free way of life it stands in peril of living in a rationed world.

Amusingly and dramatically, free enterprise must tell its story to the young people of America—tell it in all the mass-appeal mediums of which it is master.

Capitalism must create an ideology to tell the truth about itself; a young and vigorous ideology managed, planned, and promoted by young men who are master mechanics in the vast apparatus of opinion and amusement.

Capitalism has the voice. It has only to find the words.

Are We Plain Saps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunbury (Pa.) Daily Item of September 17, 1945:

ARE WE PLAIN SAPS?

This week should see at least the approach to an understanding of what the United States will do for Great Britain in the way of postwar aid—to what extent fire insurance is also provided by the great American fire company which extinguished the flames in Europe kindled by hands that certainly were not American, and kept burning by Britain, we are told, until our firefighters and apparatus were ready. And in spite of impertinent sallies from across the Atlantic, there is little doubt that a sizable hand-out will be granted.

It is surprising to see how England and France have adopted planned national socialization of industry as a political philosophy after they had turned to the biggest capitalistic country in the world to save them from destruction by that very same philosophy of life.

There was delightful sarcasm in the remarks of conservative Sir Oliver Lyttleton in the House of Commons when he said that the British standards of living depend on financial aid from the United States, and that "you must be careful about the nasty things you say about private enterprise that will affront American opinion."

Why should the socialistic regime in England think of turning to the United States and private enterprise to finance its socialistic schemes? Let the Liberal Party in England tax its own people to pay for the gifts which it promises them at the hands of Government. If socialism is superior to free enterprise, it can certainly finance its spendings.

General de Gaulle has also sought financial aid for the program of national socialization of industry which is planned for France. Why should we finance a system of government that threatened world peace? We spent countless American lives and some three hundred billions to help curb the crushing effect of national socialism under Hitler and Mussolini.

The seeds of national socialism are well planted in our own soil, in the form of Government enterprises which compete with private business, and Congress is being asked for additional billions of dollars to nourish and expand this malignant political growth here. Are we now ready to admit that the totalitarian type of central government is superior to our own free enterprise and profit system?

The United States stands as the last exponent of free enterprise, private opportunity, and the philosophy of allowing the individual to profit from his own labors. Are we going to throw in with the schemes of those who cried for help from political oppression and now seek to adopt the system from which we fought to save them?

Organized Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from The Cresset, a Lutheran magazine published by the Walther League:

ORGANIZED LABOR

Lately organized labor has been receiving considerable criticism. Southern Senators and Representatives, coming from areas where labor organizations are particularly weak, have been most vociferous in their criticism.

In evaluating the current criticisms of organized labor we must keep in mind General Marshall's statement: "The number of man-hours lost through strikes represents less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total time available." The report of the National Labor Relations Board is also relevant: "Management has been in defiance of Government rules and regulations more frequently than labor has." Criticism regarding the vast amount of time lost because of strikes somewhat loses its validity when the Department of Labor is able to say that "United States workers staying on jobs July 4 more than made up for every day lost by all strikes since Pearl Harbor."

We are forced to agree with William Rose Benet when he quotes in the Saturday Review of Literature from T. S. Adams' Labor Problems:

"In the last six centuries the laboring population has risen from a condition of serfdom to a state of political freedom. In this struggle for economic equality the victories have been won by the wage earners themselves. Where they did not pursue their interest, they lost their interest. When they forgot to demand their full reward, they failed to receive their full reward. They had occasional encouragement and even an occasional leader from the employing class, but in the main they fought their way against the opposition, and not with the assistance, of their employers. Their weapons were the strike and the trade union. * * * Always and everywhere the salvation of the working class has been collective action and, while the wage system remains, their progress will continue to be dependent upon collective action."

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce Supports Amendment to Celler Foreign Trade Zone Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the Foreign Trade Zone Act, as embodied in H. R. 3382, permits exhibiting and manufacturing in a foreign trade zone.

I herewith set forth an interesting letter from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce:

SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
San Francisco, Calif., September 5, 1945.
The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Believing you would be interested to learn of the support given your bill, H. R. 382, to amend the Foreign Trade Zone Act of June 18, 1934, we are taking this opportunity to report that the board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has endorsed the proposed legislation.

This action was taken by the board of directors upon request of the Foreign Trade Association of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, on August 16, and with the concurring approval of the foreign trade committee of the chamber.

In 1944 the board of directors endorsed the application of the board of State harbor commissioners for a foreign-trade zone for San Francisco and has consistently supported the establishment of such a zone in this city. One of the reported obstacles to the development of the foreign-trade zone program in the United States has been the restrictions of the Foreign Trade Zone Act of June 18, 1934, regarding exhibiting and manufacturing of merchandise in foreign-trade zones. The bill you have introduced amends the act to remove the obstacle. Needless to say, we are most anxious to see its passage by Congress.

Sincerely,

HENRY F. GRADY,
President.

Uncle Sam Is Not a Junkman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the September 22, 1945, issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

UNCLE SAM IS NOT A JUNKMAN

There is some danger that the men who administer the Surplus Property Act will become so obsessed with protecting their reputations that they'll let caution interfere with their main job of disposing of goods. The Surplus Property Board may become known as the "Scandal Prevention Board." This would seriously delay reconversion, for, if surpluses aren't moved out of plants, men can't move into jobs.

The dilemma of the surplus disposers is clear. The task of selling billions of dollars' worth of Government property through thousands of individuals has hardly begun, but already the Mead committee has discovered that a searchlight was bought at auction for $31 and resold to a defense plant for $325, and that ship floor strainers, which had been knocked down at $3.25 each, were sold back to the Government at $12. Although the investigation did not produce a first-class scandal, it left a fragrance, and undoubtedly gave many vigorous surplus-disposal officials pause.

So much money, so many items and such a wide variety of personnel are involved that someone, somewhere, is bound to stray from the straight and narrow. Resulting investigations are likely to shower unpalatable publicity on innocent as well as guilty. Consequently, officials hold "to-sell-or-not-to-sell" soliloquies with themselves. What if I set too low a price? What if a junk dealer buys the stuff and makes a big profit? What if Congress investigates? What will happen to my reputation?

The Surplus Property Board has properly recognized the danger of overcaution and undue delay, and has instructed contracting agencies to make arrangements with contractors for the prompt sale of surplus equipment or inventories, either directly to the contractor or through a third party, presumably a junk dealer. The idea is to clear plants and open the way for peacetime production and peacetime jobs. But carrying out the instructions requires a high order of individual courage. Earth holds no fury like that of a Congressman belaboring a profit.

Yet a profit is the price the Government must expect to pay to move surpluses out of plants into economic channels; it is an inescapable cost of reconversion. When a manufacturer or scrap dealer purchases Government inventories or equipment, he obviously intends to make money on the deal; he wants to use the machine or the inventory in his peacetime operation. Or a scrap dealer will take a miscellaneous hodgepodge of stuff and sell it as scrap or sort it out and market it. Such operations take time and acumen. Time and acumen bring a price.

This is not to suggest that officials should sell Government property at any price just to get rid of it. The Government has hired scrap consultants and experts to set valuations so that reasonable prices can be established. But these officials ought to feel free to use their market judgment and common sense in setting prices, and not be paralyzed by fear of a congressional inquiry if perchance they err on the low side. Therefore, it behooves the Surplus Property Board and Congress to make clear that profits are an integral cost in surplus disposal and will not—just because they're profits—subject both seller and buyer to public obloquy.

The alternative is that officials will play safe, refuse to risk criticism, and, consequently, will set prices too high. In that case, plants will be clogged longer than necessary with Government equipment and inventories, and reconversion will be delayed. The Government itself will have to take possession of the surplus, move it into warehouses and try to sell it in commercial markets. This multiplies the difficulties and the cost. Besides, it puts the Government in the junk business, where the Government does not belong.

The United States Navy

REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the first meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee since the end of the war, the esteemed chairman, the Honorable CARL VINSON, made a most admirable statement, the appropriateness of which is not limited to that occasion. It is a statement which I feel should be reread and studied every year lest we forget its message of undying value, lest we revert to dangerous complacency, and lest we forget our obligation to those who gave their lives for us and our country. This statement, I feel, should be given congressional perpetuity

by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a document of true statesmanship.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein Mr. VINSON's message to the committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL VINSON, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, AT MEETING OF THAT COMMITTEE ON SEPTEMBER 19, 1945

Members of the committee, the war which began on December 7, 1941, with the treacherous and dastardly attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor has been brought to a brilliant and victorious conclusion.

This is the first peacetime meeting of the committee since the beginning of the war, almost 4 years ago.

This country was on the brink of disaster then. Japan was swiftly sweeping the Pacific in those early days of the war. Our fleet had been badly mauled and battered at Pearl Harbor.

Since we went to war with Germany at the same time, the United States Navy had the double task of fighting the battle of the Atlantic and the battle of the Pacific.

The dates and sites of two major naval operations forcefully demonstrate the magnitude of the Navy's task in World War II—the invasion of Normandy on June 6, 1944, and 9 days later and halfway around the world, the landings on Saipan on June 15, 1944.

Our Navy conquered the German submarines in the Atlantic; landed millions of men of our Army in Africa, Italy, Normandy, and even across the Rhine; and maintained a constant flow of materials across the Atlantic to the Army that it had put ashore in Europe and Africa. These accomplishments were unparalleled.

But the Navy's accomplishments in the Pacific were all the more remarkable for (1) the Pacific war was predominantly naval and (2) it was waged almost solely by the United States. While our allies made some contributions to the final defeat of Japan, and while our Army and Army Air Force contributed greatly to the complete victory, let there be no mistake about it, the defeat of Japan was predominantly an American Navy victory.

The darkness of Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, Wake, and Guam began to lift with our most successful, and last, defensive action—the Battle of Midway, in June 1942, when a Japanese task force that greatly outnumbered our naval forces was completely annihilated. This was the turning point from defense to offense, as it eliminated the peril of our naval bastion, Pearl Harbor.

Then came the glorious beginning of our forward offense with the assault on Guadalcanal 2 months later, in August 1942. The rising sun of Japan began to set.

Heretofore strange names became historical landmarks of American courage and fighting supremacy—Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Kwajalein, Eniwetok, Saipan, Peleliu, Iwo Jima, and other Pacific scenes of American naval victories. On the islands and atolls, and ships that went down, Navy personnel died that America might remain free. Guam and the Philippines were liberated. Attu and Kiska were taken in the north. Glorious naval history was written in the inspiring victories of the battles of the Coral Sea, the Bismarck Sea, the Philippine Sea, and the China Sea.

The beginning of the end came on April 1, 1945, with the invasion of Okinawa, only 330 miles from Japan itself. Japan threw in her last resources in a futile defense. This was the last operation, and the later securing of Okinawa marked the setting of Japan's rising sun.

Official surrender on the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay came without the necessity of invading Japan. Never before in history had naval power been so effective as to bring a major nation to its knees and surrender without invasion of its homeland. Such is the greatest testimony to the magnificent performance of the United States Navy.

The committee salutes the personnel of the Navy, from the Commander in Chief down through the lowest rating, for their heroic sacrifices and brilliant service for their country. The inspiring leadership of our naval officers has been matched by the courageous devotion to duty of the enlisted personnel. The Government can never repay these men and women, the cream of the Nation, for their patriotic services.

Especially are we indebted to those who went down at sea never to return. The cost has been heavy, for the naval service suffered 57,595 killed and missing and 94,165 wounded, together with the loss of 502 ships, 156 of which were in combatant categories. We must make certain that these sacrifices of lives have not been in vain. It is our solemn duty to those who have gone.

The committee pays tribute to the late Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Frank Knox, who, in giving his life to his country in service as Secretary, was truly a war casualty. The country was most fortunate to find as his successor the present Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable James V. Forrestal, whose steady hand on the helm so successfully steered the Navy to its position of greatest prestige.

The assignment for victory was well planned and executed. To the Navy the committee says, "Well done!"

This committee and the Congress have the satisfaction of a job well done in unstintingly authorizing the weapons which enabled the Navy to banish the rising sun of Japan from the horizon. You have given unceasingly and generously of your time and effort to the work of the committee.

But we have a big job ahead of us—to fulfill our sacred trust to those who gave their lives that America might remain free, by insuring that martial history will not repeat itself and plunge the world into the holocaust of a third world war.

The noble intentions of international charters and treaties must be constantly vitalized by the realistic maintenance of a Navy of sufficient strength of matériel and personnel to keep inviolate the national security of the United States.

Peace is not only a matter of desire. It is a challenging problem of enforcement.

Today this committee squarely faces the challenge by its timely consideration of the postwar Navy, which still remains our first line of defense. Before us for consideration is House Concurrent Resolution 80 on the composition of our postwar Navy.

However, before taking up this resolution for consideration I want to read to the committee a letter I received from the Secretary of the Navy and telegrams I sent to the commanders in the Pacific with their replies thereto.

Managing Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Yale Review during the summer of 1945:

Russell Cornell Leffingwell has had a distinguished career. He was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in 1917–20, and is a director and chairman of the executive committee of J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc.

He began the practice of law in New York City in 1902 and was a member of the firm of Cravath & Henderson from 1907 to 1917 when he went to the Treasury Department. He resigned his Treasury post to become a member of the law firm of Cravath, Henderson, Leffingwell & de Gersdorff. He became a partner of the Morgan firm in 1923 and took an active part in monetary reconstruction abroad after World War I. He became an officer and director of the Morgan bank upon its incorporation in 1940.

Mr. Leffingwell was born in New York City. He received his bachelor's degree at Yale in 1899 and his law degree at Columbia in 1902.

MANAGING OUR ECONOMY

(By R. C. Leffingwell)

(Reprinted from the summer, 1945, Yale Review)

Nothing must divert us from the great task of winning the grim war in the East; but now that the war in the West is won, we must plan for peace, prosperity, and employment after final victory. Let us therefore consider the lessons of experience. I do not mean to criticize any fiscal or monetary policies of the past or to suggest that I knew better at the time when these things were done. I had a full share of responsibility as a public servant for those policies of the United States while we were in the First World War and for some time after; and later in private life I had some part in the monetary reconstruction of the principal countries of the world, which laid the basis for peace in our time though war followed. In public and private life I knew and admired and worked with some of the chief actors in these affairs, at home and abroad. I do not mean to praise or blame things that were done but to draw useful conclusions from them to guide our future course.

From soon after our Civil War until the First World War, we got along within a rigid and even deflationary money system. We paid off the Civil War debt. Between 1865 and 1878 we worked our way back from the debased paper dollar of the Civil War to a gold dollar. We managed to stay on gold in Cleveland's time, not without a major effort. We suffered from deflation at times. The depressions of the seventies and nineties were severe. Populism, the greenback movement, Bryan and the free silver movement, reflected deflation. Nevertheless the half century between those wars was on the whole a period of good times, and the country grew and prospered. We developed the great industrial system which made it possible for us to turn the scales in the First World War and again in the Second World War. We absorbed not only the natural growth of population but an immense immigration, and found employment for most of those who were willing and able to work, with a rising standard of living. Our economy was neither debauched by monetary inflation nor strangled, though restrained, by monetary deflation. Our money was not managed, nor mismanaged, by mere men. But it was inelastic and inadequate. The rigid currency system had grave defects, which became evident in the first decade of this century, and the great and constructive Federal Reserve Act was the result. That came just in time to make it possible to finance the First World War in an orderly way.

Since then we have had managed money, expanded and contracted by the public authorities. Monetary management is the immediate concern of the banking authorities, who, however, must proceed in accord with the overriding policies of the National Government. Banks of issue may advise but they cannot control national policies. The Reserve banks create money and credit and make them plentiful and cheap, or contract money and credit by making them scarce and dear. The chief instruments of monetary management are raising and lowering the Reserve bank rate of interest for loans and discounts, the purchase and sale of bills in the market, and increase or reduction in reserve requirements. It is little understood how great is the power of these instruments.

Management of our money by public authorities dominated the period between the World Wars, and will probably dominate the period after this war. Yet the Government exhorts businessmen, and businessmen exhort each other, to provide full employment after this war, as though neither Government nor business were aware of that. All of us little people talk about our good and bad times, our statistical charts and curves, our business cycles, our full dinner pails and our bread lines, our bull markets and our bear markets, and we make our prophecies or guesses, in ignorance or disregard of the fact that the public money-managers largely determine all that, as they make money plentiful and cheap, to finance a war or to stop a depression, or as they contract credit or make it dear to stop a crazy speculative boom. It is a mistake to think that businessmen can create employment if governments create deflation after this war; or that businessmen can avoid speculative booms if governments continue inflation after the war.

We had nearly 2 years of inflation after the First World War. Even then, in 1920, deflation did not come of itself, but by monetary management. The central banks of the United States and England, rightly I think, made money dear, to arrest inflation and to regain and retain the old gold standard, which had been maintained for 40 years by the United States and for a century by England. The bank rate in England was raised to 6 percent in November 1919, and 7 percent in April 1920. We established here a 6 percent bank rate in January and a 7 percent rate in June 1920. Dear money, after the inevitable lag, stopped the inflation and defended the gold standard; but it caused deflation, unemployment, and distress. That was the first postwar inflation and managed deflation.

From 1921 for some years, Federal Reserve authorities relaxed the dear-money policy of 1920, and, first gradually, then actively, pursued a cheap-money policy through open-market purchases of bills or Government securities, with good results at first. They overdid it in 1927, however, and this was the chief cause of the disastrous inflation in stocks and real estate which occurred in 1927–29. Government authorities let the inflation run until August 1929. Then, too late, the New York Federal Reserve bank was allowed to establish a 6-percent bank rate; and London followed with a 6½-percent rate at the end of September. These steps were necessary to stop a crazy inflation. But a panic followed; and our Government permitted the consequent deflation to run too long and too deep. England went off gold in 1931. But, though our authorities tried a little reinflation in the first half of 1932, the United States hung on to the prewar gold standard, almost alone in the whole world, for a year and a half, while prices collapsed, credit was contracted, and banks closed their doors. Our people thought of the dollar as stable. It was not stable; it was rising rapidly in sterling exchange and in domestic buying power; and of course, as the dollar rose, prices fell. Ironically, it was not until then, in 1932 and 1933, that Bryan's phrase came true, nearly 40 years after he used it, and we were indeed crucified on a cross of gold. That was the second postwar inflation and managed deflation.

The third postwar inflation was begun in 1933. Our Government authorities, wisely and of necessity, stopped the deflation by abandoning the old gold standard. Later, they pursued an inflation policy by actively selling the dollar for gold to cheapen the dollar, by devaluing the dollar 40 percent in terms of gold, by Government spending to make work, by unbalancing the Budget and increasing the public debt. Yet full recovery and employment did not follow these inflationary measures until the Second World War.

That was because inflation does not "take" unless the money issued, including bank deposits, circulates with velocity (that is, turns over rapidly), either because of hope of gain or fear of loss. During the period from 1933 to 1939, there was not much hope of gain, because of Government investigation, legislation, regulation, and taxation at home, and the fear of them, and because of the fear of trouble abroad. And in spite of monetary inflation there was no flight from our money. It was more than amply secured by gold at the reduced value of the dollar, and there was nowhere to fly to that wasn't more dangerous than here. European conditions were bad and getting worse. The flight was the other way, hither not hence. These conditions sterilized the inflation.

Resulting excess or idle reserves in the banks occasioned anxiety to the authorities. The $2,000,000,000 soldiers' bonus paid in 1936 was highly inflationary. Prices and inventories began to rise. The authorities, fearing inflation, adopted drastic deflationary measures. They sterilized gold imports and raised reserve requirements. The President announced that some prices were too high, and Government purchases were curtailed. And the cash budget was nearly balanced by means of a surplus in the social security accounts.

There resulted, in the latter part of 1937 and early 1938, one of the most abrupt, precipitous, and unnecessary depressions in our history. From their high in the forepart of 1937 to their low in 1938, the index of industrial production fell from 118 to 76, that of factory employment from 109 to 82, that of wholesale commodity prices fell from 88 to 77, and of industrial common-stock prices from 153 to 84. That was the third planned and managed deflation in the years between the wars.

Turning from managed money to fiscal policy, let us consider what that has to do with inflation, deflation, and depression. Some believe that there is a tendency toward depression and unemployment in a budget surplus and public-debt reduction, and a tendency toward recovery and full employment in a rising public debt and deficit handling. However, our experience between the world wars does not support that theory. There was a budget surplus every year from August 1919 to the end of 1930, and the public debt was reduced $10,000,000,000, or more than 40 percent. This included the period of the great inflation which culminated in 1929. The period of the twenties, although it began and ended with depressions due to the dear money policy of 1920 and 1929, included the greatest era of prosperity the country has ever known.

On the other hand, from the end of 1930 to the middle of 1939 the public debt rose rapidly. From $16,000,000,000 on December 31, 1930, the lowest point reached after the First World War, it rose year by year to $46,400,000,000 on August 31, 1939, when the Second World War began—nearly three times what it was at the end of 1930. Yet this second postwar period of the thirties, notwithstanding public expenditures and increase in the public debt, included a long continuing depression and underemployment which ended only in the war and war buying. We found we could not spend and borrow our way out.

I conclude that a balanced budget and moderate debt reduction are not inconsistent with prosperity and a high level of employment, and that an unbalanced budget and deficit financing do not assure prosperity and full employment.

Closely related to deficit financing is the matter of government spending. In the period beginning in 1933, public made-work spending was resorted to to stop the depression. The doctrine of public made-work spending, as a balance-wheel when private investment gets scared off, is alluring. There are several difficulties with it mostly due to the nature of human nature. Public spending provides patronage and gets votes. Instead of being just a temporary device for counterbalancing a deficiency of private enterprise, it tends to become a permanent device for keeping the party and the bureaucrats in power. It corrupts the electorate. To suggest public spending as something to do in bad times and stop in good times—as an automatic adjuster to avoid booms and depressions— is to ignore politics. As "pump-priming" was forgotten, and made-work spending became habitual in the 1930's, the deadening effect of increasing taxation and government competition counterbalanced the stimulus of government spending; and the depression was prolonged. Neither long-continued government spending, nor long-continued deficit and deficit fianancing will end depression or underemployment, however helpful a brief pump-priming of that sort may be.

Another aspect of fiscal policy, taxation, requires attention in our study of our Government's management of our economy. During the second postwar deflation, though the debt increased, taxes, or rather tax rates, were actually increased. The drastic Hawley-Smoot tariff was adopted in June 1930, and was followed by an abrupt fall in international trade to which it contributed. Customs receipts, which had been $602,000,000 in 1929 and $587,000,000 in the fiscal year 1930, fell to $378,000,000 in 1931, $328,000,000 in 1932, and $251,000,000 in 1933. Rates were increased and receipts reduced.

The total receipts of the Federal Government exceeded its expenditures by a relatively small margin in 1929 and in 1930; but in 1931 the decline in receipts resulted in a deficit of nearly $1,000,000,000. This situation led Secretary Mellon, in his annual report for 1931, to recommend "a very substantial increase in the revenues through taxation."

Early in 1932, Secretary Mills stated that the new revenue act should provide $1,125,000,000 of new taxes; and after the enactment, in his annual report for 1932, the Secretary wrote: "The revenue act of 1932 effected one of the largest increases in taxes ever imposed by the Federal Government in peacetimes. In a year in which the enactment of any new revenue measure presented grave difficulties, the placing on the statute books of an act so substantial in scope was an impressive achievement."

Notwithstanding the higher rates of income tax imposed by the 1932 act, receipts from such taxes fell off sharply. In 1931, they had amounted to $1,860,000,000; in 1932, they were $1,057,000,000; and in 1933, they were $746,000,000 Total ordinary receipts of about $2,000,000,000 from all sources in 1932 and 1933 were only about one-half what they had been in 1929 and 1930. That shows the futility of the persistently deflationary tax policy pursued by our Government in the course of the most dreadful deflation in modern history. From 1931 to 1933 our Government tried to cover the deficiency in revenue due to falling business, falling incomes, and rising burdens of expenditure by raising tax rates. Government tried to squeeze blood out of a stone. It tried to collect reve-

nues out of the taxpayers' losses. It aggravated the depression in the futile effort to balance the budget.

Government revenues are chiefly dependent on business and incomes, and must fall off in bad times; and the only way to improve them is to let honest, well-managed business show a profit after taxes. In bad times the higher the tax rate, the less business, the less employment, and the less revenue there will be. Tax rates should not be raised but perhaps even be lowered in bad times to bring business recovery and employment and revenue to the Treasury. As a businessman who is losing money may have to reduce his prices to move his goods in bad times, so a government which is losing revenue in bad times may have to reduce tax rates and face a temporary deficit so that its citizens may be able to do business at a profit and have some income to pay taxes on.

Furthermore, our tax system came, during the thirties, to be deflationary and depressant, not only because the tax burden was excessive but also because the incidence of taxation was bad. Excessive surtax rates in the higher brackets, excessive death duties, double taxation of corporation income (once to the company and again to the stockholders) put a heavy premium on inertia and a penalty on enterprise and risk taking. This should be corrected. A man must see the hope of adequate profit after taxes for himself, and of adequate savings for his family after his death, or he won't take business risks or make great efforts.

Other Government policies were depressant, too. Restrictions on the hours and days of labor, and on output, and restrictions on farm production, were part of a planned economy of permanent depression and artificial shortages. We were producing more food than world markets would take, and our Government paid marginal farmers to stay in the farm business, instead of turning to something else, and paid them not to produce so much, to plow under crops and to kill little pigs. "The business of 'not raising hogs' was a highly flourishing industry," said the Statist. The planners seemed to have lost faith in America. They sought to benefit organized labor and farmers at the expense of the general public. They could not see that neither farmer nor laborer could prosper long in an impoverished community. They could not believe in the economy of abundance and were concerned more with changing each man's share of poverty than with sharing wealth.

I have reviewed the three postwar inflations and deflations to make it clear that inflation and deflation are not just happenings, or strokes of fate, or acts of God. The first inflation was war's aftermath, but the other two were managed inflations, and all three deflations were managed deflations. It won't do to attribute them to the weather, or the crops, or war or peace, or the wrath of the gods, or the business cycle, or the disappearance of the frontier, or to a mature economy. Government made inflations and deflations, booms and depressions, by taxing and spending, by currency inflation, and monetary management.

I do not say that in criticism of the high-minded and able men in Government and its agencies who managed our money and our fiscal policy during the last quarter century. Our Government managers have been good men doing the best they knew how to do under evil conditions created by the wars and the economic wars between the wars. To relieve a depression with cheap money, to arrest an inflation with dear money, to balance the Budget (or try to) by raising tax rates, all these are classically correct measures in accordance with the best tradition of monetary management and public finance in England and America. But it did not work well. It must not happen so again.

These are the lessons of the past. Let us turn now from the too gorgeous 20's and the drab, dreary 30's to the years ahead. What prospect is there of jobs for the boys when they come home victorious from the wars? In the New York Times Magazine, May 24, 1942, Geoffrey Crowther, editor of the London Economist, wrote:

"The popular memory is short, and the public has a rather distorted view of what happened after the last war. For example, the general view at this distance in time is that it proved to be difficult to find jobs for all the men released from the Army and from munitions factories, and that the resulting unemployment was the origin of the sharp postwar slump. But the actual facts were very different.

"Both in Great Britain and in America the demobilization of the great war armies was virtually complete by the fall of 1919; most of the war factories were closed or reduced to a care-and-maintenance basis by about the same time. But there was very little unemployment in 1919 or for the greater part of 1920 either. On the contrary, those were boom times with a distinct shortage of labor. It was not until the spring of 1920 that prices began to weaken and it was not until the last months of that year, 2 years after the armistice, that unemployment in significant dimensions began to appear; 1921 was the first depression year."

Judging from that experience, we may reasonably hope that there will be employment for those who want to work during the first postwar period of, say, 2 to 5 years after the war. There will be job displacements on a vast scale, and many a delay in reemployment, but we need not have to endure continuous mass unemployment of normally employable persons in that period.

This reasonable hope of reasonably full employment in the first years after the war can, I think, only be realized if the Government terminates its war contracts promptly and fairly, pays the contractors promptly and fully without quibbling, clears the factory floors of its war machines, does not dump its accumulations of war supplies in the market too fast, and does not go into business with its war plants in competition with business. That is quite a lot of "if's." Yet it is a very simple and sensible program; and it is a condition of full employment after the war. Is it too much to hope that after our final victory overseas we shall have an era of peace and good will between government and business and labor here at home?

Inflation control may be the major domestic problem during the first postwar period of from 2 to 5 years after the war, more or less. There is, of course, war inflation now. Nobody has ever yet invented a way of stopping an inflation without making money dear, as in 1920 and 1929, or relatively scarce as in 1937, and so bringing on deflation, depression, and unemployment.

We are told now that we are always to have managed low interest rates; and indeed the war debt issued at low interest rates will be so great, and the displacement of men and industry for war purposes has been on such a vast scale that a strong, dear money policy would seem to be quite out of the question, at least in the early postwar years. It would be wholly inconsistent with prompt readjustment and jobs for all. Our war-weary people could not endure another deflation so soon.

An alternative measure of inflation control, which was experimented with in 1936 and 1937, is an increase in reserve requirements, with a view to making money scarce, rather than dear. That may be more violent even than a severe increase in interest rates, which increases the cost, but not, in the first instance, the amount, of loans available. Gov. Benjamin Strong, the first great Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, used to tell me: "You may increase the price of money, but you must never make it unobtainable." We have seen how drastic was the effect of increases in reserve requirements, among other things, in 1937, when the banks had immense excess reserves. That remedy would create unimaginable disaster if applied at a time when the banks' resources were quite fully employed.

Then how shall our rulers stop inflation? In view of the impossibility of using a strong dear money policy, or scarce money policy, the only plan of inflation control I have heard of is to continue rationing and control of prices and wages indefinitely. I doubt that would, except as a temporary expedient, be acceptable to the people. If it were adopted as a permanent policy, it would, I fear, lead to long depression and unemployment and decay of our economy. Diocletian couldn't make it work. Hitler had to have a Gestapo and a World War to make it work; and even then it didn't work too well, as Howard Smith shows in Last Train From Berlin. We had our experience with bootleggers of drink after the last war. It would be too bad to have to deal with bootleggers of food after this one.

But we cannot take the lid off and abandon all price fixing, wage fixing, and rationing with any safety immediately after the war. It can only be done gradually and selectively. Whatever may have been the merits or demerits of the policy, it must be continued in each case until actual shortages of civilian goods have been measurably relieved and until supply and necessitous demand have been measurably balanced. I say necessitous demand because production will never catch up with inflation demand. Sooner or later monetary inflation has got to be controlled somehow. Price control only deals with symptoms.

We must control money inflation after the war, but not be rough about it. We must do it so skillfully, so carefully, as to avoid throwing ourselves into depression and unemployment. To that end taxes should be held at a pretty high level at first, but not too long. Debt should be decreased, but not too fast. Federal Reserve support of the bond market should be withdrawn cautiously, but withdrawn. Money may thus be allowed to become, but not be made, less cheap, though not dear. By that I mean to suggest a negative or static rather than a positive Federal Reserve policy at sometime after the war; that is, to stop buying more Government paper but hold what the System then has; and to let the bank rate follow the market rather than force it. The authorities must control money inflation, but go gently about it; and at the first sign relax controls instantly before deflation sets in; remembering it is much easier to stop the economic machine than to start it again, much easier to stop an inflation than to stop a deflation.

If these gentler methods succeed it should never be necessary to revert to the rough old method of dear money. Let us hope not. It is too devastating, too certain to create depression and unemployment.

When inflation has been controlled, and urgent civilian shortages have been satisfied, and war savings of cash and bonds have been spent by the unthrifty—say, 2 to 5 years after final victory—the problem of maintaining full employment without interruption may be expected to arise. It has never heretofore been solved for more than a limited period and under special conditions. Russia solved it for a time between the wars. Her authoritarian government, with despotic power, undertook the gigantic task of revolutionizing her economy, of industrializing the nation and mechanizing its agriculture, and creating a great army, in two decades. Of course, there was full employment for everyone, though at a low standard of living. In Germany Hitler undertook the task of rearming a disarmed nation, and creating the greatest mechanized army

and air power then ever known, in less time. Of course, there was work for all, making guns and going without butter. Just so during the war there is more than enough work for all in America who will accept it.

It does not follow, however, from the examples of Germany and Russia, that in a well-developed, industrialized economy such as ours, in time of peace, the secret has been discovered of immunity from the alterations of good and bad times, the revolving of the business cycle, which like sunshine and shadow, rain and drought, summer and winter, have characterized the affairs of man on this earth from the beginning. There seems no reason to believe that, from the ashes of the greatest and most devastating war of all time, there can promptly spring, full-grown, an economy so perfectly functioning that everybody will have a job waiting for him, whether he wants it or not, and that everybody will have social and economic security assured to him, whether he works very hard for it or not. But in the course of her growth and development our beloved country has been able to provide more jobs and a higher standard of living for her people than any other country under normal conditions. After the war we must continue the march of economic and social progress and the struggle for the production and better distribution among all the people of the good things of life. We should not promise too much, but we cannot and need not endure mass unemployment again.

What government can do is to avoid active deflation such as occurred in the period between the wars. Tax reduction, easy money, free prices and wages, and private enterprise will be the best instruments for avoiding deflation and depression in the secondary period after this war.

We can bear neither inflation nor deflation, neither boom nor depression, nor unemployment, after this war. For better or worse, we have given our Government and its agencies heretofore unheard-of powers to plan our economy and to manage our money. We expect from them an orderly America for the men of our fighting forces to come back to and work in. We do not expect a feather bed for them, but a good happy healthy place to work in and jobs to work at. We cannot expect for them security, though we provide a measure of insurance against some of the ills no foresight can avert. But we do expect and demand for them opportunity.

Mechanization and mass production have made it necessary for government to care for the welfare of all its citizens to an extent never dreamed of before. To talk about laissez faire, self-reliance, thrift, the struggle for existence, and the survival of the fittest, to workers whose job is to tend the machine, is just stupid when the machine stops, as it did in 1933. The machine must not stop again.

After this war, as after the last, government policy, fiscal, monetary, and economic, will determine these matters. I do not know whether that is a good thing or a bad thing. I know it is a necessary thing. It is quite impossible for government to carry us into the second of two world wars and through it, and then just release the controls and say "laissez faire." It would be quite as disastrous as if the pilot of a big bomber were to fly up 30,000 feet and then take his hands off the controls and say "laissez faire."

This is an essay about managing our economy and so concerned chiefly with domestic policies. But our economy cannot be managed in isolation. We must find outlets abroad, foreign markets, for our surplus production. We are geared to produce far more of many things than we can consume among ourselves. To do so we must buy, as well as sell, goods and services abroad; and make foreign loans and investments.

The first condition of foreign trade and investment is the establishment of law and order in the world. We must have a peaceful world to trade in.

Further, our Government must cancel our allies' war debts, new and old. These represent wealth blown up and destroyed, not self-supporting investment. They represent munitions and supplies provided by us to enable the gallant men of our allies to fight, in the common cause, battles which otherwise our own men must have fought. And we should have repealed before this the Johnson Act, which, to our shame, has blacklisted our allies and forbidden private loans to them. These are barriers to recovery and employment.

Another thing we must do is to make Government loans and grants to friendly countries for relief and rehabilitation. Another condition of better business is to lower excessive tariffs and avoid subsidies. Still another is to establish orderly exchanges with the principal trading countries. Last but not least is a United States Government policy to advance and protect American interests and investments everywhere.

Without these reforms in our foreign economic relations, I fear we shall, sooner or later, have unemployment and unemployed capacity at home, while the world outside will be eager to buy our goods—in dire need of them—and will be unable to pay for them.

So our Government has the bear by the tail. It must continue to manage our money and public debt, arrange our taxes, and control our economy, for a time after the war, to avoid inflation, deflation, and unemployment. It must also aid in maintaining peace and world order and in the reconstruction of foreign nations, foreign exchanges, and foreign trade. But all this it should do with a view to ever decreasing its activities, relaxing its controls and restoring their freedom to our people. Gradually Government must free agriculture, industry, and commerce here at home if we are to have a prosperous economy. Our economy should not be repressive. Our money, if not mismanaged, was too much managed, between the wars. Business was overregulated, overinvestigated, overtaxed. The pump-priming, the Government spending, and deficit financing were sterile, as we have seen. After this war our Government's policy should be not to meddle much with our money and to give agriculture and enterprise a measure of freedom and a hope of profit after all taxes.

With all our Government's managing and planning let us not forget that we need the men who have vision and take risks, the farsighted men, the men who spend themselves, the ambitious men, and the thrifty ones who save money and form capital, in war and in peace, as we have always needed them, to vitalize our economy, to give it life and strength and hope, to give us inventions and discoveries, to provide all our people with profitable opportunities, to make jobs plentiful, and well-paid jobs for everybody. We are winning these wars partly because of the health, skill, and efficiency, the high standard of living, which the American system of enterprise and of economic rewards has developed in this country. America was settled by adventurous, individualistic men and women who came from Europe in search of freedom of speech and faith, freedom to work out their own salvation by their own unaided efforts. These immigrants and their descendants have achieved a high level of general welfare which makes healthy, hardy people. Imbued with the spirit of freedom, adventure, and enterprise, they have created and renewed and developed American industry and American farming, American management and labor and mechanized farming, and above all American manhood, to unparalleled efficiency. Our gallant fighting men are huskier and better armed and better fed than our enemies. Therefore, it is that they, with our great allies, have won the war on the western fronts and expect and intend to finish the job in the east before too long. Let us see to it that we keep our America the land of freedom and opportunity.

Radio Speech of Hon. John W. McCormack Made From Station WNAC Over the Mutual Broadcasting System the Evening of September 4, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by me:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, what volumes it means to us, and to many millions throughout the world, that the war is over. The holocaust of hate, terror, and destruction has ceased. We now know this war was nothing but a sequel to the last one. Woodrow Wilson tried to avert this war, but he was before his time. The people failed to heed his voice. Certain political opponents, demagogs, bigots, and false prophets divided our people. Let us hope we will not let the same thing happen again.

It is what we do now, and in the next few years, that will determine whether or not we shall have another war 25 or 30 years from now, as well as determine the course of the world for generations to come. In the shaping and the making of a better world each one of us has our duties to perform. Above all, we must think and reason clearly, and we must exercise our God-given will power in the right direction. All other countries and their peoples who seek peace must also do the same thing.

"The true foundation stone," as has well been said, "of sound peaceful relations with other nations, as well as with ourselves, is 'Love thy neighbor as thyself.'" When nations, as well as individuals, ignore the Ten Commandments, they are in trouble.

While this is a time for joy, it should be a serious joy, a spiritual joy, to thank God for guiding our leaders, our armed forces and our people to a righteous victory; and to petition Him for His divine guidance in the trying days to come, to direct and guide the leaders and the peoples of the nations of the world in the making of a durable peace, and to help us solve successfully our domestic problems.

This is the time to honor those in the service, and particularly the memories of those who gave up their lives that our country might live. Those who have paid the supreme sacrifice are heroes and martyrs for continued American independence and liberty, and for a decent world in which we might live.

In this time of spiritual joy and reflection, let us pause to pay honor to the mothers, fathers, wives, and children of those who died that we might live as a free people. There is not much we can say to them except to express our deep sympathy, but a grateful country can and should always remember the sacrifices of their loved ones. I am sure, as time passes, the loved ones left behind will secure more and more consolation in the knowledge that their son, husband, father, brother, or sister gave up their lives not only to save our country—but that it might continue to live to give to you and I of today, and to future generations of Americans, the rights and blessings of liberty as understood

under, and guaranteed by, American institutions of government. Liberty is a precious heritage, sanctified by the blood of martyrs, something to be cherished and fought for when endangered. The Revolutionary heroes fought to obtain liberty: The heroes of this war fought to retain liberty.

For we must remember, that if we lost this war, we would not only have lost a war, but we would have lost our beloved country as well.

In the Great Beyond is this generation of Americans' contribution to the great figures of all time, our late beloved President and leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Without regard to our political affiliation, or how we felt on some of his policies when he was with us, as Americans, we can all pay homage to his memory. For it was the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt that planned and guided the United Nations to victory.

We respect and value the contributions made by the leaders of the other United Nations, but the outstanding leader among them all was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Faced with the most serious and dangerous external threat to our country's existence in its history—Franklin D. Roosevelt steered the ship of state in such a brilliant and courageous manner that upon his death it had entered a safe port.

To him—all honor is due.

This man of destiny has taken his place among the outstanding leaders of all history.

We cannot and should not forget the masterly handling of the war by President Truman since he entered the White House. Faced with the most trying situation that ever confronted a President of our country, President Truman has carried on with tact and judgment and courage.

To him, we are indebted for the leadership that brought about the final capitulation of Japan.

We must remember that on the Monday preceding the offer to quit, that President Truman, then on the high seas, on his way back to the United States, announced the invention of the atomic bomb, one of which was immediately dropped with deadly effect on the city of Hiroshima.

The following Wednesday, President Truman announced to the world the entry of Soviet Russia into the war in the Far East.

These were staggering blows to the Japanese leaders.

But President Truman climaxed these blows by his blunt speech of the following Friday night, which showed the Japs that unless they surrendered unconditionally our powerful attacks, growing in strength, would continue.

The Japanese offer to surrender came the next day.

For 4 days President Truman carried on a war of nerves against the Japanese leaders, the like of which the world has never seen before. It produced the desired results—the early capitulation of the enemy, thereby saving countless of thousands of American killed and wounded, as well as British, Russian, and Chinese.

While it was only a matter of time, during which our death toll would have been large, the sudden ending of the war was due to the determined, well-considered, and well-timed drive made by President Truman during the 4 days prior to the Japs' offer to surrender.

We should take pride in this leadership, which shortened the war, thereby saving countless of thousands of lives of our boys, and quickening the time when your loved ones will be home again with you.

To defeat the enemy it took the combined might and efforts of the United Nations. Let us hope that the unity that existed to win the war will continue to exist to win the peace.

While we give full credit to the other nations allied with us, we should also take full credit for the part our country played in this historic victory. Our country's contributions were the determining factor in the winning of the war.

It was the weapons of war produced by American labor and management; the money of our people that enabled Great Britain and Soviet Russia to first resist, and second take the offensive and help bring victory. The people of brave China also played their part, an important one, in the successful outcome of the war.

If it were not for the contributions of the United States before Pearl Harbor, Great Britain and Soviet Russia, despite the bravery of their people, could not have carried on. After Pearl Harbor it was the might of America—on land, on sea, underneath the sea, in the air, in our factories—everywhere, "America on the march," that turned the tide and brought ultimate victory. Without boasting, we can take justifiable pride in that fact. "I am an American" has greater significance to us today than it ever had before in our lifetime.

While we have won the war, we have the results of the war facing us. This presents many trying problems to solve. None of these problems are unsurmountable if we continue, as in war, to have unity of thought and action among our people. During the period of the war America showed the world an example of leadership and action amounting to what has been termed "a miracle." Free men and women, realizing the danger to our institutions and our liberties, produced weapons of war and food; our manhood and womanhood responded for service, fought, and died; we were the deciding factor in the greatest victory in the history of man. Nothing was impossible. If we continue with the same spirit in the postwar era there will be no problem confronting us that we cannot solve.

On the domestic front the big task is the quick reconversion from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy.

This is a matter of vital importance to each one of us.

In this transition, the Congress can and should play its part by the passage of legislation that will help bring about the change quickly. Speed is the essence of success. In the passage of such legislation, the Congress must consider human rights and values as well as property rights and values. Industrial and financial leaders should recognize this fact. We are living in a dynamic era, with great changes taking place, and more to come, and leaders in all walks of life should take cognizance of that fact. We want the leadership that will guide those changes along the pathway of the American way of life; leaders with vision and courage.

One thing is certain, that whatever further legislation is necessary in the best interests of our returning veterans, it should be passed as quickly as possible. A grateful Nation must assume and pay its just obligation to our veterans of this war.

Once there was a time when the wide expanse of the Atlantic Ocean constituted a natural barrier against aspirations of aggressors far removed from our shores. We had the Pacific on our western shores as a further guaranty of protected isolation. Today, these tremendous bodies of water can be spanned overnight by modern aircraft. More and more deadly weapons of war will be devised. Oceans are no longer liquid fortifications that insulate us against the ravages of war. We cannot live apart from the rest of the world.

America is the most powerful military nation today the world has ever seen. Not for imperialism, or for war, but for peace, we must maintain our power. That does not mean maintaining our armed forces at their present strength, but it does mean that we cannot permit our strength to again slip away as we did after the last war. It means that we must remain strong and powerful for good. America has no imperialistic aims. No other nation need fear the power of the United States. Our motives are clean and wholesome. But we have seen what can happen when we allow our strength to become dissipated—the birth of a Hitler, and the lust of a hateful Japan. We should not permit that to happen again. Smaller nations need have no fear of a United States that maintains military power to be used as trust for peace. Power in a nation like the United States is protection for their sovereignty and for their continued existence. Might in itself is not evil. It is only when the policy of "might is right" is followed by a powerful nation that evil results. If the powerful nations of today were to renounce the policy of might is right, and to substitute the policy of respect for all nations, large and small, the foundation laid at San Francisco would have greater assurances of success.

The greatness of our people lies in their faith in the principles, which are based on truth, which our country stands for. It was that faith which stood by us in the dark days of the war, turning impending defeat into a glorious victory.

After two painful experiences of global wars within the lifetime of most of us, let us use that faith, asking the guidance and help of God Almighty, toward another great objective, the victory of peace.

Let us go forward determined to do those things that will enable your children and their descendants for countless generations to live a normal, happy, peaceful life, instead of being constantly faced with the fear of war.

If we do this, out of the evil of this and the last war, we will have brought goodness.

Report on Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pleasure that I report to you that the degree of doctor of laws—honoris causa—was conferred upon our former colleague, Hon. Francisco A. Delgado, by the Indiana University on Sunday, August 19, 1945. Judge Delgado served in this body as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States. He was a delegate to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco and is one of the prominent jurists of the Philippines. Under leave granted me, I include with my remarks the commencement address delivered by Mr. Delgado at Indiana University:

Mr. President, distinguished members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, it was about 4 decades and 1 year ago that I first entered the portals of Indiana University as a student of law. Since then, under the very able guidance of Presidents William L. Bryan and H. R. Wells, and the various faculties, it has progressed so much in all lines of endeavor—scientific and educational, moral and spiritual, as well as physical and material—that I felt like a total stranger here upon my return this time. However, though most of the old landmarks and members of the former faculty are no more, upon meeting the new executives and members of the present

faculty, I at once felt at home again because it was evident that the same spirit of democracy, service, kindliness, and loyalty still pervades the whole atmosphere of our dear alma mater.

Although the most savage global war in history has just terminated, it may not be untimely to address you on the Effects of the Pacific Conflict on American-Philippine Relations.

As a matter of historical retrospect, it may be recalled that in the year 1941 the Philippines was a land of plenty and of 18,000,000 happy people.

With an area of 115,000 square miles or about the size of the combined territories of the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, they were very rich in agricultural, mineral, and forestal resources.

Located in the very center of the Far East or southwestern Pacific, their principal neighbors were Japan, less than a thousand miles on the north, the Asian Continent on the west, and on the south Malaya, Borneo, and Java, with Australia and New Zealand in the far south.

The Filipinos are the only Christian nation in that part of the world. Upon the foundation of four centuries of Latin-western civilization brought over by Spain, which was happily blended with the autochthonous-Malayan type found there, America's liberal colonial policy since 1898 helped the Filipinos build up a fine superstructure of a truly democratic form of government of the Anglo-Saxon pattern.

In the sphere of laws, the Philippines became the happy meeting and blending ground of the world's two greatest systems, the civil or Roman law and the Anglo-Saxon common law. Our substantive laws were patterned after the Spanish codes with such changes as the local customs required; but on the subjects of corporations, bills and notes, and bankruptcy, as well as on procedural laws, we have followed the common law.

Our standards of life were much higher than those of our neighbors. Organized labor prevailed all over our entire archipelago.

Under the Tydings-McDuffie law, approved by the United States Congress in 1934, the Philippine Commonwealth was established November 15, 1935, with complete self-government in internal affairs and a promise of complete independence for July 4, 1946, or after a preparatory period of 10 years.

Is it any wonder, then, that upon the breaking of the hostilities in the Pacific, of all the colonies held by the western powers in the Far East, the Philippine archipelago should have been the only one wholly contented and absolutely loyal to the sovereign power and the American flag, as well as to the ideals and traditions which the same represented? This is the best tribute that can be paid to the American experiment in colonization.

By the same token, it is only natural that the Philippines should be, as they were, among the first places attacked by the Japanese when the treacherous raid on Pearl Harbor took place.

This brings us to the Japanese invasion and occupation of the Philippines. To begin with, it may be asserted that though the President and the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth had to leave their capital city and were finally exiled at Washington, D. C., the Philippines was never actually conquered by the Japanese: First, because guerrilla warfare, entirely supported by the people, never ceased in all the principal islands; and second, because passive resistance on the part of the populace always prevailed in all the occupied cities and towns.

But it must be conceded as a fact that the Japanese, after 5 months of very hard fighting on land, sea, and the air, as well as terrific losses in men and equipment, did succeed in occupying Manila (already declared an open city and yet repeatedly bombed) and almost all the provincial capitals and important towns. This was due to the fact that we were caught utterly unprepared at the outbreak of the Pacific war.

Nevertheless, the decided resistance offered by the less than 10,000 American and about 75,000 Filipino officers and men, ill-equipped and poorly fed, against the overwhelming odds of almost one-half million well-trained and modernly equipped Japanese soldiers, and which resulted in a delay of about 5 months in the Mikado's schedule, is the most eloquent proof of both the unexcelled strategy of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his staff and the unequaled bravery and spirit of heroism of each and all the officers and men under them.

Had MacArthur and his men received the necessary and promised outside assistance in equipment and supplies, the Philippines would never have been occupied by the Japanese.

Withal, the 5 months' delay suffered by the Japanese in the Philippines had two vital results of very far-reaching consequences in the Pacific war: Firstly, it gave the United States of America time to send the necessary assistance to Australia, and thus the latter was saved from invasion and occupation. Had the Japanese bypassed the Philippines and gone directly to Australia, at the very beginning, that country would have been conquered, in the same way that Hongkong, Singapore, and Java were conquered. And in that case we would have lost the only base in the southwest Pacific large enough from which to start our counteroffensive. Secondly, the attention of the Japanese was detracted from following up the advantage gained by them from Pearl Harbor debacle. In other words, they were compelled to use in the Philippines air, naval, and land forces which they could have used in further assaults on Hawaii or the west coast of continental United States.

Hence the battlegrounds of Bataan and Corregidor shall ever be consecrated in this Global War's history as the hallowed places where American-Philippine friendship and unity have been cemented in blood and in the common cause of freedom, and as the first real turning point of the tide of battle in the southwestern Pacific's total fight.

Now, let us delve briefly into the policies followed by the Japanese during their occupation of the Philippines. At the beginning, they attempted to attract the people to their ideas and ideals and used force only against those openly recalcitrant to the same. Under such pompous propaganda words as "Greater East Asia coprosperity sphere" and "Asia for the Asians" they tried to force the Filipinos to go through what they called a spiritual rejuvenation, whereby they wanted us to cast off Christianity and all vestige of western civilization and influence, at once and forever, and to imbibe, in place thereof, the so-called Japanese oriental culture, including the blind faith in the alleged divine origin of their Emperor. Naturally they failed, and they failed, among other reasons because: (1) The Filipino people's faith in America and her ideals and pledges were unshakable, based, as it was, on convictions brought about by rational thinking; (2) the so-called Japanese civilization was not in reality autochthonously oriental, but rather a composite one, hinging primarily on ideas borrowed from the west. A mere inspection of their soldiery's uniforms and equipment conclusively demonstrated this; and (3) actually they took everything of value (our currency, rice, medicines, machineries, automobiles, etc.) and gave in return nothing but absolutely worthless war notes, which did not even contain a promise to pay. The purchasing power of these war notes was so depreciated by 1944 that a pound of rice cost ₱1,000; a pound of beef or pork or sugar, ₱800; a package of Camels or Chesterfields, ₱200; a box of matches, ₱25; a pair of shoes, ₱1,000; and other commodities at about the same rates.

And because they failed in obtaining the cooperation and good will of the Filipinos, Tokyo decided on a policy of absolute ruthlessness and brutality, and wanton destruction of properties all over the Philippines. Consequently, from the very beginning of the landings of the forces of liberation at Leyte, orders were issued to barricade and fortify every building and street corner of any importance at all, and to place artillery emplacements, machine-gun nests, and infantry billets in strategical places everywhere, including the strictly residential sections of the cities and towns. Later on, as the battle for the recapture of Luzon progressed in favor of the forces of liberation, orders were given to shoot and kill the people on sight and to destroy whatever of value could not be carried away. As a result of their inhumanity, numerous young girls in Manila and elsewhere were ravished and then bayoneted or otherwise put to death; whole families were wiped out; men, women, and children were herded in churches and other large buildings, which were then set on fire or blown up by explosives. According to the latest estimates, the casualties will probably total a million souls.

Manila, formerly known as the Pearl of the Orient, is no more. The old walled city, originally founded more than three centuries ago, with all its ancient cathedrals and churches, is completely destroyed with the exception of one. Also gone forever is the old site of Santo Tomas University, the oldest university under the American flag. Other irreplaceable landmarks, the entire business section, most of the Government buildings, two-thirds of the University of the Philippines, Government and private hospitals, and many residential districts are all a pile of rubble and rubbish. In short, the modern city known as Greater Manila, is, on the whole, about 40 to 50 percent destroyed.

But in the same way that no cloud is ever without a silver lining, the great suffering caused by the Second World War has revealed a very bright side of American-Philippine relations, coupled with brilliant prospects for the future. In the first place, it has shown to the world that gratitude, absolute fidelity to the pledged word and sincere loyalty are human virtues shared alike in the highest degree by the peoples of both this great country and the Philippines.

Undoubtedly, these were the fine sentiments which impelled the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in behalf of the American people, to proclaim, as early as December 28, 1941, to the people of the Philippines that their freedom would be redeemed and their independence established and protected. It should be noted that this protection then proffered is a new addition to the terms of the Independence Act (known as the Tydings-McDuffie law) of 1934. Such a pledge was subequently and repeatedly reiterated in public addresses and messages to Congress. Indeed, the late President further implemented and supplemented that pledge by giving the Philippine government the de facto recognition of an independent state when, through his efforts, the said Commonwealth government was invited to and did become a signatory of the United Nations Declaration of 1942. Since then it has participated in its own right in all the meetings and conferences of the United Nations, as a regular member thereof.

The United States Congress, by approval of Senate Joint Resolution No. 93 in June 1944, confirmed the above pledges of the President of the United States and granted the authority he requested for the acquisition of the necessary land, air, and naval bases in the Philippines, to carry out the protection promised, as well as for the advancement of the date of independence as soon as constitutional processes and normal functions of government have been restored.

President Truman, soon after his assumption of office, reaffirmed President Roosevelt's promises and commitments, and recommended that there shall be free trade with the Philippines even after independence.

The pledge of liberation has now been fulfilled. On October 20, 1944, General MacArthur and his forces of liberation landed on Leyte Island, saying that he had returned in accordance with his promise to do so. With General MacArthur were President Sergio Osmeñ and members of his war cabinet. Two days thereafter General MacArthur turned over the Commonwealth government to President Osmeña in Tacloban, capital of Leyte. On January 6, 1945, the forces of liberation landed in Lingayen, Luzon Island, and on February 27, 1945, the Commonwealth government was reestablished in Manila. Early last July he officially proclaimed the liberation of the entire Philippine Archipelago, with only mopping-up operations still remaining to be done in some parts of Luzon and Mindanao.

On the other hand, the same fine human feelings mentioned above impelled the people of the Philippines to reciprocate in kind and be absolutely loyal to America and the Americans. To illustrate this, it is unnecessary to enumerate the epical deeds of the Philippine guerrillas, which are now well known here. It is the behavior of the common people, the anonymous and unsung heroes, that I wish to mention today. A few examples will suffice to demonstrate the general spontaneous feeling of friendship and devotion prevailing in their hearts.

When the bombing of Manila by our air forces started in earnest on September 23, 1944, the people, instead of seeking shelter as at the time of the Japanese bombing, actually went out to the streets to cheer our aviators, disregarding the great danger from the antiaircraft shrapnel of the Japanese. And when the corpses of three of the aviators of the only B–24 ever brought down by the Japanese in Manila fell in the San Juan district, later that day, the people of that neighborhood, as if moved by magic, marched in procession to give them a Christian burial. Thereafter peoples of all ages and means flocked at all hours of the day and night to their graves with flowers and other decorations, in tribute to their memory. This became so notorious that the Japanese had to use a regiment of soldiers to stop the pilgrimage.

The food vendors in the railroad stations, many of them young girls in their teens, time and again risked their lives and broke through the cordon formed by Japanese soldiers to give their foodstuffs to hungry American prisoners herded in boxcars of passing trains. Likewise, old people and young boys also risked their lives, or at least their freedom, just to hand a cigarette or a cigar to the poor prisoners.

In the cities and towns, as well as in the villages and mountains, every Filipino, rich or poor, was ever ready and willing to share what little or much he had with the servicemen of the United States. But what was still more astounding was that everyone, old and young, man or woman, was ever a potential underground worker to assist the forces fighting the Japanese.

In short, the present war has brought about the most magnanimous and unselfish attitude on the part of both America and the Philippines toward each other and the only thing remaining in the great undertaking of education and emancipation carried out by this country in the Orient is the formal proclamation of the independence of the Philippines on or before July 4, 1946.

In passing, it should be mentioned right here that Indiana University has amply shared in that fine undertaking. From the very beginning it has contributed such educators and scientists as Dr. E. B. Bryan, Dr. Rebecca Parish and Mr. H. V. Bordner, to mention only a few. They were followed by a list of scholars too long to enumerate and its latest important contribution in the political field was in the person of High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt. In addition, it has opened its gates to Filipino students since 1904 and always gave them every facility to attain higher education.

When the crowning glory of that unprecedented work shall have come about, it will not mean that the Philippines shall be cast aloof themselves, as formerly contemplated. On the contrary, under the present arrangement the independent Philippines shall have the double protection of the United States and the United Nations. And, in addition, free trade shall be continued between the two countries according to the latest recommendation of the present administration.

I wish to emphasize the importance of the continuation of free trade between the two countries after independence. While I believe that the Philippines are sufficiently rich in resources to survive the loss of American markets, yet it cannot be denied that such a loss at present might cause an economic dislocation, if not an economic revolution, due to the confiscation and destruction of machinery and other effects of 3 years of enemy occupation, and since free trade is mutually advantageous there is no valid reason whatever why the same should not be continued as long as the Philippines serve as the frontier of the Western Hemisphere in the southwestern Pacific.

In the second place, it has also demonstrated that the mutual usefulness to each other of this country and the Philippines will long survive the Pacific conflict just ended and will continue in the ascendancy in the days of peace to come. It must be recalled that the future markets of the world will be in that part of the globe. The billions upon billions of underprivileged peoples in China, India, Malaysia, and Indonesia are just waiting for their turn in the enjoyment of the blessings of education and the democratic ways of life promised them by the Charter recently adopted by the United Nations. The United States of America, as before, and the Philippines led in the formulation of such policies in that Magna Carta of the world in the Conference at San Francisco and will naturally lead in their actual execution in the near future. This will enhance more and more the undiminished great moral prestige and influence of the United States among the oriental nations. It will win for America not only their increased respect and admiration but—what is most important of all—their confidence, good will, and friendship. And whether you want it or not, trade will follow such good will and friendship. So that from the point of view of both the strictly moral values of world altruism, as well as the utilitarian—but more realistic—one, this great country will be twice blessed by ample returns in the future.

But the Philippines shall not lag behind in this very bright prospect of the future. As the western and Christian frontier out there, together with their central location, they are the natural and logical distributing center of American ideals and ideas, as well as of American products, in the Far East. The Philippines can be the spearhead of democracy in the Far East. Therefore, as I visualize the future for my country, it is evident that in the same way that the Philippines were inseparably linked with America in the titanic struggle of the past 4 years and by blood jointly spilled by their citizens, the two will be just as united in the days of prosperity and happiness to come.

Before closing, I hope I may be permitted to add my grain of sand in the forum of public opinion on the world topic of the hour, the peace terms to be imposed upon the Japanese.

Without hatred in my heart, notwithstanding the wanton and absolutely unprovoked wastage on their part of so many lives and countless properties in our country, I sincerely hope that those in charge of the preparation of the conditions to be imposed on them will see to it that the basic causes of the past world catastrophe are forever removed and that the real war criminals of the Pacific, irrespective of whoever they may be, are duly tried and punished.

Any signs of emotional softness or of becoming unduly lenient might be construed as weakness. It must ever be remembered that the Japanese cannot hide their hideous crimes even under the scriptural request of forgiveness because "they knew not what they were doing." For indeed they knew full well what they were about when they started in their inhuman and ruthless rampage for world conquest and domination.

The only way, to my mind, to prevent its recurrence in the future is by eliminating the system and philosophy of life by which, through blind faith, men became mere automatons who must uselessly sacrifice everything, life itself, to the ruler and the state. If necessary, the myth of the alleged divine origin of their Emperor must be exploded, to destroy once and for all the very basis of that blind faith. This is also essential if the program of the United Nations to reeducate the Japanese into the democratic ways of life and thought is to be carried out. They must be reborn and raised up, so to speak, into a proper evaluation and comprehension of the values of individual human rights and their proper relation with the prerogatives of the institutions organized by society for the common good of all.

On the other hand, to maintain the future peace and security of the world, due precautions must be taken in the distribution of the spoils of the war among the victors, to the end that the few potential sources of trouble may not be unduly furnished with means which might be used to start another world conflict.

We must succeed in these purposes, if the supreme sacrifice of those of our peoples who have laid down their lives in the field of battle shall not have been made in vain.

To the graduating class may I suggest the very brilliant and attractive prospects that the foreign service of this great Nation, both public and private, will hold in the near future to the young men and women duly qualified. As the primacy of the leadership of the United States in world affairs becomes more and more pronounced there shall be a correspondingly larger need for the necessary and suitable personnel to handle her diplomatic and commercial interests in the four corners of the earth. The possibilities are immeasurable, both in terms of service to one's country and one's own interest.

The Gored Oxen Bawl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a most interesting and timely editorial. It is from the September 19 issue of the Chicago Tribune:

THE GORED OXEN BAWL

The only unfavorable reaction to General MacArthur's announcement that he believes 200,000 American soldiers will be sufficient to police Japan 6 months from now came from the little jackasses in the State Department.

The consternation of the Army and Navy brass hats was, of course, expectable and to be ignored. They are worried about technological unemployment. Maybe they should take it up with Bill Green or Phil Murray.

The asininity of the striped pants brigade is something deserving attention. Acting Secretary Acheson said, testily, that the Department knows nothing about the General's statement, implying that he should have obtained departmental approval before making it. Some sublimated nitwit in Acheson's entourage made the snide comment that he hoped MacArthur was not creating the impression abroad that the United States was planning to withdraw from the Pacific area at an early date.

The answer to that one is so simple that even a State Department cooky pusher might have anticipated it. We aren't withdrawing from any part of the Pacific as long as we have a couple of dozen fleet carriers, an equal force of battleships, the biggest and best air force in the world—and the only supply of atomic bombs in the world.

Theoretically, at least, General MacArthur shouldn't need any troops. He could sit down in Japan by himself. The Japs know we've got it and they know we'll be back if they misbehave. Quite obviously MacArthur's plan for Japan is based on this fundamental fact, that we have this tremendous force, that the Japanese people realize it, and that they can be brought to regenerate their own nation with a minimum of administrative guidance from our Army.

That isn't a soft peace, but merely a sensible one. The sword is in our hand and they must do our bidding. It is unnecessary, in order to emphasize our power, to swashbuckle around Japan with a tremendous occupation force. Nearly every Japanese knows by now what happened to Hiroshima and no Japanese wants that repeated. Except for the modest force specified by General MacArthur, the rest of our Army in the Pacific can start home to resume the essential task of restoring peacetime production and the welcome one of picking up their own civilian lives where they abandoned them to defend their country.

The consternation in the State Department is quite easy to understand. Mr. Acheson and his subordinates are frightened witless by General MacArthur's statement because the line of policy he has adopted reveals, by contrast, the mental and moral bankruptcy of the policy they are attempting to execute in Germany. There is as yet no peace in that country. We are still waging a war of revenge on all of the German people and the measures we are pursuing will, unless they are corrected, remove all hope of stability in Europe for a generation or generations to come.

The Times, of London, on Monday, remarked that Germany's political and economic situation is not so much one of immediate crisis but rather of a slow stagnation which will almost certainly break down completely under the stress of the winter. The Times asserts that the time has come to place on the Germans a greater responsibility for the administration of their own country.

"In imposing on themselves the task of administering German affairs," the newspaper said, "the occupying powers have assumed a burden which they cannot possibly sustain for more than a brief period and there is a danger that the Allies, while falling far short of what would be needed to establish a competent administration, will discourage the Germans themselves from doing so and so unwittingly drive Germany further along the road of disruption and chaos."

That is the conservative British view. It is undoubtedly conditioned by the apprehension of British conservatives that Russia and communism will take over all continental Europe. The Communists thrive on chaos and suffering. Mr. Acheson and a number of his subordinates, who have moved in under the supposedly conservative Secretary Byrnes, are New Dealers. They may view a Russianized, communized western Europe with a good deal less foreboding even than Prime Minister Attlee, who has to live across the Channel from them. It is most certain that their views are not shared by the American people.

At the present level of chaos in Germany it is at least an even money bet that from five to fifteen million German men, women, and children are going to freeze or starve to death before this winter is over. There may be some who are willing to argue that this is a just punishment upon the German people for the suffering which Hitler and his gang inflicted on the rest of the world. If so, they should say so.

They should admit the consequences of the course of action that is being taken in Germany and not merely seek to defend it abstractly, on their present thesis that the Germans cannot be trusted to take part in an administration which we and our Allies are demonstrating daily we are incapable of carrying on. They should deny in their arguments, as they are denying by their actions that the war is over. They should assert, as they now imply, that people are evil because of their race and deserve to be extirpated because of their race. That's what the Communists and the American diplomats sympathetic to Russian imperialism are trying to do in Germany without admitting it.

Some of the military brass hats are already starting a campaign of ridicule in Berlin of what they call the soft-hearted policy of General MacArthur. We know this because we received a dispatch, quoting some of them anonymously along this line, and threw it in the wastebasket because we recognized it as false and malicious propaganda. These generals would be wiser if they kept their mouths shut and tried to remedy some of the deficiencies of our own administration.

MacArthur showed them up when he said that he could administer Japan on behalf of the United States alone with 200,000 men, while they are talking of keeping a million or a half million in Germany to share the job of administration with the British, the French, and the Russians. These generals are arguing, and arguing, not without suspicion of personal selfishness, that we have to keep that half million or a million American men away from their homes. That is not a popular argument and those who voice it are not going to be popular with the American people.

Quieting Title to Lands Beneath Tidewater and Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of the Federal Government, created by the consent of the States, the right of the respective States to the sovereign ownership of the lands constituting the boundaries of these States beneath the tidewaters has never been seriously questioned, and none of these lands was ever intended to be the property of the central government. In recent times, I know full well it has been the practice of the central government to ignore certain fundamental rights of our respective commonwealths. Recently, the Secretary of the Interior, embarking on his usual program of ignoring many fundamental concepts of States' rights, began to put the fear of God in the hearts of every State governor and every attorney general in the Nation who would be affected by a program of appropriating these lands.

I know of no State which has failed to cooperate with the Government in ceding to the Government lands needed for the function of protecting the shores of the Nation or in advancement of the general welfare of al' of the people. There is an unbroken array of legal decisions upholding the State's ownership in lands affected by this proposition. It is unfortunate that the Congress of the United States has to be called upon, once and for all, to settle this question. I am glad, however, that it is our privilege to uphold the rights and to protect the unquestioned property of our sister States.

In extending my remarks, I am including a letter from the Honorable Cotesworth P. Means, vice chairman of the South Carolina State Ports Authority, under date of July 21, 1945, which sheds a clear beam of light on this question. It is so concise and so appropriate that I want every Member of this House and the Nation at large to know how my State feels on this question:

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE
PORTS AUTHORITY,
Charleston, S. C., July 21, 1945.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MENDEL: In connection with our recent discussion of House Joint Resolution 225, designed to quiet the titles of the States to lands beneath tidewaters and navigable waters, my further study of this subject amply confirms my earlier conclusions that the evidence supporting the facts and principles set forth in the resolution is overwhelming and irrefutable.

From 1775 to 1945 there is an unbroken array of legal findings, all upholding the sanctity of State ownership of these lands, directly derived from titles previously held by the British Crown. Nowhere is there any record of successful questioning of these rights.

In South Carolina, there are many sites owned and operated by the Federal Government, and in each case the original transfer of title from the State is on record. I recall several such grants made while you and I were in the State legislature, and have in mind the more recent transfer of the present fleet landing at Charleston, which was acquired by the United States Navy upon approval of their application made through the Charleston County delegation, of which I was then the chairman.

The proposed invasion of the property rights of the several States in this instance not only violates principles in universal practice since the founding of the Nation, but attempts to cast a cloud upon the homes of literally millions of citizens now living upon land reclaimed from the waters bordering North America. It also constitutes a serious reflection upon the moral integrity and intellectual stamina of our National Government.

The slight publicity given the present attack thus far confines its reception to limited areas, but full realization of its implication over the whole country will set off a conflagration of righteous indignation and resentment.

There may be times when the killing of two birds with one stone is considered a bright accomplishment, but when one of these birds is the dove of peace and the other

the American eagle, it is time to call a halt, unless we are prepared to adopt the cuckoo as the national symbol of our habits and standards.

There is no need to exhort men like you and FRANK BOYKIN to do your full duty in stamping out any and all such harmful and destructive proposals. I am confident that this matter will be handled with the virility and dispatch to which the American public is entitled.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

COTESWORTH P. MEANS,
Vice Chairman, South Carolina State Ports Authority.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this House will pass this bill by such a resounding majority that never again will such an unfortunate occurrence transpire in our Nation.

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I feel a serious mistake is being made in not expediting the discharge of boys and young men in the armed forces who are anxious to return to school and complete their education. I have previously called the attention of the House to this matter and have been urging that special consideration be given to this group. Unfortunately, up to now, no attention has been paid to these boys, and they are being kept in the Army until under the point system they become eligible for discharge. I wish to quote from a letter written by a boy in Germany to his father, which explains what I have in mind:

We have been declared category I, or occupation troops, which means with my 40 points I cannot get home for over a year at the earliest. Needless to say I am discouraged—not disappointed, but just disgusted. I want to get back to finish my education and start doing something useful with my life, but the present set-up is a terrific stumbling block. I have racked my brain but know of no help from this side.

I would like to see the immediate return of combat veterans with 2 years' service, and further that Congress take immediate steps to declare when the duration will end. The point is that inductees are in the Army for the duration and 6 months, and Congress, by failing to declare the duration, is taking unfair advantage of the soldier. Moreover, there are hundreds of thousands of soldiers who have never left the States, and they could share this occupation. I could have swallowed six more months over here, but now that it stretches into a year I wish something could be done.

Mr. Speaker, all of us heard General Marshall today explain the point system under which these boys are being released. I have repeatedly urged that special consideration be given to certain groups in the Army and mentioned specifically combat veterans, men with families and those who wish to return to school. I think the Army is making a serious mistake by holding rigidly to their point system and ignoring facts such as presented in this letter.

Similarly, it is hard to understand why it is necessary to take young men out of college in their freshman year and induct them into the Army. However, this seems to be the policy of Selective Service. I have been advocating for several years that every boy should be permitted to finish high school. I offered an amendment to the voluntary enlistment bill this week providing that 18- and 19-year-old boys should be exempt from induction in order that they might at least finish high school. I was happy to see Selective Service announce just yesterday that boys in high school will not be inducted. However, it was also announced that 18-year-old boys in college would be taken at the end of the first semester. No one can explain why they should not be permitted to finish at least 1 year.

I am not at all convinced that it is necessary to continue the draft. But in any event, these 18- and 19-year-old boys should be exempt. I still feel Congress should act in this matter, and the responsibility is ours to determine what policy shall be adopted.

Demobilization of 8,000,000 men is a difficult task, but I believe it can be made easier and many hardships averted if certain basic and fundamental truths can be recognized and followed, regardless of the point system.

Sugar-Beet Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an interesting and informative editorial from the Fairfield (Mont.) Times of September 6:

AS SEEN BY FATHER TIME

LA GUARDIA THINKS, OR DOES HE?

While testifying before the Senate Banking Committee on the administration's jobs-for-all bill last week, Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia of New York said he "thinks" the United States shouldn't grow a pound of beet sugar. He went on to say, "We should produce nothing synthetically which can be produced naturally any place in the world. Products which are abundant should receive no protection at all—no subsidies." He said the United States can get sugar from Cuba, Santo Domingo, Puerto Rico, Hawaii and the Philippine Islands, adding: "We shouldn't grow a pound of beet sugar." Now in the first place, LaGuardia's statements are silly completely, and we are sure if he came West and observed the sugar beet growing he would retract such statements. Evidently the Mayor has never been out of New York because where he gets the idea sugar made from sugar beets is synthetic, is beyond us; for, believe it or not, before the sugar is produced, a seed must be planted in rich soil. It also requires nature's sunshine—the same sunshine and elements necessary for the production of sugar from cane. And in testifying before a jobs-for-all committee, it doesn't seem sensible to discourage an industry which requires as much labor as does the raising of sugar beets. Then, furthermore, we don't care how much sugar is produced in the Islands. We would like to have our sugar produced in the United States—yes and we will even accept it from the lowly synthetic sugar beet.

Chicago and the St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun of Saturday, September 22, 1945, entitled "Chicago and the St. Lawrence Project."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO AND THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

A new drive is under way to revive the St. Lawrence seaway and power project with bipartisan support. When the proposal reaches a vote, the Midwest's spokesmen in Congress—including Senators LUCAS and BROOKS, of Illinois—must recognize at last their responsibility to make the seaway an actuality.

The St. Lawrence project is not merely a sectional program. To open a 27-foot channel to the Atlantic, with dams, locks and generating plants, would improve navigation and produce vast quantities of cheap power all along the route. It would expand and enrich the economy of the valley as the TVA has enriched the economy of the South. Easterners of vision have always seen this—Franklin D. Roosevelt, the New Yorker, no less than Harry S. Truman, the Missourian. Backers of the bipartisan program now being developed include Senators WAGNER of New York and AIKEN of Vermont.

Yet the St. Lawrence project offers so much to Chicago and the Midwest that previous failure of our Congressmen to support it unanimously amounts to a sell-out of the people to protect the imagined special interests of railroads and private power companies. The strong men who built this city from its infancy dreamed a century ago of Chicago as a great ocean port. The dream is now within reach—but it is blocked by timidities and private selfishness. Thus we have the irony of Governor Green going to Washington to support barge navigation on the Tombigbee River in Alabama, but remaining silent on the St. Lawrence project. Thus we have Senators LUCAS and BROOKS voting against the St. Lawrence project last December—and seven other hostile Senate votes from Iowa, Indiana, Ohio and Nebraska.

No private interest has, in fact, any reason to fear the St. Lawrence project. Alarm is as foolish as that of those fearful Chicagoans who 100 years ago blocked William B. Ogden's first railroad from entering the city. The standpatters of the 1840's thought they would lose trade if farmers shipped their grain and livestock instead of coming to town, but the railroads brought immensely expanded prosperity. So would the St. Lawrence seaway bring expanded opportunities, and all would share in the new commerce and wealth created by the sound development of natural resources.

The St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes are the Midwest's and North America's birthright. They must be claimed and used for the people.

Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Labor Is His Business," by Jack H. Pollack, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of September 16, 1945. The article deals with one of the leading and most able citizens of my State, the Secretary of Labor, Lewis B. Schwellenbach.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR IS HIS BUSINESS—THIS TOUGH FIGHTER WILL HAVE TO SOLVE WORKER-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS OF RECONVERSION

(By Jack H. Pollack)

Lewis Baxter Schwellenbach, the new Secretary of Labor, looks big and tough enough to handle any kind of workingman's job. A 6-foot, 200-pound Westerner with thick, bushy eyebrows himself, he cannot be frightened by John L. Lewis. Nor by Petrillo. Schwellenbach already has made many face the music, and even blustering captains of industry have smarted under his verbal blows.

Still, Lew Schwellenbach didn't want to be United States labor boss. President Truman, his former Senate buddy, had to spend 4 days persuading him to accept the Cabinet hot seat. With Uncle Sam facing the greatest employment challenge in history, and a possible knock-down, drag-out labor-management battle looming, Schwellenbach has his hands full.

Labor's new generalissimo got his start as a rough-and-tumble Senator from Washington State. Late in 1934 Senator-elect Schwellenbach called at the White House.

"Sit down, Lew, and tell me about things out West," the friendly voice of F. D. R. greeted.

Before long, he was Roosevelt's chief Upper Chamber drum-beater, denouncer, and trouble-shooter. Seemingly fearless, he lambasted reactionary financiers, publishers, and columnists until he became the leader of a New Deal clique.

Swaggering Huey Long met his match in Schwellenbach. The Kingfish would saunter into the Chamber with a bottle of milk and a sandwich, prepared to speak indefinitely. He would orate fervently about cornbread and Louisiana shrimp. When he finally needed to rest, the garrulous southerner would have to ask the Senate's unanimous consent for time out. Invariably Schwellenbach's voice would boom, "I object!" Huey would have to keep going or stop filibustering altogether. The Louisianian called him "that wild man from the West."

CALLED THE JAP MENACE

Schwellenbach early sensed a rising Nip peril. Though assailed by thousands of businessmen, from 1937 on he introduced bills to stop sending scrap iron to Japan. Only a handful of legislators heeded his prophetic speeches. Senator WAGNER mused, "If the Nation had listened to Lew Schwellenbach then, we might have avoided Pearl Harbor."

The two-fisted Pacific-coaster was put on the lobby investigating committee, chairmaned by present Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black. Critics of Senate investigations term them "fishing expeditions," but Lew Schwellenbach never fished. A tough and tireless fact-finder, he trapped people with their own words.

Once a businessman called upon him to protest a shipment of imported goods.

"What's the annual salary of your president?" Senator Schwellenbach asked.

"I don't see how that concerns * * *."

"Well, I happen to know it's $250,000. How can you talk about being put out of business?"

In desperation, the businessman bluffed, "Senator, if you don't cooperate, we'll close our plants in your State and tell the voters it was because of your stubbornness."

"Remember, I can talk to the people of my State," replied Schwellenbach, showing him the door. The plants were never closed.

Schwellenbach's labor roots stem from his own childhood. Born in Superior, Wis., 51 years ago, his family knew many lean days. "I just can't ignore the problems of those who suffer," he explains.

When he was only 4, he was smitten by his first politician, William Jennings Bryan, who visited his home. Thereupon he made his first political speech, shouting, "Hurray for Bryan!" When he was 8, the Schwellenbachs moved west in search of their fortune.

WORKED HIS WAY UP

Lew's father died when he was 14 and he worked his way through school as a newsboy, water boy, messenger, railway worker. Saving enough money to enter the University of Washington in 1912, he made the debating team and founded the Woodrow Wilson Club, with Representative JOHN COFFEE. After earning his law degree in 1917, Schwellenbach taught at the university, then enlisted as a buck private in the Twelfth Infantry, which was bound overseas when the armistice was signed.

Rather than return to eastern Spokane, the demobilized, broke barrister hung out his shingle in coastal Seattle. Defending unions, he fought for the legal right of strikers to picket. In one case, he proved how employers had planted a stink bomb in a theater and blamed it upon workers. In another, before the Supreme Court, he established the Seattle Labor Council's right to "advertise" a labor dispute.

Elected State American Legion commander in 1922, he helped smooth the friction between the Legion and labor. Legionnaire Schwellenbach lined up the veterans' organization solidly behind labor's pension program for the families of men killed in industry.

Advocating public ownership, Schwellenbach battled the Power Trust for cheaper rates. He didn't hesitate to oppose bankers, newspapers and council in 1930 when he stopped the refinancing of the city's broken-down streetcar system. This saved Seattle several million dollars.

In 1932 Democrat Schwellenbach ran for Governor of the Evergreen State. It was an extremely dirty campaign. An opposition epithet hurled at him was "Looney Louis Peddles Hooey." Despite labor's strong support, 38-year-old Schwellenbach was defeated in the primaries by rich, conservative Clarence D. Martin, who appointed him an unpaid regent at the University of Washington. Later elected regent president, he opened the door for thousands of additional students.

In a bitter 1934 election Schwellenbach won the United States senatorship, succeeding Clarence Dill, who had been his high-school debating coach. Campaigning on an "End Poverty in Washington" issue, he urged that unemployed citizens be given jobs by "taking over the idle factories and idle lands."

Senator Schwellenbach opposed the Roosevelt administration on selective service, believing that if manpower was to be conscripted so should industry.

Because overwork was impairing his health, Schwellenbach did not seek reelection in 1940. Instead, to reward his loyalty, F. D. R. gave him a permanent judicial appointment on the Spokane district court.

When Senator Truman visited Spokane in November 1941 on an aluminum investigation, he asked Schwellenbach whether he preferred the judicial to the senatorial life. "What I miss most on the bench," admitted the ex-Senator, "is an argument. In the Senate I always had to fight to get what I wanted. But on the bench nobody argues with me. I have the last word."

Today Secretary Schwellenbach has the last word on labor matters. Needing a strong labor aide in the reconversion era, canny Harry Truman chose to sit in his administration's front row, a man who, as a freshman Senator, sat with him in the back row.

When the appointment was announced, organized labor was hopeful, though somewhat disappointed, at not having been consulted in advance. Schwellenbach was not allied with any labor faction. Business circles labeled it the most liberal Truman nomination.

Even the cynical press corps likes colorful, straight-shooting Schwellenbach. When he is stuck for an answer, he looks them straight in the eye and replies simply, "I don't know"—which in itself makes him almost unique in the Capital.

Secretary Schwellenbach combines dignity with a friendly smile. He wears horn-rimmed glasses, has pleasant hazel eyes and speaks in a warm, relaxed manner. He forgets to cut his brown hair unless Mrs. Schwellenbach reminds him. She was his Senate campaign manager. A year after arriving in the Nation's Capital, the 41-year-old bachelor Senator married pretty Irish-born Ann Duffy, who once worked for labor's nonpartisan league. Politically astute, Mrs. Schwellenbach has been an invaluable aide to her busy husband.

The chief chore of the Secretary of Labor is to promote the welfare of the wage earners. Yet, if he is to put labor's divided house organized and unorganized, skilled and unskilled, hand toilers and white-collar workers. Yet, if he is to put labor's divided house in order, he must steer a diplomatic course between rival groups.

TOUGH PROBLEM

One of Schwellenbach's thorniest tasks is getting the AFL, CIO, and John L. Lewis' miners working together and, if possible, through the Labor Department. Asked if he expected to achieve this miracle, Schwellenbach shrugged and told about the couple whom he sought to reconcile in his first divorce case. "Within 5 minutes they both turned on me and you would have thought I was the cause of their trouble."

Dynamic Secretary Schwellenbach is now busy revamping the Labor Department, recapturing powers that slipped from it in recent years. After taking over most of the Government labor agencies, he can be responsible for the single, clear Federal labor policy that Truman, then a Senator, once urged. As a militant unemployment foe, he says, "People out of work want jobs, not charity. I hate idleness and the poorhouse and what it does to human morale. One part of our people cannot go hungry while the other half lives in luxury."

CIGAR-CHEWER

For recreation Lew likes to curl up with an armful of law books. He also likes to relax with a who-dunit yarn while puffing a thick, nickel cigar, but today he is forced to buy 7½-cent stogies. Friends say expensive cigars are wasted on him, as he chews them up.

When he was a Senator, a soldier once dropped in to see him. His secretary explained the Senator was out. Later, when Schwellenbach heard the doughboy's name, he exploded, "My God! Where is he? He was my first sergeant." When the non-com finally was located, the Senator and the sergeant spent several hours reminiscing about Army days.

Though he says this will be his last public post, many Capitol insiders expect him one day to sit on the Supreme Court.

The new Secretary recently warned labor to be ever vigilant of its most effective weapon—United States public opinion.

He warned management not to slice wages, crush unions, and "to refrain from doing those things, thoughtlessly or purposefully, which provoke men and tempt them to act first and reason later."

With Uncle Sam's big wartime labor stick—its power to seize plants—being laid aside, another weapon may have to be substituted. But whether it is a Presidential bludgeon, a congressional mace, or an old-fashioned club carved from one of his giant Pacific oaks, Lew Schwellenbach won't mind wielding it. Forsaking his cloistered judicial nook for a more perilous post, you can count on the Secretary of Labor not to run for cover. Confidentially, he loves it.

Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times:

AN INQUIRY INTO FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 13.—Influential persons in Congress and the administration are hearing from an eminent citizen, whose counsels have been in demand here for years, unusually vigorous comments on the foreign economic policy of the United States. These comments largely take the form of questions and were stimulated by the arrival in Washington of the British mission headed by Lord Keynes.

The author of the questions has put them on paper. Because his views carry great weight in Washington, and because he has always been a foe of isolationism in any area of foreign policy, his memorandum is likely to have important effects. The bulk of it follows:

"What are our resources? What are our obligations to ourselves? What promises are we undertaking to carry out, and can we do so from our already heavily depleted economy?

"If we let Britain have X billions, we will have to let Russia, China, France, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Italy, and the Balkans have some too. What will this total be? And where shall we get it?

"We have engaged to give our veterans about $2,000,000,000 dismissal pay—less than what some of the countries who want to borrow from us are doing for their servicemen. We have engaged to lend the veterans up to $4,000 each, which is $40,000,000,000, in 2 years. There are enormous shortages in this country and in the rest of the world. The place where over half of these things can be obtained is the United States. Who will get things first and why? The United States? Or the countries which want aid? Or those, like the South American countries, which can pay? Shall we skimp in our economy in order to help others who do not sufficiently help themselves?"

CONDITIONING THE LOANS

"What conditions shall we impose upon loans or help? Will Britain be permitted to lend to Czechoslovakia and France while borrowing from us? Shall we lend large sums of money to countries without asking them what they are going to do with it and seeing what their budgets are? Shall we help Russia to build up a large army and navy? * * *

"With Germany and Japan out, there will be plenty of room for exports for the whole world, but Britain cannot survive if she does not modernize her industries. She can never keep her population at 45,000,000 unless she revamps her production and distribution and supplies the ideas, imagination, money, and engineering for the whole Empire, which has a vast untouched source of wealth.

"Great Britain with her sterling areas and empire preferences and acts of discrimination against foreigners has established an isolationism much worse than this country with our tariff system. We must in no way interfere with Britain's own method in carrying out her nationalization, economic, or political life, but she must not ask us to expend ourselves in helping her to hurt us.

"It is claimed that our capitalism interferes with her. There is no thought of British nationalism interfering with our free-enterprise system. Some Britons say capitalism is finished. Yet it saved the world twice. Now they want it to save the world again. But capitalism will fail if it lets nationalism load it down with iridescent dreams.

"The British will claim they do not propose to go beyond the nationalization of certain things like finances, railroads, and public utilities. But they surely will go beyond those, and every industry they nationalize will have to be subsidized, because it will become less efficient.

"There is recognition, as evidenced by Cripps and Churchill, that Britain must work and save in order to get back her place in the sun. A nation which has carried on so well through the war can certainly do so in peace with her greatest enemy destroyed and the markets formerly employed by Japan and Germany open to her."

PRIVATE TRADE THE SOLUTION

"If governments will get out of the way, private individuals will soon commence to trade. Private consortiums of sellers here can sell to private consortiums in Britain and other countries. The more we fix government's hands upon enterprise, the shorter will be the life of the Republic. We should cooperate, but we should not appease. We have to be prepared for oceans of tears and wringing of hands and beating of breasts for what is demanded of us and what we certainly should not give. * * *

"What would Britain do with the money? Would she pay the 3,000,000,000 sterling she owes to Egypt and her colonies? Her claim is that she owes to others and not to her own people. We like to pay our own people as well as others.

"What Britain apparently wants are two things:

"1. A loan—or what could be called a gift. 2. Things—raw and manufactured materials, food, etc. The resources of the British Empire, agriculturally and minerally, have not been affected as those of the United States have been and there is an unlimited demand for these things by our people also. There can be no reason why money should be given to other countries to take care of their civilian populations if ours have not had an opportunity to get the things to which their work entitles them."

It should be added that the writer of this document has studied the British economic situation at first hand, aided by intimate acquaintance with the public leaders in that country.

Use of National Guard To Train Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 24 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Francis S. Murphy, publisher of the Hartford Times, a most distinguished editor and publisher of my State, published as a guest editorial in the Greenwich (Conn.) Time of August 8, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE NATIONAL GUARD TO TRAIN YOUTH

(By Francis S. Murphy)

The National Guard has made a splendid record in two great wars, and it was available for duty at the start of both conflicts. It seems to me, therefore, that if we are to have a policy of required military training in this country, we should seriously consider the advantages of joining such training with our National Guard program.

Each State of which I have information has facilities for the military training of its share of the several hundred thousand youths who reach their eighteenth birthdays each year. I suggest that these boys could be given 3 months of intensive training during the summer.

Army pay, $50 a month, probably should be paid these young men while they are in summer training.

Those asking for a full year given over entirely to military training probably will object to limiting the program to two summers and with that one should not quarrel. It can be pointed out, of course, that boys, during this war, have been sent into action after a few months of basic training. Possibly a complete program would require that two summers, be given over to the acquiring of military competence and that between those two summers the youth could be required to drill one night a week on a schedule approximating that of the National Guard in peacetime. In effect, we would be setting up a compulsory National Guard, somewhat at variance with our national ideas but far less so than the proposal to turn over to the Federal Government, in peacetime, control of every healthy 18-year-old boy in the Nation.

WOULD NOT REPLACE PRESENT GUARD

I would not expect this compulsory military training program to replace the volunteer National Guard as we have known it. As a matter of fact, many young men would wish to continue military experience after their required service and the senior, volunteer branch of the National Guard would probably be much larger than formerly because of the earlier interest aroused. The Army would be able to assign substantial numbers of officers and non-commissioned officers as instructors. In the event of unemployment and the need for a made-work program, there is much of a worth-while nature that could be done in providing additional facilities for this program. The State would

find it necessary to provide more armories. Certainly we should find that to be the case in Connecticut.

This proposal is in harmony with that of many educators who feel that if we must have compulsory military training, much of the program should be conducted at the community and State levels. Dr. Alonzo G. Grace, commissioner of education for Connecticut, a few months ago, asked the War and Navy Departments in planning for compulsory training to provide for "the organization and administration of a basic program by the National Guard in the several States." Dr. Grace believes that if the military leaders of the country will seek the full cooperation of the adjutants general and the educational authorities in the States, we can have a thoroughly American program of military training, much of it conducted in the home States.

FACILITIES IN STATE

One advantage of such a plan, in my opinion, is that by operating it at the State level, we should be more able to take advantage of State facilities. In Connecticut, for example, we have adequate facilities for the training of our 12,500 youth who annually reach their eighteenth birthdays. I suggest that these boys could be given 3 months of intensive training during the summer, and certainly we have ample places. The Niantic training grounds will accommodate a large force of men and such is the case, also, at both Bradley Field and Trumbull Airport, both of which will revert to State control. Then there are the 22 municipal and other airports to which boys could be assigned. Let's not overlook Connecticut's extensive State park and forest system in which boys could get the outdoor experience considered so essential a part of military preparation.

In planning for basic training of Connecticut youth, it should be remembered that at Bradley Field there are barracks, a hospital, and other buildings. Trumbull Airport is well provided with military housing and it would be no difficult task to prepare several of the aviation fields for reception of youth in training.

These installations are paralleled in most States, exceeded in some. I do not wish to overstress aviation. Although I am an air enthusiast, I see no proof that military victory can be achieved without plenty of ground forces. Aviation, however, will probably loom larger in military planning of the future and a sizable proportion of the 18-year-olds will need to know something about planes. The advantages of using available space at airports for some of the basic training of youth is obvious. We have the fields the war gave us and we shall have municipal and other airports, all of which will be included in any national-defense plan likely to be written. Why not use these fields to the limit of their availability?

At the State university there is an ROTC unit, and students who are members of this regiment would be fulfilling the requirements otherwise met in compulsory National Guard training. Other colleges offer similar drill. Possibly the National Guard training, compulsory at 18, could be made optional at 17, and many boys would like to meet the requirements while they are in high school.

It would be my hope that our health resources, our education facilities, and the aviation opportunities of the State would be joined in such a program sufficiently to help Connecticut's boys in preparation for civil life as well as giving them basic training as soldiers.

I am not attempting to write a military preparedness program for the Nation. In fact, it is an idea, rather than a plan, that I should like to advance. Our military leaders are men of good judgment, and their advice regarding minimum military strength for the United States should have great weight when we write a national policy.

IN KEEPING WITH AMERICA

It is my hope, however, that we shall adopt a training program in keeping with American ideas, rather than European continental policies. While we decry increased centralization of power in Washington, we should try to decentralize, so far as possible, any required training program for youth. If the job can be done at home, or some substantial part of it, we should not turn it over, completely, to the National Government.

All that can be done in the community and State should be done here. Perhaps it would be necessary, especially during the second summer, for boys to go out of the home State to participate in maneuvers or war games involving armies. It would be well, I think, for the boy to have some military training at home in advance of that experience.

I submit that there are two questions, not one, for the American people to decide. First, do we need a peacetime policy of compulsory military training? Second, if we do, is it possible to give much of this training in or near the home community, coordinated with education and employment, and to require a few months, rather than a year, of full-time service in the armed forces?

In Memory of Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on this eighth anniversary of the death of Thomas G. Masaryk, Czechoslovakia faces the problems of the rebirth of the Republic according to the principles of its founder and its first President.

Masaryk spoke these words, which today are both a summary of the war we have all just fought and won and a prophecy for his nation's future:

> Individuals and nations are to a great extent the creators of their own future, and * * * in the long run it is the idealists who always win.

Czechoslovakia kept faith with her great liberator during all this war—she fought valiantly for the ideals for which Masaryk fought during his lifetime. There is no doubt that Czechoslovakia will keep the faith with her great man in the coming years of the peace—she will cleave to the principles of democracy of which Masaryk was so stanch a champion.

Czechoslovakia and the United States have always been extremely close, not only in their ideals but in their actual practices of democracy. Profoundly influenced by American democracy, Thomas G. Masaryk patterned the Czechoslovak Constitution after that of the United States. He believed, as do we, that a system of free elections is one of the fundamental tenets of the democratic system. He said:

> I find the principles of American democracy appeal to me and I accept them. At this moment I can declare that those principles have ever been and ever will be the leading principles of my politics and of all my life.

Masaryk was well known and much loved by many American people. We pay reverence to him today. May the strong bonds which he helped forge between our two nations long endure.

Seniority Credit for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the October issue of Railroad Workers' Journal appears a striking editorial over the signature of Maurice R. Franks, editor, entitled "Servicemen Deserve Service." I deem it a very important subject to have the attention of the Nation's legislators, at this time when so many servicemen are being demobilized and returned to their former jobs in industry. Therefore I ask that the article appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where all interested may read it. The writer stresses the point that returned servicemen be given seniority credit for the time they have spent in the service of their country. Many employers do this, and some unions also allow seniority credit to their members for the time spent in military service. It is indeed interesting to have this suggestion come from one who himself is a leader in organized labor. To the men in military service goes the main credit for winning the war. Except for their victory there would be no labor unions in America today. Therefore I hope that both employers and union organizations give the returned servicemen the credits suggested in the editorial. The suggested plan of seniority is not entirely new by any means. It is, in fact, used by most of the railroad brotherhoods and many other unions. I am glad to offer it for the RECORD in the hope that it may be helpful in developing a harmonious relationship as the GI returns to civilian rank.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICEMEN DESERVE SERVICE

If ever the union labor movement had an opportunity to prove serviceable to the man who is destined to earn his livelihood through toil, it is now. According to history, the labor movement came into being for the purpose of uplifting the workingman, an admirable objective when followed through. Unfortunately, and history proves it, this objective has not always been kept in full focus by the labor movement.

Followers have been gathered into unionism under the righteous axiom of "One for all, and all for one," and such slogans as "The injury of one is the concern of all." From the very inception of unionism good unions and their leaders have constantly fought against man's inhumanity to man. On this righteous foundation organized labor has, in spite of many obstacles, grown to become

recognized as a necessary instrument for the promulgation of our way of life.

Examination of union history discloses that the very selfishness of some so-called labor leaders has played no small part in hampering popular acceptance of unionism. Throughout history leaders have come upon the scene who paid little or no attention to the axioms just mentioned. Their operations lead one to believe that injury to the labor movement is inconsequential so long as it does not directly affect the leaders. This damnable condition must come to an end if unionism is to be accepted as a necessary part of Americanism. Today, as of yesteryear, the axiom still stands that "The injury of one is the concern of all."

Speaking of injury, I wonder if many of our present-day labor leaders realize that numerous workers are being injured through stupidity and avariciousness. In case they don't I will tell them right now that it is not just the injury of one, but of millions. So the axiom today is even greater than at the time of its origin. No; I am not going to "beat around the bush" in coming to the main point of this editorial. The reference I have made is to the injury of millions of servicemen, who have served their country so as to allow us to enjoy our American way of life and all its bounties, including unionism. If our servicemen hadn't given their all to protect the principles of democracy, it would be impossible to operate unions today. And for this they should be highly commended and rewarded.

They have been somewhat commended, but more or less in idle gesture. But the reward they are receiving is a kicking all over the "union lot" by the football players of unionism. These players are playing the game on a knock-down, drag-out basis, with the attitude of "to hell with who gets hurt." This may be union football, but it certainly isn't union cricket by any means. The fullbacks of unions, the leaders, are leaving nothing in the way of making their goal. With them it seems to be "knock 'em down and drag 'em out," no matter who they are, including servicemen. Their goal is power, numerical, political, and financial strength, with complete disregard to the rules.

The men who fought for this country didn't play the game this way. They fought for a principle, the principle of democracy. They sacrificed, as we all well know. Thousands of them gave up their lives. Their goal was justice. Many of these servicemen not only sacrificed their families but their positions, for a job, which, remuneratively, meant only a fraction of their civilian one. As a whole, they did it, and wholeheartedly, to safeguard the principles of Americanism, which include unionism.

And what is their reward? They are coming back here daily by the thousands and being told by many labor leaders, in so many words, that they have no right to enjoy the fruits of their victory. Some of them are being told that, unless they join a union, they will not be allowed to work. Others, returning to their previous civilian positions, are informed that their jobs are now filled by peacetime workers, and that they will have to await their turn for reemployment. Just what the hell is this? What kind of treatment is this to mete out to the men who are really responsible for the safeguarding our industrial structure? They are responsible for making jobs possible in our system of free enterprise. They made it possible, through the defeat of the Axis dictators, who, if victorious, would have reduced the workers of this Nation to serfdom. In plain language, this treatment of our servicemen stinks, and something must be done about it.

If I were one of these servicemen seeking the return of my old job or a new one, I think I'd be asking myself some questions. One of them would be, "Is this the kind of democracy that I fought for and that my buddies laid down their lives for?" And, my answer to this query would be, "No." Also, I'd say to myself, "I thought that when we laid down our guns the war was over, but it isn't. We still have a fight on our hands and right here in the United States—a fight against the dictators of labor. These dictators have set themselves in a position of power that can be wielded to exclude everyone from making a living who will not follow their dictation."

To tell an ex-serviceman, especially one who worked at a task prior to entering the military service, that, on account of his services to his country, he has no seniority is to also tell him that this is not the America that he fought for. It is telling him that, in his absence, this country became a dictatorship as far as his working rights are concerned. Proof of this assertion is backed up by the fact that, when the serviceman wants employment, he must follow behind the man who took his place after he entered the service. His successor, the war worker, has been steadily employed during the war, and thereby, has created substantial seniority, and, in many cases, beyond that of his predecessor.

In other words, under the present system of seniority, the serviceman is out of luck, as for instance, a GI who had been employed by a company for 1 year prior to his enlistment and replaced by a war worker acquiring more than a year's service during the war, can only assert 1 year's seniority, and must "dove-tail" behind the war worker. The union leaders enforcing this type of seniority should be kicked out of the unions. They are not fit to be associated with a movement that stands against man's inhumanity to man.

If this writer had anything to do about seniority, the serviceman who had, as illustrated, 1 year's employment with a company prior to his enlistment and has served his country honorably would, upon returning, be given accrued seniority and allowed to exercise same. All those employed by the company after the declaration of war would be given consideration only after the employment of servicemen, and this too would be handled on a dovetail seniority basis.

Yes, if I had my way about the treatment of servicemen, I'd go a step farther. Anyone of them desiring to become a unionist would not be required to pay an initiation fee. Until the time of complete rehabilitation, there would be no dues. All unionists among servicemen would be rewarded by free dues and assessments for a time equal to that spent in service.

No doubt these suggestions will not be very popular in unions which have, through the condition of this war, become financially fat, powerful, and avaricious. Neither will these suggestions be popular in unions which place the value of the dollar beyond the value of valor. To those among labor who may consider this plan unsound, let me ask why it is that most union contracts embody a specific clause stating that members who are advanced to higher positions in their occupation, or in lines of duty with their unions, are guaranteed accrued seniority for the entire period, whether it be 30 days or 30 years. If this seniority protection is good for the soldiers of labor, why isn't it good for the real soldiers?

Unionism is on trial right now, and unless it comes forth with evidence of good intentions and constructive ideas, it faces a battery of prosecutors in the form of servicemen who will present a case before the jury of public opinion that may bring the death sentence to the union-labor movement of these United States. It happened before and it can happen again. And, if you doubt this statement, I suggest that you read the history of the American labor movement. Those who understand the history of the labor movement know that its life's blood comes from the vein of righteousness. They know too that the union-labor movement will not live on lip service, that it must deliver real service to those who must toil for a livelihood. And, with this fact in mind, it will be well to remember too that servicemen deserve service.

Critics of the Industrial South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by one of the most prominent men of Tennessee and the South, Mr. E. H. Crump, of Memphis. His statement appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal for the 16th day of this month. It concerns the critics of the industrial South. I hope my colleagues will read the statement in the Appendix of the RECORD. It deals with a question which is vital to the South and which is of particular interest at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRUMP FLAYS CRITICS OF INDUSTRIAL SOUTH—SMEAR ATTACKS CHARGED BY SHELBY LEADER—SEES GREAT DAY AHEAD

E. H. Crump, Shelby County political leader, yesterday charged that deliberate attempts are being made through vocal, printed, and pictorial attacks to prevent the postwar migration of industry to the South.

Mr. Crump said: "A lot of us are getting terribly weary, terribly tired, and I am sure all loyal southern people are, too, of the vocal, printed, and pictorial attacks that are being made on the South.

"IT LOOKS LIKE ARSON

"When there is so much smoke there is bound to be a fire and, if the truth was known, a charge of coldly planned arson could be proved against northern and eastern interests that are hiding behind the authors of all of this vicious stuff. It has all of the earmarks of inspired postwar propaganda, designed to head off, if possible, the migration of industry that is headed our way. The jungle tiger always stalks his victim from behind.

"A glaring example is the way they refer to our great Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest—'git thar fustest with the mostest.' He never said that. They are endeavoring to make the South out a land of poverty and ignorance. And they like to refer to 'Old Hickory' Andrew Jackson's lack of education. It is true he said it was O. K., which is accepted commercially and generally to imply an assurance of correctness, but it has been said that Jackson used O. K. when he tried to say orl k'rect (all correct). Of course, that was grossly misrepresented.

"The records of Sumner County, Tenn., contain this entry, October 6, 1790: 'Andrew Jackson proved a bill of sale which was O. K. But when he defended this country against the British behind cotton bales at New Orleans, he wasn't ignorant there. Jackson was

truly a wonderful man, with foresight and courage. Every Tennessean is proud of him. Theodore Roosevelt said he was wise and brave, and he acted for the common well-being of all our people whenever and in whatever manner was necessary without fear."

HITS AT MAGAZINES

"Another example is the article entitled, 'What's the Matter With Texas?' Sam Houston's great State. He was a former Congressman and Governor of Tennessee—a real man, a solid man.

"Many magazine articles and motion pictures critical of the South, filled with misinformation, have sprung from the same sources, all written and produced for no other purpose on earth but to put this Southland of ours in an unfavorable light before the Nation. These writers and picture-show producers can find a great many more things to praise in the South than to criticize. Yes; 50 times more.

"Time was, and not so long ago, that practically all of the livestock, including horses, mules, beef and dairy cattle, hogs and sheep, and poultry, were raised north of the Mason and Dixon line and west. For years the South bought all of these things and most of its canned goods and processed cotton goods from other sections of the country. Absurdly enough, practically all of the cotton mills were situated in the far Northeast, and practically none was situated in or near the areas in which cotton is grown."

SOUTH ADVANCING RAPIDLY

"It is entirely different now, and the South is coming into its own, by leaps and bounds industrially, as well as agriculturally. The South has more than any section of America—has cotton, oil, coal, timber, some iron, and a climate that can produce vegetables the year around. Any State in the South can do anything any Middle Western State can do and still have its cotton. The South can do everything Wisconsin is doing in the way of manufacturing and dairy products and still have its cotton, and so on up throughout the New England States. The South's courage is in the saddle. The South has realized there is no such thing as success without effort. It has overcome obstacles in surmounting difficulties of the Civil War.

"Our own Tennessee is one of the wonder States of the Union, and the only one that can boast two great valleys such as the Mississippi and Tennessee Valleys (TVA). New industries are springing up everywhere, from Memphis to Bristol, and it is a knowledge of this fact that has evidently actuated northern and eastern interests in resorting to slurs through conscienceless newspaper, magazine, and scenario writers to spread the network of lies that are being told about Southern States. At least it appears that way. They would paint a gloomy picture of the entire Southland in the vain hope of throwing dust in the eyes of manufacturers and other potential investors in southern prosperity, thereby obscuring from their view the wonderful advantages the South has to offer.

"That low, filthy, depraved book entitled 'Strange Fruit,' serving no worthy purpose whatever, was written by a southerner. Any southerner who casts reflection on the South, picturing it unfairly, is just what Quisling was to Norway, Petain and Laval to France, Lord Haw-Haw to England."

WARNS AGAINST CLEAVAGE

"There are many States up the country that have skeletons in their closets. I recall how the late Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, quickly sat a Senator down from a middle Northern State, showing how that State had been bled to death by crooked officeholders. Volumes could be written about several of those States, but these writers and Hollywood picture producers bypass other States on their concentrated attack on the South. These writers and picture producers, with an overdose of cocksureness, like to take a dig at the South. They may be turning somersaults before it is over.

"If this country goes into sections—North, East, South, and West—while embarking upon a common destiny, a sorry spectacle will be made of the adventure. It will be like the eagle, the pike, and the crawfish in the fable. Instead of pulling together, one pulled up, another pulled down, and the third horizontally, with the ship of state getting nowhere. Therefore, it will be a tragic error if any split-up comes.

"We people of the South prefer to feel there is no North, no East, no South, no West. We are all America and we lov^ America—there is good cheer in the South for all the people throughout the land, but if they keep it up there is going to be a shoulder-to-shoulder fight of all the Southern States against this great injustice.

"Gen. Andrew Jackson, Gen. Sam Houston, and Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest will ride again."

Officer Strength of Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, at my request the Statistics Branch of the War Department has prepared a table showing the officer strength of our armies as of June 30, 1945. Because I believe Members of Congress should have this information, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this table in the Appendix of the RECORD:

World-wide strength, by grade, June 30, 1945

	Male	Nurses, hospital dietitians, and physical therapy aides	Women doctors	Women's Army Corps	Total
Generals of the Army	4				4
Generals	13				13
Lieutenant generals	50				50
Major generals	392				392
Brigadier generals	1,060				1,060
Colonels	10,719	1		1	10,721
Lieutenant colonels	28,970	88		19	29,077
Majors	69,652	283	5	146	70,086
Captains	194,823	1,667	41	1,060	197,591
First lieutenants	296,836	27,684	26	3,699	328,245
Second lieutenants	169,992	27,364		808	198,164
Total	772,511	57,087	72	5,733	835,403
Chief warrant officers	9,060				9,060
Warrant officers (junior grade)	16,039			44	16,083
Flight officers	31,117				31,117
Total	56,216			44	56,260
Master and first sergeants	111,724			583	112,307
Technical sergeants	214,758			638	215,396
Staff sergeants	608,215			3,644	611,859
Sergeants	1,039,643			11,632	1,051,275
Corporals	1,521,250			20,449	1,541,699
Privates, first class	2,231,447			24,173	2,255,620
Privates	1,556,893			29,661	1,586,554
Total	7,283,930			90,780	7,374,710
Grand total	8,112,657	57,087	72	96,557	8,266,373

Equal Points for Army Air Corps Ground Personnel

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have been calling for a revision of the War Department discharge policy based on the point system, which would accord overseas Air Force veterans who served in ground forces at various air bases in Europe the same discharge point credit recognition as that accorded all persons performing similar services at the same, or similar, air bases.

Under the point system, ground force personnel attached to a bomb squadron received battle stars as part of bomb squadron personnel, the same as combat flight personnel of the same squadron. However, aircraft mechanics attached to the service group of the same air base as mechanics in one of the bomb squadrons attached to the base would not receive a battle star. In neither case would the mechanics participate in actual combat; yet, each battle star is good for five points toward discharge.

At McChord Field, in my own congressional district in the State of Washington, and at various other bases in the United States, there are thousands of overseas air-force veterans formerly attached to service-group units who will not have enough points to be discharged from the Army for many months to come, in contrast to their more fortunate buddies who were attached to bomb

squadrons and received battle-star credit points as a result of the combat record established by the flight personnel of the squadron.

This system, in my opinion, represents an unjustified discrimination between men who performed similar ground-force duties overseas in favor of those soldiers who were organizationally attached to a bomb squadron, cited for battle-star recognition by reason of the combat records of the flight personnel of the same squadron.

The Tacoma Rhodes Post of the American Legion appointed a committee to take up the cause of returned Air Force personnel whose morale has been seriously endangered because of the discrimination in connection with the discharge-point credit policy of the War Department

I have taken up the matter with the War Department and am awaiting their decision following a thorough investigation of the subject matter, which they have promised me. If the decision is adverse, I shall discuss the entire problem with members of the House Military Affairs Committee.

Aside from the veterans' service organizations, these men have no champion, or spokesman, in connection with their grievance, and they are prohibited from taking action on their own behalf by War Department regulations.

I have congratulated the Rhodes Post of the American Legion at my home city of Tacoma for taking up the cudgels for the veterans. My entire interest in this subject is that we obtain fair treatment for our ground-force personnel of the Army Air Corps. In this connection, while in my home city of Tacoma, I sent the following telegram to Secretary Stimson:

TACOMA, WASH., *September 7, 1945.*

HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

Your attention is directed to current policy of War Department, which allows the inclusion of discharge points based on battle-star awards in computing point eligibility of Air Force personnel attached to overseas bomb squadrons. In this connection, respectfully but urgently request your personal aid in formulating War Department discharge point policy which will give Air Force personnel of service groups attached to same bomb group as aforementioned bomb squadrons same credit points for discharge as that received by ground personnel who were given battle stars account their happenstance organization inclusion as bomb squadron personnel. Have thoroughly investigated this situation and find, as example, aircraft mechanics in service group with longer Army and overseas service have far less discharge points as aircraft mechanic ground personnel of bomb squadron by reason fact former did not receive battle-star credits while stationed at same overseas airbase. Battle stars awarded squadrons included every man in bomb squadrons in addition to obvious inclusion of flight personnel. Net effect this whole system is to penalize engineering, material, and headquarters service personnel of service group in matter of discharge points. Thousands of soldiers in latter category do not ask for battle stars but merely ask they receive same discharge point consideration as ground personnel bomb squadrons. This request fair and reasonable and I reiterate my request prompt action be taken correct this inequitable situation so highly dangerous morale of men adversely affected. Will appreciate personal reply directed my offices Washington, D. C. Thanks and regards.

JOHN M. COFFEE,
Member of Congress.

To this the Department replied as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *September 7, 1945.*

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
Member of Congress:

Mr. Stimson has asked me to inform you that he has received your telegram concerning the award of discharge points on the basis of battle stars to ground personnel of bomb squadrons and service groups. As requested a full reply will be made to your office in Washington filed Washington, D. C., date.

MILES REBERT,
Brigadier General, General Staff Corps; Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

To show the strong feeling entertained by individuals in this connection, I am quoting a letter sent to one of the service newspapers, which speaks for itself:

BATTLE STARS

To the B-Bag:

There is one, and only one, fair way to solve this battle-star-points question which has caused so much discontent among ground personnel of the Air Forces. The mere fact that a soldier wears a battle star on his uniform should indicate that he has participated in a battle. Therefore, only the AF combat crews, airborne troops, and combat ground troops, who stuck their necks out, deserve the stars and all the points that go with them, but I'll be damned if its fair play that any AF ground personnel be awarded stars for residing on airdromes or in luxurious headquarters while the crews sweat out their next mission.

One of my brothers was forced down in a neutral country on his 20th mission over Germany. He has two stars. My other brother spent a month on the front lines in the infantry, resulting in frost-bitten feet which required 2½ months' hospitalization to return to limited duty. He has only one star. But I am the hero. I have four stars (20 points) for having my name on bomb group rosters for 33 months. Why, I don't have the guts to wear them.

It's a laugh the way the Army passes out awards, authorizing its soldiers to mislead the public. No wonder men who have earned awards through sweat and blood do not wish to wear them.

Lt. RICHARD WESSEL,
Eight Hundred and Sixty-second Bomb Squadron.

Until the 1st of September the following represents the position taken by the War Department. I am quoting as printed in a current periodical:

ON BATTLE PARTICIPATION STARS FOR AIR FORCE SERVICE UNITS

In reply to numerous letters from members of the Air Force service units protesting their ineligibility for battle participation stars, we are printing, without comment, the following letters from headquarters USSTAF, through the theater commander, to the Adjutant General's office, War Department:

1. Attention is invited to attached pages containing the eighth, ninth, and tenth endorsements to request initiated by the Third Bombardment Division for the award of Battle Participation credit to service units.

2. It is believed that these endorsements clearly show that the problem of unequal recognition in connection with battle credit was early realized by this headquarters and that vigorous steps were taken to secure a more equitable basis for this award insofar as service units are concerned.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
USSTAF.

(Eighth endorsement)

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES STRATEGIC AIR FORCES IN EUROPE, APO 633, U. S. ARMY,
October 12, 1944.

To: Commanding General, European Theater of Operations, United States Army, APO 887, U. S. Army.

1. Request reconsideration of the decision of the Adjutant General as contained in fourth endorsement War Department, A. G. O., Washington, D. C., August 12, 1944, file AGPD–M 200.6 (June 28, 1944), to letter, HQ. VIII Air Force Service Command, dated June 28, 1944 (enclosure No. 7).

2. The functions of personnel in service command units and combat units at an Army Air Force station are so integrated as to form an operational entity, and it is only in the combined operation of these units that a combat force is created.

3. In the case of a bombardment group, service units not assigned or attached directly to the group are pooled at an Army Air Force station with group units. The service units are assigned to the station, and the group commander is commanding officer of the station and exercises through such command, jurisdiction and control over all units and personnel physically present at such station. The service units thus become an intrinsic element in the operation of a combat group, and they are not assigned or attached directly to groups only because it would be administratively unwieldy to do so.

4. It is, therefore, urgently requested that favorable consideration be given the recommendation that the interpretation of eligibility for battle-participation credit be broadened to include personnel in service command units who are physically present at a station where combat units are stationed.

CARL SPAATZ,
Lieutenant General, United States Army.

(Ninth endorsement)

AG 200.6 OPGA

HQ European Theater of Operations, United States Army, APO 887—26 October 1944.

To: The Adjutant General, Washington 25, D. C.

1. Attention is invited to sixth endorsements.

2. Request consideration.

For the Commanding General:

S. H. GAMBLE,
Lieutenant Colonel, AGD,
Assistant Adjutant General.

(Tenth endorsement)

War Department, AGO, Washington 25, D. C., 13 November 1944. To: The Commanding General, European Theater of Operations, APO 887, care Postmaster, New York, N. Y.

1. The decision of the War Department contained in fourth endorsement of letter, Headquarters Eighth Air Force Service Command, dated June 28, 1944, subject: Request for recognition of Eighth Air Force Service Command units for battle participation, applies with equal force to all similar cases for the reasons therein stated. The application of War Department policy permits, in some instances, extension of battle-participation credit to individuals who do not actually or physically engage the enemy, but these

individuals generally are members of units which contain combat or fighting elements. However, these regarded as border-line cases.

2. A distinction must be made between the deserving and undeserving cases, and this distinction logically lies between the cases mentioned above and those cases of serving units which do not contain combat elements. To extend credit in the latter instances would be so all-inclusive as to result in dissipation of the value of battle-participation credit and defeat of the purposes for which it is accorded. In view thereof, basic recommendation is not favorably considered.

By order of the Secretary of War:

———,
Adjutant General.

In one case the ground personnel of the bomb squadron received six battle stars for doing the same work as the service squadron. On this basis many men with less service than service-squadron mechanics are receiving discharges under the point system, while ground personnel of the service squadron have 6 months or a year of Army service to look forward to before they can be released.

Listed are a few examples of the discrepancies that have occurred and the way they affect present discharge possibilities:

Service group personnel

Rank	Job	Army service	Overseas service	Points
		Months	*Months*	
Technical sergeant	Instrument specialist	41	36	77
Do	do	36	24	60
Staff sergeant	Aircraft mechanic	36	18	55
Private	Squadron barber	36	18	54
Do	Orderly	24	14	38
Staff sergeant	Air Corps supply technician	36	18	54
Technical sergeant	Armament specialist	48	24	72

Bomb squadron personnel

Rank	Job	Army service	Overseas service	Battle star credits	Points
		Months	*Months*		
Technical sergeant	Instrument specialist	36	36	40	112
Do	do	36	19	30	85
Staff sergeant	Aircraft mechanic	36	24	35	95
Private	Squadron barber	36	19	30	85
Do	Orderly	24	14	30	68
Staff sergeant	Air Corps supply technician	36	18	30	84
Technical sergeant	Armament specialist	48	24	35	109

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Army Air Corps and the War Department officials will take steps promptly to remedy this unjust and inequitable situation.

Child Welfare Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, we are informed that after October 31, 1945, funds provided under the Lanham Act will not be available for continuance of child-welfare centers throughout the country. I am receiving protests from women's groups not only from my own State but from many States in the Union. Mass meetings are being held in city after city to protest the closing of day-care centers throughout the country. The closing of day-care centers is developing into a very desperate situation.

The Lanham program of day-care centers for children was set up for the purpose of caring for children of women recruited for war industries. The program was set up because there was a need. That need still exists. It is part of the demobilization program. It is the human side of reconversion. To ignore this problem will incur serious social risk.

The following is a statement from the Day Care Committee of Cleveland, Ohio, which explains the need which still exists in an exceptionally clear and forceful manner:

Fifteen hundred children from Cleveland and outlying districts depend on the 40 day-care centers supported during the war by Lanham Act funds. The Lanham program was for the sole purpose of recruiting women for war industries. These funds have been arbitrarily withdrawn, effective October 31. A good proportion of the mothers depending upon the day-care centers are servicemen's wives. Servicemen fathers will not be home for long months; many will return handicapped; some will never return.

Seventy-five percent of the mothers, consisting of servicemen's wives, widows, and wives of the incapacitated will need permanent day-care centers during 1945 and 1946, as they are the chief wage earners of the family—many will need a day-care program indefinitely. When a mother is obliged by hard necessity to assume the burden of family support, she has the right to look to society as her traditional ally in providing for the safety and well-being of her children. The termination of the Lanham Act ignores the long-term human needs of these families.

A bitter war has been fought and won for the future health and happiness of America's youngest generation. We must never forget the price that was paid for our children; we have a sacred obligation to those who fought and died that their future be guaranteed.

We therefore plead that:

1. Emergency funds be immediately appropriated through Federal and State action to forestall the impending closing of the day-care centers.

2. Adequate day-care centers be permanently assured by passage of Senate bill 1318.

In my own county of Los Angeles there are 260 child-care centers which accommodate 10,000 children. Seventy-five percent of the working mothers of these children have normal peacetime jobs. More than half of these mothers are servicemen's wives whose families depend on them for support, and if they had to care for their children personally they would have to leave their jobs and become public charges.

The nursery schools are maintained largely by the Federal Government. Only two States, New York and Washington, contribute actual funds to this program despite urgent pleas in January 1945, by the Federal Works Administration which administers this measure. At that time the States were opposed to handling this program since they claimed that servicemen's wives were a Federal problem, and since the war was still in full swing they did not anticipate the end of Federal aid. Some States contribute space where it is available—but not actual cash. The program has been supported by the Federal Government and by the mothers of the children attending the day care centers.

If the child-care centers are closed October 31, undue hardship will be imposed upon women who must work to earn their living. The end of the war does not and should not mean the end of social-service work if that social-service work is needed. This is an unsettled time we are in and our problems, if anything, are exaggerated. With cutbacks and the lowering of salaries nurseries are more than ever necessary for the wives and widows of servicemen.

We are asking, many of us, for a 6-month extension of the Lanham child-care center program until permanent legislation can be enacted.

I would like these mothers to speak for themselves so I am including some of the letters from my own district which are samples of the hundreds of letters received in my office, not only from California but from many other States:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *September 17, 1945.*
Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
Member of Congress:

Today representatives of the parents and children of 90 nursery schools formed a parents council for the purpose of marshaling all community forces to work for the continuation of the child-care center program. We feel that this continuation is imperative for the welfare of the children and the economic stability of the parents and the community. Therefore we urgently request that the Lanham committee and the Federal Works Agency interpret the present legislation to permit the continued use of the available funds for the child-care program until such time as State action can be taken. All California communities affected and taking forceful steps to bring this about at earliest possible time by requesting our Governor, Earl C. Warren, to give top priority to this problem on his special call of the legislature. We further request that this interpretation be made at once and that the Federal Works Agency issue a directive which will prevent the threatened closing of the schools in Los Angeles City on or before October 31, 1945. We await your reply.

Sincerely yours,

MARJORIE ROWE,
Executive Secretary.

———

McKESSON & ROBBINS, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 12, 1945.
Congresswoman HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: May I urge your kind consideration in the coming session of the neces-

sity of the nurseries remaining open for those who must continue to work?

Several of our female employees have indicated that it is important that they continue working but can only continue to do so providing Federal-owned nurseries remain open.

Your careful study and consideration of the foregoing shall be much appreciated by

Yours very truly,

C. R. MIELE,
Superintendent.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *August 27, 1945.*
Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: I wish you would do all you can to keep the present public-school nurseries open for children from 2 to 6 and make it a part of the board of education system permanently.

It seems as though if the Lanham Act is not continued the schools will close by October 30, 1945. In my particular case, my husband is missing in action, and it is absolutely necessary that I keep on working; and even if he does come back, it will be necessary that I work for a while until he becomes adjusted. From my own experience, I know that children in these nursery schools are in better care than many children that are with their mothers all day.

As you know, there will be many, many widows after this war is cleaned up, and we must have competent schools to care for these children, or some provision made. Not only that, but many of our husbands will not return for many, many months, and what are we mothers to do until that time?

The Government never asked us if they could take our husbands; therefore they should see to it that there are schools as the above I have mentioned to care for their children while the wives are having to work. If we are to have good citizens in the future, I believe these schools are the best. I know from experience, as I have had my child in one of these for quite some time, and it has proved very satisfactory.

All that you can do to keep these schools open will not only be appreciated by we mothers but also by our servicemen husbands.

Yours truly,

Mrs. JOHN A. HOWARD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *August 29, 1945.*
Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Though I know you will undoubtedly back peacetime extension of the Lanham Act nurseries, I am writing with the idea that letters like mine will corroborate your viewpoint.

I am a serviceman's wife with a 4-year-old son. If it were not for the Federal nurseries we would be unable to function. Private nurseries in Los Angeles are beyond our means and any less formal arrangement proves unsatisfactory for both mother and son. The cheaper Federal schools are a real boon to us.

I would like to add that it is a great satisfaction to see a policy of nondiscrimination so adequately and smoothly enforced.

I am sure my situation and attitude are typical, and I hope that letters like these prove effective.

Very truly yours,

DOROTHY GANSSLE BRIGGS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 27, 1945.
Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative DOUGLAS: This letter is a direct and sincere plea for your needed consideration and helpful aid to families of men still in the service of their country.

It is necessary for me to have employment in order to maintain my home and take care of my small son.

At the present time I have him enrolled in the Nursery School at 2726 Francis Street, Los Angeles, but it is my understanding these nursery schools may be abandoned now the war is over.

It would seem unfair for this act to be done now because, while the war is over, it would leave no assistance to the wives of the men still in service who have the same difficulties to overcome as those which were encountered during hostilities. We must still carry on until our husbands are discharged.

My husband was called into the Navy last February and has not even received a first-class seaman's rating as yet so that he is unable to furnish me with extra money, and it is imperative that I have employment, but if my son cannot attend nursery school, it will take away that privilege and I know it will have the same affect on thousands of servicemen's homes.

May I ask your kind consideration of this serious matter, and urge you to carry on the fight for us who still must serve? I feel sure you will understand our problem and do your best to help us. Thank you sincerely.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. G. R. MEADOWS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *August 20, 1945.*
HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MADAM: I would like to protest, through you, the closing of the Government nursery schools. I have just read of this in the newspaper and feel that perhaps somethings can and should be done to prevent this closing.

To me and many other like me, the war is not over. It won't be until our husbands come home. That is something that is uncertain and to many of us won't come about yet for many months. The number of discharges will be limited and it may be several years before he will be in civilian clothes and on a civilian job again. Until that happens I will have to keep working and if the Government schools close it will place me in a difficult situation. After having had my child in a Government school I do not want to place him in a haphazardly run private school where there is little or no supervision. I think that he is entitled to the best of care even if the war is theoretically over. To my child it won't be over until his daddy is home. Now, why should he be subjected to indifferent care when his father is still serving his country? Even if he gets a discharge reasonably early he may need a rest after serving 18 months overseas and if this is so during that time it will be necessary for me to continue working.

In view of these facts I'm hoping that you will take the necessary steps to prevent the closing of these vital nursery schols.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. BEATRICE KINMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *August 27, 1945.*
HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: I am writing you in regard to having the Lanham Fund for the Federal nursery schools continued. To me and my family this is essential until such time that my husband is released from military service.

We have two children, both preschool age, and there is no place, regardless of cost, that I can leave them for care during the day. Here I know that they will be given the proper food and have the care that I myself would give them if I were at home. I am not working for the fun of it—neither is my husband in the service for the fun of it. At the present time he is about to be shipped overseas.

True, the shooting is over, but what about the fathers that will be in service for a long while yet? What about those fathers that are not coming back? Is it being honest with them to discontinue a program on which their families depend so heavily?

I also feel that if this program is discontinued at this time there will immediately be an increase in child neglect due to mothers leaving their children in care of neighbors and friends. I know of one such incident that a small child was burned so badly, and received no medical attention, that it died. Yet this woman has a license to care for children. You cannot expect them to take the time and trouble to watch a child and give it the care it would receive in a Federal nursery school.

As my Representative, I shall expect you to give this matter your 100-percent support and see to it that these schools are not discontinued.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MARVIN G. RONK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *August 25, 1945.*
Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am taking the liberty of writing you concerning a perplexing problem that has just now arisen concerning mothers who have had their children cared for at the public school child care centers during the war while they earned the livelihood.

I am a widow with a small boy 3½ years old and am compelled to go out to work to earn a living for both of us. I have no other means other than what I bring in myself. I have had my little boy cared for at the Hoover School Child Center, Hoover and Ninth Streets, Los Angeles for some time. I am now informed that due to the termination of the war the child centers are going to be closed within the next month or so. If this is the case I will be unable to hold my position if I do not have access to facilities for his care during working hours. I boarded him out for 10 months before putting him into the care center, which proved very unsatisfactory both from a financial standpoint as well as a mental one. I paid $65 per month for this service, supplying everything, including all his bed linen, etc., which necessitated my working 3 nights a week extra besides my daytime job to make ends meet and which my health now will not permit.

I understand, Mrs. DOUGLAS, that there is talk about appropriating funds for the maintenance of permanent public school care centers for the use of mothers like myself who are compelled to work, which certainly would be a blessing; for it is a grand feeling to have peace of mind while working, knowing your baby is receiving adequate care and proper diet. I have noticed quite a difference in my little boy since attending the care center, especially his progress in speech and self-reliance, and the women in charge are always so helpful in solving any problem concerning the child which might arise from time to time, and the charge is so reasonable—$4.50 per week against $16.25 per week I was paying in the private home.

As mother to mother, Mrs. DOUGLAS, will you please use your influence to have these child centers permanently established so that little fellows like my boy can get the proper start while their mothers earn the living?

I trust you will not be offended at my writing you, but it means so much. Thanking you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARGARET FINLEY.

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
LOS ANGELES AREA COUNCIL,
Hollywood, September 8, 1945.

Hon. HELEN G. DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: It has come to our attention that the families of some of our members will be adversely affected by the termination of the Lanham Act child-care centers.

These members to which we refer are all servicemen who may remain in the service for many months. The emergency circumstances which forced their wives to become employed therefore still exists.

Discontinuing the centers would compel these servicemen's wives to leave their jobs and would result in a drastic lowering of living standards for their families.

We urge that you do everything you can to extend the Lanham Act. The emergency which fostered the child-care centers still exists.

Respectfully,
COURTNEY ANDERSON,
Chairman.

In reply to a request to the Federal Works Agency asking for a list of the communications received urging the continuation of child-care centers, I include the following letter, together with exhibits A and B:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES,
Washington.

Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: In accordance with your request there is attached a listing of the written communications received relative to the proposed termination of Federal assistance for the child-care program October 31, 1945. This includes communications received directly by the FWA and those referred to FWA by the White House, Members of Congress, and various Government departments. The list is complete as of September 19, 1945.

These communications include letters, wires, postal cards, and petitions. Exhibit A shows the total number of each received by the State of origin, together with the total number of signers on petitions. Since many of the letters, wires, and petitions were from organizations and groups, exhibit B shows the groups represented under various classifications and according to locations.

All of the communications listed asked for continuation of the program past the proposed closing date of October 31, 1945. Requests for continuation were for varying periods to give more time for making other arrangements for the care of the children.

Reasons for requesting this temporary continuation included principally (1) need of servicemen's wives until husbands return, (2) need of mothers who are sole support of their children for a variety of reasons, and (3) lack or inadequacy of other forms of satisfactory care in the community.

In addition to the communications herewith listed are 6 approving immediate closing.

I hope this is the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,
MARY G. MOON,
Assistant Commissioner
for War Public Services.

EXHIBIT A.—*Total number of written communications received by or referred to FWA relative to continuation of the child-care program*

State	Letters	Wires	Cards	Petitions (signers)
Arizona	6	2		
Alabama	22			
California	833	103	549	838
Colorado	2			
Connecticut	3			
District of Columbia	47		34	503
Florida	1	6		
Georgia	10	153	45	
Illinois	65	15	8	458
Louisiana	4			14
Maryland	25	3		611
Massachusetts	4	1		
Michigan	6	4		
Minnesota	4			
Missouri	9			
New Jersey	4	5		182
New York	13	11	82	403
North Carolina	5	1		
Ohio	23	1	76	449
Oregon	1			
Pennsylvania	44	8		21
South Carolina	4	1		
Texas	1			
Utah				95
Virginia	19			73
Washington	7	2		
Wisconsin	10	2		
Total	1,155	318	794	3,647

EXHIBIT A.—*Total number of written communications received by or referred to FWA relative to continuation of the child-care program*—Continued

EXHIBIT B

ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS PROTESTING CLOSING OF CHILD-CARE PROGRAM

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND POLITICAL CLUBS

El Sereno Chapter, American War Mothers, Los Angeles, Calif.

CIO Women's Auxiliary Council (350 women and families), Los Angeles, Calif.

Southern California Chapter, National Citizens Political Action Committee, Los Angeles, Calif.

Fifty-fourth Assembly District Democratic Club, Los Angeles, Calif.

Fifty-sixth Assembly District Democrats, Los Angeles, Calif.

East Hollywood Club, Communist Party, Los Angeles, Calif.

I. A. of M. No. 767, Los Angeles, Calif.

American Veterans Committee, Los Angeles Area Council, Los Angeles, Calif.

Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Local No. 103, CIO, Wilmington, Calif.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, No. 2967, Wilmington, Calif.

CIO Council, Sacramento, Calif.

Roosevelt Democratic Club, Burbank, Calif.

Local No. 442, American Federation of Teachers, Palo Alto, Calif.

Palo Alto Democratic Club, Palo Alto, Calif.

Women's Auxiliary Local Nine, CIO, Harbor Hills, Calif.

Bellflower Post, American Legion, No. 225, Bellflower, Calif.

League of Women Voters, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Veterans Service Council, Oakland, Calif.

Northeast Chapter, United Federal Workers of America, CIO, Washington, D. C.

United Office and Professional Workers, CIO, Washington, D. C.

Unions Affiliated with CIO Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.

U. F. of L. Auxiliary, CIO, Washington, D. C.

United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America (Greater New York and New Jersey) (50,000 women workers), Newark, N. J.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Local No. 199 (26 servicemen's wives and widows), Jacksonville, Ill.

United Office and Professional Workers, Social Service Division, CIO, Chicago, Ill.

Chicago Teachers Union, Chicago, Ill.

International Association of Machinists, Seattle, Wash.

American Federation of Labor, No. 79, Seattle, Wash.

Civilian Defense Committee, Vancouver, Wash.

Phoenix Central Labor Council, Phoenix, Ariz.

Philadelphia Club Dubonnet, Philadelphia, Pa.

American Legion Auxiliary, No. 136, Greenbelt, Md.

Milwaukee Industrial Union, C. I. O., Milwaukee, Wis.

Auxiliary of Morris Little Post No. 6, Milledgeville, Ga.

American Legion Auxiliary of Joseph N. Neal, Unit No. 3, Macon, Ga.

Ninety-sixth General Assembly, Special Session of the Ohio State Senate, Columbus, Ohio.

United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, affiliated with C. I. O., Sheboygan, Wis.

Teachers Union Local No. 481, A. F. of L., Newark, N. J.

CIVIC GOVERNMENT, CLUBS, CITIZENS' GROUPS, AND BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

Chamber of Commerce, Bellflower, Calif.

Executive board, Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Bellflower, Calif.

Women's Professional Club, Bellflower, Calif.

Hollywood Women's Council (350 members), Hollywood, Calif.

Modern Forum, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.

Aliso Village Residence Council, Los Angeles, Calif.

Emma Lazarus Club Division No. 141, Jewish People's Fraternal Order I. W. D., Los Angeles, Calif.

War Widows and Servicemen's Wives, Los Angeles, Calif.

Aircraft War Production Council, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mayor and city council, Albany, Calif.

City commissioners, Santa Monica, Calif.

Board of Supervisors of Solano County, Fairfield, Calif.

Channel Heights Residents' Council, San Pedro, Calif.

Todd Shipbuilding Co., San Pedro, Calif.

Plastic Manufacturing & Supply Co., Anaheim, Calif.

National Supply Co., counsellor of women, Torrance, Calif.

City manager, Richmond, Calif.

Ybor City Chamber of Commerce, Ybor City, Fla.

Miami Air Technical Service Command, Miami, Fla.

Mayor, Greenbelt, Md.

Georgia Citizens' Council (appointed by legislature), Atlanta, Ga.

Mayor of City of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio.

Cleveland Branch of National Association for Advancement of Colored People, Cleveland, Ohio.

Urban League, Cleveland, Ohio.

Master Refrigeration Co. (president), Cleveland, Ohio.

Mayor of City of St. Paul, St. Paul, Minn.

GI Wives Clubs, Minneapolis, Minn.

Northwest Community Council (50 organizations and 5,000 members), Milwaukee, Wis.

Wives, Inc. (servicemen's wives), New York, N. Y.

Wives, Jane Froman Chapter, New York, N. Y.

Ivy City Citizens' Association (22 signers), Washington, D. C.

City Council (President), Philadelphia, Pa.

Juvenile, and Domestic Relations Court, Richmond, Va.

Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad Co., Richmond, Va.

Copolymer Corp., Baton Rouge, La.

Mayor, city of Greenville, Greenville, S. C.

Mayor, city of Gloucester, Gloucester, Mass.

Child Service Department, Kaiser Co., Inc., Portland Yard and Oregon Shipbuilding Corp., Portland, Oreg.

Newark Defense Council, Newark, N. J.

CHILD-CARE COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

Committee Representing Parents, East Baton Rouge Parish, Baton Rouge, La.
Child Care Coordinating Committee for Women in Industry, Los Angeles, Calif.
Committee for Care of Children in Wartime, Los Angeles, Calif.
Parents' Council Representing 90 Nursery Schools, Los Angeles, Calif.
Mayor's Committee for Care of Children, Oakland, Calif.
Investigating Committee for Parents and Citizens of Baldwin Park, Baldwin Park, Calif.
Community Council, San Diego, Calif.
Committee for Continuation of Day Care Centers, Cleveland, Ohio.
Clark County Child Care Committee, Vancouver, Wash.
Day Care Committee, King County Council of Social Agencies, Seattle, Wash.
Acting Committee for Continuation of Day Care, Washington, D. C.
Child Care Committee, Chicago, Ill.
Child Care Committee, New Rochelle, N. Y.
Wayne County Day Care Committee, Detroit, Mich.
Fetonsville Children's Council, Philadelphia, Pa.
Child Care Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
Greenbelt Cooperative Nursery School Association, Greenbelt, Md.
Greater Hartford Committee on Care of Children in Wartime, Hartford, Conn.
Tenants' Council, Grady Homes, Atlanta, Ga.
Arizona Congress of Parents and Teachers, Phoenix, Ariz.
Emergency Child Care Association, Durham, N. C.
Patrons of Baker and Elba Schools, Richmond, Va.
Patrons of William Fox Nursery School, Richmond, Va.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL WELFARE AND HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS

Orange County Board of Public Instruction, Orlando, Fla.
Cleveland Child Health Association, Cleveland, Ohio.
Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio.
Cleveland Chapter of Lawyers Guild, Cleveland, Ohio.
Principal, Prospect School, East Cleveland, Ohio.
American Education Fellowship, New York, N. Y.
Chicago Division, Illinois Education Association, Chicago, Ill.
Citizens' School Committee, Chicago, Ill.
South Chicago Community Center, Chicago, Ill.
Principal, Shephard Elementary School, Chicago, Ill.
Superintendent of Public Schools, Aurora, Ill.
Board of Education, District 99, Cicero, Ill.
Superintendent of Schools, Rock Island, Ill.
Board of Education, Alameda School District, Alameda, Calif.
Bellflower Public Schools, Child Care War Service, Bellflower, Calif.
Administration Groups, Public Schools, Bellflower, Calif.
Medical Women's Society, Bellflower, Calif.
Bellflower Teachers Club, Bellflower, Calif.
Progressive Women's Elucation Club, Bellflower, Calif.
Principal, Adult Education, Santa Barbara, Calif.
Superintendent of Schools and Board of Education, San Francisco, Calif.
Group Work Section, Social Agencies, Richmond, Calif.
School for Nursery Years (8 signers, private), Los Angeles, Calif.
Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles, Calif.
Dean of University College, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Family Service Bureau, Oakland, Calif.
Council of Social Agencies, Oakland, Calif.
Board of Education, Albany, Calif.
Superintendent of Schools, Albany, Calif.
Board of Education, Detroit, Mich.
Board of Education, Highland Park, Mich.
Superintendent of Schools, Highland Park, Mich.
Pennsylvania Association of Teachers of Colored Children, Philadelphia, Pa.
Council of Social Agencies, Seattle, Wash.
Portland Council of Social Agencies, Day Care Committee, Portland, Oreg.
Baldwin County Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools, Milledgeville, Ga.
Superintendent of Public Schools, Greenville, S. C.
Superintendent of Schools, Greensboro, N. C.
Superintendent of Schools, Newark, N. J.
Superintendent of Schools, Richmond, Va.
Division Superintendent of Norfolk County Public Schools, Norfolk, Va.
School District, St. Joseph, Mo.
Business Manager, Public Schools, Birmingham, Ala.
Madison Public Schools (supervisor), Madison, Wis.

PARENT ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS OF MOTHERS

Eighty-eight parents and supporters of Westbury child care centers, Westbury, N. Y.
Mothers of Freeport child care center (167 signers), Freeport, N. Y.
Thirty-six mothers, Freeport, N. Y.
Fifty-seven parents, Duarte, Calif.
Parents' groups, Elysian Heights center, Los Angeles, Calif.
Mothers of Decotah child care center (51 names), Los Angeles, Calif.
Three hundred and eighty-two parents, Aliso Village Mothers' Club, Los Angeles, Calif.
Castellar child care center, Los Angeles, Calif.
Hyde Park child care center parents' committee, Los Angeles, Calif.
Thirty-six parents of Laurel child care center, Los Angeles, Calif.
Parent-teacher group, Hamilton child care center, Los Angeles, Calif.
Ninety-three mothers of Excelsior child care centers, San Francisco, Calif.
Mothers of Sheridan child care center, San Francisco, Calif.
Twenty-six mothers of Commodore Stockton child care center, San Francisco, Calif.
Parent-Teachers Association, Presidio Hill, San Francisco, Calif.
Eighteen mothers, Jefferson child care center, San Francisco, Calif.
Glendale mothers committee, Glendale, Calif.
Thirty-eight mothers (petition by wire), South San Francisco, Calif.
Twenty-nine working mothers, Richmond, Calif.
Fifteen parents, Richmond, Calif.
Parents of children in Berkeley child care center (313 signers), Berkeley, Calif.
Thirty-nine parents, Bellflower, Calif.
Parents and citizens of Baldwin Park, Baldwin Park, Calif.
Twenty-one mothers, Harbon Hills Nursery School, Louiston, Calif.
Parents in Redwood City (200 signers), Redwood City, Calif.
Martinez Nursery School mothers, Martinez, Calif.
Twenty-four mothers, Mothers' Club, Coronado, Calif.
Association of Working Mothers, Coronado, Calif.
Twenty-four mothers of nursery school children, Coronado, Calif.
Twenty-eight mothers, Eureka, Calif.
Fifty-nine mothers, Oakland, Calif.
Forty working mothers, Tru-Sisters' Day Care Center, Cleveland, Ohio.
Parents' Committee, Berea Day Care Center, Cleveland, Ohio.
Eleven mothers and teachers, Cleveland, Ohio.
Parents of 275 nursery school children, Cleveland, Ohio.
Fifteen mothers of central area, Phyllis Wheatley Association, Cleveland, Ohio.
Mothers of 64 children, Berea, Ohio.
Eighteen mothers of children and wives of servicemen, Berea, Ohio.
Thirty-five mothers, Summit County Child Care, Akron, Ohio.
Association and Parents' Committee of Hyde Park Nursery School, Hyde Park, Ill.
Jewish People's Institute Nursery School parents, Chicago, Ill.
Newberry Avenue Center Mothers' Group, Chicago, Ill.
Citizens' School Committee, Chicago, Ill.
Northwest District Mothers (800 signers), Chicago, Ill.
Mothers' Club of the Good Shepherd Nursery School, Chicago, Ill.
Sullivan School Parent Council of Nursery School, Chicago, Ill.
Mothers of Prussing War Nursery, Chicago, Ill.
Parents' Council, Altegeld Gardens, Chicago, Ill.
Mothers of Abraham Lincoln Center War Nursery, Chicago, Ill.
Twenty mothers, Shepherd School, Chicago, Ill.
Twenty-six mothers, Chicago, Ill.
One hundred and twelve mothers, Chicago, Ill.
Thirty-two mothers, Chicago, Ill.
Mothers of Cleveland School, Chicago, Ill.
Twelve nursery school mothers, Chicago, Ill.
Forty-six parents, Chicago, Ill.
Fifteen parents, Chicago, Ill.
Twenty-five mothers, Chicago, Ill.
Mothers' Club, McCash School, Chicago, Ill.
Thirty-eight mothers, Edgewater Beach, Chicago, Ill.
Forty-two mothers, Fairfax Avenue School, Chicago, Ill.
Parents of Parkside Child Care Center, Washington, D. C.
Parents, Nichols Avenue SE, Washington, D. C.
Twenty parents, Strong John Thompson School, Washington, D. C.
Twenty-one mothers, Washington, D. C.
The Carberry Parents' Club (117 signers), Washington, D. C.
The Carberry Parents' Club (34 signers), Washington, D. C.
Thirty-five Carberry parents, Washington, D. C.
Twenty mothers, Southeast Settlement House, Washington, D. C.
Twenty-six signers, Highland Center Mothers' Club, Washington, D. C.
Twenty-seven mothers, Georgetown House Nursery, Washington, D. C.
One hundred and sixteen mothers, etc., Carroll Street, Washington, D. C.
Fourteen mothers, Bellevue Nursery School, Washington, D. C.
Fifteen mothers, Van Buren School, S. E., Washington, D. C.
Mothers' Association of Pimlico War Nursery, Baltimore, Md.
Parents of St. Mary's Nursery School (67 signers), Baltimore, Md.
Sixty-seven mothers, Baltimore, Md.
Sixty-eight parents, St. Mary's School, Baltimore, Md.
Five hundred and eighty-three parents, Greenbelt, Md.
Mothers of Corcoran Nursery and Day Care Center (31 signers), Minneapolis, Minn.
Twenty war wives and working mothers, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mothers of Calhoun School, Minneapolis, Minn.
Nineteen mothers of Stuart Haynes Nursery School, Arlington, Va.

Fifty-one parents, Alexandria Child Care Center, Alexandria, Va.

Thirty-one parents, William Fox School, Richmond, Va.

Mothers' committee, speaking for 250 mothers, Houston, Tex.

Parents' group, Jerome Jones Nursery School (45 signers), Atlanta, Ga.

Mothers of Henry Grady Home, Atlanta, Ga.

Parent-Teachers Association of the Riverside Nursery School, Paterson, N. J.

Parents and teachers of College Nursery, Paterson, N. J.

Three servicemen's wives, Philadelphia, Pa.

One hundred parents and working mothers committee, Philadelphia, Pa.

Nursery School Mothers' Club, Hazleton, Pa.

Pittsburgh Council of Working Mothers, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Fifty mothers, Espian Heights parent group, New Orleans, La.

Mothers, Winter Park Nursery School, Winter Park, Fla.

Ninety-four mothers, Scranton Child Care Center, New Haven, Conn.

South Boston Nursery parents, South Boston, Mass.

Parents, Leominster, Mass.

Ninety-five parents, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial entitled "Lest We Forget," published in the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of September 4, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEST WE FORGET

Stamford, which lost two of its sons at Pearl Harbor and 191 in the World War which has just come to an end, feels a poignant interest in the reports of the Army and the Navy covering the disastrous attack on our Pacific outpost. To be fully understood, these documents must be studied in the light of related material. It is easy to lose all sense of perspective in this rapidly changing world. If we are to reach a sound judgment today about events even as recent as 1941, we must, first of all, strive to recapture something of the atmosphere of that time.

With this in view, we have been scanning the record. In a volume entitled "Peace and War, 1931–41," published by the Department of State, we find an extract from a telegram dated September 12, 1940, addressed to Mr. Hull by our Ambassador in Japan. In this telegram Mr. Grew says: "Britain and America are the leaders of a large world-wide group of English-speaking peoples which stands for a way of life which today is being threatened appallingly by Italy, Germany, and Japan. * * * The avowed purpose of these powers is the imposition of their will on conquered peoples by force of arms. * * * Only by force or the display of force can these powers be prevented from attaining their objectives. Japan is today one of the predatory powers; having submerged all ethical and moral sense, she has become unashamedly and frankly opportunist, at every turn seeking to profit through the weakness of others."

Three months later, on December 14, in a letter to President Roosevelt, recently published in his book "Ten Years in Japan," Mr. Grew confirmed this judgment. "Japan has become openly and unashamedly one of the predatory nations, and part of a system which aims to wreck about everything the United States stands for," he wrote. And there follows this striking statement: "It therefore appears that sooner or later, unless we are prepared, with Gen. Hugh Johnson, to withdraw bag and baggage from the entire sphere of Greater East Asia including the South Seas (which God forbid) we are bound eventually to come to a head-on clash with Japan."

But Mr. Grew, while pointing to this danger with unerring realism, did not—as we are so apt to do—lose sight of the delicate and complex problem it presented. Convinced that we are bound to have a showdown someday the concern uppermost in his mind was whether it is to our advantage to have that showdown sooner or to have it later. And he lists among the chief factors in the problem the question whether our getting into war with Japan would so handicap our help to Britain in Europe as to make the difference to Britain between victory and defeat.

It must be evident that the contents of Mr. Grew's letter was of such a nature that it could not possibly have been made public at the time. "After 8 years of effort to build up something permanently constructive in American-Japanese relations," he wrote, "I find that diplomacy has been defeated by trends and forces utterly beyond its control, and that our work has been swept away as if by a typhoon, with little or nothing remaining to show for it." It is well to recall that this was the situation with which Mr. Roosevelt was confronted in the Pacific.

The President replied on January 21, 1941. We quote from his letter a few sentences which reveal the breadth of vision which he brought to bear on the problem. "The fundamental proposition is that we must recognize that the hostilities in Europe, in Africa, and in Asia are all parts of a single world conflict. We must, consequently, recognize that our interests are menaced in both Europe and the Far East. We are engaged in the task of defending our way of life and our vital national interests wherever they are seriously endangered. Our strategy of self-defense must be a global strategy which takes account of every front and takes advantage of every opportunity to contribute to our total security."

This was no secret thought conveyed in strictest confidence to our Ambassador. On December 29, 1940, in a fireside chat, Mr. Roosevelt strove to impart to the public an understanding of our peril.

"Never before since Jamestown and Plymouth Rock," he said, "has our American civilization been in such danger as now. For, on September 27, 1940, by an agreement signed in Berlin, three powerful nations, two in Europe and one in Asia, joined themselves together in the threat that if the United States interfered with or blocked the expansion program of these three nations—a program aimed at world control—they would unite in ultimate action against the United States. * * * We are planning our own defense with the utmost urgency; and in its vast scale we must integrate the war needs of Britain and the other free nations which are resisting aggression. This is not a matter of sentiment or of controversial personal opinion. It is a matter of realistic, practical military policy, based on the advice of our military experts who are in close touch with existing warfare."

These quotations may help us to recapture something of the atmosphere of that fateful year before the attack on Pearl Harbor. After a long period of hesitation, we began to move vigorously ahead in response to Mr. Roosevelt's eloquent plea. Within a few months Congress passed the Lend-Lease Act. It was no easy matter to convert our peacetime economy into that "arsenal of democracy" the President had called for. There were inevitable delays and shortages as we strove at one and the same time to arm ourselves and equip and supply our friends. In the time allotted to us before the storm broke it was impossible to produce nearly enough to go around. We had of necessity to spread ourselves too thin, and our Pacific outposts suffered in consequence.

Nonetheless, as we read the reports of the Army and the Navy, we wonder whether vital matériel which could more prudently have been used to strengthen our Hawaiian base was not unwisely diverted to other areas. After all, Pearl Harbor was the key to the strategy of the Pacific. It would seem that insofar as possible it should have been made impregnable. We find it hard to avoid the suspicion that a serious error of judgment was committed—that maybe the blame for it must be shared by the Commander in Chief.

But reflecting on all the circumstances of those troubled days, we question whether this really makes any difference now. Politicians may derive a certain amount of satisfaction out of seeking to prove that a great American, now dead, was fallible, like other mortals. We doubt if there will be much political profit in the enterprise. The people know too well how easy it is to appear wise after the event. Thy will gratefully remember Franklin Delano Roosevelt not for his mistakes, of which no doubt there were many, but for the inestimable services he rendered to his country, and to the cause of freemen everywhere. And of these none was greater than that which he performed almost singlehanded as with high courage and with ringing words he awakened a slumbering Nation to the character of its enemies and the nature of its peril.

Testimony of Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, on Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the testimony given by me before the Banking and Currency Committee concerning the Full Employment Act of 1945.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Mr. Chairman, you have asked me to discuss in a rather broad way the full employment idea. First of all, I want to take my theme from the question asked by Senator TAFT yesterday: What is meant in the bill by the "right to full employment," the "right" idea is a legal concept.

I am not afraid of the question, and I think that we have plenty of evidence in our constitutional history to point out that we are not entirely moving into a sphere that has been unknown to our constitutional scheme. While it is true in this bill the "right to a job" refers to that type of right which is mentioned in the Declaration of Independence, there are other things which our Government has done which have set up partially the right, in a constitutional way, to a continuation of employment. There would be no sense at all to compensation laws if the Government had not, for example, accepted the theory. There would be no sense in our

civil service, the tenure in civil service, if we had not in some way or another accepted the theory of a right to continue employment. Tenure has no meaning if it has not the right with it, that is, in a strictly legal sense. Retirement of the Army, the Navy, and all of the various services of our country indirectly point to a right.

But we have laws dealing with the right to a job. For example, in the Selective Service Act we have guaranteed a man who is called from a job that he shall be returned to a job, in that act. Mr. Chairman, that amendment happens to have been mine, and when the amendment was offered and handed to a former chairman of our Judiciary Committee—a great lawyer, a great jurist, probably as great a one as the Senate has ever had—he remarked that the amendment was patently unconstitutional; that, of course, Government couldn't do anything of that kind. But we did pass the law. It is on the statute book. There is a guaranty, then, for a job for certain people.

There is also in the record an honest endeavor to try to prove its constitutionality. If it isn't out of place: I stayed up all night writing it, Mr. Chairman, because I expected serious opposition to the amendment, after having discussed it with the men that I did discuss it with. But there wasn't opposition. That amendment, that section of the Selective Service Act, is now being tried in the courts, and we shall know before long whether the guaranty which the Government promised the men that it called can be maintained as a governmental process or not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, full employment is, of course, an old idea. Whether government should attempt to do what is attempted in this bill is, of course, a matter of theory and depends greatly upon the theory of the government which is acting. I believe in all that Congressman PATMAN has said about the theory relating to our basic democracy and that the full employment as understood in this bill is really and truly a guaranty that all elements of our democracy—the right to have and to hold, the private property right, and all the rest—are thought of by the sponsors of the bill.

Full employment has become a national objective of 50 nations in the world. It is not something that we here are dealing with by ourselves. That came about as a result of a resolution sponsored at the International Labor Organizations' Convention in Philadelphia a year ago last May.

The CHAIRMAN. Where you were a delegate, where you represented this country.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, sir.

The declaration of Philadelphia was in reality the first serious study to try to bring about that condition which is promised in the "four freedoms"—a condition which would make freedom from want a real freedom. In the declaration of Philadelphia there are many different theories and many different ideas sponsored, but among those ideas was the idea of sponsoring the concept of full employment as an objective of government.

That, Mr. Chairman, is new in the history of governments and the history of governmental activity. It, or course, goes without saying that in the presentation of this idea to the nations of the world there was great opposition to it. It was spoken of as being absolutely a matter of theory, that our people were not practical, that our feet were in the clouds, and the editorial reception of the idea was exactly that sort of reception. We were charged with dealing with great unknowns—things that could not be.

Throughout the ages it has been assumed that things are because they are, and that you can't do anything about it. We in our country are assumed to have laid down a system under which Government shouldn't do very much about it; that man in his freedom should find his way, and all of that type of argument we had to deal with. Mr. Chairman, I needn't call your attention to the fact, but I am going to mention it here because I used this point in my remarks at Philadelphia in closing for the United States; our willingness to sponsor the full employment idea, and the argument that I made that the nations of the world would accept it.

I called attention to the fact that in Grover Cleveland's second administration there was a great failure of crops throughout the middle part of the United States and that farmers were so much in want that they didn't even have seed corn for the next planting. The Congress of the United States passed a bill providing for the distribution of seed corn to the farmers. The bill was vetoed, Mr. Chairman, by President Cleveland, with a very, very strong veto message wherein he stated what he considered this constitutional fact; that the Government of the United States was set up to be sustained by the people of the United States and not to sustain the people of the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the constitutional dictum of Grover Cleveland, of course, is wrong, whichever point you make. The Government of the United States was set up for various purposes set out in the Constitution. Not all of them were foreseen, but the general-welfare idea was there, and there is only one definition for the Constitution of the United States that will stand throughout the whole history of our country and in our country as it is evolving, and that is that the Constitution of the United States is the companion of the American people in the accomplishment of the people's social, economic, and political purposes. That's all the Constitution means, and that's all it can ever mean.

If America was established for any purpose, it was not established for the narrow purpose that Grover Cleveland set out. If it was established for any purpose, it was established for the purpose of developing men, women, and children and of promoting civilization in the world. That is my concept, Mr. Chairman, of the Constitution of the United States. I think that that is what it means to the hearts and the souls of the American people, and I know that that is what it means whenever the concepts of our Constitution are spoken of and talked to to other people in the world, because our country has become under that Constitution not only the hope of civilization but an actual beacon for activity.

It was essential, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that America give its approval, I thought, to the full-employment resolution. It seemed to me that, after it had been suggested, for America to refuse to vote in favor of it would be a backward step and the type of step which would be extremely unfortunate in the world, especially at the time when we were taking so much leadership and making so many promises.

I was told, Mr. Chairman, that the biggest nation of the earth, aside from ours, represented there would be against it, and that therefore it would be unsuccessful. After I made my closing speech I was followed by a Chinese gentleman. He came and sat down by me, and he said, "Well, we are not going to be successful. Your delegation is going to be split." And he mentioned another great power, and he said, "That great power is going to vote against this." The Chinese gentleman was followed by a South American, and he, too, came down with the same discouragement. I told them that we had a saying in America, probably taken either from the Scriptures or something which has an influence of Scripture on us, that some day the time would come when a little child would lead them; and I pointed out that the great Government referred to, which is Great Britain, when it saw how Canada was going to vote, when it saw how Australia was going to vote, when it saw how India was going to vote, when it saw how South Africa was going to vote, and when it saw how we were going to vote, in the main, that the little children would lead the great mother country and she would fall in line.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in the International Labor Conference they vote in an extremely interesting way; you vote as a nation, and you also vote as individuals, so that there are two chances to record yourself: The four individuals in each national delegation were made up of the representative from industry, the representative from labor, and two national representatives. President Roosevelt appointed me, as you said, one of our national representatives. When the roll call was finished, every nation voted for this full employment as a national policy, and every delegate from every nation voted for it. The idea, as has already been said by Congressman PATMAN, was taken up by the two political parties, and it has a place as an objective in both the Democratic and Republican platforms of last summer.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone further. We have put full employment into our national law, not in the sense that this bill provides for it, but in the passage of the Surplus Property Disposal Act of last October full employment was made one of the objectives that the administrators of that act should keep in mind in the disposal of governmental property. So that full employment can be a consideration and should be a consideration in the disposal of this property. And the questions between Senator MURDOCK and Congressman PATMAN about the great plants; full employment can become a consideration in drawing up the contract for the disposal of our great plants; a primary consideration, because the National Government and the law recognize it as an objective of government.

I thought it worth while, Mr. Chairman, to point out those facts to you, both the constitutional fact and then that which we have already done, in harmony with this bill, to show that the bill comes not as something absolutely and completely new—a pioneer movement on the part of our Government—but that it comes as a fulfillment of ideas and ideals that have already become part and parcel the national aim of 50 nations in the world, and part and parcel of our own national aim as we have moved into that aim by law itself.

Now, just one more idea, Mr. Chairman, and I think that I shall have done all that you asked me to do. In the beginning of the discussion of this bill it was charged that the full-employment idea was taken from the Russian Constitution. The Russian Constitution does contain the concept of the right to work and the right to a job, but the idea was not taken from the Russian Constitution, although it is there; and the concept as expressed in our full-employment bill and the concept as would be expressed in any American consideration would be just as different from the concept as it is worked out under a communistic-sponsored constitutional theory. It should be remembered that the basic difference between the American constitutional concept in doing for its people and doing for the individuals is that in America we have all the time the welfare of the individual person in mind. Under any single-will idea which is expressed by a communistic nation, or under the single will as we had it in Germany, or the single will as we had it in Italy, in all of those three peoples in their basic theory the concept is the welfare of the state.

Woodrow Wilson used to explain the differences in his classroom discussion: The difference between an individual in American democracy and an individual in a single-willed state or in a communistic state, in its idealistic sense. One difference lies in the fact that America is made up of so many individuals each standing by himself. If you put it in a fractional arrangement, there are 130,000,000 above the line and 130,000,000

below the line, and you come out 1, no matter how you figure out your fraction. But on the single-willed state, where the state is the aim, you have 1, as in Russia, over 190,000,000, and the individual is merely a fraction of the whole.

I do not know how to make the contrast any simpler than that. But, to repeat what was said about our Constitution and our constitutional idea, the purpose of the Constitution is to develop men, women, and children, to develop the individual, and to guarantee the dignity of the concept of the individual in our political and economic scheme. We stand practically alone in the world in this, Mr. Chairman, today.

The movement toward bringing government into all of man's activities is a movement which the people themselves are insisting upon from one end of the world to the other, and it is a movement that can't be stopped because the whole is greater than any of its parts, and it has been deemed by the political leaders in the world that only the whole can take care. But we haven't destroyed the concept of individual freedom. We have, Mr. Chairman, gotten away from—very, very far away from—the ancient theory of what constituted freedom.

I happened to be reading, thinking about, the other day, the most idealistic concept of freeman that I know of in literature. It is very, very old, but we have gotten away from this notion of freedom. This is anti-governmental. It is anti any kind of influence about the man who wants to be by himself. It is the glorious, free individual that some people have been talking about. In other nations in the world they are trying to get freedom from freedom. This is the ideal, and if you like it we can make very, very easily a world such as this represents:

"Work, work—from the rising sun
Till sunset comes and the day is done
I plough the sod,
And harrow the clod,
And meat and drink both come to me—
Ah! What care I for the powers that be?"

There is the concept of the absolutely unrestrained, free individual who never did exist in society, and never will exist, and can't exist.

Senator MURDOCK and I grew up around the institution of the irrigation ditch. We know how individual ownership and community ownership go hand in hand in that great institution. Liberty has in no sense ever been interfered with. The right to have and to hold and dispose of—all of the freedoms that go with private property—have never been interfered with. But when water is the lifeblood of the whole community, we have learned how to join together to see that everyone puts his energy into maintaining the lifeblood for the individual and for the community—that government, therefore, reaches out and tried to provide situations whereby the individual in his freedom is able to move from station to station, from rank to rank, to gain in his private property, to have and hold in greater abundance, to do more things.

Now, full employment, Mr. Chairman, cannot in America ever mean that we want everybody working. We want to maintain all the fine standards of our civilization. Persons who should be in school should be in school—that the future generation of our country shall be strong.

And, Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States has already acted in another way in support of this theory of full employment in the veterans' bill, and especially the educational section of the veterans' bill, wherein our Government has seen for the first time that we could not afford to neglect leadership for a whole generation and not sustain the possibility of that leadership—therefore the educational provisions. Now that is governmental action that government itself may be benefited by producing for the next generation the leaders that it should be able to produce.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, in both the national and international sense, is sponsored vigorously by the great democracies of the whole world, and Government now has had imposed upon it the task of attempting to keep the people independent of charity—independent of Government doles—by keeping them active. So that this bill is closely related to the health bills, the educational bills, and all of the various activities.

Now remember this, Mr. Chairman: That we have produced, as a result of the war and as a result of our war economy, a tremendous surplus of money profit which, if it isn't invested properly for the good of the people, will in and of itself result in destroying that which the people have, by a tumbling of values. So that I say that this bill has behind it not only statesmanship but the best kind of political theory and the finest kind of economic thoughtfulness.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator THOMAS.

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would just call this to the Senator's attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Senator MURDOCK. And see if he wants to make any comments on it.

I forget what witness it was yesterday, but some witness indicated that full employment in the United States may have adverse implications with reference to some other country.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. In other words, that we can produce so much that it would put other persons out of employment?

Senator MURDOCK. That was my inference as to what the witness meant. I would like to have you say something on that, Senator, if you care to.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Well, Mr. Chairman, if we can produce so much that we can bring about in the whole world even the standard of living that we have on the average in America, and the goods that the world needs, we shall produce thereby such a new demand for our things that there will actually be a scarcity. That sounds rather strange, I know, but the need for things that we are trying to do in America—the need for clothing, the need for food, the need for building materials, the need for all of the economic products of our completely industrialized system—is so great that, if there is the power in the rest of the world to get all that we can produce, that in and of itself will produce another demand. The higher your standard of living the greater the needs.

Senator MURDOCK. So I assume that you are not alarmed at all as to what full employment in this country will mean internationally?

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I am not at all alarmed about that.

Senator MURDOCK. That is, as to the effect that it may have on some other country?

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I am about as far away from the good old Middle Age theory about justifying the poor in the world as a man can get. You know, we were told that we mustn't do anything for the poor because, if the poor are not here, you and I who are so rich will fail in exerting those ideas of charity which develop our soul. [Laughter.]

Now, I can find you chapter and verse on that if you want it, but there are still a lot of people in the world who accept that philosophy in one way or another. I am not afraid of it. I have never been afraid of American democracy. And, Senator, let me just say this to you, between us: that you just take the family of your grandfather and your father and yourself, and my father and myself, just three generations in your case, two generations in mine, and we have gone from absolutely nothing in the economic scheme of things to the place where at least we educate our children and give them all they need in that line.

Senator RADCLIFFE. Senator THOMAS, in section 2, paragraph (b), on page 2, it states:

"All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment—"

et cetera. I am assuming, of course, that in stating that general objective you are not in any way favoring the weakening of the need of a personal initiative in trying to get work. I am assuming that you are not suggesting that a man not only has to be able to work but has to be willing to work, and he has to try to seek to do his work, and he has to try to earn the opportunity to continue in work, both by his work and by his temperament and all other characteristics.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Do you think that a scholarship at Johns Hopkins University when you were there ruined the initiative of the boy who got it?

Senator RADCLIFFE. No; I do not. But at Johns Hopkins when I was there—and I was there for a number of years—there was the need for personal initiative, and no one assured us either that we could get our degree or that we could write a thesis. We had to go out and we had to find some field we could work in, and we had to demonstrate that we were equipped to get it. That was the concept there.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Do you think that the history of America shows that those who have, in America, have shown less initiative than those who have not?

Senator RADCLIFFE. Well, I don't know. It is pretty hard to classify people that way. I certainly would not want to see anything said or done which would lessen the initiative of a young man to feel that he has to earn what he is going to get, and not that it is going to be handed to him. Now, that, of course, has reference to the application of the whole idea, and we run into a great many people nowadays who feel that positions should be handed to them. You and I didn't start that way.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Nobody is guaranteeing anything but the right to work.

Senator MURDOCK. Didn't we do that, Senator, in our first national declaration when we said that it was the inalienable right to pursue happiness? I cannot very well conceive of that pursuit without the right to a job.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. The way I interpret "work" means that everybody has a right to use his energy to the utmost to develop his individuality to the utmost, to "go to town" to the utmost and build himself up. Instead of being a dulling bill, this is a bill which should invigorate every human being in the United States, and that is what I think the result will be.

Senator RADCLIFFE. I wasn't criticizing the bill or suggesting it in any sense at all. I am just hoping that no one will give the impression that it is going to lessen the need of the individual to try to fit himself for work and to see to it that he continues to be qualified to do the work, and that he continues to be resourceful and active in trying to find it, that he continues to find it essential to make a good impression as he works, and that both by this temperament and by his work, and in all other ways, he continues to show a qualification for it.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Well, if it does the other thing, the whole economy will fall down upon us and we shall be dead. So you don't need to worry about that.

Senator RADCLIFFE. Well, I don't worry about it, but I think it is a thing that we always have to keep in mind in carrying out any policy of this sort, that we do not weaken and lessen that need of the individual to fit himself.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. This is to destroy the need for charity, to destroy the need for being dependent upon someone for my bread

and butter. In fact, the bill, to my notion, Senator RADCLIFFE, does exactly what you want done in your argument for keeping the initiative of individuals going. There is nothing quite so dulling to any individual as to find himself in a position where he cannot do, where he cannot take care.

Senator RADCLIFFE. Yes; there is something just as dulling, and that is for a young man to feel that he doesn't have to work and try to get a position, but that it is going to be handed to him. I think that is dulling. I believe that is very dulling, very benumbing.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I have never experienced that.

Senator RADCLIFFE. I never did, either.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. And I cannot talk from experience.

Senator RADCLIFFE. I have never, either, but I have seen a lot of people who are afflicted with that attitude of mind, and it is certainly not very healthy.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Control of the Atomic-Bomb Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. DOUGLASS BUCK
OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 24 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., president of the du Pont Co., to the Secretary of State. His letter has to do with the atomic bomb, with the manufacture of which the du Pont Co. has had some part. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the same subject from the president of the du Pont Co. to the stockholders of that company.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 4, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been brought to my attention that Walter Winchell, in what he described as an "exclusive revelation," has charged that the State Department is threatening to have legislation introduced into Congress to give the atomic bomb secret to the du Pont Co., and has implied that control would thus pass from the Government into the hands of a private industrial concern.

As you know, from the beginning we have specifically disclaimed any possible authority over this development. Instead of seeking control, our position has been quite the reverse. We undertook our part of it only at the urgent insistence of the Government. We stipulated that no profits come to us except a fixed fee of $1, that no patent rights whatsoever in connection with the atomic-energy project should accrue to the company or any of its employees; and it was written into the contract that all discoveries of a novel or inventive character should be at the sole disposition of the Government. That is du Pont's position today. In fact, we stated at the time we undertook the task, and repeated it in a statement to stockholders on August 13, that we felt the importance of the field was such that all patents should be Government-controlled. The du Pont Co. assumes that the State Department is conversant with its position in this respect.

This program is one in which scientists, university officials, industrial companies, and Government have cooperated magnificently and satisfactorily discharged their respective responsibilities.

I am sending this telegram to you, and also making it public tomorrow, and sending a copy to the Secretary of War, in order that no misunderstanding of the facts will persist and because it is important to the Government, to the Nation and to ourselves to keep the record clear.

W. S. CARPENTER, Jr.,
President, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO.,
Wilmington, Del., August 13, 1945.

STOCKHOLDERS' BULLETIN

To the Stockholders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.:

The du Pont Co.'s assignment in connection with the industrial development of the use of atomic energy recently announced by the Government involves several factors of an unusual nature. For this reason, and because of the extent of the du Pont commitment, I have deemed it my duty to report to you, the owners of the company, on this situation as soon as military security made it possible for me to make any mention of it at all. The action of President Truman and the War Department in making public a good deal of information concerning the atomic bomb has cleared the way for such a report.

Two things should be explained about this report at the outset. Technical aspects of this development are matters the discussion of which, in my opinion, rest in the discretion of the Government rather than du Pont. I shall, therefore, confine myself here to matters involving the contractual relationship between du Pont and the Government in this program. The second is that this report has been read and approved by the War Department for distribution to you.

Du Pont's connection with this work began in the fall of 1942. At that time the War Department, represented by Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, asked the du Pont Co. to undertake a phase of this project involving the engineering, designing, construction, and operation of a large plant. He explained that du Pont's general work in chemistry, and especially its experience in developing new processes, made it the organization best qualified to undertake this work.

Accordingly, after some technical conferences, General Groves met with me, stating that the project was of utmost importance in the war effort; that it was so considered by the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, and General Marshall; that it was recognized that under normal circumstances the information available would be considered insufficient to proceed even with preliminary designs; but because of the importance to the safety of the Nation, the design, construction, and operation must be begun at the earliest possible moment, recognizing fully the chances of failure and the unknown hazards which were involved in the operation of the plant.

This was repeated at a meeting with our executive committee, where reluctance to undertake the task was expressed, based on two reasons: first, that the company was already so heavily burdened with war work, undertaken at the urgent request of the Government, that it was difficult to see how a task of this magnitude could be assumed without badly overloading the company's personnel; and second, that du Pont's exploratory work had in the past been confined mainly to the field of chemistry, rather than the field of nuclear physics into which this project would take it.

However, in the light of the extreme importance and urgency of the work, as evidenced by General Groves' statements that the first nation to solve this problem could force a victorious end to hostilities merely by its military use, and that available evidence strongly suggested that the enemies of the United States in the present war were seeking to solve the problem, du Pont stated that if in the opinion of the Government its assistance was needed, it could not refuse to attempt the work.

Your company, therefore, agreed to undertake the task, provided the Government accepted two conditions. The first was that there be no profit for du Pont in the project. The second was that any patent rights developing out of the work should become the property, not of du Pont, but of the United States Government. In return for these unusual conditions, du Pont requested that in view of the unknown field into which it was being asked to embark, and in view of the wholly unpredictable hazards involved, the Government provide equally unusual protection against all costs, expenses, claims and losses sustained by du Pont.

The contract between the Government and du Pont covering this project established a fixed fee of one dollar. The Government agreed to pay all costs of the work by direct reimbursement, or through allowances provided by the contract to cover administrative and general expenses allocated to the work in accordance with normal du Pont accounting practices, as determined by audit by certified public accountants; and to protect du Pont as requested.

Under the terms of the contract, any portion of these allowances not actually expended by du Pont will at the conclusion of the work be returned to the United States Government. The contract also provided that no patent rights would accrue to the company. Du Pont felt that the importance of the field was such that all patents should be Government controlled.

The specific responsibilities assumed by the du Pont company were to engineer, design, and construct a small-scale semi-works at the Clinton Engineer Works in Tennessee, and to engineer, design, construct, and operate a large-scale plant at the Hanford Engineer Works in Washington.

Because of its close association with fundamental research, the Clinton semi-works was to be operated under the direction of the University of Chicago. A large number of key du Pont technical people was to be used by the university on a loan basis at Chicago and at Clinton to provide the university with much needed personnel, particularly with industrial experience, and to train certain of such personnel for future service at Hanford.

Inasmuch as du Pont was being asked to step out of its normal chemical pursuits into a new field, it was agreed that it would be necessary for us to depend most heavily upon the metallurgical laboratory of the University of Chicago for fundamental research and development, consultation, and advice. Du Pont has engineering and industrial experience, but it had to rely on the development work of the metallurgical laboratory for certain other features of the problem. The metallurgical laboratory conducted the fundamental research on problems bearing on the design and operation of the semi-works and large-scale production plants. It answered many specific questions raised by du Pont, and studied and concurred in the final du Pont decisions and designs.

In carrying on this work, du Pont was confronted with many new and unusual problems. The cost has been approximately $350,000,000. The area owned or controlled by the Government for this project amounts to more than 600 square miles.

Before the project could be built, it was necessary to erect housing for construction workers at Hanford, and the construction camp grew to a population of 60,000 in the

course of 2 years. The actual construction force reached 45,000 at its maximum. Secrecy was another problem.

Beyond that, in the time and with the information available, the Clinton semiworks could not be designed to be an early edition of the Hanford production units, as would have been the normal procedure. Therefore, the Hanford units had to be designed, constructed, and operated without major guidance from Clinton experience. However, the Clinton semiworks proved to be an extremely important tool in the solution of the many completely new problems encountered at Hanford.

It is with a deep sense of gratitude to all those du Pont employees who worked on the project, not only at Hanford but in other company locations from which assistance was supplied, that I am able to report to you that the carrying out of this undertaking has been thoroughly satisfactory to the Government.

In addition to the project involved above, several other important contributions were made by the company to the atomic program.

It seems to me that in this great project we have played a part consistent with the company's traditional role in American industry. With the able and whole-hearted support of General Groves, through whom the powerful resources of the Government were made available; with the cooperative effort of thousands of men and women in our own operations, in the ranks of other units of industry and the universities, an effective contribution to the war effort has been made.

W. S. CARPENTER, JR.,
President.

Chester Bowles on Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the testimony of the Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, in support of the Full Employment Act of 1945. It is, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I would like your permission to testify before you today as a private citizen and not in my official role as Price Administrator. I would like to speak as a former businessman who, as a young man, built his own business under our free enterprise system and who during the war years has had an opportunity to serve his Government.

In this role I can speak perhaps more freely.

With the coming of peace it is my deep conviction that we, the American people, are on the threshold of a whole new world of peace, prosperity, and plenty. During the war years we have seen at first hand the tremendous production of which our industrial machine is capable. There are few of us who do not sense what this same industrial machine, turned from the production for war to production for peace, can create in the way of a vastly higher standard of living, modern homes, good educations; far higher standards of health, recreation, leisure, and the money with which to make life worth while.

S. 380, the Murray-Patman bill, which is now before your committee, states that it shall be the national policy of us Americans to achieve this kind of prosperity—sustained prosperity under a system of free enterprise.

This bill has been discussed and rediscussed during the past few weeks. It will be discussed still further in the weeks to come. There are many who feel that this bill should be viewed with grave alarm. Some oppose it because they dislike and distrust all government, even our own democratic Government. They fear even the limited government planning which this bill calls for, planning to sustain and promote free enterprise, with all the power of individual action left, as it should be, in the hands of individuals.

I wonder if these opponents think for one moment that we would again be able to go through another depression even approaching the intensity of 1932, without Government controls being carried far beyond any proposal outlined here.

Some oppose this bill because they claim it will bankrupt the Federal Government. On the contrary, it seems to me that this bill and the program necessary to make it effective provide our only practical hope of a balanced Federal Budget. With a national production of $200,000,000,000 worth of goods and services annually, a regularly balanced Budget should be readily obtainable with relatively moderate taxes. But who would assume that with a national production of, let us say, only $110,000,000,000 and with 20,000,000 men walking the streets in search of jobs, we could raise the necessary funds to meet our Federal commitments within the bounds of practical taxation?

There are some who oppose this bill because, I am sorry to say it, they seem to feel that a little unemployment is not such a bad thing after all. In their view this is the only way to maintain a sensible "market" for labor. These people, and I believe they are in a relatively small minority, are still looking upon labor as a commodity to be bought and sold in the market place.

Others oppose the bill in a spirit of general defeatism. It is their belief that freedom and security are incompatible. If we are to maintain our free enterprise system, they say, we are doomed to the cycle of booms and depressions. They point out that we have gone through this cycle many times before and in spite of it our country has grown great.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I believe thoroughly in our free enterprise system. Through this system of private initiative, we have developed the greatest industrial machine the world has ever seen. We have developed the highest standard of living of any country on earth. We have achieved it with a greater degree of individual freedom than any other land.

But I must take sharp issue with those who seem to worship this free enterprise system of ours as a mystic, untouchable oriental goddess before whom we should all bow in awe and adulation.

Our free enterprise system has brought us many great things. But certainly no one who can remember as far back as 1929 to 1932 with all the misery of bankruptcy, farm foreclosure, and mass unemployment will maintain that its record is a perfect one.

Periods of inflationary boom and of consequent disastrous collapse have plagued our free enterprise system in the past. And they have been getting worse. I believe that these boom and bust cycles, if permitted to continue, will eventually destroy our free enterprise system in spite of its great achievements in the past and the unlimited contribution it can make to our future.

The times in which we are living are changing times. Scientific discoveries are flooding upon us in unbelievable profusion. The miracles of radio, transportation, and mass production are still beyond the comprehension of most of us. How can any reasonable person believe that the economic system under which we all live must not be flexibly adapted to the changing world we live in?

Isn't our real goal the personal freedom of the individual? Aren't we anxious above all to protect the right of any young man and woman freely to enter any field of activity? The right of a young man to go into business, farming, medicine, law, or architecture or any other occupation he may choose? The freedom to develop his own life and to be compensated in accord with his ability?

Except for those who idealize our economic system into a kind of dream world, I do not believe that there can be many who claim that any great sense of individual freedom and opportunity was present during the terrific depression days of a decade ago.

The worker suddenly found himself out of a job. The farmer found himself overnight without a market for his crops. The able, energetic businessman was pushed into bankruptcy because of economic conditions far beyond his individual powers to control. What freedom was there in this?

It is my deep conviction that the only way we shall know true economic freedom in this country, the only way in which we shall be able to develop the life of the individual according to our American traditions, is in an atmosphere of full production and full employment, with good profits for business, good jobs at steady wages for workers, and high incomes for our farmers. When we have developed a basis of security for everyone, then and only then can all individuals feel free to grasp the opportunities which surround them. Then and only then are we released from the trammels of fear and insecurity which in the past have rendered millions of us incapable of imaginative and courageous thinking.

The passage of this bill will be a long step forward in our efforts to achieve full peacetime production with full employment. But I believe it is clear that the bill in itself is not a program. It merely states a national policy and calls for the development of a program to achieve it.

Speaking as a private citizen, I sincerely hope that such a program will be developed during the coming months.

First. As soon as the inflationary danger is past, a long-range tax program should be developed—a program which will encourage the maximum of private investment and enterprise; a program which eliminates all possible tax restrictions on lower income groups which in the past have served to deplete our purchasing power.

I hope this tax program may be encouraging to those who may start their own business. I hope it will be a program to discourage monopoly and other restraints of trade.

Second. I hope that we shall see the development of a social security program which will cover all our working groups. I hope that the social security which Congress provides will be adequate really to care for all of the people of our country in their old age. With it, I hope, will go more adequate minimum wage legislation, an adequate unemployment compensation program for temporary and unavoidable unemployment and a broad health insurance program.

Third. I hope to see a farm program which will develop as a national policy the maintenance of a high farm income. Our farmers for many years have had more than their share of our depressions and a far too small share of such national prosperity as has come our way. Moreover, I hope we shall be able to give to our farmers the same protection against adversity we provide for our factory workers and all others.

Finally, I hope that during the months that lie ahead we shall be able to drop rapidly the controls which have been developed because of the needs of wartime, so that we may return to a maximum of individual freedom and opportunity.

These steps must be taken courageously and with all possible promptness. The Murray-Patman bill is a long step forward toward the full peacetime production and employment which are our obligation and our right.

America has come through this greatest of all wars as the strongest Nation on earth. But as we turn to peace we must face the fact that it is in America and only in America that there is worry about too much capital, too many workers and too many machines.

For the sake of ourselves and the sake of all those who love democracy throughout the world, we must put aside defeatism and apply ourselves to the building of the future of which we are so fully capable.

The world will be watching America closely during the coming months and years—watching what we do and watching what we fail to do.

The Murray bill, while not a program in itself, will amount to a clear-cut statement to the world that America has seen the last of her great depressions. It will be a clear-cut statement that we are determined to make the free enterprise system work with a high level of security and with individual freedom and opportunity greater than we have ever known before.

It is my earnest hope that the committee, the Senate, and the Congress will see fit to make the Murray bill a part of our national legislation.

Public Ownership: When?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, an interesting adress was delivered by Dr. Colston E. Warne before the People's Lobby over the American Broadcasting Co.'s network during the summer. It contains much interesting argument and factual data which should be of interest to the Congress and the country. The People's Lobby is an organization of liberals which is militantly fighting for progressive legislation designed to improve the economic picture in the United States.

The executive secretary of the People's Lobby is Mr. Benjamin C. Marsh, an outstanding and fearless champion of advanced legislation and a relentless enemy of reaction.

Here is the speech:

During the war years the world has taken immense steps toward collective ownership and control. The war had to be won. It could not be won by chaotic private groups. In every nation vast governmental enterprises were created. The United States Government has become the largest owner of plants and equipment—private or public—outside of the Soviet Union. Its controls over production and prices remain unchallenged as an essential tool of war.

Today as we debate the merit of scrapping governmental control and ownership the movement for extending its scope is gaining ground on the continent of Europe where national action appears the only means of restoring devastated industries and cities and unscrambling the corporations which had merged into the Hitlerite system. They are unafraid of collective action. Indeed, they possess no alternative.

Here the situation is vastly different. Our venture into collectivism was taken without reference to ideologies or theories. As a nation we have for many years scorned the term "socialism," but have, nevertheless, moved steadily toward extensive collective action. We have built a great public school system, a great public highway system, a great public power and irrigation system, and have in a thousand ways extended the Government into financing, into the granting of social security, and the control of corporate enterprise. These fields have more recently been supplemented with Government steel, aluminum and chemical plants, with Government shipping lines, and with important Government investments in hundreds of industries—a total investment of around $15,000,000,000.

This public planning of and participation in the economic system has, despite its drawbacks, brought amazing results. Industrial production has reached 260 percent of the prewar level. At an unprecedented pace we have built immense new factories and have created capital goods. We have permitted the Government to absorb nearly two-thirds of the production of the country and yet have not lowered significantly the standard of living of the people of the Nation.

Most of us have had our share of growls at the mistakes that have been made. We have heard of the petty grievances of disgruntled radio commentators and of special interests which call every Government official a bureaucrat and call for an abandonment of controls. As a nation we are unconvinced. We have just continued the OPA for another year and will continue it as long as control is necessary to insure a fairer distribution of scarce goods. Similarly we shall continue other wartime agencies so long as they are needed.

The big question is, How long are they needed? Should we immediately liquidate Government ownership and control and trust to our business interests to supply full employment? Should we keep our Government investment and even expand it?

The latter seems to me to be the wiser course.

The British have had during the war, and will continue to have for some time, much more drastic control of production processing and distribution of foods than we. In fact, all processors and distributors of farm products were made agencies of the British Government, with equipment pooled and profits very drastically curtailed. This was done by the coalition government, controlled by the Conservative Party. No one called that socialism, either. When the war ends people will want jobs and continuous employment. They are not going to accept a denial of full employment. A conservative southern United States Senator remarked not long ago: "I'm not a theorist, but after this war we are going to have public ownership of as many industries as necessary to keep people employed because we don't dare go back to the unemployment with which we entered the war." That Senator is a practical politician. He looks at the situation ahead of us, and remembers conditions when the war started nearly 6 years ago, with almost as many people unemployed here as we have in our armed forces today. Prewar Britain had heavy unemployment; France also. Most small European nations were plagued with the same problem.

The great technical advances of the war period confront us with even greater peril of postwar unemployment. Little wonder that American statesmen in industry, as well as in political life, are anxious that the slogan of "full employment" should not gain firm root. They realize that returning soldiers will not willingly accept a repetition of prewar joblessness when our capacity to produce has been so vividly demonstrated. In the past widespread unemployment has been cared for and the unemployed kept from violence by relief and by the more or less useful tasks of the WPA. It was financed by interest-bearing bonds running for 40 to 50 years. That isn't the American way, and we all know it. A large majority of our people realized it long before Hitler's armies marched into Poland.

Even adequate and inclusive unemployment insurance is, for any long period, not the answer because failure to attain the maximum possible production lowers the standard of living below adequate level, while maintaining an army of unemployed, by taxes or bonds. This is just as much a dead loss as maintaining an equal army in uniform. The cost falls on those who are producing.

The repeated assertions of large manufacturing and commercial organizations that private enterprise will provide employment, even though usually qualified to practical or desirable employment, has a hollow ring. The very first reaction is: If private enterprise knows how to do this, why hasn't it done it? Why didn't it do it in the thirties? That term "private enterprise" applied to the modern corporation is very misleading.

What we are actually facing is an unprecedented propaganda campaign of manufacturers to liquidate wartime controls and restore Government to the role of granting privileges and subsidies to corporations, without compelling them to take responsibility for full employment. Does that sound unfair? The record proves it.

Not a few large corporations, and we are discussing principles and not personalities, have attained their dominance through private monopoly of land or other natural resources, patents or suppression of patents, trade-marks, price maintenance, tariffs, or some special privilege in credit. To make these more profitable they have set up trade associations or other devices to keep out effective competition.

A special privilege is something that ceases to have any value when it is made available to everyone. Business and landed farmers have done as well by themselves as by the Nation during the war.

I shall not burden you with statistics. Here are a few round figures.

At the end of 1941 the surplus and undivided profits of some 400,000 corporations were almost $55,000,000,000, of which 426 corporations had nearly half.

About 100 corporations got nearly seven-tenths of the war contracts.

For the 6 years, 1939–44, corporate profits above taxes were almost $47,000,000,000, while profits of unincorporated business jumped from $6,900,000,000 in 1939 to $12,300,000,000 in 1944.

The selling price of farm lands increased about $14,000,000,000 during the war and profits of landed farmers topped all records.

Business is guaranteed postwar tax rebates. Congress is now rushing through, without public hearings, legislation to increase tax-exempt corporation profits. Prices of 32 important farm crops have been guaranteed for 2 years after the war in the Pacific ends, at a cost to consumers of about $2,000,000,000 a year.

Congress, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and the Department of Commerce have been framing a program to help little business become big business through subsidies, and crutches from the cradle to the grave. They realize that about a third of small business ventures fail the first year, and only one out of five lives for 10 years, and are seeking the remedy through the subsidy of cheap credit and governmental assistance. Even the fact we spent nearly $7,000,000,000 for alcoholic drinks last year doesn't fully explain our mental state when we call this private enterprise. To offset this outpouring of Government help to large and small business, we are now spending in subsidies to consumers $2,500,000,000 a year to keep prices from rising further. This essential antidote to subsidized private enterprise amounts to about four times the expense we incurred for consumer subsidies 3 years ago. The People's Lobby is attempting to stop some of these inflationary trends by securing a Government investigation of the capital structure of corporations, which will

probably reveal at least $50,000,000,000 of inflated stock valuations; also to secure legislation levying a special tax on the wartime increase in the selling prices of city and farm lands. I have already indicated that we must have widely extended public ownership, if we are not to head into postwar unemployment.

We don't have to be so foolish as to wait and we run serious risk of trouble at home, if we do. We are rejoicing over the concept of postwar "United Nations."

An economy of abundance will help to make us stay "United Nations."

Let us call the roll of some of them.

Russia has a socialized economy—for which the American term is public ownership—and it has brought advancing production standards, despite some mistakes made. These we can avoid as we did in the Tennessee Valley Authority and Grand Coulee, to mention two.

The British Labor Party, which is a close second in popular vote, demands "public ownership"—that's their term—of the fuel and power industries, inland transport, iron and steel, and the banking and credit system, and "public supervision of monopolies and cartels," as well as land nationalization.

France is committed to major public ownership, and most of Europe will adopt it, if British and American Tories don't block it.

Australia and New Zealand are headed far to that economy, and Ontario's hydroelectric enterprise has given it impetus in Canada.

China, as Madam Chiang Kai-shek has warned imperialists everywhere, is ready to have her resources used for all her people.

America doesn't need to wait for another unemployment disaster, which would inevitably mean much violence, to obtain public ownership—we really have much now—bought and paid for, though not signed and delivered.

Uncle Sam owns about $9,000,000,000 of industrial plants, which some of his grasping children are trying to secure. Every Member of Congress and every Federal official knows this. All we need is to prevent ourselves from being robbed of what we have—to retain and expand public ownership in a way which will make us the envy of the rest of the world. Of course, we must have operation, by technicians, not politicians, and public corporations divorced from political controls, like the Tennessee Valley Authority.

We will not have full victory if, after we win the war, we lose the Government plants which enabled us to win it, to selfish interests that believe this is a Government of dividends by dividends for dividends. This is a people's war, only if we make it a people's peace dedicated to the plenty to which our resources and resourcefulness entitle us—a plenty for ourselves and to help others not so fatefully placed.

Army Doctors

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, once more I feel compelled to protest against the wastage of doctors and nurses in the armed services. A case can be made out for 5 or 6 doctors per 1,000 men when going into battle. But surely they do not need any such ratio in peace, as contrasted with less than one doctor for 1,000 in the civilian population. It is the latter, not the Army, which has the three groups from which come most illness, namely, children, the aged, and women.

Let the services review their patients as rapidly as possible, discharge those who can and should go home, and keep only those doctors who have a full day's work to do 6 days a week. It will be better for the patients, the doctors, our civilian sick, and the United States Treasury.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the following protest from some Army doctors whose letter was published in the Minneapolis Star-Journal. It is mild compared to many I have received from doctors who are my personal friends and whose patriotism is above reproach. In fact it is their patriotism that makes them rebel at such waste of time, men, and money.

IN THIS CORNER

(With Cedric Adams)

It's a serious blast, but the letter was signed by six Army captains of the medical corps, all of them doctors. Men in that profession are pretty honest so we can assume there must be some justification in their plea. Here it is:

"The medical profession responded most generously when our country needed their services. After a few months in service, it became painfully apparent that the number of doctors needed, as set down by the Surgeon General, was a gross overestimate. Disillusionment became more complete as the months and the years passed by. It's no idle talk that the vast majority of doctors in the service have led a very leisurely existence. It is and has been very common to have less than 2 hours of work a day. This condition has prevailed in the majority of Army hospitals for over a year. The situation is especially bad for doctors used to an energetic and busy civilian life. When we hear of the "crying need" for doctors and more doctors we become enraged beyond words. Our bitterness and disgust find outlets in letters to our Congressmen. How futile are those letters. * * *

"What the sequelae will be as a result of this short-sighted, stupid attitude of the authorities toward the medical profession is hard to say. This much is certain: It will be next to impossible for the Army, the Navy, the United States Public Health Service, the Veterans' Administration to obtain able doctors after the war. The pay, the politics, the poor professional associations are enough to make any doctor shudder. Look at the artful defenses of the Regular Army against the charge it has hoarded doctors. They'll tell you of the huge number of patients in Army hospitals. But understand this: Patients in convalescent hospitals are still counted as bed patients even while they're home on convalescent furloughs up to 90 days. New-born babies are counted as regular patients. Uncounted thousands of ambulatory cases are retained in hospitals long after they're ready for discharge. Some hospital commanding officers instruct their admitting officers to pack hospitals with patients. Cases are brought in for observation and prolonged treatment of minor conditions. * * *

"All these facts are true. And yet the Army still desires a ratio of one medical officer to every 165 men. We hope you'll find room for this expression and lend your efforts to aid an honorable profession from being degraded by military politics. For obvious reasons we desire our names deleted if this letter is published."

House Rules

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, these remarks will be considered trite and commonplace by all Members of Congress, and any others who are familiar with the rules which govern the House of Representatives.

However, the hundreds of letters now being received in my office dealing with the subject of demobilization of our armed forces convince me that an explanation should be made regarding parliamentary procedure in the Congress.

In the first place, it must be borne in mind that the party in power absolutely controls each and every committee of Congress, by having a majority of its members on each committee. The party in power (which at present is the Democratic Party) is responsible for each and every piece of legislation which comes before the Congress for a vote, or which is permitted to remain gathering dust in a particular committee.

It makes no difference how many bills a Member may introduce, or the subject with which that legislation deals, unless the proposed legislation meets with the approval of the present Democratic leadership and receives the "green light" from them, that particular bill does not have a chance of ever being reported out of the administration-controlled committee for action or for a vote by the Members of Congress.

Perhaps when the Republicans were in power, back in the dim and distant past, they followed the same procedure. I am not condemning this method, nor am I finding any fault with the rules of the Congress which govern this situation. I am merely trying to point out to those folks who want to know why the Congress does not take immediate action, declaring the war ended, stopping the draft, releasing all married men and fathers, discharging all boys who have served 2 years in the armed forces, releasing all boys whose education was interrupted, getting agricultural workers home at once, and so forth; that legislation dealing with these subjects has been introduced, but that there is no way under the rules of the House whereby the minority Republican Members of Congress can compel the majority Democratic membership of Congress to report any of this legislation to the floor of Congress for a vote.

It is true, a discharge petition may be filed at the Speaker's desk. This means that if a majority of the Members—218—sign this discharge petition, the committee to which the bill was referred is relieved of further consideration of that bill and it then comes to the floor for a vote under this discharge rule. Here, again, the minority party is stymied, since we only have 189 Repub-

lican Members in the House, and must have help from the Democratic membership in order to obtain the necessary 218 signatures.

The point I am trying to make is that the present Democratic majority has the votes and the authority to either permit legislation to come before Congress for a vote, or to bury it, as they see fit, and the responsibility for failure to report out legislation dealing with the subject of demobilization rests squarely on the shoulders of the present Democratic administration.

Back to Slavery

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the message of President Truman to the Congress of September 6 was the second longest message ever addressed to the Congress by any President. Its 18,000 words were couched in such adroit phrasing and encompassed so comprehensive a program of socialization that it has taken many days and much study to penetrate its obscurity and to single out from the pleasant phraseology those hidden threats to American freedom which it so unfortunately contains.

There are 21 points in this message. I do not intend in the short time available to me to discuss each one of them point by point. Rather would I warn against the generalities, the fancies, the vagaries, the utter lack of specific and informative detail in this message, and discuss the results we may expect from the passage of such legislation as the President requests.

Certainly those portions of the message requesting adequate provision for returning veterans are beyond controversy. No one will question either the necessity or the justice of providing in the fullest for the physical and mental rehabilitation, the educational and economic opportunities, and other measures necessary for the proper readjustment to civilian life of our fighting men. Nevertheless, we owe also to those men the hope and the promise of freedom and opportunity. Their comrades have not died; they themselves have not endured suffering and hardship amid the horrors of battle in order to promote their own enslavement. They did not go to war for socialism; they went to war for Americanism. They fought for the spirit of freedom and faith in the dignity of the individual. To create behind their backs a blind and coercive state to rob them of their rights as free American citizens would be to deal them a cowardly and faithless blow. They have faced the enemy with the determined courage, moral and physical stamina, the hardihood and manliness of free men. Yet they are powerless and defenseless against those who would betray them at home; those who would cast over their future the pall of hopelessness, the dread, dead miasma of socialism.

But as our sons and brothers went out to fight for total freedom, we here at home put aside all personal considerations to devote ourselves to the tasks of total war for total freedom. We who have performed the civilian duties—in the fields and in the factories and in the offices of the Nation—have not freely made our lesser sacrifices in order to establish socialism. We, too, like those who have gone forth to fight, have determined in our hearts that the close of war would find us as free and independent as we were before. We temporarily suspended our Bill of Rights to fight a ruthless and desperate enemy who would have enslaved us. We did not temporarily yield our Bill of Rights so some enemy here at home might destroy our free government.

Americanism, the experimental promise of the eighteenth century, has become the great accomplished fact of the twentieth century. Our generations have known the greatest prosperity, the greatest physical comforts, the highest wages, the greatest and most evenly destributed physical wealth, the most expanded luxuries of any people in any nation on the face of the earth. We have known depression and hardship. We have known wars—other peoples' wars. Yet we have proved in peace that depressions in a free economy can be assuaged and softened not by blind bungling government, but only by ever greater and more expanding freedom. We have seen that in war the combined treachery and slave power of our totalitarian enemies was nothing compared to the overwhelming avalanche of machines, foodstuffs, and matériel which rumbled down to the fields of battle from the mountaintop of freedom. Crushed in their valleys of oppression, tyrannical marauders lie a dreadful example of bankrupt hopes—a compelling reminder to the free men and women of America.

These broken peoples once fed their self-esteem in the vain glory of an aggressive state. Their pride was in the nation's pride. Their problems were in the nation's problems. Their jobs were in the state's jobs. Their wishes were formed and bounded by the state's wishes. Divided among themselves in bitter hatreds they united themselves in slavery.

Intent on assurance of individual security, those deluded peoples never formed the habit of freedom. They instinctively turned to a leader to solve their problems which in this country independent citizens themselves face.

There was no desire of the majority of those individuals to assume their own responsibilities; they turned to a mystic superman to bear their burdens for them. In seeking this relief from personal responsibility they gave up the priceless privilege of individual independence. The state which would provide them jobs would also tell them where to work, when to work, and at what wages. The leader would would soothe economic, social, and political fears had to find a reason for them. The reasons Hitler found resulted in the persecution of the minorities in Germany; the adoption of a policy of conquest and aggression, and the principle of mass loyalty without right of question, or question of right. In the United States we had the same technique in the nuturing of class and sectioned hatreds, fears, and prejudices.

The Nazis who clicked their heels and threw out his chest during the temporary triumph of Germans arms is today a beaten and abject derelict, helpless and hopeless amid the devastated cities and industries of a vanished state. The brutal Jap who delighted in his wanton cruelties now cravenly begs for mercy. Had these countries possessed a true independent citizenship to exert influence over government, rather than citizens content to be the slaves of their governments; had the citizen of those nations been able to express his free opinion; to seek his own job without governmental decree; had he read the dissenting opinions of free newspapers; had he himself respected in the slightest degree the rights of minorities; had he been permitted to join a free labor union; had he preserved within himself that sobering respect for the inviolable right of mankind to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, there would have been no war. The free citizens of a peaceful Germany might even now be walking in the paths of art and industry warmed and heartened by the good will of the peoples of the world. The Japanese might still be forging forward in a friendly world instead of being defeated and broken.

The Axis peoples chose the other course. They would not solve their problems among themselves in the democratic way. They invoked a leader and a blind state to regiment all into fancied security and into slavery at the same stroke. Over and above the individual they placed a superstate by whose decree all problems would be solved and whose command all must obey.

We in this Nation now face this test. Problem will mount upon problem. All of us as a nation and each of us as an individual must face possible unemployment, temporary dislocation in our economy, the hazards of wind and weather. Throughout the vast network of jobs and callings and professions which comprise our economy some will temporarily forge ahead; others will temporarily fall behind. Medicine, psychiatry, biochemistry, and surgery will never completely eradicate all disease and all suffering. The risks of business are not ever to be weighted all on our side. All the jobs in the Nation will not at all times be pleasant. Not every life will attain that dignity and greatness to which we all may aspire, and some achieve. Yet fundamental in the course of this Nation, running straight on into its ever-expanding future is the sustaining principle that our Government is the servant and not the master of the citizen.

If at any time we depart from this fundamental so far as to ask from our Government the favors of a servant from a master, then just so far do we depart from the basic reason of our greatness, and by that much dim the hopes of succeeding generations. If in our desire to see high employment we invest the power in the state to compel it, we become serfs

with outstretched palms before a capacious master. The Government can have nothing to give unless it first takes away. It takes money and material possessions from one, and in the giving of that money to another robs the recipient of his freedom, his independence, and his opportunity. Government cannot create jobs unless government becomes the despotic ruler of all society. If government provides the jobs, then it will also provide orders. Like Nazi Germany, labor will work whenever, wherever, and at whatever wages government may dictate. Gone will be the free decision of an independent citizen to take this job and not that one.

These are not conjectures. We have had the experience. We know. To win this war we subjected ourselves to just such regimentation as I have described. Familiar now to men between the ages of 18 and 65 is the registration card—to be carried at all times, to be displayed to any police officer on demand, and not to be forgotten in the bureau drawer on pain of fine or imprisonment. Men between the ages of 18 and 65, and many American women now know what it means to be compelled to get Government permission, releases, and letters of transferral, before quitting one job and taking another. Housewives now know the meaning of Government dictation as to what we may eat and what we may wear. Our fighting sons and brothers know the meaning of regimentation. Those of us who own automobiles have known what it means for the Government to set police along the roads to spy on our traveling.

Stripped of the reassuring words of President Truman, words carefully inserted to ease the fears of those who would resist the socialization of America, the President's message to Congress proposes a high arch of legislation through which, unless we study it well, socialism may parade in triumph over American independence. That is the challenge to us all.

By every possible device we should do all in our power to assure the fullest possible employment. But we must do it in such a way as not to endanger our personal independence, our free economy, and our free government.

Lanham Act Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 19, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, many servicemen are perturbed over the cessation of the Lanham Act funds for nursery schools in their respective communities. Records show that nearly half of the mothers who have been sending their children to these schools are wives of servicemen. I sincerely trust that we are not going to add to the worries of these men about their families by an untimely closing of these schools. Methods should be found to continue them beyond the deadline of October 31, which has been set by the FWA for their closing.

I am including with my remarks a letter received from a serviceman. Inasmuch as there have been instances of servicemen being disciplined for writing Congressmen, I am withholding his name. The letter reads as follows:

My attention has been called to a matter which is of great importance to me, and I am sure of equally great importance to thousands of other servicemen.

I was inducted into the Army May 4 and, inasmuch as neither my wife nor I have relatives to whom we could turn for living quarters, etc., it was necessary for my wife to go to work to make a living for herself and our little son. Therefore, it was necessary to put the boy, who is 4 years old and of preschool age, into a nursery school which is supported, or partially supported, by Federal funds under the Lanham Act. This has been a lifesaver for my wife and myself.

Now, I understand, however, that there is a possibility of funds being discontinued as of October 31. Very frankly, I strongly feel that these schools should definitely be continued, as no doubt a great many of the children cared for in them are those of servicemen in the same situation as myself. And, inasmuch as fathers were about the last ones into the Army, they are likely to be the last ones out, particularly under the present point system of discharges.

Therefore, I seriously urge you to do whatever is in your power to continue these funds for this purpose. I, as much as anyone else, believe in economy in government, but hardly if that economy is going to be detrimental to the families of servicemen.

Postmaster General Hannegan Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a testimonial dinner arranged by the citizens of St. Louis without regard to politics was given in honor of Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan, in St. Louis, on Tuesday, September 18, 1945.

Business and professional men, outstanding city, State, and Government officials, regardless of politics, participated in this event.

Born and reared in the city of St. Louis, in my district, Mr. Hannegan delivered an excellent address, and as part of my remarks I include that address, which follows:

I was especially glad when I learned that I had been invited to a gathering made up predominantly of businessmen. As a visitor here from the Nation's Capital, I am glad to have this chance of renewing tonight what I consider to be some very valuable business contacts of the United States Government.

Those contacts are yourselves. Several times in the past few weeks I have had opportunities just like this, to speak to business groups. And I like it. I find that I get along with them. I find that it is possible in America for business and government to speak the same language—without an interpreter. And after all the things we hear in political campaigns, you know, that can be a very pleasing discovery.

You businessmen value your contacts with other businessmen. They are good for your business. That is one of the ways you get along in the world.

Well, I want to tell you that I believe contact with businessmen is good for government, too. I believe it is one of the ways for government to get along. I believe making and keeping up contact is the way for government to get along with industry, with labor, with the farmer. It is the way Americans in all walks of life get along with each other and with the world. And the administration of government with which I happen to be associated does not intend to be an exception to this rule.

Now, as a spokesman coming among you from that far-off, mysterious world known in the newspapers as "government circles," I want to take up and dispose of one question right at the outset.

The question, which I have been asked on several occasions, is this:

"Is President Truman going to the right or the left?"

I want to give the answer before it is asked here. Then, if you should get into conversation with your friends after this meeting, and they get to talking politics, and someone should ask you that question, "Is Truman going right or left?" you can say that you have the answer to that one on authority direct from "government circles." And here is the answer:

President Truman has never troubled himself about whether he is moving to the right or to the left. The State of Missouri has never been a good breeding ground for the kind of ideologies that produce those terms. Here we guide ourselves by an ideology called common sense, and Harry Truman, who has always been one of us, is generously gifted with that good common sense, that American common sense, which accounts for the greatness of this State and this Nation.

In tackling the problems of the Nation, each one as it arises, in reaching a decision and then acting on it, Harry Truman makes it a point to guide himself by the answer to only one question—and he is very, very particular about that one question. It is not "Am I going right or left?" but "Am I going right or wrong?"

The fact is that those terms, "right" and "left," in the political or economic sense, have never been applicable to what goes on in this modern democracy of America. On the road that we have traveled since 1776 those signposts cannot be used. They are Old World language. They have been applied to the politics of European countries with large parties at the extreme right, or the extreme left, or both, and with many shades, many other parties, in-between.

In some of these countries the extreme right has meant fascism. In others the extreme left has meant communism. And a trend to right or left has meant a trend toward one or the other of those extremes.

Now, in America—thank God—we have no major party of either fascism or communism. True, we have a few "fringes." In any country of a hundred and thirty-five million people you are bound to find a few citizens at those extremes. America does not let the eccentricities of these people interfere with their right to speak and assemble. But for all sane and reasonable political purposes we are a nation with a two-party system. We have, as major parties, only Democrats and Republicans.

What the one represents is not communism. What the other represents is not fascism. And to bandy charges of communism and fascism back and forth among sane and reasonable Americans is not only to speak in error; I believe it is something worse than that; I believe it is being un-American.

I have often thought I would like to ask these people who insist on seeing trends toward communism or fascism in everything

we do, who try to scare their fellow citizens by demanding to know, for example, whether daylight saving is an insidious move to the right, or a proclamation setting a date for Thanksgiving celebration is a sinister step to the left—I would like to ask such people this question:

Under a government of either the extreme left or the extreme right, there is no free press. Now, looking back in our own history, would you say that Thomas Jefferson's victory in the struggle for a free press in America was a victory for the left or the right? Where did Jefferson take us? In which direction?

The answer, of course, is that when Jefferson won a free press for America he won a victory for democracy, which is neither left nor right. Other advances have been made by our democracy since Jefferson's time, other vital decisions have been made, other struggles won, which have taken us neither to left nor right, but straight ahead on the long upward climb, the way we are going today toward an even better, ever more secure and wholesome life for our people.

It is unbecoming an American citizen, it seems to me, to hold in such low esteem that democracy in which he places his own faith as to plaster any great sector of it with undemocratic labels, totalitarian labels which are suited only to the uses of governments less enlightened, less perfect, than the form that our forefathers gave us.

But I think the question that you men who are in business would like to ask is of another kind. I think you would like to know whether the administration of President Truman is going to assist you to the limit in your own function of producing material goods, performing needed services, creating jobs for others, and making a legitimate profit.

The answer to that question is an unqualified yes. 'To the limit" consistent with good government in time of peace, which, as you know, is a time of less Federal control than in war. It is a time of less regulation, less Government in business, lower Government expenditures, easement of taxes. It is a time to expand civilian markets and to create trade, profits, and jobs in private industry.

But that "limit consistent with good peacetime government" needs further definition.

Now, you will recall that back in 1933, when a Democratic administration took over, conditions in America called for drastic, emergency action. Americans in all walks of life, business included, wanted Government to act because we had spiraled down into a crisis, the worst peacetime situation in our history. We were a sick Nation. We needed strong medicine. And we got it from the administration of President Roosevelt. At the time, he called it "the New Deal."

Well, what of today? How does this America of 1945 compare with the America of 1933?

Today we are neither sick nor weak. Against our late enemies we have proved our strength and won. Against insecurity at home, our people are now protected by certain advances which our democracy has made since 1933, certain social gains which the American people—management as well as labor—do not intend to give up.

We need no more strong medicine. And we are getting none. In his recent message to Congress, President Truman has outlined a program for meeting and solving the economic difficulties that face us in the wake of war. Those recommendations simply point the way for business, for industry, for labor, working together, to bring about the necessary change-over to a peacetime economy.

All the world knows the kind of job that our industries did in building up America's military power, in a short time, military power that knew no equal by any other nation in history. That was a magnificent job. It required the utmost effort, the utmost patriotism, of both labor and management. It showed what we Americans could do. And it is my conviction that an industrial system capable of performing the miracles that we can credit to our own industries in meeting the problems of war is certainly capable of readjusting, of going ahead to meet and solve the problems of peace.

Now, while he gave full weight to the temporary difficulties of reconversion, President Truman had this to say about the basic economic situation of our country today—I quote:

"Let me emphasize that there will be no reason for undue timidity. A vast backlog of orders may soon make possible the greatest peacetime industrial activity that we have ever seen."

That is a view I share with him. And I am an optimist not only in view of these orders that you business men and women will have to fill, but also in my faith in your ability to work with labor toward the goal of peacetime prosperity just as you worked together in building America's wartime might.

The whole program outlined in this message of President Truman is based on that same hopefulness. We see tremendous possibilities ahead for America if America does not muff the opportunity now. And we are resolved that she shall not do so. We are resolved that the American people—all of them—are going to get this chance to win their security. That security will be for all who want to earn it. We are resolved that our citizens should now enjoy the right to prosper, each in accordance with his abilities.

That—you and I are agreed—is the American way.

Demobilization of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a report on demobilization of Army personnel made to the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs by a subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman. In view of the interest in this subject, in Congress, and throughout the Nation, I hope that the report will prove helpful:

REPORT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEMOBILIZATION AT FORT DIX, N. J., AND FORT DEVENS, MASS.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1945.

To the Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs:

Demobilization is proceeding well ahead of schedule, both at Fort Dix and at Fort Devens. Separations personnel at both bases obviously are bending every effort to cope with their huge and growing task. The enthusiasm and determination with which they are working are very commendable.

Administrative personnel at both establishments gave their fullest cooperation to the subcommittee and showed a desire to benefit from any suggestions which may be advanced as a result of this study.

The subcommittee confines itself in this report to a summary of the progress noted and to certain recommendations. In view of the complete coverage given to the full committee on demobilization by spokesmen for the War Department, details on processing will not be described herein.

It is important that the progress of demobilization be noted. Fort Dix, for instance, was set up to handle 1,750 separatees per day. On September 2 (VJ-day) 1,527 enlisted men and Wacs and 200 officers were discharged, or a total of 1,727. Afterward a goal of 3,000 separations daily was set, with these results:

Date	Enlisted men	Enlisted Wacs	Officers	Totals
Sept. 13	1,512	46	226	1,781
Sept. 14	2,955	81	355	3,391
Sept. 15	2,991	39	336	3,366
Sept. 16	1,911	26	342	2,279
Sept. 17	1,901	82	345	2,228
Sept. 18	1,958	84	366	2,408
Sept. 19	2,970	70	356	3,396
Sept. 20	2,953	84	353	3,390
Sept. 21	3,000	----------	420	----------

Increases on September 14 and 15 are credited to double shifts, which later had to be given up by exhausted personnel. By September 19, however, additional personnel had been made available by training and otherwise and the post again went on a double shift. New goals set by separation center officers and personnel are 4,000 enlisted men and Wacs and 500 officers. The post already has achieved the rate of separation set up for December, and hopes to reach the new goals by the end of September.

The subcommittee feels that it should point out that some of the facilities at Fort Dix appear poorly adapted to the enormous task being done there, and it is felt that the workers are accordingly handicapped.

Fort Devens was originally scheduled to handle 350 separations daily. The program was then stepped up to 535 daily in September with a gradual increase to 1,740 in December. On September 2, 53 officers and 529 enlisted men were discharged. From September 13 to 21, the numbers are as follows:

Date	Enlisted men	Officers	Totals
Sept. 13	551	61	612
Sept. 14	558	57	615
Sept. 15	559	62	621
Sept. 16	591	55	646
Sept. 17	589	60	649
Sept. 18	584	78	662
Sept. 19	651	80	731
Sept. 20	711	77	788
Sept. 21	642	84	726

It will be of interest to note that two and one-half men are found necessary to carry on all of the functions incidental to the discharge of one man per day; one and one-half of these being required for the actual processing of records, for counseling, for medical examinations, and other details of separations.

At this point it is important that we note another factor. The number of men received at both posts is increasing faster than the number of separations. For September, Fort Devens processed to September 21 a total of 1,282 officers and 11,499 enlisted men. But there were received a total of 1,579 officers and 17,102 enlisted men. In other words, despite the highly creditable achievements of separation personnel at both posts, there is a growing backlog of men awaiting separation from the service. The end of hostilities and increased shipments from overseas have meant that men are arriving at separation centers in excess of anticipations and preparations.

The result is a constantly increasing time lag before new arrivals can be discharged. The actual process of separation is a well-executed one which requires no more than 48 hours. But men are now waiting several days at these posts before they can begin the separation process. The result quite naturally is not conducive to high morale

in men who have been led to anticipate discharge immediately upon arriving at a separation center.

Remedies immediately suggest themselves. It was stated by Brig. Gen. Peter Rodes at Dix and Brig. Gen. W. C. Crane at Devens that their number one need is for additional trained personnel. Workers are now being trained at both stations but losses of key personnel through the point system or through discharges for age make serious inroads into the separation organization.

It is strongly recommended by the subcommittee that a wide-scale training program, using low-point men for trainees, be undertaken by the War Department immediately to meet this serious problem. It is conceivable that the success of the demobilization program may be jeopardized and its progress stalled for months if the present lack of personnel is allowed to continue.

Administrative personnel state that they have found it more desirable to use Army personnel in the work of demobilization. It requires long hours and goes on 7 days a week. Civil-service regulations do not lend themselves to continuous separations.

Additional separation centers or expanded facilities at present centers are an obvious necessity. The flow of men into the separation centers will increase sharply in the months ahead, and there must be facilities to accommodate them as well as personnel to process their discharges.

As the subcommittee has pointed out, a backlog of several thousand men are awaiting discharges at these stations. They represent men shipped to the center in excess of its capacity for demobilization. At Fort Devens when men are received they are now immediately furloughed to their homes until the time when it is estimated they can be started on the 48-hour demobilization process. This is highly commendable. The alternative is to hold men at the station for 6, 8, or 10 days awaiting discharge, with resultant dissatisfaction and unrest. It is recommended that other centers follow this custom of Fort Devens.

A frequent source of trouble to men being discharged is faulty records. Despite the fact that records are checked before the men are shipped from overseas, some men arrive at the separation centers without records or with incomplete or inaccurate records. From the standpoint of the soldier and from that of the War Department, complete and correct records are extremely important.

The subcommittee observed that men with faulty records at Fort Dix were scratched (pulled out of processing line) and diverted through a special section where records are corrected, or where temporary records are provided if corrections cannot be made. This results in delays which may detain the soldier 2 days or even more than a week. It causes much dissatisfaction among the men so affected.

At Devens men with faulty records are allowed to continue in line. Efforts are made to clear up their records as a part of the continuous demobilization process, but if this cannot be done, temporary records are provided, and the soldier receives his discharge without being delayed.

It is probable that greater accuracy results from the Dix method, but there is doubt in the minds of the subcommittee that it is the preferable method. The Devens method causes less confusion, and it is much more satisfactory to separatees.

The subcommittee cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of expediting the process of separation in every way possible. The attitude of the American public toward the Nation's Military Establishment will definitely be influenced by the manner in which this job is done. Confidence in the country's peacetime military organization may stand or fall on such factors as speed of demobilization. The subcommittee states again that lack of trained personnel and of adequate facilities, unless quickly remedied, will soon represent a distinct threat to the success of the demobilization program, which at the moment is performing very creditably.

ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
Chairman.
PHILIP PHILBIN,
CHET HOLIFIELD,
J. LEROY JOHNSON.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a news item published in the Milwaukee Journal of September 17, and an editorial published in the Capital Times, Madison, Wis., of September 20, 1945. Both items pertain to the St. Lawrence seaway.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of September 17, 1945]

MILWAUKEE—OPPOSITION TO SEAWAY PROVES PROJECT HAS VALUE

President Truman is the sixth President to favor construction of the St. Lawrence seaway to open up the five Great Lakes to large ocean ships. Yet, as has been true for 30 years, selfish opponents of the waterway are deriding the project and trying to prove that it is fantastic.

The very opposition of interests that view the seaway as competitive should convince most people that it is, indeed, practical. If not, why do the railways, and persons interested solely in New York as a harbor, and others who have a personal interest elsewhere, fear the seaway?

Of course it is practical and it will immeasurably facilitate trade between the entire Middle West and foreign markets. The St. Lawrence waterway is the necessary conclusion of a process that began in 1679 when La Salle built the *Griffin*, first commercial ship on the Great Lakes, just above Niagara Falls, and sailed his 60-foot, 45-ton vessel to Green Bay for a load of furs.

Here in the Great Lakes lies half the fresh water of the world; the area contains great cities and rich mines and fine farms. For 265 years there has been commerce on these lakes. For more than 100 years ships have sailed from lake ports to Europe. A brigantine sailed from Cleveland to Liverpool in 1844. Ten years later, the first ship sailed from Lake Michigan to deep water, berthing at Stavanger, Norway. As early as 1857 a vessel carried 14,000 bushels of wheat from Chicago and Milwaukee to Liverpool.

Now, after a century of commerce from the Great Lakes to deep water, only comparatively small ships can make the trip. They come to us chiefly from Norway, Holland, and England. But the millions of Americans and Canadians in the heart of the continent demand and deserve completion of the deepened waterway. It is almost criminal that selfish interests in Congress have been able to block this progress through administration after administration.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capitol Times, of September 20, 1945]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

In view of the economic problems with which the country is confronted, the St. Lawrence seaway project, which will be brought up again in Congress this year, assumes a peculiar significance.

It is a most timely reminder of our failure as a nation to utilize to the fullest possible extent the productive resources with which we are so richly endowed. Unless we change our attitude of indifference toward the utilization of these resources we will be wasting our human resources which can be put to work only if we make full use of our industrial and natural wealth.

Briefly stated, the St. Lawrence seaway project is a plan to harness the St. Lawrence River for cheap electric power and open it to deep-draft navigation by removing obstructions which prevent ordinary ocean-going vessels from reaching the heart of the American Continent. These obstructions involve a short distance of 119 miles. Their removal will open to sea commerce that part of the Middle West which contains 31 percent of the total population of the United States, a territory which produces over 75 percent of the steel of the country, over 73 percent of motor vehicles and parts, 67 percent of the United States corn production, 56 percent of meat-packing products, almost 67 percent of creamery butter, and close to 69 percent of American Cheddar cheese, in addition to a high percentage of a number of other products.

United States and Canadian engineers have completed surveys showing that for $421,000,000 the last remaining obstructions to deep-draft navigation could be removed and a power plant built to give the people of the Northeast a hydroelectric development far bigger than the TVA. According to a recent article in the Nation, with an annual output of electricity, which would be shared equally by the United States and Canada, the project would be the biggest in the world.

The St. Lawrence seaway project has been before Congress perennially for over 50 years. It has always been defeated by the joint efforts of private transportation interests and private monopolistic utilities. The utilization of a great natural resource which would prove a blessing to the Middle West and to the Northeast has been thwarted because it threatened powerful private interests.

This disregard of the public good is especially distressing now that the country is faced with the probability of mass unemployment.

The well-being of all of us depends upon the fullest possible use of our resources. We are continually hampered in our efforts to attain this goal by private interests which thrive on an economics of scarcity.

Full employment, which means the full utilization of our human resources and hence that of our physical resource, is fought by powerful groups who want large "pools" of unemployed to depress wages.

The fight against the St. Lawrence seaway, against full employment, against the extension of projects like the TVA to other areas, is a fight against the undeniable right of the people to make full use of the abundant resources with which this great country of ours is blessed.

Heroes Immortal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most beautiful

poem written by the Reverend Father James E. Smith, of the Haven of Our Lady of Peace, Myrtle Grove Post Office, Pensacola, Fla.:

The war is over! Peace has come
To earth, and people long distressed
In frenzy dance and sing and scream
With joy that cannot be suppressed.

Their voice was heard around the world,
Two giants of the century,
Whose courage, honor, love of God
Made rendezvous with destiny.

To arms! To arms, my country's men!
In thundering words was Roosevelt's call.
Go meet the Germans and the Japs.
Bring to their knees our en'mies all.

And Churchill called to England's men—
Called to the Empire's anxious horde—
To fight for liberty and right;
To meet the foe with fire and sword.

All implements of peace were dropped.
Men shouldered arms and marched away
To suffer, starve in prison camps,
To shed their blood in armed array.

From each profession, factory, farm
They flocked to air and sea and land
To halt the foe, long well prepared—
And now victorious Allies stand.

The bones of some on deserts bleach;
In jungle graves some turn to dust;
On beds of oceans others lie—
An awful price for peace that's just.

Now Roosevelt to his God has gone—
America's voice is silent, hushed—
And Churchill from his task released—
Their work is done; the foe is crushed.

They turned their task to other hands.
To history they now belong.
In mankind's heart they e'er will live.
They stood for right. They righted wrong.

Our boys, flow'r of American youth!
They bled and died to keep us free.
In history's pages they will stand;
In hearts of men eternally.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

McDOWELL NATIONAL BANK,
Sharon, Pa., September 18, 1945.

Hon. R. L. RODGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re full-employment, S. 380.

DEAR MR. RODGERS: Of course full employment is a nice-sounding phrase, and everyone is for it—but some serious questions arise if it is to be accomplished.

The easiest and probably the quickest way to accomplish this would be for the state to take over all business and put everyone to work, which would be some form of state socialism.

Another and better way would be for the state to remove itself from all business, while still retaining such regulatory powers as might be needed.

The production enterprises never did and never will employ over one-fourth of the employables; the balance must be employed in the service occupations. Employed people must eat, attend religious services, and find amusement, must have their requirements supplied by restaurants, banks, service stations, stores, etc. All of these add up to full employment, but to the extent Government goes into business, expansion in other lines is retarded.

The forty-odd lending agencies—many of which are not self-supporting—curtail employment in banks; Federal Housing operations curtail employment by private enterprises and retard building, because people wait to see if the state will give them a home at less than cost.

Unemployment compensation is now making itself felt in a willingness to not work, and in minority strikes which throw large numbers out of work, who immediately become eligible for compensation, and stoppage of work is prolonged thereby.

As a theory, unemployment compensation and full employment are attractive slogans, but humans do not change much, and we continually bump our noses against the facts of life.

What everyone needs now is a "green light" to go ahead, even though we need a policeman and a semaphore to stop the reckless and ruthless. Laws will not provide employment, which would come quickly if the controls were favorable. Business and labor both need controls, but not bounties.

Yours sincerely,

H. B. McDOWELL.

Britain's Jersey Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial entitled "Britain's Jersey Act," written by Tom R. Underwood for the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky., and published in the September 17 edition of that newspaper, of which Mr. Underwood is the editor. The Jersey Act is very unfair to the American thoroughbred.

BRITAIN'S JERSEY ACT

Anglo-American conferences now under way are developing discussions of all the problems concerning postwar business relations between the United States and Great Britain. Tariff reductions and other specific questions including the proposal for grants of credits, perhaps to the extent of from $3,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000, will be taken up in international conferences and diplomatic discussions. The position of the United States Government as outlined by Dean Acheson in the absence of Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, who is in England now, is that the issues involved are too complex for definitive settlements to be reached at this time.

The Herald, as its readers well know, supported from the start the late President Roosevelt's policies of friendship for Britain before and throughout the war, favored lend-lease from its inception, endorsed cancellation of World War I debts, and recognizes in Great Britain a necessary friend, ally, and customer.

We believe, however, that perhaps the most glaring of all the examples of unfairness in trade relationships is to be found in what is known as the Jersey Act by which virtually all American-bred thoroughbred horses and their progeny are made ineligible for the General Stud Book, which is the English registry of thoroughbred horses. This so-called Jersey Act is not an act of government but is a policy set forth in volume 21 of the General Stud Book (dated 1913) which says:

"No horse or mare can, after this date, be considered as eligible for admission unless it can be traced without flaw on both sire's and dam's side of its pedigree to horses and mares themselves already accepted in earlier volumes of the book."

Although almost all American thoroughbreds are predominantly of British blood, records were not carefully kept in the early days and under the Jersey Act the descendants of such great thoroughbreds as Lexington, Hanover, Ben Brush, and Domino are not acceptable but bear a "taint" that makes them ineligible for registration in the General Stud Book of England.

Now, of course, action in regard to this matter is timely because of the fact that so many importations have been made during wartime. Other countries of the world, not only Great Britain but other parts of Europe and South America, are contemplating purchases to replenish their reduced blood stock.

Even Whirlaway, though by a celebrated imported British stallion, because he is a son of one of the famous Sweep mares; Shut Out, Market Wise, Alsab, War Admiral, Gallant Fox, Seabiscuit, Pavot, Hoop Jr., this year's great filly, Busher, and others are ruled out from registration.

The other day in England a yearling colt sold for 28,000 guineas, the largest amount paid for a thoroughbred of that age. This yearling was a full brother to this year's English Derby winner, Dante, and both are contaminated by the same strains that would deny to them registration in the General Stud Book in England if their sire were not already in the British Stud Book.

Of course, from a standpoint of international trade the sale of thoroughbred horses is a small item, highly limited in its scope, but it is because it serves as such an outstanding example of unfairness and discrimination that the Herald believes attention should be called to it now by American statesmen.

Friendship with Britain should be continued and trade relations reestablished quickly on a fair and equitable basis and such things as the Jersey Act should be eliminated in the same spirit by Britain as part of the bargain, while the United States prepares to make many concessions and to extend financial cooperation and credit to a gallant ally.

Transportation Priority for Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from a soldier in Marseilles, France, and also a clipping from the Stars and Stripes which indicates that horses instead of dogs now have transportation priority over soldiers. The letter follows:

MARSEILLES, FRANCE, *September 17, 1945.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: As a serviceman with over 2 years' overseas duty, I am interested and appreciative of what you seem to be trying to do for us servicemen. Hundreds more feel as I do. The War Department should be relieved of the transportation and discharge problem, and Congress should take over. The Stars and Stripes of Monday, September 16, 1945, shows a picture of two horses being sent back to the States by Colonel Carmichael.

I can assure you there are plenty of us who would like to occupy this cargo space as we have been handled many times as human cargo by the Army. I can assure you this one extra trip and cold canned rations would be endured with pleasure. If you can do anything to help us get home ahead of the horses, it will be greatly appreciated.

Signed by a Pfc.

[From the Stars and Stripes of September 16, 1945]

COLONEL SHIPS NAGS TO UNITED STATES "AT—STRESS THIS—MY COST"

Any day now the 4,700-ton ship *Santa Marta* will glide into an east coast port from Le Havre and disgorge 200 GIs and 2 horses—the latter the personal property of a Seventeenth Airborne Division colonel who purchased the animals in Munich for $1 and "other good and valuable considerations."

Earmarked for delivery to his wife in Hudson, Wis., the two horses were redeployed by Col. Edward L. Carmichael, who claims the horses possess "definite race track potentialities."

The *Santa Marta*, a United Fruit Lines cargo vessel, sailed from Le Havre on September 2.

Questioned at Marseilles before the Seventeenth embarked for the United States, Carmichael said he transported the horses "on a commercial liner at my own expense," and added: "Be sure you stress that I did this at my own expense."

Sent along as nursemaid to the horses was Sgt. Ernest J. White, a 78-pointer (VE-day score) from Louisiana and Headquarters Company of the Six Hundred and Eightieth Glider FA Battalion. He is scheduled to report to Camp Shelby, Miss., after he delivers the horses.

Warrant Officer Bernard Lefkovitz, of Chicago, a member of the colonel's battalion, quoted a supply officer as saying the colonel detailed him to secure oats and to feed the horses—an assignment requiring a six-man detail.

Lefkovitz said also that to get the horses to Le Havre took a specially built truck, while to obtain permission to ship them took numerous jeep and plane rides between Le Havre and Paris by Carmichael.

Carmichael made arrangements for shipping the horses with the Paris office of the War Shipping Administration, according to Edward Gaskell, WSA regional director for France.

"We were glad to get the business," Gaskell said. "We've got plenty of space on these cargo boats."

Cost of the shipment was $120 per horse, Gaskell said.

The animals spent 21 days normal quarantine at Neufchateau and Epinal, France.

About August 21, they were put in a two-and-a-half-ton truck at Epinal, where the Seventeenth Airborne Division was located, and driven to Le Havre. That truck was accompanied by another two-and-a-half-ton truck which carried the forage. Both trucks returned to Epinal.

Once aboard ship, the horses were placed in padded stalls. En route, they would consume 260 gallons of water, 4 bales of hay, 3 bales of straw, and 3 bags of oats.

A Soldier Writes to His Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, soldiers are writing interesting letters back to their families. It is of interest to the Congress and the country to learn the ideas they entertain. One young man, Technical Sgt. John H. Long, recently wrote a beautifully phrased letter from France to his parents in which he tells of his impression of the implications arising from the surrender of Japan. Sergeant Long speaks feelingly of the bewilderment of people in connection with the atomic bomb and of his own philosophic assessment of his personal status following impending discharge from the service.

The letter is as follows:

AUGUST 17, 1945.

DEAR MOTHER AND DAD: Now that the surrender of Japan has been confirmed I feel a rather hollow sensation such as is felt when some continuous noise suddenly halts and the quiet is more impressive than the noise. The whole ending of the war has been so dramatic that it seems like the scenario of some third-rate movie.

But now it's over—the sole and encompassing reason for the activities of millions of people has ceased to exist. After a period of bewilderment mankind will shake the blood out of its eyes, survey its wounds and bruises, and then—still groggy—begin to search for the road which it was traveling when it became so disastrously sidetracked. After a period of wandering, when the old road fails to appear, its memory will become hazy and mankind will once again wander off into its self-made jungle, beating a new path through the thickets of ideas and institutions with which it has become entangled, searching for its Utopia, its Shangri-La, its "green valley beside the still waters."

Now is the time for greatness. The generals and statesmen have defeated the common enemy, but where is the man who will tame this atomic energy—the Sword of Damocles—which will hang over every man's head from now on? Or, more important, who will lead men to their own hearts—the final arbiter of each man's destiny. Perhaps we are too intelligent now, our minds have been developed at the expense of our hearts and conscience. But some moral force must gain control of the engineers, the scientists, the industrialists.

Another Manhattan project—which may be developing now—will certainly destroy what is left of civilization. Perhaps it is time for the slate to be wiped clean and a new story begun. I wonder if it's symbolic that the spark which turned on the lights all over the world was kindled by the instantaneous extinction of hundreds of thousands of lives.

No, the end of the war will bring little change. The only cause for celebration is that few lives will be wasted for the time being. Now the hangover appears.

Naturally, all of my thoughts—and those of my comrades—are turning to home. But, after the joys of homecoming—of family reunions—will come the problems of beginning anew. I'll be returning to a vacuum—no home I can call my own, no job assuring my family more than a mere existence. And I suddenly realize that I'm not as young as I once was. By the time I am discharged I'll probably be 30 years old. All of the past 8 or 10 years when I should have been building up a business or progressing along some line of endeavor have gone. Part of them through my own fault, no doubt.

But I have a wonderful family and, I think, quite a few good friends. That should be as good a starting point as anyone could wish. There only remains my homecoming. When that will be I have no idea. Our maintenance work here has been canceled. I don't know what we will do while waiting to be shipped.

With hope and love,

JOHN.

Financial Assistance for Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The United States has become the world banker. The British are asking for from three to six billion dollars in some form of credit. Premier Stalin has told an American delegation in Moscow that the Soviet Union would like to get a $6,000,000,000 loan. General de Gaulle recently was in this country, largely for the same purpose—to get credit—and the Chinese Prime Minister, T. V. Soong, recently in Washington, made it clear China is depending on American financial assistance as the only possibility of recovery.

These are four of the Big Five; we can imagine what the smaller nations are thinking.

The word "assistance" is misleading. We are not engaged in international philanthropy. If General Motors or the Ford Co. want to sell automobiles they help finance the dealers so they can help finance the customers. Nobody considers this charity; on the contrary it is supp sed to return a profit. That is the situation of the United States, which needs customers for its prodigious production.

We are pretty new at this business. Prior to the last war the United States was a debtor in international finance. A debtor can only be solvent through an excess of exports over imports. When, after the last war, we became the leading creditor Nation and still pushed exports while restricting imports, we contributed to upset the whole world economy. The problem is whether we have learned the lesson now when we are infinitely stronger—both absolutely and, above all, relatively—than we were then.

As far as one can see at the present stage of negotiations and from what we know of them, we again are preparing to push exports with accelerated political and economic vigor, without indicating to other nations how they are going to pay for them.

A leading issue with Britain is over the sterling bloc. We practically are demanding that Britain dissolve it. The sterling bloc, which includes the Empire Commonwealth, and Near and Middle Eastern States from Egypt to India, stabilizes the currencies of these countries around the pound sterling. As a means of maintaining this stability, the Bank of England becomes, in effect, the central bank of the whole area, taking over all foreign exchange coming into these countries and redistributing it according to demands for exchange to pay for imports.

If an Egyptian merchant, for example, wishes to buy in the United States, he has to get dollars from the British. We argue that many Egyptians want to buy here but do not get the dollars. By this, it is argued, our trade with Egypt is less than it would be otherwise.

This, it seems to me, is a primitive concept of foreign trade. Dollars have to be spent eventually in the United States. If they are not spent by Egypt, they have to be spent by Britain. Britain is obviously willing to spend them—her great question is how she can get more dollars to spend here. So our demand will not, in my belief, expand our trade. What it will do is to dissolve the British system, contribute to the dissolution of the

British Empire, and weaken Britain all over the world.

Our second demand on Britain would have the same result, if accepted. It is that Britain scale down the debts she owes to members of the sterling bloc; first, because we believe her own solvency depends on it, and, second, because Britain can only repay her debts by British exports, and we fear that this diminishes our own chances in these debtor countries.

But it is highly dubious whether Egypt or India—to both of which Britain is in debt—could buy more from us if Britain exports less to them. The question still is how they shall pay for the goods. They can pay to Britain, since Britain is in debt to them, and Britain is, by nature, a great importing nation. The consequence of this policy, it seems to me, might be that Britain would suffer a stroke which would make her really insolvent, and that therewith we would lose what has always been our best foreign market, namely, Britain herself.

The first lesson that every banker has to learn is: Don't ruin your customers. The second lesson is: Provide means for your customer to repay the loans you are willing to grant him.

And international financing cannot be divorced from foreign policy. We have to ask ourselves whether in the present constellation of affairs it is political wisdom further to weaken Great Britain's world influence.

We need more enlightened self-interest than we are showing.

Succession Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

SUCCESSION ISSUE

Three months have elapsed since President Truman called upon Congress to pass a new Presidential succession law. "The question is of great importance now," he said in a special message, "because there will be no elected Vice President for almost 4 years." The House, in response to this appeal, promptly passed a bill carrying out one request of the President—that the Speaker be named as successor to the White House in the event of the President's death when there is no Vice President. But the Senate has done nothing and there seems to be no indication that it intends to concern itself with this loophole in our Presidential system.

We have frequently pointed to the dangers in this prolonged inaction. The President thinks that this great office should not be left to an unelected official. Even if the Speaker should be designated as heir apparent, the President reasonably contends, a double vacancy in the Nation's top executive posts should be followed as promptly as possible by a special election. Yet if Congress should attempt to provide a special election after two vacancies had occurred and the Secretary of State had become acting President under existing law, the possibilities of confusion and deadlock would be legion.

There is only one safe way to meet the situation and that is for prompt passage of emergency legislation. Why is the Senate lying down on the job? The only explanation offered is that it is jealous because the President asked for the Speaker of the House as heir apparent instead of the President pro tempore of the Senate. But that is such a petty objection that the Senate is ashamed to avow it in public.

Something more than emergency legislation is needed. Creation of somebody to determine when the President is physically unable to perform his duties so that a substitute may act temporarily is almost as urgent as clarification of the succession issue. Obviously a commission of experts should be at work devising means of avoiding any future possibility of leaving this great office either vacant or hedged about by a fog of uncertainty. The least the Senate can do is to sponsor a study of this sort.

We think the utter inactivity of the Senate on this issue is a grave reflection on its statesmanship. Responsibility falls in the first instance upon Senator GREEN, chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. In the second instance it falls upon Senator KILGORE, chairman of the subcommittee to which the Presidential succession bill has been referred. Surely a question of this importance should also enlist the interest of Majority Leader BARKLEY, for if this stubborn attitude should plunge the country into a melee over succession to the White House the prestige of the Senate would take a nose-dive. And even if the Senate were unconcerned about its reputation as a responsible legislative body, it should be able to see the explosive possibilities of trifling with succession to the Presidency.

Child Centers Patronage Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House have been telling us of the great hardships some American families are suffering because fathers of young children are being kept in the Army. With much that they have said I agree, and I have consistently urged the War and Navy Departments to find ways and means to speed the return of these men to their families.

But while we attempt to solve this basic problem, I trust the Members of the House will not lose sight of an aspect of this problem that calls for immediate action. The wives of many veterans are working so that decent standards can be maintained for their children. Children of these veterans' wives, between 2 and 4 years of age, have been cared for in nursery schools run in part with funds granted by the Lanham Act.

These funds have been arbitrarily abolished as of October 31, 1945. If these schools are shut down, the mothers will have to stop working and the worries of fathers in uniform will increase.

I sincerely hope this House will take prompt action to avert this new danger to the morale of our armed forces.

I am inserting a news article from the Milwaukee Journal of September 19, which describes the situation in my home city:

CHILD CENTERS PATRONAGE UP—SEEK NURSERY FUNDS

Registrations are coming in almost daily at the three Federal child care centers for which Federal subsidies under the Lanham Act will be discontinued October 31. The nursery schools were established here (as in other industrial cities) as a war measure to provide day care for children of working mothers.

That the end of the war and its resulting industrial cut-backs only temporarily put many of these Milwaukee mothers out of jobs is evident by the sustained enrollment in the nurseries, limited to children from 2 to 4 whose mothers are employed. A number of the women have obtained new employment in other plants, hospitals and stores or have taken day by day work in homes.

COMMITTEE IS FORMED

Attempting to obtain partial private support, so that the centers may continue after Lanham funds are cut off, a public child care committee was incorporated last week by Milwaukee State Teachers College, sponsor of the centers. Aid from the Milwaukee County Community Fund is sought.

The attendance Tuesday was 35 at the Tenth Street center, 36 at the Cass Street school and 28 at the nursery at the Alexander Mitchell school.

Mrs. Hans Weisel, director of the three nurseries, said Tuesday that the Cass Street center has an enrollment of 45 and a waiting list of 30, Mitchell nursery, 44 enrolled with a long waiting list, and Tenth Street, an active enrollment of 38 with three more children registered to attend soon.

Fifty-five percent of the children in all three have fathers in the service, she said. The mothers of some are widowed or separated from their husbands.

FEE RAISE CANCELED

The fee to the parents had been raised 2 months ago from 50 cents per day per child to a flat rate of $4.50 a week, she said. Because of the inability of many of the families served by the Tenth Street center to meet the higher cost after the mothers lost their higher pay war plant jobs, the rate there was returned to 50 cents a day earlier this month, she reported. Many of these mothers had been employed at Signal Battery and A. O. Smith, she said.

Because of the 2 to 4 age limit for the nursery "pupils," only a few families have more than one child in the centers, Mrs. Weisel said. There are several sets of two from a family and for a time three children from one family attended the Tenth Street center.

Demobilization Getting in the Groove for Rapid Discharges—Personal Report on Visit to Camp Dix and Camp Devens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last Friday and Saturday a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, consisting of ROBERT L. SIKES, of Florida, chairman, CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, and the speaker, LEROY JOHNSON of California, made a field trip to Camp Dix, N. J., and Camp Devens, Mass., for the purpose of studying first-hand the method and problems of demobilization. These two separation centers are among the largest in the country. They are stepping up their rates of discharge very rapidly. Fort Dix has already exceeded its quote and will continue to climb until 4,000 or more are discharged from this place each day.

Camp Devens has exceeded its quota for this time and is rapidly climbing and will exceed its ultimate quota of 1,740. Our committee filed a formal report giving more details than contained in the brief personal report, which I am submitting, having been accorded unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD. The report follows:

PERSONAL REPORT ON VISIT TO DISCHARGE CENTERS AT CAMP DIX AND CAMP DEVENS (SEPTEMBER 21 AND 22, 1945)

Three of us made a trip to two separation centers to learn something about the actual processing of discharges.

We visited Fort Dix, N. J., and Fort Devens, Mass. At Fort Dix we learned that the center is now turning out over 3,000 men and officers each day. The capacity of the center has jumped from 1,781 on September 13, to 3,390 on September 20. They anticipate reaching a goal of 4,000 per day soon. The listed capacity of this center at the hearings held before our committee on August 31 was 3,000.

These are some of the things which impede the rapid discharge of men at Fort Dix:

1. The housing facilities are not adequate.

2. Certain men who have defects in their records are delayed unduly in getting their discharges while waiting for their service record to be corrected. It was stated that about 7 percent of the men had defective records; that is, one in each 14 men. We found men who had been waiting as much as 10 days to have the record corrected. The room where this was handled was overcrowded, and there seemed to be no well-worked-out system to handle the situation. The men in charge were at a great disadvantage because of lack of space and lack of a well-thought-out plan to take care of the situation. This was not the fault of the men handling the job, but the fault of those supervising and planning the job. Various suggestions were made as to how this could be helped but no practical one was offered. However, the group at Camp Devens has solved the problem by permitting soldiers to make an affidavit giving the facts to supply those portions of the records which are missing. They thus retain their positions in the line and get discharged promptly.

3. The inflow of dischargees, of course, varies with the boats which come in. (Most of those being discharged are overseas veterans.) This cannot be rigidly controlled and the result is that at times there is an inflow far greater than the capacity to discharge. If the inflow continues to step up or to exceed the capacity of the centers, I believe additional centers should be established to keep up with the inflow of men. If it is only a temporary matter we believe that when men land that they should be given a leave if it can be seen that they will have a delay of over 5 days.

4. Another matter of grave concern is that competent employees are hard to get and hard to keep. Many of the keymen who were there in the beginning, under the reduction in the necessary points for discharge, have left or are leaving. We should try to find some way to furnish help which would be semipermanent. The work is highly technical and requires considerable training in order that it be done rapidly and accurately. Therefore, if we can find some way in which to staff these centers with people who will be semipermanent, so that there will not be unduly large withdrawals of this help, it will make for smoother running and more rapid discharges. One suggestion is that low-point personnel be trained and assigned to this job. Another is that inductees into the Army, as far as possible, be used for this purpose and that, if necessary, some limited-service inductees, not now taken by induction, be inducted for this highly critical and important work. Many registrants who are drawn are not able to pass a rigid physical examination but they have good minds and could be taken in for the purpose of working in induction centers.

5. Counseling at Fort Dix was too slow. Many men do not want counseling as they know exactly where they want to go and what they wish to do. Therefore we urge, as is done at Fort Devens, that groups be taken into a room where a counselor may talk to them. There he asks general questions as to what they would like advice on and also explains that they are entitled to a personal counseling interview. In this way most of the soldiers would be eliminated. We were informed that 75 percent do not need or wish any counseling at this particular time. This plan has been highly successful at Camp Devens and would work at Camp Dix.

FORT DEVENS

At this camp we found somewhat the same situation as at Fort Dix. Their discharges of enlisted men have risen from 529 on September 1 to a peak of 711 on September 20 and officers had gone from 53 to 84.

There was a backlog of enlisted men waiting for discharge. During the period mentioned 17,102 men and 1,579 officers had been sent to the camp for discharge; 11,499 men and 1,282 officers had been discharged. The large backlog of about 5,600 men is too high.

However, this camp had handled this very judiciously by sending men on furloughs. They would give the number of days furlough they anticipated the particular soldier would have to wait in order to be discharged, varying from 3 to 8 days.

This camp handled the counseling very well by grouping men for preliminary discussion with a counselor and finding out if there were any special questions which men desired answered. The result was that many of them had an opportunity to ask a question or more without the necessity of taking up the time of an individual counselor. Those who had further questions or wished more time were offered the privilege of a personal interview with a counselor at which they could discuss anything they wished to discuss and obtain the advice of the counselor.

On the matter of scratched records, this camp in the event of missing records, permitted the dischargee to sign an affidavit to supply the necessary data. In that way he would not lose any time because of some missing record.

The chart on page 54 of the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee on August 28 and August 31 indicates that the daily capacity of this camp is 1,740. However, the camp does not now have the buildings or the personnel to turn out such a large group each day. New buildings are being prepared and additional help has been requisitioned. If this is forthcoming we have no doubt that the full capacity will be turned out, or perhaps more, within a month, whereas its quota of 1,740 was not to be attained till December 1, 1945.

If the results at these two separation centers are typical of what is happening in other centers, I predict that the predictions of General Marshall as to dropping points for discharge and the number of discharges will be found to have been too modest. We all want this to happen so our men and women may get out with the greatest possible speed. No one, who has not actually experienced the return to civil life after several years in the Army, can understand the impatience of a civilian soldier to get out of the Army and back to his civilian work, when the war is over. Nor can those who have no husbands, sons, brothers, sisters, or children in the Army appreciate the anxiety with which those who have one or more in the Army are looking forward to their return. I will do everything possible to get our men and women home as quickly as possible.

Market Center Program of the Quartermaster Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give credit where credit is due. The market center program of the Quartermaster Corps, acting as purchasing agent for 90 percent or more of the perishable foodstuffs of the Army and Navy during nearly all of the war period, deserves the thanks of the Congress and the American people.

Because of the purchase and delivery of well over a billion dollars' worth of highly perishable foodstuffs, less than $60,000 worth had to be written off as a loss. Great credit is due to the service personnel and civilians who carried out this tremendous program of supply with a loss of less than five-thousandths of 1 percent during the 10-month period ending July 1, 1945.

The market center program of the Quartermaster Corps has done a tremendous job superlatively well. Certain fundamental truths emerge from an examination of its war record. As the single perishable food procurement agency for all the armed forces, its success demonstrates that the armed forces can cooperate efficiently in a single organization. As a Government agency whose losses due to spoilage and mishandling were less than five thousandths of 1 percent in the last fiscal year, it proves that War Department operations even in wartime can be conducted economically and efficiently.

I believe it will be of lasting value to set forth here just how the remarkable record of the market center program was achieved, and the principles underlying its operation.

Back in 1940 when the armed forces started mushrooming toward their present immense size, enormous purchasing power was unleashed. Overnight, we had to begin thinking in terms of shortages.

San Antonio convinced us of that, because in San Antonio there were a number of airfields and military installations, all paying exorbitant prices for food. Camp bid against camp on the same market, and prices skyrocketed. The civilian population was itself caught in the squeeze. What happened in San Antonio could have happened throughout the country. Uncontrolled, this great purchasing power could have wrecked markets, created intolerable surpluses and caused violent fluctuations in the cost of living. That it did not is due in no small part to the market center program.

The Army recognized that buying food on a large scale was a highly specialized business. You could not assign a cavalry major to food procurement any more than you could commission a food buyer and put him into an important cavalry job. The War Department did the obvious and proper thing. It went to the

food industry for help. In a matter of weeks some of the leading food men in the country had got together in committee with military officials and were working out what now is the market center program.

The committee set up a pattern of perishable food buying; three principles, all of which still hold. The first was having a single organization buy all fresh foodstuffs. The second was strategically scattering the actual buying and supplying; in other words, setting up the buyers close to the source of the food and as close as possible to the ultimate consumer, the soldiers themselves. Naturally this had to be modified as more and more troops moved overseas. But still, much of the export buying activities gravitated to the market centers closest to the ports through which men overseas were supplied. And finally, it relied on trained, experienced men to do the buying. These men knew what the Army wanted and how to get it.

The market center program was under Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, the Quartermaster General, the man responsible for the procurement, storage, and distribution of all the Army's food, clothing, fuel, and countless other vital supplies and services in this war.

The market center program's job, as defined by the War Department, was "to purchase fresh and frozen fruits and vegetables, milk, poultry, eggs, butter, cheese, fresh, frozen, and cured meats, and meat food products, fresh and frozen fish, and other sea foods, and such additional items as may be directed by the Quartermaster General." It bought those foods not only for the Army but also for the Navy and Marine Corps through 32 market centers, each staffed with an Army officer and civilian and military marketing specialists who do the buying. Supervision was exercised through a field headquarters in Chicago.

It has been buying from $100,000,000 to $162,000,000 worth of perishables a month. About $40,000,000 of this has been spent for the Navy and Marine Corps. And of what is bought for the Army, about 50 percent has been for overseas use. And about 70 percent of Navy expenditures were for Navy men on sea duty.

All overseas buying was handled through Chicago. The chief quartermaster of the theater of operations estimated what he needed in fresh foodstuffs. He requisitioned that amount from the port. The port officials got together with OQMG liaison men at the market center nearest the port. The requisition was forwarded to Chicago, screened as to availability and filled by buying through whatever market centers and field buying offices were in a position to furnish the kind and amount of perishables desired. Sometimes substitutes had to be offered. A theater quartermaster would ask for spareribs. The weight of the bones in this item often made it impracticable for shipment, especially if shipping were tight. The next best thing was shipped; sometimes it was a better thing.

The focal point of all operations was, of course, the market center. The 32 of them were located in virtually every important city in the country. They bought perishables for camps and naval stations in the immediate area when the amount was less than a carload and the price was right. For larger amounts they cleared by wire with Chicago. They bought for other market centers in case they were in an area which produced a great deal of some product which those other market centers wanted. And they bought for export at the direction of field headquarters in Chicago. It used to be that they bought only fruits and vegetables, and only for the Army at that. Later they bought all kinds of perishables, not only for the Army but also for the Navy and prisoner of war camps.

Market centers were not set up along inflexible military lines. They could expand or contract in line with the amount of business they had to do. But the real market center was not the office, often bare of everything except desks and telephones, but the markets and buyers themselves. Round about dawn the buyer of fruits and vegetables was out in the market place, looking over the stuff, exchanging gossip with the vendors, checking his order sheets against what appears to be on hand, and soliciting informal bids.

He would go from stall to stall—noncommittal and unmoved by the vendor's enthusiasm. After obtaining a bid, he would merely tell the vendor that he would notify him later. He was under strict orders not to divulge bids to other vendors, thus discouraging collusion which might cost the Government money. He also carried out the policy of spreading Government business to as many vendors as possible. The vendors usually knew and respected the buyer—who was from their own industry—and he knew the vendors, their reliability and integrity. This personal knowledge of the business saved the Government time and money.

More went into his consideration of a bid than price. Sometimes by paying a little more he saved the Government money. Low-priced fruits and vegetables with little "carrying power"—that is, inability to stand a long, hot trip to the ultimate consumer—were no bargain.

The buyer was not satisfied merely with selecting the product and then placing an order. It was his responsibility to see that the precise quality he ordered was what the Army got. That is why he was at the Government loading dock with the Federal inspectors. The inspectors put a grade on the food that was delivered, rejected what was below specification—but it was the market center buyer who made certain that the grade which he ordered made the grade when it came under the Federal inspector's scrutinizing eyes. Fruits and vegetables were the tempermental members of the Army's food family, requiring more personal insight on the part of the buyer than other foodstuffs.

Buyers of meat were allowed to buy only from firms licensed by and operated under the supervision of the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture. No meat or meat products were accepted without a certificate of inspection from the Veterinary Department of the Army Medical Corps. Orders specified the type, class, and grade of each article and in most cases the way in which it had to be packed.

There were nearly 2,500 inspectors checking the orders for quality. While they were not an administrative part of the market center organization, obviously no safe and sound Government food buying job could have been done without them. In the plant of every meat packer, fish processor, egg packer, poultry processor, cheese manufacturer or milk processor, inspectors checked on the sanitary conditions, the actual conditions of the product being prepared for Army consumption, and the proper packing and refrigeration before shipment. They inspected at destination or shipside, and at 30-day intervals in storage.

The market centers did not account for all the fresh foods the Army bought. The Army could not wait for all the food to come to it. That is why there were field buying offices from which buyers went out and moved with the seasons from crop to crop.

The ends of all the busy activity of field buying offices and market centers were gathered up in field headquarters in Chicago. Here, at the terminal ends of thousands of miles of teletype wires, operators received and sent hundreds of messages that were ultimately translated into food call for millions of our soldiers and sailors all over the world. All orders representing more than a carlot had to be cleared through Chicago, okayed as to price.

By this method, still another purpose was accomplished. It got a bird's-eye view of prices, scarcity conditions, and the state of the market throughout the Nation. This enabled it to obtain the best perishable foods at the best prices. But not at the farmer's expense. By acquiring food from sources as close as possible to the farmer, it gave him the greatest possible share of the purchase price at the same time that it saved the taxpayer money.

Transportation and storage were geared to handle and protect food purchases. The transportation branch of field headquarters had this responsibility. There were at least 2,000 carloads a week of Army perishables rolling all packed with stuff that a slight variation of temperature or the delay of a few days would ruin. When routing GI Joe's food, these transportation men had to avoid all the perennial trouble spots they could.

How did the market centers and field headquarters know what to buy and how much to buy? One way, of course, was through the requisitions which were given them to fill. But also they had an indirect hand in the requisitions themselves, because they helped fashion the master menus, both in this country and overseas. Their experts in meats, poultry, fruits, and vegetables constantly advised Washington on what would be available at the time the menu was to be put in use. Likewise, market centers kept Service Commands informed of crop

prospects so that intelligent local modification of master menus could be effected. Field headquarters procurement specialists also screened overseas requisitions with an eye to how crop and production conditions lined up with what was being requested.

During the past year, for example, millions of pounds of boneless beef were on order for all the overseas theaters. Before field headquarters could be sure of filling those requisitions it had to be assured of the number of cattle available for slaughter, the amount of the desired quality of beef that could be had from that slaughter, and whether enough packers were set up to carry on boning operations. By the simple process of taking out the bones of cattle and cutting and grinding the meat in three different classes of beef, 30 percent in weight and at least 70 percent in cargo space are saved.

In addition to all the day-to-day problems of perishable procurement, it was a must of the War Department that every GI Joe and Jane get his or her pound and a half of turkey on Thanksgiving.

Surprisingly few persons know that Army and Navy worked as one when it came to perishable procurement. It is only natural that this should be so. In the combat zones, there are many places where Army feeds Navy and Navy feeds Army. When food is unloaded on a South Pacific island, nobody bothers to see whether it is Army or Navy food. It is there for the American boys who were fighting this war. And here at home, it would have been absurd for the Army and Navy to compete for the same food supplies when they both have a common objective. Thus, almost from the start, the Navy joined the Army in the market center program. The Navy Department's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts shaped policy. The Navy liaison officer and staff right in OQMG, field headquarters in Chicago, carried out the policy and directed Navy market offices in the 13 cities where they shared space with Army market centers.

In summary, here is summed up the objectives of the market center program:

1. Adequate food of approved quality shall be available to our soldiers wherever they are, when and as needed.

2. This food must be used to best possible nutritional advantage and with a maximum of conservation.

3. Food shall be acquired only in such quantities as are necessary to insure that the troops will be adequately supplied with rations on all fighting fronts and in training at home, yet avoiding the building up of excessive reserves.

4. We shall acquire the foods from sources as close to producers as possible, thus giving the producer the greatest possible share of the purchase price and resulting in larger savings to the taxpayers.

5. Food shall be acquired in such manner as to create a minimum impact upon the civilian economy, both as to effect on available supplies of food and upon food prices.

6. Food shall be procured within the price limitations and other regulations of civilian agencies of the Government and with due regard for existing commodity shortages.

The market center program is at present continuing to supply our troops during demobilization. And it is significant that postwar purchases of all food by a single War Department agency has been recommended by a special food committee composed of food industry leaders appointed by the Undersecretary of War.

Thanks largely to the efficient mass procurement of perishables through the market center program, with an overhead cost of 1½ cents for each dollar spent, 10,000,000 young Americans have become accustomed to well-balanced vitamin-rich diets. At the same time, sound, intelligent, trade practices have been fostered through an equitable, exacting expenditure of public funds. These two facts are bound to have a salutary effect on both physical and economic health of the country after the war.

The Rash of Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in the St. Louis Star-Times on Tuesday, September 18, there appeared an editorial on the front page in reference to strikes, making suggestions to the employer and the employee.

This is a friendly editorial and contains some excellent suggestions.

Therefore under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

THE RASH OF STRIKES

America is at the crossroads in industrial relations. Will she plunge down the old road of strikes, lost income, retarded production, or will she hew out a new technique for labor peace? Much will depend upon labor and management's willingness to use the technique already fashioned. That willingness will require a new spirit in both camps.

Organized labor has been the beneficiary of all of the vast body of legislation passed in its behalf by its friends. It possesses the Wagner Labor Act, sharply curtailing many of the previous powers of the employer in order that nothing shall stand in the way of union organization and collective bargaining.

The labor injunction has been curbed. The courts, in the main, are friendly to labor's side. Labor has benefited further by laws establishing minimum wages, maximum hours, extending social security, workmen's compensation, and unemployment insurance. All of these benefits were handed on to labor in order to correct a serious unbalance and injustice in the economic picture of the Nation.

Moreover, these measures certainly were designed to further industrial peace. They had as their purpose the establishing of rights and privileges, which would reduce the necessity for that ultimate break-down of industrial relations—the strike.

But at the present time many among organized labor move at will, if not by caprice, from utilization of the orderly machinery set up in their behalf, to the strike, the boycott, and other violent instruments of economic power. They ignore all too frequently the fact that the orderly instruments of industrial relations should be exploited to the full before resort is had to the strike. Yet only yesterday the United Auto Workers were coolly planning an industrial war against the automobile industry if a 30-percent blanket increase in wages is not granted. Today, fortunately, the auto union came to its senses and rescinded its strike threat if management would grant a 5-percent wage increase prior to negotiations.

Upward of 80,000 automobile workers are already idle, largely because of a wildcat strike over a trivial issue at the Kelsey-Hayes plant. We have just witnessed the great Monsanto plant virtually paralyzed because of a jurisdictional fight over which union will put up an iron fence.

On the other hand, of course, there are stubborn, reactionary men in industry as violently extreme in their approach to industrial relations as any union leader. Many of these men strike down every effort to further compromise and cooperation, as their quiet and sinister sabotage of the projected labor-management conference in Washington proves. These are the men who are deliberately trying to goad labor into the extremism of rash, precipitous strikes, and those labor leaders who are so quick on the strike trigger are foolishly playing into their baleful hands.

But more and more a large section of the Nation is coming to the conclusion that the strike power in many instances is reposed in completely irresponsible hands. Great industries are shut down, entailing millions of dollars of losses for both management and workers, with all the light-hearted unconcern of a child throwing a hammer through a plate-glass window.

The end is inevitable. Public reaction ultimately will grow so strong and so outraged that many of labor's gains will be wiped out. To be sure, labor has tremendous political power, but it was not sufficient to avert passage of the Smith-Connally anti-strike bill 2 years ago which, through no fault of the United States Congress, turned out to be a boon to striking labor. It is by no means certain, however, that if the present threatened wave of strikes materializes, Congress will miss its mark as badly again when it decides to legislate against the interests of labor.

The Star-Times has fought for and still fights for the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. In final, ultimate cases where labor can obtain justice no other way, it condones the use of the strike. We do not ignore the prevalence in some quarters of a determination to "bust" the unions at any and all costs. Where management is obviously unreasonable and unfair, where there is an angry determination to wipe out all advances and to retreat into an era of industrial feudalism, labor obviously has the right to defend itself. When it fights in such cases, it is actually fighting for the health of the whole economy. However, we cannot defend the capricious, headlong strike policy beginning to manifest itself in the reconversion period.

Organized labor has an absolute obligation to exhaust every orderly means of reaching its goals before resorting to a stike. A half a century ago a wealthy business baron proclaimed that the public could be damned. That attitude caused a slow but relentless revolution of public feeling against management until it was finally manifested in a large body of laws that now protect labor. There is no reason to assume that capricious and damaging strikes will not be interpreted as a public-be-damned policy by labor with the same kind of reaction.

America has many sober, responsible labor leaders who are striving to bring about peaceful industrial relations, but it has too many who are not responsible in whose hands economic power has become the power to destroy. They are the ones who are injuring the cause of labor and the economic and social well-being of the Nation. Desperately needed is a coming-of-age of organized labor leadership.

President Truman's announcement today that he will reorganize the Labor Department is a move in the right direction. With

the projected dissolution of the War Labor Board, some Government direction more positive and aggressive than mere conciliation is certainly needed, unless we are to drift into costly industrial chaos.

An effort should be made speedily to build up a reliance and a willingness to use arbitration before resort is had to a strike. The alternative to working out an effective national labor policy is to stumble and agonize through a period of economic warfare which will leave its scars not only upon our income, but upon our morale as a nation, with resultant extremism in our political life.

Uncle Sammie's Oldsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

UNCLE SAMMIE'S OLDSTERS

Just a moment, Mr. Congressman, if you can
spare the time,
I'd like to talk about us oldsters and our
friend, old Father Time.
We saw him just this morning, right behind
that old pine tree,
As we were eating breakfast of moldy bread
and tea.
We know he's got us beaten, but we didn't
want to call his hand,
Till we had a chance to talk to you about the
Townsend plan.

Now, Mr. Congressman, we have helped our
dear old Uncle Sam,
To build this mighty Nation, until today it
stands,
The richest and the greatest, and can the
world command.
We've paid our tax without a word nigh on
to 50 years,
We've labored hard to raise our kids through
sunshine and through tears.
We had saved a little nest egg for our declining years,
But alas our bubble burst, and now we stand
in line
For help from Uncle Sammie, and await old
Father Time.

We're not the least bit jealous, Mr. Congressman, of your money in the bank,
Or your shiny automobile with ethyl in its
tank.
We're mighty glad you're able your income
tax to file,
But in our high day, Mr. Congressman, we
had you skinned a mile.
Then we'd hitch old Dobbin to the sleigh or
the bays up to the hack,
And we'd drive clear up to the meetin' house,
nigh on to 8 miles there and back.
Those were the days, Mr. Congressman, we
were playing quarterback.
Oh, boy! And did we shine, while dear old
Father Time
Was running our interference, and backing
up the line.

Our Uncle Sam, Mr. Congressman, has loaned
billions on the cuff,
He really had to do it to call the Axis bluff.
So our Franklin and Winston met to talk
war, and trade and barter,
And they drew a document then and there,
and called it the Atlantic Charter.
It proclaimed all men should have freedom
from want and fear,
It was a glorious thing to say, it gave us hope
these words to hear,

But wait a minute, oldster, let's go a little
slow
Until this really happens, what are we going
to use for dough.

I sometimes think, Mr. Congressman, that it
would better be,
Than to try and get along on this present
social security.
If our Uncle Sam would do us, as some nations
o'er the sea.
When we get old and helpless and our body
full of ills,
Just let us face a firing squad, or give us a
lethal pill.
Then our old and shriveled bodies could be
rendered out for grease,
And our souls released from bondage, to enjoy
eternal peace.

Now, Mr. Congressman, you can put your
money on the red,
That we're for Uncle Sammie, from our heels
up to our head,
But the cost of living almost doubled and
a-climbing every day
We only think it just and right, that we get
a boost in pay.
But we'll just keep a-praying, and drink the
bitter cup,
Till Father Time steps up behind and says
"Bud, your number's up."

I would like to ask a favor, Mr. Congressman,
before you go your way,
Won't you figure out my budget, for just a
buck a day,
I'm not much good at figures, and I'm getting
pretty blind,
And it just keeps me a-humpin' to dodge old
Father Time.
Sure, Mr. Congressman, take all the time you
need,
And when you get it figured out, just give me
call
Or take it as a reference, to your seat in
Congress Hall.

And if you turn us down this time, we'll kneel
beside our bed
And without malice in our hearts, we'll bow
our old white head
And thank our Heavenly Father for this, our
moldy bread.
We'll put more paper in our shoes 'cause our
soles are gettin' thin,
Ar i we'll try and stave off Father Time till
election time again.
There'll be many of us oldsters gone before
another election falls,
And they are going to watch you how you
vote when the Townsend bill is called.

We won't be here much longer, Mr. Congressman, for our legs will hardly trod,
And it's going to be mighty peaceful, down
there beneath the sod.
And when we get to heaven, God will take us
by the hand,
For we won't be oldsters anymore, nor will we
need the Townsend plan,
For God is still within His heaven, and He's
got plenty on the ball
And He's going to sit beside you when the
Townsend bill is called.

—*W. A. Luce.*

No Soft Peace for Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable article appeared in the Seattle Times, September 16, under the byline of the well-known correspondent, Leland Stowe.

Raising the pertinent question of whether America is risking the loss of the peace by our present handling of Japan, Mr. Stowe asks, "After Pearl Harbor, who would have believed that the treacherous Japs would get a much softer peace than the Nazis?"

America's fitness for world leadership is at stake in Japan, Mr. Stowe believes, adding, "Either Hirohito's present backers or our own leaders must emerge with the title of 'honorable suckers.' In Japan we are playing for keeps. Somebody is bound to take an awful beating."

To make his challenging article available to every Member, I am including it in the RECORD:

GOVERNING WHIPPED JAP RANKS AS TOUGH, RISKY JOB

(By Leland Stowe)

The toughest and riskiest job in the world now presses upon the collective judgments of President Truman, the United States State Department, General MacArthur and his chief advisers. If we lose the peace with Japan, history will hold these few Americans chiefly responsible. Americans are taking over the fearfully complex task of occupying and administering Japan alone. Should they botch this colossal gamble, the Truman administration's top men cannot escape a crushing verdict of responsibility and blame.

Whether we Americans are sufficiently experienced and adept in world affairs to assume the onus of re-educating the Japanese and reconstructing Japan's political system, alone—or virtually alone—well, that's already an academic question. Already Americans, all by themselves, are up to their necks in Japan. Our title to world leadership is just as much at stake as winning the peace with Japan. And this is the trickiest, most fateful game of wits ever risked by Americans in our entire history.

Either Hirohito's present backers or our own leaders must emerge with the title of "honorable suckers." From now on out, there's no dodging this unpleasant and dangerous fact. In Japan we are playing for keeps. So somebody is bound to take an awful beating.

The terrific responsibility must weigh very heavily on the consciousness of the President, Secretary Byrnes, and their aides.

General MacArthur, too, must be profoundly aware that the final measure of his greatness will be decided in these next few months. But does the average American realize that the prestige and future safety of all Americans is equally "on the spot" in Japan?

In our handling of the Japanese we shall demonstrate whether we are a mature, perceptive, and able people—or whether we are political adolescents, fantastically naive.

Developments inside Japan are still extremely disquieting. As yet the Japanese imperialists seem to have our occupation well in hand. Every day's dispatches out of Nippon bring new danger signals. The temptation to criticize American actions is correspondingly great. Even so, we must remember that MacArthur's hands are pitifully weak physically. Not until mid-October will we have a real army on Japanese soil. Perhaps the Japanese home army of 3,000,000 will not be completely demobilized before November. MacArthur's present situation is terribly delicate. With five or six divisions he has to try to control a nation of 80,000,000 or more.

This is why we can't yet know what Washington's and MacArthur's real policies are. While in a lions' den no sensible Daniel tries to outroar the lions. Perhaps this also explains why MacArthur's first statement of

methods and objectives is so remarkably restrained and vague. If MacArthur appreciates how cleverly Japan's imperialists and feudalists are digging themselves in, he gives no sign. There's no present way for you and me to know whether these seemingly alarming trends in Japan—and in our own Army's actions or omissions—are what they seem; or in reality are quite different from what they seem. American and Jap bigwigs are indulging in a great poker-faced salaaming contest. If all we fought for were not at stake, it would be funnier than Gilbert and Sullivan.

MacArthur's statement promises American "encouragement of liberal tendencies." Why didn't MacArthur mention democracy, by name, as our objective for Japan? Was this just a ruse to hoodwink Japan's present government? What does MacArthur mean by creation of "conditions that will insure that Japan will not again become a menace to world peace"? * * * Like the Japs, we are using double-talk and weasel words.

PUBLIC IN DARK YET

The American public probably must remain in the dark until all Japan's home army is demobilized and our own forces swollen to half a million or more. But once that moment comes the American people have the right to expect swift, sharp, clear-cut action—an American policy in Japan which is realistic, democratic, and bold. Will we get that kind of action and policy? Only President Truman, Secretary Byrnes, and associates can decide. But if they lack wisdom and courage, we shall all pay the same fearful price.

Out of fairness we try to suspend judgment. For all that, the duty of every American citizen is plain. The American people must be the watchdogs of our peace with Japan. The American people must follow closely every development there. We must analyze every action by our Government and MacArthur. We must see Japan's system for what it is. On that all necessary information is available. If Americans become "honorable suckers," we shall have no one but ourselves to blame.

Right now, however, it's perfectly fair to remark certain things. After Pearl Harbor who would have believed that the treacherous Japs would get a much softer peace than the Nazis? Thus far the contrast between Allied treatment of Germany and of Japan is amazingly and disconcertingly great. If this is anything more than expediency in our first stage of occupation of Japan, it is a crime. That possibility certainly exists. This is why the American public must beware.

In Germany the Allies have imposed their own military government. Top German war criminals face trial. German industrialists and monopolists are being shorn of their plants and power. The great Junker feudalists are dispossessed, their estates distributed to the peasants. Not a shred of Nazi government remains. Nazis are being weeded out of municipal jobs. The whole German bureaucratic and economic system is being radically altered. The Gestapo is hunted. The German Army is dissolved. Most of the fundamental reforms which were ignored in Germany in 1918 are now being imposed.

JAPAN NEEDS REFORMING

The same fundamental reforms are required in Japan's equally Fascist-militarist state. Obviously MacArthur is not yet strong enough to launch such drastic changes. So none of the truly important and decisive steps has yet been taken in Hirohitoland. Japan's reactionary government remains in power. Unlike Hitler—or even the Kaiser—Hirohito also remains. Japan's Krupps, her Junker feudalists, her oriental Prussian aristocrats—all are still untouched, and confidently pouring honeyed poison into American officers' ears.

Probably this is necessary as an expedient for American arms to gain real control of Japan. But only as a temporary expedient can such favored treatment of Jap warlords and imperialists be justified. By November there cannot persist any convincing excuse for such expediency. By early November, at the latest, we shall know whether the Truman administration's policy is to let the Jap system off with a slap on the wrist—whether we are going to be hard realists with the Germans, but trusting babes with the Japs.

This is the choice. Unless the American public understands this choice, the smooth-tongued, treacherous Jap imperialists and Fascists have an excellent chance of taking the Americans for the most shameful and costly sleighride in modern times. Our only hope of safety is to apply the allied pattern now being imposed on Germany to Japan's entire imperial, feudalistic system. For decades Japan's leaders—industrial, landowning and aristocratic as well as military—have proved themselves the world's most deceitful powermongers.

Are Japan's leaders any less treacherous today? Only the world's champion "honorable suckers" could base their actions and policies in occupied Japan upon that assumption.

We Americans have elected to control Japan and reform her system. That makes Japan our baby. Whatever the Japanese do from now on, America gets the credit—one way or the other.

An Anglo-American Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

AN ANGLO-AMERICAN BASIS

British-American negotiations for a lend-lease substitute have been launched in a fog of propaganda. This is unfortunate. The propaganda merely befuddles the public. It hampers understanding of the facts of international high finance, which in their fundamentals are relatively simple.

One propaganda line says if Uncle Sam abandons the role of Santa Claus that means a return to isolationism. The truth is that popular desire for international cooperation is at an all-time high in this country. All Americans ask is that cooperation shall be a two-way street.

Another propaganda fog bank results from the recent British elections. The line is that Washington could have done business with a Churchill government, but will not make loans to a Labor regime. President Truman promptly and properly nailed that one as silly.

Still another befuddler is that Britain has no assets left and therefore, as a rich friend, we should make her an outright grant of several billions. That suggestion also is silly. Britain is not broke. Very many of her natural resources were less exhausted by the war than were our own.

Britain proposes to advance credits to other nations. These are to be made in her own commercial interest. O. K. But why with our money? Why with money that would come out of pockets of the American taxpayer, whose per capita of national debt is approximately as great as that of the supposedly bankrupt Briton?

An American businessman with assets would not expect a banker to make him a gift. He would dispose of some of his assets. In the negotiations under way here Uncle Sam is the banker. What is wrong or unbusinesslike in our suggestion that Britain dispose of some of her expensive bases in our Atlantic defense areas? These would have asset values for us, even though they are economic liabilities to Britain.

Never in her history has Britain made an outright grant of billions to any nation—certainly not when that nation was solvent and possessed of assets of value to England.

Why should we do so? The answer is that we should not.

We want to see Britain and America bound together even more closely in the years ahead. The way to insure this is to put our business relations on a business basis that will endure.

The Equal Rights Amendment—Article From the New York Herald Tribune With Introductory Statement by Mrs. Florence L. C. Kitchelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune with introductory statement by Mrs. Florence L. C. Kitchelt:

The adoption of the Charter of the United Nations has brought home to us all the essential character of this proposed amendment, a principle to be added to the American Bill of Rights. Equality of rights for men and women has been written into the preamble of the Charter and in five different chapters. This international bill of rights proposed for the world like the equal-rights amendment is part of the last lap in a historic struggle to obtain full equality under the law for women. It began long before the days of Aristotle, who always coupled the words "women and slaves." It continued through the Middle Ages, leading Mazzini to declare "long prejudice and a perennial legal inequality" have oppressed women. Susan B. Anthony campaigned for more than votes. She asked for equality of rights, civil and political, of which the franchise was one.

Opposition to the amendment has centered around the fear that it would undermine legislation which protects women, especially in industry. Friends have hoped that some industrial legislation, originally protective but now hampering and outmoded, would be swept away. But much of the evidence was merely personal opinion without the authority of special knowledge of the law, of labor legislation, and of constitutional government.

As a long-standing member of the League of Women Voters and as a convert to the amendment, I asked for the views of Dr. E. Wight Bakke, Sterling professor of economics at Yale University and chairman of appeals of the War Labor Board.

"Can anyone suppose," he replied, "that the granting to women of equal rights as persons will remove the interest of the community in the protection of women as present and future mothers?"

"Equal rights for male citizens," Dr. Bakke continued, "do not preclude special rights

for particular groups of male citizens. * * * We will not turn aside from the task of protecting the unique role of women in the life of the community because we are bound by narrow legalistic interpretations of a word. Certainly our democracy would be strengthened by a constitutional amendment giving women equality of rights."

INTERVIEWS ATTORNEYS

"Will laws that protect women, if they obtain equal legal status, be wiped out?" I asked several patient attorneys, who paused between court and client long enough to say "No."

Mr. Sanford Stoddard, one of the legal deans of Bridgeport, said, "I see nothing in the amendment which would take away from women any protection given them by State laws or which would prevent the passage of further protective legislation."

The Honorable Homer Cummings, former Attorney General of the United States, was of the same opinion. "The amendment," he wrote, "will remedy a long-standing injustice."

A busy counselor at law in New Haven, Alexander Winnick, dashed off the following message: "I trust you will not permit any of the opponents of your equal-rights amendment to raise the bugaboo that it could in any way affect protective legislation for women."

Next I wrote our Connecticut Congressmen who were sponsoring and voting for the amendment in committee. Did they fear retaliation from labor? Senator BRIEN MCMAHON replied he was publicly backing it. Our Congressman-at-large, JOSEPH F. RYTER, wrote that in his personal opinion "the passage of the amendment would in no way detract from or invalidate any protective legislation" or prevent the future enactment of such laws.

Finally Representative JOSEPH E. TALBOT, who has stood by the amendment through thick and thin, wrote: "I would assume that minimum pay, protective devices, and minimum daily or weekly hours of employment would remain unchanged by the passage of the amendment * * * I still feel that a court might say, under the police powers, that women or children could not do certain jobs that men can do, nor work at certain hours when men could work. * * * Probably the best authority on this constitutional subject is Prof. Edwin Borchard, of Yale."

Dr. Borchard, who is Justus S. Hotchkiss professor of law, with the ease of a man who has read every decision ever handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States, declared that the amendment builds a floor under which laws "discriminating against" would be illegal. But, he added, there is no ceiling! Laws discriminating in favor of women may go as high as you please!

In New York, David Stock, outstanding attorney who served as associate counsel to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, referred me to a passage from Corpus Juris Secundum, which says that the State legislatures have jurisdiction over all statutes enacted "in the interest of the public health." "An act will be declared void," the text reads, "only where it has no relation to the public health or is unquestionably a plain violation of constitutional rights."

In his opinion, Mr. Stock said, the amendment would not and could not change "the reality of the physical differences between the sexes." For example, if a State had a law prohibiting the employment of women in any occupation that required the lifting of objects weighing more than 50 pounds, that would not be an abridgement of equal rights on account of sex, but rather a reasonable exercise of the police power in the protection of women.

Drafting Boys—Returning Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the administration will cease drafting 18-year-olds, when it will return those already in the service, many of whom for months have been in combat duty, depends upon the outcome of the bloodless battle which has been revived here in Washington between the internationalists and New Dealers, who want a United States of the World, and those who insist that we remain a United States of America.

During the war, the fight was out. Now the old controversy between those who believe it is America's duty to participate in all the quarrels which may arise anywhere in the world; that it is her obligation to give in unlimited volume of her natural resources, her money and her merchandise, to rebuild, to feed and clothe—yes, and to reform, or, more accurately, to mold to our fancy—every nation on earth which may come knocking at our door, and those who, desiring to be charitable and to aid other peoples and other nations, are firmly convinced that we will never be able to assist them materially or to preserve our own power and protect our own future unless we first take care of our own interests and people, is still on, although the internationalists are now working more quietly and under cover.

The internationalists crowded us into this war. That is now established beyond argument by recent revelations and, as time goes on and additional facts are made public, all who care to read will be made aware of that fact. There are those who, still preaching and insisting that it was our duty to carry the "four freedoms" throughout the world, forgetting that every nation is entitled to follow its own economic policy, its own religious views, now insist that we impose upon other nations our economy, our views, or, as they put it, our way of life.

Those advocating this view do none of the fighting. They contribute little in the way of financial assistance. They are quite content to remain here in security and comfort. But they want American boys to be drafted for foreign service. They want Americans who were conscripted for service, those who enlisted from patriotic motives, to remain abroad, and there, as one young serviceman wrote me, do manual labor, menial tasks, not only to police and rebuild foreign communities but to, at a soldier's pay, further the financial interests of commercial enterprises.

If this school of thought wins out, your men, who fought and won this war, will continue for years to remain in the armed service, and your boys, coming 18, who should be finishing their education, preparing for their life work, getting married, establishing homes, and rearing children, will continue to be conscripted for foreign service.

General MacArthur—and he ought to know, for he is the one who directed the job your sons and husbands, at the cost of so many lives, successfully did—tells us that he can now strip the Japs, and keep them stripped, of their industrial and military power with no more than 200,000 men in Japan.

If the stories which come to me from returning servicemen of the efficiency and the courage of our military police in Germany are correct—and they ought to know—it will not take many men to keep the Germans in line.

All the men who are needed for either the Pacific or the European service can, in the judgment of Congress, be obtained if we will offer volunteers adequate pay—somewhere near that given workers in war plants—and other fair inducements.

Many men in the service and many other young men wish to make the armed service their life work. Congress had that in mind this week when the House passed a bill to encourage volunteering. It had that in mind when many of its Members joined together to force the Army to discharge men more rapidly. It had that in mind when it called the attention of the armed services to the necessity of returning to their home communities many of the dentists and doctors who are not now needed abroad or in the camps here at home.

Congress is being prodded sharply and vigorously—and rightly so—by parents and wives, who, now that their men have fought and won the war, want them home. Congress is not listening quite so willingly to the warmongers, to the would-be profiteers, who, howling patriotism, pointing to a nonexistent duty, insist that we should keep several million men for 5 to 10 years on foreign soil.

Some Congressmen are suggesting that those who howl so vigorously that men be kept in the service, that others be drafted, that billions of dollars be given to foreign nations, do some of the police work, some of the street-cleaning, and rebuilding, some of the giving of financial aid themselves. Increasingly, Congressmen are beginning to follow the theory of Churchill and of Stalin that their own country and her interests, their own people and their welfare, should come first. If they will, drafting will end—your men will soon be home.

The Times Is Honorably Discharged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Ernest Bixby, commanding general of Camp Atterbury, Ind., invited James DeLaurier, publisher, and Harold Cross, editorial writer of the Hammond Times, Hammond, Ind., in company with other newspaper editors, to spend several days at Camp Atterbury. The purpose of this

invitation was to give the newspapermen practical experience in Army life and first-hand information on the methods and facilities used in the demobilization program in order that they might convey the same to their readers. Upon completion of this "enlistment" for inspection purposes, the representatives of the various newspapers were given honorable discharges by the brigadier general.

The following editorial, by Harold Cross, including an exact facsimile of the honorable-discharge certificate, was published in the Hammond Times of September 18, 1945:

THE TIMES IS HONORABLY DISCHARGED

This newspaper feels honored and is very appreciative over receiving an honorary discharge from the war. A representative of the Times along with other Indiana newspapermen was called to Camp Atterbury and for 2 days the gentlemen of the press lived the life of a soldier and were shown in detail how a GI is demobilized. They saw how well Uncle Sam treats his soldiers, giving them the best of food and providing comfortable living quarters. Permitted to go through the hospitals, they left convinced that everything afforded by science and expert nursing is being done to restore the incapacitated men to normal health and rehabilitate them for civilian life.

At a ceremony concluding their stay the newspapermen were called forward and to each was given an honorable discharge.

But in the words of General Bixby, the capable and courteous commanding general of the camp, each newspaper was reminded that the honorable discharge from the Army was also reenlistment in the battle to win the peace.

The Times congratulates General Bixby and his aides and the success of the newspaper mustering-out conference and the opportunity to obtain first-hand information of the greatest importance to its readers who are gravely concerned about the care of wounded soldiers and were anxious for the assurance that men eligible for discharge are being sent home as rapidly as possible.

Full Employment and Sound Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over unemployment compensation benefits has again focused attention on a short-sighted philosophy held by some Members of Congress and some people in the business world. If they prevail, the Government will save a few million dollars—but the Nation will lose large markets for the necessities which unemployed workers will be forced to forego. It is not unlikely that the difference will have to be made up in direct relief.

This is another example of the short-sighted perspective that is impeding the path to full employment in this country. Full employment is not a luxury which we can take or leave. It is a sheer necessity, if for no other reason, because we cannot afford depression.

Mass unemployment is an extraordinarily costly affair. We all know its toll in terms of human misery—poverty and frustration, family tensions, group conflicts, crime and delinquency, and serious impairment of skills and health.

But apparently there are some who have not counted the cost in dollars and cents, and who protest that a full-employment policy would involve us in growing deficits and eventual national bankruptcy.

Are these people aware that depression meant the loss of $335,000,000,000 in sales from 1929 to 1941, $169,000,000,000 in corporate profits, twenty-four billions in farm income, and one hundred and seventy-five billions in wages and salaries? Do they know that during a depression tax yields go down and Government expenditures for relief go up? From 1930 to 1932 tax yields dropped from $3,500,000,000 dollars to one billion eight hundred million, while expenditures rose from three billion four hundred million to four billion six hundred million and kept on rising. In 1943, on the other hand, tax yields had risen to thirty-five billion eight hundred million and nonwar expenditures had fallen to six billion two hundred million.

If we want to minimize deficits, service the debt, and approach a balanced budget, we must achieve full production. "Sound financing" call for a full employment level of national income.

Why So Silly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego (Calif.) Union of September 14, 1945:

WHY SO SILLY?

President Truman characterizes as "silly" the objections of some Republican Congressmen to a big loan to Great Britain as giving United States funds to finance the socialization of British business and industry. He gives no reason for his statement except to say that such a loan would not be used to influence British politics, adding that the British people are entitled to whatever kind of government they want.

As to the last proposition, there will be no disagreement. As to the statement that a $3,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 loan from the United States (British spokesmen have made it plain that what they really want is a gift) will not be used to finance internal politics, the facts may be otherwise. It is the declared policy of the Labor Government to take over and operate the Bank of England, the mines, the transportation systems, and other major industries. Unless these industries and businesses are confiscated outright, funds will have to be provided to pay for them. Britain is practically broke.

The plea is made that for the sake of stable world economy, Britain must be put on her feet financially and rehabilitated industrially. If there is industrial rehabilitation under the Socialist scheme, it will be through governmental ownership and operation. If United States funds are used to effect this rehabilitation, it certainly means that our dollars are to be used for British internal politics. There can be no other construction of the proposition.

No banker of ordinary intelligence would make a loan of billions of dollars unless he approved of the character of the applicant, and the nature of the enterprise to be financed, as well as his probable capacity to pay. We do not think the citizens of the United States approve the Socialist character of the British Government or the character of the enterprise it proposes to finance. Neither do we think they have great confidence in the ability to repay, in view of the still unpaid World War I debt of some ten billion dollars.

Instead of being silly, the issue raised by Members of Congress is entirely pertinent. With a $300,000,000,000 debt of our own and the heaviest taxes in history, it is perfectly proper that American taxpayers should know where their money is going and for what purposes before we ladle out more billions as gifts.

Correspondence With the MFA About Flood Control and the MVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the last flood-control bill there was no record vote in the House. There seemed no opposition to it, the measure passed and is now law. At this late date the Missouri Farmers' Association, usually a thoroughly reliable organization, comes forward with the startling and novel idea that this flood-control law will wreck Missouri and for that reason, among others, should be superseded with the proposed Missouri Valley Authority. My comments on the question are contained in the following reply I have made to the editor of the Missouri Farmer, who has requested each Member of the Missouri delegation to state how he voted on the Flood Control Act of 1944 and how he proposes to vote on MVA:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 22, 1945.

Mr. H. E. KLINEFELTER,
Editor, the Missouri Farmer,
Columbia, Mo.

DEAR MR. KLINEFELTER: Thank you for your letter of September 10, 1945, enclosing a copy of resolutions adopted by delegates representing the MFA on August 28. As an MFA member myself and one interested financially in some of the MFA enterprises, I am delighted to know that the association has enjoyed such a fine growth during the past year. I also am pleased with the 17 resolutions with which I generally agree with one main exception. I make reference to the resolution on flood control.

I am in agreement with your general statement of principle in the first paragraph of this resolution. I respectfully disagree with the rest of the resolution which is based upon an error of fact and, commenting on Public Law 534 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, slurs the integrity of those in the Missouri congressional delegation voting for the bill

by the statement, "It is our fear that Missouri has been sacrified in the interest of irrigation and navigation and for the selfish interests of the powerful, privately owned public utilities."

I also wish respectfully to point to error in the following part of the resolution: "We believe the State of Missouri will be greatly harmed by the provisions of the act which provides for the construction of 26 high dams in Missouri that will inundate some 900,000 acres of land without generating any appreciable amount of electric power and which will mean the condemnation of at least half of the fertile Missouri River bottom land from one end of the State to the other." It is stated in the same paragraph that reference is made to "The present flood control law, enacted by Congress last December." This is the law which is supposed to bring forth the dire results mentioned above. This is Public Law 534 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 22, 1944. I certainly agree that if this law had such results it would be most unfortunate and I would have been in serious error in voting for it. However, the facts are otherwise. The law to which you refer does not authorize construction of a single dam in Missouri. The statement that these 26 dams will cause "inundation of 900,000 acres of land and result in condemnation of at least half of the fertile Missouri River bottom land from one end of the State to the other," is, therefore, equally without foundation. I enclose a copy of the law for your information. I have verified the accuracy of my statement in these particulars with the chairman of the Flood Control Committee which wrote the law, Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON and with Lt. Gen. E. Reybold, chief of Army engineers.

No dams have been authorized for Missouri while I have been a Member of Congress. Prior to that time flood-control projects were authorized by the law of June 28, 1938, for the Osage, Grand, and Pomme de Terre Rivers, and which would, in my opinion, adversely affect the district I have the honor to represent in Congress. I shall oppose appropriations for them. In all, there are some 15 projects authorized by Congress for construction in scattered sections of Missouri. These were authorized between 1936 and 1941. General Reybold states: "Under authority now available to the Department for partial accomplishment of the authorized comprehensive plans for the above-mentioned river basins, only about 3 dams and reservoir projects may be selected from the 15 for construction when funds for that purpose are made available." As the administration asks funds for these projects I will examine them as best I can and take such action as I feel proper for the majority welfare, keeping in mind my natural distaste of these dams for accomplishment of the purposes for which they are designed and have seldom been as effective as soil conservation, reforestation, farm ponds, small check dams at the heads of streams, and related practices.

Your resolution on flood control concludes with a recommendation for a Missouri Valley Authority to supersede the present flood-control act. Inasmuch as the act in question does not do the things you fear, it seems futile to suggest it be superseded with an MVA in order to get around these objections. There may be cogent reasons for an MVA eventually to be developed in the hearings and reports of committees of the Congress making a study of the question. Upon evidence presently available there is inadequate reason to support such a proposal, anxious as I am to live in an era overflowing with the blessings which MVA's backers conjure up as the natural consequences to flow from this extension of Federal control. Public Law 534, to which your resolutions make reference, states in its first paragraph that "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control." I am most reluctant to see the farmers of Missouri abandon their right of self-determination, through State government, over matters of such vital concern. Such a declaration of policy might well have come from Congress earlier, but now that it has been achieved it would seem reasonable to protect it. The law provides that further proposals on flood control can be submitted to Congress only after compliance by the War Department with restrictions set forth to insure local coordination and representation.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

MARION T. BENNETT,
Member of Congress.

New Deal and Communists Attack General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Communists inside and outside the Government have joined forces to smear Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It is an administration move aided and abetted by Russian leadership. I hope that the citizens of the United States will beware of the vicious New Deal and Red propaganda now being launched to poison the mind of the public against General MacArthur.

We do not want another Billy Mitchell persecution. The ultimate results of such injustices are too ghastly. The sovereign citizens of the United States have a great heritage of liberty under law to preserve and protect against the New Deal and Red forces striving to undermine and overthrow our form of Government. We must not let these un-American forces destroy such patriotic, courageous leader such as General MacArthur has proved to be in every responsible position to which he has been assigned.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Times-Herald, September 24, 1945:

BOOS HINT COMMUNISTS PLAN MACARTHUR SMEAR CAMPAIGN—DEMONSTRATION AT NEW YORK MEETING SEEN BUT START OF SCHEME TO DIM GENERAL'S STAR

(By Guy Richards and Russ Symontowne)

NEW YORK, September 23.—A few small boos—harbingers of bigger and better boos to come—greeted the name of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur at the Madison Square Garden meeting of 12,000 Communists and their sympathizers last Tuesday night.

The boos went almost unnoted against the background of tumultuous cheering for the early overthrow of capitalism and the quick rise of the socialist state, demanded by leaders of the newly reorganized party.

SEEN AS TEST BOOS

But it is almost certain these were test boos, little samples of a wide variety of boos and hisses, hoots and jeers soon to come rolling from the party's production lines.

In fact, we were told by Communists off the record, and it took little reading between the lines of party publications to assure us, the great Red propaganda machines are ready-greased for a full-scale smear campaign against the general who brought an end to the world's greatest war.

GROUNDWORK DESCRIBED

Today we will describe how the groundwork for this campaign to discredit MacArthur has been laid and what the Reds hope to gain by it in this country. In another article we will attempt to show how this get-MacArthur movement fits into the jig-saw picture of Moscow's plan for world expansion.

Before he left New York for Chicago, where he spoke tonight, William Z. Foster, national chairman of the party, gave us a quotation which broadly summarizes the party's new hatred of MacArthur.

"MacArthur's conduct in Japan," said Foster, "has been such as to require his correction by the President and by the State Department. His activity on behalf of a Quisling regime in the Philippines, his methods in Japan and Korea demonstrate that he is unfit to carry out the job of crushing Japanese fascism and its collaborators.

"It is no wonder that the reactionary, pro-Fascist press in America is grooming him for the Presidency in 1948."

A careful study of the columns of the Daily Worker, the Communist official organ, and talks with Communist leaders disclosed the party's alleged grievances against MacArthur.

MAC ARTHUR IS TARGET

But also it was revealed to us that the party is not hankering at this time for an out-and-out fight with the Truman administration and intends to use MacArthur as a convenient target for abuse it might otherwise heap upon the President and State Department.

"We may never learn to love Harry Truman but we may still wish to support him in 1948 against some greater reactionary," one Communist put it. "For the time being, at least, MacArthur will serve our purpose very well."

Now, turning to the specific Communist "case" against the general, we found that until quite recently the party had very little against him.

BLASTS FROM DAILY WORKER

Quite suddenly the Daily Worker began, shortly after VJ-day, to blossom forth with headlines, articles, and editorials blasting the general.

"As a reactionary military man he didn't matter so much to us," said one Communist high in the leadership. "But as a reactionary boss of Japan, playing with its Fascist elements, he matters a great deal."

The first thing griping the Reds is the fact that only American soldiers are occupying Japan.

"Instead of planning a joint occupation with our allies, as in Germany, the United States is making the job harder and costlier," a Worker editorial of last Wednesday read.

WANTED REDS IN JAPAN

"Of course we wanted Russian soldiers in Japan," a Communist leader told one of us. "We wanted the same quick and virtually bloodless revolution we had in European countries, in Poland, Rumania, and even France. We wanted the old Fascist leaders, not merely the military but the industrial war makers as well, turned out immediately and democratic elements installed in their places. As it is, every day MacArthur plays with these industrialists and politicians they entrench themselves and fix Fascism's hold more tightly on Japan."

So, it is the party line to fix the blame upon MacArthur for the over-all occupation plan which was surely decided upon by the administration in agreement with the other Allies.

In many editorials in the last 2 weeks the Worker has harped upon MacArthur's continuance in office of Japanese officials.

"If we can raise enough heat we might be able to force the administration to withdraw MacArthur from Japan," a Communist told one of us. "Frankly, we are not very hopeful. But, it might be done. He's been spanked several times by the administration."

A series of articles, signed with a nom de plume and datelined from the Philippines, appeared last week in the Worker, purporting to show that under MacArthur's orders troops in the Philippines were working with Quislings and in some instances actually jailing Filipinos who worked in the underground.

RED FEAR CITED

Russia's mounting fear of American might peeps through the lines written by James S. Allen in the Worker September 16:

"It is well known," Allen wrote, "among those in close contact with MacArthur, and it has also been voiced in the press, that the commander views Japan as a base of reconnaissance against the Soviet Union."

The Daily Worker is seeking hard to make it appear that MacArthur is on the defensive. This is an old and familiar party tactic, used often before against its enemies. When MacArthur announced that he believed only 200,000 troops would be needed to occupy Japan, instantly the Worker declared this was "bait" to make American mothers and fathers of soldiers and sailors accept his "soft" handling of the Japanese.

NOT VERY HOPEFUL

But, while the party feels that abusing MacArthur as a Fascist is helpful and useful in restoring it to prewar vigor, one leader confided to us it really had little hope of altering the course of affairs in Japan.

"However," this man said, "we will certainly fix his wagon for the Presidency. You see, we don't really think he can be elected President. But you never can tell what will happen in politics and it is a good thing to knock him out of the race now.

"However," he continued, "that isn't the main idea. Our real fear is that the reactionary and Fascist politicians and newspapers will build him up and then use him to force the nomination and election of some lesser known Fascist tool. If we can discredit him thoroughly now, he will lose his value to the American reactionaries long before 1948 rolls around."

It was a little boo for MacArthur at the Garden last Tuesday, but that little boo will soon become a great big boo, if the Communists can so contrive it. The party line says: "Get MacArthur."

Aid to Liberated Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by me:

I wish to thank station WIND for its generous consideration in extending to me this radio time. I propose to briefly convey during this broadcast some information regarding the critical situation involving the peoples of the liberated countries of Europe.

We should not forget the heroic fight made during the war, through resistance and underground organizations, by the conquered countries. These patriots, while under the Nazi heel, knew that every bridge destroyed, every convoy ambushed, and the sabotaging of Nazi war plants, meant that great numbers of enemy troops would be delayed in their onslaught upon our boys. They knew too, that the reprisals of the enemy would be—more shootings, more hostages, more villages burned and looted. Thus, right through the fighting, there was in every conquered country a war within a war, and there was also added the havoc caused by the heroic resistance of conquered men and women who were ready to sacrifice their homes, their lives and their children in order that freedom might survive.

In these countries which were overrun during the war, the enemy made the devastation complete when he was driven out. In Greece, for instance, there was not a single railroad functioning, every bridge and every tunnel was blown up. There were only 30 locomotives that could be repaired; their fishing boats were sunk or stolen; their coastal vessels were at the bottom of the sea; tens of thousands died of hunger; the poor in all the cities were living on Red Cross food. Conditions in Greece were on a par with devastation and ruination wrought in other European countries.

All through the war we assured these people that when the fighting ended, we would come to their aid. We knew that they could never rebuild their economic life alone; that they would need food and other essential imports for which they could never hope to pay. Our Government was the moving spirit in organizing the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This great mercy organization is made up of a membership composed of the countries of the world who were not conquered by the enemy during this war. This organization is popularly referred to as UNRRA.

UNRRA was set up originally in 1943. It really began its work this year. Already close to 2,000,000 tons of UNRRA supplies have been delivered to nations that are in dire want. These supplies are made up of vital foodstuffs, medical necessities, children's foods, agricultural implements and machines, of which a single ton may be worth its weight in gold. When the war ended, over 6,000,000 people had been driven by Hitler from their homes to work as slaves for the Nazi war machine. These people must be rehabilitated and resettled for a peacetime life. Every kind of problem has arisen in their maintenance and their movements and their care. UNRRA has helped the Army to solve these problems. Some of these unhappy people, for various reasons, cannot or will not go to their homes—they are refugees. UNRRA will be their foster parent in the coming months. The supplying of these necessary provisions has already curtailed or postponed an inflation that was threatening to smash the economic life and bring civil war to these unfortunate countries.

UNRRA's work has really just begun and it is vital that it should develop and continue. No one could contemplate for a moment the terrible conditions which would arise in Europe—the famine, disease, anarchy, and bloodshed that would follow if the liberated peoples had to face the next 12 months without assistance. UNRRA, therefore, is not charity. It is a plan to reconstruct the shattered lives of nations who cannot do it for themselves; to bring them back to economic health where, by their own exports, they can buy the things they need. UNRRA is not generosity. It is in America's interest to insure the people that Europe should not collapse. UNRRA is a common effort to promote the common interest of the world.

When America is called upon to give their pro rata share, we will be helping people who do not want to live on dole but who are looking forward to the day when they can become reestablished and reciprocate for this aid.

In his recent message to Congress, President Truman outlined the program for postwar reconstruction. Of pressing demand were two recommendations: (1) That Congress fulfill its commitment to UNRRA by appropriating the remaining $550,000,000 for United States participation; and (2) that Congress promptly consider the request of UNRRA for a new appropriation of $1,350,000,000 to permit this international agency to complete its work in Europe and Asia. UNRRA is virtually without funds. Nations it is now helping in Europe must be supplied if hunger, disease, social unrest, and political chaos are to be avoided.

Herbert L. Lehman, UNRRA Director General, said on his recent return from Europe that the problems of obtaining funds to continue and expand aid is extremely urgent now that the war is over. Until the end of the war, part of UNRRA's planning was necessarily in the realm of speculation. No one knew precisely the extent of devastation or how long suffering would be prolonged. Estimates or requirements could not be definite. Now, however, an estimate can be presented on how much money it would need to terminate this great work of mercy. By the end of 1946 UNRRA expects to have fulfilled this job it set out to do in Europe.

Up to the present, the United States has authorized a contribution of $1,350,000,000, roughly speaking, 70 percent of the total assessed against the 31 uninvaded nations contributing to UNRRA's operating expenses. Of this authorized sum, only $800,000,000 has been appropriated by Congress. Under the UNRRA financial plan, all 47 member nations contribute to the administrative cost, while only the nations not invaded by the enemy contribute to the so-called operative expenses. Operating contributions under the first assessments were fixed at 1 percent of each nation's income for the year ending June 30, 1943. At last month's Council session in London, a second 1 percent assessment was imposed on a motion of Assistant Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, the American delegate. Until the recent Council meeting in London, UNRRA aid had been going to Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, Poland, and in a limited amount to Italy. China has asked for aid and preparations were being made for shipments there as soon as ports were opened. Now, Korea, Formosa, Austria, and Italy have been added to the full scale program. Largest items needed for UNRRA operations are food and clothing, then follow medical and sanitaton items, vitamins, penicillin, agriculture rehabilitation items, such as tractors, seeds, pesticides, fertilizer, etc.

To see that relief is distributed without discrimination, the agency maintains its staff of observers at points of distribution. It has been charged in the past that the question of who would represent UNRRA, notably in Yugoslavia and Poland, has been the subject of international jockeying within the agency and between governments. Mr. Lehman said at a press conference last week that while he was abroad he had not found any hindrance to UNRRA operations and, on the contrary, the agency was receiving the full cooperation of all governments.

Half of the UNRRA employees abroad are engaged in repatriation of Europe's millions of displaced persons. As of August 16, more than 4,000,000 of those persons, many of them slave workers, had been returned to their native countries. By this winter, UNRRA officials expect only 1,000,000 to be left in Germany. In order to carry on this work in cooperation with the Allied Control Commission, the agency workers are supervising over 300 assembly centers in Germany. UNRRA is proceeding with the idea that to rehabilitate a nation is just as necessary as to provide relief. Its aim is to help the people of Eu-

rope to help themselves by putting to good use all their economic resources. Transportation experts estimate Europe's shortage of rolling stock is now approximately 1,000,000 cars, thus years would be required to replenish completely the shortage of railroad cars. In the field of health, UNRRA has assembled emergency stock of medical supplies and is cooperating with many governments in providing public health facilities. Aside from the problem of obtaining new financial resources, UNRRA expects during the next year to face difficulty in obtaining some of the supplies it needs, especially sugar, fats, and oils in which there exists a world-wide shortage.

It is expected that within a short time a joint resolution will be introduced in the House and Senate, authorizing an appropriation of the full amount of the United States assessment. This act on the part of our Congress will be keeping faith with our allied countries across the water and contribute to the relief of human misery and reestablish peacetime economy not only in Europe, but throughout the world. By cooperating in this way America is indirectly aiding its own postwar problems by hastening the reestablishment of international trade which will eventually provide jobs and prosperity on our home front.

This program will supplement and strengthen the pattern for peace—a pattern that will lead us away from the selfish isolationism that followed the last war, and will insure our heroic dead in this war that they have not died in vain.

America has become the world leader by reason of its past humanitarian policies. Intolerance and prejudice, whether religious or racial, cannot become imbedded in the mind of a true American because of our inherent love for liberty and freedom. Therefore, I have great hope that we will continue to enlighten nations less fortunate, and convince them that a policy of humanity and justice in international affairs are the greatest guaranty for permanent peace.

Resolution on World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk for the need for United States leadership in establishing and maintaining world peace. There is also much talk about the need for our financing world economic recovery. This means, of course, additional drains on the already overburdened American taxpayer. Until we know the responsibilities of leadership in world peace, that is the rules under which such peace is to operate, we cannot even guess, let alone estimate, what such leadership will cost.

The longer we delay in establishing the rules of peace, that much longer will it be before we have peace. Therefore, in order to expedite the bringing about of peace by establishing its rules, I have introduced a joint resolution directing the President to call a peace-treaties conference in Washington at an early date. The resolution I have introduced follows:

Whereas the vast majority of the people of the world desire that a firm and lasting peace be established as quickly as possible; and

Whereas the foundation for such a peace cannot be truly established until the rules under which it is to operate are agreed upon; and

Whereas said rules cannot be established and agreed upon until all necessary treaties of peace are signed and accepted by all interested nations; and

Whereas the entire world is looking to the United States for leadership in establishing and maintaining peace; and

Whereas the people of the United States cannot have full knowledge of the obligations they must assume if they accept such leadership until all necessary treaties of peace have been approved and accepted by all interested nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President hereby is authorized and directed to:

1. Issue a call for a peace treaties conference to all interested nations, asking that they send official representatives to Washington at the earliest possible date for considering and agreeing upon all necessary treaties of peace required to end World War II and thereby lay the foundation for world peace; and

2. Request that the Conference of Foreign Ministers now sitting in London be recessed to reconvene in Washington in conjunction with the peace treaties conference provided for above.

This joint resolution shall become effective immediately upon its acceptance by a majority of those present and voting in both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Conservation of Childhood Not Less Important Than Reconversion of Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, conversion or reconversion of machinery, factories, and material things is certainly not more important than is the conservation of the childhood of our Nation in this period of transition from a war basis to that of enduring peace.

Several weeks ago this House passed legislation anticipating financial loss and detriment to the business interests of our Nation in the amount of millions of dollars. We did it for the fundamental reason that we recognized that it was essential to cooperate to the maximum with business, in order that property rights and material things, so essential to the happiness of men might suffer as little loss as possible in this period of reconversion.

But, Mr. Speaker, not yet have we undertaken or satisfactorily in my judgment, the protection of the human rights and the conservation of childhood and the characters of children which might well be rocked or ruined or even be made liabilities as the result of this war. We must do so—and do so promptly!

This leads me to say that in my judgment that the childhood of the Nation is the most valuable asset—the most valuable item of the national wealth that we have. Does any Member of this House disagree with me? If so, please state those grounds to me now. Nearly every Member of this House is somewhat familiar with the beneficent operation of the child-care centers all over the Nation—especially in the industrial and manufacturing centers during this period of war.

Perhaps you do not realize that under the policy of the Lanham Act Committee, and in accordance with the previous understandings and commitments for the funds for these child-care centers, they are being terminated as of October 31—this very next month! It is imperative therefore, gentlemen, that these funds—or some Federal funds—be made available for a little longer time during this time of reconversion; until the States themselves get under way with the problem. Possibly now should the Federal Government do a duty exclusively that of a State. But our children are considered national assets in time of war, are they not?

The terrific strain, impact, and tragedy of this war impress themselves upon childhood experience not less than on those of older years and the impressions that are made on the character of children last longer than upon those of older people. Children live longer. Children have more to give—or to take away from national security and happiness and progress. And, because they live longer than do adults, they have a better chance to become more valuable to the Nation and the world than do adults. Therefore, children of our Nation are worth potentially more than the adults of our Nation; that is, the children of our Nation can be made a greater national asset than any adult generation before them. If we as adults in this generation will give our gifts of God in sound reasoning and efforts, the result will be that children of this generation will be even more sound and even more just and more cultured and ethical than are we. I even say that we should see to it that the children of this generation make this more effectively a Christian Nation than have we.

My State of California says it cannot handle its child-care centers unless there is an extension of Federal funds for several months. It will have to enact laws at a special session. It has not yet fulfilled its duty. but plans to do so, I hope. To date it has been tardy.

Reliable reports show that about one-fourth of the Nation's children which are in child-care centers are in the State of California; about 20 percent of these children have to rely upon their mothers as sole breadwinners; that 47 percent of these children have fathers who are still in uniform. Therefore, there is still a very definite Federal obligation to such children. Yes; not only to the children whose fathers are still in uniform but to the children in homes where the mothers are still the sole breadwinners as a war result and where there is a hazard still resulting from war over which there is presently no other control.

War is a Federal problem and not a State problem. The transition from war to peace is a Federal problem also and not alone a State problem, as to people as well as to property. This applies to the conservation of childhood as well as it does to the values of character in adulthood. If there is fear in the adulthood of our Nation—or if there is hunger

or lack of employment—or if there is any other daily economic stress or strain which proves increasingly unbearable and just cause of fear or worry or grief; then these stresses and strains eventually form levels in a child's character and attitude and relationships both in home and community. Character is created on the levels of daily living.

Any time a child has to be reared in a broken home—or in a home where there is lack of income for the daily necessities of life—or in a home or a community, where there is lack of available playgrounds, parks, and recreation facilities—then, gentlemen, such children most easily become potential juvenile delinquent or juvenile dependent problems. Thus the cycle of a child becoming an expense and liability to the home and to the Nation begins.

These child-care centers are specifically factors which definitely help keep these children thus helpfully surrounded. Thus childhood character is not only conserved but developed into assets, instead of liabilities. Thus also untold sums of tax money are saved by the elimination of tax expenditures for handling juvenile dependents and juvenile delinquents in later years; with all the resultant costs and ultimate economic and social losses resulting from juvenile delinquency or juvenile dependency which cannot be approximated in dollars.

The National and the State obligations and responsibilities to the childhood of the Nation, at this period of transition from war to peace, is not yet met. It must be fully met—it must be promptly met. The childhood of our Nation must be adequately protected. Our children must not be further penalized by a war they did not cause or allow to come about.

These child-care centers, which are chiefly in large metropolitan manufacturing centers, all over our Nation, which have at least partially become so on account of the war, are surely a continuing obligation for a reasonable time. The States must also undertake their own problem forthwith—and their own obligation. But, in the meantime, until the States can set their house in order—to immediately undertake their respective obligations to these children—let us do our full duty by these children who are so clearly products of the war conditions.

In this connection, I ask leave to file a resolution just received by me from the board of supervisors of the Los Angeles County, in which county is situated the Eighteenth Congressional District of California and which I have the honor to represent in this great Congress. It is dated September 18, 1945. In this Eighteenth Congressional District such child-care centers are located and operating in the communities of Long Beach, Bellflower, Clearwater, Compton, Lynwood, Willowbrook, Downey, South Gate, and so forth. The resolution was made as the motion of Mr. John Anson Ford, one of the distinguished citizens of California and a member of the said board by which said resolution was unanimously carried.

The resolution follows:

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
Tuesday, September 18, 1945.

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors William A. Smith, chairman, presiding; Leonard J. Roach, John Anson Ford, and Raymond V. Darby; and J. F. Moroney, clerk, by Alice Burks, deputy clerk. Absent: Supervisor Roger W. Jessup.

CHILD-CARE CENTERS—RESOLUTION URGING FEDERAL AID FOR OPERATION

On motion of Supervisor Ford, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be, and it is hereby, adopted by this board:

"Whereas the sudden cessation of hostilities, and the announcement of the Federal Government of the rather abrupt withdrawal of financial assistance for the operation of child-care centers, has left no machinery nor sponsorship for carrying on this important program during the transition period immediately ahead; and

"Whereas so many of the mothers of children cared for in these centers are the wives of men still in the service, or widows of men who lost their lives in the service, and are therefore responsible for earning the livelihood for their families; and

"Whereas a considerable number of the women whose children are served in child-care centers came from other parts of the country to work in the war industries of this area; and

"Whereas the sudden enforced abandonment of child-care centers will cause irreparable damage and hardship: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of supervisors urge the Members of Congress from Los Angeles County, and the Senators from California to give their support to the continuation of financial assistance from the Federal Government for the operation of necessary child-care centers in order to meet the present emergency; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That those community organizations that have been giving the child-care problem their attention, be highly commended for their efforts in finding a solution to the child-care problem during this emergency period."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on September 18, 1945, and is entered in the minutes of said board.

[SEAL] J. F. MORONEY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and Ex Officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Said County.
By ALICE BURKS,
Deputy.

Retirement of Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the farewell statement Hon. Henry L. Stimson made at a news conference in the Pentagon Building the day before his retirement as Secretary of War.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have called together you ladies and gentlemen of the press and radio for my final press conference as Secretary of War. In taking leave of you, I should like to tell you how greatly I have valued our association. In the midst of a war there are many tensions. Tempers are apt to grow short. For my part, I feel that our differences have been unimportant during the 5 years I have been the subject of your scrutiny.

You have always seemed to me to be carrying out your duty to the public with a high regard for the ethics of your profession and the safety of the Nation. I know you have accepted with at least an outward show of cheerfulness the War Department's review of your copy.

Now that hostilities are over I am confident you realize how seldom the requirements of military security has been allowed to interfere with your freedom of action. I should like to take this occasion to offer you my sincere thanks for the quality and understanding of your service and to give you my best wishes for your future success.

During a rather long career in public life I have occupied a number of posts of importance. These 5 years as Secretary of War have been the high point of my experience, not only because of the heavy responsibility of guiding the Nation's military establishments, but because of the opportunity they offered me to serve the Nation in a great war. I shall always be grateful from the bottom of my heart to Mr. Roosevelt for giving me that opportunity.

STATES VIEWS ON PRESENT SITUATION

There is no need to review the events of these years now. They are history, and no one has followed their developments more closely than you. But on the eve of my retirement I should like to leave my own impression of the situation in which this country finds itself at the conclusion of the greatest crisis in its history.

The United States is now not only at the peak of its military strength but it has attained an influence and leadership among all nations that is unprecedented. Now that we have arrived at that position we must make sure that we can serve it and use it in the cause of justice and peace throughout the world.

In my opinion, the maintenance of this pre-eminent position will depend on two factors. One of these is the acceptance by our people of the military and naval strength that necessarily go with leadership in the world today. The State Department will have increasing difficulty in making our voice effective in the councils of nations unless our people and our Government show their readiness to carry the inconveniences and burdens and sometimes sacrifices which accompany such leadership under the present unstable conditions.

The state of our military establishment in the future must be the constant concern not only of our Government but of our people. In particular, we must be alert that no system is established—however palatable it may seem—which fails to provide the power we need at this stage of the world's development.

We do not yet know the full implications of the release of atomic energy in relation to future military strategy, but we do know that it is revolutionary. This will require the most careful study. We must not make early and easy assumptions that the days of armies and navies are over.

PREPAREDNESS IS CALLED FOR

We can be sure, if war should come again, that it would be awful in its sudden intensity, and we must never again allow ourselves to be caught in a state of complete unreadiness. And we can be sure that it will always

be the duty of the citizens of these United States to share in providing for the country the power that we must have to carry out our responsibilities.

The second factor necessary to preserve our leadership is an attitude of trust and frankness on our part toward all nations working for collective security. It has been the inescapable conclusion of my years spent as Governor General of the Philippines, as Secretary of State, and Secretary of War that cynicism and suspicion on our part can only breed a like response among those we suspect.

By this I do not mean that our relations with other governments should ever lack a practical sense of realism. But in the long run, I am convinced that a full and frank attitude of trust by our Government will strongly tend to lead to a like attitude on the part of all members of the brotherhood of nations.

In the present state of world affairs a strong military establishment is essential. I fervently hope that this condition will not always prevail. The United Nations are now moving toward an organization which I believe will reduce the chance of war by creating justice and better understanding among all nations. We should be false to the promise of this organization if we fail to give it our utmost confidence.

PRAISES GENERAL MARSHALL

I cannot leave the War Department without giving some account, more personal than official, of my association with the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, during the 5 years we have worked together. Our day-to-day, almost hour-to-hour consideration of plans and policies on which the safety of the Nation depended has given me an unparalleled opportunity to measure the stature of this great and modest man.

In spite of the great prestige which General Marshall justly holds among his countrymen, I doubt that many fully realize how his leadership has counted. I know, because we could talk freely of it in private, how clearly he saw the inevitable involvement of this Nation in the war and tried by every means at his disposal to prepare us for it.

A man in high office cannot always make public the things that are in his heart. Yet in his biennial report in July 1941, General Marshall uttered as strong a warning to the Nation as he appropriately could. His recommendation that the Selective Service men, the National Guard men, and the reserve officers taken into the Army for a year of service be retained beyond that period touched off a violent debate in the Congress.

General Marshall fought to make clear the pressing need to hold these men in the service. To release them would have destroyed the Army which later we required so urgently. He won his battle by a single vote in the House of Representatives.

When Japan attacked, General Marshall's vision was displayed in the global view which he immediately took of our situation. From the beginning his concept of proper strategy was that we must defeat Germany first in order to gain victory in the shortest possible time. In spite of the far distance between European and Pacific theaters of war, he saw them as separate battlefields of a single conflict. The major, the menacing force, was Germany. How sound that strategy proved was shown when the Japanese collapsed 4 months after the German surrender.

PREFERRED AGREEMENT TO PRESTIGE

From the very beginning, he insisted on unity between the services and among our allies. He realized that only by this means could our combined resources be employed to the fullest advantage against the enemy. To achieve wholehearted cooperation, he was always willing to sacrifice his own personal prestige. To him agreement was more important than any consideration of where the credit belonged. His firm belief that unity could be preserved in the face of divergent opinions was a decisive factor in planning throughout the war.

In all the military councils, General Marshall's leadership constantly pressed for adoption of the most direct means of defeating Germany. From the outset, he held to the plan that this must be accomplished by a cross-channel invasion of northern France. Other plans were proposed and considered. Marshall never swerved from his bold insistence of a frontal attack on the coast which would bring us quickly into contact with the mass of Germany's military forces on terrain favorable for their defeat.

There have been times when General Marshall's swift decisions have averted possible disaster. In the summer of 1942, when in a single battlefield Marshal Rommel had destroyed a larger proportion of Britain's tanks in Libya, General Marshall unhesitatingly stripped our training forces of medium tanks and shipped them to Egypt as the only means of meeting this crisis.

One of our armored divisions was at that time in a port of embarkation, ready to sail for further training in North Ireland. That division, too, was divested of its armor and its shipment delayed until the tanks could be replaced. But the important thing was that Rommel had been stopped. The dangerous crisis was met. We know now that Marshall's estimate of this situation was correct. We know that Hitler intended to break through Egypt to the Near East. Had he succeeded, the entire course of war would have been changed.

The man has a sure approach to every problem he studies. When we were determining the number of units of all sorts which would be required for victory, the combat divisions were fixed at an even hundred. General Marshall questioned that estimate. After going over our planned operation for all theaters and the time table of war, he decided that 90 divisions should be sufficient, and in the end that figure was cut to 89. How accurate was his judgment can be gaged by the fact that at the close of the war all but two of those 89 divisions had been committed to action in the field.

IS OPPOSED TO MILITARISM

General Marshall's leadership takes its authority directly from his great strength of character. I have never known a man who seems so surely to breathe the democratic American spirit. He is a soldier, and yet he has a profound distaste for anything that savors of militarism. He believes that every able-bodied citizen has a personal responsibility for the Nation's security and should be prepared to assume that responsibility whenever an emergency arises. But he is opposed to a large standing Army as un-American.

His trust in his commanders is almost legendary. During the critical period of the Ardennes break-through, no message went from the War Department to General Eisenhower which would require his personal decision and reply. This is standard practice with General Marshall. When one of his commanders is in a tight spot, he does everything possible to back him up. But he leaves the man free to accomplish his purpose unhampered.

He is likewise the most generous of men, keeping himself in the background so that his subordinates may receive all credit for duties well done.

His courtesy and consideration for his associates, of whatever rank, are remarked by all who know him. His devotion to the Nation he serves is a vital quality which infuses everything he does. During the course of a long lifetime, much of it spent in position of public trust, I have had considerable experience with men in Government. General Marshall has given me a new gage of what such service should be. The destiny of America at the most critical time of its national existence has been in the hands of a great and good citizen. Let no man forget it.

Recent River and Harbor Improvements for the Ports of Galveston and Texas City, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter to Hon. E. H. Thornton, vice chairman and general manager of the Galveston Wharves, together with his reply thereto:

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1945.

Mr. E. H. THORNTON,
Vice Chairman and General Manager,
Galveston Wharves, Galveston, Tex.

DEAR MR. THORNTON: You, of course, were quite familiar with the port and channel conditions in the Galveston area as they existed prior to the time you severed your connection with them to take charge of the port of New Orleans. I desire to call your attention to the improvements that have since been made under bills piloted through Congress by me as chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

I became the Representative of Galveston County with the convening of the Seventy-fourth Congress on January 3, 1935. Thirteen days thereafter (January 16, 1935), I convened the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and secured the adoption of two resolutions of primary interest to the ports of Galveston and Texas City, respectively.

The first of these resolutions was for a review by the Army engineers of Galveston Channel. In response to this resolution, the Chief of Engineers submitted report on June 22, 1935, recommending that the channel depth be increased from 32 to 34 feet. This report is printed as Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 61, Seventy-fourth Congress.

The second resolution was for review of Texas City Channel, on which the Chief of Engineers reported recommending 34-foot depth for that channel. This report is printed as Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 62, Seventy-fourth Congress.

Believing that additional depth was also necessary in the approach from the Gulf where wave action was sometimes heavy, on January 28, 1935, I secured the adoption of committee resolution for review of Galveston Harbor. On this the Chief of Engineers reported recommending a 36-foot depth to a point near Bolivar Roads. This report is printed as Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 57, Seventy-fourth Congress.

All of these projects with several others of importance to Galveston and Texas City were enacted in the river and harbor bill approved by the President on August 30, 1935.

Three other projects in the 1935 bill were enacted on reports in response to Rivers and Harbors Committee resolutions. One of these was for extending the Texas City rubble stone dike to connect with the shore line; one for increasing the depth of the Texas City Channel from 30 to 32 feet; and one for the maintenance of the Bolivar Ferry channel by the Federal Government. Previously, this channel had been maintained by Galveston County.

In the first few years of the Roosevelt administration no river-and-harbor legislation was permitted. We were in the depths of the depression and a large public-works program was inaugurated, principally for the

purpose of affording employment. This work was being carried out by the Public Works Administration under the National Industrial Recovery Act approved by the President on June 16, 1933.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the Parker Dam case in 1935 limited the authority of the PWA Administrator with reference to river and harbor projects. It was then deemed advisable to return to the regular course of procedure, and I decided to attempt to put through a regular bill, embracing all of our Galveston and Texas City projects. We succeeded, and the President approved it.

The allotment of funds that have been made to carry out these improvements for Galveston and Texas City, including their maintenance to 1943, amounted to $4,144,773. We now have pending with the engineers resolutions for further review of Galveston and Texas City Channels with a view to securing additional depth, if found necessary or advisable in the interest of postwar shipping.

Galveston and Texas City now have channel and harbor conditions reasonably comparable with those of the major ports of the Gulf and South Atlantic coasts. If the provisions in the bill of 1935 had not been enacted, such would not have been the case, as the facts will show.

On September 16, 1933, the Administrator of PWA made grant of $1,500,000 to Houston and a like sum to Beaumont and Port Arthur to increase those channel depths from 30 to 32 feet. A short time thereafter the engineers submitted favorable report for 34 feet for Beaumont and Port Arthur. Those measures when carried out would have given those ports an advantage of 2 feet over Galveston and 4 feet over Texas City. Yet Texas City was in need of the greater depth for tankers, the same as Houston and the Sabine-Neches Ports. In these circumstances I lost no time in hurrying up action on Galveston and Texas City. With the cooperation of the engineers and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, we succeeded in putting those measures through in less time than has ever been accomplished on any other measures of like import in our history. The authority for the surveys was granted by committee resolution on January 16, 1935. The finished bill was signed by the President on August 30, 1935.

The most complicated and difficult problem we had to deal with in the bill of 1935 was the groins for the protection of the sea wall. This matter had never been surveyed by the Army engineers under authority of Congress, as provided by law for river and harbor improvements. The report was made by the Beach Erosion Board which had authority to recommend the most practical method of preventing beach erosion, but not to participate in financing of such projects. We wanted to find a way to convert it into a river-and-harbor project, if possible.

In 1934 Galveston County made application to the PWA for a 100-percent grant under the National Recovery Act. It was rejected by the Administrator, who held that it was not a Federal but a municipal project, and therefore could only be considered for a 30-percent grant. The county judge and commissioners appealed to me in January 1935.

On returning to Washington, I conferred with Senators Sheppard and CONNALLY for assistance. They went with me in person before the President, the Chief of Engineers, the Administrator of Public Works, Mr. Ickes, and Mr. Hopkins. Failing to get any definite assurance, I then endeavored to find a way to convert it into a river-and-harbor project.

A portion of the sea wall was built with river-and-harbor funds in 1913. A portion of it for the protection of Fort Crockett was built with regular Army funds. The main central section was constructed locally, with funds provided by the county.

I could find a way to finance the protection of that portion of the wall built with river and harbor funds, but there was no erosion there, and no groins were recommended on that section. The War Department through the Committee on Military Affairs could have financed the section in front of Fort Crockett, but that was a comparatively short section and involved so much red tape I soon abandoned the idea.

Congress had never financed the construction of any beach-erosion project, and all previous efforts to that end had resulted in failure. The problem was to convert it into a river and harbor project if possible. An engineering memorandum on file states:

"Chairman MANSFIELD considered the plan of passing a committee resolution referring the report back to the Army engineers with request for specific recommendation as to financing. There was doubt as to legal authority for such resolution in a case of this kind, and this was at first the view of the War Department. After more careful consideration it was the belief that the resolution might be legally considered and acted upon."

I adopted the plan of referring the matter back to the engineers, and secured the passage of a committee resolution for that purpose. Before this resolution could go through the regular course of procedure the river-and-harbor bill had passed the House and gone to the Senate where it was in the charge of the Committee on Commerce. Senator Copeland was chairman of the Commerce Committee, and Senator Sheppard was chairman of the subcommittee dealing with rivers and harbors. On June 15, 1935, I wrote Senator Sheppard in part as follows:

"On Monday I will be down before the board of engineers and will go over the matter with the Chief of Engineers, if possible, and see if we can get them to make some kind of report on the committee resolution that we recently sent to them that might be a basis for getting the groins in the river-and-harbor bill."

On June 20, 1935, General Markham, Chief of Engineers, wrote Senator Sheppard, as follows:

"Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR SENATOR: At the request of Judge Mansfield, I take pleasure in furnishing herewith information with respect to the proposed construction of groins to protect the sea wall at Galveston.

"The city of Galveston, with adjacent military reservations in Federal ownership, occupies the eastern end of Galveston Island along the narrow barrier island separating Galveston Bay from the Gulf of Mexico.

"The Federal Government has constructed two jetties to secure a deep-draft channel in Galveston Bay, one of which extends over the easterly tip of the island about 7 miles out into the Gulf. The city and the Federal Government have constructed a substantial concrete sea wall as a protection against destruction by hurricane storms.

"The Chief of Engineers in a report submitted to Congress on February 11, 1913, printed as House Document No. 1390, Sixty-second Congress, third session, recommended the extension of the sea wall and jetty to protect the harbor from blockade by storms and to permit an extension eastward of relief facilities. This work was conditioned on the city of Galveston constructing 3,300 feet of similar sea wall extension. This work has been completed, the Federal Government constructing approximately 7,000 feet of wall.

"The Chief of Engineers, in a report submitted to Congress on March 17, 1920, printed as House Document No. 693, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, recommended the further extension of the sea wall in a straight line to the south jetty, a distance of about 2,880 feet, and the protection of its junction with the south jetty, as a cost of $628,000, to protect the shore arm of the south jetty and prevent this arm from being breached.

"These provisions, providing for the construction of extensions to the Galveston sea wall, were carried in the River and Harbor Appropriation Act of 1916, and in the River and Harbor Legislative Act of 1922, respectively.

"Sand has accumulated along the angle between the sea wall thus provided and the jetty extending along the front for some 17,000 feet from the jetty. Along the remainder of the frontage, the beach has suffered erosion. Sand has been dumped along the toe of the sea wall and covered with riprap to prevent the undermining of the sea wall and to protect the wooden sheet pile cut-off wall from marine borers. Further steps are necessary at this time to protect the sheet piling. This protection should consist in the construction of a system of low groins firmly attached to the sea wall, and extending 500 feet perpendicularly to it, spaced at intervals of 1,500 feet. The estimated cost of these works is $234,000.

"I have recommended this project to the Division of Applications and Information of the National Emergency Council, for inclusion in the emergency relief program. However, work of this type involves a comparatively high cost per man per year for direct employment on the site, and it is doubtful if this project will be considered as meeting the requisites established for the emergency relief program.

"Sincerely yours,
"E. H. MARKHAM,
"Major General, Chief of Engineers."

On this letter the groins project was inserted in the river and harbor bill as a Senate amendment and duly passed the Senate. When it came back to the House I asked unanimous consent to send it to conference. Congressman O'Connor, of New York, who was bitterly opposing some of the other Senate amendments, objected to the bill going to conference. He refused for nearly a week to withdraw his objections. I then applied to the Committee on Rules for a rule to send the bill to conference, but the same Mr. O'Connor was chairman of the Rules Committee, and I was up against another stone wall. The Rules Committee, of course, was reluctant to take action over the protest of its chairman.

I then appealed to Senator Copeland to have the bill withdrawn from the House in order that some of the amendments objected to might be eliminated, but he was unable to get the Senate to agree. The Rules Committee finally granted a rule, but it was nearly a week before the chairman would let it be approved by the House, and Congress was expecting to adjourn in a few days which would kill the whole bill.

After many days we were able to get the rule presented and adopted. I was appointed chairman of the conferees. We had a bitter fight in the House, though no objection was made to the groins provision. The conference report was finally approved in both the House and Senate and the bill was signed by the President.

We endeavored to get emergency funds for the early construction of the groins, but under the new order pertaining to cost per man-year for direct employment, emergency funds could not be obtained. No other fund was available at the time. The Chief of Engineers had all the districts to check up in an effort to secure enough money from various small balances. He succeeded in this, and an order was prepared for his signature setting aside the necessary amount. This was halted by a provision in the old appropriation bills that no part of the funds could be expended on projects adopted after the appropriations were made. We then made an effort to devote a portion of the deficiency

appropriation for this work, but the Comptroller General finally ruled it could not be done.

No other appropriations were to be made by Congress until the following spring, and that would delay the commencement of the work upon the groins for at least a year. The possible danger to the sea wall was imminent, and a year's delay might result in very serious consequences. I then advised Judge Holman that the best course was to borrow the money from the local banks, if possible, which, under the law, could be repaid out of the next available appropriation. The banks agreed to furnish the money, and the Secretary of War approved the agreement. The work was carried out by our then efficient district engineer, Colonel Marks, now General Marks, division engineer, with headquarters in Dallas.

I hope I have not bored you with all this detail, but it embraces facts which should be of record in your archives. For your further information, I will say that during the nearly 29 years I have been in Congress, no other piece of legislation has had as many hurdles to pass as that pertaining to the groins for the protection of the Galveston sea wall. I am,

Yours sincerely,

J. J. MANSFIELD.

P. S.—In the above statement I omitted to make reference to the project for the extension of the harbor basin of Texas City. In the river-and-harbor bill of 1937 we had a project in response to a committee resolution, printed in Committee Document No. 47, Seventy-fifth Congress, recommending extension of the harbor basin 1,000 feet to the Southwest, with width of 800 feet, at a cost of $112,000. This bill became a law on August 26, 1937.

J. J. MANSFIELD.

GALVESTON WHARVES,
Galveston, Tex., July 2, 1945.

Congressman J. J. MANSFIELD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Beg to acknowledge receipt of your very interesting letter of June 30. I have read this letter with a great deal of interest.

This letter might be called a report of their Congressman to the citizens of Galveston and Texas City. After reading your letter I can well appreciate the amount of maneuvering that you must have to resort to in order to obtain proper legislation and appropriations for the construction of various harbor and other work in and around Galveston. I never realized before just how much maneuvering was required in order to put legislation of this kind through Congress and then later to obtain the necessary appropriations of moneys to do the work.

With kindest personal regards, beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

E. H. THORNTON,
Vice Chairman and General Manager.

Army Discharges—Regulations Regarding Insignia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from a group of servicemen in my State:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1945.

Mr. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: There are a few matters which we Portland boys and of Oregon as a whole desire you to correct or recommend changes for in the matter of military policies. We know that it is for the good of all people concerned. We feel that you and possibly United States Senator WAYNE MORSE, from Oregon, could get together and help the situation a lot for the people of the States.

In the first place we feel that all the higher ranking men, both enlisted and officers, could be discharged immediately unless they are Regular Army men and expect to stay in the military service. Privates and corporals could take over many jobs where different grades of sergeants are doing the work. Our Wacs could be discharged at once, and no rank over the grade of a major would need to be the heads of various departments that call for higher ranks at present. If this would be done immediately in every case of the National Guard and Reserves or Officers' Reserve Corps it would save our Federal Government and our country millions of dollars in a very short time. We have entirely too many noncommissioned officers and high-ranking officers who are lieutenant colonels and above in grade who just sit around and draw their pay, and the rest of us and lower ranking officers from a major down have to do the work anyway. This is an indictment of our military service that you could cause to be corrected immediately. Will you please do it, Mr. ANGELL?

The next thing that you could get remedied is the matter regarding the changing of insignia. Every time we change from one branch to another or command we are required to tear off our sleeve insignias or to change them. We are also allowed to wear the insignia of our past organization on our right sleeve. We feel in all fairness and justice that we should be allowed to wear the insignias of all the military organizations to which we have belonged in the past. They could be worn and should be allowed to be worn on our right sleeve or on our left if we desired to leave it on that sleeve and we could add the other insignias below the original one or the first one that we had. Also if we change from one group to the other we should be allowed to retain our insignia on our left sleeves if we so desire. Some of us prefer to keep our Air Corps insignia in spite of the fact that we have been loaned or recently assigned to the War Department personnel centers in various places. Others desire to retain their ASF or AGF insignias. Why can't you recommend this as a change of the policy in the military service for all of us hundreds of military men from Oregon. I am typewriting this for a large group of men. Please expedite and remedy these things for us.

Yours very sincerely.

Address by the Postmaster General at Springfield, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, last week, Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan, an illustrious Missourian, returned to his home State to be honored by his many friends with two dinners. On the occasion of each dinner, Mr. Hannegan discussed the affairs of the Nation in a dignified and impressive manner. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Postmaster General's remarks on one of these occasions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT E. HANNEGAN DELIVERED AT DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S MEETING, SPRINGFIELD, MO., SEPTEMBER 17, 1945

For me, a trip back to Missouri is well timed whenever I can make it. There is always a thrill in homecoming, in seeing old friends and fellow Democrats and shaking their hands. But I am especially glad to be with you at this time, because there are some things that I have been wanting to say about politics, and this is the place, Missouri is the State, where I think they ought to be said.

It was our State, you know, that proposed the name of Harry S. Truman for the Vice Presidency at the last national convention. We did that because the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt preferred Truman; and of course, we of Missouri were gratified by that preference.

We ought to be very proud of the part that our State played in the convention last year at Chicago. We ought to be proud of the choice that was made then, and proud of the wisdom of that choice as it is being demonstrated now.

Of course we did not know, in July of 1944, that the hand of fate hovered so closely over us, that within a few months the man whose leadership had saved America from Fascist aggression would no longer be here to build a future for America safe from all aggression, that the man who had led America out of the depths of peacetime depression and unemployment would not be able to carry on to a new security in a new peace.

But we did know that the Democratic Party had a program. It was a program for winning the war, for lasting peace, and for full employment after the war. And we did know that there were men, members of our party, who could and would carry out that program.

Roosevelt knew that Harry Truman was such a man. And today, my fellow Democrats of Missouri, taking stock of ourselves and of the state of the Nation, appraising the brand of leadership that Harry Truman has given us since he took over the Presidency, today I ask you, how many Americans do you think there are—whatever their party affiliations—who publicly or within the privacy of their own homes and their own consciences are not ready to thank God for the foresight that was shown by Franklin D. Roosevelt when he made his choice of a running mate last year in Chicago?

But being thankful is not enough. We Democrats cannot be content with sitting back now and congratulating ourselves on the high caliber of a national ticket we succeeded in electing last November. For us, for the membership of the Democratic Party throughout the Nation, there is a continuing obligation. It is the obligation to go on giving our active support to the man whom we have charged with the tremendous responsibility of carrying out our party's program, the program that was outlined in our platform in 1944.

I have pointed this out at every Democratic meeting I have attended since the election, and I want to emphasize it here in Missouri. I want to emphasize to you my strong feeling that the party's job—your job and my

job—is not only to support a slate of candidates at election time. It is to support policies, too, the policies for America which our party has pledged itself to carry out. And that is a job that goes on between elections. It is to support our President continuously as he carries on from day to day with the huge tasks that face him. That remains your party's responsibility, and therefore your own individual responsibility as well.

The great majority of Americans who elected the Democratic ticket last November have been giving President Truman this needed support. Among these citizens, you know, there were a large number of Republicans who last November deserted their own party because they saw that neither the party nor the candidate had a constructive program for America. Today these Republican voters who joined us in electing our national ticket are rejoicing with us in the record that Harry Truman is making.

But there remains one group, a relatively small group of leaders in the Republican Party, who are unhappy about America. Oh, they are glad that their own skins have been saved, that the war has been won—won in spite of the obstructions to preparedness and victory which they themselves stupidly threw in America's path.

But now they are ready to forget all that. In fact, they are only too willing to forget it and they would be very happy indeed if the American electorate would forget it too.

During the war years a whole army of rank-and-file Republicans turned against this leadership. They were disgusted. They were frightened. In the antipreparedness voting of their party Members in Congress they saw a threat to the safety of the Nation. In the speeches of some of those same Republicans on the floor they heard an ominous note—ominously like defiance of Government policies and Government emergency regulations in time of war, ominously like a deliberate attempt to alienate us from our own allies, ominously like appeasement of our enemies, ominously like pressure for a negotiated peace.

The Democratic administration was attempting at that time to enlist the energies and abilities of Americans of both political parties in the defense of this Nation for victory and for lasting peace. Those aims were put above party politics. We needed national unity, and we crossed traditional party lines time and again in our resolve to achieve it.

Meanwhile, certain individual members of the Republican Party leadership were giving one of the most shocking demonstrations of party-line voting in a time of war emergency that has ever gone down in the annals of our country. And those men who were directly and personally responsible for that shameful performance are able to stand brazenly before the electorate and call themselves Republicans today.

Well, the war is over now. There is no further need for the Democratic Party, the party in power, to lean over backward in covering up disruptive or disunifying elements in the opposition. In the interest of national unity, both for military victory and in those critical days when the administration's program for world peace was at stake, the Democratic Party set party politics aside. These emergencies were America's emergencies, not those of one party as against another.

Rather than say that this is something we should be proud of, I say that if we had not done it we should have been ashamed. But under Roosevelt, and then under Truman, the Democratic Party has kept full faith with America. To the last letter, it has discharged that obligation to hold the destiny of America among nations of the world above and beyond the destiny of any political party.

With this duty fulfilled, today we are no longer obliged to coddle reluctant Republicans into going along with America. The administration was elected on a platform that was simply stated and made clear to every American. The objectives stated in that platform express the will of the majority of our people.

The opposition either wants to attain those objectives or it does not want to attain them, and hereafter, when it attempts to thwart or circumvent the will of the majority, no longer must we, the majority party, refrain from exposing that opposition relentlessly to the light.

For my part I regard this as a welcome change. We are faced with the third problem that we promised to tackle in our 1944 platform—full employment after the war. The solution to that problem will not be easy. But you have read the message of President Truman to Congress, in which the President expresses his confidence that with proper action now, not only can we succeed in reconversion but America will be able to fill a huge backlog of orders—orders that mean prosperity for industry and jobs for all.

I share the President's optimism. I also believe, as he does, that action by Congress is necessary now. We Democrats mean business; we know we have a workable program, and it has now been put before the Congress. On this issue of jobs for American workers we are not going to mince words with the opposition.

Either the members of that opposition are for full employment of American workers at all times or they are not for it. If they are not, let them say so. Then we shall see to it that their position is fully revealed to the American people.

This time we are not going to let them conceal their final objectives behind platitudes or counsels of perfection. As legislation to carry out President Truman's domestic program comes up, we are not going to let congressional members of the minority party get by with endorsements in principle and amendments that would cancel out the principle they have endorsed. We are not going to let them say, "Sure, we think any American who wants to work ought to have a chance"—and then proceed to undermine every effort to create and insure that chance.

That is a technique, you know, which has become very popular among the Republicans. Having no program of their own, they hope, by employing this technique, to be placed on record as favoring the objectives of the Democratic Party—at the same time subverting its program.

Sometimes it works. Sometimes that technique succeeds in making the real purposes of these Republican leaders who are very long on general principles and very short on specific action. Well, this time we are going to expose these purposes to the light of day, where the American electorate can have a good long look at them between now and November in 1946.

Already there have been indications that the sentiment in Congress on legislation to protect America from postwar unemployment is running to the old familiary party lines.

It is a familiar picture. And it looks as if there are going to be all the old familiar trimmings to it. The Republicans are not against jobs for all our people. Oh, no; they are merely against doing anything to make those words mean something. They are not against unemployment compensation. No; only against taking any action to make that compensation available and adequate.

Already the President's message to Congress on the domestic postwar situation has caused the Republicans to come out in their true light. The Old Guard leadership already has taken its stand against the 21-point program that President Truman has put forward to meet and solve the problems facing America here at home. Yes; they are against it, but you will search in vain if you want to find out what, specifically, they are for.

And so, once again, the Republican Party is forced back by its leaders into the complete political bankruptcy of its old position, the position of opposing all progressive efforts to keep America safe and prosperous and at the same time of being without anything constructive to offer. That is a position on which the Republican Party has held a complete monopoly since 1932.

Its leaders call this conservatism. They are going back now, they say, to "old-fashioned conservatism." Those were the exact words they used. Harry Truman's message to Congress, they say, has given them their cue. They know where he stands. Now they can formulate their party line.

Well, we know where they stand too. So far as I can see, they need not exert themselves with any great amount of new formulating. It's the same old party line which the people of America have rejected in four national elections.

Yes; it is the old-fashioned conservatism of old-fashioned Republicans. Nothing has been added except another 4 years of hoping—hoping that the American people will turn back the hands of history to those good old days of the twenties which the Republican leadership can never forget.

When this leadership speaks of "old-fashioned conservatism" all the world knows what it means. It means reaction, the Nation thrown into reverse gear, the crumbling and collapse of that whole structure of present-day democracy which has been built to protect the incomes, homes, and children of our people. It means the ruinous turn-and-turn-about of boom and depression that threatened the life of American democracy within the memory of this present generation.

That is not "conservatism" as we Democrats use the word. That is reaction. Our own Democratic Party has its "conservative element." We are a big party, and we have room in our party for all good Americans whose heads are not attached to their necks in reverse so that they must always be looking backward.

Well, the American voter who has followed Republican propaganda all the way around the circle since 1932, may now be saying to himself, "This is where I came in." But at least the party leaders are making no bones about it. If you know what they mean when they say "old-fashioned conservatism," then you know just where the two parties stand—and which way they face.

What this means is that the Republican Old Guard has abandoned the "Me too" strategy that failed to elect Tom Dewey last year. Dewey, you may recall, promised to give the people Roosevelt's program—only more so. He could do for America everything that Roosevelt was doing—but he could do more of it.

Well, the Old Guard went along with Dewey, but it was only a case of temporarily shelving one false front—the mask of "conservatism" which covers Republican Party reaction and backward looking—for another false front.

It makes me think of the man who was hired to take the lion's part in the circus when the lion died. He got into the lion's skin and went into the cage. The crowd gathered around, and he roared aloud and acted the part of the lion. But suddenly he saw, in the same cage, a tiger. Whereupon the king of the jungle gave forth a very unkingly cry for help, and backed into a corner. The tiger advanced upon him. But when he was very close, the tiger said out of the corner of his mouth, "Shut up, you big fool, or we'll both lose our jobs."

Well, that seems to be what has happened inside the Republican Party. The "me too" lions have been shut up by the "conservative" tigers. But it is our job, the job of the Democratic Party in the elections of 1946, to take the masks off both of them

and show the people of this country just what the Republican leadership brings forth.

That brings me back to the theme I am trying to hammer home wherever I go among my fellow Democrats. I say to you again:

It is our job to support our President and his policies. He has come out most courageously with a program of action to keep the promise we made America in our platform of 1944.

A vote for Roosevelt and Truman in that 1944 election was something more, as I see it, than a vote for personalities, for individuals to hold office. It was a vote for a whole program for America, and it was a personal pledge on the voter's part to see America through the crisis of war and peace, through the economic problems of a postwar era. It was your pledge and mine to do what we could, personally, individually, and as members of our party, to speed victory in war, to support a lasting peace, and to maintain jobs for our people.

Harry Truman has shouldered his part of this Democratic obligation. He has been keeping the promises of the platform on which he ran for office. He has worked hard. And from every part of the country, the word is spoken and reechoed—"well done!"

Under his administration great strides have been made toward the cooperative peace that Roosevelt had promised. And now, with a program to maintain jobs for American workers, he has started on the fulfillment of the third great pledge in the Democratic platform.

If we, the members of the Democratic Party, are to do all in our power to discharge our own responsibility, we must work hard to elect a Congress in 1946 that will share those hopes for America. With the exception of the Old Guard Republican bloc that I have been discussing, we have such a Congress now. That bloc is in the minority and we are going to keep it there.

But the Republican Party leadership itself has given us a tip-off which I think we ought to take very seriously. If the reactionaries have their way in the party—and there is now every reason to expect that they will—then the Republican candidates in the 1946 congressional elections are pretty sure to be men of their own stamp.

This means that the consequences to America in a Democratic defeat would be doubly disastrous. In other words, if the Republican Party were allowed to capture control of Congress with the type of candidates now favored by the old guard, every move made from that time on by the administration to protect the interests of the great majority of Americans against a favored few would be relentlessly sabotaged. The Nation would be swept back into the economic chaos that brought upon us the boom of the twenties and its tragic aftermath.

America does not want that again. The people have four times given expression, at the ballot box, to the mandate for something better. The Democratic Party, producing that something better, has four times been endorsed, four times returned to power.

In going back to the same old stand after these repeated rejections by the electorate, the reactionary leaders of the Republican Party once more prove the old description that has been given of all reactionaries: They never forget anything and they never learn anything.

The people of America did learn. In 1930, 1931, and 1932 they learned the costliest lesson of our peacetime history. But now, 15 years later, with our country victorious in war, hopeful of lasting peace, and with the depression far behind it, the bitter meaning of that 15-year-old lesson must not be allowed to fade.

New voters have come into the electorate, voters who were so young in 1930 and 1931 that they did not bear the brunt of joblessness, helplessness, and hopelessness which three Republican administrations had wrought upon America.

If the Republican Party proposes to give us more of that kind of government, these young voters should know precisely what it means. They should be reminded of what it did to this country. They should be warned that what happened to their fathers and mothers in 1930 and 1931 can happen to them now. The fact that we have today a secure and prosperous Nation, successfully weathering the two-edged crisis of war and peace, should not be taken by them as something that has come about automatically. It did not just happen. And if it was good government that has brought it about in the course of these 13 years, bad government could undo it within a single session of Congress.

That is something for all American voters, old and young, to think about. Our job is to keep them thinking, and when the time comes to express these thoughts at the ballot box a year from next November, to see that they go out and vote.

When Will Johnny Come Marching Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two broadcasts prepared on the subject of the Army's demobilization program which went on the air over stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie; WMAM, Marinette-Menominee; and WDBC, Escanaba:

Friends, I am glad to be back on the air again after a lengthy absence, which I am sure most of you appreciate was due to a heart attack which I suffered on Good Friday and which confined me to the Naval Hospital for some four weeks, after which I was ordered by the doctors to take things easy for the following 6 weeks and during the summer recess. I am glad to report that I believe I have fully recovered my health and expect to be able to continue these broadcasts without further interruption.

The thought uppermost in the minds of most people today, as borne out by the almost overwhelming correspondence we have been receiving, is the question of when can Johnny get his discharge and come marching home. There has been, unfortunately, a great deal of misunderstanding and misdirected criticism on this subject, not only in the press and over the radio, but on the floors of the Congress itself. Much of this, of course, has been occasioned by the constantly—and I must say not unexpectedly—changing information coming from the War Department itself. However, to clarify the matter and give us all a complete understanding of the situation as it actually exists today and in the foreseeable future, and to give us the background of the reason why Johnny has not come marching home any sooner, General Marshall, Chief of Staff, and General Henry, Chief of Army Personnel, addressed Members of Congress last Thursday morning in the Congressional Library auditorium, to which meeting were admitted members of the press and also a number of soldiers and Wacs who were standing around outside at the start of the meeting and whom we were all glad to have sit in the auditorium with us. Today, and next week, I want to give you first of all, the over-all picture as presented to us by General Marshall, and then a more detailed picture of the method of discharge as described by General Henry, who is in charge of that Army responsibility.

First of all, let me impress upon you that conditions are different today than following the last World War inasmuch as this time we first conquered one foe and then still had another one to dispose of on the other side of the world. Following the last war we were able to bring home troops from Europe by divisions and effect their discharge by divisions. This time—and for the first time in history—an army is being discharged having primary concern for the individual soldier, himself, rather than as a unit. It must be remembered that basically the soldier's rights in the postwar world must be protected for his own good. This cannot be done for each one unless he is properly discharged and his service record and all of his other papers and, above all, his physical examination records are brought completely and accurately up to date when he walks out of Uncle Sam's Army. That is for his own good so that later when he comes forth with any claims on any branch of the Government—like the Veterans' Administration—his record will be absolutely correct in his own hands and in the Government files. That makes common sense. Unfortunately, after World War I it was found that many boys' records were far from complete and far from accurate. We hope that mistake will not be made again this time and I believe it will not.

Now to understand the military reasons why some boys with lower points have been coming home first and why some of those with long service overseas have not yet come home—let me give you the picture as General Marshall painted it for us last Thursday. On VE-day, May 10, 1945, we had some 89 combat divisions overseas, including about 4,000,000 men in Europe. All but two of these divisions were actually committed to combat. Germany was crushed; MacArthur was making rapid strides up the Pacific and was, in fact, 2 months ahead of schedule. He contemplated having to invade Japan proper. It was to start on the island of Kyushu about November 1. It had to start then or weather conditions might have delayed the invasion at least 6 months, giving the Japs a breather and probably costing us hundreds of thousands American boys. He had about 2,000,000 men in the Pacific stretched out over a very extended series of battlefields on the various islands. He asked for 17 combat experienced divisions from the European theater for the invasion of Japan proper. Consequently, the first move in Europe was to bring those 17 combat-experienced divisions back from Germany down to the French water-front and start them for the United States. The bottleneck was, of course, shipping. All 17 divisions obviously could not move at once—and having been returned to the States—shipping to the Pacific front was also a problem.

These divisions were carefully screened for the high-point men and arrangements made for their discharge on their return to the States after they had helped to train their replacements because modern armies fight as a team and when you pull the end or the guard out of the line, an experienced man has to be sent in as a replacement. These battle-worn veterans with 85 points—under a system which I will describe next week and which was selected by the men themselves—were to be discharged as soon as the proper paper work could be accomplished. So these 17 divisions were brought down to the waterfront and as fast as transportation could be made available they were to be brought to the States for shipment to the Pacific. Meanwhile, of course, engineer

units had to be rushed directly from Europe, via the Suez and Panama Canals, to the Pacific theater to prepare air bases from which an ever-increasing softening up bombardment of Japan could take place. For instance, originally, after the capture of Okinawa was assured, we started bombing from that island with 200 planes. By August 1, 2,000 planes were using those fields, and by October 1 it was to be stepped up to 3,000 planes—and all on a little island about 6 miles in width—so you can see what a problem presented itself to build air bases which would be sufficient to handle the large B-29's. Now, after these 17 divisions had been brought to the French waterfront and replaced in Germany with relatively green troops of men under 85 points, then came the sudden collapse of Japan, which actually occurred on August 9 although VJ-day was not celebrated until August 14. Immediately, General MacArthur's request dropped from 17 to 6 divisions, then later to 3 divisions—and only on September 19 he advised the General Staff that he could get along with 2 divisions—both of which are already on the high seas and both of which had men with 75 points and over removed—which men would be eligible for early discharge.

Now, that meant a complete reversal of the flow in Europe to send back to the Army of Occupation some of the green replacement troops that had been screened into the 17 divisions and bring out of other divisions occupying Germany the high-point men who most naturally are the leaders; namely, the top sergeants, the cooks, and other noncommissioned officers who had long, bitter experience but who, of necessity, had to be retained for the time being to guide the team occupying Germany; so there was, of necessity, a lull in the number of high-point combat veterans coming back to this country and in order to keep the demobilization program going along, there were quite a number of boys in the service on this side who were considered nonessential, such as limited service men, who could be released at that time—and that was done—but as soon as the combat veterans began to flow back into the country they were given their warranted priority.

The General Staff in Washington proposed, even before VJ-day, to drop the points required for discharge from 85 to 80. This was vigorously opposed by General Eisenhower in Europe and General MacArthur in the Pacific because they were afraid it would be devastating to the morale of their battle-scarred veterans. It was only after we could begin to actually occupy Japan and get replacements for the high-point men in MacArthur's outfit that we could lower the point requirement from 85 to 80—and I am glad to report to you that as of October 1 the points will be reduced to 70 and as of November 1 they will be reduced to 60, and by the end of winter General Marshall said the points would be eliminated entirely and men with 2 years of service would automatically qualify for discharge. The biggest difficulty right along in this question of discharging men has been the question of transportation. Right now—and ever since VE-day—every available cargo ship, not only of our own but of our allies and even naval craft have been employed to bring men back from Europe and every available aircraft has been employed. In this latter connection it is of interest to note that one day last week over 2,500 men were returned by air from Europe and 1,055 of these came in within a 3-hour period at 3-minute intervals. The same thing is, of course, true out in the Pacific.

Originally, General Eisenhower estimated he would require 400,000 men to properly occupy and police our assigned section of Germany. That number is still in effect. Originally, General MacArthur estimated he would need 900,000 men to occupy Japan and Korea, and part of China. Within the past week, as you know, he has now stated he can get along with 200,000 men to occupy Japan and Korea alone. Of course, that does not take into account the troops that we will have to have to garrison our recaptured island bases nor the troops needed in the Philippines, the Aleutians and Hawaii, and probably some additional troops in China for a relatively short period. Then, in addition to these troops, it must be remembered that we have to maintain a relatively large number of troops for the Service of Supply. Also, that we have to have a number of troops stationed all over the world to get our supplies eventually moved back to the United States after our manpower has been returned. There are some 6,000,000 tons of supplies and matériel in the European theater alone and over 800,000 tons spread all over the Pacific, and that in itself is no small task and explains some of the reasons why the Navy is slower in demobilizing than the Army and why the Merchant Marine will be kept busy for some months to come.

Now, with respect to the actual discharge of the men after they have reached the United States.

As I have previously said, the paper work and the physical examinations take a lot of time, but that time is necessary if the men are to be properly discharged and their future properly protected by their accurate discharge and service record. Originally it required 17 days to process a man's discharge. That has now been reduced to 44 hours on a schedule which I will give you next week. Originally, there were 26 separation centers set up by the Army. Effective September 24 there will have been set up a total of 178 separation centers for the Army, the Air Force, and the Service of Supply. Whereas on VE-day actually 2,000 men were discharged that very day—as of today we are discharging 17,000 each day and by Christmas time this will have been stepped up to 27,000 per day, over 1,100 per hour. By the end of the fiscal year, June 30 next, it is expected that approximately 6,000,000 men and officers will have been returned to civilian life.

If there is one unfounded criticism that makes me thoroughly disgusted, it is the statement that men are not being discharged more rapidly because the "brass hats" want somebody left to command. As a refutation of that statement let me remind you of the fact that when we started to get ready for this war we had a standing Army of 280,000 men and 14,000 Regular Army officers. We still have approximately 14,000 Regular Army officers and our present expectation is that we will have a standing peacetime Army of around 2,000,000 men and 200,000 officers. Consequently, there is little reason to believe that the Regular Army officers—as we have always known them and whom some uninformed persons choose to call "brass hats"—will stand to lose any reduction in the present rank or any reduction in their salary—and so as far as they are personally concerned they do not want to keep one single man in the services one single day longer than is absolutely necessary to get them back into this country first of all—and secondly to get them properly discharged just as soon as possible and returned to civilian life. After all, in peacetime, the Regular Army soldier—a volunteer who enlisted—is a contented career soldier who asks for and expects to take orders. The draftee is usually a "problem child" in times of peace. General Marshall repeatedly stressed the fact that there is no relation whatsoever between demobilization and the size of the future Army. After all, the size of the peacetime standing Army is properly determined by Congress. As far as I am concerned, I am convinced the Army is doing an honest and sincere job, and I think a reasonably efficient job, and is having Johnny come marching home just as soon as it is humanly possible to get him out—having due regard for his own protection under the GI bill of rights.

Last week I gave you the gist of General Marshall's explanation on September 20 to Members of Congress and the press of the reason why the Army demobilization program has not proceeded as fast as many fathers and mothers, and wives and sweethearts and the soldiers themselves would like to see it proceed. I think he clarified the atmosphere considerably. General Marshall was followed on the platform by Major General Henry, Chief of Army Personnel, who went into detail explaining the method presently employed for the demobilization of our Army. He stressed the fact that whereas following World War I, when we had been faced with a single enemy and had but to return to this country the 2,000,000 troops then in Europe—but relatively few of whom had actually engaged in combat—it was then possible to bring the Army back to these shores by divisions, send them all to one camp and process their discharge immediately. I recall the same clamor went up after the last war that Johnny should have come marching home the day before yesterday rather than tomorrow or the next day. The result was that in the haste of demobilizing the Army and sending the boys home, there were a great many mistakes made which in later years proved not only embarrassing but indeed worked very much to the detriment of the soldier in denying him his proper relief from the Government in the form of aids to employment, in the form of veterans' hospitalization and veterans' rights in the future years.

In this war, the Army decided very early in the game to eliminate as far as possible the mistakes of the past and to discharge the boys on a seniority or on a priority basis. Secondly, no man should be discharged until they were sure that his service record and his physical examination were as complete as possible so as to benefit the soldier himself in the years to come and insure him all of his rights under the veterans' program known as the GI bill of rights. In my opinion both of these principles are fundamentally sound. Furthermore, as both General Marshall and General Henry pointed out, it was utterly impossible after this war to demobilize the Army on the basis of whole divisions because of the fact that following VE-day, when Germany collapsed on May 10, we still had a vicious enemy opposing us in the Pacific with an army of over 2,500,000 men, well armed and well fed and occupying strategic positions from which we had learned he was very difficult to dislodge.

It was confidently believed that our sea forces and air forces would not suffice to bring the enemy to his knees and that we would have to prepare for a large-scale land-troop invasion of Japan, starting with the island of Kyushu about November 1. (That, however, was before the devastating atomic bomb had proven itself.) He explained that with that thought in mind, immediately following VE-day, General MacArthur asked that 17 combat-experienced divisions be dispatched to him at the earliest possible date for that invasion and, in order that Japan might be softened up for the kill, combat-experienced engineer troops be dispatched as quickly as possible from Europe to the Pacific theater to, as rapidly as possible, prepare an abundance of island airfields to permit us to rapidly expand our bombing operations against the islands of Japan proper. Those troops were dispatched at once, and those airfields on Okinawa, Iwo Jima, and other islands rapidly expanded and put in service for our heaviest bombers. General Marshall pointed out that, for instance, immediately after the capture of Okinawa was assured, we started bombing Japan from airfields on that island with 200 planes; by August 1, 2,000 planes were operating off Okinawa alone, and by October 1 it was planned that the fields would be able to accommodate 3,000 planes.

Contrary to the land troops' program for demobilization of European forces, the Air Force—very properly, I think—decided that the situation was such that they should properly send in their first team against the Japs, with the result that relatively few of the air crews and the ground crews were eligible for discharge following VE-day. Immediately following VJ-day, however, the Air Force began its own demobilization very rapidly.

Now, this question of giving seniority or priority rights to the individual is a fundamental principle approved by the American people in their every-day life. I support it myself 100 percent. The boys themselves said they wanted it. Consequently, early in 1942, the Army proceeded to ask the boys on what basis they wanted to be discharged. A scientific poll was conducted of the entire Army along the lines of the famous Gallup poll, which has proven itself to be as accurate as anything heretofore evolved. Following out that idea, therefore, the Army took its pay rolls and marked off every fourth or fifth name in each unit. Those men were then called together in groups and asked to write down on paper on what basis they would like to be discharged and in what order they thought the point system should be worked out. Ninety-five percent of them said that length of service was paramount; second, length of combat service; third, dependency; and, fourth, combat stars or decorations, etc. After the Army's staff of statisticians had compiled this order of priority desired by the men themselves, early in 1943 they went back again to GI Joe, conducted another poll asking them how many points should be awarded for each of these principal considerations, and so we see that, despite all of the protestations to the contrary from back home and even from the boys in the various camps—naturally impatient at the delay in getting out—that, after all, it was the boys themselves who thoroughly approved of the priority or seniority system and set up their own schedule under which they should be discharged. I think it is about as fair a system as could possibly be worked out. Of course, it is but natural to expect that there may be seeming injustices or inequalities here and there in the working out of the system, but, on the other hand, I must say this in all frankness and in fairness: That it has been my observation, based upon communications that reach my office and representations made to me personally, that many of these complaints are more or less of a selfish nature, and I use that word "selfish" in a most charitable sense. By that I mean I have had many letters and many representations from people asking me if I cannot expedite the release of John Doe or Pete Smith because they need him to staff their own business or perhaps to help run the farm, and many of them come from parents or boys themselves who ask that their schooling be not further interrupted.

I can fully appreciate that they all feel, and I feel, that they are perfectly sincere in their requests asking to expedite the discharge of some particular soldier for their own reasons as well as for his own reasons of wanting to get back to school or beat his buddy to the job, but I ask you friends, in all sincerity, do you not believe—as I do—that in fairness to all of the 8,000,000 boys in the service—6,000,000 of whom are coming out before next July—that each should properly await his own turn in line with the seniority or priority system that has been set up by the boys themselves? It seems that when we try to play favoritism for any reason, we are just simply muddying the waters and causing further discontent among the millions of boys who are being returned to this country just as fast as shipping on the water and in the air can be provided and just as fast as they can possibly be processed after they have been returned to this country.

Now, of course, it is to be appreciated that there are a number of hardship cases for which provision has been admirably made by the Army Personnel Department. If there is justifiable hardship at home by reason of which any soldier's discharge should be expedited, then the Army asks that the case be clearly stated and at least two affidavits from responsible citizens outside of the family be presented with his application to substantiate his claim of hardship. The soldier must make application to his immediate commanding officer, regardless of where he may be situated, in this country or overseas. In the case of a soldier, for instance, who is badly needed on the farm, an affidavit from his county agricultural agent and from a responsible citizen of his community should suffice. These affidavits must be notarized. It is appreciated that in some intances, where the soldiers' family is in an isolated community, it may be difficult for his parents, or his wife, to get into town to secure the necessary affidavits, in which case if they will appeal to the Red Cross, and the Red Cross will certify that definite hardship exists, the Army will honor that just as well as affidavits and in these cases if the soldier is overseas he will be returned as promptly as possible to this country and if possible his discharge will be processed promptly.

For instance, last week my attention was called to the case of a mother, seriously ill, in the Soo, which was certified by the Red Cross, and within 6 hours the Adjutant General's Office sent a wire to her son's commanding officer in the Pacific, authorizing an immediate furlough for the soldier and his return by air to the United States.

Now with respect to the soldier seeking discharge in hardship cases, if you will remind him he must first of all apply to his immediate commanding officer, if you will secure affidavits from either citizens or the Red Cross and send such to him for submission to his commanding officer, and then if you will explain the case to me, advise me when application has been filed as well as the soldier's complete name, serial number, and address, we will do everything we can from my office here to help expedite action.

Now let me just explain to you exactly what happens after a boy gets back to this country eligible for discharge. Just as soon as he gets back, he is dispatched as rapidly as transportation can be provided to a typical separation center. If, however, the separation centers are so overcrowded that they cannot take care of the soldier and, therefore, he is destined, theoretically, for further Army duty, he is permitted to apply for "temporary duty" at a base of his own selection usually at or near his own home town. He is then free to do as he pleases during the 45 days, the only requirement being that he report initially to the place he selected for "temporary duty." The "temporary duty" provision is made under a rest and recuperation measure allowed under Army regulations. A soldier on regular furlough pays for his own transportation, but on "temporary duty" his fare is supplied by the Army, and I think that is a pretty good break for the lad who has to await his turn for discharge.

And, by the way, let me remind you again that when we started demobilization after VE-day, on which very day the first 2,000 boys were separated from the service, there were at that time 26 separation centers set up in the United States. As of September 24, 178 separation centers for the Army Ground Forces, separation bases for the Air Force, and separation points for the Services of Supply had been put into operation. So when a boy arrives at a separation center at 4 o'clock, the roll is called; at 5 he has dinner, and at 6 o'clock he goes through his initial processing. In other words, his papers are presented, he is asked to select his uniform for travel home, and that uniform is taken and carefully cleaned, his division and overseas insignia sewed on the sleeve, his service ribbons sewed on, and even his discharge insignia sewed on the uniform. At 7:30 he is asked to attend a movie explaining the discharge process and what future opportunities are in store for him, and he retires a tired but jubilant young man at 10 p. m. He is up again the next morning at 7 for breakfast. He is then on his own until 9:30, when he gets his general orientation and gets ready for his medical examination at 10. During the medical examination every boy is given a complete physical examination, a complete blood test and X-ray of every part of his body. Any boys who are found to have contracted tuberculosis or South Sea fungus, or diseases of that nature, are held over for medical treatment. At 11:30 he files his pension application; at 12:30 he has lunch, and from 1:30 to 3:45 he visits the counselors, who advise him as to his rights under the GI Bill of Rights and seek to guide him into industry or back to school, or give him whatever other advice he wants to receive from those counselors as to what a grateful Uncle Sam can provide for him.

In other words, the Army is doing its best to let the boys out with a sweet tooth in their mouth. At 3:45 any decorations he has coming are awarded to him. At 4:15 he gets his clothing back, all pressed and ready for going home. At 5:45 is mess time and from 6:45 to 10 p. m. he is on his own or can attend some more moving pictures if he so desires. The third morning he is up at 7 o'clock; has final inspection at 8:45; he is finally processed out at 9:30, receives his final pay, travel pay, and his discharge pay. Fifty dollars of this amount is given him in cash and the balance in the form of a check. If he desires, and is wise enough, to mail this check home all he has to do is drop it into a mail-box right alongside of him. The Army will then put it into an envelope and mail it to his home. In other words, the "galloping dominoes" cannot take more than $50 out of his pocket before he gets home.

At 11 he is assembled for the departure ceremony, at which time every man is met by the senior officer of the center, personally thanked for his services, and then invariably the question is asked, "Young man, would you like to reenlist to serve until 6 months after the duration or for a period of time in the Regular Army"; and, as General Henry puts it, invariably "the line moves on."

Incidentally, it is of interest to note that just recently the Marine Corps, after careful study of the Army method, has adopted their program and point schedule 100 percent and is hereafter using it in processing the discharge of its marine veterans.

Address of Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1945

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, at a conference of Republican Congressmen from Pennsylvania at Hershey, Pa., on Tuesday, September 4, 1945:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a source of deep gratification to be able to meet again with the Pennsylvania's Republican delegation in Congress and to exchange views on America's problems.

When we last sat down together, we were in the midst of war. Since then, much water has gone over the dam. Victory has been won. We are at the threshold of peace. Not war problems, but peace problems, now occupy our attention.

A great deal of history will be made by the congressional activities of the next few months.

The world position of the United States must be defined. Reconversion policies must be worked out. Programs must be developed looking to national solvency and prosperity. The extent of Government aid to, and supervision over, the individual must be determined. Amity and cooperation must be cultivated on the home front.

Under the Constitution, the responsibility for these decisions belongs to Congress, as the direct representatives of the American people.

The responsibility of the Republican Party is clear.

Congress is ripe for aggressive and enlightened leadership. Such leadership can come only from the Republican Party.

I am quite aware that there are those who see for our party only the role which the British call loyal opposition—a function of criticism which can easily fall away to pure obstructionism.

I do not agree that this is the part we ought to play.

We need to show positive action.

Have we the makings of a national Republican program?

There are inherent Republican convictions on public issues which have frequently served as a guide for proper legislation. In many cases they have proven sufficiently sound and attractive to win the support of numerous Democratic Members of the two Houses of Congress, in preference to their own party's muddled plans and divided councils.

But is it sufficiently clean cut to permit us to chart a Republican position on the major issues of the times which shall be forward-looking and constructive—positive in nature instead of merly negative?

I believe the answer is "yes."

Today I wish to outline a declaration of some of the principles and policies, representing the sound Republican stand, as I see it.

What is the major problem of the postwar world?

Is it not defining the world position of the United States during the era of internationalism now dawning?

Mistakes in that field will reflect themselves not only in future international dissensions, possibly even in future wars, but will gravely endanger our own domestic well-being.

The first proposition I would like to make is that our Nation has earned the right of world leadership.

That does not mean domination, nor does it mean control.

But it does mean that our immeasurably vast contributions to the defeat of the Axis entitle our opinions to weight and our wishes to consideration.

The American form of government and way of life have now been vindicated as never before.

Of all other Allied Nations, with their varying concepts of government, American democracy alone proved strong enough in the hour of need to turn the tide against totalitarianism.

Free government in America was sturdy enough to rescue the other floundering peoples of the world from serfdom at the hands of Hitler and Hirohito.

The war made it painfully clear that many of the other large nations had more vanity in their own institutions than tenacity and strength to defend them.

What is America's postwar objective?

It is not material gain, not new territory.

It is only the privilege of living in a friendly, liberty-loving family of nations. Unlike many another nation risen to power, we ask nothing from the rest of the world but peace and good will.

Our political ideals are those of a Republic, though we do not insist that all other national groups accept such a pattern. But we do insist that the people of every nation have the right to choose freely its own form of government, so long as it is not used as an instrument of oppression and persecution, with the limitation that those known to be war-breeding forms be eliminated.

There, in a nutshell, is a foreign policy which I believe will win the overwhelming support of America's men and women.

The general policy must determine the extent and nature of the aid we give war-stricken nations elsewhere. The help we give must not be used against us, nor dare we allow it to be used to defeat the objectives of world friendship we have in mind.

Too often in the past have we dug into our pockets to refinance nations struggling in pits of their own digging, only to see them dig new and similar pits with the tools we furnished.

We need backbone and vision in foreign aid, quite as well as generosity.

The end of lend-lease should mark the end of the blind generosity of the war.

Whatever forms our post-war contributions take, good business and enlightened self-interest require that they be used for purposes which the American people desire to see advanced.

Spot assistance in the form of food for the hungry, clothing for the naked, and fuel and shelter for the destitute must of course be forthcoming to the limit of our ability to spare.

Loans of money and of industrial goods must be made more guardedly.

There should be assurance of repayment. Despite the talk of our war aid being a "loan" or a "lease," no one seriously expects it to be repaid. It will have to be charged off as part of the cost of victory.

But more such gifts would impoverish both giver and recipient.

There must be definite terms for retiring further loans—easy terms, over a long period—but terms that are going to be met.

So far as possible, there should be the businesslike procedure of obtaining security for the loans—if not tangible security, then at least its moral equivalent in good will and good intentions.

In the long run, the best foreign aid is that of prosperous commerce.

Regardless of crackpot Socialistic ideology and misrepresentation, money and profit still make the wheels go round, in international as well as domestic fields.

World prosperity depends upon large-scale and profitable exchange of goods.

The Republican Party believes in the widest possible world trade. This has been proven in the past by the fact that all of the sound advancement of commercial relationships among nations, as well as the industrial expansion of America, occurred under Republican administrations at Washington and in line with Republican principles.

The essence of Republican trade policy is that all nations have access to world markets on an equal basis.

In noncompetitive goods, which form two-thirds of normal trade, this is simple enough. But it is not so simple in competitive goods.

Straight dollar-for-dollar competition does not provide an equal basis, for the very simple reason that not the same part of the dollar in different nations returns to the labor that produced the goods.

We demand that the right of all nations be recognized to protect their standards of living by requiring that foreign goods competing with domestic goods be not admitted at less than their production costs at home, particularly when underpayments to labor are the reason for the lesser costs.

Congress must again stand ready, as it did 25 years ago, to protect American industry, labor, commerce, and farming from floods of foreign-made goods which might stifle our own production.

In the field of foreign policy it still remains for the United States to define its intentions in Germany and Japan.

Our proper function in those conquered nations should not be hard to see. Preventing future aggression is only a part of the task. Our responsibility is to try to harness the undoubted energies of those two races to some useful purpose, which in the fullness of time will permit them, chastened and sobered, to reenter a friendly family of nations as full members.

Here again, as in all foreign relationships, our contributions must be spiritual as well as material—and perhaps as much of one as of the other. The demoralized foreign peoples need inspiration as well as food, courage as much as coal, and many of them guidance, more than cash.

Many of the questions I have mentioned bear directly on our solvency. In any question of further foreign loans, for example, one of the most important considerations is whether we have the money to lend, or can afford to borrow it from our citizens to lend to another nation.

It may even prove, when normal living begins to emerge from the confusion of war, that we have none too much for our own needs—that we already have used up virtually all our resources and borrowing capacity.

Recently Herbert Brownell, Republican national chairman, made a comment which I am sure you have all seen—that it is time to audit the national books and see where we really do stand.

Most heartily I indorse this proposal. The New Deal, in 12 years, has spent at least five hundred thousand million—or five hundred billion—dollars, most of it borrowed.

In that time, there has been no accounting of stewardship.

As a preliminary to reconversion, the records should be examined to see where this money went, what has been mortgaged, and what, if anything, remains free and liquid.

I would like to see the audit extended to the entire New Deal—to Social Security, pump-priming, the various spending programs, and to the war itself, from Pearl Harbor down.

But we do not need to wait for such an audit to begin a drive for the National Budget to be balanced.

A balanced budget, as the term implies, means that revenues and costs be equal. There are therefore two separate factors—taxation and spending.

The first responsibility is to determine a reasonable and nonoppressive rate of taxation.

Bluntly, and from the Republican point of view which seeks maximum industrial expansion under free government, this spells immediate tax reduction.

Taxes are too high. They are a drag on our national economy.

A 20-percent income-tax reduction, coupled with corresponding reductions in the various corporate taxes, would prove the greatest incentive to expanding industrial and commercial activity which our Nation could enjoy.

A pledge by a majority of Congress, made soon after you reconvene, that such a realistic tax program will be made effective before next March 15, would prove to be the very shot-in-the-arm so desperately needed by lagging reconversion.

We have only one road open to bring future national revenues up to the necessary level, and that is to put taxes on a mass-production basis—each individually lower, but much greater in the aggregate.

The second point in balancing the Budget, and which is the more important of the two,

is to reduce the outgo—the expenditures—bring them far enough below revenues to permit us to pay the interest on the debt and start retiring it.

Everything which forces our spending above national tax revenues is simply a short cut to bankruptcy, depression, and the form of receivership known as communism.

Government aid must be limited to ability to pay.

Innumerable costly projects are being urged by Washington leaders which, however attractive they might be if our debts were not so high, should be turned down now for the elementary reason that we cannot afford them without risking insolvency.

Some of these measures would defeat their own expressed purposes. The proposed full employment bill, for example, while greatly increasing the cost of Government and the danger of state socialism, would further stifle the free-enterprise industrial expansion which is the sole hope of full employment.

The Wagner health and social security bill, likewise, which purports to make health and security available to all, actually would endanger both—public health by demoralizing medical practice in the attempt to socialize it, and social security by piling up the costs of the program beyond the ability of the American people to pay.

Such legislation is no more than a brazen and communistic scheme to bankrupt the Nation and allow the bureaucrats to take it over.

The Republican Party must not only fight them, but evolve and support full employment and health programs which actually reach the very real needs in these fields.

Unemployment compensation in the past was efficient and sound. Moneys intended to be reserved for future emergencies were held in trust—there are $600,000,000 of such funds credited to Pennsylvania today. They were not spent as rapidly as received, but prudently a reserve has been built up to provide funds during periods of unemployment.

One of the early responsibilities of Congress is to see that the national administration carries out its promise that the employment services be returned to the States intact.

President Roosevelt gave his word that this would be done. It is up to Congress and President Truman to see that the promise is not broken.

The President has intimated that there should be over-all standardization of unemployment compensation, and that this may be reason enough for nationalizing the program.

This is by no means logical. The unequal living needs of residents of such climatically different States as Maine and Florida, Pennsylvania, and New Mexico, or States with such differences in economic background as New York and Arkansas, are reason enough for allowing the States themselves to help determine the amount to be paid their unemployed.

Likewise there is danger in raising the payments under unemployment compensation to a point where many would receive more for remaining idle than for working.

Incentive is as important to the individual employee as to the business firm. There is a Socialist concept which has received some attention recently to the effect that there ought to be a basic rate of pay which everyone would receive, whether he works or not. This is neither economically nor politically sound; the burden it imposes on those who do the work is too great; so far as national economy is concerned, it is burning the candle at both ends.

Unemployment compensation should be high enough to tide an employee and his family through a period of transition from one job to another.

Nothing could be further from the sturdy American spirit of self-reliance than some half-baked scheme of allowing the lazy, incompetent, and improvident to live lives of luxury at the expense of the industrious person.

It must be clearly understood by the American people that all forms of public assistance and Government spending are a direct tax on the earnings of the productive workers of the Nation. There is no magic formula for creating Government income; it comes only from the pockets of individuals who sweat and earn it.

We have seen a great deal of wasteful generosity at Washington with other people's money. Some of the notes are beginning to fall due. If we are ever to climb out of the mire, it can be only on the basis of holding future expenditures down to essentials.

One current field of waste and extravagance will soon have the attention of Congress.

I refer to what Senator BYRD, Virginia, Democrat, has called the need for demobilizing the vast civilian army of Federal jobholders.

Cut-backs are in process in the industrial army and in all branches of the armed services.

But no serious move has been made to cut back the more than 2,000,000 surplus Government employees who are saddling the finances of the Nation annually with approximately five billion of badly needed but wasted dollars.

However painful for such patronage-minded Democrats as National Chairman Hannegan to contemplate, this retrenchment should and must start at once.

The national administration's promises of economy are a joke until this conspicuous waste is halted.

It is idle to talk of the need for a reorganization bill before the President can act. His predecessor had authority enough to order the employees hired—he has power enough to start firing them.

If there is no concrete action in this direction before Congress reassembles I would recommend immediate steps by Congress to force the wiping out of this destructive waste.

Free enterprise in America is straining at the bit.

Needed only, in general terms, is for the bureaucratic brakes to be released. The result would be to produce the greatest industrial expansion in all history—full employment, prosperity, and abundance.

It is a job for Congress to pry loose all remaining reluctant fingers which are still gripping the brakes and locking the wheels.

Most dangerous of these restrictions are those insisted upon by OPA. On the theory that inflation is our worst danger, prices are being frozen at levels which even the largest mass-production plants find will prohibit a profit, and which leave smaller producers, whose overhead charges are naturally higher, out in the cold.

As has so often happened with this and other New Deal agencies, OPA is looking in one direction and moving in another.

If, instead of trying to freeze prices, Government would cooperate wholeheartedly in getting industry and business into quick production, we would be on the way to success. Expanding and developing industry would quickly produce the abundance which is the only sure-fire, competitive method of keeping prices low and our people employed.

Not prices, but national finances, are the real driving force toward inflation. We cannot be safe from inflation until the national budget is put in balance. We cannot stabilize prices until reawakened industry creates an abundant supply.

Too rigid price controls defeat their objective. They stagnate initiative by discouraging venture capital; they slow down industry and thereby aggravate the shortages that drive prices up. The result is less employment, less production, less Federal revenues, increased public spending and the irresistible inflationary force of a mounting public debt.

Incentive, not discouragement and hardship, should be given to all forms of business and production—farming, mining, industrial and commercial.

Production and management need to feel that they, as well as organized labor, have friends at Washington.

This is no time to pile new burdens on American industry. Government should resist all pressure for its further extension into private fields. General policies in tax, labor, and other matters should be clarified and stabilized so that management and labor know what to expect and can plan ahead.

Congress should require that Government agencies treat labor, business, and industry in good faith and justice.

Let's have a moratorium on waste, confusion, shifting policies, and bureaucratic experiments.

There has been, for example, talk of a so-called "resettlement" program, under which industries and employees would be forcibly removed from where they are, to somewhere else that the blueprint boys at Washington think they ought to be.

This project, which is a sort of Americanized version of the Communist 5-year plan, is a very real threat to Pennsylvania and other industrial States in the North and East.

It is a high-handed raid by New Deal politicians upon the resources of the present industrial States in an attempt to bribe other areas with the promise of letting them share the stolen goods.

Like any other good Republican, I look forward eagerly to the industrialization of all suitable sections of the United States. But this can be done only gradually and in the spirit of free enterprise. I don't believe other areas can hope to build their own prosperity on wreckage—and I don't believe they want to try.

I mention this because of the frequency with which schemes are submitted to Congress which bear the appearance of being this same old national socialistic project in new form.

I urge your close scrutiny of all new spending programs as may be pressed upon you by executive departments and bureaus, to be sure that what is being financed is democracy and not socialism or communism. All too often the bait conceals a barb.

There continue to be expressions of open hostility toward private enterprise by those high in the administration or its councils.

One leader has suggested that business be allowed to operate on sufferance and that, if it cannot produce prosperity, it be punished by being taken over in the communistic fashion.

Private initiative and private enterprise can fail only under one circumstance—continued bureaucratic interference and overregulation.

Should that happen, punishment would fall not only on business, but mostly upon the men and women who labor and toil for their livelihood.

But there is no need to talk of failure. That is defeatism.

There will be no failure if employer and employee join as partners in an enterprise of peace, production, good will, and prosperity for postwar America.

Before there can be such a partnership, Congress must make clear and definite our national labor policy.

In Pennsylvania, we have recognized that labor has three inherent and inseparable rights: the right to work where it chooses; the right to organize and bargain collectively; and the right to strike. The Republican Party should and will defend these rights.

We should encourage sympathy, understanding, confidence, cooperation between

employee and employer and make Government the impartial friend of both. Free men and free women working in a free economy can produce three times more per worker than dictator-driven slave labor. The interdependence and mutual trust of labor, industry, and commerce must be emphasized. Labor, industry, and the state must work together in this peace period.

Labor organizations must be responsible labor organizations. When they enter into engagements, their leaders must see to it that these engagements are kept. They must have the leadership and courage to eliminate wildcat or unauthorized strikes. If this is not done, they will bring down upon themselves legislation which will enforce the terms of the engagements they have made.

I am certain labor will accept with patriotic enthusiasm the obligation which we all owe our returning veterans.

The rights of 12,000,000 veterans must be protected by the Congress. I am sure that every consideration will be given the veterans by you and your colleagues.

Now, in conclusion, let me say a word about Pennsylvania.

All these various matters have to do with national problems which relate to many of Pennsylvania's concerns and a great deal of the future welfare of labor, agriculture, and industry depends upon the wisdom and vision with which these problems are met.

Pennsylvania has made a contribution to the war effort of which we ourselves, the whole Nation, and our allies may well be proud.

Just as America proved to be the arsenal of democracy, so Pennsylvania proved to be the arsenal of the Nation.

No man could fail to feel deep pride and gratification over having been a war governor of such a State with such a record.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that we may enjoy in the years to come a rank equally high in contributions to national happiness, well-being, and prosperity.

We have what is needed—skilled manpower, markets, raw materials, transportation, abundant power, and financial resources.

The same economic, physical, and spiritual factors which kept Pennsylvania in the forefront since the days of the Revolution and which helped to decide the outcome of victory in this global war are still available for future use.

In the industrial period which is ahead of us it is my hope to see Pennsylvania continue to be the principal assembly line of the world.

Pennsylvania has everything.

We know that Congress has the most difficult job in all its history. We know you will meet the challenge. We are with you.

To you I pledge my full aid and cooperation.

If I Were a Labor Leader Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "If I Were a Labor Leader Again," written by William S. Jack, president of Jack & Heintz, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

This article is based on sound reasoning and experience with the human family. Mr. William S. Jack is qualified to speak on this subject because he has been a worker, a labor leader, and an employer. Apparently in all fields he was successful because he had a good understanding of human relationship and human reactions.

Very frequently in life there is only a little difference between getting along and not getting along together, and if that little difference is solved at the right time, then we get along together.

I believe this article is worth reading by every Member of Congress, and all citizens who peruse the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF I WERE A LABOR LEADER AGAIN

(By William S. (Bill) Jack)

"What would I do if I were a labor leader again?" This question is asked of me because years ago, in 1915, I was a union labor leader. In fact, in that year I became the business agent of District Lodge No. 54 of the International Association of Machinists. In that capacity, I fought for the rights of my constituents. Yes, I made my mistakes, but they came from the head and not from the heart, and, if I were a labor leader again, there is no doubt in my mind but what I would be able to profit from these mistakes, as would my constituents and the employers as well. I don't believe that I would have to deviate from my points of principle, because they were then, as now, based on the simple formula of humanism. Industrial relations, to be properly handled, must always be done on a humanitarian basis.

As far back as 1914, I wrote articles on labor and management. Naturally, these articles covered my opinion on strikes, wages, compensation, labor's obligation to management, and management's obligation to labor. Therefore, these articles did not slight efficiency methods and production. That was 31 years ago and the ideas that I then promulgated are now in operation in our plants. It is not boasting when I say that ideas based on humanism have played no small part in promoting industrial peace and greater productivity. Large incomes for our associates (employees) and greater profits have been the reward of this policy. You will notice that "associates" is designedly used. We feel that every person connected with our business is an important and integral part of it, that we are associated together for the purpose of mutual advantage. We are in business together to produce profitably.

Back in 1917, three other members of the machinists' union and I founded a business with a total capital of $5,100. After that, the Accurate Machine Co. was born, then the Marquette Metal Products and the Pump Engineering Service Corp., known as "Pesco." All of these companies through the years have been operated on the basis of humanism. The year of 1939 gave birth to the Jack & Heintz Co., of which I am the president and general manager. Today, this company is known throughout the world as "Jahco." The obligations of this company necessitated disposing of my holdings in the other companies, and from that day on my entire interest has been for Jahco associates.

It has always been my determination to practice what I preach, and this preaching has come by means of actual experience, because I, too, have been a worker, a labor leader, and now a businessman. I am not trying to paint a picture of myself as a character of the Horatio J. Alger series, but facts are facts. At the age of 6, I sold newspapers on the Public Square of Cleveland, Ohio, the town of my birth and rearing. I did this, not because I cherished the idea of standing in the hot sun, in the snow, and in the rain, but because those pennies earned played no small part in putting bread upon the table of my humble home. I know what it is to be down, hungry, to wonder when the landlord would threaten eviction. At the mature age of 14, I started as an apprentice tool and die maker. That was back in 1912.

After 10 years' experience in shops as a worker, and 5 years of this as a labor leader, I now look back upon 28 years' experience in business, and, believe me, these 28 years have taught me plenty. And, that is, no matter what part we play in this industrial structure, whether we be the most humble worker, the mightiest employer, or the most powerful labor leader, we are, in the final analysis, just partners in industry. We labor in a common cause. We all have a definite responsibility, and to each other. Again I say my fundamental principles have not changed, and never will. I still maintain the same objectives, which are covered by the following credo:

1. Labor and management are: Associates in progress through cooperation.
2. Practice the Golden Rule.
3. In all dealings, sincerity of purpose must be demonstrated by actions—not words.

It is considered unfair to answer one question by asking another. However, I will risk it in this case by asking: "Can you change the leopard's spots?" The obvious answer is: "No." Neither can you change a man's deep-rooted and sincere convictions. My record as business agent of District Lodge No. 54 of the International Association of Machinists is an open book, and, therefore, public knowledge. The method of operation at Jack & Heintz is also an open book. Every moral principle advocated by myself as a union leader has been put into practice in the operation of the Jack & Heintz plants.

Today, as always, my greatest ambition is to see the workingman as a human and not a machine. Humanism in industry will always be my theme, as an employer of thousands of people, or as a labor leader; humanism to all associates, and, to my mind, associates are the workers, their employers, the labor leaders, and the general public.

No, I have not changed my theme song, in fact, I am singing it louder than ever. The motto, or if you please, the slogan, of the Jack & Heintz Co. is: "All for one and one for all." There is no better nor more efficient way to operate, because in the final analysis, another slogan could well be applied: "The injury of one is the concern of all." Thousands of industrialists throughout the country have come to see the Jahco system at work, and have practically without exception exclaimed: "Marvelous," "Good," "Excellent," "Unbelievable." And what is this system? Just one founded on the principles of that grand old axiom, not of my origination, oh no, it was here before I was ever born, available to all who wished to use it: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

The past 4 years have afforded great experience and ample opportunity to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Golden Rule in industry is practicable. To my readers, and especially the employers, I may add it pays larger dividends spiritually and financially. The record of productivity at Jack & Heintz is conclusive. Our war effort has been recognized by the Government, by industry, and most important of all, by the men in the service, by the men who actually used Jahco products to rout the enemy and to protect their own lives. This is not an idle boast. It is a matter of record, and one of which to be proud. With the practice of the golden rule, we have been able to live up to contracts, deliver goods at the right time and at the right price with a vast saving to the Government, or, if you prefer, to the taxpayer.

All of the philosophy that I have expounded so far has had for its main objective to portray to you a three-way mind,

that of a worker, a labor leader, and an employer. My position as such is rather unique, and, in that it is, I am trying to take full advantage of the situation.

If I were a labor leader again, I would still stick to the principles of the Golden Rule, and I would not make demands as a labor leader that I would not grant as an employer. I would at all times hold as sacred the interests of my constituency and I would govern my operations accordingly, realizing that all business must be operated in line with good business acumen, operated on the basis of give and take. I would not try to take everything away from the employer, as I always have looked upon him as a partner, and, as such, would be cooperative. As to my members, it would be my objective to keep them employed, realizing that, when they too operate profitably, I as their leader would be worthy of my hire as such. And, as their leader again, I would, as in the past, impress on the minds of my followers that we must all give as well as take. As a present day labor leader, I would consider it my duty to determine the capabilities of the employer to meet present day demands. No, I would not demand concessions that would put my partner out of business, but, if I knew that he could grant them safely, I'd fight to the last ditch for my constituency.

I would try every legitimate means to affiliate every worker within the calling into my organization. I would sell him the merits of unionism, but I'd never force him to join. I'd place unionism in a posiition that it would be considered an honor to be a member of my organization, and I don't believe there'd be any shortage of membership. As their leader, I would always bear in mind that to lead you must have a following, and, toward that objective, it would be my endeavor to attain and maintain the respect of my constituency. Yes, and the respect of the employer as well, bearing in mind that the greatest promoter of respect is responsibility.

As a labor leader, a contract would be a sacred document, lived up to and to the letter by the parties affected, and, if any employer infringed upon the rights governed by the contract, I would leave no stone unturned to rectify the conditions, and by this same token, I would demand that my constituency lived up to the last letter of the contract.

There isn't anything mysterious going on when a company such as Jack & Heintz operates harmoniously. The credit can be attributed in a large portion to the circumstances surrounding our company. It has been my good fortune to have been a worker, a labor leader, and an employer, thus being afforded the opportunity to study industrial questions from many angles. I believe that if all employers were to make it their business to make a study of the trials and tribulations of the worker, they would be making a tremendous forward step to a better understanding, because they too would learn that workers, are, in the final analysis, just human beings. Then, on the other hand, labor leaders would do well to make a study of the trials and tribulations of the employers, because that is exactly what I would do if I were a labor leader again.

Reorganization of the Intelligence Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by me on Saturday last relative to President Truman's plans for a reorganization of the Nation's Intelligence Service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President is to be congratulated for taking prompt action with regard to our future Intelligence Service.

However, as to the nature of that action, the President has gone off on a tangent.

He has transferred some of the Office of Strategic Services' major activities to the State Department, other activities to the War Department, and has abolished the remainder.

Thus, the President has, in effect, further departmentalized our Intelligence instead of unifying it. He has ignored the need for a central, super authority which should have ample power to coordinate all the scattered intelligence work performed by the various departments and agencies—Commerce, War, Navy, etc.

We may, unfortunately, anticipate more interdepartmental duplication, confusion, rivalry, and lack of planning such as has characterized our intelligence work in the past.

The existence of these conditions in our country is intolerable in the atomic age and the President's action has merely aggravated them.

Moreover, by tying our major intelligence work to the striped-pants diplomacy of our State Department, the President has critically weakened it.

What we need now, in my humble opinion, are as follows:

1. A new unified International Intelligence Service which would report directly to the President and which would give him a cohesive picture of all developments abroad affecting our defense.

2. This service must have its own agents to gather open and secret information abroad, its own counterintelligence, and its own expert researchers who would correlate all the fragments of information reported by its own and other departments' agents.

3. This service must have no domestic police operations. It must not perform in any way tending to make it a Gestapo.

4. This service must be headed by the kind of man as J. Edgar Hoover. Of course, if Mr. Hoover were to take this position, he would have to sever his connection with the FBI in order that there would be no possible question of a police tie-up.

The Polish Catastrophe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Polish Catastrophe," published in the September 1945 issue of the magazine called The Nineteenth Century and After. The article is by F. A. Voigt, an outstanding article presenting a clear-cut picture of the Polish issue, which is of so much interest to this country and to the world.

I have ascertained from the Printing Office that the cost of printing the article will be $138.80.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLISH CATASTROPHE

It is convenient to forget the fate of Poland, or, whenever the inconvenient reality challenges forgetfulness, to conclude, by a process of deception and self-deception, that the fate of Poland is not what it is, and that the consequences will not be what they will be. What for more than 200 years has been known as the Polish question remains unsolved. But the tearful forebodings of Maria Theresa and the grave admonishments of Edmund Burke and Sheridan retain all their force and, until the Polish question has been solved, neither the German question nor the larger European question will have been solved.

The mere catalog of pledges, of promises, assurances, guaranties, pacts, treaties, and charters, that commit Great Britain politically, morally, and juridically to the restoration of Polish independence, would fill many pages. There has not been a debate in the House of Lords or Commons, with Poland for its subject (and there have been many such debates), in which one or the other of these pledges has not been repeated and reaffirmed, from the time when the Anglo-Polish pact of mutual assistance was signed, on August 25, 1939, until the meeting of the Big Three at Potsdam, where these pledges have found their burial place.

It has been asserted, and is widely believed, that although Poland has lost her eastern territories, to which, so we are falsely told, she had no right, she has received compensation at the expense of the common foe, so that what has been achieved on her behalf and in fulfillment of so many pledges, may not be altogether what the Poles desire, may not be entirely what Great Britain intended when she went to war for Poland, but is on the whole (and considering the difficulties and the changed circumstances), a solution of the Polish problem, a solution which, if it does not satisfy the Poles, ought to satisfy them; which does, broadly speaking, honor the pledges given by Great Britain and her allies, and is, taking it all in all, the fulfillment of one of her principal declared war aims, the restoration of Polish independence.

But the truth is that these pledges have not been honored, either severally or all in all, and that the declared war aim has not been achieved, for the extinction of Polish independence is complete.

It is not our purpose here to recapitulate all the pledges,[1] but to remark on the one which is the most important, after the guaranty which was honored when Great Britain went to war with Germany, although its significance is unknown, or hardly known, to the public.

We refer to the secret protocol which was first disclosed by Mr. Petherick in the House of Commons on February 28, 1945. It is appended to the Anglo-Polish pact of mutual assistance and is described in the pact itself as an integral part thereof.

Under paragraphs 1 and 2, article 6, of the pact, Great Britain and Poland agreed to inform each other about new undertakings of assistance against aggression which they have already given or may give to other states. Under paragraph 3 of the same article, they agree that any new undertaking by either party shall neither limit their obligations under the pact, nor indirectly create new obligations between the contracting party not

[1] For the principal pledges made from August 1939 until January 1945 v. the Nineteenth Century and After, June 1943, February 1944, February 1945.

participating in these undertakings and the third state concerned.

The agreement between Great Britain, the United States, and Russia, which was adumbrated at Teheran, confirmed at Yalta, and formally integrated in the European order at Potsdam, with regard to the status and the frontiers of Poland, is not compatible with this last paragraph insofar as it indirectly created new obligations between Poland, who did not participate, and Russia, the third state concerned.

In article 1 of the secret protocol, Great Britain and Poland declare—what is not stated in the published text of the pact (the text, that is to say, minus the protocol)—that aggression, not by Russia, but by Germany alone, will be regarded as a casus belli. Article 3 of the protocol, however, lays down in clear, even if clumsy, language that undertakings of the kind referred to in article 6 of the pact must be so framed that this execution should at no time prejudice either the sovereignty or territorial inviolability of the other contracting party, that is to say, of Poland or of Great Britain.

At Yalta, Great Britain not only agreed to the miscalled Curzon line (which she had herself proposed) as the eastern frontier of Poland, but also to the Lublin committee as the basis for the future Government of Poland, but also to the Lublin committee diced the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Poland. It, therefore, violated the fundamental treaty between Great Britain and Poland, the pact of mutual assistance.

The "settlement" negotiated between Great Britain, the United States, and Russia, and imposed upon Poland by force, is illegal. The new frontiers of Poland are illegal, the new Polish Government is illegal, and all the decrees and laws enacted by that "Government," and all its agreements and treaties with other powers are illegal.

The Polish Republic, within the frontiers as they were in August 1939 (the district of Teschen excepted), its President, Raczkiewicz, its Government in London, with its Prime Minister, Arciszewski, its Ambassador, Count Raczynski, and its other ambassadors, ministers, and consuls abroad—these, and these alone, are legal. The "Government" established in Warsaw, with M. Osobka Morawski as Premier, is a "government" of usurpers. It would be swept out of existence overnight if it were not sustained by the irresistible power which Russia is able to exercise in association with Great Britain and the United States. Its representatives abroad no more represent the lawful Polish State and the Polish Nation than the representatives of Vidkun Quisling would have represented the lawful Norwegian State and the Norwegian Nation if any such had been dispatched to take over the Norwegian legations and consulates throughout the world. The new Polish Government is seizing the assets—the investments, the shipping, and so on—which are the lawful property of the Polish State and the Polish Nation abroad. This seizure is surely illegal.

The dark and lamentable thing that has been done to Poland with the connivance of Great Britain, amid the untarnished glory of British arms, appears the darker and the more lamentable by contrast with the transparently honorable attitude of Great Britain, not only toward Poland but toward eastern Europe as a whole, during the year 1939.

Great Britain was, in that year, unable to negotiate an alliance with Russia, because the price demanded was a price she had no right to pay—namely connivance in the partition, not only of Poland, but of all eastern Europe, between Russia and Germany. Speaking in the House of Lords on December 5, 1939, Lord Halifax said:

"Earlier in the year [i. e., 1939] we tried to improve our relations with Russia, but always maintained the position that rights of third parties must remain intact and unaffected by our negotiations. I think that events have shown that the judgment and instinct of the British Government in refusing agreement with the Soviet Government in the terms of formulas covering cases of indirect aggression in the Baltic States were right, for it is now claimed that these formulas might well have been the cloak of ulterior designs, and I have little doubt that the people of this country would prefer to face difficulties and embarrassments rather than feel that we had compromised the honor of this country and of the Commonwealth."

The ethics and the policy that inspired Lord Halifax's declaration are those that inspired the Pact of Mutual Assistance and the Secret Protocol—indeed, the very language reveals the same underlying conception. Russia planned the seizure of the Baltic States in disregard of international treaties, both specific and general, ostensibly because they might be used as a base for German "indirect aggression" (as it was termed) against herself. But the truth—as events were soon to show—was that she planned and executed the seizure by arrangement with Germany. It was by arrangement with Germany that she carried out the partition of Poland in 1939 (and later on, of Rumania)—to be deprived of her share by Germany in 1941, to renounce that share by treaty with Great Britain and Poland in the same year, only to reassert her claim with a political craftsmanship and an inflexible resolution which, in the end, forced Mr. Churchill, President Roosevelt, and then President Truman to recognize those conquests which Stalin had, in 1939 and 1940, made by arrangement with Hitler.

The attitude of Great Britain in 1939 was as realistic as it was honorable. Had the alliance been concluded on Russia's terms, the only terms possible, namely the partition of eastern Europe—and perhaps of even more—Germany would have become master of Europe—and more—without an armed effort.

The decisive "No" to German aggression could not have come from Poland, for Poland would not have existed. Nor could it have come from Great Britain, still less from wavering France, for they would have forfeited the occasion and, therefore, the possibility of going to war. There are some today who have deep misgivings and doubt, by no means lightly or irresponsibly, whether it was not a terrible mistake on the part of Great Britain to have concluded the alliance with Poland and to have gone to war at all. We are convinced that they are themselves mistaken. The alternative would have been the peaceful conquest of the whole European mainland by the Germans. The end would have been the dissolution of the British and Russian empires.

It was because Poland—together with Great Britain—said "No" to Germany and, together with Great Britain, said "No" to Russia in 1939, that war came, and did not come too late. And, because it did not come too late, it was victorious. The British and the Russian Empires survive—and the American Empire will have removed a deadly menace to its own greatness and security—because Poland said "No".

After the war had begun, Russia tried to restore a situation which, had it endured, would have been her own undoing, for without the aid of Great Britain and the United States, she could not have withstood the power of Germany—it is even conceivable that she would have capitulated "peacefully" to that power.

Nevertheless, her principal purpose after the outbreak of war was to persist in her great error—an error which was, fortunately, overwhelmed by Germany's even greater error in 1941 and redeemed, to the salvation of all by her own valor, sacrifice, and resolution.

She strove not only for the closest possible association with Germany but for the augmented power of Germany as a necessity for the "peace of Europe." And "peace" it would have been, no doubt, for a while at least. But it would have been a Pax Germanica extending from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The Russian policy, in those days, was disclosed by M. Molotov in three speeches as the following quotations will show, plainly enough. We give them without comment, for they need none:

Speech on August 31, 1939: [2]

"The conclusion of a pact of nonaggression between the U. S. S. R. and Germany is of tremendous positive value, eliminating the danger of war between Germany and the Soviet Union" (p. 11).

"People ask, with an air of innocence, how could the Soviet Union consent to improve its political relations with a State of Fascist type? * * * It is not a question of our attitude toward the internal regime of another country but of foreign relations between two states" (p. 17).

"The fact that our [i. e. Germany's and Russia's] outlooks and political systems differ must not and cannot be an obstacle to the establishment of good political relations" (p. 19).

Speech on October 31, 1939:

"Today * * * Germany is in the position of a state which is striving for the earliest termination of war and for peace, while Britain and France, which but yesterday were declaiming against aggression, are in favor of continuing the war and are opposed to the conclusion of peace" (p. 28).

"The British and with them their French supporters of the war have declared something in the nature of an 'ideological' war on Germany, reminiscent of the religious wars of olden times. * * * Is it back to the Middle Ages, to the days of religious wars, superstition, and cultural deterioration that the ruling classes of Britain and France want to drag us? * * * an ideology cannot be destroyed by force * * * it cannot be eliminated by war. It is, therefore, not only senseless but criminal to wage such a war as a war for the 'destruction of Hitlerism' camouflaged as a fight for 'democracy'" (p. 29).

"It is fear of losing world supremacy that dictates to the ruling circles of Great Britain and France a policy of fomenting war with Germany * * * the imperialistic character of this war is obvious to anyone who wants to face realities and does not close his eyes to facts. One can see from all this who is interested in this war that is being waged for world supremacy. Certainly not the working class" (p. 30).

"Here (i. e., in Russia) development has proceeded along the line of strengthening our friendly relations, extending our practical cooperation and rendering Germany political support in her efforts for peace" (p. 31).

"We have always held that a strong Germany is an indispensable condition for durable peace in Europe. It would be ridiculous to think that Germany could be 'simply put out of commission.' * * * The powers which cherish this foolish and dangerous dream ignore the deplorable experience of Versailles" (p. 32).

"Today our relations with the German State are based on friendly relations, and on our readiness to support Germany's efforts for peace" (p. 33).

Speech on August 1, 1940:

"Particularly the British and Anglophile press has been frequently speculating on the possibility of disagreements between the Soviet Union and Germany. * * * These attempts have been expressed more than once by ourselves as well as by Germany and

[2] These speeches were collected in a volume published by Laurence and Wishart in 1941, under the title "Soviet Peace Policy," with an introduction by D. N. Pritt. The pages indicated are the pages in that volume.

have been swept aside as worthless. We can only reiterate that in our opinion the good neighborly and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Germany are not based on fortuitous considerations of a transient nature, but on the fundamental interests of both the USSR and Germany" (p. 73).

Although the British Communists, then, as always, supported Russian policy and were in open opposition to the imperialistic war, and although even amongst prominent British politicians and publicists there were some who, although they had little sympathy with communism, were in favor of a negotiated peace, the nation and its chosen leaders, with insight, high principle, and unswerving determination continued the war through error, defeat, and the proximity of utter calamity, until the armed might of Germany was broken. They were lavish and sincere in their pledges to Poland. The chivalrous spirit of the Prime Minister, above all, was caught up by the great deeds accomplished by the Poles on land, on the sea, and in the air, and by the fearful sacrifices of the Polish Nation to whom his country owed so much (as none knew better than he).

Lord Halifax, in his speech on the 1st of August 1940, went back, in imagination, to the eighteenth century, so as to point the contrast between English honor and Prussian perfidy. Then, as in 1939, he said, quoting Macaulay, "England was true to her engagements." And, in Macaulay's words, he condemned the selfish rapacity of Frederick the Great.

It was Frederick who, by arrangement with Catherine of Russia (with Maria Therese as a reluctant, apprehensive third), consummated his own rapacity by the extinction of Polish independence.

Both Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden are men of honor, neither is a cynic as Frederick the Great was a cynic, both are wholly free from the rapacity which Frederick shared with Catherine. Both have endeavored in all sincerity to save Polish independence. Both have failed.

They were from the beginning outmaneuvered by Stalin, who has much more in common with Frederick and Catherine than they have. By their endeavor to save one half of Poland by sacrificing the other half, they lost the whole. Stalin chose his own ground and on that ground he fought. It is evident that Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden inadequately grasped the Russian thesis and did not grasp the Polish thesis at all. It is evident that they were ill-advised and ill-briefed. They and Stalin used the same words but with different meanings. And it was Stalin's meaning that invariably prevailed. They and Stalin were often in agreement as to the form. But they did not see the content which the form concealed from them, though not from Stalin. Just as words were made to mean what Stalin meant, so the content, revealed little by little as the husk dropped off, was the content which Stalin, not they, had willed. Their public statements, especially those made in the House of Commons, on the subject of Poland abound in historical inaccuracies and are lacking in any deeper insight into eastern European history and the eastern European situation. It is true that if we examine Russian public pronouncements on the same subject, we shall find many errors and much misrepresentation. But all these errors and misrepresentations had a purpose—they served a policy and helped that policy to triumph.

Unlike Stalin, Mr. Eden and Mr. Churchill were deceived by their own propaganda. They never had the corrective of an enlightened public opinion at home, because British public opinion was never enlightened by the conformist British press. What the daily newspapers imparted with regard to Poland—and not only with regard to Poland—was not enlightenment, but propaganda.

Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden treated irrelevancies like the Curzon line as relevant. What Stalin wanted, in the first place, was the line he had negotiated with Hitler—the so-called Ribbentrop-Molotov line. He got it, simply by calling it, or, rather, by allowing Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, and the press and wireless to call it, the Curzon line. Had the Curzon line, as originally proposed in 1919, been readopted, the Polish title to the territory east of that line would not be prejudiced. The allegiance of that territory would be decided at a future Peace Conference, and there can be no doubt at all that if fair dealing and legality prevailed, the Polish Republic would be reconfirmed in the possession of her territories as far as the line negotiated to the satisfaction of both parties at Riga in 1921, and accepted without the slightest demur by all the other Powers—a line that represented a fair compromise after an inconclusive war, a line that strikes a just balance between the frontiers drawn in successive partitions, a line corresponding with the wishes of the peoples concerned and with economic, political, and juridical realities.

Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden accepted the principle of compensation. By doing so they lent a spuriously legal and moral sanction to the loss of eastern Poland without saving western Poland. Worse than this, they inflicted upon Poland, under the appearance of an award, a terrible penalty, for the cession of German territories vaster than any claimed by the Polish nation or by the lawful Polish Government must perpetuate and exacerbate to an unprecedented degree the age-long strife between Pole and German.

So far from being solved, the Polish problem has been made more intractable and more perilous than ever. Germany will never accept the loss of her eastern territories. But if provides her with a demand upon Poland which Russia—not Poland—can grant when the time comes to establish a modus vivendi between Germany and Russia. It provides Russia with a powerful means of achieving an association with Germany and of preventing any association between Germany and western Europe, indeed of sustaining permanent German hostility to the west. The principal claim which Germany will make, and must make, some day—the claim to her eastern territories—cannot be met by the Western Powers, cannot be met by Poland, but can be met, with one stroke of the pen, by Russia alone.

However the Polish situation may change, the gainer will be Germany. Russia will not be the loser. Only Poland will be the loser.

Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden were sincere, beyond a doubt, in wishing for a strong, democratic, and independent Poland. So were—and are—the people of England. So was Stalin, but what he means by a strong, democratic, and independent Poland is a Poland strong as part of the Russian Empire, democratic as that Empire is democratic, and independent of Europe. And he has had his way, because he has made words mean what he wants them to mean.

The Poland of today is, according to the European meaning of words, which is also the Polish meaning, not only weak, but impotent; not only undemocratically, but tyrannically governed; not only dependent, but a vassal. It makes no difference if there are a few democrats, even genuine democrats, or a few Poles, like M. Mikolajczyk or Professor Grabski, from London in the Government at Warsaw. That Government remains the instrument of the Kremlin. It could not resist, or even deviate, even if it wished to, for the coercive powers of the modern state, especially of the Russian state, are irresistible. Irresistible coercion is exercised not only from without and about, but also from within and from below, as it were. The Government is but a faithful transmitter and matters little compared with the municipal and rural councils, the judges and the juries, the management of the banks, the factories, of transport, of the cooperatives, of electric power, of the trade-unions and of the political parties, indeed, of all organized life, including books, newspapers, and the wireless. It makes no difference whether elections are held or not, for if held, they will be organized in advance by the real administratives of the country; that is to say, in a last analysis, by the instruments of Russian rule. These elections, if held at all, will serve but one purpose—to convince those who are still somewhat hard of belief that they are mistaken, that the Polish people want what Stalin, and not Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, or Mr. Truman, mean by a strong, democratic, and independent Poland.

But if words still have a true meaning, then Poland has lost her national independence, and the Poles have lost their individual liberties to an extent that would have been inconceivable under the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns or even under the Tsars. What was done by Frederick, Catherine, and Maria Theresa has been far outdone by Mr. Churchill, Mr. Truman, and Marshal Stalin in Frederick's own city, Potsdam, and in his own palace, Sans Souci.

The independence lost is the more unendurable when it wears the outward aspect of independence regained. The Polish catastrophe is the more catastrophic because it is misunderstood by the outside world, which is but too willing to misunderstand. It is a catastrophe endured in isolation. The misunderstanding deepens and widens the abyss that separates Poland from Europe and severs her the more hopelessly from the Christian and Graeco-Roman heritage which was always hers in common with Europe, even under the czars.

The catastrophe is the more catastrophic by reason of the fearful sacrifice that has been made in vain, of the terrible wrongs endured not only at the hands of the common foe but of the ostensible friend—the deportation of a million Polish men, women, and children to the Russian Empire, where hundreds of thousands are still eating out their hearts with nostalgia for their lost native land and are being killed off by hard labor, disease, and exposure to a rigorous and unaccustomed climate in regions as far afield as Komi and Kamchatka; the inhuman suppression of the home army, elite of the Polish Nation, by the ostensible liberator, after a heroic and sanguinary struggle in the common cause; the public arrests and deportations; the annihilation of high, though not unreasonable, hopes in the pledges and promises broken by the one-time friend and ally, Great Britain; and, most grievous of all, the partition, carried out by Russia with the connivance of Great Britain and the United States, which has made one-half of Poland part of the Russian Empire and the other half the helpless vassal of that same empire.

But the Polish catastrophe is not Polish only. It is the vortex of a much bigger catastrophe that has engulfed more than a hundred million Europeans from the Arctic to the Grecian border.

Amid the resplendent victories achieved by British arms, it stands out as a dark and terrible political defeat. Amid the uncertainties of our day, one thing is as sure as anything can be in politics—that what was done at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam cannot last, that the catastrophe is so deep and wide that it cannot be patched up or passed over, and that Great Britain will, some day, have to grapple with the consequences in defense of her national and imperial security, of her own future, and of Europe's future which, as she will find, is inseparable from her own.

F. A. VOIGT.

Report From Iwo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine poem by Victor Heyden, boatswain's mate first class, United States Coast Guard Reserve, which was written shortly after D-day at Iwo Jima while the author was on duty aboard a Coast Guard-manned LST. Mr. Heyden has been in the Coast Guard since July 15, 1942.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM IWO

There is no way to speak of those great
Who lay before the ridge in cross-fire
Of mortar and of mountain gun.
The terraced slopes in every yard,
All previously marked and ranged
And mined, felt flame.

No chosen vocables enumerate the courage
Of those dead; there can no anguish match
The weeping and the cursing of the maimed.
No requiem is adequate for even one marine.
"Casualties moderate," so ran the first communique.

When they came in the long, black beach received them,
Not all at once, in waves,
That broke and rolled upon the pounded
Sand. They took it, and moved up.

More terrible than Tarawa the metal rain;
More bitter than the salted Carthaginian plain
The redder stain soaking still the red hill.
On the fifth day the flag went up on Hot Rock's top.

The heart and flesh of each marine may deliquesce;
That other part which does illume the heart,
Glorious with agony and pride,
Shall freight the warring unchaste wind
And unforgotten soar and ride.

—*Victor Heyden.*

Remarks of J. Howard Pew at Picnics of Sun Oil Employees' Athletic Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from the remarks made by J. Howard Pew, president of the Sun Oil Co., at the picnics of the Sun Oil Employees' Athletic Associations at Marcus Hook on August 12 and August 19, 1945.

The remarks show what I have always known to be a fact, namely, that successful results in the conduct of any industry or business are, to a substantial extent, dependent upon sound human relations in that business.

I have great faith in the human family of working people, and if they understand the objectives of any company, and feel that the company wishes to be as fair to them as it expects them to be to the company, then most of the working men and women of this country will be found to be cooperative in creating such a reciprocal relationship.

Mr. Pew's remarks about the employees of the Sun Oil Co. are evidence of sound thinking in connection with this great problem that faces the world, namely, proper human relations in all walks of life.

I urge all Members of Congress to read the excerpts to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No refinery in this country has done such a magnificent war job as that which has been accomplished right here at Marcus Hook, and this would not have been possible without the best of teamwork. What I particularly like about your teamwork is the way you solve all of your problems among yourselves, and then to the outside world you speak as one voice. There is a story about this which has always appealed to me.

Now, I want to talk with you a little about the postwar period. We must do a better job then than ever before. That means that sound principles must govern our every action. Let me read to you the seven principles which I regard as of the greatest importance.

The first of these is sound human relations. This means that everyone in the company is a human being and should be treated as such. Fairness and justice for all must be our motto. Each should be adequately rewarded for his or her services. Sun's policy always has been to pay maximum wages, consistent with sound protection of the financial and general security of the company. The reason so many businesses fail is largely because they do not have proper human relations. Without proper human relations there does not exist the spirit and will to produce. It is only the companies that produce the most goods per worker that eventually succeed. The oil industry, like many others, is a highly competitive one, and if our company is to live and prosper we must all realize that production is the key to success.

The second of these principles is public service. This means that our first objective in all we do should be to make a useful contribution to the general welfare in raising the standard of living and in making our country a better place in which to live. It means that, both as individuals and as a company, we must be good citizens, doing our part in worthy undertakings in the communities where we live and where we operate. It means that we must live by the Golden Rule—by doing unto others that which we would have others do unto us. It means we must give an accounting to the public from time to time. The American people will permit private corporations to exist only so long as they can make a good accounting of their stewardship.

Third. Good customer relations: We can best serve the public by supplying good products, fairly priced, and delivered where and when they are wanted. This is the surest way to obtain public approval and to win the good will of our customers. Thus we must strive for efficiency in all that we do, pulling together as a team, in order to make the best possible products at the lowest possible cost. As long as we do that, we shall all have work to do.

Fourth. Modern equipment: This means the maintenance of adequate and up-to-date plants, buildings, and tools. This enables all of us to achieve the highest efficiency and makes possible the payment of higher wages, while at the same time we manufacture products at a cost which will enable them to be sold at prices which the public is both willing and able to pay. We should do everything possible to make these plants and tools produce the maximum output of which they are capable. If we do not have the most modern plants and tools, or if they are not operated at their maximum capacity, then our wages and salaries, as measured by our standard of living, will have to be reduced, or at best remain stationary. For every industrial worker in the oil industry, there is an investment of $15,000. Just think of it—for every man and woman employed in any capacity in the oil industry there is an investment in plants and tools of $15,000.

Fifth. Research: This means a constant search for better ways of doing things and for methods of making better products. Research prevents a company from going to seed. It is the sparkplug of all of our efforts to make progress, for through the development of processes for making new and better products we create new and better jobs within our company, provide better products for our customers, and again make possible higher wages for all. This is the policy we have followed so successfully in the past. It is the policy which will assure us a great future as long as we have the money necessary to carry on adequate research programs and to build new plants.

The sixth principle is personal opportunity. This means nobody must be barred, no invention rejected, no idea untried; everyone must have his chance. Hard work, brains, and skill constitute the only badge of aristocracy recognized in our company. Nor does our company, in the great race for a place in the world, desire monopoly or special privilege. We believe there is room for all, the small-business man as well as the large company. We invite competition. We believe it to be the surest method of keeping us alert and assuring that we shall render the greatest service to the public.

Finally, the eleventh principle is financial stability. This means our company must be faithful to its trusteeship. The company is entrusted with the interest of its stockholders, among whom many of you are included, and with the human relations of its workers. Thus the company should never pay out so much money, either in dividends to its stockholders or in wages to its workers, as to weaken its capital structure. This is important to the stockholders; but it is of far greater importance to the workers, because a financially sound company is the best insurance for them that they are going to have jobs.

There we have the whole picture—sound human relations, public service, good customer relations, modern equipment, research, personal opportunity, and financial stability. So we see that when peace comes, the answer as to what happens to us will rest largely in our hands. If at that time we are living in a political and economic atmosphere conducive to individual initiative, and if we exercise that initiative by increasing our efficiency and production—and I refer to everyone of us—then the Sun Oil Co. will be able to keep all of us employed, to pay higher and higher wages, and to offer to the public better and better products at lower and lower prices. So long as we do that, we need not fear our future. A job with a company which pursues these policies is the best insurance which we can have against the vicissitudes of life.

The Unemployment Problem—Debate Between Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, and Leo M. Cherne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a joint debate released on April 16, 1945, between Mr. Leo M. Cherne and myself relative to the full-employment problem.

There being no objection, the joint debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD GOVERNMENT PASS LEGISLATION INSURING FULL EMPLOYMENT?

(As debated by Leo M. Cherne, executive secretary, Research Institute of America, Inc.; author of The Rest of Your Life; and Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin; member, Committee on the Judiciary)

Mr. CHERNE. Yes. No laws are necessary for us to reach a level of high employment after the war. But legislation is needed to stay there. Most economists agree there will be a rebuilding boom after the war. They also agree there will be a period of mass unemployment. The only difference between the optimists and the pessimists is when. Nothing in the automatic nature of our economy will avoid unemployment. Nothing in the automatic nature of our economy will prevent recurring cycles of boom and bust. There is no need to scrap that economy. It has produced too much that is good. We have achieved and retained political liberty under it. But we can lose this in the crisis of another disastrous depression. The full force of private enterprise must not only be permitted, but encouraged to produce as much as it can and provide a maximum of jobs at as high a standard of living as possible. But if ever that proves insufficient, let's realize this war, which has complicated our economy, has also created a responsibility for government to generate the remaining number of necessary jobs. Without prompt legislatively authorized and previously planned action, a temporary slump can too easily become a pyramiding, paralyzing depression. Or have we not yet learned the lesson of our muddling and improvising through the thirties, the lesson multiplied by war and underlined by the conservative, irrefutable Baruch-Hancock report?

Senator WILEY. First, who was it that did the "muddling and improvising" through the mid and late 1930's? Was it not the very same group of Government meddlers and muddlers who may now seek to regiment our economy under the guise of promoting full employment? Second, of course, Government must take up the slack and provide a job buffer in the event of temporary unemployment. But if it does this heavy-handedly as is implied, will it not perpetuate the depression instead of cutting it short? Is this not what happened to our sorrow between 1933 and 1940, leaving 10,500,000 unemployed after 7 years of Government handouts and regimentation?

Mr. CHERNE. The non-New Dealer Baruch insisted several pillars, at least, must be erected if America is to have its adventure with prosperity. The social security laws must be so expanded as to remove the fear of insecurity and prevent temporary joblessness from multiplying into the contagion of depression. We must also, said Baruch, have ready a shelf of useful public works, a reserve of Federal action, to soak up the rivulets of unemployment before erosion causes the flood of jobless disaster. Job conservation comes no more naturally than soil conservation. Peace requires no less thought and action than war. It has taken civilized man centuries to learn these truths. We have another historic opportunity to apply that knowledge.

Senator WILEY. Let's get down to cases: The Murray (full employment) bill promises to insure jobs for all who are willing and able to work. No American should prejudge this new bill with its tempting title. But everyone who desires abundant private pay envelopes and not Government subsistence hand-outs for America should do "a heap of asking" about this bill or any other such bill. The bill's advocates have the burden of proof to justify their radical proposal. They must prove the bill is not just a high-faluting excuse for more ruinous deficit spending; that the bill, with all its "silver platter" guaranties by Government, will not sap the initiative and confidence of private enterprise while paying lip service to the latter's vital role; will not encourage State and local governments to dump their employment problems into the lap of Washington, D. C.; will not give the President more sky-high grants of authority. They must explain whether the elaborate predictions and statistics required for the proposed national budget may not be artfully manipulated and interpreted; whether the bill will not cause more financial backaches, political headaches, and spiritual heartaches than it tries to avoid. Remember that the outlook for America's postwar prosperity is bright in spite of the gloom of some synthetic thinkers. So we'll appreciate some tall explaining on why this bill or any such bill is at all necessary, Mr. Cherne.

Mr. CHERNE. In the year of America's best peacetime income and production—1940—there were 8,500,000 unemployed. Since 1940, we've learned how to turn out the same quantity of goods with one-fifth fewer workers. The business-minded Committee for Economic Development, the conservative Department of Commerce, the nongovernment National Planning Association agree that we shall have at least 11,000,000 unemployed if we return to our best prewar level. There's nothing temporary in these figures. They can't be wished away with the phrase "Government muddlers." The problem of jobs will not be solved without Government action—whether Democrats or Republicans, New Deal or old, are in the saddle.

Senator WILEY. We have examined specific questionable features of a particular full employment bill. We have seen their many dangerous implications. Mr. Cherne has ignored these dangers in his eagerness to whoop up some vague Government cure-all. Full employment, yes. But not through some bureaucratic patent medicine with poisonous ingredients. Rather, one, through flashing a real green light to private enterprise to encourage appropriate expansion in old and countless new fields. (Remember, since 1870, the go-ahead signal enabled free enterprise to produce 15,000,000 new jobs in 15 new industries.) And, two, through having Government assist in practical, economical planning with and for private enterprise rather than against it. That is the American way to prosperity.

Council Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Council Fiasco," published in the Washington Post of September 25, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL FIASCO

Let us ponder one reason for the lack of success of the first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, which, as set up by the Potsdam Conference, has the job of drafting the peace treaties. Secretary Byrnes seems to have taken no policy with him. This we noted on August 9, when the conference opened, in referring to the State Department split on the issue of what to do with the Italian colonies. In this editorial we insisted that the only tolerable solution was an international, not a single, trusteeship, and somewhere in the middle of the discussion the American delegation came around to this solution. The point is that they should have made up their minds before they sailed for Europe.

The lesson is that when Secretary Byrnes comes back no time should be lost in hammering out a security policy toward the whole Mediterranean, for this is the context in which the Italian colonies should be considered. We have seen at London what the Post, reporting from San Francisco, warned would happen when the United States adumbrated a policy which to all intents and purposes was aimed at turning the Pacific into an exclusive American lake. At London these San Francisco chickens came home to roost; that is to say, the Russians, as a quid pro quo, insisted on a voice in the disposition of all the Mediterranean problems, and talked—doubtless for bargaining purposes—about "unilateral trusteeships"—a system of veiled exclusive control which this country advanced at San Francisco for Pacific bases. The Russian case is shocking one British newspaper after another, though why it should do so is beyond our understanding. What the Russian stand would be was plain enough to see in the trusteeship discussions in San Francisco. It was explicitly stated by Stalin at Potsdam. Indeed, in general, there is less uncertainty and less mystery about Russian policy, and has been in the last 3 years, than about the policy of any other great power.

The United States must make up its mind on this vital subject before the Council of Foreign Ministers meets again. Our leave-it-to-us attitude in the Pacific area is thrusting us into a position where we are compelled to choose in the Mediterranean between the competitive British and Russians, as if national stakes were the only things to reconcile, and spheres of influence the only frame of reference. There is no need for such a choice in a world to which we pay lip service as one world. We should be thinking primarily in terms of international solutions. Specifically we should take our stand squarely back of the internationalization of all the Italian colonies and the strong points in the Mediterranean—Gibraltar as well as

Tangier, Pantelleria as well as Trieste. This might be acceptable to the British if they knew whether we intend to be a stayer in Europe and whether we would be an enthusiastic participant in international trusteeships. They don't relish letting Russia sit astride the Mediterranean in part because they fear that the United States would one day be found leaving the British to cope with the Russians.

An international solution should likewise apply to the Pacific. The community of interest which we all have in the maintenance of peace can be expressed only in a community of responsibility for keeping it. The present scramble for sites and bases should be stopped instantly by an acceptance and application of the principle of reciprocity in the use of them. With such a policy fixed, there would be no need for Mr. Byrnes to dodge the reporters, or let the Russians set first the agenda and then the pace, as they did at San Francisco and again at London. He would be able to see the reporters because, like Molotov, he would have something to say. The weakness we continue to show in international conferences is pitiful when it is contrasted with our strength and the yearning of the world that we should assume moral leadership.

Harm Seen in Sterling Pool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the editor of the New York Times:

HARM SEEN IN STERLING POOL—REPRESENTATIVE CELLER FAVORS AID TO BRITAIN WITH SAFEGUARDS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your issue of September 17 Josselyn Hennessy tries to answer my animadversions against the continuance by the British of the sterling area bloc pool. The answer sheds very little light. There is nothing more baneful to international postwar trade in general and American postwar trade in particular than the sterling bloc pool.

India, with a billion and a half dollar credit against the United States, is prevented from using those dollars and buying from us capital and consumer goods which she direfully needs. A dearth of goods has caused dreadful inflation. We can supply those goods for which India has the dollars to buy. Britain cannot at present supply those demands. But she needs time to regear her industry. She says, in effect, "Let India do without."

Your correspondent, Josselyn Hennessy, says: "The sterling bloc is maintained by agreement." That is one for the books. India never consented. India rebelled and still rebels against it. Palestine, which Britain does not own, was not even asked, but despite objections was coerced into the sterling pool. Most of England's dominions, condominiums, protectorates, colonies were given Hobson's choice. Canada alone was big enough to demur.

WAR MEASURE JUSTIFIED

Britain was justified in marshaling dollars and other currencies and directing their spending from London in such a way as to benefit the war effort. But she means to continue the pool indefinitely and thus canalize empire trade as she wills it—to the extreme detriment of our traders.

It is true that the United States does not ultimately lose any of its dollars, but the pool operations create most serious repercussions. Those dollars will ultimately buy our goods, but meanwhile England converts them into pounds and locks them up. Britain, during this "dollar hiatus," foists wherever possible her own goods upon unwilling purchasers in the hope that good will for British goods will spread and reorders will be for British goods to the exclusion of American goods.

Several members of the India Supply Mission were forced to resign by the British Embassy in Washington. They were told they were buying too much of American goods. This mission is now allowed only a mere trickle of dollars out of the sterling pool.

MUTUAL ACTION URGED

By all means help Britain out of her economic embarrassment. But let us do this with as much enlightened self-interest as she displays. Lend her at low rates over a long period. Give her goods. But surely we are entitled to demand at least a gradual breaking down of the dams surrounding the sterling area bloc pool, a dissolution of imperial tariff preferences which discriminate against our exports and safeguards against devaluation of the pound.

We have a right to know what Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, etc., will do to help the mother country. Will they scale down the debts owed them? We will cancel lend-lease. What will they cancel?

Lastly, will Britain embrace the Bretton Woods International Bank and Currency Stabilization Fund? The British sterling area bloc pool in peacetime is utterly inconsistent with the Bretton Woods proposal. It is, in fact, a rival and would encourage similarly a Russian sphere or pool or a French Empire Bank. In self-defense we would have to establish our own American pool.

EMANUEL CELLER.

NEW YORK, *September 19, 1945.*

Buffalo Boy on Nagasaki Atomic Raid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the parents of Corp. Richard F. Cannon, 160 Carmel Road, Buffalo, N. Y., are very proud of their son who they recently learned was a member of the crew of one of the superforts in the squadron that dropped the atomic bomb on Nagasaki. The superfort on which Corporal Cannon was a member carried two distinguished observers from Great Britain, whose scientists played an important role in the development of the atomic bomb. He is a graduate of Bennett High School, Buffalo, N. Y., and was employed by the Curtiss-Wright Corporation and enlisted in the Army Air Forces in August 1943.

Corporal Cannon was a radar observer and was one of the carefully selected members of the crews of the superforts, who were chosen because of their specialized abilities. The parents of Corporal Cannon have a right to be proud of the fact that their son was selected to play a part in the great device that reduced Nagasaki to ashes and helped materially in bringing about the surrender of Japan. The dropping of the first atomic bomb is not only an epic in the history of warfare, it is also the opening of a new phase of scientific discovery that may lead to many new avenues of development of energy useful to mankind instead of destructive. Its use at this time in this war has saved the lives of thousands of our soldiers who would otherwise have been killed if it had been necessary to invade Japan by the usual methods of warfare. Corporal Cannon is a relative of my aunt, Elizabeth McDonough, of Buffalo, N. Y.

Alleged Violation of Veterans' Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including herewith a letter I have written today directed to the Secretary of the Navy, and being with respect to the issuance of orders for the immediate firing of 45 World War veterans who were employed as civil-service employees in the Washington (D. C.) Navy Yard and, who, according to the article, were released while nonveterans were retained on the pay rolls:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 25, 1945.

Hon. JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY FORRESTAL: My attention has been invited to an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald, dated September 25, 1945, by Tyrell Krum, veterans' editor.

In view of the seriousness of the charges which were made, it would be appreciated if you would furnish full details regarding the dismissal of the 45 veterans from the Washington (D. C.) Navy Yard, including answers to the following questions:

1. Were the Veterans' Preference Act and the civil service reduction-in-force regulations followed in connection with the dismissal of the 45 veterans in the Washington (D. C.) Navy Yard?

2. What is the policy of the Navy Department regarding reductions in force?

3. In determining the area of competition, were limitations placed upon the 45 employees who were dismissed so that they were not in competition with all of the other employees at the Washington (D. C.) Navy Yard?

4. As of this date, would you furnish me the following statistics:

a. Number of employees at the Washington (D. C.) Navy Yard holding war-service appointments.

b. Of these in (a), how many are veterans and how many nonveterans?

c. How many employees at the Washington (D.C.) Navy Yard have permanent civil-service status acquired prior to the date upon which war-service appointments originated?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

EDWARD H. REES.

The Dairy Industry Must Show the Value of Its Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the same source that prophesied that Fortune magazine was about to publish an article on oleomargarine in November 1944, now prophesies that the oleo interests are tightening their belt and sharpening their ax for a knock-out blow at the dairy industry. According to information this is to be accomplished through the new tax bill.

It appears that the oleo people are to side-step the Agriculture Committee and present their propaganda to the Ways and Means Committee.

The vegetable-oil interests have had a marked consideration during the war. It is well for the dairy industry during peacetime to be familiar with what is really taking place in the legislative halls of the Nation at this time.

Today I submit the following official letter from Mr. Grover B. Hill, of the Department of Agriculture, in reply to my letter of May 18:

MAY 26, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of May 18 regarding certain experiments that are being conducted for the determination of vitamin A in butter. We have had a project under way for some time in which the Bureau of Dairy Industry, in cooperation with many States (including Wisconsin) is analyzing representative samples of butter in the United States in order to determine the average vitamin A content. The data accruing from this project are now being compiled in their final form. Results of the Wisconsin work have been published and are as follows:

The vitamin A potency of creamery butter produced in Wisconsin

Number of samples and date analyzed or collected	Carotene per gram in butterfat	Vitamin A per gram in butterfat	Potency of butter per pound	
			Not corrected for loss in analysis	Corrected for loss of vitamin A in analysis
	Micrograms	*Micrograms*	*International units*	*International units*
22 samples, March 1942	2.16	5.61	9,568	10,185
65 samples, January 1943	2.97	5.89	10,488	11,141
20 samples, July 1942	7.43	8.96	17,738	18,731
70 samples, September 1942	7.66	9.06	18,032	19,034
Average of winter samples [1]	2.56	5.75	10,028	10,663
Average of summer samples [2]	7.54	9.01	17,885	18,883
Mean for annual output	5.82	7.88	15,167	16,039

[1] Probably about the average potency for butter produced from December to April, inclusive; i. e., 34.6 percent of the State's annual output.
[2] Probably about the average potency for butter produced from May to November, inclusive; i. e., 65.4 percent of the State's annual output.

We shall be glad to send you a copy of the final results of the survey upon its completion.

Sincerely yours,

GROVER B. HILL,
Acting Secretary.

You will note that recent experiments show that butter has an average of from 9,568 to 13,032 international units of vitamin A. The oleo propaganda has it that oleo has as much or more vitamin A than does butter. This is false advertising and false propaganda, as is so clearly and definitely shown in Mr. Hill's letter.

In addition to Mr. Hill's letter I also include a portion of a letter from Dr. Hazel K. Stiebeling, Chief, Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, which shows the vitamin A content of Wisconsin creamery butter:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is to confirm the information given by Miss Merrill, of our staff, by telephone on May 29 in reference to the table on vitamin A potency of creamery butter produced in Wisconsin sent to you by the Secretary's office. On a per-pound basis, the averages given in this table for the vitamin A content of butter and butterfat (assuming a fat content of 81 percent) are:

International units of vitamin A per pound

	Butter	Butterfat
Average of winter samples	10,663	13,164
Average of summer samples	18,883	23,312
Mean for annual output	16,039	19,801

Any time anyone anywhere states that oleo with 9,000 international units of vitamin A injected into it contains as much or more vitamin A than does butter, he is not stating a fact.

Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John Cyprian Stevens, reprinted from Civil Engineering for August 1945, publication of American Society of Civil Engineers:

Some groups, both inside and outside of the Government, seem to believe that the natural laws of economics can be repealed like man-made laws, and one would almost think that they are trying to repeal them. Acting under those natural laws this country has made the nearest approach to Utopia ever recorded in history. In the face of this historic fact it appears somewhat absurd and futile to attempt to substitue an artificial economy controlled by administrative edict and bureaucratic regulations.

THE CAPITALISTIC SYSTEM

This system, founded on the profit motive, has made the United States of America the outstanding Nation of the world. We should not "pussy-foot" that statement but proclaim it boldly as a thing of which we have a right to be proud. That system produced the ships, the tanks, the planes, the munitions, the clothing, the foodstuffs that made it possible to outfit 11,000,000 men and women and completely equip them for combat duty within a period of 4 years—an accomplishment unparalleled in the annals of the world.

Some may contend that the war capital was supplied by the Government. Yes; but whence came the Government funds? The answer is obvious. They came from my earnings and yours and from those of every other taxpayer.

Let us face the facts. Private enterprise and the capitalistic system have, during the past 150 years, built the railroads; cleared the forests; built irrigation systems; cropped the lands mined the coal, iron, and copper; launched ships; produced petroleum; erected the factories and power plants; designed and built automobiles, airplanes, caterpillar machinery; constructed highways; developed explosives, guns, electronics, communication systems; but above all they have produced officers of industry that, with the aid of free labor, knew how to turn their inventive and management genius to the business of winning a war. Patriotism supplanted profits and induced industry to carry on and produce in spite of many grueling regulations promulgated by well-intentioned but inexperienced and overlapping authoritative Federal bureaus. Business has accepted this regimentation as a thing necessary to the war effort but will justly demand a respite when peace again appears on the horizon.

The capitalistic system and free competitive enterprise have made the winning of this war possible. That same capitalistic system, with the stimulus of free competition in cooperation with free labor operating under the natural economic laws of supply and demand, will make it possible to liquidate the unprecedented debt that now hangs, like the sword of Damocles, over this Nation.

Any attempt to continue the artificial manipulation of prices and the harrowing control of management after the war necessity therefor has passed, can only result in inflation with its consequent repudiation of values and its unthinkable social effects. Taxes must be reduced. The present hazards of conducting business efficiently must be eliminated. Surplus earnings must be allowed in some reasonable degree to provide for expansion of industry. Risk capital must foresee reasonable profits or it will not be forthcoming but remain nestled among Government securities. If private enterprise cannot take the helm, the national income will sink to sickening levels and we will again find ourselves in a slough of despond.

REGULATION

Wholesome and intelligent regulation, by law, of business activities to insure that they are carried on in a truly competitive field, will have the continued support of the Nation. Such affairs as the Insull and Foshay debacles must not again be allowed to besmirch the good name of well-conducted enterprise and give ambitious politicians the

ammunition for broadsides against corporations in general, and honestly acquired wealth and competence in particular.

Private enterprise is the only system that can solve unemployment. But to do so it must be permitted a fair field, unshackled by excessive taxes and meddlesome regulations, and stimulated by a stable policy of fair dealing, with only sufficient intelligent control to insure that its operations are truly competitive. Under such conditions small businesses will spring up all over the country; a portion of profits will go back into the businesses; financing by private sources will be the order of the day; expansions will follow; new plants will be built; and unemployment will be reduced to a minimum.

In brief, unhampered private enterprise operating under a constructive labor policy, encouraged by a reasonable scale of rewards to both labor and management, will keep this Nation operating with a high degree of business stability, balance the National Budget, and pay off an unprecedented national debt.

THE ENGINEER HOLDS THE STAGE

The engineer will play a most important role in the revitalization of the world for peacetime pursuits. His is the task of converting industry to produce consumer goods in lieu of war matériel and munitions. He must design the highways and airways, the modern stream-liners of rail and stratosphere, improved radio, television, automobiles and trucks, household appliances, office equipment, air-conditioned housing, modern buildings, industrial instruments, communication systems, bridges, tunnels, and subways. He must not only design, but he must prepare specifications, execute contracts, and supervise construction. He just about occupies the center of the stage all the time.

All these—and yet he is virtually without honor save among his own colleagues; as witness the recent National Council for International Organization at San Francisco. The list of organizations asked to send representatives as consultants occupied several typewritten pages and included labor unions, service clubs, Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant groups, lawyers, guilds, many social and professional organizations, but not one representative of either a national or local engineering society. And why? Because the engineer is not organized into pressure groups. He devotes time to civic service only on special request. He can solve technical problems but is rarely consulted on human problems. Public relations for him are merely word sounds without an urge to action. Politics is almost anathema in his thinking. He appears to prefer being left alone in his own technologic world without fanfare or encomiums.

The engineer does not yet fully realize that his usefulness to humanity would be enormously increased if he would take public relations to himself as a problem to be solved in the same earnestness with which he approaches the solution of a technical problem.

The engineer is no dullard. In cultural matters and accomplishments, he will easily march abreast of those in other vocations. He can and must broaden his social horizon if he hopes to play effectively his part in getting this turbulent world back on an even keel.

He should take an interested part in civic affairs; join service and social clubs, chambers of commerce; serve on committees; learn to speak effectively in public; become interested in people and tolerant of their opinions. He'll soon find himself on important committees, on boards of direction in industry and finance; and his advice and counsel will be solicited on all important matters.

Private enterprise must be manned and managed by men of integrity, of analytical mind, of technical ability, of sound judgment; men who are cooperative with labor and who so conduct their businesses as to hold the support and confidence of the public. To such positions the engineer should aspire.

Such enterprises, so managed, can accomplish the objectives herein set forth of balancing the budget, of maintaining the national income at a high level, and of paying off the most staggering debt that has ever been faced by any country in the world. It is vital that the public and Congress recognize the full import of that potentiality and give private enterprise the opportunity to justify our faith in it.

Critical Need for Lanham Act Funds in Vallejo, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Vallejo, Calif., is one of the most conspicuous war towns in the Nation. Located near it is the great Mare Island Navy Yard, the largest navy yard in the world.

Pursuant to permission granted to me, upon a unanimous-consent request, I am publishing herewith a letter which tells briefly the plight of this city and also of the county of Solano. I hope that many Members will find time to read it.

The letter is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1945.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Members of House Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am addressing this identical memorandum to each of you (having talked this matter over with only Mr. DIRKSEN) concerning the critical situation at Vallejo, Calif., which, I think, requires that the Federal Government spend some money for some time to take care of child-care center, hospital, recreation, police protection, and fire protection projects.

Here, briefly, are the facts as to Vallejo:

According to the official census of 1940, the town had a population of 20,072. At that time the Mare Island Navy Yard had less than one-sixth of the number of employees it has now.

When I visited the yard on August 23, it had slightly over 41,000 employees. It is the biggest navy yard in the world and is largely a repair yard.

The housing projects built to take care of the greatly increased number of workers contains a larger population than the city prior to the time they were built. Most of the projects are outside the corporate limits of the city, on land which formerly was practically bare land—grazing and grain land.

The vast proportion of the workers have come from outside California, many of them women. The wives and widows of men from all branches of the service, stationed in all parts of the world, are employed in the yard. Women have been urged to work and have been recruited as this yard's work has gradually gone upward, it being the largest repair yard that services our battle-damaged Navy craft smaller than battleships. There has been a slight tapering off of the work load of the yard, but it will be busy for a long time repairing vessels from the Pacific. I doubt if the pay roll will fall below 20,000 for several years. The former pay roll (before December 7, 1941) was between 4,000 and 6,000.

As to the child-care centers: The need for these is due entirely to the war effort. Women were brought in to work and urged to work to increase production and to place their children in the child-care centers. This same situation will continue as long as the work load keeps up, as the repairing must be done before the vessels to be repaired deteriorate too much. Also, critical workers, such as nurses and teachers, who are married, have been recruited to handle health and educational problems. Some are women with children. These married women were obtained because single women were unavailable.

Hospital: A large hospital was built by the Federal Government. It handles many emergency cases. It is so large that the city of Vallejo—with its small tax base—simply cannot maintain it. Many of the cases are emergency cases and all of the patients are workers in the yard. Furthermore, the hospital is outside the corporate limits, so there is some doubt whether the city has the legal power to operate such a hospital outside its corporate boundaries.

Recreation: The need for recreation is imperative. With the tremendous migrant population, recreation is essential to prevent a crime wave and wholesale juvenile delinquency. The county has appropriated $51,983 for this, but the amount is not enough to carry on a program of adequate magnitude to handle the situation.

Police protection: Additional deputy sheriffs have been put on, but the cost to the county is prohibitive. The situation in the city of Vallejo is very bad, and additional policemen have been added to the force. All this extra need for police protection has been caused by the activity of the Government in connection with the war effort. The main county jail has been enlarged and a branch jail has been built in Vallejo. All that is being asked is some help in law enforcement, the need for which has been entirely created by the war activities at the yard.

This is one case where all the distortions from the normal life of the city have been caused 100 percent by the war effort. It is a typical case for the application of Lanham Act funds. The distortions will not be corrected until the population at the yard is reduced more than half. This will not occur immediately, as the yard is the largest repair yard on the Pacific coast for Navy vessels smaller than battleships, and these will be repaired for several years. This repair work is directly required because of the war, as all of the vessels now going to the yard are battle-damaged craft.

I trust you can give Vallejo some help in its desperate plight. I understand there are funds available, but the FWA had an informal agreement with the committee that when the war was over no more money would be spent. Certainly the war is not over for Vallejo as long as this big force is repairing battle-damaged vessels with such a large group of workmen and women. When it tapers down some, the city and the county will be able to handle the situation.

I trust you will listen to this plea, which is based on facts within my personal knowledge.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

Shall It Be Military Schools or Public Schools?

REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, why is the military sending out telegrams to State colleges requesting the names of the faculty members who are in the service, the degrees held by them, the places where they received their degrees, and the learned societies of which they are members? The military gives its own reply, which is "in order that they may be properly assigned to the Army's education program."

Has the time come when the military plans to freeze the educated men now in the service to carry out a military program of education?

Those who have denied that the boys are to be held in the Army as the policy of the administration may have a rude awakening as the program unfolds. Must every device that can be conjured up to delay demobilization be used to please a radical element who fear the completion of the returning soldiers?

My mail from overseas from boys who wish to be released to enter college indicates their true American spirit. Unless the citizens of the future, those who have fought and bled for their country, are to be given a chance to finish their education, is it not depriving them of the right which they have earned?

Can they be deprived of this opportunity without gross injustice to them? This is no time for the military to strip our colleges of their teaching force to be used in setting up Army schools throughout the United States in competition with the public-school system and the private schools.

The honest thing to do is to demobilize the men who have served 18 months or more and let them choose their school or colleges. Why weaken our public-school system by keeping former teachers in the military service when these teachers are sorely needed in the educational institutions which they left to serve their country? The war is over, the men have performed a heroic service for their country and a grateful citizenry ought to see that the men get a square deal—not a New Deal.

Demobilization of Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. HAVENNER Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1945, I introduced H. R. 4086, which provides that all general officers in the Regular Army who have been appointed to a temporary higher grade shall revert to their permanent grade not later than 60 days after the bill is enacted into law, and that every retired officer in the Regular Army recalled to active duty after December 7, 1941, and appointed to a higher temporary grade above the grade of colonel, shall be relieved from active duty and revert to the grade previously held by him on the retired list.

I hope that the Military Affairs Committee, to which my bill has been referred, will request the War Department to answer a list of questions which I have prepared, because I believe the information requested will be of value to the committee and to Congress in connection with the whole problem of demobilization of the Army, and particularly in connection with the consideration of my bill. The list of questions follows:

1. How many general officers were there on active duty in the Army on June 1, 1945?
2. How many general officers are there on duty as of this date?
3. What, if any, is the ratio at present of general officers to other grade officers?
4. List the number of general officers per theater, including the United States.
5. How many general officers are on duty in any status, including temporary duty, in the Pentagon Building; the Army Ground Forces?
6. List the number per section, both general and special staff, in the War Department.
7. What plans are in effect for the demobilization of surplus general officers?
8. List the number of Army and corps headquarters in the United States; in each of the theaters.
9. If the number is greater in the ETO than on VE-day, what is the reason for this?
10. What steps, if any, have been taken to deactivate these headquarters?
11. State the number of Army group headquarters in each theater.
12. State the number of independent group headquarters in the United States and elsewhere which no longer have their original units under their command.
13. State the number of field grade officers on active duty; number of colonels, lieutenant colonels, majors; number per theater; number in the United States; in Pentagon Building; in AGF; number per general and Special Staff Section.
14. What is the number of retired officers on active duty as general officers; the number in each theater; in the United States; in the Pentagon Building; in the Army Ground Forces.
15. What plans are in motion to return these officers to inactive status?
16. What is the number of National Guard officers who held the rank of general officer from December 7, 1941, to VJ-day?
17. What is the number of National Guard and Reserve officers now holding rank of general officer?
18. What is the number of general officers contemplated in the postwar military organization, i. e., ratio of general officers to other officers?
19. What is the number of three-, four-, and five-star generals contemplated in the postwar military organization?

From Coal to Kilowatts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Neuberger:

FROM COAL TO KILOWATTS—RAILROAD ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT TERMED NATURAL DEVELOPMENT FOR FAR WEST WITH 11 STATES AFFECTED IF PROGRAM ADOPTED

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

CHAPTER III

In the light of the considerations advanced by Bonneville's technical experts, the railroad electrification project seems as inevitable as the dawn. A gambler would call it a natural. There is sure to be great pressure for it from western Senators, Congressmen, and just plain citizens, now that Japan has surrendered. It will probably have more political and economic support than any other single postwar undertaking in the West, especially because it would affect 11 States rather than 1 particular localized area.

What, then, are the objections to the idea—the idea which Franklin D. Roosevelt and J. D. Ross discussed at Bonneville so long ago?

Traditionally, railroad electrification has required three conditions:

1. High density of traffic.
2. Heavy grades.
3. Twisting right-of-way with sharp curves.

The first condition is the most important. Under normal circumstances, it does not exist in the far west. Deep gorges and narrow passes restrict the transcontinentals to single-track operation in the mountains. The Southern Pacific, with the only route north and south along the Pacific slope, carries more tonnage than any other line on the coast. Yet even in 1943, a record year, the Southern Pacific hauled less than half the carloads of the Chesapeake & Ohio or the Pennsylvania. Under the impact of the Pacific war the Union Pacific is shoving across the Continental Divide 144 percent more cargo than in 1941. The Milwaukee has tripled its previous westward tonnage. But even this is dwarfed by the traffic density of the Pennsylvania, which operates electrically over a New York-Harrisburg-Washington triangle.

Diesels can be purchased engine at a time

A railroad can modernize with Diesel equipment a piece at a time. At the close of a plush year it can buy five Diesel engines and retire a string of steam locomotives to the scrap heap. Electrification allows no such judicious procedure. It must be done at one fell swoop, or not at all. The initial investment is large, often staggering. Nor has an electric locomotive the mobility of its Diesel counterpart. A Diesel is restricted only by the tracks. It may go wherever rails are laid. The electric is limited by two factors—tracks and wires. Once the pantograph cannot touch the trolley line, the biggest electric locomotive is a dead elephant. It cannot swallow a peanut or move a kiddy car.

And what about the equipment now in use? The Union Pacific recently added a fleet of huge "4–8–8–4" locomotives, with 16 drive wheels apiece, for service on heavy mountain grades. Bonneville engineers estimate that it would cost $6,000,000 to string a catenary above the Union Pacific from

Portland to Huntington, and another $5,000,000 for special power facilities. Is the railroad likely to undertake this investment when it already has motive power particularly designed for service in the Columbia gorge and over the Blue Mountains? What would the western lines do with their expensive Diesels and steam locomotives?

For the past 5 years such railways as the Santa Fe, Great Northern, and Denver & Rio Grande have been investing heavily in Diesel equipment. Few railroad men claim that a Diesel can "perform" on the line like an electric locomotive. But the Diesel is self-contained. All it needs is fuel. It is not dependent on an expensive overhead system of trolley wires, substations, and transmission lines.

Railroads changed greatly in past decade

Diesel power has changed the railroads in the past decade. The City of Portland, the Zephyr, and other colorful streamliners roll behind Diesel engines. Once steam locomotives did practically all the switching. As recently as 1935 the railroad companies of the United States purchased 119 steam engines and 8 Diesels for switching purposes. In 1936 it was 79 steams and 45 Diesels. The newcomer was growing up. By 1941 it was 4 steams and 780 Diesels. The railroads found that Diesels were more economical of fuel, required less maintenance, gave off less smoke, and had a high degree of availability.

"In this connection," declares M. P. Taylor, assistant mechanical engineer of the Southern Pacific, "it should be pointed out that the development of the Diesel has in a way advanced the possibility of main-line electrification, as Diesel-electric switching and local freight units can be used, taking overhead power on main line and using Diesel engines in yards and on industrial tracks. This eliminates a lot of expensive wiring over little-used trackage."

Diesel advocates also claim that the proponents of electricity are unfair in their assertions. In discussing the comparisons on the Moffat tunnel division of the Denver & Rio Grande, the Diesel people point out that a Diesel engine of 5,400 horsepower was lined up against an electric locomotive of 6,000 horsepower. Diesel exponents contend that such comparisons are invalid. On the other hand, the advocates of electricity claim the comparison merely underscores the advantage of an electric engine, which in a length of 85 feet can concentrate more horsepower than a Diesel 196 feet from coupler to coupler.

J. V. B. Duer, assistant to the vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, is an advocate of main-line electrification. Yet he recently pointed out that the economies of electric operation "increase with heavy traffic and decrease with light traffic."

Diesel enthusiasts point to this as a strong argument against electrification in the wide open spaces of the far West. Lines beyond the Continental Divide have never carried as much tonnage as the roads of the Atlantic seaboard. In December of 1944 the Pennsylvania grossed 11,109,518,000 ton-miles; this contrasted with 7,681,619,000 ton-miles on the Union Pacific, which hauls more cargo over its Sherman hill ascent of the Continental Divide than any other route across the Rocky Mountains.

Traffic has vital role in rail project

The high density of traffic requirement, generally stipulated when a railroad is electrified, does not exist on the wilderness lines that thread through the far West. In addition, even Bonneville's electrical engineers concede that General Motors has done an outstanding job in the production of Diesel locomotives. These giants of the rail have been standardized, modernized, and improved. Few large railroads in America are without at least a pair of General Motors Diesels for main-line operation.

Most Diesels perform in four units. This means that if one unit fails, the locomotive can still reach the nearest division point with its train. A power failure, on the other hand, means that an electric engine is stranded like a whale out of water. However, Tom Martin, of Bonneville, cites chapter and verse to show that the Great Northern's electrified Cascade Tunnel division has never been out of service for more than half an hour due to a power break.

Some of the advantages of the Diesel engine are conceded by Martin. He himself points out that total operating failures in Diesels are few, although maintenance cost is high. But he maintains that the problem of fuel cannot be shrugged off. With the sole exception of the Northern Pacific, which flanks a vein of bituminous coal, every railroad in the far West fires nearly all its steam locomotives with bunker C. Diesels use oil for fuel, too. For this reason, if none other, Martin is certain that western railroads will be electrified. "Each drop of oil burned in a Diesel engine or steam locomotive is gone forever," he claims. "It passes off into the atmosphere as smoke. On the other hand, not a single ounce of any irreplaceable resource is lost in the generation of water power at Bonneville, Boulder or Grand Coulee dams. The water merely flows on to the sea, as it has done for centuries."

Martin says steep grades need electric cabs

Martin also maintains that two of the factors that make railrod electrifiction most advisable are present throughout the far West. These are steep grades and sharp, twisting curves. In Switzerland, a country of lofty mountains, all railroads are electrified. The Pacific Northwest, in particular, has similar conditions.

"Railroads in the Pacific Northwest," points out Ivan Bloch, Bonneville's marketing chief, "must traverse rugged country. They must negotiate several mountain ranges, via routes that include many tunnels, and require frequent 'helper' service to obtain the most efficient use of steam locomotives. Generally speaking, freight trains must be restricted to 3,000 gross tons or less, not only from the standpoint of getting them up the long and difficult grades but because of the difficulties of downhill operation with heavier trains, where the airbrake is the sole means of controlling the speed of the descent."

Electric locomotives flatten these obstacles. At the end of curves it accelerates faster and picks up speed more quickly than any other engine. It can handle loads up to 5,000 tons. It goes into gear while descending grades—a process known as "regenerative braking," which puts power back into the trolley wire. This eliminates complete reliance on air brakes going down long, dangerous mountain grades. "The advantages of the electric locomotive are such," says an announcement from Dr. Raver's office, "that there is scarcely any debate regarding its superiority when considered merely from the aspect of engineering efficiency and operating performance."

Power held economical in western area

Martin emphasizes the fact that, ultimately, railroad electrification will pay for itself. On its first 8 years of electric operation in the Cascades and Rockies, the Milwaukee line saved $12,400,000 over its previous steam equipment. At a rate of 5 mills a kilowatt-hour, the water power of the far west is the cheapest fuel yet available to railroads. And the price of oil has been going up, the price of hydroelectricity going down. Let this cable-car process continue, and the cost of installing catenary wires will be retired in 5 or 6 years. From the conservation perspective, trains are virtually the only vehicles which can be connected with central-station sources of energy. Airplanes, ships, automobiles, trucks—none can feasibly be linked with the foaming rivers of the West. Under present technological conditions, they must continue to burn an exhaustible fuel—oil. But it is possible to tie the seven transcontinental railroads which serve the sundown side of the Nation with "an oil that will never run dry, a coal mine that will never thin out."

Engineers envision all trains hauled electrically

In a world in which resources rather than dollar balances may be the measurement of power and sovereignty, Bonneville engineers and economists feel certain that eventually every train in the West will roll blithely along behind an electric locomotive.

"The Bonneville Administration," declares Dr. Raver, "hopes to assist in the standardization of systems and equipment so as to provide the greatest availability of engines on all electrified roads. In this effort it hopes to join with the Bureau of Reclamation, the TVA, manufacturers of equipment, and the railroads themselves. The problems of electrification are not insurmountable. Their solution requires willingness on the part of Government, the railroads, and equipment manufacturers to 'talk turkey,' to exchange ideas freely, and to arrive at some specific conclusions.

"The Bonneville Administration is fast reaching the point where it will want to discuss the matter directly with top American railroad executives. We have wanted first to appraise all the aspects of this complicated problem to ascertain that our approach to other Government agencies, to the railroads and to the manufacturers of equipment be rational and on a businesslike basis."

Program covers more ground than other projects

Bonneville engineers and economists have broken down the seven western lines by divisions, in proposing the eventual electrification of all railroads that cross the Continental Divide. These are the sections first studied and examined:

	Miles
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific:	
Othello, Wash., to Tacoma	[1] 217
Harlowton, Mont., to Avery, Idaho	[1] 437
Avery, Idaho, to Othello, Wash	226
Great Northern:	
Skykomish, Wash., to Seattle	85
Wenatchee, Wash., to Skykomish	[1] 72
Spokane, Wash., to Wenatchee	180
Havre, Mont., to Spokane	527
Spokane, Portland & Seattle (G. N.-N. P.): Portland to Spokane	350
Santa Fe:	
La Junta, Colo., to Winslow, Ariz	635
Daggett, Calif., to Riverside Junction	100
Winslow, Ariz., to Daggett, Calif	453
Daggett, Calif., to Bakersfield, Calif	150
Union Pacific:	
Cheyenne, Wyo., to Salt Lake City	520
Huntington, Oreg., to Portland	390
Granger, Wyo., to Huntington	550
Northern Pacific:	
Tacoma to Pasco	250
Pasco to Missoula, Mont	400
N. P.-U. P.-G. N.: Portland to Seattle	183
Denver & Rio Grande: Denver, Colo., to Salt Lake City	607
Southern Pacific:	
Davis, Calif., to Sparks, Nev	241
Davis, Calif., to Portland	696
Ogden, Utah, to Sparks, Nev	466
Tucumcari, N. Mex., to Los Angeles	1,150

[1] Division already electrified.

No railroad electrification program a fraction of this magnitude has ever before been proposed. The Pennsylvania is the most extensive and elaborate electric system ever built, yet it would be eclipsed many times by this vast network of electrified lines, extending across the Nation's loftiest mountain battlements. The electric railways of Switzerland climb high passes and pierce the Alps through the Simplon and St. Gothard tunnels. Yet they total only 1,300 miles, as compared with the prodigious 8,000-mile system visioned by Martin and his associates.

Will the project be undertaken? Many factors are involved. Men need work. There will be an immense surplus of Bonneville and Grand Coulee power when the aluminum plants taper off. The Nation must conserve its oil supplies. The 200,000,000 gallons, which could be saved annually on western railroads if catenary wires were strung overhead, might propel dreadnaughts and lift bombers on some future day "when Heaven was falling and earth's defenders fled."

But the venture is costly, and what share will the Government be able to carry? This may be the critical question. If Federal financing can undertake the substations and other facilities required to bring the energy directly to the trolley wire, then the last steam engine may whistle on the Pacific seaboard before many more years have passed. Should the Government do this as a measure of participation in a project which would substitute the eternal flow of falling water as a railroad fuel in place of the country's limited reserves of petroleum? This is the advocacy of Bonneville engineers, although some private power company authorities believe it would be a subsidy and unsound economically.

Executives view proposal with approval

The satisfactory performance of the big diesels constructed by General Motors also clouds the answer to these questions. Ben Wagner, an engineer on the Denver and Rio Grande on the 2.2 grade out of Helper, Utah, patted four-unit Diesel No. 540 affectionately.

"I've never pulled the throttle on a better locomotive than this one," he said.

Many railroad executives in the far West are enthusiastic over the operation of diesel engines on the stiffest mountain grades. These men will be reluctant to discard such outstanding equipment for engines which require expensive trolley installation before they can move half an inch. Nor can the satisfaction of the Union Pacific with its proud, snorting "Big Boy" locomotives be overlooked. Fullbacks which score touchdowns are seldom put on the bench. Railroad men do not dispute the superiority of electric locomotives. But always they eye skeptically the initial cost of installing wires and substations.

Yet there still exists the question of fuel consumption. Diesels and steams burn oil. The electrics would not draw on America's precarious petroleum supply.

And so the controversy is joined. With Japan finally laid low, the question will confront Senate ommittees and boards of directors before many more barrels of bunker C have been reduced to smoke. In the meanwhile, trains clatter down from the high summits and the sonorous roar of the locomotive whistle fills granite gorges. Across innumerable trestles the proud steams and lordly diesels roll, and below the decks of the bridges the white water of the mountain rivers foams and surges.

These flecked reaches in which trout lurk and salmon spawn may yet revolutionize transportation west of the Continental Divide. Where the rivers rush around the piers of railroad bridges, the glacial water lifts in snapping arcs—like the loops of a thousand question marks.

Elliott Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Col. Charles L. Woods, editor, Rolla Herald, Rolla, Mo., of September 20, 1945:

EDITORIAL COMMENT

(By Charles L. Woods)

The investigation by Congress of the private business transactions of Elliott Roosevelt is unlawful, high-handed, and is not being done for any good purpose. Since when has Congress become the agency to investigate bad loans by one citizen to another? If I were Elliott I would tell Congress to go to h—— and to let my private business alone. I might go so far as to tell the snooping Congressmen, that I had borrowed $200,000 from John Hartford to promote what seemed to be a good enterprise in Texas, the proposition looked good, Hartford made me the loan. Like thousands of other loans and investments in oil stocks and other businesses failed and money lost, so the Texas enterprise proved a failure and money lost—Mr. John Hartford was settled with and the incident closed. Now, Mr. Congress, what are you going to do about it? You are not a trial court, you cannot take judgment against me; I have violated no law against the Government; the business transaction was wholly between John Hartford and myself. If Hartford has any grievances the courts are open—not any snooping Congress.

But that is not the purpose of the investigation. The real purpose is to try to make the late President Roosevelt responsible for the acts of a reckless son, in hopes of impugning something against his high, his untarnished name.

As Walter Winchell says: President Roosevelt is lying in his grave and his traducers are still lying, lying, and lying.

The people are not fooled.

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, by act of Congress and proclamation of the President, the week of October 7 to 13 has been set aside for the observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

The joint resolution making provision for this observance of which I had the honor to be the author was passed by Congress in large measure due to the earnest sponsorship of two organizations—the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped and the Disabled American Veterans. And to Mr. Paul Strachan and Miss Mildred Scott of the first organization and Mr. Millard Rice of the second organization should go a great deal of the credit for the passage of this legislation.

Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks the challenging proclamation issued by President Truman calling upon public officials and community leaders throughout the country to arrange for proper observances of this week:

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK, 1945

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the people of this Nation are determined to foster an environment in which those of their fellow citizens who have become physically handicapped can continue to make their rightful contribution to the work of the world and can continue to enjoy the opportuniteis and rewards of that work; and

Whereas Public Resolution No. 176, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 11, 1945, provides in part:

"That hereafter the first week in October of each year shall be designated as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. During said week, appropriate ceremonies are to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which will be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified but physically handicapped workers":

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe the week of October 7–13, 1945, as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. I ask the Governors of States, mayors of cities, heads of the various agencies of the Government, and other public officials, as well as leaders in industry, education, religion, and every other aspect of our common life, during this week and at all other suitable times, to exercise every appropriate effort to enlist public support of a sustained program for the employment and development of the abilities and capacities of those who are physically handicapped.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 21st day of September, in the year of our Lord 1945, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventieth.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:
DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary of State.

Free Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial

from the Philadelphia Record of Tuesday, September 18, 1945:

CONGRESS' CHANCE TO MAKE FREE ENTERPRISE OF ALCOA

Congress has prided itself on being a champion of free enterprise. Its conservative Members most of all.

Now they have a chance to back up their words.

Attorney General Tom Clark calls on the Nation's legislators to help private industry in reconversion by breaking up the Aluminum Trust, i. e., the Aluminum Co. of America, nicknamed Alcoa.

The Senators and Representatives who have been thundering about the perils of socialism in England can now end the biggest socialistic institution in the United States of America.

For Alcoa is what President Roosevelt called private socialism. It differs from Harold Laski socialism only in that Laski means socialism controlled by all of the people, and Alcoa is socialism controlled by a very few of the people.

We hope Congress will follow Attorney General Clark's lead and restore free enterprise in the aluminum industry.

The Nation's courts should have done the job long ago. They failed. They failed because the Mellon interests, controlled judges as well as Cabinet ministers and Presidents.

The Mellon Aluminum Trust was born back in 1888, with a paid-in capital of only $20,000. It used the familiar tactics of monopoly—Government favor, plus a combination of either crushing competitors, buying them out, or bleeding them to death with litigation.

An example of the control the Mellons exercised concerned a previous Attorney General of the United States, Harlan F. Stone, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Stone back in 1926 moved to challenge the Aluminum Trust as a monopoly.

Coolidge was President then and Andrew Mellon himself was Secretary of the Treasury. Whereupon Stone was kicked upstairs to the United States Supreme Court by Coolidge to rid himself of a too nosy Attorney General.

That, of course, won't happen to Tom Clark.

But Clark calls on Congress, because he knows that if anything is to be done quickly to restore competition in aluminum and force down the high prices kept up by monopoly if anything is to be done in time to help reconversion, Congress must do it.

Clark knows that litigation over the Aluminum Trust has been in the courts since 1910. In 1912 it was found a monopoly; a court order was entered forbidding it to continue monopolistic practices. The trust ignored the order, and nothing happened.

Nothing, except the Aluminum Trust got bigger and richer, and aluminum prices went higher.

Only last March, as Clark recalls, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals found Alcoa to be a monopoly but made no move for dissolution, possibly because of the war emergency. But that particular litigation had dragged on more than 7 years.

So, clearly, action is up to Congress.

It should not need any prodding.

This is the opportunity which Republican and Democrat champions of private enterprise have been waiting for.

This is their chance to liberate a "conquered industry."

It is their chance to make one of our greatest American industries truly enterprising and truly free.

The Congressional Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent edition of the Congressional Front, which is issued from my office each week:

THE CONGRESSIONAL FRONT

(By Congressman EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Sixteenth Illinois District)

THE LEGION OF UNDISCIPLINED

Just as society generally has its antisocial individuals who fail to observe the laws and rules laid down by society in the interest of public health, safety, and good morals, and must therefore be punished by fine or imprisonment, so the Army and Navy, by the very law of averages, gets their quota of persons who fail to adhere to discipline or to the rules laid down for the conduct of the services and who must, therefore, in like manner be fined or imprisoned. One might refer to this group as the legion of undisciplined because they have failed for one reason or another to adjust themselves to military or naval discipline and have failed to abide by the rules. In times of peace, the Army and Navy can well afford to err on the side of leniency concerning those who violate the rules, but in time of war it is a different matter. The very size of the military and naval organization requires discipline. Victory is a matter of teamwork involving the coordinated effort of all. If it breaks down at any point, not only is victory placed in jeopardy but there is involved the lives of others as well. During the war, therefore, there has been no disposition to quarrel with the procedure whereby violators of the military code ar charged with offenses, tried by a court martial, and then sentenced if found guilty. Now that the war is over, however, the matter commands attention. Not only is the future welfare of thousands of young men involved who were court martialed and sentenced to prison or to disciplinary barracks, but it involves the hearts and feelings of mothers and fathers back home who must quietly suffer the odium and stigma that goes with it.

FORGOTTEN MEN

From time to time efforts have been initiated to investigate the whole judicial procedure of the Army and Navy. Most recent endeavor in this direction is a resolution by the Cleveland Bar Association. Many allegations have been made. It is said that enlisted men in the Army and Navy do not receive proper attention when charged with some offense. It is said that they become the "forgotten men." It is said that in many cases penalties have been unduly severe for minor violations. It is said that the court martial code virtually makes the military or naval officers the judge, jury, and prosecutor. It is said that the accused must depend for aid and advice upon counsel who are inept, amateurish, and untrained. It is said that too often proper allowance is not made for physical or mental defects which existed in enlisted men prior to enlistment or induction. It is said that the civilian record of the youngsters in service is not considered and that proper allowance is not made in the case of first offenders. In any event, interest is gradually developing in the matter and action is on the way.

IMPORTANCE OF THIS MATTER

The annual report of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy Department indicates that for the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1945, 27,861 general courts martial were reviewed by the Judge Advocate General. In addition there were 92,236 summary courts martial and 123,476 deck courts involving minor offenses. Here, then, is a total of more than 243,000 courts martial of all kinds in a single year in the Navy. In the case of general courts martial, sentences can be extremely severe and can include long imprisonment together with dishonorable discharge from the service. That means that many young men in the service who finally achieve freedom will go forth into civil life with a black stain on the record that is inerasible unless some action is taken.

A BOUQUET FOR ARMY AND NAVY

Let it be said that the Army and Navy have grown quite mindful of the problem which is involved and have already taken affirmative steps which look toward remedial action. Secretary Stimson has appointed former Senator and later Circuit Judge Minton of Indiana as chairman of a special commission to investigate military court-martial procedure and also review the 35,000 convictions under which men who were serving in the armed services are now in prison or in disciplinary barracks. Long ago Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, while serving as Under Secretary, became cognizant of this problem and enlisted the services of a prominent New York attorney in reviewing the matter. That work is also definitely under way and there is reason to believe that a report may be forthcoming on this whole problem in the near future.

Speech Delivered by Congressman Lane in Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein part of my remarks delivered at the exercises of the unveiling and dedication of the plaque and honor roll for service men and women of World War II at the Highland School grounds, Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, September 23, 1945. This honor roll contained the names of over 800 young men and women of the Highland area of the city of Lynn that attended the school in their younger days and have served in every branch of the service during this war.

Example is the greatest of teachers.

Today, we stand before it, proud of its achievements, yet humbled by its sacrifices.

Each star of gold, or blue, represents a young man or woman from the highlands who put aside every comfort and every desire to go into the dark night of fear and pain and nameless anguish, so that we at home might be secure.

The father in service did not do this for his children alone, the sons and daughters in uniform were not thinking of their parents only as they went forth to meet the enemy.

Great qualities of mind and character, under the spur of necessity, came into being. Selfishness gave way to a common energy. These boys and girls grew up overnight to a realization of something finer and more durable than the loneliness of self. They had discovered the nourishment from which we draw our common life. They knew that all of us, friends, neighbors, and relatives alike, were members of a higher loyalty—that of the wide and all-embracing American family that we call these United States.

As affection and sacrifice strengthen the ties of private family life, so too, these virtues animated the men and women from the highlands as they went out to defend our national life.

Some served above and beyond the call of family duty, and now they rest far from the homeland. In the free and sunlit peace of this autumn Sunday, remembering their devotion, we feel the spell of reverence steal over us. It reaches through the commonplace habits of our lives to awaken the souls in all of us. These men and women who sleep in foreign lands were Americans, even as we might be, living and dying for their belief in the great unfolding promise of human brotherhood that is America. Before their testament we renew our own faith.

We honor them with a star, symbol of truth, a clean eternal guide for those who are confused, an inspiration for those who are oppressed. These stars we must follow as we go forward with courage and with conscience, extending the mental and the spiritual frontiers of our country through the wilderness of intolerance and greed and economic uncertainty which faces us.

Those who have died in the service of our American family must ever remind us of this. Those who come back, in word and deed, will bring into our lives an awareness of the realistic world which we must be prepared to lead.

The hardest part of the job has been done by those who served so well. The rest is our responsibility. Not for a President or a Congress, or labor or industry, but for every American citizen, all working together.

We have faith in our future. In spite of carelessness and complacency, that faith has the vitality to bring us through any crisis that may challenge us. It is a faith which raises the dignity of the individual and promotes the cooperation by all. It is the nearest approach to God's will on earth. We have found the right road and we intend to go forward on it. In the brief instant of time that we call life, we intend to do everything in our power to further the upward pilgrimage of man.

This is the faith that makes America.

In dedicating this memorial, we dedicate a shrine to all that we hold best and dear in those we knew. They are no strangers, these boys and girls of the Highlands. They played in these streets; they brought milk and groceries to the door; they filled homes with the lifting grace of laughter; they were eager for life.

Then these children went out to save us.

What happened to them we should never really know.

They are coming back, most of them are coming back as mature men and women, in their twenties. They have been many places and they have seen many things. In the light of the stern knowledge that has come to them, they will examine us and our ways to see if we are truly measuring up to the service and the sacrifice that was theirs.

We shall have to catch up with them to be worthy of America in the making.

This day we are consecrating ourselves to that task.

By honoring the boys and girls of the Highlands who served us we are, at the same time, setting higher standards of conduct for ourselves. Through them, we shall become better Americans.

With them we shall move on into as great a future as man ever dared to dream of to work for and to win.

Fundamental Progress in Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the Reader's Digest for September 1945 there appeared an article condensed from the Survey Graphic by Roger William Riis and Webb Waldron entitled "When Black and White Work Together." This article is the story of Flanner House in Indianapolis and its director, Mr. Cleo Blackburn. It is such an inspiring account of fundamental progress in the improvement of race relations and the conditions of life of many people in the city of Indianapolis that I cannot refrain from asking unanimous consent to include it here with my remarks in the RECORD:

WHEN BLACK AND WHITE WORK TOGETHER

(By Roger William Riis and Webb Waldron)

You'll rarely find a town so stirred by an enterprise and a man as Indianapolis is by Flanner House, Negro community center, and its director, Cleo Blackburn. "A bright and shining achievement," says Booth Tarkington. "Best thing this town ever did," says Dr. Thomas Noble, distinguished surgeon. "An inspired program," says Charles Lynn, industrialist. And Norman Isaacs, chief editorial writer of the Indianapolis News, adds: "Any ticket Blackburn writes, this city backs."

Flanner House has been making headway on a terrific problem—the problem of how Americans can live and work happily together when some happen to be white and some happen to be black. Indianapolis, center of the northward migration of southern Negroes, is the perfect proving ground. It has the greatest percentage of Negro population of any city north of Mason and Dixon's line—65,000 Negroes to some 335,000 whites. But while race clashes have smirched many northern cities, Indianapolis has had none. The answer lies largely in the wise leadership among both whites and Negroes which finds its expression in Flanner House.

Founded in 1900, Flanner House was a small and shabby service center for Negroes when Blackburn was brought from Tuskegee Institute to take charge a few years ago. Then things began to happen that affected the whole Indianapolis scene. By an amazing piece of community teamwork, it has built a new center on the edge of what former United States Housing Administrator Nathan Straus called the worst Negro slum in America. It is constructing a new health center. It is operating perhaps the largest community gardening and canning project in the United States by and for Negroes. But above all, it has shown whites and Negroes how racial troubles lift when two races work together for their common good.

That is why the Indianapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce, 4 years ago, picked Cleo Blackburn as the man who had done most for his city in that year—the first time a Negro has been so honored in Indianapolis, perhaps the first time in any American city. And that is why Flanner House is backed solidly by the Community Fund—the Indianapolis Foundation, the city, State and Federal Governments, and thousands of plain citizens.

"In the history of the United States the Negro has faced two crises," declares the 34-year-old director of Flanner House. "The first came when 3,500,000 freed slaves were dumped into a competitive world for which they had no training. The second crisis is with us now, when 2,500,000 southern rural Negroes are here in the North to stay, bringing neither the aptitudes nor the attitudes necessary for city and industrial life. It is a greater readjustment for the Negro who goes from the fields of Alabama to the factories of Indianapolis than it is for the Italian who goes from industrial Milan to industrial Indianapolis."

Blackburn had been a research associate in the study of the great migrations of history when he was called to Indianapolis to solve the problems of just such a migration. Always reinforcing his dreams with facts, he persuaded the Indianapolis Foundation to appropriate $4,000 for a survey of the local Negro situation. This revealed that the movement of Negro population was northwestward toward a slum already overcrowded. Right there, on the edge of that slum, Blackburn said, was the place for the desperately needed new home for Flanner House.

Adjoining the slum was a whole block occupied by a deserted tile factory. Here would be room for a community house, health center, workshops, playgrounds. Flanner House persuaded the city to buy this block for $35,000 and rent it to them for $1 a year. Now for a building.

"We'll help build it ourselves," Blackburn eagerly announced.

The brick in the wrecked factory would do for the bulk of the new structure, but first the old mortar had to be carefully knocked off and good bricks separated from broken ones. For this tough job, all hand labor, Blackburn enlisted some of his own people. Some white neighbors joined them in off hours. Soon the Quakers appeared on the scene with a work camp of the American Friends Service Committee.

So the news spread around town, and more people came to work on the project. Volunteers couldn't do it all, but they helped dig the foundation, carry brick, make doors, build closets, put up shelves. And the new community house, admirably designed by the Negro architect Hilyard Robins, cost about half what had been anticipated. This volunteer work by whites and Negroes stirred the whole city and gave Flanner House a community aspect as nothing else could have done. More than that, it disclosed the simple fact that when a man sandpapers a board his forearms become covered with fine gray dust—and that dust is exactly the same color on black arms as on white ones.

Lured from the South by war jobs, rural Negroes came from a timeless, clockless world of their own. What matter when you came to work? So they had to learn about alarm clocks and time clocks, what modern toilets are, why doctors examine you, what a foreman is, why you have to wash and what is a pay check. All this Flanner House undertook to teach them in classes in the settlement house and in factories and shops. For Flanner House lives and works in many places in the city.

An Indianapolis factory wanted girls to sew parachutes. Flanner House picked and trained 50 Negro girls—not only in sewing

but also in diplomatic conduct, since they were to work side by side with white girls. These girls did so well that the company hired 100 more without consulting Flanner House. Instantly there was trouble, fights with the white girls and the foremen. The factory had to fire almost all of the new group, and conformed thereafter to Flanner House standards.

At a large garment factory, word came suddenly that all the newly hired Negro employees were quitting. Nobody could make out the trouble. There was a rush call for Cleo Blackburn. He found they couldn't understand the deductions for social security and bonds. Explanations by the management only tended to confirm them in the notion that they were being slicked. Blackburn made them understand.

One plant called in Cleo to talk to the foremen on how to deal with Negro workers. Many of these foremen were southerners. To see a Negro up on a platform addressing them was a real shock. But Blackburn's talk was so skillful, had such a warm plea for patience and understanding of the peculiar qualities of the Negro, that it went over with a bang.

Classes at Flanner House train potential housemaids in the handling of electric stoves, vacuum cleaners, electric refrigerators, and washing machines. And they teach manners, too. When a girl has a chance to move on from household work to the job of tearoom waitress or soda-fountain clerk, she is taught more work habits, new attitudes. Some 4,700 employers look to Flanner House for help. Last year the house placed 6,385 Negroes in such jobs, had 2,425 more requests it could not fill. And it carefully checks on the performance of each worker; 92 times out of every 100, "satisfactory" goes down on the record.

Negro women nurses and dietitians, and wives of Negro professional men formed the Flanner House Guild, which operates a day nursery for young children of working mothers, and a toy-lending library. Since the hard-used toys wear out, there is a workshop where fathers and mothers come evenings to repair them. Also, under the direction of a Negro expert, they are introduced to such crafts as cabinet making and carpentry.

Flanner House has a make-over shop, too, where women, under skilled direction, turn tag ends of cloth into wearable garments; old sugar sacks into napkins and doilies; discarded felt hats into handbags. Flanner House aims to help people help themselves. Last year it spent $9 on charity, $44,000 on training people to work.

The Federal Government and the city have combined to provide $130,000 to build the health center at Flanner House. It will specialize in child and maternity care.

Blackburn started the Flanner House community gardens, where last year 200 Negro families raised $25,000 worth of vegetables. This year it is 300 families. The Indianapolis Water Co. lent 20 acres, the president of a large printing company 20 more. A family gets a plot 50 by 100 feet for $1 a season. Flanner House projects always spread out, and the gardening grew into a cannery where last year they put up 19,000 cans of food. This year they expect to do 60,000.

And what about that slum? Streets and streets of hovels—the streets often muddy paths, the hovel without toilets or running water. A group of families patronizes a community privy and a community pump.

One shack with an assessed valuation of $850 rents for $25 a month. Taxes are $21.38 a year. That's the owner's only expense—no one would ever dream of putting a cent on repairs. So this owner gets $278.62 clear each year, or a 32.8 percent return. Nearby is a coal shed rented to a family at $7 a month. There's a service flag in the window.

Led by Flanner House, civic-minded citizens in Indianapolis got an act through this year's legislature authorizing the city to buy this slum area under the power of eminent domain, turn part of it along the banks of a stream into a park, with a picnic ground, swimming pool, and baseball diamond; lay out new streets in the remainder and sell off lots to low-income people at reasonable prices. For those who can't afford to buy, decent low-rental homes will be made available. A great city parkway which halted in despair at the edge of the blighted area will run through the development.

How will these homes be built? Cleo Blackburn has an exciting plan. At Penncraft, near Uniontown, Pa., coal miners built themselves a village of 50 houses on the labor pool idea. The men who can carpenter, do plumbing, stonework, painting or glazing, or maybe just dig, pool their skills and build one another's home. These miners put up six-room modern houses, that would have cost $4,000 elsewhere, for under $2,000, and smaller houses for much less. Blackburn went to look, came back full of enthusiasm. William Book, executive secretary of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, agreed heartily with him. Two local realtors were skeptical until Cleo sent them to Uniontown to see for themselves. They were convinced that the plan would work.

Flanner House calls forth more good will than people ever knew they had. Every city with a slum area cries out for an enterprise like it and a man like Cleo Blackburn—a man with vision who builds firmly for the future on the bedrock of human need.

Once upon a time, runs the fable, a traveler came upon three men chipping stone beside the highway. He asked each of them in turn what he was doing.

Said the first man: "I'm chipping this stone."

Said the second: "I'm helping build the wall of a building."

And the third, proudly: "I am building a great cathedral."

Denazification Difficulties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 25 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Denazification Difficulties" by Raymond Moley.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENAZIFICATION DIFFICULTIES—PRESENT PROBLEMS OF GERMAN OCCUPATION MORE SERIOUS THAN THOSE OF JAPAN

(By Raymond Moley)

If the top-hat-and-tails critics of General MacArthur in our State Department would turn their attention to Germany they might have something to worry about.

The Army has retreated so far from nonfraternization that we may soon expect the setting up in the War Department of a bureau of marriage and maternity. Public resentment against our most dangerous enemy has disintegrated so fast that it might be better to think about withdrawing the Army entirely and policing Germany with a division of Red Cross nurses and school ma'ams. Aristophanes might have found material for another Lysistrata in the current conquests of the frauleins.

On one hand we have contemptuous comments by Germans like Heinrich Hauser who, in his current book, The German Talks Back, says that to attempt to govern Germany by anti-Nazis is like running America by conscientious objectors. On the other hand we find the return of notorious militarists to power and influence.

Take the case of the former Reich War Minister, Dr. Gessler, as an example. This man came into the German Government in 1921 as a democrat. He was the same kind of democrat as Dr. Schacht. As early as 1921 Gessler proposed to the Reich President and his cabinet that open war be waged against Poland and also against the Allied forces then occupying Upper Silesia. He gave assurances that the reichswehr and the Black Army would throw the Poles back beyond the prewar frontier. Later, in 1923, Gessler advocated various other war-like measures.

The papers now report that Gessler has been one of the advisers to the Bavarian Government of Dr. Schaeffer and, thus, one of the advisers of our army of occupation. If this can happen in the higher ranks of the German restored government, what may be expected among the rank-and-file administrators?

It is true that the difficulty of keeping Nazis and militarists from power is very great. For 12 years the Nazi Party systematically removed anti-Nazis from every leading spot in government and in business. But there is a marked difference in policy between the British and Americans, on one hand, and the Russians, on the other. Whenever in our zone of occupation the elimination of the owner or manager of a factory, bank, or department store comes up, a wall arises that he is indispensable; that he was a Nazi by compulsion; that the business cannot run without him.

The Russian credo is that there is no indispensable German. The simple Muscovite mind reasons that if these owners and managers should die, the business would still go on. We hear of German owners and managers disappearing into Russia. But as far as can be ascertained, businesses are beginning to operate in the Russian zone, despite personnel troubles. Soon we shall hear sympathetic wails for the poor Germans and curses for the cruel Russians.

Perhaps the occupying American soldiers and administrators, whose homeland was never bombed and never felt the feet of German soldiers, are too kind. No doubt, our people over there are impressed by the neatness of German homes, the exactness of German offices. Such things appeal to American feelings for order and efficiency. This is a softening influence.

Against this influence, it ought to be remembered that 95 percent of these people acclaimed Hitler's conquest of Europe. But like the girl in the play, "Oklahoma," we "fergit."

Exploits of Officers and Crew of the Submarine "Trutta"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the New York

Sun of August 13, 1945, relative to the gallant exploits of the officers and crew of the U. S. submarine *Trutta*, especially the executive officer thereon, Lt. Comdr. Jarrel Dunson, of La Grange, Ga.:

FIGHTER PILOT, DOWN AT SEA, RIDES OUT TYPHOON ON RAFT—YANK RESCUED BY SUBMARINE IN JAP WATERS—LATTER LIVED THROUGH BLOW BY DIVING 200 FEET BELOW SURFACE

(By Malcolm Johnson)

PACIFIC FLEET HEADQUARTERS, GUAM.—Forced down in Japanese waters, a Mustang fighter pilot, Second Lt. Arthur A. Burri, of Davenport, Iowa, rode out the full fury of a typhoon in his frail, one-man rubber raft. His survival is one of the miracles of this war.

Burri, a husky lad of 21, had been on this tiny, bobbing raft for 5 days when the typhoon struck on June 5 last. For hours as the typhoon howled with unabated force, he clung desperately to his raft. Several times—he doesn't remember how many—he was washed off by the impact of the towering waves, which swallowed his craft, bouncing it around like a rubber ball. But each time Burri managed to crawl back aboard. How, he does not know. Probably his will to live gave him superhuman strength.

LIVED ON CHOCOLATE

In the 5 days before the storm he had lived on chocolate bars and other concentrated foods and water provided pilots for emergencies. What little food and water he had left were lost in the typhoon. The next day, with the sea calm once again, found him weak from his long battle for survival, without food or water, and babbling incoherently of impending rescue by his flyer comrades.

He knew those comrades would come; he could hear them overhead. He called out to them, and he could hear them. They were just over the horizon now, and he could hear them laughing and talking. They seemed to be having a party.

"I knew. I could hear them just as plainly as I hear you now," young Burri insisted stoutly to his rescuers later. "They seemed to be having a good time, and I remember I got mad because they didn't invite me to the party. But I was never really worried; I knew the boys would find me and take me with them."

RESCUED BY SUBMARINE

That was the pilot's condition when he was rescued by the U. S. submarine *Trutta*, on patrol in enemy waters. The submarine's skipper, Lt. Comdr. Franz Hoskins, United States Naval Reserve, of Tacoma, Wash., lean, wiry, and prematurely gray, told the story of the rescue, together with other exploits of the *Trutta*, at a sumbariners' rest camp here at Guam.

"When we sighted that little yellow raft with Burri on it we figured he had just gone into the drink," Hoskins said. "When we learned that he had ridden out the typhoon on that raft we could not believe our ears. It seemed impossible. And yet in spite of everything that boy had gone through he was still strong enough to climb the ladder on our sub under his own power. We didn't realize, of course, that he had been afloat out there for 6 days or we never would have permitted him to climb it himself."

Hoskins said that Burri's body was covered with sores. His skin was badly lacerated, apparently from constant rubbing against the rubber fabric of the raft. He also was badly sunburned. He was slightly delirious and talked incoherently. But, on the whole, his condition was fairly good.

DAY-AND-NIGHT TREATMENT

"We kept him for 5 days," said Hoskins. "Our chief pharmacist's mate, Bernard F. Sarafin, of Detroit, looked after him. Serafin deserves a lot of credit. He treated Burri just as a doctor would—and did just as good a job, if you ask me. He was at this pilot's bedside constantly, night and day.

"Five days after we picked him up Burri seemed perfectly all right again and we transferred him to another submarine. He made the transfer in his little rubber boat. Hell, after weathering a typhoon, that raft seemed to us about the most seaworthy thing around.

"For all I know, Burri is still flying. We don't know where he was taken. We never saw him again, but Serafin says he received a letter from him a few days ago thanking him for the good treatment."

SUBMARINE DIVED UNDER

The *Trutta* had had her own troubles in the typhoon—the same typhoon which heavily damaged some of our vessels in those waters off the coast of Japan.

"This was our second patrol in the *Trutta*," Hoskins said. "We had been out about 3 days when the typhoon struck. The barometer had been falling rapidly. It nosedived 25 points in 1 hour. That is phenomenal. We knew then we had something to worry about.

"When it came the wind velocity was better than 100 knots. We eased into a trough and began to submerge, figuring we'd have a better chance to ride it out underwater. We suffered some minor damage, though, before we could submerge. Our conning tower was flooded, for one thing.

"We rode out the typhoon 200 feet under water. But even that far down we were rolling 10 degrees. You can imagine how rough it must have been on the surface."

This correspondent can imagine it, indeed, for he was on the fringe of the typhoon himself, aboard a battleship in Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet. It was rough, all right, even for a ship as huge and as heavy as one of our fast battleships, and the waves at times seemed as high as New York skyscrapers.

"We stayed submerged all that day and night," the skipper continued. "We surfaced the next day and the sea was calm. That was when we sighted Burri's raft."

HAVE SUNK 25 SHIPS

The Trutta's executive officer, Lt. Comdr. Jarrell Dunson, Jr., 26 years old, of LaGrange, Ga., interposed a word. "I don't believe that pilot could have lasted another day," he said. "When we found him he had been without food or water for 18 hours. Lack of food wasn't so bad, he told us, but he suffered terribly from thirst."

It is unusual to find a reserve officer in command of a submarine. In fact, it's practically unheard of. Submarine commanders are usually regular Navy. But then Hoskins is an unusual guy. He is 30 years old and he's done just about everything in the submarine service, which he entered early in 1941. He has served continuously in that dangerous and little publicized branch of the Navy since then, beginning with the commissary department and working his way up, step by step, to his prasent rank as commander of his own sub. Hoskins has seen plenty of action, too Subs on which he has served have sunk a total of at least 25 big enemy ships.

"We used to get kicked around plenty in the old days," he recalled with a grin. "But things have changed now. It's all on our side. Our biggest disappointment these days is that there isn't much left to hunt any more.

WORKED IN NEW YORK

"Most of the Jap Fleet, as you know, has been sunk. Big enemy ships are few and far between now; we have to take what we can find. Why, we are sinking craft now that we wouldn't have been bothered about early in the war. We'd have thought they were too small. I must say, though, that we still have lots of fun now that we know we have the war on ice."

Hoskins says he hasn't had time to get married. He was in the ROTC at the University of Washington, and when the Navy called him to active service he was teaching physical education at Ohio State University. Such is the background of one of our present-day fighting submariners.

The executive officer, Dunson, is also a Reserve officer, having been in the ROTC at Georgia Tech, from which he was graduated in 1940. He is married and his wife now lives at the Broadmoor Hotel, Washington, D. C. Although LaGrange, Ga., was originally his home, Dunson just before entering the Navy was working in a New York brokerage office.

Veterans Over 38 Discriminated Against

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a glaring inequality; a mockery of fair play. Several hundred thousand veterans of this war are bitter and resentful toward that provision of the Mustering Out Payment Act of 1944 which denies mustering-out pay to those over 38 years who requested and obtained their release.

The Army did not want these men because it found out that they were physically unable to complete with 20-year-olds. The Army should have known this simple fact in the first place, but it called these men and they responded. They were pooled with men who were as young as their sons and were subjected to the same rigorous training. For them, the physical strain was twice difficult.

To add to this unequal situation, the Army ignored the experience and intelligence of these older men, making it virtually impossible for them to obtain ratings.

To cover up the initial mistake, it was decided to release these men "to enter essential employment." As if veterans, no matter how released, would do otherwise.

On this flimsy technicality, they were denied mustering-out pay and treated as if they were dishonorably discharged—when their records prove otherwise.

These men have the American right to expect from us a standard of fair treatment to all who served honorably. They did not evade service when they were called. By the same token, they will not excuse any evasion of our responsibility to them.

They have not forgotten. They look to the Congress to correct this inequality by an amendment that will remedy the exclusion errors in the present law.

Address Delivered by Henry J. Kaiser Before the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Henry J. Kaiser before the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce at the San Francisco Commercial Club July 19, 1945:

If what I say today seems both intimate and personal, it is because I feel that I am at home. San Francisco really means this to me. I feel the things which she represents: that love of life which we call Bohemian, that friendship and understanding, and, most of all, that devotion to principle and the noble self-confidence which enabled her to arise from the ashes of disaster and build again. Perhaps it is the fusion of all these that makes San Francisco one of the best-loved cities in all the world. From the day of its founding it has sheltered men and women of magnificent courage, who, through nearly a century, have followed the vision of a West where one day a new world would be born.

In April 1946 our city will be looking back on 40 years of progress since her historic disaster. No doubt there was something prophetic in that ordeal from which she came forth, refined and tempered for the role destiny would call on her to play.

Cities, like men, have souls. It was no mere turn of the wheel of fortune that brought the nations here to draft a charter for the new world. That spirit of adventure, that love of mankind, that unselfish nobility throughout nearly a century of trial and testing, fixed the time when San Francisco would be called upon to serve the world.

It is altogether fitting that we recall the tragedy of 1906, for today it is the world that lies in ruins. The face of the earth is scarred with destruction. All mankind seems to be sitting among the ruins in desperate need of the courage to build again; to build at last so surely and so well that all may share in the strength; yes, and in the beauty of this new world which is being bought at so great a cost.

So many wonderful things have been accomplished in the San Francisco Bay area since Pearl Harbor that the honors really belong to the communities, one and all. Old-established industries converted and expanded to meet the challenge of war production, dormant industries were revived, and new industries were born. California celebrated the centenary of the "roaring forties" by demonstrating that the pioneer spirit had not only survived but was ready to venture on a scale heretofore untried.

While I was thinking about this, there came to my mind the poet's prophecy written 100 years ago in which he "saw the heavens filled with commerce."

Then our fabulous past began to merge with tomorrow, and I remembered that I would be meeting today with the men of commerce who are making this dream come true.

It is always good to get on high ground and see the vision. With you I cherish such experience. But I can never escape the urge to do something about it. Whenever and as often as I listen to, or indulge in generalities about opportunities, there comes to me also the overpowering desire to make them real. I believe that history can repeat itself here. The will and determination which was so evident in San Francisco before the smoke had cleared from the ruins is just as vital today as it was then.

I can never cease to admire the men who rebuilt San Francisco, but we honor them most when we come to grips with the work of the day. Noble sentiments have to be implemented by deeds. The outlines of industry, trade, and finance have been sketched. But we know that construction is more than a blueprint. It is now time to build. Here in this metropolitan bay area hundreds of plans have been formulated, looking toward the day when we shall be released from the restraints and necessities of war. In these brief moments I could not hope to review them all. Our chamber of commerce is in itself a listening post and a clearing house for these plans. As we have been a vast arsenal for war, so we must be a tremendous reservoir of strength for peace.

The West is in the van. A vast number of our people have come into the area for the first time. Despite the prophecy about their departure, I am informed that even today there are more arrivals than there are departures. We know that many who leave will return, for this is the history of the call of the West since it was first sounded.

It is human needs that stimulate production. It is people who make markets. Necessity is the great creator. All of our facilities are inadequate. Housing, communications, highways, transportation, and all of the institutional life which modern living requires, are taxed far beyond their capacity. Furthermore, there are many essentials which we have never enjoyed. So vast were the resources of the West that we seemed incapable or organizing them for the good which should have been our portion.

And so the stage is set, and now let the play begin.

To date, in the organizations in which I share responsibility, upwards of $1,000,000 has been spent in research and experimentation which will influence our industrial future. Throughout the whole effort we have felt ourselves one with those of you who have recognized and subscribed to the principles on which the hopes of a new world are oriented.

1. Surely the first is employment. We can all agree that there should be a job for everyone who has the will to work and the good will to work well.

2. We hold with you that competition is the most compelling force in production when it is practiced within the rules of fair play.

3. We share the belief that initiative is furthered, responsibility encouraged, and independence assured when business stands on its own feet, with an absolute minimum of shelter and protection and with a maximum of freedom from regulation and restraint.

4. We all accept the challenge of new levels of productivity.

Let me first mention housing—since it's certain to be the leader in the postwar advance. It is my belief that right here and now there can be launched a housing program which will inspire building in every corner of the nation—one which will be the pattern for many nations whose cities have been destroyed.

In meeting this requirement which is almost as basic as the need for food, we could set in motion a great chain of production, every phase of which can be developed here in the West. In the new world men must have not only shelter but they must have the comforts and conveniences which science and invention stand ready to provide.

But back of all modern construction there are the so-called basic industries. Until war laid its current necessities upon us, the West stood virtually isolated in this regard, dependent upon a far-off supply with all of the increased costs which distance imposes. The other day one of our own San Franciscans, who is serving the Nation in the task of reconstruction, came home to tell us what he thought about the needs of the West for a basic industry. It happened that we had spent many months in concentrated and diligent effort to explore this prospect. So it was not difficult to respond to his challenge when he said that a western syndicate should be formed to fully exploit the steel facilities which the war had brought into being.

There is no doubt but that we could continue to be dependent on existing sources for this prime building essential. But this again would not be in keeping with the spirit of the West nor with the new responsibilities which are ours to discharge. The industrial West must have a steel industry of its own. This is the unanimous verdict of our own representatives in the State and National Governments.

I said this session was going to be personal and intimate—so I need not apologize for talking about steel. The subject occupies most of my waking hours. It is far bigger than you or me. It is not just an industry. It is the West.

Colonel Heller's thoughts about western steel called out an instant and heartening response. His suggestion that A. P. Giannini head the syndicate was a natural. A. P.'s whole life has been devoted to building the West.

The other day I was reading about him in the April issue of a national magazine. He was only 35 years old when he helped a handful of his employees save the records and cash from his little bank in North Beach, which the great fire was about to destroy.

Surveying the ruins of his beloved city, he set an example of courage which will never be forgotten. He knew that San Francisco would rise again. And so from a shed on the waterfront he began providing the banking services which were so sorely needed by refugees and by the courageous few who were ready to undertake the rebuilding at once.

As I read this inspiring record of faith and humanity, I wished I could have been with him. I would have been 23; just the age for the kind of encouragement he and the men of his kind knew how to give.

We can have an all-western steel industry if we fight for it—and, make no mistake, we will have to fight for it.

This basic enterprise will be the seed from which the industrial West will bloom.

And the light metals will also be produced and fabricated throughout the entire area. If we really mean to achieve a fully productive industrial economy in the West, we must go the whole way—and now is the time.

I am ready to declare my belief that automobiles will be built in the West. Our transportation requirements are stupendous. It has been said by labor leaders, who are in a position to know, that the industry can produce only 60 percent of the Nation's requirements. What an opportunity.

If we can have as little as 5 percent of the national steel market and 10 percent of the automobile market, we will make a real contribution, not only to our own needs but to national employment.

And while we're thinking about transportation, let's remember that the age of the air has already begun. The West is unquestionably the center of the airplane industry. Tomorrow we fly with speeds and comforts which defy imagination. Is there any reason why there should not be in San Francisco Bay the greatest international airport in the world? An airport so well located, so perfectly appointed, so far in the lead that the world which came to us to draft a charter will come to us as the metropolitan center of the whole Pacific Basin? Why can't we do this?

As to the other war industries in the West, shipbuilding easily stands first in the volume

of workers employed and in values created. It is obvious that the wartime schedule of shipbuilding could not possibly be sustained over a long period after peace has been declared. It is nevertheless our conviction that ships will continue to be built on the Pacific coast after the war, and that this area will have a part in constructing the tonnage required for the normal resumption of peacetime maritime activities. As long as war continues, the repair and maintenance of the vast Pacific Fleet will be a major task in which the west coast will play an important part. When the period of emergency repairs has passed, there will be the gigantic job of converting a large number of ships from wartime to peacetime service.

Some phases of the present shipbuilding activities may well continue through 1946. Many western companies are now engaged in repairs and are preparing to undertake additional responsibilities in this field. The important thing to remember is that the techniques of mass production in the shipbuilding industry were perfected on this coast during the war. Through these techniques costs per ton have steadily declined. Notwithstanding the fact that we must compete with lower labor standards in other countries, it is conceivable that we can produce ships in this area in competition with any other shipbuilding industry in the world. There is a wholly unwarranted pessimism in the fatalistic prophecy that the West will have little, if any, part in the postwar shipbuilding industry. Whether or not we continue in this field involves decisions which may not be ours to make, but we are not yet ready to abdicate on the theoretical assumption that western shipbuilding is through.

Now, just a word about highways. When I first came to California, 25 years ago, I took a contract to grade and pave a road from Red Bluff to Redding—30 miles of concrete pavement on what was to be Highway 99. At that time our conception of the West was so meager that this main artery of traffic was nothing more than a sidewalk.

Can you picture the problem we will face when gasoline rationing has been removed? There isn't a highway in California that can meet the traffic requirements. There ought to be a six-lane highway between San Francisco and Los Angeles without a single grade crossing. Pennsylvania has shown that it can be done with their magnificent turnpike between Harrisburg and Pittsburgh. They carried that road almost every mile through the mountains and built seven huge tunnels to make it what perhaps is the safest highway in the world.

Is there any reason why we cannot have a network of arterials and feeders throughout the Nation which will break every bottleneck and open up travel and transportation to the safety requirements which are already hopelessly inadequate? California is the first State in registrations. Why can't our highway system be the model of the best?

Perhaps it's just an obsession with me, but I can't picture the new America without adequate provision for the health of its citizens. Why can't we lead the way in providing the best in medical facilities to be within the reach of all? Just across the bay we have a laboratory, or shall I say a model, which has been studied by medical authorities and public health officials from all over the Nation and from a number of foreign countries. The confidence and commendation which has been expressed gives us the faith to believe that this is a good idea. If only we could have at least one prepared medical health center in every western community, we could be assured that there really is to be a new world in which this priceless service becomes a right rather than a privilege.

In all this I am thinking with you about western leadership. We are not likely to indulge in regional selfishness. We cannot prosper unless the Nation prospers, and America cannot be an island of plenty in a world of despair.

I accept the judgment of the experts who proclaim that the Pacific basin will be the theater where civilization makes its next great advance. I am not impressed by those who say that the hundreds of millions in the Orient are doomed to a low standard of living because they have nothing with which to pay for the goods and services which would better their lot. From well-documented and carefully studied surveys, I am ready to accept the forecast that the Orient will be one of our best customers, even as we will be one of theirs.

I cannot think about the problems of rebuilding world shipping, Europe's cities, her transportation systems, her docks and harbors, her farms and homes, without foreseeing a tremendous demand for American goods. I go wholeheartedly with those who say that we will move to higher production levels than we have ever known, and that they will be sustained for years, during which time the markets of the world will continue to expand.

I want to declare my belief that if we in the West will take the leadership which is ours by heritage from the pioneers, our efforts can stimulate employment for as many as 30,000,000 people throughout the Nation in housing, transportation, highways, and public health alone.

Perhaps the question which is most often posed is why we have ventured into so many fields. When this query is put to me personally, I am asked why I don't step aside and watch the game from the sidelines. Perhaps I ought to let you answer the question in terms of your own philosophy as to what constitutes a good life. Builders have an advantage since it is their privilege to see and enjoy the finished product. May I venture the commonplace observation that there can be no joy in creative work unless one loves it. In the construction field and in industrial enterprise alike there is the thrill of meeting the hazards and overcoming the obstacles. We have loved our work. It has been our chief preoccupation. It has been a constant source of recreation.

But all this is personal, and there is a larger and more significant answer to the question. We feel a deep kinship with those in this community who have the sense of obligation to the men who are fighting our battles and to those who have carried war production through to magnificent records. Our fighting men and those who have built the ships, the planes, the tanks, the guns, the munitions, have a right to opportunity in the world which they have saved from destruction.

If our forecasts of national income, national product, and foreign trade are correct, there is room for every industry which operated effectively before the war and for every war-born industry. As Governor Warren has said, our problem in the West is less a problem of reconversion than it is a problem of conversion. We must convert our war plants to peacetime pursuits. We must dare to see a demand which will absorb the vast new product. We must encourage that demand at home and abroad. We must be bold, yes, even to the point of ignoring the caution which stifles initiative and forestalls progress. The epoch upon which we are now entering is not one for the timid. The fearful and the uncertain had better get out of the way. If we will, we can have a golden age in terms of political accord and social agreement, and finally, in terms of the production and distribution of goods on a scale heretofore unknown. According to the record, it is not a question of can we do it. It is a question of will we do it.

I will not be confused or influenced by the rumors of depression, deflation, disorder, or revolution. All such reports discount the good which is everywhere in prospect: The greatest skilled labor force in our history; the greatest pent-up demand on record; the greatest volume of purchasing power; and most of all, a new understanding and a new recognition of human needs.

I join with you in the determination to nourish and sustain the spirit of the San Francisco Conference. It was the New Year's Day of the year one in the new world which it is now ours to create.

The men who rebuilt San Francisco in 1906 were under the spell of the founders. Many of them are with us today. The heritage of all who joined in this great prospect is a spirit of adventure, a courage which holds fast to the faith that it can be done. The will and the determination to build again.

The interests of this San Francisco Bay metropolitan area are identical. Our State has common hopes, aims, and objectives. There is no north or south. Even so, the West—all 16 of the Western States—have the common need of an industrial development which will complete the national economy so that America may prosper in all its parts. Then indeed we can contribute to the industrialization of the rest of the great Pacific Basin—through which process alone the teeming millions in the Orient can enjoy a better life.

This is the brief of some phases of postwar as they appear to me. But I cannot close without a word of heartfelt appreciation for your kindness in sharing this hour with me.

In this room are many of my partners and associates. I wish I could name them all. As often as I am credited with the "can do" and the "will do," I long to make known the truth about these high-sounding phrases. The merit for all that has been accomplished belongs to those who have both labored and sacrificed to reach the goals we have set. They share fully in the recognition you bring us today.

Now we stand with you on the theshold of a new day. We survey a world, the material values of which have in considerable part been swept away. There are some who hold that our spiritual values have also been impaired. Such times call for heroic action. The Iron Age has not passed. It will take men of iron to stand firm in the midst of ruin. Such men alone will have the strength and the will to forge the future of the West. They are the men in whom there lives today the spirit of the pioneer. They are the men without fear.

GOP Chance To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an interesting and timely article from the Chicago Journal of Commerce written by Frank R. Kent, highly regarded political columnist:

GOP CHANCE TO WIN

(By Frank R. Kent)

If the Republicans have the sense and the courage (which is very doubtful), it may be possible next year—and in 1948—to have an issue between the two major political parties that should have been drawn long ago but which, for one reason or another,

could never be presented in a clear-cut, concrete, unmistakable fashion.

Yet, it is the most fundamental of all—and the most important. It poses the question of whether the country is conservative or radical; whether it wants to cling to the capitalistic, free-enterprise system it has had for so many years or whether it wants to swing to the government-ownership socialistic state, toward which we have been tending the last decade.

All the New Deal experiments have taken us in that direction. The spending policies involving ever-increasing deficits and ever-mounting debt moved straight toward that goal.

Nevertheless, the people have never had an opportunity to vote clearly on this issue. It has always been so confused and complicated with other matters that an unmistakable expression by the majority could not be had. In not one of the four Roosevelt elections can it be said that a verdict was rendered.

In 1932 the people voted against Mr. Hoover because of the depression and for a Roosevelt who denounced deficit financing and demanded a balanced budget. In 1936 Mr. Roosevelt had launched the New Deal and definitely allied himself with the left-wingers. But neither the Republican candidate nor the Republican platform took the conservative side. On the contrary, they accepted some of the Roosevelt radicalism and were overwhelmingly beaten.

In 1940 Mr. Willkie, and in 1944 Governor Dewey, both denounced the New Deal but in some respects tried to outbid Mr. Roosevelt for support of the so-called liberals and the professional labor leaders. And, of course, in 1940 and in 1944, the war weighted the chances heavily on the Roosevelt side. So that, though the Communist Party and every radical, anti-private-enterprise group in the country ranged solidly behind the Democratic candidate, the issue of conservative or radical never could be clearly drawn. In both these elections many conservatives voted for Mr. Roosevelt, hating it, but believing they had no alternative.

Analysts of the vote in the last three elections have claimed that in any one of them had all the conservatives opposed to the New Deal been able to get together the decision would have been different. But there is no way of proving that. Thousands of conservative Democrats were held in line by the party label; many thousands more by the expanded Federal pay rolls; other thousands from disgust with the Republicans for their cowardice in following instead of fighting the radical groups.

Since his recent message it has been generally accepted that Mr. Truman, who had been hailed as a middle-of-the-road man, definitely has cast his lot in with the liberals. The radical press and spokesmen hail him as one of them. The Wallace type of statesman applauds. His own Postmaster General and national chairman, Mr. Hannegan, proclaims him a liberal. The labor bosses, the Communists, and the spenders are delighted.

The question now is: Will the Republicans have the guts and gumption to accept the challenge? If they do, at least we have a chance to find out which way the country really wants to go. We will find out then whether, as claimed, it is really conservative at heart or whether it is eager for continued governmental expansion and experiments.

The door has been opened for the Republicans to take an emphatic stand against unrestrained spending; against the closed shop; against governmental interference with private business, for a firmer regulation of labor unions, for reduction in the size of the governmental machine and an end to all socialistic experiments.

In brief, if the Republicans, instead of aping the advanced thinkers, angling for the radical vote, being afraid of the labor bullies and of being called reactionary, go strongly conservative, the voters can divide cleanly on one side or the other. Many believe that if the Republicans play the game that way and put up a candidate who will make the fight along those lines, they will, for the first time, get all the conservatives and win. Others are just as firmly convinced they would be terribly beaten.

No one can tell about that, but what has been demonstrated is that they are always beaten when they try to work both sides of the street. If they try that again they certainly will be beaten again.

For they cannot pry the radicals loose from the Democratic Party, which they are gradually making their own, and all the Republicans succeed in doing is undermining conservative confidence in their integrity and intelligence.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 26 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, about the end of July, I introduced a bill providing for the ratification of the treaty between the United States and Canada, dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Dewey Insists on New York Rights in Seaway Bill. His Message to Truman Demanded Guaranty on St. Lawrence's Power," from the New York Herald Tribune of today.

I might add that the position of Governor Dewey is favorable to the early enactment of my bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY INSISTS ON NEW YORK RIGHTS IN SEAWAY BILL—HIS MESSAGE TO TRUMAN DEMANDED GUARANTY ON ST. LAWRENCE'S POWER

WASHINGTON, September 25.—Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, in his telegram to President Truman last week served notice that he would withdraw his support from the proposed St. Lawrence seaway unless the administration included in its legislation for the project plans to develop water resources and turn them over to the New York State, it became known today as the New York Herald Tribune came into possession of a copy of Mr. Dewey's message.

The New York Governor wrote that he had been informed that the President planned to sponsor legislation drafted by Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, and Samuel I. Rosenman, White House special counsel, which would merely ratify the 1909 agreement with Canada to develop the seaway without mentioning the power development which the Federal Government was to turn over to New York for $93,375,000 under the previous accord.

Mr. Dewey conceded that the power accord might be added to the bill as an amendment, but declared that such a fundamental feature should be included from the beginning and should not be "subjected to the perils and vagaries of parliamentary procedure."

"Rather than see the fundamental rights of the people of this State disregarded, I should be compelled to oppose any measure which omits the agreement as to power development already made and approved by the executive branches of the Federal Government and this State," he wrote.

Although his message did not mention it directly, it was understood here that Mr. Dewey was fearful that an amendment might be added to the bill to circumvent the power accord and develop the power resources under Federal authority.

It was also learned today that a tentative draft of legislation for the St. Lawrence seaway omitting all reference to the power-development phase of the project has already been submitted to Mr. Truman and is awaiting his decision.

TEXT OF TELEGRAM

The text of Governor Dewey's telegram, which the White House had refused several times to make public, follows:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.:

Chairman Bonbright of the New York State Power Authority has informed me of the series of conferences recently held in Washington between members of the United States Senate, Under Secretary of State Acheson, Judge Rosenman, and Dr. N. R. Danielian, who purport to represent your views. Secretary Acheson and Judge Rosenman have stated or implied that you intend to sponsor a bill which will merely ratify the international agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence and completely omit the accord between the Federal Government and the State of New York for the development of its power resources.

"The St. Lawrence bill, which in substance has been introduced year after year, provided that the Federal Government would construct both the seaway and power facilities and that this Nation's share of the power facilities would be turned over to the New York State Power Authority in return for $93,370,000. This amount was agreed upon by President Roosevelt's administration and the United States Army engineers who have prepared the plans for this project and who would supervise the construction. Relying on Federal executive approval previously expressed the State of New York has already expended $1,500,000 in advancing this project.

In 1941 a suggestion like that now proposed was advanced, striking the Federal-State accord from the bill. At that time members of the Federal administration who advocated Federal control of this power were heard and their views were not followed. President Roosevelt after conferring with my predecessor, Governor Lehman, rejected the proposal.

WANTS ACCORD AS PART OF BILL

It has even been suggested that you will urge an amendment of the proposed bill, after introduction, to permit the inclusion of the Federal-State accord. I am sure you recognize what a hollow procedure it would be to have this bill introduced in an emasculated form and in such form made the subject of committee hearings and Federal departmental recommendations. If the Federal-State accord is ultimately to be part of the bill, in fairness to the committee members considering it and to the vital interests of the people of the State of New York, the accord should be a part of the bill from the very beginning. Rights so fundamental should not be subjected to the perils and vagaries of parliamentary procedure. They should not be subjected to a cross-fire between the advocates of Federal power monopoly and private power monopoly.

For the last 5 years I have advocated every constructive movement to make possible this great St. Lawrence development. But rather than see the fundamental rights of the people of this State disregarded I should be compelled to oppose any measure which omits the agreement as to power development already made and approved by the executive branches of the Federal Government and this State. I am confident you will agree that the accord should not be omitted from the bill to be introduced and earnestly trust that I may count upon your support in this matter of such vital interest to the people of New York State.

I am mailing a copy of this wire to the interested Senators and members of the New York State Power Authority.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Pay of the Armed Forces in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following open letter received by me today from a group of soldiers stationed overseas, which speaks for itself:

CAMP TWENTY GRAND,
Le Havre, France, September 16, 1945.

THIS IS NOT AN APPEAL—THIS IS A STATEMENT OF FACT

Personnel of the Second Armored Division, stationed in Berlin, were paid for the month of July 1945 in Russian Allied military marks. Also, at this time these men holding French francs, Dutch guilders, or Belgian francs had their currency exchanged into these Russian marks.

During this same month (July), money orders were limited to the amount drawn across the pay table plus 10 percent. However, during the following month, even after this pseudo limitation, commissioned officers signed for money orders from one hundred to one thousand dollars. Those men closely connected to orderly rooms, headquarters sections, etc., were able to send home hundreds of dollars worth of money orders, all purchased with these Russian marks. These men less fortunate were usually told that the quota had already been filled. In the meantime the accumulated savings piled up. Men were forced to carry huge sums of cash in their pockets. There was nothing to buy in Berlin. Gambling was inevitable. To add to the confusion, the sale of watches was declared legal in the Stars and Stripes.

At Camp Atlanta, on the way home, all of the Russian Allied military marks were accepted, but only 2 months pay plus 10 percent was exchanged into French francs. The balance was held for safe-keeping in the orderly rooms of the various companies.

At Camp Twenty Grand, near Le Havre, all of the marks left over were returned to the men. Next came an order limiting the amount to be turned into American dollars to 2 months' base pay plus 10 percent plus 20 percent for overseas service. Of course, many soldiers had more than that amount in French francs and German marks. In order to get this overage converted into dollars, many soldiers paid heavily (sometimes as much as 30 percent) to have other soldiers turn in some of the money for them. The whole business was very complicated and cost the soldiers hundreds of unnecessary dollars because, in the long run, most of the money was turned in anyway. Those men still retaining Russian marks, American marks, French francs, were advised that this currency might be converted into dollars in the United States of America.

Many disgusted soldiers burned their extra marks. It was all too stupid and too fantastic. Their own Government was letting them down after they had served overseas, in combat, for 3 years. Their own Government would not honor money printed for the use of invasion troops nor would this fine democracy honor the currency of her Allies—France, Russia, Holland, or Belgium.

The Late Monsignor John A. Ryan, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered at the funeral of Msgr. John A. Ryan, D. D., St. Paul Cathedral, St. Paul, Minn., September 19, 1945, by Most Rev. Francis J. Haas, D. D., bishop of Grand Rapids, Mich.:

"The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips; he walked with me in peace, and in equity, and turned many away from iniquity." (Malachias 2: 6.)

It is with deep sorrow and yet with a sense of privilege that we assist at the solemn obsequies of one of the few great men of our generation—John Augustine Ryan. You, Your Excellency, the most reverend archbishop of St. Paul, and you his clergy, have lost a distinguished priest. You, his very reverend brother, you his sisters in religion, and you his other surviving brothers and sisters have lost a loving brother. To you our hearts go out in profoundest sympathy.

And yet your loss, if I may say it, does not begin to measure the loss today. The late Monsignor William J. Kerby once remarked: "The Catholic Church in the United States should fall on its knees and thank Almighty God for John Ryan." And when we recall the vast services that Monsignor Ryan rendered to all our people—to the poor in enabling them to acquire some little property, and to the rich in assuring them that the right to honestly won property is sacred and inviolable—our entire Nation should offer a prayer of thanksgiving to heaven that John Ryan lived and worked. There can be little question that future history will support this judgment.

Let me say something first of Monsignor Ryan's life, then of the secret of his life's work and of the man himself. Although I speak as one of his former students, I shall endeavor to keep myself free from any bias that may arise out of my filial regard and affection for him.

I

The facts of his life are well known and call for no detailed recital. They can be summarized briefly, although, in a career as full as his, it is not easy to separate what is important from what is not. He was born on May 25, 1869, on a farm some 20 miles south of St. Paul, the son of God-fearing Irish immigrant parents from Tipperary. Of the 11 children, 2 became priests and 2 nuns.

On the Ryan farm there was the usual pioneering thrift and hard labor, the farm mortgage with interest up to 12 percent, the little shelf of some five or six books, and first among them the book of books, the Life of Christ, and that of His Blessed Mother. In addition, a newspaper came to the farmhouse each week. It was the Irish World and American Industrial Liberator, which the boy John eagerly devoured and which, as he said, gave him his first interest in social questions and social betterment.

Later followed his training for the sacred ministry at St. Paul Seminary, and his ordination to the holy priesthood by Archbishop John Ireland in 1898. Then came 4 years of graduate study at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., followed by 13 years as professor of moral theology at St. Paul Seminary, and still later by 24 years as professor at the Catholic University, during which time, since 1919, he was director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference until the time of his death.

Of his 24 years at the Catholic University the late rector of the university, Bishop Joseph M. Corrigan, declared at the dinner attended by some 600 persons at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., on the occasion of Monsignor Ryan's seventieth birthday, May 25, 1939: "It would be difficult indeed to vision the Catholic University in the past quarter of a century without the pioneering work and untiring ability of Father John Ryan." (Ryan, Social Doctrine in Action, Harpers, 1940, p. 279.)

This statement, however generous, should have been made very much stronger than it was. In my observation it was through Father Ryan, more than through any other individual, that the Catholic University during its first 50 years came to be known and recognized, here and abroad, as an institution of courageous scholarship and of service to humanity.

But he spoke not only in the lecture room. He spoke through the printed page, and literally to the whole civilized world. Beginning with the first edition of his Living Wage in 1906, down to his last work, The Norm of Morality, which appeared only a few months ago, he managed to publish a small library of some dozen volumes, in addition to hundreds of pamphlets, and articles in encyclopedias, and in journals, religious and secular, here and in foreign countries.

Moreover there was hardly any major moral question of contemporary life into which he did not inquire, and upon which he did not pass judgment. I mention only some of them: Wages and hours, farm prices, monopoly, price fixing, interest taking, housing, divorce, birth prevention, population problems, human sterilization, church and state, and the ethical foundations of international life.

Pioneer, he was, in the sense that he dared to have opinions on subjects from which, all too frequently, the less courageous shrunk back from having them. Pioneer, he was not in the sense that he strove for novelty. On the contrary, his sole aim was to call men back to the ancient truths delivered by the Master to His Church.

It would be interesting to review the extent to which Monsignor Ryan's teachings have been put into operation in our country. Time will permit me to refer to only one. In 1910, he made two addresses, one in March in Milwaukee, and the other in May in St. Louis, in which he advocated the establishment of a minimum wage by law. Prior to that year, there is no record of any public statement by any person of standing in support of a legal minimum wage.

How much his addresses in 1910, together with his writings on the subject, contributed to the subsequent enactment of such legislation, is difficult to determine, but it is the fact that shortly thereafter minimum-wage bills were introduced into various State legislatures, and that he himself wrote the first minimum-wage bill presented to the Minnesota Legislature, and that this bill, in revised form, became law in this State in 1913. By 1917, 11 States had similar laws, and at present the number is 26. Moreover, in 1938, our Federal Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act establishing national minimum-wage levels for men and women.

In all truth, his was a full life as priest and scholar. Teacher, thinker, author, lecturer, administrator—his record does not have to be made or to be built up. It is known to all the world. Without exaggeration, one can say that his social program is now the property of the American people, and even of some abroad, and that men are beginning to recognize its measured wisdom, and even to live by it.

II

So much for his life. What was the source of his strength? What was the secret of his life's work?

Those who knew John Ryan will answer that the source of his strength was Almighty God himself. Upon the great truths of divine revelation he exercised his splendid mind, and from them drew all his reasoned applications to everyday life. He was too clear-eyed not to see that man's relation to his Creator is more important than man's relation to his fellow men, and that unless the first relation is right the second cannot be. He saw, too, that by helping to bring the second nearer to what God intended, he was helping to bring the first to fuller reality.

In May 1891, when John Ryan was 22 years of age, the great Leo XIII issued his epoch-making encyclical, On the Condition of Workers. In the following month the Review of Reviews carried a 7,000-word commentary on the encyclical, praising it lavishly and hailing it as the book of the month. The reviewer, however, sounded a note of warning: "The Encyclical opens a door through which we may see a great vista of social transformation. The Pope has taken the first step. He has put his hand to the plough. * * * Everything will depend upon how the lead, taken in the Encyclical, is followed up" (p. 89).

That was a challenge and, almost alone in our country, the young Ryan took it up. In the Encyclical he read a principle to which he clung to the last, and in it he observed a method, from which, scientist that he was, he never deviated.

The principle was this: The Catholic Church has jurisdiction over economic matters in everything touching men's lives, technical and mechanical activities only excepted. Leo had declared unequivocally: Confidenter ad argumentum aggredimur ac plane iure Nostro, "We approach the subject with confidence and surely by our right" (par. 24).

But it was abundantly clear to the young Ryan that this principle rests on a much deeper one: That the Holy Father, as head of the church, speaks for, and in the name of, and with the same authority as, Jesus Christ. As to this latter principle John Ryan never entertained the slightest question. It was the basis and groundwork of all his doctrine. To him, it was the church and the church alone to which Christ, speaking to Peter, had given His own divine powers: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matthew 16: 18): "As the Father has sent me, I also send you" (John 20: 21); and to which He had given His comforting assurance of protection from error, "And behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world" (Matthew 28: 20). To him, the church was "the pillar and mainstay of the truth" (1 Timothy 3: 15), and, as he once wrote, "It is the dearest thing in my life."

But young Ryan detected something else in Leo's encyclical besides its reassertion of the principle that the church has unquestioned jurisdiction over everything affecting men's lives in the social and economic field. That something else was the method that the pontiff used. It was what we call today the scientific method. Leo, indeed, had a philosophy as what scientist, deny it as he may, has not. Leo's procedure was: Observation, experiment, induction, with proposals for change dictated by his philosophy. In a word, he first gathered before him certain verifiable data, and then only passed moral judgment on them and advocated remedial measures, wherever, according to his philosophy, there was need of remedy. This was Leo's method. This was John Ryan's method.

Regarding the encyclical of 1891, years afterward monsignor Ryan wrote: "At the beginning of the encyclical, he (Leo XIII) declared that the condition of the working classes had come to be little better than that of slavery. This was a statement of fact, not a repetition of a general principle. It was not arrived at by deductive reasoning. Throughout the encyclical, he deals constantly with the actual conditions of labor in all its relations. Hence the concreteness and usefulness of his moral pronouncements." (Questions of the Day, Stratford Press, 1931, p. 223.)

This procedure of Leo XIII of combining divine truth and scientific method, and yet in giving each its fullest scope, Monsignor Ryan followed throughout his whole career. Needless to say, in doing so he was acting in the best Christian tradition.

Recall the touching incident in the synagogue at Capernaum (John 6: 60–70). The Master has just proclaimed His divinity again and had just declared to His disciples that He was going to give them His flesh to eat and His blood to drink. Some of them were scandalized at what He had said and, murmuring among themselves, began to walk away. Turning to the Twelve, He asked, "Do you also wish to go away?"

It is beside the point to inquire why our Saviour put this question to the Apostles, whether He wished them to understand that He was leaving them free either to remain with Him or to go away, or that as sovereign God He could readily secure substitutes in their place if they decided to leave, or whether He wished to stifle any thought in their hearts that by remaining with Him, they were extending a favor to Him rather than receiving one. The fact is, He asked the Twelve, "Do you also wish to go away?"

Simon Peter, speaking for the Twelve, replied at once: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast words of everlasting life, and we have come to believe and to know that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God." It is as if Peter had said, "Thy words, O Lord, are sweet and life giving; Thou art our only refuge; who but one who is dull and unbalanced would leave Thee?"

Peter made an act of faith, and Peter used his powers of reasoning. Peter believed and Peter knew. He believed because he accepted Christ, true God and true man. He knew because he had heard with his own ears the preaching of the Baptist, and because he had seen with his own eyes and had witnessed with all his other senses the miracles and the sanctity of the Saviour. Peter believed, and Peter knew.

Like Simon Peter, John Augustine Ryan exemplified the faithful use of the twofold talent of faith and of reason. While his reliance on the teachings of Peter's successor was truly childlike, he yielded to no one in the complete and unfettered use of his vigorous intellect.

Living answer, he was, to the shallow taunt that a Catholic cannot be a scientist. To him reason was the light of God's face. To him was given the Psalmist's joy: "The light of Thy countenance O Lord is signed upon us: Thou has given gladness in my heart." (4–7.) That gladness, we may venture to say, gave him the extraordinary calm which he maintained in the face of hostile critics, and the satisfaction that was his to see no small part of what he had worked for coming to be accepted even during his lifetime.

To his success in combining in himself the moral teacher and the scientist, let one testify whose commendation may come as a bit of a surprise. In 1917, Dr. Alvin Johnson reviewing Monsignor Ryan's monumental work Distributive Justice in the New Republic of February 17 wrote: "Few ethical authorities have had sufficient knowledge of economic facts to adapt ethical principles to the economic field; few economists are abreast of the best modern work in ethics. To this rule, the most notable exception is Dr. Ryan. His economic scholarship is unimpeachable; survey his writing, and you are forced to the conclusion that among the economists of today there are not many who can match him in command of the literature and in sanity of judgment."

A single formula, then, guided him throughout his entire career: complete adherence to the teaching magisterium of the church, and painstaking use of the tools of the scientist. He did not merely accept the depositum fidei, the body of Christian faith, but worked and toiled in order to set it forth in its primeval purity.

In 1913, he became disturbed at the charge of certain socialists that the early fathers of the church—Basil, Ambrose, and Jerome—denied the right of private property, and advocated a system of collectivism. He set himself to work on early Patristic literature and published the little volume The Alleged Socialism of the Church Fathers, in which he revealed the true mind of the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries on ownership and private property.

Later, as students in his seminar at Catholic University can well bear witness, he was almost meticulous in analyzing the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, both in directing dissertations and in publishing his own researches in this field, in order to discover the true position of the angel of the schools on the two main pillars of medieval economic doctrine, the just price and the prohibition of usury. Again, it was the theologian and the scientist at work.

There is one feature of John Ryan's thinking that may not be overlooked. Theologian though he was, he had a passion for facts. He took the perfectly rational position that no one can pass valid judgment on industrial or other questions unless he is acquainted with the facts concerning them. He adopted the homely common sense of the person in the street; a man, when he talks, should know what he is talking about.

Deductive reasoning alone, he held, is not enough. Convictions alone, even when they are sound and right, are not enough. "The general principles," he wrote, "are true, indeed, but they are practically useless unless they are applied specifically to the actual conditions and relations of the industry. Unless we know the facts, we cannot apply the principles." (Questions of the Day, Stratford Press, 1931, p. 222.) Could clearer declaration be formulated of the rights and liberties of the true scientist?

One other phase of his thinking might well be referred to here. It was his constant practice to view things in their causal relation to one another and, in the case of social wrongs, to propose remedies to eliminate the causes of these wrongs, rather than to wait until the causes had worked themselves out, and then merely to deplore the evil results. I refer to the matter of communism. All the world knows that communism can take root only in the soil of injustice and oppression. It can hardly thrive in any other.

Monsignor Ryan denounced communism, and its earlier counterpart, socialism, more vigorously and certainly more intelligently than any other writer in the English language. (See for example his The Church and Socialism, University Press, Washington, 1919, and his A Better Economic Order, Harpers, 1935.) But he did not content himself with condemnation. His was a positive crusade. He sought to remove the causes out of which socialism and communism grow. If any proof is needed for this assertion, the clear answer is the Bishop's Reconstruction Program of 1919, which he not only conceived but also wrote.

Indeed, he does not fall under the censure of Pope Pius XI, but rather merits the praise of that great pontiff who, after lamenting the attitude of those who look with indifference on the spread of communism, asserts: "All the more gravely to be condemned is the folly of those who neglect to remove or change the conditions that inflame the minds of peoples, and pave the way for the overthrow and destruction of society." (Quadragesimo Anno, par. 112.)

But, mark well, Monsignor Ryan did not demand justice for workers merely because injustice would drive them to communism. When all is said and done, this is a view that is born of selfishness. It was not John Ryan's view. His was far more Christian. He condemned oppression, and proposed measures for social justice in behalf of the appressed, because justice is their right as children of God and brothers of Jesus Christ.

III

Now, let us look at the man himself. Persons who met Monsignor Ryan for the first time were frequently heard to remark: "How strong and yet how simple he is." This was the judgment not merely of strangers, but of those who were privileged to be close to him. Massive strength with childlike simplicity—nothing portrays him quite so well.

If we may draw aside the curtain of his young manhood, we may say, I am sure, that he did not build his character to this formula by chance, and least of all, by self-promoting design. Christian and Catholic that he was from birth, he saw and loved and made his own the transcendent wisdom of Him who being God "emptied himself, taking the nature of a slave and being made like unto men" (Philistines 2: 7); who laid it down as a first condition of man's blessedness "unless you turn and become like little children, you will not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 18: 3); who remains with us, true God, under the frail appearance of bread upon our altars; whose own Mother became all powerful because she was all lowly; and whose Apostle could proclaim with triumph, "Strength is made perfect in weakness" (II Corinthians 12).

To this great mystery of Christian faith—strength is made perfect in weakness—John Ryan yielded allegiance. It captivated him and shaped his character. Here is the explanation of his childlike simplicity and of his manly strength.

Child, he was, to his last breath. Even at the risk of seeming to trifle, I would say that it was only a boy who, at the age of 70, could look back at the time when he was 29 and write of himself, as he did, in his autobiography: "Until I left home for the Catholic University the latter part of September 1898, I had never seen as large a city as Chicago. The 2 or 3 days that I spent in that metropolis on my way to Washington were extremely interesting. I still recall the powerful impression made upon me by the elevated railroads, the tall buildings, the lake front, the crowds, and the noise, hurry, and bustle" (Social Doctrine in Action, Harper, 1941, p. 62). This same attitude of utter truthfulness runs through all his writings, as it dominated the man himself. "The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips" (Malachias 2: 5).

But God's paradox had worked itself out. The Seat of Wisdom had declared: "He has put down the mighty from their thrones, and has exalted the lowly" (Luke 1: 52). Indeed, the childlike simplicity of John Ryan had made of him a man of judgment, of courage, and of breadth of view.

Judgment, he had, to separate fact from make-believe; and when he rendered judgment, there was none that did not know its meaning. Courage, he had, but it was the courage that the God of hosts vouchsafes only to those who fight for the right. Breadth of view, he had, both of God's world and of God's church, as witness his desire for a study to discover whether the status of the church in Catholic countries is not in direct proportion to the degree to which the peoples of these countries have sought to carry out the Catholic program for social justice and to live it in their daily lives.

This morning I venture the prophecy: He will stand in our country almost alone, to offset the sentence of condemnation that future generations will justly pass upon our own, that whereas we have made revolutionary advances in scientific research in behalf of things we have made little, if any, progress in the high science of social thinking in behalf of human beings.

Such is the man and such is the priest whose mortal remains we consign to the earth today. His soul can be happy and his bereaved brothers and sisters can even rejoice in the assurance of St. Paulinus of the fourth century: "It is one thing to pray for yourself. It is quite another for a multitude to clamor to God for you." With the faith that is ours, we can confidently hope that the uncounted thousands whose cause he espoused have already prevailed for him at the seat of divine mercy.

O angels of God, if eternal Justice, before whom no man stands without fault, still holds him in the prison house of suffering, lift up the bars and admit this valiant champion of justice and charity into the mansions of peace and of rest. Amen.

Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Expenditures of the House of Representatives has reported out a reorganization bill, H. R. 4129 giving the President broad authority to reorganize the executive department of the Government. This bill exempts the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers of the Army from any reorganization or transfer out of the War Department or from the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

Every waterway organization and everyone interested in waterways will desire to work assiduously to see that the aforesaid exemption remains inviolate in the bill during its passage through the House and the Senate.

The Hoover Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel:

THE HOOVER FORMULA

Former President Hoover's analysis of what the United States can do, and should do, in the matter of postwar loans and assistance to foreign governments, should be studied carefully by every American who is anxious to help the other countries, but who is interested at the same time in going about it in the wisest, safest way.

In his talk before the Chicago Executives Club, Mr. Hoover expressed first a sentiment with which all will agree: "Let me say at the outset that I favor such financial assistance, under safeguards and limitations. * * * We in America can let no child, woman, or man starve—whether friend or enemy—as long as we have an ounce of surplus."

But at the same time, he said, "When it comes to financial assistance for postwar reconstruction, if we act without wisdom and without regard to experience, far from curing the ills of the world we will make them worse."

With that premise established, the former President pointed out an elemental truth, and one that should be understood by everyone, both here and abroad.

"Europe is much more greatly impoverished by this war than the last one. But, Europe should not ignore the fact that we also are far more greatly impoverished by this war than the last one.

"American recovery and financial stability is the first need of the world. Unless we recover, no one will recover. There is a limit to the aid 30,000,000 American families can give to the 300,000,000 families abroad who are hoping for our postwar help."

Mr. Hoover's considered judgment is that even though our hope of collecting lend-lease debts is very slight, they should not be written off the books now, but that "we should, instead, propose a world-wide moratorium on all intergovernmental war debt, and 5 years hence, when the shape of the world is more clear, we should join our allies in settling the disposition of all such debts."

It is his belief also that we should not open credits to foreign countries until the considerable balances which some of those countries still have in the United States are exhausted.

"We cannot afford," said Mr. Hoover, "to just make general loans or give unrestricted financial aid as our Government did in part after the last war. We cannot today afford having our resources used to keep up armies, to engage in nonproductive enterprises, to pay debts to other countries, to subsidize social experiments, to go into business abroad

in competition with us, or to pay for propaganda to upset our Government."

This, of course, is precisely what some of the sophomores in the Washington school of delirious economy plan to do, unless they are forcibly restrained. Thus, they would finance Great Britain's experiment with monarchial socialism, reestablish her merchant marine so she could compete with us in world trade, and enable her to pay on her other creditors while ignoring her debt to us. Also, of course, they would help Russia to finance her scheme for world revolution by drenching America with pro-Soviet, anti-American propaganda.

After demonstrating that "all loans or credits should be reduced to terms of commodities," Mr. Hoover proceeded to explain his belief that "we should open a credit to the particular nation and that credit should be available to purchase commodities in the United States which we approve. This will assure the employment for our own people in producing these commodities."

It is recognized by the former President, as it is by anyone conversant with the situation, that we shall get back only a little part—if any—of the advances we make to foreign countries for relief and reconstruction.

There are, however, some other indirect benefits which we may receive.

"We should insist that there be no quotas against us, no discriminatory tariffs against us, no dumping of goods upon us, no cartel operations against us * * *. We must have some protection from socialized foreign trade for such trade contains both the essence of dumping and cartelization * * *. There should be agreement of no trade discriminations in spheres of influence against us in favor of the dominant power. There should be agreement that no propaganda against the American system of life will be carried on."

In summary, Mr. Hoover gave a capsule formula for our help to other nations:

"We must help. We should use common sense; we should limit our help to what our taxpayers can afford; we should consider our own employment situation; we should limit our aid to the minimum necessary; we should limit it to the direct purpose of restoring their domestic needs through commodities; we should organize it so as to minimize the ill will over repayment. We should do it with the knowledge that we are doing it at a loss to ourselves but to aid mankind."

The Quiet Sector

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Traveller:

THE QUIET SECTOR

The tumult and the shouting does not die, the captains of industry and the kings of labor stand their ground. American heavy industry is glowing with the fires of discontent and around the Detroit area those fires are flaming skyward. The predicted period of industrial strife is at hand.

And yet there is one quiet sector, admirably and laudably quiet, one sector going about the job of industrial, economic, social, and intellectual reconversion from peace to war with almost no confusion and bickering and an almost total absence of strikes.

Expanding industries and industries now being born might observe the fact and draw a deduction favorable to the industrial growth of that sector and to their own long-term well-being.

The sector, of course, is New England.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following column, This Changing World, written by Constantine Brown and appearing in the Washington Evening Star for Monday, September 24, 1945:

THIS CHANGING WORLD
(By Constantine Brown)

The conference of the Big Five Foreign Ministers is drawing to a close in London. It has been so shrouded in secrecy that only general hints of the struggles behind the scenes, from which Russia has emerged victorious, have been given to the American public.

The secrecy of the debates adopted at Russia's pressing request was helped by other news in this country. The State Department-MacArthur row, strikes, reconversion problems, and other domestic problems, were more interesting to the public than the complex diplomatic discussions in London.

Although the sequel to the first postwar conference of the Big Five is likely to have a great repercussion on America's position in the world, the public had only an academic interest in the London talks. Americans by now have become accustomed to secret diplomacy.

So far as can be ascertained from reports received in diplomatic quarters here, the hopes of the American representatives, who met with the others in London determined to see democracy reinstated in eastern Europe, were frustrated. The map of postwar Europe, which they wished to blueprint on the basis of justice and fair play, also was junked. The Americans, the British, the French, and the Chinese bowed to the unyielding attitude of the Russians, who put their cards on the table and adopted a policy of "take it or leave it."

In one of the concessions to the Soviet, we accepted Moscow's point of view in regard to the former Axis partners, Rumania and Bulgaria. Before the London meeting the American and British Governments sent notes to the heads of these Russian puppet governments saying that the countries must have free elections supervised by American, British, French, and Russian observers. The notes said that unless this condition was agreed to, no peace treaty could be signed, since America and Britain did not wish to deal with governments which were not truly representative of their own people.

Commissar Molotov opposed this thesis. He declared that his government, which had placed puppets at the helm of the affairs of the three states, regarded such intervention as a violation of the principle of sovereignty for the "independent" states.

In spite of the positive information received from American and British ministers in Bucharest and Sofia that the governments there were not representative of the people, we yielded to Russia. Thus one of the main principles for which we fought the war—free governments, freely elected by their people—has again been discarded because a minority—Russia—was able to impose its will on the majority.

This diplomatic defeat, which may appear of secondary significance to the average man in this country, may have important repercussions in the future. In fact, the Western democracies are placing their stamp of approval on futher territorial conquests by Russia, which will have complete control over large and rich territories inhabited by tens of millions of persons. These peoples have to choose between accepting this situation, much as they dislike their new police-state of government, or opposing it. In the latter case, they know the fate that awaits them—mass deportations, concentration camps, starvation, and frequently legal assassinations.

Russia also has taken advantage of this first meeting of the Big Five Foreign Ministers to peg her claims to naval and air bases in areas far removed from her. She has indicated that in the settlement of the Italian peace she wants slices of the former Italian Empire, such as Eritrea, a port in Tripolitania and some strategic islands in the eastern Mediterranean.

The American, British, and French Governments felt that while Italy should be clipped of the political control of her empire, some portions should be returned to her under the guise of a trusteeship, supervised by the Trusteeship Committee of the United Nations Organization. In this manner Italy would not be in a position to use these territories for future aggression and at the same time would be able to obtain raw materials and have a place for her surplus population.

Russia showed little interest in Italy's future. But she insisted, and is reported to have obtained, in principle at least, the consent of the other Allies to the bases she has selected.

The State Department is pointing out that nothing definite has been settled in London. Secretary of State Byrnes has obtained that much of a moral victory. He will not be compelled to sign on the dotted line, handing over to Russia at this time everything she has demanded.

Subcommittees have been organized and will study these questions further. But observers point out that since the foreign secretaries themselves had to knuckle under to the adamant attitude of the Soviet Foreign Commissar, there is little chance that the studies of the subcommittees will change the picture materially.

Discharges From the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a veteran friend of mine now stationed on Saipan. This veteran—and there are thousands like him—needs to be considered for discharge as rapidly as possible. I feel that his communication is very worthy of the attention of Congress, and I am doing all I can to see that this

group will be given every possible consideration so that they can be discharged just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, because of the logic contained in this letter I am inserting it in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, so that the Congress can more fully understand the plight of this forgotten group:

SAIPAN, *September 21, 1945.*

DEAR MIKE: Just a note to leave everyone of those responsible, know how we married men with children in the 30- to 37-year group feel. We were called to the service during the last year of the war. Every place we went from the day of induction to now everyone has shown surprise that we were drafted. Now here's the catch and we would like to thank those responsible if you know what we mean. We also wonder what's going to be done for us and when can we expect to get home to support our wives and children properly.

1. The Army makes provisions for the discharge of the 38-year-olds. That leaves us out.

2. Then comes the discharge of those 35 years old or over with 2 years of service. Nothing here for us.

Now the Army is going to drop the discharge points to 60 within 3 months and stop discharging on points.

How could we have possibly acquired that many points?

After the 60 points, anyone with 2 years' of service is entitled to discharge. We're about a year short here. Anyone over 26 years old won't be used or needed for occupation troops.

So what? We just seem to be betwixt and between with no one looking out for us and our families needing us while were doing no good but keeping up expenses. From this whole set-up we have, anywheres from 12 months to 20 months to sweat it out. Do you think that's fair? Someone in sure overlooking us.

We don't begrudge the long service and high point men their discharge. Those boys did a great job and have that coming to them. Can you throw any light on this situation for us? Someone's slipping.

Fifteen of us here and probably thousands all over the world.

First, the news in the Stars and Stripes was to the effect that all high-point men would be shipped out by October. Well, they send them out in such small numbers that, at the present rate it will take months. For instance, we have a matter of 60-plus going out in our next quota from 96 points up. Most men have 90 to 95 points in my particular outfit and that means, at the present rate, a long time getting to 85 points. Surely not in 1 month.

Second—why are all divisions allowed just 800 low-point men "to take with them" when everyone knows that several divisions with all low-pointers have sailed? Naming one, the Thirty-fifth, of which I have a brother-in-law in it who came in the Army after I'd been in about 17 months. What kind of a racket are they running?

In my particular case—I'll mention it only as a guide to show what can and does happen. I'm nearly 40 and have 87 points. Have nearly 2 years overseas, earned five battle stars. Came to the redeployment area near Rheims the first part of June. The commanding officer of the regiment I was in at that time tried to hold every one of his high-point men. Finally, August 1, I was sent to this battalion—four men from each company in the regiment being sent—a great reduction. All my records were in order, having been processed in Camp Brooklyn and I thought I was on my way. Since I've been here I haven't done 2 days' work. There is no work, so that can't be used as any sort of an excuse. Shortly after arriving I was told to sign an application for discharge for 40 years of age. I told them I wasn't 40 but I signed it. Today I signed one for 38 years, and was told it probably wouldn't do any good as I had over 85 points. What kind of system (?) are they using? Incidentally, the news says "any man over 38 will be discharged upon request."

This war has caused a lot of us a lot of trouble, grief, and money, and those who have earned the right for a quick discharge should be considered first. Otherwise, why have the point system?

We have no means of doing anything about the situation other than this which I am doing.

No one else seems to take any interest. Lots of the boys say "Hell, they don't want the soldiers home." Nice thoughts to carry back to America.

Army Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter recently published from a member of the armed forces in Europe:

There are a lot of us over here in France with sufficient points for discharge and some with sufficient age, or both, and we seem to be getting a royal run-around. We've decided, several of us, to write to our individual towns, to Congressmen, etc., to see if something can't be done for us, through the medium of public opinion being brought to bear in the proper places.

I don't know much about such matters but I can state a few facts in mind and other cases and what is handed us in the Stars and Stripes, by radio, etc.

Unemployment-Compensation Bill—Repeal of Smith-Connally Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Times, dated September 25, 1945, relative to the action taken by the Committee on Ways and Means on the so-called Kilgore bill.

I also include an editorial from the New York Times, dated September 26, 1945, entitled "Repeal the 'Antistrike' Act." On September 13, 1945, I introduced H. R. 4050, to repeal the Smith-Connally Act.

The article and editorial follow:

HOUSE GROUP VOTES, 14 TO 10, TO SHELVE JOBLESS PAY BILL—MAJORITY OF WAYS AND MEANS MEMBERS BLAME WAVE OF STRIKES FOR ACTION—BUT OTHERS DISAGREE—GREEN AND MURRAY PROTEST DELAY—DOUGHTON SAYS TAX BILL MUST BE CONSIDERED

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, September 25.—The unemployment compensation bill which has been approved by the Senate and related House measures, were sidetracked indefinitely today by the Ways and Means Committee, and it decided to turn its attention, starting tomorrow, to drafting a new tax bill.

With four Democrats joining the Republican members, the committee voted, 14 to 10, to give no further consideration to the unemployment benefit program pending receipt of "more concrete information as to what the unemployment situation is to be during the reconversion period."

The postponement motion was offered by Representative MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas.

Before making this decision, the committee, by a vote of 18 to 6, defeated an attempt by Representative FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, to force action on a companion measure to the original Senate (Kilgore) bill, which called for payment of jobless benefits at a maximum of $25 weekly for 26 weeks annually on a Nation-wide scale, as recommended by President Truman. State payments would have been supplemented by Federal funds.

By this latter action, Members conceded the committee's 3-to-1 stand against the President's maximum benefits proposal left little if any hope for a change in sentiment, even though other provisions of the bill might be revived.

HOW THE COMMITTEE VOTED

The committee voting was done in executive session today, but members reported that it was as follows:

For indefinite postponement of further consideration of the Senate bill or related House measures: Representatives MILLS, WEST, of Texas; CAMP, of Georgia, and GREGORY, of Kentucky, Democrats; and KNUTSON, of Minnesota; REED, of New York, WOODRUFF, of Michigan, JENKINS, of Ohio, GEARHART, of California, CARLSON of Kansas, SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, KEAN, of New Jersey, GIFFORD, of Massachusetts, and CURTIS, of Nebraska, Republicans.

Opposing postponement: Representatives DOUGHTON; COOPER, of Tennessee; DINGELL, of Michigan; ROBERTSON, of Virginia; LYNCH, of New York; FORAND; WASIELEWSKI, of Wisconsin; MALONEY, of Louisiana; EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania; and KING, of California, Democrats.

The five Democrats who supported Mr. FORAND in his attempt to substitute his bill for the Mills motion were reported as Representatives DINGELL, LYNCH, MALONEY, EBERHARTER, and KING.

A majority of the committee members blamed the recent wave of strikes as a major factor in today's decision. They argued that the walk-outs had so muddled the unemployment picture as to make it impossible to legislate intelligently on a jobless compensation program.

A minority, however, disagreed and accused their colleagues of using the strikes as a foundation on which to base excuses for refusing to shift from positions taken before the emergency reconversion period when the same issues came up.

"With hundreds of thousands out on strike, who have also forced tens of thousands of others into idleness, we're in no position to survey the unemployment situation in this country at the present time," Mr.

KNUTSON said at the committee hearing, then added:

"We'll have to wait until the strikers get back to work. To extend the time for paying unemployment benefits would be to encourage idleness."

Several other committee members who voted to shelve the measure expressed themselves as feeling the same as Mr. KNUTSON.

Some committee members also argued that the postponement did not necessarily kill all of the legislation. Chairman DOUGHTON said that "it could be called up again tomorrow, next week, next year, or 2 years from now."

"Unemployment will rule," he said, but promised no early reconsideration of any phase of the measure.

"I don't see," he added, "how we can break off consideration of the tax bill to take anything up again. The tax legislation must be completed by both Houses by November 1 if it is to be effective January 1."

UNION LEADERS PROTEST DELAY

Spokesmen for organized labor viewed the committee's action as final, however, and urged that it be overridden.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, accused the committee of having "defied the President of the United States and slapped in the face millions of loyal workers who are losing their war jobs."

Congress has "let them down and repudiated the solemn pledge of the Government," he asserted, adding:

"First, the Senate struck out from the Kilgore bill the key provision recommended by President Truman for lifting maximum benefits to $25 a week. Now the House Ways and Means Committee has tabled the rest of the bill.

"This hostile attitude by Congress is contributing in large measure to the unrest and uncertainty that is sweeping the country. Congress is in no position to complain about strikes when it deliberately goes on strike itself against the best interest of the Nation."

REPEAL THE ANTISTRIKE ACT

Sentiment for repeal of the Smith-Connally Act is reported to be gaining strength in both Houses of Congress and among members of both parties. That repeal could not come too soon. It would not solve the present strike situation, but it is an essential step in reducing the problem and in clearing the air. Here is a chance for Congress to prove that it can take at least one step quickly in the present emergency. Representative SMITH, one of the cosponsors of the law that bears his name, has himself introduced a resolution to repeal it. That resolution should be reported or called out of committee and voted upon without delay.

It should now be obvious to everyone that the Smith-Connally Act has outlived whatever wartime usefulness it may have had. It has become not merely useless but an encumbrance and an absurdity. Its chief effect at the moment is to compel the Government to take strike votes at the taxpayers' expense. The United Mine Workers' vote last year, involving 400,000 workers, cost the Government $250,000. On that basis, to take a strike vote at the General Motors plants, as the United Automobile Workers have demanded, would cost the Government about $185,000. Yesterday the union announced that it had asked NLRB also to conduct a strike vote in 20 Chrysler plants employing 120,000 workers.

The National Labor Relations Board, which is compelled to take these votes, has itself complained that "labor organizations are making use of the strike-ballot machinery of the War Labor Disputes Act to dramatize and focus public attention on their demands and to marshal employee support for the union's position." The fact that the Government has sponsored the vote gives a semblance of official approval to the subsequent strike. One of the minor absurdities of the situation is that, though the war has been over for more than a month, the question which NLRB must still, under the terms of law, ask the workers is whether they "will permit any such interruption of war production."

A mere repeal of the Smith-Connally Act would not necessarily end the life of the National War Labor Board. That Board existed by Executive order before the Smith-Conally Act gave it direct legal status and powers. But at least in repealing the act Congress would leave the President free to terminate the War Labor Board immediately. Or it could itself do so by adding an unambiguous line to its resolution. In any case the Smith-Connally Act, which now merely provides additional encouragement to strikes, should be repealed without a day's unnecessary delay.

We Can Lose the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of September 25, 1945:

WE CAN LOSE THE PEACE

In its great determination to avert another world war by avoiding the mistakes which helped to produce the last one, the United States has adopted policies that seemed to recommend themselves by being the exact opposites of those we followed during and after the First World War. Out of that determination grew the demand for unconditional surrender and the complete military, economic, and spiritual disarmament of the enemy. Out of it grew the imposition of direct or indirect Allied, including American, rule over the enemy nations and the supervision of the restoration of democracy in liberated and satellite countries. Out of it grew, above all, a new American world policy which abandoned isolation and pledged the United States to provide, with its allies, sufficient force to prevent or suppress new aggression.

Yet in one respect, and that the most important of all, the United States appears to be bent on repeating the mistake which more than any other single error contributed toward precipitating the war just ended. In the exaltation of having finished the "war to end war," the United States led the world after 1918 in pacifism and disarmament. It scrapped its Army and much of its Navy and depended on international law and treaties to enforce themselves. It denounced armament among its present allies even while the aggressor nations were already arming themselves for war. It even furnished the latter with war materials in order to avoid trouble at the very time it was bombarding them with protests and pleas to stop their aggressions. In short, it adopted a role which appeared to the German and Japanese war lords to reveal a nation too "decadent" to fight and north worth much consideration in their plans for world conquest. They now know what a mistake this was, but it took a second world war and more than a million American casualties to prove it to them.

Today that tragic history shows signs of repeating itself. The war is scarcely over; the peace treaties are still to be written; the objectives for which the United States entered the war are still to be attained; even the occupation of all enemy lands is still to be completed. Yet the cry that rings loudest through the land and makes every Congressman jump in fear of his job is, "Bring the boys home," with its accompanying demands for an immediate end of the draft, and a demobilization of our citizen army in favor of a small volunteer army and a greatly reduced navy. There is no doubt that the young men who fought the bloody battles of this war are enlisted to the earliest possible release, and that those who risked their lives to win the war should not be saddled also with the task of policing the lands they conquered. But it is the duty of both the President and Congress not only to provide adequate replacements for service abroad from among those who have not had combat duty but also to provide for an adequate permanent system of defense which will meet all foreseeable requirements.

That is more necessary now than ever before—first, because of the great new obligations the United States has assumed, and second, because of the changed power balance in the world, which the United States helped to bring about. A dispatch from our correspondent Tania Long in this newspaper yesterday points out that withdrawals from our occupation army in Germany are already so extensive, and replacements so inadequate, as to impair the functions of the occupation army as a whole, to the detriment of its objective and our prestige. Unless early safeguards are provided, a similar situation may easily arise in Japan. Only our enemies could welcome that.

Beyond this, however, the effectiveness of the United Nations organization, the aims for which we fought and the future peace itself depend entirely on the balance of power now established, of which the United States is one of the main bulwarks. But any power balance can be disturbed not only by excessive armament of some nations, but also by excessive disarmament of others, which must automatically lead to a new alinement among nations alert to maintain their security.

The present pell-mell rush out of Europe and out of Asia, under congressional pressure, is nothing less than a new retreat into isolation. Unless it is checked by sober counsel, it will invite risks which will endanger the peace that we have won.

Discharge of Medical Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 24, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the membership of the House might be interested in the replies of the War and Navy Departments to my inquiry regarding the discharge of medical students. First, I include my letter:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to call your attention to an urgent situation involving our medical colleges and to urge the Department to meet this situation just as soon as possible by providing for expeditious discharges for young men who can qualify for entrance upon medical courses.

A number of leading physicians have discussed this matter with me and are pointing out that the sources of our professional leadership, particularly in the field of medicine, will dry up unless this problem receives constructive study and a solution is found at once.

I would appreciate your advice.

Sincerely,

BROOKS HAYS.

The Secretary of War replied:

DEAR MR. HAYS: Your letter of September 6, 1945, concerning early release from the Army of medical students, has been received.

I am sure that you are familiar with the details of our plan for the demobilization of Army personnel. This plan was adopted only after a meticulous survey and study, including an analysis of the opinions of representative groups of enlisted men. There are, of course, many special categories of men in the Army, including students who were pursuing medical educations, engineering, science, chemistry, etc., and when they are considered separately, they would appear to warrant special or preferential consideration. However, in view of the number of these groups, it was concluded that the plan as now devised would best serve the over-all national interest and, at the same time, be fairest to the individuals concerned.

I might add that through the normal operation of the demobilization plan it may be anticipated that the number of medical students being released from the Army will be proportionate to those released in other specialized groups. In view of the large number of releases being made under the readjustment regulations, it is believed that the future medical needs of the Nation will be largely met without resort to special treatment of medical students.

I assure you that this matter has received the War Department's serious consideration and I trust that the foregoing will prove helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

The Under Secretary of the Navy replied:

Dear Mr. HAYS: Acknowledgement is made of your letter of recent date commenting on the Navy's personnel release program.

In establishing the policies for priority of release in general demobilization, the Navy's responsibility for hastening the return to civilian life of various groups of its personnel was given earnest consideration. On 9 September the Navy Department made public a modified formula which included point credits for age, length of service, and dependency, as previously announced, and added point credits for sea duty and overseas service. In addition, men who have won certain combat awards are not obliged to accumulate points but are automatically eligible for release.

A total of approximately 750,000 persons in the Navy will be eligible for demobilization on 15 September, an increase of 423,000 over the number who became eligible when first demobilization plans were announced.

Although the reasons behind the request that young men who can qualify for entrance upon medical courses be given priority are fully recognized and appreciated, you will no doubt agree that orderly and impartial general demobilization requires primary consideration, and the earlier release of any individual or group must be subordinated to that view.

Further steps to expedite orderly demobilization will be taken by reducing the critical scores governing release under the point system when conditions permit. The Navy's goal is to reduce its size to 58,000 officers and 500,000 enlisted men by 1 September 1946. Present strength of the Naval force is 3,389,000 officers and men.

Your interest, in this important matter and in the welfare of naval personnel is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ARTEMUS L. GATES,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

Improvement of the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "For Land's Sake and for Life's Stake," delivered by Mrs. Roy C. F. Weagly, of Hagerstown, Md., the very able and distinguished president of the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at the Northeast Farm Bureau Conference in New York on September 18, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR LAND'S SAKE AND FOR LIFE'S STAKE

For several months it has been my desire to speak, first, to my own group—the farmers—then to other groups of our society.

That desire dates back to the week of June 26, 1945, when, as a member of a national committee to secure factual information on the relation between soil fertility, nutrition, and health, I was deeply impressed by what we saw and learned on a study tour in the Tennessee Valley.

The study began on the mineral-rich soils of the Central Basin, covering approximately 10 counties in middle Tennessee, where the committee observed luxuriant growth of nitrogenous plants and grasses; cattle and horses were in excellent condition; and the people appeared to be well, happy, and contented.

In sharp contrast, we saw the Highland Rim region where the soil is mineral poor; the grasses were inferior; the soil has become eroded; trees stunted in growth; all kinds of livestock were poor in quality and few in numbers; homes appear poverty stricken; and the people, apparently, have been undernourished.

Several test-demonstration farms were visited. The amazing improvement of soils, crops, and income, resulting from a 5- to 7-year period of soil-building practices under extension guidance, bears constant testimony of what proper quantities of correctly applied fertilizer minerals, in connection with proper land use, will do for the soil, for the plant and animal growth thereon, and for the people to whom the land has been entrusted.

It seems incredible, but it is nevertheless true, that it took the most cruel war of all ages to make the people of our Nation conscious of many of our faults, both as a nation and as individuals.

It also seems paradoxical that the same minerals essential to the life and growth of plants, animals, and human beings and their progeny are some of the most deadly weapons, in time of war, to destroy life.

In many ways war has hastened the depletion of soil fertility. War is also responsible, to a great degree, for the near exhaustion of mineral deposits in our most accessible mines. War has heightened the difficulties of soil replenishment.

We cannot, however, lay the blame for soil depletion on the war entirely. Some of our land scars are results of the faulty agricultural practices of generation after generation. The fertility of our soil has been greatly reduced by erosion, overcropping, leaching, and man's failure to return sufficient nutrients to the soil. And yet the war has aggravated and accentuated all of these conditions.

The nutrition, health, and welfare of our people are directly linked with agriculture. Even though only 20 percent of our people live on the land, 100 percent live from the soil. It is, therefore, essential that every citizen of the Nation be vitally concerned about the protection and restoration of the health-giving minerals in the soil.

In our virgin soil there were scores of minerals. It is becoming apparent that even those which are found in minute quantity play a vital part in the nutrition of plants, animals, and human beings.

Of the minerals none is more important than phosphorus. Many diseases of animals and people have been traced directly to the lack of phosphorus and its associated calcium in their foods; and these, in turn, have been traced to deficiencies in the soil that produced those foods.

The soil is, therefore, the starting point in human health. The human body demands much calcium and phosphorus. They are the nutrients of importance in terms of common deficiencies.

The dozen chemical elements coming from the soil are the body-building units. If the soil contributes these nutrient elements liberally to our food, and we do not destroy them in handling or in food preparation, a healthy Nation will result. If they are contributed stintingly, an unhealthy Nation will result, and unfavorable social and economic conditions will follow.

We all know about the part calcium, or lime, plays in the growth of bone and how it maintains normal blood clotting, normal rhythm to the heartbeat, normal nerve and muscle response, and proper permeability of membranes, so that foodstuff in solution can flow into and nourish all the cells of the body. When calcium is deficient all of these important functions are affected unfavorably. This is especially true in the bodies of growing children who, as a result, become irritable, nervous, and present real behavior problems.

A healthy body cannot be built from foods produced on mineral-deficient soils. Without adequate soil minerals, we are producing foods which may provide us with energy but not with health. A soil deficiency soon shows up in animals; it is also highly perceptible in the individual.

Certainly our national health picture as it is coming into clearer view from the data collected in assembling our armed forces will give us a clear conviction that our health is determined according to the soil. This view should likewise bring into focus the international picture as it rests on the different soils.

I firmly believe that an enduring peace will depend, to a great degree, on adequate soil fertility of this and other nations.

As far back as 23 years ago, Dr. Robert McCarrison observed and reported that different soils have an important bearing on the diet and the health of the inhabitants of a region. One of his illustrations was that at one time he was stationed among an isolated group of natives in one of the more

remote parts of India. This was a remarkably healthy group of people. They were farmers and lived largely on grains and dairy products. Part of the tribe, however, migrated to a region not very distant from the original home, but where the soil was much poorer. They were no longer able to raise the quality of foods to which they were accustomed. As a result, the health of the emigrant group deteriorated greatly. In this case, dietary inadequacy was largely the result of an inferior soil, for the dietary habits and even the farming traditions were the same as those of the parent group.

Plants lacking in minerals lack vitamins and, as one would expect, in order to get the proper vitamins in our food it requires the presence of an optimum amount of essential minerals.

For instance, it has been reported that in certain soils the vitamin C content of tomatoes could be increased up to three times the average by adding just a trace of manganese; that 2 pounds of boron to the acre in some fairly good orchards would double the vitamin A content of the apples; that lime definitely increases the vitamin B content of wheat. So it would seem that only a healthy plant carries an abundance of vitamins and that to attain the optimum it must have the right amount of essential minerals.

It is possible to vary the calcium content of the salad leaf as much as sixty-fold by varying the calcium content of the soil in which it is grown. With improper farm practices the lime is the first to be washed out of the soil. Our virgin soil had phosphorus enough for 100 crops of grain cereals such as wheat. The importance, therefore, of calcium and phosphorous deficiency to the welfare of ourselves and of our children is becoming of interesting significance. We must learn to borrow these minerals and to return them again to the soil if we are to survive.

The time is here when all women—not only rural women—but city women, too, should make it their policy to look into the quality of the food they eat. The quantity may be sufficient but if it lacks the necessary minerals the diet is deficient and certain illnesses will follow.

The cause of rickets has been traced to a shortage of calcium; night blindness to shortage of carotene; anemia to iron and copper shortage; tooth decay to shortages of calcium, phosphorus, and fluorine; and so on down the line of health disturbances.

To neglect the nutrition of our people just does not make sense. Their health, their ability to learn, their resistance to infection are determined just as much by the state of their nutrition as it is by their vaccinations and inoculations. All who are interested in the health of the Nation should make it their duty to help the farmer to put sound conservation and soil-building practices into effect so that our people may have high quality food with which to get and to maintain good health.

It would be well for this generation to bear in mind that the land is ours only as a loan or trust. If we would be true to the trust we will not longer continue to take from the soil without returning such quantities and qualities of minerals as will restore and maintain productivity.

For land's sake, let us prove our stewardship by replenishing the soil with the life-giving minerals that have been thoughtlessly extracted by man.

If we would be worthy progenitors, we will no longer continue to short-change future generations by turning over to them land that has been robbed of the minerals which are essential to health, welfare, and even life itself.

Let us, therefore, for life's stake to posterity pay back that which has been wrongfully taken, even two, three or fourfold.

Farmers need to at least double their use of mineral fertilizers to produce more economically, to produce more highly nutritious foods, and to reverse the long trend of devastating the soil by mining out, to the point of exhaustion, the vital health-building minerals.

In order to obtain these objectives there is need for a national plant-nutrient policy, such as the national fertilizer program which is being sponsored by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Those who oppose the national plan to make plant-nutrient fertilizer available to all areas of our country claim that their opposition is on the ground that they oppose Government in business.

Have they forgotten that it was at the request of Government and for the defense, yes, even the survival of our Nation, that countless acres were overcropped during both world wars?

Certainly Government has a responsibility in opening the plant-nutrient deposits in our country and it has the responsibility to help make those minerals available to the farmers that the land scars sustained during those war years might be healed.

Simply because certain farms are thought to be adequately fertile, is no just reason to deny the availability of mineral fertilizer to mineral-poor farms.

And yet, because certain areas are thought to be adequately fertile, there is grave danger that the people in such areas will stand in their own light by opposing a plan to make the mineral deposits of our country available to mineral-poor areas.

Since no State, or region of States is sufficient unto itself for the production of foods and feeds, more consideration must be given to the type of soil on which such supplemental quantities of foods and feeds are produced. Else one would defeat his own purpose; to gain better health, to insure better living, to improve flocks and herds and the products therefrom.

Most people will agree that the broad purpose guiding the use of soil resources should be to maintain the highest possible standard of living for the people of the United States. This includes secure farm homes, adequate income for farm people, and a continuous and abundant supply of farm products of high quality for all the people. Thus the soil problem is really a national problem of the welfare or well-being of all the people.

One of the great national objectives is to pass the soil on to our descendants as nearly unimpaired as possible.

The Nation, rightfully, looks to the future, but many farmers find it necessary to do things to the soil that are not for the long-time interest. Many cannot promote the long-time interest without sacrificing their own present necessities.

The national interest and the individual interest can be reconciled through the national fertilizer program, which deserves the support of every conscientious citizen of a great democracy.

What the Fighting Men Are Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here are a few typical letters from which some people, if they are so inclined, may learn what our servicemen are thinking.

It occurs to me that, instead of devoting so much of their time to determining how we should treat returning servicemen, we devote our energies to getting them out of the service, let them have something to say about working out their salvation and perhaps accept some of their advice as to what we should do.

They successfully took care of the Germans and the Japs, and it is just possible that they may have some suggestions as to our conduct which would be beneficial to us:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1945.

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
Michigan Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take this opportunity to write to you concerning present conditions at this Army Air Transport Command air base, located at Stephenville, Newfoundland.

My fellow weathermen and myself feel that a condition exists at this base which should be brought to your attention and to the attention of Congress as a whole.

It has been announced to the Army personnel here that in about 6 to 8 weeks civilian air lines will operate through this base. In fact, for several months now, civilians have been allowed to travel on the aircraft operating through Harmon Field under the authority of the Army Air Transport Command.

We object strenuously that we are held at this base to service civilian aircraft for civilian air lines. We are Army men, and we are drawing Army pay. Furthermore, it is not right and just that we be held overseas to further the commercial interests of a civilian business enterprise.

Mr. HOFFMAN, you are our voice in Congress and the one who can speak for our just rights in this matter. We, the undersigned, feel confident that you will bring this matter before the proper committee or committees. You have our permisison to use this letter and the signatures affixed below in any action you may take in our behalf and for the good of all Army personnel stationed at this field.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1945.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have a situation here in this county that is pitiful.

A young man was inducted in service about 3 months ago; he has three children under school age, one a tiny babe about 1 month old.

Had a furlough of 10 days but has his overseas sailing orders now.

The mother is a nervous wreck and with the three small children she has an almost impossible job.

He tried the Red Cross and everything here to get out to help care for his family, but could do nothing.

Clare, this war is over; why do we have to still have such things as this? This young man is willing to do his bit but now the fighting is over I believe his place is at home helping to care for his family. I am afraid the wife will never be able to stand up under the strain.

Please advise me what can be done, if anything, to get this boy out at least for 6 months until the children get a little older.

I do not know what we would do here in Barry County if you were not available. It seems like I should not bother you with these troubles but I do not know of any other reliable source of information and help. I hope you can see a little light for us.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOFFMAN: Congratulations to you for your recent demand in the House that President Truman define our surrender terms to the Japanese. We Ameri-

cans have a right to known these terms. And if they are terms designed to establish peace in the Pacific there is no good reason why the world should not know them. We endanger our future if we aim to destroy Japan by military might just because we have the means to achieve this destruction. The world is not going to readily forget our power to destroy. We think we have waged war in self-defense; so do other nations think that of their efforts.

Every effort must be made to stop the war at once. Enough slaughter has gone on. A precise definition of our surrender terms to Japan should be a step in this direction.

Sincerely.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1945.

DEAR SIR: As a Member of Congress, you will soon be considering all the aspects of the Army discharge program. I believe that you will be interested in the facts concerning 10,000 or so of us 18- or 19-year-olds and some over 20 years in the Army Air Forces aviation trainee program.

When we were 17 we enlisted in the Air Corps Reserve for aviation cadet training. Most of us were called to duty shortly after our eighteenth birthday. Some of us volunteered for flying training through our local draft board. We were assigned for basic training and classification, qualifying for aircrew training. We were then transferred to fields for "several weeks on-the-line training" before being sent to preflight.

Here at Keesler Field several hundred of us have now been waiting for preflight for 14 months. During our year and a half or 2 years in the service we have received no real training other than our original 6 weeks' basic course. We have washed, gassed, oiled airplanes, walked wing tips, and pulled KP for the field.

Now the war is over and our legal enlistment period is coming to an end. We have been out of school over 2 years. We still are completely untrained and unessential. Almost every one of us is planning to go back to school, to finish college. However, the longer we are held in the service the more boys will give up their hopes of continuing education. At the present we are 10,000 potential college students who would not, if released, compete for jobs.

Lastly, we understand from the newspaper reports that naval air and officer trainees in the V-5 and V-12 programs are shortly to be released. We hope Congress will take steps to let us go back to college, too.

Respectfully.

Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a citizen of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I would like to express an opinion and a wish to you, my representative in Congress.

After 18 months of sea duty in the Navy I can't help but feel that I have contributed something toward democracy. Now I want to feel that something is being done back home.

I believe that you will agree with the saying, "Education is necessary in a democracy." That being true, why doesn't Congress enact legislation to stop the drafting of 18-year-old boys while they are still in high school?

I'll admit my wish is a personal desire inasmuch as I am thinking of my brother. He became 18 last June; he just started his senior year of high school, but I will venture to say there are boys in his same situation all over the country. As the selective-service law now stands, they can be called any time. I know that it isn't necessary to present an argument to you explaining why those boys should be allowed to finish high school.

I had to leave college during my senior year. It would please me very much if my brother could finish his last year of high school. If the war wasn't over, I wouldn't think of making this request to you.

One thing more I want to add: As a citizen, I am not satisfied with the investigations conducted so far concerning Pearl Harbor. I don't think the truth could ever have an ill effect upon Americans. I think it should have been told to us even during the war regardless of its nature. Now that the war is over, the holding back of the truth makes me wonder if I haven't given up the last 2 years of my life for nothing at all. Freedom of the press, of speech, of thought, and the right to know the truth, that is why I have been away from home for two and a half years; isn't it? If those traditions and ideals are some of the reasons why we fought this war, why are they being cast out the window right in the very seat of our National Government? The people look toward Washington and the men we have placed there in positions of honor and trust for examples of the highest kind in American traditions and ideals, and what have we got?

Consider this letter as the opinion of one citizen whom you represent, but please consider it.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 27 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Need Power Plus the Seaway," from the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WE NEED POWER PLUS THE SEAWAY

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey insists that the pending St. Lawrence seaway legislation shall not drop the development of hydroelectric power in the International Rapids. Some Senators had proposed to build a seaway for navigation only, the byproduct power development to come later, if ever.

Governor Dewey is right. As Governor of New York it is his duty to see that the power rights of that State are not infringed. Those rights are public property, belonging to the State of New York. Although the title is in New York, the benefits of St. Lawrence power will be shared by the entire country and Canada as well.

This newspaper has always supported the St. Lawrence seaway project. Opening the Great Lakes to the shipping of all the world is a plan on the order of the Suez and Panama canals. It is a world necessity.

To oppose it is to set one's face against greater prosperity for all the world. To oppose the seaway is to fight Chicago's destiny in world trade as a world metropolis.

But if the St. Lawrence seaway were wholly unfeasible as a navigation project the Daily News would still advocate the development of every potential kilowatt of hydroelectric power in the St. Lawrence River. Failure to harness the river is unpardonable waste of a great resource. This has been true ever since the turbines began to whirl below Niagara. But the discovery of atomic energy adds untold value to St. Lawrence power.

But for the abundance of hydroelectric power at Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River, and at TVA dams and the great volumes of cold water available in the Columbia and Tennessee, the harnessing of atomic energy would have been vastly more difficult and costly. The cold St. Lawrence is another natural for the production of atomic energy—whether for defense or for peaceful production.

As a part of the world's longest undefended boundary between two nations, the St. Lawrence has been a symbol of the type of international cooperation the world seeks. It has been a symbol of hope for the future. Let us keep it a symbol by opening it and the Great Lakes to world shipping, and linking it with the world of unprecedented power that lies ahead.

Presidential Tenure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 27 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in support of Senate Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the Presidential tenure to two 4-year terms.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the birth of our Republic, and up to 1940, tradition had established as a maximum two 4-year terms for Presidential tenure of office.

Four years was considered sufficient time for the incumbent to formulate his policies and make them plain to the Nation. He could then ask for four additional years in which to carry out the Presidential program.

This has been the tradition, cherished and upheld, with only one exception, by all the Presidents of the United States.

During the past decade we have unfortunately witnessed the destruction of this wise practice. The struggle to perpetuate one-man rule, though legal, and not in violation of constitutional provision, was certainly in open defiance of well-established tradition. It exceeded the recognized and accepted tenure policies of our Republic and opened the way to life tenure and ultimate dictatorship.

To safeguard the American people against future abuse of the Presidential term, we must restore the tradition discarded in 1940 and make impregnable by constitutional amendment, a limitational provision respecting the number of Presidential terms.

For this purpose I have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 1 which is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee. It provides that no person shall be eligible to hold the office of President if he has already been elected to or has held such office during the whole or any part of each of any two prior terms.

Though similar resolutions have been introduced relating to the terms of office of the President, it is my belief that Senate Joint Resolution 1 more clearly defines the exact time limit to this high office and eliminates future misinterpretations growing out of ambiguous phraseology.

If acceptable to the committee, Senate Joint Resolution 1 will accomplish what the American people want—equality of chance and the elimination of unlimited succession in office by any one man.

In a republic there is no room for selfish individual aims and no place for the foundation of permanent dictatorship.

The Nation is now face to face with the unhappy fact that tradition is not sufficient to prevent the possible rise of a dictator in this country. No one believed the tradition would ever be violated until it was. No one believed that it would be violated by more than one term, but it was. It therefore becomes perfectly apparent that if a man young enough, brilliant enough, determined enough, and clever enough should get into the Presidency he could cite precedent to run not only for a third term, and a fourth term, but a fifth term and a sixth term. Each term in the Presidency would make him stronger and more impregnable in his position, so that after a matter of three terms he would not only have appointed nearly the whole of the judiciary, but he would have such a machine built up, he would have such power established, he would have such fear engendered that no one would dare openly oppose him.

We must go back to the wisdom of Lincoln who in addressing the Young Men's Lyceum, of Springfield, Ill., on January 27, 1937, spoke as follows:

"It is to deny what the history of the world tells us is true, to suppose that men of ambition and talents will not continue to spring up amongst us. And when they do, they will as naturally seek the gratification of their ruling passion as others have done before them. The question then is, can that gratification be found in supporting and maintaining an edifice that has been erected by others? Most certainly it cannot. Many great and good men, sufficiently qualified for any task they should undertake, may ever be found whose ambition would aspire to nothing beyond a seat in Congress, a gubernatorial or a Presidential chair; but such belong not to the family of the lion, or the tribe of the eagle. What! Think you these places would satisfy an Alexander, a Caesar, or a Napoleon? Never. Towering genius disdains a beaten path. It seeks regions hitherto unexplored. It sees no distinction in adding story to story upon the monuments of fame erected to the memory of others. It denies that it is glory enough to serve under any chief. It scorns to tread in the footsteps of any predecessor, however illustrious. It thirsts and burns for distinction; and if possible, it will have it, whether at the expense of emancipating slaves or enslaving freemen. It is unreasonable then, to expect that some man possessed of the loftiest genius, coupled with ambition sufficient to push it to its utmost stretch, will at some time spring up among us? And when such a one does, it will require the people to be united with each other, attached to the Government and laws, and generally intelligent, to successfully frustrate his designs."

A Stronger Conciliation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Stronger Conciliation Service," published in the Journal of Commerce of New York City of date September 25, 1945. The editorial comments upon the bill recently introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] dealing with labor problems.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRONGER CONCILIATION SERVICE

Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach has made the strengthening of the United States Conciliation Service a major objective of his administration of the Labor Department. With more than 300,000 workers on strike at the moment, and with additional walk-outs looming immediately ahead, the need for this course cannot be questioned.

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, has introduced a bill that is designed to strengthen the prestige and organization of the Conciliation Service to an extent not possible by administrative action alone. Holding that civil service salary restrictions limit the effectiveness of the Conciliation Service, he would set up a Conciliation and Mediation Division within the Department of Labor, headed by an administrator appointed by the President who would be authorized to "appoint such experts, moderators, conciliators, and their assistants and fix their compensation as may be necessary to carry out the division's functions." Experts from the War Labor Board's disputes division would be transferred to the new Conciliation Division to assure competent personnel.

Senator MCMAHON'S bill contains no controversial compulsory arbitration provisions, such as have aroused strong opposition to the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill. The McMahon proposal provides for a United States Board of Arbitration, but its use is to be purely voluntary. Where arbitration is refused, the parties to the dispute retain full liberty of action, although the President is authorized to appoint a board of inquiry to study the causes of a strike and publicize them.

Every effort should be made to strengthen the Conciliation Service so that it can operate to reduce the number of strikes within the framework of collective bargaining. The McMahon bill provides a promising means of attaining this result. Early action upon this proposal is highly desirable.

Along the Banks of the Nishna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Willard D. Archie, appearing in the Shenandoah Sentinel August 10, 1945:

ALONG THE BANKS OF THE NISHNA

(By W. D. Archie)

NRA was declared unconstitutional, but the OPA seems to be taking its place. I am not sure which is worse, but surely both are completely un-American.

OPA is regulating prices, just as NRA did. It sets ceilings like NRA. It is trying to control the movement of goods from the factory to buyer. No agency since NRA has taken on such a colossal—and impossible—task.

All this is bad enough, but in addition they have in many cases blackened the names of businessmen, and made them appear as crooks, without the chance to be tried by jury. These same things were done by NRA boards throughout the country. The same businessmen are afraid to defend themselves for fear of being further penalized by the OPA, and, therefore, we hear only the Government side of all co troversies. Can there be anything that strikes deeper at the liberty of the people than all this?

Some folks defend the OPA because they say it offers them security. But this security is very often a myth. The mere fact that OPA says an article will be sold for a certain price does not make it worth that much. You can have dishonest OPA officials just as well as dishonest merchants. There are many ways of skinning a cat, and when OPA makes unfair rules there are many ways of getting around them, and the final result is higher prices.

For one, I am tired of being protected. I want to be cheated once in a while, for this is the way I learn to judge values. I want people to get mad and rebel at certain practices, for that is the way they learn to judge values. I want people to get mad and rebel at certain practices, for that is the way they learn to defend their rights. It is good for all of us to get mad enough to stage a rebellion against such practices. It was through such anger that we first won our liberty. I do not want everything to be perfect, for then we would become soft and would be completely ruled by our central government in Washington.

It is true there must be a fairly strong central government in our present complicated system of living, but it does not follow that we must be regulated in everything we do. We do not need a bureau to decide our every act from the time we get up in the morning until we go to bed at night.

If everyone wants all this protection, then they should all join the Army. In the Army and Navy they will be completely protected. Officers with bars and braid will tell them everything. No worries at all. It is a lovely way to live and just what many civilians are now asking for. For one, I have had plenty of it; but if we allow OPA to continue, there is little use coming home except to get regimented by a different set of officials.

When are we to stage another Boston tea party? When are the people going to rise up and demand a chance to live again as freemen? I hope the day is not far off.

We have been living under the finest government yet conceived by man, and should not let a bunch of bureaucrats who have failed under the competitive capitalistic system under which we have grown strong take it all away from us by their rules.

Where is the Thomas Paine to show us the way out? Where is the Paul Revere to shout the warning of danger? Where is our John Adams to defy everyone to gain his liberty? Who will be the 1945 defender of the Bill of Rights?

Stop Bureaucracy, or What

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, is there anyone who doubts that bureaucracy has established a firm hold on the administration of our public affairs in this country? Do not we all know that we are being governed today principally by the bureaucrats and the orders, directives, and regulations issued

by the various bureaus of the Federal and State Governments? All freedom-loving Americans decry the situation as deplorable, and Democrats and Republicans alike are demanding that the further encroachments of bureaucracy be stopped, and that a vast majority of the existing bureaus be abolished at the earliest possible moment. The No. 1 question is: How can this be accomplished? Whose job is it? Where does the responsibility lie for the present conditions, and the relief therefrom?

Our forefathers wisely established our form of government as a representative democracy, created a republic, and ordained a republican system of government. It was designed to have been a government by law enacted by the representatives of the people for the government of themselves and their relations with their fellow citizens. Under our system the laws were to come from the people up to their officers, who were to be their public servants and not their dictators.

There were no bureaus in the early days of this Republic. Congress did not create bureaus in those days, and neither were they created by Executive order of the President. Hence, there were no directives, rules, and regulations promulgated and enforced, with the sanctity and effect of law; but the country was governed by the regularly constituted departments of government.

Through the years, under the excuse that society has become more complex, Congress has weakened and yielded to the importunities of bureau-minded people in this country and from abroad, and has authorized the creation of a number of bureaus. Many of the functions performed by these bureaus could and should have been performed by the various departmental heads of our Government. The condition became so prevalent in the Federal Government, that it spread to a number of our State governments; and today we find ourselves overburdened and perplexed almost beyond endurance by innumerable bureaucratic edicts and bureaucrats themselves in both Federal and State Governments.

During the depression of the early thirties, Congress was prevailed upon to authorize the creation of a number of bureaus as emergency agencies. They were supposed to have been only temporary. But history reveals that bureaus created to relieve a temporary emergency seldom relinquish the authority vested in, or assumd by, them. It is an easy matter for the public to fall under the spell of bureaucracy, but it is most difficult for the people to free themselves of bureaucratic dictatorial rule, and reclaim their own sovereignty.

With the advent of World War II, both Congress and the President seem to have gone all out for the policy of establishing bureaus, subbureaus, and combinations of bureaus, alphabetical confusions, duplications of activities and complexities without end. To make matters worse, the President, in many instances without specific authorization of Congress, issued Executive orders creating and setting up almost innumerable bureaus.

A wise doctor attempts to make a proper diagnosis of the ills of his patient before he begins to administer treatment. America is politically ill. One of its afflictions might be diagnosed as bureauitis. Apparently, this diagnosis, which is easily confirmed by all who have observed the patient, suggests heroic treatment. The patient should be taken immediately to surgery, and the bureaucratic infection removed before it spreads throughout the entire system. Otherwise, the patient, our republican form of government, is sure to die, and the undertaker will act in the role of a dictator from then on out.

Now, let us call the surgeons into the operating room and let them operate before the patient expires. The ones who should be most skillful in performing this operation are the President and the Congress. First, the President can wield the knife which, even without any action on the part of Congress, may prolong the patient's life and may even prevent the further spread of bureaucratic infection. Recently, the President indicated that he wanted to see a lot of the bureaus abolished. This is something we have all been wanting for a long time. The war is over; there is no depression now, and all the emergency bureaus should be abolished forthwith. All such bureaus as were established by Executive order of the President can be abolished by Executive order of the President, and these, generally speaking, are the most obnoxious of all. If the President sincerely desires to get rid of these bureaus, the power lies with him to do so by a simple stroke of the pen, and he should do it.

More recently, there have been indications that the President is not really seeking to rid us of bureaucracy, but that his plans are to integrate the functions now being performed by these odious bureaus into the various departments headed by the Cabinet members. This will not cure the patient. This will not prevent the spread of bureaucracy. This is not doing away with bureaucracy. It is merely transferring the personnel and the functions of the bureaus into the main bloodstream of our body politic, and putting the President in a more dictatorial position than ever before. A rose smells just the same by whatever name it is called. If the President's present scheme of reorganization of government as recently reported in the press is carried out, we will witness and experience the rankest form of bureaucracy and the strongest trend toward dictatorship that this country has ever known.

Congressional surgeons should also perform their duties in the operating room. The Congress should abolish the bureaus it has created as emergency agencies. If we shrink from this responsibility, we are derelict in our duty and betray the trust our constituents have reposed in us. We will, in effect, be helping the executive branch of Government to sell the people down the river into totalitarianism, exactly as was done in Germany and elsewhere, in recent times.

Hence, I say, stop bureaucracy, or what? This simply means that we must stop it. The people demand that the heavy hand of government imposed by these bureaucrats be lifted from their backs, and that the bureaucrats be sent home to earn an honest living for themselves. It means that the responsibility rests upon both the President and the Congress. But the President should set the example of absolutely abolishing those bureaus which were created by Executive order, and not attempt to transfer their functions and personnel to the regular departments of Government headed by his Cabinet members. He should further cooperate with Congress to the end that Congress will play its role in abolishing the bureaus it established, instead of trying to prevail upon Congress, as apparently he now is doing, to reorganize the Government in a way which would be more bureaucratic than ever.

If the people only understood that it is to stop bureaucracy or what, I am confident that the Members of Congress and the President would be besieged on every hand—except by the bureaucrats—to take immediate steps to return the Government of the people to the people, for the people.

Looking Down the Road; Our Policy and Our Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial reprinted from the Washington Teamster of September 21, 1945:

LOOKING DOWN THE ROAD; OUR POLICY AND OUR DUTY

Labor leadership faces a rigorous test as we plunge deeper into the period of reconversion. Whether we will be able to return to peacetime ways of life with a minimum of shock to our economic structure or whether we shall experience turmoil that will rock our Government and our system of business to the foundations, will be determined by the manner in which we handle our problems through the American medium of collective bargaining.

In this time of stress we must have the same high degree of courageous leadership and splendid membership activity that marked our relations with government and industry during the war. This is certainly not the time to try crackpot theories which would lead toward economic and industrial revolution.

It is the job of labor leadership to study the problems of industry as well as those of the working people. We have learned by experience that we can only prosper and make progress to the degree that industry prospers. We must, therefore, as we go forward, give firm consideration to the rights of the public, and of industry, as well as the welfare and aspirations of labor.

It will be the policy of the teamsters' union of the 11 Western States to conduct its relations with industry and business along the

same cooperative, sympathetic lines we followed during the war. We will strive hard to avoid any and all work stoppages, while exerting our best efforts in behalf of the welfare of our membership.

We know—and industry and the public know—that the cost of living raced far beyound the limits of the Little Steel Formula of 15 per cent during the war. It was the position of the War Labor Board during the war that the actual weekly take-home pay of working people, due to hours worked in excess of the standard 40-hour week, compensated them for the actual increase in living costs reaching approximately 46 percent.

The teamsters union protested vigorously to the WLB and to its regional agencies, urging them not to establish formulas or adopt policies contradictory to sound business and public welfare. We insisted there should be no interference by government with wage increases, voluntarily granted, which did not increase prices to the public. Our protests, however, were of no avail.

Finally, the policy of the War Labor Board resulted in the Seattle dry-cleaning industry dispute, in such a serious situation that the board changed its way of thinking. It adopted, at last, the sound policy that should have been its guide from the beginning.

We submit to thinking people that there must inevitably be an upward readjustment of labor's earnings, based on increases in the cost of living and upon the increased productivity of those who toil and the latest developments of labor-saving machines. At the same time there must be careful consideration of the cost to the consuming public.

Under no circumstances must prices be permitted to rise with increases in wages to labor, for that would defeat us all. That would prevent the increasing of purchasing power which is so vitally necessary to bring about the highest degree of production.

Without question some price increases will be necessary from time to time, but these must be based on facts determined by investigation. It stands to reason that some of these increases have been long delayed. Those found to be honestly necessary will not, however, effect materially the pattern of reconversion by unduly raising the cost of living. No industry should be driven into bankruptcy by unsound price structures: that would injure all of us.

There must be a return to full and complete collective bargaining, without mandatory government interference. There must not be any form of compulsory arbitration; compulsion is poison to democracy.

Government must stay out of business; it must not go into competition with private enterprise. If we have such government competition, wherein government does not assume all of the burdens that rest normally upon individuals in a system of free enterprise—burdens such as taxes and regulations of various kinds—that will lead to socialism. The teamsters union is unalterably opposed to socialism.

Civil service must not be used to defeat private enterprise. Our Army and Navy comprise the military arm of our Government; they should be required to stay strictly within that sphere of activity. They must be kept out of business. At the present time a fact-finding survey is needed for the purpose of putting the military back into normal and reasonable bounds. Attempts to use the civil service as a subterfuge to undermine private business are not to be tolerated. Instead of broadening the scope of civil service and thereby destroying our American system, contracts should be let wherever possible to American business firms which may then employ American working people at fair wages and under decent working conditions.

There is not now, and there never has been, any place in our American scheme of things for the slave labor of prisoners of war.

We know well that the reconversion period and its problems present grave difficulties to industry. It is going to require great courage and intelligence upon the part of industry to bring about the necessary readjustments with a minimum of disturbance. We do not contend that industry has no problems; we know that it has. We desire to sit down with its leaders and to assist in solving our common problems in a spirit of complete sympathy and cooperative understanding.

Insofar as the trucking industry is concerned, we believe that the greatest number of jobs can be provided by bringing about the lowest possible unit cost of operation consistent with reasonable profits and good wages. We favor the adoption of mechanical devices which tend to decrease costs to the public, but insist that when such mechanization decreases jobs, it injures the public. We believe in shorter working hours and increased wages, as mechanical genius develops ways to save manpower. All of the benefits of mechanical progress must not be plowed into profits, they must be shared with labor.

We call upon the leaders of teamster unions across the 11 Western States to study their industries diligently, to accept the full responsibility imposed by leadership in times like the present, to keep their people fully advised of the facts and the problems which confront us.

It does not take brains or ability to plunge industry and business into turmoil, to call strikes and work stoppages. But, it does require a high degree of true leadership to make progress without strikes and without trouble.

Under no conditions shall we forego our right to strike. We are not so naive as to think that some employers would not take unfair advantage of us if we were to lay down our strongest economic weapon. We will, however, hold it in reserve, for use only when every other road to peaceful settlement of disputes has been traveled without result. We recognize the responsibility that rests upon us in exercising our right to strike, and we will use it only as a last resort.

We call upon industry and business to play the game squarely with us. We urge the public to resist propaganda efforts and to seek the facts before forming its opinion. On the whole, we have received good cooperation from press and radio; we ask that they continue to bear with us and to assist us in finding common grounds for understanding, for they can be of tremendous help in maintaining industrial peace.

We ask public officials to rely on facts; we hope they will not play politics with human conflicts and disagreements.

We, of the teamsters union, are determined to preserve our country and its democratic form of government. We believe sincerely in our system of free enterprise. We know that our system has made possible the highest standard of human happiness and well-being ever known. We have confidence that it can, with all our aid, do still more for the American people.

While we earnestly desire fair dealings with other nations, our own country comes first.

We will continue to devote our efforts and our resources to all worthy community enterprises. We know that as we develop our communities, we also help to develop business life and thereby create more and better employment for our people.

Finally, as we endeavor to look down that road to the future, we envision steadier, greater progress, both for those who toil and for those who operate business and industry, as well as for the public, if we cling steadfastly to the ideals that have brought us thus far along the way.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 of this year, the Creek Tribe of Indians, which is one of the Five Civilized Tribes in my district, had its regular annual session in the Creek Council house in the city of Okmulgee, Okla., and adopted a resolution:

That all members of the council engage in silent prayer for a period of 5 minutes in memory of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and, thereafter, audible prayer in the Creek language was made by Roly Canard, principal chief of the Creek Nation, not only paying tribute to the late President but also asking divine guidance for President Truman.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to know Mr. Canard personally, as well as practically all of the members of his tribal council, and I wish to take this means of commending them for their action and, under the authority granted me, I am pleased to insert at this point a copy of the resolution:

The Creek Indian Council of the State of Oklahoma met in regular session at the Creek Council house in the city of Okmulgee, Okla., on April 26, 1945, and motion was made by Rev. Samuel Checote, which was duly seconded and unanimously carried, that all members of the council engage in silent prayer for a period of 5 minutes in memory of the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and thereafter, audible prayer in the Creek language was made by Roly Canard, principal chief of the Creek Nation, not only paying tribute to the late President but also asking divine guidance for President Truman.

Whereas the above-mentioned action was taken, it was unanimously resolved to have a copy of this resolution sent to the widow of the late President Roosevelt, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to President Truman.

CANUKY LOWE,
Chairman of the Council.
TURNER BEAR,
Secretary of the Council.
ROLY CANARD,
Principal Chief of the Creek Nation.

Mare Island Leads All Nation's Navy Yards in Improvement Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we all take pride in the various Federal projects in our respective districts. It is with particular pride that I am able to report to my colleagues that the largest Federal project in my district, the Mare Island Navy Yard, has led all of the yards in the Nation in construc-

tive ideas for improvement suggested by its workers and put into operation by the Navy. The men who conceived these ideas and those that developed the plan which tapped and used this latent ingenuity deserve our gratitude and congratulations.

Mare Island Navy Yard commenced operations in the early fifties and for nearly a century has contributed to our national security. It is the largest navy yard in the world, occupying 2,200 acres. Its record is excellent. It is the largest repair yard on the Pacific coast and for many years will have a large force of men repairing the tremendous battle damage caused to many of our ships in the Navy's great battle with and blockade of Japan, which really was the vise which caused her to throw in the sponge. Many men at this yard are career navy yard men, having followed their fathers in this work. Traditions of loyalty and efficiency have grown up among these workers which add to the productivity of the yard.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Grapevine, the official newspaper of Mare Island Navy Yard, giving some details as to the number of ideas accepted and put into operation and the prizes awarded therefor. It follows:

MARE ISLAND SETS ANOTHER RECORD: 1930 BENEFICIAL IDEAS PUT INTO WAR EFFORT

In the 2½ years between January 1943 and June 1945, Mare Island "idea men" reaped a harvest of $68,665 for 1,930 suggestions which were adopted by the Navy, and put Mare Island ahead of all other yards in the number of suggestions adopted and the amount of awards received.

The other navy yards and the number of their suggestions and the amounts of their awards are:

Number of suggestions

Navy yard	Adopted	Awards
Norfolk	1,838	$38,370
New York	996	14,955
Puget Sound	694	22,767
Charleston	616	15,270
Portsmouth	605	12,985
Boston	554	16,373
Philadelphia	537	27,866
Pearl Harbor	466	14,905

In announcing the continuation of the Navy's beneficial suggestion program as a peacetime measure, Under Secretary of the Navy Artemus L. Gates stated that the first year's savings on more than 17,000 adopted ideas submitted by civilian employees exceeded $66,000,000 during World War II.

Mr. Gates pointed out that while the savings were important they represented only a portion of the benefits. Through the application of these ideas valuable time was saved in supplying improved munitions of war to our fighting Navy to meet the ever-increasing logistics requirements.

These 17,000 suggestions for which awards were paid were submitted by workers at navy yards, air stations, ammunition depots, torpedo stations, and various other types of shore establishments operated by the Navy. They ranged all the way from skillfully designed tools, jigs, and fixtures used in streamlining production to new and ingenious methods of construction and repair. In addition, several new instruments were invented by Navy technicians outside of their assigned duties which played an important part in tactical operations and training programs.

Secretary Gates stated: "I am pleased with the accomplishments of the program during the wartime emergency. We will continue to encourage the submission of constructive ideas so that the Navy may operate at the highest possible efficiency on a peacetime budget."

Warning in 1934 by Edwin Gordon Lawrence of Trouble With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Everyday Events," which appeared in the El Paso Times on September 20, 1945. It contains an exact copy of an article which appeared in 1934, and, in the light of recent events, it is very interesting reading.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYDAY EVENTS

(By W. J. Hooten)

Once in a while this writer takes pleasure in presenting a guest column. For today, let us turn back the calendar to May 30, 1934. On that date, Edwin Gordon Lawrence, now of El Paso, wrote in the Transcript of Athol, Mass., as follows:

"A SINISTER SHADOW

"True it is that 'coming events cast their shadows before.' Equally true it is that the sun of events now rising in the East casts the sinister shadow of Japan upon the western world; and that if the substance which is responsible for the shadow (the determination of Japan to control the Far East) is not removed, the result must be a grapple to the death between the Orient and the Occident.

"Pause for a moment and consider this train of events:

"CONQUESTS BY JAPAN

"In 1910, Japan annexed Korea with its 85,228 square miles of territory and a population which today numbers over 21,000,000; in 1931 she made undeclared war upon China, seizing Manchuria, a division of the Republic of China, consisting of 363,310 square miles and a population of about 30,000,000. Thus in less than a quarter of a century she has added by conquest about 450,000 square miles to her domain and more than 50,000,000 to her population. This, be it remembered, is aside from the large increase by birth of her own nationals.

"A PUPPET EMPIRE

"True, Japan has constructed a so-called independent empire out of the seized Chinese territory to which she has given the name of Manchukuo, but to all intents and purposes it is a part of the Empire of Japan.

"The world may now prepare itself to shortly behold the claim of the puppet emperor of Manchukuo to sovereignty over the whole of China. When that time comes, Japan will uphold the validity of the claim and make it good by means of her military power.

"SHADOWS OF COMING EVENTS

"Coming events certainly cast their shadows before in the affairs of the Orient. The conquest of Korea in 1910 forecast that of Manchuria in 1931, and the seizure of the territory of Manchuria and the recent pronouncement of Japan relative to the overlordship of the whole of Asia indicate her probable control of the vast territory and population of China unless the western nations refuse to allow her to violate her treaty obligations and thereby become dominant in the Far East.

"A SERIOUS MENACE

"This might be of no concern to the United States were it not for the fact that the consummation of Japan's scheme of conquest would ultimately lead to the welding of the vast horde of orientals into a mighty military machine which would be arrayed against the nations of the Occident.

"This is no 'pipe-dream,' no hallucination. It is as sure to become an actuality as is now the possession of Korea by Japan and her mastery over Manchuria unless means are taken by the western nations to checkmate her intentions to usurp authority over all the Asiatic countries.

"THE SCRAPPING OF TREATIES

"The Japanese Government will not of its own accord abide by and live up to Japan's treaty obligations. Her statesmen, military and naval officials, and publicists declare that all treaties which interfere in any manner with Japan's freedom of action must give way before her great needs. Thus must the Treaty of Washington, the Nine Power Treaty, and the Kellogg Peace Pact all go by the board because, forsooth, she must have more room for expansion even though she takes it by force from other nations.

"A PLEA FOR SYMPATHY

"Under the caption 'Japan, her back to the wall,' the eminent columnist and editor Arthur Brisbane, puts forth this plea in behalf of Japan:

" 'It is important for citizens of this country to examine, understandingly and sympathetically, today's condition in the Japanese Empire, making allowances for the pressure, at home and abroad, on a government facing the alternative of starvation or expansion.'

"Granting that this is true, would the circumstances justify Japan's seizing the territory of China, converting it to her own use, and killing the inhabitants? To concede the righteousness of such actions would be comparable to acknowledging the right of John Dillinger to seize the property of others on his plea that he needs it.

"Will the learned editor contend that need comes before all else, and that a bandit (granting that he is sorely in need) should be permitted to help himself to the belongings of others, and that he is justified in using force, even to the extent of taking life, in carrying out his intentions?

"Should Mr. Brisbane hold (as he seems to do in the case of Japan) that 'self-preservation is the first law of nature,' I would answer him by saying:

" 'Yes, in her wild untamed state—such as is exemplified by the famished tigress who leaps upon its prey, be it brute or human, in order to appease the hunger of itself and its cubs. But mankind, as represented by nations as well as by individuals, is presumed to have outgrown that brutish instinct.'

"LOOK TO THE MORROW

"This is not intended to be a plea in behalf of war, nor favoring armed intervention by the United States between Japan and any other nation. But it is in advocacy of our country minding its own business and, at the same time, making its defensive forces so adequate that no nation will have the

temerity to interfere with what is primarily the business of the United States—the protection of its own people and their territory and the safeguarding of the Caucasian division of the human race.

"My countrymen, before it is too late, remember this: Coming events as surely presage their approach as do the growing shadows slanting toward the east indicate the passing of the day. Therefore prepare for the morrow."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Biggest Power Source," from the Democrat and Chronicle of Rochester, N. Y., and the other entitled "Labrador Ore and the Canal," from the Vindicator, of Youngstown, Ohio.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle]

BIGGEST POWER SOURCE

Close on the heels of President Truman's announcement of the atomic bomb came a dispatch from Spokane, Wash., that three more giant electric generators are to be installed at Coulee Dam, to make that project the greatest power-producing center in the world. Boulder Dam, also a Government project, now is said to be the largest single unit for the production of hydroelectric power.

According to William E. Warne, assistant commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, each of the new generators will be of 108,000 kilowatts. It is stated that the War Production Board has ordered immediate beginning of construction, which is expected to require 3 years. Inasmuch as abundant electric power is required for atom smashing, as well as for the expected rapid expansion of industry and for rural electrification in the Northwest, it seems reasonable to expect that by the time the new electric generators are ready, the demand for their electrical energy will have been created.

Progress in the Northwest, as forecast by the expansion of Grand Coulee power, possibly may spur the advocates of St. Lawrence River power to new activity, in order that Northern New York and New England may share in the benefits of the postwar era of activity.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator]

LABRADOR ORE AND THE CANAL

The discovery of high-grade iron ore in Labrador and nearby Quebec gives Youngstown a new reason to work for the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, and gives Pittsburgh a strong incentive for joining.

It is well known that the high-grade ore of the Michigan and Minnesota fields is nearing exhaustion. The Labrador ore is of first-rate quality, averaging 63.2 percent iron and manganese. If the St. Lawrense seaway is carried through and the lake-to-river canal built, the Labrador ore can replace America's dwindling reserves.

This possibility has as much interest for Pittsburgh as for Youngstown and nearly as much for Cleveland, whose M. A. Hanna Co. has bought an interest in the Labrador discovery. Indeed, it concerns all Ohio, and the whole eastern region. During the war the population of this section has been falling, while the West and South have gained. The South has won a new advantage in the lower freight rates recently granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The West, already favored over the East, is asking still further reductions, and there are strong private and public movements to accelerate the westward shift of industry.

The stimulus of connecting the Atlantic with the Mississippi, via the St. Lawrence and a lake-to-river canal, would help the whole East. It might well be a life saver in years to come for the steel industries of Youngstown and Pittsburgh. And since setting up new steel mills in the West will not produce any iron ore, the whole Nation would have a stake in cheap transport for the Labrador ore. The waterway plan should have President Truman's support, in view of his own plan for unifying the waterways of Europe as a means of raising the standard of living.

Probably the railroads will continue to oppose both the seaway and the canal. But if their executives are farsighted enough, they will come to see that the eastern railroads interest lies in helping to stop the deterioration of the region in which they operate, and seeing that it keeps up with the rest of the country.

The Veteran and Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, "It's over! He's coming home!"

Through millions of American minds on the night of August 14 flashed that blessed realization, with the news that the Japanese were ready to surrender. For days and days it was the only thing most of us could think of—the only thing that mattered in all the world.

And now he is coming home. On ocean liners, on hospital ships, in bombers, aboard every kind of craft that can travel on the seas or above them or under them, our men are coming home—by the first of the year they will be coming home at the rate of nearly a million a month.

And now is the time to think soberly and with responsibility about what those boys are coming home to. There is not much time—very little time. Even as those youngsters shout and whistle and sing on the swarming decks of the *Queen Mary* as she glides into her berth in the Hudson River, our factories are closing down. The postwar problem that seemed so dim and far away to many only a few months ago has become a reality. What are those 11,000,000 men coming home to?

First of all, what have they been thinking about while they were away? From everything we can find out, there have been two thoughts uppermost in their minds during those terrible, endless months in another world: winning the war, quickly, and getting home and finding their place in a community—getting a job. The first part is over, and they won it. Now comes our part, a part in which, again, we need their help. Working together again, soldier and civilian, we have got to lick unemployment. Those men who did their part in far corners of the earth so magnificently and so unselfishly have every right to expect that, having gone all out for war, we shall now go all out for peace.

We have made a beginning where the veteran is concerned, but it is only a beginning. We have made into law a GI bill of rights. We have given him a preferential rating on jobs. But our responsibility does not stop there. What is the good of having a preferential rating on a job that does not exist? What is the good of training if there is no place to use the skill you have labored to acquire? What are your chances of getting a job in a surplus labor market if you are a disabled veteran? Of what value to you are your captain's bars and the Congressional Medal of Honor around your neck if you went away an office boy—just a kid starting out in industry—and that is all there is to offer you when you return?

These men do not want to be coddled. They do not want to be placed in a position where there is only 1 job for 10 men; and if that job is given to a veteran, he eventually becomes the inheritor of the resentment of the community. They cannot be happy and successful themselves unless the home folks are happy and successful, too. If the neighbors cannot buy his produce or his goods or his services, what chance has the veteran to make a success of that farm or that business or that profession he may obtain under the GI bill of rights?

Full employment—nothing less—will give that veteran the chance he has been dreaming about all those long months. If it is a farm he wants, if it is a business he wants, if it is a job in industry, if he wants to be a doctor or a lawyer or a scientist, he can only function in an economy of abundance. He must have customers, and, if he is to have customers, other people must be able to earn a living, too.

This man who was willing to lay down his life for your security and mine now wants a chance to bring up his children in a community free of racial and religious frictions. These are things he has risked his life to stamp out. He wants for his children and for all children of the community the fullest opportunities of education that our modern world can provide. He wants the same effort made as they made during the war to control the spread of disease and loss of life. He wants time for leisure for himself and his family, leisure which our society with technological advances that have been made can provide. He wants a living wage, and he wants some security against sickness and old age. He will not be able to understand why a peacetime civilian should not be given the same opportunities as were given to the green soldier, who was

taken into the Army and trained to use his body and his mind for war.

The veteran does not need or want all the flowers and parades and fine speeches. All he wants is a chance to get back into his community and live a normal, happy, decent life. We are dead wrong if for one moment we think we can give him a hero's welcome and then forget about him.

We muffed it after World War I. We ended up with the disgrace of a bonus army being driven out of Washington. The only way we can fulfill our obligation to the veteran now is to see to it that we fulfill our obligation to all citizens. A peacetime government must answer this challenge—or answer at the polls.

Secretary Patterson's Tribute to General Wainwright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, September 25, 1945, will long be remembered by the residents of the beautiful village of Skaneateles, N. Y. It was Wainwright Day when the villagers proudly and affectionately welcomed home their greatest citizen, Gen. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright.

The principal speaker on that memorable occasion was Secretary of War Patterson. As a part of my remarks, I include his eloquent tribute to General Wainwright:

As the home of General Wainwright, Skaneateles has a just claim to national distinction.

Beyond this town—in the United States, in the Philippines, in the islands of the Pacific, in all the United Nations—General Wainwright is far more than a good neighbor or an outstanding general or a great American. He represents for all time the heroism of the soldiers who fought on Bataan and Corregidor.

He led those brave men through the darkest days of the war. By his own endurance, his own indifference to danger in the front lines, he inspired them to an endurance far beyond the call of duty. Above all, his career marks the long and bitter road the heroic survivors of that little army have traveled, from the tragic shadow of hopeless battle to the grateful welcome of a victorious homeland. In honoring General Wainwright we honor them all, the living and the dead.

He had a force of 50,000 men. No army more completely representative of all our fighting forces has ever fought under the American flag. Soldiers and sailors, marines, and airmen fought it out side by side in the jungle of Bataan and on the rock of Corregidor.

There were veteran regulars of the Thirty-first Infantry. That regiment had not been home as a unit since its formation in 1916. There were National Guard men and selectees, in such outfits as New Mexico's Two Hundredth Antiaircraft, who little more than a year before had been students and clerks, farmers and factory workers. There were marines of the Fourth Regiment in the line of resistance, along with cavalrymen of General Wainwright's Twenty-sixth.

There were other regiments whose members hailed from every State in the Union. In every way they were typical of the men who by the millions have poured into the armed forces since Pearl Harbor.

Standing with them in the line were the Philippine Scouts and the new recruits of the newly formed Philippine Army, whose fathers had fought American occupation 40 years before, but who had become as devoted to American ideals of freedom as our own boys.

History teaches us that armies of disciplined soldiers can generally be counted on to fight well so long as there is hope of victory. But General Wainwright's army belonged to that distinguished group that would fight on when all hope was gone. Courage flamed brightest when doom was closest. It was an army whose like has seldom been seen.

From the night in January 1942, when the last platoon crossed to Bataan Peninsula and General Wainwright saw to it that the bridge that was their last link with the mainland was blown up, they knew themselves a holding garrison without hope of relief.

Humor and courage were the commonplace. Sacrifice was part of the daily routine. Rations were cut in half in order that civilian refugees might be fed. Men fighting in malarial swamps turned in their quinine that it might be saved for the bedridden in hospitals. Those hardly able to walk launched counterattacks to draw the enemy away from the lines held by the completely exhausted.

They waged a glorious fight because they were spurred by the sense of responsibility that is found fully only among disciplined soldiers with the inheritance of freemen. In the hours of stress they were able to stand, each man on his own, handling his own appointed task as though the ultimate outcome depended on him alone. Their endurance under heavy hammering is the fullest vindication of the democratic way of life. At the very outset of the war those men set a standard of soldierly behavior that was of priceless value to our fighting forces in the 3½ years of warfare that followed.

Day and night, they were subject to savage attack by the fresh troops of the Japanese. Incessantly the enemy guns rained death on them. Enemy planes bombed them at will.

Though they were short of food, short of ammunition and equipment, short of medicine, there was never any weakening. There was no shortage of the spirit that enables men to rise above disaster. And always they were inspired by the sight of their general walking the front lines under enemy fire, driving himself relentlessly, determined that the enemy would pay the full price for every inch he gained.

When the end came, it was the signal of troops, out of food and ammunition, exhausted and diseased, overwhelmed by superiority of forces. But it was not the signal of broken spirit.

Those soldiers had the traits of character that mark the American fighter—an individual initiative that enables him to take advantage of the particular situation, a saving sense of humor when he is in trouble, and above all a strong urge to do his full duty toward the other soldiers who fight beside him. These traits, along with the discipline and confidence in the use of his weapons that come from thorough training, make our soldier the formidable fighter that he is.

Bataan and Corregidor are history now, unforgettable pages in our national life. No victorious army will be longer remembered or more highly honored in the days to come than those men who marched out of the swamps and the tunnels into the prison camps of a barbarous foe. In defeat, the American flag was not shamed.

But in paying tribute to the valor and sacrifice of those heroes, we should not overlook their achievements.

The men of Bataan and Corregidor won for us in the United States what we most desperately needed—the time to muster our strength. Behind their line we were able to convert the Nation to war. Hours and days were precious, but those heroes won us weeks and months. The Nation is in their debt forever.

Nothing that we can say or do will bring back the men who died far from home or adequately compensate the living for the tragic suffering that was their lot for years. But their heroism will serve to keep us from a return to the indifference to our world responsibility that produces Bataans and Corregidors.

They won—as much as any army in Europe or the Pacific—peace for the United Nations. They paid a higher price for that peace than any other army. There rests on us the responsibility to guard by every means in our power the peace so dearly bought.

We cannot preserve that peace if we are weak, or if we seek to appease those who may threaten its continuance. We can no longer live in isolation and expect to survive. Our hope lies in a world organization for peace, but that organization will not succeed unless it is supported by our military strength. Without such strength we would be like a community with a model set of laws but no policemen to see to the enforcement of them.

Today the United States has world leadership, a leadership which could not have been achieved without its armed power. That leadership, that armed power is necessary to guarantee the peace. If we dissipate our military strength, we will be asking for another war, a war more fateful than any we have yet known.

To the heroic survivors of Bataan, Corregidor and Japanese prison camps—and to their brave comrades who did not survive—we owe the duty to maintain the future peace of the United States.

St. Lawrence Seaway—Expense Without Recompense, Nothing in Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, since birth I have lived and worked in the water-front neighborhood of Buffalo where the average citizen has a fair understanding of shipping and transportation. We know that the seaway propaganda is a lot of visionary buncombe.

My first thought is to protect the United States and we cannot do that by investing billions of our taxpayers' money in foreign countries which will lead to friction. Actually the project is a relic of that period in American history when American good will was mistakenly purchased, in many cases, at the expense of the American industries and American labor. We do not need to purchase Canadian good will at such an exorbitant price. We enjoy the best of relations with our neighbors to the north without creating an instrument of friction and unnecessary competition. Normal trade and competition with the usual

international relationship, such as we have now, between the United States and Canada, will continue on the basis of free enterprise and does not require an artificial stimulation. This monstrosity was conceived in the impractical brain of some spendthrift or it is a seed for future war with our neighbor. Labor will again be sold down the river. You will not be allowed to work on this project—only furnish the money through taxing your hard-earned money. If we have to sweat, let us sweat to develop our own United States. Lord knows it needs plenty of things to feed and clothe our own workers.

The seaway would work economic havoc to the New England and Atlantic Seaboard States because it would introduce inferior competition from Europe and Asia which could not be met without sacrificing American standards. This we cannot afford.

The entry of foreign ships into the Great Lakes trade would injure the American merchant marine and would subject our sailors to competition with foreign seamen with much lower wages. The development of the St. Lawrence seaway would cause diversion of business from existing transportation agencies with the dislocation of business and bring serious hardship to working people now engaged in these services. Electrical services, mining, shipping, and all forms of transportation will be severely affected. The economic consequences will be terrific. Employees engaged in the production of electrical energy, coal mining, rail and water transportation, including auxiliary operation and repair shops, foundries, boiler factories, machine shops, marine engines of all types, refrigeration machines, pump works, 20 grain elevators alone worth millions of dollars, flour mills, of which Buffalo has the largest in the world, will be affected. All these factories and employees pay taxes. Destroy them and you destroy our source of revenue. The installation of this project will very likely result in raising taxes which everyone now is clamoring to lower. Is there any sense at all to the whole thing other than planting the seed of friction between two friendly nations? That is one of the reasons for armed conflict.

I have not time or space in which to deal with all the objections which a large section of labor has against the St. Lawrence seaway. So far as power is concerned we have gone through one of the greatest demands for electrical power in the world and we have supplied it with a safe surplus. Gentlemen, beware of this international scheme, this monstrosity to sell American labor and her free enterprise down the river.

I would like to know why the proponents of this project do not come out in the open instead of having secret sessions with all sworn to secrecy on such a vital question to the American people.

There is not an industry that I know of which will escape competition with foreign industries in the same category. Under no circumstances should a project be undertaken that will impose hardships on American enterprise and American labor. It looks to me like someone is willing to sell American labor down the river to bring our standard of living down to that of our foreign competitors.

Five-Talent Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George S. Benson, president of Harding College:

FIVE-TALENT MEN

Once upon a time a successful man decided to take a rest from business, and travel. Before leaving, he set up a budget to continue operations, appropriating substantial funds to three subordinates: 62½ percent to A, 25 percent to B, and 12½ percent to C. When, after a long time, the head of the firm came back and asked for an accounting, he learned that A and B both had doubled their money but the incompetent Mr. C had barely saved his principal.

What happened after that? Well, the management dismissed C and assigned his appropriation to the especially capable Mr. A. The story is told perfectly in the New Testament, Matthew 25: 14–30. In this text is the origin of the term "five-talent man," meaning a person of exceptional ability in matters of business. In it, Jesus shows how business prospers in the hands of capable, energetic people.

The knack of making money is a skill desired by many but admired by few. Often we hear people speak of it with contempt. On several occasions, curiosity has led me to ask different ones why they did it. Every answer implied that accumulating capital is selfish. One woman said, "Musicians play and sing for all to hear. Artists make pictures for all to see. But the man who piles up money is serving only himself."

Her answer disclosed considerable prejudice but not much thought. The truth is that a man with money-making ability is almost always a blessing to his community. People who know how to assemble capital and manage it well are public benefactors. They improve incomes for people around them more than for themselves. The best wages are paid only where big investments have been placed and where good profits are being made. Economists say: Wages increase with capital invested, but it's more than a mere theory.

Common sense teaches (1) that in the long run people get paid for what they produce, (2) with good equipment they can produce more and earn more, (3) but it takes investment to provide equipment. Every workman in any plant is richer because of the investment in it. Wages in America are twice as high as in England and six times as high as in Russia because only in America are workmen backed up with 4½ horsepower of installed equipment apiece, worth $6,000.

Do American workmen earn more because they work harder? No, indeed. They do not work as hard nor as long. Their pay is in proportion to their production: Twice that of an Englishman, three times that of an European, six times that of a Russian. The necessary investment has been made by men who have prospered and saved and now hope to prosper further by intelligent investment.

Under the American system of free private enterprise, a few five-talent men are extremely well paid. They earn it because all they get is very little compared to the income they create for others. Less than 16 percent of the national income will pay everybody in America who earns $10,000 a year or more. Occasionally somebody shouts for equalized incomes. What the complainer really says is: "Down with competent men. Let's ruin their investments, wreck their machinery, and live on oriental standards."

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

To the Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes,
To the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable THOMAS CONNALLY,
To the United States Senators and United States Representatives of the State of Connecticut:

The members and friends of the Polish-American Congress of the State of Connecticut, in meeting assembled, in commemoration and observance of the sixth anniversary of the invasion of Poland by Germany, and the official end of World War II, at the Bushnell Auditorium, Hartford, Conn., Sunday, September 9, 1945, respectfully address themselves to bringing to your attention the results of the lack of a forthright policy with regard to Poland at the Potsdam decisions.

"Whereas since the Soviet-dominated present Government of Poland is causing serious trouble in central Europe by its policy of unregulated transfer of populations, and proceeding without mutual discussion or consultation with other members of the United Nations, ousting millions of families without concern as to their ultimate care, or for the ultimate results in the European economy; and

"Whereas since this Soviet-dominated government does not represent the wishes of the Polish people, but is creating a set of circumstances, under pressure from the Soviets, which cannot help but have dire consequences to the future peace of Europe; and

"Whereas since former Prime Minister Churchill himself has denounced these Soviet-sponsored actions in eastern Europe; and

"Whereas since there has been inexplicable and serious delay in the holding and supervising of free elections in Poland; and

"Whereas since each day's delay in holding said free elections results in the continued liquidation by Soviet agents of anti-Soviet Polish men and women, thus reducing any unfavorable vote balance against ultimate pro-Soviet regimes in Poland; and

"Whereas since further delay in a vigorous protest or insistence that justice be done Poland by the United States in concert with the other members of the United Nations or the Security Council thereof, of the Assembly thereof, will result in untold misery, setting up the festering sores for another war: Be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the present assemblage, and the distinguished persons who are honoring it by their presence,

that official requests be entered at once with a view toward terminating the present deplorable state of affairs in Poland and eastern Europe."

Done and unanimously adopted by the 4,000 members of a State-wide delegation of the Polish-American Congress of the State of Connecticut, at Hartford, September 9, 1945.

LUCIEN MACIORA,
President.
JOSEPH KOZAKIEWICZ,
Secretary.
B. J. MONKIEWICZ,
FRANK A. ROGOWSKI,
Vice President,
Resolutions Committee.

President's $25 Per Week Deferred Employment Program Becoming Very Unpopular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received literally hundreds of letters on the program suggested by the President that the defense workers who were thrown out of employment in the defense plants on the cessation of hostilities be paid a vacation wage of $25 per week for not to exceed 26 weeks while they remain unemployed.

I doubt if any suggestion made in recent years by a Chief Executive of this Nation has provoked more unfavorable comment and criticism than this recent pronouncement of the present Executive. I dare say that at least nine-tenths of the letters which I have received from my constituents on this subject vigorously denounce the program as economically unsound, un-American, and an unworthy bid for political support.

The adverse criticisms came from people in all walks of life and of all religions and political faiths. I am sure it would be no exaggeration to say that some of the bitterest protests have come from lifelong Democrats who have been active in the support of their party in my State.

An erroneous impression has gone out to the effect that Congress is eager to adopt such legislation. The first pronouncement on the subject, so far as I can recall, came from President Truman. The President dealt at length, in a rather defensive manner, with the subject, in his message to the Congress on Thursday, September 6, 1945. In concluding the two pages of the printed text devoted to this subject, the following sentence appears:

> But I sincerely urge that we do not wait for consideration of such a complex question before enacting this much needed emergency legislation.

Hence, I am sure that all who are informed on the subject will admit that the idea and the plan are not those of Congress, but in their inception came from the President; and that he on September 6 was still urging the enactment of his suggestion into law by the Congress.

Among the many letters which I have received from business and professional men, representative citizens and others who still think for themselves, is one which I quote in its entirety from Mr. Ernest R. Brown, an attorney at Pryor, Okla., former judge of the county court of Mayes County, Okla., a World War I Navy veteran active in veterans' organizations, a stanch Democrat, and the father of a World War II serviceman in the Navy. Judge Brown has lived at Pryor, Okla., many years, and Pryor is within 5 miles of the Oklahoma ordnance works, a large powder plant and defense industry. Many hundreds of the employees of this huge plant live in Pryor. Judge Brown's letter concisely expresses the opinion of a large percentage of those who have written me on this subject, and his statements and those of the vast majority of my constituents who have expressed themselves on the matter indicate conclusively that the President's $25 per week deferred employment program is becoming very unpopular.

Judge Brown's letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1945.

GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For several days I have intended to write you about a certain bill now pending in the House of Representatives, granting defense workers compensation for 6 months, and I want to express to you, and I hope through you, to such other Members as you care to show this letter, my objection to that bill.

Numerous income-tax payers here have expressed to me their disguset at such extravagance on the part of Congress. I have heard dozens of people say they would never buy another war bond, when the Congress lavishes the proceeds thereof upon defense workers.

It is common knowledge that defense workers throughout the Nation, for the period of the war, have drawn the highest wages and worked the shortest hours that have ever been tolerated in the history of the United States, and there now stands no reason under the sun, except politics, that the public should be still further penalized by wasting the public funds.

All people who are worthy of consideration have saved their money and are now in the best financial condition they ever were in their lifetime, and, of course, there are those who have nothing, but for the last 12 years we have been pampering the lazy, the indolent, and the extravagant, and it is about time, in my opinion, that the Congress of these United States make some effort to curtail strikes rather than encourage indolence.

In communities like this the Government now is attempting to pay them more than they are worth, which only means that they will remain on the public pay roll rather than seek employment.

I hope you will see your way clear to assist in the defeat of the legislation now pending, afore-mentioned, and if this Government has any funds to give away, give it to the GI's, who, while these so-called defense workers were drawing from $7.50 to $40 a day, were defending their country for $50 a month.

I believe that if you were here you would find a great majority against the legislation and I hope you defeat it.

Why pick out the defense workers and humor them as a class? Did not the farmer contribute to the winning of the war? Shouldn't he have $25 a week for 6 months? Didn't the man in small business contribute to the winning of the war? Wasn't he a defense worker? Why shouldn't he have $25 a week for 6 months?

These are just questions that the average citizen is asking.

I hope the House will keep a level head and legislate for the people of the United States as a whole and not pick out a certain class for its generosity.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very truly yours.
ERNEST R. BROWN.

A Congressman Sees Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be one of 11 Congressmen each selected by the chairman of a different committee of the House of Representatives to visit the British Isles, the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, Germany, France, Italy, Russia, the Balkan countries, the Middle East, India, and China. Our assignment was a broad one. We were to study, first, administration of lend-lease; second, operation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; third, labor conditions in European countries; fourth, housing and food problems in occupied countries; fifth, inspect our military hospitals; sixth, obtain information relative to international legislative matters and the administration of these activities; and, seventh, become familiar with the problems involved in the gigantic task of reconstruction.

A vast area had to be covered in limited time, and therefore it was impossible to obtain all of the detailed information that we desired, had time permitted. However, we were able to obtain a good perspective of the awesome responsibilities that we face on problems which will have a direct bearing on world prosperity, for the peace, and for our own future well-being.

We left the United States on July 20. Our trip covered 21,000 miles over a period of 35 days—about 700 miles daily—during which time we visited 20 countries. Four of the original group, namely, Congressmen RAMEY, Republican, Ohio; DONDERO, Republican, Michigan; CHELF, Democrat, Kentucky, and myself did not tour the Middle East, India, and China because the arduous grind of daily travel was so exacting that we were not able to continue with it. We returned to the United States on August 25, 1945.

ENGLAND

Our first visit was in London and we spent 4 days there. I was particularly interested in labor problems, and we talked with many labor leaders. Also, since my congressional district contains a substantial number of men engaged in mining operations, we talked to coal miners. We found that labor was well organized, but it had not yet achieved the gains of American labor unions. Our visit took place just a few days before

the election returns were tabulated, and the predictions of labor unions that there would be a change in government was borne out several days later.

Rationing of food and clothing was stringent, and we found that the ration controls had been very effective, with little evidence of black-market traffic.

Fuel was extremely critical in this area, and all signs point to a severe condition this winter as a result of this shortage.

Food, too, is very short, but leaders informed us that they did not anticipate any starvation in the British Isles this winter. Conditions, however, will be no better than during the war years.

Our inspection revealed that one-seventh of the London area had been bombed out, creating a critical housing shortage. Unlike the Scandinavian countries, England had very little modern housing before the war. Reconstruction is now under way and war-torn buildings are being replaced. We also found the British lost little time in getting industries back to the production of civilian goods.

IRELAND

Upon our arrival in Belfast, Ireland, we met with Edward Warnock, Minister of Home Affairs, and Sir Basil Brooks, Prime Minister. They spent many hours discussing the problems of the postwar world with us and were profuse in their gratitude to the United States. It was their firm belief that the British Isles would have been doomed after Dunkerque had not the United States intervened with lend-lease supplies.

We visited sessions of Parliament in Ireland as we did in every other country on our itinerary, and we heard some very interesting debates on the unemployment problems, the housing shortage, and the many critical domestic matters.

I would like to say in passing that the Parliament Building here and elsewhere in Europe far surpassed the design, acoustics, and the beauty of our own Capitol in Washington, or any of our State capitol buildings.

Since Ireland was not "blitzed" like most of the English mainland, the war damage was negligible and the problems of rebuilding are few.

FRANCE

Arriving in Paris, we spent the first day and a half with various officials of the De Gaulle government and our own Embassy staff discussing the many problems of war-torn France. Here are a few of my observations: Labor is divided into several different groups and is extremely disorganized; wage rates are very low; civilian goods are so scarce that black-market operations are worse here than anywhere else in Europe. The stores that we visited had little to display and were quoting staggering prices.

There is little or no fuel in France and few of her industries will be able to function this winter because of this shortage and her crippled transportation systems.

We visited Cherbourg, the entire Normandy beach front, St. Lo, Caen, and many other cities in this region. It was obvious that the destruction here has been so complete that little remains. The housing conditions are deplorable. Thousands of homes were completely bombed out and we found people here living in the hills in temporary wooden shacks, in cellars, and in all types of make-shift structures. In this area people were using sewer water reboiled for drinking and cooking purposes. All through this region we saw children pick up food scraps at American messes. There were no dairy products for children. There was sickness and disease everywhere. I am convinced that only American assistance will prevent the death of thousands of Frenchmen this winter, particularly from starvation and disease. Not only must the United States undertake this responsibility for humanitarian purposes but we must also be aware of the lurking danger of revolution. If these conditions are not alleviated with food, shelter, and clothing, the people will rise against democracy and will form revolutionary forms of government. General Eisenhower has warned us that "without food in Europe, there will be no peace."

Our visit to France included a tour of the old battlefields of World War I—Chateau Thierry, St. Mihiel. In addition, we visited Camps Cleveland, Pittsburgh, New York, Brooklyn, and St. Louis, where we met hundreds of our boys with whom we discussed conditions in the Army, world affairs, the GI bill of rights, pending legislation, and the problems of the postwar world. We inspected military hospitals and found that our boys were receiving the finest medical attention possible. No effort is being spared in taking care of the wounded and returning them to the States for any further necessary treatment as rapidly as possible.

Morale in France among the GI's was on a high plane despite the fact that many of the boys were being redeployed to the Pacific. The American people have little conception of the tremendous problems that the Army faces in transporting troops from the European theater back to the United States, across the country, and to the Pacific. I was amazed to learn of the complexity of the job. Now, however, since the Japs have been defeated, a great number of the problems have been solved. Obviously the problem of redeployment to the Pacific is only a fraction of what it was when I visited these staging areas.

The Special Services Division was doing everything possible to keep our boys occupied and contented while waiting return home. Baseball and other sports had been encouraged, large touring show acts were on hand to provide entertainment, and much other valuable work in the entertainment field had been performed. The Army is to be commended for the splendid job that it has done in building up morale. I found that even though our soldiers had their gripes, on the whole they were fairly well satisfied.

DENMARK

Copenhagen was a refreshing contrast to the desolation we left in France. Here there were practically no slums and the housing was comparable to the best in our own country. The hard-working Danes, although they suffered much under German occupation, had been able to maintain their fine little homes and beautiful, well-cultivated farms. Everywhere there were great supplies of dairy products, and we found that the food was excellent.

However, here too we found critical transportation and fuel problems. Much of the Danish shipping was destroyed by the war; and supplies of coal were running low. As a result Danish leaders expect a marked increase in unemployment this winter. Without the necessary fuel, wheels cannot turn, plants cannot operate.

I found that labor conditions here were good. Unions were well organized and the predominating party here, as in England, now is also the labor group. Wages were comparatively low, however, by American standards since the average wage is only $20 a week.

The educational standards of the people are extremely high and they are enlightened on modern-day problems. It was interesting to note that the study of English was compulsory in the schools.

Denmark offers few problems. If we can get fuel to them, resume their shipping, then the wheels of industry will start turning.

NORWAY

Problems in Norway are very similar to those of Denmark.

Here also it was apparent that the biggest difficulty arises out of the fuel shortage and a crippled shipping industry which before the war was Norway's mainstay. We were advised that 60 percent of Norway's fleet was lost in the war and that as a result many of the other industries cannot properly function because of the lack of the necessary supplies which must be carried across the seas. We visited many plants, wood shops, paper mills, and so forth, and found that their problems would be solved by fuel and shipping facilities.

Although this country is a principal agricultural area, the supply of food was very low. During the occupation, the Germans walked off with millions of heads of cattle and chickens leaving Norway's cupboard bare. This shortage is aggravated ironically enough by the presence of 400,000 German prisoners who must be fed from the dwindling food supply. However, the Norwegian people are optimistic and feel that with the aid of Sweden and Denmark, they will be able to manage through the coming winter without American help.

Like Denmark, housing conditions are excellent with facilities comparable to the United States. Cooperatives, municipal housing and private interests have all participated in building up the fine apartments and homes that we saw.

Labor conditions are excellent. Unions are well-organized and wages are agreed to by national collective bargaining. Only in isolated instances are individual unions concerned with establishing wage rates.

We found very little illiteracy in Norway and discovered that educational standards were very high. English is a

compulsory course in the schools. The Norwegians, served by seven independent newspapers, are well informed on current events and political problems. The Norwegian quest for education has stimulated our own GI's there. Everywhere I went our boys indicated a desire to take advantage of the GI bill of rights and seek more schooling after their return to civilian life. The people are deeply grateful for American help and equally appreciative of the battles that Russia fought against our common enemy.

Trials of war criminals were in progress and interest was keen in the trial of Hans Brunner who admitted to killing 1,100 Norwegians. As a side light I might mention that General Thorn, British head in Norway, now occupies Vidkun Quisling's home which was built at a cost of 14,000,000 kroner, about $3,000,000. It is interesting to note that Quisling's salary before becoming head of the puppet Nazi government was but $2,500 per year.

The biggest problems in Norway are clearly fuel and shipping. If these can be solved, reconversion will be facilitated.

SWEDEN

We were pleased to find that Sweden is the "bread basket" of present-day Europe. There is plenty of food on hand including an ample supply of meat. It was evident that the Swedish people will be better fed this winter than any other Europeans.

Although there was little or no unemployment, some industries are working part time because of lack of coal. Here, too, fuel is a major problem.

Labor conditions are good. There have been few strikes. Housing is excellent and comparable to the other Scandinavian countries. I was impressed with the cleanliness in Sweden—to me, it seemed one of the cleanest countries in Europe.

The Swedish people feel that Americans are hostile toward them because of the position they took during the war. However, they do want to trade with us, and they respect our strength and power in world councils.

BELGIUM

The Belgian people bore the initial impact of both World Wars. In this war, their country was literally looted and wrecked by the Nazis. There is an acute housing situation. Medical supplies are scarce, and industry is just now beginning to function. Although some of the coal mines have been repaired, the necessary manpower to mine the coal is scarce because of the large number of war casualties which the country suffered.

At Antwerp we saw the devastation caused by the V–2 bombs. We talked to a number of Belgians who described the terror of these bombs which shot out from the sky as out of nowhere and without warning killed thousands of innocent people and caused hundreds of thousands of dollars of property damage.

At all our port installations our Army uses Belgian labor which Colonel Noble, who heads the command in Brussels, described to us as "the best workers in the world." It was at one of these ports that we talked to Gen. E. F. Koenig and watched and chatted with hundreds of GI's who walked the gangplanks of ships which were headed westward toward the arms of the Statue of Liberty. I was impressed with the fact that the officers were doing everything within their power to speed these GI's homeward and to make their trip as comfortable and pleasant as possible.

HOLLAND

Although it is impossible to say which one country suffered most from the war, when history is written and more exact evaluations can be made, I think we will find that Holland stands high on the list. I saw Rotterdam—a city wrecked beyond repair. If it had been wrecked due to the fact that it had been the scene of military operations, it would have been one thing, but Rotterdam was bombed and orders given for its destruction after Holland had capitulated to the Germans. This was wanton destruction. This was Nazi bestiality and criminality at its worst.

In other parts of Holland we saw evidence of the Nazi wholesale looting and stealing of everything that could be moved—food, clothing, homes, and cattle. I am certain that the Germans would have transplanted Holland itself to German soil if it had been possible. The Germans had a policy of doing either one of two things; stealing and sending the goods back to Germany, or destroying the goods.

Housing throughout Holland is scarce. Everywhere the supplies of both food and fuel are inadequate.

At Amsterdam, we had the pleasure of meeting Burgomeister de Boe, the man who during the German occupation fearlessly directed the underground. Although he knew his life was at stake and the Gestapo was continually hunting for him, he and his faithful group of followers and workers blew up bridges and trains, disrupted communications, and, to their everlasting glory, aided hundreds of American flyers to return safely to England.

The once beautiful city of Hague just does not exist any more. Fifteen thousand homes had been destroyed in one raid. It was here that the Germans built the first portion of their famous Atlantic wall, composed of heavy reinforced concrete, 10 feet thick, and 20 feet high. There is poetic justice in the fact that the Germans are now being required to clean out the mine fields which they had so carefully laid all along the beaches for miles and miles.

Although, obviously, at this time no precise evaluation can be placed on the amount of destruction which the country suffered, I found that the consensus of estimated damage was in the neighborhood of $7,000,000,000. Just think of it, little Holland, which is about the size of our own Rhode Island, suffered $7,000,000,000 worth of damage.

GERMANY

Our visit to Germany brought home to me the severity of the bombing damage and the immensity of the reconstruction problems. The devastation we saw was far worse than any words could describe.

Bremen is a good example of how severe the damage has been. There were no street lights, no electric lights in homes and no water supply. Forty percent of the 119,000 prewar homes were completely destroyed; 15 percent were partially ruined. People today are living in cellars, in huts, in caves, and as many as 15 people together in 5 rooms. The damage to this port runs into millions of dollars.

Similarly, Hamburg was completly devastated. The damage to this city exceeds even that at The Hague and along the Normandy beach front. We were advised that about 300,000 people here were killed or wounded in air raids and by blitz bombings from May 15 to July 1, 1944. Some 50,000 bodies still lie in the debris. Here also the port has been destroyed as were submarine bases, oil and gas reservoirs and other installation of military importance. One of our bombs pierced a 12-foot concrete reinforced submarine shelter, sank the submarine and wrecked the floating dock.

The food situation in German Bremen and Hamburg was very critical; sickness was evident everywhere, and disease is spreading rapidly. There is a shortage of doctors, and American physicians are doing everything possible to halt an epidemic.

Frankfurt, the headquarters of the European Theater Service Forces, is a very busy Army community. General Eisenhower's headquarters in this city are located in the beautiful I. G. Farben building, one of the finest in Europe. Here the problems of displaced people were very apparent. Everywhere we saw them wandering around with no possessions and nowhere to go. They have seen thousands of their friends die of starvation and by German cruelty. None knew whether their loved ones, or friends are still alive. Hundreds of cattle cars, freight cars, trucks and wagons bring them in and out of Frankfurt daily. It was indeed one of the most tragic sights that I have ever seen.

Our visit to Berlin proved to be an extremely instructive one. We were taken to Allied headquarters upon our arrival and met with Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay and General Milburn, General Echols, Gen. Luke Smith and other military leaders. Considerable time was spent with them discussing the American army of occupation and our military government. Following these conferences we decided to view some of the damage, talk to the people and get a first-hand impression. For 2 days we toured Berlin, Reichstrasse, Bismarckstrasse, Unter den Linden, Reichschancellery, Reichstag, Goering's Air Ministry, Gestapo Headquarters, the famous Tiergarten railroad headquarters. We viewed miles of every street in Berlin and saw nothing but complete destruction. Over 70,000 homes and buildings were gone and I predict that thousands of them will never be rebuilt. Here clearly one can see the horrors of war. The German mothers with whom we talked were well aware of the consequences of the Nazi war machine. They were now realizing that the privations of living in cellars, in the hills, and in temporary

shacks are the price that the Germans must pay for the human slaughter which they started. Everywhere the stench of death was in the air, with thousands of bodies still lying under the ruins.

We visited a hospital which had more than 600 political prisoners, many of whom were Germans who refused to subscribe to the Nazi ideology. They related to us the stories of Nazi atrocities and recited inconceivable accounts of butchery which were inflicted upon them by the Gestapo. One man told me he witnessed the death of more than 100,000 Germans, Poles, and Russians, among whom were both Christians and Jews. The survivors in this hospital are an example of the Nazi treachery and after hearing their accounts, it is impossible to have any sympathy for the Nazi war criminals who are shortly to be tried for their horrible crimes.

The civilian economy here as elsewhere in Germany has been completely disrupted. Few consumer goods are available and the black market flourishes. We have a heavy responsibility in reestablishing a democratic form of government in Germany, feeding the people and in rebuilding an economy which will prevent future wars. To me it seems that this is almost a superhuman task.

RUSSIA

We were the first congressional group to visit Russia. We flew there from Berlin in a Russian plane which was manned by a Russian crew and let me take my hat off here to the pilots for that wonderful trip. At the Moscow airport we were greeted by Averill Harriman, our Ambassador to Russia, members of his staff, Dr. Kemenoff, Russian president of Vaux Society for Cultural Relationships with Foreign Countries, and members of his staff. That evening we were guests of Mr. Harriman, who, as is his custom, was entertaining American soldiers and sailors who happened to be stationed in Moscow. I talked to a number of these men, and although they stated that they themselves would not want to live in Russia, they had nothing but praise for Russia, the Russian people and that country's great contribution to the Allied Nations victory.

We made a tour of Moscow and found, as we had expected, that most of the stores were owned by the state.

We visited several industrial plants and one of their famous machine tool steel plants where over 3,000 people are employed. The average common laborer earns about $60 per month, and the skilled workers about $160 to $185 per month. They are permitted to belong to unions and they have the right of collective bargaining, but it was evident that with the state in control of almost everything, the unions cannot be as effective as our own great American labor unions.

We met with Russian housing officials and were shown the vast housing programs which had been prepared for the postwar period.

The few Russian people with whom we spoke agree that they receive greater privileges today than at any other time in their history. Stalin has made it possible for these people to have the essentials of life: food and shelter. Most of them remember only too vividly the terrorism during the czarist regimes.

There appeared to be plenty of coal and sufficient food everywhere in Russia. The country obviously is rich with natural resources.

We were given a banquet by Dr. Kemenoff and his associates which was attended by Maxim Litvinov, who is Molotov's assistant and former Ambassador to the United States. Dr. Stanislaw Marshak, the famous Russian poet, and other leading Russian notables were present to pay homage and tribute to America for her 60 million dollars worth of voluntary Russian relief and for the billions of dollars in food, tanks, guns, and planes which had been given to the Russians under lend-lease to be used in her gallant war against Germany. Everywhere people expressed the strong desire for a close American-Soviet friendship. General Eisenhower and General Clay were right when they said that we can work with the Russian people in peace just as we fought side by side with them in war.

We left Moscow and flew to Berlin and en route flew over devastated Stalingrad. We stopped in Warsaw, Poland, which had tasted the same ruthless bombings as Rotterdam. The food situation in Warsaw is critical. Although coal is being mined, the Poles will suffer during the winter because the housing situation is critical.

ITALY

In Italy we were able to see the difficulties attendant upon the re-establishment of the economy which had been so thoroughly disrupted by military events. A conference was called with the Allied commission headed by Admiral Stone, representatives of the Office of War Information, Foreign Economic Administration and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. We spent many hours very favorably obtaining first hand information on some of the difficulties that our representatives have had in trying to solve the complex problems of returning Italy to a peoples government. It was apparent that the efforts to reconstitute the Italian Government had not yet been completely successful. Here, elements of chaos are still present. It is no simple task to weed out Fascism which had been so firmly entrenched, but I have every confidence that the job will be done as quickly as possible.

The housing conditions in Italy are not as bad as in some other parts of Europe. Labor is completely disorganized, and unemployment is one of the most serious problems that the Allied leaders must face. I found that UNRRA had done a magnificent job in administering relief to the Italian people and without this assistance it is likely that the forces of occupation would have had considerable difficulty in maintaining order.

General McNarney, of Emporium, Pa., just 133 miles from my home town of Glassport, met me and we spent the substantial part of the day conferring. I discovered that General McNarney did not believe it was necessary to keep a large group of American occupation troops in Italy, and he favored the return of our boys to the United States as soon as possible. During the month of August 1945, he had plans of returning 40,000 men from this theater. It was heartening to see what a splendid job he was doing.

The ruins of Cassino and other historic battle fronts remain as silent memories of the Mussolini regime. The Italian people with whom I talked have only a hatred for his memory and can recall that he gave them nothing but poverty and war. We will have a difficult job rebuilding Italy, but it can be done with less difficulty than the other parts of Europe.

One of the high lights of my entire trip was the opportunity of meeting with His Holiness Pope Pius XII. It was a thrilling moment for me and all members of the committee to be favored by an audience with the Pontiff. We were impressed with his sincerity and his complete grasp of the enormity of the problems with which we are confronted. I found that the Pope was a great admirer of our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and that he has the highest respect for President Harry S. Truman. The Pope asked all of us to keep in mind the importance of fighting as hard for the peace as we fought to win the war.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Above all else, the European trip convinced me of one thing: This world cannot survive another war. The destruction and famine which I saw everywhere were grim—very grim—reminders of what mechanized warfare is and can be. If the efficiency of the technological aspects of war increases, there is no doubt in my mind but that the next war, if it comes, will be the last war. It will be the last war because civilization thereafter will no longer exist, the population of the world would be obliterated, our universities, industries, resources, homes, and food will be completely destroyed. Those few who would by chance survive would lead the same kind of lives that the few million people on this planet lived four or five thousand years ago. I am appending to this report a recent article written by Norman Cousins which sets forth in the clearest language the alternatives which the civilized people of this world have today. We must, once and for all, realize that we are living in one world and that that world knows no artificial mandrawn boundaries, is no respecter of race or color, ignores the different languages and dialects, and scoffs at national customs. This one world has never heard of trade barriers, knows that famine cannot exist in one part of its borders while food rots from overabundance in another part. It was a long struggle before families became parts of tribes; it took thousands of years before tribes were integrated into states and nations; it has taken a long time for people to realize that these nations must be integrated into one world. The evolutionary process of civilization has been

a slow one. In the past century, technological developments have speeded this process until, today, we know that no artificial border can segregate one part of the world from the other.

I am greatly concerned over the fact that too many people, now that the fighting war is over, will want to return to normalcy. It has been said before, but it cannot be said too often—we must fight and keep the peace with the same vigor, the same enthusiasm, the same mobilization of resources, and the same far-sightedness with which we won the war. During the conflict our military strategists considered the war as a global one. Each of the military moves was coordinated with other military moves hundreds and thousands of miles away. We could not divorce our own security in this country from what happened in Europe, and we could not divorce our military actions in Europe from those which we took in the Pacific. We must also correlate and integrate our strategy to keep the peace. We must realize that what happens in Europe is a concern of ours; we must integrate what we do in Germany with what we do in north Africa and Argentina; we must correlate our activities in Europe with our activities in Japan. We can no longer make isolated moves and fail to understand the global repercussions of what we are doing. Just as a chess player must watch not only the particular piece that he is moving but must also watch all of his pieces and all those of his opponent at the same time, so must we view the world as one living, dynamic organization of which we are a part and, whatever we do, we must realize that ours cannot be an isolated, individual action. A pebble dropped in a lake causes a number of ever-enlarging circles to go out from the point at which the pebble touched the water. We must view our actions in the same light. What people do in McKeesport, Pa., what our legislators do in Washington, what the meeting of the foreign ministers does in London, what the Allied Military Government does in Germany, and what General MacArthur does and says in Japan is just the beginning of circles that are ever-widening and ever-growing, until they encompass the whole world.

Aside from these general observations about which I feel most deeply and which lie at the heart of the problems facing the world today, I want to make the following specific recommendations:

1. LEND-LEASE

Although there are a few instances in which lend-lease was administered loosely, for the most part I have nothing but words of praise for the results which I saw accomplished through its activities. It indeed was a far-sighted gesture when our great and beloved President Roosevelt decided that this country should be the source from which our allies could draw in order to defeat our common enemy. Something that is not widely realized is the amount of reverse lend lease given to the United States by the Allies. It will be impossible for the countries of the world to balance off in dollars, pounds, franc, or liras, their indebtedness to one another. How are we going to evaluate a plane which we gave to England, and which was used by an English flier to shoot down a German Messerschmidt? How are we going to evaluate the life of the young Englishman who was lost, and the American life that was saved because that Messerschmidt and that German aviator were thereafter never able to attack one of our planes? How are we ever going to be able to evaluate the cost of our aid to England which permitted that nation to survive and to become the fortress from which we launched the attack upon the continent? Had England not survived, we should have had to launch our attack directly from our own ports of embarkation, and how can we evaluate the number of lives and material saved by having England as a port of embarkation for the attack? When the history of this war is written—not now nor 20 years from now, but 50 and 75 years from now—I want it to be said that this great Nation of ours did not deal with its allies at arms' length when it came to settling the debts incurred during the course of the conflict. I want it to be said that this great Nation understood that the war was won by the joint efforts of all of the Allies; that each contributed its maximum. The historians will probably point to the millions of Russian lives that have been lost, to the devastation of England, and to the vast amount of resources which this Nation poured into the effort. Let it be said that this country did not seek repayment for its efforts in the same way that it will not be said that the Russians placed a price upon the lives of the millions of soldiers that they lost or that the English did not appraise each house, church, and university which was wrecked and ask its allies for reimbursement.

2. UNRRA

On August 9, President Truman stated that Europe was hungry and that "unless we do what we can to help, we may lose next winter what we won at such terrible cost last spring. Desperate men are liable to destroy the structure of their society to find in the wreckage some substitute for hope. If we let Europe go cold and hungry, we may lose some of the foundations of order on which the hope for world-wide peace must rest." There is very little that I can add to this sentiment of our great President, except to report from personal observation that Europe is at the brink of starvation and that unless this Nation, as well as others who have the food, come to its rescue, millions will starve and other millions will die of cold and disease during the coming winter.

It seems to me, then, that our most important task now is not the Atlantic Charter, or peace treaties, but the feeding and clothing of these war-weary Europeans to avert threatened disaster.

I urge the sending of food and medical supplies to Europe and the continuation of UNRRA, for two reasons: First, I want to see that the war which we have won stays won. I want to be assured that Europe does not become embittered and disillusioned. I want to make certain that no new Hitler will find the seeds of disorder, discontent, and disillusionment already sown. No dictator can rise in a country where the people's stomachs are filled, where their minds and bodies are well, and where ample shelter and fuel are available. Dictatorship arises when men have reached the last straw and they clutch at anything that gives them new hope. The second reason I advocate this course of conduct by this great country of ours is that it is in keeping with the tradition of its humanitarian policies, and, I believe, the wishes of its people, who are essentially religious people. The teachings of the Old and New Testaments are as valid today as they were centuries ago. We cannot turn our eyes away from the outstretched hands of children begging for food. We cannot close our fists and rebuke children whose bodies are racked with pain and disease. I do not think that the American people would stand for such conduct. We, who are the best fed, best clothed, best sheltered, and who have the greatest abundance of medical supplies and doctors in the world, cannot, and we must not, say to other peoples that we will refuse to help.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration operations everywhere, except in Italy and the Balkans, were disappointing due to the lack of trained personnel and the utter failure and lack of cooperation between the agencies involved. In this area there were no distribution points or depots, which are vital to the proper administration of this important agency. I suggested to Army leaders overseas that the program be integrated and unified so that these difficulties could be eliminated. We must not let UNRRA fail for lack of intelligent planning. The European Continent is leaning to the left, and unless we help feed, clothe, and shelter these distressed people, I predict that communism will envelop all of Europe and the Middle East. This will endanger the welfare of our Army of Occupation and require a greater number of occupation troops, which will bring a howl from all American parents. If under the circumstances and with greater cooperation anticipated by the Army, UNRRA cannot perform its function, then I recommend that its trained personnel be transferred under the supervision of the Army. Relief and rehabilitation could be administered by the Army because it has the personnel and facilities to do this gigantic and important task.

3. ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

The Bretton Woods proposals are a step forward in establishing a firm monetary system for the world. One cannot travel from country to country without realizing the dangers inherent in the exchange of one nation's currency for another's without some coordinated stabilizing influence. Economic chaos comes from artificial currency exchange rates. Bretton Woods will, in part, eliminate the possibility of this occurring and aid in the prevention of another war.

4. LABOR AND HOUSING

I specifically recommend that more German prisoners be utilized in the production of the necessities of life in Europe. There are at the present time over 400,000 such prisoners available in Norway; they should immediately be set to the task of mining coal and doing other labor which is urgently needed. This is vital. Coal mining in Belgium, Germany, and Poland could be increased 50 percent within 2 months with p. o. w. labor.

It is imperative that the United States give immediate aid to the Netherlands. The Dutch people have always been friendly and their trade relations with the United States have always been the best. The Dutch people are in need of fuel and housing due to the ruthless and wanton bombings by the Germans, and the Dutch need aid this winter. Therefore, we must furnish fuel by the recommendation just outlined or by sending some direct from the United States now. We can also furnish temporary housing by dismantling many of the Quonset huts or barracks located in many sections of the staging area in France and Germany which are not being used and will not be needed by our army of occupation. They can be dismantled and shipped to Holland before the cold weather sets in. I am informed that medical supplies will be available through the United States Government and food through our Government and the Scandinavian countries.

5. RETURN OF SOLDIERS

General Marshall's statement last Thursday, September 20, was heartening. In effect, he said most of our men will be released from military service by November 1. I think the Army is well aware of the grave morale question involved in keeping men in the service who are not performing vital functions. From General Marshall's statement, it is apparent that the Army will bend every effort to return our men to these shores and, once they get here, put them back into civilian clothes. I talked to thousands of GI's, most of whom came from my district. They discussed with me frankly and openly their eagerness to return to the States. It is not a question of shirking duty; a number of them pointed out to me that they were performing no worth-while function. The GI's, our Congress, and the Army must face realistically, on the other hand, the problem involved in policing Europe. We will be required to maintain a certain force there. We must do this. Now that we have won the war, we must be certain that we keep the peace.

6. MAIL

I want strongly to urge that everyone in the United States send letters and more letters to the men who still remain in the Army. While they were fighting their minds were occupied and their leisure time was scarce. Time now weighs heavily on the hands of a number of them and mail from home is one of the best morale stimulants that there is. Mail your Christmas packages to your boys now and you might also remember your neighbor's son this Christmas. It's a real morale builder.

7. SPORTS

I have discussed with a number of Army officials, and will continue to do so, the necessity of a coordinated and complete sports program not only for the men remaining in the Army but for civilians as well. For those who remain in the Army, I think it is essential that we bear in mind the great number of leisure hours which they have on their hands. They have been trained in cooperation and coordination; participation in competitive sport activities will continue their endeavors to cooperate and coordinate their lives with those of their fellow men. I have already introduced into Congress a bill which calls for the raising of the physical fitness standards of this country. I am not a worshiper of sports as such. I believe there is a purpose in sports and that purpose is to make Americans the most physically fit people in the world, and there is no greater morale factor among our men in the armed services. The GI's, knowing they must serve in the army of occupation, suggested interzone competitive athletic competition in basketball, baseball, football, track, and boxing. They strongly desired a European championship and a series or championship events between the European theater and the Pacific theater, with final world's championships against the best in the United States. We cannot underestimate the great value of such athletic competition to our GI's and the spirit of fair competition it will instill in the peoples of the occupied countries.

8. GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Although our men are generally satisfied with the GI bill of rights, they are disturbed by two things. First, they want it clearly understood that they are not asking for doles or hand-outs; they do not want pity or sympathy. All they ask for is a chance to get started in civilian life, and they want the GI bill of rights administered in that spirit. Secondly, they are disturbed by the great number of stories involving the red tape required in order to receive the benefits of the GI bill of rights. I am certain that, under the courageous and wise leadership of General Bradley, the Veterans' Administration will be run in such a way that no GI need fear that his rights will be smothered under a sheaf of papers and the shifting of responsibility from one person to another. General Bradley is a soldier. He knows his GI's. He knows what they are asking and he will see that they get it. This includes proper hospitalization, without red tape; rehabilitation, education, and provisions for return to business and normalcy.

9. MERCHANT MARINE

It is vital to our post-war economy to keep a large Navy and merchant marine; therefore, I would recommend the retention of a large merchant marine of at least 20,000,000 tons with a large reserve. The surplus tonnage can be sold to countries like Norway, Denmark, and Holland, whose very existence depends upon the shipping industry.

In order to have a prosperous and peaceful America we must aid in the reconstruction of a devastated Europe. This can be done if the Government of the United States will only exert the bold, vigorous, and democratic leadership which it has long since been called upon to assume. After World War I the United States lost its moral leadership in the world because it did not commit its military forces to the preservation of the international order its President helped establish. It would be even a greater disaster for the United States after this war to commit its military forces to the preservation of an international order in which it had abdicated its moral leadership. We must exert all our power and moral leadership. We must invoke Divine guidance in preserving world peace. Our failure to act following World War I hastened and brought about World War II. Regardless of the cost, we must not fail again.

The Doyle Bill To Meet the Immediate Emergency Caused by the Closing of the Wartime Child-Care Services, H. R. 4202—This Act May Be Cited as the Emergency Child-Care Act of 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully and specifically call attention of every Member of this great legislative body to H. R. 4202, which I have this day filed, entitled "Emergency Child-Care Act of 1945." The import of this bill is to meet the immediate emergency in the closing of the child-care services which were carried on through the administration of the FWA, enabled by funds provided through the Lanham Act.

But these Lanham Act funds, which have proved so beneficent and sensible in this war emergency, were, in fact, war funds and were especially provided in connection therewith. They were not intended to be spent for a long period of months after the cessation of actual fighting in this war. And as General Fleming, of the FWA, recently advised us in conference, that he had agreed with Congress that the expenditure of these funds would cease after the cessation of hostilities.

Therefore, last week General Fleming informed me—and other Representatives—in conference with him, that the FWA had given notice in January of this year to the officials of my native State of California and all other States concerned, that these respective States would have to immediately plan to take care of the children in these child care centers with the cessation of hostilities. There appears no question but that the respective States had this notice and information from the Department—headed by General Fleming who was assisted by Mr. George Field. At that

time, a very few States, took heed and began to make provision to handle this needy problem as soon as it arose. These few States are now taking care of their own problem without Federal aid but my native State of California did not maks such provision, and I am reliably informed that less than one-half dozen States did make such provision when they were notified that it would be advisable and necessary so to do last January.

Gentlemen, while the Lanham Act does not legally require that these funds stop on any fixed date, the notice of several weeks ago from the FWA to all the States using such Federal moneys, was in keeping with the notice given all of these same States last January—that they could expect such termination of moneys promptly after the cessation of hostilities. Therefore, in submitting this bill, the FWA cannot very well be criticized too severely for sending out the notice to terminate the centers on October 31, 1945, in view of the aforesaid notice last January of its intention so to do when this time arose.

Rather the States themselves that did not heed the advice from the FWA in January and those States which flatly refused to initiate or enact the necessary legislation, or provide the necessary moneys, are to be criticized. For manifestly the States themselves cannot expect the Federal Treasury to continue indefinitely spending war moneys, a problem which is primarily a State problem even though it is a field of national concern and responsibility for every child in the Nation. But we are all hopeful that the FWA may yet be able to extend the date for termination of moneys to the States for the programs until December 31, 1945. This extension from October 31 would give the States which actively take over their responsibilities some further time to protect the children within their borders who are in these child-care centers. It is an emergency. If the FWA does not extend the date from October 31 to December 31, then the emergency is greater than otherwise, for then the States will have a reasonable opportunity to get their legal machinery and program in readiness to protect these children and their mothers from the hazards resulting from such dilemma.

The Doyle bill, H. R. 4202, is not intended as a permanent measure. It is, as its title indicates, an emergency child-care act of 1945. Manifestly, the $5,000,000 therein provided and as will appear from the text of the bill, which bill is herein set forth, is entirely inadequate to do more than to act as a stopgap for a few months, but it is drawn to definitely aid and assist in reducing the hazards and dilemma in the delay of the States now making the provisions which they should have begun to make several months ago; a few States did, but almost all of them did not.

H. R. 4202

A bill to meet the immediate emergency caused by the closing of the wartime child-care services

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Child-Care Act of 1945."

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 2. For the purpose of enabling each State through its departments of welfare and education to assist local communities in meeting emergency needs in the reconversion period, caused by termination of child-care services established under the Act of October 14, 1940, as amended, entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," in supplementing these services as necessary to meet emergency child-care needs, and to plan with local communities for the development and use of resources for meeting the continuing needs of children through child-care services, the sum of $5,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. Of this amount $4,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the Office of Education and $1,000,000 to the Children's Bureau for the development of cooperative programs with State departments of education and of welfare, respectively, for carrying out the purposes of this act. These sums shall be used for making allotments to State departments of education and State welfare departments, respectively, for payment of part of the cost of the programs established under State plans for extended school services developed jointly by the State departments of education and the Office of Education, and for programs of day care service developed jointly by the State departments of welfare and the Children's Bureau, respectively.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 3. (a) To be eligible for an allotment from the Office of Education under this act, a State will, through its State department of education, prepare and submit to the Office of Education a State plan to provide for extended school services. Such a plan may provide for nursery schools, centers for school-age children before and after school hours, on Saturdays, and during vacations; provisions for parent education programs, related to the services defined above; and health and other auxiliary services necessary to assure an adequate program for children.

(b) To be eligible for an allotment from the Children's Bureau under this act, a State will through its State department of welfare prepare and submit to the Children's Bureau a State plan to provide for such services and facilities as are required for children whose child-care needs cannot be met fully through services provided under school auspices, and may include advisory and information services, foster family day care, day nurseries or day care centers, and health and other auxiliary services necessary to assure proper care for the children receiving such services.

(c) Such State plans shall in each case show the relation between the State plan for educational services and the State plan for welfare services.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 4. The amount allotted with respect to each State under this act shall be paid to the appropriate State agency by the Secretary of the Treasury prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 5. From the funds appropriated pursuant to section 2 the Office of Education shall make allotments to State departments of education which have an approved plan, and the Children's Bureau shall make allotments to State welfare departments which have an approved plan, of amounts which shall be used for carrying out the purposes of the State plans; such funds to be available for reallotment to local governmental units through their boards of education and of welfare to provide services where needed.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 6. Of the funds allotted to the Children's Bureau and the Office of Education, sums not to exceed 1½ percent of the sums appropriated shall be available for the administration of this act.

As I have said, my own State of California is one that did not make the necessary provision or anticipate the need by appropriate legislation or allocation of moneys. It did enact legislation permitting the State to accept money for these child-care centers but not to spend its own money, so, Mr. Speaker, I am not undertaking to excuse my own State in being slothful about the business of taking adequate care of its own children in child-care centers, but I am seeking to eliminate the penalties to the children—and their mothers—which will clearly result if there are no moneys available after October 31, 1945, and those penalties are affixed to all children and mothers in every State which have not yet made adequate provision for these worthy children and mothers.

Therefore, gentlemen, let us not penalize these children of our Nation on account of any lack of any adult in adequately planning for the conservation of childhood character and values. Children are a community liability largely as the result of lack of foresight and planning on the part of adults of that community.

So I am reminding you gentlemen that this $5,000,000 will not do the job until June 1946—which is its termination date—but will merely help to do it in a very meager way for a portion of that time and not fully or adequately at all up to that time.

I ask you to read the bill; it is very short; it has been worked out and reduced to full benefit and consideration after conference, analysis, and finding of needs. My hopes are as follows:

First. That the FWA will continue its program in all the States as long as possible and not less than December 31, 1945.

Second. That supplementary to this continue expenditure to December 31, 1945, by FWA, this sum of $5,000,000 will then become available by this great Congress.

Within the last 2 weeks I have heretofore addressed earlier remarks to you upon this same subject which is so important on the subject of continued care to these children. I refer you to both series of remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are Nation-wide in import.

Thus this program of child care and protection of this unit of children of our Nation will be enabled to carry on for a reasonable number of months until the States themselves, whose chief responsibility it is, are going to take up their own problem with adequate provisions and law and with ample funds. Nothing less than adequate provision for these children will be an honorable discharge of the duty to these members of childhood by the adulthood of our Nation. I commend to you the provisions of the Doyle bill, H. R. 4202.

Address by Irving E. Rogers, Tuesday, September 18, 1945, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very able address by Irving E. Rogers, publisher of the Lawrence Daily Eagle and the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., at a noon luncheon meeting, held in the St. Mary's Auditorium, Lawrence, Mass., sponsored by the Lawrence Daily Eagle and Evening Tribune, tendered to Chairman Joseph P. Kennedy and the members of the Massachusetts Legislative Recess Commission studying the need for the establishment of a Department of Commerce in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This meeting was well attended by leaders and representatives of industry, labor, and business in Greater Lawrence, Mass., and was high-lighted by the stirring appeals made by Irving E. Rogers, Joseph P. Kennedy, and others, who stressed the need for concerted action by the citizens of Massachusetts:

WELCOME BY PUBLISHER

The remarks of Mr. Rogers follow:

"Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy, members of the Special Massachusetts Commission, members of the clergy, and guests: We have scheduled a fast moving program with a great amount of information to be absorbed, so I suggest you all stand up and relocate your chairs in a comfortable position.

"I want to thank you all most sincerely for attending this luncheon meeting today, for by doing so, you have expressed your personal interest in the future of Greater Lawrence and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

"And I want to assure you that before today's program is over you will realize that many serious problems we have confronting us to maintain the outstanding position of Massachusetts in these United States.

"At this point, if I may digress, I would like to offer a suggestion and recommendation to all service club members present. Service clubs are fine, and do occupy their place in the community as well as promote good fellowship. But, after all, remember, in unity there is strength and therefore I firmly believe you should hold combined open meetings such as this, more frequently, with an outstanding speaker who will really instill in us all the enthusiasm and fight that we need for accomplishment rather than adopt the customary attitude of letting the other fellow do the work. I assure you also that the Eagle and Tribune will back you to the limit in such a program.

"It was my good fortune in August to attend two hearings at the State house of this special commission headed by Massachusetts' most enthusiastic citizen, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy. As you all know, Mr. Kennedy is internationally known and has many diversified interests, yet his number one project is Massachusetts.

"We all have a lot at stake—our future, in fact; so why shouldn't we all unite and give a little extra energy toward the future of Greater Lawrence and Massachusetts?

"Let's all forget politics and work on the theory that it is our bread and butter, and it is, too. For as a city, such as Lawrence, prospers, so do we all, and the same applies to our State."

FAVORS DEPARTMENT

"At this time, I would like to express my feelings to Mr. Kennedy and his commission.

"I strongly favor the establishment in this Commonwealth of Massachusetts of a department of commerce, and am heartily in accord with its purposes. In fact, I regard it as highly essential, if we are to keep our place among the leading and more progressive States of the Nation. It is highly important, in this period of economic, industrial, transportation, and post-war problems. These will test our greatest resourcefulness so that, we should have as a background, a worthwhile department of commerce. It must be built upon a sound foundation of it is to adequately meet the demands of these unprecedented times and problems.

"Problems of commerce such as never before confronted the Nation, the separate States and the various communities are certain to arise and we here in Massachusetts must be prepared to meet and cope with them. I know of no better way than through a department of commerce as a clearing house. It must be guided by men of real business and industrial experience, sound judgment, and must be staffed by men who have the exceptional ability to serve in such capacities. It must be designed to advance the best interests of the entire State because in that way it can serve better the separate communities. Men already returning from the wars must rehabilitate themselves. So also must States and communities.

"We in Lawrence are already planning to meet some of the postwar problems, and surveys, with reference to building in such a way as to intelligently face the new future, are already under way.

"We are rushing a modern airport to early completion that we may be abreast of the times in air transportation. There seems to me to be a pressing need in Massachusetts for a livewire department of commerce. I am interested personally as a businessman and because of my pride in my home community of Greater Lawrence and its important industries. Today I wish to endorse this movement and to pledge support of it through the newspapers of which I am publisher, and also through the facilities of radio station WLAW."

MUST ENLARGE CHAMBER

"I know of no more appropriate time than this to sow the seed for a revitalized and enlarged Lawrence Chamber of Commerce. No business can operate without funds and support, but that is just what we—and I use that term because I happen to be a chamber director—are trying to do.

"Here is Greater Lawrence, with 125,000 population, trying through the chamber of commerce, to serve our present industries, as well as attract new ones on a $7,200 yearly budget.

"Worcester, for example, with a population of 200,000 found itself lagging behind with a chamber of commerce budget of 25 cents per capita and has set out to increase its budget from $50,000 to $140,000, an increase of $90,000, of which $57,000 has already been raised although the drive officially doesn't start until next week.

The goal Worcester has set will give their chamber a budget of 70 cents per capita, which is the average of 42 comparable cities.

"Our Lawrence Chamber of Commerce is trying to do a job on a budget of less than 6 cents per capita. The absurdity of this situation can be easily seen by comparing this 6 cents with the following per capita chamber of commerce budgets:

"Wilmington, Del., with a population of 112,000, 64 cents per capita.

"Fort Smith, Ark., with a population of 43,000, 55 cents per capita.

"Hartford, Conn., 38 cents, and New Haven, 48 cents. Fort Worth, Tex., 86 cents. Oklahoma City, Okla., $1.02.

"To meet the average chamber of commerce budget on a per capita basis, Greater Lawrence should give its chamber an annual income of $87,500. Yet, we only give them $7,200.

"It is high time that we (and I refer to merchants, industrialists, labor, bankers, and citizenry of Greater Lawrence) all open our eyes, rather than continue ostrich tactics. Let us face the facts.

"If this State department of commerce is established, Lawrence will be in the same position as Massachusetts is now nationally, with each and every city in the Commonwealth competing with each other to retain its present industries as well as to attract new ones.

"The challenge of this new postwar era of economic development and competition is so great that those communities who fail to meet it head-on and standing up may wake up when it is too late and find themselves in the rearguard of the march of progress.

"Again I want to thank you all for coming here, and, at this time, I would like to turn the responsibilities of this meeting over to my personal friend and an outstanding citizen of Lawrence and Massachusetts, Attorney James A. Donovan, your toastmaster."

Rationing of Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution in the House which has for its purpose the enactment of the act stopping all allocation for rationing of beef.

The country, for the past 3 years, has had about 10,000,000 more cattle on its ranges than at any other 3-year period in its history. It is now estimated that there are about 81,000,000 head of cattle in the country. There has never been any need for a shortage of beef. The one thing which has caused the shortage has been the rules and regulations and red tape which has brought on slaughter quotas, price freezes, roll-backs, subsidies and a whole host of other regulations.

If the OPA had left the cattle industry alone, they would have supplied all the meat that this country, our armies, or the world would have needed. Now, we are faced with a surplus of cattle. The OPA still insists that you should have red points to buy meat. They have just recently released about one-third of the beef from red points but they still make it impossible to buy good meat without red points. If this condition continues to exist, we will find meat spoiling in the counters of every city in the country. Slaughter quotas have been removed but now we have the bottleneck of no red points and much good meat.

The OPA does not want to lose their grip upon their power to regiment and control the American people. There is no rhyme nor reason for continuing the rationing of beef.

Modern Man Is Obsolete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Review of Literature of August 18, 1945:

MODERN MAN IS OBSOLETE

There is elation in the world today because of victory. But there is also fear. It is a primitive fear, the fear of the unknown, the fear of forces man can neither channel nor comprehend. This fear is not new; in its classical form it is the fear of irrational death. But overnight it has become intensified, magnified. It has burst out of the subconscious and into the conscious. It is thus that man stumbles fitfully into a new age of atomic energy for which he is as ill-equipped to accept its potential blessings as he is to counteract or control its present dangers.

Where man can find no answer, he will find fear. While the dust was still settling ever Hiroshima, he was asking himself questions and finding no answers. The biggest question of these concerns the nature of man. Is war in the nature of man? If so, how much time has he left before he employs the means he has already devised for the ultimate in self-destruction—extinction? If not, then how is he to interpret his own experience, which tells him that in all of recorded history there have been only 300 years in the aggregate during which he has been free of war?

Closely following upon these are other questions, flowing out endlessly from his fears and without prospect of definite answer. Even assuming that he could hold destructive science in check, what changes would the new age bring or demand in his everyday life? What changes would it bring or demand in his culture, his education, his philosophy, his religion, his relationships with other human beings?

In speculating upon these questions, it should not be necessary to prove that on August 6, 1945, a new age was born. When on that day a parachute containing a small object floated to earth over Japan, it marked the violent death of one stage in man's history and the beginning of another. Nor should it be necessary to prove the saturating effect of the new age, permeating every aspect of man's activities, from machines to morals, from physics to philosophy, from politics to poetry; in sum, it is an effect creating a blanket of obsolescence no only over the methods and the products of man but over man himself.

It is a curious phenomenon of nature that only two species practice the art of war—men and ants, both of which, ironically, maintain complex social organizations. While all entomologists are agreed that war is instinctive with ants, not all anthropologists and biologists are agreed that war is instinctive with men. Many scientists claim that the evidence to date is incomplete and misleading, and that man does have within him the power of abolishing war. Julian Huxley draws a sharp distinction between human nature and the expression of human nature. Thus war is not a reflection but an expression of his nature. Moreover, the expression may change, as the factors which lead to war man change; for, as Huxley says, " . . . human nature contains no specific war instinct."

But even if this gives us a reassuring answer to the question—is war inevitable because of man's nature?—it still leaves unanswered the question concerning the causes leading up to war. The expression of man's nature will continue to be warlike if the same conditions are continued that have provoked warlike expressions in him in the past. And since man's survival on earth is now absolutely dependent on his ability to avoid a new war, he is faced with the so-far insoluble problem of eliminating those causes.

In the most primitive sense, war in man is an expression of his competitive impulses. Like everything else in nature, he has had to fight for existence; but the battle against other animals, once won, gave way in his evolution to battle against his own kind. Darwin called it the survival of the fittest, and its most overstretched interpretation is to be found in Mein Kampf, with its naked glorification of brute force and the complete worship of might makes right. In the political and national sense, it has been the attempt of the "have-nots" to take from the "haves," or the attempt of the "haves" to add further to their lot at the expense of the "have-nots."

What does it matter, then, if war is not in the nature of man so long as man continues through the expression of his nature to be a viciously competitive animal? The effect is the same, and therefore the result must be conclusive—war being the effect, and complete obliteration of the human species being the ultimate result.

If this reasoning is correct, then modern man is obsolete, a self-made anachronism becoming more incongruous by the minute. He has exalted change in everything but himself. He has leaped centuries ahead in inventing a new world but he has not prepared himself to live in that world. He has surrounded and confounded himself with gaps—gaps between revolutionary science and evoluntionary anthropology, between cosmic gadgets and human wisdom, between intellect and conscience. The struggle between science and morals that Henry Thomas Buckle foresaw a century ago has been all but won by science.

Man is left, then, with a crisis in decision. The main test before him involves his will to change rather than his ability to change. That he is capable of change is certain. For there is no more mutable or adaptable animal in the world. We have seen him migrate from one extreme clime to another. We have seen him step out of backward societies and join advanced groups. Within the space of a single generation, tribes of headhunters have spurned their acephalous pastimes and rituals to become purveyors of the Western arts. This is not to imply that the change was necessarily for the better; only that change was possible. Changeability with the headhunters proceeded from external pressure and fear of punishment, true, and was only secondarily a matter of voluntary decision. But the stimulus was there; and mankind today need look no further for stimulus than its own desire to stay alive. The fabulous power of change, says Spengler, is directly linked to the survival drive. Once the instinct for survival is stimulated, the basic condition for change can be met.

That is why the power of total destruction as potentially represented by modern science must be dramatized and kept in the forefront of public opinion. The full dimensions of the peril must be seen and recognized. Then and only then will man realize that the first order of business is the question of his continued existence. Then and only then will he be prepared to make the decisions necessary to assure that survival.

In making these decisions, there are two principal courses that are open to him. Both will keep him alive for an indefinite or at least a reasonably long period. These courses, however, are directly contradictory and represent polar extremes of approach.

The first course is the positive one. It begins with a careful survey and appraisal of the obsolescences which constitute the afterbirth of the new age. The survey must begin with man himself. "The proper study of mankind is man," said Pope. No amount of tinkering with his institutions will be sufficient to insure his survival unless he can make the necessary adjustments in his own relationship to the world and to society.

The first adjustment or mutation needed in the expression of his nature concerns his savagely competitive impulses. In the preatomic age, those impulses were natural and occasionally justifiable, though they often led to war.

Yet all this has been—or can be—changed by the new age. Man now has it within his grasp to emancipate himself economically. If he wills it, he is in a position to refine his competitive impulse; he can take the step from competitive man to cooperative man. He has at last unlocked enough of the earth's secrets to provide for his needs on a world scale. The same atomic and electrical energy that can destroy a city can also usher in an age of economic sufficiency. It need no longer be a question as to which peoples shall prosper and which shall be deprived. There is power enough and resources enough for all.

It is here that man's survey of himself needs the severest scrutiny, for he is his own greatest obstacle to the achievement of those attainable and necessary goals. While he is willing to mobilize all his scientific and intellectual energies for purposes of death, he is unwilling to undertake any comparable mobilization for purposes of life. He has shattered the atom and harnessed its fabulous power to a bomb, but he balks—or allows himself to be balked—when it comes to harnessing that power for human progress.

Already, a puzzled public has been given words of synthetic caution, told that we shall not see the practical application of atomic energy for general use in our lifetime. If it works out this way, it will not necessarily be because of lack of knowledge of skill, but only because of the reluctance in certain quarters to face up to the full implications of the atomic age, which does not exempt the economic structure any more than it exempts man himself.

The size of the need is exceeded only by the size of the opportunity. But even as man stands on the threshold of a new age, he is being pulled back by his coattails and told to look the other way, told that he must not allow his imagination to get out of hand—all this at a time when he should know almost instinctively that the same courage, daring, imagination, ingenuity, and skill that won the war are needed just as desperately to win the peace.

He must believe, too, that mobilization of science and knowledge in peace should not be confined to cosmic forces, but must be extended to his other needs, principally health. What a fantastic irony that organized science knows the secret of the atom but as yet knows not a fig about the common cold! Who can tell what advances in medical knowledge might accrue to the welfare of mankind if as much mobilized effort were put into the study of man as there has been of matter! Cancer, heart disease, nephritis, leukemia, encephalitis, poliomyelitis, arteriosclerosis, aplastic anemia—all these are anomalies in the modern world: there is no reason why mobilized research should not be directed at their causes and cure. Nor is there any reason why even old age should not be regarded as a disease to be attacked by science in the same intensive fashion.

The most crucial aspect of this general survey relating to the first course is the transformation or adjustment from national man to world man. Already he has become a

world warrior; it is time for him to grow up and become a world citizen. This is not vaporous idealism, but sheer driving necessity. It bears directly on the prospects of his own survival. He shall have to recognize the flat truth that the greatest obsolescence of all in the Atomic Age is national sovereignty. Even back in the old-fashioned rocket age before August 6, 1945, strict national sovereignty was an anomalous holdover from the tribal instinct in nations. If it was anomalous then, it is preposterous now. The world is united geographically. This is not only the basic requisite for world government but the basic reason behind the need. A common ground of destiny is not too large a site for the founding of any community.

Reject all other arguments for real world government—reject the economic, the ideological, the sociological, the humanitarian arguments, valid though they may be. Consider only the towering problem of policing the atom—the problem of keeping the smallest particle of matter from destroying all matter. We are building on soapbubbles if we expect this problem to be automatically solved by having America, Britain, and Canada keep the secret to themselves. That is not only highly improbable, but would in itself stimulate the other nations to undertake whatever additional research might be necessary over their present experimentation to yield the desired results. In all history, there is not a single instance of a new weapon being kept exclusively by any power or powers; sooner or later either the basic principles become generally known or parallel devices are invented. Before long, the atomic bomb will follow the jet plane, the rocket bomb, radar, and the flame thrower into general circulation. We must not forget that we were not the only horse in the atomic derby; we just happened to finish first. The others will be along in due time.

Nor can we rely on destructive atomic energy to take care of itself. Already there is the tempting but dangerous notion to the effect that the atomic bomb is so horrible and the terror of retaliation so great that we may have seen the last of war. This is quasi-logical, but war is no respecter of logic, relative or absolute. And if history teaches us anything, it is that the possibility of war increases in direct proportion to the effectiveness of the instruments of war.

Far from banishing war, the atomic bomb will in itself constitute a cause of war. In the absence of world control as part of world government, it will create universal fear and suspicion. Each nation will live nervously from one moment to the next, not knowing whether the designs or ambitions of other nations might prompt them to attempt a lightning blow of obliteration. The ordinary, the inevitable differences among nations which might in themselves be susceptible of solution might now become the signals for direct action, lest the other nation get in the first and decisive blow. Since the science of warfare will no longer be dependent upon armies but will be waged by push-buttons, releasing radio-controlled rocket planes carrying cargoes of atomic explosives, the slightest suspicion may start all the push-buttons going.

There is the argument, of course, that each nation will realize this; that is, that the first button might lead to universal catastrophe as all the other nations rush to their switchboards of annihilation. Here, too, there is the unwarranted presupposition of reason. In an atmosphere of high tension and suspicion, reason is an easy victim. Moreover, there will always be the feeling that one nation can escape though all the others may go down. What a temptation for the blitzkriegers.

No; there is no comfort to be derived from the war-is-now-too-horrible theory. There is one way and only one to achieve effective control of destructive atomic energy and that is through centralized world government. Not loose, informal organization. Not even through an international pool, or through an international policing agreement. A police force is no better than its laws, and there can be no laws without government. Finally, the potency of the weapon must dictate the potency of its control.

There is no need to discuss the historical reasons pointing to and arguing for world government. There is no need to talk of the difficulties in the way of world government. There is need only to ask whether we can afford to do without it. All other considerations become either secondary or inconsequential.

It would be comforting to know that the world had several generations in which it might be able to evolve naturally and progressively into a single governmental unit. In fact, even as late as August 5, 1945, it seemed that the Charter of the United Nations had made an adequate beginning in that direction, providing the machinery for revision which might lead within 15 or 20 years to a real world structure. But the time factor has been shattered. We no longer have a leeway of 15 or 20 years; whatever must be done must be done with an immediacy which is in keeping with the urgency. Once the basic peace settlements are arranged, the United Nations must convene again for an atomic age inventory, under taking an over-all examination of the revolutionary changes in the world since its conference in San Francisco in the long-ago spring of 1945.

If all this sounds like headlong argument, posing methods or solutions which seem above the reach of mortal man, the answer must be that mortal man's reach was long enough apparently to push science and invention ahead by at least 500 years during 5 years of experimentation on atomic energy. His ability to do this not only indicates that he can extend or overextend himself when pressed, but emphasizes the need to do the same with government.

In meeting this need, man need not be frightened by the enormity of the differences which shall have to be accommodated within the world structure.

It is not in spite of these differences, but because of them that man is now in need of a general amalgam. If those variations did not exist, if man's actions were uniform and uniformly predictable, then man would be as free of war as the vegetable kingdom. The differences point up the problem, not the problem the differences. The important question is not how great an obstacle the differences may be to the setting up of a closely knit world structure, but whether man will be in a better position to reconcile those differences within world government than without it.

Man must decide, moreover, what is more important—his differences or his similarities. If he chooses the former, he embarks on a path that will, paradoxically, destroy the differences and himself as well. If he chooses the latter, he shows a willingness to meet the responsibilities that go with maturity and conscience.

True, in making the jump to world government, man is taking a big chance. Not only does he have to create the first world authority, but he shall have to make sure that this authority is wisely used. A world state without a world conscience can be world tyranny. The world institution must be compatible with—indeed, must promote—free institutions. This challenge is not less important than the challenge to establish world government itself, for all through history there has been too great a contradiction between ideals and institutions and the forces which have taken over those ideals and institutions. Another way of saying this is that we have too often allowed the best ideas to fall into the hands of the worst men. There has not been a great ideal or idea which has not been perverted or exploited at one time or another by those who were looking for means to an end.

That is the double nature of the challenge: to bring about world government and to keep it pure. It is a large order, perhaps the largest order man has had to meet in his 50,000-odd years on earth, but he himself has set up the conditions which have made the order necessary.

All these are the various mutations and adjustments needed in the expressions of man's nature, in his way of life, his thinking, his economics, his education, his conditioning and orientation, and his concept of government in an atomic age. But if he rejects this, the first course, there is yet another way, an alternative to world government. This the second course. Preposterous as this second course may seem, we describe it in all seriousness, for it is possible that through it man may find a way to stay alive—which is the central problem under consideration in this editorial.

The second course is relatively simple. It requires that man eliminate the source of the trouble. Let him abolish, carefully and completely, everything relating to science and civilization. Let him destroy all machines and the knowledge which can build or operate those machines. Let him raze his cities, smash his laboratories, dismantle his factories, tear down his universities and schools, burn his libraries, rip apart his art. Let him murder his scientists, his doctors, his teachers, his lawmakers, his mechanics, his merchants, and anyone who has anything to do with the machinery of knowledge or progress. Let him punish literacy by death. Let him abolish nations and set up the tribe as sovereign. In short, let him revert to his condition in society in 10000 B. C. Thus emancipated from science, from progress, from government, from knowledge, from thought, he can be reasonably certain of prolonging his existence on this planet.

This can be one way out—if modern man believes he is not ready for world government. This is the alternative to world government—if modern man wishes an alternative.

NORMAN COUSINS.

Child-Care Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE W. ERVIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which sponsored the Lanham Act. One of the purposes of the Lanham Act was to provide housing for some war workers. Another purpose was to provide child-care centers for the care of children of mothers engaged in work in war plants.

This program is administered by the Federal Works Agency. These child-care centers have rendered a splendid service. It was absolutely necessary to have child-care centers of this kind during the war effort, and it is my opinion that such child-care centers have been very beneficial to the children as well as to the mothers of those children.

The Lanham Act is still in full force and effect. The question of whether or not those child-care centers shall be con-

tinued is purely an administrative matter. Whether those facilities are continued or not, I think it is only proper to say that such facilities have been necessary and indispensable and have been operated in a splendid manner.

Until the soldiers, sailors, and marines of this war are demobilized, some facilities must be provided to care for their children at child-care centers, when the mothers of such children are compelled to work to support themselves and their families.

Exemption From Taxation of Annuity Payments Under Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, this bill properly relieves a retired civil-service employee from taxes upon his small annuity. It corrects the injustice of taxing an annuity under the civil-service retirement system while exempting from taxation old-age and survivors' benefits under the social-security laws and annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act.

The committee has seen fit to resist the efforts made to increase annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Due to increases in the cost of living most of our retired civil-service workers have had to stretch a modest annuity to cover substantial increases in living essentials during these war years. With the prospect of continuing high price levels the small annuity will have to continue to be spread pretty thin to cover the necessities of life. The committee has evidently decided that changes in the amounts of annuities, with the fluctuation in the cost of living, are impractical under this system. Therefore, in view of sharp increases in personal income taxes and higher prices of living essentials, the exemption of small annuities from taxation is clearly justified, particularly in view of the exemption from taxation of annuities under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts.

There is another matter in connection with the civil-service retirement system that should have our consideration. The act of January 1, 1940, provided for joint and survivorship annuities but stipulated that this form of annuity should not apply to those retiring prior to that date. This prevented those who had already retired from making provision for a survivor. There are many who have retired under this act who feel the need of joint survivorship coverage and who are unable to receive it. Whether the annuity plan in effect can be modified so that annuity coverage can be converted to joint survivorship coverage is a question which offers a possible solution. Certainly any retired employee who desires this form of coverage, regardless of the fact that he retired before January 1, 1940, should have it if it can be provided practically, without special privilege, and without prejudice to other classes of retired employees.

Disposition of Aluminum Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Batesville (Ark.) News Review:

ARKANSAS IS VITALLY INTERESTED IN DISPOSITION OF ALUMINUM PLANTS

All Arkansas is interested in an announcement from Washington that the Government has canceled leases on the Jones Mill and Hurricane Creek aluminum plants in this State.

These huge war plants have been operated by the Aluminum Co. of America, turning Arkansas bauxite into aluminum—one of the most vital requirements of war—a most useful material for thousands of peacetime products.

Arkansas provides the major portion of all the bauxite mined in America. Large quantities of lime used in the manufacturing process is also produced in Arkansas. In fact, a large part of the total production of the Batesville White Lime Co. has been going to the aluminum plants of this State for the past several years. Our local industry has been helped. In turn they have been able to help hundreds of local citizens by providing good jobs at good wages. This cycle of industrial activity has placed thousands of dollars into the channels of trade in this country.

It is of the utmost importance that the aluminum industry continue to provide an outlet for Batesville lime in order that we may absorb these industrial war workers into permanent jobs in our community.

The Aluminum Co. of America performed a miraculous task in building and putting into operation these processing plants for the Government in its time of need. Pride and patriotism, and skill enabled them to outproduce aluminum manufacturers of other nations. Converting raw materials into finished products sufficient for us to gain overwhelming air superiority against the aggressor nations was not an accident—it was the result of know how. The magnificent contribution of Alcoa to the cause of victory is a tribute to the ability and genius of private industry, a story that has been retold in many fields of endeavor throughout the national emergency. For the big jobs our Government called on big men, on big industries, and they delivered the goods. As long as we were in trouble nobody kicked about their being too big.

Because Alcoa is a large industry with a record of doing big things in a big way, they have become the target for unjustified criticism. Since the war is over, there has been an effort in some quarters to convince the Government that it would be unwise to sell or lease them the Jones Mill and Hurricane Creek plants in Arkansas for fear that they will monopolize the aluminum manufacturing industry.

It appears to us that in the interest of national economy it would be a wise move to make these and other war plants of peacetime usefulness available to the operators at a very nominal cost, either on an outright sale or rental basis, in order that we may provide jobs for thousands of workers, and start immediately to process our raw materials to meet the mounting demands for consumer goods. Reconversion of the aluminum plants in Arkansas can be accomplished without delay, with the loss of a minimum of time, without disrupting the economic status of present employees.

We would like to see the Government sell or lease these important plants to Alcoa. They own a majority of the bauxite deposits in this State. They have an abundant supply of raw material for peacetime needs. They are familiar with the plants and can operate them to better advantage for the common good than any other concern.

It is hard for private industry to compete with tax-free, Government-financed manufacturing plants. Private industry has always had to make its own way on merit, on popular appeal, and a fair price for its product. This standard will continue to prevail. We cannot afford to degenerate. American industry and incentive to the level of socialistic ideals advanced by demagogic groups who favor Government ownership of everything from a peanut stand to the country's railroads—at the taxpayer's expense.

We hope the RFC and other Government agencies charged with the job of liquidating these two plants will have a kindly feeling for Arkansas in their negotiations. We hope they will give serious considerations to the future usefulness of this industry to the Nation and its effect upon the State's economic welfare in years to come. We trust they will see the opportunity here for keeping thousands of Arkansas workers in Arkansas. We hope they will consider fully Alcoa's contribution to victory when they are tabulating bids on the property. We hope they will give prime consideration to the fact that Alcoa can finance its own operations without borrowing from the Government.

Arkansas needs the Jones Mill and the Hurricane Creek plants. We need Alcoa to keep them going. Above all, there is a need for the Government to give private industry a fair break—free from insinuation that to grow is un-American, to earn a profit is unethical. Now is the time to remove socialistic ideals and restraints in Government that threaten to shackle our American way of life.

Termination of Hostilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a House joint resolution to declare September 2, 1945, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of this Congress not to prolong many of the acts which now owe their life and activities to the fact that war is still supposed to be going on. After the last World War, it took nearly 3 years before Congress finally decided that hostilities were at an end.

The Japs signed the surrender document on September 2, 1945. The fighting did stop. War was ended. This resolution would put an end to legal

tricks of continuing wartime regimentation during this reconversion period on the grounds that neither the President nor the Congress has proclaimed the end of the war. There are many Government agencies that desire to retain their extraordinary war powers.

Is there any reason why Congress should not resume its rightful role of making the laws? Unless Congress does declare hostilities at an end, they can expect many war agencies and bureaus to continue many activities displeasing to the American people. I feel it is the duty of this Congress to explode the myth that the war is still on. Unless we do, this Congress will shrink more and more in size as the lawmaking body of the land.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD a telegram which Governor Dewey, of New York, sent to President Truman in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reply of President Truman to Governor Dewey as it appears in the New York Herald Tribune of this morning.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN BACKS NEW YORK POWER ROLE IN ST. LAWRENCE—REASSURES DEWEY ON PLAN FOR SEAWAY; STIFF FIGHT IN SENATE IS PREDICTED

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON, September 27.—President Truman, in a reassuring reply to a protest by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, has pledged his support to the Federal development of power facilities in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and to the relinquishment of these facilities to New York State.

The President, in a telegram sent to Mr. Dewey last night and made public by the White House today, committed his administration to back the power-development phase of the St. Lawrence project. His position was virtually the same as that taken by Mr. Dewey last week when he objected strenuously to purported administration plans to omit power from the seaway program.

Mr. Truman wrote the New York Governor that he continued to favor enthusiastically the development of power resources in connection with the St. Lawrence waterway, and that he believed very strongly that such power facilities should be turned over to New York in keeping with the accord between the Federal and State governments.

"This was the program of President Roosevelt, and I have always been for it," he declared.

Governor Dewey, replying today, wired President Truman that he was gratified by the President's reassurance concerning the rights of New York and expressed earnest hope that the "point of view on which we are happily agreed will be reflected in legislation proposed to the Congress."

The complete text of Mr. Dewey's reply:

"Many thanks for your telegram of September 26 and your gratifying reassurance concerning the rights of the State of New York to the ownership and management of the power facilities to be developed on the St. Lawrence River. The question still remains, of course, as pointed out in my original telegram, whether the point of view on which we are happily agreed will be reflected in legislation proposed to the Congress.

"It is my most earnest hope that the legislation will specifically respect and preserve by act of Congress the fundamental rights of the State of New York, in accordance with our joint desires."

PRESIDENT TO PUSH IT

The President urged the "early construction" of the St. Lawrence project, both power and seaway, in his message to Governor Dewey. He has also informed Senate advocates of the project, it was learned today, that he is prepared to "fight" for prompt Senate authorization.

He plans to send such a message to the Senate within 10 days, but a new treaty to authorize the seaway is expected to be introduced in the meantime, probably with Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, Democrat, of New York, as sponsor.

A nonpartisan group of Senators headed by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Democrat, of Kentucky, majority leader, virtually completed today the drafting of this treaty, which follows the plan advocated by the President in his message to Mr. Dewey and differs only slightly from that advocated by the late President Roosevelt and turned down by the Senate twice.

Among those who took part in the secret conferences at which the treaty draft was prepared are Senators WAGNER, GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont; HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Republican, of Minnesota; ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., Progressive of Wisconsin; and HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan.

There was every indication today, however, that the seaway project is heading for the same bitter fight it has run into in previous Senate appearances. Opponents of the measure predicted that Mr. Truman would have no more luck with it than did Mr. Roosevelt.

Governor Dewey had charged that Samuel I. Rosenman, special counsel to the President, and Dr. N. R. Danielan, Department of Commerce expert who formerly advised Mr. Roosevelt on the seaway, had been acting for Mr. Truman and had suggested dropping the power-development phase of the project.

Senators familiar with the project suggested that this idea had been considered in the belief that it would be easier to push the seaway alone through the Senate.

The text of Governor Dewey's message to the President was published in Wednesday's New York Herald Tribune.

THE PRESIDENT'S TELEGRAM

The complete text of President Truman's telegram to Governor Dewey:

"Hon. THOMAS E. DEWEY,
"The Governor of the State of New York,
"Albany, N. Y.:

"This is to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of September 19 with reference to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power projects.

"I am sure that you are aware of the fact that I have been and still am in favor of constructing both the seaway and the power projects; and was happy and proud to vote for them on December 12, 1944, when I was Vice-President-elect but still a Member of the United States Senate.

"I continue to be enthusiastically in favor not only of the development of the St. Lawrence waterway but also of the water power on the river. I also continue to believe very strongly that the necessary power facilities should be built by the Federal Government and turned over to the appropriate New York State agency in accordance with the agreement recommended by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the power authority of the State of New York dated February 7, 1933. This was the program of President Roosevelt, and I have always been in favor of it.

"A group of Senators interested in these same objectives, composed of Republicans and Democrats, have been holding meetings to discuss the best means of obtaining these results. I am informed that you have been kept fully advised about these conferences as they have progressed. The conferees have been advising with my representatives as to the best manner to bring the proposals to a successful conclusion in the Congress of the United States.

"Inasmuch as it is a legislative matter, I am inclined to follow their ultimate conclusions on the best means of avoiding continued fruitless discussion and of getting some early, definite action toward accomplishing both of these objectives. It is the early construction of the project—both power and seaway—which will benefit the people of New York and the Great Lakes area, and not the form of any particular bill.

"As you know, I have always been, and still am, ready to cooperate in any way I can to have the Congress of the United States ratify as soon as possible the Canadian-American agreement of March 19, 1941, for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, and also take the appropriate steps to transfer to the State of New York the ownership and management of the St. Lawrence power facilities at the International Rapids.

"I am not so much interested in the details of legislative procedure; nor do I feel that it is proper for me to interfere with the sponsors of the legislation as to the legislative procedure to be followed. I am, however, most interested in the ultimate objectives which I am sure you wish to attain just as I do.

"Copies of this telegram are being sent to the interested Senators and to the members of the New York State Power Authority.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

1919 Peace Conference Compared to Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

1919 PEACE CONFERENCE COMPARED TO YALTA—MAKING OF ANOTHER WAR SEEN IN TERMS IMPOSED ON FOE

(By David Lawrence)

Publicity has come at last for the official records of what happened behind the scenes at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and the amazing thing about the documents is that they resemble the very comments that are being made today in some quarters about the future arrangement for Germany.

Substitute for Paris the name Yalta—where the Big Three decided the biggest is-

sues—and substitute for President Wilson the name of President Roosevelt and there is a curious similarity. Only the protest made by Secretary of State Lansing in 1919 is paralleled this time by a small minority and there is even less awareness of the impracticability of the peace terms than there was 26 years ago.

"The terms of peace," wrote Secretary of State Lansing in a memorandum that sees the light of day for the first time this week as an authorized and official document, "appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating while many of them seem to me impossible of performance.

"The League of Nations created by the treaty is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the great powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later. * * *"

JUSTICE SECONDARY

"Examine the treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off the yoke; but as sure as day follows night, the time will come when they will make the effort. * * *

"It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that the power to compel obedience by the exercise of the united strength of 'The Five' is the fundamental principle of the League. Justice is secondary. Might is primary."

The words might have been written the day after Yalta or the day after Potsdam. In 1919, however, there were many voices raised in protest President Wilson conceded the weaknesses in the Paris Treaty but hoped the League of Nations would operate as a corrective force. Even this hope, however, went by the boards because the United States refused to join the League.

Today there are not many voices raised in protest against the impracticable terms of peace imposed on the German people. There is a tendency to conform—to accept what has been done as an example of Allied unity. Mistakes have been glossed over, public opinion is indifferent, and the spirit of hate and vengeance is dominant. Out of precisely this sort of hodgepodge called "peace" came the economic disorder that brought chaos to Germany the last time and gave the militarists and Hitler their chance. The Allied peoples in a decade and a half became sick and tired of policing Germany—as they doubtless will again, judging by the demands in Congress that all troops be brought home within a year.

FORERUNNER OF WAR

There is no zest in democratic countries for permanently policing enemy countries. Hence a peace based on justice and fair dealing rather than revenge would probably be more readily attained. But public opinion has become emotional and the probabilities are that a world war will come sooner this time because the injustice, perpetrated by the major powers upon the defeated are even more provocative of trouble than were the provisions of the 1919 treaty.

Recently the London Economist spoke out frankly and called the Potsdam terms a forerunner of another war. American and British technical experts told the Associated Press correspondent in Berlin a month ago that the reparation terms wouldn't work and that the whole thing had been bungled. Are the American people interested in how the seeds of World War III are being sown? Most of the documents and secret understandings have been suppressed once more.

Perhaps a quarter of a century from now the truth will be revealed. Thus do nations drift into war and then call on their patriotic youth to make sacrifices, promising them that it will not happen again. And when it does happen, scapegoats are found in other lands and the real causes of the war and the failures of one's own governing authorities are never brought to light in time to prevent another war.

Meeting in London—Task of United States Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 28 (legislative day of Monday, September 10), 1945

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable commentary by former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles on the administration of our foreign policy. The article is entitled "Meeting in London—Task of United States Leadership."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING IN LONDON

(By Sumner Welles)

TASK OF UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP

The reports of the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London have caused general bewilderment. For it is to this conference that we have been looking for cooperative, rapid, and just action in commencing the reconstruction of Europe.

It was agreed at Potsdam that the Italian treaty would be taken up at this first meeting. But when the council met it soon leaked out that no agenda had yet been decided upon.

Then it developed that the question of procedure had not previously been settled.

Next we learned that the five major powers had reached no prior understanding covering the principles to govern the Italian treaty.

The secrecy in which the sessions of the council are shrouded has made it impossible for people generally to know what is under discussion or for the foreign ministers of the democracies to benefit from the support of democratic public opinion.

It may be premature to pass judgment upon the statesmanship of the foreign ministers themselves. Three of them are without prior experience in international affairs. But it is already apparent that the technical preparation for this all-important peace conference was entrusted to officials who have proved themselves grossly incompetent. The deputies, and their assistants, were selected as technicians. It should be the obligation of diplomatic technicians before any conference to make sure that there is prior agreement upon the agenda and upon procedure, and that the participating governments fully know each other's views concerning the subject matter to be negotiated. Unless these elementary precautions are taken the success of any conference is jeopardized in advance. No such precautions were taken before the London meeting. The United States should not have attended the council meetings until they had been taken.

The Big Five have given the smaller powers no right to select representatives to take part in the negotiations. All that has been decided is that the major powers may "seek the views" of other nations "directly concerned" in any given settlement. The result of such undemocratic procedure should readily have been foreseen.

In London, as in San Francisco, Dr. Herbert Evatt, the Australian Foreign Minister, has assumed the championship of the lesser powers. The British Government soon found itself compelled by Commonwealth pressure to request that representatives of the British dominions join in the discussion of the Italian treaty. The Soviet Government thereupon demanded that representatives of Poland, of the Ukraine, and of White Russia should likewise be invited.

We were then confronted with the ludicrous spectacle of the Council of Foreign Ministers halting its consideration of the problem of Trieste and of the frontiers between Italy and Yugoslavia in order to obtain the "expert" views upon these subjects of the representatives of countries so "directly concerned" in the Italian treaty as the Ukraine and New Zealand.

The views of such leading European states as Belgium and the Netherlands, which are certainly "directly concerned" in a peace treaty which will affect the whole structure of western Europe, and whose advice could greatly contribute to the negotiation of a wise settlement, have not been sought.

The foreign ministers have had to confess their inability to reach any agreement regarding the Italian colonies. They have sidestepped the problem by referring it to their deputies—the very individuals responsible for the lack of all adequate preparation for this conference—with instructions to report prior to the next meeting of the council. This means that the determination of such a vitally important question as the disposition of Italy's colonies will be undertaken in an even greater vacuum than that surrounding the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers itself, and subject to influences of which the public will know nothing.

Public opinion should fully understand what is going on.

The discussion of the Italian treaty has made it clear that the major powers, with the exception of the United States and China, are giving a display of power politics in its rawest form. By staking out claims in the Red Sea and in the Mediterranean, the Soviet Government is attempting to horse trade the western powers into letting it dominate the Balkans and large areas in central and eastern Europe which it considers legitimately within its sphere of influence. Great Britain is trying to regain its ancient position by reconstituting a balance of power. The French Government is mistakenly attempting to use the Italian negotiation as a means of obtaining agreement to its intrinsically just demand for security along the Rhine. The American delegate has already completely reversed himself on one basic issue and has thereby gravely weakened the authority of this Government.

The objective sought by the American people is the conclusion of a treaty with Italy which is inherently just, and which will help to establish a peaceful Europe, both politically and economically stable. That objective is in the direct interest of the United States. It also represents the highest interest of the peoples of Europe.

The time has arrived for tough and realistic diplomacy on the part of the United States. There is no European nation which does not know that European reconstruction is impossible without full American cooperation and without prolonged American help.

If the five powers delay reaching an agreement upon the Italian treaty, or if a treaty is agreed upon which proves to be a shoddy

compromise based upon neither justice nor common sense, the present democratic goverment of Italy will topple and anarchy within Italy will break out.

The peoples of Europe confront the worst winter in their history. They face hunger, cold, and general unemployment. Widespread social and economic disorders are inevitable. If the European peoples now learn that the governments of the United Nations are unable to cooperate effectively in laying the foundations for a new and better order, the measure of the resulting upheaval staggers the imagination.

This is the moment for responsible American leadership.

We seem to be heading for a catastrophe. If it takes place, it will be our own shortsightedness, and our own incapacity to play the cards which we have in our hands, that will be largely responsible.

Get Tough, Jimmy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Philip Simms:

GET TOUGH, JIMMY

(By William Philip Simms)

In a day or so Secretary of State James F. Byrnes will return from London empty-handed save for a satchel full of bitter experience. On the use he makes of that experience, diplomats here say, depends the future of the United Nations peace organization.

Naively Mr. Byrnes went to London expecting Russia, Britain, and the rest to live up to their war aims as publicly and officially expressed, time and again. What he encountered was demands for territory and loot based on conquest. The promises of the Atlantic Charter, Yalta, San Francisco, and Potsdam had been consigned to the ashcan.

As soon as the gavel fell, according to reports, Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov laid down the law. What Russia had tagged as hers—Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, Finland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Austria, eastern Germany and Prussia—was to be severely let alone. What went on there was not open to question. What was left, she would share with the Allies—in the Mediterranean, Red Sea, the Middle and Far East, and in the Pacific Ocean.

There was power politics and bargaining behind closed doors. Nations without any interest in certain problems were invited in. Others, vitally concerned, were barred. For sordidness, this first "peace" parley made the 1919 Paris peace conference look like a thing of sweetness and light.

As a result, in the opinion of foreign observers, the United States today faces a dilemma. Either it will get tough and insist on a peace which will be worth fighting for, or, in disgust, turn isolationist again and refuse to implement its membership in the new league of nations.

Already there are signs of a backward swing of the pendulum. Up to now American sentiment has been overwhelmingly in favor of world cooperation. Many soldiers, however, are returning home as disillusioned as Mr. Byrnes seems to be. From Normandy's apple orchards to India's coral strand, some of them are saying, the natives seem to regard them as interlopers. Implications that we did not do very much in the war anyway, and that we still owe additional billions of dollars to our Allies who did so much more, aren't helping. So for one reason or another propaganda is springing up not only against long years of occupation abroad, but even against armed services adequate to hold up our end as a great power—a dangerous phenomenon.

Foreign observers—especially those representing the small democracies—are becoming anxious over United States policy. They say that unless all signs fail, the United States will adbicate its present world leadership without ever having made a serious effort to exercise it. Field Marshal Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, chief of the British Joint Staff Mission in Washington, was slapped on the wrist by Whitehall, and severely spanked by a portion of the London press, for intimating something of the kind. But as yet no one has attempted to refute what he said. They only say he should not have said it. Opinion here is overwhelmingly on his side.

A great deal now depends on Secretary Byrnes. The hope is that he will profit by his London experience and get tough. As the world's strongest power and greatest democracy, most of the "little 45" members of the United Nations admit the United States is their main hope.

Who Won the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Who Won the War?" by William Philip Simms:

WHO WON THE WAR?

(By William Philip Simms)

There is danger that the reaction of Congress—which eventually must pass on the billions which Britain is trying to raise in this country—will be precisely the opposite of what the British hope as a result of the softening-up process now under way.

Many Congressmen are finding it especially irksome when a British mission, here to obtain three to six billion dollars as a grant-in aid, ask for it on the grounds that the United Kingdom contributed more than the United States to the defeat of the Axis.

True, the British claim contains a qualifying clause. It speaks of "resources considered." No one here disputes that United Kingdom resources are less than those of the United States. But, it is asked, what about the British Empire's resources? The empire covers one-quarter of the habitable globe, of more than 13,000,000 square miles. That is more than four times the area of the United States.

The British claim a 20-percent decline in the United Kingdom's national wealth as a result of the war. But, it is pointed out, our loss was likewise colossal. Government experts say we used up 25 percent of our proved oil reserves; 7 percent of our iron; 20 percent of our copper; 25 percent of our lead; 25 percent of our zinc; and so on. And whereas the British are talking only in terms of the United Kingdom—not of the vast British Empire, whose oil and other natural resources are almost untapped—our reserves here in the United States are pretty much all we have.

The British also compare the respective drains on manpower. In the United Kingdom, they assert, men and women employed either in the armed services or war industries were 55 percent of the total compared with only 40 percent in the United States.

But here again, it is observed, they deal only with a tiny fragment of the Empire. As a whole, the Empire includes 557,000,000 inhabitants, or one-quarter of all the people on earth. Altogether it provided approximately 10,000,000 for the armed services as against about 12,000,000 for the United States, which has fewer than 140,000,00 inhabitants.

The war, it is remarked, is usually spoken of as global. India, Hongkong, Burma, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada, and the rest of the British Empire were just as much involved as the United States and the United Kingdom. Thus when the British say they need money largely because they owe $15,000,000,000 abroad—mostly within the Empire and its dependencies—many Congressmen wonder. We contributed more than $19,000,000,000 to the Empire by way of lend-lease. And we are not going to get it back. Why, it is asked, doesn't the sterling area treat its contributions to the Empire more or less in the same way.

But, most of all, Congressmen are asking why all this who-won-the-war palaver, anyway? America doesn't need to be sold on our ally, Britain. She wants and intends to be helpful to the limit of her own solvency and her taxpayers' interests. So if Britain wants money, why not lay it right on the line instead of starting off by telling us we did not quite hold up our end of the war?

Six Billion United States Loan Discussed by Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star:

SIX BILLION UNITED STATES LOAN DISCUSSED BY STALIN

Moscow, September 17.—Premier Stalin met a group of Members of Congress for an hour today and was understood to have expressed a desire for a $6,000,000,000 loan from the United States.

The Premier told the group, studying postwar planning in Europe, that Russia needs economic assistance, particularly from the United States.

Premier Stalin talked separately with Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, after talking with a seven-man House committee headed by Representative COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi. Mr. COLMER said the committee would report details of the conversation to Congress when it returns.

The Congress Members sought from Premier Stalin and received from him his ideas of how the Soviet Union would repay the loan if granted.

Premier Stalin is understood to have given assurances of Russian friendship for the United States.

The Russian leader also expressed the opinion that the Japanese should receive the

same sort of postwar handling that Germans now are getting.

Premier Stalin was reported to have disclosed some details of the Soviet Union's demobilization, but these were not divulged to Congress Members.

Premier Stalin said the Soviet Union faces a number of years of hard building to restore the damages of war and to raise the standard of living in Russia.

Other Congress Members visiting in Moscow are Representatives WOLVERTON, Republican, of New Jersey; HOPE, Republican, of Kansas; WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan; LEFEVRE, Republican, of New York, and SIMPSON, Republican, of Illinois.

A British delegation headed by Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax are conferring in Washington with American officials, seeking a $3,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 grant-in-aid, rather than a loan.

Address of Brig. Gen. William O'Dwyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid speech on Commodore John Barry, "the father of the American Navy," delivered by Gen. William O'Dwyer, of New York City, on September 25, 1945, at Copley Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass., on the occasion of the Commodore Barry commemorative exercises conducted under the auspices of the Central Council of Irish Clubs of Boston, Mass.:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very proud of the distinguished privilege conferred upon me by you tonight. It is a great honor to address such a group of distinguished citizens of this historic city, gathered to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest of all Americans. It is an occasion for reflection and rejoicing, especially for those of us who are of Irish birth or lineage, since the man we honor was born in Ireland, and yet deserves to be known in history, if anyone deserves to be known, as the father of the American Navy—Commodore John Barry.

It is something of a great tragedy that a more serious interest in this mighty figure did not arise when many of his contemporaries were still alive. He was dead one hundred years, and his bones open to the elements were reposing in a neglected tomb, in old St. Mary's Churchyard in Philadelphia before the first serious investigation into his amazing career brought out a single volume on his life. In the meantime, popular historians had long conferred on another the title which so justly belongs only to him. For this lapse in the writing of our American history, our Nation, and especially those of Barry's stock in this country, can hardly escape valid censure.

It is not my intention, nor could it be within the scope of this occasion, to undertake a proper survey of the life of Commodore John Barry, nor to record anything more than the slightest reference to the rightfulness of his title "Father of the American Navy."

Let me assure you, however, Commodore Barry's claim to the glorious honor now popularly conferred upon him, is not the result of vapid enthusiasms nor the outcome of latter-day misreading of history.

The great naval hero was dead but 10 years when the editor of the Port Folio, America's foremost periodical before the founding of the North American Review, was already referring to him in the very terms we now hail him, as the father of the most gallant Navy that ever sailed the seas. James Fenimore Cooper, the author, and himself a lieutenant in the Navy, wrote early in the nineteenth century, "For the first regular cruise that ever got to sea under the new government, we must refer to the *Lexington*. * * * The command of which was given to Capt. John Barry." It is likewise historically correct to say that Commodore John Barry commanded the first vessel of our Navy to fly the flag now called familiarly the Stars and Stripes. In conjunction with this fact, it seems certain that his wife, Sarah Austin Barry, worked on the embroidery of that flag with Betsy Ross and the other ladies of the patriotic group associated with historic Gloria Dei Church in Philadelphia.

It is likewise true that Commodore Barry was the first officer placed in command of the first war vessel commissioned to fight under the Continental colors. There are many firsts in the life of the Commodore besides the ones I have mentioned, but I shall allude only to those weightiest, from an historic point of view. It deserves to be proclaimed that Commodore John Barry captured the first British war vessel, in a real naval encounter, in the American War for Independence. Thus was struck to him the first enemy colors ever to be officially hauled down in an engagement with the American Navy. Commodore John Barry was the first supervisor of construction of the Philadelphia Navy Yard under the Marine Committee of the Continental Congress. In addition to all this, one of our greatest naval historians insists that Barry should be called the father of the American Navy, if for no other reason than that more young Americans received their naval training under his direction in the early days of our Nation than under any other commander.

History, finally, is perfectly clear on the point that from the day that Barry took command of his first ship of war on October 13, 1775, to the day of his death September 13, 1803, he was the senior or ranking officer of his ship and squadrons, and at no time did he serve under the orders of a senior officer, and reported directly only to Washington, Congress, or to the secret and marine committees. It is not possible for us here to dwell on the one thousand mighty deeds of Barry's great life, leading to the day when George Washington handed to John Barry that supreme honor of commission No. 1 in the officers' roster of the United States Navy.

But it may be a proper moment for us now to reflect on the background of this extraordinary man and to examine, however briefly, the chief events which led him finally to so high a place in American and world history.

John Barry was born in 1745 of poor Irish farm stock, living in the most southeasterly corner of Ireland. His home was on the windswept little peninsula terminating in Carnsore Point, that toe of land jutting out into a stormy channel. He was born with the salt of the sea on his lips. The family—father, mother, and several brothers and sisters—later moved to the famous harbor town of Rossiare. From here, at the tender age of 10, little Jack was sent to sea as a cabin boy. The experiences of a lonely Irish child, face to face with the cruel world of the sea, in the days of Captain Bligh, with its tempests, trials, and terrors, cannot be even remotely imagined in our own age.

However dreadful to a country lad of 10 the life at sea might be, conditions in the land of his birth arising out of misgovernment and social callousness were more dreadful still. Archbishop King, the Protestant prelate of Dublin, gives us the following picture of Ireland about the time Barry was a child: "Want and misery are in every face * * * the roads spread with dead and dying bodies * * * two or three sometimes on a car going to the grave for the want of bearers to carry them, and many buried only in the fields and ditches where they perished." The Ireland that Barry escaped was a ghastly monument to tyranny such as has not been equaled perhaps until the recent monstrosities of cruelty afflicted continental Europe.

Neither the background of misery nor the perils of the sea, however, overwhelmed the dauntless Irish spirit Barry carried in his little heart. He rose from cabin boy to able seaman, and from that to mate. He learned navigation, and somehow miraculously educated himself to a degree which made him the equal, the confidant, even the adviser, of the ablest and most refined personalities of the great world in which he later moved.

Young Barry spent some half-dozen years on merchant ships, sailing the seas of the world, not without an occasional visit home to Wexford, before he finally arrived in Philadelphia, the seat of his ultimate greatness. While still a youth in his teens, his ability was recognized by a merchant whose ancestors, too, had hailed from Wexford, and he was made master of a cargo vessel sailing between the city of Quakers and the Barbadoes. This trust in his character and skill was never to be forfeited. Barry was soon a member of a distinguished sea captain's society. He had made his way. For a full decade before the Revolution he sailed many ships and became known as one of the most distinguished of ship masters out of the Delaware. The sea captain's income was good. We find from the records that he was aiding his father and mother, brothers and sisters back in Rosslare. Finally he became a ship owner, and is on his way to wealth and social position.

In September 1775, then 30 years of age, mature, experienced, Capt. John Barry was in London. He had crossed the Atlantic in command of a cargo ship, *The Black Prince*. Rumors of colonial revolt were sweeping the Capital. Events had moved rapidly during the summer in Boston, New York, and in Philadelphia. Barry realized that the conflict with the Colonies was now in serious crisis. He himself had been in the thick of the conflict against unjust import taxes and the slave trade as far back as 1770 in that he had been a signer of the Non-Importation Resolves.

Now, with the rumblings of war in the air, Captain Barry hurried back to his home port, and he arrived there on the day Congress resolved to fit out two armed cruisers. He at once offered his ship and services to the infant government, sacrificing his business, then at the height of its prosperity. He became at once part and parcel of the Continental Navy. That was the tiny but brave navy that was to challenge boldly and successfully an imperial fleet of a thousand ships!

Unawed by superior force or by superhuman difficulties, against his own material interests, this resolute American of Irish birth cast his lot with the cause of liberty and independence. His mighty deeds of superb seamanship and daring soon made his name legendary. We have his words as he took command, "I accepted the command with a determined resolution of distressing the enemy as much as in my power." The promise was more than kept. But he was no showman and his reports are the briefest possible, and never personal. After a most gallant action covering many hours, he would merely state that his personnel behaved with bravery, and leave all the coloring to the historian.

As commander of the *Lexington*, as aide to Washington at Trenton, as victor over the enemy ship *Alert*, as commander of the *Raleigh* in the gallant action off the coast of Maine, as commander of the *Delaware*, as master of the frigate *Alliance*, and finally as commodore of the noble squadron to which the beloved ship *Constitution*, Charlestown's honored relic, belong, and as commander of the greatest warship of its day, the frigate *United States*, Commodore John Barry every hour of his unmatched service advanced the splendor and renown of the United States Navy.

Countless incredible feats of seamanship and heroic conflict follow his name. He frequently turned seeming reverses into victory. He was skillful, courageous, but never rash. His deeds on the sea rivalled those of Washington on the land. Indeed, the very appearance of this athletic, 6-foot-4, ruddy son of the Gael, with his resolute but kindly features, suggests a counterpart of the great military genius who guided America to that victory of all victories which has brought such opportunity and so much freedom to the peoples of all the world.

I am sure now that every American, especially every American through whose veins course some Irish blood, who contemplates the career of the epic figure of Commander Barry in retrospect, fully realizes that this No. 1 man of our American Navy did not suffer grievous battle wounds, did not risk fortune and life just to see reestablished under American auspices the poisonous imperialisms and the hatreds which motivated the Europe that he knew.

Commodore Barry, the intimate of Adams, Franklin, and Washington, conceived as they did a New World dedicated to the liberty and equality of all men regardless of wealth or station, regardless of race, religion, or color. Does anyone propose to believe that this man, born to oppression and poverty, because of his racial background and his Catholic belief, could contemplate giving his life for a world in which liberty of conscience and liberty of action could not endure?

Commodore Barry, Irish-born as he was, in very evil days, fought for the same concepts that we Americans of Irish blood have always fought for, and will fight for to the end of time. The primary basis for those concepts rests on the dignity of the individual man, and his right to progress and to the pursuit of happiness, no matter how lowly his station, no matter what his beliefs, no matter what his origins. The Irish race, and all Americans springing directly or indirectly from Irish origin, in common with their fellow Americans of every other racial source, have always held uncompromisingly to these ideals. Those who challenge this fact can only do so under the blindness of malice or ignorance, a blindness which has no place beneath the bright sun of human freedom and universal brotherhood.

It is for us who are living to see that America shall never be seduced in our day from the blessed course of liberty first charted in such gallant actions as those of Sullivan at Laconia, of O'Brien at Machias, and of Barry off the Capes of Virginia.

But when have we ever been deaf to Liberty's call? Were we silent yesterday when a bestial tyranny swept this world? Let the names of recent heroes speak: Colin Kelly, Edward O'Hare, Commander John J. O'Shea, Admiral Daniel J. O'Callaghan, Commander Bartholomew Hogan, John Cornelius Cullen, Lt. Patrick J. Walsh, Chaplain Commander Joseph T. O'Callaghan, and likewise let us not fail to call a name or two from the volunteers of Ireland who served brilliantly under other flags in the name of freedom, such as Capt. Stephen Fogarty Fegan, of the *Jervis Bay*; of Maj. Harold Andrews, of Barry's own county of Wexford, first to win the Victoria Cross in this past war; and Brendan Finucane, and a thousand like him, who were the chief inspiration of the whole Royal Air Force in the days of blackest crisis.

How proud now would the great commodore be if he could only scan the lists of those names of Irishmen who served the Navy, and the other forces as well, in all our conflicts since he laid the foundation of that mighty Navy. How proud he would be of their victories. How proud he would be to know that the principles of decency, freedom, and honor emerge once more triumphant following the greatest challenge made against them since history began.

In closing, may I say, so shall it ever be, when tyranny, under whatever name and under whatever guise, seeks to challenge the dignity of the individual man and deny him personal and political liberty, may the sons of Barry's breed arise to vindicate his name in action and uphold and sustain the ideals of brotherhood among all men for which he fought, that a world filled with justice and liberty, as God Almighty intended, shall always endure.

Congressional Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I herewith present for the RECORD a statement by Samuel B. Pettengill.

Members of the House who were here 10 years ago will remember this gentleman as one of the most able, the most courageous, and the most independent men of this body. He was a Representative from Indiana. He was a life-long old-time Democrat. He believed in the Constitution of the United States and recognized it as the foundation upon which our laws have been and should be based.

He became so utterly disgusted with the attempts of the then administration to break down constitutional law as we understood it; he became so disgusted with the attempts of the so-called Democratic administration of that time to destroy the independence of the judiciary, that he quit the Congress in disgust and since has been devoting his great ability to bringing home to the people the necessity of returning to the laws and practices which made this country the greatest, most wonderful place in all the world in which to live. He recognized the fact that in this country our most unfortunate lived on a higher scale than those in other countries who were presumably much better off.

Mr. Pettengill had an opportunity, through his personal experience, to learn for himself the things which he so well discusses in his releases, which he circulates under the heading "Inside your Congress," from 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. The release I herewith present is one which I think will be of especial interest to the Members of this House:

CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Now that President Truman has recommended better pay to Congressmen, I refer back to my recent question, whether Congress is not worth a dime to every voter. My mail shows that the people are sore and are taking it out on Congress. They are like the man who got mad at his wife, but because the rules wouldn't let him kick her, he kicked the cat instead.

People write that most Congressmen don't earn the salaries they already have; that they ought never to have voted away their powers to the President, etc. If the people stay mad, the Congressman who votes himself a raise may find the going tough next year.

So I suggest that Congressmen had better first run a trial heat and show what they can do.

Here is a place for them to start. We have around 400,000 folks who have some trace of Indian blood. Their care has become big business in Washington. It pays handsome dividends to the professional do-gooders to keep them as a "guinea pig for experimentation," as Senators THOMAS of Oklahoma, WHEELER, CHAVEZ, and SHIPSTEAD have put it.

So, the Office of Indian Affairs has grown to 7,383 persons, or one bureaucrat to every 55 Indians. The office is asking an appropriation of $32,000,000 for next year and 306 new jobs.

Now do a little figuring. The salaries paid Congressmen and Senators total $5,310,000 a year. The Indian Office bureaucrats alone want six times that sum, yet the Indian Office looks after 400,000 Indians, and Congress has responsibility for 140,000,000 people. And, isn't it time to emancipate the Indians and let them look after themselves?

If Congressmen would cut out these millions or billions of waste, they would be worth a lot. If Congress cut this requested appropriation for this one Office of Indian Affairs in half, they would save enough to pay their own salaries for 3 years.

And that is only one of scores of similar sewer-holes through which the taxpayers' money is being poured. Senator BYRD recommends that Mr. Truman's branch of Government be reduced by at least 50 percent.

Mr. Truman can't pass the buck to Congress either. He could help the taxpayers by hundreds of millions of dollars with a single nod to his staff. No Executive is obliged to spend all that Congress appropriates.

Courageous Comptroller General Lindsay Warren has just reported that the executive branch is a "hodgepodge of duplications, overlappings and inefficiencies." Listen to what he reports. Public housing is financed by 15 different bureaus; a dozen handle Government land; 8 handle labor relations, and at least 75 bureaus, and what have you, handle transportation matters.

When the New Dealers say private enterprise has failed, the answer is that taxes, red tape, and Government flypaper make it impossible for it to do its full job. The boys would grow beards before you could close up a Sunday school picnic if you had to get Washington to appropriate and audit the expense.

Listen. A billion dollars would pay the present salaries of Congress for nearly 200 years. Six billions would pay them for 1,100 years, or until 3045 A. D. And twenty-five billions for nearly 5,000 years. Yet we propose to tax and spend twenty-five billions a year from now on, and you can't walk down Pennsylvania Avenue without being buttonholed by impecunious foreign statesmen, for anywhere from one to six billions. Not a dime of these vast funds could be pried out of the American taxpayers' pocket except by the vote of Congress.

So, I repeat that congressional salaries are the merest bagatelle if Congress looks after the real interests of those who pay their salaries and rescues them from the "road toward bankruptcy," to quote Franklin D. Roosevelt in those far-off days of 1933.

Only unbalanced men can believe in unbalanced budgets.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Earle S. Draper Retires as Deputy Commissioner of FHA—Has Made Notable Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today Earle S. Draper, Deputy Commissioner of Federal Housing Administration, has resigned his position to reenter private business. The Government is fortunate in having had Mr. Draper as Deputy Commissioner of FHA during the past 5 years. We, on "The Hill," know that he has kept Congress fully informed of the activities of FHA, and an exceptionally good spirit of cooperation has existed between FHA and the congressional committees handling housing legislation. Mr. Draper has performed an outstanding service and I know that the many Members of Congress who know him and have had dealings with him as Deputy Commissioner are sorry to see him leave Government service but wish him good success in his private business as a consultant in land planning and housing construction here in Washington.

The war housing insurance program of FHA, according to a release in July, has aided private builders in producing more than 400,000 dwelling units for war workers. The insurance authorization has been increased to a total of $1,800,000,000 during the past 3 years. It is estimated that these loans accounted for construction of more than 90 percent of the Nation's privately financed war housing. I think we all agree that Federal Housing Administration, under the active supervision of Mr. Draper, has done a remarkably good job and we are very grateful.

Mr. Draper leaves Federal Housing with the best wishes of Commissioner Foley and in a private capacity undoubtedly his advice and counsel will be of much benefit in helping FHA carry on efficiently.

The Unemployment Bill, October 1, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, we so often think of things we would like to say, only to find that somebody else has said it, is the experience of all of us. With respect to the full employment bill, I have wondered why its provisions were not made so extensive as to cover all those available for employment, or who should be insured of an opportunity to be employed.

Recently the editor of the St. Johnsbury Caledonian, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., wrote an editorial which parallels my thinking so generally that I am, under permission heretofore granted, inserting it in the RECORD. It deserves the careful consideration of every 100-percent American. Here it is:

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

There is an angle to the so-called full employment bill that we have not previously discussed, a viewpoint considered by the columnist William S. Howe in the Concord (Mass.) Journal, who stresses the fact that the duty of the Government is to all groups.

If it is the obligation of the Government to assure jobs at a living wage, argues the Concord columnist, it is equally its duty "to guarantee the employer a sufficient profit on which to live; the farmer a regular and liberal income; the investor who depends upon interest and dividends a regular and satisfactory return; the lawyer and doctor regular professional fees; and the landlord a regular rent sufficient to maintain his property and give him a fair return. We are all members of the country doing our best in our several ways to earn a living, and we should all have equal treatment."

This argument is unanswerable. The so-called full employment bill is class legislation at a time when there should be public resistance to the persuasiveness of the demagog. The bill is a political play for mass votes—a strategem to still further entrench the party in power.

Once the time comes when a young man in the professions or as the proprietor of a small business becomes discouraged at the hazards of private enterprise and finds it easier and more profitable to throw in the sponge and accept a Government job guaranty, then the day of state socialism and collectivism has arrived.

A guaranty of a job cannot be made in the unregimented society of a democracy. Such a guaranty could only be made possible by a vast spending program of Government funds, a program which would reach far into the pocketbooks of all taxpayers and threaten the goal of economic security sought to be attained.

The so-called full employment bill, if passed in its present form, will but strengthen class lines already drawn too taut in the pump-priming days of the New Dealers.

Does England Want To Be Kept?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

DOES ENGLAND WANT TO BE KEPT?

As soon as our Government discontinued lend-lease after VJ-day—which the law required it to do—Great Britain's Attlee governing group fired a few curses across the Atlantic at President Truman, and followed these curses up with Lords Halifax and Keynes.

Their lordships came over to persuade this Government to resume lend-lease, in effect, but to do it in the guise of a loan.

This loan would come to anywhere from three billion to six billion dollars, and it would be a highly special kind of loan. It would bear no interest, as the British envoys see it, and it would extend over a long period of time. In view of the World War I debts' record of small payment and no payment, it is hard to distinguish this proposed loan from a gift.

The British argument is that Britain proportionately suffered more than we did in the war, physically and financially, and it is now our duty to bail Great Britain out. If we refuse to perform that duty, there is a veiled British threat to return to Empire trade preferences and thereby freeze American goods out of the British Empire.

What do they mean return? The Ottawa Conference of 1932 set up an Empire preference system, which is still in existence.

During the war we gave the British Empire about $29,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease goods of virtually all descriptions. That sum is 1,000 times $29,000,000. We also sent some 3,500,000 men to the European war theater alone, thereby furnishing about 75 percent of the Allied fighting strength on the western fronts.

We didn't start that war. The war started because England and France told Hitler not to attack Poland or the Danzig Corridor, and because Hitler attacked. With our help, the Danzig Corridor was recovered but not for Poland. Russia got it as part of its reward for having been a semially of Hitler's for almost 2 years of World War II and getting into the war on the Allied side only when Hitler booted it in.

THE PARADE OF THE "GIMME GUYS"

In World War I, which likewise we did not start, we sent about 2,000,000 men to the western front, and those 2,000,000 men furnished the necessary extra weight to win that war for the Allies. We also put out about $14,000,000,000 in loans, which are still owed us, Britain's share being about six and one-quarter billions and France's about four and one-half.

World War II has ended with Britain's old Far East Empire restored to it, or in process of being restored. We did that part of the job virtually alone.

We are now asked to forget the twenty-nine billions in lend-lease—just wipe it off the books—and put up another three to six billions in cash for Britain to spend as it sees fit.

Russia, not to be outdone, also talks of a $6,000,000,000 loan from us. This is the same Russia which, because we want to keep the Pacific islands our men won at such cost in blood, says it has to become trustee of Tripolitania and Eritrea in Africa.

If we fall for these propositions, we shall start a parade of most of the other nations of the world past our paymaster's window. France and China will naturally want their cuts in our wealth. Before we know it, we can expect Germany and Japan, our late enemies, to be presenting arguments to show why we should give them money. Italy, another of our late enemies, is already tentatively on the list for $450,000,000 in relief funds.

All this will just mean that every American will take a certain fraction out of his or her every dollar from now on—maybe 5 cents, maybe 10 cents, maybe a quarter— and blow it away beyond the borders of the United States and its possessions. Instead of working for ourselves, as the British, Chinese, French, Russians, etc., work for themselves, we'll be working for the wide, wide world.

We cannot go on forever winning wars which the British are brave enough and noble enough (and we aren't being sarcastic here) to start, but which with the best will in the world they are no longer strong enough or wealthy enough to finish.

It may be Britannia's ambition to be permanently kept by Uncle Sam; we don't know. But certainly our Congress ought to scrutinize this British loan request, and the Russian loan request, with extreme care.

Surplus Potatoes for Starving Nations

REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, since the world is facing a food shortage the Department of Agriculture should take immediate steps to prevent wasting this year's huge potato crop such as occurred in 1943 when thousands of bushels of Government-owned potatoes were allowed to spoil. Early plans should be made to ship these potatoes to the starving nations abroad. Many potatoes should be shipped in the raw stage, because it will be cheaper on the American taxpayers. Others can be dehydrated and shipped at a later date. The Red Cross should replace UNRRA in handling these surplus potatoes.

While potatoes were selling at 75 cents per peck in the stores, Federal officials permitted Government-owned potatoes to spoil. Thousands of carloads of potatoes were dumped in the United States in 1943.

This year's crop of potatoes will be the second largest in our history, according to reports now coming in from potato-growing sections. The Government has committed itself to a loan policy on all potatoes grown this year, which will guarantee the producers against serious loss, but will probably mean that the Government will be forced to purchase millions of dollars worth of this year's crop of potatoes.

Federal officials responsible for the handling of food should follow recommendations by members of the potato industry and Members of Congress by making plans to take care of the huge potato crop now coming to harvest. Unless such plans are made immediately and steps taken at once to carry them out, there is certain to be a terrific waste of the taxpayers' money and spoilage of potatoes at a time when many people in other nations are going hungry.

If our present transportation system is not adequate to distribute these potatoes, then it is high time that we take over thousands of Federal-owned trucks to do the job. Last year Federal officials allowed Federal trucks to stand in open fields and rust when they were needed to haul food and coal.

The starving people abroad will need our entire surplus potatoes, wheat, and corn because of the crop failure in Europe.

Disabled Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 4218, a bill to give financial assistance to those men and women in our armed services who lost the use of their limbs or were blinded in the line of duty.

I realize that these individuals, due to their disabilities, will be the recipients of pensions but I feel that in all too many cases, the amount of the pension will be just about enough to maintain existence on a bare subsistence and care basis. It is my conviction that these individuals, who constitute a needy and special group, should be given an outright grant of funds based on the extent of their disability so that they may use this to set themselves up in business and further their own security. These people are entitled to the utmost consideration from the Congress and the American people while they are looked upon with honor today we want to make sure that tomorrow their heroic deeds and sacrifices will still be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I have some estimates which I have reason to believe are quite accurate as to the extent of the number of people who would benefit by legislation of this kind. Out of this war the Army has had 1,200 totally blind persons and 14,500 amputations. Of these amputees, 2 have lost 4 limbs and are basket cases; 9 have lost 3 limbs; 1,000 have lost 2 limbs; and 13,489 have lost 1 limb. On a percentage basis 11 percent have had amputations below the elbow and 11 percent have had amputations above the elbow; 48 percent have had amputations below the knee; 30 percent have had amputations above the knee.

The purpose of this bill is to pay to these people a sum of money based on the extent of their injuries and the amount would be based on comparable payments made for similar disabilities by our major insurance companies and would be as follows:

Type of disability	Number disabled	Individual payment	Total cost
Blind in both eyes	1,200	$2,000	$2,400,000
Loss of 1 limb	13,489	1,000	13,489,000
Loss of 2 limbs	1,000	2,000	2,000,000
Loss of 3 limbs	9	3,000	27,000
Loss of 4 limbs	2	4,000	8,000
Total	15,700		17,924,000

The cost, as can be seen from the above figures would be only nominal. The 15,700 service men and women so afflicted would be given this compensation by the Government over and above all other benefits so as to give to them some degree of security in the planning of their future. I do not think money, as such, can convey our gratitude to those who have contributed so much to victory but it is one way by means of which we can convey to these heroic people our acknowledgment of the real debt we owe them and which we can never fully repay.

Cash in Britain, Deficit for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, by Edward T. Austin, from the San Diego (Calif.) Union:

CASH IN BRITAIN, DEFICIT FOR US

(By Edward T. Austin)

Great Britain is by no means the only European country which has representatives in the United States seeking vast postwar loans. Nearly all of them have delegations here for the same purpose, the chief difference being that Britain was our chief ally and got here first.

Another difference is that Lord Keynes, who appears to be spearheading the drive upon our Treasury, is widely known hereabouts. He, it will be remembered, is the so-called fiscal expert who sold the former President Roosevelt and his New Deal entourage on the fanciful theory that the way to prosperity lay along the way to bigger and bigger deficits; that our debt amounted to nothing because "we owed it to ourselves."

There seemed to be nothing significant in the minds of the New Dealers in the fact that Britain never had paid much attention to Lord Keynes' theories and had, in fact, shunned them with enthusiasm.

Now, however, Lord Keynes is pursuing a different course for Britain but is using the same argument to us, and that, in itself, should serve as a warning. The British desire for a $6,000,000,000 loan is that it is needed to stabilize British currency. All of the arguments about Britain being a first line of economic defense for this country are being delicately polished, although this requires considerable finesse in view of England's recent sharp swerve to the left and the installation of a Socialist government.

If ever our experts get around to asking a few questions, they might inquire as to why deficit spending is so important as a means of bolstering prosperity in the United States, while precisely the opposite course must be taken to achieve the same objective in England. If deficit spending and "owing it to ourselves" is the way to American prosperity, why not let the British public in on this beneficent course through the issuance of British bonds to the British people? If such a means of salvation is so effective and really was a British idea in the first place, why overwhelm us with another $6,000,000 of it at a time when the British apparently need it more than we do? We have had about all of this sort of prosperity we can stand.

Much stress was laid by both the United States and Great Britain on the importance of allowing other nations, both Allied and enemy, to select their own forms of government in free elections. Presumably that principle still goes. But nothing ever has been said to indicate that either we or the British feel the slightest obligation toward financing these experiments in postwar social, economic, or political theories. Certainly Britain hasn't dsplayed any enthusiasm in the financing of Greece's postwar government.

Britain doubtless requires help, and we, of course, are expected to extend it. But let it be hoped that a more reasonable and realistic course motivates whatever action we may take. Lord Keynes' theories, by his own actions, have been proved fallacious. They won't work in his home country. So, as the

loan discussions continue, there should be a more realistic approach, one based upon assets and the ability and inclination to repay, rather than a head-in-the-clouds attitude that our prosperity demands deficits while Great Britain's depends upon cold cash which we are expected to contribute.

Support H. R. 3939 to Eradicate Cancer and Infantile Paralysis

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, at a cost of only $2,000,000,000 the atomic bomb saved the lives of countless thousands of American boys as well as the lives of thousands of our allies. The cost of the atomic bomb is infinitesimal in comparison with the lives saved and the early ending of the war.

Likewise the eight hundred millions spent in perfecting the radio fuse fashioned by the mind of man to put a brain in antiaircraft and artillery shells which licked the Nazi robot bomb and the Jap suicide plane was money well spent in comparison to the lives of civilians and fighters saved for us and our allies.

Commenting on these things in an article appearing in this morning's Washington Post, Marquis Childs said:

Into the discovery of the proximity fuse and its fashioning went the work of from 600 to 800 scientists. Different groups were assigned different problems. Sometimes 2 or 3 groups were working toward the same goal so that if 2 failed, 1 might succeed. The tie-up with industry was very close. Industrial technicians and researchers were in on the whole project. Nothing like this has ever happened before. Here is the pattern for the solution of all man's ills, if only we had the courage to use it in peace as in war. Who can say how long it would take to discover the cause and the cure of cancer or infantile paralysis with 600 or 800 men and women working together toward a common goal?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the bill I introduced in this body on September 5, 1945, H. R. 3939, authorizing the appropriation of $500,000,000 to be immediately available and to remain available for expenditure under the direction of the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, for research with respect to the causes and cure of cancer and poliomyelitis. This bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, where I trust it will receive early and favorable consideration. I have received letters from men and women from practically every State of the Union expressing their hope that this bill receive favorable consideration by the House and Senate of the United States. Statistics show that more than 160,000 die every year in the United States from the scourge of cancer. To wipe out the scourge of cancer and infantile paralysis will save untold suffering and anguish to the human race and the lives of countless thousands throughout the world. Human suffering and the terrors of these dread diseases cannot be measured by the yardstick of money. But in comparison to the saving of human life and alleviation of human suffering and fear, half a billion spent for the eradication of these scourges is infinitesimal. I ask the Members of this body to support my bill and to join me in helping to wipe out disease—the master killer of all mankind.

Claims of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

ORDER OF AHEPA,
GEORGE JARVIS CHAPTER, NO. 80,
Worcester, Mass., September 25, 1945.

Hon. PEHR G. HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing a copy of a resoluton sent by the supreme lodge of the Order of Ahepa to the foreign ministers of the Big Five assembled in London to adjust the affairs of the world.

One of the first actions of the Big Five was to exclude Greece from the deliberations on the Italian and Bulgarian treaties. This unheard of strangulaton of the Atlantic Charter was committed at the expense of Greece, the country that has contributed more to the common victory and has suffered more than any other nation.

Furthermore, it is rumored that in spite of the complete destruction and utter annihilation of Greece by the Italian and Bulgarian Armies the Big Five will not award Greece any reparations on the ground that Italy can not afford to pay and that Bulgaria is protected by Russia.

Has anybody ever heard of anything like this before? But who in the name of God is going to pay for the stupendous damage willfully and maliciously done to Greece by the infamous invaders? What has become of the Atlantic Charter anyway? Why was Greece lured into the fight?

We will appreciate it if you would take this up with our State Department, and/or, if you would take any action that would forestall this great international crime. A speech in Congress would be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES ANDERSON,
President.

WORCESTER, MASS., *September 15, 1945.*

Mr. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
United States of America.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Whereas the heroic people of Greece held the Nazi and Fascist hordes at bay for many months in 1940 and 1941, and, by their brilliant resistance, exploded the myth of Axis invincibility and turned the tide of battle, defeating Italy, and fighting resolutely the delaying action against the Germans which aided Russia to stop the Nazis at the very gates of Moscow, gave Britain much-needed time and moral aid and America the opportunity to organize her industrial might and military power; and

Whereas Greece is traditionally loyal to the western allies and also is associated by warm, time-honored, and unbreakable ties of friendship and religion with Russia and is a coastal fortress of strategic significance and a dependable ally whose position should be strengthened; and

Whereas ethnically, ethically, and historically eastern Thrace, Epirus, the Dodecanese, and Cyprus inarguably are and have been Greek territory since the dawn of history and the Greeks have been the bulwark of democracy and western civilization fighting the battles against barbarian invaders which made eventually Europe and America possible; and

Whereas the victories Allies, under the Atlantic Charter, are committed to the policies of self-determination of peoples and security of nations from aggression, and, in conformity with these policies, Greece is legitimately entitled to a favorable rectification of her frontiers, and particularly to the territory hereinbefore mentioned, and, incidentally, the Allies are morally bound to recognize her unfailing loyalty and, as well, her timely and valuable contributions to the United Nations' cause and to reward her for her sacrifices in blood and material by supporting her claims to just reparations from the Axis aggressors who plundered her country and destroyed its resources; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Ahepa, an American organization, having more than 400 chapters in the United States, assembled in annual convention in the city of Washington, D. C., voicing the sentiments and hopes of about a million Americans of Greek descent, all of whom have abiding faith in the sense of justice of each minister in the Council of Foreign Ministers, gave careful consideration to the foregoing matters; and thereupon it was unanimously

Resolved, That the supreme lodge of the Order of Ahepa respectfully petition and hereby petitions Your Excellency as a member of the Council of Foreign Ministers to consider fully, in the light of the Atlantic Charter, and determine favorably the just claims of Greece—firstly, for the awarding of due reparations; secondly, for the annexation of Epirus, the Dodecanese, and Cyprus; and, thirdly, the rectification of the Bulgarian boundary to a line which will provide the maximum natural defense from this predatory aggressor who attacked her neighbors thrice in three decades.

In that connection Your Excellency may bear in mind that these awards are vital to afford—

(a) security from recurring aggressions;

(b) the maintenance of peace in the Balkans;

(c) living space and the chance for survival for the heroic people of Greece;

(d) the opportunity to realize their ideals and develop their economic life free from fears; and

(e) to enable them to make their pacific and democratic influence strongly felt in the United Nations' policy of insuring durable peace and continued progress in a better world.

Your Excellency, to give Greece less and the two Axis satellites, calculating Bulgaria and cunning Albania, more, and thus to keep Greece weak and make them strong, inevitably will bring about her economic strangulation and military subjugation—a glaring injustice to a faithful and honorable ally and a glaring historical inequity that would remain indelible in the memory of friendly small nations.

Bulgaria in the past had, and Tito's Yugoslavia now has, ambitions to expand and dominate the Balkans. A resurgent Bulgaria will revive old plans. Therefore, a common

frontier between Greece and Turkey is imperative. It will remove the eruptive potential of aggression. In the event that military or political neutralization of the Dardanelles and incidental modifications of status quo take place, the historically Greek Gallipoli Peninsula should be allocated to Greece for the foregoing, obvious, weighty, and just reasons.

Respectfully submitted.

ORDER OF AHEPA,
HARRIS J. BOORAS,
Supreme President.

Ample Food To Share

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Monday, October 1, 1945, entitled "Ample Food To Share":

AMPLE FOOD TO SHARE

Most Americans have assumed that we can prevent wholesale starvation in Europe this winter only by a good deal of belt tightening at home. No doubt that is the foremost reason why Congress has not yet approved the giving of additional aid through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Men whose political future is determined by votes are always hesitant about asking the public to cut down its food consumption. It is now becoming apparent, however, that substantial relief can be given to Europe's hungry millions with little sacrifice on the part of consumers in this country.

A current report by the Department of Agriculture says that civilian supplies of meats, canned fish, canned fruits, juices, and vegetables, turkey, chicken, dried and canned milk, and potatoes will be much larger this fall and winter than in the same period last year. We can easily spare, the experts say, substantial quantities of these and various other commodities, including some corn and wheat. There seems to be even a hint that the Department would like to see large shipments of foodstuffs go to Europe to avoid a depression of farm prices in this country. The experts know that incomes are shrinking and that military demands are greatly reduced. They do not want to see the United States emerge from the war period with excess food that might readily become a burdensome surplus.

The Post has repeatedly advocated that we share our food with the starving peoples of war-torn Europe as a matter of high policy. For that is a first essential to demonstrate our adherence to the one-world idea. It is also the best means of nourishing the seeds of democracy that are now beginning to sprout in some parts of Europe. We have consistently asserted that these objectives are worth a good deal of belt-tightening even if immediate humanitarian considerations could be overlooked. Now it appears that the price of carrying out these aims will be a good deal lower than we, and many others, had supposed. In these circumstances it would be utterly inexcusable to deny to stricken peoples in the dark winter ahead means of sustenance that we can easily spare.

Nor does the fact that some of this aid may have to go to Germany change the situation. General Eisenhower reports that food rations in Germany are dangerously low. If Germans suffer from starvation they will be unable to mine the coal that other European countries desperately need to get their industries and transportation systems into operation once more. What we face is the necessity of helping Europe get back onto her feet economically. We cannot shirk this responsibility without grave danger of undermining the peace that has been won at such great cost to ourselves as well as the rest of the world.

OPA Blocks Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, by regulations which deny to either manufacturers, wholesalers or retailers, and sometimes to all of them, a price sufficient to enable them to continue in business, the OPA has driven much low-priced merchandise off the market; forced the purchase of higher-priced goods; favored the well-to-do and wealthier purchaser at the expense of the low-income worker.

OPA has adopted a formula for fixing prices which, while it takes into consideration some increases in the cost of labor and materials, does not cover the over-all cost of the manufacturer or the retailer.

Because there was a wider margin between the cost and the selling price of higher-priced items, as distinguished from the low-priced ones, the manufacturers and the retailers in some instances were able to absorb the increase and still do business, but many times that just could not be done.

The five-and-tens and variety stores have been unable to purchase merchandise in sufficient quantities to supply their trade, and the average worker, the individual who wanted low-priced goods and for whose welfare price control was supposed to operate, has been deprived of his opportunity to purchase goods he could afford to buy, been forced into the high-priced field.

For example: One retail merchant who needed 1,700,000 pairs of children's anklets to sell at 10 cents, 12½ cents, and 15 cents, could get but one-quarter of what he needed. He was forced into buying and selling higher-priced ones. He needed 660,000 pairs of work socks to sell at 10, 12½, and 15 cents. All he could get was 150,000. Workers and their wives were forced to pay 50 cents, 75 cents, and a dollar.

He ordered 1,100,000 men's work shirts to sell at 50 cents. He got none. He could get shirts to sell at $2.50 and $3. He wanted 360,000 children's union suits. He got 36,000. He wanted thousands of pairs of shorts to sell at 50 cents. He bought some at $2.95 and $3.95 a pair. He wanted 16,000 women's hats to sell at $1.69; 6,000 to sell at $1.09. He got none. The $10, $20, and $25 hats were for sale.

Let us get into flatirons. Prior to the war about half of the flatirons manufactured in this country retailed at less than $3; the balance at a higher price. This particular concern sold flatirons as low as $1.29 and as high as $3.95, and the fastest-selling electric iron was priced at $2.29, which the retailers purchased at $1.72½. Now, under OPA, the lowest-priced iron they can buy is a $6.50 one, which the woman with little money to spend is now forced to pay, while, before OPA went into action, she could buy at $2.29—all because OPA will not give the manufacturer a fair small increase to cover increased wages and cost of material.

Do you want a low-priced sheet? This same merchant paid $1.28½ each for sheets; was forced to sell them at $1.29. He lost money on every sheet. Another competitive store sold the same sheet at $1.59. More exclusive, higher-priced stores sold the same sheet at $1.79 or $1.89. The low-priced sheet went off the market; you get none.

A manufacturer in Cleveland, Ohio, made a small cheap medicine cabinet prior to the war at a cost of 70 cents. When OPA took over, because of increased costs, he asked that he be permitted to make and sell it at 82½ cents. OPA refused, but permitted a manufacturer of lamp shades who lived in Philadelphia to make and sell for $1.30 the same medicine cabinet.

The Cleveland man made a better medicine cabinet, which formerly sold at $1.50. He asked for an increase to $1.77 to cover the increased cost of labor and material. OPA refused, but that identical item is now on the market at an approved OPA price of $2.30.

As long as OPA refuses, as it does refuse, to allow manufacturers to charge a price at least equal to the actual cost of production, low-priced goods will not be manufactured.

The individual who has a low income, the housewife who has little money to spend, will not get the low- or medium-priced clothing and other necessary items, but the man with the dough will be able to buy.

Army Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a letter from the statistical control section, Kelly Field, Tex.:

We have 12 men over 35, and they were to get out September 22, but our commanding officer, Capt. John Skipton, is now holding them up until we get replacements.

Not even half our men have anything to work at, and all of it could be done by our civilian employees if it were turned over to them.

Last month in our command, 720 should have been discharged, but only 123 were released.

The taxpayers should know how these Army officers are holding the enlisted men, and if they did know, something would be done.

When will the Army get these men out?

Views on the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I gave to the press today on the draft. The statement follows:

I have been asked my opinion in regard to the draft and I am glad to respond.

I would first of all see to it that the men who are suffering from combat fatigue and the rigors of long, hard service are discharged and sent home as rapidly as transportation facilities will take them there. These men are entitled to our first consideration.

I am opposed to the conscription of boys of 18 and 19 and the early twenties. Instead of sending those boys into the military ranks I would send them to school. In a few years they will be running our country and they have a right to receive the training and education necessary to enable them to meet their responsibilities. To put a gap in the lives of these boys in a time of peace when their careers should be molded for future usefulness is an appalling disregard of the national interest. We have in the armed forces many thousands of young men who were taken from high schools and colleges into the service and if they remain in the service for any great length of time I fear they will not have the inclination to try to finish their education. That would be a national misfortune.

I believe that the problem of the manpower needed for the armies of occupation can be solved—completely and satisfactorily solved—by use of the volunteer method. I believe that if the President would issue a strong appeal to the patriotism of those who have not yet done their bit in the armed forces in connection with the war, asking them to rally to the colors and render this service to their country, the response would be surprisingly effective. I believe that enough men would respond to meet all of the requirements of the armies of occupation. Such a proclamation would appeal to thousands of younger people who would be thrilled by the spirit of adventure and to older, single men who have no particular ties at home. The armies of occupation open a wide opportunity for older men who would not be useful in combat duty. There is no reason why a man of 40 or even 50 or older would not be useful for police duty. The War Department informs me that 400,000 men will be needed in the American forces of occupation in Europe.

General MacArthur has said that 200,000 men will be sufficient for the permanent armies of occupation in the far eastern theater. His declaration almost tore the roof off of the Pentagon Building, as a good many high-ranking military authorities are loath to countenance such a heavy reduction in forces with resultant reactions on their influence and prestige, but I, for one, am willing to trust MacArthur to determine the size of the force required to do the job. A personal acquaintanceship of 40 years has given me the highest opinion of his judgment and dependability in reference to military matters. The Navy Department expects to operate on a volunteer basis after September 1 next with a force of between 500,000 and 600,000 men, and if the Navy can raise that force of volunteers, why should it not be expected that the Army can raise 600,000 by the same method?

At the same time the President issues a proclamation calling for volunteers he should, in my opinion, call on China and Great Britain to contribute men to the army of occupation in the Asiatic theater. There is no reason on earth why America should do this job alone or even the major part of it. American intervention in World War II saved China. She has 400,000,000 people right at the threshold of the theater of occupation. American intervention also saved the British Empire, whose interests in the Far East are far more important than those of the United States. The British Empire, on which the sun never sets, embraces a population equal to that of China, or four times the population of the United States. Australia, a British possession with 7,246,612 people also is right at the threshold of the occupation area and in all fairness should make a sizable contribution to the forces of occupation. In my opinion, these countries whom we have helped so much should be reminded of their postwar responsibilities. With a big job of policing the occupied countries still to be done, they have no right to sit back complacently and say, "Let Uncle Sam do it."

Navy Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOWELL PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Lowell, Mich., September 17, 1945.

Hon. BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
United States Representative,
National Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONKMAN: If I were a Congressman, I would make a speech. The next best thing to do, I presume, is to tell it to a Congressman in the hope that my observations and convictions might be relayed in some manner to the proper bureau or authorities.

Now that the war is over, I feel that it is my right and duty to call the attention of the "big wigs" in the Navy to a very unfair and unreasonable procedure in discharging men from the service. I served for 16 months in World War I. For the past 3½ years it has been a privilege to serve as chairman of a draft board which sent thousands of men to the armed services. I have been glad to act as chairman of all seven war-bond drives in this community, and I have been happy in helping in various aspects of rationing. I mention this, not because I feel I am entitled to any special considerations but because I want you to know that I have a right to speak my mind.

My son, like millions of others, was inducted in April 1943, and he willingly accepted an assignment in the Navy. I could have had him enter college at Government expense for special training, but my conscience would not permit such procedure. This boy, like millions of others, was put into immediate service, and he spent about 18 months on a destroyer until it was sunk off Okinawa on May 18. By the grace of God, he was among the survivors. Like thousands of others who have risked their lives and have suffered almost fatal wounds, he has spent months in hospitals from Guam to Asheville, N. C. He hasn't been home in 2 years. He has now been told that he is slated for further duty. The Purple Heart is beautiful to behold, but no points are allowed toward discharge for the wearer of this honor.

It has recently been brought to my attention that many of the college programs will soon be terminated. Many of the boys who, in substance, have earned a college degree at Government expense and who have never heard the swish of a wave or the pop of a rifle are slated for return home, and they are scheduled to be placed on the reserve list, where draft boards cannot touch them.

My son and thousands like him were in college at the time they were called to the colors. They have made their contribution. They want to go back to college—at their own expense, if need be.

In time of war I would grant that experienced men are needed at the front. But in time of peace I insist that those who have basked in the splendid securiy of college walls should now shoulder their responsibilities and permit those who have actually served in the theaters of war to return home. I am not speaking for my son except that he is representative of thousands of others. I do not want him to return home until others like him are granted the same privilege. I am arguing a matter of policy and common sense.

Very truly,

W. W. GUMSER.

Doctor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Washington Post of October 1, 1945:

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

We can detect no evidence of thoughtful planning in the War Department's report to Senator REED that the Army had 506 more doctors on September 1 than on January 1, when the war was in full progress in Europe and the Pacific. The shortage of doctors serving the civilian population has been acute for several years. In some communities doctors are working from 14 to 18 hours a day and are still unable to make the rounds to all who are sick. This situation could be endured patiently so long as men were being wounded or contracting diseases at abnormal rates in fox holes and jungles. But, with the fighting at an end, it seems inexcusable to hold such a large number of doctors in the armed forces.

Of course, Army and Navy doctors must still be available to protect the health of men in uniform, and they have a big assignment in examining veterans as they are discharged. But we suspect that the release of both doctors and dentists could be greatly accelerated without depriving the services of any essential medical talent. Certainly it would be difficult to show that the ratio of doctors per thousand men served should be greatly increased when the fighting stops. Yet that is what the present policy, so far as it has been made public, appears to call for. Obviously the need for doctors in the services should be more closely scrutinized in the light of the acute shortage at home.

Let Us Harness Our Rivers and Make Them Fully Useful and Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there is a controversy now raging concerning the proper method of river management in the United States. The Tennessee Valley Authority is widely acclaimed, and justly so, for the best all-around development and control of that remarkable river. I view the TVA with commendation and admiration, and I think the country might well look to that development for lessons, and to a certain extent, for a pattern. However, in this big country of ours, conditions differ greatly in the four corners of the Nation, and I can see that what would be best for one river basin in the southeastern humid section might not necessarily be best for a basin in the opposite portion of the country in an arid or semiarid section.

Not only because I am chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation am I stressing the irrigation phase of the development, but because I realize full well the absolute dependence of the West upon utilizing our water resources to the limit, and in every possible way. Water is one of our scarce though indestructible minerals in the West, and it is capable of many different uses, some of which are more important than others. That makes the gradation of uses for water in the West highly important so that the law shall specify what are the more important uses in the order of their rank. After that is done, all other planning should logically follow the consistent order of rank in beneficial uses. A recent enactment in December 1944 contains a statement of most beneficial uses and lists water for irrigation ahead of water for power production or water for navigation, as well as ahead of other uses in western streams. Any planning done then for the West must provide for multiple-purpose construction, observing the rank of importance at least on all rivers west of the Mississippi.

The President, in his message of September 6, foresaw the immediate need of western-river development and stressed work in irrigation and reclamation and the prevention of floods and the harnessing of our rivers for power. As chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I have asked the Bureau of Reclamation to furnish Congress an inventory of projects and plans for immediate use in irrigation projects and related development. The Bureau has given an extensive list of such projects, and these appear in part 1 of the hearings on H. R. 520, to which I call the attention of my colleagues interested in western postwar development.

The West needs the understanding of the whole country with respect to its great regional problem, the use of its rivers. Arid or semiarid, the West in order to develop, must conserve and use its waters. Often, I find that the fundamental fact that life itself is dependent upon the availability of water to support it, is overlooked in areas that are blessed with plentiful rainfall. One of the most thoughtful and penetrating discussions of the western problem appears in testimony recently given by Assistant Commissioner William E. Warne, of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I have extracted pertinent paragraphs and urge all my colleagues to read them in the interest of better understanding:

WESTERN WATER DEVELOPMENTS ESSENTIAL

(Excerpts from a statement by William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation)

We have just been through a global war. All-out use of our great resources played a mighty part in our victory. Prodigality was justified by our critical need. Everyone now recognizes, however, that we have dipped into our store of natural wealth with a lavish hand. We must now consider this fact: To remain a great Nation we must conserve and husband our remaining resources. We must use wisely what we have left. That is why, throughout the land, people are turning their attention to the development of our river basins. * * *

The actual development for 43 years of the policies, practices, and organization of the Bureau of Reclamation, I believe, demonstrates the logic of planning and operation of water projects along river basin lines. Because the Bureau of Reclamation has been planning and constructing works for the development of all of the river basins in the West, it has found it advantageous to regionalize its administration and to provide technical controls in its central office to coordinate the activities under way in the decentralized basins. * * *

BASIN DEVELOPMENTS ADD WEALTH

Nothing short of full development of the water and related resources of our rivers along unified, basin-wide plans will satisfy the needs of this Nation. Full development of the river basins is needed from coast to coast.

Every basin so developed will add to the wealth and the strength of the United States. Consideration of the developments that have been made in the basins of the Colorado River, the Columbia River, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Rivers, and the Tennessee River proves this beyond any question.

Full development of the river basins of the West, however, is doubly important. I say this not because the work of the Bureau of Reclamation is in the West, but for the reason that West of the ninety-seventh meridian, the climate is subhumid, semiarid, or actually arid. Therefore, little, if any, of the arable lands of the West can reach full production without irrigation, and hundreds of millions of acres are worthless and must remain deserts because they cannot be irrigated. With irrigation, part of these areas have become and more could be made into gardens. It is no accident, for example, that two California irrigated counties consistently lead all the counties of the Nation in the value of their agricultural produce. Irrigation of dry land where the growing season is nearly a year long, and the summer sun is seldom obscured by clouds, has made leaders of Los Angeles and Tulare Counties. Without irrigation, these same counties would be sheep pastures, at best. As we see it now, no more than 42,000,000 acres out of a total of some 750,000,000 acres of arid lands in the West can ever be irrigated. About 21,000,000 acres are now irrigated, and only about that much more can be watered and settled even with the full development of all the western streams. The streams of the arid West, of course, could not be expected to and they never will supply more than a fraction of the water that could be beneficially used in the region. Because water for irrigation is the foundation of the West's great agriculture and the whole regional economy, the full development of western streams is doubly important. Because all of the West's water when fully used will irrigate only a pitiful 17 percent of the vast desert areas, it is doubly important that new works be made to serve best the long-range needs, and that means advance basin-wide planning on a comprehensive scale.

BASIN PLANS EFFECT ECONOMIES

A unified plan of basin-wide development, if adopted in advance as a guide to construction, can effect great economices over the long period in the cost of the component works required in the basin-wide conservation system. The comprehensive plan that interrelates all the needed engineering works and considers all the needs, also will protect the public interest against many mistakes that cost more than money. I do not mean to say that it would be possible now to prepare a blueprint for all future water developments in any river basin. It is possible, however, to present a unified plan for the use of each stream that will assure intelligent selection and design of the dams and other works that are now needed. This plan can be followed and modified in the future as revisions are dictated by changing conditions, and by additional knowledge gained through continuing study of the basin, and by new technical developments. The construction of Boulder Dam had to wait until technological advances made it possible to transmit power with negligible loss to Los Angeles, 266 miles away. Elements of the broad plans for many river basins may have, for other reasons, to await a future opportune time.

A unified plan, however, will eliminate such costly mistakes as the building of a small or inadequate dam on the best and cheapest site available on the river, or the construction of a single or dual-purpose dam where a dual or multiple-purpose dam is needed for the complete use of the basin's resources, or the preemption of water rights through the irrigation of third-class land while first-class land remains unused in the basin. These and other such obvious errors in sound regional and national development may provide expedient solutions to pressing local problems. These errors appear only when the local problems are taken up for consideration without relating them to the broad public interests within the basin. There is scarcely a stream in the West today, the value and use of which have not been depreciated by construction for such narrow use in the past. Fish runs have been blocked off by failure to include fish ladders in the design of dams. Irrigation developments have been prevented by the dedication of the stream flows to a lesser use at a point so far downstream that the water, so far as irrigation is concerned, must be wasted. There are other illustrations, of course. If the Black Canyon site on the Colorado River had been used to build some lesser structure before we learned how to transmit power without great losses over relatively long distances, it might well have been impossible ever to have built the great Boulder Dam, regardless of the need.

ABSENCE OF PLANS BRED CONFLICTS

There are historical reasons why it was not possible to provide unified plans for complete development of our rivers in advance of the first use of the streams. I do not deplore the present pattern of development and use of western streams. It could hardly have been otherwise up to very recent time. I simply advocate the preparation and adop-

tion now of basin development plans. It was impossible earlier to avoid the mistakes that grow out of lack of broad plans. We now have the information, however, that makes it possible to prepare such plans.

When the pioneers trekked across the western deserts a century ago, they found it necessary in order to live to make simple diversions from the flowing streams to irrigate lands to grow potatoes and beans. Little thought was given by them at that time to the expanse of arid land that lay beyond their fences or to the floods of water that rushed unused down the streams in the spring. They opened the era of irrigation without previous experience in this highly specialized agriculture and with little, if any, conception of its future growth or importance.

In a few decades, the diversion from many streams grew to exceed the low summer flows. When this happened, the farmers dueled with pitchforks and shotguns on the ditch banks to settle their claims to the trickles that were available. They suddenly found that water was the basis of their economic life. Whole new bodies of law grew out of the use of the streams in the irrigation of the West. New governmental subdivisions were created. New types of engineering were developed. "Water wars" do not occur now because of controls and improvements that now exist, but the irrigation water right is as zealously guarded today, though by other means.

At the stage in the development of the West of ditchbank warfare, men turned their attention to the construction of reservoirs to conserve the spring floods for use during the long dry summers. Of necessity, they banded together cooperatively, formed irrigation districts under State laws, and began to work out their water problems on a community basis. This gave rise to demands for Federal participation in the irrigation development of the West because many of the problems were interstate and many of the works were so costly that the large and nearly vacant States and territories could not finance them. Many of these States had less than half of their lands in private ownership, the rest being retained as public land by the Federal Government. Some still are largely publicly owned and Nevada has only 13 percent of privately owned land today.

IRRIGATION A NATIONAL INTEREST

Other national governments, since the dawn of history, had sponsored the irrigation of their arid lands as a matter of public interest and national policy. In Biblical times, under the ancient Mediterranean civilizations, in Asia, on all continents this was true. Today it is also true. In all of the regions of the world in which there are significant arid and semiarid lands, Government interests itself in their irrigation as a matter of public policy.

The Federal Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, adopted as a national policy the development of the waters and related resources of the western streams.

In the United States, there had been irrigation dams built earlier than 1902. There had been dams constructed by private capital to produce hydroelectric power in the West before 1902. It was only after the enactment of the Federal reclamation law, however, and through the planning of the Bureau of Reclamation that, as a general practice, the functions of irrigation and hydroelectric power production were combined in the construction of dams in the western streams. At the Roosevelt Dam cite in Arizona as early as 1906 there was demonstrated the feasibility of this double use of water that now so greatly increases the efficiency of many western reservoirs. Since then, there has been a steady growth in the idea of the multiple-purpose water development.

Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, Shasta Dam, serve many purposes. They aid navigation, contribute to the control of floods, provide water for irrigation of arid and semiarid lands, and provide water for culinary use in cities and for use by industries in their manufacturing processes. They provide hydroelectric power in such great quantities that they formed the foundation of the war effort of the far West. They alleviate stream pollution. One of them repels the saline ocean water and prevents its encroachment upon 400,000 acres of rich delta lands. They all provide recreational opportunities of the first order of magnitude, contribute richly to the conservation of the fish and wildlife of the areas, and generally promote the development of commerce, sound local and State governments, and support the transcontinental railroads and communications systems which bridge the western deserts on the piers of the irrigated valleys.

TWENTY BASIN PLANS

Only now, however, has the study of the water and related resources of the West progressed to the point at which broad plans for the basin-wide developments can be made for most western regions. The first such plan to be presented and approved by the Congress was that for the Missouri River Basin (see S. Doc. 191, 78th Cong., 2d sess.; S. Doc. 247, 78th Cong., 2d sess.; and sec. 9 of the Flood Control Act of Dec. 22, 1944). Other comprehensive plans are being formulated and will soon be presented to the Congress, dealing with some 20 additional basins in the West. These are Columbia River Basin, Rogue River Basin, Central Valley (Sacramento-San Joaquin Rivers), Russian River Basin, Santa Barbara (Santa Ynez and Santa Maria Rivers), Colorado River Basin, Rio Grande Basin, Nueces River Basin, Bonneville Basin, Lahontan Basin, Red River Basin, Guadalupe River Basin, Arkansas River Basin, Colorado River Basin (Texas), Brazos River Basin, Sabine-Neches Basin, Little Missouri River Basin, Virgin River Basin, Muddy River Basin, Little Colorado River Basin.

The development of our river basins is essential to the conservation and use of many of our resources. Control and conservation of water, in fact, are basic elements of the national conservation program. Never before was there greater need for the dedication of our country to the principles of resource conservation.

We in the United States are not alone in this increased attention to our waters. In China, in Russia, in England, in India, in Afghanistan, in Australia, in the Near East, in Central and South America, and in Africa, other governments are preparing national plans for the improvement, the development, and the use of their rivers. The realization of the fact that planned river developments add to national strength and well-being is world-wide. * * *

I repeat that the planned development of our rivers is basic to many related conservation programs. A multitude of illustrations could be given. Our petroleum reserves have been greatly diminished. Yet we are using great quantities of oil to generate electric power, while many unharnessed streams are wasted to the sea. These streams could provide hydroelectric power in substitution for the use of an exhaustible resource, petroleum, and often the hydroelectric plants could produce the power at lower rates to the consumer, especially when the generation of power is linked with other water uses in multiple-purpose public projects. The water resources, if intelligently used, are not exhaustible. Nature replenishes the streams. Water projects unlock for use other resources. The conserved waters irrigate arid lands and make them productive. The controlled waters produce hydroelectric power to smelt ores. The reservoirs make attractive playgrounds. Many of the man-made lakes are refuges for wild waterfowl. This list has been extended so many times that it is not necessary, I believe, to expand it further here.

A POSTWAR FOUNDATION STONE

Beyond doubt the United States is entering an era during which the full development of her water and related resources along river basin lines will be required in support of her national growth and development. In the arid West, particularly, prudent use of the rivers will provide opportunities for sound and wealth-creating expansion. Through the years the Congress has enacted legislation shaping the Bureau of Reclamation organization, policies, and programs to the needs of the arid region. The Bureau of Reclamation has presented a comprehensive plan for the Missouri Basin in accordance with these enactments, and the plan, after coordination with those of the Corps of Engineers, has been approved by the Congress. Work is getting under way in the execution of the plan. In addition, similar plans for the use of the waters of some 20 other western basins are in preparation.

Such river basin plans help to provide a firm foundation upon which to build postwar America.

Someone Should Tell GOP the Facts About Roosevelt and Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Record, Sunday, September 30, 1945:

SOMEONE SHOULD TELL GOP THE FACTS ABOUT ROOSEVELT AND PEARL HARBOR

(By Philip Wylie)

Way back in the old 1920's, your analyst was a Republican for awhile. He is still ready to cast a vote for a worthy Republican. Being a Republican doesn't seem to hurt most people any more than being a Democrat. But, lately, a small number of Republicans have begun to show signs of psychic trauma. This worries me; some of the mentally ill are friends.

Their trouble may be expressed figuratively. They keep digging up the body of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and beating it to death all over again. Even in a metaphorical sense, that is ghoulish. And the reason they give for the act is alarming. They are heaping calumny upon the dead man, they said, in order to influence the 1948 elections. Can't somebody convince them that F. D. R. isn't going to run in '48?

Last week a magazine of national circulation got into the sickly business of grave-drubbing. In one of those articles seeded with perhaps, possibly, it may be, and it is inferred, the magazine established a new altitude record for self-contradiction, preposterous hindsight, and nitwitted extrapolation.

F. D. R. WARNED UNITED STATES

F. D. R. told America month by month that America would be attacked. He told his Cabinet some while before Pearl Harbor that the attack might be soon. But the magazine berates him for saying nothing about our danger. Next it blames him for not telling exactly where Japan would attack. And in another wobbly breath it implies that F. D. R. deliberately perpetrated Pearl Harbor. In view of the late President's passion for the Navy; that seems a curious thought.

Indeed, the article ought to be turned over to all English teachers to use as a model of how not to write plainly.

It plunges on into the stupidest of these delirious claims. It carries the torch for the incredible idea that Dewey might have been "swept into the White House" if during his campaign he had told a few secrets about what he used to call blundering and bungling.

Dewey knew that we had solved the Jap code before Pearl Harbor and that we had thus learned ahead of time that the Japs were going to break off diplomatic relations. Dewey also knew, while he was electioneering, that the Japs were still employing the same code, which we could read. His refusal to reveal those facts, according to some of these back-dreaming Republicans, cost him the Presidency.

WE WERE HARD PRESSED

There, pals, is thinking. Have such persons no imagination? Don't they remember that when Dewey was running we were at war with and hard pressed by the terrible Jap? Don't they realize what would have happened if Candidate Dewey had then given away the secret of America's knowledge of the Jap code? President Roosevelt would have made one more speech. He would have pointed out—with the urgency and despair which any such recklessness would have warranted—that his opponent had struck a tremendous weapon from the hands of America for the mere hope of political gain. I do not believe Dewey would have been swept into any White House after that, do you?

Naturally Dewey did no such thing. For patriotic reasons. And for reasons of plain common sense, too, in my opinion. The Governor of New York is, I believe, a man of great intelligence, scrupulousness, and responsibleness.

But those who are still planning to beat a great, dead President ignore reality. They even seem to be unable to get Truman in focus. And they'd better. Harry Truman is an entirely different person from Franklin Roosevelt, for one thing. For another, it begins to appear that Truman has as much resolution and force and human vision as the man he so admired, the man he succeeded. And whatever happens, three years of peace will have passed between the surrender and the next elections. Pearl Harbor will not be an issue. The adversary of these few furious Republicans will be no ghost.

Demobilization of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a soldier:

OKINAWA, *September 20, 1945.*

Hon. BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the GI's who have been in the European theater from 12 to 40 months, and redeployed directly to the Pacific theater (without furlough), will try in this letter to convey to you some of our mutual hopes and fears concerning our speedy return home. It was not with a feeling of elation that we heard the news of Japan's surrender, for the same broadcast intimated that we would be retained here to occupy Japan. If that were the opinion of the Army alone, we could not gripe at you people back home, for we realize that in wartime, the Army has absolute control. It is now peacetime and you hold the reins. You can force the Army to change its plan, if it is your opinion too, that we should not be kept here.

How many times have we heard the statement, "I would go through anything to speed the end of the war so I can go home"? The Pacific GIs have gone through everything; yet their only wish is ignored. The victory they have won is empty, for they are not going home. They do not want glory, nor honor, or praise for their part in this war. These men want only one thing, that is to be with their wives and children, their mothers and fathers—the people they love. They want to continue again the life that was interrupted by the war. Naturally, we are all desirous that the entire world should benefit from the peace we have won, but we want to have a share in those benefits, too. Is anyone so selfish as to deny us veterans that pleasure? We have already been denied the happiness our victory should have brought by the callous and indifferent remark that we should be used to police Japan. The only reason given was that the Pacific GIs are the closest to Japan and, therefore, the logical ones for the job. Yes; they are close to Japan, probably as close as the Japs were to our shores when those same GIs started driving them back from Pearl Harbor across the thousands of miles of ocean to where they are now. After driving them from one small, blood-soaked island after another, they were forced to spend lonely, cheerless months on those same islands. Now that the war is won and their job is done, their spirits should be soaring instead of being lower than in the darkest days of the war.

The veterans out here realize as much as anyone else that Japan must be occupied and policed, for they have known her treachery first-hand. The question is whether they, or the thousands of fellows who were stationed in the States, should do it?

They want a plan which actually works, not one of promises and conditions which tells the people at home that all is being done quickly and fairly, when actually it affects so few that it is really of no consequence to the mass of GI's. They propose a system wherein it is compulsory that all men eligible be returned and discharged, so that no individual can keep a man in for selfish reasons.

The proposal that the GI's ask is fair and simple. The only specification they make is that action be taken immediately, for the delay has already been too long. They propose that the fellows in the States, who have never been overseas, be shipped over as occupational forces to allow the Pacific veterans to return home. Those who have been overseas the longest would be allowed to go home first, while those with the least service in the States would be the first overseas.

Within 3 months after the proposal is adopted, the veteran having more than 1 year of overseas service should be home, while the State-side soldier with less than 1 year in the Army should be overseas. Overseas duty for him would not be especially dangerous or lonely. He would have privileges that were denied the veteran he replaced. We are glad that he would not have to spend nights in a foxhole or days trading bullets with a Jap and that he would not be forced to spend months and even years over here as we did.

We all feel that some consideration should be given GI's who were redeployed directly to the Pacific Theater and have to go into Japan as occupation troops.

It is up to you people back there to see that our wishes are known and that action is taken, for our hands are tied.

China Moves Toward More Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement I made recently on the NBC program called The Pacific Story:

National independence, the first of the three principles which Dr. Sun Yat-sen laid down as the objectives of the Chinese revolution, has now been achieved under the direction of the party he established for that purpose, the Kuomintang Party, and under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, the loyal disciple whom he chose for the task.

After 34 years of struggle, the Republic of China stands today as an independent and equal nation among the nations of the earth. Extraterritoriality for foreigners in China is gone. The concessions controlled by various European powers have been returned. The Japanese attempt at conquest has been broken. Russia has signed a 30-year treaty of friendship, including a promise not to interfere in China's internal affairs. The Communists in China are without hope of outside assistance, and the danger of civil war is thereby greatly reduced. China at last is free.

With this great new opportunity comes a greater responsibility. For national independence is merely the necessary first step in order to make possible the second step of transferring control of the government from the hands of the Kuomintang Party to the hands of the people, and the third step of devoting more and more of the government's attention and energies to the improvement of the people's livelihood and welfare.

Achieving these further objectives will be almost as great a test as was the first. I know China's great leader, Chiang Kai-shek, welcomes that test. When in September 1943 he became the President of China as well as generalissimo, and thus had almost absolute power, the first thing he did was to state that within a year after the end of the war he would lay his power down. Few westerners at that time appreciated the significance of his words, but he knew and the Chinese knew that when he made that voluntary pledge he would have to make good on it. He himself has said, "If I die a dictator I shall go down into oblivion as all other dictators have gone. But if before I die I manage to give back power to the people, I shall be remembered in every Chinese home."

Political machinery must now be established which the Chinese people can handle and by which their collective will can be registered effectively. Their first constitution proclaimed in 1911 gave the people the right to vote. But it did not work, because most of the people in China had had no experience in government by elections. Understanding of the techniques of democracy comes largely by experience. One of the many values of the Peoples Political Council has been that it gave such political experience.

In some quarters it has been popular to criticize China for not making more rapid progress in achieving our type of democracy. Yet if looked at with perspective, it is clear that she has made substantial progress even in the midst of a cruel war of survival. In fact, the real import of recent political events in China is this: that at a time when so much of the rest of the world, including our own country, has been putting more and

more power into the hands of centralized government, the Chinese people and their greatest leaders are moving resolutely in the opposite direction. They are putting more power into the hands of the people. They have rejected the colonial system, which the imperialistic powers of Europe are trying to perpetuate in Asia; they have rejected totalitarianism of the Fascist pattern; they have rejected totalitarianism of the Communist pattern; they have rejected totalitarianism of the racial pattern which Japan tried to develop in Asia; they are deliberately choosing for themselves democracy of the American pattern with such modifications as their own particular situation and genius dictate.

This is the fact which overshadows all others. It has great significance not only for China and Asia but also for the United States. Our kind of democracy, with respect for the rights of each individual human being, is under attack in many parts of the world. We are now gaining a new partner in democracy, one whose experience with it will almost certainly determine which way Asia is to go.

Let us have no illusions about the ease of China's task. The Chinese know how great are the difficulties—the hunger, the disease, the poverty, the inflation, the lack of transportation and modern industry, the millions of refugees, the illiteracy, the sectionalisms. They know there are some in their Government who do not want to follow Chiang in laying down their power, and that there are those among the Communists who want to continue as a separate government with a private army, rather than become a loyal opposition in a unified China. It will take time for each group to learn to trust the other, and to trust the democratic way of winning support from the people—not by arms but by giving them better government.

Yes; it will be slow and hard, and there will be discouraging set-backs. We must learn to think in terms not of months or years but of decades. Nevertheless, the great moment of opportunity has come. China at long last is on the march toward government of the people, and by the people, and, therefore, for the people.

The Lost Generations of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William B. Plank from Power Plant Engineering for August 1945:

THE LOST GENERATIONS OF ENGINEERS

(By William B. Plank, professor and head, department of mining and metallurgical engineering, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.)

While the energies and interest of the entire country have been centered on winning the war against Germany and Japan, two very important and significant educational considerations seem to have been overlooked by those who are planning for the successful culmination of the war in Europe and in the Pacific, and for the expected rapid development or reconversion of our industries after the fighting stops.

It is eminently right and proper that all elements of our society should make their respective contributions to the winning of the war, and I have no criticism whatever of any Government agency which has had to put the common welfare and safety above the interest of any group.

It cannot be denied, however, that the successful prosecution of this war, more than of any other war in the history of the world, depends absolutely on the continued, phenomenal production of our American industries which, through the 'nventive genius and special skills of our American engineers, with the loyal support of labor, have produced and are producing the guns, ammunition, ships, and armament that have made our armed forces invincible on all fronts.

In addition to the engineers in industry, the armed forces who are winning our battles against the enemy so magnificently would be helpless without the peculiar, specialized, and brilliant abilities of the engineers in the uniforms of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Air Forces, and the merchant marine.

THE PRESENT SUPPLY OF ENGINEERS

With these facts well known and acknowledged by everyone, educators, whose job it is to train these engineers, are beginning to be alarmed at the present situation affecting the immediate and future supply of engineers to fill these absolutely vital functions in our Nation's existence.

The two points in this situation that seem to have been overlooked are that: (1) Unless we begin immediately to make it possible for qualified young men to complete their formal engineering education, there may well develop a critical shortage of engineers in the armed forces with a resultant prolonging of the war; and (2) even though we begin at once to train engineers, the vacancy in the normal supply of engineers from our engineering colleges will never be filled, and the expected development of our industries after the war consequently may not be fully realized.

WHO ARE THE "LOST GENERATIONS"?

It is these "lost generations of engineers" about which I wish to speak particularly. They are the men who, because of selective service, were prevented from completing or, in many cases, even beginning their formal education at the 150 or more engineering colleges of our country. They are, for the most part, in the uniforms of our armed forces. Although they may have received specialized training in the Army or Navy, their complete professional engineering education has been stopped, or at least seriously interrupted.

Ever since the selective service began to operate, especially after Pearl Harbor, the enrollment in the engineering colleges has been steadily dropping. In 1941–42, there were 15,000 engineering college graduates in the engineering colleges of the United States and Canada, as compared with 42,000 today. This is a drop of 64 percent in 3 years.

What is more alarming, however, is that the number of students who may receive their engineering college degrees this spring will be only about one-fifth the number that graduated 2 year ago. In 1942–43, there were 14,714 men graduated in engineering in the United States and Canadian colleges, whereas there are only 3,000 senior engineering students in college today, and not all of them will likely receive degrees for one reason or another. In normal years, between 12,000 and 15,000 engineering college graduates annually took their places in the industries of the United States and Canada.

ARE VETERANS FLOCKING TO ENGINEERING COLLEGES?

The common belief that the returning veterans will flock back to the engineering colleges in large numbers appears not to be borne out by studies made by educational authorities. It is estimated that about 60,000 veterans might be expected to apply for technical and engineering training, but not all of these will likely want to take the time to complete professional engineering courses.

From the partial picture we now have of the educational desires of the veterans already returned to us, it is seen that, for the most part, they will want short, special, intensive training courses to fit them for a job as soon as possible. This kind of training will likely be given largely by the colleges in industrial communities where the veteran can work at a job during the day and go to school at night.

The type of institution best suited for this work is the so-called technical institute, where the objective is the training of technicians for industry, or the upgrading of them in occupations for which professional engineering school graduation is not required. This type of training is admirably fitted for immediate productivity on completion of the training program, and for the attainment of occupational goals sooner than is normally the case with graduates of engineering colleges.

TECHNICAL INSTITUTES

From a recent study of vocational-technical training made by the United States Office of Education it was estimated that, on the average, industry needs 5.2 technicians for each engineer. There are not enough technical institutes at present to train all the technicians that are estimated to be essential for industry in the postwar days.

The study shows that not less than 250 of such institutions will meet the needs of the country, and that there should be 1 in each community of 50,000 or more.

It is the opinion of many educators, with whom I concur, that the professional engineering colleges should not attempt to provide the technical-institute type of training because they do not have the proper facilities nor the staff to do the work well.

These colleges, in my opinion, should now be planning for the professional engineering training of the young men now in secondary school. According to one estimate made last fall, three out of every four high-school seniors expect to go to college and 43.4 percent of these are planning to study engineering. The other choices in order are medicine, law, business administration, agriculture, and physical education.

The effect on our national life of the absence of the "lost generations of engineers" can never be fully remedied.

Bureaucracy Rides the Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article prepared by me and published in Nation's Business, September 1945, to wit:

BUREAUCRACY RIDES THE RIVERS

Unless a halt is called, the United States faces the prospect of being burdened with eight new independent Government agencies, superbureaucracies, called regional or valley authorities, each with lump sum appropriations and controlled by three-man oligarchies with enough power to influence the economic and social life of large areas of the country.

Only indirectly responsible to Congress, these agencies will be performing operations which, in many cases, will duplicate functions already set up in the regular governmental Departments of War, Interior, and

Agriculture. In some instances, they will supersede some of the activities of these departments. And, if the past is a criterion, they will have carte blanche to use their appropriations for extracurricular purposes of social engineering which, in my judgment, the people of the various regions should do for themselves.

Already a start has been made:

First came the Tennessee Valley Authority, an experimental project created primarily to test out hydroelectric power possibilities, and secondarily navigation and flood control. More recently Congress has been asked to approve the Missouri Valley Authority, expressly designed for flood control and reclamation, with the development of hydroelectric power, but endowed with far-reaching economic experimentation prerogatives.

These two are the opening wedges for a system of seven more authorities of the same pattern to operate in seven other regions of the United States as Congress can be talked into appropriating the money. The other seven proposed are:

The Atlantic Seaboard Authority, including the Savannah River and generally rivers flowing into the Atlantic, from Maine to Florida.

The Great Lakes-Ohio Valley Authority for rivers flowing into or from the Great Lakes, and including the Ohio River and its tributaries except the Cumberland River which would be added to the Tennessee Valley Authority, to which would also be added rivers flowing into the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

The Arkansas Valley Authority for the Arkansas, the White, the Red, the Rio Grande Rivers and for other rivers flowing into the Gulf of Mexico west of the Mississippi River.

The Southwestern Authority for rivers flowing into the Great Basin with no outlet to the sea.

The Columbia Valley Authority for the Columbia River and other rivers flowing into the Pacific north of the California-Oregon line.

The California Authority for rivers flowing into the Pacific Ocean south of the California-Oregon line.

The Colorado Valley Authority for the drainage basin of the Colorado River in the United States.

I am not opposed to the flood control or reclamation objectives with the development of incidental hydroelectric power which are the expressed aims of the promoters, but I am opposed to the mushrooming plan of new bureaucracies. As a Member of Congress for more than 20 years, and as chairman of the House Committee on Flood Control for many years, I have been an outspoken advocate of effective flood control and wise reclamation projects.

But when I approve the building of a levee or a dam, I want to know that the job will be done by a veteran staff of engineers like the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, who have been doing this kind of work for the Government successfully for more than 125 years. When I endorse a land reclamation project, I would like to have the assurance that the enterprise will be carried out by an experienced agency like the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, with funds for which it will be responsible directly to Congress. I prefer to leave the soil conservation and the reforestation jobs to the skilled technicians of the Department of Agriculture.

I hesitate to turn the Government's money over to a so-called authority, staffed, perhaps, by planners and idealists interested in remaking society according to their ideas, and vested with power to use part of the funds as they choose for social and economic experimentation instead of building dams and reclaiming land.

I am opposed to the creation of a string of these authorities, superbureaucracies responsible directly to no one but themselves.

I believe in reducing instead of increasing bureaucracy. Uncontrolled bureaucracy leads to irresponsible bureaucracy.

I believe in direct accountability for public expenditures. I oppose lump-sum appropriations or their equally undesirable equivalent, the so-called revolving funds. The bills creating authorities are usually enveloped in vague phraseology, including phrases that could be stretched to justify engaging in activities which many patriotic taxpaying Americans do not consider proper governmental functions.

I believe in definite appropriations for definite purposes. Public projects should be safeguarded. In the case of the authorities the selection and improvement of the projects rests generally with the authority itself. I believe the representatives of the people who levy the taxes should have a voice in the approval of the projects to be constructed.

I am opposed to authorities because they would duplicate much of the machinery already functioning in the established governmental departments. To the taxpayer, this means added expense.

CONGRESS SHOULD HAVE CONTROL

Under existing law, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior submit their studies and surveys to Congress for approval. Under the authority plan these departments could even be subjected to the control of the authority in certain areas, the authority being supreme in its own territory and free to use its own technicians or to borrow those of the other Government departments and blueprint their operations.

I do not think it is necessary or efficient to form new agencies to "coordinate" the various development operations, such as planting trees, improving soils, building dams and levees. Government departments often work together on a single project. If an authority is necessary to coordinate these varying functions, we might as well combine the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. If the departments do not cooperate, the remedy, in my judgment, is not to scrap the department, but for Congress to insist upon cooperation.

There is plenty of chance for dissension inside the structure of the new authorities themselves due to an inherent defect of their organization. The authorities are managed by three-man directorates. A public enterprise needs to be operated by a single executive who can make prompt decisions as he goes along. Divided authority can be worse than no authority.

When I make this statement I have in mind the clashes and differences of opinion that developed among the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority under the chairmanship of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan. The clashes were fundamental. Inefficiency and delay in management resulted. Resort was finally had to court proceedings for the determination of the President's power to oust Dr. Arthur E. Morgan.

TANGLES HARD TO CORRECT

In trying to dodge possible rivalries among the existing governmental departments, we can tumble into an even more serious tangle inside the directors' room of the Authority itself, a tangle that will be harder to correct because it is further removed from congressional or executive control.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was created in 1933 by the first regional authority act passed by Congress. It was intended primarily for the development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River where there are greater power possibilities than along any other river east of the Rocky Mountains. Previous efforts to take advantage of these resources had been thwarted by the shortsighted opposition to the utilization of the Muscle Shoals project by private utility interests. The Authority, it was hoped, would serve as a useful yardstick to measure the value of water power development.

I have supported the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I gladly accord to it all the credit it deserves in the reduction of power rates. It should be borne in mind, however, that Congress has passed other legislation that has materially contributed to the reduction of power rates, including the Public Utility Act and the Securities Exchange Act.

On the flood control side, the picture is less roseate. The fact is that, instead of protecting the Tennessee Valley from floods, the construction of dams from the mouth of the Tennessee River to its source has converted the entire valley into reservoirs. Before the Authority was created it was estimated that the greatest area that could be overflowed was 420,000 acres. Now 360,000 acres, or six-sevenths of the entire area, is permanently under water in the reservoir bottoms of the Tennessee Valley. Other careful estimates aver that substantially all the lands that were overflowed are now condemned as bottoms for reservoirs.

The Directors of the Valley Authority concede that their improvements have converted those lands to perpetual overflow as bottoms of reservoirs. They virtually admit that any flood control benefits accruing from the Tennessee Valley Authority improvements operate to the advantage of the lower Mississippi River in the reduction of flood heights from Cairo south.

OUTSTANDING JOBS BY ARMY

The one outstanding job of flood control along the Tennessee River will not be done by the Authority, but by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, who recommended the project authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1911. That is the flood control project for the protection of the city of Chattanooga recommended by the Corps of Engineers and approved by the Valley Authority, even though it is not connected with its construction. The contention of those who urge authorities for cooperation is thus exploded in the only authority thus far authorized by Congress.

It is claimed that the Authority has furthered navigation along the Tennessee River. Casual investigation will show that adequate navigation could have been provided by low dams at much smaller cost.

One of my principal objections to a general adoption of a region or valley authorities plan has to do with its probable effect on the Corps of Engineers of the War Department and consequently on future national defense. The Tennessee Valley Authority did not use the corps in any of its enterprises.

Generally the authorities plan to use their own engineers. The Corps of Engineers would thus be deprived of its traditional means of obtaining training and experience in peacetime for its vital tasks in war.

It is not an accident that in World War II many of the outstanding engineering accomplishments, as well as the miracles of supply of the United States Army, have been achieved by the Army engineers. Proof of the value of this training is the long list of "high-water fighters" who have won distinction in the war theaters.

Among those who have graduated from service on the rivers in this country are Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding the Army Service Forces; Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Army Engineers; Lt. Gen. John C. H. Lee, chief of supply on the staff of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and deputy commander in chief; Maj. Gen. Thomas B. Larkin, deputy commanding general and chief of communications zone, European theater; Maj. Gen. Donald H. Connolly, who built the Russian supply base in Iran; Lt. Gen. Daniel I. Sultan, commander of the American forces in Burma; Maj. Gen. Daniel

Noce, who conceived and trained the amphibian engineers who took part both in the European and Pacific invasions; Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, who built the Ledo Road; Maj. Gen. William Hoge, who built the Alaskan Highway, and was first to cross the Remagen Bridge over the Rhine in the European invasion. There are many others.

EXPERIENCED IN RIVER CONTROL

The Corps of Engineers has a background and experience in river control and river improvement unequaled in the world. They planned, built, and operated virtually all flood-control programs for the Mississippi, the Ohio, the White, and the Red Rivers, and for many other river basins.

When we have a Corps of Engineers of this kind at our disposal, it simply doesn't make sense not to use them.

Nor do I see why the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior should not carry on with its outstanding record of reclamation projects accomplished for the Government since 1902. It has demonstrated its worth. It has not been utilized by the Tennessee Valley Authority any more than the Tennessee Valley Authority has used the Soil Conservation and the Forest Services of the Department of Agriculture already in existence to do just such jobs as the Tennessee Valley Authority chose to do on its own.

I do not think that any social or cultural planning, however praiseworthy its objectives, should be part of a flood-control and land-reclamation project. There are some things a community should do for itself if it is to retain its strength and its initiative. We are individualists in America.

In the Tennessee Valley Authority I have observed a marked tendency by those in control to divert their energies and a definite portion of their funds to purposes of economic experimentation with social and cultural byproducts. At Norris and, as I recall, at Fontana, permanent school buildings were constructed. Libraries with circulating facilities have been built. Community buildings have been erected. Fertilizer has been provided for local farms. Nurseries for reforestation have been established. Soil experiments have been made.

These ventures were financed from appropriations under the large discretionary powers possessed by the Authority intended primarily for the development of hydroelectric power. The powers of the Authority are broad. They embrace the economic and social development of the valley. The language can be constructed for very liberal social planning. The words "social" and "cultural" occur in the additional authorities proposed.

The opportunities for using funds appropriated by Congress for social planning and for remaking the society of the area are couched in language that is most inviting to those who would remake and reform the country. Community planning is desirable, but not when it results in one pattern for all communities.

FUNDS BY DEVIOUS WAYS

It is interesting to recall that the first dam built by the Tennessee Valley Authority was not specifically authorized for construction by Congress. Funds were provided for the initiation of the Wheeler Dam and the Pickwick Dam under the National Industrial Recovery Act. Subsequently the Tennessee Valley obtained money from the Works Progress Administration or from Public Works funds, all of which were lump-sum appropriations.

I do not think it is wise to give a Government agency such wide latitude of discretion that it can do almost anything it wants to, back almost any economic or social project, on the ground that it will further its general program of economic and social development. With its easy and liberal spending powers and its control over local development operations, it would not be difficult for an authority to mold a great part of the life of the area in which it operates.

Multiply the Tennessee Valley Authority by nine, for the nine proposed regions, and you have a new and powerful trend that could materially change the American way of life—and not for the better.

A More Balanced World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Fielding Eliot from the Washington Star of September 26, 1945:

A MORE BALANCED WORLD

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

The postwar policies of the Soviet Union seem to center on the idea of security. This leads Soviet statesmen into the somewhat paradoxical position of insisting on the formation of an association of closely knit states around their own frontiers, for the better protection of their own country, while opposing any close association of Western European states as being necessarily anti-Soviet in character and therefore dangerous to Soviet security. Thus, in effect, the Russians say to the western states: You must trust us, but we do not trust you.

Upon the dissolution of this paradox depends to a great extent the future security of the world. There may not at present be any imminent danger of the world dividing into eastern and western groups, of increasing hostility to each other; but such a danger may appear unless present tendencies can be checked, and particularly unless a greater degree of confidence can be established between the Russian people on the one hand, and the American, British, and western European peoples on the other.

The cynical observer of the postwar world might point out, with considerable truth, that it is a curious commentary on the congenital weaknesses of the human race that this whole structure of fear and suspicion is largely imaginary; that, as a matter of fact, the western powers have no designs whatever upon the security and well-being of the Soviet people; nor is there any real reason to suppose that the Russians have any designs upon the security and well-being of any of the western nations. But this is no moment to listen to cynics, nor to airy dreamers, either. It is a moment for practical and reasonable consideration of the facts, and for action based on facts and not upon either prejudice or illusion.

As a matter of fact, there exists an Anglo-American unity which is potentially the greatest power in the world. The hard facts of the war have demonstrated that the United States and the nations of the British Commonwealth form a natural military unit, conformable to the conditions of modern war. They possess between them, today, not only the dread secret of atomic warfare, but also the sea power, the long-range air power, the industrial and technical resources, and the world-wide system of bases by which the split-second, highly mobile military forces of today can best be operated and supported.

The hard facts of the postwar world have demonstrated that on almost every conceivable phase of policy the interests of the American people and the interests of the peoples of the British Commonwealth run in conjunction, or at least in parallel. These two collections of hard facts—military and political—dictate to both nations that they must find a means to achieve an economic community of interest, in order that their military and political unity, upon which their safety has been demonstrated to depend, may not be impaired.

Yet when all this is recognized—as it is not yet fully recognized by everyone—there still remains the necessity for finding a policy which will promote the growth of confidence and friendship between the English-speaking states and the Soviet Union.

Bank Earnings and Interest Rates

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the growth of the Federal debt plus the fact that so much of it is becoming funded in the form of short-term paper and more and more shifting to bank portfolios raises questions which all students of banking will have to become interested in, and that is the earnings of banks, and whether or not interest rates remain high, as well as whether or not the capital funds of banks are adequate. A study has been made by a prominent banker of my State, Mr. Howard J. Stoddard, president of one of the larger banks out there, dealing with these three questions. I submit it for the RECORD for the information of the Members of Congress and others who may be interested:

AN ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL BANKING IN THE UNITED STATES

In common with most bankers, I have been deeply interested during recent months in the current discussions relative to commercial banking in the United States. My interest has been largely centered on the three major questions:

1. Are bank earnings excessive?
2. Will interest rates remain at the present levels?
3. Are bank capital funds adequate?

While attempting to form some satisfactory personal conclusions from the various statements and articles dealing with these questions, I took occasion to study rather carefully the published statistical reports relative to banking operations. I set down for my guidance, in comparative form, the consolidated balance sheets and earning statements of all insured commercial banks in the country over a 10-year period.

The visual presentation of this data, in condensed form, gave me a reasonable, satisfactory answer to the foregoing questions. The thought then occurred to me that other banks might be equally interested in these reports and some of the conclusions which seem obvious from a study of the figures. With this thought in mind, I am pleased to present the following brief analysis.

ARE BANK EARNINGS EXCESSIVE?

During the past 10-year period, the average net earnings of all commercial banks have been but 6.6 percent, certainly not an excessive amount. Increased earnings of 8.5 percent for 1943 and 9.4 percent for 1944 on total capital funds do not necessarily forecast a continued increase. As a matter of fact, probably the high point was reached in 1944, as future earnings will be adversely

affected by (1) a leveling off of increase in deposits, (2) lower interest rates on loans and investments as maturities are being refunded at lower rates, (3) increased taxation as proportion of tax-exempt securities decline, (4) increased operating expenses.

The dividend average of 3.4 percent for the 10-year period is very conservative, and it will be noted that the rate has not been increased during the past 2 years, thus permitting substantial increases to the capital funds.

Statements of all insured commercial banks in United States

[000,000 omitted]

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
ASSETS										
Cash and due from banks	$13,851	$15,731	$14,931	$17,176	$21,875	$26,290	$25,793	$27,594	$27,191	$29,746
United States securities	13,275	14,750	13,670	14,506	15,567	17,064	21,047	40,712	58,694	75,896
Total cash and Government securities	27,126	30,481	28,601	31,682	37,442	43,354	46,840	68,306	85,885	105,642
Other securities	6,841	7,556	6,807	6,944	6,860	7,099	6,985	6,632	5,985	6,157
Loans and discounts	14,698	15,940	16,717	16,024	16,866	18,398	21,262	18,907	18,843	21,355
Bank buildings and real estate	1,747	1,738	1,680	1,769	1,657	1,534	1,430	1,348	1,201	1,079
Other assets	505	480	416	381	321	335	310	266	332	380
Total assets	50,917	56,195	54,221	56,800	63,146	70,720	76,827	95,459	112,246	134,613
LIABILITIES										
Commercial deposits	30,945	35,317	32,517	34,949	40,839	47,716	53,561	71,559	84,956	101,793
Savings deposits	13,180	13,941	14,674	14,830	15,237	15,753	15,860	16,261	19,160	23,959
Total deposits	44,125	49,258	47,191	49,779	56,076	63,469	69,421	87,820	104,116	125,752
Other liabilities	582	609	626	586	546	577	564	583	676	871
Capital stock	3,300	3,081	3,030	2,982	2,914	2,872	2,849	2,849	2,875	2,912
Surplus	1,946	2,184	2,268	2,247	2,443	2,563	2,686	2,802	3,090	3,402
Undivided profits	548	666	712	742	789	838	896	972	1,006	1,169
Reserves	416	397	394	364	378	401	411	433	483	507
Capital funds	6,210	6,328	6,404	6,435	6,524	6,674	6,842	7,056	7,454	7,990
Total liabilities	50,917	56,195	54,221	56,800	63,146	70,720	76,827	95,459	112,246	134,613

Earnings of all insured commercial banks in United States

[000,000 omitted]

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Interest on securities	$547	$573	$572	$522	$522	$500	$509	$610	$861	$1,090
Interest on loans	642	663	708	705	727	768	848	805	692	681
Other income	294	328	351	347	356	363	373	376	406	444
Operating income	1,483	1,564	1,631	1,584	1,605	1,631	1,730	1,791	1,959	2,215
Interest on time deposits	277	237	235	229	215	201	190	175	164	187
Salaries and wages	410	437	463	473	483	497	527	564	594	640
Federal and State taxes	79	98	107	103	107	123	153	177	228	300
Other expenses	315	353	360	353	355	372	396	387	398	433
Operating expenses	1,081	1,125	1,165	1,158	1,160	1,193	1,266	1,303	1,384	1,560
Net operating income	402	439	466	426	445	438	464	488	575	655
Nonoperating income	−195	84	−86	−126	−57	−37	−10	−48	62	96
Net income	207	523	380	300	388	401	454	440	637	751
Percent on capital funds	3.3	8.3	5.9	4.7	5.9	6.0	6.7	6.2	8.5	9.4
Dividends	$207	$223	$225	$222	$232	$237	$253	$227	$233	$253
Percent on capital funds	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.2	3.1	3.2
Addition to capital funds	----------	$300	$155	$78	$156	$164	$201	$213	$404	$498
Number of banks	14,123	13,970	13,795	13,659	13,535	13,438	13,427	13,347	13,274	13,268

WILL INTEREST RATES REMAIN AT PRESENT LEVELS?

During 1935 the banks were earning 2.7 percent on some $20,000,000,000 of securities. Ten years later, or in 1944, the rate of return had declined to 1.3 percent on about $82,000,000,000 of securities. On loans and discounts the decline has been from 4.4 percent on $14,000,000,000 to 3.2 percent on $21,000,000,000. Income from other sources during the same period has gradually increased, but it is not a determining factor in the over-all picture.

The Federal Government, through the issuance of more than $250,000,000,000 of securities to banks and other investors, has created an interest pattern which, if revised sharply upward, would cause a substantial decrease in quoted market values. Furthermore, enormous refunding programs must be carried out within the present rate structure in order to minimize the burden of carrying this tremendous debt. It seems almost mandatory that the fiscal powers of the Government must, and undoubtedly will be, utilized so that interest rates will remain at or near the present levels for many years to come.

The profitable functioning of the banking system seems assured through the simple fact that despite a substantially lower rate of interest, banks now have through increased deposits $3 to invest for each $1 they had for a similar purpose in 1935.

ARE BANK CAPITAL FUNDS ADEQUATE?

In 1935 the banks had $1 for capital funds for each $7 of deposits. Ten years later, in 1944, banks had $1 of capital funds for each $15 of deposits. However, due to the fact that the increase in deposits has been largely invested in United States Government bonds, the ratio of bank capital to risk assets has not changed in the 10-year period.

If the capital funds of the Nation's banks were now increased to the ratio of 1935, then earnings would be inadequate to justify the additional investment. Whereas in 1935 banks could make a fair return with a deposit leverage of 7 to 1, today a leverage of 15 to 1 of deposits to capital is required because of the lower yield on loans and investments.

Unless one views the stability of the Federal debt with misgivings, present bank capital, on the average, appears adequate, as there is no factual evidence to support the belief that risk assets will increase materially during the coming years, and the policy of retaining one-half to two-thirds of earnings in the capital accounts should offset the percentage gain in assets other than Government bonds.

The foregoing analysis has been based on consolidated figures of all commercial banks, and certain average figures which have been quoted will, of course, be entirely different for each individual bank.

HOWARD J. STODDARD,
President, Michigan National Bank.
LANSING, MICH., *September 30, 1945.*

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the single most important issue before this country today, and before the whole world, is how to control the use of atomic energy. Unless we and our allies solve that problem, we face the prospect in the next half century of a return to the cliff dweller or cave man stage of civilization.

The scientists who created the atomic bomb have spent sleepless nights on the question of what to do with their brain

child. The fact that in some places they have been kept almost incommunicado makes it all the more important that their views be given wide publicity and study.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a statement from a group of these scientists still residing in one of the centers where the bomb was developed:

The development and use of the atomic bomb has introduced an important new element into world politics and has created a situation fraught with grave danger for our Nation and the world. Many of the scientists who have been working on atomic bombs as a necessary military measure in time of national peril did so with misgivings concerning the ultimate repercussions of such a discovery. Consequently, they have been thinking about this situation for a considerably longer time than was possible for the public. We feel that it is our duty to present to the public the basic facts concerning the atomic bomb and their implications for United States foreign policy. Only by a full realization of these facts can the citizens of this country intelligently participate in making the decisions that the unleashing of atomic energy compels us to take. If wrong decisions are made, it may mean the destruction of our cities, horrible death for millions of our people, and possibly the end of our Nation.

We propose to discuss this problem by analyzing possible courses of action for our Government.

ALTERNATE I. NO CHANGE IN PRESENT INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Many Americans believe, either after serious consideration or because of inadequate information, that no special change in our national policy is necessary. Arguments supporting this view are that the atomic bomb does not change the basic causes of international friction and war, that it is not a development of sufficient magnitude to change the nature of warfare, that an effective defense is sure to be found, and that moral pressure and the fear of retaliation will prevent the use of atomic bombs or prevent war altogether.

Importance of the atomic bomb

The primary feature of the atomic bomb is its tremendous destructive power. The newspaper accounts of the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are adequate for an appraisal of the present destructiveness. By using more bombs, larger bombs and more efficient bombs it will be possible in the near future to completely destroy the bulk of the population, industry, and military strength of any nation within a few weeks. Moreover, aviation and rocket developments might enable this to be accomplished within a few hours, without possibility of effective retaliation. Alternately, strategic locations may be mined in advance by agents of foreign nations. A factor of such extreme destructiveness cannot be neglected in formulating our foreign policy. By constituting a serious threat to the safety of every nation, it intensifies the causes of friction and of war.

Possibility of specific defense

In spite of the adage, "to each offensive weapon there has been found a defense," we as scientists can offer no hope of a specific defense against the atomic bomb. The only immediate defensive measures are retaliation, counter-offensive or "preventive" warfare, but these will not restore the ruins of our cities nor revive the millions of our dead. Dispersal of population and industry over wide areas or underground can reduce the efficiency of atomic bomb raids, but cannot be considered an adequate permanent defense.

Moral sanctions

Moral considerations did not prevent the use of atomic bombs against Japan, but it might be argued that the population at large was not consulted in this decision. It is evident, however, that the Allied people have, to a large extent, approved the decision subsequently. In time of war, moral sanctions have never prevented the use of any weapon, no matter how terrible. Moreover, those having control over the use of atomic bombs may not be subject to moral pressure of the world in general.

Fear of retaliation

In the past, fear of retaliation has never been a deterrent to aggressors who thought they had a chance to win. Fear of being subjected to atomic bomb attacks may, in fact, enhance the possibility that a nation will itself use them as a preventive measure.

As a result of these considerations it is evident that the world situation is definitely and considerably altered by the introduction of the atomic bomb, and that this factor must be given major consideration in our foreign policy.

ALTERNATIVE II. UNITED STATES SUPREMACY IN ATOMIC WARFARE

Many people feel that the security of the United States can best be preserved by maintaining supremacy in atomic warfare. They propose that we keep the secret of making atom bombs, that we seek to corner the strategic materials, that we produce more numerous and more deadly bombs, and disperse our population and industries.

Keep it secret

Those who advocate that the secret of the atomic bomb be kept mislead our own people rather than other countries. There are no longer any fundamental secrets about the atomic bomb. The Government has made public the broad outline of the discovery and methods which led to success. The remaining secrets are scientific and engineering details. It would be foolish to suppose that scientists and engineers in other countries would not be able to redevelop at least one of the methods we have used or develop new methods. It took the Anglo-Americans 3 years to achieve the transformation from the laboratory to the plant scale. Working with the knowledge that this transformation has actually been achieved, even those nations with lesser resources than those of the United States will be able to produce atomic bombs within 2 to 5 years.

A very dangerous consequence of a policy of secrecy is that while spurring other nations to develop atomic bombs by withholding detailed information from the majority of our own scientists we will artificially channel and sterilize the further development of nuclear physics and chemistry in our own country.

United States control of raw materials

It has been suggested that a way to monopolize atomic bombs is for the Anglo-Americans to control the raw material necessary for their fabrication. The world-wide distribution of uranium ores does not permit us to achieve this control unilaterally, except by conquest. Before the war there were known uranium deposits in Canada, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, and Russia. Other deposits have undoubtedly been discovered since. It would be foolhardy to rely on the assumption that we alone or together with Britain can deprive the rest of the world of access to enough uranium for the production of atomic explosives.

Bigger and better bombs

If we cannot hope to monopolize atomic power, cannot we make our future secure by producing more and better bombs than the rest of the world?

Producing more and better bombs may be necessary for what security it does give during the next 5 years. However, we want to warn emphatically that more and better bombs cannot provide us with lasting security. Because of the tremendous potential destructiveness of atomic bombs, and because of the industrial and population concentration of the United States, having more and better bombs is no defense. Once a nation possesses a certain minimum number of bombs, there is no great advantage in having more. In a few years a nation with a small number of atomic bombs carried by rockets or planted as mines in our cities could in a few minutes destroy most of the industrial resources of the United States and much of its population.

Furthermore, if we have more and better bombs, another nation may fear, justifiably or not, an attack by us, and deem it necessary to attack first.

Dispersal of population and industries in the United States

The only known possible defense to existing atomic bombs is the dispersal of industry. By not presenting single targets of sufficient concentration, the effect of atomic bombs can then be reduced. However, there is no reason to doubt that in the future, atomic bombs of sufficient number and destructiveness can become available so that decentralization of industry will be only a partial defense. This would also be a difficult and costly program, resulting in a severe economic dislocation and disorganization. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the United States could carry out a program of decentralizing industry and population without exercising totalitarian powers which would destroy both democracy and free enterprise.

ALTERNATIVE III. IMMEDIATE WORLD CONQUEST

If we reveal no more information to other nations, the United States may maintain leadership for a few years. It is almost certain that after 5 years all of the great powers will, if not prevented by force or agreement, possess atomic bombs in such number, size, and efficiency that raids can produce tremendously more destruction than that inflicted on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Science can promise no defense against such raids. Because of the industrial concentration of the United States and the congestion of our cities, we are especially vulnerable to such attacks and it is entirely possible if we do not decentralize our industries, that most of our industrial potential could be wiped out by such raids in the first 10 minutes of war.

This means that after 5 years the United States cannot rely for its security upon producing more numerous and more deadly atomic bombs. This knowledge has led some to propose that the United States insure its security by forcibly preventing other nations from producing atomic bombs. Since no nation would peacefully consent to our suppression of their development of atomic power, this course of action means that we must conquer the world within the next 5 years, before the other nations of the world achieve equality in atomic power. At the present stage of atomic-bomb development, such world conquest would be neither quick nor certain. Clearly, such a policy is against the democratic tradition and expressed views of the American people. In fact, it is hard to see in what way such a course of action differs from that of the Nazis.

ALTERNATIVE IV. INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC POWER

International control of atomic power is another alternative that has been widely proposed. No specific plans have been prepared, and we do not intend to offer one here. We recognize that any such plan involves many difficulties, and may require that in order to preserve the peace of the world,

we forego some potential peaceful applications of atomic power and some phases of our national sovereignty. The alternatives are clear. If we ignore the potentialities of atomic warfare, in less than a generation we may find ourselves on the receiving end of atomic raids. If we seek to achieve our own security through supremacy in atomic warfare, we will find that in 10 years the whole world is as adequately armed as we, and that the threat of imminent destruction will bring about a "preventive" war. If we recognize that our present leadership in atomic power can last at the most several years, and we attempt to dominate the world, we will find ourselves immediately involved in another and greater war in violation of our democratic moral code and with no assurance of victory.

In view of the disastrous nature of these alternatives, we must expend every effort to achieve international cooperation and control as the only real and possible long-term solution.

We strongly urge the people of the United States and their leaders to think about, and find a means for, the international control of atomic power. The United States must exert its leadership to promote world peace. The people of the United States, together with the peoples of the rest of the world, must demand that their leaders work together to find the means of effective international cooperation on atomic power. They must not fail. The alternatives lead to world suicide.

War Food Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, September 28, 1945.

Hon. MALCOLM C. TARVER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE TARVER: Pursuant to the request of the committee and in accordance with my intention as expressed to you, I would like to outline the steps which I have taken thus far to remedy the conditions set forth in the committee's report of June 1945 relating to the investigation of the War Food Administration under House Resolution 50.

At the outset I want to express to the committee my sincere appreciation for the great value which the information obtained as a result of the investigation and the suggestions and conclusions of the committee have been to me in the beginning of my work as Secretary of Agriculture. I have not only made a careful study of the report, but have kept it constantly before me as a guide for deciding many questions that have arisen in connection with the merger of the War Food Administration with the Department of Agriculture. I have insisted that the members of my staff become thoroughly acquainted with the report and, as we have approached each administrative problem, we have tried to set machinery in motion which will eventually lead to the elimination of the conditions criticized by the committee.

I had hardly begun the difficult task of merging the functions and activities of the War Food Administration with those of the Department of Agriculture in accordance with Executive Order No. 9577, when I was confronted with the necessity for acting immediately on many new problems that arose when the war ended sooner than most of us expected. The cessation of hostilities brought about a termination of the lend-lease program, sharp reductions in food procurement by the armed forces, the necessity for reconsidering and revising Government war policies and programs, and the relaxation or removal of many restrictions and controls which I felt were no longer justified. These and other changes that came with the war's end have been of such far-reaching importance and urgency as to require almost the full time and attention of most officials in the Department of Agriculture. As a result, we have not had the opportunity to act as quickly on the problems presented in your report as I had anticipated. In spite of the pressing nature of these developments, however, I have moved forward as rapidly as the time remaining after the handling of current work would permit.

As I analyzed the report at the time I became Secretary of Agriculture, the major conclusions which I derived from it were that the organization and operations of the War Food Administration with respect to the activities covered by the investigation were deficient in two important, basic respects: (1) It was not organized in the manner needed for placing jurisdiction among its component parts, for fixing responsibility and for installing workable procedures for carrying out its numerous and complicated activities; and (2) its fiscal, inventory, and other controls were inadequate for its large-scale operations in the procurement, storage, transportation, and disposition of food and other agricultural commodities.

To meet the first of these deficiencies, I appointed a committee on organization immediately upon taking office to make recommendations regarding needed changes. This committee was under the chairmanship of Milton Eisenhower, president of Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, and in addition to some departmental employees, it included Mr. Jesse W. Tapp, vice president of the Bank of America; Mr. Gerald K. Thorne, vice president of Wilson & Co.; and Mr. E. W. Gaumnitz, executive secretary of the National Cheese Institute. After an intensive examination of the existing organization, this committee recommended that I establish a Production and Marketing Administration in which would be consolidated the numerous bureaus and offices engaged in administering the production and marketing programs of the Department. I acted favorably on this recommendation, and on August 18, 1945, issued a memorandum establishing the new organization.

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of this agency is the fact that its head is not only its principal administrative officer but is also President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This concentration of responsibility will, I believe, avoid many of the difficulties that have arisen as a result of the division of authority heretofore existing where one man as President of the Commodity Credit Corporation has been responsible for fiscal control of and accountability for the Corporation's assets and another has been responsible for program operations.

Since I am attaching a copy of the memorandum for your information, it will not be necessary to discuss its provisions in detail but I do want to point out some other salient features. It is organized primarily along commodity lines with a complete consolidation in one commodity branch of all of the production and marketing functions and activities relating to that commodity. Heretofore these functions and activities in the case of several important commodities were divided among as many as four separate agencies. Under this new set-up when I, or a Member of the Congress, want to know the answer to some sugar question, for example, we can call on the sugar branch where the responsibility for all such programs and activities relating to sugar are now vested.

The organization also includes a field service branch where its programs dealing directly with farmers are carried out in the field by State and county agricultural committees through which the farmer will have an active part in the development and administration of production, marketing, and other programs affecting him.

A great deal of work remains to be done before we can complete the physical consolidation of offices and personnel of this large agency into an efficiently operating unit, but I believe it provides the basic framework through which we can eliminate most of the confusion and division of authority which the committee pointed out, and achieve the coordination and supervision which you have found lacking.

I fully realize that it is not enough to establish a proper organization. It is of equal, if not greater, importance to obtain competent personnel for supervising its activities and to see that adequate procedures are provided for within the organization to guide and control its operations. It has been exceedingly difficult to obtain men with the required training and experience to fill some key positions. After exhausting the rolls of the Department and suggested sources in private business, I turned to the War and Navy Departments. With the cooperation of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, we have obtained nine carefully selected men who I believe will strengthen some of our weakest spots.

I was so impressed with the committee's conclusions regarding the inadequacy of our financial and inventory records and by my own examination of the situation which I found in the Department that I decided to call in an outstanding businessman to advise me as to what should be done. Fortunately I was able to obtain, on a consulting basis, the services of Mr. Luther H. Hodges, vice president of Marshall Field & Co., and requested him to inform me what steps should be taken in order to make available to my office (a) a perpetual inventory that is accurate; (b) a monthly report that will show our stocks by classes in units and/or dollars; (c) follow-up system that will disclose shortages and spoilages; and (d) a current record of purchases, allocations, etc. After a brief but careful study of the situation, Mr. Hodges made a number of recommendations which we are putting into effect as rapidly as possible.

Among other things, Mr. Hodges urged me to obtain a strong, experienced man to take charge of inventory management and related work of the Production and Marketing Administration. To fill this post, I persuaded the Secretary of War to detail Col. R. L. Harrison to my office. I selected Colonel Harrison because of my personal knowledge of his financial independence, his integrity, and proven ability for this type of work. For more than 25 years Colonel Harrison has successfully directed activities of this kind in several large business organizations having annual inventory turn-overs which exceed a million dollars. He comes to us from the Army Service Forces with an excellent record of successful direction of Army activities similar in nature to those for which he will be responsible in the Department. As Assistant Administrator for Inventory Management of the Production and Marketing Administration, Colonel Harrison will be generally responsible for managing and controlling all its inventories for the issuance of procurement and sales policy, for giving general direction to the activities of the Shipping and Storage Branch and for coordinating procurement, sales, and shipping, and

storage functions of the various branches of the new agency.

While it will require more time than has been available to us and much intensive work to get our inventory controls and records in proper condition, we feel that considerable improvement has already been effected.

The General Accounting Office took a physical inventory of the commodities held by the Office of Supply as of March 31, 1945, and transmitted a report on this inventory on June 2, 1945. The inventory records maintained by the Inventory Accounting Section in the Fiscal Branch have been adjusted with the assistance of this inventory and an adjusted inventory as of June 30, 1945, has been obtained. This inventory was also reconciled with reports of warehousemen showing commodities in storage on June 30, 1945, and we feel that it is the most accurate inventory that has been made on commodities under the control of the former Office of Supply. Procedures have been issued for improving the recording and speeding up the reporting of inventory transactions. On March 1, 1945, measures were taken to correct the erroneous method of pricing all sales at the published bulletin prices. Since that time sales have been reported at prices specified in the sales contracts.

The system of accounting for losses was revised on July 1, 1945, and accurate information on losses due to spoilage and salvage operations occurring after that date will be currently available. Because of the difficulty of locating many records covering transactions prior to that time, we are unable at this time to produce complete and accurate figures on such transactions. We shall continue our efforts in this direction, however, and actively follow up sources of documents available in order to make the record as complete as possible.

In view of the emphasis which the committee placed on warehousing practices and related activities under the supervision of the Shipping and Storage Branch, we have taken pains to obtain the best qualified man we could find to direct the activities of that branch. In this instance again, we had to turn to the War Department and have placed Col. H. O. Warlick in charge of this work. In addition to 6 years of civilian experience in supervising the procurement, storage, and transportation of many types of supplies, he has just completed more than 3 years' service in shipping and storage work in the Army, along with some other related service. We think he is well equipped to direct the work of the Shipping and Storage Branch.

Plans have been developed by the Shipping and Storage Branch for decentralizing primary responsibility for most shipping and storage activities to the regional offices, including responsibility for reporting inventory movements.

Allocations of commodities for storage in a warehouse are no longer being made unless the warehouse is on the approved list of warehouses for that commodity, except in cases of emergency, and then only with the approval of the Director of the Branch. Steps are being taken to strengthen our force of warehouse examiners, to remove over-age or out-of-condition commodities, and to place more responsibility on the owners and operators of warehouses utilized by the Department.

The problem of what disposition should be made of the cave cooler at Atchison, Kans., referred to in the committee's report, has been one of the most difficult and perplexing which my staff and I have had to face. We began by attempting to get a complete statement of all the essential facts regarding this storage space in order to afford a basis for judgment as to what action should be taken in the interest of the Government. We have sought to reduce the operating costs and, through negotiations with the Kansas Power & Light Co., have secured a refund of $3,800 of the amount already paid for power charges and have obtained a substantial reduction in the rate for power used hereafter at this facility.

After I had personally inspected the cave and counseled with competent people who have studied the situation, we have concluded that it would be detrimental to the Government's interest to abandon the project at this time. The information we have obtained shows that if this were done only a small portion of the Government's total investment could be salvaged. We feel that some other means should be found for recovering a larger portion of the amount spent. It is our best judgment at this time that the most feasible plan is to lease the facility to some commercial warehouseman, provided the lessor will consent to a sublease. With this in mind, invitation for bids from commercial operators are now being prepared. It is too early to predict the outcome, but we are hopeful that through this or some other means we can salvage more of the cost than would be possible by abandonment of the project.

It is impracticable in the space of this outline report to set forth the details of every action that has been taken to remedy the conditions pointed out by the committee. I want you to know, however, that we are giving diligent attention to all of the conclusions appearing in the report. I had a member of my staff prepare a digest of each of the committee's conclusions and the pertinent evidence found in the hearings. I have made these digests available to those of our people who are concerned with these activities and have asked that they be prepared to report in detail on the progress that has been made in correcting these conditions.

If the committee wishes, I shall be glad to see that all of this information is made available to its investigative staff. On the other hand, it appears to me that if the committee desires more detailed information on the present status of any of the matters referred to in its report, it would be preferable if you would set, in advance, a definite time for a hearing. If this action is decided upon and you will so advise me, we will bring our records before the committee and submit as complete and current information on all your inquiries as is possible for us to obtain.

I want to make it clear that I consider the job of putting our house in order as one of my primary and most important obligations. To that end, I shall appreciate any further suggestions and counsel which the committee may see fit to give me.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

McDonough Bill, H. R. 2827, Answers Scientific Scarcity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call attention to the Military Affairs Committee to the necessity and urgency of giving speedy consideration to H. R. 2827, which I introduced April 2, 1945, and which will provide the means for restoring to civilian life scientists who are badly needed for the development of peace and reconversion. Since I have introduced this bill, my mail has been flooded with urgent demands and requests that it be acted upon. With the discovery and revelation of atomic energy for military purposes which has stunned the world with its potentialities, it is now necessary that scientists be released from the monotony and inactivity of Army life so that they may continue to develop and expand the use of atomic energy for peacetime pursuits, and, most important of all, to find ways and means for neutralizing, controlling, and making ineffective the unbelievable destructive powers of atomic energy for military purposes which was revealed in the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

We must not, we cannot allow any other nation to move ahead of us scientifically by discovering how the atomic bomb operates without first discovering scientific counteraction which will make their bombs ineffective.

We are, however, permitting this to become possible by holding scientists in the armed services and drafting them through selective service at present while other nations, such as Great Britain, France, and Russia, have carefully preserved their scientists by keeping them at work in the laboratory instead of digging ditches and doing KP duty, even when they were threatened with defeat. The question the Military Affairs Committee and the Congress must answer is what are we going to do about it, and the answer and action must not be delayed.

Iron Curtain Around Czechs Undiscoverable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maurice Hindus from the New York Herald Tribune, September 8, 1945:

IRON CURTAIN AROUND CZECHS UNDISCOVERABLE—COUNTRY IS DESCRIBED AS PARADISE OF FREEDOM FOR FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS

(By Maurice Hindus)

PRAGUE, September 7.—In the 2 weeks I have been here I have nowhere detected a sign of the iron curtain that is supposed to hang over Czechoslovakia. For foreign correspondents the country is almost a paradise. There is no censorship, direct or indirect.

In territories which the American Army is holding in Europe, correspondents no longer are subject to censorship, but are required to submit copies of their stories to the military authorities. The Prague Government makes no such demands on foreign newspapermen. We file only one copy at the post office. What is more, to accommodate American correspondents the Prague postmaster arranged special hours in the afternoon and evening for the immediate transmission of stories.

We may write as we please and move about the country as we please. When I was in Banska Bystrica, Slovakia, I met two American correspondents who came over in a jeep for the recent celebration of the first anniversary of the revolt against the German-dominated regime of Josef Tiso. They had

been in Budapest, where they were told their presence was undesirable. They didn't even have Czechoslovak visas, nothing more than the passes our military authorities issue to accredited correspondents. Yet nowhere did Russian, Slovak, or any other sentries or officials challenge their right to enter or stay in the country. They still are here, driving around the towns and villages with the utmost freedom.

Only when correspondents wish to cross from the Russian to the American zone in Pizen (Pilsen) and the Sudetenland are they required to have special permits, but these are easy to obtain.

Czechs and Slovaks everywhere, whether officials or ordinary citizens, seem only too glad to offer help in arranging interviews or visits to whatever places or institutions may be of interest to newspapermen. No special passes are required to enter the Ministry of Information or the Foreign Ministry. No armed soldiers guard either institution, and the policeman at the doorway, if he is around at all, does not even bother to inquire who we are and whom we wish to see.

For the present government by decree rules Czechoslovakia. The discussions and controversies of this Government are neither open to the public nor reported in the press. Only the results—decisions by decrees—are published and often enough, elucidated and elaborated by various ministers of the Cabinet. But since the celebration in Banska Bystrica the call for early elections on the basis of a "direct, free, secret, universal ballot" has been growing more insistent, if only because the people, as well as many leaders, want to put an end to the political confusion and uncertainty that prevail in the country.

There is no secret political police organization. Nor is there interference in the relations between Czechs and foreigners, and the Czechs as well as the Slovaks, regardless of their political persuasion, never hesitate to speak freely on any subject.

The rumor of an iron curtain over Czechoslovakia is a pure myth.

Army Demobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following letter which I have just received from a serviceman overseas giving his ideas on the Army's demobilization program and expressing the despair shared by all men who are hopelessly enmeshed in the red tape of discharge procedure:

DEAR SIR: This is in regard to the Army point system for discharges.

It is my personal suspicion this system was created so the Army could find a good reason to procrastinate on letting us out, and to stall for time till they could bludgeon permanent conscription out of us. Already the intimation is creeping into the Army newspapers that our getting out is conditional to new draftees coming in.

Here is how this system works: One point for very month of service since the emergency; 1 for every month overseas; 5 for each battle star and decoration; and 12 for each child; this up to VJ-day. The present total required making one "eligible" for immediate discharge is 80. They say anyone with over 70 should be en route home by Christmas.

That sounds fine, but how does it work? In the first place, the points only make you eligible. Quotas are set for each organization. In my organization when the points were set at 85 on a VE-day basis, they had only gotten down to 95 points at the time because the quota didn't allow everyone to go.

Now here is hurdle No. 2: You might have 150 points, but they don't mean a thing if your records are not in order. This is the fix I am in. I supposedly have 81 points, but no one knows where my records even are. I came here over a month ago, and despite numerous letters by my officers, the records have never followed me. Not only am I not yet "eligible" to get out of the Army after 4 years' service; I can't get paid, and haven't been for 2 months. If those records don't show up, I may be staying here till the next war because every order sending a man home states in underlined type he won't go till his records are in order.

Besides losing your records, the records may not be up to date. This is very prevalent. The little matter of five points per battle participation star is the most troublesome. This is not one of my worries, but I know lots of people who don't have all their campaigns recorded because nobody ever troubled to put them in their service records. Then they get transferred out of the organization and it takes months to even get an answer out of an old organization, for these reasons: (1) Army slowness; (2) checking an endless list of campaign awards listing every organization entitled to a star for a campaign (there must be several dozen lists, put out by many different headquarters, and God help anyone who earned a star in one theater of operations and then tries to get it credited in another theater, because they just don't have these letters. I went around to the awards and decorations office of the Seventh Army, which held down the whole southern front in France and Germany for a year, and they didn't even have all the campaigns for western France, though many soldiers had probably been transferred into that Army who had been there. It would be worse if a man ever went from Europe to the Pacific or vice versa); (3) having to check whether a man was in the hospital or guardhouse at the time of campaign.

And what about points for overseas service? This is something that sounds simple until you discover that Hawaiians serving in the United States are overseas or you are overseas in Alaska; especially if you live in Alaska and get into the Army in the United States, as soldiers are beginning to point out in service periodicals. If you get tangled up in such legalistic wrangling you might as well volunteer to stay in the Army. Suppose someone forgets to put in your record when you landed in England a year or two ago? You'd be amazed how carelessly Army records are kept.

Even if someone knows all the answers to these problems, it isn't usually somebody you know and you can hardly get anything at all done in the Army by people who don't know you.

We had one man who habitually got drunk and spent 3 weeks in the guardhouse because he had over 100 points, but his records were lost. He's no good to the Army and he should have been on his way home instead of in the guardhouse.

Now here is another hurdle: Even if they do have your records, the total isn't official until they type it all down on a little sheet of paper and stick it in your service record. Then your officer signs it; then you sign it and it's official. This is very fine too, until you learn it takes a couple of weeks just to type the things. Then you discover your men are spread all over and you have to chase off to the hospital and other units where they are on temporary duty to get them to initial the thing. There are several men in this unit who don't even know how many points the Army credits them with because they have never been shown the computation to sign. This is especially bothersome in an organization like mine, which is spread in little groups all over Germany. Not only that, but now there is a new computation since VJ-day and the monkey business has to be done all over.

There are still three occupational specialties which will keep you in the Army indefinitely no matter how many points you have. This is not at all fair. Let the Army hire civilians to do these things if they are so damned important. Before they changed the list, I held three of these numbers. They weren't numbers put out by Washington, but were in addition to those numbers, and they were put out by the European Army headquarters for their own convenience. I know of cases where men were eligible to go home but got reclassified just so they could be made ineligible.

I have been in the Army 4 years. I volunteered to get my year of training over, and the day I volunteered they started talking about 18 months. Two months after I started training, the war started. I came overseas a year and a half ago and have been in England, Africa, France, and Germany, and have gone through three campaigns. I was a $21 and $30 private, a $36 private first class, and a $54 corporal and heard people complaining later when they raised the wages because they only made $50 as privates. I am married and haven't seen my wife for 18 months, in fact I have several times gone weeks and weeks and even over a month without any letters, another example of Army efficiency. Now I am supposed to be "immediately" discharged and don't even know where my records are or if I'll ever see them again and may rot here some more because my "neighbors" wanted me to come over here and stay.

Now what I suggest is that they junk this damn-fool system and get something that really works without cheating 10 or 15 percent of the people who get gummed up in Army red tape. Let's junk these silly points and let the first ones in out first. I have a year more than one full Army enlistment already and I certainly never desired to serve that long. I am not a 30-year man. Let's leave the peacetime Army to people who like to "eat crow" and cut down some of these military empires. If they can't find records, let's get the men home and into civilian clothes on inactive duty and on pay till they make an effort to do so. The selective-service office certainly knows what day in 1941 I came into the Army. The Army can't even get its men paid. If they gum up the works any more, discharges should be ordered by Selective Service or some other civilian agency. At least Congress should take a hand in this. We've taken enough bullying by brass hats.

Russian Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted by the House, I offer for the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star of September 29, 1945, by Constantine Brown, one of the foremost writers on foreign affairs in the Nation's Capital.

This article contains information that should be known by all of our citizens. It is difficult to understand the attitude of foreign governments with whom we have recently been alined in crushing Germany in her attempt to gain world domination. We all know that every effort is being put forth to establish permanent peace on this earth. Certain it is that patience and tolerance has been exercised by us and will be in an effort to bring about that most desired objective in a war-wrecked world.

The article follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Secretary of State Byrnes is returning from London, a disappointed man. He and his colleagues discovered there is a great difference between discussing lofty ideals, such as those expressed at San Francisco, and the stark realities of "territorial adjustments," when the power complex of the victorious nations emerges as strong as it has existed for thousands of years.

The American Government has sought to end the old philosophy of balance of power and has attempted—at the price of giving up many of its ideals about international justice—to put into effect the thesis of "one world." Previously our policy framers had reluctantly thrown overboard such nations as Poland and Finland. But there was a firm belief among them that these were only temporary situations and eventually, after peace and political sanity were reestablished in the world, the nations would all regain their freedom.

The same thought governed the American policy framers in regard to other states in the Balkans, where the Russian "liberation" hand laid heavily on the "liberated" peoples.

Mr. Byrnes was convinced that when the representatives of the Big Five nations, which had suffered so much devastation from the war, sat around the green table, they would make concessions—not necessarily to each other—but to a peace-hungry world. They all had pledged themselves to work in full harmony and cooperation at San Francisco. The American Senate, known in the past for its fear of international entanglements, had almost unanimously voted America's full participation on international affairs. Yet Mr. Byrnes is now reported to be a sadly disappointed man.

Not only was he met with a challenging attitude on the part of Foreign Commissar Molotov on all matters which were discussed in London, but he was told plainly that Russia does not intend to yield on any matter in which her interests are involved. Her "interests" meant plainly the complete domination of all the areas in Europe where her forces have been stationed as a temporary war measure with the consent of the other Allies, and the expansion of her influence to far areas such as the Red Sea and the eastern Mediterranean.

The far eastern situation was not discussed officially. But unofficial agents who frequently voice Russia's point of view before Russia takes an official stand let it be known that America's "privileged" position in that area will have to be thoroughly reviewed in the near future.

Mr. Byrnes would have been happy to make concessions to the Russians' point of view if he thought he could obtain some sort of a quid pro quo from Commissar Molotov. But the further the discussions went the more apparent it became that Russia was more interested in territorial matters than in the lofty ideals contained in the UNO Charter. The Charter, it became obvious to the American Secretary of State, was to have as a principal function in the future the guaranty of the territorial grabs.

This also was the opinion of Britain's Foreign Secretary Bevin and France's Foreign Minister Bidault. Britain and France are in a much weaker position than America; are closer to the USSR and consequently have an even greater practical interest than ourselves in not opposing Russia.

Yet their representatives could not see how Russia's demands could be met fully without giving up everything for which the United Nations have fought so desperately since 1939. They imparted the view to Mr. Byrnes that if Russia's territorial ambitions—which are a far cry from what was discussed at San Francisco—were granted, the world would be placed under a totalitarian system far more dangerous than anything we have ever seen.

It was this thought that put a halt to the policy of yielding which had been characteristic in all the previous negotiations between Russia and her major allies.

The break-down of the London Conference may result in a division of Europe into two power blocs: The eastern, extending as far as the Elbe River and down to the Balkans as far as Greece, and the western, the rest of Europe, including Scandinavia.

Such a division would present even greater dangers than the former European power alliances. It may mean not only another armament race with all its devastating consequences, but also an open economic warfare. Russia is not interested in establishing merely a political hegemony over the territories she now controls. As evidenced in the economic agreements with Rumania and Hungary she has placed them under an absolute economic tutelage which precludes their trading with any other country.

Russia has established a complete monopoly over all productive activities of the nations under her domination. If any trade is to exist between the western nations and those in the east it must go through Moscow, which will be the clearinghouse and the banker of her puppets.

Mr. Byrnes and his colleagues never had in mind the organization of two such blocs in any part of the world. But this new phantom is creating an even greater uncertainty for the future and cannot be ignored.

Discharges From the Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, many letters come to my office calling attention to the fact that the war is over and that we need to get back on a peacetime basis and recognize the fact that we face civilian or peacetime economy rather than a wartime economy.

A SUGGESTED CHRISTMAS PRESENT

Among the many letters which have come to my office in connection with the problem of speedy demobilization of the armed forces is one from a mother with two children. She speaks volumes when she says that the best Christmas present she can get is to have her husband sent back home so that he can be with the family at Christmas time. She reminds me that the war is over and just wants to know why there is so much red tape in getting men out of service who have been in the armed forces for over 3 years and have a wife and children at home. I think this mother is entitled to be heard and she ought to have this Christmas present. I pass this request along to the administration leaders for what it is worth. They ought to talk to the Army and Navy about it, and, far more important, the matter of speeding up discharges should be supervised by Congress if those in responsible positions bungle and make mistakes in connection with the program and then try to cover up.

DELAYS COULD BE AVOIDED BY MAILING DISCHARGES

Among the many suggestions made to eliminate delays in demobilizing the Army and the Navy is one to the effect that discharges of these men could be mailed to their homes. This would speed up the process and it seems to me is a sound approach to solving the problem. The idea originated with Mr. Clinton S. Golden, chairman of the Congress of Industrial Organizations veterans committee. This is a committee established by the CIO to promote the interests of its members in the armed forces. Mr. Golden contacted the War Department officials and recommended that discharges be sent returned soldiers by mail and pointed out that this would speed up their return to civilian life. His plan is accurately outlined in a brief way in a newspaper item which appears in the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., under date of September 25, 1945, and which reads as follows:

HOME AT ONCE, MAIL DISCHARGE, CIO PLAN FOR SPEEDING UP

The CIO suggested today that the Army issue discharges by mail to eliminate the present demobilization bottleneck created by separation centers.

In a letter to the War Department, Chairman Clinton S. Golden, of the CIO veterans committee, said soldiers should be processed for discharge at whatever base they happen to be when they become eligible for release.

"The Army could give him his travel pay—it would have to figure that anyway for a transfer—and impress his fingerprint and obtain his signature on a discharge blank. He could then be sent home on terminal leave, technically remaining in the service until the paper processing shall have been completed."

Golden said the proposal would make it possible to send home every GI almost as soon as his services can be dispensed with.

"The Army has exercised considerable flexibility in the field when faced by an emergency. The same kind of thinking that speeded up victory can be used to speed up demobilization."

Many Congressmen have urged the Army to furlough soldiers home pending discharge so they can look for jobs and plan their new lives as civilians.

In addition to writing the War Department officials, Mr. Golden also communicated with Members of Congress and set forth his views in some detail. I hope that his suggestions are carried out.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN MAKES IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

A newspaper dispatch indicates that the President of the United States is also taking notice of this important question of demobilization. This dispatch calls attention to the fact that he has asked Congress to cut more than $28,500,000,000 from the current War Department appropriation. This is not so important because the War Department does not have to waste money, just because Congress gave them everything they asked for. They will do well to

come back to Congress and show how much money they have saved the taxpayers now that the war is over.

It is significant to note, however, in the President's statement that he simultaneously announced a large reduction in Army forces. President Truman announced that there was to be a reduction in the Army so as to bring it down to 1,950,000 men by June 30 next. This is approximately 550,000 under the lowest previous War Department estimates of future strength. I congratulate President Truman upon recognizing the fact that the war is now over and that this means the Army must be demobilized because you do not need a large Army of millions of men in peacetime.

The President recognizes the fact that he is our Commander in Chief, and I am glad that he is telling the officials whom he has appointed to carry out the war program to now proceed with a prompt demobilization system.

America Needs Protection Against Her Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it may be unusual but there is no language more correct than the statement that America must protect herself against her friends, real or otherwise. This almost appears to be postwar problem No. 1, if we are to be guided by newspaper accounts of recent developments which appear to me to be tragically significant.

GREAT BRITAIN AND RUSSIA ASK THE UNITED STATES FOR BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

Some time ago the newspapers here carried a statement which was headlined "British plead poverty, asking more United States help—raw materials and food wanted." The newspaper item then went on to say they only wanted the small sum of $6,000,000,000 from this country. This appeared in a leading newspaper under date of August 19, 1945. This modest request by Great Britain did not go unchallenged. It was protested by Members of Congress who love America and their American institutions. However, such protests in no way lessened the ardor and enthusiasm of our cousins across the sea. They decided that, instead of asking for a loan, a gift of $6,000,000,000 would be much more appropriate and would save them the trouble of figuring out interest.

Then, just a short time ago, following the generous request of Great Britain, our cousin, Joe Stalin, suggested that he could use about $6,000,000,000, because war conditions had really caused him some inconvenience. I suppose Joe felt just as some of the other boys, that it would not be hard to figure out that the United States was responsible for the World War, and that war now being over, this country should foot all the bills. I don't want to discriminate against Great Britain and Russia, so I will say that there are some other foreign governments who deserve honorable mention and gold medals for their patriotic efforts to have the American people either donate or make an alleged loan to them of all the money they can get from us.

OUR DOMESTIC PROBLEMS REQUIRE SOLUTION AND IMMEDIATE ACTION

These demands that America reconstruct the rest of the world come, of course, from idealists, intellectuals, internationalists, "do something for somebody else" groups, and propaganda groups and other agencies which will readily occur to you. Perhaps the international bankers should be included in this list. Anyhow, all of these groups will bear watching because either with good intentions or with bad intentions they are bound to ruin America, its economy, and its system of government. Right now, Congress is considering a full employment bill. Congress is considering unemployment compensation. Congress is considering the problem of tax reduction. Then, just so you do not forget it, the American people are interested in demobilizing our armed forces and getting our servicemen back home. These are matters that press for a solution, and it is rather absurd to advance a program for help for the other countries of the world before America does something to help itself.

BURT D. PEARSON SUMS UP THE SITUATION CLEARLY

I have just finished reading the Mesabi Daily News, of Virginia, Minn., for September 26, 1945, and my attention has been attracted to a splendid editorial by Burt D. Pearson, editor and manager of this daily newspaper. It seems to me that Mr. Pearson approaches this matter correctly and I hope that his opinion receives widespread publicity. He says, in part, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHOULD PROCEED WARILY IN DONATIONS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

By and large, the American people have heard so much about their obligations to the rest of mankind that they believe it to be in the national interest to extend certain help to countries less secure economically, but this does not mean that they think the United States ought to finance every conceivable kind of experiment elsewhere, and at the price of harm to our own economy; nor is there a definite belief on the part of Americans that we should cancel out all war debts. There is rather an inclination to go along with former President Herbert Hoover's proposal to declare a moratorium for a few years on these debts, including lend-lease.

Paul Mallon has been writing realistically about the British expectations of American money to finance indirectly the pledges made to Britons by the Attlee government, these political commitments involving the socialization of many basic industries in Albion. There is no suggestion of confiscating these industries. The Attlee government will buy them on stipulated terms, payment to be made in bonds carrying an interest rate far and above that which British emissaries say is too high to pay Uncle Sam for pure loans beyond contemplated gifts. In order to put the best front possible on these negotiations for United States funds, the Attlee government has placed the pleading in the hands of former stalwarts of the Churchill administration. There would seem to be full agreement between a Churchill and an Attlee in this.

Mr. Pearson concludes his editorial comment by suggesting that America ought to know very definitely just what any begging nation intends to do with the loans or gifts they seek from us.

REACTIONS TO LEO T. CROWLEY RESIGNATION ARE IMPORTANT

Announcement was made yesterday that Leo T. Crowley, in charge of the Foreign Economic Administration, has resigned. Mr. Crowley is a modest man, but he deserves unlimited approbation for telling foreign countries that he would not recommend donations to them of billions of dollars of American money. He believes evidently that America must protect itself against its so-called friends. He has translated into action the highest patriotic service that he could render to his country. We hope that his successor will do as well.

The newspaper item which has just been called to my attention and which appears in the Washington Times-Herald under date of Saturday, September 29, reads as follows:

BRITISH ELATION OVER CROWLEY RESIGNATION DISTURBING TO UNITED STATES

(By Walter Trohan)

Word that the British are rejoicing over the resignation of Leo T. Crowley, the man who turned off the $42,000,000,000 lend-lease faucet, was received in the Capital yesterday with misgivings.

In London the retiring of the soft-spoken, silver-haired head of the Foreign Economic Administration, which controlled the lend-lease pipe line, was acclaimed as the greatest event since VE-day.

CALL HIM AN EVIL GENIUS

The British press and radio characterized Crowley as the evil genius who is withholding grant of billions of American dollars to Britain. The rejoicing was mixed with some concern that Crowley would carry to Congress his fight to keep American dollars at home.

Crowley was described in editorials in the London press as the power behind the throne against Britain on the matter of that nation's request for a gift of three to six billion dollars for postwar rehabilitation and economic revival.

It was said that he is the one man who has prevented America from being as generous as America would like to be toward Britain. It was said Crowley had lost his behind-the-scenes fight to prevent the flow of money to Britain.

FEAR HE WILL FIGHT ON

However, fears were expressed that he would not rest after his unsuccessful fight in the executive branch of the Government, but that he would appeal to Congress in his determination to thwart Britain.

Reaction of the British press and radio was reported in Washington in radio broadcasts. Crowley declined to comment on the reports, but Members of Congress expressed concern that the resignation of Crowley should be regarded as a British triumph.

Crowley reportedly had bitterly opposed extensive grants to Britain during the current negotiations between American and British fiscal experts on the request for billions. In sitting in on the conferences Crowley did not oppose all help for Britain but insisted that any aid be given in the form of an interest-paying loan.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that some Government agency, probably the famous State Department, ought to keep the ordinary American citizen better informed about what is going on in foreign countries. I have not the slightest doubt in

the world that this newspaper item is correct. I am concerned about the fact that responsible United States Government officials will do nothing about it unless they are carefully watched by the American people.

Let's Avoid Another Pearl Harbor by Maintaining Adequate Military Strength and by the Decentralization of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE W. ERVIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss the significance of the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor and some related subjects.

While the Congress is about to launch this investigation of our greatest military and naval disaster, we must remember that history could repeat itself in a somewhat similar respect if we are not alert to all possibilities.

Insofar as the defense of a nation is concerned, we have seen that too many chances must not be taken.

Of course, the disaster at Pearl Harbor was caused principally by the Japanese. However, it has been said to have been caused in part by the American state of mind.

There are certain evidences that that state of mind may be inherent in too many of us.

There is a belief in many quarters that peace has come to stay.

Of course, we trust that peace is here to stay, but it may not be permanent. Nations which have been attacked in recent years were those which were militarily weak or believed to be weak.

What lesson should we have learned at Pearl Harbor?

We learned, or should have learned, that there may be surprise attacks upon a nation that does not have adequate military strength, that concentrated military installations are sometimes vulnerable and that we must be alert at all times.

How should we apply those lessons now and in the future?

We must maintain adequate military strength. We must not permit our military resources to be concentrated in such manner as to be vulnerable. We must be ever alert.

How can these things be done?

We must be realistic. Adequate military strength can be maintained only by having enough military and naval equipment of the right kinds and by having enough adequately trained men to operate them.

In order to have the equipment, we must promote scientific research, as well as promote the production of materials. We must be absolutely certain to avoid large concentrations of military equipment which would be vulnerable. Likewise, we must be absolutely certain to avoid large concentrations of vulnerable manufacturing plants which produce material for defense.

We have learned in recent months of the atomic bomb and the V-bomb.

If we should ever be engaged in another war, the first attack to be made upon this arsenal of democracy would probably be upon our large manufacturing centers. If a few atomic bombs or V-bombs should be dropped on parts of California, New York City, Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and other centers of production, our arsenal of democracy might be severely or disastrously crippled in a short time.

Consequently, it seems inescapable that many of our critical industries should be relocated in sections which are now rural areas. Everything possible should be done to prevent plants which produce critical materials from being vulnerable from overhead. Some of them could be concealed by camouflage, while others should be located underground. If some of our industries producing critically needed implements were located underground in our mountain areas, the natural camouflage and the surface of the mountains would constitute the best natural defenses available.

If some of our industries should be relocated, I trust that proper care will be given the construction of adequate housing for the employees who work in such industries, and I especially hope that each house will have an ample plot of ground for a garden. To those of you who do not know, I would like to say from experience that, in my opinion, a house and a garden in the mountains or in any rural area are nearer to heaven than any other place on earth.

Please do not misunderstand. I think that a man in private enterprise should be permitted to locate and operate his manufacturing plant anywhere he chooses. I also think that any individual in America who desires to live in a congested area should do so.

The question of the decentralization of industry is one for private enterprise, but it is of more than passing interest to the Government and the people.

Purely from the standpoint of self-defense, both for the nation and for those engaged in owning and operating manufacturing establishments, the decentralization of industry and the relocation of those plants in rural and mountainous areas offer the best escape from the possible effects of destructive bombs and the discovery of a more abundant life for the employees who work in such plants.

Immortal Lidice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted me, I include in my remarks an editorial published in the Norfolk Daily News, Norfolk, Nebr.:

IMMORTAL LIDICE

When the Germans reduced the village of Lidice to ruins, massacred the male population, and drove the women and children into exile, they said they had forever obliterated the village from the face of the earth.

What they did was to make Lidice immortal.

"It was reduced to dust and rubble, but it will live forever as a symbol of man's fight for freedom," writes William Kostka, secretary of the Lidice Memorial Committee. "It will not be forgotten, for the heroism of the valiant Czechs and the lesson their sacrifice teaches will be perpetuated in a magnificent memorial."

The American people, no doubt, will respond to the appeal for $1,500,000 with which to build a magnificent altar on the site of the ruined town, for they have a deep feeling of admiration for the inhabitants who sacrificed everything they had, even life, in the fight against nazism.

Earning Their Way Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the west coast feel very deeply about the Japanese. They are opposed to a soft policy. They recall the mistakes we made in our tolerant treatment of Germany following World War I. They are sympathetic to the views entertained by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, who knows the Japanese intimately, and was the victim of their sadistic and savage treatment as a prisoner of war in their hands during recent years. In my home town of Tacoma, the daily newspaper, the Tacoma News-Tribune, recently carried an editorial which summarizes very well the views of my constituents. The editorial is as follows:

EARNING THEIR WAY BACK

Americans more than most peoples are inclined, individually and collectively, to forget and forgive offenses. It is a noble trait but usually overdone. This has been the case especially in our relations with foreign countries. We practiced our careless and soft-hearted procedure after our war against Germany a quarter of a century ago. We forgave the war criminals and we permitted the German Kaiser to seek a safe refuge in Holland, where he lived in luxurious exile the rest of his life. We gave Germany large amounts of money and helped that nation to rebuild and refit its factories. As a result the Nazis were enabled to start a war that overran all Europe and almost conquered the world before we entered the struggle. Only then, at an enormous cost of men and treasure, were we able to put down the new menace.

In the Far East Japan had set out on a deliberate policy of aggrandizement, beginning in 1929. We permitted her to seize Manchuria and to carry on a war against China. We helped her arm. Our officials permitted the movement of scrap iron, gasoline, and munitions of war out of Pacific coast ports almost up to the hour of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Citizens of the Pacific coast protested vehemently against this policy, but Government officials at Washington, D. C., were employing appeasement tactics and would not be swerved from their

course. Our friendly indulgence to Japan cost us thousands of lives and many bitter defeats until our superior resources and might finally turned the tide in our favor.

There should be, and presumably will be, no such softness this time. We started lining up Germany for retribution and so far have held to that policy, which it is to be hoped we will continue. It is reassuring to observe the strict, upstanding attitude toward Japan, the latest and worst of war criminals, by Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, who has both patriotic and personal reasons to avoid either a soft occupation or a soft peace.

General Wainwright and his officers suffered much during their imprisonment. The American commander was beaten by Japanese private soldiers repeatedly with the approval of their superior officers. Men of all ranks were tortured by the Japanese, as General Wainwright says, "as a studied plan to belittle the Anglo-Saxon races before the oriental peoples."

"The Japanese can be subservient; they can be pleasant and cooperative if it suits their purpose," he said. "But the men who were captured on Bataan and Corregidor have seen the Japanese character in the raw. They have seen what Japanese soldiers do when they are on top, and I think all of us who lived through tortured days are determined they shall never be on top again.

"I have seen the Japanese as they are—with the veneer stripped off. I shall bear the scars of those years all my life, and I could not forget them if I would. I have come to know the cunning with which they conceal their true nature, and how quickly it leaps forth when there is no immediate chance of retaliation. * * *

"The Japanese are not sorry for what they have done to countless thousands in the populations of countries they have overrun. They are not sorry for the torture they have inflicted on American soldiers. It simply would not occur to them to be sorry, because they have done nothing which is at variance with their accepted philosophy.

"That is the point which should be clearly understood. I am a soldier and so do not pretend to know how long will be required or by what steps the bestial elements in their nature can be eradicated. But until we are assured that these qualities have been extinguished—not simply submerged—then the Japanese nation, powerless as it is today to make war, will remain a menace to our world. * * *

"Before Japan is allowed to take her place among other respected nations, she must be made to realize that her medieval ways have no place in our modern world."

Americans know that enemy now, just as they know the German enemy and they should not forget. There is no merit in trying to measure precise degrees of crime and turpitude in either case, except to remember how low and inhuman men may become and be on guard accordingly. It is not enough for enemies who have perpetrated such unspeakable atrocities to insist like naughty children, "I am good now." It must be proved by good behavior.

In Regard to the Policy on Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned over the rumors regarding our policy in Japan. I am making no criticism of General MacArthur; he is a soldier and will have to carry out the mandate of the President of the United States through the State Department.

I am sure that we do not intend to interfere with the religious beliefs of the Japanese people. If they wish their Emperor as a symbol of religious belief, I am certain that no American can complain, indoctrinated by our Constitution. About the future government of Japan, I believe we have a right to be concerned. Japan is a feudalistic, militaristic nation under an imperialist, monarchical form of government. We do not say to any nation in the world that it must adopt our form of government. Therefore, the people of Japan should be allowed to determine by their own choice who shall govern them.

I believe that universal compulsory education should be the first step in our advisory program in Japan; this to be followed by universal suffrage in as short a time as possible. We are hopeful that the Japanese people will embrace a republican, democratic form of government, based upon their own people's rule, similar to our own. This ideal and principle can only be successfully accomplished in Japan if we, in cooperation with the United Nations, retain absolute control over Japan, setting an example of our democratic way of life, in a program lasting over a period of years.

The experiences of the past in regard to the German Government after the last World War should be a lesson to us. For, after the last war when Germany set up a republican democracy under a very fine constitution, we pulled out of Germany, and later had France pull out of the Ruhr area. Then the Fascist politicians went to work on Germany. The persecution of liberals, progressives, Jews, Catholics, and everyone not in sympathy with their doctrines, ensued. The result was a totalitarian, fascist form of government. We do not want this to happen again in either Germany or Japan.

We must adopt a stern, long-range policy to remain as long as necessary in these countries to see that the people themselves try out their powers in full expression of their own ideas. They should have absolute religious as well as political and economic freedom. Feudalism in Japan must go, and likewise any opportunity to sow the seeds of fascism. It is difficult to dictate the thought of a nation; however, we must protect ourselves against a repetition of fascist imperialism which in this decade brought the world to the brink of chaos. The seeds of fascism must be destroyed wherever they show their ugly heads on the face of the world.

American Slav Congress Gives Its Position on the Balkans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the American Slav Congress is naturally very interested in the Balkan situation which has been discussed in the Council of Foreign Ministers in London in recent days. The executive secretary of that organization delivered a speech recently in which he set forth the views entertained by the membership. The American Slav Congress is fearful that the State Department is seeking to front for certain reactionary forces which are making serious attempts to revive the old pro-Fascist and Fascist regimes in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. The Slavic Congress has sought to present its views in the New York Times, but has been rebuffed and space refused for the presentation of its case. It is imperative that the United States, one of the greatest strongholds of democracy in this war, should not take a position calculated to alienate the friends of democracy throughout Europe. We have heretofore made a mistake in befriending the Fascist government of the Argentine. I recall vividly that the United States voted for the admission of the Argentine Republic, under its present dictatorship control, into the family of the United Nations at the UNCIO conference. We likewise resumed diplomatic relations with the authoritarian government of the Argentine many months ago, and thus gave aid and comfort to antidemocratic forces in the Western Hemisphere. Developments of the past few days reveal the error on our part. We should not repeat such errors.

The speech of Mr. George Pirinsky, executive secretary of the American Slav Congress, is as follows:

WHO PROFITS BY UNITED STATES INTERVENTION IN BULGARIA AND THE BALKANS?

(By George Pirinsky, executive secretary, American Slav Congress)

Despite the fact that the London Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Big Five is still in session and the final decisions have not yet been announced, it is clear from what has been published so far that there are sharp differences between the Soviet and Anglo-American representatives on the nature of the present regimes in the Balkan countries and the means of establishing a lasting peace in that turbulent peninsula.

On a few occasions Bulgaria has been mentioned as an example of the sharpest differences. This fact was brought out even before the conference in London, when our Secretary of State Byrnes openly intervened in the internal affairs of Bulgaria and forced the postponement of general elections scheduled there for August 26 past. Secretary Byrnes declared at the time that in the opinion of the United States Government the elections in Bulgaria, as planned, would not be conducted in a true democratic fashion and that the United States would not sign a peace treaty with a government resting on the results of such elections.

Some liberal radio commentators and others raised their voices in protest against this action of our State Department, pointing out that the Bulgarian election laws were much more liberal than those in Byrnes' own State of North Carolina. Most Americans, however, felt that our State Department was performing a real service to the concept of true democracy and that we were helping the people of Bulgaria to establish a freely chosen democratic regime, which would be a great contribution to the peace in the Balkans and the world as a whole. The fact that the greatest enthusiasm about our intervention in Bulgaria came from the most reactionary circles in American life did not alarm even the more clear-thinking Americans. The Hearst-McCormick-Patterson pa-

pers were openly jubilant. They proclaimed that by intervening in the Bulgarian elections we were saving the poor Bulgarian peasants from the imposition of a despotic, totalitarian regime, that we were saving Bulgaria and the Balkans from bolshevism. That this "red bogey" cry sounded as if we were taking over where Hitler and Goebbels were forced to leave off was not sufficient to warn most Americans of the true significance of United States intervention. Even some of the liberal newspapers failed to see anything wrong in the American action; even they fell for the cry that the main trouble was that no American correspondents were permitted to visit Bulgaria.

It is, of course, not true that no American correspondents were in Bulgaria at that time. Constantine Poulos, of the Overseas News Agency, has been in Sofia since January 1945. He sent many reports on events inside Bulgaria. The real difficulty was that none of these, except an article in the Nation, was ever published. The New York Times, it is understood, has exclusive rights on the Overseas News Service in the Balkans. The Times evidently considered Poulos' reports on Bulgaria not fit to print. Why? Because Poulos brought out some very alarming facts about the effect of United States intervention in Bulgaria.

In a dispatch on the effect of the protection our political representative in Bulgaria, Maynard Barnes, gave to Dr. George Dimitrov, a peasant leader who was expelled from his party because of his efforts to break the coalition of the Fatherland Front, Poulos wrote: "The consensus appears to be that the American political representative by granting asylum to Dimitrov has risked the possibility of a serious incident, has amateurishly intervened in the partisan politics of a small nation, and has played into the hands of those who are faithfully executing Hitler's legacy to create a rift between the United States and Russia."

"It is disquieting," wrote Poulos further, "that the people made happiest by the American action in the Dimitrov case are the same people who smugly defended Bulgaria's collaboration with Germany, who are strongly opposed to any social or economic reforms, and pray for a break in the American-British-Russian alliance."

These dispatches were not printed in the New York Times. The same paper, however, carried everything another correspondent, H. Levy, wrote earlier from Istanbul. Why? Because Mr. Levy's articles were depicting a distorted picture of Red terror in Bulgaria. All attempts by persons informed on the Bulgarian situation to answer Mr. Levy's charges in the New York Times were unavailing. From this the only possible conclusion that can be drawn is that the New York Times is striving to influence its readers, and thereby American public opinion, against the anti-Fascist Fatherland Front government in Bulgaria. The sense of impartiality and "objective reporting" about which the Times writes so often and so eloquently has been discarded completely in this case.

Poulos wrote in his unpublished dispatch of June 5: "Coming after the British refusal, on orders from London, to grant Dimitrov sanctuary, the American action may well make the United States the 'fall guy' and trim American influence in this area for some time to come."

This seems to be exactly what has been happening. By taking up the fight and, consciously or unconsciously, the cause of former Nazi collaborators and reactionaries, we are destroying the good will that exists among the vast majority of the Balkan peoples toward America. We are trimming our influence. It will do us no good to blame the Russians, as many writers are inclined to do, for the growing resentment which is developing in the Balkans toward the attitude of our representatives there and of our press here at home.

The Balkan peoples like America. They want to see the United States as one of their staunchest friends. That is why they are bewildered, nay, indignant, when they see us taking the side of petty disrupters and former collaborationists. They may justly wonder whether America is trying to help them establish their life on a new democratic basis or stand in the way of achieving this objective.

The American people in turn might well ask where our intervention is leading us and what it is doing to the "reservoir of good will" that freedom-loving peoples in the Balkans have for us.

Another case in point concerns Yugoslavia. Recent dispatches mentioned that business leaders and United States Government representatives there have made it clear to Yugoslav officials that they should not expect any United States economic help unless they change their present policy, that is, unless they behave as some of our diplomats and bankers want them to. It is easy to imagine how the Yugoslav people, who fought Hitler and their native quislings with such heroism, would react to such pressure. They are no less proud of their way of life than we are of ours, and would not be willing to yield their hard-won freedom at any price. What such "bargaining" must do to the Yugoslavs' feelings of good-will for Americans can only be imagined, and Americans may in turn ask again whether Uncle Sam is not attempting to use the "economic stick" to beat weaker nations into toeing the line according to our concept of what their way of life should be.

What is the main reason for this negative United States policy toward the Balkan peoples? Why are we acting like the British Tories acted toward us when our own country decided to gain its national independence, when we fought the Civil War to preserve the gains of 1776? I think that the explanation lies in the fact that our policy makers, our State Department, and our representatives in the Balkan countries are in most cases people who are afraid of the progressive, anti-Fascist revolution that has been taking place in the Balkans. They do not understand the upsurge of the masses of people toward real freedom for the common man. Our diplomats cannot sense, or do not want to sense, the determination of the Balkan peoples to break with the hateful past which brought them unspeakable suffering, and to build their life on a firm new foundation of true democracy.

There is another factor. Some of our political representatives in the Balkans were there before the war and mingled and made friends mainly among the most reactionary pro-Fascist circles. Despite the fact that these people have been thoroughly discredited in their own countries, the American diplomats still like their old friends.

Bulgaria, a former Hitler satellite, has set the best example of how to punish war criminals and Fascist traitors, yet responsible Government officials and some Congressmen do not seem very happy about this positive feature of the Fatherland Front government. This raises the inescapable question: Have we and our allies fought this war to such great sacrifice to eradicate fascism and Hitlerism, or are we going to let its supporters get a foothold again to foment further trouble for their people among us?

The inconsistency, the glaring contradiction of our intervention in Bulgaria is even more apparent when compared with our silent approval of the monarcho-Fascist terror now raging in Greece, where there is a real need for intervention. The present regime in Greece, as the entire world knows, was established by the bayonets, tanks, and bombers of the British Army. Our State Department at the time voiced verbal disapproval of British action. Since then it has been conspicuously silent. We have not lifted a finger to help the people of Greece choose their own government. The Yalta decisions to assist all liberated peoples in setting up their own democratic regimes has not applied to Greece—that heroic country which suffered long and bitterly under Nazi terror and now suffers under native Fascist terror. Only the Soviet Union of the Big Five has spoken out against the present monarcho-Fascist regime in Greece.

Is it any wonder then that the people of the Balkan countries resent our attitude and welcome that of the Soviet Union? Was it any wonder that the American people were much more in agreement with Molotov than with our own American delegation when the question of admission of the Fascist Argentine Government came up at the San Francisco Conference?

Recent events showed how correct Molotov was, yet he compromised. The Soviet delegation held to the view, as it seems to be holding now at the London conference, that the experience in collaboration among the Allies during the war proved that the difficulties can be overcome. The Balkans, of course, are much closer to the ravaged lands of the Ukraine and Byelorussia than Argentina is and the Soviet Union cannot be expected to make such concessions there; nor will the peoples of the Balkan countries stand for anything that resembles the old prewar reactionary regimes that betrayed them to fascism and Hitler. Of this there should be no doubt.

Full Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 1945, I made a statement on the floor of this House concerning the basic principles of H. R. 2202, the full employment bill. I pointed out at that time that while it might be possible to compromise on some minor points, there were certain fundamentals on which the sponsors of the full employment bill believed compromise impossible. At that time I listed the 106 Members of this House who had joined together as members of the House steering committee to further the progress of this vital legislation.

Since that time nine additional Members have joined our committee, and I should like at this time to list these additional cosponsors:

RICHARD F. HARLESS, of Arizona; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, of California; EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky; JOHN B. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; BERKELEY L. BUNKER, of Nevada; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of New York; WILLIAM R. THOM, of Ohio; MICHAEL J. BRADLEY and THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania.

As the chairman of this steering committee, I again extend an invitation to every Member who desires to join with us on our steering committee. This bill is not a partisan measure and should not be so considered. Republicans and Democrats have joined together in an attempt to enact into law this measure which will "establish a national policy and program for assuring continued full employment in a free competitive economy through concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local

governments, and the Federal Government."

I sincerely hope that many additional Members of this House will join with us in sponsoring this measure.

Naval Academy Becomes Air-Minded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a timely article on our Naval Academy written by Mr. Jim Chinn appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, September 30, 1945. This article indicates that some of the recommendations made by the Board of Visitors to the Academy of which I was a member in April 1944 are being carried out by Vice Adm. Aubrey W. Fitch, the new Superintendent. I call the attention of the House especially to recommendation No. 11 in the report of the official Board of Visitors of April 20, 1944. This recommendation reads as follows:

"The Board looks with favor on the aeronautics program and recommends the acceleration and expansion to the end that all midshipmen will be well grounded in the field of aviation."

The Washington Post article indicates that this recommendation is now being carried forward. By leave granted me, I include with my remarks the very interesting article by Mr. Chinn:

RADICAL CHANGES AHEAD AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY AS ONE HUNDRED AND FIRST YEAR OPENS

(By James E. Chinn)

The United States Naval Academy, with 100 years of glorious history behind it, now finds itself on the threshold of a change in life as revolutionary and progressive as the Navy's shift from sail to steam as a propulsive power for ships.

It's a big jump from sea to air. But that's the Academy's new goal as it kicks off for the centennial year.

The officers it makes from now on are going to the sea in ships just as they have always done, but with an added consciousness and fundamental knowledge of the potentialities of air power.

Startling achievements of bomb-loaded planes during the war forced the Navy to become air-minded. The devastation wrought on Germany from the skies and which later brought Japan to a crushing and ignominious defeat, even before an invasion army started on its way to the Jap homeland, destroyed at the same time what resistance there might have been left in the goldbraided Navy mossbacks against an air arm as an integral unit of the Nation's armada of fighting ships.

With an air-minded top command, modernization of Academy curricula was inevitable. And the Navy did not have to search very long for the man it needed to do the job.

FORESEES POTENTIALITIES

In the South Pacific several months before the shooting stopped, Vice Adm. Aubrey W. Fitch received a coded message one day last summer to drop everything and come to Washington. For him the war was over. But there was a bigger job ahead.

A veteran sea fighter, Fitch, too, was equally at ease in the air. Years ago he had foreseen the potentialities of air power and had helped to prove it in the scrap with the Japs as commander of aircraft in the South Pacific for nearly 2 years. He drove the Japs out of the air in that area after his airmen had destroyed 3,104 enemy planes.

So to Annapolis went Fitch as new superintendent of the Naval Academy—the first air-minded head in its history—with one primary objective:

To continue the Academy's tradition of making a Navy officer, but to indoctrinate in that officer a basic understanding of the science of aeronautics.

There's no difference except a span of 100 years, as Fitch sees it, in the conversion he has charted than in the transformation from armed sailing ships to steam-propelled men o' war.

NEED APPROPRIATION

Skeptics wailed loud and long in those days that the "gol durned steam engine wouldn't work." But Fitch does not have that resistance. The world knows what the airplane can do.

His big job is to pry out of a Congress suddenly gone economy mad enough money to establish a Department of Aeronautics which the Academy needs to carry out his program. And it's said of Fitch that he's ready to "fight anything that comes along," and usually comes out on top.

The white-haired, baldish admiral, now 62, came out of the Academy with the class of 1906 and has done about everything in the Navy an officer is supposed to do.

He was a gunnery officer aboard the battleship *Wyoming* in World War I. In 1935–36 he was Chief of Staff to the commander of the Aircraft Battle Force, also served as commander of the carrier *Lexington*. He learned to fly at Pensacola in 1929 and still flies.

"The war," said Fitch, "has given everybody an appreciation of what the military means. Therefore, it is incumbent that every midshipman leaving the Academy should be air-conscious, with full appreciation of air power and its potentialities.

"In order properly to indoctrinate midshipmen, we should have a special department and not have instruction distributed, as now, between various departments. (Midshipmen devote 20 percent of their academic year to aviation.) Aeronautics should be given the same weight as mathematics, history and government, seamanship and navigation, ordnance and gunnery, marine and electrical engineering."

KNOWLEDGE USEFUL

Fitch emphasized he had no thought of making the Academy an air-training station. Men who want to fly, he pointed out, will have to get their flight training elsewhere—Pensacola or Corpus Christi, Tex.

"A midshipman must learn engineering, not because we want to make an engineer out of him, but because his knowledge of engineering may prove useful. We teach him ordnance and gunnery for the same reason. The same goes for aeronautics."

The admiral pointed out the aeronautics course would serve another purpose, too—stimulate interest in aviation, so that the Navy would be able to get the quota of men it needs to man planes.

Not all midshipmen could become pilots, even if they desired, he explained, because many would not be able to pass the stiff physical examinations.

Fitch does, however, plan to give the midshipmen one entire summer of aviation training in lieu of a 3-month cruise at sea. Six weeks would be spent at a naval aviation station, followed by 4 weeks aboard a carrier and a 2-week wind-up in amphibious training.

Fitch's second project is expansion of the Academy itself, and he's looking in the direction of the nearby history-bathed St. John's College.

Bancroft Hall, midshipmen's quarters with four floors covering about 40 acres, is not crowded; it's jammed with 3,000 men, 800 more than it was designed to accommodate. And to this deficit in accommodations, he said, 800 more men must find room in 1947.

"Without a wild peacetime increase in the Navy," Fitch declared, "there must be expansion somewhere. The solution can be either the expansion of this academy or establishment of another.

BRIDGE IMPRACTICAL

"We can't expand to the south on account of water. The nearest land available is St. John's College and a few blocks in Annapolis.

"Why not go across the river? That would necessitate building a bridge, and would take too much time for midshipmen to go back and forth. Our heavy schedule would not permit it. Moreover, if we had to build we might as well establish a new academy somewhere else."

Fitch indicated he was not in sympathy with the move which has won widespread support in Congress to establish a new naval academy on the west coast.

His views he expressed in these carefully thought-out words: "If we build a new academy on the west coast, wouldn't it be the same if you moved Yale to Los Angeles? Tradition, history, everything connected with Annapolis mean too much. These are things you just can't transplant."

As the admiral sees the situation, ever since the Academy was founded on the mud banks of the Severn in 1845, the names of its graduates have become an integral part of the history of the United States. There is Dewey's victory at Manila, Sampson's achievements at Santiago, the exploits of "Fighting Bob" Evans, the explorations of Byrd and the World War II deeds of Nimitz, Mitscher, and scores of others.

These names, and the glory attached to them, Fitch points out with just pride, are all a part of Annapolis. Yes, he said, the Academy can get a mate elsewhere, but that's all—its spirit will remain always at Annapolis.

ALL PART OF GLORY

As the Academy moves into its centennial year, a gala celebration has been arranged for the week of October 7. Old grads—many now famous—will return to join in festivities. The list reads like a page from the history of World War II—King, Halsey, Mitchell, Spruance, Hewitt, Kirk, Mitcher, and many others.

Appropriately, the celebration will open with a memorial service next Sunday for graduates who gave their lives "in line of duty." The Navy-Penn State football game the following Saturday will bring it to a close.

In between there will be scores of events—banquets, cocktail parties, brigade reviews, organ recitals, an aviation demonstration, and a traditional Academy "hop," with Kay Kyser tossing out dance tunes.

"The first 100 years are the hardest" and so it is with the Academy, with five wars behind it. The pages of history will be turned on a new century with a bright ray of everlasting peace—but with the Academy going along in the same old way, turning out men trained to fight.

And What of the Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include excerpts from a short speech of Hon. Winston Churchill, delivered in the House of Commons on the 16th of August last:

There are those who considered that the atomic bomb should never have been used at all—that rather than throw this bomb we should have sacrificed a million American and a quarter of a million British lives in the desperate battles and massacres of an invasion of Japan. Future generations will judge this dire decision, and I believe, if they find themselves in a happier world from which war has been banished and where freedom reigns, they will not condemn those who struggled for their benefit amid the horrors and miseries of this grim and ferocious epoch.

The bomb brought peace, but man alone can keep that peace.

Nothing can stay the progress of research in any country, but the construction of the immense plants necessary to transform the theory into action cannot be improvised. So far as we know, there are perhaps 3 or 4 years before the great progress in the United States can be overtaken. In these 3 years we must remold the relationships of all men of all nations in such a way that men do not wish or dare to fall upon each other for the sake of vulgar, outdated ambition, or for passionate differences in ideologies, and that international bodies by supreme authority may give peace on earth and justice among men. Our pilgrimage has brought us to a sublime moment in the history of the world.

From the least to the greatest, all must strive to be worthy of these supreme opportunities. There is not an hour to be wasted; there is not a day to be lost.

Increase of Base Pay Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include letter of Mr. H. E. Wilson, president of the Peoples Cotton Oil Co., of Wharton, Tex. Mr. Wilson is one of the prominent businessmen of southern Texas, and his statements are always considered as timely and informative.

PEOPLES COTTON OIL CO.,
Wharton, Tex., September 26, 1945.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have been following very closely the President's idea of increasing the base pay rate from 40 cents to 65 cents per hour; and, then in the next 3 years to increase the rate up to 75 cents per hour.

This morning, we read in the A. P. News that there is southern opposition to this movement; and, well there should be. The writer has had 50 years' experience with labor in the South in the cottonseed oil mill business. With the knowledge we have of it and knowing the conditions as they are today in war construction work and other cost-plus construction where the contractors are allowed to increase the per-hour rate in order to get labor, we have found that the legitimate manufacturer or processor of raw agricultural products where prices are stalemated by ceilings which are based on a 40-cent-hour basis cannot secure the labor badly needed. When the manufacturer or processor hires a limited number of laborers they only work 3 to 4 days per week at 40 cents per hour. We have found when the laborer gets $10 to $12 in his pocket, he lays off for 2 or 3 days to spend it.

This company has been a processor of cottonseed products for the past 45 years. We buy and sell on an open market, hire and pay a legitimate wage to our employees. We have always been able to function and fill the economic needs in this agricultural community by furnishing fats and feeds for livestock. During this great war we have furnished all the raw materials we could possibly gather for fighting this war without complaint. Now we are faced with disaster in this labor situation, for if this bill passes increasing the base wage rate from 40 cents to 65 cents; and, we are not allowed to lower our price for the raw materials or allowed to have our products' ceiling raised, every cottonseed plant like our own faces ruin.

We are opposed to any bill that increases any wage rate unless there is an equalization in manufacturing or processing spread. In other words, we simply have to purchase the raw materials cheaper or receive a higher price for our finished products.

With the writer's kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

H. E. WILSON,
President, Peoples Cotton Oil Co.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of October 1, 1945:

FULL EMPLOYMENT, PERHAPS—IF—POSSIBLY!

The amended full employment bill passed by the Senate Friday is a disappointment to everyone who sincerely wants to see full employment an assured, continuing reality in this country.

As it stands it's a P-I-P of a bill—

A perhaps, if, possibly measure.

It doesn't say that America is going to have full employment come hell or high water—the only effective approach.

It actually jeopardizes attainment of the universally desired goal.

With restrictive conditions, it cripples the means the Nation has of assuring jobs for all.

There are some hopeful aspects. More than 100 Members of the House have announced they will fight the watered-down version of the bill and exert all their efforts to have the original bill restored.

And even the bill as it emerged from the Senate does put the Government on record for the first time in history as committed to a policy of maintaining full employment.

Mark that word "policy" well, however. The bill does not commit the Government to an obligation, merely a policy. There, perhaps, is the fundamental difference between the full employment bill as it was, and as the Senate enfeebled it.

Providing the right of a job for all Americans able to work and desiring to work must be an obligation and a responsibility of Government.

Every place where the original bill spoke of the "right" of Americans to a job, the language was changed in the Senate to they are "entitled" to an opportunity, or some other noncommittal phrase.

The Senate further crippled the bill by limiting Federal funds to provide jobs to an extent "consistent with the needs and obligations of the Federal Government and other essential considerations of national policy."

That means we'll fight for prosperity half-heartedly, with one hand tied behind us.

If we had fought the war that way, we'd still be fighting it 20 years hence.

The Senate also required that any program of Federal spending for jobs submitted by the President must be accompanied by a tax program to meet the cost.

The budget-balancing boys are back again, worshiping their own little deity—ignoring the more far-reaching responsibility of Government. Hoover balanced the budget in 1932. In that year farmers got 7 cents a bushel for corn and thousands of city dwellers searched the garbage pails for a crust of bread.

It would be the poorest kind of economics, of course, to raise taxes in a time when unemployment existed and had to be absorbed by Federal spending.

It would be a time of deflation, and deflation would be aggravated by upping taxes.

It is difficult to understand why Senators WAGNER and MURRAY, authors of the original full employment bill, went along on the amendments. Maybe they have some strategy in mind of rewinning lost ground in the House or in a House-Senate committee. We hope so.

But one fact cannot be ignored: All the Senate amendments were proposed by opponents of the bill.

Let the liberals of the House fight for real full employment from the word go—put the teeth back into the bill.

America will not get full employment if the measure providing it begins with "if."

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 26, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a bill has been introduced proposing the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority as a Government corporation managed by a three-man board, to be given power, among other things, to plan, construct, and administer a basin-wide program not only for the development of the water resources through dams, reservoirs, and other structures but of other resources as well for the entire Missouri drainage basin inclusive of main stream and tributaries. In that development is to be included due regard to economic, social, and cultural values.

In the Denver (Colo.) Post of July 29, 1945, an eminent Denver attorney, L. Ward Bannister, wrote an article which I wish to enclose in the Appendix of the RECORD.

L. Ward Bannister, eminent Denver attorney, is recognized nationally as an outstanding authority on western water laws. He has had more than 25 years of experience in the practice of western water laws and has lectured on them at the University of Denver, Cornell, Columbia, and Harvard Universities. He was of counsel for the State of Colorado in connection with the Colorado River

compact, and special attorney for the city of Denver in conferences on the Colorado River bill which authorized construction of the Hoover Dam. He is a member of the Colorado water-conservation board, assistant counsel of the Platte Valley Water Users Association, a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce and a member of its natural resources department, and a past president of the Denver Chamber of Commerce and Denver Rotary Club.

His article follows:

TOTALITARIANISM ON THE MARCH

The Missouri Valley Authority is but one of a total of some nine proposed in some government quarters for various different river basins of the Nation, and roughly may be taken as a type.

There is no question but that in planning water projects for the development of the water resources of a river basin it is preferable to have in mind the entire basin rather than some single part of it, since under the former method the peoples of the various States of a basin are more likely through well-selected, scattered project sites to share in the benefits of the common source of water supply. It does not follow, however, that the interest of any particular State or its people should be unjustly sacrificed to other States and their peoples upon the same stream system.

ARMY-BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PLAN

It was for the very reason that basin-wide planning in advance of construction is the preferable system that, as applied to the Missouri Valley, the Congress by its Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, approved the coordinated—and it may be said the better—plan of the War and Interior Departments for the development of the water resources of the great Missouri Basin; the War Department acting through its Corps of Army Engineers and the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation.

This co-ordinated plan is the result of many years of study by the Army engineers with their more than a century of experience in planning and operating projects for flood control and navigation and by the Bureau of Reclamation, an agency likewise of many, many years of experience in the construction and operation of reservoirs and other structures for supplying water for municipal irrigation, domestic, stock-watering and industrial uses in accordance with the laws of the States. These reservoirs constructed by the Bureau also often serve to control floods.

The generation of power at the dams constructed by the Army engineers or by the Bureau is a frequent incident of the projects of both the Army engineers and the Bureau.

The coordinated plan contemplates some 174 projects for flood control, navigation, and all sorts of beneficial uses, and even for recreation and wildlife.

In March 1945 the Congress passed the River and Harbor Act for the improvement of the navigation channel from the mouth of the Missouri as far northward as Sioux City. In appraising the Missouri Valley Authority bill it is important to know that both the Flood Control Act already mentioned and this River and Harbor Act purport to protect water uses west of the ninety-eighth meridian other than navigation uses as against navigation uses east of that meridian, as to water arising west of that meridian. Doubtless this is because there are transportation substitutes for navigation in the way of trains and trucks, but no substitutes for these other uses. Then, too, it may have been thought that although there might be enough water for navigation anyway, yet certainty should be imparted to the other uses west of the meridian referred to.

The protecting language is the same in both of the bills, and is as follows:

"The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein authorized for construction, of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes."

The Flood Control Act is Public Law 534 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The River and Harbor Act is Public Law 14 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

THE ISSUE

Both the coordinated plans of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation (sometimes called the Pick-Sloan plan after the names of the engineers in the Corps of Army Engineers and in the Bureau, respectively) and the Missouri Valley Authority plan call for flood control and the use of water for various beneficial purposes.

The question at issue is not whether floods should be reduced and water should be applied to beneficial uses, for these objectives are emphatically favored. No; the question is which, all things concerned, would be the better plan and agency for their accomplishment.

SYSTEMS OF WATER LAW

Some of the 10 Missouri Valley Basin States have in force, as do the States of the East generally, the riparian system of water law. Other States of the basin have, as do 17 of the States of the far West generally, the appropriation or priority system. By far the larger area of the Missouri Basin States is under the appropriation or priority system.

The fundamental principle of the riparian system is that each landownership contiguous to a stream has a right as against other landownerships on the stream to make a reasonable use of the water. Under the appropriation or priority system of water law, landownerships contiguous to the stream system count for little in themselves. The waters are allocated in accordance with the principle of priority in point of commencement of use—to the oldest use, the first right, to the next oldest, the second right, and so on through the series until the source of supply is exhausted. Under the appropriation or priority system the water may be used in connection with ownerships of land contiguous to the stream or remote from the stream.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO THE MVA BILL

The bill is subject to objections that just can't be answered. They prove, among other things:

That intrastate uses or rights are not adequately protected.

That interstate uses or rights of States on the same stream likewise are not sufficiently protected.

That water uses west of the ninety-eighth meridian for purposes other than navigation are not adequately safeguarded against navigation uses each of that meridian.

That water rights acquired under State law are not safeguarded as they should be against impairment or extinction by the proposed Authority.

That new water rights cannot be obtained within the States or old ones be changed or dams or bridges built without the consent of the Authority.

That State law is flagrantly ignored when it comes to the procural of new water rights.

That plans made by the Authority could become effective and carried out without the approval of Congress.

That the Authority is given the power to sell water as distinguished from furnishing it to consumers on reasonable terms.

That the use of water for irrigation is too much limited in respect to the size of the farms to be irrigated.

That the employees of the Authority would be outside of civil service and therefore subject to the spoils system.

That suits against the Authority or its employees would have to be brought in the Federal court of that 1 of the 10 States in which the authority would maintain its principal office.

That the bill centralizes instead of decentralizes power over the waters and also centralizes the administration of that power.

That there is not reserved to the Congress the right to discharge members of the three-man board which control the Authority, with the possible consequence that the President, in the exercise merely of so-called inherent power, may become the water czar of the Nation.

That the bill, if enacted, would prove an open sesame to socialism.

That the bill would effect a change in our form of government totalitarian and Socialist in its trend.

That the plan and agency which it proposes are far inferior to that of the coordinated plan and agency of the Corps of Army Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation with respect to the development of the waters of the Missouri Basin.

SPECIAL OBJECTIONS TO MVA BILL

It is easy to reduce the general objections to the specific. They challenge answers equally specific. Some of these objections will now be stated:

Objection No. 1

The bill fails to protect existing vested intrastate water rights adequately. The relevant section 10, which proponents of the bill say protects water rights within a State, contains the following provision:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way to interfere with any vested right acquired under the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof."

Since some of the officials of the Government claim that under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution the public right of navigation is superior to either appropriation water rights or riparian water rights within the States, and since this section provides that "nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government," etc., it follows that there is grave danger that this declared right of the Federal Government may be made the basis of an attempt to cancel the so-called vested right acquired under the laws of any State.

In that event those so-called vested rights would not be protected.

Again, there is danger that the authority, being an agency of the Government, may claim (although the States would deny and fight any such interpretation and claim) that there can be no vested right conferred by the laws of the State and that instead vested rights can be created only in pursuance of Federal laws. So in that event the vested right could not be acquired under the laws of the State and therefore would not be protected.

If the authors of the bill really meant to protect water rights that are acquired in harmony with the laws of a State they should have said so expressly and without any nullifying clause subordinating any rights acquired in harmony with State laws to a superior right of the Federal Government. Again, this section 10 purports to protect only irrigation uses or rights and does not protect municipal, domestic, and industrial uses or rights of the people of the States as against the authority.

Furthermore, no future water uses or rights may be acquired without the consent of the

board of the authority, instead of being acquired as now supposedly under the laws of the State. Again, the farmers' well and stock tank water are not protected since if this underground water is not intercepted and would reach a stream it is by law considered as part of the stream, and farmers' well and stock tank water not being for irrigation are entirely outside any protecting language of section 10. Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 2

The bill fails to protect the interstate interests of States on the same stream.

The principle of law as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the great case of *Kansas* v. *Colorado* is that each State upon an interstate stream has a right as against the other States to an equitable or fair portion of the waters of the stream and to that portion may apply its own system of water law, whether it be the appropriation system or the riparian system.

Compacts between States ratified by their legislatures and approved by the Congress have been a favorite and successful method of adjusting the division of water uses as between States and have been encouraged by the Supreme Court itself. If the States do not agree, the question of equitable or fair division is one for the United States Supreme Court. It is of vital importance that States be treated fairly in the division of water uses as between themselves.

The States are political units in our Federal system and should not be ignored in distributions of water without which those units could not exist.

The bill in question throws overboard the practice of interstate compacting which has been resorted to so successfully; throws overboard the aid of the United States Supreme Court and instead allows three interested men constituting a board to locate all the basin water projects and construct them and thus in effect determine what the different States shall have in the way of water. The Board, under the bill, is to disregard State lines and develop the entire basin as a unit. Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 3

The bill fails to protect water users on the upper Missouri and its many tributaries where rainfall is scarce against water uses, including navigation, down below. Section 11 (a) contains the following provision relating the Board's plan of development:

"If the Board determines that there is or will be an insufficient stream flow from waters arising west of the ninety-eighth meridian to satisfy both the beneficial consumptive uses of such waters for domestic, irrigation, mining and industrial purposes west of such meridian and navigation requirements for such waters east of the meridian the plan shall give priority to the satisfaction of the said beneficial uses of such waters west of said meridian."

The ninety-eighth meridian is a meridian passing north and south through approximately the center of Kansas and Nebraska and other States north and south. The supposed effect of the section quoted is to protect all water uses west of that meridian, the rainfall being light, against navigation and other uses east of the meridian, where rainfall is abundant and where trucks and trains may be used, if need be, for transportation in lieu of navigating boats and barges.

The reader will note that the section leaves it to the Board, this Federal board, to determine whether or not the waters arising west of the ninety-eighth meridian will be insufficient to take care of water needs west of that meridian. It would be unsafe for the water users west of the meridian to have the sufficiency of their waters left to the determination of a three-man board which would be interested in upholding any decision which it might make and apparently without right of appeal. Indeed the section does not even compel the board to make a decision at all, in which event again there would be no safety to water users west of the meridian.

The decision of the questions of sufficiency of water supply should be left to courts and not to the board.

The general section under discussion was modeled supposedly under the Flood Control Act of 1944. This act, however, empowered no board of any kind to make a decision, but laid down the rule that waters west of the meridian were not to be sacrificed to users east of the meridian, thus leaving the question of the application of the rule to the courts. Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 4

The bill fails to assure holders of water rights under State law that if their rights are impaired or extinguished by the activities of the board the owner shall be entitled to compensation.

Although the board is given power to condemn "land" and "real property" (see secs. 9 and 21 (a)), and although water rights—those intangible rights to use water—are "real property," it is significant that the words "water rights" are nowhere used in the bill.

Why? A military secret easy to disclose.

For good or bad, it very likely is because the drafters of the bill may have had it in mind that possibly under the rule promulgated by some courts (*U. S.* v. *Rio Grande Dam & Irrigation Co.* (174 U. S. 690) and *U. S.* v. *Willow River Power Co.* (89 U. S. Sup. Ct. 809)), to the effect that all private water rights, if not confirmed by the Congress, are subject, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, to the public right of navigation, and that, therefore, if impaired or extinguished, need not be paid for; in other words, need not be condemned.

Can it be that the drafters of the bill had it in mind that the board of the authority should be able to impair or extinguish domestic, stock-water, irrigation, industrial, and even municipal rights without compensation? It would look so in the absence of express language recognizing water rights as being the subject of condemnation if impaired or extinguished. Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 5

The bill by section 19 (a) prohibits, without the consent of the board, the construction or maintenance of any dam, sewer, bridge, and apparently even a farmer from changing the location of his headgate on a stream or maintaining an intercepting well or watering tank or pond in connection with the Missouri River or any of its tributary streams.

Will municipal and private water users stand for any such power of the board as distinguished from what they may do under their own State law? Again totalitarianism!

Objection No. 6

This bill ignores any necessity of water users complying with the State law in order to obtain a water right, the permit of the Board apparently being regarded as sufficient.

It is by strange contrast that when the Bureau of Reclamation constructs a Government water project within a State it is required by section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 to do what any private individual or municipality would have to do, namely, comply with the law of the State relating to how water rights may be acquired. The Bureau of Reclamation has over 70 Federal water projects in the West and has a great record behind it.

Why so unnecessarily create a regional authority and endow its board with the powers of Federal dictatorship over the water of the States. Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 7

The bill fails to require approval of the Congress to the development plans submitted. (See section 11 (e), p. 23). Under this section the Board submits its plans to the Congress and, unless rejected within 120 days by both branches of the Congress, those plans become effective.

Now, suppose one branch favors and one rejects, or, suppose, because of other pressing matters, neither has time in which to act. In either case the plans go into effect without congressional approval. The members of this Federal Board are not elected by the people. The Members of the Congress are.

Why deprive the legislative branch of Government of the approval of economic plans so vital to the interests of the States concerned? Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 8

The bill purports to give the Board authority to sell water (sec. 8 (a)), whereas the general rule of State law is that furnishers of water to others for use do not own the water which they furnish, but simply have a right and duty to provide it to the consumer at a reasonable rate. This is the rule as applied even to the Bureau of Reclamation of the Federal Government.

Why should this Missouri Valley Authority arrogate to itself the "ownership" of water? Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 9

The bill limits the use of the water furnished by the board or Authority to irrigate the farms of 160 acres, and requires that if the number of acres exceeds 160 the excess shall be sold. See section 13 (b), (i), and (j). Experience under the Homestead Act proves that 160 acres frequently were not enough for a "family type" farm.

The proposed authority limitation is too restrictive upon the farmers and to that extent is totalitarianism.

Objection No. 10

The bill fails to provide for civil service. There may be thousands of employees working for the board or Authority if the bill should pass. Without civil service those employees would be deprived of all sense of security in their jobs and become a mere political tool of three unelected officeholders. Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 11

The bill (sec. 7 (b)) requires suits against the Authority or the board or any of the employees to be brought in the Federal court of the principal office of the Authority, wherever that office might be. The principal office, of course, would be located in one of the 10 States of the Missouri Basin.

The resident of any of the other nine States would be obliged to travel to the State of the principal office, wherever it might be, and retain legal counsel and fight his case there instead of allowing him to bring his suit in the Federal court of his own residence.

Too much totalitarianism!

Objection No. 12

Contrary to the claims of its proponents, the bill centralizes power as distinguished from administration, instead of decentralizing it.

At the present time the power to determine what water system shall prevail in a given State and what the legal incidents of the system shall be as to the creation and exercise of water rights is left to the States themselves, through their legislatures and their courts.

Under this bill that power is to be taken away from the States and put in the single board which manages the Authority.

What is this but a centralization of power in an agency of the Federal Government instead of a decentralization? Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 13

Contrary to the claims of its proponents, the bill centralizes administration also as distinguished from power in the Federal Government instead of leaving it in the States.

The various States in carrying out their administrative functions in the course of exercising the power which is theirs have

their attorneys general, their State engineers, their water commissioners, and their courts for the purpose of effecting a distribution of water among various kinds of water users in accordance with State law. This function of administration or distribution would be taken away from the States by the bill and put in this Federal authority.

This is not decentralization, but centralization. Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 14

The bill contains no provisions relating to removal of directors of the board as does the Tennessee Valley Authority law, which in other respects is supposed to be the inspiration of the present bill. The TVA law expressly gives to the Congress the right of removal and, upon certain designated grounds, expressly gives to the President of the United States the power of removal.

Why, in the present bill, is the power of removal withheld from the Congress, and why is there silence as to the President? Can this, too, be a military secret?

Suspicion answers in the affirmative.

In the case of *Arthur Morgan* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (112 Fed. 2 (d) 630) the United States Circuit Court of Appeals held that Mr. Morgan (he was the first Chairman of the Board of that Authority) was removed by order of the President and could be removed without any reference to enumerated grounds upon the theory that the President, through mere inherent power, may remove a public officer whom he has nominated to the Senate and whom the Senate has confirmed. The effect of that decision would be to make the President the water dictator of the Missouri Basin and of all other basins in respect to which authoritties are created.

It is to be remembered also that the Missouri bill as well as other bills empower the President to supervise the activities of the administrators of the various authorities. This power of supervision plus the power of removal make the President of the United States the czar over the uses of the Nation's waters. This is too much power to give to any one man no matter to what party he may belong.

The reason that Congress is not given by the bill the power to remove a member of the Board is undoubtedly to take that power from the legislative branch of the Government and to make the President not merely a dictator but the sole dictator in the realm of government over the waters of the Nation.

The only way to defeat this power of the President is to defeat the bill. Totalitarianism!

Objection No. 15

The bill would give to the authority (this Federal corporation) power to far more than take over the control and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, for the authority is authorized to control and develop any other natural resources as well.

It could carry on any kind of economic activity that is related to the use of the natural resources. (See preamble to bill, also sec. 2; sec. 11 (a), (3), (6), (9); sec. 12 (b), sec. 12 (b) (1), (2); sec. 14; sec. 15 (b); sec. 16 (a); sec. 20 (a)).

It could conduct farming operations, quarry rock, mine for various metals, grow timber, run sawmills, generate electrical energy, and engage in the distribution of the products of these industries; in fact, the bill, if enacted, would prove an open sesame to that enslaving, personality-stunting, economic system known as socialism.

Indeed, Norman Thomas, the titular head of the Socialist movement in our country, said in Nashville in 1944 when referring to the Tennessee Valley Authority, that "the TVA exemplifies what Socialists might do and the technique it would use in the process."

In representing the deprivation of political and economic powers of the people, the bill represents the hated thing we call totalitarianism.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing considerations, it is evident that if the bill were passed it would change our form of government, taking away from the States the power of control of waters and their functions of administering in accordance with that power and put both power and administration in the hands of a Federal agency under plans that would not require the affirmative approval of the Congress of the United States, and even would be beyond its supervision and control.

It would tend to transform our present economy from one in which private enterprise is the main factor into that enslaving, personality stunting, and race-degenerating system of socialism, communism, or fascism, and this in the face of the better plan and the better agency of the Army engineers and of the Bureau of Reclamation, the water uses of which plan for municipal, industrial, domestic, stock-watering, and agricultural purposes are to be under the law of the States and not at the will of any Federal corporation or board.

The Bureau already has 75 water projects in the West alone; 22 are in the Missouri Basin States. There are 79 REA cooperatives, and of the 79, 7 are supplied with electrical energy by the Bureau. The remaining 72 are supplied from other sources, mainly private.

The coordinated plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and of the Army Engineers has in contemplation the possible construction of some additional 174 water projects for flood control, navigation, and for municipal, domestic, irrigation, and general industrial uses, and even for recreation and wildlife.

The Army engineers and the Bureau, with their fine records behind them, with the water uses which they create, subject as they are now to State law, and with the new uses in prospect, should not be liquidated in favor of a Federal corporation, defying State law and totaliarian in character.

It is gratifying to note that opposition to the bill as its purport and effect are being revealed is gradually growing, that a multitude of organizations are opposing it, and that its defeat seems probable.

Let us remain politically free and economically free! Down with totalitarianism!

The Coffee Situation Needs Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months American consumers have been noticing a continuing deterioration in the quality of coffee offered for sale in this country. Investigation discloses that the reason for this condition is the price policy and other restrictions imposed by OPA on coffee importation.

Without regard to the cost of production, OPA has established ceiling prices of coffee at the retail level in this country and has based the wholesale and producer's price on that arbitrary retail standard.

In spite of protest from coffee producers and importers that the better grades of coffee cannot be produced and sold at the figure established by OPA, that agency, with the collaboration of the Foreign Economic Administration and the State Department, has stubbornly maintained its position.

The result is that American buyers in Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, and other coffee-producing countries are able to obtain only coffee of inferior quality for the price they are permitted to offer, while the top grades go to purchasers for firms in Great Britain, France, Holland, Sweden, and Switzerland, who pay 1 to 2 cents more a pound.

This senseless situation has resulted in up-grading by both importers and distributors. By this practice coffee of a lower grade, which normally sells several cents below standard top-grade coffees, is now being sold as top-grade coffee at the top ceiling price. It has also resulted in outright black-market transactions by coffee importers who were willing to pay more than OPA decree and take a substantial loss on their current business in order to maintain the quality of their product.

In an effort to end these practices the Department of Agriculture is now spot checking coffee as it is imported. Because of this activity and because of a growing reluctance on the part of coffee producers to part with a product which European countries are in a position to buy in increasing quantities, and at higher prices than American importers can pay, coffee imports have fallen off sharply during the past 2 weeks.

During the first 17 days of September, new purchases of coffee by importers and roasters in this country were reported at the rate of only 400,000 bags a month, according to the Department of Agriculture. Purchases for August totaled 890,000 bags, and normally average between 800,000 and 1,000,000 bags per month.

The senselessness of this policy at a time when we are looking for markets abroad for our agricultural and industrial production, and particularly trying to develop trade with our neighbor countries to the south, should be apparent. If we are to sell our products to South and Central American countries, there must be ample credits available in those countries to pay for such purchases. We will not be able to sell freely to coffee-producing countries unless we are willing to buy their coffee at prices as high as are being paid by Europe. If our coffee importers cannot meet the competition of Great Britain, France, Holland, and other European countries, it is only natural that the coffee-producing countries will turn increasingly to those European countries for their imports.

Less obvious to the American consumer than the poor quality of coffee he has been getting, but possibly even more serious to the future of American agriculture, is the fact that OPA's shortsighted price policy is creating in coffee-producing countries, notably in Brazil, direct competition on the world market for cotton grown in the United States.

In Brazil cotton and coffee are grown on the same kind of soil, in the same geographic areas, and with the same type of labor. For the past 15 years there has been a trend away from coffee and into cotton production. The cotton grown in Brazil is very similar to that grown in our own Southern States and is in direct competition with our cotton on the world market.

In the past 3 years this trend to cotton has been sharply increased by the arbi-

trary restrictions OPA has placed on American purchase of coffee—restrictions which Brizilian growers say force them to produce many grades of coffee at a loss.

Figures compiled by the Department of Agriculture indicate the magnitude of this shift in Brazil from coffee to cotton production:

Coffee	*Bags*
1935–39 average	22,776,000
1942	14,841,000
1943	13,086,000
1944	9,500,000
Cotton	*Bales*
1930	483,000
1935–39 average	1,956,000
1942	1,844,000
1943	2,089,000
1944	2,675,000

Officials of the Department of Agriculture report that the reduction in coffee production and the increase in cotton is no mere coincidence, but is due directly to the price factor, and that coffee trees are actually being pulled up and cotton being planted in their place in many parts of Brazil.

This is substantiated by reports from Brazil which indicate a constantly decreasing number of coffee trees in that country:

	Coffee trees
1935	2,960,000
1941	2,559,000
1942	2,388,000
1943	2,303,000

OPA stubbornly refuses to alter its coffee price policy on the theory that this helps control the cost of living, a theory which merely gives lip service to price control, since the direct result of its restrictions is that American consumers are now paying top ceiling prices for coffee of poorer grade than that on which the ceilings were established. Coffee which formerly sold for 21 cents a pound for example, may be upgraded to sell for 31 cents a pound, instead of at its normal price. This is the type of hidden inflation in many food commodities brought about directly by OPA policies and regulations.

OPA price policies on coffee are forcing American consumers to use coffee of inferior quality, have created hidden inflation through upgrading, are aiding in establishment of cotton production in competition with the United States, and are endangering our trade relations with South American countries. They should be adjusted at once to conform to realities.

They Were in the White House Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, upon obtaining unanimous consent of the House, I am pleased to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial appearing in the Tulsa Daily Tribune, Tulsa, Okla., September 22, 1945, entitled "They Were in the White House Business":

THEY WERE IN THE WHITE HOUSE BUSINESS

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Something more than political fortune followed the late Franklin Roosevelt through his 12 White House years. He was our first President to end his White House tenancy richer than when he went in, richer infinitely than anything possible by any salary saving. And he made the living costs of the White House more than the total of a majority of the Presidents who preceded him. One of the first of a series of prompt, commendable acts of President Truman was to cut the White House costs down to a rational figure.

Franklin Roosevelt was the first President whose family found White House prestige a considerable aid to their financial improvement. Never before did a First Lady of the land publicize herself for profit as did Grand Lady Eleanor. Contemplate such samples as her candy and coffee ballyhoos and journalistic enterprises.

A conservative compilation by tax experts shows Mrs. Roosevelt's earnings in her White House enterprises to have net her more than $900,000. And not even her editors on the Ladies' Home Journal can assume that her name would ever have drawn such earning power had she never been more than a housewife in a Hudson River village with no White House panhandle with which to hurl her into an advertised and advertising name. The family's listed White House enterprises netted over two and a half million. What were the earnings of any of them before they got into the White House? That is the story.

And to crown their money-minded White House activities, Franklin Roosevelt is the first President who planned his own, and governmentally endowed, memorial. Running true to the Roosevelt form of thinking, his monument is not an imposing architectural arrangement of enduring stone, the cost of which ends when completed. His memorial is a continuing cost to the people for the benefit of his family.

It is a simple but significant historical fact that every President and his family, Roosevelt alone excepted, retired to his private home without cost to the country. But not so with the omnipotent. He used his patronage powers so efficiently that his congressional stooges provided for the perpetuating costs of manning and maintaining, as a residential concern for his family, his palatial home at swanky Hyde Park.

There is not an American who knows the history of our country and loves it for its nobilities who would not be outraged to hear anyone suggest that George Washington had ever dreamed of putting the maintenance costs of his Mount Vernon on the public bills for the people to pay. Yet, through the 12 years of Franklin Roosevelt, the people have been so schooled in moral decadence in public matters that we quite expect all the Roosevelts to profit, ad infinitum, in the Presidency business.

A great granite shaft rises 555 feet in the air in the Capital of our country to symbolize the altitude of George Washington's nobilities. And that lofty monument was placed there by a grateful people after they had the perspective measure of the man for more than half a hundred years. In that perspective the whole world had come to know his giant stature.

Franklin Roosevelt did not dare trust himself to posterity's measure. In every business enterprise in which he ever engaged he was a considerable failure until he got into the White House business.

Three score and ten years after Lincoln left his great, unfinished task a grateful people, having placed a memorial where his humble life began, erected a monument where that exalted life came to an untimely end.

Lincoln never dreamed of a memorial to himself. Nor did Washington. The giants of time never do. They don't have to. Duty is their whole domain. Their place in fame, or fortune, was of no concern to them. Reason, human rights, the right to work without paying tribute to a toll-taking dictator, the right to be free, freemen, freedom. Free to initiate enterprise. Free to enjoy the rewards of work. These were their concern, these their obsessions. They were men of exalted principles. They were above being smart political manipulators.

As the people's Presidents they dared leave their office records, their state papers, for all posterity to read. Theirs were open records. But not so with Franklin Roosevelt. With him the Presidency was a business. So he did not dare leave his Presidential papers for all who care to read. They must be carefully culled, read, and sifted by his trusted confidants who knew all his tricks, that all the seamy, schemy stuff can be destroyed, obliterated. The residue, grand, eloquent rhetoric is to go to his Hyde Park library of Presidential papers.

His White House pal, Harry Hopkins, his speech doctor, Judge Samuel Rosenman, and Grace Tully, his private secretary, are, by his own orders, to be paid by the people for finding what the people must not know about their late President. The New Dealers' legend of the omniscient must be protected lest a pin prick cause its total collapse.

Woodrow Wilson led us through domestic confusions and through a world war without concern over a single pencil note on his cuff. Everything that was said, done, written, noted, or annotated while he was the people's President was the people's business. And he left it so. Historians found a true record of that time in Wilson's words. So with Cleveland. So with Hoover. Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Jackson, name them all up and down the line. Their written records belonged to the people and they were not afraid to let the people read them. Why this concern and caution now? Why this suppression and distortion of historical fact? What are mysteries in Mr. Roosevelt's Presidency business that he dared not let come to light?

If the Roosevelt library is to be the people's property, if the people are to pay all the bills of putting its papers in place, then let the Congress, acting like honest representatives, promptly fire Hopkins, Rosenman, and Tully from their none-too-honest work and put honest historians on the job.

If Franklin Roosevelt was the exalted nobility his staunch supporters profess he was, this New Deal President would have been as unafraid of true historians as was Woodrow Wilson. Let him stand the time test that lifted Washington and Lincoln up to mountain altitudes of enduring esteem.

The shocking revelations of Elliott Roosevelt's borrowing escapades with the aid of his cunning Presidential father is but a sample of the unethical uses that never before were made of our exalted White House. May such debasing use of the President's home never occur again. There still are to be appraised by the people's certified accountants the fantastic financial antics of Jimmy. This family is the first in our history to look upon the White House as their personal enterprise.

Hopkins, Rosenman, and Grace Tully have a job sizable as shabby. For if the American people ever learned the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about Franklin Roosevelt's 12 White House years, it is altogether possible that our Congress 50 years from now might erect a monument to his memory that would stand no higher than a hitching post.

Interdependence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, just as "interdependence" has become the by-word and guiding light for the path to peace, prosperity, and good will in the family of the United Nations, so, too, can we apply the principle of interdependence within our own Nation—to our own American family of citizens of diverse national origins, varied religions and creeds, occupying numerous and sundry positions in life, and practicing multitudinous occupations, trades, and professions which go into the making of our great Nation.

Because I feel so strongly that within the word "interdependence" lies the clue and solution to a world of justice, dignity, and well-being for all, I wish to take this opportunity to acquaint my fellow colleagues who may not know of the outstanding, dynamic movement recently initiated in California for the purpose of promoting the principle of interdependence through education. This organization, the Declaration of Interdependence, Inc., inspired and headed by Dr. Will Durant, sponsored and endorsed by prominent persons the Nation over, is nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nonpolitical in character, seeking merely to propagate the noble American spirit of interracial and interreligious friendliness.

Now that we have won a great and glorious victory over the venomous forces of fascism, certain malicious elements of our society are seeking to spread in our own country the poisonous ingredients of the doctrines of the very enemies we defeated on the battlefield—racial and religious hatreds. For this reason, the appearance of the Declaration of Interdependence, Inc., on the scene at this time is of inestimable value in counteracting and defeating these forces. For, by learning to broaden the circle of our relations with our fellow man, we immeasurably enrich our lives in the sharing of the diverse qualities and cultures which have met and fused in this Nation since its inception. These differences increase the cultural richness of American life and stimulate all to give their best to the common lot.

In the words of Associate Justice Frank Murphy at the interdependence for Americans rally at Hollywood Bowl on July 4 of this year, we can "reject the destructive doctrines of hate by a living affirmation of the positive values. We cannot wage the battle negatively." In the following words of the declaration of interdependence, is the living affirmation of the brotherhood of man, which I firmly believe will in time be adopted in spirit by all Americans as an integral code of the democratic way of life so cherished by all:

DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

Human progress having reached a high level through respect for the liberty and dignity of man, it has become desirable to reaffirm these evident truths:

That differences of race, color, and creed are natural, and that diverse groups, institutions, and ideas are stimulating factors in the development of man;

That to promote harmony in diversity is a responsible task of religion and statesmanship;

That since no individual can express the whole truth, it is essential to treat with understanding and good will those whose views differ from our own;

That by the testimony of history intolerance is the door to violence, brutality, and dictatorship; and

That the realization of human interdependence and solidarity is the best guard of civilization;

Therefore, we solemnly resolve, and invite everyone to join in united action—

To uphold and promote human fellowship through mutual consideration and respect;

To champion human dignity and decency, and to safeguard these without distinction of race or color or creed;

To strive in concert with others to discourage all animosities arising from these differences, and to unite all groups in the fair play of civilized life.

Rooted in freedom, children of the same Divine Father, sharing everywhere a common human blood, we declare again that all men are brothers, and that mutual tolerance is the price of liberty.

Among the signers of this fine statement of interdependence are the following outstanding citizens:

G. P. Agnew, Hon. Judge Curtis Bok, Mrs. Murray Boocock, G. Raymond Booth, Rev. Everett K. Bray, Prof. Ernest W. Burgess, Eddie Cantor, Morse A. Cartright, Vivian D. Corbly, Paul M. Cook, Hon. John M. Coffee, Emmanuel Chapman, Prof. Elizabeth Donnan, Theodore Dreiser, Prof. Charles A. Ellwood, Hon. Herman P. Eberharter, Hon. Sam C. Ford, Hon. Curtis E. Frank, Hon. John Anson Ford, Waldo Frank, Brig. Gen. Patrick J. H. Farrell, E. C. Farnham, D. D., Harry Fleischman, Edgar J. Fisher, Clarence M. Gallup, D. D., Dr. Robert Gordis, Hon. Bertrand W. Gearhart, Hon. J. Allison Glen, Mrs. Florence Eno Graves, Arthur Garfield Hays, Joseph C. Hazen, D. D., C. C. Hemenway, Walter Hilborn, Mary Francis Hill, Ernest Holmes, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Herbert Hoover, Calvin E. Holman, Prof. Herman H. Horne, Darlington Hoopes, Dr. Stewart P. MacLennan, Daniel L. Marsh, Hon. James T. Kirk, Mrs. Clara S. Littledale, Hugh E. Macbeth, Rabbi Edgar Magnin, Adolph Meyer, M. D., Thomas Mann, Emma Guffey Miller, Prof. William Pepperill Montague, Robert Nathan, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. O'Dwyer, Miss Amy Burman Onken, Gwendolyn Peacher, Capt. Paul Perigord, Rear Admiral George H. Rock, United States Navy (retired), Dr. Frederick W. Roman, Prof. Edward A. Ross, Robert A. Rowan, Dr. L. S. Rowe, Harry Sandager, Eric Scudder, David O. Selznick, Mrs. Maurine Simpson, George Smedley Smith, Prof. Bradley Stoughton, Upton Sinclair, Prof. Pitirin A. Sorokin, Mrs. Oline C. Stewart, Rt. Rev. W. Bertrand Stevens, Clarence K. Streit, Raymond Swing, Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, Dave Tipp, Ralph Waldo Trine, J. Barnard Walton, Althea Warren, Hon. Samuel A. Weiss, Mary D. Webb, Hon. Thomas Vien, Hon. Jerry Voorhis, L. A. Weingarten.

I sincerely hope that the group of those who espouse this just creed will grow and grow. I am sure that many of my colleagues here will be interested and also become sponsors of such a worthy objective.

Strikes in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two newspaper editorials. The first is from the Lexington Clipper, of Lexington, Nebr. This editorial was written by Lloyd Kane, its editor and owner. The other editorial is from the Paxton Times, of Paxton, Nebr.

Mr. Speaker, strikes continue to occupy the headlines of the newspapers of the country. It is time for union leaders to realize that their unions have become of age. If they assume such a powerful position in this reconversion period that they can stop all production of critical goods on the least pretense, then this country is headed for many difficulties.

The great majority of these men who occupy places of leadership are not only the CIO's, Communists, and left wingers, but, incidentally, supporters of the New Deal Democratic Party. Certainly, not all strikers are Democrats. The labor racketeers holding in the hollow of their hand the right of millions to work are mostly New Dealers. This administration should take a more active part in controlling these leaders.

It can be hoped that labor and industry will see the handwriting on the wall and work together in harmony. Otherwise, the wrath of an aroused public will force Congress to bring out legislation to prevent further discord between labor and industry.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Lexington (Nebr.) Clipper]

MUST GREED PREVAIL?

It is predicted that America's most violent strike era lies ahead. Union leaders have given union locals the word that they are free to strike whenever ready. The skilled craft unions are already preparing to refuse new members. They think that they can maintain prosperity for a few by keeping supply below demand in closed shops.

Some union leaders can see that this policy of denying the right to work to a man will play into the hands of advocates of legislation which would permit men to enter any occupation for which they are qualified, regardless of union restrictions.

Both unions and Congress seem to have forgotten that there is a Constitution of the United States, under which men were guaranteed the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which means the right to work. If we have any Constitution left, or any semblance of freedom for the individual, and courts to protect him, why should any man be shut out of work by any union or any industry, until he pays some organization for the privilege of being allowed to earn his daily bread and butter?

Until this question is answered and a man is free to work and free to join a union or not join it, as he sees fit, we cannot hold the United States up to the rest of the world as a shining example of a free country.

[From the Paxton (Nebr.) Times]

Labor has come a long, long way during the past 5 years. Many benefits sought for half a century have been won by the unions for their members. There is one thing, however, which has been omitted. That is the responsibility of a labor union for its contracts. Nearly all unions are rich organizations and are in a position to be made subject to damages for breach on contract. It would seem that this might be a good time to drive home this point of responsibility.

The Elliott Roosevelt Tax Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the internal-revenue law provides that the Ways and Means Committee may investigate individual income-tax returns and may report the result of its investigations to the House of Representatives. The Ways and Means Committee has for several weeks been giving consideration to the income-tax return of John A. Hartford, who, it was claimed, loaned Elliott Roosevelt and his wife $200,000, no part of which has been repaid, except $4,000 which Jesse Jones paid by way of settlement. By this deal, Hartford lost $196,000. He sought to take a deduction in this amount against his income tax.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue, in passing on Hartford's claim for deduction, allowed the same, although admitting that there was some doubt as to the legality and propriety of that decision. The voluminous record, consisting of several hundred pages of testimony, was not entirely convincing. The majority of the Ways and Means Committee, acting on party lines, decided to send the whole matter to the House. In its report to the House, the majority members fail to take a definite stand as to the merits of this controversy, and in the final sentence of their report say:

The committee, therefore, does not feel justified in challenging the conclusion reached by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and herewith transmits to the House the correct copies of said reports and the record of the investigation.

Although the majority members of the committee do not approve the decision of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, they do not object to it and consequently the decision of the Bureau heretofore made allowing Hartford to take this deduction will stand.

The Republican membership on the committee was more militant and demanded that since the record was unconvincing that the proper course to follow would be to bring Elliott Roosevelt, John A. Hartford, and Jesse Jones before the committee in open session. These three men know all the facts in connection with the case. Their testimony taken in open session would have given the committee, the Internal Revenue Bureau, and the public a complete picture of the facts.

Now that the Hartford case has been practically settled by passive inaction, and since there has been so much publicity with reference to the matter, the public is entitled to know the facts.

The record shows that seven individuals played a more or less important part in this somewhat sordid story. The story begins with Dr. Sirovich, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who, according to the record, claimed that the President had spoken to him relative to assisting Elliott Roosevelt in obtaining a loan of $200,000, and that it had been suggested by the President that probably a Mr. Ewing, who was the attorney for the Hartford brothers, could arrange an approach whereby this loan could be obtained from the Hartford brothers. Dr. Sirovich apparently acted on this suggestion because, according to the record, he did contact Mr. Ewing and did ask that Mr. Ewing make arrangements whereby Elliott Roosevelt and his uncle, Hall Roosevelt, should have an audience with the Hartford brothers. The record goes into detail with reference to the arrangements for this meeting and with reference to the meeting itself, and Mr. John Hartford, in his testimony, says:

Elliott Roosevelt called upon me as per appointment and during the course of the conversation I inquired of Elliott Roosevelt whether his father knew of Elliott's request for the loan and that I certainly would not make such a loan without the President's approving it. Elliott stated, let's get Dad on the telephone and that there would be no difficulty about obtaining his father's approval and put a call through to the Little White House in Warm Springs, Ga., for his father. When the connection was made Elliott said, "Hello, dad," and after some preliminary conversation on personal matters with his father, Elliott informed his father that he was in John A. Hartford's apartment at the Hotel Plaza and said here's Mr. Hartford and handed the receiver to me.

In several places in the record Mr. Hartford goes more or less into detail with reference to the conversation he had with the President and in one place in the record with reference to this telephone conversation, Mr. Hartford says:

I said, "Hello, Mr. President," and I heard a familiar voice, a voice I had heard over the radio many times, said, "Hello, John"; I then told him that Elliott was in my apartment and asked him what did he think about this $200,000 loan Elliott wanted to make in connection with the radio business, and the President said that he was entirely familiar with it, that it looked good, and gave assurance to me that it was a sound business proposition and a fine thing. He said he would appreciate anything I could do for him.

Further in this connection Mr. Hartford says:

I then told Elliott I am going to make the loan and that the only reason I was making the loan was that his father practically asked me to make the loan and I further told Elliott that I was not interested in radio and that I was not asking any favors.

The record further shows the following questions and answers. The answer was made by Mr. Hartford:

Question. Were any representations made to you by any one as to possible benefits that might accrue to you or the A. & P. if this loan was made?

Answer. No, sir. After the President was so enthusiastic about it I felt that I was on the spot and I had to make a decision right then and there and I did not want to do anything to incur the enmity of the President.

Further in the record, Mr. Hartford was asked the following questions and answers:

Question. Mr. Hartford what reason did you have for expecting this loan would ever be repaid?

Answer. F. D. R.

Question. That was placed primarily on a moral obligation.

Answer. Yes.

Mr. Hartford is very positive in his statements and the historical facts bear out his story.

It would not be fair to Elliott Roosevelt not to state that he, although acknowledging contacting Ewing and acknowledging calling his father over the telephone in Mr. Hartford's apartment did attempt to show that he felt sure that some of the representations made by Mr. Hartford as to his conversation with the President were not entirely accurate for he felt that the President would not have made those statements. The fact, however, that the Hartfords would never have been approached except for the activities of Ewing and the fact that Ewing must have been approached by someone in the interest of having the Hartford brothers make this loan, leads any reasonable person to the conclusion that Sirovich, who was a friend of Ewing, did present the matter to Ewing and if this is true, then some one must have prompted Sirovich to take this step. Elliott says positively that he did not contact Sirovich and had no recollection of ever having seen him. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that the President contacted Sirovich as Sirovich claimed and thereby initiated the whole program and it is only natural that the President having gone to all of this trouble to make contact with John Hartford, would surely proceed to advance his best arguments to make the final arrangement for this loan with John Hartford. The telephone conversation was held on March 30, 1939, and the loan was made March 31, 1939, the day following the important telephone conversation with the President in the little White House.

Elliott got $200,000 just as the President had planned it. Nobody can claim that the Hartford brothers initiated or encouraged the proceedings in any way. When Ewing first presented the matter to the Hartford brothers, George Hartford became very much incensed at Ewing and flatly stated that he would have nothing to do with the Roosevelts and left the room. John Hartford felt that Ewing had put them "on the book" and that he could not afford to offend the President.

The loan having been made, we naturally pass to the discussion of what, if anything, was done with reference to paying the first note of $50,000 and with reference to paying the interest on the loan. No one made any payments on the principal or interest on the notes when

they became due and in line with Mr. Hartford's testimony, that he expected to have the loan repaid, he contacted Elliott and vigorously requested that payments be made. Mr. Hartford's actions in this respect proved rather conclusively that when he made the loan, he expected that the loan would be repaid. He did not act as one who had made a gift. The matter ran along until according to the record, Jesse Jones, the then Secretary of Commerce in Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet and the great financier of the Roosevelt Administration, early in February 1942 telephoned several times in an effort to talk with Mr. Hartford. The record shows that finally contact was made and that Mr. Jones invited Mr. Hartford to come to Washington to see him.

Ultimately, Mr. Hartford did call upon Mr. Jones in Washington where a settlement was made of the Elliott Roosevelt matter. Mr. Jones paid Mr. Hartford $4,000 and took back the 2,000 shares of stock in the Texas State Network, Inc., which had been deposited as collateral for the loan.

Now let us see how Jesse Jones came to get into this picture. In a sworn statement filed in the record, Mr. Jones stated that:

In December 1941 the President asked me, as a personal favor to him, to look into Elliott's financial difficulties and see if anything could be done about them. He asked me to see Mr. Charles Rosier and Mr. Sid Richardson, of Fort Worth, who were both interested with Elliott in his radio business in Texas.

I conferred with Mr. Rosier and Mr. Richardson and with Mr. R. K. Hanger, attorney for Elliott and his radio company. I was advised that Elliott had borrowed $200,000 from Mr. John Hartford, $50,000 from Mr. David Baird, and $25,000 from Judge Charles Harwood, all of New York City. The money had been borrowed to invest in the stock of the Texas State Network, Inc., and the stock given to these gentlemen as collateral for the loans—250 shares to Judge Harwood, 500 shares to Mr. Baird, and 2,000 shares to Mr. Hartford. I was furnished with a financial statement of the Texas State Network, Inc., as of December 31, 1941, prepared by A. J. O'Brien & Co., certified public accountants of Fort Worth. The statement showed the company to be insolvent at that time, and Messrs. Rosier and Richardson advised me that they regarded their stock as of no value.

When I had ascertained the facts I reported them to the President and he said that he would appreciate it if I would confer with Elliott's creditors and find out what they were willing to do, as Elliott had gone into the Army and had no way of paying his debts.

I did not personally know Mr. Hartford, Mr. Baird, or Judge Harwood, but I got in touch with them. Mr. Hartford agreed to accept $4,000 for the collateral he held and Mr. Baird agreed to accept $500 for the collateral he held. Judge Harwood was unwilling to surrender his collateral for a nominal sum, and apparently did not have Elliott's note although he said that Elliott owed him the money.

I reported the situation to the President and he asked me to conclude the arrangements with Mr. Hartford and Mr. Baird and to continue negotiations with Judge Harwood. The matter was concluded with Mr. Hartford in March 1942, at which time I gave his attorney, Mr. Carruthers Ewing, a cashier's check for $4,000 payable to Mr. Hartford, and received the 2,000 shares of stock in the Texas State Network, Inc., which I delivered to the President. The $4,000 was my personal money. The $200,000 notes which were signed by both Elliott and Ruth Roosevelt were destroyed in my presence by Mr. Hartford's attorney.

The President told me that he would see that I was repaid—that Elliott would be able to pay the $4,500 from an inheritance he would receive from the estate of his grandmother, Mrs. Sara Delano Roosevelt.

The money has not been repaid, but Mr. Hanger has told me that either Elliott or his former wife, now Mrs. Ruth Eidson, expect to pay it.

Further in the record Mr. Jones says by questions and answers:

Mr. IDEN. Had Elliott at the time the President approached you—had Elliott approached you?

Mr. JONES. Elliott had not.

Mr. IDEN. So the first overtures to you came from the President?

Mr. JONES. Correct.

* * * * *

Mr. IDEN. Now, what fact led to the proposal to the tender of $4,000? Why $4,000 rather than $3,500 or $4,500?

Mr. JONES. Some figure had to be mentioned, and I suggeseted $4,000.

Mr. IDEN. There was left $196,000 face of the notes and accrued interest. The sum of $4,000 might as well have been some other amount. Was there any formula for the offer of $4,000—that Elliott might be able to pay $4,000? Whose idea was the $4,000?

Mr. JONES. Mine. I suggested it. I had reached the conclusion from Mr. Hartford's attitude that he would accept anything that was offered.

Mr. IDEN. Would it have any relation to anything at all?

Mr. JONES. Just a small sum of money to constitute a sale.

This testimony shows conclusively that Mr. Jones, acting for the President, settled this $200,000 debt with $4,000, which he paid from his own pocket and that after destroying the notes, he returned the stock certificates to the President and the record shows that the President wrote a personal note to Elliott's ex-wife, Ruth, and enclosed the Hartford stock. Mr. Jones in the testimony says that in making this deal, he considered that he was purchasing the stock. He was apparently very much interested in having the stock certificates returned. All through the testimony there runs evidence of the smooth manipulations of the President and the crafty horse-trading ability of Jesse Jones to which he referred in the conversation inviting John Hartford to come down to Washington to see him at once. They were more anxious to get the stock back than to cancel the notes. If Elliott had not put up this stock it is not likely the President would have taken any interest in it for he knew that Elliott was conveniently insolvent.

The record further shows that although Mr. Hartford had been made to believe that the stock was worthless, yet immediately after these transactions had been concluded, the stock began to advance in value and today it is considered to be worth par. Whether Mr. Hartford is entitled to a deduction from his tax return is one thing. This would only amount to a loss of about $35,000 to the Government. If the President of the United States, through his emissaries and by reason of his high position, obtained a loan of $200,000 for his son, then through his emissaries and by reason of his high position settled for the small sum of $4,000, this is something far more important.

To my mind the facts are clear that the President initiated this loan. That Hartford did not encourage it, but on the contrary made it as he said because he "did not want to do anything to incur the enmity of the President."

England's Characteristic Unfairness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the press recently to the effect that the British Government has representatives in this country paving the way to make it possible for England to borrow from the Government of the United States funds with which to rehabilitate the industrial, commercial, and social interests and welfare of Great Britain. The appeal is made on the basis that England and her industries and commerce have suffered tremendous losses during the war and that we should be charitable to the extent of lending to them this money, without interest, for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. Speaker, everyone is familiar with the fact that England has never paid her World War I debt to the United States, and there are some in this country who have gone so far as to advocate the cancellation of this obligation. Most of us think that England has never attempted to repay her World War I debt to us, and that she perhaps never intends to.

Under the lend-lease practices, multiplied billons of dollars, in money and material, were furnished to England during the war. A very large percentage of the thinking people of this country doubt if England expects to pay any portion of the money advanced or for the goods furnished her during World War II. Some have estimated these obligations, already in existence and which may be entirely repudiated by England, to amount to approximately $26,000,000,000. This is so huge a sum that the average American citizen cannot even comprehend it, and it staggers our imagination to contemplate such a tremendous obligation.

Is there any difference between the debt of a nation and the debt of an individual, so far as honesty and fair dealing are concerned? Should not the same rules of ethics and morality govern? Should we not begin to think of our own indebtedness, the indebtedness of the United States to its own people? As a matter of fact, we are not yet self-sustaining. That is, our income does not equal our expenditure. We are operating on credit on a large scale ourselves. This Nation has already too long been engaged in deficit spending. We are still trying to borrow more money—float the Eighth War Loan. Is it not time to begin thinking about paying our own

debts rather than borrowing more money from our overburdened taxpayers to lend to England or some other foreign country? Can you imagine a bank lending you money to pay your interest, and lending you further money to live on when your individual income does not sustain you? How far will you have to stretch your imagination to conceive of a bank that would, in the face of such a situation, lend its customer money to lend to someone else, without interest and without any definite assurance of repayment? How long could a bank keep its doors open and operate on that basis? It does not make sense. It is not good business. It is not fair to the American taxpayer.

Some advance the argument that this proposed $6,000,000,000 loan to England, and the other loans of untold and unestimated amount that will be asked by other foreign governments, is only a part of the clean-up of war obligations. They suggest that this idea may be projected further, and such loans must be made as a matter of self-defense and self-preservation of our country. We heard this same talk during and after World War I. We have heard it throughout this war. But our boys know who has borne the brunt of this conflict, who did the real fighting and who won the war. They will never be convinced that England won the war, nor that the Allies could have won it without our money, our material, and our men. We had better begin to think about getting our own house in order, straightening out our own financial structure, and looking to the welfare of our own industries and domestic and foreign commercial enterprises.

So far as England and some of the other foreign powers are concerned, they are not willing to play fair. England is characteristically unfair. Historically she has been unfair to her colonies; but now that she is weakened, she can no longer be so arbitrary with them. Her per capita indebtedness is far less than the per capita indebtedness of this country. Likewise, the per capita indebtedness of England's colonies and dominions is far less than that of the United States. I am told that England is paying interest on its indebtedness to its own citizens and on the meager sums borrowed from its colonies. Why should we be expected to tax our people and borrow further money to lend to England without interest and without any assurance of repayment?

Still worse, and as a further manifestation of the characteristic unfairness of the British Empire, they are making it extremely difficult, and in many instances impossible, for our industries and commercial enterprises to compete openly and fairly with the English merchants and industries. A concrete illustration of England's characteristic unfairness is shown in the following letters:

TULSA, OKLA., *September 26, 1945.*

The Honorable GEORGE SCHWABE,
Congressman, First District, Oklahoma,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: We are enclosing letter received from our export office, which is self-explanatory.

Of course, we feel sorry for any of our allies, but when they go to taking drastic steps in forcing business that rightfully belongs to us, and the United States taxpayers' money paying the bill, we hardly favor giving them the money with which to take our business away from us.

We understand that Great Britain's representatives claim that they are not able to pay us interest on money borrowed from us, but yet are able to pay interest on the bonds they anticipate floating in their own country.

We would appreciate your comments with the return of the enclosed letter.

Very truly yours,

BEN F. KELLEY CO.
B. F. KELLEY.

BEN F. KELLEY CO., EXPORT DIVISION,
New York, N. Y., September 24, 1945.

BEN F. KELLEY CO.,
Tulsa, Okla.

GENTLEMEN: Great Britain's efforts to conserve their dollar exchange, to liquidate their indebtedness to their colonies, and to secure the dollar balances of these colonies by forcing them to buy British-made goods has hit rather close to home.

Asiatic Petroleum Corp. will soon send five of their key New York buyers, J. Schneider, F. McManus, M. Testa, W. Owens, and C. Guerine, to London to assist in procuring British-made oilfield equipment. The British- and the Dutch-controlled oil companies will be forced to buy British goods wherever possible, even though American products might be specified by the fields.

While it is too early to evaluate the effects of this policy, we can expect a reduced volume of business from some of our better customers.

I believe this development should be pointed out to our Congressmen who are now weighing the possibilities of loaning billions of the United States taxpayers' dollars to Britain.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD L. CARTER,
Manager.

The Salvation Army in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there came to my desk over the week end the first report of the work of the Salvation Army in World War II. The services rendered are commended by those in the armed forces and the public.

Under the permission granted me, I include the report as part of my remarks. It follows:

THE SALVATION ARMY IN WORLD WAR II

Salvation Army clubs, hostels, and mobile units gave services to approximately 225,000,000 service men and women in all theaters of war during World War II, according to a report released today by Commissioner Ernest I. Pugmire, commander of the Salvation Army in the United States.

These services were made not only to our own armed forces, but to the fighting forces of all our allies.

The figure includes aid to 115,760,605 individuals who took advantage of social and recreational facilities offered in this country by USO-Salvation Army clubs. An estimated 110,000,000 meals or snacks were served to men and women of the armed forces by Red Shield Clubs, operated solely by the Salvation Army, and by Salvation Army mobile units.

During the 6 years of war, Salvation Army's international organization carried on its religious and social-service program in 97 countries and territories, taking its diversified activities to 26 fighting fronts.

Religious work by officers of the Salvation Army has been an important part of this wartime program, although it has been subordinated to work of immediate war urgency, Commissioner Pugmire said. Salvation Army chaplains have served with all armies of the Allied Nations, on all fronts.

In the forefront of the Salvation Army's services for the armed forces were those given by its 3,000 Red Shield clubs, often improvised huts set up on beachheads, in jungles, and in desert outposts; and those given by 1,000 Salvation Army mobile canteens which, from the time of Pearl Harbor until May of this year, accompanied the armed forces on hazardous fighting fronts.

Most of these are still in operation, serving troops still stationed in the occupied countries.

INVASION CANTEENS

In major Allied amphibious landings, Salvation Army mobile units—"invasion canteens"—rolled down the ramps of LST's along with jeeps, trucks, and tanks. Upon landing they set up shop on main roads leading to the front and they advanced with the invasion armies. In France alone, 23 Salvation Army mobile units were attached to the invasion army.

Salvation Army mobile caravans have to date traveled a distance equivalent to four times around the world, the units accompanying and, in some instances, preceding the Allied fighting forces. Many of these mobile canteens went into the field equipped with library, radio set, a film projector and film, and a record-player, and had facilities for serving 4,600 men on a single trip. With curtains drawn these canteens offered a place for meditation or for religious services.

RED SHIELD HUTS

Another outstanding war service by the Salvation Army was given by its Red Shield huts, or canteens. During 6 years, 3,000 of these operated from a variety of locations, ranging from snow-covered mountains in Syria to caves in Sicily and tents in Iraq.

Plans for the Red Shield canteens were started in the fall of 1939 and the first Red Shield huts entered the field almost with the first armies.

Red Shield canteens sent to the continent took part in the famed retreat to Dunkerque, serving the retreating armies on the way. Only two of the score of Red Shield canteens returned from Dunkerque to England, and it was there that the Salvation Army had its first war casualties.

When the Red Shield huts returned to the field they were streamlined to the conditions of modern, mobile fighting. Throughout the war, the canteens often operated no more than a few hundred yards from the actual fighting, and were seldom more than lean-to's suspended between trees. They were established on practically every desert isle, in every jungle wilderness, and in every other place where troops were fighting or stationed.

WITH INVASION TROOPS

During the epic Allied assaults on the island stepping stones to Japan, the Salvation Army landed workers with the leading elements of the first assault waves. These set up makeshift coffee bars and were open for business while the first troops were storming ashore.

In the invasion of Labuan Island, for example, four Salvation Army canteen operators went ashore with invasion troops and had

established their Red Shield unit in a Japanese hut within a half hour after hitting the beach.

These beachhead Salvationists—both men and women—were termed by the soldiers "strictly first-line operators."

A particular instance is given of two tented Salvation Army canteens which started operations on Iraq desert in a sandstorm. In less than 2 hours, the canteen had cooked 400 eggs and had made 500 sandwiches to serve men who had just completed a 380-mile trek through the desert.

An auxiliary service to the land Red Shield canteens was provided in Australia by a motor launch, which visited remote outposts on the island rivers, and which met sea and land convoys.

OTHER WAR SERVICES

War services given to men and women of the armed forces by Salvation Army clubs, canteens, and mobile units varied from the gift of stamped postcards and envelopes to sleeping accommodations and legal aid. A variety of "personal and accommodation services" included mending, wrapping, and mailing of packages, checking of valuables, financial aid, and emergency transportation.

In the United States alone, approximately 1,598,100 servicemen were provided with sleeping accommodations during leaves or furloughs at Salvation Army clubs, some operated in conjunction with the USO. At these centers, 50,613,894 stamped post cards and envelopes were given out. Under "personal and accommodation services" were listed 21,936,529 instances of aid.

At these centers alone, the Salvation Army individually counseled almost 1,000,000 soldiers. Voice recordings were made for more than 260,000 soldiers, not including those made in hospitals. Approximately 595,000 wounded and sick servicemen were visited in hospitals by Salvationists in these operations.

Counted in its war services was the Salvation Army's home hospitality given in this country to 285,610 servicemen and their families.

VARIED ACTIVITIES

Other varied war-related services by the Salvation Army during World War II have included a home in France for children returned from Germany, who are now being cared for until their parents can be found; a refugee boys' home and a "warphanage" in China; soldiers' and sailors' rest homes in South America and the Middle East; homes for evacuees, demolition crews and moving units in England after bombings; grocery stores in Canada for stranded families in war-boom towns; dining rooms that served noonday meals to children of war workers; restaurants in Belgium for child and adult refugees; and hostess houses, throughout the United States, for families and friends of enlisted men.

EVANGELICAL WORK

In its evangelical work on the fighting fronts, religious observances have been adapted to circumstances and location, according to Commissioner Pugmire. Red Shield clubs and even "invasion canteens" have served as chapels for thousands of church services, and other hundreds have been held impromptu in deserts and on beachheads. Religious guidances and consolation have been given to all individuals requesting them, regardless of creed, race, or color.

The strains of Onward, Christian Soldiers have greeted many soldiers, sailors, and marines storming ashore on many fronts, for a record player has been part of the equipment of every Salvation Army unit.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Tuesday, September 25, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] delivered a speech over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the control of atomic energy. His speech is a most thoughtful, interesting, and challenging one. In it he discussed a bill which he has introduced, dealing with the control of atomic energy. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLLING ATOMIC ENERGY

Seven weeks ago the bomb bay doors of a B–29 opened over Hiroshima and a few ounces of uranium encased in some steel gently swayed toward the ground. Before it landed this object exploded in the most fateful and terrible explosion that the world has ever known.

A previously unscarred city was leveled off, most of its population consumed in the blast. You have undoubtedly seen pictures of it in the news reels and the newspapers.

When we recovered from the impact of the news of this monster, our people began to think about the future of atomic energy in war and in peace.

What are we going to do about it?

Obviously, we must bring to the handling and solution of this problem our best intelligence, brains, and thought.

On how it is used, on how it is controlled may well rest the fate of every man, woman, and child in America; in fact the very fate of our country will be involved in our decision.

Since I introduced the first bill into the Senate of the United States to deal with atomic energy, it might be helpful to you if I quickly reviewed my thinking and reasoning which resulted in the McMahon bill on the subject.

I do not claim perfection for this bill. It may well be improved on further study and consideration, which I am sure the Congress will give it. But I introduced it because I wanted to get started immediately, now, on the consideration of the most important, the most momentous question of our whole national history.

The problem seems to me to be more easily considered if we divide it into two parts.

First, how is atomic energy to be used in America in peacetime?

Second, how are we going to prevent the power which we unloosed on Japan from being unleashed on us, to our destruction, by some future aggressor?

Let us examine first, as I did, the question of the peacetime use of atomic energy.

Every scientist with whom I have talked has sensibly refused to be nailed down to any predictions as to the date when peacetime use of atomic energy will be accomplished. And yet every one of them say they are certain that on some not too distant day atomic energy will be the source of all of our power, which will drive our trains, our autos, our ships, and our planes, heat our homes and run our factory machines.

Some guess this will happen in 5 years, some 10, some 25.

I am satisfied that we can't stand by and gamble America's economic stability on the fact that it won't be done because the odds apparently are overwhelmingly in favor that it will. In fact it must be done. The American people have already invested $2,000,000,000 in splitting the atom to destroy. That investment if turned into peaceful work could bring a fabulous return to the whole human race in health and prosperity.

It was immediately apparent to me, however, that the unregulated and uncontrolled displacement of coal, of oil, of gas, of hydroelectric power and steam as sources of our energy would wreck our economic system. Not only would the jobs of millions of Americans dissolve overnight, but the securities represented by now valuable properties would become worthless. Our banks and insurance companies would crash. Our system of free enterprise would collapse—in fact it is difficult to see how we could maintain a free and solvent government in the absence of an orderly transitional period.

Obviously, then, atomic energy must not be turned loose to fall into private hands for unlimited private exploitation and gain. On the other hand, scientific progress and invention, which enhances the wealth and comforts of the people, cannot and must not be hindered or delayed.

What's the alternative?

The only one that I am so far aware of is to create a Government Board, which is representative of all the people, to control it.

I realize that a great many people claim that this would result in socialism and a socialized state. It would if we were to permit the Government Board which I have proposed to engage in actual operation of Government factories with atomic energy. I do not provide for this, however, in the bill which I have suggested. I would vigorously oppose such a suggestion. I want atomic energy to be used in a free-enterprise system. I have provided that the Board shall be composed of a chairman to be appointed by the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. This Board will have the power under the bill to develop, control, and supervise the use and application of atomic energy. It will be empowered to license its use on an equal basis to all comers. Frankly, I have been able to devise no other satisfactory way to handle this particular phase of the problem. I appreciate the fact that this Government Board will have a tremendous power, but I would rather have this power in the hands of the chosen servants of the people whose will they would be obliged to carry out than in the hands of a predatory and grasping few over whom we would have little, if any, control. So much, then, for what we shall term the internal problem.

Now, what shall our foreign policy be on atomic energy? There are so far three schools of thought. First, the United States should hold on to the atomic process and endeavor to maintain it in secrecy. The second school of thought, which is slightly more realistic, says, since you can keep the bomb secret for only a very short period of time, we should use this period in which to drive bargains; that is, to make the world accept our system and concepts of morals and beliefs. The third view of the matter, and the one to which I hold, says, since the secret is really not a secret, since three nations already are fully informed, since in 2 or 3 years practically every nation will know all about it, any attempt to use this weapon as a club to get other nations into line with what we

stand for and believe in will fail. The very certainty that other nations will soon apply what is now supposed to be secret will lead them to resist bitterly even a short period of domination. The effort to bring to bear the very temporary power which America, England, and Canada now have in common would be bound to develop those very prejudices and passions and hates which would burst into flame as soon as the war-making power became equalized by other nations' application of the secret.

Now, I have tried to state the three widely held opinions on this vital problem. When I drew my bill I rejected theory No. 1 because we just can't lock up this atomic energy in a national lock box. All scientists with whom I have talked agree that it is impossible to keep this business a secret. How in the name of common sense could we make any peacetime use of it and keep it a secret anyway? And does anyone believe that the American people would stand for the locking up of a possible source of wealth and comfort beyond the dreams of man? Obviously, then, when people say, "Let the United States keep it," they are unrealistic and talking utter nonsense to boot. The people who hold to the proposition that America should say, "We've got the bomb and we are going to do as we please with it" are significantly enough the isolationists of yesterday. They have, however, been joined by some good people who have been more enlightened in the past. These are the people who are dissatisfied with the United Nations Organization as it is now set up in its infancy, although they are very much for it in principle and believe that it should be very much stronger. This group believes that we should use the temporary hour that is ours to strengthen the United Nations Charter.

I sympathize with the good intentions of these people but what do they really mean? They really mean that we should say to all nations, "Now you'd better adopt all our concepts of morals and economics or else." To be frank about it, that's an implied threat. The threat obviously is, you'd better do these things or else we'll use our temporary power on you. I know and you know that the American people would never accept such a program. All of us would like to see free speech and a free press and many others of our blessings enjoyed by the people of the world, but you could never get this country to set off atomic bombs and weapons of destruction in order to accomplish this purpose. The atomic bomb is not exactly an instrument of education.

When you make a threat you had better carry it out, and if you don't intend to carry it out, don't make the threat. Therefore, I adopted the proposition that we should turn over to the Security Council of the United Nations what we know about atomic energy in return for every member of the United Nations making available to us and to the other members of the Security Council all information and know-how that they might have on armaments and weapons of war.

I also provided, and this is very important, that the Security Council would have the right to inspect all plants and laboratories or operations in every country of the world to see whether the agreement was being kept.

I also provided that after the agreement was made it should not become effective until it was approved by the Congress of the United States. If we follow this proposal, we will strengthen the organization of the United Nations. We will demonstrate our complete faith and trust, and by our good example, I would hope to dissipate the fog of suspicion and distress which is now being generated and which will inevitably arise to envelop us if we insist in attempting what is after all impossible, the holding to ourselves of the power to dominate the world. Let's be blunt about it. How would you feel tonight if some other nation had this weapon and announced that they were going to hold on to it? I am telling you that there would be the biggest convention of scientists called in Washington that the world has ever seen, and that the National Treasury would be opened up overnight for 10 times the two billions that we spent on it. We would be literally scared to death.

Now, could any other nation say to the nations of the earth, "Oh, you need not be afraid of us, we will not make war. We will hold this power in trust for the betterment of people everywhere"? Well, there are two things wrong with that.

First, it is not in the nature of peoples, least of all the people of the United States to be willing to be subject completely to any foreign power; and second—and I emphasize it again—they wouldn't be able to keep it for any length of time anyway. On the other hand, if we go through with my suggestion, as embraced in my bill, we will, in my opinion, be making the best of necessity. We will allay suspicion that we intend to dominate the world. We will demonstrate to the world that we intend to use our scientific gains for the betterment of people everywhere. We will strengthen collective security which is the only hope of permanent peace. We have given it lip service; this would be a practical demonstration of our sincerity, demonstrable proof of the greatest dimensions the world has ever known. If we can lead the way in turning atomic energy to the production of higher standards of living, for the peoples of the world, you can be certain that the atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima contained a guaranty of future peace as well as immediate destruction.

The Emancipation Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, Hon. John S. Tilley, of Montgomery, Ala., on January 19, 1945, delivered an address before the Jonesboro Historical Society on the Emancipation Proclamation issued by President Lincoln. This address shows a very thorough research of the records and available facts on that subject, and will be of very great interest to students of the proclamation.

I request unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Upon investigation I find that the cost of printing will be $121.40.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Wonders never cease" is a cliche strongly buttressed by a comparison between the popular conception of the Lincoln Emancipation Proclamation and the cold facts of the record. The power of propaganda, however unfounded in fact, to build up a desired doctrine needs no apter illustration than such a study reveals. Witness the widespread acceptance of the theory which teaches, first, that the proclamation was a noble stroke in the interest of human freedom; second, that it effected the liberation of the slaves in this country. That it was, and did, nothing of the sort, a cursory examination of the very text of the instrument clearly demonstrates.

A warm-hearted, heaven-inspired humanitarian movement is a far cry from a coolly calculated maneuver designed to cripple the opposing force in a sanguinary struggle. For a clean-cut authority regarding the true motivation of the step in question one needs to go no further than to the author of the proclamation. Lincoln not only knew precisely what he was about; he took care to outline his plan in strikingly unambiguous language.

With the first glance at the instrument, a puzzling discovery is unearthed. It bears date January 1, 1863. The war was then nearly 2 years old. Closer scrutiny reveals that, preceding this, there was a pronouncement issued September 22, 1862, at which time hostilities had been in progress for more than 1 year. Instantly, these dates challenge attention. What did it signify, this evidence that, as related to the issues of war, the proclamation was palpably an afterthought? There looms up a second relevant inquiry: did the difficulties incident to the freeing of the slaves bring on war, or did difficulties jeopardizing the winning of the war bring about the proclamation of emancipation?

A second glance, and the reader is confronted by another enigma. He learns that the prior, September 22, proclamation contained the following:

"That on the 1st day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty three, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free. * * * That the Executive will on the 1st day of January aforesaid, by proclamation designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof, respectively, shall then be in rebellion against the United States."

This meant, simply, that he would allow the seceding States exactly 100 days in which to return into the Union; and that, at the expiration of the named period, he would free the slaves in any State, or part of a State, then remaining recalcitrant.

Here was nothing short of an amazing ultimatum. To each of the States it gave the choice of alternatives; one, to lay down its arms, to return into the Union, and so to keep its slaves; two, to remain loyal to the Confederate cause and, in consequence, to have its slaves freed by force of victorious arms. Such a threat incorporated little of the "coming of the glory of the Lord." Curtly, it put the South on notice that failure of compliance would result rather in the coming of the Federal legions with a resultant confiscation of their valuable slave property.

On January 1, 1863, the Southern States were still flying the Stars and Bars. And so, the blow fell. The President said:

"Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States * * * as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion * * * do order and designate as the States and parts of States * * * the following: Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana (except the parishes of St. Bernard, Placquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terre Bonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, including the city of New Orleans), Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia (except the 48 counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkely, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth

City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth), and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued."

"A fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion": not a response to the cry of humanity for the unshackling of the slave, not a great and glorious sacrifice preparatory to the coming of the glory of the Lord. The quoted text supplies all the testimony needed to demonstrate that the suppression of rebellion was the end, the confiscation of slave property only a means. Nor does the evidence close here.

A third glance, and the student is enveloped in a haze of bewilderment. What, he surely must wonder, is the meaning when, by its very terms, the immortal document specifically exempts from its field of operation all of West Virginia, 13 counties of Louisiana, 7 counties of Virginia? The answer is not far to seek—"and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued." And, what of another phase which left Goldwin Smith so nonplussed as to elicit his comment that the proclamation had set the Negro free "only in the States with which the North was at war." When his reading of the instrument disclosed that the States of Kentucky, Maryland, and Missouri were not so much as mentioned, the English historian was at a loss to understand what Lincoln was driving at, inasmuch as there was left no option other than to conclude that the proclamation simply left the slaves of those States in slavery.[1]

The sum total of the situation was that Lincoln had declared the slaves free in territory where the authority of the United States Government was repudiated and defied, without lifting a finger to rescue from bondage those Negroes held in whole States over which the Federal authorities had unquestioned control.

It is not to be wondered at that Lord Palmerston, premier of Great Britain, arose tauntingly to observe that Lincoln abolished slavery where he was utterly without power to do so, and protected it where he had full authority to destroy it.[2] Earl Russell, also of England, confessed to mystification at the absence of any declaration of principle adverse to slavery. He had contemplated in wonderment a proclamation the apparent effect of which was to make the institution of slavery at one and the same time both illegal and legal. And Charles Sumner, one of the faithful, was to hear from his friend, the Duchess of Argyll; she wished him to relieve her confusion regarding a document purporting to be an evangel of freedom but which, as she read it, "left the slaves of the loyal in slavery." Further, the London Times was not without a suspicion that someone's realization of the terrible potentialities inherent in a "servile insurrection" was the driving force behind the promulgation of such a remarkable decree.[3]

Such was the foreign reaction. Was not it to be expected that the President's own apologists, those who knew him best, would arise angrily to rebuke the English criticism? Later developments indicated that any lingering hopes along that line were doomed to frustration. As a matter of fact the foreign interpretation was to find a rather definite echo in a categorical admission by his celebrated biographer, Ida Tarbell, that it was Lincoln's "unswervable purpose to use emancipation purely as a war measure."[4] Very pointedly, these words serve even to accentuate the English thesis. The New England historian, Channing, was also to throw additional light upon the real motive behind the President's action; in his view, Lincoln felt that he was justified in a resort to emancipation as "a means of distressing the southerners."[5]

What was back of all this? What possible combination of circumstances could have moved Lincoln to a procedure which satisfied few, if anybody? Why, with a single gesture, irritate the Abolitionists, enrage the southerners, mystify his loyal adherents, and call down upon his head the withering ridicule of eminent old-world statesmen?

The answer has multiple ramifications. For one thing, the war was going badly. In the Richmond sector the Army of the Potomac had far more than met its match. Monotonous repetition of reports of one reverse after another was plunging into gloom the masses of the North. A presentiment of possible disaster was in the air. The crisis called for emergency measures. Bearing in mind that an army travels on its stomach, Lincoln centered his attention upon the sole possible source of food supplies for the Confederate Army. He well knew that slave labor was indispensable on southern plantations. More than this, he was aware that, due to the limited supply of whites available for army service, the South was recruiting slave labor for construction of fortifications and digging of trenches. It was his conclusion that effective encouragement of a revolt of the slaves would handicap the military effort of the Confederates and likely bring collapse of the home front.

There was something more. Plainly the President was turning over in his mind the power and the terror of a properly aroused black fifth-column in the rear of the Confederate lines. Frightful as might be the consequence—was not all fair in war?

Lincoln was a lawyer, a capable lawyer. And all capable lawyers had more or less contact with, and respect for, the Constitution of the United States. Even a speaking acquaintance with that document of organic law carried with it knowledge of its protection of the institution of slavery. Having assumed his high office less than 2 years before, he had not forgotten the supreme moment of the inaugural occasion, that of the taking a solemn oath to uphold and to defend the Constitution. Doubtless he could also recall that immediately afterward, in his inaugural address, he had affirmed in unequivocal language that he had no intention to interfere, directly or indirectly, with slavery in the States in which it then existed.

Lincoln was also a politician, a shrewd and successful politician. In common with all politicians of the period he was not unmindful that the ardor of the abolitionists had contributed materially to his election. Futhermore, along with all elected officials, he was increasingly conscious that organized groups which throw their support to a successful candidate are wont to expect favors in return; and that the canons of practical politics require the recipient of a pressure group's backing, in simple gratitude, to mobilize behind its pet project the power inherent in his newly acquired position. In the language of the street, the Abolitionists had a call upon him. Strangers to timidity, their pressure was becoming more and more insistent. Because of his apparent reluctance to meet their demands, an impressive faction of his political bedfellows was reportedly succumbing to lukewarmness. More than this, they were now clamoring for the arming as well as the freeing of the slaves, and were sponsoring the rumor that a failure to carry out their wishes might result in an effort on their part to hamstring his war policy by drying up the sources from which were flowing the streams of gold essential to its success. In consequence, his advisers were reaching the conclusion that only a concession to the Abolitionist program of slave liberation would restore their spirit and allegiance.

And so, rival voices were calling: on the one hand, those of the founders of the Nation, the signers of the Constitution, men of the caliber of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin; on the other, the raucous chorus of those who were denouncing that Constitution as "an agreement with hell," rabble-rousers of the stripe of Garrison, Thompson, et al. Surely, Lincoln was on what ward-heeler statesmen of the sidewalks characterize "a tough spot." As occupant of that spot he was to learn that it was a locale compared with which the area lying between the devil and the deep blue appeared restful and inviting.

This dilemma threw wide the gates to another field of speculation, one of surpassing concern to Lincoln, the politician. It is an axiom of immemorial standing that, immediately upon taking the oath of office, the political job holder looks to the strengthening of those fences which will insure his reelection. At this juncture, Lincoln had ground for suspicion that his prestige was slipping. He feared that he was losing his hold even upon the people of the North.[6] The recent past rose in reminder that, with the combined influence of all factions favorable to him, and in a campaign flaming with tension, he had received far less than one-half the popular vote. Now, apathy was corroding the former fanatical loyalty of the abolitionist legions. But what if he should yield to their demands, nerve himself for the plunge, and by Executive decree blot out slavery in the United States? That would bring on more headaches

Doubtless there were multitudes who would stand up and cheer. But what would be the reaction of the border States, States still loyal to the Union yet holding multiplied thousands of slaves, slaves representing a cash outlay reaching into fabulous figures? Presumably, these slaveholders, in addition to their very desirable votes, had reasonably retentive memories. Would they, in the brief period remaining before the next Presidential campaign, be likely to forget who was responsible for a wholesale manumission of their valuable slave property? No superior acumen was needed to figure out that such a step would be tantamount to political suicide. Whether or not this constituted the motivating influence, the fact stands that the names of the border States are conspicuously absent from Lincoln's proclamation.

Still another factor, one assuming the proportions of an awe-inspiring specter, was rising up to haunt him. The whole world knew that in certain powerful European governments there was under consideration the question of recognition of the Confederate States of America. With the fortunes of the Federal armies apparently on the wane, with the southerners more than holding their own, interposition by even one foreign nation would in all likelihood tip the balances in favor of the Confederacy. The prospect was getting on Lincoln's nerves.[7] Nor were his fears without substantial foundation. An English statesman had named the incumbent of a government office as authority for his statement that Palmerston and Louis Napoleon were preparing to move, and that at an early date.[8]

Lincoln needed no telling that such action on the part either of England or of France

[1] The United States, Goldwin Smith, p. 294.
[2] Expansion and Conflict, W. E. Dodd, p. 314.
[3] History of the United States, Rhodes, IV–354, 357, 358.
[4] Lincoln, Tarbell, II–171.
[5] Students History of the United States, Channing, p. 515.
[6] History of the United States, Rhodes, IV–199.
[7] Division and Reunion, Wilson, p. 227.
[8] History of the United States, Rhodes, II—542.

would likely be fatal to his cause and, incidentally, to his career. That the suggested recognition was not lightly to be dismissed as rumor, he had good reason to understand. Particularly was this true with regard to the English between whom and the Southerners there was a close relationship, one involving strong ties of trade, of friendship, of blood. To England the South sold the bulk of its cotton. To the South there flowed in return a steady stream of English goods. Southern families sent their sons to English universities. Southern girls were intimates in English homes. Southern family trees had their roots in English soil. On the other hand, it was an open secret that, relatively, English feeling for the North was appreciably less cordial.

Furthermore, it was understandable that the South's fight for independence from the North might easily stir British memories of a day when the American colonies resorted to war with England for an identical objective. Now that the young Republic of the West was bidding for a place in the sun, the English cousins might anticipate with ill-concealed satisfaction success of a movement the consequence of which would be a weakening of a prospective, formidable rival.

More than this, interested onlookers everywhere were standing on tiptoe thrilled by the gameness with which the southerners were battling heart-breaking odds. Even so, the obvious, inescapable conclusion was that, limited to ther slender resources of men and matériel, the outcome of the struggle was written on the skies. Apart from selfish considerations, the spectacle had warmed the sporting blood of the British; it simply was not cricket to stand by unmoved while a powerful North was ruthlessly bludgeoning into submission an underdog, asking merely to go its own way and be let alone. Nor did the English memory overlook the gripping circumstance that the very power at the command of the northern war machine was due to the strength of the Federal government in the building of which the South had played the leading role. Lastly, there was always the possibility—admittedly quite remote, but none the less pregnant with pleasurable sensations—of another development, namely, that with the conclusion of the struggle, even a victorious South would awake to a realization of its impaired resources, its drained manpower, its long lines of vulnerable coast. Stranger things had happened. The southerners might welcome a new and close association with the mother country whose financial support might bridge the gap in their economy and whose navy could stand guard during the precarious period of rehabilitation.

Here was the making of a serious case of insomnia. The emergency admitted of no neglect, no delay. In whatever manner, British recognition must be circumvented.

Casting about for an anchor for his hopes, Lincoln finally hit upon what gave promise of a solution of his problem. Friendly as were the British to the South, they were uncompromisingly inimical to the institution of slavery. Here was material for an opening wedge, one which, shrewdly driven, might chill the enthusiasm of those who were about to cast in their lot with the South. Might not the desired cleavage be effected by the expedient of a humanitarian gesture in the interest of freedom for the slaves? Might not such a clever maneuver clear the decks by stimulating the lagging allegiance of the abolitionist, at the same time plunging the South into chaos, and undermining the popularity of the Confederate cause in Europe? [9]

Constantly recurring in his thoughts was an 1861 report to Secretary of State Seward by Carl Schurz, United States Minister to Spain. Schurz had forwarded a solemn warning. With the outbreak of war in the United States, he had observed, Europe had assumed that at least in one aspect it represented "a grand uprising of the popular conscience" against the institution of slavery. Had this proved a correct deduction, the realization would have hushed, once and for all, any agitation for armed intervention. But, he had continued, it so happened that unequivocal and repeated avowals of authoritative Federal spokesmen had proclaimed that there was no intention to interfere with slavery in the States in which it then existed. This insistence had produced in the English mind a precisely opposite reaction, namely, that of alienating any sympathy which might have existed for the Northern cause. It was Schurz's considered judgment that failure of the Federal leaders to wake up to the possibility of European intervention and to take action to prevent it would constitute an irreparable blunder. Either of two courses would, he believed, save the situation; a prompt and decisive turn of the tide in favor of Northern arms, or a forthright declaration that the destruction of slavery was a major objective of the war.[10]

The first of Schurz' named alternatives offered scant hope of realization. The military status had grown steadily worse. For the present at any rate, that solution was out. True, the only remaining course involved a radical about-face from the position Lincoln had emphasized more than once since the opening of hostilities; namely, his prompt countermand of orders issued by generals freeing slaves in their respective command areas. Embarrassing or not, at last it was dawning upon him that his war for the subjugation of a proud people was alienating those whose disfavor might mean the difference between victory and defeat. He must, and that promptly, throw over himself and his cause snow-white vestments more in keeping with the fiction of the coming of the glory of the Lord. In the words of Woodrow Wilson, "It was necessary to put the South at a moral disadvantage by transforming the contest from a war waged against States fighting for their independence into a war waged against States fighting for the maintenance and extension of slavery, by making some open move for emancipation as the real motive of the struggle." [11]

And so, it came to pass that, after nearly 2 years of bitter, wholesale fratricide, by the expedient of a proclamation which conveniently forgot multiplied thousands of black bondsmen, Lincoln set about to convince mankind that the struggle was, primarily, a crusade in the interest of human freedom. The real effect of the proclamation, Mr. Channing, a New Englander and an accredited historian, evaluates in one sentence: "Of course, it did not abolish slavery as an institution anywhere."

[9] Lincoln, Tarbell, II–95.

[10] Lincoln, Tarbell, II–98; History of the United States, Rhodes, III–512.

[11] Students History of the United States, Channing, p. 516.

Retirement of Charles M. Galloway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Galloway Retires," published in the Columbia (S. C.) The State, on August 27, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. GALLOWAY RETIRES

This newspaper is naturally interested in anything that Charles M. Galloway does or says. He is one of The State's valued alumni. His progress has been watched with keen pleasure as he has carved for himself an important place in official Washington, first as secretary to Senator Smith, next as a member of the Nation's Civil Service Commission and for the past 16 years as counsel to the Comptroller General of the United States.

As chronicled in this newspaper yesterday, Mr. Galloway is retiring at the end of this month to the private practice of law after a public career of which he and all his friends may well be proud.

We could let our appraisal rest with that, but we shall not, for the very simple reason that the fineness of his character, his loyalty, his devotion to high ideals are, if anything, more important than his success in the material things of life. Virtues remain, when other honors pass. It is because of them that he is appreciated by his friends.

May he be spared for many more years of usefulness.

Butter Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. WILSON

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-thought-out and informative editorial entitled "How Endless Spenders Bungled Butter Trade," published in the Creston News-Advertiser, of Creston, Iowa, on September 26, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ENDLESS SPENDERS BUNGLED BUTTER TRADE

There has been an enormous amount of adverse criticism concerning the butter situation during the past year, and all the facts, as they gradually develop, go to show that the complaint was fully justified.

There has, perhaps, been no single item of food that has caused as much resentment of the rationing system as butter. That has probably not been particularly true in Creston, but in many sections of the Nation—wide sections—the official bungling has made it impossible on many occasions for the citizens to secure it at all, while at other times their purchases were limited to quarter-pound quantities.

Had it been shown that this severe restriction was actually necessary to the war effort, in all probability the situation would have been calmly accepted, and the people, without serious protest, would have done without their butter. However, there was a constant announcement of Government holdings that had been permitted to become too rancid for use. There were reports of great quantities being sold to the soap makers; reports of other cases where it was trucked out and left on dumps; and with it all, came statements of men in the creamery business who insisted

that there was no legitimate reason for serious butter shortage. As a result, the citizens came to bitterly resent the extravagant policy of the endless spenders, and the dictatorial rulings of the bureaucrats, whose chief objective appeared to be to discipline the people, and to make the Nation war conscious.

Yesterday we received a letter from the manager of an Iowa creamery, which, while not for publication, contains some interesting facts that the people are entitled to know. We quote:

"Many of us have wondered for several months as to the reason and necessity for some of the rationing practices. The industry has never been able to determine the exact amount of butter held by Government agencies as various reports seem to conflict as to their holdings.

"Less than 3 weeks ago manufacturers were advised that all butter commitments due under the set-aside program would be required and set-aside butter would have to be delivered to the last pound. A week later manufacturers were advised that all set-aside on hand would be canceled and not required for Government use.

"Under date of September 18, Weekly Letter No. 194 of the Dairy Products Marketing Association gives facts regarding the butter holdings which, to say the least, are interesting in view of the continued demand from Government agencies that butter be rationed. We are also attaching two clippings from the September 19 issue of the Dairy Record. These seem to bear out the fact that the need for butter rationing is rather more of a political issue than a necessity."

The letter refeired to above—No. 194—shows that the cold-storage figures released last week by the Department of Agriculture itself, sets creamery-butter holdings on September 1 at 205,500,000 pounds, and that is 68,000,000 pounds more than on the same date last year, and it is 34,000,000 pounds more than the 5-year average.

It discloses that of the total amount of butter on hand at that date—the first of this month—the Government held approximately 135,000,000 pounds, and the non-Government owned stock totaled about 70,500,000 pounds, "and this was probably the largest for any month since wartime controls of butter were established."

The clippings from the Dairy Record, which are referred to in the letter from the Iowa creamery operator, quote the figures announced by the Agricultural Department, and makes this additional statement: "During August butter stocks increased more than 20,000,000 pounds, whereas a year ago they actually showed a drop.

"The all-time record for September 1 was made in 1943, when there were 231,543,000 pounds of butter in the coolers. In only two other years, 1938 and 1941, were holdings of more than 200,000,000 pounds ever recorded on the date of September 1."

Yet, today the country has more butter in storage than in either of the latter 2 years, and we lack but about 26,000,000 pounds of equaling the all-time peak year of 1943.

With all war demand fast ending, and with the surplus growing at the rate of 20,000,000 pounds per month, there is no more need for the butter ration-point system than there would be on the air we breathe, for it is self-evident that citizens are not going to purchase more butter than they really need for the mere pleasure of seeing it rot in order that it may be sold to the soapmakers at less than a half-cent per pound.

The fact appears to be that butter control, and many of the other controls and restrictions, were established by little men, without experience, whose chief objective was to exercise authority. The power which was given them by the President, through his bureaucratic form of government, under the claims of war necessity and war crisis, went to their heads. They became power-mad, and their dominating thought was dictation.

The President made a great hit with the Nation when he ended lease-lend, and he made another when he asked authority to readjust the executive department downward by the combination of bureaus and agencies. Now, he can make a third one by tying cans to most of the wild-eyed purchasing groups and most of the dictatorial rationing boys, for we no longer need them, and by and large, they are a pain in the neck and a thorn in the flesh. Ooze 'em out, Harry; ooze 'em.

The Road to Serfdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD a summary of the Road to Serfdom, by Friedrich A. Hayek, an internationally known economist, presented by Max Eastman, roving editor of the Reader's Digest, which I believe is timely. It follows:

FRIEDRICH HAYEK'S THE ROAD TO SERFDOM

(Presented by Max Eastman, roving editor, the Reader's Digest)

In my opinion, the Road to Serfdom is the most important book on political economy in our generation—worthy our deepest pondering. If our civilization survives the desperate crisis it is passing through, it will be because we arrive soon enough at its wisdom. Here is but a preliminary glimpse of its reasoning:

1. With gathering speed our Western World is rushing toward a "planned economy." Offhand this seems sensible and necessary now that life is getting so complex. But when we talk of a planned economy, we tacitly assume that some all-wise individual, usually ourselves, will do the planning. Society cannot plan its economy like an individual, because its members do not agree about the ends to be planned for. They do not agree about life's values; life would be a bore if they did. The abstract phrase "common good" or "general welfare" merely conceals the lack of agreement about specific ends.

2. Only in a national calamity or a war do people agree, spontaneously and in large numbers, about the main thing to be done. Only at such times can a planned economy be adopted by a society as a whole. At other times it has to be adopted by some closely organized group who do agree and are willing to coerce the rest. Totalitarian one-party rule is thus the inevitable prelude or end-result of a planned economy.

3. The totalitarian group tends to be of low caliber, because the more highly developed men are, the more they disagree. It tends to think vaguely, because accurately defined ideas and aims lead to disagreement. It fosters envy and hate, because those are the passions on which men most easily unite. Its leaders have to be devoid of moral scruple, because coercing a whole society under pretense of agreement is a brutal and hypocritical job. A planned economy thus brings the lower types to the top.

4. It is the higher types, however, the idealists of socialism (or communism) who lead us into this mess. By advocating a state-planned economy in which society would freely agree upon a noble plan, they prepare us for an economy in which an ignoble plan is forced on society by its crudest members. They lure us with an impossible dream into an actual nightmare.

5. Only outsiders imagine that fascism was a capitalist defense-reaction against communism. Fascism, like communism, was a left radical movement, appealing primarily to the masses, not the classes. Totalitarianism is socialism freed of its democratic and internationalist illusions. It is socialism as a reality. This was just as true in Germany, where the state controlled most of the economy directly and thus all indirectly, as in Russia where the state directly controls all.

6. The high level of civilization attained under free competition is the very thing that makes idealists impatient of its faults. They think to reach new heights by kicking down the ladder on which they rose so high. They think that the competitive market and price system are a clumsy and bungling mechanism of adjustment, suitable only to early stages in the division of labor. The opposite is true. Only because mankind stumbled upon this impersonal mechanism has the division of labor (and that means civilization) been able to advance so far. No central directing mind, even with the purest motives, could register the myriad facts and make the innumerable adjustments that are made promptly and automatically by the competitive market. The more complex our life becomes, the more indispensable is this impersonal mechanism.

7. Not only freedom, but the rule of law, disappears automatically with central planning. Under the rule of law the acts of the state power conform to rules laid down in advance and applying to all alike. But a planned economy cannot be run on the basis of general rules laid down in advance. The directing power has to make impromptu decisions, determining the fate of specific persons or groups, and yet having the force of universal law. The planning state thus has to be dictatorial, the dictator has to be above the law. Our choice is not between abstract justice and the hazards of competitive life. Our choice is between arbitrary personal rule and the impersonal regulative mechanism of the market.

8. A growing impatience of parliaments (Congress) is an ominous sign of this. Parliaments are just as capable as they ever were of agreeing upon general rules for the regulation of men's spontaneous activities. They are not fit for the detailed direction of these activities. They cannot produce agreement where no agreement exists. They cannot, in short, conduct a planned economy. For that, dictatorship is essential.

9. People who think tyranny in "economic matters" will set them free for the "higher things of life" are tricking themselves with a word. There is no separate phase of life called economic. Every significant end man seeks to attain, from founding a church to presenting a ballet, requires economic means. Those who control the economy control the means to all ends.

10. Opposition to a planned economy does not mean that we should cease to have foresight and think planfully about our future. It means that we should employ our foresight in regulating the spontaneous activities of men, not trying to prescribe and operate these activities from a center according to a single plan. A competitive system requires a carefully thought-out legal framework, and continual new adjustments. But the competition, if it is to serve as a planning mechanism, must remain genuine. There must be free buying and selling, freedom of entry into all trades, free movement of prices and no control of the quantities of goods produced.

11. Competition can bear enough State regulation to assure everyone a minimum livelihood, and that is one of the main tasks of planning in the good sense. But it cannot remove the risks of enterprise, or give any person or class "security" in the sense of guaranteeing him the standard of life to which he may have become accustomed.

12. Competition cannot be "combined" with central planning on a large scale without ceasing to operate as a guide to produc-

tion. "Planning and competition can be combined only by planning for competition."

13. The so-called "inevitability" of the State-planned economy is part of the ballyhoo with which it is being put over. It has no support in economic fact. If we fall for this false utopia, it will be because we choose to—because we have lost our pride in Anglo-Saxon achievements, and begun borrowing inferior ideas from Germany and points east.

14. To one who has lived in both countries, the similarity of trends in England and America now and Germany 15 or 20 years ago is alarming. We must hold fast to our Anglo-Saxon principles of individual liberty and free competition, or we will arrive at the totalitarian state.

The Atomic Age

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, we are at the beginning of the atomic age. With the development of the atomic bomb man entered a new world. The greatest discovery made on this earth to date is the release of atomic energy. The effects will be revolutionary. The ultimate results of the use of atomic energy in war and in peace stagger the imagination.

There is much current discussion concerning what we shall do with our knowledge of atom splitting. In my opinion the divulging of the scientific processes employed in the production of the atomic bomb would be the height of stupidity. Such action ought to be unthinkable. Why should we put in the hands of others the secret of the atomic bomb which through our ingenuity and through our resources we have discovered? If others had the secret I am certain it would not be made available to us. The turn of recent world events is one of the most important reasons for keeping this secret.

For our own security and our self-defense we must guard the secret of the atomic bomb.

On September 11, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee introduced the following bill:

H. R. 3997

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever, without authority of the Congress, communicates, delivers, transmits, discloses, or divulges or attempts so to do, to any person whatsoever, any information concerning the composition, manufacture, production, and use of the explosive known as the atomic bomb, or any record, paper, or document containing such information or the contents or tenor of any such record, paper, or document, shall be punished by death if the verdict of the jury shall so recommend, or by imprisonment for such term as the court shall determine.

I hope this measure will be reported favorably in the immediate future and that it will be passed by both Houses of Congress. To make available the secret of the atomic bomb would be most disastrous for the United States. It is the duty of Congress to act and act at once upon this important issue.

American World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, after a rather comprehensive survey of much of Europe, I am convinced that with the exception of Russia, the peoples of the Old World are largely looking for America to take the leadership among the nations of the globe.

It is probably true that the American people have never thought of their Nation as being the leader of the world, and it is probably true that they do not particularly want that position. Wrong or right, in many respects, the American people are somewhat isolationists at heart. They want no more wars. They want their sons and daughters returned to their firesides. That is a natural human quality.

It is my personal belief that much as we may want these things and many more, leadership has been thrust upon us and we must go forth from here resolute in a determination to fulfill this mission.

If this be reasonably true, it is regrettable indeed that we find ourselves involved in disputes with labor and employers at home just at the close of the greatest war in all history, one to which we have given so much, and without our leadership and contributions victory could not have come to the Allied forces. It would then seem reasonable to me that it is the duty of every American citizen to apply the law of justice and reasonable thinking in this period of the postwar.

It might be well if all of the people of the Nation could come to understand that whether we want it or not, we now have the leadership of the world. And if once we could come to understand this, perchance we could approach it in a greater spirit of tolerance, in a desire to find a solution of our own domestic problems, because only by unanimity of action on our home ground can we fulfill that place of leadership now expected of us by the other nations of the world.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a timely statement has been made by Eric A. Johnston, the distinguished progressive president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. With unanimous consent, I include herewith a statement made by President Eric A. Johnston that seems to me to portray the thinking of a statesman and a great leader. It is sound advice to give to the folks at home as we set ourselves to the task of becoming the leading nation of the world.

The statement follows:

The industrial strife by which we are now engulfed is not a job crisis. It is a wage crisis. It came about with the reduction in the size of pay envelopes when war production ceased and working hours were cut down.

This is a deadly serious hour. Thousands of workers are on strike. We have had some shut-downs and lock-outs. This is an hour of stress and high tension which threatens every hope of our future and is dangerous enough to command the earnest thought of every American regardless of the way he earns his living. Let none of us dismiss it lightly. One wrong turn, and we are going to be in social and economic chaos.

But as a measure of reassurance, and with the hope that it will serve to some good purpose when we are reminded of it, I want to borrow a phrase which has come out of this war. It is a terse and trenchant phrase.

It is slang, but like most American slang it is far more forceful than it is flippant.

Soldiers have used the phrase this way: "Take it easy, Mac!" Sailors have said, "Take it easy, Mate!"

You've heard it, of course, hundreds of times.

It has been a favorite of men in the service who may have said it lightly to be sure, but they didn't mean it lightly one single bit. Used in one sense, it is a term of farewell, but in another it is a term of reassurance. "Take it easy, Mac!" our soldiers said, and what they meant was "take care of yourself; hold tight; keep your chin up, use your head and you will be all right."

I want to borrow that combat war-born phrase to apply to this industrial war. This in a time when we must all keep our chins up—and use our heads.

Segments of our economy which should be working in absolute harmony and understanding are pulling and straining in opposite directions. They should be pulling together toward the same objective. But they are running head-on at each other. These segments are labor and management. The objective they both want, of course, is a high level of prosperity for all of us and a program of helpfulness for those nations which were our brothers in arms just a few months back.

The coming of that era of high prosperity will depend in large measure on the reason and the restraint and the leadership we exercise now. It will depend in part on just how well we will follow the advice of our men in service and—take it easy.

IT'S UP TO US

When I say that we can anticipate a bright era of good times, I am not trying to play fortune teller. I am not making idle predictions based on wishful thinking. I am not blinding myself to a single discouraging factor in the economic picture and I am allowing for the crushing load of Federal debt besides.

But still I can tell you that the only thing which will deny us an extensive period of sustained prosperity will be our own failure to take advantage of our opportunities. The field is now definitely open for high levels of production and high levels of employment—which we call prosperity—for a relatively long period—depending on what decisions we make now.

Let's reason together.

Millions of people want new radios; they want new refrigerators; farmers want to paint their homes and their barns and their poultry houses; millions of people want new automobiles, and washing machines, and mattresses and furniture. They want reading lamps; they want woodworking tools for their basement hobby shops; they want harnesses for their horses. The list is endless. There's a tremendous backlog of pent-up wants in this country. Everybody wants and needs innumerable things. There's a tremendous backlog of purchasing power, as well. Put those two together, and they spell high production, high employment, good wages, reasonable profits and good times for all of us.

RISKS INVOLVED, NATURALLY

We're not going to have good times if we're going to hit ourselves over the head

with the hammer of industrial strife and nail ourselves into a coffin of chaos. Of course, we're going to have troubles and worry and disappointment. It is not a one-sided problem, and it is not an easy problem. In my opinion, it is one of the most difficult tests our country ever faced, and yet it is a test we must face, and we must face it in terms of reason and restraint and give and take.

Above all, it is going to involve risks. Yes, risks. But what sort of risks are they compared to those which our young men took day in and day out in the fox holes and fo'castles all over the world?

Management must take some risks if this industrial war is to work its way toward peace; labor must take some risks as well; therefore, I would like to make a suggestion to management and a suggestion to labor.

AS FOR MANAGEMENT

To management, facing a wage crisis, I would say this:

I urge you to take a fresh look at the wages paid in your plants and at your ability to increase them.

We in management must recognize that millions of American war workers have had big slices taken out of their pay envelopes. None of us likes to have his pay cut. Who could like it? It means a lower standard of living. The family budget is thrown out of balance.

I understand how the worker feels about this, and I appeal to management to take these factors into consideration and to be as generous and as fair with labor as it can.

We in management must take leadership in this hour of crisis. Is American industry which forged the weapons of war afraid to take leadership in the cause of another victory—a victory over ourselves and for the sake of us all?

It will involve risks. That leadership must recognize that reduced incomes in plants is a reduced income for the communities in which these plants are located. We must realize that reductions in our pay rolls hit everyone in the community.

In recognition of this, some firms have already increased wages by 10, 12, or 15 percent. More will follow. But of course we must recognize that many firms cannot increase wages at this time without increasing prices, and that we do not want.

The important thing is real wages—not dollar wages—the kind of real wages which enabled America to have a higher standard of living. Merely raising wages and then raising prices and repeating the process from time to time means going through a vicious inflationary circle which obviously hurts everybody.

HIGH PRODUCTION VITAL

We pay an American coal miner more than three times what a coal miner is paid in Great Britain. He earns it because he produces more than three times as much coal. In the automotive industry, American workers, before the war, were getting more than twice as much as German automotive workers. The American worker was worth it. He produced twice as much.

Over and over again, we must reduce costs, produce more efficiently, and increase income to perfect and develop these high standards of which we all have a right to be proud.

It is efficiency which has permitted us to pay our coal miners three times the British wage and gave our automobile workers more than German workers. That efficiency is based on individual skill and on production methods which were developed long before the last war, and which have been improved during this war. We will improve them again in the postwar years.

Such efficiency presents a problem we must solve during these next prosperous years. What proportion of the advantages gained from increased efficiency will go to labor? What proportion will go to the investor, and what proportion will go to the consumer?

If any one element gets too large a share of the benefits of increased efficiency, the whole economy is thrown out of balance.

AS FOR LABOR

To labor, confronted with loss of pay, I would say this:

I urge you to take a fresh look at your wage demands and see if they are not excessive.

Give management time to turn around. Labor, I am sure, will understand that in many, many cases management cannot accurately predict what its costs will be when it is converted into full production. Management can better judge its position then. I ask labor to be far-sighted enough to give management a chance to reconvert, to get its breath, and to get into the stride of peacetime production. Then it can sit down with management and find out what fair adjustments can be made.

Labor should be willing to accept moderate increases at this time, leaving the way open for further negotiations at a future time.

To both labor and management, I would say this:

Do an honest job of collective bargaining. Sit down around the conference table and work your problems out. Collective bargaining is the civilized, democratic process of settling differences. This democratic process involves sitting down together for an exchange of viewpoints. It is the answer to whatever selfishness may prevail in a situation of this kind and reveals any misunderstanding which may exist.

But I do see a deadly parallel between what happened after World War I and the present situation. We ought to draw a needed and salutary lesson from our experience after the First World War. Fighting ended officially on November 11, 1918. But the era of good will and peace which we all hoped would come to pass did not materialize. Violence continued in Europe. It spread to this country. The year 1919, when many of our troops were still on foreign soil, was perhaps the worst year for industrial conflict in American history.

Strikes and lock-outs were not the exceptions. They prevailed in every corner of the country. There was an unrestrained increase in prices to complicate the hardship situation. There was a steel strike, a soft coal strike, a dockworkers strike, a railway shop workers strike, a police strike in one city and lesser disorders in wide numbers. Civil disorder—bloodshed—broke out between opposing groups in the Pacific northwest. We learned then that violence is one of the easiest things to start and one of the hardest to stop. There was violence then not only in action but in thought, speech and method.

So it was that, in 1919, we lost a great many of the things for which we fought. President Wilson called a labor-management conference. It was a dismal failure, and within 1 year after November 1918 we were at war again—this time on the home front—this time among ourselves. It could well be said that we had lost World War I—on the home front.

Now, in an environment threatening to approach that of those years, we look forward to another labor-management conference, called by President Truman; again there is difficulty abroad as well as at home—as it was in 1919.

Are we going to say of ourselves that we won World War II abroad in 1945 and lost a war at home in 1946?

We know what we all want. We want peace. We want steady, good paying jobs. We want peace at home as well as abroad. It is our own job to make peace at home—and keep it.

BE MODERATE

What are other people going to think of us unless we do? We have practically promised to show all the world the way to peace. We can't be at war with ourselves and point the way to peace in other countries.

I appeal to both management and labor to use their heads and not to lose them. Be moderate. Go forward in the best American tradition. Of course we will always have differences. But we ought to be able to adjust them in the traditional American way—in friendly fashion—in a spirit of mutual understanding. America has achieved her greatest success by moderation and self-confidence. I say to both management and labor:

"Take it easy, Mac!"

The Atomic Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Atomic Secret," by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE ATOMIC SECRET

Among those who know the secret of the atomic bomb, there does not seem to be anyone who thinks it can remain a secret very long. Mr. Churchill, for example must have been speaking for the British scientists who know the secret when he said that it could be kept not longer than 4 or 5 years. A very large number of the American scientists who worked on the bomb are on record as believing that "we can claim no enduring monopoly in the possession of the atomic bomb."

They ought to know, and if the secret cannot be kept, it is unnecessary to argue whether it ought to be kept. Moreover, it would be in the highest degree dangerous to suppose we were keeping the secret if in fact we were not. For that could only give us, as it has already given many, a false sense of security and a false sense of our own power.

This secret is now known to a certain number of scientific men in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. No one could, I imagine, say exactly how many they are, whether there are 50 men or 500 who possess the knowledge which other scientists and inventors do not as yet have. Let us suppose that the British, the Canadian, and the United States Governments were to bind each of these scientists to keep the secret. How could this be done? One way would be to lock the whole lot of them up in a concentration camp. Another might be to forbid them to do any research in any way connected with the atom. For if these men go back as free men to their laboratories, they are bound to use what they know in their researches. That in itself will soon provide their scientific colleagues throughout the world with all the clues they need to rediscover the secret.

It is impossible to imagine how scientific research in nuclear physics could be carried

on in three countries without disclosing the secret. It is fantastic to suppose that a selected bit of knowledge in a vast field of knowledge could in time of peace be kept hidden within the national boundaries of three democratic countries. Even in wartime and in spite of the secret police of totalitarian Germany, we managed to get wind of the secret of Germany's most secret weapons.

How, then, can we best protect mankind against the terrible possibilities of this new scientific knowledge? In the last analysis only by making the knowledge so universal that it would be impossible for any government to perfect in secret some new devilish application of it. The best international inspectors, the best international detectives—in fact the only competent inspectors and detectives—will be the scientists who work in this field.

The more of them there are in all countries, and the more they know, the more difficult it will be for any government to conceal the development of atomic weapons. For when a man knows almost everything that is known about a subject, a small hint, a slight clue, will either give him the rest of it, or make him smell that something is being hidden which needs to be ferreted out.

The object of our policy cannot be to keep the secret. That cannot be done. Our object must be to prevent the secret use of the knowledge as a military surprise. We can hope to do this only by measures which make the knowledge so much the common property of the scientific world that scientists would quickly be alerted if any of their colleagues anywhere went underground to develop a weapon of surprise.

No form of international control can work if it is not based on the premise that the scientists themselves must be the detectives and inspectors of the control. If we start with that premise, then it follows that the international agreements should aim at the most prompt and detailed exchanges of scientific knowledge in the whole field of atomic energy. It ought to be quite feasible for the scientists who now have the secret to say what reports, correspondence, exchange of visits among laboratories, would make most certain that no development can long be carried on secretly.

It will be said that this is all very nice but how do we know that the Soviet Union, which is so secretive, would sign such a scientific treaty, or interpret it in the same spirit as we do. The answer, I believe, is that the wider we open this knowledge to the scientists of the world, the more nations we bring into the research, the more difficult it will become for any nation to isolate its own scientists and to conceal their work.

Even if not all the nations adhered to such a treaty, the nations which do adhere ought still to make all their knowledge common property. For they can best guard mankind against the use of atomic energy as a destructive surprise by multiplying the watchers and sentinels who already know so much that it is hard to surprise them. All the scientists of 30 or 40 nations can afford much greater protection than a few hundred scientists in three nations. There will be more of them and they will be working in more parts of the world.

If, on the contrary, we ourselves try to keep the secret, we shall not only instigate others to act in secret, but we shall also make it much easier for them to act in secret. For instead of alerting the scientific world so that it can alert governments and people, we should be closing the eyes and ears of the very men who can most quickly detect any hidden mischief that is being concocted in the dark.

To those who contend that we should guard this secret, we must, I believe, reply that, on the contrary, the safest course is to guard against its being a secret anywhere.

Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Secretary of the Treasury Vinson before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, October 1, 1945:

It is a pleasure for me to appear before the Ways and Means Committee because coming here is like coming home. It is also a pleasure because you are considering not the necessity of tax increases but the opportunity for tax reductions. After climbing the mountain of war taxation in 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943, and moving along the crest during 1944 and 1945, we are now in the fortunate position of being able to go a little way down the other side. We did not reach the peak of wartime taxation in one revenue act; it took five major acts in 4 years. I am sure we all agree that more than one step will be necessary to convert the wartime tax system into a postwar system.

Every one of us wants to see an end to the burdens of the war as soon as possible. But these burdens do not end easily or quickly. War and its aftermath will keep Federal expenditures high for months to come. We cannot liquidate a great fighting machine overnight. It will be some time before expenditures for feeding, equipping, and paying the men and women of our armed forces will shrink to the peacetime level. Demobilization itself is expensive. Contract terminations will probably cost between $4,000,000,000 and $5,000,000,000. Mustering-out pay will average about $270 per discharged man, to say nothing of the costs of bringing him home. Even after completing demobilization we must meet our obligations to the veterans and to the 85,000,000 war bondholders. To reestablish veterans in peacetime jobs and to provide care for sick and disabled veterans is a responsibility of first importance. The Federal debt, which on September 27, 1945, was $262,500,000,000, must also be serviced at a cost of over $5,000,000,000 a year for interest alone. Finally, we are determined never again to be caught off guard. The peace must be won. That means occupation of enemy countries to make them powerless and to put them on the road to a peaceful instead of a warlike future. It also means a military establishment large enough to maintain the peace.

Nonwar programs to aid agriculture, the unemployed, and the aged, and delayed public-works expenditures, together with the ordinary civilian expenditures of government, will also cost money.

These facts make it clear, first, that expenditures cannot fall immediately to their eventual postwar level and, second, that when we do reach a postwar plateau it is bound to be far higher than the prewar expenditure level.

The only real solution of our tax problems and our debt problems is a high level of production, employment, and national income. A large tax paid from a high level of income is far easier to bear than a small tax paid from a low level of income. We can have a high level of income. The war has demonstrated that this is a $200,000,000,000 country; an annual gross national product of $200,000,000,000 at present prices is within our reach. We have before us the possibility of a far higher general standard of living than this country has ever known. In achieving and maintaining that higher standard we shall do more than is possible in any other way to solve the postwar tax problem. And a good tax structure will aid materially in achieving that higher standard of living.

But achieving and maintaining the high levels of production and income of which this country is capable is not a simple nor an easy task. We must have a smoothly running economic machine with ample profit incentive and ample consumer purchasing power. We must prevent both inflation and deflation—the inflation which disrupts the economy by throwing out of gear the value of our income and the deflation which leads to unemployment, depression, and stagnation.

Taxation is an important factor in expanding and stabilizing our economy. The tax structure for the postwar years should be modernized to make the greatest possible contribution to a high level of employment, production, and national income. Recently I had occasion as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to outline what I believed the guiding principles underlying our postwar tax policies should be. I would like to quote a few sentences from my report of July 1, 1945:

"I regard the modernization of our tax structure as the foundation of our entire program to reach and maintain full employment after the war.

"In our complicated economy it is not easy to see the ultimate effects of taxes, on whom they fall nor what they mean to the prosperity of the people. After the war, Government revenue needs will be three times what they have ever been in peacetime. The Federal tax structure will, therefore, be a far bigger factor in the economic health and stability of our Nation than ever before.

"I believe the following principles should guide us in constructing our tax program:

"1. Taxes should be levied in such a way that they have the least harmful effect on the expansion of business investment and the creation of jobs, because productive employment is the source of our standard of living, of all income, and of the revenue which the Government collects from taxes.

"2. Taxes should be levied in such a way that they have the least harmful effect on the maintenance of mass markets and mass purchasing power, because that is the basis of business, labor, and agricultural prosperity.

"3. Taxes must be fair among people.

"4. Tax policy should be integrated with a fiscal policy designated to prevent inflation and deflation.

"Acceptance of these principles means, in my opinion, that the personal income tax must be the chief source of tax revenue and the base must be broad.

"It means that we should eliminate, as far as possible, the sales and excise taxes, because they not only put an unfair and hidden tax burden on those with low incomes, but they also restrict markets for business.

"The excess-profits tax should be repealed after VJ-day. Taxes on business earnings should be modified, bearing in mind, on the one hand, the revenue needs of the Government and, on the other hand, the incentive for risk-taking and expansion to be gained by the modification."

It is my understanding that you do not intend at this time to undertake a modernization of the tax structure. I agree that the problem of 1946 taxes is more immediate and that for the time being a thoroughgoing job of postwar tax revision must give way to it. Accordingly, I shall withhold my suggestions for basic revision until a later date and shall confine these remarks to the immediate problems of tax legislation for 1946.

First of all, let us look at some facts concerning the budgetary outlook. The peak of Federal wartime expenditures was reached in the fiscal year 1945 when war expenditures totaled $90,500,000,000 and total expenditures

$100,100,000,000. The August 31 Budget Bureau estimate for the fiscal year 1946, indicates a decline in war expenditures to $50,500,000,000 and of total expenditures to $66,400,000,000. Thereafter expenditures will continue to decline but will remain at relatively high levels.

The peak of wartime revenues was reached in fiscal 1945 with total receipts in general and special accounts of $46,500,000,000, leaving a Budget deficit of $53,600,000,000. The latest estimate for the fiscal year 1946 indicates that revenues will decline to $36,000,000,000, leaving a Budget deficit of $30,400,000,000. Although a $30,000,000,000 deficit represents an improvement over a $53,000,000,000 deficit, it remains a stubborn, sobering fact. Immediately, the thought of tax reduction must be narrowly confined.

There are no official budget estimates beyond June 30, 1946. To facilitate the work of your committee we have prepared revenue estimates for the calendar year 1946 based on the most reasonable assumptions that we are able to make at this time as to levels of business and income in 1946. Before presenting these estimates, I should like to point out that while the figures have been prepared by the Treasury staff, they have been reviewed by a committee jointly representing Mr. Stam's staff and the Treasury tax staff. I am informed that the two staffs are in agreement on the estimates.

The revenue figures for the calendar year 1946 are presented on a liability basis; that is, they are not the amounts that would actually be collected in 1946, but the amounts that would accrue under existing tax laws on the basis of present estimates of 1946 income and business. This liability basis of estimate, rather than a collection basis, is used to give a clearer picture of the taxes which existing law will impose on individuals and businesses in the year just ahead, the year to which the committee is now devoting its attention. The liability basis also avoids confusion by disregarding variations in the dates of collecting taxes accrued for any given year.

The tax liabilities for the calendar year 1946 under present law are expected to amount to a total of $32,500,000,000, or $8,900,000,000 less than the corresponding liabilities of $41,400,000,000 for the calendar year 1944. Thus it appears that by 1946 even without any change in tax laws, falling national income, pay rolls, and profits will bring about a tax drop of nearly $9,000,000,000. The taxpayer will not feel any relief from that drop in tax liabilities but the Government must reckon with its impact on revenue receipts.

The $32,500,000,000 figure of estimated tax liabilities for the calendar year 1946 is reached without allowing anything for a possible reduction of the excise-tax rates under existing law. The provision of law is that the so-called war tax rates shall end "on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities" as proclaimed by the President, or specified by concurrent resolution of Congress; at that time the excise-tax rates revert to their levels prior to the Revenue Act of 1943. In his announcement of VJ-day the President stated that he was not proclaiming the end of hostilities. There is no way of forecasting at this time when the end of hostilities for the purpose of the excise-tax reduction will occur; for this reason the estimates did not include any amount for reduction.

An important question facing your committee is: How much room is there for tax reduction at the present time? I urge that in considering this question you keep first in mind the protection of our 85,000,000 bondholders. They must be protected against inflation and a weakened national credit. Without confidence in a strong national credit we shall be in a weak position indeed to promote business expansion, production, and employment.

In considering the possibility of tax reductions during the transition period, we must consider not merely the state of the Budget, but the state of the economy as well. As I have said before, we want a tax system geared so far as possible to the prevention of both inflation and deflation.

During the coming year we shall find ourselves in a somewhat paradoxical situation. The rate of Government expenditures—and particularly those expenditures which find their way currently into the pockets of consumers—will be declining rapidly. Millions of workers will be laid off and forced to seek new jobs. As the labor market loosens, the workers' total income will decline. Overtime pay will rapidly diminish. Many workers who have been promoted to well-paid classifications will find themselves reclassified into less remunerative jobs. Workers, in many instances, will have to move long distances in search of new jobs. In many States, unemployment compensation, under existing legislation, will not prove adequate to sustain mass purchasing power.

All these are deflationary factors. They do not result, however, from any fundamental deflationary situation—that is to say, they do not result from a deficiency of total purchasing power in the hands of individual consumers and business investors. On the contrary, both business and consumers have more money in reserve than at any time in our history. Rather, such deflationary dangers as we face are the byproducts—many of them inevitable byproducts—of a titanic physical change-over from war production to peace production.

In other words, we should have adequate demand if we were able to mobilize our physical resources quickly enough to satisfy it. Therefore, one of the primary objectives of our fiscal policy must be to encourage the boldest, the quickest and most venturesome expansion of peacetime enterprise by business investors.

So long as we remain in this period of physical transition, we shall continue to be faced with inflationary pressures. There is an enormous pent-up demand, particularly for capital and consumers' durable goods. The budgetary deficit will be large. Accumulated individual and corporate savings are enormous. We are starved for new houses, new cars, new radios, and the like.

We must, therefore, at present keep up our guards against inflation, not only through price and other direct controls, but through taxation. It would be pathetic if, after besting the enemy of inflation all through the war, we allowed it to overtake us on the home strength. In other words, I am convinced that, in considering how much room there is for tax reduction your committee will be well advised to keep a weather eye to the storm signals of inflation.

At the same time, we cannot overlook the deflationary dangers to which I have already alluded. If the physical change-over of our economy is delayed or hampered, by fiscal or other impediments, the temporary phenomena of deflation may take on a more permanent and inflexible character. If business lacks confidence in the future, enterprise will be timid. If workers and consumers lack confidence, they will contract their purchases and hoard their savings. In either of these events, the prompt expansion of our peacetime economy will be endangered.

To a major degree, we must rely on nonfiscal measures to guard against deflation. Skillful wage policy, price supports for agriculture and adequate unemployment compensation are important weapons. Nevertheless, a modest reduction in taxes can help. But it must not go too far. After all, although there will be both inflationary and deflationary pressures, tax laws are Nationwide as to area and composition.

Hence after considering all factors, economic and budgetary, it is my considered judgment that total reductions should not exceed $5,000,000,000 for 1946.

This is a time when rapid reconversion and business expansion are of the utmost importance to the maintenance of a high level of employment and income. Tax reduction for 1946 should be designed to afford the maximum aid and stimulus to reconversion and expansion that is compatible with our revenue needs. Therefore, I suggest that the committee should view the primary function of this bill to be the removal from the tax law of serious impediments which it may present to the swift transition from a war economy to a prosperous peacetime era for which we are preparing. If, as I believe, we can do this without an unwarranted sacrifice in revenues, then the present problem will be successfully met.

In this connection, I wish to discuss with you the excess-profits tax because I consider it to be a class by itself in its relation to postwar business expansion.

The excess-profits tax was imposed in 1940, and the rates were increased in 1941, 1942, and 1943. It has been a major source of wartime revenue. It should be noted, however, that the net yield from the tax has not been as large as the apparent yield, for if the excess-profits tax did not apply, the corporation normal and surtaxes would apply. The net yield of the excess-profits tax is the additional revenue produced by imposing on excess profits the 85½ percent excess-profits tax rate instead of the lower corporation normal and surtax rates. At the level of profits expected for 1946, the net yield for the excess-profits tax is estimated at $2,555,000,000.

Despite its importance as a source of revenue, the excess-profits tax was not imposed merely as a revenue measure and has never been viewed primarily as such. The primary purpose of the tax has been to prevent war profiteering. Although it has not altogether succeeded in that purpose, there can be no doubt of its great value in recapturing war profits.

The excess-profits tax has been a control measure, one of a large group of control measures which were absolutely necessary to the effective conduct of the war and to the maintenance of economic stability and a fair distribution of the sacrifices of war. It is the fixed policy of this administration that every war control over American business and American life shall be dropped as soon as conditions make it possible to do so. A long list of controls has already been dropped and many more are going day by day. I believe that by December 31, 1945, conditions will be such that the excess-profits tax, as a wartime control measure, can be eliminated and I recommend that it be repealed as of that date. It should not be repealed before that date because large amounts of war profits will continue to be received during the closing months of this year, as contracts are completed and termination payments made. Moreover, December 31 is a desirable date on which to end the tax because it is the close of the taxable year for the great majority of corporations and thus is a convenient date, both for the taxpayer and the Government.

The case against the excess-profits tax for 1946 goes beyond the fact that it is primarily a wartime control. It is also an obstacle to that reconversion and expansion of business which are so necessary for a high level of employment and income. The testimony of businessmen is that they are unable to take the risk of full peacetime business expansion until this tax has been removed. Their attitude is not difficult to understand when we reexamine the nature of the excess-profits tax and observe the erratic character of its measurement of excessive profits.

The idea of taxing excessive profits is an attractive one in peace as well as war: If profits are truly excessive, why should they not be heavily taxed? The label "excessive" condemns them. The difficulty is that calling

profits excessive does not make them excessive and calling profits normal does not make them normal.

As you will recall, the present system of excess profits taxation was not adopted in 1940 without grave misgivings as to the methods of distinguishing normal and excessive profits. Efforts were made through extensive amendments in 1941 and 1942 to remove some of the more obvious discriminations. The results were not notably successful. Nevertheless the tax was tolerable as a method for preventing war profiteering. With the war over, the tax must stand or fall on its merits as a peacetime source of revenue. Judged as a peacetime tax, it has many defects.

A serious defect of the excess-profits tax for the postwar period lies in the weakness of the average earnings credit, which uses prewar profits as a measure of normal profits. A corporation may continue to earn free of excess-profits tax 95 percent as much as it averaged during the years 1936–1939, and this amount is often enlarged by various relief provisions. A corporation with a high prewar earnings experience may thus earn 20 percent, 30 percent, or more on its invested capital without paying any excess profits tax. New and rising corporations do not have the benefit of such a credit and are thus at a competitive disadvantage in relation to established long-prosperous corporations. Whatever the merits of the average-earnings credit in measuring excessive war profits, it would be grossly unfair if applied to peacetime business.

The invested capital credit also has serious limitations as a measure of excessive profits. For example, corporations are permitted to treat as current invested capital, amounts which have long since ceased to contribute much if anything to earning capacity. This gives them an unfair tax advantage over more recently established concerns not having inflated capital structures.

These are only a few of the ways in which excess profits as computed for tax purposes may differ widely from any logical concept of excessive profits, and this despite repeated efforts by the Congress during the war to remedy the defects.

It is often assumed that the problem of excess-profits taxation is practically synonymous with the problem of big business. It is, of course, true that a much larger percentage of very large corporations than of small corporations have been subject to wartime excess-profits tax. Even so, in 1943 over 70 percent of the corporations with incomes subject to excess-profits tax had net incomes of less than $100,000. Even with the $25,000 exemption in effect, it is estimated that if the excess-profits tax is continued into 1946 roughly one-half of all corporations with income subject to excess-profits tax will have net incomes of less than $100,000. Moreover, by no means all large corporations pay excess-profits taxes. In 1943, the latest year for which actual tabulations are available, 33.3 percent—one-third—of the corporations with incomes of $1,000,000 and over did not have taxable excess profits. Repeal of the excess-profits tax will give relief to corporations of all sizes, except those already exempted, and throughout all industry.

In recommending repeal of this tax I am not suggesting that there will not be any excessive profits in 1946. There will be, and part of them will be attributable to the war. The excess-profits tax would reach some of them; but some of them it would not reach because of its defective structure. The excess-profits tax would also reach certain amounts of high level profits which were not due to the war. In addition, the excess-profits tax in 1946 would reach large amounts of profits which would not be excessive by any acceptable standard. This is too erratic a tax engine to turn loose for even one full year of the postwar period. I am confident that for peacetime the only satisfactory cure for the defects in our present excess-profits tax is repeal.

One of the methods of improving the excess-profits tax was the carry-back of losses and of unused excess-profits credits placed in the law in 1942. The chief purpose of the carrybacks was to correct inflated wartime profit figures by allowing a deduction of war-induced costs not incurred until the end of the war. It appears that a considerable volume of such costs will remain to be incurred after December 31, 1945. Accordingly, despite repeal of the excess-profits tax, the carrybacks should continue for one more year.

It would, of course, be highly satisfactory to all of us if a great deal of tax reduction could be made effective immediately and if it could be spread in many places. Unfortunately, that cannot be done.

Any changes that we do make at this time should meet two tests. They should contribute to a vital, invigorated peacetime economy. They should be fair in themselves and should, insofar as possible, remedy present inequities.

The repeal of the excess-profits tax will meet these tests. There is another change, of even broader implication, which I would now like to discuss.

Let us never forget the human side of the taxation problem. No system of taxation is an inanimate thing. Directly or indirectly, it inevitably touches the pocketbooks and influences the lives of every man, woman, and child of our country.

In this connection I urge that in distributing the limited amount of tax reduction now possible, you give full consideration to relieving the direct pressure of wartime taxes upon lower income groups.

Whatever relief can be given in reducing personal income taxes will be most beneficial, in sustaining mass purchasing power, when given to the individuals and families to whom a dollar means most. And beyond this economic argument is the overpowering logic of equity.

I direct your particular attention to the so-called normal individual income tax. This tax is normal in name only. In 1942 Congress imposed the so-called Victory tax of 5 percent (less certain credits) on gross income above an exemption of $624, thereby sweeping into the income-tax system some ten to twelve million families not subject to the regular income tax. This tax contained a provision for automatic repeal at the end of the war. In the Revenue Act of 1943 the Victory tax was modified into a tax on net income with an exemption of $500, and was designated the normal tax. The automatic repeal provision was omitted.

The normal tax imposes income tax on about 12,000,000 families which are exempt from the surtax. Thus, a family composed of a man, his wife, and one child has three surtax exemptions of $500 each and is thus exempt from surtax on net income up to $1,500. The normal tax, however, applies on all net income above $500 for each income received without regard to family status or number of dependents. Accordingly, this family would pay normal tax of 3 percent on all income above $500. The amounts of tax are relatively small from the viewpoint of the Government and, accordingly, relatively expensive to collect, both through withholding and through the method of estimates and returns. The amounts are, however, by no means negligible to hard-pressed families with small incomes and large numbers of dependents. The normal tax applies, of course, to taxpayers subject to the surtax. Its repeal would be an equitable method of reducing their taxes. For example, in the case of a married taxpayer with two dependent children, receiving $3,000 of net income before personal exemption, the repeal of the normal tax would reduce his tax from $275 to $200, a reduction of $75. This is very substantial relief and goes to the kinds of taxpayers needing it the most. I recommend that you repeal this special wartime normal tax levy as of January 1, 1946. The revenue loss from repeal is estimated at $2,085,000,000.

Additional relief to individuals which could be particularly helpful to the lower- and middle-income groups can be given also by setting an effective date for the excise-tax reductions now provided in the law. The industries involved in the excise taxes have pointed out the disadvantages arising from uncertainty in the effective date for these automatic reductions. I recommend that the effective date for the reductions be made July 1, 1946, which is at the end of the fiscal year. This would result in a reduction of excise-tax liabilities for the calendar year 1946, estimated at $547,000,000.

When the revenue reductions associated with the three recommendations just made are added, the total is somewhat in excess of $5,000,000,000. However, in estimating the revenue effect of each of these items, no allowance has been made for their interrelation or combination effects. Thus, the reduction in the excess-profits tax would be expected to result in increased dividends with resulting increases in individual income-tax collections. Likewise, the elimination of the normal tax makes more money available for expenditure and thus, to some extent, should increase the excise-tax collections. And, of course, it is hoped that the proposed program will mean a higher level of business in 1946 than would otherwise be the case. Although I do not suggest any figures to indicate these combination effects, I believe they would be of sufficient magnitude to bring the total program within the $5,000,000,000 limit which I have proposed.

Another issue which must be met before the end of the year is whether or not to allow the pay-roll tax rates for old-age and survivors' insurance to rise on January 1, 1946, as provided by existing law. At present, as the result of four successive postponements of rate increases, the rates stand at 1 percent on the employer and 1 percent on the employee instead of 2 percent on each as the law originally provided. Another increase, this time to 2½ percent, is scheduled to take place January 1, 1946. Thus, in the absence of legislation these pay-roll taxes will rise from 1 percent each to 2½ percent each. I understand that active consideration of the whole problem of social-security coverage and financing is now underway in the Congress. I believe that revision of pay-roll tax rates should wait to be made part of the broader action on social-security financing as a whole.

These proposals are all for 1946. I believe it would be very undesirable to make any tax reductions retroactively for the taxable year 1945. Incentives work only with respect to the future. To get the maximum incentive from a tax reduction it should be enacted long enough in advance of its effective date to permit businessmen and investors to take the reduction into account in making their immediate plans. Since one of the main purposes of tax legislation at this time is to encourage business to speed reconversion and expansion, it is highly desirable to pass the contemplated tax legislation early this fall. Moreover, if individual income-tax changes are made, the Bureau of Internal Revenue will need to reprint and distribute new withholding-tax tables to employers and taxpayers in time to go into effect on January 1, 1946. To meet this schedule the new bill should become law not later than November 1, 1945.

Only a very simple bill with a minimum of controversial features can be moved through

the necessary legislative processes before that date. The pressure for speed combined with the continuing requirements for revenue necessarily limit the scope of the bill.

Next year Congress undoubtedly will want to consider more far-reaching legislation. There will be more time than to plan a thoroughgoing and basic revision of our revenue laws. We shall have better knowledge of our budgetary requirements. We shall be in a better position to view the national economic picture as a whole and to fit the tax revisions to that picture.

In closing I should like to make one more point. I am sure the members of this committee feel, as I do, a deep sense of duty. Only a few weeks ago we celebrated the surrender of Japan. Our military victory was earlier and more complete than we had dared hope for. We are able to make an earlier start on the road toward our peacetime goals. But we will win the rewards of victory only if we are able to bring to the tasks of peace the same devotion we demonstrated during the days of war.

We have had our celebration. We now face new responsibilities. Our responsibilities extend alike to business and labor and agriculture, to the Nation's bondholders, to the disabled men of our fighting forces; in short, to all the people. They have shown their willingness to shoulder extra burdens when there was need for them to bear them. They have the right to expect that their load will be lightened as there is opportunity to do so. They also want their Government to fulfill the obligations remaining from the period of war and the new duties pressing upon us with the peace. Taxation presents perhaps the most difficult of legislative problems. Those problems can be met only with a sense of responsibility for the interests of all the people.

DISCUSSION OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1940, 1945, AND BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1946

The attached table shows a summary of Federal expenditures by fiscal years for 1940, a prewar year; 1945, the peak war year; and Budget estimates for 1946, a year of transition from war to peace. The table also includes net receipts and deficits for each of the years.

Total expenditures increased from $9,300,000,000 in 1940 to $100,000,000,000 in 1945, and will fall off to about $66,400,000,000 in the current fiscal year which ends next June 30.

War activities

In the fiscal year 1945 more than 90 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government went to meet the direct costs of the war. According to the revised Budget estimates released August 31, this proportion will drop to about 76 cents. This reduction is the net result of decreased war expenditures and by an increase in other expenditures. War expenditures, according to the Budget, will amount to $50,500,000,000 in the current fiscal year, compared with $90,500,000,000 in 1945, a reduction of about 44 percent. The estimate for 1946 of $50,500,000,000 might seem high at first appraisal in view of the capitulation of Japan just 1½ months after the beginning of the fiscal year. It should be kept in mind, however, that even though billions of dollars of contracts have been and will be canceled, cash outlay will remain relatively high for some months. Time is required to demobilize more than 12,000,000 men; probably $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 will be spent in terminating war contracts; mustering-out pay will require about $270 for each man discharged; to name some of the factors which will tend to keep expenditures from dropping quickly.

The following shows a rough break-down for several years of war expenditures including net war outlays of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its affiliates:

[Fiscal years—in billions of dollars]

	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946 (estimated)
Munitions	(1)	4.5	20.3	55.2	60.2	58.5	21.0
Nonmunitions:							
Pay and subsistence	(1)	1.0	2.8	10.6	17.5	21.6	19.0
Miscellaneous	(1)	1.1	5.2	9.5	12.0	10.4	10.5
Total	1.7	6.7	28.3	75.3	89.7	90.5	50.5

[1] Break-down not available.

The classification "munitions" includes not only military-type items but also civilian or industrial-type products. In fact, the term as used here covers all products except food procured in the continental United States for the armed forces or for lend-lease. The classification "pay and subsistence" consists of pay of the armed forces, dependency allowances, mustering-out pay, subsistence, and travel allowances. "Miscellaneous" includes civilian pay in war agencies, stock piling of critical materials, agricultural lend-lease, payments for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, contract-termination payments, and commercial transportation and public utilities relating to troops and equipment in the United States.

Following the fiscal year 1946, war expenditures will, of course, decrease very rapidly, although it is too early at this time to indicate the probable cost in 1947 and thereafter of maintaining the Army and Navy.

Other activities

Expenditures other than war activities increased from $7,600,000,000 in 1940 to $9,500,000,000 in 1945, while the estimate for 1946 is $15,900,000,000.

In connection with these activities there are two factors of interest, (1) the expenditures in 1946 for certain items are higher than they are expected to be in succeeding years, notably under refunds of taxes where corporate refunds are at their peak, and the international payments under the Bretton Woods agreements being at a considerably higher level than expected in the future; and (2) the expenditures for 1946 will be greater than those at the prewar level in certain instances where they are directly affected by the war, such as for care, rehabilitation, and hospitalization of war veterans, expenses of the Treasury Department incident to the collection of larger taxes and the management of the war debt, and expenses of the General Accounting Office in connection with the audit and settlement of accounts.

Veterans, refunds, and interest

Expenditures for veterans, refunds, and interest are largely war caused, being sometimes referred to as "aftermath of war." These expenditures amounted to $1,700,000,000 in 1940, $7,400,000,000 in 1945, and are expected to require $10,600,000,000 in 1946, this latter figure representing the all time peak. The estimate for 1946 represents more than a sixfold increase compared with 1940. During the current year these "aftermath of war" items will account for about two-thirds of all Federal "nonwar" expenditures.

Total expenditures for veterans' benefits might be at a higher level in the next 2 or 3 years than the $3,200,000,000 now forecast for the current year, due largely to the educational and readjustment allowance programs. However, these programs, as well as the Government's contribution to the national service life insurance fund, should be substantially reduced in later years.

The fiscal year 1946 is probably the peak year for refunds of taxes, the estimated expenditures for this purpose amounting to $2,900,000,000. This is due principally to the provisions of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1945 speeding up corporate refunds following the end of the war. It is believed that both corporate refunds and refunds arising from individual withholding will decrease substantially below the current year level.

Expenditures for interest on the public debt will no doubt increase from the level of $4,500,000,000 estimated for 1946, the Budget estimate of total public debt outstanding on June 30, 1946, being $273,000,000,000. The extent to which interest payments increase or decrease in the future will depend upon the rapidity with which the Government can balance its Budget.

Unemployment relief

The Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1946 do not contain any provision for unemployment relief. In 1940 expenditures for unemployment relief amounted to $2,200,000,000, about $1,500,000,000 of this sum having been expended by the Work Projects Administration. The balance of the program took the form of aids to youth by the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, and loans and grants to States, municipalities, etc., by the Public Works Administration.

International finance

Budgetary expenditures for international finance, that is, subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and capital stock of the Export-Import Bank, are estimated to aggregate $2,300,000,000 for the fiscal year 1946. This excludes $1,800,000,000 to be subscribed to the International Monetary Fund out of the United States Stabilization Fund created by the Gold Reserve Act of 1934.

The break-down for the fiscal year 1946 is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Amount authorized	Estimated payments in 1946	
		Budgetary items	From exchange stabilization fund
International Monetary Fund	2,750	950	1,800
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	3,175	317	----------
Export-Import Bank, capital stock	999	[1] 999	----------
Total	6,924	2,266	1,800

[1] Includes $174,000,000 to be paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to retire capital stock previously subscribed by that Corporation.

As will be seen from the above table, membership of the United States in the International Monetary Fund will require subscription of $2,750,000,000, payment for all of which is expected to be made by June 30, 1946. Also, on the basis of Budget estimates, payment for the full remaining authorized capital of the Export-Import Bank of $999,000,000 is expected to be made by the end of this fiscal year, which, together with $1,000,000 of stock already owned by the United States, will give that bank capital stock of

$1,000,000,000. In addition the Export-Import Bank may borrow not to exceed $2,500,000,000 from the Treasury to carry on its authorized program. It is not believed that any of this latter amount will be required until after the fiscal year 1946. With regard to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development Congress has authorized subscription for capital stock by the United States to a total of $3,175,000,000, of which $317,000,000 is estimated to be paid in the fiscal year 1946 and about the same amount again in 1947. The remaining $2,540,000,000 can be called only when needed to meet the proportionate share of any losses suffered by the bank in the course of its operations.

Other expenditures

The balance of expenditures, under the classification "Other Activities", consists of (1) the budgetary items: aids to agriculture, public works, social security and railroad retirement, the Government's contributions to employees' retirement funds and the regular operating expenses of the various departments and establishments; and (2) net outlays of Government corporations and credit agencies other than war expenditures of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its affiliates. The budgetary items amounted to an aggregate of $3,400,000,000 in 1940, $3,000,000,000 in 1945, and, although there are various internal shifts, are expected to again amount to $3,400,000,000 in 1946.

Expenditures for aids to agriculture, including administrative and other expenditures of the Department of Agriculture classified in daily Treasury statements as "departmental", amounted to $1,571,000,000 in the fiscal year 1940 compared with the Budget estimate for 1946 of about $700,000,000, a reduction of $871,000,000.

Expenditures for principal items of a continuing public works character amounted to $571,000,000 in 1940, while in 1945, due to postponements on account of the war, they aggregated less than half of that amount. Such expenditures are estimated to be about $400,000,000 in the current year. These items are likely to increase in the immediate future as Congress has already authorized additional outlays for public roads, and rivers and harbors and flood control.

Expenditures of the social security and railroad retirement boards increased from an aggregate of $493,000,000 in 1940 to $779,000,000 in 1945 and for 1946 are estimated at about $875,000,000. Increased grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and transfers to the railroad retirement account are responsible for the higher level of expenditures in 1945 compared with 1940. The grants to States are estimated to be still higher in the current year, while transfers to the railroad retirement account will be slightly lower.

The balance of budgetary expenditures, "General administration, etc.," represent for the most part the regular operating costs of the various departments and establishments of the Government. These expenditures amounted to $814,000,000 in 1940, $1,174,000,000 in 1945, and are estimated at about $1,400,000,000 for 1946. These expenditures do not include costs of administration of war activities, Veterans' Administration, aids to agriculture, public works, and social security, and railroad retirement boards.

The outlays of Government corporations and credit agencies represent transactions in checking accounts maintained with the Treasurer of the United States and are stated net, i. e., gross payments by the agencies less their gross receipts. In 1944 net expenditures of these corporations and agencies amounted to $254,000,000 compared with net collections of $846,000,000 in 1945. In 1946 net collections are expected to be about $400,000,000. Since the war began liquidations of loans of such organizations as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation have proceeded at a faster pace, resulting in total net receipts rather than net expenditures as in earlier years in this category. The lower net receipts in 1946 compared with 1945 is due principally to an expected increase in net expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the current fiscal year.

Summary of actual receipts and expenditures of the Federal Government for the fiscal years 1940 and 1945 and Budget estimates for 1946 [1]

[In billions of dollars]

	Actual, fiscal year 1940 (prewar year)	Actual, fiscal year 1945 (peak war year)	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1946 (reconversion to peace)	Increase (+) or decrease (−), 1946 compared with 1940
Net receipts	5.4	46.5	36.0	+30.6
Expenditures:				
War activities:				
Budgetary items	1.7	90.0	51.0	+49.3
Government corporations (net)	------	.5	−.5	−.5
Total, war activities	1.7	90.5	50.5	+48.8
Other activities:				
Veterans' Administration	.6	2.1	3.2	+2.6
Refunds	.1	1.7	2.9	+2.8
Interest on the public debt	1.0	3.6	4.5	+3.5
Subtotal	1.7	7.4	10.6	+8.9
Unemployment relief	2.2	------	------	−2.2
International finance	------	------	2.3	+2.3
Other expenditures:				
Budgetary items	3.4	3.0	3.4	------
Government corporations and credit agencies	.3	−.8	−.4	−.7
Total, other activities	7.6	9.5	15.9	+8.3
Grand total, expenditures	9.3	100.0	66.4	+57.1
Excess of expenditures	3.9	53.6	30.4	+26.5

[1] Includes net outlays of Government corporations and credit agencies.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Government Expenditures and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. WILSON
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial on "the most discouraging thing of the age," appearing in the Centerville Iowegian, a newspaper published at Centerville, Iowa.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The most discouraging thing of the age is the number of people who are for a thing no matter what it is as long as it is to be paid for by tax money. One of the first reasons a member of a democracy should learn is that tax money is earned by labor and thrift and is paid out of the savings of workers. A man builds a house out of his savings or sets up a business or an industry out of his savings. It is these savings that are taxed to pay for all utopian schemes. If the worker who puts his life's savings into home doesn't pay his taxes to support the schemes of those who desire to live off the Government his home is taken away from him and he is set out on the street. No matter in what glowing colors the picture is painted by starry-eyed dreamers, tax money pays the bill and tax money comes from the worker who practices thrift, and self-denial, and industry, and good judgment, and sobriety. (Centerville Iowegian.)

Hazel Scott, Famed Negro Pianist, Cruelly Rebuffed by the DAR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the metropolitan newspapers of October 1, 1945, carried the disturbing announcement that Miss Hazel Scott, the talented wife of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, had been denied the use of Constitution Hall, in Washington, D. C., apparently because she is a Negro. At least, no other excuse seemed valid, inasmuch as the date previously requisitioned by Miss Scott's representative was allegedly available. Upon inquiry, the manager of the Hall stated that "the policy is laid down by the National Board of Management of Constitution Hall, a committee of Daughters of the American Revolution."

"Constitution Hall," indeed! Under the circumstances, the name is a misnomer. The shades of the ancestors of the members of the DAR, in heavenly discourse, must have much to say to each other about this incident. One would like to ask these tradition-conscious ladies if they harbor the opinion that their forebears fought and died in the Revolution in order that they, their descendants, should strive to exploit the differences between men? Were the Thirteen Colonies welded into a nation struggling toward an ideal of freedom and equality in order to nurse prejudices, fan hatreds, and drive wedges between the diverse groups in our population?

Our American civilization is the culture of no single race, no single creed, no single nation. Historically, we are a composite of the toil and energy, the blood, the sweat, the tears, the sacrifice, and the intelligence of countless millions who came as immigants to these shores. Our recent enemies have dearly learned the lesson that an amalgam of many peoples, such as we have here in America, can be stronger and more flexible than any other group presuming to conspire against us. The great American poet, Walt Whitman, joyously stated—"this is not a nation—but a teaming of nations."

Let me remind the Daughters of the American Revolution that they are living with other Americans in a country created by the continuous efforts of a vast conglomeration of people of all colors, all creeds, all races, and of all national origins. No one anywhere can

any longer cherish the myth that this is a country exclusively white or exclusively Anglo-Saxon or, possibly exclusively Protestant.

To the marvelous mosaic that is America today, the Negro people have made their tremendous and awe-inspiring contribution and they have had a long and sustaining record of achievements, overcoming, as they did, the handicaps of color, lack of education, equality, and opportunity. We all remember and applaud the great work of Booker T. Washington. We have deeply admired the brilliant mind of the late lamented George Washington Carver. We bow before the great artistry of Marian Anderson and of Paul Robeson. Bill Robinson has delighted us for years with his dancing feet. Richard Wright, and many others, have enthralled us with their creative writing. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the colored race for the gift of their many folk songs and moving religious hymns, speaking so eloquently of the travail of these people. Joe Louis has amazed the sports world and only recently at Fort Hamilton, he was decorated for good conduct and meritorious behavior by his military superiors. The list is endless. Nor can we overlook the nameless heroes of the Negro race who contributed so mightily to the war effort and brought the eagerly sought day of victory that much closer. Well over a million Negroes served in the armed forces. Negroes served in the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, the Marine Corps and in the merchant marine. They went abroad as war correspondents and finally won admission into the Army Air Forces. The list of individual awards for heroism is most impressive. They served with the American Red Cross at home and abroad.

Negro troops abroad were lauded by the British and the Australians and General Eisenhower commended the courageous service of colored soldiers during action in north Africa and elsewhere in the European theater of combat operations.

The Negro women willingly served in the Army Nurse Corps and enlisted with the Wacs, the Waves, and the Spars, and entered the Nurse Cadet Corps when permitted to do so.

Be it remembered that the great American Negro artists of the stage, screen, and radio are not denied the freedom of the airways, and as we all know, their broadcasts are eagerly awaited in millions of American homes.

By imposing this prohibition against Miss Scott now, and Miss Marian Anderson in 1939, the DAR, wittingly or unwittingly, is making its sinister contribution to the current attempts of demagogues to divide the American people into mutually hostile and suspicious groups. They are feeding the smouldering racial antagonisms and intolerances that lie so near the surface of society today. Such stubborn hate mongering, consciously or unconsciously, is doing America a grave disservice. We have just fought the most devastating war in history, despite the efforts of dissident elements. Must we permit them to achieve the calamity of race persecution? Do they desire to drag America down to the level of the bestiality that prevailed in Nazi Germany? As every rationally thinking American will agree, this is a form of national degeneration and disintegration in which we cannot afford to indulge. America has overcome her enemies from without, but we all know that the danger that threatens America today, unless throttled, will come from the stimulation of latent prejudices agitated by deliberate propaganda. In its operation discrimination is a completely destructive factor. Freedom of the individual is the most vital condition of creative life—of human existence. Such freedom is impossible if men and women are restricted in their pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness by race, religion, or national origin, or paralyzed by the fears and hatreds of their neighbors.

It is such obvious examples of intolerance and discrimination—as indicated by the barring of Miss Scott from Constitution Hall in the Nation's Capital—that we must combat with all our available skills and energies. We must conquer this type of prejudice and such evidences of racial myths if we as a people, as a nation, are to continue to exist.

St. Lawrence Seaway Might Aid Steel Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway Might Aid Steel Mills," from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of September 24, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY MIGHT AID STEEL MILLS

In another column * * * is an article on discovery of a huge deposit of high-grade iron ore at the base of the Laborador Peninsula, about half way on a line between the southern end of Hudson Bay and the Straits of Belle Isle.

This has a direct bearing on the St. Lawrence seaway project. It shows the seaway might be of great value in carrying ore up the St. Lawrence for the American iron and steel industry.

This development will not take place until the Lake Superior mines begin to run out of high-grade ore. But as the article shows, such exhaustion is no longer a matter of the remote future.

Advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway have always emphasized the value of both aspects of the project—opening of a deep channel between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean and development of large amounts of low-cost, steady, hydroelectric power.

Seaway traffic would by no means be restricted to that which now reaches or leaves Montreal by rail, or passes through the existing canal around the rapids of the St. Lawrence. The low freight rates offered by genuine deepwater ships could and would encourage a much larger movement.

Ore from Labrador-Quebec iron mines would be handled by the same boats that now carry iron ore at such low costs from Lake Superior to the ports serving our steel mills.

This is just one example of the new types of traffic which a deepwater connection with the Great Lakes can develop.

The St. Lawrence seaway meets the requirements for lasting success. It would have few locks, a minimum depth of 27 feet, and only a few miles of restricted channel, the river itself being wide.

Canada is to pay her full share of the cost—or rather more than her share when her much smaller percentage of total traffic is considered.

It seems a shame that Government funds, to which New York makes a larger tax contribution than any other State, are being expended lavishly for much inferior projects, while St. Lawrence power and navigation remain undeveloped.

Why piddle with 9- to 12-foot channels and neglect a 27-foot one?

When Nature has provided so much, it is foolish to delay removal of the remaining obstacles to such a magnificent waterway.

New York has a direct stake in the power. It has an even greater stake in whatever makes for the prosperity and industrial progress of the Northeast and United States as a whole.

Atomic Bomb Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Collier's mafazine:

ATOMIC BOMB LESSON

It is hard to think of anything that could have dramatized more forcefully the need for a national scientific research policy, as advocated by Dr. Vannevar Bush and numerous others, than the loosing by United States forces of the atom bomb on Japan.

Dr. Bush heads the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which had a large hand in the $2,000,000,000 research gamble whereby the Allies won the race for the atom bomb. He is also the author of a plan for putting scientific research on an organized, businesslike, year-in-year-out, well-financed basis. It may seem farfetched at the moment to say so, but it is possible that this plan or something like it will prove more important in the long run than the development of the atom bomb.

Anyway, what Bush wants the Government to do is to set up a National Research Foundation, which would deal out money to medical and other research centers whose work contributes in any way to the public welfare or the defense of the Nation.

(Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, has, in fact, introduced a bill for the establishment of a National Research Foundation, carrying out recommendations in Dr. Bush's report to President Truman.)

This foundation would not be allowed in any way to monkey with the research centers' policies or personnel—a prohibition which Dr. Bush considers of top importance to the success of the plan. Wartime controls and official powers over private industries' research departments, he also believes, should be removed as fast as possible. We must * * * recover freedom in inquiry and that healthy competitive scientific spirit so necessary for expansion of the frontiers of scientific knowledge."

A major detail of the Bush recommendations is that the proposed National Research Foundation establish 24,000 scholarships in scientific institutions of learning, and 900 postgraduate fellowships.

That would cost about $30,000,000 a year. But since October 1940 this country, unlike the other Allied Nations, has refused to draft-defer young men of demonstrated scientific talent. The result is that, unless we do something about it, we face what Secretary Charles L. Parsons of the American Chemical Society calls "the loss of an entire generation of scientists."

Bush may not have the full prescription for all these ills and threatened ills. But at least he has a detailed plan—and a plan, it should be emphasized, which contemplates research for peacetime progress and the public welfare as well as research to keep us abreast of all development in weapons of war.

The Germans were far behind us in the race for the atom bomb, but they beat us to the development of the jet-propelled fighter plane. It was talked quietly around among observers last winter and spring that if the Germans could throw an operational force of 1,000 jets onto the western front they could nullify Allied air superiority until the Allies could counter the jets somehow, and thus prolong the war.

It was the persistent bombing of German factories, railroads, and oil plants that wiped out that menace, by keeping the Germans from assembling sufficient jet planes and putting them in the air. But it was not until August 1, 1945, almost 3 months after Germany surrendered, that our Army Air Forces could unveil the P-80 jet fighter in its 526-m. p. h. flight from Dayton to New York.

A strong Navy and Air Force and a system of universal training for war (not in the traditional military sense, but including, besides some military education, training in industry and science) look like the keystones of our national defense structure. Equally important will be systematic research in the art and science of war, until such time as war is definitely eliminated from the earth. We hope the United Nations World Security Organization may accomplish that result in time. But it hasn't yet done so, nor got well started toward doing so.

Congress will have a lot of important jobs on its hands. We don't know of a single more important job than the setting up of a comprehensive national scientific research policy.

Truman-Congress Rift Seen Caused by President's Yielding to Labor Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—TRUMAN-CONGRESS RIFT SEEN CAUSED BY PRESIDENT'S YIELDING TO LABOR LOBBY

(By Frank R. Kent)

The reason a rift has developed in the beautiful relations between President Truman and Congress is because Mr. Truman appears to be yielding to pressure from the labor lobbyists (particularly the CIO) at a time when resentment in Congress and the country is rising by reason of the strikes which render hundreds of thousands of workmen idle, seriously impede the vital business of reconversion, cripple great industries, and enhance inflation dangers by curtailing production.

This is the truth about the refusal of Congress to carry out the Truman recommendations which the labor bosses and their radical supporters are demanding. The idea that there is a conspiracy on the part of low-minded Republicans and evil southern Democrats to thwart the President in his effort to put through a "great liberal" program is not well based.

That charge is made every time Congress refuses to follow blindly the labor line. The changes on it are rung regularly in the CIO publications, the Daily Worker and by the radical spokesmen, in and out of Washington. Its absurdity was shown Friday in the votes by which the Senate emasculated before passage of the so-called full-employment bill, the chief advocate of which was the CIO.

Nevertheless, it remains the favorite propaganda method of conveying the notion that those who oppose CIO-endorsed legislation are a sinister and selfish lot, while those who favor it are unselfish patriots whose only concern is the welfare of the "common man."

This is a completely false conception. Yet, there is a well-organized and well-financed publicity campaign to make it stick. The effort at the moment is to apply it to the opposition confronting the two most highly cherished CIO projects—the full employment bill, now fundamentally changed; the other, the plan to have the Government give $25 a week unemployment pay for 26 weeks, temporarily shelved in the House a few days ago.

Mr. Truman had endorsed both proposals in their original form and Congress was not enthusiastic about either. Nor did the opposition come exclusively from Republicans and southern Democrats. In fact, some of the most outstanding senatorial CIO sycophants are administration Democrats from the South.

Actually, it took courage to oppose these CIO bills. The pressure is all on their side. Their opponents are entitled to considerable credit for standing firm for their convictions against an ardent and effective lobby.

The first, in its original form, would have made possible unrestricted governmental expenditures and moved us toward Government control of private industry; the other put a premium on idleness, offered an inducement to many to remain unemployed instead of going to work, opened the door to abuses of various kinds.

When the House sidetracked the latter proposal, the President sent for the Democratic members of the Committee, told them the Senate had "let him down," urged them to reconsider and pass the bill. It was made clear the White House intended to use its weight to satisfy CIO criticisms that the President was not backing his words up with acts. He would have been wiser not to have tried.

PROOF OF CONGRESS STAND

The overwhelming adoption by the Senate of the emasculating amendments (not offered by southern Democrats) and the general denunciation of the dangers of the original bill gave proof that Congress no longer proposes to be prodded into accepting CIO proposals which take us toward national bankruptcy because of the White House wish and the raucous drum beating of the professional liberals.

We had a good many years of that before Mr. Truman became President. Afflicted with an unprecedently violent epidemic of strikes, the state of the Nation today is eloquent testimony of the deplorable effects of the Roosevelt-CIO combination.

There will be disappointment to find the CIO still able to swing a President behind its proposals and some surprise that Mr. Truman could be driven into a militant support not in accord with his previous policy toward Congress.

From the political standpoint there is sound ground for the argument that he will lose rather than gain in prestige and strength. As the strikes spread and the willingness of the CIO bosses to cripple the country in order to promote their own interests is shown, the indignation of the people as a whole is mounting. Soon or late that will be translated into votes which will shatter the idea that it pays to placate them.

This seems just the wrong time for Mr. Truman to succumb to pressure. It is true his nomination for Vice President was "cleared with Sidney" at Chicago in 1944, but Sidney's first choice was Mr. Wallace, and Mr. Truman is under no CIO obligation comparable to that which weighted down his predecessor.

Who Shall Succeed Crowley in the American-British Financial Discussions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, only a business settlement with Great Britain will satisfy the American public. There can be no diplomatic shenanigans. Leo F. Crowley set off a firecracker amongst the softies. He rightfully opposed an outright grant-in-aid and said if it was to be a loan-in-aid it would be on a Yankee-trading basis. His resignation followed.

Those who forced his withdrawal are the same group who usually ride in on the coattails of John Bull. They advocate unconditional aid to Britain. They are reckoning without their host—the American taxpayer who must foot the bill. The taxpayer is willing to pay under sensible business terms, but he won't let his pockets be picked. The aid shall be given only with a fair degree of self-interest. The English must gradually abolish the sterling area bloc pool and abrogate imperial preferences.

Britain must call in all her creditors including Canada, Argentina, Egypt, and so forth, and ask them to scale down her indebtedness to them.

Of course, Britain is loath to do this. These creditors would ask concessions. Egypt, for example, would say, "Remove your soldiers from our shores." India probably would say, "Give us the independence you promised." This would be very embarrassing to Britain, but that is just too bad. Her imperialism is catching up with her.

We must hedge around the loans so that the money could not be used to pay off other creditor countries like Argentina and Sweden. In bankruptcy, preferring a creditor is a crime. It should be no less in international finance and trade.

Presently, Czechoslovakia has a delegation in London headed by Thomas Masaryk arranging for a loan from Britain of 5,000,000 gold pounds. It is difficult to understand where Britain can lay her hands on such resources and

make such a loan. She asks our aid upon the ground of poverty. Will she use our money to make a loan to Czechoslovakia? John Q. Public would not stand for that.

One of the conditions of the Czechoslovakian loan is that the money must be used in the exclusive purchase of British goods in British markets. If we make a loan to Britain and she can use that money for that purpose we would be plain suckers. We would be opening British markets and closing our own as far as Czechoslovakian trade is concerned.

It is hoped that Crowley's successor will like him be a hard-headed businessman who will demand terms from Britain that will be nondetrimental to our trade and interests.

Address by Frank E. Gannett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune recently to be present at the annual outing of the Republican Club of Utica and Oneida County, N. Y., which was addressed by Mr. Frank E. Gannett, of Rochester, one of the most able and distinguished newspaper publishers of America.

His remarks, which I append, were most timely and an important contribution to our national thought of today. I earnestly recommend them both to the Members of the Congress, and to the country at large.

Mr. Gannett said:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Republicans, I am glad I could accept your invitation to participate in your program today. To see and meet so many faithful and enthusiastic Republicans is encouraging and inspiring.

There never was a time when the State and Nation so much needed the Republican Party as it does today, for our country is at the crossroads. In Lincoln's time the great issue was whether black men should be slave or free. Now the issue is whether all men, white as well as black, shall be slaves to the state.

I am not exaggerating. This is the great question that must be settled. And nothing is more important than how it is to be decided; nothing more important in the lives of every one of us.

Are we going to continue to have constitutional government, or are we to have as a substitute a system of planned economy that dooms us to some form of statism, call it national socialism, fascism, communism, or what you will? Are we to have an all-powerful government that becomes our master and makes us its servants? The line is clearly drawn.

When President Truman took office we were all eager to have him succeed. We supported him in all his efforts to win the war. Partisan feelings were put aside. Many things the President did soon after taking office received wide commendation. There developed a feeling of relief and there arose hope that under his administration we might get back to sound Government principles.

The recent message of President Truman to Congress, however, has chilled these hopes, for the message reflects a socialistic New Deal program as dangerous to our national welfare as was that of his predecessor. It reveals that President Truman favors planned economy, under which government would take care of us all. He advocates Federal housing, Federal support of many projects, increased pay and shorter hours for Government workers, the same lavish spending of the taxpayers' money as we have had for the past 12 years.

To him, as to the man who originated the costly and disastrous New Deal, a balanced budget apparently is not of great concern, although you know that a balanced budget is the first essential of a sound economic future for the country. In his long message, President Truman mentioned almost everything else under the sun, but he overlooked entirely the most important item of all.

Although the danger point was reached long ago, we must expect to have further sad experience with unbalanced budgets, with national debt and carrying charges mounting higher and higher. The financial condition of our country is truly cause for grave concern.

President Truman's message and its plan for various proposed socialistic measures, received the heartiest approval from the Daily Worker, the organ of the Communists. Other Socialist papers also warmly praised his program.

If the Communists and all the rest of the fellow travelers are elated over the President's program, that in itself is reason enough to make Americans who believe in our form of government suspicious of it. All of us should be disturbed over what his proposals, if carried out, could do to your country.

During the war we heard much about the danger of inflation. We were told by Government spokesmen that to avoid inflation we would have to submit to price ceilings, wage controls, rent controls, production controls, market controls, and all sorts of Government regulations.

Great inflation can indeed be ruinous. We all know what happened in Germany after the First World War. Money became worthless. A dozen eggs sold for millions of marks. Other prices were proportionately high. The nation became bankrupt. The chaos that prevailed brought on a revolution, produced Hitler, and a totalitarian government. Similar conditions developed in Italy, France, and other countries. Thirty-two governments were overthrown as a direct consequence of the devastating World War.

Inflation always is a frightening monster. It devours everything in reach. Our leaders, our newspaper, our magazines, and our commentators and public speakers were dead right when they warned that inflation must be avoided at all costs. It brings woe and misery to the people on whom it feeds. It brings on revolution and an end to liberty and freedom. Next to war, it is the greatest curse that can come to any country.

The Government, however, was wrong in its methods of dealing with the problem. The danger of inflation was not lessened by the steps taken. They did not get at the basic problem. They merely created black markets, disregard and disrespect for law, and corruption among our people. Inflation steadily increased. Today that inflation has reached a point where it demands the first consideration of our President. In my opinion, it is one of the greatest issues that America faces.

What is this dreadful inflation. When there is a vast supply of money and a limited supply of things to purchase with it, money becomes cheap. It buys less of everything. Prices rise and keep on rising as money becomes less and less valuable.

The principal source of inflation is the issuing by the Government of additional currency. To pay for the cost of the war it was of course necessary to issue billions of dollars worth of bonds. We must now face the fact that the issuing of bonds has exactly the same effect as increasing our supply of money. Currency is generally understood to be engraved pieces of paper issued by the Government. Bonds likewise are engraved pieces of paper. The principal difference is that bonds bear interest. Either bonds or currency will be accepted in payment of obligations. Currency is better known to the average citizen because it is issued in small denominations such as one dollar bills.

But bonds that bear interest are as useful for paying debts of large amount as is currency. No one wishing to sell a piece of property valued at $10,000 would refuse to accept payment in bonds bearing interest. This being true, inflation results from the issuing of bonds just as it results from the issuing of noninterest bearing currency. Both are currency in that they both are acceptable in paying debts or in purchasing property or goods.

Our national debt is now over $263,000,000,000 and is expected to reach three hundred billion. If the cost of the war is paid through bonds issued for this fantastic sum, the effect will be about the same as if we had issued currency for the staggering amount.

During the past 5 years the United States also has increased its currency in circulation from five to twenty-five billions, thus adding twenty billions more to our money supply.

Likewise inflationary was the action of the Federal Reserve Board giving banks the authority to issue $100 of currency for every $25 on deposit. Previously $40 in deposit was required. This means that if the banks have deposits of one hundred billions they may issue four hundred billions of currency, instead of two hundred and fifty billions under the 40-percent requirements. This therefore tends to increase purchasing power by more billions without additional security.

These acts of inflation add more billions to the currency of the United States. These inflationary moves simply must increase prices and decrease the purchasing value of the dollar. The vast extent of these inflationary forces is enough to make everyone shudder at the consequences. It is as if we were threatened with a great flood, a tidal wave of national disaster.

How does President Truman meet this rapidly growing menace to the value of your dollar? The various proposals in his message call for increasing Government expenditure and decreasing Government revenue. They indicate that his administration will be molded after the pattern of his predecessor that our Government believes outgo need have no relation to income, and that the size of the national debt is unimportant and the piling up of national deficits is nothing to worry about. Think of that as a policy for the country!

President Truman's peacetime proposals as they are given in his message would easily add another thirty billions to our debt. Following the message a strong administration Senator proposed to reduce the working time of Federal employees to 30 hours a week, but to pay them at the 40-hour rate. This alone, Senator BYRD asserts, would add some $2,000,000,000 a year to the Government's expense. And in the face of all this lavish expenditure come proposals for decreasing the Government's revenue!

In other words, the Truman administration seems to have adopted a theory that the higher the debt and the greater the deficits, the better off the Nation will be!

This theory is in accord with the thinking of Secretary Henry Wallace in his new book which the radicals are boosting as their bible. Wallace, of course, believes in the crackpot

theory that we can spend ourselves into prosperity. He is the all-out spending hero of the radicals.

If you believe Wallace is right, try out his plan in your own affairs and see what happens to you. Bankruptcy and financial ruin are inevitable under his theories. If to get the political support of the radicals the President is going to adopt the policies of the left-wingers, the spenders, the planners, you can see what we face.

The only way to check inflation which is coming upon us at a terrifying rate is to balance the budget, and begin to pay off our crushing debt. We must also begin at once to cut down Government spending.

To check inflation we should produce more goods but at the very time we need increased civilian production as never before we are hog-tied by widespread strikes. These have been encouraged and condoned by utterances and statements of men high up in the administration.

With our national financial situation as serious as it is, it is plain that we need in Government able men familiar with finance and business methods. Only rigid economy, courage, and patriotism that place the country's welfare above person or party can save us from financial doom.

Here is one great challenge to the Republican Party! We must meet it. But there are others.

Throughout the land are militant forces who are working night and day to undermine our form of government. They would substitute for our constitutional system national socialism, communism. These promoters of foreign isms are daily becoming more threatening and more powerful. They are busy everywhere all the time. Like termites, they work in the dark, unseen, boring in and eating away the foundations of our Republic.

In the city of Chicago there are between forty and fifty Communist labor schools where young men and women learn parliamentary procedure, public speaking, labor journalism, all the tricks of the trade. They are turning out highly trained specialists in these fields. They have their commentators on the air, subtly arousing contempt for our Constitution. They have unlimited supplies of books, attractive and alluring pamphlets and literature that openly advocate the overthrow of our form of government and the substitution of communism for it. They are following the technique of Lenin and the crackpot idealism of Marx.

In New York City these people occupy the entire space in an eight-story office building and openly espouse communism. They have enthusiasm and determination and are confident they will overthrow our form of government. The Republican Party must fight them to the finish.

Harold J. Laski who did much at Harvard and in Washington to promote Socialist plans said recently in England that the capitalistic system is doomed. If that be true, then everyone is destined to be deprived of his property. Our Constitution says that no one shall be deprived of his property without due process of law. If Laski and his Red followers are right, our Constitution means nothing. It goes out the window.

There are many who say that this can't happen here and smugly ignore what is going on. Let me remind you that no one expected that a handful of schemers could overthrow the Czar of Russia, but they did and they have remained in control of the Russian Government ever since.

It seemed most unlikely that Churchill, the great war leader, who saved Britain and probably the whole world, could be driven from office by those who stood for a program of state socialism that may lead to almost any kind of an economic revolution in England. But he was liquidated and today America with its Constitution stands as the last great bulwark in the world against the disaster of national socialism and a superstate.

The enemies of our Constitution say they will either dominate the Democratic Party, as now seems possible, or they will have a party of their own to put across their communistic program. I hope the conservatives in the Democratic Party will stand firm and drive out the Reds, but there is little hope now that this will be the case.

I should like to see those who favor New Dealism driven into a new party. And then I should like to have all those who believe in our system of government—in the real Democratic Party and in the great Republican Party—form a solid coalition. The genuine liberals and progressives, the Constitutionalists of the two parties would vastly outnumber the radicals. United they can save America.

The line of battle is beginning to form. The issue soon will be drawn. The question will be whether we are to adopt a reactionary system and go back to slavery—to the conditions that prevailed everywhere in the world before our Constitution was adopted—or shall we continue to be freemen and be masters of the state.

A few days ago we observed the 156th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution. This again brought out the story of the amazing progress we have made, a broader advance than in all the preceding ages. This great charter of liberty struck from the hands of man the shackles that had bound him for centuries. It gave to all an incentive to work, to save, to build, to create. It recognized the profit motive. It gave to all opportunity. For those with ability, character, thrift and ambition, there was no limit to what could be achieved.

Under this system of competitive free enterprise with a reward for individual effort, this Nation has grown from a little group of colonies to become the greatest and most powerful Nation in all the world.

A form of government that has given to more people more of everything, a higher standard of living than ever before known on this planet, a government that has given us so many blessings is worth saving and must be saved.

But it will not be preserved unless the public is aroused to the dangers that threaten us and unless the Republican Party rises to meet this challenge as it did in Lincoln's time.

Under our banner should be united every owner of farm or home, every owner of life insurance, every owner of a Government bond, every savings-bank depositor. Members of these groups far outnumber all the radicals in the country. They should see clearly that unless sound financial policies are restored, we are doomed. Private ownership then would be displaced by an all-powerful government which would own our property and all manufacturing plants, and which would control production and distribution.

But more important still, unless we rally the majority of the people to our side and check the drive down the road to serfdom, we shall lose all our freedom and liberty, just as it was lost in Germany, Italy, and Russia.

In these critical times, the Republican Party can offer a program that will appeal to every patriotic American. It must stand for rigid economy in Government and for an end to wasteful, needless Government spending. It must bring about a balanced budget. It must lower taxes and thereby stimulate production. It must increase employment and thus raise Government income. It can check inflation, put the Government's finances in sound condition. And by wise, fair, and just legislation it can promote peace and harmony in industrial relations and cut down the strikes that are so costly to both employees and employers as well as all consumers. Under the Wagner Act we have had more strikes than ever before in our history. It is one-sided legislation that has cost employees and employers alike a fabulous sum. It should be repealed and a new labor act drafted that would avert these needless wars in our industrial life.

Furthermore, the Republican Party must put a stop to the trend toward centralization of Government and restore to the States their full rights. Our party must drive out the bureaucrats who have bungled their jobs and disastrously tried to regulate our lives and way of living.

Our party must wisely employ the great power of the United States in helping prevent another war, in helping to reconstruct the devastated countries so that they may regain their strength and be able to ward off revolutions.

Our party must stop the trend toward State socialism, which is revealed in the plans for socialized medicine and federalized education, Federal housing, and a score of similar proposals.

It must put an end to Government subsidies. It must stop Government support of indolence and give free enterprise the green light to continue its sound efforts to promote the general welfare within the Constitution.

Our party must adopt policies that will regain friendship and support of South and Central American countries lost to us by the unwise policies of our State Department. We know that the best market for our exports is in these countries, not in Europe.

The Republican Party must drive out of Government the crackpot theorists whose wild policies would ruin America. We must put in their place sound, experienced, practical men who can restore business methods in the handling of the country's affairs.

The publisher of the Farm Journal recently stated the case perfectly when he said:

"Our people want a Nation in which there is free opportunity to achieve and to receive the just reward for achievement. They want a Nation in which there is a stimulus of competition—that tremendous driving force which compels the constant search for ways of doing things better, more efficiently, more economically. They want a Nation in which Government encourages initiative, energy, and investment in enterprise, instead of penalizing and punishing them, because the people know from experience that these are fundamentals of a prosperous economy. They want a Nation where the individual has freedom of choice to determine his future; freedom of action to pursue his chosen activity within constitutional limits."

And he might have added that the great majority of our people do not want government to take care of them; they don't want government to control them or to restrict their efforts and ambitions. They want to drive ahead to new heights, to a glorious new age in the life of our Nation.

The Republican Party, if put back in power, would give us renewed faith, a new, inspiring outlook on life and raise our hopes with just such a program.

There is no doubt about our future if we only give our wonderful people a chance to develop our resources, a chance to use our ingenuity and inventive skill. New horizons await development in every field. I am sure the Republican Party will make the most of these unlimited opportunities and, by preserving our wonderful American way of life, bring about greater progress, prosperity, and happiness than has ever been known.

The time in which to save this great Republic is getting short. With renewed patriotism we must build up our party so that it will be able to preserve our form of government—and we must begin now.

Our hope lies in Congress, the bulwark of our liberties. Next year we shall elect all Representatives in the House and 32 Members of the United States Senate. The next Congress will likely determine the whole future of this great Nation, decide whether

the people are to be master of the state or be its slaves. We must organize now for that election. We must arouse the public to the perils that we face from the radicals who are plotting to gain office.

A victory for our Republican candidates this fall will have tremendous effect next year.

Let us here today rededicate ourselves, as untold millions have in the past, to the great task before us. We must keep ever in mind the great sacrifices of those who built up this Nation and who made possible its unmatchable form of government, the sacrifices of those who fought and died to save the Union, the sacrifices of those who, under terrible suffering, cruel torture, and with a million casualties, have just won a great victory over the enemies who attacked us let us see to it that all these sacrifices shall not have been in vain.

Favoring Granting of Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity to Steamship Companies To Operate Overseas Air Service—Resolution of Board of Harbor Commissioners of Port of Long Beach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this day I have received a resolution dated September 25, 1945, which was unanimously adopted by the board of harbor commissioners of the great city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., and which resolution emphatically and clearly sets forth the unanimous thinking of this board of harbor commissioners of this nationally and internationally known port of Long Beach, my home city, if you please.

I commend the reading of and the reasoning in this resolution to each of you, and I ask your favorable consideration of the principles set forth in the resolution:

Resolution with respect to the granting of certificates of public convenience and necessity to steamship companies to operate overseas air service

Whereas the prosperity and development of the Port of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., depends in a degree upon its place in world shipping and as a gateway for overseas transportation on the sea and in the air through its seaport and airport of the city of Long Beach; and

Whereas any measures that strengthen these transportation services in the public interest will enable them to keep step with progress in transportation, is a benefit to this port, city and county, and the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas shipping companies who have long pioneered and developed their trade routes seek to improve their service by adding aircraft and providing a coordinated sea-air service over their regular routes and between their regular terminals; and

Whereas if this right is denied them it will:

(a) Jeopardize the position of the port of Long Beach, the city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, as a gateway to overseas points and to the interior of the United States;

(b) Deprive the public in general from the benefits of a new type of overseas transportation service that neither ships nor planes operating alone independently can provide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the Port of Long Beach:

1. That the port of Long Beach and its board of harbor commissioners urge upon the President of the United States and the Civil Aeronautics Board that in the matter of certificates for overseas air service, that applications of shipping companies be given the same consideration as any other applicant, irrespective of the operation of surface vessels,

2. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronatuics Authority, members of the United States Maritime Commission, members of the Commerce Committee of the United States Senate, members of the House of Representatives Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Merchant Marine Committee, and to all California Representatives in Congress.

The city of Long Beach is on the Pacific Ocean about 20 miles south of Los Angeles city; it is easily the second largest city in Los Angeles County; the third largest city in southern California; and probably the fifth city in population in the State at this time. Situated on the great Pacific coastal plain, it has a frontage of 8.7 miles, land area of 32.68. The temperature of my home city of Long Beach ranges from a mean maximum of 71° in the month of August to a mean of 55° in January; the annual average rainfall is approximately 15 inches, and practically all of which comes during the winter months; there being practically no rainfall from May to December. Therefore, and as a consequence and result of this extremely favorable climate and weather, it is possible to fly airplanes practically every day of every year. So this fact also has a definite bearing on the import of the resolution from the board of harbor commissioners.

Growing from a municipality of 564 people in 1890 to 18,809 in 1910, and 142,032 in 1930, and to at least 235,000 people in 1944, the municipally developed, owned, and built harbor of the port of Long Beach has rapidly and conclusively become established as one of the Pacific coast ports which will contribute much in t'e way of material prosperity to the coast, to the Nation, and to the world. The records of its creation, development, and present important place in the ports of our great Nation speak louder than any words, either spoken or written indeed.

Watch the port of Long Beach. Its place in world shipping and as a gateway for overseas transportation on the sea, and also in the air through its seaport and also its great airport facilities mark it as one of the assured ports in the initiation and expansion of our postwar world trade. It is believed that the combination of seaport and airport transportation facilities and advantages is economically sound and in the interests of the prosperity and development of transportation services if we promptly initiate and reach out as a nation into the world neighborhood in the matter of transportation development, services, and advantages, economies, and efficiency.

I respectfully urge again, gentlemen, the principles so clearly set forth in this important resolution from the board of harbor commissioners be adopted favorably in your thinking and conclusions.

And in mentioning the airport at Long Beach, I also call your attention to its great record of development, expansion, and services rendered in this great war. Furthermore, it is so strategically located geographically in the great coastal plain of southern California that it is already proven to be readily accessible to commercial and passenger use. Presently covering an area of 738 acres, its longest runway is about 6,900 feet. It is adequately equipped with a modern administration building, and it is said that it has easily been one of the busiest in the Nation in the number of take-offs and landings. Long Beach is the home port of the Pacific Fleet. Navy personnel of the fleet, therefore, come to Long Beach from all parts of the Nation and the world; and the Navy drydocks at Terminal Island in Long Beach have and will continue to employ more than 15,000 people daily; and the great Roosevelt base installations are also there situated. The municipality of Long Beach constructed this airport and has announced the holding of another municipal election on the important subject of further development and expansion of this airport. So, gentlemen, it is quite natural that the board of harbor commissioners of my great city should unanimously and so emphatically state its position in favor of granting of certificates for the combined services of seaport and airport transportation advantages.

St. Lawrence Seaway Canal and Full Employment

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the St. Lawrence Canal and power project, if carried out, will be the most effective full employment measure that was ever adopted in this country. We know what the TVA did for the Tennessee Valley, and like projects have been accomplished in other parts of the country. The problem of unemployment is one that affects, not only the servicemen and laborers, but capital as well. Because of the war, we have contracted a great debt, but that debt is not near as great as the resources and capital here in the United States. If this capital is to be employed, that debt can readily be paid and projects such as the St. Lawrence Canal is one of them. We must build for the future as well as for the present.

When a city like Minneapolis, Minn., tears down a structure worth a million

dollars and replaces it with one worth $5,000,000, that represents progress and added employment. It seems a shame that from the ravages of misfortunes such as war, employment is kept at its peak. Whenever there is a disastrous fire or earthquake, employment increases in the area that had the disaster. A little judgment would tell us that it is necessary to build for the future on a greater scale than we have at the present to keep labor and capital employed in their fullness.

It is for this reason that I believe it is important that we now, as soon as we can make the machinery of this House and Senate, work to pass this bill. It will accomplish wonders. It will give us a trade area and will build up New York City, as well as the rest of the country. It will open up avenues for investment of capital and the employment of labor on an extended scale. We need these avenues opened when 10,000,000 men are released from the service, when the closing of war agencies force the release of another million from the Government, and the closer of war industries throw more men on the labor market. Then is the time we need this employment, and the only way to get it is through progress such as this bill would bring to our united country.

The special message I want to bring to you all is that capital needs employment as well as labor.

Medical Doctors

REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the American people were most fortunate that during World War II no great Nation-wide epidemic struck, such as those which swept the country during World War I, for our medical men on the home front would have been unable to cope with it. So great was the demand of the armed forces for medical doctors that less than 80,000 effective practicing physicians and surgeons were left to take care of 130,000,000 civilians at home. The strain on these civilian doctors has been terrible, with 15 to 18 hours of regular daily service being not at all unusual. Hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of them have died as a result of overwork.

At the height of the war the Army had in its Medical Corps approximately 47,000 doctors and the Navy 13,000 doctors, or a total of 60,000 medical officers to take care of 12,000,000 men. Justification for such a large number of medical officers was made on the ground of need to care for battle casualties. Yet, official testimony before congressional committees reveal combat troops were often far short of necessary medical officers, while troops in training or in quiet sectors had more medical personnel than could possibly be used. Recently letters received from medical officers in the Pacific theater show that a shortage of service doctors still exists there despite the ending of the war. At the same time hundreds of medical officers have been assigned to administrative duties only and have performed no direct medical service at all. To show what some of the Army medical officers, at present overseas, think about this situation, I am quoting the following letter from which, for obvious reasons, I have deleted the name of the writer:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1945.

The Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Representative from the State of Ohio,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Recently I read in the press that you have been concerned over the release of doctors from the Army. I am a native of a State other than your own, and a Democrat, but I'd like to give the Representatives some pertinent information, which is of value, regardless of my political beliefs or native State.

I've been in the Army 38 months, and I've been overseas 17 months. All of this time, I've held the position of Battalion Surgeon. I've had 87 days of combat in an island of the South Pacific and 219 consecutive days of combat on another since D-day. I also spent some time in the States with an armored division—also as a battalion surgeon.

Medically speaking, I haven't earned a dollar of my salary since I've been in the Army. Of course, I've given instruction in close order drill, how to pitch a tent, compass reading, map reading, care and cleaning of vehicles, and first aid and sanitation. I've had 25 mile marches, 5 months of maneuvers, and few other odds and ends. I've inspected latrines, kitchens, and fly trays; I've been shot at, shelled, strafed, and have helped withstand banzai attacks, and I've forgotten all the medicine I ever knew. In short, to use a vulgar, but succinct army phrase—"I'm about as essential as ——— ——— ———."

My technicians and medical administrative corps officer run the sick call, which consists of blisters, sore throats, constipation, headaches, and "goldbricks." The battalion aid station is equipped to do nothing but act as a clearing house. Anyone seriously ill is sent immediately to the hospital. I'm not a trained surgeon—I am a diagnostician, and I can do no surgery there, even if we had the equipment.

In combat, the injured are given first aid, plasma, morphine, splints, etc., at the battalion aid station and are then evacuated to a hospital by ambulance. Nearly all of this work is done by my technicians and MAC officer, who had 2 months training in first aid, administration of simple drugs, and simple diagnosis.

At present, he and the technicians do the "monthly short arms" inspection, inspect the latrines, kitchens, garbage dumps, and urinals. They give lectures on health and sanitation. They hold sick call, taking care of the minor cases and sending all others to the hospital—and that is all I'd be able to do myself. In short, all I do is sit around on my "tokus" all day reading reports as to how essential doctors are in the Army. What a laugh.

I'm 32 years old—and married—no children. I've had 1 year of internship only, and on top of that I've forgotten a great deal.

When I finally get home, if and when I ever do, I'll have to take more graduate school work and more hospital training—I'm not competent at present to handle civilian patients—or at least in my own opinion. No conscientious doctor would consider himself competent if he were in my position, until he had more training to regain knowledge that he has lost.

Also, I will be nearly 40 years old before I can even earn a living, and my wife, as patient and understanding as she is, cannot live on leaves, grass, and nuts and berries.

They've enough hospitals on this island now to sink the place. Some of them aren't even functioning, and yet they are fully staffed, or partially staffed. Why can't they send some of those very young doctors in these hospitals out here to replace these Bn surgeons, if they insist on maintaining such a useless office?

Hell, after a year of living in the mud, night attacks, shelling, sniping, etc., I'm tired. I've aged 10 years since I've been here—so have we all in this particular job—and yet we are the forgotten men. They hang onto us like grim death. We are essential. Yes, we are—like the fifth wheel on a wagon. It is ridiculous and absurd.

No inspector ever gets down to the Bn aid station to make an estimate of the situation. They fly in from Washington and have a few drinks with the commanding officer of a general hospital, who has been previously warned of the inspector's arrival. Then, the inspector, if he is really daring, straps on a pistol and makes a flying trip into what he considers no man's land—a field hospital which is probably 40 miles behind the lines. Then he goes back to the States with a theater ribbon and a Legion of Merit, and reports that all is well; everyone is working at top speed and all doctors are essential. Baloney.

Yes, I've done a lot of manual labor in this Army, but medically speaking, I haven't earned a dime of my salary. We all think that it is high time that someone knew about this ridiculous situation, and it is ridiculous. I've seen rear bases with enough doctors there to care for the whole Russian Army, and some of them doing nothing, and others filling out reports—or doing technician or MAC jobs running a dispensary. I came into the Army willingly, and ready to work at my profession. What a surprise I received.

Very sincerely,

——— ———,
Officer in the Medical Corps.

I might quote to you from letters of hundreds of medical officers, in both the Army and Navy, which I have received during recent weeks and since my demand, in late August, that the Army and Navy stop hoarding doctors and return them to civilian life, where they are so badly needed. These letters would reveal that thousands of medical officers now have no worth-while duties to perform in the armed services and would substantiate fully the charge, made by a medical officer of the Army assigned to the Senate Military Affairs Committee as an investigator, that the average medical officer in the Army carries less than 10 percent of the case load—or performs less than 10 percent of the work—now carried by the average civilian doctor.

While various plans and programs for the demobilization of medical officers have been announced by both the War and Navy Departments, such demobilization seems to be moving at a snail's pace. For some reason or other an attempt is evidently being made to hold on to these medical officers just as long as possible. Such a policy is wrong. It is unfair to the doctors who left their civilian practice and volunteered for Army and Navy service as a patriotic duty. Now that the war is over, to hold men in service 1 minute longer than they are needed, or can be used effectively, cannot be justified, and will work unnecessary hardship on the civilian population. The same situation holds true for dentists, veterinarians, and other professional men now in the armed forces.

So, in my capacity as a Member of Congress, and as the ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Public Health, I am calling upon both the Army and Navy to take steps to immediately speed up the discharge of medical officers, and to see to it every unneeded doctor is returned to civilian life promptly.

Repeal the Silver Purchase Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the OPA recently raised the price of foreign silver and advanced it to 71.111 cents a fine ounce, and thus put foreign silver on a price level with the domestic product. The current price for foreign silver was 45 cents, but apparently this kept out of the American market much needed silver supplies for silversmiths and other manufacturers.

We have thus created a bonanza for foreign mine owners. The Bank of Mexico has discontinued the issuance of silver coins. It is worth far more to sell the minted silver to Americans. The Mexican silver peso had a normal value of 20 cents. It is now worth 27 cents—a handsome profit to the hoarders of Mexican coins. This price dislocation caused by the OPA has created havoc all over the world, especially in those countries where silver is the standard metal for money.

All this highlights the need for our removing all our artificial restrictions off silver. The war taught us many practical advantages in the use of various metals. It has taught us that silver is not as precious as it is cracked up to be. Many other metals have far more strategic values. Furthermore, it is not essential as a base for currency. Any metal, with the full weight of American faith and American resources behind it, can pass for currency.

Silver should no longer be sacrosanct. It should no longer be a sacred cow for the benefit exclusively of the mine owners of the silver States. They are making lush profits by the compulsory purchasing by the Government of all domestic silver mined. The price Uncle Sam must pay is 71.11 cents per ounce. It is worth far less. Thus the American taxpayers are bilked for the silver brahmins.

The Treasury has 2,000,000,000 ounces of idle silver. Yet, the Government must continue to purchase and add to the stock pile. This vast hoard is daily mounting to what end? Certainly, we cannot mint it all into money. After a great deal of argument we finally permitted, in the interests of the war effort, some of this hoard of silver to be used for so-called nonconsumptive uses. We permitted its use in form of bus bars in the manufacture of aluminum. Those bus bars are now being returned to the Treasury. We are no longer making aluminum in vast quantities.

The silver-purchase acts should be scrapped and any silver beyond currency needs should be sold to jewelers, manufacturers, and silversmiths at intrinsic values. Silver should compete with other metals like copper, lead, and zinc. It has its proper use in the arts and sciences and in manufacturing.

Manufacturers cannot use up our supply of domestic silver. There is no need to import silver. There is need, however, if we continue the silly silver-purchase acts and require the Government to hold on to and store and keep purchasing domestic silver. We are the only suckers in the world which pay extortionate prices for a domestic product for the benefit of a favored few, hide the useless products in vaults, and ask no return or profit on it. We treat the silver like museum pieces.

It was very proper to increase the selling price on silver because of the obnoxious silver-purchase acts, but the latest ruling of OPA is far from a constructive move. It is like trying to cure a disease with a plaster.

H. R. 177 and H. R. 178 are two bills which I have offered to abolish the monstrosity known as the silver-purchase acts. It is hoped that Congress will see the light and pass them.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a column, by Mr. Jerry Kluttz, which appeared recently in the Washington Post.

The week of October 7 is designated by the Congress as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. The people Mr. Kluttz has written about are wonderful examples of what can be done by physically handicapped workers when they are given the opportunity to work. We should extend our energies to see that the opportunity to have productive employment is denied none.

A great many things have been learned during the war period about the capacities of physically handicapped workers. I hope that we shall add to this knowledge and increase our facilities for making it available to those who would profit by the techniques of job analysis and careful placement. I believe the following examples will be an inspiration to all of us.

THE FEDERAL DIARY
(By Jerry Kluttz)

ONE-ARMED TYPIST AIDS VETERANS AT HOSPITAL

An interesting person in Government is Frances L. Hudson, a War Department clerk-typist, who recently passed a Civil Service typing test at an average speed of 60 words a minute. You may think that slow, but it's something of a record considering the fact that Miss Hudson has only one arm, the left one. The story about her goes back to 1937 when she was studying typing in the Mount St. Rose Girls School in Dubuque, Iowa. That summer she injured her right arm in a mangle and an amputation was necessary. But Miss Hudson was determined to finish her secretarial course. Her typing teacher, who taught the touch system, couldn't help her much, so Miss Hudson decided to develop a system all her own.

She started by using the regular set of home keys, A, S, D, F, and J, K, L. She used her left hand on the keys as would an ordinary two-handed typist and she would shift her hand from one side of the keyboard to the other. Eventually she developed a system whereby she could cover the entire keyboard without taking her hand from the home keys. She still uses this system and she has learned to type better than many typists with two hands. In fact, she became so efficient that she taught typing at her alma mater before she accepted a job with the War Department here in April. Miss Hudson learned to type with her left hand before she was able to write with it. It took her a year and a half to learn to type and about 2 years to write.

But her ordeal has been a blessing to some of the men who lost their arms in the war. Miss Hudson goes out to Walter Reed Hospital to teach typing to veterans. She gave typing hints to Col. Robert S. Allen, former coauthor of the Washington Merry-Go-Round column, who lost an arm in Germany. She has asked to transfer there permanently as she is convinced that she can teach anyone who is willing and has the patience to learn her method.

It isn't generally known, but the War Department has a dictaphone unit in its discharge review branch which is manned entirely by blind typists. Lois Christiansen, the supervisor, had an even tougher break in life than Miss Hudson. She lost her right arm and injured both legs permanently in an accident several years ago, but she has overcome this handicap and she is both a stenographer and typist. She devised her own system of touch typing which enabled her to pass the civil-service exam. There were many skeptics when the unit was created. One was Warrant Officer Edwin Arundell, Miss Christiansen's superior. He isn't now, however. "It is," he says, "one of the most efficient units in the office. The employees don't ask for nor do they receive special consideration. We treat them like they want to be—like everyone else."

James Key lost both hands in a plane crash, but he will be placed in the Weather Bureau when he is discharged from the Navy. He studied meteorology during his cadet training and he likes it. Key has been fitted with hooks and he can write legibly. He has even worked out a system to type with them. The Weather Bureau plans to use him as an observer.

The veterans' hospital here recently had perhaps the most interesting physically disabled person, a 21-year-old girl who was born without arms. And she held down a job which would seem to require wide use of arms—phone operator. She dialed, plugged in lines and wrote messages with her toes. The girl could do just about everything for herself and she did it with her toes. She combed her hair, lit cigarettes, cooked her meals, dressed herself, and applied make-up. She is one of the few Federal workers who has her toeprints, instead of fingerprints, on record at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. She resigned from the service following a traffic injury.

It would have been almost impossible a few years ago for these interesting people to get Government jobs. Personnel directors wouldn't have hired them for fear they would be a burden to the offices. But during the war Dr. Verne Harvey, medical director of the Civil Service Commission, made a study of 3,500 Federal jobs and he discovered that

most physically disabled people can meet the minimum physical requirements. He also found that the production efficiency of disabled persons was about equal to that of able-bodied workers. Furthermore, that there was little turn-over problem among the handicapped. Dr. Harvey started a campaign to get personnel chiefs to give these people a chance. The war and the manpower shortage was made for the situation, and since April 1943, when the handicapped placement unit was created, more than 58,000 disable persons have been placed in Government, about 5,000 here.

A Letter to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the excellent editorial in Sunday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch. This editorial, in the form of an open letter to Congress, puts the definite responsibility upon the Congress for a thoroughgoing reorganization of our machinery. The editorial was written by Miss Gene Lightfoot and is comprehensive in outlining many of the major reforms advocated for our organization during the 3 months' hearings held by the Joint Committee on Organization of Congress.

The editorial follows:

A LETTER TO THE CONGRESS

To President McKELLAR of the Senate and Speaker RAYBURN of the House of Representatives;

To the majority leaders, Senator BARKLEY and Representative McCORMACK;

To the minority leaders, Senator WHITE and Representative MARTIN;

And to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

It lies within your power, and has become your grave duty, to do the Nation a service without which our kind of government may fail to pass the test of these critical times.

None know better than you what that service is. Now, in an hour when representative government is on trial throughout the world, you are trying to do the multibillion-dollar business of the greatest parliament with the rusty machinery of the nineteenth century. You can't carry a twentieth-century load of social, economic, and international evolution with a horse and buggy.

The creaking of our weary old legislative machinery echoes across the continent and grates like sand on the public ear. It is costing you prestige. It is throwing government out of balance. It is stifling the very functioning of democracy.

Only you can make the changes, do the stream-lining, and rescue a system stuck in mud of an era that was dead along with the gaslight.

Gentleman, what are you going to do about it?

CHANGE IS URGED BY MANY

Eight months ago, the tide of sentiment for bringing out a 1945-model Congress ran strongly. Within the span of a few weeks, a 10-point program was advanced by the American Political Science Association, a 14-point program was proposed by Robert Heller and the National Planning Association, a five-point program was suggested by James F. Byrnes, based on 25 years of experience in the House and Senate. Magazines, newspapers, citizens' groups joined in.

All agreed with Mr. Heller that Congress was operating with hand tools in a mechanized age. Mr. Byrnes said: "The trouble is not with Congressmen, but with the Congress." Attended with concern were warnings from thoughtful men among you—the late Senator Maloney, Senator Pepper, Representatives Kefauver, Dirksen, Fulbright, Voorhis of California, Outland, and Cochran, of Missouri.

Without reform, Representative MONRONEY said, Congress might well "fade out as an effective control by the people of their Government." And Senator LA FOLLETTE: "Upon a stronger and more effective Congress may well depend the preservation of democracy in the United States."

These were strong words. They jolted the people and their representatives from the ruts of routine and tradition, and prepared them for moving toward necessary change.

There was a general area of agreement on what was wrong. The machinery of Congress was hopelessly jammed by confusing and overlapping committee structures; hobbled by archaic rules and procedures; tended by inadequate and unskilled helpers. In one sense worst of all, it was hampered by lack of policy-making organization to back up real leadership.

But that was only part of the picture of rusting inefficiencies and decaying practices. The executive branch of Government, because it was staffed with experts, was towering over the legislative, and because the role of Congress as overseer of public expenditures was frustrated by an appropriations system that was out of date. And further:

DECLINING POWER OF CONGRESS

Lobbies and pressure groups and the more clamorous constituents had driven a wedge between the people and their representatives. Precedents and privileges and rules such as seniority chairmanships, filibuster, committee packing, legislative riders and the mogul-like powers of the House Rules Committee had corroded that very democracy to which a people's parliament is dedicated.

Miserably under-staffed, inadequately paid, hopelessly burdened with picayune demands and details, you on Capitol Hill were yet expected to discharge your duties with the wisdom of philosophers and the vision of angels, and were maligned when you fumbled or failed.

Your liaison with the executive branch was as effective as if you spoke one language and the Administration another. The weathering of years and social and economic change had so battered your whole legislative machinery that it was a mystery, to those who watched, that it functioned at all.

Sensitive, then, to the pressure of popular opinion, and increasingly aware of the decadence of a system virtually untouched since 1893, you set up a joint bipartisan committee of 12 on the organization of Congress, headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE and Representative MONRONEY.

It is time to direct attention, in- and outside Washington, to do the work of that committee, to the minimum that should be expected of it and to the reception it can expect for its recommendations.

FLAWS BROUGHT OUT BY CRISIS

The rushing events of war's end, occupation, and labor problems are vigorous contenders for the public interest. But the whole question of strengthening Congress cries for notice. Social security, full employment, public works, all phases of reconversion congest the legislative mill and focus upon it a new awareness of its crippling weaknesses. What the committee leaves undone could well become the big issue in the 1946 elections.

Just what can the committee do? The original resolution limited its recommendations to the organization and committee level. It was barred from such matters as rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precedents, or the consideration of any subject on the floor of either House. Such sacred cows as filibuster, trick riders to unrelated bills, the despotic power of the House Rules Committee were not to be disturbed. These aspects were discussed to some degree in 3½ months of hearings, but the committee is naturally reluctant to exceed its authority lest it frustrate all hope for other vital reforms.

If a courageous and comprehensive report is given Congress when the La Follette-Monroney committee makes its suggestions in the next few weeks, it will specify these changes:

Consolidation of committees: The 33 committees in the Senate to be cut to 12 or 13; the 43 in the House to 14 or 15, making them twin committees insofar as possible. Other phases of necessary committee streamlining include giving the consolidated committees a functional relationship to administration policy, so that each broad area of public policy would have its corresponding committee in Congress; staffing committees with qualified experts, appointed on a merit basis; more use of joint committees to save time, money, and repeated use of witnesses.

TO ACHIEVE STRONGER LEADERSHIP

Strengthened leadership and responsibility in both Houses: Creation of a majority policy committee composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker, majority leaders, and committee chairmen, and of a similarly constituted minority committee, each to function as what Robert Heller calls a focus for party responsibility and accountability. Party organization on both sides of both Houses is so loose that the whips have nothing to whip, the leaders nothing to lead, and policy is so many straws in the daily wind.

Improved liaison between Congress and the executive branch: Both policy committees could form what Mr. Byrnes suggests, a congressional cabinet, to meet with the President, adopting on measures of bipartisan nature the same cooperative line taken by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in the last 2 years. There should also be more departmental liaison offices such as those maintained by WLB, War and Navy Departments in the Capital; more informal conferences between members of the Government agencies and the Cabinet and corresponding committees, after the fashion in which the Lanham committee has operated.

Easing of the load on Congress: Reforms in this category include provision for giving each member an administrative assistant to be appointed on a merit rather than patronage basis, with a salary of not less than $7,500 a year; expansion of the excellent but badly understaffed legislative reference service and of the Office of Legislative Counsel. Congress should, and surely will, be relieved of the burden of having to sit as town council for the District of Columbia and of acting as a court of claims.

Increasing the incentive for men of high caliber to serve in Congress by raising salaries to $15,000 a year and setting up a retirement plan, to provide a measure of economic security. Mr. Truman recently proposed an increase to $20,000.

FOR CLOSER LINK TO PEOPLE

Improvement of the relations between Congress and constituents. The best suggestions advanced at the hearings were for more frequent recesses, and for a home office staffed with a clerk for each Representative and Senator to report on district sentiment and to interview constituents.

More control over lobbyists, including compulsory registration of purposes, memberships, financing, is also important. With lobby pressure eased, Congress would naturally come closer to the people.

The joint committee should also recommend that conference committees be prohibited from considering any parts of any bill except those upon which there is disagreement between the two Houses. They have frequently taken the liberty, in the past, of rewriting nearly everything after the enacting clause.

Seniority. Still a big question is whether the committee will recommend against the practice of giving chairmanships to senior Members. It could do so. There is nothing compulsory in the rules on seniority. The custom grew up in the Senate in the 1850's and exploded into the House in 1910, in the famous revolt against Speaker Cannon, led by a coalition headed by George Norris. Putting tenure ahead of merit is a vicious practice. The soundest substitute is 6-year rotating chairmanships, which would train new leadership and encourage interest in committee work among younger Members. Separating patronage from the chairmanship would remove one grip of vested interests on seniority.

CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS ITSELF

Gentlemen of the Congress, these things represent the least your committee can do. They represent the least you, insofar as you are guided by it, can do to put your rickety old house in order.

And still these proposals are not enough. Committee reform, with 95 percent of your business hammered out in committee workshops, will bring great constructive change. But if democratic procedures can continue to be frustrated by parliamentary mumbo-jumbo, you will still find yourselves unequipped to cope with your terrific tasks.

Demand the best of a committee whose leaders are capable, sincere, earnest men, whose staff is expertly headed by Dr. George B. Galloway. But remember that the public wants both parliamentary reform to democratize Congress, and organizational reform that eases your burdens and increases your financial security.

We have a President who highly respects Congress as an institution. But reforms geared to 1945, to our complex international, social, and economic problems, can wait no longer. Representative government has got to grow, change, evolve with the demands upon it, or lose its power in government and the respect of the people, even as the Congress under the Articles of Confederation fell before its own inadequacies, and gave rise to our present Congress.

That is your most pressing business, gentlemen of the Congress—to win new public esteem by reform of the machinery by which you work. You will not have that esteem so long as you remain wedded to ancient ways and rules, to an archaic system; so long as you handicap your efficiency and your progress with the dead hand of the past.

Congress, heal thyself.

Grand Jury Indicts Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago in Kansas City, Mo., a Federal grand jury, making its report to the court, brought in an indictment against bureaucracy in the following language:

In the course of our investigation, we were also impressed with the number and variety of the Federal bureaus completely regimenting the American way of life and American liberty, and we were further impressed by the vast number of regulations evolved by them which have the force and effect of laws. Of course, we realize that war conditions may have necessitated most of these and for that reason this reference to them is not intended as a criticism. However, now that our country is entering an era of peace under the leadership of a President personally known to this honorable court and its officers, we do not think it amiss to here express the hope that such wartime bureau activities soon will be brought to a minimum and speedily ended.

Kansas City, Mo., as you know, is a close neighbor to President Truman's home town of Independence. The members of this grand jury are from that vicinity. They know the President personally.

Mr. Speaker, these men reflect the thoughts and hopes of the Middle West and possibly those of the President.

In the light of this indictment, it is suggested that the defendants plead either guilty or nolo contendere. Thereupon, the death sentence can be pronounced with no Executive clemency expected.

A Message From Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's New York Times:

A MESSAGE FROM STALIN

When Senator PEPPER asked Generalissimo Stalin whether he wanted to send him away from his interview with any special message, the Russian leader "hesitated" and then said:

"Just judge the Soviet Union objectively. Do not either praise us or scold us. Just know us and judge us as we are and base your estimate of us upon facts and not rumors."

It is an excellent prescription, but how are we to follow it? How are we to "know" Russia, how are we to base our estimate of Russia's purposes and aspirations "upon facts and not rumors," if the Russians themselves discourage us from doing this?

A Russian observer in the United States, whether he is a Soviet journalist or an official of the Soviet Government, can travel wherever he likes, see what he wants to see, talk with anyone he wants to talk with, and send back to Russia, wholly without censorship of any kind, a report on any given situation which is based to the best of his ability "upon facts and not rumors." But this is not true of an American observer in Russia. An American in Russia can travel only where the Government wishes him to travel, see only what he is permitted to see and talk only with people the Government wishes him to talk with. He cannot separate facts from rumors because the Government will not give him the means to do so. And when, on the basis of evidence which is often insufficient, he prepares his report for transmission to the United States he must submit it to a heavy-handed censorship which is more interested in the propaganda values than the "objectivity" of his findings.

Moreover, this is true not only throughout the whole territory of the U. S. S. R. It is also true wherever, outside of the U. S. S. R., Russian influence is paramount today. For months our own Government was placed in the humiliating position of begging Russia to permit American newspaper correspondents to go into countries in eastern Europe—Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, etc.—which had been liberated from German domination with the aid of American arms. Now, when these correspondents have at last been permitted to visit such countries, they find obstacles placed in some cases in the way of transmitting their dispatches. Moreover, what has been happening in Russian-controlled Europe has been happening also in Russian-controlled Asia. The American public is now so thoroughly accustomed to Russian blackouts that it has seemed to be the most natural thing in the world that we should now be told not an inkling of what is happening in Soviet-controlled Korea. The moment the Soviet armies occupied Manchuria, the inevitable headline read: "Soviet Blackout in Manchuria."

Why does Generalissimo Stalin's government pursue this policy, if Stalin himself really wants us to judge the Soviet Union objectively, if he really wants us to know Russia, if he really wants us to judge the Russians as they are and base our estimates of them upon facts and not rumors?

This policy defeats its own purposes. Inevitably it feeds rumors instead of clearing them away. It creates suspicions. It handicaps good relations. It makes difficult certain actions which would otherwise be simple. When, for example, the American people are asked to make a very large loan to Russia, it is natural that they should want to be in the position of acquiring as much knowledge about Russia and Russian policies as any prudent private creditor would desire in similar circumstances. Certainly in private transactions of this kind full and willingly granted access to all relevant information is the sine qua non of extending credit. Present Russian policy does not encourage the acquisition of such information. It does not encourage that mutual confidence which alone can serve as a sound basis for the pooling of Russian and American efforts in such matters, for example, as control of offensive weapons like the atomic bomb.

Probably nothing else in the world is so important at this moment as good relations between Russia and the United States. Probably nothing would do so much to promote and cement those good relations as an end of Russian black-outs, foreign and domestic.

Jobless Pay Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal of September 26, 1945:

MILWAUKEE—OUR LIBERAL JOBLESS PAY LAW STILL MEETING EVERY TEST

The State industrial commission, reporting on the condition of unemployment compensation in Wisconsin, says that the law now covers more than 15,000 employers and more than 650,000 workers.

In the 9 years it has been paying benefits the State has paid out $29,400,000 to unemployed workers and now has a net balance of more than $172,000,000. "Wisconsin's fund,"

says the report, "should prove ample to meet any foreseeable drain of postwar benefit payments."

Wisconsin citizens can be proud of their State's record in this matter of unemployment compensation. Wisconsin, it will be remembered, was the first State to pass a compensation law. Because of this it may take credit for establishing the basic philosophy common to many State laws that unemployment compensation is intended solely to assist the unemployed during the transition from job to job and that it is by no means a substitute for relief in periods of general unemployment.

Wisconsin also pioneered the individual employer reserve system, which tends to stabilize employment and make payments unnecessary by encouraging year around jobs for the same group of employees.

Federal leaders in unemployment compensation prefer to look upon jobless pay as a complete substitute for relief. They frown on the individual reserve system.

The figures, however, show that Wisconsin is doing a better job with its system than most of the other States—and that, despite lowered rates to good employers, its fund is in better position to meet serious situations than the funds of many other States.

Wisconsin planned its law well. It has since revised it from time to time to make benefits more liberal, both as to the number of weeks of payment and the maximum amount payable per week.

Purchase by Veterans of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OCTOBER 2, 1945.

Hon. W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator of Surplus Property Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SYMINGTON: First, permit me to congratulate you upon assuming the sole responsibility for the Surplus Property Administration. At the same time permit me to offer you some form of condolence for the duties that you have taken on. I know they will ofttimes be unpleasant. Criticism is bound to be frequent and heavy, but I know that your shoulders are broad and your sense of balance will enable you to distinguish that which is constructive and that which is merely criticism. The suggestions that I am about to offer are not critical ones, for you had nothing to do with the drawing or the passage of the Surplus Property Act.

The act as it is now drawn gives to the veterans of this war merely a paper preference. There has been a great demand on the part of veterans for the purchase of automobiles, trucks, and a goodly number of other items. If these items were procurable, they would be of vast assistance in the rehabilitation process of the veterans. The present execution of the act, as I see it, gives the veteran absolutely no chance to procure that which he desires and needs. Would it not be possible to establish in each one of the 48 States and in every city of 250,000 people or over, either a veterans' surplus bureau or a headquarters to be run by the existing national veterans' organizations wherein 10 days before being offered to the general public all surplus property to be sold in that region might be listed and for that period be sold only to veterans?

It is not a question of automobiles and trucks alone. I have seen many small and easily handled articles, such as blankets, DDT, cooking utensils, and hundreds of other items of surplus p operty, now being purchased and resold by great department stores, chain organizations, and others. If these articles could have been purchased by veterans in smaller lots, it would have given them magnificent opportunities to engage in small businesses and reestablish themselves in their communities. To date the only ones who benefit from the Government surplus property are those individuals, firms, or corporations who have immense purchasing power.

I really feel that if the opportunity is given to the returning veterans to purchase and distribute this property, we will find that it can be distributed just as quickly, efficaciously, and equitably as is being done at the present time.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

DONALD L. O'TOOLE,
Member of Congress.

Will Congress Assume the Responsibility?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, American workmen will expect nothing less from the Full Employment Act of 1945 than full employment. If this bill is enacted, the American workman will assume that Congress has promised everybody a job. If Congress makes this promise, it pledges itself to create job opportunities, through Federal expenditure, sufficient to close any employment gap. Every Member of Congress wants every willing worker provided with an attractive job opportunity. If this could be done without additional burdensome debt or taxation, and national brankruptcy, it would have unanimous support. Now, however, with the provision that any program of Federal expenditures must be accompanied by a program of taxation "designed and calculated to prevent during that period any net increase in the national debt," the full employment bill presupposes the intention of Congress to tax the people to any extent necessary to finance sufficient Federal jobs to attain the goal of full employment.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a grave responsibility for the Congress to assume.

As typical of the opinion of a great many people of my district, I include herewith an editorial from the Concord Monitor of September 29 which deals with the subject of full-employment legislation:

THE WORK OF PIOUS ASSES

The full employment bill has passed the United States Senate, but before it did there was added a provision that if under its terms recommendations were made by the President for public spending to provide jobs there must accompany the recommendations proposed tax increases to pay for the public spendings.

This amendment takes from the bill as originally proposed much of its glamor. For what the sponsors were seeking to do was to create the myth that if times got hard the Government would make jobs for everyone, at no cost to the taxpayers.

Practically, though tax increases must be recommended if the President is honest in forecasting the need for public spendings to make jobs, the Congress can continue to do just what it has done in the past decade and more, appropriate without bothering about balancing the Federal Budget. This would be deficit spending. The President, however, would be embarrassed by the necessity of recommending tax increases.

We must be old-fashioned, but we have always assumed that Government was created in the public interest, and that in its administration it should concern itself with policies designed to encourage a sound "state of the union" in which the people would be industrious and happy. We hadn't supposed that it was necessary to pass measures saying this was the policy of government, just as though it hadn't always been. Yet that is essentially what the full employment bill does.

It is an attempt to make the people think that what is a governmental responsibility is, by the magic of this legislation, to be assured of discharge henceforth. No one will ever want for a job again in this Nation. At least that is what the administration hopes the people will believe. And so does the opposition to the administration, apparently, for most of the Republican Members of the United States Senate didn't have courage enough either to call an end to political subterfuge when the bill came to a vote.

The Government, simply by public expenditures, can't make people industrious and happy. For the people l ave to be industrious themselves by nature, and if they are so they are usually reasonably happy. What Government has been doing, and is still doing by putting forth the full employment bill, is to encourage people in the belief that the world owes them a living. Encouragement of this philosophy, by whatever means, is bound to be destructive of the essentials to a sound national economy in the end.

The idea of individual worth has been largely abolished by the antics of Government in this Nation in recent years. A man is no longer born in a society in which he is taught as a first principle that upon his own talents and ability depend the measure of his economic success. Instead he is taught that because he has been born in this favored country its Government will see that he is assigned to some job, that he will not have to work at it more than 40 hours a week (soon it will be 36 or only 30), that his take-home pay, regardless of the value of his work, or the ability with which he discharges his task, will be enough to give him all the material things his heart desires, and that so long as he votes for the Democratic Party candidates it will remain so. His preceptors close with a muttered: "God bless Roosevelt."

It is like crying in the wilderness to keep harping upon the way in which the birthright of United States citizens has been sold. Men who have in the past seen and understood this birthright today are lost, along with the American people they have helped to mislead. Raised to places of public responsibility they have succumbed to the bunk which prevails in the national political life. They have become as selfish as they seek to make all Americans. They hide behind glittering generalities such as "full employment" and act like pious asses. The hordes, whose minds have been purchased with their own money, applaud.

There must be better leadership than what we have.

Foreign Financing

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, during this period of loan, or rather gift, negotiations with England, public interest is aroused by the departure of Mr. Leo T. Crowley from the Government. Mr. Crowley was one of the United States negotiators.

One report stated that Mr. Crowley disagreed with President Truman over terms of the pending proposal. Another item said: "British elation over Crowley resignation disturbing to United States."

The British press characterized Mr. Crowley as the evil genius who is withholding a grant of billions of American dollars to Britain. Crowley was reported as being described in editorials in the London press as the power behind the throne against Britain on the matter of that Nation's request for a gift of three to six billions of dollars.

The London Daily Mail is reported as stating that the resignation of Leo T. Crowley, Chief of the Foreign Economic Administration, was regarded as meaning the hard-bargain group in the United States has lost out.

Here we have it again that anyone who dares to stand up and endeavor to protect the interests of this country is quietly eased out of the picture. Right at the time the world has come to us for loans or gifts, we hear very disturbing news.

One item states the New Zealand press would ban United States trade in the most protracted anti-American campaign in the history of New Zealand. The press hit again at the United States, the Nation which provided New Zealand with its first line of defense in war.

Another headline: "Russian trade program builds Balkan monopolies. Romanian, Hungarian, and other Balkan states agreements give Soviet both stock in and control of industries which must buy through Moscow."

So here is part of the picture produced by the Administrator's give-away policy which shows no sign of letting up as far as the administration spokesmen are concerned. The American people are disturbed and this Congress should be disturbed.

In addition to giving England on lend-lease $29,000,000,000 in supplies, we sent some three and one-half million soldiers to the European theater alone, thereby furnishing about 75 percent of the Allied fighting strength on the western front. And this after Churchill said to us: "You furnish the tools and we will furnish the men."

The alien-minded jellyfish within the framework of our Government, who are mistakenly called experts, are scheming now to find a plan for an outright gift which to the American people will have all the aspects of a loan. One is the $20,000,000,000 in gold in the ground out in Kentucky. The idea is that the United States could give Britain a warehouse receipt from three to six billions of dollars of this gold without having to go to the banks to borrow or without having this receipt show up in the public debt. Then Britain could use this receipt to deposit to her account in the United States and could write checks against it to pay for the goods that Britain must have.

If this scheme is consummated, it will amount to an outright betrayal of the American people, particularly our returning soldiers—the men and women who have fought freedom's battles all over the world.

There is not a banker in this country that would loan money to a defaulter. What point is there in us giving away dollars in order that they can purchase goods from us? Just try to figure profit out of that deal. Appeasement dollars never come home to roost. If we refuse this loan or gift, there is a veiled threat that England will return to Empire trade preference. What do they mean return?

The Ottawa Conference of 1932 setting up an Empire preference system which fenced us out is still in existence. Britain's life blood is foreign trade. She cannot remain economically alive without it. To surrender any part of it would render her impotent to meet her obligations. It would certainly be a dumb America that would give away hard dollars in return for sugar-coated promises.

Trade in the future will be, as in the past, on a hard dollar-and-cent basis. Our foreign friends are tough traders. They will buy where they can get the most for their money. They trade on no other basis. They will buy from us that which they need and that which we can supply at low prices and of good quality. This is just common sense, and we can expect nothing more.

If you want to know how we have fared on lend-lease, UNRRA, and so forth, just talk to our returning soldiers or some of the Members of Congress who toured Europe this summer. You will find that the good-neighbor policy of giving has almost completely failed in its objectives. The only thing that can prevent this administration from endangering our economic security by further grants of enormous sums is by an aroused public opinion, and it is our duty to inform the people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD part of an address made by me before the Kiwanis Club of Baltimore, Md., on September 27, as follows:

Some day the history of financing in this country for the past 10 years will be written, I hope, and a clear picture presented to the American people. This history, if not astounding and shocking, will certainly be extremely interesting and revealing.

The change of American thinking to the point that would develop and permit the operation of such financing as has occurred under lend-lease and proposed foreign loans has no counterpart in history. Every known practice of sound American business—the business philosophy that has guided this Nation for 150 years, the principles that have created the greatest national wealth, the system that has created the greatest national production that the world has ever seen—all have been completely smashed and all laws of common sense are abandoned in lend-lease and foreign loans made and proposed.

While I discuss the English problem, it is not because it is singular. The same problem exists with all our allies to a greater or lesser degree; nor is it necessarily a criticism of our allies. We have certainly given them every reason to believe that we do not expect any payment now or in the future and that we have plenty more that can be had for the asking. Any criticism is and should be directed to our own managers.

To review a little history: After World War I England owed us $6,500,000,000. After a small fractional payment she led the world in repudiation. All countries joined except Finland; France, $4,000,000,000 plus; Italy, $2,000,000,000 plus, and so on. And during this period we took severe punishment with British cartels and trade agreements, which discriminated against us.

We all remember the early twenties when automobile tires cost us $30 and $40 because the Dutch and British ganged on us in trade agreements. But Uncle Sam's memory is very short.

Today the British tell us that all debts should be forgiven and a further gift of from $3,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 should be forthcoming. They have monopolized press propaganda on this subject for two well-prepared months. A fair presentation of the facts have not been given to our people because our negotiators are following a silent policy.

Here is the picture briefly: We have canceled the World War I debt of $6,000,000,000 plus. A delegation here this minute asks cancellation of lend-lease of approximately $29,000,000,000—all to be forgotten in addition to new grants. But here is an extremely interesting situation. The $15,000,000,000 which the British got from within the Empire under similar arrangements is not to be forgotten. Indeed, the only official suggestion of what is to be done about the war debt within the Empire is that it may be refunded, scaled down, and paid. Not a move has been made and it stands today as a valid existing debt. In short, she comes to us pleading her inability to pay us a dollar. She makes no similar claim to members of the Empire, the so-called sterling bloc.

I want to impress this fact upon you. There is no such thing as cancellation. The only question is: Shall this sum of money be paid by the British people? Or, shall it be paid by the American people in addition to our own national debt, which is approaching $275,000,000,000?

The English delegation here now is composed of two holdovers, representing her former capitalistic regime. They have not sent representatives of the new socialistic government. On the day the delegates arrived here, the mentor of the new regime, Harold Laski, addressing a party meeting in England, was quoted as saying: "The age of capitalism is drawing to a close." Here they are seeking to draw $35,000,000,000 out of our free enterprise Nation and at the same time tell us our way of life is dead. They sent two representatives who are not in a position to give valid promises, while the new regime stays at home and says our system is dying.

We are asked to finance their venture into state ownership. They say they have lost their world trade during the war, while the records disclose that their exports and imports about balance during that period. In any case we did not secure their foreign trade. They are going to float bonds to pay for the Bank of England, the mines, and transportation, and pay 2½ percent interest, which they proudly say will be paid. They make no demands on the British Empire such as they make on us. Their proposition falls down completely. They cannot pay us but they can pay the Empire. They cannot pay us interest on new loans but they propose socialism with big interests with a complete pay-off to their own people. Surely it will be a feeble-minded America that will fall for

such deceit. All our allies have politely told us to keep our nose out of their internal business—all they expect of us is more money.

It is time that we Americans get ourselves together. Europe can pull in her belt and work harder—just as we are going to do. The enormous debt we have piled up, and to a large extent through waste and mismanagement, will be left for our soldiers to pay when they return home and take their place in the business life of this Nation. It is not fair to them to conduct our fiscal affairs on the basis we have been operating. Our lend-lease has gone far beyond the necessities of war. We have literally maintained the economy of the British Empire.

France after a decade of socialistic experiments and popular front government suffered an ignominious defeat. We have given them $1,000,000,000 and they want $2,000,000,000 more. These nations, who through political debauchery and failure to meet their responsibilities as world powers, have to bear their share of the responsibility in tolerating a condition which would create another World War.

We bailed them out of the first war and they scheme to have us bail them out of this one and put the whole burden upon the backs of the American people. The American people, particularly the returning soldier, will not stand for it if they are properly informed and as far as I am concerned, they will be informed.

Atomic Bomb

REMARKS
OF
HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see how nervous and hungry and anxious many people are to tell the whole world all they can about what we found out by spending $2,000,000,000 to develop the atomic bomb. They say there is no use trying to keep the secret because everybody has got it or will get it soon, and they seem to reason that we should, therefore, give it to them now or else. Else what? That seems to me as absurd an attitude as an intelligent people could take. What we ought to do is to stop discussing processes and machinery, scientific aspects and problems until we shall have deliberately and advisedly determined our policy with regard to the atomic bomb.

Of course, others may discover the process. That is not our responsibility. We are responsible for having developed this bomb and thereby made ourselves trustee of the secret of the terrible power and destructive potentialities of this bomb. It is our duty to guard it as best we can; at least, until a dependable agency strong enough and secure enough is developed to take over the trusteeship as the guardian of the world's peace. A proper sense of that responsibility and duty to be cautious should restrain us from incautious statements and from hasty actions which no amount of caution or regret later could repair. Nobody can see through this curtain of battle smoke which surrounds the earth. Nobody can judge who our allies will be in the event of another war or when that war may come. We do know that wars make just as strange bedfellows as do politics. Let us not forget that this secret, whatever of it still remains, is as important to the security of our own people now and to the support of the things we stand for as when the secret process was developed. No amount of wishful thinking can alter the fact that the United Nations is only a loosely held together association of some fifty-odd nations, and that the Security Council has not progressed beyond the document stage. When they shall have developed the authority to counsel and the strength to secure will be time enough to consider the shifting of our responsibility acquired as the developer of this bomb and the trustee of at least a substantial part of the secret of the development of its tremendous powers. These and other circumstances conspire to give to us a greater responsibility, with reference to this bomb, than any other people have, and associated with the sense of that responsibility a greater disposition than any other people have to hold this discovery within the limits of proper and useful service.

After all, why such a hurry to dump this $2,000,000,000 product of our money out into a disorganized and largely psychopathic world with the possibility, definite possibility, that the bombs might be coming back to us just as Japan sent back to us our scrap iron.

Butter and Meat Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House have frequently called attention to the regulations which continue the rationing of butter and meat. At the present time, meat is piling up in many meat counters and will soon spoil unless a different attitude is taken as to its rationing. Our people must still buy meat with red points.

The letter which I include with these remarks indicates just what is happening in thousands of stores all over the country. Butter and meat should be immediately taken off of the foods that are now being rationed. Rationing is no longer necessary. Rules and regulations merely interfere with the law of supply and demand.

GRAND ISLAND, NEBR., *September 22, 1945.*
Congressman A. L. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I was on the radio a week ago and heard your round-table discussion in regard to certain OPA dealings, etc.

Now, let me say right here. There is no sense in keeping points on butter, and hasn't been for some time. I have a small grocery store and have been forced to take butter in order to get meat, and I am not alone. All dealers in this territory are forced to take butter and cottage cheese, etc., or no meat, and the Armour Packing Co.'s representative makes no bones about it.

We pay a premium on A-grade butter with score 90-plus when we can get AA grade with score 93-plus for less money right in our own city. Now we can have all the meat we want. In fact they ship us more than we want (beef) as customers don't have red points to buy with—a fine situation when children can't have butter on their bread and it is going to waste; also, can't have meat when there is a surplus.

Sincerely,

FRED E. BABEL.

Subcommittee Report of Patterson Field, Ohio, Separation Base and Indiantown Gap, Pa., Separation Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

A subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, composed of ROBERT F. SIKES, of Florida; LEROY JOHNSON and CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, visited the AAF separation base located at Patterson Field, Ohio, on September 28, 1945.

Orders to set up this separation base were received on September 15 by the commanding officer, Brig. Gen. H. A. Bartram. Buildings were obtained, medical laboratories were set up, office equipment installed, and key personnel quickly organized. Four days later, on September 19, 31 separations were made. The daily separations increased as shown in the following table:

Total separatees, officers and enlisted men:

Sept. 19	31
Sept. 20	43
Sept. 21	104
Sept. 22	118
Sept. 23	171
Sept. 24	126
Sept. 25	129
Sept. 26	148
Sept. 27	194

The original quota for this separation base was set up as 100 per day. As the table shows, 9 days afterwards, the separation of personnel had reached 194 per day. The subcommittee was told by Col. Richard Gimbel, the officer in charge of separation personnel at this base, that their present goal was 300 separatees per day, which it is hoped will be accomplished soon. In the opinion of the subcommittee their goal to be attained by December 1 should be nearer 600 per day. Officers at Patterson Field stated that the attainment of this goal will be possible when certain additional buildings, now in construction, are completed, when additional separation personnel complete their training, and when additional equipment is obtained for medical and X-ray laboratories.

This base has been occupied during their first 9 days in separating high-point and eligible personnel from their own Patterson Field and the adjoining Wright Field. All eligible personnel from these two fields have been separated and the base is now ready to accept for separation all returnees assigned to them from their geographical area.

The top flight officers at this base, Commanding Officer Brig. Gen. H. A. Bartram, Brig. Gen. G. L. Usher, and Col. Richard Gimbel—in charge of separation personnel—

were most cooperative in furnishing the subcommittee with copies of their records and conducting our subcommittee through every separation operation of the base.

Our subcommittee recommends that the War Department make available at once the needed laboratory equipment, and that complete and full use of facilities existing at Patterson Field, and building facilities nearing completion, be used to its fullest capacity as soon as practicable, to the end that 600 separations per day be attained. We also recommend an increased training program of Army separation personnel—low-point classification—to replace the civil-service complement of 40 percent, now in use at this base. Adequate trained Army separation personnel would enable this base to function on a two-shift capacity instead of the one-shift operation now current. The 5-day-per-week civil-service custom does not lend itself to the continuous assembly-line operation of a separation facility. Therefore, whenever possible, trained Army personnel should be substituted.

INDIANTOWN GAP, PA.

Our subcommittee next visited the Army separation center located at Indiantown Gap, Pa. This separation center, under the direction of Brig. Gen. M. F. Lindsey, is being operated in a very efficient manner. Part of this efficiency is due to the fact that they have superlative facilities and a background of experience in separation work. Here, as elsewhere, the separation of returnees is being rapidly accelerated. From the 1st day of August to the last day of August, their rate increased from 390 to 699 persons per day. From the 1st day of September to the 27th of September, the rate per day of separatees has increased from 889 to 1,754. We were told by General Lindsey that they have set a goal of 3,000 separations per day by November 1, and it is felt by the committee that shortly thereafter their capacity could reach 3,750 separations per day. We inspected the complete "assembly line" of separation here and found it to be well equipped and efficiently operated.

Although this separation center is 60 days ahead of its original projected schedule, returnees are arriving at the reception center in excess of ability to separate. Furloughs are being extended up to 10 days to applicants to bridge the gap between arrival and separation. When questioned, many of the boys stated that they had remained in the reception center 5 or 6 days before entering the separation "assembly line." This separation center's geographical area is Pennsylvania and Ohio, and most of the separatees live in these two States. It should be noted here, however, that a residue of men, who were on their 30- or 45-day redeployment furloughs, which were granted before VJ-day, have been processed in this center or are being processed. The setting up of additional separation centers, bases, and points will soon enable all separatees to be processed near their homes.

Here as elsewhere some civil-service personnel, with their 40-hour workweek, slows up to a certain extent the potential operation. The subcommittee was informed that a school of separation personnel training, comprising 4,900 trainees, was being conducted at this center. This project is highly commended, as it will furnish replacement of discharged personnel and eventually enable this center to function on a double-shift basis.

The subcommittee has given careful thought to the time required in various steps of processing. Preparation of form 100 requires considerable time and the services of several additional counselors. Many of the separatees subsequently discard this form. It is suggested that form 20, which is a permanent part of the soldier's record, be duplicated, and a copy mailed to each separatee at his home address. It may be desirable to add to form 20 certain additional information now contained on form 100 for the benefit of prospective employers.

It will be of interest to note, in view of the committee's comment in a previous report on the varied treatment of "scratches" (men dropped from a going roster for various reasons), that Indiantown Gap Center diverts these men into a special section, where their records are corrected, brought up to date, or completed with data based on the separatee's affidavit, which enables the separatee to join his original roster without loss of time.

This committee, in every center visited by it, encountered considerable disappointment and criticism from soldiers (including WACs) because they were not permitted to retain certain articles.

The ones predominantly mentioned were B-4 bag (by Air Corps personnel), field (battle) jacket (by WAC's), and paratroopers' jump suits (by paratroopers). These articles seem to have a strong sentimental value to the persons concerned.

The value of these articles to the Government is slight, or perhaps nil. We, therefore, strongly urge that the list of articles that may be kept by the separatee be enlarged so as to include these three articles. We were advised that this must be done by higher authority, and therefore we suggest that those on the General Staff, who have the power to make this change, do so. It would be tremendously appreciated by those who are concerned.

ROBT. L. F. SIKES, *Chairman.*
CHET HOLIFIELD,
J. LEROY JOHNSON.

Demobilizing the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, by now it must have become painfully apparent to the armed service from the General Staff on down to company officers, as it has to Members of this House, that the people of this country are not satisfied with their policy on demobilization. A flood of mail has come to my office, as it has to the office of every Member, criticizing that policy and appealing for the discharge of sons, husbands, and brothers who have been in service for a long time and who are now wasting time in boondoggling practices in the camps of this country while the folks at home are unable to do the work that has to be done. Surely, the calls that have come to them from the Members of Congress have given them an inkling of the storm of public opinion that is building up against them.

We should recognize the fundamental fact, Mr. Speaker, that in a democracy no plan will finally succeed unless it has the approval and support of public opinion. The military must know this. If they do not recognize it, then Congress must make it plain to them. The dilatory way in which they are going about the business of discharging the members of the armed forces, the misleading statements they are making to the public, and the continuing attitude of "we know best" is building up a pressure that soon will break its bounds and destroy any chance of building up a defense policy based on reason and the needs of our country in the postwar period. You may dam a stream but when the floods come, unless you have provided for an escape, they will wash out your dam and wreak destruction on everything in its path. This is what is happening and unless something is done, and done quickly, it will be impossible for the Congress to formulate a reasonable program for the future.

There is still time to avoid this calamity. An exercise of a little judgment on the part of the General Staff would stem the tide and, though the going might be a little rough, they would, in the end, get their desire—a reasonable military program that would support our position as a leading nation in the world of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that President Truman stated that one and one-half million men would be discharged by Christmastime. Secretary of War Patterson stated there would probably be 2,000,000 men discharged by Christmastime. General Marshall, when before the joint session of Congress, stated on September 20 that he hoped "within 4 weeks to reach a point where the Army can release all men for whom useful employment cannot be found." If this is not done, we may well see 5,000,000 men under arms in this country at Christmastime. They will be waiting for a discharge from the Army. This prompts me to offer the following advice to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy:

First. Issue orders immediately to discharge or place on indefinite furlough every man who desires it and for whom useful employment cannot be found.

Second. Put on inactive status every officer in the Reserve as soon as he can be spared from the demobilization program.

Third. Clean out the camps and posts in this country.

Fourth. Keep up the good progress that is being made in returning the soldiers to this country.

Fifth. Submit to Congress their estimates on the size of the postwar Army and Navy that will be needed.

By this bold stroke, the pressure will be relieved. Resentment will die down. Freed from the emotional strain, Congress can consider these proposals and will adopt a reasonable policy. The postwar Army and Navy can then be recruited in a short time. The task will be immeasurably easier for, out of the fifteen or twenty million men who have been under arms, many will be glad to make the Army or Navy a career. If enough are not gotten in this way, Congress will provide other ways.

There is a growing fear among the military that this country is rapidly swinging toward isolationism. I do not believe that is the case. True, there is a natural swing in that direction after every war. I believe, however, that the bulk of the feeling mistakenly thought of as isolationism is merely that revulsion to the military life felt by the American people. Get the men out of uniform for a short while and public opinion will support a military establishment sufficient for our needs. After two wars, I believe this Na-

tion realizes that we must take a leading part in assuring a peaceful world and that we cannot do this unless we have the strength to make our ideas effective. This attitude can quickly change if the military persist in their present policy in regard to demobilization and incur the resentment of the people.

It is the duty of the Congress to declare what size our armed forces will be during peacetime. With that in mind I introduce a bill which would limit the size of the Army in the United States to 1,000,000 men. This would take effect on July 1, 1946.

It is my firm belief that if the military forces would immediately send men home on an indefinite furlough and get them released as quickly as possible that many of these men would then reenlist in some branch of the armed forces. They will not do it while members of the armed forces.

There is a great deal of growing resentment against the armed forces, but most of it could be eliminated by adopting the suggestions I have just made. Certainly when Christmas rolls around and we have several million men under arms in this country, the resentment will be greatly increased.

The Road to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD against the absurd proposal to pay $25 a week for loafing, placing a premium on idleness, I include an editorial by the Democrat and News of Cambridge, Dorchester County, Md., entitled "The Road to Ruin."

The editorial follows:

THE ROAD TO RUIN

The new and better life we are all promised in our postwar world may be costly entertainment. The plan to pay $25 maximum unemployment benefits for 26 weeks might better be called the national vacation measure. What would happen at the end of 26 weeks when the vacation was over? Would there be a new bill for the next year, on the theory that unless it was passed there would then be unemployment? Naturally, the higher the benefits and the longer the period each year for which they are paid, the more difficult it will be to recruit help. Retail stores, garages, and many other trades find workers unwilling to accept work, even when thousands are being laid off from war industries. Farm help is almost impossible to get at any price the farmer can pay, to raise food to sell at a figure demanded by the Government.

Sooner or later we are all going to have to get down to earth and work and save, or we will starve. All the hot air to the contrary, government can't take money away from the people in taxes to furnish the handouts now proposed. Legalized loafing on the Government pay roll will break any nation ultimately.

Is General Bradley for or Against the Veterans' Pauper-Oath Requirement?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Joseph Leib:

IS GENERAL BRADLEY FOR OR AGAINST THE VETERANS' PAUPER-OATH REQUIREMENT?

(By Joseph Leib)

In the August edition of Veterans Outlook magazine there appeared an announcement that in a subsequent issue there would appear an article by this writer on the much discussed pauper-oath requirement for the honored veterans of the World Wars.

This magazine came to the attention of Edward E. Odom, Solicitor of Veterans' Administration—a hold-over from the morbid Hines' regime—who immediately contacted the publisher demanding space for a rebuttal without having the slightest conception of what my remarks would be.

Of course, this unusual request was granted and Odom emerged as the author, prolonger, and defender of that obnoxious pauper oath that is demanded of our veterans. The phraseology and ridiculous reasoning and word trickery in Odom's article also proved beyond all doubt that he was the man who penned the prolific letters that the ousted General Hines addressed to members of Congress in a childish attempt to debunk the implications and reasons behind the existence of the pauper oath.

What Odom said in between words—but didn't have the courage to say openly—is that if he had his way, and it appears that he might—he would furnish free hospitalization only to service-connected veterans and more important exclusively for the very ailment, injury or cause of discharge. In other words if a veteran is declared service-connected because of loss of a leg he can demand free medical treatment for that particular part of his body only. Should he have kidney trouble the Veterans' Administration will insist on a pauper oath. I have told of a veteran who was wounded in his lower jaw while fighting in France. Recently he developed pains in the upper jaw and sought medical aid. The VA officer in charge adamantly refused to treat him because this veteran could not prove that the trouble in his upper jaw was service-connected.

When Odom's masterpiece of picturesque misinformation came off the press, I forwarded a copy to General Bradley and respectfully asked whether or not his Solicitor spoke for the new Veterans' Administrator. This is the confusing reply received:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 27, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. LEIB: I am in receipt of your letter of September 20, 1945, calling my attention to an article in the Veterans' Outlook and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Solicitor had previously invited my attention to the Outlook articles.

Insofar as concerns the material to which you refer, there is involved only a factual discussion of certain legal and historical aspects of the statutory provision, which you refer to as the "pauper oath," but which was provided by the Congress as an aid to the veteran in establishing eligibility for hospital care. Even if the article were an expression of policy, it would be inappropriate for me to comment thereon inasmuch as the policies of the Veterans' Administration are established by the Congress through legislation implemented by existing regulations issued pursuant to statutory authority. Incidentally, you may not have observed the amended regulations issued effective August 14, 1945 (Federal Register, p. 11156, August 30, 1945), which are the most liberal possible under existing legislation. Any basic change in policy would require amendatory legislation, as to which suggestions on my part would be properly addressed to the Congress or to a committee thereof.

Very truly yours,
OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

If this is not straddling an issue, then what is it? The Solicitor of the Veterans' Administration emphatically pointed out in his peculiar way that he favored the retention of the pauper oath as is. I merely asked General Bradley if Odom's views were his views, and look at the answer I got.

Furthermore, Odom stated in his article that the pauper oath is "prescribed by the law, not by the Veterans' Administration," yet this great friend of the veterans daily breaks his neck to see to it that this oath is not removed from the statute books, I am wondering if this man is trying to serve two masters.

My friend Odom pointed out that—

The Veterans' Administration has recommended legislation intended to liberalize these provisions and such legislation is pending in the Congress at the present time (H. R. 3522, S. 1203).

What Odom failed to make clear, however, was the fact that John Thomas Taylor, national legislative director of the American Legion, in a statement to the subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee on July 18, 1945, charged that—

The Veterans' Administration utterly failed to anticipate the hospitalization need of veterans—

scoring this very legislation now hailed by the Solicitor. Taylor added that—

This legislation which would wipe out all hospitalization rights of World War veterans suffering from non-service-connected disabilities is a cover-up on its part to escape responsibility for its failure.

The VFW and the DAV joined Taylor in denouncing H. R. 3522 and S. 1203.

I ask General Bradley again, Does Solicitor Odom speak for the Veterans' Administration when he wrote this article appearing in the Veterans' Outlook magazine? I think that the veterans of this Nation have a right to know and have an answer to this question. I believe that General Bradley should back up his underling or else banish him from the Veterans' Administration.

Everyone who has followed this issue from the beginning knows what is behind this pauper-oath requirement. If they do not, I wish to point out that the Veterans' Administration has been too susceptible to pressure from the professional medical associations intent upon hamstringing any and all forms of public medical care. Let me cite the position taken by the American Medical Association in a letter dated March 7, 1945,

signed by its secretary, Dr. Olin West. Some of his crystal-clear views are quoted, as follows:

"In 1934 the committee on legislative activities of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association submitted a report in which reference was made to article 29, section 6, of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress." (NOTE.—This law is known to veterans as the Economy Act, that sent many discharged soldiers to an early grave.) "It is provided in that section that the statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses. In the same report opposition to the Reed amendment was indicated and the opinion was expressed to the effect that any oath required in the law should be interpreted to mean that the veteran subscribing to such oath is in actual need."

In other words, the AMA was willing to have VA provide medical care in only those instances in which a veteran was in such dire straits that he couldn't possibly be able to pay the fee usually charged by a private physician. Here are other statements in Dr. West's letter:

"Objection has been offered by the AMA through the house of delegates to the general policy of provisions by the Federal Government of hospitalization and medical care for veterans for conditions not even remotely associated with military service. Some of the remarks supporting this opposition were offered in a memorandum filed with the Senate Committee on Appropriations in 1934 and reproduced in the printed hearings on H. R. 6663, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1935. * * * It was emphasized in the memo that nothing in it should be construed as directed in any degree against legislation to make adequate provisions for medical and hospital service for veterans suffering from disabilities, diseases, or defects of service origin. * * *

"In 1933, Dr. Lewis, as president-elect of the AMA, addressed the house of delegates, stating that almost 70 percent of the cases that were hospitalized in veterans' hospitals presented disabilities that had nothing to do with the service and did not have even presumptive service connection. * * *

"I think it is probably true that Dr. Lewis may have been concerned over the possibility that more hospitals for the service of veterans might be erected than the existing situation justified. * * *

"There may be a possibility that a hospital building program could be initiated and put into effect that might conceivably affect existing civilian hospitals unfavorably. Much would depend, in my opinion, on the nature of the use that might be made of facilities provided by an unduly large number of Federal hospitals, which facilities might be readily available to a large segment of the population."

This is exactly why the construction of more veterans' hospitals are being delayed and ignored.

There are now six separate bills introduced in the House alone to remove this pauper's oath. They are: H. R. 599, by Representative SPRINGER; H. R. 1923, by Representative MORRISON; H. R. 2413, by Representative WICKERSHAM; H. R. 2717, by Representative SASSCER; H. R. 2587, by Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts; H. R. 3332, by Representative BARRY.

Scores of Congressmen have expressed deep interest and support in this legislation, yet it is impossible to get hearings on this issue. Here are some of the pledges of support:

NOVEMBER 23, 1944.

I appreciate very much your letter of the 22d. I favor H. R. 5454 (now H. R. 599). In fact, I have just recently filed a rather strong protest with the Veterans' Administration as to this particular matter and I had the matter up with them. I shall be glad to support H. R. 5454 and even sponsor similar legislation.

Thanking you for writing me and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Member of Congress from Florida.

NOVEMBER 24, 1944.

Acknowledging your letter of November 22, 1944: I concur with your position in regard to eliminating the requirement that veterans take the pauper's oath, and you can count on me among your supporters in that matter.

Very sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
Member of Congress from California.

NOVEMBER 24, 1944.

Answering your letter received today, please be advised that I am in favor of the passage of H. R. 5454. (Now H. R. 599.)

Sincerely yours,

B. W. KEARNEY,
Member of Congress from New York.

NOVEMBER 24, 1944.

Replying to yours of November 22 regarding H. R. 5454 (now H. R. 599), this is to say that I will not only support the measure on the floor but in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am a member.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
Member of Congress from Mississippi.

NOVEMBER 24, 1944.

Your letter relative to H. R. 5454 (now H. R. 599) was received this morning. You can rest assured that it is my intention to vote for the bill introduced by Judge SPRINGER. With kind regards.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Member of Congress from South Carolina.

DECEMBER 5, 1944.

I have read your letter of November 22, and the attachment thereto, and I am pleased to inform you that I am in favor of the legislation proposed in H. R. 5454 (now H. R. 599).

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Member of Congress from Illinois.

Assistance has also come from the following Members of Congress: NOBLE J. JOHNSON, of Indiana; GEORGE H. GILLIE, of Indiana; EARL WILSON, of Indiana; CLYDE DOYLE, of California.

In conclusion I wish to say that one of the basic reasons for this oath is to discourage veterans from applying for Government hospitalization, and to encourage former soldiers to give their medical business to private hospitals or to civilian doctors.

If this is not a logical conclusion, then what is the basic reason behind the powerful insistence of this oath.

Is it not a shameful state of affairs that when a veteran seeks hospitalization he must declare himself either a pauper or make of himself a deliberate liar? Surely, no Member of Congress will approve such a law as it stands today, and I feel confident that General Bradley will want to see this great injustice eliminated once and for all time.

Rural Communities Need Certain War Equipment Which Is Now Surplus

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from one of my constituents enclosing resolutions which were adopted by the Owala Community Improvement Group, of dirt farmers and their wives, in assembly September 26, 1945. This resolution has been skillfully drafted, and shows the familiarity of the authors with the circumstances referred to and described in the resolution. It should challenge the attention and thinking of the Members of Congress and the agencies of Government charged with the disposition and distribution of such equipment as could be used to construct and maintain country roads not included in the Federal and State highway systems.

The resolution follows:

The following resolution was duly adopted and approved by the Oowala Community Improvement Group, consisting of dirt farmers and their wives, in assembly on September 6, 1945:

"Whereas the Federal Government in World War II, caused to be manufactured many types of earth-moving machinery and equipment consisting of road maintainers, tractors, bulldozers, and other types of earth-moving equipment; and

"Whereas the successful conclusion of the war has caused a great deal of such equipment to be no longer needed by the Government and will not be used further in the prosecution of the war effort; and

"Whereas such equipment was paid for by the citizens of the United States who purchased bonds; and

"Whereas large quantities of such equipment have been, or will be classed as surplus equipment or property and will be sold and disposed of as being no longer needed or necessary to the Government; and

"Whereas many mail routes, school bus routes and farm-to-market roads, not a part of either the Federal or State highway system, are in need of permanent improvement and the use of such earth-moving equipment by the boards of county commissioners, school boards, soil-conservation districts, or similar boards or bodies, would enable the rural citizens to benefit as a result of the construction and improvement of roads, not otherwise provided for, as well as to afford economical transportation of products from farms and ranches to market; and

"Whereas the need for conservation of the Nation's soil is of national concern and it is keenly known by the farmers that the necessity for prompt and efficient and relentless rehabilitation of methods to conserve the soil and the need for immediate action; and

"Whereas many improvements and practices can be put into immediate effect, both by the farmers themselves, boards of county commissioners, soil-conservation districts and school districts, with proper and adequate tools and machinery; and

"Whereas funds are not available to purchase such surplus property and equipment, which would be usable to inaugurate and put through a work program for the construction of such roads and the preservation of soil conservation; and

"Whereas it is the announced intention of the Government to put into effect work programs which will provide gainful and worthwhile employment for returning service men and women, and which will provide work at minimum expense and at once, and will produce thereby worth while and lasting improvements to the various communities throughout the Nation and particularly to the farmers in the upbuilding of the soil; and

"Whereas the need and necessity for such surplus property and equipment is most urgent in the rural sections which, of necessity, would require the distribution of such equipment on the basis of road mileage rather than on the basis of population: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Federal Government and its appropriate agencies, make available to the various boards of county commissioners, school districts, and soil-conservation districts, all surplus earth-moving machinery and equipment such as road maintainers, tractors, bulldozers, and other like equipment for immediate use in the construction and improvement of mail routes, farm-to-market roads and soil-conservation work to the end that a constructive program may be put under way at once and returning service men and women be given immediate employment in the construction of better roads over mail routes, school bus routes, farm-to-market roads and soil rehabilitation and conservation practices; be it further

"Resolved, That the distribution and disbursement of such surplus property and equipment be apportioned on the basis of road mileage, rather than on the basis of population; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the Governor of this State and to the two Senators and the Representative in Congress from this district and be made available to the press."

The Wage-Price Balance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of September 29, 1945:

THE WAGE-PRICE BALANCE

What Americans really want is to preserve a high standard of living and then try to raise it even higher and spread it more widely. They can achieve this if wages go up and prices remain level, or if prices go down and wages don't. But if both prices and wages go up together, not even labor benefits. Such a process is like the traditional fruitless pursuit of lifting oneself by one's bootstraps.

The present situation contains some disturbing possibilities. If labor's current demands should gain higher wages only out of greater economies in production and distribution without affecting prices, the whole country would stand to gain. For this would swell and distribute purchasing power. And a good part of the problem of reconversion lies in keeping consumer buying up to the Nation's greatly augmented capacity to produce.

But there is very real danger that the more powerful labor groups may be able to force pay increases regardless of whether the industry affected can absorb them without boosting prices. Less powerful unions and the vastly more numerous ranks of unorganized workers may gain smaller increases or none at all. Then the majority of Americans would face a situation in which all must pay higher prices, but only a small minority have more money with which to pay them. And labor knows as well as any other group of consumers that a climbing price spiral, like an upward wage spiral, often only needs a start.

Labor spokesmen have long insisted that wage gains won for one sector of workers eventually improve the condition of all. This is doubtless true. But the postulate contains the same specious element as did the much-maligned doctrine associated with the Coolidge era: if banking and big business is propserous, the abundance eventually trickles down to the little fellow. The speciousness is tied up in the word "eventually." What happens while "eventually" is traveling to "now"?

In the present situation, what happens if both prices and wages are thrown badly off balance? The question would not be so critical were the country not confronted with preserving a very delicate balance while compelled by events to embark on an enormous and a very difficult conversion to a peace economy.

Americans find it easier to think and act as wage earners, employers, or investors than as consumers. But here is a problem which can be seen more clearly and attacked more coolly from the consumer's angle. That angle is neither pro nor anti capital or labor. It is concerned with both income and costs of living. It is a platform on which all can stand—in fact, do stand. But more need to realize that fact.

The Postwar Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of September 30, 1945:

THE POSTWAR CRISIS

Making due allowance for the fact that bad news is generally more exciting than good news, and therefore more likely to come over the wires and through the air and get prominently into print, we have just had a discouraging week. In the midst of peace we are having a kind of economic war at home and a kind of diplomatic war abroad. In each case the loss and danger are great. In each case a solution is desperately necessary.

The cause of the present epidemic of strikes is not mysterious. For nearly 4 years millions of American workers have been accustomed to a relatively high take-home wage. They are now faced, not with a cut in the hourly rate, but with a reduction of overtime which automatically cuts the weekly rate. They don't like the prospect. Nobody does. At the same time employers are losing the best customer of all history—the United States Government buying in a war-inflated market. If they were able to boost prices at will they could afford any wage increases demanded, but then we might have a run-away postwar inflation. In that case real wages would drop, few would be better off, and the great majority would be worse off.

Obviously the real income of the Nation is in goods and services, not in dollars. Just as obviously the real income drops with every work stoppage. The strikers lose wages, the employers lose profits, and generally, as in the elevator strike in this city, millions of dollars are lost by innocent bystanders who have nothing to do with the controversy. It is these indirect losses that are rapidly becoming intolerable. Our civilization has become too complex to permit the disagreements of a few thousand persons, employers and employees, to disrupt whole industries and whole communities.

We cannot solve the problem by governmental coercion. No man can or should be forced to stay on his job against his will. No employer can or should be forced to operate at a loss. The fact remains that all strikes are sooner or later settled. We need machinery to settle them sooner or prevent them from occurring at all. The machinery that we now have has some virtues and some defects, but manifestly it is not adequate. The strike, which is always economic war and often leads to actual violence, continues to be an American institution. We do not come nearer a solution by indulging in outbursts of indignant emotion against either the employers or the unions. What we need is a substitute for these contests of endurance, in which workers' families sometimes suffer for the bare needs of life and employers face bankruptcy. If we do not find such a substitute we are in danger of economic civil war between increasingly large unions, not always democratically controlled, and increasingly large and close-knit organizations of capital.

The present domestic crisis is a failure in human relations. There is no peacetime substitute for the cooperation which with some exceptions existed during the war. Peacetime patriotism does not subdue self-interest to the extent that wartime patriotism did. The international crisis is a part of the same failure. In the heat of fighting everyone is ready to accept noble principles nobly expressed. When the fighting is over the victors begin to squabble over special advantages, or, as is certainly the case with some Americans, to revert to isolationism. The London Conference of Foreign Ministers ran into this morass. The immediate threat here is not war. No nation now wants war. The danger is that we shall have a new balance of power blocs, as precarious as any old one, and that there will be no concerted effort to carry out the only plan that can save civilization: the total and final abolition of war.

Mankind's desperate need is for new social inventions, new inventions in human relations, comparable in scope with the progress of physical science.

John C. Floyd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to pay my tribute of respect and the respect of this House to a gallant young American, John C. Floyd, formerly an employee of the House and a grandson of Hon. John Charles Floyd, who for many years was the Representative in Congress from the same district which it is now my honor to represent. I have known the Floyd family since my early childhood. They are fine, brave pioneer people—the kind of people

who made this country great. John's forebears pioneered in Marion County, Ark. Hard-working, clean-living, God-fearing people who always took their stand for right and justice. Never sought a fight nor ever ran from one.

John was brave, too. He was only 17 years old when he died this past Sunday. About 2 years ago he lost a leg—a thing that would have crushed many boys. He loved athletics, but he was not downed. He learned to fly and was arranging to complete his education. I talked to him a few days ago. I did not realize then that he was so near the end of his life. I told him to keep his chin up. His characteristic reply was, "Of course, I will." The same old fighting spirit of his ancestors. A gallant lad has passed on. And the world has lost a valuable citizen with his going. His chin was always up.

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in these days of industrial unrest in America, when clear heads and sober thinking are so greatly needed, I think it would be well for the Members of the Senate to read an editorial which appeared in the Railroad Workers Journal, written by Maurice R. Franks, entitled "We Can Win the Peace, Too." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN WIN THE PEACE, TOO

America has proved beyond the question of a doubt her ability to cope with any force aimed at her destruction. The year of 1941 can be considered, and no doubt will be recorded, as the darkest year in American history.

It doesn't take any great amount of mental effort to retrace the happenings of the last 4 years and meditate on their importance. What happened at Pearl Harbor and the immediate subsequent events made it appear as though we were living in an era of the survival of the fittest. In those gloomy days, it seemed that our chances to survive were rather remote. The catastrophe of our Navy being bombed in the sneak attack of the Japs was not our only trouble. Our morale had been torn down as though we had been hit with a morale atomic bomb. Our spirits were lower than ever in the history of this Nation. We, a peace-loving Nation, in the midst of trying to promulgate world peace, had been stabbed in the back as a reward for our efforts. Yet, in spite of all of these handicaps, America, in just 4 years since, has been able to raise her head in gallant victory. We have accomplished the impossible, but by the grace of God. Victory is ours. Yes; we have won the war. Now we must win the peace.

The war that we have just finished was nothing more than a battle against man's inhumanity to man, a political war predicated on the false axiom of "might is right." If we are to win the peace, we must accept the truthful axiom that only right is might.

Speaking of might, it will be well for labor leaders to bear in mind that the numerical strength of unions does not necessarily constitute might, only right is might. Just a few years prior to December, 1941, the condition of organized labor, numerically speaking, was very weak, less than 2,000,000 members, and yet the principles of these 2,000,000 followers were mighty because these principles were right.

There are several reasons why organized labor did not attain the strength that it enjoys today. One reason is that unionism in this country did not have the necessary legal tools with which to build. Prior to 1935 the law did not recognize the right of the worker to bargain collectively by means of his own choosing, but today it is a recognized prerogative of every worker to avail himself of unionism, and there are penalties for interference with this right.

Before the enactment of labor legislation, workers were openly discriminated against, because of union affiliation. Jobs were lost, black lists created, credit stifled, and numerous other abuses were in effect unfair to organized labor. The pendulum of unfairness had swung so far to the side that the condition became repugnant not only to the workers but to the public as well. Public opinion became so concerned that the inevitable took place. Yes; legislation was enacted aimed at the alleviation of this unfair and undemocratic condition.

Many employers, prior to labor's magna carta, were imbued with the idea that their financial power was might, and that, no matter how they used it, even if their manipulations promoted privation, might was right. Today, organized labor has risen to a position of numerical might, but, if it is to take a lesson from the original "mighties," it will well remember that, no matter which side of industry causes the pendulum to swing too far to either side, only right makes might.

The union labor movement today enjoys the enrollment of better than 16,000,000, represented by the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the independent unions. If this aggregate of unions will only awaken to the realization that it takes unison to win economic wars as well as political ones, then unions will be playing their part as necessary instruments to our American way of life. When, and only when, this happens will we be well on the road to winning the peace.

In my mind, workers are workers, no matter what organization they belong to. They are workers even if they do not belong to any union. They all have a common cause: To eat, sleep, and be sheltered, to enjoy the niceties that our American way of life has to offer. We are all in this together as one big army, fighting for a common cause. Petty animosities, such as, if you don't belong to the American Federation of Labor, you are not a union man, or, if you are, and you cooperate in promoting the common objectives of organized labor promoted by the CIO, you are a traitor. This attitude must stop. Organized labor in the United States is far beyond its childhood days, and this childish attitude must be cast aside by the adults of unionism. The proposition of not allowing a man to hold a job unless he belongs to a union is passe if unionism is to go forward. Unionism must drop all barriers and encourage every worker into membership. Unionism will never progress as a system of feudalism. Erecting barriers of entry into unions and placarding all nonmembers as "scabs" will do nothing more than promote a sore condition for the body of industry.

Since collective bargaining is an accepted part of Americanism, then it must operate accordingly and cooperate with everything aimed at the progression of this system. Much has been said about the inequity of the National Labor Relations Act, that it does not deal equity to all parties affected by this law. Since this law was created by man, it is no wonder that it has its imperfections. These imperfections, even though their correction would be favorable to the employer, should be taken care of at the earliest possible moment. Employers too are part of this system. They should be considered as a necessary factor in the progression of good unionism. Therefore, it is important that a law covering industrial relations be written in the language of equity to all parties affected.

To win the peace, whether we be the workers, the labor leaders, or the employers, we must march shoulder to shoulder as industrial soldiers fighting for a common cause. The haters on both sides of industry will do well to accept the fact that as long as we have a democracy within these United States, we will have unions and employers, and we will fare better if we operate harmoniously.

Again we have trying days ahead with the problems of reconversion, with workers being dismissed because of war contract abrogations. The sudden ending of the war presents some terrific problems that must be solved before we get on to normal production. These are the days when we had better hang together as one body of Americans, because right now we are in an economic fox hole.

The task of reconversion is a tedious one that requires control of our nervous system. There will be times when we will have jumpy nerves. We will be disappointed, anxious, and in that we are humans, inclined to become selfish. These are the obstacles we have to fight. They are our present-day enemies. We did not win World War II by grumbling, distrust, or in the language of the street, by bellyaching. We won it because we had confidence in America and what it means to us. We all realized what the repercussions would have been in case of defeat. We dreaded the postwar treatment of our inhumane enemies, and we fought desperately at home and abroad to hold the line of our American way of life. If our way of life was worth fighting for across the waters thousands of miles from home, it certainly should be worth fighting for right here on our own land, and with this in mind, we can win the peace too.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor.

The Service Club—Its History, Obligation, and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and member of the Public Affairs Committee for the United States of Kiwanis International, before the Kiwanis Club of Camden, Camden, N. J., September 14, 1945. The address concerns the service club, its history, its obligation, its responsibility, as well as the obligations

and responsibilities of all of us as individual citizens.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD two editorials dealing with the address.

There being no objection, the address and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, VICE PRESIDENT, THOMAS A. EDISON, INC., AND MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED STATES OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

THE SERVICE CLUB—ITS HISTORY, ITS OBLIGATION, ITS RESPONSIBILITY

The first international service club was founded in Chicago on February 23, 1905, by a group of four men, a coal dealer, a mine operator, a merchant tailor, and a lawyer.

The name Rotary was given to this new club because it was planned that the members should meet in rotation at their places of business.

At the first meeting it was decided to invite to the membership only one man from each business or profession.

In the early years, the motivating forces behind the movement were friendship and profit. For a time, the member who gave the most business to his fellow members was given a special award of merit.

Eight years following the founding of the new club, its international president, in referring to the organization's objectives, said, "Unless we are able to find for ourselves new and higher purposes than those we now have (friendship and profit), I fear we shall not grow." He concluded, "We may not even endure."

Following this address, Rotary's meaningful creed, "He profits most who serves best," was adopted.

The second international service club—Kiwanis—was founded in Detroit, Mich., on January 21, 1915. Its original motto, "We Trade," was not dissimilar from that of Rotary, suggesting that the club was composed of tradesmen and merchants, and thus indicating mutual commercial advantages for its members.

Four years later, Kiwanis adopted the creed, "We build," which has since typified both the spirit and ideals of the organization.

Kiwanis invited to its membership two men from each business or profession. Today, there are approximately 20 service club organizations, 14 for men and 6 for women. A reliable estimate of the membership is 650,000 divided by 11,000 clubs. There are approximately 2,300 Kiwanis Clubs in the United States and Canada with a membership of approximately 150,000.

It is interesting to note the extraordinary growth of the service clubs, their increase in membership, and in reputation, during a period when many fraternal organizations were declining in both members and influence.

Early in the history of Rotary and Kiwanis, significant changes took place in their ideals and objectives, which elevated the thinking of their membership to those higher spiritual satisfactions which come from doing things for others without hope of material gain.

These organizations became constructive influences in their own communities. Today, their record of contribution to the public welfare is unsurpassed by any other type of organization.

Among the many other fields in which notable achievements have been attained are those of emphasis on business ethics and progressive international relations. The latter phase of our work is probably best publicized and evokes more general interest and favorable comment.

It is in the smaller communities that I think service clubs do their best work. The service club in the very large community or city is often one of the many laudable public-spirited groups. In the smaller community, it is often the one most important activity.

I know of many small towns where the service club or service club members are its mainspring, its vitalizing force, and its inspiration for better living. It would be no exaggeration to say that the service club has done much to change the pattern of life in "middletown" America.

The question is often asked, Is there any conflict between the aims of the chamber of commerce and those of the service club in small towns? The answer is no. Both are interested in a better life for the American people, and here they aid each other.

What of the future of the service-club movement, you ask? That depends on the vision and courage of its leadership. If its leaders continue to possess vision, ability, and the daring to discharge their responsibilities, the service-club movement is destined to play an increasingly important role in American life and in world affairs.

To grow and make its constructive influence felt, Kiwanis must continue to cling tenaciously to, and courageously promote, its objectives, some of which are:

1. Strengthen democracy by personal acceptance of the responsibilities of citizenship. That's politics.

2. Mobilize public opinion in support of private enterprise and individual opportunity. That's politics.

3. Expand youth services to build character and citizenship. That's politics.

4. Develop a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship. That's politics.

5. Create and maintain a sound public opinion on current questions based upon American ideals. That's politics.

Politics has been defined as the science or practice of government, the regulation and government of a nation or state for the preservation of its safety, peace and prosperity. Yet, a large group of our citizens, apparently not understanding this, often say, "I want nothing to do with politics." Nothing to do with the science of government.

It will be seen that politics—the science of government—affect every phase of our lives. Every minute of our lives, our standards of living, our taxes, our wages and salaries, the condition of our cities, every condition of life, is affected by politics.

"Those who would treat politics and morality apart," said John Morley, "will never understand the one or the other."

The open forum, patterned after the New England town meeting, so successfully employed by the New York City and other Kiwanis clubs, provides an opportunity for citizens to bring enlightenment on critical issues and thus guide our representatives throughout the land in making decisions affecting the welfare of the people. That too, is politics.

Service clubs, being nonpartisan, are in a position to promote understanding among all segments of our human family. They can often succeed where partisan groups fail.

For almost 4 years, we have spilled the blood of the youth of the Nation, dissipated our wealth and mortgaged the future with an unprecedented debt, that we might continue to enjoy the fruits of our free society. Victory on the battlefields has been won. Our goal today is: Jobs, production, and higher living standards.

"How can this goal be attained?" you ask. In my opinion, it can only be realized in the fullest measure in that free society for which brave men and women have for centuries laid down their lives; this goal can only be attained in countries where all men are equal in their rights and opportunities and this brings us to an economic system known as "free enterprise."

When we speak of free enterprise, we use a term that has been widely misunderstood. It is of vital importance for the future of our country that the term "free enterprise" be understood. The free-enterprise system has been defined as a system of investment, production, and consumption, under which private individuals, largely by their own initiative and responsibility, combine the community's labor skill, managerial skill, and capital to produce the goods and the services men want and need. Its most characteristic features, as compared with other economic systems, are: Maximum dependence upon competition and free play of prices to determine who shall produce what; maximum dependence upon profit as an incentive, rather than on compulsion; and maximum emphasis on a free personal choice among the economic opportunities, be they goods or jobs.

This is the system—the free-enterprise system—that provided the arsenal for the United Nations in World War II.

This is the system which Churchill and Stalin declared made possible the winning of World War II.

This is the system which Hitler said would destroy nazism if it reached its peak of production before he enslaved the world.

This is the system without which De Gaulle said, "There would have been no victory."

This is the system which has given us, in a relatively short period of time, world leadership in production, in finance, in invention, in comfort.

This is the system that has given us the greatest amount of happiness and the highest living standard ever experienced by any people in the history of man.

This is the system from which other forms of government are now seeking continuance of lend-lease, extensive credits, and a larger share of our domestic market.

This is the system—the free-enterprise system—to which the world now looks for the establishment of an enduring peace on a basis of economic abundance, political and personal liberty.

During the next few months many efforts will be made—often by the beneficiaries of our form of government—to discredit the part which economic freedom and political liberty have played in our victory. We will be told in scores of ways that the war was a perfect example of what can be done by expert planning and the subordination of individual economic freedom to governmental direction.

No other nation, either ally or enemy, was able to approach the production record we achieved.

This victory was a victory for individual enterprise. Of course, the fallacious rebuttal will be that the Government told producers what to do.

However, the fact is that in this country the very Government organizations, improvised for war work, were headed by businessmen and representatives of labor.

It will likely be said that our record is to be accounted for by our having more abundant raw materials. Compared with the natural resources of the British Commonwealth of Nations, of Soviet Russia, of the Belgian Congo, of China, and of France, our natural resources are indeed small.

Natural resources, however great, do not make wealth until they are put to work. Free enterprise, the economic system of the United States, is largely responsible for our progress.

Capital and labor are the two pillars of wealth. To the uninformed, our economic system may look like an avaricious tug of war between entrenched greed and organized covetousness. A superficial analysis will eradicate such an erroneous impression.

No enemy could do our country a greater disservice than to foment a three-cornered squabble among labor, farmers, and investors.

The "isms" of foreign lands will not be substituted for free enterprise in our country if our citizens will intelligently discharge their responsibility in the primary and general elections.

Pure democracy can exist only in countries where the population is so small that all the voters can meet in one place at the same time to formulate policies and enact laws.

Where a nation is too large for this, the laws may be made, administered, and enforced by representatives chosen by the people. In this case, the country becomes a representative democracy. This is what we have—or are supposed to have—in the United States.

But we can have representative democracy only insofar as the citizens realize their individual responsibilities and cast their ballots. Unless a great majority of the citizens vote, the representative form of democracy ceases to be truly representative.

Generally speaking, about 10 percent of the qualified voters in this country are controlled by political machines and bosses.

When only 15 percent of the voters turn out in the primary, as is the case here in New Jersey, the winners usually are the candidates of the machine-controlled 10 percent and, having been nominated by the machines, they become subservient to the political bosses instead of serving the people who elected them.

Here in the State of New Jersey, the incumbent Governor, the State's chief executive, was elected in 1943 by a majority of the qualified voters—by less than one-third, receiving only 634,364 votes of the 2,134,143 registered voters.

Actually, the defeated Republican nominee for governor in 1937, received 10 percent more votes than the successful nominee in 1943.

In New York State, there has been a small primary vote in many elections, and the results often have been sinister.

For example, in one or more congressional districts in New York City, professional liberals and others, supporting economic theories entirely foreign to our way of life, have, when a small percentage of voters participated in the primaries, captured both the Democratic and Republican nominations for their Communist-supported candidates.

In these cases, those who normally support the candidates of the two major political parties, find on election day that if they exercise their rights as citizens and discharge their responsibility by voting, they are compelled to vote for candidates nominated by those who follow certain party lines inimical to our way of life. Had they voted in the primary, they would not face the alternative in the general election of either voting for Communist-supported candidates or not voting. Thus, representative democracy, having been defeated in the primary, cannot prevail in the general election.

Let us now turn to the national scene.

In 1944, 80,500,000 American citizens could have voted had they been willing to register. Sixty and a half million registered, but only 48,500,000 voted in the presidential election.

The successful candidate received 25,500,000 votes, or only 31 percent of those who could have voted had they been willing. This hardly is representative democracy.

Although the successful candidate received more votes than his combined opposition, he was elected by only a small minority of our citizens.

For many years the balance of power in this country has been held by those voters who, for one reason or another, do not exercise it.

If we are to have truly representative democracy, we must elect our public officials by a majority of our citizens instead of by machine-controlled minorities.

It is one of the responsibilities of service clubs to encourage our citizens not only to vote but to familiarize themselves with issues so that they may vote intelligently and thus preserve and expand our freedoms.

This is a political duty. It is politics in its truest and best sense and, in this sense, Kiwanis cannot be nonpolitical if it is to build aggressive citizenship. Kiwanis must be nonpartisan as to political parties and candidates for public office, but never nonpolitical.

After hearing each party set forth its program, good citizens vote according to their common sense and calm judgment.

If service club organizations ever neglect for any reason—political or otherwise—their obligation to work for good government and the preservation of our liberties, they should and will forfeit the confidence and respect of all segments of our human family.

Let us preserve our heritage, our institutions and our way of life, by inducing all citizens to vote according to the dictates of their conscience in all elections.

[From the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News]

ELOQUENT PRAISE FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

In the course of an address yesterday before the Kiwanis Club of Camden, George E. Stringfellow, noted Kiwanian, industry executive, and one of New Jersey's leading citizens, made some very worth-while comments on the free-enterprise system.

Mr. Stringfellow doesn't see free enterprise as on the defensive. He sees it standing gloriously upon an outstanding war record. He sees it as the system which has given us world leadership in production, in finance, in invention, and in comfort. "This is the system," he says, "from which other forms of government are seeking a continuation of lend-lease, extensive credits, and a larger share of our domestic market." How true that is. Our great system was the deciding factor in defeating the dictatorships of Italy, of Germany, of Japan. Our great system was the saving grace which fed the British Empire, which supplied the Russian dictatorship, which physically and morally kept in existence the Chinese dictatorship.

Free enterprise has nothing to apologize for. The world of today looks to it, as Mr. Stringfellow rightly says, "for the establishment of an enduring peace on a basis of economic abundance and political and personal liberty."

Mr. Stringfellow is eloquently right, too, when he says that the outstanding record of the United States cannot be accounted for by our natural resources, for Russia and China and the British Empire have more abundant resources than we. We have triumphed because free enterprise has made better use of the resources we possess, has made them abundantly available to the people.

Free enterprise has done a record-breaking job. It need offer no apologies, hide its light under no bushel. It needs more business leaders like Mr. Stringfellow who will stand up proudly and proclaim its virtues.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Evening Courier of September 17, 1945]

A MINORITY THAT MUST BECOME THE MAJORITY

When George E. Stringfellow told his fellow Kiwanians that as an organization theirs will "fall into oblivion if it neglects for any reason—political or otherwise—its obligation to work for good government and the preservation of our liberties," he not only sounded a warning to the 140,000 Kiwanis members, but to every civic association and every citizen in the United States.

Stringfellow appealed for majority rule. He wants the Kiwanis members to join a drive for election of public officials by a majority vote, instead of a "machine controlled" minority.

Stringfellow is widely known in business. He is vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc. He has twice served as president of the New York City Kiwanis, largest in the Nation, and is present United States chairman of that organization's international public affairs committee.

He is a well-known Republican, but an independent Republican.

And he points out that Republicans and Democrats alike are elected to public office by a minority vote, while the majority of voters stay away from the polls.

One such case was the election of Governor Edge, who received less than one-third of New Jersey's 2,134,143 registered voters in 1943, to win the election.

Stringfellow points out that Edge, in winning, received 10 percent less votes than the Republican candidate in 1937, Dr. Lester H. Clee, who lost the election.

President Roosevelt, despite his overwhelming majority in 1944, received only 42.14 percent of the total registered vote in the United States.

Stringfellow called upon his group members to help mobilize public opinion in support of the American system of private enterprise and individual opportunity.

"During the next few months many efforts will be made to discredit the part which economic freedom and political liberty have played in our victory," Stringfellow declared. "But there is no likelihood of foreign isms being substituted, for our way of life if the citizens of our Republic will intelligently discharge their responsibilities in the confines of the voting booths.

"The only danger lies in the fact that an alarmingly small number of voters exercise their right and discharge their responsibility both in the primary and the general election."

The Courier-Post newspapers have long fought to get the independent vote to the polls on election day. Like Stringfellow, we recognized that the balance of power in this country has been held by those voters who, for one reason or another, refused to cast their vote.

We wish Stringfellow and his coworkers every success in their efforts to get the people into the polling booths.

No matter what their politics, no matter for whom they vote, they should recognize their right of franchise as a sacred one, and exercise it.

The Heroism of Betty Barton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler from the Washington Times-Herald of October 3, 1945:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Far be it from me to throw down a story or pump one up. But this report on those unfortunate but by no means unanimously wretched young men who lost arms or legs or combinations of both in the war will moderate a shocking estimate given some of us recently by Eddie Rickenbacker of the number so maimed and needing sympathetic consideration from employers when they leave the hospitals to earn their way.

At a luncheon party of Banshees, Rickenbacker said there were more than 30,000 of these patients and put the plausible and generally feasible proposal that employers, especially stout companies, find pleasant, interesting work for them in which they could serve with inner knowledge that they were pulling their weight and fully earning their salaries. He said his air line, the Eastern, was absorbing a few, and suggested that there were enough substantial and permanent companies, as permanence goes in business, to employ them all in positions of dignity as long as they might care to stay.

However, Gen. Omar Bradley, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, was instantly skeptical of Rickenbacker's figure of 30,000 and, flipping a lever on a black talking-box on his desk, addressed a question to a voice which answered.

How many amputees were there, General Bradley wanted to know, resorting to a ghastly form that has given us, also, trainees, dischargees, and retirees, the last being pensioners, a good-enough and valid word for them which has served its purpose down to now without provoking shudders.

In 2 minutes the voice from the box told General Bradley there were 12,000 such patients from the Army and 2,000 from the Navy.

Nor was the general impetuously in favor of Rickenbacker's plan, taking the view, as I understood him, that they are remarkably optimistic men on the whole, preferring not to be distinguished from other wounded men carrying on with equal, if less obvious, impairments.

In more than just so many words he conveyed a belief that there was in Rickenbacker's well-meant plan an element of mistaken kindness which would keep these men constantly reminded that they are special or different, whereas there are ever so many normal jobs, especially those calling for intelligence, in which they may serve as well as any others, rather objecting to special patience.

His gentle rebuff recalled Lord Nelson, who lacked an arm and an eye as well, a man whose name I disrecall who had no arms at all and was said to shoot better golf than most of us with the handle tucked underneath his chin some 15 years, and the two indomitables, Pete Gray, of the Browns, with only one arm, and Lt. Bert Shepard, late of the Arizona-Texas League, who, at any rate, had the gumption to challenge the major leagues this year.

Lieutenant Shepard was shot down near Berlin in 1944 and came home with one leg gone below the knee, but the baseball news last spring reported that he had practiced with the Washington club and thought a good artificial leg would give him enough get-around to run bases and field a position, as who knows but it might in some leagues, although hardly in the majors.

Bruce Barton's daughter, Betsy, a beautiful girl, if it's any of your business, wrote a book last year out of long suffering, disappointment, and powerful courage, called Now I Live Again, which I think should be spiritually helpful to many of these 14,000 men.

Betsy was paralyzed by a spinal injury in an automobile accident more than 10 years ago since which time she had been lied to by friends with cheerio platitudes that came from the heart, not the mind, and victimized by quacks who came in when the doctors had failed.

It would be futile to attempt to paraphrase her story of the cure wrought within herself, the physical result of which has been that now she goes alone about New York, even riding the buses, and emancipated herself from sympathy and help.

Her case was more trying than any but the worst casualties of the war and yet today some among those who love her draw comfort from Betsy in our own exaggerated anxieties and fears.

Bill Corum wrote some time ago about a friend, Bill Gibson, who lost a leg in the other war and yet became a professional tap dancer, and a friend of mine who last year lost his right arm at the shoulder, a redoubtable inventor and gadgeteer, again flies and builds planes for sale and has promised himself an arm or, as he says, a reasonable facsimile thereof, by which to accompany himself on his mandolin as he sings ribald songs, like a radio cowboy, through his nose.

General Bradley looks mainly to such as him, ingenious men with a personal interest, to invent better artificial limbs and tells of a soldier who lost both arms in the other war who lately tried a new one on his left arm and became left-handed that late in life because it was so much better than his old-fashioned right.

Those who have observed the dreadful suffering of friends so hurt that we cannot imagine their agonies while the wounds and nerves are healing.

But General Bradley, knowing hundreds of soldier patients, is heartened for them by their own optimism and foresees most of them, after training, valuable, confident, competent men.

And it was as though the voice from the talking box had suddenly made whole 16,000 more victims.

The London Conference of Foreign Ministers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, under the heading "This changing world," dealing with the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, published in the Washington Star of September 30, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Secretary of State Byrnes is expected to return to Washington in the near future.

Attempts are being made in high official quarters to minimize the failure of the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, although it is admitted privately in the same circles that the results of the meeting have been negative, at best.

Should the eleventh hour attempts to reconcile the views of the Russians and those of the Americans and British fail the administration may have to consider a reshuffling of this country's foreign policies in which our security will have to be based primarily on our own physical strength rather than on the high ideals of the San Francisco Charter. It is still hoped in high quarters that this shift may not become necessary.

Now that the war is over, there is no longer any need to conceal certain developments which led to the San Francisco Conference. When the representatives of the United States, Britain, and Russia met last year in Washington to draft the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, it became apparent to the American and British delegates that Russia was only academically interested in the matter. Moscow was building up its own security by complete control of states situated not only at her boundaries but hundreds of miles away.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference ended inconclusively. In the months which followed, Russia evidenced even less interest in the idea of international cooperation, while the public in the United States and Britain was told nothing except that international cooperation would save the world from another catastrophe after the defeat of the Axis.

Because of the lack of real interest in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill arranged to meet with Premier Stalin.

At Yalta the Russian leader spoke with a certain degree of scorn at the idea of having about 50 countries banded together to keep peace in the world. He strongly favored a permanent tripartite alliance of the great world powers—America, Britain, and Russia—to rule the world in their own way and thus prevent any outbreak in any part of the globe. He spoke warmly about America's primary interests in the Western Hemisphere.

When the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which recognized equality between the big and small powers, were mentioned, Stalin asked scornfully whether we expect the "great" military powers such as Nicaragua or Ethiopia to police the world.

Ample concessions regarding Poland and the Balkans were granted to the Russian leader, who then agreed to participate in the San Francisco Conference, provided that two other members of the Soviet federation—the Ukraine and White Russia—were also admitted to the family of nations. Russia, which even at the height of her collaboration has been suspicious of the Empire, wanted three votes of her own in the family of nations to be created, to offset the votes of the British Dominions. But the important thing is that Russia was never more than mildly interested in the idea of world collaboration as conceived by the western powers.

The London Conference has proved to the American Government—although high officials are still reluctant to admit this publicly—that the Soviet intends formally to clinch her zones of influence throughout the world before the United Nations Organization becomes a practical reality. Commissar Molotov's adamant attitude in regard to Italy, the Balkans and the eastern Mediterranean, and the trusteeship of the Italian colonies was a result of Moscow's determination that all the territorial changes desired by Russia should be accepted and confirmed by the Allied Council of Foreign Ministers. Then when the UNO became a working organization, all of Russia's expansionist aims would have been approved by the Big Five and the new organization would be caretaker of a USSR which had been widely expanded politically and economically.

The fundamental Russian policy is now so clear and definite that the American Government will be compelled to take stock of the whole international situation in the near future and determine our next move.

Political leaders in this country wish to extend a large share of assistance to Russia. But there are certain limits to how far it is safe for this country to go in making concessions.

Unless there is a radical change of heart in Moscow and unless Premier Stalin recognizes that it is to his advantage to cooperate with the other powers, the administration may be compelled to revise its present policies.

Secretary Byrnes will soon make his report to President Truman. On the basis of that report, moves will be made to try once more to bring Russia into line. If this fails, Mr. Truman will be compelled to revamp America's foreign policy on an entirely different basis.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Esther V. W. Tufty, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Paterson (N. J.) Call of September 4, 1945. This article sets forth very clearly some of the arguments used by the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and shows equally clearly why these arguments do not hold up under careful analysis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT FACES TOUGH FIGHT IN CONGRESS THIS SESSION

(By Esther V. W. Tufty)

WASHINGTON.—The only construction project endorsed by both the late President Roosevelt and Republican Candidate Thomas E. Dewey during the last national political campaign—the St. Lawrence Seaway—is in for a rocky time in this session of Congress. Not because we have a new President, for Harry Truman is not opposed (he voted for the seaway when in the Senate) but because the fight again may not be launched on the merits of the proposed great water link between the land-locked American Middle West and the sea.

Eventually it will win, old-time observers on Capitol Hill say, because progress and principle are on its side. It is a fact that so far the opposition has sidestepped the basic issues and the strategy of attack is to appeal to fear of this and that, or to fight over side issues, and legal and procedural technicalities.

TALKED ABOUT FOR YEARS

Politically the seaway would help make the Middle West "go international" with the opening of a direct outlet to world markets.

The seaway has been talked about for half a century. Men of vision have been saying the opening of the channel to ocean vessels and the release of so much additional electric power in upper New York State would mean the dawning of a new era.

If this is so obvious, why has the victory of achievement been so slow? Well, the Panama and the Suez Canals became realities, with slow, difficult birth pains, too. Probably the rival factions in London, Paris, Constantinople, and Cairo would still be wrangling over the Suez if Count De Lesseps had not gone over the heads of the governments and vested interests to finance the undertaking by general public conscription.

In our own country a half a century ago the proposal to cut across the Isthmus of Panama from the Atlantic to the Pacific equally split this country until President Theodore Roosevelt cut through all contentions and saw the Panama Canal through to the finish.

In the St. Lawrence seaway and power project we have another of those undertakings of such gigantic magnitude, affecting the life and work of so many it is normal to expect unending argument until the day when a daring and courageous President, with the help of many a Senator and Representative, will cut the Gordian knot.

The opponents are many and powerful in the coming free-for-all linguistic brawl ahead.

Topping this list are the Association of American Railroads, the Railroad Brotherhoods, the National Coal Association, the United Mine Workers, the Lake Carriers Association, the Mississippi Valley Association, and many chambers of commerce in the Atlantic and Gulf coast cities. Private utilities also oppose the project, but their opposition has not been overt.

The proponents are many and powerful, too, and they claim the rank and file of the people.

On this list are the National Grange and the State granges; many of the State farm bureau federations; the National Farmers' Union; the CIO and all its constituent units; international American Federation of Labor unions such as the teamsters, electrical workers, the garment workers, and the machinists; many chambers of commerce in the Great Lakes area; many business and civic organizations.

Trying to coordinate all factions is the active National St. Lawrence Association under the leadership of Julius Barnes with a membership roll that includes Henry Ford II, Edward Noble, Marshall Field, Sidney Smith, and other prominent businessmen. In numbers of people actively supporting the project, one would have to concede the proponents have the edge.

Here are the major pros and cons:

1. "Costs too much to the taxpayers—$1,000,000,000."

ONE BILLION DOLLARS

Yet as parsimonious a citizen of Vermont as Calvin Coolidge considered it an economical investment and another Vermonter, Senator George Aiken, is the most active spokesman in Congress today. Even former Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones says it could be self-liquidating. So does Governor Dewey.

It is estimated the development of the International Rapids section would cost $285,000,000, of which one-third would be allocated to power and would be self-liquidating. The cost of permitting ocean-going ships to come into the harbors of the Great Lakes is about $200,000,000 to the Federal Government.

2. "The waterway would not be used for traffic because this circuitous route takes longer time to travel; because ships would not come into the Lakes fearing tortuous and unsafe navigation conditions; because there is not enough traffic to attract steamship lines into this longer inland route; because the Lakes and rivers, are closed by ice 5 months of the year."

Ice or no ice, in the 7 months of navigation the Great Lakes system carries normally more than one-third of all the deep-water traffic of the continental United States. In 1939, the traffic of the Great Lakes (without duplication) was 130,000,000 tons, as against 246,000,000 tons for the other Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific coasts, including both domestic and foreign commerce.

GREAT LAKES TRAFFIC

Even with limited navigation channels of a river with 22 locks and only 14 feet of water, the traffic amounted to nearly 10,000,000 tons a year before the war. Trade was so attractive that Dutch and Swedish firms constructed special ships for through traffic between the Great Lakes and European points.

3. "Cheap British and Russian coal will take away a large share of the market for American coal in Great Lakes area, both on Canadian and American side." (This is what coal miners of Ohio, Illinois, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania fear.)

Prior to the war there was hardly any importation of coal from abroad even to the Atlantic, Gulf, or west coasts. Total imports in the 10 years before the war is around 650,000 tons as against the national production and consumption of over 400,000,000 tons.

4. "Railroads would lose business from diversion of traffic to the waterway from Chicago east." (This worries the railroad workers, seeing their jobs in jeopardy.)

Not enough will be diverted to be serious since the capacity of the St. Lawrence is limited. Also low cost transportation and power rates will help bring full employment, creating more business for everyone. History has proven that while railroads always fight the opening of new waterways they usually enjoy increased "feeder" business when the improvement comes.

5. "The St. Lawrence will ruin the waterborne traffic of the Mississippi River." (The Mississippi Valley group is really in a frenzy, and it is natural that regional jealousies and fear of competition should be aroused.)

But most of the business comes from the tributary area south of St. Louis and east and west of the Mississippi below that point and could not possibly be influenced by the St. Lawrence seaway.

6. "Labor standards on lake carriers will suffer grievously if foreign ships are allowed to come into the Great Lakes." (This is of concern to the men who man the Great Lakes ships and all members of the Lake Carriers Association.)

Those on the other side call this a "red herring." That the lake carriers, which consist mainly of subsidiaries of the steel companies, real desire is to maintain a monopoly condition in iron ore and steel production.

Yet those limited iron ore reserves of the Lake Superior region should be protected against depletion. If that happened the iron and steel industry in the Great Lakes region would have to move to the coast or abroad to have easy access to cheap foreign ores. Since lake carriers are engaged in inter-lake shipping neither competition nor labor standards are involved, it is said.

Maybe these "pros and cons" only confuse the average American trying to be objective about the desirability of building the great seaway.

ECONOMICALLY SOUND

But it must be significant to everyone that every official study of the merits has ended with an approval. All of these called the project economically sound and in the public interest.

Resolutions Adopted by the American Legion, Department of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter that I received from the American Legion, Department of Maryland, and four resolutions adopted by them in their recent convention in Baltimore, Md., as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., October 2, 1945.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'ALESANDRO: Enclosed herewith please find copies of four resolutions passed by the American Legion, De-

partment of Maryland, Inc., in convention assembled in Baltimore, Md., August 23, 24, and 25, 1945.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

J. NELSON TRIBBY,
Department Adjutant.

[Enclosure]

Whereas Senate bill 1767, known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, relating to a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, passed in the Senate on March 24, 1944 (legislative day, February 7, 1944), and passed in the House of Representatives with an amendment on May 18, 1944, provides for many types of services and benefits to which members of World War II are entitled; and

Whereas subsequent to the enactment of said Senate bill 1767 many inequalities have been disclosed which do not operate to the benefit of the veterans of World War II in the manner in which it had been originally proposed; and

Whereas there is now in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives bill H. R. 127 entitled "Veterans' Adjusted-Service Pay Act of 1945," which provides adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; and

Whereas bill H. R. 127 further provides an allowance of $3 for each day of active service within the continental limits of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, and $4 for each day of active overseas service during the period of the war, and further provides an amount of $500 for any wound for which the issuance of a wound chevron or other decoration or medal is prescribed; and

Whereas we of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, recognize that men and women of the armed forces of the United States fought and made innumerable sacrifices for the preservation of our country and their loved ones, at the same time we believe they are entitled to a consideration above that which they received while serving in this war: Be it therefore

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., in convention assembled in Baltimore, Md., August 24, 1945, That we urgently advocate the passage of House bill 127, entitled "Veterans' Adjusted-Service Pay Act of 1945"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and the Members of Congress from the State of Maryland asking them to support and vote for the enactment of H. R. 127.

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., in convention assembled this 24th day of August, 1945, That the Governor of Maryland, and the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Maryland, be requested to notify the proper authorities that surplus Government material which is now being sold to dealers in lots of ten (10) or more should be released to veterans in individual lots of one or more.

Whereas the acute need for hospitalization of the returning veteran is far in excess of that required, and crowded conditions of available facilities in this area; and

Whereas under existing demands present hospital facilities are inadequate; and

Whereas the present and future needs will require even greater facilities than now exist: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., in convention assembled this 24th day of August, 1945, go on record endorsing the immediate construction of the necessary plant to properly care for this need at Fort Washington, Md., and that it be equipped and staffed to give the needed service to the veterans of this area. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of Maryland, the Senators and Representatives in Congress, and the Veterans' Administration, urging that no effort be spared to bring this program to a successful conclusion.

Be it resolved by the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., in convention assembled this 24th day of August, 1945, at Baltimore, Md., That we advocate the passage of H. R. 3166, introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. ELLSWORTH, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which provides—

"That it is the purpose of this act to aid in providing housing for veterans pursuing courses of education or training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and which aid is to be provided in each case by whichever method outlined is most practicable and appropriate"; And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of the United States Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland to advise them of our attitude toward H. R. 3166.

Ohio River-Lake Erie Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at recurring intervals for many years the proposition to construct a canal to connect the Ohio River with Lake Erie has been agitated. Various routes have been surveyed, reports have been made, and the matter has been considered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

It seems the question is being revived at this time. Just why or how it should be does not seem clear. Certainly there is nothing at this time before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and so far as we are able to learn, nothing is contemplated for the near future. However, the subject is again being discussed pro and con by proponents and opponents.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared September 14, 1945, in the Jefferson Gazette, Jefferson, Ohio.

AND UP BOBS THE DEVIL AGAIN—THAT OLD CANAL BOGEY REDRESSED FOR CONGRESS THIS FALL

With the Nation given a thorough fright about reconversion and vast numbers of unemployed because of shut-down of war-material plants and the cutting of half a million persons from the public pay roll, the advocates of a canal and big reservoir that would destroy 62,000 acres of farm, village, railway, and public property are at it again. It is another case of up bobs the devil.

I know of no project so misrepresented by its advocates as the plan to build a barge canal from the Ohio River via the Beaver and Mahoning, then across 9 miles of the divide above Warren into the valley of Grand River, then 6 miles of locks to drop flatboats from 845-foot reservoir level to the lake at 573 feet, a little west of Geneva, Ohio.

Not an advocate of the plan would pay $1 toward its start and finish as a personal investment. The backers depend solely on a gullible Congress to appropriate public funds so as to make work. If the administration acts with common sense, there will be no long depression. In fact, we face the greatest industrial expansion in civil history and there is no excuse for wasting taxpayers' money.

The basic reasons for advocating this canal come from certain industries near and in Youngstown which are handicapped by high rail rates on coal and iron ore. The Army engineers state that a drop of 29 cents per ton in freight rates would wipe out any advantage to these companies coming from canal transportation at public expense.

The Mahoning Valley has suffered a shortage of water, except in flood periods, but Kirwan's mosquito pond has given relief. Since more water is in the minds of the industrialists and since they depend on the Mahoning for water, they must be very dumb to propose to run the waters of the Mahoning River northward to help fill a vast reservoir of 147 square surface miles with a maximum depth of 115 feet at Harpersfield Dam, and imagine they will get more water at Youngstown from the Mahoning by shutting the Mahoning off from Youngstown.

The engineers claim it will take 4 years of the Mahoning and Grand River watersheds to fill the Grand River Reservoir to a use level of 845 feet and that it will require about 10 years to put the reservoir and canal into operation. They do not show that the canal can be maintained at 845 feet and use the locks very often.

In operation, owing to ice, floods, and storms, the reservoir and canal will be useless about one-third of the year.

But railways run 365 days a year.

The maximum of canal tonnage is estimated at 40,000,000 tons.

To haul this maximum by rail will take only one freight train an hour, 24 hours in the day, on a single track. There are now four single tracks from Ashtabula Harbor to Youngstown.

To build the canal and reservoir, various estimates are made, we shall use $340,000,000.

You can build and equip a modern railroad for $111,000 a mile. It is about 60 miles from the lake to Youngstown.

You can build 50 single-track railways for the cost of one canal and reservoir at $340,000,000.

We suggest that if the steel interests do not get a lower rail tariff that they do as the United States Steel Company has. It owns the Bessemer and Lake Erie from Conneaut to Pittsburgh. It has often made four to six times the cost of the B. & L. E. in savings on its own freight in a single year.

Instead of sticking the public to get a free waterway, operable only 240 days in the year, it would be smarter to buy or build a single track railway from Youngstown to the lake and save about $333,000,000 in construction costs for a canal operable only two-thirds of the time.

The people of the Mahoning Valley never have had the truth told them by the Youngstown Vindicator about this canal and the damage it may do, not only to Trumbull and Ashtabula Counties, but to Mahoning County and the Youngstown steel district.

First. If and when this reservoir is built, destroying the Pennsylvania railway and inflicting $10,000,000 damages to Ashtabula Harbor (see Army engineer's report), one of the largest and most modern steel mills in the world will be built at Ashtabula. Plans are being made for this very event. In that case any temporary advantage of low water rates will be lost to Youngstown and the steel mills in the valley will close shop.

Second. If the Vindicator will publish a topographical map of the steel section along the Mahoning, with its many railway tracks, mills, towns, and its high valley sides, and show the proposed 200-foot-wide canal, in this valley, the docks and ore piles necessary and the needed channel for the river outside of the canal for sewage, etc., where will the

railways find room in the valley? If the railways are moved up the hill, then the steel mills are completely crippled. Lord, what fools these mortals be.

Third. By destroying 10 miles of tracks of the Pennsylvania Company and no advantage left in relocation, then the taxes paid by this road in Ashtabula, Trumbull, and Mahoning will be lost and the added burden placed on the remaining property.

Fourth. The reservoir will destroy 62,000 acres of good land, several hamlets, the village of Rock Creek, and the town of Austinburg, many miles of highway, about a score of cemeteries, and all the present bridges across Grand River. The waterworks plants for Geneva and Jefferson villages will be destroyed.

The narrowest point across the big pond is about 3 miles west of Rome Center, where the water will be 65 feet deep in the river channel. No other spot is proposed for a crossing. Imagine the cost of such a fill, and the trouble to the citizens on the west side and the east side to keep up transportation and communications.

To get to Ashtabula from Jefferson will require a roundabout route or two fills in the little and big marsh. In the big marsh the arm will be over a mile wide and the water 12 feet deep over the present concrete roadway.

The banks of this reservoir will be marshy, making a fine breeding place for mosquitoes and malaria.

Fifth. Probably no citizen supporting the plans of MIKE KIRWAN and associates knows that the Federal Government does not propose to pay all of the costs.

The Government in the law now on the books, but without appropriation, requires that the canal district furnish to the Federal Government all rights-of-way. Besides most of the cost of annual operation must be borne not by the Nation but by the canal district.

The canal district has no funds unless the taxpayers are dumb enough to vote an enormous bond issue and levy taxes annually—taxes that will be close to the savings effected by the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. if it can sink its claws in the public pocket deep and long enough.

Under Ohio laws, it requires a vote of 65 percent to issue improvement bonds. No such majority is possible, once the people get wise to what is being cooked up.

Sixth. The Army engineers' report states there will be no advantages from such project to Ashtabula County.

A few farmers may think they can soak a big price on the canal district for their lands. In this they will be disappointed. If by any means the Government becomes the buyer just get the record of other flood-control projects and you will find no joy among the farm owners. In fact, go to the former reservoir land owners in Trumbull and Mahoning and you will find great dissatisfaction and a long-time waiting for pay.

Seventh. We see no reason for a subsidy to the Mahoning Valley steel interest at the expense of Ashtabula County. The 147-mile lake will destroy this county as a civil unit. It will make a ghost town of Jefferson after a few years. Any talk about pleasure resorts is twaddle. We have enough of them now.

The canal and reservoir, if built, will drive about 7,000 people out of their homes. While real estate would be paid for, the losses of citizens who have established business would not be compensated. The Rock Creek bank would be destroyed as Rock Creek would be under water.

Eighth. Test wells have been drilled on the north bank of the proposed lake, which prove it will be difficult, if not impossible, to impound such a volume of water safely. Any breach in the 8 miles of dikes along the north shore would create a disaster worse than the Johnstown flood.

The Gazette challenges the Youngstown Vindicator to republish this editorial and let its readers find out the truth about this scheme to damage not only Ashtabula County but the Mahoning Valley as well.

CHET LAMPSON.

Letter From an American Soldier in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I submit a communication I have just received from an American soldier on duty in London, England.

Apparently he is a keen observer, and conditions there among a certain class have aroused his indignation.

Enclosed with his communication were two "liners" advertising for help and assuring top wages as well as a cartoon by Grimes depicting two people to whom he refers in his letter.

In view of the probability that this administration will either loan or give—and I count each one of them exactly the same thing—it may interest some of those who favor such action to read what this American doughboy has to say.

LONDON, ENGLAND, *September 1945.*

For the past 4 years, one-half million bums from the English doss houses (no mechanics), loafing around the bombed houses in London, etc., drawing from $25 to $50 a week. No work. Rushing the can to the saloons, sleeping, and making out dog bets. Double time Saturday and Sunday. Right now they're holding meetings in the bombed houses for more wages. Boodle for the ward heelers and building contractors.

Tearing the guts out of the English Treasury so Uncle Sam is going to get a cent on the dollar.

Seven street sweepers to every street. No work. Common sight here, 10 men with a hand car and pick and shovels standing over a hole 3 by 3, a foot deep, in the middle of the street for a week and then move to the next street. No work. Padded pay rolls.

Newspapers teeming with ads: "Men for the building line." Building contractors get 30 days in each district, and then more.

Monday a load of bricks; Tuesday, sand; and then haul them away.

Billions this crew got away with and now the nine-ball financial jugglers are in the States looking to throw pepper in the American's eyes.

Common sight here is to see American soldiers 50 strong in the subway going through the turnstiles paying an extra 2 cents fare.

Victory days in London. No Stars and Stripes. All Union Jacks.

This report covers the London area only. Elsewhere they must have robbed the English Treasury of another billion (by permission of the boodlers). They're all in it and no bloodshed.

Building craftsmen can be assured of continuous employment at top rates of pay under good conditions.—Shell Builders, Ltd., 70 North End, Croydon. CRO 6101.

Building trade operatives required (Class A or over 50), carpenters, scaffolders, labourers, maintenance contracts, guaranteed full time employment.—Law Land Building Dept., Ltd., Brettenham House, Lancaster-place. W. C. 2. (Waterloo Bridge.)

Leo Crowley

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leo Crowley is about to leave the Government service. His return to private life is deeply regretted by all true Americans, regardless of political affiliation.

Mr. Crowley is a Democrat from Wisconsin. As a Republican Member of Congress from that great State, I can testify to the magnificent contribution he has made to the national welfare through his brilliant handling of a multiplicity of intricate and complicated domestic and international problems.

Time will not permit a proper appraisal of the bold and at times daring courage which he has evidenced in the interests of the welfare of the people of the United States of America. He loves this country, and has been vigilant in protecting its welfare.

Regardless of current rumor as to the background of his alleged resignation; regardless of the fact that certain foreign interests applaud his separation from the public service, the people of America sincerely regret his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation can ill afford to lose men of Mr. Crowley's ability. I esteem it a rare privilege as a Republican to be able to say, "Leo, you did a good job. Wherever you may go, I know that you will continue to carry on in the interests of the people of America."

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of these remarks an editorial from the Sheboygan Press, of Sheboygan, Wis.:

WELL-EARNED VACATION

While the country at large will regret to learn of the resignation of Leo. T. Crowley as FEA Administrator, his friends here at home realize the sacrifice that he has made and the deserved rest that he is entitled to.

No one in public life has risen to such heights as the distinguished Wisconsin banker who was drafted by President Roosevelt back in 1932 to become head of the newly created Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Many times we have recounted the incidents connected with Mr. Roosevelt's selection of Mr. Crowley. It was in the dark days when our banks were crumbling on the eve of Franklin D. Roosevelt's inauguration that Mr. Crowley, along with Governor Schmedeman, went to Washington and had an early morning conference with the soon-to-be President. He sold Mr. Roosevelt the idea of the moratorium, and no sooner was he inaugurated than the proclamation was issued and banking legislation enacted along the lines suggested by Mr. Crowley.

As time went on, Mr. Crowley was honored with other appointments at the hands of the President, until he was a very much worked man. Just to recount some of his positions, he was first made head of the Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation, Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, Foreign Economic Administrator, and Alien Property Custodian—all jobs requiring a tremendous amount of work, yet Mr. Crowley was equal to the occasion.

Previous to Mr. Roosevelt's death, he had asked to be relieved and only at the President's solicitation did he agree to remain until the end of the war with Germany. Then followed Mr. Truman as President after Mr. Roosevelt's death and he agreed to continue, but only until the end of the war.

We recall the many fine letters from President Roosevelt, tributes to Mr. Crowley, and unsolicited. There was never an occasion when in Washington that Mr. Roosevelt didn't have something fine to say about the man he had stolen from Wisconsin.

When Mr. Crowley announced to President Truman that he was resigning effective October 15, again he was urged to continue, but to no avail. Mr. Truman, in his letter of acceptance of Mr. Crowley's resignation, said: "Now that you have decided to leave public life and to relinquish the multiple responsibilities you have been discharging, I can only say, 'Well done.'

"Yours has been a long, varied, and highly useful public service. In peace as in war, you brought to the work in hand tireless energy, integrity, and ability of a high order which was the result of wide experience in many fields."

Among Republicans and Democrats alike, in both the Senate and House of Representatives, Mr. Crowley was not only highly esteemed but sought on many occasions for advice and counsel. He is a man of vision and he has been one of the keymen in Mr. Roosevelt's administration. He returns to private life enjoying the confidence of Republicans and Democrats alike.

Appeals From General Courts-Martial Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to introduce two bills designed to permit appeals to civil courts from general courts-martial decisions of the Army and the Navy.

Extensive observation, investigation, and study prompt my criticism of the processes of courts martial and their questionable standards of justice. The War and Navy Departments are two branches of our Government. The Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy largely are based upon laws enacted by Congress in earlier days. Mostly, they were intended, in my opinion, to govern a professional Army and Navy. Bad as they are for that purpose, they are even worse when applied to millions of civilian soldiers and sailors, who have had no instruction in the body of law they come under when they enter the service.

Generally, these defects appear in Army and Navy administration of so-called justice:

First. No course of training is given in Army and Navy law and regulations, although they differ radically with the laws civilians must live by.

Second. Charges often are based upon reports of inexperienced investigators; they are approved by high officers. When the accused goes to trial it is generally conceded that the chances of acquittal are poor, because the court is influenced by the conclusions of those of high rank, who signed the charges.

Third. In many instances the accused is represented by so-called counsel, untrained in civil or military law. Civilian counsel is frowned upon and the accused must pay for such counsel personally.

Fourth. Often military counsel requested by the accused is denied.

Fifth. Often the accused has no opportunity to examine witnesses who complain against him, before he is brought to trial.

Sixth. The attitude of the court is to be tough and use the accused as an example to accomplish discipline. It is an attitude of retribution devoid of human rehabilitation.

Seventh. Punishment inflicted by courts martial can extend beyond the scope of the departments; it can deprive, by dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of certain civilian rights, without review by our higher civil courts, as guaranteed by the Constitution.

I do not need to review the newspaper stories of recent months to recall to your mind instance after instance in which unreasonable penalties have been imposed upon civilian soldiers and sailors by military and naval courts. Time and again those injustices have been aired at the bar of public opinion and they have been hastily corrected by higher authority, solely because of their exposition by the press and the reaction of the public.

It is for these reasons that appeals should be permitted to our civil courts. These courts are specialists in determining the violation, if any, of our fundamental laws and constitutional rights. Justice is their business.

We cannot go too far—in these days when so much of western civilization has drifted so far from the paths of humanity, righteousness, and justice—in safeguarding that incalculable American heritage, "Equal justice for all."

Jewish Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the Winthrop (Mass.) Zionist district:

BOSTON, MASS., *October 3, 1945.*
Congressman THOMAS LANE:

Whereas the Jewish people have suffered unbelievable persecution and have withstood the ravages of nazism like a Malta in a hostile sea; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States in 1922 in consonance with the expression of every President from Wilson to Truman has pledged itself to the establishment in Palestine of a homeland for the Jewish people; and

Whereas the British Labor Government and the Republican and Democratic Parties of these United States have committed themselves to a pro-Zionist platform; and

Whereas the Jewish people have contributed to the war effort beyond all numerical and physical proportions, which has been surpassed only by the persecution they have endured: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the President, in cooperation with all duly appointed and elected agencies of the United States, assert themselves in a true Christian spirit in order to forestall any implementation of a white-paper policy, and insist that the Jewish people be given every opportunity to establish themselves in their homeland in Palestine which shall become a democratic Jewish commonwealth.

WINTHROP ZIONIST DISTRICT,
HAROLD YOUNG, *President.*

Strike Wave Misses City of Minneapolis

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have before me an article appearing in the Minneapolis Tribune entitled "Strike Wave Misses City," which I shall include as a part of my remarks.

This article is a tribute not only to the labor of the city of Minneapolis but to the businessmen. The strike wave has missed the city of Minneapolis. All troubles have been settled, which have been due to the men who have handled the matter and especially the conciliator.

Mr. Speaker, at a time like this we need not only full employment of labor but full employment of capital if the country is to prosper.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Why does not labor get to work and stop striking?

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly my contention. They did quit striking in my district.

Mr. Speaker, the article appearing in the Minneapolis Tribune is as follows:

STRIKE WAVE MISSES CITY—CONCILIATION SERVICE SETTLES 51 DISPUTES

(By Milton Kaplan)

Minneapolis has gone through 6 weeks of reconversion without a single major strike.

Fifty-one labor disputes have been handled by the Minneapolis office of the United States Conciliation Service since VJ-day, Carl R. Carlgren, senior conciliator, reported Saturday.

Not one was unsettled or referred to regional or national offices.

About 20 disputes are now being processed—an average number.

In only one are men away from their jobs. Though no formal strike has been called, about 40 Minneapolis on-the-job glaziers have been away from work for 2 weeks.

In most cases here unions sought to maintain take-home pay near wartime levels.

Carlgren, who, with Walter Munro, special conciliator assigned here temporarily, has

handled most of the major cases, attributed the labor peace here to cooperation received from both unions and employers.

The conciliation office here is headquarters for Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and northern Wisconsin.

Major cases handled here include those affecting Minneapolis-Moline Power Implement Co., Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., United States Thermo Control Co., General Mills, Inc., Griffin Wheel Co., A. O. Smith Corp., and Char-Gale Manufacturing Co.

Emergency Child Care Act of 1945, H. R. 4202

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith set forth a copy of a letter I have just addressed to FWA in regard to the subject of the bill herein indicated. There is such widespread and urgent interest and anxiety about the status of the child-care centers in the different States, and so much inquiry concerning the status of H. R. 4202, which I filed on September 27, 1945, and which was appropriately referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which is so ably chairmaned by the Honorable FRITZ LANHAM, will give a status of said bill as of this date.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, October 3, 1945.

Maj. Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Commissioner GEORGE H. FIELDS,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D. C.

Re: H. R. 4202. Authored by Congressman CLYDE DOYLE, of California, on child-care centers.

DEAR SIRS: Knowing that in due course the above-named bill has been referred to you for information by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I wish to briefly inform you as follows with reference thereto. May I request please that your report go forward to Hon. FRITZ LANHAM, chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1. Anticipating that the FWA will continue the expenditure of funds on hand for the above purpose until December 31, 1945, some or all of the $5,000,000 asked for in the bill will continue the Lanham Act services until at least many of the States so vitally concerned can legislate and appropriate State moneys to continue the program until they feel the need thereof in their respective States.

2. If the Lanham Act funds are not continued after October 31, 1945, then I recognize that it will create a most destructive period so far as children themselves are concerned and so far as the present Lanham Act services are concerned.

3. But, sirs, I take the position that, granted that you gave the States notice in January 1945 of your intention to discontinue the Lanham Act funds for these child-care centers as soon as practical after termination of actual war hostilities, that is no sound reason to presently discontinue these necessary expenditures.

4. The conditions actually surrounding most of the 70,000 child-care center children in the different States indicates they have not been reconverted into peacetime conditions yet. No doubt your records will illuminate on this point and prove same.

5. Therefore, a sensible combination of a program from here on for these child-care centers is, it seems to me, to be as follows:

a. That the Lanham Act be extended to December 31, 1945.

b. That H. R. 4202 be enacted as soon as possible so that the centers in the respective States will be able to plan continuity for these children, with Federal funds, for a few months after December 31, 1945, if necessary until their State funds are available.

Let us not penalize 70,000 children and help make them liabilities for the State instead of national assets.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Copy to Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, Member of Congress, House Office Building.

Army Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the following letter indicates the reaction of many men in the armed forces toward the Army. This resentment can be expected to grow unless the General Staff of the Army and Navy will speed up their demobilization plans.

General Marshall stated on September 20 that he hoped in 4 weeks to have all men out of the Army for whom useful occupation in the Army could not be found. Just how is this to be done? The only answer I can see is that of giving every man in the United States for whom the Army does not have useful occupation an indefinite furlough home. He can then be with his family, his business, and the community. He can be recalled to an Army camp or separation center when the Army is ready to complete his physical examination and see that his discharge papers are in proper order. This is definite action and would relieve all the irritations from the soldiers and the people at home.

MICASA, LA LUZ., N. MEX.,
September 28, 1945.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your fight, gaining national prominence, in behalf of the serfs, still denied their rights though the war is over.

The psychological injury resulting from the legal trick of not declaring the war, which is over, over will be longest remembered, and most deeply resented by every GI, and every partisan of the GI.

With a trick as the basis, what else can the GI expect but a separation bottleneck, a point-system betrayal that was never heard of before it was published (I have yet to meet an aerial gunner or command pilot from overseas who heard of it), and other subterfuges all adding up to the fact: a rapacious War Department will seek to prolong its now obsolete power and preserve its now tax-draining prerogatives—until the delegates of the people legislate otherwise.

Yours respectfully.

Resolutions of Minnesota People's Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday a group of patriotic Minnesotans, of various political beliefs, gathered at Minneapolis and formed an organization that is to be called Minnesota People's Political Action Committee. This organization was set up to combat those sinister influences which would destroy the body and soul of America. It is significant that the gathering at Minneapolis was made up of American citizens who believe in the American form of government and wish to keep this a land of freedom and opportunity.

The gathering adopted a set of resolutions which should be read by every American voter because they restate in simple but effective language the cardinal principles upon which the Republic rests.

These resolutions will probably be attacked and ridiculed by elements that are hostile to the principle of individual initiative and personal freedom. That is to be expected. On the other hand, they will give new hope to those who would strengthen and extend the principles and blessings of American free government. The resolutions follow:

Resolutions adopted at a State-wide meeting of citizens, held in Minneapolis, September 28, 1945, at which the Minnesota People's Political Action Committee was organized

In the progress of a government that is of, by, and for the people, it is necessary for citizens to examine tendencies which, if neglected, might destroy the blessings and the opportunities of the American way of life.

Active and growing pressure groups led by selfish men, most of whom are alien to this State, now seek to control the Government.

These men and groups must be opposed if democracy, under the Constitution, is to survive.

There are other tendencies in this country that also menace the American way of life. We see them in—

1. The increasing demand that business of the Nation be turned over to politicians to administer and manage.

2. The accompanying growth of bureaucracy with its withering effect upon individual initiative, ambition, and character.

3. The continued belief in high places that public spending is a panacea for domestic problems.

4. The centralization of government in Washington with its usurpation of rights of States and communities.

5. The idea that the Government ought to support all citizens, regardless of their unwillingness to support themselves.

6. The growing power of group organizations to interfere with the individual freedom of citizens.

We will call upon all citizens who view these tendencies with distrust and alarm to unite in a State-wide, nonpartisan movement to check them and to turn back the leaders responsible for them. In order that citizens may unite in this common purpose,

we submit for their consideration and support the following declaration of principles:

(a) We believe in the American way of life.

(b) We believe that America's greatness rests upon a foundation that has as its cornerstone, religious freedom, freedom of the press, personal liberty, full economic opportunity, and the right of private enterprise.

(c) We believe the first duty of government is to protect the citizens under the law.

(d) We believe that any combination of power, be it government, business or labor, that seeks to stifle freedom of the individual is a menace to democratic institutions.

(e) We strongly oppose political action groups which threaten to coerce the Government against the rights of other citizens.

(f) We believe profoundly in the rights of organized labor to have such bargaining power as will secure for it an equitable return for labor given.

(g) We believe that agriculture must be given the administrative machinery, under farmer management and control, to insure parity of income and opportunity with other groups.

(h) We believe with Thomas Jefferson that that government is best that governs least.

(i) We believe that big labor as well as big business, when uncontrolled by the people, are a menace and a danger to the guaranties that assure the American way of life.

(j) We believe in the free enterprise system.

(k) We believe, now that the war is ended, it is of first importance, if we are to have any certainty of prosperity, happiness, and opportunity for the service groups when they come home that there be formulated a national labor-relations policy. Such a policy must recognize the rights of the public in labor disputes, and the rights and duties of both management and labor, seek to maintain uninterrupted production as the basis for national prosperity, provide just and fair opportunity for settlement of labor disputes and provide for firm insistence upon acceptance of such settlements.

(l) We believe that the people's savings, whether life-insurance policies, war bonds or other forms of savings, should be protected from the inflation that will follow continued reckless public spending.

(m) We believe that no member of an organization, labor, agriculture, or business should place the demands of his group above his rights and duties as an American citizen.

The Minnesota People's Political Action Committee opposes embarrassment and intimidation of those who make the laws of the land. We seek to improve the making of laws by substituting the good of the whole public for the interests of special blocs and groups. We will with all our power and influence protect the independence and political self-respect of those who make laws.

The Minnesota People's Political Action Committee seeks to uphold intelligence, integrity, and independence in the great task of making laws, State and Federal. It will oppose any effort, no matter how apparently worthy the cause, which uses political threat as a weapon of selfishness or political aggression.

In commenting on this inspiring and timely meeting of real Americans, Earl Almquist, staff writer with the Minneapolis Tribune, comments, as follows:

Minnesota People's Political Action Committee was launched in Minneapolis Friday with adoption of a thorough organization program designed to reach into every county, township, and precinct in the State.

Militant opposition to the CIO-PAC and the NCPAC group headed by former Gov. Elmer Benson, particularly during the congressional, State, and county campaigns, were emphasized.

OLSON NAMED CHAIRMAN

A. J. Olson, Renville, University of Minnesota regent, who served as temporary chairman, was elected permanent chairman of the group, and R. S. Wilcox, St. Paul, was named secretary-treasurer.

Seven vice chairmen, representing various parts of the State, also were named by the board of directors following conclusion of the organization meeting.

They were: Leo Lauerman, Olivia; State Senator J. V. Webber, Slayton; Representative Leonard Dickinson, Bemidji; L. A. Rossman, Grand Rapids publisher; Mrs. Mary Conley, Verndale; D. B. Hunt, Rochester, city attorney; and Rudolph Lee, Long Prairie publisher.

MORE DIRECTORS PLANNED

At present the board of directors consists of 50 members, with 45 named at the meeting, but eventually the directorate will be more than 100, with at least 1 member from each of the State's 87 counties.

Regular membership in the organization will cost $1, but, in addition, contributing memberships costing from $5 to $500 will be sought, plus associate members who will pay dues of only 25 cents per year.

Idea of the associate membership plan, in addition to enlarging the scope of the organization, is to help finance a publication which will be patterned after a similar publication printed by the Ohio PPAC.

STATE SENATOR SPEAKS

Principal speakers at the noon meeting included State Senator Karl Neumeier, Stillwater; Mrs. Conley, Dickinson, and Lauerman.

They emphasized high lights of the platform adopted during the morning session which included opposition to tendencies which, if neglected, might destroy the opportunities of American way of life.

Campaign against pressure groups which seek to control the Government; growth of bureaucracy; continued belief in high places that public spending is a panacea for domestic problems; the idea that the Government ought to support all citizens.

The platform also put the organization on record as opposing political action groups which threaten to coerce the Government against the right of other citizens, and declared that big labor as well as big business when uncontrolled is a menace and a danger.

Discharge of Liberated Prisoners of War From the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Navy has announced that they would discharge from service any man who had been a prisoner of war for 60 or more days. I am wondering why the Army does not make a similar statement.

There is no reason why liberated prisoners of war, some of them who have been wounded, should not be permitted an immediate discharge from the armed forces. It is such arbitrary action by the general staff which is creating so much resentment against the Army. The letter follows:

FORT BENJAMIN HARRISON, IND.

DEAR YANK: As a result of great quantities of Nation-wide publicity, including a congressional investigation, the greater part of the population of the United States is well versed on the living conditions and treatment of former prisoners of war. Yes—lots of publicity, but as yet very little done about it. Unless physically incapacitated, the former prisoner of the Jerry or Jap is returned to duty with no concern toward the possible event of discharge—not even an added point or two to help along the way. Why?

Orchids to Representative MILLER, Republican, of Nebraska, for his bill proposing release within 90 days of application to those who were prisoners of war. More than one man is necessary to get a bill on the floor of the House, especially when it is cubbyholed in the Military Affairs Committee room. Here's more power to Representative MILLER.

LOST—AND FOUND.

(Signed by 18 former prisoners of war.)

Necessary Child-Care Centers Must Be Continued in States With Continuation of Lanham Act Moneys Until States Can Enact Legislation and Take Care of Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the original of the following telegram from Mr. H. F. Whittle, chairman of the emergency child-care committee of that great metropolitan city of Los Angeles in my native State:

Emergency child-care committee in meeting held October 1 approved report made by research department of welfare council of metropolitan Los Angeles on present status of mothers using child-care centers. Ninety-eight percent of mothers using nursery centers returned cards and about 85 percent of mothers using extended day care centers. Twenty percent of mothers are sole support of families; 78 percent provide partial support. Over 50 percent of the group have husbands still in service. Copy preliminary report on study on survey and copy of statement of principles adopted by committee being sent you. Urge Appropriations Committee authorize continued use of Lanham Act funds already appropriated for child-care centers. At least for period long enough for State legislature in special session to take necessary action.

The brief facts set forth on the face of the telegram must be shocking and also convincing. I also attach a copy of a letter dated September 20, 1945, from the Travelers' Aid Society, of Long Beach, Calif.:

MY DEAR MR. DOYLE: We are much concerned over the possibility of discontinuance of the Federal child-care program, and wish to respectfully urge your active effort in its support. It can be saved by the action of Congress and the Federal Works Administration by making available the latter agency's funds under the Lanham Act until such time as the State can act to assume financial responsibility.

California schools are faced with the practical problem of loss of leases for housing where such care has been provided for children, and are in need of very prompt action if this vital service is to be saved. Private nursery schools also are reported springing up in the various communities which are uninspected and without proper supervision,

due to the lack of a law in the State of California for a licensing program.

We appreciate your loyal support of social welfare, and realize that your interest in the present problem is as deep as our own. However, we do feel a responsibility, as a small section of your constituents, to assure you of our support of any legislation along that line.

Sincerely yours,

TRAVELERS' AID SOCIETY,
Mrs. DWIGHT MCFADYEN,
President.

Also I include a copy of a telegram dated September 24, 1945, from Ardella Tibby, superintendent, Compton City Schools, Compton, Calif.:

We advise inclusion of nursery-school program as part of present school system of California with particular emphasis on parent education. We believe public education should include all people who are educable in any age group and that the school system should be extended both upward and downward. We believe that both the State and the Federal Government should participate in the financing and that such financing should be adequate. A poorly financed system is worse than no system at all. We believe that such participation by the Federal Government and the State should not interfere with local control of schools. Advise extension of Lanham Act to June 30, 1946, pending further study and adequate State and Federal legislation.

Following is a copy of a report dated August 25, 1945, from the Long Beach public schools:

SURVEY OF CHILD-CARE CENTERS

On August 25, 1945, a survey of child-care centers was completed to determine the present needs of the mothers using these centers. The following information is based on that survey:

1. Enrollments before and after Aug. 15, 1945:

June 11:

Nursery schools	575
Extended day	430
Total	1,005

July 9:

Nursery schools	563
Extended day	624
Total	1,187

(Peak enrollment in child-care centers.)

Aug. 13:

Nursery schools	523
Extended day	585
Total	1,108

Aug. 27:

Nursery schools	480
Extended day	374
Total	854

2. Present need in child-care centers:

a. Mothers whose husbands have been lost or incapacitated by military service:

Nursery schools	20
Extended day	14
Total	34

b. Mothers whose husbands are still in the armed services:

Nursery schools	218
Extended day	101
Total	319

c. Mothers who must provide support because of other reasons:

Nursery schools	65
Extended day	60
Total	125

d. Others:

Nursery schools	177
Extended day	199
Total	369

Also a copy of a letter from Gov. Earl Warren to President Truman and which copy was forwarded me from the Governor's office:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Sacramento, September 12, 1945.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A serious situation has arisen in California as a result of your announcement that all Lanham Act funds will be withdrawn from child-care centers on the dates specified in your order.

At the present time we have in California 530 centers in which approximately 24,000 children are enrolled. There are 260 centers caring for 10,000 children in Los Angeles County alone. The mothers of a large proportion of these children are wives of servicemen who are working of necessity. To close the centers abruptly would cause a great wrench in our community life because of the large number of people affected. Furthermore, a summary closing of these centers would involve a number of dislocations in family life because it would be difficult for the mothers to find other places for their children. This is particularly true in California, where we have had such an influx of people during the war and where the housing situation is so acute.

These centers were created by a Federal agency to meet a war purpose, and the emergency still continues. The emergency is not over as long as thousands of wives of servicemen, many of whom came here from other States to engage in war industries at the solicitation of the Federal Government, are obliged to leave their children in these agencies while they are working.

When the Legislature of California meets in special session I shall ask it to define the State's policy concerning child-care centers, but there will not be a session of the legislature for at least a couple of months. May I suggest that further study be given California's problem in this regard and that if possible the Lanham Act funds be continued while the emergency exists.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely.

Also a table furnished me by the Federal Works Agency showing child-care project for which Federal assistance under the Lanham Act was being provided as of July 31 and August 31, 1945:

Child-care projects for which Federal assistance under the Lanham Act was being provided as of July 31 and Aug. 31, 1945

Date	Total number of projects	Total number of centers	Number of children enrolled			Number of mothers represented		
			Preschool	School age	Total	Service connected		Other
						Wives	Widows	
July 31	611	2,791	63,335	38,437	101,772	25,250	----------	40,363
Aug. 31	615	2,656	58,806	32,500	91,306	29,545	1,811	41,492

Number of mothers represented in July figures is a spot check on 410 projects. The figure, 25,250, represents both wives and widows of servicemen and is 38.4 percent of the total number of mothers represented.

The August figures cover all operating projects. Wives and widows of servicemen amount to 43 percent of total number of mothers represented.

About 70,000 children in the Nation are still necessarily in child-care centers. These centers are now all being financed, and have been during the war, by Lanham Act moneys administrated through the Federal Works Agency. That Agency still has unexpended balances which are available to continue continuation of this necessary and child-protecting and child-conserving program until at least December 31, 1945—if the Appropriations Committee of this great Congress will indicate to the Federal Works Agency that such funds will not be regranted or rescinded as of October 31, 1945. Admitting that Lanham Act moneys were not for peacetime purposes in this connection, I frankly say, gentlemen, that the child-care centers are not a peacetime program until or unless there has been reconversion from wartime conditions and surroundings as relates to these children in wartime child-care centers. Is it not sensible to resolve delay on the part of any States in the taking care of their own problem, in favor of the children of the Nation?

Why do we stop protecting and conserving child life, child character, and child health with Federal moneys on account of wartime needs and conditions before these wartime conditions under which it was wise and expedient to set up these child-care centers with Federal funds have been materially eradicated to peacetime conditions? Let us not penalize 70,000 children of our Nation in favor of so-called immediate peacetime economy. There is no dollar economy in placing 70,000 children of our Nation in immediate economic and social circumstances, which are clearly detrimental to good health, the soundest morals, reasonable educational, and supervisory circumstances and surroundings.

Granting that California and other industrial metropolitan States and areas, have been slothful and dilatory about anticipating their own duty and responsibilities in planning to provide for these child-care centers upon the termination of hostilities, does that justify us in penalizing 70,000 children? Every youngster being raised in a home which is broken or in which there is only one parent or in which there is no parent during daylight hours is more nearly a potential liability than otherwise. There is no normalcy, no safety in asking a youngster to grow up without adequate parental care, supervision, aid, or guidance. But, Mr. Speaker, every thinking gentleman of this House certainly agrees with me on that statement and reasoning. In behalf of these 70,000

children in our Nation, I bespeak the immediate communication by Members of this House, who have the child-care centers in their respective congressional districts, to inform and advise the members of the Appropriations Committee of this House of the respective needs, whatever they may be in their respective communities. I believe our Appropriations Committee is doing its dead level best to ascertain the truth and facts in the premises. Now is the time for Members of this House who have reason to be concerned on account of having these child-care centers in their congressional districts, to immediately inform the members of the Appropriations Committee of this House of the facts as relates to these children in their respective districts. Such action on the part of House Members will promptly and more nearly inform the Appropriations Committee of the actual status of the need. Once again the committee is being asked to extend the expenditure of Lanham Act moneys which are already available and on hand and unexpended through December 31, 1945, so that the States so vitally concerned can have a bit longer to prepare themselves to take over the financing and administration of these child-care centers according to their needs.

It is admitted that even the date of December 31, 1945, will not be long enough in the case of all the States, but it will help.

Then the bill H. R. 4202, filed September 27, 1945, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, asking for the appropriation of $5,000,000 to meet the immediate emergency caused by the closing of these wartime child-care centers, will if possible carry over the emergency for the period of time necessary for all the States concerned, to equip themselves to handle the problem. So two things are reasonably necessary to handle reasonably the total problem, to wit, first, extension of the Lanham Act moneys already on hand and unexpended to December 31, 1945, by the FWA and second, enactment of H. R. 4202 at the earliest possible date so that such portion of $5,000,000 therein provided shall be available to the States which have not set their house in complete order to take over the problem by December 31, 1945.

Having authored bill H. R. 4202, I respectfully commend a reading thereof to your attention. The text of the bill appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the date of September 27, 1945, on page A4076.

The Battleship "Texas"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the famous battleship *Texas* is about to end her 31 years career in which she participated in two wars. I deem it proper to include a brief history of her glorious achievements:

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE U. S. S. "TEXAS"

Bred out of Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. by the best naval architectural minds of the era, this old war horse was commissioned to charge the open seas on March 12, 1914. She was a two-stacked, cage masted triumph and the pride of the fleet. Her twin-gunned 14-inch turrets were of the latest design, and she had what was reputed to be the largest and most efficient set of reciprocating main engines afloat.

The *Texas* was commissioned in Norfolk Navy Yard, and then proceeded on her maiden voyage to New York. This passage was without incident, and after fueling and provisioning there, she sailed south to join the fleet without a preliminary shake-down cruise. She was to shake-down with the fleet.

The fleet was at Vera Cruz, and upon joining, the *Texas* was immediately detached to an area off the lonely coast of Mexico, north-northwest of Vera Cruz, near a place called Cape Rojo. Here she drilled and trained her crew and cleaned house. The latter always being necessary on any new ship or any ship fresh out of the hands of navy-yard workers.

In midsummer 1914 she steamed north to New York for her post-shakedown navy-yard check, and then running of her speed trials. In her speed trials, she made her designed speed of 21 knots with no apparent strain, and was able to maintain that speed for 4 hours, which was all that was required. While at New York she had one other job of importance to complete, and that was the firing her first gunnery practice. In this she made an excellent score, and laid the foundation for her permanent reputation as one of the finest gunnery ships in the Navy.

In October she rejoined the fleet and remained with it, operating where it operated and totally living the life of a man-of-war of the United States Navy.

Nineteen hundred and seventeen saw her only serious accident, and during the mid-watch on the 27th of September of that year she ran aground on Block Island. She was hard aground, and the engines alone were unable to pull her free. Her crew worked for 3 days lightening ship by moving all weights aft, putting them aboard other vessels, or jettisoning them over the side. On the morning of the 30th with tugs alongside to assist and her main engines going full astern, another attempt was made to clear her. She would not budge, and as the minutes wore on it appeared that she was grounded permanently and hope began to wane in more than one seaman's heart.

The *New York*, who was lying to close aboard then gave birth to, and was to be accepted by all hands who ever served on her, the *Texas'* battle cry. All hands on the *New York* were watching the operation, and when it appeared that the "*T*" would not move they commenced to cheer in unison "Come on, *Texas*." No sooner had this cheering started than the *Texas* started to quiver, and almost inperceptibly to move, and suddenly she was backing cleanly and smoothly clear of the island. Since that day "Come on, *Texas*" has been the motto of this ship and has followed her throughout her naval career. Many times during action, in the present war, we have received messages from old hands aboard the *Texas*, now serving on other ships, wishing us luck and admonishing us with "Come on, *Texas*."

The damage incurred to her bottom prevented the "mighty *T*" from proceeding to Europe with the other battleships of the United States Fleet, but as soon as she was ready, on January 30, 1918, she became a unit of the Sixth Battle Squadron, together with the *New York, Wyoming, Florida,* and *Delaware.*

On her fifth day with the Grand Fleet the ship fired her first shot of aggression and was fired at, by the enemy, for the only time in the war. The Grand Fleet was at sea to hunt down the German Fleet on a rumor that it had put out to sea. The *Texas* sighted a submarine and fired a shot at it from its No. 20 5-inch gun. The shot landed in the water at the spot where the submarine had only a moment before submerged. A few seconds later a torpedo wake was sighted aimed for the *Texas*. The ship was swung hard right and the torpedo passed harmlessly alongside.

With the war over and no further need for the battleships in the European theater, the Sixth Battle Squadron reverted to the United States Fleet and steamed out of Scapa Flow on the 1st of December 1918, en route to the United States.

The summer of 1919 saw the *Texas* join the Pacific Fleet and start her career as a member of the battle line in peacetime. Her peacetime activities were more or less run of the mill, except that she maintained her reputation as an excellent gunnery and engineering ship. In 1921 she led the fleet in gunnery, and there were very few years that she did not have an E painted on her stack, and innumerable E's on her turrets and 5-inch guns.

Modernized in 1925–26, at Bremerton, Wash., she rejoined the fleet and served at times as the fleet flagship, carrying aboard her many now-famous personages.

The outbreak of this war in Europe in 1939 found the *Texas* as flagship of the Atlantic Training Squadron, making training cruises with the midshipmen from the Naval Academy, Reserve units, and the fleet marine force. She remained on this duty until late 1940, when she became the flagship of Admiral Ernest J. King, United States Navy, the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet.

In April of 1941 she returned from the Caribbean area to Norfolk Navy Yard and started preparing for war. The first item on the preparation list was to strip ship of all unessential gear. Woodwork, linoleum, excess paint, and all the extra comforts of the peacetime Navy went over the side.

May, June, and July of 1941 saw her making the long and tedious neutrality patrols out of Newport, R. I., across the stormy North Atlantic, and north into the German-declared war zone. Her crews were at gun watches, and she was ready for instant action then, 6 months before the entry of the United States into the war.

After a brief overhaul period she went to Argentia, Newfoundland, and stayed there for 3 months on very short steaming notice, to protect the convoy lines from enemy surface raiders.

On the fateful day of December 7, 1941, the *Texas* was in Portland, Maine, having just arrived there to give the crew some recreation after 3 months in the barrenness of Newfoundland. Shortly thereafter she returned to her watch-dog post and stood by on call until the middle of January 1942.

January 1942, and the commencement of a long series of troop convoys across the sub-infested waters of the Atlantic. Two days before the *Texas* was to leave New York with the first convoy, which, incidentally, was the first convoy of American troops to go to the British Isles, a merchantman had been sunk just off Ambrose Lightship, at the entrance to New York Harbor. Needless to say, all hands were aware that this was not, and the following duties of the *Texas* would never constitute, a pleasure cruise.

During that year she convoyed to Europe, to Africa, and to the Panama Canal Zone. She spent a month in Iceland, and received a terrific battering from an 11-day storm on the return trip.

At Mehdia-Port Lyautey, North Africa, the *Texas* poured her 14-inch projectiles into ammunition dumps, and into armed columns

moving up to the aid of the enemy. Here she stayed for 8 days supporting the ground troops, and providing protection for the transports.

In 1943 the "Old Girl' resumed her convoy escort duties and made trips to Casa Blanca, Morocco, Gibraltar, Scotland, and Ireland.

April of 1944 found her escorting a convoy to Scotland, and upon arrival in the European theater, was ordered to remain there and prepare for the invasion of Normandy. This she did, training with the combined forces of the United Nations. Operating out of Belfast, North Ireland, she became proficient in functioning with British, Free French, and Polish units.

At Normandy the *Texas* approached Pont du Hoe, a promontory just east of Grand Camp, France, in the early hours of the morning of June 6, and anchored about 12,000 yards off shore to deliver her preinvasion bombardment. On Pont du Hoe, as intelligence reports indicated, were six 155-mm. coast-defense batteries. The mighty *"T's"* dawn bombardment threw 250 projectiles into these batteries, and literally demolished the entire promontory. The rest of her main battery ammunition was expended within the next 3 days in support of the ground forces.

After a brief interval of approximately 48 hours, in which she returned to Plymouth, England, to rearm, the ship returned to the Normandy coast, and for 10 days continued her support to ground troops until they had advanced farther than her effective gun range.

On the 25th of June 1944 the *Texas* was tagged by the enemy for the first time in her 30 years of life. She had steamed across the English Channel in company with the *Nevada*, *Arkansas*, and a small cruiser force to engage the coast-defense batteries at Cherbourg. There during a 3-hour gun duel with the German guns, in which she was straddled at least 30 times, she was hit by two 288-millimeter projectiles. One struck the top of the conning tower and exploded, wiping out the navigation bridge, killing 1 man and wounding 14 others. The other struck the side of the ship and penetrated to an officers' stateroom, there to lie as a dud, and causing no damage except an above-the-waterline hole in the side.

After having been patched up by the navy yard at Plymouth, England, the *Texas* departed the British Isles late in July and proceeded to the Mediterranean for the invasion of Southern France. The invasion of Southern France was of little import as far as outstanding events were concerned, however, the *Texas* did add to her laurels in that operation. Her accurate gunnery, the reputation for which she has always had and will never lose, under the most difficult navigational, and direct-fire conditions, won the personal praise of Vice Adm. H. K. Hewitt, United States Navy, who was in command of the operation.

The need for battleships in the European theater having come to an end, the *Texas* returned to New York on the 14th of September, and after 35 days for repairs, steamed to the Pacific to fight our Nipponese enemy.

One month was granted the *Texas* in Hawaiian waters to practice and get used to working with the Pacific Fleet, and she was then sent post haste to the forward areas. Ulithi was her first forward area port, and she arrived there just in time to prepare for the invasion and capture of Iwo Jima.

At Iwo Jima she conducted herself with the usual high standards of performance, and blasted the enemy installations with every round of ammunition allotted her. She was present at the now famous flag raising on Mount Surabachi, and all hands topside witnessed it, cheering with uncontrollable enthusiasm one of the most morale-lifting scenes of this war.

After a brief rest at Ulithi the ship participated in the invasion of Okinawa. Arriving there a full week before the landings, her task unit made preliminary bombardments, supported mine-sweeping operations, and in general harassed the enemy.

While at Okinawa the *Texas* fired four complete shiploads of ammunition in her preliminary bombardment and in support of the ground operations. She shot down one kamikaze plane unassisted and assisted in the shooting down of three others. Her crew set a near record by remaining at their battle stations for a period of 50 days, sleeping at their posts and beside their guns, and chowing down at odd hours. This, as much as anything else, aided her in coming through that, one of the toughest naval operations in history, unscathed.

Anything that can happen to her from now on will be anticlimactic. She is past the retirement age, and has little active life left in her. When she does, like all old sailors, finally pass on to "Snug Harbor" we know that the fighting heroes of the Alamo, could they voice their opinions, would be just as proud of her as are the men who have sailed on her.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF U. S. S. "TEXAS'" WAR RECORD

1. Her operations against the enemy have consisted of the following:

(a) Sixteen neutrality patrol and convoy operations in the North Atlantic.

(b) Invasion of north Africa.

(c) Invasion of Normandy and Battle of Cherbourg.

(d) Invasion of southern France.

(e) Capture and occupation of Iwo Jima.

(f) Capture and occupation of Okinawa.

2. She has spent the following number of days in operation against the enemy (apart from normal cruising):

	Days
(a) Patrols and convoys	362
(b) North Africa	28
(c) Normandy	15
(d) Southern France	3
(e) Iwo Jima	20
(f) Okinawa	50
Total	478

3. She has been out of the United States since December 3, 1944, and she has been west of Pearl Harbor since January 9, 1945.

4. In this war she has steamed the following number of miles operating against the enemy:

	Miles
1941	14,400
1942	34,200
1943	36,000
1944	25,900
1945	25,000
Total	121,100

5. The *Texas* has been damaged only once in action, when the German shore batteries at Cherbourg, France, hit her with two 280-mm. projectiles on June 25, 1944.

6. She has shot down one Japanese aircraft and assisted in the shooting down of at least two others.

7. Following is a list of the ammunition she has expended against the enemy:

Main battery (14-inch, .45 caliber):

	Rounds
Port Lyautey, North Africa	273
Normandy	891
Southern France	172
Iwo Jima	923
Okinawa	2,019
Total	4,278

Secondary battery (5-inch, .51 caliber):

	Rounds
Port Lyautey, North Africa	6
Normandy	272
Southern France	0
Iwo Jima	967
Okinawa	2,640
Total	3,885

AA Battery (3-inch, .50 caliber):

Southern France	90
Iwo Jima	4
Okinawa	490
Total	584

Machine-gun battery (40 millimeter):

Normandy	192
Southern France	429
Okinawa	3,100
Total	3,721

Machine-gun battery (20 millimeter):

Okinawa	2,275
Total	2,275

8. The personnel casualties on this ship have been very small:

Killed in action, June 25, 1944	1
Wounded in action, June 25, 1944	13
Wounded in action, Apr. 26, 1945	26
Total casualties	15

9. This vessel entered her war career when she steamed on neutrality patrol in the North Atlantic into the German declared war zone in the summer of 1941.

10. She is the only battleship in this war to have engaged the enemy in definite planned operations off the coasts of Africa, northern and southern Europe, and in the Pacific, wherever this war has been she has been.

11. Her wartime commanding officers have been: Capt. Clarence N. Hinkamp, Capt. Louis W. Comstock, Capt. Lawrence Wild, Capt. Roy Pfaff, Capt. Charles A. Baker, and Capt. Gerald L. Schetky.

12. Her wartime executive officers have been: Commander Thomas B. Inglis, Commander John J. Twomey, Commander William E. Hennigar, Commander Jose E. Cabanillas, Commander George D. Dickey, and Commander Charles W. Truxall.

13. Since 1941 she has flown the flags of the following flag officers: Admiral Ernest J. King, Vice Adm. Alexander Sharp, Rear Adm. Monroe Kelly, Rear Adm. David McD. Le Breton, Rear Adm. Carleton F. Bryant, Rear Adm. Ingram C. Sowell, Rear Adm. Peter K. Fischler, and Rear Adm. Calvin H. Cobb.

Resolution by City Council, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the city council, Lawrence, Mass., on September 24, 1945:

Whereas in the opinion of the City Council of Lawrence, Mass., Federal legislation is required to expedite reconversion of industry from wartime to peacetime basis and also for the purpose of lessening the adverse effects of

unemployment during the period of reconversion and for providing a sounder basis for full employment in future years, and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the City Council of Lawrence, Mass., that the achievement of these aims would be assisted by enactment of several bills now pending before the Congress, which bills are namely as follows: the Pepper bill, so-called, providing for establishing a minimum hourly wage of 65 cents in interstate commerce; the Kilgore-Forand bill embodying the proposals of our President for payment of unemployment compensation at the rate of $25 per week for a maximum period of 26 weeks; the Murray-Patman full employment bill, so-called, providing a method of future planning for full production and to provide work for all employable workers; and by adoption of the bill establishing a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Lawrence, Mass., desires to be recorded in favor of the passage by Congress of the bills referred to in the foregoing paragraph and respectfully urges the necessity of enacting the aforesaid measures as a means of assisting the process of reconversion and establishing a sound basis for the future welfare of our Nation's workers.

IN CITY COUNCIL,
September 24, 1945.

Adopted by unanimous vote on motion of Alderman Donahue, seconded by Alderman Carney. Clerk instructed to forward copy of resolution to Congress.

Attest:

GORDON E. GAFFNEY,
City Clerk.

July 4 Was Day for Oratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial from the Maryville and Alcoa Daily Times, of Maryville, Tenn. The editor of this paper is one American who does not apologize for his belief in and devotion to the institutions of this country. He believes in the principles of the Declaration of Independence and is devoted to our Government. His editorial is well worth reading and pondering by all who believe this Nation is God's last hope for the world.

JULY 4 WAS DAY FOR ORATORY

Many of us remember the old-fashioned July 4 celebrations. Nowadays, the verbosity of the speakers who, in their fanciful phrases, often "tickled the feet of the angels" and described our Tennessee as "pillowing her head on the mountain of east Tennessee, comforting her body in the plains of middle Tennessee, and bathing her feet in the Mississippi," seem rather out of place. But we wonder if that is true. Those old-fashioned orators emphasized democracy and Americanism. Annually they held before the minds of their hearers—who flocked to such places by the thousands—the ladder by which we Americans had climbed to our freedom. It was over a blood-drenched battlefield. Sacrifices had been made. Liberty was to be maintained only through eternal vigilance and obedience to and respect for law. Our forefathers were a God-fearing people who gave emphasis to the spiritual and the moral.

We have advanced far in material development, medical care, modernized school houses and school systems, and scientific wonders, but amid it all we too seldom reflect upon the route by which we have arrived.

We still believe that there was much merit in those old-fashioned Fourth of July observances. And we believe that it would be good for the body politic again to begin such observances and for folk by the thousands to manifest their patriotism and Americanism by taking part in them. We must ever keep our faces toward the future, but we must never forget the road over which our Nation has traveled to give us the heritage that is ours.

Labor Department Apparently Rules Contrary to Congressional Intent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include explanatory correspondence between the Honorable L. B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, and James E. Weir, secretary of the West Virginia Publishers' Association.

It was my feeling at the time of the passage of the Wages and Hours Act, for which I spoke and voted, that there was need for certain exemptions for weeklies, semiweeklies and triweeklies of 3,000 circulation.

My contention, Mr. Speaker, is that Congress has the right to expect that laws will be administered in accordance with the recognized intent of the legislative branch of our Federal Government. That is not being done in many instances, and the following letters should be carefully considered by my colleagues, and our citizens generally.

ELKINS, W. VA., *August 11, 1945.*
Hon. L. B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your kindness in being willing to personally review the second ruling of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor in connection with the exemption of weeklies, semiweeklies, and triweeklies, is very deeply appreciated, but may I not impose further upon your time and inclination at such a time as you can reach the matter by submitting further information, history, and background on this matter for your enlightenment and in the hope that you will further consider the question of whether the original ruling of the Wage and Hour Division promulgated in 1939 or the ruling of 1941, completely reversing the original one, is correct and in accordance with the intent of Congress, in view of all the circumstances.

In view af the fact that no reference is made to the original ruling of the Wage and Hour Division in your kind communication of August 7, it is possible that the Division has not brought the 1939 ruling and interpretation to your attention and that, therefore, you are not familiar with it. The original ruling of 1939, I believe you will find, did construe the language of the exemption as meaning employees of weekly papers, semiweekly papers, and triweeklies—all employees—as being exempted taking into consideration that in the plant of the average country newspaper, employees are interchangeable as between the issuance of the newspaper and the production of job work and that the average newspaper plant within the category mentioned could not long exist if it were solely dependent upon newspaper revenue and if employees could not be utilized in getting out job work when not occupied in getting out the newspaper.

If the first or original ruling was right and carried out the intent of Congress and the language of the exemption, then the second one now in force was wrong, and if the second one is right, then the first one was wrong, because the one is contradictory of the other.

I believe it must be fairly obvious that if a change was made after the lapse of 2 years, then there must have been some circumstances rather than a reason for the change and it is therefore important to know why there was a reversal, what prompted it, what brought it about—in short, the circumstances leading to such a change. At least it is only fair that those affected should be permitted to inquire into the matter.

Circumstances are such as to lead to the reasonable belief that the Wage and Hour Division changed its ruling—after 2 years—not because of any change in the language of the exemption, but because of a change in division heads and to meet the objection of large printers not engaged in the newspaper business. I believe that you will find if you care to go into it that such was the real reason and if that be true, it is respectfully submitted that it was a case of changing the interpretation not because of the language of the law but to take care of a special group that had protested which it is respectfully submitted is not the proper way either to construe or administer the law.

That we believe the circumstances will show was the purpose in making the change in the ruling.

Just what were circumstances leading up to the change, so plain and so evident, that I knew what was coming when I was invited to appear before the division heads in company with Mr. William L. Daley, legislative representative of the National Editorial Association, as president at that time of Newspaper Association Managers.

Let me submit my connection with this matter so that it will give you a more complete picture and possibly the reasons which led to the change, the complete reversal of the original ruling.

Some months before the annual meeting of the National Editorial Association at Jacksonville, Fla., in April 1941, either Mr. Jacobs, Assistant Chief of the Wage and Hour Division, or the head of the division had appeared before the United Typothetae of America and in an address had intimated that a change was to be made and that it was to be made along the lines subsequently done. The records will show that. It was evident that the UTA or large printers had asked the Division to change the ruling for competitive reasons.

That that was what the Division chiefs had in mind became evident when Mr. Jacobs addressed the National Editorial Association convention. After his address had been concluded, he agreed to answer questions propounded to him by members of a panel of which I was one. I asked him about his remarks at the UTA and whether he had in mind what had been indicated at the UTA convention.

Mr. Jacobs did not make a direct answer. In substance he said that supposing there were two lumber firms in the same town, one across the street from the other, and that one was within the purview of interstate commerce and the other not—was that fair to the one not on the face of things within

interstate commerce. Manifestly that statement meant that a way would be found to bring the one big firm under the interstate commerce. That was in April. Three months later a way was found. I think it is a logical conclusion to assume that this is why the exemption was in effect nullified, in the face of the very plain intent of Congress.

In short the Division found a way to get around the exemption by providing that if an employee of a weekly newspaper was engaged 51 percent of his time in any 1 week on job work and in that week had overtime, and if at any time within 2 years thereafter any part of a job delivered to a local customer was mailed or found its way into interstate movement, that particular employee for that particular week was subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, even in the face of a plain exemption from such act, if the circulation of the newspaper was 3,000 or under, even though a part of that circulation was in interstate commerce.

It is respectfully submitted that such a ruling is not only incompatible with the intent of Congress and the language of the exemption when all the circumstances are considered but is not even susceptible of enforcement for how is the publisher of a newspaper to know, no matter how complete his records when, if at all, any part of a printed job has moved in interstate commerce?

The author of the amendment, Representative Creal, of Kentucky, now deceased, and Members of Congress as a whole—possibly you, if you were in the Senate at that time, voted for the exemption in the understanding that it exempted newspapers and employees connected with such newspapers—weeklies, semiweeklies, and triweeklies—so enumerated, where their circulation was not over 3,000. That was the purpose of the amendment, as so understood by Members of Congress in general and that the way the Wage and Hour Division in its original ruling which stood for 2 years, construed the exemption.

Members of Congress and certainly the author of the amendment were in a better position to know what was in their own mind, what they intended—and that should govern—and what they had done especially in case of any question of doubt as to the interpretation—and no question was raised nor any doubt raised or expressed by the Wage and Hour Division under the first Administrator, Mr. Andrews, nor any question raised as to what the exemption, in Congress by Members of Congress, collectively or individually, meant nor any disagreement with the original ruling. The change came with a change of Administrators, and it came in 1941, 2 years after it or the first ruling had been promulgated.

There was objection to the new interpretation, on the other hand by the author of the amendment, Mr. Creal, of Kentucky, and by Representative RANDOLPH of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, a member of the House Labor Committe which drafted the bill and who therefore would be in a position to know what was intended and completely familiar with provisions both original and agreed upon by the conference committee of the two Houses of which Mr. RANDOLPH was a Member.

Mr. Creal, the author of the exemption, who certainly was in a position to know what was intended, and Mr. RANDOLPH both told Mr. Holland what the intention of the exemption was and argued the case at length before him. Notwithstanding the fact that the Wage and Hour Division had originally agreed with such an interpretation even without any statement from any Member of Congress, Mr. Holland in effect told the author of the amendment and Mr. RANDOLPH that he knew better what Congress intended than they did. As Mr. William L. Daley said: "As the matter now stands, the impression prevails that the current enforcement of the Wage and Hour Division in connection with section 13 (a) (8) have the effect of an administrative division of the Government legislating in direct opposition to power delegated by the legislative authority to the Wage and Hour Division as construed by Administrator Andrews on July 13, 1939." I believe that is what the Division has done in this instance. It has legislated.

I believe that Mr. Creal's reasons for offering and securing the adoption of the exemption show what he and Congress had in mind and how the present attitude and ruling of the Division tends to nullify the exemption almost completely and if that be true nullifies an act of Congress or renders it inoperative.

Mr. Creal had a brother-in-law engaged in the publication of a weekly newspaper in Kentucky—a small shop. He realized that if the weekly newspapers were included in the act, inasmuch as most of them have small forces with interchangeable employees as between the production of the paper itself and the necessary adjunct of job work production, it would work a great deal of hardship as is proving to be the case under the second ruling of the Wage and Hour Division.

What effect is the present ruling—the ruling now in force having? Let me submit an instance. Last fall an inspector walked into the newspaper plant of a nationally known publisher of the highest character, in another State. He showed that there had been no violations but the point is that one of his employees quit afterward and after he quit he hired a jack-leg lawyer and entered suit for overtime. While only about $700 is involved that is a very large sum for a small newspaper plant, but it is certainly irksome and worse for a publisher to have to defend himself when he has every reason to believe down deep in his heart that he does not come within the purview of this act as so plainly stated in the law and the first ruling and until the Division changed its mind for reasons not frankly disclosed. There are cases similar to the ones I have mentioned all over the country—and that is what the Wage and Hour Division has done in its latest construction of the exemption clause.

Whether there should be an exemption in the Wages and Hours Act, exempting weeklies, semiweeklies, and triweeklies, is not the issue. The exemption is there. The Congress thought they should be exempted. Perhaps even you, as a Member of the United States Senate, if you were a Member when the law was enacted, were under that impression that they were exempted. Congress thought they were exempting papers in the categories covered by the exemption. The Wage and Hour Division thought so too, in the first place, and said so. In view of the circumstances I do not believe that the ruling now in force is tenable and under some circumstances nullifies an act of Congress.

You are a distinguished jurist, a former distinguished Member of the Senate, and able head of a great department of the United States Government, a man of eminent fairness, and I am only a layman, a secretary of a State association and publisher of a small country newspaper, but I do not believe that you will countenance the ruling of the Wage and Hour Division when you have had a further opportunity to review all the circumstances and all the background, and I express the hope therefore on behalf of some 10,000 weekly newspapers that your time and inclination may permit you to review this matter still further before finally closing the case.

I realize, of course, that you may feel a good deal of reluctance about overruling a division of your department and reversing its position but then it should be taken into consideration it has already reversed itself and that you would only be in the position of affirming the original ruling of the Wage and Hour Division in this matter of exemption.

If time and inclination permits, I hope this matter may have your personal consideration, as it is a matter of reviewing a division's ruling—and manifestly the division will not reverse its own decision.

With assurances of high regard and respect, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES W. WEIR, *Secretary.*

WEST VIRGINIA PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION,
Elkins, W. Va., August 23, 1945.

Hon. L. B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of certain information given me today—August 23—by the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, and I think you will find he will verify it, may I not have your leave to amend my last letter to you, asking you to further review the matter of the Wage and Hour Division ruling of 1941, as contrasted to the 1939 ruling, by adding the following to that paragraph of my letter beginning with the words, "There was objection to the new interpretation": "a member of the House Labor Committee which drafted the bill, and therefore would be in a position to know what was intended, as being completely familiar with provisions of the original bill and the bill as agreed upon by the conference committee of the two Houses of Congress, of which Mr. RANDOLPH was a member." We do not feel that the Wage and Hour Division can go behind that to place its own construction upon a law, especially after having construed it correctly and in accordance with the intent of Congress in the first place, as here shown.

I am making this admendment in order to change and amend my letter to you as it will appear in our monthly printed Bulletin in a few days.

With appreciation of your consideration of this matter, I am

Very sincerely yours

JAMES W. WEIR, *Secretary.*

Mr. JAMES W. WEIR,
Secretary, West Virginia
Publishers Association,
Elkins, W. Va.

DEAR MR. WEIR: This is in reply to your letters of August 11 and 23, 1945, in further regard to the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions' interpretation of section 13 (a) (8) of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I assure you that the Divisions' interpretation of section 13 (a) (8) was not made to satisfy the demands of "large printers." The files reflect that the interpretation to which you object was made after exhaustive economic and legislative studies. For the reasons expressed in my letter of August 7, 1945, on this subject, I believe that the Divisions' view is legally sound, since it is required by the language of the act, is supported by the legislative intent to confer the benefits of the act broadly, and is in accord with the legislative intent in providing the section 13 (a) (8) exemption.

Consequently, I believe the Divisions are justified in adhering to its view and, indeed, could not properly follow any other interpretation.

Yours very truly,

L. B. SCHWELLENBACH.

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a letter that was sent to

me by Mr. Tony Siminoff, a former member of K Company, Eighteenth United States Infantry with active service in the Philippines during the years 1898 and 1899.

Mr. Siminoff's letter includes a plan on how to properly dispose of surplus property and at the same time bring results to our taxpayers who paid for this property. The letter also describes the administration to be used that will expedite the disposal of this property when reconversion is uppermost in our minds.

Let us not forget that reconversion and surplus property problems are one and the same. It is, therefore, fitting that Mr. Siminoff's letter be included in the RECORD for study.

The amount of money involved in surplus property, and it is more than $100,000,000,000, indicates consideration of Mr. Siminoff's proposal. We cannot afford to let this question lay idle or the property be automatically dumped on the market.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 26, 1945.*

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This letter is written to you with reference to our several recent conversations concerning a matter that is now pending before the Congress, a matter that needs immediate attention, the granting of relief to war-stricken people in the Philippine Islands.

I am sure you will agree that this problem cannot wait because it is very urgent that relief be given these peoples of the islands. As you know the Japs brought nothing with them in their conquest of the islands, took everything possible away with them and what couldn't be taken along with them was destroyed.

Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, you may recall, made a recent hurried air trip to the islands, staying, I believe, only a few days and coming back here with a very tragic story since he actually viewed the horrors which took place there in the Philippine Islands. And, during the first part of last month Mr. TYDINGS appeared before the Senate, as a whole, and told that body in session all of the things he had witnessed and strongly urged that something be done for these unfortunate victims of war, and done without further delay. The Senator in his talk asked the Senate for an immediate appropriation of $100,000,000. He further urged that all red tape concerning this appropriation be done away with because of the great and immediate human need. It appears that the Senate was 100 percent for Mr. TYDING's plan. Now the important thing is—how actually to administer that amount of money in order to get the most results from the use of it by those persons for whom the appropriation was intended.

I believe the best method to employ would certainly not be to grant the Philippines $100,000,000 in cash outright, authorizing its expenditure at will. This would only invite speculators and manipulators. There would be a number of obstacles confronting them if this method were to be used, and then too there might be some waste and extravagances in so doing. On the other hand, it is my suggestion that the sum of $100,000,000 be given to the Philippines in credit, rather than in cash, and that this credit be operated in some such manner as this:

1. In place of the Philippines going out and buying commodities on the open market, they be instructed to prepare requisitions such as are used by the Army and Navy.

2. That these requisitions be sent to the Treasury Procurement Division for the filing of all requisitions that Division is able to fill.

3. That these requisitions then be cleared through the General Accounting Office, that office to be responsible for a strict accounting of all moneys involved.

The reason for the above suggestions is that the Treasury Department could thus perform a twofold function:

1. Procure the majority of the commodities needed through its Surplus Commodity Division, and,

2. Utilize the trained personnel (several thousands of people throughout the Nation who would do nothing but handle surplus properties) thus enabling that group of people to secure maximum available commodities.

By handling this complete transaction through the credit medium and through Government requisitioning, only those persons for whom the money was originally intended will receive the benefits of the appropriation.

Some time ago there appeared a story in the Washington Star stating that there is at this time $100,000,000 worth of drugs available through the Surplus Commodities, and drugs of course must be utilized for the most part within a reasonable period of time. Why not draw the amount of drugs necessary for use of the Philippines from this stock pile already at hand, instead of going out in the open market to purchase the same goods which the Government already has at its disposal? The same theory should hold good for many other items, such as food, clothing, tools, etc.

Surely the Government of the Philippine Islands and the people of the Philippine Islands should look at this in the proper spirit because in so doing they will receive 100 percent on each dollar instead of having a great deal of money go to waste. Then again, the American people, that is the American taxpayer who pays for it in the long run, will be satisfied that the administration of this relief is being properly and thriftily handled.

Also, of first importance to me is the matter of the protection of my good friend President Osmeña, of the Commonwealth Government of the Philippine Islands, a very fine Christian gentleman, who has at all times the interest of his people at heart. He is at present in the islands trying to salvage what he can for them out of the chaos wrought by the Japanese.

Should perchance some of these manipulators or speculators move in on this relief program now, and also on the rehabilitation program later on, naturally the people will blame President Osmeña, as well as his appointed officials here and in the Philippines. If the plan outlined herein is followed, the records will be kept clean and no one can in any way blame President Osmeña for his administration while this immediate relief and rehabilitation are going on.

There is no doubt in my mind that these suggestions will meet with your approval. However, I would appreciate it very much if you will be kind enough to send them on to all members of the Appropriations Committees—House and Senate—as well as to the White House.

President Harry S. Truman, as you know, has long established a record along lines of efficiency and economy, which record has earned for him the Presidency of the United States. Surely this suggestion should meet with his approval because it is based on facts, and he, too, would like to see the war-stricken and poverty-ridden people of the Philippine Islands get all that is due them without having certain elements inject themselves into the picture in an attempt to wrest something out of it for personal gain.

With best personal wishes, I remain,

Cordially yours,

TONY SIMINOFF,
Former Private, K Company, Eighteenth United States Infantry, with active service in the Philippines during the years 1898 and 1899.

Socialistic Experiments in Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Amherst (Nova Scotia) Daily News of September 18, 1945:

AUSTRALIA REPORTS SHOW FAILURE OF SOCIALISM

(By W. R. Clarke)

Those who have been arguing on behalf of socialized industry and business as a remedy for adverse economic conditions have often referred to Australia's supposed socialization in terms of laudation. They rarely produce facts and figures; rather they rest their claims on generalizations, on broad statements about happiness and well-being.

Unfortunately, in all the argument there has been a lack of specific information which it should have been easy to provide because Australia has had several decades of Labor-Socialist governments. In fact the Labor-Socialist movement began to gain office during the First Great War and socialization was getting under way in 1915.

A detailed report of socialized enterprise in Australia since its start during the First Great War was recently furnished the London Daily Mail by Sir Keith Murdoch, proprietor of the Advertiser and the News, of Adelaide, the Herald and the Sun, of Melbourne, and the Brisbane Evening Mail. Some of the information is worth repeating in Canada because it will enable Canadians to learn the other side of the story.

Australia has eight governments, seven state administrations and one federal. All of them have been Labor-Socialist at one time or another and some of them have been so fairly steadily. At present two states are Conservative and Sir Keith, somewhat naively perhaps, remarks that in them "services are sound * * * but elsewhere pressure politics have been much too strong for cleanliness, modernity, and efficiency." Sir Keith may, perchance, be a little prejudiced in his opinions but the factual parts of his report stand on their own feet, cannot be altered by personal feeling.

Here are some of the facts presented by Sir Keith:

"The annual money losses have been fantastic since 1915. They reached a zenith of £10,000,000 in 1931, and in the year before the war were still £2,750,000. And this, it should be noted, was without adequate depreciations and after several millions of pounds of capital had been written off."

Socialism really got going in the state of Queensland and there many enterprises were socialized. During the period of state operation they lost: £1,669,809 plus £324,000 uncharged interest on cattle stations and closed them down (private owners made good money); £28,014 plus £3,396 uncharged interest on butchers' shops; £143,000 on a cannery; £52,000 on a fish supply venture; £68,000 on cold stores (cold storage); £375,000 plus £110,000 uncharged interest on five coal mines; £89,000 on an arsenic mine; £1,196,347 plus £385,000 uncharged interest on zinc mines and smelters; £75,000 on some metal treatments works; £44,000 on a gem pool; £37,000 on an iron and steel project; £45,000 on a trawler; and £34,800 on a trading steamer.

These were the socialist failures in Queensland in which the state lost £4,697,247. After

those losses all the projects were sold to private enterprise and today Queensland is out of business.

But it should be noted that Queensland's Socialist governments had two successes: A state-owned hotel, the Babina, which made £62,000 profit in 13 years, and some sawmills which also showed a favorable balance.

The experience of the other states has been about the same but some of the high points are worth noting. Victoria has a socialized coal mine the product of which is taken wholly by the railways, which are state-owned and always show a loss. After 11 years it has a total loss of more than £1,000,000 and in 1941 was still losing £2,337 a week.

The New South Wales government's coal mine at Lithgow charges the state railways 2s. 6d. a ton above ruling prices, but in 1941 was still losing £300 a week.

Back in the 1920's New South Wales also had state bakeries, state fish shops, quarries, brickyards, and timberyards. They all had losses, one timberyard losing £314,000. After being a drain on the state taxpayers for many years they were sold to private enterprise or closed down.

In western Australia the state's socialist enterprises are an implement works with an accumulated loss of £343,334; state sawmills with losses of £44,566; state brickworks which lost £1,266 in the last year for which Sir Keith had figures.

And so it goes through nearly all of the socialist enterprises that were so hopefully started some decades ago. There are a few exceptions such as the hydroelectric supply for Tasmania, and the coal-electric supply for Victoria, both of which are government monopolies and charge rates that are all the traffic will bear.

Sir Keith observes that in these state enterprises strikes have been just as frequent as in enterprises operated by private capital.

In theory, a business enterprise operated on socialist lines by the state can be as successful as any operated by private enterprise. Given good management it should be quite possible. In fact it has been proven often enough in Canada that it can be done. Examples are the Ontario Hydro or the Canadian National Railways or any one of dozens of socialized enterprises in Canada. In Canada, of course, these state or municipal enterprises are operated by governments which are not socialist, which are, in fact, antagonistic to socialism and which resist any socialist pressure.

Why then have these socialist ventures failed in Australia? Sir Keith says that many of the Australian enterprises had capable managers who knew their business. The failure was due to other causes. Sir Keith puts them into a few paragraphs:

"Australians * * * are, alas, so very human that, when governments have gone into industry, those concerned have used their unions and their pressure politics. Their votes and their influence to get personal advantages."

And again after observing that managers and executives were capable, he says, "They have been powerless against constant political interference, leading to overdevelopment, overcapitalization, and faulty finance."

And finally:

"Australia is, in fact, stripped of her socialist enterprises, except such major concerns as railways, some water services, some electric undertakings, and her recent ventures into banking and broadcasting.

"All the others faced the competition with private enterprise and—although private enterprise paid heavy taxes while they paid none and private enterprise had no government favoritism and they had much—they all fell by the wayside.

"They proved wanting in a world which demanded efficiency and which is demanding it now."

Australia plunged into an orgy of socialization during and at the end of the First Great War. Federal and state governments waded full speed into fish handling plants, brickyards, mines, canneries, cold storage, lumbering, butcher shops, and produce agencies as well as into utilities and services.

Today nearly all these state enterprises are back in the hands of private enterprise after having proven inefficient and a huge drain on the taxpayers. In fact, today, it is open to question whether Australia has more state enterprises than Canada and they are not as successful as those in Canada.

Admiral Ernest J. King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal of September 29, 1945:

A SALUTE TO THE ADMIRAL

There is honor and glory for all the members of our armed forces who fought the magnificent battles which resulted in the defeat of Germany and Japan.

Lorain is justly proud of Admiral Ernest Joseph King, Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet, whom it is honoring at the Victory-day celebration Sunday. But it is proud of him not so much because of his high position as because he is a symbol of all the boys, living and dead, who left homes and families in Lorain and went to fight the enemy.

War is a grim business which requires the utmost effort of every soldier and sailor, as well as every civilian. Not all can be leaders. It is given to some to occupy the spotlight and to others to fill subordinate positions in which they may serve with equal energy and sacrifice.

What thrills Lorain about Admiral King is that he is a man's man, a sailor's sailor who embodies the highest virtues attributed to the individual American serviceman who successfully carried the Nation through its greatest crisis.

Admiral King's story by now is well known to practically every Lorain resident. Hardly a national magazine but has published at least one highly laudatory article about the admiral since he assumed command of the Nation's naval forces.

He is generally credited with taking the United States Navy at its lowest ebb and whipping it into shape for a gruelling 4-year campaign which would have been considered impossible a few years ago.

From every standpoint, Admiral King is the ideal representation of military strength and greatness. In his middle sixties, he is tall and straight, and his chin is firm. He has a reputation for strict discipline. As a ship's captain he always "ran a taut ship," as the naval saying goes, and this spirit soon spread into all naval operations. It is said that the man who does his work to the best of his ability never has trouble with Admiral King. The man who doesn't, never has anything else.

He knows intimately and at-first-hand problems and capacities of all three branches of the fighting Navy. He served during his earlier years with the underseas fleet, the aviation branch (qualifying easily as a pilot), and the surface Navy.

He has had the benefit of a keen, practical brain and wide experience. He was fourth in his class at Annapolis and attained a cold, objective mastery of the art of war.

He thinks in straight lines that produce superb organization. He has had at his command a wily sense of strategy that has assisted him in laying many traps, such as that at Midway for the unsuspecting Japanese Navy.

With all this, he is eminently human, has a saving sense of humor, and takes a genuine pleasure in coming back to the home town—which he has managed to do three times during the busy war years.

We are proud to welcome back Admiral King at the end of the war which he assisted so materially in winning, and at the same time to pay tribute to the thousands of boys who fought the fight along with him.

Letter From an Ex-Prisoner of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OCTOBER 1, 1945.

SIR: Being an ex-prisoner of war, and realizing that I belong to a small category which up to date haven't been given the deserved consideration inasmuch as discharges are concerned, I find it as a part of my privilege to seek your assistance by bringing to your attention some unknown facts that the War Department is evidently overlooking or ignoring.

It occurs to me that the people responsible for this unfairness are getting the impression that prison life was spent behind a barbed-wire fence and that we were rationed enough food to keep us living normally. I regret to comment that they are misjudging the comparison with enemy-held prisoners interned here in the United States.

I don't know too much about the atrocities that were claimed to have been committed, but allow me to tell you about some of my experiences and of many other GI's. I was captured during the Battle of the Bulge in late December of 1944. I (like many others) spent the following 4 months walking and starving for the cause we were sent to accomplish—American freedom. I admit we quit, but it was only temporarily, because we lacked the implements, munitions, and, most of all, food. I myself was a part of a small group of American noncoms who refused to cooperate or work for the Jerries. Although we could no longer participate in the big fight, we started the fight behind the enemy lines. We weren't licked by any means. It was due to our constant refusals that we were punished by forced marching and insufficient food to maintain normal stamina. We walked between 15 to 20 miles a day, but even their barbarous treatments failed. We slept in mines, in barns intended for animal use, in open fields covered with snow, and in some instances in freight cars. They packed us 60 men to a car and in one case for six straight days had us locked in with half a loaf of German bread minus water. The Kraut doctors claimed it would give us diarrhea, a disease we were already suffering from. We had to urinate and have bowel movements amongst each other in spite of our beggings. One couldn't blame our hysterical reactions when our own low-flying fighters attacked without mercy. In one attack alone we lost 46 men without a chance to escape but to make the best of it. We were the human targets because we refused to sign papers promising to work for them. Rather than

work for them we accepted brutal and barbarous treatment (and to some it was their life) because we didn't forget the promise we made upon induction. Remember, it goes something like this: "I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend * * *," and adds up to the most cherished privilege—American way of living. We kept and fulfilled that promise although we had to combat two enemies (the Allied planes and artillery and the enemy). We didn't fight the enemy directly, but I am proud to say that I was a part of those who made victory possible. We didn't get decorated for it, nor were we mentioned, but only the Almighty God can repay our sacrifices. I'm sorry to admit that some of fatheads in Washington have not kept their promise.

It's about time the American people know about the most active, destructive, and true patriots who did not hesitate to secretly exterminate nazism. It wasn't the well-famed and popular French and English underground but the Americans who were willing to sacrifice anything in order to preserve what our forefathers have fought for. We fought for the maintenance of their lives and it's about time those concerned made an effort to consider us forgotten boys.

I appreciate your attention.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS C. RONSIVALLI.

Why Discriminate Against the GI?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD concerning H. R. 4051, granting to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave, which was introduced by me on September 13, 1945, I include the following editorial from the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla., dated September 21, 1945:

ESSENTIAL FOR EVERY GI

Every GI will be interested in the progress of House bill 4051 introduced by Congressman DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Fort Lauderdale.

Congressman ROGERS explained the measure to the House:

"The purpose of this bill is to provide for enlisted men furlough or leave time equal to 2½ days per month or 30 days per year; it further provides that when GI Joe is discharged he shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for full pay and allowance of accrued leave that he has not used at the rate of pay for the rank held at the time of discharge. In other words, this bill provides for the same equality of treatment to the enlisted men as are now enjoyed under the provision of the law in the Army Regulations by commissioned officers. This bill provides the same benefits for the discharged GI so that he may receive the same reimbursement of accrued leave that the commissioned rank receives and enjoys.

"This legislation is not a gratuity. It simply provides for reimbursements that the GI Joes are justly entitled to and opens this benefit to the GI to whom we acknowledge a profound debt of gratitude.

"Therefore, since the present set-up grants to the officers leave equal to 2½ days per month, or 30 days per year, and the right to apply for all accrued leave just prior to discharge from active service, the provision of this bill certainly is just and fair and accords the same and equal treatment to GI Joes to which they are entitled and should be given."

Congressman ROGERS writes that his bill was prompted by the suggestion made by Sgt. Milton S. Lifset of Miami Beach in the column, Behind the Front Page, on this page.

The bill recognizes a penalizing of the enlisted man and sets up the machinery to rectify the discrimination. It should be enacted by Congress as an essential of veteran legislation.

Speak Out, Americans!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a timely and interesting editorial from the Tablet, a great American Catholic weekly publication:

SPEAK OUT, AMERICANS!

The one thing upon which all veterans unite and upon which their relatives agree is: let us have no more war.

Despite this well-established opinion, together with the realization that our own beloved country has peacetime problems both intricate and monumental, yet we are compelled to tolerate a shouting alien minority which is plotting still more hate and conflict. They are busy on several fronts, always fomenting discord, suspicion, prejudice, belligerency and always among others, for they participate not in the fighting but only in the profits of war. On one day they attack General MacArthur because he has taken definite steps toward peace, as opposed to vengeance which can only mean more war. The next day they are damning and denouncing United States Army generals in Europe because they are not liquidating all those whom the warriors at home dislike. The third day they have their sniping rifles out for anyone and everyone who protests against Soviet imperialism and the determination of Russia to keep and loot every nation it has seized, making Hitler's world claims seem puny. The fourth day they are meeting in Madison Square Garden and demanding war on Spain, with whose government we are at peace, and applauding alien propagandists who demand a class war, a religious war, a racial war, in order to fulfill the Communist ideology, namely, that from hate comes war, from war comes chaos, from chaos comes despair, and from despair comes communism. This ideology can be seen in action at the five-power meeting in London where Russia insists on its right to foment revolution, to seize by might everything she desires and to laugh to scorn the Atlantic Charter and Christian idealism.

Anne O'Hare McCormick, in her article from London appearing in Wednesday's New York Times, points to the world confusion over the Soviet tactics at the conference. She cites example after example of throwing the monkey wrench into the world-peace movement and she brings forth the contradictions in Soviet policy on a vast scale. For instance, she wonders why Russia on one day resents the British-American demands for disarmament in the Balkans and the next day insists on disarmament in Japan—with whom the Reds were on good diplomatic terms up to a few days before the war in the East ended. The well-known writer naively asks: "Why do the Russians put themselves in the position of emphasizing and multiplying points of disagreement?" We would respectfully urge Anne O'Hare McCormick to read some of the works of Lenin on world revolution and study the record of Stalin. The entire Russian procedure is according to pattern.

The action of these noisy minorities at home—led by unregistered Soviet agents—would not amount to anything more than a disagreeable and hideous-sounding wind if it was not for the support and pressure which they receive and exercise. Thus Arthur Krock in Sunday's New York Times ascribes Acting Secretary of State Acheson's undiplomatic and imprudent attack on General MacArthur as due to "the pink publications" which intensified their attacks on the general until the Acting Secretary went to town. We might add this was not very difficult. Thus, too, on Sunday when 4,000 people overflowed Manhattan Center to protest, in strictly American fashion, the liquidation of Poland and other small nations, not one radio station broadcast the meeting; not one daily paper carried an account of this appeal for a return to Christian, American policy on the part of our leadership. But on Monday, when a number of foreigners, including two who are dedicated to the destruction of religion, addressed a Communist demonstration at Madison Square Garden, both the radio and the press gave significant attention to publicizing their un-American propaganda to send our boys into other and bigger wars.

All these zealots, from the Red leader Foster down, stand as one for revolution and almost as one in their hatred of the Catholic Church. Thus Harold Laski—who spoke "in a purely personal capacity" but whose individual views were given valuable radio time on WJZ and its nationally affiliated outlets—militantly attacked the Vatican and in a coarse and untruthful way. This is easily explainable. The one power for peace in the world—this before, during, and after the World War—was and is the Catholic Church.

In passing it must be said that Catholics noticed with regret an omission in Acting Secretary of State Acheson's press interview on Wednesday. Mr. Acheson related that he had found a letter in the State Department files voicing the late President's disapproval of the present Spanish Government. Mr. Acheson, since he seemed unwilling to face the issue himself, might have brought forth at least one Roosevelt letter excoriating such an attack as that made on a quarter of the population of the United States by the two aliens last Monday evening at Madison Square Garden.

Americans have no greater obligation today than to stand up for their own country, its priceless ideals of human liberty "under God," as Abraham Lincoln said at Gettysburg, its Constitution, and Bill of Rights. They should have no larger glory than to uphold the brotherhood of man and denounce the only one remaining of the three great totalitarian slave ideologies—communism, fascism, and nazism. They should tell the world that we have not sacrificed the lives of our men, the happiness of our people, or the wealth of our Nation, to perpetuate new world infamies. Let America speak as one for America and for American ideals and oppose the motley crew of God haters, peace destroyers, and Constitution attackers who endeavor to utilize the platform, the press, the radio, and Congress itself to carry out their campaign for hate and revolution—dictatorship by discord. The time to speak out is now.

Peace and the Moral Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 2, 1945

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the distinguished Augustinian scholar and educator, Rev. Francis X. N. McGuire, S. T. D., president of Villanova College, at the annual red mass under the auspices of the Catholic Lawyers Guild of Brooklyn on September 27, 1945. This traditional service which commemorates the opening of the fall term of the courts was celebrated by Bishop Thomas E. Molloy and was attended by hundreds of lawyers, jurists, and public officials of all faiths. Rt. Rev. William T. Dillon, president of St. Joseph's College for Women is moderator of the guild and Charles J. Dodd, Jr., is its president.

The text of Father McGuire's sermon follows:

"Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. Unless the Lord keep the city he watcheth in vain that keepeth it." (Psalms 126: 1.)

The nations of the world today stand once more at the threshold of peace or war. True, the clash of arms has ceased. The buzzing drone of motors overhead dumping their cargoes of death have vanished from the scene. The thunderous roar of cannon, the crash of bursting shells, the steady tramp of soldiers' weary feet, the dripping spill of the blood of men wounded, their anguished cries of pain, and the last struggling gasps of men dying—all of these have passed with the proclamation of what is called peace.

The recognition of a state of war is a simple task. Men locked in the combat of arms, death terrible because of its unnatural aspects, atrocities of every description, suffering, famine, and destruction of every sort leave an indelible impress on warring peoples. Never in its history has the world been in doubt concerning the events resulting from the call of men to arms. In our modern day this is even more true since civilian populations have become the direct targets of attack.

The recognition of a state of peace is not so simple. Presumably, the world was at peace before the initial action of World War II. Are we to assume that peace prevailed up until the very second in which the catastrophe was launched in Europe in September of 1939? Do we assume that peace prevailed in the Pacific right up to the split second of the Japanese attack in December of 1941? If the causes of war had not been sown and fertilized and watered, they would not have ripened into the global catastrophe through which we have so sorrowfully passed, and if the causes of war were so flourishing, then certainly it cannot be said that peace prevailed.

The era of the present has been proclaimed an era of peace. It is fitting at this time that we ask the question whether the causes of war are still prevalent or are we really living in the blessed happiness of true peace. We welcome most gratefully the efforts of statesmen to find the pattern of true peace and at the same time we would remind them and ourselves that "unless the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it."

St. Augustine of Hippo, luminary of the episcopate and illustrious doctor of the church, whose penetrative genius has given us the unexcelled solution of so many of humanity's problems, defines peace for us in one short, simple sentence. "It is," he says, "the tranquillity of order." And order in the Augustinian definition is "the distribution which allots things equal and unequal, each to its own place." Peace, therefore, consists in the tranquillity which results from the proper arrangement of all the parts of the whole.

Order is evident in the universe as a whole. The arrangement of the planets—the sun, the moon, and the stars—and the earth, the relationship of one to the other, the consistent and constant succession of day and night, the following of the seasons one upon the other, is a masterpiece of order that could only be produced by an omnipotent God. The resultant tranquillity—the peace—of the universe is the gift of divine goodness.

Order is further evident in all created things from the lowest inanimate object through the animal world to the noble body that is man's and even to the union of this body with the spiritual soul which makes the human being.

The problem of war is a human problem. If peace is the tranquillity which results from order, then war is the chaos which results from disorder. Wars take place between the members of the human family. We must look, therefore, for the disorder and the disarrangement within the ranks of the human family. Tranquillity prevails in the universe because all the objects therein are subject of necessity to the laws of nature, obedient to the divine command. Even man himself recognizes the necessity of adhering strictly to the laws of the physical universe in dealing with things. Fancy the resultant chaos if we neglected to take into account the law of gravity, or the principle of displacement in physics; if we disregarded the laws of chemistry in assembling the various elements in their combinations. The peace of the universe stems from the order produced by the strict adherence to nature's laws.

Man lives not only in the physical universe but also in a moral universe. His body like all other bodies is of necessity subject to the laws of the physical universe. His soul and with it his body is subject to the laws of the moral universe, but his subjection depends on his own freedom of choice. A body cannot choose not to tend toward the center of the earth as the physical law of gravity demands. A man can choose not to be honest with his fellow man as the moral law of justice demands. The fact of human liberty, the freedom of the human will is incontestable. It is basic in the structure even of civil law. The policeman has yet to release a delinquent motorist who drives through a red light on the plea that he could not have done otherwise. The lawyer does not argue for the thief on the score that he was obligated to steal. The judge would not sentence a man to death for the murder of another human being if the murderer were not free in the commission of such a crime.

In the physical universe the order arising from adherence to law produces tranquillity and harmony among things. In the moral universe the only hope for tranquillity and harmony lies in the recognition of the moral law and the voluntary submission of men to its dictates. Man has certain relationships in which order must be found. He has a relationship to God and to his fellowman. St. Augustine again in his City of God speaks of various kinds of peace which stem from these relationships. The first is peace between man and God which "is the well ordered obedience of faith to eternal law." The second is peace between man and man, which "is well ordered concord." The third is domestic peace of "the well ordered concord between those of the family who rule and those who obey." Finally civil peace "is a similar peace among the citizens."

Submission to the moral law, which is the only true guarantee of tranquillity in the moral universe, demands that the moral law be known. By the light of his own reason man can know it, but only in part. For his knowledge of it "in toto" man requires a revelation on the part of God. And God in His divine goodness has given this revelation to mankind in the sacred Scriptures and in the incarnation of His divine Son, Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In the Old Testament among the Hebrews the Ten Commandments embodied the basic precepts of the law. They are as basic today in a civilization that calls itself Christian. Christ on His own testimony came "not to destroy but to fulfill" the law and the prophets. Referring to the Ten Commandments, a lawyer once put the question to Him, "Master, which is the greatest commandment in the law?" The answer was forthcoming in a flash, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind." This is the greatest and the first commandment.

And the second is like unto this: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Here in the words of Christ we have the rock-bed foundation of the entire moral order. It is the law of charity without which no other virtue is possible. St. Paul in his characteristic distinct manner minces no words when he says: "If I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And if I should have prophecy and should know all mysteries, and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing."

The tranquillity from which is born peace between man and God can be had only in the recognition of and submission to this basic precept of the moral law. The tranquility from which is born peace between man and man, whether in the family, or in the state, or between nations has the identical basis. It is for this reason too that man cannot be at peace with his God and at war with his fellow man.

Every human being who says there is no God, besides being an enemy of God, is an enemy of his fellow man and of civilization. Every human being who, recognizing the verity of God's existence, refuses to submit to the law of charity destroys the foundation of justice and the other virtues requisite for peace among men and becomes a sower of the seeds of war. Every philosophy of life, whether it be social, or economic, or political, of pseudo-religious, which runs counter to the divine command is a far more potent factor in the destruction of our civilization than the atomic bomb which so thoroughly destroyed the industrial citadels of the Japanese. Every school, college, and university which sends forth youthful citizens denying the existence of God in the name of liberalism, rebelling against the power of authority in the name of democracy, and ridiculing the practice of virtue under the guise of a psychological complex, is hostile to Christian civilization. There can never be peace as long as these elements threaten mankind.

The false gospel of nazism and fascism have been stamped out by the force of arms. The other isms that may threaten humanity must now be stamped out by the moral force of right, if peace is to continue. A civilization that calls itself Christian must harken to the moral law in the teachings of Christ. We call Him Master, we call Him the Light, we call Him the Truth, the Way, the Life. There is an inscription on the wall of one of the famous cathedrals of the European Continent which reads:

"You call Me Master, yet follow Me not
You call Me the Light, yet see Me not
You call Me the Truth, yet believe Me not
You call Me the Way, yet walk Me not
You call Me the Life, yet live Me not
If I condemn you—then, blame Me not."

A hopeful world struggling to right itself, the city of man laboring to bring order out of chaos will, we trust, recognize "that unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. Unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain that keepeth it."

Resolution Memorializing the United States Veterans' Administration and the Congress of the United States to Investigate the Feasibility of Dividing Into Small Tracts Lands Owned by the Government in the Operation of the Oklahoma Ordnance Works, and Offering the Houses Located Thereon for Sale to Disabled Ex-Service Men and Women and Merchant Marines of World Wars I and II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

Resolution 28

Resolution memorializing the United States Veterans' Administration and the Congress of the United States to investigate the feasibility of dividing into small tracts lands owned by the Government in the operation of the Oklahoma Ordnance Works, and offering the houses located thereon for sale to disabled ex-service men and women and merchant marines of World Wars I and II

Whereas the United States Government now owns 500 prefabricated houses at Pryor, Okla., and approximately 16,000 acres of land used in conjunction with the operation of the ordnance works, on which are situated 65 dormitories capable of housing 2,500 people; and

Whereas upon the termination of the war, such property will be of no further use to the Government; and

Whereas it appears feasible to divide the lands above mentioned into small tracts and move said houses upon such premises, and sell the same to disabled exservice men and women and merchant marines; and

Whereas the area described herein is accessible to electric energy generated by the Pensacola and Grand River Dam projects, and the Markham Ferry Grand River Dam project; and

Whereas such area is at the foothills of the Ozarks and in close proximity to the Grand River, the Pensacola Grand River Dam, the Spavinaw Lake and reservoir, the Markham Ferry Dam and reservoir, and the Fort Gibson reservoir, making such area ideal from a recreational standpoint: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the senate concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That the United States Veterans' Administration and the Congress of the United States be and are hereby memoralized to investigate the feasibility of dividing into small tracts the lands owned by the Government of the United States of America, in the operation of the Oklahoma Ordnance Works, removing therefrom the houses at or near Pryor, Okla., now under the control of the Federal Housing Authority, and offering the same for sale for cost plus a low rate of interest on long-time payments to disabled ex-service men and women and merchant marines of World War I and II.

SEC. 2. That the secretary of the senate be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 10th day of April 1945.

JACK BRADLEY,
Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 25th day of April 1945.

HOMER PAUL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the song entitled "Tennessee," by Dr. A. D. Albright, of Knoxville, Tenn.:

TENNESSEE
(By A. D. Albright)

The russet shawl of morning
Proclaims her reveille:
Where else are mornings dawning
Like dawn in Tennessee?
The smell of rain, the hum of bees,
The glory of the sun;
And, oh, the homey sights we see
When noonday rest has come.

CHORUS

We're Volunteers, we're free with cheers
For all that's good, and brave, and true,
We're not concerned about your birth,
But we think much of "What are you?"

Horizon's band of opal
Above a purple rim,
Reminds us to be noble
And pay our vows to Him
Who set the stars, and nowhere brighter,
Kind Lord, how could they be?
And daily tasks are nowhere lighter
Than in sunny Tennessee.

And where is beauty fairer
Or chivalry more true?
And where are June days rarer
Or autumn skies so blue?
Where'er you be you cannot know
The thrills we hold in fee—
That days, and months, and years bestow
In sunny Tennessee.

Industry, commerce, farming,
Facilities for play,
And whippoorwill at dusk-time
Complete a perfect day.
The mocker, wren, and redbreast
So merrily sing to me
I feel next door to Heaven
When I'm in Tennessee.

Peace; It's Wonderful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on the floor today I called attention to the superlative job done by Governor Dewey, of New York, in settling the elevator strike in the Nation's greatest city. In the meantime other strikes go on because of the failure of the administration to take a firm stand. As I said today:

What is good for New York is good for the Nation.

Why not enlist Dewey's cooperation?

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from today's Washington News:

IT'S WONDERFUL

Ho, hum. We see that Sidney Hillman, over at the World Labor Conference in Paris, is demanding a place for labor in the United Nations Economic and Social Council plus labor representation on the Allied Control Council for Germany.

There can be no permanent peace, according to Mr. Hillman, unless labor sits in world councils.

Well, Mr. Hillman certainly is a great authority on labor's ability to make and preserve peace. Look at all the labor peace now raging in his own United States. Look at how his own organization, the CIO, is waging peace against the AFL and John L. Lewis. If world peace depends on Sidney, let's build some more atom-bomb plants.

Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on August 4, last, during the recent recess of Congress I was privileged to make a brief statement on full employment over the American Broadcasting System. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Involuntary unemployment must not be tolerated in the postwar world if we hope to prevent another depression. When the Government stops buying the products of farm and factory for the purposes of war, we shall be face to face with another collapse unless we undertake by constructive and intelligent action, to provide full employment. All business, all agriculture, all industry depend upon it. For if people cannot purchase the goods and the services the Nation is capable of producing, business will go into another tailspin.

The last depression cost the businessmen of America $355,000,000,000 in sales. It cost

farmers billions in income and corporations billions in profit. The loss caused by the depression was actually far greater than the war debt which has now reached more than $260,000,000,000.

The full employment bill, of which I am happy to be one of the sponsors, is not a bill to provide only industrial jobs. It is a bill to prevent a business depression.

It rests upon the firm basis of fact that the best market for the businessmen of America is to be found among the people at the bottom of the economic scale.

The total income of those who, in 1944, received less than $2,000 a year was three times greater than the total income of everybody who received $10,000 a year or more. There were more than 32,000,000 persons receiving less than $2,000 a year and only 575,000 receiving more than $10,000. Obviously the 32,000,000, if they are steadily employed, can buy more food, more clothing, even more luxuries than those at the top of the economic scale, for the 32,000,000 at the bottom have a total income vastly greater than the total income of those at the top.

The economic history of the country proves that every war has been followed by a depression. The full employment bill is a bill to prevent a depression after this war.

Industry acting alone has never in the past been able to prevent depressions. Government must now assume the responsibility, not be regimenting the people but by coordinating all economic activity so that opportunities for employment shall be extended to every person capable and willing to work.

Foreign Relations of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher and editor of the Chicago Tribune, on the 2d of October, before the Washington Advertising Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

About everybody is talking about creating employment. The President is concerned about it. The gentlemen on the Hill are writing laws. Secretaries of manufacturing associations are issuing releases on the subject, but the job, if it is done, must be done by you men.

Manufacturers can only manufacture as much as the public demands. That demand can only be created by advertising. That you will create such a demand I have not the least doubt, in spite of all the interference you will have from crackpots here and in New York mostly.

I have known Washington for 50 or more years. I was at President McKinley's first inaugural, but what I remember more vividly was the day the *Maine* was blown up on February 15, 1898.

Through my grandfather, Joseph Medill, I met a large number of the statesmen of that day, including President McKinley and Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt.

MONROE DOCTRINE ESTABLISHED

Away back then, Washington was the American Capital of the upstart Republic which had conducted a successful revolution from its proprietor, and then had argued, threatened, and fought its way to the Pacific.

The influence of its revolution brought about the revolutions in Central and South America. To protect these revolutions, it had established the Monroe Doctrine, which said:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting that the American continents are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

The guaranteeing of the American continents against encroachment by foreign monarchies was a logical enlargement of the union of the States.

FIRST MORAL FOREIGN POLICY

It was also the first moral foreign policy in the world, and I think the only moral foreign policy the world has ever known.

In upholding this Monroe Doctrine, the Republic had forced France from Mexico, had kept England out of California; had compelled her to give up the Mosquito coast; and only 2 years before, in the Venezuela case, President Cleveland had used this threatening language:

"It will, in my opinion, be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power, as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela.

"In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibilities incurred and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow."

BRITISH CLAIM DENIED

In view of all this, the claim that it was the British Fleet that upheld the Monroe Doctrine is obvious falsehood.

In the dispute over Samoa, the American commissioners had found Bismarck overbearing and cabled about his irascibility. Blaine promptly replied: "The extent of the Chancellor's irritability is not the measure of American rights."

Great ill feeling had been incurred in Italy when the United States Government declared itself unable to punish the Louisiana lynchers of some Italian banditti.

At the moment, Americans were giving great aid to the Cuban insurrectionists, and America was preparing to intervene.

EUROPEAN POWERS PRESS UNITED STATES

England, France, Denmark, and Holland, holding islands in the Caribbean, had not welcomed insurrections among other island subject peoples, nor American support of them. Holland and Denmark were too small to fish in troubled waters, but the Ambassadors of those outstanding democracies, Great Britain and France, joined those of Germany, Russia, Italy, and Austria-Hungary in calling in a body to coerce President McKinley. Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador, under the personal instruction of Queen Victoria, handed to the President a joint note from the European concert.

ISSUES OF REFORM UNTOUCHED

The maintenance of peace, the reestablishment of order in Cuba, were accentuated, but neither reform of existing tyrannies nor the freedom of the Cuban people was mentioned—conditions which have not been accorded to their own subject peoples in the nearly 50 years which have ensued since then.

The atmosphere at that time was not propitious for fraternization between the embassies and missions of the foreign monarchies and the people of Washington. It never had been. These diplomats had continuously considered the United States not only as a threat to their imperial ambitions in this hemisphere and in the Pacific but to their institutions at home, and as aristocrats looked down upon and treated with hauteur the American commoner, whom they termed "the common Americans," while the Americans, confident of their superior form of government and superior civilization, ignored the royalist pretensions.

WAR WITH SPAIN DECLARED

President McKinley, the last of a long line of great American diplomats, made a diplomatic reply to the concert of Europe, but a few days later Congress declared that war had existed with Spain since April 21.

What the European concert might have done if the war had been confined to the Caribbean will never be known, because, before they had reached a common attitude, Admiral Dewey won the Battle of Manila Bay on May 1 and broke the concert of Europe as neutrons fission plutonium.

On May 19 Cervera's fleet entered Santiago and was blockaded by the American squadron under Admiral Sampson. General Shafter's army landed at Daiquiri on June 22, won the preliminary skirmish of Las Guasimas, and took San Juan and Kettle Hills on July 1. This forced Cervera's fleet to leave the harbor on July 3 to be annihilated.

Soon afterward General Merritt took Manila and General Miles captured Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES VICTORIES STUN WORLD

Such complete victories, at such distant places, and so soon after the declaration of war, stunned the world.

Verily, the upstart had become a giant.

The European monarchies reacted in two ways: First, they organized a campaign to minimize the American military achievements, which, I regret to say, was aided by jealousies in our Army command and in the Navy by the bitter Sampson-Schley controversy.

Time has shown that the criticisms were unjust. The alleged crowding and disorganization on the transports came at a time when maritime expeditions were unknown and the standards of comparison were those of private travel.

YANK TACTICS FIT WEAPONS

Since then we have had the South African war and the great World Wars, which have shown that to transport armies speedily, either by sea or by land, conditions intolerable to private travel are unavoidable. The Army suffered from the then not understood diseases of typhoid and yellow fever, and also discovered their causes and their prevention. As to tactics, the old Civil War generals and Indian fighters had accommodated them to the new weapons better than the English in Africa 2 years later or the European armies in 1914.

Having put the Republic in its place by propaganda, there began a great competition to win its support. Stately embassies were raised in Washington and summer embassies at the fashionable resorts. The practice of sending royalty to flatter our democratic sensibilities was begun. An attitude of polite disdain was succeeded by one of kindly condescension to American millionaires. The response was instantaneous. The opinion soon gained ground that Americans could shine in the reflected glory of European aristocrats and become, as it were, a subordinate aristocracy superior to other Americans.

BRITISH LAY DOWN RULES

We had little merchant shipping to transport troops. British ships were offered on the sole condition that we would send only infantry and machine gunners.

The First Division, which was hurried to France at the request of Marshal Joffre, arrived on July 4 and went into training. I then was attached to the First Field Artillery

Brigade, and as somewhat of a French scholar, was used to assist the French teachers of the school of fire. I thus learned that instruction was to be furnished only up to the battery commander—that the American regiments were to operate their own supply systems, but that all tactical orders were to come from the French command.

In order to refresh my memory on these events, I have recently reread the memoirs of Generals Pershing, Harbord, and Dawes. I was reminded that where Clemenceau and also Foch insisted on commanding Americans, Joffre and Petain accepted our point of view.

PERSHING PROVED RIGHT

The correctness of Pershing's insistence was amply proved when, in a year of general Allied defeats, the Americans suffered not one set-back.

The tide was turned at Cantigny, Chateau-Thierry, and Belleau Wood, which battles have received some acclaim but I have never seen anything published about the activities of the First Division in the defense of Amiens or of Montdidier.

Our allies never gave us credit for the five terrible days at Soissons when the First and Second Divisions broke the German Army, which elsewhere had been stopped by American divisions at the Marne. The outstanding victory at St. Mihiel was explained away, while the determination and heroism of the Argonne, which won the war, have been generally disputed.

ERA OF EUROPEAN COLLAPSE

As we know, the Russian Empire fell in 1917, the German and Austrian Empires in 1918, the Italian Monarchy in 1922, and the Spanish Kingdom in 1931.

For the last 15 years, lovers of democracy could find kindly condescension in only one embassy. This, of course, was the top patron; however, the habit of looking up to foreigners and looking down on Americans had become so well established that champagne and caviar at the embassy of the Soviets have become as exhilarating as the same confections when set out by the ambassador of a crowned emperor. This delusion became so much of an obsession that indignation was not only expressed, but really felt against Americans who loved their country first.

It fell so low as to try to blacken the Nation's air hero, Charles Lindbergh, whose great technical accomplishments and battle achievements still are kept under a cloud by the Navy censorship. People in authority felt their responsibilities were to foreigners and their duty was to control Americans to that end.

INTERNATIONALISTS SURGE TO CAPITAL

Millionaires from the mines, the marts of trade, and the gambling markets swarmed to Washington. Most of the great private houses in town were built at that time, and gave the internationalist movement the economic support of a real-estate and building boom.

Styles were set in the embassies and social position in America was fixed by their favor. International marriages tied American families to the nations of the bridegrooms. Graduates of our more polished universities became career diplomats to hobnob with their European confreres.

In official life, they introduced the protocol, which substituted the European social hierarchy for American equality and made officialdom consider itself the master, not the servant, of the people.

SNOBBERY RIDES APACE

Some Americans, unable to reach the residential apex of Washington and Newport snobbery, did their best by joining various exclusive hyphenated organizations.

From 1914 to 1917 the war on the battlefields of Europe also was carried on in the drawing rooms of Washington. That there might be an American point of view and an American interest was ignored on Connecticut Avenue as it was on Park Avenue. Nobody in official life raised a voice in the American interest at the peace conference.

After our entrance into the war, our Navy became a squadron of the British Fleet in Scapa Flow. National Guard troops were called out for training. The Regular Army regiments were broken into cadres that were to become five regular divisions in France, and a draft law was enacted.

ALLIES TRY TO GRAB ARMY

Before our declaration of war on Germany, the British and French in Washington, of course, had worked in harmony. After our declaration, they broke over the question as to whether the English or the French were to command the Americans.

The British plan was that our soldiers should be incorporated as recruits in the British Army. The French plan was for artillery batteries and infantry regiments to serve in French divisions. How public opinion here divided I do not know, as I was not here, but the bulk of the Americans in Paris favored the French. There was, however, a not inconsiderable fraction, including the diplomats, that took to the British idea.

To the American colony in Paris, the suggestion that American officers from Texas or the Philippines and unfashionable West Point could command large bodies of troops was unthinkable. I know, because I was on Pershing's staff part of the time and began those more or less acrimonious arguments with American diplomat among others, of which I am sure this is not the last.

ALIENS TAKE THE HELM

It is no secret that in the late thirties American generals and admirals were not the advisers to their respective departments. The much criticized tank was not designed to American specifications, nor were the fleet dispositions in 1941 those that had been made by American admirals.

With the outbreak of the war, control of the Southwest Pacific was put under General Wavell, who took from the Philippines bomber planes badly needed for the defense of Bataan; and our western Pacific fleet was annihilated under command of a Dutch admiral, while the principal squadron of three American and two Australian heavy cruisers, to protect the landing at Guadalcanal, was surprised and sunk under the British Admiral Crutchley.

VICTORIES WHEN UNITED STATES TAKES HOLD

Across the Atlantic, our only check, at Kasserine Pass (North Africa), was with our troops under foreign command. The blunders in Italy were not American blunders. The landing in Normandy was under command of General Montgomery, and General Bradley's famous break-through at St. Lo came only after the original plan of campaign had failed. Thereafter all the victories, offensive and defensive, in France, Belgium, and Germany were exclusively American victories.

The panics and routs on land and sea in the Pacific were not stopped until MacArthur assumed the command on land and American admirals the command at sea. All of the important land and naval victories in that ocean were American victories. All the distinguished admirals and generals in this war are Americans.

The glory of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators has astounded the world.

It will be impossible to explain away these victories as the victories of 1898 and 1918 were explained away, and there will never again—thank God—be a class of groveling, obsequious snobs, who will seek to be better than other Americans by admitting inferiority to foreigners.

Atomic Bomb Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a splendid article from Collier's magazine regarding the atomic bomb and national research.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC BOMB LESSON

It is hard to think of anything that could have dramatized more forcefully the need for a national scientific research policy, as advocated by Dr. Vannevar Bush and numerous others, than the loosing by United States forces of the atom bomb on Japan.

Dr. Bush heads the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which had a large hand in the $2,000,000,000 research gamble whereby the Allies won the race for the atom bomb. He is also the author of a plan for putting scientific research on an organized, businesslike, year-in-year-out, well-financed basis. It may seem far fetched at the moment to say so, but it is possible that this plan or something like it will prove more important in the long run than the development of the atom bomb.

Anyway, what Bush wants the Government to do is to set up a National Research Foundation, which would deal out money to medical and other research centers whose work contributes in any way to the public welfare or the defense of the Nation.

(Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, has, in fact, introduced a bill for the establishment of a National Research Foundation, carrying out recommendations in Dr. Bush's report to President Truman.)

This foundation would not be allowed in any way to monkey with the research centers' policies or personnel—a prohibition which Dr. Bush considers of top importance to the success of the plan. Wartime controls and official powers over private industries' research departments, he also believes, should be removed as fast as possible. "We must * * * recover freedom in inquiry and that healthy competitive scientific spirit so necessary for expansion of the frontiers of scientific knowledge."

A major detail of the Bush recommendations is that the proposed National Research Foundation establish 24,000 scholarships in scientific institutions of learning, and 900 postgraduate fellowships.

That would cost about $30,000,000 a year. But since October 1940, this country, unlike the other allied nations, has refused to draft-defer young men of demonstrated scientific talent. The result is that, unless we do something about it, we face what Secretary Charles L. Parsons, of the American Chemical Society, calls the loss of an entire generation of scientists.

Bush may not have the full prescription for all these ills and threatened ills. But at least he has a detailed plan—and a plan, it should be emphasized, which contemplates research for peacetime progress and the public welfare as well as research to keep us abreast of all developments in weapons of war.

The Germans were far behind us in the race for the atom bomb, but they beat us to the development of the jet-propelled fighter plane. It was talked quietly around among observers last winter and spring that if the

Germans could throw an operational force of 1,000 jets onto the western front they could nullify Allied air superiority until the allies could counter the jets somehow, and thus prolong the war.

It was the persistent bombing of German factories, railroads, and oil plants that wiped out that menace, by keeping the Germans from assembling sufficient jet planes and putting them in the air. But it was not until August 1, 1945, almost 3 months after Germany surrendered that our Army Air Forces could unveil the P-80 jet fighter in its 526-miles-per-hour flight from Dayton to New York.

A strong Navy and air force and a system of universal training for war (not in the traditional military sense, but including, besides some military education, training in industry and science) look like the keystones of our national-defense structure. Equally important will be systematic research in the art and science of war, until such time as war is definitely eliminated from the earth. We hope the United Nations World Security Organization may accomplish that result in time. But it hasn't yet done so, or got well started toward doing so.

Congress will have a lot of important jobs on its hands. We don't know of a single more important job than the setting up of a comprehensive national scientific research policy.

Declaration of Policy and Program by American Food Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very excellent statement of principles and policies of the American Plant Food Council, of which the Honorable CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, a distinguished Member of the House, is president, and Hon. Harry B. Caldwell, master of the Grange of North Carolina, is secretary and treasurer.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PLANT FOOD COUNCIL, INC.,
September 26, 1945.

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PROGRAM

A stable and efficient agriculture must be based on soil maintenance and improvement. Good soil management and efficient crop production depend upon many practices, including good rotations, the use of lime and manures, the control of erosion, and proper use of commercial plant food.

The American Plant Food Council recognizes and advocates the various practices that make for efficient soil management. Its chief responsibility relates to supplying the needs of American farmers for commercial plant food.

The council recognizes the industry's obligation to supply the right kinds and amounts of fertilizer to farmers of the United States at the lowest price consistent with efficient management and reasonable profits. The council will use its influence to assure the production and use of the right kind and amount of fertilizer to foster a sound system of farming and will support the following policies and program:

1. Encourage the production and distribution of an abundant supply of plant food for all agricultural needs through private industry[1] by—

A. Ascertaining needs from State and Federal agricultural agencies and the possible demand, including needs for research and demonstrational purposes;

B. Supplying this information to all branches of the industry so that the production capacity will be fully adequate and properly distributed geographically to meet all needs economically;

C. Maintaining free access to sources of plant food materials without discrimination as to prices and other factors for all branches of private industry.

2. Encourage the efficient utilization and conservation of our potash, phosphate, and other mineral plant food deposits so that future national needs will be fully safeguarded by:

A. Encouraging the exploration and evaluation of the phosphate, potash, and other mineral plant food deposits by both Government and private industry;

B. Cooperating with Federal and State agencies in the periodic review of our plant food resources and demand situation and the dissemination of this information;

C. Encouraging research to assure non-wasteful mining and efficient processing of the plant food resources;

D. Continuing the traditional American policy of duty free imports of all fertilizer materials.

3. Encourage the development and use of improved methods in producing, blending, and distributing fertilizers so that plant food will be available to farmers at the lowest possible cost by:

A. Encouraging and supporting a research program by both private industry and Government to evaluate and demonstrate new materials and to develop improved methods for producing, blending, and distributing plant food to farmers;

B. Encouraging joint action by State agencies to standardize grades and promote the use of the most economical and efficient fertilizers;

C. Encouraging the further elimination of all unnecessary practices which tend to raise plant food costs to farmers;

D. Continuing the traditional practice of the industry to supply plant food to farmers at low cost by passing on the savings resulting from advances in technology.

4. Encourage and support the agricultural research, educational, and control agencies by:

A. Supporting agronomic and economic research on all phases of crop production and soil improvement;

B. Cooperating with the agricultural educational agencies in encouraging the use of officially recommended fertilizers and fertilizer practices;

C. Giving all possible aid to the public agencies in the collection and dissemination of statistics relating to plant food production and consumption;

D. Cooperating with the State agencies in the development of improved uniform State fertilizer control laws and regulations;

E. Observing fertilizer control laws to assure full compliance with quality standards and supporting their impartial enforcement.

5. Cooperate with farmers and their organizations in developing policies designed to place agriculture upon a satisfactory, self-sustaining basis. The council recognizes:

A. The importance of soil management practices and of maintaining the productivity of our soil resources, thereby providing for stable and efficient production;

B. The need for changes in the systems of farming in some regions and has the desire to cooperate with farmers and Government in bringing about beneficial adjustments.

6. Urge fertilizer manufacturers, dealers, and agents to fully understand and support recommendations for crops, soil management practices, and fertilizer use within their respective areas as developed in the recognized findings of scientific research. The council will therefore:

A. Keep the industry fully informed regarding official fertilizer recommendations and the result of research on the use of plant food;

B. Promote by the most effective means the education of dealers, agents, sellers, and handlers of plant foods in the proper use of fertilizers and other desirable agricultural practices under the direction of State agricultural colleges and experiment stations;

C. Invite frequent conferences with college and Government agronomists and control officials.

[1] Includes farmer-owned and -controlled cooperatives.

Insurance Journal Comments on Southeastern Underwriters' Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a year ago the insurance press of the country was practically a unit in criticizing the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Southeastern Underwriters' Association case. My attention has just been called to an interesting editorial from the Insurance Field, a well-known trade paper, devoted to the activities of the insurance industry. In the editorial the statement is made that "It becomes increasingly clear as time marches on that the SEUA decision may eventually turn out to be a blessing in disguise." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL REGULATION—LET'S FACE IT NOW

From all of the studies of the impact of the SEUA decision on the insurance business one thing is gradually being conceded by most thoughtful executives and insurance counsel. It is that Federal regulation cannot be entirely divorced from the future picture. And some are coming around to the view that complete divorcement would not even be desirable.

While the all-industry committee is analyzing the Federal antitrust laws, it would not be a bad thing for all of us to burn a little midnight oil in an effort to determine just what function the Federal Government should perform. What could the Federal Government best do in the public interest, leaving the rest of the supervisory and regulatory powers and functions to the various States?

We have a real quick answer, and it isn't original with us either. Even though (outside of the fire and casualty mutuals and reciprocals) the insurance industry has a glowing record of solvency and financial prowess; right there perhaps is the place for

Federal regulation both in the interests of the business and in the interests of the insuring public. If there is a weak link in the State supervision machinery today (and few will deny that there aren't many) it certainly is in the examination of the companies and the various rules, regulations, and State statutes relating to financial statements and other financial matters. State insurance department examiners, for the most part, are notoriously ill-equipped for that work. The system is costly and one which most insurance company executives will tell you, in private, is all too frequently meaningless. Many, costing thousands of dollars, are actually ludicrous.

And what is more important to an insured than the solvency of the carriers underwriting his protection? Uniform accounting procedure, for example, is generally considered highly desirable. It is also considered highly improbable of achievement under any system of state supervision.

Those who raise their hands in horror at any semblance of Federal regulation of the insurance business, believing that an opening wedge will result in Government ownership, are, to our minds, jumping at their own shadows. It becomes increasingly clear as time marches on that the SEUA decision may eventually turn out to be a blessing in disguise if for no other reason than that it presents to the entire business an opportunity, or rather an ultimatum, to redesign its procedures and recodify its regulations to the end that the public will be better served.

THE FEDERATION IS THE ANSWER

With all the talk about unity of thought and action in our business, it becomes increasingly apparent that the various factions are split farther apart than ever before. It is our contention that real unity can never be achieved through any looseknit all-industry set-up. It must be through a permanent federation of insurance. The sooner insurance leaders recognize that fact and act accordingly, the sooner will the industry as a whole solve its all-industry problems.

Evidence of the truth of that assertion may be found by studying the results of State insurance federations where they have really had broad-gaged and visionary leadership. The Insurance Federation of the State of Pennsylvania is a good example. The business needs a more solid base for its all-industry activity.

A Middleport, Ohio, Soldier a Great Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Pfc Edward Bennett, a resident of the district which I am proud to represent, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

At a great celebration held in his honor in his home town of Middleport, Ohio, he, with the modesty of a real hero, said that seeing his wife and children was a greater thrill than winning the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Army sources report that when Bennett's company was being pinned down by machine-gun fire from a house near Heckuschied, Germany, Bennett crawled to the rear of the house where he killed a sentry with a trench knife. He followed this up by entering the house where he killed three of the seven German gunners with his rifle. When his rifle jammed he slugged a fourth to death and then killed the three others with his pistol.

He was a veritable one-man army. His comment when he had finished the job was "I just got mad and I just went up after them. I didn't know much about what happened until afterward."

Bennett went away to the Army and left his wife and babies just as many other American soldiers have done. He performed nobly and risked his life for his country and came back to receive the plaudits of a grateful people. The celebration in his honor was an opportunity for the people of a patriotic community to show their appreciation for the splendid work which their home boy had done as well as the splendid work that many other boys and girls in that community have done in this great war.

His wife, Thelma, and his little daughters, Mary Louise and Elaine Ruth, were proud to welcome home their own personal hero.

Splitting Up of the Aluminum Co. of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial entitled "Dubious Road to Competition," which appeared in the American Metal Market, New York, on Friday, September 21, 1945:

DUBIOUS ROAD TO COMPETITION

United States Attorney General Tom C. Clark, in his report to Congress recommending the splitting up of the Aluminum Co. of America into a number of smaller scattered concerns competing against each other, declared that Government-financed and -owned aluminum plants, most of them built and operated by Alcoa, do not enjoy as low production costs as do Alcoa's private plants in the United States and the Shipshaw-powered plant in Canada, and that on the basis of Government plants alone, independent operators could not survive in a competitive struggle with Alcoa.

The Aluminum Co. of America, in its reply to the Attorney General's assertions, hold that the report "is an argument for Government subsidies to operators of Government-owned aluminum plants." Subsidies, the company stated, whether they take the form of outright grants of the taxpayer's money, discriminatory power rates or other form of discriminatory Federal aid, are inexcusable.

The company further held that its dissolution as recommended to Congress by the Attorney General would destroy property values running into millions of dollars owned by many small investors and in an unusually large proportion by religious, educational, and charitable institutions, as well as insurance companies. And, the company contended, the Attorney General's proposal would be directly contrary to the findings of courts in which the issue has already been tried. "The district court," the Alcoa statement set forth, "found that the United States was the best served aluminum market in the world and that the dissolution of Alcoa would not be in the public interest."

We believe the district court's opinion holds the essence of the controversy now being reaired by Attorney General Clark, who is endeavoring in one survey to make a full appraisal of the true relationship to the public interest of one of the outstanding industrial organizations of the world. The question may arise as to the value of such opinion in an extra-legal sense, since the Attorney General's survey indicated there is no "punitive atomization of Alcoa contemplated." What, then, is his purpose in proposing the dissolutior of an industrial energy that has so long and so effectively served this Nation and other nations over the past 57 years?

As we interpret his report, he assumes the aluminum industry of this country would become more competitive if the Alcoa company were broken up into smaller units, self-integrated, and forced to compete with each other; and that new interests would take over Government-owned war-born facilities and add to the competitive ranks of aluminum producers. But the Attorney General, at the same time, deplores the fact that the Aluminum Co. of America can now undersell operators of Government-owned aluminum plants. How would the Attorney General undertake to have those plants run at costs sufficiently low to make aluminum a more competitive industry? His answer seems a little vague, as presented in his recommendations to Congress.

The Aluminum Co. of America is represented by the Attorney General as holding a monopoly on the aluminum industry. Is this now true? The Alcoa plants today are said to account for 36 percent of the Nation's capacity, versus 57 percent controlled by the Government (RFC), and 7 percent by Reynolds Metals Co. All leases held by the Aluminum Co. of America on Government-owned plants producing alumina and ingots are being canceled by the RFC, a step taken on recommendation of the Surplus Property Board to "create competition in the aluminum industry."

Mr. Clark's report also pictured the vast possioilities of aluminum's use in various consumptive fields, this phase of the survey apparently being to build up a case for prompt engagement of some of the aluminum plant capacity constructed with Federal funds to meet the war requirements.

As is the case with many other Government surveys, there can be no quarrel with the general aims of giving the public a better break. But the means to attain those general aims are usually inconsistent with sound economic growth. Mr. Clark's survey implies primarily the need for greater competition among aluminum producers, with the end that cheaper aluminum might find its way into more markets. But his proposal merely skims the surface of the problem, for there are competitive factors outside the aluminum industry to be reckoned with, such as price advantage now held by other metals, manufacturing equipment and methods now adaptable only to the use of other metals, consumer preferences, etc. These competitive factors, at the same time, may continue to serve to accelerate further technological developments in aluminum and to spur the industry to greater production efficiencies and improved service to the end that the public interest will be the better served.

The dubious road to such competition routed by Mr. Clark apparently disregards those intercompetitive factors of other metals and the gradual, tedious battle constantly being waged in laboratories toward greater application of available metals.

The United States, the record seems to be clear, did not suffer for want of aluminum for long after the war started, in spite of the

fact that at the outset of the war in 1941 there were only the Aluminum Co. of America and the Reynolds Metals Co. in the field. It can truthfully be said that at no time during the war was there an actual shortage of aluminum metal. It is true that there were shortages where aircraft manufacturers changed their designs, with attendant shortages in forgings and extruded shapes. But the record stands that no other metal industry's production skyrocketed as quickly as that of the aluminum industry in the war.

And when the war began, the Aluminum Co. of America enlisted its vast wealth of know-how in the primary interest of serving the Nation. It built eight of the nine aluminum metal-producing plants for the Government, "without fee or profit to itself," and, in addition, put up and expended for its own facilities a total of $300,000,000 primarily to meet the war requirements, going the virtual limit of its financial resources to augment the Government-financed expansions.

In addition to being a dubious route to competition in aluminum, the Attorney General's proposal to dissolve the Aluminum Co. of America into small, competing concerns seems to be a signally dangerous prescription to remedy a vaguely diagnosed ailment. There is still room for initiative and competition in any industry in this country. If, meanwhile, some of our industrial organizations have grown to giant size, it is partly because they grew with the Nation. Penalty for abuse in using industrial might is one thing; penalty for merely being "big" is another.

Is Mr. Clark cloaking the main issue in his proposal? In our opinion, he fails miserably to overshadow the opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals, which in substituting for the Supreme Court stated that dissolution of the Aluminum Co. of America should take place only as a last resort because otherwise "it will be a disservice to break up an aggregation which has for so long demonstrated its efficiency."

President Truman Endorses St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Harry S. Truman sent a message to Congress calling for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. He makes the sixth President of the United States to endorse this development. He is to be congratulated upon his forthright statement that this is one of the great projects of the world and that it is feasible and economically desirable.

Just as a matter of history, President Herbert Hoover said about the same thing and the matter stopped there. His political enemies stated very frankly that the prestige and power of his important office could have been used to bring about a treaty while he was President of the United States. They also stated that the matter, so far as the President was concerned, was just another political football.

The late President Roosevelt expressed about the same views as President Truman in connection with the seaway project. Likewise, Roosevelt's political enemies stated that the prestige and power of his important political office could have been used to bring about the ratification of an agreement with Canada while he was President of the United States. True, when the war started, the administration used the war as an excuse for postponing the St. Lawrence seaway and power development. They also stated that the matter so far as Roosevelt was concerned was just another political football.

This recital of facts is not pleasant, but we may just as well keep the records straight, and unless administration leaders who handle these matters for President Truman carry out his plans, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will stop right where it started on October 3 in the year of our Lord 1945.

The opposition is powerful and has always been able to stand in the way of progress in connection with this matter which would add to the wealth of America for the benefit of the American people. If you do not believe it, take time to read the hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives in 1941. You will be interested to note the long list of witnesses who opposed this project. Then note their background and their reasons for this opposition.

This project will succeed if the full force and the power of the administration (and not lip service) is turned loose on Capitol Hill in support of the project.

This matter is not a political or a partisan proposition. No political party has a monopoly on any program that will benefit the American people.

Every American citizen who wants to develop the natural resources of the United States will endorse the President's message which was delivered to us yesterday. His message is sound and constructive and his arguments in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project cannot be successfully challenged.

All of us can contribute to the success of this program by carrying on a campaign of education so that the American people may be informed as to what this development means to them, and the need for prompt action in Congress in connection with this subject.

Sugar and Beer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable said in reference to the use of sugar by the brewing industry and statements have been made which contain figures that are certainly not based on facts.

I have been informed that Herbert J. Charles, president of the United States Brewers' Foundation, asked John E. O'Neill, Chief of the Brewing Section of the War Food Administration, for some figures. Here is what Mr. O'Neill wrote:

We find that during April 1945, the brewing industry consumed 184,690 pounds of rationed sugar. Assuming April 1945 to be a normal month insofar as sugar is concerned and applying the usual seasonal indexes, it appears, based upon April operations, that the brewing industry uses approximately 2,209,200 pounds of sugar annually.

This is only 1,100 tons.

The total United States consumption of cane and beet sugar for 1943, latest year for which figures are given, was 5,895,000 tons. The amount used by the brewing industry accordingly represented one five-thousandths of that total.

Dry propagandists, that is, the type whose "facts and figgers" appeal to some, had been saying "the brewers got 144,877,697 pounds of sugar per year while the housewives are denied the usual amount necessary for canning fruit." That is far from the 2,209,000 pounds the brewers actually got.

The One Great Issue: Can the Atom-Bomb War Be Prevented—H. R. 4014

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday in the Washington Post appeared the column of Merlo Pusey under the heading "Secrecy of weapons should be abolished." It is one of the most intelligent and best balanced discussions of the world's No. 1 problem that I have read and I am asking consent that it be printed herewith in the RECORD. It is natural that I should agree with what he says since I introduced in the House H. R. 4014 which is the companion bill to the bill of Senator MCMAHON to which Mr. Pusey makes reference and gives commendation.

SECRECY OF WEAPONS SHOULD BE ABOLISHED
(By Merlo Pusey)

What shall we do with the atomic bomb? Discussion of that subject is spinning so fast and furiously and gathering so much confusion as it goes that it seems almost a crime to give it further momentum. Since it is the biggest issue that the world is likely to face in the next decade, however, any effort to strip it down to fundamentals should be welcomed.

Much of the discussion has gone askew, in my opinion, because it is directed to the question of giving away the atomic bomb secret. That question arouses emotions and obscures the more basic issues. It could assume great significance only if we were trying to halt research and further development of atomic power and to induce all other peoples to do likewise. But no one I know of is thinking seriously of any such proposal.

The general assumption is that science will now move heaven and earth to harness atomic power, as it previously harnessed electric power, for industrial and commercial uses. This necessarily means that atom splitting will be brought into the light of day. Senator MCMAHON hit the nail on the

head last week when he asked "How in the name of common sense could we make any peacetime use of it and keep it secret anyway?"

We must start, then, with the fact that if this knowledge is to be utilized for the benefit of mankind, it cannot be hidden under a bushel. Secrecy would imply that atomic power should be reserved for destructive purposes only. I think Senator McMAHON is 100-percent right in assuming that the American people would never tolerate such a policy. Even if it were possible to prevent other nations not now sharing the secret from obtaining it, which it is not, the idea of bottling up the formula for release of atomic energy over any extensive period of time must be discarded.

But the argument on the other side—that we should hasten to give away the atomic bomb secret—is equally untenable. Suppose we should open our files and equipment to inspection by Russian, French, and Chinese experts tomorrow and impart to them everything we know about atomic power. Would such blind generosity automatically prevent other countries from using atomic power against us? Of course not! The result would probably be to give the Russians, for example, more knowledge than we have, for they would add all the information developed here to the data assembled through their own independent research.

Instead of talking loosely about giving our secret away, therefore, we ought to be using it in this period of its novelty to minimize the dangers of future atomic warfare. Senator McMAHON has the best formula I have seen. What his bill proposes is the abolition of military secrecy among the United Nations. The governments in possession of the atomic bomb secret would turn it over to the Security Council in return for all the information the other nations possess on weapons of war.

Of course, the agreement would have to be applicable to future discoveries as well as present knowledge. It would create a common pool of military information among the great powers. The next logical step would be an agreement forbidding the use of atomic weapons in any possible future war, as use of poison gas is now forbidden by international convention, or, if that should prove impossible, rigidly limiting the manufacture of atomic weapons.

The key to future world security must necessarily be, however, the lifting of all secrecy as to weapons among the armed powers. It is to be assumed that Germany and Japan will be kept disarmed. But in the absence of internationalization of atomic information and controls, all of the other big powers will probably be in a position a decade hence to wipe out their neighbors, even distant neighbors, without warning. Without a common pool of military information and a rational understanding among them, the only feasible course for any one of them would be intensive research and large-scale production of weapons infinitely more deadly than the bombs which laid Hiroshima and Nagasaki low.

Secrecy would goad each nation to the utmost efforts to avoid possible annihilation. Russia is said to be already whipping up her scientific research in feverish haste. Unless we can succeed in bringing about an open defense system among the United Nations, we shall not know whether the atomic bombs Russia is certain to develop will be more powerful than our own. We shall live in fear and distrust, as every other people must. The logical outcome of such a state of tension would be an earth-shaking attack by the nation suffering from the greatest fear complex.

The least we can work for in these circumstances is an open defense system, with the Security Council regularly inspecting all military establishments and all sources of information on new weapons. It would be futile and self-defeating to ask more. And to trade our secret for less would leave the world without a foundation on which future security could be built.

Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, America has progressed from a few struggling colonies to the most powerful nation in the world. Under the American system we have established the highest standard of living the world has ever known. We possess over 50 percent of the world's telephones, 75 percent of the world's automobiles, and over 60 percent of the world's gold. We pay the highest wage rates and we spend more for education than all of the other nations in the world combined. We have built the finest roads and parks in the world. We have better sanitation and more of the world's comforts than any other nation.

The American system of free competition and private enterprise is better than anything that has been offered as a substitute. Our system is not perfect but it is responsive to the demands of progress and to the requirements of the common welfare. It has made mistakes but it has not failed to correct its methods when the right remedy was found.

We have American political and religious freedom, assurance to the common man that opportunity is rich and free; that each may go as far and climb as high as his abilities can carry him.

The world points with envy to the American system. The universal opportunity for all has made our Republic the marvel of the age. We made the people the master of the State, and the Government his servant; we said there should be equal opportunity for all, to the end that the poorest boy in the land might rightfully and hopefully aspire to its highest offices and richest rewards.

Why has America been a haven for seekers of freedom and opportunity from all the world? Why does every country want to borrow money from the United States? You know the answer. It is because we have the greatest system on earth.

While this picture in America makes our hearts swell with pride, yet a searching analysis reveals a danger demanding immediate action. The "reds," "pinks," and "punks" are making a direct attack upon the American form of government and the American way of life. Millions of printed pages of subversive propaganda is calculated to develop religious, racial, and class hatred between groups of citizens in the United States. This propaganda drive is meant to create disunity. These individuals and groups have tried to smear General MacArthur, one of our leading military officials. They accuse President Truman of being an imperialist.

Many of the subversive individuals have entered the motion-picture industry, the labor unions, schools and colleges, churches, and other organizations. They would like to take over the radios, labor unions, movie industry, and business. They want to destroy our form of government.

These reds are not going to fool the American workingmen. Jobs in foreign lands do not compare in wages or working conditions with similar jobs in the United States. Knowing this, the laboring people of America are not going to sit idly by and let these Reds take over America. No; too many American workers own their homes, hold Federal bonds and insurance, and enjoy the many freedoms of America.

These Reds are not going to fool the American farmers. Our farmers know too much about regimentation. They will not succumb to this Red propaganda. Their forefathers left the Old World in order to enjoy religious freedom and to get away from regimentation.

No; these Reds are not going to fool the people of America, who through free competition and private enterprise, have developed the highest level of individual possession in all the world. Our people know that our system is capable of high production and full employment which does not require Federal control and regimentation. Businessmen are now making every effort to stop the fake propaganda drive that there is a reconversion unemployment crisis in America. Businessmen in America know that while thousands have been laid off at closed war plants, the Nation is in the midst of an acute labor shortage. Manufacturing, service industries, and agriculture are desperately in need of new workers. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs at good pay that are only waiting for men who want to work.

Now it makes no difference to us what kind of a system they have in England, Russia, and China. That is their business. But it does make a difference what kind of a system we have in the United States. That is our business. America has no place for an individual who places any other flag, constitution, way of life, or any other ideals of government above our own. The administration in Washington has coddled subversive activities too long in America. We must gird ourselves to resist all attacks on the American way of life. America has reached the cross roads. Where do we go from here?

How Many Must Starve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of September 28, 1945:

HOW MANY MUST STARVE?

"We can't save all the people of Europe. Some must starve."

This is the gloomy prediction, horrifying in its implications, of Representative WALTER B. HUBER, who returned to Akron last week from a 35,000-mile tour of Europe and the Near East.

Even America, the richest and most prosperous nation on earth, hasn't enough food to meet all the demands. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's policy is to save our friends first and then do the best we can for the others, HUBER reports.

There isn't enough for everyone to have even a little.

The question every American has to answer in his own conscience is: "How much am I willing to give to keep more of Europe's hungry millions from starving?"

The answer cannot be passed off with "I'm not my brother's keeper—and, anyway, those millions in Europe are not my brothers." The responsibility of keeping them alive cannot be evaded so easily.

They are our brothers—if the brotherhood of peoples of the world in peace is to amount to anything. But even more important is the fact that the extent of starvation in Europe will have a definite and lasting effect upon us here in America. Each of us, personally, may suffer in the future if we turn our backs on Europe's pleas today.

Hunger breeds trouble. Hunger twists minds as well as bodies. The hate that engendered Germany's war in 1939 was born in the starved bodies and warped minds of a generation of German children who went hungry in the years following World War I.

The best foundation for lasting peace is a full stomach.

Americans cannot afford to let Europe starve.

Even if it means that we shall have to continue rationing of foods, that we shall have to go on making wartime sacrifices and denying ourselves luxuries of the dinner table, we must do all in our power to get food to the millions of war victims facing death from starvation.

This Nation's future prosperity—and the prosperity of every individual citizen—is firmly joined with the future health and prosperity of Europe.

Men and women cannot work to rehabilitate Europe's devastation on empty bellies. But the sooner Europe gets back on its feet, so to speak, the sooner we will have a broader market for the products of our industry.

United States has taken the leadership in carrying the doctrine of world peace to all people. But we cannot feed only the minds. Fine words fall on ears deafened by the pangs of hunger.

Lasting peace is the greatest goal to be achieved. If attained, it will mean that our sons and grandsons will not have to leave their homes and their jobs, to shoulder guns and fight and die on battlefields. It will mean that the vast wastes of war, in resources and money and lives will be employed for the good rather than for the destruction of our fellowmen.

Selfishness is a part of war. It has no place in the scheme for peace.

Shall we let selfishness rob us of the rewards of victory?

America's neighbors—Poles, French, Belgians, Greeks, and all the others—are hungry. The people who fought with us against a common enemy, the people who suffered the most at the hands of that enemy, are starving.

Are we going to stand by and do nothing to help them?

Press Carried Big Load in War Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of the United States have ample reason to be proud this week as they observe the first peacetime National Newspaper Week.

Thanks to the publishers of our Nation's newspapers, drab subjects of vital importance to the war effort were dressed up and dramatized and public interest aroused in them. These included such subjects as tin-can salvage, waste-paper drives, hoarding, fat salvage, and others.

Many of you will recall the efforts of some of us to have a proportionate share of the Government's national advertising programs allotted to the weekly newspapers when the program was started at the beginning of the war. I sponsored a bill in this connection.

Although the advertising of the Federal Government did not, for the most part, reach down to the weekly press, nevertheless the papers in this group carried an estimated $18,000,000 of war advertising. Also to their credit in this total of weekly newspaper advertising is that approximately 32 percent of this space was contributed by the publishers themselves.

The accomplishment of the weekly newspapers is well stated in the last issue of the American Press which said:

In addition to advertising, the weekly newspaper publishers outdid themselves in their editorial columns to make sure that their readers were kept up to the minute on all war programs. And in many cases the weekly publishers helped direct local defense and war activities.

A summary of some of the outstanding things done by weeklies, which have won the praise of our Nation's war leaders, follows:

1. Local defense organizations: Within 2 months after Pearl Harbor thousands of small towns had defense organizations set up. Practically all of these were made possible by the encouragement of the local editors who stirred up the people about the need for them, enlisted recruits for air raid warden work and other services. Throughout the war the activities of local defense organizations were front page news in the hometown newspapers. In most towns the editor was the publicity chairman of the leading defense organizations.

2. Recruiting: Although the weeklies got little paid advertising from the Army and Navy, they ran thousands of inches of free advertising and publicity aimed at getting local men and women to join the armed forces. The weeklies ran a total of 2,421,000 inches of recruiting advertising valued at $968,400.

3. Free printing: In most all small towns the publishers took on the job of printing air raid information circulars and posters, defense instructions, and other necessary printed matter.

4. Waste paper salvage: County newspapers tackled this problem right at the beginning of the war. They not only told when collections would be made and editorialized on the need for waste paper, but in many cases they set up the collection machinery and kept it running. The weeklies ran 1,524,600 inches of advertising on waste paper salvage valued at $609,840.

5. Automobile and tire conservation: Spearheaded by ads of local automobile agencies and service stations, the weeklies backed this campaign with a vengeance. They published and republished instructions for keeping cars and tires in the best possible condition and, in many cases, they organized car pools in their communities.

6. Army and Navy morale: This was perhaps the No. 1 job done by the weeklies. Not only did they publish millions of inches of news, letters, and pictures of the boys in service, but they sent copies of each week's issue to all of the boys from their section. A survey in March, 1945, showed that more than 2,000,000 men and women in the armed forces were receiving their hometown newspaper regularly.

7. Food for freedom: In 1942 the weeklies began running special editions to encourage farmers and victory gardeners to produce more food. The Department of Agriculture gives the weeklies part of the credit for the record food production during the war.

8. Fund raising: The weeklies always have heavily supported the work of worthy voluntary and charitable organizations, but during the war they outdid themselves in supporting, through ads and publicity, such organizations as the Red Cross, the USO, the Boy Scouts, etc. On the National War Fund they ran 1,886,100 inches of advertising valued at $754,440. For the Red Cross they ran 2,764,350 inches of advertising valued at $1,105,740.

9. War bonds: From the advertising standpoint, weekly newspapers made the sale of war bonds their leading war job. Although no national or Government paid advertising on war bonds was placed in weeklies, the publishers got the full cooperation of local merchants and also contributed a large amount of advertising themselves. War bond publicity was also a leading feature in weeklies throughout the war. Total war bond advertising run in weeklies is estimated at over $11,000,000.

10. Hoarding: Weeklies began an editorial drive against hoarding 2 months after Pearl Harbor and have not yet let up.

11. Black markets: Due to the unrelenting editorial and advertising drive against black markets in the country newspapers, coupled with the private police work of many publishers, black markets never flourished in small towns as they did in cities. The weeklies ran 1,157,940 inches of advertising, valued at $463,176, on black markets and food conservation.

12. Strikes: The weekly publishers of the Nation fought hard for legislation against strikes in war factories. A poll in May 1942 showed that 89 percent of them were working for a law to make strikes illegal. Their constant editorial campaign against strikes is believed to have influenced the no-strike pledges by labor unions and the passage of the inadequate Smith-Connolly antistrike law.

13. Scrap-metal salvage: In July 1942 the weekly newspapers got their first nationally paid war advertising campaign—the campaign to increase the collection of scrap metal and scrap rubber. The advertising spurred the publishers on to make this one of their greatest drives. They made scrap salvage the chief feature of their newspapers for months, 80 percent of the publishers organized local scrap-collection committees, they sold thousands of inches of tie-in advertising, and they personally took on the responsibility of seeing to it that their communities overreached their scrap-collection goals.

14. Fat salvage: Although weeklies did not get paid fat-salvage advertising until 1945, they began in 1942 to run large-space publicity and free ads aimed at persuading housewives and farmers to save fats and oils. When the paid advertising began the weeklies went at this problem with hammer and tongs and immediately boosted fat collections to record heights. Before the paid national advertising started the weeklies ran 960,300 inches of fat-salvage advertising valued at $384,120.

15. Merchant marine recruiting: The Maritime Commission ran a small recruiting campaign in a select list of weeklies. Because of the cooperation given on this campaign, both through publicity and personal effort of publishers, the Commission reported that it brought in recruits at a lower cost per capita than any other method used.

16. Victory gardens: This was a "natural" for the weeklies since most nonfarmers in small towns have plenty of room for home gardens. They ran sponsored ads on victory gardens, carried instruction columns by county agents, ran special victory garden editions, and in some cases organized their towns for cooperative spraying and ploughing services. Seventy-six percent of all victory garden acreage was in towns of under 10,000 population. The weeklies ran 766,800 inches of advertising on victory gardens valued at $306,720.

17. Rationing: Everyone in small towns relied on the weekly listing in the home town paper for information on what points were good, how many points were required for different items, changes in rationing regulations, etc. All weeklies carried this information regularly throughout the war and many ran OPA advertisements explaining rationing procedure.

18. Pulpwood: Weekly newspapers have been the backbone of the campaign to increase pulpwood production. Paid advertising was placed in weeklies in August 1943, and has been running ever since. The publishers organized local pulpwood committees, ran special editions, sold ads to local mills and local merchants, and ran thousands of inches of publicity to stimulate pulpwood production. Up to the end of 1944 the 1,000 weeklies in the pulpwood areas had run 41,211 ads, 12,360 news stories, 8,491 pictures and cartoons, and 11,120 editorials.

19. Inflation: Working closely with the OPA and the American Bankers Association, the weeklies have been running anti-inflation publicity and advertising regularly. In over 1,000 towns the publishers persuaded the local banks to make anti-inflation the theme of their regular weekly advertisements. The weeklies have run over 850,000 inches of anti-inflation advertising valued at $344,000.

20. Service centers: By the middle of 1944, weekly newspaper publishers began publicity and organization work for service centers to help and advise returning veterans. Some of them directed the complete organization job and others headed the publicity work for creating a working organization.

21. Gasoline and oil conservation: The weeklies backed this campaign every week and found sponsors for 644,600 inches of advertising on this subject valued at $257,840.

22. Tin can salvage: This campaign was backed throughout the war by the weeklies. Not only did they publicize and advertise the drive, but in many cases they made the arrangements for regular collections.

23. Miscellaneous: In addition to the above, many of the weeklies pushed other war campaigns including such campaigns as blood donations, Christmas mailing, V-mail, forest fire prevention, light and power conservation, postwar employment, travel conservation, and war industry recruiting. On these and other miscellaneous campaigns they ran over 7,000,000 inches of advertising valued at about $3,000,000.

24. Postwar planning: Since the German surrender the weekly publishers have devoted a great deal of space and effort to postwar planning. They have analyzed job opportunities, made surveys of postwar plans of merchants, looked into construction possibilities, analyzed the postwar purchase plans of their readers. The publishers also have done much to stimulate the construction of local airports.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

Whereas agitation for the passage of Federal legislation approving the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project has been revived in the Federal Congress; and

Whereas the General Assembly of Pennsylvania is vitally concerned in the effect that the completion of said project would have upon its citizens; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relies substantially for its economic stability and future prosperity on the preservation of its essential mining, manufacturing and transportation industries; and

Whereas the production of bituminous and anthracite coal, the manufacture of steel products and the transportation of freight by steam railroads constitute important segments of the industrial life and well-being of the commonwealth and its citizens; and

Whereas the development of 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity as contemplated by the St. Lawrence project would displace in excess of 5,000,000 tons of bituminous coal annually; and

Whereas the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway would open existing markets for bituminous and anthracite coal mined in the commonwealth, to ruinous competition from foreign coal mined by cheap labor and transported to Great Lakes ports of the United States and Canada in tramp foreign-flag vessels at ballast rates; and

Whereas the importation of steel and other manufactured products similarly produced at low cost in foreign countries and sold in competition with Pennsylvania manufactured goods would injuriously affect manufacturing industry and employment in the Commonwealth; and

Whereas the diversion of freight tonnage to the proposed waterways from steam railroads serving the Commonwealth and the loss of traffic due to the diminution of coal tonnage would seriously and adversely affect the railroad industry; and

Whereas as a result of the foregoing thousands of citizens of Pennsylvania engaged in the mining and production of coal, the making and fabrication of steel and other products, and the transporting of freight would be deprived of their means of earning a livelihood at their chosen occupations; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence project would have an injurious effect upon the economy of the country, with incidental benefit, if any, being confined to relatively few small areas and certain manufacturers; and

Whereas a large part of the enormous cost of this unwise and uneconomical project would fall upon the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States not to approve or authorize the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Justin Miller, Capable New President of National Association of Broadcasters—His Inaugural Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of Justin Miller on the occasion of his installation as president of the National Association of Broadcasters, delivered to the guests of an inaugural dinner given in his honor at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., October 2:

PUBLIC INTEREST, SELF-DISCIPLINE, AND GOOD BUSINESS

When I accepted appointment as president of the National Association of Broadcasters, I made the following statement: "I accept a challenge to render a public service. I see in broadcasting, with its promising developments for postwar expansion into frequency modulation, television, and facsimile, a vital agency for carrying forward our traditional American policy of free speech and for protecting and strengthening our system of free enterprise. The opportunity is thus presented to demonstrate to the world the vitality and validity of these fundamental American concepts. To have a part in the development of the industry, to help in securing for it a sounder foundation in law and operating policy, in reconciling and integrating the various interests—public, governmental, and industrial—is an assignment so challenging to me as to make my decision a matter of course." The convictions expressed in that statement have been fortified tenfold by my experience, during the past summer, in visiting western Europe and in studying at first hand the methods and philosophies of radio broadcasting prevailing in those countries.

One of my friends, in commenting upon my new work, said he hoped I could persuade the radio people to stop calling broadcasting an "industry." I replied that so long as the Justices of the Supreme Court choose to call its highly professional and governmental activities the "business" of the Court, I see little possibility of inducing my present associates to abandon a similar terminology which seems to satisfy them.

My friend's proposal suggests, however, the widespreading reach of interests and activities which are included in this lusty young agency of communication, entertainment, and education. What word is broad enough in its meaning to include the work of scientists, artists, engineers, executives, and members of the various other crafts, guilds, and

professions who combine their skills and talents in radio broadcasting; and what is to be its ultimate sphere?

Fortunately it is not necessary, for me or for anyone, to answer, immediately, such large questions as this. The troublesome but reliable method of trial and error must continue to serve our purposes, here, as it has done in the older vocations and professions. There are some things, on the other hand, concerning radio broadcasting so obvious that even the uninitiated may speak of them with confidence; and so important that they cannot be too much emphasized.

When we thank God for the courage, the unity of purpose, and the capacity for effective joint action which recently brought us and our civilization triumphantly through another crucible of war, we thank Him, also, for entrusting to our use the discoveries of our scientists which played so large a part in achieving that triumph. Not the least of these are the various forms of radio communication. When we ask guidance for our country and for all countries in the world of today and tomorrow, we realize, at the same time, our grave responsibility so to control the dynamic potentialities of these discoveries that they will serve to build up, rather than to destroy, the real values of civilization.

Our people should know well the four-way contribution of radio to the winning of the war: First, in war operations themselves, providing intelligence of enemy movements, collecting and distributing information between our own operating units and in all the other vast coordination of operations which characterizes modern warfare; second, in conveying information to the "underground" in occupied and enemy countries and in securing information from such countries; third, in providing news and entertainment for our fighting men, right up to the front-line fox holes; fourth, in furnishing news to the home front, in many instances actual battle-front stories from war correspondents and men in the armed services.

It would be a valuable lesson, too, for all our people if they could visit the scenes of recent warfare and see with their own eyes what can happen in countries in which great power and great agencies of power come under the control of untrained and undisciplined leaders; to know what havoc can be wrought; to see how low a people can fall.

In Rome, the purple rug is still draped over the grille work of the balcony from which the bald dictator bellowed; but he has gone—unwept, unhonored, and unsung. Rome is fortunate in one respect, however. Although it is frayed, decayed, and run down at heel, yet it escaped the penalty of precision bombing.

In the once great German cities, by way of contrast, harbors are filled with tangled wreckage of ships, docks, and warehouses. Mile on mile stretch the gutted ruins of proud buildings, the stumps of shade trees sheared off by artillery fire, and the long lines of rusting railroad tracks, flanked by ravaged rolling stock. Windrows of fetid, musty rubble have been shoved out of the way by bulldozers, or left to lie on abandoned side streets, littered as it fell, still sepulchering the bodies of uncounted thousands.

The Reichschancelory, in Berlin, where a ranting paperhanger once held court, is now a shattered shell of stone and concrete. The floors are littered with papers, books, manuscripts, letters, pictures, broken furniture and the unescapable rubble. Bomb holes in the roof let in the light upon gaudy, twisted Christmas-tree chandeliers and upon walls from which the inlaid trappings have been torn. Water drips from leaking pipes; a dank atmosphere pervades the place, as in a mausoleum or catacomb. Everything of present value has been removed; the once secret files of a once powerful government have been swept to the walls, or tramped over by many feet, no longer valuable to anyone.

In Japan, a similar holocaust of destruction was climaxed by two examples of devastation, so complete as to leave little doubt of the inevitable, even in the mind of an unconquered army; an achievement reminiscent of the subjugation of brute force, in olden times, by appeals to the supernatural.

Even more devastating, perhaps, has been the effect upon the people in these countries. In Berlin, the grim-faced inhabitants push their little carts, ride their decrepit bicycles, dodge the trucks and jeeps of the occupation forces; worming their way in and out of basements, cellars, and crudely built lean-to shanties; looking forward to a winter of cold, hunger, and disease. In Rome, the little square in which Mussolini's close-packed crew of frenzied zealots screamed is now a scene of dejection, a place of tired, disillusioned people. New leaders, who have come out of hiding—or out of jail—are struggling to rebuild a sufficient government to negotiate for a permanent peace. In Rome, as in Paris, the people look to us for food, for material equipment, for tolerant, kindly understanding.

Everywhere in the countries occupied by Hitler are children with hollow eyes and stunted bodies, begging for candy and chewing gum, or just staring, listless and dispirited. There are men and women so lacking in self-respect that they hover about a group of GI's, ready to pounce upon a discarded cigarette, with the avidity of sea gulls pursuing a fishing boat. "The shouting and the tumult dies; the captains and the kings depart." It will be a long generation before normal leadership can be found—in low places as well as high—to restore the efficiency, the dignity and the self-respect of the people who were their willing or unwilling tools.

The atomic bomb provided a face-saving argument for the last of our enemies and brought the war to a sudden dramatic end. But it did far more. In the minds of many of our people there was consternation; in the minds of others, exultation, as they thought, on the one hand, of the great dangers, and on the other hand of the tremendous possibilities of useful energy, latent in the newly discovered source. They said, "We have come now, perhaps, to a time when man can destroy his universe; or, in the alternative, he may achieve for himself and his posterity an era of unprecedented earthly comfort and happiness."

As time goes on we will realize more clearly that this is just one more step—although a long step, indeed—in man's mastery of the powers, which God has provided for his use. In its day, the discovery of gunpowder was probably regarded as of equal significance. And there were very mixed opinions among the people who lived a century or two ago concerning the propriety of using steam power and electricity.

The one inescapably obvious point which appears from all that has gone before is that our future depends upon how we use these great powers which scientific discovery makes available to us. Specifically, we must understand that if we are to succeed in insulating and confining to useful channels the physical energy which can now be released by atom smashing, our success must come from effective teamwork among our own people, and between the peoples of the world. This, in turn, will require mutual understanding, mutual respect, and mutual confidence in each other. Such results can come only from unshackled opportunity to interpret and publish to the world the American way of life, of free, competitive enterprise operating under disciplined self-restraint; the American philosophy of Government, by responsible leaders chosen by the people.

Radio provides the mighty vehicle of communication which can carry us to this end. But it provides opportunity, also, for misuse and for the hastening of destruction. In this sense it is just as explosively dangerous as is the process of atom smashing.

For this reason there are those who speak for Government-owned radio. This reflects an old tendency, as applied both to the individual who wishes to speak and to the means which he would use. Tyrants of early days cut out men's tongues. That took care both of the individual and the means. Tyrants of later days suppressed newspapers and destroyed printing presses. Those in power, frequently, are tempted to destroy or suppress their critics.

In some countries, prior to the war, as everyone knows, radio communication was grossly misused for spreading the propaganda of hate and to maintain in power, terrorists, gangsters, and paranoid personalities. In those countries, and in others, persons who have come, more recently, into power insist also upon government control of radio. This may seem curious to us, in a country where everyone believes in freedom of speech, but history is full of examples of oppressed people who, after throwing off their oppressors, have used the same terroristic and arbitrary methods to maintain themselves in power.

We are committed so definitely in the United States to freedom of speech—whether by word of mouth, by the printed page, or by the various modern methods of amplification—that there is no vogue for government-owned radio here. Even provisions of the Federal Communications Act—giving war emergency power to the President to suspend the rules of the Commission or to take over broadcasting stations—have remained unused. Instead, the President—while the war was still going on—described radio as a medium which "must be maintained as free as the press." He commended Congress for its foresight in decreeing that America "should have a free, competitive system, unfettered by artificial barriers and regulated only as to the laws of nature and the limitation of facilities."

But this does not mean, of course, that radio should violate the law, any more than should an individual, in the material which is broadcast, or in the manner of its broadcasting. Some zealous people take their definition of free speech too literally from the statement attributed to Voltaire: "I wholly disapprove of what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it." On the other hand, as Justice Holmes—the great apostle of liberal thinkers—pungently commented: "The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting 'Fire' in a theater and causing a panic."

Moreover, within the limits of particular laws, there can be much room for the exercise of voluntarily imposed restraints. Abuse of discretion, by administrative officials and by judges, sometimes requires the setting aside of their acts and orders. Sometimes, as members of this assembly well know, the indiscreet and abusive conduct of overzealous officers has resulted in the cutting off of appropriations—and occasionally—even the abolition of agencies.

So it is with freedom of speech and with the control of other practices in areas which effect the public interest. It becomes very much a matter of balancing good manners and good taste against a frankness necessary for maintaining honest government and effective business. It is easy to give examples of such restraints, imposed and respected by professional and trade groups, without the intervention of law—indeed, in areas in which the intervention of law might do more harm than good.

It is not because of compulsion of law that a lawyer refrains from misquoting the law to a judge or that a judge refrains from making contributions for political purposes. The voluntarily adopted canons of professional and judicial ethics impose those stand-

ards. It is not because of compulsion of law that a journalist who respects his profession protects the source of confidentially given information.

Again, in family and social life we are familiar with self-disciplines which do not require the sanction of law. It would be considered bad manners in most households—although not prohibited by law—for host or guest to tell a nauseating story at the dinner table. And many people would consider it in bad taste for a speaker to tell an off-color story in the midst of a memorial address. Some of us think it is equally poor taste to insert a nauseating plug-ugly in the midst of a serious news commentary. If the result is to prevent that broadcast from being heard at many a family fireside, it would seem to be equally poor business. Those with axes to grind, as well as persons seriously concerned with the importance of properly balanced programs for public consumption, make embarrassing demands for time, for changed regulations, and for preferred treatment on the air. Far more than is generally realized, the radio executive stands between importunate, shortsighted advocates of this or that, on the one hand, and the general public on the other.

For these and similar reasons many attacks have been made upon radio broadcasting, and many demands for restrictive legislation and regulation. Wiser counsel has prevailed, however, and we are witnessing a steady coming together of natural leaders—in Government, in the industry, in civic and professional life—for the purpose of discovering a substantial basis for self-control and self-discipline along the line of greatest public interest.

The leaders of radio have no doubt of their ability to assume their full responsibilities. Although the industry is scarcely a quarter century old, it has already perfected an organization of broadcasters and established canons of conduct which compare favorably with those of professional groups with centuries of experience behind them. Like its older counterparts, it has discovered that reluctance and recalcitrancy cannot be overcome, completely, by codes and canons. Like them, it has discovered that eternal vigilance is the price of success; and that a process of education may be more effective in the long run than attempts at coercion.

Some radio executives are inclined to chafe at the barbed attacks which are made upon them and at the standards which are sought to be imposed. They should be highly flattered, instead. These are compliments, perhaps unintentionally paid. The importance of radio was so generally recognized that in the first law passed concerning it, the public interest was declared. What industry or profession can match that in legislation? Again, the importance of radio is so generally accepted that it is expected to correct, immediately, evils which have prevailed for decades and centuries in other walks of life.

For example, one of radio's best friends and most persistent critics recently called attention to the discrepancy between the salaries, in radio, of writers, actors, and artists, compared with those of salesmen and executives. Having spent several years in universities, I can testify that the same discrepancy still prevails in the hallowed halls of great institutions of learning. I am reminded in this connection of the treasurer of a well-known university who, when told of the threatened resignation of a professor to accept a higher salary at another university, replied: "Oh, well, professors is cheap." He was reflecting the attitude of the world toward a group of unorganized workers, who have been always concerned more with their work than their income. Would anyone say that radio is more affected with the public interest than is the university? Or should we permit invidious comment upon the fact that the football coach's salary sometimes tops even that of the president, the treasurer, and the other executives?

The example of the universities could be multiplied many times, in many occupations. Government officials are notoriously underpaid, measured either in terms of cost of living, or of comparative salaries in private industry. Perhaps radio can correct these discrepancies; perhaps not. But it is certainly a compliment to it that it is thought able to do so, in the highly competitive market-place in which it carries on.

Indeed, Congress, in decreeing that America should have a free, competitive system, insured the competitive factor by making the broadcasting industry one of the most hazardous of all. If income is measured, properly, in terms of the risk taken, then the broadcaster's income should be high, indeed. No businessman in the country does business on a more uncertain tenure. It takes courage to be a licensee in this industry. The only protection for his investment is a license of not longer than 3 years' duration, subject to revocation, and upon its termination renewal is limited and governed by the same conditions and practices which affect the granting of original applications. The Supreme Court has further so limited the language of the Communications Act that no person has anything in the nature of a property right as a result of the granting of a license, and a person, in appealing from a decision of the Commission granting or refusing an application for a license, is limited to a showing in protection of the public interest. By way of comparison, imagine lawyers coming up every 3 years for reexamination and licensing, upon a basis of purely public interest, in competition with the brilliant youngsters of the profession. It is not hard to understand an aggressive reliance upon business methods, under such circumstances. Radio must meet the challenge both of the balanced program and the balance sheet.

Perhaps the time may be ripe for all of us who are concerned, to sit down together and look for areas of agreement in an effort to clarify and reinterpret the law not only in respects mentioned, but in others as well. Several years of experience have now rolled by since the act was last enacted. Such a procedure will be more productive of results than a too-long-continued—no matter how friendly—pointing out of differences.

It is a challenging era which lies ahead—for men and women of courage, imagination and resourcefulness. These were the characteristics which enabled us to win the war. May they serve us equally well in winning the world to a way of life which will provide for all its people, not only comfort and security, but opportunity to grow, to build, to achieve. May we not forget too quickly the price, in young lives and in material treasure, which we paid for this opportunity. Let us play so large a part in international affairs, henceforth, that the next war may be long in coming. Let us stand firm in our intention, and assure the listening world that the voice of America shall continue to carry, to its uttermost reaches, a message of good will, of hope, and insistence upon the eternal verities of free government, free speech, free competition, and free men.

Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Veterans' Journal, a Philadelphia, Pa., publication:

WHY VETERANS' HOSPITALS?

The Federal Government has appropriated $100,000,000 for the building of veterans' hospitals. This action is in keeping with the Nation's policy of providing the best possible care for its ex-service people and, of course, is gratefully acknowledged by those whom it is meant to aid. However, in this instance, it seems as though the lawmakers "have lost sight of the forest for the trees."

Building hospitals is one thing; staffing them with competent personnel is still another. It will be difficult, if not altogether impossible, to obtain the services of physicians, nurses, technicians, and other personnel to administer to the needs of so large a portion of the male population eligible for non-service-connected disability benefits in the years following the cessation of hostilities.

As a result of three wars, one-third of the adult male population of the country will be entitled to such benefits. It is difficult to believe that physicians, nurses, and technicians who have spent many years in training, and many more in the service of their Nation, will want to further handicap themselves by joining the staffs of veterans' hospitals whose compensation, of necessity, cannot match that of private practice, nor give the independence he could enjoy from such practice.

It would be wiser, and far more expedient, to permit veterans to enter approved private hospitals in, or near, their own homes rather than to force them to travel hundreds of miles at the expense of the Government, and cause them to be separated from their families for long periods of time. To do this would, undoubtedly, be less costly to the public and would inevitably raise the standards of small hospitals who would seek such approval.

Further it would relieve the Government of entering into competition with the medical profession, a condition which, in any field of business, has been distasteful to the American people. To adopt such a plan would certainly reduce opportunities for graft and lush jobs. This, in itself, is of primary importance and one of its best recommendations.

The Butter Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I addressed the House urging that the Secretary of Agriculture use his good offices in having all ration points removed on butter. The Creston News Advertiser, of Creston, Iowa, in its issue of September 26, contained an editorial with relation to the butter situation which I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress and the country, as follows:

HOW ENDLESS SPENDERS BUNGLED BUTTER TRADE

There has been an enormous amount of adverse criticism concerning the butter situation during the past year, and all the facts, as they gradually develop, go to show that the complaint was fully justified.

There has perhaps been no single item of food that has caused as much resentment of the rationing system as butter. That has

probably not been particularly true in Creston, but in many sections of the Nation—wide sections—the official bungling has made it impossible on many occasions for the citizens to secure it at all, while at other times their purchases were limited to quarter-pound quantities.

Had it been shown that this severe restriction was actually necessary to the war effort, in all probability the situation would have been calmly accepted, and the people, without serious protest, would have done without their butter. However, there was a constant announcement of Government holdings that had been permitted to become too rancid for use. There were reports of great quantities being sold to the soapmakers; reports of other cases where it was trucked out and left on dumps, and with it all, came statements of men in the creamery business who insisted that there was no legitimate reason for serious butter shortage. As a result, the citizens came to bitterly resent the extravagant policy of the endless-spenders, and the dictatorial rulings of the bureaucrats whose chief objective appeared to be to discipline the people, and to make the Nation war conscious.

Yesterday we received a letter from the manager of an Iowa creamery, which, while not for publication, contains some interesting facts that the people are entitled to know. We quote:

"Many of us have wondered for several months as to the reason and necessity for some of the rationing practices. The industry has never been able to determine the exact amount of butter held by Government agencies as various reports seem to conflict as to their holdings.

"Less than 3 weeks ago manufacturers were advised that all butter commitments due under the set-aside program would be required and set-aside butter would have to be delivered to the last pound. A week later manufacturers were advised that all set-aside on hand would be canceled and not required for Government use.

"Under date of September 18, Weekly Letter No. 194 of the Dairy Products Marketing Association, gives fact regarding the butter holdings which to say the least are interesting in view of the continued demand from Government agencies that butter be rationed. We are also attaching two clippings from the September 19 issue of the Dairy Record. These seem to bear out the fact that the need for butter rationing is rather more of a political issue than a necessity."

The letter referred to above—No. 194—shows that the cold storage figures released last week by the Department of Agriculture itself set creamery butter holdings on September 1 at 205,500,000 pounds, and that is 68,000,000 pounds more than on the same date last year, and it is 34,000,000 pounds more than the 5-year average.

It discloses that the total amount of butter on hand at that date—the first of this month—the Government held approximately 135,000,000 pounds, and the non-Government owned stock totaled about 70,500,000 pounds, "and this was probably the largest for any month since wartime controls of butter were established."

The "clippings from the Dairy Record," which are referred to in the letter from the Iowa creamery operator, quote the figures announced by the Agricultural Department, and make this additional statement: "During August butter stocks increased more than 20,000,000 pounds, whereas a year ago they actually showed a drop.

"The all-time record for September 1 was made in 1943 when there were 231,543,000 pounds of butter in the coolers. In only 2 other years, 1938 and 1941, were holdings of more than 200,000,000 pounds ever recorded on the date of September 1."

Yet, today the country has more butter in storage than in either of the latter 2 years, and we lack but about 26,000,000 pounds of equaling the all-time peak year of 1943.

With all war demand fast ending, and with the surplus growing at the rate of 20,000,000 pounds per month, there is no more need for the butter ration-point system than there would be on the air we breathe, for it is self-evident that citizens are not going to purchase more butter than they really need for the mere pleasure of seeing it rot in order that it may be sold to the soapmakers at less than a half cent per pound.

The fact appears to be that butter control, and many of the other controls and restrictions, were established by little men, without experience, whose chief objective was to exercise authority. The power which was given them by the President, through his bureaucratic form of government, under the claims of war necessity and war crisis, went to their heads. They became power-mad, and their dominating thought was dictation.

The President made a great hit with the Nation when he ended lease-lend, and he made another when he asked authority to readjust the executive department downward by the combination of bureaus and agencies. Now, he can make a third one by tying cans to most of the wild-eyed purchasing groups and most of the dictatorial rationing boys, for we no longer need them, and by and large, they are a pain in the neck and a thorn in the flesh. Oooze 'em out, Harry; ooze 'em.

Telegram to the Secretary of State from National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a telegram sent to the Honorable James Byrnes, Secretary of State, by the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, September 19, 1945, regarding displaced persons:

The Honorable JAMES BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Care of United States Embassy,
London, England:

On August 14, 1941, America, through the proclamation of the Atlantic Charter, declared that it desires "to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned," and in the same solemn declaration stated that it wishes "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

At Yalta, February 13, 1945, upon the demand of Stalin, President Roosevelt obligated himself to recognize the Ribbentrop line, by this action giving to Russia almost half of Poland. This decision, made without the agreement or even the knowledge of the legal Polish Government with which the United States maintained well-established relations, violated the declaration of January 1, 1942, and made ineffective the alliance status hitherto existing between America and Poland.

In June, 1945, Harry Hopkins made a deal with Stalin, whereby agreement was given to the illegal trial in Moscow of the 16 leaders of the Polish underground 5-year-struggle against the Germans—leaders who revealed themselves to the Soviet authorities on the advice of the British and American Governments.

At the same time Mr. Hopkins agreed to American recognition of a Polish Government composed of Soviet agents with the Soviet citizen Bierut as its head, and the addition of such quislings from among the émigrés as Stalin should select.

On July 6, 1945, you, Mr. Secretary, accepted the existing state of affairs, thus withdrawing recognition of the only constitutional and legal Government of Poland and recognizing the Bierut regime.

These facts show that the Government of the United States shares the responsibility with the Soviets of treating their Polish Ally as an enemy. For morality does not allow and international law does not foresee the possibility of one ally depriving another ally of its territory and its sovereignty.

After taking their country from the Poles and after the destruction of the Polish State, to whose sacrifices victory is in large measure due, the Government of the United States is at present proceeding in a manner that will also deprive of their freedom those Poles who are not on territory under Soviet occupation.

While you, Mr. Secretary, are in conference in London, the fate of some 2,000,000 Poles in the American and British occupation zones of Germany, and of the Polish Army, which for 6 years heroically fought the Axis Powers, is being decided.

A policy of pressure toward the Poles in the "displaced persons" category has been instituted in the American zone. According to the press this consists of depriving these people of their liberty, of making it impossible for them to seek employment and change of location, of prohibiting correspondence with relatives in the United States and Britain, and also of putting pressure on them to return to territory under Soviet occupation. This procedure cannot today be interpreted as dictated by the necessities of war.

The future of the Polish soldiers, who together with our American soldiers, fought the decisive battles of Monte Cassino, Ancona, and Bologna in the Italian campaign; the future of the Polish aviators, who beside the British airmen won the Battle of Britain; the future of the Polish sailors, who, on September 1, 1939, were the first to fight on the sea—the future of all these men is to be decided. After taking upon themselves coresponsibility for depriving the Polish Army of its homeland, the British and American Governments cannot transform that army into Soviet prisoners. For thus should the monstrous proposal of transferring the command of the Polish troops in the west to nominees of Stalin be understood, since these men are to take those troops into Soviet-occupied territory, which means that they will be placed in concentration camps.

This being the situation, we turn to you with the very earnest appeal that you break with the Yalta tradition harmful to the interests of America. For at Yalta not only was an ally abandoned, but along with it the Atlantic Charter, justice, and honor. To offset the mistakes President Roosevelt made at Yalta, apparent now to all, we should not mistreat Polish deported and Polish soldiers but see to their welfare. We will not conceal those Yalta mistakes by mistreating the Poles in exile. Therefore we demand:

1. That the promise given by General Eisenhower be honorably observed by America, namely, that no one will be in any way compelled to return to a Poland occupied by the Soviets;

2. That postal communication with displaced persons be made possible immediately, that printed matter, parcels, and money may be sent them from America;

3. That a decided stand be taken against surrendering Polish troops now under British Command to the Soviets or their agents; respect for Allied flags is indeed the minimum of army honor;

4. That there be an immediate working out of means whereby Poles deprived of an independent homeland may be assured a free and decent life in free countries.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC.,

W. CYTACKI, *President, Detroit, Mich.*
J. PIECH, *Vice President, Chicago, Ill.*
P. FLAK, *Vice President, Springfield, Mass.*
M. KOWALSKI, *Vice President, Rochester, N. Y.*
S. LODZIESKI, *Treasurer, Cleveland, Ohio.*
J. GODLEWSKA, *Secretary, New York, N. Y.*

Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Hammonton (N. J.) News of September 21, 1945. Since the publication of this editorial, the Secretary of the Treasury has announced a plan to reduce taxes by $5,000,000,000, but even that sum bears little relation to what should be the reduction of our Federal expenditures. The editorial follows:

SOMETHING SCREWY, SOMEWHERE

Secretary of the Treasury Vinson has dashed a bucket of cold water on the hopes of the American taxpayer. He says there will be no significant tax reductions next year. Previously, congressional leaders had pumped the oxygen of hope into the Nation. There would be big tax cuts in 1946, they said. A tax cut as high as 20 percent was predicted by Congressman KNUTSON, ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

How come this wide disparity of opinions—or guesses? Only a few days ago, Budget Director Smith estimated Government spending for the current fiscal year at $66,000,000,000 or $18,000,000,000 less than he had estimated on August 1, due to the Jap surrender and cut-backs in war spending.

Yet the American taxpayer is due to face the same size tax bill in 1946 that he faced—and paid—in 1945, according to Secretary Vinson.

"There would be something screwy, somewhere," says the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, "if the collapse of huge war spending is not reflected in a commensurate reduction in national taxation."

Columnist Paul Mallon takes a startling view of the new tax picture. He says: "The spending program of the first peace year will make pikers of both Franklin Roosevelt and James Maynard Keynes."

One hopes this will not come to pass. But if it does, the onus will rest on Congress, the only legal agency that can chart a runaway spending program in these days of peace.

It's time to trim taxes, Mr. Congressman!

Golden Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a Bristol (Pa.) newspaper of October 1, 1945:

GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

President Truman has protested that the United States Senate "let him down" by not immediately accepting his $25-a-week jobless pay proposal.

Without going into the question of whether his present attitude is in harmony with his earlier promises to "listen" to congressional opinion, there is a quite different rejoinder to be made.

It might be well for the President to worry lest he is guilty of "letting down" the hopes of Americans and all other citizens of the world by his refusal to take a realistic attitude toward British demands for loans.

A golden opportunity came within the President's grasp when the new Socialist regime in England decided that they were not too anticapitalist to try to raise some capital in capitalistic United States.

The President might have demanded, as virtually the sole condition for such a loan, that Great Britain consent to show this Nation the same cooperation in striving for peace and justice that she has shown in wars—particularly during wars in which British self-preservation was at stake.

There is nothing selfish in such a demand. It would further the cause of world humanity, of peace, justice, progress, and prosperity. No nation has higher and more unselfish ideals than the United States.

Yet neither the State Department nor the President appears to have either the vision or the courage to put this on the line.

Unless Congress intervenes, it seems likely that the loan will be granted; subject to some self-deceptive conditions as to term and interest, of course, but with no agreement whatsoever that it will not promptly be used against the interests of this Nation and against the type of international federation of friendly nations which is the American concept of proper world politics.

If England gets the money under conditions which allow her to do what she makes no secret she would like—use it to build up a tight trading bloc in a forthcoming international trade war—the United States will be chief economic sufferer in future years.

This produces a paradox: If England is denied the money, it will ruin her; if she gets it, it will ruin us.

Quite as much of a paradox is threat that money from free-enterprise America is to be used to finance the bitterly anticapitalistic program of national socialism in England. It takes money for a government to buy up and nationalize banks, basic industries, and land—and it still remains to be disproven that this is the real purpose of the English application for our loans.

Neither American security nor world security would be advanced by such a happening; communism, even somewhat diluted, has thus far produced more dictators than peace.

Most emphatically England needs to be told that she can have billions for a program of harmonious cooperation with America looking to world peace, justice, and prosperity—but not one cent for trade wars, anti-American alliances, or state socialism.

Has President Truman the vision and backbone to make England take this condition and like it?

This remains to be seen.

The present outlook is not hopeful.

If he fails, it will at least keep the record clean. Woodrow Wilson plunged the United States into an expensive and bloody struggle for the rescue of England in the First World War—without getting Lloyd George's signature on the dotted line in advance for a League of Nations or any other form of world cooperation.

Result: World War II.

Franklin Roosevelt plunged us into a "nonshooting war" to save England from Hitler, and thence we went all the way with our men, our money, and our future—again without getting England to promise to stand by us for peace as we stood by her for war.

Churchill, so great was the emergency, would have signed a real Atlantic Charter quite as willingly as he agreed to lend his name to a publicity stunt aimed at deluding the world into thinking he actually had signed.

Result: The present sorry state of justice and harmony in what is still optimistically called the United Nations.

Three Democratic Presidents in a row, each under different circumstances, all had a chance to put John Bull under bond to stand up in peace for what he said he stood for during war.

Two struck out.

What about it, Mr. President?

Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the Crosser amendment providing for the exclusion of the Railroad Retirement Board in the reorganization and consolidation of Government agencies as proposed by President Truman.

The Railroad Retirement Act has been in effect 10 years during which time 387,000 retired or disabled workers and widows have been recipients of its benefits. At the present time the number on Railroad Retirement rolls is approximately 167,000 of which 18,000 are classified as pensioners having been transferred from the pension rolls of the railroads. Those employees who have become eligible for retirement benefits since the law became effective are known as annuitants. Ten years ago when the transfer of pensioners from the pension rolls of the railroads was made there were over 48,000 persons eligible and their names were added to the Railroad Retirement Board's list when the law became effective.

The reason for this amendment excluding the Railroad Retirement Board from other Government agencies is because the Railroad Retirement Act is financed solely by the contributions paid by the railroads and their employees and the Federal Government has not been obliged to bear any of the cost. The Railroad Retirement Board, composed of

a chairman and two members, administers the act and invests any surplus money in Government securities.

It is the consensus of opinion among railroad employees that this fund should be administered separately from any other governmental retirement funds and I am in full accord with their views.

Overseas Air Transport Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

Resolution adopted by board of directors of San Pedro Chamber of Commerce on September 24, 1945

Whereas consideration is being given by the Civil Aeronautics Board to applications by both air-line companies and steamship companies for certificates of convenience and necessity to inaugurate overseas air transport services, and

Whereas shipping companies who have pioneered and developed their trade routes seek to improve their service by adding aircraft and providing a coordinated sea-air service over their regular routes and between their regular terminals, and

Whereas San Pedro is the port of the city of Los Angeles and the Pacific Southwest and therefore interested in all forms of transportation whether by rail, ship, truck, or air, and

Whereas overseas transportation should be developed on the most efficient, adequate, and up-to-date manner and transportation by air is becoming more and more important, and

Whereas all applications for the aforesaid certificates of convenience and necessity should be considered strictly on their respective merits without prejudice as to whether the applicant be an air-line operator or a steamship company desiring to augment its service to the public: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce, That the Civil Aeronautics Board be respectfully urged to grant certificates to shipping lines for supplemental services to the public if such service is warranted and the applications of the shipping companies be given the same consideration as those from any other applicant; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to our Representatives in Congress.

Resolution adopted by board of directors of Wilmington Chamber of Commerce on September 20, 1945.

Whereas the prosperity of southern California depends upon the development of trade and commerce moving through Los Angeles Harbor as a major port for overseas transportation, therefore, southern California has a vital interest in all forms of transportation which serve it, whether sea, air, rail, or highway; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 requires that there shall be the maximum development of American-flag transport service by air lines privately owned and operated which can be constructively supported by the traffic offering; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board is now considering the establishment of transoceanic air routes, in accordance with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce

1. Strongly desires the fullest development of transportation facilities of every kind, in all phases, so that the volume of commerce and travel through Los Angeles harbor will be increased to the maximum.

2. Is convinced that passenger and tourist traffic cannot be fully developed by shipping companies operating ocean vessels alone, nor by air lines operating airplanes alone, and therefore contends that only combined sea-air travel facilities under one management can provide the facilities the public wants.

3. Calls to the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board that southern California is entitled to all the air transportation service by as many companies as are needed to serve the public interest.

4. Subject to the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and other transportation laws which apply, believes in and wants unrestrained competition between air transport services.

5. Strongly desires service out of Los Angeles harbor by carriers whose interests are largely identified with the areas they serve, as contrasted with transportation companies who serve this community only incidentally in connection with service to other territories and places where their interests are as great or greater.

6. Opposes, in the establishment of transoceanic air certificates, all discrimination against steamship companies, because they operate seagoing vessels, which desire to serve their established routes and patrons with both air and surface ships. And be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the United States Maritime Commission, members of the United States Senate Committees on Commerce and Interstate Commerce, members of the United States House of Representatives Committees on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and all California Members of Congress.

America, the Bountiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 18, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared an editorial, America, the Bountiful, in the Wadena Pioneer Journal, Wadena, Minn., a progressive and wide-awake newspaper published by our able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] was born in Norway, but his family moved to Minnesota when he was a small lad, and, like most rugged Americans in the Midwest, came up the hard way in that pioneer State.

Through honest ambition and by ceaseless toil, the gentleman from Minnesota, HAROLD KNUTSON, has been elected for three decades as a Representative of his district to the Congress of the United States.

Because of his thorough historical knowledge and wide travels, this Congressman with Norse blood in his veins and with daring and adventurous spirit of the Vikings, realizes much more than most native Americans the many advantages which the United States possesses over nations in the Old World.

The global war just ended has left its ugly scars upon the face of the earth and also upon the hearts and minds of men. America has not escaped the damaging repercussions of such a global conflict. With the rest of the world we, too, have many headaches and baffling problems to solve.

Eventually our people will recover from the war jitters and America will return to sanity. In an age of might and materialism we should all pray that our people turn their backs upon hate and greed and turn to the faith of their fathers.

Under leave heretofore granted, I include the timely and helpful editorial which comes from the pungent pen of the gentleman from Minnesota, HAROLD KNUTSON, a great American:

AMERICA, THE BOUNTIFUL

A few days ago the publisher of the Pioneer Journal received a letter from a young man living in one of the liberated countries in Europe. It was written in English and the thought, composition, and spelling indicated the writer to be unusually intelligent and well educated. However, throughout the missive there was undercurrent of despondency and frustration that was most depressing.

The young man's purpose in writing, he quickly explained, was his boundless ambition to come to America, the land of freedom and opportunity, and here carve out for himself a new life. For four and more years he had lived like a hunted animal in constant fear of the Nazis, who occupied his homeland. He had taken an active part in the underground movement and more than once had been but a jump ahead of the hangman. During the occupation his father and an older brother had died in concentration camps; their home had been destroyed and the mother rendered a helpless invalid because of sufferings she had endured.

Would the individual to whom he wrote help him get to America? This was his one purpose in life and to gratify that ambition he would give anything and everything. To him America symbolizes all that is good, all that is noble, all that is worth while. He realized that he was asking much, but he was sure that the Almighty Lord would amply repay anyone who would help him attain his most cherished objective. He would slave and save to bring his mother and a young sister over here after he had become established. "Please, please, help me to freedom, to opportunity, to a more secure life." This was the concluding paragraph, and each word was twice underscored.

The letter set the writer to thinking. He, too, had been born in Europe, but unlike his young correspondent had been privileged to partake of the greatest boon and blessing that can come to any human being. By the grace of God he is an American citizen—free, free, free.

The thought also came to him that too many Americans do not fully appreciate all that America has given them. They take their citizenship in this great and glorious Republic as a matter of course and altogether too lightly. On all sides we see signs of violence, selfishness, and disregard for the rights of others. Thousands are out on strikes, thereby depriving other thousands of employment. Too many are loafing and living off

harassed taxpayers and a Treasury that is always empty, while employers desperately seek helpers.

Can this be the America that drew here countless thousands from other lands as the lode star attracts the magnet? No! No! This is not America; it is but a manifestation of a cancerous growth that is both foreign to our soil and threatening to our well-being. Rather it is a repercussion of the war.

In time sanity will return as surely as night follows day and America will again settle down to the even tenor of her ways. In time these discordant elements will subside and again take their places in the ranks of the greatest producing country in all the world for deep down in their hearts they know that no country can compare with ours, view it as they will. It is a land where every man is a king and every woman a queen. America has but stepped over the threshold of a new era that fairly dazzles with opportunities and promises for an ever continuing better life.

When we think of the millions who would come here and establish themselves in our midst and partake of our propesity and well-being it evokes mixed feelings—thankfulness for being an American, sadness that we cannot share our blessings with the less fortunate of other lands.

We derive much comfort and satisfaction in the knowledge that we can best help the less fortunate in other lands by remaining strong and solvent at home. A bankrupt America would but add to the troubles and tribulations of the times.

Check on Use of Strike When Public Interest Involved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent statement on industrial peace by George Ericson in Christian Science Monitor of September 29, 1945:

Strikes have now become dinner table conversation throughout the Nation as the number of workers who have left their jobs approaches the 2,000,000 mark. That they are a distinct threat to reconversion and a direct cause of loss of millions of dollars, not only to the industry struck, but to innocent parties, as well as to the striking workers themselves, is conceded by everyone. But the weapon of the strike is not, therefore, regarded as an anachronism, but as an inevitable part of the American scene. The unions consider it as the last and most effective arrow in their quiver in obtaining their demands.

It is barely possible that the present flare-up of strikes throughout the country is serious enough to bring about an insistent demand by the public for adequate machinery to remedy labor disputes before they reach the point of violence or an impasse where two antagonistic parties "stand on their rights" all the while that public rights are being trampled upon. It is commonplace that the public, as innocent bystander, must suffer losses and hardship while the contestants fight it out, but it is not common sense or justice, and sooner or later this problem will have to be solved in the light of public interest.

PUBLIC INTEREST INVOLVED

Illustrations of how strikes affect others not concerned directly are numerous. The elevator strike in New York by 15,000 operators has made idle a majority of the 300,000 workers in the garment and fur industry. Unable to deliver goods because of mounting congestion, the American Railway Express has put an embargo on shipments into Manhattan, while mail remains undelivered above the first floor of struck buildings. Altogether some 1,500,000 persons are adversely affected.

In the Pennsylvania and West Virginia coal mining areas, striking foremen have forced idleness on some 35,000 miners. The loss in coal production at a time when the Nation faces a fuel shortage is rising 200,000 tons a day. Public utilities see possible stoppages of essential services as a strike of oil workers in seven States is cutting off the flow of gasoline and oil.

A breakdown in transportation threatens in Detroit where the bulk of the gasoline service stations are displaying "no gas" signs and the bus system has had to curtail operations. The strike of 60,000 lumber and sawmill workers in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana is adversely affecting the construction industry.

PAY QUESTION MAIN STRIKE CAUSE

Basically, the strikes are to enforce the demand for more money, though some have occurred because of an accumulation of grievances during the war period; such as changes in hours of work, discharges, seniority difficulties, holiday pay, and even promotions. The strike at the Packard plant took place when union stewards were reported to have ordered workers to leave their benches on July 21 because they had decided the plant should not operate on Saturdays, at which the president of the company broke off negotiations with the local.

At the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. plant, a strike followed the discharge of three union members who had ejected a foreman they didn't like. In another instance, union members struck because several men were discharged for loafing. Other extensions of union authority have caused a stiffening of company officials' attitude in the conviction that these actions are an infringement of the management's right to manage.

The demand for more pay is certainly understandable, and as the prognosticators predicted, to be expected. But, because the unions ask a 30-percent increase to offset the drop in take-home pay because of a shorter workweek does not prove that it is either feasible or just.

TAKE-HOME PAY ARGUMENT

The increase is aimed to keep the workers' weekly pay at the peak level obtained during the war. Figured on basic, straight-time wage rates, the gain for labor since January 1941, has been about 20 percent, but on an average weekly earnings basis, the gain has been 77 percent. During the war, the War Labor Board, with the unions concurring, based increases on the basic straight-time wage basis. To retain the war gains, the unions have shifted to the weekly or take-home basis. It is this shift which management finds illogical.

The urge of labor to attempt to retain its present standard of living should receive every sympathetic consideration. It is regrettable that irresponsible unions or leaders have prejudiced labor's cause in various instances by hasty action, relying on intimidation and refusing conciliation services. The 30-percent demand is regarded in many quarters as not genuine, but as a bargaining figure. Certainly, the ill-considered CIO charge that industry has huge concealed profits from the war will hardly bear analysis. The assumption, of course, is that much higher wages could be paid out of such concealed profits. The truth of the matter is that no such profits could be hidden from the sharp eyes of the Treasury tax collectors or from the keen contract-negotiation boards.

COMPROMISE SEEMS NECESSARY

What then can be done to bring about understanding between the opposing sides and get on with domestic peace, now that international war is ended? Already more unions are calling for strike votes, in particular, at General Motors with its 325,000 employees, and possibly at Ford and Chrysler plants. These votes are taken under the stupid Connally-Smith Act which puts the Government in the ridiculous position of being forced to supervise strike balloting at taxpayers' expense.

Under this act, the balloting by the mine workers in 1944 cost the Government $250,000 and on the same basis would cost about $185,000 for a General Motors strike vote. The act lacked real teeth to prevent strikes during the war and it appears to have outlived its usefulness. Of course, its repeal would end the President's right to seize a struck plant, but such seizure is out of place in peacetime, and moreover, it doesn't solve the problem.

The business of adjudicating the disputes between labor and management has been a difficult one for generations. Differences of opinion are prone to arise as to what a man's work is worth and how much a person or a company can afford to pay. In a case like the present, compromise is the essence of wisdom where wages only are concerned. The Government cannot properly settle disputes during peacetime, though the present administration would like to keep its hand in by failing to declare the war ended. This enables it to retain some of its war powers.

CONFERENCE BEST SOLUTION

The best hope lies in representatives of labor and management getting together around a table and in time-honored fashion and with open minds examining the others' point of view. There is still time for a labor-management conference, if called at once. The one that the Government has set for November 5 may find a fait accompli facing it—a nation besieged by strikes. Putting it off to that late date is hardly a stroke of statesmanship.

Management should make concessions where these do not jeopardize a company's or industry's position. Labor should accept WLB decisions or an arbitration award even though they be distasteful. And Congress or the separate States had better consider remedial legislation where the public health is jeopardized or where strikes substantially involve the public interest. The right to strike is not an absolute one as was made evident at the time of the police strike in Boston. It is intolerable that any small group can, at will, put the essential functions of a big city at a standstill. One cannot legislate fairmindedness or an objective point of view, but at least the law can restrain and can impose penalties.

UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me September 29, 1945, over Station WIND:

My fellow Americans, though the actual shooting is practically over in the war-torn parts of the world, poverty, pestilence, and starvation still take a heavy toll of human lives. The coming winter will be the most cruel yet experienced by the unfortunate peoples in these countries. To combat this postwar strife, our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as early as December 1942, established the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations within the State Department. OFRRO was created to provide and transport food, clothing, and other necessities to war-liberated victims. During the spring and summer of 1943, OFRRO's program was put into effect to aid refugees in north Africa.

This was the beginning of what was to develop into a larger and more comprehensive civilian relief program. In June 1943, jointly with the British Foreign Office, the American Government presented to all the United Nations the draft of an agreement for an international relief organization. On November 9, 1943, the representatives of 44 nations met and signed the agreement establishing the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. UNRRA, as this organization is now commonly known, is not a permanent organization, but is self-liquidating in its activities. Its main task is to provide immediate relief and rehabilitation to those of the United Nations who cannot finance their own relief imports, and it is organized to assist the authorities of these countries until their essential relief needs have been met.

Each member in UNRRA contributes to the administration fund. Of 44 nations, 39 have paid their allocated share of the administrative expense. The remaining 5 have notified the Administration that their payments are in process. Of the $9,500,000 of administration expenses allocated for 1944, $69,167 remains unpaid.

Each of the 31 nations which were not occupied by the enemy during the war contributes to the operating fund. The contribution roughly is set at 1 percent of the national income for the year ending June 30, 1943. Twenty-six member nations have responded to date. The remaining five governments have notified the Administration that contributions are now in the process of authorization or appropriation. To date, approximately 70 percent of the total operating fund asked by the Atlantic City resolution has been paid in. The total made available up to September 15, 1945, is $1,268,750,254. There remains to be paid by the 26 nations which have already taken authorization action $597,365,987. Of this, $550,000,000 is to come from the United States. The original total UNRRA budget was about $1,862,000,000.

The assistance given by UNRRA might be classed under three heads: Relief supplies, consisting of food, clothing, fuel, medicines, household supplies, etc.; relief services such as health and welfare service, repatriation of displaced persons, etc.; rehabilitation supplies and services, such as seeds, fertilizers, raw materials, machinery, transportation, public utilities, technical services, etc.

UNRRA is concerned with meeting the immediate basic needs of the unfortunate people in order to tide them over their trying times—it is not intended to carry on reconstruction or permanent facilities.

Due to the destructive power of modern weapons and the scorched-earth policies of the enemies, the relief problem of this war is unprecedently great. The acute scarcity of housing, food, clothing, blankets, soap, medical supplies, and the like, increase the prevalence of disease and the threat of large-scale epidemics and plagues. The shortage of agricultural and industrial equipment, tools, livestock, and other machinery, prevents immediate resumption of production. UNRRA reports from Poland indicate that 98 percent of the agricultural field work is done by hand and one-horse equipment; during an entire journey through the country only three hogs were seen. Congressmen who recently returned from this unfortunate land report seeing very few cows and horses. The destruction of the transportation facilities, power resources, and installations greatly hampers the relief work that must be carried on.

It must be remembered that the Nazis stripped the countries they overran of everything that could be moved. All machinery, equipment, and livestock was moved out bodily. What could not be moved was demolished and destroyed. Thus, these people are no better equipped to look after their immediate needs than a man cast off on a barren desert island. They need tools, seeds, temporary shelter, food, and clothing until they can begin to take care of their own needs.

UNRRA has made necessary arrangements with the governments of supplying countries for the contribution of goods and convertible exchange and completed arrangements with the appropriate governmental authorities for the procurement and forwarding of more than $1,000,000,000 worth of supplies. It has made arrangements with SHAEF to provide assistance in connection with displaced persons in Germany, completed formal agreements governing the provision of goods and services to the governments of Greece, Italy, San Marino, and Albania.

On April 1, 1945, UNRRA took over relief operations in Greece, and on April 15, in Yugoslavia. Though it has experienced considerable difficulty in obtaining cooperation, it is now providing relief also in the Russian-dominated countries of southern and eastern Europe, including Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia.

Since the spring of 1944, it has operated six large camps in the Middle East, housing approximately 40,000 Greek, Yugoslav, and Polish refugees and providing them with food, clothing, health care, some recreational facilities, and supervisory services. The population of the camps is being steadily reduced by the repatriation of the occupants.

UNRRA has cooperated with voluntary agencies in the United States in collecting 15,000,000 pounds of used clothing in the fall of 1944, and 150,000,000 pounds of used clothing, shoes, and blankets in the spring of 1945. Further, it has helped organize similar collections in late 1945 in Australia and Canada.

A number of the nations, even though overrun by the enemy, had substantial foreign exchange and credit abroad and, therefore, did not call upon UNRRA for assistance, declaring they could take care of their own needs. Among these are France, Belgium, and Holland. Only those nations in the most extreme conditions have applied for UNRRA assistance.

Had the war in Europe ended in 1944, as it was generally believed it would, many of UNRRA's difficulties, doubtless, never would have arisen. But the war continued through the spring of 1945. Shipping and supplies remained tight and in many cases became tighter. Adequate personnel was hard to get. Communications and travel were a constant problem for a civilian agency. Thus UNRRA was confronted not only by practically all the problems of the armed forces, which had to fight a war in all parts of the globe, but in addition, did not have the priorities on manpower, supplies, and shipping that the military had. In addition, the continuation of the war meant increased destruction, suffering, and a greater need for relief than had been anticipated. These factors, in large measure, account for some of UNRRA's shortcomings in the eyes of the people.

The total break-down in transportation facilities has made it difficult at times to get goods through to their destination. Beginning about April 1, for example, UNRRA sent supplies for Poland into the port of Constanza, Rumania. There the cargo was unloaded and delivered to a representative of the Polish Government. There was considerable delay before the cargo began to move toward Poland, because the only means of transportation was by truck, and these were not in first-class condition, making the journey tortuous and slow and exposing it to frequent lootings. As a result, less than 75 percent of the total cargo eventually reached its destination. However, according to latest reports, the ports of Gdynia and Danzig are now open. The first shipload of UNRRA supplies bound for Danzig arrived there on September 17. The delay in making these ports available resulted from the fact that the retreating Germans destroyed the port facilities at Gdynia, making it accessible only to small vessels. The warehouses, however, are not completely destroyed. In Danzig, the situation was different. There, the port was intact, but the warehouses were destroyed. Arrangements now have been made to have the ships go to Danzig, leave half their goods there, to be loaded on railway trucks and sent to Gdynia, to be stored in the huge harbor warehouses. After unloading half the cargo, the ships are able to enter the port of Gdynia to unload the remaining goods.

From April 1 to the end of July 1945, UNRRA shipped well over 100,000 tons of supplies to Poland, valued at nearly $50,000,000. A few days ago UNRRA supply experts in Europe, in charge of obtaining Army surplus supplies for relief, advised their Washington headquarters that 500 Canadian Army trucks are now on their way to Poland. This should greatly relieve the transportation problem. When UNRRA delivers a cargo to a nation its control over the cargo ceases after the authorities of the recipient country take it over. However, UNRRA observers watch with a critical eye over the distribution of the supplies in a given country in order to make certain that it is not tainted by discrimination, whether for racial, religious, or political reasons. Reports of misuse of UNRRA supplies are immediately tracked down. While a few minor local instances have come to light, no large-scale instances of misuse exist. In these minor cases the local authorities have been quickly apprised of their error and the situation corrected.

The preservation of the lives of these unfortunate people who have suffered so greatly and given so much will be a decisive factor in our winning and preserving the peace of the future. Hunger and want are the most fertile fields for communism, fascism, hate, and war. UNRRA's principal aim is to help these people help themselves. The people of the United States readily contributed nearly $2,000,000,000 a week to gain victory. There is no doubt that they are willing to expend a lesser sum than a week of such spending to assure a lasting peace.

Contest in Selfishness Seen Between Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by David Lawrence on the failure of the recent London Conference expresses my own view of the moral origins of that failure.

Those of us who reproached the administration for the secrecy with which it conducted its negotiations at Yalta and Teheran, and the cynicism with

which the decisions made there scuttled the high principles heretofore always held by this Nation in its international dealings, have been justified by events.

The betrayal of Poland to meet Russian demands was the initial step down the road to the bog and mire of power politics in which our Nation now finds itself.

CONTEST IN SELFISHNESS SEEN BETWEEN ALLIES—WORLD IS PAYING PENALTY FOR EXPEDIENCY, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Failure of the Big Five Conference at London should occasion no surprise. The war is over. Allied unity evidently isn't considered abroad as imperative as it was before. The European nations are out to get what they can for themselves—and a contest in selfishness will inevitably wind up where the London Conference is today.

The responsibility, however, rests as much on the American people as it does on any of the nations now blocking an agreement. The first misstep was the Yalta Conference, when idealism was tossed out the window and the so-called practical school of thought came into the saddle. Persons who argued that the Atlantic Charter was being scrapped were rebuked and told they were perfectionists. Persons who contended that the Yalta Conference was a return to power politics were informed that public policy must rest on power, anyway, and that in the interest of Allied unity and prospective aid of Russia against Japan any compromise was logical and desirable.

Today the world is paying the penalty for such programs of expediency. Any agreement that concedes something that is basically wrong in principle, merely to gain some temporary end, rests on an unsound foundation.

RUSSIANS HELD LOGICAL

Secretary Byrnes announces that the difficulties at London are in matters of procedure. Obviously the Russian position has prevented an agreement, but the Russian Government has been both logical and frank from the beginning. It is pursuing an admittedly nationalistic position and wants whatever it can get. The British, on the other hand, have definite interests in the Mediterranean area and want a sphere of influence, too. No matter by what name it is called, the British and the Russians have marked out the areas which they want to control or influence in Europe.

The United States, ever since the Teheran Conference of 1943 under the leadership of Secretary Hull, declared against special alliances and spheres of influence. Efforts to introduce the balance of power by devices that are claimed not to be spheres of influence, but which really are just the same, have caused Russia to ask for a voice in everybody else's domain on the ground that if she is not to rule her nearby countries without interference from the other Allies then she—Russia—wants a voice in any other nation's diplomatic domain.

But as soon as the United States and Great Britain agreed to Russian participation in their own areas of interest, including the Japanese occupation, Foreign Commissar Molotov revived the position he took at San Francisco, namely, that other nations be ruled out and matters be decided by the Big Three.

START OF DEBACLE

In the end the situation resolves itself into a problem of accepting or rejecting collective security and collective settlement of all major questions. If this is to be a universally managed world to maintain peace, then such settlements as were made at Yalta were wrong. When Poland was dismembered to meet Russia's demand and separate zones of occupation for Germany lacking in uniformity were really sanctioned despite the public professions to the contrary, the start was made toward the debacle that has emerged this week.

There can be no sailing without some compass or chart or guide. The Allied Nations gave up their ideals when they violated the Atlantic Charter and proceeded to sanction a vengeful peace. Power politics is not compatible with a universal society of free nations. Russia has much to account for in her unilateral actions and politics but she looks about and sees power politics played by others.

Until there is mutual forbearance and a willingness to forego territorial or material advantages in the interest at least of a spirit of genuine friendship, there is likely to be little progress made toward the so-called peace treaty that is formally to end World War II. The deadlock may go on for a long time but at least Secretary Byrnes has courageously declined to discard any more American principles. In the end, giving fullest publicity to what has happened in London may awaken peoples everywhere to the dangers of trying to make peace on a nationalistic or selfish basis.

There is no harm in waiting patiently for a change in the moral climate of European diplomacy.

A Road to Home Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, America has always been a Nation of home owners. Sound, national policy has always called for the doing of anything which would promote the ownership of their own homes by the American people.

In recent years there has developed, however, a consciousness that there were some groups in the population who in the very nature of their economic circumstances could never hope in any human probability to become home owners. We have tackled the problem of the slum by means of publicly constructed housing to be rented to low-income groups among our people. Many, however, who have supported public housing where they believed it the only answer to the necessity of enabling American children to grow up in clean and decent surroundings, have hoped that the field of such public housing could be restricted as much as possible and that to the greatest possible extent other means could be adopted to enable the overwhelming majority of our people to meet their housing needs through their own effort and to look forward to the actual ownership of the dwellings in which they live.

To this end thoughtful people have sought an answer to the housing problem which would meet the needs of a group of our people who cannot command the resources to afford to own individual dwelling houses, but who at the same time are well enough off so they should not need to depend upon public housing for a solution of their problem. The question really resolves into whether or not the needs of this middle group are to be met by an expansion into higher income groups by the public-housing program or an extension of the home-owners program to reach lower-income groups.

The best answer that I know of—indeed the only one which has proven of practical and tested benefit—is the mutual home-ownership plan whereby groups of people of modest income are united together to own cooperatively multiple-unit dwellings, to share the financial and maintenance costs of such dwellings and to contribute to construction and maintenance cost and proper ownership share. Thus, home ownership can be made available to millions of people who could otherwise not know its meaning. Outstanding examples of the success of the home ownership plan are the Walnut Grove homes in South Bend, Ind.; Greenmont Village homes, Dayton, Ohio; and Oak Park homes, also at Dayton, the last of which was financed and constructed without governmental participation whatsoever. In the other two cases the homes were built originally by Federal agencies, but are now purchased by the associations of the people who live therein.

There has recently been formed an organization known as the National Mutual Housing Association, consisting of representatives of the different successful mutual housing organizations throughout the country, as well as representatives of other organizations which are desirous of promoting this constructive answer to a great segment of our problem of providing homes in America. One of the moving spirits in this organization, as well as the secretary of the Walnut Grove Mutual Housing Corp., is Mr. John Lutes, and under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks a description of the mutual housing plan written by Mr. Lutes:

MUTUAL HOUSING A PRACTICAL PLAN

(John R. Lutes, secretary, Walnut Grove Mutual Housing Corp.)

Recently Raymond Foley, the new FHA Administrator, wrote in a signed article in Bildor that the means must be found for serving the housing needs of the great middle class; above the lowest income and below the upper stratum. This was a practical, timely, and true statement and should be followed by concrete action.

Action that is predicated on full consideration of the problem, including its economic aspects, is required. Just building houses with an initial down payment within the reach of this income group is definitely not the complete answer. This has been tried to some extent and found to be an excellent method of developing housing that was predestined to become substandard in a few short years. What is needed is a means of providing low-cost housing with a small down payment and still providing protection from the economic forces which accelerate the depreciation of this type of housing.

WHY RAPID DEPRECIATION?

With mass production techniques plus building on low-cost land, and limiting houses to not more than two bedrooms, it was possible to build for this market in some areas. However, in reaching this market the builder had to operate so that he could not avoid accelerating depreciation of the housing, and here are the reasons why.

First, holding down construction costs and still providing a livable house meant that the house provided would require greater and

more constant maintenance than a higher priced house. Still the income level of the occupant of a low-priced house increased the possibility of his not being able to afford proper and regular maintenance.

Second, in building on low-cost land, the housing was usually located in a newly developed area not adequately protected by building-code regulations and land-use ordinances. It was common practice to use the familiar gridiron lay-out plan with houses crowded together and no provision for playgrounds or recreational areas. This, of course, increased the possibilities of neighborhood depreciation and provided no means for either preventing the inevitable development of spotty depreciation or controlling its spreading to adjacent dwellings.

Third, in housing of this type the turnover of occupants was very high, thereby accelerating depreciation. This high rate of turn-over resulted from the fact that families in this income group usually had accumulated very little, if any, financial reserves to enable them to weather periods of illness or unemployment. Added to this was the fact that low-cost housing seldom contained more than two bedrooms which increased the rate of turn-over as families outgrew the house.

FIRST PROTECT THE HOME OWNER

Efforts by the Federal Housing Administration toward developing ways and means of providing housing for this market have been limited to how it could be accomplished while still protecting the builder, the mortgage lender, and the FHA. Furnishing this protection was of prime importance to the FHA and they were justified in taking this viewpoint. But the way to provide housing for this market and also provide this protection is to first protect the home owner from the rapid depreciation of his house. This can and has been done under the mutual housing plan.

MUTUAL HOUSING

During the past 3 years the development of the mutual housing plan has been carried on by the Federal Public Housing Authority in order to provide a means for disposing of its permanently constructed war housing projects. However, the basic principles of the plan readily lend themselves to the development of private housing projects under the FHA program.

Briefly here is how the plan was put into effect on several FPHA housing projects. Occupants of the project organize a nonprofit corporation with membership limited to project residents. The project is leased to the housing corporation with an option to purchase in 2 years. During the time the project is operated under a lease any income after payment of operating costs, taxes, and interest is credited toward the purchase of the project. After the option to purchase is exercised the Government takes back a mortgage for the purchase price of the project payable over a period of 45 years and bearing 3-percent interest. A value is established for each dwelling with the total of all residence values at least equaling the project's mortgage indebtedness. Monthly payments are established for each dwelling unit sufficient to pay off its value in 30 years at 3-percent interest plus a charge representing the resident's pro rata share of the project's operating costs and taxes. In that the housing corporation has 45 years to amortize its mortgage indebtedness, the resident member is in effect making advance amortization payments. The difference between the amount the corporation is required to pay off on the resident's dwelling and the larger amount that the resident is charged in order that his indebtedness will be paid off in 30 years is called the resident's equity.

If a member moves from the project the corporation will purchase his equity or he can sell his equity at whatever price he can obtain to anyone whom the corporation will accept as a resident member. In case of extended unemployment or illness, a member may continue to occupy his home without making monthly payments until he has used up his equity credit. Also a member is not tied down to one size house. Should the size of his family increase or decrease he may transfer his equity to a dwelling which meets his needs.

POSSIBILITIES OF MUTUAL HOUSING

Construction of an entire project at one time will result in a low per unit cost. It will be possible to construct well-planned communities with adequate provision for the immediate or future construction of playgrounds, community facilities, shopping centers, etc. A community can be built that will be a safe and healthy place to raise a family with plenty of light and air, safe play areas, reduced traffic hazards, greater privacy, and less noise. Also under the mutual housing plan the savings made through a large-scale operation and the elimination of large sales commissions and speculators' profits will make it possible to give the consumer more housing for his housing dollar.

Uniform maintenance of the project and its continuous control by the mutual corporation will prevent rapid depreciation. Also the members of the corporation as a group will be able to protect their neighborhood against the effects of relaxing or changing local building regulations and zoning laws far more effectively than an individual home owner could.

Development of community interests will tend to lessen possibilities of residents moving. The fact that a resident can change to a larger or smaller dwelling within the project and can tide himself over periods of financial stress by using his equity, will substantially reduce resident turn-over.

In addition, a lower cost of operation will result from the cooperative management of the housing project than could possibly be attained by an individual home owner or by a corporate owner operating the project on a rental basis. This has been proved by the Walnut Grove Mutual Housing Corporation, which operates a 250-unit FPHA housing project in South Bend, Ind., and by the Greenmont Mutual Housing Corporation, which operates a 500-dwelling FPHA project in Dayton, Ohio. Audits made by FPHA of the first year of operation of these projects by mutual housing corporation show that both corporations have operated at what is claimed to be the lowest cost of operation for any war housing project of comparable size in the country.

Here is one plan which has proved its possibilities. Something should be done about its perfection and use. For years housing officials, experts, and economic planners have been talking at great length about the all-important job of providing decent housing for this middle income group, but adequate housing has not been provided. The time has come for action.

An Army Gold Brick?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the California Grange News of September 20, 1945:

AN ARMY GOLD BRICK?

Has Congress been sold a gigantic gold brick in the Central Valley by the Army engineers?

This question is being asked by many farmers, workers, and others who heard Col. Lester F. Rhodes, district engineer, tell the Farmer-Labor-Consumer Association Conference in San Francisco on September 8 that the Army program in the Central Valley is not, in fact, a flood control, but a multiple purpose one, chiefly concerned with irrigation and conservation.

Last summer high-ranking United States Army engineers' spokesmen told congressional committees that their program in the Central Valley was predominantly one of flood control. It was on the basis of these repeated claims that Congress included in the Flood Control Act last December authorization to the Army to build Pine Flat, Table Mountain, Folsom, Isabella, Success, Terminus, and other multiple purpose dams in the heart of the Central Valley project.

At the San Francisco Conference, Colonel Rhodes brought gasps of astonishment when he read a prepared statement, presumably official, in which he said that actually only 6 percent of the storage proposed for their total dam-building scheme in Central Valley are "for purely flood control purpose." Here are Colonel Rhodes' exact words:

"It will be noted among other illuminating facts in this table that of the total 11,213,400 acre feet of ultimate storage authorized or recommended, only 6 percent is provided for purely flood control purposes; whereas 53 percent is provided for solely conservation uses and the remaining 41 percent serves both flood-control and conservation purposes."

To these illuminating words surely Congress will paraphrase Fibber McGee's old-timers retort, "That ain't the way I heard it Johnny."

Testifying last summer before the Senate Flood Control Committee, on Monday, June 5, 1944, Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robbins, Deputy Chief, United States Engineers, said: "Take the Isabella Dam on the Kern River. Our figures show the percentage of benefits to be 65¾ percent flood control, and 34¼ percent irrigation." Referring to Kings River and Pine Flat Dam, General Robins stated that benefit would be 54 percent flood control and 36 percent irrigation. Terminus Reservoir on the Kaweah River would have "an estimated 61 percent for flood control, and "36.8 percent" for irrigation. "Flood control benefits are 56½ percent; irrigation 12¾ per cent" on the Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers.

Testifying before the House Flood Control Committee, on Thursday, June 10, 1943, Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, said: "On the San Joaquin group (Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and San Joaquin Rivers), to which I am now referring, the benefits of the projects would divide approximately as follows, in percentages: 56½ percent to flood control, 12.75 percent to irrigation; and 30.75 percent to power." Referring to the Kings River, he said, "the following distribution of annual benefits in accordance with this report are to flood control and prevention of flood damages, 54 percent; value of water that would be saved for irrigation, 36 percent." The Kaweah River would have benefits allocated to flood control of 61 percent, and the Tule River would have flood control benefits of 76 percent. Colonel Goethals said that on the break-down of benefits on the Kern River, "there is indicated allocation to flood control of 65¾ percent, to irrigation and increased power combined, 34¼ percent."

Congress certainly thought it was voting authorization for the Army to build dams that are predominantly for flood control; Senator OVERTON of Louisiana, chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee that heard the testimony, made it plain that the Army engineers should build only flood control dams, while the control of reclamation dams should be under the Bureau of Reclamation.

He said: "You just cannot have two in control. You cannot serve two masters, the Bureau of Reclamation and the War Department. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to vote to put the dual control of any dam under two different masters. You have got to have one. Where a dam is predominantly for flood control, it ought to be constructed by the Army engineers and be under their control, and then the surface storage required for irrigation and the use of water for irrigation is under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation. On the other hand, the reclamation dams ought to be under the control of the Secretary of the Interior. I do not see any other answer to it."

Whether the Army engineers willfully deceived Congress or whether they have just changed their minds again since last fall, as they have done at Folsom, Table Mountain and other spots, Congress should lose no time in amending the Flood Control Act to straighten out the mess we are in. As Senator OVERTON and many, many others have said, let each of these two Federal agencies attend to their particular knitting. Navigation and purely flood control works are the legitimate concern of the Army. Conservation, irrigation, and power dams should and must be planned, constructed, and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. Anything else spells chaos.

Leaning Over Backward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following Associated Press news item from Berlin on September 30 surprised and shocked many people in this country, offering as it does one more extraordinary evidence of our own lack of policy in Germany and of our desire to lean over backwards in helping Russia in its desire to spread communism in Europe.

The editorial from the Bridgeport Post of October 2 expresses some measure of the indignation that every American must feel in reading about this one-way radio proposition.

BERLIN RADIO USED ONLY BY RUSSIANS—ALTHOUGH IT IS IN BRITISH SECTOR, THE BRITISH AND AMERICANS CAN GET NO TIME ON IT

BERLIN, September 30.—The Berlin radio, once the voice of Nazi Propanganda Minister Goebbels, now broadcasts the political philosophy of the Soviet Union 19 hours a day under the direct supervision of 10 Red Army officers.

Although the radio station is in a borough of the British sector, the Soviet Military Command has retained strict control. Representatives of the other Allied powers who accepted tentatively the claim that the station was a Soviet zonal function are still awaiting Marshal Georgi K. Zhukoff's action on modified requests for some air time.

Sample tests indicate that the radio exerts a greater influence among the 60,000,000 Germans in the post-Hitler Reich than any other medium of Allied propaganda. It is heard by only a small percentage of those whose opinions it attempts to mold, but word of mouth repetition with a colorful extra dash of rumor spreads its message far west of the Soviet occupation zone.

PROPAGANDA BEATS PROVED

In 5 months the Berlin radio has scored what might be termed four "propaganda beats." They are:

Marshall Zhukoff was the first Allied commander to give the beaten Germans food, bringing in fats and other necessities to save Berliners from starvation; the Red Army was the first Allied force to declare itself free of racial hatred of Germans; Soviet authorities were the first foreign rules to encourage rebirth of non-Nazi political parties; Marshal Zhukoff's administration was the first to give the go ahead for redistribution of big estates to landless farmers.

Rigid security measures surround the station personnel. In contrast to the Moscow radio, where British and American broadcasters mingled casually with Russian technicians, the directors of the Berlin radio appear to believe silence is the best policy when curious Allied officers make occasional visits.

Similar to the six Berlin newspapers controlled by Marshal Zhukov, the radio is staffed amply by German subordinates. Virtually all in key jobs were drawn from the Free Germany Committee, founded about two years ago in Moscow by Civilian Communist expatriates and dissident German Army prisoners.

The Berlin radio shuns fairy tales for children and hammers away on disseminating the Soviet version of the meaning of democracy in a variety of programs. One baffled children's author said he had been instructed to go ahead with some children's script but "there were no romances between nobility and commoners, no mention of castles or peasant huts, no reference to soldiers or other military things, no largesse by an aristocratic hero to a humble maid."

Instead of medieval glamor a typical "youth hour" features a dialog between a mother and her farmer son. He described how a selfish German baron punished him for taking potatoes from his land to keep from starving but how today all the estate is divided into new homes in the liberated countryside," he exclaims.

WEIMAR A "CLASS" REPUBLIC

For adults a lecture entitled "Democracy as a Task" deals with more complex ideology in this fashion.

"The Weimar Constitution attempted to establish democracy in Germany, but it only gave democratic rights to a certain class. It was a complete failure and its most disastrous consequence was that it allowed fascism to gain power."

For current opinions on world politics the Berlin radio draws chiefly on statements by Soviet Foreign Commissar V. M. Molotov and leading articles in Moscow newspapers. Direct mention of communism is almost never made.

The American Army has one low-powered radio station in Berlin. It is operated exclusively to suit the tastes of American troops, but many Germans listen to it. Hour after hour it plays American jazz.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of October 2, 1945]

BERLIN RADIO

The Berlin radio station operates 19 hours each day. It is under the direct supervision of 10 Red Army officers, though it is located in the British occupation sector. Only the Russians get time on the station, and representatives of the other Allied Powers have been waiting in vain for action on their moderate requests to be allowed to offer programs to the German people.

It is still a one-way proposition, just as when Goebbels was shouting Nazi propaganda over the air. Now it is used for Soviet propaganda and nothing else. It limits its programs to the glories of the Russians and the Soviet version of the meaning of democracy.

It extols the virtues of Marshal Zhukov, first to bring food to the Germans; first to declare racial hatreds at an end; first to encourage non-Nazi parties; first to urge splitting the barons' estates to poor farmers; first to bring democratic rights to the 60,000,000 Germans.

Its news reports repeat articles in the Moscow-controlled press and statements by Foreign Commissar Molotov. But communism is never mentioned. That is not the way to woo the Germans, who have been brought up for years on a fear of communism. The Russians are so anxious to win the Germans to their side they do not make the mistake of talking about communism too freely.

The station is manned by Germans who banded together in Moscow. They are expatriated Communists and ex-German prisoners who turned against the Nazis. Children's programs, youth hours, adult lectures, all contain the philosophy on world events, culture, and economics of the Soviet Union.

The two most potent aids in bringing democracy to the German people are the press and the radio. Both are in Russian hands. The six Berlin newspapers are in Red Army control. Such an unfair situation should not be allowed to proceed unchecked. In the first place the Berlin radio should be used for education and entertainment and not for propaganda for Soviet Russia. Its radio time should be divided among the Allies and its programs supervised by a joint commission until the Germans can be trusted to handle the radio themselves.

Meantime the American Army operates a single low-powered radio station for the benefit of American troops. The German listeners are few, and hour after hour they are entertained by recordings of American jazz. What a contrast in the reeducation of Nazi Germany.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse President Truman's request of Great Britain that the doors of Palestine be opened immediately to around 100,000 displaced Jewish refugees now in Europe.

Acting on a report from Earl G. Harrison, American representative on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, the President late in September sent to Prime Minister Attlee a request that Jewish refugees now living in Germany and Austria be permitted to settle in Palestine. At the same time the President in a published letter to General Eisenhower directed that conditions under which many of these displaced families were living in American occupied Germany and Austria, as described in the Harrison report, be improved at once.

In connection with the tragic situation of these refugees I should like to

include herewith an article which I wrote recently for the October issue of the Christian Register—Unitarian:

PALESTINE—A CALL TO CONSCIENCE

(By HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS)

A friend of mine has just returned from a visit to Palestine with a shining story of faith. A young Jewish girl, brought into Palestine from the horror and bestiality of Hitlers Europe to begin a new life, is found writing a poem. She is the last of her family. Her parents lie in some common grave in a Polish field. But now she has been among friends and the subtle magic of Palestine has worked upon her. "What shall be our revenge?" she asks in her poem, and her answer is, "We shall plant 10 trees on the land and the birds shall make nests in them and sing every evening; and through the songs we shall hear and the trees we shall plant, we shall bring peace and happiness to all the inhabitants of the land.

Perhaps it is an apocryphal story, but it has a warming simplicity about it that is the very stuff of truth. If there is a moral to be drawn from the magnificent hope of this Jewish child so bitterly used by a Christian world, it is that the answer to pagan and Fascist negation is Christian affirmation; that the reply to the agony suffered by the world in this last frightful decade is to rebuild what has been shattered, and to make justice and decency grow where iniquity and hatred flourished before. Our opportunity to meet this challenge is a tremendous one because we are now in a time of historic decisions. What you and I do now will affect generations to come. And it is our generation—this generation—we the people, and we the legislators—that is making these decisions. The responsibility is enormous. I think that in our own fallible, questing way, we are on the right road. Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, San Francisco, Potsdam—these are milestones on the path. If we have realized at last that the world is one, and we are each part of it and must shoulder its obligations—then we have taken the first great step.

In this knowledge I think we must approach the problem of Palestine, for in many respects Palestine is a test of the ability of mankind to establish this brave, new world. Let us not mistake the situation. The Jewish problem, that much discussed and disputatious and embarrassing problem, is more a Christian than a Jewish problem. Upon us rests the responsibility for its solution. We know now that anti-Semitism is simply part of the weapon in the war against democracy. Failure to understand its role as a tool of world reaction had much to do with the rise of Nazism. As Dr. Henry A. Atkinson has pointed out, the real purpose behind Hitler's attack on the Jews "was to strike at the Judaeo-Christian tradition and the religion of Christianity and Judaism based on common principles." The Jew was the ostensible target but all of us were the victims. Politically, Hitler used the insecurity and homelessness of the Jews as an entering wedge to divide democracy. In their homelessness and defenselessness he recognized—as tyrants have always recognized through the ages—the weakest point in the armor of organized society, and there he struck.

Hitler is gone, but the forces he represented, whether labeled fascism, racism, reaction, antiliberalism, so on. No man can venture the full measure of the tragedy. Did 5,000,000 Jews die in Europe simply because they were Jews? Six millions? Our minds falter before such multiplication of horror. And this horror has not ceased. It has spread beyond the bodies of Dachau and Buchenwald and infiltrated into the hearts and minds of an entire generation of European youth. Is it not appalling to realize that virtually the entire younger generation of Europe—those who will be the leaders of the world of tomorrow—has undergone a studied, effective, anti-Semitic conditioning and that virtually every European youngster under 21 years of age cannot help reflect this?

Today the result is that even liberated Europe is in some respects a vast psychological Dachau for the Jews. Liberation has not meant liberation for all of them. The hardship of the postwar transition period are not conducive to the elimination of resentment and antagonisms. You could scarcely find better soil to nurture antisemitism than a situation in which the Jewish owner of an establishment returns to find it in possession of a non-Jew who asserts it is his by right of purchase. The return of confiscated loot and Aryanized property is the sebject of violent discussions everywhere. In Holland where anti-Semitism was once unknown, anonymous Dutch pamphlets advise the Jews to leave "since there are no prospects for them in Holland." In Hungary Jews in the provinces have been killed in broad daylight and in Poland, with pogroms reported in various villages, the Soviet authorities have ordered all Jews into the larger cities for their protection. In Slovakia Jews have returned after months of hiding in forests to discover their belongings, originally left with friends, no longer evident, and their homes either destroyed or in the hands of others. So it is throughout much of Europe. Homeless, pauperized without clothes, without food, their nerves shattered, their spirits broken, dazed by the murder of their families, they are in a sorry position to be integrated into a population still poisoned by Nazi propaganda and itself torn by economic and nationalistic stresses.

What is the answer? And where does Palestine fit into this unhappy picture?

Withall other minorities the Jews must fight side by side for full citizenship with all its rights and privileges everywhere in Europe. But at the same time large masses of them must be given an opportunity to make a fresh start. They are entitled to have their chance for a normal existence in a land where they are welcome and where they are needed. In this Palestine, uniquely prepared for precisely such physical and psychological rehabilitation, looms indeed as the promised land. It will welcome Jewish immigrants as no other place in the world.

It has work for their hands and sustenance for their spirit. In Palestine they will no longer be refugees, nor aliens, nor transients, but citizens among fellow citizens; and in rebuilding Palestine they rebuild themselves. Jewish leaders in Palestine, I am told, have already prepared a program for the absorption of the first million men, women, and children who come to them. Manpower is needed in Palestine: there is a shortage of labor. That herculean and magnificent task—the rebuilding of Palestine, the reclamation of her lands now derelict through centuries of neglect—is being carried out in a way which history has not seen paralleled anywhere.

This is the situation, then. All through Europe, the Jews, by the thousands, plead to enter Palestine. The word is on the tongue of multitudes in France, Switzerland, Belgium, the Balkans, Poland, Italy. Most of Rumania's 300,000 remaining Jews want to go to Palestine. In Greece the Jews presented Sir Walter Citrin, the British labor leader, with a memorandum signed by thousands requesting they be rescued by admission to Palestine. American soldiers daily bring back to us stories of the pathetic eagerness with which Jews in France, Germany, and Austria speak of Palestine.

But the incredible fact is that Palestine today—in this most critical time and when it can fulfill its greatest role—is closed to the Jews because of the Chamberlain white paper of 1939. This document, devised in an era of appeasement, sought to placate the pro-Fascist Arabs, who were then being agitated by Hitler and Mussolini, by limiting Jewish immigration into Palestine to 75,000 persons over a 5-year period. During the war the white paper was bitterly denounced by liberal leaders throughout the world. Winston Churchill called it a "plain breach of a solemn obligation." Herbert Morrison, then British Home Secretary and now American representative on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, stated bluntly:

"We regard this white paper and the policy in it as a synical breach of pledges given to the Jews and the world, including America." The late President Roosevelt declared that this Government had "never given its approval to the white paper," and the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations refused to sanction it. In England the British Labor Party, now at the helm of empire, unequivocally denounced it and in December 1944 went on record with the words, "There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now."

This white paper, deliberately reversing the intent of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate for Palestine, restricts Jews to settlement upon over 6 percent of the area of Palestine and limits their number to one-third the present population. The intolerable result is that today when we have completely repudiated appeasement, the white paper, born of appeasement and a sense of defeat, reaches its full and terrible flower. Now, in truth, what Munich began comes to its cruel conclusion. The gates are closed, and the welcomers who have worked only in hope of being able to welcome their suffering brethren, and the wanderers, who have lived only in hope of rescue when liberation came, are still apart. The pledges of civilization are still unredeemed.

The stand of the United States is clear and unequivocal, and I am proud of it. We are for justice. We support Jewish aspirations in Palestine. When the Balfour Declaration itself was formulated, it was done only after consultation with our Government and other Allied Governments. Pledging the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, it was included in the Mandate for Palestine, which was endorsed by more than 50 nations. Congress by unanimous resolution approved it in 1922 and it was later incorporated in the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, which made us co-responsible with Great Britain in the carrying out of the mandate. Every President since Wilson has supported it.

Last year both the Democratic and Republican parties adopted planks endorsing it. This year the vast majority of the members of both Houses of Congress, under auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee, went on record favoring the reconstitution of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth, and this was followed by the historic petition signed by 40 Governors to President Truman, recording their unqualified support "for this historic objective."

What is our duty as Americans who seek international justice for all minorities and lasting peace? I think our duty is clear. We in this country should join with the liberals and builders of lasting peace in England and France, and in the resurgent democracies of Europe, in a pledge that justice be done. Let us work together to open the gates of Palestine and help bring about its transformation into a Jewish Commonwealth in which the civil, cultural, and religious rights of all its people will be safeguarded. A Jewish state in which a great people can once more reinvigorate the world with those priceless contributions in law, in ethics, in social justice, in human brotherhood, which they have so nobly bestowed upon the world in the past; such was the vision of Balfour, Lloyd George, Wilson, Roosevelt, and all the great leaders of the past. It is the dream of the Jews of Palestine.

who have already seen that dream made substance, who have already built that little country into a stronghold of democracy in a sea of feudalism. It is the dream of thousands who wait in Europe today, sick at heart, shattered in spirit, hoping that the Christian world will, in some way, make restitution, restore honor, and carry out the pledges so long repudiated.

"We shall plant ten trees on the land, and the birds shall make nests in them, and sing every evening; and through the songs we shall hear, and the trees we shall plant, we shall bring peace and happiness to all the inhabitants of the land."

That is the call of conscience we must answer.

Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House is well acquainted with my views in connection with anti-Semitism. I have consistently fought prejudice and hate because I have felt and feel that it is a menace to our American form of government.

The war has demonstrated that men of all races, creeds, and colors have died in order to perpetuate freedom for all peoples. I have fought prejudice whether it be against the Catholic, Protestant or Jew, Negro or white. This should not be tolerated in the United States. We are all born with equal rights and privileges under this constitutional form of government, and no one should be permitted in any way to destroy that, for otherwise those who have shed their blood have not accomplished anything.

I know that the great majority of the American people believe as I do, and it is only because of a small minority, dangerous to a greater extent than their numbers, that we must be ever vigilant of our liberties and ready to fight the menace wherever and whenever it may appear.

The following is a copy of the May 10 issue of Counterattack, published by the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism, which deals with this subject:

TREASON TRIAL TO GO ON—SEDITIONISTS LINKED TO NAZI PLOT

The sedition trial is to be reopened. A new judge will be appointed, and a picked group of defendants tried.

This electrifying news comes to Counterattack directly from the Attorney General's office in Washington. It represents one of the greatest victories won in recent months by the American people. And, like a blockbuster, it explodes in the midst of America's fascists who thought they could get away with murder.

Hard-hitting O. John Rogge, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the prosecution, put the case squarely when he answered the following question raised by Counterattack:

"Are these seditionists linked to Hitler's world-wide conspiracy to use anti-Semitism as a wedge for fascism?" Bluntly, Mr. Rogge replied, "There is no doubt about it. The world-wide Nazi movement to destroy democracy planned to use anti-Semitism to set up nazism as a form of government in order to destroy our feeling for law and order and in order to accustom us to the use of force and violence."

AMERICA'S WAR CRIMINALS

Included among America's war criminals are the sedition trial defendants who plotted to establish fascism in America. Representing a real threat to the peace and security of the American people, they are to be retried and made to pay for their crimes—just as their fascist friends abroad are going to be made to pay for theirs by the United Nations.

Among America's war criminals are:

Lawrence Dennis: Collaborated with convicted German agents, George Sylvester Viereck and Dr. Friedrich Auhagen; author, The Coming American Fascism.

William Dudley Pelley: Organizer of the Silver Shirts, first native Fascist storm-troop outfit in America; organization emblem—the swastika; sentenced on August 12, 1942, to 15 years in jail for sedition.

Joe McWilliams: Spoke at German-American Bund meetings along with Fritz Kuhn; founder of the Christian Mobilizers and the American Destiny Party.

George Deatherage: Organizer of the White Camelia and the American Nationalist Confederation; ran for Congress on McWilliams' American Destiny Party.

Gerhard W. Kunze: Successor to Fritz Kuhn as fuehrer of the German-American Bund; known as the Goebbels of the bund; convicted of espionage.

HITLER "PARADISE" PROPOSED FOR UNITED STATES

The Government will prove that these men were in conspiracy with Hitler to carry out his ghastly plot to rule the world. Only today is America becoming aware of what the conspirator Hitler is capable of doing. Now that the veil of censorship has been lifted from the fighting fronts, atrocity reports are shocking the world. The master plan which set up concentration camps in Buchenwald, Belsen, and Nordhausen is the same plan followed so slavishly by Lawrence Dennis, Joe McWilliams, George Deatherage, and others. As recently as 1940 McWilliams declared: "Adolf Hitler is the greatest leader in the history of the world." His admiration for the Fuehrer was so unbounded that he expressed a wish "to make this country the paradise that Hitler has made Germany."

A paradise indeed. On April 25, 1945, reports from inside Germany gave grim details of how 1,000 American war prisoners were made to run a gantlet of slashing German bayonets on their way to a Nazi concentration camp. Their route was lined with German marines who cut and jabbed at them with bayonets and pounded them with rifle butts, all the while yelling to them to escape—while other Nazis waited to shoot them down with tommy guns if they tried.

This is the paradise that Joe McWilliams and other Fascists have planned for American soldiers and the American people. This is the paradise that the sedition defendants had in mind for America. As one of them, Frank W. Clark, put it, "When the day comes to settle the score and I'm given a reward for my patriotism, I want to be made chief executioner of those guys who are now sticking up for democracy." It was only last year that the same Frank Clark called for "a general civil war against the Jews" which would drive them into the Pacific or Atlantic Oceans "or else bury them here."

This is why these defendants, among the most dangerous and vicious men in America, are about to be retried for sedition.

ANTI-SEMITISM—FASCIST WEDGE

Jumping through the hoop every time Hitler snaps the whip, these criminals fall all over themselves to carry out his commands. And what are these commands? Said Hitler, "My Jews are a valuable hostage given to me by the democracies. Anti-Semitic propaganda in all countries is an almost indispensable weapon for the extension of our political campaign. You will see how little time we need in order to upset the ideas and the criteria of the whole world, simply and purely by attacking Judaism. It is beyond question the most important weapon in my propaganda arsenal, and almost everywhere of deadly efficiency."

Having heard their master's voice, the leaders of the Nazi world conspiracy in America set out to make anti-Semitism a propaganda weapon of deadly efficiency. Regular contact was established with Weltdienst—super-Nazi propaganda outfit charged with sending out to the United States and other countries pro-Fascist and anti-Semitic material. As early as 1933, the year Hitler bludgeoned his way to power, World Service recommended Lawrence Dennis' paper, The Awakener, as on a par with their bund's Deutscher Weckruf. Another sedition-trial defendant, Robert E. Edmondson, was thought of so highly by World Service that when, in 1937, he was unable to attend its conference at Erfurt, he received a letter of regret signed by Nazi gauleiters in attendance from 22 countries. Another defendant, Ernest F. Elmhurst, attending a propaganda meeting at Erfurt, delivered into the hands of the congress a speech entrusted to him by George Deatherage, now also on trial for sedition. Deatherage's speech was read and received so favorably that it was widely used in Germany under the title, "Is America the Jews' Waterloo?" These traitors did their work efficiently. The most recent congress of Weltdienst in Berlin paid tribute to their activities in these words: "Anti-Semitism has made deep inroads even in so-called democratic countries, and will be the greatest single factor determining the current conflict."

If ever an international plot existed, it is here plainly shown.

That anti-Semitism was used by the Nazis to destroy democratic forms of government all over the world was proved beyond the shadow of a doubt at the first sedition trial in the testimony of Dr. Hermann Rauschning, former president of the Free City of Danzig.

Under cross-examination, the witness for the Government, who had carefully recorded his many conversations with Hitler, declared: "Hitler used anti-Semitism to disintegrate established forms of government." In greater detail, Dr. Rauschning outlined Hitler's procedure: "According to what Hitler told me, he would tell this bad American to stir up anti-Semites and race prejudice, and American bankers against the New Deal, and capital against labor, and labor against capital."

ANTI-SEMITISM DIRECTED AGAINST 135,000,000 AMERICANS

In February 1944 the American people were warned by Franklin D. Roosevelt as to what Hitler and the Fascists meant by anti-Semitism. He knew and he plainly stated that anti-Semitism was not directed alone against 4,500,000 Jews in America but against 135,000,000 Americans. We warned: "Some of the sources of anti-Semitism in this country were created to serve Hitler's purpose. Let every American look to his own mind and actions so that while we defeat Hitler's armies we also defeat his poisonous propaganda. Whoever condones or participates in anti-Semitism plays Hitler's game. There is no place in the lives or thoughts of true Americans for anti-Semitism."

POSTWAR FASCISM IN AMERICA PLANNED

Military defeat will not, if the Nazis have their way, mean the end of fascism. Even now, Joseph Goebbels whines for the Nazis to go underground, hoping in this way to win the war for Hitler in the postwar period. On this score, too, the Nazis have

their friends in America. Here, too, are individuals and groups, the seditionists and their friends, who are carrying out Hitler's latest commands.

"Our movement is getting ready to break out into the open after the war, and when we do, this country is going to get the shock of its life." So boasted Gustav Homer Maertz, founder of the German-American National Alliance, to Chicago Sun reporter William I. Flanagan, adding, "We are organized—but not openly—all over the Nation." Maertz will be remembered as the author of a resolution, introduced last summer into the American First Party convention, calling for the deportation or sterilization of all Jews in America. The resolution was filed by Party Leader Gerald L. K. Smith for future action at an appropriate time.

These seditionists and their friends were accused of undermining the loyalty of the armed forces of the United States. But that's peanut stuff compared to what they're trying to do to the entire country!

It matters little to these hate mongers that Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish boys are fighting side by side in the fox holes of the world. Their objective is clear. If they can sow again the seeds of prejudice and hatred they will be doing Hitler's job in the postwar period. So cleverly is their work done that three veterans, appearing at a New York Times forum on America's Future, declared flatly that the greatest single obstacle to an enduring peace lay in the rise of racial tensions. Said former Corporal John Duff Stradley, "Dwell for a brief moment on the question of the returning Negro heroes from Burma hearing the detailed stories of the Fascist-inspired Detroit race riots, or the Jewish heroes returning to Boston and the tales of swastikas painted on their churches, the Protestant boy returning to the South and finding that the children of his Catholic buddy were being ostracized because they were Catholics."

PHONY VET GROUPS INCLUDED IN FASCIST SCHEME

Joe McWilliams' servicemen's reconstruction plan calls for a flat $7,800 bonus to every mustered-out serviceman. The plan which won high praise in the Chicago Tribune, is being mailed out in the form of reprints to servicemen's relatives all over the country.

Trying to use the veterans to advance their racket are seditionists William Kullgren and Edward James Smythe. Kullgren's rag America Speaks attacks President Roosevelt as one who knifed veterans of World War I. Smythe, for his part, heads a high sounding but largely paper organization entitled "The Protestant War Veterans." Designed for World War I vets, the organization makes a point of its exclusiveness—no Catholics or Jews. Under the cloak of this catch-all title, Smythe kept in close contact with Nazi propaganda agencies, receiving and spreading vast amounts of their poisonous printings before our country entered the war.

POSTWAR PEACE IN DANGER

On the political front the conspirators are no less active. Their boldness is nowhere more clearly shown than in their openly announced plans to wreck the peace of the world in the years to come.

The National Emergency Committee, claiming an advisory board of 50 men and women who include anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic leaders from 17 States, is now in action. Elizabeth Dilling, sedition-trial defendant, is one of the charter members, along with Carl Mote, Indiana Telephone Co. president, and Charles Madden, Christian Front organizer in Pittsburgh. Gerald L. K. Smith, who keeps a finger in every seditious pie, boasts in the Cross and the Flag that the committee is establishing a lobby in Washington and plans to visit Congressmen to fight the adoption of the Dumbarton Oaks superstate program.

FASCIST ATROCITIES STUN COUNTRY

The new order, which these home-grown Fascists are working for, is, of course, the same one Hitler strove to establish in Europe, with all of its trimmings—including concentration camps. Americans find it hard to think in terms of such hell holes, so deep is their love of liberty and individual freedom. Yet they are coming to understand the nature of the Nazi and to see how far his cruelty can reach. Compare Lawrence Dennis' eagerness to attend a Nazi Party convention in Nuremberg in 1937 with the disgust of an American infantryman who entered the city last month. Everywhere the mark of the beast. The stamp of Nazi cruelty on French, Polish, Russian, and, yes, American prisoners of war brought horror to the Allied liberators. Day after day American newspapers have reported gruesome new tales of wanton torture and murder.

At Rehau, Germany, American soldiers, passing through the town, were given the dog tags of six of their buddies who had been killed in cold blood by retreating Germans. These Germans had 369 American prisoners of war, most of whom had been working in salt mines. One liberated prisoner had this to say about his experiences: "It was worse than one big nightmare. The soldiers treated us bad enough but the mine owners treated us even worse. All of us were in irons and many of us were badly beaten." They were marched from the mine until they were almost unable to walk. At Rehau six dropped out. They just couldn't go on. There they were shot, one by one, and left lying in the streets. They were not even buried.

"WE'LL GET THEM"—EISENHOWER

No wonder General Eisenhower, when he met a recently freed American sergeant and heard of the brutal beatings he had received from a Gestapo captain, said grimly, "Would you recognize him if you saw him again?"

"Yes," said the sergeant, "and I'd like to kill him."

"Just let us get him," said General Eisenhower. "We'll take care of the rest."

Eisenhower was echoing the thoughts of President Truman who, in his first speech to Congress, said: "* * * We do not wish to see unnecessary or unjustified suffering. But the laws of God and man have been violated and the guilty must not go unpunished. Nothing shall shake our determination to punish the war criminals even though we must pursue them to the ends of the earth."

INCREASE IN ANTI-SEMITISM MENACES NATION

The search for these war criminals leads to our own country. Anti-Semitism is on the increase here. At a recent meeting of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Elmo Roper, director of Fortune magazine's public opinion poll, warned that America faces a revival of violent antiminority feeling in the postwar period. "While anti-Semitism has spread all over the Nation, it is mainly prevalent in the large cities," declared Mr. Roper.

Too often, acts of vandalism and hoodlumism, directed against the Jewish people and inspired by organized anti-Semites, are reported in the papers. In New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, Cincinnati, and other cities, synagogues have been pillaged, cemeteries desecrated, store fronts smashed, and individuals beaten.

Here is what happened in Waltham, Mass.:

The week before Easter a gang of 20 youths broke 30 windows in the library of Middlesex University Medical School. Two hours later they stoned a nearby synagogue. On doorsteps of houses, where Middlesex students board, the words "This is a Jew house" and "Kill the Jews" were written. The librarian of the medical college compared the stoning of the library with a similar occurrence at Philanthropic Medical College at Frankfort-on-Main, Germany. "When you see these things happen here," he said, "it gives you a shock and you wonder what's going to happen next. It was a piece of Nazi work that can grow and grow."

As Dr. Rauschning testified at the sedition trial, Hitler told him that "the best method of undermining the social order" was to accustom people to "illegal actions of their own or those around them." Anti-Semitic terror in America serves to carry out the directives laid down by Adolf Hitler. Youthful vandalism reflects the deliberate teachings or the careless conversations of adults. So that, consciously or not, these adults are following the seditionists and other organized anti-Semites in the country.

JAIL SEDITIONISTS TO SAVE AMERICA

All these facts point to one thing—for the safety of our country these defendants must be jailed. After the abrupt ending of the first trial some of the jurors, when asked, stated that they were ready to convict the conspirators. Yet, despite this, the defendants and their friends have boasted, and still are boasting, that a democracy cannot defend itself. The Government is determined to show them they are wrong. The Government is resolved not to allow American citizens to undergo the terror the Nazis unloosed on millions of innocent men, women, and children. The Government is firmly set against permitting the herrenvolk over here to hang their victims on hooks and then club them to death, a favorite Nazi pastime.

Assistant Attorney General Rogge is out to put some of the most dangerous and vicious men of our time in jail. Every American soldier knows that his job is not finished until every Fascist is wiped out. Rogge, too, knows that his job is not done until every one of these seditionists is stopped in his tracks.

Rogge is not fighting alone. The Government is behind him. It is for us to let him know that we, too, are with him. Every person and every organization can do this by writing to O. John Rogge, Assistant Attorney General, Washington, D. C., telling him that we support the determined fight he is waging on our behalf. Each of us should reach as many others as we can with this message.

This is what we must do for the good of our country.

Waterways and Industry in the Texas Coast Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while many sections of our great country experienced substantial industrial development during the war, I am quite sure that in no other area was that development more extensive than in the coast country of Texas. In that section, all the way from the Sabine River to the Rio Grande, a distance of about 450 miles scores of great plants were built to supply products that were essential to the winning of the war. Our fine ports and inland waterways, especially the Intracoastal Canal, provided the necessary transportation while the great oil and gas fields and sulfur mines that exist in that rich area furnished in unlimited abundance the essential raw materials for a great chemical industry whose contribution to victory was unsurpassed in any other locality. Magnesium, high-octane aviation gasoline, and synthetic

rubber came from these plants in vast quantities and our excellent ports and inland waterways insured their quick transportation to the battlefields of the world.

Now the war is over but many of these great plants will continue their operations to supply the needs of our peacetime economy. At Freeport, Tex., an important city I have the honor to represent, is located one of the most important war industries in the United States. It is now being converted to peacetime production, with enlarged facilities.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Russell Porter which appears in today's issue of the New York Times:

DOW CONCERN MAPS EXPANSION IN TEXAS—CHEMICAL COMPANY HAS $15,000,000 PROGRAM TO MEET EXPECTED DEMAND FOR PLASTICS

(By Russell Porter)

HOUSTON, TEX., October 4.—Executives of the Dow Chemical Co. are planning a $15,000,000 expansion program at Freeport, about 60 miles from here on the Gulf of Mexico, to help take up the slack in production and employment caused by the cancellation of war orders for magnesium, the lightweight metal which has become such an important factor in aircraft construction.

The company also hopes to lease part of the $90,000,000 Government-owned plants which it has operated during the war for the production of magnesium and styrene, a plastic which forms one of the most essential components in the production of synthetic rubber. If this lease is made, the expansion program will be increased by several million dollars.

Newspapermen touring the country to check on the progress of reconversion motored to Freeport today. They were informed by Dr. A. P. Beutel, general manager of the company's Texas division, that the proposed expansion would provide facilities for the manufacture of plastics for some new products, which he declined to specify for competitive reasons.

NEW AND ENLARGED PLANTS

New plants will be erected and existing ones will be augmented. From 2,000 to 3,000 construction workers will be employed during the next 9 to 12 months. When reconversion is completed, the company expects to stabilize employment at about 3,800 men. It now has 4,200 on the pay roll, but expects to drop to 3,200 during reconversion. The company started operations with 1,200 men in 1940, and got up to a peak of more than 6,000 during the war.

There is a greater demand for some plastics than the company is able to supply with existing facilities, but shipments of other products have decreased 35 to 40 percent pending reconversion by other companies which use them in the manufacture of finished products.

The Government-owned magnesium plant has been shut down since VP-day, but the company can use part of it for plastic operations if the Government accepts its offer to lease. According to Dr. Beutel, the Government-owned styrene plant will have to shut down in 30 days if the oil strike continues, the strike having cut off its supply of ethylene, byproduct of the petroleum industry essential to the production of styrene.

The company is anxious to continue the styrene plant in operation, and hopes the Government will continue to encourage the production of synthetic rubber.

SOME WAGE RISES NEGOTIATED

During the war the company operated on a 48-hour schedule but has been on a 40-hour basis for a month. It offered the nine unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, which represent its workers, a 10-percent increase in pay, and has settled with two of them for 10 and 13 percent, respectively.

According to the company the average annual earnings at 48 hours were $2,950, and will be $2,540 if all the unions accept the new wage scale. There have been no serious work stoppages so far.

Wages have not been increased in the Government-owned plants because of wartime regulations still in effect, but company officials said they were willing to pay the same scale there as in their own plants.

"We want to make arrangements to keep the Government-owned plants in useful work," said Dr. Beutel. "We have uses for them that would help industry and provide employment."

The executive said he thought some unions, especially those of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, were making a great mistake in their "arbitrary" insistence on 52 hours' pay for 40 hours' work.

If labor strife were allowed to stop production to any great extent, he warned, reconversion to high levels of peacetime production and employment might be seriously affected. While industry expected business to be good, it did not know for certain, he went on, and labor should be willing to accept the 40-hour week and wait a reasonable amount of time before pressing large demands.

If labor insisted on 30 percent or nothing, he declared, it might have to take nothing in the end, in the event that the whole production for quick and efficient reconversion was impeded.

The Dow Co. plans to continue operation of its own magnesium plant at Freeport. It uses sea water and oyster shells from the Gulf for the manufacture of the metal.

Wool and Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in 1943 the Commodity Credit Corporation started a wool-purchasing program for the avowed purpose of maintaining a domestic supply for war purposes and to prevent the too rapid liquidation of the sheep industry.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased this wool and has supported the wool price at the OPA ceiling price. In September this support price varied from 34 cents per pound in Oklahoma to around 50 cents per pound in other States, with an average of 41.4 cents per pound for the month.

The parity price for September for wool was 31.8 cents per pound, so the support price has been 130 percent of the parity price.

I received the following reply to a letter I had written regarding the storage situation of wool:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, October 3, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REID: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 1, 1945, requesting information with respect to the wool situation.

According to the last report issued by the Bureau of the Census July 1, 1945, there were 246,421,000 pounds of foreign wool and 468,592,000 pounds of domestic wool in storage in the United States. Of this amount the Commodity Credit Corporation reports as of August 1, 1945, they had a stock pile of 342,000,000 pounds.

I am informed that in addition to these figures, the British Government has a considerable amount of wool stored in this country from which they are constantly withdrawing supplies. I have been promised by the proper division of the RFC the British figures tomorrow. My office will phone these to your office immediately on receipt.

We are very glad to have the privilege of serving you and hope these figures will answer your purpose.

With best wishes and highest regards.

Sincerely yours,

LAFAYETTE PATTERSON,
Administrative Officer,
Special War Food Staff.

The British Government's storage is 297,000,000 pounds in the United States at this time.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is considering selling some of their stock pile and I am advised that this will entail a loss of some 6 cents per pound, as of today.

I have no desire to comment upon or to criticize the operations of this wool pool, which during the war has assumed the role of a governmental monopoly. The wool of the British Empire is evidently handled by the British Government as an established policy.

There is no reason why the wool people themselves could not effectuate a formula that would give the producer at least equal benefits if and when they had an assurance of a fair share of the American market for their product. Wool is not classified as a commodity coming under the Steagall amendment with a 90 percent parity floor but is a commodity that has its price supported outside the Steagall amendment.

The St. Lawrence Seaway—An Unwanted Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence scheme of today offers as many dangers to the Niagara frontier and the whole eastern seaboard industries and labor as it did in 1919. Although the golden bait of cheaper electric power may put some of our New York delegation into a zone of twilight sleep, the waterway provisions are still included in the pending legislation. There lies the danger to the vast and fast transportation and industrial empire in western New York. Business interests in the port of Buffalo already have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars in revenue since the deepening of the Welland Canal.

Lake shipping interests all agree that all the ocean shipping would leave ports on the Great Lakes in ocean bottoms and that would leave ports on the Great Lakes to compete for domestic traffic. The entry of foreign ships to the Great Lakes trade would injure the American merchant marine and would subject our sailors to competition with foreign seamen with much lower wages and living conditions aboard the vessels.

The return of normal shipping on the Lakes in coastwise and intercoastal trades together with the ability of the trucking companies to repair and replace their present equipment will provide this country of ours with more means of transportation in the postwar period than will be necessary.

Our carriers have earned the praise and gratitude of everyone for their splendid contribution to the war effort and it would be a rank injustice to make them face the loss of traffic that does accompany cessation of hostilities with the further loss of revenue tonnage that would be diverted to the proposed seaway.

Any student of freight rate adjustments knows it is not without reason that the loss of revenue to the existing carriers resulting from loss of tonnage would be offset by increased rates on the remaining noncompetitive traffic. The proposed seaway would not reduce the over-all cost of this Nation's business and while it may be of some small value to a relatively small section this would be offset many times over by the cost of the project and the loss to those who would be adversely affected.

The claims of the large benefit to our grain farmers is not a fact. Stop and think not so long ago the United States was one of the largest grain countries and supplied a great portion of the world. Where has that industry gone? Why has it gone? Cheap labor and cost of production. We cannot live as foreign labor lives. So beware. You remember just a few years ago when South America came to your doorstep with grain cheaper than you could produce it. This will happen again if we spend the billions of dollars necessary for this project and its upkeep.

No subject has been more fully discussed by the American people for the last 20 years than the St. Lawrence seaway. The overwhelming mass of testimony and irrefutable facts presented in opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway at the hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee during July of 1941 clearly shows the incalculable injury that would be inflicted on the transportation system of the United States, both land and water. The destruction of port values especially on the eastern seaboard and the disruption to shipping and industry generally.

The project is economically and commercially unsound. The tax burden without corresponding benefits and the permanent detriment on banking and industry, employment and purchasing power, increase in unemployment affecting a large army of railroad men, miners, seamen, and many other industries. Even if this were economically sound, which it certainly is not, the result of its development would not be available for many years, and what the postwar conditions are to be is beyond the comprehension of even the keenest and broadest scientific mind.

Of one thing we can be sure—namely, that it will be many years before we recover from the enormous financial burden and loss of manpower due to the years of war.

I do hope the men who have been elected to represent the people, especially of New York State, will not run out on them. Some of our people have a change of mind after an election. Our senior Senator from New York apparently has had a change of heart. I cannot believe that anyone who so vigorously fought against this project can be wholeheartedly for it now. Members of Congress from New York should present a solid front against this project, and it is my hope our senior Senator will join with the opponents of this project and not split up the delegation.

Some of our greatest engineers have testified this is one of the projects that at best would only be navigable 7 months of the year.

It looks to me now as though Congress is getting ready to dispose of a lot of our surplus ships built at the cost of our tax payers by turning them over to our foreign competitors. I am sure the average American citizen who believes in American labor and industry will not be for building this huge project. The opponents of this seaway should all band together and defeat this effort to sell America down the river.

Have We Trapped Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial by Richard Lloyd Jones, appearing in the Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla., September 29, 1945:

HAVE WE TRAPPED THEM?

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

What's the big idea? The war is over. The boys who won our victories in Europe and in the Pacific should be returned to their homes without all this delay.

Hundreds of thousands of precious sons and daughters have given their lives that America might forever remain the "land of the free and the home of the brave." We now betray their faith in freedom if we keep their comrades who survive them in a vast idle army to accommodate a lot of brass hats.

In the last national campaign Governor Dewey time and time again warned that plans were being made to keep the soldiers in service after the war was won.

Victory is won. And we now face exactly the same economic confusion that we were in when the war began. The party in power is unequal to the task of guaranteeing freedom of enterprise that full employment for all willing workers might return us to the robust national health that was our tradition for a hundred and fifty years.

Governor Dewey was right when he accused the party in power of needing a war to make jobs for the jobless. Now that the war is won the party in power betrays our men who won the war if the only solution they can devise for jobs for all is to keep our boys in uniform on petty soldier pay.

Technically we are still at war with both Germany and Japan and will be until Congress declares the war ended. But the fighting is ended. Our enemies have surrendered and laid down their arms. For Congress to delay official acknowledgment of the war's end is to play a contemptible political game on our sons who enlisted to save our country. This they have done. Their war work is done. The people must bring them home.

America has repudiated her heritage and denied citizens their birthrights if, now that the wars are won, we must keep a wartime army because we are not equal to create and to protect the industry, enterprise, and commerce that can provide civilian jobs to the men who have done their soldier duty. The boys are impatient to return to their civil life, their privileges and opportunities. Is the Democratic administration going to deny them this?

President Truman has said that five and a half million men now in the Army may be returned to civilian life within a year or 18 months. Why bind them for a year and a half to war duties when there are no war duties?

Washington's heroic little army of volunteers made this Nation. When that job was done, they, like John Burns, of Gettysburg, went home to their cows and bees.

When Lee surrendered the soldiers of both the Union and the Confederate forces promptly returned to their fields and factories and went back to work as freemen, as freemen should.

It is true that neither Japan nor Germany can be trusted. They are licked, but they won't stay licked unless we police them. But there is enough manpower in Russia, England, and France, who are menaced by Germany as we are not, to do all the policing job that is needed to keep the Germans in strait-jackets. There are enough soldiers in China who are eager to keep the offensive Japs in place so they cannot disturb the peace of Asia again. Through the professional soldiery of our standing Army and those who may elect soldiery as a life vocation, we can set up a force that is amply adequate to meet our part in the policing job of Germany and Japan. Pay the soldiers what we paid our war workers, and we will have all the army we want.

General MacArthur has announced that 200,000 men are all that are needed to keep the Japs in submission. He knows the needs as no swivel-chair "political duck" does. Yet, Acting Secretary of State Acheson had the impudence to rebuke MacArthur and to announce that we would keep our sons in the Asiatic area indefinitely to conduct a social and economic revolution in Japan.

Our sons did not give up their civilian life, their homes, and rights to conduct any social enterprise in Japan.

Nothing can be so un-American, such a repudiation of our freedom and our rights, as to enlist men for a war need and then trap them—trap them.

It is asserted that this may be part of a political scheme to ingratiate the war workers who, free from war hazards, were paid fabulous wages while our fighting men were paid a pittance for facing death.

No German army and no Japanese treachery can menace our freedoms and our rights as much as a political scheme here at home to keep our civilians in a mammoth military machine for political purposes. And if this be done, our brave and patriotic civilian sol-

diers have been trapped. We must make Congress bring the boys back home.

The professional soldiers have done a great and grand war work in these two wars against the Germans and the Japs. And all honor to them. Now it is up to the professional soldiers to do the policing job for which they are trained and which is their vocational work by choice. A lot of them have been advanced in rank because of the overwhelming proportions of our enlisted army that enlisted only to fight the war.

Many of these promoted officers will be reduced in rank when the Army is reduced to peacetime proportions. Are we to keep our civilian sons in military regimentation merely to accommodate the rank rating of officers who make soldiery their business?

Our volunteer and drafted soldiers enlisted for the duration of the war, plus 6 months. The Government at Washington has not officially declared either the German or the Jap war at an end. Without that honest proclamation the war may be accepted as continuing for the next 25 years, as long as we participate in the policing of Germany and Japan.

Whether the Democratic Party, whether President Truman wants to proclaim the truth or not, the fact remains that the war with Germany came to an actual end 4½ months ago. Under the enlistment pledge our soldiers should have their honorable discharge before November. And our Government cheats these valiant civilian soldiers if it does not keep its pledge to them. Like Cincinnatus of old they should return to their plows, to the jobs they left and that are waiting for them, to the homes where they are wanted and needed—to the loved ones who have endured this enforced absence and who have been waiting with patriotic patience.

There are over 8,000,000 men in the uniform of our country today and the military experts whose appraisal of our military needs are to be respected have declared that 50,000 men is all that is needed for our participating contribution to the policing of the Germans and the Japs. In his victory speech General MacArthur spoke of the spiritual strength and power of the American civilian soldier who brought us through to victory, and he said, "They are homeward bound, take care of them." Are they homeward bound? And what is our Government doing to take care of them? Every American who is worthy of his American heritage should write our Representatives in Washington and demand that the President and the Congress bring the boys back home.

What Are Floor Prices for Farm Products To Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish at this time to include two letters, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 29, 1945.

Mr. WILLIAM J. ROGAN,
County Agent, Wausau, Wis.

DEAR MR. ROGAN: In compliance with my promise to you a few days ago I am writing to give you the legislative position of agricultural prices which are of particular interest in this reconversion period.

H. R. 5765 provides for a 90-percent parity floor in the following language: "During the continuance of the present war and until the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January following the date on which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated."

H. R. 4972 provides the following: "Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation that is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make readjustment in the production of the commodity."

The basic commodities, which as you know are corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, provided for in basic legislation, have the loan features for their protection. This is on the basis of 90 percent of parity, except cotton, which is on the basis of 92½-percent parity loan.

There are some 33 nonbasic commodities eligible to come under the announced price support or under the Steagall amendment or the 90-percent guaranteed parity floor.

It is then evident that there are two strings attached to this guaranty for nonbasic commodities:

1. It is up to the Secretary to determine when he will give sufficient public announcement as to the discontinuation of support.

2. It depends upon the moneys appropriated by the Congress to support the support price.

The farm interest must be very vigilant, or the producers are going to entail considerable loss due to the fact that if the provisions are not maintained and the commitments not fulfilled an enormous farm loss will be encountered.

This is a big problem and how this floor is going to be maintained for the next 2 or 3 years without some formula or machinery to determine the amount the guarantee is to apply to, surely merits and requires some forward thinking at this time.

The import situation also injects itself into this picture because at present world prices on practically all major products plus the proposed duty under the new reciprocal trade treaties is a less price than is the 90-percent parity price guaranteed. In other words, we are liable to find ourselves not only providing the 90-percent parity floor in the United States but we will, in fact, be in the position of providing a floor for the agricultural prices of the whole world.

Frankly, I think this situation can be fairly and equitably handled if it can be approached on a practical basis. If too much politics is injected into it, I am afraid we will have a confused situation which will bring great financial loss to the rural people as well as to the general public. Since the national income is seven times the farm income, no doubt the effects will apply to the whole economy of our country.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 4, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REID: As per your request of October 1, 1945, we are listing for you the following commodities which come under the Steagall amendment: American-Egyptian cotton, butterfat, chickens (except chickens under 3½ pounds and broilers), dry beans (specified classes), dry peas (specified classes), eggs, flaxseed for oil, hogs, milk, peanuts for oil, potatoes, soybeans for oil, sweetpotatoes (cured), turkeys.

In addition, as you know, 90 percent parity loans are provided for the following six basic crops with the exception of cotton, on which 92½ percent parity loans are provided: Corn, cotton, peanuts for nuts, rice, tobacco, wheat.

Other commodities under price support in 1945, although not under the Steagall amendment, are: Barley, fruits for processing (apricots, peaches, pears, prunes, raisins), grain sorghums, hay and pasture seeds (specified kinds), naval stores, rye, sugar beets, sugarcane, vegetables for canning (snap beans, sweet corn, green peas, tomatoes), winter cover-crop seeds (specified kinds), wool, oats.

With best wishes and highest regards,

Sincerely yours,

LAFAYETTE PATTERSON,
Administrative Officer,
Special War Food Staff.

We are confronted with a serious problem. If a common sense approach is not made, the Congress can easily be blamed for not furnishing enough funds to support the support prices. I believe every Member of Congress wants to see the commitments fulfilled. However, the Administration must assume its share of the responsibility and offer a program or formula based on common sense and common fairness.

Hogs evidently came under both the provisions of the Steagall amendment and the support program as well. The first floor price was 110 percent of parity. Hogs were allowed to sell in the winter of 1943–44 at 50 to 60 percent of parity, which was contrary to the provisions of the Steagall amendment. The other support price had applied only to certain hogs of certain given weights. Eggs were and are a Steagall commodity that was allowed to sell 50 to 60 percent of parity also in the winter of 1943–44. Eggs have and are supposed to have had both the price support and the Steagall support price set-ups.

The difference between the crops or products under the Steagall amendment and the crops or products under the support program is apparently this: The 90-percent parity floor price under the Steagall amendment is mandatory legislation so long as the Secretary does not make a public announcement to the contrary and so long as Congress appropriates the money to support the 90-percent parity floor price.

The crops and products not coming under the Steagall amendment will be supported at the wish of the Secretary of Agriculture and if the Congress makes sufficient appropriations to the Commodity Credit Corporation to enable the CCC to conduct a governmental monopoly of a crop or product.

Wool, if it came under the Steagall amendment, would have a 90-percent-of-parity floor. The parity price of wool as of September 15, 1945, is 31.8 cents per pound, so under the Steagall amendment the support price would be 28.6 cents per pound. The support price on the basis of the OPA ceiling price of wool was an average of 41.4 cents per pound in the United States on September 15, 1945, or really 130 percent of parity instead of the 90-percent parity floor price protection afforded some of the other farm products.

The need for wool may have justified this 130-percent parity floor and ceiling during the war, but the long-time approach must have a yardstick that applies to all farm products equally and fairly.

We as a Congress do not want to give the bureaucrats the opportunity of blaming the Congress if farm prices go below 90 percent of parity at a time they have the responsibility of providing a sensible program.

This is the opportune time to be thinking about it and doing something about it as well.

Russian Semantics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of October 1, 1945:

RUSSIAN SEMANTICS

In the discussions of the Council of Foreign Ministers the representatives of Russia, the United States, Great Britain, France, and China have employed no word with greater frequency, vehemence, or approval than the word "democracy." Yet when the Russians speak of democracy, they mean something very different from what we or the British or the French or even the Chinese mean by it. At his recent press conference Foreign Commissar Molotov insisted that the present governments in Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary are democratic. But all the evidence that has reached Washington, London, and Paris indicate that at the present time they are not democracies in our sense of the word at all; that is to say, they have no clear mandate from the people they rule; they tolerate no real freedom of speech, of the press, and of assemblage; opposition elements in those countries have little or no rights. The Russians, however, insist that the regimes at Sofia, Bucharest, and Budapest are democratic.

The question arises: What do the Russians mean by democratic? In a recent Soviet broadcast David Zaslavsky has given a curious answer. He said: "In my opinion the best answer was given in the war just fought and won. Without doubt, this was a war of the united forces of democracy against the joint forces of fascism, and democracy was the victor. German fascism was defeated by the Red Army. The Red Army liberated the democratic states of a considerable part of Europe and restored to them their independence, freedom, and democratic institutions. And now that the war is over, the country which is most persistently fighting for the eradication of all remnants of fascism should be considered the most democratic."

In other words, the fact that a nation has fought Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy is enough by itself to make that nation democratic. This argument clearly evades the issue. Incidentally, Zaslavsky never once discusses the presence or absence of civil liberties as a test as to whether a nation is democratic. But he does make a great to-do about the possibility of democracy existing in a country, such as Russia, which is ruled by a single party. Just as he says there have been nations, such as Austria, where before the war "there were almost as many parties represented as there were deputies," and that such a multiplicity of parties did not make for democracy, so the existence of a one-party system does not mean the denial of democracy. We would call such an argument a non sequitur, if we called it anything.

Apparently Zaslavsky realizes that this argument may sound strange to western ears. Accordingly he asks the rhetorical question: "But supposing there is no opposition, what then?" His answer is that "an opposition is an integral part of bourgeois parliamentary democracy for the simple reason that the opposing interests are proof of the very life of these countries. It cannot but exist in a country which has within its classes with conflicting social interests." And he goes on to say that "under Soviet democracy there is no opposition because we have no landlords and no capitalists. All power, both in the Soviet Parliament and in Soviet economy, belongs to the people, to those who labor. Is not this, then, the highest form of democracy?"

To many Americans this may appear to be an egregious play on words, with Mr. Zaslavsky begging the question he is supposed to answer. But, since he is probably sincere in his belief, we can only come to the disturbing conclusion that Soviet and American conceptions of democracy are too far apart ever to meet. The time has come to drop the word when dealing with the Russians and define exactly what we mean when we insist upon democratic regimes in the former enemy countries.

Soldiers in Pacific Should Be Released

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I submit herewith copies of two letters received from men on Okinawa. These letters are revealing and truly reflect the attitude of the men who serve there. It is our solemn duty to see that they are returned home without delay, notwithstanding War and Navy Departments excuses to the contrary.

OKINAWA, *September 12, 1945.*

DEAR MR. LAWRENCE SMITH: I am writing you this letter to know and find out why doesn't Congress do something about us men in the armed services. It's about high time that some action take place soon. We came into the service to do our part for our country and for all you people back home—so we want you people to do your part now, which you all should of done long ago. Instead of talking back and forth like a bunch of kids, why don't you do more in getting us men back that have over 3 or 4 years in the service? If there won't be any action taken soon, then we as the whole will take it in our own hands and when we all do get back we'll see to it that we get a new Congress. Don't only think of the civilians, about getting them jobs, etc. Think and do something in getting us back home and then we all can and will be happy. You seemed to be doing so darned much about getting other men home, but did you ever stop to think about us married men? The Government could save a lot of money on us married men if only they do something so we can get home to our families so that we could support them ourselves. The way you all work out these point plans makes us laugh at how you run things. You may think who in hell am I to write you this letter. If that's what you have in your mind, then go ahead and think that. But you'll be surprised (if action isn't taken soon) to find out that there are thousands and thousands of men like me that will do something ourselves soon. All we can say, it isn't fair at all the way you are trying to get us men back home—the way you all run things makes us sick now. We all thought that the good old United States of America was a place for freedom. But no; you people are changing things, but it won't and shall not be changed. Now, before I close this letter, we want something done soon in getting us men back home and not so darned much of this red tape either. We men that have over 3 years of service are entitled to come home, and don't say we aren't. If it's replacements we need, then why in hell don't you send them over? There are lots and lots of replacements for us, so get them in the Army soon. We will be waiting to see how long it will now take you all to do what is fair instead of doing what isn't fair. I could have so many fellows sign this letter that it would make your hair stand on end. But I can't because it would take pages and pages to get their names. So, you see, I am writing this letter, not only for myself but for all of us. We did our part to bring this war to an end as quick as we could and we expect you to do your part now in getting us back home.

Just one of the thousands of boys or fellows that think I know what's right from wrong.

P. S.—Better tell that War Department to go to hell and take over the job yourselves.

OKINAWA, *September 9, 1945.*

DEAR DAD: We are beginning to get a pretty raw deal here on Okinawa since the war has been over, and I thought you would like to know about it, and possibly pass the information along to WILEY or some other Wisconsin Congressman or Representative who might be able to do something materially toward alleviation of it.

First off, the trouble here centers on a Colonel Baer, Chief Signal Officer, for the island command, who seems to be typical of the Regular Army career officers, who is exhibiting all the indications of being sorry that the war is over and he is in danger of losing his own little empire by it. He's too high for civilian time rank, with its pay and privileges and position of absolute ruler is now in danger, and he is naturally doing all he can to protect and hold it, with the power and wartime rights of review over all his command; he's doing all right by it, too. He made this statement to a conference of Signal officers: "I don't care what the points or age the men have; I'm going to keep this command together and do the job here, if they (the men) and you are all old men by the time you're through." I've been a Signal officer on this island as long as any white man has been on it, and I know that we have more men, units, and matériel here now than at the height of the battle, when we did a very adequate job. And he won't let anyone go, and he is still asking for more. He just turned back a request for a replacement officer for our company to take the place of Lieutenant Lugenbuehl, a friend of mine who started in this Pacific war at Guadalcanal, and he is still here. He sent the papers back marked "No action to be taken." Lugenbuehl has over 90 points, and that's low compared to some men and officers who he has refused by his powers of declaring them "essential." If these men aren't allowed to go back home now—we who are average in points and service will never get back. Colonel Baer is happy and satisfied here; this is his profession, and by the war he has really outdone himself in it. He's set and he doesn't want to lose anything, and he is perfectly typical of all the Regular Army colonels and generals who have all to lose and nothing to gain—now. The trouble is the system of leaving the decisions of relief and discharge opportunity up to them. The job is a legislative one, and until these systems—all of them—are scrapped, and the only point of question pertaining to a man's civilian or military status is strictly one of self-election, the underdog deals that are so unfair out

here will go on to the men out here—there are a few simple solutions:

1. Send back immediately all men who were overseas in forward areas during combat.

2. Replace them with the regulars and volunteers that a higher standard of pay and conditions will induce to accept this life.

3. Give Okinawa to China or at least use it only for an advance Navy base.

(It has no peacetime strategical value that Saipan and Guam can't take.)

4. Take the power of declaring men and officers essential away from field commanders. It is being terribly abused here in our case and makes for empire-holding military men.

5. Investigate and stop the use of men who came over here to fight Japs from being used as pure labor for the construction of permanent military installations intended for 20–30 years use, when first it isn't yet known if we will keep this island, and second it is a flagrant abuse of fighting men as virtual being slaves.

Well, I guess that's about all for this time although there are other minor abuses also which might be more important except for these mentioned. The lack of fresh food which is beginning to show serious health effects—is one among many. These may be better presently though through more shipping and thus unavoidable at present. Time will soon tell. Personally, I'm quite well, although due to this type of climate and the food vitamin shortage I'm tired out; the moment I wake and have very little strength or energy at all which gets quite depressing. I received Alice's letter telling of her mother's death—and all. I'm worried about her now as I know how her dad will be now and I would worry a lot more if I didn't know you were there to look after her for me and see that all that can possibly be done will be.

Please let me know all that is going on and how things are. I will feel much better if I know all that is going on and that nothing is being held back.

Merger of War Department and Navy Department Should Be Accomplished as Soon as Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time our attention is called to things which have taken place in connection with our war effort, which point clearly to the need for a unified single department of national defense. The claim has been made and substantiated on many occasions that the War Department and Navy Department work at cross purposes. It is not my intention to discuss the need for reform at this time, but I do intend to support any legislation that will bring about a single national defense agency.

One of the best articles that has appeared on this subject is written by Gustaf A. Nordin, a staff writer for the Duluth News-Tribune, of Duluth, Minn. Mr. Nordin's article is worth while and presents powerful arguments for a single command. His article appears in the Duluth News-Tribune for Tuesday, October 2, and is as follows:

WASHINGTON WITH NORDIN

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—When the full story of Okinawa is made public—as it will be some day—it will be one of the strongest arguments possible for merger of the Army and Navy into a single new Department of National Defense.

The loss of 30 naval vessels and various degrees of damage to 193 others probably is explainable, but differences which existed on the island between our military commands may provide ammunition for a congressional inquiry as important as that of Pearl Harbor.

From reliable Washington sources comes information about Okinawa which speaks volumes for a unified command of American military forces in the future. The identity of these sources must by necessity be kept secret.

The story of the American pilots who fought day and night to protect the American forces which stormed Okinawa would be worth while for any congressional committee to hear.

Many of these pilots were forced to sleep in water-soaked tents and dugouts. Some even slept in foxholes half filled with water. A few yards away these fighting American pilots could daily view rows of neatly stacked, unused steel huts stored for future use on the island. The huts were under the control of a different branch of the service and could not be released to the war-weary pilots.

A general ordered commanders on Okinawa during the fighting to be ready to receive many times more bombers than could be accommodated on the fields then under American control. Orders were orders, so the planes were flown in. When the airfields could no longer be used for storage, the planes were pushed into the muddy tracts of land adjacent to the airstrips. There they were mired and could not be moved during enemy attacks.

Noncombatants were used as sentries, and many of them lost their lives because of accurate Jap sniper fire—and probably due to inexperience in combat techniques.

For 3 months on Okinawa, dozens of Jap snipers were killed each night as they filtered in behind American lines, and picked off the the noncombatant sentries. Trained Army sentries were not available at these camps.

An incident which occurred, but undoubtedly cannot be blamed upon lack of unity in command, was a surprise raid by five Jap transport planes, loaded with troops. Four were shot down just as they were ready to land. The fifth succeeded in landing. Before the Japs were wiped out, they had destroyed a number of Superfortresses and the reserve gasoline supplies. A follow-up at this point might have been damaging.

Another informant contends that the American and British Navies differed in fighting tactics to such an extent that the daring raids on Jap home islands became extreme risks for some American units.

The British followed the quick-jab and sudden withdrawal technique. After several days' fighting, these units would withdraw for a rest period and to get additional supplies. When the British ships pulled out of the well-planned joint fleet formations, it left a certain number of American ships open to suicide attacks on unprotected flanks.

Admiral William F. Halsey held the Americans in formation for weeks at a time as he blasted and tantalized the Japanese. Had there been a unity of command, the British would have been compelled to hold their places. It was not a difference in fighting qualities of the two fleets, but lack of unified command and tactics.

There are other incidents which could be cited, some which would reflect even worse upon the system which prevailed at the time in the Far East. These were given in utmost confidence and cannot be divulged at this time.

The severe naval losses were due chiefly to the suicidal attacks of the Japanese. Those suicide thrusts were not by kamikaze planes alone but came in two other forms as well. Small Japanese boats, loaded with high explosives, were deliberately driven into the American ships standing off Okinawa. In some instances fanatical Japanese swam into the ships with explosive charges lashed to their backs.

The heroism of American fighting men on Okinawa is something to marvel at. Stories are trickling back now as to what took place and the trying times experienced by the military men. It makes the hardships they suffered stand out all the more because, experts here believe, unity between the military commands could have eliminated some of the difficulties encountered.

On the basis of these reports—and their accuracy is attested to by very reliable sources—it would seem the Military Affairs Committees of the House and Senate ought to give serious consideration to a merger of the Army and Navy Cabinet posts.

Chairman CARL VINSON, Democrat, Georgia, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, says "there will be no merger," and he adds, "I hope it's off forever."

Chairman ANDREW J. MAY, Democrat, Kentucky, of the House Military Affairs Committee, is just as set. "I don't think you can merge the Army and Navy," he says. "I am against it."

Senate military affairs leaders believe the chances for a merger have disappeared. If it is ever to be done, it must come during peacetime, not at time of war. The mistakes caused by split authority at Pearl Harbor and Okinawa may be fatal if this country is suddenly attacked again without warning.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Nordin and other newspapermen in Washington will carry on a campaign of education, so that the public may know what this unified command is all about. There should be no delay in having legislation presented to Congress along the lines suggested by Mr. Nordin. So far as I am concerned, arguments against such a merger are antiquated, out of date, and not in the best interests of this Government.

These Are the Victims: The People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving telegrams, long distance telephone calls, and letters from constituents in Michigan protesting against the rationing of gasoline by management, CIO unions, municipalities, or any other groups except as authorized by law.

As is generally known, industrial Michigan today is beset with an epidemic of strikes that bids fair to end in a most serious crisis in the State. We are advised that the President is finally taking

action in the matter in an effort to protect our miltiary forces and the safety of our Nation.

I am just in receipt of an editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of September 28 which expresses the general views of many of those who are contacting me and urging that something be done about this matter before it is too late. The editorial is as follows:

THESE ARE THE VICTIMS: THE PEOPLE

CIO union officials graciously permitted the mayor of the city of Detroit and the police commissioner to consult with them concerning what they considered a sufficient supply of gasoline for vital municipal necessities.

These union leaders magnanimously agreed that gasoline might be used by the municipal bus lines, the fire and police departments, the health board, the hospitals, airports, and United States Government agencies, such as the postal system.

Doctors, nurses, undertakers, clergymen, food agencies, and newspapers were also granted special dispensation.

As a patriotic gesture, men and women in the armed services were told they might have some.

All such grants, of course, were declared subject to change in the judgment of the union.

It was to be taken for granted, of course, that the CIO candidate for mayor, Richard Frankensteen, would have what gas he might need for his big limousine, to careen around the city proclaiming the blessing of the new order.

But you, if your just an ordinary taxpaying citizen, are in a different classification.

You have no more personal liberty or individual rights than a political slave in a Communist factory in Russia.

You will take no rides into the country, go to no football games, nor even go to work unless you are willing to pay a terrific price on the black market for your supply of gasoline. This is dangerous as the goon squads may smash both your car and your head for violating CIO orders.

If this is not dictatorship then Hitler was a Democrat.

During the past generation the technological age has so meshed every phase of civilization that a general strike in any key industry affects everybody.

This being so, any little handful of willful men at any time can paralyze our Nation.

Management of great industries, working with union leaders, can easily take over government unless government asserts itself.

If this is to remain a government of and by and for the people, then it is time for the people to wake up to that fact.

Both employers and union leaders scream in protest against any laws to meet a situation that each year grows more ominous.

And the Government at Washington walks a tightrope, fearful of any possible loss of votes.

Unless laws are enacted safeguarding the rights of all the people, there can be no hope for industrial peace, economy, security, or individual liberty.

The American people are living today with a nihilistic sword of Damocles hanging over their heads by a thread.

And craven politicians fear to take the actions necessary to establish law and order by constitutional statute.

The pendulum on this issue can no longer swing.

Unless there can be established law and order, our whole national structure faces an economic bomb of atomic proportions.

In 1899 President Cleveland used the power of his office against strikes to keep the railroads running.

In 1902 President Theodore Roosevelt used the power of his office against the operators of the coal mines so that the people would not freeze.

These are now a part of American history because they were isolated cases.

Today such action has grown commonplace. Our civilization has become so complicated that this system will soon become ordinary practice—a makeshift, patchwork method, based on individual judgments, passions, prejudices, blind fear, opportunism, and political chicanery.

Is this the way we are to be governed from now on?

If so, we have not much longer to wait before a dictator rises amongst us.

Every dictator is the child of chaos.

Right now big business interests are supposed to be fighting big union interests. How easy it is for them to merge can be found in the study of any nation which has eventually known the heel of the tyrant.

The union has its spokesmen.

Big business has its spokesmen.

Where are the spokesmen of the people—the Government?

Must they forever hide under the bed of political expediency in the hope of saving their pusillanimous souls?

Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue. That time has arrived. When any organization attempts to engage in any such activity, the public will arise. There must be action on the part of the Government now. This dilly-dallying must stop now.

Suggestions for Postwar Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby include a memorandum of conclusions that my Subcommittee on War Appropriations drew up and submitted to the President on September 24, 1945.

The committee traveled over 36,000 miles and came down on part of our strategic war centers that we are occupying, such as Honolulu, Tarawa, Canton, Australia, Guadalcanal, Guam, Saipan, Okinawa, Manila, Chungking, Kunming, Calcutta, New Delhi, Abadan, Tehran, Cairo, Greece, Naples, Frankfurt, Berlin, France, and England, and so forth.

Among the conclusions:

1. Possession of enemy islands in the Pacific should be retained by the United States. We should never have to take them again.

2. Allied islands which our forces found necessary to occupy should be made the subject of joint study to determine to what extent mutual interests call for maintenance of bases by lease or cession on mutually satisfactory terms.

3. Our surplus war stocks in every foreign country should be regarded as a national asset, including lend-lease goods that the borrower does not now care to pay for. These stocks should be sold immediately or exchanged for the best values that can be obtained, including currencies, deliveries of raw materials, legation or embassy properties, commercial or military rights. Speed is necessary to avoid depreciation and to expedite demobilization.

4. The world-wide networks of airways, landing fields, weather and traffic control facilities established during the war should be conserved and private lines should be encouraged to operate them. In the meantime, staffs should be reduced and war veterans should be replaced. Army and Navy air transport services should be consolidated now and operated in peacetime by a staff recruited for that purpose.

5. There is a world-wide tendency to regard the United States as a country of unlimited wealth. We should say frankly to every country asking aid that here, as there, wealth is produced only by work and that if supplies or credits are furnished, repayment must be assured.

6. China offers the largest and most fruitful single field in the world for United States foreign trade. China is friendly and would welcome assistance by military and economic mission from the United States.

7. Current appropriations for the War Department should be reviewed and reduced by at least $27,500,000,000, but care should be taken to insure continuing research and development in such fields as jet propulsion, radar, rocket projectiles, and atomic power, together with facilities. This war has destroyed old concepts of frontiers and perimeter defense.

8. This subcommittee handled the appropriation of funds for, and maintained the secrecy of, the atomic bomb project. We recommend the immediate creation of a commission representing the scientists who directed the project, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the State Department, and the Congress to study all phases of atomic power. Pending such study and its findings, we recommend against the release of the atomic bomb secrets.

J. BUELL SNYDER, *Chairman.*
ALBERT ENGEL.
GEORGE MAHON.
FRANCIS CASE.
W. F. NORRELL.
JOE HENDRICKS.
HARVE TIBBOTT.

America's Dead and Dying Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an article from the October Reader's Digest on the subject of control of pollution of the waters of the United States entitled "America's Dead and Dying Rivers":

AMERICA'S DEAD AND DYING RIVERS

(By Holman Harvey)

When America can get back to her own housekeeping she has a pressing chore to tackle, the job of liberating our waterways from pollution.

The other day I rode the ferryboat across the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Camden. Some 360,000,000 gallons of raw sewage from the two cities was churning down the stream. The paint on ships and on buildings along the banks was blackened by sulfurous gases rising from the contaminated water.

Next day I went downstream to Chester, Pa. The city's drinking water for its 60,000 people comes from this river and is so heavily weighted with purifying chemicals that many buy bottled water. Bathing in the river is unsafe, and fish life has all but vanished.

Chester's plight is by no means unique. More than 3,400 American cities and towns, inhabited by 29,000,000 people, discharge a daily volume of 2,500,000,000 gallons of raw sewage into our waterways. Another 2,900 communities, with 22,000,000 inhabitants, dump their sewage after a lick-and-a-promise treatment that leaves it still 65-percent disease-laden. In addition to sewage, vast tonnages of factory wastes are drained into our streams. Such pollution of our water sources, with its continual threat of epidemic disease, is wiping out water-front property values, corroding dams and bridges, obliterating bathing and other water sports over large areas, and progressively destroying our once-abundant fish life.

Three-fourths of the Nation's waterway pollution centers in the densely populated industrial belt stretching from the Atlantic coast to St. Louis and Chicago. In the Ohio River Basin the drinking water of hundreds of communities is endangered, despite Herculean efforts to stave off infection by filtration and heavy doctoring of the water with purifying chemicals. In 144 communities in the basin, annual death rates from diarrhea and enteritis have risen during the past 12 years to as high as 91 per 100,000 persons.

Absolutely pure water does not exist even in streams untouched by man. Therefore, all American communities, other than the tiniest, filter their drinking water and treat it with chlorine and other chemical purifiers, the degree of treatment depending on the amount of impurities in the water. The extent of pollution is determined by what public-health bacteriologists call a coli count—the number of harmless coliform bacteria, normally present in all human sewage, which are found in a measured sample of water. The coli are readily detected, whereas disease organisms often are difficult or impossible to identify. It is assumed that disease germs may be present in water containing more than six coli to the pint; therefore, this maximum count is the official purity standard of the United States Public Health Service for safe untreated drinking water or for safe public bathing. And the Public Health Service considers that the most modern and effective purifying treatment now known cannot safely be depended upon to remove all the disease organisms from water which contains more than 100,000 coli to the pint.

The most comprehensive coli count ever undertaken was completed 2 years ago in the Ohio River Basin by the Public Health Service and the Army Engineer Corps, aided by a consulting civilian scientist. At 1,160 out of 2,000 locations tested the water was unfit for bathing and of questionable quality as a source of drinking-water supply.

Pollution is severe in the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Louisville areas. Along the 90-mile stretch between Pittsburgh and Wheeling, W. Va., the average coli count was 125,000 to the pint, and at one place it was 405,000. The safety limit, remember, is 100,000. Below Louisville the coli count ranged from an average of 320,000 to a maximum of 1,200,000.

While water-borne typhoid fever has been virtually eliminated in most communities by purification of the drinking water, death rates indicate that the organisms causing diarrhea and enteritis often survive treatment. And periodic outbreaks of so-called intestinal flu have been traced to polluted water. This disease has swept over hundreds of cities in recent years. Moreover, the mysterious origin of infantile paralysis may at last be found in waterway pollution. The Journal of the American Medical Association has reported that the poliomyelitis virus has been isolated from water containing raw sewage.

In its natural state, a healthy stream can cleanse itself of waste matter—animal, bird, and fish excretions and carcasses, decaying plant life and a very considerable volume of sewage—within a few miles. But its capacity to purify itself breaks down when the load of waste becomes too heavy. The self-functioning stream "dies," and becomes merely a lifeless conduit.

A stream purifies itself chiefly by means of its own bacteria: the aerobic bacteria which can't live without oxygen, and the anaerobic bacteria which can't live in the presence of oxygen. The anaerobes devour the solid materials which settle to the river's bed, while the aerobes attack the dissolved and suspended solids which remain in the water above. As the waste passes through their microscopic bodies, it is converted from complex, organic material into inorganic, or mineral, material which no longer can putrefy.

Neither the aerobes nor the anaerobes attack the human disease organisms present in sewage, but these are devoured by microscopic animal organisms, the aquatic protozoa.

As the aerobes feed they multiply; and as they multiply they use up more and more of the available oxygen in the stream. However, a healthy stream passing over rocks and rapids and falls aerates itself, drawing oxygen from the atmosphere. Also the tiny plant organisms, the algae, return oxygen to the stream as sunlight strikes their green chlorophyll and brings about the miracle of photosynthesis. And while the algae thus are providing the aerobes with oxygen, they feed upon the mineral matter which the aerobes are manufacturing from the waste. As the algae consume this inorganic matter, it is changed back into living organic matter, and so is completed one of the mysterious, complex and never-ending cycles of organic life.

Finally, as the wastes are consumed and converted, the aerobes, with a dwindling food supply, themselves subside in numbers and make less and less demand upon the stream's oxygen. The elaborate process draws to a close; the natural balance of the stream is restored. Cleansed, vigorous again with oxygen, it is ready for the next assult upon its purity.

Thus, left to their own devices, many rivers carry vast burdens of sewage to the sea without serious injury. But when the load becomes too heavy and too continuous, this is what happens:

The aerobes, attacking the fluid wastes, reproduce in such numbers that they use up more of the stream's vital oxygen than the stream can replace. For lack of oxygen the aerobes and disease-destroying protozoa die. Up then from the stream's bottom, into the oxygenless upper waters, move invading multitudes of anaerobes. With an abundant food supply, safe now from the hated oxygen, they soon take over the entire stream. And as they avidly feed they extract hydrogen from the water and sulfur from the waste and combine them into the evil-smelling hydrogen-sulphide gas which you have noticed rising from the surface of a sluggish stream.

The algae die away as the beclouded water blocks off their life-giving sunlight. Deprived of sufficient food and oxygen, fish life languishes. The stream is dead.

In treating sewage, before it is discharged into our waterways, sanitary experts follow the stream's own purifying methods, but speed them up. The solid material, or sludge, is allowed to settle in vats. Then it is placed in airtight tanks for from 30 to 60 days. Here the anaerobic bacteria digest it, as on the river bottom. The gas produced by the anaerobes often is used to heat and light the treatment plant. Any surplus is sold or given away.

Settling out the solids achieves only about 35 percent purification of the total sewage. To accomplish 85 percent purification the effluent (dissolved and suspended matter) is placed in tanks exposed to oxygen, where it is attacked by aerobic bacteria and protozoa.

For a theoretical 100 percent disinfection, the treated effluent also is chlorinated. Where public bathing beaches are located near the point of discharge, this final treatment is considered advisable.

Some communities package and sell their treated sludge as a fertilizer. Notable are Milwaukee's Milorganite, Toledo's Tolegro, and Grand Rapids' Rapidgro and Grandgro, the latter fortified with additional chemicals. The financial return to these cities is of considerable help in defraying the cost of treating the sewage.

Numerous cities, among them some of the long-time offenders, have become aroused to the need of freeing our streams from the dead weight of pollution. Pittsburgh is considering a $50,000,000 plant. Philadelphia, under a No. 1 priority over all other postwar projects, plans to spend $45,000,000. Camden, Cincinnati, Louisville and others are expected to install treatment plants.

But an Augean job remains. According to an official United States Public Health Service report issued last year, only 1,300 of the 16,750 incorporated communities in the United States have adequate systems for collecting and treating their sewage. Local inertia, politics, and the apathy of industry have obstructed progress. It is for this reason that the Public Health Service believes the only practicable way to solve the problem is to deal with each river basin as an entity and recommends that Congress authorize all States contiguous to interstate waterway basins to enter into cooperative compacts to set up and carry out coordinated regional abatement programs.

Six bills providing for waterway-pollution abatement now are pending before Congress. They would encourage cities to build modern sewage-treatment plants, and industries to solve the knotty problem of waste disposal. Legislation favored by the Conference of State Health Officers, and approved by the Public Health Service, would authorize the Federal Government to extend grants-in-aid to communities, and loans to stream-polluting industries, to a total of $1,000,000,000 over a period of 10 years, provided that equal amounts are expended by the communities, and that all loans are to be repaid in full.

The annual cost to the Nation of operating and maintaining a complete system of sewage and waste treatment for the liberation of our waterways would total about $100,000,000—almost exactly the estimated annual economic loss now caused by pollution. The gain in the resulting safeguarding of the public health and the imponderable recreational and esthetic values cannot be evaluated.

President Truman's Position on Palestine Applauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter from George Berke, chairman of the Chattanooga Zionist Emergency Council:

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *October 4, 1945.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEFAUVER: It has been reliably reported that the British Government

decided "to continue with slight modifications" the policy of the Palestine white paper, which in effect will bring Jewish immigration into Palestine to a standstill.

This decision, if enforced, will create an unprecedented crisis for the thousands of the surviving European Jewry who are seeking a place of refuge, with Palestine not only their choice but the only place now available for them to immigrate. Years of Nazi persecution made Continental Europe an unsafe place for European Jewry.

America, being a legal party to the mandate over Palestine, should exert every available and possible effort, if for no other reason than humanitarian, to bring about continued immigration for all those who must or desire to enter Palestine. We, as a member of the United Nations, can solve thereby the great repatriation problem facing us in Europe. Unless the doors of Palestine are kept open there is little hope for the survival of the small remnant of Jewry now homeless and in concentration camps in Europe. There is at present no country that is willing or able to absorb large-scale immigration other than Palestine. There they will be welcomed by their fellow Jews and help create a home for them.

As chairman of the Chattanooga Zionist Emergency Council, representing a majority of Chattanooga Jewry, I plead that you take whatever action necessary to strengthen the hand of President Truman in his plea to Great Britain to permit 100,000 homeless Jews enter Palestine. I believe that there are here as well as in Great Britain those whose conscience will not be stilled, if they are made aware of the facts that the lives of thousands are at stake, unless corrective measures are taken at once.

The Palestine white paper, therefore, which was a relic of an appeasement policy, must be revoked or relaxed to insure justice for the homeless Jews of Europe.

Yours sincerely,

CHATTANOOGA ZIONIST COUNCIL,
GEORGE BERKE, *Chairman.*

President Truman Urges Opportunity for Reconversion of Wartime Child-Care Program to Peacetime Operations—President Truman Asks $7,000,000 Be Spent to March 1, 1946, to Protect Children and Working Mothers and States and Local Agencies—Time for Reconversion From Wartime Conditions—Sends Letter Reducing His Recommendation in Favor of Nation's Children—I Commend Him

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, our great President, Harry S. Truman, has struck a most sensible, sound, and understanding keynote in his very important and significant letter of October 4, 1945, addressed to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, wherein he requested that funds authorized under the Lanham Act be made available to provide continued Federal assistance for child-care centers in the various States for these essential child-care centers, until March 1, 1946. As the letter to you, sir, was made public as of October 4, 1945, I now incorporate it herewith in these remarks:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
October 4, 1945.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In my communication of September 5, 1945, I transmitted for the consideration of the Congress proposed rescissions of portions of several war-related appropriations, including appropriations available to the Federal Works Agency under the heading "Office of the Administrator, War public works (community facilities)" to the extent of $19,115,000.

This item included funds that had been appropriated by the Congress for wartime child-care centers on the understanding with the Federal Works Agency that when the need for women in war production and essential supporting services ended, Federal funds would be withdrawn. Therefore, my communication of September 5 was based upon that understanding.

On August 27 I requested the Federal Works Administrator to present to the Congress the problem which had arisen where local communities were not able to continue needed child-care centers for children whose mothers are the wives or widows of servicemen. The Federal Works Administrator now advises me that the appropriate committees of the Congress do not believe it feasible to enact special legislation to take care of this problem for this particular group of mothers.

Although some communities have already arranged with local funds to operate centers for children of working mothers, the majority of them have not yet completed such arrangements. In some communities, State or local laws or other limitations make it impossible for them to assume this responsibility by October 31, the presently scheduled date for the termination of Federal assistance.

The reconversion of the wartime child-care program to peacetime operations under which the local communities would assume the financial responsibility requires Federal assistance for a few more months. This extension of time would give working mothers more time to make other arrangements for the care of their children and would give local communities additional time to provide the necessary State or local funds.

Included in the amount which I have heretofore recommended for rescission is an item of $7,000,000 for service projects. If this amount is not repealed, the Federal Works Agency would be able to make Federal funds available for the operation of needed child care centers until March 1, 1946. I therefore now recommend that the amount of the proposed rescission for "War public works (community facilities)" be reduced to $12,115,000.

Yours very truly,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Because of the present Nation-wide interest and anxiety in connection with this great subject on the part of hundreds of thousands of parents and relatives of small children, and of thousands upon thousands of men still in uniform, who are parents of children still in these child-care centers, I herewith set forth copy of recent communications of mine to President Truman on this same subject. One dated September 26, 1945, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1945.

In re child-care centers.

MR. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I herewith hand you a copy of a memorandum which the Honorable FRITZ LANHAM, chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee of the House, just handed me in response to my communication of early this morning on the above subject matter. "The Lanham Act has not been repealed, and its terms and provisions are still applicable to the carrying out of its purposes. It is the sense of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that the determination of matters under the act is an administrative and not a legislative function."

The governor of my native State of California sent me a copy of letter to you of recent date on the same subject. And as I anticipate your file already has sufficient facts and evidence in it showing the need of the continuation of these funds until the State of California can legislate and appropriate necessary moneys therefor. I will not remit to you any further data. However, my file has abundance thereof, which is available to your needs if you desire.

Mr. President, as General Fleming told us last week that you had indicated certain questions to him on this subject matter, and as the above set-forth memorandum from Mr. LANHAM places the matter "an administrative and not a legislative function," and as I am also informed that there are adequate funds in the Department for continued necessary protection of the problem, I respectfully inform you that it is the sincere hope of thousands upon thousands of parents and citizens of California that it may be immediately determined that it is a wise administrative policy and in the interests of conserving the characters of the children of our Nation—that Lanham Act moneys be continued in use until June 30, 1946.

I have been working for more than 2 weeks on an outline of a single proposed bill to file in this House immediately to ask an appropriation of $5,000,000 to be distributed to the respective States according to their needs through the State departments of education and welfare, respectively, and to terminate June 30, 1946; this distribution to the State departments, of course, to be in cooperation with the appropriate Federal departments, to wit, the Department of Education and Children's Bureaus.

Mr. President, too many of these children in these child-care centers might well become war casualties. The reconversion period for these children has not yet expired—any more, Mr. President, than the reconversion period has expired for industry, commerce, trade, and labor. The conservation of childhood of our Nation is not less important than the reconversion of material properties and things of our Nation.

I have the honor to be, sir, at your service.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Another, dated October 3, 1945, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 3, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: 1. I believe it will be soundly in the interest of conservation of the childhood character values of at least 70,000 American children now in the child-care centers for you to indicate the appropriate Government department concerned, the extension of this child-care-center program from and after October 31 to at least December 31, 1945.

2. These 70,000 children should not be penalized on account of the delay on the part of States heretofore in making adequate provisions for this period of reconversion as relates to these children.

3. A very early indication by you to this effect will be concrete evidence that this Government moves promptly to conserve child-

hood from becoming liabilities in this period of reconversion, as well as to enact legislation to give industry time, opportunity, and advantages toward reconverting its industrial plants and machinery to a peace production program.

4. Let's not penalize those 70,000 children who were caught in this period of reconversion. The situation and circumstances surrounding them still substantially continues. About 25 percent of this 70,000 children are in California; thousands in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I represent.

If, Mr. President, it should be your desire that this program be continued, then I respectfully suggest that such indication be made by early Friday morning of this week. This is because my present information is that the Appropriations Committee of the House will probably be determining their policy Friday morning.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment, this distinguished House has not yet since the surrender of Japan begun to seriously or adequately enough consider the problem of the conversion of the human being to peacetime status. I refer to the human mind, the human heart, the human spirit, the human soul, and to the physical and human body in its entirety—to its muscles, to its physical functioning. Is there any question that the human body in its entirety and that the human spirit and soul and mind have been under a wartime stress and strain and fear and anxiety? Which are the great natural assets of our Nation, I ask you? Is our enduring national health made up of the human beings of our Nation and their spirits, loyalties, characters, tenacity of purpose, and patrotism, or is it made up of factories, machines, and merely things which can be created by man, which are made by the hands and with the brains of man? I say, Mr. Speaker, that the imperishable and the real national wealth and values of our Nation are not the Nation's machines and the houses, the boats, the airplanes, the big and little material things of life which are made by man—but man himself is the enduring, indestructible national asset. The men and women and children of our Nation are the real worth of our Nation instead of the material things which are made by the men and women of our Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, our great President, Harry S. Truman, has caught the gleam. Our President has recognized that the children of our Nation in these child-care nurseries and their parents need time to reconvert and adjust and turn from the basis of war to a reasonable normalcy of a time of peace, and our President is quite right. His thinking is sound and sane and in the interests of continuing democracy. It will not only save childhood health and spirit and character if we adopt his recommendation; it is bound to save real tax dollars to this Nation. Yes; this great House anticipated the needs of industry, of commerce, and of trade even before the surrender of Japan. In advance of VJ-day we voted millions upon millions of credits and favor of the processes and procedures which make money. We have not yet taken step to vote money for the processes and procedures which make for sounder men and women and children.

Note, please, that our President recognizes that his request of us that we spend this $7,000,000 in the interests of the children of the Nation was based upon the chief factor of its being reasonable and sound that these children and their parents have a reasonable time to reconvert. This is what we have given industry and manufacturing and commerce. And we have given them hundreds of millions of dollars to do it with in forms of credit and what not. How, then, can we justly or sensibly decline to comply with our President's request, and spend a few millions in order that these children of our Nation shall not become national liabilities instead of national assets.

Because some gentlemen of this great House who have been uninformed in the premises, have asked me what percent of Federal funds have been spent to the total support of these child-care centers, I herewith set forth the following figures, to wit: In California in the 121 projects, 64.9 percent of the total funds expended are Federal moneys, and the balance of the funds come largely from the parents for their children's care, meals, and supervision during their working hours. In Illinois the percentage of Federal moneys of the total is 66.2 percent; in Michigan it is 77 percent; in Ohio it is 68.5 percent; in Washington it is 69.1 percent; and in the United States, as a whole, it is 66.6 percent. So you see, gentlemen, these working mothers, who still have to work, if you please, are not doing too small a share of the support and care and supervision of these children who are the victims of conditions brought about by this World War; and as a result of this condition, over which these self-same children have had no control and in which they have had no voice.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it should be significant to any thinking person that the fact is that out of more than 6,500 persons who have protested by letter, telegram, or petition to the Federal Works Agency since its announcement of the termination of these moneys on October 31, 1945, not a single one of these persons has expressed desire or willingness to accept welfare funds for their children or themselves. In all instances these mothers have emphatically expressed their desire to continue working in order to be independent enough to pay for the care of their children. They only ask that these centers be continued until such time that it is possible to make financial and community arrangements.

The least we can do is to follow the sensible, sound reasoning and leadership of President Harry S. Truman and at the earliest possible moment give the States and other political divisions interested and the local agencies notice that this $7,000,000 will become immediately available for the continuation of these centers till March 31, 1946.

Answering questions as to what my thought is as to H. R. 4202, known as the Doyle bill, introduced by me September 27, 1945, and which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and which was a bill to meet the immediate emergency which would be caused by the announced closing of these child-care centers on October 31, 1945, and which bill asked for $5,000,000, I gladly state that that bill was only a stopgap, as its own text and small amount asked for will reveal. The immediate need is that the President's request be complied with. It is much better that way.

To Come Back Europe Must Have Major Revival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Army and Navy Journal of September 29, 1945, as follows:

Representative J. BUELL SNYDER, chairman of the Army Appropriations Subcommittee which returned this week from a 36,000-mile globe-girdling trip of inspection, told the Army and Navy Journal that there is need for better housing for Army maintenance personnel.

"The committee found," Mr. SNYDER said, "that in such places as Tarawa, Guam, Saipan, Okinawa, the Army maintenance personnel stationed there to take care of our equipment and airport facilities should be better housed. Of course, they have the best rations, the best of American foods, but the housing is inadequate."

The committee chairman is strong in his belief that certain of these islands should be maintained as permanent bases for American forces. "We should keep," he said, "Okinawa, Saipan, Guam, and certain other bases as the strategy boards of the Army and Navy think advisable."

Continuing, Representative SNYDER said:

"The first impression you get at all these centers is not only the magnitude of the accomplishments of the Army in its victorious efforts but the efficiency of the management and the line discipline found in all cases.

"The purpose of the trip was for the committee to get first-hand knowledge of the equipment and tonnage that the Army has at these centers and to learn as far as possible what percent of the equipment should be maintained for operation; what percent should be deemed surplus; what percent should be disposed of in the theaters; and what percent brought back to the States at such time as appropriate to bring it back—keeping in mind that the first objective in transportation is to get the boys back from the various theaters to the States at the earliest practicable date.

"The committee found in such places as Tarawa, Guam, Saipan, Okinawa that the Army Maintenance personnel stationed there to take care of our equipment and airport facilities should be better housed. Of course, they have the best of rations—the best of American foods—but the housing is inadequate.

"The committee is strong in its belief that certain of these islands should be maintained as permanent bases for the American forces. That is, we should keep Okinawa, Saipan,

Guam, and certain other bases such as the strategy board of Army and Navy think advisable.

"In China we had conversations with Ambassador Patrick Hurley and Chief of Army Forces Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, as well as Mr. Lung at Kun Ming and learned that the Chinese are at heart strong for the United States. I believe that certain portions of the equipment that is not economical to bring back to the United States should be disposed of to the Chinese on such terms as the diplomatic relations between these countries deem advisable.

"In Calcutta where we have a million tons of equipment the Army is planning to get out and close down at an early date. The same is true at New Delhi and Carrachi, Tehran, and Cairo, etc.

"In the European theater General Eisenhower has the situation well in command, with such able assistants as Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay in Berlin, Lt. Gen. Walter B. Smith in Frankfort, and other right hand bowers such as Gen. George Patton, Lt. Gen. Larkin, and Gen. Mark Clark.

"Of course, in Europe the task is confined to mopping up the war theater and carrying out the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement, together with keeping our boys physically and mentally fit until transportation is available for them to come home.

"It will be encoraging for the people to know that every effort on the part of the commanding officers is being made along this line. The boys can participate in all kinds of sports activities. We have supplied them with equipment—baseball equipment, tennis balls, boxing gloves—in fact, everything, and that helps a lot.

"Transportation is the big problem—water transportation, especially. Next month we hope to be able to bring 700,000 of our boys from the different theaters to our shores and continue this approximate number each month until we get all back home that are to come.

"All in all, we, the American people, can be proud of what has been accomplished toward freeing the world from despotism, intrigue, and atheism, and to know that we have such a fine set of men guiding the destinies of our men in these various theaters.

"About future Europe—as I see it, the only hope of Europe coming back is a moral and spiritual revival of many times the magnitude of a John Wesley revival, a Martin Luther Revival, a Garibaldi revival.

"In closing, a word about the atomic bomb. I believe that the use of the atomic bomb is the only thing that saved us from making an invasion on the mainland of Japan—it saved the lives of at least a half million of our American boys. I believe we should keep the secret of the atomic bomb just as securely as we kept the secret of the Norden bombsight. I think it can be done, if we leave it to the scientists who make the bomb possible and who apparently can keep secrets better than other groups."

The Bigot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting for inclusion in the RECORD a poem by Alexander M. Sullivan, business manager of the Boston school committee:

THE BIGOT
(By Alexander M. Sullivan)

A spectacle before us stands,
Who stabs with cruel thrust;
He's more the fool and less the man,
Lo! Anything but just.
His voice rings out in blatant shout
In valley, hill, and town;
He stems the tide of tolerance,
To keep his godless crown.

Sweet charity he flouts and flails,
Kind words he's always spurned,
Deceit and lies he freely seeks,
With heart that hate has burned.
The Man Who died on Calvary
He mocks through his career,
Until too late the Reaper comes,
To punish and to sear.

Let him attend while life is his
The shrines where patriots rest,
Who sacrificed their all to shield
Their country's bleeding breast.
There should he learn and contemplate
Compatriots at the heights,
And cease to leer through envious eyes
Or bigotry's fell blights.

Pity that man who will not see
The God of him, of you and me,
Who lacks beneficence sublime
And gives no heed to fleeting time,
Who never that great lesson learned
Or kindly to his neighbors turned,
Who missed in life's allotted span
The noble brotherhood of man.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley at Memorial Dinner in Honor of the Late Alfred E. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the general committee for the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Hospital, on the occasion of a memorial dinner to honor the memory of the late Alfred E. Smith, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, on Thursday, October 4, 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Your Excellency, Most Reverend Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, Governor Dewey, Secretary Acheson, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen:

We are gathered here tonight on the first anniversary of his death, to pay tribute to a great and tolerant American. Two thousand of us, representing at once all faiths and creeds, races and colors, are here out of respect to the memory of the late Alfred E. Smith. We are here to launch a Nation-wide appeal to obtain $3,000,000 with which to build a symbolic tribute to his memory—the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Hospital—a 16-story addition to St. Vincent's Hospital, which he loved so well and which through the years has cared for those who meant so much to him—the everyday people of New York.

I need not remind you of the greatness of our friend's heart, of the loyalty of his character, or of the depth of his interest in his fellow men. His life was spent in devoted service to the welfare of the people of the city and State of New York and of the people of this country. No man I have ever known gave more of himself to the needy, to the sick, and to those who were heavily burdened. I'm sure were he here tonight, he would be touched by your tribute to him. I am equally sure that could he have chosen his own memorial he would have selected the project we are inaugurating.

For more than 30 years Al Smith was closely connected with St. Vincent's Hospital. He served it as a patron and director. He raised funds for it. He fought for it. He worked for it. Through it all he insisted that its doors should ever be open to the afflicted of all classes, without distinction of faith, color, or country. He once said: "In its constant service to humanity, St. Vincent's is a living monument to my creed as an American citizen, my belief in the common brotherhood of man under the common fatherhood of God."

Governor Smith had every right to be proud of St. Vincent's. Not only is it the largest hospital in the greatest city in the world but it was the first hospital for the care of the needy sick ever operated in New York. Founded by five Sisters of Charity 96 years ago, the Sisters of Charity have served these needy sick with tender, compassionate care.

The new Alfred E. Smith Memorial Hospital will keep faith with Al Smith's life and with his memory. One of the greatest tributes to Al Smith are the thousands of letters we have received, paying homage to this man, their friend. Unsolicited, thousands of men and women throughout the Nation are giving their services to make this campaign equal to the character of the man they are honoring, and nearly $1,000,000 have come to us from his legion of friends throughout America.

We offer our humble thanks to everyone who has participated in making this dinner the greatest gathering of its kind in the history of our city. Many of you have come from distant cities and States to salute a man whose claim on the affections of the American people was the fact that he lived and died in the belief that the sacred trust of every American is love of God and service to his fellow men. Our gratitude goes, too, to those of you who, in loyalty and charity to him, have already contributed to this living memorial and to those of you who will join with us as our campaign continues throughout the weeks.

America's Homecoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Odd Fellows homecoming at Frederick, Md., on Sunday, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S HOMECOMING

Grandmaster, distinguished officers, fellow Americans, this is homecoming. That brings to my mind an incident which occurred some time ago.

A college was having a homecoming—the fiftieth anniversary of its first commencement. It had arranged to have its most prominent son make the speech of the occasion. He began in somewhat this manner:

"It was 50 years ago that our class had its commencement. Those 50 years have flown on eagle's wings. They have been rich in experience. Our country has grown great during that period. Modern invention has transformed it in every field of human activity. Tonight I can sing, God Bless America, and the song of my old Alma Mater.

"The years have been so full of rich experiences, new demands, great challenges, that I have not had the time to indulge in reminiscence. But now, on this occasion, with old friends around me, the hands of the clock are turned back, and I see myself on a moonlight night, sitting out on yonder college wall—the same wall that is out there now. And I believe it was the same apple tree which still stands there, like myself now grown a little older, a little sturdier—in those days I was a spare fellow. This apple tree was in blossom, and that night I sat up there on the wall with a young lady, with the moon full and the apple blossoms overhead. Under the inspiration of the time and place, I kissed that girl.

"Now, if that young lady, now grown a little older in years should happen to be in this audience and is no more ashamed of the occasion than I am, I wish she would arise." And immediately 17 gray-haired women arose.

Well, now that you have had a good laugh—and that is the way to start a homecoming—I will talk in a little more serious vein. Let the subject be, "America's Homecoming" with all its significations.

Our boys are coming home. They have been all over this globe—this globe that revolves once in 24 hours on its axis and travels at enormous speed so that in a year's time it has circled around the sun. These boys are coming home—every day, thousands of them. Many things have happened to them. But whatever their experiences, there isn't a one who doesn't want to come home. Why is that? Home means something to them. They went out to fight for something when they went on their great journey in the service of Uncle Sam, and they are coming back to that same thing. In a large sense, that is what we Americans have to do. We have to join with our returning sons and daughters and "return home."

Now, just what do I mean?

Many of us have been in a far country. Like the prodigal who wanted to leave his father's home, many of us have taken our share and gone into a far country of synthetic living, of wild experimentation, of fruitless adventure. Our sons and daughters who went into the service have been on another journey. They have been away, serving this country, sustaining it, dying for it, that the real America might be real to them again when they return.

While they have been absent we have permitted foreign isms, foreign concepts, to permeate our institutions. We have strayed away in part from many of the lessons of our fathers. We have neglected many of the ancient landmarks.

But, thank God, we are awakening; we are coming home. There is going to be a real homecoming. We are going to celebrate again. We are going to refresh our minds with the great principles embodied in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, the Gettysburg Address, the Sermon on the Mount. We are going to turn to thrift, industry, tolerance, and faith, as sources of our strength. The prodigal is returning to his father's house, because he has found that living among the swinish concepts of foreign isms is not the American way.

This homecoming of which I speak, wherein the Nation awakens from its slumber in the things material to where is grasps the higher principles involved in man's existence, will not only enrich this country, but will be the greatest stabilizing force for all nations of earth. Too long have we thought that life consists simply of feeding the stomach. We know that "man does not live by bread alone." And now we are coming home to a realization of the fact.

Recently I talked to a boy who had returned from foreign parts, and he said:

"Senator, I wish every American could have the experiences I have had. They were tough, they were hard, but the grand result of all those experiences was that America meant more to me. You know, Senator, that before the war, this generation of which I am a part, hadn't realized that liberty, with all its freedoms—the American way—had been bought by the blood of the martyrs and the patriots. Oh yes, we talked about it, we read about it, but we didn't appreciate the American way with its freedoms, because we had paid nothing for it.

"Now we have paid. I have seen my buddies die at my side. I have seen how inadequate these foreign states are in every way compared with my beloved America. And I am coming home, pledged to give all my strength and whatever I possess to see to it that we do not permit these foreign isms to be siphoned into our body politic, and our economy."

For this boy, it is a homecoming.

I spoke on the floor of the Senate the other day, calling attention to the fact that there were forces (yes; forces even in our schools) which were trying to teach that Communism was superior to our way of life. And, too, this insidious suggestion has even permeated some of the lectures given to our armed forces.

But this boy whom I quoted said:

"Such rot as was talked to us didn't have much influence with the men with whom I associated. I am coming home to see to it, as far as I can, that the man at home gets the true picture of these other countries, and when he does the American way will not be compared unfavorably to their way of life."

Ah, but I hear someone ask: "What about this strike situation? Does that mean that the American people are indeed 'returning home'? What of the temporary failure of America to get into maximum production because of this strike situation, and the lack of planning in getting materials into the factory? Does that indicate that we are coming to a true homecoming? What about the statement of some of the labor leaders that they will not go back to work, even if the Government takes over strike-bound plants? Is that an indication of this homecoming? What about striking coal miners and oil production workers, who apparently do not take into consideration that thousands may freeze this winter? Does that indicate the kind of homecoming you are talking about, Mr. Senator? What about the failure of Government to reduce the number of bureaucrats and unnecessary overhead; the dissolute living in high and low places? Is this an indication of homecoming?"

These, my friends, are signs of the times, but to a large extent they apply to only a very small minority of our people, who have temporarily lost their balance.

The strike situation is serious. I have taken the position that the Nation needs a compulsory arbitration law—one that works. I have taken this position because it is apparent that our past machinery has been inadequate. It has been inadequate because we have educated too many of our people with the wrong idea, to wit, that there are simply two parties interested in strikes—management and labor. We have forgotten the biggest interested party, and that is the public.

The general welfare has been neglected in this picture. It is our obligation to preserve intact those values which our sons and daughters fought for. It is an obligation that we cannot neglect. It is to preserve a land of free men and free women—a land where there is no economic or political bondage. We must eradicate bigotry and intolerance. We do not want in this country class distinctions or a system where caste obtains. We do not want class pitted against class.

And so one of the obligations of this homecoming—this return of the Nation to balance and judgment, the return of our citizenry to the high and noble concepts of the American way, and the return of our veteran men and women from the battle fronts of the world—is to purge all foreign "isms" from America.

You know that we too often think that citizenship is a matter of rights and not also a matter of obligations. This war has taught this great generation of American men and women—fighters for the right—that there are obligations attached to citizenship.

Now, in this great homecoming, we are going to clean up the mess on the home front. We are going to do it with judgment and reason. We are not going to lose our heads in the process. But we are going to eradicate the influence of any foreign concepts and ideas.

I say that this calls for judgment and reason. It calls for something else. We have to get busy in this matter of education. We have to become acquainted with our American charter—the ideas which gave us Washington, Lincoln, and the heroes of every generation of American life, and preserved our way of life.

So, my main purpose today is to challenge you with the subject of being adequate in this great homecoming. I sincerely hope that this will not be simply another occasion, another common experience, but a great one. Would it not be wonderful if today we could start some dormant human being up Jacob's ladder? Would it not be a rich experience to see men and women go out from this meeting, filled with a living force and a dedication to the common good? If this should happen, it would not be the first time that a common man has seized a common occasion and made it great.

We are discussing today the things which make life a matter of great adventure. As members of a great fraternity, we know the dynamic influence of right ideas—friendship, love, truth, fellowship, charity. We have built this order on those great concepts. But the thought on this homecoming—great, if we make it so—is that now in this period, after we have defeated the enemies on foreign fronts, our country is calling to us to get rid of those things which make for dissension, discord, on the home front, and to replace them with the things which make for serenity, tranquillity, and as I have said, reason and judgment.

So this is an unusual homecoming. We are met with old friends, with playmates of school days past. We are met with boys returned from the battlefields of this globe. We are renewing old friendships and swapping old yarns—reestablishing a great American institution known as homecoming. But

to this American way of homecoming, we are doing something more. We are dedicating ourselves, as Lincoln said at Gettysburg, to see to it that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom. That's it, a new birth.

We must be born again, and when we are, we shall be made new, full of the things which make for a greater and a better life, ready for new adventure, looking for more horizons to cross, thinking in terms of ever building, ever growing, ever developing, ever harmonizing.

In this great homecoming of the Nation, where we have to meet head-on the postwar problems, we know that there is a source of guidance and direction available to man, if he will but ask for and seek the same. We are particularly required to do that now, in order that we may be able to build safely and securely for the coming generations.

The atomic bomb has opened up a whole new world to us. Nothing, probably, that the human race has discovered can be compared to the possibilities of this new discovery. We found it out, and in the finding there arises another great group of obligations to which this people must measure up. In the Congress we are giving consideration to the whole matter. We know its great potentialities in war. We have to ascertain its utilization for peace. To a certain extent, we have been designated as the chosen people, and under God, we must prove our adequacy.

There is much that seems dark and murky in the road ahead. But let me ask you: Have you ever been in the mountains; have you seen through the mists of an early morning, when the world is hushed and only the twittering of the birds is heard? Have you seen the dark shadows steal away in the first brilliant fingers of the dawn? So we must approach these problems, knowing that our differences at home and abroad (shadows of the night) will give way before the bright light of earnest endeavor to get the proper solution. Faith can move mountains.

With this thought, there are numerous confirmations of that faith all around us. We see boys without limbs walking; we see men with wrecked pasts made new by a noble desire to serve; we see our own country do the impossible in the war effort; we see blind men, cheerfully and with a song in their hearts, do a real job. All about us are the expressions of men and women in action, overcoming, building, demonstrating that nothing is impossible for the man or the woman or the race which "comes unto itself" and returns to the Father's house.

National Policy Committee Is Helping Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in this period of industrial strife and sharp economic and political controversy it is heartening to witness the activities of one national organization whose purpose it is to bring together representatives of divergent interests to discuss public problems and to suggest policies based not upon domination by any group but upon the public welfare. I refer to the National Policy Committee, which has worked quietly but effectively for 10 years to promote the democratic process. Mr. David J. Winton, of Minnesota, is chairman, and Mrs. Helen Hill Miller, of Virginia, is executive director. Headquarters are maintained in the National Press Building in Washington. The committee maintains no lobby, uses no high-pressure tactics, and seeks no prominence, but it is generating a quiet influence for democratic practices in America that has become highly significant. Its uniqueness lies in its practice of maintaining discussions in an atmosphere of complete freedom, with participation by representatives of all groups within the community. A cross section of our political and economic structure will be found in its meetings. Groups are being established upon a community, State, and regional basis.

Mr. Speaker, America needs this type of activity. It is based upon faith in democratic principles and in the integrity of America's leadership. We need more discussions and publications of the kind sponsored by the national policy committee. I have full confidence in our capacity as a people to make sound decisions and to move in the right direction, but we must know the nature of the problems confronting us and possess the facts relating to them. Otherwise, those decisions would be delayed and the delays might be costly.

Among the topics to engage the committee's attention are: The organization of Congress, new responsibilities of labor, management and Government, international civil aviation, national wage policy, universal military training, postwar problems in education, the public and the State Department, transition price controls, and the future of industrial risk.

According to its official statement the committee has the following objectives:

First. To further the formation of groups of responsible and representative citizens whose common purpose is to work toward the development of governmental policies by democratic means on the basis of the general interest;

Second. To supply such groups with concise information on issues of regional, national; and international importance;

Third. To stimulate discussion of questions on which public policy is developing;

Fourth. To facilitate the exchange of thought and experience between different parts of the country; and

Fifth. To encourage active participation in the democratic process of forming governmental policy.

Every encouragement should be given to such an enterprise.

Second Lt. Arthur J. Jackson, U. S. M. C., Is Presented the Congressional Medal of Honor by the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and a deep sense of honor that I call to the attention of my colleagues the award made by the President of the United States to Second Lt. Arthur J. Jackson, U. S. M. C., a resident of my congressional district, the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award within the power of the Nation to bestow. The award was made on the White House lawn on October 5 and I deemed it a great privilege to have had the honor of attending the presentation of the award. Lieutenant Jackson, then a private first class as set forth in the citation, proceeded beyond his own lines and, courageously defying the severe and heavy barrages of Japanese forces on the island of Peleliu in the Palau group, on September 18, 1944, charged a large pillbox containing approximately 35 enemy soldiers. With great presence of mind and bravery, he poured his automatic fire into the opening of the first installation to trap the troops therein and hurled white phosphorus grenades and explosive charges against the pillbox, demolishing it and killing the enemy. Not satisfied with this heroic effort, he determined to crush the entire pocket of resistance, although he was encompassed by the enemy. He stormed one pillbox after another, dealing death and destruction to the enemy, and was successful in completely destroying a total of 12 pillboxes, together with 50 Japanese soldiers. As stated in the citation, this gallant initiative and heroic conduct in the face of extreme peril reflect the highest credit upon Lieutenant Jackson and the United States Navy, as a result of which the award was presented to him.

Lieutenant Jackson is a resident of Portland, in my congressional district, was a student at Grant High School where he played on the football team. He was twice wounded taking part in the engagements of Cape Gloucester, Peleliu, and Okinawa. His twenty-first birthday will occur later this month. His father, mother, and sister were proud participants in the ceremony when he received the award at the hands of the President on the White House lawn. His statement at the time he was first apprised of the award was significant when he said:

> This came as a big surprise to me. I heard about 9 months ago that I was going to be recommended for something but I had forgotten about it.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the sentiments of every Member of the House when I say that the outstanding courage and indomitable will and resourcefulness of the American fighting man in defense of our country as exemplified by this brave young marine, is unexcelled in the military forces of any nation on earth.

The following is the citation given to Second Lt. Arthur J. Jackson upon the presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor by the President:

> The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to Pfc. Arthur J. Jackson, U. S. M. C., for service as set forth in the following citation:
>
> "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty, while with the Third Battalion, Seventh Marines, First Marine Division, in action against enemy Japanese forces on the island of Peleliu in the Palau group, September 18, 1944. Boldly taking the initiative when his platoon's left-flank advance was

held up by the fire of Japanese troops concealed in strongly fortified positions, Private First Class Jackson unhesitatingly proceeded forward of our lines and, courageously defying the heavy barrages, charged a large pillbox housing approximately 35 enemy soldiers. Pouring his automatic fire into the opening of the fixed installation to trap the occupying troops, he hurled white phosphorus grenades and explosive charges brought up by a fellow marine, demolishing the pillbox and killing all of the enemy. Advancing alone under the continuous fire from other hostile emplacements, he employed similar means to smash two smaller positions in the immediate vicinity. Determined to crush the entire pocket of resistance although harassed on all sides by the shattering blasts of Japanese weapons and covered only by small rifle parties, he stormed one gun position after another, dealing death and destruction to the savagely fighting enemy in his inexorable drive against the remaining defenses and succeeded in wiping out a total of 12 pillboxes and 50 Japanese soldiers. Stout-hearted and indomitable despite the terrific odds, Private First Class Jackson resolutely maintained control of the platoon's left-flank movement throughout his valiant one-man assault and, by his cool decision and relentless fighting spirit during a critical situation, contributed essentially to the complete annihilation of the enemy in the southern sector of the island. His gallant initiative and heroic conduct in the face of extreme peril reflect the highest credit upon Private First Class Jackson and the United States naval service."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Washington Star for September 23, 1945, published in its feature section an article entitled "Aids for Small Business," which seemed to me to be so important as to deserve reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Naturally enough I should like to call attention to the mention made in this article of a bill introduced by myself which, though not referred by number, is H. R. 52 and which would provide for a program of guaranteed private-bank loans to small business in order to try to equalize the credit opportunities of small business with those which big business has consistently enjoyed.

AIDS FOR SMALL BUSINESS—MAURY MAVERICK, CHAIRMAN OF SWPC, SEEKS SECURITY FOR LITTLE FELLOW

(By Edward A. Harris)

Small business has been defined by some tongue-in-cheek economists as one that does not have a lobbyist in the Nation's Capital. If this definition once held true, it has been pushed into obsolescence by the aggressive Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Government-created friend, lobbyist, and underwriter of the small businessman.

Maury Maverick, the rampaging chairman and general manager of the SWPC, has performed miracles in attracting national attention to the plight of small business. Indeed, at times he has kicked up so much dust in its behalf that alarmed politicos have mistaken his antics for political campaigning techniques. The irrepressible Maury would be the first to plead guilty to campaigning, even to crusading. For he is convinced that the future of small business in America is the most transcending question mark of our economy—and in this belief he has plenty of distinguished company.

When Secretary of State James F. Byrnes was War Mobilization Director, for instance, he declared that small business always has been the foundation of American enterprise. Commerce Secretary Henry Wallace has been a consistent champion of the small-business man and critic of cartels. On assuming his new post his first act was to suggest ways to enable small business to do its full share in furnishing maximum employment after the war. The Senate and House have set up committees on small business which have worked long and hard, if not speedily, on the basic problems involved. Numerous economists have warned that chaos lies ahead unless the trend toward concentration of power in the hands of big business is halted and reversed by an upsurge of small business.

SEES CATASTROPHE IN BIGNESS

"Economic concentration leads toward the elimination of small business," said Maverick in a recent report to the Congress. "It leads to the strangulation of free enterprise, competition, and industrial democracy. When the 'bigs' get too big, when they get too much, they fix prices, restrict production. Unemployment then comes in millions. Finally the bottom drops out, and catastrophe, one way or the other, comes to the society which has fallen in confusion.

"If we want the American system, we must undo this situation. Or else we lose the free enterprise system and drop through our own trapdoor of ignorance and complacency into a form of totalitarianism."

What, then is the outlook for little business? What have the war years done to the little businessman, and what specific program is being evolved to save him from the economic oblivion feared by Maverick and so many others?

The primary and startling fact that must be comprehended first of all, says the SWPC, is that three-fifths of the postwar capacity to produce is held by the 250 largest manufacturing corporations and two-fifths is diffused among the more than 75,000 remaining medium-sized and small corporate manufacturing enterprises.

This is a distortion of our economy which threatens disaster, it is contended. To add to the top-heavy advantage already enjoyed by big business, private operators of Government-owned war plants are in a position to exercise options to purchase most of the Government facilities, and they possess the financial resources to do so, in contrast to small business.

PART IN WAR WORK SMALL

As pointed out by Maverick, despite all safeguards, small business was able to share in war production only to a limited extent. The prewar trend toward expansion of big business was accelerated by military emphasis on speed and volume in war production.

Along with this reliance in wartime on large corporations, many small concerns engaged in service and distribution activities and in the production of luxury commodities found it necessary to curtail or stop operations for lack of manpower and materials. Thousands of one-man enterprises closed as their owners were drafted or took war jobs. It is estimated that half a million small businesses disappeared from the American economy during the war.

A "small business," incidentally, is defined by the SWPC as one that employs fewer than 500 persons, except that in some cases a company may exceed this number and still remain "small" compared with dominant producers in its line. For statistical purposes the Commerce Department defines a small business as a manufacturing plant with less than 100 employees; a wholesale establishment with less than $200,000 annual net sales volume; retail stores, services, hotels, amusement places and construction firms with less than $50,000 annual net sales volume.

More generally, the department describes a business as small when it cannot afford to buy for itself the kind of engineering, marketing, economic, and financial counsel which a big business buys for its own use out of its substantial resources.

TWO PERCENT EMPLOYS FORTY PERCENT

Even before the entry of the United States into World War II, the Temporary National Economic Committee found "the tendency toward dominance by a small number of establishments to be increasing." At that time the committee said the point had been reached where less than 2 percent of the plants employed 40 percent of the workers, and went on: "Until the 1929–33 depression, there was no evidence that small-scale operators were being affected, but since then there has been a noticeable decline in small plants."

During the last 4 years of the war a sixth of all businesses ceased operations, ranging from one-twelfth of finance, insurance, and real estate firms to one-third of all contract construction units. In the metal products industries, plants with more than 2,500 employees increased their share of total production in that field from 22.3 percent in 1939 to 55.5 percent in 1943. Plants with from 500 to 2,500 employees declined from 31.3 to 21.3 percent during the same span, while small plants with 100 to 500 workers fell from 27.8 to 12.2 percent and plants with less than 100 employees declined from 18.6 to 11 percent of total production in the industry.

Through persistent efforts the SWPC did succeed in the final year and a half of the war in increasing the amount of contracts held by small plants from 8 to 25 percent in the case of Navy procurement and from 12 to 24 percent in the case of the Army. It is stressed, however, that these benefits consisted of larger allocations of orders to existing small businesses rather than an increase in the number of small business enterprises, and in any case the improvement came only near the close of the war.

Maverick has pointed out repeatedly the little-realized fact that the SWPC as a Government agency represents about 95 percent of business and plants by number and 40 percent or more of the manufacturers in volume. "It is obvious that for the welfare of the country, and for the free enterprise system, all these little businesses should be encouraged, and not be allowed to fall by the wayside in any hysteria and rush, where the big people will get the seats with the little people left to stand and wait," he has warned.

ONE HUNDRED CORPORATIONS HANDLE BULK

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, who has served as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, sounded repeated warnings during the early part of the war that wartime requirements were leading to a further concentration of business in the Nation. Between June 1940 and March 1943 more than 770 percent of the value of all Government contracts had gone to 100 corporations, he said, and during the first year of active war production these corporations had received more than 86 percent in value of all Government contracts.

The Small Business Committee of the Senate on July 14, 1944, reported that the chief factors leading to a decline in the activities of small business during the war were (a) a drastic shift in markets from individual to

Federal purchases, (b) need for rapid conversion of plants to war production, (c) curtailment and regulation of supplies, (d) manpower shortages, (e) need for capital to finance conversion and to cover expanded operational needs, (f) involved detail work incident to Federal controls over manufacturing and distribution.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation was set up under an act approved on June 11, 1942, to lend funds to small plants, to acquire facilities for them, and generally to assist them in overcoming the difficulties of wartime operation. It recently recommended to Congress a major three-point program to bring about the rejuvenation of small business in the postwar reconversion era: (1) Resumption by the Government of a strong antitrust policy to prevent giant corporations from gobbling up small business, (2) the granting of priority purchase rights to medium-sized and small business of publicly owned war plants under direction of the Surplus Property Board, (3) strengthening the ability of small business to compete by making available financial assistance at reasonable interest rates and by providing Government technical assistance.

SEEK TO GUARD LITTLE FELLOW

The latter two proposals have been incorporated, partially in measures enacted to aid small business during reconversion. The Surplus Property Act, signed October 3, 1944, gives the attorney general authority to halt the sale of any Government-owned production facilities if necessary to prevent perpetuation of monopolies. The Reconversion Act, adopted a year ago, assures small business participation in production of restricted items during reconversion, and projects an equitable allocation of civilian items on a quota-production basis. Finally, a provision of the GI bill of rights, enacted June 22, 1944, offers loans to veterans to purchase small business properties.

Bills introduced in the present Congress by Representatives CELLAR, Democrat, of New York, and PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, and in the Senate by JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, would extend the life of the SWPC from December 31, 1946, to the end of 1947. A measure by Representative JERRY VOORHIS, Democrat, of California, would extend it to July 1, 1948, and change the name from SWPC to Federal Small Business Corp., the name favored by the SWPC Board of Directors.

Under VOORHIS' bill the corporation would be authorized to lend funds for the expansion of peacetime production, to help develop new enterprises, to insure bank loans to small businessmen, to aid veterans, to provide technical and managerial service and assistance, and to place at the disposal of small business such patents, processes, facilities, or other technology as may be owned by an agency of the Government. The corporation also would be directed to study proposals for tax relief of small businesses and to suggest legislation that would stimulate small enterprises.

War Mobilization and Reconversion Director John W. Snyder in his comprehensive report to the White House a few weeks ago, had this to say in summing up the Government's plans to assist small business:

"Priorities now granted to small business firms will continue in effect until September 30. Thereafter, in granting priorities to break bottlenecks, the War Production Board will give special attention to bottlenecks affecting individual small business firms.

"The SWPC has a Government priority enabling it to buy surplus equipment and materials for resale to small business and will aid any small-business man in locating surplus property which he needs. These aids will be extended to veterans who desire to open a business. Financial as well as technical aids will be provided."

MAVERICK'S PROGRAM

More specifically, Chairman Maverick has recommended the following immediate program:

Give the corporation the same wide power to make loans to small business as is possessed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in making loans to big business.

Enact legislation to enable small business to obtain its fair share of materials and machinery during the entire reconversion period, irrespective of the discontinuance of total controls.

Maverick explains that under the Reconversion Act assistance is granted to small business in obtaining a fair share of allocated materials. No provision is made for assistance to small concerns when allocations or similar controls are discontinued.

Of long range importance, Maverick states, are the following steps:

Give the corporation power to establish a system of credit insurance to be extended to banks making loans to small business, comparable to the Federal Housing Administration system.

Extend to the corporation the authority to accept basic contracts offered it by foreign purchasers of a governmental nature, to be subcontracted to small business.

Expand the Corporation's authority to render technical and advisory service, including managerial assistance, and including the limited power to provide scientific research, using or cooperating with Government agencies, colleges, and private laboratories, and

Give the Corporation power to rediscount its paper with the Federal Reserve banks.

SWPC AS LENDING AGENCY OPPOSED

Maverick's proposal that the SWPC be extended in peacetime as a small-business lending agency was vigorously opposed before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by the American Bankers Association. Harold Stonier, executive manager of the association, said that the banks had a plan which would "take care of small business all right." This plan was formed after adoption of a resolution by the ABA in September 1943, which condemned "Government loans or the guarantee of loans" for commercial enterprise after the war as "actually contrary to sound financial policy and the best interests of the American economy."

The bankers said they were prepared, as an alternative, to extend term loans to small concerns, to create small-business loan departments in every major bank, to extend specialized services to smaller correspondent banks so that they in turn might lend funds to small-business men, and to form credit groups or pools to minimize credit risks which a single bank might hesitate to assume. More than 34 of such bank-credit pools already have been organized.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, in step with the American Bankers' Association, has expressed the view that the chief difficulties of small business have been due to conditions which hindered all business, and that special remedies or special privileges are not desirable. "Should Government or private groups provide special aid to small business, abuses are less likely to develop if such aid is made available to firms of all sizes," the chamber declared.

An opposite position is taken by the Committee for Economic Development, which believes that obstacles must be removed which impede the establishment of new business and the growth of small, independent concerns. The committee supports strict enforcement of antitrust legislation, fair treatment of small business in production quotas for civilian goods during reconversion, and preferential treatment for tax relief. As an alternative to Federal financial aid and technical advisory services, the CED suggests action by its 1,300 local committees to provide capital, to establish research institutions and to use existing educational facilities for instruction of small-business men in commercial subjects.

The outlook for small business is not painted in dark strokes by all Government spokesmen by any means. Experts like Howard Bowen of the Department of Commerce (which is expected to absorb the SWPC) foresee a postwar resurgence of small business with the removal of wartime obstacles to the starting of new firms, with the return of potential businessmen from the armed services and war jobs, and with the restoration of civilian economy. There is abundant evidence, says Bowen, that small business is "an institution of great vitality."

Notwithstanding this evidence, Maury Maverick and other top administration figures are determined to help smooth the road ahead for small business. For they rightfully look upon the small-business man as the mainstay of our economy, and in the competitive war ahead he will need all the help he can get.

Demobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the General Military Staff makes some public announcement two or three times a week which changes the picture of demobilizing the Army. When General Marshall on September 20 appeared before the joint meeting of Congress, he stated that he hoped within 4 weeks to be able to release every man for whom "useful employment" could not be found in the Army. The time has approached to carry out that promise. It seems to me that the only way the military forces can satisfy not only the enlisted men but the parents at home is to give every man in the military who does not have useful employment a furlough of 30, 60, or 90 days at home. These men could be recalled when the Army is ready to complete their physical examination and ascertain that their papers are in proper order. This could be done at any Army camp. Unless some system of this type is instituted, we may well have 5,000,000 men, most of them in this country, under arms at Christmas time. The Members of Congress may be sure that the soldiers and their families will not be very happy under those circumstances.

The men coming back from the Pacific and European theaters of war are now being given a short furlough home and then called back to a camp to await discharge. Some of them sit around several weeks or months just waiting. Some of them are being shipped from one camp to another without any good reason. I quote a part of a letter received today as follows:

Two and a half years ago I joined the Navy and was in the recruiting service in

Cheyenne, Wyo. When I came up for a discharge, they sent me to Denver for 3 days at Government expense. It took just 8 minutes to be checked of everything but my blood pressure. I was then sent to Bremerton, Wash., with pullman expense to the Government with all the trimmings at 5 cents a mile and return to get my blood pressure checked and to receive my discharge.

This example could be multiplied many times.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce a letter at this point from Guam signed by 50 servicemen. It gives their opinion of the so-called point system of the Army:

GUAM, *September 19, 1945.*

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since our President, our duly-elected Representatives, and the War Department have concurred in the general proposition that service men and women should be returned to civilian life as rapidly as practicable, the difficulty seems to be in the method of demobilization used.

Under the present so-called point system of demobilization, only two categories of servicemen receive adequate consideration for discharge. Those with sufficient combat service and those who have two or more children coupled with a minimum of 2 years' service. The vast majority of the remaining members of the Armed Forces can easily look forward to an unnecessarily long period before they are demobilized.

It is still our belief that the United States of America does not have to resort to a glorified WPA program using the Army as a convenient vehicle to dispose of several million of its youth which might otherwise be considered as an economic surplus. We refuse to believe that human life, which was admittedly expendable during wartime, is now to be coldly considered as an economic factor relative to the over-all economy of the United States. And since the Army has no further use for us, since our purpose of defending this country in time of need has been removed, we believe that the people at home wish to see us returned to our normal lives as soon as possible.

Toward this end the undersigned who represent all different age groups from 19 through 36 years of age, who average from 2 to 3 years of honorable service and who have differing statuses of dependency, single and married men alike are unanimous on one thing, namely, that the present point system as a means of demobilization is grossly inadequate and unfair to the vast majority of service people.

In its place as a prerequisite for discharge we are all agreed that a provision stipulating 2 years of honorable military service be substituted.

It has been alleged that the present point system was instituted after the War Department polled the opinions of enlisted personnel. The undersigned who believe that they are a fairly good cross section of opinion in the armed forces never would concur with the present system.

Because we still have faith in our elected representatives we respectfully submit this letter for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

FIFTY SERVICEMEN.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to place on the Clerk's desk, at the earliest possible moment, a petition which, when signed by 218 Members, will get a bill out of the Military Affairs Committee and which, when amended and passed by Congress, should greatly assist in helping the Army to demobilize in a just and efficient manner.

Nothing Could Conquer Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Nothing Could Conquer Him," delivered by Hon. Basil O'Connor, chairman of the executive committee of the board of trustees of the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, at Warm Springs, Ga., on August 24, 1945, on the occasion of the first day issue of the Little White House stamp. The address is a well-prepared tribute to the late lamented President Roosevent.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Postmaster General Hannegan, Governor Arnall, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot stand here today—just outside the entrance to the Little White House at the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation here in War Springs, Ga.—and not have memories—memories of very happy, exciting days and great events—memories of a great inspirational force—memories of a great soul.

Over 20 years ago I journeyed to Warm Springs with Franklin D. Roosevelt when he first came here, and I arrived with him late last March when he came here for the last time.

President Roosevelt loved Warm Springs. He called it his second home and he meant that. From the day he founded this institution to help humanity, it played a major role in his life and his philosophy. It was here that he learned to walk better after he had been stricken by infantile paralysis. From here he was drafted unwillingly back into public life. Here he came for treatment and for fun and for laughter. Here he came during those consuming days of war to find quiet and rest—to gain strength for the inhuman demands upon him.

In this simple, unpretentious cottage—the Little White House—many of our fundamental domestic policies were decided, and here, too, were charted many of the pathways of peace—a peace he wanted so much for the world, and a peace he wanted to last; and finally it was here that he died—died in so tragically short a time before that peace came to the world.

The victory for which he fought and lived—for which, in the final analysis, he gave his life—has now been won. He did not live to see that day, but he left the affairs of this Nation in the hands of an able successor, and one in whom the American people have full and complete confidence.

In founding this institution at Warm Springs, Ga., President Roosevelt demonstarted, almost a quarter of a century ago, that foresight and vision that many, at times, found so difficult to follow. Frequently he predicted what we now have here at the Georgia Warm Springs Foundation—the largest center in the world for the treatment of poliomyelitis, to which can come, up to the limit of our capacity, from all over this country, regardless of race, creed, or color, and regardless of their ability to pay, those who are afflicted as he was—with infantile paralysis. He foresaw an institution here treating, as it does today, from 500 to 600 patients every year from every State in this Union.

But he saw more than that. He saw an institution in which those who are patients receive not only the best medical care but also gain from their surroundings that indomitable courage which he had to refuse to be handicapped in any way by this disease. It did not conquer him, and his fervent daily prayer was that all who entered these gates would know it could not conquer them.

And then he went on—he went on from the treatment here at Warm Springs of those afflicted by this disease—to the founding in 1938 of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, so that by scientific medical research a way could be found to prevent people from ever suffering from this disease.

I'm certain that in 1938 he had no doubt as to what the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis would be today—one of the greatest public foundations of all times, representing for the first time in the history of mankind scientific medical research supported by the people themselves; yes, supported by well over 50,000,000 people in these United States, so that there is now available to all who can intelligently use them, funds for scientific research to conquer this disease and to care adequately for every individual in this country—man, woman, or child—who has become a victim of it. He did live to see the day when it could be truthfully said that the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and its 3,000 chapters throughout the Nation were able to provide for every sufferer from infantile paralysis in this country the best medical care. That's what he wanted and he wanted that to continue—and it will.

When this stamp representing the Little White House, which I have purchased today, travels over this country, it will make some think of President Roosevelt's statesmanship; it will make others think of his grasp of international affairs; but it will remind all people of his love for the common man.

It was here in this Little White House that I saw him for the last time. On a beautiful Easter Sunday morning, 12 days before he died, I said goodbye to him for the last time. Here in the shadow of approaching death he was still smiling—and he left that smile have for us—nothing could conquer him!

The London Council of Foreign Ministers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Friday evening, October 5. This address constitutes Secretary Byrnes' report on the first session of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON FIRST SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS

The first session of the Council of Foreign Ministers closed in a stalemate. But that need not, and should not, deprive us of a

second and better chance to get on with the peace.

In the past I have been both criticized and commended for being a compromiser. I confess that I do believe that peace and political progress in international affairs, as in domestic affairs, depend upon intelligent compromise. The United States delegation acted in that spirit at Berlin. We acted in that spirit at London. And we should continue to act in that spirit at future conferences.

That spirit is essential in international conferences where action can be taken only by unanimous agreement. When any one member can prevent agreement, compromise is a necessity. Men and women who have served on a jury can appreciate that.

Compromise, however, does not mean surrender, and compromise, unlike surrender, requires the assent of more than one party.

The difficulties encountered at the London conference will, I hope, impress upon the peoples of all countries, including our own people, the hard reality that none of us can expect to write the peace in our own way. If this hard reality is accepted by statesmen and peoples at an early stage of the peacemaking process, it may at later stages save us and save the peace of the world from the disastrous effects of disillusionment and intransigeances.

Regardless of how Americans may differ as to domestic policies, they desire unity in our foreign policies. This unity will be essential in the days ahead of us, when we may expect differences in views by various governments as to peace settlements. However, the political party in power cannot expect this unity unless it freely consults representatives of the opposing political party.

Believing this, I requested Mr. John Foster Dulles, one of the best-informed Americans in the field of foreign relations and a loyal Republican, to accompany me to London in an advisory capacity. He has been more than an adviser; he has been a partner. Between us there have been no secrets. At the council table and in private conference he has participated in the making of all decisions. Our accord serves to show that in foreign affairs Republicans and Democrats can work together and that in vital matters of foreign policy we Americans are united.

When it was agreed at Berlin to establish the Council of Foreign Ministers I think we all had in mind the precedent of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. There, representatives of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and the United States worked together to prepare draft proposals for the United Nations Charter as a basis for discussion with other nations. France was not present at Dumbarton Oaks only because France had not yet been liberated. Her right to permanent membership on the United Nations Security Council was not questioned.

Experience reveals that a certain degree of understanding among the major powers is essential to secure general agreement among many nations. When understanding among the great powers is not achieved in advance of a conference participated in by many nations, it usually has to be secured informally during the conference.

At the Versailles Conference, for example, it took the Big Three and the Big Five so long to agree among themselves that the complaint was made that the smaller powers had little more time to consider the treaty than was given to the Germans.

The Berlin agreement envisaged the naming of high-ranking deputies who could carry on the work of the council in the absence of their chiefs, the foreign secretaries. The council, as President Truman and I understood it, was to be a sort of combined staff to explore the problems and prepare proposals for the final peace settlements.

At Berlin it certainly was never intended that the three powers present or the five powers constituting the Council should take unto themselves the making of the final peace. The Berlin declaration setting up the Council begins with the statement "The Conference reached the following agreement for the establishment of a Council of Foreign Ministers to do the necessary preparatory work for the peace settlements."

The Council was not to make the peace settlements but to do the necessary preparatory work for the peace settlements. It certainly was not my intention to agree to any final treaty without first getting the views of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate which must pass upon all treaties before ratification.

The first session of the Council, so far as the personal participation of the Foreign Ministers was concerned, was intended to provide directives for the Deputies in the preparation of treaties for Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland.

This work was exploratory—to find out on what points we were in agreement, on what points we differed, and on what points further study and data were required. It is a little naive to suppose that when really vital differences emerge, one nation or another is likely to abandon its position on the first interchange of views.

At this stage it is as important to know and understand wherein we and our Allies differ as wherein we agree. We must understand our points of difference before we can intelligently consider means of reconciling them.

So far as the Italian treaty was concerned I think we made very good progress toward agreement on directives to govern the work of our Deputies.

There was ready acceptance of our proposal that Italy should undertake to maintain a bill of rights which will secure the freedoms of speech, religious worship, political belief and public meeting envisaged for Italy in the Moscow Declaration of November 1943 and which will confirm the human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

There was some difference among the conferees at the start as to providing for the limitation of armaments. But it was our feeling that Italy should rely on the United Nations for protection against aggression and should not engage in competition in armaments when all her resources are badly needed to restore her civilian economy. And this view gained general acceptance.

While the very controversial boundary dispute between Yugoslavia and Italy was not settled, it was encouraging to find that it was possible to agree that the line should in the main be governed by ethnic considerations and that regardless of its sovereignty there should be a free port at Trieste under international control.

The Council was in general agreement that the Dodecanese Islands should go to Greece, although the assent of one member was qualified pending the study of certain questions by his government.

There was general agreement that the Italian colonies should come under the trusteeship provisions of the United Nations Charter. Various views were expressed as to the preferred form of trusteeship for the colonies.

The American delegation was particularly gratified that the directive to the deputies, while not restricting their studies, called for special consideration of the American proposal for a truly international administration directly responsible to the United Nations with a view to the attainment of the greatest degree of independence of the inhabitants of two of the colonies at the end of 10 years and independence for the people of a third colony at as early a date as possible.

This proposal was presented by the American delegation when the Italian treaty first was taken up and was consistently adhered to.

It is our view that the object of a trusteeship should be to promote the self-government of the people of a colony and not to enrich a trustee or increase its economic or military power.

It was also agreed that Italian sovereignty should be restored on the conclusion of the treaty so that foreign troops may be withdrawn and, except as specially provided in the treaty, foreign controls within Italy terminated.

There was no definite understanding on reparations. The United States took the position that Italy could not pay anything like $600,000,000. Apart from certain foreign assets, she should be required to pay as reparations only such factory and tool equipment designed for the manufacture of war implements which are not required for the limited military establishment permitted to her and which cannot be readily converted to peaceful purposes. If she is stripped of more, then her economy cannot be restored.

We have contributed several hundred million dollars for the relief of the Italian people. Their condition is deplorable. We must continue to help them. But we cannot contribute more millions, if those millions are to be used to enable Italy to pay reparations to other governments. We did that for Germany after the last war. We shall not do it again.

Substantial progress was also made on the directives for the preparatory work on the Finnish treaty and the treaties with Rumania and Bulgaria. The principles suggested by the American delegation and accepted for the Italian treaty for the safeguarding of human rights and fundamental freedoms are also to be incorporated in these treaties.

The directives concerning the limitation of armament for Rumania and Bulgaria are expected to follow the same general line as those accepted for Italy.

Before work could be commenced upon the directives for the Hungarian treaty the Soviet delegation announced they felt obliged to withdraw their assent to the procedure previously accepted by the Council for dealing with peace treaties.

Before taking up these procedural difficulties I should say a few words about the Soviet delegation's disappointment with the failure of Great Britain and the United States to recognize the Bulgarian and Rumanian Governments.

The thought apparently exists in their mind that our Government objects to these Governments because they are friendly to the Soviet Union and that our unwillingness to recognize these Governments is a manifestation of unfriendliness to the Soviet Union.

There could be no greater misconception of our attitude. I was at Yalta. The Yalta Declaration on the liberated and ex-satellite countries was based on a proposal submitted by President Roosevelt. Under it the Allied Powers, including the Soviet Union, assumed the responsibility of concerting their policies to assist in the establishment of interim governments broadly representative of all important democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people. That pledge cannot be fulfilled in countries where freedom of speech and of assembly are denied.

That policy sponsored by President Roosevelt was America's policy and remains America's policy.

We are well aware that no government is perfect and that the representative character of any provisional government will always be subject to debate. We do not demand perfection where perfection is unobtainable.

In an effort to concert our policies with our Allies we have tried to show a spirit of conciliation. Certainly we did not make unduly exacting the requirements we set before we recognized the Provisional Polish Govern-

ment or the conditions which we have proposed as a basis for the recognition of the Provisional Hungarian Government.

And I hope that as the result of efforts now being made by the Provisional Austrian Government to broaden its representation, we may soon be able to recognize that Government.

At Berlin we stated we would examine in the near future, in the light of prevailing conditions, the question of recognition of Rumania and Bulgaria. We have investigated and we shall continue to investigate. But we cannot know whether conditions justify recognition unless our political representatives are fully informed and unless our news correspondents are permitted freely to enter countries and freely to send their stories uncensored.

We do not seek to dictate the internal affairs of any people. We only reserve for ourselves the right to refuse to recognize governments if after investigation we conclude they have not given to the people the rights pledged to them in the Yalta agreement and in the Atlantic Charter.

The peace of Europe depends upon the existence of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and its European neighbors, and two wars in one generation have convinced the American people that they have a very vital interest in the maintenance of peace in Europe.

The American Government shares the desire of the Soviet Union to have governments friendly to the Soviet Union in eastern and central Europe.

But lasting peace depends not only upon friendship between governments, but upon friendship between peoples.

Had it not been for the difficulties experienced by the Allied Governments in agreeing upon a common policy in regard to the recognition of the governments of Rumania and Bulgaria a more conciliatory spirit might possibly have prevailed and might greatly have helped to overcome the procedural difficulties of the Council.

No one present at the Council on September 11 questioned the decision taken by the Council that day inviting all five members to be present at all meetings.

Directives for the Italian treaty were under discussion for several days with China, not a party to the surrender terms, present, participating in the discussion, but not voting. No one objected.

Directives for the Finnish treaty were then considered, with the United States, France, and China present but not voting. No one objected.

Directives for the Rumanian treaty and then for the Bulgarian treaty were considered, with France and China present but not voting. No one objected.

It was only on September 22 that the Soviet delegation took the position that the decision of the Council on September 11 violated the Berlin agreement.

It will be recalled that the Berlin agreement set up a Council of the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, China, and the United States to undertake the necessary preparatory work for the peace settlements. It provided that the Council should draw up with a view to their submission to the United Nations peace treaties with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland.

It provided that in the discharge of these tasks the Council will be composed of members representing those states which were signatory to the terms of surrender imposed upon the enemy state concerned, and for the purpose of the Italian settlement, France should be regarded as signatory to the surrender terms.

The Berlin agreement further provided that other members of the Council will be invited to participate when matters directly concerning them are under discussion.

This distinction between members of the Council who were parties to the surrender terms and those who were not, was not part of the original American proposal and was reluctantly accepted by us. We were fully aware that a member would not have the right to vote if not a party to the surrender terms, but we understood from the exchange of views at the table that all members would be allowed to participate in all discussions in the Council.

It certainly never occurred to President Truman or myself that any of the five members of the Council, who are also the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, which is charged with the responsibility for maintaining the peace which the Council of Foreign Ministers is preparing, would not be invited to be present during the discussions of the treaties.

Such exclusion of two permanent members of the Security Council would not promote the harmonious relations essential to the success of the United Nations Organization.

The Soviet delegation's position was not simply that they wished to withdraw the invitation to China and France to participate without right to vote. Their position was that it was beyond the authority of the states signatory to the surrender terms to extend the invitation.

Alhough this construction of the Berlin agreement did not accord with the understanding of the American delegation or the British delegation or the President of the United States or the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Soviet delegation insisted that they could no longer discuss treaty matters in the presence of members who were not parties to the surrender terms.

Thereafter the meetings of the Council for a number of days were confined to the discussion of other items on the agenda such as international inland waterways, the Ruhr, acceleration of German reparations, restitution, repatriation of Allied nations, and the Austrian food supply.

When the general items on the agenda were exhausted, agreement had not been reached for solving the procedural obstacles which, in the view of the Soviet delegation, made further discussion of treaty matters impossible until the decision of September 11 should be rescinded.

Since it had always been my view that the Berlin agreement contemplated a broadening out of the participants before the final conclusion of a peace treaty, I sought to find a compromise along that line.

The Berlin agreement expressly provided in section 4 of the article establishing the council that the council may adapt its procedures to the particular problems under discussion; that in some cases it may hold its own discussions prior to the participation of other interested states; and in other cases it may convoke a formal conference of states interested in particular problems.

I therefore proposed, with considerable reluctance, that we ask our French and Chinese colleagues to accept the position of the Soviet delegation that the preparatory and exploratory work of the Council for the peace settlements be confined to the signatories of the surrender terms in question, provided that at the same time it should be agreed that a truly representative peace conference should be convoked before the end of the year. To insure the calling of such a conference we thought that France and China, in the interest of peace, might make even this sacrifice.

This conference would be convoked for the purpose of considering the peace treaties with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland. To the conference would be invited—

1. The five members of the Council of Foreign Ministers which are also the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council;

2. All European members of the United Nations;

3. All non-European members of the United Nations which supplied substantial military contingents in the war against the European members of the Axis.

The American delegation took the position that, in an interdependent, democratic world, peace cannot be the exclusive concern of a few presently powerful states; that unless we were to revert to a world of isolationism none of the states which we wanted invited to the Peace Conference could be said to be not directly concerned in the peace.

We urged that those states, both large and small, which had fought and suffered in the war must make the peace. This has been a peoples' war and it must be a peoples' peace.

The Soviet delegation stated, however, that they could not agree to the American proposal for a Peace Conference until they had returned to Moscow and had personal consultations with their government.

It therefore became obvious that there could be no agreement unless the other delegations were prepared to yield their views and convictions to those of the Soviet delegation. This none of the other delegations was prepared to do.

The United States is willing to dictate terms of peace to an enemy but is not willing to dictate terms of peace to its allies.

Our task then became one of arranging an adjournment until the Soviet delegation could return to Moscow. It is customary before adjournment to adopt and have all conferees to sign a protocol containing a record of the agreed decisions of a conference. The Soviet delegation would not agree to the inclusion in the protocol of the decision of September 11 that the five members should participate in all meetings, even though it included a statement of the action taken by the Soviet delegation on September 22 to withdraw their assent to that decision.

On that last day of the session the Soviet delegation announced it would offer a compromise proposal. The proposal was that there should be four separate protocols without recording in any of them the decision of September 11 which had been agreed to by them but which they later wished to rescind. This was the same position that they had urged for days. The only thing new about it was the suggestion that on the following day they would discuss unsettled questions including the American proposal for a peace conference and the disputed September 11 decision.

In answer to a question the Soviet Foreign Minister stated that while he could discuss the proposal for a peace conference, he still was without authority to act upon it. The proposal had been discussed for a week. Further discussion without action was futile.

It was also obvious that once the four protocols were signed, it would be useless on the following day to discuss the question of inserting in the protocols the decision of September 11. An objection by the Soviet delegation would prevent its insertion.

The Soviet delegation also reiterated their position that they would not discuss the treaties in the presence of members they now believed to be ineligible. This would have excluded China from the consideration of all treaties and France from the consideration of all but one without any assurance of participation in a peace conference.

It became apparent that agreement was impossible and further meetings were useless. The Chinese Foreign Minister who was presiding when the Council adjourned and at whose instance the Council had remained in session from Sunday until Tuesday, stated that under the circumstances he could not ask the Council to continue in session longer.

As the record stands the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union has not rejected our proposal for a peace conference. During the discussions he admitted it was correct in principle. My hope is that, after he had conferred with his Government, his Government will agree that the nations that fought the war—the World War—shall have a chance to make the world peace.

The matter that caused the suspension of our work is no trivial, or technical question. It presented an issue that had to be met. It is whether the peace shall be made by three or even five nations to the exclusion of other nations vitally concerned in the maintenance and enforcement of the peace which is being prepared.

The issue goes even deeper. The Council of Foreign Ministers acts under the unanimity rule just as the Security Council of the United Nations must act in many important matters, but in the Security Council no nation has the veto power in procedural matters while in the Council of Foreign Ministers one nation can veto all action.

The veto power is a great power and should not be lightly exercised. We are willing to make many concessions but the United States does not believe in agreement at any price.

The power of veto in procedural matters should not be used by the United States or any other nation to coerce the judgment and conscience of fellow nations.

Peace must be based upon mutual understanding and mutual respect. It cannot be secured by procedural maneuverings which obscure from the people the real and vital issues upon which their peace depends.

Undeterred by temporary set-backs and ever willing to accord to others that tolerant understanding that we wish others to accord to us, we must not relax in our efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace for ourselves and all nations. "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Philadelphia Record and reprinted in many newspapers throughout the country in the form of an advertisement paid for by the International Latex Corp., entitled "Think, Two Billions for a Bomb—How Much to Conquer Disease?" The editorial is, indeed, a timely reminder of our backwardness in the handling of medical research so vital to the well-being of our people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINK, TWO BILLIONS FOR A BOMB—HOW MUCH TO CONQUER DISEASE?

Congress, asking no questions, appropriated $2,000,000,000 for the atomic bomb.

The project was so secret our national legislators had to act chiefly on faith.

As Secretary of War Stimson explains, it accepted "the assurances of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff that the appropriations were absolutely essential to national security."

That's the way we expect American Congresses to act—in wartime.

But we don't carry over into peace the same attitude of going all-out against our perpetual enemy, disease.

Back in 1937 scientific circles were stirred when Congress appropriated $1,450,000 for a research program in cancer. Of this sum, $750,000 was for erection of a National Cancer Institute and $700,000 a year thereafter for its operation.

It was a record-breaking Federal appropriation.

But compare that $700,000 a year with the $2,000,000,000 spent for the atomic bomb. Less than one-tenth of 1 percent as much.

Total capitalization of all privately endowed cancer research funds is estimated at not much more than $5,000,000.

Total funds granted by American foundations for research into all the problems of medicine and health in 1940, the last year for which figures are available—totaled a little less than $5,000,000.

DISEASE KILLS MORE THAN WAR

Yet cancer alone, in 1942, killed 163,000 people in this country. Total deaths in all our armed forces in nearly 4 years of war are less than twice that figure.

Perhaps the reason for the reluctance of Congress to spend to fight disease as it spends to fight the war lies in the comparatively undramatic character of the war against cancer or heart disease or pneumonia.

The bombs over Pearl Harbor and the valiant response of our fighting men there roused the country.

A scientist peering into a test tube, a physician bending over a sick bed, doesn't call for cheers and patriotic music.

We must turn into the fight against disease some of the drive—some of the excitement—we used in fighting the Japs.

We built whole new cities and employed 125,000 workers to develop the atomic bomb. We wouldn't have thought the two billion wasted even if we had lost the gamble.

Let's show the same daring after the war as we showed during it. Let's not be afraid to spend money to fight disease as we spent money to beat the Japs. (Philadelphia Record.)

Presented as a public service by—
INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORP.,
Playtex Park, Dover, Del.

Gallup Poll on Major Issues

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in Sunday's Washington Post was published the results of the most recent poll taken by the American Institute of Public Opinion, popularly known as the Gallup Poll. In this poll the American people were asked which party they preferred to accomplish eleven specific objectives, and it is interesting to note that on all eleven counts the Democrats won. Even on such issues as taxation reductions, concerning which some minority members in the House have been howling, the Democrats have a clear-cut lead.

To me this poll is encouraging, not because I happen to be a member of the Democratic Party, but because it is a clear indication that the American people realize the basic issues which we are facing, and the stand which each political party is fundamentally taking. It is an indication that while the late President Roosevelt is being smeared, while Pearl Harbor is being extended, and while Government agencies are being attacked, the great mass of the American people see through the smoke screen. It is clear to them that on the really important problems of the day they have much more hope from the Democrats than they have from the Republicans. The latter are looking backward only; the Democrats are concerned with pressing present problems.

DEMOCRATS WIN PUBLIC SUPPORT OVER GOP ON 11 MAJOR ISSUES

(By George Gallup)

The Republican Party faces an uphill fight if it is to regain political control at next year's election.

Just how tough the battle will be is revealed in the results of a national survey on Government problems.

Voters were asked which party they thought would do better at handling 11 important public problems.

In every case the Democratic Party won a higher vote of preference than the GOP—the ratios in some instances being more than 2 to 1.

The survey was completed before the strike wave reached its present intensity, and before the Truman administration encountered its first major impasse in foreign policy—the break-down of the foreign ministers' parley.

One surprise is that even in the matter of administrative efficiency and of encouraging new business—major talking points of Republicans—Democrats come out on top.

Voters were queried as follows:

"It's another year until the congressional elections, but, as you feel today, which political party do you think can handle each of these different problems better?"

	Democrats	Republicans	No difference	No opinion
	Per cent	*Per cent*	*Per cent*	*Per cent*
Encouraging new business	35	30	20	15
Reducing labor troubles	34	26	23	17
Seeing taxes don't get too heavy	37	26	23	14
Running Government efficiently	41	23	23	13
Getting back to peace production	41	23	20	16
Improving health of people	36	15	32	17
Improving educational level	36	15	33	16
Keeping farmers' income high	46	19	20	15
Taking care of veterans	42	12	33	13
Working out a lasting peace	45	14	28	13
Keeping wages high	49	15	23	13

Dawn in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner, of October 6, 1945:

DAWN IN BRITAIN

A distinguished member of Parliament, Capt. L. D. Gammans, has written in the London Daily Mail that there are two sober facts Britain must face.

One of these facts, he observes, is that in order to have a sound postwar economy Britain must gain a leading position in world trade and that "it is with America that we have to compete in the neutral markets of the world."

The other of the basic facts he cites is that accomplishment of this essential purpose is solely conditioned upon the success of Britain in negotiating "some financial agreement with the United States of America to tide us over until our export trade can be reestablished."

This presents a novel situation, although Captain Gammans does not particularly concern himself with it.

In his recitation of "facts" he does not comment upon the rather amazing conflict between them—the element of conflict being in a situation where the competitor to be overcome is assigned the role of financial backer of the process.

But what he does comment upon most frankly and realistically, and with apprehension, is the possibility that the new program of socialistic nationalization in Britain may make America wary of the role assigned to her.

He recognizes and emphasizes that Britain's vital task is to get American financial support.

"Has the advent of a labor government made that task easier or otherwise?" he wonders.

"One thing is quite certain," warns Captain Gammans.

"American financial aid will not be forthcoming to bolster up schemes of nationalization which in themselves are not economically sound.

"Some of the things said during the election by men now holding key positions in the Government will not help us.

"For example, Sir Stafford Cripps' suggestion that a government of the left is more likely to get on with Russia.

"From this sort of thing, and the more recent utterances of Professor Laski, it might be assumed in America that Great Britain is determined to enter the Russian orbit and is keener to foment left-wing governments abroad than to play an objective role in world affairs, or even to promote her own security."

Obviously, the cold dawn of realization and appraisal has come to socialistic Britain.

The American people, as Captain Gammans implies, are well aware that socialism and nationalization in Britain today are the projects of men and groups intending ultimate communization.

There is no legitimate American concern in that, if it is Britain's choice.

But the American people want no part of it for themselves.

They particularly want no part of paying the bill for it.

The current socialization of Britain and the ultimate communization are strictly Britain's own business.

But let the British pay the bill for it, or, lacking the means to do so, let them look to Moscow.

Birds of a feather flock together.

Hanley Visits Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the National Tribune, Washington, D. C., of date September 13, 1945, as follows:

HANLEY VISITS LOUISIANA

Joe Hanley, native of Chopin, La., and Federal employee in Washington, D. C., since 1922, is receiving national recognition for his activities in Vincent B. Costello Post 15 of the American Legion in Washington.

Since joining the post 3 years ago, Hanley has brought in 200 new members, 60 of them in 1945.

In both the Washington Post and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, tributes to his activities as a one-man, steam-rolling, go-getter recruiter have appeared. In addition, he holds congratulatory letters from the late President Roosevelt, former Postmaster General James Farley, Robert Jackson, W. Forbes Morgan, L. W. Robert, Jr., Edward J. Flynn, and many other prominent Democrats. In an attempt to regain a civil-service appointment recently, he was endorsed in letters from 231 of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, 57 Senators, and several Cabinet members.

Hanley is a member of the F. and A. M. Lodge, No. 273, at Boyce, La., where he became affiliated in 1921. He has just returned to Washington after visiting relatives in central Louisiana, of whom he estimates he has some two or three hundred. His home is at 716 Seventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

London Conference of Big Five

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer the following article by Drew Pearson for printing in the Appendix:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)

The inside story of what happened behind closed doors at the Big Five Conference is now leaking out. Actually, from the moment the five Foreign Ministers sat down they were in trouble. They never had a single profitable session during the 3 weeks they met. At times the atmosphere became so ragged that both Jimmy Byrnes and Ernest Bevin threatened to walk out.

As usual at recent Allied conferences, the American delegation was content to play a defensive game. The British knew what they wanted, but were afraid to make the moves necessary to get it. Therefore they tried to act as mediators, keeping friendly with both the United States and the U. S. S. R. and coming off fairly well except for blustering Foreign Minister Bevin, who lost his temper repeatedly. President Truman, after Potsdam, described Bevin as "the rudest man I ever met."

The Russians knew what they wanted, and came prepared to sabotage and obstruct until they got it.

Discussion got so bitter that at one time Molotov proposed that Russia play a part in governing the Panama Canal—if the United States refused to let Russia have its way in the Dardanelles. Near the end of the conference Molotov sarcastically remarked to one English diplomat, "Byrnes wants to push democracy in the Balkans to see how it works there before he tries it in the State of South Carolina."

TROUBLE BEGAN AT ONCE

Trouble began right off the bat over procedure. At Potsdam it had been definitely decided that the London Conference was to concern itself only with peace treaties for Italy, Bulgaria, and Rumania—in that order. However, the Russians came prepared to discuss problems all over the world. And when Molotov opened up on other subjects, Byrnes and Bevin brought him up with a sharp reminder of the Potsdam Agreement.

"But," countered Molotov, "the Yalta and Moscow Conferences Agreements also called for regular meetings of the foreign ministers to discuss all matters—not merely Italy and the Balkans." So, he said, he proposed discussing other questions at London.

Finally, however, they began with Italy. No great difficulty arose. They reached the question of Italian reparations. Then the Russians said they wanted the Italians to pay $600,000,000. The British chimed in, said they also wanted large reparations from the Italians. At this point, Byrnes cracked down, said that the United States would be footing the bill in the long run and flatly refused to go along.

As a result, all reparations plans for Italy were left unsettled, except that the United States, Britain, and Russia agreed to retain for the time being those portions of the Italian fleet and merchant marine which they had seized during the war.

First big blow-up came when the Russians tried to do some horse-trading on Italian colonies. After Byrnes had suggested the Italian colonies be put under some sort of trusteeship arrangement, Molotov came out for an individual Russian trusteeship over Tripoli, and he frankly admitted that Russia desired a sphere of influence in the Mediterranean, but Bevin and Byrnes flatly refused.

Molotov hinted broadly that he was prepared to make certain concessions in the Balkans to the British and Americans in exchange for a Russian sphere of influence in north Africa, but Byrnes refused to do any horse-trading. Instead, he began hammering at the way the Russians were dominating their Balkan satellites.

In the course of this deadlock, Byrnes brought up the question of the Dardanelles, which locks the Russians up in the Black Sea. Byrnes said the United States and Britain were against the harsh terms which Molotov sought to impose upon Turkey to secure control over the Dardanelles.

PANAMA CANAL QUESTIONS

Molotov replied that Russia must have complete and free access to the Dardanelles both in war and peace. But Bevin and Byrnes remained adamant.

Whereupon Molotov said, "How about discussing the Suez Canal and our relationship to it?"

This made Foreign Minister Bevin furious. But Molotov proceeded to add fuel to the flames. Turning to Byrnes, he said:

"Well, let's discuss the Panama Canal and its relationship to the United States."

This enraged Byrnes, who indicated to Molotov that the Panama Canal was none of Russia's business.

To this Molotov replied that if the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal were none of Russia's busines, then the Dardanelles were none of the United States' and Great Britain's business.

Half way through the Conference, Molotov walked into one meeting and demanded that Russia be given the right to participate in General MacArthur's control of Japan at a high level. Molotov did not criticize MacArthur's actions, contrary to some reports. He said that the Russians had helped win the war in the Pacific and expected adequate representation in the questions arising from Japan's defeat.

Byrnes became so angry that he delivered a scorching 30-minute speech so hot that at one point Molotov stood up to walk out. Noting this, Byrnes stopped, and the meeting cooled down.

In the course of later discussions on Japan, Brynes explained this country's great need of a chain of island bases in the Pacific for security reasons against Japan.

Molotov laughed. He hinted strongly that Russia felt the United States wanted the bases solely for defense against the Soviet Union. "O. K.," he said, "you've got your naval bases in the Pacific. Then we want Paramoshiri. If you're going to have your ring of steel, we'll have ours."

There Should Be Retirement Benefits for State and Local Government Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. Watson B. Miller, Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

I feel there should be retirement provisions for city employees and other State and local government groups.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, October 2, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: On September 14 you sent Mr. McNutt a letter from Mr. W. L. Rice, who suggests that coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program should be extended to policemen.

I agree with Mr. Rice that it would be desirable to extend the protection of old-age and survivors insurance to employees of State and local governments as well as to other groups excluded under the present law. As you know, the Federal Security Agency has made recommendations to Congress to this effect.

Public employees were originally excluded from the program because of doubt as to whether it would be constitutional to levy the employers' tax upon States and localities. For this reason, if legislation is enacted, it might very likely take the form of an amendment permitting the governmental units to elect coverage for their employees on a voluntary basis. The provisions should be such as not to endanger any rights of workers under existing retirement systems.

A number of bills dealing with an extension of coverage to public employees have been introduced in Congress in recent years. Among the bills of the present Congress are H. R. 420, H. R. 2469, H. R. 2816, S. 753, and S. 1050. Formal consideration has not yet been given to any of these. S. 1050, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, provides, in part, that governmental units could obtain old-age and survivors insurance coverage for their employees by entering into voluntary compacts with the Social Security Board. It would, however, exclude from participation those employees of a governing unit having a previously established retirement system.

I might mention that a few States have already enacted laws looking toward coverage of public employees under the Federal system if that is extended. A number of other States and localities have indicated their desire for an extension of the Federal system to some or all governmental employees.

Mr. Rice's letter is enclosed. I hope I have been of assistance to you in replying to him.

Sincerely yours,

WATSON B. MILLER,
Acting Administrator.

Reconversion Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in these days when we are all so greatly concerned over reconversion problems, I have been much impressed by the statesman-like character of the editorials and special articles appearing in the Washington Post. I call particular attention to a series of four articles by W. S. Woytinsky, economist for the Social Security Board, appearing in the August 23d and 30th, September 6th and 13th issues of the Post. The first article discusses the task of reconversion; the second, our immediate goal; the third, depression danger; and fourth, chances of prosperity.

At a time when it is so easy to spread fear among the people through an unduly pessimistic view of our immediate future, it is most encouraging to have a competent economist offer objective facts and conclusions which clearly show that if Government adopts sound policies, and industry and labor cooperate as they should for the benefit of the whole people, there is every prospect of moving from the heights of wartime prosperity through a brief period of economic dislocation to new heights of peacetime prosperity in which the free-enterprise system can and will underwrite a program of full employment.

These Washington Post articles are, in my judgment, so pertinent to an understanding of the serious problems of reconversion that I ask permission to have them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the cost of printing the articles will be $130, as they will exceed by one-half page the two pages allowed under the rule without an estimate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 23 and 30, September 6 and 13, 1945]

AMERICA RECONVERTS

(By W. S. Woytinsky)

1. THE TASK OF RECONVERSION

The gloomy predictions of mass unemployment in the coming weeks and months are based largely on the idea that reconversion must provide peacetime jobs for all persons laid off by war industries or released from the armed forces. According to this idea, mass unemployment is inevitable unless a suitable peacetime job replaces each war job that is ended. Actually, however, the task of reconversion is more complicated. The goal is to restore the peacetime pattern of life in the Nation—work and leisure. This implies deflating the labor force and shortening hours of work. This readjustment substantially reduces the number of new peacetime jobs needed for full employment.

Our labor force has been overexpanded during the war. At the end of March 1940, before the defense program started, we had 53,300,000 men and women who were in jobs or were looking for paid work. Through normal population growth, we might have had 56,300,000 by March 1945 under peacetime conditions. Actually the number rose to 63,800,000, including the men and women in the armed forces. This surplus of 7,500,000 included about 4,000,000 boys and girls, most of whom ordinarily would have been in school; more than 1,000,000 old people, who normally would have retired, and slightly handicapped persons; and perhaps three-fourths of a million servicemen's wives, and one and three-fourths million other married women who would not have been in paid jobs under normal conditions.

Recruitment of emergency workers was vital for industrial mobilization, but the Nation paid for it with lower educational level for the war generation and much disorganization of family life. Fortunately, most of the emergency war workers do not consider their work as permanent, and many are willing to withdraw when their wartime jobs end.

Since the winter of 1943–44, thousands of emergency war workers have disappeared from the labor market after each lay-off in war industries. Their withdrawal, however, has been more than offset by recruitment of new workers, and in April 1945 there were 1,000,000 more workers in the Nation than a year before. The turning point came after VE-day. There are indications that 1,250,000 emergency workers left the labor market in May and June. The task of reconversion is to accelerate the deflation of the labor force and to bring it back to its normal peacetime pattern.

Another aspect of overexpansion of the economic system is the long workweek. During the war the Nation averaged an hour of overtime a day for every worker, which was equivalent to the employment of 5,000,000 additional workers. Although overtime work was essential to the success of the war, it wiped out decades of social progress. The end of the war in Europe launched a movement toward a shorter workweek. The task of reconversion is to support this trend—not only to ensure more jobs but also to regain the basic values of shorter hours of work and greater leisure.

The economic implications of these aspects of reconversion should be kept in mind. If the labor force is reduced by more than 10 percent and each worker works 1 hour less every day, the total volume of work performed in the United States (including the services of the armed forces) will drop at least by 20 percent. From the point of view of economic and social progress, however, the unavoidable reduction in gross national output will be no loss. As a Nation, the United States does not have to work as hard in peacetime as we worked during the years when nearly half our total output was swallowed up by the war.

Moreover, the money families have to spend need not decline in the same proportion as the national output. About half of the setback may be absorbed by a reduction in taxes, and cuts in individual incomes may be kept low enough to avoid undue hardships for individuals. At the same time, excessive losses in purchasing power of the working population can be prevented by a rise in hourly wage rates in industries shifting to a shorter workweek. Geared in with the elimination of premium pay for overtime and withdrawal of inexperienced and less efficient workers, such a rise need not cause a rise in prices.

In terms of jobs, the task of reconversion may be summarized as follows:

According to the best information now available, about 7,000,000 men will be released from the armed forces and 7,500,000 workers will have their jobs closed down during the next 12 months.

On the other hand, it is not too much to expect that 3,000,000 emergency workers will withdraw from the labor market in the same lapse of time that 500,000 ex-servicemen will

return to schools and colleges; that peacetime industries will need 2,000,000 additional workers because of the reduction in hours of work; and that 1,000,000 persons will be absorbed immediately by jobs now vacant. These changes would take care of 6,500,000 persons, leaving 8,000,000 persons for whom jobs should be provided by expansion of peacetime production.

If about 1,000,000 workers and ex-servicemen return to agriculture and an equal number establish themselves in independent businesses and professions the number of needed industrial jobs will be close to 6,000,000. The figure is not alarming if we remember that manufacturers expect to hire not less than 3,000,000 additional workers for peacetime production; that 2,000,000 men will be wanted in building construction; and that hundreds of thousands of vacancies will be open in trade, transportation, professional services, and similar fields. If only 5,000,000 nonagricultural jobs are provided instead of 6,000,000 the number of persons temporarily out of work will increase by only 1,000,000 and will still be below the level of 2,500,000 which most experts consider as an irreducible minimum for frictional unemployment—that is the number of people who are out of work temporarily because of seasonal changes, because they are shifting from one job to another, and so on.

In brief, if the Nation handles reconversion with the same wisdom and courage with which it has waged the war, full employment may be reached long before 12 months are up.

Reconversion, as I see it, is a transition from overexpansion caused by the war to peacetime prosperity. When we had to climb up to full employment from the depths of the depression, the goal seemed far above the clouds, almost inaccessible. Now, the trail leads downhill, from the lofty peak to the fertile highland at its foot. With the aim clearly in sight, we should be able to make the descent without exposing ourselves to landslides of deflation or avalanches of inflation.

2. OUR IMMEDIATE GOAL

To appraise the chances of full employment in postwar America one should visualize how many jobs and how much production and consumption full employment will require. The slogans "Sixty million jobs" and "Fifty percent rise in consumption" may be excellent for the long run but they cannot be applied to both 1947 and 1952. What is the goal of full employment immediately after reconversion?

Our normal labor force (without war emergency workers) would average 58,500,000 in 1947. Assuming that 2,000,000 surplus workers will still be in the labor market, the labor supply might rise to 60,500,000 at that time. Allowing 1,000,000 for military losses (killed and disabled) and for former servicemen returning to schools and colleges, the actual supply will probably be closer to 59,500,000.

The floating temporary unemployment due to seasonal factors, industrial changes, shifts of workers, and the like may amount to 2,500,000 persons in a prosperous year. Assuming that 1947 is such a year, employment may approach 57,000,000. If 3,500,000 men are still in military service, the number of civilian jobs should average 53,500,000, as compared with 46,000,000 in 1940. The goal of full employment immediately after reconversion may be described, therefore, as 7,500,000 more jobs than in 1940, or as a 17.5 percent increase in civilian employment. The task is not too difficult in comparison with the problems this Nation had to solve during the war.

To describe the goal of full employment in terms of production and consumption, we should take into account changes in number of man-hours of work, in productivity of labor, and in disposition of national product. The number of man-hours of work would not necessarily rise proportionately to that of man-years. Even if the work does not shrink as sharply as after 1918, the long-range trend toward a shorter workweek and paid annual leave will probably be resumed. If the average work week in 1947 is, say, one hour shorter than in 1940, a 17.5 percent growth in the number of man-years will mean only a 14 percent growth in the number of man-hours.

The probable change in productivity of labor is more difficult to measure. The long-run trend and experience after past wars, which tended usually to accelerate technological progress, suggest that the output per man-hour may rise 20 to 30 percent from 1940 to 1950. Since gains may be heavily concentrated in the last 3 years of the decade, however, the output per man-hour might not advance more than 10 points by 1947. In that event, total national product would increase approximately 25 percent—and this is the advance we need to enjoy full employment by the end of reconversion.

A part of the advance—maybe 4 percent of the total national output of 1947 (or 5 percent of the output in 1940)—will be absorbed by military needs: Maintenance of a powerful Navy and Air Force, development of military and naval bases overseas, hospitalization of wounded veterans, pensions to the disabled, and the like. After these needs are met the product available for civilian use in 1947 may exceed the 1940 pattern by 20 percent, in round numbers.

It should be kept in mind that these figures refer to total volume of production, not the share per capital or per household. Because of population growth and war marriages, the number of households in the Nation will increase about 10 percent from 1940 to 1947. The output per household, therefore, will hardly rise more than 10 percent.

The conclusion is that full employment by the end of reconversion does not presume fabulous wealth for all or extravagance; what it presumes is the beginning of a slow but steady improvement in the standard of living. The task of reconversion is to bring the Nation back on the road of economic progress so that, as time goes on, the level of consumption will rise gradually, keeping pace with technological progress. It may rise more than 15 percent in the three post-reconversion years and continue to advance thereafter. The core of the problem is to insure its smooth and continuous advance, say by 2 or 3 points annually, in the coming decades, without setbacks and waste in human and technical resources.

Full employment after reconversion—i. e., 53,500,000 jobs in 1947, with the output per household 10 percent above the prewar level—is a very modest aim and there is no reason to doubt our ability to reach it. The question is whether we will reach the more ambitious goal of lasting prosperity and economic security. I think that our chances to win this ultimate goal are good—better than ever before. In my next article I shall develop the arguments in support of this opinion.

The greatest danger and one which may offset all these considerations is purely psychological. All important economic and social reforms achieved through peaceful procedures rest necessarily on some sort of compromise between conflicting interests and divergent opinions. Such a compromise is also the price to be paid for full employment. No progress can be made in this direction if the issue is handled as a showdown between conflicting, mutually irreconcilable principles.

3. DEPRESSION DANGER

In discussing the dangers of economic dislocations after the war, the pessimists seem to have both theory and past experience on their side. Theoretical considerations point toward the immediate danger of deflation; past experience in this and other countries makes us fear the danger of inflation as an aftermath of the war.

It should be recognized that the sudden termination of war contracts threatens to set in movement a deflationary spiral and create conditions unfavorable for a smooth expansion of peacetime production. The danger is greater now that the surrender of Japan has come on the heels of Germany's collapse, sooner than military experts dared to hope. Since demobilization and reconversion are telescoped into a shorter period than was expected, we have no time to lose.

However, when we plan antideflationary measures to absorb the shock of the sudden end of the war economy, we should remember that reconversion itself is necessarily a deflationary process. Cuts and contractions are vital to its success, and it would be futile to try to postpone the necessary readjustments or to stretch them out indefinitely. It would be senseless, for example, to try to delay cancelation of war contracts, to pile up stocks of useless war materials, or to launch public works in communities that have been overexpanded during the war.

On the other hand, most economists, whatever their divergent political views, agree that the following measures would cushion the deflationary shock of reconversion:

Speeding up reconversion of industrial establishments;

Expanding and improving unemployment insurance and interpreting present provisions liberally;

Widening the responsibilities of employment offices, and providing travel money for workers who are referred to jobs in places far from those where they have been working;

Adjusting hourly wage rates; raising minimum wages, continuing rent controls, and gradually repealing other price controls;

Reducing business and income taxes, beginning with 1946;

Setting a comprehensive housing program into operation not later than next spring.

In different combinations, these proposals appear in every one of the 5-point, 6-point, 10-point, and 20-point programs which have been released from various headquarters in recent weeks. I would add only one point which I consider essential to the success of reconversion: A wide educational campaign against panic and defeatism, inspired by the unforgettable words of Franklin D. Roosevelt:

"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

The pangs of fear return, however, when one recalls our experience after the First World War—the 20 years of violent economic dislocations.

The first set-back occurred immediately after demobilization, in the winter 1918–19. It was followed by a short inflationary boom which ended in a collapse in 1921. Unemployment of unprecedented severity lasted about a year. The revival which started in 1922 degenerated into a new boom and ended almost at once with a new sharp set-back in 1924. Then followed a period which was first glorified as the era of prosperity and later branded as a fool's paradise. It started as a postwar expansion, developed into the gargantuan orgy of stock exchange speculation which collapsed in 1929, and left the entire economic system so disorganized that it took 7 years to restore an economic equilibrium.

We face the danger of similar dislocations on a much larger scale after this war. If the postwar prosperity, which many people expect, does degenerate into a boom, as in the 1920's, it is bound to end in a depression, as in the 1930's. Pent-up demand and war savings make the danger of such a pattern of economic development particularly acute.

A characteristic of the 1920's was that the economic system was flooded with billions of dollars which had not come from production of goods and services but had been pumped into circulation from outside. They happened to come from stock gambling, which was the most lucrative industry at that time.

In the last 12 months of prosperity $32,000,000,000 was made on the stock market as compared with total profits of $5,000,000,000 from manufactures, mining, trade, railroads, utilities, banking, and all other business. After all the privations of the 1930's, the United States will not retrace the road of the 1920's. There will be no stock boom after this war. But a similar danger may come from another quarter. It will make little difference if the country is flooded, this time, with easy money from some other source—a precipitous liquidation of war savings, for example, over-expansion of bank credits, public spending, and the like.

What is reassuring in our experience after the First World War is that its lessons are perfectly clear to everybody who is able to learn from the past. Not only does it reveal the origin of both depressions—in 1921 and in the 1930's—but it shows that they could have been prevented. The 1921 depression grew out of war inflation and would not have occurred if the inflation had been checked at the proper time. The depression of the 1930's could have been ironed out if the boom and over-expansion in the preceding era had been stopped in time. Whether we repeat old mistakes or avoid them is up to us. With all the technical and financial resources at our disposal, we can readily expand our production and employment to almost any extent. But with a little forethought and courage, we can keep the speed of expansion within limits that will preserve our capacity for further economic growth, at a more or less steady rate, through years and decades.

In the relatively brief period of reconversion, deflation is our No. 1 enemy. Inflation will become the No. 1 enemy after reconversion is completed.

Let us watch this enemy, even when it appears in a highly respectable disguise and in respectable company. Economic theory and experience converge in one: entrance to fools' paradise is free, but you pay the charge when you leave.

4. CHANCES OF PROSPERITY

When we speak of prosperity in postwar America we do not think of an economic system completely immune to cyclical ups and downs. The maladjustments in the economic system which have caused past business cycles and recurring periods of unemployment were not eliminated by the war. They will remain after reconversion as a constant threat to prosperity and a warning for the Nation to be on its guard. Our postwar goal is a steadily expanding economy in which fluctuations in employment are reduced to a minimum, occasional setbacks are comparatively rare, brief, and mild, and unemployment is not allowed to rise above a definite—not very high—level. Our chances to achieve this goal are good—in fact, better than ever before. This opinion is supported by an analysis of the postwar conditions of production and consumption, the status of major industries, the international position of the United States, the political climate at the end of the war, and the state of our social legislation.

1. The goal is within our reach. As pointed out in my previous articles, full employment does not require radical changes in our prewar patterns of production and consumption, but only a slow and gradual expansion of production keeping pace with improvement in the standard of living of the majority of the population.

2. Our capacity to produce peacetime goods, temporarily curtailed by the war, will soon be restored and expanded.

3. To reach the volume of production which corresponds to full employment, we do not have to climb up from the depths of the depression, as was the case before the war. We will rather descend from the peak of the war boom, to a more balanced pattern of economic activity on a somewhat lower level.

4. We enter the postwar era with a tremendous pent-up demand for capital goods, public buildings, houses, and durable consumer goods. We are engaged in vast relief and reconstruction plans in Europe and Asia. The demand from domestic and foreign markets for our products not only will give an impetus to our peacetime economy immediately after the war, but will maintain a high level of production long after reconversion is completed.

5. As the last report of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion declared, the vast reservoir of war savings adds a completely new factor to our economy. Combined with the demand for goods unobtainable during the war, it can be a self-starter of our postwar economy, and if handled right, a flywheel for years to come.

The major industries emerge from this war full of strength and dynamic potential.

6. Agriculture is returning to peacetime production, financially stronger than ever before, with reduced debts and considerable liquid reserves. It will therefore represent a vast market for urban industries and a stabilizing factor in the whole economic system.

7. Manufacturers are returning to peacetime conditions with the largest financial reserves in their history, with increased ability to expand and adjust to changing conditions, well protected against occasional setbacks.

8. Transportation system in the United States has been revolutionized by the war. Railroads are in an unusually favorable financial position and ready to make heavy investment for modernizing their equipment. The merchant fleet is ready to assume a leading role in world trade. Progress in air communication opens new horizons to passenger traffic and tourist travel and raises new problems for urban planning.

No less important is the international factor—the new position of the United States among the nations.

9. The United States is now the greatest economic power in the world, with all foreign markets open to its products, with interests and responsibilities in all continents and on all seas.

The political climate in this country is much healthier than at the end of the last war.

10. Apart from a few exceptions, the prevailing attitude of business is sound. Far from planning for liquidation of labor, as in the early 1920's, most of the businessmen are inclined to seek an understanding which will permit them to utilize the unique opportunity to expand their operations.

11. Labor unions gave wartime proof of statesmanship and seem ready to work in the same spirit in peacetime, seeking an understanding with management and pleading for the support of public opinion.

12. The Government succeeded in handling difficult economic problems during the war, such as keeping prices and wages under control and preventing a general speculative boom. It is ready to use in peacetime, the experience and know-how acquired during the war.

13. The most precious asset of the United States during the war, the real key to victory, was national unity, and there is a good chance of its being maintained in the postwar era as the key of prosperity.

The progress of social thinking and social legislation in the United States, in recent years, gives us a fair chance to avoid the social turmoil which characterized the American scene after the last war.

14. One of the principal sources of social friction in the 1920's was the problem of veterans. Now the Nation is united in its pledge to do all humanly possible for the servicemen returning to their homes. The program may require further development and adjustment, but it is certain that this time veterans will not need to march on Washington and brave the fire of American rifles to remind the Nation of their needs.

15. We now have a system of social security, which was nonexistent after the last war. Its invaluable contribution to national welfare is that it gives a feeling of security to working men and women and their families, especially in the troubled days of transition and economic shifts. Even if there is little unemployment in the near future, there will be fear of unemployment, and this fear itself might become a destructive factor in the national life if it were not mitigated by the unemployment compensation system. There is a chance that this role of social security will be fully recognized in coming legislation and that the system will be further improved and expanded.

16. The last but not the least important reason why one may expect this country to enjoy full employment after the war is that public opinion is unanimous in supporting measures to insure economic stability and full employment. When the Nation sets its mind firmly on a goal, it cannot fail.

Ours Is a Thinking Nation!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Spokane Chronicle.

To my mind this is one of the finest expressions of American journalism.

Fortunately, ours is a thinking nation. Therein lies our greatest hope—our honest basis for optimism for the future.

The editorial follows:

FOR THEY SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH

The great powers of civilization, standing on the threshold of a wonder world of scientific discovery, will have to go back 1,900 years to solve their problem of survival.

Force alone has failed mankind.

Political cults and leaders have strutted across the stage of culture in varying attire ever since the pitiful legions of Egypt were held in subjection by the Pharaohs. They have all summed up to one conclusion: Man, who was fashioned in the image of the Creator, cannot be dominated by violence, an expedient of his own conception.

The world has just witnessed two striking examples of rule by domination—and their dismal failure. Ask the cowering Tojo whether long years of intrigue and cunning preparation have paid off for the fiendish coterie responsible for Bataan and Pearl Harbor. Ask the gross Hermann Goering, whimpering in the waiting rooms of justice, whether the swaggering bullies of the swastika still measure success by the roar of Stukas and the panzer juggernauts.

Here on the verge of great new findings of science mankind is confronted with the choice of whether he shall use them for the glorification of progress or for the destruction of everything for which he has struggled on his long march up from the primordial jungle.

He has been asked by an outraged Providence to go back to a shrine in the near eastern sands and the doctrine that the meek are blessed, for they shall inherit the earth.

This is no brief for unpreparedness. The fever of war has burned so long in human

veins, the creed of the brute still is dominant in so many hearts, that nations cannot say overnight that arms are a thing of the past. The peace-loving peoples of the earth have tried that to their sorrow.

Yet, gentleness must be their ideal, the star by which every ship of state must set its course. It must be the guiding beacon of the Foreign Ministers of the five great powers in London. They must not shape their plans on the predication of another war, for another war would mean that man, having proved himself unfit to be heir to the earth, is disinherited.

Almost 20 centuries ago a carpenter of Nazareth looked down the tragic road which man has traveled since and tried humbly and earnestly to dissuade him from his suicidal venture. Buddha and Confucius and Mohammed tried to tell their followers that they must turn aside from carnage and harken to the still, small voice. The world has never really needed any law other than the Golden Rule.

That counsel has been insolently disregarded and the results are too pitifully real to permit of argument.

The option which man faces here at the portals of the atomic age is not a matter of preference nor of opinion. Whether a man goes to church on Sunday or to the golf links, he surely must agree that force has availed nothing but misery and destruction. He must see that it is idle folly for the Foreign Ministers at London to shape the machinery of peace while their constituents at home talk preparations for another war. Whether he likes it or not, anybody who can read and reason must grant that the foundation of peace must be built in the hearts of men.

A long-suffering Creator has opened the door of unlimited progress and happiness for man to see his birthright. Before him lies a road that will take courage and sacrifice and humility to travel. God grant that he have the strength to take it, for the alternative is certain annihilation.

The Editor's Notebook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present an editorial by John S. Knight appearing in the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, September 23, 1945:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

What's the matter with America?

Why does a nation that responded so magnificently to the challenge of a frightful global war stumble into the long-awaited era of peace with such faltering and awkward steps?

Why, in proclaiming universal brotherhood for the rest of the world, should we be torn with dissension and hatred in our own beloved land?

What has happened to the moral fiber of a country that gave its sons on the field of battle so the world might be freed forever from enslavement by vain and unscrupulous conquerors?

Where is the individual will to offer a silent prayer for our blessings and the firm resolve that as members of a free society we shall dedicate our lives to the betterment of a nation for which hundreds of thousands of our finest young men have died in mortal combat?

These are questions that all of us might well ask ourselves every hour of the day.

Paul R. Leach, chief of our Washington bureau, writes that "Not only is American domestic welfare seriously endangered by our inflationary labor-price crisis, but so is the welfare of the civilized world. It could end in chaos."

He might have added that unless we can find a way to adjust our domestic differences along just and equitable lines, the United States of America will be in no position to help anyone and the inevitable result will be chaos.

For one, I dislike believing that our political and economic reasoning has become so muddled that we are unable to embark upon an era of sound postwar development without the imposition of strict Government controls.

Thus far, however, we have shown neither the inclination nor the courage required for the job ahead. Let's look at the box score:

1. In Detroit the United Automobile Workers are demanding a 30-percent increase in wages even before industry knows how many units it can produce or what prices it can charge. Spokesmen for the UAW-CIO have boldly stated that "it's 30 percent or else" and threaten to "single out" one company at a time in order to enforce their demands.

There is no disposition to sit down and negotiate a new contract as prescribed by law. The union is pointing a gun at the industry's head and saying in effect, "Sign, or else."

The Government's answer to this organized banditry is to reorganize the Labor Department, a technique that the late Mr. Roosevelt found so convenient when he hated to get down to brass tacks.

From a reading of the pronouncements of UAW officials, you would get the idea that putting General Motors or Chrysler out of business was more important than coming to agreement on a basis that would insure uninterrupted production at high wages.

If such an uncompromising attitude is an example of labor statesmanship, there is disappointingly little hope to be held for the betterment of our industrial relations. What happens in Detroit will set the pattern for the rest of the country.

2. In Washington, there are indications that President Truman is reverting to type, that his pride in being a "good" party man will spell disaster for first-rate leadership.

Balanced as they were by naming Robert P. Patterson as Secretary of War and Senator Harold H. Burton to the Supreme Court, the appointments of Bennett Clark to a District of Columbia judgeship and Paul McNutt as Commissioner of the Philippines shows that the President intends to take care of the "faithful."

The abrupt canceling of lend-lease to Britain was politically expedient and won a heavy round of applause, but in view of the fact that everyone knows we shall eventually give England the aid she needs, a better solution might have been reached through a series of negotiations which would have insured us corresponding benefits in our trade relations with the best customer we had in prewar days.

It is possible that such criticisms are unfair but they are nevertheless discouraging to anyone who feels rather deeply that in this critical period of readjustment, each and every act of the President must be based upon only one test—is it good for our country and will it further the peaceful progress of the world?

In the 24 years that separated our participation in two World Wars, we have lost many of the intangibles that made America great. Our sense of values was discarded in the Harding-Coolidge era of unprecedented prosperity; our faith disappeared with Hoover; our morals with Roosevelt.

President Truman has an opportunity such as has been accorded few other men in history. A fateful destiny has placed him in the White House unfettered by obligations or hampered by precedent.

We devoutly hope that he will give us an administration of Lincolnian simplicity, that by his own example he will establish such a high standard of personal conduct that morality, fair play, and respect for law will once again be regarded as cardinal virtues.

I have an idea that the people of the country would give one resounding cheer after another for any man in Mr. Truman's position who decided that, as our leading public servant, his life would be consecrated to upholding the right, regardless of political consequences.

We have drifted a long way from our spiritual moorings on the sea of cynicism and material values. Something fine has gone out of American life. Culture, the grace of living, courtesy and respect for others have become the casualties of case-hardened materialistic scramble for wealth and power.

We have triumphed over our enemies in spectacular fashion.

But unless we can conquer our own baser instincts and rearm ourselves morally with the true precepts of Christianity, the generations to come will be reading best sellers entitled, "What Happened to America?"

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Roger W. Babson Writes About Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the following article on one particular cooperative together with comments on the cooperative principles written by Roger W. Babson is worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore include it herewith with my remarks:

[From the Washington Post of September 17, 1945]

COOPERATIVES

(By Roger W. Babson)

A LESSON IN OPPORTUNITY

GLOUCESTER, MASS., September 16.—I recently walked by Lord & Taylor's beautiful Fifth Avenue show windows. Behold, I saw an elaborate exhibit of Folly Cove designs. When a boy here in Gloucester, I had a girl friend at a place on Cape Ann known as Folly Cove. When I went down there, my father used to call it Roger's Folly. As I had never since heard of any other Folly Cove, I stopped at Lord & Taylor's and examined the goods. Sure enough, they were from my own Folly Cove of Gloucester. Furthermore, I was again proud of this cove. The goods were as pretty as the girl I used to go with.

So, at my first opportunity, I hiked back to my old home at Gloucester, where I am writing this column for my 400 friendly newspapers. Well, here is the remarkable story—a very intelligent girl named Virginia Lee Burton, a graduate of the Boston Art Museum, married a successful sculptor named George Demetrios. (By the way, if any Massachusetts Tech men read this story, please note she is the daughter of our beloved Dean Burton and the sister of Senator Burton, of Ohio.) Well, although this couple could afford to live in any apartment of any city, they chose to live as God intended they should live. Hence, they bought a little

farm here at Folly Cove and are living better for less money.

After the honeymoon was over and George and Virginia had started two fine boys on their way, they decided to try a truly cooperative experiment in art. They felt that many of the so-called cooperative enterprises are just a form of big business sailing under false colors. So this is what they did. They called together all their married neighbors—wives of farmers, fishermen, stone cutters, and others. These were mothers who were doing their own housework and taking care of their own children. Hence, the first requirement was that the work must be done at home.

The second requirement was that to hold these mothers' interest they must be encouraged to use their heads as well as their hands. Hence, Virginia had them actually design and then create something themselves. Yet, all of the townspeople, except Dorothy Norton and Louise Kenyon, thought this was impossible. Only these two believed that untrained people could design original patterns (and they must be absolutely original) for which great Fifth Avenue stores would scramble.

Well, these women have no company nor organization. They call Mrs. Demetrios president; while all the others are vice presidents. They also elect a jury of five to settle any disputes which may arise. Each woman makes and owns her own designs; she carves the blocks (out of battleship linoleum); mixes the ink and rolls it on the blocks. Then the blocks are put over the cloth laid upon the floor and stamped; yes, literally stamped upon because a woman must jump up and down on her block to make a good print. They began by making only table doilies, scarfs, etc., but now they make yard goods for dresses, curtains and exquisite wall paper.

But there is one more feature which should be noted. It usually costs more to sell goods than to make them, but not at Folly Cove. The overhead advertising and sales expenses of these women amount to only 1½ percent. Hence, each woman gets 98½ cents of every dollar which the retail stores pay for the goods.

These women certainly are teaching manufacturers something in connection with distribution. This lesson alone entitled this story to be in this weekly financial column. But most important of all, this is proof that nothing succeeds like true cooperation. Here all have the same powers, vote opportunities, and yet the income of each is based upon her own individual efforts. Questions: Why cannot this cooperative principle be applied to many other products? May there not be a suggestion here for returning veterans who want to be both independent and useful?

Russians Still Get Marxist View of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult indeed for Americans to understand the current attitude of the Soviet Government controlled press toward the United States and its people. Intemperateness marks the words of Pravda and the former publication War and Working Classes, now called the New Times, to a degree that is frequently hurtful to the cause of understanding between the peoples of the U. S. S. R. and ourselves.

For one, I have endeavored to find a basic reason for this currently expressed antagonism toward us by the official Soviet press. In the New York Times article which follows, it is explained in part.

The article referred to follows:

RUSSIANS STILL GET MARXIST VIEW OF US—MATERIALIST IDEAS DOMINATE FRIENDLY TEXT ON HISTORY, DR. COUNTS SHOWS

(By Dr. George S. Counts)

(Professor Counts is a director of the Division of the Foundations of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. From 1927 to 1932 he was also associate director of the International Institute, devoted to the study of education in various countries. He visited Russia in 1927, 1929 and 1936.)

Polls of public opinion in the United States reveal mistrust of the Russians. Though there are no public opinions in the Soviet Union, we can easily know the conception of America being deliberately and systematically cultivated in the minds of the Russian people.

The history books used in Soviet schools present interpretations of all the major countries of the world, interpretations that express faithfully the views of the highest authorities of party and state.

In 1943 the textbooks in use in the schools were found to have lagged behind the march of events and the new conception of America as an ally. The first school history expressing the new viewpoint was published late in 1944. Under the title of "The New History (1789–1870)," it was designed for 14- and 15-year-old children.

Though comparatively friendly, the portion devoted to the history of the United States was made to conform mainly to a rigorous Marxian interpretation. The cruelties of slavery, capitalistic exploitation, misery of the masses and class struggle dominate the scene. Political liberty, the Bill of Rights, the advance of public education and the general condition of equality which so impressed Alexis de Tocqueville in 1831 receive no attention.

ROLE IN MAN'S PROGRESS

At the same time America is cast in a significant role in the progress of mankind. Also the point is emphasized that forward-looking Russians always were interested in and encouraged by the struggle for democracy in America.

The following brief sketch gives in broad outline the conception of America being taught to Soviet children:

The English Colonies in North America were established as an outthrust of British capitalism. Labor in the Colonies was performed largely by white slaves and black slaves. The former were criminals and bond servants, reduced to slavery for debt; the latter were African Negroes.

The treatment of the black slaves was especially cruel: "If the Negro ran away from the plantation, they hunted him with dogs. Seizing the slave, they cut off his hands and then dipped the stumps into boiling pitch. After this terrible experience they hanged the Negro."

On the eve of the War for Independence these working people, white and black, were subject to exploitation by three ruling classes—the English bourgeoisie, the northern capitalists, and the southern slaveholders.

CALLED A CAPITALIST WAR

The English bourgeoisie, to protect itself from the competition of the rising capitalism of America, sought to stifle the development of industry and trade in the Colonies. This rivalry between English and colonial capitalism brought on the War for Independence.

The war had large progressive significance. It brought forth the Declaration of Independence, which proclaims "All people are created equal." This declaration was composed by Jefferson, the foremost Democrat of his time, a man who voluntarily freed his own slaves.

The struggle made a great impression on the forward-looking people of Europe. To them, the Americans, fighting for independence and for a democratic order, stood in the first place. Also people of like mind in Russia sent greetings to the Americans fighting for independence and for a republic.

The people, however, profited little from the struggle. It ruined many farmers and left a heavy public debt. The Government decided to shift this debt to the farmers by increasing taxes. Forced to sell their cattle, homes, and lands to meet these exactions, the farmers and the poor of the towns rebelled under the leadership of Daniel Shays. This rebellion was quelled with difficulty by United States troops.

CONSTITUTION CHANGE NOTED

Frightened by the democratic tide, the bourgeoisie of the North and the slaveholders of the South joined forces and decided to change the Constitution for the purpose of strengthening the central power. The result was the Convention of 1787 and the framing of the Federal Constitution, which in its basic provisions continues to the present time.

The new Constitution, by limiting the franchise in various ways, by placing great power in the hands of the Executive and by giving the Supreme Court authority to nullify any American law by declaring it contrary to the Constitution, strengthened significantly the central government. It also placed power in the hands of a bloc of trade-industrial bourgeoisie of the North and slaveholders of the South.

Because the western lands were offered for sale in large tracts and at a price beyond the reach of the poor * * * the land question was decided in the interests of these same two classes. The separation from England, combined with the abolition of tariffs between the States, stimulated the development of industry and commerce.

During the first half of the nineteenth century the American economy advanced at a furious pace. The population moved ever westward, the Indians were driven back and ruthlessly destroyed, and vast numbers of immigrants arrived from Europe. Invention followed invention, and trade and industry expanded rapidly. But the lot of the working people under the capitalistic system was hard.

They were "subjected to cruel exploitation," toiling "13 and 14 hours a day." Women workers "lived in special barracks under strict supervision." Some factories "employed only those workers who had not less than six children." And "if a worker took his child out of the factory and sent him to school he was discharged." Yet the "condition of workers in North America was somewhat better than in Europe."

NEGRO'S PLIGHT CALLED WORSE

The condition of the Negro slaves in the South was still worse. They were treated by the plantation owners with great cruelty. They were bought and sold "like cattle." They were "bound in chains and flogged with whips." Commonly they "died after 8 to 10 years of labor on the plantation."

Against this condition, the "slaves rose in revolt repeatedly," but "having neither organization nor program of action, they invariably suffered defeat."

In the 1840's a movement for the abolition of slavery supported by "farmers, workers, and liberal bourgeoisie," appeared. The "underground railway" was organized and vigorous propaganda was conducted against slavery. Harriet Beecher Stowe wrote Uncle Tom's Cabin in 1852. John Brown led a revolt in 1859.

Karl Marx declared: "In my opinion, the greatest events of the present time are the

movement of slaves in America, beginning with the death of John Brown, and the movement of slaves in Russia."

In 1854 a new political party, the Republican, was launched. This party was formed by a union of the industrial bourgeoisie and farmers, supported by city workers. In 1860 the Republicans came into power under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, the son of a poor, illiterate Kentucky farmer, a friend of the Negroes and a giant who could drive an ax farther into a tree than any other man in the neighborhood. The Civil War followed.

The war went badly for the North until the Emancipation Proclamation. Thereupon it assumed a revolutionary character. Decisive measures were taken against counter-revolutionists. The Army was purged of counter-revolutionary and doubtful elements.

Industrial workers organized separate regiments and companies. These worker regiments elected their own commanders, among whom were not a few Socialists. Under General Grant and particularly under General Sherman, they proved themselves the best regiments. Consequently, the northern troops began to fight with enthusiasm and achieved victory.

BOURGEOIS DICTATORSHIP SEEN

The democratic forces, however, failed to win the peace. Lincoln was killed by the actor Booth, who was bribed by slaveholders of the South and large bourgeoisie of the North. There ensued a struggle for power in which the large bourgeoisie triumphed and established a dictatorship.

The Civil War, while destroying slavery, did not bring actual freedom to the Negroes. Not receiving land, they were forced to work in the fields of their former masters. The old bondage was exchanged for a new capitalistic bondage joined with the heritage from slavery. The war accelerated the growth of trade-unions and brought the first laws for the 8-hour working day.

To the farmers it gave the Homestead Act, but it also led to divisions among them. On the one hand, a class of kulaks [rich farmers] emerged, while, on the other, the great mass of farmers were ruined and forced into the ranks of hired labor, there to experience the cruel misery of capitalistic exploitation.

At the same time capitalism developed more rapidly than in any other country. Toward the end of the century the United States passed England and became the first industrial country in the world.

In Russia the foremost democrats followed anxiously the course of the Civil War and the freeing of the Negroes from slavery. In numerous articles about America in their journals under the guise of discussing questions concerning the American Civil War they issued in allegorical form a call to revolution in Russia. Thus, America, in both the War for Independence and the Civil War, served to hasten the liberation of the masses in Russia.

Philippine Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include with my remarks a memorandum on Philippine rehabilitation written by the Honorable Harry B. Hawes:

In considering the present deplorable and tragic situation in the Philippines it is essential to have at least a brief sketch of its historical background and of our relations during the last 48 years.

Our papers were filled with accounts of brutalities committed in Cuba by General Weyler. This aroused the indignation of our Nation. War was declared on Spain in 1898. The war was concluded with the loss of only 101 men on this front.

The Spanish had acquired sovereignty over the Philippines more than 300 years before and had built a great wall around Manila which, without heavy artillery, was impregnable.

A Spanish squadron was stationed in Manila Bay and fortresses surrounded it. On May 1, 1898, Admiral Dewey entered the bay with an American squadron instructed to destroy the Spanish Fleet. This feat was accomplished without the loss of a single American.

Upon the arrival of Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt, commanding our troops, the Spanish were ordered to surrender. They agreed on condition that Filipino troops should not be permitted to enter the Walled City.

Our refusal to permit Filipino troops to enter the city which they had surrounded brought fights and clashes between Americans and Filipinos, resulting in a long war in which our casualties numbered 4,000, the Philippines 16,000, requiring 3 years of hard and bloody fighting.

Then began American occupation under an American governor general. Following our troops we sent school teachers, and English became the official language of the islands.

During the long Spanish occupation Filipinos adopted the Christian religion, which had become universal except in the limited Moro districts which even today retain the Mohammedan faith. The foreign population in the islands was almost exclusively Spanish.

When World War II began there were 117,487 Chinese, 4,627 Spanish, 29,057 Japanese, 2,500 Europeans, and 8,709 Americans. The native population had increased to 18,000,000.

Our Army established the Filipino Scouts, partly drilled and officered by Americans, numbering about 10,000. These men and their sons were the best drilled troops I ever witnessed.

During the war with Japan the Scouts, a splendid body of fighting men, furnished the nucleus for the guerrilla warfare carried on by the Filipinos.

Schools and colleges were established. The Filipino is an avid student. His grasp of English words and diction always amazes me. Some came to America and were graduated from our universities. They produced some great natural orators. They grew in wealth, education, and population. But it was American territory under American direction and control.

BUSINESS

Trade, both export and import, was confined to business with the United States. Their trade was put in what might be termed a "strait-jacket." There were no sales agents for Philippine goods to the rest of the world and all Philippine supplies came from the United States.

During the last year before the present war, the Philippines sold to the United States $90,000,000 in Philippine products, but they bought at the same time $105,000,000 of the products of American farms and factories and became our sixth best world customer.

All other nations of the earth have some world-wide trade; the Philippines have none.

In 1916, the Jones Act was passed by our Congress, promising ultimate independence and all of our Governors General and military and civil administrators encouraged the belief that independence under a democratic form of government would be established.

Patriotic Filipinos formed missions to the United States asking for independence. Their solicitations met with approval and, on January 17, 1933, the first independence bill was enacted by the Congress which registered its approval by two-thirds majorities over a Presidential veto.

The first offer was rejected by the Philippine Congress and a commission was sent to the United States to change the terms of the offer.

The Philippine Commission to secure changes was headed by Manuel L. Quezon. I was able to secure a meeting at my home with Senator TYDINGS, chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and Congressman John McDuffie, chairman of Insular Affairs in the House, and the Philippine Commission was informed there would be no substantial change in the offer.

One word was changed in the title. The word "complete" was inserted and Senator TYDINGS wrote the following statement which he said he would present to President Roosevelt.

In approving, the second bill carried this exact language from President Roosevelt:

"Where imperfections or inequalities exist, I am confident that they can be corrected after proper hearing and in fairness to both peoples."

After approval of the bill by both Houses it was accepted by the Filipinos.

In passing, it will be noted that the Filipinos did not have what is called free trade with the United States. Limitations were placed upon some of their principal exports. Sugar, for illustration, was limited to 850,000 tons; manufactured cordage to 6,000,000 pounds.

JOINT PREPARATORY COMMITTEE

Carrying out the promise of President Roosevelt, on April 14, 1937, a Joint Preparatory Committee was created, composed of six Americans and six Filipinos. They occupied many months in their investigation, carrying on their hearings both in the United States and in the Philippines, resulting in four volumes of testimony and a recommendation that trade relations should continue until 1960.

TRADE RELATIONS

In 1939 a bill was introduced to create a commission of three Senators, three Congressmen, and three to be appointed by the President; nine to be appointed by the President of the Philippine Commonwealth. War intervening, the commission was not named.

In June 1944, Congress passed an act amending the 1939 act. This new act created the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission which, upon organization, selected Senator TYDINGS as Chairman.

Filipinos have no world trade; have no consular service to secure world business; they have no sales agencies abroad.

THE JAPANESE

On December 7, 1941, while the Japanese Ambassador in Washington was proclaiming friendship for the United States, the Japanese attacked the American flag and American territory at Pearl Harbor.

This was an attack upon American sovereignty, followed on the same day, again upon American sovereignty and the American flag, in the Philippines.

This was United States territory just as much as the District of Columbia or any State in the Union. No prior relinquishment of sovereignty had been agreed upon before July 4, 1946.

With their ships, airplanes, and troops, the Japanese added a psychologic attack by promising immediate independence. They established a puppet government intended to weaken the morale, fighting spirit, and loyalty of Filipinos.

While temporarily successful in a physical way, their emotional appeal for quick independence failed. Filipinos remained faithful and were brutally punished for their loyalty to America.

The terrific damage by the Japanese in the Philippines was done under American sovereignty. This was to have been followed by a diversion of trade relations from the United States to Japan.

There is but one question before the American people:

Having taught and established democracy in the islands and confined trade relations practically to an interchange between the Philippines and the United States, shall we, because of the war and solely for that reason, destroy a friendly cooperative relationship which has existed for half a century?

Can the United States with honor change its policy because of the acts of Japan?

Governments of Europe and Asia are being altered in form and are still in the process of change.

We sent to these foreign countries not only our fighting ships, our fighting men, and fighting planes, but, in addition, we are sending food, clothing, money for rehabilitation, sums for rebuilding and repair.

FAITH AND PRESTIGE

Our past treatment of the Philippines and promise of independence increased our prestige throughout the world It made us strong in our dealings with other nations. It gave the Filipinos courage to fight. It was a practical demonstration of American policy and now, after we have destroyed the physical power of Japan, there remains but one question:

Shall we abandon the Philippines, refuse them trade which had been theirs for years? Shall factories, farms, and homes remain in ruins in the hour of triumph?

Manila can be rebuilt. It can become the greatest metropolis in the Far East. From it can flow trade, Christianity, self-determination, democracy.

We take pride in the resolutions of a world understanding of peace, a result of the San Francisco Conference.

Shall we, as this Conference is concluded with its promise of civilized enlightenment for the world, abandon the loyal Filipinos?

On July 4, 1946, by mutual agreement, the Philippines will become an independent nation. For its economic security, trade relations must be maintained for a period and damages to persons, farms, and industry provided.

Japan, over a period of years, may ultimately be compelled to make payment, but the problem is immediate; it is now. Rehabilitation cannot be passed to a new generation.

My justification for this memorandum is experience acquired while in the United States Senate in preparing the first offer of independence, various trips to the islands for physical examination of the subject and active participation in preparing all the laws passed by our Congress and the Philippine Commonwealth since it came into existence, intimate acquaintance with Americans doing business there and Philippine leadership, both economic and official.

The Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding development in science in World War II is the discovery of atomic power and the successful application of it to the atomic bomb. It was reported in the news releases yesterday that President Truman has stated that in his opinion the secret of the atomic bomb should not be released to the world. The United States has spent in excess of $2,000,000,000 in research and production facilities to produce the atomic bomb, only two of which were used in actual combat. The full story has not been told and, in view of national defense, will not be made public. There are, however, many facts with reference to this great discovery that have been known to the scientific world for long periods of time.

Many conflicting statements are being made with reference to the prospect of early use of the atomic energy in industrial enterprises. It is reported that a certain railroad company has under consideration a locomotive with a mercury turbine, employing a formula for disintegration of mercury and steel atoms. An official of the company has been reported as saying, "One teacupful of the mercury atoms, exploded, would run a locomotive, pulling 120 freight cars, for 45 round trips between New York and San Francisco."

On the other hand, Maj. Gen. Leslie Groves, who headed the Nation's atomic bomb project, is reported to have said, "A number of years, in fact, a number of decades away is peacetime productive use of atomic power. I cannot imagine any civilian effort being worked on with the same intensity as was applied to the atomic bomb."

A very interesting discussion of atomic power by Arthur S. Maxwell, which appeared in the magazine Signs of the Times in its issue of October 2, 1945, is as follows:

ATOMIC POWER AND THE RACE FOR DOOMSDAY—END OF THE WORLD NO LONGER IMPOSSIBLE

(By Arthur S. Maxwell)

When the atomic bomb burst on Hiroshima it not only destroyed 60 percent of that ill-fated city and killed or injured 200,000 of its inhabitants; it also shook the whole world to its foundations. It sent a shudder through all mankind.

Common people everywhere talked with unaccustomed solemnity. They sensed the implications for themselves and their children. They realized that science, forever searching the treasure chest of nature's secrets, had stumbled at last upon the basic power of the universe, and they were afraid.

Some commentators talked unashamedly of the end of the world. They said it must no longer be considered impossible, and that the epochal discovery had given new meaning to apocalyptic visions and prophecies.

Others freely expressed the conviction that nothing would be the same again. History, geography, politics, indeed, every phase of life, were shocked and jolted by the blast.

"This new bomb," said Gen. Carl Spaatz, "is the most revolutionary development in the history of the world."

"The world has changed overnight," said the London Daily Express.

"This is it!" exclaimed the scientists who watched the first experimental blast in New Mexico. "Atomic fission * * * a great new force to be used for good or evil."

"Man," said Time, has been "tossed into the vestibule of another millennium." "This was a new room, rich with hope, terrible with strange dangers. The door that slammed behind man at Hiroshima had locked. Life, as always, was irreversible. There was no choice but to grope ahead into the atomic age."

"The atomic bomb was not merely a new weapon; it was a new dimension of military and political power. Each in its turn, steel and gunpowder and aircraft had gradually changed war and society. In a single day the atomic bomb made a bigger change than any of them. Its blast hit every war office and chancellery on earth.

"Treaties boundaries, alliances, the Charter of the new United Nations, the foreign and domestic policies of states—all are affected by estimates of the relative strengths of the nations. Now, all the estimates had to be recalculated."

In the words of Chester Rowell: "The more we hear of the action of the new atomic bomb, the more unimaginably startling it becomes." At first we were told that the explosive force was equivalent to that of 40,000,000 pounds of TNT; that a single atomic bomb could do more damage than 2,000 Superfortresses. Now we learn that all the destruction wrought by aerial bombardment in Europe through the 4 years of war could have been accomplished by 123 planes, each carrying a single atomic bomb. In other words, a few hundred men with 10 dozen planes could have destroyed in one night—in one bombing raid—all the major cities on the Continent and wrought all the other devastation which thousands of men and tens of thousands of planes brought to pass.

Perhaps the most impressive feature of the atomic bomb is its awful power to disintegrate everything and everybody within miles of the point of explosion. Simply nothing is left. People, homes, factories, are not only incinerated, but also vaporized, and ascend in a gigantic column of smoke 40,000 feet into the air.

Even toughened steel is vaporized, indicating a temperature of more than 3,000 degrees Centigrade, or 5,400 degrees Fahrenheit, which is heat beyond all human comprehension.

The first explosion of the atomic bomb revealed that man had become possessed of a physical force millions of times greater than any known before. Further research and additional facilities will multiply that force perhaps a million times more. At present "the basic power of the universe" has only been tapped at a single point. Soon scientists may release it in infinitely greater volume and, as some fear, bring it thundering upon us in an avalanche of power that could well blot out the human race and all its works.

How near we have all been to disaster was revealed by Commander Herbert Agar, who said on June 29, that "if the European war had gone on for another 6 months, it is quite possible that this planet would have ceased to exist, because it was probable that someone would have learned to break the atom without controlling it." He added: "There was a danger that the Germans would learn how to split the atom first. I sincerely believe that in a very few years human beings will know how to destroy the human race."

Behind the scenes, throughout the war, every nation sought the great secret, reckless of the cost, fearful lest the enemy would discover it first. It was literally a "race for doomsday."

In this connection it is interesting to recall a description made as long ago as 1868 by the Rev. Daniel March of the enormous but invisible powers all about us. In his book, Night Scenes in the Bible, page 26, he wrote: "We are compassed about at all times * * * by forces of illimitable power. * * * The partition between us and the unseen world is thin as the garments that clothe our flesh, and as easily pierced as the bubbles that float on the wave. A slight change in the elements of the air we breathe would wrap the whole earth in devouring fire or stop the breath of everything

that breathes. The draft of water with which we quench our thirst holds imprisoned an electric force great and terrible enough to darken the heavens with tempests and to shake the eternal hills with its thunders."

The splitting of the atom gives new meaning to those words now well-nigh a century old. And they add new force to other words written more than two millenniums ago. Implying the existence in the universe of forces hitherto unknown to man, the prophet Malachi wrote:

"For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Malachi 4: 1.

Similarly the apostle Peter predicted: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." 2 Peter 3: 10. What a perfect picture of the powers of destruction now revealed to be resident in the atomic structure of the universe!

Evidently the prophets and apostles were not mistaken when, by inspiration, they wrote of coming judgment and spoke of a day when the whole world, because of its iniquity and rebellion against God, would be consumed by fire.

Perhaps the discovery of atomic power has come today as a last warning of the fearful scenes shortly to burst upon mankind when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven "in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." II Thessalonians, 1: 8.

The atomic bomb has certainly brought us face to face with things infinite and eternal. It has confronted us with the possibility of annihilation on a global scale. It has stamped the prophecies of the Bible with a new seal of authenticity. It has emphasized, with all its enormous tumult of energy, the necessity for us to make peace with the God of infinite power before the final tragedy ensues. And it has thundered into our ears the last call of infinite love: "Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come." Revelation, 14: 7.

"Tapping the Till"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1945

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of September 28, 1945, entitled "Tapping the Till." The proposal discussed in this editorial is so fantastic, so utterly ridiculous that it might well have been the product of some of the minds of our British friends who are here undertaking to despoil us of further billions of dollars. I believe the Members of the House will find this editorial most interesting.

TAPPING THE TILL

What has the earmarks of a trial balloon appeared in a Washington news dispatch yesterday in the form of a statement that "American financial experts are warming up to the idea of using a fraction of the country's $20,000,000,000 gold reserve as a basis for financial aid to Great Britain." The gold device is attractive, the story goes on to note, because it would not involve further Treasury borrowing. In other words, these financial experts, whoever they may be, see in the gold reserve a way to raise the funds required to help Britain without cost. If they could do this, of course, it would make it politically much easier to sell to Congress and the public the idea of making a substantial loan to the British without interest.

It is probable that, next to deficit financing, the huge stocks of American gold which form the backing for the American currency and credit system constitute the favorite mechanism of every financial illiterate with a panacea for the world's economic ills. There are few editors who do not in the course of a year receive a certain number of letters from persons who have just hit upon a short-cut, if not to the millennium, at least to the reenergizing of the world economy. Though the details and objectives of these schemes differ, they usually rest on the principle of activating the inert gold buried in the ground at Fort Knox, or some similarly airy and meaningless but appealing mumbo-jumbo.

Now, this gold happens to be the collateral behind the gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve System. It may be likened to the physical assets behind a warehouse receipt or the security collateral behind a bank loan. And the warehouseman caught tampering with the goods against which a warehouse receipt is issued or the bank officer who is found to be borrowing part of the bank's loan collateral for his own uses has an excellent chance of winding up in jail. In short, as matters stand, such procedure would be both immoral and illegal.

It is true that, as this Washington story notes, the question of legality might be taken care of by new legislation. But legislation would not alter the fact that such procedure would not only set a new low mark for political pusillanimity but would establish an extremely dangerous precedent. If we can dip into the country's gold reserve as a matter of political convenience in settling the British aid program, then why not do it for other purposes? If we can reduce the collateral from $20,000,000,000 to $17,000,000,000, then why not to $10,000,000,000, to $5,000,000,000, or to $500,000,000? Once such a precedent was set, the temptation would always be present, when a legislative proposal was vulnerable to the argument that it would add to the Government debt, to meet that argument by this type of device. Bad as deficit financing is, it can always be defended, in theory at least, on the ground that interest must be paid on such borrowing. The proposal arbitrarily to appropriate part of the Nation's gold reserves as a matter of political convenience does not even boast this theoretical excuse.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Founding of Army Air Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 20, 1945

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, fittingly designated August 1, 1945, for celebrating the thirty-eighth anniversary of the founding of the Army Air Forces of the United States.

On that date several hundred Air Force Day dinners were held throughout the Nation. Millions of Americans all over our country paid homage and tribute to the gallant men of our Air Forces who did such a superb job in the Global War.

In Washington, D. C., our celebration was held at the Statler Hotel where more than 800 distinguished men and women attended the dinner in the Presidential Ballroom.

The dinner in our Nation's Capital was sponsored by the Aero Club of Washington, of which Robert B. Kinkead is president. It was my privilege and honor to serve as toastmaster at this distinguished gathering.

Many high-ranking Army and Navy officers of both the United States and Great Britain were present. Brief talks were delivered by Gen. Jacob Devers and by Maj. Gen. Frederick Anderson. The two principal addresses of the evening were delivered by British Air Marshal Douglas Colyer and by the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air for the United States.

Under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks, I include the two very able, entertaining and enlightening addresses by Air Marshal Colyer and Secretary Lovett, delivered on this memorable occasion:

SPEECH BY AIR MARSHAL DOUGLAS COLYER, C. B., D. F. C., R. A. F.

When this function was originally planned it was hoped that the British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, would be the speaker. But he, as you know, is now on a visit to England.

It has therefore become my privilege to represent my country, however unworthily, at your Air Force Day banquet in Washington tonight—I need not tell you how proud I am to have the honor, as a member of the Royal Air Force, of saluting the sister service in America—and in the capital of your great country.

At first sight it may seem strange to some of you that at a dinner of this kind, given to celebrate the anniversary of the foundation of the Army Air Force, the principal speaker should belong to a different air force, indeed a different nation.

I hope, however, that by the time I have concluded my remarks that you will not think it so strange.

I know all about the achievements in war of the USAAF, because it has been part of my job to observe them during the war years in Europe, and also I know a good deal about the difficulties against which air forces have had to battle in the days of peace, because I myself have been in ours for nearly 30 years; and, of recent months, I have come to know something about the work and spirit behind the achievements of the USAAF because here in Washington and at Army Air Force bases across the country, I have been privileged to see and work behind the scenes.

I want to speak principally tonight about the spirit of cooperation between the two Air Forces, yours and mine, because that is something very significant. I don't suppose that ever in the history of mankind have the armed forces of two nations worked so closely together as we in the Air Forces have done during this war.

This has accounted for many things. For one thing it has accounted for the defeat of Hitler. It is going to account for the defeat of Hirohito for another. It accounts for the remarkable number of Britons in uniform that you see in the streets of Washington.

I heard an American say the other day that there were more British troops in Washington now than there were in 1814—and they had a much better grip on things now than they had then.

That was before my time and so I can't vouch for the truth of it, but I do know that we are getting along together much better than we did then. We haven't come here to burn down the Capitol this time. We have come here because only by working together, side by side, often in the same office, were we able to lay the plans that have defeated Italy and Germany and will soon, we hope, defeat Japan.

I wish you could have all been at the Pentagon a few weeks ago when General Spaatz handed to General Arnold a gold loving cup that had been presented to him in London by my chief, Sir Charles Portal. It was a token of appreciation from the Royal Air Force to the Army Air Corps.

After the ceremony the cup was filled with champagne and passed round the mixed company—Americans and British toasting each other alternately. It was a simple little ceremony without fuss or pomp, but to me it signified a lot, as, indeed, I think it did, too, to the American officers who took part.

For that cup was a token of something for which no material symbol could ever be adequate. It was a token of the appreciation of the Royal Air Force for the wholehearted, selfless cooperation that existed between the United States Army Air Forces and the Royal Air Force throughout three of the most critical years in the whole history of civilization.

Yet no symbol or token could properly represent what that cooperation meant to both nations or what it contributed to the final victory in Europe.

Its achievements are its only true and fitting monument. None can deny that the teamwork of your Air Forces and ours shortened the war in Europe and saved the lives of countless American and British soldiers.

These men, then, who are alive today because of that teamwork—these men and their children and their children's children—will forever symbolize what we accomplished together. For, in a very real sense, they will owe their enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to that unity of thought and purpose which lent such mighty additional force and effect to all our operations.

Long after we are gone—as generation succeeds generation—in what we hope will be peace and prosperity—men will be able to say of that integration of effort, in the words of Wren's famous epitaph in St. Paul's Cathedral, "Si monumentum requiris, circumspice"—if you want to see what it did for you, just look around.

Our loving cup represents our appreciation of all that the United States Army Air Forces did. But, more than that, it symbolizes the sincere good will and bears the good wishes of all ranks of the Royal Air Force. They will always cherish the memory of a most cordial relationship and of countless warm personal friendships with the United States Air Forces, forged in 3 years of high endeavor.

If, in the years to come, this token can awaken in your minds memories only half as stirring or half as pleasant as those it represents to us, we of the Royal Air Force will feel proud, indeed.

The reason for this celebration tonight is the thirty-eighth anniversary of the formation of an aeronautical division in the Army Signal Corps. That was the beginning of what is now the Army Air Corps, and it puts you 4 years ahead of us, because a comparable date in our evolution was the formation of an Army air battalion in 1911, which just goes to show that there are some institutions in the New World that are more venerable than those in the old. However, if your Air Force is older than ours, we always seem to be the first to get mixed up in any trouble.

In 1914 the first British airplane landed in France on August 13, just 9 days after the war began. The air war in those days was a rather gentlemanly affair. The British and German planes used to pass each other in the air each going about its own business without interfering with one another.

This blissful state of affairs continued until one day, so the story goes, a dastardly German pilot hurled a monkey wrench at a passing British plane. Intent on revenge for this unsportsmanlike act, the British pilots went up with shotguns, determined to pepper the offender with buckshot. The Germans, who have never been notable for their sense of humor, retaliated with pistols, rifles, and finally machine guns, so that when you Americans came over in strength the air war had really become quite dangerous, and your pilots had to learn fast if they were not to be shot down by some unsportsmanlike opponent.

But long before you had entered the war as a nation, there were a number of greathearted American boys—of whom one of your guests tonight is one; I mean Mr. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air—who joined our squadrons and fought side by side, wing tip to wing tip, with us.

The record of the American fliers in the last war is a fine one. When the war ended there were 45 American squadrons overseas. They destroyed 755 German aircraft for the loss of 357 of their own.

It is interesting to note how times change. In this war the British are flying thousands of American aircraft. In the last war the Americans mainly flew in British, French, or Italian aircraft, and most of your pilots were trained at British flying schools in England and on the Continent.

Two of your squadrons, the famous Seventeenth and One Hundred and Forty-eighth, flying in Camels, served under British command, and took part in that great attack on Zeebrugge which laid the pattern for many a combined operation in this war.

Now we are fighting the Second World War and once again we were mixed up in things some time before you. At first we were very hard put to it to produce all the trained men that we needed. We had won the first round against the Luftwaffe but we knew we were going to be up against it in the next round.

That was where America came to our help. The positions of the last war were reversed. Then we provided planes and schools for you. This time you did it for us. General Arnold in 1941 made available to us a very substantial part of all the American facilities for training pilots. Hundreds of our young men came to the United States and learned to fly in your army training schools.

These young ambassadors of ours and the Army Air Corps men with whom they lived and worked rekindled the spirit of comradeship between British and American fliers that had begun in the training schools and the skies above France during the last war. In return we were able to repay in part the debt that we owed to General Arnold and the Army Air Forces by teaching some of your men at our radar schools.

There were also hundreds of your young men who were so eager to get into the air war that they could not wait for America to join officially. We catered for them by arranging refresher courses in flying at American schools. Others with no experience of flying crossed the border into Canada and jointed the RCAF. I can assure you that we were very glad to have them. The story of the Eagle Squadron is known to you all. The boys who formed it came over with an unquenchable American spirit of high adventure and knight errantry and they remained to put up a fighting record as good as any in the annals of the RAF.

Then America came into the war officially. At first your production of combat aircraft was but 700 a month. Three years later, when your production had reached its peak you were turning out almost 10,000 a month. That growth is almost fantastic.

In the 3 years, 1942 to 1944, your industry produced no fewer than 228,295 combat planes. In the same period Britain made 76,393 planes. If you work that out you will find that the production of planes per head is almost exactly the same for our two countries, for our population is exactly a third of yours. I think the millions of aircraft workers, both here and in bombed, blacked-out Britain, deserve a tribute for this achievement.

On the operational side you bombed the enemy by day and we gave him no rest at night. As an example of martial cooperation, the joint work of our two air forces in the European theater is probably unequaled. When two armies fight as allies they fight side by side—one in one part of the front and the other in another part. But when two air forces fight together they use the same sky, attack the same targets, encounter the same units of enemy opposition, rely on the same weather reports, the same safety services.

So you can readily understand the importance of getting on well together. We did it in Europe, to the consternation of the enemy; we did it in Burma, where British and American flyers were mixed together under a unified command; and we are going to do it in the Pacific, where British heavy bombers are to resume their place in the team that has been so successful in other theaters just as soon as there are sufficient airdromes from which to operate.

Where the United States Army Air Forces are fighting, I can assure you that the Royal Air Force is going to be found at their side, and let no one think that we aren't just as set and just as determined on the elimination of the Japanese military machine as you are. Already in Burma we have deployed a greater air force than that which won the Battle of Britain. The only reason that the R. A. F. has not destroyed as many Japanese aircraft as German is that there are not as many in that theater to destroy.

Logistical difficulties will be the only obstacle which will limit the forces which we shall deploy at the earliest possible moment to deal ever harder blows against our common enemy wherever he may be found.

But, apart from these broader aspects of Anglo-American cooperation, I would like to tell you one or two stories of how this spirit of comradeship works out in the field. I will tell you first about a B-29 that came down in the Indian Ocean earlier this year after a raid on Malaya. The port wing had been set on fire over the target by a Jap incendiary bullet and after flying for 3 hours, with the wing on fire all the time, the pilot gave the order to bail out. He gave the order only just in time, for 30 seconds after the last man had jumped, the huge aircraft blew up in the air.

Eleven men floated down into the Indian Ocean. They had not a life raft between them, the sea in those parts was a haunt of man-eating sharks and the nearest friendly airbase was 800 miles away—as far as Jacksonville, Fla., is from New York. Eleven heads bobbing in the ocean swell, eleven specks of humanity scattered over several square miles, a thousand times tinier in scale than the smallest particle of dust on the map on the operations-room table far away in India. On the face of it their chances of survival were practically nonexistent. Yet nine of those men are alive today. They were rescued by R. A. F. Catalinas.

Four days later this record was eclipsed when the crew of another B-29 bailed out over the Indian Ocean 1,150 miles from land. The R. A. F. picked up 10 out of the 11. This rescue was even more astonishing than the first, for the swimming men were spotted by an R. A. F. Liberator—your B-24—just 27 minutes after they had jumped. One

thousand one hundred and fifty miles from their base and they were found in 27 minutes.

Altogether 22 men bailed out from those 2 Superfortresses and 19 of them were saved. Those 19 Americans come from 12 different States and all of them must have a new slant on lend-lease now, for they owe their lives to it. The aircraft that spotted them, bobbing like corks in the sea, and the flying boats that picked them up, were all built in American plants and then handed over to the R. A. F. to operate. Several of the British air crew were trained in America.

Those boys of yours and our lads who had the good fortune to rescue them have a two-fold bond—a bond of Anglo-American comradeship and the indefinable fellowship of the air which is so hard to explain in words—but is so very real a thing that it transcends all national bonds. To travesty Rudyard Kipling a little—"Once you've 'eard the air a-calling you don't never 'eed naught else."

Then there is the story of the rocket-firing Typhoons in Normandy. After General Patton's forces had broken through the German lines and were streaming south, the enemy gathered all his available armor and made a final desperate attempt to cut the American lines in the Mortain area. Had he succeeded it might have been extremely awkward for a while and at one time it looked as though he would succeed. Hundreds of German tanks emerged from their hiding places in woods and behind hedgerows and began rolling toward the American lines of communication.

There was a quick-witted American officer in charge at that spot and ignoring what are called the usual channels, he cut right across red tape and telephoned direct to the R. A. F. for help. "Glad to oblige," said the R. A. F. officer at the other end of the line and in a few minutes the first of the Typhoon wings was in the air. As you know, on that day the Typhoons with their powerful rockets destroyed 81 tanks, probably destroyed another 27, and damaged 27 others. The German attack was completely smashed.

No one will ever know how many American lives were saved by that little affair. Many thousands perhaps.

When your Air Force first came over to Britain, the RAF was a going concern, complete with all the subsidiary organizations that are so important in modern warfare. Such things as our chain of radar stations, our weather reporting service, our photographic recco unit, and our air-sea rescue system. To take an analogy from business, the RAF had set up, so to speak, the public utilities of air warfare.

It would have been a waste of time and duplication of effort if your Air Force had set up its own services on the same lines. It just used and added on to our services.

We, on the other hand, have never developed our air transport in the way you have. We have not the right type of aircraft, for we have been too busy turning out fighters and bombers. So whenever we have a big haulage job in the air we turn to you. We have done it in Burma and we did it in France and Holland. It has worked very well.

Now we are moving into the Pacific and the RAF will find that this time it is you who have provided the utility services.

I could give you many other examples of the cooperation which is winning the war. It is closer, more complete, and more efficient than any two allies have ever achieved in history. In fact, there is some evidence that Hitler counted on our not being able to achieve it—another of those colossal intuitive blunders of his which made the doom of Germany certain.

I suggest that this cooperation is a very real asset in the balance sheet—an asset which should not be allowed to depreciate in the future.

We shall still have work to do when Japan is defeated. Our plant, as you might call it, will have to be converted to produce and service a successful peace. We cannot afford to lose our assets and good will if we are to perform that task successfully.

As those of you who are businessmen know better than I do, good will is a sensitive thing—that has to be nursed and cherished, even by the most powerful corporations—especially during periods of plant conversion.

I said in a speech that I made in Chicago recently, that superior production facilities and material resources were not enough in this scientific age. The race is to the clever rather than to the strong. I believe that this is a truth which has a profound significance in the solution of the problems that confront us and in ensuring a lasting peace.

If this seems far-fetched, look at some of the things which the Germans nearly brought off.

First of all there were the German jet-aircraft. However good we think our British and American jets are, we have to admit that Germany was months ahead of us both.

Then there were the V-2's and the mysterious weapons which the armies found buried in emplacements on the coast of France.

The V-2's—as it turned out—were not very accurate and not sufficiently numerous to constitute a serious military menace. But, toward the end, they were getting more accurate and, if the Germans had had the idea sooner, it is reasonable to suppose that they would have been both more accurate and also more numerous.

If we had had many more V-2's and V-1's and other horrible weapons pouring into Britain in the winter preceding the invasion, the whole success of it might, to say the least, have been gravely imperiled.

Trouble makers of the future will not obligingly give us warning of their intentions in time for us to prepare. So we must be ready all the time. There is a statue in Washington with an inscription that reads: "War's legitimate object is a more perfect peace." I agree with that sentiment, but if the peace is to be what we consider more perfect and not what the aggressors do, we must be prepared to see it is kept.

The RAF finished up the last war as the largest air force in the world. It had over 200 squadrons and nearly 23,000 aircraft. That mighty force was allowed to wither away and later, when the peace of the world was threatened, we were hard put to it to revive it in time to save ourselves and the world from the hordes of the barbarian who sought to plunge us back into the Dark Ages.

This time the air arm of the United States, 38 years old today, will end the war as the greatest air force the world has ever known. I pray that those who direct its destinies will never allow it to decay, as we did after the last war, and that they will always understand that it has functions as vital in keeping the peace as in winning it. Then, indeed, they will justify the vision of those who, all those years ago, set about "to study the flying machine and the possibility of adapting it to military purposes."

Air Forces of America, the Royal Air Force salutes you.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT A. LOVETT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR FOR AIR

The men and women of the Army Air Forces deeply appreciate the honor that you and many other millions of Americans are rendering them today. More specifically, Mr. Chairman, those of us who are here this evening wish to express, through you, to our hosts our warm thanks for their hospitality and to make grateful acknowledgment to the assembled guests for their generous and friendly interest.

I am told that several hundred Air Force Day dinners are being held tonight and, knowing the generosity of this country, I have no doubt that various speakers have paid great tribute to the Army Air Forces. It is altogether fitting that this be done. After almost 5 years with the Army Air Forces, I believe I know, as well as any single person can, the job which they tackled in 1940, the problems they have overcome, and the superb results they have attained.

On the other hand, I also know some of the things that were involved in our tremendous air effort which the Army Air Forces did not bring about and could never have done alone. For these things the greatest tribute is due to many others. Therefore, in the brief time that is allotted to me tonight, I would like to say a few words about those others. I want, on behalf of the Army Air Forces, to pay our respects to the real source of the air power that this Nation has built and used against our enemies. That true source is, in the last analysis, the American people themselves.

In all the planning for our future security and for our common defense from now on, it is terribly important that we understand the truth of that statement. It should influence every step in our program. However, in order to appreciate fully its truth, we must first understand what air power is in today's stage—its make-up and what must be preserved and developed if we are to continue to have it during the generations that lie ahead.

Air power is the capacity for action through use of aircraft and air-borne matériel. An air force is merely the instrument through which air power is at present exercised. There are many who try to measure air power in terms of so many thousand airplanes in the hands of an air force. This is just the old numbers racket. An air force is definitely not just a lot of planes in being.

An air force is basically people, some in scientific work, some in experimental work, some in factories, and some in the military service. It is a complex and wonderful thing which combines the efforts of many thousands of people. In the first place, a nation will not have true air power over any period of time unless its people have the ingenuity, the intelligence and the curiosity which keeps striving toward something better through experimentation and endless research. It is hard to overemphasize the extent to which air power depends on such characteristics in a people. They have existed in the American people since our early days. Their enterprise, their system of education, the desire of Junior to take the alarm clock apart to see what makes it tick and to drive the family car almost as soon as he can walk, the constant struggle to find better ways of doing things—these are the factors which constitute the first reason for the existence of United States air power today. So the Army Air Forces pay tribute tonight to our scientists and engineers this system of life produces. We must never allow their stimulating leadership to lag.

Secondly, air power in its true sense cannot exist among a people who have not mastered the industrial problems involved in flexible mass production. An air force is absolutely dependent on its supporting industry. The relationship is unique in the sense that a fine military plane is never really completed. Changes are constantly being made in the aircraft to meet new tactics and new conditions and the designers and engineers work right on the fields from which the aircraft fly into combat. An air force is a true, cooperative effort.

The American aircraft industry has not only performed marvels of production, which have astonished the world, but they have mastered this vital problem of integration and cooperation with the airmen who are using their products. These industries and the skilled Americans who man them are the very foundation of our air power. Their healthy existence during the years to come cannot be left to chance. The Air Forces acknowledge tonight our debt to them and pledge them all the support that lies within our control.

A third component of a nation's air power is its commercial air lines—the men who plan and build them, the pilots who fly them, the

mechanics who maintain their fine operating standards. Unless our air lines—domestic and international—continue in the next 20 years their remarkable progress of the last 10 years, our air power will suffer immeasurably. The Air Forces take pride in the great cooperative effort, known as the Air Transport Command, in which the skills of the commercial operators and of the Air Forces have been blended with such extraordinary success. We therefore pay tribute tonight to the air lines, their operators, their pilots, their ground crews, and all those in the airways system who have made the operation possible.

There are many other elements in the complex factors that make up true air power, but there is time to speak of only two more. First is the courage, the unselfishness, the gusto, and humor of the young men and women of America and the sacrifices of their parents. It is the youngsters who, with the strong backing of their families, have really built the Army Air Forces and the Naval Air Service. The Army Air Forces today is made up of about two and a quarter million people. Eleven out of every twelve today are civilian soldiers. It is a true people's air force. Its skills, its determination, and its accomplishments came from the people of this country, who possess the imagination and pioneering spirit which are the very essence of power in the air.

Finally, among the factors to be borne constantly in mind in considering airpower is the tremendous importance of time. The amazing production record of this country has obscured the fact that it takes an average of about 5 years from the time the young engineer starts jotting down formulas and making drawings on the back of an envelope to the time when the proved and finished aircraft is fully combatworthy. Five years is a long time and it must be obvious that in a critical period of national danger we cannot wait that long for the production of modern aircraft. In an art which is in a revolutionary stage today, obsolescence of aircraft and engines is very high. Recent scientific developments make it more than likely that 5 years from now almost every combat plane we have in production today will be obsolete. Therefore, an air force, in order to give real national security, must be constantly supplied with aircraft embodying the latest scientific developments. This can only be done from an industry which is maintained in a healthy and progressive condition in peacetime, so that it is always ready to produce in physical form the continually improved planes that had their origin on the drafting boards 5 years earlier.

This country has attained airpower today. I have outlined some of the less obvious aspects of airpower and have emphasized the fact that it depends on a combination of elements which go beyond the mere quality and quantity of aircraft, or of personnel, or of airfields, or of military leadership. It is, of course, a combination of all of these things, plus the all-important element which is an informed and alert public.

We have paid a heavy price to get where we are today. Surely we cannot disregard the lessons we have learned at such great cost in life and effort. We must never forget that our air strength does not flow alone from the Air Forces but that it represents the consolidated and continuing efforts of millions of Americans—scientists, engineers, factory workers, civilian fliers, airport and air-line operators, and the professional military men who are your servants.

More than any other group in the entire complex structure, the officers and men of the Army Air Forces recognize the fact that the true secret of our airpower today, and in all the years to come, cannot lie with them alone. It lies with the American people as a whole. And, therefore, once again on our thirty-eighth anniversary, the AAF salutes you with gratitude and affection.

Union College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress the fact that Union College in Schenectady, N. Y., is celebrating its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. As an alumnus of Union College, it is with great pride that I point to her outstanding history, and I can think of no more fitting outline of this history than that stated in the commencement address delivered in June of this year by Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, a member of the board of trustees and a graduate of Union College with the class of 1910. Excerpts from this speech follow:

The history of Union College is interwoven with the entire history of the Federal Union. The first petition for a college in Schenectady, signed by nearly a thousand citizens of northern New York, was made in 1779 before the United States of America had come into existence. When the college opened its doors in 1795, George Washington was still the President of our country. The very name chosen for the college was symbolic of the spirit of unity which was the lifeblood of the new-born nation.

During the 150 years of its history the college, through her sons, has made countless contributions of the highest order to the building of our national life. One of her sons conceived the idea of building the Erie Canal. Another had a major part in projecting the first railway to the Pacific. A Union alumnus completed the treaty which ceded Alaska to the United States. Another established our national system of rural free delivery of mail. From the ranks of Union's alumni have come a President of the United States, six Cabinet officers, holding the posts of Secretary of State, of War, of the Treasury, of Agriculture, and of the Post Office; 13 judges of Federal courts, 15 United States Senators, more than a hundred Members of Congress, 14 Governors of States, 50 important diplomats, including Ambassadors or Ministers to Great Britain, France, Italy, Denmark, the Netherlands, Russia, Korea, and Mexico. Union has also trained at least a hundred presidents of educational institutions of higher learning and equally outstanding leaders in the church, in law, in medicine, in engineering, in science, and in industry. It would be safe to say that no college of its size has a more impressive record of service to the upbuilding of America.

In its own life as an institution Union College was an embodiment of the pioneer spirit. It was located on the edge of civilization between the Hudson Valley and the wilderness. It represented the demand for greater educational opportunity among a people who were concerned for high standards of citizenship in the growing Nation. Schenectady was then only a town of a few hundred inhabitants.

The college also broke fresh ground in another respect: it was the first to be founded, as a matter of fundamental principle, on an interdenominational basis. The name Union was deliberately chosen to emphasize this fact.

In educational policies also Union has been a forerunner in many developments that later were widely accepted. The college, almost from the start, became a place for new ideas.

Reviewing the 150 years of Union's existence, the thing that stands out most clearly is its frontier spirit. It came to birth on the geographical frontier of American civilization and its early life was an expression of the spiritual frontier of a people who desired to rise above divisive interests for the sake of a national unity.

The old frontier which Schenectady represented in 1795 has long since disappeared. It moved farther and farther west till it was lost in the Pacific Ocean. Today there is a new frontier of civilization. As the men of 150 years ago struggled to achieve a unified nation, so we of today struggle to achieve a unified world.

As Union College incarnated the spirit of the frontier in our national life, it likewise manifested the frontier spirit in its educational policy. During its first 50 years it blazed a fresh trail by emphasizing the place of science and the application of scientific knowledge to the practical arts. A hundred years ago when Union was developing this side of its life, science was not held in much public esteem. Today we regard the rise of science as the most marvelous feature of the modern world.

As we look over 150 years of Union's history, we pay tribute to her genius for pioneering and from it take courage for untrodden paths that lie ahead.

Production of Alcohol From Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America in peacetime will be a prosperous Nation when we have finally solved the question of agriculture. So long as we produce depressing surpluses it will in the end pull down the economic well-being of other sections of the country.

It would seem to me that agriculture should enjoy the benefits that have accrued to it as a result of this war, as should be the case with all phases of American life, every branch of industry.

It is regrettable if a battle is to ensue on the part of certain industries against the use of farm products in the production of alcohol from farm surpluses. Surely it is reasonable that if we can bring the great midwestern country, in which the vast production of farm products which produces our surpluses grow, to a state of permanent prosperity, all of the country will be the beneficiary.

Successful farmers will buy automobiles and automobiles in increased numbers will buy gasoline, whether it comes from the wells of the oil companies, or whether power is generated from alcohol produced from farm products and mixed with gasoline. It would seem to me that this matter should be viewed with care on the part of all concerned. The primary objective must be to keep agriculture staple and prosperous, and if this can be attained, certainly all industry will be the beneficiary.

Under unanimous consent, I present here a statement taken from the Wash-

ington Post on October 6, 1945, dealing with the question of closing alcohol plants in the midcontinental section of the United States of America, that I commend to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

FARM BELT FIGHTS

The old, old battle of the big oil companies against Midwest corn growers is raging again over synthetic rubber made from alcohol.

Very quietly Jesse Jones' old friends on the RFC are closing down the Midwest alcohol plants which made butadiene for synthetic rubber. Meanwhile, the costly petroleum process for synthetic rubber is continuing, despite the fact that oil experts say we have only a 12- to 15-year supply of oil in the United States of America.

The battle of synthetic rubber from alcohol or petroleum raged just after Pearl Harbor, until Barney Baruch finally castigated Jesse Jones for using only the oil process instead of alcohol. Baruch ordered alcohol used at least in part, and, as a result, three Midwest alcohol-butadiene plants have operated in Kansas City, Muscatine, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr. Now, however, the RFC, still run by Jesse Jones' pals, is closing the plants down. The Kansas City plant, built by the Government for $15,000,000 and operated by National Distillers, is already shut tight, while the plants at Muscatine and Omaha have had their orders reduced to one-sixth.

Farm-belt Congressmen have always urged the operation of alcohol plants in the Midwest to handle surplus corn, wheat, etc., but it looks as if the big Eastern-Cuban lobby together with the oil interests have the drag with the RFC; for, while these three plants close, we are still importing 3,000,000 gallons of alcohol per month from Cuba and Mexico, while there is still not enough blackstrap molasses to produce alcohol for industrial needs.

Military Mathematics Must Be Revised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial, Military Mathematics Must Be Revised, by Dr. Roy L. Smith in the Christian Advocate. I do this at the request of some very splendid American citizens:

IN MY OPINION MILITARY MATHEMATICS MUST BE REVISED

(By Roy L. Smith)

The single atomic bomb which completely destroyed Hiroshima also wiped out all values of large standing armies and reduced the proposal of peacetime military conscription to utter futility, in the opinion of Dr. A. Allan Bates, famous industrial scientist of the Westinghouse research laboratories, who has served as a technical officer with an Army scientific unit in Germany.

Speaking before the American Society for Metals in the city of Chicago, Dr. Bates said: "Look at Japan. When the first atom bomb fell 5,000,000 Jap soldiers armed to the teeth were of as much use as a bunch of kindergarten kids armed with pea shooters."

There was a time, only a few months ago, when the military might of any nation was estimated in terms of the number of men that could be put into the battle line, but the atomic bomb wiped out battle lines just as it also wiped out Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Every military strategist in the world today is confronted with the fact that even a tiny nation, like Switzerland, for instance, will be able to reduce mighty Russia to helplessness if it is armed with 5,000 planes, each one equipped with 10 atomic bombs.

A few years hence even planes will be unnecessary, and bombs will be designed for rockets which can be fired from backyards or secret platforms hidden away on inaccessible mountain sides. Under those circumstances armies of ten and twenty millions of highly trained and thoroughly equipped fighting men have lost their military significance.

In one statement, at least, the Japanese told the truth. Within a few hours after the atomic bomb dropped on Nagasaki a high military authority of Nippon is quoted as saying: "This is a weapon against which there can be neither defense nor defiance."

Let there be no delusions in the matter; the atomic bomb is here to stay and is destined, in our opinion to hold the world in the grip of terror for the next 100 years.

At the moment these lines are being written the technical secrets according to which the bomb is fabricated are known only to the United States Government. Such secrets, however, cannot be confined indefinitely. Scientists in every land have been conducting researches in the field; and tomorrow, or the day after, they will solve the problem just as American scientists did. In the meantime, there will not be a research laboratory in all the world which will not be watched with infinite care. Rumors will race across the world from time to time, and the whole race will be subject to a war of nerves.

Very much of the protest against the use of the atomic bomb, in our opinion, has missed the central facts entirely. It has been argued that it must not be used because it is so diabolically effective. That is, we believe, superficial reasoning. To disallow the use of the atomic bomb because it wipes out an entire city with a single blast and to allow the use of 5,000 block-busters in a single raid because they are less effective is to merely cavil. If force is to be used in settling international differences, is it reasonable to draw a mathematical line beyond which it is not to be applied because it begins to be effective at that line? In other words, the use of force is a moral problem and not a mathematical proposition.

We are dealing here with the philosophy of force. If to use force under any circumstances is justifiable, then to use it effectively can hardly be wrong. The indictment against the atomic bomb cannot be mathematical, as though killing men one at a time or a hundred at a time were "civilized" and killing them 200,000 at a time were "uncivilized."

Up to the moment that the first atomic bomb was exploded in the New Mexico desert, any nation's military might could have been estimated in terms of the number of men and the amount of material it might have been able to put into the field. The atomic bomb completel" upset those calculations. Military mathematics must begin all over again.

Peacetime military conscription has been urged upon the people of the United States as a "defense measure." But as long as the United States Government is in possession of the secret of the atomic bomb, it needs no more effective defense. Twenty thousand planes armed with 10 atomic bombs each would constitute a defense which 200,000,000 armed men could not provide. If any other nation comes into possession of the secret of the atomic bomb, then 12,000,000 American boys armed with rifles would be no more adequate as defenders than were Japan's 5,000,000.

That first atomic bomb has laid an inescapable obligation upon the governments of the world to find some other means of settling international disputes. It has written, in letters of fire and fused earth, the verdict: "They that take the sword must perish by the sword."

We have come to that point in human history when mathematics has lost its military significance in large measure. Multitudes of men, skies full of planes, ships filling the seas, and national industries producing war material—all these things have been dwarfed into insignificance. Meanwhile, the conflict has been turned inside the laboratories where brilliant young scientists conduct intricate experiments in test tubes and among radioactive waves. The scriptures have had a ghastly fulfillment, for one has put many more than 10,000 to flight, and even to death.

Again we commend Congressman MARTIN'S proposal that the United States shall enter into a solemn covenant with the other nations of the world by which all shall abandon the process of universal conscription. Our possession of the secret of the atomic bomb which has revised military mathematics so drastically constitutes a powerful argument in behalf of such a proposal. Never was the American Government in a more strategic position to provoke peace upon the earth.

Man-Run Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD Malvina Lindsay's article which appeared in the Washington Post on Wednesday, October 4, and in which she points out the justified claim of the women of America for a greater voice in domestic and international affairs and urges larger representation on the various councils being established:

MAN-RUN PEACE

(By Malvina Lindsay)

FEMININE DISCONTENT

If a delegation of national women leaders were to wait upon the President, the Secretary of State, and other officials with important appointive powers and say frankly what many of their followers were thinking, they would speak something like this:

"Good sirs, we are alarmed at the disappearance of women from top policy positions in American public life. We have lost a Cabinet member, two foreign ministers and many high appointive officials whose jobs have been sloughed off in reorganization schemes. We feel ourselves being increasingly frozen out from high Government positions and from knowing what is going on in top councils.

"We recognize women have made progress in State legislatures and in State and city

public offices. But the lack of women in important national posts causes this country to present a somewhat fantastic picture to the world. As to the foremost exponent of democratic government, it cannot afford to do this.

"Also, since women are now more than 50 percent of the electorate, this is unfair. Moreover, women have special talents urgently needed now in the reconstruction of this Nation and the world. We have had a man-run war. There must not be a man-run peace. Therefore, we ask:

"First, that at least one woman, preferably two, be among the five delgates the United States will send to the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization, which is expected to meet in London in December.

"Second, that one of the President's administrative assistants be a woman, to serve as a bridge of contact and information between women's groups and the executive branch of the Government.

"Third, that there be a woman Assistant Secretary in the Department of State to help interpret foreign policy to the millions of women who in their organizations are studying international relations, and to the greater millions of women consumers who largely hold the key to foreign trade relations in their pocketbooks.

"Fourth, that competent women (of whom there are plenty) be sent to Japan and Germany in important civil positions to help administer reconstruction programs and to give public encouragement in political activity to the women of those countries.

"Fifth, that this Nation actively support the use of women in operating the machinery and making the policy of all the United Nations' subsidiary organizations."

Possibly women's demands will not take such form as this—yet. But the gathering movement among women, both in this country and abroad, for more voice in the momentous world decisions now being made is bound to break out in some fashion. French women, newly politically conscious, have invited women of other nations to a meeting November 19 to discuss this problem. In Washington women leaders have held several quiet conferences to map strategy. Right now they are concentrating on getting representation in the United Nations General Assembly, but they also have their eye on the spots in their own Government where they feel their influence is needed.

This time they are prepared to meet the traditional excuse, "Where is a competent woman?" by citing the list of specially trained and experienced members of their sex that was drawn up by women's national organizations and presented to the President and the State Department prior to the San Francisco Conference. The list is being checked and brought up to date.

The policy of giving women representation on national bodies was instituted at the Hot Springs Food Conference and has been followed to a degree at successive conferences. But women should have a much larger part than they have yet had in drawing blueprints for a new world in which they will be much more than half the population.

In the United States particularly they should not have to beg, contrive, and present resolutions and petitions for the privilege of helping to solve the baffling problems their Government faces. They should not be regarded in the nuisance class, to be held at bay by doorkeepers and secretaries and appeased with perfunctory appointments to high-sounding advisory committees. Political leaders should wake up to what scientists already know—that women have a special strain of achievement to contribute to almost any type of enterprise, and that government, if it is not to be myopic and lopsided, needs them even more than they need it.

Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a poem written by Helen Hall Bucher, Highland Terrace, Boiling Springs, Pa. Mrs. Bucher has also written the music for this song, but I am placing it in the RECORD because the words and thoughts are so fine and so beautifully expressed.

PENNSYLVANIA

All hail to Pennsylvania!
The glorious Keystone State;
Blood bought through strife and carnage
From the red man's deadly hate;
Then Britain held us captive
Till Washington the great
Released us from all bondage
Of king and potentate.

I love thy purple mountains
And thy deeply wooded hills;
I love thy noble rivers
And thy lovely sparkling rills;
While the wealth of buried treasure
From the mines in Mother Earth
Is a lasting source of riches,
Proving Pennsylvania's worth.

Thy fields and fertile valleys
And every fruited vine
Yield food for starving nations,
O Pennsylvania, mine!
Where the happy songs of toilers,
As they till the verdant sod,
Reveal their faith in harvests
That come from Nature's God.

We'll sing of Pennsylvania.
The glorious Keystone State;
Our aims and all we cherish,
To thee we dedicate.
Here blooms the mountain laurel
In Nature's sun-lit bower;
We hail thee, Queen of Beauty,
As Pennsylvania's flower.

—*Helen Hall Bucher.*

Giving Our Goods Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial from the Times-Record, published in Spencer, W. Va.

Spencer is situated in Roane County, important in farming and the production of natural gas.

At this period of negotiations for loans to foreign governments, lend-lease discussion, and the request by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for $550,000,000, I feel you would like to know what the hard-working, patriotic Americans in this community think on this important subject.

The editorial follows:

GIVING OUR GOODS AWAY

The international-minded brethren who have adopted foreign trade as their fetish and would have us believe that nothing else is important in making us prosperous are now having a field day. They have taken their pens and typewriters or have mounted the stump to convince us that the only way we can return to normal prosperity is through a full measure of foreign trade.

This, in their opinion, is more important than all other things combined. Therefore they would have us go to any length in financially aiding other countries so that these may buy from us. They would lend to alien nations to buy from us, send them the goods on lend-lease, or even give money to them in order that these other nations may get the wherewithal to buy from us.

Just how Uncle Sam can give his goods away, lend or give the money to other nations to buy the goods, and still remain sound, is a little difficult to see, yet this is a major recommendation in the list of many folks who think that is the only way we can become prosperous.

We know that no little businessman—says a modern manufacturer—could get rich by giving his goods or his money away to his customers, or by extending them credit which they may never pay and which he knows they may never pay. He might, by getting rid of his products in this manner, keep the wheels going for a while, but sooner or later his fate would catch up with him. It is not necessary to go into the painful details. Now Uncle Sam, as a Nation, is in exactly the same fix. Sooner or later he will run out of credit and the good will he is building up abroad will vanish with it. There may be some temporary benefit to some manufacturers whose goods are exported on borrowed money, but sooner or later all the taxpayers will have to foot the bill in one way or another.

Labor and Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Labor and Management," which appeared in the September 27 issue of the Winlock News, of Winlock, Wash., and a copy of my letter to the publisher, Mr. M. R. Alexander, of October 8, 1945:

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

We were eating lunch with a friend a few days ago and in the course of our conversation fell to discussing the current wave of strikes and labor trouble prevalent throughout the Nation, including our own west coast. "You should take a stand editorially on the matter," said the friend, "don't straddle the fence; don't pussyfoot; take a definite stand one way or the other. You'll probably be wrong, but whether folks agree with you or not, they will respect you for expressing your convictions."

The last part of the friend's statement is probably true to a limited extent. However, we have never been particularly interested in whether or not the readers of this family journal were in agreement with the opinions expressed in the editorial column. Rather our purpose has been to encourage our read-

ers to think for themselves on matters of national or local importance.

Altogether too many people in America accept their opinions and convictions ready-made from one source or another, being too lazy mentally or too indifferent to take the time and effort to acquaint themselves with the background of necessary facts and information with which to form any logical opinion. Most of us think with our emotions rather than our minds and are not much interested in facts, a characteristic that has long been recognized by purveyors of propaganda in their effort to sway public opinion.

The method of handling the news concerning strikes and labor troubles by the great news agencies and fed to the American people by the metropolitan press is designed to leave no doubt in the mind of the ordinary reader that organized labor is almost wholly to blame for the present mess in which we find ourselves. Actually the blame rests neither with management nor labor. Our national economy operates under a profit system and the worker, in seeking to get a raise in pay, is simply asking for a greater profit for his time and skill, and is driving home his request by refusing to produce the goods from which both he and his employer derive their income.

Management, on the other hand, is refusing to grant pay increases because doing so would mean less profit for business and smaller dividends for stockholders. True, management can raise the price on the goods produced and thus escape for the moment a cut in profits by passing the worker's raise on to the people who buy the goods. But most of these people are also workers in one sense or another and will need a raise in pay if they are to continue buying. Sort of a dog chasing its tail proposition.

The cause for the continual battle between management and labor is inherent in the economic system tha produced them both, and until we become intelligent enough to devise a means of producing and distributing the things we need on a basis other than that of profits, we can expect to travel the same old vicious circle.

OCTOBER 8, 1945.

M. R. ALEXANDER,
Publisher, Winlock News,
Winlock, Wash.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: Let me congratulate you on your editorial in the September 27 issue of the Winlock News. I read a great many editorials, including some from the large eastern newspapers, but it is interesting, if not surprising, to find the first courageous editorial that actually gets at the roots of the cause of industrial strife in a small paper far from the metropolitan centers of the Nation.

I have been waiting to see what paper might bring out the fact that our profit system causes a terrific strain of relations between employer and employee because their financial interests so conflict with each other. I don't say that it can't work out all right, I think it can, but we must not blame the worker altogether for the strife when our system actually promotes it. The worker is probably the least to blame of all of us for our method of producing everything for the profit motive instead of for consumption. If we are going to be able to maintain our private profit system it must be the responsibility of all our people to try to make it work and not just the employees alone.

Your fine courageous editorial goes to show that one cannot judge the value of a newspaper by its size alone. I am taking the liberty of inserting your editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the other Members of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. SAVAGE.

Shortage of Coal in the Head of the Lakes Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year the great sections of the Northwest, which must of necessity look to a probable period of cold weather, are deeply concerned with having available at the Head of the Lake area adequate supplies of coal in order that the civil population may be carried through without distress.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following resolution passed by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak.:

Whereas it is reported that there exists a serious shortage of bituminous coal on docks at the head of the Lakes area for the heating season of 1945–46; and

Whereas the present supply of coal on the docks in the head of the Lakes area appears inadequate to take care of consumers' wants during the coming heating season; and

Whereas reliable figures and information show a deficiency on the docks of approximately 6,000,000 tons; and

Whereas all bituminous coal used by industrial plants and domestic consumers in this area moves from these docks; and

Whereas it is imperative that coal should be carried by boats to such docks immediately to avoid a serious coal shortage and to insure a sufficient supply to last until the opening of navigation next year; and

Whereas navigation at the Head of the Lakes usually opens late in April, and sometimes as late as May; and

Whereas the close of navigation is set this season as for November 17, but cannot be relied upon, because severe weather conditions may stop all lake shipments earlier than November 17; and

Whereas a failure to have a sufficient supply of coal on the docks in the head of the Lakes area before the close of navigation this season will create conditions resulting in imminent danger to the health and general welfare of a large number of communities in the Head of the Lakes area: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak., That a possible emergency exists for the preservation of the health and general welfare of the city of Fargo, and neighboring communities, requiring that the board of city commissioners petition the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, that the Federal Government start immediate action through the proper officials to insure to the head of the Lakes area a sufficient supply of bituminous coal on the docks before the close of navigation in 1945 in order to prevent suffering and hardship in this area during the coming heating season; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak., respectfully urges that the Solid Fuels Administration be given every opportunity to provide No. 1-A priorities to immediately facilitate the shipping of coal from the lower lake ports to docks in the head of the Lakes area; and be it further

Resolved, That the city auditor be and he is hereby directed to mail a certified copy of this resolution to Senator William Langer, Senator Milton Young, Congressmen William Lemke, and Charles Robertson, President Truman, and to the Secretary, and the Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

The Shape of Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "The Shape of Things," which appeared in the October 6 issue of the Nation:

THE SHAPE OF THINGS

Senator TAFT's problem in regard to the full-employment bill was to wreck it without incurring the political risks of voting against jobs for all. By winning acceptance of his amendment rewriting the clause providing for compensatory Government investment, he has achieved a satisfactory solution from his point of view. What dismays and astonishes us is the way in which the bill's backers persuaded themselves that this and other amendments made no important difference. Fortunately a large group of progressives in the House appear to appreciate to what a degree it has been emasculated. A statement signed by 115 cosponsors of the measure declares: "We are committed to the principle that the Government must make full use of all its powers and functions relating to employment and production and must specifically pledge its financial resources to make good on the assurance of continuing full employment opportunity." Representative GEORGE E. OUTLAND, one of the leaders of the group, told reporters: "We'll make a fight for the original language and we think the people will go with us." They will, indeed, if steps are taken to expose to the country the fact that the deadly words injected into the heart of the bill will, unless removed, serve to paralyze it.

The London Conference Break-Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Byrnes gave the reasons for the London Conference break-down very clearly and bluntly to the people of the United States in his radio broadcast on October 5, 1945. In doing so he performed a real service to the Nation, and deserves the heartfelt thanks and loyal backing of all our people. That break-down threatens not only to destroy the preliminary work for world peace done at Dumbarton Oaks and at San Francisco, but it also threatens to

sabotage the United Nations peace organization before it can be set up and start to function.

Analyzing Secretary Byrnes' report, we deduce the following disturbing demands made by Russia at the London Conference:

First. That Russia's unilateral actions (contrary to the Yalta agreements) setting up puppet governments in the Balkan States, be approved and those puppet governments recognized.

Second. That Russia be given new bases both in the Mediterranean area and in the African area.

Third. That Marshal Tito, Stalin's Charley McCarthy in Yugo-Slavia, be given what he asks from Italy.

Fourth. That a four-power commission to control and govern Japan be created to supersede MacArthur, who had been agreed upon and accepted at the Potsdam Conference.

If these four demands had been agreed to at the London Conference then Russia would have been given a privileged world position and acknowledged as the world's number one power.

Mr. Speaker, if Russia will not play ball with the other United Nations, under rules agreed upon by all the other players, then I believe the other nations should go ahead with the United Nations peace organization without Russia.

Dorothy Thompson expressed the same thought in her column, On the Record, carried in the Washington Evening Star, October 5, 1945. Because she points out so well the situation the world faces as a result of the break-down of the London Conference, I include her statement as a part of these remarks.

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

While industry after industry is struck in the United States, and cries for more rapid demobilization descend on the people's representatives, and the tax structure is overhauled, and America prepares to enter peace as sensationally as she went to war, eyes have been diverted from London, where a first-class tragedy has taken place.

The peace negotiations have broken down. There is no peace. We have been counting our chickens before they were hatched. The eggs that were to produce the great new age of peace are sterile. The situation is just as bad as it can be.

Truth is, it was bad at Casablanca, at Moscow, at Yalta, at San Francisco; and at Potsdam it was worst of all. We put the most favorable interpretation on things; we trusted our leaders; we hoped for the best—once our enemies were unconditionally surrendered. But in sober moments, studying the documents that issued from these various meetings, we could not hide our doubts and fears.

What was to be the fate of small nations in the Big Three—or Big Five—world? What was a small nation? France? Was she really one of the bigs—or was her inclusion all hooey? If the small nations disappeared, as power factors, along with Germany and Japan, what would move into the vacuum thus created? The Big Three? And when, in history, have great powers restrained themselves, each in the interest of the other?

Where—we asked ourselves—was that ancient figure, her eyes bandaged against prejudice, holding the scales? Where were the people, the common men, whose peace and whose century this, we were told, was to be? The small nations, plus the enemy peoples in Europe alone, composed populations totaling those of the United States and the Soviet Union combined. Were all these to be permanently disfranchised? Was not Dumbarton Oaks a fraud from the beginning—from the moment it was accepted that the strong should enjoy privileges denied the weak, and exempted from restrictions that the small countries must assume?

The cry went up, "We must be realistic!"—but no one could define for us this new realism. It looked to us very much like the Old Nick. And, oh, the fascination exerted by the enemy. How easy, while fighting him, to accept his very principles, or his unprinciple, elevated into a "Weltanschauung" (a political philosophy).

To question was futile, a selling job was being done. The American State Department sent out its salesmen. Mr. Stettinius, Mr. Pasvolsky, Mr. James Dunn, and lesser lights called a meeting in New York of publishers, editors, editorial writers, and radio commentators. They sat in the Waldorf ballroom and listened for about an hour while the Dumbarton Oaks Plan was described—excruciatingly bored, for all of them knew the plan by heart. Many had studied and restudied it, annotated and commented on it. Finally they were allowed to submit questions, but only in writing. There was no discussion.

Afterward the ballyhoo of San Francisco. In Europe, where "the toad beneath the harrow knows exactly where each toothpoint goes," the people called it "San Fiasco." And in London, American journalists have been protesting against the lack of liaison between the American delegates and the American press, who had to get their information of the Conference's deadlocks largely from non-American sources.

No world organization was created at San Francisco. No principles were enunciated at Potsdam. Free elections were promised, but no steps were taken at any time to insure the most primitive conditions for popular rule anywhere. So the new world organization has not survived as many months as the wretched League of Nations survived years. We must start over again—from scratch.

If Russia will not join us, then we must organize without Russia. Under no circumstances must we direct ourselves against her; the international organization should guarantee even nonmembers aid against aggression, and leave its ranks open at all times to everyone, including our late enemies.

The issue transcends all other issues, for it is the issue of life or death on this planet. It cannot be settled by collective bargaining among great powers over the spoils of war. It can only be settled according to principle.

A Letter the New York Times Suppressed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article entitled "A Letter the New York Times Suppressed," by Norman Thomas, from the Progressive of October 8.

In Germany truth was suppressed by burning books and by other drastic measures. It is possible, however, for free discussion and free speech also to be eliminated by silk-glove techniques, by selecting in one case and rejecting in another, the news matter to be published.

Norman Thomas, long the titular leader of the Socialist Party in America, often has views differing sharply from many of us. But the news value of his judgments on public matters cannot be legitimately ignored.

Accordingly, the letter the New York Times failed to print, together with Thomas' introductory remarks in the Progressive of October 8, follow in full:

A LETTER THE NEW YORK TIMES SUPPRESSED

(By Norman Thomas)

We are governed in foreign affairs by a conspiracy of concealment and propaganda on the part of a clique of supposedly liberal radio commentators and editors more or less in alliance with the State Department. Fortunately the State Department or President Truman has a little more humanity or common sense than the miscalled liberals or else our boys would still be fighting a desperate war of extermination of Japan.

But the State Department which had no decent plans for Europe or Asia and no plans at all for Korea has gone along with the critics of General MacArthur—the man who has accomplished the remarkable feat of the peaceful occupation of Japan in a spirit of justice and tolerance except when he has been forced to appease his American armchair critics.

The worst of it is that supporters of common sense and decency can barely get a hearing on the radio or in the press. Senators of very different political beliefs have told me that a large part of their correspondence merely echoes the outpourings of a Winchell or some less popular commentator.

To some degree I can corroborate that statement from my own experience. We who differ can only very occasionally be heard over the radio or even get a letter of considerable length in a leading newspaper. To illustrate this point I am presenting to readers of the Progressive a rather important letter for which the New York Times has no room, although it comments on articles by one of the best of its writers.

Here is the letter which was refused space in the Times:

"To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

"No military analyst has rendered such competent and thoughtful public service as Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin. He has put all lovers of peace peculiarly in his debt by his constructive six-point program in his article, 'Atomic Bomb Responsibilities,' in your issue of September 12. He is, therefore, entitled to more respect than the strident rationalizer of vengeance and hate when he discusses with moderation his fear that General MacArthur's policy may permit our foe 'to retain war traditions.'

"Without examining Mr. Baldwin's article in detail, and admitting that there may be value in some of his suggestions and criticisms—for example, of MacArthur's neglect of the Navy—I want to state certain general principles concerning the treatment of a defeated enemy on which I suspect that our supreme commander is wisely acting.

"1. Germany's Second War was not due to any 'softness' in the peace of Versailles; it was due to disunity among the victors, lack of constructive policy fit for peace, and positive encouragement by powerful forces in both Britain and France to the rise of nazism.

"In no foreseeable time can either Germany or Japan directly undertake a new war of aggression unless the present victors fall out and one of the two colossi who now dominate the world, the United States and Russia, permits or encourages aggression. Another possibility might be that the Japanese could help to organize Asia against the continuance of white imperialism. An obviously vindictive peace would make this more likely.

"2. Japan surrendered with great armies as yet unbeaten because of her threatened de-

struction by the overwhelming might arrayed against her, especially in the field of mechanized warfare. There is not much that a conqueror can do after this sort of surrender either to encourage or discourage 'the myth of an unbeaten army.' Certainly great harshness to a disarmed people won't do it. Punishment of particular criminals will help only to the degree that it is obviously just.

"3. Nations even more truly than individuals cannot be taught true repentance or high morality by the superior force of a master. The most they can learn from defeat is prudence for the future, and surely that lesson has been sufficiently taught.

"4. The new international morality upon which peace depends can only be taught by example. It is the rival imperialisms of the present victors which already threaten future peace. Asia waits for a demonstration that we do not intend to perpetuate white imperialism after having defeated Japanese imperialism. The British Labor Government has thus far missed an enormous opportunity to symbolize the coming of the new day, at little price to British interests, by its failure to return Hong Kong to Chinese political rule. We shall miss our opportunity if we neglect Mr. Baldwin's six-point program, or if we fall into the old error, so dear to the Anglo-Saxon, of clothing our own imperialism in the robes of a Messiah anxious to do good to 'lesser breeds without the law.'

"5. Our best chance of teaching penitence to the Japanese for their collective sins would be to practice it in relation to our own guilt for the use of two atomic bombs without even warning or demonstration of their power. It would be hard to name a worse crime in this cruel war than that second bomb over Nagasaki."

Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of September 1945 Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold retired from active service as Chief of Engineers of the Army. A group of representative citizens, including recognized leaders of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, the Army, and national civic organizations joined together, the evening before in doing him honor. It was an appropriate tribute to the man who successfully led the Corps of Engineers through the toughest war in the history of the Nation.

General Reybold is essentially a product of our democratic system and his record is a justification of that system. He was born in Delaware City, Del., and came up the hard way through the public schols and the university of his native State. His education did not end there, for, according to Army practice, the education of an engineer officer is a continuous process from school to military operations, to civil works, and back to school again throughout his career. He learns by practice as well as by precept and the stress laid on organizing technique is the preparation that pays off best in the national crises. When the test of the Army's measures for controlling floods on the Mississippi came, in 1937, it found Reybold in charge of the critical section of that river. By all previous criteria the high stages reported in the upstream reaches spelled impending disaster. But Reybold and his colleagues and predecessors had planned and builded well, and he was confidently able to reassure the President and the people of the great valley that the new works would hold. And they did hold. From there he was sent to work out the control of the Arkansas and White Rivers as head of the southwestern division. He had that work actively under way when the threatening international situation occasioned his call to Washington to assume direction of the Army's Service of Supply, with the rank of brigadier general.

It was only 2 months before the actual outbreak of hostilities that General Reybold stepped up to the post of Chief of Engineers, as major general, and it must have taken but a short time for him to realize the magnitude of the responsibilities he had inherited. The Engineer Department then had under way a comprehensive program of navigation, flood-control, and power projects in the areas where booming war industries were leading the way in our preparations for national defense. Not the least of the responsibilities confronting the new Chief was providing for a continuation of the planning for these vital civil works, certain to be needed to cushion our transition from wartime to post wartime economy. As a result, there is now in the blueprint stage a considerable supply of worthy projects ready to absorb a substantial part of the equipment and manpower displaced in the process of our adjustment to a peacetime basis.

Before General Reybold had been in office 3 months the war was on and army construction of all kinds, from seacoast fortifications and munitions plants to airfields, supply depots and troop camps, was centralized under the control of the Corps of Engineers. Later came the necessity for extending these activities all over the world and the need for mobilizing the entire American engineering potential to push them through. With all available machinery and skilled personnel to assemble a competent staff to to select and organize; with docks, barracks, roads, bridges, canals, tracks, and pipe lines to build; beachheads to consolidate and mine fields to clear, there was neither time nor opportunity to observe the niceties of economic balance between expenditures and accomplishments. Dead lines had to be met; lives meant more than dollars, and the Army engineers assumed the responsibility, met the dead lines and absorbed the inevitable criticism in their unfaltering stride.

Many American heroes risked and lost their lives in bringing the war to a successful conclusion, but the incontrovertible fact is that this was a technician's war and we won it largely because we were better technicians than our adversaries. Statistics will show that we won it without the blind, wholesale suicidal sacrifice of fighting men that characterized the totalitarian way of waging war. Statistics will never suffice, however, to record the innumerable technical achievement of the Army engineers that helped so much to minimize the loss of life among our combat troops. And the leader in planning, organizing, and carrying out these operations was General Reybold. He is entitled to the gratitude of the Nation for a complex, difficult, and vital job well done.

Oscar S. Cox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith an editorial from the New York Times of October 6, 1945, being a justly deserved tribute to Oscar S. Cox, who has served the Government ably for the past 7 years:

YOUNG MAN IN WASHINGTON

In the resignation of Oscar S. Cox as Deputy Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, which takes effect today, the Government loses another of the able young men with whom President Roosevelt surrounded himself. Less well known than some of the others, Mr. Cox was one of the ablest. It was he who dug up the 1892 statute permitting the Government to lease munitions of war to other countries. On this was based the famous H. R. 1776, the Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. Cox joined the Roosevelt administration in 1938 as an assistant to Treasury Counsel Oliphant after a successful career as an assistant corporation counsel of New York City. In the latter post he directed investigations that added $200,000,000 to utility company property assessments in New York City. In Washington he moved from the Treasury to the Office of Production Management, then to the Lend-Lease Administration as general counsel, to the Justice Department as Assistant Solicitor General, and finally to his last position as Deputy Administrator of FEA. He served well in all of them. His liberal ideas and his persuasive voice will be missed in Washington.

The Truth About the Coffee Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, some of these days the American people are going to want to know who is to blame for the coffee shortage, for an inferior grade of coffee, and so forth, and in order to keep the record straight, they should be told now that the present policy of the Office of Price Administration and other Government agencies is heading us for a coffee shortage. These glib bureaucrats, when the shortage comes, will have their

alibis and they will want to blame somebody else for their mistakes. I suppose they will even suggest that Congress has had something to do with this.

The present policy of OPA and probably some of its kindred agencies, is not only going to make the American people do without coffee, but it is going to close a lot of our coffee companies in this country, throw the people who are employed by them out of a job, and otherwise do no good to anyone. Such a happy program is, of course, characteristic of the average bureau and bureaucrat, although we do find exceptions where these Government agencies are run for the benefit of the people and not to their detriment. Not so with the case of coffee. The following statement is reprinted from the Tea and Coffee Trade Journal for October 1945, and tells its own story:

MUST WE HAVE ANOTHER COFFEE SHORTAGE?—THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THEIR ACCREDITED REPRESENTATIVES ARE ENTITLED TO HEAR THE TRUTH ABOUT COFFEE BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

As this is written it is absolutely impossible to purchase a single bag of coffee in any of the producing countries at United States ceiling prices. If OPA regulations continue no coffee will be available for United States consumption. We might be able to get along without coffee, but how about that wonderful good-neighbor policy we so eagerly seek?

European nations, including Great Britain and Canada, have purchased upwards of a million bags of good coffee during the past 6 weeks, at prices ranging from 10 to 20 percent above the ceilings which OPA established in 1941. And what is more, while these foreign buyers received the better quality coffee we in the United States received the poorer grades, and now even the poorer grades are unobtainable. New importations have stopped.

There is a little more than 3 months' supply of coffee in United States right now, but most of it is of the poorer grades, and the cool months of our heaviest consuming season are rapidly approaching.

WHO WILL BE BLAMED?

If the coffee served in our homes and restaurants grows steadily poorer in quality?

If coffee has to be heavily rationed?

If wide unemployment and failures occur among coffee roasters, importers, and jobbers?

If 100,000,000 Latin American people resent our dictatorial attitude regarding their principal business?

In that event, the blame must be placed directly where it belongs, in the lap of the present administration.

We now consume almost twenty million bags of coffee annually and in view of the fact that we grow none, how can we hope to successfully dictate the international market prices for the coffee produced by at least 14 of our neighbor nations?

The coffee industry is so highly competitive that consumer prices are sure to remain reasonable after the OPA regulations are eliminated and forgotten. The prices will quickly adjust themselves to the lowest possible level if the basic economic factors are permitted to function freely—factors such as cost of production, transportation, distribution, roasting and lastly a reasonable profit.

Clinton P. Anderson was appointed Secretary of Agriculture because he aggressively sought the truth about this country's food situation. Since coffee is not grown in United States it was not made the subject of those public hearings and debate. Unfortunately, the truth about coffee seems to have been a secret deeply guarded from the American public.

Congress should promptly undertake a thorough investigation of the whole coffee problem, as part of its duty to the American people and to our Latin-American neighbors. When the facts are known, there should be no question as to the necessity of an immediate remedy.

Now that the war is over, it is our opinion that we should immediately do away with ceilings and all restrictions and allow the law of supply and demand to take care of the situation.

The undersigned, on their own initiative and at their own expense, take this means of bringing to the attention of the public and of our governing officials what we deem to be a situation of vital concern to the entire Nation. We believe the opinions expressed meet with the approval of the entire coffee industry.

ANGUS MACKEY & CO.,
Coffee Brokers and Agents,
New York, N. Y.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that it is suggested that Congress should promptly undertake a thorough investigation of the whole coffee problem. It will take more, in my opinion, than an investigation to relieve conditions. We will have to get rid of OPA or any other agency that is failing to exercise common sense in connection with this situation. There appears to me to be no real reason for a coffee shortage if businesslike methods and a practical approach to this question is followed.

A Century of Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1833 Frederic Ozanam organized a brotherhood of Catholic companions which he dedicated to the practice of charity and the service of the poor under the title of Society of St. Vincent de Paul. This was in Paris, France. Following this, charitable conferences were organized in the Old World. It was not long before America learned of the outstanding accomplishments of this new organization. It was on November 14, 1845, that the Honorable Bryan Mullanphy with some associates and with proper ecclesiastical sanction organized the first conference of the Society in the United States at the Old Cathedral in St. Louis. One hundred years have passed since that time, and other conferences or branches can be found throughout the entire United States.

In July 1945, his excellency, the Most Reverend John Joseph Glennon, S. T. D., Archbishop of St. Louis, addressed the following letter to the clergy and laity of the Archdiocese of St. Louis:

The honor of observing the centennial of the establishment of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in the United States has been accorded the city of St. Louis. It was here at the Old Cathedral that the first American Vincentian group was organized in 1845. The commemoration of this event will be held September 28, 29, 30, and October 1.

This worthy Society deserves well of us all because it has throughout the years maintained and exhibited the spirit of true Christian charity, having no political, social, or financial aspirations, but instead the members thereof seek the poor, the sick, and the errant in the streets, alleys, and slums, or wherever they may be, freely extend to them the help needed, try to restore them to health and if death comes have them a requiem chanted and a last resting place in consecrated ground.

In a world teeming with discord and strife, the highest brotherhood that man can offer is to enforce their wills upon others by the sword. Wouldn't it be in order to revert to that peace which is based on the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God—a brotherhood attainable only in the fostering of Christian charity? The St. Vincent de Paul Society appeals to you to help in securing that peace and brotherhood which we desire and which is expressed in the exercise of Christian charity.

As a result of this letter the centennial observance of the founding of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in America was arranged. It was a dramatic religious demonstration in the city of the founding of the Society's first conference in this country. People in all walks of life participated in this demonstration.

A brief history of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul was prepared by the Right Reverend Mark K. Carroll. I quote from Monsignor Carroll's paper:

THE FOUNDING OF THE SOCIETY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL

The Society of St. Vincent de Paul was founded in Paris, France, in May 1833, by Antoine Frederic Ozanam, a brilliant youthful lawyer, historian, and social philosopher. Dark days had fallen on France. The Revolution, the downfall of Napoleon, the "July days" of 1830, which gave France its citizen king in Louis Phillippe—these political changes brought in their wake tremendous upheavals in the religious and social order—even greater was the change in minds of French citizens. Voltaire and his ilk had scattered far and wide the seeds of rationalism and atheism and the irreligious of that day had proclaimed the death of Christianity. Skepticism and a contempt for the old moral order were firmly entrenched in all the schools, particularly in the Sorbonne University, founded by St. Louis IX.

It was the constant taunts of professors and students that disturbed deeply young Frederic Ozanam, both at the Sorbonne and the Ecole de Droit, where he had studied law. In a dispute with an atheistic student, Ozanam heard this challenge: "We admit your church was all you claim it to be, but its day is gone. It is an effete and powerless agent in the hands of humanity. You Catholics who boast of a Catholic faith, show us your works." This slur made Ozanam resolve to make his own faith practical in administering to the wants of the poor. With this high resolve, he gathered about him seven student companions and formulated plans for an association of charity, first to strengthen the members themselves in piety, then by deeds to give the lie to the unbelievers who had stated that there was no difference between a Christian and an infidel.

The name and spirit and purpose of the youthful organization of charity, a Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, was readily suggested by another distinguished son of France who two centuries before had confounded the world with his amazing and transforming confraternities of charity. This courier of charity was the great St. Vincent de Paul who as early as 1618 devoted himself to the needy and afflicted of his parish at Clichy, near Paris. The first confraternity of charity was made up of pious

women who by grace and nature seemed best fitted for the menial tasks of helping the sick and the poor in their homes. These women became later the Daughters of Charity, now the largest order of Catholic Sisters in the world. Soon after Vincent de Paul formed conferences of men to aid the poor of his parish by means of spiritual and material assistance; then to overcome the deplorable ignorance of the peasantry he established missions for their relief, thus beginning a religious order of men, the Congregation of the Mission, or as they are popularly known today, the Vincentians.

St. Vincent de Paul is unquestionably the father of Catholic charities as we know them today. It was his conferences of men and women which collected and distributed the necessities of life to the teeming poor of Paris and its environs. It was Vincent de Paul's zeal, courage, and principles which quickened Catholic organized charities throughout the world; and the Saint's wise rules and counsels have governed Ozanam's Society since its foundation. At the same time posterity can evaluate the saintly character and life of Frederic Ozanam who, at the tender age of 20, founded one of the best known and most universal societies in the Catholic Church.

Ozanam was an able defender of the faith and bested in daily disputes the rationalistic professors and students at the Sorbonne and the Ecole de Droit. Had Ozanam lived (he died at 40) his fame as an historian and apologist would have assured his place in the immortal annals of men. But Frederic Ozanam is remembered—and shall be remembered—not as historian or lawyer but for his Christ-like charity. Solving the problem of his day, he translated into other youthful hearts the ardent love of truth and charity which inflamed his own soul. Ozanam, a layman, ably demonstrated to the world that the blessed complement of faith is works of charity, realizing that God's best blessings come to a man through the blessings of the poor.

THE FIRST ST. VINCENT DE PAUL CONFERENCE IN THE UNITED STATES

Twelve years after the founding of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul at Paris, France, by Frederic Ozanam, its Christ-like work was introduced at St. Louis, Mo., by a prominent layman, Bryan Mullanphy, in 1845. This was the first conference of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul in the United States. The name of Mullanphy needs no introduction to the people of St. Louis. John Mullanphy, father of Bryan, was Missouri's first millionaire. At his death in 1833, John Mullanphy, lauded as the noblest Catholic of St. Louis, and no one of any creed or nationality was more prominent in laying the foundations of the city. The Catholic paper, Shepherd of the Valley, stated: "In his death the orphan and the afflicted have lost a most liberal benefactor." The Mullanphys were a distinguished pioneer family, deeply religious, and most generous to the Catholic Church and to its varied charities. Many monuments to the sick, the indigent, the orphan, donated by this family graced St. Louis a hundred years ago. Bryan Mullanphy himself must have been held in the highest esteem by the citizens of this community for he was elected judge of the circuit court, then mayor of St. Louis in 1847.

The introduction of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul at St. Louis was in this wise: Born to wealth, Bryan Mullanphy was educated in the best schools of this country. Later he went abroad and attended the Sorbonne University in Paris to pursue higher studies. There he apparently met Frederic Ozanam and was enamored not only with the saintly character of Ozanam but with the fruitful activities of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in and about Paris. Mullanphy thought of his native city of St. Louis, the imperative need of this type of charity at home, and resolved that upon his return he would establish a branch of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in St. Louis, only recently a part of France in the New World, a city French in foundation, French in name, and French in its culture.

Accordingly, in November 1845, Bryan Mullanphy called together a group of the prominent Catholic laymen of St. Louis and in the schoolhouse attached to the Cathedral Church—a building subsequently destroyed in the fire of 1849—established the first conference of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, a most interesting letter was received in connection with this celebration, written and signed by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII. It follows:

To our venerable brother, JOHN GLENNON, Archbishop of St. Louis:

The centenary celebrations of the foundation of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, which from its pioneer beginnings in the Archdiocese of St. Louis has spread so felicitously throughout the length and breadth of your great country, affords Us a most welcome opportunity to extend to you, venerable brother, and to the members of the American hierarchy, of the Clergy and of the Society united with you on this occasion, Our heartfelt and paternal congratulations on the most consoling fruits that have been reaped so abundantly in the vast field of charitable endeavor which has characterized the virile growth of the Catholic Church in your land during the past century.

We are well aware of the important part played in the accomplishment of these happy results by the first organizers of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in the early days of your great Archdiocese and in other parts of America. We know, too, how with the passing of the years and ever growing needs of the Catholic population the members of the Society, worthy successors of their elder brethren, not only continued their splendid self-sacrificing labors, but extended ever more widely the sphere of their activities until the Society embraced in its efforts almost every form of Catholic charitable and social effort.

Your Archdiocese is justly proud that within its territory were laid the foundations of this truly Apostolic work, erected on the unchanging inspirations of faith and love of God in the service of the poor and the unfortunate. Hence, it is indeed fitting that St. Louis should be the gathering place of that worthy assembly which, while thanking God for the golden harvest of the past century that has brought new glory to the name of Christian charity and to the Church in America, will consider the ways and means of advancing to yet greater accomplishments in the years to come on behalf of those who, by the very reason of their suffering, misfortune and want, are the more dear to the sacred heart of our Savior.

It is then from the fullness of Our paternal heart, venerable brother, that We lovingly impart to you, to the members of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and to all bishops, clergy, and laity participating in the centenary celebrations, Our special Apostolic Benediction as a pledge of bountiful divine assistance.

From the Vatican, August 18, 1945:

PIUS PP. XII.

The President of the United States recognized this outstanding charitable organization and addressed a letter to Mr. George J. Gillespie, president of the Superior Council of the United States, Society of St. Vincent de Paul. The President's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 20, 1945.

DEAR MR. GILLESPIE: I have great pleasure in extending to you and through you to all members of a noble organization throughout the Nation my hearty felicitations and warmest personal greetings on the noteworthy occasion of the centenary of the establishment of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in the United States. It is a matter of special felicitation that this great work in behalf of the poor should have had its beginning in the United States in the Old Cathedral in St. Louis where the first American Vincentian group was organized in 1845.

In the 10 decades that have elapsed since that far-away year which saw the beginning of this great work in behalf of the poor of St. Louis, the wheel has come full circle. In every community throughout the land today the Vincentians are bringing hope and happiness, through the charity of Christ, to the poor and to all who are heavy laden. Best of all they dedicate themselves to the relief of man's estate without distinction of creed or color.

We have seen in these latter days too great a tendency toward what is sometimes coldly described as the scientific approach to the problems of poverty. Thank God that the spirit of the Vincentian is the spirit of Christianity—the spirit of Him who said that when we minister unto the least of His brethren, we minister also unto Him.

It is a particularly happy circumstance that now for more than 40 years the destinies of the Archdiocese of St. Louis have been directed by a great and good prelate who is himself the embodiment of the Vincentian spirit. Archbishop Glennon is a worthy successor in a long line of Chief Pastors—a happy combination of learning, eloquence, apostolic zeal, and true charity. I send him an affectionate greeting.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Leaders of Catholic charities from all over the country accepted the invitation of Archbishop Glennon and joined with the clergy and laymen of the Middle West in the celebration. This event will be inscribed in the history of the city which I have the honor to partly represent.

In Defense of General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters from fathers, mothers, wives, sweethearts, and citizens, in defense of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I have also received a number of letters protesting against the statements of the acting head of the State Department for his criticism of General MacArthur concerning the number of men needed to police Japan. In my opinion, the editorial from the South Buffalo News of September 27, 1945, a small weekly paper, is the best I have heard or read in defense of General MacArthur and it covers the situation completely. I would like those of whom I speak to place their confidence in Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The editorial follows:

CONFIDENCE IN MAC ARTHUR

We put great confidence in the judgment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. A more competent commander or an abler military administrator has not emerged

from this or any other war. His recent statement, indicating that within 6 months no more than 200,000 men may be needed for the occupation of Japan seems to have aroused the resentment, and possibly the jealousy, of Dean Acheson, acting head of the State Department, who implied that MacArthur has been interfering with our Nation's policy in Japan.

It is true, of course, that the State Department dictates foreign policy and MacArthur implements it within the area and province of his authority. But we submit that no one knows the military situation in Japan better than he, and its police requirements certainly is a matter for the military to decide. General MacArthur is the man on the ground. His sources of information regarding conditions in Japan are superior to those of anyone in or out of the State Department. He may be in error today as to the size of the Army of occupation 6 months hence, just as he was a few weeks ago when he put the number of men needed at 500,000. But it is encouraging to hear that he is scaling down the number and things may be going so smoothly that a little later he may again cut his estimate.

As a matter of fact no great standing Army is required to keep order in Japan. The Japs are prisoners on their home islands. A great Navy hems them in. Destitute of the materials that go into war production they have no shipping of their own and can import nothing contraband under the watchful eyes of our naval commanders. Our carrier-based planes could quell any uprising, and if they were insufficient an atomic bomb or two would do the trick in short order.

In these circumstances it does not appear that a large standing Army would seem to be necessary, and we cannot understand why anybody should take umbrage at MacArthur for indicating as much.

Of course, the prime purpose of MacArthur is not to get the boys back home, but to complete the defeat of Japan. However, there is absolutely no reason whatever why a single GI should be kept where he is no longer needed a day longer than necessary. And General MacArthur's implied promise of demobilizing his surplus troops and returning them to their homes is glorious news not only to the men themselves, but to all in this country to whom they are near and dear.

Aid to War Sufferers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I return from 5 weeks in liberated Europe convinced that the most pressing issues presently before the Congress have to do with making immediately effective the national policy of giving aid to war sufferers so that they may be brought back to health and strength and may again start normal productive life.

My independent visit to north Africa, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Germany, France, and England gave me an opportunity to see on the ground the degree of destruction and the danger of anarchy. The United Nations have won the military struggle. The enemy has been defeated. But we face just as important, just as difficult a task in seeing to it that our allies are given the opportunity which they have won, at so great a cost, to become again free from want as well as from fear.

Traveling, which by the way was at no expense to our Government or any other agency, I was not content to visit only the capitals of our Allies. I was given the opportunity to tour the rural areas, the smaller cities, to visit the villages and the homes where the need is greatest and where the relief work is proceeding. I traveled by command car several hundred miles through the mountainous areas and the burned villages in Greece, over the main highway of that country, which today is in such poor condition that no county in the United States would tolerate it even as a third-class road. I wandered through the burned villages, in which thousands of people still live under indescribably meager conditions. I flew into the recesses of the old Montenegrin Kingdom to witness personally the havoc of repeated bombings and I saw how appallingly difficult is the task of the government and the United Nations to get even a minimum amount of life-giving supplies to the people whose whole basis of life has been destroyed by the enemy as well as their allies in obtaining liberation for them. I drove the entire distance from Naples to the Swiss border over the area that Gen. Mark Clark's men took at such heavy cost, leaving behind them impossible highways, completely destroyed railroads, blown bridges, and cities and villages in total or heavy destruction.

I have talked with the Pope in Rome and with the Regent of Greece, with the chief officials of all the governments in all the countries we visited, with military leaders, our own and our Allies, and with hundreds of little men and women who have borne the burden of war and whom we are pledged to help to a new day of opportunity and freedom.

I say we are pledged to help them. As a Nation, our administration has pledged us to help these people, and by passing the appropriation through this Congress, this Congress has pledged itself to this task. I say to you, these people are desperately in need of help. We have begun to send them relief through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. It is a good beginning. I am not unmindful of the criticisms that have been hurled against this organization. I freely confess that it has made mistakes. It is an institution of great magnitude and it is difficult to fit together the peoples of these many nations all working on a different wage scale. Supplies are flowing generally in a volume that increases each month. Under the principle of the United Nations, they are being distributed by the governments insofar as transport is available and can get them to the people.

Wherever I went the hopes of the people in war-ravaged, drought-stricken lands—and in addition to war, southern Europe has suffered excessive drought—were fixed on the past record and future prospect of aid from the United Nations and especially from the United States.

There may be many people in the United States who are not aware of the position our Nation occupies today among the nations of the world. Whether we want it or not, the United States of America possesses the leadership of all the nations of the world. Wherever I went, there was expressed by peasants and officials the most profound gratitude for the life-giving assistance from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and for the predominant part that the United States plays in that aid.

I should not want to deny that there are some places where the line must be drawn between the peoples themselves and the attitude of their government. The peoples of these distressed lands are looking to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for help in this dark period of their life. I readily accept the fact that even in the capacity of the leading nation of the world, we cannot assume the responsibility for the welfare of all the other peoples of the globe. Whatever we may do in their behalf we must serve notice on them that it is of short duration. We are concerned to carry them through this first bad winter and we assume no particular further responsibility beyond that. By that process we will impress upon them the fact that they must be responsible for themselves and set to work at their own task of rehabilitation and wanting to live.

In all appropriations that are made by the Congress, I believe there should be specific limitations made as to dates.

Contrary to what has frequently been said, I found the staff of UNRRA to be truly representative of the United Nations ideal in practical operation. Its achievements in the face of great difficulties are impressive, joined together from the many countries, inspired by public service and helpfulness that work in harmony.

I have referred to the almost complete break-down of transport. Communications are either lacking or very slow. The devoted members of the international staff live and work under rugged conditions. They are straining every nerve to reach quickly the goal before them and the governments of the liberated lands—reestablishment of normal life and production and resumption of peacetime progress.

There are some who will criticize the work of UNRRA. There are some who claim it should be turned over to other agencies. There can be no denying the fact that in the beginning the Army rendered great service to these people. The Army is being liquidated. They do not want this responsibility. Arrangements have been completed in many instances to turn the work over to UNRRA, and in some cases where the installations will remain, such as in areas of occupation, they are working in close collaboration and cooperation.

In short, I found that the United Nations' first postwar venture—the rescue of the perishing and the aiding of self-reliant peoples to help themselves—is going ahead with accelerated speed, now having overcome the numerous obstacles presented by the priorities of

winning a war which precluded adequate shipping of supplies during the months immediately preceding VE-day and VJ-day. For myself, I am convinced that no other means of doing what needs to be done in the shortest possible time is at hand. I feel sure that when the facts regarding the perilous conditions of our allies are known to the Congress, there will be the required speedy action to provide the needed funds for this work, and that this Government will not only supply funds for this work, and that the Government will not only supply the goods but will provide more of the experienced, capable and devoted personnel that it should provide to make the American share of the management of this vast enterprise commensurate with the size of the American investment in it.

Slow action in providing United States funds for the relief program will mean that the level of supply will fall off in the most critical times—the dead of the grim winter that is ahead for liberated Europe. This winter will be the crucial period. At best, regardless of how much we can do jointly as United Nations, thousands will die for lack of food, shelter, and heat.

It would seem to me that we are confronted with a practical question. We must choose the facilities of UNRRA to do this job. Any alternative means that we must return the Army to the task. There is no time to waste. The situation balances on a knife edge. Reduction in the volume of aid asked or tardiness in supplying it is almost certain to tip the scales on the side of chaos and anarchy, and to create a situation which will necessitate keeping more of our boys in Europe for a longer time than anyone wishes. It is the part of wisdom and the part of humanity and the part of common sense to act generously, and to act immediately on the provision of our country's contribution to the relief of those peoples whose suffering the past several years has reduced them to a state where they can no longer "take it."

Are Our Veterans Getting a Square Deal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since this country entered the war in 1941, and even prior to that time, the Congress has enacted many laws designed to benefit servicemen and their families and dependents. We have tried to guarantee, under the Selective Training and Service Act, that returning veterans shall be entitled to the jobs they were forced to give up when they entered the service. We have increased their compensation, added to dependency benefits, granted special income-tax exemptions, and tried to show a grateful Nation's appreciation for loyal and patriotic service in many other ways.

Congress, in 1944, passed the so-called GI bill of rights, and only last July the House of Representatives approved a measure to liberalize that act. I am sure that as additional amendments to the GI bill are found necessary the Congress will make the changes that are required. After all, this law is an entirely new departure in legislation, and it is bound to be faulty in some respects, no matter how liberally it may be interpreted and administered.

Now, it is a well-known fact that the Congress does not and cannot administer the laws which it enacts. This job must be done by the executive agencies of the Government. We are also aware of the fact that too many times the job is not well done and that the peculiar interpretations placed on public laws are a far cry from the original intent of Congress.

One glaring example of this misinterpretation and maladministration of a law enacted by the Congress is the present operation of the Surplus Disposal Act. I have been under the impression that when this law was passed it was designed to insure preferential treatment for veterans who desired to purchase surplus Government property in order that they might go into business for themselves or reestablish a business or profession which they had been forced to leave when they entered the service of their country.

However, I continue to receive an increasing number of complaints from exservicemen who are having extraordinary difficulties in their attempts to obtain surplus Government property. For example, I should like to call attention to a communication which I have just received from a young naval officer who expects to be released from active duty in the near future. His letter follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1945.

Hon. J. Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My discharge from the Navy is expected very shortly and, having heard from many sources that the Government is anxious to help veterans get started in their own business, I contacted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with reference to a contract for the sale of surplus electronic equipment. I was informed that my application could not be considered, as only manufacturers were allowed to hold these contracts. This policy constitutes the rankest sort of discrimination against the veteran who is trying to get started in his own business. Having been in the Navy the last 3½ years, I have had no opportunity to be a manufacturer and, therefore, I am excluded.

The present distribution policy tends to create and maintain a monopoly for eastern and midwestern manufacturers who have made an estimated 95 percent of wartime electronic products. These same manufacturers now have the opportunity of extending this monopoly to the sale of surplus equipment.

My plan is to organize a corporation with offices and shops in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle. This territory could be expanded later, if desired. We will have personnel qualified to handle reconditioning, modifications, and sales. This personnel will be obtained largely from veterans of the armed forces. Ample financing is available.

The adoption of the above plan of distribution will not only tend to destroy existing monopolies, but will create opportunities for the returning veteran.

My qualifications for handling this program are as follows:

(a) Degree in electrical engineering.

(b) Six years sales and sales management experience.

(c) Three and one-half years United States Navy education and experience in design, installation, maintenance, and operation of electronic equipment.

I am not asking for any preference or favors because of my military service. All I ask is a chance to compete with the established manufacturers on an equal basis.

Your assistance in working out this problem will be greatly appreciated. I will telephone your office to request an appointment to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

JACK W. JONES.
Lieutenant, U. S. N. R.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this young man calls on me, I am going to do everything I can to help him obtain the equipment he desires. Not because he is Jack Jones, a naval lieutenant, but because he symbolizes the veteran who is trying to find for himself the niche in civilian life to which every returning serviceman is justly entitled.

What is wrong. If the Surplus Property Disposal Act is at fault, let us change it. If the administration is faulty, let us raise merry Ned until it is corrected. There are lots of things we can do, but we cannot sit idly by and permit this sort of discrimination to continue.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in including the following address by Harrison S. Robinson with reference to the Central Valley project in California:

WHY THE STATE SHOULD ADMINISTER THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

(By Harrison S. Robinson, president, California State Chamber of Commerce)

The Central Valley project in California was brought into being by the long cycle of dry years in the 1920's. In Tulare, Kern, and King Counties thousands of acres of farms were abandoned. Lowering water tables threatened other acreages. The legislature appropriated money for a survey of the State's water resources. In 1924 the funds for this project ran short, and the State chamber raised about $100,000 of supplemental moneys by private subscription. The legislature afterward repaid this money. A State water plan was developed by the State engineer, then and in subsequent years, which contained most of the elements which now make up the Central Valley project.

RECLAMATION BUREAU ENTERS PROJECT

In 1933, $170,000,000 of State revenue bonds were authorized to finance the project. They could not be sold in the depth of the depression. Federal funds to start construction were allocated from a Federal emergency relief appropriation in 1935. Later in the same year the project was approved as a United States Bureau of Reclamation project. Its completed cost for all

purposes—aid to navigation, flood control, irrigation, salinity control in the delta, hydroelectric power—is now estimated at $360,000,000. The reasons for the increased cost are a higher Shasta Dam, more power facilities, and the rising cost of labor and materials.

In 1936, the then chief engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation state at a Senate committee hearing that the funds which Congress would appropriate for the Central Valley project would be repaid in accordance with the reclamation laws (i. e., 40 annual payments) by contract with the State constituted water authority.

STATE EXCLUDED FROM PROJECT

References to mutuality of Federal and State operation were not dropped until the 1942 hearings. Only then was an intention evidenced by the Bureau of Reclamation to remove the State from the Central Valley picture.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES INVOLVED

The Central Valley project potentially is more than a plan for irrigation, flood, and salinity control, navigation, and the generation of electric power. Wrapped up in the same package is the power greatly to influence, sometimes to determine, where and how large numbers of the inhabitants of the great valleys of California shall live, and whether business therein shall be privately or publicly owned and privately or publicly operated; as well as the power to influence, if not to determine, who shall be the owners of those agricultural lands in the valleys, the usefulness of which depends on irrigation.

These are the types of social and economic issues upon which men's minds will often be focused as the years ahead of us unfold.

THE PATTERN OF FEDERAL REGIONAL OPERATIONS

It would be blindness not to see the developing pattern of Federal regional operations where great sums of Federal money have been put into flood control, irrigation, and power projects. It is the setting up of a Federal bureau as the richest and most powerful entity in the region. Once in the saddle and fully under way, it is the very nature of tremendous centralized power to become autnoritarian, whether that power resides in the management of a private or a public corporation. This is particularly the case where the wielders of such centralized power are fairly well insulated from effective supervision or criticism. In the Federal regional set-ups they are so insulated, unless the Administrator himself wills otherwise.

It requires little imagination to foresee the Administrator of a future Central Valley Authority using his position and power to override the social and economic views of a majority of the citizens of California.

POPULAR CONSENT BEING AVOIDED

The people of a commonwealth are entitled to change their social and economic systems. It has been done many times, and it will be done again and again. But if such changes are to be made in a democratic country, they should be by popular consent.

That means that the proponents of social and economic change candidly state their purposes; that all the material facts of the case are brought out into the open; that there is full discussion of the issues, and that the final decision is made by the constitutional expression of the will of a clear majority of the citizens.

A sample of this procedure occurred last July when the Labor Party in Great Britain asked the voters for approval of its program to nationalize the Bank of England, the coal mines, electric power, means of inland transport, and the steel industry. They got it. Their spokesmen say that this program represents the first step, and that later on, if the voters still support them, the party will go on to nationalize other industries and to establish public ownership of the land. They say, however, that there will be no confiscation; that they propose to pay market value for property so acquired by the Nation; that they are opposed to any attempt to injure the savings of the "little man."

One does not have to be a Socialist to describe these procedures as impeccable in terms of good conduct under and in accordance with the laws and customs of Great Britain.

In the United States, however, too many of the proponents of basic economic change are either confused or uncandid. They declare that they are striving to preserve capitalism and to strengthen the private enterprise system, at the very times when they advocate or actually take steps that are part and parcel of the program of socialism. They are to be blamed, not for wanting socialism but for being either stupid or deceitful about what they want.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

"The private ownership of the means of production is capitalism. The public ownership of the means of production is socialism." This definition ought to be correct, because I quote it from an article by Harold J. Laski, chairman of the executive committee of the British Labor Party, published on August 26, 1945.

The United States has long had small segments of socialism in its economic system. Great Britain is apparently about to find out whether a definitely socialistic state can also be a democratic state. Today, no one knows for certain.

In our own country, it is well known that plans have been worked out, not only in general terms but in much detail, for setting up a number of regional units, the total of which would include all the territory of continental United States, the pattern and administration of which would, initially at least, follow those of TVA.

WHY WAS TVA?

In fact, the pattern and precedent of all regional plans is TVA. And why was TVA? Principally to introduce manufacturing and improved agriculture, concurrently with improved health and education, into the most backward region in our country. In brief, to attempt to raise the often deplorably low standard of living of the region.

Because seven States were involved, the plan of a Federal administrative set-up was developed, using the familiar formula of improving navigation and providing flood control. In this particular case, there was also in being a federally owned nitrate plant built during World War I.

WHY NATIONALIZE CALIFORNIA'S VALLEYS?

One of the supporting arguments for such regional plans is that the country should be divided for purposes of administration and development into logical regional units. Well, the valleys of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin, and their rivers, form a logical regional unit without crossing any State line whatsoever and without need or excuse for setting up a Federal regional set-up.

The Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys are not backward areas, menacing the Nation with unhealthy and illiterate inhabitants. Nor are the people uninformed as to how to farm. Nor are they lacking in industrial development where there was any justification for it. As to electric power, the valleys are well supplied and the rates, fixed by Government itself, are favorable to the consumer.

Why, then, the fever to start a "nationalization" of these valleys? Why attempt to proceed toward nationalization just for its own sake, when other justification is so meager?

At least a part of the answer is that it is the law of the life of Federal bureaus to strive for more and more power; that some earnest, eager people have no idea where they are really going, and that others seek to bring about a socialist state, not with candor and by above-board means, as did the British Labor Party, but by sly device and indirection, a technique of which we have seen altogether too much in the Federal Government.

CHANGE MUST COME BY DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

If there are people in California, or if there are people in some community in our State, who want to take over certain means of production and have them publicly owned and operated, let them raise the issue as did the British Labor Party in last July. If the limit on farms in irrigated areas is to be 160 acres or 40 acres or 10 acres, let the change be effected by democratic procedures, and let the displaced owners be reasonably compensated. But let us not tolerate any Federal bureau using the powers and the money of the United States Government to lure or scheme our State into situations vitally affecting our social and economic structure without the approval of our citizens, given after the issues are clearly defined, openly debated, and regularly voted on.

CALIFORNIA MUST DIRECT THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

The principal reason for insisting that the irrigation and power phases of the Central Valley project shall be directed by California and not Washington is to make sure that issues affecting our social and economic system will be determined by the citizens of California through democratic processes, and not by the board of directors of a Federal Government corporation or by a proconsul from Washington.

Apart from the support of those who seek as a final objective the public ownership of the means of production, some of the most earnest support of Federal control of the irrigation and power phases of the Central Valley Project comes from those who hope to see the Federal Government spend hundreds of millions of dollars in the Central Valley and never get back more than a small part of it.

Someone in authority in the Bureau of Reclamation must have been conscious of the lure of spending what looks like somebody else's money when at a meeting in Sacramento recently its representatives waved before his audience another $570,000,000, making nearly one billion in all for the Central Valley project.

This action of the representative of the Bureau of Reclamation makes crystal clear that the possession of outstanding engineering skill (which the Bureau has) does not mean that the Bureau has basic economic good sense or is a good maker of public policy. California is vitally concerned with both of these factors in connection with the Central Valley project, and Washington is 3,000 geographical miles—and often 300,000 thought miles—away.

THE NATIONAL DEBT AND THE STANDARD OF LIVING

The national debt will soon top $300,000,000,000, or about $8,000 for each breadwinner in the Nation. Californians enjoy per capita incomes about 40 percent above the national average, and therefore with 6.6 percent of the Nation's population, this State contributes 10.4 percent of the Nation's internal revenue collections. We in California, therefore, are obligated for and will pay a proportionately larger share of this and any future debt which may be incurred for the purpose of raising living standards. We should have a greater interest than the people of any other State in the question of whether or not these Federal projects are a sound investment.

Remember that all these regional authorities are supposedly justified on the ground that they will help to create a better standard of living. There is a close relation between the national debt and the national standard of living. How close that relation is appears

on a consideration of the three ways by which the debt can be dealt with.

The national debt can be repudiated. Then everyone will go broke and standards of living will almost disappear. The national debt can be cancelled, wholly or in part, by inflation. Then all standards of living will go down, sometimes away down, because under inflation rarely, if ever, does the increase in people's incomes catch up with the increase in the cost of everything. On the other hand, the national debt can be reduced to reasonable proportions by adding nothing to it and by making substantial payments on the existing principal, and still the national standards of living can gradually be raised.

There is no way of raising standards of living that does not include working hard and paying one's bills. No desirable standard of living will long prevail unless integrity is a characteristic of a people who enjoy it. The integrity of a people is not handed down from Government bureaus. It comes from the grass roots or not at all.

WHY SURRENDER STATE CONTROL?

I suggest that the course of action of people with good common sense would be to get, as soon as possible, water from the $360,000,000 project onto the farm lands of the upper San Joaquin, which was the basic and compelling reason for the entire project; to make the highest use of the developed power; and then to get the feel of how things are going before starting to spend $527,000,000 on additional works in the Central Valley alone.

I suggest that such people would not be parties to spending Federal funds in any manner which they could not justify to a group of reasonable taxpayers.

Seeing a greater and greater picture, planning bigger and better—no wet blanket should be thrown over such vision and thinking and study. But men who must justify themselves and their works in a world of realities, wait to learn how an initial project works before doubling or trebling it.

No one is as much interested in the prosperity and the standard of living in the Central Valley as are the people and the Government of the State of California. Certainly in few, if any, parts of the world has so good a job been done in these respects as in California, and the job has been done in the democratic way. Honestly, we have not yet seen anyone who can do a better job and make it stick. There is no reason why the people of California and their Government should not continue at their appointed task, from the Sierras to the Pacific and from the Oregon line to the Mexican border.

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me at the convention of the Capital District, Kiwanis International, Richmond, Va. October 5, 1945:

We are gathered here tonight at a season of the year when all nature evidences its willingness to contribute to a program of peace and prosperity. A kind and gracious Providence has emptied into our laps the horn of plenty—the largest wheat crop in history, the second largest corn crop in history, while some 80,000,000 cattle roam our bluegrass hills and western plains. The English poet may well believe "What is so rare as a day in June," but he had never seen Highland County in October after the Midas hand of fall had touched the greenery of our mountainsides, and our sugar maples and gums were bidding farewell to summer in a riotous flame of color.

But what doth it profit a man for nature to proclaim a season of contentment if there be no contentment in his heart? And we all know we are now in a period of great discontent, both here and abroad. Sit behind the desk of any Member of Congress and open his morning mail, and you will better understand what I mean. Why don't you stop these strikes? Why don't you bring my boy home? Why don't you lift the crushing burden of wartime taxes? Why don't you abolish OPA so that a free citizen may be free in fact as well as in name? Why don't you make it possible for me to get more canning sugar? Why do you continue to send food abroad when we don't have enough at home? Why do you plan to lend billions to rehabilitate Great Britain, Russia, and others when our war debt already amounts to $262,000,000,000 and is going still higher?

The plain and unvarnished truth is that we are war-weary, we are tired, we are impatient. The people of the world are war-weary, and some with more cause than ourselves. In such an atmosphere representatives of five world powers met at the conference table in London to dispose of some vital preliminary questions prior to a peace conference and prior to the permanent organization of the United Nations Organization. Those delegates were war-weary, tired, and impatient. Minor differences were easily intensified and tempers were short. The British representative was offended when the Russian representative referred to the fact that previous conferences had been more successful because of the presence of Mr. Hull and Mr. Eden. The British representative is quoted as replying to that dig by saying that the proposal of the Russian representative to exclude France and China from consideration of the Balkan and eastern European issues was in the nature of a Hitler proposition. In white heat the Russian representative said he would leave the conference unless that remark were withdrawn.

"Boys flying kites haul in their white-winged birds;
You can't do that way when you're flying words."

The remark was withdrawn, but the damage had been done. And thus a conference so vital to future peace and prosperity broke up with nothing accomplished.

I am a charter member of the Lexington Kiwanis Club. I am proud to belong to a civic organization whose motto is "We build." In the postwar world what shall we build? Is it to be feudal castles built on the principle of every man for himself and the devil catch the hindmost? Is it to be a wall of isolationism around our country built on the principle of what happens abroad is no concern to us? Or is it to be a new era of good feeling built upon the principle of "Love thy neighbor as thyself," to the end that each and every one of us as individuals and as nations shall do unto others as we would have others do unto us? Through unity of Allied action, what at one time appeared to be an irresistible Axis war machine was crushed, and the war was won. Through the same type of unity the peace can be won. But peace can no more by won by signing a peace treaty than war can be won by a declaration of war. We have learned that war is indivisible and, hence, have frequently referred to World War II as a Global War. Peace likewise is indivisible. It will be a global peace or there will be no lasting peace. Peace and prosperity are handmaidens. After the Revolutionary War, Patrick Henry, pleading for a resumption of trade with Great Britain, predicted a period when the white wings of peace would be spread above our fair land and contentment lies down at every door. A peace without contentment will be but the prelude to another conflict. Hence, both here and abroad peace and prosperity must be our twin goals.

On the home front our immediate concern is prosperity. It is estimated that the national income will fall this year about $10,000,000,000 below that of last year and will continue to fall an additional $15,000,000,000 next year. Unemployment, that now totals about 2,000,000, is expected to rise for the next 5 or 6 months until it reaches a figure estimated by War Mobilizer Snyder of 8,000,000 persons. We will end the current fiscal year with a deficit of about $30,000,000,000. No one yet knows what the deficit of fiscal 1947 will be, but I predict there will be a deficit. Without any tax relief, tax revenue in the next calendar year will probably be $15,000,000,000 less than in the present calendar year, and the Congress is proposing, as an aid to reconversion, to reduce that amount by an additional $5,000,000,000. Our objective of an expanding economy that can be reflected in an increased standard of living will of necessity be controlled by the number gainfully employed, the wages they receive for that employment, their per-unit output, and the prices at which the goods can be purchased by the ultimate consumer.

Corporations now have liquid assets in excess of $40,000,000,000 which can go into the program of increased production. Consumers now have liquid assets in excess of $100,000,000,000 that can go into the purchase of goods and services. Business is anxious to produce because idle plants pay no profits. Consumers are anxious to buy because 4 years of war restrictions have left many unfilled needs. That leaves the question of wages and the question of per-unit production.

There is a close relationship between wages received by workers, the prices received for farm products, and the general level of national prosperity. Those familiar with that relationship favor good wages and good farm prices whether they represent an agricultural district, an industrial district, or one which combines the two. The present indications are that farm prices will go down because of production in excess of domestic requirements, while labor leaders are demanding that the wages in industry go up. It is highly essential that a happy medium between those two opposite trends be found if our domestic economy is not to be seriously dislocated.

The two major factors in per-unit production are the energy and skill of the worker and the tools with which he works. If the employer will furnish better tools and the employee will render the type of service of which he is capable the resulting per-unit production will enable higher wages to be paid without price increases. The threat of price increases is the most serious threat to full employment and an expanding economy. We already have price inflation. The issue, therefore, is how much more are we going to have? A so-called prosperity based upon price inflation involves serious dislocations, is of a temporary character, and will be followed by a period of deflation. A Virginia farmer once told me that the tendency of everything is to be more so. The tendency of inflation is more inflation. The tendency of deflation is more deflation. The best safeguard against price inflation is increased production.

In fighting the most terrible war of history we have incurred a tremendous debt. It is expressed in terms of dollars, but dollars are merely a medium of exchange. What our debt actually means is that the insatiable maw of war has consumed billions of dollars of our products, which is the only true wealth. The liquid assets in

the hands of consumers, to which I have referred, resulted to a large extent from the war spending of borrowed money, which in turn created a national debt of about $275,000,000,000, which is a first lien mortgage on all that we possess. Instead, therefore, of being made richer by war, we have been definitely made poorer. The only way that loss can be repaired is to produce more goods, which in turn means more work. "Seest thou a man diligent in his business?" said King Solomon, "He shall stand before kings." Lord Macaulay, in commenting on our Constitution soon after its adoption, predicted that the time would come when it would prove to be all sail and no anchor. That prediction was based upon the assumption that a democracy in which the will of the majority prevailed would be unwilling to make sacrifices. In the recent war we proved how wrong Lord Macaulay was. We have yet to prove that he is wrong with respect to postwar economic problems because never in our history have we faced economic problems of such magnitude, and never have we in our history had such powerful groups seeking selfish group advantage.

On the international front we are living in a new world—a world of jet planes, of rocket bombs that travel faster than sound, and of atomic bombs whose capacity for destruction is almost unlimited. Therefore, as Secretary of States Byrnes recently said: "Our international policies and our domestic policies are inseparable." I have referred to the reconversion of our domestic economy to a sound peacetime economy. Our second objective is to work out with our allies the reconstruction of world economy to achieve that world peace and prosperity without which we cannot hope to live free from the phantom of war.

If you agree with my premise that we can't have lasting peace without a healthy world economic system, you are under an obligation to accept either the proposed plans to reconstruct that economy, or else propose some better ones. Today millions in Europe face starvation. Their need is food and there is no alternative. Failure on the part of those able to help in that program will mean famine, anarchy, and chaos. We can't do that job alone, but when we ratified the San Francisco Charter we promised in that Charter "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom" among all nations agreeing to enter with us into that plan of international cooperation. The Congress will soon be called upon on behalf of the American people to make good on that promise in appropriating funds for the relief of the distressed in war-torn countries. We must not fail.

We have ratified the Bretton Woods Proposal for an international bank for reconstruction and development, and for an international monetary fund; we have joined the International Food and Agriculture Organization and the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization. While we, as a Christian nation, have felt that we were under a moral obligation to assist in the relief and rehabilitation of those who fought with us in behalf of a mutual freedom, we did not make those promises solely on philanthropic grounds. We know it is vital for our own well-being that the blasted and overrun countries be helped back to their feet.

We have promised our allies to join in the occupation of Germany and Japan and to cooperate with them in rendering those two aggressor nations impotent to start another war. If we immediately demobilize our Army and our Navy we cannot, of course, carry out that obligation.

In addition to spiritual and intellectual ties with Great Britain and the British Empire, we are not unmindful of the fact that in the prewar years Great Britain was our best customer, and that Canada, as our second best customer, purchased from us more than all the Latin-American countries combined. Great Britain incurred vast debts during the war in the purchase of supplies from her dominions and colonies. Those debts can be paid in only one of two ways, either in gold or with goods. Great Britain does not have the gold with which to pay nor its equivalent, which would be pound sterling. Therefore, she has frozen the pound sterling in the hands of that sterling bloc, which means that that money can be used only for the purchase of British goods. Great Britain now seeks from us a loan of dollars with which to pay off at least one-half of those debts. In addition to giving collateral for that loan and the payment of a reasonable rate of interest, Great Britain is willing to join with us in a program for the removal of trade restrictions. In prewar years we were exporting about 8 percent of our total production of movable goods, and over 3,000,000 American workers were dependent upon foreign trade for their employment. It is vital for us for that volume of foreign trade to be restored.

In my opinion, it would be helpful to prosperity here and to a lasting peace for us to give financial assistance in this emergency to Great Britain, and I feel the same way about Russia. I agree with President Truman who recently said:

"Any man who sees Europe now must realize that victory in a great war is not something that you win once and for all, like victory in a ball game. Victory in a great war is something that must be won and kept won. It can be lost after you have won it—if you are careless or negligent or indifferent."

The same thought was expressed by William Hard in the leading article of the September issue of the Reader's Digest.

Fifty nations united at San Francisco in the drafting of a Charter to preserve the future peace of the world. But it is not a self-executing instrument nor is it a perfect one. You can't step off a plane, as Chamberlain did upon his return from Munich, wave the Charter and declare now we have peace in our time. As a matter of fact, the result of the recent London Conference between the Five Powers who are to be permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations Organization was disturbing. They were unable to agree even upon a start on the road to a permanent and lasting peace. I fully endorse the stand taken by Secretary of State Byrnes at that conference in refusing to endorse a program he felt did violence both to the Atlantic Charter and to the principles embodied in the San Francisco Charter. Naturally, I have no way of knowing whether or not the Russian demands were prompted by a desire to surround the Soviet Union with enough buffer states under Soviet Union control to protect the Soviet Union from future aggression, on the assumption that the United Nations Organization would fail in that undertaking, or whether by a desire to secure trade advantages in Europe before the Economic Council of the United Nations Organization had an opportunity to function.

In any event, the situation that has developed is fraught with serious danger to our future peace as well as our future prosperity. Without a friendly and cooperative Russia, which now has the largest land army in the world, the United Nations Organization will have no better chance to successfully function than did the League of Nations without our cooperation. Before another international conference of the Allies is called we will have an opportunity to demonstrate to Russia and to the world whether or not we intend to live up to the commitments I have previously referred to. It is vital for the American people to understand the issues that confront us because, in my opinion, the Congress is going to reflect their will on the subject of international cooperation. At the moment we are the most powerful nation from a military standpoint in the world. God grant that we shall not rely upon force for our future protection.

"Thou comest unto me with a sword, and with a spear and with a shield," said David to Goliath, "but I come unto thee in the name of the Lord of Hosts."

There is a lot of selfishness in the world; there is a lot of brutality in the world. I can understand the barbaric conduct of the Japanese easier than I can that of the Germans—a Christian nation which was the first area in all of Europe to accept Christianity and which through the centuries has produced leaders in theology, in music, in literature, as well as in the sciences. A few weeks ago Dr. Warren Draper, formerly of the United States Public Health Service and now a major general in the United States Medical Corps, returned to Washington after 2 years of duty in Europe, during which he visited all of the concentration camps. At Buchenwald, said General Draper, one refinement of cruelty practiced by the Germans was to herd prisoners in a concrete basement room about 30 by 20 feet in size. Around the walls of that room were meat hooks. On one side of the room was an elevator that operated from a subbasement below to the incinerator above. In another part of the room was a trapdoor by which prisoners could be dropped about 10 feet to the subbasement concrete floor. When so dropped and stunned, two strong-armed ruffians would throw a rope around their necks and garrote them. The bodies were then placed on the elevator and sent to the holding room above where they would be hung by the necks on the meat hooks. If they showed any sign of life after being so hung up, they would be hit on the head with a club kept handy for that purpose. Then the dead bodies would be loaded again on the elevators and sent up to the incinerators.

Recently there returned to Washington the hero of Wake Island, Colonel Devereaux. He suffered torture for 3 years in Japanese prison camps but fortunately he survived. When Colonel Devereaux arrived home the birds were singing in Washington and the flowers were blooming in Washington, but not for him because he knew his beloved wife would not be there to greet him. He was greeted at the airport by his 11-year-old son, Paddy. After clasping him to his heart, father and son made their way to a little grave in Arlington Cemetery where Paddy's mother had been buried while Paddy's father was a Japanese prisoner. No one except Colonel Devereaux and his God knows the prayer that was in Colonel Devereaux's heart, but I can imagine that he said to the spirit of his departed wife, "I shall do my best to raise your boy as you would want him to be raised."

Yes, we build, and one of our building jobs is to make of this a better world in which Colonel Devereaux and all of the other 11,000,000 American men who have fought for our freedom may raise their children. There is a lot of darkness in the world, but not enough to put out the light of one candle. There are a lot of people in the world, but they are the children of Him who notes even the sparrow when it falls.

If we go out into a cloudless night and glance skyward, we observe the eternal stars and constellations; we call some of them by their name—Venus, Mars, Saturn, Jupiter, Neptune, the Pleiades, and the Milky Way. If there be no moon, we believe that the visible stars shed the light upon our pathway, and indeed they do, but astronomers who peer through remote spaces of the universe tell us that more than one-half of all the blended radiance of the skies that falls upon our pathway comes from stars we never see. They are invisible; they have no name on earth; they seem to have no place in heaven, yet they light us on our way. Thus, it is with human life and human destiny; a few persons may become bright particular

stars in the political, financial, social, or economic sky, but we all may be, if we will, a part of that invisible host of stars that serenely shed their kindly lights on the paths of all mankind.

In winning the peace let us meet the challenge of the problems that confront us in the spirit of young Samuel, who said:

"And I heard the voice of the Lord saying, 'whom shall we send and who will go for us?' And I said, 'Here am I, Lord, send me.'"

"Only thus," said Woodrow Wilson, "can discontent be driven out and the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

They That Take the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when we contemplate the terrifying possibilities of the atomic bomb, the product of the genius of our scientists, we should do so with a full awareness of our responsibility as a righteously motivated and God-respecting Nation to see that, insofar as we can control its future, it is not used inhumanely.

A thoughtful editorial on this subject appears in the publication entitled "Signs of the Times," and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

THEY THAT TAKE THE ATOM

In one of those profound, axiomatic utterances of Christ, He said: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matthew 26: 52).

Passing ages have proved the truth of this statement over and over again.

In our day we have seen it exemplified by the spectacular defeat of Germany and Japan in World War II.

But we must be careful not to apply this principle only to those who are opposed to us. It is not only for our enemies, but for ourselves. It is for all nations, groups, and individuals. It is a warning against aggression by whomsoever practiced. It is also a warning against the misuse of force and the wrongful employment of any weapon, whether it be a stick or a crowbar, a revolver or a machine gun, a torpedo or an atomic bomb.

It is not the possession of a weapon that matters, but the use of it. It is the use, or rather misuse, which involves such enormous responsibility. Attached to it, for all the world to see, is the ominous word "retribution." Christ did not say how it will come, or when it will come, or even by whom it will come. But it will come. Slowly or swiftly, expectedly or unexpectedly, it will come. It may wait for years, for decades, for centuries, but it will come. Inexorably it will come. "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

It is this that makes the possession of the secret of the atomic bomb so tremendously important, for it must be equally true that they who take the atom shall perish with the atom. In other words, he that uses this enormous force unjustly, cruelly, without due regard for the value of human life in the sight of God, will be in direst danger of perishing by the use of the atom against himself.

Some may say: "That is all very true. The principle is correct. But then, only Britain, Canada, and the United States know the secret; and only the United States is able to produce the materials in sufficient quantity to make the bomb; and we will never use it unjustly."

Let us hope this proves correct. It is open to question, however, whether a device that kills, burns, and disintegrates every man, woman, and child within a radius of 4 miles could ever be used justly. Already there is a wide difference of opinion on this point. Be that as it may, there are two considerations that should not be overlooked.

First, there is the possibility that those who control the knowledge and use of this fearful weapon in the future may not be as magnanimous as those who control it now.

In a recent speech to the House of Commons, Winston Churchill remarked that because of its ability to manufacture the atomic bomb, the United States "stands at the summit of the world." He then added: "I rejoice that this is so. Let them act up to the level of their power and responsibility, not for themselves, but for the men of all lands, and then a brighter day may dawn on human history."

It was a gracious compliment. But as we watched the howling, drunken mob rioting in San Francisco's Market Street in celebration of victory over Japan, we wondered if it was fully deserved. Suppose men like these—men who cannot control themselves—should ever become possessed of the grim and terrible secret of the atomic bomb?

The second consideration is this: We may pride ourselves upon having discovered this new weapon as a result of the collaboration of the Anglo-Saxon nations. We may rejoice that the ability to make it resides in America. But if we think for a moment that the secret and the ability will remain here, we are of all people mistaken. We may be well assured that scientists in every land of earth, now they are assured that research along these lines can be crowned with success, are bending every energy not only to seek out what the Anglo-Saxons have discovered, but also to improve upon that discovery and to find a way to liberate and utilize the same force without the time, trouble, and expense involved in the present method. This is the way of science. Without doubt the scientists of Russia, Italy, Sweden, and other lands are even now hot upon the trail. Perhaps even in Germany or Japan, well hidden from prying eyes, the same desperate search proceeds.

That is why we must be so careful. We have this secret today. Others will have it tomorrow. That which we do to others now, others may do to us later on. It is not impossible that the extinction of Hiroshima may come back some day in the total obliteration of New York or Los Angeles.

It could be. So easily. So very easily. Only one small plane, one little parachute, one medium-sized bomb.

For which cause we need to watch our step, to seek divine guidance in the use of the mighty power vouchsafed to us, and so to live nationally and individually that the hand of God may yet be over us for good.

The Italian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 12, our Nation once again will celebrate the discovery of this continent by a great Italian, Cristofero Columbo. It is fitting that we do so.

For a time, it became fashionable to decry the exploits of this great navigator, and to attribute his success to mere chance. However, no student of Columbo's life will subscribe to this view. A few years ago, a studious and comprehensive biography was published under the title "Admiral of the Ocean Sea." This was an unusual book in many respects, because the author not only spent years in a painstaking library research of the admiral's life, but actually sailed the course taken by him in a boat of size comparable to the *Santa Maria*, and thereby acquired a personal experience of the hazards and difficulties which faced these intrepid explorers.

A reading of that book wholly establishes the fact that the discovery of the New World was the direct result of the magnificent character of this man. He was persistent, courageous, and incurably optimistic, and he had strong faith in Divine Providence, and in the importance of his mission.

In our annual celebration of his achievement, we now celebrate in a larger sense those same characteristics in the Italian people, who have contributed so much to America. They, too, are courageous, faithful, determined, and loyal. History does not record a greater advance in any race than those who came to this country, for the most part as unskilled laborers, and who now deservedly sit in the highest councils of our Nation.

They not only have made notable contributions to government, but they have continued their traditional contributions to the art and culture of this society.

I cherish a personal friendship with hundreds of Americans of Italian heritage, and nowhere else have I found more loyal affection.

It is a pleasure to pay this tribute to a strong and virile people, who have become such an important part of the life of our country.

Paul A. Strachan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Washington Daily News of October 8, 1945. This is a column by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes entitled "Give Paul a Hand."

The Paul referred to is Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. Mr. Stokes' column does not exaggerate Mr. Strachan's devotion to the welfare of the physically handicapped. He is tireless in his efforts to secure for them a broad public understanding of their problems, and to get

aid for them in the solution of those problems.

Mr. Strachan deserves the gratitude of all those for whom he has labored so energetically. I am sure he has earned the affection of a great many Members of this House who are interested in improving the opportunities for a full and productive life for less fortunate citizens.

The article follows:

GIVE PAUL A HAND

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

There's a long, tall, gangling fellow about this town, blessed with amazing and persistent energy despite physical handicaps. He won't let people alone because of something he's got in his mind and heart.

He might be called a lobbyist, but of the better and commendable type in the field of human welfare.

This is Paul A. Strachan's big week, and the big week for those he represents.

It is National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, so decreed by an act of Congress and proclaimed by President Truman. Paul Strachan is responsible for this week's being set aside to enlist interest in the millions of physically handicapped in the country. It will be observed annually from now on. He is responsible also for the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, of which he is president and dynamo.

Getting a week set aside nationally and officially was a job that took him 3½ years. It was his idea. He went at it by himself. He enlisted Representative JERRY VOORHIS (Democrat, California) and Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE (Democrat, West Virginia), who introduced resolutions in House and Senate. Then he started buttonholing other Members. He's the greatest buttonholer you ever saw, and once he gets hold of your lapel he doesn't let go soon or easy.

The resolution, approved by Congress, was signed by President Truman August 11, this year. Afterward the President issued a proclamation specifying that during this week, October 7–13, appropriate ceremonies are to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which will be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified but physically handicapped workers.

There are millions of them in the country normally.

Observance of this week for the first time this year is particularly timely. It serves to call our attention, as a Nation, to the hundreds of thousand who are handicapped, in one way or another, from service of their country in the war, disabled veterans.

War plants took a toll as well as the war.

Helping all these citizens to readapt themselves to a place in our society—in business, industry, agriculture, the professions—is a national responsibility, a State responsibility, and a community responsibility.

The physically handicapped contributed to the war program, too, by finding jobs in plants to help relieve the manpower shortage.

Many remarkable, and almost miraculous, readjustments have been made. What can be done is no better exemplified than by Paul Strachan himself. Once a successful businessman, he was incapacitated by a long illness from which he emerged with complete loss of his hearing as well as other marks. For a time he was active in the labor movement.

Then he got the idea of trying to help others who were physically handicapped. Three years ago he started the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, which now has lodges all over the country.

He is tireless, indefatigable. Early every morning he is down at his little office. All day he is busy at his numerous chores, getting out mail and tending to the details of his organization. All day he's busy at his job, visiting Members of Congress and officials at Government agencies charged with rehabilitation. He is responsible for a congressional investigation going on now into the problem of the physically handicapped to establish a better coordinated Federal program. A skillful writer, he turns out his own copy, and he is an eloquent speaker.

Give Paul Strachan a big hand this week.

Jewish Immigration in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at Wilmington, Del., on October 4, 1945:

The British rejection of President Truman's plea, urging that 100,000 Jews be allowed to enter Palestine, is another dark page in British history. I believe that Britain has a plan to admit 1,500 Jews a week, or a total of 18,000 a year into Palestine. I had hoped that the new Chancellor Attlee, being a Laborite, would show more leniency toward a race of people, who have stood the most cruel persecution of any group of God's people since the beginning of the world. The British white paper now in effect limits immigration to 10,000.

President Truman has stated that he was horrified at the unexpected developments, and he had made arrangements for transportation by General Eisenhower of the Jews out of Germany.

Senator BARKLEY states that 3,000,000 Jews could be absorbed by Palestine. We can no longer be indifferent, he said, to the plight of the people of a great race, that are being hunted like the beasts of the fields.

One of the reasons, in the minds of the Jewish people and their friends, for the English keeping the Jews out of Palestine, is that the Moslem countries, Turkey, India, and Persia have large oil supplies that England is anxious to use, and they are playing up to the Arabs by keeping a restriction on the number of Jews going to Palestine—their own country, which we all know is the Jews' homeland.

It is my thought that if Britain does not assume a more liberal attitude in handling the Jewish program in Palestine, I will be compelled to vote against a loan or financial assistance to England, when the bill comes before the House of Representatives in Washington. I expect and demand better treatment for my friends.

Should We Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1945

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I desire to insert in the RECORD an article by Phelps Adams, of North American Newspaper Alliance, that deals with Britain's financial condition. The article is quite complete and needs no elaboration at my hands. However, I cannot refrain from suggesting that if Britain wishes to secure a loan in this country it should be negotiated with the International Bank that is to be created under the Bretton Woods agreement, because it should be placed on a business basis with all necessary safeguards for its liquidation. We have had several rather unpleasant experiences with Britain in the past when it came to settling obligations that they owed us. In order to obviate any further disagreeable incidents, the method I have suggested should be followed.

The article follows:

BRITAIN NOW PAYS—DEFICIT SPENDING OF PAST YEARS BRINGS NATION TO BRINK OF BANKRUPTCY—BIG BUSINESS IS POOR—HEAVY TAXES DRAIN RESERVES NEEDED TO MODERNIZE PLANTS TO COMPETE WITH UNITED STATES—NEW DEAL POLICIES WERE COPIED FROM ENGLAND, A WRITER DECLARES

(By Phelps Adams)

WASHINGTON, October 1.—Negotiations for the British multi-billion-dollar loan were spreading consternation and despair among New Dealers here today as the study of Britain's present economic plight offered new and persuasive proof of the faults of the anti-big business and social reform program which the Roosevelt administration imported from England a decade ago and has been seeking to transplant in America ever since.

While the Democratic Party program—even under President Truman—still is one of high taxation, heavy spending, and general hostility toward big business, current negotiations between the British and Americans show clearly that this identical program—adopted in England years ago—is largely responsible for the economic difficulties which have led the British exchequer to the brink of bankruptcy.

SPONSORED DEFICIT SPENDING

Long before the depression affected the United States, England had adopted a policy of deficit spending. Through a national dole, instituted after the last war, idleness was financed at public expense and a broad program of relief and subsidy, costing tremendous sums, was set up.

To finance this program, Britain levied staggering taxes, designed specifically to break up concentrations of wealth and to dry up the major reservoirs of capital. Britain made it virtually impossible for poor men to become wealthy, and to this end imposed confiscatory taxes upon all incomes above a middle-bracket level.

The New Dealers in the last decade have copied all these policies. Whenever they raised taxes—and they raised them tenfold in a single decade—they argued that American taxes were not as high as the British levies. When they inaugurated their "soak the rich" and their "soak business" programs, they argued that we were not as advanced in our economic development as was Britain, and when they embarked on their billions-for-boondoggling, deficit-spending plans, they held up the British experiments in this field as shining examples of liberalism in social reform.

BRITISH EXPORTS TOO LOW

Today, as negotiations for the British loan proceed and are discussed widely in the corridors and lobbies at the Capitol, it is beginning to be understood that Britain faces bankruptcy because she is not able to export enough goods to pay for the imports which she must buy to live.

Her coal mines are one example. England once exported large quantities of coal, and so obtained foreign credits with which to finance her imports. Today she must import

coal. Her mines, it is true, are old and deep and hard to work, and her miners are paid wages which would be regarded as hideously low by miners in this country, but a British miner produces only about a fourth as much coal daily as an American miner, who uses expensive modern machinery.

The British mine owners do not have enough capital to buy and install this machinery. So the British Government must take over the mines and try to find funds with which to modernize them, if it can.

So it is with textiles, which long have been one of the most important products of the British. Because 95 percent of American looms are automatic, while only 5 percent of the British looms are, an American worker can produce up to 10 times as much in an hour as can a British worker. Again, the British mill owners do not have the capital to modernize their plants.

UNITED STATES HAS BIG BUSINESS

It is extremely disconcerting to New Deal economists, therefore, to be told now that the one thing that the United States has which Britain has not—and which makes it possible for the United States to lend the billions that England needs—is big business. It is even more disconcerting for them to have all these facts spread on the record at a time when Lord Keynes is acting as the special emissary from Britain in seeking financial aid from America, for though Lord Keynes is a delightful and persuasive pleader, it was he who sponsored the deficit-spending theories embraced so heartily by the New Dealers and who—with Harold Laski, the British Labor Party's mentor—has been held up by them as the fountainhead of all economic wisdom.

Food for the Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the Bridgeport Telegram of October 3, reflects, I believe, the will of all the people of Fairfield County and the State of Connecticut, on the subject of food for Europe's starving millions:

FOOD FOR THE HUNGRY

Only Russia, France, and Belgium can look forward to a winter any less arduous than the hard war years. The rest of Europe faces starvation, disease, and exposure.

From Scandinavia to the Mediterranean the crying need is for coal, not only for the normal needs of millions of homes, but particularly for fuel to get the fires of essential industry going. Industry, agriculture, and transportation are shattered. Clothing and footwear are almost nonexistent. Nothing is scarcer than medicine, so sorely needed for the ill and undernourished.

Britain is still operating under tight rations, but is contributing as much as she can toward relief of continental Europe. She does this while facing a winter only a little brighter than the war years, under a diet largely dependent on the continuance of imports. Eire, comparatively a land of plenty, has set aside $14,000,000 worth of food for European relief.

The United States Department of Agriculture reveals that we have plenty of food for our own needs and a lot to spare. The Department wants our extra food supplies sent abroad to save millions from near starvation and at the same time, by sales to the UNRRA, keep our farm prices from depressing.

We have more potatoes, eggs, lower grades of meats than we can use. Apparently our only lack, which may not be remedied until 1947, is sugar. The matter of foreign relief will be pressed in Congress soon. Feeding the hungry with our surplus is not a political matter, though there may be a struggle in Congress over the appropriation of nearly $2,000,000,000 for foreign relief.

What we do with our funds is one thing and what we do with our surplus food is another. If there is any way possible to send our extra food to Europe it should be done. We have always responded to appeals for help. One only has to recall the assistance given by the United States to homeless Japs when their country was devastated by earthquake and fire. Nearly every nation in Europe has benefited by a relief agency in this country.

Europe may not like us any better, and we may even be accused of having ulterior motives. No matter how much we do for them, there will be some who will say nasty things about Americans. But they are hungry and cold and sick. Because of the American way, we produce more and better than our European neighbors. Let's give them what we have to spare, where the need is great. We can by-pass the country whose only shortages are in cigarettes and liquor, but such nations as Greece, Italy, Austria, and Finland are in desperate plight with virtually no prospects for food or clothing.

We are the strong member of the big family of nations. A way should be found, regardless of political angles, to bring relief to the weaker members of the family.

The Physically Handicapped

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago it was my pleasure, in committee and in this Chamber, to support legislation pursuant to which the President has called upon the people of the United States to observe the week of October 7–13, 1945, as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

It is well that we pause in these hectic days and give consideration to the unfortunate physical and financial situation in which many thousands of our people find themselves, through no fault of their own. Consequently there must be public support of a sustained program for the employment and development of the abilities and capacities of these physically unfortunate persons. Any action on the part of our citizens spectacularizing and calling attention to present conditions will be most helpful. The magnitude of the problem is not realized by most of our people. When I tell you that there were approximately 25,000,000 physically handicapped before Pearl Harbor, you will begin to understand why this special week is being observed. When we stop to think that in industry alone during the war years 7,800,000 have been injured, 365,000 permanently disabled, and 62,000 killed the problem is at once apparent. If we add these numbers to an estimated 1,100,000 military casualties in the recent war, then we must be impressed that some special effort should be made to call the attention of employers, from the Government down, to the availability of these people, as well as to the necessity of giving special attention to the requirements of this group when employment is involved.

Mr. Speaker, there are many jobs which the physically handicapped can perform that will not only be agreeable and financially profitable to them but which will also add to the productivity of our people. Of course these handicaps are of all sorts, yet we know that the blind person ofttimes can do certain work as well as the person with perfect sight. Just because one cannot see as others do, or walk as others do, or talk as others do, or hear as others do, is no indication that this person does not have a mission in life and a definite productive place in society and in our economy. However, it is easy for the American people to forget, and the celebration of this particular week will not only stimulate the memory, but will impress the necessity of remembering that there are in every community some physically handicapped persons.

I have become personally interested in this legislation because of some of the physically handicapped in the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent, who are accomplishing much and with whom I am personally acquainted. For instance, Mrs. Margaret Nickerson Martin, of Jackson, Mich., who a few years ago was a very active lady, especially in community affairs, was overtaken by sickness and is now permanently confined to a wheel chair. She cannot get about as she once did, yet she is as mentally alert as ever and just as desirous of being an asset to the community. Having enjoyed an active life and then finding herself physically handicapped, she sees the problem from both sides and accordingly takes an especial interest. She is now national vice president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, as well as being the Michigan district president, and I am sure is doing a splendid work and assisting other unfortunates.

Mr. Speaker, this group does not want charity. They are not asking for something for nothing. They are only asking for genuine Christian consideration and for an opportunity to use the talents which they have for their own benefit and for the benefit of society. It is well that we all do our bit in impressing upon all of our people at this particular time the opportunity which obtains to practice the principles of the Golden Rule.

American Sketches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks by inserting into

the RECORD the proceedings of a forum I participated in on the subject of immigration with Mr. Sydney Tannen on Station KFWB in California on Saturday, September 1, 1945:

ANNOUNCER. American sketches. Presenting Sydney Tannen, who will interview one of our outstanding Congressmen, Representative SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, of New York, on the present activities of one of our important congressional committees.

Mr. TANNEN. Of current interest to hundreds of thousands of people in the United States is the question: "Shall any changes be made in our present immigration and naturalization laws, and what will be the effect of any changes on our country and the rest of the world?" So important has this question become that Congress authorized its Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to conduct a thorough study of this subject matter. We are fortunate in having prevailed upon Congressman DICKSTEIN, a Member of Congress for more than 20 years, who is the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives, to come here tonight that you might receive some first-hand information on the work of his committee and the hearings he has conducted on the west coast.

Is it true, Congressman DICKSTEIN, that hearings on naturalization and immigration are being held by your committee all through the United States?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Yes, Mr. Tannen; several subcommittees of my committee which I have appointed under House Resolution 52 are now holding hearings in various parts of the country.

Mr. TANNEN. What is the purpose of holding these hearings?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. It is to determine the views of the American people throughout the country as based upon the particular local problems regarding the present and postwar immigration and naturalization policies.

Mr. TANNEN. What prompted the hearings?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Many of our present immigration and naturalization laws have proven inadequate to cope with a number of complicated problems brought about by the war. Many changes in our laws seem to be desirable to protect our country against infiltration of undesirable aliens and foreign ideologies. On the other hand, different changes are needed to protect the law-abiding aliens to permit and even facilitate the reunion of their families. Our immigration laws have not been revamped for a great number of years, while the conditions which prompted them have changed rapidly, both in the United States and in the rest of the world.

Mr. TANNEN. Congressman, have any basic changes been suggested to your committee?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Yes, there is quite a controversy regarding our present quota. Some people feel that certain quotas, like those of our enemies, should be closed completely. Some feel that the German quota, which is one of the largest quotas, should be allocated to smaller nations who were our allies and who bore the brunt of German domination. Some people are opposed to the cutting of the German quotas, because they feel that it would discriminate unjustly against anti-Nazis who were born in Germany.

Mr. TANNEN. That might bring up this question, Congressman: Would former German citizens, who have fled Germany, and are now residing in other countries, be charged to the German quota?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Yes, under present immigration laws a person is always charged to the quota of the country in which he was born no matter whether he has become a citizen of another country.

Mr. TANNEN. What is the basis for our present quota system?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. The census of 1890—the quotas allotted to the various countries were computed as to allow 2 percent of the number of people of certain nationalities who resided in the United States at the time of the census of 1890. Of course this basis of computation clearly favors the so-called Nordic races, and discriminates against other nationalities. Some people feel that the Germanic group, being responsible for two major wars within one generation, has betrayed the trust we put in them and should no longer be favored in the quota.

Mr. TANNEN. Have there been any proposals to use the German quota to bring in children from Germany?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Yes. It has been suggested to the committee that we bring in German children and try to reeducate them in this country. There is a great doubt in the minds of our committee and the committee members as to the desirability of such a step. We doubt that children who have been indoctrinated with the Nazi philosophy of life can be rehabilitated.

Mr. TANNEN. Do you know whether any study has been made on the question of rehabilitating the German children, so as to make advisable their being allowed to come into this country?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. A study has been made. I doubt whether a complete study was made on that question by our armed forces in Germany, and I doubt very much from my information and from the information derived from the Government, our Government, that these children can possibly be assimilated in our Government—because they are too far gone in the philosophy of Hitlerism.

Mr. TANNEN. How about the racial qualifications under the present immigration and naturalization laws. Have any changes been proposed?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Yes. Some people object strenuously to racial qualifications. They take the stand that to continue to disqualify against people solely upon the grounds of race is undemocratic, and the country as a whole, from my examination and study, feels exactly that way.

Mr. TANNEN. Have any proposals been made to change our present naturalization laws, especially with regard to parents of our servicemen?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Yes; there are several bills before our committee which seek to waive certain educational and other qualifications for parents of men and women who have served honorably in our armed forces. There are other proposals before the committee to strengthen the laws regarding the deportation of criminal and undesirable aliens; while at the same time to try to prevent separation of American families where deportation is based on technicalities only and would bring untold suffering and hardship to the American citizens.

Mr. TANNEN. In connection with hardships. Can you give us some examples?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Well, within the last 20 or more years, young men who came from all parts of the country—especially from Italy—have committed minor offenses. Under our law they were deportable. A warrant of deportation was issued, but we could not deport them because Mussolini would not receive them. As a result of that, these warrants were outstanding. Now with the doors open for deportation we are picking them up for deportation, when we find that they have American wives, American children, and boys who are in the armed services of our country, and in separating the head of the family it is a hardship imposed, not on the deportee, but the wife and the children. And in the opinion of the committee some action must be taken to save these families.

Mr. TANNEN. Can you say anything about whether or not the quotas have been used up?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. No; the quotas have not been used up at all—in the last 10 years we have not used up 1,200,000 numbers, and the present quota today still stands open. Last year's quota was less than 37,000. A year before was less than 41,000, and the quotas are open and have not been filled.

Mr. TANNEN. Is there anything then to the rumor that too many immigrants are being allowed to enter the United States?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. No; there is no such evidence at all. The fact of the matter is that there has been a lot of propaganda spread by sinister and organized groups all through the country, and alarmists, by trying to create a boogie boo in scaring the American people that the doors are open and an influx of aliens are coming in.

Mr. TANNEN. Keeping in mind that the immigration laws, as they now stand, and the naturalization laws as they now stand, are based upon years gone by—upon the way the situation then was, has your committee given consideration to making some changes with regard to the educational requirements where naturalization is concerned?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Yes. After visiting at least eight or nine States throughout this country we find that people—elderly people—who came here 30 or 40 years ago, who raised families, who worked day and night in coal mines and shipyards and railroads and other work in this country, did not have the opportunity to have an education and are unable to pass the literacy test, but in heart they are true Americans and are ready to defend their Government with their own life. Their children, most of their children throughout the country, in every section and part of this great United States, are serving in our armed forces, and I believe that we owe it to the old people to waive that literacy test, which is nothing more than a requirement placed in the law without real consideration way back in 1924.

Mr. TANNEN. You spoke of hardship. I wonder could we have a word on the romantic side. I have in mind the servicemen, our boys who are now overseas and who married girls from foreign countries. What is the situation?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. Well, there were many marriages. In fact, 1 month there were at least 14,000 in Australia. They worked up so fast on the question of marriages in all European theaters of war it is impossible to bring these wives of the GI's, though they need no quota, they are exempt from quotas, but we haven't got enough shipping facilities. I have requested the War Department to add additional ships if necessary, as many as will be necessary, to bring them all in, because I believe it is to the interest of the GI's and these foreign women they have married to bring them in as quickly as possible.

Mr. TANNEN. Congressman, your hearings that have been held here in Los Angeles undoubtedly have had many questions. We here at times have heard much said about aliens that there has at times been raised the question about too many aliens being employed in the moving-picture industry and thus preventing employment of Americans. Has your committee considered this question?

Congressman DICKSTEIN. We have looked into this question very thoroughly, as we considered it to be a very serious charge. We directed inquiries to all the major studios and requested the studios to submit to us the statistics as to all the aliens that they were employing. The statistics submitted to us were broken down into the various classes of employees they had, starting from the production and the directors, and going down

to the extras. From the books as well as from the testimony of the representatives and from all other sources of information, we were satisfied that only less than 1 percent of their employees are aliens—and this 1 percent also includes extras—people mostly used for mob scenes and to portray natives from the country from which they come. Among them are many legal resident aliens who are racially ineligible for citizenship. There are no aliens among the executives or the policy determining body of the industry. On the whole we find that the accusations that the studios were flooded with aliens were absolutely false, that no foundation whatever exists for that statement.

Mr. TANNEN. Thank you very much, Congressman DICKSTEIN, for appearing with us this evening.

The Japanese Emperor and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star of September 20, 1945:

THE JAPANESE EMPEROR AND PEACE

The thermometer registered a high fever. Let us break the thermometer, and thus bring an end to the high fever.

Obviously such reasoning does not make sense. But it makes just as much sense as some of the statements made by such men as Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, who demand that Hirohito be tried as a war criminal, and the Emperor, as an institution, be abolished.

Because this matter involves hundreds of thousands of lives that have been saved by using Hirohito as an instrument of our authority, it calls for sober thought. Anyone who knows anything about Japan knows that whatever role Hirohito played in bringing on the war, he has used his authority to bring it to an unexpected, early end.

Today he is under the authority of General MacArthur. He has obeyed General MacArthur's orders implicitly. Not an American life has been lost. American occupation of Japan has begun with a trivial number of troops. In China, Manchuria, Burma, Malay, and everywhere throughout the Orient Japanese soldiers and sailors have laid down their arms, largely because Hirohito has given the order.

What does Senator RUSSELL want? Is that a criminal act? Would he have preferred that the war be prolonged and hundreds of thousands of American lives be lost just to satisfy our dislike of a monarchy, or to humbug ourselves into thinking that by destroying a monarchy, we will prevent a future war?

Senator RUSSELL might recall the First World War when we were going to prevent future wars by dethroning old Kaiser Bill. We did, but look at what we got in his place. A man who was unknown in Germany at that time came to be worshiped like a god in place of the divine Kaiser Bill. Let us not kid ourselves into thinking that we can control or reform a people's religion by force. From the time of the early Pharaohs down to the present date that attempt has never succeeded. Religions have been made by the blood of martyrs.

Not only are we saving hundreds of thousands of lives by the skill with which President Truman has used his political power, but today we are saving the use of at least 500,000 troops in the occupation of Japan. This saving is made possible by the use of Emperor Hirohito's authority. In the absence of his authority it would take at least another 500,000 troops to compel the obedience we now get voluntarily. Will Senator RUSSELL stand up and insist that demobilization be slowed down, or will he have his State of Georgia furnish these troops?

Senator RUSSELL might remember some of the history of Georgia. His own bloodthirstiness and blindness corresponds exactly with those of the "Radicals" of the North in the years that followed 1865. They, too, were opposed to a soft peace. They, too, sought to prevent another war by trying Jefferson Davis as a war criminal and imposing the carpet-baggers on the South. How significant it is that the man who favored a "soft" peace, Abraham Lincoln, is remembered with honor, while the "Radicals" are remembered as a disgrace to the North and a scourge to the South.

Finally, Senator RUSSELL and his "Liberal" friends might remember that no amount of harshness, no schemes for destroying Japanese institutions, will insure peace in the future. A truly democratic Japan can be just as warlike as an emperor-dominated Japan. No democracy in history has been peaceful for a great length of time. Consequently, and here is where we all bear a responsibility: There will be peace in the Orient only as long as America is alert and responsible enough to maintain it.

That is the lesson we Americans must learn, rather than attempt to end the fever by breaking the thermometer.

The Commander in Chief Will Have to Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers carry an item dealing with the report submitted by George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, covering activities in connection with World War II. This report tells in magnificent language the story of our armed forces in the most colossal war in the history of mankind.

I was struck this morning when I received a letter which is in sharp contrast to General Marshall's report. This letter reads:

OCTOBER 8, 1945.

Mr. PITTENGER: I'm writing to see if anything can be done to speed up the return of my husband ——— ———.

He has the required points for a discharge, and we have four children, ages 11, 5, 3, and 2.

After 2 years of the responsibility of keeping our home and raising a family, I'm absolutely exhausted.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would use your influence to bring him home.

This is a genuine letter signed by the wife of this serviceman and it comes from my district. It is typical of numerous letters which come to my office every day. It tells its own story—a story of incompetence, bungling, and mishandling of the demobilization of our armed forces.

Someone ought to tell General Marshall that his magnificent report will fail on deaf ears when it reaches the American people. His message will "not go over" when it reaches American citizens who are wondering why the War Department and the Navy Department have failed in the demobilization program.

For a long time there has been talk about discharging physicians and surgeons in our armed forces. The charge has been made, and has not been contradicted, that both the Army and the Navy have a surplus of doctors, that these doctors are doing nothing, and that apparently nothing is being done to speed their discharge. Responsible Government officials ignore the fact that there is a shortage of doctors in almost every community in the United States and that these men should be returned to those communities to look after the health of our people.

Just by way of a reminder, the Constitution of the United States says:

The President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

It begins to look as though the American people will have to ask President Truman to assume his responsibility and take proper steps to encourage someone in high authority to embark on a demobilization program. If this does not happen, the Congress of the United States should forthwith investigate the situation, and, so far as possible, undertake to do the job itself.

Refugees Temporarily Residing in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received recently from Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, and also an extract from a broadcast by Robert St. John over the National Broadcasting Co.'s hook-up, Wednesday, July 18, 1945:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., August 6, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am taking the liberty of enclosing a transcript of a broadcast made by Mr. Robert St. John on Wednesday, July 18, 1945. It describes the situation of the refugee now stationed at Oswego so clearly and tells the story so well that it fully meets everything that for some time I had been intending to bring to the attention of Congress.

The present confinement of these people, by whatever name it may be called or under what good intentions they were brought here, is nonetheless a concentration camp. I feel that something should be done about it. It

might well occur to you and to a great many others that if anything is done it will establish a precedent. Frankly, I think it will establish a precedent. I'll go further and say that the time is not distant when our country, along with all of the United Nations, will have to face the problem of overpopulation in other countries. Overpopulation causes hunger, and hunger causes war.

Our Government has often expressed its sympathy for persecuted and oppressed people as well as for the distress and sufferings of people in crowded countries. Here in the Western Hemisphere we are not suffering from overpopulation. Congress should give careful study to this question in order to meet our responsibility when the matter comes up and we ask other countries to help in this situation.

I believe that the Bureau of Immigration, along with the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture, should make a joint study of manpower needs in each of the 48 States. State quotas might well be provided in accordance with the particular need in each State. A casual reading of all that has been said and all that is being done and what will have to be done in world cooperation will indicate that the question of population distribution is on the top of the list. The old division of restriction or open-door immigration is not involved. Here is one big task that has to be done and once done will be settled for an entire generation. A Bretton Woods agreement for balanced population is needed as one of the important factors in establishing world security and the maintenance of peace.

Do not trouble to reply to this letter. I know how difficult it is to answer every suggestion. All I ask is that you give the subject some thought.

Sincerely yours,

F. LAGUARDIA, *Mayor.*

EXTRACTS FROM BROADCAST BY ROBERT ST. JOHN

I want to take you on a trip to the peaceful little city of Oswego, N. Y., which nestles on the shores of Lake Ontario. Oswego has seen plenty of history in the making. The explorer Champlain stopped there 'way back in the year 1616. The spot was settled by Jesuit missionaries. It became an English trading post. A great fort was built there—a fort which figured in the French and Indian wars, in the Revolutionary War, and in 1814 it was captured and held, for a time, by British and Canadian troops. Yes; Oswego has figured in the history of other wars. This time the usual number of Oswego's sons and daughters went off in uniform. Her factories, like factories all over the country, turned out their quota of war goods. But Oswego will be remembered in this war for something else. There, at Fort Ontario, for the past year nearly 1,000 victims of war have been living behind high steel fences. I don't suppose that if you tried you could get together a more conglomerate group of people. Let me tell you about them, for their story is as interesting as it is tragic. Seventeen different nationalities are represented there: Yugoslavs, Austrians, Poles, Germans, Czechs, Russians, Belgians, Frenchmen, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Turks, Spaniards, Greeks, Italians, Hollanders, people from Danzig, people from almost every country on the face of Europe. Some are Catholics, some are Jews, some are Protestants, and some were wont to worship in the Greek Orthodox Church. When the first arrived, they ranged in age from a baby just 3 weeks old to an old woman who was 80. They're not the scum of Europe. They're practically all of them cultured and talented people, men who once were important business and industrial leaders back in their own countries, musicians of note, actors, writers. Among the number are nine lawyers and nine journalists, five physicians and five portrait artists, four teachers, four pharmacists, four stenographers and four farmers, two dentists, two ministers, two architects, two actors, two engineers. They were law-abiding people whose only crime was that they hated the Nazis, and the Nazis hated them. And so they fled down the corridors of Europe, hoping to escape the doom which was always so nearly catching up with them. Thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of their friends and relatives and former associates were caught and killed by the Nazis. But these were the lucky ones. These escaped. When Italy was liberated by the Allies, they found sanctuary there. There they had freedom of movement and a chance to earn their own living. They were treated as human beings, as people to be pitied and helped. But Italy was overcrowded. Supplies were scarce. The Allied Governments realized that Italy was no place for homeless refugees. And so President Roosevelt set an example to other democratic nations. He issued an Executive order, and those 1,000 refugees from 17 different countries were told that they were going to be guests of the great United States. They were told that we would provide a home for them at a place called Fort Ontario, at Oswego, N. Y., on the shores of a beautiful lake. You can imagine how you would have felt had you been one of those lucky ones. America—God bless America! America, the land of the free and the home of the brave. Some of those poor people had been on the march since 1934, trying to keep out of the grasp of the Nazis. Ten long years of homeless wandering. But now they were being invited to America, as guests of the United States. During their years of flight they'd lost most of the values which ordinary human beings hold dear—homeland, possessions, security, friends, relatives, children, and parents.

But now, America! God bless America! So they came! They found that Oswego, on the Ontario, is an attractive small city. But why this steel fence? Fences are what Nazis put around concentration camps, aren't they? Why fences? But those fences were merely outward and visible signs of a loss of freedom and liberty which I'm ashamed to talk about, because I think that the impression we create on foreigners is very important. Nineteen of those refugees we invited to this country have sons in our armed forces, fighting for liberty and democracy and freedom. And yet the parents are kept behind wire fences, and instead of the freedom and liberty they dreamed of, they are allowed to leave the place only for 6 hours at a time, and they can't visit friends and relatives unless they happen to live in Oswego. Instead of the chance to fashion a new life, here in this land of opportunity, they have been deprived of any chance to work at any gainful or life-building pursuit, despite the manpower shortage which still plagues us. Of course, bringing 1,000 refugees over here was just a gesture. One thousand. Why there are millions over there whose life these past 5 or 10 years has been torment and torture. But it was a gesture, our token of good will toward mankind. (That's what we said when we did it.) Oh, of course, we were very careful. We picked only the best, the brightest, those whose records were above question; people we thought would live democracy, after the samples they'd had of the autocracy of the Old World. But tragic little democracy they've seen in this past year. And now they're living under the threat of being shipped back where they came from. For some of them—for Spaniards, for example—that will mean quick death. It's no wonder that up there at Oswego these desperate people have been driven (by worry) to the point, in some cases, of suicide and insanity. They say in Washington that they were admitted by an Executive order of Franklin D. Roosevelt. And now Mr. Roosevelt is dead, and besides, it would disrupt the economy of the country to allow them to stay. Wait a minute! There are just 969 of them. What a shaky economy we must have, if the admittance of 969 refugees would "disrupt the economy of the country." These people might help to make America an even better place than it is. One of the four physicians might quite possibly help to discover the cure for cancer. One of the writers among them, inspired by our freedom and democracy, might write an ode which would live forever. One of the artists might take a piece of canvas and turn out the greatest painting of all time. But no, let's send 'em back, back where they came from, the little children and the old women. "Guests" of America? They've overstayed their welcome. And anyway, they ought to be tired of staying behind a steel fence. The war in Europe is over. Let them go back where they came from. If you don't happen to feel that way, drop a card to your Congressman. It's up to Congress, now, because a congressional committee is investigating the case. The fate of those 969 people who live behind steel wire (getting such a bad opinion of these United States) may well depend on whether you care. I hope you do.

Twenty Million American Colonials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me, I would like to include with these remarks an article entitled "Twenty Million American Colonials," by Wallace Thorsen, which appeared in the magazine This Month for October 1945. In the article Mr. Thorsen calls attention to the status of the American farmers and the need for cooperation and unity between the small farmers of this Nation and the consumers and workers of the urban areas. Masterfully he points out the fallacy of scarcity production—or starving our economy and with it our small farmers and our workers—of starving those who truly are America. As one of the many in this House who believes that only through full production and with it full employment and full consumption in the cities can we have a prosperous and peaceful America, with prosperous workers, farmers, and industrialists. I take real pleasure in calling the article to the attention of the House.

The article follows:

TWENTY MILLION AMERICAN COLONIALS HIT BACK

(By Wallace Thorsen)

Industrial America must realize that our economic future depends on cooperation with—not exploitation of—our farmers.

Rural America looks to the future with great fear and great hope. There is fear because little has been done to insure against postwar deflation and depression. There is fear that the war will end with industrial America more firmly in monoply control than ever. The city man's view of his country cousin remains imperialisitic. The monopolists will insist on continuing the mass of farmers in their status of exploited colonials. An attitude which must bring

catastrophe to all except our biggest and richest farmers.

There is hope in the growing strength of the farmers' cooperative movement which manages to short circuit some of the greater evils of our scarcity-monopoly system; in the rising clamor for a postwar economy of abundance; in the growing number of urban Americans who realize that this Nation's wealth is indivisible and what affects one segment of our population affects us all.

In other words, the average farmer and his leaders admit that they cannot solve their problem themselves. The cannot solve it because it is predicated on an outmoded system organized and perpetuated by a small group of urban Americans who has deliberately made a "colonial state" out of rural America. Today, having reached the danger point in our exploitation of the land, its resources and its people, we stand at a fateful crossroads. If we do not end forever the colonial status of the vast majority of farmers, if we do not pull their standard of living up to ours—ours can be pulled down around our ears.

The true picture of postwar America can be understood only if we assess these hopes and fears properly, and recognize them as our own, whether we are farmers or not. And looking ahead must begin, as always, by looking back.

As America grew industrially, those in control refused to let farmers have their share of the Nation's rapidly increasing wealth, either in goods or money. Our factories hummed, no matter how much or how little the farmer bought. We were a growing industrial giant, eagerly consuming everything we could manufacture. The only trouble was the farmer had to buy processed goods at high, controlled prices while he sold his at low, open-market prices—and at prices the market determined, not the farmer.

How did the farmer make up this difference? At first it was very simple. He took more land and by increasing production made up for the spread in costs between what he bought and what he sold. But soon there was no more new land.

Next on the list was the fertility of our Nation's soil. The farmer could expend that. As a matter of fact he had to. And so, while the monopolist leaders of industrial America grew fatter and fatter, rural America's main source of capital, the fertility of our rich land, grew thinner and thinner. We got less and less per acre as our farmers, tried harder and harder to produce enough food and fiber at low prices to pay for the processed goods they were forced to buy at high prices.

That was the system our forefathers built for the farmer's "sunny days." When it "rained" depression in the cities, however, industrialists put an even greater burden on rural America. They cut back production and fired workers—the farmer's customers—while the owners lived out the storm on their fat. They could have done it another way. They could have lowered prices instead of lowering production, kept labor on the job, so that farmers could have a market to sell to, and labor a chance to eat. But they didn't.

Students of economics have dignified this program with a name: an economy of scarcity. An economy in which there is never quite enough. An economy that gradually soaks up our great wealth into the hands of a few who can always ride out the storm.

Over the years some people tried to tell farmers that all they had to do to change all this was to threaten a scarcity farm economy—limited production, high prices—to match the scarcity city economy. Some of them listened, as you shall see. But it isn't the normal farmer's nature to take less from the soil than he can get, nor to put his corn or grain or cotton away to rot if his high prices aren't met. Moreover, there are 6,000,000 farm producers, and it isn't easy for that many free enterprises to combine in the ways of scarcity.

So what could the little farmer do to make adjustments? He gave up any fancy ideas of getting equal education for his children. He heard about the marvelous development of electricity, of the telephone, of radio, and many other comforts urban Americans were able to buy, but he couldn't afford them. Hard roads? Central heating? New paint every year? Balanced, vitamin-full diet? College? No; not for colonial America.

How can small farmers afford it when the system calls for high prices from the city and low prices to the city? How can small farmers afford it when, for the last few decades, roughly two-thirds of them—some 4,000,000 American families—have been reduced to producing almost nothing they can sell to the cities? They must spend almost 100 percent of their time and energy producing for bare subsistence, and the resultant diet, contrary to popular opinion, is not even enough to produce healthy children. Our rural draft boards can testify to that.

For a while the mechanization of agriculture gave hope to the rank and file of American farmers. Here was the American dream—a little late, it is true—but here it seemed to be. Tractors, trucks, combines, motorcars for every farmer, new seeds, new ways of cultivation—what a prospect for a new day. But gradually this dream vanished. Soon it became apparent that mechanization was being made too costly for small farms; that progress in agriculture, just as in industry, was giving to those who already had. So, while mass production of farm goods made it possible for big farms to turn a profit, it put a greater burden than ever on the ordinary farmer.

While that was happening, the farmer was losing the one thing he had left to make up the difference—the title to his land. And little by little the census figures are writing another page in his century-old struggle, that of his increasing tenancy or amalgamation with a more successful farm. Farms are growing larger. And today over 40 percent of our farmers are tenants or sharecroppers, most of whom have no roots in the land they till.

That is the broad record of our agriculture.

Somehow, farmers in colonial America have "made up the difference." But it couldn't go on forever. There is an end to what you can get out of land planted over and over with the same crop. There is an end to the amount of drudgery 20 percent of a nation can undergo.

How the two types of farmers—the rich ones on the one hand, the family farmers on the other—have struggled to break out of their colonial status is a fascinating chapter in our larger fight for true democracy. Here is what happened:

Not all farmers have sat supinely under the yoke of industrial scarcity. Some of them for many years have been seeking an answer. And to a small group of them the answer arrived at seems very satisfactory, indeed. It is simply counterpressure. Urbanites call it the farm bloc. It is a group of "willful men" who say, in effect: "As long as you are conducting an economy of scarcity in this country and exploiting American agriculture to make it work, we will cut ourselves in on the exploitation by cutting down on the food supply. Just as you try to keep prices up, so will we."

That is the purpose and guiding philosophy of the farm bloc. That is why organized monopolists find it so easy to play ball with these equally shortsighted and ruthless "big farm" pressure groups, who do not mind exploiting the rest of us while they "get theirs."

And that is why other farmers, the farmers who believe in abundance and cannot understand scarcity, have created a movement of their own—the cooperative movement. Caught in a trap set by industrial monopolists and sprung by the farm bloc, most farmers had to find such a movement or go under altogether. It started long ago, this people's movement, and it has had many failures. But each time it stumbled it rose painfully to its feet again and gained new strength.

Today cooperatives find themselves strong enough to convince even the skeptics that they are here to stay, and to grow.

They buy from the cities in bulk, at lower costs than their farmer members could achieve alone; they sell to the cities at better prices than individual farm growers could negotiate; they sell to each other and to nonmembers many things, from gasoline to salad oil—and in all cases the savings go back to the farmer.

But one outstanding fact remains: Co-ops alone cannot prevent our economy from falling apart. Unless we can produce an economy of abundance for both city and farm, America will be divided into haves and have-nots and a gradual economic stagnation of our entire Nation may result.

This, then, is the present situation:

(1) Most farmers have been colonials. (2) This colonial status has been paid for by ruining our land and a large segment of our Nation. (3) There are hopeful signs that the farmer isn't going to remain a colonial any more—because his cooperatives are more and more able to balance urban and rural America. (4) There are farm leaders who know that the food scarcity plan advocated by some members of the farm bloc will not raise the standard of all farmers and all workers, but will cause new class cleavages. (5) These same farm leaders are uniting with consumers and city workers in demanding an economy of abundance in both farm and factory production and distribution. (6) One group in particular, the National Farmers Union, has gone further in its thinking and planning for the family-type farmer than any other. It is now working with city leaders in a broad campaign of education and action to put an end to colonial America.

City people working with family-type farmers? And why not? Isn't our land a national resource? Isn't food a basic problem? And don't city people want to create good customers in rural America for the products of our factories?

To farsighted urbanites, the answer to all these questions is, fortunately, "yes." The next step is to back a specific program which does not selfishly try to advance the small farmer at other people's expense, but rather seeks a better living standard for all.

Such a program has been set down on paper by the leaders of the National Farmers' Union and voted for by its hundreds of thousands of small-farm members. Based on two assumptions—full employment in our cities and a multiple of river valley conservation authorities like the famous TVA—the program is so simple and so workable that its big-farm enemies are hard put to discredit it even with conservative Congressmen.

"That doesn't mean they're not trying," says big Jim Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, with a smile. "After all, our plan calls for a National Agricultural Resources Act to guarantee plenty of food for all Americans and a minimum income for some 18,000,000 or 20,000,000 people—who can't earn it even today—under decent living conditions that will make them an asset to our Nation and a big market for city products.

"We want them to get low credit on a long-range basis so they can pay off a lot when crops are good; pay nothing if crops are bad. We want them to have decent education. We want them to get low-cost machinery specially designed for family farms. We want them to have electricity and the benefits of Government research. We want them to have guaranteed prices quoted before they start planting so they'll be able to plan for themselves. And a lot more."

"Boil it all down," Patton says, with conviction, "and you'll find we want democracy

with roots in the soil and a man's head up where it ought to be. A sound family-type agriculture is the best way I know to kick fascism out of our country. City people, more and more, are coming to see that. And we welcome their support. With it, we'll win."

Draft of Teen-Age Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the question of keeping 18- and 19-year-old boys in the service who should be in school is a very serious one. Something had better be done to stop this draft, and something should be done at the earliest possible moment compatible with our military commitments to get young men out of the Army and back in school where they belong.

I have received a most depressing letter from one of my constituents, who has been compelled to give up her two 18-year-old twin boys to the military service. This letter puts the case in a most deep and moving way. I hope every Member of Congress reads it and, after having read it, gives serious thought to this expression which is the expression of countless thousands of mothers and fathers throughout this Nation, who are willing for their boys to help win the war, but who are not satisfied and who disapprove of these youngsters spending their time now in policing Japan or Germany.

This is a serious question which, in my judgment, has not been settled. It is entitled to serious thought by the Members of this House.

I now quote the letter:

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In regard to our youths being in the armed services, as a mother of 18-year-old twin boys now in the service at Camp Fannin, Tex., who have just finished their basic training on October 2, 1945.

My husband and I disapprove very much of drafting 18-year-old youths as they should be home and allowed to continue their education. Also, these young 18-year-old boys should not be sent overseas in the army of occupation.

We realize there is a large task ahead of our Nation to see that all our overseas fighting men are given their discharge, etc. Nevertheless, our youth should be home and I mean at home under the guidance of their parents.

Please, please send our young boys home and do it quickly. Refer this letter to our Commander in Chief, President Harry S. Truman, just how we American mothers feel about having our sons in the services.

Trusting the Government of the United States will endeavor to release our youth from the armed services for the making of a true and just Nation.

Sincerely I remain,

Mrs. P. H. BERGER,
A Mother of 18-Year-Old Twin Sons.

The Inequity of the St. Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, in 1920 New York State appointed a commission to study the St. Lawrence project. The report of that commission was unfavorable to the State and the Nation as a whole. Commerce and industrial associations of New York, who have billions of dollars invested, are opposed to this project. Before we invest large sums of the people's money, which we take from them through taxes, we should get the answers to a few questions. What will it cost to build this monstrosity? What will be the benefits? How much and how long will we have to foot the bills for maintenance of this project?

The heavy volume of traffic passing through the St. Lawrence now are all foreign ships. The seaboard ports, such as New York, Boston, Baltimore, and all the way to New Orleans are feeling the effect of this now. Building this project will permit the dumping of foreign-made goods of all kinds on our markets. Ice and fog are a constant danger for the best part of 7 months of the navigable year on the river. It is common knowledge that much of the export grain moves to the seaboard ports by rail from huge grain elevators in Buffalo. Better than three-fourths of the St. Lawrence project lies wholly within the Province of Canada and none of it is wholly within the boundaries of the United States. It would mean the development of about 900 miles of a river in a foreign country. Not only the development, but the maintenance for years to come.

Who are the people and what interests are so anxious to have the St. Lawrence seaway approved. New York State paying 20 percent of the Federal tax would be called upon to pay about $150,000,000 in taxes and 20 percent of the continued maintenance of the project. This figure covers only the St. Lawrence without considering that before a 27-foot draft boat could enter any of the 13 harbors on the Great Lakes they would have to be deepened. That would cost about $48,000,000 for the Buffalo River alone.

This summer I spent a few days in the Thousand Islands, Alexandra, Clayton, across the river to Brockville. I saw tons and tons of iron ore being loaded in lake vessels to be transported to steel plants along the upper Great Lakes. We have the barge canal to improve and recondition within the United States and this is a much shorter route than the St. Lawrence.

Coastwise shipping is essential to the national welfare by its contribution to the economic development of the country and by its aid in national defense and it affords essential employment to thousands of workers in the United States.

Prominent engineers say the St. Lawrence would be open for navigation less than 50 percent of the year and it would be 1953 or 1954 before the first ship could get through. Shipping interests have opposed this project on the grounds that it presents serious navigation problems and is unsound in principle. To utilize the St. Lawrence as a seaway would require vessels of special drafts. Operation through the channels would be slow even when navigable and the highly organized traffic in the Great Lakes of grain, ore, coal, and so forth would be seriously disrupted, affecting the business of all the Great Lakes ports and the eastern seaboard and would put thousands of people out of work.

General MacArthur and His Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star of September 21, 1945:

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR AND HIS CRITICS

Regardless of what opinions one may have on the occupation of Japan one thing has become apparent from official statements. A struggle is going on within the State Department, within the White House, and within the War Department over the matter of official policy in connection with Japan. That Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson dares to rebuff General MacArthur would indicate that the so-called liberals, who champion a policy of "Russia is always right, or Britain is always right, but America is always wrong," are winning out.

For instance, General MacArthur announces that 200,000 men will be sufficient to disarm Japan, and that the occupation need not be a prolonged job. General Eichelberger, another successful general, is on the spot and agrees with this estimate. After the successful campaign these men have conducted, it would seem that they are qualified to speak.

But no; they are not.

Instead of jubilation or relief back in Washington, General MacArthur's announcement brings anger and disappointment. The plans of some of the young liberals, like Mr. Acheson, have been upset. They want to reform Japan as well as Germany and Italy. They plan for Japan an economic and social revolution. Mr. Acheson boldly says that "Whatever it takes to carry out this policy will be used to carry it out," and that "occupation forces are the instruments of policy and not the determinants of policy."

Those words of Mr. Acheson call for sober, even solemn, consideration by the American people. Their implications are far-reaching. They mean that demobilization will have to be slowed down and indefinitely prolonged to allow Mr. Acheson and his subordinates to carry out their "economic and social revolution." American soldiers are going to be kept in Japan in larger numbers than military experts like General MacArthur and General Eichelberger say are necessary.

The confidence with which this bureaucrat tells Congress and the people of the country what they are going to do is only matched by the way President Truman has since equivocated on his first spontaneous approval

of General MacArthur's announcement. Somebody has spoken in firm enough tones to President Truman to cause him to speak evasively where once he spoke frankly. When people are evasive they know something which they are afraid to tell about.

The resignation of Mr. Grew takes on a new importance. His moderating influence, an influence whose value can be measured by the hundreds of thousands of lives saved by the early surrender, has been supplanted by those whose ambitions appear so far to be alarming.

The astounding part about this development is that civilians in our Government, of unproven competence, seem more anxious to use our armed forces extensively than the men who did the fighting and have proven their competence to speak.

Thus we see the spectacle of a bureaucrat like Mr. Acheson boldly slapping a great and successful general like General MacArthur in public and getting away with it. With apparent confidence that the public will not realize the far-reaching implications of what his words mean he speaks of carrying out a "social and economic revolution" in Japan "regardless of cost."

American soldiers and American money, "regardless of cost," are going to be used to carry out a policy the people of the country know nothing about.

That is what is going to happen unless the people and the men in the armed services arouse sufficient opposition in Congress to stop this gross misuse of American power.

Eradication of Cancer and Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, here is how the people feel about my bill, H. R. 3939, to eradicate cancer and polio:

DORCHESTER, MASS., *September 14, 1945.*
Representative STEVENSON, of Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you can readily see from my address, I am not a constituent of your State. However, I do wish to commend your statesmanship in introducing a measure to combat disease.

I have noticed an AP report in the papers headed, "Billions for atoms, a mite for disease." I absolutely agree with your attitude in the matter and hope that you will be very successful in obtaining quick action on your measure. There is no doubt that a country such as ours, if a large sum of money is appropriated for research, may be able within a very short time to discover the cure for the dread diseases which have been responsible for the majority of deaths in this country.

Unfortunately, during the war years, many people who might have otherwise maintained their health, have had it undermined by being obliged to perform hard work around their homes where formerly sons and brothers performed these chores. Then, too, the absence of many doctors in whom these families had confidence kept them from seeking prompt medical attention. Looking at it from this light, it would seem that we owe these people a bill of health and that Congress ought to take prompt and active interest in combating these dread diseases, which not only claim their victims, but also break down the spirit and health of the families which have to helplessly watch this suffering.

Good luck to you in your measure, and may you be very successful in bringing about a result for which you will be blessed over and over again by millions of families.

Gratefully yours,

A WELL WISHER.

Zionism and Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me at the conference dinner meeting of the Jewish National Fund, October 7, 1945, Los Angeles, Calif.:

The Jewish homeland is not a Jewish question alone. Not any more than was the killing of 5,000,000 Jews in Europe. Not any more than the social and economic oppression of the Negro is the concern of only the Negro. Not any more than is a low national income and a low standard of living the concern of the laborer alone. Not any more than social security is the problem only of the man and women over 65. Not any more than fascism in Spain and Argentina are merely internal problems for those countries bowing under the yoke.

At first thought, it seems an almost impossible mental stride to connect Zionism with, say, free elections in Greece or, again, the banning of Father Coughlin from the use of the radio. Yet as surely as Hitler's appeasement spelt disaster for the whole world, just as surely are every act of tyranny and oppression, every act of exploitation, every expression of poisonous prejudice, every denial of right by use of superior force links in the chain that pulls the world back and downward.

A lynched Negro in Mississippi and a Jew dead on a street in Warsaw are the expression of the same evil. Wherever human rights have been trampled on there is the fighting front of the aware and awakened liberal.

Not as a Member of Congress, not as a Jew, not even as an American citizen do I champion the cause of Zionism, but as a member of society concerned with the dignity of man and his freedoms, freedom of speech and press, freedom from want and fear.

Let us review the picture briefly as the Liberal views the Zionist cause. Here are a people, homeless and dispersed for 2,000 years, settling in this country and that. A minority wherever he goes, the Jew is a puppet on a string, now praised, now cuffed, now elevated to high office, now driven forth, as it suits the high or low purpose of the government or the majority groups around him. In Spain, in Poland, in Russia, in Hungary, in Germany, at one time or another, he has been the scapegoat to divert the wrath of an oppressed people, of the victim of demagoguery. A people without a land of its own had been robbed of its dignity and that dignity could only be restored with the redemption of a homeland, and only that homeland to which his spiritual ties drove him.

The modern renaissance of the Jewish people sprang into being with the conception of a Jewish state. I'll not even try to give you a notion of the struggle and the heartbreak of the early Zionists. In 1917, however, came recognition from the high and mighty. The Balfour Declaration pledged that his Majesty's Government would do all in its power to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jews.

What followed is almost fantastic.

The Allied Powers won. They had even succeeded in freeing the Arabs from Turkish domination. The rights of small nations were to be recognized. Self-determination for all.

Britain secured the mandate over Palestine with the consent of 52 members of the League of Nations. The mandate called for the eventual establishment of a Jewish Homeland. In 1922, the American Congress passed a resolution embracing the ideology of Zionism, and in 1924, the United States signed a treaty with Britain reiterating the terms of the mandate. Wilson and Lloyd George and Lord Mellet and Lord Wedgwood and Marshal Smuts championed the Homeland. Subsequently Churchill, Roosevelt, and Truman endorsed the Zionist cause.

It had come to pass. The Jewish National Homeland was to be. Then followed the most remarkable colonization of all time. The wasted barren country which had once been the land of milk and honey was redeemed. Malaria-infested areas were decontaminated, swamplands cleared, artificial irrigation introduced, and Palestine took shape and form through the pioneer spirit of the Jews. They did give of their blood and sweat and tears.

In 1933, the scourge of Hitlerism rose and the first victims were the Jews. The apathy and indifference of the rest of the world was tragic to behold. As the fury grew in intensity so did the appeasement of Hitler. Six months before the invasion of Poland, England issued the MacDonald white paper, restricting Jewish immigration to a total of 75,000 in a 5-year period and restricting land purchases by the Jews. Throughout the 6 years that followed, England stood pat on the white paper. Five million Jews lay dead in Europe, those who contrived to escape from Fortress Europe were turned back to the inferno because they could not get into Palestine.

Words of sympathy for the condemned Jew poured forth in profusion. But the white paper stood. President Roosevelt said the United States had never accepted the white paper. The Republican and Democratic Parties thought it of sufficient importance to give the Palestine issue a plank in their platforms. Four hundred Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress formally stated that the white paper must be abrogated and an eventual Jewish commonwealth be established. The American Federation of Labor and the CIO embraced these principles. The British Labor Party platform in 1944 bitterly inveighed against the Churchill Party for its repudiation of its pledge. It, too, thought it of sufficient importance to include in a party platform. Going back a little while, we even find Churchill condemning the white paper. But then he was on the opposition bench, and it is well said that a "friend in power is a friend lost." And we more than suspect that it can be said of erstwhile friends Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison, too.

Britain was never landlord, was never owner of Palestine; she was and is trustee, no more no less.

To go on, the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations condemned the white paper. But England stood pat, stood pat among the sound and the fury, among the condemnations. The dead were counted up and the homeless and England stood pat. Strategic empire defenses, the Arab uprisings, military expediency, oil and oil again, these were the excuses and the Jews paid the price.

Today, thousands of Jews still remain in concentration camps. There is no place to make them welcome save Palestine. The end of the war did not bring them dignity nor hope. They live, that's all. Others in Europe who have returned to liberated areas find the poison of anti-Semitism has lost none of its potency. Pogroms in Poland, and suicides in France testify thereto. Property and job restorations are all snarled up. The non-Jew who replaced the Jew in job or home will not give up easily.

Into the little portion of land which had been pledged as a Jewish homeland, anybody can go except the Jew. He's barred.

If the liberation of Greece or the liberation of Korea are of primary concern to the liberal, is the opening of Palestine to Jewish immigration of any less concern?

I have viewed Palestine from the international scene. I want to narrow it down now to the Near East and to note its electrifying liberal potency in the cradle of ancient civilizations.

The hue and cry raised by Arab propagandists is that the Jew has displaced the Arab. Far from being displaced the Arab has doubled in population in the past 10 years. Here is the highest standard of living for the workers in all of the East. The Arabs recognizing this have flocked in increasing numbers to Palestine. The birth rate among Arabs had increased as the death rate from disease decreased. The Jewish pioneer has brought a social awakening to the East an awakening that is feared by reactionary Englishmen and Arab rulers alike. The modern techniques of the intensive cultivation of the soil and the quickening brought in the wake of the industrialization swept new values into the East, an assertion of independence, the equality of women, the principles of trade unionism, the development of cooperative projects. Jewish pioneer spirit has accelerated the tempo of the East. The disease ridden, exploited, illiterate Arab has found a new source of strength. What he knows of schools for the peasant, medical treatment, the protection of labor is gained from Jewish settlement in Palestine. It is not the Arab peasant who objects to untrammaled Jewish immigration. He has gained too much thereby; it is the Arab chieftain and the imperialist who see their hold loosened by this awakening social consciousness. They have followed the work of the Histadruth, the powerful organization of Jewish workers of Palestine which has brought western working conditions to labor, among which will be found the 8-hour day and a widespread efficient workers' medical system. It must be remembered that the self-employed regard themselves as workers and the Histadruth includes professionals such as doctors and lawyers. Without the redemption of Palestine by the Jews, that part of the Arab world would have slumbered on, the mass of its people in the grip of fuedalism.

British colonial policy is wily. To keep control, it must divide and rule, set Arab against Jew and then step in on the pretext of keeping the peace. Unity with the Arab in Palestine is possible if imperialism would keep its ugly head out.

One of the most potent forces for liberal development in Palestine is the Jewish National Fund. I'd like you to listen very carefully to its program:

1. To use the voluntary contributions received from the Jewish people in making the land of Palestine the common property of the Jewish people.

2. To lease the land exclusively on hereditary leasehold and on hereditary building right.

3. To allocate farms for returning soldiers.

4. To assist the settlement of Jewish workers without sufficient means.

5. To safeguard Jewish labor.

6. To see that the soil is cultivated and to combat speculation.

The age-old dream of social philosophers to free the land from exploitation, to make it serve the people as a source of wealth for the people, to escape from the evils of land speculation and the consequent unearned enrichment of the land speculator is surely coming to realization through the work of the Jewish National Fund.

We know, of course, that without land ready to absorb the immigration of large numbers of Jews, the task of building up the homeland would be a futile one. Without continuing to buy land, we admit total defeat, we necessarily concur in the absurd contention made by some that the Jews don't really want a commonwealth in Palestine, and we, in truth, ally ourselves with the reactionary, and actually consent to the terms of the white paper. The continued purchase of land by the JNF is an integral part of the resistance of liberals to the closing of Palestine to Jewish immigration. Every dunam of land (about one-fourth of an acre) that is purchased by the Jewish National Fund and every contribution that makes these purchases possible is the concrete acknowledgment that the forces of oppression will not win and that no force on earth is strong enough to deny a homeless people the right to exist as a nation, a free, unfearing, democratic nation. The purchase of land is part of the program for militant action. It is an answer to duplicity, double-talk, and double-dealing. It is an answer to exploiting imperialism.

During the war, the Jewish National Fund continued to make purchases in Palestine—despite the white paper. By 1945, the land purchases had risen to over 800,000 dunams. The Jews had been challenged. They could have the homeland, they were told, if they proved they wanted it. The JNF as part of the World Zionist Organization went out to prove it and prove it they did. The Jews came with plows and not with guns. It was a back to the land movement. The JNF land in town and country is occupied by 25,000 people, 15 percent of the total Jewish population in Palestine, 45 percent of the rural population and more than 70 percent of the Jews actively engaged in agricultural pursuits. The land means new life, new dignity.

Whether on the world scene or in the Near East, the opening of the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration means the fighting of reaction—everywhere. We must have an aroused and militant public opinion. This means the support of every function of the World Zionist Organization, and with special emphasis on the JNF.

The democratic processes must not be denied. We have the right as citizens of a democratic country to insist that the program upon which we elected our leaders be carried out. The people of England went to the polls and in reliance on the program of the Labor Party voted it overwhelmingly into office. It was a clear-cut repudiation of the Churchill and Chamberlain brand of appeasement in all respects, not the least of which was the shameful breach by this Government of its pledge on Palestine.

If we condone for one instance the inaction on our part and the perfidy on the part of the Labor Government toward Palestine, then we deny our faith in democracy. We talk through the ballot. Our meaning was clear. We dare not countenance this disregard of our will.

It seems to me at times that we are tragically lacking in idealism. We talk of the practical and the expedient; we talk so little about human rights and human values. To maintain that people do matter, that individuals do matter above power politics, above empty prestige, above the might of arms is the function of the liberal today.

Let's face it.

We are at the crossroads today. We either face the beginning of a new era in which decency and honor are more than words a politician glibly uses or we face the destruction of our civilization. That's the story the atom bomb tells. We need a moral atom bomb dropped on the world today to save it from its own lack of faith.

If we remain indifferent, if we remain apathetic because we think we're safe anyway, we, ourselves become part of the putrid world of moral degradation.

But deep down in my heart I know we will not give in. We will fight until there is nothing left of the white paper except as a symbol of how low man can fall and yet rise again.

What Does Labor Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article What Does Labor Want?, by Benjamin L. Masse, which appeared in the September 29 issue of the magazine, America. It is worthy of consideration by management, labor, and the Congress.

The article follows:

WHAT DOES LABOR WANT?

(Benjamin L. Masse)

All week long the news from the industrial front has been ominous—from Dayton, from Pittsburgh, from Chicago, and especially from Detroit.

The one possibility that reconversion machinery might be jammed—the possibility of strikes and lock-outs in the Nation's great basic industries—began to look like a grim reality. Official Washington was obviously scared, and there were hurried conferences at the White House. But those close to the scene knew that if labor and management decided to stand up and slug it out, there was precious little that Washington could do. The War Labor Board, shorn of most of its wartime powers, had become a shell of its former self. In all Washington there was no other agency that had a club big enough to deal with the situation.

Behind the headlines, many of them needlessly inflammatory and slanted against the workers, lay a fundamental issue of the gravest importance. As wage demands multiplied—in transportation, steel, rubber, oil, automobiles—it became increasingly clear that organized labor had embarked on no hit-or-miss excursion. It was conducting a unified and well-conceived campaign. It was choosing to raise an issue now which was bound to come up sooner or later anyhow. Spearheaded by the CIO, it was challenging the willingness of American industry to provide full employment and an economy of abundance. It was challenging its ability to survive.

This was not the only issue, of course. There was the question of union discipline, especially acute in the huge, faction-torn United Automobile Workers, and the question of managerial prerogatives. There were war weariness, reconversion jitters, the itch to settle grudges which had accumulated during the war. But all these matters, while important in their own right, only tended at this time to obscure the main issue.

What this issue involves was clearly indicated in the September 16 number of the

New York Times magazine by Vice President Walter Reuther of the United Automobile Workers. Discussing labor's demands for the postwar era, Mr. Reuther wrote:

"We suffer, to put it briefly, from what Thorstein Veblen called the 'inordinate productivity' of the machine. We have mastered technology and possess a complex, high-octane B-29 production machine. But our productive genius has always been stalemated by our failure at the distributive end. We have found it impossible to sustain a mass purchasing power capable of providing a stable market for the products of a twentieth-century technology. This disparity between our B-29 technology and our huffing and puffing Model T distributive system led to the crash of 1929 and ushered in a period of unprecedented waste of human and material resources—a waste estimated at $200,000,000,000 in potential goods and services."

If this diagnosis of the 1929 smash-up is even partly true, it follows that reconversion policies must not be designed merely to cushion the shock of returning to normal business practices. Labor believes that normal business practices are just not good enough. The country must aim, in moving from war to peace, at a fundamental remedy for the fatal weakness of the capitalistic system, wiping out the fitful succession of boom and bust, feast and famine, and providing stable mass distribution of the goods and services available by mass production.

To accomplish this reform, Mr. Reuther argues that we must: (1) make full use of our industrial plant; (2) adopt a wage-price policy capable of creating and maintaining an effective demand for the products of that plant and equipment.

It is this second point that has been dramatically called to public attention by the current wage demands of organized labor. It should be noted, however, from Mr. Reuther's words quoted above, that the 30-percent wage increase his union is pressing on the automotive industry is not a wage demand in the ordinary sense. It is not intended, that is to say, merely to improve the hours and wages and working conditions of the individual worker. It is consciously designed to deal with one of the major causes of depressions; to force industry to level out the violent ups and downs in the economic cycle; to work, in a word, a major reform in the private-enterprise system. Hence, the unanimity of these demands, and their simultaneous presentation to all the basic mass-production industries.

The CIO, I think, through its unions, is talking to industrial executives in these terms: "You men are charged with the responsibility of producing for a mass market. In the past you have done this very well. But you are charged, too, with the responsibility of creating and sustaining that mass market, and in fulfilling this responsibility you have in the past periodically and tragically failed. Your failure has meant untold suffering to our people; it has meant unemployment, relief, bread lines.

"We do not want you to fail again—for your sake as well as for our own. We propose, accordingly, to help you save the system of private enterprise by adopting wage and price policies which will tend to sustain the mass market you aim to satisfy. In the past, you have worked on relatively high-unit profit margins. This enabled you to pay dividends to your stockholders even when you produced at only 60 or 70 percent of capacity. We insist that this wasteful pattern be changed. We want you to accept lower-unit profit margins and to produce at capacity levels. In this way, without any loss to your stockholders, you will enable wage earners to buy more of the goods they produce. You will sustain a mass market. While you will make a smaller profit on every car, or refrigerator, or ton of steel you produce, the sum of these small profits will add up to a very satisfactory total, as they have during the war.

"Therefore, we want you, without raising prices over 1942 levels, to maintain wartime take-home wages. To do this on the basis of a 40-hour week, you will have to boost straight-time hourly rates about 30 percent over present levels. We realize that no one of you can do this alone and survive, at least over a long period. We are, consequently, pressing our demands on all employers of CIO labor, and other unions are doing the same thing.

"We do not believe, however, that industry by itself, even if it adopts a policy of low-unit-profit margins, can maintain capacity production and full employment, but we are certain that it can do much more than it has done in the past. Since we do not wish any more Government intervention in economic affairs than is necessary—a wish you devoutly share with us—we suggest for our mutual benefit that you adopt our proposals and work with us to make them effective.

"In accepting this policy, you will, naturally, run some risk, but then we notice in your speeches, as reported in the press, that you have a high esteem of risk-taking and competition. This is just the sort of gamble, then, that ought to intrigue you; especially since the stakes—freedom from growing Government interference—are so high. And really the gamble isn't so desperate right now. If you are ever going to strike out on your own, this is the time. If you should happen to be squeezed by your 1942 price ceiling—and we don't think you will be—you have your lush wartime reserves to fall back on, your cash refunds from the excess-profits tax, and a promise from the Federal Government that, if your profits fall below prewar levels or you sustain losses, it will refund other tax moneys as well. The people of this country want jobs, preferably in private enterprise. But they want jobs. If you don't deliver, the Government will—and then, sooner or later, good-by to private enterprise."

The result of this strategy has been to put American industry on a spot it hoped to avoid, at least for a while. During the past year it has become clear that business and political conservatives had decided to gamble the future of private enterprise on their ability to effect a speedy reconversion to peacetime production. For some of the proposals being bandied about in Washington—for liberalizing unemployment benefits during the reconversion period and imposing a unified pattern on the variegated State systems, for vastly expanded social security, for the Murray-Patman full employment bill—they had no stomach at all. But they could not oppose these proposals too openly, not if they hoped someday to regain control in Washington. So they elected to stall, feeling sure that within 5 or 6 months after the war reconversion would develop into a boom which would remove the pressure for social reform.

It was a good gamble. It may still be a good gamble. There is an enormous backlog of wartime savings; there are all sorts of consumer wants to be satisfied; there are new tools to be bought and worn-out machinery to be replaced; there are orders from abroad—and for a year or two the Government will continue to spend on a heavy scale, or perhaps forty or fifty billion dollars a year. The elements of a boom are there, all right.

But now the CIO strategy threatens to prick the bubble. If management in the basic industries turns thumbs down on the 30-percent wage increase and the unions refuse to retreat, production will come to a dead stop. And without a high level of production in steel and rubber and automobiles, there will be no boom at all. In that event the Government will most certainly intervene, and intervene in a big way. Remember what happened in the early 1930's?

For American industry the hour is critical, since the wage demands of labor are really a challenge to capitalism's ability to survive. There may be room for argument over the size of these demands; there is no argument, so far as I can see, over the economic reasoning behind them. The relatively few men who determine wage and price policies in our private-enterprise system must either make a greater effort to sustain mass purchasing power than they have in the past—and this means, necessarily, lower unit profit margins—or they must step aside and let the Government do it. That is the real issue behind events in Detroit and elsewhere.

Jewish Resistance—A Program for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me at the dinner meeting of the Jewish National Fund, October 2, 1945, Los Angeles, Calif.:

I remember dimly many years ago an old song that was sung, some song called A Hundred Years From Now. Many of you may remember it too. It was a recital of all the good things that would happen to us a hundred years from now. And that's what we're being fed when it comes to Palestine. Wait. Be patient. We have to study the problem. It can't happen overnight. Rome wasn't built in a day, et cetera. In the meantime, there are wars and pogroms, there are millions dead, there are hundreds of thousands that wander homelessly over the face of Europe, there are thousands still in government camps without hope and without dignity. And we are still waiting.

Remember, Palestine is not a cause that has been relegated to inch notices in newspapers, nor confined to Tuesday night club discussions. It has been the subject of covenants and international treaties. Its pros and cons have echoed through the halls of the two most powerful democratic legislatures in the world—the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Great Britain. Every political party in England and the United States seeking favor with the public has been pro-Zionist. The Labor Party in Great Britain, the Republican and Democratic Parties in the United States made room for a Palestine plank in their election platforms. Even Churchill when on the opposition bench whipped out against Parliament when the white paper was being debated before passage. Leaders of historic stature, Thomas Masaryk, Lord Balfour, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, Field Marshal Smuts, Lord Wedgewood, Franklin Delano Roosevelt openly and verbally, at least, championed Zionism.

There was the Balfour Declaration. There were 52 nations signing consent to Britain's mandate over Palestine which called for the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. There was the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, reiterating the terms of the mandate. Strange, isn't it, that

all these documents of state and all the party platforms and all the oratory culminated in the inexcusable, nay, despicable retreat of the Palestine white paper of 1939. Through the 13 years of misery, persecution, homelessness, and murder the dispossessed Jew of Europe found between him and salvation a certificate of immigration. He couldn't have the certificate, so he must die. In the face of the Jews overwhelming tragedy, with a smugness and callousness that was unbearable, his lord and master, the British colonial administration in Palestine told him he could not make land purchases, that only 75,000 Jews would be admitted into Palestine at the end of the 5-year period. Boatloads of escaping refugees sank off the coast of Palestine. There were no certificates.

In 1945 the white paper is still in effect. The guns are silent all over the world, but we are still waiting for the redemption of a pledge. Because the guns have ceased firing is the necessity any the less?

President Truman had sent Earl G. Harrison, formerly head of immigration and naturalization, abroad to study the plight of the Jews. That report has now been published, but prior to its publicity its content could have been gleaned from what the President did immediately following the report. He asked that 100,000 Jews be permitted to enter Palestine immediately. That tells the story.

What is Britain's answer? She offers in her magnanimity the entrance of 1,500 Jews per month, but the white paper remains intact, with no more land purchases. What a complete give-away. The Arabs will protest just as vigorously at 1,500 per month as at 10,000 or 15,000 per month. The English know this, which proves that England does not fear Arab intransigence. It is merely another of its shabby excuses.

The following is a portion from the Conference Record, issued by the American Jewish Conference: "It is now 4 months since VE-day. But there are still hundreds of thousands of Jews in concentration camps in Europe behind barbed wire, wearing their prison clothing, unwilling and unable to go back to their past, knowing nothing of their future, and beginning not to care. And from outside the camps, from the villages and towns of a Europe that is liberated but not yet free, there come sordid stories reminiscent of the past—of pogroms in Cracow, of suicides in France, of discriminations within the very shadow of the Allied flags."

The conferences go on all right. They went on with Roosevelt and Churchill, between Truman and Attlee, and now between Byrnes and Bevins.

I know what the trouble is. I know what's wrong with us here in the United States, with you and with me. We're not angry enough; we never were angry enough.

We've not known the ravage, the desolation, and the destruction. It was a shame and an outrage, we thought, but what could we do? We are and continue to be the victims of our own lethargy. Because the Jews are a minority group in the United States, they feared to speak up. It was easier to sit back and watch the victims of England's duplicity perish than to initiate a program of militant protest. Not that desire was lacking, not that honor was lacking, but the insistent fear of a minority group that it must not be too obstreperous was greater than these. That, too, is understandable. Having recognized this, we go a step further and realize that a people who have been scattered all over the face of the earth for 2,000 years without a home of their own can never achieve the full dignity that is his due as a man and a citizen. Otherwise the Jew becomes the scapegoat of the political pervert. He has no place in international bargaining, he has no national champion if his own government does not recognize his rights as an individual and as a citizen. That's what happened in Germany. That's what happened in Poland, for instance, following the First World War. A minorities guaranty clause had been written into the peace treaty at Versailles. Grievances could only be submitted through a national government and if the Jew in Poland had a grievance against the Polish Government, would the Polish Government submit the complaint to the League of Nations? Would or did any government in behalf of the Jews? Certainly not. The Jews had no national strength behind them. The minorities guaranty clause was as meaningless to the Jews then as the declaration of rights in the San Francisco Charter is today. Those alleged rights were and are as fake as a theatrical storm—as meaningless as a 2-foot yardstick unless we are a Nation of our own and can demand and secure enforcement of those rights. I dwell on this point to show that the opening of Palestine is as personal a problem with you, though not so immediate nor so urgent as it is with the displaced Jew of Europe. To say you are against sin does not abolish sin and to say that each man must live on an equal plane, regardless of race, creed, or color, does not abolish persecution. For, as Tom Paine has said: "Prejudice like a spider makes everything its home and lives where there seems nothing to live on."

And, further, to say that you are for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine does not establish it. There must be a program for action now—not a hundred years from now. And that program must be yours, individually and collectively.

Only 1,250,000 Jews are alive in Europe today, outside of Russia. Translated into personal terms, it means that the Jews in the United States, almost 5,000,000, must bear the brunt of the responsibility in the redemption of these Jews in Europe. It means we are strong and able and we cannot, dare not, evade that responsibility. It means that we must be the leaders, the moral force in shaping our destiny. We can no longer rely on the political leaders of the world, on their promises before election and their nonperformance after.

If the excuse of military expediency is removed, then the excuse of limited absorptive capacity is raised. If a Walter Clay Lowdermilk, famous soil conservationist, comes along and says Palestine can safely absorb 4,000,000 more with proper cultivation of the soil and the development of waterpower, then the excuse of Arab rebellion is dusted off and paraded again.

We can only depend upon ourselves and upon all peoples, Jew or gentile, who hold human rights above political intrigue and honor above greed.

Any intelligent down-to-earth program must include a twofold approach—land and immigration. Without land ready to absorb the immigration of large numbers of Jews, the task of building up the homeland would be a futile one. Without continuing to buy the land, we admit total defeat, we necessarily concur in the absurd contention made by some that the Jews don't really want a commonwealth in Palestine, and without buying the land we, in truth, actually consent to the terms of the white paper. The continued purchase of land by the Jewish National Fund is an integral part of the Jewish resistance against the closing of Palestine to Jewish immigration. Every dunam of land (about one-fourth of an acre) that is purchased by the Jewish National Fund and every contribution that makes these purchases possible is the concrete acknowledgment that the Jewish national homeland is not a mirage, that it is, that it will continue to be, and that no force on earth is strong enough to deny us the right to exist as a nation, a free, unfearing, democratic nation. The purchase of land is part of our program for action. It is our answer to duplicity and double talk and double dealing.

During the war private purchase of land dropped to nothing. The Jewish National Fund continued to make purchases in Palestine despite the white paper. In 1919 the JNF owned 22,400 dunam; in 1945, the land purchases had risen to over 800,000. The Jews had been challenged. They could have the homeland, they were told, if they proved they wanted it. The Jewish National Fund as part of the world Zionist organization went out to prove it and prove it they did. The Jews came with plows and not with guns to begin the most remarkable colonization of all time. The wasteland was redeemed, swamps drained, sources of malaria eliminated, productivity of the soil restored, arrangements made for water supply. It was a back to the land movement. The JNF land in industrial and rural areas is occupied by 25,000 people, 15 percent of the total Jewish population in Palestine. This covers factories, homes, farms, cooperatives, etc. Forty-five percent of the rural population of Palestine, i. e. more than 70 percent of the Jews actively engaged in agricultural pursuits, work and live on JNF soil. Over three and one-half million trees have been planted by the JNF on 15,000 dunam of formerly arid land.

The land is needed for hundreds of thousands of Jewish youth—immigrants, refugees, Palestine-born and Palestinian soldiers. The land means new life, new dignity. The land was bought with the pennies and nickels and dollars or their equivalent of Jews all over the world.

The contributions were not a mere giving; it was a way of creation in which everybody could join. Through the JNF, the Hebrew University was built on national soil as was the Rothschild Hadassah University, and scores of other hospitals and schools. It has bought land for industrial zones and allocated land for workers' quarters.

Actually it was not my intention to dwell on what the JNF has accomplished, nor even on its present needs in terms of dollars and cents. What I did want to underscore primarily is that the JNF is one of our weapons in the redemption of Palestine; that it is our acknowledgment that we do not recognize the white paper; that the JNF is a repudiation of the defeatists and cynics. This is our answer to imperial England. We will continue to buy land. The national homeland is and will continue to be.

A story comes to mind. A Zadig in an effort to raise funds for the temple asked the richest Jew in town for a substantial contribution. Time and again he was promised and time and again told to return. The Zadig did return and the rich man in exasperation finally slapped his face. The Zadig paused and then said, "That was for me. Now what do you give for the temple?" What are you going to give for the restoration of the temple—for the reconstruction of Eretz Israel. Do not rebuff us. Give to the Jewish National Fund.

Sometimes I wonder exactly what England is trying to do? Is England like the bully who tries to see how far he can go before he backs down? Is England trying to find out if we will follow the pattern first of Indian passive resistance? Does she want to see if Palestine will embrace the principles of Satygraha—a program of civil disobedience where without bloodshed the Jews will refuse to recognize the laws of the colonial administration, refuse to pay the taxes imposed, bring refugees to Palestine shores in small boats and secrete over the border, refuse to obey the edicts and decrees? Is she waiting until she can provoke a general strike, where the entire Jewish population as one refuses to acknowledge any administration, but that of the Jewish Agency?

Let it not escape us that the Jewish state does exist in fact. It has all the attributes of statehood except two, an acknowledged foreign policy and control over export and import trade. With these two exceptions, Jewish institutions function as to exist as a de facto government. The Jewish Agency, together with other agencies, levy and collect taxes. An effective police system has been instituted which though at first was underground has been legalized with the war into the home guard. Health and social services are completely under the direction of Jewish institutions as is the system of education with minor contributions from the colonial administration. We must likewise not forget that the Jewish Agency was able to raise a volunteer army of a higher ratio than did the United States through Selective Service. Were Britain to withdraw from Palestine today, Palestine as a state would continue to function. They do not need to be taught self-government. Unlike other mandated territories, they need no tutoring to take over the reigns of government. They would not crumble should the British Foreign Office retire. It remains clear that the Jews of Palestine can make amicable arrangements with the Arabs with no imperial interests around intent upon a policy of divide and rule.

Is England then waiting to see whether Palestine will use the Indian civil disobedience program—Satygraha—or the Ireland resistance program? Will there be black and tan riots? Suppose a program of passive resistance is followed by the Jews in Palestine, will England or can England arrest each one? Or will England be the one to initiate a program of bloodshed? Will England once again turn away the boatloads of despairing Jews who seek the only haven in the world for them, and then expect the Jews of Palestine to bow in placid resignation?

She has sent a part of her Eighth Airborne Army to Palestine. What does that forebode? Certainly, nothing good. Ironically enough, the Eighth Army is withdrawn from Germany. Instead of policing Nazis, shall it be used to bayonet and bullet Jews?

I don't know if any of these things will happen. I can only count the possibilities. I do know, Palestine is a seething volcano. I do know that the Jews in Palestine, encouraged by Jews without, are firmly resolved not to accept or tolerate any immigration or land restrictions. They will take heroic measures to insure homeless Jews entrance into Palestine and to insure their settlement on the land. To that end they are prepared to make any sacrifice. It is England's responsibility. She can elect to redeem her pledge, to remove the stigma of her infamy toward the Jews, or she can elect to take whatever consequences may flow from her disregard of human rights and moral law. The choice is hers.

Legally and ethically, the right is on our side. We'll not give up.

Atomic Power and Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared an editorial in the Peninsular Gateway, a weekly newspaper of my district, published at the scenically attractive community of Gig Harbor in Pierce County, Wash. Its editor is a liberal thinker of profound and penetrating perception. Mr. C. E. Trombley, the editor, was formerly a member of the State legislature. Two of his editorials in recent issues discuss topics of controversial interest which are absorbing the attention of the people of the country.

The editorials are as follows:

MATTERS OF INTEREST

(By C. E. Trombley)

ATOMIC POWER

The discovery and use of the newly found atomic power, as demonstrated by the atomic bomb, is the outstanding subject and question of the day, nationally and internationally, and in fact it has to do with the welfare of every human being on earth and those yet to be born. Therefore it should be of first concern to all of us, high and low.

Some 3 weeks ago Walter Winchell, the radio commentator, insinuated that the duPonts were endeavoring to secure control of the atomic bomb secrets. This insinuation has been denied by the duPonts through a telegram sent to all the papers in the country, a copy of which will be found in another column of the Gateway. However, on the heels of this denial, a Winchell broadcast stated that his previous insinuation was to the effect that while the duPonts have not directly endeavored to secure a monopoly of the secrets, other influences are endeavoring to secure these secrets for the duPonts. So now the fat is in the fire and Walter Winchell and the duPonts are in the midst of a red-hot argument, which in any event will do no harm.

There appears to be a mad scramble on the part of various influences, both national and international, to form some sort of control over atomic power, with the idea of taking the secrets involved from the exclusive control of our country, Britain, and Canada. This scramble has already reached proportions beyond all sense or reason. Why not let our Government have time to get a grip on the subject involved. We furnished all the money, most of the brains, and raw materials in connection with the successful experiments and accomplishments involved. Canada and Britain have both stated officially that they are satisfied with the idea of having all responsibilities in connection with the atomic secrets kept in our hands for the present and for some time to come. So why this fuss and bother on the part of people who had nothing to do with the production of this modern miracle, the atomic bomb?

It has been stated unofficially that our Government may be willing to pool the use but not the secret of the atomic bomb or atomic power. In our opinion this sort of a scheme would not be a good one for some time to come. The line of demarcation between pooling the use and pooling the secret could be drawn so fine under certain conditions, as to make the difference of non-effect, with the result that we might seriously regret any such arrangement.

For the benefit of humanity as a whole the secrets of atomic power production should be left where they are now, at least for some time to come. There is no country, or sphere of organized society on earth more worthy of this responsibility than ours. As a peace loving people we have succored the weak, fed the hungry, clothed the naked, and given in blood and sacrifice the best of our manhood, unselfishly, freely, and without thought of cost. If our Government cannot be trusted with the atomic power secret for the immediate years to come, no form of government on this earth that we know of, can be trusted with it.

It causes one to shudder at the thought of this great power falling into the hands of the scheming, treacherous cutthroat nations of Europe, or some other nations of the world. The dangers are most frightful and should not be played with. The people of America should arise as one man against the relinquishment of any and all power and authority which we now have over atomic power production. A special congressional commission composed of the most honorable and intelligent men of our Nation, subject to the will of Congress, should be appointed to have full supervision of all atomic activities.

President Truman is being deluged with a multitude of proposals in regard to this question. He will do well if he keeps his head and is not swept off his feet by the pressure that is becoming greater every day. Let us all pray that God will give him wisdom and guidance in this matter. This is a tremendous question that affects us all.

In considering the subject of atomic power, it would be well to realize that besides England and the United States there is no other nation on earth with resources sufficient to produce atomic energy, except Russia. It is now known that Russia has been working on this problem for some time and will no doubt obtain the secrets involved in the not distant future, for she has the raw materials necessary and plenty of gold in her hills with which to buy necessary technical talents should she need them. At this junction it would be well to ask the question: Would Russia share with us any atomic or other superior secrets she might obtain? If her past performance is any criterion, we would say most certainly she would not.

The fact is Russia, at present, is afraid to trust any nation. If England had full control of the atomic secrets in question, would she be willing to share the economic benefits of them with us? If her past performance is any criterion she most certainly would not. She positively refused to pay her World War I indebtedness to us, and even in the war just ended she made us pay tolls on our war craft passing through her Suez Canal, while we were allowing her vessels free passage through our Panama Canal. In fact, England, through her financial manipulations over the decades, has milked us to the last drop of our economic blood obtainable, and there is no question but that if she had full control of atomic power she would charge us for its use and benefits every farthing the traffic would bear. How about France, we might ask. If past performance is any criterion we could expect little from France if she controlled atomic power. In World War I we lavishly poured our wealth and blood into France to free her from the Hun, and in return she made us pay to use her highways while carrying on military operations; flatly refused to pay even the interest on her war loans from us; and when we suggested that she make at least a moral showing in regard to this matter, our nationals were openly and flagrantly insulted on the streets of Paris and other French cities, and Uncle Sam was termed by the press and otherwise as "Uncle Shylock."

There should be a lesson for us in the above-mentioned recent history to the effect that after we have done everything possible for the nations of Europe, even to the extent of taking bread from the mouths of our own children for their benefit, we will be unduly criticized and vilified by them because we have not given more.

In the face of these facts and other things that have gone before, it is our opinion that it would be a most unpatriotic, silly, and simple-minded procedure for us to turn over to any national power or organization of men any part or parcel of the secrets of atomic energy which we now possess, until our neighbors, beyond question, have proven by their conduct that they are worthy of our confidence, and that state of affairs promises to be several years in the future.

The control of atomic power is a tremendous problem, because, morally speaking, the

world is not fit to control it with any degree of capability. While atomic power is of such vast proportions that we are unable to comprehend its scope, still there is one thing it cannot do, namely, change men's hearts; that is one accomplishment only God Himself can bring about. But it is an accomplishment that must be consummated if we are to avoid destruction, and as an alternative secured the untold blessings which the newly found power has placed at our feet.

MATTERS OF INTEREST

(By C. E. Trombley)

PEARL HARBOR

On December 7, 1941, the American Navy suffered its most crushing blow and defeat in its history at the hands of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor. Our entire Pacific Fleet consisting of first-class battleships, cruisers, and other minor vessels were either sunk or totally or otherwise disabled by Japanese torpedo flyers, based on aircraft carriers. Accompanying the aforesaid destruction there was the loss of precious lives, the killed and wounded totaling thousands.

The seriousness of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe was kept from the general public for many months, but in due time the truth of the situation became known and in consequence there has been a growing demand for courtmartials, or at least a thorough investigation of the whole affair.

Light on the Pearl Harbor debacle has been kept from the public on the grounds of war prosecution necessity, but now that the war is over President Truman has released two reports on the subject, one covering the findings of a board which has investigated the Navy's part in the unfortunate affair, and one having to do with the Army's official records of the same.

In the summing up of things there seems to be a disposition on the part of certain elements, especially those influences close to the military heads in Washington, D. C., to put a soft pedal on the whole affair, and to justify this procedure the thought has been expressed in high places to the effect that it is not fair to make certain people among the higher up the "goat" or "goats," because in their opinion the people of America as a whole are to blame on account of pacifist or isolation influences and lack of interest in war preparation activities.

In this deduction we cannot agree. The Pearl Harbor debacle had nothing to do with politics or economics in any form. It was, strictly speaking, a military operation. We have carefully read and reread a lengthy summary of both Army and Navy reports and to us the said reports bring but one conclusion, that is: Regardless of the fact that the authorities in Washington, from the President down, had every reason to fear the Japs would strike in the very manner in which they did strike, at any hour, our entire Pacific fleet was anchored en masse at Pearl Harbor in a most convenient manner, and at an hour tending towards the greatest success of the attack from the Japanese view point. Why this combination of circumstances with its attendant disastrous results? This is a question the average citizen of this country is asking on every hand today, and he is entitled to an intelligent, frank answer. We do not think it fair to make Mr. Average Citizen the goat in matters far beyond his control.

The taxpayers of this country have been lavish in their support of West Point and Annapolis, where the flower of our young manhood have been trained over generations in the art of offensive and defensive warfare. We have every right and reason to expect from the ranks of these institutions the very highest, keenest and most efficient results, an example of which can be found in Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur; and Admirals Nimitz and Halsey, and many others. Both the Army and Navy reports show that it was not a lack of knowledge of military strategy that allowed the successful Jap sneak attack. But there was surely something lacking or our terrible defeat could never have been consummated. The average citizen is seriously curious to know what could have been lacking.

Along with other necessary things for our protection our taxpayers have not knowingly been stingy in their support of our intelligence or secret service department. In this department of our Government we have always had great pride, feeling that we have had the best secret service department of any country on earth. In considering this phase of our national protection our faces have reason to become red when we read one paragraph of the Army's report as follows:

"The Japanese Navy was lost to us for considerable period. * * * The task force which made the attack on December 7 left home ports, assembled at Tankan Bay and, notwithstanding that it was a relatively large convoy, sailed for thousands of miles without being discovered. Part of its aircraft was in flight for the targets at Pearl Harbor and on Oahu before we knew of its existence. Its detection was primarily a naval job, but obviously the Army was intensely interested. * * * The Japanese armed forces knew about us. We knew little about them."

The information contained in the foregoing paragraphs furnishes reason enough for a most thorough congressional investigation. If the brass hats in Washington are allowed to get away with this sort of thing the lives and property of our people will never be safe.

There may be those who will reason that now we have won the war and victory is ours, why not let the matter drop, and charge the whole affair, with its mistakes, up to experience? There might occasionally be some merit to this argument in ordinary affairs, but the Pearl Harbor espisode presents problems of far reaching importance which cannot be considered lightly.

A recent Brookings Institute report estimates that when we cease borrowing funds with which to carry on national activities and begin a pay-as-you-go plan through taxes with which to meet our national expenses, we will be faced with a yearly national budget of $22,300,000,000. Add to this stupendous amount $10,000,000,000, the cost of upkeep and running expenses of our States, counties, and various municipal activities, and we have a grand total of nearly $33,000,000,000 which we must raise yearly in taxes, or to be more explicit, about $1,000 each year per family. The Brookings Institute figures did not allow anything for the payment of bonds. Its estimate covered such items as interest, general peacetime expenses, care for our returning veterans, etc. However, among the items was one of $7,000,000,000 for the upkeep of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, and right here we think that it would be well to note that recent estimates by some of our high officials in Washington place our future military expenses at no less than $10,000,000,000 a year and possibly more. Just where this money is coming from we, of course, have no idea and when we saw their estimate we wondered whether they ever thought of things in the light of taxation possibilities.

In giving the foregoing information we have in view the positive necessity of having at the head of our military affairs in Washington men of the highest efficiency and character. We are now the leading military power in the world and the expenses of keeping up our Military Establishment will be in extra large figures and the responsibilities will be tremendous. From the evidence furnished by the Army and Navy Pearl Harbor reports it is evident that a most drastic brass hat housecleaning should be made, and, in our opinion, there is no better place to begin this housecleaning than through a thorough congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor debacle.

Palestine and the Labor Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me at the dinner meeting of the Jewish National Fund, October 3, 1945, San Francisco, Calif.:

When I read the report that the subcommittee of the British Cabinet had recommended that the white paper stand, that 1,500 Jews be admitted each month into Palestine, making a total of 18,000 yearly, it was as if a bombshell had struck. It's incredible. The Labor platform pledge meant nothing. The urging of President Truman to admit 100,000 Jews into Palestine meant nothing. All the fine speeches in the Houses of Parliament meant nothing, and all the rotund oratory before election. Liberal people the world over rejoiced when the Labor Party was swept into office. To what end? It's a sad hour for England and for the world.

Chaim Weisman rightly said he would not accept any of the certificates under the white paper. We want no truck with the white paper; none whatsoever.

The New York Times reports that England has offered to submit the question of Palestine to the United Nations Organization. We'll not be taken in. Knowing the impact of British imperialism and the hardships her colonial administration foisted upon the Jews, knowing her endless perfidy in her relations with Palestine and her willful disregard of pledges, we must beware of Britain bearing gifts.

I know what would happen. Again, we'll have study commissions and dilatory tactics. Palestine has been studied, restudied, and re-restudied. There is no need for further study. This referenec to the United Nations is a well-known legal trick, known in the trade as delaying action. It is again a disavowal of England's obligation.

The leaders of the Labor Party have become "McDonaldized," idealists who have lost their sight.

And even more incredible is the news item that England is transferring part of her Eighth Army from Germany to Palestine. This was the Government that was to set the world aright, that was to concern itself with the needs of humanity. Let's contrast the performance of the Labor government with the promise of the Labor Party.

The British Labor Party at its forty-third annual conference in London last year, in no uncertain terms, went on record to help in every way possible the Jewish cause in Palestine. Its Palestine plank reads as follows:

"Here we have halted halfway, irresolute between conflicting policies. But there is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home, unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish to, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe.

"Here, too, in Palestine is the case on human grounds, and to promote a stable settlement for the transfer of populations, let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organized and generously financed.

"The Arab has many wide territories of his own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews

from this small area—Palestine—less than the size of Wales.

"Indeed, we should reexamine also the possibility of extending the present boundaries by agreement with Egypt, Syria, or Trans-Jordan. Moreover, we should seek to win the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments for the execution of this Palestine policy."

That's the plank. There is no mistaking their preelection promise.

The Labor Party had again and again challenged and chided the Chamberlain and Churchill governments for their dereliction in Palestine and bitterly condemned those governments for their perfidy and for their failure to redeem their pledges repeatedly given to the Jews and to the world; to wit, that England would keep open the gates of Palestine for untrammeled Jewish immigration and land ownership to the end that the Government might facilitate the establishment therein of a national homeland for the Jewish people.

Time and again, the leading members of the Labor Party had expressed themselves in favor of the Zionist aspirations in Palestine. In fact, the British Labor Party had been pro-Zionist for a quarter of a century.

Maj. Clement Attlee, the 62-year-old British Labor Party leader and now Britain's Prime Minister, while a member of the British delegation to the World Security Conference at San Francisco, had reassured labor friends of Palestine that he was fully in accord with his party's program on Palestine. In 1935 he expressed gratitude to the Jews in Palestine for the part they played in the rescue of the first Jewish victims of Nazism. He rose in his seat in Parliament and declared that the political and economic reconstruction of Palestine had become an "imperative duty," particularly in face of the tragedy of the German Jews. He said that the Jews were "bearing the burdens of other people's sins."

It seemed significant that Prime Minister Attlee had placed in important cabinet posts numerous of his colleagues who had been not only sympathetic to the Zionist cause but who had openly and courageously denounced the efforts on the part of the British Government to sabotage and scuttle the struggles of the Jews to develop the homeland.

George Alfred Isaacs, Minister of Labor and National Services, in 1936, proposed as a resolution an appeal from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, calling on the British Trade Union Congress to use its influence in preventing suspension of Jewish immigration to Palestine.

Miss Ellen Wilkenson, Minister of Education, continually spoke against the white paper and voted against its passage in 1939. Likewise, Tom Williams, First Parliamentary Secretary of Agriculture and Fisheries, in 1940, denounced the white paper land restrictions and the imprisonment of Palestinian Jews for possession of arms for defense against marauding Arabs. George Henry Hall, Secretary of State for the Colonies, Emanuel Shinwell, Minister for Fuel and Power, and Philip John Noel Baker, Minister of State, had all plainly indicated their friendliness to the Jews of Palestine.

Lastly, Herbert Stanley Morrison, Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House of Commons, was one of the principal opponents of the promulgation of the nefarious white paper. On the floor of the House of Commons in May 1939, when the white paper came up for passage, he stated:

"We regard this white paper and the policy in it as a cynical breach of pledges given to the Jews and the world, including America. This policy will do us no good in the United States, where we need to be done good and where we need the good will of the great American people. It comes at a time of tragedy and apprehension for the Jewish race throughout the world, and it ought not to be approved by the House today * * * if we do this thing today we shall have done a thing which is dishonorable to our good name, which is discreditable to our capacity to govern and which is dangerous to British security, to peace and to the economic interest of the world in general and of our own country."

Addressing the majority party, he said, "I ask them to remember the sufferings of these Jewish people all over the world. I ask them to remember that Palestine of all the places in the world was certainly the place where they had some right to expect not to suffer or to have restrictions placed upon them. Look at the extent of the country—this little patch of territory. Transjordan has been taken away. The rest of the Arabian countries released from Turkish rule as a result of the war have an enormous area. This tiny patch, Palestine, about the size of Wales, is left and we are to stop these people from going there. I appeal to the honorable members opposite to take their courage in both hands, to put the honor of their country before the narrow claims of party."

Thus spoke Laborite Herbert Morrison. And now it's a case of "Et tu, Brute." Again it was the outpouring of words of compassion and of logic. They, it can be said now, had no more meaning than the torrents of words that poured forth before, while millions upon millions of Jews were being slaughtered, and with no country of sufficient humanity to make them welcome. Palestine, though pledged and repledged to the Jews, is again forbidden them.

That's the Labour Party record, before and after election.

The Labor Government seeks and needs the good will of the United States. The United States has made clear its stand on Palestine. We embraced the principles of the Balfour Declaration in a congressional resolution in 1922 and reaffirmed it in the Anglo-American treaty of 1924. Nor have we hesitated to declare our disapproval of Britain's repudiation of her pledge and her unilateral breach of the treaty and the terms of the Palestine mandate. Both major parties in the last election adopted Palestine planks in their platforms favoring the abrogation of the white paper of 1939 and favoring the ultimate establishment in Palestine of a democratic Jewish commonwealth. Both candidates for the Presidency, the late President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey, publicly and strongly endorsed these planks.

Some time ago at a news conference President Truman disclosed that he had made a plea at Potsdam for the setting up of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. As a matter of fact, after the death of the late-lamented President Roosevelt, President Truman told me personally at the White House that he stood four-square behind President Roosevelt's declaration and that he would not budge from the provisions of the Palestine plank of the Democratic platform.

Thirty States through their governors recently petitioned President Truman to adhere to these principles. Over 400 Senators and Representatives of the United States gave favor to the Zionist viewpoint.

There can be absolutely no doubt on how the United States feels both officially and publicly.

We must recognize that the Chamberlain government gave the world two dreadful and dreaded papers, fathered by appeasement. One was the Munich pact with its false "peace in our time," the other was the MacDonald white paper, which in the cruelest and most uncomprehending manner and with grossest irresponsibility to human lives slammed shut the doors of Palestine. That paper, too, must be scrapped.

Churchill, while on the opposition bench, called this MacDonald white paper a "breach of faith" and "the filing of a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy." Rest assured his words often come back to plague him. Churchill was friend before he wore the ermine. It can be said of Clement Attlee, too, "A friend in power is a friend lost."

Every manner of excuse, shabby as they were in the face of human suffering, has been used to keep the Jews out of Palestine. Military necessity, lack of transportation facilities, the inability of Jews to escape, Arab uprisings, all these were given in reply long after they had lost even the sound of reasonableness. One, Lord Devonshire, sitting in comfort and safety in the House of Lords presumed to say the stateless Jews do not want to go to Palestine. How could you know, Lord Devonshire? Are they given a chance?

Where can displaced Jews go? Every country has its immigration bars. We in the United States, in our strength and power, were magnanimous, were we not, in permitting a thousand Jews to enter our shores outside of the quota. We placed them in a camp at Oswego as if they were a special breed and imposed conditions and restrictions upon them as if they had been guilty of a crime against society instead of the victims they were of the most callous crime in history.

Thousands of Jews are now wondering homeless over Europe. Thousands are still in concentration camps. Those Jews who have returned to the countries from which they have been driven find that a military victory did not wipe out antisemitism. The Nazi propaganda machine had done its work well. The antagonism is sharpened by job and property entanglements. No people with a land of their own could have been subjected to such continued indignities.

Over the years, we on the Zionist side have spoken softly, nor did we carry the big stick. Now Zionist demands are streamlined as through a megaphone and the sound is amplified by justice and impatience.

Fulfill your pledges, Major Attlee, and those of England, lest the sound become more than a roar. Resultant fury may lead to something more than beer and skittles. Unless the nefarious white paper is abrogated immediately, trouble awaits. Unless humanity and fidelity to her promise shape her course in Palestine, England will not be the winner. Her dominion and her honor will be lost to her.

The Arabian world is vast; there is no lack of space for the Arabs. They cannot with justice claim that the 10,000 square miles that are Palestine is the one stumbling block to a unified Arabia. At the Pan Arabian Conference, the representatives of the Arabian world could not agree on any one social program that would lift their people out of feudalism; they could not agree on an educational plan; they could not agree to relinquish a mite of their respective sovereignty in the interest of unity; they could not even agree to lower trade barriers between the countries. The one thing they did agree on is that the tiny bit of land of Palestine is the only impediment to their way of harmony. It is thus obvious to even the most politically inastute that Palestine is to be used as the pawn for international bargaining. They don't, of course, point to the fact that the Arab in Palestine has the highest standard of living in the Middle East; that he has schools and hospitals; that rampant disease has been checked; that far from being displaced by the Jews, the Palestinian Arab has doubled his population in the past 10 years. Nor does Arab propaganda make any mention of the amazing cultivation of a once barren soil or the rapid industrialization which served the war needs in the Levant. Were the Arabian propagandists concerned with the welfare of the Arab peasant, they would change their tune.

What makes England think we are going to bow in humble submissiveness. There are the people of England who will not be silent. We here shall not be silent. We will redouble our efforts. We will continue to buy

the land. Every contribution to the Jewish national fund is a protest against the trickery of England. Every dime and every dollar given is the meeting of a challenge. President Roosevelt had said that the United States had never accepted the white paper. That still holds true. Every bit of land that the JNF buys for the kibbutzim, for the returning Palestinian soldier, for the youth of Palestine, and for the refugee is our answer to England. We're not helpless though we be thousands of miles from Palestine. Our protests will be militant. Rich and poor in the United States will help build the homeland. We will and must be ready for the day when the white paper will go. For it will go. No one government on earth is strong enough to defeat forever the ends of justice and keep a land and a people in bondage.

As the JNF built before, it will continue to build. It will continue to drain the marshes, clear the swamps, plant the trees, and provide the workers' quarters. The JNF had never acknowledged the white paper, nor bowed to its restrictions. All through the war JNF bought land—despite the white paper. It was making ready for both the dispossessed Jew of Europe and the pioneer in Palestine. It made ready, it looked ahead, for without vision a people perish.

If it's too much for England's frail shoulders to keep the faith, we'll keep it, and if England has yet to be taught the meaning of honor, we'll teach her.

An Overseas Serviceman Unburdens Himself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, thousands of servicemen have written me from overseas during the past year in support of my bill creating a national academy for foreign service, or better known as a West Point for diplomats. Typical of the countless epistles which have flowed into my office in this connection is one written by Walter George, which I am appending herein below in the hope that it will be of benefit to the country and to my colleagues. I have been grateful to these service men and women for the time and effort they have expended in writing these very helpful communications to me. It is inspiring to know that young men and women wearing the uniform of Uncle Sam are not so preoccupied with their military activities that they fail to reflect upon recondite national and international issues. It is my profound conviction that those who wear our country's uniform are more concerned at the mistakes made by the State Department than any other group, for they know that wars of such great proportion evolve from diplomatic ineptitude and international illiteracy.

If my colleagues will get behind me in urgently requesting the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to give a hearing to my measure, it would be helpful pro tanto that the voters throughout America would advise their Congressmen they want a new era in the State Department. Will we get results? All of us have been looking for the new dawn, "when night's candles are burned out." Let us work toward that goal.

The letter of Walter George, a thoughtful serviceman, is as follows and in the classic language of the lawyer, res ipsa loquitua—the thing speaks for itself:

HEADQUARTERS COMPANY,
FIRST BATTALION,
534 E. B. & S. R., care of Dolphin, APO 713.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
Representative from Washington,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am in the Southwest Pacific and sometimes it take a very long time for reading material to reach here and be brought to one's attention.

This evening I picked up a copy of Coronet magazine, dated October 1944, and the first article that I read was Why Not a West Point for Diplomats.

Mr. Representative from Washington, if my envious admiration for you could be measured in miles instead of warm mutual feeling, then it would extend across the seas and the continent that separates us tonight and it would give to you renewed hope and courage to carry on your fight for such an institution.

With my conscience as my guide and practical thinking as a tool, I have argued, I have debated, and finally I have discussed the future of our Nation in practically every phase. I feel that in those five words, "The future of our Nation," lies too the eventual future and destiny of the entire world.

It is with the deepest regret that I can say, "I wish that I had seen that article sooner," but now instead, a year has come to pass. I am well read on politics and all good policies, yet it was only tonight that such a revolutionary idea has come before me. I must ask why? I must know why! Every clear-thinking American should be told why.

I have seen numerous instances during the last few years of representatives of our Government, in both Houses coming forth with new ideals and new plans, but before they could successfully impress the people with the necessity and practicability of it, they were suppressed and silenced by a majority opposition through fear of one form or other. Whether it was a fear of loss of position, wealth, or friends, it was a traitorous fear and a cowardly one.

I beg from all the powers and forces in this world that represent sincerity and honesty, that this is not the reason that your plan has not yet assumed prominence nor international publicity.

You are the first man of national fame whom I have met through the literary world who dared to write of something so unconventional, yet so foresighted and practical. It is for this reason alone that I still believe your efforts are still untiringly devoted to the foundation of such an institution, in which every color, every race, and every creed will be represented and accorded equal privileges and social standing.

From such an institution would flow, not only in the minds and hearts of these young men and women but also graphically in their physical beings, the true spirit and meaning of the principles of democratic government. These men will have lived together, assimilated the best characteristics in principle from each other, and finally and most important of all, they have found that educated men and women can take any problem, be it simple or complex, be it local or international, and with mutual understanding and logical orderly discussion, find a workable and a just solution.

You, Mr. Representative are fighting for an idea. With your basic ideal and my determination I am fighting for the rights of peace-loving young men and women throughout the world. Yes, I am fighting for the rights, not only of those who were allied with us, in this, the cruelest and most destructive of all wars, but also for those men and women of our once enemy nations who now sneer and curse us in their every breath.

Can't you realize or are you so pitifully blinded to this self-evident of all facts that armed force and suffering can merely change a people physically and even in this way it is only temporary? People must eat to live and work and build. After these things are done, they will again fight with greater determination and revenge.

We have merely conquered a people and we have promised that now understanding and leadership will be given to all those not directly involved in the fostering of the war and the many savage cruelties inflicted on the Allied peoples. I can think of no greater stride in leadership, no greater bond of understanding, than that of fellowship, fraternity and tolerance among all men and women of the entire world.

The young men and women of today are the foundation and leaders of every country, of every nation in the future. Should they be forgotten and left to go on uneducated as their forebearers are now doing, then the impeding danger that is now confronting us will eventually lead to total disaster and disunity among all the peoples of the world.

A small part of this impeding danger can be witnessed today in every country of the world in destruction, disorganization, and mutual distrust among each other, not only on the other side of the fence, but rather, too, in our own back yard.

There is nothing; no ideal, no invention in this world today that hasn't come to pass because someone experimented; someone with foresight and the courage of his convictions fought and conquered every obstacle that stood in his path and won eventual victory.

Every individual at birth, without exception, is born honest and free. His education molds him into an individual of a lustful and savage nature with no character and no morals, or, conversely, a gentleman or a lady of honesty, integrity, and high ideals.

With the introduction of atomic energy, the menace that confronts us now is too great to mention and almost too ghastly to comprehend. Our Navy will be useless and vulnerable on the sea, and our armies will perish where they stand. The actual concept of the power behind this new force is quite beyond the most vivid of imaginations, and relatively few people realize it, due to the hoodwinking on the part of the Government of all statistical details in relation to it. I know that soon it will be a weapon equally shared by all nations. It can be effectually used by a relatively small but clever group with gigantic and fatal results.

Therefore the time has come to bring together representatives of every nation and country in the world under a program sponsored by the United States and, with the cooperation of the Allied Powers, carry it to its utmost. The primary success will be immediate and overwhelming, passing all expectations; who can at this time guess the future potentialities of such a league of definitely defined men and women of a single purpose.

For centuries youth has fought the wars of the world; it has been the youth of the world who have given every sacrifice, including death, to satisfy the lustful desires of a greedy, gaming, restless, and fickle world. Youth wants life and love and a sense of freedom, but above all he wants a peaceful world for his children. Therefore, why must we go on pitting the youth of the nations against each other and making some pay the price of defeat in bitterness and hate for the rest, when a few can be punished justly and nullify the acts.

There is no man or woman in this world who is physically normal and mentally sane who doesn't place his life, his liberty, and the pursuit of whatever happiness he may desire for himself and his children above all other things.

The American people must forget whatever hates they may possess for every Allied soldier that met death on the field of battle, did so that peace would be the final victory. We have now won the fight; the war has yet to be won permanently and successfully.

Victory and lasting peace is not decided on the field of battle, but rather is formulated in halls heavy with the atmosphere of wisdom and tolerance and filled with men and women of mutual understanding who place the immediate and future problems of the world beyond any and all personal gains.

It would be my fondest hope and most unselfish desire that I could stand before the representatives of our nation and tell each and every one of them that youth is crying to be heard all over the world and point out to them that the existing conditions in the world today are due, mostly in part, to their lack of foresight and perspective. I should tell them that in a matter of months military techniques and strategy will lie parallel with the children's game of marbles in its relative importance. Atomic power has outmodeled and outdated many of its phases already. There is only one counter-weapon for this and that is a workable and practical peace as soon as possible, for all the people of this world.

Now, Mr. Representative from Washington, what do you think? Soon I shall return to the United States and at that time I should consider it a privilege to keep an appointment with you. Then I expect to travel as extensively as conditions will permit. I should enjoy nothing more than to carry with me messages of good faith, good fellowship and above all, assurance and proof that the American Nation and its people have forgiven and forgotten and will help them in every way to find that "New Horizon" that we are all so unconsciously seeking.

WALTER GEORGE.

Strike Rash Needs Action by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of October 4, 1945:

STRIKE RASH NEEDS ACTION BY CONGRESS

The labor distempers that have been cursing other parts of the country are reaching our own homes and business houses. They come as a threat to stop telephone service in this city and State 4 hours tomorrow. No quarrel here brings the threat, nor any elsewhere between workers and employers over wages or conditions. The trouble arises in a fuss involving two or three unions and the National Labor Board, something like a jurisdictional dispute. It seemed to be centered in a city away up in New Jersey. The ukase of a gentleman up in New York calls the workers out in Louisiana and everywhere else.

One union explanation says the work stoppage is designed to give time to vote whether to strike or not. If so, that is worse than most union excesses in this line. For unions usually do their voting on their own free time and not on the public's or the employers'.

Another explanation is that the stoppage is to be a demonstration of union power. If so, this is like saying to the whole people of the country, "We are going to give you a taste of what we will do to you if we don't get what we want from other unions or the employers."

No term can characterize such wanton aggression against the Nation as a whole which is milder than the one Governor Dewey applied last week to the generally destructive elevator strike in New York City. He denounced it as "intolerable"—exactly what it was.

But the national administration has been begging and pleading with oil workers and coal miners not to stop the flow of the country's fuel on the edge of winter, and doing nothing worth mentioning about this threat to telephone service. Hence it appears that President Truman and Labor Secretary Schwellenbach, lacking the spirit of Governor Dewey in the face of recurring threats of national paralysis, can't be expected any longer to deal with such dangerous manifestations of ruinous tendencies as the country's safety requires.

The people should therefore appeal to the Congress to exhaust every legislative power to curb the rising tide of aggression threatening national paralysis. Congress, largely tremulous before the labor vote, has shown no stomach for this duty. But the heritage of Roosevelt and later events have been hurrying these United States to a situation in which the national legislature will inevitably be confronted by the wrath of a popular vote which will dwarf the labor vote—unless the trend is checked.

Meanwhile, every loss of life, every dollar loss, every disruption of orderly civil life, every embarrassment to Army or Navy, which may result from any interruption to telephone service tomorrow in New Orleans or elsewhere, will rest squarely on the doorsteps of the heedless and destructive men who shall cause it.

What Congress may do to stop the country's headlong pace toward chaos is for Congress to say. It could begin by putting the same salutary Federal regulations upon labor unions that it has long ago placed upon employers. It should find means to check wanton calling of strikes without previous arbitration. It should exhaust every constitutional means to stop those strikes in particular which bring loss and ruin to millions of people who are nowise concerned in the quarrels involved. For these are now reaching stages that threaten whole communities and the Nation at large.

You cannot throttle a vast country's telephone communications, shut off its coal and oil, stifle its business, kill its transportation, choke its electric plants, stop its industries, without rousing, before the end is reached, a fury of public resistance that cannot be checked or abated.

The full force of this in all probability would fall upon the mistaken figures who have raised the whirlwind. In that case, their misled followers would lose all they could have gained in their mad career. But if fortune veered the other way, the fate of the workers would be fully as bad. And if events ran their full course it would be even worse.

Unless Congress can legislate a return to sanity before it is too late we shall have at the end of the road a revolutionary struggle between two great camps. If one side won we should have a Fascist government in full totalitarian control. If the other side won we should have a Communist government in full totalitarian control.

In either case, the workers' plight would be every whit as bad. For they would be regimented, ordered about, pushed around by a selfish set of American commissars. These would rule them with sword, gun, and concentration camps, as the fashion is in Russia. To the plain man who has once known freedom, there is no difference between the ways of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin. Therefore, let the Congress assume its responsibilities and save this country and its people from the methods of either.

Palestine and Human Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me at the Ambassador Hotel conference of the Jewish National Fund:

We are assembled in the interest of the Jewish National Fund. The purpose of this fund speaks for itself:

1. To use the voluntary contributions received from the Jewish people in making the land of Palestine the common property of the Jewish people.

2. To lease the land exclusively on hereditary leasehold and on hereditary building right.

3. To assist the settlement of Jewish workers without sufficient means.

4. To safeguard Jewish labor.

5. To see that the soil is cultivated and to combat speculation.

Human conscience is a lazy thing. It may stir a little uneasily at injustice done elsewhere. Justice in the abstract simply doesn't have enough pull to rouse the conscience from its sleep. It's not that man lacks the divine spark. He does espouse causes; he does start to move mountains. He does begin his labor of love. But the tug of his conscience slackens. Not that he believes any less in what he started out to do, but it becomes less a personal problem and more of a let-George-do-it attitude. Just why that is I can't say. I don't know.

I don't know why the tragedy that overwhelmed the Jews of Europe met with such apathy, and even indifference. I don't know why governments meeting on an international plane at refugee conferences at Evian in 1938 and Bermuda in 1942 did not seize on the only obvious, practical, and expedient solution, the opening of Palestine to mass Jewish immigration. In fact, in less than a year, when the need for havens of rescue was so dramatically pointed up, Great Britain, who had been a major participant in the Evian Conference, promulgated the white paper of 1939, closing Palestine to Jewish immigration within 5 years, limiting to 75,000 the number who could enter in the interim, and restricting land purchases by the Jews.

We let it happen. That's what I meant about conscience a minute ago.

Parlous times are upon us. Long since the gates of Palestine should have been opened to receive the Jews driven like dried leaves before the autumn blast. But the flint-like callous British colonial policy keeps the door shut tight.

Where can the stateless Jew go? Immigration laws bar his entrance everywhere. In the countries which, though liberated, are not yet free from the scourge of anti-Semitism, he is the trespasser. His job, his property, his very home are not returned to him. He is made to feel excess. The pogroms in Poland and the suicides in France testify to that.

But England, under Socialist or Tory government, continues imperialistic. Her colonial policy, regardless of the political ideal of her leaders, remains the same. The Jew must be cabined, confined, and restricted. The Arab must be appeased. The white paper must continue, despite the fact that Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison, when campaigning for office, held their hands high to heaven and vowed that the white paper would be abrogated. The Labor Party even went far beyond the purposes of general Zionism. Its Palestine plank in the party platform urged that the Arab be let out and the Jew brought in.

Yes; they are willing to throw a bone. They are willing to permit 1,500 Jews to enter each month, a total of 18,000 yearly, but the white paper, they say, must remain. But we shall have no truck with the white paper.

A mad wag observing Foreign Minister Arthur Bevin speaking in the House of Commons remarked, "By jove, Eden's put on weight." Apparently, it is the same old duplicity in a fatter bottle, with a new label.

The newsprints carry the item that part of the British Eighth Army is being taken out of Germany and sent to the shores of Galilee. Why? We remember quite vividly how in the Palestine pogroms of 1929 and 1936 the Jews were denied arms with which to protect themselves against the armed Arabs; how they fought the Arab off with their bare knuckles while the British stood by in a studied pose of seeming helplessness. Now the British Tommies are taken out of the Reich to bayonet and bullet Jews who may try to get into Palestine, regardless of the white paper. British soldiers will kill Jews going home.

The Jew remains a minority wherever he lives without the dignity of a homeland. He is a minority even in the United States, numbering less than 5,000,000 in a population of approximately 137,000,000. Thus in a democracy like the United States where the tenets of such Government demand that the majority scrupulously observe the rights of a minority, the Jew, as a minority people, is the concern of all the population. If he is the target of prejudice, as in the countries of Hitler's festung Europe that prejudice in part derives from the fact of his homelessness. The establishment of the Jewish homeland does not mean that the Jew cannot be free to emigrate to any other country to live on an equal plane with others, any more than it would mean that with the establishment of the Irish Republic, the Irishman could not emigrate from Eire or that Americans of Irish descent must go back to Ireland. But without Palestine, the Jew generally is permanently insecure and permanently without roots.

President Truman proved his humanity and statesmanship when he requested that 100,000 Jews be permitted to enter Palestine immediately.

He had based his request upon the report of Earl G. Harrison, special emissary sent to examine into the condition of homeless Jews in Germany. Mr. Harrison reported that the Jew has no political status in the German zones occupied by the English and American forces. In some places, he was treated as a friendly alien; in other places as an enemy alien and still in other places he was looked upon as a German and therefore treated like a Nazi enemy. His plight is still pitiable. He wears the same prison clothes though months have elapsed since VE day. Some are still in the Malaria-lice infested concentration camps. They were given the most meagre diet of stale soup and black bread. Scores were dying daily. Harrison even went so far as to say their plight was so bitter and dispairing that it would be only fair to confiscate German homes and place the Jews therein. As the one possibility of sure rescue, Harrison recommended that they be sent to Palestine at once.

General Eisenhower has been ordered by the President to ameliorate these dreadful conditions and review all cases promptly.

An authentic report comes through that some 600 Jews tried to escape from their misery in Poland, making for the American Zone of Occupation. They were confronted with American guns at the Border. We have every reason to believe that General Patton was instrumental in ordering that reception, the same Patton who said he could see no difference between Nazi and Anti-Nazi party any more than there was a difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties. Even his apologies can't remove any of the stain. Patton is a great hero—but who must be held fast and rendered inactive between battles. The pearl handled revolver attitude of all our generals must go.

England's answer to President Truman has not been made public. It needs no soothsayer or crystal ball to tell us that Attlee has rebuffed Truman. The white paper stands. Despite the Balfour Declaration which pledged the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jews, despite the pledge given by England upon her designation as mandatory power to 52 nations that she would observe the terms of the Mandate, and despite the treaty we signed with Britian in 1924 reiterating the terms of the Mandate, and agreeing that there shall be immigration discrimination in race or religion, Great Britain continues the white paper.

Well might we ask: "Is a friend in power a friend lost?" Churchill, while on the opposition benches, had called the white paper a breach of faith and a filing of petition in moral bankruptcy. Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison, likewise denounced the Churchill and Chamberlain Governments for the Palestine policy. Does the ascension to power carry with it a repudiation of honor? Their words must often come back to plague them, to give them many a sleepless night.

I recall the story of Churchill and his beloved fish. At his Chartwell Manor, Churchill had several ponds full of tropical fish. He grew very fond of them, spending much time with them and calling them by name. When the blitz from the air became intense, he had the fish removed to safer ponds.

The Jews died in the millions. But there was none to remove them to places of safety. Millions could have been saved were it not for the infamous white paper. They were worthy of treatment accorded Churchill's tropical fish. There are two blots on England's honor—to her everlasting shame. One of them is the Munich Pact and the other the white paper.

The express purpose of the mandate was to establish a national homeland for the Jews. Nothing contained therein leads to any other interpretation. It was never the intent to establish a homeland for the Arabs. There are no restrictions whatsoever on Arab immigration. That's the ironic note; anybody at all can enter Palestine except the Jew who as the Royal Peel Commission said, "The Jew is in Palestine by right and not on sufferance." So much had the pioneering Jew brought to Palestine, the redemption of the barren soil, the clearing of swamps, the draining of marshes, schools and hospitals for Jew and Arab alike, that the Arab has doubled his population in Palestine in the last 10 years not only because of the decreased death rate and increased birth rate but by emigration. He came to Palestine to get the benefit of the highest standard of living in the East.

The Allied Powers had succeeded in freeing Arabia from Ottoman domination, making possible the states of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria. They reserved the area of Palestine and Transjordan for the Jewish homeland, later severing Transjordan from Palestine, leaving an area of 10,000 square miles for the homeland. Lloyd George testified, "The idea was, and this was the interpretation put on it (the Balfour Declaration), that a Jewish state would be established." Wilson, Smuts, Wedgewood, Churchill, Roosevelt, Truman, Dewey—all have repeated with marked approval this statement of Lloyd George.

There is no intent to dispossess the Arabs. The Jewish agency in a memorandum submitted to the United Nations stated: "On behalf of the Jewish people it gives solemn assurance that the Jewish state will have scrupulous regard for the preservation of the personal and property rights as well as of the religious, linguistic, and cultural rights of the Arab and other non-Jewish population of Palestine and it pledges further the civil and religious equality of all the inhabitants of Palestine before the law. The inviolability of the holy places of the various religions shall be guaranteed by appropriate international agreement."

I began with a flat statement of the purpose of the Jewish National Fund. I did not develop that purpose because the outline of the perfidies of government as I have tried to give it more than any detailed account tell the significance of the work being carried on by the Jewish National Fund. That work will continue long beyond the time the white paper does. The white paper will go. Must go. All men of high purpose, of integrity, of honor will take pride in the work of the Jewish National Fund, will join with it to give it strength. This is the answer to infamy.

We are at the crossroads of civilizations. Civilizations have died before, the Babylonian, the Grecian, and Roman civilizations. There is no word from up on high that ours will endure into eternity. We have split the atom. Dreadful forebodings fill us. We know this, however, if honor is not redeemed, if the lust of nations is not reined in, if the greed of man is not curbed, we head for darkness.

In a very definite sense, the fate of Palestine will be the clearest indication of what road we have elected to follow.

Presidential Candidate Tom Dewey Would Have Lost, Not Gained, by Divulging Military Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently there was much speculation that New York's Governor, Tom Dewey, refrained out of the highest patriotic consideration from divulging secret information to the effect that Japan was about to launch a sneak attack upon Pearl Harbor or one of the other possessions. Life Magazine gave wide latitude to a feature writer, John Chamberlain, in discussing this subject. There seems to be a concerted conspiracy on the part of many to discredit the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. I still adhere to the ethical tenet generally observed among people of good taste.

There is a maxim well known in courts of equity and among lawyers, to wit: de mortuis nil nisi bonum—concerning the dead naught but good should be spoken. But there are some who are so bitter and cynical that they would go to any length to muddy the memory of one of America's great leaders.

In this connection, a recent article by the eminent writer, Ernest Lindley, as printed in the Washington Post, is in order.

Here it is:

WEIGHING EVIDENCE

(By Ernest Lindley)

DEWEY AND PEARL HARBOR

It is not astonishing that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey knew during the 1944 campaign that in the days just before Pearl Harbor the United States Government had secret information that Japan was at the point of breaking diplomatic relations with the United States and making war.

By 1944 this was known to a good many people. And the method by which the information was obtained—by intercepting and decoding Japanese messages—also was known to them. The exact contents of the intercepted messages were not widely known, and some inaccurate versions were current. But it would have been surprising if Governor Dewey had not heard about them.

John Chamberlain, in Life, seems to think that if Dewey had made public the information in his hands he would have been elected President. This assumes that Dewey's information was (1) accurate and (2) damaging to Roosevelt and (3) that Dewey could have used it without damage to himself.

We do not know whether Dewey's information was accurate. The relationship of these messages to the disaster at Pearl Harbor is discussed in the official Army and Navy Pearl Harbor reports. So far as the record shows, they only filled in and pointed up the other evidence that Japan had decided to break relations and launch an offensive. Some subordinate officers noted that the hour at which the Japanese reply to the American statement of November 26 was to be delivered on December 7 coincided with dawn at Pearl Harbor. But the significance of this timing did not impress their superiors.

All the known evidence shows that the attention of the President, like that of his chief military advisers, was focused on Siam, Malaya, the East Indies, the Philippines, and Guam. The indications were that the main Japanese attacks would be in that direction—and they were. When an intercepted message of December 6 reached General Marshall in the late morning, Washington time, of December 7, he talked with General MacArthur by telephone while the message was forwarded to Hawaii by commercial radio.

The Army Pearl Harbor Board criticized General Marshall. Secretary Stimson exonerated him from responsibility for the errors or omissions of his staff. President Roosevelt had and retained the highest faith in Marshall. This faith has been fully justified. Governor Dewey thought so highly of Marshall and of Admiral King, with whom Roosevelt had replaced Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations at the time of Pearl Harbor, that he made a firm pledge in his speech accepting the Presidential nomination to keep them and to rely on their military advice.

Roosevelt surely did not have any information about Japanese intentions which Marshall and Stark and the Secretaries of War and the Navy did not have. He surely had every reason to assume that our commanders in Hawaii, as well as in the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Philippines, had been properly alerted. And the record shows that, while there were some slips, all of them had been given forceful warnings that war might be imminent.

Our success in breaking certain Japanese codes was of immense value to us during the war. It saved untold numbers of American lives and shortened the war. The fact that we had found the keys to certain Japanese codes was therefore one of our most zealously guarded secrets. That is why General Marshall and Admiral King wanted Dewey to keep quiet about the intercepted messages of December 1941.

There is nothing in the known record to support the thesis that Dewey would have damaged Roosevelt's reputation or hurt his chances of reelection by disclosing in 1944 that certain Japanese messages on the eve of Pearl Harbor had been intercepted and decoded. An incomplete disclosure might have smeared Marshall, to whose retention Dewey already was pledged. But the principal victim almost certainly would have been Dewey himself. He would have forfeited the confidence of many who voted for him because they considered him patriotic and responsible enough to be President.

Women Go to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the October 5 issue of the Waterloo Daily Courier, Waterloo, Iowa, on the subject of the equal rights amendment:

WOMEN GO TO WASHINGTON

The perennial issue of the equal rights amendment is again coming before Congress. The proposal has passed the House Judiciary Committee and may come up for debate in the House soon. The Senate Judiciary Committee is expected to vote on it shortly.

"Equality of rights," states the proposed amendment, "under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Proponents point out that in some States, particularly the South, women have inferior rights as regards dowers, control of children, property, and divorce. In other States, like Iowa, some school boards before the war enforced a rule that women teachers could not be married and hold their jobs.

Opponents argue that the amendment would, if adopted, eliminate many of the social laws protecting women from excessive working hours and unfavorable working conditions. Theoretically, moreover, women would have to be drafted for army service on the same basis as men if the amendment became part of the Constitution.

Although the inequality of wage rates for women as compared to men in private employment is sometimes used as an argument in favor of the amendment, the proposal actually would not affect that situation. It would merely compel equal wage rates for women who are Federal or State employees.

Because adoption of the amendment would remove the desirable protection which women now have as regards hours and working conditions, it would seem that the "equal rights" advocates are seeking an improper solution to an admittedly unjust situation. If State laws discriminate against the property rights of women, the women of that State should organize to have those laws revised. If Iowa women feel that a woman teacher should not lose her job when she marries, they should seek to obtain from the legislature a legal prohibition against such practices.

By seeking adoption of the "equal rights" amendment, in other words, the women are actually seeking to eliminate some of the desirable advantages and protections which they now enjoy. They are ignoring the more logical approach of seeking the elimination of the discriminatory laws on a State by State basis.

One Cure for Powercrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "One Cure for Powercrats," which appeared in the October 6 issue of the Grange News:

ONE CURE FOR POWERCRATS

There are no more eloquent disciples of Americanism than the private power companies, yet they led the fight to prevent America from developing its hydroelectric powers resources that proved so essential to the building of our air fleet and the development of the atomic bomb. You will find no more fervent advocates of freedom of the press than the power trust, but did you ever try to secure publication of an article controverting their propaganda in the average newspaper? They urge free enterprise, but did you ever hear of one power company competing with another?

Representative government, free of "pressure groups" is their constant war cry—yet we find them constantly subverting government, education, and civic life by the liberal use of money which is collected from their customers and charged to "operating expenses" or "public relations."

One brief (1944) investigation by the Federal Power Commission disclosed payment of large sums of money to individuals and organizations for political purposes. The Washington Water Power Co. paid $2,090.47 to C. Rea Moore for "observing" in the State legislature. Northwestern Electric and Pacific Power & Light spent a total of $6,045.17 for "expenses" in connection with the 1943 session. P. P. & L. spent $9,644.38 to influence the Hood River, Oreg., PUD power vote. Washington Water Power spent over $30,000 to defeat referendum 25. P. P. & L. spent $27,773 campaigning in the franchise elections at Walla Walla and Yakima. P. P. & L. and Northwestern paid Bozell & Jacobs, Nebraska advertising firm, nearly $8,000 for "services" in combating referendum 25. Washington Water Power paid ex-Governor Carr, of Colorado, a $1,000 retainer fee for purported advice on irrigation law. P. P. & L. paid $753.72 to E. N. Hofer & Sons, of Portland, an agency furnishing free editorial service to newspapers. And these figures do not include expenditures in the main campaign against referendum 25, from July 31 to November 7, 1944.

As to organizations, the Washington companies paid $1,500 to the National Association of Manufacturers as dues, W. W. P. Co. paid $500 to the anti-co-op National Tax Equality Association, three companies paid $8,360 to the so-called Oregon Business and Tax Research, Inc., another paid $800 to the Spokane Taxpayers' Economy League, three companies contributed $6,425 to the Washington State Taxpayers Association, two paid $2,000 to the Committee for Economic Development, and three subsidized the Washington State

(WSC) Committee on the Relation of Electricity to Agriculture to the tune of $6,055.38.

Kinsey Robinson, WWP president, managed to get rid of $12,580, and Vice President J. E. E. Royer unloaded $6,807 on "travel and other" expenses in 18 months during the war.

This orgy of spending ratepayers' money doubtless still goes on, and there's nothing that the customers can do to stop it—except demand immediate public ownership of power facilities.

The Navy's Demobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from an enlisted man in the Navy, regarding the Navy's demobilization formula:

Congressman JOSEPH O'HARA.

DEAR SIR: It gives be great pleasure as a serviceman of the United States Navy to be able to write you as a Representative in the House of Representatives.

I and a great percentage of my shipmates have a very serious problem regarding the discharge of the naval personnel by point system.

I myself and for the benefit of the men of the United States Navy wish you would bring this problem, as I am about to explain, in the session of Congress. I know you will from my personal experience of the business you conducted in the past.

In the first place, the Navy has one of the poorest point systems that anyone or a group of men could have made. The way the point system stands there is no consideration whatsoever for overseas duty at all. I don't think the people realize the difference being in service in the States and having sea duty. From your experience in World War I, I know there is no use discussing the life in line of battle.

In the second thought, a young unmarried man has only a slim chance of being released. I realize that a married man with a family has a lot of responsibility, but after all we also have mothers and fathers that are looking for the day of our return.

Just now the Navy issued a cause that a man 30 years old or older with three dependents is eligible for a discharge. Now why should a man like this, whether he served a month or 3 years, be able to receive a discharge whereas a single man who has 3 or 4 years and nearly all sea duty has a small chance for release.

If the Government is turning the men with families out first for that they have the first choice for jobs, then what do they expect an unmarried man to do when he gets released? After all the biggest majority of us want to settle down and get married some day also.

I think the Navy should give more points for oversea duty and also engagements involved in.

Speaking for myself, I have 3 years in the service and 34 months of sea duty; during this time I have experienced some very unpleasant days. It will be some time before I am eligible for a discharge. I certainly would like to see a different system treating all men alike for a release from the Navy.

I again say I would like you to bring this matter up and let the men in Congress know what the biggest percentage of the men feel toward this.

The Matter of Foreign Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby offer for printing in the RECORD an article appearing in the Irish World. This article was written by Msgr. James H. Cotter, a very distinguished leader among the people of Irish extraction, and also a very distinguished churchman and writer on religious and philosophical subjects. It follows:

THOUGHTS

(By Rt. Rev. Msgr. James H. Cotter, LL. D., Litt. D.)

CHEEK

We were not disappointed in England's recent course claiming more and then more and more moneys of this good-natured but thoughtless land. England does not lack brass when she needs gold. And, mind you, she wonders why we should have the audacity to hesitate, since evidently we are, in her mind, her offspring. Yes, indeed we are; dare you say we are not? For unbounded conceit and immeasurable effrontery, England never doubts her ability to get what she wants or if not, take it. She never assumes a beggar role, with a bag on her back, but demands her necessities. Such a thing as a blush never stains her superior face, when she puts her claim into billions. Past obligations. What about them? In fact she considers such a thing as a calculation unwarranted and touching elbows with insult. What if our generosity would hurt ourselves? That never enters her mind full of the thought that, only one of the yesterdays, the United States were her colonies, whose life or death makes little matter now and ever. Is not she our king who can do no wrong? To give her a good kick for her impudence might make her see and feel and give proof to her that we see and feel when an unwarranted wrong is invading our finances. America, waiting anxiously for a thank you for unpaid debts, England feels that we are honored in her asking more and making no reference to her obligations. Does she not compliment us in wanting our wealth that we do not know how to use, and she will show us?

Then why take exception to the manner England pursues in getting finances. She sends two officers of a past regime to negotiate—officers who have no connection with the present English Government. America, beware of one who then and now has no interest in your welfare.

Modern Man Is Obsolete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Norman Cousins which appeared in the Saturday Review of Literature under date of August 18, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before this Congress and the peoples of the world is survival. All other issues must be viewed with this primary issue always before us. Only then will we see clearly what is demanded of us now as individuals and as a nation.

Mr. Cousins' editorial, Modern Man Is Obsolete, should be read and digested by everyone for it places the future of man where it belongs—in his own hands. But man, unless he changes himself rapidly, has no future.

The editorial follows:

MODERN MAN IS OBSOLETE

(By Norman Cousins)

Whatever elation there is in the world today because of final victory in the war is severely tempered by fear. It is a primitive fear, the fear of the unknown, the fear of forces man can neither channel nor comprehend. This fear is not new, in its classical form, it is the fear of irrational death. But overnight it has become intensified, magnified. It has burst out of the subconscious and into the conscious, filling the mind with primordial apprehensions. It is thus that man stumbles fitfully into a new age of atomic energy for which he is as ill equipped to accept its potential blessings as he is to counteract or control its present dangers.

Where man can find no answer, he will find fear. While the dust was still settling over Hiroshima, he was asking himself questions and finding no answers. The biggest question of these concerns the nature of man. Is war in the nature of man? If so, how much time has he left before he employs the means he has already devised for the ultimate in self-destruction—extinction? And now that the science of warfare has reached the point where it threatens the planet itself, is it possible that man is destined to return the earth to its aboriginal incandescent mass blazing at 50,000,000°. If not—that is, if war is not in the nature of man—then how is he to interpret his own experience, which tells him that in all of recorded history there have been only 300 years in the aggregate during which he has been free of war?

Closely following upon these are other questions, flowing out endlessly from his fears and without prospect of definitive answer. Even assuming that he could hold destructive science in check, what changes would the new age bring or demand in his everyday life? What changes would it bring or demand in his culture, his education, his philosophy, his religion, his relationships with other human beings?

In speculating upon these questions, it should not be necessary to prove that on August 6, 1945, a new age was born. When on that day a parachute containing a small object floated to earth over Japan, it marked the violent death of one stage in man's history and the beginning of another. * * * [The author at this point discusses at some length the opinions of scientists regarding man's nature—whether he is by nature a war-like animal. There is disagreement among them, he observes, but a broader and more generous, certainly more philosophical view is held by those scientists who claim that the evidence to date is incomplete and misleading, and that man does have within him the power of abolishing war.]

In the most primitive sense, war in man is an expression of his competitive impulses. Like everything else in nature, he has had to fight for existence; but the battle against other animals, once won, gave way in his evolution to battle against his own kind. Darwin called it the survival of the fittest, and its most overstretched interpretation is to be found in Mein Kampf, with its naked glorification of brute force and the complete worship of might makes right. In the political and national sense, it has been the at-

tempt of the "have-nots" to take from the "haves," or the attempt of the "haves" to add further to their lot at the expense of the "have-nots." Not always was property at stake; comparative advantages were measured in terms of power and in terms of tribal or national superiority. The good luck of one nation became the hard luck of another. The good fortune of the Western powers in obtaining "concessions" in China at the turn of the century was the ill fortune of the Chinese. The power that Germany stripped from Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and France at the beginning of World War II she added to her own.

What does it matter, then, if war is not in the nature of man so long as man continues through the expression of his nature to be a viciously competitive animal? The effect is the same, and therefore the result must be as conclusive—war being the effect, and complete obliteration of the human species being the result.

If this reasoning is correct, then modern man is obsolete, a self-made anachronism becoming more incongruous by the minute. He has exalted change in everything but himself. He has leaped centuries ahead in inventing a new world to live in, but he knows little or nothing about his own part in that world. He has surrounded and confounded himself with gaps—gaps between revolutionary science and evolutionary anthropology, between cosmic gadgets and human wisdom, between intellect and conscience. The struggle between science and morals that Henry Thomas Buckle foresaw a century ago has been all but won by science. Given time, man might be expected to bridge those gaps normally; but by his own hand, he is destroying even time. Communication, transportation, war no longer wait on time. Decision and execution in the modern world are becoming virtually synchronous. Thus, whatever bridges man has to build and cross he shall have to build and cross immediately. * * *

Man is left, then, with a crisis in decision. * * *

That is why the quintessence of destruction as potentially represented by modern science must be dramatized and kept in the forefront of public opinion. The full dimensions of the peril must be seen and recognized. Then and only then will man realize that the first order of business is the question of continued existence. Then and only then will he be prepared to make the decisions necessary to assure that survival.

In making these decisions, there are two principal courses that are open to him. Both will keep him alive for an indefinite, or at least a reasonably long, period. These courses, however, are directly contradictory and represent polar extremes of approach.

The first course is the positive approach. It begins with a careful survey and appraisal of the obsolescences which constitute the afterbirth of the new age. The survey must begin with man himself. * * *

The first adjustment needed * * * is his savagely competitive impulses. In the pre-atomic age, those impulses were natural and occasionally justifiable, though they often led to war. But the rise of materialistic man had reasons behind it and must be viewed against its natural setting. Lyell, Spencer, Darwin, Lamarck, Malthus, and others have concerned themselves with various aspects of this natural setting, but its dominant feature was an insufficiency of the goods and the needs of life. From Biblical history right up through the present, there was never time when starvation and economic suffering were not acute somewhere in the world.

This is only part of the story, of course, for it is dangerous to apply an economic interpretation indiscriminately to all history. Politics, religion, force for force's sake, jealousy, ambition, love of conquest, love of reform—all these and others have figured in the equations of history and war. But the economic factor was seldom if ever absent, even when it was not the prime mover. Populations frequently increased more rapidly than available land, goods, or wealth.

Yet all this has been—or can be—changed by the new age. Man now has it within his grasp to emancipate himself economically. If he wills it, he is in a position to refine his competitive impulse; he can take the step from competitive man to cooperative man. He has at last unlocked enough of the earth's secrets to provide for his needs on a world scale. The same atomic and electrical energy that can destroy a city can also usher in an age of economic sufficiency. It need no longer be a question as to which peoples shall prosper and which shall be deprived. There is power enough and resources enough for all.

It is here that man's survey of himself needs the severest scrutiny, for he is his own greatest obstacle to the achievement of those attainable and necessary goals. While he is willing to mobilize all his scientific and intellectual energies for purposes of death, he is unwilling to undertake any comparable mobilization for purposes of life. He has shattered the atom and harnessed its fabulous power to a bomb, but he balks—or allows himself to be balked—when it comes to harnessing that power for human progress. Already, many representatives of industry have counseled words of synthetic caution, informing a puzzled public that we shall not see the practical application of atomic energy for general use in our lifetime. If it works out this way, it will not be because of any lack of knowledge or skill, but only because of the fear in certain quarters that atomic energy will mean a complete revamping of the economic structure, with the probability that it would be operated as a Government utility or public service.

This is not a matter of urging a change away from the present economic structure just for the sake of change; it is recognition of a hard new fact of life that has made that economic structure obsolete in an atomic age just as it has made practically all our other institutions obsolete.

The cry is certain to go up against further Government experimentation with atomic energy for peacetime purposes, and industry will demand that Government withdraw and give it the right to carry on its own experiments. These experiments, however, would most likely be no more consequential than the atomic bomb would have been if left to decentralized chance. Moreover, it takes enthusiasm to fertilize invention, and there is as yet little discernible enthusiasm for atomic energy in those quarters which are asking for the right to sponsor its peacetime uses. However, understandable this lack of enthusiasm may be, it should not blind public opinion to the critical importance of having research for practical use carried on with the same urgency, the same fullness, the same scope and intensity at it has been for war ends thus far.

The size of the opportunity is exceeded only by the size of the promise. But even as man stands on the threshold of a new age, he is being pulled back by his coattails and told to look the other way, told that he must not allow his imagination to get out of hand—all this at a time when he should know almost instinctively that if he can put the same courage, daring, imagination, ingenuity, and skill that he demonstrated in winning the war into meeting the problems of the new age, he can win the peace as well.

He must believe, too, that mobilization of science and knowledge in peace should not be confined to cosmic forces, but must be extended to his other needs, principally health. What a fantastic irony that organized science knows the secret of the atom but as yet knows not a fig about the common cold! Who can tell what advances in medical knowledge might accrue to the welfare of mankind if as much mobilized effort were put into the study of man as there has been of matter! Cancer, heart disease, nephritis, leukemia, encephalitis, poliomyelitis, arteriosclerosis, aplastic anemia—all these are anomalies in the modern world; there is no reason why mobilized research should not be directed at their causes and cure. Nor is there any reason why even old age should not be regarded as a disease to be attacked by science in the same intensive fashion.

Surveying other adjustments he shall have to make if he chooses the positive course, man must consider himself in relation to his individual development. He can have the limitless opportunities that can come with time to think. The trend during the last 50 years towards shorter work weeks and shorter hours will not only be continued but sharply accelerated. Not more than half of each week will be spent earning a living. But a revolution is needed in his leisure-time activities—which so far have come to be associated almost entirely with the commodities of vended amusement. Once before, the world knew a Golden Age where the development of the individual—his mind and his body—was considered the first law of life. In Greece, it took the form of the revolution of awareness, the emancipation of the intellect from the limitations of corroding ignorance and prejudice.

* * * * *

We have saved for last the most crucial aspect of this general survey relating to the first course: the transformation or adjustment from national man to world man. Already he has become a world warrior; it is but one additional step—though a long one—for him to develop a world conscience. This is not vaporous idealism, but sheer, driving necessity. It bears directly on the prospects of his own survival. He shall have to recognize the flat truth that the greatest obsolescence of all in the atomic age is national sovereignty. Even back in the old-fashioned rocket age before August 6, 1945, strict national sovereignty was an anomalous and preposterous holdover from the tribal instinct in nations. If it was anomalous then, it is the quintessence of anomaly now. The world is a geographic entity. This is not only the basic requisite for world government but the basic reason behind the need.

A common ground of destiny is not too large a site for the founding of any community.

Reject all other arguments for real world government—reject the economic, the ideological, the sociological, the humanitarian arguments, valid though they may be. Consider only the towering problem of policing the atom—the problem of keeping the smallest particle of matter from destroying all matter. We are building on soapbubbles if we expect this problem to be automatically solved by having America, Britain, and Canada keep the secret to themselves. That is not only highly improbable, but would in itself stimulate the other nations to undertake whatever additional research might be necessary over their present experimentation to yield the desired results. In all history, there is not a single instance of a new weapon being kept exclusively by any power or powers; sooner or later either the basic principles become generally known or parallel devices are invented. Before long, the atomic bomb will follow the jet plane, the rocket bomb, radar, and the flame thrower into general circulation. We must not forget that we were not the only horse in the atomic derby; we just happened to finish first. The others will be along in due time.

Nor can we rely on destructive atomic energy to take care of itself. Already there is the tempting but dangerous notion to the effect that the atomic bomb is so horrible and the terror of retaliation so great that we may have seen the last of war. This is quasi-logical, but war is no respecter of logic, relative or absolute. And if history teaches us

anything, it is that the possibility of war increases in direct proportion to the effectiveness of the instruments of war.

Far from banishing war, the atomic bomb will in itself constitute a cause of war. In the absence of world control as part of world government it will create universal fear and suspicion. Each nation will live nervously from one moment to the next, not knowing whether the designs or ambitions of other nations might prompt them to attempt a lightening blow of obliteration. The ordinary, the inevitable differences among nations which might in themselves be susceptible of solution might now become the signals for direct action, lest the other nation get in the first and decisive blow. Since the science of warfare will no longer be dependent upon armies but will be waged by push buttons, releasing radio-controlled rocket planes carrying cargoes of atomic explosives, the slightest suspicion may start all the push buttons going.

There is the argument, of course, that each nation will realize this; and that the first button might lead to universal catastrophe as all the other nations rush to their switch boards of annihilation. Here, too, there is the unwarranted presupposition of reason. In an atmosphere of high tension and suspicion, reason is an easy victim. Moreover, there will always be the feeling that one nation can escape though all the others may go down. What a temptation for the blitzkriegers.

No; there is no comfort to be derived from the war-is-now-too-horrible theory. There is one way and only one to achieve effective control of destructive atomic energy and that is through centralized world government. Not loose, informal organization. Not even through an international pool, or through an international policing agreement. A police force is no better than its laws, and there can be no laws without government. Finally the potency of the weapon must dictate the potency of its control. * * *

It would be comforting to know that the world had several generations in which it might be able to evolve naturally and progressively into a single governmental unit. In fact, even as late as August 5, 1945, it seemed that the Charter of the United Nations had made an adequate beginning in that direction, providing the machinery for revision which might lead within 15 or 20 years to a real world structure. But the time factor has been shattered. We no longer have a leeway of 15 or 20 years; whatever must be done must be done with an immediacy which is in keeping with the urgency. Once the basic peace settlements are arranged, the United Nations must convene again for an atomic age inventory, undertaking an overall examination of the revolutionary changes in the world since its conference in San Francisco in the long-ago spring of 1945.

If all this sounds like headlong argument, posing methods or solutions which seem above the reach of mortal man, the answer must be that mortal man's reach was long enough apparently to push science and invention ahead by at least 500 years during 5 years of experimentation on atomic energy. His ability to do this not only indicates that he can extend or overextend himself when pressed, but emphasizes the need to do the same with government.

* * * * *

Man must decide, moreover, what is more important—his differences or his similarities. If he chooses the former, he embarks on a path that will, paradoxically, destroy the differences and himself as well. If he chooses the latter, he shows a willingness to meet the responsibilities that go with maturity and conscience. Though heterogeneity is the basic manifestation of nature, as Spencer observed, a still greater manifestation is the ability of nature to create larger areas of homogeneity which act as a sort of rim to the spokes of the human wheel.

* * * * *

All these are the various mutations and adjustments needed in the expression of man's nature, in his way of life, his thinking, his economics, his education, his conditioning and orientation, and his concept of government in an atomic age. But if he rejects this, the first course, there is yet another way, an alternative to world government. This is the second course. Preposterous as this second course may seem, we describe it in all seriousness, for it is possible that through it man may find a way to stay alive—which is the central problem under consideration in this paper.

The second course is relatively simple. It requires that man destroy, carefully and completely, everything relating to science and civilization. Let him destroy all machines and the knowledge which can build or operate those machines. Let him raze his cities, smash his laboratories, dismantle his factories, tear down his universities and schools, burn his libraries, rip apart his art. Let him murder his scientists, his doctors, his teachers, his lawmakers, his mechanics, his merchants, and anyone who has anything to do with the machinery of knowledge or progress. Let him punish literacy by death. Let him abolish nations and set up the tribe as sovereign. In short, let him revert to his condition in society in 10,000 B. C. Thus emancipated from science, from progress, from government, from knowledge, from thought, he can be reasonably certain of safeguarding his existence on this planet.

This is the alternative to world government—if modern man wishes an alternative.

Global Alphabet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, the following clipping appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of October 7, 1945:

THE PHONETIC ALPHABET—VIRTUES OF THE PROPOSAL TO ASSIGN EACH SOUND A LETTER ARE EXPLAINED

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

On page 15 of the Herald Tribune of August 24 is a very timely article headed "Shaw renews demand for 42-letter alphabet." It seems that Dr. Pollock introduced, in the House of Commons, a bill to make a 40-letter alphabet to be used in writing English phonetically. The very next day, on page 10, your editorial, Twenty-six Are Enough, ridicules Dr. Shaw because he is an old man and because he is trying to improve the English language and make it easier and better for the children, as well as for the adults.

Many teachers know—undoubtedly Dr. George Bernard Shaw knows—that: 1. Our English and American spelling is the most absurd and ridiculous spelling in the world. 2. There should be a distinct letter for each separate word sound in our spoken language. 3. A phonetic alphabet would save every child 2 years of useless drudgery in the elementary school and 1 year in the high school, and still give each of them a better education than they now have when they are graduated from America's best high schools.

4. (a) There can be no permanent peace until there is a permanent world government. (b) There can be no world government until there is a world language. (c) There can be no world language until the spoken language of one of the world's great nations is made phonetic, and this spelling is taught not only in all of the public schools of that Nation but in the public schools of all of the civilized and progressive nations of the world.

5. All of the small and weak nations of the world look to the English-speaking people to save them from total destruction under the heels of tyrants. Therefore, if we make the English language phonetic it will be the world's commercial and diplomatic language within 5 or 10 years.

If the President of the United States will take the lead and appoint a commission to meet with commissions from other English-speaking countries our language—spelled sensibly—will be the world language long before we can possibly leave Germany or Japan.

WOODFORD D. ANDERSON.

TOTTENVILLE, STATEN ISLAND,
September 29, 1945.

The above commentary of Mr. Woodford D. Anderson is particularly interesting to the people of Oklahoma for the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma on April 24, 1945, 2 days before the endorsement of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco, passed a resolution unanimously urging the Congress of the United States and the citizens of the United States to consider the global alphabet devised by former United States Senator Robert L. Owen, as a mechanism by which the people of the whole world could be taught to read English as now printed in our daily press, magazines, and books and to speak it.

Senator Owen's plan has been endorsed by the greatest linguists in the world, and he has now available for the public press books teaching the Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, Chinese, German, and English to understand each other and to make English a world language. The matter is pending in the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate and has been pending there for 2 years without action. It has been repeatedly submitted to the Department of State without action.

May I not call attention to the Spanish-English and Portuguese-English books as a means by which, with high speed, to teach the Spanish and Portuguese of the Western Hemisphere to read, write, and speak the English language.

I invite the Members of the House and Senate to look at the record contained in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on July 12, 1945, when the committee was considering the United Nations Charter. See pages 534–549.

Mr. Speaker, considering that the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs has been furnished with seventy or eighty million dollars for the express purpose of improving the cultural relations between the United States and the Latin-American Republics and has expended millions for educational purposes, why has not advantage been taken of the improved method of teaching the people of the Western Hemisphere to speak English and to read our American newspapers, magazines, and books, printed in current English.

Postwar Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1945

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a broadcast prepared this week for Stations WSCO, Sault Ste. Marie; WMAM, Marinette-Menominee; and WDBC, Escanaba:

One of the most important postwar bills to come before the Congress passed last week in the House by a voice vote. It is called the ship-sales bill of 1945 and had been under consideration in our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am the second ranking minority member, for the past 15 months. It was a very important and extremely involved piece of legislation for us to work out, but I believe as it passed the House it is a good bill; although, of course, it cannot hope to satisfy everyone interested. Undoubtedly, it will pass the Senate in a somewhat different form and in some respects at least will be rewritten in conference between the two Houses, which is customary with most important legislation.

The first bill introduced was presented to our chairman by the Maritime Commission and seemingly had the endorsement of the Roosevelt administration. It was so vicious in its discrimination in favor of subsidized American operators and prospective foreign purchasers as opposed to the unsubsidized American operator, who puts his own cash on the barrel head to buy a vessel and operates it all over the world in direct competition with foreign operators, that our committee immediately rejected it and made its position clear not only to the Maritime Commission but to the State Department and to the Roosevelt administration as well.

In order that you may understand the situation, let me explain briefly that when Congress passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, it did so with these thoughts in mind—and I quote: "It is necessary for the national defense and development of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States that the United States have a merchant marine sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times." I might point out that by domestic commerce we mean our coastwise shipping—that is between ports along the Atlantic and Pacific coast lines and between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts in which foreign flag ships are not permitted to operate. And then the act provided that it is necessary to maintain a merchant marine capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency—and certainly without our merchant marine at the start of this war and as it has been augmented since we could not have won the war—and it provided further that these ships should be owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States and was to be composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel and supplemented by American-owned facilities for repairs, marine insurance, and other auxiliary services.

Now it is a well-established fact that in the prewar world foreign shipyards could construct, and foreign operators could operate, ships at about half the cost of our own. This is because of lower wage scales, lower material costs, smaller crews on the vessels and the fact that most of the foreign operators were receiving financial help from their own governments.

Consequently, in order that the American flag could be kept flying all over the seven seas, Congress provided that our Government should help certain American operators in their foreign operations and did this in two ways. It provided for a construction subsidy for them so that for ships engaged in these trades the Government would advance half the construction cost of the vessel. Secondly, it provided that in the operation of ships on certain routes, Congress would provide a subsidy to help carry our higher operating costs but at the same time stipulating just what routes should be served by these companies, how many ships should sail on these routes, and when they should sail. Some 30 such routes all over the world were set up and just prior to the war some 12 companies only were serving 25 of these routes with no bidders seeking to serve the additional 5. The Maritime Commission was the sole judge as to who should operate on these routes and how they should operate and maintained very tight jurisdiction over those routes and their operators and by that control thereby eliminated any other lines from competing in those routes, if they were to receive either of these Government subsidies. Those operators then are known as subsidized operators. I believe Congress was wise in providing for those subsidies and believe also, however, that in some instances the Maritime Commission has not operated wisely in the handling of that particular program. Although it was plain to us time and time again in our meetings with the Maritime Commission officials that they showed a very definite preference for the subsidized operator, probably because in that way it was somewhat akin to a socialistic program of Government ownership or at least Government control of our maritime industry.

The other class of American operators, however, who, in line with our traditional system of free enterprise and free competition, were men who invested their own funds in the construction of their own ships and by efficiency of operation and management took their chances in world-wide competition, sailing wherever they wanted and when they wanted to go. These last, of course, were far in the majority in the prewar world and probably will be in the postwar world.

Now, with that background, perhaps, you will be as amazed as we were, when the Maritime Commission submitted its first out of four proposed bills to us, to find that they proposed to penalize this last class of unsubsidized operators 100 percent in favor of sales of our surplus merchant marine to the subsidized operator and to the prospective foreign purchaser. Bear this in mind. We have invested in our war-built merchant fleet about $17,000,000,000, including the cost of the shipyards construction. Approximately $8,000,000,000 worth of ships will be declared surplus by the Maritime Commission after consultation with the War and Navy Departments. Some 2,000 of these ships are of the Liberty type for which a suitable market is very doubtful indeed, because they are too slow and inefficient to compete in the world market, although they did work out very satisfactorily for convoy service. It is proposed now that such of those ships as remain unsold will be, and can be, carefully laid up without serious deterioration for many years and will be available in the event we should unfortunately have another catastrophic war in the next 20 or 30 years.

We do have, however, many excellent ships of prewar design which are fast and efficient and capable of competing in this postwar world and it is those cargo ships and those tankers which are no longer needed for wartime use that we seek to dispose in the bill passed last Tuesday.

As I previously mentioned. Our best estimate is that the foreign shipyards could probably build these or comparable ships at about half our prewar costs and probably for about half as much as our wartime costs which, of course, were naturally higher than they were prewar. So that has to be our yardstick when we seek to sell these ships in the postwar world markets. In the first bill submitted by the Roosevelt administration, it was proposed that we should sell these to the subsidized Government-controlled American operator at that foreign cost of 50 percent our own prewar cost and provided that both of these buyers—foreign and domestic—should pay 12½ percent down in cash and the balance should b paid in 20 equal installments over the next 20 years, bearing interest at 3½ percent. The unsubsidized freely competitive American operator, however, would pay exactly twice that much. The most absurd, asinine proposal that I have ever heard come out of the Roosevelt administration, and it went still further in its recommendation, namely, that the foreigners could come over here with the approval of the President and borrow their money from any one of several governmental agencies—such as the Export-Import Bank, the RFC, or lend-lease—and provided further that the President could suspend their payments any time he wished.

Well, I am glad to say, friends, that that entire proposal was dumped overboard in a hurry by our entire committee—Republicans and Democrats alike—even though a report from the State Department stated clearly and unequivocably that our so-called statesmen believed that it was not in the interests of this Nation for us to take advantage of our present dominance in the maritime world because of our war-built construction to set us up as the postwar first-rate maritime nation but rather we should relegate our position in favor of other countries abroad. In other words, reading between the lines, the State Department, the administration, and the Maritime Commission proposed that we should once again assume a position as a fourth- or fifth-rate maritime nation. The excuse was given that if we want to increase our foreign trade we must make it possible for the foreigners to deliver those goods to our shores and take our exports out of here in order that they might have money with which to pay for the goods they purchased from us. The facts of the matter are that our foreign export business has never been more than 10 percent of our national sales and the freight that those nations would have received for carrying goods to and from the United States would not amount to more than one-tenth of 1 percent of our national trade.

And here is another interesting thing that they tried to pull off on us which you can thank our committee for stopping.

At the very time that we were vociferously objecting to this proposal, and being resisted just as stubbornly by the administration, the State Department executed a lend-lease agreement with the French Government—this was long before France had been retaken by American blood—in which they proposed to sell the then thoroughly unstable French Government $2,000,000 worth of our ships under lend-lease at half of our prewar domestic cost, with no down payment but to be paid for under lend-lease terms with interest at 1½ percent over a 30-year period; and again with a proviso that the President could suspend payments any time he deemed it wise for our Government. You can thank our committee for bringing about the canceling of that agreement before the ink was barely dry.

And I might add in closing that this administration pressure has kept up right to the very day we brought this bill on the floor. For instance, the Senate committee in its

hearings on a comparable bill to the one we passed in the House had a letter from Mr. John D. Snyder, Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, in which he said:

"This bill is conceived too narrowly. We live in a world in which our own safety and prosperity are directly dependent on the maintenance of friendly relations with other countries and on their economic progress as well as our own. As you know, the President has made this his policy and he believes that it should be followed in the case of ship disposal as well as in all other aspects of our foreign relations."

And, also, that same Senate committee had a letter from none other than the Director of the Budget, Mr. Harold D. Smith, who is presumed to speak for the President, that we should not adopt a narrow nationalistic policy and should sell these ships to the foreign purchasers at a favorable price.

What we actually did in the committee, and the House passed our bill, was to set the price on these surplus ships at 50 percent of the prewar domestic cost to our unsubsidized American operators and at 55 percent of our prewar domestic cost to the subsidized operators and to the foreign purchasers. We provided further that taking into account depreciation, which was normally considered as 5 percent per year on all ships with a 3-percent accelerated depreciation for wartime use, that in no event should any ship be sold for less than 35 percent of its wartime cost to an unsubsidized operator nor less than 40 percent to a subsidized American operator or a foreign purchaser. Therefore, we assured to Uncle Sam that he could at least get that much money back out of his wartime expenditure, necessitated originally by the necessities of war, and at a price at which it was indicated to us these ships could be sold and at the same time return the largest possible part of its investment to the American taxpayer. After all, whatever loss Uncle Sam has to take is all out-of-pocket expense for his war-built merchant marine and must be charged up to the cost of the war. We could not return 1 cent to Uncle Sam unless we priced those ships at a price that could insure their sale.

Shall We Give Away the Secret of the Atomic Bomb?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to share the secret of our atomic bomb with the other nations of the world is a shocking display of indifference to the security of our own people. It is internationalism run wild. It is appeasement run mad. It is the same appeasement policy of the Roosevelt administration which armed Japan with our scrap iron, oil, firearms, motors, and other essential war materials in sufficient quantities to make possible the ghastly slaughter of our boys in the Pacific as well as to cripple hundreds of thousands of other American soldiers. There could have been no Pearl Harbor—nor wholesale massacre of our men, nor the destruction of our ships and our grounded planes had it not been for the policy to which I have referred. Now it is proposed by the internationalists, a group of warmongers who should be classed as internationalist Socialists because their philosophy is to take the property of the citizens of the United States and distribute it among the peoples of the earth, that we share our secrets of national defense with our "good neighbors."

To place the secret atomic bomb at the disposal of a nation which has already refused to cooperate in a postwar security program would be to betray our people, usher in another war, one which would surpass in fury and destruction of life any holocaust heretofore recorded in human history. The dragon's teeth of another war are being sown broadcast by our international meddlers and appeasers.

Are we to share the secret of the most deadly implement of war with a nation which refused us airfields from which to launch an attack on Japan, and thus save the lives of our boys by shortening the war?

Did our officers ever get behind the lines of the nation which now refuses to cooperate with the postwar plans for national security?

The world is seething with hate, destruction, greed, and intrigue, and most of it is directed at the United States. If the internationalists that infest our administration succeed in arming other nations with the atomic bomb, as they did Japan with scrap iron, steel, and firearms, long prior to Pearl Harbor, then we may be like the "dying eagle which turned its head and saw that the arrow piercing its heart was feathered from its own wing."

Why Discharges Are So Slow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the War Department and the Navy Department are too slow in discharging the men. These discharges should be speeded up. These men entered the service to win the war—that has been done and they should be allowed to come home.

The fact that the Army had only 27 separation centers when the war closed is evidence that there was no real plan for the discharge of these men. Every Army camp or post should be a separation center.

No individual should be held in the armed service because of any bottleneck arising in the process of issuing discharges. A plan should be worked out whereby the men could be furloughed home and report back at the nearest station at a later date for their discharges. The War and Navy Departments should concentrate on getting the men home instead of on reasons for not discharging them.

Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican candidate for President in 1944, was right when he declared at Philadelphia on September 7, 1944:

> This basic issue was clearly revealed in the recent announcement by the Director of Selective Service in Washington. He said that when Germany and Japan have been defeated it will still be necessary to demobilize the armed forces very gradually. And why? Because, he said, "We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."
>
> For 6 months we have been hearing statements from the New Deal underlings in Washington that this was the plan. Now it is out in the open. They have been working up to it. Because they are afraid of peace. They are afraid of a continuance of their own failures to get this country going again. They are afraid of America.
>
> I do not share that fear. I believe that our members of the armed forces should be transported home and released at the earliest practical moment after victory. I believe that the occupation of Germany and Japan should very soon be confined to those who voluntarily choose to remain in the Army when peace comes.

The New Deal candidate later on issued a statement describing Mr. Dewey's charge as being fantastic and implied that it was not true. This was answered by Governor Dewey at Oklahoma City, Okla., on September 25, 1944. He then said:

> My opponent describes as, and I quote him, a "fantastic charge" the statement that his administration plans to keep men in the Army when the war is over and that it intends to keep them there because it fears there will be no jobs for them in civil life. Well, who brought that up?
>
> Here is the statement of a high official of the administration as reported on August 23, 1944, in the publication of the United States Army, the Stars and Stripes. He said: "We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."
>
> Now, who said that? It was the National Director of Selective Service appointed by Mr. Roosevelt and still in office.
>
> But, says Mr. Roosevelt, the War Department thereafter issued a plan for what he called speedy discharges. You can read that plan from now until doomsday and you cannot find one word about speedy discharges. It is, in fact, a statement of the priority in which men will be discharged after the war. It does not say whether they are to be retained in service a month or years after victory. That will be up to the next administration. The present administration, with its record of peacetime failure, is afraid to bring men home after victory.

Time has proven that Governor Dewey was correct. The wrath of the entire Nation is turning upon the War and Navy Departments because of their failure to get the men home. This is a tragic situation and will impair the future work of the Army and Navy. The people will not be to blame, however. It is this administration that is failing.

Can it be that discharges are being delayed by this administration so that the choice jobs in reconversion go to the CIO-PAC boys? Is our discharge program being cleared through Sidney?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the Congress to do, by direct legislation, what the War and Navy Departments have failed up to date to do. The brave men who have won this war are entitled to take their places with their families without further delay.

Telegram From Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following splendid telegram was sent by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, of China, to a large meeting held in War Memorial Hall in Trenton, N. J., last night, October 9, on the occasion of the celebration of the Double Tenth. I am sure all the Members of the House will be glad to read it, and that they and our Nation wholeheartedly join with China's great leader in wishing for a new era of cooperation and brotherhood between our two great nations.

China was the first of the Allied Nations to fight and the longest to suffer. Ours was not only a war against aggression but by force of our social development was also a struggle for reconstruction. We are deeply grateful for help from the American Government which has been a decisive factor in the Pacific war. We are also very appreciative of the generous aid from the American people received through the National War Relief Fund, United China Relief, and the American Red Cross. This has been from the people of America to people of China. It has eased the burden of suffering. It has helped maintain morale when conditions were discouraging. It has improved efficiency of services to our soldiers and civilians. It has enabled many of our social agencies to carry on. It has preserved universities for their great postwar task. All this has played a significant part in the achievement of final victory. Now the days of war have ceased and days of rehabilitation and reconstruction have come. During the war the Allied armies fought as one. Allied Governments planned as one. Allied peoples bore their burdens as one. In unity was strength and in strength victory. Therefore let us now be resolved that this cooperation and brotherhood may not be things of the moment only but in even deeper measure may characterize the days ahead so that in peace as in war unity will prevail.

CHIANG KAI-SHEK.

Santa Claus and Chicken Feed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Marion (Ohio) Star of October 3, 1945:

SANTA CLAUS AND CHICKEN FEED

As was expected, the Truman administration has come out in favor of tax reduction as a broad, general principle, in much the same way that it is in favor of Santa Claus.

Since there is no record of Congress ever having voted against tax reduction when the opportunity presented itself to curry votes by seeming to be generous to its employers, some kind of reduction beginning in 1946 is a certainty. Further than that, the prospect is vague. It is not customary, however, to be too particular about Santa Claus, on the premise that almost anything is better than nothing. But the fact is that the Government's proposal is hardly worth considering.

The Truman administration, through Secretary of Treasury Vinson, proposed repeal of the normal tax, thus removing perhaps 12,000,000 persons from income-tax lists at a time when the national debt will be approaching $300,000,000,000 and the ordinary expenditures of government will be continuing to rise. However, the 12,000,000 are only nominally taxpayers; they contribute virtually nothing.

It proposes elimination of the excess-profits tax on corporations, a gesture of good will to business enterprise. And it proposes an automatic return after next June 30 to prewar excise-tax rates, wiping out wartime rates on luxury items. All told, the maximum effect of the cuts would be no more than $5,000,000,000, a small sum relative to the total of anticipated tax collections—and a small amount of tax relief relative to what the population must have in order to release the buying power that is the only possible source of national prosperity.

Either the Truman administration should declare plainly that in its opinion no tax relief at all is feasible under the circumstances or it should propose enough relief to do some good. Five billion dollars one way or the other these days is chicken feed. What the country needs is a wholesale retrenchment in Government spending and a tax cut of something like $20,000,000,000 to give it a postwar shot in the arm.

Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following notable address given on October 9, 1945, by our distinguished colleague, Mrs. LUCE, at a meeting in Trenton, N. J., in celebration of China's Independence Day:

Tonight, on this great Double Tenth, many, many eloquent tributes have been paid to our valiant ally, China. Her long resistance to Japan, before we entered the war is our historical debt to her, for it saved us immeasurable costs in blood and materials. But that service to us, tremendous as it was, is only one great episode in the history of mutual aid between China and America. It is that mutuality of aid and obligations between our two great nations that we must all try to emphasize tonight.

For over 80 years America has played a notable part in helping China to be and stay a free nation. Way back in 1861, when the freedom and unity of our own Nation was in grave jeopardy, we had still the strength and wisdom to strike shrewd diplomatic blows for China's freedom. Anson Burlingame, whom Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Seward had sent as minister to China, found that nation weakened by opium wars and by corruption in high imperial places, and almost defenseless before internal dissension and the truculent trade and territorial demands of European powers. Other western diplomats suggested that the outright partition of China would be the wisest, as well as, to them, the most profitable, solution.

But Burlingame, with a courage and vision worthy of Mr. Lincoln, wrought a miracle of diplomacy over the more cynical and experienced diplomats of other then far greater powers. His views of justice and good will prevailed. He stated, and Seward, John Hay, and Elihu Root in time, established, the great principles of the Open Door for China: noninterference in its internal affairs by foreign nations, guaranties of Chinese sovereignty and territorial integrity, and equality of interest, obligation and cultural and economic exchange between China and western powers.

After 80 years Burlingame's policy endures, not only as a great doctrine, but a great challenge still to America. Have Americans the vision, the good will, the intelligence to walk with China in united friendship and respect toward the great common goals of progress and freedom? There is no time in history when America's answer to that challenge, that question, is more crucial to the future of both nations than in this very year.

For the first time since China became a republic she has an even chance of becoming a great modern nation. That will not be easy. Her postwar problems are vast. Eight years of war have intensified the poverty of a nation which was, even before those years, terribly poor compared to our western democracies. Uncounted millions of Chinese have been killed and maimed; perhaps 30,000,000 more are homeless. China's railways, mines, industries, roads, factories, dams, power plants, communications and agriculture are all in chaos. To gain the most elementary economic stability, she still needs much help from us. And this we owe her, for at last she has a chance.

That chance must, of course, be predicated on the assumption that China and Soviet Russia will stay at peace with one another; that the present pact between Soviet Russia and China will be honorably observed to the letter by both parties. But surely, after the lessons of the past decade any other assumption is incomprehensible.

But China has notable assets, too. She has a government and a leader which have surmounted every hazard ever offered to a struggling nation: revolution, civil war and foreign war, domestic and foreign intrigue, inflation, disease, and famine. China's leader, Chiang Kai-shek, has remained longer at the helm of the ship of state under incomparably greater difficulties than any other world statesman. He has stood the greatest test of statesmanship by bringing peace to his people and guaranties from Soviet Russia and the other great allies of territorial and domestic sovereignty.

And this Chinese leader has presented his nation and the world with another great challenge—greater than any voiced by any other world leader. On VJ-day, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek delivered this message to the Chinese people:

"I am," said the generalissimo, "deeply moved when I think of the teachings of Jesus Christ that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us and love our enemies. My fellow countrymen know that to 'remember not evil against others' and 'do good to all men' are the highest virtues taught by our own sages. We have always said that the violent militarism of Japan is our enemy, not the people of Japan. Although the armed forces of the enemy have been defeated, and must be made to observe strictly all the terms of surrender, yet we should not for a moment think of revenge * * * upon the innocent people of Japan * * *. Permanent world peace

can be established only upon the basis of democratic freedom and equality and the brotherly cooperation of all races and nations."

We westerners have talked much in times past of our spiritual superiority to the Chinese—without reflecting whether such superiority existed. Yet it remained for a Chinese leader, among all the leaders of the world on VJ-day, unmistakably to strike the most clear and profound Christian note.

No nation has fought so long, nor endured a tenth so much as China at the hands of the Japanese. Perhaps no other people, except the Jews of Europe, have suffered individually so terribly, and could be less criticized for overlooking the Christian doctrine of forgiveness. Under these circumstances, surely all men who believe that the truest expression of religion is the love of one's fellow man must thrill to these words of Chiang. Surely, if he means it, as he must, he ranks with the Lincoln who could say "with malice toward none and charity toward all." So let us accept his text and examine how Chiang may be expected to apply it, not only to his foreign enemies, the Japanese, but to his domestic enemies, the Chinese Communists.

It is certainly not for us to direct any nation as to its forms of government or the solutions of its internal problems—certainly not that of China, the longest standing of all our global allies, the oldest and most sophisticated people in the world.

And yet, as Americans we have a duty to the world to set forth our opinion on those forms of government which we have found in the past serve best to meet the demands of a common peace and prosperity. We can justifiably place our own experience at the disposal of China, which like America, claims to love democracy.

Democracy to us in America means many things. But basically I think it means the civil rights of man—his right to say what he thinks, to think what he chooses, to worship as his conscience dictates, to assemble with like-minded people peaceably. It means, as Lincoln said, "That the Government is the instrument of the people and can be changed by the people at their will, through the free exercise of their ballot." It means, furthermore, that majority rule carries with it no right forcibly to liquidate the rights or convictions of the minority.

With its blood and its aid and its share in victory, America has surely won the right to speak frankly to her friends. Are we not justified in admitting that these basic civil rights and freedoms have never existed throughout China, and particularly not during the terrible decade of the war for national existence? But is not America also justified in believing that China has postponed the realization of democratic freedoms only because war made postponement necessary, and that with the blossoming of peace, these basic rights will speedily be granted to the people of China? "Do good to all men" can have no other meaning in a true democracy.

China during the war was a house politically divided. The problem of political unity in China today stands before all others, even the tremendous economic ones which face her. But lasting unity and true peace in China can come only through the basic precepts of democratic freedom.

It goes without question that no nation can exist if two independent governments share its sovereignty, or if two independent political armies stand marshalled face to face along the line of a shaky truce. There must be a basic solution. A China half Communist, half Kuomintang, and both halves armed, cannot endure. From that truth, other truths follow: China is too vast and numerous a nation, its communications too inadequate, its local customs too varied, to permit, short of tyranny, of one enormously centralized government organ controlling every detail of national life down to the remotest village. We Americans learned that lesson 170 years ago—we wanted unity, and yet our regional variety made impossible that integration of every State and every conviction, into one rigid, central framework. We sought and found a solution that has endured to this day—a Federal Union.

Within our Federal Union, the most diverse elements live at peace. The customs and laws of South Carolina or Nevada are different from those of Connecticut or Maryland, yet there is no doubt that we are one united people. Our Federal Union has been granted certain basic powers—national defense, foreign affairs, finance, interstate commerce, but other powers are reserved to the States, and sometimes further subdivided from States to municipality and county. Each State chooses its own governors, makes its own criminal and civil laws, creates its own educational system, permits and regulates the political franchise to individuals as it sees fit. By this system of unity in variety, we have become a great Nation.

China is even greater in numbers than America, and far behind us in communications and unity. It cannot wisely be controlled in toto from Chungking or Nanking or Peking, by one man or even a group of men, however patriotic. Its customs are too disparate, its distances too great for governors of provinces to be selected by one central government, for universities in each province to be the creation of one central government, for its local tax laws and police administration to be the creation of one central government. It needs a central government to provide for its national defense, to direct its foreign affairs, to lay the foundations of national industrial reconstruction, to regulate its commerce, to collect taxes for these projects, and to do all those things without which no sovereign power can exist. But by attempting to do all, it will turn the clock of democracy backward, either to communism or fascism, but in any case, to dictatorship.

There are certain areas in China which we all know are now dominated by the Communist Party. There are certain areas—much larger—controlled by the central government of Chiang Kai-shek; others where Moslem militarists are in control; still others where the people are ethnically and racially non-Chinese. All of these areas must make of their political armies one single force subordinated to a central government. But none of these armies will lay down their arms if they feel that their political convictions and beliefs, indeed, their very lives, are at the mercy of other revengeful political parties—if they believe that all they have gained in local reforms or local self-government during the war is to be wiped out by dictatorial edicts from far away.

It is the opinion of many thoughtful Chinese and Americans that only federal union offers a real solution for China's problems. A federal union, in which each political party should be allowed to organize and govern provinces they now clearly possess and hold, and the citizens of which are loyal to it. Each party must participate in one central government on a basis of representation; and to that one government all armies in China must be subordinate. Further, the federal government should, as it does in America, guarantee that every province should have a representative form of government as soon as possible; and to every person in any province, no matter what his political creed, the right to speak his mind and think his thoughts. Kuomintang papers must be allowed to publish in Communist areas, and Communist papers in Kuomintang areas. The federal government should allow no terrorist police of any party to operate anywhere in any province. If Chiang Kai-shek thus does unto the common men of China, who honestly believe in Chinese communism, exactly what he would have them do unto the common men of his political party, we need have small fear for the democratic future of China.

I say incalculable forces for peace and happiness have been tapped if 450,000,000 Chinese even partially follow this advice of their leader, if he follows it himself, and if we will follow it, too: "Do unto others."

And follow it we must—Americans, Chinese, and everybody. The atomic bomb alone has made any other course impossible. The splitting of the atom, which has found the ultimate secret of material destruction, has also destroyed the supremacy of all material values. What remains, in an atomic age, alone indestructible, is mind and spirit. The Golden Rule of all religions, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," has become the political law of survival for governments, for nations, for all mankind. To follow that law is what we and the Chinese, who owe one another so much in the past, owe the world in the future.

Possible Surplus Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the Honorable CHRISTIAN HERTER, of Massachusetts, who has been selected by the Secretary of Agriculture to visit the countries that are in the greatest need of food, has furnished me the following list of apparent surplus of foods:

Possible food exports as shown in the statement of the Department of Agriculture, dated Oct. 1, 1945

	Million pounds
Meat (after maintaining our level at 150 pounds per capita; production 40 percent over prewar)	1,500
Fish (canned)	175
Cheese	300–400
Canned milk	1,000
Lard	450
Vegetable fats and oils	100–200
Dried fruit	300
Dry beans	150
Dry peas	200
	Million bushels
Wheat	325
Potatoes (dehydrated)	10
	Million dozen
Eggs	600
Powdered milk	Large quantities

During the war I, like all my colleagues, have made every effort to support legislation that would increase the production of war foods.

We now are faced with the problem of fulfilling the commitments made to the American farmer, and we are faced with the problem of furnishing the foods that have been promised by President Truman at Potsdam. The above table with the Agriculture Department estimates of food indicates that the foods are available in the United States. The big question seems to be as to how to accomplish the distribution of this surplus where it is most needed.

Statement of Policy of the House Steering Committee on H. R. 2202

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 9, 1945

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the cosponsors of H. R. 2202 today adopt the following statement of policy:

We have joined together as sponsors of H. R. 2202 because we believe that it is a measure which will materially further the goal of full employment in a free competitive economy. We do not consider this bill to be a panacea; we consider it to be only one step, but a most essential step, in the achieving of full employment in the United States.

The importance of this measure is twofold:

(a) It is a statement of basic principle, namely, that every American who is able to work and desires to work has the right to the opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment. We as sponsors reaffirm this principle and its corollary, that the Federal Government has the responsibility of insuring continuing full-employment opportunities through the full use of all of its powers including its financial resources.

(b) The machinery to implement this principle is present in the authorization of the President's national production and employment budget and the joint committee of Congress to consider and make specific recommendations on that budget.

Any amendment which weakens either the statement of principle or the machinery proposed, weakens the bill as a whole and is injurious to the achieving of full-employment opportunities. As cosponsors of H. R. 2202 we oppose any such amendments and we respectfully urge the chairman and the members of the Committee on Executive Expenditures, which is now holding hearings on this bill, to report out H. R. 2202 without any such weakening changes.

The American Constitution and Its Significance in These Critical Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by Frank E. Gannett at the Sons of the American Revolution luncheon, Rochester Chamber of Commerce, Constitution Day, Monday, September 17, 1945:

It is a great pity that more of us do not realize what the Constitution means to everyone. Our well-being, our happiness, our freedom, all our many blessings, all that America is and all that America stands for has been made possible by this great document described as the greatest charter of liberty ever penned by man.

Of the 40,000,000,000 people who have lived on this planet since the birth of Christ, probably not more than 3 percent have lived under a government where they might call their souls their own; where they were something more than herded cattle to be ordered about by someone in power. And by far the great majority of that tiny 3 percent who have had any liberty are those who have lived in this country under our Constitution, since its adoption in 1789.

It is most fitting that we should come here today to observe the anniversary of this great event and the tremendous achievements that have resulted. Normally we would rejoice, but if we open our eyes and read the signs correctly, this is not a time to celebrate. Instead, it should stir us to action.

Everywhere throughout our land today are militant groups striving viciously, selfishly, arrogantly to undermine our Constitution, wreck the framework of our liberty and happiness and destroy the very foundations of this Republic. Even as you and I pause on this occasion to pay tribute to the structure of our Government as conceived by its founders, these insidious influences, cheaply camouflaged with scores of disguises are tunneling under our institutions, gnawing at the base of our economy.

These forces would substitute for our constitutional system a planned economy. They have a definite program of alluring promises. They have unlimited money, fine sounding slogans, and clever, unscrupulous leaders. They are influencing the minds of our youth with their false representations and they propose to destroy the foundations of this very Constitution to which you and I today pay tribute.

This, then, is a most appropriate time for us to rededicate ourselves to the preservation of that document and all that it has meant, not only to America, but to the entire world.

You are all familiar, I am sure, with the history of those critical days when our Republic was being developed. I should like to point out that it was to escape exactly such intolerable conditions as recently prevailed in Italy, Germany, and Japan under the tyrants now overthrown, that our forefathers left their homes and friends in Europe and fled to an unknown wilderness here in America. They had found arbitrary government unbearable. They wanted freedom to worship as they pleased. They wanted to live better than animals. They resented the all-powerful government that had made them slaves, subject to the whims of their rulers who exercised authority over all, under the theory of the divine right of kings. The people in those days had no voice in government, no way to protest against oppression, no way in which they could obtain justice. There was no opportunity for them to improve their lot. For long hours of toil they got only a bare existence. They were mere pawns to be used at a tyrant's nod. A man's life, his home, his family, were not safe from arbitrary, despotic rulers.

Even at the time our Constitution was being adopted, men in Europe were put to death for debt. For petty offenses men were drawn and quartered; that is, pulled apart by horses. Even at the beginning of the nineteenth century there were, in fact, 230 crimes, including theft, punishable in England by death. In other countries of Europe conditions were still worse. The very year our Constitution was adopted, a woman counterfeiter was burned at the stake in England. In much of Europe there was no trial by jury. The accusation of the king or of a government official was sufficient for execution or imprisonment for life. Every safeguard of innocence was abolished or destroyed, and all the ingenuity of cruelty was exercised to find new modes of torture.

The patriots who fought the war for our independence were not merely protesting against a tax on tea. They had a far nobler purpose and that was to find a way to limit the power of government. Here was born a glorious new idea, namely, that man is not the servant, but the master of the state.

After we had won the war with Great Britain there came a period of chaos in the Colonies that resulted finally in calling the Constitutional Convention. Sixty-eight delegates were named, but such was the conflict of ideas that many delegates did not attend. Out of the sessions of the Convention, which we should remember was composed of young men, there finally emerged our great Constitution. Five of the men who were powerful in bringing about its adoption were in their thirties—Hamilton was only 30; Madison, 37; Randolph, 34; Pinckney, 30; Gouverneur Morris, 35. The document they produced, which finally was signed by only 39 of the delegates, has proved to be the greatest charter ever devised by man. It has been rigid enough and yet flexible enough to stand the storms and crises of 156 years, and is as useful and workable today as when written.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, guaranteed to all, for the first time on this planet, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of religious worship, the right of petition and of assembly, trial by jury, privacy of home or office, and protection against unlawful seizures by the Government.

Under the Constitution it became the right of everyone to manage his life as he saw fit, to engage in any trade or profession or in any field of work that he might choose, so long as he did not harm others.

And most important was the provision that whatever reward he might win from his efforts became his, to be used and disposed of as he wished. This meant opportunity and an incentive for all to achieve success according to their abilities, energy, and ambition.

Of special significance was the fifth article of the Bill of Rights which reads: "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

Here life and property, the one dealing with the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," and the other dealing with the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," are put into the same classification and protected by our law. Thus the individual is entitled to his property because it is his. If its public use should be desired, there must be just compensation, a recognition of his ownership of it and the value of it. This involves the profit motive, the individual's gain of his property, and the whole system of individualism that is attacked today in the propaganda of the radicals who would undermine and destroy our way of life.

As a result of these provisions, the removal of Government restrictions, the opening of unlimited opportunity, America began the greatest development the world has ever seen. At last there was an incentive for all to work, to save, to create new products and new methods. In a century and a half, more progress was made in every field—transportation, communication, education, manufacturing, invention, medicine, science—than in all the countless preceding centuries. Labor-saving devices lessened toil for man, gave us unlimited production, raised the standard of living to heights never before dreamed of.

America's great progress amazed the world and aroused its envy. Our form of government was widely copied. Nation after nation

became more prosperous. Countless millions enjoyed liberty and freedom for the first time in the world's history.

Then came tragedy. In search for power and to satisfy intense greed, despotism again raised its ugly head. In 1914 there began a devastating world war. Democracies finally triumphed but at frightful cost. Then in 1929 there began a depression so deep and so widespread that it proved even more destructive than the war itself. Let us not forget that during that period 32 governments were overthrown. Leaders groped in vain for some solution of the woes of the depression. All sorts of schemes and panaceas were tried.

Despite the warnings of history, the theory was again promoted that government could solve our problems and take care of us. Promising bread, glory, and everything else to hungry, unhappy peoples, the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, and the Lenins came into power. Once again the state became master of the people in a large part of the world. Men again became the servants of the state.

Ambitious dictators resorted again to war, a war that has caused more misery, more suffering, greater destruction of property and loss of life than the world has ever known. Thank God that war, too, has been brought to a victorious end, even though at staggering cost—a public debt of more than $275,000,000,000 and more than a million of our finest boys killed or wounded in combat.

In carrying on the war it was necessary for us to surrender to our Government tremendous power, full control over our lives and our mode of living. But now that the war has been won this Government control must end. We must return again as soon as possible to constitutional government.

In winning the war against our powerful enemies we proved to the world that individual effort can surpass years of planning and preparation for war by any totalitarian government. It was our system of free enterprise, the efforts of freemen, that made it possible for us to outdistance our enemies in war production, a vital factor in winning victory. It was our vast aid to Russia in material that paved Russia's road to victory.

No nation in the world can in war or peace match our production under our system of free enterprise, with its incentives and rewards for effort. The United States has emerged from the war as the most powerful nation on earth.

A system of government that has made all this possible, that has given us the highest standard of living ever known, that has opened the way for our amazing progress and has provided opportunity, happiness, and blessings not enjoyed anywhere else in the world—such a system of government certainly is worth saving. And it must be saved.

To accept the substitute, a planned society, it is necessary to surrender the right to think—to surrender the mind which controls the free actions of men. In a planned society education is controlled, freedom of speech is abridged, freedom of the press is abridged, freedom of assembly is abridged. The control of the mind of man for the maintenance of the plan is not economic democracy; it is not social justice. It is tyranny, blind tyranny, the darkest, blackest tyranny that the human race has ever seen.

These people who advocate state socialism advance the theory that we should depend on government for everything. They ignore the fact that not even supermen could from Washington successfully manage our lives and our affairs. They ignore the fact that government is carried on by a group of only average men and that government does not create wealth. The money that it spends lavishly comes out of the pockets of the people. No one who buys any article or receives compensation escapes taxation. Unlimited government spending leads to disaster. Neither the government nor an indidual can spend itself or himself into prosperity.

Planned economy means reverting to the all-powerful state and inevitably will bring back slavery to the state. Italy, Germany, and Japan had planned economy. Russia still has it. Surely we don't want it in America. And we must not have it. The tremendous sacrifices that we have made in this war will have been in vain if we should finally see established here the very same statism, national socialism or totalitarianism that we fought to overthrow in Europe and in Asia.

And yet such a fate for us is entirely possible if we neglect and forget the Constitution and the way of life that it has provided. Failing to realize the great benefits and blessings that have come to use because of our Constitution, most of us remain asleep and do nothing to protect our form of government and offset these efforts, while zealots who promote socialistic and communistic programs fight on with enthusiasm and determination. If they succeed in their plans, it will mean the end of the America we love.

There are too many who say that this can't happen here and smugly ignore what is going on. Let me remind you that no one expected that a handful of schemers could overthrow the Czar of Russia, but they did and they have remained in control of the Russian Government ever since.

It seemed most unlikely that Churchill, the great war leader, who saved Britain and probably the whole world, could be driven from office by those who stood for a program of state socialism that may lead to almost any kind of an economic revolution in England. But they did succeed, and today America with our Constitution stands as the last bulwark in the world as protection against all the dire results that will surely come from any form of a superstate.

Harold Laski, who did much at Harvard and in Washington to promote socialistic plans, said recently in England that the capitalistic system is doomed. If that be true, then everyone who owns a farm or a house, a mortgage or a bond, a business or a factory, is destined to be deprived of his property. It would mean the scrapping of our Constitution.

Why have the people of this country supinely allowed the terms "capitalism" and "private enterprise" to be referred to with a sort of apology; something to be talked down, whispered down, as being of the regrettable past? They are as much a part of America as the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Capitalism has made this Nation the great, rich country that it is, incomparably the most powerful on earth. After saving the rest of the world and having acted as the storehouse for its rehabilitation, thoughtless and subversive elements in this country would tear down what we have built up.

Almost every inhabitant, other than agitators, in every country in Europe, would prefer the American system if he could have the opportunity to live under it. That is his dream. In his present despair he is turning to forms of socialism and communism under the mistaken delusion that, in some manner not understood by him, he will obtain a measure of security. What a pity he does not know what that means—the loss of freedom.

What we need here is a great educational campaign that will acquaint our people with the basic principles of the Constitution and arouse them to defend at all costs that great charter. It is most encouraging to see Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution both becoming active in this task. The substitutes advocated for it have been tried again and again throughout the ages and have always failed.

Who is being most deceived in this matter of liberty? Surprising to some, it is the laborer, who is the highest paid, has the best tools and finest working conditions, and the highest production record in all the world. The Constitution is the greatest bread-and-butter document in the history of the world. The propaganda used to mislead the worker aims to make him think he is going to get something more under a new system. He is being fed propaganda that inflames class hatred in America—hatred of the capitalist, hatred of management, hatred of those who have money.

The demagogs overlook the fact that if it had not been for those Colonists like Washington, who gave their money to finance the War for Independence, the America we know would never have existed. False propaganda has made some believe that the wealth of America is in the hands of a few, while, as a matter of fact, the riches of this great country are owned by the people, the average level of wealth being higher than in any other country.

Here 45,000,000 people have life insurance, some 50,000,000 have savings-bank deposits, and more than 15,000,000 own their own homes or farms.

The laborer also is being told that the way to get even with those who have prospered by toil, effort, thrift, and ambition is to destroy the system that makes it impossible for anyone to succeed. But the destruction of the system will make it impossible also for this man, his children, and his children's children to improve their lot.

The American workingman is too sensible, I hope, to be duped by such unsound proposals. He must know that the individual knows better than the state what is good for him. He knows that bureaucrats who live on the earnings, sweat, and toil of others are not supermen. They are instead a crushing burden and a great obstacle to all progress.

Jefferson, that great democrat who drafted our Declaration of Independence and had much to do with the creation of our Constitution and our Republic, said this: "A wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall otherwise leave them free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government."

That is the kind of government that would get all its powers from the people and never be their master. It would give every individual by divine help the right to shape his own destiny. But when government undertakes to guarantee economic security, it destroys individualism, destroys initiative, thrift, self-denial, self-reliance, independence, pride, and self-respect.

In the Proverbs we read, "He that tilleth the land shall have plenty of bread, but he that followeth after vain persons shall have poverty enough."

In these days there is much confusion in our thinking about the future. I have faith in America's future if we cling to our constitutional government which has given to us in every way more than any people on the globe have ever had. The scientists who were developed under our free-enterprise system have solved the greatest mystery of the ages, the power of the atom. Their mastery of this secret may lead to a release of tremendous power, progress, and production for all, such as no one can now imagine.

Our free scientists in their laboratories also have found ways to create new products and uses for old products, that regardless of what the atom may do, will change everything about us—the clothes we wear, the food we eat, the houses we live in. They have given us new horizons that will lead to health, happiness, and prosperity such as never before known. They have charted the road to more leisure, more culture, better living and a better world for all mankind.

But to achieve all this we must have the protection of the Constitution that has made possible our amazing progress. We must cling fast to that great charter of our liberties.

We must remain freemen, free from slavery to our Government or any other government.

I have faith in the American people. I believe that their common sense, their intelligence and patriotism will yet triumph and that the trend of Government toward State and national socialism, totalitarianism, and communism in the rest of the world will be checked here in America and that our constitutional form of government will be preserved.

The chairman of the convention that framed our Constitution was George Washington. On the back of his chair there was a painting of the sun as it appeared just above the horizon. When, after many months of wrangling and discussions which often threatened to break up the convention entirely, the Constitution was finally signed by the 39 delegates, Benjamin Franklin, then 83 years old, who had been a great stabilizing force in the convention, arose and said:

"I have looked at that painting again and again. I have wondered whether it was a rising or a setting sun, but now I know it is a rising sun."

And for 156 years it has been a rising sun. Now we must see to it that this sun that has shone upon us with such favor, that has seen America grow from a weak little group of colonies into the greatest of all nations, see to it that this sun does not set.

An Editorial on the MVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not there shall be a Missouri Valley Authority is now being discussed by a great many people, including many of our midwestern newspapers. I wish to extend my remarks by including an editorial from the Miles City (Mont.) Star for Sunday, September 30, 1945. The editorial is as follows:

HAS ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH GROWN WEARY OF MVA?

The only vehement supporter in the big time journalistic field of the Missouri River Basin, for the totalitarian scheme of a Missouri Valley Authority has been the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. (Not counting its twin paper in the same city and under the Pulitzer ownership.) All of a sudden about a year ago, and for no good reason at all, the Post-Dispatch climbed on the socialist wagon of the authority boys. Since then it has been doing its level best to cram this bunch of nonsense down the throats of plain people of the valley. No one ever heard of the twins of Mr. Pulitzer raising a voice about our welfare back in the drought years of 1934 and 1936 when choice cattle herds were being destroyed by the Government at $15 a head to save them from death by thirst and starvation. There was no socialism in that situation for men of inherited wealth, such as Mr. Pulitzer, to dabble in. There was no chance to control the lives of people by socialist experiments, when even the waters of the earth dried up. None of the pro-MVA boys were on hand then; not Mr. Pulitzer of the inherited wealth, Marshall Field of a lot more inherited wealth; the CIO'ers and other rabid unioneers from St. Louis and Kansas City; the TVA'ers of Lilienthal's stripe; the pseudo farmer, Jim Patton and his left-wing Farmers Union political organization; magazines like Collier's of former high thoughts and ideals; certain pinkish and ill-informed New York newspapers, plus a few misguided clergymen who can't smell socialism when it is laid in front of their very noses.

At the time Mr. Pulitzer decided to put over this reform on the Missouri Valley he selected his ace editorial writer and rumor has it he told said writer to stay on the job until the MVA was an accomplished fact. In other words Pulitzer apparently figured that whatever his ideas were, they were good for everybody in the valley. So he picked this ace, Sam Shelton. Now Sam has tried hard to carry out instructions of the big boss. He has written reams of clever, wordy and at times slightly caustic articles on the matter of an MVA. He dispatched another writer (pardon us for the term) into the valley who was supposed to write a fairly correct account of what he found therein. Well, what that fellow sent back to Sam reminded us of the figures of the three monkeys who see nothing, hear nothing, and tell nothing. His writings were just about that good and had just that much effect on the question under discussion. We recall that brother Shelton dogged the water conference committee which met in Chicago last September for the purpose of formulating a national water use policy for the guidance of Congress. What he wrote about that conference was in the same class as what might have fell out of the transom. In other words, Sam didn't get very close to the heart of the discussion which indicated he might have been on the outside listening in. Oh, he did write a magnificent editorial once. It took up a whole page in the Post-Dispatch and was illustrated with a half-baked drawing by their staff drawing-board artist. Sam thought so much of the editorial he addressed it to all the editors in the valley (including ours), and sent out reprints helter-skelter up and down the river. That was the one which launched his MVA campaign. Of course, it fell like a dud in the upper basin States and that was something Sam Shelton never could understand. It was such a noble thought and the bushlander editors just wouldn't fall for it.

But as time went on Sam's efforts became more and more feeble in the cause of the MVA, and his arguments lost whatever potency they once had. Now we learn via Editor and Publisher that Sam is no longer on the editorial staff of the Post-Dispatch. It seems he made much more of a fist of handling a strike of the St. Louis carriers than of putting over the MVA. So now Mr. Pulitzer has gathered Sam unto himself, for Editor-Publisher says: "Shelton will assist Pulitzer on various problems relating to publishing the newspaper and will join the management's committee in negotiating all contracts."

Isn't that a nice way of getting a good guy out of a tough spot where you placed him, after finding that the "reform wave" has failed; especially the one you tried to backwash up the Missouri Valley?

Well, so long, Sam. You put up the best scrap you could in view of the fact that you had been equipped with propaganda pillows instead of boxing gloves. Anyway we enjoyed your shadow boxing on the TVA benefit performances.

The Benefits to Agriculture From the Full-Employment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by me:

Friends of the Twelfth District, one of the most widely discussed legislative measures now before Congress is the full-employment bill of 1945 which recently passed the Senate and will shortly be acted on by the House of Representatives.

I have talked to you before about this measure and have indicated to you the reasons for my strong endorsement of it. Tonight I want to discuss full employment again but from another point of view.

When the problem of maintaining employment is discussed, people are very inclined to think of employment or unemployment in terms of the urban industrial worker. This is a natural thing to do growing out of the obvious role of the millions of industrial workers in our total economic picture.

The city worker, however, is just the most obvious beneficiary of an economy of full production and full employment. All the people of our modern America will benefit from the fullest possible use of the total work force in a program of full production.

We have seen how this worked during the war when we did use a maximum number of workers in the maximum effort to produce the weapons, the machines, the uniforms, and the food necessary to achieve victory.

The impact of the war upon agriculture was as great and its results as miraculous as was the unprecedented production records reached in industry. The American farmer proved himself to be as great a production genius as the industrial worker.

One of the byproducts of this great wartime record by farmers in the United States has been the change in thinking among many economists and theorists as to the potential productivity of agriculture and its relationship to the whole economy. The theory of scarcity economics in agriculture has been completely outmoded by the war experience. America at war consumed all the farmer could produce and could have used even more. America at peace can do the same if the purchases of farm products is sustained through full employment of the farmers' No. 1 customer—the urban industrial worker.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, in a pamphlet discussing the peacetime role of farmers has this to say:

"What peace can mean to American farmers depends more upon the level of business activity and nonfarm employment that can be maintained after the war than upon anything else."

It is perfectly true that a program of full employment will not solve all the problems or cure all the headaches of the American farmer, but without full employment the average farmer is doomed to an ever-decreasing income, to a lessened standard of living, and to abandonment of the land as a livelihood for many thousands of them.

It is very interesting to note that it was a farm organization which first proposed the full-employment bill. It was the Farmers' Union, a national organization of working farmers, which proposed the plan of Senator MURRAY, of Montana, in August of last year.

Full employment is not an academic or abstract theory to to the farmer, to the man who raises the pigs, the cows, chickens, corn, wheat, and other foodstuffs to supply the tables of America. Full employment throughout the Nation means full production and cash in hand on the farm.

The great agricultural production record during the war demonstrated as nothing else could the economic interdependence of farmer and worker, of city folks and country folks. That relationship did not start with the war; it will not stop with victory. If anything, the dependence of the farmer on industrial pay rolls will grow with the end

of the war. During the last several years the farmers have shared with industry the United States Government as their most important customer.

Even with a vast Government program of relief in form of food and clothing for the peoples of the war-devastated countries, the United States Government will no longer be the big consumer of farm products that it has been. The ordinary American will have to take up the slack through increased purchases of the farmers' produce. This means the ordinary American is going to have to eat more and better foods than he did before the war, and he can't do this unless there are more jobs at decent wages than there were before the war.

What this means is clear. The farmers' stake in full employment in the United States is as great as is the workers', the shopkeepers', or the businessmen's.

A very good example of how the farmer benefits from widespread increases in purchasing power among urban workers is found in the consuming habits established during the war. Not only did total production go up to amazing records, but individual consumption of farm products went way up.

Even taking into account rationing and the diversion of great supplies to the armed services and to lend-lease, civilian consumption of pork and lard jumped from 67.1 to 87.1 pounds per person, of chicken from 17.9 to 28.1 pounds, of wool from 4.5 to 7.7, and of cotton from 25.3 to 39.8 pounds.

Of course there were decreases in consumption by individuals, too, but these were in foodstuffs and other farm products that simply were not available for civilian use. It is very significant for the future, that American consumers during the full employment period of the war used ever increasing amounts of agricultural products whenever they were available.

There is no reason to believe that this trend would not continue after the war when the inhibitions against buying have been removed.

This increased consumption of farm products during the war was possible because a war economy is an economy of full employment. What could this not mean in a peacetime economy of full production and employment when the wartime brakes on civilian consumption have been removed?

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has estimated that if the United States had full employment at a national income level of $150,000,000,000 in 1950, the average consumer in the United States would eat 113 percent of the beef and veal he ate during the 1935–39 period, 143 percent of the pork and lard, 140 percent of the chickens, 117 percent of the eggs, and 112 percent of the dairy products.

The Bureau estimates, on comparison with consumption in past years, that the average citizen would use 154 percent more citrus fruit, 138 percent more canned vegetables, 119 percent more sugar, 133 percent more wool, 119 percent of cotton and 132 percent of tobacco.

Imagine what this kind of consumption by the American people would mean to the farmer. And it is possible. The figures arrived at by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are based on past relationships between employment levels throughout the country and farm-products consumption.

These figures, amazing as they may seem as opposed to the old concept of scarcity planning, do not take into account such important factors in increased consumption as nutrition education resulting in better eating habits, or a greater diffusion of buying power through elimination of substandard wages.

They are based on present consuming habits, and on present wage levels which, in millions of cases, make adequate family diets impossible.

In all my discussions of full-employment legislation, I have said repeatedly that it would not solve all the ills of modern industrial capitalism. It is not the open sesame to the world of peace and prosperity which ideally we strive for. It does provide a blueprint for the kind of healthy total economy in which peace and prosperity can thrive.

I want to emphasize this in relation to the farmers' stake in full employment.

The full-employment bill will not cure all the headaches in the present agricultural system. Even full employment itself, with all that it will mean to improve the lot of the farmer, will not automatically take care of such pressing agricultural problems as soil conservation, of balanced production, of monopoly farming—to mention just a few of the most urgent problems.

A comprehensive agricultural program designed to correct the old ills and to promote new methods must accompany full employment if the American farmer is to share in the fullness of American life.

Such a comprehensive program, designed to secure to the farmer the full benefits of an economy of full production must be based on the proposition that agriculture is an integral and vital part of the total economy, not a stepchild of the American system.

Although as I have said, the passage of the full employment bill will not solve the postwar problems of American agriculture, it will, for the farmer as for the rest of us, provide a blueprint for the kind of economy in which general prosperity, with an ever-increasing standard of living for all, is possible.

I have heard the full employment bill compared, as far as farmers are concerned, with support prices for agricultural products. Support prices, as you know, put a floor under the prices of farm products. The full employment bill will put a floor under the whole economy.

If the United States does achieve the full employment envisioned by the study of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics with a national income of $150,000,000,000 in 1950, the cash income of farmers would be about $17,000,000,000, assuming a slight decrease in prices from present levels.

If, instead of full employment, we were to have another depression comparable to that of 1929–32, farm cash income would drop to about $6,500,000,000. Net income would be $3,000,000,000 as against $11,400,000,000 under full employment.

These figures alone make clear the farmers' stake in full employment in the postwar period when the increased technological improvement in farm operation and the increased speed of the impact of depressions on farmers constantly tend to bring the farm and urban populations of the country closer together to share in the total economy, whether it be one of acute depression or of full employment.

Address by the President at Dedication of Kentucky Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by President Truman at the dedication of Kentucky Dam, Gilbertsville, Ky., October 10, 1945, as well as his informal remarks upon the same occasion, both of which are published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S TALKS AT DEDICATION OF KENTUCKY DAM

GILBERTSVILLE, KY., October 10.—The prepared text of President Truman's address here was as follows:

"Ladies and gentlemen, 9 years ago the first dam of the Tennessee Valley Authority—the Norris Dam on the Clinch River—was dedicated by my illustrious predecessor—Franklin D. Roosevelt. At the very start of his presidency he had the great vision and foresight to recommend and encourage the comprehensive development of this entire great valley.

"It is now a matter of great pride to me to dedicate the sixteenth great structure built by the TVA—the Kentucky Dam. The system of dams across the Tennessee now puts under the control of man a whole vast river—and harnesses it to do his work. This has not yet happened on any other river. The completion of this dam marks a new high point in modern pioneering in America.

"Nine years ago TVA was a highly controversial subject. Today it is no longer an experiment, but a demonstration. By all except a small minority it is now regarded as a great American accomplishment, of which all of us are proud.

"Here in this great valley American enterprise and courage and skill have come through again with a genuine achievement. The TVA does not belong to the people of the Tennessee Valley alone. It belongs to all the United States. And indeed, it has inspired regional resource development all over the world. Distinguished observers from more than 50 countries have come to this historic American valley. They came here to study what has been done. They went away to try to adapt to their own regions the lessons that have been learned here from actual experience.

"As a Senator I was always a strong supporter of the TVA. And I can say to you that I have never had occasion to regret my support of the TVA and of the idea it represents. Its record has fully justified the hopes and the confidence of its old friends."

EXPERIMENT IN DEMOCRACY

"But it is more than dams and locks and chemical plants and power lines. It is an important experiment in democracy. In it, administrative methods have been devised which bring the people and their Federal Government closer together—not in Washington, but right where the people live. Here in this valley there has been firmly established the basic principle of development of resources on an autonomous regional basis.

"Why has TVA succeeded so well? Why does it have the esteem of the people of this valley, and attract the attention of other regions of America, and of the entire world? To me the answer is clear—TVA is just plain common sense. It is common sense hitched up to modern science and good management. And that's about all there is to it.

"Instead of going at the river piecemeal with a dam here and a dam there, the river was treated as a whole. The dams were all designed so that they would fit together as a unit and in that way get the most service out of the river for mankind.

"Consider Kentucky Dam itself. This dam will hold back 4,000,000 acre-feet of flood water from the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. The people behind the levees on those rivers know how much that will mean to them in protection from disaster. When the danger of flood is past, those flood waters are not to be wasted. They will be put

through the water wheels here at the dam to produce great quantities of electricity. That electricity will rush to serve the people of the valley, their homes and farms and industries."

CALLS BENEFITS FAR FLUNG

"Kentucky Dam also provides a deep-water, navigable channel 183 miles long. The other TVA dams carry that reliable deep-water channel all the way to Knoxville in east Tennessee, 650 miles away. As a result, the South and the Middle West of this Nation are now connected by water transportation. The benefits of this dam go not only to the Tennessee Valley; they go to St. Paul and Minneapolis, to New Orleans and Memphis, to St. Louis and Kansas City, to Omaha and Sioux City—to all the communities in the great Mississippi Valley that are served by our inland waterways.

"In addition to power and flood control and navigation, there is recreation. TVA has joined with the various States and local communities in the development of great lakes here in the South. Here we have boating, fishing, and hunting where thousands upon thousands of people in the Tennessee Valley and the Middle West may enjoy themselves.

"As President Roosevelt said when he first recommended the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority in April of 1933:

"'* * * the usefulness of the entire Tennessee River * * * transcends mere power development; it enters the wide fields of flood control, soil erosion, afforestation, elimination from agricultural use of marginal lands, and distribution and diversification of industry.'"

SEES ROOSEVELT PROPHECY FULFILLED

"His prophecy has been fulfilled, for in the TVA the Congress has provided for a tying together of all the things that go to make up a well-rounded economic development.

"It is easy to see that most of these common-sense principles can be applied to other valleys, and I have already recommended to the Congress that a start be made in that direction. Careful planning and common-sense development can convert the idle and wasting resources of other valleys into jobs and better living.

"No two valleys are exactly alike, of course. For that reason, the details of just how this region or that region should be developed are matters that require study and judgment in each particular case. The procedure in each valley may have to be a little different. The details of administration and control may have to be different. But the underlying common-sense principles of this development here in the Tennessee Valley can provide guidance and counsel to the people in other regions who likewise aspire to put their resources to the greatest use.

"Let me emphasize that in the last analysis such development is a matter for the people themselves to decide. Here in this valley State and local agencies, public and private, have joined with TVA in a two-way partnership. This was a natural result of the policy of regional decentralization. That same policy ought to be followed in the other river valleys as regional agencies are created by the Congress and set to work.

"We must continue all over the United States to wage war against flood and drought. Our vast store of natural resources can be made to serve us in peace with the same efficiency as they did in war. We should exercise our common sense, go ahead, and continue to get the job done."

PICTURES RIVERS MADE TO SERVE

"Much has already been done in the past 12 years on river development in other parts of the country—on the Columbia and Colorado, on the Missouri, on the rivers of the Central Valley of California. They are all designed to make the rivers and their generous bounty serve instead of injuring mankind.

"Waters are now being harnessed and changed into electricity—electricity which has helped supply the weapons of victory in war—electricity which can be used to improve the standards of living and comfort and efficiency in the farms and homes of thousands of American families. Waters are now making crops grow on land where recently there was only desert dust.

"The valleys of America await their full development. The time has come—now that materials and manpower are more plentiful—to press forward. The days of the pioneer are not dead. The development of our natural resources calls for men of courage, of vision, of endurance, just as in the pioneering days of old.

"The Nation, I am sure, is determined to march forward. We will not listen to the whispers of the timid, that dreams like those of the Tennessee Valley are impossible to accomplish. In the great valleys of America there is a challenge to all that is best in our tradition. Ahead of us lies a great adventure in building even stronger the foundations of our beloved country.

"America will not hesitate to meet that challenge."

HIS EXTEMPORANEOUS TALK

The transcript of Mr. Truman's extemporaneous remarks was as follows:

"Now, I want to say to you how very happy and how glad I am to be your guest here today. I am particularly glad because Senator BARKLEY and Congressman GREGORY informed me that people always turn out like this for them when they come home. BARKLEY whispered to me coming over here that if the people keep treating him like this, there is no possible way for him to retire from public life.

"I hope that time will never come, because BARKLEY is a good public servant. Congressman GREGORY—I had the pleasure of giving him his first plane ride the other day. He said he didn't like riding in a plane. Lots of people are averse to riding in a plane. Even my wife hates to ride in a plane.

"But after I got GREGORY aboard he confessed that if he was going to get his neck broken, he would just as soon break his neck in with BARKLEY and me."

DEPLORES WASTE OF RESOURCES

"I hope that the development of this great valley here will result in the development of our other river valleys along the same line. You know our resources have barely been touched. Some of our national resources, lumber, for instance, have been exhausted by senseless deforestation.

"We are trying to remedy that situation now by reforestation. This great development has proven conclusively that a free people can do anything that is necessary for the welfare of the human race as a whole.

"We created the greatest production machine in the history of the world. We made that machine operate to the disaster of the dictators. Now then, we want to keep that machine operating. We must keep that machine operating.

"We have just discovered the source of the sun's power—atomic energy; that is, we have found out how to turn it loose. We had to turn it loose in the beginning for destruction.

"We are not going to use it for destruction any more, I hope. But that tremendous source of energy can create for us the greatest age in the history of the world, if we are sensible enough to put it to that use and to no other. I think we are going to do just that.

"I think our Allies are going to cooperate with us in peace just as we cooperated with them in war. I think we can look forward to the greatest age in history, and I have said that every time I have had an opportunity to address anybody."

WORKING FOR PEACE IS URGED

"The greatest age in history is upon us. We must assume that responsibility. We are going to assume it, and every one of you and all of us are going to get to work for the welfare of the world in peace just as we worked of the welfare of the world in war. That is absolutely essential and necessary.

"We are having our little troubles now, a few of them. They are not serious. Just a blow-up after a let-down from war. You remember what a terrible time we had the first two days after the Japanese folded up, everybody had to blow off steam.

"Well, there is still some of that steam that wants to be blown off. And we still have a few selfish men who think more of their own personal interests than they do of the public welfare. But they are not going to prevail. You are not going to let them prevail. You are going to force everybody to get into this harness and push and pull until that great age I am prophesying comes about.

"We can't do it tomorrow; we can't do it next month, we probably can't do it next year. It is going to take some time for us to realize just exactly what we have and what we will do with it.

"Now let's all go home and go to work. Cut out the foolishness and make this country what it ought to be—the greatest Nation the sun has ever shown upon."

Being Two-Bitted to Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a column from the Washington Post of October 9. It was written by Seymour E. Harris and carried the title "World's Free Trade at Stake."

I consider this article factual, objective, and definitely informative. I have changed the title, since I feel the expression "free trade" to be misleading. In this world—which does so badly need acceptable international definitions—the term "free" is overworked. What we all hope for is the liberalizing of trade by removing, within the realm of equity, those things which hamper or prohibit trading.

Nor can many of us close our eyes to the need for international trade. My own State produces from three to four times as many apples as the next most productive State; more lumber than any other State than Oregon; and far more eggs, wheat, peas, and fish than we or the western area can possibly consume. Distant markets, either foreign or domestic, are important to us. The Pacific Northwest produces almost 40 percent of our total aluminum and much of our zinc and lead. This incomplete list will at least indicate why we are interested in world trade.

Naturally, we know that world trade can only thrive when the world has a stabilized monetary medium upon which to base the exchange of goods. That, to me, was the persuading factor that saw this House pass the Bretton Woods agreement. Now, it seems that Bretton

Woods must wait upon other factors engendered by this war—that is, sterling must first be stabilized by removing the dangers of England's external debt before she can participate in the agreement. Whether that is so or not will be for the Congress, sooner or later, to decide.

Somehow we never get through paying for wars. I am reminded of the fellow who bought the cheap second-hand car. He thought he had something. But the thing could only limp from one garage to the next. Finally he exploded, "I wish I did not have it. It did not cost much, but it is two-bitting me to death."

The article follows:

DOLLARS FOR BRITAIN

(By Seymour E. Harris)

WORLD'S FREE TRADE AT STAKE

British and American experts in Washington are now discussing aid to the British. Undoubtedly the British would like to get several billion dollars additional under lend-lease. This the administration has ruled out.

Other practical alternatives are an interest-free loan, the principal to be repaid after an initial period of 5 to 10 years, over 25 to 50 years, and a loan at cost, say 2½ percent. Apparently the British are cold to the latter on the ground that the burden of interest payments would further increase the pressure on the pound sterling. If a loan of $5,000,000,000 were made—current discussions seem to suggest three to six billion dollars—then freedom from interest payments would save the British $125,000,000 annually, or about 4 percent of the foreign currencies annually required before the war. When the demand for dollars and other foreign currencies is strong and insistent, this additional burden may have the effect of the last drops of water that make the pail flow over.

In my opinion, neither Congress nor the American people are willing to give the British an outright gift. A strong case could be made out for a gift of several billion dollars which might cover the British shortage of dollars over the next few years. The war did not end with VJ-day. In this common war the British paid much more than we did: and they could afford less. Their consumption was down 20 percent; ours was up 20 percent. Their export trade was down by three-quarters; ours was relatively well maintained, and inclusive of lend-lease (one-half munitions) was even up by several hundred percent. Their casualties of 600,000 by the latter part of 1944 were a much larger percentage of the population than ours. They have lost heavily in shipping and in foreign investments.

We need especially underline the investment position of the British. In 5 to 6 years they disposed of $18,000,000,000 of assets abroad; gold, securities, dollars, etc. At present they owe $14,000,000,000 on short-term account largely to the Dominions—these debts were incurred primarily through purchases of foodstuffs and materials in the waging of common war and largely in various parts of the Empire. These are the much-talked-of blocked balances—so-called because the British Government does not allow free use of them. If the owners were allowed to withdraw them in order to buy foreign currencies, the British pound sterling might well take a headlong flight down to $3, $2, or even less.

The British, then, are in a precarious state. It is not our job to bail the British out in every crisis. They would be the last to ask us to do so. There are, however, moral commitments that are part of the cost of war. We should help the British get back on their feet. Once having learned to walk again, the British will have to dispose of their crutches. They have announced in the official white paper on employment that the way out is more work, more efficiency in industry, encouragement of export industries; and a necessary condition is high world incomes and a relaxation of trade barriers. This country is being asked to provide the aspirin, morphine, and nutrition, while the British economy is being subjected to surgery.

Ultimately the British hope to reestablish their export position and even improve it. They will have to pay for their essential imports of food and raw materials. Their exports will have to contribute much more relatively to their budget of required dollars, pesos, etc., than before the war, both because the dollars, received from foreign investments and shipping, are substantially reduced and because at high levels of employment the need for imports will rise. They will need all their resourcefulness and salesmanship; and in addition they will need a peaceful and prosperous world—if they are to reach this goal. If they fail, the alternative is self-sufficiency, trade restrictions of all kinds, cartelization of British industry, monopoly buying, and with it all, trade wars.

In short, we had better help put the British on their feet and thus share in the resulting world prosperity. The exact amount of aid is a matter for the technical experts and Congress to decide. The British Prime Minister estimated recently that the British shortage of all foreign currencies was of the order of $5,000,000,000 annually. And the most careful husbanding of dollars might bring the dollar deficit over the next 2 years down to $2,000,000,000.

It is difficult to see how the British could get by with less than four to six billion dollars of interest-free loans from this country during the transition period. Though a strong economic case might be made out for outright gifts, political considerations rule that out. Her other creditors—largely the Dominions—will have to scale down their claims on the United Kingdom by a substantial amount as well—possibly by one-quarter to one-half. They should also share in the rehabilitation of the British financial position.

Financial purists are now beginning to ask whether we can afford this additional debt. Let us be clear that we expect the debt to be repaid—hence the cost is only the interest charges. Let us be clear also that our trade and income and hence our financial position will profit greatly from an improvement in the British economic position.

If we treat the British generously we also have the right to insist that the British fulfill the promises made, under article VII of the material-aid agreement. (This article provides for "the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment of international commerce and the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers.")

This country is soon to make a decision on aid to Britain. It is to be hoped that the decision will be one which will raise the hopes of those who want freer trade and improved political relations, and will not encourage the political isolationists, the British baiters—and the others who are prepared to risk economic warfare and World War III.

Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a speech I recently made in Philadelphia, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, friends, and neighbors, I am very happy to be with you today, not as your Congressman, not as a privileged and honored guest, but as your neighbor and, I most sincerely hope, as your friend.

We have gathered here today to do honor to our fellow Americans who have freely given their lives, liberty, and property to the cause of freedom and democracy.

They have given their lives on the battlefields of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and on the seven seas.

They have lost their liberty through capture, and suffered unspeakable torture in the prison camps of our inhuman enemies.

They have given freely of their property for the support of the war effort.

I say all honor to the Negro race for its unselfish response to the demands of our Government in its time of danger and need. No one has questioned the color of your contribution to the common cause. It was gladly accepted by a grateful nation. Our hearts are still filled with gratitude. You are entitled to every honor and benefit that we can bestow on you.

Don't let your hearts be troubled by the actions and words of a few alleged statesmen and demagogs in the Halls of Congress. Their remarks are like the mists of an autumn morning; they are dissipated by the sunshine of truth and fair play.

The men and women who have served and are now serving in the armed forces are of all creeds, colors, and national origins. Their service to their country is not predicated on color.

But there is one disturbing note in all our gratitude.

And I am going to take this opportunity to make a few remarks on a bill in which I am keenly interested and in which, I am sure, every fair-minded American is interested, and that is the Fair Employment Practice Commission.

I want to register my protest against the intolerance, the prejudice, and completely unfair attitude of the opposition.

This bill, if enacted, would provide humane justice to every person irrespective of color, creed, and race, and I stand here today to plead, nay, to demand that common justice be given to the minority races.

The civic and military record of the Negro cannot be challenged; they fought on the battlefields of the world and died for the freedom of the peoples of the enslaved countries only to come home and find that for which they fought denied them in their own homes.

A striking example of this injustice was perpetrated on April 28, 1945, when in the Pennsylvania State Legislature the Brown FEPC was defeated by a solid Republican vote of 102 to the unanimous Democratic vote of 92.

There has never been a more flagrant disregard of the hopes and wishes of the Negro people than was exhibited by the Republican organization.

Official Philadelphia is exerting every effort to permanently establish the United Nations Council here. A committee of prominent citizens has been selected. Senators, Congressmen, and influential citizens throughout the Nation have been persuaded to give their support to this effort.

Philadelphia bases her claim for this distinction on historic grounds. Here is where liberty and independence were born. But I believe that the site of the United Nations Council should be a place where the hopes and aspirations of mankind for tolerance, equality, and brotherly love are practiced and exemplified in the daily life of its people.

I believe that an atmosphere of race prejudice and intolerance at the capital of the United Nations would increase racial

tension throughout the world and endanger the peace.

No city can be deemed a suitable place for a world capital whose present record is one of segregation, discrimination, and offense.

None of the responsible Philadelphia city officials have declared for the passage of the FEPC, which would merely wipe out racial discrimination in employment; although all of them must know that the right to work is fundamentally bound up with the right to live.

As you may remember, a year ago it was necessary to bring Federal troops to the city to protect the rights of Negroes to work as conductors and motormen.

And friends, this is what the Negro has fought and died for.

If you will bear with me for a moment, I should like to give you some figures that were taken from the Government files. They will show the debt of gratitude this country owes to the superb courage of the Negro race.

In all branches of the service as of May 1, 1945, there were 700,304 Negroes in the Army of which 511,493 were serving overseas.

As of March 1, 1945, 160,080 were serving in the Navy, 15,867 in the Marines, and 3,809 in the Coast Guard.

Contrary to the opinion of Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, who, in a shameful address made recently in the United States Senate, accused Negro members of our armed forces of not being good soldiers; a release by the War Department dated June 18, 1945, made the following statement: "In a ceremony deep within conquered Germany, 10 Negro doughboys of the One Hundred and Fourth, Timber Wolf Division, this month, received the praises of five generals and awards they had won in combat while fighting alongside their white comrades against the enemy." They were former rear Quartermaster Corps soldiers who had asked for a chance at the front-line infantry fighting.

Their own commanding general, Maj. Gen. Terry Allen of the Fighting Timber Wolves, in pinning the medals on their uniforms, said: "We are all proud of you."

To members of the Ninety-second Infantry Division, a colored division which served in Italy, there were awarded 7 legions of merit, 65 silver stars and 1,377 purple hearts.

These are only a few instances where recognition has been given colored soldiers for outstanding services.

They are Americans fighting for a common objective, freedom in the broadest sense of the word.

We have repeated over and over again that this war is being fought to preserve freedom in our own country and to extend it to the peoples of the world.

If we are honest and, I believe we are, at least most of us are, there remains one way to prove it and that is to end discrimination in our own country and pass the bill making the Fair Employment Practice a permanent agency.

No one in this country has the right to deny employment to anyone because of his race, religion, or color. For this reason it is important that each and every one of you should continue the great work which you have carried on up to now, so that the realization of a permanent FEPC may be your reward in a very short time.

In June 1941 our late beloved President made the following statement:

"No Nation combating the increasing threat of totalitarianism can afford arbitrarily to exclude large segments of its population from defense industries; even more important it is for us to strengthen our unity and morale by refuting at home the very theories which we are fighting abroad.

"Our Government cannot countenance continued discrimination against American citizens in defense production.

"Industry must take the initiative in opening the doors of employment to all loyal and qualified workers regardless of race, national origin, religion, or color.

"American workers, both organized and unorganized, must be prepared to welcome the general and much needed employment of fellow workers of all racial and nationality origins in defense industries."

My friends, my actions, both in and out of Congress, are always for the welfare of my constituents, who have honored me with their confidence and support.

And I say to you tonight, with my whole heart and soul, as surely as there is a God in Heaven, that I shall fight with all my power and strength to see that you are not discriminated against.

I shall see that you and your family shall have a decent living.

I shall see that your children shall be brought up in the proper environment.

I shall see that all educational facilities shall be afforded them.

The Adjustment of Industrial Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles entitled "The Adjustment of Industrial Disputes," by B. L. Masse, and C. W. Anrod, from the magazine America, the issues of August 25 and September 1.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From America of August 25, 1945]

THE ADJUSTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

(By B. L. Masse and C. W. Anrod)

On any list of the half-dozen most critical problems confronting the country after VJ-day, you will be sure to find industrial relations.

Under the best of circumstances, it is not going to be an easy or painless job to shoft back to peacetime production. Billions of dollars worth of war contracts must be terminated with as much speed and as little fraud as possible. Billions of dollars worth of surplus property must be sold without clogging the channels of trade or encouraging monopoly. While factories making machine guns are being retooled for typewriters and washing machines, unemployment must be kept to a minimum and workers helped over the bad months. The Army must be demobilized and the veterans assisted in finding a place in civilian life. And all this must be done under the threat of inflationary pressures which, if they ever get out of hand, can make the dollar look like 15 cents.

UNITY IN PEACE

While the job is difficult, few doubt that we can do it. A nation that mobilized as we did for war can successfully demobilize for peace. But when we mobilized for war, the country was united, and that made the difference between failure and success. Will it stay united for peace?

Since the attack on Pearl Harbor, labor and management have been bound by a no-strike, no-lockout pledge, and the War Labor Board has called balls and strikes with plenary authority. What will happen during the reconversion period when the no-strike pledge no longer binds and the War Labor Board is disbanded? Are we heading for the old industrial warfare which was interrupted only by the exigencies of making another kind of war against external enemies?

If we are, then the reconversion program may become the biggest fiasco in economic history.

RECENT PROPOSALS

It is obvious that public opinion cannot and will not tolerate such a national disaster. The best indication of this was the reception given the proposed Federal Industrial Relations Act sponsored in Congress by Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL. Outside of labor circles, which unanimously condemned the proposals, there was general praise for the initiative shown by the Senators and widespread recognition that the problem they approached must not be permitted to go unresolved. This was true even when the commentators found serious fault with the suggested legislation.

Lately Senators MCMAHON and VANDENBERG appealed respectively to President Truman and Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach to call a national conference of labor and industry, under the auspices of the Federal Government, to formulate a workable code of industrial relations. The idea was immediately welcomed, although not without reservations, by the leaders of the major labor organizations and by the heads of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. That it has the approval of the public goes without saying.

Referring to the proposed conference, Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric, said:

"The Federal Government can make its greatest contribution at this time by setting the stage for such a meeting and then letting the principals deal directly."

Any legislation that might fellow such a definite and constructive conference would then have a fair chance of acceptance and continued existence, because it would represent substantial agreement between business and labor leaders, and not the exaggerated sentiments of a lunatic fringe.

With this conference approach to the problem, the authors of this article are in hearty accord. They agree, too, that the clock is running out on labor and management, that unless the leaders of labor and industry agree to voluntary changes in the prewar system of industrial relations, the changes will be made for them. The fact is that our prewar system, which consisted solely in free collective bargaining, assisted, when necessary, by the Federal and various State conciliation services, will not be adequate in the postwar world. In the following words, Economic Stabilization Director William H. Davis gives two of the reasons why:

"There will be in the field of industrial relations a situation substantially different from anything in prewar days. * * * That difference will lie in the increased size and organized strength of the parties to industrial disputes and in the absolute urgency to attain a high level of peacetime economy."

In other words, the Nation, confronted with a critical need for full production, cannot be permitted to face, practically unarmed, the possibility of industrial warfare on a scale never before experienced. The common good demands that we prepare now, without violating the essential liberties of either labor or management, to keep this warfare within the narrowest possible bounds.

It should be the purpose, then, of any conference called by the President to suggest legislation designed to diminish the number

of strikes and promote the orderly settlement of industrial disputes.

FREE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING DESIRED

We do not wish, however, to be misunderstood. We believe firmly that free collective bargaining must be the cornerstone of postwar industrial relations. In general, we are opposed to cumpulsory arbitration, or any other coercive legislation which would deprive labor of the right to strike. But we believe that it is possible, without weakening the Wagner Act, to fashion machinery which will assist the parties to collective bargaining to settle their differences peacefully. That is all that can reasonably be attempted in this complex matter, since no machinery, unless reinforced by totalitarian bayonets, will do away with strikes completely.

In order to achieve this limited, but very necessary, objective, it seems to us that the proposed labor-management conference ought to explore thoroughly the nature of industrial disputes. On this fundamental question, there is a great deal of loose and careless thinking.

A careful analysis of industrial disputes will show that they can be divided into two main and clearly distinct groups: those of a legal or quasi-legal nature, so-called disputes of rights; and those which arise from conflicting social and economic interests, so-called disputes of interests.

This distinction is of capital importance, since the basic principles and institutions for the settlement of industrial disputes must be related to their various natures and causes. Disputes of rights, for example, can be decided on the basis of a statute or rule of law, on which the rights in dispute are based; whereas disputes of interests lack such legal or quasi-legal foundation and must be handled in some other way.

DISPUTES OF RIGHTS

Disputes of rights arise over the interpretation or application of a specific statute or of an individual employment or collective-bargaining contract already in force.

These conflicts (often called grievances) are not peculiar to industrial relations. From the standpoint of applicable rule of law, as well as from the standpoint of jurisdiction over subject matter, it makes no essential difference whether a trade union argues with an employer or whether an organization of retailers argues with a wholesaler about the interpretation or application of a statute or a contract. In other words, from a strictly legal point of view, it is immaterial whether a dispute concerns an interpretation or application of the Fair Labor Standards Act or of the Sherman Antitrust Act; whether a worker sues his employer for back wages, or a landlord his tenant for back rent. In both types of cases, the decision will be based on the applicable statute or contract, and the agency rendering it will be a lawfully instituted court.

It is possible, of course, for the parties to such controversies to eliminate the courts by agreeing to submit the dispute of rights to arbitration. In that event, the arbitration agencies clearly perform a judicial function. They are quasi-judicial arbitration courts, and not quasi-administrative arbitration boards.

From the foregoing, the conclusion is obvious that disputes of rights, disputes, that is, which involve statutory or contractual rights, must be left principally to the judicial branch of our tripartite governmental system. This appears to be a requirement of our Constitution. In *Dorchy* v. *Kansas*, Justice Brandeis stated flatly that "in the absence of a valid agreement to the contrary, each party to a disputed claim may insist that it be determined only by a court." Consequently, unless both parties agree otherwise, the final decision in all disputes of rights between labor and management is the prerogative of the courts.

The courts, however, as presently constituted, are not ordinarily equipped to handle day-to-day industrial disputes of rights satisfactorily. In addition to their tardy procedure in a type of case which demands speedy settlement, the courts are not usually staffed by men who have the necessary social and economic understanding of industrial disputes. Since this is a matter of procedure rather than of principle, the solution lies in creating a new type of court equipped to deal with disputes of rights that arise between labor and management.

Actually this is what has been done by many foreign countries. Confronted with the same problem which now faces us in an acute form—the necessity of minimizing industrial warfare—they have instituted special labor courts which operate under modernized and streamlined procedures and are administered by judges who have the necessary economic and social understanding. Prior to the war, such courts existed in about 20 countries.

In the event Mr. Truman summons a labor-management conference, we should like to suggest that the creation of labor courts to deal with disputes of rights be given serious consideration. Since this device has been widely used elsewhere, it cannot be considered an untried innovation. It does not seem to conflict either with the letter or spirit of our Constitution, or with any legitimate freedom now enjoyed by labor and management. It merely assures, by a strictly legal process, a just, speedy, and orderly settlement of that type of industrial dispute which can be, and which ought to be, settled by rule of law, namely, disputes between labor and management over the interpretation and application of existing laws or existing contracts. Certainly, the public has the right to demand, and so have labor and management, that such disputes of rights be settled by reason and not by recourse to economic warfare.

If labor courts of this kind are ever established by the Congress, the enabling legislation ought to contain a provision facilitating and encouraging voluntary arbitration, since voluntary arbitration is everywhere recognized as the best means to settle industrial disputes. Indeed, the mere fact of instituting labor courts, recourse to which would be mandatory unless the parties to the dispute were able to arrive at a peaceful settlement, would have the salutary effect of widening the area of voluntary arbitration.

So much, then, for disputes of rights. Next week we propose to deal with so-called disputes of interests—a much more difficult proposition.

[From America of September 1, 1945]

THE ADJUSTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES—II

(B. L. Masse and C. W. Anrod)

(Continued from August 25, 1945)

As distinguished from disputes of rights, which arise over the specific terms of a statute or contract already in force, disputes of interests have their origin in the terms to be included in a new collective-bargaining agreement. They are controversies over the wages, hours, and working conditions which should be adopted for the future and written into a new contract.

The parties may feel that their moral or natural rights are at stake, but there is no legal question involved which can be decided on the basis of a statutory or contractual right. For example, if a union asks for a wage increase in order to bring the workers' income up to what is known as a living wage, any fair-minded man will be inclined to grant the union's demand upon moral and social grounds, but no court of law has jurisdiction over such a case.

The determination of wages, hours, and working conditions to be included in a new contract contains quasi legislative elements which cannot be dealt with by the courts. In other words, the handling of disputes of interests is outside the legal field.

FEDERAL MEDIATION BOARD

Now, in our peacetime industrial-relations set-up, there exists no governmental agency, apart from the National Mediation Board provided for in the Railway Labor Act of 1934, for dealing effectively with disputes of interests. There exists here a lawless vacuum in which, apart from the activities of the Federal Conciliation Service, labor and management are forced to settle their controversies by naked economic force. We propose that this vacuum be filled, as it has been for the railroad industry, by the creation of a Federal Mediation Board.

The jurisdiction of the Mediation Board would not overlap that of the labor courts, described last week, any more than the jurisdiction of the National Mediation Board encroaches on the preserves of the Railroad Adjustment Board. Under the Railway Labor Act "disputes of rights" are clearly distinguished from "disputes of interests," and the Supreme Court has recognized this distinction. In *Elgin, Joliet, & Eastern Railway Co.* v. *G. W. Burley et al.*, the Court found that "the differences between disputes over grievances and disputes concerning the making of collective agreements is traditional in railway labor affairs. It has assumed large importance in the Railway Labor Act of 1934, substantively and procedurally. It divides the jurisdiction and functions of the Adjustment Board from those of the Mediation Board, giving them their distinct characters."

If further clarification of the jurisdictions of the proposed labor courts and Federal Mediation Board, based on the distinction between "disputes of rights" and "disputes of interests," is necessary, this could be supplied by the labor-management conference projected by President Truman.

QUESTIONS OF SCOPE

The conference would have to consider, also, three other questions related to the establishment of a Federal Mediation Board. Would the Board's jurisdiction be governed by a broad or a narrow interpretation of the commerce clause in article I, section 8, of the Constitution? Would the Board be free to deal with all "diputes of interests," and to deal with them according to its own wisdom and discretion? Or should Congress limit its scope and write definite directives and policies into legislation? Finally, what legal powers should the Board possess?

With respect to the jurisdiction of the Mediation Board, it seems to us that it should be as large as is legally possible. The pattern set by the National Labor Relations Act, and by various decisions of the Supereme Court on the "affecting commerce" clause of the act, can readily be used as a guide. It should be remembered that even if the Board's jurisdiction is thus liberally interpreted, many businesses will still not be subject to it. The small number of State labor relations acts, complementing the coverage of the Wagner Act, offers no great hope that the States will remove these businesses from the "lawless vacuum" mentioned above. If industrial peace is the goal, the coverage of the Federal Board should be as wide as possible.

The scope of the proposed Board's activities, as well as its freedom to determine policy, are extremely complex and difficult questions. It was the failure of the labor-management conference called by the late President Roosevelt after Pearl Harbor to agree on the scope of the National War Labor Board's activities that caused many of WLB's worst headaches. Should the Mediation Board be permitted to deal with any

question customarily a matter of collective bargaining, such as, for example, the closed shop? Or should its field be limited? If it is granted a free field, should Congress determine its policies, at least on some of the more fundamental relations between labor and management? Then, too, should the Board be subject to directives from higher administrative authorities, such as the Secretary of Labor, or be independent of them, like the courts?

The latter question was the subject of extensive deliberations in the West Coast Airframe case, decided by the War Labor Board on March 3, 1945. There are many pros and cons to these questions, and the conference would need to study and clarify them.

As regards the legal power of a postwar mediation board it is sufficient to say that it is just that—a mediation board and not an agency for compulsory arbitration. We have already stated our opposition to compulsory arbitration of "disputes of interests" and our warm approval of voluntary arbitration. We should like to emphasize this here by stating that the proposed Mediation Board ought to have no power to act if and when the parties are bound by previous agreement to submit their dispute to arbitration. The less need there is for the Government to interfere with industrial relations, the better it is. Any labor law contemplated by Congress should make all possible provisions to strengthen, encourage, and enforce voluntary arbitration agreements. But the Mediation Board should not have the power to impose its recommendations on the parties to a dispute.

From this it follows that the right to strike or to lock-out would not be destroyed by the proposed Mediation Board.

What legal powers, then, should the Board have?

In the first place, it ought to be empowered to investigate any and all "disputes of interests," either on its own motion or at the request of either party to the controversy. This would include the power to hold public hearings, to compel the appearance of the parties, to subpoena witnesses and to demand the production of documents.

In the second place, it would have the right to make and publish its recommendations for a peaceful solution of the dispute. These publications would constitute a valuable contribution to the literature on the adjudication of industrial disputes.

Finally, it would have the power to enforce a "cooling off" period, which would be brief and limited, to enable it to investigate the dispute and make recommendations. The right to strike or to lock out, it must be remembered, is not a right to destroy. It is the right to use economic force when every reasonable effort to achieve a justified aim has been made and has failed, and when the possible good to be achieved outweighs the evil to the community. It is the last and not the first means to correct an injustice. Hence, it does not seem unreasonable to require the parties to a dispute to maintain the status quo for a limited time until the Board has a chance to work for a just and peaceful settlement. If, however, either party does not see its way clear to accept the recommendations of the mediation board, it would not be prohibited from resorting to economic force.

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE

A few words may be said about the organizational and procedural set-up of a postwar mediation board.

It seems that the present organization of the War Labor Board—that is, various regional boards and one national board—is satisfactory and can easily be carried over into the postwar period.

The procedures of the board should be as streamlined as possible. They should be free from formalities, yet still be sufficiently formal to preserve the official character of the board and to guarantee a careful and impartial investigation. In other words, they should provide for a speedy but fair disposition of the cases.

As a matter of principle, the same members of the board who hear a case ought also to make the recommendations. The procedure generally followed by the present War Labor Board, namely, to assign dispute cases to a hearing officer or to a panel for investigation and recommendation, but to leave the decision of the cases to Board members who never saw or heard the parties, does not seem advisable or practical. Nowhere is the factor of personal contact with the parties more vital in determining the issues than it is in the field of industrial relations. Furthermore, the use of an intermediary hearing officer or panel may easily, and often does, lead to undesirable delays.

PERSONNEL OF BOARD

A final point may be mentioned briefly, to wit, the composition of postwar labor agencies, especially of a mediation board such as we have described.

There are practically no neutral observers to the industrial struggle. Industry, labor, and the public are all affected by it. Since this is so, justice and equity would seem to postulate that this threefold interest be reflected in the composition of agencies dealing with industrial disputes.

Although the idea of tripartite industrial-adjustment agencies is comparatively new in the United States, it has proved its worth during the war, as Dr. George W. Taylor, WLB Chairman, recently testified. By its very nature, it strengthens the reputation and moral authority of any agency dealing with industrial disputes. After all, the final outcome in any dispute between workers and employers depends largely on the support of public opinion, at least in democratic countries. An employer or union which would refuse to consider seriously the recommendations of a tripartite agency composed of members representing labor, industry, and the public would likely lose the sympathy of the public and endanger its own cause. The tripartite board is a fine example of democracy in action in industrial relations.

Much is being said and done these days with respect to postwar industrial relations, but no workable blueprint has yet emerged. We are suspicious of a great deal of the legislation passed by the several States during the war; we are equally dubious about the approach associated with the names of Senators BALL, BURTON, and HATCH. We do not believe that anything will be gained by watering down the Wagner Act, or by writing too many restrictions into law. Collective bargaining on a large scale is a relatively new phenomenon in this country and it must be given a chance to grow in a spirit of freedom. Similarly, the union movement is largely a child of the past decade and needs time to achieve maturity. Sympathy is called for at least as much as discipline. For the present, the imperative need is not for a complete and detailed blueprint but for a workable plan to minimize industrial disputes of rights and disputes of interests. This the authors of these papers have tried to supply.

The Strike Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled, "How To Lose Friends and Not Influence People." This editorial appeared in the Camden Courier-Post, Camden, N. J., on October 6, 1945. The Courier-Post has always been extremely friendly to labor and is today, but it is sounding this warning because it does not want to see labor lose its friends or any of its proper gains. The publishers of the Camden Post, like all right-thinking Americans, realize that if this country is to be prosperous, verile, and strong, the relationship between employee and employer as well as the relationship between labor and the general public, must be on a harmonius and cooperative basis.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO LOSE FRIENDS AND NOT INFLUENCE PEOPLE

As we write this editorial, long distance telephone service in most parts of the United States is at a standstill. The head of the CIO Oil Workers Union has ordered his men back to work, for the Navy. Various other strikes for a 30-percent wage boost are in progress, with the coal walk-out the most menacing to the public welfare.

A lot of these strikes are "natural" as war's aftermath, as we said the other day.

But the uncompromising attitude behind many of them is a perfect example of how to lose friends and not influence people.

There was a time when the public tended to be against all strikes. That's long past.

Most Americans—the fair-minded ones—have recognized the magnificent wartime record of United States labor.

Wartime strikes got a lot of publicity. But most people know that most unions kept their "no strike" pledge to Roosevelt.

And when the war was over, and the statistics were down, it was shown that the amount of time lost during the war through strikes was only about one-tenth of one percent of the total work time.

Yes, labor's war record won it a lot of friends. That's why labor has a lot of public sympathy in its campaign for higher wages.

But when the oil workers bluntly reject a 15-percent wage boost; when the phone workers inconvenience a nation merely to show off their strength; when other unions insist on "52 hours' pay for 40 hours' work" and refuse compromise—

They are sure to lose labor a lot of friends.

As it is, their obstinacy has put on the spot a lot of administration leaders who were with the unions in their fight for more pay, but recognized that the pay boost would have to be stepped up gradually.

The basic policy of the Truman administration—the same policy pursued by the late President Roosevelt—is to keep inflation in control, to permit wages to rise slowly.

So industries can absorb most of the higher wage costs through improved processes and stepped-up production, and thus hold prices down.

The Government knows, every union leader ought to know, that runaway inflation will hit the worker hardest of all. Without control prices will probably rise faster than wages, and the wage earner will merely use his higher wages to pay still higher prices.

Suppose the unions persist in "30 percent or nothing." Suppose they refuse to compromise on a gradual rise. Suppose the strikes become so widespread as to force the Government's hand.

The administration will have to abandon price controls. It will have to let the manufacturers charge what they choose so they can pay the 30-percent wage boosts. Prices will rise, wages will rise, prices will rise again—and where it will stop is anybody's guess.

We can be sure of this: When inflation has run its course—the heaviest casualties will be in the ranks of labor. That has always been true.

That is why we say again:

Let labor adopt a policy of gradual wage increases. Let it accommodate its plans to those of Uncle Sam. Let it help get reconversion going. Let its extremists quit trying to grab plums from a tree not even in blossom.

We want to see labor win friends and influence people.

It can. But not the way it is behaving.

General Marshall Speaks of Fair and Rapid Demobilization—Sounds Good, But Just Read What GI Joe, an Officer in Europe, Says—Like "The Voice of Jacob But the Hand of Esau"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was received from an Army officer in Europe. It vividly depicts the plight of many an American soldier in Europe, and is convincing proof that the War Department is not treating American soldiers fairly in their so-called demobilization plan. It is high time the War Department put their house in order.

GERMANY.

Hon. JIMMY MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington.

DEAR JIMMY: How about getting on the box and doing something about getting us the hell home?

The War Department is still fooling you boys—what have you done about it? I don't want any War Department salve.

Just as a little data, take this propagandized deal of trying to solicit volunteers from the service as "civilians" to remain over here—Eisenhower sends out a directive that it's urgent—but what happens but red tape and "job analysts" (rest their souls in hell), snafu it to the point of impossibility, but still you boys gobble up the War Department propaganda that "everything possible is being done to solicit volunteers." Wake up, Jimmie! I have some men who are interested, but it's like pulling eye teeth.

Believe me and my men, this point system is a damnable rotten chairborne idea which you fellows are gullible enough to swallow. Aren't you yet sold on the fact that the War Department will do nothing unless you fellows kick them in the pants? You are our only hope. Are you going to let us down? Yes, I have kept up with developments, but believe me, Jimmie, the wool is being pulled over your eyes. The only solution to all problems is to get us home. What would you and America say if soldiers rioted over here? Think about it. No, I'm not advocating it.

The Marseille just announced tonight that it could ship three times as many if they had ships for the 33 berths instead of six ships. You can back up those ships over here and take us home at one time. Over a year ago we had over 4,000 Liberty ships alone.

I've piloted a unit through four countries for over a year. I'm 35, married (no points for either because I'm an officer) and I want to get home, damn it! I have one enlisted man with 90-plus points but he has not been sent home. I have others with upward of 70 points, and they're not on order to go home. Why? I have 73 "points," 4 battles—going on 4 years—over 3 years in grade—married, over 35—still no prospect of getting home. What the hell, Jimmie? We're fed up with this deal we're getting. Wake up and do something. You can take my word that I'm in a position to know what's what over there—but don't send me any mahogany foxhole baloney—I want facts.

Sincerely.

Gift of Airplane to General de Gaulle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Following Precedent Makes Things Simpler," by John M. Cummings, published in the September 26, 1945, issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOLLOWING PRECEDENT MAKES THINGS SIMPLER

(By John Mr. Cummings)

WASHINGTON, September 25.—It is no secret that during his years of residence in Washington the late President Roosevelt divided his time between breaking one set of precedents and establishing another. Whenever Mr. Roosevelt found an unbroken precedent rotting away in a forgotten corner of the White House he'd break it over his knee and laugh in a manner calculated to arouse in hard-shell Republican hearts fear for the future of the Republic.

In the matter of tenure alone he smashed precedent. He put the old two-term precedent on the shelf with other junk and handed us one which means there is no limit so long as the voters give you the green light.

At the White House the other day they recalled a precedent set up by President Truman's immediate predecessor in office. It seems that Mr. Truman, in a moment of generosity and inspired by the thought of promoting international good will, gave an airplane to Gen. Charles De Gaulle, head of the provisional French Government. It was a transport plane of the C-54 variety and if you ever stepped around the corner to buy one of the late models you're familiar with the price—$250,000.

In response to an inquiry by an inquisitive reporter the White House conceded it was not too sure of the authority that permitted the President to make a gift of a flying machine which cost the taxpayers a cool quarter of a million—maybe it wasn't so cool at that.

But, the White House added, the gift was "in line with precedent" established by Mr. Roosevelt when he presented planes to Britain's former prime minister, Winston Churchill, China's Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and his Royal Highness the King of Egypt.

Pushing the inquiry a bit further, the reporter, you read in the Washington Post, went to the Treasury. Here he had high hopes of discovering how the plane was earmarked, as the saying goes, for payment. The Treasury said its ignorance of the subject was as deep as the bottomless pit; so the reporter pulled on his hobnails and headed for the Pentagon and the Army.

"We don't know," an Army spokesman was quoted as stating, when asked to name the particular fund which provided the cash for the plane. "They've got a lot of funds over at the White House that we don't know anything about."

Next stop, the State Department. At this center of diplomacy, where some of the Assistant Secretaries are on speaking terms only on pay days, the reply was short, to the point, and as full of information as a departmental proclamation establishing the terms of a trade agreement for an exchange of hog's bristles for a consignment of Chilean nitrate.

Ask the White House, said the State Department. The run-around was now complete. The vicious circle had been negotiated. The reporter went out and got drunk.

The sweet and luscious details are lugged in here today merely to elevate the spirits of the downtrodden taxpayers and to show how a precedent can be put to work even in this era of strikes and lock-outs, walk-outs and knock-outs. The nice thing about a precedent is that you don't have to be guided by it if it doesn't suit your purpose. But if you want to get away with something there's nothing like a handy little precedent.

At a Cabinet meeting, for instance, the President might say he'd like to send a Sherman tank to an old friend of his'n in Missouri. Hold on, there, says the Attorney General, we have no precedent. There was one in Grant's administration, says the Secretary of the Interior. We had no tanks in Grant's time, says the Attorney General. Grant himself was a tank, says the Secretary of Agriculture. That's precedent enough for Missouri, says the Postmaster General.

Roll out the tank, says the President, and send it along freight prepaid.

General Patton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about General Patton. Every American looks with pride to our armed forces and their achievements which brought us victory. General Patton's courage and the driving force of his personality, which inspired high devotion to duty on the part of his staff and the rank and file of his command, has made him one of the outstanding leaders in this war. The Congress of the United States gave recognition and expression to the high esteem in which General Patton is held when it elevated him to his present rank in spite of an unfortunate episode.

In no way should General Patton's transfer from command of the Third Army be considered as a reflection upon the very great contribution which he has made. A man may be a great general but not a great administrator of peacetime duties. American history shows that very few generals have shown the same abilities of leadership in peace as they have in war.

Much as I personally regretted to see General Patton transferred I still do not question the decision of General Eisenhower in taking the action he did, since

his is the final responsibility for effectuating the policy of the United States in the American-occupied portion of Germany.

We must be as tough in peace as we were in war if we are going to win it. It is no easier to win the peace than it was to win the war and in a lot of ways it is more difficult.

Now a deliberate effort is undertaken by a group of newspapers to make it appear that General Patton's removal resulted not from problems of administration but from some sinister plot hatched by certain individuals of Jewish faith holding high public office here.

This theory is advanced in a vicious article—by John O'Donnell in last Wednesday's New York Daily News and Washington Times-Herald—imputing to General Patton anti-Jewish sentiments which I am sure he would be the first to deny and repudiate.

This defamatory article not only gratuitously insults General Patton but casts a vile slur also upon Americans of Jewish faith who served so gallantly under him and in all branches of our armed forces side by side with other Americans of varied faiths and nationality backgrounds.

Entirely apart from the merits of the question of Patton's removal the brazen injection of a religious issue in the columns of a newspaper is so shocking and contrary to American journalistic practice as to raise a doubt whether it does not encourage the very type of thinking which the Nazis hoped to implant here with their propaganda.

The private motivations behind the O'Donnell calumny are not too clear at the moment, although indications would seem to point to an attempt to exploit and capitalize General Patton's brilliant military record for political purposes—and as a first step in that direction to create a false issue putting him at odds with American Jews.

If there is a movement afoot by certain people, who regard themselves as supernationalists, to advance their own interests by trying to build up General Patton as a martyr, then it is foredoomed to failure. I feel sure that General Patton would not associate himself with nor lend encouragement to the idea. His record of valor on the fields of battle is too bright to permit it to be sullied by association with activities that involve bigotry.

The O'Donnell article itself is grossly inaccurate from a factual standpoint.

He intimated a connection between the fact that the soldier-slapping incident was made public by Columnist Drew Pearson and that Col. Robert S. Allen, Pearson's former colleague, was on Patton's staff. Actually Allen himself says he was on maneuvers in Louisiana with the Third Army when the incident occurred. General Patton did not take command of that unit until more than 6 months later, in March 1944.

O'Donnell asserts that the soldier who was slapped was Jewish. Actually this soldier, who was later identified as Charles Herman Kuhl, of Mishawaka, Ind., is of the Christian faith as are his wife and family.

O'Donnell's story that the then Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Justice Felix Frankfurter, and other officials brought pressure at the White House for General Patton's ouster at the time of the earlier incident is flatly denied by Mr. Morgenthau. The former Cabinet member is quoted as saying:

It is an absolute untruth. I never discussed the incident with President Roosevelt, Frankfurter, or anybody else in the United States.

Since the premise on which this O'Donnell story is based is so inaccurate, its conclusions obviously are also false.

The blackest reflection cast upon the character and the good name of General Patton is the insinuation that he is anti-Semitic.

Palestine—A Home for the Stateless Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror on September 15, 1945, an editorial in which shocking truths are recited, facts which should not, and I am quite certain will not, pass unnoticed and unacted upon in this legislative body.

In an effort to find a solution for this vexing problem, crying out as it is for legislative treatment, I have this day introduced, in collaboration with my colleague the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS], a concurrent resolution calling for the resettlement of the Hebrews of Europe in Palestine, the ancient homeland of their ancestors, and the setting up of appropriate intergovernmental machinery to bring about the establishment in Palestine of a free and independent democracy.

If the membership will but read the editorial which I offer and contemplate the problem in a sympathetic light, favorable action on my resolution will be electric and the problem will soon be on its way to a humanitarian solution which will permit the surviving Hebrew people of Germany to live again in happiness and security under the beneficent influence of the democratic way of life.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial:

ACTION FOR JEWS

The frightful and incredible position of the Jews in Germany today should receive the immediate attention of our Government.

It is up to us, because England, France, and Russia do not seem interested in the fate of the Jews.

Peter H. Bergson, chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, has urged President Truman to take immediate steps to permit every Jew in a German concentration camp to proceed to Palestine.

There are still 200,000 Jews in Germany and Austria and they are, asserts Mr. Bergson, in the same position as they were prior to VE-day.

Mr. Bergson presents this appalling picture: "The same notorious camps are there, the same bunks, the same hideous prison clothes, the same barbed wire, and armed sentries watching outside. Only it is an American, British, or Russian soldier that stands guard now, and this, if anything, makes it even more painful."

Mr. Bergson has recommended to the President that all Jews in the central European countries, particularly those in concentration camps, who want to go to Palestine, should be aided by us to get there.

He suggests that an American commission, composed of Jews from the concentration camps, take charge of this program and begin its work immediately in the American zone of occupation.

Mr. Bergson tells President Truman that—

"Palestine is not British territory. It has been placed under British mandate by international authority. The present leading position of the United States among the United Nations puts direct responsibility on it for the Palestine situation."

The Hearst papers have been contending for years that England has a clear duty to perform in regard to the Jews and to the status of Palestine under the Balfour agreement; that the Chamberlain white paper, baring Jews from Palestine, was such a raw repudiation of England's pledged word that Winston Churchill denounced it as such in the most heated terms.

Today, the world understands that the Jews in Germany have been liberated.

To discover that they are still in concentration camps after victories by the United Nations is enough to send a shudder throughout the civilized world.

Palestine is the natural historic homeland of the Jews.

They should have their homeland, where they can always find refuge from persecution.

It should be in all ways a worthy homeland, not merely a refuge.

Moreover, the homeland must be owned and controlled by the Jews themselves.

It should not be run like present-day Palestine, under the protection of England, where refugees are turned away, sometimes to perish, as for instance:

The steamship *Sturma*, flying the Panama flag, carrying 750 Jewish refugees from Rumania and Bulgaria, sank with all on board on February 24, 1942, in the Black Sea.

These Jews had been refused entry into Palestine because "they exceeded the quota."

On November 25, 1940, the *Patria*, carrying 1,800 Jewish refugees from Hungary and Austria, sank with great loss of life in the harbor of Haifa, in Palestine.

On December 14, 1940, the *Salvator*, from a Turkish port to Palestine, with 230 Jewish refugees on board, sank with all on board.

These are among the most hideous acts of intolerance, callousness, and incompetence ever perpetrated, and comparatively little has been said about them.

We boast of our humanitarianism.

We give away billions, even to countries that have been—and in truth still are—our enemies.

We cancel billions in debts.

We practically propose to rebuild the whole world.

Well, what about the Jews? Have we forgotten their unspeakable lives under Hitler?

As long as we are bent on rebuilding the world, why not sponsor, first, for the first victims of Hitler a Jewish-rebuilt Palestine?

President Truman would further show his human traits to the world if he set in motion the machinery to alleviate the lot of the Jews, as proposed in Mr. Bergson's letter.

We have had expressions from the White House (especially during campaigns) in this direction for years, but no action.

Only Congress Can Do This Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Hon. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, chairman of the House Committee on Reorganization of the Congress, made a very interesting address over the radio in which he expressed some of his views on this very important subject.

This address was reprinted in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and under the permission granted me I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

Few people outside Congress know or realize how far the monumental problems of supervising the administration by our Government of the world's largest organization have outstripped the machinery of Congress to do an effective job of control.

More than 95 per cent of the present organization, with its committee-system workshop, has remained almost unchanged since 1893, the date of the last reorganization of the Congress. Yet Congress refuses to adopt modern mechanical and technical aids for its supervisory work, despite the fact that the job its machinery was designed to control was only three one-hundredths of 1 percent the size of the task it has today.

No directors could possibly run General Motors without modern mechanical means, thorough modernization and departmentalization of its work and adequate personnel to keep itself informed on what is going on in the plant and other departments of the business. Yet today, with but few additions, congressional machinery adopted in 1893 creaks and groans under the pressure of problems a thousand-fold greater than any industrial organization must meet.

There are today 145 Government bureaus and departments, each of which employs more people than are in the entire congressional staff. The Office of Indian Affairs spends more than twice as much to supervise the nation's Indians as it costs to operate Congress.

DRAFTING SERVICE A MIDGET

The principal duty of Congress is to draft, study and pass legislation. Yet the legislative drafting service is so limited that only five attorneys are available for the entire House membership of 435, and only three for the Senate. The total cost of this basic service runs $83,000 a year.

The appropriations committees are perhaps the best example of this blind economy. The Senate Appropriations Committee has four clerks and the House eight, plus a few extra investigators on loan from Government departments. This is a number hopelessly inadequate properly to challenge, investigate, and study the requests that enter into the billions of appropriations.

Only an alert and well-informed Congress can know where to reduce expenditures. A little money spent to analyze, study, simplify, and chart increases in departmental expenditure by an adequate congressional appropriation staff, plus investigators to determine whether money requested is actually needed, would pay dividends a hundredfold.

Yet we find leaders openly advocating that Congress "borrow" experts from the Government departments to help the appropriation committees. This illustrates the danger that Congress will still further slide out of the picture as one of the three branches of our Government.

Tens of millions of dollars are appropriated annually for research and statistics in most of the larger departments, yet Congress, which needs to have correct and unbiased information, must rely on the hopelessly inadequate Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress.

This career service, designated to be a research staff to Congress, attempts to cope with the problem with only 66 on its staff, 44 of whom receive less than $2,600 a year salary. The one expert on the immense problem of foreign and domestic commerce is a $3,200-a-year man.

JOB NEGLECTED 50 YEARS

Congress has recognized the need in many cases through the years for reorganization, regrouping, and simplification of the Government plant, yet has never in more than 50 years turned the spotlight upon itself. And Congress alone can give the order to modernize itself.

Both Houses could sharply reduce the number of committees, consolidate overlapping activities, and more clearly define their jurisdiction. The committee is the workshop in Congress and the effectiveness of legislation depends on how well the committee work is performed.

In addition, the individual Members of Congress need access to improved research facilities. This should be provided by enlarging the Legislative Reference Service. Researchers who could supply on short notice necessary statistics and data would relieve Congress from dependence on Government departments or business organizations for hand-outs.

The gulf between Congress and departmental government is widening. Under the Constitution, the executive departments and Congress are two separate and distinct branches of our Government, but it was never intended that they go opposite ways.

The Star's Policy on Distilled-Liquor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in this fast-moving atomic age, when every open channel is being used to disseminate the falsehood that alcohol is nourishing, it is good to know that there are courageous agencies like the Washington Star who do not accept liquor advertisements.

My attention has just been called to this policy of the Washington Star. I believe this great metropolitan newspaper voiced the sentiments of many of our people when it adopted this wholesome attitude, and I give this word of commendation.

The following is a reprint of an editorial from the Star of February 14, 1934:

NO DISTILLED LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Consistently with its past policy, adopted and carried out through the years prior to the adoption of the eighteenth amendment, the Star has, since repeal, rejected, and will continue to reject, all copy offered to it which advertises distilled liquor. With enactment of a liquor control law for the District, the sale of such liquor here again becomes legal, and the Star's rule of exclusion from its columns of the advertising of even legal distilled liquor automatically revives.

Exile under constitutional prohibition and permission to return under repeal have not worked any miraculous uplift transformation in the character and influence of alcoholic intoxicants. As they were before prohibition and repeal they are now.

Observation and experience teach that distilled liquor, with its high alcoholic content, is not nutritious or in any way health-promoting as a beverage, but is a powerful, habit-forming stimulant; in large doses a paralyzing narcotic depressant; of value medicinally if intelligently prescribed, but poisonous if used to excess and dangerously hurtful to body and mind of the multitude of susceptibles, if habitually used even at first in comparative moderation.

Since our American tendency is to excess in everything, and since the excessive or habitual use of high-power intoxicants operates (as President Roosevelt well says) "to the detriment of health, morals and social integrity," the Star believes that the use as a beverage of this hurtful commodity should in the community interest in protection of our homes and our families be reduced to a minimum and should not be increased by the Star through the admittance to its columns for pay of this sales-promoting advertising.

We Can Conquer Infantile Paralysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, we read in this morning's Washington papers that a young mother-to-be has been stricken with infantile paralysis, raising the number of polio cases in the Washington metropolitan area to more than 200. Last year there were 300 cases of polio reported in the Nation's Capital. Deaths so far this year in Washington from this dread disease total 13.

During the past months an epidemic of infantile paralysis has been raging in my congressional district in the State of Wisconsin, striking down many young people and causing several deaths. These epidemics have been plaguing the human race from time out of mind, all over the world.

Experience has proved to us that infantile paralysis has not been conquered by the usual endowments and foundations established in this country for that purpose, because there has not been sufficient funds provided to make it possible to assemble the hundreds and thousands of scientists and medical men and women necessary to make a concentrated attack upon this scourge of the human race.

If millions are provided by the Government for the sole purpose of combating polio and finding the cure for infantile paralysis, and for the construction and equipment for necessary scientific laboratories where many and varied scientific and medical groups can be working toward the eradication of polio, it will not be long before the cure is found—just as we found the secret of harnessing atomic energy.

I trust the humanitarian spirit of the Members of the House to support and pass my bill, H. R. 3939, the bill that will provide the means and the scientific know-how to conquer man's mortal enemies—the scourge of cancer and the scourge of infantile paralysis.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a copy of a letter—one of many—received from a resident of the State of New Jersey, indicating how the people of that State feel toward H. R. 3939:

HARRISON, N. J., *September 11, 1945.*
Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have noticed in the daily press that you plan to introduce a measure to appropriate $500,000,000 to find the cause and cure of cancer and infantile paralysis. I also see by the press that your approach is based on the idea that if the scientists are capable of splitting the atom and producing the atomic bomb for the destruction of mankind, that they should also be capable of finding the cause and cure for the diseases that are ruining mankind today.

I am indeed pleased that someone in our lawmaking body has the intelligence to sponsor such a bill. This is the kind of legislation that we need today and I sincerely hope and trust that the rest of our Congress and Senate will give your measure the sympathetic support that it so justly deserves.

It is my intention to have any friends that I may be capable of influencing, to write to their Congressmen asking their support of this measure. Please accept my sincere congratulations for your most splendid thought in sponsoring such a bill. I shall also write to my own Congressmen asking them to give this bill their wholehearted support.

With best wishes for the success of this measure, I remain

Very truly yours,

HENRY H. BEGLEY.

The Revenue Bill of 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that practically all of the time allowed for discussion of the bill is taken up by members of the committee I am using this medium to express very briefly my views on the bill to reduce taxation known as the Revenue Act of 1945.

I am frank to say that I am not by any means wholly in agreement with the views of the committee. Under the rule no amendments can be offered other than by the committee. I fully realize that revenue bills cannot be written on the floor of the House.

Whether or not we are making a mistake in passing this bill now only time will tell. It will reduce the revenues, according to the committee, $5,319,000,000. The committee was very liberal in dealing with those in the higher brackets. More so than was recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury. Of course industry as usual serves notice that if taxes are reduced there will be a decided increase in business with the result that the Government will profit more by the new rates than it does by existing law.

Those in the small income brackets receive some benefits but not as much as those in the higher brackets. The situation confronting us requires that we either accept or reject the bill. I am going to vote for the bill in the hope that the Senate will make changes that will prove more beneficial to those in the lower brackets.

Address by Governor of Tennessee at Presentation of Portrait of President Polk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, on October 10 last the distinguished Governor of Tennessee, Hon. Jim McCord, delivered a thoughtful and interesting address on the occasion of the presentation of the portrait of President James K. Polk to the United States Naval Academy. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The most wonderful events since the dawn of creation have been the birth of nations and the birth of individuals. Long shadows had lengthened themselves across the Old World, crowding strong characters into dark corners—making them seek an avenue of freedom where they might worship God as they would. As a result, some 338 years ago the first English settlement on this continent was founded at Jamestown. This was in 1607; 2 years later, Hudson entered the narrows and dropped anchor in a magnificent bay—now the Harbor of New York. A few years later, the Pilgrim Fathers landed on the rock-bound coast of New England and there erected an altar and gave thanks to God for the privilege of worshiping Him on a new continent. Stalwart sons and daughters were born to the families who came early to our shores where they immediately established a program of life and began to push the frontier inward and westward. The trackless wilderness was invaded, homes were built, schools and churches erected, and a new civilization was brought into being.

The indomitable will and courage of those early settlers drove hard through the years, accepting the challenge of the wilderness and the order of Government under which they lived. Many hardships were encountered, but with unswerving devotion to the ideals they came here to preserve, they pushed through the years until the birth of this Nation in 1776.

It is interesting to note that it required 169 years from the founding of the settlement at Jamestown to attain this independence. This Nation came into being to create a democracy that has been defended on the battlefronts of the world and maintained by the greatest Navy and Army ever molded into a fighting machine and marshaled in array against an enemy showing that there still lives the same patriotic devotion and stalwart courage that brought us through the primeval forest to our fertile hills and valleys and the freedom we still enjoy. It is coincidental that this has happened just 169 years since the birth of our independence. There is no event in history that surpasses that of bringing this Nation into being and we cannot but believe that the Declaration of Independence is the greatest program of human life since the Decalog and the Sermon on the Mount.

We turn now to another great event—that of the birth of an individual. In 1795, 19 years after the winning of our independence, there was born in North Carolina, James Knox Polk, destined to become the eleventh President of the United States. Young Polk moved with his parents at the age of 11 to what is now Maury County, Tenn. Again the pioneer spirit was exemplified in the seeking of a home in foreign lands where the elder Polk devoted his thought and attention to farming and trading. Young Polk, who was a rather delicate youth, showed inclinations for study and let it be known that he was not interested in actual farm life. His father, trying to fit him for a business career, placed him in a mercantile firm where he remained only a few weeks until he convinced his father that he should have an education, then he entered the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Completing his education, he came back home and read law in the office of Felix Grundy, United States Senator and Cabinet member from Tennessee.

In 1821, he was chief clerk of the House of Representatives of Tennessee. In 1823, he was elected a member of the Tennessee House of Representatives and in that body he acquired the character of a prompt, attentive, practical, business member, and a ready, efficient, and forcible debater. In 1825, he was elected to Congress where he remained until 1839 when he voluntarily retired. In 1835 and 1837 he was Speaker of the House of Representatives and during that time passed on more points of parliamentary law and order than had been made from the beginning of our Government. He decided them with promptness and on every occasion was sustained by the judgment of the House without distinction of parties. In 1839, he was elected Governor of Tennessee and served one term. In 1841 and 1843, he was unsuccessful as a candidate for the governorship. In 1845, at the age of 50, he was elected President of the United States, defeating Henry Clay, of Kentucky.

As he assumed the duties of Chief Executive of the United States, he faced many unsolved problems. The question of the annexation of Texas and that vast territory extending to the Pacific coast was one of the first problems which he undertook to solve. He did such a splendid job that the Nation has been enriched through the years because of his vision and the expansion of territory under his administration gave to the United States an area rich in fertility that has increased our wealth immeasurably. The annexation of Texas in 1845, Iowa in 1846, Wisconsin in 1848 (the same year in which Oregon was organized as a Territory) and a year later, when California organized its own government, mark an era of progress in our development that is unsurpassed. Another problem was the Mexican War. The necessity for striking a decisive blow at the very heart of Mexico was immediately apparent. President Polk was courageous enough to originate a plan that challenged the admiration of the entire world and his ideas were executed with promptness and energy. Then, was presented to him the Oregon cession. The United States claimed that the line of 54°40' north latitude was the northern boundary of the territory acquired from France and Spain, whereas Great Britain insisted that the Columbia River was the boundary. "Fifty-four forty or fight" was a popular rallying cry. War with Great Britain was narrowly averted by a compromise to fix the boundary at the forty-ninth parallel.

In regard to intercourse with foreign nations, President Polk adopted the principle to demand nothing that was not clearly right and to submit to nothing that was wrong. In his entire career he followed this course.

In his Cabinet as Secretary of the Navy was the Honorable George Bancroft, of Massachusetts. Secretary Bancroft devoted much time and thought to the establishment of a Naval Academy. This was not altogether a new thought in the United States, but an apathetic public, a recalcitrant Congress, and the opposition of old naval "seadogs" of the hard knocks school and "iron men of wooden ships" who considered the sea the proper place to train future officers, combined to defeat the effort. However, in 1845, 43 years after the founding of the military school at West Point, it was possible to make Annapolis, a Naval Academy. Secretary Bancroft had the loyal support and approval of his Commander in Chief and this magnificent Academy today stands as a monument to the genius and indomitable will of two men who have so impressed this Nation that they will live in history as outstanding statesmen.

President Polk was a thinker and a student. He was tenacious of his opinions and not easily moved by argument or public clamor. George Dallas, his Vice President, described him as temperate, but not unsocial; industrious, but accessible; punctual, but patient; moral without austerity; devotional, though not bigoted.

So, today, just 100 years after the establishment of this wonderful institution, we come to pay tribute to a man who lived only a short time in the world, but during that time wrought well. He sleeps his last long sleep on the sunny slopes of the State capitol grounds at Nashville, a building erected the same year in which he made the contribution to the naval affairs of this Nation. The shadow of that building falls across his tomb as a sentinel guarding sacred the memory and achievement of a great man and a great President.

It is my pleasure as the chief executive of the State of Tennessee to present to this Academy an oil portrait of James K. Polk, eleventh President of the United States.

The Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my greetings to the American Federation of Physically Handicapped. This organization, under the able leadership of Paul A. Strachan, whose offices are located in Washington, is rendering a valuable service to the physically handicapped and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Strachan has been tireless in his efforts to secure approval of legislation that would assist this large segment of our population. It was largely through his efforts that Congress designated the week of October 7 to 13 as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

Our Nation must support a program of education and rehabilitation for our handicapped citizens. They rendered invaluable service during the war and will be equally helpful in our postwar period. Our educational system must be so constituted as to give special consideration to these individuals. Both Government and civilian employers must give special consideration to the abilities of these so afflicted.

It is well that our Nation devote this week to special consideration for this excellent group of citizens.

Trend of the CIO Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. MOORE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Where Does the CIO Program Lead?", written by Dr. Willford I. King, professor of economics, New York University.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DOES THE CIO PROGRAM LEAD?

Just as problems of reconversion are at their height, just as employees by the thousands are being dismissed from war plants, the United Automobile Workers Union, a leading CIO member, launches its campaign against the motor industry. The major demands comprise a 30-percent wage increase, an annual guaranteed wage, vacation pay, and pensions. Various minor requirements are added for good measure. The United Automobile Workers start their campaign with a $4,000,000 war chest and they expect the CIO treasury to supplement this to any extent necessary. They promise that, if their demands are not granted, they will first tie up General Motors and later the other automobile companies.

Presumably the CIO begins its campaign in the motor-car field because this is the industry that everyone expects to set the pace in providing reemployment for war workers, and because it believes that the demand for automobiles is so strong that wage increases can readily be passed along to the consumers. However, R. J. Thomas, UAW president, justifies the action by demanding "that the great profits made by the industry be used to create full employment."[1]

That this is mere camouflage is indicated by the figures on profits in the industry as reported in the Survey of Current Business, put out by the United States Department of Commerce. The issue for July 1944 shows that, for all automobile manufacturers, total profits after taxes were $381,000,000 in 1940 and $432,000,000 in 1943, an increase of only 13 percent. Profits of 15 large companies were in the first quarter of 1945 about 15 percent higher than in the first quarter of 1943.[2] This would indicate an increase of about 30 percent.

However, net earnings per common share for General Motors were only $3.68 in 1944 as compared to $4.45 in 1941, while the net for Chrysler was but $5.70 per share in 1944 as compared to $9.22 per share in 1941.[3] Therefore, the statement that the big companies are making exorbitant profits seems contrary to the facts.

In December 1941, average hourly earnings in the automobile industry were $1.11—the highest of any industry recorded by the United States Department of Labor. The average for all manufacturing industries was only $0.79.[4] In May 1945, the average hourly earnings in the automobile industry stood at $1.27, an increase of 14 percent.[5] Now it is proposed to push the rates 30 percent higher, and then add allowances for vacation pay, pensions, etc.

The wage increase cannot well be taken out of profits for, in 1941, the last year when the automobile concerns were operating normally, profits after taxes amounted to but $378,000,000, while wage and salary payments totaled $1,469,000,000.[6] Thirty percent of the latter figure is $441,000,000, a sum apparently approximating the current net-profit total. Since companies cannot long operate without profits, the conclusion seems to be inevitable that the wage increase must be passed on to the consumers unless, since 1941, productive efficiency has increased greatly so that the number of workers required to make a million cars has been greatly reduced.

Reports from automobile factories indicate, however, that exactly the reverse is true—that, in fact, production per man-hour is down at least 25 percent. If such is the case, it seems evident that to include a 30 percent wage advance, car prices will need to be advanced some 60 to 75 percent above the 1941 level.

Thus, if we assume that in 1941 the labor cost on a car was $500, the total labor cost on 1,000 cars would be $500,000. If in 1945 the United Auto Workers push the price of labor up to $1.65 per hour instead of $1.11 paid in 1941, this will make the total labor cost $745 per car or $745,000 for 1,000 cars, instead of $500,000 paid for labor in 1941. If, however, by loafing on the job, workers turned out only 745 cars instead of the former 1,000, labor costs per car would be advanced to $1,000 instead of the $500 prevailing in 1941. This would mean that the manufacturer would be compelled to raise the price of the car at least $500, and the retail dealer might charge for it $600 more than the old price. But here the OPA steps in and demands that prices be kept down.

It is not unlikely that the CIO can overrule the OPA, but it will have more difficulty in overcoming the law of supply and demand. The total demand for automobiles depends upon the net volume of new spending power in the Nation—that is upon the algebraic sum of the realized national income and any change occurring in the volume of money and bank deposits in circulation. In 1944, our people had about $174,000,000,000 of new spending power. Of this, $21,000,000,000 represented currency inflation. It is to be hoped that inflation will be much smaller in 1945 and 1946. If so, the public will have less money to spend, and buying will therefore tend to slacken unless prices are kept down.

The attack on the motor industry is merely the opening gun of a general battle for higher wage rates in all industries. If the CIO wins this fight, there is grave danger that it will produce a repetition of the 1929–32 crash, with mass unemployment in most industries. If it does this, a general cry will go up that private enterprise has failed and that Government must intervene. Presumably, the first step will be to start a huge public-works program, financed by inflation. This procedure will gradually rob the thrifty of what value remains in their life insurance, bonds, mortgages, and bank deposits, after the squeezing process of the last decade. Little by little the Government will take

[1] New York Times, September 15, 1945, p. 2.
[2] Survey of Current Business, April 1944, p. S–18; August 1945, p. S–17.
[3] Monthly Stock Digest, September 1945, pp. 13–15.
[4] U. S. Survey of Current Business, April 1942, p. S–12.
[5] U. S. Survey of Current Business, August 1945, p. S–13.
[6] U. S. Survey of Current Business, July 1944, p. 6; June 1945, p. 19.

over and the ensuing socialistic regime will doubtless crush the CIO and other unions as effectively as has been done in Russia. Not satisfied with its almost complete dominance of the Nation for a decade, the CIO will have wrought its own destruction.

For years the CIO has sponsored policies which have been steadily undermining the economic system which has made the United States the most prosperous and powerful nation on earth. Take, for example, the following measures:

1. Taxing away all incomes larger than $25,000 per year.
2. Ratification of the Bretton Woods agreement.
3. A Federal guaranty of full employment.
4. An increase to 65 cents per hour in the minimum wage required by law.
5. An upward revision in wage rates in general.
6. Expansion of unemployment insurance.
7. Extension of social-security benefits to workers in fields not now covered.
8. Public medical care.
9. Continuance of price controls.

Let us now consider the probable economic effects of putting this program into action. We shall deal with the proposed measures in the order just listed.

I. TAXING AWAY ALL INCOMES LARGER THAN $25,000 PER YEAR

One of the most fundamental rights in any free society is the privilege of acquiring property, keeping it, and doing with it what one pleases. A corollary of that right is freedom of contract. Without such freedom, our American system of free enterprise could never have achieved what it has.

The proposal to limit incomes to $25,000 per year nullifies both the right of private property and freedom of contract. Thus, if a corporation decides that the services of a certain man are worth to it $100,000 per year, if freedom of contract is permitted, it has the right to agree to pay him that amount, and he has the right to receive the money, and to do with it whatever he pleases. Any restriction by law which prevents a man from earning more than $25,000 obviously takes away from our most competent citizens the incentive to climb the economic ladder higher than the $25,000 mark. Any legislation which destroys this type of incentive tends to restrict production and prevent progress.

There is also another way in which limitation of income to $25,000 per year tends to paralyze the competitive capitalistic system. Careful investigation shows that a large proportion of the capital used to finance new industries comes from persons having high incomes. When government prevents the existence of high incomes, this capital will never be amassed and, if it is not amassed, new enterprises will not get under way, and old industries will not expand. Without the appearance of new enterprises or the expansion of old ones, progress disappears, unless government itself steps in and does the financing. But, if Government finances enterprise, it tends to own the industries of the Nation, and collectivism therefore replaces the capitalistic system.

II. RATIFICATION OF BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT

The CIO also advocated the implementation of the Bretton Woods agreement. When this agreement is stripped of its several coats of camouflage, the fact is revealed that it is nothing more nor less than a plan for lending the resources of the United States to foreign nations. Our experience after World War I makes it all too evident that collection of loans to foreigners is virtually impossible, and that any attempt to collect merely makes the debtor nations our enemies. Why give away our products and at the same time make ourselves unpopular?

Moreover, our Government has been finding it extremely difficult to raise by taxation funds sufficient to pay its running expenses. To meet the ever-recurring deficit, it has, therefore, resorted to borrowing from the banks, and thereby inflating the currency. This currency inflation has reduced the value of the dollar, and has, therefore, been nothing more nor less than a surreptitious method of robbing the thrifty of their hard-earned savings. The real worth of war bonds, savings-bank deposits, life-insurance policies, fixed salaries, and the like has been shrinking day by day and month by month, even though many of the owners of these fixed obligations are blissfully unaware of the fact that they are being robbed of their savings. Expansion of this inflationary process in order to secure additional funds to lend to foreign nations not only makes those nations hate us, but also discourages those who accumulate capital. Such discouragement hampers economic progress in the United States.

III. FEDERAL GUARANTY OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

The CIO endorses enthusiastically the proposal that the United States Government guarantee full employment in the future. Apparently, however, no leader of the CIO has come forward with any workable plan for preventing idleness. They merely propose to have the Federal Government absorb any unemployed by initiating a limitless public-works program. Since the CIO has consistently opposed any attempt to raise the taxes of persons in the low-income brackets, and since the incomes of persons in the upper-income brackets are largely taxed away already, it seems evident that the CIO expects the public-works program to be financed entirely by inflation. But as we have seen, inflation spells disaster for the thrifty, and hence tends to destroy the capitalistic system.

IV. INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE

If the CIO leaders have ever heard of the law of supply and demand, they should recognize the fact that raising the price of labor lessens the quantity of labor which can be sold. Since this law always holds true, their proposal to increase the minimum wage to 65 cents and to raise wage rates throughout industry evidently is in direct conflict with their insistence that private industries ought to provide full employment. No private employer can afford to pay a man more than that man's production is worth.

Potential employees differ tremendously in intelligence, physique, reliability, and diligence. Those ranking low in these characteristics are not worth 65 cents per hour to any private employer. Therefore, when the minimum wage rate is fixed at that level, it means that these people must either remain idle or be employed by government. Such employment by government merely means that taxpayers are hiring these workers at wage rates higher than they can legitimately earn.

One of the best criteria of the extent to which a nation has become socialistic is furnished by the proportion of the working force employed by government. It therefore is obvious that the higher the minimum wage level is set the less is the fraction of economic life left to private enterprise and the greater is the fraction taken over by the state—in other words the greater is the advance of socialism at the expense of free enterprise.

V. UPWARD REVISION IN WAGE RATES

Similarly, when the unions push up wage rates all along the line faster than increased productivity warrants, the net result is always to make it impossible for private employers to hire the less competent members of the Nation's potential working force. Since we are now too altruistic to allow people to starve, when workers are unable to obtain jobs in private industry they are made wards of the Government. But, the larger the proportion employed by government, the greater is the extent to which statism has taken over the economic system.

If workers were ready at all times to sell their labor for the best prices obtainable in the open market there would never be any unemployment problem. Nowadays the usual cause of mass idleness is the action of huge labor monopolies in maintaining wage rates above normal market levels. The CIO has been most active in this line.

VI. EXPANSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

When, during the last decade, the attempt to collect monopoly prices for various grades of labor resulted in a huge volume of unemployment, the labor unions succeeded in having enacted a series of statutes granting unemployment-insurance benefits to those workers who were out of jobs. This means, of course, that citizens who are working are now burdened with the support of those who are not producing anything. Since a considerable proportion of potential workers prefer idleness at low pay to hard work at high pay, it follows that unemployment insurance insures unemployment.

In England the British labor unions managed to keep from one to two millions of potential workers idle during almost the entire period between World War I and World War II. Indications are, therefore, that unemployment insurance asserts a strong influence in the direction of socialism or fascism.

VII. EXTENSION OF SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

The idea of compelling every citizen to protect himself against the unfortunate vicissitudes of life has much indeed to recommend it, but those who favor private enterprise point to the fact that in the United States numerous well-managed insurance companies offer almost every type of protection which any considerable number of people have deemed desirable. Under such circumstances there seems to be no excuse for putting the Government into the insurance business. To do so is plainly to encroach upon the field of private enterprise, and to strengthen the movement toward socialism.

Furthermore, our existing social-security system is not constructed on sound insurance principles, for those insured do not receive benefits in proportion either to the premiums paid or to the risks involved. As long as this is the case, Government social insurance represents a curtailment of the right of private property, for certain citizens are compelled to contribute to the support of other citizens.

VIII. PUBLIC MEDICAL CARE

The CIO also favors installing a system of public medicine. If this is done, it will again mean expanding the field of public activity at the expense of private enterprise. If the system as proposed is adopted, it will siphon into the Public Treasury most of the income now spent for medical care by the citizens. Past experience indicates when Government takes over any function the citizens gradually lose all control of the way that function is administered. Presumably, therefore, medical treatment will gradually be regimented to suit the whims of the administrators.

IX. CONTINUANCE OF PRICE CONTROLS

The CIO has also declared in favor of continuing price controls. As stated above, one of the essential factors of a free economy is freedom of contract. One cannot have freedom of contract and at the same time have price control by government. Our experience under the OPA has amply demonstrated that controlling of individual prices hampers production, wastes the time of consumers who wish to buy products, and generates a great variety of shortages. Price control is merely a convenient entering wedge for the Fascist state, and is entirely incompatible with free enterprise. As someone has said, "Prices are the safety valves of the economic system."

It is never sound policy to sit on a safety valve.

The Murray bill affirms the right of every American to a job—the very thing that the CIO is designed to prevent. The fundamental reason for the existence of the CIO is, indeed, to establish monopoly in the labor market and, as the constitution of one of our States puts it, "monopoly is contrary to the spirit of a free people." Labor monopolies promote unemployment and thus generate a demand on the part of the public that free enterprise be overthrown and statism be substituted. Furthermore, labor monopolies control the labor market by robbing the citizen of his right to take a job when and where he can get it, and at such a price as seems to him desirable. Nothing could be more destructive of freedom.

Unions usually enforce their demands by intimidating would-be workers. When one group of citizens thus ruthlessly and repeatedly interferes with the constitutional rights of other citizens, and escapes unscathed, the general tendency is to breed contempt for law and order, and thus to undermine the very foundations of liberty.

Is it not time for the Nation to rise up against the rule of the tyrannical labor monopoly which has so long ruthlessly dominated our Government?

Shall we again stand abjectly by while they throw millions out of work and bring about again the situation which Henry Wallace portrays so well under the caption "The high cost of failure" in his book Sixty Million Jobs? Heaven forbid!

It is time for the common man to strike for freedom against the special privileged groups that may cast him into the depths of unemployment, inflation, poverty, and collectivism, while posing as his benefactors.

WILLFORD I. KING,
Chairman, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

Observance of Marine Corps Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 249 providing for the observance of Marine Corps Day on November 10, 1945.

The Marine Corps is the oldest military organization now in existence in this country It was organized under the authority of the Continental Congress on November 10, 1775, and soon will celebrate its one-hundred-and-seventieth anniversary. The United States Marines have written glorious pages in American history that time can never erase. That was true before the beginning of World War II. It is doubly true today. If the Marine Corps had never been organized prior to the outbreak of World War II, the contribution made by the men and the officers of the American Marines in the war just ended would, alone, more than justify the passage of this resolution and the celebration of this day in honor of the Marines.

America has given due and fitting tribute to the Army and to the Navy through those leaders who have already come back to us from the war and it would seem most appropriate that on November 10 we give the American Marines the recognition that is so well deserved. I hope that we may have early and favorable action on this resolution by the Judiciary Committee to which it has been referred and that, thereby, the Congress will join with all of the rest of the country and say, "Well done," to the United States Marines.

Increase in Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Marlow:

INCREASE IN LIVING COSTS IS OUTLINED
(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON, October 4.—Take a look at your living costs, at how they've gone up. All the details are not here, but you'll get a good idea.

Living costs in this country have risen at least 30 percent since August 1939, which was just before World War II started.

That 30 percent rise is a Government figure. It's an absolute minimum figure; labor says the figure is far too low.

Labor says living costs are almost double what the Government says they are. If that were true, living costs would have gone up 60 percent.

That's one of the chief reasons why labor—now that it has lost its high wartime pay—is yelling for higher wages.

FOOD UP 50 PERCENT

The Government's latest figures are for August 1945. So the increases given here will be the increases between August 1939 and August 1945.

Food: Up 50 percent.
Clothing: Up 45 percent.
House furnishings: Up 44 percent.
Miscellaneous costs and services: Up 23 percent. (This includes movies, tobacco, medical care, drugs, transportation.)
Fuel, electricity, and ice: Up 14 percent.
Rents: Up 3 percent.

INDIVIDUAL ITEMS SOAR

But this is far from telling the whole story: How individual items within those six categories above have risen far beyond the average for the group.

For example:
Fresh fish: Up 124 percent.
Apples: Up 197 percent.
String beans: Up 159 percent.
Potatoes: Up 114 percent.

There are various reasons for those huge increases.

Some of the reasons:

Fresh fish: Price control on fresh fish didn't go into effect until last January.

String beans: Price controls were taken off on July 1 and in that month the cost of string beans—to you, the consumer—shot up 37 percent.

RENTS MAKE BEST SHOWING

Now take a look at clothing, which has gone up 45 percent: One of the main causes here occurred in cotton cloth. Price of this cloth increased 66 percent.

Mostly it was due to the disappearance of low-cost cotton goods.

Which means: Manufacturers were making less of the cheap stuff, far more of the expensive stuff.

Before the war you might have been content to buy a $1.50 cotton dress. During the war, if you couldn't get a $1.50 dress, you might have to buy one costing $10. That boosted your living cost.

Incidentally: Woolen goods increased 43 percent; shoes went up 32 percent. Government people say the increases in those two items were due largely to the same factors that boosted cotton goods prices.

Rents—which had gone up only 3 percent—made the best showing of all the main groups in the Government's effort to hold down living costs.

Justice for the Jewish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, for centuries the treatment accorded Jewish minorities has been a blot on the record of civilization. Crowded always in the least desirable sections of European cities, and living at all only at the sufferance of majority groups, their history in Europe has been a tragic tale, marked at the best with inferior status, and at the worst by outbreaks of disgraceful savagery on the part of their oppressors.

It was not until the dawning of the light of freedom, at the time of the French and American Revolutions, that they were really accorded any rights at all. On September 28, 1791, the National Assembly of the First French Republic brought honor to themselves, and comfort to the Jewish people, by a recognition of their citizenship in France. Nevertheless, they patiently continued as an underprivileged group in Europe while hoping, someday, to gain a free and independent life wherein, by their own efforts, they could achieve that self-respect the desire for which is inherent in all human beings.

During the First World War, their ancient homeland was wrested from Turkish domination by the Allied Powers, led by a Jewish legion. Palestine was promised them in recognition of their historic claim to that country, and in appreciation of their services to the Allied cause. It was assured them by international covenants agreed to by the civilized nations of the world.

In 1922, the Congress of the United States adopted a joint resolution approving the use of Palestine as a Jewish homeland, and, in 1924, an Anglo-American convention lent its endorsement, and recorded American assent to British administration, subject to the terms of that convention.

What happened? With limited immigration and under considerable handicaps, thousands upon thousands of members of this energetic and able race successfully commenced to build in Palestine an economy which at long last was affording them comfortable, and even prosperous living conditions, and an

opportunity for real achievement, while at the same time the priceless gift of freedom and liberty seemed to be theirs. Those who would suggest that the Jewish people are not constructive builders must be confounded by the results, because by their efforts a flourishing agriculture and trade have been created and cities built, such as Tel Aviv, which in many respects equal any modern community in the world.

Such was the situation at the time of the rise of Hitler. What happened to the Jews of Europe under his monstrous dominion was and is an eternal reproach to all of us who call ourselves Christians. Millions of these people were tortured and exterminated for no fault or crime except that they were Jews, and the pitiful remnants of their race wander over the face of Europe, homeless and almost hopeless. Their families have been destroyed, their homes have been destroyed, whole communities have been destroyed, and only faith in God and in their ultimate deliverance sustains them. They pray only for a chance to live. Shall civilized Christian people deny them this chance? Shall agreements, and promises, and good faith all be repudiated? Are sacred undertakings to be regarded as mere scraps of paper?

Of course, the primary obligation is that of Great Britain. As late as 1939, Mr. Winston Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons in a debate on the Palestine White Paper, said:

> The provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped * * * is a plain breach of a solemn obligation. * * * I cannot understand why this course has been taken. * * * I cannot believe that the task to which we set our hand 20 years ago in Palestine is beyond our strength, or that faithful perseverance will not, in the end, bring that task to a glorious success.

The leader of the Conservatives was supported in that debate by Herbert Morrison, speaking for the Labor Party. And less than one-half year ago, in May of 1945, the British Labor Party, which now controls that Government, faced the problem very clearly in this language:

> There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales.

But now we see signs of hedging and stalling. Objections are being raised. The question is being postponed. It is now being made to appear that the Jews may only enter Palestine by consent of the Arabs. We are asked to believe that the peace of the Near East will be threatened if we carry out the solemn promises we have made. It has been suggested that it may be necessary to send 500,000 troops to keep order in Arabia. Let us examine that statement.

It is estimated that there are 25,000,000 Arabs scattered over a vast country; 16,000,000 are in Egypt, whose Army consists of 22,000 ineffective troops. In Iraq, a movement to aid the Nazis in the middle of the war was suppressed by a handful of British soldiers. The desert horsemen of Saudi Arabia can hardly be reckoned as a military force, which is equally true of Syria and certainly of Transjordan, with a population of 350,000. It is impossible seriously to imagine that such groups would attempt any large-scale organized violence in the face of a firm and definite policy by the Allied Powers.

Mr. Speaker, anti-Semitism is still with us even in this great country where freedom and tolerance have reached a high peak. Our treatment of minority groups leaves much to be desired. It is often inconsistent with the noble professions of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. We are by all odds the strongest country in the world, and I have no doubt of the greatness of our institutions, and the security of our future; but complete greatness can only come with a revival of spiritual grace, and a much wider extension of the Golden Rule in our governmental attitude as well as our private attitudes.

We must no longer bear the shame of intolerance or of broken promises.

I fully appreciate that this problem is not one for the American Congress, which has, so far as I know, never reversed the stand it took in 1922; but I earnestly and respectfully urge that the President and the Secretary of State make forceful representations to the Government of Great Britain to the end that the remnants of the Jewish people of the Old World may be saved. We owe it to them on plain principles of humanity, and we owe it to the 5,000,000 Americans of Jewish blood who enjoy their freedoms as American citizens, but who nonetheless are working wholeheartedly and unselfishly for those less fortunate members of their racial group.

Amid the other great problems that trouble us, do not overlook justice for the Jewish people.

There Will Always Be an America if the New Deal Doesn't Give It Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, it is time to call a halt on hand-outs to foreign countries. Every American is tired of having America play the role of Santa Claus to foreign nations. During the war we gave the British Empire about twenty-nine billion, Russia about ten billion, France five hundred ten million and China three hundred and sixty-two million in lend-lease. Not only did we furnish about 75 percent of the troops on the western front in Europe but we equipped soldiers of our allies. Truly, we did our part to win the war.

We are now being asked to make loans to Britain and Russia that aggregate twelve billions. If we make these loans other nations will want their share of our wealth. Our war debt is the largest in all the world. Where are we going to get the money to make these loans? If the Administration in power in Washington decides to make gifts or loans to these countries every American will be called upon to pay his share of these loans out of his "take home" pay or out of his savings. The nations that lean on us should go to work and solve their postwar problems as we will have to do. However, if the New Deal decides to make such loans, I hope they protect these loans with contracts for strategic and critical materials. Rubber, tin, mica, industrial diamonds, nickel, chrome, and vegetable oils are needed items which are largely controlled by British interests. The United States could make advances against delivery of such articles. Additional sums should be secured from the International Bank on a business basis.

No; I do not believe that America should be called upon to make loans to these countries in order to make socialism work in England and communism work in Russia. The American people should not be required to keep their "nose to the grindstone" to aid foreign nations, when we have a reconversion job to do in the United States, not to mention the care of the wounded and maimed and the widows and orphans of those who died.

America will be willing to cooperate with these nations. We will be willing to aid them with our surplus food. But we will not bankrupt America in order to finance the world.

Instead of making gifts or loans for foreign countries, let us take care of our returning servicemen and old folks at home.

Internationalists in America do not appreciate the new slogan which is reaching every home in America, "There will always be an America if the New Deal does not give it away."

Well, Why Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. ROGERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Rochester, N. Y., under date of October 9, 1945, written by a 15-year-old girl by the name of Helen Herendeen, of Canandaigua, N. Y.:

WELL, WHY NOT?

EDITOR, DEMOCRAT AND CHRONICLE:

The other day I heard two women talking. One of them said, "Well, I don't trust Russia." The other one interrupted and said, "Russia! Heavens, I don't trust England." Then they turned to me and asked my opinion, so I gave it. Here is my opinion:

I think the reason that our boys went out to crush our enemies was because they wanted to end war. They believe that when they get back they will find a better world or at least that's what they're planning on. They want peace and security. Also the English and the Russians want that peace and freedom, I believe.

I wonder what we would remark if we heard an Englishman or a Russian saying, "I don't trust America." We would be shocked, and wonder why that person could have been led to say that.

To sum it all up: If we want a better, more secure world, we will have to trust in our sister nations. Wars start with suspicion and distrust. Let's all get together and help make this land what so many courageous boys have fought so hard for and what some have laid down their lives for.

I am 15, have lived through one war, but that is all the war I ever want to see or hear of again. I think that many people must feel this way. Let's have no distrust. "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

HELEN HERENDEEN.

CANANDAIGUA.

House Joint Resolution 243

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution No. 243 has for its purpose the tendering of the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall for, as the report states:

Formulating and executing the global strategy of the wars; his initiative, wisdom, and foresight as Chief of Staff of the Army in conducting the expansion, equipping, training, and deployment of the great Army of the United States.

On October 3 I objected to the immediate consideration of this resolution because of some reflections which have been cast upon General Marshall and his responsibilities in connection with Pearl Harbor. The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Mr. MAY, stated:

That was a newspaper story that I happen to know is not true in any sense and is wholly without foundation.

I am sure the Members of Congress will be interested in reading briefly the report of the Army Pearl Harbor Board. This report was:

Appointed by the Secretary of War, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 339, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 13, 1944, to ascertain and report the facts relating to the attack made by Japanese armed forces upon the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941, and to make such recommendations as it may deem proper. Also, to consider the phases which related to the Pearl Harbor disaster of the report of the House Military Affairs Committee, as directed by the Acting Secretary of War in his memorandum for the Judge Advocate General, July 12, 1944.

It must be remembered that this is an official board and an official report made to the President and the Congress on the events leading up to Pearl Harbor and the responsibilities attached to certain individuals. The summary and conclusion of this board are as follows, and I quote:

2. The Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. George C. Marshall, failed in his relations with the Hawaiian Department in the following particulars:

(a) To keep the commanding general of the Hawaiian Department fully advised of the growing tenseness of the Japanese situation which indicated an increasing necessity for better preparation for war, of which information he had an abundance and Short had little.

(b) To send additional instructions to the commanding general of the Hawaiian Department on November 28, 1941, when evidently he failed to realize the import of General Short's reply of November 27, which indicated clearly that General Short had misunderstood and misconstrued the message of November 27 (472) and had not adequately alerted his command for war.

(c) To get to General Short on the evening of December 6 and the early morning of December 7, the critical information indicating an almost immediate break with Japan, though there was ample time to have accomplished this.

(d) To investigate and determine the state of readiness of the Hawaiian command between November 27 and December 7, 1941, despite the impending threat of war.

It further states the extent of the Pearl Harbor disaster also due to:

2. The failure of the War Department, with knowledge of the type of alert taken by the commanding general, Hawaiian Department, to direct him to take an adequate alert, and the failure to keep him adequately informed as to the developments of the United States-Japanese negotiations, which in turn might have caused him to change from the inadequate alert to an adequate one.

The report further states:

The responsibility of War Department is clearly defined and plain. Action by it would have been sufficient further to have alerted the Hawaiian Department. It was in possession of the information which was the last clear chance to use the means available to meet an attack. It had the background of the full development of the Japanese preparation for war and its probable date.

Again, the equally important and vital information of December 7, the day of the attack, was in the possession of the War Department at 0900 on the morning of December 7. Colonel Bratton made an immediate effort to get the Chief of Staff at that hour.

The press reports that General Marshall was out horseback riding and could not be reached for this vital message on December 7. Continuing the quotations from the report:

It was not until nearly 3 hours later that any action was taken by the War Department, when time was of the greatest importance.

Under the circumstances of the clear and explicit revelation of Japanese intentions, arrangements should have been made for immediate action to further warn Hawaii and not leave the situation to be acted upon when the Chief of Staff could not immediately be reached. The responsibility is the Chief of Staff's for not providing an arrangement by which another could act in so critical a situation when he could not readily be reached

I further quote from this official document as follows:

There was failure of understanding at both ends of the line. The Washington officials had full knowledge of impending events, which full knowledge was not available to Short.

A cardinal principle in good management is the necessity to "follow up" on directions. The War Department had 9 days in which to check up on the state of defense in Hawaii, which it did not do.

Repeatedly, since General Short took command in Hawaii in February 1941, General Marshall during this peacetime had written to him at length, advising him on details of operation and here, late in November, with war expected almost daily, he communicated none of those personal messages containing needed inside information.

The evidence indicates that the manner in which authority to act was delegated or not delegated had its influence on this situation. The Chief of Staff had three deputies, Generals Bryden, Arnold, and Moore. None of these three was given the secret information concerning the known Jap intentions. When General Marshall went away on November 27 he had, prior to departure, prepared a first draft of the November 27 message. It was the Secretary of War who initially followed through on it on November 27. Then it was given to Gerow to complete. Complete authority to act in General Marshall's absence does not seem to have been given to any one subordinate. Had there been an officer either with authority or with courage to act on the information that was in the War Department on the evening of December 6, and had he sent a message to Short, Hawaii should have been fully alerted.

As has been repeated so many times, there was positive evidence in the War Department that it was only a matter of days before war would ensue and the War Department had notice that Hawaii was on only a sabotage alert, inadequate for full warfare. Had a full war message, unadulterated, been dispatched or had direct orders for a full, all-out alert been sent, Hawaii could have been ready to have met the attack with what it had.

I am also reminded, Mr. Speaker, that conducting this war was a tremendous task. It is impossible to carry on such a vast undertaking without mistakes being made. It is only human to make mistakes, but I believe there were mistakes made, traceable directly to the General Staff, which should not have been made. Committees of Congress frequently called the Army's attention to waste, extravagance, and their high-handed methods of directing the domestic economy.

President Truman, when he was Senator Truman, published an article for Collier's magazine on August 26, 1944. This article calls attention to the "famous Detroit tool case, which emphasizes the waste of independent, uncoordinated action in the war effort." I quote from this article:

In December 1940 the Army awarded contracts for a certain type of airplane engine but switched to another company after a large amount of cutting tools had been made. The value of these surplus tools, at a fair estimate, was $1,721,136, and yet they were sold as scrap in 1943 for $36,924—about 2 percent of their value.

The article further states:

The Canol project undertaking was for the supply of oil to the Alaskan area from a field in the vicinity of Norman Wells in Canada—only 75 miles of the Arctic Circle. Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell authorized the project on April 30, 1942, estimating the cost at $34,000,000 and directing that it be completed by October 1, 1942. Canol did not come even into partial operation until May 1944 and then only with limited quantities of truck gasoline produced at excessive cost and, instead of $34,000,000, the bill on that date, May 1944, had amounted to $134,000,000, not counting the pay of officers and enlisted men

for several months and the cost of air transport. * * *

On learning about the project after it was underway, the Secretary of the Navy, the Petroleum Administrator, and the War Production Board united in urging its abandonment. Secretary Ickes went so far as to brand the undertaking as well nigh fantastic and the WPB damned it as a huge and useless program.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this program would not have been undertaken without the consent of General Marshall and his board. Did General Marshall raise his voice against extravagance, waste, and incompetence in the Army? If so, I fail to find it a matter of record.

It should also be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that this granting of a medal and also thanks is an unusual procedure. I believe the last time it was given to General Grant. Under rule 33 of the House, when the Congress thanks someone in this manner, it gives that individual the privileges of the floor of the House.

It should also be remembered that the job of demobilizing the Army is far from complete. The War Department, under General Marshall, has made numerous statements and changes in plans. Many of the promises have not been kept. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction.

Does the Congress want to give an individual a special medal and thanks for initiative, wisdom, and foresight when there is still a job to do? Is the Congress acting under a mob psychology? It would seem to me that General Marshall would insist on waiting until his name is cleared, if it is to be cleared. Why not let history, time, and the final report on Pearl Harbor be recorded before extending our thanks for a job yet to be completed?

Mr. Speaker, history in time has a peculiar way of evaluating a man's worth. The crucible of time reflects rather accurately a man's worth to society and his services to mankind.

It is the inherent desire of every man to leave imprints in the sands of time and heritage and a good name for posterity. It is probably that reason which impels men to build buildings and place their name upon that building. People soon forget that individual unless there is something which may constantly remind them of that individual's service to society. The Good Book says a "good name is more to be desired than great riches, and loving favor rather than silver and gold."

In the resolution which we are presently considering, the Congress of the United States, through a joint resolution, confers the thanks of the American people to the General of the Army. They do it for a statesmanship, as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staffs. They do it because of his leadership in formulating and executing the global strategy of the wars, for his initiative, his wisdom, and his foresight. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if there are not other men who also deserve the thanks of the American people. I am thinking now of Fleet Admiral Ernest Joseph King, who occupies a comparable position to General Marshall. Admiral King was Chief of Naval Operations, which amounts to being Chief of Staff of the Army, and he was a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staffs of the United Nations. I am also thinking of Admiral Chester Nimitz, of General MacArthur and General Eisenhower. Are these men not worthy of recognition?

The other body on October 9 passed a Concurrent Resolution No. 35 which invites Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur to address a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress at such a time convenient to General MacArthur. Is there anyone here who would question that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who has been the commander in chief of the air, land, and sea forces in the Pacific theater, did not have a major responsibility and did as good a job as any other military leader in this war? If the Congress is to give a special thanks, why do we not include these outstanding men in the same resolution?

Recently I visited the Walter Reed Hospital. I saw a man there who had lost both arms and another who had lost both of his legs in this war. Did not these men make a supreme sacrifice and would they not be entitled to a special recognition just as the generals of the Army? In other words, Mr. Speaker, when Congress starts awarding special gold medals where is it to stop?

The war technically is still on and will be until Congress sees fit to pass some legislation declaring the end to hostilities. The men mentioned for congressional thanks still have a job to do. The crucible of time and public opinion with historians will write the final chapter and place a proper evaluation upon their services to the country. We hope it is something for which we may be proud. The events surrounding Pearl Harbor have not been clarified at this time. If it develops that General Marshall had a responsibility in connection with Pearl Harbor, then this Congress might feel rather foolish in granting a special medal of thanks to someone who might have had, and according to the Army and Navy boards' official reports does have, a direct responsibility for what happened at Pearl Harbor; then this Congress might regret an affirmative action on this resolution.

If history, time, and further examination of the Pearl Harbor fiasco, which is now authorized by Congress, indicate that there is no blame upon General Marshall, then I would be the first in this House to support a resolution extending our thanks and giving a special medal not only to him but to Admiral King, General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, and others, including our valiant soldiers. The entire country does owe our soldiers a debt of gratitude. No money nor medal can repay those who made the supreme sacrifice for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Congress should not act hastily in granting special medals and thanks to our generals in the Army or our admirals in the Navy.

Endorsement by Physicians' Forum of Health Program in Senate Bill 1050

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the Physicians' Forum endorsing the health program incorporated in Senate bill 1050 which was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, and in a similar bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative DINGELL.

The Physicians' Forum is a group of outstanding doctors who believe that medical care is a problem which concerns the entire Nation, and that legislative action by the Congress is necessary in order to provide adequate medical care for the American people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH

ONE MORE VICTORY

Like the weather, health is something that everybody talks about.

Unlike the weather, health is someting that they can do something about.

"It is well to superintend the sick and make them well, to care for the healthy to keep them well," Hippocrates said 2,400 years ago. Hippocrates, the father of all doctors, wrote the Physician's Oath which to this day governs the conduct of doctors.

Almost within our time, yours and mine, the world discovered ways of fighting disease, of preventing it, of curing it. New treatments—new instruments—new medicines were found overnight. That is, overnight, if you think back those long days to Hippocrates.

America has led in many of these discoveries and inventions. Our country today has the best-equipped and best-trained doctors in the world. Perhaps no other country is our peer in medicine.

And yet—

With all our victories in this world battle to keep human welfare and decency from barbarous destruction, to save democracy for the peoples of the world, we need one more victory—for the health of the American people.

MILLIONS OF YOUNG MEN

A committee of the United States Senate has just finished an investigation of health problems in our country. From these Senators we have learned some tough facts about the health of all of us.

During the past 4 years, millions of young men in the prime of life have been examined by Selective Service. You, and I, and the next fellow were shocked at the results of these examinations. We found out that—

Four and one-half million young men have physical and mental defects which make them unfit for military service.

It is estimated that between eight and nine million men, out of 22,000,000 are not suited for general military duty because of reasons of health.

This is more than twice the number of men we had overseas in January 1945 winning the battles of Europe and Asia.

MORE SCHOOLS—MORE BATHTUBS

Ours is the richest nation. We have more schools, more bathtubs, more radios, more beefsteaks, better doctors than any other country on earth.

But in 1935 the Public Health Service found more than 23,000,000 Americans suffering physical impairment or chronic disease.

The Farm Security Administration examined a large number of people among 2,500 farm families in 17 States in 1940. Only 1 in 100 was "in prime physical condition."

In 1940 the National Youth Administration examined 150,000 youths. Out of each 100, 85 needed dental care; 20 needed eye adjustments; 19 needed to have their tonsils removed; 12 required special diets.

Approximately one youth in every seven was in urgent need of some kind of medical or dental treatment.

Their conclusion: Health defects limited the kind of work that one-third of American young people could do.

A FIGHT WITHIN A FIGHT

The American people, industry, labor, and farmers have done a great job on the home front during this war. They have produced guns, planes, tanks, jeeps, and food as no one ever thought possible.

To do this, they have had to fight illness and disease.

The average man worker lost more than 11 days—the average woman worker more than 13 days—because of illness or injury in 1943.

Eighty percent of the men and ninety percent of the women lost this time because of common ailments.

If you add up the figures, you will find that more than 600,000,000 workdays were lost that year.

If every man and woman who works got complete medical and hospital care under a system of health insurance, much of this lost time could have been saved.

BECAUSE THEY EARN LESS

The less money people earn the more they are sick. Because when they earn less, they can't eat as good food, wear as good clothes, sleep in as good a house, or pay a doctor when they are sick.

In 1942, 21 out of every 100 American families had less than $1,000 income during that year. People in families whose income is below $1,000 are sick about three times as often as those who have more money.

The American Medical Association has said that families with incomes under $3,000 need help to meet their medical bills. This meant more than 70 percent of the American people in 1942, a prosperous year.

TO HAVE STRONG AND HEALTHY PEOPLE

To have strong, healthy men and women, physical defects which show up in youth must be corrected early.

Some months ago the United States Public Health Service went over physical examination records of school children in Hagerstown, Md. They compared them with the reasons given by selective service for rejecting young men in that city. Here is the rub—

As much as 15 years earlier, when these youths were in grade schools or in high schools, their defects had been noted on a card. The young men were rejected, in many cases, because of the same defects. Nothing had ever been done about them. There was no health insurance to provide a chance of improvement or correction.

Every doctor, who is guided by Hippocrates' words which you read on the first page, has been discouraged time and again. He has found physical defects. He has recommended ways to repair them. He has seen nothing done because children and their parents could not afford, or were afraid they could not afford, the treatment he suggested.

WHERE DOCTORS HANG THEIR SHINGLES

Today, we are talking about full employment. We know that everybody must have a job at decent wages to keep our country from another disastrous depression. We must have a health program for our Nation. Full employment and full social security are both rock-bottom needs for really effective health.

We need better distribution of doctors throughout the country. We need more hospitals. We need more public health service. Forty percent of all the counties in the United States with 15,000,000 people in them have no registered hospitals. And 40 percent of our counties have no full-time public health service.

We know the reasons why doctors hang out their shingles where they do. They have to earn a living. They choose a town where people have money to spend, where people are earning money at work. They choose a town or location where there is a hospital.

In New York City there is a doctor for every 700 people. In Mississippi there is a doctor for every 2,100 people. In New York City there is a general-hospital bed for every 196 people. In Mississippi there is 1 to every 667.

IT IS YOUR RIGHT

Before they wrote our Constitution with its Bill of Rights, the fathers of our country declared that we are freemen. They said that our freedom rests on rights that are plain for everyone to see, the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To live those rights today, we need one more thing—the basic human right of health. The right to live with mind and body whole in order to be free.

In January of 1944, our late President Roosevelt gave us a new bill of rights. He said:

"We have accepted, so to speak, a second bill of rights, under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed."

And then he added that among these is:

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment."

CONGRESS HAS A PLAN

A plan which will begin more adequately to meet the social-security needs of all the American people is before the United States Congress. Senators ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, and JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, have introduced this plan in the Senate, and Representative JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, has introduced it in the House.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill broadens our social-security program for all the people.

It increases money to the States to help them give aid to the needy. Old-age benefits would be increased. For those permanently disabled, it would provide benefits. The temporarily disabled, who now get nothing, would be entitled to benefits.

Men in the armed services would get full social-security wage credits of $160 a month for the period they are in the service. Their families, their children, their dependents would be covered, too.

Farmers, professional, and small businessmen, the self-employed, merchant seamen, and domestic workers would be brought under the new social-security system.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill makes the United States Employment Service a permanent national employment system.

National unemployment insurance with larger benefits would replace the present inadequate and limited State systems. President Truman has underscored the need for more adequate unemployment benefits. Asking Congress for reconversion unemployment legislation, he said:

"Even if reconversion proceeds rapidly, no amount of planning can make jobs immediately available for all displaced personnel. We must provide maximum security to those who have given so fully of themselves on the fighting and production fronts.

"The transition from war to peace is part and parcel of the war, and we cannot shirk our obligation to those temporarily unemployed through no fault of their own."

FOR THE HEALTH OF 135,000,000

For the first time in our Nation's history, 135,000,000 Americans—those who work and their families—would be included in an over-all health-insurance plan.

Today, we know that people want adequate medical care. They are willing to pay for it on a basis equal with everybody else. They know that one-third of our country has inadequate medical care. They know this is because people haven't got money to pay for it.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill sets up a means of collecting premiums for insurance on a pay-as-you-go basis. Regular pay-roll contributions from employers and employees will enable people to pay their own medical costs out of their earnings. That isn't charity. It is insurance, paid by the people for the people.

Today, people have to lay out money every time they see a doctor—$3 or $5 each visit—$100 or $150 for an operation. Under this bill they wouldn't be suddenly burdened with doctor's bills or hospital bills.

This bill does not affect the present set-up of medical practice. Doctors can refuse patients; patients can choose doctors. Administration is put in the hands of States and localities when they wish to undertake it. Local committees on which doctors and patients serve will control the medical program.

THERE ARE SOME WHO SAY—

There are some who oppose health insurance.

They say that quality of medical treatment will be lower.

They say that it will regiment doctors and patients—that it will prevent you from having the doctor of your own choice.

They say that health insurance will mean political medicine, socialized medicine, State medicine, bad medicine.

They say that it will destroy private initiative, free enterprise, and States' rights.

These arguments are very old hat, as the saying goes. The same arguments by the same kind of people have been used against every forward advance our country has made in the last 150 years—against our post office, our public roads, our water systems.

These words were hurled against public education. Nobody today argues against the right to a public education.

The same arguments were shouted against giving the Federal Congress the power to tax income. Today, during this war almost everybody in America pays income taxes.

The same arguments were howled against workmen's compensation. Now, every State but one has workmen's compensation laws.

Even 10 years ago, the same shouts rose to the rooftops, trying to defeat our present social-security laws.

AND NOW IT WORKS

Today, our social-security system works. Nobody says we should not have it. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill seeks only to expand it logically for the benefit of all the people. It seeks to make it work better.

The United Nations is organized on the basis of the "four freedoms." Along with freedom of speech and freedom of religion, there are two freedoms which go together—freedom from want and freedom from fear.

The calamity howlers who shriek political medicine, socialistic medicine, even dare invoke our "four freedoms." One little leaflet handed out all over the country warns the people that in seeking "freedom from want" through the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill "it may well develop that you will have to con-

fer with your ward political leader about the choice of a doctor or a hospital in the event of illness."

That's not true. It is completely false. Under this bill you will not have to get health treatment from a Government agency or confer with a politician. You will choose your own doctor and your insurance will pay your doctor bills. This bill is a real step toward the "four freedoms."

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

What do you—an American—think about National Health Insurance?

Fortune magazine notes a survey made by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver, Colo., a few months back. The surveyors asked you what you think about health insurance. Or if they didn't ask you personally, it was several thousands like you, so it amounts to pretty much the same thing. Here is what you said:

"Out of every 100 Americans, 81 think that some people can't afford to see a doctor as often as they should.

"Eighty-two are not satisfied with the medical care now given the public. They think something should be done to make it easier for people to get medical care when they need it.

"Sixty-eight said that it would be a good idea for social security to provide medical insurance to cover cost of seeing a doctor and going to a hospital, and 92 said that they feel it is a good idea for some people to have hospital insurance."

THE ONLY FAIR WAY

Ask yourself what happens to you when you get tuberculosis or appendicitis?

Do you have the money or does everyone you know have the money to pay for hospitals, doctors, nurses, medicine?

When the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill becomes a law—

If you have cancer or other disease, you can have a doctor's care, a hospital bed, a specialist if you need one, a surgeon, X-rays, laboratory tests, nursing, because your insurance will cover all these.

If your wife has a baby, she can have all the medical and hospital care she needs because your insurance will cover it.

If your child has measles, he or she will be covered, too.

If you are a farmer or live in a small town, a hospital can be built in your area so you won't have to travel 40 or 50 miles for care.

If illness begins, it can be spotted early—be nipped in the bud. This bill emphasizes prevention of disease.

The only fair way to assure that the people's health is cared for is through a national social-security system. We already have a national social-security system. All we have to do is broaden it.

On the road to the "four freedoms," we need this one more victory.

IT'S UP TO YOU

To have the full program of national health insurance and other benefits of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, you, and all the people you know, will have to get behind it. So, in a very real sense, it is up to you.

Soldier Without Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of Tuesday, September 18, 1945. This editorial concerns one of our most popular businessmen in Philadelphia. He has long since proved his ability and good fellowship to the citizens of that city. We want everybody to know that he is one grand fellow, and we take off our hats to him.

SOLDIER WITHOUT UNIFORM

Frank L. McNamee, since he became regional War Manpower Commission director here in July 1943, has been under the handicap of the baseball umpire.

While performing a highly essential job with remarkable efficiency—the job of directing industry and labor under wartime regulations—he has never received commensurate public recognition.

Because it was so thankless a job the Record believes McNamee, Philadelphia businessman and civic leader, deserves all the more credit for his performance.

He demonstrated his administrative ability and his liberalism particularly well during the PTC strike of 1944 by refusing to yield to racial intolerance. He went on to Washington last January to become deputy WMC chairman.

A measure of his success here was his call to the National Capital.

McNamee has now resigned. The war is over. He feels his own business—a chain of motion-picture theaters—needs him. And he probably needs it.

He is one of a large number of patriotic Americans who accepted tough, uncongenial work because they wanted to aid the war effort—and who turned in bang-up jobs.

They, too, have been soliders.

Statement of the CIO on H. R. 4309, the Tax Bill Proposed by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The tax proposals adopted by the House Ways and Means Committee require drastic revision to eliminate unnecessary windfalls and to provide relief where it is critically needed in the reconversion period. The committee proposals suffer from these major defects:

(a) The committee proposals grant huge windfalls to the most prosperous corporations. The provision reducing the excess-profits tax rate from 85.5 percent to 60 percent for 1946 will benefit prosperous corporations by $1,270,000,000. Estimates based on official data indicate that about $910,000,000 of the $1,270,000,000 would go to 850 corporations with $1,000,000 or more of net income subject to the excess-profits tax. These estimates also indicate that 6,960 companies with incomes running from $100,000 to $1,000,000 would benefit by $290,000,000; while only about $70,000,000 of tax savings would go to 12,190 companies with incomes under $100,000. None of this $1,270,000,000 would go to the 250,000 corporations paying the regular corporate taxes but which do not earn enough profits to pay excess-profits taxes.

Thus, the 850 large corporations which have been making tremendous profits during the wartime period and which will continue to make excessive profits in 1946 will be the chief beneficiaries of the reduced excess-profits tax rate. At a time when budgetary requirements permit only limited tax reductions, it is indefensible that tax cuts should be granted to these most prosperous corporations. Only 3 months ago Congress passed the Tax Adjustment Act, which bettered the cash position of corporations—mainly the large corporations subject to excess-profits taxes—by $5,500,000,000. This tax relief includes the redemption of $1,300,000,000 in outstanding postwar refund bonds for 1942 and 1943, $1,500,000,000 in currently available 10-percent excess-profits credits, $1,000,000,000 in carry-back refunds, and $1,700,000,000 in accelerated amortization of emergency facilities. If the excess-profits tax rate is cut to 60 percent and the ordinary corporate rates are cut 4 percent in each bracket—for a total revenue loss of $1,674,000,000—the result would be that the 850 large corporations, or 3½ percent of the 250,000 taxpaying corporations, would receive 54 percent of the corporate-tax reductions, apart from the savings flowing from the 4-percent bracket reductions.

The provision reducing the ordinary corporate rates by 4 percentage points in each bracket, from the 40-percent maximum on down, means a revenue loss of $404,000,000, which will largely benefit the big corporations with large incomes.

The large, powerful corporations require no tax relief for they have huge liquid reserves—the largest in history—for reconversion. The SEC estimates that on March 31, 1945, American corporations had $46,900,000,000 of liquid capital, $22,300,000,000 more than in 1939. These huge liquid reserves were built up out of wartime profits, after the payment of the largest dividends in history. According to Department of Commerce estimates, corporations paid $25,900,000,000 in dividends from 1940 through 1945. Despite high rates of wartime taxes, corporate profits after payment of taxes, for the war years 1940–45 aggregated the colossal sum of $52,000,000,000, the largest profits ever made. Small business, however, will receive only modest relief from the 4-percentage point reductions and requires greater assistance so that it may be able to reconvert more rapidly and so as to encourage the organization of new enterprises by veterans.

(b) The committee proposals, by retaining substandard personal exemptions, grant only meager relief to low- and middle-income groups. The failure to raise personal exemptions, lowered during the war to $500 for a single person and $1,000 for a married couple, is a major deficiency. The only possible justification for such substandard exemptions was the need to combat inflation during the war, at a time when civilian goods were scarce. But with civilian goods beginning to flow more freely, the substandard exemptions become utterly unjustified. We need fear no inflation from the purchase of goods by the bulk of the people in the income brackets under $3,000 a year. Not with prices having soared from 30 to 45 percent over prewar levels, and workers' incomes shrinking through unemployment, loss of overtime pay, downgrading to lower-paid jobs, new jobs at lower wage levels. Conservative estimates indicate that wage and salary payments will drop from the VJ-day rate of $115,000,000,000 a year to $78,000,000,000 in 1946. Nearly 90 percent of the shrinkage in income payments will be suffered by working groups. The committee proposals would allow a family of four an exemption of only $2,000, which is insufficient to maintain a minimum standard of living at a level of health and decency. These substandard exemptions should be raised.

On the positive side, the committee proposals contain two very commendable provisions These are the repeal of the inequitable 3 percent tax on all incomes above $500 a year, regardless of family responsibilities, and the reduction next July of many of the sales taxes which burden the low-income groups, such as the $5 automobile-use tax and the heavy taxes on movie tickets, electric bulbs, luggage, travel, and telephones.

The provision applying surtax exemptions to the normal tax, and reducing taxes in all brackets by 4 percentage points eliminates the oppressive effects of the "normal" tax. This provision removes a most inequitable tax burden and merits full support.

However, the committee's adoption of the Knutson proposal providing a minimum cut of 10 percent in taxes for all individual taxpayers is unwarranted. This $100,000,000 concession will benefit exclusively taxpayers whose incomes exceed $21,000 a year. The minimum 10-percent cut means that a taxpayer with a $1,000,000 net income will save $90,000 in taxes, without the 10-percent cut, the tax savings would have been $26,980, which is quite ample.

The prime objective of reconversion tax legislation should be to sustain mass purchasing power, assist small business, and grant relief where the need is greatest so as to minimize hardship and speed an orderly transition to an era of full employment and high level capacity production. To achieve this objective, the following changes should be made in the proposals of the House Ways and Means Committee:

1. Excess-profits-tax rates should not be reduced for 1946 but should be repealed as of January 1, 1947, along with the unused excess-profits credit carry-back. The continuation of the excess-profits tax, without reduction, will prevent windfalls to the most prosperous corporations. It will recapture excessive profits made from meeting the pent-up wartime demand for goods. Moreover, war expenditures in the fiscal year 1946 will still amount to $50,000,000,000, according to revised Budget estimates released August 31. Retention of the excess-profits tax would provide $2,500,000,000 in revenues. It is also of great value in offsetting competitive advantage which early reconverters will obtain, and this is particularly desirable from the viewpoint of encouraging small business. The Ways and Means Committee very properly rejected the Treasury proposal to repeal the excess-profits tax in 1946, but it erred in reducing the excess-profits-tax rate.

2. Personal exemptions should be raised to $1,000 for single persons and $2,000 for married persons, while continuing the $500 credit for each dependent. The existing substandard exemptions should be lifted to restore incomes required to maintain a minimum standard of living at a level of health and decency. The authoritative estimate of the budget necessary to maintain a family of four at a minimum standard of living—the Heller committee budget—is approximately $3,075. The exemptions here proposed would allow amounts approximating the Heller budget minimum standards to go tax-free. The purchasing power, thus released by increased exemptions, would stimulate production and employment and help offset the decline in workers' incomes during the reconversion period.

3. Provide individuals with a 2-year carry-over and carry-back of unused personal exemptions and credit for dependents. The carry-over and carry-back principle which looms so large these days in corporate enterprises and business should be extended to individuals. This provision would be particularly important during reconversion, when workers' incomes are sharply declining.

4. Veterans should be forgiven their unpaid income taxes within reasonable limits. The committee neglects to give needed relief to veterans with unpaid income taxes. These should be forgiven within reasonable limits so that veterans seeking jobs or undertaking small businesses should not be burdened with these liabilities. This is a must for the reconversion tax bill.

5. The corporate tax rate of 40 percent on net incomes above $100,000 should be retained with small business given relief through an exemption from the corporate income tax of the first $5,000 of net income, the adoption of a liberal graduation of corporate income tax rates on net incomes under $100,000, and the granting to such corporations the option of being taxed as partnerships.

Substantial tax relief for small businesses is needed so that small business may be speedily reconverted and new enterprises encouraged. Small business does not have the resources to finance reconversion available, either internally or in the money market, to the big corporations. In developing new products and markets, small business runs comparatively very large risks, for these businesses must concentrate on a few products and markets, lacking the benefits of diversification which large business enjoys. The ability of small business to survive in the competitive struggle has been considerably weakened by the wartime distribution of governmental contracts and reconversion shortages of materials and machinery. Small business must therefore be strengthened in the transition and post-transition periods. Our proposals are much sounder than the 4 percent across the board tax reductions provided in the committee proposals.

The enactment of these measures would help pump the blood of purchasing power through our economic system during the reconversion period. It would help assure mass markets on which the prosperity of labor, agriculture, and industry depend.

Sale of Surplus Government Property to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, if the present policy of the Surplus Property Board is continued throughout the country, a wave of protest will sweep the Nation as veterans return by the thousands. Under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Public Law 457, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, 58 Statutes 765, article 8307, Congress made it clear that there was to be a definite preference for veterans. With the present limitations and restrictions imposed, and with the utter lack of cooperation towards the veteran by administrators in regional areas, a wave of resentment is evident. Dozens of veterans complain that they have received nothing but discouragement from the Pittsburgh regional office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which office is delegated with the responsibility of selling surplus cars, trucks, goods, and supplies to the veterans. Applications are accepted for the purchase of a truck but no notice is ever given of the sale.

It is clear to me that every veteran seeks only an opportunity for—not a guaranty of—success. However, he refuses to be deluded. His war experience has made him keenly conscious of fraud in any degree. A veteran distrusts those people who are vague, or "slippery." He would sooner accept a disappointing "No" rather than a compromising "Yes." Complicated forms, long-drawn-out procedures, and red tape are taboo so far as the veteran is concerned. In the instance where the veteran had an opportunity to buy a car, or truck, he found that he was required to go from Pittsburgh to Reading, Pa., or even Kentucky or Ohio just for the opportunity to bid, and with little likelihood of success.

Under the provisions of the act, it is the responsibility of the Surplus Property Board to establish distribution centers and depots in every major city in the country for the disposal of such surplus property. Unless the Surplus Property Administrators together with the Smaller War Plants Director make effort to carry out the spirit and intent of the act with particular refeernce to article 8307 to give real preference to veterans, I shall ask for an investigation. The synthetic business heads now in office who show no real concern for the veteran and who have shown no evidence of cooperating with the veteran should be replaced either by more competent and humane personnel, or perhaps by a former GI who will have a real interest in the problems of his former buddies. It is important to take corrective steps now to forestall any possible ill effects when the veterans come home by the thousands and create a scandal when they learn that "preference for veterans" means preference for veterans at the whim or call of a regional director. I demand action now.

Discharge Boys Under 21 Years of Age and Do Not Draft Any Under 21—It Is Important to Our Boys and to the National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of October 10, 1945:

VETERANS AND COLLEGES

Demobilization presents a challenge to American universities. A great many young men streaming out of the armed services these days want to complete educations which were interrupted by the war. It is the intention of the Government that they should be enabled to do so—both as a matter of justice to them and because the continuation of their schooling is genuinely vital to the national interest. Congress, under the GI bill, has made funds available to carry out this purpose. But the colleges and universities of the country have not adequately adapted themselves to the peculiar needs of these young veterans. The tendency has been to treat them like any other students and require them to conform to a system of education as usual.

A number of institutions, to be sure, have inaugurated refresher courses for men com-

ing back and trying to pick up where they left off. Some have set up what are called vestibule schools—designed to ease the reorientation from military to academic life. It is by no means an easy reorientation. The men emerging from the Army and the Navy are, generally speaking, older and more mature than the youngsters who are to be their classmates, yet they have lost the habit of study and are handicapped by rustiness in the particular courses they are to resume. The Army and Navy discharge systems are not attuned to collegiate schedules. Many men find themselves released from service just too late for the beginning of a new term or semester, and they find, too, that most colleges are inflexible in their admission procedures. The result is that they are forced to wait several months before starting on their academic work, and to wait at a time when delay is peculiarly frustrating and difficult for them. Veterans are understandably in a hurry to make up for lost time. A great many of them, undoubtedly, are forced to give up their educational plans because colleges refuse them admission promptly upon discharge.

All colleges, we think, should do everything within their power to facilitate the return of veterans to their halls. If the colleges have been remiss in this regard, the Veterans' Administration, it seems to us, has been even more so. As trustees for the interests of the servicemen, this Federal agency long ago ought to have canvassed the schools and prompted them to undertake the necessary adjustments. It is not too late to begin now. Demobilization is still in its early stages, and hundreds of thousands of veterans will become eligible for admission to our graduate and undergraduate schools during the next year. Perhaps credit can be arranged for some of the technical courses they have taken while in uniform. Special examinations might be desirable to take into account their service experience. Orientation courses and special entry provisions will certainly be necessary. The Veterans' Administration and the colleges ought to cooperate to meet this urgent educational problem, and we hope that Congress, in considering amendments to the GI bill now before it, will insist that this be done.

Statement by Oak Ridge Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I have repeatedly said before, it is my opinion that there is no one in the entire Nation better equipped to advise this Nation about the policy it should pursue with regard to the control of atomic energy than the scientists who were the very people who perfected the atomic bomb.

I therefore include in the RECORD another brief statement by these scientists:

OAK RIDGE, TENN., September 26.—The Association of Oak Ridge Scientists at Clinton Laboratories declared today that in its judgment atomic bombs can be independently produced by other nations within a few years.

The association has been formed to emphasize its conviction that no enduring monopoly of the atomic bomb by the Americans and British is possible and that an international authority for its control must be set up with adequate safeguards to prevent exploitation by any one nation.

The association comprises 96 percent of the civilian physicists, chemists, engineers, and biologists at the main reasearch and development laboratory on the Oak Ridge, Tenn., atomic bomb project, all having 1 to 3 years of experience in the development of the bomb and plants for its production. (Names of members are being withheld temporarily but this release may be verified by phoning Dr. L. W. Nordheim—6250 or 5-4587.)

These views are shared by like groups at the Chicago and Los Alamos, N. Mex., laboratories. The scientists propose to appear before committees of Congress and to sponsor news releases and advertisements presenting their views. A statement follows:

"We, a group of scientists who have pioneered the development of the atomic bomb, feel it our responsibility to point out to the American people certain facts about this weapon which may help the people to see clearly its military and political implications.

"We can expect no enduring monopoly of the atomic bomb. Other scientists can apply the fundamental principles, perhaps more successfully than we have. Other nations, anxious for their own security, will endeavor to develop such weapons.

"Our own work was handicapped by the necessity for basing major decisions on largely theoretical predictions; every minor set-back reopened the question of whether the development of the weapon during the war was feasible.

"This question has now been answered; other countries know that they can produce such bombs within a few years without any detailed technical information from us.

"The only remaining 'secrets' are technical and engineering details of processes, plants, and devices. The fact, as announced in the Smyth report, that several different processes have been successfully employed on these projects, the fact that other independent attempts can be made with the knowledge that the goal is achievable, and the fact that other countries possess the scientists and the resources which are necessary, make it a probable certainty that our efforts can and will be duplicated in other countries within a few years.

"We believe that there is only one way open to us as a nation. Every effort must be made immediately to arrange for the control of this weapon by a world authority which can exercise complete and effective control of the production of the essential materials and of their use in every country."

Medals for Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member will be interested in reading an article by an outstanding educator and writer, Prof. J. T. Salter, of the political science division, University of Wisconsin, entitled "Medals for Politicians."

Professor Salter points out in the article that we properly accord recognition and honor to our outstanding military and naval leaders. He raises the question whether politicians or men in public office should not likewise be accorded some recognition or medals for their public service instead of being subject to condemnation, abuse, and criticism.

Under the leave granted to me, I insert the article of this outstanding gentleman and scholar believing that it deserves insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that it may serve to give thought to critics of men in public office to the end that they will refrain in their continuous unjustified faultfinding and attacks and confine themselves to constructive criticism. Professor Salter's article follows:

MEDALS FOR POLITICIANS

(By J. T. Salter)

A recent news story about a soldier and a medal of honor interests me very much. It makes me wonder what a politician would have to do to have a medal conferred on him. Actually, politicians are not awarded medals: They receive unsavory epithets, not epaulets. This is very strange, or at least regrettably unfortunate, for our soldiers fight for democracy, and democracy cannot exist without politicians; at least it has never managed to do so as yet.

While the politician does his work well, we do not need soldiers on any battlefield. It is only when government by politicians breaks down that millions of our soldiers face suffering and death in war. It must be obvious to the dullest that all of us should do what can reasonably and effectively be done to maintain and strengthen the politician and the Government. I suggest that there are just as compelling and unanswerable arguments for giving an appropriate medal of honor to a politician as to a soldier. The self-consciousness of the former is as certain to respond to public recognition as is the morale of the armed warrior. America must give effective recognition to both, and she will, too, when we become as wise on our politics and politicians as we are on our armies and fighting men.

Maj. Richard I. Bong is the soldier in the news item. He shot down 38 Japanese planes, and has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. The medal was given for "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action above and beyond the call of duty in the Southwest Pacific area from October 10 to November 15, 1944." The item adds that Major Bong was assigned to duty as a gunnery instructor, and was not expected to enter into combat service, but he did. Major Bong voluntarily, and at his own urgent request, engaged in repeated combat missions and shot down 8 enemy airplanes during this period.

I cannot imagine any person objecting to the distinguished recognition given to this most valuable and intrepid warrior. Yet a soldier has in a sense a more favored time than a public man. The former risks his life, but the latter may place his immortal soul in jeopardy not once, but many times. The soldier has arduous, maybe bitter days and nights living out of doors, sleeping on the ground—getting shot at, too. The politician may work late into the night, every night, on a more perfect piece of legislation, and then see it defeated or amended beyond recognition. He may serve the people faithfully every waking minute of every day for 2 years, or 4 or more years, and then suffer defeat at the polls right in the first blush of his most creative period. He may begin to construct a super highway, or a new city plan, or in a totally different field he might work to reorganize the administrative side of our Government, and just before he reaches his great objective, he is defeated. In the months following his defeat he may see the work of a lifetime overturned, come to naught. Winston Churchill tried to arouse the conscience—the mind—of England to the positive danger of war, but he failed, and yet in the months and years of his failure he saw war coming on just as he had predicted it

would. The horror of that vision must be as awful as anything witnessed by soldiers in actual warfare.

The soldier has a decided advantage in that he can definitely recognize the enemy, his enemy and his country's enemy. But how can the politician recognize the people's enemy? Sometimes it can easily be done, but on other occasions the detection of truth and error, good or evil, and of their protagonists, is not easy. It may be impossible until it is too late. It was in France.

The soldier works in the field of absolutes, but the politician, like Einstein, is forever concerned with relativity. If the soldier shoots a man, the man stays shot, but the politician may make a great speech today, and later feel that he must make an even better speech a week from today or the situation is lost. A President or governor may have a working majority in the legislature during the first part of his term, but not the last. There are no absolutes in politics. Everything is relative, and everything is constantly changing. A favorable majority in the legislature or at the polls may change overnight into an unfavorable minority. The politician must forever strive for the objective; only in war is the battle won once and for all.

The politician may hear the truth he has spoken "twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools," or he may see it unheeded or ignored as though he had never lived, never uttered a word. Yet he may know, later the history books may record and verify his truth. In fact the history books do verify and celebrate the politician's truth more often that that of the soldier. Yet the politician of all men must be recognized on the instant, on the day that the ballots are marked, or he will be denied official place: He will be defeated if he has not this positive approval on election day. A million votes after the polls close are not worth as much as one single ballot voted before the polling ceases. As I have said before, the politician is contemporaneous. And to be that he must get attention: More than that, he must have favorable response. He must get the voter to act, and to act according to the politician's interpretation of the facts.

This means that the public man has a life of action, passion, and dramatization. He must feel the passion of the day; he must be part of it. He must express it. I mean he must express the nature and significance of the issue or problem that confronts the people so that the people will better know the truth or the facts, and consequently be in a better position to work out their own salvation. For we now know, if we know anything, that if any good is achieved by the people, the people themselves will have to do it. There is no one to do it for them. The politician is an agent or tool that they use in governing themselves; the soldier is a warrior-agent that they used in defending themselves. However, it is important to remember that in case of either the politician or the soldier we have the citizen too—the citizen as politician or as a soldier, always the citizen. Only the citizen takes more naturally to politics than he does to armed warfare. He volunteers for politics, but he is drafted for war. And that is right and proper, for America has achieved its greatness under politicians, not generals. Of course we are what we are because of both our politicians and our soldiers. (And they are what they are because of us.) But the primary importance of the civil authorities, the politicians, was recognized as early as 1787 when the Constitution was drafted. It provides that the military shall be subject to the nonmilitary or civil. The President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and not the other way around. Congress declares war—not the Army. Yet we give the Army medals, but have none for Congress.

The Army likes its medals. In Ernie Pyle's Brave Men there is the remark that no matter how a soldier may joke about a medal, he never misses the ceremony at which a medal is to be conferred on him. He wants it. I think a politician might want it too, if the people ever got interested in the idea, if some institution were established to award a medal now and then for some great service to a great cause. There might even be the counterpart of the Purple Heart for one who labored mightily and failed. I am not now concerned with how the committee would award the medal, or how often, or on what occasion, or with the method of selecting the committee or its personnel. Here I merely want to point out the incontestable fact that the politician deserves credit as well as censure. His cup is running over with criticism. Friends of democracy should also give him praise.

I say this because I want to direct attention to the political function in our democracy, and more particularly to the voter and his politician. I say the voter too, because the voter sets the standard and the politician comes up to it.

It is important to know that the awarding of the palm instead of the boot to the politician will work both ways. It will help the politician's morale; he will feel more pride in his work. This will happen because the voter's attention will encourage it. People will see their politicians or public men as individuals valuable to our democracy. Physicians and dentists are recognized as useful and necessary members of our society now; so are plumbers, ditch diggers, and undertakers. Politicians are useful and necessary too, but often we fail to realize this simple fact. Our neglect costs us, the people, untold millions of dollars, for any servant that is not adequately appreciated is not able to do his best. They will more and more come to see that politics is not only one of the most strenuous arts that men follow, but it is also one of the noblest.

A George W. Norris might faithfully and effectively serve his State and his Nation for a lifetime; he might bring about the creation of a giant public-electric system, TVA, a system that revolutionizes the life of a region; but near the end of his life he is defeated at the polls and goes home after a long day well spent, with great sorrow in his heart, and shortly thereafter dies.

How much nicer for America and for public men everywhere, as well as for Senator Norris and his family in particular, if he had been awarded a medal of some sort—a medal comparable to the concrete recognition a gallant soldier receives for conspicuous service to his country. It might be a Carnegie Medal or a Nobel Prize or a Pulitzer Prize. Better still, I think it should be something entirely new. It might be called the People's Medal or the American prize. It might be awarded to an elected person for service of extraordinary value to his country. Who will do the awarding and who will receive the award are problems to be worked out in the future. And such problems can be. The existence of innumerable prizes, or medals, or honorary degrees in this country now indicates that the awarding of distinctions in any number of fields can be done with great, if not unanimous, approval.

The words "conspicuous gallantry" are words beyond comparison in war or in peace. But in times of tranquillity people associate those royal words with warlike deeds. I suggest the need for symbols or royal words for the politician doing the work of the citizen—the citizen qua citizen. The public man cannot live by words alone, and neither can he live without them. In the days of peace ahead we might come to realize that the sympathetic understanding of the politician, in neighborhood and Nation, is of public value to us and our country as truly as is the gallantry of the soldier or the honor and virtue of men and women. As Dwight Morrow well said: "The enduring institutions of a people are not made by cavalry charges. The victories of peace are to be won not in days but in centuries, and by the energy not of feeling but of thought." [1]

Past and Future Waterway Improvements in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Brig. Gen. E. H. Marks, southwestern division Army engineer, Dallas, at the annual meeting of the Texas Water Conservation Association, Driskill Hotel, Austin, Tex., October 3, 1945:

THE ARMY ENGINEERS—ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE AND PLANS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a real privilege to be present at this, your annual meeting, and to congratulate you on a year of noteworthy achievement. I enthusiastically accepted the invitation to sketch for you past accomplishments of the Corps of Engineers in Texas, and our future civil-works program for this great State.

Since the beneficial use of the ground and surface waters of the United States promises to be one of the most important economic, political, and social problems of the postwar period, we of the Corps of Engineers shall need and assuredly welcome your continuing cooperation and advice regarding the conservation, control, protection, and utilization of the water resources of this empire within an empire.

In the earliest days of our Government, Congress recognized the necessity for a program of navigation improvements in our principal rivers and harbors. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army was first called upon to function in the development of streams and harbors for navigation, by an act of Congress, approved in 1824. The program thus started has never ceased. The people of this country have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on a nation-wide network of outstanding navigation improvements. The Corps of Engineers in creating those improvements has built up an engineering and administrative organization that holds a recognized place in the theory and practice of waterway engineering.

In late years, in addition to the earlier responsibilities for improving navigation, the corps has investigated and reported upon flood control, hydroelectric power, irrigation, and kindred matters for nearly all important river systems. We have brought together, for the first time, all the important physical data concerning our water resources. From these data comprehensive and coordinated plans for most drainage basins in the country have been formulated.

In 1936, the Congress, for the first time in its history, established a definite national

[1] Works of T. H. Green, vol. III, p. 354, cited by D. W. Morrow, Introduction; Morse, Anson D., Parties and Party Leaders (Boston, 1923), p. xx.

policy for Federal participation in the construction of economically justified flood-control projects, through the United States, in cooperation with the States and other political subdivisions. Aggregate authorizations for general flood control now approximate $1,000,000,000, exclusive of the Mississippi River.

Texans and the Army engineers have, together, accomplished much. They have played on the same team, and have had the same goals for more than 65 years. The Galveston Engineer District, established in 1880, has operated continuously since. While for some years following its establishment, the efforts of the district were largely confined to Galveston Harbor improvements, by 1884, Buffalo Bayou had been made navigable to a point 6 miles below Houston for boats of 9-foot draft, and boats of 6-foot draft could reach the center of Houston's business section. The Sabine River had been improved from Sabine Lake to Orange. The Neches River was being kept open by annual dredging, and the Trinity was kept navigable as far north as Liberty. The entrance to the Brazos was open. On the Rio Grande, flood protection work was executed at Fort Brown, Brownsville, for the protection of the military installation.

In contrast to those early days when the Galveston district was carrying the ball alone, we have today, in Texas, the southwestern division headquarters, directing the operations of five engineer districts whose undertakings cover portions of eight States. Three of these district cover the streams of this vast State. Today, innumerable projects are in the survey stage, and Congress has already authorized projects for construction in Texas aggregating upward of $126,000,000.

Although many of the members of your association are doubtless acquainted with the procedure under which river and harbor and flood control projects are investigated, it seems pertinent to take this opportunity to point out the careful and painstaking investigations and studies behind what is generally known as an adopted project. Such a project must have the conviction of the local people as to its desirability. Through their initiative, legislation by Congress must be secured, authorizing the Department to conduct a preliminary examination and subsequent survey.

The preliminary examination is made by the district engineer. He first holds a public hearing, after widely published notice thereof. Interested agencies and persons attend this public hearing and are encouraged to state their views freely. A complete record of the hearing is made.

With the completion of the preliminary examination, the district engineer now submits a preliminary report for review, first by the division engineer, then by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and finally by the Chief of Engineers. If the report on the preliminary examination is found unfavorable by the Chief of Engineers, Congress is so advised. If the aspects are favorable, the Chief of Engineers authorizes the local district engineer to conduct a detailed survey. This second, or survey, report is also reviewed by the division engineer, the Board, and by the Chief of Engineers, and the opinions of these authorities, for or against, are transmitted by the Secretary of War to the appropriate congressional committee for suitable action. Able Judge MANSFIELD, of Texas, has been chairman of the House Committee for Rivers and Harbors for many years, and you are all familiar with the fine work he has done.

The favorable recommendations of the congressional committees are included in a river-and-harbor or flood-control bill presented to Congress for its action. It is important to know that these bills when enacted into law carry no appropriations of funds. They merely authorize the projects listed therein to be prosecuted if and when necessary funds are appropriated. Appropriations come about as a regular Budget matter handled by the Congress.

In my judgment there are no public projects in the country which are given more extensive analysis and study than that which is given to navigation and flood-control improvements before their adoption as Federal projects; and, while there may be individual cases which have not fully realized their expectations, by and large, for the sums disbursed and the results obtained, it is doubtful if any expenditures by the Federal Government give to the people of the United States as large a return measurable in dollars and cents as the improvements of our waterways for navigation and flood control.

While our investigations and reports are basically for flood control and navigation, the law requires that full consideration and discussion be given to other water uses and to the effect of one character of improvement upon the other. There is, therefore, in every navigation and flood-control report not only a full discussion of these two classes of stream improvements, but also a full presentation of other possible water uses. These special subjects involve hydroelectric power, irrigation, domestic and industrial water supply, the abatement of stream pollution, recreation and wildlife considerations, and similar problems.

Just what does all of this mean to Texas?

Forty years ago, there was but one seaport worthy of the name on the Texas coast. Today, deep-water ports capable of handling the largest ocean-going freight vessels stud the Texas coastline from Port Arthur to Brownsville, including the port of Houston 50 miles from the Gulf of Mexico.

The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was a dream four decades ago; now 12 feet in depth and with a bottom width of 125 feet, it extends from Appalachee Bay, Fla., to Corpus Christi, and its extension to the Rio Grande Valley has been assured by congressional appropriation. A barge canal across Florida, already authorized by Congress, is the sole missing link in a great inland waterway from Trenton, N. J., to Mexico.

Let us turn for a moment to a statistical evaluation of the development of these waterways. In 1900 the total population of the 18 Texas counties contiguous to the route of the Intracoastal Canal was approximately 250,000. These same counties by 1943 census estimates have a population of 1,500,000.

Waterways tonnage figures tell an even more graphic story. In 1910 all Texas waterways handled approximately 9,000,000 tons. In 1930 the figure had risen to 50,000,000 tons, and in 1940, a peacetime year, to 100,650,000 tons. Even during the depression years of 1929–33 the tonnage of the Texas ports held to a rising curve.

Therefore it seems to me that it may well be said that the development of Texas and Louisiana waterways and ports has been a major factor in the phenomenal growth of the great Southwest during the past 20 years, and that with half the country's crude oil production, practically all of its sulfur, and a great chemical industry the canal territory may logically be offered as an exemplification of the theory of my good friend, Roy Miller, that industry, commercial activity, and population growth are byproducts of water transportation.

It is predicted that at a not too distant date the benefits of water transportation will be extended to communities now remote from the coast by the improvement of feeder streams to the Intracoastal Canal.

The Department presently has about 20 authorizations for specific navigation improvements for deep water and shallow-draft channels, including tributary feeder channels. These authorizations provide for additional improvements to the Houston Ship Channel, to the Port Aransas-Corpus Christi waterway, to the Brazos Island Harbor, and to the tributary channel from the Gulf Intracoastal waterway up the Arroyo Colorado to Harlingen. Improvement of the Trinity River to Liberty, as an initial step in making that stream navigable to Fort Worth, and of the Guadalupe River to Victoria are also included in the above-mentioned authorizations which aggregate an estimated cost of $14,000,000.

The only major flood-control project completed in Texas is the Denison Dam, shared jointly with Oklahoma. This great dam which furnishes flood protection to the areas along the Red River develops hydroelectric power, and in Lake Texoma, which it forms, creates one of the finest recreation areas of the entire Southwest.

Congress has authorized construction of a number of projects for flood control, generation of hydroelectric energy, and for conservation of water for irrigation or domestic use. Those projects consist of 16 dams and reservoirs (including modification of 2 existing privately owned structures), 6 levees or levee floodways, and 5 channel enlargements or rectifications. These flood-control projects, which will provide a substantial measure of flood protection in the valleys of the Neches, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, Lavaca, and Trinity Rivers, and Buffalo Bayou, will cost in excess of $112,000,000.

Our civil-works construction program was, of course, suspended during the war, and, although funds are not now available for these authorized projects, considerable progress in their advance planning has been made. It now appears that construction on a number of them can be started within a reasonable period, and it is understood Congress is now considering a deficiency bill to provide funds for work on projects postponed during the war and to initiate construction on many new ones.

Finally, please note that, in addition to these authorized projects, Congress has directed preliminary studies for work on unimproved rivers and harbors or the betterment of projects now complete for practically every major stream and waterway in the State.

In conclusion, may I reiterate that the War Department cannot authorize improvements nor can the engineers prosecute them unless funds are made available by Congress. You, as an association, can, through your representatives in Congress, secure the necessary authorizations for investigations and reports. You have the same privilege and duty to urge upon Congress the necessity for providing funds for those projects that have been authorized.

Allow me to thank you again for the privilege of joining in your annual deliberations. I wish you another successful year and sincerely trust that you will maintain close contact with the existing and future activities of the southwestern division.

The President's Stand on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Shies at Questions on Key Issues," from the Des Moines Register of October 4, and an article entitled "Don't Shoot the Pianist, He's Doing the

Best He Can," from the Providence Journal of October 9.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register of October 4, 1945]

TRUMAN SHIES AT QUESTIONS ON KEY ISSUES

(By William Mylander)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—President Truman has begun to spar for time as troubles rise to plague him at home and abroad.

The weekly White House press conference Wednesday was notable for the President's disinclination to take a decisive stand on current issues, either domestic or international.

As correspondents filed from the President's office, the rapidity with which a good-natured quip passed among them seemed indicative of the gravity of the problems confronting Mr. Truman, and the lack of progress in solving them that had just been revealed.

"Don't shoot the piano player in the White House, boys," said Bert Andrews, of the New York Herald Tribune, "he's doing the best he can."

LONDON CONFERENCE

For example, the President declined to comment on the failure of the London meeting of foreign ministers, explaining that he wanted to get a report from Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.

Last week he had sternly cautioned reporters to wait for the official communiqué of the meeting—none was issued—before concluding it was a failure.

Mr. Truman similarly avoided a request for comment on Russia's renewal of its demand for a four-power council to administer the affairs of Japan.

That, too, he said he wanted to discuss with Secretary Byrnes, although only last week the President made clear his opinion that the council was unnecessary, and said Russia had agreed to designation of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as supreme commander.

WAGE POLICY

On domestic affairs, the President was asked in view of the labor crisis to define the administration's wage policy. He said he had anticipated the inquiry and was prepared to answer.

He then read an executive order issued August 18, and said he thought that was a definite wage policy although some people were saying the administration didn't have one.

The order directs that wage and salary increases can be granted voluntarily or through collective bargaining without the necessity for Federal approval on condition that the increases wouldn't be used as the basis for seeking higher price ceilings, or for resisting otherwise justifiable reductions in price ceilings.

INEQUITIES

It also directs that the War Labor Board can approve increases to correct maladjustments or inequities "which would interfere with the effective transition to a peacetime economy," but when such increases would require higher price ceilings, approval by John Snyder, Director of Economic Stabilization, also would be necessary.

A third section of the order instructed the Federal agencies involved to regard any labor disputes which would interrupt work "contributing to the production of military supplies" or interfere "with effective transition to a peacetime economy" as disputes which interrupt work "contributing to the effective prosecution of the war."

Mr. Truman said the order was issued with approval of Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach and labor organizations.

OIL STRIKE PLAN

Neither labor nor management circles, however, could reconcile it with Secretary Schwellenbach's proposal to settle the oil workers' strike through a 15-percent basic pay increase, and arbitration to determine whether there should be an additional increase.

Federal officials have calculated privately that application of the 15-percent formula to industry generally would result in price rises on a broad front, and upset the hopes of the Office of Price Administration to maintain living costs at current levels through the reconversion period.

It has been the contention of industry management that wage increases are reflected not only in the immediate labor cost of a product, but also in the cost of every material used to make the product.

Under the order which Mr. Truman has described as his wage policy, Economic Stabilizer Snyder is empowered to approve wage increases even if they result in increased prices if this would correct maladjustments or inequities which would interfere with the effective transition to a peacetime economy.

PRICE CONTROL

In his message to Congress, however, Mr. Truman called for continued price controls, and said "it will similarly be necessary for the Government to resist pressures for increases in wage rates which would imperil price ceilings."

The President also was reticent at his press conference on the legislation which he regards as emergency, and which Congress either is trimming or refusing to enact.

He was reminded that, although a week has elapsed since he called in Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee, and urged them to act on the unemployment compensation bill, nothing has happened.

Asked if he had in mind any further steps to spur congressional action, Mr. Truman merely smiled broadly and said he thought that, if the committee had a little time to deliberate, the country would get some action.

[From the Providence Journal of October 9, 1945]

"DON'T SHOOT THE PIANIST, HE'S DOING BEST HE CAN"—FREDERIC W. COLLINS SAYS SIGN ALLEGEDLY HUNG AT WHITE HOUSE REFLECTS PREVAILING MOOD THAT TRUMAN HAS HIS HANDS FULL

(By Frederic W. Collins)

WASHINGTON, October 6.—There was a new and meaningful wisecrack in circulation here this week. A sign had appeared over at the White House, it was alleged, reading:

"Don't shoot the piano player, he's doing the best he can."

Making use of Mr. Truman's well-known tendency to sit down and knock off a few bars of Chopin now and then, this topical application of a rich American folk phrase summed up—sympathetically, it should be noted—the impression that the President was at least temporarily floundering.

Mr. Truman was having many different kinds of trouble. Congress and foreign affairs were producing worries. The wisecrack owed its utterance chiefly, however, to the widespread existence of labor controversies of a serious nature.

They had begun developing almost at the moment of the Japanese surrender. For more than a month there had been no major Presidential action to deal with them except the seizure of the oil refineries, which did not pass without criticism. There had been no Presidential statement.

NOT AN EXPERT PERFORMANCE

So with friendly acknowledgment that the President was trying, there came the conclusion that he was giving something less than an expert performance.

As the week closed, the impression was growing stronger that Mr. Truman would soon do something. He talked labor problems with his congressional leaders and with Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Out of these meetings there developed reports that in a radio speech or press conference statement, the President would shortly lay before the Nation's workers the proposition that strikes were interfering with reconversion, and ask for labor peace.

Some of Mr. Truman's troubles with labor, it began to be suspected, lay in his choice of Lewis B. Schwellenbach as his Secretary of Labor. In accordance with his administration policy of relying upon his department heads to do their jobs and relieve him of the details, Mr. Truman has been giving Schwellenbach a free hand to try to cope with the epidemic of serious disputes in key industries. There has now begun to be heard a question whether in choosing a man intellectually and politically committed to favoring labor, Mr. Truman has not saddled himself, vis-a-vis public opinion, with an anachronism.

Schwellenbach has had too short a career in the Labor Department to justify an out-of-hand condemnation of his attitudes and methods. Certain stubborn facts, however, are prominent in his record.

In the first place he is a politician from the State of Washington which, labor-wise, is one of the wildest and wooliest in the Union.

In the second place, his performance as a United States Senator 1935–40 was more extremely pro-labor than that of Mr. Truman, who was sympathetic to labor without being uncritically so, and whose record appeared to have satisfied labor.

The best exemplification of their differences of viewpoint was presented by their votes on a resolution condemning sit-down strikes in 1937. Truman was for it. Schwellenbach was against.

It is against this background that Schwellenbach is being accused of unfairness in his handling of the current oil strike, and of proposing a basis of arbitration which ran counter, as one expert on industrial relations asserted this week, "to the very meaning of arbitration."

The complaint is that after Schwellenbach had obtained from the oil companies an expression of willingness to grant a 15-percent wage increase, he proposed to make that the starting line of arbitration and determine how much more the companies would concede out of the additional 15 percent the unions have demanded.

When the oil companies insisted that arbitration should be free to make any award between zero and 30 percent, Schwellenbach held that they had rejected arbitration. Presidential seizure of the refineries was the next step.

The unfortunate part of this episode is that the record, as written by the Government, asserts that the companies refused arbitration, and the companies are left to persuade the public as best they can that they received no real offer of arbitration.

Schwellenbach feels that his offer was fair. To him the 15-percent concession of the oil companies represented agreement and the additional 15 percent a point of difference. His understanding, he said, is that differences, rather than agreements, are what one puts up to arbitration.

BASIC QUESTIONS ARE RAISED

Mr. Truman's difficulties with labor, however, go far beyond technicalities of settlement procedure. Fundamental questions of public policy are forcefully presented by the existing disputes, as well as the obvious ques-

tions of labor-management relations and the less obvious questions of economic policy.

It is presumably the President's desire to bring out of the present conflict not merely an uneasy truce but a permanent stabilization under which both labor and management will know where they stand and the public will be able to expect more from its Government than improvisation.

The oil refinery strikes and the trouble in the coal mines, the telephone business, and the New York elevators present to Mr. Truman the necessity of constructing a durable policy for dealing with disputes in enterprises having the nature of public utilities.

The telephone strike, provoked by union dissatisfaction with a lower-echelon decision in the National Labor Relations Board, served notice on Mr. Truman that there must be a fixed doctrine to apply in what are essentially strikes against Government authority.

The telephone strike, involving also rivalry between the CIO and the AFL, meant further to Mr. Truman that there must be a policy covering disputes in which management is a party only in the sense that unfortunate circumstances put it in the middle.

The oil strike and turbulence in the automobile industry were a warning that Mr. Truman must collect his thoughts on the issue of industry-wide bargaining with all its implications of concentration of vast economic power in the hands of a few men on either side.

And all the controversies in which wages were at issue, notably the strike in the oil industry and the fast-growing crisis in the automobile plants, meant that Mr. Truman must make decisions on the interrelation of wage increases, prices, and volume of production.

He is called upon to work out, in fact, an economic timetable for reconversion under the threat of inflation if he turns too much money loose before goods are ready, or depression if he turns too many goods loose before money is of a mind to take them.

To a press-conference question this week as to whether he has a labor policy, President Truman offered the answer that his statement of August 18 embodied his labor policy. This proved to be a rather unsatisfactory answer, inasmuch as the August 18 statement set forth chiefly a wage policy, and what in the practical circumstances has not even turned out to be an effective wage policy.

Truman is under more than public pressure to assert himself on labor problems.

His own reconversion officials are discouraged by the set-backs industrial strife has produced at a time when the change-over process otherwise was going better than they had dared hope. His political advisers must be aware that the Republicans are already at work seeking to reap benefits for their side from the troubles the administration is having with the unions.

The early promise of the Truman regime, is, however, that he will tackle the problem because it needs tackling. If it is true that he is at present floundering, he cannot be accused of having picked an easy problem for his first try at temporizing.

Pay of Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pay the Soldier War-Worker Wages," to be published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of October 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAY THE SOLDIER WAR-WORKER WAGES

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

World War II was the costliest, most devastating and tragic human convulsion in history. We Americans did not make either the German or the Jap war. We were a peaceful people, minding our own business and generously helping other nations in distress. It was our ability to be generous that made other piratic nations covetous and plot to capture us. To save ourselves we had to save the world from the barbarism of both the Germans and the Japs. We did. We saved civilization. Civilization was hurled into the agonies and holocausts of frenzied scientific warfare. The wreckage is so far beyond comprehension the whole world is dazed.

Now are we to let these confusions confound us in the peace that we won? Have we the civilization that can stand the test? Has our boasted culture, the creative learning, character, refinements, and qualities that our colleges and educational enterprises have affected, produced the leadership that can now marshal our forces to a progressive, prosperous peace? As never before America must now test her Americanism.

Is that which made us the savior of the world to perish? Must we be booted back into medievalism by the uncomprehending? Have the 252,885 American sons who were killed in action died in vain? Are the 651,218 American sons who were wounded, most of whom will carry their battle scars to their graves, suffering their bruised bodies for no better end than to see the robust America that saved the world now disintegrate by builders of dissensions and repudiators of the rights of freemen?

We can recover from the loss of $287,000,000,000. But nothing but free enterprise can pay that debt. Strikes will not liquidate our incalculable foreign "loans," loans which, by brazen repudiation, are now donations that do not earn even gratitude.

The boys in the ranks who died that we might live got less than $15 a week. For that same pittance of pay their comrades who survived suffered tortures. And their families here had to endure as best they could. And while our soldiers took the whole brunt of battle, the "economic scholars" who planned it that way, directed our ordnance workers to be paid eighty or more dollars per week.

Now while the whole world is in need of our full peace power production, we stop to demand money from ourselves that we just haven't got.

According to the schooling we have had for the last dozen years, the great sinners among us are the men who planned production, built the factories and mills that provide work for workers.

The heroes of this false economic "scholarship" are the men who themselves can make nothing alone and who can only contribute to the making of anything as they are taught how to lend a helping hand.

They should be paid. They should be well paid. Paid so that they themselves become consumers of the commodities they help to make. No less the creator is entitled to the awards of creating. Arbitration boards of fair-minded men should adjudicate disputes. But no group of men, if this is to remain America, can have a right to deny an honest, willing, and efficient worker the right to work, and be rewarded for his work, unless he pays tribute to and is subservient to a fee-collecting dictator. And those who so contend are the foes of the America that was born to protect the rights of free men.

What are we doing with our soldier sons now? Their war work is done. Still we keep them in an idle, useless Army demanding that they earn a certain number of points that time alone can accumulate. That is like a penal sentence pronounced upon them. For having won the war, we now sentence them to serve a stretch. And they don't get out until they have done their time. This is infamous. But not a voice in Congress is articulate.

Has the Congress of the United States become so senile that it condones this imprisonment of our sons?

Every Congressman is untrue to his trust who does not voice his stoutest protest to this confiscation of our men who only enlisted to win the war.

Are the boys being kept in the Army at this less than $15 per week pittance to make a labor shortage when enterprise, like a curbed colt at the post, is nervously eager to go? Are the boys to be trapped in uniform until the wartime ordnance workers find the new jobs enterprise creates before the soldier sons get home to seek their earned employment share?

Established industries are eager to start their factory fires. New enterprises are impatient to begin. There is work for everybody willing to work. Enterprise pleads for workers. But the workers demand wages that many enterprises cannot pay and prosper. They cannot meet the dole wages the New Dealers dished out of the taxpayers' pockets during the war. And still, with work waiting for workers mass strikes are halting work, arresting reconversion, and blocking progress.

We need a measure of a standing army for occupation of the outlaw nations. The boys who put on uniforms to fight the war did not enlist to police the peace in foreign lands. They should be honorably discharged at once. Bring them home to their families and their jobs. Jobs for all of them are waiting.

This done, then fill the ranks of a policing army by volunteers who are properly paid. Turn the table and the Army problem is solved. Pay the soldier what we paid the war worker who stayed at home. Let the soldier who now volunteers get $80 a week and you'll see the ranks of the policing army quickly filled and the warriors who won the war will return to the life they fought to live.

There is no shortage of labor that the ill-advised New Dealers have not made. With full patriotism the people have oversubscribed every war-bond drive. These, and confiscating taxes, have filled the Federal Treasury with the boodle which New Dealers have handed out to the voting workers who did not go to war. Now $40 and $50 a week jobs go begging. But the union bosses, who demand responsibilities and will assume none, will beat up any freeman who goes to any job that he pickets. You must carry his card that shows you have paid his tribute. You are not free to work as a freeman.

Moreover these confiscating economics have destroyed the whole domestic-science industry. Our colleges and high schools might as well fold up their domestic-science courses. Who's going to peel the potatoes now? Homemaking is too menial.

The New Dealers have it all doped out. You don't have to work at any job if you don't want to. It is planned to pay $25 a week for declining to work. What a wholly un-American way. What cockeyed economist "thunk this up"?

If Congress would put every soldier who wanted to be a policeman in foreign lands on a war-worker's pay of $80 a week and bring the boys home who want to fill the jobs that are waiting, America would be the prosperous, peace pacemaker of the world. We would be self-reliant, self-respecting, robust Americans again.

Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pearl Harbor," by John Chamberlain, one of the associate editors of Life magazine. The article appeared in the September 24, 1945, edition of Life. I have been advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the article will be $182.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR—THE FACTS WERE KNOWN TO REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE THOMAS DEWEY IN 1944—HE WITHHELD HIS FIRE, BUT NOW IS THE TIME TO ASSESS THEIR MEANING

(By John Chamberlain)

Up until August 14, the day Japan sued for peace under the terms of the Potsdam offer, "Remember Pearl Harbor!" was a rallying cry, a Halseyesque battle slogan urging us to be up and at the Nips. After that date its meaning changed; indeed, it became a slogan with many meanings, not the least of which might be interchanged with the moral of Kipling's Recessional. Some of the meanings were so charged with political dynamite that Democratic Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN wished the wording of the slogan might be altered to "Forget Pearl Harbor!" But Pearl Harbor will be investigated, its many meanings spread upon the books. Whether the meanings will be combined in the right proportions to point the true moral of Pearl Harbor, whether the American people will extract the lesson from the story in terms that will profit their behavior in a world that will demand a close integration of foreign and military policies and the popular understanding and control thereof, is the only matter that really calls for conjecture.

For a long time the official explanation of Pearl Harbor was that we were slugged without warning when we were innocently going about our business. Slugged we were, and there is no need to palliate the Japanese behavior. But to say that we were slugged without warning is a radical distortion of the truth; Roosevelt, the Chief Executive of the Nation and Commander in Chief of its Army and Navy, knew in advance that the Japanese were going to attack us. There is even ground for suspicion that he elected to bring the crisis to a head when it came.

The justification for Roosevelt's precise course of action will probably be argued until doomsday. But even though the Patterson-McCormick press may continue to file demurrers, history will certainly approve Roosevelt's basic decision to oppose the spread of the Axis Nations by whatever means were necessary. History may even justify the claim that Roosevelt exercised great foresight and pragmatic statecraft in manipulating events, even though the morality of waging a two-front psychological war against the Japanese and against a sizable percentage of his own people cannot be reconciled with the methods of democracy. But what history will not be able to justify is the military negligence exhibited by a Commander in Chief who was knowingly—and perhaps wisely—playing an exceedingly dangerous game in his other capacity as Chief of State. The Roosevelt course may have been the only one by which a reluctant people could be led into a perhaps inevitable war on a basis of fused rage and unified morale. But it was a course that called for alertness all down the line in all departments of national defense, and the alertness could only have been produced by unequivocal orders from the very top.

As the coming investigations will show, the Pearl Harbor case moves on many levels. The Republicans will charge—and prove—that the Democrats, in revealing the skeleton in the closet piecemeal, now a femur, now a jawbone, have chosen tactics and timing designed to frustrate the expression of any effective political reaction to it. The "isolationists" will charge—and they may have evidence for their case—that Roosevelt maneuvered the Japanese crisis in such a way as to invite the Pearl Harbor attack when it came, just about within the time-span implied when the President said to Churchill during the Atlantic Charter Conference of August 1941, "Leave it to me. I think I can baby them [the Japanese] along for 3 months." The "interventionists," countering the "isolationists," will say (perhaps truly) that it was our duty to be in the war "all the way" and that Roosevelt chose the method of entrance least calculated to leave the Nation dangerously divided as to the wisdom of its course. (The fact that we have fought the most successful war in our history lends tacit strength to the interventionists' case.) Finally, the technicians and strategists of warfare will charge that there was low-level negligence on the part of Admiral Kimmel and General Short in the field in Hawaii and high-level negligence in the White House and the War and Navy Departments in Washington. And the technicians and strategists will also be right, for the liaison between Washington and Hawaii was terrible, but not so terrible as to preclude the use of imagination by the field commanders and those under them who had at least a few glimmers that something was funny about United States-Japanese relations in November and December of 1941.

Of all the cases, that of the Republicans is the most tantalizing. For the Republican high command—Dewey and Brownell—knew the full story of Pearl Harbor in the autumn of 1944, when the Democrats were arguing the indispensability of their Commander in Chief. The Army Board report on Pearl Harbor says: "Information from informers, agents, and other sources as to the activities of our potential enemy and its intentions in the negotiations between the United States and Japan was in possession of the State, War, and Navy Departments in November and December of 1941. Such agencies had a reasonably complete knowledge of the Japanese plans and intentions, and were in a position to know their potential moves against the United States. Therefore, Washington was in possession of essential facts as to the enemy's intentions and proposals." Just what the "other sources" of information were is not made clear in any of the official Pearl Harbor reports. But long before the Nation went to the polls it had come to Thomas E. Dewey's attention that we had cracked the Japanese "ultra" code some time prior to Pearl Harbor and that Roosevelt and his advisers knew what the Japanese were going to do well in advance of the overt rupture of relations. More than 15 hours before Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt and the members of the Washington high command knew that the Japanese envoys were going to break with the United States the next day; the only thing they did not know was the precise point of the military attack, which they assumed would be toward the East Indies and/or at the Philippins or Guam. Dewey, realizing this, was in a position to charge that the President had "betrayed" the interests of the United States in failing either to forestall or mitigate an attack for which we were, on the certification of General Marshall, not yet ready. The political impact of such a charge, if supported by the evidence of the code-cracking, would have been terrific, and might well have landed Dewey in the White House.

Dewey's rage was already smoldering when the President made his speech to Dan Tobin's teamsters, a speech which seemed, in Dewey's own words, to be "sneering and snide." Reading the text of the speech while riding on the train between Los Angeles and Oklahoma City, Dewey decided to give Roosevelt a little of his own medicine. Accordingly, he ceased to be constructive at Oklahoma City, where he lit into Roosevelt with both fists flying. Certain of his innuendoes must have frightened the War Department into believing that the Republicans planned to spring the truth about Pearl Harbor, for the next day, in Tulsa, a tall, dark, and handsome colonel came knocking at Dewey's door with a letter from General Marshall. The colonel had flown out in a bomber from Washington.

The first paragraph of the letter, contents of which were known only to Marshall and Admiral King, ordered Dewey to stop reading at that very point unless he was prepared to keep the rest of the letter secret. Despite his curiosity, Dewey obeyed the order; he stopped and told the colonel that the letter might possibly contain material which had already come to him from other sources, and that anyway, a candidate for President was in no position to make blind promises. And then he handed the letter back.

The turn-down didn't suit Marshall, for later in the autumn the colonel appeared before Dewey with another letter. This time Dewey was permitted to read the letter and to keep it. In substance the letter told Dewey what he already knew, that we had cracked the Japanese ultra code. But it was of the highest importance, said Marshall, that the Japanese be kept from realizing it. We were still deriving enormous military advantages from possession of the code, and lives would be lost if the Japanese were to change their signals.

The Marshall letter put Dewey in a terrible dilemma, which he talked over at length with Herbert Brownell and Elliott Bell, his closest advisers. Could they believe that the Japanese were still adhering to the old code? Or was Roosevelt using his chief of staff as a means of forestalling charges and inquiry? After wrestling with his conscience for a long time, Dewey decided to follow George Marshall, whom he regards as an utterly truthful and honorable man.

What the Republican Party high command knew and refrained patriotically from using in the autumn of 1944, the isolationists, led by John T. Flynn, are employing now as the basis for a charge that Roosevelt trapped the Japanese into attacking us in order to get around the constitutional necessity for a congressional declaration of war. Since this charge will inevitably become the basis for a quarrel over war origins that will make the argument over 1917–18 look like a polite exchange at a garden party, there is no point in ignoring it. Regardless of the source of the charge, and quite apart from the questioning of whether we should or should not have gone to war, the evidence shows that Roosevelt made it progressively less easy for the Japanese Government to both keep the peace with us and save face at home after the summer of 1941. The story of how we tightened the screws on Japan in 1941 is told with bitter anti-Roosevelt animus in Mr. Flynn's two privately published pamphlets, The Truth About Pearl Harbor, and The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor. But it is a story whose main outlines comes from the State Department's own white paper, Peace and War, and from former Ambassador to Japan Joseph C. Grew's Ten Years in Japan.

If participation in all-out shooting war were the only way by which the United States could carry out its policy of halting the Axis

and saving China from dismemberment, then the case against Roosevelt's methods boils down to a charge that the President was neither open nor honest about putting the inevitable up to the people. Roosevelt was no Churchill, crying a halt to appeasement; he was no Cato, crying "Delenda est Carthago." His method, infuriating to the Willkieites, was to work both sides of the street. At the very moment he was promising to keep our boys out of foreign wars except in case of attack, he was at least complaisant about welcoming attack. Maybe it was necessary to break the facts of 1940 and 1941 life gently to the people by making the war seem something not of our own making. But we will never know whether Roosevelt chose a wise course until the true facts of the Japanese peace offers of August and September 1941 are known.

In the early part of 1941 the United States, in conjunction with Britain and the Dutch East Indies, had cut off trade with Japan. Without oil and rubber, Japan had only two courses open to her, either to seize the Indies or to make peace with China and reestablish her trade with the world. Prince Konoye, the Japanese Prime Minister, was for the second alternative. A moderate by comparison with the Japanese militarist party, Konoye sent word to Ambassador Grew that he would like to meet Roosevelt on United States soil, either in Hawaii or Alaska. His proposal for peace with China, handed to Ambassador Grew by the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs on September 22, 1941, was hardly satisfactory, for the terms stipulated that after liquidation of the war Japanese troops were to continue garrisoning parts of China where communistic and other subversive activities threatened the security of both countries. Japan also wanted to remain in French Indo-China until the China incident is settled.

KONOYE IS TURNED DOWN

Roosevelt refused to meet with Konoye on the basis of the Japanese proposal; it seemed to him to contain to many weasel phrases and clauses, and maybe an invitation to abject appeasement. But in his diary Ambassador Grew wrote that the Japanese did not consider the peace proposal "a formal document, such, for instance, as a treaty; the text is to be regarded as 'entirely flexible.' It is therefore open to any revision which the Government of the United States may propose, but any modification of the document's substance will not be agreeable to the Japanese Government."

Grew may have changed his mind later, but in September of 1941 he was for the proposed Konoye-Roosevelt meeting without waiting for "clear-cut commitments." Otherwise, he noted in his report to Hull, it was "logical" to suppose that the Konoye cabinet would fall, military dictatorship would take its place, and war would ensue. His gloomy prediction did not bring Hull and Roosevelt to his way of thinking; the Konoye meeting was turned down. And on Oct. 16, 1941, Konoye gave way to General Tojo, the cropped-headed "warmonger," who became the new prime minister.

In the State Department white paper the maneuver to get Konoye and Roosevelt together is more or less dismissed as a Japanese trick to gain a breathing spell. If the State Department's attitude is based on evidence, then Roosevelt and Hull were not necessarily remiss in failing to meet with Konoye. But if we could have used a meeting with Konoye as a springboard to attain our aim in the Orient peacefully, then the isolationist charge that Roosevelt "trapped" Japan into provoking us to war is a grim one. For if we could have won peacefully in the Orient, then we might have been able to bring about the collapse of Hitler in Europe without the loss of a single American soldier merely by supplying Stalin and Churchill with the tools to finish the job. Whether or not it is honorable to fight with other peoples' lives is quite another question.

In any case, after the collapse of the Konoye cabinet the issue of war with Japan became one of "when" and "under what conditions." General Marshall and Admiral Stark, in charge of Army and Navy respectively, wanted to play for time; they told the President that they were not ready with the physical means to back up any ultimatum or quasi-ultimatum to the Japanese. The Pacific Fleet had already been unbalanced to provide convoy, patrol, and scouting services in the Atlantic, and manufacturing for lend-lease purposes had precluded adequate preparation for the defense of the Philippines, Guam, Wake, and Hawaii. In Hawaii there was insufficient antiaircraft, and the Navy at Pearl Harbor lacked the requisite number of long-range reconnaissance bombers provide a 360° watch.

Knowing this, Roosevelt and Hull still insisted on sending the November 26 note that Japan took for an ultimatum. In Hawaii Admiral Kimmel and General Short were obliquely warned that trouble might be brewing, but the whole emphasis of the despatches was that an attack was to be expected on the East Indies, the Philippines, or Guam. General Short was advised to take precautions, but not to disturb the civilian population; it was desirable, said Marshall, that Japan commit the first overt act. Short informed Washington on two separate occasions that he had ordered Alert No. 1, the alert against sabotage. When Washington failed to ask for Alert No. 3, which would have ordered full readiness, General Short took it as evidence that no danger was to be expected from the sea.

After November 27 Roosevelt and Hull knew that war was likely at any moment. The intercepted Japanese code messages heralded a break in negotiations; Japanese consulates were destroying material; in the Far East the Japanese forces were mobilizing for the seizure of Singapore and the Indies. Two Japanese aircraft carrier units had disappeared from the ken of United States intelligence agents; other Japanese naval vessels were moving south. And on December 6, the final clinching code message from Tokyo to Nomura and Kurusu was intercepted and decoded. The message revealed what Hull, with a dissimulation worthy of a Barrymore, took for a "surprise" that next day when Kurusu and Nomura broke off relations and let the United States know officially that Japan had chosen war.

Just why Kimmel and Short were not told of the Japanese intentions on the evening of December 6 or the morning of December 7, before the hour for dawn (which is bombing time) cannot be gathered from the Army and Navy Pearl Harbor Board reports. By use of the "scrambler" phone Marshall could have reached Short well before the sun was up in Hawaii on the morning of the seventh; instead, he elected to send a code message by the relatively slow-moving commercial radio. The message reached Short as the Japanese bombs were already destroying his closely huddled planes, which had been bunched to keep them away from saboteurs. Marshall's explanation for not using the phone was that he didn't want to risk interception by the Japanese. But the Japanese certainly knew their own plans; their battleship and carrier task force, which had met in rendezvous at Tankan Bay in that twilit northern Japanese waters, had set sail on November 27–28, its radios mute, its airmen nervously going over the briefs for the December 7 attack on the great sitting ducks of the anchored United States Pacific fleet. If the Japanese had intercepted a Marshall phone call, they had only one alternative to carrying through with their attack, and that was the alternative of calling it off.

The ironical details of the local failure at Pearl Harbor have been made known to the United States people in the various reports of the Army and Navy. These details are known even to the point of tedium, and the only effect is to confuse everybody. Admiral Kimmel knew from his intelligence officers that certain Japanese carrier units had blacked out their radios and disappeared into space; he did nothing about it, for he lacked the planes for 360-degree patrol, and the general tenor of his instructions from Washington had emphasized the probability that the Japanese would not attack Pearl Harbor. General Short learned of a mysterious spy message from Hawaii to Japan on the night before the attack; he did nothing about it, because he could not decode it. Two youngsters who were learning to use radar caught an indication that Japanese planes were moving toward Pearl Harbor from a spot to the north of Oahu on the morning of the seventh, but an Army lieutenant who was also in Hawaii for training purposes surmised that the planes must be United States planes from the mainland and advised the kids to forget it. In general, the Hawaiian armed forces were training-mined rather than alert-minded; the failure of Washington to let Kimmel and Short in on certain vital secrets made it inevitable that this should be so. Even the Department of the Interior, headed by the so-called warmonger Ickes, had played its part in lulling Hawaii to sleep; the National Park Service had refused to allow the Army to install radar equipment on Government park land before meeting certain esthetic architectural requirements.

Whether Kimmel and Short should have sensed the danger to Hawaii without premonitory advice from Washington is a fascinating field for conjecture. But actually it has little to do with what Pearl Harbor has to teach the American people. Even the charges and countercharges of isolationists and interventionists, pacifists and warmongers, Republicans and Democrats, fatalists and nonfatalists, have a way of leading us away from the point. It may be important to render justice to Kimmel and Short. It may be important to establish the guilt or the nonguilt of Franklin Roosevelt in inviting the Pearl Harbor disaster. But the real point about Pearl Harbor for the American people to ponder has to do with their own education for life in the world of tomorrow.

When President Truman said the people were to blame for Pearl Harbor, he was palpably stretching it; the people had no idea of the vulnerability of Hawaii. But in one sense the people were to blame; they had never risen up to insist that we bring order out of chaos in the conduct of our foreign affairs and in the relation of our military policy to our foreign policy.

WHAT THE CASES PROVE

In all the various Pearl Harbor cases, whether made by Republicans, isolationists, military strategists, or mere military technicians, one point stands out clearly: There was no integration, no coordination of our foreign policy, our military policy, and our policy of public information. Everyone has commented on our cross-purposes in 1941; some people wanted all-out war, some wanted measures short of war, others wanted peace at any price. Maybe this explains why Congress had no clear philosophy of the national interest. Maybe it is partial justification for the fact that Roosevelt chose to make his own foreign policy in secret conclave with Harry Hopkins, Cordell Hull, and a few favored insiders. But explanation and justification do not necessarily serve to protect the Republic in moments of extremity.

Assuming that Roosevelt was right and that we had to get into the war "all the way," it still remains to be explained just why Chief of Staff Gen. George Marshall and Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Harold R. Stark were not listened to before Secretary of State Cordell Hull delivered the ultimatum to the Japanese on November 26, 1941. They had told Roosevelt they were not ready.

They had confessed their inability to defend the interests of the Republic in the Far East at a time when their antiaircraft guns and reconnaissance planes and submarines and destroyers were being used in the Atlantic, yet almost defiantly, without any real attempt to consult with Marshall or Stark, Roosevelt and Hull elected to toss the dice for war overnight.

The story is at least inferentially told in the excerpts from Secretary of War Stimson's diary, which is quoted in the Army Pearl Harbor Board report. On November 25, 1941, Knox and Stimson met with Hull in his State Department office. Hull showed the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War a proposal for a 3-month truce which he had planned to lay before the Japanese. The proposals, said Stimson, adequately safeguarded our interests, although it appeared to him too drastic for acceptance in Tokyo. Later in the day Hull, Stimson, and Knox met with Marshall, Stark, and President Roosevelt to continue discussion of the problem.

The following day, as noted by Stimson, Hull told him that he had "about made up his mind not to make the proposition that Knox and I passed on * * * to the Japanese, but to kick the whole thing over and tell them that he had no other proposal at all." The so-called ultimatum, in which Hull laid down 10 points for the Japanese to meet, did "kick the whole thing over" that very day. On the morning of the 27th, Stimson called Hull to find out what he had done about the Japanese—"whether he had handed them the new proposal which we passed on 2 or 3 days ago or whether, as he suggested yesterday, he had broken the whole matter off." Hull said, "I have washed my hands of it, and it is now in the hands of you and Knox, the Army and Navy." According to the official reports, Marshall and Stark had seen a draft of the Hull ultimatum at some earlier point, before Marshall had departed for North Carolina to watch Army maneuvers on November 26. Both Marshall and Stark protested against its use. "For God's sake," they have been quoted as saying, "Don't send it. We are not ready."

If the Army and Navy were not consulted on the policy which it was their business to back up, neither were the American people. Ambassador Grew complained that the Japanese people knew more about the progress of negotiations involving the proposed Konoye-Roosevelt peace discussion meeting than did his own compatriots. Although the Constitution vests the power to declare war with Congress, the people's representatives were not consulted as to the advisability of the Hull note of the 26th, which, as Grew noted, "touched the button" of war.

The real lesson of Pearl Harbor is to be found not in the evidence of war guilt or nonguilt, but in the mountain of detail that indicates irresponsibility on the part of our leadership in its failure to offer a clear path through the jungle of diplomatic, military, congressional, and popular cross-purposes. For the future, the meaning is clear: we must have a foreign policy that is clearly proposed to the people for their perusal and majority consent. Congress must have a coordinate hand with the Chief Executive and the Department of State in shaping this policy and applying it in given instances. The foreign policy must be integrated with military policy. The Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations must be consulted on the timing of diplomatic demarchés, ultimata, and what not, since they are inevitably called upon to pick up the pieces. The various arms of the services must themselves be integrated, with adequate liaison between Washington headquarters and the theaters of potential action. If the Commander in Chief is playing a ticklish game in his other capacity of Chief Executive, he must himself see to it that the Chief of Staff is taking adequate precautions in warning men in the field. Finally, the American people, who are the ultimate judges of their own commitments and policies, must at all times be told the truth, at least in terms of broad and clear alternatives. No President should go on the assumption that the people have to be kidded or jockeyed along; just as much as any British Prime Minister, a United States President should be willing to stand or fall on the issue which he himself regards as crucial to the safety of the Nation. Roosevelt might have lost the 1940 election if he had said forthrightly what was in his heart. But in losing he would have established an American Churchillian position, and in the event that war was to become necessary the American people would have responded by forcing it on Willkie, Taft, or whoever happened to be in the White House. The Japanese might have forced the issue without relation to American desires anyway.

The American people were not to blame for the military failure at Pearl Harbor; they had nothing to do with keeping the fleet in a vulnerable port with inadequate seaway for maneuvering. They were not consulted about moving scouting planes and patrol craft from the Pacific to the Atlantic theaters. They were not the ones who failed to keep Kimmel and Short abreast of the situation in Washington and in the Far East. But the American people have much to learn about the necessity for having a correct foreign policy. They have much to learn about the facts of international life in this era of the robot rocket and the atom bomb. They must learn how to correlate the conduct of foreign affairs with constitutional government on the one hand, and with military plans and preparations on the other. They must find a way of making Congress and the President work together in formulating foreign policy, for Congress is called upon to supply the ships and guns and to pass on war if war becomes the issue. And they must find a way of making facts in the possession of the State Department available to themselves, for if they lack information they will not be able to pass correctly on vital questions of policy and preparedness.

The coming investigation of Pearl Harbor will prove much about technical errors, mistakes of judgment in the field and errors in the transmission of information. But it will also prove that the American people were not allowed to pass on high policy, that they were kept in ignorance of the importance of events in the Far East, that Congress was not allowed to pass on the ultimate issue of war and peace, and that military and foreign policy were hopelessly unintegrated at a time when the chips were down. For the sake of democratic procedure, it is to be hoped that the people will discover the necessity for having policy and knowing thing. But for the sake of their continued existence as a nation, they must learn once and for all that military and foreign policies are all of a piece, that one cannot be pursued without reference to the other. If the people do learn this amid all the charges and countercharges of Pearl Harbor, the mud-spattering experience through which we are about to pass will have been worth more to the Republic than anything since the adoption of the Constitution of 1787.

APPENDIX

For shorthand purposes journalists and politicians have used the word "ultimatum" to describe the Hull note of November 26, 1941. Justification for such use of the term must derive from the fact that the Japanese, taking the note as such, ordered their carrier task force to set sail from its Tankan Bay rendezvous in northern Japan on its Pearl Harbor mission on November 27. The fleet was poised, however, before the ultimatum. Presented herewith are both the text of the Japanese offer of November 20, which Hull found unsatisfactory, and the text of the so-called 10 points of the November 26 Hull note that Japan took to be an ultimatum.

THE JAPANESE DEMANDS OF NOVEMBER 20

1. Both the Governments of Japan and the United States undertake not to make any armed advancement into any of the regions in southeastern Asia and the southern Pacific area excepting the part of French Indochina where the Japanese troops are stationed at present.

2. The Japanese Government undertakes to withdraw its troops now stationed in French Indochina upon either the restoration of peace between Japan and China or the establishment of an equitable peace in the Pacific area.

In the meantime the Government of Japan declares that it is prepared to remove its troops now stationed in the southern part of French Indochina to the northern part of the said territory upon the conclusion of the present arrangement which shall later be embodied in the final agreement.

3. The Governments of Japan and the United States shall cooperate with a view to securing the acquisition of those goods and commodities which the two countries need in Netherlands East Indies.

4. The Governments of Japan and the United States mutually undertake to restore their commercial relations to those prevailing prior to the freezing of the assets.

The Government of the United States shall supply Japan a required quantity of oil.

5. The Government of the United States undertakes to refrain from such measures and actions as will be prejudicial to the endeavors for the restoration of general peace between Japan and China.

THE HULL "TEN POINTS" OF NOVEMBER 26

1. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will endeavor to conclude a multilateral nonaggression pact among the British Empire, China, Japan, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Thailand, and the United States.

2. Both Governments will endeavor to conclude among the American, British, Chinese, Japanese, the Netherlands, and Thai Governments an agreement whereunder each of the Governments would pledge itself to respect the territorial integrity of French Indochina and, in the event that there should develop a threat to the territorial integrity of Indochina, to enter into immediate consultation with a view to taking such measures as may be deemed necessary and advisable to meet the threat in question. Such agreement would provide also that each of the Governments party to the agreement would not seek or accept preferential treatment in its trade or economic relations with Indochina and would use its influence to obtain for each of the signatories equality of treatment in trade and commerce with French Indochina.

3. The Government of Japan will withdraw all military, naval, air, and police forces from China and from Indochina.

4. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support—militarily, politically, economically—any government or regime in China other than the national government of the Republic of China, with capital temporarily at Chungking.

5. Both Governments will give up all extraterritorial rights in China, including rights and interests in and with regard to international settlements and concessions, and rights under the Boxer Protocol of 1901.

Both Governments will endeavor to obtain the agreement of the British and other governments to give up extraterritorial rights in China, including rights in international settlements and in concessions and under the Boxer Protocol of 1901.

6. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will enter into

negotiations for the conclusion between the United States and Japan of a trade agreement, based upon reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment and reduction of trade barriers by both countries, including an undertaking by the United States to bind raw silk on the free list.

7. The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will, respectively, remove the freezing restrictions on Japanese funds in the United States and on American funds in Japan.

8. Both Governments will agree upon a plan for the stabilization of the dollar-yen rate; with the allocation of funds adequate for this purpose, half to be supplied by Japan and half by the United States.

9. Both Governments will agree that no agreement which either has concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement, the establishment and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area.

10. Both Governments will use their influence to cause other governments to adhere to and to give practical application to the basic political and economic principles set forth in this agreement.

Appointment of Muriel E. Reynolds and Margery M. Porter as Corporate Officers of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent statement which was made by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey when Miss Muriel E. Reynolds and Mrs. Margery M. Porter were appointed as corporate officers of the company. The appointment of those ladies was a step forward in recognition of women in industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first women to be appointed corporate officers by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) have been named assistant secretaries of the world-wide concern, it was announced today by Eugene Holman, president.

The new executives are Miss Muriel E. Reynolds, 503 Carlton Road, Westfield, N. J., and Mrs. Margery M. Porter, 530 Riverside Drive, New York City. Both started with the company as stenographers, serving in various departments before their selection to be assistants to A. C. Minton, secretary of the parent company of the Jersey group at 30 Rockefeller Plaza.

"The appointment of Miss Reynolds and Mrs. Porter is another indication of the growing importance of women in industry," Mr. Holman said. "As assistant secretaries they will share the responsibilities in the corporate administration of our company.

Miss Reynolds has been with the company for 19 years, starting as a stenographer in the accounting division of the producing department. Later she joined the secretary's department and last year became assistant secretary of several subsidiary companies.

Mrs. Porter started with the company in 1930 as a stenographer of the sales department of an affiliate. In 1933 she moved into the secretary's department of the parent company and since 1944 she has been assigned to the secretary of the executive committee.

Fighting Each Other

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, although apparently the fighting on sea and in foreign lands is over, here at home we fight each other, delay the return of prosperity.

In California, a picket line numbering a thousand by force keeps others from working, blocks a superhighway—all because two AFL unions cannot agree as to which union 77 workers shall pay dues. In New Jersey, bakers not only keep other workers from the bakeries, but by force blockade the highways and prevent bread trucks from other cities bringing in bread for women and children.

In Michigan, the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Corporation workers go on strike, throw thousands of willing workers out of jobs, because the company, at the demand of the Government, discharged three employees who, by force, threw a foreman out of the shop. In Texas, strikers pulled the switches on power plants, and towns and cities were without light, water, and power until the strikers were replaced by veterans.

In Indiana, a picket line formed by automobiles, parked bumper to bumper, prevented employees from entering the plant to produce the gasoline and oil we need, until the Governor broke it up. In the East, striking refinery employees stopped the production of oil until, to protect the Navy and operate the ships which are bringing your sons and husbands home, the President was forced to order the Navy to seize the plants.

A Nation-wide telephone strike is threatened. Many, many other strikes are threatened, among them strikes closing mines producing coal—and 80 soft-coal mines are down today. More than a half million workers are on strike; millions have been, others will be, thrown out of their jobs.

We have heard a great deal about reconversion; about a man's right to a job; about paying $25 a week for 26 weeks to those who are out of jobs. But strikes and millions of idle workers bring prosperity to no one and, if they continue, we will suffer from cold, lack of food, lack of many necessities which we can only get if our economic system operates smoothly and efficiently.

The Wagner law was hailed by labor as its great charter, guaranteeing freedom from employer oppression. The truth is it settled nothing, because it was unfair, lop-sided. There have been more strikes since it was enacted in 1935 than before.

THE REMEDY

It is easy to complain, to point the danger. Have I a remedy? Not a complete one, but suggestions which will help.

Amend the Wagner law so as to provide:

(a) That an employee shall be free to join or not to join a union.

(b) That he shall be free from coercion from any source—from union boss and from union, as well as from employer.

(c) Keep collective bargaining. Protect the right to work when and where a man can find a job, without interference from anyone.

(d) Continue the right to strike, but protect the man who has a job, who wants to work, from the violence of a massed picket line.

Enforce the laws which prohibit violence.

Americans, with very few exceptions, want to work, because they wish to provide for themselves and their families. It is only the Communists and those who follow the Communist line, those who believe in violence, in mob rule and in rioting, who use force to prevent their fellow citizens following their chosen lawful way.

It seems absurd to talk about world peace when, here at home, under the best form of government ever devised by man; in a land where there has been and is available for each of us more of the things which tend toward happiness and well-being, we fight among ourselves; refuse to peacefully, in the method provided by law, settle our differences of opinion; but, yielding to the urgings of those who would overthrow this Government by force, continue to battle each other.

If the Wagner law is amended to protect the union man from the racketeering of union bosses, as well as from oppressive practices by the employers, and if we can have law enforcement, nine-tenths of the trouble growing out of strikes will disappear.

Prophecy by Gen. George S. Patton Concerning Inevitability of Another War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 2), 1945

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me regarding General Patton's prophecy concerning the inevitability of another war.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General Patton is one of our truly great military leaders. What I am about to say is intended in nowise to derogate from his military genius nor to diminish the great sense of gratitude that I and all other Americans

bear toward him for his military performance in this war.

However, his very eminence makes most unfortunate and regrettable the statement attributed to him in today's press that another war is inevitable. This is the prophecy of doom. It is nihilism in its most tragic form.

I disagree sharply, therefore, with the General's statement, and I express keen regret that any such sentiment could be voiced by any American. Such a striking statement is fraught with the most terrible danger that it is possible to imagine. Unless vigorously challenged and overwhelmingly stifled at its inception, it is the kind of thing that could gather momentum and give an orientation to the thinking of our people that would be nothing short of disastrous to civilization itself.

Let us rather, therefore, burn into our hearts and souls the "will to peace." Therein lies our only hope of peace. Let us accept the theory that another war is inevitable and we are doomed.

Take-Home Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic of September 27.

The editorial concerns itself with some of the factors involved in the current discord between labor and industry.

The heart of the present labor unrest is wages. Management traditionally considers wages from the view of percentages of production cost—from the view of margins of profit. Working men, who are "labor," think of wages in terms of shelter, food, clothing, education for their children, and medical care for their families.

The decisions reached in the struggles now spreading over the country will have the effect of setting this country upon its way to a bountiful and prosperous period, or of starting us down the road of depression, want, and human misery.

I believe this editorial on take-home wages points the way to sound decisions:

TAKE-HOME WAGES

Since the root cause of many, if not most, of the strikes that are interfering with industry's switch from war to peace production is the determination of the workers that their actual wages shall not be reduced, it is important that the issue be understood and the soundness of the workers' position, from the standpoint of the general welfare, be recognized. During the war we have had an over-all picture of prosperity (although there were numerous and serious exceptions): plants have been working to full capacity, due to Government orders; total wages paid have been high—the highest in the Nation's history; prices of goods that enter into the cost of living have been kept, to a considerable degree, under control; as a result of all this, the purchasing power of the people has been high enough to enable them to buy and pay for their needs, and thus there has been a ready market for all the consumer goods that could be produced, so that the cycle of manufacture, pay of the workers and consumption, has been kept moving. It is a shameful fact that it took a war, with all its suffering and destruction, to bring this about, but it will be a more shameful fact if the lesson thus learned is ignored and the condition thus established is allowed to lapse.

For the key to a balanced economy is that the wages the workers take home must be sufficient to enable them to buy the goods they produce; when improvements in methods, the installation of machinery, or scientific discoveries, bring about increased production, then prices must be reduced or wages must be increased; otherwise, the extra production becomes a drug on the market, manufacture must be halted, unemployment follows, and a depression is inevitable. And the end of the war means that purchasing power will fall, unless wage rates are increased, for the overtime that was necessary heretofore is being discontinued and "take-home" wages are sharply reduced—some estimates say as much as 30 percent. Manufacturers have no intention of reducing the prices of their goods—there are shortages in most lines and the demand, for the time being, will probably encourage them to raise prices. But every day that wartime prices, or higher prices, are exacted, while "take-home" wages are reduced, means that reserve purchasing power is being drained away, the economic cycle is not being kept in balance, and the inevitable collapse is being brought nearer. Only stupidity, or selfishness, or both, will postpone the restoration of "take-home" wages to the level that will assure a just, and therefore prosperous, industrial system.

Railroads Big Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted by the International Association of Retired Railroad Employees, John Fritz Chapter, East St. Louis, Ill.:

Whereas the railroads have been the means by which the United States from a small beginning has become the leading nation of the world and the railroads are continually seeking to improve the service without financial aid from either the Government, State, county, or municipality. We note with alarm the bill now before Congress that will allow $75,000,000 each year, for a period of 5 years, to construct runways for airplanes. The number of these to be 350 and those financially interested in airplanes are not to contribute a dollar—50 percent to be paid by the Government—from the said $75,000,000—the State to contribute 25 percent—and county or municipality 25 percent. Railroads are dependable. Regardless of the kind of weather or how strong the wind may blow, trains run, but airplanes do not fly.

Railroads give employment to untold thousands, airplanes but to few. The railroads have tracks to maintain, build depots at the various stations along the line, pay taxes in every county traversed. This expense the airplane contingent does not have.

As an illustration showing discrimination against railroads, the Relay Depot in East St. Louis constructed a building in 1874 which is out of date and the public is clamoring for a new union depot which is to cost approximately $600,000. Is the Government to meet this expense in whole or in part? No! Is the State? No! Is the county or municipality? No! All of this expense is to be borne by the railroads. Is it to be tax exempt as are the airplane runways? No! We believe the airplane promoters should meet all the expense for the construction of runways.

Press dispatches tell us that a Senator from Mississippi would have the railroads erect a new building in Washington to cost $250,000,000, all because the railroads have asked Congress to release them from having to transport Government war material gratis or at half cost. He says the railroads should do this because of land grants given 50 or 100 years ago. Any favor thus shown the railroads has been paid for long since. The Iron Horse has done a wonderful job for nigh a century and will continue to do so in the future if not unjustly discriminated against. We believe the railroads to be entitled to a square deal, that is why we are appealing to Congress.

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon our records and the secretary send a copy to President Harry S. Truman, Senator Scott W. Lucas, Senator C. Wayland Brooks, Congressman Melvin Price, all of Washington, D. C.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK C. SMITH.

The above-named resolution was presented, read, and on motion adopted by a unanimous vote. This was the 28th day of September 1945.

C. A. DUNCAN,
President.
V. C. POWELL,
Vice-President.
ERNEST COOMBS,
Chairman, Board of Directors.
H. W. BRINKHORST,
Chaplain.
E. C. JENKINS,
Secretary.

People With Wide Influence Must Be Careful What They Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter written me by my friend, Mr. W. C. Ross, an able businessman of Knoxville, Tenn.

Mr. Ross, in his letter to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, accords to her and to all others the same freedom of opinion and speech he claims for himself. In this American spirit, he is not without distinguished company, and in his support of his sound views he is supported by the proverb of Solomon: "Where no counsel is, the people fall; but in the multitude of counselors, there is safety." This we have from Thomas Jefferson, "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." And on freedom of speech, Voltaire thus took his stand, "I do not agree with a word that you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Let us have light and the people will find a safe and sane course. This country is at the crossroads. Mr. Ross' ap-

peal to preserve inviolate for our children the heritage that is ours should not fall on deaf ears.

The letter follows:

[From the Knoxville Journal of October 7, 1945]

PEOPLE WITH WIDE INFLUENCE MUST BE CAREFUL WHAT THEY SAY, ELEANOR TOLD

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT,
Hyde Park, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. ROOSEVELT: You are a woman much beloved by a large part of the American people. You have a great influence on public opinion. I believe you are sincerely interested in the good of all men. I am, too. I know you can do us a wonderful service by searching out and telling us the facts as to where our good really lies. With that in mind, I would like to point out some of these facts as I see them. I assure you I am doing so with the best intention in the world.

Dr. L. D. Weatherhead, a London divine, recently published In Quest of a Kingdom. As long as he wrote of what he knew, he did a wonderful job, but when he strayed into the field of economics it was quite evident he know not whereof he spoke. He indicates that the unbrotherly distribution of food is due to human selfishness holding up the resources God offers all his children to make money for the few, and further that the great resources of the world, such as coal, land, and oil, are held by no more than 5 percent of the population and that means 95 percent of the people cannot enter into the fullness of life which God means them to enjoy because the motive of the 5 percent is selfishness. That is mere rabble rousing. He should ask himself who burns the coal, who uses the oil, and who eats the food? Naturally, he would find it is the many—not the few. Should he think a little further, he would find these facts. All the people could never enjoy them unless men with the ability, the capital, and the know-how developed them for the use of us all.

This type of men are the ones who produce more than they consume, save the difference and invest it in tools to be loaned to the many, with proper instruction in their use, in order to still further increase production for everyone. They are the ones to whom God gave the 10 talents. Do they not, in open competition, continually strive for better methods of increasing quantity output, always at lower and lower prices, in order to get larger volume through wider distribution? With increased volume, the profit per unit declines. The chief thing that maintains or increases prices is the labor cost.

The facts are it takes all our most capable men, backed by the capital (that which has been created and not consumed) accumulated by many thrifty citizens, to properly develop our natural resources, our manufacturing, distribution, transportation, communication system, etc., in order that we may all enjoy them to the fullest, as God intended. The owners are always seeking the cheapest methods in order to undersell their competitors and increase their volume. Thus we all benefit by lower prices and more goods. The higher the profits the people will pay, the more capital to invest in new developments and the more jobs. Whether the motive is selfish or altruistic, the results are the same. So what difference does it make from the material standpoint? The men who have large incomes do not eat any more, live in much better houses, or consume much more of the production of the good things of life than they would if their incomes were much less. Their chief idea is to risk their excess incomes in expanding industry in hope of producing still more things the public will buy. What most people want is more things at less cost. The so-called selfish are giving us just that. Why not tell us that we should thank God for our wise and thrifty men and for all they have done and can do for us, rather than denounce them as selfish devils who are a menace to us all?

Our organization of production, of distribution, and of rendering services is what it is, not because it was planned so by any one man, but is the result of natural evolution. It is subject to change, and is changing all the time. If not interfered with, it will surely take the form best suited to serve the community as the community changes and develops. We have always allowed the millions of minds, all so different, to plan what each individual thought was for his own good. This principle has produced marvelous results for us all and not alone for the ablest, because, under our system, they cannot, in general, benefit themselves without benefiting us, even if they try. Certainly the recent war has demonstrated the fact that we are the greatest producing Nation this world has ever seen. This was made possible by our time-tested principles of free enterprise, individual initiative, and unhampered incentive. It is a fact, in our kind of economy, no man can earn a dollar unless he renders a service to some members of society for which they are willing to pay. (Even bootleggers render a service for which a good many people seem willing to pay.) Therefore, it naturally follows that the men who render the greatest material service to the greatest number have the greatest earnings. Why not tell us that?

Sound economists believe increased production is the thing that increases purchasing power. If a man produces nothing or renders no service, he has nothing to exchange for what others produce. He, therefore, has no purchasing power. The more he produces or the more services he renders, the more he has to exchange and the greater his purchasing power. If a farmer produces only one chicken, he can exchange it for only one shirt. If he produces two, he can have two shirts. The number of dollars he receives for his chickens has very little to do with it. If the cost of producing chickens is up, so will be the cost of shirts. Why not tell us that?

Of course, economists realize the quantity of money available for use plus the rapidity of its turn-over makes for high or low prices and cash (not real) wages. It seems to be unchangeable human nature for most of us to have periods of elation and depression. The whole country apparently follows this pattern. That gives us cycles with optimism running rampant, then changing to pessimism. When things are going strong there is always a large supply of Federal Reserve money outstanding, and the enthusiasm of the people make them spend freely. That makes for higher prices and wages. But when optimism has run its course, fear grips the people, they stop spending, reduce the money supply by paying off debts or locking their cash in safety boxes where it is as useless as if it didn't exist. Down we come. Then, Lopsy-Daisy, up we go again, unless fear is perpetuated by unwise regulations.

Again, fear has a tremendous influence on those men who have the natural ability, the energy and the thrift to accumulate money in quantity. They will not invest in new enterprises that create new jobs when they are afraid Government rules and regulations will make it impossible to make a profit. Nor will they seek investments where they fear any possible profit they could make will be reduced by labor-union demands and by excessive taxes, to a point where the risk is not justified. There is never any other production of what people want when they are not afraid. Note the Florida boom in the twenties and the stock-market crash in 1929 for examples of optimism turning to fear. Your husband called attention to the effect of fear in his first inaugural address in no uncertain terms. Why not tell us all that?

Of course, all right-thinking people want labor to have everything it is justly entitled to, but is it not evident that labor often selfishly and probably ignorantly demands more than it should for its own good? The same is true of the tax gatherer. Mr. Justice Holmes, a great liberal, said, "Labor leaders seem to think that the universal standard of living could be raised if only they could lay hold of the sums withdrawn by capital, as if those sums do not now support labor. I think the crowd now has substantially all there is; that the luxuries of the few are a drop in the bucket and unless you make war on moderate comfort there is no general economic question." Why not tell labor that it gets most of production now, and if it wants more, the only fair and lasting way to get it is to produce more; that the way to do that is to cooperate with, not fight and hate, our ablest men who have the know-how, and with our thrifty folks who are saving the capital from its small share of production, then use the tools provided by them, working the maximum number of hours real efficiency permits. Tell labor that anything else will not get them what they want and will eventually be to labor's disadvantage, destroy their real wage, and lead to inflation with the resulting destruction of all values.

The principles we have long followed, which we call the American way, have without doubt brought our people the highest standard of living on earth. There is no earthly reason to believe that, if they are continued, the prospects for the future are not limitless. Methods will change by natural evolution, but the principles must remain the same if we are to progress. Millions of individuals, each working for himself, is far better than having some bureaucrat, with his limited knowledge and experience, tell all of us how we must run our affairs. That's not the American way. Why not tell us that?

When I see you, Dr. Weatherhead, and many others expressing ideas on purely economic matters, I cannot help but wonder whether you have ever studied economics or have thought through to a logical and common sense conclusion the things you discuss.

Karl Marx said, "As capital increases the lot of the worker gets harder." Is it not perfectly apparent that the facts are just the opposite? Not many years ago our pioneer workers toiled from daylight to dark for the bare necessities of life, and they got all the products of their labor. Today the worker has 100 times as much, with much less effort in time and strength. In fact, he has many things the richest man on earth could not have then had because they did not exist. Yet Marx' untrue statements have caused more misunderstanding, bickering, hate, and harm to progress than most anything I know of. That is the reason I so regret people with wide influence making statements about things of which they know so little. We should never be led to believe that those who have done and can do so much for us are our worst enemies.

If the things I have mentioned above be facts, as I sincerely believe them to be, is it not for the good of all of us that we be told about them?

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

WM. C. ROSS.

Lt. John Carlton Sjogren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the eyes of the Nation will be focused on Rockford, Mich., a city in my district,

and the home of one of the heroes of World War II, along with several other cities honored by having brought forth sons who distinguished themselves in defense of their country.

On the 14th of September his native city turned out to honor Lt. John Carlton Sjogren. The governor of our great State had proclaimed Sjogren Day and the whole community fitly turned out to honor him.

Tomorrow he will receive from the President of the United States the Congressional Medal of Honor for his outstanding services when, in one of the engagements on Negros Island in the Philippines, he single-handed killed 43 Japs, and captured 9 pillboxes in a 5-hour battle.

Such courage and gallantry in the face of heavy odds, and beyond the call of duty, is worthy of the highest honor our Nation can bestow. The history of our great country, beginning with the early pioneer days up to the close of this past war, is replete with accounts of heroic deeds beyond the power of comprehension. The great deeds which Lieutenant Sjogren has contributed to the winning of this war have indeed won for him a place amongst the great war heroes of our Nation, a small token of which is the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Inflation in Home Building Must Be Prevented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram from a large home-building firm in the Southwest, which is located at Dallas, approving my stand in favor of preventing inflation in home prices.

The telegram manifests such a fine public-spirited attitude, I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *October 8, 1945.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As one of the largest home-building firms in Dallas, we are heartily in favor of your fight to maintain price ceilings on new homes. Such ceilings are absolutely necessary to protect returning veterans and the general public, and for the best interest of the building industry. With price controls in general favor on new cars, radios, and other scarce goods, why should the public be placed at the mercy of the home-building industry? Rigid and strictly enforced price ceilings on all building materials and on the completed house and lot are imperative to prevent chaotic inflation and a repetition of a disastrous building boom of the twentieth period. The claims that the building industry will police its members to keep prices in line, and that competition among builders will hold prices down, is sheer nonsense. The city of Dallas needs 10,000 new homes. Until at least six or seven thousand have been built, it will be strictly a sellers' market, with the only competition being that of bidding of builders for labor and materials, causing a continued upward spiral in prices, all of which to be passed on to the public. The argument that ceilings and controls will prevent construction of new homes can be quickly exploded by examining the record of the title VI housing program, in which private builders constructed record number of housing units under most rigid controls. With adequate materials and labor and an unprecedented demand, the houses will be built. The only question is whether they will be sold at reasonable prices with fair profit or at inflationary and profiteering prices. Price ceilings on the completed house should be determined by the FHA, using OPA prices of materials. FHA already has adequate machinery for determining fair ceiling prices. We plan to start 50 houses in next few weeks, and to build 300 next year, and we will welcome the placing of ceiling prices thereon. We believe that this opinion is shared by many builders interested in a fair profit but not in profiteering. Letter with additional suggestions follows, air mail. If you will secure air-line priority and make hotel reservations, one of us will come to Washington at our expense to testify in this matter if it will help your fight. We are members of National Home Builders Association.

LEWIS & LAMBERTH.
H. D. LEWIS.
E. P. LAMBERTH.

I also received a letter from a constituent in which he made the following statement concerning my proposal to keep down the prices of homes to a reasonable level:

Unless this is done the rich man, by whom I mean any man with an income of over $10,000, will be able to build fine homes and provide kennels for their dogs and barns for their horses, and fancy chicken coops and pigeon houses, and private swimming pools, before the returned veteran and little man can provide a house for his wife and baby to live in.

I hate to see any more regulations, but as long as we have as many as we already do, I think one that would accomplish as much good as your idea, should be added.

I have received unfavorable communications, most of them by wire, from hundreds of people in Texas, and especially the district I have the honor to represent. I have the feeling that most of the telegrams were inspired and most of the people who sent them have not given consideration to all the facts. Otherwise they would not be critical of my action in this matter.

Bethlehem-Fairfield's Great Building Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of September 21, 1945, on the amazing record as to production and administration of the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyard located in South Baltimore, Md. This shipyard received the highest award of the United States Maritime Commission for its efficient and speedy production of a total of 5,187,800 tons, which is one-tenth of the total American merchant-marine tonnage built during the emergency period.

The editorial follows:

BETHLEHEM-FAIRFIELD'S GREAT BUILDING RECORD

The Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyard, whose war work was brought to a close on Wednesday when four Victory ships slid down the ways, has the distinction of having built more ships during the emergency building program than any other shipyard in the world. That ought to correct any possible impression made by the ballyhoo over the shipyards on the west coast that they and they alone did the job.

Bethlehem-Fairfield has won half a dozen pennants, including the Gold Wreath Pennant, highest award of the United States Maritime Commission. And, in addition to the distinction mentioned above, there were other impressive reasons why those awards were merited.

Bethlehem-Fairfield started virtually from scratch. There were only four ways on the site when the program began. In short order they were increased to 16. Bethlehem-Fairfield converted shipbuilding into an assembly-line process. No sooner was a ship launched than workmen stepped forward to lay the keel for another. Building time for a Liberty ship was cut from 150 days to 19.

Bethlehem-Fairfield in its four busy years built and launched a total of 508 ships, of which 384 were Libertys, 94 Victorys, and 30 landing craft. It delivered 100 Libertys in the time allotted for 50. The 508 ships totaled 5,187,800 tons, or 10 percent of the deadweight tonnage of the American merchant marine built in the emergency period.

At its peak Bethlehem-Fairfield employed 46,700 persons, so that the industrial community was a city in itself. How well it built is proved by the fact that not one of its ships ever broke in half when it went to sea, a circumstance not unknown to ships from some other yards.

Bethlehem-Fairfield's record is an outstanding example of administration and production, and one which places the local shipyard high on the list of those that made the Nation's monster shipbuilding program one of the great wonders of the war. Congratulations are due to all hands, from President Willis down, who had a part in that achievement.

Army Discharges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to explain the alarming conditions described in the letter appended. If the Army cannot discharge men as fast as planned, then it ought to say so, frankly. Nothing could be more devastating to morale and to general respect for our military leaders than to have men on the ground know that announced figures do not correspond with the facts. I appreciate fully the magnitude of the Army's task and have tried to explain

it to my constituents, but let us have no misrepresentation.

ARMY AIR FIELD,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak., September 28, 1945.

Dr. WALTER JUDD,
Congress of the United States,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: * * *. We have a great number of men who were eligible for separation 3 or 4 months ago but still are not separated because no one takes the interest in getting them processed out. Meanwhile we sit and read or write letters because of the lack of work.

The talk here now is of mass desertion which no doubt will occur if the discharges do not soon reach the figures stated in the papers. Publicity says this base is to discharge 300 men a day and that it is on schedule, when, however, the truth is that we separated less than 300 in all of last week, and currently reach a figure of 50–60 per day. We have 10,000 permanent party men here who are helping separate the 8,000 transients. On the present schedule, which has been operating for several weeks, it will take 3 years to separate the men on this base. By Christmas, unless the rate is speeded up, we look for mass desertions of men who are eligible but have not been considered. Many enlisted men and officers are talking and planning to be gone for Christmas with or without leave. A great many officers are preparing letters to resign their commissions, the chief reason being that there is so much confusion and so little work to do. Also many men who had been considering Regular Army life have changed their minds and want nothing to do with it. This includes men who were Regular Army before the war began and who had planned a career of the Army.

Yours truly,

_____,
Captain, Medical Corps, A. U. S.

Speech of Gen. Brehon Somervell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, commanding general of the Army Service Forces, on the occasion of the testimonial dinner at the Emerson Hotel, Baltimore, Md., on September 18, in honor of Mr. Howard Bruce who recently received from President Truman the Army's Distinguished Service Medal for his major role as director of matériel in keeping supply lines open to the battle fronts.

The speech follows:

Governor O'Conor, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be with you tonight. You people of Maryland can take the greatest pride in your accomplishments and in the contribution which you have made to the war. Your factories, your arsenals, your shipyards, your proving grounds, your training camps, and many other Army and Navy installations played a vital part in the winning of the war. Most of all, you can take pride in the hundreds of thousands of stalwart Marylanders, who in the Army and Navy, helped to raise our flag over Berlin and Tokyo.

The United States entered World War II somewhat better prepared than we were in the first world conflict. Nevertheless, the beginnings were woefully small and pitifully inadequate. We needed men, matériel, camps, and training areas. We needed uniform and shoes, tents and trucks, guns and more guns, amunition—everything. Well, not quite everything. We had the will to win. We had the American capacity to organize. We had the best industrial skill in the world. We had unity. We had the American knack of turning our dreams into reality, of converting ideas and aspirations into steel, into cannon, into trucks. We had the men and women in all walks of life, who when handed the job, did that job up to the hilt.

The United States Army was too small and ill-equipped to wage war on a world-wide scale. The enemy was ready. His conquests in Europe had already proved his strength. The rapid surge across the East Indies was to demonstrate Japanese preparedness. The Nazi and the Jap were powerful, arrogant and determined to crush us at once. In order to combat their aggression, we not only had to perfect an organization that would work and to supply the tools of battle to that organization, but we had to fight a war while we organized and equipped our armies.

The Army Service Forces had a job of work to do. Nothing could stand in the way of its swift accomplishment. The problems were manifold. There was the task of digging out enough raw materials to make all that had to be made and the additional task of convincing a persistent minority that the military must be served first at whatever inconvenience to others. There was the business of land on which to build camps, posts, airfields, and bombing ranges. There was the actual construction which had to be accomplished swiftly in spite of shortages of labor and materials; military production had to be expanded; ports had to be made ready; millions of men had to be trained to countless jobs.

In those early months only one thing counted. That thing was speed. Speed in getting into military production; speed in headquarters itself; speed on the drawing boards of the planners; speed in the shops and mines, in the forests, and on the railroads and waterways; speed in the ports and the new depots and camps; speed in making decisions and in carrying them out. New plans had to be drawn for new weapons to meet new conditions of war. New tools had to be designed and hammered out to make these new weapons. New buildings had to be constructed to house the new tools. New workers had to be trained to use them. New materials had to be found in abundance to replace traditional materials which were scarce.

The Army Service Forces faced the problem of managing these diverse and far-flung operations. It had to set up the structure within which they could be made to work. It had to find the men best fitted to accomplish its hundreds of thousands of highly specialized tasks. It had to integrate and coordinate their labors. It had to apply some checks and balances. It had to institute new management methods, improve old ones. It had to design and build the machinery of the largest and most complicated business in history. It had to find exactly the right personnel to operate that business smoothly at all levels, had to get immediate results. It was evident then, even to the laymen, that the task ahead was well-nigh impossible. Time, that most precious and most expensive element, would be the major factor in the program.

To bolster our own determination and to fortify the weaker spirits, ASF adopted a brash and boastful slogan—"The impossible we do at once; the miraculous takes a little longer." We had to find the leaders for this organization, men who believed in our slogan and moreover, men who could make it a reality. We are meeting tonight to do honor to one of these miracle men.

The impossible was done immediately. Production mounted steadily. Weapons poured out of new munitions plants. Scientists found means of using new raw materials to take the place of scarce ones. Engineers found new means of producing more of everything faster. Mechanics and farmers, housewives and preachers and school children stood along the assembly lines of the Nation turning out the tools of battle.

Around the clock, day and night, week after week, month after month, industrial America labored from Maryland to California to keep up with the endless, growing demand. Men were talking no longer of defense. These were not weapons of self-protection we were making. They were weapons of victory. We were shipping men and materials overseas in the longest supply lines in history and getting them where they were needed on time.

For two hard years the Army Service Forces had been performing the impossible. The American people had produced and the Army Service Forces had delivered weapons and supplies we had only wished for on December 7, 1941. Landing a million men and a hundred thousand vehicles through the surf of the Normandy beaches in 109 days stirred barely a ripple of comment at home. It was expected and accepted. Yet this landing and many others would have been impossible without the hundreds of amphibious vehicles and other devices which a few months earlier had been regarded more as a Jules Verne concept than a possibility.

We had not fallen short of the second half of our pledge. We had performed our miracles but not all miracles to talk about. In secrecy, scattered about the continent, ASF officers and the leading scientists of the world were experimenting, planning and building and preparing. Some results were appearing.

The Signal Corps, working on British beginnings, had made radar a weapon of war from a scientific curiosity. It performed daily miracles behind the screen of censorship. Our planes were equipped with this device in rapidly increasing numbers and its application both on land and sea for offense and defense gave deadliness to our attack and certainly to our defenses. Thanks to the magic eye of radar, able to penetrate night and fog, we had miracle number one. But it was a secret and no one dared talk about it.

Army doctors were performing their miracles. Penicillin already had proved itself and the ASF and industry had commandeered enough labor and machinery and raw materials to turn out the new life-saving drug in ever-growing quantity. Our doctors proved its use and application. Meanwhile in Italy they were halting plagues with another drug called DDT, a magic powder which destroyed vermin and insects, with little danger to man. Operating in tents behind the battlefield and in the hospitals, they daily did their miracles in surgery and medicine.

Other miracles came to pass in this year, miracles of the Ordnance Department. Long a dream of artillerymen was a shell which would burst of itself when at the best distance from the target, burst without man-made errors in estimating distances and altitudes in fuze setting. Such self-operating shells came into being and were hurled with deadly effect against the enemy. Another Ordnance miracle was a recoilless cannon of unbelievably light weight and precision, completed and rushed into battle in time to assist in the destruction of the enemy's forces. Until seen, these weapons could not be accepted by soldiers accustomed to the age-old heavy cannon with the elaborate mechanisms.

Other miracles appeared. The mobile 36-inch mortar, the greatest gun of all time, which fires a shell weighing nearly two tons; infrared light apparatus for fighting in the

dark; the Army communications network, linking together all the principal cities of the world, all the continents and all our secret outposts; landing mats which in reality are prefabricated airfields—all these and many others followed.

Early in the war the ASF had set up its most secret of secret weapons. It was dubbed, disarmingly the Manhattan Engineer District. With $2,000,000,000, 125,000 workers, and with all the resources of American science, British aid, our university and industrial laboratories, the Army engineers began the production of the atomic bomb. You all know the result. The war ended in a flash of atomic energy.

The miracle that produced all the other miracles was something even more American than any one of them. It was the organization and vitalizing of this vast machine. It was the job of marshalling into one cohesive group the knowledge, power, and determination which made it possible to mobilize and direct almost limitless capacity of this Nation to serve the needs of the combat elements of the Army. It was the creation of a will and power that brooked no interference and was undaunted by any obstacle, to create and supply the weapons of victory, to furnish the necessary services for those who swept our enemies from the fields.

Mr. Bruce was one of the great architects in the design of that machine. He didn't enter the military service—he just exposed himself to it. Before he knew what had happened to him, we had him in the fold. We didn't quite get him in all the way. We tried to persuade him to put on a uniform. We didn't succeed in that. Mr. Bruce smiled benignly and always managed to keep one civilian foot on the free soil of the free State of Maryland. He said he wanted to preserve the inalienable right to tell anyone to go to hell whenever he felt like it. You know him. You know, when he really had something on his mind, how he made a speech here in Baltimore when his teeth were actually wired together. You know how dear the right to say what he pleases must be to a man like that.

His job assignments have been legion. Originally we gave him the task of cracking some of the hard nuts, some of the especially difficult things which were of major importance, and which were slowing our progress. After starting a successful program for the conservation of critical and short materials, he was appointed chief of the Production Service Branch. During the months that followed his responsibility increased as in a series of changes he served as Deputy Director of the Production Division, Director of Production Scheduling, Director of Procurement, Deputy Director of Matériel, and, finally, Director of Matériel. In addition to these full-time jobs, he took over the task of reorganizing the entire system of procurement for the Transportation Corps. He acted as chairman on a committee for postwar planning and demobilization and as co-chairman of the Army-Navy Electronics Production Agency. He was the War Department representative on the War Manpower Commission and a member of the powerful production executive committee of the WPB, which actually steered the production of the Nation. Always he moved from one tight spot to another, always to more and more responsibility, and always he left behind him a well-organized job, a well-organized group of capable officers—officers he had hand picked to carry on after he was summoned to another field.

It was more than a comfort to have Howard Bruce at hand. I soon found myself, when problems were tough and going hard, calling on him to go to work on them. I knew if anyone could handle them he could, and he never let us down. During all this while he was a constant inspiration to the others in the organization. His ability to take on heavier and heavier jobs, one after another in quick succession, and to turn in the same orderly successful performance every time, pushed our programs forward at the desired pace. He moved fast, but he was never flustered and he never lost his sense of humor.

It was a great relief in some of the times of greatest stress when we were loaded with difficult problems, to have our honored guest of this evening, walk into the room, his face lighted, eyes twinkling, his spirit at ease. I will admit there were times when he became so engrossed that he let his pipe go out, but he never stopped pushing.

Every man who fired a shell or a cartridge on the front, every man who had enough to eat, enough to wear, who had shelter between battles, owes Howard Bruce for a part of this. I want to express my own personal gratitude to your distinguished guest for a job superbly done. I want to thank him not only for getting what was needed to the men who needed it but for preparing against the end of the war so that the business of halting procurement could be an orderly process.

So much for the job Howard Bruce has done for the Army. So much for the man on whom we all depended and who never once let us down.

I would like to add that I have come to know Howard Bruce intimately not only as an executive but as a man, and I esteem it a great honor to call him my friend. Though I treasure our official relationship most highly, I hope that the warm bond of friendship which we have established will last through the rest of my days. I want to congratulate you, the people of Maryland, on your good fortune to have him with you again. I know what he means to you and I know that his presence among you will be a source of strength and inspiration. I know that you love him as we do in the Army and that you are glad to have him back with you.

Continuation of Federal Funds for Child-Care Centers a Necessity To Give States Time To Enact State Legislation To Protect These Children—President Truman Is To Be Commended for Sensible, Sound Letter to the House and Senate of October 4, 1945, Asking $7,000,000, Already Appropriated, but Unexpended, Be Used

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States wrote you a letter, October 4, 1945, on this vital subject of child-care centers. The Clerk of this great House on yesterday read it to the Members of this House, and it was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It called our attention to the fact that on September 5, 1945, he had proposed rescission of several war-related appropriations, including community facilities. The President then asked rescission of $19,115,000 unexpended balances therein. In his letter on October 4, he recommended that his request for rescission of the amount of over $19,000,000 be reduced to $12,115,000. In other words, he recommended the continuance of the expenditure of the $7,000,000, already in hand and already appropriated—to the end that these needed child-care centers until March 1, 1946, be operated in the respective States.

Recently Representatives from several States appeared before the Appropriations Committee on this very subject. This was before the President's letter came to you, Mr. Speaker, and also before the same letter went to the President pro tempore of the Senate. We urged that the continued operation of these needed child-care centers in the respective States was a continuing Federal obligation, at least until the States had been granted further and reasonable time to enact their own State legislation for these 70,000 kiddies. We argued that these children were the victims of this war—and that these children must not be penalized. We argued that it was at least as essential to protect the children in a period of reconversion as it was to protect reconverted machinery from war purposes to those of peace.

It is to be sincerely hoped that the Appropriations Committee will coincide with the President's request. After all, he took the original responsibility on September 5 of asking the rescission of over $19,000,000. Now he is also far-seeing enough, human enough, and sensible enough to squarely meet the issue of the need as it is, and ask that this amount be reduced by $7,000,000. I fail to see how the Appropriations Committee can do less than follow our great President in the interests of conserving the character of these 70,000 children of our Nation.

To comply with the President's request will make unnecessary the further consideration of the Doyle bill, H. R. 4202, on the same subject, which asked $5,000,000 for the same purpose; and by complying with the President's request the Appropriations Committee in this House will be doing a bit of prompt, sensible, sound action. It is bound to save big budgets in tax dollars later.

I herewith set forth a valued communication to me of October 4, 1945, from the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles. This should be valuable for down-to-date, concrete factual data, and also sets forth an interesting and constructive statement of principles. The thought of this communication is reflective of the thinking and needs of these children and their parents:

WELFARE COUNCIL OF
METROPOLITAN LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., October 4, 1945.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This will confirm telegram sent you on October 2, reading as follows:

"Emergency child-care committee in meeting held October 1 approved report made by Research Department of Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles on present status of mothers using child-care centers. Ninety-eight percent of mothers using nursery centers returned cards and about 85 percent of mothers using extended day-care centers. Twenty percent of mothers are sole support of families; 78 percent partial support. Over 50 percent of this group have husbands still in service. Copy preliminary report on

survey and copy of statement of principles adopted by committee being sent you. Urge appropriations committee authorize continued use of Lanham Act funds already appropriated for child-care centers, at least for period long enough for State legislature in special session to take necessary action."

In accordance with our telegram, we are enclosing copy of preliminary report on survey which was made during the week September 10–15, and copy of statement of principles adopted by the emergency child-care committee at its meeting on October 1, 1945.

Yours very sincerely,

H. F. WHITE,
Chairman, Emergency Child-Care Committee.

SOME ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ABOUT CHILD-CARE CENTERS IN LOS ANGELES

(This is a part of a more complete report on child-care program facts which will soon be released)

Question. How complete was the coverage on the recent child-care survey?

Answer. The recent child-care survey included all nurseries and extended day-care centers in Los Angeles County. Returns for the nursery centers were nearly 98 percent of September attendance. The extended day care returns represent about 85 percent of September attendance. (Over 7,600 questionnaires were tallied.)

Question. Is there still a wartime need for child-care centers?

Answer. Yes. Since 39 percent of these mothers are working to supplement the soldier allotments from their husbands who are still in service. This does not include divorced women or women whose husbands have recently returned from service but who are not yet able to work.

Question. Child-care centers were set up as a wartime service. Is this program needed after VJ-day?

Answer. Yes. Ninety-nine percent of the mothers returning the questionnaire say that the child-care program is still necessary.

Question. Who supports these children who use the child-care centers?

Answer. Twenty percent of the mothers are sole support of the children. Although 77.9 percent receive partial support from the father, half of this group are fathers in service.

Question. Where are the fathers of these children?

Answer. The following percentages explain the whereabouts of the fathers of these children:

	Percent
Home and employed	35.6
Home but incapacitated	2.9
Still in armed forces	39.0
Missing or killed	1.4
Deceased	3.3
Other	17.8

("Other" includes all divorced, separated, and deserted mothers.)

Question. Are these mothers still employed after lay-offs in war industries?

Answer. Yes. Ninety-two and three-tenths percent of the mothers are employed at present. About 5 percent of the mothers are unemployed since VJ-day and are now looking for work.

Question. What ages are the children who require child care?

Answer. Fifty-seven and six-tenths percent of the children are between 2 and 5 years.

Question. Is this an in-migrant problem?

Answer. No. Only 15 percent of these mothers have been in Los Angeles County less than 3 years and could be considered in-migrants. One-third of the mothers were born in California.

Question. What kind of jobs do these mothers hold?

Answer. In rank order of largest percentages, mothers are employed as:

1. Secretaries, office clerks.
2. Operatives in industry.
3. Sales clerks.
4. Bookkeepers, cashiers.
5. Teachers.
6. Laborers.

Question. Could these mothers bear full cost of these centers during an interim period before proper legislation is passed?

Answer. Probably not. About 50 percent of the mothers say they could pay as much as $1 a day for a brief period; 75 cents per day is the amount which most say they are able to pay.

Question. Are mothers who have employed husbands at home justified in continuing work and using child-care centers?

Answer. Yes; in many inviidual cases. Here are a few sample remarks from some of the mothers who use child-care centers, but have employed husbands at home: "My husband is just out of service and is starting a business. It is necessary that I help him for a while until he can get a better start." "My husband is employed in shipyards now and may lose his job any day. We have five children to support. The money I make is needed to keep us going." From a Mexican cannery worker: "We have four children to support. It takes the two of us working to keep up the family expenses." "When we moved to Los Angeles we couldn't find a house to rent. We had to buy a house and if I stopped working we would lose everything because my husband's salary is too small to keep up the payments." "I am a qualified teacher with a California credential and returned to teaching because of the desperate need for teachers." "All the hospitals are short of help and overcrowded. St. Joseph's Hospital asked me to work because of the shortage of registered pharmacists everywhere at this time."

(Prepared by research department, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles.)

Accepted by emergency child-care committee, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles, October 1, 1945.)

EMERGENCY CHILD-CARE COMMITTEE WELFARE COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN LOS ANGELES—STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

I. Community obligation to our children: In order that our children, who constitute our country's most valuable asset, may receive the protection, care, nurture, and training needed for their wholesale development, the community has an obligation to provide such community facilities as may be needed to supplement and strengthen their home life.

II. Need for day-care facilities: Social and economic conditions of long standing have made it necessary for many mothers to work. These conditions, which have been accentuated by the war, will continue. To assure the welfare of their children, working mothers must arrange for day care while they work. Many mothers cannot provide this care without publicly operated facilities.

III. Value of Child Care Center Program: The present child-care center program administered by the public schools has proved to be the most effective and satisfactory means of providing these necessary day-care facilities. In addition to the educational values accruing to the children from the operation of the centers, they have helped to eliminate the "door key" child, have tended to reduce child neglect and delinquency, and have made it possible for mothers to maintain homes for their children.

IV. State responsibility: The State legislature should enact legislation needed to provide—

A. authority to the school districts to allow the continued operation of these child-care centers;

B. a practicable plan of financial support, to be based upon a combination of reasonable fees by parents, and State subsidies.

V. Federal responsibility: The Federal Government should contribute to a State child-care center program to help meet those needs which are specifically connected with military service.

United States Textile Industry Has Great Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the splendid cooperation of both employers and employees in the textile industry in providing war essentials, I call attention to the attached article from the Greenville (S. C.), News, of September 23, 1945:

UNITED STATES TEXTILE INDUSTRY HAS GREAT RECORD

(By Mary James Cottrell)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—How the textile industry stepped up production from an average output of 1,850,000,000 linear yards per quarter during the period from 1934 to 1938, to 2,588,000,000 linear yards during the first quarter of 1944, as shown by figures from the War Production Board, marks a record of achievement for southern textile mills which have played an important role in the war effort.

All too often the average person is prone to look upon statistics as cold figures. But back of all statistics there are stores of human beings. Just as back of the statistics or figures showing the remarkable record the American textile industry compiled in producing for victory in World War II are the men and women who made that record possible.

HOUSEWIVES HELP

This record of greatly increased production is the story of the housewife who took her husband's place in the factory when he went away to war. It is the story of the men and women who worked longer hours, usually 48 hours a week and sometimes as much as 54 hours in 1 week. The record of the textile industry is one upon which any industry, great or small, may well look with satisfaction. It is a record of production increased manyfold as the need for materials for the armed service grew by leaps and bounds. It meant round-the-clock operation with much of the machinery worn and obsolete—for the steel that would have gone into the needed new machinery was being made into guns and tanks. It took much planning and much ingenuity, but the textile industry, more than 80 percent of which is located in the South, was equal to the task. And the proudest part of this record is that the textile industry made its contribution to the war effort without calling to Uncle Sam for large hand-outs of public funds.

This record was compiled in the same plants in which civilian goods had been turned out in the comparative quiet of the peacetime years. While other industries were calling on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its various subsidiaries for loans and grants totaling $22,864,000,000, the textile industry borrowed only $1,353,900 from this branch of the Government to finance its expanded operations. And only $200,000 of even this comparatively trifling amount of $1,353,900 went to mills in the South. The remainder went to mills in the North or in border States.

FEW LOANS MADE

Figures compiled by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation show that through August 31, 1945, that agency made loans totaling $1,684,000,000 for war purposes to going concerns, those already operating but needing additional financing to expand production. This included the $200,000 borrowed by southern textile mills and the total of $1,353,900 borrowed by all the textile industry. But when loans made to all industries, including those made by such RFC subsidiaries as the Metals Reserve Corporation, Petroleum for War Administration, and the Rubber Reserve Administration, the total soars up to $22,864,000,000.

The cotton textile industry in common with other industries obtained certificates of necessity from the War Production Board under which they were permitted to amortize within a maximum of 5 years funds spent on improvements. The cotton textile industry can well be proud of being able to stand on its own feet during the wartime emergency and yet meet all demands made on it.

How the textile industry stepped up production from an average output of 1,850,000,000 linear yards per quarter during the period. * * * From 1934–38 to 2,588,000,000 linear yards during the first quarter of 1944, is shown by figures of the War Production Board. And this record is even more remarkable when it is taken into consideration that it was made while the armed services were drafting the younger and more able-bodied men away from their machines.

Present reports indicate that production during the present quarter will total almost 2,500,000,000 linear yards, which is 250,000,000 yards more than the WPB had set as the industry-wide goal. Production for July and August was 1,580,000,000 yards, with production in September expected to reach approximately 900,000,000 yards.

Speech of Hon. Clarence J. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN before the Giddings Club of Warren, Ohio, on October 6, 1945:

There are many reasons why it is a genuine pleasure to be with you here in Warren tonight.

First. I consider it a great honor and a real privilege to be invited to attend the annual banquet of so famous an organization as the Giddings Club, and to be asked to speak before it on the issues of the day. This is not the first of the Club's banquets I have attended, for I recall, with pleasure, previous occasions of this kind during my years of service as a State official.

Second. The acceptance of your gracious invitation has given me the opportunity to again meet and greet many of my old friends of Warren and northeastern Ohio—for, as one grows older, the truth that the friendships we make along the way are the greatest values we can gain from life becomes more evident year by year.

Third. Coming to Warren has given me a reason and an excuse to get away from the madhouse called Washington, for a little while, to mingle with you staunch and sound Americans of the old western reserve and from you to draw the strength and inspiration to continue to carry on the fight those of us in the minority have been waging on Capitol Hill for the past decade or more to preserve representative government, free enterprise and the American way of life.

The struggle has not been an easy one. Indeed, the last few years have been difficult ones to serve in the Congress of the United States—especially for a Republican. Since March 4, 1933, we have seen many changes in government and in our national life. Long before war came, waste and extravagance were the order of the day, and the political philosophy that the Government should support the people rather than that the people should support the Government was, temporarily at least, accepted by the majority.

For seven long years, prior to the inauguration of our national defense program in the early summer of 1940, the New Deal administration, then in power, based its entire approach to the domestic problems of those days upon deficit spending. Spending was the easy way out. Spending was popular—and it was politically expedient. However, it was a program which brought no real or permanent solution for any of the problems then confronting the Nation. Instead the New Deal spending program was both short-sighted and selfish, for it simply shifted the domestic problems of that day, and the debts which were being incurred, to the shoulders of those not yet endowed with the right to vote, and to their children yet unborn. The New Deal policy of the prewar years was to pass on to future generations the burdens which the Roosevelt administration and the citizenship of that day were finding difficult to carry.

But the greatest crime of thirties was not the wasting of billions upon uneconomic and foolish projects, through deficit spending, or the tripling of the national debt which resulted therefrom. The great crime of that decade—yes, perhaps the greatest crime of all our political history—was the New Deal's destruction of America's self-reliance—the self-reliance of each individual citizen which had helped so much to make this Republic the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. What price we shall pay for this tragic political and national mistake only time can tell.

And then the wars came. Wars for which we were ill-prepared because of the New Deal policies which had prevailed for more than 8 years before. Americans everywhere forgot their differences and joined in a united effort to win the conflicts in which we were engaged. Through their heroism the flaming youth of the day gave proof that within their veins still flowed the blood of their forefathers, and that they, too, loved liberty and freedom more than life. American industry, the whipping boy of the administration, met the challenge by outproducing all the rest of the world combined. From the farms of the Nation came increased food supplies, the largest in our history, despite all the handicaps which war placed upon agriculture. Labor and management forgot their differences and worked together in the common cause.

Yet even during the darkest days of the struggle, while the Battle of Armageddon swung in the balance, there were those who continued to carry on—from within the Government structure as well as from without—their damnable endeavors to destroy representative government, as we have known it, and to set up in its place some sort of a socialized state. At the very time young Americans were fighting and dying to protect the liberty of others, there were those here at home who were planning and plotting to do away with our own liberty and to crush our own freedom.

When Mr. Truman came to the Presidency, Americans everywhere were hopeful the beginning of his administration would mark the ending of New Deal rule and the return to a sounder system of Government. Mr. Truman started off well, and with the good wishes of every true American. His announcement of victories in Europe and in the Pacific, his reporting of surrender terms, his lifting of rationing and restrictions, and his abolishment of a few wartime agencies, were all popular, as well as noncontroversial, actions. But as the weeks of Mr. Truman's administration grew into months, more and more citizens began to ask the question: What will President Truman do on domestic issues—will he turn to the right, will he steer a middle-of-the-road course, or will he swing to the left?

President Truman gave his answer to this question in his message to the Congress early in September. No one can read that message without knowing exactly where Mr. Truman stands. In it he did not bear to the right, keep in the middle of the road, or swing to the left. Instead he made a sharp and square turn to the left, and started down the New Deal highway at a full gallop.

In his message the President covered 21 issues or questions of domestic policy. On two of these—his pledge to care for the veterans of this war, and his proposal to reduce taxes as quickly as possible—everyone is in agreement. But of the other 19 proposals contained in the Presidential message, 13 were a reiteration and reaffirmation of New Deal policies carried over from the Roosevelt administration, and six were New Deal proposals which go even further than anything ever suggested by Mr. Roosevelt.

Let us stop for a moment and consider the President's 16,000-word message to the Congress outlining his program for reconversion and for postwar America. In it you will find nothing different from the spending program of his predecessor. Mr. Truman's formula for solving the problems of today is the same old New Deal formula of spending; spending for unemployment compensation instead of jobs on the pay rolls of converted industries; spending to guarantee Government jobs when spending to provide private jobs fails; spending to pay subsidies to agriculture and on food products; spending to provide Government housing; spending for research to compete with privately endowed research; spending to build unnecessary public works; spending to build duplicates of the TVA; spending for socialized medicine; and the spending of Federal funds, in numerous other ways, to urge or compel State and local governments to go deeper into debt.

Here are just a few of the spending proposals, now pending before Congress, which have either the direct or the implied endorsement of Mr. Truman and his administration, and which, if adopted, promise to make necessary a peacetime Federal budget of approximately $50,000,000,000 a year. One bill would appropriate $550,000,000 annually for Federal aid to education, while another seeks $100,000,000 per year for aiding vocational education; a food-stamp plan costing $500,000,000 per year; $200,000,000 for rural electrification in 1946; and an additional $585,000,000 for future years; $50,000,000 for Government-sponsored telephone service; $110,000,000 per year for Federal aid to local hospitals; other Federal-aid health programs costing $600,000,000 each year; a school-lunch program of $100,000,000 annually; $50,000,000 to eliminate river pollution; $50,000,000 annually for aeronautical experiments; additional public housing subsidies of $80,000,000 per year; veterans' bonus legislation totaling $13,000,000,000; increased salaries and a 30-hour week for Federal employees, costing $500,000,000 a year; an additional $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA; $500,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation; from three to fifteen billion dollars in additional loans to foreign governments, which may or may not be repaid; funds for highway construction totaling $3,000,000,000; Federal aid for airport construction to cost $1,000,000,000;

unemployment compensation contributions of from one billion to two billion dollars; new river valley authorities costing from five to ten billion dollars; Federal spending to guarantee employment at the rate of a billion dollars for every 1,000,000 jobs provided; and a dozen or more similar proposals I will not take the time to mention.

Many of these projects may be worthy and desirable, providing we could pay for them out of surplus or current income, but remember, the administration proposes to do all of these on borrowed money, and while we are in debt nearly $300,000,000,000.

Oh, yes; Mr. Truman is promising to give more people more money out of the Federal Treasury than ever before and still reduce taxes. He is proposing a postwar program of domestic spending which will cost from three to five times as much annually as the Roosevelt administration ever spent in any one peacetime year. And yet he promises taxes will be materially reduced, despite a lower national income and a Federal debt which is already up to the $275,000,000,000 mark.

Well, it will be a good trick if he can do it.

Yes; Mr. Truman has made his decision. The country now knows the political philosophy which will guide his administration. It is, and will be, a radical philosophy; a philosophy of government even more radical than the original New Deal philosophy; a political philosophy which is just one more long step toward turning this Nation into a socialized state.

Mr. Truman has turned his back on the conservative members of his own party, and on sound Americans everywhere. He has chosen to march along with the left wingers. He has made this decision for the Democratic Party, which he heads. Make no mistake about it—the Democratic Party has become a radical party. Its strength is drawn from radical sources. It believes in and preaches radical doctrines. It engages in radical practices.

We who belong to the Republican Party, and have been given positions of power and influence within it, must now make our decision. We must decide whether our party is to follow along with Mr. Truman and his brand of New Deal political philosophy, as a sort of second-rate liberal party, or whether we are to take a strong and constructive position as the Nation's conservative party. The American people are demanding the opportunity of choosing between the radical and conservative philosophies and forms of government. I believe we should give them that opportunity and right of choice. If we do not, then some other political party will.

But don't let anyone try to tell you that to be conservative means to be reactionary; or against progress; or opposed to change and reform; or desirous of clinging to obsolete or outmoded methods.

No; by the use of the word conservative I mean we should and must, as a party, oppose the radical philosophies of the Truman New Deal administration which we know can result only in the final destruction of the Republic, the crushing of American liberty and freedom, and untold misery and suffering for our people.

Here on this continent and in this Nation stands the last bulwark of human and political freedom. Elsewhere in the world the tides of dictatorship and totalitarianism are at full flood. At this moment our citadel of democracy is being threatened. If it is to continue to stand we must defend it well.

The Republican Party must champion and fight for the continuance and the strengthening of representative government. We must follow the admonition of Thomas Jefferson and make representative government here in America work so well as to inspire the other peoples of the world to follow our example. We must stand as the defenders of the Constitution. We must make certain that those who serve in high places within the Government of the United States shall remain the servants of the people and shall never become their masters.

During the last few years we have wandered a long way down the road which leads to the loss of liberty. The American people have been the victims of regimentation. Bureaucracy has developed into a civic cancer which is gnawing away our very vitals. Waste and extravagance sap our national strength and endanger our financial stability. We are headed toward becoming a decadent Nation. Yet, the Democratic Party continues to follow the very same practices and policies which have led other nations to their doom. If this Nation is to survive as our forefathers constituted it, we must return to the principles they enunciated and to the practices they followed. Call these policies and practices old-fashioned and conservative, if you will. They gave us the greatest freedom and prosperity ever enjoyed by any people in the history of mankind.

Yes; the Republican Party can best serve by championing the old-fashioned, conservative and sound principles of representative and constitutional government, and by protecting and defending private enterprise.

In the short space of 150 years our free enterprise system has made America the most productive and the most prosperous Nation in all the world. It has provided our people with a plane of living unequaled elsewhere on this old earth of ours. By the continuance of the free enterprise system—and only through its continuance—can we guarantee the youth of today the opportunities they seek.

We have seen the dictator nations—the socialized states—the totalitarian countries, defeated and crushed on the battlefield by the strength, the courage, and the faith of free men who had something to fight for—the preservation of their liberty and the freedom of their loved ones. We have seen the American free enterprise system, and American free labor, out-produce all of the state-controlled factories and all the slave labor of the dictator nations combined, and pour fourth such a great flood of war material as to virtually drown our enemies.

The youth of today, who fought and won this war, on half a hundred far-flung battle fronts, have seen enough of foreign isms and totalitarian governments. No land looks so good to them as America. They want no part of giving up their liberty on the plea its surrender is necessary to guarantee security. They have learned, in the holocaust of war, to depend upon themselves. They know the peoples of other nations who have surrendered their liberty have also lost their security. They know that representative government is the greatest form of government ever devised by man. They know the free enterprise system gave to them the weapons with which to win.

These fighting men of ours, who are now returning home, want no unfair advantage. All they ask is that they be given the opportunity, under representative government and the free-enterprise system, to carve out their own careers. They want no bureaucratic officials to tell them what they can or cannot do. They have had enough of regimentation.

The Republican Party, and the Republican Party alone, offers to these young men and women, who are now coming home from the armed forces, the kind of government in which they believe and the kind of opportunity they seek.

The Republican Party must repudiate and prove the fallacy of the New Deal contention that the Government owes every citizen a living—or even a job. All that any government owes to any citizen, or all it can long give, is the opportunity to get a job and to earn a living—the opportunity to do with his life that which he will, subject only to the rights of others.

The Republican Party must continue to oppose the New Deal practice of restricting production and dividing up shortages. Instead our party must sponsor an expanding dynamic economy. Through the free-enterprise system we must have as our goal increased production and better distribution. America is not suffering from overproduction, but from underconsumption. We, as a party, must see to it that more of the good things of life are produced and that more of our citizens are given the opportunity and the wherewithal to consume them.

If we are to restore and rebuild that which has been destroyed in the wars just ended; if we are to attain the complete fulfillment of our national destiny; if we are to enjoy a higher plane of living and a happier and more secure future here in America, then we must restore incentive for more work and greater production, and maintain and expand the profit motive.

We might even take a page from the handbook of Soviet Russia and insist that while every worker is worthy of his hire, and is entitled to a living wage, he who produces the most, shows the best talent, has the highest efficiency, or demonstrates the greatest skill, shall be additionally compensated according to his ability and the value of his contributions to the welfare of all. Thus would be given an incentive for producing more for the benefit of mankind and for the increasing of our national wealth. After all, if we are to pay the great national debt now saddled upon us, if the people are to live on a higher plane than ever before, then we must create new wealth, and wealth can be created only through production.

The Republican Party must protect the American people against exploitation, either from within or from without. We must not only guarantee full opportunity and a decent wage to him who labors, but we must insure industry against unfair competition, regardless of its source, and give to capital a fair return on its investment. In compensation therefor, labor, capital, business, and industry must never fail to consider the rights of the consuming public.

Labor must be protected in its rights to organize, to bargain colectively, to strike against unfair working conditions; but it must not forget its responsibility to keep its own house in order, to live up to its contracts, and to respect the rights of others. Business and industry must abandon cartels, patent controls, and secret agreements which too often in the past have retarded production and resulted in higher prices. Some must learn that instead of producing a few units at high profit per unit, there are equal earnings, and perhaps greater ones, to be found in increased production and lower profit per unit.

The benefits which accrue from scientific development, better manufacturing methods, and the greater production of labor must be divided equitably between the worker, management, capital, consumer, and government. Thus all will profit. Employment will be greater, wages better, industry more prosperous, and the national income higher. It is the only way America can go forward.

The program the New Deal is offering is one of deficit spending; of increased debt; of regimentation and restriction; of lessening opportunity; of public doles. In the end such a program can only result in the loss of both liberty and security. It is the program of defeatism and decadence. It can only end in the destruction of our Republic, just as the French Republic was destroyed—destruction which comes from deterioration within.

The Republican Party offers the American people a conservative program based on sound constitutional government. It is also a truly progressive program—one which will give to every American the opportunity and

the incentive to succeed in life. It is a program which will guarantee each citizen liberty under law, freedom from regimentation, the right to order his own life, a higher plane of living, security in work, life, and property, and a full share of the wealth he produces.

The Republican Party offers to every American full protection against ever becoming a simple statistic in a socialized state, and pledges full voice and participation in the affairs of a prosperous nation, firmly anchored in the solid foundation of a representative and constitutional form of government.

I am convinced that if this Nation is to saved, if representative government is to long continue, if our people are to prosper, then the Republican Party must lead the way.

Need I remind you the strength of our great party rests in you and others like you? Must I remind you that to win control of the Presidency and the Government in 1948 we need win control of the Congress in 1946? And need I remind you that if we are to win control of the Congress in 1946 we must win in the local elections of 1945?

The political campaign in which you are now engaged, here in this community, is of the greatest importance. A Republican victory here in November will give the strength and the encouragement to fight the harder and to win a greater victory next November; all in preparation for returning our America back to sound, sane constitutional government in 1948.

I know those of you who are here will do your full share now and in the future to make certain this "government of the people by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Golden Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1945

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of October 1, 1945:

GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

President Truman has protested that the United States Senate let him down by not immediately accepting his $25-a-week jobless pay proposal.

Without going into the question of whether his present attitude is in harmony with his earlier promises to listen to congressional opinion, there is a quite different rejoinder to be made:

It might be well for the President to worry lest he is guilty of letting down the hopes of Americans and all other citizens of the world by his refusal to take a realistic attitude toward British demands for loans.

A golden opportunity came within the President's grasp when the new Socialist regime in England decided that they were not too anticapitalist to try to raise some capital in capitalistic United States.

The President might have demanded, as virtually the sole condition for such a loan, that Great Britain consent to show this Nation the same cooperation in striving for peace and justice that she has shown in wars—particularly during wars in which British self-preservation was at stake.

There is nothing selfish in such a demand. It would further the cause of world humanity, of peace, justice, progress, and prosperity. No nation has higher and more unselfish ideals than the United States.

Yet neither the State Department nor the President appears to have either the vision or the courage to put this on the line.

Unless Congress intervenes, it seems likely that the loan will be granted; subject to some self-deceptive conditions as to term and interest, of course, but with no agreement whatsoever that it will not promptly be used against the interests of this Nation and against the type of international federation of friendly nations which is the American concept of proper world politics.

If England gets the money under conditions which allow her to do what she makes no secret she would like—use it to build up a tight trading bloc in a forthcoming international trade war—the United States will be chief economic sufferer in future years.

This produces a paradox: if England is denied the money, it will ruin her; if she gets it, it will ruin us.

Quite as much of a paradox is the threat that money from free-enterprise America is to be used to finance the bitterly anticapitalistic program of national socialism in England. It takes money for a government to buy up and nationalize banks, basic industries, and land—and it still remains to be disproven that this is the real purpose of the English application for our loans.

Neither American security nor world security would be advanced by such a happening; communism, even somewhat diluted, has thus far produced more dictators than peace.

Most emphatically England needs to be told that she can have billions for a program of harmonious cooperation with America looking to world peace, justice, and prosperity—but not one cent for trade wars, anti-American alliances, or state socialism.

Has President Truman the vision and backbone to make England take this condition and like it?

This remains to be seen.

The present outlook is not hopeful.

If he fails, it will at least keep the record clean. Woodrow Wilson plunged the United States into an expensive and bloody struggle for the rescue of England in the First World War—without getting Lloyd George's signature on the dotted line in advance for a League of Nations or any other form of world cooperation.

Result: World War II.

Franklin Roosevelt plunged us into a "nonshooting war" to save England from Hitler, and thence we went all the way with our men, our money, and our future—again without getting England to promise to stand by us for peace as we stood by her for war.

Churchill, so great was the emergency, would have signed a real Atlantic Charter quite as willingly as he agreed to lend his name to a publicity stunt aimed at deluding the world into thinking he actually had signed.

Result: The present sorry state of justice and harmony in what is still optimistically called the United Nations.

Three Democratic Presidents in a row, each under different circumstances, all had a chance to put John Bull under bond to stand up in peace for what he said he stood for during war.

Two struck out.

What about it, Mr. President?